UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 8

MAY 3, 1966, TO MAY 18, 1966
(PAGES 9511 TO 10980)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1966

J
11
.R
v.112
pt. 8

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord and Father of us all, we are recipients of the showers of blessings of life.

Physically, we are dependent upon Thee. Thou hast created us. Thou dost give to us air to breathe, and life to live. Strengthen us physically.

Mentally, we receive from being created in Thy image the power to think, to plan, and to live intelligently. Help us to use our mental capacities to find a better life for ourselves and others.

Spiritually, we are souls—the breath of God—the kingdom of God within. We are at unrest unless we rest in Thee. Quicken our spirit within.

Bless this U.S. Senate session and these Members to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight. Empower the President and all leaders of the world with spiritual insight to find peace even for our day. We pray in the name of our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. INOUYE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 2, 1966, was dispensed with.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls for the presentation of petitions and memorials.

The Chair calls for reports of standing and select committees.

The Chair calls for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

The Chair lays before the Senate for second reading a bill which has been read the first time.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. May a motion be made to refer the bill now about to be read to a committee, with the requirement that the committee report it to the Senate on a day certain, after the bill has been read the second time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. After the second reading, such motion would be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make this suggestion to the leadership, if I may: I do not know whether I shall make a motion or not, because I have not had an opportunity to ask the leadership about their intentions upon this matter; and rather than make a motion, which would allow me to debate it and then perhaps withdraw it, or follow some other artificial procedure, may I ask the majority and minority leaders if there would be any objections to proceeding for 15 minutes, at this stage, to discuss the subject, and then have the clerk read the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is such a motion in order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If it were a unanimous-consent request, it would be in order, but such a motion is not in order. The Chair is indulging the Senator from New York. The bill should be read a second time before a motion to refer would be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of that fact, then, I would suggest that the bill be read the second time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill the second time.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3296) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have heard rumors that such a proposal has been advanced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York. I have had no definite information to that effect. But I have stated publicly, and I state again, that I shall speak against a proposal to refer the bill just introduced to a committee, with instructions to report back at a time certain. I would also vote against such a proposal, if it came to that.

But if the Senator from New York will indulge me, I should like to say this: It is always the intention of the joint leadership to insure that every measure introduced receives fair and orderly consideration by this body and its committees. It is also our policy to permit every committee of this body to exercise its jurisdiction over measures introduced. It is for this reason that the joint leadership opposes any divergence from this policy with respect to the bill introduced by Senator HART and other Senators last Thursday. In conjunction with this general policy, the joint leadership does not preempt any parliamentary option available to assure that every measure receives fair and orderly consideration in the event future circumstances dictate a change in tactics.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes at this point, with the right to yield to other Senators without losing my right to the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the main purpose for which I delayed the bill's being read a second time may be served by a discussion of the matter at this time.

It is already clear, Mr. President, that we are embroiled in what I believe was a foreseeable and avoidable controversy over the housing and antidiscrimination provisions of title IV of the administration's bill (S. 3296), which I blocked for a second reading last Thursday, so as to give us time to consider the appropriate strategy to secure passage of the bill. A motion to refer the bill until a day certain may not be wise at this time.

The bill has just come in. The House has not even had a chance to consider the bill, or to act. And I know one inevitable thing, Mr. President: With this kind of issue in the bill, any such motion would be snowed under, and this measure would receive a black eye which it does not deserve.

So, because of the fairness of the leadership in not denying me this opportunity to discuss the matter, I do not intend to block its reference today, for these reasons:

First, another similar bill can always be introduced, by me or any other Senator, the same procedure gone through, and the motion made to report on a day certain, which might, at a later date, have much more chance of success than this motion now.

Secondly, as the majority leader has properly said, when a bill comes over from the other body, that bill can be held at the desk after a second reading. Any Senator may object, after the second reading, to its reference, and this would automatically place the bill on the calendar.

Let us remember that on two occasions—in 1957 and in 1964—we passed civil rights bills which came over from the House using that parliamentary tactic, and on two occasions—in 1960 and in 1965—we sent civil rights bills to a committee with the requirement that they report it on a day certain. That accounts for all four previous bills. So there will be—and I think the people who are deeply interested should be assured of this—no deprivation of our rights to get action on this bill; on the contrary, a defeat today would, as I have stated, unduly damage its chances.

But, Mr. President, I wish to enter a protest—a very sharp protest, because it will be a very important feature of this whole situation—against the tactic which has been adopted by the administration in respect to this measure. I approve completely—and I have introduced similar bills, as have others—the features of this measure with respect to jury selection and punishment for interference with the effort to enforce the civil rights of another. But, Mr. President, the key to this bill has already been flagged as the antidiscrimination in housing section, title IV, over which we are now embroiled in a foreseeable and avoidable controversy.

Mr. President, it must be crystal clear to the country that the administration has invited a bitter civil rights fight, in which it may lose upon this issue, when the President could, by a stroke of the pen, cover more than 80 percent of the housing supply in the United States by extending the existing Executive order against discrimination in housing to all housing which has any relationship to or benefits from the Federal Government. The existing Executive order covers only the initial sale of FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed housing which was insured or guaranteed on the date of the issuance of the order, November 1962. This covers approximately 20 percent of the total housing supply.

By extending the order, by Executive order, to conventionally financed housing which is financed through banks and savings and loan institutions whose deposits are guaranteed by FDIC or FSLIC, the President could cover more than 80 percent of the total housing supply.

Instead the administration has chosen to seek an act of Congress to achieve virtually the same result and in doing so has put the entire bill and especially the antihousing bias provisions in grave jeopardy. The impact of failure in this most crucial cause of urban blight could be disastrous. I believe that a very great mistake is being made by choosing this path.

I and others have constantly importuned the President to expand the Executive order. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I wrote to the President on this matter on September 16, 1965, and a statement which I, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] made on that same subject, in December 1965.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1965.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As I have long been one of those who have argued that the power of Federal funds could be the most powerful single instrument for achieving equal opportunity, I deeply believe that there is a great need to expand this principle in the field of housing discrimination. Accordingly, I urge that the great power of the Federal antidiscrimination policy, which has now been enunciated by all three branches of the Government, could be made effective in this field through the extension of the 1962 Executive Order No. 11063 against discrimination in housing to all housing assisted by the Federal Government. This would include housing conventionally financed through lending institutions whose accounts are guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or which are supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank System. It would also extend to all federally aided housing built or contracted for prior to the November 20, 1962, cutoff date in the present order.

Having followed closely the impact of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, I have been most heartened by the reports of progress which has begun to be achieved, for example, in school desegregation, because of the possibility that Federal funds would be withheld.

The constitutional basis for reaching all Federal funding and support in housing is the same as in the cases of the existing Executive order and title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The moral basis for doing so need not be argued.

Despite all our efforts up to now, racial ghettos are a corrosive fact in our cities and towns and are to a significant extent the result of a racially discriminatory housing market. The inability of Negro families to move into improved housing in the cities and suburbs, once they are financially able to do so, is a serious contributing factor toward widespread dissatisfaction and unrest.

President Kennedy's 1962 housing order was a valuable first step forward in the field of housing discrimination. But, since it covered only FHA- and VA-financed housing built or contracted for after November 20, 1962, the order presently reaches only approximately 25 percent of the Nation's federally assisted housing supply and only about 18 percent of the total new housing supply. A number of responsible industry representatives have themselves urged extension of the housing order to eliminate this very serious gap in the Federal Government's equal opportunity program.

I respectfully urge that the Executive order be expanded in the indicated manner at the earliest possible time.

With warm regards.
Sincerely,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

THREE REPUBLICAN SENATORS URGE PRESIDENTIAL DECREE ON HOUSING DISCRIMINATIONS

Three Republican Senators today called upon President Johnson to issue a new Executive order against discrimination which would broaden its impact to all federally assisted housing. At the same time, they deplored reported administration plans to send to Congress a bill to broaden the 1962 Executive order against discrimination in housing instead of issuing a new Executive order. They called the reported request for legislation wholly unnecessary and said it would needlessly delay an effective Federal policy against racial prejudice in housing.

The three Senators—Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York; Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey; and Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania—issued this statement:

"We are deeply concerned about the recent published reports that Attorney General Katzenbach has recommended to the President that he should not issue an Executive order expanding the coverage of the 1962 Executive order against discrimination in housing, and that the administration is now considering instead sending a bill to Congress for this purpose. In our view, such legislation is wholly unnecessary since the President has constitutional power to amend the Executive order already in effect. A request to Congress for such legislation would needlessly delay the development of an effective Federal policy against racial discrimination in housing.

"Despite all our efforts up to now, racial ghettos continue undeniably to be a higher corrosive influence in our cities and towns and are to a significant extent the result of a racially discriminatory housing market. President Kennedy's 1962 housing order was a valuable first step forward, but because it covered only FHA- and VA-financed housing, built or contracted for after November 20, 1962, it presently reaches only approximately 25 percent of the Nation's federally assisted housing supply and only about 18 percent of the total new housing supply; the remainder includes a large percentage of conventional mortgages issued by lending institutions whose deposits are guaranteed by U.S. Government agencies.

"A newly expanded housing order would have a significant impact only if it covered all housing assisted by the Federal Government, including housing conventionally financed through lending institutions whose accounts are guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or which are supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank System. Such a broadened order should also cover all federally aided housing built or contracted prior to the November 20, 1962, cutoff date in the present order.

"The constitutional basis for reaching all Federal funding and support in housing by Executive order is the same as in the case of the existing Executive order. The moral and constitutional bases for doing so are an integral part of the great civil rights reform of the last decade. It would be tragic to delay further the effectiveness of the Federal antidiscrimination policy in housing."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, let it be made crystal clear that we will go through all the mechanics. I am confident that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] will have reasonably early hearings. For example, I am told that he is planning hearings in 2 or 3 weeks. That, of course, is a long way from having a bill reported. The agreement seems to be that we will wait for a bill from the other body, and then we will catch it at the desk and have the traditional civil rights debate, the filibuster, and the need for watering down or emasculating the bill, because we cannot break a filibuster in view of the already announced vigorous opposition which, with his customary eloquence and sincerity, my own minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has voiced.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator suspend for a moment?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question of time is not involved here. Time was called for, but unanimous consent was not requested.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the administration has now made its choice and, therefore, the administration bears *the responsibility. If I say nothing else* today, let that be crystal clear. The administration will have to deliver on antidiscrimination in housing, using the means which it has chosen, or be subject to a charge that by its own choice of means it has destroyed the opportunity for ending a great deal of discrimination in housing a great deal sooner than it might otherwise have been ended.

One other point to which I should like to refer is the feeling which has been expressed that the antidiscrimination in housing provision in the bill sent to us by the President—I believe it was included in the bill most unwisely but, nonetheless, it is there—is unconstitutional. I cannot agree with that. I do not believe that it is unconstitutional. I stand with the Attorney General of the United States who, I assume, impliedly certifies his view as to the bill's constitutionality when it is sent here as an administration bill.

The housing industry in the United States is substantially an interstate industry in supplies, in labor, and in financing. And Congress has validly undertaken to deal, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, with housing of all levels, including single family dwellings, in a great variety of enactments, including a whole series of housing acts, under a number of regulatory agencies such as the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and in numerous labor relations enactments. These enactments have for decades been unchallenged parts of our Federal law, despite their obviously great impact on what, prior to their passage, had been entirely a matter subject of individual contractual relationships on a local basis.

But I do seriously question the decision, the judgment, of inviting the argument on constitutionality here, when almost the total result, reaching more than 80 percent of the housing supply, could have been obtained by adhering to the same rules of constitutionality upon which the original Executive order was based and which have stood the test of time these last few years. Accordingly, Mr. President, the battle is on. I believe that the administration has been very unwise in its first move. I believe that it has jeopardized, by that move, a serious aspect of what is still needed in terms of civil rights legislation.

I do not abandon the hope that if the President runs into a brick wall on the housing provisions—as I believe he will, and as has already been indicated that he will—he may still issue an Executive order.

I have never posed as the sole aspostle of equal opportunity for our people. There are many men in this Chamber, in the other body, and in the country, who feel as deeply and are as wise and alert as I am. However, I believe that the time has come for them to speak up, and I hope that many of them will.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the statement made upon introduction of the administration bill by the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, which, since 1950, has been the national clearinghouse on antidiscrimination in housing, representing 41 major national religious, civil rights, labor, and civic organizations; I also ask unanimous consent to include an article stating the legal case for extending the Executive order.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NCDH POSITION REGARDING PROPOSED FEDERAL ANTIDISCRIMINATION HOUSING LEGISLATION, APRIL 28, 1966

(Statement by the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing (NCDH))

The proposed Federal Antidiscrimination Housing Act is totally inadequate to meet today's critical national problem of the explosive racial ghetto. Twenty-five years ago, such an act by Congress might have established the posture of the National Government as opposed to racial discrimination and prevented the use of FHA and VA guarantees, resources of the Home Loan Bank Board, savings and loan associations, and other federally guaranteed lending institutions from creating the massive lily-white suburban rings surrounding and constricting and swelling our tension-filled, inner-core black ghettos. This proposal is too little and too late to effect the affirmative and immediate step required.

Congressional action in 1866, as stated in section 1982 of title 42 of the United States Code, established 100 years ago that a Negro shall have the same real property rights as white citizens. Neither President nor Congress has seen fit to enforce these rights; instead, the Congress has abdicated its control of vast billions of dollars in housing appropriations since the 1930's to the will of the executive department and the whim of the real estate and mortgage lending industries. They have been allowed, with Federal sanction and Federal support, to follow the custom of the marketplace to restrict the housing choices of Negroes and other minorities and segregate them in multiplying and expanding ethnic ghettos in growing urban communities over the country.

The proposed bill, even if it could be strengthened and ultimately passed after long and divisive debate, could not alone have appreciable effect on the accelerating racial tensions created by a ghetto way of life. In fact, such a proposal at this strategic moment may raise false hope among the Negro masses which cannot possibly be fulfilled by this proposal. With or without this additional legislation, the key to today's racial problems in housing lies right now in the hands of the President and his executive department, including the recently established and powerful Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The President has not been reluctant to use his executive powers in others areas to bring about needed reforms. Under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for example, he has alternately tightened and then loosened the purse strings under executive control in order to effect desegregation of schools, health and other facilities, in North and South alike, wherever Federal funds or powers are directly or indirectly involved.

It now remains for him to make comparable use of executive control of the vast Federal funds, credits and powers available for the planning, development, and marketing of housing accommodations, utilities and facilities in projects, neighborhoods and large parts of entire communities. Every day these funds are being used more to segregate Negroes than to include them. The President has the power now to require the use of these funds and powers to bring about dispersion and inclusion, rather than segregation and exclusion. He must exercise this choice every day, whether or not he *ultimately achieves national antidiscrimination* housing legislation with adequate enforcement machinery.

Furthermore, he now has before Congress vast and sweeping housing legislation to reshape urban communities. Unless the President directs the control and use of funds and powers, these new programs will surely accentuate the ghetto problems of a Watts or a Harlem long before the limited effect of any national antidiscrimination law could be applied. In that event, the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing could not support the adoption of any current or new national housing programs until the President moves to exercise affirmatively the great powers now in his hands.

NCDH has always favored the concept of insuring equal opportunity under laws which provide machinery for effective enforcement. We do not oppose this antidiscrimination legislation, although at this juncture we believe it to be of little moment. Until the President exercises to the fullest the pervasive Executive powers already in his hands to bring Negroes back into the stream on national and community life, he will not have redeemed the pledge in his landmark address at Howard University on June 4, 1965.

On that historic day in June 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson said:

"But freedom is not enough. You do not wipe away the scars of centuries by saying, 'now you are free. You can go where you want or do as you desire, and choose the leaders you please.' You do not take a person who for years has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him up to the starting line of the race and then say, 'You can compete with all the others,' and still justly believe that you have been completely fair. Thus, it is not enough just to open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates."

We strongly and vigorously commend the President for having taken this position. We now call—and while the Congress works its will, shall continue to call—upon President Lyndon B. Johnson to give meaning to those words with affirmative Executive action to insure that the Nation's housing and related programs and resources are administered to provide true equality of opportunity for all Americans, and with the specific goal of wiping out the ghetto way of life which afflicts our whole society.

THE EXECUTIVE ORDER ON HOUSING AND CONVENTIONAL FINANCING

(By Martin E. Sloane*)

(NOTE.—This article states the legal case for extending the Executive Order (No. 11063) prohibiting discrimination in federally aided housing to reach the conventional mortgage lending market. It was prepared for presentation at the National Legal Conference on Equal Opportunity in Housing, held February 5–6, 1965, under the joint sponsorship of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing and the University of California Law School at Berkeley. Well documented, it is of especial value at this time when NCDH and its member agencies are leading an accelerated effort to secure expansion of the order and strengthening of its implementation. Mr. Sloane's article is being distributed to religious, civil rights, labor, civic, and other community leaders throughout the country.—National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, 323 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10016, April 1965.)

---

* A.B., 1949, New York University; M.A., 1950, University of Michigan; LL.B., 1958, Columbia University. Attorney, Office of General Counsel, Housing and Home Finance Agency. Former Chief, housing section, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. This paper is a revision of an article which Prof. Monroe H. Freedman and I wrote for the Howard Law Journal shortly after Executive Order No. 11063 was issued. See Sloane and Freedman, "The Executive Order on Housing: The Constitutional Basis for What It Fails To Do," 9 How. L.J. 1 (1963). The views expressed in this paper are, of course, those of the author and do not purport to express the position of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

LIMITATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER

From the time of its issuance, it has been quite apparent that President Kennedy's Executive order on equal opportunity in housing[1] is a limited one. This is true in at least two senses. First of all, the principal thrust of the order, as set forth in section 101, relates almost entirely to housing and related facilities provided through Federal aid agreements executed after the order's effective date of November 20, 1962.[2] Thus, existing housing that previously received Federal assistance and housing that is still receiving such assistance is unaffected by section 101 if the assistance agreement was entered into before November 20, 1962. Moreover, housing that has not yet even been built is, in many cases, unaffected by section 101 for the same reason. This is of particular significance in connection with the urban renewal and public housing programs because of the long timelag between execution of the agreement for Federal financial assistance and the ultimate construction and occupancy of the housing so aided.[3] The critical cutoff date for purposes of section 101 of the Executive order, it must be remembered, is the date on which the financial assistance is agreed to be made, not the date on which the housing is constructed or occupied, nor even the date on which money changes hands.

Housing provided under pre-Executive order Federal aid agreements is covered by section 102 of the order, known popularly as the good offices section.[4] Experience after 2 years under the Executive order indicates that the use of good offices alone is inadequate to secure compliance.[5]

To some extent, of course, the problems of enforcement under section 102 are transitory. The principal lack of success has occurred in connection with FHA-aided single-family housing. Here, however, the timelag between the Federal aid agreement (FHA commitment) and the construction and occupancy of the housing is the shortest,[6] and in fact, all FHA-aided single-family housing now being sold by builders and developers, or to be sold in the future, is covered by section 101 and is, therefore, subject to the mandatory requirement of nondiscrimination. In this program, at least, section 102 is a dead letter.[7]

In addition, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964[8] has virtually eliminated the 102 problems in connection with the urban renewal and public housing programs. Pursuant to the HHFA regulations effectuating title VI,[9] and the URA requirements implementing that regulation,[10] all urban renewal projects that had not reached the land disposition stage[11] by January 4, 1965, are subject to the nondiscrimination requirements of title VI, regardless of the date on which the loan and grant contract was executed. In view of the fact that the time lag between execution of the loan and grant contract and disposition of the project land is often 5 years or more, and that the urban renewal program has only begun to have a significant impact in terms of project completion, it can be seen that title VI has the effect of subjecting the great bulk of urban renewal activity to the requirement of nondiscrimination.[11a]

In public housing, all low-rent projects still receiving annual contributions from the Public Housing Administration on January 4, 1965 are subject to the requirements of title VI, regardless of the date on which the annual contributions contract was executed.[12] This means that virtually every public housing project authorized since 1937, when the program was initiated, is subject to the mandatory requirements of title VI. Here, too, then, section 102 is a dead letter.

The principal programs for which section 102 is still a live issue are the FHA multifamily programs, in that all FHA programs are exempt from coverage under title VI.[12a] In the single-family program, it will be recalled, the problems of section 102 are at an end in that all homes coming on the market through builders aided by FHA are now subject to section 101. In the multifamily programs, on the other hand, landlords managing apartment houses built with the aid of pre-Executive order FHA commitments are under no FHA requirement of nondiscrimination. Here, it is quite apparent that some means more forceful than the use of "good offices" will have to be used to open up the hundreds of thousands of pre-Executive order FHA-aided multifamily units on the market.[13]

The second shortcoming of the Executive order relates to the limited kinds of Federal assistance made subject to its provisions. While the order is addressed to generally "all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government," its command of nondiscrimination affects only a fraction of the home financing in which Federal agencies play a part. The major inadequacy is that mortgage lending institutions are affected only to the extent that they engage in FHA and VA loans.[14] Housing provided through conventional financing by federally supervised mortgage lenders is excluded from coverage entirely. The institutions omitted are commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations. As of the end of 1963 they commanded, in the aggregate, resources of $470 billion.[15] They also represent the major source of conventional mortgages, and it is, in fact, through them that most of the Nation's home financing is done.

For example in 1963, the dollar amount of home loans made was $36.9 billion.[16] of this amount, only $8.6 billion (23 percent) were loans insured by FHA or guaranteed by VA.[17] Of the remaining $28.3 billion—representing conventional loans—$22.1 billion were loans made by commercial and mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations.[18] Moreover, the combination of Government-underwritten loans and conventional loans made by the above institutions totalled $30.7 billion—83 percent of all home loans made in 1963. Almost all of these institutions receive substantial Federal benefit and are subject to close Federal regulation and supervision by one or more Federal agencies.

---

[1] Executive Order No. 11063, 27 Federal Register 11527 (1962).

[2] Sec. 101 directs that "all action necessary and appropriate" be taken to prevent discrimination with respect to housing and related facilities that are "owned or operated by the Federal Government" (sec. 101(a)(i)) or are assisted by the Federal Government in any of the following ways:

(ii) "Provided in whole or in part with the aid of loans, advances, grants, or contributions hereafter agreed to be made by the Federal Government, or (iii) provided in whole or in part by loans hereafter insured, guaranteed, or otherwise secured by the credit of the Federal Government, or (iv) provided by the development or the redevelopment of real property purchased, leased, or otherwise obtained from a State or local public agency receiving Federal financial assistance for slum clearance or urban renewal with respect to such real property under a loan or grant contract hereafter entered into."

[3] For example, in the urban renewal program the lapse of time between the execution of the loan and grant contract and the ultimate completion of the project may be as long as 8 years, or more.

[4] Sec. 102 directs Federal departments and agencies "to use their good offices and to take other appropriate action permitted by law, including the institution of appropriate litigation, if required, to promote the abandonment of discriminatory practices with respect to residential property and related facilities heretofore provided with Federal financial assistance."

[5] For a discussion of the comparative ineffectiveness of the use of "good offices," and the legal basis for more forceful action under sec. 102, see Sloane, "One Year's Experience: Current and Potential Impact of the Housing Order," 32 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 457 (1964).

[6] FHA commitments in this program expire after 1 year and none have been renewed without a nondiscrimination agreement.

[7] Once a house is sold to an owner-occupant, it is exempt from coverage under FHA regulations. See 24 CFR sec. 200.315(b) (Supp. 1963).

[8] Public Law 88–352, 78 Stat. 241 (1964).

[9] 29 Federal Register 16280 (1964).

[10] See local public agency letter No. 318, from Urban Renewal Commissioner William L. Slayton, Dec. 28, 1964.

[11] In the urban renewal program land is typically acquired by a local public agency, cleared, and then disposed of to private redevelopers for a fair market price.

[11a] For example, by the end of 1962, only 86 projects had been completed, while over 1,000 projects, which had already been approved, were in various stages of planning and execution (16 HHFA annual rept. 358 (1962)). In addition, it has become apparent that discrimination by private developers under the urban renewal program violates the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. See *Smith* v. *Holiday Inns of America, Inc.*, 336 F. 2d 630 (6th Cir. 1964).

[12] See circular from Public Housing Commissioner Marie C. McGuire to the central office division and branch heads, regional directors, local authorities, and managers, dated Dec. 30, 1964.

[12a] Sec. 602, Civil Rights Act of 1964 Public Law 88–352, 78 Stat. 252.

[13] For a discussion of the legal basis for action more forceful than "good offices" in this regard, see Sloane, supra note 5.

[14] Sec. 101(b) of the Executive order directs that action be taken to prevent discrimination: "in the lending practices with respect to residential property and related facilities (including land to be developed for residential use) of lending institutions insofar as such practices relate to loans hereafter insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government."

[15] Commercial banks held $312.8 billion; mutual savings banks held $49.6 billion; and savings and loan associations held $107.4 billion. See 1964 Federal Reserve Bulletin 1554; Federal Home Loan Bank Board, savings and home financing sourcebook No. 8, (1964).

[16] This figure represents nonfarm mortgage recordings of $20,000 or less. See Federal Reserve Bulletin, supra note 15 at 1580.

[17] HHFA, housing statistics 28, December 1964.

[18] See Federal Reserve Bulletin, supra note 15 at 1580.

Thus, if the Executive order had covered conventional financing by federally supervised mortgage lenders as well as FHA and VA loans, 83 percent of the home mortgage market would have been subject to the requirement of nondiscrimination in 1963. Instead, under the order as it now exists, only 23 percent of this market was so affected in that year.

It is the purpose of this paper to determine the validity of an amendment to the Executive order requiring nondiscrimination with respect to housing provided through conventional financing by federally supervised lending institutions.

THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION

Just as the banks and savings and loan associations are separate in nature and organization,[19] so their supervision and regulation are conducted separately. The supervisory pattern in each case can be likened to a three-block pyramid.

Banks: National banks; member banks of the Federal Reserve System; FDIC-insured banks.

Savings and loan associations: Federal savings and loans; FSLIC-insured savings and loans; member savings and loans of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

With respect to banks, the upper block represents national banks, chartered and supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency.[20] The middle block represents member banks of the Federal Reserve System, supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. These are the 4,615 national banks, which are required by law to be Federal Reserve members,[21] and 1,497 of the 8,944 State-chartered banks, which have voluntarily joined.[22]

The broad base of the pyramid represents banks whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC). These consist of all 6,112 member banks of the Federal Reserve System (both national and State-chartered), which are required by law to be FDIC-insured,[23] plus 7,173 State-chartered non-Federal reserve member commercial banks and 330 mutual savings banks, which have voluntarily applied for and been granted the benefits of FDIC deposit insurance.[24]

In all, 98 percent of the Nation's commercial banks are FDIC-insured. They hold 99 percent ($310.7 billion) of all commercial bank resources. In addition, of the 509 mutual savings banks in the country, 330 are FDIC-insured. They hold 87 percent ($43 billion) of all mutual savings banks resources.[25]

Federal supervision over the banking community is thus carried on by three agencies—Comptroller of the Currency: national banks; Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System: State-chartered member banks; FDIC: State-chartered nonmember insured commercial and mutual savings banks. FDIC, however, has jurisdiction over institutions in the first two categories (national banks and State-chartered member banks) as well as those in the third (State-chartered nonmember insured banks).[26] In fact, if FDIC should terminate the insurance of a bank that is also a member of the Federal Reserve System, the Board of Governors is required, in turn, to terminate that institution's membership in the Federal Reserve.[27] If the institution is also a national bank, the Comptroller of the Currency is required to appoint a receiver.[28] The crucial agency, therefore, for purposes of amending the Executive order so as to cover banks, is FDIC, for it includes within its jurisdiction all banks that are supervised by the other two banking agencies.

With respect to savings and loan associations, the upper block represents Federal savings and loan associations, chartered and supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB).[29] The middle block represents savings and loan associations whose accounts are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC), which is operated under the direction of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.[30] These consist of all 1,968 Federal savings and loan associations, which are required by law to be FSLIC-insured,[31] and 2,451 of the 4,357 State-chartered savings and loan associations, which have voluntarily applied for and been granted the benefits of FSLIC insurance of accounts.

The broad base of the savings and loan pyramid represents associations that are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System (FHLBS). These consist of all 4,419 FSLIC-insured associations (Federal savings and loan associations are required by law to be members of the FHLBS; [32] State-chartered FSLIC-insured associations are not required to be FHLBS members, but all are nonetheless members) plus 541 noninsured associations. In all, 70 percent of the Nation's savings and loan associations are FHLBS members. They hold 98 percent ($105.6 billion) of all savings and loan resources.

Unlike Federal supervision of the banking community, there is a concentration of Federal authority over savings and loan associations. The three functions carried out by three separate banking agencies is carried out by a single agency—the FHLBB—with respect to savings and loan associations. Also unlike the supervisory pattern in the banking community, the broadest category of savings and loan associations subject to Federal supervision consists not of insured associations, but of members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System (analagous to the Federal Reserve System). Another distinction is that State-chartered, FSLIC-insured associations are not required to be members of the FHLBS. Nonetheless, all FSLIC-insured associations are, in fact, FHLBS members.

Thus, the two crucial categories of lending institutions for purposes of amending the Executive order so as to obtain full coverage are FDIC-insured banks and FHLBS-member associations.[33]

THE ISSUE TO BE RESOLVED

The basic issue to be resolved in determining the validity of an amended Executive order is whether the FDIC and the FHLBB can be said to have exceeded their powers by complying with a Presidential directive to prevent discrimination with respect to conventional financing by FDIC- and FHLBB-aided institutions.[34] Even assuming, however, that these two agencies have sufficient authority to require nondiscrimination in the mortgage lending practices of the institutions they supervise, the further question arises concerning their authority to affect the practices of builders who borrow from these institutions. For maximum effectiveness, an amended Executive order must reach not only the lending practices of federally supervised lending institutions, but also the sales and rental policies of the builders and developers with whom these institutions deal. This paper will consider, first, the overall question of the authority of the FDIC and FHLBB to comply with a Presidential directive concerning nondiscrimination in conventional financing, and secondly, the question of their authority to reach the practices of builders and developers who borrow from the institutions they supervise.

---

[19] For example, as the Civil Rights Commission has noted, savings and loan associations, unlike banks, "accept no deposits, pay no interest, and possess no independent capital structure. Their entire capital * * * consists of funds from individuals in the form of share accounts. Share owners receive dividends on their shares, not interest on deposits, and constitute, in effect, the associations' stockholders, not depositors." 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report, housing 32, hereinafter cited as 1961 Commission report.

[20] As of the end of 1963, national banks constituted only 34 percent of the Nation's 13,570 commercial banks, but they held more than 54 percent of all commercial bank resources ($170.2 billion of a total of $312.8 billion). See Federal Reserve Bulletin supra note 15, at 1554, 1556.

[21] Federal Reserve Act, sec. 2, 38 Stat. 251 (1913), 12 U.S.C. 282 (1958).

[22] Member banks, while constituting 45 percent of the total number of commercial banks as of the end of 1961, held 84 percent ($261.4 billion) of the total resources. See Federal Reserve Bulletin supra note 15, at 1554.

[23] Federal Deposit Insurance Act, sec. 4(b), 64 Stat. 875 (1950), 12 U.S.C., 1814(b) (1958).

[24] Figures are as of the end of 1963. See Federal Reserve Bulletin supra note 15, at 1556.

[25] Ibid.

[26] This is because all national banks and State-chartered member banks are required by law to have their deposits insured by FDIC.

[27] 64 Stat. 880 (1950), 12 U.S.C. 1818(b) (1958).

[28] Ibid.

[29] As of the end of 1963, they constituted only 31 percent of the Nation's 6,325 savings and loan associations, but they held 53 percent of all savings and loan resources ($56.4 billion of a total of $107.4 billion). See savings and home financing source book, supra note 15, at 8.

[30] 48 Stat. 1256 (1934), 12 U.S.C. 1725(a) (1958).

[31] 48 Stat. 1257 (1934), 12 U.S.C. 1726(a) (1958).

[32] 48 Stat. 133 (1933), 12 U.S.C. 1464(f) (1958).

[33] These two categories include all federally supervised lending institutions. With respect to savings and loan associations, however, it should be remembered that although all FSLIC-insured associations are, in fact, FHLBS members, they are not required to be. Therefore, in terms of broadening the Executive order to cover all federally supervised savings and loan associations, legal authority must theoretically be found regarding FHLBS-member associations and FSLIC-insured associations.

[34] With respect to the President's power to direct the FDIC and FHLBB to impose a nondiscrimination requirement (in the unlikely event that either agency should refuse to comply with a Presidential request to take such action), both agencies are within the executive branch of government and are necessarily subject to the authority of the President, in whom the Constitution vests "the executive power." (U.S. Constitution, art. II, sec. 1). Regarding the FHLBB, the act expressly provides: "The Home Loan Bank Board shall be an independent agency (including the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation) in the executive branch of the Government." 69 Stat. 640–641 (1955), 12 USC 1437. The FDIC act is silent concerning the Corporation's status. In view of the function of FDIC, however—administering the law concerning the insurance of deposits—it seems apparent that it, too, is a part of the executive branch. See *Myers* v. *United States*, 272 U.S. 52 (1926). Furthermore, the FDIC does not grant licenses, nor is it involved in adjudication. There is, in short, no reason for ascribing to FDIC a status that is independent of the executive branch. Compare *Humphrey's Ex'r* v. *United States*, 295 U.S. 602, 628 (1935); *Wiener* v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 349 (1957). In *Morgan* v. *TVA*, 115 F. 2d 990, 994 (6th Cir. 1940), the Court, in deciding that the TVA is a part of the executive branch, said: "Whatever their character, [TVA's quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions] they are but incidental to the carrying out of a great administrative project. The Board does not sit in judgment upon private citizens and the government, and there is no judicial review of its decisions, except as it may sue or be sued as may other corporations. It is not to be alined with the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, or other administrative bodies mainly exercising clearly quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial functions—it is predominantly an arm of the executive department."

THE BASIC OF AUTHORITY

It is well established that when Federal benefits are granted, the administering agency may impose reasonable conditions upon the granting or continuation of such benefits, provided that these conditions are consistent with national policy, that they are consistent with the purpose of the program, and that the agency possesses sufficient discretionary authority to impose such conditions.[35]

NATIONAL POLICY

There is a clear national public policy against housing discrimination and in favor of equal housing opportunity. Housing discrimination has been held by the Supreme Court to be "contrary to the public policy of the United States"—a public policy of such forces that in one case—*Hurd* v. *Hodge*[36]—the Court prohibited lower Federal courts from enforcing private housing discrimination agreements on the ground, inter alia, that such enforcement "would be violative of that policy."[37]

In addition, in a statute first enacted almost 100 years ago, Congress has provided: "All citizens of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real * * * property."[38]

Congress has also established (in 1949) as a national housing objective: "A decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."[39]

Congress has further provided in the same statute: "The Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constitutent agencies, and any other departments or agencies of the Federal Government having powers, functions, or duties with respect to housing, shall exercise their powers, functions, and duties under this or any other law, consistently with the national housing policy declared by this act and in such manner as will facilitate sustained progress in attaining the national housing objective hereby established.[40]

This command of Congress, particularly when read in conjunction with its century-old declaration guaranteeing equality in property rights, would appear to authorize, if not require by implication, that appropriate measures be taken to assure equal access to the benefits of all Federal programs relating to housing, "for all Americans." The national housing objective can hardly be achieved in any other way. As President Kennedy observed shortly before issuing the Executive order: "It is clear now, as it was then (in 1949), that this objective cannot be fulfilled as long as some Americans are denied equal access to the housing market because of their race or religion."[41]

It is to be noted that in establishing the national housing objective, Congress did not limit responsibility for its effectuation to the housing agencies alone, but extended responsibility to "any other departments or agencies of the Federal Government having powers, functions, or duties with respect to housing."

The agencies concerned with the supervision of home finance institutions would clearly be within the scope of this congressional directive, for an essential prerequisite to achieving the national housing objective is the availability of mortgage credit. Another prerequisite to achieving this objective "for all Americans" is that there be equal access to mortgage credit. Yet, as the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has found: "The financial community in which * * * [Federal] agencies play so large and so vital a role is a major factor in the denial of equal housing opportunity to minority groups."[42]

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964[43] is also relevant to this discussion of national policy. Section 601 provides: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."[44]

This language is all-inclusive in its scope. Section 602, wherein Federal departments and agencies are directed to effectuate the provisions of section 601, expressly excludes "a contract of insurance or guarantee." The U.S. Attorney General, in explaining the meaning of this exclusion, stated: "Section 602 would not apply to any contracts of insurance or guarantee. Among the kinds of insurance or guarantee which are excluded from section 602 by the quoted language are insurance of bank deposits by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation."[45]

The significance of this exclusion for our purposes is that section 601, which contains no such exclusionary language, applies with undiluted force to FDIC and FLSIC insurance. Moreover, section 605 makes it clear that Congress, in providing for the exclusion of contracts of insurance or guaranty in section 602, had no intention of interfering with any existing executive authority.[46] The fact that title VI does not add to the existing authority of the FDIC or the FHLBB is of little moment. As demonstrated below, these two agencies already possess abundant authority, sufficient for any purpose consistent with national policy. Whatever else section 601 may represent in terms of the force of law, it is at the least an expression of congressional policy and national purpose.

In light of the above declarations of law and policy relating to equal housing opportunity, uttered by both the judicial and legislative branches of Government, it is clear that action by the FDIC and the FHLBB to assure nondiscriminatory access to home financing by the institutions they benefit and supervise would be consistent with our national policy.

The remaining questions are:

1. Would such action be consistent with the purpose for which the FDIC and FHLBB were created?

2. Do the FDIC and FHLBB possess sufficient discretionary authority to take such action?

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The system of Federal Deposit Insurance provides security for depositors in commercial and mutual savings banks. This is the literal function of the system, but it is clear that Congress had another, and perhaps, more basic purpose in creating Federal deposit insurance. That purpose was to preserve and stimulate the free flow of credit so as to serve the credit needs of communities throughout the country.[47] Representative Steagall, the guiding spirit of the FDIC legislation, explained the purpose of the legislation in this way: "This bill will preserve independent, dual banking in the United States to supply community credit, community service, and for the upbuilding of community life. That is what this bill is intended to do. That is the purpose of this bill; that is what the measure will accomplish."[48]

In view of this emphasis on community credit, of which housing credit is such an important aspect, and in view of the important role that commercial and mutual savings banks play in supplying such credit,[49] it would appear beyond question that the adoption by FDIC of measures to assure nondiscriminatory access to housing credit would be consistent with this purpose of FDIC. In fact, it might well be argued that to the extent that people are denied equal access to such credit on the arbitrary grounds of race, color, creed, or national origin, this purpose is thereby frustrated.

As to the discretionary authority delegated by Congress to the FDIC, there appears to be little question that it is of sufficient breadth for this purpose. For example, section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act[50] sets forth as a statutory criterion which the FDIC Board must consider in determining whether to accept an applicant bank for insurance, "the convenience and needs of the community to be served by the bank." As the Civil Rights Commission commented regarding this statutory factor: "Where the FDIC dispenses its benefits, the banking needs (if not the convenience) of the entire community, including minority groups, would seem to be entitled to consideration."[51]

It is to be noted in this connection that there is no express statutory requirement that FDIC must consider the convenience and needs factor once the deposit insurance has been granted. The governing statute, however, authorizes the FDIC Board to exercise "all powers specifically granted * * * and such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry out the powers so granted."[52] The FDIC Board is further empowered to "prescribed * * * such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."[53] In addition, FDIC is authorized to terminate its insurance of any bank for violation of FDIC regulations.[54] It is difficult to argue, in the face of these broad grants of discretionary and regulatory authority, that FDIC is powerless to assure that banks receiving the benefits of its insurance will serve the convenience and needs of the community while such insurance is in effect. Thus, FDIC appears to have ample discretionary and regulatory authority to take action pursuant to a directive from the President to assure equal access to mortgage credit from FDIC-insured banks for all qualified persons in the community, regardless of their race, religion, or national origin.

---

[35] See, e.g., *Oklahoma* v. *Civil Service Commission*, 330 U.S. 127, 143 (1947); *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, 301 U.S. 548, 598 (1937); *State of Indiana* v. *Ewing*, 99 Fed. Supp. 734, 735 (D.D.C. 1951), vacated as moot, 195 F. 2d 556 (D.C. Cir. 1952).

[36] 334 U.S. 24 (1948).

[37] Id. at 34.

[38] Act of April 9, 1866, ch. 31, sec. 1, 14 Stat. 27, reenacted in sec. 18 of the act of May 31, 1878, 42 U.S.C. 1982 (1958).

[39] 63 Stat. 413 (1949), 42 U.S.C. 1441 (1958).

[40] Ibid.

[41] Hearing held in Washington, D.C., before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 12 (1962).

[42] 1961 Commission Report 51.

[43] Public Law 88–352, 78 Stat. 241 (1964).

[44] 78 Stat. 252.

[45] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 7, p. 9763.

[46] Sec. 605 provides: "Nothing in this title shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract or insurance or guaranty." (Public Law 88–352, 78 Stat. 253.)

[47] See House of Representatives rept. No. 150, 73 Cong., 1st sess. 6 (1933); 77 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3840 (1933). See also Golembe, "The Deposit Insurance Legislation of 1933: An Examination of Its Antecedents and Purposes," 75 Poli. Sci. Q. 181 (1960).

[48] 77 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4033 (1933).

[49] In 1963, of the $36.9 billion in home loans made, $8.4 billion (23 percent) were made by such institutions.

[50] Stat. 876 (1950), 12 U.S.C. 1814 (b) (1958).

[51] 1961 Commission Rept. No. 50.

[52] 64 Stat. 881 (1950), 12 U.S.C. 1819 (1958).

[53] 64 Stat. 882 (1950), 12 U.S.C. 1819 (1958).

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

In the area of Federal supervision over savings and loan associations, the power to adopt such measures appears, if anything, more manifest. The legislative history regarding the creation of both the Federal home loan bank system and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation clearly demonstrates that a major purpose of both is to facilitate home mortgage credit so as to serve the Nation's home buyers.[55] Again, the FHLBB has ample discretionary and regulatory authority to assure that this purpose is carried out—that institutions receiving the benefits of membership in the Federal home loan bank system or of FSLIC insurance will not deny home loans on the arbitrary ground of race, religion, or national origin. The Federal Home Loan Bank Act states: "No institution shall be eligible to become a member of, or a nonmember borrower of, a Federal home loan bank, if, in the judgment of the (Federal Home Loan Bank) Board, * * * the character of its management or its home-financing policy is inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the purposes of this act." [56]

The act further states: "The [Federal Home Loan Bank] Board * * * shall have power to adopt, amend, and require the observance of such rules, regulations, and orders as shall be necessary from time to time for carrying out the purposes of the provisions of this act." [57]

Finally, the act provides: "The [Federal Home Loan Bank] Board may, after hearing, remove any member from membership * * * if, in the opinion of the Board, such member * * * (i) has failed to comply with any provision of this act, or regulation of the Board made pursuant thereto; * * * or (iii) has a management or home-financing policy of a character inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the purposes of this act." [58]

With respect of the FSLIC, which was created as part of the National Housing Act,[59] the act provides: "[The FSLIC] shall be under the direction of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and operated by it under such bylaws, rules and regulations as it may prescribe for carrying out the purposes of this title." [60]

Further, the act authorizes the termination of FSLIC insurance if the FHLBB finds that the institution in question "has violated its duty * * * or negligently permitted any of its officers or agents to violate any provision of any law or regulation to which the insured institution is subject." [61]

Thus, both the FDIC and the FHLBB possess broad authority to regulate the institutions they supervise—authority of sufficient breadth, it is submitted, to comply with a Presidential directive to assure nondiscriminatory access to home financing by these institutions.

SCOPE OF PROPOSED AMENDED ORDER

If the FDIC and the FHLBB possess sufficient authority to require nondiscrimination in the lending practices of the institutions they benefit and supervise, the question remains whether these agencies may validly adopt measures to assure that when these lending institutions supply funds to builders or developers, the housing provided with such funds will be available on a nondiscriminatory basis.

On one hand, it may be argued that while the FDIC and the FHLBB may validly control the policies and practices of the lending institutions they supervise, it is beyond the scope of their authority to control the policies and practices of those who borrow from these federally supervised mortgage lenders. This argument would further contend that since such borrowers are not subject to the supervision of the FDIC or the FHLBB, neither of these agencies may prohibit them from discriminating if they so choose.

Such an argument, however, reduces itself to a matter of administrative technique, rather than one of substantive legal authority. To be sure, neither the FDIC nor the FHLBB is empowered to issue regulations addressed to parties other than the institutions they supervise. By the same token, however, it cannot be doubted that they are empowered to regulate the lending practices of these institutions, including such matters as the manner in which loan activities are carried on and the terms and conditions of particular loans.[62] These regulatory measures necessarily affect the activities of borrowers, but they do so only through regulation of the institutions from which the funds are borrowed. The interest of the Federal agencies lies in the fact that the institutions under their supervision are the source of the funds. To complain that these measures ultimately affect the activities of those who wish to borrow the funds misses the point. Virtually every exercise of supervisory control over lending practices necessarily affects the activities of borrowers or potential borrowers. Very often, that is the principal purpose of the measure. The question is not who is ultimately affected by the measure, but whether the measure is consistent with the relationship between the supervisory agency and the institutions supervised, in terms of statutory authority and national policy. Thus the validity of the measure is determined by examining its purpose and effect, not by identifying the parties ultimately affected.

In the area of housing, the fact that the builder may ultimately be prohibited from discriminating with respect to the housing provided with funds borrowed from a federally supervised mortgage lender does not render invalid the requirement imposed on the lender, so long as the imposition of such a requirement on the lender is consistent with national policy and within the purpose and scope of the authority of the FDIC and the FHLBB.

The basic justification for amending the Executive order to cover federally supervised mortgage lenders is that they constitute the major source of credit necessary for the provision of housing. As noted earlier, a principal purpose in the creation of the FDIC and FHLBB was to facilitate, on one hand, community credit in general, and on the other, housing credit in particular. Moreover, this purpose must be read in conjunction with the national policy of furthering equal housing opportunity and the national housing objective of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." Congress has further directed that all Federal departments and agencies having powers, functions, or duties with respect to housing, shall exercise them "in such manner as will facilitate sustained progress in attaining the national housing objective hereby established."

To the extent that mortgage funds from these institutions are used by builders to provide housing available only on a discriminatory basis, the fulfillment of these related purposes is necessarily frustrated. In order for these purposes to be fulfilled, it must be assured that the housing credit offered by these institutions results in housing available without regard to the arbitrary factors of race, color, creed, or national origin. To the extent that action by the FDIC and the FHLBB furthers this end, such action would be in accord with national policy. In view of the purpose for which these agencies were created and the broad regulatory power conferred on them by statute, such action would also be within the specific purpose and scope of their authority.

SUMMARY

The legal basis for amending Executive Order No. 11063 to include housing provided through conventional financing by federally supervised mortgage lenders can be summarized as follows:

1. Both Congress and the Supreme Court have enunciated a clear policy in favor of equal housing opportunity.

2. This policy cannot be realized unless there is equal access to home finances.

3. Federally supervised lending institutions are the Nation's major source of funds used to provide housing.

4. The relevant Federal agencies that supervise these institutions (FDIC and FHLBB) and the programs they administer were created with a principal purpose of facilitating community credit, of which housing credit is a major aspect. In the case of the FDIC, the system which it governs was created with a prime purpose of serving community credit needs in general. In the case

---

[54] 64 Stat. 879 (1950), 12 U.S.C. 1818(a) (1958).

[55] Regarding the creation of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the House report stated as a principal reason, "Our national credit structure needs * * * these home loan banking units to serve the small saver and the home buyer in the cities and small towns." House Committee on Banking and Currency, H. Rept. No. 1418, 72d Cong., 2d sess., 8 (1932). See also Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, S. Rept. No. 837, 72d Cong., 2d sess., 1932). Regarding the purpose in creating the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the House report states that among the principal purposes are: "to improve conditions with respect to home mortgage financing * * * to eliminate the necessity for costly second-mortgage financing, to promote thrift and protect savings." House Committee on Banking and Currency, H. Rept. No. 1922, 73d Cong., 2d sess., 1 (1964).

[56] 47 Stat. 726 (1932), 12 U.S.C. 1424(a) (1958).

[57] 47 Stat. 737 (1932), 12 U.S.C. 1437(a) (1958).

[58] 69 Stat. 640 (1955), 12 U.S.C. 1426(i) (1958).

[59] 48 Stat. 1246, 1256–57 (1934), 12 U.S.C. 1701, 1725(a) (1958).

[60] 48 Stat. 1256 (1934), 12 U.S.C. 1725(a) (1958).

[61] 68 Stat. 633–634 (1954), 12 U.S.C. 1730 (1958).

[62] See 12 CFR, sec. 563.9 for examples of requirements in this regard imposed upon FSLIC-insured institutions. See also Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Manual of Examination Policies, sec. 1, for instructions to FDIC examiners regarding examinations into loan policies and particular types of loans. It is to be noted that banks whose loan policies are subjected to criticism and which fail to correct the deficiencies, are subject to termination of insurance by FDIC. See Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Manual of Examination Policies, sec. 5.

of the FHLBB, the system which it governs was created with a prime purpose of serving housing credit needs in particular. Thus, a directive from the President to these agencies to assure nondiscrimination in housing provided through funds borrowed from the lending institutions they benefit and supervise would further the overall national policy of equal housing opportunity and the purposes of the programs they administer.

5. Both the FDIC and the FHLBB possess ample regulatory and discretionary authority to put such measures into effect so as to further this national policy.

6. The fact that these measures would affect not only the practices of the lending institutions but ultimately the practices of builders who borrow from these institutions does not invalidate the measures in that they would be imposed on the lending institutions as requirements in their home financing activities. As such, these measures would be within the regulatory authority of the Federal agencies and would serve to further national policy.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the transaction of morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 6 or 7 minutes——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me assure the Senator from North Carolina that the Senator from North Carolina can have that much time during the morning hour.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator. I need to say some things in reply to what the Senator from New York has just stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator can be assured that he will get that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Hawaii? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read a second time, it will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3296) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purpose, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] may be allowed to proceed for 8 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it falls to my unhappy lot to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to which virtually all civil rights bills come. Consequently, it falls to my unhappy lot and that of a very limited staff to try to analyze bills which the Department of Justice, which has the aid of 600 or 700 lawyers, has taken 4 or 5 months to draw up.

Since I have spent so much of my time and energy studying civil rights bills since I came to the Senate, I had hoped that Congress would have one session in which it did not have to consider civil rights proposals. I do not favor such bills because, in the final analysis, there has not been a civil rights bill of modern vintage which does not do violence to the American system of government. All of them are predicated upon the proposition that one minority in the United States should be singled out and given rights and privileges superior to those ever sought by or granted to any other Americans in the long history of this Republic.

I am somewhat saddened by the fact that we have the prospect of another season of legislative turmoil over civil rights legislation, so-called, but my sadness is not as deep this time as on prior times, because we now have a civil rights bill, so-called, that will affect other than "sinful southerners." For the first time, we have a bill which proposes that other than southern oxen are to be gored.

I would like to enter a dissent to the position taken by the distinguished and able Senator from New York who makes it plain that it would have been a source of consolation to him if the President had settled all controversy in the field of housing by the stroke of a pen. I confess that it would conduce to our case if we had a process by which Congress could avoid all controversial matters and let the President decide them by a stroke of the pen. But the Constitution of the United States states that every bit of the legislative power of the Federal Government is vested in the Congress, and none in the President.

I think the President is faithful to the Constitution in one respect at least when he allows Congress to do the legislating in the field of open housing, instead of attempting to usurp the power of doing so himself in violation of the Constitution.

I want to commend the majority leadership and the minority leadership for refusing to set a time limit on the search for truth in respect to the merits and demerits of this bill.

The bill is clearly a violation of the due process clause of the fifth amendment according to the decisions handed down from the time George Washington took his first oath as President of the United States until the present moment. I will not be so foolhardy as to predict what five or more of the men who sit in that wonderful marble building which bears the words "Equal Justice Under Law" will decide at some future time. But I do commend the majority leader and the minority leader for saying that we will have no time limit on the search for truth concerning this bill, and that we will have in this body legislative due process in performing our duties under the Constitution.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON OPEN OCCUPANCY HOUSING

Mr. President, title IV of the administration's Civil Rights Act of 1966, would enact a Federal housing law, depriving the American people of their right to sell or lease to whom they choose. Leaving aside for the moment the questions of Federal power in this regard, it is imperative that we fully understand what is proposed. Mr. Everett R. Trebilcock, who is counsel of the Michigan Real Estate Association, made some very cogent observations concerning such laws at a seminar of Real Estate Board Administration 2 years ago. He has correctly pointed out that they are not only unwise but that they will not and cannot accomplish the objectives for which they are drawn.

These comments are of such importance that I trust that all Senators will give them serious attention. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON OPEN OCCUPANCY HOUSING

(Observations by Everett R. Trebilcock, counsel, Michigan Real Estate Association, at the 1964 annual seminar of Real Estate Board Administration, May 5, 1964)

The subject which I am about to discuss with you is variously described depending upon one's viewpoint. Proponents of legal force to compel integrated residential living refer to the legislation in question euphemistically as "fair housing laws." Opponents of this legislation such as the National Association of Real Estate Boards often refer to it as "forced housing laws." Perhaps the most common label attached to this legislation is "open occupancy law." Since I am more accustomed to the latter term, I shall employ it today in my discussion.

Although my remarks will be limited to open occupancy laws in the form of statutes or ordinances, it should be observed that there are other types of law which have been employed to force or facilitate integrated housing. Thus, we have had experience with administrative rules and regulations by a host of different public agencies, a cardinal example of which is the notorious rule 9 promulgated by the Michigan Corporation and Securities Commission under the Michigan real estate brokers and salesmen's license law. You are all familiar with the Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration antidiscrimination regulations initiated by the late President Kennedy's Executive order issued during the fall of 1962. The so-called antiblockbusting statutes and ordinances thrust at yet another facet of the problem. Since all of these legal methods are to be encountered in dealing with the problem of interracial living, it is obvious that open occupancy legislation is only part of the total legal picture. Nevertheless, this type of legislation is certainly the most widespread legal approach at State and local levels, and I think it is fair to say that legislation of this type will make its debut in many States or localities which have not previously considered it. It is appropriate therefore that we limit our discussion today to legislation of this nature, for in dealing with it, we are grappling with the major weapon presently advocated by civil rights proponents for use in the private housing field.

Open occupancy laws or ordinances are of varying types—some far more severe in their provisions than others. In its most comprehensive form, an open occupancy law will forbid a property owner to refuse to sell or rent to anyone by reason of the latter's race, creed, or national origin. These more drastic provisions are frequently made applicable to virtually all private homeowners as well as land developers and multiple-dwelling owners. Usually, they forbid discrimination by real estate brokers irrespective of whether or not the broker acts in accordance with restrictions laid down by his client. Often they are expanded to cover lending institutions and to censor any references to race, creed, or national origin in real estate advertising media. Penal sanctions are usually provided in such laws coupled with provisions permitting a complainant an injunction which will forbid any disposition of the subject property until such time as the question of discrimination has been judicially resolved.

Now there are many statutes and ordinances of the open occupancy type which for political reasons are less stringent in their provisions. These more moderate statutes or ordinances frequently contain exemptions which exclude private homeowners selling the home in which they reside, or they may strike at land developers or apartment owners while exempting persons not similarly engaged in real estate businesses as a livelihood. Almost invariably, however, one will find that real estate brokers are forbidden to discriminate, with no exception being provided in terms of the brokers' obligations to follow restrictions laid down by his principal. These less stringent open occupancy laws and ordinances are more limited in their scope because of political expedience. However, one cannot view the growth of open occupancy legislation without noting the steady progression from limited open occupancy ordinances to the comprehensive and stringent ordinances to which I earlier alluded. Hence, it would be foolhardy for one to countenance the enactment of an open occupancy ordinance of limited application on the assumption that this will end the matter. The whole history of this legal development indicates that the latter is simply not in the cards. I would therefore make the point that any citizen who lends support to open occupancy ordinances in any form must be prepared to reap the whirlwind in the form of legislation or ordinances which will ultimately strike directly at his right to dispose of his residential property on some not far distant day.

Quite obviously, open occupancy legislation is calculated to equip minority groups with a cudgel which can be employed against property owners, private or commercial, to enhance the opportunity of minorities to acquire or rent residential property by overriding any objections in terms of race, creed, or national origin which the property owner might otherwise evince. Negroes seeking housing accommodations have been persuaded by their leadership that this legislation if enacted will be an efficient instrument for solving minority housing problems. This accounts for the concerted efforts being made by minority groups to procure the enactment of statutes and ordinances of this nature in our northern cities wherein minority groups form a sizable part of the populace. Ever-increasing pressures for more and more drastic legislation of this character may be anticipated since the Negro realizes that the victory which he won in the celebrated case of *Brown* v. *Topeka Board of Education*, prohibiting legally enforced discrimination in public schools will not integrate the schools until such time as the Negro has succeeded in attaining integrated residential living. Hence, the Negro may be expected to attempt to employ the force of law in increasingly severe forms in the belief that by so doing, he will accomplish or facilitate the accomplishment of two of his major civil rights objectives, integrated housing and integration of the public schools.

Open occupancy statutes and ordinances at the State and local levels fall in that category of law which we lawyers commonly refer to as the police power. This is a tremendously broad field of law—one that encompasses most legislative enactments which are directed at human conduct and the regulation of economic and social activity. This is the power which the States and municipalities exercise to further public health, welfare, and morals. It is a power which when improvidently exercised can destroy individualism and personal liberty even under representative government. Quite obviously then, the salutary use of the police power must be squared with fundamental principles of democratic government, if totalitarian regimentation is to be avoided. Bringing this concept of the police power down to earth, I suppose that we can say that it is this power of government to which the layman turns when, out of disgust or dissatisfaction with a given situation, he opines, "There ought to be a law against."

From a purely legal angle, the only major restrictions on the police power are to be found in constitutional guarantees and constitutional provisions that no one shall be denied life, liberty, or property without due process of law and that no one shall be denied the equal protection of the law. The due process and equal protection clauses which are to be found in the Federal Constitution and the constitutions of the several States are the most commonly employed limitations on the exercise of the police power by State or municipal governments. The equal protection clause requires that police legislation be acceptably nondiscriminatory in its application, and the due process provisions require that the law based upon the police power be free from arbitrariness or caprice. Generally speaking, police legislation in aid of the public health, welfare, and morals is endowed with a heavy presumption of validity under the equal protection and due process provisions of applicable constitutions. It is therefore reasonably accurate to say that if the object of the legislation is legitimate, any means reasonably related to the accomplishment of that object will be upheld from a constitutional viewpoint. Thus, if there is a social evil, and, if legislation meeting reasonable standards of relevancy to that evil is enacted, it is increasingly rare that a court will strike down the legislation as being constitutionally infirm.

Now, as applied to open occupancy legislation, the evil which the law seeks to redress is racial discrimination. Discrimination in private housing is one facet of this social problem. Eradication or mitigation of the problem being the thrust of open occupancy laws, the latter have been repeatedly held to be constitutionally valid exercises of police power. When the abrogation of property rights implicit in such laws has been called to the attention of the courts, the most frequent answer given is that the enjoyment or exercise of property rights are at all times subject to the public interest and welfare.

The point to be noted here in that numerous adjudications exist at State levels upholding the validity of open occupancy legislation. To my knowledge, no Federal Court has held that such legislation by abrogating property rights offends either the equal protection clause or the due process clause of the 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution. It is therefore overwhelmingly probable that such legislation is constitutionally valid.

In view of all this, you will discern that the frequently proclaimed constitutional right to dispose of one's property as one will is more apparent than real. Worse yet, this assumed legal right in many cases serves to divert attention away from the only real avenue of legal relief. I should like to impress upon all of you that open occupancy statutes and ordinances will not be invalidated by the courts under normal circumstances and that there is only one source of enduring relief—that being the ballot box. In my study of the civil rights problem as it relates to private housing, I am convinced that there will be no permanent respite found at either State or local levels from open occupancy legislation in ever more drastic forms, until such time as the people in any given State resolve to place in their State constitution an express prohibition against the use of the State and municipal police power in this regard with respect to their private real property interests. I am sure that our friends from California in their current campaign against the Rumford Act have reached this conclusion, and those of us from Michigan know full well that this has been the lesson to be derived from our not inconsiderable experience.

Up to this point in my remarks, most of you will have surmised that your speaker is not an ardent advocate of open occupancy legislation. I hasten to confirm the correctness of your supposition. I would hope, however, that none of you will have assumed that my opposition to open occupancy legislation is predicated on a belief that racial, creedal or ethnic discrimination is good for society, or at worst, a matter of indifference. Most certainly, the latter does not represent my view or does it represent the view of many other people who, after sober consideration of the legal methodology of open occupancy laws, are persuaded that such are not in the public interest, nor even in the long-range interest of the minority groups themselves. I should like therefore to suggest to you some of the considerations and reasons which should be persuasive on one of moderate views in reaching the conclusion that open occupancy legislation is inimical with the long-range good of a free American society.

Racial discrimination is compounded of many elements. It is a gross oversimplification to say that racial discrimination is the offspring of bigotry to the exclusion of other factors. I suggest that with particular reference to private housing, malice toward minority groups is a very minor element and that other considerations are of far greater moment. It is a stark sociological fact that people of a given racial group tend to cleave unto themselves, and this is exhibited in private residential living by the manifest tendency of our white population to seek out racially homogeneous surroundings. Putting it another way, much of the race relations problem in housing arises from the fact that white people prefer to live among their own and correspondingly resist developments which require them to adapt to the culture, customs or mores of racially dissimilar inhabitants. We cannot overemphasize the element of preference in this social phenomenon, and I suggest that it is quite dissimilar in character to bigotry toward or hatred for another racial group. Discrimination is also occasioned by fears of the white population for consequences which are believed to follow in the wage of residential integration. This apprehension may be in terms of reduced property values, a concern that neighborhood congeniality will diminish, a fear that cultural standards will be depressed or trepidation that behavioral problems will ensue. For instant purposes it is not necessary to determine whether or not these fears and apprehensions are well founded. It is sufficient to note that they exist and that they are not the equivalent of race hatred.

I am quite convinced that if, through the temporizing influence of the church, school, and men of good will, the poignant preference of our white people to live among their own can be changed to an attitude of indifference, and, if the conduct and behavioral patterns of minority residents can be shown to be exemplary or at least unexceptional, the problem of biracial living will be largely resolved. Parenthetically, I suggest that it is from these extra-legal sources that an enduring solution to the problem must necessarily come and not through exercise of the police expedient.

I submit that a decision on the part of a typically white homeowner about to sell his property that he will not sell to a Negro is inaccurately characterized as an expression of racial bigotry in the usual situation. A moment's thought will indicate that this typical homeowner, looking only to his selfish concerns cares not one jot about any other factors than those of a financial character. However, this selling homeowner will most likely have formed attachments for his neighbors and friends in the area which he is about to leave, and he is cognizant of that preference for homogeneous neighborhoods which undoubtedly his friends and neighbors indulge. He knows that by selling his home to one not of his own race he may visit insecurity and apprehension on those who remain behind. Confronted with a choice of visiting hurt upon his erstwhile neighbors and friends in acceding to the colored prospect, he will typically choose the former. I deny the proposition that such a man is a bigot or that his act connotes malevolence toward any minority group.

Turning now to the apartment owner, the homebuilder and land developer, we must note that their decisions on open or closed occupancy in the disposition of their property are determined by the economic incidence of what they may elect to do. The apartment owner must necessarily consider the attitudes of his tenants to whom he looks for financial reward and whose sense of security and well-being he cannot brush off cavalierly except at his own expense. The land developer knows full well that ordinarily the market for his enterprise will be governed by the desirability of the neighborhood which he is about to create, and here the preference for racially homogeneous living may be decisive of the success or failure of his venture. Surely the multiple dwelling owner or the land developer from the standpoint of self-interest would be happy to accommodate an enlarged market made up of all minority groups if such could be done consistent with his financial security. His decision to sell to less than all racial groups is not motivated by bigotry but rather by prudent financial consideration. The unfairness of so-called "fair housing laws" is nowhere more manifest than in the thrust which these laws have upon investors in real estate who are compelled to dispose of their property inconsistent with their obvious financial security and with no protection or guaranty of law against loss through obedience to these laws.

Similarly, I submit that real estate brokers operating as the market media have been unfairly characterized as racial bigots by reason of their reluctance to be the instrumentality through which the introduction of minority elements into racially homogeneous neighborhoods is accomplished. Again, if people were indifferent to interracial living, the real estate broker should and would be the happiest man in the world to accept this state of affairs. The market for given properties would be greatly enlarged and the broker's pocketbook would reflect this situation in short order. Like the homeowner, however, the typical real estate broker has been reluctant to profit at the expense of those residing in a racially homogeneous neighborhood upon whom he would visit insecurity and apprehension were he to be the instrumentality through whom minority elements are introduced. The broker in this situation is the obvious target for recrimination from those whom he may offend deeply by selling a home to a minority prospect. Here again, open occupancy laws operate most unfairly for it is quite obvious that they contain no means for protecting the broker in this situation.

Thus, I submit, it is not realistic or accurate to say that open occupancy legislation can be justified as a legitimate means for extirpation of racial bigotry. As has been suggested, the impediments to integrated housing minimally rest on bigotry and fundamentally rest on quite differing considerations. Hence, those who advocate open occupancy law, if they were candid, would have to establish the validity of the following propositions:

1. The preference of white people to live among their own ought to be and is inferior to the desire of nonwhite to live among them;
2. The preference of the majority homogeneous living is properly subject to suppression by the State, for personal preference may not be indulged except to the extent that public authority permits;
3. Subjective concerns, fears or apprehensions may properly be visited through the exercise of public authority upon the majority, if in the eyes of public authority such fears are unjustifiable or should be treated as a calculated risk;
4. Investors in real estate can properly be made to dispose of their investments without regard to financial security or well-being in aid of integrated housing and without compensation or redress for hardships which may ensue;
5. All private real estate is impressed with a servitude in favor of the State which may be exercised in advancing any public policy which the State may decree.

To state these underlying propositions is to refute the fairness of fair housing laws. But this is not the end of the matter.

The ordinary citizen called upon to support or register his objections on the subject of open occupancy laws sees but one small facet of the implications of such legislation, if he considers only this legislation in whatever form it may be cast at the moment.

Even if he has under consideration the more extreme forms of open occupancy legislation, his view will be truly myopic unless he looks beyond to developments which will naturally follow in the wake of the laws which he views today. I suggest that open occupancy legislation is merely the opening of the door to a burgeoning of police legislation in human relations, the scope and severity of which can only be partially comprehended.

I have in mind the fact that 10 years or more ago no one would have thought that there could be any threat to the right of any home owner to dispose of his home without complying with criteria to be decreed by public authority. The typical layman would have conceived 10 years ago that this was an area completely beyond the scope of legal compulsion. Now, I predict that if open occupancy laws are accepted as legitimate exercises of the police power by those on whom the law is visited today, the not far distant future will see a vast expansion of regulatory police legislation far beyond the legislation which we discuss today. This is virtually assured, in my judgment, because open occupancy laws will simply not produce the results which they are supposed to accomplish commensurate with the insistent demands of their proponents. Other and more vigorous measures will most surely be spawned from the springboard of today's open occupancy legislation.

I would, therefore, predict with reasonable certitude that in the wake of open occupancy legislation we will see public laws enacted which will require the home owner to procure a license before he may dispose of his property, a condition of which will be a unilaterally enforcible provision requiring that he dispose of his property without regard to race, creed or national origin, coupled with suitable criminal or civil sanctions for its breach. The owner's motivations for rejecting a minority prospect will be subject to scrutiny by a licensing authority and the latter will be the ultimate arbiter of the issues with minimal hope of relief from the judicial processes. No real estate broker will be permitted to serve anyone who has not procured such a license and the broker's livelihood will be held as an additional pawn for full compliance with the open occupancy conditions of the license.

I can also foresee the time when public authority will claim the right to determine the motivations of one who elects to move from a transitional neighborhood into a homogeneous neighborhood, for arresting the mobility of the white will be a key objective of those who demand integrated living under force of law.

Having in mind that open occupancy housing is only one facet of the total problem of interracial relations and having used the police expedient to compel compliance with State declared criteria in private housing it is eminently probable that the police expedient will be directed at discrimination in other areas of concern. Censorship of the written and spoken word will most certainly be tried insofar as private or public utterances are deemed inimical with integration of the races. No private association, club or society will be free from the thrust of the police power. Finally, I sincerely believe that the enthusiasm for legal force will not be satiated until it is employed to censor and abridge the advice and counsel of parent to child or guardian to ward in matters pertaining directly or indirectly to race relations.

Bureaucratic power in a democracy can be abused. One must anticipate that it most surely will be used by the bureaucrats who will be constituted the architects of the new egalitarian scheme of things toward which open occupancy laws are but the first step. Freedom of choice, conviction and expression will be slyly crucified in the name of civil rights, and the Cross will bear the pious legend "equal opportunity." "Conform or else" will be the watchword, and ever more rigorous sanctions will provide adequate to the enforcement task. Such an Orwellian state of affairs is the inheritance of any American who docilely accepts the proposition that mutual acceptance may properly be legislated by police authority in the private affairs of life. There is no logical limit, legal or philosophical, once this insidious premise is accepted. Here and now, and for the good of us all, white and black, we must realize that a nation which has committed to its people the right to accept or reject their God as their convictions might dictate, cannot, consistent with its traditions, engage to use legal force to compel a citizen to accept his fellow man. This is a paramount truth which should register upon freemen when they are called upon to accept or reject open occupancy through force of law.

Doubtless, there are many people who would disagree that the rather dire predictions which I have outlined are likely to follow in the wake of open occupancy legislation. It will be claimed that the anticipated consequences are merely the mutterings of a dissident; that the minority groups themselves would be the last to pursue the matter to the extremity indicated; and that, in any event, public authority would never abide the use of law in the areas or degrees which have been suggested. To comments of this nature, I would reply by pointing out that the policing of human relations through the coercive use of law simply will not lend itself to termination until it covers the many areas wherein human relations problems are presented. One has only to remember that the police power in civil rights law was initially invoked in the northern States to abridge the right of choice of the owner of public accommodations; that from this point it progressed to the employer under fair employment practice laws; and that today it is directed at the private home owner under the label "fair housing laws." To conclude that this is the end of the matter is to ignore the obvious and espouse the fatuous. The question is not whether or not further legal measure will be tried. The question is whether or not an aroused public will defend itself against this legal methodology or permit under representative government the further forging of its shackles. There is yet time to take a stand in opposition to these developments, but time is most surely running out.

What then may we who earnestly oppose open occupancy legislation say to the American Negro who outwardly professes enthusiasm for this police legislation as an efficient means of bettering his lot in life? Certainly, he is entitled to know there are countless numbers of white people who are concerned for his welfare and who recognize that the Negro people of this Nation must be brought to a level of living comparable to that enjoyed by the white man. Let our colored friends understand, then, that opposition to use of police methods in human relations is not a quarrel with the ultimate end sought, but rather a fundamental disagreement with the means by which this end is supposed to be achieved. I would also remind the American Negro that the current civil rights controversy tends to obscure the fact that the American people, white and black, are going through a painful, if not agonizing transition looking toward the establishment of a biracial society unique in human experience. Many of us who must oppose the police expedient so frequently put forth to facilitate this transition do so out of conviction that this evolving biracial society once attained, must continue to bestow freedom on all of its components. We would also suggest to our minority brethren that coercion by government cannot produce that peace on earth and good will toward men which the biracial society of tomorrow will require as a condition to its birth and continuity.

The strident cries of the Negro leadership that full social and economic equality must be now should be disturbing to all men of good will irrespective of their race, for a moment of practical reflection will indicate that this simply cannot be. Progress and fruition must be the keynote of the day if the good society of tomorrow is to be assured. This is to say that the present generation of the American Negro will be called upon to exhibit selflessness in great degree, to the end that his posterity may experience that fuller life, the advent of which he would advance today.

This proposition that the Negro of today must be posterity oriented in his efforts to uplift his race has had application to the forebears of many of our white people who came to America from the many nations of the world. My own family serves to illustrate the point which I would make here, if I may be pardoned a familial anecdote.

About 85 years ago my paternal grandfather emigrated from England at the tender age of 17 to mine iron ore in the iron mines of Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Before he was 18 he had lost a leg in a mining accident. Crippled and poor, he nevertheless set out to make his way in his adopted country. Through self-education he was able to obtain a more sedentary employment and a livelihood. Determined that his son should rise to a higher station in life than was his lot, he somehow saw to it that my father received a college education.

I well recall the old gentleman visiting with me as I was about to enter my professional training or, as he put it, as I was about to start making "a mark in life." He reminded me that my father with the opportunities given him turned out to be a more useful and enlightened man than he, and that since I was the recipient of even greater opportunity, it was but right that I should endeavor to rise to a yet fuller and more useful life than that which my father had enjoyed. He referred to all of this as "climbing the ladder of life" with the preceding generation extending a helping hand to the one that followed. He concluded his homely comments by saying, "My son, if with the shove which your dad gives, you manage to reach the upper rungs of the ladder, and things are looking pretty good from there, just remember now and then, that your old granddad set the ladder in place and steadied it for awhile."

Now there was nothing really exceptional about this old Englishman who happened to be my ancestor. Doubtless, the sense of responsibility which he had for the welfare of his descendants and the joy which he felt as he viewed their betterment was in the hearts of many of his fellow immigrants, and their grandchildren enjoy today a fuller life because they who preceded us willed that it be so.

In closing, I would express the fervent hope that our Negro people will be blessed with men possessed of such convictions who will be able to remind their uplifted sons and grandsons in future years that they too were there to "steady the ladder for a while" during these difficult years. Upon such as these, the future of American institutions may well depend.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the latest so-called civil rights proposal follows the trend of recent years to ignore the rule book—the U.S. Constitution.

After the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964, it was hard to imagine anything more that could be proposed under this general heading. It is obvious from the latest proposal, however, that when the criteria of constitutionality, fairness, impartiality, reasonableness, and individual liberty are ignored, there is no end to what may be proposed.

President Johnson's latest proposal, introduced in the Congress last week, is, in many respects, patently unconstitutional, arbitrary, oppressive and dictatorial.

Under title II, the National Government would, in effect, prescribe procedures and qualifications for selecting jurors for all State courts down to and including city recorder courts. The terms of this proposal are so general that it would, in practice, make the U.S. Attorney General into a National Jury Commissioner for all State courts with arbitrary power to make up the rules as he goes along.

Title III would empower the Attorney General to bring suits in Federal courts to desegregate schools and other public facilities even when he had no complaint.

Title IV, under which the Federal Government would exercise control over the sale and rental of private property, is patently unconstitutional.

Title V creates a new class of Federal "protectorate," by establishing a whole new series of criminal offenses based not on the "act" committed, but on the identity of the person against whom the act is committed. In other words, the new law would not make it a Federal crime to beat your wife, unless she says she was engaged in "civil rights" work or activity when you administered the beating.

Not all the provisions of this bill are aimed directly at the South. Perhaps this time the constitutional objections will be more discernible to Members of Congress from outside the South than was the case in 1964.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. **Inouye**, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION ATTENDING THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR PATRICK V. McNAMARA, DETROIT, MICH.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces the following congressional delegation to attend the funeral of the late Senator Patrick V. McNamara, of Michigan:

Senator **Mike Mansfield** of Montana, majority leader.

Senator **Philip A. Hart** of Michigan, chairman.

Senator **James O. Eastland** of Mississippi.

Senator **Wayne Morse** of Oregon.

Senator **Paul Douglas** of Illinois.

Senator **Frank Carlson** of Kansas.

Senator **John O. Pastore** of Rhode Island.

Senator **Alan Bible** of Nevada.

Senator **Ralph W. Yarborough** of Texas.

Senator **Jennings Randolph** of West Virginia.

Senator **Eugene J. McCarthy** of Minnesota.

Senator **Gale W. McGee** of Wyoming.

Senator **Edmund S. Muskie** of Maine.

Senator **Harrison A. Williams, Jr.**, of New Jersey.

Senator **J. Caleb Boggs** of Delaware.

Senator **Daniel K. Inouye** of Hawaii.

Senator **George Murphy** of California.

Senator **Joseph D. Tydings** of Maryland.

Congressman **Elford A. Cederberg** of Michigan.

Congressman **Charles C. Diggs, Jr.**, of Michigan.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Contracts for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Authorization for Department of Commerce To Make Special Studies

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Negotiated Procurements, U.S. Coast Guard

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Treasury Department, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on negotiated procurements, U.S. Coast Guard (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Shipping Act, 1916, To Authorize Exemption From the Act

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to authorize exemption from the provisions of the act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on limited success in obtaining contributions for the binational educational exchange program, Department of State, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through improved management of ammunition, Department of Defense, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on reduction in dollar outflow possible through more extensive use of American-made building materials in Embassy and related construction projects, Department of State, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on policy guidance strengthened on direct procurement of components needed by contractors in production of weapon systems and other major end items, Department of Defense, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of absences of trainees enrolled in institutional training programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for improved coordination of transmission line construction practices of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the activities of the office of the Government Comptroller of the Virgin Islands, fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965, Department of the Interior, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of Division of Coal-Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Division of Coal-Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Receipt of Project Proposals Under Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of project proposals under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Attorney General

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Civil Rights Act of 1966

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, without amendment:

S. 3293. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1142).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON U.S. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO MAINLAND CHINA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 91), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations five thousand additional copies of its hearings on United States Policy With Respect to Mainland China, of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated April 25, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Brewster):

S. 3297. A bill to authorize the carriage of military cargoes by U.S.-flag vessels at reduced rates which are fair and reasonable; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3298. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to ban hazardous toys and articles intended for children, and other articles so hazardous as to be dangerous in the household regardless of labeling, and to apply to unpackaged articles intended for household use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3299. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernando Regino Milanes-Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 3300. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3301. A bill for the relief of Charles Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3302. A bill to amend the act of October 10, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes," so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts):

S. 3303. A bill to authorize on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3304. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3305. A bill relating to the deduction for Federal income tax purposes of contributions to certain organizations for revision of the revenue provisions of State constitutions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. JORDAN, of Idaho):

S. 3306. A bill to provide for establishing and maintaining reserve supplies of agricultural commodities for national security and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 3307. A bill to amend section 705 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to increase the membership of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from five members to seven members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 3308. A bill to amend the Act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

REVISED BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 89); which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in view of the clear and present danger represented by the mounting inflationary forces active in the Nation's economy, the President be and hereby is requested to prepare and submit promptly to the Congress a new budget for fiscal 1967 which reflects a valid surplus achieved by postponing or eliminating low priority nondefense expenditures.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF THE STUDY TEAM REPORT ON THE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JACKSON submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) to authorize printing of additional copies of hearings, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JACKSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON U.S. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO MAINLAND CHINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 91) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on U.S. Policy With Respect to Mainland China, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

COMMENDATION OF THE SOCIETY OF MOTION PICTURE & TELEVISION ENGINEERS

Mr. MURPHY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92); which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

S. CON. RES. 92

Whereas the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers is, in 1966, completing fifty years of continuous public service, not only to the United States of America but to the world; and

Whereas the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers sponsored and conducted the first International Congress on High Speed Photography, and is continuing to sponsor and conduct these important international meetings when they are held in the United States of America; and

Whereas the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, working through the American Standards Association (ASA) and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), has created and sponsored standards which have helped to achieve worldwide standardization of motion picture film and associated equipment; and

Whereas the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, at the request of and in cooperation with the United States Department of State, has sponsored and cohosted highly successful scientific and cultural exchange agreements, dealing with motion picture science and technology; and

Whereas the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers will conduct its one-hundredth semiannual technical conference in October 1966; and

Whereas the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers is continuing to foster, carry on, and advance the engineering and technical aspects of the motion picture, television and allied arts and sciences, not only in the United States but throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the best wishes and commendation of the Congress of the United States are hereby warmly extended to the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers for its many contributions to the United States and the world and upon the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary of continuous public service.

PARITY PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. MILLER (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. THURMOND) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 93) providing that no Federal agency take any action to discourage parity prices for any agricultural commodity, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MILLER, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

COMMEMORATION OF 1,000TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHRISTIANITY IN POLAND

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 255) to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

U.S. DENUNCIATION OF WARSAW CONVENTION

Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 256) relating to U.S. denunciation of the Warsaw Convention, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. NELSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

CARRIAGE OF MILITARY CARGOES BY U.S.-FLAG VESSELS AT REDUCED RATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] and myself I introduce a bill requested by major carriers now participating in the movement of defense cargoes by sea. It is reported that Department of Defense intends in the next few weeks to reverse a policy for procuring space for MSTS ocean shipments that has been in effect for almost 20 years. These companies assert that the proposed change would seriously disrupt the service needed by Defense as well as cause adverse effect on the readiness of the merchant fleet. If this is true, it should be known before the changes become effective. Accordingly, Senator BREWSTER will begin hearings on May 9 and 10 before the Committee on Commerce's Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee.

The bill introduced today would authorize the system of group negotiation, uniform rates and allocation of cargo among the carriers regularly serving the trade which is now in effect. But it would also provide statutory authority for reduced rates on defense cargoes, would authorize the Department of Defense to call for cost and price data, and would empower the Federal Maritime Commission to determine, if the parties could not agree, fair and reasonable rates on the established principles of rate regulation now developed for domestic and offshore commerce.

I do not know whether this bill or the Department of Defense competitive bidding proposal is the better solution to this important problem. That will be determined by the committee on the basis of the hearing record. In the meantime I am hopeful that the Department will not inaugurate its new system while the matter awaits congressional decision.

I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared by the merchant marine supporters of this bill be included in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Williams of New Jersey in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3297) to authorize the carriage of military cargoes by U.S.-flag vessels at reduced rates which are fair and reasonable, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and Mr. Brewster), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The memorandum presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Memorandum in Support of Bill Amending Shipping Act To Authorize the Carriage of Military Cargoes by U.S.-Flag Vessels at Reduced Rates Which Are Fair and Reasonable

I

Ever since the close of World War II, defense cargoes have been carried at uniform rates with the cargo allocated among all U.S.-flag berth carriers in the trade. Ever since 1950, the rates have been set by the Military Sea Transport Service as a result of discussions with groups of carriers serving the several trades.

For a year past, the U.S.-flag berth lines and MSTS have been in dispute or uncertainty as to whether rates under the MSTS shipping contracts were fair and reasonable. To help resolve that dispute, the Federal Maritime Commission has carried forward an elaborate investigation, FMC docket 65–13. For their part, the carriers in all the principal trades have produced searching cost studies which broke new ground in steamship accounting. These studies indicate that MSTS rates are substantially less than the commercial rates on comparable goods.

On April 4, 1966, a witness for the Department of Defense announced in FMC docket 65–13 a new policy for the carriage of defense cargoes. This would be done under contracts procured by competitive bidding by the individual lines or, in cases where this was not feasible, by individually negotiated contracts. The commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, has recently declared his intention to open bids and have the system in operation by July 1.

II

The steamship industry believes that any such system spells disaster to the industry and will preclude the Department of Defense traffic agencies from accomplishing their mission. They summarize their position as follows:

1. The effect on the lines: (a) For nearly a century, without known exception, rate competition among ocean steamship berth lines has always produced a rate war in which rates were driven far below costs.

(b) This uniform history is not an accident, but results from the fact that over 75 percent of the costs of a berth operation are fixed, so that any return over the 25 percent of variable costs is better than free-space. In the case of the FIO defense cargoes, about 83 percent of the costs are fixed.

(c) The MSTS cargo represents close to half of the outbound cargoes carried by the U.S.-flag lines on the principal MSTS trade routes. None of the lines on those routes can do without this cargo.

(d) Under a competitive bidding system, each line will in normal times be forced to bid low enough to insure that it obtains at least its share of this indispensable cargo, with the inevitable and classic result of bids below fully distributed costs and approaching the added costs of cargo handling and vessel loading time costs for the MSTS cargoes.

(e) The apparently proposed absence of restriction upon bidders will in all likelihood stimulate the formation of transient steamship lines which will offer low bids for selected routes when vessel charter rates are low and desert the damaged trade when these rates rise.

(f) The unsubsidized lines will be forced to abandon U.S.-flag service almost immediately after the return to a normal period of excess tonnage. The subsidized lines could hang on longer, but with up toward half their cargoes carried at a loss their eventual survival would be equally doubtful.

2. The effect on MSTS: (a) MSTS has often enough indicated its need for berth services and for fast modern ships. There will be no vessel replacement for services conducted at a loss, and MSTS would sooner or later be forced into sole dependence upon its own fleet. The costs, we believe all agree, would greatly exceed those resulting from use of the berth lines.

(b) MTMTS, which is responsible for Department of Defense traffic management and terminals, was opposed last September to any system of competitive rate bidding on the ground that it could not discharge its function if it had to deal with line-by-line routes, rates and priorities. It was not consulted on the Department of Defense policy announced on April 4.

(c) The Department of Defense negotiates with rate bureaus, not individual roads, to obtain railroad rates. It accepts the CAB determinations for fair rates for military cargoes and personnel. The steamship industry, with its unvarying history of destructive rate wars whenever rates are fixed by competition, would seem the last, not the first, transportation industry in which to procure rates by competition.

(d) For 15 years past, the berth lines have felt themselves obliged to meet all MSTS requests, whether or not the voyage would produce a loss and whatever their competing obligations to commercial shippers. One simply cannot expect an MSTS contract holder, who obtained his contract by competitive bidding below the cost of service, to be willing to take on costly obligations beyond the perimeter of his contract. Negotiations and special costs will replace automatic and uncompensated compliance with special requests.

(e) At this moment, something of a rarity in steamship history, the lines are not short of cargoes. In 1966, but not as a rule, we should expect a sharp increase in MSTS freight rates if competitive bids are substituted for continuing contracts.

CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act which I originally introduced as S. 1283 in 1959 was passed by the Congress and signed by the President in 1960. This is a strong consumer protection law which requires cautionary labeling on hazardous substances in packages intended or suitable for household use.

Testimony before our committee indicated that thousands of children were dying each year from the accidental ingestion of hazardous susbtances commonly found around the household and that the lack of adequate warnings on these products contributed to the increasing toll of accidental poisonings. I am confident the legislation has saved the lives of untold numbers of children since its passage. However, recent developments have pointed up the need to consider revisions to this act.

If a hazardous substance is not in a household package, the Federal law does not apply to it. It is a labeling law. If a product's label carries the legally required warnings, it can be sold to anyone, even small children. Further, it may be sold even though the product is so dangerous a layman cannot safely use it. These limitations contribute to the needless injury, and even death, of an undetermined number of men, women, and children each year.

Today, I am introducing the Child Protection Act of 1966, a bill which will close these loopholes in present public health protection. As you know, Mr. President, we received recently a "Message on Consumer Interests" from President Johnson urging that we enact such legislation. My bill will not eliminate all injuries from these products, but I am firmly convinced that most of these can be avoided if appropriate safeguards are provided.

Mr. President, I would like to cite a few examples demonstrating the need for this legislation. During the past three Easter seasons, American parents have been disturbed over a threat to their children's health. Imported toy ducks from Japan made from the stuffed skins of ducklings were found to contain high concentrations of a poisonous insecticide. Other such "toys" were contaminated by the dangerous salmonella micro-organisms and others by arsenic. But these "toys" were not packaged. Thus, they escaped the jurisdiction of the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act. Many parents bought these decorations for their children unaware of the danger.

Another example of this type of hazard involves the jequirity bean, a colorful seed used in a variety of ways such as necklace beads and as decorations on toys and novelty items imported into this country. These bright little beans are deadly poisonous and can cause death in a matter of hours. We all know how small children love to put things in their mouths. This childish habit could be fatal if it involved a jequirity bean. But here again, these articles generally are not packaged so the Federal Government is powerless to require a warning statement on them.

The Child Protection Act will remedy this defect by extending the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to cover hazardous substances intended for household use or use by children, whether or not sold in a household package.

But this revision alone would not be sufficient. This is best illustrated by another example. There was recently on the market a product called "Cracker Balls." These were intended for use by children but yet were so dangerous that children could not properly handle them. Cracker balls are small, brightly colored, torpedolike firecrackers which explode on impact. However, they look like candy and were often packaged and sold like candy. A number of children thought they were candy and, as a result, were injured. When they started to chew them the cracker balls exploded. Some children lost teeth. Others suffered damage to oral tissue.

The cracker balls were labeled so as to avoid State and local prohibitions on firecrackers. They were, however, subject to the Federal Hazardous Substance Labeling Act because they were in a package. But, Mr. President, the futility of requiring an article intended for use by children to be labeled "Keep out of the reach of children" is readily apparent. Such labeling affords no protection to small children in search of fun. The Child Protection Act will ban such articles as these from interstate commerce.

However, the need to change the character of the present labeling law goes beyond those articles intended for children. I am sure many of us remember the tragic consequences associated with a product called "X-33 Water Repellent." Some of us may have used it to waterproof our basements. If we did, we are indeed fortunate to be here today. When X-33 first went on the market it had a flash point—the lowest temperature at which it will flash when ignited—of 40° below zero Fahrenheit. At least three people were killed while using X-33 and over 30 were injured. One woman was killed while using it in her basement. The force of the explosion was so great that it blew the roof off the garage overhead.

All that the Food and Drug Administration could do was to require a relabeling. Since the firm which produced the product was financially unable to recall all of the original stocks of the extremely flammable X-33 from the market, it was removed by over 500 seizures executed by U.S. marshals. The warning the Food and Drug Administration required said that X-33 was so hazardous that it should not be used by laymen without consulting a professional expert in handling such highly hazardous materials. Yet this product was sold to laymen. This is ridiculous.

Products too dangerous to be used by laymen should not be sold to them for their use. My bill will authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to ban, by regulation, articles offered or intended for household use when he finds that the hazard involved is such that cautionary labeling is not an adequate consumer safeguard. Of course, proper procedural safeguards such as opportunity for a hearing and judicial review are provided to protect the rights of the manufacturer.

The Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act excludes from its scope pesticides and other economic poisons that are subject to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. My bill will amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to make it clear that this exclusionary provision does not apply to an article which is treated with a pesticide or other economic poison but which is not itself subject to Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. This will remove any doubt as to FDA's authority to require warning labeling on children's articles, such as toy ducklings, containing pesticides.

Mr. President, I believe the merits of the Child Protection Act are so persuasive that this legislation should move through the Congress promptly and soon be on President Johnson's desk for signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3298) to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to ban hazardous toys and articles intended for children, and other articles so hazardous as to be dangerous in the household regardless of labeling, and to apply to unpackaged articles intended for household use, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE BOOTLEGGING OF UNTAXED CIGARETTES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at a conference in Baltimore, Md., on April 14 and 15, representatives of 13 States, the District of Columbia, and the city of New York met to discuss a problem of common interest—cigarette bootlegging. Only two States, Oregon and North Carolina, do not impose a retail cigarette tax. As other States have sought increased revenues and imposed increasingly greater taxes on the retail sale of cigarettes, a lucrative trade has developed which begins with the purchase of tax-free cigarettes in the tobacco-growing State of North Carolina and culminates in the illegal sale of untaxed cigarettes in a jurisdiction imposing an excise upon their sale.

The cigarette traffic, I am told, customarily begins with an order from a buyer in a cigarette-taxing State to a source in tax-free North Carolina or in the District of Columbia where the tax is relatively low. Agents of the buyer travel to North Carolina or the District of Columbia and load their vehicles with legally purchased cigarettes. The buyer's agents then begin their smuggling adventure. They travel through States which forbid the transportation and sale of untaxed cigarettes. Finally, they reach their destination in a State or municipality imposing a tax on the retail sale of cigarettes and the venture ends with an "under the counter" sale of cigarettes.

Every transaction in this illicit traffic, diminishes State and local tax revenues. As a former delegate in the Maryland legislature, I am well aware of the difficulties which State and local governments have in funding necessary programs and in finding acceptable sources of revenue. When an expected source of revenue fails to materialize because of a large scale smuggling operation, the burden on other sources of revenue, of course, become greater.

Every clandestine sale of cigarettes has an additional impact. The purchaser of the untaxed package is channeled away from the normal retail outlets for taxed cigarettes. The legitimate businessman thus loses his normal cigarette sale as well as the benefit of whatever additional purchases a consumer might make. As most outlets for the legitimate sale of cigarettes are small business operations, this loss of revenue strikes at those who can least afford it.

The representatives of State and local governments who recently met in Baltimore have agreed to take aggressive action to halt the illegal transportation and sale of untaxed cigarettes. Maryland State law enforcement officers have been especially vigorous in attempting to break up this illicit traffic. Arrests for unlawful transportation of untaxed cigarettes on Maryland highways are not uncommon. Recently, the Maryland Legislature made cigarette smuggling a felony in an effort to ease enforcement problems and to increase the cost of the bootlegging. Yet, the traffic continues and, according to State tax authorities, is increasing.

The Baltimore conference also recorded the belief of many State tax officials that organized crime syndicates have become deeply involved in the bootleg cigarette business. Officials from the States of New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Maryland made pointed reference to this development. One indication of such involvement is evident to Maryland authorities for invariably a person caught in the act of smuggling is able to call for funds to meet the heavy fines imposed on them.

The State representatives who met in Baltimore concluded that the Federal Government could play a helpful role in combating this cigarette traffic. The Comptroller of Maryland, Louis L. Goldstein, informs me that the conference unanimously adopted a resolution urging Congress to enact into law amendments to the Jenkins Act—title 15 United States Code, sections 375 to 379. Such amendments have been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressmen HERBERT TENZER, SEYMOUR HALPERN, and RICHARD OTTINGER, all of New York.

The State taxing authorities at their meeting in Baltimore noted that the Jenkins Act had the effect of almost completely eradicating the use of mail-order deliveries to avoid the payment of State and local cigarette taxes. These State officials believe that passage of appropriate amendments to the Jenkins Act would likewise aid the States in the enforcement of their cigarette tax policies.

I believe it is incumbent upon Congress to provide measures to halt this widespread evasion of legitimate State and local revenue measures. I have carefully studied the bills offered in the House by the New York Congressmen. I believe their proposed amendments to the Jenkins Act provide an effective solution to the problem.

The proposed amendments to the Jenkins Act will impose reporting requirements upon those who sell 5,000 or more cigarettes to an unlicensed distributor for transportation into a State taxing the sale of cigarettes.

Thus, by setting the high number of 5,000 cigarettes we do not put any restriction or burden on the ordinary citizen who might be purchasing two or three cartons of cigarettes.

The amendments will, as the Jenkins Act does, require reports by persons who make such sales to State taxing authorities. The amendments to the Jenkins Act will also place documentation requirements upon persons who deliver or transport such quantities of cigarettes. Persons failing to meet the reporting requirements or to have the necessary documentation of sale will commit a misdemeanor punishable by fine of not more than $1,000, or imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.

I, therefore, introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of October 10, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes," so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes.

I trust that the Senate will act promptly to air this proposed solution to cigarette smuggling and to enact into law the mode of assistance which the State officials meeting in Baltimore have requested.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record and held at the desk for 10 days for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The bill (S. 3302) to amend the act of October 10, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes," so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes, introduced by Mr. Tydings, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3302

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An Act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes", as amended (15 U.S.C. 375–379), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That, for the purposes of this Act—

"(1) The term 'person' includes corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals.

"(2) The term 'cigarette' means any roll for smoking made wholly or in part of tobacco, irrespective of size or shape and whether or not such tobacco is flavored, adulterated, or mixed with any other ingredient, the wrapper or cover of which is made of paper or any other substance or material except tobacco.

"(3) The term 'distributor licensed or located in such State' means—

"(A) in the case of any State which by State statute or regulation authorizes the distribution of cigarettes at wholesale or retail, any person so authorized, or

"(B) in the case of any other State, any person located in such State who distributes cigarettes at wholesale or retail; but such term in no case includes a person who acquires cigarettes for purposes other than resale.

"(4) The term 'use'. in addition to its ordinary meaning, means the consumption, storage, handling, or disposal of cigarettes.

"(5) The term 'tobacco tax administrator' means the State official duly authorized to administer the cigarette tax law of a State.

"(6) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(7) The term 'transfers for profit' means any transfer for profit or other disposition for profit, including any transfer or disposition by an agent to his principal in connection with which the agent receives anything of value.

"(8) The term 'transportation' or 'to transport' does not include carriage by a common or contract carrier holding a certificate of convenience or necessity or equivalent operating authority from a regulatory agency of the United States or of any State or the District of Columbia, nor does it include carriage within or through a State by a distributor, wholesaler, or other dealer in cigarettes licensed as such in that State.

"Sec. 2. (a) Any person who sells or transfers for profit cigarettes in interstate commerce, whereby such cigarettes are shipped into a State taxing the sale or use of cigarettes, to other than a distributor licensed by or located in such State, or who advertises or offers cigarettes for such a sale or transfer and shipment, shall—

"(1) first file with the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which such shipment is made or in which such advertisement or offer is disseminated a statement setting forth his name and trade name (if any), and the address of his principal place of business and of any other place of business; and

"(2) not later than the tenth day of each calendar month, file with the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which such shipment is made, a memorandum or a copy of the invoice covering each and every shipment of cigarettes made during the previous calendar month into such State; the memorandum or invoice in each case to include the name and address of the person to whom the shipment was made, the brand, and the quantity thereof.

"(b) The fact that any person ships or delivers for shipment any cigarettes shall, if such shipment is into a State in which such person has filed a statement with the tobacco tax administrator under subsection (a)(1) of this section, be presumptive evidence (1) that such cigarettes were sold, or transferred for profit, by such person, and (2) that such sale or transfer was to other than a distributor licensed by or located in such State.

"(c) A person subject to this Act may prepay applicable State taxes on behalf of his customers remitting to the tobacco tax administrator at the time he files the memorandum or copies of invoices required by subsection (a)(2) of this section, the full amount of taxes due on the shipments therein described.

"Sec. 3. (a) Any person who sells or transfers cigarettes for profit in quantities exceeding five thousand cigarettes whereby such cigarettes are delivered for transportation or transported into a State taxing the sale or use of cigarettes for the account or use of anyone other than a distributor licensed by or located in such State shall not later than the tenth day of each calendar month file with the tobacco tax administrator of the State in which such cigarettes are transported a memorandum or copy of the invoice covering each and every such sale or transfer made during the previous calendar month; the memorandum or invoice in each case to include the name and address of the person to whom the cigarettes were sold or transferred, the brand and quantity thereof.

"(b) Any person who sells or transfers and delivers cigarettes in quantities exceeding those set forth in subsection (a) of this section to any person who is not a distributor licensed by or located in the State where possession of the cigarettes is transferred shall require evidence of the identity, the business address and residence of the purchaser, and in the event that such identification discloses facts reasonably leading to the belief that such cigarettes are sold or transferred to a nonresident of the State, or in the event that such cigarettes are delivered for transportation to a vehicle with an out-of-State registration, it shall be presumptive evidence that the transaction is subject to the reporting provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Any person who transports cigarettes in quantities exceeding five thousand cigarettes into or through a State taxing the sale or use of cigarettes shall have in his possession invoices, bills of sale, or delivery tickets for such cigarettes which documentation shall show—

"(1) the name and complete address of the vendor or other person from whom such cigarettes were acquired or received by him, and the brands and quantities thereof;

"(2) (A) the name and complete address of the owner of such cigarettes, or

"(B) if such cigarettes are to be delivered to a person other than the owner, the name and complete address of the person to whom delivery is to be made; and

"(3) if such cigarettes are destined for delivery in a State taxing the sale or use of cigarettes, the name and complete address of the distributor, dealer, or any other person who will assume liability for the payment of applicable taxes in such State.

"Sec. 4. Whoever violates any provision of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"Sec. 5. The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of this Act."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect thirty days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I also ask that two recent newspaper articles and a letter from Maryland's comptroller, Louis L. Goldstein, be printed in the Record as documentation of the need for this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the articles and the letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 15, 1965]

Cigarette Racket Is Linked to Mafia by Tax Officials—13 States Seek Ways To Curb Smuggling From South To Evade Local Excises

(By Martin Arnold)

Baltimore, April 14.—Organized crime syndicates are apparently taking over the bootleg cigarette business, tax authorities said here today.

Indications of the organized nature of the smuggling, mostly from North Carolina, were noted in the speed with which expensive legal help is provided for arrested smugglers and an increase in the counterfeiting of State cigarette-tax stamps.

This was discussed by officials from New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Maryland in the opening session of a 2-day conference of State tobacco tax administrators called here to explore means of curbing the traffic.

MOST TO NEW YORK

North Carolina, the only tobacco producing State that has no retail cigarette tax, is the main supply center for tens of thousands of cigarettes that are smuggled North, mostly to New York, each day. Oregon is the only other State without a cigarette tax.

Today's conference was attended by 53 officials from 13 States, New York City, and the District of Columbia.

John J. Purcell, assistant director of the New York State Miscellaneous Tax Bureau, told the meeting that the State police had the phones of known narcotics dealers and had recorded conversations in which they had said "they were switching to cigarettes."

He also said that State police had recently confiscated a planeload of cigarettes that had been flown from North Carolina to an airport in Linden, N.J., and then trucked into New York.

ACTIVE GANG TOLE SEEN

Capt. Louis L. Cottell, deputy inspector of the New York City Police Central Bureau of Investigation, said:

"I don't say the gangs are controlling the smuggling, but they are active in it, and if it is not curtailed soon they will run it as effectively as they ran rum in prohibition."

But Louis L. Goldstein, Maryland's controller, said flatly that the crime syndicate, Mafia or Cosa Nostra, had already taken over.

In an interview he said: "when we arrest a young man driving cigarettes up north he'll go before a judge and plead poverty, sometimes for hours.

"But when the judge fines him, say $1,300, he'll pull a roll of bills out of his pocket and pay it, or make a call and the money will be there in short order," Mr. Goldstein said. "It's not his old auntie or poor parents who are supplying him with the money or the legal help."

In this illicit trade, the profits are large and the risks, fines, and confiscation of the contraband, are small.

In North Carolina, regular brands of cigarettes can be purchased for $1.83 to $2 a carton, depending on the type and quantity involved.

In New York, the same brands sell for $3.36 to $4.40 a carton.

CAROLINA SALE IS LEGAL

The sale of large quantities of cigarettes to anyone who can afford to buy them, tourists or known professional bootleggers, is legal in North Carolina. Only the importation into other States is illegal.

An indication of the size of the business in North Carolina is the fact that U.S. 301, the State's most traveled north and south artery, is known as "Tobacco Road."

This is particularly true near the Virginia border, where almost every gasoline station, hamburger stand, grocery store, motel, and restaurant is also in the bulk cigarette business—often with large roadside advertising signs that give names and prices.

Although most of the cigarettes are trucked north, some go south, particularly to Florida.

Albert B. Bavtel, of the New Jersey Cigarette Tax Bureau, said that the movement north was well organized.

Trucks will be stopped near a turnpike toll station by "the gang's contact man, who will tell the driver where to take them," he said.

The contact man will tell the driver, for example, to use the Holland Tunnel in going into New York City, Mr. Baytel said.

"But before the driver gets to the Holland Tunnel entrance he will be stopped by another contact man who will say, 'take them to such and such an address in Brooklyn or the Bronx,' " he said.

CRIME SYNDICATE SEEN

Mr. Baytel said:

"I honestly believe that there is an organized crime syndicate behind this situation."

Once in New York, the cigarettes are presumably distributed in two ways, and no one in authority can estimate now which method is used the most.

Some are sold directly to the public, for $1 less a carton than the regular price, by "cigarette runners" who hawk the cartons outside industrial plants, sports stadiums, or any other place where there are apt to be large numbers of people.

Sometimes they are sold under the counter in small stores. Officials also said they were sold by housewives, milkmen and garbage collectors.

The other method involves the counterfeiting of cigarette tax stamps and stamping dies. In it, the honest wholesalers of cigarettes are bypassed, with the gangs selling directly to shopkeepers, who pay less for the cigarettes than they would to a regular wholesaler but who sell them at or near the established prices.

Officials estimate New York State's tax loss at $40 million a year and New York City's at $9 million.

PENALTIES ARE SMALL

Despite the massive quantities of cigarettes being smuggled into New York, an arrest on such a charge is only a misdemeanor, with fines and jail sentences ranging from $50 and 30 days for a first offense to $250 and 6 months for subsequent offenses.

New York enforcement authorities also complain that judges are reluctant to hand out these relatively small penalties.

They cite a recent case in Nassau County that involved counterfeiting cigarette tax stamps. The defendant was given a suspended sentence.

Further, if only a misdemeanor is involved it is unconstitutional to stop and search trucks or cars merely on suspicion.

"We almost have to actually see them making a sale to make an arrest now," a New York State tax official said.

Many legal experts believe it would be equally unconstitutional if the charge was changed to a felony, as has been proposed in a bill before the New York State Legislature now.

Maryland recently made cigarette smuggling a felony. The State now attempts to stop every truck or vehicle it suspects of transporting contraband cigarettes.

GANGS OF LAWYERS

But Mr. Goldstein said that "the gangs have lawyers fighting in the courts on the ground that stopping on suspicion violates the interstate commerce laws."

The felony section of New York's proposed new law is not expected to pass the State legislature.

But sections that would provide fines of $25 for every carton of cigarettes seized and a jail sentence of up to a year will probably be passed.

Another part of the proposed law expected to pass would give State tax agents the arrest powers they do not have now. New York City's tax agents can make arrests.

The States that sent representatives to this conference passed a resolution calling for tighter Federal control over the transportation of cigarettes.

On a more practical level, many of the States represented agreed today to supply tax agents who would go to North Carolina to record the license numbers of suspected bootleggers.

These would then be telephoned or wired to a central point and distributed to all the States which would then be on the watch for the trucks as they pass their borders.

Each of the States agreeing to the program would send the agents at different times. One State, for example, would cover in November and another in December.

Some of this spying has been done in the past, and the tax authorities said today that their agents were always spotted and followed by scouts working for the North Carolina distributors.

One recent northern visitor to a North Carolina warehouse, from which cigarettes valued at $20,000 were being shipped north every 24 hours, was told by the owner:

"My customers are getting upset. You'll do me and yourself one big favor getting out of here as fast as possible."

One of the upset customers was busily putting brown paper over the Massachusetts license plates of his rented truck.

Taking part in the conference here are Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York City, New York State, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 14, 1966]

YANKEE SMUGGLERS BRING BOOM TO CAROLINA CIGARETTE DEALERS

(By Martin Arnold)

WHITAKERS, N.C., April 13.—Night and day on the highways through this village of 1,000 people and others like it there is a flow of trucks and cars loaded with tens of thousands of cigarettes.

They are being smuggled north, mostly to New York City, to be resold at comparatively low prices that do not include the sales tax. North Carolina, the only tobacco-producing State that has no cigarette sales tax, is the distribution center for cigarettes that turn up on markets outside the State as contraband.

Those who supply the cigarettes say that the truck volume of traffic, though not the profits, in cigarette smuggling is far greater than the movement northward of moonshine liquor during the prohibition era. Many of them, apparently, were involved in the liquor business during prohibition in the twenties and some say they have the same customers now as then.

So great is this traffic in cigarettes now, that U.S. Route 301, the most traveled north and south artery in the State, has recently become known from Virginia to South Carolina as the new "Tobacco Road." Its major industry is the sale of cigarettes to Yankee bootleggers and tourists.

Cigarettes bought here for less than 20 cents a pack bring up to 45 cents a pack retail in New York.

The tax loss—estimated at $9 million a year in New York City alone—is so great that representatives from 12 States, New York City and the District of Columbia are opening a 2-day conference in Baltimore to try to curb the traffic.

At Whitakers, about 70 miles northeast of Raleigh, the State capital, and 30 miles south of the Virginia border, Tobacco Road narrows to two lanes.

The village is in Nash County, where the gray sandy soil is perfect for the growing of tobacco and the backwoods pine brush effectively camouflages the manufacture of white whisky and moonshine brandy, also for consignment to New York.

Whitakers, like Rocky Mount, 15 miles to the south, and Enfield and Halifax and Weldon to the north are the major distributing points for cigarettes going northward to illegal markets.

LARGEST SUPPLIER

The roadside signs on Route 301, between asking for the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren, all offer cigarettes.

"Hulls' Shell, 2 Miles. Cigarettes and Ice Water," says one. "Malcolm's Esso 3 Miles—Cigarettes—Filter and King—Regular," says another. Malcolm operates a small, wooden, run-down grocery and sundry store by Route 301 here. It has three gas pumps in front. Overhead, for his cigarette customers, is a freshly painted white sign that says, "Trucks—Cigarettes—Clearance 14 feet."

Malcolm is known not only in the trade but also to the State revenue department as one of the largest suppliers of northbound cigarettes in North Carolina.

A small room at the rear of Malcolm's is piled high with cases of cigarettes, and so are the garage and cellar of Malcolm's new red-brick ranchhouse in a tobacco field across the highway.

Cases of cigarettes are also piled high in front of his store, and each of these has scratched in pencil the name or code of a customer who has ordered them, usually several days in advance: "Billy," "Connie," "Joe," "NX," "Willie," and others.

Malcolm is tall and lean and his face is chalky white because he spends every day, from 6 a.m. to 9:30 p.m., in his store.

During prohibition he used to bootleg, but he likes the cigarette business better because "This is a lot larger and from this end it is legal."

"I went home one night, about 15 years ago, went to bed and told my wife: 'I believe I can do something with this'," he said of his cigarette business. He has been in it ever since.

On Tuesday morning at 1 o'clock, Malcolm said, he was sleeping in his ranchhouse when he got a telephone call.

"There was this customer from New York—I can recognize their voices by now—who said it was an emergency. He was in Washington and wanted to make a pickup at 5 a.m."

Malcolm took the order and awakened several of the Negro boys who work for him. They opened the store and put together the shipment as carefully as Sears, Roebuck would put together a mail order.

It was for: 3,347 cartons of kings at $1.91 per carton—$6,392.77; 831 cartons of regulars at $1.87 per carton—$1,553.97; 30 cartons of specials (Benson & Hedges) at $2.60 per carton—$78; 1 carton of kings at $1.91 for the driver—$1.91.

The total came to $8,026.65. Malcolm was paid in cash.

Several miles north of Malcolm's well off the highway but near a railroad track, is a white concrete, one-story building about the size of a high school gymnasium.

It is owned by a sparrow-like man, who until 6 months ago operated a gasoline station on Route 301, but who now devotes himself exclusively to the sale of cigarettes.

He spends his days shouting into the telephone cursing the Negroes who load the trucks and his teenage son who hauls in the cigarettes.

"You haven't the brains to blow through a bamboo stick," he barked at the boy, who had brought a stranger from the North to the warehouse on Monday night.

"He's a damn tax agent from New York taking down license numbers, I know it, I know it," the man said.

"I don't care about me because I'm not doing anything wrong," the boy's father said. "But these drivers, damn it, they're good boys—one of them has to be back at work in New York in the morning—and I don't want to see them arrested."

This man, like Malcolm, deals in bulk cigarettes, although Malcolm, being beside the highway, also sells to tourists. Selling to tourists is called carton pushing, a phrase used in disdain by the bulk sellers.

From the warehouse near the tracks, cigarettes valued at $20,000 retail are shipped north every 24 hours.

In the warehouse, as in the smaller stores, there are hints of gangster tieups.

Malcolm, for example, concedes that he sells cigarettes to some of the people he sold liquor to during prohibition.

The teenage boy, until his father shut him up, was able to give the visitor the lineage of the Gallo family in Brooklyn, where apparently some of the cigarettes shipped from North Carolina end up.

All the big retailers in this area of northeastern North Carolina insist that tax agents from other States are cluttering up the highway jotting down license numbers.

"In Maryland they confiscated 50,000 cartons since last November," one retailer said, laughing. "They bragged about it. Why, that's like a half hour of work on Route 301."

Another indication of the size of the business can be seen by a retailer in Rocky Mount, who makes pickups from the wholesalers up to three times a day, with each pickup averaging 60 cases, each with 60 cartons.

The wholesalers in turn buy the cigarettes directly from tobacco companies in North Carolina and Virginia.

Malcolm's operation is typical of a large retailer. He usually purchases from the three wholesalers within a 10-mile radius of his grocery store, but if he has a real need there are some 10 or 11 other large wholesalers within a 100-mile radius.

Malcolm buys from wholesalers at from $105.60 to $110.40 a case, depending upon the make and the length and whether or not they have filter tips. He usually gets a 1-percent discount because of the large quantities he buys.

Also, each month he must send the State a 3-percent general sales tax on every case he has purchased.

For the king size cigarettes his total cost is $111.58 a case. He sells them to bulk smugglers at $1.91 a carton, bringing him a total of $114.60 for the case of 60 cartons—a $2.02 profit on the case.

For tourists or for truckdrivers who buy 20 or 30 cartons at a time Malcolm's prices range up to $2 a carton.

He says that over a year's time he averages a profit of $1.94 for every case he sells, either to tourists or bulk buyers.

In New York, for example, the same brand cigarettes sell from prices ranging from $3.36 to $4.40 a carton.

This is because each pack of cigarettes has 22 cents taxes on it—a New York City tax of 4 cents, a State tax of 10 cents in addition to a Federal tax of 8 cents.

Attending the Baltimore meeting will be representatives of Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York City, New York State, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia.

State of Maryland,
Comptroller of the Treasury,
Annapolis, April 19, 1966.

Senator Joseph D. Tydings,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Joe: During the period immediately prior to October 1949, the various States of this Nation which had imposed cigarette taxes suffered a tremendous loss of revenue as a result of mail order trade in cigarettes.

Congress came to the rescue of the States, by adopting a law which became known as the Jenkins Act (15 U.S.C. 375–379). This act was adopted to assist the States in the collection of their cigarette taxes through the avoidance of cigarette mail order dealers located in States having no cigarette taxes. The States at that time with relatively low cigarette tax rates were losing millions of dollars annually. The Jenkins Act was extremely effective and has almost completely eradicated this type of tax evasion against which the States were powerless.

Because of the fact that a number of States have substantially increased their cigarette tax, a new trade has arisen—cigarette bootlegging. These bootleggers drive to North Carolina where there is no cigarette tax or to the District of Columbia where the tax is only 2 cents per package, purchase large quantities of cigarettes and run them into the States having a high tax rate. This illicit traffic has resulted in the State of New York losing over $50 million in tobacco tax revenues in this fiscal year and many other States' revenues are being vastly affected.

Congressman Herbert Tenzer, of New York, has recently introduced a bill, H.R. 14153, which would amend the Jenkins Act so that it would apply to the present method of bootlegged cigarettes.

At a recent conference in Baltimore, held at my invitation, the tax representatives from 13 cigarette-taxing States, the District of Columbia, and the city of New York were present and at this meeting a unanimous resolution was adopted to urge our respective Senators and Congressmen to support Congressman Tenzer's bill, H.R. 14153.

This remedial legislation is needed immediately and your active support of this bill will be greatly appreciated by the State of Maryland and the other States which are being victimized by this insidious form of tax evasion. We are confident that the mere existence of Congressman Tenzer's amendment as a law of the United States would aid the States in their enforcement in much the same manner that the original Jenkins Act put a stop to mail order sales.

As State comptroller of the State of Maryland, I am vitally concerned with the increased traffic on our highways of contraband cigarettes and the well-organized criminal elements involved and I wish to take every means possible to stop this illicit traffic. At the same time, the tobacco tax revenues of our State must be protected, as well as our other revenues.

Needless to say, your active participation and support of H.R. 14153 is greatly needed and you will be performing a valuable service for the people of Maryland and our sister States by supporting this bill.

Thanking you for your cooperation and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,
Louis L. Goldstein.

AMENDMENT TO COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with regard to the provisions of the newly enacted Veteran Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, Public Law 89–358, popularly called the cold war GI bill.

I introduce this bill on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and myself.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be permitted to lie on the desk until Monday, May 9, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 3303) to authorize on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Yarborough (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill would amend the recently enacted cold war GI bill and bring the level of benefits up to the level of benefits provided in the Korean GI bill.

The cold war GI bill passed by the Senate contained the same level of benefits as did the Korean GI bill. When the bill reached the House, provisions for benefits were reduced and were removed from the bill. These provisions involved on-the-job training, on-the-farm training, and flight training.

The House reduced the monthly allowance from $110 a month for a single veteran, $135 a month for a married veteran, and $160 a month for a veteran with two or more dependents, to $100 for a single veteran, $125 for a married veteran, and $150 for a veteran with two or more dependents. These dependents might be the mother and father.

Higher allowances are needed. It costs more to send a man to school now than it did in 1952. Tuition has more than doubled in the average State and private college in America since 1952.

As we know, the Senate bill was amended in the House and different language substituted for the Senate language. That language lessened the benefits that would be received by cold war veterans. The House language omitted several important items which have traditionally been a part of the GI educational program.

Public Law 89-358, as passed, contains no provision for on-the-job training or on-the-farm training, and there is a specific exclusion of flight training from the category of qualifying courses.

In view of the dire social needs in precisely these areas, it is difficult for me to understand the rationale of the House omissions. The Presiding Officer knows of these areas through his service on the Manpower Training Subcommittee.

There is an extreme shortage of airline pilots, and it is becoming more and more apparent that the military is not training and releasing enough qualified personnel to meet the growing demand.

Our late colleague, the beloved Pat McNamara, was always a cosponsor and a strong supporter of the GI bills and he told me that the key to him was the on-the-job training provision that was stricken out by the House.

Our need for on-the-job training has been emphasized time and time again in the Federal poverty and job training programs. Much of the testimony in the cold war GI bill hearings dealt with the need for on-the-job training. Certainly farm training is no less important in light of the impending world shortage of food and in light of this country's expressed desire to use all its resources to help meet this problem.

Mr. President, the world population is increasing 2 percent every year and the world food production is increasing only 1 percent a year. There are more hungry mouths to feed every day than there were the day before.

And here we cut out on-the-job training on farms, which was intended to help train people for food production.

The bill I am introducing here today will increase the rates of assistance to the levels granted under the Korean GI bill.

Flight training, on-farm and on-the-job training are restored to the classes of instruction which may be taken under the bill.

In addition, we would restore the credit allowances as provided in the Korean bill. Under the Korean GI bill, a GI received 1½ months of schooling for each month of service. Under the bill recently enacted, the House of Representatives cut back that allowance to 1 month of schooling for each month of service. The amended bill being introduced today would restore the same level of credit as in the World War II GI bill and the Korean GI bill, of 1½ months in school for each 1 month of active service.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have not yielded the floor, Mr. President. Finally, the bill restores a provision of the older GI bills whereby educational institutions which are required to make reports on their student-veterans may receive partial reimbursement for expenses incurred in making such reports.

The rates for educational assistance granted under the Korean GI bill were $110 per month, if the veteran had no dependent; $135 per month, if he had one dependent; and $160 per month, if he had more than one dependent. These rates were established in 1952 and were intended to be in the nature of assistance, and not complete subsidy. In other words, it was recognized at that time that the specified allotments would not pay the total cost of a full-time educational program. The rates currently effective under Public Law 89-358 are $100 per month with no dependents, $125 per month with one dependent, and $150 per month with more than one dependent.

In amount, the difference in the old and the proposed rates may seem small, but in total buying power, it is sizable: it counts.

When we raised the monthly allowance from $100 a month to $110 a month, from $125 a month to $135 a month, and from $150 a month to $160 a month, in 1952, that helped the veterans. I have talked to many veterans of World War II, who told me that when their allowances were then raised from $65 to $75 a month, it made a great difference in their ability to get along.

In 1965, the Legislative Reference Service made a report on the increase of tuition costs and living expenses. On the basis of the allotments granted under the Korean GI bill, they prorated the grant between tuition and required fees, and other subsistence expenses. Correlating these amounts to the increases witnessed respectively in tuition costs and the cost of living, the report concluded that in 1963, $153.68 would be required to give a full-time single student the equivalent of the $110 per month allotted in 1952; that $182.50 would approximate the 1952 value of $135; and that $211.33 would equal the $160 given in 1952 for a full-time student with more than one dependent.

Let me repeat that, Mr. President. To buy for a student today what a student could purchase for $110 in 1952 would take $153.68; and for a married student, the $135 of 1952 would buy as much as $182.50 will buy today. And for a student with two or more dependents, Mr. President, to buy what $160 would buy in 1952, today would require $211.33. In light of these increases in the cost of acquiring an education, Public Law 89-358 gives an amount which is actually less than that which was felt necessary in 1952.

As the President reported in last year's education message to the Congress, it costs, on the average, $1,600 per year to attend a public college, and $2,400 per year to attend a private college. These costs are expected to rise by one-third during the next 10 years.

Because these costs will rise, and because the cost-of-living index will probably continue to climb, Congress should be especially mindful of the inequities which exist now. The danger that the beneficiaries of one year could receive less than those of another is only emphasized by the permanent nature of the new bill. This problem was articulately expressed by Senator John F. Kennedy in a floor statement on July 21, 1955, supporting his bill to increase the Korean GI bill's assistance rates:

> It has been argued by some that inasmuch as the basic philosophy of the 1952 act was one of assistance and not complete subsidy, any increase would not be in harmony with this underlying philosophy. This argument is irrelevant to this bill, which would only increase veterans' allowances in proportion to increases in the cost of education since 1952. On the contrary, I feel that my bill, if enacted, will erase many of the inequities presently existing under the 1952 GI bill of rights. Korean veterans presently enrolled in institutions of higher learning should not be rewarded for their services to a lesser extent than veterans who enrolled during the early days of the act.

Mr. President, if we applied that language today, we would raise these allowances, not from the modest increases I have in this bill, but to $153, $182.50, and $211.33, respectively. As pointed out at that time by the then Senator John F. Kennedy, this is not an increase in allowances; this is merely an effort to assist the veterans to meet increased costs.

Mr. President, airplane pilot training was cut out of the bill as passed. Let me point out that at the present time, the commercial airline industry is faced with a serious shortage of qualified pilot personnel. Approximately 22,000 flight officers are presently employed by the airlines, and at current operating rates, approximately 12,000 new pilots will be needed by 1970. The military training schools have traditionally been the main source of manpower in this area. The Federal Aviation Agency's Aviation Human Resources Study Board reported that in 1955, 64.3 percent of the airlines' flight personnel had a background in military flight training; by 1963, that figure had declined to 44.5 percent. This can only mean that private and institutional flying schools are filling the gap.

Despite the fact that this is one of the greatest shortages and needs in American industry, the House amendment cut out flight training from the cold war GI bill.

The amendment contained in this proposal retains for flight training the safeguards present in the current law, whereby the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not approve the enrollment in any course found to be avocational or recreational in character unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation. That is, if a pilot is just learning to fly his own plane around for fun and pleasure, he cannot get the training. He must be training to be a professional pilot.

We all know that temporary pilots have been licensed by the airlines because of this great shortage. It is like licensing temporary schoolteachers, who do not have a regular certificate.

The amendment also states that no more than 75 percent of the established tuition for such flight training shall be paid for under the bill, with the amount of the veterans' educational entitlement being used up at the rate of 1 day for each $1.25 which is paid to the veteran as an education and training allowance for such course.

The numbers of veterans enrolled under earlier GI bills in institutional on-farm and on-the-job training have not been too large. Under the World War II bill, 2,106,000, or 27 percent of those receiving benefits, chose to use their entitlement in farm or on-the-job training; under the Korean bill, 310,310, or 13 percent chose this type of training. The definite trend in the nature of work taken under the several GI bills has been away from farm and job training, and toward higher education. Under the World War II bill, 29 percent took their benefits in higher education, and this figure swelled to 51 percent under the Korean bill. There is every reason to believe that this trend will continue and it is quite probable that of the veterans utilizing the benefits of the current law, an even smaller percentage will select on-farm and on-the-job training. But to cite these facts is not to give reason to the proposition that categories of training should be arbitrarily excluded from the law. The choice of a man's lifelong vocation is not a matter of legislative determination; it is not a matter which can be objectively resolved within these halls. And for this reason, I feel that the scope of opportunities under the educational assistance provisions should be as broad as practicable.

To obtain assistance for on-the-job or on-farm training, the student must be pursuing a full-time program of instruction. The amount of assistance for on-the-job training is established by this bill at $70 per month with no dependents; $85 per month with one dependent; and $105 per month with more than one dependent. The sum of the veteran's pay and assistance allowance cannot exceed $310 per month. The allowance for on-farm training is established at $95 per month with no dependents; $110 per month with one dependent; and $130 per month with more than one dependent.

Approval provisions established with reference to on-farm and on-the-job training set up strict standards which every such course must meet in order to be approved by the State approval agency.

The final provision of this bill restores to schools the right to receive $1 per month for each eligible enrolled veteran on whom reports and certifications are required, to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the amendments to the cold war GI bill be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of the Yarborough Amendments to the Cold War GI Bill

Section 1. Changes the amount of entitlement from 1 day of education for each day of active duty, to 1½ days of education for each day of active duty.

Section 2. Deletes those sections of the present law which prohibit enrollment of a veteran-student in flight training, on-the-job training, or on-farm training.

Section 3. Increases the allowance for educational assistance to the length given under the Korean GI bill. The amount for cooperative training (which is new and was not set out in the Korean bill) is increased proportionately to the other categories.

Assistance for on-farm training for a full-time course is established at $95 per month for no dependents, $110 for one dependent, and $130 for more than one dependent. This amount is allowed for 9 months, after which time the allowance is scaled downward. (The approval sections of the proposed amendment require that the GI allowance, plus farm income provide income sufficient for a reasonable standard of living.)

Allowances are made for full-time on-the-job training in the amounts of $70, $85, and $105; these amounts are scaled downward after the first 4 months. The sum of the allowance and the salary cannot exceed $310 per month.

The allowance granted for flight training is to be 75 percent of tuition costs, and the period of entitlemen is used at the rate of 1 day for each $1.25 allowed; the bill states no limit on the monthly amount to be granted, but as the amount increases, the veteran's eligibility will be used up faster. If the veteran qualifies for education or training allowances under sections of the GI bill, he shall be entitled to the allowance for his other entitlement and for flight training.

Section 4. Sets out the requirements for approval of the new courses.

For on-farm training the program must involve:

1. Group instruction of at least 200 hours per year;
2. Practical work on land the veteran controls and shall continue to control until completion of the course;
3. Tailoring the course to fit the type of farm the veteran controls (e.g., dairy training for a dairy farmer);
4. Annual individual instruction of at least 100 hours, with at least two monthly visits by the instructor to the farm;
5. Nonduplication of training the veteran has already received.

The program for on-the-job training must involve:

1. Training adequate to qualify the veteran for the job for which he is training;
2. Reasonable certainty that this type of job will be available to the veteran upon completion of the instruction;
3. Promotions on the basis of skills learned through organized training-on-the-job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover;
4. Equivalent pay for both veterans and nonveterans;
5. Training for a length of time ranging from 3 months to 2 years, but in no case longer than that customarily needed for such training;
6. Adequate facilities for instruction, records of attendance and progress, and credit for prior training with such wage adjustments as that training warrants.

Section 5. Adjusts the statute of limitations for the time period allowed for taking advantage of the benefits—as to the benefits granted under this amendatory bill, the time limits begin to run from the date of enactment of the amendments.

Section 6. Restores to schools the right to receive $1 per month per veteran-student to help defray the expenses of preparing and submitting reports and certifications on such students.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I repeat my unanimous-consent request that the bill remain at the desk through Monday, May 9, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide the disabled an income tax deduction of up to $600 to cover transportation to and from work, and to allow them an additional $600 income tax deduction, as is now given to the blind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3304) to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lay upon the desk until May 9, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. The bill is a companion to one introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Eugene Keogh, of New York.

In February of 1950 I first began this effort to do something about the matter of special expenses incurred by the handicapped to get themselves to work.

At that time, in the 81st Congress, I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to give the handicapped the $600 exemption now given to the blind. This was done in deference to a suggestion made to me by a constituent, Mr. Sidney Lockeman, of New York, himself a physically handicapped person.

In the intervening years, this measure was reintroduced in subsequent Congresses, its provisions sharpened through the diligence and craftsmanship of Representative Keogh and others, until now there appears some immediate hope that it might be enacted into law. We all owe a debt of gratitude to the citizen who first took the trouble to write me, his Congressman, which resulted in planting the seed which—hopefully—will soon come into full flower.

Under the bill now introduced the disabled taxpayer, in order to qualify for the additional $600 exemption, must suffer from a loss of one or more extremities or a 50-percent-or-more loss of ability as defined under the "Schedule for Rating Disabilities of the Veterans' Administration." In addition, both the blind and the disabled would qualify for the tax deduction of up to $600 for expenses of going to and from work.

Our handicapped citizens can be—and are—capable of being productive workers, contributing to the economy of the Nation instead of being dependent upon it. But because of their disabilities, they have imposed upon them in pursuit of their livelihoods additional expenses which are not fully tax deductible—special orthopedic devices; extra travel expenses—such as taxi service—because they are unable to utilize routine means of transportation; expensive additions to home and office to facilitate their movements, higher insurance rates and the costs of hiring help to perform simple tasks which nonhandicapped individuals perform for themselves.

It is estimated that some 300,000 disabled persons would qualify under this legislation at a maximum cost to the Government of $40 million. This cost seems small when we consider the average cost of from $479 to $544 to rehabilitate each disabled individual. What we will be doing through this legislation is helping these people to help themselves and aiding them to achieve some personal independence from institutions, from overburdened families and from local and State governments.

I understand that 30 Governors have indicated to the Joint Handicapped Council their support of this proposal. It has had editorial support ranging from the New York Times to the Progressive Farmer. Endorsements also include the AFL-CIO, the VFW, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Association of Social Workers, and the National Council of Churches of Christ.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans have endeavored valiantly to transform their physical handicaps from stumbling blocks to building blocks. They wish to use their crutches to move on, not to lean on. This legislation will help them do just that. It is as hardnosed and practical in economic terms as it is humanitarian. It is, in effect, a practical bill for the benefit of people who have no alternative than to be practical.

Mr. President, thousands of Americans will bless us if we finally pass this legislation, as I hope we will, at an early date.

NATIONAL SECURITY FOOD AND FIBER RESERVE ACT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, the National Security Food and Fiber Reserve Act, which will provide for establishing and maintaining reserve supplies of agricultural commodities for national security reasons and other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that this bill remain at the desk until May 9, so that Senators who wish to do so may join as cosponsors.

Mr. President, the general concept of an agricultural commodity reserve program has been with us for a good number of years. All agree that the general principle of agricultural reserves is sound and desirable from a national policy viewpoint. Because this principle has been widely recognized and generally accepted the maintenance of adequate supplies of agricultural commodities has been an implied, if not specified, part of agricultural legislation since the early thirties.

The term reserves generally is intended to describe those quantities of food, feed, and fiber which are in excess of current normal needs and expected future demand. There are several reasons why this cushion of agricultural commodities is so vital to our national interest. First, all recognize that national defense requirements demand that we have on hand sufficient quantities of food, feed, and fiber to meet wartime conditions. As we can never anticipate when, where and how this country may be involved in military commitments and as there is always at least a year's lag between the time the need for additional quantities or agricultural commodities is recognized and the time in which agricultural production can actually be expanded, it is absolutely vital that we maintain an adequate cushion of reserves as an integral part of our national defense program.

Second, we can never anticipate when major crop failures or natural disasters will result in a situation where current production will fall far short of domestic needs. Third, this cushion of agricultural commodities has been and will continue to prove valuable in domestic relief programs.

Every country has the maintenance of adequate agricultural reserves as an ideal goal of national policy. But except in the Western World few countries successfully achieve this goal. As a result they periodically suffer food shortages and serious disruptions to the stability of their economies.

Mr. President, in recent years we have become profoundly aware of the fact that there is another vital reason why the United States must maintain adequate levels of food, feed, and fiber. Agricultural shortages create hunger and starvation, disrupt the Nation's economy, and retard its growth. We are vitally concerned in such situations for humanitarian reasons but also because the tensions and provocations which arise inevitably affect our own foreign policy interest and goals.

This country has recently authorized emergency shipments of food to India to help meet the desperate food shortages there which are approaching major famine conditions.

Mr. President, I shudder to think of the humanitarian and international political implications had not this country been in the position to supply that emergency aid.

We all recognize, of course, that the United States cannot "feed the world," and that it would be foolhardy to delude ourselves into thinking that we should even try. On the other hand, it is clear that as the population in the less developed nations continues to grow more rapidly than their capacity to increase their own food production, the United States must supply a critical share of their needs.

More significantly, we realize that we cannot anticipate famines in other parts of the world which may be brought about by natural disasters or other factors. When such dramatic food shortages occur, these nations need relief immediately. They, like India today, will not be able to wait until we go through the slow and uncertain process of expanding our own production.

The United States simply cannot achieve its full defensive strength, protect our own economy against unforeseen shortages, or hope to fully implement our foreign policy goals without adequate agricultural reserves.

Mr. President, there is simply no question of the need for the maintenance of adequate food, feed, and fiber reserves. But the enactment of a specific reserve program has been superfluous to date because of our large surpluses. Indeed, for at least a decade now we have been primarily concerned with the problem of trying to reduce what has been an excessive reserve of agricultural products.

But conditions have dramatically changed; our surpluses are virtually gone. In a speech before this body on April 27, 1966, I documented the decline in our reserves as indicated by the Commodity Credit Corporation's holdings or Government-owned stocks, which today constitutes the major portion of what can be properly treated as reserves. The decline in CCC stocks and the disappearance of agricultural commodities in other positions continues and at an accelerated rate. In my speech of April 27, I pointed out that this year's carryover of wheat—that is, stocks in all positions—for example, would be less than that which is generally considered adequate and considerably less than what the Department of Agriculture had been predicting for several months. Since preparing that speech, new Department of Agriculture estimates confirm my prediction. CCC stocks of several other critical commodities have also been sharply reduced or virtually depleted.

Thus, Mr. President, there is no question but that we have reached the stage that we must begin to plan for expanded production to meet national security needs.

I would emphasize, as I have repeatedly in the past, that this expansion in production must not occur too rapidly, nor should it be an across-the-board expansion. Sudden removal of all production controls would surely bring a disastrous break in farm prices.

Mr. President, the enactment of a truly meaningful and practical commodity reserve program at this time would serve two vital needs. First, it would serve our national security interest. Second, by spelling out the desired reserve levels, we would create production and marketing objectives to aim for. This would be an invaluable aid in insuring that we do in fact make the needed production expansions. The identification of these objectives would at the same time serve as a restraint against any unlimited expansion. This latter point is important because the Nation in general and farmers in particular do not wish to see the reimposition of burdensome surpluses which might well result from any ill-conceived expansion program.

But, Mr. President, while there are dangers in an ill-conceived program of expanded production, I am convinced that the most dangerous prospect at the moment is that we will not expand soon enough and as a consequence get caught in a situation where our reserves are depleted to a point far below national security needs.

Two factors justify this concern. First, too many government planners and policymakers are likely to be so accustomed to thinking in terms of surpluses and the need for controls that they may, quite unintentionally, err in not recognizing the need for greater production soon enough.

Another factor which might cause us to be caught with inadequate reserves is the administration's shortsighted, ill-conceived, and unjustified policy of dumping Government-owned stocks on the open market in an effort to freeze or roll back farm prices. Not only have these actions been unjustified, but I am convinced that they will come back to haunt the administration in the months ahead. An ill-conceived depletion of our reserves by creating a tight supply situation would foster the very inflationary pressures that the administration is seeking to eliminate. Some farmers might see in this situation the prospect for sharply higher prices. Certainly, considering rising farm costs, higher farm prices are justified. But the realization of such a prospect is unlikely. The administration, at the moment, would not even let prices rise to the parity levels which farmers deserve and which Congress has long declared to be a national policy.

Thus, the end results of a serious depletion of our agricultural reserves would be that farmers would be cheated out of a chance to increase production, the Government would have to curtail its Public Law 480 programs, and a significant loss in our export markets would occur.

Mr. President, the administration claims to have recognized the need for an agricultural commodity reserve program. But a close analysis of its proposal (S. 2932) shows that it has little relationship to the true purpose of a reserve program. A careful reading of the proposal clearly reveals that its primary purpose is to give the Secretary of Agriculture new and vast powers by which he can dictate agricultural production and set farm prices at will. The administration's proposal would give the Secretary blanket authorization to amend and change any and all existing agricultural programs which Congress has written into law over the years. It would in effect make the Secretary an agricultural czar.

The administration's proposal has not even identified objectives of national security as a purpose of the bill. It talks about the need for reserves but identifies no specific commodities and sets no reserve levels. This determination would be left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. The commodity reserve program could be anything that the Secretary so chose to make it.

Mr. President, the bill that I introduce clearly identifies the legitimate and sound objectives of an agricultural commodity reserve program. It provides that reserves be established so as to meet the requirements for national security, natural disaster, domestic relief programs, commercial exports, food for freedoom, and to provide stability for the domestic economy.

The objective of establishing commodity reserves has often been discussed and considered by the Congress. Specific reserves or carryovers of agricultural commodities have not been specified by quantity in legislation, but have been implied in such legislation by congressional direction to the Secretary to provide for adequate supplies and to protect the national interest. Formulas for computing the amount of the national marketing quota for an agricultural commodity have at times been enacted by the Congress with a specific provision for a carryover allowance. For many years the law directed the Secretary to determine the national marketing quota or the national acreage allotment which would result in a carryover at the end of the marketing year that was a certain percentage of estimated domestic consumption and exports. This general treatment of the matter has been changed in recent years to provide that in the case of wheat the product on program should result in an "adequate carryover." In the case of cotton, the basic formula still contains a carryover allowance equal to 30 percent of domestic consumption and exports which would at present utilization levels amount to around 4 million bales. The rice national acreage allotment is such as would result in ending carryover of 10 percent of domestic consumption and exports. The current acreage diversion programs for the feed grains are to be based on a program which will bring excess supplies down to a level which will maintain reasonable and stable supplies and prices of feed grains, will meet any national emergency, and will provide an adequate carryover.

While there has been general agreement on the desirability of enacting a policy and a directive with respect to adequate reserves of agricultural commodities, several problems have been encountered in establishing an effective program. The setting aside of certain amounts of each commodity raises the question of how the reserve can be insulated from the market. Since one Congress cannot bind another, it is evident that this method would impose a depressive effect on market prices.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce identifies the commodities and specifies their reserve levels. In developing this list and the reserve levels, I have followed the recommendations by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission in its report on food and fiber reserves of October 7, 1964. The NAAC based its recommendations on studies conducted by the Department of Agriculture. I might also note that these reserve levels were endorsed as being sound by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, in testimony before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee earlier this year. I believe these are reasonable levels which will provide stability under emergency conditions and yet will not prove burdensome.

The bill, in establishing specified amounts as reserve supplies, does not set aside these commodities, but applies that term to the carryover of all stocks in private and Government hands at the end of the marketing year.

Mr. President, this avoids all the hazards and drawbacks to the old physical set-aside concept of Government-owned stocks which has often been a part of proposed reserve programs. Under this approach, no additional storage costs will be incurred by the Government to maintain such reserve levels, and the program will not interfere with the operations of the private channels of trade.

We all know only too well that large Government-owned stocks are not only expensive to maintain but can be used as a tool for breaking, or threatening to break, farm prices. The administration's commodity reserve proposal requires that these reserves will be owned by the CCC. And it is particularly alarming that the Secretary would be given great freedom to dispose of such stocks as he saw fit. In view of recent actions by the Johnson administration, one can have little doubt but that enactment of the administration's commodity reserve proposal would only serve to increase the Secretary's power to continue his war on farm prices. But now it would be clothed under the so-called and mislabeled commodity reserve program.

Mr. President, the reserve supplies called for in this bill would be established and maintained without countermanding any existing farm programs. The bill would simply and directly require that the Secretary in carrying out all agricultural laws relating to marketing and production would formulate such programs as would result in a carryover at the end of the marketing year as specified in the bill. Thus, present law would be modified only with respect to the carryover allowance which the Secretary must use in computing the national marketing quota, national acreage allotment, or desired production. The present minimum national marketing quotas and national acreage allotments would not be affected.

The National Security Food and Fiber Reserve Act which I propose is clearly in the national interest, as well as in the interest of our farmers. Because of the vagueness of the administration's proposal, it is difficult to see what national interest would be served by this enactment. On the other hand, it is very clear, considering present actions by this administration and the sweeping grant of power which its bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture, that the enactment of S. 2932 would definitely not be in the interest of American farmers.

The reserve proposal which I introduce does not require that the specified reserves be owned and controlled by the Government. However, the operation of existing programs will mean that the CCC will continue to acquire and hold stocks. To prevent the dumping of such stocks as a tool for rolling back farm prices or preventing them from rising to parity level, the Secretary of Agriculture would not be allowed to dispose of these stocks at less than 115 percent of the applicable loan rate, plus reasonable carrying charges.

Except for increasing the minimum resale price of commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation to 115 percent of the loan rate plus reasonable carrying charges, the bill does not attempt to direct the Secretary to sell at any specified level above the minimum, nor to refuse to sell such stocks. It is recognized that in a situation where the actual carryover of a commodity will fall well below the level specified in the bill, many considerations must be taken into account and the Congress would be unable to enact general legislation which would be desirable for each situation. However, the intent and purpose of the bill is that authority granted the Secretary not be used in a manner ultimately detrimental to the interests of farmers.

Mr. President, our once great surpluses are now, with few exceptions, depleted. This alone demands that we seriously address ourselves to the need for a sound agricultural commodity reserve program. The world food shortage and the military situation in southeast Asia makes the enactment for such a program imperative. The bill I introduce clearly identifies the true purpose of a reserve program and specifically identifies the commodity and their reserve levels. These objectives will be achieved without disrupting existing agricultural programs. It will create a program that will be to the interest of the country as a whole and the farmer as well, and it will be achieved in a simple and direct manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed National Security Food and Fiber Reserve Act be printed in full in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kansas.

The bill (S. 3306) to provide for establishing and maintaining reserve supplies of agricultural commodities for national security and other purposes, introduced by Mr. Pearson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3306

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Security Food and Fiber Reserve Act of 1966."

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to provide for the establishment of reserve supplies of agricultural commodities in sufficient quantities to meet requirements for national security, natural disasters, commercial exports, the food for freedom program, and domestic relief programs, and to provide stability for the domestic economy. It is the policy and the intent of Congress that existing agricultural programs shall be administered in a manner that will accomplish the purposes of this Act without adversely affecting the primary purposes that such programs were designed to achieve, and without disrupting the normal channels of trade in agricultural commodities.

Sec. 3. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to administer programs under his jurisdiction relating to the production and marketing of agricultural commodities in such a manner as will result, as nearly as practicable, in a carryover for the next succeeding marketing year for each commodity specified below of a quantity equal to not less than the quantity indicated after each such commodity:

Commodity:		*Quantity in millions*
Wheat	bushels	630
Rice, rough	pounds	900
Feed grains	tons	45
Cotton	bales	6.2
Soybeans	bushels	100
Vegetable oil, edible	pounds	800
Beans, dry	do	150
Nonfat dry milk	do	530
Butter (including butter oil)	do	100
Cheese	do	380
Flaxseed	bushels	8

(b) The Secretary is also authorized and directed to administer programs under his jurisdiction relating to the production and marketing of any agricultural commodity not specified in Subsection (a) of this Section in such a manner as will result, as nearly as practicable, in a carryover for the next succeeding marketing year for such commodity of a quantity determined by the Secretary to be adequate to achieve the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 4. In determining the acreage allotment, base acreage, marketing quota, or other production or marketing control for any commodity for any crop or marketing year, the Secretary shall take into consideration the quantity of such commodity necessary to attain the carryover prescribed under Section 3 of this Act; but nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary, in the case of any agricultural commodity, to reduce below the minimum prescribed by law, the acreage allotment, base acreage, marketing quota, or other production or marketing control applicable to such commodity. As used in this Act, the term "carryover" means the quantity of any commodity on hand in the United States at the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity, not including any quantity of such commodity which was produced in the United States during the calendar year then current. Notwithstanding the foregoing definition, where such term is defined otherwise in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, such term when used in this Act shall have the same meaning ascribed to it (in the case of the commodity concerned) under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Sec. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not dispose of any commodity owned by it for less than 115 per centum of the applicable loan rate plus reasonable carrying charges, except that sales for foreign currencies or upon long-term credit may be made pursuant to and subject to the provision of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 705 OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in honest production and the competent performance of their jobs do men of integrity and good will find their place in society and their pride as rational men. Worse than the social loss involved is the tragic loss of purpose and human dignity which confronts the worker whose talents are not fully utilized and whose mind is not challenged to the limits of its capacity.

More than any other system, our free enterprise economy has provided the means and delivered our Nation from institutionalized discrimination based upon racial, or religious factors, or on factors of national or ethnic origin. In a free economy, it should be realized, a premium is put upon the ability of the individual at the expense of all other considerations including national or racial background. Thus in the free economy consideration of such factors is of minor relevance to the wise employer. The advances made in dealing with problems of race relations over the past century have been great, and no small credit must go to the organization of our private enterprise economy.

In 1964 Congress saw fit to enact, as a part of the Civil Rights Act of that year, a provision including the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, composed of five commissioners appointed by the President for staggered terms of 5 years each.

However laudable in concept the plan may have been, it has been brought to my attention that certain groups within our Nation are not receiving proper consideration and attention even from the Commission itself. Specifically, on March 28 at Albuquerque, N. Mex., 50 delegates to a meeting called by the Commission walked out in protest of the policies of the Commission. The delegates were all U.S. citizens of Mexican-American descent. It is their feeling that the Commission has not been sympathetic to their grievances in the past and that the problem can be traced to the absence on the Commission of those who understand the nature of their employment problems.

Mr. President, if the Commission is to fulfill its function of assisting all groups, then this experience would seem to indicate the necessity of assuring representation on the Commission by a person or persons who understand the unique problems of workers of Mexican heritage, as well as the problems of all other groups in our heterogeneous American society.

Accordingly, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase membership of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from five to seven members in order that groups—particularly Americans of Latin heritage—may be better represented.

It is my belief and hope that the President will welcome this opportunity to enlarge representation on the Commission and I am suggesting that a Mexican-American be named to one of the seats.

In addition, Mr. President, if there is no objection, I wish to enter into the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter I have sent to the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.

The purpose of the letter is to request that consideration be given to naming a U.S. citizen of Latin American heritage to the Commission at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3307) to amend section 705 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to increase the membership of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from five members to seven members, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. TOWER is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
May 2, 1966.

Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr.,
Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sure that you are aware of the problems which are experienced by Americans of Mexican heritage in their quest for more meaningful employment opportunities in our Nation's industries and trades. The problems of this group, the second largest group of members of a minority race living in the United States, are no less real than the problems of other races. I would like to urge that serious consideration be given to appointing a U.S. citizen of Mexican descent to the Equal Employment Opportunity Council at the earliest possible time.

I believe also that consideration should be given to inviting participation by outstanding and responsible leaders of all racial minorities in the anticipated White House Conference on Civil Rights in June. It would seem that this would be in keeping with the goal of the Conference and would make it more meaningful for all Americans.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. TOWER.

ACQUISITION OF WETLANDS FOR CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the 1950's there were warnings that the twin plagues of drought and drainage were threatening a great natural resource, migratory waterfowl. Following detailed studies and investigation, Congress acted in the public interest. It is time for us to act again.

Last year, more than 1½ million Americans bought duck stamps and went duck hunting. They found recreation and food that is a delicacy. They also contributed substantially to our economy. A survey in 1960 revealed that duck hunters spent almost $89.5 million.

In recent years, our waterfowl population has been declining. In the mid-1950's, somewhere between 13 and 14 million waterfowl were bagged annually in the United States. In sharp contrast, the bag during the 1961 and 1962 seasons was less than half that number.

The difference was due to drought and drainage.

Beginning in 1959, the important mid-continent breeding area of the United States and the Canadian Prairie Provinces was plagued by drought. There were some 6 million small ponds in the southern portions of the Prairie Provinces in 1955. By 1962, there were only half a million. From these ponds come half the ducks that are shot in the United States. When these ponds are dry, the duck population drops, and bag and possession limits must be reduced to preserve the breeding stock.

Experts tell me that an increase in the number of potholes started in 1963 and in certain areas at least we are in a wet cycle.

But this does not mean that the problem is solved. During the drought, the duck population dropped by some 40 percent from the mid-1950 level. The decrease in some important species, such as mallards, was even greater. American and Canadian hunters shot more mallards in 1958 than there were in the fall flight in 1962. In the spring of 1958, the mallard breeding population was in the neighborhood of 13 million. In the spring of 1965, the population was estimated at less than 6 million.

Drought is one thing which has made the fate of waterfowl uncertain on this continent. Another is the permanent drought that is drainage. The needs of waterfowl, on which an important segment of our economy is based, are in ever-increasing competition with those of our increasing human population. The draining of marshes for farm improvement, for community growth and development, for airports and highways have brought problems that are hard, and expensive, to solve.

For years, marshes and ponds have disappeared as agriculture has expanded. In the prairie pothole region of Minnesota and the Dakotas, agricultural drainage mopped up an average of more than 156,000 acres a year in the 1959–64 period. This same thing is going on in Canada.

Similar drainage is taking place in many coastal sections which once were important wintering grounds. Many of the great natural marshes on the east coast and on the Gulf of Mexico have been ruined for waterfowl use by housing developments, by salt water intrusion, or by exploration for sulphur or oil. In the Pacific Flyway, waterfowl face a crisis because the marshes, which once supported millions of ducks and geese wintering in California and northern Mexico, have become cotton and rice fields, orchards, and suburban developments.

During the period 1940–64, more than 45 million acres of U.S. wetlands were drained. The average for the 1959–64 period was 1,403,358 acres a year. At this point, I ask unanimous consent to include a table of drainage statistics.

There being no objection, the table was ordered printed in the RECORD at this point.

Drainage statistics,[1] *total U.S. drainage*

	Acres
1959	1, 526, 895
1960	1, 574, 404
1961	1, 443, 089
1962	1, 394, 107
1963	1, 305, 033
1964	1, 176, 618
Annual average (1959–64)	1, 403, 358
Cumulative total 1940 to 1964, inclusive	45, 628, 618

DRAINAGE IN PRAIRIE POTHOLE STATES (ACRES)

Year	Minnesota	North Dakota	South Dakota	3-State total
1959	138, 855	22, 467	1, 560	176, 768
1960	168, 655	25, 460	2, 859	196, 974
1961	129, 543	13, 683	2, 188	145, 414
1962	111, 201	16, 541	1, 932	129, 674
1963	137, 421	14, 138	1, 541	153, 100
1964	116, 504	17, 689	588	134, 781
Annual 3-State average (1959–64)				156, 118

[1] As published in Annual Summaries of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, USDA. Practices C–9[a] and C–10[b] only for 1959–62. In 1963 and 1964 drainage was not differentiated by practice.

[a] Agricultural conservation program practice C–9: Permanent open drainage systems to dispose of excess water (in agricultural areas).

[b] Agricultural conservation program practice C–10: Underground drainage systems to dispose of excess water.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, as the wetlands have decreased, the number of hunters has increased. There are three times as many of them as there were 25 years ago.

So, the uncertain future of waterfowl results from the decrease in the area in which they can nest, and rest, and the increase in the number of duck hunters.

Before long, the duck hunters of this country will depend for their game on land dedicated to the needs of waterfowl, land owned by our Federal Government, the States, or by private individuals or groups who have dedicated the land for that purpose.

Farsighted conservationists and sportsmen saw this situation developing more than 30 years ago. To conservationists, one of the important programs of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal was the acquisition and development of millions of acres of refuges for waterfowl, facing extinction in the early 1930's.

Led by that great conservationist, Ding Darling, a careful study of our waterfowl resource was made in 1934. Based on a careful estimate of future requirements, the study reported that this country must have at least 12.5 million acres of land managed primarily for waterfowl; that is, we must have it if we are to continue to hunt ducks.

The recommendation was that our Federal Government acquire and develop the major part of this acreage.

By Public Law 87–383, which I cosponsored and which was enacted, the 87th Congress faced up to the public responsibility for acquisition of the wetlands needed to preserve this waterfowl resource. In that law, we authorized the advance of up to $105 million in the 7 years beginning with fiscal 1962 and ending with fiscal 1968 for the acquisition of 2.5 million acres of waterfowl habitat. It was provided that this advance must be repaid with 75 percent of the receipts from the sale of duck stamps beginning in fiscal 1967.

In the first 4 years of this 7-year program, a total of $41 million was available for acquisition of waterfowl habitat. Of that amount, $25 million was appropriated as part of the advance, and $16 million came from the duck stamp receipts.

With these funds, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife acquired or obtained purchase contracts on 523,000 acres as of the end of this past fiscal year, June 30, 1965. In the remaining 3 years of the authorized 7-year program, it is anticipated that we will acquire an additional 757,000 acres. At the present rate, this program will end with the acquisition of less than 1.3 million acres—or about half the goal set when Congress enacted the program at the request of our sportsmen.

As a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I, therefore, offer legislation to extend the 7-year program to 15 years. This legislation, companion to a bill introduced in the other body by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] would give the Congress the opportunity to appropriate the remaining $57.5 million of the $105 million authorized.

In addition, it is estimated that $40 million of duck stamp money would be available during the 8-year extension.

With these funds, we might be able to acquire close to 1 million acres during the 8-year extension. I say we might, because of the increase in land values, which the Department of Agriculture says has gone up at an average rate of 5 percent a year in the past 5 years.

I ask that the text of the bill I am introducing today be printed in full at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3308) to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Metcalf, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3308

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes", approved October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813; Public Law 87-383; 16 U.S.C. 715k-3), is amended by striking out "seven-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen-year period".

(b) Section 3 of such Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715k-5), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1977, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 per centum of the moneys accruing annually to such fund. In the event the full amount authorized by the first section of this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid fifteen-year period, the repayment of such funds pursuant to this section shall begin with the next full fiscal year."

NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, spring has returned across our Nation and with it the flowers of our country are once again blooming. It is therefore perhaps appropriate to call to mind that, although each of the 50 States of this great Nation has a State flower, we still lack a national floral emblem.

Many flowers have been offered to Congress to consider for the honor of representing the beauty of our floral heritage, but each time these flowers have failed to win such distinction because they were felt to be too regional.

Mr. President, today I introduce a joint resolution designed to offer a national floral emblem not only acceptable to each State, but in keeping with the great traditions of democratic principles.

The flag of the United States has 50 stars, one for each State on a field of blue. At the time Congress was considering approval of our flag, it was suggested and wisely rejected, that one star could represent all the States.

It is the individual dignity, contributions, and particularities of each of our States that make this Nation strong. It was wise therefore to designate a star for each State.

The stripes on our flag, if I recall the facts correctly, represent the original 13 States. Again each State received its individual recognition. What then could be more in keeping with American tradition but a floral emblem composed of the State flower of each State arranged in a bouquet or floral display? Certainly the individual honors of the flowers of our 50 States are upheld and the National Union represented most appropriately.

Perhaps a national competition could offer us the exact arrangement of the flowers, but at any rate the actual arrangement would present no great problem.

Mr. President, I think that I am also under an honest obligation to reveal to my colleagues that the idea prompting this resolution came to me from a group of American schoolchildren.

I recently received a series of letters from the fifth-grade students of St. George's Episcopal Day School in Clarksdale, Miss. These letters explained that the students at this school had given lengthy discussion to the problem of selecting a national flower and had decided that the only truly American way would be to give each State representation in a floral display. I recall a classic quotation which says, "Out of the mouths of children you shall hear truth." Let us then, at this time of the year when our Nation is filled with flowers, give thought to this joint resolution so that we may have a national floral emblem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 158) to establish a national flower of the United States, introduced by Mr. Eastland, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I say that my friend from Mississippi not only interests me, but he fairly overwhelms me by his interest in beautification and in a national floral emblem, after my having carried on in the interest of the marigold, because he proposes a floral emblem that will contain the official flower of each of the States, which will include the violet, the petunia, the hibiscus, the zinnia, the dahlia, or the canna.

I can only hope that my distinguished friend will have the bill referred to committee, because it will delight me to have hearings held and summon people from every State in order to draw them into a discussion and selection.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator. As everyone knows, he is chairman of that subcommittee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF THE STUDY TEAM REPORT ON THE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on February 11 and 12 of this year the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held hearings in Seattle on the report of the study team on the recreational opportunities in the State of Washington, better known as the North Cascades report. Combined with a discussion of the North Cascades at this hearing was a proposal to change the boundaries of Olympic National Park. Response was so great at this hearing that about 600 people testified or turned in statements for the hearing record. In addition to that, numerous letters were received from all over the United States on these important resource issues.

In order to satisfy the requests of these people for a copy of the printed hearings, I am today submitting a concurrent resolution for additional copies and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee two thousand five hundred additional copies of the Senate hearings of the Study Team Report on the Recreational Opportunities in the State of Washington, held in the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

PROHIBITION OF ACTION BY ANY FEDERAL AGENCY DUE TO DISCOURAGE PARITY PRICES FOR ANY AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution and ask that it lie on the table through Thursday of this week for additional cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 93) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

Whereas under the present Secretary of Agriculture and the Democratic administration, prices received by farmers for their products have consistently averaged below 80 per centum of parity of the past five years, costs of farm production have steadily increased, and the resulting cost-price squeeze has been accompanied by a loss of over five hundred and sixty thousand farms and over three million two hundred and thirty-five thousand in our farm population; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has declared it to be a national objective that marketing conditions for agricultural products be such as to enable farmers to receive parity prices for their products; and

Whereas section 2 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended by section 302 of the Agricultural Act of 1948, states that the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture are to be exercised "to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions for agricultural commodities in interstate commerce as will establish, as the prices to farmers, parity prices as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938"; and

Whereas statements and actions by the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense have been inconsistent with the said national objective declared by the Congress and have, instead, had a depressing effect on the market prices of agricultural products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that no action shall be taken by any agency of the Federal Government for the purpose of discouraging, or the natural consequence of which would discourage, the market price of any agricultural commodity from selling at prices averaging 100 per centum of parity over a twelve-month period.

THE 1,000TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHRISTIANITY IN POLAND

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The purpose of this resolution is to call to the attention of all people that the year 1966 represents the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland, and that during the month of May a number of significant historical events have taken place in Polish history.

From the perspective of the 1,000-year existence of Poland as a Western Christian country, 31,500,000 Poles at home and 10 million Poles abroad living all over the world can view proudly Poland's role in the history of the world and its part in the progress and achievement of mankind. The indomitable spirit of Polish history is a guarantee that this country, halted in its progress through the Communist regime, imposed on it by force by Russia, in time will throw off its shackles and will regain its freedom and independence.

In view of the fact that May 3 is Polish Constitution Day anniversary, and since this year's constitution anniversary coincides with the millennium of the origin of Poland as a Christian nation, I feel it is entirely appropriate for the Senate of the United States to call attention to the observance of this millennium and the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

The resolution (S. Res. 255) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 255

Whereas the year 1966 represents the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland; and

Whereas the occasion of this millennium is being celebrated by the people of Poland throughout the year 1966 and honored with worldwide observances during this year; and

Whereas May 3, 1791, the Constitution of Poland did away with anarchy, restoring hereditary monarchy and a strong government; and

Whereas on May 7, 1794, General Tadeusz Kosciuszko issued the Polaniecki Manifesto which served to partially free the peasants from serfdom thus leading to complete freedom during the 1863 uprising against Russia; and

Whereas May 12, 1364, marked the year of the founding of one of the great institutions of learning in the world, the Jagiellonian University of Krakow; and

Whereas May 12, 1944, was the date of the beginning of the Battle of Monte Casino where Polish troops so valiantly fought and captured the mountain from the Germans; and

Whereas throughout the great history of Poland that nation and her people fought in historic battles to preserve the freedom and dignity of man; and

Whereas May 3 is recognized throughout the world as Polish Constitution Day and is observed by Americans of Polish descent and by Free Poles everywhere as a Polish National Holiday and since this year's Constitution Anniversary coincides with the millennium of Poland's Christianity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States salutes on this day Americans of Polish descent and Free Poles throughout the world and calls upon the people of the United States to join with these people in observing this anniversary.

The preamble was agreed to.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY AND MILLENNIUM OF CHRISTIANITY IN POLAND

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today is a very special day to all freedom-loving Poles and people of Polish descent, for it is the 175th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution which, this year, coincides with the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland.

The year 966 is particularly important in Polish history both for its religious and its national implications. For it was then that the Duke of Mieszko, one of Poland's earliest tribal leaders, accepted Christianity. This action was of particular significance because the decision and resulting actions of this influential and farsighted man, led to the opening of the hearts and minds of Polish people to the political, cultural, and religious influences of European civilization. Poland joined mankind's struggle for freedom, and in her religious unity and strength contributed greatly to the progress and development of her church and of all civilization.

It was not an easy road for Poland, for her geographic location as well as internal difficulties placed many obstacles in her path, including oppression, partition, and exploitation by others. Yet her faith and the quest for freedom ultimately led to the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791, which established a form of equality, assured the peasants protection of their governmental rights, abolished class distinctions, and provided for religious freedom. The Constitution was enthusiastically received by the Poles, and brought tributes from leaders of many nations, including our own President George Washington. But it was short lived. Through Russian intervention, Poland was partitioned and forced to abandon her Constitution.

Certainly the ideals embodied in the Polish Constitution have lived on, and these ideals are, I know, still in the hearts of Polish people everywhere, just as they are deeply cherished here in America.

There have been many contributions by the Polish people in the fields of science, literature, religion, art, music, government, and law for all the world. And we here in America know how fortunate we are to have benefited from the rich heritage offered by Poland and her people. Polish artisans were among our country's first settlers, and their descendants and Polish patriots supported our struggle for independence. We have a strong bond, and we will not forget it.

I think that it is fitting all Americans pay tribute to the Polish people on their Constitution Day and the commemoration of the millennium of Christianity in Poland. I know that many Americans who hoped to travel to Poland this year to take part in the celebrations were denied this opportunity by the Communist regime. But, I feel sure that the Polish people know that we share their love of freedom, and that we hope for the day when they will once again have a government based on the principles and ideals symbolized by this commemorative day.

POLAND'S CHRISTIANITY MILLENNIUM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this year an honored member of the community of nations of the Western World will be celebrating an event which is rare in the history of any nation. Poland will commemorate during this year the 1,000th anniversary of its identity as a Christian nation. The basis for this heartwarming surge of Polish patriotism is the anniversary of the time when the earliest historical ruler of Poland embraced the faith of his Christian wife and began the development of the modern Polish state and nation. In the year 966 Mieszko I was baptized with the rites of the Roman Catholic Church. At that time the first efforts were begun by a missionary bishop to spread the faith to the pagans and to create a national church organization.

We cannot but rejoice with the people of Poland and their emigrated brethren everywhere in remembering this historical group of events. From the development of the Polish State and the adoption of a faith which emphasizes the principles of human dignity and freedom which we so deeply cherish there emerged over the centuries a record of national and individual striving for liberty which evokes our admiration and gratitude.

The examples of struggling for a man's freedom which Poland has given to our heritage are a source of encouragement to peoples now fighting for liberty throughout the world. It is these examples, so passionately expressed in recent years in events like the Poznan riots of 1956, which remind us that Poland has not yet won its fight for national and individual freedom. We know that the gallant Polish people are not alone today in their aspirations for human liberty and national self-determination. They are similar to many peoples now held by force in the bondage of international communism in Eastern Europe.

Mr. President, the memorial festivities of Poland's great national anniversary provide a fit occasion for those of us living in this blessed land to reaffirm our willingness to do all we can to keep the light of the spirit of freedom burning in the hearts of millions of captive human beings in Eastern Europe. The great hopes for mankind which were so apparent in the conversion of this one country, Poland, must be kept strong for all peoples. Let me express my great desire that the Polish nation may soon achieve the promise first given in that great time in the past we celebrate on this May 3.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, today I should like to join with my colleagues and with Americans of Polish descent in commemorating two anniversaries of crucial importance to the great Polish people. This year marks the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's conversion to Christianity. And on May 3 the Polish people will celebrate the 175th anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution.

The beginning of Poland's conversion to Christianity was the result of a dynastic marriage. In the year 966 Poland's first historically known ruler Mieszko I, married Dobrava, a Christian princess from Bohemia. As a result of his conversion, Mieszko I was able to place his lands under the protection of the Pope and thus stem threatened German aggression. Mieszko's son, Boleslaw the Brave, encouraged missionary activity all over Poland and established many Christian bishoprics. Today Christianity remains a powerful Polish tie to the West. Despite the Communist government's disapproval, thousands of Poles have flocked to hear Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski every time that he has spoken publicly.

The liberal western yearnings of the Polish people were symbolized by the great Constitution of 1791. Just 4 years after the U.S. Constitution was signed, the Polish Diet adopted a constitution which replaced a medieval type of government with a modern constitutional monarchy and parliamentary system. Unfortunately this great document was given no chance to prove its potential. Imperial Russia regarded its reforms as extremely dangerous and used its provisions as an excuse to invade Poland on April 8, 1792. Today the Poles find themselves in the same tragic position. They want to live in freedom, under a democratic system of government, but they are forced to live under a Communist system of government which relies on Soviet imperialism.

We in the United States can help sustain the hopes of the Polish people for growing liberty by recognizing their plight and by expressing our concern for their welfare. The many Americans of Polish descent can help to form a living bond between the two peoples. Let us hope that this bond will be strengthened and that new ways will be found to increase the freedom and independence of the Polish nation, despite its current domination by the Communists.

CELEBRATION OF THE POLISH MILLENNIUM, MAY 3, 1966

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, the observation of Poland's millennium is a celebration of faith in God and of freedom of the human spirit.

One thousand years ago, Duke Mieszko accepted for his people the Roman Catholic faith. In so doing, he faced his nation toward the West and its values and culture.

In turn, Poland has enriched the fabric of Western civilization.

Especially impressive has been Poland's contributions to the ideals and concepts of democracy.

In the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries, Poland was the largest and most civilized and powerful state in Central and Eastern Europe.

Significantly, this achievement was built on a series of fundamental concepts of liberty.

They included the "Neminen Captivabus" in 1425 which guaranteed personal liberty of the citizens; the "Statutes of Nieszawa" in 1454 which established a bicameral parliamentary system known as the "sejm" consisting of the Senate and the lower House; and the "Nihil Novi" in 1505 which made the crown powerless to legislate without consent of the two chambers.

Beginning in 1573, Kings of Poland were elected, and a new set of laws, known as pacta conventa, evolved. With them, citizens gained the right to withdraw allegiance to the King if he transgressed any law or broke any stipulation under which he was elected.

These and other concepts, such as liberum veto which enabled any member of the sejm to dissolve Parliament and annul its acts, are striking examples of a nation's will to be free of tyranny.

Significantly, the concepts preceded the framing of our own Constitution by 200 years, and many of Poland's ideals were reflected in our Bill of Rights.

In the 18th century, Poland's empire was diminished through several partitions. She responded to her internal turmoil by writing the constitution of May 3, 1791. It was a remarkable document for the times, balancing individual freedoms against the needs of the nation.

The liberum veto and other independent but divisive practices were abolished. Class distinction was ended. Towns obtained administrative and judicial autonomy and parliamentary representation. Peasants were placed under the protection of law. Measures aimed at the abolition of serfdom were sanctioned.

Poland's premium on freedom has been demonstrated throughout its history.

For centuries, Poland was a bulwark in the defense of Europe against the Tartars, Turks, and Mongols. In our own century, in 1920, she defended the Continent against the Russian Bolsheviks, and was credited with saving Europe from communism.

Starting in the 14th century, she was the first European nation to grant sanctuary to the Jews.

In the 16th century, she guaranteed free worship of any religion, and remains deeply religious today.

Regrettably, the last two centuries have dealt unjustly with Poland. In our own lifetimes, the injustices have been savage cruelties.

It is wise to remember that it was Christianity, a thousand years ago, which led Poland away from pagan darkness. And it was Christianity which guided her to her most noble achievements.

Christ taught us that righteousness will prevail. At this time, as Poland embarks on a second millennium, let His teaching give us faith that Poland again will resume her rightful place in the community of free and independent nations.

Mr. President, this morning, in a beautiful ceremony in the rose garden, the President addressed a large group of Polish-Americans on the anniversary of Poland's millennium. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD I may include the text of the President's remarks and also the text of my remarks on that occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT POLISH CHRISTIAN MILLENNIUM ANNIVERSARY AND SIGNING OF PROCLAMATION

Ladies and gentlemen, today is the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity and nationhood. It is also the 175th anniversary of a document that holds a place of honor among the noble statements of human rights—the Polish constitution of 1791.

All men who revere liberty acknowledge their indebtedness to these landmarks in the struggle for individual freedom. That is why we have gathered today.

Life has never been easy for the people of Poland. Time and again she has endured the unwelcome intrusion of her larger and more powerful neighbors. Time and again she has endured suffering and sacrifice, only to recover and rebuild. In all of this, her proud and resourceful people left an indelible mark on western civilization.

Americans owe a special debt to Poland, for almost two centuries ago her sons joined our own revolution and Polish patriots fought under the American flag. Nor can we forget the millions of Polish immigrants whose personal faith and tenacious labor helped to tame a continent. Our national heritage is rich with their gifts. This debt, and our long ties with the people of Poland, give us a special interest in her future.

Twice in this century she has been devastated by war. Yet her people have remained loyal to their ancient faith and to the human values it represents. Even as we meet here today, they are meeting—by the hundreds of thousands—at the historic monastery of Jasna Gora. Led by a great Polish Cardinal, they are offering prayers of hope and thanksgiving which reflect their enduring belief in God and in their national destiny.

In Poland, and in other countries in Eastern Europe, new ideas are winning new friends. Windows are opening to the world—only slightly in many places, but they are opening.

And despite the severe limitations on its national freedom—limitations that prevent many Polish-Americans from celebrating this day on Polish soil—the ancient spirit of Poland is not dead. Her people still yearn for a lively future in Europe and among the community of nations.

We see this, for one thing, in economic policy. Poland, and some of her neighbors in Eastern Europe, are sensing the vigor of individual enterprise.

Men are coming to understand that decentralized decisionmaking is proving more efficient than highly centralized state control. Profits are coming to be understood as a better measure of productivity and personal incentive as a better spur to effective action on behalf of the national economy.

How hopeful these signs are, we cannot yet say. We can only trust they foreshadow a new reliance upon—if not a new understanding of—the individual as the most important element of society.

If they reflect a willingness to respond to reality, if they signal a readiness to sift ideas for their own worth rather than to dismiss them as politically impure, if they reflect a gradual rebirth of reason and open discourse among men, then seeds exist for genuine confidence that things, indeed, may yet change.

For this reason, it is not vain, on this day of great memories, to speak also of great hopes. Chief among them is the future of Europe.

So vast are the resources of that continent, so important its policies to the rest of the world, so vital its prosperity to the world economy, that Americans ignore the future of Europe only at the expense of peace and progress on both continents.

Men and nations must labor long to bring to reality:

A Europe free of artificial political barriers that block the free movement of people, ideas, and commerce;

A Europe secured by international-inspected arms control arrangements that remove the age-old fears of East and West alike;

A Europe of interdependent friends in which the strength of each adds to the strength of all;

A Europe in which the people of every nation know again the responsibilities and rewards of free political choices.

Not because we have treasure to gain or territory to acquire, but because we have common roots and common interests, the United States seeks to help build that kind of Europe.

It was in that spirit that the Marshall plan was offered 19 years ago; it is still the spirit of American policy.

Our guiding principles are these:

First, our alliance with Western Europe—which we believe is in the common interest of all who seek peace—is a charter for changing needs, not a relic of past requirements.

It was—and continues to be—a basis for security, solidarity, and advance in Europe. It remains our conviction that an integrated Atlantic defense is the first necessity, not the last result, of the building of unity in Western Europe for expanding partnership across the Atlantic and for reconciling differences with the East.

As we revise the structure of NATO to meet today's realities, we must make sure that these forward-looking purposes are served, and served well.

Second, we believe the drive for unity in Western Europe is not only desirable but necessary. Every lesson of the past and every prospect for the future argue that the nations of Western Europe can only fulfill their proper role in the world community if increasingly, they act together. From this base of collaboration, fruitful ties to the East can best be built.

Third, we will encourage every constructive enrichment of the human, cultural, and commercial ties between Eastern Europe and the West.

Fourth, we will continue to seek ways to improve relations between the people of Germany and their fellow Europeans to the East and to move toward a peaceful settlement of the division of Germany on the principle of self-determination.

Fifth, we welcome growing participation by the nations of Eastern Europe in common efforts to accelerate economic growth in the developing areas of the world and to share in the worldwide war on poverty, hunger, and disease.

Almost 2 years ago at the George Marshall Memorial Library, in Lexington, Va., I said we must continue to build bridges across the gulf which has separated us from Eastern Europe. Since that time, we have taken limited steps forward along what will be a long road.

In Poland alone, for example, we have:

Dedicated an American-financed children's research hospital in Krakow;

Increased support for CARE, Church World Services, and American Relief for Poland in their food and medical programs for hospitals and needy individuals;

Reached an understanding between our National Academy of Sciences and the Polish Academy of Sciences on an important exchange program similar to the one we have reached with Yugoslavia, Rumania, and the Soviet Union;

Invited Poland to cooperate in our satellite program;

Increased by 44 percent in the second half of 1965 the number of Polish visitors who come to the United States for academic, scientific, and technical purposes;

Increased by more than $200,000 the sale in Poland of American books, newspapers, plays, motion pictures, and television programs. Our international media guarantee program with Poland is the largest in the world.

These are small steps. But, as Cicero once said, "the beginnings of all things are small." From these we will take other steps to help revive the intellectual, commercial, and cultural currents which once criss-crossed Europe—from London to Budapest, Warsaw to Paris, Frankfurt to Krakow, Prague to Brussels.

As one additional step, and as I pledged in my state of the Union message, I am today instructing the Secretary of State to send to the Congress legislation making it possible to expand trade between the United States and Eastern Europe.

The intimate engagement of peaceful trade over a period of time, can influence Eastern European societies to develop along paths favorable to world peace. After years of careful study, the time has come now to act. With these steps we can help gradually to create a community of interest, a community of trust, and a community of effort. Thus will the tide of human hope rise.

It is a good occasion that brings us here today. In issuing this proclamation, I am asking all Americans to join in the observance of historic events which have inspired man's long walk on earth.

May we draw new resolve, even now, from the Polish millennium and constitution day.

A Proclamation in Commemoration of Poland's National and Christian Millennium by the President of the United States of America

May 3 marks an important anniversary for freedom-loving people the world over. It was on this date, 175 years ago, that the patriots of Poland adopted a constitution that stirred the hopes of the Polish people.

But this year, May 3 takes on a significance that is truly unique. It marks the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity and Polish nationhood.

Ten centuries ago today, Poland became a part of the community of Western nations. Ten centuries ago today, Poland entered the mainstream of Western thought and Western culture.

It was this tradition that gave birth to the Polish Constitution of 1791. The Christian expression of the dignity of man found its ultimate expression in the cause of freedom and national independence.

It was no accident that this great political document came into being just 4 years after the American Constitution—or that the two were so similar in content and spirit. The same spark of freedom that flared into the American Revolution also burned in the hearts of the Polish people. Our Revolution was theirs, and to these shores, to help in our struggle, came two great champions of liberty: Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Kazimierz Pulaski.

The rest is history: a triumph for America, for the most part tragedy for Poland. Today, after nearly two centuries of struggle, of invasion, of foreign domination, of partition—and always of bravery—love for national independence and for the basic rights of man still lies deep in the hearts of the Polish people. The spark of freedom has never been extinguished.

And through it all, the historic ties between our two great nations have remained as a symbol of friendship and hope. Today, on this anniversary, we reaffirm that friendship and pledge ourselves to that hope.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim this day, May 3, 1966, as Poland's National and Christian Millennium Day on which we spiritually unite ourselves with the people of Poland and those gathered today at Jasna Gora and wherever they might be observing this historical event.

I invite the American people to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities and particularly to join with Americans of Polish heritage in their continued celebrations throughout this memorable year, both in America and in Poland.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 3d day of May in the year of our Lord 1966, and of the independence of the United States of America the 190th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie at the White House, May 3, 1966

Mr. President, a thousand years ago Poland entered both history and Christianity. That thousand years, to all Americans of Polish descent is a heritage of tears and pride. It is the story of a fiercely independent people. It is the story of a people devoted to the cause of freedom.

We are grateful to you, Mr. President, for this recognition of that history. It is a heritage which binds us to the ideals and purposes of our beloved country.

Mr. President, Americans of Polish descent speak to you today through a committee consisting of: Karl Rozmarek, president, Polish-American Congress; Most Rev. John J. Krol, S.C.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia; Dr. Leopold Obierek, president, Polish Daily; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis Palecki of Philadelphia, chairman, Millennium Committee for Eastern States.

In the name of all Polish Americans, the committee presents to you, as a small token of their high esteem and admiration for your courageous leadership and significant contribution to the cause of freedom and equality, a replica-mosaic of the Polish Black Madonna.

The original of Our Lady of Czestochowa, called also The Miraculous or Black Madonna has been in the monastery of Jasna Gora in the City of Czestochowa, since the 14th century. In 1655 the monastery withstood a 40-day siege by the Swedish Army which occupied all of Poland, and the victory by the Poles was attributed to the Madonna. Since then it has been a national symbol of Poland's independence and patriotism. On May 3, today, millions of Polish pilgrims in connection with Poland's millennium celebrations will pay their respects to her at the monastery of Jasna Gora.

This beautiful mosaic, Mr. President, was executed by the well-recognized artist, Jan Kranz, an American of Polish origin, whose works have been exhibited in many museums and cathedrals of Poland and Venezuela.

The inscription on the mosaic, Mr. President, is worded as follows:

"To the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, champion of freedom and equality on the occasion of Poland's Christian millennium from Americans of Polish descent, White House, May 3, 1966."

Mr. MUSKIE. The President used the occasion to deliver a major foreign policy address concerning our relations with the Eastern European countries. It is appropriate that he should have done so in connection with the anniversary of Poland's millennium. All Polish-Americans are grateful to the President for having given this recognition to the long history of Poland.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Polish people are today celebrating 1,000 years of Christianity in their country. They have designated May 3, as Polish Millennium Day, and the year 1966 as millennium year.

One cannot approach this celebration without mixed emotions. It is largely due to the bravery and valor of the people of Poland that Europe is Christian, that it is in the Western bloc of nations, and that it is largely free of Communist domination. In the fight for their own independence, the Polish nation has guaranteed freedom to Europe. But freedom itself has been denied the Polish people.

In 966, Mieszko, the first ruler of Poland for which we have historic proof of his reign and existence, espoused Christianity and thereby set the Eastern limits of Christian Europe at that time. By his action, Mieszko forestalled invasion of Poland by Germanic princes who wanted to increase their holdings under pretext of converting the pagan Slavic tribes to Christianity. In a sense, Polish history begins with Mieszko and with his historic decision.

Because of its unique border position as the eastern edge of Christianity in Europe, it has been the historical defender of Europe.

Polish blood and military leadership saved Europe from Moslem invasion, and from Eastern Mongol warriors and princes. With Polish aid, the Turks were defeated in Vienna and an end was put to westward Turkish expansion.

In our own century, Europe was safeguarded for a time by the victorious Marshal Josef Pilsudski who defeated the Bolshevik armies in their attempt to annex a defeated and militarily prostrated Germany in 1920.

And in 1939, Poland was the first to oppose Hitler in his attempt to establish German hegemony over Europe.

But today, Poland is not free. For all the bravery of the Polish people and their desire and determination for national freedom throughout a millennium, they are held in captivity as a Communist hostage country. Much of Europe is free, Christian, and in the western bloc of nations because of Poland's actions over 1,000 years in pursuit of her own freedom.

But the heroes of the Poznan uprising in June of 1956 have established beyond doubt and Polish patriotism and dedication to the future history of Poland as an independent nation are not extinguished.

Poland has been called the bulwark of Europe, and I am confident, Mr. President, that the work of a thousand years has not been undone.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on this 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution we join millions of Americans of Polish descent in commemorating the firm friendship that has linked the American and Polish peoples since Kosciuszko and Pulaski entered our Pantheon of Revolutionary War heroes.

This year's observance takes on added and special significance, moreover, because 1966 also marks the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's acceptance of Christianity and a millennium of identification with Western culture and development.

This heritage makes all the more poignant the fate of the Polish people under Communist rule. Denied the freedom to shape their own destiny, they continue to look to us for sustenance of their faith that justice will triumph. Let this then be a year of renewed dedication to the restoration of an independent Poland, committed to freedom and justice for all.

POLISH MILLENNIUM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the Polish people as they celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of the coming of Christianity to their land.

In the year 966, the Polish ruler Mieszko was converted to the Christian faith, shortly after his marriage to the daughter of the King of Bohemia. This momentous event led to the entry of the Polish people into the Catholic Church, and the long and fruitful relationship between Poland and the West.

The 1,000 years since then have been years of triumph and of tragedy for the Polish people. Defenders of Christianity at the gates of Vienna in the late 17th century, the Poles saw their land deprived of its independence and partitioned among Austria, Prussia, and Russia a century later. Restored to independence after the First World War, Poland fought valiantly against the Nazi and Soviet tyrannies during and after World War II, and suffered more from the ravages of that conflict than any other nation. But the spirit and love of freedom lives on in the Polish people today.

Poland has given to the world great men in many spheres of life. From Copernicus, founder of modern astronomy, to Madam Marie Sklodowska-Curie, discoverer of radium, Poles have made eminent contributions to our science. And how many millions have had lives made richer through the books of Joseph Conrad Korzeniowski and the music of Chopin and Paderewski.

And in our own land, people of Polish ancestry have made an indispensable contribution to our national development, from Pulaski in the Revolutionary War to men such as Ambassador John A. Gronouski and our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

The American people and the Polish people are tied together by bonds of indissoluable affection. So as one Senator, I wish to pay tribute to the gallant Polish people on this millennium of the coming of Christianity to their nation. I would declare my continued support for policies of increasing contact between Americans and Poles at all levels, and working for the day when that great nation may live in greater freedom and happiness.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, 1,000 years ago the borders of Christendom were expanded to include the principality of Poland. One hundred and seventy-five years ago on this day a modern constitution was adopted in the kingdom of Poland. Reverberations from both events are still very much in evidence today.

> There is a weird power in a spoken word * * * and a word carries far—very far.

This wistful fragment from the writings of one of Poland's sons, Joseph Conrad, so evocative of the Gospel of St. John, has a special relevance this year on this day.

In 966, Prince Mieszko, of Poland, abandoned the paganism of his forebears and espoused Christianity. The religion spread rapidly to almost all the people, and the teachings of Christ had a visible influence upon their culture. A special relationship with Rome grew out of Poland's dedication to the patrimony of St. Peter. The protection of the Holy See insured Poland's absorption of the heritage of antiquity that was largely preserved and nurtured by the church during the Middle Ages.

During the 14th century, when a Polish queen married Prince Jagiello of Lithuania, the merger of the two principalities resulted in another extension of Christendom. The religion spread north, Latin became the language of the educated classes, Romanesque and then Gothic churches were built, and the binding treaty was sealed in the name of the Lord. This extraordinary document proclaimed the certainty that salvation is to be found only in love which "radiates goodness, reconciles those in discord, unites those who quarrel, dissipates hatred, puts an end to anger, furnishes to all the food of peace, brings together the scattered, lifts up the fallen, makes rough way smooth, turns wrong into right, aids virtues, injures no one, delights in all things. * * * Through love, laws are established, kingdoms are ruled, cities are set in order, and the welfare of the state is brought to its highest."

Thus, it was believed, would the teaching of Christ bring order and peace. For many years it seemed that constitutional ideals were germinating under what was known as "the Most Serene Republic of Poland."

In 1454, a parliamentary system was established with a bicameral Sejm, or Diet, consisting of representatives of the nobility and of the burghers. In 1505, a law forbade the Crown to legislate without the consent of the Sejm. Gradually the representatives of the gentry exacted privileges at the expense of the people of the growing towns. But during the golden age of the Jagiellonian era the kings protected the political rights of the cities, where self-government flourished. Freedom did not extend to the common people but the idea of constitutional government gained strength with the support of the nobility who wanted to be free from royal control.

The federation of Poland and Lithuania extended from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea. Union was not imposed by conquest but by royal matrimony and the mutual consent of the nobles. Each country retained its own government, treasury, and army, but they had a common king and parliament. The Jagiellonian dynasty lasted throughout the 15th and most of the 16th centuries. It came to an end in 1572 and a period of elective monarchy followed. Kings were elected by the gentry for lifelong reigns, but they had no voice in the choice of their successors. This was an interesting development at a time when, elsewhere in Europe, monarchy was gaining power.

Having no natural boundaries either to the east or west, Poland has always been vulnerable to the predatory tendencies of her neighbors. In the 18th century decentralization led to the tragic partitioning of Poland by the powerful autocracies of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The increasing pressure gave rise in 1768 to an uprising of Polish patriots under the leadership of Pulaski, a nobleman whose son later became a hero in our own struggle for national independence. The Confederation of Bar, as the revolt was called, struggled for 4 years but could not prevent the first partition in 1772.

The ideas of the Enlightenment which had immediate political significance in the American and French revolutions, also played a stunning role in Polish history.

The word "Liberty," carries far—very far. On May 3, 1791, strong central government was restored in Poland and a modern constitution was adopted by the Sejm. The powers of the monarchy, were limited and biennial parliaments were called for. Towns were given autonomy and their inhabitants were permitted ownership of land and access to state and church offices. Peasants were assured protection of the law and the harsh conditions of serfdom were somewhat mitigated. Complete religious toleration was established.

The great promise of this reform unfortunately never had a chance to ripen. Partitions followed, reducing Poland to one-third of its size and causing the abandonment of the constitution. Independence was lost. However, a great civilization had bloomed in Poland; a national patrimony that no misfortune will ever extinguish. The strong bonds with the Latin west have been of critical importance to the people of Poland as a cultural lifeline through the difficult years that ensued.

Earlier, as the Renaissance had spread north from Italy during the 15th and 16th centuries, Poland participated in the flourishing commerce of ideas and made her own gigantic contributions to the rebirth of learning. The Jagiellonian University at Krakow became the world's leading center for the study of mathematics. Mikolaj Kopernik revolutionized man's beliefs about the universe by expounding the heretical theory that the earth is round and revolves around the sun. It might be said that this theory inspired the first drama of what was to become a scientific revolution. Centuries later another Polish scientist, Mme Marie Skodowska-Currie, gave still unmeasured impetus to that revolution by her discovery of radiation.

Without wishing to slight the practitioners of other arts, I must point out that Poland has given us an outpouring of musical genius that is to her everlasting glory. Paderewski, Chopin, Joseph Hoffman, Artur Rubenstein, Helena Modjeska, and many others have given us music in composition and performance of unsurpassed beauty. Fortunately for all of us this great musical heritage seems to be self-perpetuating. All one need do to be forever grateful is to look at the number of Polish names in virtually all of our symphony orchestras.

The wonderful independence of Polish intellectual and esthetic creation has its parallel in the continual struggle for political independence. Against enormous odds there have always been heroes of the stamp of Pulaski, Kosciuszko, Pilsudski, Sikorski, and Cardinal Wyszynski. The people of Poland cherish their memory and continue to have faith that independence will someday be won again.

The most recent evidence that the Communists are afraid of "the weird power of the spoken word" is their denial of permission for Roman Catholic prelates to visit Poland during the millennium year. Even the Pope has been turned away. In March, I twice requested that our State Department intercede on behalf of Archbishop John P. Cody of Chicago and other Catholic clergy who wished to make the pilgrimage to Poland for the commemoration of Poland's millennium. When the Polish Government persisted in delaying and then denying such visas I wired the State Department, asking them to protest strongly against this dictatorial policy of the Gomulka regime. Americans pay particular attention on this day in this year to the plight and promise of Poland, because we, too, believe in the power of ideas to change the course of history. We believe the idea of freedom will prevail over police power. We believe that fear and repression cannot extinguish faith. In this millennium year we want the world to listen. I ask unanimous consent that my later telegram of April 22 to the Secretary of State, along with the Department's reply which has come to my office this morning, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 22, 1966.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.:

On March 18 I urged your Polish desk to strongly request that the Polish government grant a visa to Archbishop John P. Cody of Chicago, and the other Catholic dignitaries who desire to visit Poland for the celebration of the millennium of Poland's adoption of Christianity. Up to date no such visa has been granted. I am now informed that the Polish government refuses to permit any of the Catholic clergy to come to Poland. I know that you have been doing everything to obtain these visas and I do not blame you in the slightest, but I believe our Government should register the strongest possible protest at this denial of the right of free travel. I also believe that Cardinal Wyszynski's request for a visa to go to Rome or come to the United States should be given our support. Poland pretends that it wants friendly relations with the West. I do not see how they can maintain this position in view of their denial of visas to Catholic clergy of the United States, to the Pope, and to the clergy of their own church. This is important and I think our protests should be strong.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 29, 1966.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The Secretary has asked me to thank you for your telegram of April 22, 1966, in which you express deep concern that Archbishop John P. Cody of Chicago and other Catholic clergy from this country have not been granted visas to visit Poland for the celebration of the millennium of the advent of Christianity to Poland. You urge that the U.S. Government register a strong protest over this restriction of travel and that it support visits to the United States and to Rome for millennial observances of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland.

According to information received by the Department from official Polish sources and elsewhere, it now appears clear that Polish visas will not be granted to 15 American bishops and archbishops or to other church dignitaries throughout the world who were planning to lead pilgrimages by lay Catholics early in May. One of those refused a visa was Archbishop Cody. There is also evidence to indicate that the restrictive policy adopted by the Polish Government in this regard reflects its allegation that leaders of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland, by inviting on their own authority large numbers of cardinals and bishops from abroad to attend the millennium celebrations, have engaged in political activities which were objectionable to and unauthorized by the Polish Government.

Every country has the right to regulate the entry of foreign visitors into its territory. There is clearly no legal ground on which the United States can soundly base an official protest against the exercise of this soverign right by the Polish Government. This has not prevented us, however, from making clear to the Poles the damaging results which a restrictive policy of this nature may have upon Polish-American understanding. I can assure you that the Polish authorities in Warsaw, as well as Polish Embassy representatives in Washington, have been left under no illusion as to the negative impact that the denial of visas to high American church officials is having on many Americans and their elected representatives. In this connection, our Ambassador to Poland, John A. Gronouski, informed journalists in Warsaw on April 7, that he had discussed this matter informally with Polish officials and other Poles and had emphasized to them the adverse effects which the denial of visas would have on U.S. public opinion.

Cardinal Wyszynski was refused a Polish passport for a specific trip he planned to make to Rome in January of this year. Since Polish citizens must make new applications for their passports each time they intend to go abroad, it is not known whether this denial automatically applies to future trips as well. There are no present indications, however, that the Polish authorities intend to be less restrictive in their visa policy during the remainder of this millennial year.

Please call upon me whenever I may be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleagues in extending to the Polish nation, and to citizens of all nations who are of Polish descent, congratulations on the millennium of that great country. It is a matter of extreme regret that this proud and gifted people has fallen under the dominion of communism, and we all cherish the hope that this sad situation will be altered and that one day Poland will be as free as the free spirits of its citizens.

At the same time, however, we pay tribute to the enormous accomplishments of men and women of Polish citizenry and descent throughout this past thousand years. Every country in the world has benefited from the contributions they have made to its well-being and growth. I need hardly remind this body of Senators, so conscious of American history, of the great achievements of Poles in the United States beginning with the Revolutionary War and continuing down to the present day. They deserve praise and thanks for their accomplishments.

And so my sincere congratulations go out to this great people as we celebrate the millennium of Poland. May the next thousand years be filled with even more noteworthy achievements.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, we observe today the 175th anniversary of Poland's Constitution as an important milestone in the history of human freedom around the globe. The Polish Diet adopted this historic document on May 3, 1791, after a moving appeal by King Stanislas making Poland the first nation in central and eastern Europe to guarantee human rights for all citizens.

This Constitution was drawn up at a time when absolute monarchy was the prevailing form of government on the European Continent. With this Constitution the Polish people drastically curtailed the powers of the monarch and made him more responsive to the needs of the people. Rigid class distinctions of the middle ages were set aside, religious freedom was guaranteed and principles of equality were clearly enunciated. Poland's May 3 Constitution is particularly significant because it was adopted without anarchy and bloodshed at a time when memories of the American and French Revolutions were still vividly imprinted on the minds of Europeans.

In the years following 1791, Poland was partitioned and the freedom of the people severely repressed on four occasions, 1793, 1795, 1939, and 1945. Her people's dedication to democracy was put to test for many generations and their unceasing devotion to the ideals of freedom is a testament to their courage and fidelity.

During World War II a Polish force in exile organized under Allied command fought valiantly at Monte Cassino and the inscription on the monument to the Polish dead is a fitting recognition of the brave spirit of the Polish people. It reads:

> We Polish soldiers for our freedom and yours have given our souls to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy, and our hearts to Poland.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, today is a most significant one in the lives of 10 million people of Polish descent living in America. It is the anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution, which comes during the year marking the millennium of Christianity in Poland.

When we look at the history of the Polish nation, we can see that her people have endured oppression during the last 1,000 years in their attempt to achieve the freedom of religion—a freedom that we, in America, have known all our years. Ever since Poland joined other western nations in espousing Christianity in 966, she has constantly undergone attacks on that liberty, which were begun by the Moslems and are carried on by the Communists today. After the Warsaw Convention in 1573, where the right to worship as one chose was guaranteed, Aryans, Lutherans, Calvinists and Jews settled in Poland in their flight from persecution in other countries. But present-day Poland is a different land. It is a country where religious tolerance is promised under the Constitution, but nevertheless constantly oppressed by those who fear religion.

I think that it would be well for us to remember on this day that almost one-quarter of the Polish people in the world now live in another land, having been driven from their homeland, but that those Poles who have remained have constantly struggled for progress as has been evidenced by their achievements in many fields, including science, music and literature. It is on this day that we mark the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution with the hope that the freedoms granted therein will, in fact, be permitted one day by those who desire to oppress what we Americans have always been blessed to know.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to associate myself with my colleagues in paying tribute to the great Polish Nation on the occasion of its millennium. It is with sadness that I note the necessity that our expressions of friendship and admiration must be made as across a wall. Many Americans had desired to make a pilgrimage to Poland, the land of their origin, to join in celebrating this great event. But Poland is now a Communist satellite nation and the glory to which she is entitled in this millennium is smothered beneath the boots of Russian troops.

If the Polish people are thus to be deprived of our personal tribute, they can take heart in the fact that our thoughts are with them on this great day in their unique history.

Troubled as I am by the hostile attitude of the temporary government of Poland, I do not despair that these great people will not regain their freedom and national integrity. Indeed, history reminds us that on four occasions in its thousand-year history, Poland has been partitioned by military conquest. During such periods the Poles were to see their country divided and redivided, and their lands and cities distributed among the empires of Austria, Germany, and Russia. These artificial political lines did not deter the great people of Poland, for although their country had been stricken from the map, it survived in millions of faithful hearts and with renewed vigor was to regain its geographic and political integrity. And so it remains today, the nearly 70,000 square miles of Poland that have been annexed to the Soviet Russian Empire are but temporarily absent from the political confederation to which the people of Poland will eventually succeed.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to take a moment to pay tribute to that great Pole whose faith in God and his religion has made him the spiritual father of a nation whose history is a tribute to a spiritual heritage. I refer to His Eminence Stephen Cardinal Wyszynski, who survived imprisonment by the Communist regime only to retain, in fact, that which he had never lost in the hearts of his countrymen, the leadership of the church in Poland. The hand of God was never more evident than in the manner in which He has sustained the Polish people in their struggle to preserve their faith in the face of a godless Communist regime.

Poland has been a Christian nation for 1,000 years; she has been under Soviet Communist domination for 20. How long can it be before the flame of Polish nationlism will reignite the continuing development of this great nation as a land of free peoples, Christian principles, and territorial independence?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have been asked by my colleague from Nebraska, the Honorable Carl T. Curtis, to present for him this statement in observance of the Polish millennium because he is not able to be here today.

It is with pleasure that I comply with the request of Senator Curtis in this matter because we have many fine citizens of Polish descent in Nebraska. They are an important part of our economic, social, and family life as well as our political and governmental history.

We are proud of these people and the contributions they have made. Hence, I not only present this statement but also join Senator Curtis in these remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Curtis

It is appropriate that we pause for a moment today to express our sympathies for, and extend our wishes for a better life to, the people of nations that have fallen under Communist rule around the world.

The occasion, Mr. President, is the observance of the Polish millennium and the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the first democratic constitution in Poland.

The event is significant in our own Nation's history in that many of our citizens came from Poland and many others are descendants of Polish immigrants who came to America to find a better life after their own country fell under foreign domination by dictator powers.

More than 10,000 citizens of my own State of Nebraska either came from Poland or have one parent who was born in Poland.

The adoption of the Polish Constitution was a bright spot in the history of Europe in 1791. It came at a time when almost the entire nation was parceled among the neighboring countries of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. A small group of patriotic, determined Polish citizens defied danger, drafted the Constitution, and presented it to the country.

The document established a constitutional monarchy with a responsible cabinet form of government. Class distinction and privileges were swept aside, and peasants were granted the protection of the law. This and other aspects of the Polish constitution rank it in history as a major step in the advancement of democracy into central and eastern Europe.

That constitution of 1791 stands along with our own American Constitution as a symbol of hope not only for the people living under Communist rule in Poland but also of Communist-enslaved people around the world. The people of captive nations should know that there is hope for their freedom as long as there are people who can rise out of the despair of despotic rule and write a constitution such as the gallant band of Polish patriots did in 1791.

Not only did the people of Poland in 1791 set an example for freedom-loving peoples throughout the word, but the people of Poland today, although enslaved by communism, are again setting an example. They are God-loving people. Under the leadership of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, they are celebrating the Polish millennium this year not only as a national observance but also as a religious testimonial of their faith in God over a period of centuries.

It is appropriate that Polish Millennium Day should be observed throughout the world on this 175th anniversary day of the first democratic constitution of Poland. I hope it will stand not merely as a memorial to the past but as a pillar of bright hope to the people of all captive nations for the future.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we mark this year a unique milestone in the history of Christianity and the history of Poland—the Polish millennium. In 966, the first known king of Poland, Mieszko, received the sacrament of baptism. In the thousand years that have followed, Christianity has been intimately bound up with the culture of the Polish people; it is central to their heritage. Today, despite the efforts of a political regime to erase this heritage, Christianity does not fade. The magnificent leadership of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski and the indomitable spirit of the people sustain the centuries-old Christian aspirations.

May 3, Mr. President, is a special day of observance during this year of celebration. One hundred and seventy-five years ago, May 3, 1791, a constitution was promulgated, embodying many of the ideals that only a few years before had been set forth in our own Constitution: concepts of self-government and civil liberties. Regrettably, however, the wars and struggles of Europe wrought havoc on this valiant nation; her people have known more years of political subjugation—often to foreign masters—than years of the freedom and independence for which they yearn. Despite the ebbs and flows of political events, however, there remains among the people a vibrant spirit—a spirit that has provided them strength and unity in times when those of less courage would have submitted to enslavement.

Our own Nation can testify to this spirit; we have witnessed its strength among those who emigrated to America. Indeed, that spirit has been infused into our own cultural fabric.

Mr. President, I join well-wishers throughout the world in a salute to Polish observance of a thousand years of Christianity in the annals of their nation.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today, May 3, the Polish people celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's conversion to Christianity. Poland's Western cultural and religious heritage has again and again enabled her to resist oppression, partition, and foreign domination. That the deeply religious character of the Polish people has not been crushed by Communist rule was evidenced by the thousands who have listened to Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski whenever he has spoken in the past few months.

Poland has a tradition of great national leaders which dates back at least 1,000 years. The first historically known monarch, Mieszko I adopted Christianity in 966 after his marriage to a Christian princess, and was able to stem German expansion to the east by placing his lands under the protection of the Pope. His son, Boleslaw the Mighty, established Polish dominion from the Oder and the Neisse Rivers to the Dnieper River and from Western Pomerania to the Carpathian Mountains. The historic claim of Poland to its western boundary on the Oder-Neisse is especially significant today when we are seeking ways to liquidate the unfortunate divisions left from World War II. More important than simply reaffirming Poland's historic claim, I believe we should recognize the fact and finality that they constitute part of Poland—and then proceed with orderly steps to the reunification of Germany.

A great cultural and political hero of the 19th and 20th centuries was Ignace Jan Paderewski. One of the greatest pianists of all time, Paderewski used his talents for the benefit of his country. With the outbreak of World War I he began to use the concert stage to secure funds to aid the cause of Polish independence. He was elected first Premier of Poland and was a signer of the Treaty of Versailles. France bestowed upon him the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor. He was the last President of the free Polish state.

Today a new leader embodies Poland's heritage and inspires the Polish people in their unceasing quest for freedom and national independence. Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski has courageously assumed leadership of a cause which embodies the deepest aspirations of the Polish people. In Poznan thousands of people lined the streets to greet him on April 16. In Poznan, one of the centers of the turmoils of 1956, the cardinal replied to a bitter attack on him printed in Trybuna Ludu, the daily newspaper of the Communist Party. The cardinal declared that the church has a legitimate concern with the economic, social, and political life of the nation.

> The church has a mandate to talk about those problems.

He continued:

> It got that mandate from the Ecumenical Council.

Poland's great and ancient religious traditions have been strengthened and revitalized by this worldwide reformist movement within the church. In traditional societies these reformers are speaking out against social inequities perpetuated by the old upper classes. In Communist countries such as Poland their role is to challenge a new privileged class. I believe that in Poland this movement will succeed, for it is linked to Poland's Western heritage. It is the heritage of a people who have ultimately triumphed over all their oppressors.

DENUNCIATION OF THE WARSAW CONVENTION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution on behalf of myself, Senator Ervin, Senator Hartke, Senator Kennedy of New York, Senator Montoya, and Senator Yarborough.

This resolution relates to the Warsaw Convention which limits airline liability in international travel. The resolution asks that the denunciation of the Warsaw Convention be not withdrawn until full public hearings are held and views determined.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the desk for 2 days for cosponsors, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in full in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The resolution (S. Res. 256) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. Res. 256

Whereas the United States having on November 15, 1965, denounced the Warsaw Convention which limits airlines liability in international travel and this denunciation being finally effective on May 15, 1966; and

Whereas some airlines have agreed to a proposed system of absolute liability and damages limited to $75,000 as an alternative to denunciation of the convention; and

Whereas no public hearings have been held to carefully determine the views of qualified and interested persons: Therefore be it

Resolved, That said denunciation of the Warsaw Convention not be withdrawn until full public hearings are held and the views of qualified and interested persons determined.

Mr. **NELSON**. I do not have a formal opinion about what the answer to this problem is. I believe that many people are troubled about it in the country and in the Congress.

I believe the proposed changes imposing a system of absolute liability limiting damages to $75,000 which is under consideration may or may not be the answer, but the matter should have a public hearing, and this type of modification of the Warsaw Convention should come back to the floor of the Senate for discussion.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 WITH RESPECT TO OBSCENE OR HARASSING TELEPHONE CALLS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 557

Mr. **SMATHERS** submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2825) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3061) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize financial assistance for planning, engineering, designing, and other technical studies.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **INOUYE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 3225, to amend section 10 (c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to include provisions for the control of pollution from vessels and marinas, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] be added as cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **INOUYE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 3226, to provide Federal assistance to local communities to train personnel to operate sewage treatment plants, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be added as cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **INOUYE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 3227, a bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to assist in meeting the need for highly trained management personnel for the efficient operation of mass transportation systems, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] be added as cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **INOUYE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 3240, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a 3-year, $3 million comprehensive study of pollution in the tidal estuaries and their immediately adjacent land areas, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] be added as cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO BE HELD AT THE DESK

Mr. **McGOVERN**. Mr. President, last Wednesday, when I requested consent for Senate Concurrent Resolution 88 to lie on the desk for cosponsors, I requested that it be held for 5 legislative days.

There has been a misunderstanding, and the bill clerk closed the books on the resolution at the end of 5 calendar days yesterday evening.

I have advised several prospective cosponsors that they had through Wednesday to join as cosponsors of the resolution, and I know several will want to do so. Two or three have called today, including the majority leader's office.

In order to correct the misunderstanding, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 88 continue to be held at the clerk's desk for cosponsors to join until the close of business Thursday, May 5, and that it then be printed with the names of such sponsors as have joined.

I have handed the clerk the names of 25 cosponsors who have called my office and will submit further names, if any others join, Thursday evening.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEARINGS ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—S. 3243

Mr. **EASTLAND**. Mr. President, open hearings will be held by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, on May 4 and 5, on S. 3243, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and to make provision for necessary travel controls, at 10 a.m., room 2226, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, who is on his way to Geneva as a congressional observer at the 18-Nation International Disarmament Conference, I have been asked to announce that the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty will begin hearings, Tuesday, May 10, on S. 2993 to provide Federal assistance for family planning programs in low income areas. Secretary John W. Gardiner is expected to be the first witness.

Too much attention cannot be focused on the urgency of the world population crisis. As a member of the subcommittee and a cosponsor of this legislation I am delighted that the Senator from Pennsylvania, chairman of the subcommittee, has scheduled early hearings on S. 2993. I also wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland for his leadership in sponsoring this bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 943. An act for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka; and

S. 1804. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1308) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 602) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. REINECKE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. DENTON, Mr. STEED, Mr. BOW, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. LAIRD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8188. An act relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to certain organizations for judicial reform;

H.R. 8376. An act to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation;

H.R. 10998. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid;

H.R. 11653. An act to make permanent the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite;

H.R. 12262. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes;

H.R. 12328. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain extracts suitable for tanning may be imported free of duty;

H.R. 12461. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle;

H.R. 12463. An act to extend until June 30, 1969, the suspension of duty on crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory;

H.R. 12657. An act to continue the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite;

H.R. 12864. An act to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders;

H.R. 12997. An act to extend until July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum;

H.R. 13417. An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes;

H.R. 14644. An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year;

H.J. Res. 763. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week; and

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May 1966 as "Steelmark Month."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 518. An act for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia;

S. 1804. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; and

S. 1924. An act to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit referees from acting as trustees or receivers in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section I, Public Law 86-42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, Chairman, Mrs. KELLY, of New York, Mr. DULSKI, of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. GIAIMO, of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island, Mr. TUPPER, of Maine, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. STAFFORD, of Vermont, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Washington, D.C., beginning on May 18, 1966.

The message communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Patrick V. McNamara, late a Senator from the State of Michigan.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 8188. An act relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to certain organizations for judicial reform;

H.R. 8376. An act to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation;

H.R. 10998. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid;

H.R. 11653. An act to make permanent the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite;

H.R. 12262. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes;

H.R. 12328. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain extracts suitable for tanning may be imported free of duty;

H.R. 12461. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle;

H.R. 12463. An act to extend until June 30, 1969, the suspension of duty on crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory;

H.R. 12657. An act to continue the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite;

H.R. 12864. An act to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; and

H.R. 12997. An act to extend until July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 13417. An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14644. An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.J. Res. 763. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week; and

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May 1966 as "Steelmark Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEATH OF SENATOR PAT McNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to Senator Pat McNamara. The people of this country, and particularly the people of his home State of Michigan, have been fortunate to share in the benefits of his years of devoted public service.

Pat McNamara had a full and rewarding life, serving in the Senate of the United States for more than 11 years. Much of his adult life was spent in the city of Detroit, where he was a leader in the trade union movement. Pat McNamara was a true son of labor, and his life was a tribute to the honesty and courage of the men who organized the workingman in our great cities.

I have been privileged to serve with Senator McNamara for more than 3 years, both in this body and as a member of the Public Works Committee while he was its chairman.

As leader of the Public Works Committee, he made it a truly creative organization. This committee has traditionally been the focus of decisions authorizing construction of roads, harbors, and flood control works. Under Senator McNamara, the committee took on new and challenging tasks facing the Nation during the last 3d of the 20th century: major legislation for Appalachia, the highway beautification program, and air and water pollution problems. It has been an honor to serve as a member of the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, which was newly created during Senator McNamara's chairmanship.

At the same time, Pat McNamara did not neglect those traditional concerns of the Public Works Committee. Highways, flood control, reservoir and navigation projects have received his utmost attention—all of us can testify to the great strides made in these areas during the last few years.

Senator McNamara has always been prompt and considerate about the need for planning and survey work for new projects. Under his leadership, the committee has given public projects a close scrutiny, but it has always acted with dispatch once their soundness has been established. Senator McNamara insisted that every project should have an opportunity to stand up on its merits.

Above all else, I will always remember Pat McNamara because of his sterling personal qualities. He was an inspiration to his fellow Senators and earned their lasting esteem and affection.

I remember Pat McNamara, the big man with the gruff voice and the heart of gold. He could be counted on to attend sessions of the Senate, not to make speeches but to meet his responsibilities to his Nation and to his constituents. He was the type of man one could depend on for all contingencies. Some may say that he was not a leader in the conventional sense, but he showed us the way by the force of his conviction, his conscience, and his intense devotion.

I could not begin to recount here all those little but significant things that Pat McNamara did to help me during my beginning years in this body. In many ways, his passing will mark the beginning of a new phase in our experiences, for the senior Senator from Michigan can truly never be replaced.

There are few men in American public life today who could be called, without any exaggeration or hesitancy, the "salt of the earth." Pat McNamara was such a man. I was honored to know him, to work with him, and to learn from him. I join his colleagues, friends, and the American people he loved so much, in extending my sincere sympathy to Mrs. McNamara and his family, and in paying him well-deserved tribute.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, the Senate has lost a treasured colleague—little people have lost a giant advocate—and America has lost a profound and productive statesman in the passing of the humble and honest Pat McNamara who somehow made every setting the happier for his presence.

A genial giant—physically and spiritually—was the Senator from Michigan who never resorted to subtlety in argument and was always sincere in his stand.

It was a privilege to have participated in the Michigan hustings with him 6 years ago—and it was a pleasure to note the affection and even adulation the people who knew him best had for their man, McNamara.

He had the practical wisdom of the worker he was—and he had the dedication of a friend who knew at firsthand the hopes and fears and necessities of the senior citizen and the less favored neighbor. They found their protagonist in this man whose simple philosophy was that he was propeople.

Patrick McNamara's real monument will be in the legislation he fostered and fought for to make American more propeople—and his memory will be an enduring inspiration in this Senate.

To the widow and all his loved ones goes the understanding sympathy of this body. Beyond their sorrow they possess the heritage of a husband and father as devoted to his loved ones as he was dedicated to his land—truly a great American.

Mr. **McGEE**. Mr. President, I have been searching for some words that might adequately express my sense of sorrow and loss at the death of my good friend, Senator Pat McNamara. In these moments of grief we try, as best we are able, to surround our loss with remembrances of our association with our friend and those things which made us friends and created the respect and affection that will sustain his memory in years to come.

Emerson once wrote that "he is great who is what he is from nature, and who never reminds us of others." And I believe that this sentence explains the greatness of Pat McNamara. There is no doubt that this plain and friendly man was his own boss. He took orders from no one except his own conscience and he accepted no detours on the paths to his chosen goals. But this single mindedness, this determination, was leavened with a ready sense of humor and a warm Irish heart that had compassion for all, friend or foe. In the most heated of legislative battles, when the debate can sometimes take on an unfortunate personal turn, no one ever was angry with Pat McNamara for very long.

He chose to represent the aspirations of his State and the Nation for a better life, for a better education for our children and for better health. His championship of the cause of education is all the more remarkable since he did not attend school beyond the sixth grade. Or perhaps this fact sharpened his awareness of the need for education. For whatever reason, he never flagged in his support of education and the progress that has been made in this area in recent years—and that progress has been substantial—is due in large measure to his devotion.

In the same manner he never waivered from the goal of reasonable health care for the aged. The program which has just been enacted is a monument to his dedication.

Mr. President, those of us who live in the public spotlight often have a tendency to reflect its beams outward as if self-generated. And sometimes we adopt postures which are more apparent than real. There was none of this in Pat McNamara. He was the same man in any situation and cared not at all for the ego-building activities of public life. His ego, if he had one, was nourished and sustained by the knowledge of real service rendered in behalf of the people of Michigan and the people of the Nation.

I am proud to have called him my friend and I would join with my colleagues in mourning his passing and in our prayers that the memories of this great and guileless man will sustain his wife and family in their time of sorrow.

Mr. **SMATHERS**. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I learned of the death of my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan, Pat McNamara.

Though our points of view were not always in agreement, he was unquestionably as sincere in his point of view as I was in mine. Senator McNamara understood diversity in the legislative process.

As many of you know Senator McNamara preceded me as chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Without question he was indeed a good friend of the Nation's elderly, and a man who always gave a candid and honest expression of his views on programs to assist the senior citizens.

Much of the work of the Committee on Aging that is still being carried forward received its impetus from Pat McNamara. Under his leadership, the committee undertook many investigations into problems of the elderly, ranging from health to frauds perpetrated against those of advanced years.

We on the committee hope to carry forward the good work of which Pat McNamara helped formulate. Senior citizens in this country, and the residents of Michigan, have lost a good friend in Pat McNamara—a sometimes blunt, but always forthright proponent of the causes in which he believed.

I sincerely believe that the Senate of the United States and those of us on the Special Committee on Aging will continue to work for the betterment of older Americans, a cause in which Pat McNamara believed deeply.

Senator Pat McNamara was a great Senator, and above all a great American. The people of Michigan, and indeed throughout the Nation, have lost a good friend. His service in the U.S. Senate to his State and the Nation was one which recognized the responsibility of carrying out his duties in the highest tradition of public service.

Mrs. Smathers and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. McNamara and family.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, with the passing of Senator Pat McNamara many of us in this chamber lost a great friend. The United States lost a great Senator.

Senator McNamara was not one to seek headlines and column-inches; but his accomplishments and contributions are known.

They will be felt and known in the years ahead by those who benefit from hospital insurance under the social security program as a result of Pat McNamara's fight for medicare, by children in all parts of the Nation who are learning in better schools as a result of Pat McNamara's leadership in the struggle for Federal aid to education, by workers whose jobs are more secure and whose income is higher because of Pat McNamara's untiring efforts for the workers of this land, by those who find the barriers of segregation and discrimination crumbling because of his work in civil rights, and, by all of us who have an opportunity to live in a more beautiful and healthful America because of Pat McNamara's vision and concern for effective antipollution and beautification programs.

We, in the Senate, will long benefit from the example he set, from the warmth of his spirit, and from the groundwork he did in so many key areas of the Great Society program.

Mr. President, in late March I participated in a salute to Senator McNamara in Detroit, Mich. In the course of my speech, I made some comments about his record and his meaning to those of us who served with him in the Senate. Those comments were, in part, lighthearted, but I think they are appropriate today. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record:

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE REGARDING SENATOR MCNAMARA, MARCH 26, 1966

A summer visitor in Maine tried in vain to strike up a conversation with a native. Finally, in complete frustration, he asked if the town had a law against talking. "Not a law," he was told, "But we've got an understanding not to say anything unless it improves on silence."

This New England story described that old New Englander, Pat McNamara—and I can think of no one who more effectively improves on silence when he speaks. To use a well-worn New England pun—you can take everything he says for "granite"—rough-hewn and solid.

I first met Pat and Michigan democracy in 1954—a year when he and I were unlikely winners—but I had already pulled my surprise victory and his was still ahead of him. Ever since—my affection and respect for him have steadily grown.

This has been the result in part—I am sure—because he reminds me so much of our Maine people.

But this gruff, blunt exterior is only the shell—the protective covering designed to conceal a warm and generous heart.

Pat is a practical tough-minded, common-sense man. His is the approach of the Maine farmer who rejected a young salesman's effort to sell him an encyclopedia of farming. "Hell, Sonny," he said, "I'm only farming half as good as I know how to now."

It is because he has this practical side that Pat has been able to convert his humane impulses into meaningful, effective legislation: Medical care for the elderly, the education of our young people, civil rights, better wages and working conditions, resource development, and the quality of our environment.

On this past St. Patrick's Day Senator Mike Mansfield said of Pat:

"Pat McNamara is a man of immense heart and a burning sense of justice. He is—in my judgment—one of the great humanists of Senate history. He has never failed the people of the United States. He has stood for, by, and with the most humble of Americans. His absence from subsequent Congresses will be a heavy loss to them—to the Senate and to the Nation."

Mike spoke for all of us in the Senate, and each of us has a special personal reason for appreciating Pat.

As a member of his Public Works Committee I have seen the quiet determination of this tough-minded, warm-hearted son of New England bring out the best in his colleagues.

I have seen him stand like a rock against actions which offended his principles. And I have seen him compromise with grace to achieve his ultimate goals.

I have been the beneficiary of his friendship, his loyalty, and his uncompromising support.

I miss him tonight.

I will miss him when he leaves the Senate.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, as I look back on the career of Senator Pat McNamara, I am reminded of a sentence in the book of Genesis:

> There were giants in the earth in those days.

Pat McNamara was one of our giants, and I am grateful for the privilege of having known him.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, to speak at the death, but on the life of Patrick V. McNamara, late Senator from Michigan, is a sad, though not a difficult thing to do.

When I first became a Senator, Pat McNamara was a member of the Public Works Committee to which I was assigned. Since then, I have also worked continuously with him on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

A Senator should not be something apart from the life of a people or a nation. He should indeed be measured by the same standards by which everyone else is measured.

To me, the quality which Pat McNamara possessed and which best described him as a man, is the quality of "humanness." This word does not mean "humane," although Senator McNamara was all of that. It does not mean "human failings," although he probably had his share of those too.

It means to me, especially as applied to Senator McNamara, the quality of a gentleman. Pat McNamara had a task to perform. He knew what he was about, and he made his way without guile, but with a warmth and with a sense of humor which was constantly refreshing to behold.

I do not know what greatness really means. Perhaps it means large accomplishment. Perhaps it means historically significant contributions. These things are important in the memory of man. And, only history will decide whether Pat McNamara was, therefore, really great.

But, in the memory of God, whom Pat McNamara worshiped, the simple kindness is the measure of the goodness of man. There, Pat McNamara will indeed measure well.

DEATH OF SENATOR M'NAMARA IS A LOSS TO COMMON PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, word of the unexpected passing of my friend and colleague, Pat McNamara, on April 30 came as a shock to me, as I know it did to other Members of this body.

I knew Senator McNamara was ill and in the hospital, but it was my hope and belief that he would soon be well enough to complete his term and then return to Michigan for a well-deserved retirement.

His death is a tragic loss not only to the Senate, but to millions of people in this country who have benefited from his compassion and concern.

Over a span of nearly 12 years in this body, Senator McNamara played a leading part in the adoption of many basic legislative programs—the increase in the minimum wage, the civil rights acts, medical and hospital care for the aged under social security, the Public Works and Economic Development Act, manpower training, aid to education—to name just a few examples.

Before I came to the Senate, I knew Senator McNamara by the reputation he had made as a friend of the friendless—minorities, senior citizens, the unemployed.

Since coming to this body, it has been my privilege to serve on the Public Works Commitee, of which Senator McNamara was the chairman. In that capacity, I came to know him as a warm, friendly man who always had time to listen, and to offer his counsel to a freshman who was sometimes baffled by the labyrinthine world of the Senate.

I will miss him.

My wife, Della, and I extend our deepest sympathy to Senator McNamara's wife, Mary, and to the other members of his family.

RESIGNATION OF THOMAS C. MANN AS UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a few days ago the White House announced that President Johnson had accepted with regret the resignation of Thomas C. Mann as Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. The resignation, I, too, regret.

For close to a quarter of a century, Tom Mann has been a dedicated and capable public servant, and he will be sorely missed by those of us with whom his duties brought him into contact.

Mr. Mann entered Government service in 1942, and first served as a special assistant in the American Embassy in Montevideo, Uruguay. Working his way up through the ranks, in assignments in the State Department and at posts abroad, he acquired a proficiency in economic matters and an incisive knowledge of American Republics affairs. Tom Mann's talents, experience, and leadership qualities were accorded deserved recognition in 1955 upon his designation by President Eisenhower as Ambassador to El Salvador. Two years later, Mr. Mann became Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Under President Kennedy's administration, he served as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and as U.S. Ambassador to Mexico. In 1964, President Johnson asked Mr. Mann to return to Washington to again direct the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs. For the past year, his job has been that of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

I have known Tom Mann for a number of years and have always found him able, conscientious, understanding, and fair. He is self-effacing and courteous without fail. In my view, he is also a gentleman of integrity whose record of public service is an inspiration to others choosing to making the Foreign Service a career.

I very much regret Tom Mann's departure from Government. Nevertheless, his retirement is well earned, and certainly I wish him the best of health and a full measure of success in all his endeavors in the years ahead.

GREETINGS TO HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN ON HIS 82d BIRTHDAY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators Aiken, Allott, Anderson, Bartlett, Bass, Bayh, Bible, Boggs, Brewster, Burdick, Byrd of West Virginia, Cannon, Case, Church, Clark, Cooper, Dirksen, Dodd, Douglas, Eastland, Ellender, Ervin, Harris, Hart, Hartke, Hayden, Hill, Holland, Jackson, Javits, Jordan of North Carolina, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Kennedy of New York, Kuchel, Lausche, Long of Missouri, Long of Louisiana, Magnuson, Mansfield, McCarthy, McGee, McGovern, McIntyre, Mondale, Monroney, Montoya, Morse, Morton, Moss, Mundt, Muskie, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Pearson, Pell, Randolph, Ribicoff, Robertson, Scott, Simpson, Smathers, Smith, Sparkman, Stennis, Symington, Talmadge, Tydings, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, Young of Ohio, and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate for immediate consideration Senate Resolution 252.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. Res. 252

Whereas the Honorable Harry S. Truman, thirty-third President of the United States, will be eighty-two years of age on May 8, 1966; and

Whereas the said Harry S. Truman has devoted his life to the cause of freedom, peace, and the betterment of his fellow man, such devotion being borne out by the record of the numerous accomplishments and historic decisions made during his service as President of the United States from 1945 through 1952, among which are included the ratification by the United States of the United Nations Charter, the United States having been the first of the major powers to ratify such charter; the formulation and successful operation of the Truman doctrine which played a major role in preventing the establishment of Communist tyrannies in Greece and Turkey; the remarkable success of the Marshall plan in rebuilding the war-depleted economies of Western Europe and halting the march of communism in those nations cooperating in the plan; and the outstanding legislative accomplishments achieved during the period of his administration, such as the enactment of the National School Lunch Act, the National Mental Health Act, the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the National Heart Act, the Minimum Wage and Hour Act amendments of October 26, 1949, the Act of September 23, 1950, providing Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, and the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act amendments of July 16, 1952; and

Whereas there will be established a Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, to be located at the Holy City of Jerusalem, which center will sponsor the award periodically of a Harry S. Truman Peace Prize; and

Whereas it is fitting that appropriate recognition should be accorded by the people of the United States to the occasion of the eighty-second birthday of the said Harry S. Truman: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should issue a proclamation, on behalf of the people of the United States, extending to the Honorable Harry S. Truman the cordial birthday greetings of this Nation upon the occasion of his eighty-second birthday on May 8, 1966, and expressing the admiration and gratitude of our people to the said Harry S. Truman for his long years of devoted service to his country and to the world.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 252) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

THE CREDIBILITY GAP WIDENS

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense has spoken in very authoritative tones in replying to criticism from the Congress and its committees. Mr. McNamara's replies to his critics, as a matter of fact, are often authoritative only in tone. This fact is pointed out and illustrated most effectively in an editorial entitled "The Credibility Gap Widens" which appeared in the May 2 issue of Aviation Week & Space Technology. This editorial, written by the able editor, Robert Hotz, reveals that it is Mr. McNamara's replies rather than the congressional criticism which merits the description "baloney" and "shocking distortion."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Credibility Gap Widens

(By Robert Hotz)

Congressional criticism of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has risen in an unprecedented crescendo during recent weeks over a wide variety of issues including management of the Vietnam war, development of new manned bombers, and the combat readiness of U.S. forces not already committed to southeast Asia. Unfortunately, Mr. McNamara's replies to these critics have been characterized by an increasing flow of invective and irrelevant statistics that carry the arguments off tangentially from the points at issue.

For a man who has publicly prided himself on hewing to facts wherever they may fall, Mr. McNamara made some amazing statements in his recent 3-hour testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Since Mr. McNamara has retorted "baloney" to some of his critics, allegations and "shocking distortion" to others, we feel it only fair to point out some of the significant "baloney" and distortion in Mr. McNamara's dazzling performance before Senator Fulbright's committee.

Mr. McNamara, in attempting to answer charges of bomb shortages in Vietnam, told the committee:

"The reason why they [USAF] thought 750-pound bombs were surplus in 1964 was that nobody contemplated that the B-52's, designed for nuclear operations, would be carry out 750-pound conventional bombing operations. * * * The use of B-52 bombers, not in nuclear operations but in dropping 750-pound bombs 50 at a crack, was never conceived of."

SAC BOMBING PROFICIENCY

This is simply not true. Strategic Air Command trained both its B-47 and B-52 crews on a quarterly basis from 1958 through 1961 to keep proficient in dropping iron bombs from internal bomb bays. The requirement was dropped in 1962 but resumed in 1963 at the insistence of Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, then SAC commander. In March 1964, General Power intensified SAC crew training with iron bombs and in May 1964, initiated a program to install external racks to increase the iron bomb loan on some B-52's. Actual tests of this configuration began at Eglin AFB in August 1964. When escalation of the Vietnam war in 1965 produced an urgent requirement for large quantities of iron bombs to saturate targets in short periods of time, the SAC B-52 crews were already trained and equipped to do this job.

Mr. McNamara emphasized to the committee that the 1,600 U.S. military helicopters now in Vietnam are more than all U.S. forces had when he became Secretary of Defense and more than either the rest of the free world has or are in the combined Sino-Soviet inventory. This is perfectly true, but it conveniently ignores the fact that this Vietnam force level has been achieved only by stripping modern helicopters from other U.S. combat forces. It overlooks the pertinent fact that Mr. McNamara for several years drastically cut Army budget requests for helicopters on the ground that they would not be needed. He is now pouring money into a crash helicopter production program that proves more conclusively than any words that the Army's judgment on helicopter requirements was far more accurate than Mr. McNamara's.

Similarly he explained the tremendous demand for 2.75-inch rockets in Vietnam as due to the Army's discovery there for the first time that it needed armament for its helicopters. The fact is that the Army has been trying to develop armed helicopters since the early 1960's, only to be denied the dollars by the Secretary of Defense. Because of this the Army helicopters in Vietnam still carry jury-rigged armament, and the first purchase of a helicopter specifically designed and developed with armament was not authorized by Department of Defense until 1966.

KOREAN WAR SURPLUS

Another statement that will shock those who have been in the defense business a great deal longer than Mr. McNamara was his assertion to the Senate committee that "it is really immoral to spend $12 billion of this Nation's resources for surplus as we did during the Korean war," and that he intends to buy everything needed for Vietnam but not one thing more. Again Mr. McNamara conveniently overlooks the fact that in the Korean war this country mobilized not only to combat the North Korean and Chinese armies in Korea, but also to meet the possibility of Russian intervention and a third world war. By this action, President Truman and his defense chiefs unquestionably averted the outbreak of another general war and discouraged the spread of Soviet aggression to Europe.

If Mr. McNamara really believes it is possible to fight and win a war killing the last enemy with the last bullet as the last soldier eats the last can of beans in the quartermaster's stores, this Nation faces serious trouble ahead. Events have already proved that some of Mr. McNamara's military judgments have not been as sound as he imagined. But if he persists in trying to budget the Vietnam war or any other military confrontation with the goal of emerging with no surplus materiel, he will actually be budgeting shortages in combat equipment for the future. War is an illogical and wasteful enterprise that inevitably defies the efforts of man to calculate its fury precisely.

Almost 2 years ago we warned that a credibility gap was widening between the events transpiring in Vietnam and the versions of them that Mr. McNamara was dispensing to the American people. Mr. McNamara's recent exercises in revising history and attempting to dazzle his congressional critics with irrelevant statistics are further widening this credibility gap. Unfortunately, this is the very time that the increasing U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war requires the clearest public understanding of this military effort and the foreign policy on which it is based.

TRIBUTE TO GREGOR MACPHERSON AND G. MILTON KELLY

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, during my recent absence from the Chamber, two good men whose unique skills were used daily in recording and reporting the labors of the Senate, came to the end of their journey. I rise belatedly to pay tribute to their memory.

Gregor Macpherson and G. Milton Kelly were men of the highest professional abilities in their chosen fields. While one faithfully recorded Senate debate as a public employee, the other faithfully reported its highlights to the American people as a newspaperman, and each was equally devoted to his public trust.

Mac was chief official reporter of Senate Debates. Milt was a byline reporter for the Associated Press. Both were my friends, and my very good friends. I am proud to recall and to record that fact.

Each possessed all those fine characteristics and traits which we like to see in a man. Each was a professional in his field, and surely the two fields are not dissimilar, for truth, accuracy, and fairplay are the supreme requirements of the work of those engaged in each of these fields, along with education, intelligence, and professional skill.

Through all their daily labors, each was possessed of a truly magnificent sense of humor which helped to lighten the day for all those with whom they came in frequent contact.

Mac died on March 18, 1966. Milt died 4 days later, on March 22.

Together with their families, the Senate Official Reporters of Debates, the Senate press corps, the Senate, and their friends, I, too, mourn their passing.

Here were two thoroughbreds, toiling daily in this National Capitol, serving well their country.

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, April 24 has passed; it is a significant day in the history of the Armenians. Therefore, at this belated time I am expressing my view of the significance of April 24, 1966, to the history of the Armenians.

The year 1915 is the year of national tragedy for the Armenian people. In April of that year some 2,000 prominent Armenians in Turkey were arrested and imprisoned by the Turkish Government. From the moment of their arrest they were held incommunicado, and a few days later all of them were deported to distant parts of Asia Minor and executed there.

The perpetration of this crime on the part of Turkish authorities proved the beginning of the end of some 2 million Armenians in Turkey. In less than a year, all these Armenians were uprooted from their homes, some deported to distant parts of the Ottoman Empire, while others were massacred in the neighborhood of their homes. This fiendish policy of genocide of an entire ethnic group through wholesale massacres, and through deportation and famine, was so thoroughly and cruelly carried out that in less than a year the once thriving Armenian communities in all parts of Turkey had been wiped out. When the First World War came to an end historic Armenian towns and villages in which Armenians had lived from time immemorial had become desolate and deserted places. In this unprecedented holocaust more than 1 million Armenians had lost their lives, and those surviving were on the verge of starvation. Such was the cruel and crushing legacy of the year 1915 to the Armenian people.

Since that fateful year, Armenians everywhere observe the anniversary of that tragic event as a national day of mourning, and pray for the blessed memory of their martyrs, innocent and helpless victims of Turkish genocide.

AN OPEN POEM TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from one who has experienced 90 years of full living in our blessed United States, with a continuous interest in its future, has come her own composition termed "An Open Poem to President Johnson," which appeared in the April 13, 1966, issue of the Daily Republican Times, Ottawa, Ill.

Mrs. W. H. Outman, Sr., of Marseilles, Ill., has through verse indicated her love for her country and concern for its future and with a prophetic challenge to meet adversities of each generation our leaders and people "must turn to God for strength." I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Outman's verses be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WE MUST TURN TO GOD FOR STRENGTH"—WOMAN, 90, PENS POETIC TIPS TO L.B.J. ON THE GREAT SOCIETY

(At an age when many people have lost interest in life or have lost life itself, Mrs. W. H. Outman, Sr., 90, of 890 Sample Street has penned a few poetic tips to President Johnson on his Great Society, Mrs. Outman, who has never missed a chance to vote, observed that "we're in an awful condition in America today." In her latest sprightly doggerel, she takes the position that the Great Society was started in America long before L.B.J. Drawing on her Bible, she says the poor will always be with us, and said "we must draw on God for strength." She calls her creation, "An Open Poem to President Johnson." Here it is:)

(By Mrs. W. H. Outman, Sr.)

Mr. President, please step this way
  Let me whisper into your ear;
Your ideas are commendable
  But expensive too, I fear.

Your visions are all wonderful—
  New ones are being heard each day—
Must "America, the Beautiful"
  Be improved in every way.

We hear our streams and highways
  Must have a change of face.
With parks galore for the pleasure
  Of everyone in the race.

Your surely would "paint the lily, white"
  Make parks in which to play—
The rich might all enjoy them—
  But the poor man works all day.

There is to be "war on poverty"
  Until it is every whit removed;
But if the Nation's wealth could divided be
  It surely would soon be proved
That would not be the solution,
  For as water runs down the hill
The rich man soon would richer be
  And the poor man, poorer still.

Poverty cannot be abolished,
  This will never, never be;
For the good Master taught
  As He walked in Galilee,
"The poor ye will have with you always,
  But ye shall not always have Me."

Now a happy, happy thought
  Has just occurred to me—
For nearly 200 years
  We've had a "Great Society."

Such men as Jefferson and Adams,
  And George Washington, as well,
Put it into operation;
  It has lasted and served us well.

Some of the American people
  Are living beyond their means;
They must "keep up with the Joneses"
  And that thought pressures their schemes.

Everyone is to be educated
  Whether he wills it, or no;
'Tis truly a high ideal
  But we know 'twill never be so.

Yes, let's stop crime in our Nation,
  If we are not starting too late;
What can we expect to have
  When children are left to their fate?

A young child in the home,
  On television feeds;
He "catches on" right quickly
  And soon he supersedes.

The drinking, burglary, murder,
  Are all pictured there for him—
Later he goes out to try it,
  And goes deeper into sin.

Perhaps we do need better schools,
  First, let's use the ones we have
To wipe out some of the ignorance
  That exists in the human knave.

'Tis ignorance that tempts men
  Who cannot foresee our fate,
Since Statesmen have become Politicians,
  And Party is placed before State.

Some criticize the Supreme Court,
  And believe them to be out of line
For they think the Court's decisions
  Often make it easier for crime.

When the criminal cannot be confined
  Within the so-called "Pen,"
But soon gets back to his old "gang"
  To do the same—or worse—again.

Now if occasion should arise
  To appoint another man,
Please find one who is just and faithful
  To do the best—under God—that he can.

To wipe out crime is a fine thing,
  And this is no time to laugh;
But 'twould take half of our citizens
  To police the other half.

To clean this all up is much needed,
  For it certainly has a big start;
And like the nice red apple
  There's a worm in its very heart.

There's a Communist infiltration
  And enemies, galore,
Jealous of American prosperity,
  And anxious to take us o'er.

But this same infiltration
  Has been apparent so long,
One can scarcely trust his neighbor,
  As together we travel along.

The "Commies" threaten to "bury us"
  With no apology,
But we know they would rather have us
  Accept their ideology.

They've taken Cuba under their wing—
  Only 90 miles away,
And we cannot trust Castro
  Today nor any day.

Let us keep up a watchful waiting
 On things as they are down there,
As they receive their help from overseas
 We should drop to our knees in prayer.

We live in the "post Christian era,"
 Is what the newspapers say;
We would do well to confess our guilt
 And start over again, today.

For world conditions now
 Are causing much concern,
And the best of men are puzzled
 With causes they cannot discern.

Not long ago, a preacher friend,
 Honest and staunch and true,
Was speaking on world conditions
 And what they may lead into;
He said we must turn to God for strength—
 Then, working together, must try
To help to find the way through
 And not "watch a nation die."

Now when Congress makes the new laws—
 The cure for all our ills—
There will be nothing left for the taxpayer
 But hard work to pay the bills.

Then we'll never more so proudly
 "The Star-Spangled Banner" wave—
For Americans will not be "free" men.
 Nor live "in the home of the brave."

OBSERVATIONS ON SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I receive many communications from people who assert that the United States ought not to have become involved in the fighting in South Vietnam, and that it ought to withdraw its military forces forthwith from that unhappy land.

Ever since I came to the Senate, I have opposed the policies of the National Government which are based on the proposition that the United States should shoulder all the burdens of the earth. For this reason, and also because of the logistic problems which its terrain and undeveloped state create, I have never favored the stationing of our military forces in South Vietnam.

We cannot solve the South Vietnam problem, however, by asserting that we should not have stationed our military forces there or become involved in the fight of its Government and a substantial segment of its people against the Vietcong, even though it pleases some commentators to call that fight a civil war rather than a war for independence.

Ostriches may bury their heads in the sand when danger appears. But we must live as men, and not as ostriches.

Consequently, we must face stern realities in attempting to reach a conclusion concerning South Vietnam and our connection with it. These stern realities are as follows:

First. Communism has not yet forsaken its purpose of world subjugation. Proof of this statement is found in the fact that both Russia and China are furnishing weapons to the Vietcong.

Second. North Vietnam, a Communist controlled country, is using its weapons to arm the Vietcong forces, which are composed in substantial part of trained men from North Vietnam and are directed by officers placed in their command by North Vietnam.

Third. The question of whether or not the United States should be engaged in war in South Vietnam is an academic one. As Grover Cleveland would say, we are confronted by a condition and not a theory. We are already engaged in such war and our servicemen are being killed and wounded daily.

Fourth. There are only three courses of action open to the United States. The first is to settle the war by negotiation; the second is to fight the war with a will to win it; and the third is to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam and thus surrender southeast Asia to the Vietcong who are simply Communist agents.

The President has attempted to reach a settlement by negotiation. Despite the entreaties of virtually the entire civilized world, the only nations which can negotiate a settlement; that is, North Vietnam and China, have contemptuously rejected the President's offer to negotiate.

This being true, the hope that the war might be settled by negotiation seems to have degenerated for the time being into an empty dream.

As a consequence, it is obvious that the United States must either fight or withdraw. Neither our love of peace nor intellectual sophistry can disguise the truth that our withdrawal would constitute a surrender to the Communists, who are bent on extinguishing the lights of liberty throughout the earth.

Even though the executive department of the Federal Government may have erred in stationing our military forces in South Vietnam, the United States cannot afford to withdraw them as long as the Government of South Vietnam or a substantial segment of its people wish them to remain there.

The stakes involved are too high. If we withdraw under existing circumstances, we shall lose the confidence of the free world to which we have pledged our aid against Communist aggression. Moreover, all of southeast Asia, and possibly India and Pakistan, will immediately fall under Red Chinese domination. One hesitates to think what this would portend for the freedom of Malaysia, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, and even for that of the United States itself.

On some occasions I receive requests from well-meaning persons that I arise upon the Senate floor and denounce our presence and conduct in South Vietnam as illegal and outrageous.

Even if I were sure that these persons had complete possession of all the truth on the subject, I would be reluctant to do this for one reason and incapable of doing it for another.

While I am always ready to participate in efforts to persuade our National Government to pursue wise policies or abandon foolish ones, I am ever reluctant to denounce my country in respect to its contests with foreign foes. This is true because I was nurtured on the brand of patriotism which prompted Senator Crittenden to make this statement while the Mexican War was raging:

> I hope to find my country in the right; however, I will stand by her, right or wrong.

My incapability to stand upon the Senate floor and denounce the United States for its presence and conduct in South Vietnam arises out of this consideration: My action in so doing would lend aid and comfort to Ho Chi Minh and his Vietcong because it would tend to engender in them the belief that America's will to fight is weak and that they will be masters of South Vietnam if they prolong the war and slay more Americans.

I have seen war, and I hate war. Notwithstanding, I believe that the only course reasonably open to it under existing circumstances in South Vietnam is for the United States to fight with a will to win and to strike the enemy such blows as may be necessary to bring North Vietnam to the conference table or defeat with the least delay.

After all, war is sometimes the only road which leads to ultimate peace and safety.

ESTABLISHMENT OF 12-MILE FISHERY ZONE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Norwegian Commercial Club of Seattle, Wash., has gone on record in support of legislation I have introduced (S. 2218) along with other Senators, to establish a 12-mile fishery zone off our coast to protect our domestic fishery resources. The text of the resolution passed by the Norwegian Commercial Club points out the threat of foreign fishing operations and provides a very thoughtful statement in support of our extended fishery jurisdiction. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE FISHING INDUSTRY, PASSED BY THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE NORWEGIAN COMMERCIAL CLUB, SEATTLE, WASH., AT ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 27, 1966

Whereas the fishing industry of the Pacific Northwest is one of our major industries and makes a great contribution to the economic strength not only of the Pacific coast, but of the entire United States; and

Whereas the Pacific Northwest fishing industry is now threatened by a large foreign fishery operation which includes a huge fleet of foreign vessels which are fishing in the Northwest area without any regard to the accepted conservation practices that have been established by the United States and Canada; and

Whereas the huge foreign fishing operation has but one objective, that of exploiting our fisheries and cannot help but break down the conservation practices now employed by the North American fishermen, with the resulting destruction of stocks of fish upon which fishermen of the United States and Canada must depend for future employment in the Pacific Northwest fishing industry; and

Whereas the conditions now existing with the invasion of the foreign fishing fleets in the Pacific Northwest have not been given adequate consideration by the various departments of the U.S. Government looking toward the protection of the fishermen of the Pacific Northwest fishing industry; and

Whereas one of the principal means of giving some measure of protection to the Pacific

Northwest fishing industry is by the extension of the U.S. territorial limits from the 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Norwegian Commercial Club of Seattle, Wash., through this resolution, urges and requests the U.S. Government and its various agencies to extend immediately the limit of U.S. fisheries jurisdiction from 3 miles to 12 miles with the establishment of appropriate baselines from which these limits are determined, and after this is done, that the U.S. Government agencies be requested to seek further international agreements either to allow sufficient extension beyond the 12-mile limit, or other appropriate measures to adequately protect the stocks of fish which owe their existence solely to the conservation efforts and programs established by the North American fishermen; and to protect from depletion other stocks of fish existing in the Pacific Ocean and Alaskan waters, the exploitation of which stocks by foreign vessels is of relative recent origin and upon which stocks the fishermen of the Pacific Northwest will depend in the future for their livelihood and to which our country will look for part of its food supply in the future; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; the Members of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress from the State of Washington; the Governor of the State of Washington; and the various Government agencies dealing with the fishing industry.

WHAT IT TAKES TO WIN IN VIETNAM

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, some Americans undoubtedly are confused by the number of contradictory statements and articles about the war in Vietnam. One of those who is not confused is the editor of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, Mr. William R. Mathews. On April 24, he published an editorial entitled "What It Takes To Win in Vietnam" which I commend to all Members of the Senate and ask unanimous consent for it to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IT TAKES TO WIN IN VIETNAM

(By William R. Mathews)

If there were anything easy to predict, it would be to forecast that the troubled domestic political situation in Vietnam amounts to a continuation of what has gone on in the past, and will continue in the future. There will be elections within 5 months, probably. Once the tallies are made public, there will be losers and victors. The losers will cry about fraud.

If a civilian government is established, the chances are that it will last not many months, and possibly only weeks. Another civilian government will succeed it, and it will go through much the same process. Finally another dictatorship, probably a military one, will take over. It, too, will last only some months, unless Washington gets tough with the religious and political leaders of the country, which will include some generals.

There are some good reasons to justify this forecast. One of the most powerful is war weariness, which generates religious and patriotic passions, and divides a country into warring political fragments. Because South Vietnam is a country of fragmented political parties, civilian life will continue in a state of anarchy and thus weaken the military effort.

Amid all of this development, America will continue to wage war against the Vietcong as best it can. The South Vietnam Army obviously will be weakened, and will be unable to carry its share of the war load. Our bombing will continue and will have to be enlarged against basic targets, like oil storage farms in North Vietnam. It should be realized that North Vietnam has trucks, and that they run supplies and men south, using gasoline or diesel fuel which we permit North Vietnam to import, store, and use. If we finally hit those oil installations, the trucks would lack fuel. The supply line would be weakened at the source of its strength.

Thus the situation we American find ourselves in will continue probably for years—certainly until we get tired of it, or get tough with the leaders of the numerous religious and political factions. If enough of them do not agree to unify and create a war government with militant leadership, that will not tolerate any organized opposition during the period of the war, we should pull out. Unite and fight must be our policy, and we should mean it and not apologize for it. Our patience is no longer a virtue, because it is taken as a sign of weakness.

That it obviously has encouraged the leaders of North Vietnam is proven by their scorn of our failure to develop a unified war effort in South Vietnam. Until we do that, and add to it the extension of our bombing against military targets in all of North Vietnam, the leaders of North Vietnam will remain firm in their unwillingness to talk.

We have to break the will of their political and military leaders to resist. No war is won or even stalemated, until the will of such leaders is impaired or broken. Our Civil War was not won until the will of Gen. Robert E. Lee was broken. World War I was not won until the will of Von Hindenburg was broken sufficiently to have him demand that his Kaiser abdicate.

In World War II, the Germans were denied victory in their invasion of the Soviet Union by the will of Stalin to unite the efforts of his people in "the great patriotic war." The war was not won until the will of Hitler was broken by his own suicide.

The Korean war was not won by us because we did not have the will to win it. The persistency of the Chinese, led by Mao, endured long enough to win a compromise from us.

The war in Vietnam will not be won until we and South Vietnam unite with the determination to win it. For us to imagine that North Vietnam will talk to us as long as anarchy prevails in South Vietnam, and our political leaders openly proclaim our reasonableness, is wishful thinking.

The leaders of North Vietnam will not talk reasonably until the political government of South Vietnam unites with our Army, Air Force, and Navy to wage war with a unity that can win and can hurt North Vietnam.

Consequently, if we are going to pet and pamper the political leaders of South Vietnam, and meticulously stand aside and thereby encourage anarchy and disunity, we will be stuck in Vietnam with an ever-increasing cost in American lives and wealth. That could become a devastating political issue by 1968 at least, and possibly in 1966.

Our intensified bombing of North Vietnam could be decisive if it were backed by a unified and competent government of South Vietnam, whose armies would unite with ours in sea, land, and air operations that would drive the invaders from the country. The Vietcong will not give up, until they see that they are licked, and neither will North Vietnam.

Speeches by Ambassador Goldberg, Senator MANSFIELD and Secretary Rusk during the past week have been most unfortunate. These expressions of reasonableness will cause the Vietcong and the political leaders of Hanoi to be more adamant than ever. They see them as proof of our political weakness and our lack of will to wage war.

In such circumstances, the conclusion in Vietnam will continue; our soldiers out there will be more confused; so will many Senators and Congressmen. This confusion will grow among the people of the United States.

No wonder the Chinese people speak of us as a paper tiger.

THE THIRD HOUSE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, complaints against the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives have been long, loud, and legion, but not always legitimate. Although it has proved at times to be a formidable roadblock for good legislation—depending, of course, upon one's own viewpoint, just as "beauty is altogether in the eye of the beholder"—the committee has also been known to provide decent but timely burial for legislative measures the passage of which would have been not only embarrassing to the authors thereof but also inimical to the welfare of the country. Thus, the committee has been, at one and the same time, a good scapegoat and a scapegoat good for responsible government.

For, what may appear as the devil's handmaiden to the political scientist in the ivory tower of the college classroom may in reality be a blessing in disguise to the scientific politician in the very real arena of the legislative process.

The House Rules Committee, like the traffic policeman on the street, often finds itself the target of vituperation from those whom it serves.

It cannot be gainsaid that the committee has been authoritarian, despotic, and even diabolical, perhaps, at times in the past—again "in the eye of the beholder"—but it has also proved to be an instrument useful to harassed political administrations eager to please voting blocs by sponsoring hoped-for legislation which hopefully would fail of enactment.

Moreover, the committee has, at times, like a haven in the time of storm, been a fitting port for treacherous legislative vessels borne upon the sudden waves of public emotion and passion. Thus the "third House," as the committee has frequently been called, performs, not infrequently, a thankless task but a useful function.

So, Mr. President, the Rules Committee of the other body, like that nocturnal orb which we call the moon, may present only one side to the casual observer. But there is another side, and, although it may be hidden from the view of the uninitiated, it cannot be discounted.

An informative paper on "The Third House" has recently been prepared by Mr. William A. Smith, a senior student at the Law College of American University, and for the benefit of persons interested in the legislative process, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THIRD HOUSE

In the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, standing committees divide the thousands of bills introduced each session and assign them among the subcommittees. When the full membership of the House considers a few of these measures for deliberation, it does so in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Standing at the threshold between the House so sitting and the legislative committees is the Committee on Rules, long recognized as one of the most important and powerful units of the Congress.

That the title of this paper properly refers to the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States there can be no serious doubt. U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, said, "This committee acts as a traffic cop and has jurisdiction over resolutions relating to the order of business of the House. The House Rules Committee is sometimes referred to as 'the third House.'"[1] Any number of other descriptive names have been used with reference to this powerful congressional committee. Among these are:

"A steering ministry—without a ministry's public responsibility and without a ministry's right to speak for both Houses."[2]

"The governing committee of the House."[3]

"The terrible 12."[4]

"The most powerful and the most irresponsible organ of the House."[5]

THE POWER OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

In order to fully appreciate the place of the House Rules Committee in the House of Representatives, a survey of the committee's jurisdiction in the legislative process is necessary.

COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

The Committee on Rules has jurisdiction over (a) the rules, joint resolutions, and order of business of the House and (b) recess and final adjournments of Congress. Primarily the jurisdiction of this committee is over propositions to make or change the rules, for the creation of committees, and directing them to make investigations. It also reports resolutions relating to the hour of daily meeting and the days on which the House shall sit, and orders relating to the use of the galleries during the electoral count.[6]

The power of the Rules Committee resides primarily in the disposition of controversial and often crucial bills proposed. After the essentially noncontroversial bills have been accounted for there are approximately 100 controversial bills remaining in each Congress which claim consideration by the Members. Such bills are concerned with labor, agriculture, veterans, health, civil rights, education, foreign policy, welfare, etc. It has been said that it is around these subjects that elections are won or lost and the Congress is judged.

The parliamentary machinery of the House of Representatives ordinarily cannot dispose of these highly important and highly controversial bills when conditions call for their disposition. The several House calendars (the Union Calendar, the House Calendar, the Discharge Calendar, the Private Calendar, and the Consent Calendar) are not ordinarily adapted to these measures.

THE HOUSE CALENDARS

After the legislative committees consider and approve bills which are referred to them, the committees then report the bills to one of three House calendars. The Union House Calendar is for non-money measures for either revenue or appropriations. The House Calendar is for non-money measures that are not private measures. The Private Calendar includes only measures providing specific relief in individual cases. The Consent Calendar consists of requests of Members that bills and resolutions on either the Union or House Calendars be considered without debate and passed with virtual unanimity. Another method of bringing legislation to the floor, when a committee refuses to report a bill or resolution, is to gain a simple majority (218 members—Rules of the House, rule XXVII, par. 4) to sign a discharge petition to have the measure placed on the Discharge Calendar. On the second and fourth Mondays of each month these measures are taken up in the order in which they have been entered on that calendar.

Obviously certain measures pending on the House and Union Calendars are more important and urgent than others, and it is necessary to have a system permitting their consideration ahead of those that do not require immediate action. Since all measures are placed on those calendars in the order in which they are reported to the House, the latest bill reported would be the last to be taken up if the calendar number alone were the determining factor.

To avoid such delays on vital bills and to provide for more selectivity the House Rules Committee can be approached and be requested to issue a special resolution or "rule" for such a bill's consideration on the floor.

Having these controversial legislative matters placed on the House agenda poses the situs of the primary powers of the Rules Committee. To get these bills on the agenda of the full House earlier than normal, legislative committee chairmen write a letter to the Committee on Rules requesting a hearing for the purpose of obtaining a rule to have the bill considered immediately in the House. If a rule is reported by the Rules Committee for a bill on the Union Calendar, the reported resolution will be substantially as follows:

"*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and proceed to consider the bill (H.R. —) entitled, etc., debate to be limited to ——— hours, one-half to be controlled by the chaiman of the Committee on ———, and one-half by the ranking minority member of such committee."

If the measure is on the House Calendar the resolution reads substantially as follows:

"*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to consider the bill (H.R. —) entitled, etc., and at the end of ——— hours a vote shall be taken on all pending amendments and on the bill to final passage."

One of the committeemen calls the rule up on the floor and, if approved by the House, the legislative committee concerned then moves that the House go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to debate the bill. The Rules Committee thus participates in making decisions about the composition of the House agenda. This is a definite power role for the Rules Committee.[7] A number of procedures are followed to affect the House agenda by the Rules Committee. (1) The committee decides whether to hear a request for a rule. If no hearing is held by the committee, a rule is not likely to be given and this normally results in a defeat of the bill's chances. (2) If a hearing is granted by the committee, it then decides whether or not to grant a rule. (3) In exchange for a rule, the committee may require that the bill be modified. This barter usually operates by way of the legislative committee agreeing to offer certain amendments when the bill reaches the floor of the House. (4) Closely associated with this procedure is the power of the Rules Committee to grant various kinds of rules. Closed rules prohibit amendments; open rules permit amendments. Rules with specified time limits in hours bring a vote at a particular time, whereas a certain number of days of debate embraced by a rule are subject to the whims of quorums and adjournments. (5) Then again a rule may be granted which waives points of order against bills about which there may be a parliamentary question and this goes a long way in aiding a bill. (6) The Rules Committee also participates in resolving differences in Senate and House versions of the same bill when any Member of the House objects to sending a bill to a conference committee of the two Houses. It participates in such procedures by deciding whether or not to grant a rule to send the bill to conference or whether or not to agree to the Senate version. A negative decision by the committee cannot be reversed, except by the committee itself or by the laborious discharge proceedings. (7) Near the end of a session the Rules Committee's powers are increased because of time limitations for the House to resort to some of the thwarting mechanisms such as Calendar Wednesdays, discharge petitions, and the Suspension Calendar (which is already overcrowded). (8) The arbitration authority of the Rules Committee, with reference to disputes between legislative committees which compete for jurisdiction over a bill, adds yet another arrow of power to the committee's pouch.

All the eight foregoing procedures utilized by the Rules Committee to participate in House agenda decisions are very real sources of power. However, the exercise of this committee's power, of necessity, must await the initiative of someone else: a person, a group, a legislative committee or the House leadership. Beyond this dependent power, the Rules Committee has a ninth source of power over the House agenda which may be exercised exclusively, and that is the power to report bills directly to the House floor regardless of prior legislative committee action.[8]

As can be concluded from the above considerations the House Rules Committee's largest source of power is derived from negative action or threat thereof and delaying tactics. This power is formidable. Obstacles to the passage of a bill or power to force changes in a controversial measure in order to obtain a rule (for without a rule the bill is virtually doomed to defeat) is tantamount to an iron grip on the cherished democratic, free, and open debate on measures of national and international importance.

---

[1] Lecture No. 2, mimeograph, legislative process seminar, Washington College of Law, January 29, 1966, p. 12.

[2] Woodrow Wilson, "Congressional Government" (New York: Meredian Books, 1956), pp. 21, 87.

[3] George B. Galloway, "The Legislative Process in Congress" (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1953), p. 34.

[4] Harry F. Pringle and Katherine Pringle, "The Terrible 12 on Capitol Hill," the Saturday Evening Post (June 19, 1954), p. 22 ff.

[5] George McGregor Burns, "Congress on Trial: The Legislative Process and the Administrative State" (New York: Harper & Bros., 1949), p. 56.

[6] House Rules, rule XI, par. 16, secs. 714, 717.

[7] Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Koplan," "Power in Society" (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), pp. 55–102.

[8] House Rules, rule II, par. 16, secs. 715 and 728.

CONCLUSIONS

By the exercise of these powers the Rules Committee can sift the business coming from the other House committees and decide which bills shall have the right-of-way to consideration on the floor and the order in which they shall be taken up. Through its power to report new business it has original as well as secondary jurisdiction over the legislative agenda. By amending their measures or by forcing amendments to bills as a condition precedent to giving a green light, the Rules Committee can substitute its own judgment for that of the great legislative committees of the House of Representatives on matters of substantive policy.

The most familiar criticism made against the Rules Committee is that it has too much power. It is said that "over the years, this committee has frustrated the will of the majority by refusing to grant rules on major legislation or by insisting that bills pending before it be amended in substantial respects as conditions to the granting of a rule." [9] It is frequently said that the committee was intended to be "a mere traffic cop on the legislative highway" [10] and that it should expedite the flow of bills to the floor without regard to policy considerations.

Those who take the other side of the issue deny that the committee has the power attributed to it. Representative (now Senator) CARL T. CURTIS, referring to this matter said:

"The notion that the Rules Committee can thwart the will of the majority is without foundation of fact. A petition signed by a bare majority of 218 Members can take a bill away from the Rules Committee, or any other committee and bring it to the floor for consideration." [11]

Whatever may be said by way of a defense of the status quo for the Rules Committee or in criticism of its position, this committee of formidable power continues to share jointly with the Speaker of the House of Representatives the role of legislative programing.[12] For example, in the 83d Congress (1953–54) when the Ways and Means Committee refused to report an Eisenhower administration bill to extend excess profits and excise taxes, the Rules Committee threatened to report a tax bill directly, causing the Ways and Means Committee to bring out the measure under its own control. Again, during the 85th Congress (1957–58), H.R. 3 was introduced by Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, which declared that no act of Congress should be interpreted as prohibiting the State to legislate on the same subject unless the act specifically excluded State legislation. More than a year later the Committee on the Judiciary had not acted favorably on the bill. On March 5, 1958, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, appeared before the Rules Committee to request a rule on a bill to increase patent fees. Upon completing his statement Chairman CELLER was asked by Rules Committee member CLARENCE BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, about H.R. 3 and was told that the Rules Committee had considered reporting H.R. 3 directly to the House floor. Two months later the Judiciary Committee reported H.R. 3.[13]

The primary function of the Rules Committee of the House is in the policy processes of assisting in setting the House agenda. The committee usually does not gather independent information for the House nor does it identify problems for House action. The influence which the committee exercises on the workings of the House is possibly best observed as it assists those who wish to preserve the status quo. Opponents of any piece of legislation can prevail if at any point in the legislative process they can halt the progress of the legislation. But in order for proponents to win they must succeed at every stage.

Of the three supposed strata of House decisions, the least controversial, the medium controversial and the most controversial, the House Rules Committee principally influences the middle level. We find this to be the case because the least controversial measures can be brought to the House floor under unanimous consent, suspension of the rules, or special legislative days. The most controversial measures can be brought to the House floor usually by a determined majority leadership. In the intermediary level public notice and external pressures are more easily avoided.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF COMMITTEE POWERS

A Committee on Rules was appointed when the first Congress met in New York in April 1789, but it was not made a standing committee until 1880 when the House rules underwent a general revision comparable to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.[14] The membership numbered five until the overthrow of Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, Republican, of Illinois, in 1910.[15] The proposal of Congressman George Norris, Republican, of Nebraska, to enlarge the committee to 10 was adopted.[16] In 1911 an 11th member was added to the Rules Committee.[17] In 1917 a 12th member was added.[18] In the 1930's 14 members comprised the committee for a brief period and in 1961 the size of the committee was enlarged to 15 members.[19]

The powers and privileges of the House Rules Committee evolved gradually over the years. From 1789 through 1841 the committee's responsibilities ceased for all practical purposes after it reported a set of rules at the opening of each Congress. In 1841, Speaker John White's, Democrat, of Virginia, ruling that the committee might "report from time to time" was sustained on appeal by the House.[20] Thus began a series of innovations by which the Committee on Rules became an instrument through which the House could exercise special power for a particular piece of legislation.[21]

In 1853, the House adopted a resolution providing that this committee's report "shall be acted upon by the House until disposed of, to the exclusion of all other business, anything in the rules hereby temporarily adopted to the contrary notwithstanding." [22]

In 1858 the House authorized appointment of a select committee, of whom the Speaker was to be one, to revise the rules and report at the next session. This was the first time in the 69 years of the House's history that its presiding officer had served on one of its committees. From 1858 to 1910 the Speaker continued to be a member of the Rules Committee, serving as its chairman and exercising its authority.

The powers of the Rules Committee were greatly enhanced when in 1883 the House upheld a Speaker's ruling that a special order providing for the consideration of a particular bill was properly reported from the Committee on Rules.[23] This ruling initiated the modern practice whereby the Rules Committee has reported special orders providing times and methods for the consideration of special bills or classes of bills.

Thereby the House by majority vote was enabled to forward particular legislation rather than having to rely on unanimous consent or suspension of the rules which requires a two-thirds vote. By 1890 it was the Rules Committee prerogative to propose special orders for the consideration of business.[24]

In 1891 the power to report at any time was given to the Rules Committee, and in 1893 it was given the right to sit in committee during sessions of the House.[25]

Between 1890 and 1910, the Rules Committee rose to a preeminent position in the congressional committee system under the masterful leadership of chairmen like Thomas Brackett Reed, Republican, of Maine, and "Uncle Joe" Cannon, Republican, of Illinois. Through favorable rulings by the Speaker, which were sustained on appeal by the House itself, the Committee on Rules acquired the power to (1) consider and report special orders, (2) sit during sessions of the House, (3) report matters not previously introduced, reported or committed to it, and (4) have its reports immediately considered.

TWENTIETH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

The Rules Committee chairman's powers

A former chairman of the Rules Committee once stated, "In me reposes absolute obstructive powers." [26]

Some indicia of the powers of the Rules Committee's chairman are: (1) his power to call committee meetings,[27] (2) decide on whether or not to proceed without a quorum, (3) setting the agenda, (4) scheduling witnesses, (5) when to vote on an issue, (6) reporting of the committee's resolutions to the House or selecting another committeeman to do so, (7) calling up for consideration or assigning another to call them up and (8) being the center of communications to the committees. All contribute heavily to the policy decisions of Congress.

Revolt against Speaker Cannon (1909–10)

In 1908 a strong, antagonistic wave of House sentiment opposing the Speaker's presence on the Committee on Rules arose.

Representative Norris, of Nebraska, on March 17, 1910, introduced House Resolution

---

[9] Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, p. 1581 (1961).

[10] Ibid., p. 1579.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, p. 14 (1951).

[12] Floyd M. Riddick, "The U.S. Congress Organization and Procedure" (Manassas, Va.: National Capitol Publishers, Inc., 1949), p. 108.

[13] James A. Robinson, "The House Rules Committee" (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc., 1963), pp. 13, 14, 15.

[14] Asher Hinds and Clarence Cannon, "Precedents of the House of Representatives," 11 vols. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907–1941); Hinds, "Precedents IV," section 4320; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 44th Cong., 2d sess., p. 205.

[15] See below for further discussion.

[16] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 61st Cong., 2d sess., p. 3429.

[17] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Congress, 1st sess., p. 12, 80.

[18] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 65th Cong., 1st sess., p. 111.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 2, pp. 1573–1590.

[20] IV, Hinds, "Precedents," sec. 4321.

[21] V, Hinds, "Precedents," sec. 6780

[22] Congressional Globe, 33d Congress, 1st sess., vol. 28, pt. 1, p. 4.

[23] IV, Hinds, "Precedents," sec. 3160.

[24] Ibid., sec. 3152.

[25] Ibid., sec. 4526.

[26] Floyd M. Riddick, "The U.S. Congress Organization and Procedure" (Washington, D.C.: National Capitol Publishers, 1949), p. 123.

[27] Rule XI provides that a majority of the committee may call a meeting without the chairman's consent after 7 "calendar days." Refer below.

502, providing for an increase in the membership of the Rules Committee from 5[28] to 15, these 15 to be selected by the House, and the elimination of the Speaker of the House from the rolls of the committee.[29] A substituted plan for composition of the Rules Committee was adopted by the House of Representatives providing that the Rules Committee would be comprised of 10 members, rather than the original 15 under Norris' resolution.[30]

Thus was ended the controlling grip of "Uncle Joe" Cannon on the House agenda. For Speaker Cannon had used the Rules Committee as his instrument for setting and dominating the House agenda. He recognized whom he knew would cooperate with him and avoided recognition of those whom he knew would oppose him. He appointed committees and designated chairmen according to ruthless policies of personal favors and exchanges.

By removing Speaker Cannon from the Rules Committee, the House intended to make the committee an agent of the House majority of whatever partisan or bipartisan alignments as well as a sometime agent of the leadership of the majority party.[31]

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

The revolution of 1910, which reduced the powers of the Speaker of the House, left the main powers of the Rules Committee intact.

In 1924 the "pocket veto" power of the chairman of the Rules Committee was curbed by an amendment to the House Rules which read:

"The Committee on Rules shall present to the House, reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business within 3 legislative days of the time when ordered by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately it shall be referred to the calendar and if not called up by the member making the report within 9 days thereafter, any member designated by the committee may call it up for consideration."

Subsequently, this paragraph was amended to provide that if such rule or order is not called up within 7 legislative days, "any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose."[32]

Discharge rule

Another change in the rules of the House was adopted in 1924 which, while it applies to every standing committee, was designed, in part, to restrict the prerogatives of the Committee on Rules. The discharge rule, adopted in 1910, was amended in 1924, so as to set at 150 the number of signatures required on discharge petitions. This number was raised to 218 in 1924 and was subsequently raised in 1959 to 219 temporarily to allow for the admission into the Union of Alaska and Hawaii. Under the discharge rule[33] it is in order to file a motion to discharge the Rules Committee from the further consideration of special orders of business provided that the special order has been before the committee for at least 7 days prior to the filing of the motion to discharge. Twice a month it is in order to call up the motions which have been placed on the discharge calendar. When the House begins the consideration of a bill under this rule, it remains the unfinished business of the House until fully disposed of without intervening motion except on motion to adjourn.

The "21-day rule"

Following Harry Truman's victory in 1948 with an increase in liberal Democratic membership in the House, the 21-day rule was adopted in 1949.[34] This was a move to strengthen the supporters of the administration in the House of Representatives by curtailing the powers of the Rules Committee. The need for this procedure arose out of the "obstructive tactics" and the "undemocratic and arbitrary dictatorship" of the Rules Committee, as it had operated in recent years. This rule stipulated that a resolution providing for the immediate consideration of the public bill already reported and which had been before the Rules Committee 21 days without being given clearance to the House floor could be called up on discharge days (second and fourth Mondays each month) by the chairman of the committee which reported the bill and that "the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose." The 21-day rule was to make circumvention of the Rules Committee easier than had been provided by the Calendar Wednesday or the discharge rule. The principle difference between the 21-day rule and these two is the burden of taking the initiative. The leadership moves to dispense with Calendar Wednesday and Members have to rebel against the leadership to utilize this procedure. The discharge petition requires a majority to take the initiative. But the 21-day rule permits a committee chairman to initiate a motion to call up a bill of his held by the Rules Committee for 21 days without granting a rule on it. The practical effect of the 21-day rule was to increase the Speaker's power as he has the authority to recognize or fail to recognize any Member for the purpose of getting the floor to speak.

In 1951, the 21-day rule was rescinded, by a vote of 244 to 137.[35]

But in 1965, the rules of the House were amended to provide that if the Committee on Rules adversely reports or fails to report within 21 calendar days after reference to it, a resolution providing for the consideration of a bill favorably reported by a committee of the House, the Speaker may exercise his discretion to recognize the chairman or any authorized member of the committee that reported the bill to call up for consideration by the House, a resolution which the Committee on Rules has adversely reported or failed to report. It is then in order to move the adoption by the House of that resolution.[36]

THE CONTROVERSY IN THE 87TH CONGRESS

On July 12, 1960, the Democratic Convention adopted as part of its platform the following:

"The rules of the House of Representatives should be so amended as to make sure that bills reported by legislative committees reach the floor for consideration without undue delay."[37]

On January 25, 1960, President Kennedy discussed the matter at his first press conference. He declared that he hoped that a "small group of men" would "not attempt to prevent the Members from finally letting their judgments be known" though he recognized that rule changes constituted an internal House matter and that he had confidence the House of Representatives would act with dispatch.[38]

Chairman SMITH of the Rules Committee sent a copy of a letter addressed to Representatives Vinson and Walter to each Member of the House of Representatives. He wrote:

"I * * * want it clearly understood what we, who oppose the packing scheme, have offered to do.

"We have offered to interpose no obstacles in the Committee on Rules to the five major bills that the President has publicly announced as his program for this session.

"We have offered to support a change in the rules to deprive the Committee on Rules of jurisdiction to prevent bills from going to conference.

"We have brought out of the Committee on Rules a resolution which the leadership can pass in the House next Tuesday if they have the votes, or adopt the wise course of waiting until the Committee on Rules in the opinion of the leadership, acts in a manner contrary to the wishes of the House, at which time the leadership can bring it up, and pass it, and stack the committee, anytime the House wishes in the next 2 years.

"Those of us who oppose this packing scheme have offered every honorable solution for the sake of harmony."[39]

Sam Rayburn was quoted as saying," I think that this President [Kennedy], after winning the Presidency, has a right to have his recommendations considered in the House of Representatives. I fear that with the Rules Committee composed as it is now, that would not be done."[40]

The House of Representatives took up House Resolution 127 on January 31. One hour of debate preceded the vote. Speaker Rayburn, in one of his rare statements from the floor, urged passage of the resolution which provided that during the 87th Congress the Committee on Rules shall be increased from 12 to 15 members. The newly installed President, he said, had made it clear that the country is "neither in good shape domestically or in the foreign field." The new administration would be sending many legislative proposals to Congress. After a legislative committee had thoroughly considered and reported a bill, continued the Speaker, "and when the chairman comes to the Committee on Rules * * * comes to the leadership of the House and wants a rule after all of that consideration, I think that the Committee on Rules should grant that rule whether its membership is for the bill or not. I think this House should be allowed on great measures to work its will, and it cannot work its will if the Committee on Rules is so constituted as not to allow the House to pass on these things."[41]

Chairman SMITH condemned the resolution as an attempt to "pack or purge" the Committee on Rules. He urged the House to place the resolution on the calendar so that it could be called up at a later time if the committee did anything to cause complaint. He repeated the concessions he had offered as to the President's five points and the committee's jurisdiction over bills going to conference. He said, "I will cooperate with the Democratic leadership of the House of Representatives just as long and just as far as my conscience will permit me to go. But when I am asked to pledge aid to the passage of any resolution or bill in this House that I am conscientiously opposed to, I would not yield my conscience and my right to vote in this House to any person or any Member or under any conditions." [42]

---

[28] Congressional Directory, 61st Cong., 2d sess., Government Printing Office, 1910, p. 200.

[29] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 45, p. 3292, Mar. 17, 1910; the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1910.

[30] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 45, p. 3436, Mar. 19, 1910.

[31] Kenneth W. Hechler, "Insurgency Personalities and Politics of the Taft Era" (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940).

[32] House rule XI, par. 23.

[33] House rule XXVII, par. 4.

[34] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pp. 10, 11.

[35] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pp. 17, 18.

[36] House rule XI, par. 23.

[37] "The Democratic platform, the Rights of Man" * * *, adopted by the Democratic National Convention, Los Angeles, July 12, 1960, p. 47.

[38] Richard L. Lyons, "House Rules Change Backed by President," Washington Post, Jan. 26, 1961:1.

[39] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, p. 1576.

[40] John D. Morris, "Rayburn Rejects All Compromise on Rules Battle," New York Times, Jan. 29, 1961: 1, 46.

[41] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pp. 1579, 1580.

On a rollcall vote, the House of Representatives adopted the resolution, 217 to 212. Voting for the resolution were 195 Democrats and 22 Republicans; against it were 64 Democrats and 148 Republicans.[43]

SOME SUGGESTED REFORMS

Congressional differences between the two Houses over a particular measure at times poses a procedural problem in the House of Representatives. Under present conditions in the House it is necessary to gain unanimous consent to send to conference a measure that has previously already passed the House. It might be a step in the right direction to make motions to confer with the Senate, privileged motions, thus avoiding the Rules Committee entirely.

Abolition of the Rules Committee's jurisdiction over phases of the House agenda might well facilitate the legislative process. A cursory observation of how matters are handled by the 100 Senators of the U.S. Senate in setting the upper House's agenda will indicate a possible desirable change in the other House. By unanimous consent the Senate sets its agenda recommended by the majority leader. Surely the House of Representatives could set its agenda by a majority vote if 100 Senators can agree unanimously on that House's agenda.

"In order to circumvent the obstacle to legislative programing present in the Rules Committee's participation in fixing the House agenda, the leadership of the majority party could be clothed with sole responsibility in this regard. The leadership now shares these responsibilities: After the Rules Committee grants a rule the leadership decides when the bill will be debated. It would be far less cumbersome to leave it to the Speaker to recognize the majority leader to offer a privileged notion that the House consider a bill reported by a committee (legislative committee), under certain conditions governing time and amendments. This mechanism is very similar to the procedure now existing to go through the Rules Committee. The major difference would be that agenda-making decisions are centralized in the majority party leadership." [44]

It is obvious that the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the House majority leader are in areas of larger national responsibility than a dozen or so committeemen who are primarily concerned for their respective congressional districts. The strengthening of the House leadership still further could doubtlessly go a long way in enhancing the powers of Congress vis-a-vis the Chief Executive. Presently congressional initiation of legislation is subordinate to the role of the White House. It might well be that a centralized and coordinated leadership in the House could be a long step toward returning to our tripartite government system of checks and balances.

Former Dean W. Reed West, of the George Washington University, urged the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress in 1945 to restore the Speaker of the House to the Rules Committee. He stated that Congress needs to be encouraged to resume "the initiative in the formulation of policy" which requires the "establishment of responsible leadership."

Dean West contended that "it is ridiculous that the man who, more than any other person, has more than any other person, the confidence of the House, is barred from serving on the committee that has most to do with the overall control of the business of the House." [45]

SCOTCH-IRISH PRESIDENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as a long-time admirer of Woodrow Wilson, I was happy to learn recently that the Government of Northern Ireland has acquired for preservation the ancestral homestead of President Wilson's grandfather. The house, in Strabane, County Tyrone, is being restored for the Government by the Northern Ireland National Trust.

I have been informed, also, that President Wilson's grandson, Dean Sayre, will take part in ceremonies on June 17, when the ancestral home will be opened to the public.

For several years the Ulster-Scot Historical Society has been carrying on research into links between Ulster and America, and they have come up with 10 Presidents of Scotch-Irish origin. The society has traced the ancestral homes of these Presidents, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks the following excerpts from a pamphlet published by the society.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SCOTCH-IRISH AND THE WHITE HOUSE

Estimates of the number of Presidents of the United States of Scotch-Irish origin vary, depending on the degree of relationship on which the claim is based. For the purposes of their search for ancestral homesteads the Ulster-Scot Historical Society accepted only those of direct Scotch-Irish descent. Even limited in this way the number amounts to 10—a notable proportion when related to the very small group from which they sprang. They are Andrew Jackson, James Knox Polk, James Buchanan, Andrew Johnson, Ulysses Simpson Grant, Chester Alan Arthur, Grover Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, and Woodrow Wilson. In all they occupied the White House for 56 of the 92 years between the start of Andrew Jackson's term of office and the finish of Woodrow Wilson's. Fuller particulars of their ancestral links with Ulster are given on the following pages.

This list becomes all the more impressive when it is realized that 3 of the 10, Presidents Jackson, Buchanan and Arthur, were first generation Americans, i.e., Presidents whose fathers were born in Ulster. The U.S. Constitution lays it down that the President must be American born. In the long history of the United States these are the only three first-generation Americans to achieve this high office. Andrew Jackson has left it on record that he only just made it since he was born soon after the ship in which his parents sailed from Ulster reached harbor in America.

Though the search for presidential ancestral homesteads has been limited to these 10 Presidents we must also note that ex-Presidents Truman and Eisenhower both claim to have some Scotch-Irish blood in their veins.

Andrew Jackson: President, 1829–37.

About 1 mile north from the 13th century Norman Castle in Carrickfergus, County, Antrim, lies the village of Boneybefore where the future President's father and mother, Andrew and Elizabeth, lived before setting sail for America in 1765.

In the middle of the 19th century their home at Boneybefore was pulled down to make way for the railroad from Belfast to Larne and the stones were used to build another house beside the railroad which is still standing and which incorporates also a window from the old Jackson house. A railway survey map of the period gives the location of the Jackson homestead.

James Knox Polk: President, 1845–49.

James Knox Polk was descended from an Ulster family settled in the Londonderry area. His great-great-great-grandfather settled in America about 1680.

James Buchanan: President, 1857–61.

James Buchanan, Sr., father of the future President, who emigrated to Philadelphia, was descended from George Buchanan of Blairlisk, Scotland, who settled in Deroran, near Omagh, County Tyrone in 1674. One of George's descendants (also named George) moved from Omagh to County Donegal and the latter's grandson, James, was the father of the President. The house at Deroran, near Omagh, still stands as part of a larger building of a later period.

Andrew Johnson: President 1865–69.

Andrew Johnson is reputed to have come from a family in humble circumstances who lived in the neighborhood of Larne, County Antrim, until the President's grandfather, Andrew Johnson, emigrated to America about 1750.

Ulysses Simpson Grant: President 1869–77.

Ulysses Simpson Grant, Federal commander in the Civil War, was of Scotch-Irish extraction through his mother, Hannah Simpson, who came from a County Tyrone family. The Simpson house at Dergina, near Dungannon, County Tyrone, a drawing of which appears on the front cover, is at present occupied by Nurse Isobel Simpson whose family claim relationship with the President's mother.

Chester Alan Arthur: President 1881–85.

At Dreen, County Antrim, 30 miles from Belfast, stands the farmhouse in which lived the forebears of Chester Alan Arthur. His grandfather, Alan Arthur, emigrated in 1816 with his (i.e., Alan Arthur's) son William, who became a clergyman and was father of the President.

By Ulster standards of the time the Arthurs were substantial farmers. The President, it was said, "came of a stock which made for eminence."

Grover Cleveland: President 1885–89 and 1893–97.

Grover Cleveland was of Scotch-Irish descent on his mother's side. She was the daughter of Abner Neal, who emigrated to America from County Antrim late in the 18th century.

Benjamin Harrison: President 1889–93.

Benjamin Harrison's mother, Elizabeth Irwin, was descended from two great-grandfathers from Ulster (James Irwin and William McDowell). The sites of their homesteads have not been traced.

William McKinley: President 1897–1901.

William McKinley was the great-great-grandson of James McKinley, who about 1743 emigrated to America from Conagher, near Ballymoney, County Antrim, where the family had been settled since about 1669. James McKinley's son, David, fought in the Revolutionary War and David's grandson, William, was the father of the President.

A new dwelling house has been built alongside the old McKinley home on the farm at Conagher, close by the picturesque River Bush. Although there are many records of members of the McKinley family living at Conagher, the last was one, Francis McKinley, who left for the United States in 1836. But the name lives on: to this day the farm is known as McKinley's farm.

---

[42] Ibid., pp. 1576–1577.

[43] Ibid., pp. 1589–1590.

[44] John C. Wahlke, Heinz Eulau, William Buchanan and Leroy C. Ferguson, "The Legislative System: Explorations in Legislative Behavior" (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962), pp. 52–66.

[45] Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 79th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1945), pp. 1020–1023, vol. 762 U.S. Senate library series set.

Woodrow Wilson: President 1913–21.

Woodrow Wilson was descended from a Scotch-Irish family whose homestead at Dergalt, near Strabane, County Tyrone, 80 miles from Belfast, has been acquired for Northern Ireland through the agency of the national trust. Until the trust took it over, the house was occupied by members of the Wilson family who still farm the land around it. The President's grandfather, James Wilson, left for America about 1807 and married an Ulsterwoman, Annie Adams, whom he met on the voyage. Their son, the Reverend Joseph R. Wilson, was the President's father. James Wilson is reputed to have served his apprenticeship as a printer in the printing works at Strabane in which James Dunlap, printer of the Declaration of Independence is also said to have learned his trade.

ALASKA'S NEW ARCHBISHOP JOSEPH T. RYAN'S WARM WELCOME IN ANCHORAGE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I was privileged to accompany Archbishop-designate Joseph T. Ryan to Alaska on a plane which left New York for Anchorage with a number of other distinguished prelates on board on April 12. Also on board was Representative Leo O'Brien who has for so many years represented in Congress the district where Monsignor Ryan served before his elevation, and who was the floor manager of the Alaska statehood bill in the House of Representatives in 1958 when that historical legislation was enacted. His presence was most appropriate. We had the further privilege of attending the ceremony of installation of the archbishop in Anchorage on April 14 and a dinner given in honor of the new archbishop on the following night. Both were unforgettable and stimulating occasions.

The kindliness and charm Alaska's new archbishop radiated were reciprocated in the warm welcome given to him by the people of Anchorage. I was more than happy to have been present at these events and to have come to know this spiritual pastor and leader of the Catholic Church who, from the moment he reached Alaska, endeared himself to the many who came to greet and hear him.

In this connection an excellent article on some of the problems of the new archdiocese appears in the April 16 issue of the magazine America. I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "The Poorest Diocese in the U.S.A.," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Poorest Diocese in the United States

(By John Morris)

July 1965 found me on the murky waters of a winding river. As my small boat purred along, the barking of dogs announced a break in the endless miles of willows. Soon a few tents and rusty shacks came into view. In sharp contrast to the ugly dwellings was the rich flesh of the mighty king salmon; the fish were split up the middle and hung to dry on crudely constructed racks. A few gill-nets were stretched on the marsh grass to dry. These, along with the time-tested fishwheel, decided whether or not the family would have enough to eat that winter.

How strange a sight: "man the gatherer" absorbed in ancient patterns, doggedly striving to keep alive in the midst of a hostile nature.

To most Americans, "man the gatherer" is a subject for social anthropology, a creature from another age. Little do they realize that his sort of life is the life led by more than half the Catholics who live in one particular diocese of "affluent" America. While the average per capita income for the United States approaches $3,000, in this poorest of all American dioceses over 50 percent of our Catholics have an income of less than $500. Their low standard of living puts them on a par with parts of underdeveloped Asia and emerging Africa.

At the time of my stay in Alaska, the Diocese of Fairbanks was not only the poorest American diocese, but also the largest. It covered an area of 515,600 square miles. Yet, while nearly the size of Texas and California together, its total population numbered under 90,000. Early in February 1966, the church, in an effort to deal more efficiently with this vast tract of land, created the new Archdiocese of Anchorage, carving it from the suffragan seas of Fairbanks and Juneau. The territory incorporated into Anchorage lopped from Fairbanks the more affluent white residents. If anything, the diocese is poorer now.

Twenty-five years ago, Alaska was a land slumbering in mystery and cold. Rudely awakened during the Second World War, it became a strategic outpost, as air bases, troop depots and DEW-line installations were established. Thus began the mass migration of the white man's culture into Alaska, spurred on by Government and military funds. Today, this movement continues as a result of the tourist—along with the capitalist who looks to Alaska in his "search for gold."

The natives, however, are being steamrollered by the advent of 20th-century technology and its corresponding culture. Alaska has become a white man's world; only an occasional native manages to secure even a job requiring unskilled labor. Can a man who has been passive and silent for centuries, waiting for the salmon and listening for the caribou, be expected to compete in an aggressive and high-pressure system like our own?

A superficial dialog between the native's customs and the encroaching white culture does, indeed, exist. But to exchange the pathless tundra for the asphalt jungle, the midnight sun for a wristwatch, is at present beyond the inner stamina or even understanding of the native. In the meantime, he must live in two cultures, torn between emotion and environment.

In this half-and-half environment, the native has an unaccustomed complexity to deal with. Many of his desires are to be found in his "wish book," the Sears-Roebuck catalog, although his capacity for satisfying them is pitiful. The native family is large, and the white man's items cost from 50 to 100 percent more in the isolated village than outside, in the "lower States."

Though the white man's culture continues to infiltrate even the most isolated villages, there is little prospect that the native will soon enjoy what he has already begun to crave. At present, 69 percent of the adult native population have less than an elementary education. Of the youth of high school age, only 34 percent are enrolled in school. Even though more high schools are being constructed, the problem promises to remain for several generations because of the high dropout rate. In most native settlements there exists little incentive for young people to improve their education. Unsympathetic whites monopolize the desired jobs, while their own elders are left to languish in idleness and indifference.

Unemployment stalks the land. As in any community, most men want to work. They have families to feed, homes to improve; yet, not infrequently, the unemployment figure reaches 90 percent. It is not hard to imagine what this does to a community.

Take Fairbanks as an example. It is the largest and most affluent city of the diocese, and yet in November 1963, the area reported that of 1,792 households with a workforce of 6,398 adults, a mere 12 percent were gainfully employed. The majority of the unemployed were natives living on the fringes of the established community.

During a conversation with Father George Endal, S.J., a veteran of 30 years in Alaska, I asked him how he liked his year-old assignment at Hooper Bay, a community of 600 Eskimos on the Bering Sea. Casually, but not without concern, he said: "Fine. It's a good mission. But my people have been hungry since Christmas—bad fish catch last year." This was in April. But then, these people have been in a state of starvation for centuries. In spite of great medical strides, infant mortality, one of the primary indexes of poverty, still accounts for 36 percent of all deaths, as compared to only 6 percent for the rest of the United States.

Far more typical of a community in transition is Bethel (House of God), so named by Moravian missionaries. Surrounded by mosquito-infested tundra, it lies ugly and forlorn on the right bank of the Kuskokwim River. In 1940, Bethel had a population of 375, but with its growth rate of 11 percent over the years, it presently includes 1,700 people, of whom 35 percent are natives. This bit of humanity is housed in drooping shacks, undersized and uninsulated, which shift with the sinking tundra. In the past several years, chemical toilets have replaced less sanitary conditions. There are only two wells in the whole town, and sidewalks are nonexistent. You can't chop wood for the stove because there are no trees.

It is conditions such as these, where the average native family numbers 8 and unemployment varies from 45 to 60 percent, that one begins to realize the numbing and suffocating power of chronic poverty. This is what Walter Heller had in mind when, in hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, he said: "But open exits [due to new jobs] mean little to those who cannot move, to those caught in the web of poverty through illiteracy, lack of skills, racial discrimination, broken homes, and ill health—conditions that are hardly touched by prosperity and growth."

True, such conditions also exist in Appalachia and along the banks of the Mississippi. In Alaska, however, the Arctic winds and the bitter cold turn life into an endurance test and expose men's precarious existence to even greater odds.

The Government is interested in these problems and active in solving, or at least alleviating, many of them. At present, the Economic Opportunity Act, Headstart, and VISTA are opening up new avenues. Too often, however, poverty programs are formulated on a national scale. In those instances where the American native is taken into account, the general subject is the reservation Indian—hence their findings are not applicable for the most part to the Alaskan native, whose problems are unique.

The church is aware of these serious problems, and no one more so than the 35 priests scattered over this incredibly vast area of the former Fairbanks diocese. The average age of these men is 52—a surprising figure when one considers the adverse conditions of the North.

Education is the great imperative. The bishop of the original Fairbanks diocese had to struggle to keep three high schools and five grade schools in existence. Had it not been for the 50 or more volunteers who worked and taught with a few priests and nuns, the situation would have been desperate. Poor natives can pay no tuition. Except for the single parish in Fairbanks, no collection averaged $100 per week.

With a population of 16,000, Fairbanks has only 1 Catholic church. The 50-year-old frame building, which seats only 175, is the bishop's pro-cathedral. In order to build a more representative structure, the bishop is trying to sell his present house.

The conditions under which priests live are likewise hard. Except among those engaged in school work, housekeepers and cooks are unheard of. Quarters are often cramped and inadequate. For example, one priest lives in a tiny attic where only in the center can he stand upright.

Over 50 percent of a priest's time is spent in repairing buildings, hauling fuel, preparing meals and doing general handiwork. If the means to cope with the material side of life were available, the number of priestly work hours could be doubled. At times, these men must half agree with the facetious comment of Léon Bloy: "Money is the blood of the Mystical Body." (All of this brings to mind Bishop Sheen's comment that the average Catholic contributes less than 40 cents a year to the church's mission effort.)

I am not trying to gain sympathy or even funds for the Alaskan church. My purpose is simply to ask what implications this situation has for the American church as a whole—what obligations sister dioceses have for poorer, less affluent areas of the American family of dioceses.

Alaska may be the poorest, but there are other poor areas. In the United States there are 710 counties with an average population of 12,000 that are without a single resident priest. Together they exceed the combined land area of Germany and France. One southeastern diocese keeps two full-time priests begging funds outside the diocese in order to carry on diocesan works. Another southern diocese must make annual appeals through extra-diocesan mailings in order to train her priests. At present, there are 40 dioceses that need outside help to carry on their work.

In 1939, the Glenmary Home Missioners were founded explicitly for the neglected "no priest land" of America. Today their nearly 100 priests are working in 20 mission areas in 14 dioceses where the total population exceeds 850,000, but where the Catholic population is incredibly low—only 4,000. Priestly and financial help from other dioceses could quickly change this picture.

These are problems that have now been placed in the hands of our National Conference of Bishops, whose role has been enlarged and strengthened as a result of Vatican II. Certainly the disparity that exists today within the American diocesan family needs correcting. As far back as 1954, Pope Pius XII said, in Fidei Donum: "While each bishop is the peculiar pastor only of that portion of the flock entrusted to his charge, his character is lawful successor of the apostles by divine institution makes him jointly responsible for the apostolic mission of the church."

Dioceses rich in priests, sisters, and funds must be taught to cultivate greater sensitivity for other dioceses. Individual bishops never flag in seeing to the common good of their own diocese. Affluent parishes are expected to contribute heavily to the diocesan development fund. And a bishop would manifest just anger if such a parish balked. Is it illogical to expect this same concept on a national level?

The American church will become a thing of beauty and holiness only when the whole body becomes harmoniously integrated and delicately sensitive to total selfhood.

THE BIRTH-CONTROL REVOLUTION, PART VI

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the shift in the legal standing of birth control advice and devices in the last few years has been notable. The action by the Supreme Court in June 1965 overturning a Connecticut statute which prohibited the use of birth control devices was a milestone in the long history of 20th century efforts to legalize methods of fertility regulation. The right of privacy has been increasingly emphasized since that decision as one of the basic human rights to be protected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD, part VI of the Saturday Evening Post article, "The Birth Control Revolution," by Steven M. Spencer, entitled "Birth Control and the Law."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIRTH CONTROL AND THE LAW

While the "benevolent conspirators" were slowly changing our attitudes toward birth control, there remained a vast network of restrictive laws, the principal effect of which has been to deprive low-income families of birth-control information and services. This legislation began with the Federal law of 1873, instigated by the busy New England antivice crusader, Anthony Comstock. Some 30 States soon passed "little Comstock laws," most calling birth control "obscene and immoral."

These were the statutes under which Mrs. Sanger's pioneer meetings were raided, her clinics closed and she herself jailed. In 1936 another famous birth-control figure, the late Dr. Hannah Stone of New York, was involved in a case known as *The United States* v. *One Package*. The package contained diaphragms sent to her from Japan and seized by U.S. Customs. Mrs. Harriet Pilpel, a New York lawyer, argued the "package" case for Dr. Stone and won. In the fall of 1963 Mrs. Pilpel was called again when the St. Louis postmaster held up the mailing of 50,000 samples of an aerosol foam contraceptive on the grounds that they were not addressed to doctors. The product, Emko, is made as a crusading and semi-philanthropic sideline by a gregarious white-haired St. Louis manufacturer, Joseph Sunnen. Sunnen, who has donated thousands of bottles of Emko and hundreds of thousands of dollars to birth-control programs, always carries a few Emko packages in his pocket, passing them out to friends and casual acquaintances after asking them how many children they have. The samples were being sent to women who had clipped coupons from Emko ads appearing in 19 magazines. Again Mrs. Pilpel obtained a favorable ruling, one that said unless the postmaster could prove the packages were being mailed for unlawful purposes, they could go through.

The toughest Comstock law in the land was Connecticut's 1879 statute making the use of any drug, medical article, or instrument to prevent conception an offense punishable by a fine and up to a year in prison. Anyone who "assists, abets, counsels, causes, hires, or commands another to commit any offense" could be similarly prosecuted.

The law was enacted by a Protestant Puritan legislature and was kept on the books, in the face of 28 legislative repeal efforts in the past 40 years, by what has been decribed as "a small but very articulate and well-organized group of Roman Catholic extremists." Connecticut doctors were not barred from giving birth-control advice to private patients in their offices, but the State law blocked welfare clinics from giving such advice to their clients. Eight or nine birth-control clinics were closed under the law in 1939 and many of the doctors and nurses in attendance were arrested.

When Dr. C. Lee Buxton arrived from New York in 1954 to head the Department of Obstetrics at Yale's School of Medicine, he was both amused by the law's silliness and distressed by its social injustice. To prohibit individual couples from using contraceptives would, he observed, "require police power as a third party on the connubial couch," a thought whose "farcical implications have all kinds of possibilities."

But what sharpened his determination to do something about the law was the death of several women patients and the permanent incapacitation of another from medical problems seriously aggravated by unwanted pregnancies. All these women had sought contraceptive advice and been unable to get it. "I was brooding about these patients at a cocktail party one evening," Dr. Buxton recalls, "when I met Fowler Harper, then professor of law at Yale. I asked what he thought about the Connecticut law, which was actually preventing us from giving birth-control information to ward patients in the hospital. He said he thought it was a hell of a law. So I got some cases worked up for legal trial, and Harper filed suit to challenge the law's constitutionality, on the ground that it violated the 14th amendment, assuring citizens the basic civil and human rights of personal liberty. Professor Harper died last year, but Miss Catherine Roraback, one of his former students, masterminded the case for us."

This case was lost in the lower courts, and the Supreme Court refused to consider the constitutionality on the grounds that the law was in fact a dead issue and was not enforced. Well, if the law was a dead issue, the thing to do was to open a contraceptive clinic at once, and Mrs. Estelle Griswold, executive director of the Planned Parenthood League of Connecticut, in cooperation with Dr. Buxton as director, prepared to do so. On November 1, 1961, the clinic opened its doors to the public. On November 10 it was closed, by order of the prosecutor, Julius Maretz.

In closing the clinic, New Haven authorities had to contend with a small, white-haired woman in her 60's with a lively sense of humor and a relish for a good fight. The shutting down of Mrs. Griswold's clinic on that November day was a challenge she met with delight.

"My real concern had been that we were only fighting feathers," she said, "that no one might oppose us. This bothered me because birth-control services would still have been illegal. But when we announced the clinic was open, we were swamped with phone calls, and our appointments were soon set up for 2 or 3 months ahead."

What forced the legal move against the New Haven clinic was a series of accusations by a man who went to one official after the other demanding that the clinic be closed. "He made a lot of wild statements about me on the radio," said Mrs. Griswold, "and said that every minute the clinic was open a baby wasn't being born. Shortly after one of his radio broadcasts he went to the prosecutor with what was almost an accusation, and there was nothing for the prosecutor to do but send the detectives over to the clinic to see what was going on."

In the course of appealing the case from the lower courts, where he and Mrs. Griswold were fined $100 each and released on $250 bond, Dr. Buxton wrote to experts at every medical college in the country, asking for written support. He got it, even from many Catholic medical schools. Finally, on June 7, 1965, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its historic 7-to-2 decision. Justice William O. Douglas, in writing the majority opinion, declared the case concerned "a relationship lying within the zone of privacy created by several fundamental constitutional guarantees" and said the Connecticut law "in forbidding the use of contraceptives rather than regulating their manufacture or sale, seeks to achieve its goals by means having a maximum destructive impact upon that relationship.

"We deal with a right of privacy older than the Bill of Rights—older than our political parties, older than our school system," he concluded. "Marriage is a coming together for better or worse, hopefully enduring and intimate to the degree of being sacred."

The two dissenting Justices, Stewart and Black, both thought the Connecticut law offensive but constitutional.

Within days after the Supreme Court decision the New York Legislature modified its 84-year-old Comstock law to remove all restrictions on the dissemination of birth-control information and to permit sale of contraceptives to everyone over the age of 16. Although the law had not been enforced for years, it had been resurrected by the Catholic Welfare Conference in an effort to stop birth-control activities by the State board of social welfare.

Later in the summer the Massachusetts Legislature defeated a similar repeal move, but this was the one exception to last year's general easing of legal and administrative restraints. Ohio and Minnesota joined New York in clearing away restrictions from their statutes. Seven States—California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, and Nevada—adopted positive legislation to authorize or encourage public family planning services. And according to a Planned Parenthood survey more than 40 States have made administrative decisions favorable to such programs over the past 4 or 5 years.

The long and bitter political battle in Chicago and Illinois ended last June when the State legislature passed a resolution authorizing State agencies to provide birth-control services. And the Chicago Board of Health, under the adroit persuasion of its president, Dr. Eric Oldberg, a prominent neurosurgeon, cautiously began family planning services in 9 of its 39 city health centers. His viewpoint conflicts sharply with that of Dr. Karl A. Meyer, 79-year-old medical superintendent of the huge Cook County Hospital, which still has no birth-control clinics even though its annual delivery of 18,000 babies is the largest of any hospital in the country. "Birth control," Meyer has remarked, "is a socioeconomic problem, not a medical one."

However you define it, birth-control information has been denied to the many women who have sought it at Cook County. In an interview on CBS–TV, one woman said she asked a doctor at Cook County if he could help her stop having children. "He told me no, I was too young," she said, "and was good for 20 more."

"CIVIC ACTION" IN VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Reporter Bob Schieffer of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram has recently written a most penetrating and important article about the Vietnam war. In it, he points out the fact that in this troubled land our pacification work is going ahead on a priority equal to the battle efforts. My own trips to South Vietnam confirm for me that Mr. Schieffer is correct.

I commend him on his apt analysis and congratulate the Star-Telegram for providing its readers such professional and talented observers.

In order that other Senators may share Mr. Schieffer's thoughts, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cocked Weapons and Tip of Helmet: Killing, Pacifying Go Hand in Hand in Viet War

(Editor's Note.—Soldiers in Vietnam often find themselves engaged in civic as well as military action, writes Bob Schieffer, who recently returned after 4 months in Vietnam. Why and how the servicemen wage a war of pacification is told in this article, the fifth of a series.)

(By Bob Schieffer)

On Monday a marine private might be pinned down by enemy rifle fire as his company advances on a Vietcong controlled village.

By Tuesday afternoon he might be helping one of the villagers to build a pigsty or showing a small boy how to put medicine on a leech bite.

"Every marine is a civic action officer," Maj. Paul Melcher, who heads the Marine civic action program, explained one day.

"You might say we go into a village with weapons cocked but we still tip our helmets."

"Civic action" or "pacification" as it is sometimes called is one of the biggest efforts in the war against the Vietcong.

In short, pacification is a program to build the loyalty, confidence and respect of the peasants in Vietnam's farflung rural hamlets for the Central Government.

There is a saying in Vietnam that "the Emperor's power does not extend beyond the palace gate."

Vietnam no longer has an Emperor, but a succession of Saigon governments has found it difficult to extend much influence beyond the streets of the capital city.

Sometimes when friendly forces drive the Vietcong out of a village they find themselves unwelcome.

"You can't blame them for being suspicious," said an Army captain. "They expect the worst because that's all they've ever had."

That is why such emphasis, government officials say, is placed on pacification.

The soldiers attempt to show the villagers that their government can offer them a better life.

Schools are rebuilt, committees are organized for food distribution and public health and other services which more sophisticated societies expect in return for their taxes.

Care is exercised and tight controls are used in the civic reforms.

"If a person needs pills to cure an illness," says Maj. Mike Styles, a marine based at Da Nang, "he is given only one pill and told to come back the next day for his next dose.

"That way the Vietcong are not liable to get hold of a large supply of medical supplies.

"Also we feel that this gives a person a chance to maintain more frequent contact with his government, especially the village chief."

The village chief is always present at such functions and American representatives are careful to see that such aid is never a project greater than what the Saigon government will be able to furnish after the Americans are gone.

Civic action can range from singing classes to rebuilding burnt-out schools.

The Korean soldiers often instituted another twist. Tra Quan Do, the Korean combination of karate and judo.

The Korean soldiers often stage shows to display their prowess in the deadly art. They will break planks over their heads and shatter bricks with their bare hands.

"We tell the villager, 'See how strong we are. You don't have to be afraid of the Vietcong anymore, we'll show you how you can be this strong too,'" said Maj. Gen. Chae Myung Shin, boss of the ROK Tiger Division.

"We have 700 high school age boys enrolled in the classes," Chae said. "We've really been encouraged."

The projects are not always encouraging.

Advisers once built a small village a well only to return later and find it being used as a community latrine.

Foodstuffs are sometimes distributed and later found in Vietcong supply areas.

But the program continues and is having at least some effect.

Tien Phong, organ of the Communist Party in North Vietnam, reported the American buildup and pacification, practically speaking, had forced the Vietcong to extract higher taxes from the peasant and increase military conscription.

The Communist magazine counseled the comrades not to forget the political side of the war.

They admit they are being hurt by the pacification programs. They also admit, like politicians in other countries, that raising taxes and increasing the draft are not the easiest ways to make friends.

EIGHTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last week, together with a number of other Members of this body, and Members of the other House, I had the privilege of attending a luncheon sponsored by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee. It was a part of the Seventh Annual National Policy Conference of the committee, and coincided with the 18th birthday of the State of Israel.

I understand that the Hebrew word for 18 is "chai" which also means "life." A particularly significant birthday, I should think, for a state which has given dignity and opportunity to so many lives and which has in fact been responsible for saving the lives of a considerable part of its populace. To oppressed and homeless Jews throughout the world, living in lands where freedom is a myth and tolerance a vice, the word "life" and the word "Israel" can also be synonymous.

In the spirit of celebration of Israel's 18th birthday, and in recognition of the close and continuing ties of friendship between our two democracies, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of the address delivered last week by Dr. Phillip S. Bernstein, chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, and the policy statement adopted by the committee at the conference.

There being no objection, the address and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Address by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, Chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee

According to an ancient Jewish practice there are prescribed readings from the Scriptures in each Sabbath service. Last Saturday morning we read from II Kings, chapter 5. It told of Naaman, the Aramean general, who was stricken with leprosy. Learning of a healing prophet in Israel named Elisha he sought him out for advice. The prophet said, "Bathe seven times in the river Jordan." Naaman was furious. Were there not rivers in Syria larger and greater than the little Jordan? But he was persuaded and he was healed.

The Jordan is a little river. Palestine is a small country. Israel is no larger than New Jersey. But that little place has brought healing and light and hope to mankind. Out of it have come the three great religions of the Western World. From the Holy Land emerged moral guidance, the blueprint for the good life, the messianic goals of God's kingdom.

This has been understood in the Western World, and the special relationship of the Jewish people to its ancestral home has been recognized.

Especially has this been true in America. Every American President since Woodrow Wilson endorsed the Zionist objective. President Harry Truman gave official recognition to the State of Israel within minutes after its establishment. For decades now the Congress of the United States has indicated its approval and support by official action and practical aid. The American people on the whole have been sympathetic and helpful. Without this sympathy and aid Israel might not have come into existence, and it would have faced the greatest difficulty in surviving. For this Israel and its friends are profoundly grateful.

However, I want to point out on this occasion that this has been a reciprocal process. Israel has made very important contributions. It was one of the first free states to emerge after World War II. It became a pilot plant for small aspiring democracies.

Israel has given technical aid, guidance and assistance to more than 60 countries in Asia, Africa, and, more recently, in Latin America. Israel is committed to democracy by its deepest instincts and by its most urgent needs. It does not wish to be a pawn in the East-West struggle, but a whole constellation of factors have made it the one trustworthy bastion of democracy in that part of the world.

Israel is steadily becoming economically stronger. It still needs help from the West because of its heavy burdens of defense, because of the cessation of German reparations and because of its large-scale immigration.

However, it has been pointed out that U.S. commercial sales to Israel have climbed from about $70 million in 1960 to more than $125 million in 1964. The desalinization program for which we hope there will be adequate assistance by the United States is not entirely altruistic, but will be through Israel's technological competence of great assistance to our country as well. There is hardly an important level of life in which there cannot be a mutually fructifying exchange of ideas and personnel.

This is Israel's 18th birthday. The Hebrew word is "chai," which means life. It is wonderful after the Nazi holocaust—and remember at just this time 23 years ago the Nazis were engaged in destroying the embattled Jews of the Warsaw ghetto—that children in Israel sing "Am Yisrael Chai," the Jewish people lives. It's wonderful that a strong viable democratic state has come into existence which again promises a moral message to mankind.

But problems continue. The Arab States, and especially the United Arab Republic under Nasser's leadership, are committed to the destruction of Israel. Can we not express the hope that the United States will use its great influence, its strength, its firm statesmanship, toward bringing Arabs and Jews together at a peace table? The mood seems to be changing somewhat in the Arab countries. Can we not by a firm clear position throw all our weight behind efforts to achieve peace? Israel desperately wants it. The Arabs desperately need it.

However, until that consummation is reached and while the U.S.S.R. pours billions in arms into the Arab lands, our Government must help Israel to maintain deterrent strength. We know it is such strength that has kept Nasser from attacking Israel in the past and we know that it will be a deterrent factor in the future. By such aid as needed we are in effect saying to the peoples of the area that an arms race is futile, wasteful, and dangerous; that it will not bring victory to one or the other, and the sooner it can be ended the better for all the peoples of the area.

We express then on this significant anniversary gratitude and hope. We pray that United States-Israel friendship will deepen and grow in the interests of peace for all.

AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE STATEMENT OF POLICY, APRIL 24, 1966

The American Israel Public Affairs Committee is a national organization of American Jews established in 1954 which supports day-to-day action in Washington to strengthen U.S. policy in the Near East in order to guarantee stability, raise living standards, and promote an Arab-Israel peace settlement.

Israel this year celebrates her 18th birthday. In these 18 years, Israel has redeemed land and people, provided a home for refugees from persecution, restored an ancient spiritual and cultural homeland, translated the precepts of democracy into action to promote cooperation and freedom throughout the world.

But Israel is still a besieged land. She must remain on constant alert to defend herself from neighbors who refuse to make peace and who accumulate planes, tanks, ships, missiles and other lethal weapons in preparation for another attack.

I. THE NEED FOR PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

The continuing Arab threat to destroy Israel, reinforced by the arms escalation, menaces all the peoples of the Near East and challenges the great powers to take positive action looking toward peace.

We call upon our Government to exercise the full weight of American influence to bring the Arab States and Israel to the peace table.

II. THE ARMS RACE

The policies of the Egyptian Government gravely menace the peace of the area. In 1955, Egypt opened the Near East to Soviet penetration when President Nasser acquired large quantities of Soviet arms. Since then, there has been a constant flow of Russian military equipment, economic assistance and technical personnel to Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Yemen. To fulfill his design to encircle Israel by an Egyptian-led and Egyptian-armed unified Arab command, Nasser has pressured other Arab States to increase their armaments, with funds contributed by the oil-producing states.

We are opposed to an arms race in the Near East or any other place, but we are also opposed to an arms imbalance which favors the nation bent on destroying its neighbor.

As long as Egypt continues these military acquisitions, our Government has recognized the need to supply weapons to Israel in order to enable her to maintain her deterrent strength. Our Government has emphasized "the destabilizing effect of massive Soviet sales of arms to the area" and has assisted other nations whose regimes are threatened by President Nasser's Soviet-equipped forces.

The Arab States may be induced to make peace if they come to realize that Israel is fortified both by her own strength and by the commitment of the international community to preserve the peace.

There is no alternative to direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations. The call for peace must be raised constantly by the United States and all the great powers—firmly and without conditions.

III. U.S. AID

In recent years, American policy has clearly reflected our Government's determination to preserve the independence of the peoples of the Near East.

Its programs of economic assistance to Israel and the Arab States have fed, housed, trained, and employed people, and promoted better utilization of human and material resources.

Both the administration and Congress have adopted discriminating criteria in the allocation of economic aid, setting conditions to discourage recipients from misusing it—to the detriment of their economies and to the danger of their neighbors.

We welcome United States-Israel cooperation to develop a desalting program and we urge our Government to assist in the financing of such projects, which will open similar development in many lands.

IV. REFUGEES

We call for a realistic and constructive solution of the Arab refugee problem to serve the best interests of the refugees themselves. For almost two decades they have been kept as pawns in a propaganda and political war against Israel. They have been exploited by a demagogic leadership, which has refused all attempts to facilitate their resettlement and absorption and which now seeks to create an artificial nation in exile.

The Palestine Liberation Organization now seeks to enlist these refugees in an army and it is indefensible that funds of the United Nations Relief and Works Administration (UNRWA) should be squandered for rations which subsidize the mobilization and training of that army.

The rolls of UNRWA have been inflated and should be purged of those no longer eligible because of death, employment, and resettlement.

The Arab States responsible for the displacement of the Arab refugees must begin to assume responsibility for their rehabilitation and resettlement, and our aid program should be geared to serve those objectives.

V. THE BOYCOTT

We commend the Congress of the United States for its 1965 legislation to oppose the boycott which the Arab States have employed to harass American businessmen who deal with Israel and to involve Americans in the Arab war against Israel. We urge the administration to strengthen the regulations which implement that legislation.

We also commend the Congress of the United States for its strong opposition to the policies of the Arab States which discriminate against American Jews on the ground that they are Jews. We urge the administration to intensify its efforts to put an end to these intolerable practices.

We remind our Government that the Suez Canal is still closed, illegally, to Israel shipping.

VI. SUMMARY

We urge our Government:

To insist that the Arab governments negotiate a peace settlement with Israel which will pave the way for disarmament and economic cooperation.

To prevent a dangerous arms imbalance by providing arms to Israel to match those which the Arab States are acquiring to attack her.

To provide generous economic aid to Israel and to facilitate her water desalting program.

To continue aid to Arab countries which will be used to raise living standards and to withhold aid used to finance aggression.

To promote the resettlement of Arab refugees in Arab lands.

To resist Arab boycott practices.

Israel's progress has fulfilled the hopes of her supporters. We record our satisfaction at the continuing friendship between the United States and Israel—a friendship based on common democratic aspirations and ideals.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an editorial entitled "Stop Rewarding the Unruly." The editorial, by Editor Harry Hamm, appeared in the Wheeling News-Register on April 24. The editorial called attention to the dangerous conditions that have been spawned in this country as a result of so-called civil disobedience. It pointed out that our system of free government cannot continue to exist if persons are permitted to choose the laws they wish to obey and permitted to disregard those laws they do not like.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP REWARDING THE UNRULY

If you saw the scene on television several days ago you must have come away a bit horrified at the uncivilized behavior we are encouraging in this country today.

We refer to the shameful treatment accorded antipoverty director Sargent Shriver at a Washington conference on the problems of the poor. The unruly crowd booed, stomped, hooted, and shouted to the point where Mr. Shriver had to walk out of the meeting. Some of the participants in this mob scene appeared at times to be on the verge of taking a swing at the Federal official. The whole thing got so far out of hand that those in charge adjourned the meeting.

Equally appalling was the tenor of remarks made by certain speakers who represented the so-called grassroots poor who were unhappy at not having been given what they consider enough, soon enough. One of the speakers went so far as to come right out and demand that they be given money and "we'll show you how to spend it."

The whole affair was shocking and pointed up again how we have gone too far in what the New York Herald Tribune called "the canonization of direct action, led by civil rights radicals." We have witnessed assault after assault on the concept of law and the processes of orderly decision. We have made anarchy fashionable in today's society. And many intelligent persons have been guilty of encouraging this unlawful behavior. "Cause enough havoc and thou shall be rewarded," has become the theme of these irresponsible persons.

We saw another example of this mob rule a couple of weeks ago when a riot occurred at an amusement park in Maryland near Washington, D.C. After the rioters had been ejected from the amusement park, they left a trail of damage and terrorized homeowners in their wake as they rode buses or walked back to their Washington homes. They stoned homes and automobiles, damaged police cars and ambulances, and destroyed property in some of the most expensive neighborhoods in Northwest Washington. They invaded stores, and threw catsup, chocolate milk, baby food, and soft drinks everywhere, requiring hours of hard work to clean up the mess. Windows of service stations were broken by rock-throwers. Firemen, rescue squadsmen, and newspapermen were pelted with thrown objects. Buses were used to remove the rioters from the area, but during the bus riding every one of the buses was damaged.

One of the bus drivers stated that he "only was able to collect fares from about 50 out of 115" persons aboard. He went on to say, "The girls were raising just as much hell as the boys, and I knew I had to go along with what they wanted to do or else."

The bus driver, a 7-year veteran with the bus company said:

"They yelled four-letter words at each other and at me. They tore up the seats. All the way into the District along Massachusetts Avenue, some of the kids threw parts of the seats and things out of the windows."

These are the sad and dangerous conditions we have spawned in this country with our urging and promoting of civil disobedience. Our system of free government cannot continue if a person chooses to obey what laws he likes and disobey those he doesn't like. This is anarchy. We must stop encouraging the law of jungle and sowing the seeds of disrespect for law which can only damage our very freedom. Freedom does not mean license. It means responsibility and respect for the rights of others. Isn't it time that we regained our sanity and began punishing the rioters and lawbreakers instead of rewarding them and holding them up as great citizens?

A LOOK AT FREE CHINA TODAY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Communist regime on mainland China has received a greater measure of attention in the past 6 months than at any time in the past 15 years. With speculation that a change in leadership is imminent, and that changes in free world policy toward the Asian giant may lead to her admission to the United Nations, there has been increased interest, not only in the Communist mainland, but in the Republic of China governing from Taiwan.

In this context, I call to the attention of my colleagues an article from the May issue of the American Legion magazine written by Jeff Endrst. The article is entitled "A Look at Free China Today."

China watchers, amateur and professional alike, have acknowledged the enormous disparity in living conditions in Formosa and on the mainland. In his article, Mr. Endrst takes note of the fact that in 17 years Nationalist President Chiang Kai-shek has developed a nation-within-a-nation which boasts one of the highest standards of living in Asia, while the mainland regime has given its people little more than militancy and propaganda of hate.

With reference to talk of a change in Chinese representation in the U.N., the author notes:

> It would certainly be an oddity if the only underdeveloped nation to succeed, and the only one to lift its poor to a new life and a new future, were kicked out of the council of nations.

And he goes on to observe that "the per capita income of the Free Chinese in 1965 was three times that of the mainland reds."

The article also effectively treats the argument of Red China's apologists who maintain that the Communist regime is simply an extension of the revolution led by Dr. Sun Yat-sen in 1911. Communism, in fact, is as alien to the Chinese history, philosophy, and temperament as it is to the people of Europe.

As a Chinese, quoted in the article, puts it:

> The Peiping regime has cut itself away from the main Chinese historical stream and has thrown overboard all traditional cultural and moral values. Gone is the family system. Gone are filial piety, the sanctity of marriage, fraternal love between brothers and sisters and the entire Confucion system of human conduct and morals. In their stead the Communists have enthroned the party and the State.

Mr. President, I ask that the article, "A Look at Free China Today," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LOOK AT FREE CHINA TODAY

(By Jeff Endrst)

There is something vaguely familiar in some of the comments heard today that the Government of South Vietnam is incapable of social and land reform with U.S. help and advice, because it is corrupt, set in its ways, authoritarian, backward, indifferent to outside advice, and doomed to be overcome by the Communist wave of the future, etc.

These cases are by no means the same, yet those were the same comments made by pessimists two decades ago about the failing regime of Chinese Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek as it struggled to hold off organized Red Chinese attacks on the mainland of China. At that time, the defeatists and Red Chinese apologists told the world the now bitter joke that the Chinese Communists were only "agrarian reformers," trying to give the peasants a fair shake, while Chiang Kai-shek's government was (remember?) incapable of social and land reforms with U.S. help and advice because it was corrupt, set in its ways, authoritarian, backward, indifferent to outside advice, and doomed to be overcome by the Communist wave of the future, etc.

While today's free Chinese under Chiang were still holding out on the mainland of China in 1948, an attempt at land reform was made, working with American field representatives under the U.S. China Aid Act of that year. But in the absence of significant U.S. military assistance such as we are now giving South Vietnam it was too late for reforms in a land beset then, as South Vietnam is beset today, by Communist violence.

In December 1949, Chiang's government and army had to give up their long fight to hold back the Reds on the mainland. They fled to the island of Formosa, accompanied by a horde of refugees—some 2 million strong.

Formosa was no island of dreams, even though the name of Ilha Formosa, meaning beautiful island, was given it by early Portuguese navigators. The Portuguese looked at the 225-mile-long island through the eyes of sightseers. A magnificent mountain range dominates the central and eastern length, with some peaks exceeding 12,000 feet. Through the eyes of a people who must live there, it is something else than "beautiful island." Hot, humid, in the typhoon belt, Taiwan (as the Chinese and Japanese have always called Formosa) lies between the Philippines and Japan, about 90 miles off the Chinese mainland province of Fukien. The central mountain range leaves only a narrow strip of flat land on the west coast for extensive farming, and such footholds as may be secured in mountain valleys. The interior is so rugged that for centuries its greatest service to mankind was to provide a hideout for brigands, bandits and rebels.

In the capital city of Taipei, Chiang established a government-in-exile in 1949 variously known as free China, Nationalist China or—officially—the Republic of China.

Those were dark days. Nancy Yu-Huang, publisher of the China Post on Taiwan, says: "My husband and I came to this island bastion in the darkest hours of our national misfortune * * *. Uncertain of the future we had to abandon almost all of our earthly possessions in our hurried retreat * * * and start all over again * * *. In retrospect, it seems like a nightmare * * *. Only after years of groping in the dark did all of us gradually begin to see a glimmer of light."

Two million souls crossed the straits in 1949–50 in ships so crowded for the foodless, waterless 48-hour trip that men, women, and children even stood, sardine-style, in the lavatories.

In the first 6 months that those millions poured into Taiwan there were not jobs, food nor shelter for them all, except what could be scrounged and improvised. Huge squatter cities grew up, made of packing crates and odd bits of scrap metal and waste lumber. Former industrialists, government officials, businessmen, merchants and educators competed to pull rickshaws while Chiang and his top men tried to reorganize and settle the exiled government of China anew in its last remaining province.

Enormous inflation followed. Red China had complete confidence that the free Chinese would collapse of their own weight in 6 months. A year earlier the U.S. State Department had lost all confidence in Chiang and his people. In August 1948, it issued a China white paper all but writing them off, and stating in effect that U.S. policy would now wait for the dust to settle. Our diplomatic staffs were left at their posts in the mainland cities. At this low ebb of their fortunes, only the free Chinese of all the world believed that they still had a government and were a people.

Communism received one omen of things to come in 1949. Part of Chiang's army stayed behind to fortify the small islands of Quemoy and Matsu. These flyspecks, just 2 miles off the Fukien coast, are the military keys to the defense of Taiwan, 90-odd miles further at sea. Free Chinese guns on Quemoy look down the throat of Amoy Harbor. Matsu stands off the mouth of the Ming River. These are the only staging points along the Chinese coast on the Taiwan Strait that are suitable for launching an overwater attack on Taiwan. In 1949, the Red Chinese landed three divisions on Quemoy. Chiang's defenders fought them off, capturing or killing the bulk of the entire force.

Now, 17 years later, the 78-year-old Chiang presides over a busy, energetic people who all agree that theirs is the only legitimate Chinese Government, temporarily dislodged from the mainland but legally representing its 650 million people—and not just the 12 million Chinese who are now on Taiwan.

In those 17 years the free Chinese on Taiwan have set an unprecedented example of an undeveloped nation picking itself up by its bootstraps. Their agriculture and industry have soared, and they are today the world's only example of a country which has switched from receiving foreign economic aid to giving it.

Between 1951 and 1965 the United States pumped over $1.4 billion in economic dollar aid into Taiwan. Last year Premier C. K. Yen quietly announced, "We can take care of ourselves." On June 30, 1965, American economic aid to Taiwan ended, by mutual agreement. Free China was the first aid patient in history to be discharged as cured. Meanwhile, the free Chinese are exporting their know-how to poorer lands. They operate model farm villages and farm training centers in 10 African countries. Over 2,500 foreign technicians have been trained on Taiwan in such fields as farming, education, industrial development, and health. Farm seminars there are attended by specialists from 24 African nations. Teams of young Taiwan farmers work in Asian and African rice paddies demonstrating new techniques. This aid has been so successful that some Arab and Latin American countries have entered into agreements with the free Chinese for similar services. Volunteer civilian workers from Taiwan are assisting in the rehabilitation of South Vietnamese villages, and if the Americans would agree to it, Chiang would gladly send some of his crack troops there. Meanwhile, on the mainland, the original Red Chinese "agrarian reformers" suffer famines, rattle swords, and cannot even keep their food commitments with Castro's Cuba.

Land reform on Taiwan was the bedrock for all its other growth. Only by increasing the independence and prosperity of the farmer—including his production—was a consumer buying power created on which industrial growth could be based. The original United States-China Aid Act was transplanted from the mainland to Taiwan with Chiang, under a joint committee on rural reconstruction made up of two Americans and three Chinese. Protected from invasion and internal interference by Chiang's army, reinforced by U.S. military aid, land reform was phased in almost painlessly. Landlords who had been taking up to 70 percent of crops as rent were limited to 37.5 percent in 1949. In 1951 more than 250,000 acres of public farmlands were transferred to tenant farmers. In 1953, the Government bought 347,500 acres from absentee landlords and sold it to 195,000 tenant families, who would own the land free and clear after 10 years of paying their usual rent. Instead of chopping the heads off of the landlords as the Communists did on the mainland, Chiang's government steered their business instincts into industrial and marketing channels. They got 70 percent of the price of their farmlands in land bonds, redeemable in produce, and 30 percent in stocks in government industrial enterprises. Now no landlord may own for tenancy more than 7½ acres of rice paddy or 15 acres of unirrigated land. A farmer is limited to the land that he and his family can till themselves. Today 64 percent of the farmers on Taiwan own the land they work—which is 87 percent of the farmland on the island. A network of rural cooperatives, farmers' banks and other institutions are bringing to them new housing, electricity, better diets and above all improved farm practices, diversified crops (including cash crops) and soaring farm production.

Banana export more than tripled between 1963 and 1965, with Japan the chief customer. It is about to double again. Taiwan is even exporting pineapples to Hawaii. It is usurping some of Cuba's former sugar markets. The joint committee introduced the artificial cultivation of mushrooms which, canned or dried, are sold abroad. From importing mushrooms a few years ago the free Chinese have switched to being the world's leading exporter. The sale of mushrooms alone pumps $20 million of foreign money in Taiwan a year.

Rice is of course the leading crop. The yield per acre under new methods and new incentives is now three times that of the Philippines and well ahead of the Asian rice-basket in Thailand, Vietnam and Burma. In 1965, Taiwan's rice farmers fed themselves, the civilian populace, and the 600,000-man army—and exported 200,000 tons to Japan and other rice-short areas of Asia. Over the years they had increased their yield per acre by 41 percent.

Other crops include watermelons, wine grapes, wheat, sweet potatoes, soybeans, tea, citrus, and fruits. Initially Taiwan imported most of its fertilizer. It still imports some, but has its own expanding fertilizer industry. All of these changes, raising the income of the least tiller of the soil, created a demand for goods that is the foundation of Taiwan's late-blooming industry. It was planned that way, and it works that way, in what the Free Chinese themselves have called an imported American revolution, largely in cash, but even more in concept.

America's huge foreign aid investment, before it ended, did not go to prime the pump of the Taiwan economy, but to build the foundation tools for future self-support. The bulk of it went into railroads, transportation, port facilities, powerplants, and other basic industrial developments.

Back in 1949, industrial growth was nearly impossible. Low per capita income, meager facilities, and the threat of Red China boded ill for future success. Coupled with that was the fact that the millions of refugees brought little with them out of the mainland and except strength, experience, and a determination to work. As if anything further were needed, a continued bad press abroad, of the kind the South Vietnamese are now getting, hardly encouraged the investment of foreign capital.

Red China rattled its sword against the insecure free Chinese. The Soviet Union thundered in the United Nations that Chiang must give up his seat there to the mainland Communists. Indeed, the United States only recognized how important an ally Chiang's government might be when the mainland Reds showed their true colors in Korea in 1950. Then President Truman ordered the U.S. 7th Fleet to the Taiwan Straits to protect the Nationalists, and in 1951 we shoveled in military aid to modernize Chiang's aging army. With the end of the Korean war the free Chinese got their first big morale boost over the Communists when over 14,000 Red Chinese prisoners of war in Korea elected to go to Taiwan instead of being returned home—a hard piece of evidence to support Chiang's claim today that the huge Red Chinese army might fall apart in the face of a successful beachhead on the Chinese mainland.

In 1954, we signed the Sino-American Mutual Defense Treaty with Taiwan. In 1958, Red China put Chiang and our treaty to the test by bombing Quemoy and Matsu. Chiang's army stood up to the barrage and answered in kind while President Eisenhower sternly warned that our Navy would intervene if necessary. It wasn't necessary. The Communist simmered down to a long war of propaganda and threat.

Increasingly since 1958, the world has had to take the free Chinese seriously, though every Communist calumny against them still finds broadcasters and listeners all over the world. Unless the recent swings in world sentiment against the Red Chinese alter the situation, Taiwan may yet be voted out of the United Nations next year. Earlier this year that seemed certain, as the U.S. effort to keep China's "big power" seat from the Reds lost ground. Now, with nations like Ghana throwing out rulers like Nkrumah and expelling their Red Chinese advisers, Chiang may possibly have a new life in the U.N.

But the free Chinese are getting to the point where it would be an embarrassment to the U.N. to oust them. It would certainly be an oddity if the only underdeveloped nation to succeed, and the only one to lift its poor to a new life and a new future, were kicked out of the council of nations. For what Taiwan achieved in agriculture, it is now repeating in industry. In 1958, the free Chinese on Taiwan paid $105 million more for imports than for what they sold abroad, the mark of a sick economy. By 1964, trade both ways had tripled, and the balance of trade was then $52.7 million in their favor. It increased $32 million in a single year. Of Taiwan's exports, 40 percent are her own manufactures, another 40 percent are processed farm products—canned goods, refined sugar, etc. Raw foods are now only 20 percent. Growing industries include aluminum, plastics in many forms, steel pipe, fertilizer, petroleum, and other chemical products and automobiles. The Yue Loong Cedric is a smart, small auto and Yue Loong also turns out station wagons, jeeps, trucks, scooters, and diesel engines. Tatung Engineering Co. in Taipei puts out a host of household and kitchen appliances and industrial equipment; air conditioners, freezers, TV and stereo equipment, radios, meters, motors, pumps, machine tools, castings, pots, pans, toasters, roasters, washing machines, and such.

The overall economic record is fantastic when put against the yardstick of virtual hopelessness 17 years ago—perhaps even more so when compared to the record of the mainland Communists. In 1965, Taiwan's total foreign trade passed the $1 billion mark. Every second can of mushrooms on U.S. supermarket shelves came from there. She is the world's No. 2 sugar exporter, the leading canned pineapple shipper, the leading exporter of portland cement, the second biggest supplier of imported plywood boards in the United States. In 1965, she was the biggest banana shipper in the world. The free Chinese believe that in 5 years Taiwan will rank with the world's major suppliers of electronic manufacturers. Seven big foreign firms are building electronics plants there—including Philco and other U.S. firms and Phillips (Norelco) of Holland. The per capita income of the free Chinese in 1965 was 3 times that of the mainland Reds.

To get industry going in the early days, the Taipei government turned existing Japanese firms into state-owned manufacturing plants. Its first step to induce private ownership, investment and management to take over was the paying off of landlords in stocks and bonds for their land. The money received by the land sales was plowed into risky industrial ventures. Private ownership was then sought for those that succeeded, and proceeds reinvested in new ventures.

Incentives for foreign investment were offered in several ways. No restrictions were placed on foreign firms taking their profits out of the county. A free trading zone was established. New foreign firms were given a 5-year tax holiday, a ceiling was set on company taxes until 1970, and permanent corporate tax breaks were written into law.

Outside capital investment in industry on Taiwan rose from $2 million in 1959 to an estimated $50 million in 1965. Numerous small Japanese firms started the movement. Overseas Chinese from Hong Kong and Malaysia followed. Today, of 27,500 industrial plants, 80 percent are privately owned. By last summer the Wall Street Journal noted that favorable regulations, an abundance of labor and "Taiwan's stable, prospering economy are leading more U.S. companies * * * to build plants on the island."

The Journal noted that industrial production on Taiwan had increased 400 percent in 12 years while farm output doubled. It added: "These increases have pushed living standards up at a startling rate for Asia, despite one of the world's highest rates of population growth * * *. Per capita income in a dozen years has increased 60 percent, giving the Taiwanese a standard of living exceeded in Asia only by Japan."

The Journal listed such U.S. firms as Gulf Oil, National Distillers & Chemical, Allied Chemical, Socony Mobil, National Brewery Chemical, General Instrument, and Louis Marx among those building or planning to build plants on Taiwan, to produce things ranging from synthetic fiber materials and polyesterene to toys.

Many other U.S. firms are there. Procter & Gamble makes some of its Tide on Taiwan, Singer sewing machine is there, so is Pfizer in the drug field.

The obvious secret of Taiwan's economic miracle is plain hard work flowing from an almost religious dedication to succeed that hasn't flagged in 17 years. Eighteen hours a day, 7 days a week is not an uncommon voluntary work stint for many free Chinese in a land with stifling humidity. In Taipei not long ago I saw people in threadbare clothes, but not once was I stopped by a beggar. Some looked worn out, but it was from work, not hunger. I saw youngsters in the street after midnight, not loitering but working—be it in an outdoor kitchen or selling melons. Once I saw a line of young women waiting for a cold permanent at 11 p.m. They didn't have dates, I was told. They just wanted to look neat, and their day's labors didn't let them get to it sooner.

The labors and the achievements of the free Chinese are a point of national and individual pride. By far the greatest monument to that spirit is the Cross-Island Highway, hacked across Taiwan's mountainous spine by the hands, hammers, picks, chisels, and shovels of an army of Chiang's retired soldiers. The Japanese, who occupied Taiwan from 1895 until it was returned to China by the Allies after World War II, had tried to build such a road but gave up. The rains, jungles and earthquakes of the mountains made the roadbuilding in many ways more difficult than such a project would be in the Andes or Alps. The old soldiers tackled the job voluntarily, and refused the Government's offer of bulldozers and other heavy equipment as a point of pride. So they chiseled the two-lane road into endless walls of marble and rock, hacked out tunnels with pick, shovel and dynamite, and spanned plunging precipices with hand-mixed concrete. Before they finished, the road had claimed 175 victims of construction accidents, landslides and earth tremors. But the road stands there, just the same.

During the whole 17 years of their saga in exile on Taiwan, the free Chinese have been on a war footing. Most of Chiang's original army grew old in service and has been retired. The veterans were retrained to fit into the growth economy of the island. Thirty thousand veterans, once unskilled in anything but soldiering, are today operating farms, contracting, quarrying marble, growing such temperature-climate fruit as peaches and pears (formerly unknown on Taiwan) along the mountain road they built, or following trades new to them. A corps of the veterans went into civilian life as an engineering brigade which now fulfills some of the biggest heavy equipment contracts on the island. The one-time notion that, when Chiang's army grew old, Taiwan would be ripe for conquest from the mainland fell afoul of the birth rate that soared with the economy. Taiwan is today one of the youngest nations on earth. Forty-five percent of the population is 14 years old or younger, 54 percent is 19 or younger, although the average life expectancy (more than 65 years) is far greater than in many Asiatic nations. One in every five people on Taiwan is a student. Forty-three colleges, universities, and junior colleges have sprung up, and Taiwan's 60,000 college students (including 10,000 overseas Chinese youngsters) represent a ratio of college attendance to population twice that of Britain's.

The roughly 6 million youngsters who were born on Taiwan share with their elders the conviction that the Chinese mainland is their home and they will return there some day. As they become of military age, they reinforce and rejuvenate Taiwan's 600,000-man armed forces, which, in discipline, skill, and dedication, are considered to be the elite of Asia. The threat of their invasion of the mainland is constantly tying up half of Peking's 3 million troops. Taiwan's readiness, even eagerness, to battle the Communists is a significant factor in Red China's reluctance to commit its troops in Vietnam or in a new adventure in Korea or elsewhere.

Recovery of the mainland is a constant preoccupation of most free Chinese. Almost to the last man and woman I found them convinced that mainland recovery is their best hope for national survival. With Red China sworn to swallow them, they look upon attack as their best defense, and are certain that to soften their aggressive posture would invite a Communist attack. Meanwhile, they maintain that if they could establish a beachhead on the mainland and hold it against attack, the Communist regime would begin to crumble from within. Most of the mainland masses, they say, are prisoners of an ideology they abhor—and the masses would like to see the Nationalists topple the Communist dictatorship. A young officer I spoke to said that Chinese history is full of unpopular regimes collapsing, in spite of seeming great power, in the face of a few reverses. He agreed fully with the claim of top officials that one or two successful free Chinese battles on the mainland, and the holding of a beachhead for 3 months, would bring the masses to their support and start the disintegration of the presently well-disciplined Red Chinese Army.

Few outsiders see "mainland recovery" as anything but a distant dream. But the Taiwanese claim better intelligence on the state of the mainland masses. Among the free Chinese are natives of every province in China, and they say that today they have agents living as natives in 27 of the mainland provinces. It is an open secret that the Taiwanese regularly overfly the mainland with U-2 spy planes purchased from the United States. In recent years four were shot down by the Reds, but they continue to fly. American foreknowledge of the Red Chinese nuclear weapons development is attributed to the free Chinese intelligence network in China.

Even the Nationalists concede that they could not seize and hold a mainland beachhead today without the protective umbrella of the U.S. 7th Fleet, without U.S. material support or without the psychological advantage of a U.S. alliance. But they are not only willing, but eager, to do their own fighting on the mainland. While they have no hope that the United States will embark on such a venture with them as a matter of choice, they are virtually certain that the course of events in Asia will afford unexpected and even unpreventable opportunities, for which they propose to be ready.

On the top level, a 2,000-man board of strategists and specialists, known as the War Region Services Team, shapes and reshapes the plans for mainland recovery. Its director, Gen. Ho Yin-chin, outlined the basic stages for me:

1. Protection of Taiwan in an open war with the Communists, and full mobilization of men and resources for counterattack;

2. Temporary military administration of the occupied mainland, including immediate recruitment of local populations into Nationalist ranks, and

3. Postwar national reconstruction on the mainland, from the central government down to the last provincial office.

Special brigades—natives of or specialists in the mainland areas they would occupy—constantly train for their occupation and reconstruction duties.

The free Chinese armed forces, though one-sixth the size of the Red Chinese forces are formidable for their purpose. In relation to population, they are the equivalent of a standing army of 9 million in the United States. In order to outnumber them significantly in an invasion of, say, the Fukien coast, the Red Chinese would have to meet the challenge of how well they could maintain mastery over their own people and protect their long borders if they withdrew their best troops from vast areas. Their problem is not unlike that of Hitler when we planned to invade Normandy in World War II.

Gen. Wallace Greene, Jr., Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, recently witnessed a 200-man Taiwan marine exercise assault on an "enemy" beach bunker. "The battalion," he said, "performed tasks required of a marine amphibious assault team, a British commando unit and a German Alpine mountain-climbing troop, all at the same time."

A typical Nationalist soldier is under 20 years of age, highly literate, probably a weapons specialist. He has tough jungle training behind him and a hated image of mainland Communist usurpers before him. Each year, 200,000 youngsters rejuvenate the force. A half million are in active reserve. Another million men with solid military training in the past could be mustered fast during general mobilization.

The army can handle Nike-Hercules missiles. Most of its divisions are fully motorized. The 80,000-man air force counts several thousand highly trained pilots who are currently phasing out F-104G fighters, replacing them with supersonic F-5A's to meet the MIG-21 Communist challenge. The 600 Nationalist jets supplement American airpower on the Pescadore Islands, Okinawa, and Guam.

Taiwan's 80,000-man navy shares policing duties in Taiwan Strait with the U.S. 7th Fleet. The two navies are fairly well integrated, with the free Chinese concentrating mainly on combat escort, antisubmarine and antimine warfare, and amphibious operations. Militarily, Taiwan is a cork in Mao Tse-tung's throat.

Ever since the Reds failed to take Quemoy by direct invasion in 1949, and by trying to bombard it out of existence in 1958, a "polite war" has been waged about this island whose Taiwanese guns command the mainland harbor of Amoy, as well as its sister island of Matsu controlling the mouth of the Ming River. On "uneven" days there is shelling back and forth, to the tune of about 50 shells from each side loaded with propaganda leaflets. On "even days" there is no shelling by either side. A free Chinese pilot flew me into Quemoy (which the Taiwanese call Kinmen) on a "no shelling" day—but even so he took no chances and our twin-engined transport was barely skimming the waves to duck enemy radar as we came in. The airstrip is long and surprisingly unscarred, despite the fact that Red guns could easily smash it within hours. The reason is that the Amoy harbor approaches and the large Communist railroad depot there could be as easily destroyed from Quemoy, so that surface facilities on each side are hostage to those on the other. There's little else on the surface of Quemoy that's worthy of attack. It offers a pastoral picture of a rural community with some heavily camouflaged fortifications, but no soldiers in sight.

The other Quemoy is the underground redoubt, where some 100,000 crack troops live, sleep, train, and play for from 6 months to a year at a stretch, with their heavy guns trained on the mainland to repel another enemy attack, or become the springboard for the long-awaited "mainland recovery."

The command post of the island is in a huge cave auditorium with thick stone walls which can double as a theater and field hospital.

On Quemoy, I saw hundreds of sunburned frogmen planning and rehearsing daily underwater chores under enemy guns and field glasses. At night, groups of them carefully dodge Quemoy's underwater boobytraps, and cross over to the shore to pierce similar defenses on the Communist side. They probe the enemy shoreline, engage in hit-run missions against strategic targets or simply vanish among the teeming mainland masses to collect military intelligence. Some of them report back in due time. Others—equipped with clothes, ration cards and identification papers, as well as the appearance and dialects of the people of the provinces—join Communist communes with tens of thousands of ever-shifting, restless mainlanders. They contact malcontents, potential revolutionary leaders, and men who could be counted on to fight in the hour of need.

In the early 1950's few such agents survived. But military intelligence officers told me that nowadays discipline on the mainland is so slack that the number of trained Nationalist underground contacts in Red China runs into many thousands.

Over a million Chinese women have received military training, and quite a few Chinese Wacs serve on Quemoy. Nor have they been defeminized in the military. While they can toss hand grenades as well as the men, they also mend socks for frontline troops, dress wounds, and in other ways bring the woman's touch to the lonely outpost. I chatted with two Wacs on Quemoy, Maj. Lian Ti-yung, 32, and Capt. Hu Yung-ti, 27 and a mother of two. Both outrank their soldier husbands. Theirs is a volunteer stint. Captain Hu told me: "We stay on Quemoy 6 months, some of the boys remain up to a year. Many of them are volunteers, too. Discipline is iron, and there is little or no grumbling. The men realize that frequent rotation under Communist guns is impossible, so they take hardship quietly."

The Nationalists feel so secure on Quemoy that President Chiang Kai-shek has been a frequent visitor there. Today, at 78 and straight as a ramrod, Chiang remains the only natural leader of the free Chinese and their aspirations. Yet, unlike many Asian nations—particularly the newer ones—Taiwan has an enormous corps of able leadership. Its government bureaus and agencies, as well as its industry and public institutions, are in the hands of thousands of topflight executives—virtually the cream of the one-time government of mainland China, now reinforced by new ranks of junior executives out of the colleges. By contrast, Sukarno—the head of Indonesia's Government—has often been taken up with such things as approving who would be sent as a guide to the United Nations, a routine matter that would be layers of government apart from Chiang on Taiwan.

Today, Chiang's health seems unflagging, and his working schedule is as rigid and precise as a Swiss watch. He remains the living symbol of a China that refuses to be conquered.

Now in her midsixties, Madam Chiang Kai-shek is an Asian legend. She has lived out of suitcases, fighting Chinese warlords, Japanese invaders, and Communist enslavers. A missionary by spirit, a revolutionary by trade, a chainsmoker by habit and obstinate by necessity, Madam can ooze charm or lash out in burning anger. She is the only woman who once ran her husband's air force. A Wellesley graduate, life turned her into a tough political infighter, and she is credited with a large role in her husband's major decisions. Madam sits in on diplomatic audiences, runs the Wacs, is the country's principal troubleshooter, and at the same time remains the chief depository of traditional Chinese culture, charm, and poise.

The preservation of Chinese culture in the face of Communist attempts to erase its centuries-old character is a major platform of the free Chinese world position. Today, overseas Chinese, of whom there are millions around the globe, look to Taiwan as the repository of their heritage. Thousands of them come to Taipei each year to celebrate the Sun Yat-sen revolution against the empire in 1911, in which Chiang first rose to national prominence. Last November, as it became evident in the United Nations that the time was drawing near when U.N. votes might cast the free Chinese out of that organization in favor of the mainland Communists, Taiwan's Ambassador, Liu Chien, included in a lengthy recounting of the crimes of the Communists the following passage:

"The Chinese Communist creed of force and violence is alien to the peaceful traditions of the Chinese people who, imbued with the spirit of Confucianism, practice the doctrine of the golden mean, abjure fanaticism, and abhor war. The basic traits of the Chinese character are reasonableness, moderation, and tolerance. This is the reason why we say that the Chinese Communists are un-Chinese in character and un-Chinese in purpose, and as such are not qualified to represent the Chinese people in this international organization."

And on Taiwan, Nancy Yu-huang, whom we quoted earlier, held the preservation of Chinese culture high on the list of free Chinese aspirations and achievements, as she wrote:

"The Peiping regime has cut itself away from the main Chinese historical stream and has thrown overboard all traditional cultural and moral values. Gone is the family system. Gone are filial piety, the sanctity of marriage, fraternal love between brothers and sisters and the entire Confucian system of human conduct and morals. In their stead the Communists have enthroned the party and the state and have taught blind obedience to the party line. * * * The individual is submerged, and his dignity, which we Chinese value as much as westerners do, is nonexistent under Communist dispensation. * * * But Chinese civilization and culture have not disappeared from the earth. Though the Reds try to eradicate every vestige of [mainland] Chinese civilization and culture, increasing numbers of foreign students and tourists have been coming to Taiwan to witness the fact that here they can see and experience the best elements of our cultural values, in schools and colleges, in libraries and museums, in families, in conversation with friends or strangers. They go home to tell of the miracle that has been wrought by 12 million freedom-loving Chinese in the short space of 17 years, on a wartorn island turned into a prosperous and stable community, still preserving an image of China and the Chinese as a civilized nation and a respectable member of the family of nations."

NEW JERSEY STUDY SHOWS CHILD NUTRITION ACT WOULD SHARPLY REDUCE MILK CONSUMPTION IN SCHOOLS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as we all know, the administration has introduced legislation which would slash the funding for the special milk program for schoolchildren by 80 percent from $103 million to $21 million. Just what impact would this cut have on milk consumption in the Nation's schools?

A recent study by the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station indicates that this impact will be substantial. The study finds that in New Jersey the price per half pint of milk served in schools without a lunch program will go up by about 1 cent per half pint, while the milk sold at schools with a lunch program will go up a whopping 4 cents per half pint or more than double. Finally, the price per half pint to private childcare and training institutions would increase by about 3 cents, according to the study.

The study then goes on to estimate the percentage drop caused by these increased prices which would raise the cost of a half pint of milk to as much as 7 cents. This is conservatively estimated as between 6 percent and 13.2 percent. As a result milk consumption could drop by 20 million half pints.

I know that the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee will take these figures into account when it considers the need for increasing program funds. Certainly the House is to be commended for keeping the program at last year's level of $103 million.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article by Don McLean which appeared in the Washington Daily News on April 26.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(By Don Maclean)

I visited police headquarters the other night to make the rounds with juvenile squad detectives. Along one wall at juvenile division runs a card file of youthful offenders, ages 17 and less. Police pulled a couple of cards at random. One card belonged to a 12-year-old boy. He has been arrested 13 times, starting with petty theft and working his way up to housebreaking. Generally, after being pulled in and found guilty, a judge has released the lad to the custody of his parents. This fun-loving tyke is back on the street right now.

Another card: A 15-year-old boy, charged with unauthorized use of a car. The day after his arrest he was released in the custody of his parents. He dropped from their sight outside the courthouse and stole another car to drive home. "That's the way it is," a policeman said. "We pick 'em up and a judge lets 'em go." The law here is working under a handicap: The Juvenile Code was written in 1904 and amended only once, back in 1938.

Detectives William A. Mulloy and William J. Johns drove me out to a precinct station where two boys, ages 8 and 9, are being held. The kids were charged with setting fire to a vacant house. It is the same house they set fire to only 5 days before. On that occasion they were arrested, too. They were released to their parents by a judge. One mother came to the station the night of the second fire. The other mother refused to leave her house. The detectives patiently talked to both youngsters. From listening, even an amateur psychiatrist could tell both boys needed help. And society needed their confinement until they got it.

The owner of the house arrived. He said he's been trying to rent the place and had only begun to fix it up after the last fire. He wondered if he should start again, or would the house be ablaze next week? So far the case had consumed 2 hours for two detectives; the paperwork involved, getting it ready for court, would take another 2. Maybe this time the kids will be confined. Maybe not.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I also wish to include in the Record at this point a story which appeared in the Washington Star of April 27 dealing with the rape of a 74-year-old woman in the Northwest area of Washington.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Northwest Woman, 74, Raped, Robbed in Her Apartment

A 74-year-old woman was raped and robbed of $20 in her second-floor apartment in the Washington Circle area of Northwest yesterday afternoon, police said.

Police said the woman, a retired Government worker, was attacked about 3:45 p.m. by a young man who entered the apartment through an unlocked door and grabbed her.

Sex Squad detectives said the woman was choked and hit on the head with a fist, and was left in a closet tied up with a rope when the man fled.

She managed to free herself within minutes and sought help from neighbors. The woman was treated at the District of Columbia General Hospital.

Police said they were looking for an 18- to 21-year-old Negro, 5 feet 5 inches tall and slender. Police said the woman told detectives that 15 minutes before the attack, the same man knocked on her door and made inquiries about newspaper delivery service.

THE SHRIMP INDUSTRY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Senators from those States which border our Nation or which have active fishery industries operating near border areas, are well aware of the valuable services which are performed by the Office of the Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife in the Department of State.

In Texas we have a sizable shrimping industry, which brings in about $26 million in revenue each year, and the Office has been particularly helpful in handling and working out on a government-to-government basis difficulties which may arise between our fishing interests and shrimpers from other countries. The arrangement has, for the most part, proved quite satisfactory and the Office has won the respect of the shrimp industry in my State.

In a few words, the Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife formulates and coordinates policy and action with respect to conservation and exploitation of international fish and wildlife resources, safeguarding the rights and interests of American fishermen on the high seas and off the coasts of other countries. This Office is responsible for providing representation on international fishery commissions, and has primary responsibility for formulating and negotiating international fish and wildlife treaties and agreements.

However, staff limitations and other difficulties relating to size of the Office have become apparent during the past several years, at a time when there has been an increase in the magnitude and number of the problems confronting fisheries. Accordingly, there have been suggestions recently that the status of the Office be upgraded.

Several weeks ago Senator Magnuson sent a letter to Secretary Rusk indicating his support of this proposal. The letter was signed by Senators from several other States with fishing industries which utilize the services of this Office.

I would like to insert at this time, a copy of my recent letter to Senator Magnuson in which I offer my support for this proposal. It is my hope that action can be taken soon to assure that the valuable services of this Office are not curtailed or hampered by an inadequate staff allotment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
April 29, 1966.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: It is my understanding that there have been suggestions to upgrade the Office of the Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife in the Department of State, and that you, along with a number of other Senators, contemplate meeting with the appropriate authorities in the executive branch to discuss this matter.

I am well aware and most appreciative of the valuable services performed by this important office, and I want to assure you of my wholehearted support for the plan. The Office has been most helpful in dealing with problems in its area in my own State, and I would not want to see its activities unduly hampered by a staff allotment of inadequate size.

I would appreciate it if you could have someone on the committee keep me informed of further developments in this matter, and I, for my part, will be happy to offer whatever assistance I can in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

John G. Tower.

OBLIGATIONS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, Associate Commissioner Mario T. Noto of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service recently gave a speech which all public servants should take cognizance of. The Holy Name Society was holding its first annual communion breakfast, and Mr. Noto took this opportunity to sound out the "Obligations of Public Service."

As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I feel the Associate Commissioner has touched upon some vital aspects of the demand for improved public service. With our growing Government and expanding society, we must improve the quality as well as the quantity of civil servants.

The Government of this land is made up of men and women who carry out the day-to-day labors of administration, while exercising sound judgment, disseminating ideas and exploring new ones, answering the queries of the public, and discharging the other duties which they owe to society.

The increasing demands of government and its peoples, combined with the complexities of the times, requires a more responsible and respected public servant.

As Mr. Noto pointed out:

> Each civil servant should apply the adage, "I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I can do, I ought to do. And what I ought to do, by God's grace, I will do."

Those in public service should have the respect commensurate with their position, but we shall never have more respect than we demand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Associate Commissioner Noto's speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OBLIGATIONS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

(Remarks by Mario T. Noto, Associate Commissioner, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, before the first annual communion breakfast of the Holy Name Society, at the Sheraton Atlantic Hotel, New York, N.Y., April 24, 1966)

I am honored at your invitation to address the first annual communion breakfast of the Holy Name Society of the New York district of our service. Returning to New York, even if only for a brief interlude, is always a pleasant event, and being asked to say a few words to you makes it an exciting challenge.

I am here by your invitation which I was pleased to receive and delighted to accept. I have come because I believe it is opportune and important to address myself to you on some of the obligations and demands of public service which should be brought into sharp focus.

As I stand before you, I am hoping that none of you is like the man who, although he had consumed too much alcoholic beverage, went to church to hear the sermon. Soon, after he was seated, the effects of the liquor placed him into sound slumber. The preacher reached a climax of eloquence—and he called out for all those on the side of the Lord to stand up. They all stood up. After they were seated again, the preacher yelled in a thunderous voice "and now those on the side of the Devil stand up." The shout awakened the befuddled parishioner who had been asleep. He stood up slowly and looking around, turned to the preacher and said, "Preacher, I'll stick by you, but it seems that you and I are in a hopeless minority." I am optimistic that you and I will not be in the minority when we affirm the obligations which we owe in the service of the people.

It would be unwise for me to offer technical advice or counsel to you on immigration and naturalization matters. On such, I concede with no reluctancy that your proficiency excels that which my office allegedly cloaks me with. Neither am I here to provide, nor would I be so foolhardy to attempt to provide wisdom or understanding which you already do have. What brings me here is my deep conviction of duty to talk to you about obligations and responsibilities which we, in the Government service, must fulfill to the public which employs us. They are the things we think about, know about, but speak softly or little of. The event of this first annual breakfast and the gathering of service employee provide a proper and timely forum where we may surface and reaffirm the true significance and thrust of our obligations.

To a dedicated group as this—the Holy Name Society—I want to project some thoughts which may provoke a reexamination of and rededication to ideals and concepts which perhaps through the passage of time have eroded or diminished in perspective. I am one of you and belong with you. For many years I have dwelled not in marble halls, but within the fiery and explosive sanctum of the central office of our service. Although, from the field it appears a sanctuary—dispell all illusions—it provides at most only veiled impunity. From time to time it is necessary to descend from its pretense of insulation, and taste the experience and share the trials and tribulations of the men and women in line operations. They are the backbone of the service.

It is my hope that I may leave behind with you some thoughts which may serve as the basis for constructive and effective use. Perhaps together we may contribute further to the public we serve, in fulfilling our responsibilities as members of a proud agency priceless in heritage, acclaimed in achievement and symbolic of the amalgamated foreign blood which has and continues to enrich America.

Whether or not people are members of or dedicated to the religious beliefs of any particular church none can accept their accountability to God. We all serve in the army of a church and pursue the objectives and aspirations of all God-fearing peoples—decency, respect, dignity, and an unwavering regard for the privileges and rights of our fellow man. But while we gather to pay tribute to our God through your society, we must also pursue for a reflective look at our responsibilities to the mortal—man. We find no escape or release from accounting to Him.

I am convinced that the basic rules of true success in our human relations remain unchanged. They not only can be measured in the terms of how effectively we serve our God but also our fellow man. These rules have been impressed since the beginning of time. They do not change. Their values remain constant.

You and I are members of the corps of men and women who serve the people through our Government. To that end we have sworn to give our might and our most efficient and dedicated efforts. We must remember that we are servants to the individual people—for the true foundation of American Government is structured in the concept that the Government must serve its people. The mushrooming growth of Government and its ever-spreading impact upon our lives has created more demands for Government services—and it is only proper and fitting for people to call for need of their Government. But as the tempo of time increases, a question arises in my mind. Does the civil servant possess the luster of the earlier era? Does he retain the confidence of the people? Does he give willingly of himself in a spirit of dedication and responsibility? If we are unable to provide simple answers to these questions, they must be established through an examination of ourselves.

The complexities of our time and increasing pressures demand a higher standard of performance by the civil servant. And with these our answerability to the people and Government becomes more exacting.

We assert and clamor for our rights. And this is only just. For of what import are rights unless they are exercised? But what about our duties? There are halfway civil servants who eagerly avail themselves of every right and privilege which belongs to them. And yet, they blantantly refuse to discharge the liabilities which they owe to a free society by virtue of being Federal employees. In so varied a field as ours, where we deal daily with human beings who may be in plight, fear, or need for assistance, it is inevitable that misunderstandings, frustrations, and difficulties will be encountered in the relationship between the Government and the individual. Yet, these should not be the cushions for our shortcomings.

At times there are troublesome symptoms which tend to be present in the attitude of the Government employee. When these appear they are indicative of a lack of regard for the human element and an indifference to the needs or feelings of people. Sometimes these attitudes stem from expediency exercised in the name of necessity or propriety. Yet, our attitudes mirror our beliefs and they can make our actions increasingly marginal in worthiness, if not indefensible.

With the public, the slightest delay or indifferent reaction provides the cause to blame the difficulties on the Government agency. And it is easy for people to transfer responsibility for errors or delays to the civil servant. While this is easy, it is also self-deluding. But before accepting or rejecting responsibility for error or indifference, we in Government must ask ourselves whether this is of our own making or simply a passing of the buck by the people.

What then can we do to conscientiously fulfill the responsibility and trust which has been vested in us as employees of our Government? Each of us as civil servants must apply the adage that "I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I can do, I ought to do. And what I ought to do, by God's grace, I will do."

Each of us must avoid the inequities which may be engendered by race, color, creed or national origin. Each of us must have no room in the discharge of our duties to ventilate personal feelings on people. Each of us must affirm the integrity of our dedication to help those who need our assistance. Each of us must retain complete objectivity and assure that every privilege or right which a man may be entitled to is asserted for him. We cannot and must not remain complacent where public necessity requires determined action. And above all, each of us must never forget that as Federal employees we are officers of the Government and its agents in the preservation of the heritage which requires the impartial administration of justice.

It is so essential that to the public we provide understandable information; that we provide prompt and comprehensive response to their queries; that we provide a balanced and dispassionate approach to crises which may ignite personal or false thinking; and that we provide positive leadership for new and creative ideas which will improve the public service.

It is indispensable that we be sure of the facts upon which our determinations are made. When the facts are certain then our decisions must be clear and sharp. It would not be candid to believe that we are right all the time, but certainly we can strive to attain such goal. Our product must reflect objective, conscientious and fair decisions with due regard for the elements which affect the lives of human beings. We must enhance our ability to communicate our reasoning and actions to the public and be tolerant to those who seek and need the comfort and help of their Government.

Above all—let us remember that while aspiration is one thing, achievement is another.

Our accomplishments are tabulated in the faces and places, near and far, that our Service has brightened and invested with hope; in the lives we have rekindled with confidence and in the love born in the unity of families we have joined.

Our actions create our image, our traditions, our reasoning, and our conscience. When the civil servant falters, it is our Government that suffers. The stronger the civil servant, the stronger the confidence in Government.

Today, expanding Government creates a need for greater confidence in its institutions and in our agencies. This need has been accelerated and continues to increase because of the growing demands of modern society and the perplexities of law and regulations which affect the daily lives of all persons to an extent undreamed of in this century. Thus our human relations with the people we come into contact with must reflect not only our sense of duty to people but they must also earn their respect and confidence.

I believe that Government is a trust and that we the officers of our Government are the trustees. And both the trust and trustees have been created for the benefit of the people. Too often some civil servants become contented and ensconced within the framework of civil service with a false sense of immunity from accounting to the public and Government for their failures or indifference as representatives of the Government. This false insulation may well be shattered with the realization that there is no immunity; instead there is liability not only to the public, but to Government itself. It should be our duty to make it difficult for people to do wrong and to make it easy for them to do right.

I approach the close of my remarks. And I take license to make some personal observations. I have visited many offices of our Service not only as a necessity but as a privilege. Amidst our employees I find sincere and deep dedication to high professional standards; I find devotion, recognition, and acceptance of public responsibility which reflects their pride and esteem to be representatives of our Government.

In my many travels and encounters with the public, I find a profound respect and admiration for our service and its employees. Throughout the length and breadth of our Nation there is found public acknowledgement and confident acceptance of our sense and purpose of direction. I am filled with a personal feeling of vanity to be included among the ranks of our employees. Each passing day adds to the toll of my time as a servant of the people and the years add to my pride. My convictions are reinforced that we are serving and shall continue to serve the people loyally and to the full measure of our abilities. The passage of time adds new and challenging dimensions to dedication and devotion to duty. Together we shall meet them and fulfill them.

As this Holy Name Society meets here, we need pray to God that He will continue to grant us the serenity to accept the things which we cannot change; the courage to change the things which lie within our power; and finally to continue our wisdom to know the difference.

As for myself, if I may borrow from the 23d Psalm of David in the Old Testament, I can truly say to my fellow employees that "my cup runneth over."

WHAT IS AMERICA TO ME?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there are those who say patriotism is dead, and no doubt there are those among them who join also in the cry that "God is dead."

While I happen to be one of those who believes that neither one's patriotism nor his faith in a Supreme Being requires a defense, I feel it is worthwhile to call attention to some positive statements, particularly in behalf of patriotism and what this great country means to two young individuals in my home State of South Dakota.

Mr. President, the American Legion Auxiliary of Howard, S. Dak., recently sponsored an essay contest entitled "What Is America to Me?" The first-place winner is James Feldhaus and the second-place winner is Kathi Bradbury.

The essays by these youngsters were printed in the April 29 issue of the Miner County Pioneer newspaper of Howard. I believe they are worthy of being brought to the attention of the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that the article containing the essays be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS AMERICA TO ME?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following essays on the subject "What Is America to Me?" were selected as first and second place winners in an essay contest sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary in Howard. The essay by James Feldhaus was first place winner and the essay by Kathi Bradbury was second place winner.)

(By James Feldhaus)

America to me is land of freedom, a land with a future.

I think it is good to stop and think just how good our beautiful land is. She is like a mother who's tending her children. Her horizons are like the mother's arms who draw her children close together. When the bright sun comes up in the morning it is as if she were awakening her children. Then she watches us through the day, working and playing and at nightfall she draws her arms together and wraps us in a blanket of darkness. Then as we fall asleep we have the feeling she'll watch over us during the night, and then awake us again at dawn.

Just when our mother was starting out in the 1500's she showed signs of love and consideration for her children. When the first settlers came over looking for freedom and a future she showed them it. On her lap (the soils) she gave them food and water. From her soils America has flourished, and molded her children to help themselves. On her soils the freedom she promised was fought for and given the reward, democracy. She has been so good that she is now blessing other lands with her love. She is always ready to dress the wounds of smaller neighbors.

In America we are given freedom of religion and speech. It's like being gathered around the family table, discussing the problems of the day, giving each other suggestions and ideas.

We the Americans show our gratitude by patrotism, which means love of one's country. This is proven every day. Take for instance, the Vietnam war, where so many Americans are fighting for their mother, upholding freedom.

Patriotism is love of the customs and traditions of this land. It's a feeling of oneness and membership in this Nation. It's also the attachment to the land and the people, as well as devotion to the welfare of the land. These men who are fighting are showing all of these. They are not the only patriots. The men who are venturing out to outer-space show also a patriotism. They show a great love, risking their lives to conquer the outer space. When outer space is conquered our motherland will be able to offer her children other planets.

This is why I cannot see why there are men who would stoop so low as to protest and burn their draft cards. To me serving one's country would be one of the greatest privileges on earth.

(By Kathi Bradbury)

"Oh, beautiful, for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain, for purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain."

This is one American's description of his homeland. America is a land of variety. Lakes, rivers, plains, mountains, forests, and badlands add to her physical beauty. America is a land of great mineral wealth and it promises much potential for future generations.

America is an adventure story about cowboys and Indians, explorers, wars, rockets, and progress.

America is the mother of many great men. She has watched statesmen such as George Washington and Abraham Lincoln; inventors like Edison and Fulton; military heroes, like Pershing; and athletes, humanitarians, authors, musicians, and educators grow up under her wing.

America is freedom. We can say, do, think, and write whatever we please, as long as we don't infringe upon the rights of others. We can travel where we please, buy what we please, and work when we please. America is what we make it. It is our duty to vote for responsible representatives and to be educated on current issues if we want to preserve democracy.

America is hotdogs, hamburgers, popcorn, and peanuts; it is baseball, football, and basketball games and cheering crowds. America is competition in sports, in contests of every kind, in business and in society. Each individual has a chance to win and to better himself.

America is a mixture of people from almost every other nation on earth. People of different colors, creeds and religions live and work together peacefully and happily. America invites the tired, the poor, and the huddled masses of the world to come to her and find a new happiness that is to be found nowhere else on earth.

From my desk in study hall I can see America. It is a flag waving outside a school, where everyone has equal educational opportunities. It is a church that is neither state-run nor state-controlled. It is a policeman driving down the road insuring us of our protections and reminding us of our duties as citizens. It is the rooftops of businesses which practice free enterprise.

Happiness is living in America.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it was my great privilege as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, to witness yesterday at the White House the signing of S. 2729, a bill to increase the ceiling on the Small Business Administration's revolving loan fund—a bill which, in President Johnson's words, "will make the Small Business Administration a more effective friend of small business in America."

I invite attention to the fact that the policy of the Government to sell mortgages now held by the Federal National Mortgage Association as rapidly as the mortgage market permits, was set by President Eisenhower in 1954, and reiterated in 1955, in 1956, and in 1958. In 1963, Republicans took the lead in the House Ways and Means Committee in urging such sales by Government to private enterprise outlets.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's remarks occasioned by the enactment of this worthwhile bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

I welcome you here—Members of Congress, small business leaders, those in and out of Government who have worked long and hard to increase small business' share in the national prosperity.

I have invited you here for two reasons:

First, to ask you to witness the signing of a bill that will make the Small Business Administration a more effective friend of small business in America.

Second, to outline a progressive and reasonable method of financing the programs of SBA and other Government agencies.

There is an important relationship between these two. They are part of this Administration's effort to make sure that our Government assistance programs are wisely planned and organized, that they are supported by private efforts wherever possible, and that they are managed by the most competent men available for the public service.

The bill I will sign today allows SBA to set up two separate revolving funds—one for business loans, and one for disaster loans.

In this way the disruptions in the business loan program, which have sometimes occurred when disasters have struck various communities, can be avoided.

The bill also increases by $125 million the amount of loans SBA may have on its books at any one time. And we expect SBA to use this authority to serve more firms than ever before.

These are necessary changes, if the Agency is to carry out the small business program I have proposed for the coming fiscal year.

Our budget for fiscal year 1967 proposes that SBA make available about $725 million in loans, guarantees, and other commitments to small business. That is the largest amount of financing SBA has undertaken in its entire history. It is more than four times what the Agency accomplished in 1960.

This is an impressive program—as it must be, if it is to keep pace with the growth of small business during the past 4 years.

There are about 300,000 more small business firms operating in America today than there were 4 years ago.

There were 20 percent fewer failures among all businesses last year, than there were in 1961. You know only too well that the great part of those failures were among small businesses.

Profits after taxes in small manufacturing corporations were nearly three times greater in 1965 than they were in 1961.

Small business has taken a much greater share of military prime contract awards. In 1961 small firms obtained $3.6 billion of those awards. In 1965 the figure was $4.9 billion—an increase of 36 percent in 4 years.

So we are planning and working for a growth industry—for almost 5 million businesses, from the corner store to the small manufacturer—for those millions of men and women who by their initiative and determination and hope keep the wheels moving in our economy.

This bill is essential for their growth and development. But it is only half the answer to small business needs.

It gives SBA the authority to carry out our program for the coming year. But it does not give it any money.

We proposed to the Congress last year a new way of providing the funds necessary for our small business programs.

Today SBA has only a limited amount of money for its lending operations. That does not mean the Agency is without assets. Far from it. It has in its revolving fund—in its loan portfolio—loan paper worth almost $1½ billion.

These tremendous assests, owed to the SBA by those who have borrowed from it in past years, represent the taxpayer's money. Their representatives in Congress have appropriated it to the SBA over the years, to be invested in small business concerns.

But there is no reason for SBA to hold so large an inventory. It can and should be able to sell its loans to private investors. In that way, it should be able to generate new funds for it expanded lending programs.

SBA has long had the authority to sell its seasoned loans, as well as to make them. It has used that authority over the years—to provide new capital for assisting more small businesses.

What we are asking for is a more efficient and practical way of achieving that goal.

We want to authorize the SBA to sell participations in its loan portfolio—to sell shares in this great $1.5 billion pool of outstanding loans. Those shares would be guaranteed by the SBA, and sold to private investors large and small. The Federal National Mortgage Association, "Fannie Mae," will act as trustee.

Once the certificates are sold, the proceeds will come back to SBA. They will be available for lending to other dynamic small firms that are hungry for capital to produce and expand.

The legislation we have asked for to achieve this has passed the Senate. It is under active consideration in the House. It is as necessary for small business as it is sound for the Government.

SBA is not the only Federal agency in need of more effective financing authority. If selling certificates of participation makes sense for SBA, it makes sense as well in our other programs. That is why I have recommended that the Congress authorize the same sound fiscal procedures for agencies throughout the Government.

This policy is not original with this administration. In 1954, in 1955, in 1956, and again in 1958, President Eisenhower affirmed his belief that private capital should be gradually substituted for the Government's investment in housing mortgages.

In 1954, for example, President Eisenhower said: "The policy of this administration is to sell the mortgages now held (by the Federal National Mortgage Association) as rapidly as the mortgage market permits."

In 1955, again President Eisenhower made clear his position: "Private capital will be gradually substituted for the Government investment until the Government funds are fully repaid and the private owners take over responsibility for the program."

President Eisenhower appointed a Commission on Money and Credit, and in 1961 the Commission's report called once again for the maximum substitution of private for Federal credit.

In 1962 President Kennedy's Committee on Federal Credit Programs reported that "unless the urgency of other goals makes private participation infeasible, the methods used should facilitate private financing, and thus encourage longrun achievement of program objectives with a minimum of Government aid."

And as recently as 1963 the Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee, led by Congressmen BYRNES, CURTIS, UTT, BETTS, SCHNEEBELI, and COLLIER, argued that "the administration also can reduce its borrowing requirements by additional sales of marketable Government assets."

That is what we are trying to do through the general legislation we have offered to Congress. We are trying to further the substitution of private for public credit—wherever and whenever we can in our free enterprise system. We want to extend the principle of private participation to SBA, and to its sister agencies throughout the Government.

Now it is my great pleasure to sign my name to the Small Business Act Amendments of 1966.

NEW YORK TIMES RESPONSIBLY REPORTS ON THE CIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last week the New York Times published a series of five very illuminating articles concerning the Central Intelligence Agency.

The Times attached such significance to this series that it assigned several of its top writers, including Tom Wicker, Max Frankel, Bud Kenworthy, and John Finney to work as a team to research and write them.

As one would expect from this team, the Times series on the CIA was topnotch. It was illuminating, incisive, and responsible. The Times writers, avoiding the superficially sensational, raised a number of provocative questions about the CIA and provided substantial factual background to illuminate the search for the answers.

Because I deem these articles of considerable value to the current congressional discussion of the proper degree of congressional review of CIA activities, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times,
Apr. 25, 1966]

CIA: MAKER OF POLICY, OR TOOL?—SURVEY FINDS WIDELY FEARED AGENCY IS TIGHTLY CONTROLLED

(NOTE.—The Central Intelligence Agency, which does not often appear in the news, made headlines on two counts in recent days. The Agency was found to have interceded in the slander trial of one of its agents in an effort to obtain his exoneration without explanation except that he had done its bidding in the interest of national security. And it was reported to have planted at least five agents among Michigan State University scholars engaged in a foreign aid project some years ago in Vietnam. Although the specific work of these agents and the circumstances of their employment are in dispute, reports of their activities have raised many questions about the purposes and methods of the CIA, and about its relationship to other parts of the Government and nongovernmental institutions. Even larger questions about control of the CIA within the framework of a free government and about its role in foreign affairs are periodically brought up in Congress and among other governments. To provide background for these questions, and to determine what issues of public policy are posed by the Agency's work, the New York Times has spent several months looking into its affairs. This series is the result.

(Following is the first of five articles on the Central Intelligence Agency. The articles are by a team of New York Times correspondents consisting of Tom Wicker, John W. Finney, Max Frankel, E. W. Kenworthy, and other Times staff members.)

WASHINGTON.—One day in 1960 an agent of the Central Intelligence Agency caught a plane in Tokyo, flew to Singapore and checked into a hotel room in time to receive a visitor. The agent plugged a lie detector into an overloaded electrical circuit and blew out the lights in the building.

In the investigation that followed, the agent and a CIA colleague were arrested and jailed as American spies.

The result was an international incident that infuriated London, not once but twice. It embarrassed an American Ambassador. It led an American Secretary of State to write a rare letter of apology to a foreign chief of state.

Five years later that foreign leader was handed an opportunity to denounce the perfidy of all Americans and of the CIA in particular, thus increasing the apprehension of his oriental neighbors about the Agency and enhancing his own political position.

Ultimately, the incident led the U.S. Government to tell a lie in public and then to admit the lie even more publicly.

PERSISTENT QUESTIONS

The lie was no sooner disclosed than a world predisposed to suspicion of the CIA and unaware of what really had happened in Singapore 5 years earlier began to repeat questions that have dogged the Agency and the U.S. Government for years.

Was this secret body, which was known to have overthrown governments and installed others, raised armies, staged an invasion of Cuba, spied and counterspied, established airlines, radio stations and schools and supported books, magazines and businesses, running out of the control of its supposed political master?

Was it in fact damaging, while it sought to advance, the national interest? Could it spend huge sums for ransoms, bribes and subversion without check or regard for the consequences?

Did it lie to or influence the political leaders of the United States to such an extent that it really was an "invisible government" more powerful than even the President?

These are questions constantly asked around the world. Some of them were raised again recently when it was disclosed that Michigan State University was the cover for some CIA agents in South Vietnam during a multimillion-dollar technical assistance program the university conducted for the regime of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem.

Last week, it also became known that an Estonian refugee who was being sued for slander in a Federal district court in Baltimore was resting his defense on the fact that the alleged slander had been committed in the course of his duties as a CIA agent.

In a public memorandum addressed to the court, the CIA stated that it had ordered the agent, Juri Raus, to disclose no further details of the case, in order to protect the Nation's foreign intelligence apparatus. Mr. Raus is claiming complete legal immunity from the suit on the ground that he had acted as an official agent of the Federal Government.

Such incidents, bringing the activities of the CIA into dim and often dismaying public view, have caused Members of Congress and many publications to question ever more persistently the role and propriety of one of Washington's most discussed and least understood institutions. Some of the misgivings have been shared by at least two American Presidents, Harry S. Truman and John F. Kennedy.

A WIDE EXAMINATION

To seek reliable answers to these questions; to sift, where possible, fact from fancy and theory from condition; to determine what real questions of public policy and international relations are posed by the existence and operations of the CIA, the New York Times has compiled information and opinions from informed Americans throughout the world.

It has obtained reports from 20 foreign correspondents and editors with recent service in more than 35 countries and from reporters in Washington who interviewed more than 50 present and former Government officials, Members of Congress and military officers.

This study, carried out over several months, disclosed, for instance, that the Singapore affair resulted not from a lack of political control or from recklessness by the CIA, but from bad fortune and diplomatic blundering.

It found that the CIA, for all its fearsome reputation, is under far more stringent political and budgetary control than most of its critics know or concede, and that since the Bay of Pigs disaster in Cuba in 1961 these controls have been tightly exercised.

The consensus of these interviewed was that the critics' favorite recommendation for a stronger rein on the Agency—a congressional committee to oversee the CIA—would probably provide little more real control than now exists and might both restrict the Agency's effectiveness and actually shield it from those who desire more knowledge about its operations.

A MATTER OF WILL

Other important conclusions of the study include the following:

While the institutional forms of political control appear effective and sufficient, it is really the will of the political officials who must exert control that is important and that has most often been lacking.

Even when the control is tight and effective, a more important question may concern the extent to which CIA information and policy judgments affect political decisions in foreign affairs.

Whether or not political control is being exercised, the more serious question is whether the very existence of an efficient CIA causes the U.S. Government to rely too much on clandestine and illicit activities, back-alley tactics, subversion and what is known in official jargon as "dirty tricks."

Finally, regardless of the facts, the CIA's reputation in the world is so horrendous and its role in events so exaggerated that it is becoming a burden on American foreign policy, rather than the secret weapon it was intended to be.

The Singapore incident, with its bizarre repercussions 5 years later, is an excellent lesson in how that has happened, although none of the fears of the critics are justified by the facts of the particular case.

PROBLEM IN SINGAPORE

The ill-fated agent who blew out the lights flew from Tokyo to Singapore only after a prolonged argument inside the CIA. Singapore, a strategic Asian port with a large Chinese population, was soon to get its independence from Britain and enter the Malaysian Federation. Should CIA recruit some well-placed spies, or should it, as before, rely on MI–6, the British secret service, and on Britain's ability to maintain good relations and good sources in Singapore?

Allen W. Dulles, then director of the CIA, decided to infiltrate the city with its own agents, to make sure that the British were sharing everything they knew. Although the decision was disputed, it is not uncommon in any intelligence service to bypass or double-check on an ally.

(On Vice President HUMPHREY's visit late last year to the capitals of Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines, Secret Service agents found at least three "bugs," or listening devices, hidden in his private quarters by one of his hosts.)

The agent who flew from Tokyo to Singapore was on a recruiting mission, and the lie detector, an instrument used by the CIA on its own employees, was intended to test the reliability of a local candidate for a spy's job.

When the machine shorted out the lights in the hotel, the visiting agent, the would-be spy and another CIA man were discovered. They wound up in a Singapore jail. There they were reported to have been "tortured"—either for real, or to extract a ransom.

THE PRICE WAS HIGH

Secret discussions—apparently through CIA channels—were held about the possibility of buying the agents' freedom with increased American foreign aid, but Washington eventually decided Singapore's price was too high The men were subsequently released.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk—the Kennedy administration had succeeded to office in January 1961—wrote a formal apology to Premier Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore and promised to discipline the culprits.

That appeared to have ended the matter until last fall, when Premier Lee broke away from the Malaysian Federation and sought to establish himself for political reasons as more nearly a friend of Britain than of the United States, although his anti-Americanism was short of procommunism.

To help achieve this purpose, Mr. Lee disclosed the 1960 "affront" without giving any details, except to say that he had been offered a paltry $3.3 million bribe when he had demanded $33 million.

The State Department, which had been routinely fed a denial of wrongdoing by CIA officials who did not know of the Rusk apology, described the charge as false. Mr. Lee then published Mr. Rusk's letter of 1961 and threatened also to play some interesting tape recordings for the press.

Hastily, Washington confessed—not to the bribe offer, which is hotly denied by all officials connected with the incident, or to the incident itself, but to having done something that had merited an apology.

London, infuriated in the first instance by what it considered the CIA's mistrust of MI–6, now fumed a second time about clumsy tactics in Washington.

ACTING ON ORDERS

Errors of bureaucracy and mishaps of chance can easily be found in the Singapore incident, but critics of the CIA cannot easily find in it proof of the charges so often raised about the agency—"control," "making policy," and "undermining policy."

The agent in Singapore was acting on direct orders from Washington. His superiors in the CIA were acting within the directives of the President and the National Security Council. The mission was not contrary to American foreign policy, was not undertaken to change or subvert that policy, and was not dangerously foolhardy. It was not much more than routine—and would not have been unusual in any intelligence service in the world.

Nevertheless, the Singapore incident—the details of which have been shrouded in the CIA's enforced secrecy—added greatly to the rising tide of dark suspicion that many people throughout the world, including many in this country, harbor about the agency and its activities.

Carl Rowan, the former director of the U.S. Information Agency and former Ambassador to Finland, wrote last year in his syndicated column that "during a recent tour of east Africa and southeast Asia, it was made clear to me that suspicion and fear of the CIA has become a sort of Achilles heel of American foreign policy."

President Sukarno of Indonesia, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's Chief of State, President Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya, former President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana and many other leaders have repeatedly insisted that behind the regular American government there is an "invisible government," the CIA, threatening them all with infiltration, subversion and even war. Communist China and the Soviet Union sound this theme endlessly.

"The Invisible Government" was the phrase applied to American intelligence agencies, and particularly the CIA, in a book of that title by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross. It was a bestseller in the United States and among many government officials abroad.

SUBJECT OF HUMOR

So prevalent is the CIA reputation of menace in so much of the world that even humorists have taken note of it. The New Yorker magazine last December printed a cartoon showing two natives of an unspecified country watching a volcano erupt. One native is saying the other: "The CIA did it. Pass it along."

In southeast Asia, even the most rational leaders are said to be ready to believe anything about the CIA.

"Like Dorothy Parker and the things she said," one observer notes, "the CIA gets credit or blame both for what it does and for many things it has not even thought of doing."

Many earnest Americans, too, are bitter critics of the CIA.

Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has charged that the agency "is making foreign policy and in so doing is assuming the roles of President and Congress." He has introduced a proposal to create a special Foreign Relations Subcommittee to make a "full and complete" study of the effects of CIA operations on U.S. foreign relations.

Senator Stephen M. Young, Democrat, of Ohio, has proposed that a joint Senate-House committee oversee the CIA because, "wrapped in a cloak of secrecy, the CIA has, in effect, been making foreign policy."

Mayor Lindsay of New York, while a Republican Member of Congress, indicted the CIA on the House floor for a long series of fiascos, including the most famous blunder in recent American history—the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

Former President Truman, whose administration established the CIA in 1947, said in 1963 that by then he saw "something about the way the CIA has been functioning that is casting a shadow over our historic positions, and I feel that we need to correct it."

KENNEDY'S BITTERNESS

And President Kennedy, as the enormity of the Bay of Pigs disaster came home to him, said to one of the highest officials of his administration that he wanted "to splinter the CIA in a thousand pieces and scatter it to the winds."

Even some who defend the CIA as the indispensable eyes and ears of the Government—for example Allen Dulles, the Agency's most famous Director—now fear that the cumulative criticism and suspicion, at home and abroad, have impaired the CIA's effectiveness and therefore the Nation's safety.

They are anxious to see the criticisms answered and the suspicions allayed, even if—in some cases—the Agency should thus become more exposed to domestic politics and to compromises of security.

"If the establishment of a congressional committee with responsibility for intelligence would quiet public fears and restore public confidence in the CIA," Mr. Dulles said in an interview, "then I now think it would be worth doing despite some of the problems it would cause the Agency."

Because this view is shared in varying degree by numerous friends of the CIA and because its critics are virtually unanimous in calling for more "control," most students of the problem have looked to Congress for a remedy.

In the 19 years that the CIA has been in existence, 150 resolutions for tighter congressional control have been introduced—and put aside. The statistic in itself is evidence of widespread uneasiness about the CIA and of how little is known about the Agency.

For the truth is that despite the CIA's international reputation, few persons in or out of the American Government know much about its work, its organization, its supervision or its relationship to the other arms of the executive branch.

A former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for instance, had no idea how big the CIA budget was. A Senator, experienced in foreign affairs, proved in an interview, to know very little about, but to fear very much, its operations.

Many critics do not know that virtually all CIA expenditures must be authorized in advance—first by an administration committee that includes some of the highest-ranking political officials and White House staff assistants, then by officials in the Bureau of the Budget, who have the power to rule out or reduce an expenditure.

They do not know that, instead of a blank check, the CIA has an annual budget of a little more than $500 million—only one-sixth the $3 billion the Government spents on its overall intelligence effort. The National Security Agency, a cryptographic and codebreaking operation run by the Defense Department, and almost never questioned by outsiders, spends twice as much as the CIA.

The critics shrug aside the fact that President Kennedy, after the most rigorous inquiry into the Agency's affairs, methods and problems after the Bay of Pigs, did not splinter it after all and did not recommend congressional supervision.

They may be unaware that since then supervision of intelligence activities has been tightened. When President Eisenhower wrote a letter to all ambassadors placing them in charge of all American activities in their countries, he followed it with a secret letter specifically exempting the CIA; but when President Kennedy put the ambassadors in command of all activities, he sent a secret letter specifically including the CIA. It is still in effect but, like all directives, variously interpreted.

OUT OF A SPY NOVEL

The critics, quick to point to the Agency's publicized blunders and setbacks, are not mollified by its genuine achievements—its precise prediction of the date on which the Chinese Communists would explode a nuclear device; its fantastic world of electronic devices; its use of a spy, Oleg Penkovsky, to reach into the Kremlin itself; its work in keeping the Congo out of Communist control; or the feat—straight from a spy novel—of arranging things so that when Gamal Abdel Nasser came to power in Egypt the management consultant who had an office next to the Arab leader's and who was one of his principal advisers was a CIA operative.

When the U–2 incident is mentioned by critics, as it always is, the emphasis is usually on the CIA's—and the Eisenhower administration's—blunder in permitting Francis Gary Powers' flight over the Soviet Union in 1960 just before a scheduled summit conference. Not much is usually said of the incalculable intelligence value of the undisturbed U–2 flights between 1956 and 1960 over the heartland of Russia.

And when critics frequently charge that CIA operations contradict and sabotage official American policy, they may not know that the CIA is often overruled in its policy judgments.

As an example, the CIA strongly urged the Kennedy administration not to recognize the Egyptian-backed Yemeni regime and warned that President Nasser would not quickly pull his troops out of Yemen. Ambassador John Badeau thought otherwise. His advice was accepted, the republic was recognized, President Nasser's troops remained—and much military and political trouble followed that the CIA had foreseen and the State Department had not.

Nor do critics always give the CIA credit where it is due for its vital and daily service as an accurate and encyclopedic source of quick news, information, analysis and deduction about everything from a new police chief in Mozambique to an aid agreement between Communist China and Albania, from the state of President Sukarno's health to the meaning of Nikita S. Khrushchev's fall from power.

Yet the critics favorite indictments are spectacular enough to explain the world's suspicions, and fears of the CIA and its operations.

A sorry episode in Asia in the early 1950's is a frequently cited example. CIA agents gathered remnants of the defeated Chinese Nationalist armies in the jungles of northwest Burma, supplied them with gold and arms and encouraged them to raid Communist China.

One aim was to harass Peking to a point where it might retaliate against Burma, forcing the Burmese to turn to the United States for protection.

Actually, few raids occurred, and the army became a troublesome and costly burden. The CIA had enlisted the help of Gen. Phao Sriyanod, the police chief of Thailand—and a leading narcotics dealer. The Nationalists, with the planes and gold furnished them by the agents, went into the opium business. By the time the "anti-Communist" force could be disbanded, and the CIA could wash its hands of it, Burma had renounced American aid, threatened to quit the United Nations and moved closer to Peking.

Moreover, some of the Nationalist Chinese are still in northern Burma, years later, and still fomenting trouble and infuriating governments in that area, although they have not been supported by the CIA or any American agency for a decade.

In 1958, a CIA-aided operation involving South Vietnamese agents and Cambodian rebels was interpreted by Prince Sihanouk as an attempt to overthrow him. It failed but drove him farther down the road that ultimately led to his break in diplomatic relations with Washington.

INDONESIAN VENTURE

In Indonesia in the same year, against the advice of American diplomats, the CIA was authorized to fly in supplies from Taiwan and the Philippines to aid army officers rebelling against President Sukarno in Sumatra and Java. An American pilot was shot down on a bombing mission and was released only at the insistent urging of the Kennedy administration in 1962. Mr. Sukarno, naturally enough, drew the obvious conclusions; how much of his fear and dislike of the United States can be traced to those days is hard to say.

In 1960, CIA agents in Laos, disguised as "military advisers," stuffed ballot boxes and engineered local uprisings to help a handpicked strongman, Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, set up a "pro-American" government that was desired by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

This operation succeeded—so much so that it stimulated Soviet intervention on the side of leftists Laotians, who counterattacked the Phoumi government. When the Kennedy administration set out to reverse the policy of the Eisenhower administration, it found the CIA deeply committed to Phoumi Nosovan and needed 2 years of negotiations and threats to restore the neutralist regime of Prince Souvanna Phouma.

Pro-Communist Laotians, however, were never again driven from the border of North Vietnam, and it is through that region that the Vietcong in South Vietnam have been supplied and replenished in their war to destroy still another CIA-aided project, the non-Communist government in Saigon.

CATALOG OF CHARGES

It was the CIA that built up Ngo Dinh Diem as the pro-American head of South Vietnam after the French, through Emperor Bao Dai, had found him in a monastery cell in Belgium and brought him back to Saigon as Premier. And it was the CIA that helped persuade the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations to ride out the Vietnamese storm with Diem—probably too long.

These recorded incidents not only have prompted much soul searching about the influence of an instrument such as the CIA on American policies but also have given the CIA a reputation for deeds and misdeeds far beyond its real intentions and capacities.

Through spurious reports, gossip, misunderstandings, deep-seated fears and forgeries and falsifications, the Agency has been accused of almost anything anyone wanted to accuse it of.

It was been accused of:

Plotting the assassination of Jawaharlal Nehru, of India.

Provoking the 1965 war between India and Pakistan.

Engineering the "plot" that became the pretext for the murder of the leading Indonesia generals last year.

Supporting the rightist army plots in Algeria.

Murdering Patrice Lumumba in the Congo.

Kidnaping Moroccan agents in Paris.

Plotting the overthrow of President Kwame Nkrumah, of Ghana.

All of these charges and many similar to them are fabrications, authoritative officials outside the CIA insist.

The CIA's notoriety even enables some enemies to recover from their own mistakes. A former American official unconnected with the Agency recalls that pro-Chinese elements in east Africa once circulated a document urging revolts against several governments. When this inflammatory message backfired on its authors, they promptly spread the word that it was a CIA forgery designed to discredit them—and some believed the falsehood.

OBVIOUS DEDUCTION

"Many otherwise rational African leaders are ready to take forgeries at face value," one observer says, "because deep down they honestly fear the CIA. Its image in this part of the world couldn't be worse."

The image feeds on the rankest of fabrications as well as on the wildest of stories—for the simple reason that the wildest of stories are not always false, and the CIA is often involved and all too often obvious.

When an embassy subordinate in Lagos, Nigeria, known to be the CIA station chief had a fancier house than the U.S. Ambassador, Nigerians made the obvious deduction about who was in charge.

When President João Goulart of Brazil fell from power in 1964 and CIA men were accused of being among his most energetic opponents, exaggerated conclusions as to who had ousted him were natural.

It is not only abroad that such CIA involvements—real or imaginary—have aroused dire fears and suspicions. Theodore C. Sorensen has written, for instance, that the Peace Corps in its early days strove manfully, and apparently successfully, to keep its ranks free of CIA infiltration.

Other Government agencies, American newspapers and business concerns, charitable foundations, research institutions and universities have, in some cases, been as diligent as Soviet agents in trying to protect themselves from CIA penetration. They have not always been so successful as the Peace Corps.

Some of their fear has been misplaced; the CIA is no longer so dependent on clandestine agents and other institutions' resources. But as in the case of its overseas reputation, its actual activities in the United States—for instance, its aid in financing a center for international studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—have made the fear of infiltration real to many scholars and businesses.

The revelation that CIA agents served among Michigan State University scholars in South Vietnam from 1955 to 1959 has contributed to the fear. The nature of the agents' work and the circumstances of their employment are in dispute, but their very involvement, even relatively long ago, has aroused concern that hundreds of scholarly and charitable American efforts abroad will be tainted and hampered by the suspicions of other governments.

Thus, it is easy for sincere men to believe deeply that the CIA must be brought "to heel" in the Nation's own interest. Yet every well-informed official and former official with recent knowledge of the CIA and its activities who was interviewed confirmed what Secretary of State Rusk has said publicly—that the CIA "does not initiate actions unknown to the high policy leaders of the Government."

The New York Times survey left no doubt that, whatever its miscalculations, blunders and misfortunes, whatever may have been the situation during its bumptious early days and during its overhasty expansion in and after the Korean war, the Agency acts today not on its own but with the approval and under the control of the political leaders of the U.S. Government.

But that virtually undisputed fact raises in itself the central questions that emerge from the survey: What is control? And who guards the guards?

For it is upon information provided by the CIA itself that those who must approve its activities are usually required to decide.

It is the CIA that has the money (not unlimited but ample) and the talent (as much as any agency) not only to conceive but also to carry out projects of great importance—and commensurate risk.

ACTION, IF NOT SUCCESS

It is the CIA, unlike the Defense Department with its service rivalries, budget concerns and political involvements, and unlike the State Department with its international diplomatic responsibilities and its vulnerability to criticism, that is freest of all agencies to advocate its projects and press home its views; the CIA can promise action, if not success.

And both the Agency and those who must pass upon its plans are shielded by security from the outside oversight and review under which virtually all other officials operate, at home and abroad.

Thus, while the survey left no doubt that the CIA operates under strict forms of control, it raised the more serious question whether there was always the substance of control.

In many ways, moreover, public discussion has become too centered on the question of control. A more disturbing matter may be whether the Nation has allowed itself to go too far in the grim and sometimes deadly business of espionage and secret operations.

One of the best-informed men on this subject in Washington described that business as "ugly, mean, and cruel." The Agency loses men and no one ever hears of them again, he said, and when "we catch one of them" (a Soviet or other agent), it becomes necessary "to get everything out of them and we do it with no holds barred."

Secretary Rusk has said publicly that there is a "tough struggle going on in the back alleys all over the world." "It's a tough one, it's unpleasant, and no one likes it, but that is not a field which can be left entirely to the other side," he said.

The back-alley struggle, he concluded, is "a never-ending war, and there's no quarter asked and none given."

STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

But that struggle, Mr. Rusk insisted, is "part of the struggle for freedom."

No one seriously disputes that the effort to gain intelligence about real or potential enemies, even about one's friends, is a vital part of any government's activities, particularly a government so burdened with responsibility as the U.S. Government in the 20th century.

But beyond their need for information, how far should the political leaders of the United States go in approving the clandestine violation of treaties and borders, financing of coups, influencing of parties and governments, without tarnishing and retarding those ideas of freedom and self-government they proclaim to the world?

And how much of the secrecy and autonomy necessary to carry out such acts can or should be tolerated by a free society?

There are no certain or easy answers. But these questions cannot even be discussed knowledgeably on the basis of the few glimpses—accidental or intentional—that the public has so far been given into the private world of the CIA.

That world is both dull and lurid, often at the same time.

A year ago, for instance, it was reported that some of the anti-Castro Cuban survivors of the Bay of Pigs were flying in combat in deepest, darkest Africa. Any Madison Avenue publisher would recognize that as right out of Ian Fleming and James Bond.

But to the bookish and tweedy men who labor in the pastoral setting of the CIA's huge building on the banks of the Potomac River near Langley, Va., the story was only a satisfying episode in the back-alley version of "Struggle for Freedom."

How CIA Put "Instant Air Force" Into Congo—Intervention or Spying All in a Day's Work

(Note.—Following is the second of five articles on the Central Intelligence Agency. The articles are by a team of New York Times correspondents consisting of Tom Wicker, John W. Finney, Max Frankel, E. W. Kenworthy, and other Times staff members.)

Washington, April 25.—At the Ituri River, 8 miles south of Nia Nia in the northeast Congo, a Government column of 600 Congolese troops and 100 white mercenaries had been ambushed by a rebel force and was under heavy fire. Suddenly, three B–26's skimmed in over the rain forest and bombed and strafed a path through the rebel ranks for the forces supported by the United States.

At the controls of the American-made planes were anti-Castro Cubans, veterans of the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in 1961, 3 years before. They had been recruited by a purportedly private company in Florida. Servicing their planes were European mechanics solicited through advertisements in London newspapers. Guiding them into action were American "diplomats" and other officials in apparently civilian positions.

The sponsor, paymaster, and director of all of them, however, was the Central Intelligence Agency, with headquarters in Langley, Va. Its rapid and effective provision of an "instant air force" in the Congo was the climax of the Agency's deep involvement there.

The CIA's operation in the Congo was at all times responsible to and welcomed by the policymakers of the United States.

It was these policymakers who chose to make the Agency the instrument of political and military intervention in another nation's affairs, for in 5 years of strenuous diplomatic effort it was only in Langley that the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon found the peculiar combination of talents necessary to block the creation of a pro-Communist regime, recruit the leaders for a pro-American government, and supply the advice and support to enable that government to survive.

IN DARK AND LIGHT

From wiretapping to influencing elections, from bridge blowing to armed invasions, in the dark and in the light, the Central Intelligence Agency has become a vital instrument of American policy and a major component of American Government.

It not only gathers information but also rebuts an adversary's information. It not only organizes its own farflung operations but also resists an adversary's operation.

Against the Soviet Union alone, it performs not only certain of the services performed in Moscow by the KGB, the Committee for State Security, but also many of the political, intelligence and military services performed by pro-Soviet Communist parties around the world.

When the Communist and Western worlds began to wrestle for control of the vast, undeveloped Congo in 1960 after it had gained independence from Belgium, a modest little CIA office in Leopoldville mushroomed overnight into a virtual embassy and miniature war department.

This was not to compete with the real U.S. Embassy and military attachés but to apply the secret, or at least discreet, capacities of the CIA to a seething contest among many conflicting forces.

Starting almost from scratch, because the Belgians had forbidden Americans even to meet with Congolese officials, the CIA dispersed its agents to learn Congolese politics from the bush on up, to recruit likely leaders and to finance their bids for power.

Capable of quickly gathering information from all sources, of buying informants, and disbursing funds without the bureaucratic restraints imposed on other Government agencies, the CIA soon found Joseph Mobutu, Victor Nendaka, and Albert Ndele. Their eventual emergence as President of the country, Minister of Transportation and head of the national bank, respectively, proved a tribute to the Americans' judgment and tactics.

So pervasive was the CIA influence that the agency was widely accused of the assassination of Moscow's man, Premier Patrice Lumumba. Correspondents who were in the Congo are convinced the CIA had nothing to do with the murder, though it did play a major role in establishing Cyrille Adoula as Mr. Lumumba's successor for a time.

Money and shiny American automobiles, furnished through the logistic wizardry of Langley, are said to have been the deciding factors in the vote that brought Mr. Adoula to power. Russian, Czechslovak, Egyptian, and Ghanaian agents were simply outbid where they could not be outmaneuvered.

In one test after Mr. Adoula had been elected, rival agents of East and West almost stumbled over each other rushing in and out of parliamentary delegates' homes. On the day of the rollcall, American and Czech representatives sat one seat apart in the gallery with lists of members, winking at each other in triumph whenever a man pledged to the one turned out to have been picked off by the other. Ultimately Mr. Adoula won by four votes.

MORE THAN MONEY

By the Congo period, however, the men at Langley say they had learned that their earlier instincts to try to solve nasty political problems with money alone had been overtaken by the recognition of the need for far more sophisticated and enduring forms of influence.

"Purchased?" one American commented. "You can't even rent these guys for the afternoon."

And so the CIA, kept growing in size and scope.

By the time Moise Tshombe had returned to power in the Congo—through American acquiescence, if not design—it became apparent that hastily supplied arms and planes, as well as dollars and cars, would be needed to protect the American-sponsored Government in Léopoldville.

This, apparently, was a job for the Defense Department, but to avoid a too obvious American involvement, and in the interests of speed and efficiency, the Government again turned to the CIA.

The Agency had the tools. It knew the Cubans in Miami and their abilities as pilots. It had the front organizations through which they could be recruited, paid, and serviced.

It could engage 20 British mechanics without legal complications and furnish the tactical expertise from its own ranks or from Americans under contract.

Moreover, some CIA agents eventually felt compelled to fly some combat missions themselves in support of South African and Rhodesian mercenaries. The State Department denied this at first—then insisted the Americans be kept out of combat.

But it was pleased by the overall success of the operation in which no planes were lost and all civilian targets were avoided.

MEANWHILE, IN OTHER AREAS

In the years of the Congo effort, the CIA was also smuggling Tibetans in and out of Communist China, drawing secrets from Col. Oleg Penkovsky of Soviet military intelligence, spying on Soviet missile buildups and withdrawals in Cuba, masterminding scores of lesser operations, analyzing the world's press and radio broadcasts, predicting the longevity of the world's major political leaders, keeping track of the world's arms traffic and of many arms manufacturing enterprises and supplying a staggering flow of information, rumor, gossip, and analysis to the President and all major departments of Government.

For all this, the CIA employs about 15,000 persons and spends about a half billion dollars a year.

Its headquarters, the brain and nerve center, the information repository of this sprawling intelligence and operations system, is a modern, eight-story building of precast concrete and inset windows—a somewhat superior example of the faceless Federal style—set in 140 acres of lawn and woodland overlooking the south bank of the Potomac 8 miles from downtown Washington.

In this sylvan setting, somewhat resembling an English deer park, about 8,000 CIA employees—the top managers, the planners, and the analysts—live, if not a cloistered life, at least a kind of academic one with the materials they are studying or the plans they may be hatching.

Formerly, the CIA was scattered through many buildings in downtown Washington, which increased the problems and expense of security.

In the early 1950's, a $30 million appropriation for a new, unitary headquarters was inserted without identification in the budget of another agency—and promptly knocked out by a congressional committee so befuddled by CIA secrecy that it did not know what the item was for.

When Allen W. Dulles, then Director of the CIA, came back in 1956 with more candor, he asked for $50 million, and Congress gave him $46 million. He justified the bite that he proposed to take out of a 750-acre Government reservation on the Potomac by saying the site with "its isolation, topography, and heavy forestation" would provide the agency with the required security.

While the whitish-gray building is undoubtedly as secure as fences, guards, safes, and elaborate electronic devices can make it, the location is hardly a secret. A large sign on the George Washington Parkway pointing to "Central Intelligence Agency" has been removed, but thousands of people know you can still get to the same building by turning off on the same road, now marked by the sign "BPR"—"Bureau of Public Roads."

There, beyond the affable guard at the gate, is the large, rectangular structure with four wings, the ground-level windows barred, which stands as the visible symbol of what is supposed to be an invisible operation.

For organizational purposes, CIA headquarters is divided into four divisions, each under a Deputy Director—plans, intelligence, science and technology, and support.

WHAT THE DIVISIONS DO

The Division of Science and Technology is responsible for keeping current on developing techniques in science and weapons, including nuclear weapons, and for analyzing photos taken by U-2 reconnaissance planes and by space satellites.

The Division of Support is responsible for procuring equipment and for logistics, communications and security, including the CIA codes.

The Division of Plans and the Division of Intelligence perform the basic functions of the Agency. They represent the alpha and omega, the hand and brain, the dagger and the lamp, the melodrama and the monograph of the intelligence profession. Their presence under one roof has caused much of the controversy that has swirled about the CIA since the Bay of Pigs.

It is the responsibility of the Intelligence Division to assemble, analyze, and evaluate information from all sources, and to produce daily and periodical intelligence reports on any country, person, or situation for the President and the National Security Council, the President's top advisory group on defense and foreign policy.

All information—military, political, economic, scientific, industrial—is grist for this division's mill. Perhaps no more than one-fifth—by volume and not necessarily importance—comes from agents overseas under varying depths of cover.

Most information is culled from foreign newspapers, scientific journals, industry publications, the reports of other Government departments and intelligence services and foreign broadcasts monitored by CIA stations around the world.

ALL SORTS OF EXPERTS

The Intelligence Division is organized by geographical sections that are served by resident specialists from almost every profession and discipline—linguists, chemists, physicists, biologists, geographers, engineers, psychiatrists and even agronomists, geologists, and foresters.

Some of the achievements of these experts are prodigious, if reports filtering through the secrecy screen are even half accurate. For instance:

From ordinarily available information, reliable actuarial and life-expectancy studies have been prepared on major foreign leaders.

In the case of one leader, from not-so-ordinarily available information, physicians gleaned important health data: They made a urinalysis from a specimen stolen from a hospital in Vienna where the great man was being treated.

CIA shipping experts, through sheer expertise, spotted the first shipment of Soviet arms to Cuba before the vessels had cleared the Black Sea.

Some anthropologists at CIA headquarters devote their time to helpful studies of such minor—but strategically crucial—societies as those of the hill tribes of Laos and Vietnam.

One woman has spent her professional lifetime in the Agency doing nothing but collecting, studying, collating, analyzing, and reporting on everything that can be learned about President Sukarno of Indonesia—"and I mean everything," one official reported.

HEAVY WITH PH. D.'S

It is the Agency's boast that it could staff any college from its analysts, 50 percent of whom have advanced degrees and 30 percent of whom have doctorates.

Sixty percent of the Intelligence Division personnel have served 10 years. Twenty-five percent have been with the CIA since 1947, when the Agency was established. The heaviest recruiting occurred during the Korean war—primarily, but by no means exclusively, among Ivy League graduates.

The Division of Plans is a cover title for what is actually the division of secret operations, or "dirty tricks." It is charged with all those stratagems and wiles—some as old as those of Rahab and some as new as satellites—associated with the black and despised arts of espionage and subversion.

The operations of the CIA go far beyond the hiring and training of spies who seek out informers and defectors.

It was the Plans Division that set up clandestine "black" radio stations in the Middle East to counter the propaganda and the open incitements to revolution and murder by President Gamal Abdel Nasser's Radio Cairo.

It was the Plans Division that masterminded the ouster of the Arbenz government in Guatemala in 1954, the overthrow of Premier Mohammed Mossadegh in Iran in 1953 (two notable successes) and the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961 (a resounding failure).

Among the triumphs of the Plans Division are the development of the U-2 high-altitude plane, which between 1956 and May 1960, when Francis Gary Powers was shot down by a Soviet rocket, photographed much of the Soviet Union; the digging of a tunnel into East Berlin from which CIA agents tapped telephone cables leading to Soviet military headquarters in the Eastern Zone and the acquisition of a copy of Premier Khrushchev's secret speech to the 20th party congress in 1956 denouncing Stalin's excesses and brutalities.

LIBERALS IN THE CIA

The CIA analysts of the Intelligence Division, in the opinion of many experts, are aware of the embedded antagonisms and frustrations of peoples just emerging into nationhood. Thus they are likely to be more tolerant than the activists in the Plans Division of the flamboyant nationalism and Socialist orientation of the leaders in former colonies and more flexible than many of the State Department's cautious and legalistic diplomats.

In discussing the Portuguese territories of Angola or Mozambique, for example, the analysts are said to take the attitude that change is inevitable, that the United States has to deal with a pluralistic world. The State Department, on the other hand, tends to be diverted by Portuguese sensitivities and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization base in the Azores, also a Portuguese territory.

Regarding the CIA analysts, one State Department officer said that "there are more liberal intellectuals per square inch at CIA than anywhere else in the Government."

The operators and agents of the Plans Division, on the other hand, are described as more conservative in their economic outlook and more single minded in their anticommunism. This is particularly true of those engaged in deep-cover operations, many of whom are ex-military people or men formerly in the Office of Strategic Services of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It has been said, however, that many of the agents who are essentially information gatherers and who work under transparent cover are as sophisticated as the analysts back home, and like them are sympathetic to the "anti-Communist left" in underdeveloped countries.

The CIA agents abroad fall into two groups—both under the Plans Division.

First, there are those engaged in the really dirty business—the spies and counterspies, the saboteurs, the leaders of paramilitary operations, the suborners of revolution. Such agents operate under deepest cover, and their activities become known only when they are unfortunate enough to be caught and "surfaced" for political or propaganda purposes.

While such operatives may be known to "the chief of station"—the top CIA officer in any country—they are rarely known to the American Ambassador, although he may sometimes be aware of their mission. In fact, these deep agents are not known to the CIA's Intelligence Division in Washington, and their reports are not identified to it by name.

Correspondents of the New York Times say they have never, with certainty, been able to identify one of these agents, although they have on occasion run across some unaccountable American of whom they have had their suspicions. Often unknown to each other, the deep agents masquerade as businessmen, tourists, scholars, students, missionaries, or charity workers.

Second, there are those agents, by far the larger number, who operate under the looser cover of the official diplomatic mission. In the mission register they are listed as political or economic officers, Treasury representatives, consular officers, or employees of the Agency for International Development (the U.S. foreign aid agency) or U.S. Information Agency. The CIA chief of station may be listed as a special assistant to the Ambassador or as the top political officer.

A THIN COVER

This official cover is so thin as to be meaningless except to avoid embarrassment for the host government. These agents usually are readily identifiable.

The chief of station is recognized as the man with a car as big as the Ambassador's and a house that is sometimes—as in Lagos, Nigeria—better.

In practically all the allied countries the CIA agents identify themselves to host governments, and actually work in close cooperation with Cabinet officials, local intelligence, and the police.

In some embassies the CIA agents outnumber the regular political and economic officers. In a few they have made up as much as 75 percent of the diplomatic mission.

The chief of station often has more money than the Ambassador. Sometimes he has been in the country longer and is better informed than the Ambassador.

For all these reasons the host government, especially in underdeveloped areas of the world, may prefer to deal with the chief of station rather than the Ambassador, believing him to have readier access to top policymaking officials in Washington.

WELL KEPT SECRET

Obviously the number of agents abroad is a closely held secret, kept from even such close Presidential advisers in the past as the historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. In his book "A Thousand Days," Mr. Schlesinger states that those "under official cover overseas" number almost as many as State Department employees. This would be roughly 6,600. The actual number, however, is believed to be considerably less, probably around 2,200.

The secrecy of identification can lead to some amusing situations. Once when Allen Dulles, then CIA Director, visited New Delhi, every known spook (CIA men) was lined up in an anteroom of the Embassy to greet him. At that moment a newspaper correspondent who had been interviewing Mr. Dulles walked out of the inner office. A look of bewilderment crossed the faces of the CIA men, plainly asking, "Is this one we didn't know about?"

Mr. Schlesinger has written that "in some areas the CIA had outstripped the State Department in the quality of its personnel."

Almost without exception, correspondents of the New York Times reported that the men at the top overseas were men of "high competence and discipline," "extremely knowing," "imaginative," "sharp and scholarly" and "generally somewhat better than those in State in work and dedication."

But they also found that below the top many CIA people were "a little thin" and did not compare so favorably with Foreign Service officers on the same level.

The CIA screens and rescreens applicants, because it is quite aware of the attraction that secrecy holds for the psychopath, the misfit, and the immature person.

The greatest danger obviously lies in the area of special operations. Although it is generally agreed that the agents—overt and covert—have been for the most part men of competence and character, the CIA has also permitted some of limited intelligence and of emotional instability to get through its screen and has even assigned them to sensitive tasks, with disastrous results.

One example was the assignment of a man known as "Frank Bender" as contact with Cuban exile leaders during the preliminaries of the Bay of Pigs operation. A German refugee with only a smattering of Spanish and no understanding of Latin America or Latin character, Bender antagonized the more liberal of the leaders by his bullying and his obvious partiality for the Cuban right.

OFFICES IN THIS COUNTRY

The CIA maintains field offices in 30 American cities. These offices are overt but discreet. Their telephone numbers are listed under "Central Intelligence Agency" or "U.S. Government," but no address is given. Anyone wanting the address must know the name of the office director, whose telephone number and address are listed.

At one time these field offices sought out scholars, businessmen, students, and even ordinary tourists whom they knew to be planning a trip behind the Iron Curtain and asked them to record their observations and report to the CIA on their return.

Very little of this assertedly is done any more, probably because of some embarrassing arrests and imprisonment of tourists and students. While the CIA deals frankly with businessmen, it reputedly does not compromise their traveling representatives.

Most of the work of domestic field agents involves contacts with industry and universities. For example, an agent, on instructions from headquarters, will seek evaluation of captured equipment, analysis of the color of factory smoke as a clue to production, an estimate of production capacity from the size of a factory, or critiques of articles in technical and scientific journals.

THE HUMAN INADEQUACY

In greater secrecy, the CIA subsidizes, in whole or in part, a wide range of enterprises—"private" foundations, book and magazine publishers, schools of international studies in universities, law offices, "businesses" of various kinds, and foreign broadcasting stations. Some of these perform real and valuable work for the CIA. Others are not much more than "mail drops."

Yet all these human activities, all the value received and the dangers surmounted, all the organization and secrecy, all the trouble averted, and all the setbacks encountered, still do not describe the work of the CIA. For the most gifted of analysts, the most crafty of agents—like all human beings—have their limitations.

At the time when the Americans were successfully keeping the Congo out of the Communist orbit, it still took the same men several months to slip an African agent into Stanleyville in the Congo to check on the lives and fate of some arrested Americans.

Men are fallible and limited, and the demands on the CIA are almost infinite; that is why, today, some of the most valuable spies are not human and some of the most omnipotent agents hum through the heavens, and above.

CIA Spies From 100 Miles Up; Satellites Probe Secrets of Soviet—Electronics Prying Grows

(Note.—Following is the third of five articles on the Central Intelligence Agency. The articles are by a team of New York Times correspondents consisting of Tom Wicker, John W. Finney, Max Frankel, E. W. Kenworthy, and other Times staff members.)

Washington, April 26.—To the men most privy to the secrets of the Central Intelligence Agency, it sometimes seems that the human spies, the James Bonds, and Mata Haris, are obsolete. Like humans everywhere, they are no match for the computers, cameras, radars, and other gadgets by which nations can now gather the darkest secrets of both friends and foes.

With complex machines circling the earth at 17,000 miles an hour, CIA agents are able to relax in their carpeted offices beside the Potomac and count the intercontinental missiles poised in Soviet Kazakhstan, monitor the conversations between Moscow and a Soviet submarine near Tahiti, follow the countdown of a sputnik launching as easily as that of a Gemini capsule in Florida, track the electronic imprint of an adversary's bombers and watch for the heat traces of his missiles.

Only a half dozen years ago, at least one human pilot was still required to guide a black U-2 jet across the Soviet Union from Pakistan to Norway, or over Cuba or Communist China from bases in Florida and Taiwan.

His cameras and listening devices, capable of picking out a chalk line or a radar station from 15 miles up, were incredible in their day, the product of imaginative CIA research and developments. But spies in the sky now orbiting the earth do almost as well from 100 miles up.

COSMIC ESPIONAGE

Already, the United States and the Soviet Union are vying with each other in cosmic spying. American Samos and Soviet Cosmos satellites gather more data in one 90-minute orbit than an army of earthbound spies.

Other gadgets of the missile age have taken over the counterspy function. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara gave a congressional committee a strong hint about that last year when he mentioned "inspection of orbiting objects in the satellite interceptor Thor program as well as in the two large ground-based optical programs at Cloudcroft, N. Mex."

His testimony suggested that the United States could orbit a satellite capable of photographing and otherwise "inspecting" Soviet space spies, while other equipment could photograph them from the ground with remarkable detail.

Such electronic eyes, ears, noses and nerve ends—and similar ones aboard ships and submarines—are among the Nation's most vital secrets. They are not exclusively the property or inspiration of the CIA.

CIA cameras and other snooping equipment are riding in spacecraft that are otherwise the responsibility of the Defense Department.

No clear breakdown of responsibilities and cost is available, but, altogether, the annual cost of the U.S. intelligence effort exceeds $3 billion a year—more than six times the amount specifically allocated to the CIA and more than 2 percent of the total Federal budget.

BUGGING FROM AFAR

Not all the gadgetry is cosmic. The Agency is now developing a highly sensitive device that will pick up from afar indoor conversations, by recording the window vibrations caused by the speakers' voices.

This is only one of many nefarious gadgets that have made the word "privacy" an anachronism. It is possible, for instance, with equipment so tiny as to be all but invisible, to turn the whole electric wiring system of a building into a quivering transmitter of conversation taking place anywhere within.

Picking up information is one thing; getting it "home" and doing something with it is another. Some satellites, for instance, are rigged to emit capsules bearing photos and other readings; as they float to earth by parachute, old C-130 aircraft dash across the Pacific from Hawaii and snare the parachutes with long, dangling, trapezelike cables. The planes have a 70-percent catching average.

Sometimes the intelligence wizards get carried away by their imaginations. Several years ago they spent tens of millions of dollars on the construction of a 600-foot radio telescope designed to eavesdrop on the Kremlin. It was to pick up radio signals, such as those emitted when a Soviet Premier called his chauffeur by radiotelephone, as they bounced off the moon.

The project turned into an engineering fiasco, but technology came to the rescue by providing "ferret" satellites that can tune in on the same short-range radio signals as they move straight up to the ionosphere.

Overlooking the rights of territorial sovereignty and national and human privacy, officials throughout the U.S. Government praise the CIA's gadgetry as nothing short of "phenomenal." The atmosphere everywhere, they say, is full of information, and the objective of a technological intelligence service is to gather and translate it into knowledge.

At CIA headquarters in Langley, Va., other intricate machines, some unknown a decade or even a few years ago, read, translate, interpret, collate, file, and store the information. Sometimes months or years later, the data can be retrieved from tens of millions of microfilmed categories.

This effort has paid off monumentally, according to those who know most about it.

It was aerial reconnaissance by the U-2 spy lane—succeeded in many ways by satellites in 1961—that enabled Washington to anticipate and measure the Soviet Union's capacity to produce missiles in the 1950's. These estimates, in turn, led to the so-called "missile gap," which became a prime political issue in the 1960 presidential campaign. But it was also the U-2 that later produced proof that the Russians were not turning out missiles as fast as they could, thus dispelling the "missile gap" from Washington's thinking and jargon.

Still later, CIA devices discovered missiles being emplaced underground in the Soviet Union. U-2's spotted the preparation of missile sites in Cuba in 1962. They also sampled the radioactive fallout of Soviet nuclear tests in 1961. Highly secret techniques, including aerial reconnaissance, allowed the CIA to predict the Chinese nuclear explosion in 1964 with remarkable accuracy.

PURLOINED MESSAGES

Countless conversations and messages the world over have been purloined; even subtler signals and indications, once detected by the marvels of science, can be read and combined into information of a kind once impossible to obtain.

The first duty of the CIA is to collect, interpret and disseminate what it learns from its worldwide nerve system—weaving together, into the intelligence the Government needs, every electronic blip, squeak, and image and the millions of other items that reach its headquarters from more conventional, often public, sources: random diplomatic contacts, press clippings, radio monitor reports, books and research projects and eyewitness evidence. (Even some of these open sources, such as a regional newspaper from Communist China, must be smuggled or bought at a stiff price.)

Every hour of every day, about 100 to 150 fresh items of news, gossip and research reach the CIA's busy headquarters in Virginia and are poured into the gigantic human and technological computer that its analysis section resembles.

Four of every five of these items, it is said, now come either from open sources or inanimate devices. But in many important instances it is still the human agent, alerted to make a particular arrangement or to chase a specific piece of information, who provides the link that makes all else meaningful and significant; sometimes, now as in the 18th century, it is men alone who do the job in danger and difficulty.

When it was discovered, for instance, that Premier Khrushchev had shaken the Communist world with a secret speech denouncing Stalin in 1956, it was a CIA agent who finally came up with the text, somewhere in Poland, and other analysts who determined that it was genuine.

A REBELLION HASTENED

This feat of human spying in an electronic age yielded vital information and, leaked to the press in Europe and elsewhere hastened the anti-Stalin rebellions in many Communist countries and probably contributed to unheavals in Poland and Hungary that are still among the heaviest liabilities of Communist history.

It takes a subagent in Tibet, personally recruited by a CIA man there and paid either a retainer or by the piece, to deliver a sheaf of secret army documents circulating among regimental commanders of Communist China's People's Liberation Army.

Only his counterpart in Algeria can provide some drawings of the design of the interior of Peking's embassy (although such designs can often be obtained with no more effort than asking for them at the offices of the American who constructed the building).

And beyond this large remaining value of the human being in the humming world of espionage, it is also the human brain in the CIA that gives information its real importance by supplying interpretations for the President and his men.

The end product is a series of papers, handsomely printed and often illustrated with fancy maps to gain a bureaucratic advantage over a rival pieces of paper from other agencies.

The Agency produces intelligence reports almost hourly, and sweeping summaries every day. It provides a special news report for President Johnson's nightly bedtime reading, sometimes containing such juicy tidbits as the most recent playboy activities of the indefatigable President Sukarno of Indonesia.

More elaborate reports and projections are prepared on such matters as the rate of Soviet economic growth.

The State Department has sometimes published these, without credit to their origin. Piqued by these announcements, the CIA called its first news conference in 1964 to put out the latest readings on Soviet prosperity. The idea of the "spooks," as CIA men are called, summoning reporters caused so much amusement in Washington—and perhaps displeasure in other agencies—that the CIA has never held another news conference.

Still more important subjects, such as Soviet nuclear capabilities or Communist Chinese intentions in southeast Asia, are dealt with in formal national intelligence estimates. These encompass all information available on a given subject and reflect the final judgment of the Board of National Estimates, a group of 14 analysts in the CIA.

National estimate intelligence is intended to reach a definite conclusion to guide the President. But as other departments are consulted and the various experts express their views, their disagreements, caveats and dissents are noted and recorded by footnotes in the final document. These signs of dispute are likely to herald important uncertainties, and some officials believe the footnotes to be the best read lines of all the millions committed to paper in the Government every month.

The CIA also produces rapid analyses and predictions on request—say, about the likelihood of the Soviet Union's going to war over the Cuban missile crisis, or about the consequences of different courses of action contemplated at a particular moment by the United States in Vietnam.

HOW GOOD ARE THE REPORTS?

How effective these reports have been, and how well they are heeded by the policymakers, are questions of lively debate in the intelligence community.

In recent years, the CIA is generally believed to have been extremely good in furnishing information about Soviet military capabilities and orders of battle, about the Chinese nuclear weapons program and, after constant goading from the White House, about the progress of India, the United Arab Republic, Israel, and other nations toward a capacity to build nuclear weapons.

Reports from inside Indonesia, Algeria, and the Congo during recent fast-moving situations are also said to have been extremely good.

On the other hand, the CIA has been criticized for not having known more in advance about the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961, about the divorce of the United Arab Republic and Syria in 1961, about the political leanings of various leaders in the

Dominican Republic, and about such relatively public matters as party politics in Italy.

Some—including Dwight D. Eisenhower—have criticized the Agency for not having recognized in time Fidel Castro's Communist leanings or the possibility that the Soviet Union would ship missiles to Cuba.

Almost everyone, however, generally concedes the necessity for gathering intelligence to guide the Government in its worldwide involvements. Criticism goes beyond the value or accuracy of CIA reports. For information-gathering often spills over at the scene of action into something else—subversion, counteractivity, sabotage, political, and economic intervention and other kinds of "dirty tricks." Often the intelligence gatherer, by design or force of circumstance, becomes an activist in the affairs he was set to watch.

ON-THE-SCENE ACTION

CIA analysts reading the punchcards of their computers in Virginia can determine that a new youth group in Bogotá appears to have fallen under the control of suspected Communists, but it takes an agent on the spot to trade information with the local police, collect photographs and telephone taps of those involved, organize and finance a countermovement of, say, young Christians or democratic labor youth, and help them erect billboards and turn mimeograph machines at the next election.

Dozens—at times hundreds—of CIA men have been employed on Taiwan to train men who will be smuggled into Communist China and to interview defectors and refugees who come out; to train Chinese Nationalists to fly the U–2; to identify and befriend those who will move into power after the departure of the Nationalists' President Chiang Kai-shek; to beam propaganda broadcasts at the mainland; to organize harassing operations on the islands just off the shore of the mainland, and to provide logistic support for other CIA operations in Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

In these and dozens of other instances, an agent who is merely ostensibly gathering intelligence is in reality an activist attempting to create or resolve a situation.

Because a great many such activists are also in the field for a variety of purposes other than open or clandestine information gathering, the involvement of fallible human beings in the most dangerous and murky areas of CIA operations causes most of the Agency's failures and difficulties and gives it its fearsome reputation.

Men, by and large, can control machines but not events, and not always themselves. It was not, after all, the shooting down of a U–2 inside the Soviet Union in 1960 that caused worldwide political repercussions and a Soviet-American crisis; each side could have absorbed that in some sort of "cover." It was rather the Soviet capture of a living American pilot, Francis Gary Powers, that could not be explained away and that Russians did not want explained away.

But the CIA invariably develops an interest in its projects and can be a formidable advocate in the Government.

When it presented the U–2 program in 1956, fear of detection and diplomatic repercussions led the Eisenhower administration to run some "practice" missions over Eastern Europe. The first mission to the Soviet Union, in mid-1956, over Moscow and Leningrad, was detected but not molested. It did, however, draw the first of a number of secret diplomatic protests.

After six missions the administration halted the flights, but the CIA pressed for their resumption. Doubts were finally overcome, and 20 to 25 more flights were conducted, with Soviet fighter planes in vain pursuit of at least some of them.

The Powers plane is thought to have been crippled by the nearby explosion of an antiaircraft missile developed with the U–2's in mind.

RISKY AND OFTEN PROFITABLE

The simplest and most modest of such risky, often profitable, sometimes disastrous human efforts are reported to be carried out in the friendly nations of Western Europe.

In Britain, for instance, CIA agents are said to be little more than contact men with British intelligence, with British Kremlinologists and other scholars and experts.

With MI–6, its London counterpart, the CIA compares notes and divides responsibilities on targets of mutual interest. The Agency, having come a painful cropper in Singapore a few years ago, now leaves spying in Malaysia, for instance, to the old Commonwealth sleuths while probably offering in return the CIA's copious material from Indonesia.

Generally cooperative arrangements also prevail in countries such as Canada and Italy and, to a somewhat lesser degree, in France. In West Germany, a major cold war battleground, the CIA is much more active.

The CIA runs an office in Bonn for general coordination. Another in Berlin conducts special activities such as the famous wiretap tunnel under East Berlin, a brilliant technical hookup that eavesdropped on Soviet Army headquarters. It was exposed in 1956 when East German workmen, digging on another project, struck a weak spot in the tunnel and caused it to collapse.

A CIA office in Frankfurt supervises some of the United States own espionage operations against the Soviet Union, interviews defectors and recruits agents for service in Communist countries.

In Munich, the CIA supports a variety of research groups and such major propaganda outlets as Radio Free Europe, which broadcasts to Eastern Europe, and Radio Liberty, aimed at the Soviet Union.

JOBS FOR REFUGEES

Besides entertaining and informing millions of listeners in Communist nations, these nominally "private" outlets provide employment for many gifted and knowledgeable refugees from Russia, Poland, Hungary, and other countries.

They also solicit the services of informers inside the Communist world, monitor Communist broadcasts, underwrite anti-Communist lectures and writings by Western intellectuals and distribute their research materials to scholars and journalists in all continents.

But there is said to be relatively little direct CIA spying upon the U.S. allies. Even in such undemocratic countries as Spain and Portugal, where more independent CIA activity might be expected, the operation is reliably described as modest.

The American Agency has a special interest, for instance, in keeping track in Spain of such refugees from Latin America as Juan Peron of Argentina. Nevertheless, it relies so heavily on the information of the Spanish police that American newspapermen are often a better source for American Embassy officials than the CIA office.

In much of Africa, too, despite the formidable reputation it has among governments, the CIA takes a back seat to the intelligence agencies of the former colonial nations, Britain and France, and concentrates on gathering information about Soviet, Chinese, and other Communist efforts there. (The Congo has been the major exception.) The Agency compiles lists of travelers to Moscow, Prague, or Peking, attempts to infiltrate their embassies and checks on arms and aid shipments through African airfields.

AN EYE ON POTENTIAL REBELS

The Agency is thought to have attempted to infiltrate the security services of some African countries but only with mixed success. It gathers special dossiers on the activities of various nationalist and liberation movements and befriends opposition leaders in such countries as Algeria and the United Arab Republic, in the hope that it can predict upheavals or at least be familiar with new rulers if their bids for power are successful.

The CIA, long in advance, had information on the plan by which Algerian Army officers overthrew Ahmed Ben Bella last June—but it did not know the month in which the officers would make their move, and it had nothing to do with plotting or carrying out the coup.

Thanks to contacts with Gamal Abdel Nasser before he seized power in Egypt, the CIA had almost intimate dealings with the Nasser government before the United States drew his ire by reneging on its promised aid to build the Aswan Dam.

Some of these Egyptian ties lingered even through the recent years of strained relations. Through reputed informants like Mustafa Amin, a prominent Cairo editor, the CIA is said in the United Arab Republic to have obtained the details of a Soviet-Egyptian arms deal in 1964 and other similar information. Thus, Mr. Amin's arrest last fall may have closed some important channels and it gave the United Arab Republic the opportunity to demand greater American aid in return for playing down its "evidence" of CIA activity in Cairo.

A TALENT FOR SECRET WAR

The CIA's talent for secret warfare is known to have been tested twice in Latin America. It successfully directed a battle of "liberation" against the leftist government of Col. Jacobo Arbenz Guzman in Guatemala in 1954. Seven years later, a CIA-sponsored army jumped off from secret bases in Guatemala and Nicaragua for the disastrous engagement at Cuba's Bay of Pigs.

Not so melodramatically, the Agency runs dozens of other operations throughout the hemisphere.

It provides "technical assistance" to most Latin nations by helping them establish anti-Communist police forces. It promotes anti-Communist front organizations for students, workers, professional and businessmen, farmers, and political parties. It arranges for contact between these groups and American labor organizations, institutes, and foundations.

It has poured money into Latin American election campaigns in support of moderate candidates and against leftist leaders such as Cheddi Jagan, of British Guiana.

It spies upon Soviet, Chinese, and other Communist infiltrators and diplomats and attempts to subvert their programs. When the CIA learned last year that a Brazilian youth had been killed in 1963, allegedly in an auto accident, while studying on a scholarship at the Lumumba University in Moscow, it mounted a massive publicity campaign to discourage other South American families from sending their youngsters to the Soviet Union.

In southeast Asia over the last decade, the CIA has been so active that the Agency in some countries has been the principal arm of American policy.

It is said, for instance, to have been so successful at infiltrating the top of the Indonesian Government and Army that the United States was reluctant to disrupt CIA covering operations by withdrawing aid and information programs in 1964 and 1965. What was presented officially in Washington as toleration of President Sukarno's insults and provocations was in much larger measure a desire to keep the CIA fronts in business as long as possible.

Though it is not thought to have been involved in any of the maneuvering that has curbed President Sukarno's power in recent months, the Agency was well poised to follow events and to predict the emergence of anti-Communist forces.

LINKS TO POWER

After helping to elect Ramón Magsaysay as President of the Philippines in 1953, buttressing the family government of Ngo Dinh Diem and Ngo Dinh Nhu in South Vietnam in 1954, and assisting in implanting the regime of the strong man Phoumi Nosavan in Laos in 1960, the CIA agents responsible obviously became for long periods much more intimate advisers and effective links to Washington than the formally designated American Ambassadors in those countries.

And when the Kennedy administration came into office in 1961, the President concluded that the CIA had so mortgaged American interests to Phoumi Nosavan that there was at first no alternative to dealing with him.

Moreover, the CIA's skill at moving quickly and in reasonable secrecy drew for it many assignments in southeast Asia that would normally be given to the Defense Department. It was able, for instance, to fly supplies to the Meo tribesmen in Laos to help them fight against the pro-Communist Pathet Lao at a time when treaty obligations forbade the assignment of American military advisers to the task.

In South Vietnam, the CIA's possession of energetic young men with political and linguisitic talents proved much more successful in wresting mountain and jungle villages from Communist control than the Pentagon's special forces.

But the CIA was also deeply committed to the Ngo brothers and was tricked by them into supporting their private police forces. These were eventually employed against the Buddhist political opposition, thus provoking the coup d'ètat by military leaders in 1963 that brought down the Ngos.

In Thailand, the CIA has now begun a program of rural defense against Communist subversion. Acting through foreign aid offices and certain airlines, agents are working with hill tribes along the Burmese and Laos borders and helping to build a provincial police network along the borders of Laos and Cambodia.

FURTIVE OPERATIONS

Few Americans realize how such operations as these may affect innocent domestic situations—the extent to which the dispatch of a planeload of rice by a subsidized carrier, Air America, in Laos causes the Agency to set furtive operations in motion within the United States.

When Air America or any other false-front organizations has run into financial difficulties, the Agency has used its influence in Washington and throughout the United States to drum up some legitimate sources of income.

Unknown to most of the directors and stockholders of an airline, for instance, the CIA may approach the leading officials of the company, explain its problem and come away with some profitable air cargo contracts.

In other domestic offshoots of the CIA's foreign dealings, American newspaper and magazine publishers, authors and universities are often the beneficiaries of direct or indirect CIA subsidies.

A secret transfer of CIA funds to the State Department or U.S. Information Agency, for example, may help finance a scholarly inquiry and publication. Or the Agency may channel research and propaganda money through foundations—legitimate ones or dummy fronts.

The CIA is said to be behind the efforts of several foundations that sponsor the travel of social scientists in the Communist world. The vast majority of independent foundations have warned that this practice casts suspicion on all traveling scholars, and in the last year the CIA is said to have curtailed these activities somewhat.

Congressional investigation of tax-exempt foundations in 1964 showed that the J. M. Kaplan Fund, Inc., among others, had disbursed at least $400,000 for the CIA in a single year to a research institute. This institute, in turn, financed research centers in Latin America that drew other support from the Agency for International Development (the U.S. Foreign Aid Agency), the Ford Foundation and such universities as Harvard and Brandeis.

Among the Kaplan Fund's other previous contributors there had been eight funds or foundations unknown to experts on tax-exempt charitable organizations. Five of them were not even listed on the Internal Revenue Service's list of foundations entitled to tax exemption.

MAGAZINE GOT FUNDS

Through similar channels, the CIA has supported groups of exiles from Cuba and refugees from Communism in Europe, or anti-Communist but liberal organizations of intellectuals such as the Congress for Cultural Freedom, and some of their newspapers and magazines.

Encounter magazine, a well-known anti-Communist intellectual monthly with editions in Spanish and German as well as English, was for a long time—though it is not now—one of the indirect beneficiaries of CIA funds. Through arrangements that have never been publicly explained, several American book publishers have also received CIA subsidies.

An even greater amount of CIA money apparently was spent on direct, though often secret, support of American scholars. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology opened a Center of International Studies with a grant of $300,000 from the CIA in 1951 and continued to take agency funds until the link was exposed, causing great embarrassment to MIT"s scholars working in India and other countries.

The Agency's support for MIT projects gradually dwindled, but the fear of compromising publicity led the university to decide a year ago to accept no new CIA contracts.

Similar embarrassment was felt at Michigan State University after the recent disclosure that CIA agents had served on its payroll in a foreign-aid project in South Vietnam from 1955 to 1959. The university contended that no secret intelligence work was done by the agents, but it feared that a dozen other overseas projects now under way would be hampered by the suspicions of other governments.

The CIA was among the first Government agencies to seek the valuable services of American scholars—an idea now widely emulated. Many scholars continue to serve the Agency as consultants, while others work on research projects frankly presented to their superiors as CIA assignments.

At a meeting of the American Political Science Foundation here last fall, however, at least two speakers said too many scholars were still taking on full-time intelligence services. They also warned that the part-time activities of others could influence their judgments or reputations.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty provide cover for CIA-financed organizations that draw upon the research talents of American scholars and also service scholars with invaluable raw material. The Free Europe Committee even advertises for public contributions without revealing its ties to the U.S. Government.

Radio Swan, a CIA station in the Caribbean that was particularly active during the Bay of Pigs invasion, maintains unpublicized contacts with private American broadcasters.

The CIA at times has addressed the American people directly through public relations men and nominally independent citizens committees. Many other CIA-run fronts and offices, however, exist primarily to gather mail from and to provide credentials for its overseas agents.

Thus, the ramifications of CIA activities, at home and abroad, seem almost endless. Though satellites, electronics, and gadgets have taken over much of the sheer drudgery of espionage, there remains a deep involvement of human beings, who project the Agency into awkward diplomatic situations, raising many issues of policy and ethics.

That is why many persons are convinced that in the CIA a sort of Frankenstein's monster has been created that no one can fully control.

By its clandestine nature, the CIA has few opportunities to explain, justify, or defend itself. It can don the cloak of secrecy and label all its works as necessary to further some "national interest." And it can quietly lobby for support inside the Government and among influencial Members of Congress and with the President.

But a "national interest" that is not a persuasive defense to men who have their own ideas of the "national interest"—along with secrecy itself—has the inevitable effect of convincing critics that the Agency has plenty to hide besides its code-books.

The imaginations and consciences of such critics are certainly not set at rest when they learn, for instance, that in 1962 an outraged President Kennedy—obviously differing with the Agency about the "national interest"—forced the CIA to undo a particularly clumsy piece of sabotage that might have blackened the Nation's name all around the world.

CIA OPERATION: A PLOT SCUTTLED—PLAN TO DOCTOR CUBAN SUGAR DEPICTS CONTROL PROBLEM

(NOTE.—Following is the fourth of five articles on the Central Intelligence Agency. The articles are by a team of New York Times correspondents consisting of Tom Wicker, John W. Finney, Max Frankel, E. W. Kenworthy and other Times staff members.)

WASHINGTON, April 27.—On August 22, 1962, the S.S. *Streatham Hill*, a British freighter under Soviet lease, crept into the harbor of San Juan, P.R., for repairs. Bound for a Soviet port with 80,000 bags of Cuban sugar, she had damaged her propeller on a reef.

The ship was put in drydock, and 14,135 sacks were offloaded to facilitate repairs. Because of the U.S. embargo on Cuban imports, the sugar was put under bond in a customs warehouse.

Sometime during the layup, agents of the Central Intelligence Agency entered the customs shed and contaminated the offloaded sugar with a harmless but unpalatable substance.

Later, a White House official, running through some intelligence reports, came upon a paper indicating the sabotage. He investigated, had his suspicions confirmed, and informed President Kennedy, much to the annoyance of the CIA command.

The President was not merely annoyed; he was furious, because the operation had taken place on American territory, because it would, if discovered, provide the Soviet Union with a propaganda field day, and because it could set a terrible precedent for chemical sabotage in the undeclared "back-alley" struggle that rages constantly between the West and the Communist countries.

Mr. Kennedy directed that the doctored sugar not leave Puerto Rico. This was more easily ordered than done, and it finally required the combined efforts of the CIA, the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the State Department, customs agents and harbor authorities to disintrigue the intrigue.

The Soviet Union never got its 14,135 sacks of sugar; whether it was compensated for them has not been disclosed.

It would be unfair to conclude that this was a typical CIA operation. On the other hand, it cannot be dismissed as merely the unwise invention of some agent who let his anti-Communist fervor get out of control.

There is good reason to believe that a high-level political decision had been taken to sabotage, where feasible, the Cuban economy. The sugar project, harum-scarum as it was, developed from a general policy determination in the Plans Division of the CIA, and the general policy, if not the specific plot, presumably had the approval of the interagency, sub-Cabinet group responsible for reviewing all operations that could have political consequences.

This was not, then, a well-laid plan that went sour in the operation; it was a badly laid plan that was bound to cause trouble.

It is instructive because it illustrates many of the control problems in CIA operations and makes plain why, from the outset, so many questions have been so persistently raised by so many critics about the adequacy of these controls.

A MAJOR CONCERN

First, there is the preeminent concern whether the CIA, despite its disclaimers to the contrary, does on occasion make policy—not willfully, perhaps, but simply because of its capacity to mount an operation and pursue it wherever it may lead without day-by-day guidance or restriction from the political departments of the Government.

Operations like that of sabotaging the Cuban economy can lead to such dangerous episodes as the sugar doctoring; they can acquire a momentum and life of their own, the consequences of which cannot be anticipated by political officers who may have given them original approval.

Thus, it should be noted that, in the sugar tampering, the CIA and its agents unquestionably believed they were operating within approved instructions, and consequently resented what they regarded as "interference" by the White House officer who reported it to the President.

Another example of operations assuming a life of their own occurred in 1954 during the CIA-engineered revolution against the Communist-oriented President of Guatemala, Jacobo Arbenz Guzman.

A P–38 fighter, piloted by an American, bombed a British ship, the Spring-Fjord, which was lying off-shore and was believed to be carrying aircraft to the Arbenz government. Only one of the three bombs exploded, and no crew members were injured. The ship, which was actually carrying coffee and cotton, was beached.

Richard M. Bissell, a former CIA deputy director for plans, has admitted that the bombing was a "sub-incident" that "went beyond the established limits of policy."

An outstanding example of an operation with political consequences was the dispatch of Francis Gary Powers on the U–2 flight from Pakistan to Norway across the Soviet Union on May 1, 1960, just before the Paris summit meeting and the scheduled visit of President Eisenhower to Moscow.

UNRESOLVED QUESTION

The U–2 photoreconnaissance flights had been going on for nearly 5 years, with fabulously profitable results. It was established practice for the President to approve in advance a set of flights within a given time span, and there was also established machinery for the approval of each flight by the Secretary of Defense. Yet, to this day, no one then in the top councils of the Government is able to say with certainty whether the Powers flight, the last in a series of six, was specifically approved by Thomas S. Gates, Jr., then the Secretary of Defense.

One Senator has said that the U–2 flight was a perfectly legitimate operation of great value, and that the embarrassment to the President was not inherent in the project but was the result of a lack of coordination and controls.

"The operation," he said, "just went along regardless of the political circumstances."

A second serious control question derives from the special position of the CIA as the Government's fountain of necessary information. This appears to be at once the major advantage and a principal hazard of the CIA operation today.

"Policy," Allen W. Dulles, the former CIA Chief, once said, "must be based on the best estimates of the facts which can be put together. That estimate in turn should be given by some agency which has no axes to grind and which itself is not wedded to any particular policy."

This point is often made by the CIA and its defenders. They cite, for instance, the Agency's accurate estimate on Soviet missile strength, as a contrast to the inflated estimates that came from the Pentagon in the late fifties. The latter, they say, were surely influenced by service rivalries and budgetary battles—such as the Air Force's desire for more missiles of its own. The CIA has no such vested interest and little to gain by distorting or coloring its reports and estimates.

Mr. Dulles—like Secretary of State Dean Rusk—insists that no CIA operation "of a political nature" has ever been undertaken "without appropriate approval at a high political level in our Government" outside the CIA.

The problem is that the facts presented to the Government by the CIA are sometimes dramatic and inevitably tend to inspire dramatic proposals for clandestine operations that the Agency's men are eager to carry out, and that they believe can—or might—succeed.

LONG ODDS CAN HELP

Even long odds sometimes work to the Agency's advantage. General Eisenhower, for instance, has written that he undertook to aid pro-Western rebels in Guatemala in 1954 because Mr. Dulles told him the operation had only a 20-percent chance to succeed. If the CIA Director had estimated a better chance than that, General Eisenhower wrote in his memoirs, he would have been unrealistic, unconvincing and overruled.

Command of the facts—at least the best facts available—plus zeal to do something about them, many critics fear, can make the CIA an unanswerable advocate, not for a vested budgetary or policy interest, but for its own sincere notions of how to proceed. And its advantage of providing the facts on which decision must be made, these critics feel, can enable it to prevail over the advice or fears of political officers.

Thus, in 1958, Ambassador John Allison strongly opposed the plan of Allen Dulles to aid the rebel movement in Sumatra against President Sukarno of Indonesia. But Mr. Dulles had won the powerful support of his brother, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

Ultimately, the plan went forward—with the result that an American pilot was shot down and captured by the Sukarno forces, causing a conspicuous deterioration of relations between Indonesia and the United States. The plan was not unapproved; it was just unwise.

A third problem of control arises from the necessary secrecy that surrounds the Agency. To protect its sources of information, to permit it to proceed with any form of clandestine operations, to guard the Nation's political relations with most other countries, it is necessary for the CIA to be shielded—and Congress has so shielded it, by law—from the ordinary scrutiny, investigation and public disclosure of activities that other Government agencies must undergo.

Within the Agency, until the Bay of Pigs disaster of 1961 in Cuba, even the Intelligence Division was not allowed to know about the "dirty tricks" being planned and carried out by the Plans Division.

STEVENSON IN THE DARK

Many of the highest Government officials are told nothing of some of the Agency's activities because, in the course of their own duties, they do not "need to know."

It is now well established, for instance, that until the disaster unfolded, Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. representative to the United Nations, knew nothing of the Bay of Pigs plan. As a result, he and his Government, suffered grievous humiliation after he publicly misstated the facts.

In years past, CIA secrecy reached some absurd proportions—with high-level employees identifying themselves solemnly at cocktail parties as "librarians" and "clerks." In its early days, for instance, CIA employees who, in their private lives, needed to apply for credit were instructed by the Agency to say, when asked for an employer's reference: "Call Miss Bertha Potts" at a certain number.

It was not long, of course, before the lenders who were told to call Miss Potts would say gleefully: "Oh, you work for the CIA."

For many years prior to 1961, a good many critics had been aware of the control dangers inherent in the CIA's peculiar position. In 1954, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, obtained 34 cosponsors for a bill to create a 12-member joint committee on intelligence to keep watch over the CIA, much as the Congressional Joint Committtee on Atomic Energy does over the Atomic Energy Commission.

Allen Dulles, who was completely satisfied with the scrutiny provided by four carefully selected subcommittees of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, went to work. He succeeded in cutting away 14 of Mr. MANSFIELD's cosponsors, and the bill was defeated, 59 to 27.

BOARD HEADED BY KILLIAN

A year later the second Hoover Commission also recommended a congressional joint committee, as well as a presidentially appointed board of consultants on intelligence activities.

To forestall the first, Mr. Dulles acquiesced in the second, and in January 1965, President Eisenhower named a board of consultants on foreign intelligence activities, with James R. Killian, Jr., president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as chairman.

Those familiar with the board's work in the Eisenhower years say it performed a useful function on the technical side, where Dr. Killian, for instance, was a powerful advocate in the development of the U–2. However, it is generally agreed that the board did not give very critical attention to "black" operations, and then only after the fact.

In 1954 there was also established by the National Security Council—which advises the President on defense and foreign policy matters—what came to be known as "the special group," or the "54–12 group," after the date (December 1954) of the secret directive ordering its formation.

This directive also provided the basic charter for the agency's countersubversive and counter-Communist activity. Until that time, these activities had been undertaken under authority of a secret memorandum from President Truman issued in 1947 and inspired principally by the Italian, Czechoslovak and Berlin situations, then acute cold-war issues.

The 54–12 group was—and still is—composed of the President's special assistants for national security affairs, the Director of the CIA, the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary (or Deputy Under Secretary) of State for Political Affairs, plus other officers consulted occasionally on particular proposals.

The group seems to have been created, partly at least, in response to public concern over the problem of control, and it was given responsibility for passing on intelligence operations beforehand. However, because of the fraternal relationship of Allen Dulles and John Foster Dulles, because of their close relations with President Eisenhower and because Allen Dulles had the power to give it the facts on which it had to base its decisions, the 54–12 group during the Eisenhower administration is believed by knowledgeable sources to have exercised little control.

THE CLASSIC DISASTER

At the Bay of Pigs, just after President Kennedy took office in 1961, the worst finally happened; all the fears expressed through the years came true.

The Bay of Pigs must take its place in history as a classic example of the disaster that can occur when a major international operation is undertaken in deepest secrecy, is politically approved on the basis of facts provided by those who most fervently advocated it, is carried out by the same advocates, and ultimately acquires a momentum of its own beyond anything contemplated either by the advocates or those who supposedly controlled them.

Responsible officials of the Eisenhower administration report, for instance, that the invasion plan was not even in existence, as such, when they went out of office on January 19, 1961; there was nothing but a Cuban refugee force, available for whatever the incoming administration might ultimately decide to do with it.

Yet the testimony of Kennedy administration officials—Theodore C. Sorenson and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., for instance—is that the matter was presented to Mr. Kennedy by the CIA advocates as if it were already committed to it and would have to cancel it rather than approve it. Mr. Sorensen even wrote in his book, "Kennedy," that Mr. Kennedy had been subtly pushed to be no less "hard" in his anti-Castroism than President Eisenhower supposedly had been.

The ultimate disaster and its various causes need no retelling. Their effect was graphically described by an official who saw the shaken Mr. Kennedy immediately afterward. The President, he said, "wanted to splinter the CIA in a thousand pieces and scatter it to the winds."

At the same time, to Clark M. Clifford, a Washington lawyer and close friend, who had written the legislation setting up the CIA during the Truman administration, Mr. Kennedy said flatly and poignantly:

"I could not survive another one of these."

AN INQUIRY ORDERED

But because he could not simply abolish the Agency, much less its function, the President decided he would "get it under control."

First, he ordered a thorough investigation by a group headed by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor and composed also of Allen Dulles, Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Second, on Mr. Clifford's advice, the President recreated the old board of consultants under the title of the Foreign Intelligence Committee and asked Dr. Killian to resume the chairmanship. (Mr. Clifford became a member and later succeeded Dr. Killian as chairman.) The President directed the committee to investigate the whole intelligence community from "stem to stern," recommend changes and see that they were carried out.

Third, after a decent interval, the President replaced Allen Dulles with John A. McCone, a former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He told the new Director that he was not to be simply the Director of the CIA but should regard his primary task as "the coordination and effective guidance of the total U.S. intelligence effort." Mr. Dulles' key assistants were also removed.

Fourth, the President sent a letter to every Ambassador telling him he was "in charge of the entire diplomatic mission" at his post, including not only foreign service personnel but "also the representatives of all other U.S. agencies." These representatives of other agencies were to keep the Ambassador "fully informed of their views and activities" and would abide by the Ambassador's decisions "unless in some particular instance you and they are notified to the contrary."

The President followed this letter, which was made public, with a secret communication, saying he meant it and specifically including CIA men among those responsible to the Ambassador.

A BLOW TO BUNDY

Perhaps the most important change in control procedures, however, involved the 54–12 group within the political ranks of the Administration, and it came without any Presidential initiative.

The Bay of Pigs had dealt a severe psychological blow to McGeorge Bundy, who as the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs was a member of the group, and perhaps also to his self-esteem. Thereafter he set out tightening up the surveillance of CIA operations, subjecting them to searching analysis before and not after the event. The hard-eyed Mr. Bundy was notably relentless at that kind of administration.

The President accepted the advice of the Taylor and Killian investigations on two important questions.

First, he decided not to limit the CIA to intelligence gathering and not to shift clandestine operations to the Pentagon, or to a special agency created for the purpose.

These ideas had found favor among some sections of the State Department, among many public critics and even among some members of the staff of the advisory committee. But it was stoutly opposed by Allen Dulles, who argued that this would result in duplication and rivalry, and that the two functions were interdependent, though he admitted that they had not been working in harness on the Bay of Pigs operation.

The two committees of inquiry agreed with Mr. Dulles, and so, finally, did the President.

Second the committees recommended, and the president enthusiastically agreed, that the CIA should leave sizable military operations to the Pentagon and henceforth limit itself to operations of a kind in which U.S. involvement would be "plausibly deniable." This, however, has proved to be a rule of thumb in which it is often difficult to hide the thumb.

SOMETHING LIKE SECRECY

For instance, the later creation of an air force of anti-Castro Cubans to fly for the Congolese Government was carried out and managed by the CIA, not by the Pentagon, despite the recommendation.

The obvious reason was that the Agency could do the job in something like secrecy, while Defense Department involvement would have been necessarily more open, advertising the backing of the United States for the "instant air force."

It is beyond dispute, however, that the Bay of Pigs was a watershed in the life of the CIA and its influence on policymaking. Before that, no matter how much administrative control and political approval there may have been, Mr. Dulles ran the Agency largely as he saw fit.

He was able to do so because he could almost always get "approval"—and thus adhere to the forms of control—from his brother in the State Department or from President Eisenhower, with both of whom he had the closest relations of trust and liking.

The effect of the Kennedy shakeup was immediately apparent—on policy in Laos, for instance. W. Averell Harriman, then the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, was given a free hand in getting rid of the American puppet, Premier Phoumi Nosavan—whose backing by the CIA President Eisenhower had specifically approved—and reinstating Souvanna Phouma at the head of a neutralist government.

By general agreement of virtually every official interviewed, the CIA does not now directly make policy, and its operations are under much more rigorous surveillance and control than before. Nevertheless, there continue to be—and probably always will be—instances where the controls simply do not work.

UNCERTAIN BOUNDARIES

Richard Bissell, who as deputy director for plans was largely responsible for the U-2 reconnaissance triumph and for the Bay of Pigs disaster, has explained why this must be.

"You can't take on operations of this scope," he has said, "draw narrow boundaries of policy around them and be absolutely sure that those boundaries will never be overstepped."

Recently, for instance, the CIA was accused of supporting Cambodian rebels who oppose Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the head of state. Even some senior U.S. Foreign Service officers said they were not sure that the agency's firm denials meant no agent in the field, no obscure planner in the huge CIA building in Virginia, had strayed from the strict boundaries of policy.

A high degree of control of CIA activities exists, however, and inquiry produced this picture of the controlling agencies and how well the control works:

THE 54–12 GROUP

The 54–12 group is the heart of the control system. Its members now are Adm. William F. Raborn, the CIA director; U. Alexis Johnson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; Cyrus R. Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and two presidential assistants, Bill D. Moyers and Walt W. Rostow, who have replaced McGeorge Bundy in representing the White House.

This group meets once a week with a detailed agenda. It concentrates almost exclusively on operations. It approves all proposed operations and it passes in great detail on expenditures as small as $10,000 that have political implications or could prove embarrassing if discovered. Any differences are referred first to the Cabinet level and then, if necessary, to the President.

While the group approves every "black" operation, it does not necessarily clear all the routine intelligence-gathering activities of the agency. Nor, once approval has been given for a "black" operation, does it maintain a running supervision over every detail of its execution.

Under a given policy decision approving a guerrilla operation in a certain country, for instance, the 54–12 group might also have to approve something as specific and important as a bridge blowing. But the overall program would go on by itself under the direction of agents in the field.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Another form of control is that of the purse string.

The CIA's annual request for funds, which is hidden largely in the Defense Department budget, is the responsibility of the head of the Budget Bureau's International Division. The request has usually fared well, but in the fiscal year 1965, for the first time in several years, it was cut back sharply by the Bureau.

Another form of budgetary control centers on the Agency's "slush fund," which used to be about $100-million a year and is now in "the tens of millions." One official has said that "the CIA can't spend a dollar without Bureau of Budget approval." But another official put a somewhat different light on how the "slush fund" is handled.

Suppose, he said, that country X is having an election and the candidates backed by the U.S. Government seem headed for defeat. The Ambassador and the CIA station chief—the Agency's chief in that country—may forward a request for some fast money to spread around.

The request, when reviewed and cleared by the middle levels of the State Department and the CIA, goes to the 54-12 group for review.

This group will first decide whether the money should be spent, how the CIA should spend it and how much should be made available. Then the request goes to the Budget Bureau to be justified in budget terms against other needs.

A CALL BRINGS THE MONEY

For example, this official said, one such project was recently trimmed by the Budget Bureau from $3 to $1.7 million. But in the last week of the election, the CIA ran out of funds just as it needed some more billboards plastered, and it was able to get the money simply by a phone call to the Budget Bureau. This official explained that there had to be some way of providing "quick-turn money" under tight controls and audit.

It should also be noted that this form of control is purely budgetary and not substantive. The Bureau of the Budget does not interpose any policy judgment but simply weighs a proposed operation against total money available and the outlays for other projects.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

Another control Agency is the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. This group has nine members. Four have had extensive government experience.

The chairman, Clark Clifford, was special counsel to President Truman from 1946 to 1950. Among the other members, Robert D. Murphy, former career Ambassador and former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, has had personal experience in clandestine operations, for he prepared the way for the American landing in North Africa in 1942. He is now a director of Corning Glass.

Gordon Gray, a director of the R. J. Reynolds Co. and a newspaper owner, was Secretary of the Army under President Truman and later was President Eisenhower's special assistant for national security affairs. Frank Pace, Jr., chairman of the Special Advisory Board, Air Force Systems Command, was director of the Bureau of the Budget in 1949–50 and Secretary of the Army from 1950 to 1953.

Two members are scientists connected with industry—William O. Baker, vice president in charge of research for the Bell Telephone Laboratories, a member for many years of the Science Advisory Board of the Air Force, and Edwin H. Land, chairman and president of the Polaroid Corp., a former adviser to the Navy on guided missiles and an expert on photography.

There are two military representatives—General Taylor, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former Ambassador to South Vietnam, and Admiral John H. Sides, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet from 1960 to 1963. Dr. William L. Langer, the ninth member, is professor of history at Harvard and a frequent Government consultant.

The board meets an average of 1 or 1½ days a month. It is subdivided into two-man panels specializing in various fields, which meet more frequently. Individual members also take field inspection trips. Mr. Clifford went recently to South Vietnam; Mr. Gray has been on extensive trips to the Middle East and southeast Asia.

There is divergent opinion on the control value of this board. Some of its members are highly pleased with their own work. They point out that over the last 4½ years they have made some 200 recommendations, of which the President accepted 95 percent.

They take credit for persuading President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to create the Defense Intelligence Agency, combining the separate service intelligence divisions. This had been recommended by Secretary of Defense Gates and by Lyman Kirkpatrick, inspector general of the CIA, as a result of the widely differing estimates of the so-called "missile gap" in the late 1950's made by the intelligence arms of the services.

Another official in a position of authority, however, believes that the board does little more than provide a "nice audit" of CIA operations and that any "control" it exercises is largely ex post facto. He asked what could be expected from a board that met only a few days a month.

"By 5 in the afternoon," he said, "the guys can't remember what they were told in the morning."

Even the members concede that their work has been aimed primarily at improving the efficiency and methods of the CIA, rather than at control of individual operations. Thus, if the board does investigate some "black" operations, its emphasis is placed on whether it was done well or could have been more successful, rather than on the political question of whether it should have been done at all.

One member reported, however, that the CIA now brought some of its proposals to the committee for prior discussion, if not specific approval. This is not an unmixed blessing.

While the board might advise against some risky scheme, it also might not; in the latter case its weight added to that of the CIA, would present the responsible political officials in the 54-12 group with an even more powerful advocacy than usual.

An advantage of the board is its direct link to the President. Since this is augmented, at present, by Mr. Clifford's close personal and political ties to President Johnson, any recommendations the committee makes carry great weight with the bureaucrats of the CIA, even before they appear in a Presidential order.

STATE DEPARTMENT AND AMBASSADORS

Also exercising some control over the CIA are the State Department and Ambassadors. Secretary of State Rusk has confided to his associates that he is now quite certain the CIA is doing nothing affecting official policy he does not know about. But he added that he was also sure he was the only one in the State Department informed about some of the things being done.

Despite this information gap as high as the Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary levels, State Department officers with a need to know are far better informed about operations than before the Bay of Pigs.

Moreover, in the 54-12 group and in interagency intelligence meetings, State Department officers are now more ready to speak out and more likely to be heeded on proposed intelligence operations that they believe would compromise larger policy interests.

President Kennedy's secret letter to the Ambassadors also had some effect in changing a dangerous situation.

In 1954, William J. Sebald resigned as Ambassador to Burma because of continued CIA support to Chinese Nationalists in northern Burma despite all his protests. In 1956, James B. Conant, Ambassador to West Germany, was not told about the tunnel under East Berlin. In 1960, in Laos, Ambassador Winthrop G. Brown was often bypassed as the CIA helped prop up the American-backed Premier Phoumi Nosavan, against his advice. The same year, the Ambassador in Malaysia knew nothing of the Singapore operation that ultimately was to embarrass the State Department in 1965.

It is doubtful whether such things could happen today if an Ambassador is forceful enough in establishing his authority.

In the last 4 years the Ambassadors have been kept much better informed, and their relations with CIA chiefs of station have been consequently more cordial. Ambassadors Clare Timberlake and Edward Gullion were completely posted on CIA operations during the Congo crisis and worked closely with the Agency. So, apparently, was Henry Cabot Lodge after he took over the Embassy in Saigon in 1963.

While the Ambassador may not always be completely master in his own house, neither does it seem to be true—as a staff report of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON's Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations said in 1962—that the primacy of the Ambassador, supposedly established by the Kennedy letter, was largely "a polite fiction."

For example, Robert F. Woodward, Ambassador to Spain, vetoed a man chosen to be the CIA's Spanish station chief. And the State Department, while still complaining about the size of some CIA stations, is now supposed to approve the number of agents in each diplomatic mission.

In secret testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the summer of 1965, Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann made plain that the creation of the Imbert military junta in the Dominican Republic in May was a State Department, and not a CIA, idea.

Asked whether the CIA would have set up the junta without orders from State, Mr. Mann replied:

"I will say that in the past this may have been; I do not know. But since I arrived in January 1964, I have had an understanding first with Mr. McCone and now with Admiral Raborn, and I am sure the Department has, even more importantly, that the policy is made here [at State] and that nothing is done without our consent."

This "nothing" probably goes too far, since there remain areas of ambassadorial ignorance. An Ambassador is not always informed of "third party" spying in his country—for example, spying in France on the Chinese Communists there. Nor is he given specific details on counterespionage and information gathering about which he may be generally informed.

If the CIA has "bought the madam," as one official put it, of a house of ill fame patronized by influential citizens or officials of a host country, the Ambassador does not know it and probably doesn't want to. He would, however, have the dubious benefit of any information the madam might disclose.

These are the four institutional forms of "control" of the CIA that now exists—save for congressional oversight and the all-important role of the Agency's Director. And the New York Times' survey for these articles left little doubt that the newly vigorous functioning of these four groups has greatly improved coordination, more nearly assured political approval, and substantially reduced the hazards implicit in CIA operations.

Nevertheless, the Agency still remains the fount of information on which many policy decisions rest, and the source of facts, selected or otherwise, on which to justify its own projects.

Nevertheless, the CIA enjoys an inherent advantage in any conflict with the State or Defense Departments because of its undeniable expertise—especially in economics and science—and because it is free from such political entanglements as trying to build up a missile budget (as in the case of the Air Force) or of having to justify the recognition of a foreign leader (as in the case of State).

And, nevertheless, in its legitimate need for secrecy, the CIA simply cannot be subjected to as much public or even official scrutiny as all other agencies undergo.

A CALL FOR MORE CONTROL

For all these reasons and because of occasional blunders, there has been no abatement in the demand of critics for more and stronger control. Inevitably, their call is for some form of increased supervision by the people's Representatives in Congress, usually by a joint committee of the two Houses.

The Times survey indicated a widespread feeling that such a committee would do the Agency's vital functions more harm than good, and that it would provide little if any solution to the central problem of control.

The history of the Central Intelligence Agency since 1947 makes one thing painfully clear—that the control question, while real and of the utmost importance, is one of "not measures but men." The forms of control mean nothing if there is no will to control, and if there is a will to control, then the form of it is more or less irrelevant.

Such a will can only come from the high political officials of the administration, and it can best be inspired in them by the direct example of the President.

But even the President probably could not impose his will on the Agency in every case without the understanding, the concurrence and the vigorous and efficient cooperation of the second most important man in the matter of control—the Director of the CIA.

THE CIA: QUALITIES OF DIRECTOR VIEWED AS CHIEF REIN ON AGENCY

(NOTE.—Following is the last of five articles on the Central Intelligence Agency. The articles are by a team of New York Times correspondents consisting of Tom Wicker, John W. Finney, Max Frankel, E. W. Kenworthy, and others.)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—As copious evidence of a Soviet military buildup in Cuba, including the installation of antiaircraft missiles, poured into Washington in the summer of 1962, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, John A. McCone, had a strong hunch about its meaning.

He believed such an arsenal half-way around the world from Moscow had to be designed ultimately to protect even more important installations—long-range offensive missiles and nuclear weapons yet to be provided.

Mr. McCone told President Kennedy about his hunch but specified that it was a personal guess entirely lacking in concrete supporting evidence. He scrupulously refused to impose his hunch on the contradictory documentary and photoanalysis evidence being provided by the intelligence community over which he presided. He continued to pass to the President and his advisers reports and estimates—based on all available evidence—that the Soviet Union was not likely to do what he believed in his heart it was doing.

When the evidence that the Russians had implanted offensive missiles in Cuba did come in, Mr. McCone was among those around the President who argued for quick, decisive air action before the missiles could become operative. But when the President decided on his blockade-and-ultimatum policy, Mr. McCone loyally supported it and helped carry it out.

In 1963, Mr. McCone was personally in favor of the proposed limited nuclear test-ban treaty. He had backed such proposals since his years as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in the Eisenhower administration.

Nevertheless, because of his desire that the facts should be known as fully as possible, he furnished a CIA staff expert to assist Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of an armed services subcommittee and an opponent of the treaty. This angered the White House and the State Department, but it was consistent with Mr. McCone's view of the CIA's role in informing the Government as fully as possible.

It is in this kind of intellectual effort to separate fact from fancy, evidence from suspicion, decision from preference, opinion from policy, and consequence from guess that effective control of the CIA must begin, in the opinion of most of those who have been surveyed by the New York Times.

And it is when these qualities have been lacking, the same officials and experts believe, that the CIA most often has become involved in those activities that have led to widespread charges that it is not controlled, makes its own policy and undermines that of its political masters.

Inevitably, the contrast is drawn between John McCone and Allen W. Dulles, one of the most charming and imaginative men in Washington, under whose direction the CIA grew to its present proportions and importance.

A GAMBLING MAN

Digging a wiretap tunnel from West to East Berlin, flying spy planes beyond the reach of antiaircraft weapons over the Soviet Union, and finding a Laotian ruler in the cafes of Paris were romantic projects that kindled Mr. Dulles' enthusiasm. Sometimes the profits were great; sometimes the losses were greater.

To Allen Dulles, a gambling man, the possibility of the losses were real but the chance of success was more important.

A 20-percent chance to overthrow a leftist regime in Guatemala through a CIA-sponsored invasion was all he wanted to give it a try. He charmed President Eisenhower with tales of extraordinary snooping on such rulers as President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic and with accounts of the romantic derring-do of Kermit Roosevelt in arousing Iranian mobs against Mohammed Mossadegh to restore the Shah to his throne.

As long as his brother, John Foster Dulles, was Secretary of State, Allen Dulles had no need to chafe under political "control." The Secretary had an almost equal fascination for devious, back-alley adventure in what he saw as a worldwide crusade.

PERSONAL JUDGMENTS

Neither brother earned his high reputation by taut and businesslike administration. Both placed supreme confidence in their personal judgments.

Colleagues recall many occasions on which Allen Dulles would cut off debate about, say, the intentions of a foreign head of state with the remark: "Oh, I know him personally. He would never do that sort of thing."

Allen Dulles was also an accomplished politician. Throughout his regime he maintained the best of relations with the late Clarence Cannon of Missouri, who as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, was the key figure in providing CIA funds.

Mr. Dulles kept personal control of the selection of other Members of Congress with responsibility for overseeing the CIA, with the result that he invariably had on his side those Members of the congressional establishment who could carry the rest of Congress with them.

Thus, in the Dulles period at the CIA, there was a peculiar set of circumstances. An adventurous Director, inclined to rely on his own often extremely good and informed intuition, widely traveled, read, and experienced, with great prestige and the best connections in Congress, whose brother held the second highest office in the administration, and whose President completely trusted and relied upon both, was able to act almost at will and was shielded from any unpleasant consequences.

KENNEDY KEPT HIM IN OFFICE

When the Eisenhower administration came to an end in 1961, Allen Dulles' reappointment was one of President Kennedy's first acts. Mr. Dulles, like J. Edgar Hoover, who was reappointed head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at the same time, had great prestige and was thought to lend continuity and stability to the new administration.

In fact, Mr. Dulles' continuance in office set the stage for the Bay of Pigs and the great crisis of the CIA.

In that incredible drama of 1961, it was Mr. Dulles' weaknesses as CIA Director—rather than, as so often before, his strengths—that came to the fore. He was committed to the Cuba invasion plan, at all costs, against whatever objections. The advocate overcame the planner.

As President Kennedy and others interposed reservations and qualifications, Mr. Dulles and his chief lieutenant, Richard M. Bissell, made whatever changes were required in order to keep the plan alive. For instance, they switched the landing site from the Trinidad area to the Bay of Pigs, to achieve more secrecy, thereby accepting an inferior beachhead site and separating the refugee force of invaders from the Escambray Mountains, where they were supposed to operate as guerrillas, by 80 miles of swamp.

Above all, lacking his old rapport with President Eisenhower and his brother, lacking a coldly objective approach to his plan, Mr. Dulles never realized that President Kennedy suffered from more than tactical reservations.

These misgivings—in reality a reluctance to approve the invasion—forced the frequent changes in plans, each weakening the whole, until whatever chance of success there might have been was gone.

AT A CRITICAL HOUR

It was John McCone who replaced Allen Dulles at the CIA's most critical hour. After the Bay of Pigs fiasco, it had barely escaped dismemberment or at least the divorce of its Intelligence and Operations Divisions. There were also new cries for greater control, and the men around President Kennedy were suspicious of, if not hostile to, the Agency.

Like Mr. Dulles, Mr. McCone devoted much energy to resisting a formal congressional watchdog committee, to courting the senior members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees on Capitol Hill and to converting the members of a resuscitated Presidential advisory board to his view of intelligence policies.

But those who observed him work believe he also brought a keen intelligence and energy to a tough-minded administration of the Agency itself and to careful, challenging study of its intelligence estimates and recommendations.

He broke down the rigid division between operations and analysis that had kept the CIA's analysts—incredible as it seems—ignorant of the Operations Division's specific plan to invade Cuba. And he began to subject the CIA's own action programs to vigorous review and criticism by the Agency's own experts.

INCISIVE QUESTIONS

The intellectual level of meetings among intelligence officials at the CIA and other agencies improved greatly under Mr. McCone, primarily because he put difficult and incisive questions to those preparing formal analyses and plans, forcing them to challenge and defend their own judgments.

Above all, he set the hard example himself of putting aside personal preference, informed guesses and long gambles in favor of realistic weighing of available evidence and close adherence to administration policy.

He brought specialists and experts into conferences and decisionmaking at a much higher level of policy than before. Often he took such men with him to meetings at the Cabinet level. This exposed them to policy considerations as never before, and put policymakers more closely in touch with the experts on whose "facts" they were acting.

As Chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board—a group that brings together representatives from the Defense Intelligence Agency, the State Department's intelligence unit and others—Mr. McCone won a reputation for objectivity by frequently overruling the proposals of his own Agency, the CIA.

SOME CRITICISM, TOO

His regime was not without its critics. Many officials believe he narrowed the CIA's range of interests, which was as wide as the horizons under the imaginative Allen Dulles. For instance, they say, he was slow to mobilize the CIA to obtain information about nuclear programs in India, Israel, and other nations.

Mr. McCone also tried, but failed, to end interagency rivalries. He spent much time in bitter dispute with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara about divisions of labor and costs in technological programs and about chains of command in Vietnam. He is reported to have feared the growth of the Defense Intelligence Agency as an invasion of CIA territory.

With the State Department, too, rivalry continued—and still does. Much of this can be attributed, on the diplomats' side, to the CIA's readier access to the upper levels of Government and to its financial ability to underwrite the kind of research and field operations that State would like to do for itself.

On the Agency's side, there is undoubtedly some resentment at the State Department's recently increased political control of CIA operations. For instance, until April 28, 1965, the day President Johnson ordered the Marines into Santo Domingo, the CIA had reported the possibility of a rebellion and it knew of three Communist-controlled groups functioning in the Dominican Republic, but the Agency had not suggested an imminent threat of a Communist takeover.

When the President and his advisers became persuaded that there was such a threat, however, CIA agents supplied confirming intelligence—some of it open to challenge by an alert reader. CIA officials seem a little red faced about this compliance, and the intimation is that the CIA may have gone overboard in trying not to undermine but to substantiate a political policy decision.

WITHIN THE BOUNDS OF POLICY

Mr. McCone's pride and the fierce loyalty to the Agency that he developed made him resentful of congressional and public criticism, not always to his own advantage. Nevertheless, as a result of his single-minded efforts to control himself and his Agency, other former members of the Kennedy administration—many of whom opposed his appointment—now find it hard to recall any time when Mr. McCone or the CIA in his time overstepped the bounds of policy deliberately.

Thus, they are inclined to cite him as proof of the theory that in the process of Government men are more important than mechanics—and in support of the widespread opinion among present and former officials that the problem of controlling the CIA must begin with men inside the Agency itself.

The far more general belief is that Congress ought to have a much larger voice in the control of the Agency. This belief is reinforced by the fact that the congressional control that now exists is ill-informed, in the hands of a chosen few, subject to what the Agency wishes to tell even these few, and occasionally apathetic.

There are four subcommittees of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees to which the Director reports.

Mr. McCone met about once a month with the subcommittees. The present Director, Adm. William F. Raborn, meets with them somewhat more often.

CONFLICTING VIEWS

There are conflicting opinions on the value of these sessions. Some who participate say that they are "comprehensive," that the Director holds back nothing in response to questions, that he goes into "great detail on budget and operations" and is "brutally frank." Others say that "we are pretty well filled in" but that the subcommittees get no precise information on the budget or the number of employees and that the Director reveals only as much as he wants to.

These conflicting views probably reflect the composition and interests of the subcommittees. Those on the Senate side are said to be "lackadaisical" and "apathetic," with some Senators not wanting to know too much. The House subcommittees are said to be "alert, interested and efficient," with members insisting on answers to questions.

Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Appropriations Comimttee, has warned the administration it must itself police the CIA budget more stringently than that of any other agency because he and other Congressmen believe they should protect the sensitive CIA budget, as it comes to them, from the congressional economy bloc and the Agency's more determined critics.

As a result of this and other congressional representations, the CIA "slush fund" for emergencies has been reduced below $100 million. And—much to Mr. McCone's annoyance—President Johnson's economy drives resulted in an administration reduction in the Agency's budget.

Three things, however, are clear about this congressional oversight.

NO REAL CONTROL

One is that the subcommittee members exercise no real control because they are not informed of all covert operations, either before or after they take place.

The second point regarding congressional oversight is that a handful of men like Senators CANNON and RUSSELL with their great prestige, do not so much control the CIA as shield it from its critics.

Finally, even these establishment watchdogs can be told just as much as the CIA Director thinks they should know. In fact, one or two of the subcommittee members are known to shy away from too much secret information, on the ground that they do not want either to know about "black" operations or take the chance of unwittingly disclosing them.

For all these reasons, there is a large body of substantial opinion—in and out of Congress—that favors more specific monitoring of intelligence activity.

The critics insist that Congress has a duty periodically to investigate the activities of the CIA and other intelligence arms; to check on the CIA's relations with other executive departments, study its budget and exercise greater and more intelligent oversight than the present diffused subcommittees, which operate without staff and with little or no representation from members most concerned with foreign affairs.

A FOUNTAIN OF LEAKS

But the overwhelming consensus of those most knowledgeable about the CIA, now and in the past, does not support the idea that Congress should "control" the CIA. A number of reasons are adduced:

Security. Congress is the well-known fountain of more leaks than any other body in Washington. The political aspirations of and pressures on Members make them eager to appear in print; they do not have the executive responsibility weighing on them, and many CIA operations could provide dramatic passages in campaign speeches.

Politics. Any standing committee would have to be bipartisan. This would give minority party members—as well as dissidents in the majority—unparalleled opportunities to learn the secrets of the executive branch and of foreign policy, and to make political capital of mistakes or controversial policies. Republicans, for instance, armed with all the facts and testimony that investigation could have disclosed, might well have wrecked the Kennedy administration after the Bay of Pigs.

The Constitution. The CIA acts at the direction of the President and the National Security Council. If a congressional committee had to be informed in advance of CIA activities, covert and overt, there might well be a direct congressional breach of the constitutional freedom of the executive branch and of the President's right to conduct foreign policy.

Control. If a carefully chosen committee conscientiously tried to avoid all these dangers, it could probably exercise little real "control" of the kind critics desire. At best, for instance, it could probably do little more than investigate some questionable operations in secrecy and after they had taken place, and then report privately to the President, who might or might not respond.

Ideology. Congress is full of "professional anti-Communists" and has not a few "professional liberals." In its worldwide activities, the CIA regularly takes covert actions that would profoundly offend either or both—for instance, supporting some non-Communist leftist against a military regime, or vice versa. To report this kind of activity to Congress would be certain to set off public debate and recriminations and lay a whole new set of domestic political pressures on the agency.

Policy. Knowledgeable men in Washington do not accept the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as a desirable model for oversight of the CIA. They point out that the Atomic Energy Committee has developed its own staff of experts in its field, in some cases abler men than those in the Atomic Energy Commission, and these congressional experts now have a vested interest in their own ideas of atomic policy and projects.

AN EMPIRE FORESEEN

This, these sources fear, would be the outcome of a joint committee on intelligence—a new intelligence empire on Capitol Hill that could in time exert a direct policy influence on the CIA, separate from and challenging the President's policy decisions. This would diffuse rather than focus power over the Agency and confuse rather than clarify the problem of control.

Other recommendations for a congressional intervention have been advanced. The most drastic—and in some ways the most interesting—would be to legislate the separation of the CIA's intelligence and analysis function from the operations or "dirty tricks" function.

President Kennedy, after the Bay of Pigs, rejected a proposal to create a new and autonomous intelligence and analysis agency. This plan would have covert political operations under a small and largely anonymous section of the State Department.

EFFICIENCY DROP FEARED

If accepted, this plan would have had the great advantage, in terms of control, of divorcing "black" operators and their schemes from the source of information on which the decision to act must be made. Thus, the covert operators would have no more information than anyone else in government, no power to shape, color, withhold, or manufacture information, and could, in effect, do only what they were told to do by political authorities.

It would also reduce the sheer size and power of the CIA within the Government, much of which is based on its combination of functions—providing information, proposing action, and having the ability to carry it out.

On the other hand, as Mr. Kennedy concluded, such a divorce might well lower the total overt and covert efficiency of the intelligence effort. Those who favor the present combined agency insist that intelligence and action officers must be close enough to advise one another—with analysts checking operators, but also profiting from the operators' experiences in the field.

Moreover, they point out that so-called paramilitary operations are more easily transferred on paper than in fact to the Defense Department. They note that the Department, for instance, can by law, ship arms only to recognized governments that undertake certain obligations in return, and cannot legally arm or assist, say, rebel groups or mercenaries, even for laudable purposes.

Nor could the Defense Department easily acquire the skill, the convenient "covers," the political talents, and bureaucratic flexibility required for quick, improvised action in time of crisis.

As evidence of that, there is the case of the successful political and military organization of hill tribesmen in Vietnam carried out by the CIA some years ago. When the Army won control of the operation in a bureaucratic infight, the good beginning was lost in a classic bit of military mismanagement and the tribal project collapsed.

As for the State Department's taking over covert operations, the opponents ask how could the Department survive the inevitable exposure of some bit of political skulduggery in some other country, when it is supposed to be the simon-pure vessel of the United States proper diplomatic relations?

A LESS DRASTIC PLAN

A far less drastic but perhaps more feasible approach would be to add knowledgeable congressional experts in foreign affairs to the military and appropriations subcommittees that now check on the CIA.

Along this line is the idea backed by Senator McCARTHY—that a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should be added to the existing watchdogs.

Such men as J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, the Senate Democratic leader, and GEORGE D. AIKEN of Vermont, a Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee, might bring greater balance and sensitivity to the present group of watchdog subcommittees.

Most of those interviewed in the New York Times survey for these articles also believed that the CIA should have no influence on the selection of members of the subcommittees.

While the excuse for giving the Agency a voice is to make sure that only "secure" and "responsible" Members of Congress are chosen, the net effect is that the Agency usually manages to have itself checked by its best friends in Congress and by those who can best shield it from more critical Members like Senator McCARTHY and Senator MANSFIELD.

FUND SLASH PROPOSED

Finally, many observers consider that it might be useful for some select nonpermanent committee of independent-minded Members of Congress to make a thorough, responsible study of the whole intelligence community. Such a group might set out to determine how much of the community's activity is actually needed or useful, and how much of the whole apparatus might be reduced in size and expense—and thus in the kind of visibility that brings the CIA into disrepute overseas and at home.

One former official said quite seriously that he was not sure how much the Nation would lose in vital services if all the activities of the CIA apart from those dealing with technological espionage—satellites and the like—had their budgets arbitrarily reduced by half.

A number of others suggested that it was possible for a great many of the CIA's information-gathering functions and study projects to be handled openly by the State Department, if only Congress would appropriate the money for it.

But the State Department is traditionally starved for funds by Members of Congress who scoff at the "cookie pushers" and the "striped-pants boys." The same Members are often quite willing to appropriate big sums, almost blindly, for the secret, "tough" and occasionally glamorous activities of the spies, saboteurs, and mysterious experts of the CIA.

As another example of what a specially organized, responsible congressional investigation might discover, some officials expressed their doubts about the National Security Agency. This Defense Department arm specializes in making and breaking codes, spends about $1 billion a year—twice as much as the CIA—and, in the opinion of many who know its work, hardly earns its keep.

But to most of those interviewed, the question of control ultimately came down to the caliber and attitude of the men who run the CIA, and particularly its Director.

The present Director, Admiral Raborn, is a man who earned a high reputation as the developer of the Navy's Polaris missile but who had no previous experience in intelligence work. Nor is he particularly close to President Johnson or to other high administration officials.

INAUSPICIOUS START

The admiral took office on a bad day—the one on which Mr. Johnson dispatched the Marines to Santo Domingo last April.

Admiral Raborn and his predecessor, Mr. McCone, lunched together in downtown Washington that afternoon, unaware of the imminent intervention. As they parted, Admiral Raborn offered Mr. McCone a ride to the Langley, Va., headquarters of the CIA. But Mr. McCone said he was going home to pack his clothes.

Those who know of this exchange have a hunch that if Mr. McCone had accepted the invitation and returned to the turmoil that quickly developed in his old office, the history of the intervention might have been different. Many are inclined to blame Admiral Raborn, in any event, for the mishmash of hasty evidence the CIA contrived to justify the State Department's claim that there was a threat of a Communist uprising.

One reason the admiral was chosen, after President Johnson had searched for 6 months for a successor to Mr. McCone, was that as head of the Polaris project he had shown great ability to work with and mollify inquisitive Congressmen.

Another was that his military background made him an unlikely target for charges of being too "soft" or too liberal for his post. The same consideration influenced President Kennedy in choosing the conservative Republican John McCone, and it is notable that no leading figure of the Democratic Party, much less one of its liberals, has ever been the Agency's Director.

Because of his lack of experience in intelligence and international affairs, it is widely believed among present and former officials that Admiral Raborn was chosen primarily as a "front man." Ironically, the Congress that he was supposed to impress is actually concerned—interviews disclosed—because he has not seemed to have the sure grasp of the Agency's needs and activities that would most inspire confidence in it.

RABORN DEFENDED

Knowledgeable sources say the CIA itself, in its day-to-day business, is a bureaucracy like any other, functioning routinely whatever the quality of its leadership. These sources argue that the experience and professionalism of its staff are so great that any lack of these qualities in Admiral Raborn is scarcely felt.

But they do not agree that "Red" Raborn is just a front man. He is different—as would be expected—from any Director who preceded him, but there is evidence available to suggest that he may not be such an unfortunate choice as has been suggested in a number of critical articles in the press.

The admiral is said to have President Johnson's confidence, although in a different way from the confidence President Kennedy placed in Mr. McCone. The latter was a valued member of the group that argued out high policy and influenced the President's decisions, not with facts but also with opinions and recommendations.

Admiral Raborn is said to to make little effort to exert such an influence on policy. Partly, this is because Mr. Johnson apparently does not want the CIA Director in such a role—and among those interviewed by the New York Times there was a belief that one reason John McCone left the post was that he could not play as influential a role as he had in the Kennedy administration.

The main reason for the admiral's approach, however, is his Navy background. He regards himself as having more of a service and staff mission than a policymaking job.

He believes it is his duty to lay the best available facts before the President and those other high officials who make or influence policy, so that their judgments may be as informed as possible. To enter into policy discussions as an advocate, in his view, would inevitably compromise his role as an impartial and objective source of information.

Among knowledgeable officials, moreover, Admiral Raborn is credited with at least two administrative developments within the Agency—both stemming, again, from his Navy background.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING

He has installed an operations center, not unlike a military command post or a Navy ship's "combat information center." In it, round-the-clock duty officers constantly monitor communications of every sort. They can instantly communicate with the White House, State Department, Pentagon, and agents in the field, by means of the Agency's wizardry with machines and electronics.

This represents primarily a drawing together and streamlining of capabilities the Agency already had, but it is rated as a positive advance in CIA efficiency.

The other Raborn innovation is a Navy-like system of long-range management planning. He has assigned a group of officials to "look ahead" for decades at the shape of the world to come.

Out of this continuing study, the admiral hopes to be able to make more precise plans for the Agency's needs in manpower, money, equipment, and organization in, say, 1975, so that it can be planned for right now.

There persists among many interested in the CIA, however, a reluctance to accept the idea that the Agency should be headed by anyone other than an experienced, strong executive with a wide grasp of international affairs and intelligence work, strong ties to the administration and the knowledge and determination to keep the Agency's work within the limits of policy and propriety.

This concern has been heightened by the departure from the White House of McGeorge Bundy, now president of the Ford Foundation. As Mr. Johnson's representative on the 54–12 group, he was probably second only to the director of the CIA in maintaining "control" and took an intense interest in this duty.

Thus, if the White House replacements, Bill D. Moyers and Walt W. Rostow, prove either less interested or less forceful in representing the White House interest in CIA operations, and if Admiral Raborn's alleged lack of experience in intelligence and foreign affairs handicaps him, effective control of the Agency could be weakened without any change at all in the official processes of control.

PROMOTION DEBATE

Some people concluded even before the end of the admiral's first year that the difficulties of finding a succession of suitable CIA directors made it advisable to promote impressive professionals from within the Agency.

The most widely respected of these is the Deputy Director, Richard Helms, who was said to have been Mr. McCone's choice to succeed him.

Others argue, however, that intelligence is too dangerous a thing to be left to professional spies and that a loyal associate of the President's with the political qualifications for a senior Cabinet position should hold the post.

Whatever his identity, however, the prime conclusion of the New York Times survey of the Central Intelligence Agency is that its Director is or should be the central figure in establishing and maintaining the actual substance of control, whatever its forms may take. For if the Director insists, and bends all his efforts to make sure, that the Agency serve the political administration of the Government, only blind chance or ineptitude in the field is likely to take the CIA out of political control.

CONCLUSIONS OF STUDY

A number of other conclusions also emerge from the study:

Whatever may have been the situation in the past, and whatever misgivings are felt about Admiral Raborn, there is now little concern in the Johnson administration or among former high officials, and there is even less evidence, that the CIA is making or sabotaging foreign policy or otherwise acting on its own.

When CIA operations acquire a life of their own and outrun approved policy, they often follow a pattern well known also in less secret arms of Government. Diplomats frequently say more than they are told to say to other governments or otherwise exceed their instructions. Foreign aid and propaganda operations, though "public," can commit the United States to practices and men in ways not envisioned by Washington. Military operations can escalate by their own logic, and when things go wrong the Pentagon has at times been more reluctant than the CIA in producing the facts.

Nonetheless, while the CIA acts as the Government's fountain of information as well as its "black" operating arm, while it is the CIA that both proposes operations and supplies the facts to justify them, the danger of its getting out of control of the administration exists and ought to be taken seriously within and without the Government. The Bay of Pigs stands as enduring testimony to that fact.

The task of coping with this danger is essentially that of the President, his highest officials, and the Director of the CIA. It can only be met peripherally by congressional oversight, and then with increased danger of security leaks and domestic political pressures on the Agency.

The charges against the CIA at home and abroad are so widespread, and in many ways, so exaggerated that the effectiveness and morale of the Agency may be seriously impaired. In particular, there could ultimately be a problem in recruiting and keeping the high caliber of personnel upon whom the Agency must rely both for doing useful work and for keeping that work within proper bounds.

CRUCIAL QUESTIONS

Thus, there must be in this and in any administration a tight, relentless, searching review and analysis of the CIA and its activities, meeting squarely and answering honestly at least these questions:

Is any proposed operation or activity likely, on balance, to make a genuine and necessary contribution, in the long view as well as the short, to legitimate American interests and aspirations in the world, or is it merely convenient, expedient, and possible without regard to its wider implications or to the real necessity for it?

In sum, is the Government of a proud and honorable people relying too much on "black" operations, "dirty tricks," harsh and illicit acts in the "back alleys" of the world? Is there some point at which meeting fire with fire, force with force, subversion with subversion, crime with crime, becomes so prevalent and accepted that there no longer remains any distinction of honor and pride between grim and implacable adversaries?

These questions are a proper and necessary concern for the people of the United States. They are a proper and necessary concern for Congress. But in the nature of the case, neither the people nor Congress can easily learn the answers, much less insure that the answers are always the right ones.

THE PRESIDENT'S TASK

That can only be done within the executive branch, by the highest authorities of the Government. Controlling the CIA is a job that rests squarely upon the President of the United States, the Director of the Agency, and the officials appointed by the President to check its work. And if these men are to insist that they do control the Agency, then they are the ones who must be blamed if control fails.

"Those who believe that the U.S. Government on occasion resorts to force when it shouldn't," Richard Bissell, the CIA's former Deputy Director, once said, "should in all fairness and justice direct their views to the question of national policy and not hide behind the criticism that whereas the President and Cabinet generally are enlightened people, there is an evil and ill-controlled agency which imports this sinister element."

The New York Times study of the CIA suggests that it is not an invisible government but the real government of the United States upon which the responsibility must lie whenever the Agency may be found "out of control." For if that responsibility is accepted, there can be no invisible government.

AN ENDURING SOCIETY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on the evening of May 1, 1966, the American Good Government Society held its annual meeting in which it memorialized the enduring contributions made by George Washington to America. On that occasion, Archie K. Davis, of Winston-Salem, N.C., delivered the principal address which he entitled "An Enduring Society."

Mr. Davis, who is currently serving as president of the American Bankers Association, has made contributions of the utmost significance to his community, his State, and his Nation in the fields of banking, education, industry, good government, and religion. He is one of the Nation's most profound historians and eloquent orators.

In his address before the Good Government Society, Mr. Davis portrayed the purposes which prompted the Founding Fathers to make the America we love, and the conditions which must be met if America is to endure as a government of laws dedicated to the freedom of the individual.

His address merits the consideration of all thoughtful Americans, and for this reason ought to be as widely disseminated as possible. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. JORDAN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ENDURING SOCIETY

In addressing this distinguished audience, I am not unmindful of the signal honor accorded me; for, in paying tribute to two such distinguished public servants, the Honorable SAM J. ERVIN, senior U.S. Senator from North Carolina, and the Honorable GERALD FORD of Michigan, House minority leader, we are privileged to do so in the name of George Washington, the first and greatest of all Americans.

Even if the ingredients of history were not present, I would be tempted to provide them gratuitously. But, recognizing that the immortal name of Washington is forever linked with that of the Commonwealth of Virginia, I really have no choice but to anchor my text in history. As a provincial patriot none was the equal of Washington, although he was as national in stature and outlook as he was provincial. A grateful nation and a prideful Commonwealth justifiably claim him with equal felicity. We in North Carolina take pardonable pride in proximity to such historic eminence.

As a North Carolinian, however, I share with all other North Carolinians the knowledge that we have been nurtured in the spirit of true humility. We have long since given up any hope of ever establishing historic primacy over Virginia. Having suffered "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" lo' these many years, we have been forced to cultivate an attitude of expectancy for the future and one of resignation for the past.

It is true, of course, that the first English settlement in America was on North Carolina soil, in the years 1585–87, but we now know that the first permanent English settlement in America was begun on April 26, 1607, at Jamestown, Va. To our persistent claim that the first white child was born in North Carolina, we are always asked, "Why, then, did you name her Virginia Dare?"

Beginning in the early 1750's, and during the many years of westward expansion thereafter, we in North Carolina have always prided ourselves upon the daring exploits of Daniel Boone in opening up the Kentucky territory. Nor have we overlooked our claim to the remarkable Christopher Gist who served as companion and guide to young George Washington in the early exploration of the Ohio territory. He, like Boone, once lived in the upper Yadkin River section of North Carolina. But there, unhappily, our claims to explorer fame must end; for, as the Virginia historians remind us, it was George Rogers Clark of Albemarle County, Va., who came to be known as the defender of Kentucky and the conqueror of the Northwest. To make assurance doubly sure, his younger brother, Will Clark, and Meriwether Lewis teamed up as the famous Lewis and Clark expedition and laid claim to all the territory now known as the great Pacific Northwest. Because of this expedition, we are advised that the first white man to be buried on Iowa soil was a Virginian, Sergeant Floyd, and the first white men to set eyes on what is now the State of Idaho were obviously none other than Lewis and Clark of Virginia.

As history quite accurately reveals, the Virginians were not solely preoccupied with the Ohio territory and the Pacific Northwest. How else, indeed, could the great State of Texas have been properly sired, nurtured, and launched upon her unerring course to future eminence had it not been for Stephen F. Austin, of Virginia, long known to history as the father of Texas? And but for the timely presence and daring leadership of Sam Houston at the Battle of San Jacinto, Tex., in 1836, would anyone dare contemplate anything but ignominious defeat at the hands of the Mexicans. Obviously, it goes without saying that Sam Houston was born and bred a Virginian.

In defiance of the British Crown and the obvious injustices of taxation without representation, one would hope that the house arrest of Governor Tryon by an aroused citizenry at old Brunswick Town, N.C., in 1766, the Mecklenburg declaration of independence on May 20, 1775, and the Halifax Resolves of April 12, 1776, by the North Carolina Provincial Assembly, would not have gone generally unnoticed in the annals of opposition. But, in all candor, we must recognize that the clarion call to arms by Patrick Henry and the Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson have tended to preserve Virginia's claim to primacy in the field of rebellion. So incensed and critically abusive was Jefferson over North Carolina's presumption to this niche in history that a North Carolinian, one "Shocco" Jones, was prompted to publish a treatise entitled "A Defense of the Revolutionary History of the State of North Carolina From the Aspersions of Mr. Jefferson." This was published in 1834, in both Boston and Raleigh, and one would suppose that the citizens of the two States received no little satisfaction in its reading.

The sharing of a common border by Virginia and North Carolina, the 36° 30'' parallel designated by Charles II in 1663, has no doubt occasioned this friendly but spirited rivalry over the years. We are still fighting the American Civil War. Who went farthest up Cemetery Ridge on that fateful day of July 3, 1863, continues to be classed as a matter of high controversy.

To Virginians it was George E. Pickett. To North Carolinians it was James Johnston Pettigrew. Here again, a North Carolinian, after lengthy investigation, was constrained to set the record straight. The author was Chief Justice Walter Clark of the State supreme court, one whose judicial restraint and dispassionate temperament made for an objective and factual exposition. If there be Virginians in my hearing, I now, with no little trepidation, reveal the title of his publication: "North Carolina Regiments 1861–65: First at Bethel; Farthest to the Front at Gettysburg and Chickamauga; Last at Appomattox."

Congressman Ford may well wonder in what manner and to what degree Michigan is beholden to the Commonwealth of Virginia. Happy am I to relate publicly, perhaps for the first time, the story of the Toledo strip and the compromise, engineered by one Stevens Thompson Mason, that gave Ohio the disputed Toledo strip in return for which Michigan gained the northern peninsula wonderland from Wisconsin. Tom Mason had gone to Michigan in 1829. A grateful citizenry elected him their first Governor in 1836, the year Michigan gained statehood. He was reelected in 1838 but refused renomination in 1840, moving to New York for the practice of law. He died there at the tender age of 31. A young man of such remarkable accomplishments could only have come from Leesburg, in Fairfax County, Va., And was it purely coincidental that young Lt. Robert E. Lee, of Virginia, should have been called westward in the summer and fall of 1835 to help run the boundary line between Michigan and Ohio?

Most poignant of all perhaps, and most certainly to one of our honored guests this evening, is the sure knowledge that a North Carolinian, and none other than the aforementioned Christopher Gist, saved the life of the future father of his country; for it was on a bitterly cold day, Saturday, December 29, 1753, as they were crossing the ice-choked Allegheny River, that Maj. George Washington slipped from their raft and was retrieved from almost certain death by the frost-bitten fingers of Christopher Gist.

We, in North Carolina, yield to Virginia in many things, but on this one point and in our affection for her noblest son we yield to none. And yet, we share with all America the legacy of a name whose lasting greatness is more indelibly associated with character than with deeds. As great as were his victories in war and as remarkable as was his leadership of men, the Washington whom we revere as the Father of our Country was, above all else, a man of unquestioned integrity, unswerving devotion to duty, rare perseverance and deep religious convictions.

Mere reference to the name George Washington is suggestively connotative. He was so intimately associated, within the span of a lifetime, with exploration, revolution, war, the birth of a nation and constitutional government that one naturally, and almost instinctively, focuses upon his day and age in evaluating the evolutionary development of our federated system of government.

The problems that confronted the framers of the Constitution were seemingly insurmountable. In that day it was a question of replacing the weak, and wholly inadequate, Articles of Confederation with a strong central government. The great constitutional debates of 1788 provided mighty arguments for and against a governmental concept that was both national and federal. It was a question of providing for the general welfare of the people without destroying individual freedom. It was a question of delegating and reserving certain well-defined rights and duties between provincial and national authorities. It was a question of putting together an effective, closely knit federation of States in which dual authority was both inherent and necessary. Delicate indeed, to say the least, was this problem of balancing on the one hand, preserving on the other, providing national unity, protecting State rights and, above all else, allowing for future change and modifications as the needs of the people might require.

Provincial power was strong in those days. In fact, the Revolutionary War was a provincial war. The act of uniting 13 provinces under one central government, the assumption of all provincial debts by this delegated authority and the imposition of Federal tax levies were the accomplishments of a people dedicated to self-government. Remarkably effective was the political leadership of that day, and present always was the inspiring, constructive influence of George Washington.

The leaders of those days were, I presume, either liberal or conservative, depending upon one's point of view. Today, from our retrospective vantage point, we would find it difficult to agree upon the assignment of descriptive labels. Was Hamilton a liberal or a conservative, and just what do we mean by a Jeffersonian Democrat or a conservative Republican Party? Of this we may be certain: then, as now, the ideal of government was to balance the relationship between the governor and the governed. It was then and has always been tempered by pragmatic considerations. These considerations, of course, are shaped and molded by changing circumstances.

Presumably, the ideal of conservative government was achieved during the years of the Virginia dynasty of Presidents which, with the exception of 4 years under the Presidency of John Adams, lasted from 1789 to 1824. The Jacksonian era emerged in almost direct antithesis to its conservative forerunner. But it was representative of the times and reflected the growing influence of those who had settled west of the Alleghenies. The common man demanded recognition and representation.

The tragic era of the Civil War, and its equally tragic aftermath, was not unrelated to the Missouri Compromise of 1820. The ubiquitous parallel of 36°30''—the southern boundary of Missouri—was used to divide the 11 slave-holding States of the South from the 11 free States of the North. It was assumed to be a compromise then in the name of pragmatism, but it might have been the first official act to set the stage for civil conflict. Actually, it was not a compromise in that it fixed an arbitrary and rigid line of division. This was a departure from the American system of government, for it denied the fluidity of change.

And who is there to say that the American Civil War was not inevitable and that only in the crucible of war could the elements of disunion have been eliminated and the ties of a stronger union forged? The points of division were many and lay deep in the sectional differences and traditions of the past. But they were overcome, in time, in spite of bitterness and injustices both real and fancied. Out of this stronger union evolved the concert of power that proved to be the margin of victory in the great world wars of this century. Today, America stands alone as the greatest power on earth. She stands as a monument to freedom and as a symbol of hope in a very uncertain world. But her constitutional form of government, conceived and born in travail, has never known a day when it was not on trial or under pressure of changing circumstances. And in her comparatively brief existence of 177 years at least every generation has had good reason to express grave concern for her future.

The very nature of man, with all his human frailties, preempts any possibility of rigid consistency in the government of men—certainly in a democratic society. Vicissitudes of change provide such constant and often conflicting pressures that they must be reflected in the attitudes of both government and the governed.

Only the philosophic detachment afforded by time permits us to refer casually to that period immediately following the Civil War when a mighty Congress was intent upon destroying the balance of power between the legislative and the executive branches of Government. The impeachment proceedings against President Andrew Johnson were denied in the U.S. Senate by the fateful margin of only one vote on May 26, 1868. Anyone in that day might have been justified in saying that a government so infested with bigotry and hypocrisy could not possibly survive.

Or consider the rise of the populist movement in the latter part of the 19th century, and its influence upon the course of government down to the present day. The labor movement of this century, and the declining influence of the farmer, whose relative numerical position in our society has decreased from 35 percent to 8 percent in the past 50 years, are a part of the pattern. The Great Depression of the early 1930's provided a monumental and lasting impact upon our society. As profound as were the changes wrought in government and in the attitudes of the governed at that time, honesty requires us to recognize that what was revolutionary then is now accepted fact, and in large measure an appropriate reflection of the will of the people.

It is yet too early to assess the sociological, the philosophical, and the economic consequences of a nation at war for the past quarter of a century. Since 1941, the United States has been deeply involved in world affairs—an involvement prompted by humanitarian reasons as well as by the national interest. The burdens and pressures of this involvement, coupled with remarkably dramatic developments in the fields of atomic energy, space science, and electronics are awesome to contemplate.

And yet, our Federal Government has performed no less remarkably. With all the built-in inefficiencies of a democratic society, so necessary and so illogical, with all the partisan politics of a two-party system, so necessary and so natural, and with all the conflicting interests of a heterogeneous society, so necessary and so human, is it not with pardonable pride that we contemplate the dynamism, the resiliency and the effectiveness of our American system of government? In paying tribute to our honored guests this evening, we also pay tribute to their associates in government, to countless career officials and to the memory of our Founding Father, George Washington.

Certainly, no citizenry has had greater cause for justifiable gratitude and, consequently, greater reason for preserving and protecting what is a priceless heritage. It is not to detract from the sincerity of this observation when one suggests that the manner in which we have reacted to the phenomena of our times does raise serious questions as to present and future implications.

To any student of history it is clear that changing patterns in the relationship between government and the governed must be accepted as a normal circumstance—especially in a democratic society whose governmental mechanism is designed to provide for freedom of expression, action and reaction and fluidity of response. Therefore, our concern for the future must not be prompted by the fact of change but rather by the implications of change. Nor must we be concerned so much by the magnitude and rapidity of recent trends and developments as by the attitude of the people and their representatives in government.

No one can seriously argue the necessary and constitutional role of our Federal Government in national defense and in broad areas of public welfare. This general responsibility has obviously involved penetration into many aspects of the civil, social, scientific and economic life of our people. The question is: Does our Federal Government presume to exercise these broad responsibilities as a theoretical right or within the constitutional framework of a federated republic in which the lines of responsibility are supposed to be clearly delineated? I hasten to add, however, that these lines of delegated or retained responsibility may not have been drawn with precision. Amendments to the contrary notwithstanding, no one would presume to claim perfection for such a remarkable document either in the year of its ratification or now. But I profoundly believe that the intent of its framers is as valid and vital to individual freedom today as it was then.

Our Federal Government emerged as the unifying force between 13 separate and distinct governmental units. Today they number 50, and in the intervening 177 years every effort has been made to tear this Union asunder, from nullification, to secession, to outright war. And always the question at issue has been the same in any given area of controversy: Does final authority rest at the State or Federal level?

It is at this point that we must admit to a belief that our form of government is completely illogical if the intent of its founders was to create an efficient system of government. Obviously, it was not, for every conceivable condition was written into the Constitution—not for the purpose of insuring efficiency or uniformity but solely for the purpose of guaranteeing individual freedom in a well-ordered society. How else can one interpret the duality of State and Federal jurisdictions, and the system of checks and balances existing among the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of our Federal Government? The problem was to provide national unity and cohesion without destroying certain authorities and responsibilities of State government. The problem was also to provide a system of internal controls that would protect society against itself—against the extremes of either State despotism or of individual license. The net result was a classic in terms of cumbersome inefficiency but a monument to human understanding.

It is only within this context that we, the people, may now fairly assess our stewardship. Have we been successful in preserving this intended balance of power within government and between the States and the Federal Government? If not, has there been an overconcentration of power at the Federal level with a corresponding diminution of authority and responsibility at the State level? Has this imbalance been wrought by men of evil intent, has it been the work of some despotic or totalitarian hand or have positive forces at the Federal level simply gained ascendancy over negative forces existing at State levels of government? Finally, is this imbalance a permanent condition or might we reasonably anticipate a correction in keeping with cyclical movements in history?

These questions, in my judgment, provide the clues, and perhaps the answers, to the dilemma that confronts modern America. Unquestionably, there has been a substantial erosion of local autonomy. No facet of our lives has been left untouched. Whether civil, social, or economic, the depth of Federal penetration is matched only by its breadth. While much can be attributed to justifiable circumstances involving national interest, honesty compels us to recognize that much can also be attributed to dereliction of responsibility at the local level. We the people, supposedly the champions of so-called States rights, have not been true and loyal defenders. In certain areas we have simply abdicated and yielded the ground by default. Loud in our criticism of the positive nature of Federal power, we have been singularly apathetic in our support of counterbalancing forces. We have overlooked the key to our constitutional heritage; namely, a government of balance that can only be preserved through the exercise of enlightened and responsible citizenship. The blame lies with us, not with our representatives in government because their actions are largely expressive of the will of the people or the lack of it.

So, when we deplore the growing manifestations of Federal intrusion into our lives and into those areas once considered the domain of individual responsibility and authority, as exercised at the provincial level, let us remember that we are not without fault. Somewhere along the line, we have not responded adequately to the pressures of changing circumstances. Somewhere along the line, we have either failed to grasp the significance of these changes or, perhaps more correctly, have failed to associate ourselves as responsible participants.

Therefore, we have increasingly relied upon the agency of the Federal Government, not that of the State or of the community, to provide for ourselves a wide range of social, economic, and civil needs seemingly not otherwise available; hence, the concentration of power at the Federal level. Congress can only legislate, not administer; hence, the concentration of power in the executive branch of Government. The President must largely delegate the administrative functions of his office; hence, the powerful authority, and necessarily so, of a vast bureaucracy.

It is precisely in this situation that individual freedom occupies a rather precarious foothold; for the very complexities of government will not tolerate clearly defined areas of authority. Government of laws becomes blended with government of men. Tolerances yield to intolerances. The governed complain of restrictions and abuses that bear the color of red and answer to the name of tape. The administrators sense and expect little sympathetic understanding from those for whom they labor; so frustration becomes the lot of all men.

In this garden of confusion the seeds of synthesis are nurtured. As the ramifications of Government spread, the illogical yields to the logical, and increasingly we hear pleas for consolidation in the name of efficiency and for uniformity in the name of simplicity. The tide swings in this direction because it is the logical way out of confusion and inefficiency. It should not come as a surprise to us, therefore, that Federal aid and regulation must necessarily bear the restrictions of custodial responsibility and, in large measure, reflect the will of the benefactor. It should not come as a surprise to us, therefore, that unified systems of specialized regulatory bodies are much more practical than those systems which would attempt to preserve the duality of Federal and State supervision. So expediency leads us steadily down the road we were warned not to travel. That was at a time when individual freedom was highly meaningful, for it had just been won.

In this sense, individual freedom is a relative matter. We of this generation cannot fully comprehend that which we have never lost; so our sense of obligation is not fortified by an abiding sense of appreciation. We tend to forget that local autonomy also means local responsibility and that "every right has its corresponding duty." We take for granted that which we should be zealously guarding. Our changing attitude is a reflection of our changing will which, regrettably, is no longer firmly anchored in the bedrock of belief that individual freedom and individual responsibility are inseparable. So, we of the conservative faith decry the harvests of others while failing to till the garden in our own backyard.

It seemed perfectly clear to James Madison, back in 1788, where the powers and responsibilities lay if the people were to preserve their provincial liberties and, therefore, their individual freedom. No misunderstanding can be read into his words when he said "the powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects, which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people; and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State." There can be no doubt that Madison believed fervently in provincial responsibility and, in reserving powers to the several States, felt that primary concern for the welfare of the people must come from the people themselves.

If this interpretation be correct, then the theory would be applicable to any form of democratic society whether national, a federated republic, State, or community. For a democratic society to work, and thus preserve individual freedom, the one common denominator, the sine qua non, must be a responsible, cooperative citizenry, nurtured in self-reliance and firmly believing in the power of individual initiative and creativity.

There must be a fusion of individual and community values so that self-assertion is blended into cooperative enterprise among individuals.

The workability of such an ideal system depends not only upon enlightened leadership but upon a high degree of political vitality and intelligence among citizens. If the people become convinced that only an all-powerful Central Government can meet their needs, then the foresight of the Founding Fathers will have been in vain and their grand design for liberty will become no more than a study for future historians. If, on the other hand, the people become convinced that the power, and responsibility, to preserve self-government still rests with them, then the course of future action is clear.

Each individual must reaffirm his personal belief in his ability—as one person—to influence the course of history to some degree and in some manner. There are far too many people—some of them in positions of great influence—who seem to believe that the individual as a positive force is obsolete in our complex society.

If, as is clearly apparent, the centralization tendencies in American Government are highly pronounced, is not the importance of public opinion placed in bold relief as an effective limitation on governmental power? In such an environment, the larger question is whether the force of a democratic majority can be directed to an intelligent course of action. The question for each of us here is whether we are doing all we can, individually and in concert—to provide that kind of leadership essential to an intelligent course of action.

Those who believe in the separation of powers inherent in our Constitution can only preserve reasonable State autonomy by providing adequate State vitality. By State vitality I refer to the effective development of the human and natural resources of a State under the guidance of local initiative. State vitality can thrive only where the composite attitude of its citizens reflects a sense of pride, obligation, and determination—fired by imaginative resourcefulness. This concept of citizenship is demanding in terms of talent and energy; and heavy burdens are imposed on those who would aspire to leadership. But it is the only positive way left in which we might hopefully restore the balance between Federal and local autonomy. If this philosophy were broadly accepted throughout the many States, is it not likely that our representatives in government would both reflect and respect this attitude of citizenship responsibility?

Progress which requires the sacrifice of fundamental principles is progress at a price we cannot afford to pay. Only through continuing—and constructive—application of these fundamental principles in our society can we justify our heritage and assure its economic, political, social, and spiritual benefits to those who will follow us.

The distinguished statesmen being honored this evening have demonstrated a total commitment to these principles. By word and by deed, in the hard and often pitiless glare of the political arena, they have sought to reassert and sustain the ideals and institutions of Government so nobly advanced under the leadership of the immortal Washington.

Their mission is no less our own. The reward for success will not only be progress. It will be an enduring society.

POVERTY PROGRAM IMPOVERISHED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an excellent editorial entitled "Poverty Program Impoverished," published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 22. In it, the editors of this distinguished newspaper call for a "new start and a new direction" to the war on poverty. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POVERTY PROGRAM IMPOVERISHED

Washington's antipoverty program is doing poorly. It is undernourished in performance, in national understanding of its aims and methods, and in its own efforts to cope with the problems which face it. Like those it is designed to help, the program itself is badly in need of relief and rehabilitation.

For some reason which has not yet become clear, the antipoverty program never got off on a sound footing. Hardly had it begun than it ran into bitter attacks from both politicians and sociologists. The politicians, of whom Harlem's powerful Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL has been perhaps the most outspoken, saw in the program tremendous possibilities for political power. Thus the program at once became the victim of fierce political infighting.

As for the sociologists and social workers, they quickly became sharply split over the degree to which the poor should be encouraged to take over and run the program. Although there was general agreement that those being helped should be encouraged to take an active part in selecting local leaders, in many areas participation by the poor themselves has been disappointingly low and slow.

Meanwhile, some long-established private welfare agencies, foremost among them the Salvation Army, are reporting that, by a strange twist, the poverty program is hurting them. Such groups have long provided badly needed shelter and living to many on the lowest economic rungs through giving them work at frankly subsistence wages. In innumerable cases this has provided a refuge and a chance for rehabilitation and progress, while enabling the organization to spread its activities more broadly. Now the poverty program wage scales are said to be making it difficult to find recruits.

In the country as a whole there seems to be a widespread lack of understanding about all aspects of the program. In many cases the confusion is so great that the program has become the butt of jokes and ridicule. Nor was the situation improved by the events in Washington on April 14 when Sargent Shriver, Director of the program and widely held to be a fast friend to the poor, was booed and jostled at a "poor people's convention."

Clearly there is an immediate and strong need to rethink, replan, and further explain the whole antipoverty program. Its general purpose is one which has won wide political and popular support in America—to attack the roots of those conditions which perpetuate poverty from generation to generation. But it is clear that the chance for success is being seriously undermined by the sense of confusion and cross-purposes which overhang the program. A new start and a new direction are needed. These will be more easily attained if the program is first given long and realistic study.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, DALLAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce and its chairman, Mr. E. O. Cartwright, for their interest in better government and the legislative activity in Congress.

Their interest has been manifested in a resolution they have drawn up concerning the controversial issue of unemployment compensation.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE DALLAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, RE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION, H.R. 8282

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States, House Resolution 8282, which contains proposals for sweeping changes in the laws relating to unemployment insurance; and

Whereas such proposals would result in a major increase in the tax burden now carried by business and industry; and

Whereas such proposals would upset the long-standing control by the individual States of various facets of the unemployment compensation program, which of necessity vary greatly from State to State and area to area; and

Whereas such proposals would eliminate the disqualification from unemployment compensation of workers who quit voluntarily without good cause, who are discharged for willful misconduct on the job, and who refuse suitable work while drawing compensation benefits, all of which tend to destroy the principles of hard work and self-reliance upon which this Nation was founded; and

Whereas such proposals threaten the experience rating of employers which has proved most effective in the past: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce opposes the passage of House Resolution 8282 and urges the Congress to defeat such bill; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of the U.S. Congress and to such other persons and organizations as the officers of the Chamber deem appropriate.

Unanimously adopted in regular meeting: March 18, 1966.

ADDRESS BY GEN. WILLIAM H. DRAPER REGARDING POPULATION PROBLEMS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Monday it was my privilege to be present when the national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, Gen. William H. Draper, addressed the National Press Club. General Draper is very much concerned about population problems at home and overseas.

He reported on his 2-month trip to Europe and Africa where he met with Government, United Nations, International Planned Parenthood, and Vatican officials. Three men together, he said, can bring about a satisfactory world solution to the population crisis. The men he named were President Johnson, His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, and U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations.

General Draper carefully spells out the urgent need to bring the world's population and the world's food supply into alinement. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his thoughtful remarks entitled "Is Famine the Only Answer" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Famine the Only Answer?

Members of the National Press Club, I have just spent 6 weeks in Europe and Africa trying to determine whether the world's rapidly growing population is in fact outdistancing the world's supply of food, and whether hunger and starvation actually lie ahead for the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

INTERNATIONAL PLANNED PARENTHOOD

First I took a look at the population side of the equation. I was in London for a week visiting the headquarters of the International Planned Parenthood Federation. Family planning organizers in 40 countries make up its membership, including as one member the Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

Sir Colville Deverell, its able secretary-general, reports that women everywhere, of all races and creeds, desperately want help to avoid unwanted pregnancies. He believes that when voluntary birth control facilities become available throughout the world, and when governments give adequate support, the population problem will be well on the way to solution. To meet that objective, the Federation has doubled its budget this year and hopefully will double it again next year.

At the end of World War II, the world's population was growing at the rate of 1 percent a year, higher than ever before in the world's history. Now, only 20 years later, the annual rate has more than doubled to over 2 percent, thanks largely to the export of American medical miracles such as antibiotics and DDT powder to the entire world.

But this 2 percent world rate is far from uniform. Western Europe averages three-fourths of 1 percent, and has no serious population growth problem. Japan cut its population growth rate in half in 10 years and is now only nine-tenths of 1 percent. Russia and the United States average under 1½ percent, whereas Africa's population is growing over 2 percent, Asia averages 2½ percent, and Latin America's rate is nearly 3 percent.

Broadly speaking, the industrialized countries average about 1 percent a year growth. The rest of the world averages 2½ percent and includes more than 2 of the 3 billion people on earth today. These people in the developing countries are adding nearly 60 million of the 70 million new mouths that have to be fed each year.

A LOSING BATTLE FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

Then to check the world's food production, I flew to Rome and visited FAO—the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which has "the official mission of increasing food production in the developing countries."

FAO has made three world food surveys and knows the facts about the production, distribution and consumption of food throughout the world. Under Dr. B. R. Sen, its dynamic director-general who started the worldwide freedom-from-hunger campaign in 1960, it has a staff of some 3,000 at its headquarters in Rome and many more overseas. It is now preparing the first world food plan to assess the world's food surpluses and deficits, country by country, and to make specific recommendations for improvement.

FAO reports that per capita food production increased in 12 years after World War II in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. For the last 8 years, however, per capita production has been steadily slipping downward, and is simply not keeping pace with population growth. Dr. Sen speaks of "the losing battle against hunger and malnutrition in Latin America and the Far East." That is a polite way of saying that starvation may be unavoidable.

Dr. Sen has concluded that "the prospect seems dark indeed unless there is a combined worldwide effort to raise agricultural productivity in the developing countries along with determined measures to control population growth." He had the courage to ask the International Eucharistic Congress in Bombay, "Can we any more turn our faces away from the concept of family planning when the alternative is starvation and death?"

The whole world is waiting for the answer.

The fact is that most suitable land is already under cultivation, and that the developing countries cannot expect to increase their yield per acre fast enough to keep up with their population growth. How can a country like Brazil, for instance, possibly expect to support and feed a 3½ percent addition to its population each year when it own yield per acre of corn and wheat has actually declined during the last quarter century? Even Europe, which has increased its yield per acre by 2 percent a year would have a food problem today if its population were rising 2½ or 3 percent a year.

FAO's agricultural experience of the last 20 years, and particularly during the last 5 years, shows conclusively that under present conditions, without capital, without markets, without fertilizer, without modern technology, and even more important, without literate farm populations, the developing countries cannot hope or expect to increase food production much more than 1 percent a year. Unless the countries with two-thirds of the world's population substantially reduce their rate of population growth, they face certain starvation.

DROUGHT MENACES AFRICA'S FOOD SUPPLY

So I went on to Africa. In Cairo I was immediately informed that a serious wheat shortage was only beginning to be relieved now that American food-for-peace shipments of wheat have been resumed. Egypt's President Nasser has officially recognized the need for stabilizing his country's population growth by family planning, and a broad program is now getting started under the personal direction of the Prime Minister.

What finally convinced Nasser were the simple facts concerning the Aswan Dam. One of the great engineering projects of modern times, it will store the waters of the Nile nearly a thousand miles from Cairo to make possible the cultivation of 1 million additional acres of formerly arid soil, equal to one fifth of Egypt's arable land. The project should be completed in 1970, but during the 10-year construction period, Egypt's population will have increased by one-quarter. Therefore, the tremendously increased food production made possible by the great Aswan Dam will not put any more food in the average Egyptian's mouth.

In Nairobi, the capital of Kenya, the first words I heard on the news broadcast startled me—the Voice of Kenya was asking for contributions to a national fund to alleviate the famine conditions throughout the country. A severe drought last year had ruined much of the corn crop. Delays in food imports aggravated the hunger and distress for many months. Only recently have large U.S. shipments of food-for-peace corn improved the situation.

So famine already stalks in Africa.

The medical director of Nairobi told me that birth control facilities were already available in most of the city's hospitals thanks to the Family Planning Association of Kenya, and that the Government of Kenya encourages this program. He hoped that the Government would soon undertake or help to finance a vigorous national program, so that the rest of the country could have similar facilities.

QUEEN OF BIRTH CONTROL

In Rhodesia the National Family Planning Association has been operating for the past 9 years, supported almost single-handedly by a devoted woman, Mrs. Stilhaus. She has contributed her time 7 days a week, her home for an office, her telephone, and even her car to travel to all parts of Rhodesia. She has been able to include family planning in 25 health centers in her own country, and has started 5 clinics in the neighboring country of Zambia. Her husband manufactures nitrogen fertilizer, so her friends say the king of fertilizer is married to the queen of birth control. She told me the family planning work with the white Europeans was self-supporting, but that she needed much more outside financial help to meet the needs of the Bantus or Africans, who outnumber whites in Rhodesia 16 to 1.

The drought that brought famine to Kenya also affected Rhodesia and its neighbors. In Zambia and Bechuanaland record numbers are on food relief. In Rhodesia the rains were so late that the crops are poor, but 2 weeks more of drought would have meant real disaster—a complete crop failure, and serious food shortages.

In general, the food situation in Africa is precarious, partly because of drought, which is increasingly common, and partly because of the primitive state of agriculture which cannot keep pace with the high and still rising population growth rates. There is general interest and support for family planning services, but except in Egypt, little government sponsorship.

NEARLY 600 MILLION LATIN AMERICANS IN A.D. 2000?

Last year I visited Latin America several times. Most governments there now realize that the rapid population growth—an average of 3 percent for all of Latin America, and the highest rate for any area in the world—is their greatest obstacle to economic and social development. It even threatens—as Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, the former President of Colombia, has openly said "the very survival of their present-day civilization." But the governments have hesitated to take official action largely because of Catholic opposition. Even this opposition is now diminishing because of the rising rate of illegal abortion, and because of the poverty and misery so obviously resulting from the hordes of children who cannot be properly educated, clothed, or fed.

Latin America as a whole is growing less food per capita than before World War II—and the situation is deteriorating year by year. Without the huge and increasing food shipments from this country, famine would be rampant today in many parts of South America. At present, growth rates, Latin America's 200 millions will triple to 600 million by the year 2000—only 35 years off—and a century later Latin America alone would contain over 10 billion people—three times the present population of the entire world. Impossible, of course. But what is going to slow down the present 3 percent rate, commonsense or starvation? Is famine the only answer?

You all know the situation in Asia, where China is spending $400 million a year—40 percent of her annual foreign exchange earnings—to buy grain, and where India is facing its most acute food crisis in modern times.

In 1964, India had the best grain crop in history—88 million tons—but still she needed 6 million tons of our wheat as foreign aid last year. Then the 1965 monsoon brought very little rain. The grain crop last November was 12 million tons short, and there are 12 million more Indians to feed than a year ago. President Johnson is increasing our grain shipments to the very limit, and the Pope has made worldwide appeals for help. But India is in serious trouble.

The Indian Government knows this and is opening a determined drive to produce more food. It also plans to spend over $200 million on birth control in the next 5 years.

I would sum up the world problem as follows: Every year 1 billion people in the industrialized countries are increasing their population 1 percent and their food 2 percent. Every year the 2 billion people in the developing countries are increasing their population 2½ percent and their food less than 1 percent.

As a whole, the world is increasing its population 2 percent and its food 1 percent. This means that the world is falling behind 1 percent a year—or, to put it another way, food production is falling behind minimum needs by 30 million people more each year. This is why disaster for the human race lies just ahead.

What can be done? What should be done? And who should do it?

Shipping our food-for-peace wheat and corn and rice is no solution. Even if we were willing to pay the cost, we cannot take on the feeding of 30 million more people each year.

The developing countries must solve their own population and food problems. Otherwise nature will take over and starvation will restore the balance between births and deaths.

But we and many others can help them understand that only massive birth control and higher food yields per acre can ever feed them adequately.

THREE MEN CAN ACT

There are today three men who together have it in their power to bring about a satisfactory world solution, Pope Paul VI, President Johnson, and U.N. Secretary U Thant.

The first of these is the Pope in Rome. He has realized the danger of the present population dilemma to the world as a whole and to his half billion Catholic communicants, more than half in Latin America and other developing countries. His special commission on birth control is meeting now in Rome. He has urged it to speed up its work and come quickly to a conclusion. Pope Paul's moral influence is so great with non-Catholics and Catholics alike, that a redefinition of the church's position would have tremendous impact throughout the entire world. It would hasten greatly the day when all men could join at the banquet of life, and, no longer hungry, give greater thought to their moral and mental development.

Another man with great influence is our President, who has already taken the lead in recognizing that all lands including our own must deal with the multiplying problems of their multiplying populations. He said in January, "The hungry world cannot be fed until and unless the growth in its resources and the growth in its population come into balance."

In 1962, I went to Brazil on a mission for President Kennedy, to study acute economic and political problems brought on by President Goulart's regime. At that time, the danger of a Communist takeover in Brazil was very real. When I came back and reported to President Kennedy, I also told him about the serious population problem in northeast Brazil, where 25 million people in nine states had average incomes of about $100 a year and where economic resources were growing about 1 percent a year and population was growing 3½ percent. After discussing this hopeless situation, and the world population problem as well, the President suddenly asked me, "Why doesn't the Ford Foundation make the population problem its top priority?" Later, he asked that same question of its chairman, and last year the Ford Foundation report, and its huge grants as well, concentrated on population as never before.

So, to paraphrase President Kennedy's words, I suggest, quite respectfully, and fully realizing the many other serious problems our Government faces each day, that President Johnson make the stabilization of world population one of his administration's top priorities.

FANFARE AND DRAMATICS FOR THE POPULATION CRISIS

Suppose first President Johnson and Secretary Rusk ask every one of our Ambassadors all over the world to discuss the world population problem seriously with the head of every other government, as they recently were asked to explain our aims in South Vietnam, and with the same fanfare and dramatics.

Suppose secondly they suggest that all countries with a population problem try to reduce their rate of growth annually by one-tenth of 1 percent as the United States has done for the last 5 years. The result could be a drop in a decade of nearly 1 percent for the entire world.

And suppose thirdly that in the same conversation, our Ambassadors stress the world's food deficit and suggest that every country, developed and underdeveloped alike, should aim to accelerate its present rate of increase in food production by at least one-tenth of 1 percent a year.

And suppose fourthly that each Ambassador offer our technical assistance, and for the poorer countries our financial assistance as well, to help them solve both problems.

This I believe is a practical and possible program. If our Government would propose it, I believe that the governments of the world generally would back it.

The time has come for a great worldwide crusade by all the governments and by all the people.

If the rate of increase for food goes up one-tenth percent a year, and for population goes down one-tenth percent a year, then food and population would be brought back into balance in only 5 years time. In 10 years the present 1 to 2 ratio would have been reversed—food production would be increasing 2 percent and population growing only 1 percent. Not only would starvation be averted, but in 25 years most of the world's nutrition problems would be solved.

Perhaps I am too optimistic. Perhaps it would take longer. But only in that direction—more food, less people—is there hope for the developing countries, and for the human race.

The third individual who has it in his power to promote a satisfactory solution is U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations. For the first time last year the United Nations, sent a technical mission on birth control to India—under Sir Colville Deverell who heads International Planned Parenthood. For the first time last year the United Nations offered to extend technical help in this field to their member nations.

So the way is now cleared for a major effort by this great world body to deal with the world's greatest problem. If unsolved, hunger could become the greatest threat to world peace. Hungry men will fight. Hungry nations will make war.

NEED FOR U.N. POPULATION AGENCY

The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization already exists under Dr. Sen. What is needed is a great sister organization as part of the United Nations family to deal exclusively with the world population problem, just as World Health Organization deals with the world health problem.

So I respectfully suggest to U Thant, and I would hope our Government would back some such proposal, that his Population Commission, so far dealing only with the statistics of world population, become an action arm of the United Nations, be greatly expanded, and be authorized to draw up a world population program and to offer all possible assistance to carry it out. It should work in close cooperation with FAO, and with all member governments. It should set specific goals and strive to help the nations of the world achieve them in stated periods of time. That is my fifth and most important recommendation.

The Swedish Government has already urged the United Nations to deal more actively with this problem. Every government with a serious population problem could be expected to cooperate. Multilateral aid and multilateral advice on a problem as delicate as this one would probably be much more readily accepted than bilateral aid and bilateral advice, no matter how well intentioned.

In conclusion I can do no better than to quote Dr. Sen's words to the Population Commission of the United Nations.

"The next 35 years will be a most critical period in man's history. Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we will face disaster of unprecedented magnitude. I myself feel optimistic that mankind will not stand aloof from the drama of life and death that is unfolding before our eyes but will come forward to achieve that miracle of organized will which seems so distant today. This indeed must happen if freedom and dignity are to survive."

No, I would add, famine is not the only answer. Because I too believe that man can rise to meet this challenge, as he has so many times throughout history. But the worldwide crusade must begin soon, or it will be too late for millions of human beings now alive.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY TOWARD RED CHINA—CONTAINMENT WITHOUT ISOLATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have read three thought-provoking editorials in past weeks praising the Johnson administration's policy toward relations with China. All praise the definition of that policy as "containment without isolation."

As the editorial in the Baltimore Sun states:

> Mainland China should be in the world community, she should have help in her economy, she should be assisted out of isolation—

But it adds—

> Significantly, however, the experts who propose all this agree almost to a man that she also ought to be contained by military means at present in non-Chinese areas of southeast Asia.

I should like to call attention to a fourth editorial, printed in the New York Times, entitled "Thunderbolts Out of Asia." This commentary on the Russian-Chinese dispute and its relevance to the United States makes the intriguing suggestion that Russian leaders might be instrumental in bringing the current Vietnamese dispute to the negotiating table.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials be printed in the Record: "New Approaches to Red China" from the Los Angeles Times, March 16, 1966, "Dealing With

China" from the Baltimore Sun, March 20, 1966, "They Choose To Be Beastly" from the New York Herald Tribune, March 24, 1966, and "Thunderbolts Out of Asia" from the New York Times, March 24, 1966.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Mar. 16, 1966]

New Approaches to Red China

"Containment without isolation," as Vice President Humphrey put it, has now been defined as U.S. policy toward Communist China, though the White House denies it is a new course.

The implication is that the United States will continue to stand fast against Chinese expansionism, while at the same time seeking ways to improve mutual understanding, to the benefit of both sides and, indeed, all of Asia.

The goals of this policy are both realistic and necessary. There should be no illusions, however, about the difficulties involved in undertaking fresh approaches to a suspicious and antagonistic China. Nor should there be any unfounded hopes about achieving an early lessening of tensions.

For the present, in fact, every sign indicates that whatever gestures the United States makes to Peking will be spurned, and no doubt with typically brutal invective; "Judas kiss" was the first response to Humphrey. China's rulers, with their fixed view of the world, have simply shown no inclination to improve either communication or understanding.

Why, then, should the United States now begin the effort to break down the barriers around China, risking in the process not only verbal abuse from Peking, but possibly also running the risk that China will misinterpret the U.S. purpose, seeing in it a weakness that doesn't exist?

The most compelling answer is that a more flexible U.S. policy, even if launched without expectation of early results, could open the way to a process of eventual better understanding with the regime that controls the destinies of one-fourth of the world's people.

The word "eventual" must be emphasized, for realistically we must expect that it will be some time, perhaps 10 years, before there is in Peking a leadership prepared to move toward improved relations with the United States. But sooner or later, under conditions we can now help to bring about, such a leadership will come along.

What the United States can try to do, then, is to shorten the leadtime for future improvements. This policy won't pay immediate or even early dividends, in all probability. If it is undertaken with that in mind, and with a firmness where essential interests are concerned, it will be a low-risk policy well worth the effort.

Our purposes must be clearly enunciated, lest friend or foe misunderstand them. China, either now or in future, must not get the idea that vital U.S. commitments in Asia are compromisable. Our strong military presence in the western Pacific and southeast Asia must be maintained, and our willingness to use military power against Communist aggression must be left in no doubt.

Once this is understood, the dangers involved in a policy of seeking to establish peaceful contacts become minimal, if not nonexistent.

We must, as noted, expect an essentially negative response to our first small gestures to China, at least at the start. This should not discourage us from trying again, and again. The United States-Red China relations in this nuclear age, such as they are, have reached the point where misunderstanding based on mutual ignorance could prove calamitous.

We owe it to ourselves and the world to try to achieve something better than that.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 20, 1966]

Dealing With China

One of the theories about Communist China is that implacable suspicion of her doctrines and intentions in the non-Communist world explains her truculence. The refusal to invite her into the United Nations is cited. The U.S. denial of formal recognition to a nation of 700 million people is criticized as a rejection of obvious facts which justifies resentment in Peking. The American trade embargo is seen as a further indignity to a great nation struggling to get on its economic feet. Relaxation of these anti-China positions, so it is argued, might well alter mainland China's attitude. And if it does not, the reasoning goes on, at least the onus for continuing tension would be plainly on the Red Chinese.

But a dramatic test of precisely this theory has been under way for several months. A consortium of European steelmakers has negotiated a deal with Peking for the erection in China of a steelmaking complex priced at about $150 million. Several weeks ago the U.S. Government was informed of the project, which includes a government credit guarantee of $87.5 million by our stalwart ally in Europe, the German Federal Republic. The reason we were informed of the willingness of European steel masters to expand the basic industrial capacity of a nation second perhaps only to France in developing a nuclear weapon potential was obviously so we could file objections if we wanted to.

For reasons of the highest diplomatic and geopolitical gravity, we chose neither to object nor to recommend. At the very least in this neutral way we seconded the initiative of the Europeans, including the Government at Bonn, to bring Communist China into the trading world and the community of peace-loving nations. So far there has been no sign of any pacific response from Peking.

There are a number of acute observers of affairs Chinese who don't really expect any such response. They recall scornful rejections by Peking of the idea that China join the United Nations. They remember successive cease-fires in Vietnam which brought no abatement whatever in Chinese abuse. They note the arid results of French and British recognition. In this view the onus for continuing tension has already been allocated past any reasonable doubt.

Of course mainland China should be in the world community, she should have help in her economy, she should be assisted out of isolation. Significantly, however, the experts who propose all this agree almost to a man that she also ought to be contained by military means as at present in non-Chinese areas of southeast Asia. From that agreement it is perhaps a necessary step to the view that new overtures to China may well await some Chinese sign that earlier overtures were welcome and will be reciprocated.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Mar. 24, 1966]

They Choose To Be Beastly

Implicit in many of the recent recommendations for new policies toward Red China, notably including the new professors' manifesto, is the assumption that if only we would be nicer to Peking, Peking would stop being so beastly to everyone else. What this chooses to ignore is that the leaders of Red China give every indication, and have consistently given every indication, that they are beastly precisely because they choose to be. Repeated efforts to get them into the United Nations have been met by contemptuous assertions that the U.N. would have to reform itself drastically (including throwing out a good many of its present members) to make it worthy of their membership. The British and French, with high hopes, established diplomatic relations, only to find their representatives ignored. Mao and his aids continue to preach subversion and aggression, and to practice what they preach—to the quite considerable enlightenment of several once-admiring African nations, which have seen fit to expel the Chinese reformers. And now, in their latest tirade against the Soviets, the Peking leaders have again demonstrated how vast is the gulf, and how paranoid the hatred, that separates them even from their erstwhile Communist comrades.

Certainly the goal of "containment without isolation" is a desirable and constructive one; certainly all must hope that mainland China can be brought back into the comity of nations. But it is not we who have isolated the Chinese. It is their rulers who have done so. It is their rulers, not the truly "peace-loving" nations, who must change their ways if relations are to be normalized. And the tragedy is that they have as yet shown no disposition to do so.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1966]

Thunderbolts Out of Asia

The Soviet-Chinese dispute is now more bitter and deep seated than ever before. This basic fact emerges from two key documents whose contents have become public knowledge this week.

As seen from Moscow and stated in the originally secret Soviet letter to foreign Communist Parties, Peking is trying to embroil the Soviet Union in war with the United States. The Russians maintain that it is for this purpose, and also because China's rulers find it advantageous to have their country seem to its citizens to be "a beleaguered fortress," that Peking wants an indefinite continuation of the war in Vietnam and of the international tension that war creates. Moscow also alleges that the Chinese threaten the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union.

Peking's statement declining the invitation to send a delegation to next week's Communist Party Congress seeks to answer these charges with a fusillade of countercharges. The Chinese see Russian policy as collaboration with the United States in a joint program aimed at Soviet-American domination of the world. In Peking's view, all Soviet maneuvers in Vietnam are aimed at bringing about peace talks that might open the door to ending that conflict on terms acceptable to the United States.

Two central facts emerge from this exchange of political vituperation. First, both Communist giants are really employing ideological arguments only to justify conclusions reached on grounds of national interest. Second, there is now no foreseeable end to this split, at least while the present leaders of both nations are in power.

The Soviet leaders are clearly anxious to avoid a Soviet-American war, and they know who its real beneficiary would be. Now that they have found the courage to denounce the Chinese for wanting the struggle in Vietnam to continue indefinitely, they may perhaps also find the strength, in their own and in the world's interest, to take more energetic action than they have yet taken to help transfer that struggle from the battlefield to the negotiating table.

THE SENATE RESTAURANT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Star on April 13 concerning the Senate restaurant.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate restaurant, once the most exclusive eating spot in town, is coming back from a long decline. Responsible for the improvements are the new manager, Joseph Diamond and "Robert," the new maitre'd who migrated to Capitol Hill from the City Tavern Club at the behest of Vice President HUMPHREY.

The restaurant, on the Senate side of the Capitol Building, had declined partly because of its cuisine. At the lowest low point, only the famous Senate bean soup was edible. The decor had declined, too, but the plastic flower centerpieces on paper doilies have been removed and that's another big improvement. And finally the customers are different.

The restaurant is small. It was intended originally to be the private dining room only of Senators and their families.

Over the years, however, the restaurant became increasingly filled by Senate staff members, secretaries, their families, guests and constituents. It got so bad that recently one Senator complained the legislators sometimes couldn't find a place in their own dining room and had to go elsewhere to get something to eat. Now all that's changed.

A stern edict has gone into effect that reservations can be made only by Senators or their administrative assistants.

No more secretaries treating boyfriends to an impressive luncheon, no more staff members wining and dining associates and, finally, no more Senators forced to eat next door in the public dining room.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT'S INACTION IN REPORTING ON RAMPART DAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a very interesting article, entitled "Alaska Ponders: How Long Do We Wait?" appears in the March 1966 edition of the magazine Construction Craftsman. The articles explains very well the great importance to the United States and the Nation of constructing the great Rampart Dam on the Yukon River about which I have spoken on the floor of the Senate many times.

The article points out:

The Rampart Canyon site on the Yukon River near the geographical center of the State has long been known as a great potential power site (probably the greatest under the American flag) with a possible installed capacity of over 5 million kilowatts—which is 2½ times the capacity of Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River.

The author, Mr. Arthur T. George, who has visited Alaska, summarizes the enormous benefits which will result from construction of this project, aside from the production of the lowest cost power now known to be available from any source. As the article points out, construction of Rampart will intensify exploration and development of Alaskan raw materials such as iron, copper, lead, zinc, and other ores; high-purity limestone, and other nonmetallics; and the State's forest resources.

The reservoir will become the location of important fresh water fisheries similar to those developed at other Arctic Circle areas.

From the point of view of the construction industry, the construction of Rampart, its powerhouses and supporting structures will necessarily bring about the production of local materials for use in this and further construction work in the area. It will result in full-year employment for an estimated 60,000 to 80,000 workers in Alaska.

The enormous economic opportunity presented by Rampart has long been recognized by those wise in the use of Alaskan resources and concerned with the development of a viable economy in my State.

Unhappily, Rampart has been unnecessarily hampered and delayed by the continuing failure of the Secretary of the Interior to take action essential to the project. Under an agreement between the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior of March 14, 1962, the Department of the Interior was called upon to supply the Corps of Engineers with certain recommendations respecting marketing of power. Under the agreement, the project cannot be recommended for authorization by Congress until the report of the Secretary is made. However, more than 4 years after that agreement was signed, no recommendation has been made to the Army and Rampart remains undeveloped.

This is the meaning of the question in the title of the article—"How Long Do We Wait?"

Repeated pleas have been made to Secretary Udall to take the action he is required to take. However, this has been without avail. It is my hope the Secretary of the Interior will recognize the enormous importance of expediting Rampart construction and will submit the necessary recommendations to the Corps of Engineers as promptly as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point together with the text of a telegram I addressed to Secretary Udall on April 11, 1966, concerning this. No response to my telegram to the Secretary has been received. Therefore, I am unable to supply the Congress with the Secretary's reply.

There being no objection, the article and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA PONDERS: HOW LONG DO WE WAIT?

(By Arthur T. George)

Our 49th State, a vast land one-fifth the size of the rest of the Nation, bulges with minerals, timber, and other resources which are seen now to depend on inexpensive power for their development.

A complete inventory of Alaska's natural resources has not yet been made. However, based on limited exploration, her iron deposits appear to exceed those of all the Western States combined. Copper, coal, gold, silver, and timber—in large amounts—are but part of her and our national wealth.

Lack of development of Alaska's resources up to this time is not primarily due, as is sometimes supposed, to tremendous transportation problems. Alaska's raw materials are best suited for water transport—in the case of central Alaska, from the Bering Sea coastline down to both far eastern and western stateside seaports; and much of the State's known untapped wealth happens also to be located near tidewater. At the same time, the Yukon River is navigable from May through September, from its mouth to the south of Norton Sound (an arm of the Bering Sea) and on up to beyond Dawson, located across the Canadian border in Yukon Territory.

These and other central Alaska potentialities and resources—including several large timber stands—are to be found up and down and near the 1,800-mile-long Yukon River Valley, which cuts the State in half more or less horizontally.

Twenty-five years ago, the territory of Alaska—with a population of a mere 72,225—was getting along fairly well with its 2 economic resources: (1) fisheries, principally salmon; and (2) mining, principally gold.

A generation later, Alaska faces staggering problems in trying to create for itself, as a State, a viable and more diversified economy that can provide better living for its increasing population—estimated recently as around 250,000—and to bring in more tax money to support improved State services.

Since World War II, income from gold mining and the fishing industry have declined through no fault of the State. Alaska's defense boom has not been increasing in recent years. Up to now, private venture capital from other States has thought twice before deciding to take a chance on Alaskan industry expansion of the home-grown variety. In short, Alaskans today need a broad-based "shot in the arm" to get themselves into some kind of high gear after the decline of their former income sources, as well as after the devastating earthquake that shook the State to its foundations 2 years ago this month.

LOW-COST POWER

Oil exploration and later field exploration on the Kenai Peninsula from 1957 on proved Alaska's lifesaver as she took on problems of statehood in 1958 and 1959 and the years that quickly followed. Today, however, Alaska needs another broader-based statewide economic base that it can build on for the benefit of all.

Although under the locally controlled management of the Alaska State Department of Fish and Game the salmon runs are being slowly rebuilt, and the 5 years of State control have seen a doubling of the salmon take, additional capital investment is needed in other fields. As the population of the State has more than tripled since 1940, more jobs are needed for the State's quarter of a million inhabitants.

The economic support to which Alaska has to turn in this, the next stage of its development, is obviously hydroelectric power—of which only one-quarter of 1 percent of the State's great potential is harnessed today.

Just as Alaska, as a territory up to less than 8 years ago, was excluded from Federal highway aid; so also in much else of a Federal nature up to that time. While many of the older also sparsely settled States have been able to profit from years of public hydroelectric developments along their rivers, the only Federal project of this type in Alaska has been the 30,000-kilowatt installation at Lake Eklutna, which today supplies electricity for Anchorage and a nearby REA cooperative.

Considering Alaska further, the Rampart Canyon site on the Yukon River near the geographical center of the State has long been known as a great potential power site (probably the greatest under the American flag), with a possible installed capacity of over 5 million kilowatts—which is two and a half times the capacity of Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River.

At the same time, Rampart has been estimated by power engineers as capable of generating electricity "at the bus bar" at 2 to 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour. This would be the lowest cost power source on the American continent, and would mean a cost of 3 mills per kilowatt-hour delivered all up and down the Yukon River Valley.

Construction and operation of Rampart Canyon Dam—seen as inevitable sooner or later—will bring to central Alaska the great power base it so badly needs to attract a wide diversity of industry and other activity to the region, and will provide an exciting "new frontier" to beckon to venturesome men and women from other States who are weary of battling ineffectually with the problems connected with the population surge in and around our larger cities.

BENEFITS

To summarize: These are some of the things that will happen in central and southern Alaska as soon as Rampart Dam has been built:

1. The large blocks of extremely low-cost power will attract such major new industries as aluminum and other light metals, electric pig iron and steel, ferro alloys, and electrochemicals such as caustic soda, chlorine, and other products.

2. Availability of low-cost power in abundant quantities will also assist in commercial utilization of Alaskan raw materials such as iron, copper, lead, zinc, and other ores; high-purity limestone and other nonmetallics; and the State's forest resources.

3. Intensified exploration and development programs will be made possible on these and other Alaskan raw materials.

4. The creation of Rampart Reservoir—a navigable and traversable body of water the size of Lake Erie which will cover the desolate swampy region now known as "the Yukon flats"—will at last provide access to remote areas known to be favorable for mineral discovery but which, heretofore, have been too far removed from transportation to be of commercial interest.

5. The reservoir waters will become the location of important fresh-water fisheries similar to those under active commercial development elsewhere in Arctic Circle areas, such as at Great Slave Lake in Canada's Northwest Territory. The world's growing need for protein foods will continue to stimulate the development of such fisheries.

6. As the 200,000-square-mile watershed above the damsite (about the size of California and New York State combined) has countless streams and smaller rivers running into the Yukon River above "the flats;" and as it will require 18 years for the rising waters to fill the reservoir to full size, there will be plenty of time for the muskrats and other furry inhabitants of the flats gradually to work themselves upstream to new habitats.

7. The building of Rampart Dam, its powerhouse, and supporting structures will necessarily bring about the production of local materials for use in this and further construction work in the area—such as boarding and millwork, limestone and clay products, and new building materials from shales and coals. In addition, clearing of the forests at the reservoir site may well stimulate large-scale production of wood-fiber materials for both local use and for export.

Of interest, finally, to Alaska and to its construction industry, is the estimate given by the Development and Resources Corporation before the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works—that the building of the dam at Rampart and its attendant industrial development will result in full-year employment for from 60,000 to 80,000 workers in Alaska.

The job opportunities thus generated will permit the State to double its population without too much difficulty—to a half a million people—if one figures a family of four or five for each new jobholder. And the economic opportunities thus created for one and all will be just the spark Alaskans need as they look anxiously to the years that lie ahead.

April 11, 1966.

Hon. Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

The most important plan for economic development of the State of Alaska is the proposal for construction of the Rampart Dam on the Yukon River. This magnificent project will supply the free world with its largest source of hydroelectric power at the lowest cost of any electric energy which can be developed at any other location or in any other way. For Alaska Rampart will provide the essential foundation for a viable economy which is necessary to the growth and maturity of the State.

Rampart Dam represents one of the most valuable assets available to President Johnson and his administration in the war against poverty and deprivation. It will provide jobs, and, with employment, increased opportunities for economic security for great numbers of individuals otherwise deprived of these benefits. The impetus Rampart can provide to eradication of poverty and want will be of greatest importance in the State of Alaska, but its effects will reach beyond the State to increase opportunities for untold numbers of citizens of other areas of the Nation.

The power produced at Rampart at the low cost of 2 to 3 mills per kilowatt-hour may well provide the power that will be essential to defense requirements of the United States in the future even as the great hydroelectric power development of the Columbia River came to the rescue of America in World War II.

In the last 2 weeks many serious discussions have been held concerning the unhappy plight of the Indian people and the native citizens of Alaska who have been shamefully deprived of economic opportunities allowing them to participate on an equal basis with the other citizens of the Nation.

No group of people in the world will be more greatly benefited by the construction of Rampart Dam than the approximately 2,000 native people of the Yukon who now live in grim deprivation of the most elementary amenities of American civilization. With Rampart, the natives of Alaska will have, at last, the first chance in their history to achieve a stable, prosperous economy. In this almost inaccessible area of the world people will have an opportunity for contact with the outside world, for good educational services and for real participation in the good life of America.

Yet Rampart languishes and the Nation is denied the great progress that can come with its construction.

I am aware of the clamorous opposition to the Rampart Dam which has been proclaimed by numerous extremist conservation groups. As a conservationist and a fervent one, I am sympathetic with the philosophies leading the conservation societies to decry any possible destruction of natural resources of wildlife. When I came to Alaska as Governor in 1939, I found that there was a bounty on the bald eagle. The fishermen's fear of its predation on salmon was reflected in this legislative Bounty Act. In my first message to the biennial legislature (1941), I urged its repeal, and on my third try, in 1945, I succeeded, securing thereafter that noble bird's protection.

In the U.S. Senate I have strongly supported the wilderness bill, wild rivers bill, and the impressive and desirable galaxy of national seashores and parks created by the 87th and 88th Congresses.

While the views of conservationists on Rampart must be given careful consideration, nevertheless it is essential that the report of the Corps of Engineers be made available for study and consideration by Congress as soon as possible.

The reason for this unfortunate delay in submission of the Army report is that the Department of Interior has failed to perform the responsibility it undertook under terms of the agreement you signed with the Department of the Army on March 14, 1962. By the terms of that agreement your Department was called upon to supply the Corps of Engineers with certain recommendations respecting marketing of power from the Rampart project. A massive report of field units of the Department of Interior on all aspects of the Rampart project with which your Department is concerned was submitted to you January 1965. On February 11, 1965, you announced the formation of a high-level task force to study the data collected in the reports of the field units with a view to providing you with necessary recommendations to form the basis of a formal report to the Corps of Engineers. As of this date I am unaware that the task force has performed its duties, thus allowing you to submit your recommendations to the Department of the Army.

The delay in this very important matter is not only difficult to understand but extremely serious to many people who are deeply concerned with plans for the Rampart project.

I request that you supply me as soon as possible with a statement as to the date upon which the recommendations of the Rampart task force and your recommendations to the Department of Army may be forthcoming.

Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senator.

A COMPARISON OF REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK PROPOSALS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, there is broad agreement that a redwood national park should be established as soon as possible. There are honest differences of opinion over the location of the park.

The administration has proposed (S. 2962) a 42,000 acre park in the Mill Creek-Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park area of northern California. Nineteen Members of the Senate, myself included, and 31 Members of the House have suggested as an alternative a 90,000-acre park which is generally south of the other proposed location. Our proposal is embodied in Senate amendment 487, which is a companion to H.R. 11723, by Representative Jeffery Cohelan and other House bills.

Amendment 487, H.R. 11723 and the companion House bills would include within the park the 53,600-acre area proposed by the National Park Service in 1964, plus an adjacent 36,400-acre acreage proposed by the Sierra Club. Establishment of this 90,000-acre park is recommended also by the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the National Parks Association, the Federation of Western Outdoors Clubs, the Izaak Walton League, the Public Affairs Institute, Trout Unlimited, the Audubon Society, the Garden Clubs of America and the Citizens for a Redwood National Park.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too much the urgency of action on the redwood issue if a meaningful park is to be created. During the past 2 months, Georgia-Pacific has begun logging down to the water's edge in two places in the magnificent lower 4 miles of Redwood

Creek, which would be included in the park proposed in amendment 487. One of these cutting areas is near the confluence with McArthur Creek; the other is near Elam Creek. This logging comes after last summer's decimation of the Bond Creek Flat, which had what was possibly the world's tallest tree, by Arcata Redwood Co.

So that Members can be fully informed concerning the differences between Amendment 487 and S. 2962, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a point by point comparison of the two proposals.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMPARISON OF THE SUITABILITY OF THE REDWOOD CREEK AND MILL CREEK AREAS AS LOCATIONS FOR A REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

	AMENDMENT 487—SIERRA CLUB PLAN: REDWOOD CREEK-PRAIRIE CREEK REDWOODS STATE PARK AREA	S. 2962—ADMINISTRATION PLAN: MILL CREEK-JEDEDIAH SMITH REDWOODS STATE PARK AREA, INCLUDING DEL NORTE COAST REDWOODS STATE PARK
1. Total acreage (prospects for perpetuation improve with greater acreage):	Ninety thousand acres in Sierra Club proposal.	Forty-three thousand three hundred and ninety-two acres (an additional 1,000 acres may be donated).
2. Virgin acreage:	Forty-two thousand acres in Sierra Club proposal.	Eighteen thousand four hundred and fifteen acres.
3. Conservation opportunity (privately owned virgin acreage to be protected):	Thirty-three thousand seven hundred and sixty acres in Sierra Club proposal.	Seven thousand eight hundred and fifteen acres.
4. Record displays:	World's tallest trees. World's best example of redwood slope types (fairly even-aged stands of 400-year-old redwoods). Opportunity to include world's largest mountain covered with redwoods, nearby at Bridge Creek.	No record displays; fine bottom stands are displayed along the Smith River and lower Mill Creek.
5. Elevational contrast:	Slope types extend up hillsides to an average elevation of 2,000 feet, with a better demonstration of the variation in redwood types as elevation and distance inland increases.	Slope type redwoods here reach an average elevation of 1,000 feet.
6. Notable views:	Lower Redwood Creek Valley from Bald Hills Road: unbroken panorama of last, large valley of virgin redwoods. Northern Gold Bluffs from Highway 101. Gold Bluffs beach from the beach road. Elk Prairie from Highway 101 at south edge of Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park.	Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Park coastline.
7. Additional recreational attractions:	Eighteen miles of coastline. Eleven miles of usable beach (Gold Bluffs Beach). Twenty-two miles of river frontage along Redwood Creek on which spring float trips can be made down a canyon enclosed in virgin redwoods. Eighteen miles of scenic highway through the park (at least 8 more miles south of Orick should be protected by scenic easements); 76 miles of additional display roads are now available. Associated features include: herds of Roosevelt elk at Elk Prairie and at the beach, Fern Canyon, waterfalls over the Gold Bluffs, nearby lagoons with waterfowl and marsh displays, sites with Indian artifacts at the mouths of Redwood Creek and the Klamath River, and renowned Klamath River fishing.	Fourteen miles of coastline. Three miles of usable beach (Enderts Beach). Six miles of river frontage along the Smith River. Sixteen miles of scenic highway; thirty miles of display road available. Smith River fishing and swimming.
8. User impact patterns:	Over a 33-mile-long area available for recreational use; thus there should be no tendency to concentrate impact on fragile areas. Ideal sites for park headquarters exist near Orick. Good sites for new campgrounds exist on open flats along lower Redwood Creek.	Twenty-one-mile-long area available for recreational use, with a tendency to concentrate impact on the fragile lower valley of Mill Creek. This narrow valley is marred by the primitive road that is already there.
9. Flood protection:	Park proposals for both areas include parts of mainstem streams and tributary drainages.	
	Twenty-two miles of land along the mainstem of Redwood Creek is proposed for acquisition, embracing one-half of the creek's drainage area; 12 named tributary drainages will be entirely within the park (including Prairie Creek, May Creek, Lost Man Creek, Little Lost Man Creek, McArthur Creek, Bond Creek, Forty-four Creek, and Tom McDonald Creek). Complete flood protection will be provided to the stands in the tributary drainages. Control of one-third to one-half of the entire drainage will also appreciably help in controlling mainstem flood problems. As Redwood Creek features mainly slope types, there are only a few major flats with bottom stands (about 4) to protect. These stands should be protectible by agreements (easements) to control land treatment practices in the remainder of the drainage and by local protective works.	Six miles of land along the mainstem of the Smith River is proposed for acquisition, embracing one-tenth of the entire drainage area of the Smith River; 3 named tributary drainages are entirely within the proposed park (Mill Creek, Clarks Creek, and Cedar Creek). As the Mill Creek-Jedediah Smith area features primarily bottom stands along the Smith River (Simpson Grove and Stout Grove), flood protection is a major problem. Although acquisition of the entire Mill Creek watershed would provide protection of lower Mill Creek, protection would not be provided against flooding by the largely uncontrolled Smith River.

A Comparison of the Suitability of the Redwood Creek and Mill Creek Areas as Locations for a Redwood National Park—Continued

	AMENDMENT 487—SIERRA CLUB PLAN: REDWOOD CREEK-PRAIRE CREEK REDWOODS STATE PARK AREA—continued	S. 2962—ADMINISTRATION PLAN: MILL CREEK-JEDEDIAH SMITH REDWOODS STATE PARK AREA, INCLUDING DEL NORTE COAST REDWOODS STATE PARK—continued
10. Feasibility:	Preliminary professional report of the National Park Service identified this area as the most outstanding. National interest has centered on it (both as a result of the report and the discovery of the tallest trees). Considerable support is developing for a national park here, including support from a local citizens group (Citizens for a Redwood National Park).	Not recommended by the professional report of the National Park Service for Federal acquisition. National attention would have to be redirected toward this area, producing confusion. No local support group exists.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish also to call attention to the unequivocal position concerning the park location that has been taken by the Citizens for a Redwood National Park, of Arcata, Calif.

> We cannot support the administration bill—

Wrote Dave Van de Mark in the April 5 Citizens for a Redwood National Park Newsletter—

> It is not for acreage alone that we must support the Sierra Club proposal—the indescribable beauty, uniqueness and variety of the redwoods and other features in the Redwood Creek region make this the only choice, if indeed we are looking toward the future.
>
> To turn Jedediah Smith State Park and Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Park into a national park by renaming them would be tragic. They are State parks only and are not big enough and do not have the diversity or uniqueness worthy of national protection. Adding the heavily logged over upper Mill Creek watershed will not do anything to help.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the full text of the Citizens for a Redwood National Park Newsletter editorial, entitled "Why Redwood Creek?" at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Redwood Creek?

Citizens for a Redwood National Park have strongly favored a park in the Redwood Creek-Prairie Creek area. Jeffery Cohelan introduced such a bill in the House of Representatives last October. Since that time over 46 Congressmen have introduced companion bills, including such Senators as Lee Metcalf, Robert and Ted Kennedy, and Representative Morris Udall.

These bills embrace the Sierra Club proposal for a 97,600-acre park in the Redwood Creek-Prairie Creek region. The administration has just introduced a plan for a 45,000-acre park in the Mill Creek-Jedediah Smith region. One thousand four hundred acres would also be included centering around the tallest trees in Redwood Creek.

We cannot support the administration bill. It is not for acreage alone that we must support the Sierra Club proposal—the indescribable beauty, uniqueness, and variety of the redwoods and other features in the Redwood Creek region make this the only choice, if indeed we are looking toward the future.

The first, second, third, and sixth tallest known trees are found here; the last nearly intact watersheds are here; the largest mountain (Rogers Peak) completely covered with redwoods is here; the greatest elevational differences and climatic variations are here. With adjacent watersheds and Prairie Creek State Park as part of a park, the only place where redwoods grow in unbroken stands from ridgetop to the sea here would be protected; Fern Canyon and Gold Bluffs Beach would be in this park. The only place left in California where the Roosevelt elk roam wild and free in their native habitat is here.

The redwoods themselves are, as a forest, the most beautiful and magnificent found anywhere. There is only one place left in the world where some of the tallest and largest living things meet the river's edge—unmarred by bulldozer and chainsaw—in the unique and awesome way they do here on Redwood Creek. This stretch of river, between Devil's Creek and Bridge Creek, has been called the "Emerald Mile."

The largest "islands" of virgin redwood in private ownership left are here—over 33,000 acres. With a chance to heal, the adjacent cutover land will provide young redwood forests which will someday be nearly as beautiful as the present "islands," at which time a larger and ever-increasing population will be thankful for the larger park.

The administration has chosen a second-best park in the wrong place. It shows a lack of courage to face up to the future's needs. It is an attempt to make political hay while at the same time, attempting to classify the maneuver a legitimate compromise.

To turn Jedediah Smith State Park and Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Park into a national park by renaming them would be tragic. They are State parks only and are not big enough and do not have the diversity or uniqueness worthy of national protection. Adding the heavily logged-over Upper Mill Creek watershed will not do anything to help. Only 6,000 additional acres of redwoods would be protected. The only attractions available would be the lovely bottom land stands along Smith River and lower Mill Creek. Visitor impact upon these two areas could ruin them. All other recreational and scientific attributes are equaled or outdone by nature in Redwood Creek.

To save only a dinky portion of Redwood Creek around the tallest trees (and little else) shows the lack of understanding among the planners of the administration's bill about why we even have national parks.

The fact that Secretary of the Interior Udall has never come out here to see what will be lost means we will have to inform him and others about the real park in Redwood Creek and to let others know we will not be satisfied with an irresponsible plan proposed by L.B.J.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the March 26 letter I received from Mrs. Hollis P. Allen, corresponding secretary of the Women's Democratic Club of Pomona Valley, Claremont, Calif. The letter includes the text of the club's petition to Congress to "create a superior Redwoods National Park of 90,000 acres in Redwood Creek drainage basin.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Women's Democratic Club of
Pomona Valley,
Claremont, Calif., March 26, 1966.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Metcalf: The Women's Democratic Club of Pomona Valley wishes to call the following resolution recently adopted by our club to your attention and urges your assistance:

"Whereas the National Park Service in 1964 made a thorough study of all coast redwoods and recommended creation of a Redwoods National Park in the Redwood Creek drainage basin;

"Whereas two proposals have now been submitted to Congress, one for a superior redwood national park which would preserve an additional 34,000 acres of virgin redwoods, and an expedient proposal which would preserve only 6,000 acres more of virgin redwoods in an area vulnerable to flood;

"Whereas immediate economic dislocation amounts to a 2-year cut of the redwood logging industry in the largest proposal to a 6-month cut in the expedient proposal (based on an annual rate equal to the 1965 cut of 15,000 acres of virgin redwoods), to be weighed against the benefits from a redwoods national park for generations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, We the Women's Democratic Club of Pomona Valley at regular meeting March 15, 1966, urgently petition Congress to create a superior Redwoods National Park of 90,000 acres in the Redwood Creek drainage basin, the finest remaining exhibit of coast redwoods."

We appreciate your sponsorship of the bill to create the superior Redwoods National Park and wish to state that we and many others far into the future will be grateful if this part of our great State can be conserved for all the Nation to enjoy.

Yours very truly,
Mrs. Hollis P. Allen,
Corresponding Secretary.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3283.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3283) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, over the years successive administrations and we in the Congress have endeavored to promote the flow of private savings and credit into uses that will help accomplish necessary and desirable social purposes. In addition to the flow of such funds through the private institutions of the market, the Government, and its agencies have helped to channel and direct the flow of funds into worthwhile purposes—private, as well as public.

By facilitating the channeling of private funds into programs now supported by Government loans, the intervention of Government can bring into more effective use the vast capital resources of the private market. It can reduce the need for expanding the Federal budget to accomplish desired ends. It can also make use of the flexibility, ingenuity, and competitive forces of the private market in serving the economy's needs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wonder if the Senator would not wish a quorum call in view of the fact that there are not many Senators present.

I understand this bill deals with the authority to dispose of $33 billion worth of assets. In my opinion it is one of the major bills coming before this session of Congress because if the bill is enacted, as I understand it, it would be possible for the administration to spend up to $33 billion without including it as a part of the national debt or without including it as normal expenditures.

In other words, if this bill is passed it would be possible for the administration to operate with $30 billion deficits between now and 1968 and not show as a deficit so far as the American people are concerned. I believe that we should have a quorum call and have Senators present to let the people know with what we are dealing. This is the greatest camouflage and coverup of deficits ever proposed in Congress. I am therefore wondering whether the Senator would not wish to have a quorum call before he begins his remarks in support of the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator's request for a quorum call is pretty well camouflaged by an argument against the bill but, nevertheless, I am happy to accede. The fact is, I discussed the advisability of having a quorum call before I began my remarks, and both the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] felt that it was not necessary. However, I am happy to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Stennis in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 71 Leg.]

Bayh
Bennett
Burdick
Cannon
Dominick
Douglas
Hartke
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hartke in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken
Allott
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hickenlooper
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Young, N. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jordan of Idaho in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, effective fusion of public credit and private credit has been accomplished through the combination of various Federal lending programs with borrowing by the lending agencies or the sale of their assets to private investors. The asset-sales program has received great impetus since the mid-1950's.

The policy of asset sales has been endorsed by the distinguished Private Commission on Money and Credit, of which Secretary of the Treasury Fowler was a member and which issued its authoritative report in 1961, and by President Kennedy's Committee on Federal Credit Programs, of which former Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was Chairman. I might add that it was given high priority repeatedly in President Eisenhower's budgets and was urged in a minority report of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1963.

But despite major efforts to draw on private credit, the portfolio of direct Federal loans outstanding held by the Government and its agencies has increased in recent years. It was $25.1 billion on June 30, 1961, and $33.1 billion on June 30, 1965.

This has direct consequences on the Federal budget and, thus, on the policies followed by any administration. Money for direct lending programs must be budgeted. This means that it must be matched by tax revenue or by additional debt, or else that it must take the place of some other program, which then must be postponed or dropped. The money appropriated to a direct lending program, although it comes from current receipts, is tied up, often for years, in direct loans to individuals, businesses, and institutions, regardless whether there are private funds available which could take its place.

This situation led originally to the program of direct sales of federally held assets, which had the objective of reducing the portfolio of direct loans held by the Government. But problems occurring with the direct asset-sales program have become increasingly troublesome.

For one, we sometimes have as many as half a dozen agencies selling their loan paper, frequently to a limited market, and often in competition with each other. These agencies have greatly different degrees of experience and expertise in the field: some are very well qualified to carry on the sales—and some are less so. Finally, we have found that the direct, uncoordinated sale of assets can conflict with the Treasury's debt management operations. This is very disturbing.

The best technique we have at hand to cope with all these problems is to group assets consisting of loan paper into pools and to sell shares or participations in the pools. This is proposed in the participation sales legislation which we have received from the President.

The pools can gain diversity from the grouping of various kinds of loans. The sales will be centralized, expertly handled, and coordinated with the Treasury. Further, the participations will constitute an excellent and sought-after investment commanding a broad market.

The technique is not new. The Export-Import Bank of Washington has used it, since 1962, to sell about $1.7 billion of its direct loans which otherwise might not have been marketable. The Federal National Mortgage Association, "Fannie-May," acting under the Housing Acts of 1964 and 1965, has sold $1.6 billion of participation certificates in its own mortgage holdings and those of the Veterans' Administration.

The basic provisions of the President's proposal are taken directly from the Housing Acts of 1964 and 1965. The earlier act authorized FNMA to act as trustee for the sale of participations in pools of first mortgages. The 1965 act extended this authority.

The Participation Sales Act before us—S. 3283—which is designed to carry out the President's proposal, will broaden use of the pooling technique by extending it to all agencies of the Federal Government which hold financial assets. Sales of participation will be managed and coordinated by FNMA, serving as trustee.

The cost of selling participations through FNMA, judging from past experience, may be about one-fourth to three-eighths of 1 percent more than direct Treasury borrowings for comparable maturities. This is not a negligible difference. But it is a modest one, considering the gains from strengthening private credit flows into our programs. In time, as the participation certificates gain wider acceptance and marketability, they are likely to command rates closer in line with Treasury issues. And, of course, asset sales through participation certificates will command lower rates than would the direct sale of the underlying loans.

Moreover, because of the 4¼-percent ceiling on the interest rate that may be paid in new issues of Federal Government bonds, the Treasury, in the present state of the market, must confine its offerings to securities maturing in less than 5 years. As a consequence of this and other market conditions, interest rates on longer term securities are now generally somewhat lower than shorter-term rates. Since issues of the proposed participation certificates may have longer maturities, their sales could tap that sector of the market at relatively favorable rates. Issues of longer term securities would give a broader maturity distribution in the debt structure and attract funds from a wider range of investors.

The resulting lessened reliance on shorter term issues would help avoid increasing the liquidity of the economy and thus exert an anti-inflationary influence.

The proposed legislation preserves—and in some cases strengthens—congressional control over the Federal credit programs. No new credit program or enlargement of a credit program is involved in it. Existing limits on the amount of new loans that can be written in a particular year and on the amount of loans outstanding at a given time will remain.

Perhaps the most important control written into the bill is this: No assets of any program can be pooled under it without explicit congressional authorization in advance. Specific appropriation acts must precede—and set the size of—sales of participations in the loans of any of our credit programs. This is an addition to present congressional control.

In this connection, let me pause to deal with one note of criticism which has been voiced in connection with this legislation. The administration has been charged with attempting to provide for back-door financing. I assume back-door financing means financing programs without having to budget for them.

The congressional controls written into the bill are there for all to see. There is no way to finance a program—or a part of a program—under this bill without congressional authorization.

The budget effect of this proposal is clear—

In fiscal 1964 we replaced $1.1 billion in public credit with private credit.

In fiscal 1965 we replaced $1.6 billion.

In fiscal 1966 we expect to replace about $3.3 billion. With the participation sales act, we will be able in fiscal 1967 to substitute private credit in the fashion I have described for about $4.7 billion in public credit—more than four times the total in fiscal 1964.

The increase will result largely from broadening the use of the participation sales technique to include assets of the Farmers Home Administration, the Office of Education's academic facilities loan program, the college housing loan program and the public facilities loan program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Facilities Administration, and the Small Business Administration. Sales of assets from these programs will supplement the presently operating participation sales programs based on home mortgages held by FNMA and by the Veterans' Administration and on loans by the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield at that point?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator has been listing a number of agencies which are holding obligations, which obligations would be covered by this Participations Act. In our hearings the other day, 51 programs were included in this authority. If the Senator does not have the list, I would be glad to ask unanimous consent at this point, that page 18 of our report containing this list of 51 agencies be printed in the RECORD, because I believe it is important that the complete record be made.

Mr. MUSKIE. I have no objection to that inclusion and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Outstanding direct loans, and guaranteed and insured loans for Federal credit programs classified by agency or program

[In millions of dollars]

Agency or program	1965 actual	
	Direct loans	Guaranteed and insured loans
A. MAJOR AGENCIES OR PROGRAMS		
Office of Economic Opportunity	17	----------
Department of Agriculture:		
Commodity Credit Corporation	2,115	419
Rural Electrification Administration	4,072	----------
Farmers Home Administration	1,990	727
Department of Commerce:		
Economic Development Administration	126	----------
Maritime Administration	109	419
Department of Defense: Military assistance credits	79	----------
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
Office of Education	538	----------
Public Health Service	13	----------
Department of Housing and Urban Development:		
Federal National Mortgage Association	2,121	300
Federal Housing Administration	527	49,042
Public housing program	60	5,033
College housing program	1,927	----------
Urban renewal program	196	1,382
Other major programs	432	----------
Department of the Interior: Reclamation loans	90	----------
Department of State: Agency for International Development	8,997	144
Treasury Department:		
Loans to District of Columbia	139	----------
Foreign loans	3,763	----------
Veterans' Administration	1,649	30,951
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2,490	2,617
Small Business Administration	1,147	104
Total, major agencies or programs	32,507	91,138
B. OTHER AGENCIES OR PROGRAMS		
Department of Agriculture: Soil Conservation Service	15	----------
Department of Commerce: Aircraft loan guarantees	----------	
Department of Defense:		
Loans for construction of Ryukyu power system	9	----------
Defense production loans and guarantees	14	49
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
Community facility loans	(1)	----------
Hospital construction activities	4	----------
Assistance to refugees in the United States	6	----------
Department of Housing and Urban Development:		
Urban mass transportation loans	2	----------
Liquidating programs (Community Facilities Administration)	13	----------
Community disposal program	4	----------
Department of the Interior:		
Alaska public works (repayable investment)	16	----------
Bureau of Indian Affairs	24	----------
Defense Production Act loans	8	----------
Fisheries loans	6	----------
Ship mortgage insurance	----------	5
Guam rehabilitation program	2	----------
Minerals exploration program	1	----------
Department of Labor: Manpower development and training loans	(1)	----------
Department of State:		
Repatriation loans	3	----------
Loans to the United Nations	107	----------
Treasury Department:		
Defense Production Act loans (liquidating)	4	----------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (liquidating)	5	----------
Civil defense loans	(1)	----------
Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation fund	131	----------

See footnote at end of table.

***Outstanding direct loans, and guaranteed and insured loans for Federal credit programs classified by agency or program*—Continued**

[In millions of dollars]

Agency or program	1965 actual: Direct loans	1965 actual: Guaranteed and insured loans
B. OTHER AGENCIES OR PROGRAMS—continued		
General Services Administration:		
Public Works Administration bonds (liquidating)	58	
Surplus property sales credit	100	
Interstate Commerce Commission:		
Guaranteed railroad loans		214
National Capital Planning Commission: Advances to the District of Columbia and Maryland	(1)	
Veterans' Administration:		
Service disabled veterans fund	4	
Vocational rehabilitation fund	(1)	
Veterans special term insurance fund	5	
Veterans insurance and indemnities fund	1	
Veterans reopened insurance fund	(1)	
Total, other agencies or programs	547	276
All agencies	33,054	91,414

[1] Less than $1,000,000 outstanding.

NOTE.—Figures may not add due to rounding.

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that what I have just said describes the plans which the administration has to make use of this authority in fiscal year 1967.

Mr. BENNETT. I wanted to be clear that they were in a position to extend it to all the other agencies, so far as the authority given by the bill is concerned.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I invite the attention of the Senator from Maine to the concern which has been expressed by some rural electrification groups, several of which have talked to me about their fears that obligations issued to the REA might be involved under the terms of the proposed legislation. It is my understanding that the legislation is drafted in such a way as not intending to apply to obligations of the REA. Could the Senator give me assurances that that, in fact, is the intent of the proposed legislation?

Mr. MUSKIE. There is printed in the committee report a letter from Mr. Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which discusses the question raised by the Senator. One paragraph in that letter reads as follows:

> I can assure you that in no event under the legislation now before your committee will any participations be sold in any REA loans.

That letter was written to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

It is not the intent to cover soft loans or low-interest loans of that kind. This has particular reference to the REA proposal. It would not cover, and there is no intent to cover, for example, foreign aid loans which now amount to about $10 billion, which are included in the $33 billion cited by the distinguished Senator from Utah.

That $10 billion will not be included. There are other very low interest-rate loans which it is not intended to try to program under the bill.

Mr. McGOVERN. I had intended to offer an amendment which would make it clear that no part of this act would apply to any obligations issued to the Rural Electrification Administration. However, in view of the assurances given me by the Senator from Maine, and also the statement which he has just quoted from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, I shall withhold my amendment. However, I do wish to be very sure that it will not be necessary to offer my amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the letter written by Mr. Schultze, Director of the Budget, to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, on April 29, 1966.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1966.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have inquired whether there is any intention on the part of the administration to seek the congressional authorization which would be required to include any rural electrification or telephone loans in participation pools established under the provisions of the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

As you know, the President has proposed legislation to establish Federal banks for rural electrification and telephone systems in order to provide supplementary financing for the Rural Electrification Administration program. We believe that favorable congressional action on this proposed legislation will assure a fully adequate supply of credit to meet the needs of rural electric and telephone cooperatives.

I can assure you that in no event under the legislation now before your committee will any participations be sold in any REA loans.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES L. SCHULTZE, *Director.*

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, before the colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] I had listed the administration's program for sales under the proposals if enacted in fiscal year 1967.

Sales of assets from these programs will supplement the presently operating participation sales programs based on home mortgages held by FNMA and by the Veterans' Administration and on loans by the Export-Import Bank—participation sales programs which I indicated earlier have previously been authorized by Congress and have been previously operated successfully.

Further, this bill will enable us to stop the upward trend in the total of direct Federal loans outstanding.

In fiscal 1966, we expect to hold the total to just over $33 billion—only $200 million above the level of fiscal 1965. In fiscal 1967, we expect to reduce the total outstanding to approximately $31.5 billion. In later years, there may even be a declining trend in the volume of Federal resources immobilized in loans.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I have a poor memory, but it seems to me that in our hearings we were told they expected the total of the Federal loans in fiscal 1967, about which we are talking, to reach $39 billion.

Mr. MUSKIE. In the event the proposed legislation is not enacted and no sales were made under existing authority in fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967.

Mr. BENNETT. No—I believe whether it is enacted or not.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is not my recollection. I attended the hearings. Of course, the record of the hearings will speak for itself on that point.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to make this point clear—and perhaps I should wait until my turn to speak—that we may be talking about balances. The Senator may be talking about the total of loans minus the volume of participations out against them. But I am sure the Senator from Maine knows that the loans are still the property of the Federal Government and that the participations do not wipe out the loans.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct on that point. In the same way, FHA obligations are obligations of the Government, totaling I believe—what is it—the guarantee?

Mr. BENNETT. The guarantee?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is many billions of dollars. It seems to me that that figure approaches $100 billion for all types of guaranteed and insured loans. Thus, in that same sense, there will be a Federal guarantee, or at least an agency guarantee behind these participations to save the purchasers from loss. But, in terms of the accounting which we have traditionally used in measuring the direct loans outstanding, the figures I have just read are accurate.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the Senator means that the velocity or the volume of the loan programs will be cut down deliberately on account of policy, that there will be fewer loans made for college housing.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is not——

Mr. BENNETT. That is the point I am trying to clear up.

Mr. MUSKIE. The point I am trying to make is that the total of direct Federal loans outstanding——

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. It is hoped will be reduced——

Mr. BENNETT. That would only be by——

Mr. MUSKIE. By the use of the participation sales.

Mr. BENNETT. The participation sales have nothing to do with the amount of Federal direct loans outstanding. Federal direct loans are made by the agencies and they can only reduce those already made, and only reduce them when they are paid off. Total volume can only be reduced at a rate—move at a slower rate if the Treasury or the administration begins to taper off the program.

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand the point the Senator is making, and I am not trying to distort it. Perhaps I can put it this way: I believe that we agree on what the impact of this will be, that the total of direct loans outstanding, outside of those involved in participation pools which have been sold, will be the figures which I have indicated.

Mr. BENNETT. But those involved in participation pools have to be sold. They are still on the books.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is another argument. We are talking now about the validity of figures which I am trying to explain. I would be able now, and at a later point, to get into a discussion of whether there have been sales or not, sales of the paper that is involved, but we are now talking about the meaning of the figures I have given. I have tried to make that clear. I am not interested in trying to distort. The Senator is right when he says that the paper which makes up these pools will continue to be obligations. The loans will continue to be serviced by the agencies which hold them and will continue to be contingent liabilities of the Government in the way that I have tried to describe. But, under these pools, participation certificates will have been sold. No one has said today, on this side, that we are selling paper. We are selling certificates in the participation pools.

Mr. BENNETT. That is right.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe that point should be made clear. The Senator is right when he says that would be clear——

Mr. BENNETT. It is clear to me.

Mr. MUSKIE. And I hope that the RECORD following our colloquy will make it clear.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the patience of the Senator from Maine. I probably should not have interrupted him at the point that I did. Later on, I should like to return to this same issue and develop it from my own point of view.

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not object to the interruptions. May I say to the Senator that I am getting educated in the process. I think, since we are not going to get to a vote today, any colloquy on this subject may be useful to Senators who will read the RECORD, which may enlighten them in connection with the vote when it comes.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUSKIE. In connection with the programs to be affected by this bill, let me mention another unfounded criticism which has been made. It goes something like this: Selling these Federal assets amounts to turning over worthwhile programs to the profit-motivated designs of operators in the private money markets.

If this were true, we would be well advised not only to look askance at the legislation before us but also to rethink the asset sales policy of the last 10 years or more. But this charge has no foundation in fact.

Sales of pool participants would not give the buyers any control whatsoever over the programs under which loans are made.

We in the Congress would enact the programs and maintain control over the administering agencies. Further, the agencies responsible for administering the lending programs would retain their responsibility.

The question we face is not whether we want to turn control of Federal lending programs over to the private market. It is whether we want programs in which we have a keen interest to become increasingly subject to the fiscal squeeze that growing demands place upon the Federal budget.

There have also been charges about "budget gimmickry" in relation to the bill. This accusation relates to the budget treatment of assets when they are sold.

As we should all know, the sales of assets are treated in the budget as negative expenditures, rather than as receipts. Those who level the charge of budget gimmickry should realize that this procedure is neither something new with this bill nor something new with this administration. It is nothing more or less than the conventional budget treatment given the entire program of asset sales dating back to the mid-1950's or earlier.

An argument against the method of accounting used in handling asset sales in the Federal budget is less an argument against this bill than against the entire asset sales program already authorized by Congress.

We have at hand a useful technique which broadens the bridge between the private market and our Federal lending programs. We owe it to the taxpayers, to the many people who need the assistance our credit programs can provide and to the private enterprise economy which has sustained us so well throughout our history to take fullest advantage of the vast resources of the private market.

Let me close by quoting from the President's letter transmitting the legislation to us. No one can speak more forcefully for this bill than the President himself:

> The participation sales act of 1966 will permit us to conserve our budget resources by substituting private for public credit while still meeting urgent credit needs in the most efficient and economical manner possible.
>
> It will enable us to make the credit market stronger, more competitive, and better able to serve the needs of our growing economy.
>
> But above all, the legislation will benefit millions of taxpayers and the many vital programs supported by Federal credit. The act will help us move this Nation forward and bring a better life to all the people.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to ask if the Senator does not feel that this method of financing will cost substantially more to the American taxpayer than the ordinary way of borrowing by floating bond issues.

Mr. MUSKIE. I have explained that in my prepared statement. It would cost more—I suspect there would be a difference between us as to just how much more—through the use of participation sales than by direct Treasury borrowing; but I point out that this method has been in effect since the mid-1950's, and we have decided that it is desirable in order to reduce the commitment of public money to these loan programs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator from Maine will yield further, has he changed his mind since 1959? At that time we had up before the Senate a resolution which condemned the sale of mortgages in this way. At that time I notice that the Senator from Maine supported the resolution condemning this very practice on the ground that it represented an unnecessary cost to the taxpayers. I am wondering why the Senator has had a change of heart since that time.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am glad to reply to the Senator. He is correct if he says that my stand in 1959 as compared with at this time is a record of inconsistency, but I merely point out that, on the SBA measure which was before this body earlier this year, there was a record of inconsistency on both sides. I recall that on the vote in 1959 the vote on the Senator's side of the aisle was 29 to 3 against the position of the Senator from Delaware. The Senator from Delaware was able to convince only three Senators on his side of the aisle as to the merits of voting as he voted.

I think it is interesting to indicate that the Senator from Delaware had nothing to say on that proposal. Whether his silence at that time in comparison with his discussion this afternoon is inconsistent is for him to decide.

I may point out that in 1959 I had grave reservations about this particular device, although there was a difference in the amount, but the same fundamental question was involved. I am not quibbling over the difference as long as the Senator does not quibble over it. If neither one of us quibbles over the differences, then I will say I had grave reservations in 1959. Since that time I have become convinced that the growing loan money in the Government's portfolio of direct loans is a problem which must be dealt with.

I am persuaded that I was wrong with respect to the fundamental objective then and that my position now is right. Since the present administration is a Democratic administration, and the one involved at that time was a Republican administration, I can probably be accused of inconsistency directly attributed to party loyalty, but that is not the case.

I have become convinced as a matter of merit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I feel at this time, as I did in 1959 under a Republican administration, that this is not the proper way to finance the Federal Government. I so voted at the time, as the Senator knows, and I shall vote in the same manner this time.

Mr. MUSKIE. But the Senator did not oppose it very vigorously then.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said it with the greatest vigor I know how—by a "no" vote.

Mr. MUSKIE. If the Senator from Delaware will confine himself to the same kind of opposition at this time, and vote "no"——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Maine is making an eloquent argument. If he likewise will vote "no" I would be willing to have him forgo his oratory.

Mr. MUSKIE. Is the Senator ready to go to a vote this afternoon?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If we can win. I am always ready to go to a vote when I think we have the votes. The man who is now in the White House then led the fight as a Senator against this same procedure. It was argued then that this was an expensive way to finance the debt, that it was confusing, and that it was a way to dodge and avoid showing what the true deficit was. I agreed with Mr. Johnson at that time. I agreed with him that the purpose was to try to camouflage from the American people the true deficit. The only difference is that in 1959 we were under a Republican administration, and today we are under a Democratic administration. But it is still wrong. I wish the Senator from Maine would follow that same argument which his party advanced in 1959, and let us defeat it overwhelmingly.

Mr. MUSKIE. The then majority leader was not persuasive with 29 Members who voted on the other side of the position taken by the Senator from Delaware in 1959. Those Senators were not persuaded by the position of the Senator from Delaware until the Small Business Administration bill came to this body a few weeks ago. So there is a record of inconsistency on both sides of the aisle; almost 100 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, not quite. I voted against this proposal in 1959 and will vote against it again today.

Mr. MUSKIE. Let us get it straight.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am hoping that merely because this method is now proposed by a Democratic President, Members of the Senate on that side of the aisle will not all click their heels and follow what the President wants. I hope they will examine the merits of this measure and realize that there is no difference fundamentally between what the issue was in 1959 and what it is now. As an example of what it is costing, it has been brought out that the American taxpayers will have to pay one-half of 1 percent additional in interest rates.

Mr. MUSKIE. May I just make a reply to what the Senator has just said?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. I would urge the Senator, if consistency is the objective for which he now argues, to persuade the colleagues on his side of the aisle to prove their consistency.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not dealing with consistency. We are debating a $33 billion sale of Government assets. When the Senator from Maine said that Senators have changed their positions 100 percent, I point out that I have not changed my position today.

Mr. MUSKIE. I suggest it is inconsistent that when there is a Republican administration in office, the Senator from Delaware is strangely silent, and merely casts a "no" vote, as he did in 1959; and yet today he is articulate on the subject. I say that is being inconsistent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator will look at the remarks I made at that time he will see that when the Secretary was before the Finance Committee I joined the chairman of our committee and condemned the Secretary of the Treasury for endorsing exactly what the Johnson adminstration now proposes. The Secretary was before our committee to request an increase in the national debt ceiling. The amounts are different, but the principle is the same. The amount involved was $335 million.

Mr. MUSKIE. There is no quarrel with that——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Here we are dealing with $33 billion. So there is a difference there.

Mr. MUSKIE. May I say to the Senator on that point that it was not just $335 million involved in 1959. The administration had authority to deal with much more money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with that.

Mr. MUSKIE. So if we are going to talk about this, let us not talk about $335 million. Let us talk about whether the same kind of contention was made in 1959. I do not have that figure, but it was several billion dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree as to authority.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is talking about the authorization figure. I said on the floor we were talking about $4.7 billion for fiscal 1967, a part of which would be covered under existing authorization without the need for the passage of this bill. We are not talking about $33 billion. If the Senator wants to talk about $335 million we will talk about that also and not about $33 billion, but that part of the $4.7 billion we were discussing for 1967.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Thirty-three billion dollars is in the figure.

Mr. MUSKIE. It is not the figure I quoted. I have not used that figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have, but whether it be $335 million or $33 billion we have substantially the same principle. It is not identical, but it is substantially the same principle involved.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is one point on which we agree thus far in the colloquy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was voting against it in 1959, and I shall vote against it this time.

I agree fully with what the then majority leader, the man who is now in the White House, said at that time. It was argued then that it was a method of camouflaging a direct deficit. Under the Eisenhower administration it was such a vehicle, and today it is the same camouflage multiplied tenfold.

Mr. MUSKIE. To complete the record on the inconsistency issue, I have before me a record of the vote on the sale of participations in the SBA loan. On the vote to recommit, 26 Republicans voted "yea"—which I interpret, since we agree that the 1959 issue is fundamentally the same as this issue—there were 26 Republican "yeas" contrasted with 29 Republican votes on the other side of the issue in 1959. There were no Republican "nays" on this vote on the SBA loan pool.

I admit my own inconsistency and I undertook to explain that. My credibility on that point may not satisfy the Senator from Delaware any more than I can help entertain such reasons for his silence in 1959, which is in some contrast to his figures articulated here this afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator will admit in 1959, on vote No. 177, taken on August 20, 1959——

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator voted "no."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was joined in that "no" vote by the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Texas, Mr. Johnson, along with 100 percent of the Members on his side—I do not believe any of them voted the other way. We voted for the resolution to condemn this practice as an unsound and misleading method of camouflaging the true deficit. It does not represent "truth in Government."

Mr. MUSKIE. Does the Senator condemn those on his side of the aisle who are inconsistent in 1966——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not condemning anyone.

Mr. MUSKIE. With their votes in 1959?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We are not censuring Members of the Senate.

Mr. MUSKIE. Would the Senator chastise them the same way he did the President of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. I am merely stating the record. Perhaps they had a change of heart.

Mr. MUSKIE. Other Senators have, and that seems to be a virtue on this issue.

The Senator from Delaware may stand as the only Senator on this issue when the vote is over.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. For example, there is a member of the committee who filed minority views on this same bill who was consistent through the vote.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am for consistency, when it is a virtue.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from South Carolina signed the minority views against the bill. He voted similarly in 1959.

Mr. MUSKIE. So we are going to have two consistent Senators when this vote is over.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I pointed out that this bill will cost one-half percent more in interest charges to the taxpayers. Since that time authority to sell the SBA notes has passed and a block of FNMA mortgages have been sold at a cost of six-tenths of 1 percent more to finance. That means, if there are sold another $8 billion it is going to cost the American taxpayers several million dollars more to finance the Federal Government than it would if it were done in the normal manner. At the same time this would reduce the true amount of the deficit.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, we are departing a little bit from where we were in my speech when we engaged in this colloquy, but it is interesting to pursue the points raised by the Senator from Delaware.

I indicated earlier in colloquy that the Senator and I would undoubtedly disagree as to the cost of the program. I base that comment on the table which he put in the Record in the course of the debate on the SBA program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. In that table he undertook to compare actual costs of FNMA participation with the interest rate on outstanding treasuries.

I am assured by the Treasury that if there had been no offerings of treasuries at that time, in the unsettled state of the market, those rates would have been higher than those in the table of the Senator from Delaware.

I have two tables and I would be glad to put them in the Record so that the Senator from Delaware may digest them between now and the next time this matter is taken up.

I have a table on yields on selected issues of securities, based on market prices of April 29, 1965. The source is the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. Bond Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these figures may be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Yields on selected issues of securities, based on market prices, Apr. 29, 1965

[In percent per annum]

Direct obligations			FNMA participation certificates		
Maturity date	Coupon rate	Yield to maturity at bid price	Maturity date	Issue yield	Yield to maturity at bid price
Nov. 15, 1967	4⅞	[1] 4.96	Apr. 1, 1967	5.40	5.12
Aug. 15, 1971	4	4.88	Apr. 1, 1971	5.50	4.99
Aug. 15, 1973	4	4.87	Apr. 1, 1973	5.50	5.03
Feb. 15, 1980	4	4.68	Apr. 1, 1981	5.25	5.07

[1] When issued.

Source: Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., bond department.

Mr. MUSKIE. On short-term treasuries, the coupon rate for securities with a maturity date of November 15, 1967, was 4⅞, and the yield to maturity at the bid price was 4.96. That is short-term securities.

On participation securities, from 1967 to 1981, the issue yields were 5.4, 5.5, and 5.25, but the yield to maturity at market prices for comparable securities was 5.12, 4.99, 5.03, and 5.07, compared with the 4.96 on short-term treasuries.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator may look at those tables.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point with regard to the table?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What yield did they have quoted for bonds maturing in 1980 and 1981?

Mr. MUSKIE. 4.68 on Treasuries.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. On FNMA participation certificates—5.07 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is a difference of 0.7 on the longest and about 0.4 on the short terms.

Mr. MUSKIE. But treasuries cannot be issued on the long term.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Now we are getting to the point at issue.

Mr. MUSKIE. It is a point that I am not trying to dodge.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is a legal ceiling of 4¼ percent on Government bonds maturing beyond 5 years. The administration, under the guise that it is promoting cheaper interest rates, does not want to ask Congress to remove this artificial ceiling; so they are in effect selling only short-term Government bonds. Not only is this monetizing the debt, but it is costing more than if they would repeal that ceiling and sell in normal channels.

Under this bill they can dodge this ceiling and sell 15- and 20-year participation certificates. Thus they get around the ceiling on interest rates and get around the responsibility of reporting the true deficit, but as far as the taxpayer is concerned they are paying 5.60 percent interest.

Mr. MUSKIE. The increased cost is also involved in the direct sale of assets which President Eisenhower in several budget messages urged upon Congress, and which the minority in the House Ways and Means Committee in 1963 urged upon the Congress.

They were not concerned about the 4¼-percent ceiling. They urged direct sale of these direct loans to avoid increasing the debt ceiling.

This was the argument made by the minority in the House of Representatives.

The minority spoke for both sides of Congress. It was a different tone. I shall read from the minority views of the House Ways and Means Committee report, 88th Congress, 1st session—May 1963—to provide temporary increases in public debt limit.

> The administration also can always reduce its borrowing requirements by additional sales of marketable Government assets.
>
> For example, when the Secretary of the Treasury was before the committee on February 27, we suggested that it was incumbent upon the administration to show "good faith" before coming to the Congress for an additional increase in borrowing authority. We pointed out that the Government held about $30 billion in loans, many of which were readily marketable. In fact, there was a very good market for many of these loans. Instead of increasing its offering of these loans to private lenders, the administration was then acting on the supposition that the Congress would automatically accede to a request for an increase in its borrowing authority.

The Senator from Delaware said earlier the proposal in 1959 and this proposal were fundamentally alike; that they involved direct sale of Government paper, but they are fundamentally alike.

We can say that the admonition given to the administration by the minority of the House Ways and Means Committee in May 1963 supports this legislation. That report was signed by the following members of the minority: John W. Byrnes, Howard H. Baker, Thomas B. Curtis, Victor A. Knox, James B. Utt, Jackson E. Betts, Bruce Alger, Steven B. Derounian, Herman T. Schneebeli, Harold R. Collier.

There has been no attempt to describe this as not involving some cost. Of course, it involves cost, just as direct sales involve cost. Does this mean we should hang onto these loans forever and never attempt to sell them on the market, because they involve some cost to the Treasury to free these public moneys for use in other desirable programs? Of course it involves cost. The Senator from Delaware and I disagree up to this point on what that cost is.

The Senator has placed his figures in the Record and I have submitted some. I now offer another table and ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record. I invite the Senator's examination of this table.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Yield differentials—Dealer quotes on FNMA participation certificate issue of Apr. 4, 1966, and direct Treasury issues for Apr. 22, 1966

FNMA participation certificates			Treasury issues—market yields	Participation certificates—Treasury yields, spread
Maturity dates	Coupon rates	Market yields		
Apr. 1, 1967	5.40	5.270	4.87	0.40
Apr. 1, 1968	5.45	5.140	4.89	.25
Apr. 1, 1969	5.50	5.260	4.89	.37
Apr. 1, 1970	5.50	5.050	4.85	.20
Apr. 1, 1971	5.50	5.120	4.82	.30
Apr. 1, 1972	5.50	5.095	4.87	.23
Apr. 1, 1973	5.50	5.120	4.87	.25
Apr. 1, 1974	5.50	5.130	4.83	.30
Apr. 1, 1975	5.50	5.145	4.77	.37
Apr. 1, 1976	5.45	5.085	4.75	.33
Apr. 1, 1977	5.45	5.085	4.74	.34
Apr. 1, 1978	5.40	5.075	4.72	.36
Apr. 1, 1979	5.35	5.085	4.71	.37
Apr. 1, 1980	5.30	5.075	4.70	.38
Apr. 1, 1981	5.25	5.060	4.69	.37
Average				.32

NOTE.—Market yields shown are calculated from the mean of bid and asked price quotations. Treasury market yields are interpolated from calculated yields on specific issues for various dates.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Debt Analysis, May 2, 1966.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is important to nail down the cost. It is important that we not minimize it and that we not exaggerate it. I have no desire to distort the record on this issue. I believe that when the record is clear and when the Senator and I fully understand our opposing points of view, he and I are going to disagree as to its wisdom. Nevertheless, I think it should be clear.

There is an additional cost. We can agree on that point, which is the second point we have agreed on this afternoon. How much that cost will be is the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct about the minority views that were filed in 1959, and I am familiar with them. But that does not mean that I agree with those views.

When this question was before the Committee on Finance, the chairman of the committee, the former senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. Byrd, led the fight against this proposal, and I joined him at that time, as the record will show, in condemning it. I did not go along with the minority views when they were before the committee, and the Senator from Virginia led this argument.

I still say that there may be arguments on both sides, but I still feel, as I did in 1959, that this is not the proper way to finance the Federal debt. We both agree that it is going to be more expensive. I will admit that neither of us can project into the future and tell exactly what the higher cost will be. All we can do is to look at what happened in the past.

The one sale to which I referred perhaps was higher than the average, but that one sale averaged better than one-half of 1 percent. Perhaps later this will come closer to one-quarter of a percent, as the Secretary of the Treasury projected. No one knows. But why pay this one-quarter of 1 percent when it is not necessary? That is the point I am making. One-quarter of 1 percent is $2½ million for each billion dollars, and if the Government sells $8 billion worth of bonds it is putting out $20 million a year. Why pay this extra interest? The money goes to no source except the banking industry. There is no advantage in this situation to the taxpayers, and it is an unnecessary cost.

In addition, the American people are given a false sense of security by being led to believe that the Government is operating and paying for the cost of all these Great Society programs without creating a deficit. We are creating a deficit. The Senator will admit, I am sure, that if we sell $1 billion of these bonds under this formula it will reduce the reported deficit to the American people by exactly that same amount; it will reduce the amount of the national debt by that much as is reported to the public.

Mr. MUSKIE. To the best of my knowledge, all of the obligations of the Federal Government never have been totally reflected in the figures in the national debt.

In connection with the FHA, there is a contingent liability, which we are not worried about, because the FHA-guaranteed loans have been good. The default experience has been good. Nevertheless, it is an obligation.

If the Senator wants to be technical about it, the Government sold this paper directly all during the administration of President Eisenhower. That had the same effect. As a matter of fact, the purpose of the $335 million proposal in 1959 was to reduce the impact on the Federal debt ceiling. The Senator knows this.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator misunderstood my question. Perhaps I did not state it clearly. My question is: Does not the Senator agree with me that to the extent that bonds were sold under this formula or under the formula used by the other administration—I am not distinguishing between them—for each $1 billion we sell it would have the net effect of reducing by exactly that much the deficit as it is reported at the end of the fiscal year? It also reduces the necessity of increasing the national debt by that much. That is the point. Whether we sell $1 million worth, $1 billion worth, or $10 billion worth, the reported national deficit of the Government is reduced. Is that not true?

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me describe the other side of the situation; then I will answer the Senator's question.

When the loans are made, and when appropriation is made for them, the total amount is included as expenditures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true.

Mr. MUSKIE. Even so, it is a capital expenditure, although it is going to be repaid.

So if it is proper to include the amount as an operating expenditure when it is made, it is appropriate to give a credit against that expenditure when it is sold as it is under this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not questioning the propriety of the method. I am merely trying to get it straight.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe I can set the record a little straighter this way than by answering the Senator's question "Yes" or "No."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator were to answer the question he would agree with me that the only answer he could give would be "Yes," that the reported deficit of the Government is reduced by the exact amount by which the bonds are to be sold.

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not think the deficit will be reduced. It will be offset by the receipt of an asset.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Now we are in complete agreement. The deficit would not be reduced 1 penny although it would appear to be when reported by the administration.

Mr. MUSKIE. We are not in agreement as to the words and the emphasis the Senator uses.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator spoke my thoughts better than I could.

Mr. MUSKIE. I could not do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree that it does not reduce the deficit. It merely covers up the amount of the deficit so that the American people will not know the true deficit. In other words, if there is a $5 billion deficit normally, and an extra $5 billion of bonds is sold, a balanced budget can be reported under this system. That is misleading the American people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, partly for a question and partly for an observation?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I recently joined in the debate on this problem with relation to small business. Without going into a long discussion at this time, I invite the Senator's attention to S. 1013, a bill which I introduced and which the Senate passed several months ago. Although the bill has been passed by the Senate, it has been held up in the House Ways and Means Committee, because the Treasury Department is not in favor of it.

I believe the bill is of value because it affords an opportunity to know what the full debt—the full liability of the Government—of the Government may be.

The statutory debt, as the Senator knows, is approximately $320 billion. I invite the Senator's attention to that undisclosed or unreported debt. I cite only two or three examples, because I do not want to burden the RECORD with many.

As of June 30, 1962, the total loans guaranteed or insured by the Government agencies amounted to $60,792 million, and they had on hand to offset that $725 million.

That is one set of figures that I give the Senator. Then on the annuity and pension systems of the Civil Service, the Federal Government, as of March 7, 1966, had an actuarial deficit of $37,738 million.

Without debating the merits of the bill, which I did debate with relation to the small business loans—which involves the same principle—I believe that we should have some knowledge periodically, on either a semiannual or annual basis, of the undisclosed or nonstatutory debt of the Government. This debt involves a very substantial figure.

The Committee on Finance reported the bill twice. The bill was passed by the Senate twice. I hope that before this session of Congress is concluded the bill, either in its present form or in a different form, will be passed by Congress and sent to the President.

This would give the people of the country as well as Members of Congress information on the total obligations of the Federal Government.

By carrying out the purpose of the bill, we would increase the undisclosed or nonstatutory debt of the Government. I shall not argue that question any further today. However, the purpose of the bill is to give us knowledge of the debt. As I understand it, the bill that the Senator from Maine is advocating would increase the undisclosed and unreported debt of the Government.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, S. 1013 has a most laudable objective. However, it should be pointed out that the kinds of programs we are discussing with respect to the pending bill are fully disclosed. For example, the Bureau of the Budget each year issues special Analysis E, a 14 page booklet disclosing the Federal credit programs.

On the very first page appears a chart which indicates, over the period from 1956 to 1967, the annual growth of direct loans outstanding, the growth in the amount of new commitments made each year for direct loans and for guaranteed and insured loans. The growth indicated for the guaranteed loan has been sharper and larger than that for the direct loan program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the total figure?

Mr. MUSKIE. The total figure for commitments for 1967, which is an estimate, is $36.3 billion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That certainly is not the full obligation of the Federal Government.

Mr. MUSKIE. On page 57 of that analysis is a listing of all of the outstanding direct loans and guaranteed and insured loans for major Federal credit programs, classified by agency or program. In that table, the 1967 estimate of guaranteed and insured loans is $108 billion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In addition to that, the nonstatutory debt of the Government includes all the actuarial deficits relating to pensions and so forth.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe we should have a record once or twice a year of the total obligations of the Government.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe this analysis is such a record. However, the Senate obviously desires it in a different form. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I desire a full report which would include all actuarial deficits, which are responsibilities of the Federal Government.

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand the point of the Senator and I would agree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I debated the same question with relation to the small business loans for the same reason that I believe the Senator is now advocating the pending bill, to give the Government a chance to sell to banks and private individuals, through certificates, some of its obligations.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not believe we would have much of a problem involved here if the Government were to keep a dual-entry set of books, as any private business would do.

We have heard a lot of conversation about the debt we owe, and the Government does owe quite a bit of debt. However, if one were to borrow some money from a bank, he would submit a statement of his net worth. He would first list his assets and then his liabilities. He would subtract his liabilities from his assets and come up with a figure of net worth, if that is an accurate statement.

Unfortunately, for one reason or another, we are required by laws passed over the years to record nothing but liabilities. The statement does not list the assets of the Government or attempt to keep up with the assets.

If the Senator were to try to make a decision on whether to put more money in his business or borrow more money or invest more capital or have stock issued for the purpose of going into any venture, the first thing he would want to know is his financial worth, or assets over liabilities.

I insisted on amending the Saltonstall proposal to provide that, in addition to knowing what all these contingent liabilities are, we should have a list of the contingent assets.

I suspect that we would find that approximately $75 billion of the assets are assets which the U.S. Government owes to the U.S. Government. We would list them as assets.

If we compared the financial statement of the Senator from Maine——

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am not sure that I would want my financial statement to be compared with that of the U.S. Government.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator were to own a small bank and all the bank stock, and if the bank were to owe the Senator $100,000 because the Senator had that much money on deposit in the bank, as far as the Senator would be concerned, that would be $100,000 that he owed to himself.

Approximately $75 billion of the national debt consists of obligations that the United States owes to the United States. That is a rather ridiculous way of counting up the national debt, since $75 billion is offset immediately.

The last time that I looked into the situation, approximately $25 billion in bonds were held by the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Government owns the Federal Reserve Board. That $25 billion consists of assets of the U.S. Government. Yet that is counted as part of the debt.

There is approximately $50 billion in trust funds. These trust funds are supported by regular contributions of employees, and taxes are levied by the Government.

It can be argued that we have contingent liabilities which the balances on hand support, but we do not propose to reduce the amount in the funds. We propose to increase the amount. It will have to be increased as interest payments coming out of general revenue, or the funds will have to be increased by taxes or employee contributions.

In any event, to the extent that we hold the $50 billion, we are that much ahead of where we would be if we did not have that amount on hand. That is $75 billion of national debt that the Federal Government owes to the Federal Government.

In addition to that, no one ever bothers to put down what the value of our physical assets are. We have many physical assets. The real estate values alone, if one looks at the value of the land that we hold and the improvements that have been placed on the land, would greatly exceed the amount of the national debt in that one item alone—real estate value plus improvements on real estate that the Government owns.

I understand that that item is on the books as acquisition cost. The Louisiana Purchase, for example, was only 3 cents an acre. We debated the tidelands off Louisiana and the Senator from Louisiana had a grossly inflated idea of its cost, but it is still worth a great deal of money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I point out to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that we forced him and his cohort to let the Federal Government have the rights to the oil beyond the 3-mile and 3-league limit out to the edge of the Continental Shelf. That action has already brought $900 million to the Federal Government and $900 million is now in escrow, which will come to the Federal Government. In all, it is now predicted that $30 billion will come to the Federal Government from royalties on the oil taken from the Continental Shelf. That is a very real asset and source of revenue.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator's figure is very much exaggerated, but I would be willing to concede that the resources beneath the sea off the submerged lands are worth a great deal of money, and it will run into billions of dollars, although I would not be so optimistic as to think their value would be $30 billion, as the Senator has suggested. But that goes down in the books at zero value.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As a matter of fact, as of now, the Government does not even get the benefit of the revenues coming in from it, because there is still litigation pending, and the final settlement has not yet been made. So even what comes in does not go down on the books.

But if we simply had an honest statement, such as a bank would have, as to what the assets and liabilities are, we would be looking at a net worth picture which would make everybody happy. Instead, we have only a statement in negative terms, with the result that we have to have laws such as this to try to offset some of the mischief contrived down through the years to make it look as though the Government is hopelessly bankrupt, when the Government is in fact wealthier than all the other governments of the world put together—certainly wealthier than all the governments of the free world put together—and our assets over liabilities are greater now than they have ever been.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I heartily concur in what my good friend the Senator from Louisiana has said. The value of real and personal property owned by the Government is approximately $325 billion at original cost, with no allowance for the oil and gas rights beneath the Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of California.

In addition to that, there is the shale oil under the public lands on the western slope of the Rockies. The Geological Survey estimates that there are 2 trillion barrels of oil equivalent there in deposits yielding more than 10 gallons per ton of shale—not a million, not a billion, but 2 trillion barrels of oil. At the current price of approximately $2.85 a barrel, these deposits could yield oil worth approximately $5.7 trillion.

Eighty percent of these reserves, or perhaps $4.56 trillion worth, is owned by the Government. We got these areas as a result of the Mexican war—on the whole, I think, an unjust war; but we paid the Mexican Government $15 million in settlement, and we took about a third or half of the Mexican Republic in return.

Now, at one-eighth royalties, on the oil taken from the shale under Government-owned land, we would have revenues of approximately $570 billion, $250 billion more than the total of the national debt. I have introduced a bill to insure that the people obtain the full value—to be sure that we have no Republican Teapot Domes on that oil—and to devote the revenues to the payment of the national debt. Of course, the processes for extracting the oil from the shale are not perfected, but we are in hot pursuit of doing so and there is every reason to believe the technology will be perfected ultimately. Moreover, the extraction would be according to need so that the effect on prices would not be to completely depress them. And in any case the reserves are so large that even at a substantially lower price there would be enough revenue to cover the debt. So this may be a painless way of eliminating the national debt; and our friend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] should take full cognizance of the vast assets we have as a Nation and cease to be a Cassandra.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I suggest to my friend the Senator from Illinois that I believe he likewise has overstated the value to the United States of those resources, for the reason that if we produced all that oil, my guess is the price of oil would go down very much, because the increase in supply would very drastically reduce the price of the product.

But even so, it is a very vast asset, and as the Senator has correctly stated, all the property of the Government is stated at so-called acquisition cost. If one considered the actual present-day value of those properties, it would be far greater, perhaps even several times greater, than the acquisition cost stated on the books.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The acquisition cost of the shale oil reserves in the Rockies could not exceed the $15 million paid to Mexico.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I thank my friends from Illinois and Louisiana for their helpful interjections. It is reassuring, from time to time, to receive a little support on this side of the aisle, as well as comments on the other side.

It is my desire to make the RECORD clear. I have no intention whatsoever to distort the RECORD. I want the essential nature of this bill to be understood, and how it would operate; and I think when it is understood, the good sense of the proposal will make itself evident.

That is my position this afternoon, Mr. President, and any comments, observations, or information from either side of the aisle which contributes to that end I am eager to have in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just one question; I understand consideration of the bill is going over until Thursday.

I notice among the assets listed in the committee report to be sold is an item—Treasury Department, foreign loans, $3,763 million.

Does that include the debt owed by the British Government, totaling about $3 billion loaned that country around 1946? Do I understand that under the proposed legislation the Treasury Department could discount that note?

Mr. MUSKIE. Technically, that is why it is listed, but there is certainly no intention——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am just asking if that note, representing around a $3 billion obligation which the British Government owes and which was borrowed back around 1945, could be one of the items sold?

Mr. MUSKIE. This is the item described as foreign loans?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Three billion seven hundred and sixty-three million dollars; that is the item to which the Senator refers? Yes; this is described in the table as "Outstanding direct loans, and guaranteed and insured loans for Federal credit programs classified by agency or program."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. One further question on that. Since that loan could be discounted or sold, if we sold that note to the banking industry at the 5 percent, or 5.25, whatever percent we may pay for the discounting provision, it would still have a guarantee of the U.S. Government to pay this participation certificate should the loan default, would it not?

Mr. MUSKIE. There is no intention whatsoever to deal with that particular loan under this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But if the loan were sold——

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is posing a hypothetical situation which I cannot conceive.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Suppose we strike that authority out of the bill, then, because it is in the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. There is no intention, for example, to undertake to include the foreign aid loans, the soft loans, and so on. There is no intention to program that under this bill whatsoever.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Well, suppose we amended the bill and confined it only to those loans which are intended for resale, because the bill as drafted does give the administration authority to sell the full $33 billion listed, including this war debt that is owed to the U.S. Government.

Mr. MUSKIE. May I say to the Senator that under the bill as drafted, the specific loans and the specific size of participation sales must be approved by the Appropriations Committee of the Congress. There is absolute congressional control on every item listed in the table to which the Senator is referring.

I will be happy to put in the RECORD at this point the participation sales which the administration anticipates would be programed under this bill for fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967, that is, those that have been programed under existing legislation and those that would be programed under this proposed legislation for those fiscal years.

That will give some idea of the loans that the Treasury has in mind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Outstanding loans and other financial assets owned by Federal agencies, June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966

[In millions of dollars]

Agency and program	Actual as of June 30, 1965	Estimate as of June 30, 1966
1. Substantial sales (and private refinancing) of the following types of assets are underway or are now planned under proposed participation sales legislation. (Remainder is less attractive to buyers or must be retained to provide excess pool coverage or to help carry out program requirements):		
Department of Agriculture: Farmers Home Administration	1,990	2,054
Department of Defense: Military assistance credits [1]	79	40
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Academic facility loans	2	66
Department of Housing and Urban Development:		
Federal National Mortgage Association [2]	2,121	1,427
Federal Housing Administration [3]	527	490
College housing loans	1,927	2,170
Public facility loans	184	206
Veterans' Administration:		
Direct loans	1,145	498
Vendee loans	504	370
Export-Import Bank	2,490	2,091
Small Business Administration	1,147	1,072
Subtotal, saleable assets	12,116	10,484
2. Sales of certificates against pools of crop support loans (maturing annually in August) provide short-term substitution of private for public credit, but any considerable expansion would require substantial increases in interest rates:		
Department of Agriculture: Commodity Credit Corporation (subtotal)	2,115	1,874
3. Limited future sales or private refinancing of some of the following types of assests may prove feasible (but will probably require (a) larger discounts or supplementary payments than previously planned, (b) removal of statutory prohibitions on sales and/or (c) volume sufficient to warrant sales effort):		
Office of Economic Opportunity	17	47
Department of Commerce:		
Economic Development Administration	126	183
Maritime Administration	109	101
3. Limited future sales or private refinancing—Con.		
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
Defense education loans	536	692
Public Health Service	13	38
Department of Housing and Urban Development:		
Public housing programs	60	59
Housing for elderly or handicapped loans	95	151
Urban renewal loans	196	214
Treasury Department: Loans to District of Columbia	139	149
General Services Administration	158	166
Subtotal	1,449	1,800
4. No feasible method of making major sales of the following types of assets is now apparent (because of (a) intergovernmental agreements, (b) repayments in foreign currencies, (c) very low or nominal interest returns and/or (d) questionable investment quality):		
Department of Agriculture: Rural Electrification Administration	4,072	4,262
Department of Housing and Urban Development: Public works planning advances	64	63
Department of the Interior: Reclamation loans	90	105
Department of State:		
Agency for International Development	8,997	10,510
Loans to United Nations	107	119
Treasury Department: Foreign loans	3,763	3,728
Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	131	156
Subtotal	17,224	18,943
Total	32,904	33,101
Minor programs not included above	150	175
Grand total	33,054	[4] 33,276

---

[1] Sales by Export-Import Bank of military assistance loans transferred from Defense are included in the Bank's total sales.

[2] Excludes secondary market operations trust fund.

[3] Sales by Federal National Mortgage Association of FHA-owned loans transferred from FHA are included in FNMA total sales.

[4] Revised from original 1967 budget estimate of $33,111,000,000.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, since we are talking about specific loans that may or not be involved, there has been some discussion why the legislation has been pending before the committee as to veterans loans. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, and AMVETS, in support of the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1966.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: The Participation Sales Act of 1966, S. 3283, currently before the Senate has been reviewed by national officers and staff personnel of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States believe that the proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966 will be of benefit to veterans desiring VA direct or guaranteed loans in the future.

The favorable effect of participation by private capital on Government loan program financing in the marketing of $925 million in direct loans and vendee accounts by the Veterans' Administration. This has extended the limit of credit to permit thousands of additional loans to veterans without Treasury borrowing.

As intended, and as provided in the proposed legislation agency control of individual loans will not be impaired. The Veterans of Foreign Wars believes this to be an absolutely essential stipulation to insure that veterans will continue to deal only with the Veterans' Administration with respect to current or future VA direct loans which may be committed to pool as security for participations to be sold for the purpose of substituting private capital for Federal funds and credit.

It is of manifest importance to veterans and to this organization that the veterans loan program funding as administered by the VA not be burdened by deficiencies resulting from inclusion of lower interest rate hearing loans of other Federal agencies. Each agency should be obligated to the fund for whatever deficiencies are attributable to their respective utilization of this procedure of selling assets. It is believed that the proposed legislation satisfies this requirement.

While the VA direct loan revolving fund is now clearly adequate to meet current needs, it is conceivable that in the future additional funds will be necessary to meet the increased demand for direct VA loans by qualified veterans in areas of direct loan eligibility. Increased marketing of VA mortgage assets through the pooling device conceived in the proposal under discussion would doubtless make more funds available for VA direct loans. Likewise, the loan guarantee revolving fund for payment of claims resulting from defaults on VA guaranteed private loans would be replenished and stabilized, thus insuring prompt payment of all proper claims to lending agencies, encouraging them to continue to participate in the guaranteed loan program.

Therefore, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. recommends enactment of the proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966.

Sincerely,

ANDY BORG,
Commander in Chief.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
April 29, 1966.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which you are a member, is currently holding hearings in connection with S. 3283, to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

The Participation Sales Act of 1966 will encourage greater use of this country's private capital assets in financing education and the general welfare through loan programs. One of our country's major lending programs is that authorized by veterans legislation.

The Disabled American Veterans (DAV) supports only that legislation which is designed for the benefit of those veterans who have incurred disabilities as a result of honorable service in the Armed Forces. Recognizing that adequate financing is a foundation of any continuing program, a review of this act shows that it warrants our endorsement.

The provisions of this act have been tested and proved by a Veterans' Administration lending program in which numerous members of the DAV have participated. This includes guaranteed loans and direct loans to disabled veterans, and the special program for partial Federal financing of special homes for certain disabled veterans. These are part of one of Government's largest lending programs, administered by the VA, which has sold almost $1 billion loans to private capital. The Participation Sales Act of 1966 would extend the same privilege of "pooling" loans to other Federal agencies.

We find that the new act in no way changes the veterans program administration, and that the VA will continue to deal directly with the veteran. It provides selling of mortgage loans through the Federal National Mortgage Association, which acts as marketing agent for the loans to private capital. This, in turn, permits use of the capital from sales of the loans. The VA experience has shown that this practice has allowed loans to thousands of additional veterans.

The DAV support of the President's policy of defending freedom against communism in Vietnam is unwavering, as is the support of necessary expenditures to fight the war. As veterans who have suffered at the hands of enemies who would deny our freedom, we best understand that the primary responsibility of Government is security of our country.

Since the provisions of this act strengthen the method of financing by our Government, and encourages private enterprise participation in the loan programs, it is consonant with the aims of the DAV.

The goals of the DAV remain consistent: Benefits for those who gave so much in service to their country. Adequate financing of those benefits is essential. Therefore, I urge you to support this legislation and its passage by Congress.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE L. CALLEGARY,
National Commander.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
April 29, 1966.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: This has reference to S. 3283, a bill to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies. I note that you, speaking for the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported the measure favorably, without amendment, on April 28, 1966.

I am advised that this bill would authorize Federal agencies administering credit programs to enter into agreements with the Federal National Mortgage Association, whereby that association would sell to private investors interest-earning shares, known as participation certificates, based upon a pooling of Government loan certificates. I am told that this plan, in effect, would serve to substitute private for public credit.

The Veterans' Administration has since 1964 used this technique to sell a substantial number of its veterans housing mortgages, under a similar authorization contained in Public Law 88-560. S. 3283 would encompass this authorization and extend it to include certain other Federal agencies.

The impact of the proposed legislation upon present VA operations is the primary concern of the American Legion. It is our understanding that the sale of participation certificates under the provisions of this bill would not give the purchasers any control over the programs under which the loans were made. The veteran would continue to deal directly with the Veterans' Administration, the agency which administers his housing loan program.

We have been assured by the Veterans' Administration that the provisions of this bill will favorably affect the operations of the VA. Accordingly, the American Legion favors the enactment of S. 3283.

Sincerely yours,

L. ELDON JAMES,
National Commander.

AMVETS NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1966.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: The President of the United States has called for passage of S. 3283, which if enacted into law, will permit greater use of private capital assets in financing education and general welfare through loan programs.

One of the major Government lending programs is authorized by the loan provisions of veterans legislation. The validity of the principle embraced in this proposed law has already been tested and proved by this veterans lending program. Since 1964, nearly $1 billion in these loans have been pooled and marketed to private financial institutions through the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA). This has permitted thousands of extra loans to veterans without extra Treasury borrowing.

The act would permit the same practice by other Federal agencies, in permitting pooling to market Government-backed loans to private capital. The officers of AMVETS have reviewed the proposed legislation and find that its passage will bring absolutely no change in the management of the VA guaranteed or direct loans to veterans on homes and businesses. The VA will continue to be the administering agency, and the veteran, as always, will deal with the VA.

We also find that, under the proposed law, Congress will retain full control of appropriations, and in many areas congressional control will be strengthened. No veterans benefits funds can be diverted elsewhere.

The members of this organization fully recognize that fighting a godless enemy in Vietnam is costly, but necessary. Its cost is nothing compared to the human suffering if freedom is lost. This organization is on record strongly supporting the necessary expenditures for the Vietnam conflict and the President's policy of resisting the Communist conspiracy that has threatened to bury us. As veterans, we recognize that a primary responsibility of Government is security of our country.

We also stand firmly on the long-established principle that the veterans of this country are fully entitled to the benefits provided under present laws, and more. For without those who respond to the call to colors, there would be no freedom, no United States as we know it.

This organization is seeking liberalized expenditures in compensation for those who suffered wounds in wars, bigger pensions for those veterans who are in need, and greater aid to the widows and children of those who served. We further seek strengthening of veterans preference in Government jobs, another benefit granted veterans by the latest GI bill and previous veterans legislation.

Recognizing the need for adequately financing veterans benefits, including those rightfully extended to millions of veterans under the new GI bill passed by this Congress, and the need for financing other programs improving the general welfare, the AMVETS endorses the principles embodied in S. 3283.

The act obviously enhances and improves Government's method of financing, encouraging a greater partnership of private enterprise and Government. This improvement and this partnership is compatible with the goals of this organization, and we strongly urge its passage.

Sincerely,

RALPH E. HALL,
AMVETS National Commander.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am the ranking minority member of this committee. Ordinarily, when a bill such as this is discussed, after a statement by the Senator in charge of the bill has been made, an opportunity is given for his opposite number to make a statement. I have enjoyed this colloquy this afternoon.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets on Thursday and the bill again becomes the pending business, I may have the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Participation Sales Act of 1966 now pending before the Senate, deserves much more study and consideration than it has so far received. If it were subjected to the degree of both public and congressional scrutiny which it warrants, I am confident it would be rejected. There is little likelihood that the bill, S. 3283, will receive anywhere near the amount of public attention that a proposal of its magnitude and far-reaching implications would seem to require, and, at this point, even less chance that it will be rejected. Nevertheless, I intend to do what I can to both bare its essential elements to further study and to persuade my colleagues of its faults and hopefully, therefore, to contribute to its rejection by the Senate.

S. 3283, would establish an almost entirely new pattern of Government financing for a wide range of governmental departments, agencies, and instrumentalities. The amount of money involved at the present time, exceeds $33 billion, and there is every indication that it will increase in future years. Beginning on page 18 of the Banking and Currency Committee report on the bill is a table showing the agencies involved and the amount of money held by each entity.

I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Outstanding direct loans, and guaranteed and insured loans for Federal credit programs classified by agency or program

[In millions of dollars]

Agency or program	1965 actual	
	Direct loans	Guaranteed and insured loans
A. MAJOR AGENCIES OR PROGRAMS		
Office of Economic Opportunity	17	
Department of Agriculture:		
Commodity Credit Corporation	2, 115	419
Rural Electrification Administration	4, 072	
Farmers Home Administration	1, 990	727
Department of Commerce:		
Economic Development Administration	126	
Maritime Administration	109	419
Department of Defense: Military assistance credits	79	
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
Office of Education	538	
Public Health Service	13	
Department of Housing and Urban Development:		
Federal National Mortgage Association	2, 121	300
Federal Housing Administration	527	49, 042
Public housing program	60	5, 033
College housing program	1, 927	
Urban renewal program	196	1, 382
Other major programs	432	
Department of the Interior: Reclamation loans	90	
Department of State: Agency for International Development	8, 997	144
Treasury Department:		
Loans to District of Columbia	139	
Foreign loans	3, 763	
Veterans' Administration	1, 649	30, 951
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2, 490	2, 617
Small Business Administration	1, 147	104
Total, major agencies or programs	32, 507	91, 138
B. OTHER AGENCIES OR PROGRAMS		
Department of Agriculture: Soil Conservation Service	15	
Department of Commerce: Aircraft loan guarantees		9
Department of Defense:		
Loans for construction of Ryukyu power system	9	
Defense production loans and guarantees	14	49
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
Community facility loans	(1)	
Hospital construction activities	4	
Assistance to refugees in the United States	6	
B. OTHER AGENCIES OR PROGRAMS—continued		
Department of Housing and Urban Development:		
Urban mass transportation loans	2	
Liquidating programs (Community Facilities Administration)	13	
Community disposal program	4	
Department of the Interior:		
Alaska public works (repayable investment)	16	
Bureau of Indian Affairs	24	
Defense Production Act loans	8	
Fisheries loans	6	
Ship mortgage insurance		5
Guam rehabilitation program	2	
Minerals exploration program	1	
Department of Labor: Manpower development and training loans	(1)	
Department of State:		
Repatriation loans	3	
Loans to the United Nations	107	
Treasury Department:		
Defense Production Act loans (liquidating)	4	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (liquidating)	5	
Civil defense loans	(1)	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation fund	131	
General Services Administration:		
Public Works Administration bonds (liquidating)	58	
Surplus property sales credit	100	
Interstate Commerce Commission: Guaranteed railroad loans		214
National Capital Planning Commission: Advances to the District of Columbia and Maryland	(1)	
Veterans' Administration:		
Service disabled veterans fund	4	
Vocational rehabilitation fund	(1)	
Veterans special term insurance fund	5	
Veterans insurance and indemnities fund	1	
Veterans reopened insurance fund	(1)	
Total, other agencies or programs	547	276
All agencies	33, 054	91, 414

[1] Less than $1,000,000 outstanding.

NOTE.—Figures may not add due to rounding.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a mere glance at this list discloses the comprehensive range of activities and agencies which this bill covers. Although this list is included in the combined views of Senator BENNETT, the ranking minority member of the committee, Senator HICKENLOOPER and myself, the list was not available to the Committee during the 2 days of hearings or during the executive session in which the bill was reported to the Senate. The only guide the committee members had available during the hearings and executive session as to the agencies which might be covered by the bill was an official, but similar, list included in the Banking and Currency Committee on S. 2499. These hearings were held last year on a bill to grant the Small Business Administration authority similar to that now proposed to be given numerous other Government agencies. That list was included in a letter, which was inserted in the hearing record, from the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The lack of an official list of the agencies concerned until after the bill was approved in committee characterizes the consideration, or lack of it, to which this bill has so far been subjected.

The ostensible purpose of this proposal, according to its proponents, is to promote private financing of credit needs and to replace public credit with private funds. On closer examination, it is evident that this argument is without merit. This bill merely establishes a new method of Government borrowing, but the borrowing is done in such a way that it will not become a part of the formal debt, subject to the debt ceiling, nor will it be subject to disclosure as part of the administrative budget deficit.

S. 3283 would enable any one or all of the listed agencies to enter into a trust agreement with the Federal National Mortgage Association whereby the FNMA would issue and sell participation certificates based on pools of loans set aside by the agency for that purpose. Custody, control, collection, and servicing of the obligations would remain with the Government agency which had originally made the loan, but the beneficial title would be deemed to have passed to FNMA in trust. In short, none of the assets are actually transferred through sale to private rather than public ownership.

The assets are to be used as collateral for the issuance of other federally guaranteed obligations in the form of participation certificates which are to be sold in the private market. This is, in reality then, a borrowing transaction. In the event of a default on the original obligation, the agency will nevertheless be obligated on the participation certificate and will therefore stand to lose twice on essentially the same transaction. There is a double obligation to repay the participation certificates as the underlying obligations will be guaranteed by the agency establishing the trust, and timely payments of principal and interest on the certificates will be guaranteed by FNMA. FNMA's guarantee, in turn, is supported by borrowing authority from the U.S. Treasury.

Although the participation certificates will not be full faith and credit obligations of the United States, as a practical matter, the moral obligation of the Government to back up the certificates is entirely clear. In the final analysis, then, it may well be that the Treasury will have to step in and bail out the agencies and FNMA.

With the foregoing facts in mind, it may occur to some to ask, "Why avoid Treasury borrowing in the first place?" The answer is fairly obvious to the discerning student of Government financing. The primary reason is, of course, to avoid making this significant sum a part of the budget deficit and avoid including it in the formal debt subject to the debt ceiling limitation. This is advantageous only from a standpoint of avoiding disclosure of the total Government debt. It does not avoid or prevent future debt; and in fact, as we shall see, in all probability, it will increase debt above that which would be created if the Treasury were to borrow the money initially.

There are several questions raised by this proposal which need to be answered. The first is, "Does this bill in truth represent a method of replacing public financing with private financing?"

The answer to this question is decidedly in the negative. The operating funds of the Government ultimately come, in all instances, from private sources. If the independent agencies involved borrow the money from the Treasury, the Treasury must in turn borrow the money from the general public or take them from funds already in the Treasury as a result of taxation. I can see no difference in that procedure from the one where proposed where the agency would borrow from the general public through an agreement with FNMA.

Question No. 2, "Will the procedure here proposed to be authorized result in a more efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal agencies?"

Once again, the answer to this question is in the negative. It has already been shown that the assets held by the Government agencies will remain the property of the Government agencies for all purposes, such as serving the debt, and so forth. Any default on the obligations secured by these agreements must be borne by the agency and ultimately the Treasury of the United States.

Question No. 3, "Would the financing procedure proposed to be authorized by this bill result in terms more favorable to the Government than under normal procedures?" The answer to this question is not only in the negative in that the terms would not be more favorable to the Government, but all the testimony is conclusive on the point that the terms of the participation certificates will be decidedly less favorable to the Government than would a Treasury obligation. Administration witnesses who testified on this bill and congressional proponents are frank in their admission that the rates of interest required to make these participation certificates attractive to the public will be greater than would the rate of interest on a Treasury obligation. This is not theory; this is fact, and it is attested to by the experience of the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank has for some time had the authority to issue participation certificates. The General Accounting Office audited the issuance of two offers of participation certificates by the Export-Import Bank, and their reports reveal that the interest rate differentials amounted to more than $7 million.

Question No. 4 is, "Would the enactment of this legislation be a brake on inflation?" In my judgment, the enactment of this legislation will not stop the inflationary trend which is so evident in our country today. Without doubt, unnecessary and extravagant Government expenditures and an ever-increasing Federal deficit is contributing substantially to inflation. This bill would not decrease Government expenditures nor would it decrease the level of the Government's debt. It would only avoid the normal public disclosure of the debt, but the debt would nevertheless still exist. I fail to see how, under these circumstances, it can be seriously argued that this bill is an anti-inflationary measure.

Mr. President, one amendment to this bill which was originally added in the House of Representatives and has been included in the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency deserves mentioning. It is the so-called Widnall amendment which requires prior approval by Congress in an appropriation act before any specific issue of participation certificates can be offered to the public. To this extent, congressional approval is required.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the administration is very anxious to push this bill through as fast as possible. I regret that the administration is trying to push through Congress important legislation in such a short period of time. I regret that the administration feels it has an obligation to run the Congress as well as the executive branch of Government.

In the House report, on page 35, Representative Paul A. Fino had this statement to make:

> I regret that we had only 1 day of hearings on this bill, which was incredibly reported out of committee the day after the Presidential message was received. This program is like Pandora's box—the Nation would not accept it if they knew what was in it. As usual, deception is the objective and public ignorance of what is going on is administration bliss.

This bill was reported by the Senate committee after only 2 days of hearing, one of which was held prior to the introduction of the bill in the Senate. Committee action was taken before it was known which, or even how many, Government departments, agencies, or instrumentalities would be covered by the all-encompassing language of the bill.

To my way of thinking, this is an unsound manner in which to legislate. The most logical, and certainly the surest, way to strike a blow for economic stability is to curtail unnecessary and extravagant expenditures by the Government.

S. 3283 embodies a proposal by which the Government would embark upon a new policy of financing the activities of its many and diversified credit agencies. I am convinced that this is an unsound proposal for the reasons I have stated. It is past time that we in Congress and the administration face the financial realities of the day, as bad as they may be, and stop trying to avoid unpleasant but necessary steps by reliance on gimmicks such as this. In the interest of both economic stability and truth in borrowing, the Senate should reject this bill.

TEXAS GULF SULPHUR PROFITS SOAR AT THE EXPENSE OF ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the other day Texas Gulf Sulphur Co.—America's largest sulfur producer—reported huge first-quarter profits and sales gains. Corporate earnings soared 103 percent and sales increased 52 percent. Total first-quarter revenues sharply advanced to $29 million, up from $19 million in the same period last year.

The company expects to pile up profits for the remainder of 1966. A top corporate official already predicted:

> We expect to have a much better year than last year.

I might point out that Texas Gulf Sulphur's 1965 sales were 40 percent ahead of 1964. Its 1965 net income reached an alltime high—1965 profits were up 55 percent over 1964 and 90 percent over 1963.

So we have a fat increase on top of a big increase added to a huge increase. Higher profits are almost always good news in this country. Certainly it is welcome news for the executives of Texas Gulf. Their bonus checks and the value of their stock options will surely reflect the 103-percent increase in company profits.

But is it such good news for the economy and the American public? Lost amidst the report of rapidly rising profits is this crucial fact—and I quote from the New York Times of April 29, 1966:

> Much of the increase in Texas Gulf's profit margins was apparently attributable to recent increases in sulfur prices.

Sulfur is a basic industrial chemical. Over the past 2 years, world demand for this vital material has been outstripping supply. This heavy demand has created pressures for higher sulfur prices. And this pressure, in turn, has led to price instability in the sulfur market.

Rather than follow the path of responsible price restraint as so many of its industrial counterparts across the Nation have done, Texas Gulf is instead pursuing a path of putting profits before the national interest. I find this especially disturbing in view of the high productivity advances in the sulfur industry.

Consider what this means.

Texas Gulf's price hikes translate into higher prices to industrial customers, many of whom are making ammunition for our men in Vietnam. Before long, these increases will be passed along to farmers, to homeowners, and to consumers. And so the value of the wage earner's hard-earned dollar becomes eaten away.

Texas Gulf should be lowering prices, not raising them or holding them at presently high levels.

Whether one subscribes to the President's wage-price guideposts, as I do, the sulfur pricing is unconscionable. It is transparently inflationary.

Something must be done. The first step, I believe, is up to the Congress. Texas Gulf Sulphur occupies a preferred tax position through its 23-percent depletion allowance. In view of the circumstances surrounding its large profits, the continuation of this special tax subsidy is open to serious question. I think the time is ripe for Congress to take a hard look at it.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD CHINA

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I intend to address the Senate this afternoon on the subject of China. Before I do so, I wish to take notice that the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota, who has made important contributions to the discussion of our foreign policy in many areas of the world, is on the floor and intends also to speak on this subject.

I look forward to hearing his address. I know from past discussions we share common views on many of these matters, including the need for a public commission to suggest new China policy. I know all Senators will listen carefully to his presentation because they know as I do, he speaks from broad experience and dedication.

Mr. President, the time has come for the American Government and the American people to make a major reassessment of our policy toward China. Communist China today is an imposing presence in the world stage. She is not occupied solely with her own considerable domestic problems. She is a nuclear power. She is involved in intrigues and subversion around the world. She has replaced the Soviet Union in many areas as the spearhead of Marxist revolution. She is the chief backer of our adversaries in Vietnam. She is the only major power in the world that proclaims the inevitability of war with the United States.

Our Government has been striving toward a peaceful solution that preserves the independence of Vietnam. We are anxious to avoid more wars in Asia, and see the other nations of that area develop in peace and freedom. But we cannot begin to seek a solution in Vietnam, or stability in Asia, or effective arms control or lasting peace without knowing what China will do. And the disturbing thing, Mr. President, is that we know so little. In March, the Foreign Relations Committee, in a significant series of hearings, asked the leading China experts in the country for their views. Even they were extremely hesitant to predict how Chinese communism and Chinese foreign policy would evolve. We do not have firm answers to some of the most critical questions, such as:

Are the Chinese serious in their proclamations of inevitable war with the United States?

To what lengths will they go to bring the rest of Asia under their influence?

Does their split with the Soviet Union make it easier or harder for us to deal with them?

What changes will take place in China, and Chinese foreign policy, after the first generation of revolutionary leaders passes from the scene?

How long will these changes take? Can we do anything to hurry them along?

And most important, are there any changes we can make in our policy toward the Chinese that will make her a more responsible nation and improve the prospects of peace and stability in Asia?

One of the reasons for our difficulty is that China herself has been so secretive. For many years, our efforts to send scholars and journalists to China on a reciprocal basis have been rebuffed. But the fundamental reason is that as a nation we are still unprepared to face up to the realities of China.

For almost 15 years, until Chinese power combined with Chinese intransigence forced her problems upon us, there was no meaningful political discussion in this country of alternatives to our Chinese policy. The Communist victory over the Chinese people in 1949 was a traumatic experience for our country. It created such deep wounds and bitter divisions that all contacts were ended and effective political discussion became frozen. Men we recognize today as experts—men to whom we entrust important governmental responsibilities abroad—were pilloried during the 1950's because they had had some small connection with the China policy of the 1940's. As a result, the wellspring of respected scholarship, on which sound political discussion is based, began to dry. And today our universities produce only a handful of China scholars each year. Until the recent foreign relations hearings there has never been a thoroughgoing study by public figures of what our policy toward China should be.

On any foreign or domestic issue, there must be a long-term process of public education, leading to the public acceptance that is needed for effective Government policy. That is how our democratic process works. We have seen it in recent years as regards such issues as foreign aid, medicare, civil rights, aid to education, and many others that just a few years ago had little public support. On China and China alone, has the issue been so fraught with emotion that the normal workings of the democratic process have become stuck.

I believe sufficient time has passed for this to have changed. If for no other reason than China's increasing power and bellicosity, public interest and concern with China is great enough today for the American people to listen tolerantly to new approaches and realistic ideas.

To help bring this about, I think it would be extremely helpful if the President convened a blue-ribbon commission of distinguished men to make, publicly, recommendations for new directions in our China policy. Such a commission could be headed by an eminent citizen or past national leader. Its membership could be drawn from academic, business, labor, and other leadership circles. It should have available to it the assistance of all intelligence sources on China within our Government, as well as the advice of the China experts in our universities, the results of the policy formulation work now being done in the executive branch, and the experience of both living former Presidents who have dealt with the China issue in their administrations.

Many times in recent years, when it became obvious that the American Government would have to make new endeavors or seek new directions, commissions have proved an effective vehicle for recommendations and public education. The Civil Rights Commission under President Truman paved the way for the greatest era of progress in Negro rights. The work of the Gaither Committee in 1958–59 convinced us of the need for a large increase in missile power to make our deterrent effective. The Rockefeller brothers reports laid the basis of public acceptance for many of the social and cultural programs we have initiated in recent years. The Coordinating Committee, prior to the 1962 trade act, and the Draper Committee in the field of birth control are other examples of the use of this approach.

The Commission I suggest would have the truly historic task of seeing if more normal relations with China could be established, consistent with the goals and principles of our foreign policy. It could lay a basis for new policies to deal with those who succeed Mao Tse-Tung and the aging group of revolutionaries who lead China today. It could, most important of all, help to free the question of U.S. relations with China from the rigid emotional straightjacket which has encased it for so many years. It might also stimulate a greater desire by our young scholars to pursue China studies.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts for bringing this issue out into the open once again and getting it into the mainstream of American thought and concern.

I do not know of anything that is more important than to get this issue properly before the public.

While I must confess that I am not sure as to the best vehicle, I think the Senator rendered a great service in the speech he is making today to help get more Americans conscious of this tremendous problem.

I wish to commend the Senator most highly.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the comments of the Senator. The Senator is highly regarded for his contributions to matters of foreign affairs. He knows well the problems we face in Asia and the difficulties in arriving at foreign policy positions that will both serve our Nation and the cause of world peace. He is one of the foremost spokesmen in the Senate and I am proud to receive his kind and encouraging words.

The Commission could be asked to make recommendations on the following vital issues:

First. To make suggestions on how to increase informal and formal governmental contacts with Communist China.

The only link we now maintain with Communist China is through informal discussions between our Ambassadors in Warsaw. These have taken a rigid form, with fixed agendas, and formal procedures. So far they have been barren of real result. I do not think this single contact is adequate. We should try to establish more frequent contact with her diplomats, at various levels, in Paris and London and other national capitals in addition to Warsaw, and begin a diversity of discussions with them. I would expect the Commission to also give attention to the conditions necessary for future normal relations with China. I also believe we should not discourage other nations friendly to us from extending their own diplomatic contacts with China as far as they desire.

Second. The Commission would advise on how to increase scientific, education, cultural, athletic, and tourist contacts with Communist China.

So far China has refused our offer to permit reciprocal exchange of medical specialists and journalists. But what if a man like Dr. Michael DeBakey applied to go to China to help her physicians develop techniques for saving heart patients? What if Dr. Jonas Salk asked permission to help promote the use of his polio vaccine, in exchange for some of their leading scientists? It would be increasingly harder for China to refuse. But even if they did, in what more dramatic way could we prove to the world that it is they, not we, who continue to insist on their isolation?

To keep trying, imaginatively, constructively, could eventually result in Chinese acceptance, just as in the Warsaw link. From this beginning could come a regular exchange of scientists, professors, artists, athletes, and eventually even ordinary tourists.

One of the many impediments to Chinese-United States relations is that the Chinese people's picture of our country is based entirely on the hate propaganda fed them by their Government. The value of exposing more Chinese to our society far outweighs, in my judgment, the risk that some may come to spy—a risk that our security agencies are well equipped to guard against in any event.

Third. The Commission would make recommendations on the problem of Communist Chinese membership in the United Nations.

For the last 10 years we have successfully opposed the admission of mainland China to the United Nations. Each year the vote has become progressively tighter. Last year the procedural question to consider this matter an important issue was sustained, 56 to 49, with 11 abstentions. On the resolution itself, to admit Red China at the expense of Formosa, the vote was 47 to 47, with 20 abstentions. It is uncertain how long the necessary majority will remain.

We have a fundamental commitment to preserve the presence of the Republic of China in the United Nations. We must continue to press in the U.N. toward this end. This commitment grows out of past loyalties, and out of the Republic's strong identity with our policies in many areas. But if a system of representation were devised which would allow a seat for mainland China and still preserve Taiwan's rights, it should receive serious consideration. In developing our policy on this matter, the advice and suggestions of the Commission would be most valuable to our Government and to our country. This matter should receive the Commission's highest priority.

Fourth. The Commission would look into how to increase Chinese participation in international arms control negotiations.

I think that all Americans agree that there can be no effective arms control without Communist China's participation. At present, China is the least interested in arms control of all the nuclear countries. We urged that she be invited to the Geneva negotiations. She refused to come, even though in 1963 she proposed a general disarmament plan of her own. We should continue to hold the door open for her, at every disarmament conference, in the hope that eventually she will participate—and in the knowledge that at least the world will see which country it is that refuses to even consider abandoning the weapons of destruction.

Fifth. The Commission would reassess our present embargo on all trade with China, to see whether a limited trading relationship could be established on goods which could not be used to fuel the Chinese war machines. It is obvious that our trade embargo has, in recent years, been effective only as a symbol of hostility. What Communist China is denied by us, she can purchase from England, France, Germany, and Japan. Over half her trade is with non-Communist nations. The beginning of a trade relationship would be another source of increased contact which could yield dividends of peace in future years.

Sixth. Consider ways in which Taiwan can make the same progress in political institutions that she has made economically.

As an economic showcase, Taiwan stands as dramatic a contrast to mainland China as West Berlin is to East Berlin. Yet it is important that the 10 million native Taiwanese, who now have only 26 of the 2,900 delegates to the National Assembly, obtain a greater participation in the island's political life. In any referendum the Taiwanese would overwhelmingly reject Communist rule, and show the world that the mainland's claim to their island is the most blatant kind of old-style colonialism. The United States stands for free institutions in South Vietnam, in Asia, and throughout the world. They should be encouraged in Taiwan as well.

Most likely all of these initiatives directed toward mainland China, if offered by us, would be rejected by them this year, and perhaps for years to come. Few nations have ever been more hostile to the United States, more strongly suspicious of our every act, more inclined to interpret every friendly gesture on our part as a plot or a sign of weakness.

If this is true, why would these initiatives be useful nonetheless?

Because they are in keeping with the patience and friendship that the American people have historically held out to the people of China.

Because our efforts, even if rebuffed, will improve the prospect of peace in Asia, if in no other way than by showing that any step toward war is China's step, not ours.

Because if offered patiently and imaginatively and persistently enough, they might be accepted—not all at once, perhaps none immediately—but eventually, through the steady effect of chipping away at China's self-imposed isolation.

And finally because no nation can stand still. The forces of change are at work in China just as they are in every country. There is a new interest in a higher peasant standard of living, as shown by the widespread use of birth control. There is going to be a leadership change, as shown by the fact that Mao Tse-tung has not been seen for months in public, and even was missing from Sunday's May Day celebration. Policies like these might accelerate this evolution of China toward a posture that would benefit world peace.

It was not too many years ago that war with Russia was also considered inevitable. No two powers ever confronted each other with more opposite goals than the United States and the Soviet Union. Yet Stalin died and a change took place. The first rays of light were very small: a conference in Geneva in 1955; a trip by Khrushchev and Bulganin to Western Europe in 1956; a visit by Khrushchev to the United States in 1960. And eventually there was a shift in attitude, powered by firmness with flexibility on our part; by the post-Stalin leadership's recognition of the natural desire of the Russian people for peace and more normal relations with other countries; and by the sobering effect that possession of a nuclear arsenal seems to have on its possessor. The evolution had many setbacks, such as the U-2 incident, the breakup of the Paris summit meeting, the Berlin crisis of 1961, and the Cuban crisis of 1962. Yet from the seed of minor contacts came the fruit of significant agreements, such as cultural exchange and the nuclear test ban treaty.

We are not on the best of terms with Russia today. But we talk to them, we negotiate with them, and we are even taking some steps in certain fields of international cooperation. Our relations with Russia today are better than anyone could have expected 12 years ago. I hope, 12 years from now, that we can say the same thing about China.

So let us take a fresh look. We cannot concede in areas of vital interest. We must honor our commitments to our friends in South Vietnam, Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, Burma, Taiwan, and the other free nations of Asia. We must realize that any basic progress in our relations will depend, in the end, on China's willingness to renounce force as a means of international change, her willingness to negotiate and to accept compromises, and to give up her aim of destroying the United States. It takes two sides to make a lasting peace, but it only takes one to make the first step.

For over 100 years, the United States has taken a deep interest in the welfare of the Chinese people. Our missionaries worked there. Our clipper ships traded there. We fought together in the greatest war in history. The warm feeling that developed over this period remains in the hearts of our people and, I believe, in the consciousness of the people of this great and civilized land. It will be difficult to rekindle this feeling to a point where it can lead to better relations.

But it will serve the deepest traditions of our country and the highest aspirations of the world to try to make the effort.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Washington in commending the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts on the very welcome and helpful and enlightening address he has delivered.

There is no question that this is an area which is most controversial and most difficult to discuss. It is a question on which we need considerably more light.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts if he does not think that the pending study of the Red Chinese economy before the Joint Economic Committee would be very useful. It seems to me that it could help from the standpoint of our military policy. There is a great deal of controversy as to whether the Chinese would be able to engage in a full-scale war in South Vietnam and elsewhere.

The kind of inquiry which the Joint Economic Committee is capable of conducting would be helpful, and in a far more positive and constructive manner in ascertaining the trade potentiality and determining whether we would have a basis for extensive trade.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I agree with the Senator. I believe that that kind of study is indicative of an awakening of interest and concern within this country with regard to our relations with China.

I believe that study could unquestionably be very helpful to all of us in trying to appraise what our attitude should be. I certainly hope that the Commission that has been proposed today would be able to study that material, as well as the material that would be available within the Government and universities and come forth with some solid recommendations, suggestions, ideas, proposals, to assist us who share a deep concern over what our attitude should be and can be toward China.

I believe that the contribution that would be made by such a commission would be certainly consistent with a number of things that have been proposed today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the Commission idea. It would be a good start, particularly with the high level, thoroughly competent Commission which the Senator from Massachusetts recommends.

What concerns the Senator from Wisconsin is the consistent lack of any positive response on the part of China. They seem to have a limited vocabulary on U.S. proposals. The answer is always "No," delivered emphatically and abusively. It is my understanding that we have not only tried very hard to persuade the Chinese to permit our reporters, educators, scientists, and others to visit China, but also have gone so far recently as to invite China to send virtually any kind of scientists or other personnel to this country, with no reciprocal arrangements.

It seems to me that we have been extremely generous so far, and we have not had a response. I am speaking of the last few weeks. I do not mean to say that there are not other things that we could do. I ask the Senator whether he would not agree with me that we have made a very considerable effort along this line.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I mentioned in my speech the points that the Senator from Wisconsin has covered.

We could expect that many of the initiatives which are put forth by any such Commission would be rejected not only today but also for years to come.

The fact that we speak today demonstrates our very deep concern over our relations with the Far East and the fact that Communist China is today and is going to be the fundamental focus of our problems in the Far East with regard to the stability and peace of that area.

As I mentioned, we can make a number of proposals and we can and should expect that they will be rejected. However, we should realize that this will demonstrate to our friends throughout the world the true nature of Communist China's isolation, and that the rejection of these proposals will be a sign of strength for U.S. policy, rather than a sign of weakness.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly one of the most difficult proposals is the question of the admission of Red China to the United Nations. The case has been argued strongly that the biggest nation in the world should be a member of the United Nations if the United Nations is going to be an effective world peace force.

But a big problem appears to be that China would insist on coming into the United Nations as China, that is, as a permanent member of the Security Council with a veto power, and in view of China's attitude toward the settlement of international disputes as enunciated by the Senator from Massachusetts so clearly today, what would happen to the Security Council?

The other conditions laid down by Red China, including expulsions from the U.N. and charter revision, would make it virtually impossible for her admission into the United Nations to be accomplished.

I believe that the suggestion of the Senator could be very helpful because it is clear that this problem must be solved over, probably, a long time and by some kind of compromise. This can best be achieved by the kind of painstaking and competent study that the Senator proposes.

A number of suggestions have been made as to how to solve the problem, but they are all fraught with difficulties, and the more we probe and examine the difficulties and the more we debate the subject, the more likely it is that we will reach a more enlightened decision in this very important area.

Another important area concerns nuclear proliferation. That is a most dangerous situation, and, unless Chinese refusal to cooperate can be solved in some manner, the slow, painful progress including the test ban treaty is likely to go for naught, and we may have the kind of holocaust which, as the distinguished Senator and his brother, the junior Senator from New York, have stated so well, could engulf mankind.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts on his thoughtful, imaginative speech suggesting the setting up of a blue ribbon commission to considering new directions in China policy.

Such an action certainly is needed, as the effects in the State Department of the McCarthy holocaust followed by complete stagnation in our China and Far Eastern policy ever since can, I believe, only be removed by the winds of change from outside. One result of our Foreign Relations Committee's hearings was the establishment of the fact that the executive branch of the Government—in fact our country as a whole—is pretty sterile when it comes to actual knowledge of Communist China today.

The problem has been that we have left this responsibility over the years entirely to the executive branch. And, today, it appears to be the legislative branch that is probing for possible change.

Accordingly, I would hope that such a blue ribbon commission might, just as it would invite participation from the executive branch of Government, also draw on the views developed by the Foreign Relations Committee in the course of its China hearings and even on our committee.

I have read, too, Senator McGOVERN's speech which endorses Senator KENNEDY's idea of such a blue ribbon commission to examine China policy and which goes on to show his imagination and his willingness to pioneer in fighting for peace.

Let us remember that when Senator McGOVERN talks of peace he talks as an old bomber pilot who knows the horror of war.

It is an interesting thought, that while in the United States less than 1 percent of us have heard a shot or bomb go off in anger, virtually every person over 25 in Europe north of the Pyrenees has had this experience. And, now, so has virtually every citizen of Vietnam.

I believe, too, that this experience—or lack of experience—has an effect on public opinion in every country.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] for his observations and supporting remarks. Senator PELL, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, speaks with an experience and understanding that I welcome here today.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier today it was my good fortune to read the speech we have just heard by the thoughtful Senator from Massachusetts. I have heard some of the comment which has followed. The bad comment encompasses all that, it occurred to me, I would want to reassure myself was on the record; hence, I shall restrict myself to saying that I think this sort of suggestion, voiced by one to whom America quite properly pays a great deal more heed than to some of the rest of us, comes at just the right time.

The form, as the Senator from Rhode Island suggests, could be of such nature as to build in the experience of the past and potential contributions that we could draw from our own Committee on Foreign Relations; and I would hope thought would be given to that.

Lastly, Mr. President, when we go home, we are asked a series of questions wherever we go: "What about Vietnam? How much money should we spend for defense? When are you going to try a new equitable tax program? What is the relationship between the total spent on space and the total spent on education, and is it consistent with our obligations in both areas?"

We could go on and list innumerable questions, to none of which anybody short of God could pretend he knew the answers, but with respect to all of which, including questions concerning China, all of us have an obligation to inform ourselves.

Unfortunately, we have been unable to appropriate additional hours to each day. Therefore, it is desirable that there be available to each of us this sort of resource, so that hopefully we may be able more effectively to allocate the hours which are ours, if we cannot do anything about increasing them, to seeking answers to all of the questions which crowd us for answers.

One of the questions now often asked is, "What about China?"

As a member of the generation which went to school when China was represented by about two pages in a geography book, and a place to which I would never go unless I happened to find myself a foreign missioner, I find it necessary to do a great deal of homework on such a question. I should be grateful to such a commission for its help, and to the Senator from Massachusetts especially.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the views of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I join my fellow Senators in congratulating the Senator from Massachusetts on a very thoughtful speech. Since we have opened up the subject of China, I think it is extremely important for thoughtful Senators such as the Senator from Massachusetts—and I know the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] also has a speech along the same lines—to keep the subject alive.

This is a new subject. Most of the time since I have been in the Senate, it has been rather taboo, in that it was not considered proper and certainly not safe politically to discuss it.

I think the Senator is entirely correct in raising these questions, and I also like his idea about a commission to study the subject. It may be said by some, as indeed it has been said heretofore, that the Committee on Foreign Relations should make these studies.

We can only do so much on a particular subject, because other necessary legislation crowds it out. We now have foreign aid, a most controversial and troublesome subject. We also contemplate the necessity of giving some attention to Europe. So I think it is a very fine supplement to the work of the committees to continue the discussion of this matter.

I know of no subject upon which there is more misunderstanding, misinformation, or just plain ignorance than China. I know that that has been true of myself and other members of the committee. Our hearings were, I thought, a good start, because we had some well-informed scholars and students of China—about as good as our staff could locate in this country. But I am sure there are many others.

Also, a commission such as that suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts would, I think, be freer from the inhibitions that naturally afflict all of us in public office, because these are controversial matters, and some are loath to become involved in controversial matters.

As I understand it, the Senator is not seeking to have such a commission appointed; he is simply throwing out the idea for consideration. I believe it is his point of view that we would then hope to attract some of the best minds in the country on such a study. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. I think the Commission could well be appointed by the President of the United States, to consist of leading, thoughtful people such as those who appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee.

As the Senator from Arkansas has mentioned, this matter has been a taboo question for discussion in Congress and in the Senate for many years. I think it is true that the very effective hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee really were the opening shots of the struggle for information, and reasoned study of this issue. I think all of us in the Senate owe a considerable debt of gratitude to the chairman and the members of that committee for conducting those hearings, which I think were extremely productive and constructive in their approach.

As the Senator from Arkansas has mentioned, the idea is to have this Commission appointed by the President of the United States, to consist of persons of high caliber and expertise from our universities, from people active in public affairs, and past national leaders. Those who could bring wide and varied backgrounds and experience to bear upon the subject, and make public their recommendations, are the people I have in mind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield further, there is one further advantage to that that I can think of, among others: There is a tradition in our committee not to have foreign nationals appear in open session. We often consult them in executive session.

This tradition, I think, is probably soundly based. I have considered breaching it. But in these highly controversial areas, I do not wish to embarrass any foreign national; and they might be subjected to embarrassment. In any case, that is the precedent, according to our staff, and I do not recall any exceptions, particularly involving a matter of this kind. I think perhaps in certain technical areas and certain other aspects, there have been some who appeared, particularly some Canadians.

But such a commission would be free of any such traditions—not that that is a bad one, under the existing political circumstances. A great deal of valuable information as to the situation since the revolution could be contributed by people who are foreigners. There have been very few Americans there. There have been a number of Canadians, Dutchmen, Frenchmen, of course, and British, among others, who have been there. So the Commission would have that advantage.

While I am on my feet, may I say, with reference to the matter just discussed, as to the question of whether or not the Chinese would react favorably to an invitation to the United Nations, the testimony before the committee seemed to indicate quite clearly that the best experts did not believe they would immediately react favorably, but they thought this is no reason at all not to withdraw our objection. As I recall, not many of them, if any, said that it was our duty to recommend or to promote their interests, but the least we could do would be withdraw our opposition. It is generally believed, and I believe it, that the exclusion of China has been a result of our very firm and vigorous opposition. So we do not have to take the responsibility for promoting it, although personally I do not see any great distinction; I mean that if we change our policy, which I hope we are in the process of doing with regard to China, that distinction is rather more a matter of form and perhaps of good taste than anything else. I do not see anything of any great substance.

The same is true with respect to the offers as to students, doctors, or professional men. I do not think there is reason to expect them to make an immediate response, in view of the very serious and at times vitriolic and bitter differences which have existed since 1949. So I think this is a matter of deliberate policy, expecting that they are not likely to fall all over themselves in gratitude for our sudden change of policy.

But that is quite immaterial to the point the Senator makes. I agree with him on that, too. The Senator has made a great contribution which will help to keep this subject developing.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Arkansas. The Senator has added another reason for the formulation of such a commission; namely, access to foreign nationals, which had not occurred to me.

I wish to thank the Senator. He has summarized very well the principal reasons for the development of such a commission, and I want to express my appreciation to him for his comments.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

(At this point, Mr. CANNON took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

THE IGNORANCE CURTAIN AGAINST THE OPEN DOOR—THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to join with other Senators in the Chamber in commending, first of all, the junior Senator from Massachusetts for what I regard as a provocative and helpful speech on the question of our relations with mainland China. The Senator's name is one that is not only well known but also heard with respect around the world, as well as in our own country. I hope that the thoughtful questions and suggestions which he has raised in the Senate today will be weighed not only in Congress but also by our executive officials and the American people.

Mr. President, several weeks ago, I turned my own special attention to the issue of United States-China policy. It is an issue in which I have been interested for more than 15 years; indeed, my first campaign for the House of Representatives, in 1956, was a campaign which turned in considerable part on a recommendation which I had made publicly in 1950, that the United States should seek to establish normal relations with the new government on the Chinese mainland.

As the Senator from Arkansas has stated, this is a rather treacherous political issue to be raised in the midst of a political campaign. It was with a certain amount of anxiety that I found myself confronted in 1956, as a candidate for Congress, with statements I had made as a college instructor in 1950 on this subject. But, as it turned out, the people of South Dakota, at least, were considerably ahead of what was then the view in Congress. The issue was resolved with the election of the first Democratic Representative from the State of South Dakota in almost a quarter of a century.

Mr. President, although the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I have worked independently on the statements which we make today, we share some of the same conclusions. I noted a similar area of agreement among the distinguished scholars which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] called before his committee.

It seems to me that these areas of agreement among persons who have a special interest in this issue are reassuring. I am therefore happy to stand with the Senator from Massachusetts on those views which we share in common. On those areas where our approaches may differ somewhat, I see that difference merely as a measure of the complexity of the problem.

Mr. President, several weeks ago, I sent a draft of the speech I am about to deliver this afternoon to Prof. John King Fairbank, of Harvard University, one of the Nation's greatest authorities on China, and also to former Ambassador George Kennan, now of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton University, the principal author of our containment policy with reference to the Soviet Union after World War II.

Because of the high regard in which these two distinguished men are held, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD pertinent statements from their letters of reply to me.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY,
Princeton, N.J., April 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: Thank you for sending me the draft of the excellent speech you have in mind to deliver on the floor of the Senate. I have read it with nothing but admiration and approval, and am sure that it will not only have an important impact today but will go down on the record as one of the really great contributions to the discussion, in the legislative branch, of the problems of our foreign policy in this present period.

GEORGE KENNAN.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
EAST ASIAN RESEARCH CENTER,
Cambridge, Mass., April 21, 1966.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: I admire very much the draft of your speech "The Ignorance Curtain." I feel sure that China specialists like Barnett, Scalapino, and others who have testified recently, including myself, would subscribe to practically everything you say. Few could say it as well. You put things in a balanced context and appraise them objectively.

JOHN KING FAIRBANK.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, "We must change to master change."

This little noted phrase from President Lyndon Johnson's state of the Union message of January 12, 1966, deserves a place in American state papers comparable to Franklin Roosevelt's "We have nothing to fear," John Kennedy's "Ask not what your country can do for you," and Dwight Eisenhower's warning of the growing "military-industrial complex."

Significantly, President Johnson advanced this concept in relation to domestic concerns—his plea for a Great Society. The President was not, of course, calling for change merely for the sake of change; rather, he was suggesting that new challenges require new responses. Experiences as a youth growing up under difficult circumstances and long years in public life have led our President to reject the easy slogans which too many of us have accepted until recently. Notions such as "the unemployed are too lazy to work," "the Negro should stay in his place," "old people who have not saved up for a rainy day deserve the poorhouse," and other once accepted platitudes no longer serve the needs of a growing America. Instead, President Johnson speaks of a Great Society and reminds us that "We must change to master change."

In the enigmatic field of foreign policy, however, we have been slow to break free from the tyranny of slogans. While a changing world cries out for recognition that "We must change to master change," we are still guided in some areas by notions that have little relevance to present realities. If we are to avoid unrealistic crusades abroad that dissipate our moral and material strength, if we are to realize our dreams of a Great Society, we must begin to apply the imaginative, up-to-date approaches to foreign policy that our President has brought to domestic concerns.

Nowhere has our failure to adapt policy to change been more apparent than in Asia—especially in China and Vietnam. If our painful and frustrating involvement in the Vietnamese conflict has finally triggered an examination of American policy in Asia, this could represent the one positive result from an otherwise melancholy venture. As one who questions some of the assumptions which have sent so many American troops to war in southeast Asia, I believe that a fundamental reappraisal of policy is vital to our security as well as to the peace of the world.

The two most powerful forces moving in Asia since 1945 have been nationalism and the "revolution of rising expectations." With the collapse of the old British, French, Dutch, and Japanese imperial systems during and after World Was II, Asia was convulsed by revolutionary forces aimed at throwing off outside control and securing a better life for the people.

Our own revolutionary, democratic tradition enabled some Americans to understand these fundamental forces. Believing that Western imperialism had run its course by the end of World War II, our Government encouraged the British to liquidate their Asiatic colonial system; we insisted that Japan surrender her imperial holdings; we brought considerable pressure on the Dutch to withdraw from the East Indies; and we granted full independence to the Philippines.

But in China and Vietnam, the revolutionary leaders were Communists, which automatically made then the enemy in American eyes. To our policymakers, especially after the bitter experience of the Korean war, Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh were part of a worldwide Communist monolith bent upon global conquest. We seemed ready to ostracize any Communist government no matter how strong its base of local support, and to embrace any ally no matter how odious and ineffective, provided he carried an anti-Communist banner. Having substituted communism for the Devil, we felt sufficiently free from sin to rebuke those who failed to enlist on the side of right. Although we had followed a policy of avoiding involvement in European alliances of the 19th century, Secretary of State Dulles regarded neutralism as "immoral" when practiced by the newly emerging governments of the post-World War II period. Forgetting that what we are for has been the source of our strength more than what we are against, we made anticommunism the guiding principle of our policy in Asia.

Thus, although Ho Chi Minh had stood with us in the war against Japan and saved American pilots shot down over the jungle, we backed the French effort to crush the Vietnamese independence struggle led by Ho. This action ran counter to President Franklin Roosevelt's view that Indochina should be placed under a United Nations trusteeship and prepared for independence.

Roosevelt said:

> France has milked it for 100 years, the people of Indochina are entitled to something better than that.

But with his death, that view faded and $2 billion in American aid went to the French effort which ended in defeat at Dienbienphu in 1954.

Ho Chi Minh emerged as a victorious hero from the 8-year war against France—not because he was a Communist, but because he tapped powerful forces of nationalism and popular revolution as a counter to a crumbling colonialism and an inept puppet regime. The evidence is convincing that if we had accepted Ho and permitted the Vietnamese to work out their affairs free from U.S. involvement, North and South Vietnam would have united under Ho. Such a regime might have served as a more effective buffer to Chinese penetration of southeast Asia than the divided and warring two Vietnams which we helped initiate that have been the occasion for so much grief over the past decade.

However lofty our motives, Americans in Vietnam and the various political chiefs we have embraced in Saigon since 1954 have suffered from many of the same handicaps that plagued the French. As John King Fairbank puts it:

> We are sleeping in the same bed the French slept in, but we are dreaming different dreams.

In spite of enormous outlays of U.S. financial and military aid, it has been seemingly impossible to establish a government in South Vietnam capable of enlisting a dependable popular counterforce to the followers of Ho. Perhaps no one of the dozen regimes that have come and gone in Saigon in recent years could have stood without powerful U.S. props. Yet, the public embrace of a white Western power has also raised serious problems for the fleeting governments in Saigon, as General Ky has discovered in the Buddhist demonstrations. Given the current nationalistic sentiment of Asia, an American military embrace of the local politicians may embarrass and weaken them, while undercutting our own position. In Indonesia, for example, it was only after the American presence was diminished that local anti-Communist groups, freed from the charge that they were American stooges, took over and administered a severe setback to the pro-Chinese Communist forces.

We have supposed that the No. 1 enemy of Asia was communism and that any sacrifice to contain it would be popular. But few Asiatics share our obsession with communism. The bad memories that fester in Asian minds are associated not with communism, but with Western imperialism and corrupt local hierarchies. The exploitative capitalism Asiatics have experienced bears little resemblance to the enlightened economy and public policies that have served America so well. So, while anti-communism has been an effective rallying cry to secure ever larger congressional authorizations of American military and financial aid for compliant regimes in Saigon and elsewhere, it has not been in tune with the strongest aspirations of the people of Asia. Too often we have become identified with corrupt, stupid, and ineffective dictators who made the Communist revolutionists look appealing by comparison.

The obsession with communism that pulled us into the Vietnamese struggle has even more clearly dictated our policy toward China for the past two decades. In spite of the enormous power of the United States and the relative weakness of China, anticommunism has been a blinding light that has led us to aggravate the very dangers we most ought to diminish—the increased belligerence of China—the disruption of normal communications—a growing military involvement on China's border that could ignite a third world war.

Considering our sacrifices in World War II to save China from the Japanese, we were disappointed and alarmed by the collapse of Chiang Kai-shek before the Communist forces of Mao Tse-tung. This was an especially painful experience for Americans because we had prided ourselves on the open door policy, our use of the Boxer Rebellion indemnities to finance Chinese students studying in the United States, our Christian missionary activity, and the Pacific war of the 1940's.

Americans blamed each other for losing China—forgetting that China was not ours to lose. Many Americans saw Chiang Kai-shek as a Christian statesman allied through his charming wife with the wealthy Soong family, devoted to justice and freedom. Actually, Chiang and the Soongs presided over a corrupt regime with little concern for the ordinary citizen. They mulcted both the U.S. aid program and their own people, while ruthlessly suppressing their critics. It was such a regime that paved the way for a Communist triumph.

The galling presence of a Communist government over the most populous nation on earth—especially a nation toward which we felt a peculiar paternalism—helps to explain why we almost literally closed our eyes on Chinese realities after 1949.

Instead of quickly recognizing the fact of Mao's government in Peking, we assisted the flight of Chiang to the island of Formosa and set him up as the recognized government of the nation that had just expelled him. There was some discussion in U.S. circles about recognizing the government in Peking, but such talk ended with the eruption of McCarthyism and the strident anticommunism of the early 1950's. A well-financed China lobby skillfully cultivated American political, religious, and military circles to secure maximum aid for Chiang and implacable opposition to the new government on the mainland.

Thus was forged U.S. policy toward mainland China—a policy based on the political, economic, diplomatic, and psychological isolation of China combined with a bristling military containment. We have stoutly refused to recognize Peking and have blocked her entrance to the United Nations while insisting that Chiang's forces on the island of Formosa constitute the real Chinese government. No American trade has been permitted with mainland China, and we have tried strenuously to discourage other nations from trading with her. Travel by U.S. citizens, firsthand observation, study and reporting by our scholars and journalists, the exchange of scientific, cultural and entertainment personalities and works—all of these have been obviated by our nonrecognition policy as well as by the bitter anti-Americanism of Peking.

If an "iron curtain" describes the barriers which separated the Soviet Union from the West in the postwar years, an "ignorance curtain" has descended between the United States and China since 1949. American ignorance of conditions in China is paralleled by even greater ignorance in China of the American people—of our concerns, our aspirations, our motives—although their leaders make certain that our faults are well advertised. The lack of information and understanding based on normal exchanges is one of the most serious byproducts of the United States-China estrangement. Says China expert Doak Barnett:

> There is less responsible public discussion in the United States of China policy than of any other foreign policy question of comparable importance.

The meagerness of responsible public discussion is accented by the scarcity of competent China experts and researchers. Within the State Department, the McCarthy witchhunts of the 1950's took a heavy toll of competent, forthright specialists. Since then, State Department authorities have been largely muzzled by their fears of Congress while Congress has been muzzled by fears of the American public. The result has been a paralysis of policy and a continuing ignorance that denies policymakers, the Congress, and our citizenry the opportunity to consider realistic alternatives.

The progression of the recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings from the Vietnam issue of China policy has at long last focused public attention on the challenge of China. This may prove to be the most valuable service of Senator FULBRIGHT and his committee.

In a complex policy area isolated for so many years from searching investigation and discussion, it will be difficult to devise acceptable new alternatives. No one of us has the competence to move with certainty in this long-shrouded field. But our national interest as well as the peace of mankind demand that we open the curtain of ignorance with searching questions even if the answers are not immediately clear.

We need to ask whether it serves American security or world peace for us to ignore a nation that embraces a quarter of the world's people. Even if one assumes that the Chinese are trying to stab us in the back, the most dangerous stance would be to turn our back.

It may be contended, as has Secretary of State Rusk, that the Chinese have done much to isolate themselves. But does it really serve our interests to encourage Chinese isolationism through official American policy? Would it not make more sense from our point of view to revive the "open door"? Do Communist states evolve in a more moderate direction when they are deprived of diplomatic, cultural, and economic relationships with the community of nations?

One wonders if nations, like individuals, do not become more hostile when they are ostracized by the community. History and elementary psychology would seem to point us toward policies designed to bring China into the family of man rather than to exclude her.

For 16 years prior to 1933 we refused to recognize the Soviet Union. Since 1933 our relations with the Soviets have not been easy, but neither have they been entirely bad. We fought a great war as allies with the Russians from 1941 to 1945—a war that might have resulted in the triumph of Hitler over Western civilization had it not been for the enormous sacrifices of the Russian people. We have had many irritations and frustrations in our relations with the Soviets, but is there any responsible person who believes that Russia would have behaved more reasonably if she had been excluded from the United Nations, denied diplomatic recognition by the United States, and isolated economically and culturally from the West? The evidence is convincing that Russia's relationships with us and other nations have encouraged her more responsible position in world affairs. Soviet vetoes and speeches have often irritated us, but who would deny the beneficial impact of bringing Moscow under the subtle discipline of the United Nations family? Furthermore, as they have strengthened their own economy and society, the Russians have become less belligerent and ideological—more moderate and pragmatic.

This seems to be the historical pattern of revolutionary societies and may very well be true of the Chinese revolution. It is never easy to forecast the course of history, but of one fact we can be certain—men and nations change with the years. Today's enemies become tomorrow's allies. As Justice Holmes observed, "Time has upset many fighting faiths." History provides grounds for hope that the militant passions which now divide China and the United States may come into more balanced proportion with the passing of time. The Holy Crusades of the Middle Ages once enlisted the deepest emotions of Christians against the Moslems. But a modern authority, Sir Steven Ruciman, looking back on this period, writes:

> The triumphs of the Crusades were the triumphs of faith. But faith without wisdom is a dangerous thing. There was so much courage and so little honour, so much devotion and so little understanding. High ideals were besmirched by cruelty and greed, enterprise and endurance by a blind and narrow self-righteousness; and the Holy War itself was nothing more than a long act of intolerance in the name of God, which is the chief sin against the Holy Ghost.

The lesson of the Crusades would seem to counsel, not another Holy War, but patience and restraint on our part while time works its way in the relations between China and the United States.

It may be argued that China is too aggressive to warrant membership in the international community. The growing bitterness between Russian and China might even lead the Russians to this view. There have been many belligerent, fanatical pronouncements from Peking and no one can fully comprehend Chinese behavior. Both Moscow and Washington are vilified daily—the United States being denounced alternately as a "'paper tiger" and as an aggressor bent upon destroying China with the connivance of Moscow. Sino-Soviet expert, Prof. Donald S. Zagoria has noted that the Chinese bitterness toward Russia whom they regard as a traitor is more intense than their feeling about the United States whom they view simply as an enemy.

In any event, the gap between Chinese rhetoric and actual aggression is sufficiently wide to indicate that their bellicose utterances may be born more of fear and damaged pride than of any serious intent or capacity to conquer the world. The recent highly publicized document by Marshal Lin Piao—far from being a Chinese "Mein Kampf"—actually seems to be a warning to China's friends in Vietnam and elsewhere that they must fight their wars of liberation with little or no help from China.

In fact, Peking has been restrained and cautious in committing its military power abroad. Even in the Korean War, the Chinese did not enter until they saw American troops approaching their frontier after warnings that they would not tolerate this development. While sending "volunteers" into Korea, the Chinese refrained from the use of airpower.

In the 1962 border conflict with India, the claims of Peking were fully supported by the Nationalist Chinese Government on Formosa and by some informed people in neutral states. When the Chinese armies pushed easily beyond the disputed area, they were quickly withdrawn to the line claimed by Peking as the legitimate boundary.

It is, of course, true that Peking is giving limited aid to North Vietnam and the Vietcong in the current Vietnamese war. But so far no Chinese soldiers are fighting in South Vietnam nor has Chinese airpower appeared, in spite of heavy and persistent American attacks close to the Chinese border.

At home, China is beset with enormous problems of too little food, too many people, and incredible difficulties of organization and development. She lacks the economic base, the food supply, the navy and the airpower to protect herself, to say nothing of waging a major war abroad.

None of this excuses China's belligerence—for example, her brutality in Tibet. It does, however, suggest that there is a considerable gap between the fire-eating pronouncements of the Chinese and their inclination or capacity to engage in overt aggression. While remaining alert to genuine danger signals from China, we would do well to remember Emerson's admonition:

> Let him not quit his belief that a popgun is a popgun, though the ancient and honorable of the earth affirm it to be the crack of doom.

It should not be difficult to imagine that China is genuinely fearful of her present posture. She sees her former ally, the Soviet Union, moving into a cooperative relationship with the West. She sees the mighty American 7th Fleet maneuvering constantly off her shores and fast-flying American planes bombing daily close to her frontiers. She sees Chiang with his 600,000-man army and air force backed by the United States still insisting that he will return to the mainland. She sees herself ringed by American nuclear installations capable of pulverizing her cities.

Heavily loaded U.S. bombers are poised on bases in Formosa, Okinawa, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, and South Vietnam. Remembering our frightened and angry reaction to the installation of Russian missiles in Cuba in 1962, it should not be difficult for us to understand China's reaction to the ring of U.S. nuclear power that confronts her. What would be our attitude if enormous Chinese air power were pointed at us from bases in Mexico City, Montreal, Staten Island, and Bermuda?

This kind of containment invokes painful Chinese memories of a century of humiliation and exploitation at the hands of the Western Powers. Beginning with the opium wars of the 1840's the European states, including czarist Russia, ruthlessly carved out areas of exploitation in China that were sealed with the unequal treaties. This was an especially traumatic experience for the Chinese because of their deeply rooted sense of cultural superiority.

White China Observer Clark Taylor:

> This humiliation, still deeply felt, helps to explain the curious mixture of concern and defiance with which China regards the military power now ranged around its borders.

The triumph of the Communists in 1949 ended Western exploitation, but Chinese leaders bear the scars not only of a century of shame; they especially recall America's effort in the recent past to crush them in their struggle with Chiang Kai-shek. Now they see their country surrounded by massive American power while their former ally, the Soviet Union, has apparently deserted them.

Chinese foreign policy is aimed at the diminution of U.S. military power in Asia, the annexation of China's former territories—especially Formosa, and the acceptance of China as a great power. In effect, China would like to establish a Monroe Doctrine that would give her the kind of role in Asia which we proclaimed for ourselves in the Western Hemisphere. The Chinese mistakenly expected the Russians to back up their objectives much as the British Fleet supported the Monroe Doctrine for us during the 19th century.

Peking's current goals would doubtless be pursued by any strong Chinese government—Communist or non-Communist. The evidence is compelling, however, that China will not recklessly commit her military power.

But even if one accepts Chinese belligerence at face value—even if China has done much to isolate herself, and even if she repeatedly spurns U.S. initiatives toward improved relations, I believe that American policy should now be pointed toward achieving a reconciliation with the people and the government of this vast country. The United States is great enough and powerful enough and wise enough to take the lead during the next decade or two in modifying the bitterness and fear that have developed between China and ourselves.

A first step in that direction should be a careful examination accompanied by public discussion of all aspects of our China policy.

There is no more urgent responsibility confronting American scholars, journalists, Members of Congress and Government officials than a reexamination and restructing of Sino-American relations. A problem so important to ourselves, our children, and all mankind should be analyzed and discussed with candor and with courage. Senator FULBRIGHT has helped to set us on that course by the stimulating investigation recently conducted by his committee.

The discussions launched by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should be broadened and pursued in depth. To strengthen that effort, I would suggest that the President name a blue-ribbon China commission of highly qualified Americans headed perhaps by former President Eisenhower or Generals Ridgway or Gavin. Such a commission could look carefully at the various aspects of United States-China relations and recommend needed policy changes or initiatives.

A distinguished commission of this kind would have the authority and prestige to marshal the finest talent in the Nation and make their views known to the American people. Qualified men specializing on China are sadly lacking in the State Department although there are a handful of highly able experts there as well as in some of our great universities. But such brilliant men as George Kennan, Charles Bohlen, and Llewellyn Thompson—experts on Soviet affairs—are not easily found in the China section of the State Department. We need to be about the business of developing such men and harnessing their talent as quickly as possible.

Second, China should be invited to participate in the disarmament and nuclear proliferation talks at Geneva. This suggestion, advocated by Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and others, is clearly in our national interest. If we believe that China is a potentially dangerous nuclear power, it makes little sense to exclude her from conferences designed to bring some degree of control over nuclear weapons. It is not clear that Peking would accept an invitation to participate in such discussions, but after the explosion of her first nuclear device she suggested a global conference on nuclear control and disarmament which we promptly rejected. It might be worthwhile for some of the neutral nations to initiate a dialog aimed at reviving this proposal and drawing the Chinese into a significant role.

Third, we should drop our opposition to the admission of China to the United Nations. We need not become an advocate of Peking's admission, but neither should we try any longer to pressure other nations into voting against admission. China may be voted a seat in the United Nations this fall no matter what we do. But this is a matter for the member nations of the U.N. to decide free from undue pressures from the United States or other great powers. Certainly, we should not use our foreign assistance program as an indirect device to buy votes in the General Assembly against the admission of mainland China. Foreign assistance is too costly and serious a business to waste on a lost cause. It is not clear that Peking would accept a seat in the United Nations, but this is not relevant to the basic question of whether or not she should be offered admission.

Fourth, while encouraging self-determination for the people of Formosa, we should indicate our willingness to abide by the judgment of the United Nations as to a possible solution for the Formosan problem. This is the issue that bars serious discussion of China's relationship to both the United Nations and the United States. Both Communist China and Chiang's Nationalist regime insist that there is only one China of which Formosa is a part. The Nationalists now hold Formosa as well as the Chinese seat in the United Nations and insist that Peking must not be recognized or admitted to the U.N. Peking, on the other hand, insists that Chiang has no legitimate claim to either Formosa or mainland China and must be expelled from the U.N. before Peking will enter.

The immediate origin of the Formosa problem was the Cairo Conference of 1943 at which President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill promised Chiang Kai-shek that Formosa would be given to China after the defeat of Japan. The island had been ceded to Japan "in perpetuity" by the Chinese at the end of the Sino-Japanese War in 1895. During the next half century of energetic Japanese rule, Formosa became a developed society with a sense of identity apart from the Chinese mainland. The Formosans eagerly anticipated the end of Japanese rule in the expectation that they would have a more effective political voice in their own affairs as a part of postwar China.

Instead, Chiang's government immediately suppressed all overtures from the Formosans toward representation in the government that emerged after 1945. Formosan political leaders were imprisoned or executed and the island was invaded by hordes of opportunists from the Chinese mainland who appropriated all the property that could be carted off or exploited for private gain. Formosan residents, as distinct from those who came from China after World War II, were excluded from all important political, commercial and educational positions.

When Chiang was defeated by the Communists in 1949, he and 2 million supporters fled to Formosa and made the island their fiefdom—ignoring the wishes of the 10 million residents. Heavily supported by U.S. military and economic aid, Formosa has prospered economically, although to this day it knows little democracy. Many of its people, including some who came from China after 1949, now feel the same kind of separate identity from the Chinese mainland that developed during the half century of Japanese rule. There is considerable evidence that Chiang's professed determination to return to the mainland is not shared by many of his subjects. Meanwhile, it seems ironical that the peace of the world is jeopardized by the uncertain status of this little island.

Our only honorable way out of the Formosa dilemma is to foster a situation of self-determination there combined with a more active United Nations role aimed at an acceptable solution. We cannot lightly turn Formosa over to Peking since that would be a betrayal of both the Chinese who fled there after 1949 and of the Formosans' hope for a hand in their own governance. Neither can we hope to maintain permanent credibility for the fiction that Chiang will recover control of mainland China from his island base.

Peking can be expected to oppose any arrangement that does not simply turn the island over to her. Chiang will object to any proposed election supervised by outsiders on the grounds that it would represent meddling in the internal affairs of Formosa. The Nationalist regime has never had a popular mandate, although it has developed an election process in local administration under the Formosa Provincial government. We should applaud this development and put our influence behind any and all procedures that permit the people of Formosa to determine their own government and in time establish their independence by democratic means.

Should not the Formosa Provincial government begin to play a greater role in administration of the island's economic affairs? Should we not expect the Nationalist Government and the Provincial government eventually to merge in the interests of greater efficiency and responsiveness to popular interests? Aging President Chiang, through his controlled Nationalist legislature, has just appropriated increased power, assumed another 6-year term, and designated his successors. These are decisions that should ideally be made by the people of Formosa in genuine elections.

If our moral support of the election process is accompanied by a clear reaffirmation of our commitment to defend the island, it could not be charged that we were abandoning our allies and the containment of mainland China. We should make clear that we will not tolerate Chinese aggression, nor would we ever permit Chiang and his Nationalist followers to be handed over to Peking. Nationalist mainlanders and Formosans alike should equally enjoy the rights of citizenship in an independent, democratic Formosan state. In such a situation, the world could see that self-determination was a fact because all the people on Formosa could participate in full political life.

Since our policy toward Formosa has been widely questioned in the international community, it would be wise for us to place the entire issue before the United Nations. We could indicate our willingness to abide by the decisions of the Assembly with the understanding that the wishes of the Formosans would be considered and that adequate security arrangements would be worked out. This would place on the members of the United Nations the responsibility for finding an acceptable answer to the Formosan dilemma rather than creating the impression that America is blocking a solution. We should make clear that we are willing to live not only with a "one China" or "two Chinas" policy, but that we would be happy to see a "one China-one Formosa" solution with maximum self-determination for the people of Formosa.

Aside from such diplomatic questions as the recognition of China, her entrance to the United Nations, and the status of Formosa, there are a number of other areas in which U.S. initiatives might encourage a better relationship between ourselves and the Chinese.

In April 1965 the U.S. Chamber of Commerce unanimously called upon our Government "to more effectively open channels of communication with the people" of mainland China. Outgoing U.S. Chamber President Robert Gerholz, who favors trade, discussion, and cultural exchange with the Chinese, said at that time:

> It makes no sense for the United States not to be in touch with a country of 700 million people. Any time you can get people around a conference table * * * I prefer it to bombing and going to war.

First. In that spirit, we would encourage an exchange with China of scholars, journalists, businessmen, artists, educators, farmers, scientists, and tourists. Both China and the United States could profit from an exchange of scientific and technical information in such fields as weather modification, population control, agricultural development, and medical research. Such a policy would avoid the kind of foolish decision that recently prevented us from accepting a rare Chinese Panda bear that a friendly Australian wished to donate to an American zoo. One wonders if Chinese Pandas would really infect us with a dangerous Communist virus.

President Johnson acted wisely in his recent decision to permit American scholars to study in China and to grant visas to Chinese scholars applying for study in the United States. Whether or not Peking will admit our scholars or grant passports to her scholars in the immediate future is questionable, but at least we have taken a first step toward opening the ignorance curtain.

Specifically, I would suggest that two or more of our great universities, perhaps Harvard and the University of California, and two or more institutions of higher learning in neutral countries assemble a task force of medical or other specialists and offer through the neutralist universities to send them to China on an exchange basis.

The Pugwash group of scholars that have had such striking success in establishing private technical communication with their Soviet counterparts, even during the roughest cold war period, might be asked to apply themselves to reaching Chinese scholars on terms not offensive to Peking.

Institutions such as South Dakota State University or Iowa State University might be asked to host a conference on agricultural problems and techniques to which Chinese experts could be invited along with other participants. These universities are so located that visits to nearby farms would give the Chinese observers an opportunity to communicate directly with our farmers and view the operation of typical American farms.

Second. We could emphasize our willingness to increase communications with the Chinese by eliminating the requirement of special passports to China and other nations. Any adult citizen should be allowed to travel at his own discretion whenever he can secure a visa. The right to travel should be a basic right of American citizens.

For a time prior to 1960, Peking seemed to be interested in negotiating an exchange of newsmen with the United States. Since then, the Chinese have said that progress on this and other issues must await settlement on the Formosan problem. Some 50 U.S. journalists have validated passports for China, but only Edgar Snow and a farm expert who was inadvertently issued a visa in Helsinki have been admitted. For the United States to drop the travel ban on all citizens would make our own principles clearer and more confident while placing the responsibility on Peking for roadblocks to communications and travel.

Third. We should open the door for trade in nonstrategic materials and cease our pressures to discourage other nations from trading with the Chinese. Sixty-eight percent of China's trade is now with our free world allies. Japan has replaced Russia as China's major trading partner—an arrangement that benefits both Japan and China and makes China less dependent on the Communist world.

Since no responsible Chinese official has proposed increased trade with the United States, there is no immediate likelihood of a flourishing trade with us. But the removal of present blanket prohibitions would enable individual U.S. traders to deal with China much as they have with Russia and eastern Europe. Today, the only goods that cross borders are publications and printed material between libraries and various institutes, but this trickle might flow faster if present U.S. regulations were relaxed so that we might trade with the Chinese on the same basis as we do the Russians.

This would not weaken American security but it could introduce China's agricultural and industrial managers to American goods and methods. It could stimulate demands among their engineers and technicians for greater access to U.S. technical data. It could open the door for sales of wheat and other surplus crops to a nation which undoubtedly contains many hungry mouths.

In recent years China's fast-growing population, unfavorable weather, and the failure of the great leap forward have resulted in large grain shortages. As a consequence, Peking has purchased huge quantities of wheat and other cereals from Canada, Australia, and France. Indeed, Canadian farmers and exporters are experiencing an economic boom as a result of sizable sales to China and the Soviet Union. The Canadian, Australian and French governments have relaxed acreage controls, utilized surpluses, and stimulated their agricultural and related industries. The Chinese grain purchases have been a new-found gold mine to our wheat exporting allies.

The United States, in contrast, is struggling to control the output of farmers by acreage controls, land retirement schemes, and other expensive devices. We have sought to isolate our accumulated surpluses in government-financed storage programs. While putting up with tight acreage restrictions and price depressing surpluses, farmers have been blamed fo the high public cost of the control program. Meanwhile, the entire economy has suffered from a restricted and depressed agriculture.

Given these factors, would it not be in the Nation's interest to lift some of the restrictions that have foreclosed U.S. grain sales in China and other parts of the Communist world? Is there really any reason to believe that a well-fed Communist is more dangerous than a hungry one?

Such trade would obviously be of economic benefit to us in increased income and a sharply improved balance of payments. If the political blocks to trade could be removed, American farmers could expect to sell a quarter of a billion dollars of grain to the Chinese each year. This would not only enrich our farmers, it would mean new economic stimulus and greater sales of farm machinery, farm supplies, shipping and materials of all kinds. Idle acres and abandoned farms would once again begin to produce and rural communities would feel strengthened purchasing power. The potential impact of a flourishing trade with a nation approaching a billion people is difficult to comprehend. Such trade is also a sound political and moral position for the Nation in demonstrating the efficiency of our agriculture and industry and our recognition that even political rivals should not be denied food and other nonstrategic materials which we have in abundance that they might be willing to purchase.

The foregoing are a few of the steps which the United States could take with no serious risk that might strengthen our security by encouraging more amicable relations with the people of China. They would not lessen the effective military containment of China, but might in fact make it more practical. We have neither the mission nor the capacity to play God in Asia by a unilateral U.S. police operation. Vietnam should have taught us the futility of this role. But an enlightened U.S. policy that recognized China's reasonable diplomatic, economic and cultural interests might not only lessen Chinese belligerence; it would also be more inclined to win the approval of Japan, India, Pakistan, the Soviet Union and our western European allies whose support will be required for any effective determination of China's legitimate role in Asia.

The suggested steps should make clear that while we would resist any military aggression by the Chinese, we want to see them prosper in a climate of peace. While we do not approve of their system of government for ourselves, we could wish them continued progress in their efforts to organize and develop their vast country and conquer its staggering problems. The Chinese have accomplished much of value in a few short years—improving the status of women, lifting the educational level of the people and eliminating most of the crime, prostitution, and corruption of their great cities. In spite of droughts, floods, heavy population pressures, and organizational mistakes, they have vastly improved their food distribution so that large-scale starvation has been prevented. Scientific, technical and economic advancements have been remarkable. All these worthwhile accomplishments, achieved without substantial aid from other countries, are worthy of our respect. It is true that they have been accompanied by a high degree of regimentation, but as Prof. Lucian W. Pye has observed:

> The mere assignment of ruling what may become half the world's population with only a small fraction of the world's resources will compel Chinese leaders to keep their society on a tight leash.

It is not likely that China would respond favorably to U.S. initiatives in the immediate future. Her leaders are not presently in a happy mood. China's heavy handed interference in Africa, Indonesia, and Cuba has been rebuffed by the people of those states which she thought were logical allies. She has suffered a bitter estrangement from the Soviet Union. Aside from the deep scars of a century of Western humiliation, her leaders are haunted by the memories of "The Long March" and decades of civil strife and misrule. They bitterly resent the U.S. nuclear power that encircles them—to say nothing of the escalating war in Vietnam.

For these and other reasons, China may react in a hostile, if not hysterical manner to U.S. overtures. U.N. Secretary-General U Thant has said that the Chinese leadership is gripped by the anxieties of a nervous breakdown. If that analysis is correct, it is all the more urgent that we take reasonable steps to quiet their fears. Certainly, we will not make China less belligerent by answering hysteria with hysteria, or name calling by name calling. When the Chinese recite our faults and ignore our virtues, it does not make them more reasonable for us to display the same blind emotionalism. If they have a distorted image of us, that does not make it in our interest to live with a distorted vision of them.

We must be prepared for rebuffs, insults, and misinterpretations of our motives. But with enough patience, an imaginative policy aimed at drawing China into the family of nations should bear more fruit than a policy designed to isolate, antagonize, and hamper her development.

As the exponents of freedom, we would do well to remember the words of Judge Learned Hand:

> The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias.

Senator FULBRIGHT has brilliantly highlighted the danger of following old myths rather than new realities. If, however, one considers current tendencies to substitute military power and diplomatic rigidity for the eternal imperatives of brotherhood and reconciliation, it may be that our dilemma stems from substituting new myths for old realities.

But, regardless of the angle of vision on our growing quandary in Asia, we need to develop that reasonableness of mind, that spirit of liberty, which gives force to the words: "We must change to master change."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One of the greatest mysteries to me in this whole matter—and I wonder if the Senator had thought about it—is why we helped the French try to hold its colonial rule in this area, whereas in every other case where colonial people desired independence we were ready to give them help, certainly psychological help and moral support.

What is the Senator's understanding as to why we did not do that in this case, and in the 1950's helped France to try to maintain control over this area?

Mr. McGOVERN. I can think of only two reasons, and the Senator from Arkansas knows this subject much better than I do. In the first place, Vietnam was one area where the anticolonial movement was led by Communist leaders. In most areas, the movement against the old imperial powers was non-Communist. Vietnam's Ho Chi-Minh was a Marxist who led the movement for independence. I think his political philosophy was one reason why we decided to help the French and to depart there from what had been a rather consistent policy to encourage movements against imperialism.

Perhaps the other reason we gave the French the benefit of the doubt in Vietnam was that we were then courting French help in Western Europe in establishing a European alliance against the Soviet Union. We were willing to sacrifice our anticolonialist sympathies in Vietnam in return for French support in Western Europe.

I do not know whether these were all the reasons for our action at that time, but I think they were parts of the rationalization.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I agree that those were probably the most important ones, but it seems rather strange in view of the fact that it was in an area where we know so little about the Communists, or the Buddhists, for that matter. It seems a strange reason for me in view of our overriding interest in nationalism and in view of our history and our professions in the interest of independence in colonial areas. I know this has been the reason given. It does not quite persuade me as being a quite valid reason. I suppose that is what I am trying to say.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree with the Senator's critique of that point of view. I think, however, that in some instances where a government has been under the head of a Communist, we have automatically opposed it. We have tended to overlook the fact that even Communist governments sometimes have strong popular support and that they do not necessarily serve as puppets for either Peking or Moscow. It is my opinion that Ho Chi-Minh, Communist though he may be, does not want China running his country, and that he could have been a very effective buffer against China. One weakness in our current Vietnam policy is that we are driving the North Vietnamese into a growing dependence on China.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think there is any question that, under our present policy, if it continues, we are playing the Chinese game. I think the Chinese must be very pleased with what they are doing, from their point of view.

Another thing that has bothered me is that just at about that same time we recognized the importance of Yugoslavia and determined to give Yugoslavia aid in 1948 or 1949. I believe that is the time.

Mr. McGOVERN. That is my recollection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We gave Yugoslavia material aid. It was a Communist country. We did it then because we thought Yugoslavia had broken the uniformity of the Cominform, and had broken away from Russia. But there was no evidence that Ho Chi-Minh was a stooge. At least, he was a very long way from Russia.

So it does not quite add up. There was some kind of influence working in our Government that I do not quite understand, because there was a Communist government in Yugoslavia, and we were able to overlook it, not just by tolerating it, but giving it military assistance. So it is a curious little episode which has led to tragic results.

Mr. McGOVERN. To underscore what the Senator has said, the action of Tito in Yugoslavia in sealing off his border was a factor in the defeat of the Communists in Greece during the Greek civil war. Sometimes the Communists do not work together across borders. Sometimes they work at cross purposes. I think it is in our interest not to treat them as part of a big monolith taking orders from Peking or Moscow, but to think of them as individual states, neither should we regard proud nations' states as dominoes, which will all fall the same way because of orders from Moscow or Peking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. On what has been the theme of the Senator from South Dakota, would the Senator recognize the possibility or the probability that the loss of China to the Communists was working on the conscience of the United States—we were reacting to the loss of China to the Communists and getting extremely anxious about that part of the world? Would the Senator recognize that perhaps it was tearing at our consciences and therefore we were reacting, as the Senator from South Dakota has suggested by his statement, inappropriately?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes; I think the Senator has put his finger on one of the clues to our policy in southeast Asia—that if Vietnam were not on the border of China, we probably would not have the excessive concern we have had about the importance of that part of the world. Frankly, I have not been able to bring myself to believe that what happens in Vietnam is going to determine the fate of civilization. I think we have exaggerated the significance of this little country out of all proportion to its relationship to our own security or to its role in international affairs.

It is implied by some that by fighting a war against North Vietnam we are in effect containing China. I cannot quite see that logic but I think that is part of the rationale for our involvement in Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I congratulate the Senator on the latest of several speeches he has made on this subject, which have made a great contribution, I think, to rational, calm, and sensible discussion of the problem. I hope that my fellow Senators, and particularly the people of this country, will take his thoughtful statements regarding our relations with China and the outside world generally seriously.

I have been in the Senate now for 22 years, and I have never been as disturbed about our relations with other countries as I have been during the present session. I think the Senator is doing a great service in helping to alert the American people to the dangers of a policy which, I think, is leading us into greater and greater difficulties. I hope and believe that the Senator's expressions on these subjects will be given a great deal of attention, and I congratulate him on the time and effort he applies to this subject. I look forward to more statements along this line.

I find nothing in the Senator's statement to disagree with. In fact, I think he has condensed into a relatively short period the thoughts which have been developed in the hearings, and has interpreted them and gone farther than many of the witnesses before the committee.

I do not think, at this late stage, that it can be considered radical or bold beyond reason at all to make the suggestions he has with regard to our attitude toward China. And this is a key point. I think it is a key consideration that had led us into the morass of Vietnam.

I had the impression, in our hearings—which I believe the Senator would share—that one of the reasons why we have become involved there is the overriding fear of China. I think that fear, if it is continued, is the type of thing that will be more likely to create a real danger than if we were to take a different approach. The expectations of trouble, the expectations of a challenge and of aggression from China are one of the greatest incentives to the development of that very thing. It seems to me that is the way human nature works. If we continue that attitude, then they are more likely to do what we seem to expect than if we change that attitude toward them.

Mr. McGOVERN. Apropos of the Senator's comment about what he called our excessive fear of China, I read a statement a few days ago by one of our authorities regarding the recently publicized document by the Chinese Defense Minister in which he talked about how the rural countries were going to take over the urban countries. This authority noted that the only places in the world where that document was seriously believed were China and the United States. Everybody else thought it was a lot of nonsense, to think of poverty-stricken countries such as China, that cannot even feed themselves, taking over great, highly developed, industrialized countries such as the United States, presumably the Soviet Union, and Western Europe.

So I think the Senator's point is well taken. And, of course, we are all indebted to him for the thoughtful questions he has raised in this area for a good many months.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will not the Senator agree that if there is any basis for the fear of the Chinese being able to take us over, it will result because such countries as ourselves and others will have exhausted their resources, their manpower and their physical resources, in just such wars as we have now going on in the jungles of Vietnam?

I mean it is possible for us to destroy ourselves, or weaken ourselves to the point where nearly anyone can endanger us. But if we keep ourselves strong, and do not dissipate our physical and moral strength in overextending our commitments all over the world, then I see no probability at all, in the foreseeable future of any nation taking over this country.

But if we do come to disaster, it will be our own doing, it seems to me, and that is what has happened to many of the great countries in the past, through their own overextension of their ventures abroad.

It seems to me foreign policy should be looked upon rather as a defensive matter; that is, to protect your country. The first consideration in developing a sound foreign policy should be the protection of your strength. When you dissipate it too widely and profligately, that is the thing that endangers you.

Mr. McGOVERN. Of course, I agree entirely with the Senator on that point. Even if one assumed that the containment of China should be a very high priority matter for the United States, I do not think it necessarily follows that we have to take on that responsibility all alone. There are other countries in the world that might have a similar interest, and perhaps by following policies that are more moderate—perhaps I should say more realistic—we would find countries like Japan, India, and Pakistan supporting us instead of fearing the course we are following in Asia.

I think "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind" and a realistic appraisal of our own responsibilities and limitations will produce a more satisfactory solution of problems than the strongarmed unilateral course we are now following in Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is quite remarkable, is it not, that India, Japan, and Pakistan, all of them right up against China, are not so apprehensive that they are willing to contribute a single soldier to this effort to which we are now contributing, according to today's paper, 255,000 men? Is that not remarkable?

Mr. McGOVERN. I think it is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not only because of their greater exposure, but because they are much more likely to understand what China is like, her motivation, and her history, than we are. They have had much more to do with the Chinese over the years. They are much closer to them than we are culturally, physically, and intellectually, are they not?

Mr. McGOVERN. Japan has replaced the Soviet Union as the leading trading partner of China.

There may be one consolation about all this: the Chinese have made their mistakes, too. They have blundered into Africa in a very heavy-handed way, and have been thrown out of half a dozen different countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And Indonesia.

Mr. McGOVERN. They have taken a crushing reversal in Indonesia, and are not doing so well in Cuba. In many of the countries of the world, where they have launched a kind of unilateral crusade to take over the internal policies of those countries, they have been thrown out, not because of anything we did, but because countries do not like other nations interfering in their domestic affairs. I think while we have made some mistakes, the Chinese have made plenty of their own.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, there is no question about it. If it was not for the mistakes of others, we would be in terrible shape.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I merely wish to add briefly to the comments of the other Senators who have commended the Senator from South Dakota for his thoughtful presentation of a matter with which we all are deeply concerned. I believe that he has reviewed in detail the history of our attitude toward the Far East. His observations and conclusions are certainly worthy of the consideration of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota has performed a noble service in addressing himself to this question, and I am delighted to have been able to join him this afternoon in the presentation of some mutual observations on a subject in which I know he has been interested for a considerable period of time and which I earnestly commend to all Senators.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his generous and encourgaging comments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is a very good day for the U.S. Senate. The China problem should be debated, and there is no more appropriate place to debate it than here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We have listened to the enlightening speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], which has been so helpful in exploring an area which has been taboo and controversial for so long, and now we have the specific and detailed speech by the Senator from South Dakota, which is also most welcome.

I particularly appreciate the fact that he is specific in his recommendations on pages 7 and 8 of his speech, wherein he specifies the four steps which we should take—at least three of which are highly controversial.

I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota, in connection with his third recommendation, whether he could be even more definite. He suggests that we drop our opposition to the admission of China to the United Nations.

It seems to me that there are two points here, the possibility which the Senator from South Dakota indicated a while ago, that opposition to admission of Red China to the United Nations might conceivably be increasing.

As both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from South Dakota pointed out earlier, the vote in the United Nations was a tie on the substantive question, and not much better than a tie on the procedural question. However, in view of the setbacks which China in country after country in Africa, where so many members of the United Nations are located, and in view of the possibility that Indonesia may come back into the United Nations with an entirely different viewpoint toward China, there is a prospect, it seems to me, that China may not be admitted to the United Nations, whatever this country does.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator may be entirely correct about that. I welcome this opportunity to clarify my own position because, frankly, I have no idea how the vote will come out this fall. What I am suggesting, as I explained, is not necessarily that we become an advocate of Peking's admission to the United Nations. We certainly cannot advocate her admission under the terms that she now sets. The Senator and I agree on that. But, what I am suggesting is that we relax the pressures on other countries on this overall issue.

We have been bringing pressure to bear on member nations of the United Nations so that various countries feared the loss of American aid, American support, or American good will if they voted according to what they regarded their best interests to be, as well as the interest of world peace.

Some of these questions have to be worked out carefully, especially the status of the Nationalist Government on Formosa. But, what I would suggest is an easing off of U.S. pressure and the assumption that we, somehow, have a special mission to block China's admission to the U.N.

We should indicate our willingness to live by a decision which would be reached by the member states of the United Nations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would not the Senator also feel that it might be helpful if the kind of commission which the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested—and the Senator from South Dakota as well—would explore this area, because there are so many possibilities here which have serious implications for the future.

For instance, should Red China come in as China, or should we reconstitute the United Nations to prevent lodging a veto power in the hands of China, or should it be India instead of China that is a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council or should there be more nations which should have the veto power, or fewer nations?

Mr. McGOVERN. Those are legitimate questions. I do not have any ready answers, but I do agree that such questions should be studied in detail by the kind of commission which the Senator from Massachusetts and I have suggested; also by the most qualified people in the executive branch of the Government, as well as in Congress.

I do not come prepared today with detailed answers for all those questions. I believe that they are problems which we should approach with an open mind and not be so dogmatic about our position that we think we have the right to exert undue pressure on other countries to stand with us.

These are issues where we need the insights of every country in the world, and we should not be too cocksure about our own position.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I certainly would welcome that. The Senator is so apt in his quotations. They are most relevant to China. I especially appreciate the one by Learned Hand that—

> The spirit of liberty is a spirit that is not too sure it is right.

The Senator also emphasizes the importance of change, as did the Senator from Massachusetts. At the same time, I believe that the crux of the whole matter, in all frankness, is: While change from our present position undoubtedly is necessary, it is also essential that there be a very dramatic change on the part of China. Certainly, we should do all that we can to encourage that kind of change, but until it comes in a significant way, it is hard for me to see how we can make very substantial progress.

Mr. McGOVERN. I could not agree more with the Senator. I believe that we may run into some serious rebuff from the Chinese on anything that we do which would be constructive and worthwhile, but I believe that it behooves us to try. We found out that the Soviet Union did change, in due course. It took a long time. The same thing has happened with some of the governments in Central and Eastern Europe. While I do not have any faith that we will see any overnight change in the hostile attitude of Peking, neither do I believe it serves our own interest as a matter of official policy to do the very things which will aggravate that hostility and belligerence on the part of China.

In other words, what I am suggesting is that instead of minimizing China's contacts and relationships with the Western World, our policy should be pointed to drawing them in and maximizing their relations with the outside world as a means of encouraging the forces of moderation and reasonableness within their society.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me that the Senator may underestimate the effect of his criticisms of the past, because this is nothing new to the Senator from South Dakota. As he pointed out in 1950, 16 years ago, he took a similar position; and in 1956, with great courage, he persisted in his position. But, is it not also true that the Government of the United States has modified its policy and has changed, has sought greater contacts with China, has tried to persuade Chinese officials to visit this country, and has done just about all it reasonably could in that area?

Of course, in other areas, such as trade, we perhaps have not modified our policy in quite the same way, but there seems to be a beginning here, a serious and significant modification of policy on the part of the United States.

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that is true. Most specifically, President Johnson has authorized the granting of passports to qualified American scholars to study in China. He has also indicated that we would be ready to admit scholars from China into this country. We do not know whether the Chinese will accept these offers. My hunch is that they will probably turn us down on both counts, at least for the time being; but, nevertheless, that puts the responsibility upon them for the continuing barriers. In due course, perhaps they will gradually relax and respond to some of our initiatives.

I do not wish to imply by anything that I have stated here today that we are holding up the "ignorance curtain" alone. I believe that this has been a two-way proposition in which both the Government of China and our Government have probably been unduly antagonistic and fearful.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Do I understand the Senator from South Dakota recommends that the United States no longer present a position of opposition to the admission of Red China into the United Nations?

Mr. McGOVERN. I have just explained to the Senator from Wisconsin that there is no need for the United States to advocate mainland China's admission. What I am suggesting is that we drop our pressures on other countries to influence them, either by threats to withdraw foreign aid or by other devices. I think this is a matter for each individual member state to decide, without undue pressure from the United States or other great nations.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator in a way furnishes his own answer when he says "undue pressure." What would be "undue pressure"? Is the Senator suggesting that the United Nations is going to operate without pressure by one nation or another? I think it might be said, with respect to the U.S. Senate, that U.S. Senators should not have any pressures, certainly undue pressures, brought on them; but the Senator knows that is an academic position, and that it is a fact of life that pressures are going to be brought on Senators.

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Senator is asking whether I think it would be harmful to the interests of the United States for mainland China to become a member of the United Nations, I say I see no harm to the interests of the United States; that I see greater danger in excluding mainland China from the international community. I realize that there are problems to be worked out before we can open the door to mainland China's admission. One issue is that of Formosa, or Taiwan. We cannot accept the condition of mainland China that before Red China becomes a member of the United Nations, Nationalist China must be thrown out. That question has to be resolved. It would be beneficial if these questions could be satisfactorily worked out. I had always thought the United Nations was a place where differing points of view could be expressed and these questions could be settled in conference, rather than taking them to the battlefield.

Mr. MILLER. I merely want to repeat that I believe the point made by the Senator from South Dakota, that there should not be any pressures by any countries in the United Nations, is not realistic at all. As long as we have the United Nations, or any legislative body, there are going to be pressures. As to what constitutes undue pressure and due pressure, that is difficult to say.

But I want to emphasize the point I make here, which is that the Senator's position is that it would not necessarily be adverse to the United States if Red China were admitted to the United Nations. Rather, I make the point that it will be adverse to our interests and that of the United Nations to have Red China admitted in the present state of affairs.

The Senator from South Dakota is entitled to his view that the United Nations is supposed to be a body where nations' differing points of view can be discussed and nations can try to work them out, but the Charter of the United Nations does not go that far. The Senator is aware that the charter makes a limitation for membership which requires a nation to be a peace-loving nation.

Personally, I hope Red China would be able to qualify under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, but under present state of affairs, I find it difficult to understand why there is all this talk about admitting Red China to the United Nations and why there is not more talk about modifying or amending the Charter of the United Nations to admit any nation, peace loving or otherwise. It seems to me they are getting the cart before the horse.

It may be that some will not want to modify the Charter of the United Nations. I certainly do not want to give it as my opinion that there should be some modification; but I think some people are so wrapped up with the idea of getting Red China to be admitted into the United Nations that they do not think about the idea of modifying the charter so that any nation, peace loving or otherwise, may be admitted into the United Nations.

Does the Senator have any comment on that matter?

Mr. McGOVERN. Let me make clear that I am not an apologist for Chinese belligerency. I expressed the hope that she may be able to enter the international community, and that Red China will evolve as a more moderate and responsible power.

Does the Senator from Iowa think that the Soviet Union would have been more responsible and reasonable over the last 20 years if she had been excluded from the United Nations? It was not many years ago that we were talking about the Soviet Union in the same terms that we are now talking about Red China, as a disturber of the peace, as she in fact was.

Mr. MILLER. May I say in answer to that question that nobody knows the answer to it. Who knows? Perhaps if the Soviet Union had not been entitled to be a member of the United Nations, she may have been less intransigent in her desire to become a member of the United Nations. I do not think anybody knows the answer to that question.

Mr. McGOVERN. Neither does anyone know the answers to some of the questions being raised by the Senator from Iowa.

The Senator from Iowa is asking hypothetical questions. I can only tell him my own conviction, as an amateur student of history, that it is encouraging that nations do sometimes become more moderate under the discipline of the international community. That has happened with the Russians and we hope the same thing may be true with respect to mainland China. As the Senator has said, we do not know the answers to these questions.

Mr. MILLER. The difficulty is that most people think that closer contact results in better understanding. I do not think we can say that is absolutely so. I think as a general proposition most people would agree to that. But it is not hypothetical cases that count, but what counts is a specific case. It is only by specific action that we make progress. We get down to the specific case of Red China and the specific case of the Charter of the United Nations. The case is not at all hypothetical. The point I make is we are putting the cart before the horse. Which comes first: The Charter of the United Nations or the admission of Red China? I think the people who talk so much about the admission of Red China into the United Nations are putting the cart before the horse. What they ought to be talking about is whether Red China can be admitted into the United Nations under the present charter. They ought to be advocating an amendment of the charter and finding out on that basis.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator from Iowa is in effect setting himself up as an interpreter of the charter on that point. There are many members of the United Nations, with hundreds of years of democratic traditions, who see this question differently, and they think it would be helpful, and lawful, for mainland China to be brought into that great international institution that we call the U.N. So I cannot follow the Senator's logic on this point. All I suggest is that we not try to bring about undue pressure on members of the United Nations on this issue.

Mr. MILLER. Let me try to help the Senator understand the logic of what I have said. As the Senator has said, some nations think it would be helpful to world peace to admit Red China into the United Nations. May I suggest that they ought to speak about amending the Charter of the United Nations first so that Red China can come in?

Mr. McGOVERN. Perhaps they do not interpret the charter in the same way as the Senator from Iowa does.

Mr. MILLER. Of course, some people may call black white. That is why we have an International Court of Justice. Perhaps this question should be put before the International Court of Justice to be decided.

That is another avenue but there is no effort made to make a determination on this point. It is just a lot of talk about the admission of Red China without any attention being given to the Charter of the United Nations or its interpretation.

I would not say that I am authority on the interpretation. I suggest that we refer it to the International Court of Justice for interpretation and then we will talk about it.

If it says that she is not a peace-loving nation and does not qualify for membership, then let these people who believe it would help world peace amend the Charter. I believe that we are getting the cart before the horse. We are not going to make progress so long as we persist in that direction.

I recognize that the Senator from South Dakota speaks with the utmost good faith in what he is saying.

I repeat that these generalities, with which almost everybody is going to agree, are not going to help us to make progress because sooner or later we have to get down to specific cases, and that is where the difficulty arises.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree partially with the Senator. There are generalizations both in the statement by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] and myself today. I think that is one of the reasons both of us have seen fit to recommend a highly qualified commission that could go into some of the detailed questions and complexities that trouble us all including the Senator from Iowa.

As I said earlier to the Senator from Wisconsin, there are a lot of these questions to which I do not have clear answers. I think they should be studied by the most competent people available. I have tried to provoke some of the study, discussion, and exchange of ideas that is needed. The quicker we get about that business, the quicker we will find answers to some of the questions that trouble us all.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wish to continue further, but may I suggest there have been some very fine minds that have been carefully studying this matter for a long time who, perhaps, are not saying there never can be found something new, but I do not want to leave the impression that we have not had some expert talent, long experienced in international affairs, studying the problem of the admission of Red China to the United Nations for a long time. The position of the Federal Government under both Democratic and Republican administration has not been hastily arrived at, nor superficially retained.

I believe that while any studies are always helpful, we should not leave the impression that this has not been gone into thoroughly by long experienced individuals who are far more experienced in these matters than I suppose any Senators ever will be.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is correct about that. I would like to remind the Senator that when the distinguished Committee on Foreign Relations set out to find the most qualified men in the country to testify on this and related issues, they heard competent witnesses who generally advocated the viewpoint I have suggested here today.

I do not want to imply that there is anything original about my suggestions today. I have tried to study all sides of the question.

As the Senator knows, former Ambassador George Kennan who was the author of the successful containment policy that we used toward Russia after World War II, thinks that conditions change. It is his view that the time has come for us to reexamine in the light of new conditions some of the conscientiously held views we have followed in years gone by.

I think there are thoughtful people on both sides of these issues and I hope we can continue to discuss our differences freely.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

PRAYER DELIVERED AT SENATE WIVES' LUNCHEON FOR FIRST LADY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record a prayer composed Rt. Rev. Msgr. Newman Flanagan, pastor, Blessed Sacrament Church, Sioux City, Iowa, which was offered at the Senate Wives' Luncheon for the First Lady April 26.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Divine Creator of all life, bless and guide us, mothers, elected by Thee as cocreators of human life. Help us, wives of sentinels on the towers of freedom, to realize our responsibilities as helpmates. Give us humility and clear minds to know the fundamentals of life in society. Grant us wisdom to offer true counsel to husbands through life's daily problems. Bestow courage to stand firmly with them when life's first principles are under attack in our country.

Further, we ask, that our honored guest—the First Lady of this land—be reinspired, through today's association with us, to glorious fulfillment of the role, placed on her by divine providence. Bless her as she gives companionship to our President. Give her health for many years. Shelter her under Thy wings. Protect her by Thy might. Guide her every footstep on the path of life. Amen.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes today's session, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN BILLS, RECEIVE MESSAGES, AND FILE REPORTS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate from today until noon Thursday next, the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills; the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President, and from the House of Representatives; and committees be permitted to file their reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR KARL MUNDT CHAMPIONS THE FARMER'S CAUSE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, from east to west the farmers of America are discussing on the farm and in the small towns the sad economic plight in which agriculture finds itself today. They are discussing the said commentary on life that there is no spokesman in this administration speaking up for better income for the farmers. The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, has expressed the hope that farm prices will drop in order that food prices to the consumer will be cheaper. In fact, Mr. President, all the spokesmen in the Johnson administration are blaming the increase in the cost of living and inflation on the farmers and are using the forces of Government to depress farm prices.

The Wall Street Journal, both on April 28 and April 29, published editorial comment on the Nation's farm problems. Both editorials refer to the excellent speech made on the floor of the Senate on April 21 by Senator Karl Mundt, of South Dakota, in which he succinctly set forth the attacks which the Johnson-Freeman administration is making in its efforts to depress farm prices. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 28, 1966]

Ever-Normal Confusion

Whether or not you agree with South Dakota's Senator Karl Mundt's view that the decline in the Nation's farm population is due largely to the administration's farm policies, you have to concede that the number of farmers and farms is dwindling awfully fast.

For, as Senator Mundt said in a Senate speech, in the years since Agriculture Secretary Freeman took office more than half a million farms have been abandoned or absorbed into larger farm units, and about 2.5 million men, women, and children have left the farm population. This year, he predicts, about 100,000 more farms will vanish.

To be sure, thanks to improved farming techniques and the constant addition of laborsaving machinery, the farmers will keep on feeding Americans and a good many people elsewhere in the world. Despite, however, some formidable and peculiar obstacles.

Item: The other day, to "encourage an increase in the production of milk," Secretary Freeman increased Federal milk price supports by 26 cents to $3.50 per hundredweight. The market price is about $3.79. "The dairy farmer," he said, "has been and is among the lowest paid of all producers." Then on the same day Mr. Freeman recommended that the Government admit 7 million more pounds of foreign cheese during 1966. What effect would that have on domestic milk? Why, it would lower its price.

Item: Mr. Freeman says that the Government is not selling grain in an effort to bring down the price to consumers of cattle and hogs. However, Gardner Ackley, Council of Economic Advisers Chairman, says that the "increase in supplies of pork depends on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn, and we're trying to hold down the price of corn." And the figures tend to bear him out: In the first 2 months of 1965 the Commodity Credit Corporation sold 126 million bushels of corn on the market; this year in the same period it sold 202 million.

With these and so many other puzzling contradictions, what's really surprising is that so many rural residents cling to farming in preference to less confusing endeavors.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 29, 1966]

Fussin' at Freeeman: Prediction of Cheaper Food Brings Benson-Type Brickbats

(By Arlen J. Large)

Washington.—Ezra Taft Benson never really said lower farm prices would eliminate an unneeded surplus of farmers. But a lot of people were convinced that's what he was driving at, and they kept insisting he quit as Ike's Secretary of Agriculture.

Orville Lothrop Freeman hasn't really accused farmers of getting undeservedly rich from inflationary food prices. But outraged flocks of farm folk seem to think he has, and L.B.J.'s farm boss suddenly finds himself dodging the same old Benson-era brickbats.

It's quite a switch. Mr. Freeman's 6-year tenure had been comparatively tranquil until this spring. Then at a March 31 Washington news conference he sought to assure city consumers that food prices will be heading down soon. Some newspapers stories circulating in the Midwest said the prospect seemed pleasing to Mr. Freeman.

As Ezra Benson could have warned him, it's bad for an Agriculture Secretary's image to appear in favor of farm price declines. The rural backlash reported by Midwestern Congressmen returned from their Easter recess had a familiar sound.

"I believe Secretary Freeman should resign," declared Alfred R. Barnes, an old-line Democratic farmer in Huron, S. Dak. "I do not believe that labor would tolerate a Secretary of Labor who did not represent their interests and I see no reason why farmers should either."

SENATOR MUNDT'S REMINDER

Farm State Republicans who suffered in the 1950's from the Democrats' anti-Benson vendetta are retaliating joyously. Farmer Barnes' remarks were inserted in the Congressional Record by Senator Karl Mundt, Republican of South Dakota, who reminded everyone:

"I remember well when during the Republican administration of 1953–60 I felt that Secretary of Agriculture Benson's policy was depressing farm income that (sic) I stood on this Senate floor and urged him as the spokesman for the farmers of America to speak up in their behalf.

"Now that we have an administration of the other political party I speak out again and urge that Secretary Freeman speak out for higher prices for the farmer and for full parity of income."

To support their charge that Mr. Freeman is trying to make the farmer "the whipping boy for inflation," the Republicans and the rural editors mainly cite Mr. Freeman's March 31 food price prediction. "For the first time in memory a U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has bragged about a drop in farm market prices," said Representative Paul Findley, Republican, of Illinois, calling last week for Mr. Freeman to quit.

The critics have deeds as well as words to shoot at. For months midwestern Republicans have been attacking, as a price-depressing tactic, the Agriculture Department's sales of corn. Dairymen complain about the recent authorization for increased cheese imports, and a step-up in Pentagon margarine buying at the expense of the high-priced spread. Hog growers likewise write their Congressmen to protest a switch away from pork in military messhalls, inspiring such partisan sallies as this from Rpresentative Quie, Republican, of Minnesota: "If there is any pork to be cut out it is in the pork barrel, not in the ham that is served to our fighting men in Asia."

Yet it probably would be an exaggeration to suggest that the anti-Freeman outcry approaches the din that surrounded Mr. Benson during his 8-year fight to wean farmers from high Federal price supports. Mr. Benson knowingly accepted the role of political lightning rod, personally absorbing most of the attacks on Eisenhower administration farm policies. Some people unhappy with the Johnson administration's campaign for lower food prices so far seem inclined to spread the blame around.

TO EACH HIS OWN VILLAIN

Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, for example, is among the harshest critics. But he publicly praises Mr. Freeman for doing a wonderful job; the McGovern villains are the President's Council of Economic Advisers and other city-oriented officials permitted "to interfere in farm policy in the name of inflation control."

For President Johnson the current rural ruckus will be no joke if it continues until this fall's congressional election. With the Vietnam war already a political hazard for incumbent Democrats, farm unrest could provide the extra push to oust midwestern freshmen struggling to stay in normally Republican seats. Secretary Freeman's associates predict, though, that the flash of resentment at their chief will die down, mainly because farm income this year is rising.

No matter how things turn out politically in November, the longer range outlook is bright not only for Mr. Freeman's image but also that of his successors. Ezra Benson had the bad luck to preside over a post-World War II farm production plant that could turn out far more food and fiber than cash markets could profitably absorb. His unpalatable task was to scale back output to the actual needs of the market instead of the capacity of Government storage bins. He finally settled unhappily on a massive soil bank to augment the hated acreage controls which Congress mainly refused to dismantle. It was a bitter, confusing time for everyone.

Most of the continuing emotional quarrel over parity, controls, surplus storage and the like would vanish if the Nation's remaining farmers could turn loose and grow. And there are signs the turnabout from two decades of production curbs is in sight, due to more population growth here and food shortages abroad. Rice farmers already have been encouraged to boost production for bigger exports to South Vietnam. Mr. Freeman likewise is flashing a green light for more soybean output, and later he may do the same for wheat—the No. 1 surplus problem for Mr. Benson.

In a sense, then, Orville Freeman might well want to keep his Benson-vintage brickbats for souvenirs. Because the world is hungry, it may be a long time before a Secretary of Agriculture sees their like again.

GARDEN OF THE MISSING OF THE NATIONAL MEMORIAL CEMETERY OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on May 1, the gleaming marble Garden of the Missing of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific was formally dedicated by the National Battle Monuments Commission.

More than 14,000 World War II and Korean war dead lie in the Punchbowl, a beautiful grassy expanse which lies inside an extinct volcano crater in Honolulu, so named because it resembles a giant punchbowl.

Last week, Honolulu Star-Bulletin Columnist Jim Becker, an Associated Press bureau chief and sportswriter for many years, took Sandy Wong, a 14-year-old neighbor, on a stroll through the cemetery.

If there are no objections, I want to share their observations with my colleagues. I respectfully request that Mr. Becker's column be reprinted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(By Jim Becker)

"It makes you kind of sad, to think that so many people lost their lives in war. I didn't even know them, but it still makes me sad."

Sandy Wong, 14, musician, honor student, baseball fan and all-around American girl, leaned on the concrete railing that runs around the observation platform overlooking Punchbowl Cemetery.

She looked down at the rows of concrete slabs that marked the graves of more than 13,000 World War II and Korean war dead. The rows of slabs marched off in neat, orderly lines, shifting and changing as the eye moved, but always straight.

"But it is so neat, isn't it? So clean and nice and so well kept. And the stones make lovely patterns. It's a nice place to be buried, I think."

Sandy and I drove down into the crater and parked in front of the new memorial. The big American flag was flying at half staff, and we both wondered why, until a man explained that a funeral was in progress, and the flag is always lowered during the services.

We stood at the base of the steps and read the marker on the memorial and then began the long walk up the marble stairs to the top. We paused there to look at the statue of a woman holding a laurel wreath. It is 30 feet high, and some people think it is less than an artistic masterpiece.

"I think it's very fitting," Sandy said. "And I don't think she's too big. I read in the paper that some people thought she was too big, but she seems just right to me."

Carved on the walls of the court of honor were the names of the great Pacific battles—Pearl Harbor, Wake, Midway, Solomons, Gilberts, Iwo Jima, Okinawa.

I asked Sandy if she had heard of them.

"Some of them," she said. "I know about Iwo Jima. That's where the Marines put up the flag." And she made motions of raising an imaginary flag, like the marines in the picture.

MEMORIES OF PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

I told Sandy it was a favorite pastime among the older generations to compare notes on what they were doing on Pearl Harbor Day. "And what were you doing?" I asked her, with heavyhanded adult humor.

"Gee, let me think," she said, and started to, and then caught on and smiled. "I wasn't born yet," she said. "But one of our teachers told us about it.

"She said her husband was outside the house that day, and he saw the Japanese planes come over and he ran in and said the planes had 'u-mei' painted on their wings. You know, 'u-mei' is that small round red cherry. They put it in rice balls, sometimes.

"The teacher's husband said that the thing on the wings of the planes looked like 'u-mei.' The teacher said one of her students was hurt by the bombs. She had to have her arm amputated.

"The teacher said she used to worry about that girl, and she used to wonder what had happened to her, and years and years later she found out that the girl had become a teacher, too."

It was cool and peaceful inside the court, and we walked along and looked at the maps painted on the walls that told the story of the wars.

I pointed out Iwo Jima, and Okinawa.

"Where did they drop the A-bomb?" Sandy asked, and we looked up Hiroshima and Nagasaki on the map.

Then we went down to the Korean war maps. I asked her if she knew what that war was all about.

"Sure," Sandy said. "The Communists came down from China, and we had to stop them. We pushed them back to where they started."

How about World War II? Do you know who Hitler was?

"Of course," Sandy said. "I saw that in the Inquiring Photographer, where some intermediate school kids didn't know, but I think they must be goofing off. He was the dictator of Germany."

"Have you studied him yet?" I asked.

"No," she said. "We've studied the Civil War, and the period after that, in the South, what was it called? It starts with an 'r.' "

"Reconstruction," I said.

"That's it," Sandy said, "and now we're up to the Wright brothers, and the airplane. But I've read about the war in books, and I've talked about it, with lots of people."

We walked down into the Courts of the Missing, where the names of more than 26,000 men whose bodies were never recovered are engraved on the marble walls.

"These are unknown soldiers," I told Sandy.

"No, they aren't," she said. "Their names are here. You mean missing." Which I did, of course.

We walked through the courts, looking at the thousands of names. "Gosh, there are so many," Sandy said.

We looked for Wongs, and found two, Edward C. from New Hampshire, and Fan Y. from California. "I have an uncle in California," Sandy said.

THE GRAVE OF ERNIE PYLE

And then we walked down the steps and onto the lawn where the graves are, and stopped at the grave of Ernie Pyle.

"Do you know what he was?" I asked.

"Not really," Sandy said.

"He wrote about GI Joe," I said. "I think he invented the phrase. At any rate, he made it popular."

"Oh, I've seen GI Joe dolls," Sandy said, "and toys."

The graves on either side of Pyle's were marked "Unknown." Most of the others in the area were graves of Hawaiian men who fought in the 442d.

"Senator INOUYE was in the 442d, wasn't he?" Sandy asked. "And I think Councilman Takabuki was, too. His daughter is in our school."

Sandy knelt down and rearranged some of the flowers in a vase in front of one of the graves, and then she got up and we walked to the car and began to drive away. As we drove out we passed a bus load of tourists coming in.

"Gee, they bring tourists up here," Sandy said. She paused for a moment, thinking, and then she added, firmly: "I'm glad."

I asked her what her impressions were.

"Well, it's a lot like the cemetery I visited on the mainland, where President Kennedy is buried," she said. "That was Arlington. It looked the same, and it had the same kind of feeling, only there was a white fence around the President's grave, and the Eternal Flame and all those people."

She turned and looked back at the green of the Punchbowl and the gleaming marble of the memorial.

"It makes me feel proud," she said. "All those men who died for our country. I'm proud that Hawaii became a State."

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION GUIDELINES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today I wish to call the Senate's attention to a serious matter which ultimately will affect all States.

Following passage of the Highway Beautification Act, certain guidelines were to be established by which States could commence control of alleged unsightly signs along highways. These guidelines presently establish an impossible situation for State compliance.

In a statement to the Senate on March 4, 1966, I outlined my opposition to these guidelines and noted that the draft standards being prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads failed to follow the intent of Congress by offering standards inconsistent with "customary use."

As hearings have progressed in the discussion of the guidelines, it has become increasingly apparent that States such as Kansas must now decide whether to cooperate with the Federal highway system or assume a status of noncompliance. This consternation has been created through regulatory action which would deny State highway funds should they not choose to comply with the standards of the Highway Beautification Act. Kansas in particular is faced with the dilemma of either losing $4 to $8 million annually for noncompliance or spending nearly $10 million annually to accomplish the requirements of the Act.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the position of the State of Kansas as outlined by Gov. William Avery and director of highways, Addison Meschke, during Commerce hearings on March 8, 1966, in Topeka, Kans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GOV. WM. H. AVERY TO THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS, MARCH 8, 1966, KANSAS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY AUDITORIUM, TOPEKA, KANS.

We appreciate the opportunity to present the views of the State of Kansas to the Bureau of Public Roads on the regulations that are proposed under S. 2084.

Initially let me say that the Kansas delegation in both the House and the Senate opposed the enactment of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, the basis for the regulations that we are considering today. This vote I think represents the concensus of a Kansas position on this matter. Since the bill has become law, it now becomes necessary to make sure that its implementation places a minimum amount of burden on the financial resources of our State and on Federal funds that might otherwise be used for highway improvement.

Whereas I would have serious reservations about the propriety of committing manpower and insufficient highway improvement funds to this project at any time, I would especially point out that 1966 is certainly a most inopportune time. The military and defense industry demands for men and material are pressing in Kansas. We are having difficulty in obtaining necessary personnel in our highway department, particularly professional staff members. The beautification program, if implemented as proposed, will place an additional burden on the available personnel in the highway department.

This same conclusion also extends to funds badly needed for our Kansas highway improvement program. I am sure that this situation exists in other States as well.

Although further detail will be given later, it is my understanding that the 10-percent penalty on Federal aid appropriations for noncompliance would cost the State of Kansas approximately $8 million per year. The cost of compliance cannot be fully determined until the regulations are fully developed. However, it is estimated that the Federal Government's share for the cost of this program alone will be $45 million.

It cannot be disputed that a beautification program would be highly desirable, the same as any other luxury. I submit, however, that with so great a need for extension of improved and safer highways, the United States can ill affort to pay the price for such an extravagant undertaking.

It would be a separate question merely to stipulate that blemishes on the landscape adjacent to highways yet to be built would have to conform to carefully stated restrictions. It is a very costly undertaking however, to order all present advertising media and other undesirable encroachments to be removed from visibility on existing rights-of-way.

If the regulations must be promulgated, and I assume they must, I urge that they be implemented in such a manner that it will not require the addition of more State employees and the presently estimated loss of available funds for needed highway improvements. Let us build the roads now, and provide for the beautification of present routes at a subsequent time.

Gentlemen, again I appreciate the opportunity of placing the Kansas position on the hearing record today. Representatives of the Kansas Highway Commission and from the Kansas Economic Development Commission are scheduled to develop these objections in greater detail following my statement. I would invite your attention to the supporting testimony that will be given by Mr. Addison Meschke, director of the Kansas Highway Commission; Mr. Dale Maxwell, chief, right-of-way department of the Kansas Highway Commission; Mr. John H. Morse, State highway commission attorney; and Mr. Jack Lacy, director of the Kansas Economic Development Commission.

REMARKS FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE HEARINGS HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION ACT MARCH 8, 1966

My name is Addison Meschke and I am the director of highways for the State Highway Commission of Kansas. I appreciate this opportunity to express the views of the governmental agency of the State of Kansas most directly concerned with the Highway Beautification Act.

A few remarks concerning the act itself may be appropriate. Kansas deplores the fact that by the enactment of this legislation the Congress has seen fit to abandon the longtime partnership of Federal and State Governments in the development of a highway system in favor of prescribing actions to be taken by the State under threat of penalty. If this penalty concept is continued or expanded, there is no reason to suppose that the penalties will not soon be 100 percent of Federal aid as was originally proposed by the administration in the legislation under discussion today. We believe that this concept should be reexamined in the light of what has transpired thus far pursuant to the Highway Beautification Act and the serious effects it may have on the abilities of the States to perform their basic and necessary functions.

For the record, Kansas has not adopted any legislation to permit it to comply with those provisions of the Highway Beautification Act requiring control or acquisition of signs and junkyards or strips of land for beautification purposes located outside the highway right-of-way. We are initiating programs for the screening of junkyards where this can be done on our right-of-way and other beautification programs within the right-of-way. We are now going as far and as fast as we can under existing State law and there is no chance for additional legislative authority before the 1967 general session of the legislature. It may be that we have a constitutional problem as well, but this question has not been fully explored or tested.

Kansas has demonstrated, over many years past, its concern with the beautification of its highways through landscaping and one of the finest systems of attractive rest areas and roadside parks in the Nation. Our interest in the further improvement of the beauty of our highways can be demonstrated in many ways—but we have serious misgivings about the effect of the Highway Beautification Act on our ability to build and maintain our present system in its present condition, much less bring about the substantial improvements we believe Kansas needs and deserves. The bases for our current concern about the effects of this new program could be stated in two broad categories:

1. The cost in dollars to the State—not just the direct costs but all the consequential losses in State revenue that must necessarily follow; and

2. The cost of highway department manpower necessarily diverted from their normal tasks of implementing a continuing program of highway design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, and maintenance in favor of the monumental task of clearing nonconforming signs and junkyards from view from over 8,000 miles of our present system.

Before proceeding to discuss the specific provisions of the act and the proposed regulations and national standards to be promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, I should state the following facts for the RECORD:

1. At the present time, Kansas has 799.7 miles designated in the Interstate System and 6,894.1 miles designated in the primary system. The latter system is of course constantly changing as new facilities replace the old. The latest official map of the State highway system showing the location of the Interstate, primary, and secondary systems will be submitted, along with our more detailed written comment, to become a part of the record of this hearing.

2. The penalties prescribed by the act for noncompliance—10 percent of Federal aid apportionments—would amount to approximately $4 million in Kansas, or a total of $8 million for failure to comply with both the outdoor advertising and the junkyard sections of the act. There is no question but that this amount of money is important to the highway system of Kansas and that its loss would be a severe blow. It is a powerful incentive for the State to comply, but balanced against it must be the cost of compliance.

The Highway Beautification Act requires the State to provide for effective control of the erection and maintenance along the Interstate System and the primary system of outdoor advertising, signs, displays and devices by January 1, 1968. The act specifies that effective control means that after January 1, 1968, such signs shall be limited to (1) directional and other official signs and notices; (2) signs advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located and, (3) signs advertising activities conducted on the property on which they are located.

Section 131(d) provides that signs may be erected and maintained within 660 feet of the right-of-way within areas zoned industrial or commercial under authority of State law or in unzoned commercial or industrial areas, as may be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary. These signs in commercial and industrial areas are required to conform to an agreement between the several States and the Secretary concerning their size, lighting, and spacing, consistent with customary use.

Section 131(f) provides for signs within the right-of-way at appropriate distances from interchanges on the interstate systems, giving specific information in the interest of the traveling public.

As we read the act, the national standards to be promulgated by the Secretary are limited to the directional and other official signs provided for in section 131(c)(1), the signs within the right-of-way provided for in section 131(f) and the signs on public lands of the United States provided for in section 131(h). We find nothing in the act or in a review of its legislative history to authorize national standards for the signs advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located or the signs advertising activities conducted on the property on which they are located as provided in section 131(c) (2) and (3). Signs in areas zoned industrial or commercial or in unzoned commercial or industrial areas are to be the subject of agreement between the several States and the Secretary and not to national standards.

On January 28, 1966, the Department of Commerce, through the Federal Highway Administrator, published a notice of the hearings that we are engaged in today, along with draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations intended as guidelines for these hearings. These draft standards are so unreasonable, arbitrary, and inconsistent with customary use and practice in this State that we can find little if anything to agree with. In addition to restrictions on size, lighting, and spacing, which are specifically authorized with respect to only some signs in some areas, the draft regulations provide for restrictions on number, color, height, setback, cleanliness, state of repair, means of construction and erection, and prohibits "obsolete" signs, whatever they are. We find that signs are so restricted that even standard poster-panel billboards are unlawful as well as many of the larger painted reflectorized and lighted signs that are common in our State. We find that lighting requirements are restricted as to color and no flashing or moving lights are permitted, despite the fact that a considerable number of such signs exist in Kansas and throughout the Nation. We find that spacing requirements are designed not for the reasonable, orderly, and effective display of outdoor advertising, which the act seeks to promote, but the fewest possible number of signs even in those areas where all existing signs were thought to be outside the scope of this act. We find an absolute prohibition against any signs that move or have moving parts without any express statutory authority whatever and despite the fact that thousands of such signs are in existence today. Presumably all electric clocks and time and temperature signs are to become a thing of the past despite their usefulness and generally their very high cost.

What is an obsolete sign? At what point does a sign cease to be clean and become unclean? In what point of the life of a sign does it slip from good repair to bad? When is a sign not securely affixed to a substantial substructure? Is the earth substantial enough? These questions cannot be answered with certainty by any man, but if they remain as a part of the standards and criteria under this act they will become the source of endless and needless controversy between the States and the Bureau of Public Roads and we know from experience that most of these controversies are resolved as a practical matter by representatives of the Bureau who take a position from which they do not retreat.

We are still in the process of completing a preliminary inventory of the signs in Kansas, but this inventory will be incomplete under the proposed regulations because we have not counted the number of on-premise signs, but now we find restrictions on their size and number. Neither have we counted signs advertising the sale or lease of the premises on which they are located, but now we find that only one such sign is permitted to face each direction of traffic, whether the premises is a city lot or a ranch property 10 miles long. Nevertheless, our inventory now indicates that Kansas will have something over 50,000 signs that are affected by this legislation. We presently estimate that the program of control of outdoor advertising alone will cost the State of Kansas $10 million. This estimate does not include compliance with any requirement for any setback of signs in commercial or industrial areas, much less the 25-foot setback proposed by these regulations; nor does it include consideration of signs over 30 feet above the ground, or moving signs, or signs with moving parts. Our inventory certainly does not consider such elements as "obsolete," "clean," "good repair," "flashing or moving lights," etc. Speaking of cost, it should be pointed out that every sign erected in Kansas since the passage of this act on October 22, 1965 (and their erection is still a legitimate and lawful activity in this State), will be a 100-percent State responsibility, with no Federal participation whatever.

These cost figures in dollars and the enormous administrative task of trying to implement this act within the short time required poses an obviously critical problem for the State of Kansas. On the one hand we know that failure to comply could cost our highway funds either $4 million or $8 million per year, but from these figures you can see that noncompliance will cost Kansas far less for a number of years than compliance. Kansans presumably pay their fair share of taxes to the Federal Government and we estimate that the Federal Government's share of the cost on this program in Kansas will be $45 million. We think it is imperative that both the State legislature and the Congress take a good, hard look at this program as the Congress proposes to do in 1967, and review a decision that threatens to cost such vast sums of money for the esthetic pleasure of traveling our highways with both fewer signs to distract and fewer signs to inform—with one important long recognized means of communication between people and places eliminated, and with a highway program that needs to be accelerated, but must be curtailed to eliminate signs.

I have devoted most of the time allowed me to the discussion of the outdoor advertising control section of the act for the reason that it is by far the greatest and most expensive problem involved. Our preliminary inventory indicates approxiamtely 339 junkyards that may be involved, but we do not know at this time the number that cannot be effectively screened and must therefore be removed. Consequently, we do not feel that we can make any reasonable estimate of the cost of junkyard control at this time but we believe that with the adoption of reasonable definitions and standards on unzoned industrial areas—and we think the proposed regulations are completely unreasonable—and assuming legislative authority which we do not now have, we can comply with this feature of the Highway Beautification Act.

We applaud the provisions of section 319 of the act providing additional funds for landscaping and scenic development both on and off the right-of-way. This activity has been a standard practice in Kansas and we welcome the opportunity to expand our activities in this area. We will need new legislative authority to acquire strips of land for beautification purposes outside the right-of-way and we will seek that authority at the next session of the legislature. In the meantime, we propose to make good use of all funds allotted to Kansas under this program for improvements inside our right-of-way.

In conclusion, I cannot state too strongly our objections to the penalty provisions of the Highway Beautification Act; to the enormous cost of the outdoor advertising control features of the act; and to each and every one of the proposed standards, criteria, rules, and regulations on which these hearings are based which to us are unreasonable, unauthorized, unnecessary, and completely at variance with customary practice in Kansas.

IS FAMINE THE ONLY ANSWER?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, yesterday offered a five-point program to meet the world food and population crisis. Speaking at a luncheon of the National Press Club, which I was privileged to attend, General Draper warned that "one of the administration's top priorities" be given to the "stabilization of world population." Otherwise, he warned, "disaster for the human race lies just ahead."

As a cosponsor of the Gruening and Tydings bills dealing with the population crisis and as the sponsor of a proposed amendment to the food-for-freedom bill setting aside for family planning purposes not less than 15 percent of the local funds that accrue from sales of agricultural products for foreign currencies, I endorse his proposals.

I ask unanimous consent that General Draper's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS FAMINE THE ONLY ANSWER?

(By William H. Draper, Jr., national chairman)

Members of the National Press Club, I have just spent 6 weeks in Europe and Africa trying to determine whether the world's rapidly growing population is in fact outdistancing the world's supply of food, and whether hunger and starvation actually lie ahead for the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

INTERNATIONAL PLANNED PARENTHOOD

First, I took a look at the population side of the equation. I was in London for a week visiting the headquarters of the International Planned Parenthood Federation. Family planning organizations in 40 countries make up its membership, including as one member the Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

Sir Colville Deverell, its able secretary general, reports that women everywhere, of all races and creeds, desperately want help to avoid unwanted pregnancies. He believes that when voluntary birth control facilities become available throughout the world, and when governments give adequate support, the population problem will be well on the way to solution. To meet that objective, the Federation has doubled its budget this year and hopefully will double it again next year.

At the end of the World War II, the world's population was growing at the rate of 1 percent a year, higher than ever before in the world's history. Now, only 20 years later, the annual rate has more than doubled to over 2 percent, thanks largely to the export of American medical miracles such as antibiotics and D.D.T. powder to the entire world.

But this 2 percent world rate is far from uniform. Western Europe averages three-fourths of 1 percent, and has no serious population growth problem. Japan cut its population growth rate in half in 10 years and is now only nine-tenths of 1 percent. Russia and the United States average under 1½ percent, whereas Africa's population is growing over 2 percent, Asia averages 2½ percent, and Latin America's rate is nearly 3 percent.

Broadly speaking, the industrialized countries average about 1 percent a year growth. The rest of the world averages 2½ percent and includes more than 2 of the 3 billion billion people on earth today. These people in the developing countries are adding nearly 60 million of the 70 million new mouths that have to be fed each year.

"A LOSING BATTLE" FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

Then to check the world's food production, I flew to Rome and visited FAO—the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which has "the official mission of increasing food production in the developing countries."

FAO has made three world food surveys and knows the facts about the production, distribution and consumption of food throughout the world. Under Dr. B. R. Sen, its dynamic director-general who started the worldwide freedom-from-hunger campaign in 1960, it has a staff of some 3,000 at its headquarters in Rome and many more overseas. It is now preparing the first "world food plan" to assess the world's food surpluses and deficits, country by country, and to make specific recommendations for improvement.

FAO reports that per capita food production increased for 12 years after World War II in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. For the last 8 years, however, per capita production has been steadily slipping downward, and is simply not keeping pace with population growth. Dr. Sen speaks of "the losing battle against hunger and malnutrition in Latin America and the Far East." That is a polite way of saying that starvation may be unavoidable.

Dr. Sen has concluded that "the prospect seems dark indeed unless there is a combined worldwide effort to raise agricultural productivity in the developing countries along with determined measures to control population growth." He had the courage to ask the International Eucharistic Congress in Bombay, "Can we any more turn our faces away from the concept of family planning when the alternative is starvation and death?"

The whole world is waiting for the answer.

The fact is that most suitable land is already under cultivation, and that the developing countries cannot expect to increase their yield per acre fast enough to keep up with their population growth. How can a country like Brazil, for instance, possibly expect to support and feed a 3½ percent addition to its population each year when its own yield per acre of corn and wheat has actually declined during the last quarter century? Even Europe, which has increased its yield per acre by 2 percent a year would have a food problem today if its population were rising 2½ or 3 percent a year.

FAO's agricultural experience of the last 20 years, and particularly during the last 5 years, shows conclusively that under present conditions, without capital, without markets, without fertilizer, without modern technology, and even more imporant, without literate farm populations, the developing countries cannot hope or expect to increase food production much more than 1 percent a year. Unless the countries with two-thirds of the world's population substantially reduce their rate of population growth, they face certain starvation.

DROUGHT MENACES AFRICA'S FOOD SUPPLY

So I went on to Africa. In Cairo I was immediately informed that a serious wheat shortage was only beginning to be relieved now that American "food for peace" shipments of wheat have been resumed. Egypt's President Nasser has officially recognized the need for stabilizing his country's population growth by family planning, and a broad program is now getting started under the personal direction of the Prime Minister.

What finally convinced Nasser were the simple facts concerning the Aswan Dam. One of the great engineering projects of modern times, it will store the waters of the Nile nearly a thousand miles from Cairo to make possible the cultivation of 1 million additional acres of formerly arid soil, equal to one-fifth of Egypt's arable land. The project should be completed in 1970, but during the 10-year construction period, Egypt's population will have increased by one quarter. Therefore, the tremendously increased food production made possible by the great Aswan Dam will not put any more food in the average Egyptian's mouth.

In Nairobi, the capital of Kenya, the first words I heard on the news broadcast startled me—the Voice of Kenya was asking for contributions to a national fund to alleviate the famine conditions throughout the country. A severe drought last year had ruined much of the corn crop. Delays in food imports aggravated the hunger and distress for many months. Only recently have large U.S. shipments of "food for peace" corn improved the situation.

So famine already stalks in Africa.

The medical director of Nairobi told me that birth control facilities were already available in most of the city's hospitals thanks to the Family Planning Association of Kenya, and that the Government of Kenya encourages this program. He hoped that the Government would soon undertake to help to finance a vigorous national program, so that the rest of the country could have similar facilities.

QUEEN OF BIRTH CONTROL

In Rhodesia the National Family Planning Association has been operating for the past 9 years, supported almost single-handedly by a devoted woman, Mrs. Stilhaus. She has contributed her time 7 days a week, her home for an office, her telephone, and even her car to travel to all parts of Rhodesia. She has been able to include family planning in 25 health centers in her own country, and has started 5 clinics in the neighboring country of Zambia. Her husband manufactures nitrogen fertilizer, so her friends says the King of Fertilizer is married to the Queen of Birth Control. She told me the family planning work with the white Europeans was self-supporting, but that she needed much more outside financial help to meet the needs of the Bantus or Africans, who outnumber whites in Rhodesia 16 to 1.

The drought that brought famine to Kenya also affected Rhodesia and its neighbors. In Zambia and Bechuanaland record numbers are on food relief. In Rhodesia the rains were so late that the crops are poor, but 2 weeks more of drought would have meant real disaster—a complete crop failure, and serious food shortages.

In general, the food situation in Africa is precarious, partly because of drought, which is increasingly common, and partly because of the primitive state of agriculture which cannot keep pace with the high and still rising population growth rates. There is general interest and support for family planning services, but except in Egypt, little government sponsorship.

SIX HUNDRED MILLION LATIN AMERICANS IN A.D. 2000?

Last year I visited Latin America several times. Most governments there now realize that the rapid population growth—an average of 3 percent for all of Latin America, and the highest rate for any area in the world—is their greatest obstacle to economic and social development. It even threatens—as Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, the former President of Colombia, has openly said "the very survival of their present-day civilization." But the governments have hesitated to take official action largely because of Catholic opposition. Even this opposition is now diminishing because of the rising rate of illegal abortion, and because of the poverty and misery so obviously resulting from the hordes of children who cannot be properly educated, clothed or fed.

Latin America as a whole is growing less food per capita than before World War II—and the situation is deteriorating year by year. Without the huge and increasing food shipments from this country, famine would be rampant today in many parts of South America. At present growth rates, Latin America's 200 million will triple to 600 by the year 2000—only 35 years off—and a century later Latin America alone would contain over 10 billion people—three times the present population of the entire world. Impossible? Of course. But what is going to slow down the present 3-percent rate, commonsense or starvation? Is famine the only answer?

You all know the situation in Asia, where China is spending $400 million a year—40 percent of her annual foreign exchange earnings—to buy grain, and where India is facing its most acute food crisis in modern times.

In 1964, India had the best grain crop in history—88 million tons—but still she needed 6 million tons of our wheat as foreign aid last year. Then the 1965 monsoon brought very little rain. The grain crop last November was 12 million tons short, and there are 12 million more Indians to feed than a year ago. President Johnson is increasing our grain shipments to the very limit, and the Pope has made worldwide appeals for help. But India is in serious trouble.

The Indian Government knows this and is opening a determined drive to produce more food. It also plans to spend over $200 million on birth control in the next 5 years.

I would sum up the world problem as follows: Every year 1 billion people in the industralized countries are increasing their population 1 percent and their food 2 percent. Every year the 2 billion people in the developing countries are increasing their population 2½ percent and their food less than 1 percent.

As a whole, the world is increasing its population 2 percent and its food 1 percent. This means that the world is falling behind 1 percent a year—or, to put it another way, food production is falling behind minimum needs by 30 million people more each year. This is why disaster for the human race lies just ahead.

What can be done? What should be done? And who should do it?

Shipping our "food for peace'" wheat and corn and rice is no solution. Even if we were willing to pay the cost, we cannot take on the feeding of 30 million more people each year.

The developing countries must solve their own population and food problems. Otherwise nature will take over and starvation will restore the balance between births and deaths.

But we and many others can help them understand that only massive birth control and higher food yields per acre can ever feed them adequately.

THREE MEN CAN ACT

There are today three men who together have it in their power to bring about a satisfactory world solution, Pope Paul VI, President Johnson, and U.N. Secretary U Thant.

The first of these is the Pope in Rome. He has realized the danger of the present population dilemma to the world as a whole and to his half billion Catholic communicants, more than half in Latin America and other developing countries. His special commission on birth control is meeting now in Rome. He has urged it to speed up its work and come quickly to a conclusion. Pope Paul's moral influence is so great with non-Catholics and Catholics alike, that a redefinition of the Church's position would have tremendous impact throughout the entire world. It would hasten greatly the day when all men could join at the banquet of life, and, no longer hungry, give greater thought to their moral and mental development.

Another man with great influence is our President, who has already taken the lead in recognizing that all lands including our own must deal with the multiplying problems of their multiplying populations. He said in January, "The hungry world cannot be fed until and unless the growth in its resources and the growth in its population come into balance."

In 1962, I went to Brazil on a mission for President Kennedy, to study the acute economic and political problems brought on by President Goulart's regime. At that time, the danger of a Communist takeover in Brazil was very real. When I came back and reported to President Kennedy, I also told him about the serious population problem in Northeast Brazil, where 25 million people in 9 states had average incomes of about $100 a year and where economic resources were growing about 1 percent a year and population was growing 3½ percent. After discussing this hopeless situation, and the world population problem as well, the President suddenly asked me, "Why doesn't the Ford Foundation make the population problem its top priority?" Later, he asked that same question of its chairman, and last year the Ford Foundation report, and its huge grants as well, concentrated on population as never before.

So, to paraphrase President Kennedy's words I suggest, quite respectfully, and fully realizing the many other serious problems our Government faces each day, that President Johnson make the stabilization of world population one of his administration's top priorities.

FANFARE AND DRAMATICS FOR THE POPULATION CRISIS

Suppose first President Johnson and Secretary Rusk ask every one of our Ambassadors all over the world to discuss the world population problem seriously with the head of every other government, as they recently were asked to explain our aims in South Vietnam, and with the same fanfare and dramatics.

Suppose secondly they suggest that all countries with a population problem try to reduce their rate of growth, annually by one-tenth of 1 percent as the United States has done for the last 5 years. The result could be a drop in a decade of nearly 1 percent for the entire world.

And suppose thirdly that in the same conversation, our Ambassadors stress the world's food deficit and suggest that every country, developed and underdeveloped alike, should aim to accelerate its present rate of increase in food production by at least one-tenth of 1 percent a year.

And suppose fourthly that each Ambassador offer our technical assistance, and for the poorer countries our financial assistance as well, to help them solve both problems!

This I believe is a practical and possible program. If our Government would propose it, I believe that the governments of the world generally would back it.

The time has come for a great worldwide crusade by all the governments and by all the people.

If the rate of increase for food goes up one-tenth percent a year, and for population goes down one-tenth percent a year, then food and population would be brought back into balance in only 5 years time. In 10 years the present 1-to-2 ratio would have been reversed—food production would be increasing 2 percent and population growing only 1 percent. Not only would starvation be averted, but in 25 years most of the world's nutrition problems would be solved.

Perhaps I am too optimistic. Perhaps it would take longer. But only in that direction—more food, less people—is there hope for the developing countries, and for the human race.

The third individual who has it in his power to promote a satisfactory solution is U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations. For the first time last year the United Nations sent a technical mission on birth control to India—under Sir Colville Deverell who heads International Planned Parenthood. For the first time last year the United Nations offered to extend technical help in this field to their member nations.

So the way is now cleared for a major effort by this great world body to deal with the world's greatest problem. If unsolved, hunger could become the greatest threat to world peace. Hungry men will fight. Hungry nations will make war.

NEED FOR U.N. POPULATION AGENCY

The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization already exists under Dr. Sen. What is needed is a great sister organization as part of the United Nations family to deal exclusively with the world population problem, just as WHO deals with the world health problem.

So I respectfully suggest that U Thant, and I would hope our Government would back some such proposal, that his Population Commission, so far dealing only with the statistics of world population, become an action arm of the United Nations, be greatly expanded, and be authorized to draw up a world population program and to offer all possible assistance to carry it out. It should work in close cooperation with FAO, and with all member governments. It should set specific goals and strive to help the nations of the world achieve them in stated periods of time. That is my fifth and most important recommendation.

The Swedish Government has already urged the United Nations to deal more actively with this problem. Every government with a serious population problem could be expected to cooperate. Multilateral aid and multilateral advice on a problem as delicate as this one would probably be much more readily accepted than bilateral aid and bilateral advice, no matter how well intentioned.

In conclusion I can do no better than to quote Dr. Sen's words to the Population Commission of the United Nations:

"The next 35 years will be a most critical period in man's history. Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we will face disaster of unprecedented magnitude. I myself feel optimistic that mankind will not stand aloof from the drama of life and death that is unfolding before our eyes but will come forward to achieve that miracle of organized will which seems so distant today. This indeed must happen if freedom and dignity are to survive."

No, I would add, famine is not the only answer. Because I too believe that man can rise to meet this challenge, as he has so many times throughout history. But the worldwide crusade must begin soon, or it will be too late for millions of human beings now alive.

MICHIGAN OUT FRONT IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is to be expected that those of us privileged to represent States in this body will comment favorably on outstanding events at home. Sometimes perhaps we even stretch a point to embellish.

But it would be hard to exaggerate the recent development in water pollution control that has taken place in Michigan. It is a historical advance, a milestone in Federal-State-local cooperation, and all who have had a part in it deserve credit: former Gov. John Swainson, who first called in the Public Health Service to make a thorough, scientific study of pollution in the Detroit River; the Public Health Service personnel who conducted and interpreted the study and particularly Murray Stein who skillfully chaired the two Federal-State conferences; the Michigan Water Resources Commission which has been firm and fair in implementing the recommendations of the conference; and local industry and local government officials who have responded positively to the public interest.

With the agreement reached in Detroit last week, Michigan is out in front in the efforts to clean up Lake Erie. With two exceptions which are being resolved right now, all industries and all governmental bodies presently pouring wastes into the Detroit River have agreed—5 months ahead of the 1-year deadline which they were given—on effluent standards and on a schedule for meeting the standards.

In the case of the city of Detroit alone, this will involve an expenditure of some $100 million, with construction taking more than 2 years.

This has been responsible action by responsible officials all along the line. We are hopeful that all States and cities bordering on the Great Lakes will not only take comfort in this gigantic forward step, but will want to speed up their own efforts.

IF THOMAS JEFFERSON CAME BACK TODAY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Honorable Lowell B. Mason has been described as the most colorful member of the Federal Trade Commission to serve in that agency's history.

Although no longer a member of that important Commission, Mr. Mason continues to speak out in "The Language of Dissent"—which not coincidentally is the title of a volume of his famous protests—in a number of public forums.

One of the most recent of these occasions was an appearance before the Women's Advertising Club of Washington in which Commissioner Mason evoked the ghost of Thomas Jefferson.

I suppose satirical is the way to describe Lowell Mason's style. But it is a kindly satire with a gentle bite. No doubt that is what makes it so effective.

In his remarks Mr. Mason describes an imaginary visit with our third President. At least, I think it was imaginary. It is a clever, witty speech. But much more important, it contains a solid message, not just for the the delighted ladies to whom he was speaking, but for all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD, the text of Commissioner Mason's remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam President, distinguished guests, and members of the Women's Ad Club of Washington, I don't know whose idea it was to invite Tait Trussell here today, but in a way I'm sorry they did. After that beautiful introduction he gave me perhaps I sound ungrateful, but when you write for a living, you want managing editors to like you. If Tait hears what I have in mind to tell you, he's not going to like me any more.

Remember the story of the cub reporter? The managing editor told him to cover the wedding of a prominent citizen. The reporter filed no story. Next day the boss asked "Where's your story on the wedding?" "Oh," the cub reporter replied, "there wasn't any. The bride shot the groom and ran away with the best man."

I'm like that cub reporter. Let me tell you what happened.

Across the street from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce there is a little French restaurant called Chez Francois. It's the only place in the world where they know how to cook liver. So this day I hungered for some and I went in. Who should be sitting in a booth but Tait Trussell and his publisher, Jack Wooldridge. Mr. Wooldridge motioned me over.

"Sit down, Commissioner," he said. You're just the man we want to see." Now when a publisher and his managing editor invite a writer to sit down in a restaurant where the liver is good—you sit.

"What's up?" I asked.

"We want you to explode another myth."

"Wadda you mean" I said, "another myth?"

"Well your book, 'The Language of Dissent,'[1] exploded the myth that Federal bureaucracy was all knowing, all wise, and all perfect. We've got another myth for you to explode. There's a persistent rumor that Thomas Jefferson walks at midnight around his Memorial."

"What," I exclaimed, "you fellows want me to write a ghost story for Nation's Business—that staid, conservative, factual publication every successful, practical, hard-hitting American businessman reads?" (As long as they were paying for my lunch, I felt I should say something nice about their magazine.)

"No, no," Tait interrupted, "you don't get the idea. No one with any sense believes in ghosts. We just want you to expose it as a fake."

I didn't tell him I believed in ghosts. And I didn't tell him I preferred to write about the protections to liberty our Constitution gave us by dividing authority between the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judicial. But I figured it would be fun to write about ghosts.

"When do I start?" I asked.

"Take your time," said Jack Wooldridge. "Eat your liver first."

So I met Thomas Jefferson's ghost and he gave me a statement for the press, but I figured Nation's Business (which you might say is the official voice of Free Enterprise in America) wouldn't be interested in the fist fight that took place right inside the Jefferson Memorial that night, so I didn't mention it in my report to Tait.

Of course, the Post, the News, and the Evening Star would have carried the story if they had 'got a hold of it,' but you see Federal officers were involved in the ruckus, so the police hushed the matter up—and who am I to interfere with Government's management of news?

But being with you ladies today has inspired my confidence, and I'm gonna tell you what really happened when I visited the Jefferson Memorial.

First, I decided to 'case the joint' in the daytime. I remember the date well—April 13, and warm for the season. The place was quite isolated, across and south of the Tidal Basin. I was glad it was daytime. But when I arrived, hot and tired, I couldn't get near it. It was jammed with people—hundreds and hundreds of them. They reminded me of Shakespeare's description of the hoi polloi in Julius Caesar: Many a time and oft, have you climbed up to walls and battlements, * * * and there have sat the livelong day, * * * and do you now put on your best attire and do you now cull out a holiday, and do you now strew flowers.

And for what? It was the 122d anniversary of Jefferson's birth. Even the Secretary of Interior and other dignitaries from government and patriotic societies were there to lay wreaths at the foot of his statue.

I must admit it was an impressive scene. The posting of the honor guard and colors; the national anthem played by the U.S. Army Band; the long line of distinguished officials, with their floral offerings; and finally the invocation. The heartwarming ceremony seemed to invest the heroic bronze statue inside with actual life as though Jefferson himself stood there gazing out over the assembly. I could see his brooding eyes looking out across the Tidal Basin in the direction of the Capital of the greatest, biggest, and most omnipotent government in all the world.

After the ceremony, the crowd thinned out. At long last I was able to reach the guard. "Officer, would you please tell me something about Mr. Jefferson?"

Wearily (I guess it must have been his 50th recitation that day): The memorial is 152 feet in diameter. Jefferson's statue is 19 feet high. Its pedestal is black Minnesota granite. The domed ceiling of Indiana limestone, reaches aproximately 67 feet above his head. The exterior walls are Vermont marble, the interior, white Georgia marble——."

"Yes, yes," I interrupted, "I read all about it in your pamphlet, and I remember quite a bit of my school history on Jefferson's life. But I wanted to ask you a personal question. Have you ever been on the midnight shift here?"

"Yes-s-s-s" the reply was slow in coming. "I just resigned from it last night."

"Why?"

"That's none of your business."

"I'm sorry. I wondered if you—well, let me ask you. Is it true—the rumor about Mr. Jefferson walking at midnight?"

He pooh-poohed the idea as ridiculous. On pressing him further, a tone of asperity crept into his voice.

I changed the subject. "Those bronze panels inserted in the walls at each of the four entrances—what do they represent?" Now that I was off ghosts be brightened perceptibly.

"Nothin'," he replied. "Behind them are the fences we used to pull out to close the memorial at midnight."

"Aren't they used any more?"

"Nope."

"Why?" I asked.

"For three good reasons. First they're awkward and heavy. Second, there's always a guard to keep prowlers out. Nobody comes around after midnight anyhow. I know—I had the night shift for a year. It's damn lonely."

"And the third reason?" I asked.

The guard dropped his voice, "You don't think a fence would keep a ghost out, do you? Come around some night and see for yourself. But don't expect to find me here. I'm through sitting in the dark—waiting and listening—waiting and listening." He shuddered, started to walk away, then stopped and came back. He stuck his face up close to mine. "Say," he whispered, "you don't believe in ghosts, do you?"

---

[1] "The Language of Dissent," Long House, New Canaan, Conn., Publishers.

"Of course I do," I replied. "But I'm afraid of 'em—especially Thomas Jefferson."

A load seemed to drop from his shoulders. He took me by the hand like I was a long-lost brother. I though he was going to tell me something. But, no. Evidently he decided not to unburden himself to me. He asked a question instead. "Are you afraid ghosts will hurt you?"

"No," I replied. "I'm not physically afraid of ghosts. I'm afraid of disillusionment. For example, I would hate to meet the ghost of Thomas Jefferson, if he's like all the others. They're so trivial; what with their chain rattling, moans, and marching around with severed heads in their hands. You'd think they were kids out for tricks or treats. Except in stories like Dickens' "Christmas Carol," ghosts never do anything worthwhile. Maybe I'm naive, but I'd like to think if there is some form of life after death, it's a peg higher than all those spooky monkeyshines you read about in books. If the author of the Declaration of Independence came back and acted that way, I think I'd chuck the whole business as the mere fabrication of childish minds."

"Well," said the guard, "I wish I could chuck the whole business, because I've seen Jefferson's ghost, and it scares the hell out of me."

"And what, pray, are you afraid of?" I asked, looking at his broad shoulders and capable, strong hands.

"I'm afraid to tell anyone. You're the first person I've spoken to about it, and that's because you admitted you believe in ghosts. If I put it in my daily report the superintendent would fire me for drinking on duty. I'm a teetotaler; a family man. I can't afford to lose my job. That's why I quit the night work. Every time a fog off the Potomac came in around the statue—generally about 2 or 3 in the morning—I'd see the figure of a man walking in the thick of it. At first I thought some bum had got lost. I went up to it, with my hand on my holster. It faded. Three times in the last month that happened to me. It was driving me nuts. I quit. You don't think I'm crazy, do you?"

"Of course not," I replied.

"Would you do me a favor?" The guard's tone was beseeching. "Come here some night and see for yourself. I'd feel a lot better if someone would straighten me out on this thing."

"I'll come tonight," I replied.

He shook my hand gratefully. "Watch out for the new guard—don't tell him our conversation."

"Of course not." I waved goodby and left. I went home and took a nap. I wanted to be fresh; I was determined to stay up all night if necessary. Ghosts are not always punctual, and there might not be any fog for him to ride in on.

I overslept. It was pitch dark outside—later than I realized. The memorial closed at midnight. Maybe I should have called the National Park Service and made arrangements ahead of time. Well it was too late now. With the fence no longer used, perhaps I could persuade the new guard to let me look about inside for a moment or two.

It was a soft April night. I got into my car and set off. By the time I arrived the memorial was deserted. I parked and strode up the broad marble steps. Back of me the dark Tidal Basin twinkled in the reflected lights of the Washington sky. In front loomed the great white palladium dome. I reached the top step. Good, there was no guard about. Overhead the purplish clouds shed a sad and menacing light that exaggerated the height of the memorial. As I mounted the steps and came closer, its huge white pillars loomed taller and taller. I was alone in a forest of gigantic stone columns.

But not for long. For just then a tall, youngish man, nattily dressed in Ranger's uniform stepped out from the shadows. He was husky and well set up. He would have no difficulty tossing me out if occasion demanded.

We greeted one another. He talked readily enough, and was clearly glad of my company, but behind his broad, open face there was a shadow of uneasiness. Perhaps he wondered why I had come—one doesn't travel around a lonely park in the dead of night just to chat with an unknown guard on the cold, drafty steps of a memorial. I, too, was uneasy—I knew the rules—no visitors after 12. But there I was, and quite intent upon cajoling my way in.

We gossiped in a desultory sort of way for an hour or so, discussing everything, except why I was there—the ceremony at noon—how beautiful the building looked in the moonlight, and finally in desperation, we fell back on that staple of conversation everyone uses when they run out of ideas—the weather.

Right then, in fact, the weather was worth talking about. The bright lopsided moon, deep in the west, gave a weird light. Even the perfect symmetry of the white dome took on a gibbous appearance. Suddenly there was a chill in the air. It came from nowhere though as we buttoned our coats we could see wisps of mist straggling up from the Potomac River. It was a ground fog. It clung in silvery layers to the steps and lower pedestal of the memorial. We could look in and see the upper half of the huge heroic bronze Thomas Jefferson. Moonbeams, slanting in through the west portico combined with the mist gave him an unsubstantial, almost mobile appearance.

"Looks quite ghostly, doesn't it?"

The guard agreed. He seemed more uneasy than ever. Then in a burst of confidence: "I'm not the regular night guard. I asked for this tour of duty because I'm going to American University in the daytime. Right now I'm working on my master's thesis. It's about extrasensory perception and all that sort of stuff." He sounded flippant as though he were afraid I might ridicule his subject.

To reassure him, I said, "I believe in ghosts, don't you?"

"Mostly not," he replied. "But sometimes * * *." Suddenly he stopped talking. Though he was too polite to say so, I could see he was anxious to retire to the seclusion and warmth of his little glass cubicle at the entrance. Perhaps he felt he had confided too much in me.

It was now or never.

"I suppose it's against the rules for me to stroll around inside and get a closer look at Mr. Jefferson?"

He looked at his watch (just as though he didn't know). "I'm sorry. Why don't you drop back in a few hours. The memorial is open to the public from 8 a.m. to midnight."

I thanked him. As he bade me good night I turned for one last look into the rotunda. The mists had thickened in botches and blobs. There are panels on the walls carrying excerpts from Mr. Jefferson's writings. In front of one of the panels swirled a particularly thick blob. It had something tall and dark in its center. I walked back to the guard, and stared over his shoulder at the phenomenon.

"How many guards on duty tonight?" I asked.

He bristled defensively, "I'm alone."

"Then," I replied, "you evidently have a visitor."

There was no doubt about it. Someone in a long black academic gown, wearing a curled wig similar to those worn by barristers and attorneys in colonial times, stood there reading the inscription on the wall. There was a scroll of papers in his hand, and beneath the hem of his robe, square-toed shoes with buckles. I grasped the guard's arm. We walked slowly toward—what was it—an apparition or a masquerader? If the latter, the costume of the bronze statue in the center of the room was copied to perfection. But when the figure turned ward us and leveled its piercing grey eyes upon us, we knew instinctively the bronze statue was the copy; this, original.

I advanced and held out my hand. 'Mr. Jefferson, I believe?"

Did we shake hands? I only know a slight warmth of air caressed my fingers. The guard struck with awe stood respectfully aside, and listened intently to our conversation.

"How did you know my name Commissioner Mason?" Mr. Jefferson asked.

"That is not a proper question, Mr. President," I replied. "Everyone knows the author of the Declaration of Independence who became Secretary of State, Vice President, and then President of the United States. The millions of Americans who have visited this memorial and have seen this statute would recognize you anywhere. The proper question is; how did you know my name? A former petty official, one bureaucrat in 13 million."

"The answer is simple," replied Mr. Jefferson. "We who have joined the 'hereafter' have an advantage over earthbound mortals whose only contacts are with the present and the immediate. We who belong to history are not handicapped by time or space. Charlemagne, Henry VIII, John Milton, Voltaire, Washington, Lincoln, and George Bernard Shaw are my constant companions. But I also know the names and personal histories of every member of the Women's Advertising Club of Washington, D.C. Milton and Shaw were talking about your speech before the Women's Ad Club. They asked me to find out what you are going to say."

"Well, Mr. Jefferson, I thought I'd tell them how glad I was to be with them and what a fine profession they were in and how fast it's growing. I'll quote a few statistics out of Stan Cohen's 'Ad Age,' like how TV billings increased 10 percent last year; just to show 'em I know their business.

"Then after I've got their confidence, I'll gently ease into what's really on my mind.

"It's disgraceful how the biggest and most powerful government in the world lets free enterprise and advertising have so much influence over people. Yet, it's true unemployment is down and we never had it so good, but a lot of folks are working at jobs that aren't of any social significance, and most everybody who reads ads, buys things they don't really need.

"When we pass the truth-in-packaging bill we are going to get rid of Shirley Starbuck and all the other fine artists in advertising, who draw those beautiful pictures of flowers on seed packages. You know the flowers never turn out as pretty as the pictures. That's misleading and we are going to make it illegal. Besides, who needs flowers anyway?

"I'm against impulse buying and I'm glad the Federal Government is drafting laws to make it illegal. Ken Galbraith, one of the bigwigs in the welfare state wrote a book called 'The Affluent Society.' He says ad women ought to stop creating appetites for stuff the consuming public doesn't need.

"Confidentially I love to buy things I don't need, and secretly I like the beautiful, poetic imagery in advertising and on packages. If it were not for women in the agency ad departments, how dull advertising would be.

Imagine a perfumery ad without a man holding his violin in one hand giving a girl at the piano a violent kiss. Every time a young man sees that picture, he gets an impulse—and I don't mean to take violin lessons either.

"Fritz Hajeck, who wrote 'The Road to Serfdom,' asked Ken how he knows what folks don't need. Ken says you don't need things that 'are of a lower order of urgency' I don't know about violins, but who wants some damn bureaucrat telling you a kiss isn't urgent.

"Of course I'm not telling the girls at the Women's Ad Club this. But if they are going to get grade labeling and package control they might as well get used to not drawing any more sexy pictures, for as Richard Wilson of the Washington Star says: 'We now have a giant economy size concern for the consumer that runs to controlling the prices he pays for food, getting rid of brand names, limiting and controlling advertising.'

"I think Richard Wilson assessed the public consensus correctly. Everybody knows we must increase the poor struggling public sector that only has 12 million people on its payroll now, and decrease the private enterprise sector which is too damned affluent for its own good. Everybody—well, at least the bureaucrats—knows people are so dumb they can't distinguish between what's good and what's bad, between the sound or the meretricious.

"Oh the horror of it. To walk into a grocery or drugstore and see all those wicked shapes and sizes of packages, with their seductive phrases 'giant colossal,' 'superdelicious,' shamelessly flaunting themselves before the eyes of the poor credulous housewives.

"Avant, I say to all women advertising artists, and welcome to the good, kind, thoughtful bureaucrats who cry: 'Come all ye consumers suffering from tired blood, headaches and that rundown feeling you get when you have to choose between so many different products, each claiming it's better than the other. Come, get on Big Brother and Big Sister's laps. We'll protect you. We'll do what the Socialists in Britain propose. Lord Reith's Commission wants to recruit scientific, industrial and medical experts to determine what people should buy."

"If you think I'm kidding look at what's already happened to the pickle boys in America. Volume 30, No. 177 of the Federal Register sets their standard for olives, and if they don't obey, you know what'll happen? Here's the law on olive sizes: pewee, midget, small, medium, large, extra large, mammoth, giant, jumbo, colossal, supercolossal.

"And woe to those who miscalculate.

"Grade labeling and advertising control won't hurt advertisers much. They can still say: 'Buy Mildred's Perfumery—Grade A1'; 'Buy Kay's Perfumery—Grade 007'.

"Grade labeling will provide much needed guidance for the poor housewife who can't trust her own nose, and at the same time we'll cut out all those foolish perfumery ads of a man holding his violin in one hand, giving a girl a kiss."

"Commissioner Mason," interrupted Mr. Jefferson, "you're a damn fool. You talk just like all Washington bureaucrats when they get before an advertising audience—telling them how wonderful they are, then ending up by saying, 'and we, the Government, want to help you and to purify you, and to guide you, and to control you. We'll tell you how many ounces make one serving of "Oaty Toaties"—we'll tell you what kind of picture you can put on your soapboxes, and we'll design the shape of your perfumery bottles.'

"Tear up your speech, Commissioner Mason, it stinks. Remember, you're talking to women. They're not as dumb as the bureaucrats who want to control advertising make them out to be. Remember what George Bernard Shaw said in his introduction to his book, 'The Intelligent Women's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism': 'I have been asked whether there are any intelligent women in America. There must be; for politically the men there are such futile gossips that the United States could not possibly carry on unless there were some sort of practical intelligence back of them. I will let you into a secret. By this book I shall get at the American men through the American women.'

"Shaw and Milton said I should come down to earth and tell you to cut out the verbal massage, and give the girls the truth. They tell me practically every woman in the United States is a stockholder in a certain corporation that is violating the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Clayton Act, and if the truth-in-packaging bill becomes law a lot of women will go to jail for putting on lipstick, powder, and wearing falsies."

"Why, Mr. President," I said. "How dare you impugn the motives of the women of America; saying they own stock in a corporation that violates the law and that they're liable to be jailed."

"Commissioner Mason, I don't have to tell you monopoly is illegal and so is false and misleading advertising. The Federal Trade Commission has full authority to stop them; yet, I can show you one huge aggregation of economic power, every time it gobbles up its competition and every time it engages in bait advertising, up selling and plain everyday deception by withholding facts people are entitled to know the Federal Trade Commission looks the other way. Do you know about masking?"

"Of course, Mr. President. I know about masking. Not long ago the Food and Drug Administration put controls on folic acid because if people suffering from a serious disease took it, the symptoms were covered up. Doctors couldn't recognize the trouble and treat the patient in time to save his life."

"Well, this same crowd is engaged in a tremendous campaign of masking. Does the Food and Drug Administration do anything about it? Nuts.

"And now your bureaucrats want to add another Federal agency to play even worse favoritism, just like what happened 300 years ago in Britain. The British Parliament passed a truth-in-packaging bill.

"In those days, before mass production of goods, ideas were the principal items distributed in the market place—ideas on religion, government, philosophy, poetry, and literature. (Those were the dark ages before Batman, Pogo, and Popeye set our intellectual standards.)

"Ideas were packaged in pamphlets. Edmund Burke, Steele, Addison, John Lilburne were pamphleteers. The king's placemen (today we call them bureaucrats) said some of the stuff in these pamphlets wasn't fit for consumption so they passed a truth-in-packaging bill.

"The ridicule heaped on that silly bit of sumptuary legislation is still good for laughs. John Milton's was the funniest of all. Nobody reads Milton's 'Aeropagitica' today because of his archaic English. But I'll translate one paragraph into modern idiom and you will see the nobility's contempt for the peasants of England is the same contempt the governing elite of Washington have for the American citizen today.

"Milton asks if the king be so jealous of the consumer's welfare that he trusts them only to read such matters as he approves. 'Do we but censure them for a giddy, vicious, and ungrounded people, in such a sick and weak state of faith and discretion as to be able to take nothing down but through the pipe of a licenser.' [3]

"Mr. President," I said, "you're making serious charges. You not only are against a big private corporation, but against the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration as well. Before going any further, will you please be a little more specific?"

Mr. Jefferson was obviously moved. As I looked over his bent shoulders, the tall white pillars of the entrance made a frame for the sharp, white needle of the Washington Monument, against the blue-black sky. I saw the dark tidal basin and, in the road fronting the memorial, my car.

Ye gods. I'd forgotten to turn off the lights. A brightly lit sedan, parked at the entrance of an isolated memorial will draw the attention of any police prowl car, especially at three in the morning. I cursed my carelessness, for as I looked a squad car pulled up.

I waited breathless. Perhaps before the police reached us Mr. Jefferson would give us a clue to the future—a bit of guidance.

The police took their time. Even in the dim light they could recognize the uniformed guard standing to one side. But who were the two strangers by the bronze statue? They peered at us, then at the guard. He, poor fellow, looked as disappointed as I felt. Perhaps he, too, wanted to hear what Mr. Jefferson had to say. Nodding to the officers, he put his finger to his lips for them to keep quiet.

The officers got the wrong idea. They thought they'd arrived in the nick of time to help the guard apprehend desecrators of a national shrine.

One crept around back to cut off our escape. The other, Sergeant Grummer (I later learned his name), stealthily tiptoed up beside the guard. He held an open briefcase in his hand. In it was a tape recorder.

Mr. Jefferson, so enrapt in what he was saying, failed to see the silent drama taking place behind him.

"All right, Commissioner Mason, you want me to be specific about this big monopoly that engages in false advertising and masking, and I'll tell you why the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration lets it get away with murder.

"This monopoly has gone in for diversification—what the bureaucrats call conglomerate mergers. If the Federal Trade Commission really believes what it says: 'Bigness is wicked' (though one obstreperous Commissioner, Phil Elman, disagrees) then this monopoly is the wickedest of 'em all. It operates over 100 business-type activities. It is, among other things, the largest electric power producer in the country, the largest insurer, the largest lender and the largest borrower, the largest holder of grazing land, the largest holder of timberland, the largest owner of grain, the largest warehouse operator, the largest shipowner, the largest truck-fleet operator, and it is the world's biggest landlord and property owner.

"It owns 427,000 buildings, with a floor area of 2½ billion square feet, and 766 million acres of land. In five States it owns more than half the land; 98 percent in Alaska, 87 percent in Nevada, 67 percent in Idaho, and 52 percent in Oregon.

"It violates the Robinson Patman Laws provisions by forcing manufacturers to sell to it for less than what other customers must pay, and it violates the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act against false and misleading advertising. According to Senator JOHN WILLIAMS of Delaware it 'should stop trying to camouflage the cost of its program with a lot of fancy labels in an attempt to deceive the American people.'

"As for masking; it's hiding the cancerous growth of decadence in society. It pays a boy who was a school dropout and beat up his mother, $200 a month to cut grass in safety at home while his brother, a law abiding citizen, gets $78 a month under enemy fire in Vietnam.

---

[3] "Areopagitica," 1644.

"And I'll tell you why the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration look the other way. Both agencies are completely infiltrated with people on the payroll of this monopoly."

I looked past Jefferson. Sergeant Grummer and the guard were heatedly whispering—evidently at cross purposes. Their voices rose.

Jefferson turned in astonishment.

The Sergeant: "Hey, you! Knocking our Government—and on Government property, too! It's about time we stopped you."

"No, no," the guard remonstrated.

The officer shoved him aside, and stode forward. "OK, buddy, stick 'em up. You're under arrest. I've had enough of your bunk—trying to turn that poor boob standing there with you against our Government. I'm not asking you any questions. You don't have to talk. I know the Mallory rule.[3] You don't have to confess nothing. I've got enough to send you up. You're a commie—a subversive." He shook his briefcase at us. "Wait 'til I play back the tape I've got here for the judge to hear what you said. He'll fix you."

Mr. Jefferson said, "I didn't see you there, sir. But what makes you think a judge will send me to jail because I'm critical of your Government?"

Sergeant Grummer looked puzzled.

"Well, maybe I haven't got enough on you to prove you're a commie, but you're under arrest for entering Government property at an unauthorized time. Drop that scroll."

"But it's my copy of the Constitution of the United States," remonstrated Mr. Jefferson.

"Looks like there's a switchblade in it," retorted the sergeant. "Anyway, I'm taking no chances. Drop it. Put up your hands and walk down to the squad car—or do you want me to take you?"

"Oh, no," replied Mr. Jefferson, letting the scroll fall to the floor, "I'll go peacefully."

Mr. Jefferson bowed to me and to the guard. We bowed to him. He turned and slowly made his way across the marble floor to the entrance. His academic robe, his white combed wig, his stately figure, even the buckles on his shoes, all proclaimed here, indeed, was a great and historic figure.

Sergeant Grummer, following behind, stomped on the scroll—just to be sure, then called to his partner, "Joe, Joe."

"Here I am," a voice came from the rear of the memorial.

"Come around to the front steps. I've got a prisoner."

The sergeant turned to us, "Now all of you stand where you are."

We all stood where we were; probably only a moment or two, but in the eerie moonlight it seemed ages. A cold, clammy current of air returned. Once again the fog drifted in and circled uncertainly and randomly about the base of the bronze statue. Then, as if suddenly discovering its true aim, streamed straight to the real Thomas Jefferson.

"Hurry up, Joe, I'm getting cold," grumbled Mr. Grummer, slipping his gun back into its holster, and rubbing his hands together. "This damn Washington fog—it gets in your bones."

"OK, I'm here." It was Joe. He was standing on the top step in front, the sergeant in the rear, Jefferson in the middle. I couldn't help smiling. It was like a ball game. Jefferson caught between third and home. The guard and I were the spectators, inwardly cheering for the home team. We held our breath, hoping he would make it. But he stood frozen to the spot. Was it indecision or fear that immobilized Mr. Jefferson? The two police cautiously closed in on him. Even the fog seemed to conspire to hold him to the spot. It circled around his buckled shoes like a huge, white, vaporous python, spiraled up his legs and body until he stood invisible in the vortex of a silvery cloud.

"Come on, Joe," cried the sergeant. They dove into the mist. We could hear the impact of bodies. There were shouts, blows, and curses.

All was over.

Well Grummer didn't get his man. It was Joe who dragged the victim out. Joe staggered triumphantly out of the fog, dragging the body by its heels. The wig was gone—the academic robe was gone—the buckled shoes were gone—the face was bleeding.

"I always get my man." Joe jauntily straightened his tie and put on his hat, which had fallen to the floor in the melee.

The guard and I went over to the insensate figure on the floor.

It wasn't Mr. Jefferson. It was Sergeant Grummer.

Joe whipped around, then fell on his knees by the side of his recumbent boss. In the next instant he jumped up.

"Put the Gahdam floodlights on," he shouted as he ran around the memorial.

We obeyed. Inside and out the whole place glared with light. The quarry was gone. Nothing remained but the dense, whirling mist. Joe rushed out on the lawn, and beat the bushes with his flashlight. The guard and I bent over Sergeant Grummer who was slowly coming back to consciousness.

The majesty of the law returned, "Well, the bastard got away," Joe looked belligerently at me. "I'm holding you as a material witness." He took out pencil and notebook. "Name and address?"

I gave it to him.

"Name of the fugitive?"

"Thomas Jefferson."

"Address?"

"The Hereafter."

Joe glared at me. "Come on, cut out the kidding." "All right, I'll cut out the kidding. And since you're holding me as a material witness, open your briefcase and turn on the tape recorder. Let's have an on-the-spot record of what my testimony will be while it is still fresh."

I raised my hand. "I solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God."

"On the night of April 13, 1965 the guard at the Jefferson Memorial and I were in the rotunda of the building. A ghost dressed in a long academic robe, and carrying a scroll stood talking to us. Sergeant Grummer, noticing a lighted car out in front of the memorial, came up to investigate. He got into a violent argument with the ghost. He called for his companion, Officer Joe, to help apprehend the ghost. In the ensuing scuffle Joe knocked out Sergeant Grummer, and the ghost got away. Further affiant deposeth not."

"Look, Joe," said the sergeant getting up on his feet, "I bumped my head on the bathroom door this morning. I think the swelling's going down. Let's get the hell outta here."

The sergeant, summoning what remaining dignity he still had, took Joe's arm. The two of them walked quickly out of the memorial.

"When one petty tyrant knocks out another we have an excellent demonstration of the advantages of the Constitutional separation of powers, which your forefathers provided."

That voice. It came from the center of the mist. We looked up. Mr. Jefferson, calm and cool, stepped out.

"Your Founding Fathers gave you a republic, which guarantees a division and balancing of authority as opposed to the concentration of power of a king in a monarchy, of a demagog in a pure democracy, or in an over-zealous court."

Mr. Jefferson turned to me.

"Commissioner Mason, I want you to tell the Woman's Ad Club—in fact, I wish all women could hear my message. When a new executive agency gets so fogged up it thinks it's the sole judge of virtue and that, therefore, it should have the power to control packaging and to tell those 'awful merchants and advertisers' what they can put in their ads, it's a lucky thing your Constitution says another agency of Government (the legislative) may quiet down the power-hungry bureaucrats with a few healthy slugs.

"Good night, Commissioner Mason. It was nice visiting with you."

Mr. Jefferson stepped out toward the back portico of his Memorial.

"Watch out, Mr. President" I cried. "There are no steps out that way."

"Thank you, Commissioner," Mr. Jefferson's face was radiant as the mist slowly gathered 'round his cloak, "I need no steps."

SCIENCE OF OCEANOGRAPHY IN HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, some 700,000 tourists are expected to visit Hawaii this year and we are making plans to entertain 1 million by 1970. Despite its lack of natural resources, however, Hawaii does not intend to continue to be so dependent upon tourism, sugar, pineapple, and Federal spending.

A concerted effort has been made in the past few years under the dynamic leadership of Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, to develop for our State a leading role in the science of oceanography. We have made some small but important beginnings.

An editorial in the April 30 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin comments on our prospects.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gateway to Hydrospace

From the deepest ocean depths to the outermost explorable limits of space, Hawaii's mushrooming science and research program is finding opportunities little dreamed of as recently as two decades ago.

The scope of work in progress as well as that chartered for the future is summarized enthusiastically in "Hawaii: Gateway to Hydrospace," a publication available from the Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development, 426 Queen Street, Honolulu, 96813.

What Hawaii is doing has practical applications and commercial potential growing naturally from the pure science aspects of its explorations.

The study of the oceans will be useful to fishermen, obviously. Less obviously, technics developed in the Mohole project of drilling into the earth's mantle, will help drillers everywhere and perhaps permit tapping of hitherto undisclosed oil and gas resources. The Mohole platform may set the pattern for devices used in deep sea rescue work—or the recovery of lost hydrogen bombs. Underwater mining may find critically needed supplies of scarce minerals—and at a time when the world is increasingly concerned about its ability to feed itself, the oceans may be cultivated as a rich new source of both animal and vegetable food.

---

[3] *Mallory* v. *Hogan*. No. 110, October term, Sup. Ct. 1963. Privilege against self incrimination.

Jules Verne hinted at some of the possibilities in one of his fanciful novels. What is being done today makes Jules look like a piker.

Hawaii's special advantages as a center of oceanic research are many. First, and most obvious, it is in the center of the earth's largest ocean. More than that, it offers proximity to nearly any sea condition that might be demanded in almost any investigation.

Another major advantage is Hawaii's oceanic topography. Great ocean depths are within easy reach, here the "continental terrace" (70 to 800 miles wide elsewhere) is narrow, less than 20 miles. All the features of the continental terrace are to be found, yet depths exceeding 18,000 feet are within easy reach.

A moderate climate, favorable sea conditions, absence of violent storms, adequate weather reports, clear uncontaminated ocean water for good visibility and sites on mountain peaks for off-shore observation of surface oceanographic operations are other attractions. Not to be overlooked is the sea life which exists in variety and abundance.

Backing this up are a university which is growing rapidly into its role as one of the world's great geophysical research centers, and other Government and commercially sponsored research facilities. Military participation expands the oceanographic horizons.

The political climate also is favorable. Governor Burns and his administration are well aware of Hawaii's suitability for major oceanic research. "To serve the science of oceanography seems a logical role for Hawaii," the Governor believes. "After all, Hawaii is the Nation's only oceanographic center which is in the center of the ocean. But Hawaii will not realize her full potential without conscious, well-directed, and vigorous effort on the part of her State administration and her alert citizenry."

Business support has been forthcoming; 11 of the State's leading industrial concerns underwrote a study on Hawaii's prospects. The ensuing report concluded that oceanics should be a $25 million a year business in the State by 1970, and could reach $100 million. This was before the Mohole project was awarded to Hawaii.

We are barely at the threshold of our inner space explorations. Very likely our most optimistic forecasts will fall far short of reality when the possibilities are better known.

On this page today are some hints of the opportunities to be explored in both outer and inner space.

James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, looks from the platform earth into the vastness of the solar system and the even greater vastness of the galaxies beyond, whose mysteries may elude us for a long, long time to come.

Senator T. A. Pryor, president of the Oceanic Foundation, deals with the almost equally unknown, but potentially explorable depths of the oceans—the inner space of our planet into which man has barely dipped his toes.

The frontiers beckon. Here is youth's challenge in the last third of the 20th century, a challenge every bit as exciting as that faced by Marco Polo, Columbus, Drake, and the pioneers who broke the plains.

DEVELOPMENT OF SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we are constantly reminded of our Nation's increasing responsibilities in a troubled world. If we are to maintain our position of leadership, it is imperative that we maintain a strong and vigorous agricultural economy. We must safeguard and accelerate the development of our soil and water resources—the basic assets which produce our wealth and undergird our society.

The proposed budget for the next fiscal year for the Soil Conservation Service would not permit any acceleration. On the contrary, it would result in a severe setback for tried and proven programs.

The work of our country's 3,000 soil and water conservation districts is succeeding because they are conceived in the American tradition of self-government, with emphasis on local initiative and responsibility. This work has helped to bring American agriculture a long way from the chaotic Dust Bowl days of the thirties. Yet much remains to be done. In our zeal to buttress the economies of our distressed areas, it would be ironic, indeed, if we should neglect our soil and water resources—the basic strength of rural America.

The "Conservation operations" item in the budget represents a reduction in total man-years and a redistribution of effort largely at the expense of the very basic soil survey activity. I hope that the Congress will restore the proposed $3.6 million soil survey reduction, and will provide necessary increases for conservation operations.

The "Watershed planning" item in the budget contains a limit of 50 new plans, and the "Watershed protection" item a limit of 35 new construction starts. Both of these limits are unrealistic in terms of need. Moreover, they raise a serious question of budgetary propriety in that funding for 1966 and 1967 is virtually the same and yet new plans and new starts are essentially halved.

The watershed program, as administered by the Soil Conservation Service under authority of Public Law 566, is sound in concept and strongly supported at the State and local levels. Substantial inroads are being made into problems which have plagued our land for generations. The wide acceptance of the program and the inadequacy of our financial support is evidenced by the steadily increasing backlog of unserviced applications.

In Arkansas, only 45 of the 112 watershed applications on file have received planning assistance. It is my understanding that a similar situation exists on a national scale, with planning assistance provided on less than half of the more than 2,400 applications received. Arkansas, like most of our States, has recognized this problem and the resulting State appropriations for watershed planning have been insignificant. This action is indicative of confidence in the program and the sincere desire to move ahead with the job.

I submit that we are not keeping faith with our State and local governments by placing an unrealistic limit on the number of plans which may be developed.

I am advised that the local sponsors of 10 watershed projects in Arkansas expect to start construction in 1967. They are already making plans to discharge their responsibilities under the program. They are looking forward to the beginning of improvements to alleviate problems which retard the economic development of their communities.

These problems include floodwater damage which, in one project alone, the Upper Crooked Creek watershed, including Harrison, Ark., caused over $5 million in damage and the loss of four lives during a single storm; inadequate municipal water supply which has limited the growth potential of a key town—Alma—in the Little Clear Creek watershed; and critical loss of income because of flooding and poor drainage conditions in other projects.

I find it difficult to reconcile the new start limitation in the budget with our pronounced purpose to improve economic conditions in rural areas.

I urge that the watershed program be accelerated by increasing the appropriation for watershed planning and operations, and by eliminating the restrictions on new planning and new starts.

TRAFFIC SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, traffic safety legislation continues to hold a spot in the limelight amid all the issues before the 89th Congress. Hearings are continuing this week in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and they have been concluded in our own Committee on Commerce, which will before long be considering the question in executive session. Hearings in the Government Operations subcommittee and in the Committee on Public Works have also made their contributions to the picture which has emerged.

Before the administration's traffic safety bill came before Congress, I joined Representative JAMES A. MACKAY, of Georgia, to introduce the Hartke-Mackay National Traffic Safety Agency bill. Thirty Members of the House of Representatives have joined in offering the same bill, and 15 Members of the Senate are cosponsors of S. 2871.

Both our bill and that of the administration seek the same objectives. Some features of the Hartke-Mackay bill, however, we feel are stronger; consequently, I expect to offer a number of changes in the administration bill in a comprehensive amendment.

Before doing so, however, I invite attention to an analysis of the administration bill which has been prepared by Representative MACKAY's office, together with a comparison of its features with those of the original Hartke-Mackay bill. In addition, a most useful column is added to the comparison, which gives the recommendations which have grown out of the hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this tabular material together with a "Position Statement on Unresolved Issues" be printed in the RECORD. The statement presents the views in which I concur with Representative MACKAY as we approach the markup of this legislation.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

LISTING OF KEY UNRESOLVED ISSUES IN THE ADMINISTRATION'S TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966, APRIL 22, 1966

Points in Question	Provision in Administration Bill	Provision in National Traffic Safety Agency Bill Cosponsored by 45 Members	Recommendations of Congressmen and of Witnesses Before Congressional Committees
		GENERAL PROVISIONS	
1. Should an agency be specified in legislation with explicit responsibility for a uniform and safe traffic environment?	1. No provision.	1. Provides for an agency. (Sec. 4(a).)	
2. Should an administrator be appointed by President?	2. No provision.	2. Provides for such a post. (Sec. 4(a).)	
3. Should a periodic consumer traffic safety bulletin for motorists be published on a regular basis?	3. No provision.	3. Provision included. (Sec. 5.)	
4. Should Secretary be required to submit comprehensive annual report to President and Congress?	4. No provision.	4. Provision included. (Sec. 11(a).)	4. Favor: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Nelson; AAA; Nader; Stieglitz.
5. What should be the source of funds for this bill?	5. Highway trust fund, by transfer of equivalent of 1 percent auto excise tax from Treasury for beautification and traffic safety; any deficit supplied by Treasury sections 115, 202, 303, and 304; Commerce and Treasury request to Congress, March 21, 1966.	5. General Treasury. (Sec. 13.)	5. General Treasury: National Association Counties; AAA on 2-year basis. Highway trust fund even if thrown out of balance: National League of Cities. Delete beautification from traffic safety financing: AASHO.
		TITLE I—MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS	
1. Should all motor vehicles, including trucks, be included?	1. Excludes trucks. (Sec. 101 (a)).	1. Includes trucks. (Sec. 3 (a).)	1. Include trucks: James Hoffa.
2. Should setting of performance standards for manufacture of cars be mandatory?	2. Permissive. (Sec. 102 (a).)	2. Mandatory. (Sec. 6 (a).)	2. Mandatory: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Harris, Nelson; Nader; Hoffa; AAA; physicians for automotive safety; Stieglitz; Fairchild-Hiller; Gikes. Industry committee with voluntary compliance: AMA.
3. How soon should standards be set?	3. No sooner than 2 years. (Sec. 102 (a).)	3. Within 6 months. (Sec. 6 (a).)	3. Within 1 year: Senators Ribicoff, Harris, Robert Kennedy, Nelson; Nader; Hoffa; Stieglitz. Adopt interim standards immediately: physicians for automotive safety; AAA; Gikes.
4. How soon should the issued standards be effective?	4. Not before 6 months nor later than 2 years after issued. (Sec. 102 (b).)	4. On date specified by Secretary. (Sec. 6 (b).)	4. Not later than 1 year after issued: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Harris, Nelson; Nader; Stieglitz; Gikes.
5. Should existing informal industry standards be formalized?	5. Informal standards acceptable if are adequate and there is compliance. (Sec. 102(a).)	5. No provision.	5. Delete provision: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Harris, Nelson. Formalize informal standards: Stieglitz.
6. Should standard setting function of GSA for Federal cars be transferred to new agency?	6. No provision.	6. Transfers GSA function. (Sec. 10.)	
7. Should there be sanctions on the manufacturers for noncompliance?	7. Car not meeting standards cannot be manufactured or sold; $1,000 penalty for each violation. (Secs. 107 and 108.)	7. No provision.	7. Strenthen sanctions: Nader.
8. Should cars be federally certified if they comply with Federal standards?	8. No provision.	8. Car federally certified for labeling and advertising purposes if prove compliance with Federal standards. (Sec. 7.)	
9. Should manufacturers be required to notify consumers or Government of defects and fix defects?	9. No provision.	9. No provision.	9. Notify Government: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Harris, Nelson: Nader; physicians for automobile safety. Notify consumer: Senators Mondale, Magnuson, Bayh, Bible, Clark, Gruening, Edward Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, McGovern, Metcalf, Morse, Pell, Randolph, Tydings, Yarborough, Muskie, McGee.
10. Should the agency have specific authority to sponsor construction of test car?	10. Implied authority. (Sec. 104.)	10. Implied authority. (Secs. 4(b) and 5.)	10. Specific authority: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Javits, Harris, Nelson: Nader; physicians for automobile safety; New York Senator Speno; Gikes; American Trial Lawyers.
11. Should the funds for this title be increased?	11. Fiscal year 1967, $3 million; fiscal year 1968, $6 million; fiscal year 1969–72, $9 million each year. (Sec. 115.)	11. Cost to be determined in committee. (Sec. 13.)	11. To construct test car: increase $3 million for fiscal year 1967 to $13 million. Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Javits, Harris, Nelson.

raffic Safety Act of 1966, April 22, 1966—Continued

visions in National Traffic Safety Agency Bill Cosponsored by 45 Members	Recommendations of Congressmen and of Witnesses Before Congressional Committees
RESEARCH AND TEST FACILITY	
. Requires establishment of research cen- to examine every facet of traffic accident nomena. (Sec. 4(b).)	
. Cost to be determined in committee. c. 13.)	2. Funds for construction should not have open-ended authorization: AASHO.
SAFETY	
. Sets forth six general criteria. (Sec. .)	
. Projects generally described. (Sec. 8 .)	2. Include all roads and highway lighting: Institute of Traffic Engineers. Specific higher allotment for driver education and inspection of cars: Ribicoff. Specific higher allotment for all phases of driver education: National Education Association. Add community traffic safety programs with 90-percent Federal funds to cities and counties: National Association of Counties. Require accident investigation training: Stieglitz and Gikes.
. Secretary's set standards. State pro- me must meet minimum standards. s. 6(a) and 8(d).)	3. Highway design standards should remain joint State-Bureau of Public Roads effort: AASHO. Secretary's set standards with State and local governments and professional organizations: International Association of Chiefs of Police and Institute of Traffic Engineers.
. State designate agency qualified to ad- ister traffic safety program. (Sec. 3(d).)	
. Ratio: amount of gasoline sold in te bears to total gasoline sold in United tes. (Sec. 8(b).)	5. Distribute 25 percent by area: AASHO. Professional police advise Secretary in disbursing 25 percent: International Association of Chiefs of Police.
. Cost to be determined in committee. c. 13.)	6. Increase funds: Ribicoff; National Education Association; AASHO; National League of Cities.
. Secretary authorized to conduct research. c. 5.)	
. Cost to be determined in committee. c. 13.)	
. Provision included. (Sec. 5.)	
0. No provision.	10. Make public: Nader, American Trial Lawyers. Findings of fact be public record but conclusions only for research: Robert Kennedy, not public: Cornell Laboratories.

cious,' shamelessly flaunting themselves before the eyes of the poor credulous housewives.

"Avant, I say to all women advertising artists, and welcome to the good, kind, thoughtful bureaucrats who cry: 'Come all ye consumers suffering from tired blood, headaches and that rundown feeling you get when you have to choose between so many different products, each claiming it's better than the other. Come, get on Big Brother and Big Sister's laps. We'll protect you. We'll do what the Socialists in Britain propose. Lord Reith's Commission wants to recruit scientific, industrial and medical experts to determine what people should buy."

"If you think I'm kidding look at what's already happened to the pickle boys in America. Volume 30, No. 177 of the Federal Register sets their standard for olives, and if they don't obey, you know what'll happen? Here's the law on olive sizes: pewee, midget, small, medium, large, extra large, mammoth, giant, jumbo, colossal, supercolossal.

"And woe to those who miscalculate.

"Grade labeling and advertising control won't hurt advertisers much. They can still say: 'Buy Mildred's Perfumery—Grade A1'; 'Buy Kay's Perfumery—Grade 007'.

"Grade labeling will provide much needed guidance for the poor housewife who can't trust her own nose, and at the same time we'll cut out all those foolish perfumery ads of a man holding his violin in one hand, giving a girl a kiss."

"Commissioner Mason," interrupted Mr. Jefferson, "you're a damn fool. You talk just like all Washington bureaucrats when they get before an advertising audience—telling them how wonderful they are, then ending up by saying, 'and we, the Government, want to help you and to purify you, and to guide you, and to control you. We'll tell you how many ounces make one serving of "Oaty Toaties"—we'll tell you what kind of picture you can put on your soapboxes, and we'll design the shape of your perfumery bottles.'

"Tear up your speech, Commissioner Mason, it stinks. Remember, you're talking to women. They're not as dumb as the bureaucrats who want to control advertising make them out to be. Remember what

sion looks the other way. Do you know about masking?"

"Of course, Mr. President. I know about masking. Not long ago the Food and Drug Administration put controls on folic acid because if people suffering from a serious disease took it, the symptoms were covered up. Doctors couldn't recognize the trouble and treat the patient in time to save his life."

"Well, this same crowd is engaged in a tremendous campaign of masking. Does the Food and Drug Administration do anything about it? Nuts.

"And now your bureaucrats want to add another Federal agency to play even worse favoritism, just like what happened 300 years ago in Britain. The British Parliament passed a truth-in-packaging bill.

"In those days, before mass production of goods, ideas were the principal items distributed in the market place—ideas on religion, government, philosophy, poetry, and literature. (Those were the dark ages before Batman, Pogo, and Popeye set our intellectual standards.)

"Ideas were packaged in pamphlets. Edmund Burke, Steele, Addison, John Lilburne were pamphleteers. The king's placemen (today we call them bureaucrats) said some of the stuff in these pamphlets wasn't fit for consumption so they passed a truth-in-packaging bill.

"The ridicule heaped on that silly bit of sumptuary legislation is still good for laughs. John Milton's was the funniest of all. Nobody reads Milton's 'Aeropagitica' today because of his archaic English. But I'll translate one paragraph into modern idiom and you will see the nobility's contempt for the peasants of England is the same contempt the governing elite of Washington have for the American citizen today.

"Milton asks if the king be so jealous of the consumer's welfare that he trusts them only to read such matters as he approves. 'Do we but censure them for a giddy, vicious, and ungrounded people, in such a sick and weak state of faith and discretion as to be able to take nothing down but through the pipe of a licenser.'[2]

a national shrine.

One crept around back to cut off our escape. The other, Sergeant Grummer (I later learned his name), stealthily tiptoed up beside the guard. He held an open briefcase in his hand. In it was a tape recorder.

Mr. Jefferson, so enrapt in what he was saying, failed to see the silent drama taking place behind him.

"All right, Commissioner Mason, you want me to be specific about this big monopoly that engages in false advertising and masking, and I'll tell you why the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration lets it get away with murder.

"This monopoly has gone in for diversification—what the bureaucrats call conglomerate mergers. If the Federal Trade Commission really believes what it says: 'Bigness is wicked' (though one obstreperous Commissioner, Phil Elman, disagrees) then this monopoly is the wickedest of 'em all. It operates over 100 business-type activities. It is, among other things, the largest electric power producer in the country, the largest insurer, the largest lender and the largest borrower, the largest holder of grazing land, the largest holder of timberland, the largest owner of grain, the largest warehouse operator, the largest shipowner, the largest truck-fleet operator, and it is the world's biggest landlord and property owner.

"It owns 427,000 buildings, with a floor area of 2½ billion square feet, and 766 million acres of land. In five States it owns more than half the land; 98 percent in Alaska, 87 percent in Nevada, 67 percent in Idaho, and 52 percent in Oregon.

"It violates the Robinson Patman Laws provisions by forcing manufacturers to sell to it for less than what other customers must pay, and it violates the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act against false and misleading advertising. According to Senator John Williams of Delaware it 'should stop trying to camouflage the cost of its program with a lot of fancy labels in an attempt to deceive the American people.'

"As for masking; it's hiding the cancerous growth of decadence in society. It pays a boy who was a school dropout and beat up

---

[2] "Areopagitica," 1644.

POSITION STATEMENT ON UNRESOLVED ISSUES[1]

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. An agency should be specified by Congress and charged by it with the responsibility of building a uniform and safer traffic environment. Proponents of the "no agency" position say this will give the executive branch greater "flexibility." We argue that there must be a "focus of leadership and action," and draw an analogy with the FAA which has had notable success in air safety. We do not argue that the agency has to do everything that might be done but that it could bring an end to the diffusion of responsibility and, in some instances, overlapping of effort.

2. A traffic safety administrator should be designated by Congress to personify and fix responsibility for traffic safety. Our bill provides for his appointment by the President as is now the case with the FAA administrator, although the mode of selection is not so important as the designation of the office. Again we seek to end diffusion of effort and further fix responsibility for the provision of national leadership in a field which is much more complicated and difficult than that facing the FAA administrator.

3. A periodic consumer traffic safety bulletin for motorists should be published on a regular basis. Although not required by law the FAA publishes such a bulletin nationally and in my region which alerts and informs pilots as to vital matters affecting safety. For example, motorists are often unaware of acutely accident prone traffic locations, or new discovery of causes of accidents or resulting injuries, or what procedures to follow in case of injury.

4. An annual report to Congress, comprehensive as to casualties and important developments touching on the traffic safety environment with recommendations is nece-

and effort and no case has been made for not including all motor vehicles under one agency.

2. The setting of motor vehicle safety performance standards should be mandatory. They are mandatory for all other transportation in interstate commerce and the results have been impressive.

3. Standards should be set within 6 months. They can be interim and fairly elementary standards until more data is gathered, conferences held with the auto industry and State officials, and a better understanding gained as to the nature and extent of standards necessary to protect our people.

4. Standards should be made effective within 1 year after they are set. It is obvious that new standards cannot be applied overnight. On the other hand, no case has been made for a period to exceed 24 months.

5. Existing informal industry standards should be formalized and would provide a good beginning for the definition of standards by law.

6. The standard-setting function of the General Services Administration should be transferred to the Traffic Safety Agency and the Department of Transportation. Here again, there should not be diffusion of effort and confusion of duty.

7. Sanctions should not be placed on manufacturers for noncompliance until we have more experience and information. Contrary to the canard that the public is not interested in safety, the definition of recommended safety standards by the Federal Government and the certification of those vehicles that meet these standards, would have a profound influence on the consumer and would provide an incentive to the manufacturer to meet those standards.

8. Motor vehicles should be certified for compliance for the obvious reason that the

to be adequate, although again no expert opinion has been presented by the administration in support of this 3-million figure.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

1, 2, and 3: General criteria for a qualified State traffic safety plan should be defined and definite procedures for eliciting the opinion of State officials in the formulating of such criteria should be provided. The naked phrase, "The Secretary shall determine" is a slap in the face of countless able State officials who must ultimately make the plan work, and the effort to develop a national traffic safety program can have much better chances if the State, local, and private forces are brought into a working partnership to determine these criteria.

Conditions and structures vary from State to State and it would be impossible to cut the pattern to fit each one exactly. On the other hand the elements in the traffic safety picture are nearly the same wherever there are motor vehicles. It would therefore be desirable for legislation to attempt to designate these elements as explicitly as possible.

4. Just as the Federal diffusion of effort, lack of explicit assignment of responsibility, and low priority have contributed to our failures, so the States have failed to overhaul their own structures which have the same characteristics. The States do not have a focus of leadership, an explicit assignment of responsibility, or a high priority for traffic safety. The States should be required to designate one agency they deem qualified to administer the overall traffic safety effort in the State.

5. The formula for distributing grant-in-aid funds must necessarily be on some matching basis and it would appear that the case for 75 percent based on the amount of gasoline sold in each State and 25 percent based on the discretion of the administering official

---

to prove you're a commie, but you're under arrest for entering Government property at an unauthorized time. Drop that scroll."

"But it's my copy of the Constitution of the United States," remonstrated Mr. Jefferson.

"Looks like there's a switchblade in it," retorted the sergeant. "Anyway, I'm taking no chances. Drop it. Put up your hands and walk down to the squad car—or do you want me to take you?"

"Oh, no," replied Mr. Jefferson, letting the scroll fall to the floor, "I'll go peacefully."

Mr. Jefferson bowed to me and to the guard. We bowed to him. He turned and slowly made his way across the marble floor to the entrance. His academic robe, his white combed wig, his stately figure, even the buckles on his shoes, all proclaimed here, indeed, was a great and historic figure.

Sergeant Grummer, following behind, stomped on the scroll—just to be sure, then called to his partner, "Joe, Joe."

"Here I am," a voice came from the rear of the memorial.

"Come around to the front steps. I've got a prisoner."

The sergeant turned to us, "Now all of you stand where you are."

We all stood where we were; probably only a moment or two, but in the eerie moonlight it seemed ages. A cold, clammy current of air returned. Once again the fog drifted in and circled uncertainly and randomly about the base of the bronze statue. Then, as if suddenly discovering its true aim, streamed straight to the real Thomas Jefferson.

"Hurry up, Joe, I'm getting cold," grumbled Mr. Grummer, slipping his gun back into its holster, and rubbing his hands together. "This damn Washington fog—it gets in your bones."

"OK, I'm here." It was Joe. He was standing on the top step in front, the sergeant in the rear, Jefferson in the middle. I couldn't help smiling. It was like a ball game. Jefferson caught between third and home. The guard and I were the spectators, inwardly cheering for the home team. We held our

the bushes with his flashlight. The guard and I bent over Sergeant Grummer who was slowly coming back to consciousness.

The majesty of the law returned, "Well, the bastard got away," Joe looked belligerently at me. "I'm holding you as a material witness." He took out pencil and notebook. "Name and address?"

I gave it to him.

"Name of the fugitive?"

"Thomas Jefferson."

"Address?"

"The Hereafter."

Joe glared at me. "Come on, cut out the kidding." "All right, I'll cut out the kidding. And since you're holding me as a material witness, open your briefcase and turn on the tape recorder. Let's have an on-the-spot record of what my testimony will be while it is still fresh."

I raised my hand. "I solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God."

"On the night of April 13, 1965 the guard at the Jefferson Memorial and I were in the rotunda of the building. A ghost dressed in a long academic robe, and carrying a scroll stood talking to us. Sergeant Grummer, noticing a lighted car out in front of the memorial, came up to investigate. He got into a violent argument with the ghost. He called for his companion, Officer Joe, to help apprehend the ghost. In the ensuing scuffle Joe knocked out Sergeant Grummer, and the ghost got away. Further affiant deposeth not."

"Look, Joe," said the sergeant getting up on his feet, "I bumped my head on the bathroom door this morning. I think the swelling's going down. Let's get the hell outta here."

The sergeant, summoning what remaining dignity he still had, took Joe's arm. The two of them walked quickly out of the memorial.

"When one petty tyrant knocks out another we have an excellent demonstration of the advantages of the Constitutional separation of powers, which your forefathers provided."

That voice. It came from the center of the mist. We looked up. Mr. Jefferson, calm and cool, stepped out.

was this year and we are making plans to entertain 1 million by 1970. Despite its lack of natural resources, however, Hawaii does not intend to continue to be so dependent upon tourism, sugar, pineapple, and Federal spending.

A concerted effort has been made in the past few years under the dynamic leadership of Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, to develop for our State a leading role in the science of oceanography. We have made some small but important beginnings.

An editorial in the April 30 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin comments on our prospects.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GATEWAY TO HYDROSPACE

From the deepest ocean depths to the outermost explorable limits of space, Hawaii's mushrooming science and research program is finding opportunities little dreamed of as recently as two decades ago.

The scope of work in progress as well as that chartered for the future is summarized enthusiastically in "Hawaii: Gateway to Hydrospace," a publication available from the Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development, 426 Queen Street, Honolulu, 96813.

What Hawaii is doing has practical applications and commercial potential growing naturally from the pure science aspects of its explorations.

The study of the oceans will be useful to fishermen, obviously. Less obviously, technics developed in the Mohole project of drilling into the earth's mantle, will help drillers everywhere and perhaps permit tapping of hitherto undisclosed oil and gas resources. The Mohole platform may set the pattern for devices used in deep sea rescue work—or the recovery of lost hydrogen bombs. Underwater mining may find critically needed supplies of scarce minerals—and at a time when the world is increasingly

---

[3] *Mallory* v. *Hogan*. No. 110, October term, Sup. Ct. 1963. Privilege against self incrimination.

concerned about its ability to feed itself, the oceans may be cultivated as a rich new source of both animal and vegetable food.

Jules Verne hinted at some of the possibilities in one of his fanciful novels. What is being done today makes Jules look like a piker.

Hawaii's special advantages as a center of oceanic research are many. First, and most obvious, it is in the center of the earth's largest ocean. More than that, it offers proximity to nearly any sea condition that might be demanded in almost any investigation.

Another major advantage is Hawaii's oceanic topography. Great ocean depths are within easy reach, here the "continental terrace" (70 to 800 miles wide elsewhere) is narrow, less than 20 miles. All the features of the continental terrace are to be found, yet depths exceeding 18,000 feet are within easy reach.

A moderate climate, favorable sea conditions, absence of violent storms, adequate weather reports, clear uncontaminated ocean water for good visibility and sites on mountain peaks for off-shore observation of surface oceanographic operations are other attractions. Not to be overlooked is the sea life which exists in variety and abundance.

Backing this up are a university which is growing rapidly into its role as one of the world's great geophysical research centers, and other Government and commercially sponsored research facilities. Military participation expands the oceanographic horizons.

The political climate also is favorable. Governor Burns and his administration are well aware of Hawaii's suitability for major oceanic research. "To serve the science of oceanography seems a logical role for Hawaii," the Governor believes. "After all, Hawaii is the Nation's only oceanographic center which is in the center of the ocean. But Hawaii will not realize her full potential without conscious, well-directed, and vigorous effort on the part of her State administration and her alert citizenry."

Business support has been forthcoming; 11 of the State's leading industrial concerns underwrote a study on Hawaii's prospects. The ensuing report concluded that oceanics should be a $25 million a year business in the State by 1970, and could reach $100 million. This was before the Mohole project was awarded to Hawaii.

We are barely at the threshold of our inner space explorations. Very likely our most optimistic forecasts will fall far short of reality when the possibilities are better known.

On this page today are some hints of the opportunities to be explored in both outer and inner space.

James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, looks from the platform earth into the vastness of the solar system and the even greater vastness of the galaxies beyond, whose mysteries may elude us for a long, long time to come.

Senator T. A. Pryor, president of the Oceanic Foundation, deals with the almost equally unknown, but potentially explorable depths of the oceans—the inner space of our planet into which man has barely dipped his toes.

The frontiers beckon. Here is youth's challenge in the last third of the 20th century, a challenge every bit as exciting as that faced by Marco Polo, Columbus, Drake, and the pioneers who broke the plains.

DEVELOPMENT OF SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we are constantly reminded of our Nation's increasing responsibilities in a troubled world. If we are to maintain our position of leadership, it is imperative that we maintain a strong and vigorous agricultural economy. We must safeguard and accelerate the development of our soil and water resources—the basic assets which produce our wealth and undergird our society.

The proposed budget for the next fiscal year for the Soil Conservation Service would not permit any acceleration. On the contrary, it would result in a severe setback for tried and proven programs.

The work of our country's 3,000 soil and water conservation districts is succeeding because they are conceived in the American tradition of self-government, with emphasis on local initiative and responsibility. This work has helped to bring American agriculture a long way from the chaotic Dust Bowl days of the thirties. Yet much remains to be done. In our zeal to buttress the economies of our distressed areas, it would be ironic, indeed, if we should neglect our soil and water resources—the basic strength of rural America.

The "Conservation operations" item in the budget represents a reduction in total man-years and a redistribution of effort largely at the expense of the very basic soil survey activity. I hope that the Congress will restore the proposed $3.6 million soil survey reduction, and will provide necessary increases for conservation operations.

The "Watershed planning" item in the budget contains a limit of 50 new plans, and the "Watershed protection" item a limit of 35 new construction starts. Both of these limits are unrealistic in terms of need. Moreover, they raise a serious question of budgetary propriety in that funding for 1966 and 1967 is virtually the same and yet new plans and new starts are essentially halved.

The watershed program, as administered by the Soil Conservation Service under authority of Public Law 566, is sound in concept and strongly supported at the State and local levels. Substantial inroads are being made into problems which have plagued our land for generations. The wide acceptance of the program and the inadequacy of our financial support is evidenced by the steadily increasing backlog of unserviced applications.

In Arkansas, only 45 of the 112 watershed applications on file have received planning assistance. It is my understanding that a similar situation exists on a national scale, with planning assistance provided on less than half of the more than 2,400 applications received. Arkansas, like most of our States, has recognized this problem and the resulting State appropriations for watershed planning have been insignificant. This action is indicative of confidence in the program and the sincere desire to move ahead with the job.

I submit that we are not keeping faith with our State and local governments by placing an unrealistic limit on the number of plans which may be developed.

I am advised that the local sponsors of 10 watershed projects in Arkansas expect to start construction in 1967. They are already making plans to discharge their responsibilities under the program. They are looking forward to the beginning of improvements to alleviate problems which retard the economic development of their communities.

These problems include floodwater damage which, in one project alone, the Upper Crooked Creek watershed, including Harrison, Ark., caused over $5 million in damage and the loss of four lives during a single storm; inadequate municipal water supply which has limited the growth potential of a key town—Alma—in the Little Clear Creek watershed; and critical loss of income because of flooding and poor drainage conditions in other projects.

I find it difficult to reconcile the new start limitation in the budget with our pronounced purpose to improve economic conditions in rural areas.

I urge that the watershed program be accelerated by increasing the appropriation for watershed planning and operations, and by eliminating the restrictions on new planning and new starts.

TRAFFIC SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, traffic safety legislation continues to hold a spot in the limelight amid all the issues before the 89th Congress. Hearings are continuing this week in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and they have been concluded in our own Committee on Commerce, which will before long be considering the question in executive session. Hearings in the Government Operations subcommittee and in the Committee on Public Works have also made their contributions to the picture which has emerged.

Before the administration's traffic safety bill came before Congress, I joined Representative James A. Mackay, of Georgia, to introduce the Hartke-Mackay National Traffic Safety Agency bill. Thirty Members of the House of Representatives have joined in offering the same bill, and 15 Members of the Senate are cosponsors of S. 2871.

Both our bill and that of the administration seek the same objectives. Some features of the Hartke-Mackay bill, however, we feel are stronger; consequently, I expect to offer a number of changes in the administration bill in a comprehensive amendment.

Before doing so, however, I invite attention to an analysis of the administration bill which has been prepared by Representative Mackay's office, together with a comparison of its features with those of the original Hartke-Mackay bill. In addition, a most useful column is added to the comparison, which gives the recommendations which have grown out of the hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this tabular material together with a "Position Statement on Unresolved Issues" be printed in the Record. The statement presents the views in which I concur with Representative Mackay as we approach the markup of this legislation.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record.

LISTING OF KEY UNRESOLVED ISSUES IN THE ADMINISTRATION'S TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966, APRIL 22, 1966

Points in Question	Provision in Administration Bill	Provision in National Traffic Safety Agency Bill Cosponsored by 45 Members	Recommendations of Congressmen and of Witnesses Before Congressional Committees
GENERAL PROVISIONS			
1. Should an agency be specified in legislation with explicit responsibility for a uniform and safe traffic environment?	1. No provision.	1. Provides for an agency. (Sec. 4(a).)	
2. Should an administrator be appointed by President?	2. No provision.	2. Provides for such a post. (Sec. 4(a).)	
3. Should a periodic consumer traffic safety bulletin for motorists be published on a regular basis?	3. No provision.	3. Provision included. (Sec. 5.)	
4. Should Secretary be required to submit comprehensive annual report to President and Congress?	4. No provision.	4. Provision included. (Sec. 11(a).)	4. Favor: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Nelson; AAA; Nader; Stieglitz.
5. What should be the source of funds for this bill?	5. Highway trust fund, by transfer of equivalent of 1 percent auto excise tax from Treasury for beautification and traffic safety; any deficit supplied by Treasury sections 115, 202, 303, and 304; Commerce and Treasury request to Congress, March 21, 1966.	5. General Treasury. (Sec. 13.)	5. General Treasury: National Association Counties; AAA on 2-year basis. Highway trust fund even if thrown out of balance: National League of Cities. Delete beautification from traffic safety financing: AASHO.
TITLE I—MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS			
1. Should all motor vehicles, including trucks, be included?	1. Excludes trucks. (Sec. 101 (a)).	1. Includes trucks. (Sec. 3 (a).)	1. Include trucks: James Hoffa.
2. Should setting of performance standards for manufacture of cars be mandatory?	2. Permissive. (Sec. 102 (a).)	2. Mandatory. (Sec. 6 (a).)	2. Mandatory: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Harris, Nelson; Nader; Hoffa; AAA; physicians for automotive safety; Stieglitz; Fairchild-Hiller; Gikes. Industry committee with voluntary compliance: AMA.
3. How soon should standards be set?	3. No sooner than 2 years. (Sec. 102 (a).)	3. Within 6 months. (Sec. 6 (a).)	3. Within 1 year: Senators Ribicoff, Harris, Robert Kennedy, Nelson; Nader; Hoffa; Stieglitz. Adopt interim standards immediately: physicians for automotive safety; AAA; Gikes.
4. How soon should the issued standards be effective?	4. Not before 6 months nor later than 2 years after issued. (Sec. 102 (b).)	4. On date specified by Secretary. (Sec. 6 (b).)	4. Not later than 1 year after issued: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Harris, Nelson; Nader; Stieglitz; Gikes.
5. Should existing informal industry standards be formalized?	5. Informal standards acceptable if are adequate and there is compliance. (Sec. 102(a).)	5. No provision.	5. Delete provision: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Harris, Nelson. Formalize informal standards: Stieglitz.
6. Should standard setting function of GSA for Federal cars be transferred to new agency?	6. No provision.	6. Transfers GSA function. (Sec. 10.)	
7. Should there be sanctions on the manufacturers for noncompliance?	7. Car not meeting standards cannot be manufactured or sold; $1,000 penalty for each violation. (Secs. 107 and 108.)	7. No provision.	7. Strenthen sanctions: Nader.
8. Should cars be federally certified if they comply with Federal standards?	8. No provision.	8. Car federally certified for labeling and advertising purposes if prove compliance with Federal standards. (Sec. 7.)	
9. Should manufacturers be required to notify consumers or Government of defects and fix defects?	9. No provision.	9. No provision.	9. Notify Government: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Harris, Nelson: Nader; physicians for automobile safety. Notify consumer: Senators Mondale, Magnuson, Bayh, Bible, Clark, Gruening, Edward Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, McGovern, Metcalf, Morse, Pell, Randolph, Tydings, Yarborough, Muskie, McGee.
10. Should the agency have specific authority to sponsor construction of test car?	10. Implied authority. (Sec. 104.)	10. Implied authority. (Secs. 4(b) and 5.)	10. Specific authority: Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Javits, Harris, Nelson: Nader; physicians for automobile safety; New York Senator Speno; Gikes; American Trial Lawyers.
11. Should the funds for this title be increased?	11. Fiscal year 1967, $3 million; fiscal year 1968, $6 million; fiscal year 1969–72, $9 million each year. (Sec. 115.)	11. Cost to be determined in committee. (Sec. 13.)	11. To construct test car: increase $3 million for fiscal year 1967 to $13 million. Senators Ribicoff, Robert Kennedy, Javits, Harris, Nelson.

LISTING OF KEY UNRESOLVED ISSUES IN THE ADMINISTRATION'S TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966, APRIL 22, 1966—Continued

Points in Question	Provisions in Administration Bill	Provisions in National Traffic Safety Agency Bill Cosponsored by 45 Members	Recommendations of Congressmen and of Witnesses Before Congressional Committees
TITLE II—TRAFFIC ACCIDENT AND INJURY RESEARCH AND TEST FACILITY			
1. Should the construction and operation of facility or facilities be made mandatory?	1. Permissive authority for construction and operation. (Sec. 201.)	1. Requires establishment of research center to examine every facet of traffic accident phenomena. (Sec. 4(b).)	
2. Should the funds for this title be increased? See items 7–10 under title III for issues on Federal research programs.	2. Three million dollars for planning facility and sufficient funds for construction. (Secs. 202 and 203.)	2. Cost to be determined in committee. (Sec. 13.)	2. Funds for construction should not have open-ended authorization: AASHO.
TITLE III—HIGHWAY SAFETY			
1. Should criteria for a qualified State traffic safety plan be defined?	1. Does not set forth criteria.	1. Sets forth six general criteria. (Sec. 8(d).)	
2. Should specific projects for State programs be required in legislation?	2. Projects generally described. (Sec. 301.)	2. Projects generally described. (Sec. 8(d).)	2. Include all roads and highway lighting: Institute of Traffic Engineers. Specific higher allotment for driver education and inspection of cars: RIBICOFF. Specific higher allotment for all phases of driver education: National Education Association. Add community traffic safety programs with 90-percent Federal funds to cities and counties: National Association of Counties. Require accident investigation training: Stieglitz and Gikes.
3. What method of setting and administering standards for State programs should be adopted?	3. Secretary work with other Federal agencies in setting standards. State programs should meet minimum standards. (Sec. 301.)	3. Secretary's set standards. State programs must meet minimum standards. (Secs. 6(a) and 8(d).)	3. Highway design standards should remain joint State-Bureau of Public Roads effort: AASHO. Secretary's set standards with State and local governments and professional organizations: International Association of Chiefs of Police and Institute of Traffic Engineers.
4. What should the definition of "State highway department" be?	4. Departments, boards, or official charged by law to administer any part of State highway safety program. (Sec. 305.)	4. State designate agency qualified to administer traffic safety program. (Sec. 8(d).)	
5. What formula should be used for the distribution of funds to States?	5. Seventy-five percent on basis of population and 25 percent under Secretary's discretion. (Sec. 301.)	5. Ratio: amount of gasoline sold in State bears to total gasoline sold in United States. (Sec. 8(b).)	5. Distribute 25 percent by area: AASHO. Professional police advise Secretary in disbursing 25 percent: International Association of Chiefs of Police.
6. Should funds for State grants under this title be increased?	6. Fiscal year 1967, $40 million; fiscal year 1968–69, $60 million; fiscal year 1970–71, $80 million; fiscal year 1972, $100 million. (Sec. 303.)	6. Cost to be determined in committee. (Sec. 13.)	6. Increase funds: RIBICOFF; National Education Association; AASHO; National League of Cities.
7. Should research, development, and testing by Federal Government be made mandatory?	7. Secretary authorized to conduct research. (Sec. 301.)	7. Secretary authorized to conduct research. (Sec. 5.)	
8. Should the funds for Federal research under this title be increased?	8. Fiscal year 1967, $10 million; fiscal year 1968, $20 million; fiscal year 1969, $25 million; fiscal year 1970, $30 million; fiscal year 1971, $35 million; fiscal year 1972, $40 million. (Sec. 304.)	8. Cost to be determined in committee. (Sec. 13.)	
9. Should the collection, interpretation, and publication of data statistics, and other information on traffic safety be specified in law?	9. No provision.	9. Provision included. (Sec. 5.)	
10. Should Federal accident reports be made public?	10. Not public except for research with individuals not identifiable. (Sec. 307.)	10. No provision.	10. Make public: Nader, American Trial Lawyers. Findings of fact be public record but conclusions only for research: ROBERT KENNEDY, not public: Cornell Laboratories.

POSITION STATEMENT ON UNRESOLVED ISSUES [1]

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. An agency should be specified by Congress and charged by it with the responsibility of building a uniform and safer traffic environment. Proponents of the "no agency" position say this will give the executive branch greater "flexibility." We argue that there must be a "focus of leadership and action," and draw an analogy with the FAA which has had notable success in air safety. We do not argue that the agency has to do everything that might be done but that it could bring an end to the diffusion of responsibility and, in some instances, overlapping of effort.

2. A traffic safety administrator should be designated by Congress to personify and fix responsibility for traffic safety. Our bill provides for his appointment by the President as is now the case with the FAA administrator, although the mode of selection is not so important as the designation of the office. Again we seek to end diffusion of effort and further fix responsibility for the provision of national leadership in a field which is much more complicated and difficult than that facing the FAA administrator.

3. A periodic consumer traffic safety bulletin for motorists should be published on a regular basis. Although not required by law the FAA publishes such a bulletin nationally and in my region which alerts and informs pilots as to vital matters affecting safety. For example, motorists are often unaware of acutely accident prone traffic locations, or new discovery of causes of accidents or resulting injuries, or what procedures to follow in case of injury.

4. An annual report to Congress, comprehensive as to casualties and important developments touching on the traffic safety environment with recommendations is sorely needed. The specific assignment to gather accurate data on traffic accidents would bring an end to the present situation where we are confronted with conflicting and incomplete data. The Bureau of Public Roads gets its data from the National Safety Council, a private agency, and the National Safety Council states that not all jurisdictions cooperate in furnishing data.

5. The General Treasury is the logical source of funds for our traffic safety program, not the highway trust fund. The administration proposes to use the trust fund as a mechanism for disbursing funds which would be transferred from the General Treasury. It is anticipated that these funds, the equivalent of a 1-percent auto excise tax to finance both the beautification program and traffic safety, will not be sufficient and that additional funds will have to be appropriated. There is no indication as to which program has priority over the funds available from the 1-percent transfer. If, as President Johnson has said, traffic safety is second only to national defense in importance, then traffic safety programs should be financed and budgeted along with other Federal expenditures.

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

1. All motor vehicles, including trucks, should be included in the definition and enforcement of motor vehicle safety performance standards. Testimony already presented quoted a study indicating that trucks were involved in 39.3 percent of all fatal accidents. An example of one problem that now exists: The failure to require a simple fifth wheel device on tractor trailers results in jackknifing, the most murderous kind of circumstances. Failure to include trucks would continue the present diffusion of attention and effort and no case has been made for not including all motor vehicles under one agency.

2. The setting of motor vehicle safety performance standards should be mandatory. They are mandatory for all other transportation in interstate commerce and the results have been impressive.

3. Standards should be set within 6 months. They can be interim and fairly elementary standards until more data is gathered, conferences held with the auto industry and State officials, and a better understanding gained as to the nature and extent of standards necessary to protect our people.

4. Standards should be made effective within 1 year after they are set. It is obvious that new standards cannot be applied overnight. On the other hand, no case has been made for a period to exceed 24 months.

5. Existing informal industry standards should be formalized and would provide a good beginning for the definition of standards by law.

6. The standard-setting function of the General Services Administration should be transferred to the Traffic Safety Agency and the Department of Transportation. Here again, there should not be diffusion of effort and confusion of duty.

7. Sanctions should not be placed on manufacturers for noncompliance until we have more experience and information. Contrary to the canard that the public is not interested in safety, the definition of recommended safety standards by the Federal Government and the certification of those vehicles that meet these standards, would have a profound influence on the consumer and would provide an incentive to the manufacturer to meet those standards.

8. Motor vehicles should be certified for compliance for the obvious reason that the consumer is in no position to make judgments that require engineering training. The motor vehicle is a complicated machine and the consumer should have this protection just as clearly as he should be protected from harmful drugs.

9. Manufacturers should be required to notify the traffic safety agency of defects which endanger human life when they are discovered and the agency should notify the public. Here, again, is a development which demands attention but must be handled in a way that is fair to the manufacturer and the consumer.

10. The Traffic Safety Agency should be authorized to fabricate motor vehicles for the purpose of testing and development of safety features. It should not attempt to build a prototype car if by this term it is suggested that the Government get into the design of a car to which all others must conform. The Government's role in design should be limited to safety performance only.

11. Funds for the development of motor vehicle safety standards as provided in the administration bill appear adequate to a layman although no expert testimony on the amount necessary has yet been presented by the administration.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENT AND INJURY RESEARCH AND TEST FACILITY

1. The construction of a research facility or facilities should be mandatory and should not be permissive. Congress should not give the executive branch authority not to do something that is so critical in relation to every other facet of our traffic problem. This is not to say that there must be a new physical establishment although there is little evidence that an adequate one exists. The point is that such a facility or facilities should be established and operated.

2. The funds recommended in the administration bill for planning this facility appear to be adequate, although again no expert opinion has been presented by the administration in support of this 3-million figure.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

1, 2, and 3: General criteria for a qualified State traffic safety plan should be defined and definite procedures for eliciting the opinion of State officials in the formulating of such criteria should be provided. The naked phrase, "The Secretary shall determine" is a slap in the face of countless able State officials who must ultimately make the plan work, and the effort to develop a national traffic safety program can have much better chances if the State, local, and private forces are brought into a working partnership to determine these criteria.

Conditions and structures vary from State to State and it would be impossible to cut the pattern to fit each one exactly. On the other hand the elements in the traffic safety picture are nearly the same wherever there are motor vehicles. It would therefore be desirable for legislation to attempt to designate these elements as explicitly as possible.

4. Just as the Federal diffusion of effort, lack of explicit assignment of responsibility, and low priority have contributed to our failures, so the States have failed to overhaul their own structures which have the same characteristics. The States do not have a focus of leadership, an explicit assignment of responsibility, or a high priority for traffic safety. The States should be required to designate one agency they deem qualified to administer the overall traffic safety effort in the State.

5. The formula for distributing grant-in-aid funds must necessarily be on some matching basis and it would appear that the case for 75 percent based on the amount of gasoline sold in each State and 25 percent based on the discretion of the administering official in the Federal Government is more supportable than for the 75 percent to be based on population. The correlation between gas sold and traffic flow should be closer than population and traffic flow.

6. Funds for grants-in-aid should not be projected for more than the next 3 years for the practical reason that there has been no expert testimony as to the amounts required. Time and again it has become evident that we have not pulled together in one place available data and that we need more study in depth as to where tax dollars for traffic safety can be applied with the most positive results. We need to buy some brains and put them to work promptly and then legislate and appropriate later on the basis of positive findings.

7. Research, development, and testing should be made mandatory by act of Congress. There are forces and there are individuals who take the easy way out and dismiss our awful losses by the use of cliches such as "the nut behind the wheel," the "crashproof automobile" and the "accident proof road." We laymen know that the traffic accident is most often a complex occurrence in a complicated environment and that research, development, and testing can get results in this area as it has in others.

8. Funds for research need not be projected beyond 3 fiscal years. No expert testimony has been presented as to the amounts which could be used to good effect in the next biennium.

9. The public is entitled to have the results of the collection, interpretation, and publication of statistics on traffic accidents.

10. Facts from reports of investigations by the Federal Traffic Safety Agency should be made public. This right of the public is not incompatible with the right of those doing the investigation and collection of data from having to languish in courtroom corridors waiting on the trial of automobile damage suits.

---

[1] These numbered statements match the points in question on the attached charts.

TEXAS A. & M. BOARD OF DIRECTORS ADOPTS RESOLUTIONS URGING CONGRESS TO CONTINUE FULL SUPPORT FOR HATCH AND SMITH-LEVER PROGRAMS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, our land-grant colleges have brought innumerable benefits to this country. This system down through the years has demonstrated the value of sound cooperation between the Federal Government and institutions of higher education. There have been no more successful Government programs than those which exist between the Government and the land-grant colleges. Our abundant agriculture is the product of this relationship. I am proud that one of the finest of the land-grant colleges in the country is located in my State—Texas A. & M. College.

Recently the board of directors of Texas A. & M. passed resolutions urging Congress to provide necessary increases in funds for the Hatch Act program of assistance to State agricultural experiment stations, and to consider carefully the disruptive influence that would come from the proposed change in the basic policy of allocating Federal funds under the Smith-Lever program of support for the Cooperative Extension Service.

I deplore the action of the Budget Bureau in causing the many proposed cuts in the Agriculture Department budget. Agricultural research is at the heart of the phenomenally successful agricultural sector of our economy. You cannot stop and start these programs; continuity is necessary to successful research. The action of the Budget Bureau would have undesirable repercussions for many years.

The House has acted wisely in its restoration of these items.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of the Texas A. & M. board of directors be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ON THE SMITH-LEVER FUNDS

Whereas the Federal budget as recommended by the President of the United States to the 89th Congress, 2d session, proposes the reduction of Federal funds allocated to the State land-grant universities for support of the Cooperative Extension Service according to formula as defined in the present Smith-Lever Act and increase by the same amount funds to be allocated to State land-grant universities for support of the Cooperative Extension Service on the basis of project proposals; and

Whereas the basic Smith-Lever funds have traditionally been allocated to each State on the basis of a formula contained in the law since its passage in 1914; and

Whereas this method of allocating funds to the several States permits the maximum response to local needs; and

Whereas the Cooperative Extension Service has historically been responsive to national needs as evidenced by the special programs carried on during two world wars and during the great depression of the 1930's; and

Whereas the proposed change in the allocation of funds would require serious and disruptive adjustments in the ongoing extension program of Texas A. & M. University: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of Texas A. & M. University system, meeting this 5th day of March 1966 at College Station, Tex., That the Congress of the United States be urged to consider the benefits that have come to this Nation from the comprehensive educational programs conducted by the Cooperative Extension Services of the land-grant universities since the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 and the serious and disruptive influence that would come from the proposed change in basic policy of allocating Federal funds; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes and copies thereof, signed by the president of the board, be sent to the Executive Director of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and to the Texas Senators and Texas Members in the House of Representatives in Congress urging their support of appropriations in accordance with the formula contained in the present Smith-Lever Act.

H. C. HELDENFELS,
President.

RESOLUTION ON THE HATCH FUNDS IN THE 1967 FEDERAL BUDGET

Whereas the 1967 Federal budget proposes to reduce the funds under the Hatch Act payable to the State agricultural experiment stations in the amount of $8,500,000; and

Whereas the Hatch Funds have been the base of strength in the successful agricultural research programs; and

Whereas the proposed reduction of Hatch Funds would do irreparable harm to the research program in agriculture and to the agricultural industries of this State and Nation; and

Whereas the specific loss of the Agricultural Experiment Station of Texas A. & M. University of an amount of funds under the Hatch Act of over $300,000 would cause severe and lasting reduction of agricultural research in Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the board of directors of Texas A. & M. University system meeting this 5th day of March 1966, at College Station, Tex., That the Congress of the United States is urged to consider the benefits to this Nation that have come from the research of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations since the passage of the Hatch Act in 1887, and the irreparable harm that would come from the loss of scientific effort and manpower from the national and world production of food; and be it further

Resolved, that Texas A. & M. University urges Congress to continue, and to provide necessary increases in, the fund support under the Hatch Act for the year 1967 and beyond; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes and copies thereof, signed by the president of the board, be sent to the executive director of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and to the Texas Senators and Texas Members in the House of Representatives in Congress urging their support of adequate appropriations for maintenance of the current level of agricultural research under the Hatch Act and the need for increased effort in research in the agricultural sciences.

H. C. HELDENFELS,
President.

BANK MERGER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is now taking the position that Public Law 89–356, the Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966, "has not resulted in any substantial change in substantive antitrust law." This statement appears, among other places, in the Department of Justice's reply brief filed in the Crocker-Anglo National Bank case in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. In this same reply brief, referring to my comments on the Senate floor with respect to the effect of the omission from the new law of the Clayton Act phrase, "in any line of commerce," the Department of Justice made the following comments:

> We must take the position that Senator ROBERTSON'S statement cited on page 7 of defendant bank's memorandum is an unauthoritative personal impression of an individual legislator. While the Senator did sponsor the bill in the Senate, it was a House-drafted bill he sponsored on the day following its passage in the House.
>
> Neither Senator ROBERTSON, his committee, nor any other Senate committee held hearings or wrote a report on the statute in question. Nor did the Senator participate in the formulation of the bill in the House. Nowhere, in the act itself or in its legislative history, are interpretations such as Senator ROBERTSON'S to be found.

These statements give the impression that the Senate did not know what it was doing when it accepted the House version of S. 1698, the Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966, and sent the bill to the President for his signature.

This impression is not correct, and I should like to complete the record on the subject.

S. 1698, as introduced by me on April 5, 1965, would have exempted all bank mergers approved under the Bank Merger Act, past, present, and future, from section 7 of the Clayton Act and sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act. The Bank Merger Act of 1960—which required consideration of both banking and competitive factors, with the public interest the controlling consideration—would again have been the governing statute, as I am convinced Congress intended it to be, and the unwarranted and incorrect judicial legislation contained in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases—the application to bank mergers of the Clayton Act rule that the competitive aspects of a merger are controlling—would have been clearly and forthrightly repealed. The Department of Justice was invited three times—on April 6, 1965, May 15, 1965, and May 27, 1965—to give the committee the benefit of its views on my bill. Although the Department of Justice had a representative present at the hearings on S. 1698, and was well aware that the bill proposed complete repeal of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act as far as bank mergers were concerned, no advice on the bill was received from the Department of Justice or the Antitrust Division.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee adopted the Proxmire amendment. This made no substantive change in the antitrust laws, but merely placed a 30-day statute of limitations on future suits under section 7 of the Clayton Act and sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act in case of bank mergers approved under the Bank Merger Act and granted immunity with respect to all bank mergers consummated before its enactment, including the six cases pending in court. The Senate passed this bill on June 11, 1965, after defeating a motion by the chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee to delete the exemption for the cases pending in court.

I followed the proceedings in the House very closely, both through accounts in the press and through statements made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Without going into details or breaking any confidences, I can say that I discussed these proceedings and the various drafts that were proposed with Members of the House. I noted with interest the proceedings which led up to the opening of hearings on August 11, 1965, and the continuation of hearings through September 28, 1965. I watched with interest the proceedings which led up to the filing by Representative ASHLEY of the House Banking and Currency Committee report on S. 1698 on October 19, 1965—House Report No. 1179. It was as a result of my close attention to the House proceedings that I joined with four other Senators in writing a letter on October 22, 1965, to the Attorney General, requesting him to refrain from further steps in the cases pending in court until the Congress had an opportunity to conclude its consideration of the pending bank merger legislation in the 2d Session of the 89th Congress. This letter specifically referred to the fact that "the bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee would also provide new standards to be applied in the cases involving the three mergers consummated after the Philadelphia decision."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I followed closely the further proceedings which led up to the drafting of the bill which was introduced on January 19, 1966 as H.R. 12173, and the preparation of the report on this bill, filed January 24, 1966—House Report No. 1221. In particular, I noted the Attorney General's letter to Representative REUSS of January 5, 1966, printed in the House committee report on H.R. 12173. With this letter, the Attorney General enclosed a redraft of S. 1698 as reported October 19, 1965, which would have made competitive factors absolutely controlling, with the single exception of prospective bank insolvencies—the failing bank rule of the Clayton Act. The Attorney General said in his letter of January 5, and I agree with him, that "the proposed revision accurately reflects the present law applicable to bank mergers." I agree with him that this was the rule of the Philadelphia and Lexington cases and it was the law on January 5, 1966. But the Attorney General's recommendation was not adopted by the House Banking and Currency Committee or the House or the Senate, and it is not the law now. The Congress clearly and specifically rejected the Attorney General's recommendation. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter and draft bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and draft bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1966.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Confirming oral discussions between you and my staff, I am responding to your letter of October 20, 1965, in which you requested my comments and suggestions with respect to proposals offered by yourself and by Messrs. ASHLEY and OTTINGER to achieve uniformity of standards to be followed by the banking agencies, the Department of Justice, and the courts in reviewing bank mergers. Your letter and your subsequent assistance were very helpful to us in our further consideration of the matters involved in the proposed legislation. To meet the problems suggested by your letter and certain other difficulties, we have drafted the attached revision of subsections (5) and (7) of the Ashley-Ottinger bill. I believe that the proposed revision accurately states the standards which Congress, in the Bank Merger Act of 1960, directed the banking agencies to apply in passing on bank mergers. In amplifying in detail the position outlined in my letter of September 24, 1965, to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the proposed revision clarifies some of the possible ambiguities that that letter may have contained.

As you have pointed out in your letter, my letter of September 24, 1965, to Chairman PATMAN commented favorably on the objective of providing uniformity of standards for bank mergers; and, as I stated, I have no objection to making it clear by statute that the standards applied by the courts should be identical to those which the banking agencies are directed to apply by the Bank Merger Act.

My views in this regard, however, as stated in my September 24, 1965, letter, stem from the premise that the appearance of conflicting standards is undesirable, particularly where it is felt by the industry to be a substantial problem, and not because of any belief that the standards specified in the Bank Merger Act and those applied by the courts are, in fact, significantly different. I should like to repeat here my strong belief that the differences, if any, in the standards applied to bank mergers by the courts and the standards applied by the agencies have been overstated. Therefore, it is vitally important in my view that any legislation aimed at achieving uniformity of standards should not, by inadvertant language, create entirely new and untested standards in this field. The analysis in your letter of October 20, 1965, illustrates, however, that it has been very difficult to draft statutory language creating uniform standards without also modifying existing law in undesirable ways.

For example, as you point out, the Ashley-Ottinger proposal could be reasonably interpreted to permit the regulatory agencies and the courts to approve a merger that violates the Sherman Act. This would effect a substantial change in current law, for, as is clearly indicated by the legislative history of the Bank Merger Act, that act was not intended to affect in any way the applicability of the Sherman Act to bank mergers.

Moreover, according to the Ashley report of October 19, 1965, the proposal "would change the present standards for the consideration of bank mergers" and would provide "in effect, that the general principle that substantially anticompetitive mergers are absolutely prohibited is to be modified in the case of banks to the extent that a 'merger transaction which tends to lessen competition may be approved where the probable adverse competitive effect thereof is clearly outweighed in the public interest by the probable effect of such transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served'." In thus permitting the single factor of "convenience and needs" to override all other considerations, the proposal goes far beyond the desirable objective of achieving uniformity in the review of bank mergers by means of a direction to the courts and agencies to take into account all of the standards of the Bank Merger Act, and does not accord with my view that a substantive change in existing law is neither necessary nor appropriate.

As you know, we also had some difficulties with your bill, again largely stemming from the fact that it incorporated novel tests that would create new uncertainties in this area of the law and might lead to a substantial modification of antitrust principles, although this was clearly not your intent. I understand that my staff has reviewed the proposed revision of subsections (5) and (7) of the Ashley-Ottinger bill which I am enclosing herewith, and that you are agreeable to the proposed revision.

I believe that the proposed revision does not conflict in any way with the views expressed by Secretary Fowler in his letter to you of January 3. In my opinion, the proposed revision accurately reflects the present law applicable to bank mergers, and with the exception which I shall shortly note, I would be agreeable to the Ashley-Ottinger bill if revised as indicated.

The exception concerns section 2(a) of the Ashley-Ottinger bill. For the reasons set forth in my testimony and in my letter of September 24, 1965, I remain opposed to this or any similar provision.

Sincerely,
NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General.

DRAFT REVISION OF SUBSECTIONS (5) AND (7) OF S. 1698, AS AMENDED IN PROPOSED BILL FILED BY CONGRESSMEN ASHLEY AND OTTINGER

1. Subsection (5) to read as follows: "The responsible agency shall not approve a proposed merger transaction unless it finds that such transaction will be in the public interest, taking into consideration the effect of the transaction on competition (including any tendency toward monopoly) and the importance of protecting the public against bank insolvency. In determining the effect on competition and the likelihood of insolvency, the agency shall take into account the following factors, among others:

"(A) The financial history and condition of each of the banks involved;

"(B) The adequacy of their capital structure;

"(C) Their future earnings prospects;

"(D) The general character of their management; and

"(E) The convenience and needs of the communities to be served."

2. Subsection (7) to read as follows:

"(A) Any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of a merger transaction shall be commenced prior to the earliest time under paragraph (6) at which a merger transaction approved under paragraph (5) might be consummated. The commencement of such an action shall stay the effectiveness of the agency's approval unless the court shall otherwise specifically order. In any such action, the court shall review de novo the issues presented.

"(B) In any judicial proceeding attacking a merger transaction approved under paragraph (5) on the ground that the merger transaction alone and of itself constituted a violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the act of July 2, 1890 (sec. 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2), the standards applied by the court shall be identical with those that the banking agencies are directed to apply under paragraph (5).

"(C) Upon the consummation of a merger transaction in compliance with this subsection and after the termination of any antitrust litigation commenced within the period prescribed in this paragraph, or upon the termination of such period if no such litigation is commenced therein, the transaction may not thereafter be attacked in any judicial proceeding on the ground that it alone and of itself constituted a violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the act of July 2, 1890 (sec. 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2), but nothing in this subsection shall exempt any bank resulting from a merger transaction from complying with the antitrust laws after the consummation of such transaction."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the 2 weeks which intervened between the filing of the report and passage of S. 1698 by the House on February 8, 1966, with the text of H.R. 12173 inserted, there was ample opportunity for review of the bill by the Senate.

During this period the Banking and Currency Committee considered the House proposal. On January 25, 1966—1 day after the House report on H.R. 12173 was filed—I wrote a letter to each member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, enclosing and calling attention to the House bill and report and comparing the House version with earlier versions of S. 1698. Senators DOUGLAS and PROXMIRE replied in a letter of February 1, 1966, raising questions concerning the bill, in which they specifically recognized "the fact that the section is a substantive change in the law." I replied to Senators DOUGLAS and PROXMIRE by a letter of February 2.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letters of January 25 and February 2, and the letter of February 1 from Senators DOUGLAS and PROXMIRE be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on February 8, 1966—the day that the House passed S. 1698 amended to include the text of H.R. 12173—I wrote to each of my colleagues in the Senate, advising them that I intended to bring the bill before the Senate and move to concur in the House provisions and send the bill directly to the President. This letter made it clear to all Members of the Senate that the bill was a compromise between those who, like myself, felt that the antitrust laws should not apply in any respect to bank mergers and those who felt that the position taken by the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases should be upheld and that no legislation was needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter of February 8, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in accordance with the suggestion made in my letter of February 2 to Senators DOUGLAS and PROXMIRE, I called a meeting of the full Banking and Currency Committee on the morning of February 9, 1966. At this meeting, the committee had before it the Summary of the Bank Merger Act amendments, comparing my original S. 1698, the Proxmire amendment to S. 1698 which passed the Senate, and the House bill (H.R. 12173). This summary is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 9, at page 2657. As indicated in my remarks at page 2652, the Banking and Currency Committee reviewed the House bill extensively and, after defeating a motion to reject the amendment authorizing the banking agencies to intervene in antitrust cases, instructed me by a vote of 9 yeas to 2 nays to accept the House amendments in toto.

I need not review the extensive discussion of S. 1698 on the floor of the Senate on February 9, 1966—including particularly the discussion of the motion made by the chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to refer the bill to his subcommittee for hearings—to make it clear that the Senate was well aware that the purpose and intent of S. 1698, was in the words of Senator HART:

> The antitrust laws shall not be applied to bank mergers as they occur generally in our economy, but rather, that bank mergers shall be subject to a different test. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 9, 1966, p. 2660.)

Ordinarily, I would not take notice of comments made by litigants in court as to the legislative history of a bill. However, when the suggestion is made on behalf of the Department of Justice that the Senate did not give full consideration to the significance and effect of a bill on which it was acting, it is, in my judgment, appropriate to make it clear that the Senate had ample notice, and was fully aware, of the issues and considerations involved.

In my judgment the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional duty to legislate, has expressed its decision clearly and decisively. The majority of the House Banking and Currency Committee and the majority of the House, and the majority of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the majority of the Senate, have decided that they do not want the general rules of the antitrust laws to apply to bank mergers—they want bank mergers to be decided under, and controlled by, special standards designed for this regulated industry, under which consideration must be given both to competitive factors and to the convenience and needs of those who are to be served; they do not want the competitive factors to be controlling; on the contrary, they want the banking agencies and the courts to approve mergers, even though competition will be substantially reduced, if the convenience and needs of the community to be served clearly outweigh the loss of competition.

In my opinion the Justice Department should accept this decision by the majority of the Congress, and should carry out its functions and responsibilities under these new and different standards.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
October 22, 1965.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: It has been our earnest hope and expectation that by the conclusion of the first session of this Congress action would have been completed on a measure clarifying the existing confusion with regard to bank mergers. Such a bill, S. 1698, passed the Senate without dissent last June, and a somewhat different but equally effective measure was reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee just this week—but not in time for final floor action by the House and Senate.

It is our expectation that we will have enacted such a measure in the early days of the forthcoming session of Congress. This being so, we are deeply concerned that during this interim period, action might be taken with regard to several of the bank mergers now challenged by your Department which might prejudice the application of the new law. As you know, two such merger cases are now in the final stages of settlement by divestiture, and the four others are in various pre-trial or trial stages. All of these cases will be basically affected by new legislation which, as we have noted, we expect to be enacted shortly. For example, the bill passed by the Senate would terminate all six pending cases; all versions of the bill considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee would terminate the three mergers consummated before the decision of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia case; and the bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee would also provide new standards to be applied in the cases involving the three mergers consummated after the Philadelphia decision.

We take this occasion to express our concern lest what seems clearly to be the sense of Congress in the area of bank mergers be frustrated by action taken in any of the six pending cases.

Accordingly, we urge that you refrain from any further steps in these cases, particularly the two which are now in the final stages of divestiture, until the Congress has had an opportunity during the coming session to conclude its consideration of the pending bank merger legislation.

In addition, in view of the fact that these cases are pending in the judicial branch, we request that on our behalf you respectfully bring our views to the attention of the several courts having jurisdiction over these six pending cases.

Respectfully submitted.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate.
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency.
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate.
WALLACE F. BENNETT.

EXHIBIT 2

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
January 25, 1966.

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: As you, of course, know, the bank merger bill passed last spring by our committee affected over 2,000 banks with assets over $50 billion and thousands of stockholders.

At long last, the House committee agreed on a bill which has now been introduced by Chairman PATMAN as H.R. 12173. I enclose for your information a copy of that bill and the report thereon.

While my personal preference was for the bill I introduced originally, which made it crystal clear that bank mergers would not be subject to the antitrust laws in any respect, I accepted in the committee and on the floor the Proxmire amendment. The bill which thus passed the Senate gave authority to the Justice Department to proceed against future mergers before they were consummated but exempted mergers from attack under the antitrust laws after they had been consummated.

H.R. 12173, like the Senate bill, would give the Justice Department an opportunity for 30 days to proceed against bank mergers before consummation. Furthermore, instead of giving an exemption from the antitrust laws for all mergers which have been consummated in the past, including all six cases pending in court, as the Senate bill would have done, H.R. 12173 would not exempt the three post-Philadelphia mergers now pending in court—in St. Louis, Tennessee, and San Francisco. In addition, H.R. 12173, unlike the Senate bill, would not provide any future exemption for bank mergers from the antimonopoly provisions of section 2 of the Sherman Act.

Possibly the chief difference between the Senate bill and H.R. 12173 is that under the Senate bill, the banking agencies would first approve a merger after considering both the competitive factors and the public interest factors relating to convenience and needs of the community, and if the case went to court under the Clayton Act, the court would be limited, under the decision in the Philadelphia case, to competitive factors alone, and the overall public interest and convenience needs of the community could not be considered. Under H.R. 12173, both the banking agencies and the courts would follow the same standards, somewhat more restrictive than those under the Bank Merger Act of 1960, but still permitting consideration of both the convenience and needs of community and the public interest on the one hand, and competitive factors on the other hand.

Since an overwhelming majority of the House committee prefers the provisions of their bill, if we ask for a conference, I, as chairman of the committee, would have to state we prefer the provisions of the Senate bill.

I am very definitely of the opinion that we should accept the provisions of H.R. 12173, regardless of minor differences we might prefer if we had complete power in the matter. Accordingly, I recommend that the Senate accept the House bill, which I expect the House will send to us in the next few days.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
February 1, 1966.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: We appreciate your courtesy in letting us know, in your letter of January 25, of your inclination to recommend that the Senate agree to H.R. 12173, the Bank Merger Act Amendments recently approved by the House Banking and Currency Committee, in place of S. 1698 which the Senate passed on June 11, 1965.

In our opinion, however, several of the House committee's provisions drastically alter the intent of the Senate bill and should be rejected by the Senate. At the very least they should be the subject of serious consideration in committee or in conference before the committee recommends that the Senate accept them in whole or in part.

The House committee bill contains unprecedented language authorizing officials of a Federal banking agency to appear in court in bank merger proceedings in opposition to the Attorney General. (Sec. 1(7)(D).) Thus, although the Attorney General, the responsible executive official under the law, initiates such proceedings in accord with the policies of the President and the requirements of the law, other officials of the Federal Government representing the Comptroller General, the FDIC or the Federal Reserve Board, may, of their own motion, oppose the Attorney General in court.

To our knowledge there is no precedent or justification for such a two-headed approach by the executive branch to court enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The second major change in the House committee bill would permit the responsible Federal banking agency to approve a proposed merger whose effect is to substantially lessen competition, create a monopoly or be in restraint of trade if the agency finds "the anticompetitive effects of the proposed transaction are clearly outweighed in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the needs and convenience of the community." (Section 1(5)(B).)

While it is true that the convenience and need factors are taken into account under the Bank Merger Act of 1960, in our judgment the House bill radically increases the weight to be given to these factors. Whereas the 1960 act simply provides that these considerations are to be taken into account as one of several factors in determining the effect on competition of the proposed merger, the House bill establishes convenience and need as loopholes permitting a merger despite its clear anticompetitive effect.

The indication in subsection 5 that new substantive standards are being created is strongly reenforced by section 3, which would permit a renewal of bank merger applications even for mergers previously held unlawful. The point to be emphasized is not the number of cases affected by this section but the fact that the section is a substantive change in the law.

In our opinion, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee should exercise its responsibility to closely examine these radical changes either in committee or in conference. The innovations in the House bill clearly weaken the previously expressed intent of the Congress that vigorous competition be maintained in the banking system. They may well encourage a Presidential veto.

With best wishes

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.
WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
February 2, 1966.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: I have received your letter of February 1 in reply to my letter of January 25 concerning the Bank Merger Act Amendments. You state that several of the House committee's provisions drastically alter the intent of the Senate bill and should be rejected by the Senate, or at least should be seriously considered in the committee or in conference.

The two provisions specified in your letter are the authorization for the Federal banking agency which has approved a merger to appear in court when the Attorney General attempts to attack the merger, and the change with respect to the standards for future approvals, particularly the relative weight of convenience and need and competitive factors.

I recognize, of course, that these amendments alter the intent of the Senate bill. The long and bitter controversy in the House which resulted in these amendments could, of course, be expected to result in changes in the intent of the Senate bill. However, I do not think it follows from this that they should be rejected by the Senate. On the contrary, I am convinced that in fact they much more closely carry out the intent of the Congress when it passed the Bank Merger Act of 1960 than did the Senate bill.

I agree that the authorization for the banking agencies to appear in court is not common or customary. But it is also not common or customary to have the Attorney General go into court to attack actions taken by other Government agencies. As you know, my bill—the original S. 1698—would have avoided this by not permitting the Attorney General to attack bank mergers approved by the banking agencies. However, it appears to be the intention of the Supreme Court and the Congress to let the Attorney General attack bank mergers approved by the banking agencies, through antitrust suits against the merging banks. This being so, it makes sense to me to let the banking agency involved tell the court why it had found the merger in the public interest and why it had approved the merger. The alternatives are to let the position of the banking agency be presented to the court by the merging banks, which may well not know the reasons for the approval, or by the Attorney General, whose position is one of conflicting interests to say the least, or to let the court act in ignorance of the agency's reasons for approval of the merger.

There are, of course, numerous precedents for permitting the departments to take positions in court different from those of various agencies, one being represented by the Attorney General and the other by its own counsel. While I am not aware that there is any statutory provision of this sort in the case of antitrust litigation, it seems appropriate to note that in the St. Louis merger case the court before which the case is being heard specifically authorized the Comptroller of the Currency to intervene as a defendant and granted him authority to file an answer in the case by an order dated July 9, 1965.

I agree with you that the proposed standards for consideration of future mergers give a great deal more weight to the convenience and needs of the community than do the Supreme Court decisions in the Philadelphia and the Lexington, Ky., cases. I do not, however, agree that the House bill increases the weight to be given to these factors in comparision to the Bank Merger Act of 1960. On the contrary, the requirement that a substantial lessening of competition must be "clearly outweighed" by the public interest factors makes the test more rigorous, I am convinced, than that provided in the Bank Merger Act of 1960. In addition, the new bill does not provide exemptions from the antimonopoly provisions of section 2 of the Sherman Act, which the Senate bill would have done, and it would not exempt the three "post-Philadelphia" mergers now in court. These changes must be weighed along with the other changes made by the House.

In conclusion I should like to emphasize as strongly as I can that I am convinced that any effort to do other than to approve the House-passed bill—either by way of seeking a conference or otherwise—would be to end all chance for legislation on this subject this year or in the foreseeable future. I do not think there is the slightest chance of making any appreciable improvement in the bill at this point.

After an extraordinary amount of controversy and confusion the House Banking and Currency Committee has agreed virtually unanimously on a compromise bill. I have been reliably informed that advocates of stronger Justice Department control and advocates of stronger Federal banking agency control have irked the President, and he has informed Speaker McCormack that he wants this issue promptly disposed of. Consequently, the Speaker will bring the bill to an early vote following the rule that was granted today by the unanimous vote of the Rules Committee, and the Patman bill will receive an overwhelming majority in the House. Incidentally Mr. Patman stated before the Rules Committee that he personally favored the bill, and that was going quite far considering what he had said against the major provisions of the bill in the past. After the bill reaches us, we can either accept the Patman bill and send it to the President for his signature, or we can propose amendments and ask for a conference. But, from everything I can hear, the House will not accept any changes in the compromise bill which has been agreed on by virtually all Members of the House and by the White House.

I intend to call a meeting of the committee to discuss this matter informally so that, when the bill is received from the House, we can act promptly and I trust with as much unanimity and decisiveness as the House Banking and Currency Committee has now shown and as I expect the House to show when the bill comes before it. Needless to say I shall urge both the committee and the Senate to accept the House bill promptly.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman.

Exhibit 3

U. S. Senate,
Committee on Banking
and Currency,
February 8, 1966.

Dear Colleague: As soon as possible after the Senate completes voting on the cloture motion on Thursday, a motion will be made to take from the desk the Patman bank merger bill, S. 1698, as amended, and concur in the House bill, without amendments.

I send this letter to express my hope that you will support this motion because in my opinion it will be the only chance this session to secure this much needed legislation on this important subject.

In that connection I would remind you of my bank merger bill of 1960 and the clear understanding we all had at that time that bank mergers were exempt from section 7 of the Clayton Act and, for all practical purposes, from the Sherman Act also.

To the surprise of the legal profession and over the vigorous protests of Mr. Justice Harlan, Mr. Justice Stewart and Mr. Justice Goldberg, the Supreme Court held in the Philadelphia case that section 7 of the Clayton Act applied to all bank mergers, including those definitely in the public interest as well as those that created a monopoly. Under that decision, and under the Lexington, Ky., case involving section 1 of the Sherman Act, there is no defense in a bank merger case regardless of how strongly all banking agencies feel a merger is in the public interest.

In recent years more than 2,000 banks with assets of more than $50 billion and hundreds of thousands of stockholders have merged. Under existing law, the Justice Department has the power to attack every one of those mergers and to break up or split in two the resulting banks.

At present the Attorney General disclaims any intention to proceed in that manner and wrote a letter to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee indicating his desire to see legislation that would provide a uniform approach and guidelines for the Justice Department as well as for State and banking agencies.

The bill that will be before us Thursday, of which Representative Patman is patron, is the committee's answer to those like myself who felt that the antitrust laws should not apply to bank mergers and to those who felt that the Justice Department should have a complete veto over bank mergers, both past and future.

I have made contacts with House leaders and find that the House Banking and Currency Committee will be adamant in its refusal to consider any changes whatever in its bill. Any effort on our part to amend it, either to give greater control to the Justice Department or to give less control to the Justice Department, will either be an exercise in futility or will result in a failure to have any legislation on this subject this session. Hence, my earnest appeal for support of the motion to accept the House bill and send it to the President for his signature.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. Willis Robertson.

GEORGE WASHINGTON GOOD GOVERNMENT AWARD TO SENATOR ERVIN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on the Sunday evening of May 1, 1966, it was my privilege to attend the annual George Washington dinner of the American Good Government Society. This traditional celebration commemorates the anniversary of George Washington's first oath taking for the office of President of this great Nation.

The society takes this opportunity to honor two citizens, often distinguished Members of Congress, but always from opposite parties, for their services in behalf of sound constitutional government, and for their services to the United States generally.

Last Sunday, the George Washington Good Government Award was presented to two distinguished Members of Congress: the senior Senator from North Carolina, Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and Representative Gerald R. Ford from Michigan, who is House minority leader.

It was my honor to present our distinguished colleague Senator Ervin for the receipt of this important award. Needless to say, the recipient is one particularly deserving of this recognition. He has truly served his State and Nation well for many years.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a copy of my remarks presenting Senator Ervin.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Roman L. Hruska, on Presentation of George Washington Good Government Award to Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., Washington, D.C., May 1, 1966

How happy and fortunate a circumstance it is that this year there is a coincidence of two meaningful dates—the annual meeting of the American Good Government Society and Law Day.

This 14th annual meeting marks the occasion for presentation of the George Washington Award in recognition of and tribute for service on behalf of sound constitutional government.

Law Day signals the annual commemoration the Nation over of the indispensable place and role of law in our civilization.

There are not many public officials who are justly entitled to the acclaim of their fellowman for concurrent excellence and preeminence in all aspects of the government and law; those of the practitioner, the jurist, the scholar, and the lawmaker.

But, there has been selected and designated as such a man, the Honorable Sam J. Ervin, Jr., the senior Senator from North Carolina, a good friend and admired colleague.

This selection and designation were wisely and confidently made. This is testified to by the judgment of the trustees and members of the American Good Goverment Society, and by the enthusiastic and spirited attendance at this signal occasion.

We all know that our honoree will add luster and brilliance to the tradition of this society's selections for its annual award.

We all know that our honoree has served loyally and competently in the fields of Government and of law.

The Honorable Sam J. Ervin's distinguished career in the Senate began in 1954. He is presently a ranking member of three Senate Committees: Armed Services, Government Operations, and the Judiciary.

His highly responsible and effective work in the U.S. Senate has surprised no one who knew him. At the time of his appointment in 1954, to succeed the late Clyde R. Hoey, a State paper commented editorially:

"Endowed with grace and charm and a warm personality completely devoid of affectation, Sam Ervin will win myriads of friends for himself and his State in Washington by virtue of his personal magnetism alone. On the big issues affecting the welfare of his State and Nation he can be depended upon to vote not as a conservative or as a liberal but as a conscientious legislator who thinks things through for himself and tries to do what he believes to be in the best interests of the public he serves."

This indeed was an accurate prophecy.

From the time of his graduation from the University of North Carolina, his return from World War I duty in Europe with the scars of his bravery and the symbols of his gallantry, including the Silver Star, the Purple Heart, and Distinguished Service Cross, Sam Ervin was "a man to watch." He is now and has been for a long time a man listened to and followed.

But a well-rounded personality like Sam, deserves a well-rounded introduction. To be frank, this forward-looking man has been known to attack his goal from the rear. Perhaps it can be passed off as brilliant strategy. The fact remains, my friends, that we are honoring a sociological first. Yes, it is true, Sam Ervin was a Harvard drop-in.

Now don't stop me if you have heard this one: Sam "read" for the law in North Carolina after returning from overseas. He was admitted to the bar of that State in 1919. No doubt anticipating the present demand for those associated with that fine school, he went to Harvard for a graduate year in law. He liked it so much he then stayed a second year. Finally, Dean Pound, one of my most outstanding fellow Nebraskans, told him that if he would only take the first year work, he would have a Harvard degree. So, his third year there he did, and he does.

After some 15 years in the private practice of law with his father, he was appointed to the judiciary of his State. He has represented North Carolina in the U.S. House of Representatives. He has also been a member of the legislature of that State. And, he was 6 years an associate justice of the highest court in his State.

Sam Ervin has been everything but a sideline observer. He is lawyer, jurist, legislator, patriot, and fisherman, not necessarily in that order. And, as the Senator himself often has and will shortly again introduce irrefutable evidence, he is also a delightful raconteur.

It is particularly appropriate that the George Washington Award honors Sam. He is recognized as one of the foremost constitutional lawyers in America. His unexcelled work as chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary is testimony that this recognition is well deserved. It has been an education and a pleasure for me to serve with him on this subcommittee. That experience is certain inspiration and foundation for the esteem and respect in which I hold him.

After a few encounters with the man, one becomes immediately aware of his deep love for and interest in our living Constitution. He is one of those remarkable chapter-and-verse men who cannot only cite a decision by case name and year but also give you the page number of the volume in which it appears.

In the area of citizens' rights under the Constitution, he is astoundingly learned. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, the Senator has conducted public hearings, field studies, investigations, and background research relating to the rights of persons subject to military jurisdiction, rights of the American Indian, rights of the mentally ill, rights in the administration of criminal justice and voting requirements. He has inquired into the right to counsel in proceedings before the various Federal agencies and the rights of Federal employees in firings, hirings, and personnel practices.

He strongly believes in the efficacy of that basic underpinning of our Constitution—the separation of powers and the resulting checks and balances. The concept of our Republic as a union of federated States, with definite roles for the Union and each State respectively is a real and living one for him. It is an article of faith in its highest sense.

Even apart from the 10th amendment, the Senator is a persuasive advocate of the position that in many areas the States can simply do the better job.

Labels simply do not fit Sam Ervin. Call a position "liberal," "conservative," "right," "left," or "middle" or what you will. The particular sound you use is not a relevant fact for him. His judgment is much more soundly based. It is based on a philosophy of government developed by a mind steeped with a clear understanding of the Constitution; steeped with respect for and trust in the people and their ability to govern themselves; tempered by the experiences of active participation with his fellow countrymen in the troubles and joys of living. Such attributes as these are increasingly harder to find among lawyers, legislators, and citizens these days. They abide firmly and naturally in Sam Ervin. In fact, he, like George Washington, can truly state that "it has been my faithful study to collect my duty from a just appreciation of every circumstance by which it might be affected."

Senator Sam Ervin, it is a great honor to me to have been asked to present to you this tribute in recognition of your continuing and dedicated practice of good government.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the language of the society's resolution on this occasion perfectly expresses the esteem in which Sam Ervin is held and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the resolution of tribute and honor to the Honorable Sam J. Ervin, Jr., from the American Good Government Society.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of Tribute and Honor to Sam J. Ervin, Jr.

Patriot, statesman, and distinguished constitutional jurist, has served the people of North Carolina and the United States for a third of a century—as a soldier in battle, a State legislator, a Representative in Congress, judge in criminal and superior courts, 6 years as associate justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, and almost 12 years in the U.S. Senate.

Among his notable achievements are: perfecting the Immigration Act of 1965; defining the rights of mental patients in the District of Columbia—model legislation for the States; improving the administration of justice in Federal criminal cases; and Senate approval of judicial review of Federal grants to church-related schools.

Gifted with a genius for law and justice, devoted to the Constitution as framed, Senator Ervin must be numbered among the great lawyers, one of the smallest societies of mortal excellence. North Carolina can be justly proud of her most distinguished living son.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in responding, Senator Ervin displayed the humor and sound judgments for which he is so well known. Although the extracts from his remarks, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as a part of my remarks, does not include them, his talk was replete with the anecdotes for which he is so justly famous. You can be sure that the large audience at the dinner was not denied this pleasure. His remarks which follow evidence his deserved reputation as a scholar and man of commonsense.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of U.S. Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., in Accepting the George Washington Award at the Meeting of the Good Government Society in Washington, D.C., May 1, 1966

As I accept the George Washington Award of the Good Government Society, I am both thankful and humble.

My thanks are due my distinguished colleague, Roman Hruska, for his most gracious remarks concerning me.

My thanks are also due to the loyal friends and beloved relatives from North Carolina and elsewhere whose presence honors me far above any poor merit of mine.

My thanks are likewise due to the Good Government Society for bestowing upon me an award of high distinction. My consciousness that I am not deserving of it makes me very humble.

My thanks are due, moreover, to my wife and my sweetheart, who happens to be the self-same person, for attending this meeting. Her presence always minimizes my sorrows and multiplies my joys.

The Good Government Society merits the gratitude of all who love America for its devotion to good government. This is so because it is impossible to overemphasize the benefits of good government or the evils of bad.

Let us meditate for a moment upon the attributes of good government.

Good government derives its powers from the consent of the governed. Good government is government under a written constitution, which establishes a government of laws and puts it beyond the control of impatient public officials, temporary majorities, and the varying moods of public opinion. By a government of laws, I mean a government in which certain and constant laws rather than the uncertain and inconstant wills of men govern all the officers of government as well as the people at all times and under all circumstances.

Good government esteems freedom to be civilization's most precious value, and knows that Thomas Hobbes spoke eternal truth when he said: "Freedom is political power divided into small fragments." Accordingly, good government divides its powers among different depositories to prevent despotism. The Constitution of the United States does this in two ways. First, it allots to the Federal Government the powers necessary to enable it to discharge its functions as a central government, and leaves to the States the power to regulate their internal affairs; and, second, it divides the powers it vests in the Federal Government among its three departments in this manner: The power to make law in Congress, the power to execute law in the President, and the power to interpret law in the Supreme Court and the inferior Federal courts.

Good government secures to each citizen political, economic, and religious freedom by specific rights which he is entitled to assert, even against government itself. To this end, it guarantees to him such rights as the right to due process, the right to speak and worship freely, the right to earn his livelihood in any lawful calling, the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property, and the right to perform such acts and enter into such contracts as may be necessary to do these things.

In the nature of things, all government operates through the agency of men, and no government can be better in practical operation than the men who operate it.

The men and women who made the America we love gave us the best system of government ever devised by the experience and wisdom of man and his purpose to be free and self-governing. The system, properly administered, virtually insures good government. But even this well-nigh perfect system will not produce good government unless two conditions are met.

The first is that the people must be eternally vigilant; and the second is that public officers must be faithful to the trust reposed in them by our government of laws.

Let us consider for a moment the threat which the unfaithfulness of public officers to their trust presents to good government. Paradoxical as it may seem, the unfaithfulness of public officers to their trust may be motivated either by venality or by good intentions.

Good government may be thwarted to a substantial degree by venal men. Fortunately, however, the number of such men in public office is comparatively small, and the injury they do to good government is not wholly without remedy.

It is otherwise with respect to public men whose good intentions prompt them to govern by their own notions of what they deem to be desirable rather than by the rules established by our government of laws. They not only thwart good government, but they also jeopardize the existence of our government of laws itself.

Justice Louis D. Brandeis had these considerations in mind when he declared that "experience teaches us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficient."

And Daniel Webster made some penetrating observations concerning public officers who substitute their good intentions for rules of law. He said:

"Good intentions will always be pleaded for every assumption of authority—It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions. There are men in all ages who mean to govern well, but they mean to govern. They promise to be good masters, but they mean to be masters."

Since the best system of government will not produce good government unless it is administered by good men, America prays for the services of good men in these words of Josiah Gilbert Holland:

"God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

MENACE OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it is hard to believe that this great Nation of ours can be a bastion of freedom against world communism if we ignore subversive elements growing stronger in our own society.

In South Vietnam our forces are meeting the forces of communism in a clear-cut exchange of strength. Our young men are laying down their lives to honor our commitment to the people of South Vietnam.

But here in our own country, in our States and cities, the menace of subversive activity has not diminished. In fact, recent court rulings have helped to provide a shield for these subversives to work behind.

These elements, both Communists and those who further the Communist causes through misguided intention, or as dupes, have found fertile soil to root their movements in. They have, as I have pointed out in past statements, infiltrated the so-called civil rights organizations on many levels.

They have agitated for racial unrest and have deliberately sought to destroy communications and cooperations between persons of good faith of all races.

These elements were active in the invasion of Mississippi and I think they can be thanked for doing extensive damage to race relations in Mississippi and other States.

Today, however, Mr. President, I am not sounding a note of warning for the sake of my State. I am speaking out because I have the interests of all Americans at heart.

I believe in the coming months, many cities in many States will feel the effects of the poison spread by subversives.

Because of such activities, riots and efforts to destroy all effective law enforcement may well visit the North, South, East, and West of this country.

The bitter truth of this assertion is that these Communists and their allies are attempting to use as instruments of power shrewdly diverted poverty programs.

Mr. President, I believe there is evidence to illustrate this charge in many States and cities.

In Mississippi, where these subversive characters have had a field day attempting to incite a Negro revolution, and I mean a revolution aimed at destroying democratic institutions, I have been able to obtain data which I believe will be of interest to the Nation.

Furthermore, this information clearly shows the ease with which this movement maintains elaborate links extending to other States. I am convinced that although Mississippi has been the target of an aggressive movement to undermine our ideals, these same subversive elements are at work spewing their poison into the bloodstreams of the residents of other areas.

These Communists and their fellow travelers have discovered that the treasury of funds "donated" for civil rights activity is no longer capable of supporting their expanded operations. It must have come as a blessing to them to discover that certain programs under the poverty program might lend themselves to infiltration and financial manipulation.

It must be evident, even to the most uninformed, that the administration of millions of dollars by subversive elements could be a very dangerous thing.

Dollars are powerful tools in the hands of Communists or those who blindly accept the guidance of Communists. These funds, meant for lofty and worthy purposes, meant to educate and train men and women for useful employment, meant to help children obtain a headstart in academic achievements, can also be skillfully used to politically poison the minds of the recipients.

This danger does not exist in communities where responsible citizens have volunteered their time and energies to make these programs successful. There is no danger of these programs becoming twisted to subversive ends where regular State agencies participate in their administration.

But, when qualifications to participate in such programs are so general that nonexistent communities, or organizations formed overnight in backrooms can apply successfully, then the danger of Communist infiltration rears its head.

These pseudo-organizations are fertile ground for subversives. I am not claiming that all such organizations are Communist fronts, or that all of them are infiltrated by Communists.

Indeed it is often true that persons and organizations which are demonstrably not Communist, and which may not even know that they are serving the purposes of world communism, still are helping the achievement of a Communist objective.

For example, in Mississippi the so-called Freedom Party and its activities receives Communist support both direct and diffused. Communist infiltration of the so-called Freedom Party can be traced clearly and demonstrated readily.

But, support for this group has also come from groups and individuals that are not Communist, and from others in which the Communist influence, if it exists, is not clearly evident or easily exposed.

Mr. President, I have called attention to evidence respecting this Communist infiltration in the Freedom Party in previous remarks before the Senate. I will not take the time to again repeat this evidence, but I would respectfully advise those interested to refer to the record on this point.

Today I would like to make some observations about Communist infiltration in Mississippi regarding attempts to administer poverty funds, or to use those funds for purely political ends.

While I am not going to make a blanket charge that any organization or all its members are Communist, I believe the information I shall reveal will be clear as to the possible influence Communists and their supporters may have in such organizations.

Mr. President, in Mississippi we have an organization called the Poor People's Corp. This so-called corporation is domiciled in Jackson, Miss., and in New York City. This group, which pretends great interest in the poor people of Mississippi, is mostly made up of people who are nonresidents of Mississippi and who are completely unfamiliar with the problems particular to Mississippi.

I believe the tactics, supporters, and activities of this Poor People's Corp. are very revealing.

It might be called to the attention of the Senate that this organization sponsored the recent "camp-in" across from the White House in an effort to garner publicity.

I believe that several members of this same group helped to heckle Sargent Shriver recently when he attempted to present a report on what was being done by his agency to help the poor.

At that time, Mr. Shriver termed his hecklers "professional agitators," and I could not agree more with him.

In fact, the supporters and many members of this so-called Poor People's Corp. have interesting past histories of professional agitating and protesting.

The New York office of the Poor People's Corp. is located on the 10th floor of a building at No. 5 Beacon Street. The Poor People's Corp. was "given" space on this floor which has otherwise been used.

One of the sponsors of this corporation is William Addison Price.

Price is 51 years old, a native of Chicago, Ill., and is presently employed as a writer and editor by the National Guardian, a so-called "progressive" weekly of the American Labor Party. The American Labor Party has manifested itself as a virtual official propaganda arm of Soviet Russia, while denying that it has any affiliation with the Communist Party.

Price has been active in the New York Council to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, and reportedly has served as its executive secretary.

In February 1955, Price was cited for contempt of Congress when he refused to answer various questions after having been called before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as a witness.

He was convicted in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The conviction was subsequently overturned on appeal, on a technical point.

Among the questions Price refused to answer when he was before the Internal Security Subcommittee as a witness were these:

> Are you, Mr. Price, a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?
>
> Now, Mr. Price, have you ever attended Communist meetings?
>
> Mr. Price, did you in 1941 sign a statement in defense of the Communist Party, which thereafter appeared in the Daily Worker of March 5, 1941?
>
> Mr. Price, did you every fly an airplane for or at the direction of the Communist Party?
>
> Is it not a fact, sir, that you did fly a privately owned airplane, as distinguished from a military or Naval airplane—that you did so as a private citizen; that you flew in Latin and South America, and that during that flight you had another person with you for a good part of the time?
>
> Now is it a fact that this party who accompanied you on part of that trip was a courier for the Communist International?

Of course, refusal to answer a question is not the same as answering it in the affirmative. But I do not think any loyal citizen of this country should have any trouble answering those questions with resounding "No's".

Another sponsor of the Poor People's Corp. is John T. Gojack. Solid intelligence has described Gojack as an active Communist Party member during the period from 1941 through 1948, with the possible exception of about a year. Reportedly, Gojack was expelled from the Communist Party in 1945, but is said to have been reinstated in 1946.

In 1949, Gojack was considered an inactive member of the Communist Party, having been excused from regular membership duties because of the burden of his position as an officer of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, District No. 9.

During the period from 1958 through 1963, Gojack attended various meetings of the Socialist Workers Party. He addressed a number of these meetings. The Socialist Workers Party is an organization cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States.

Gojack was twice convicted and sentenced for contempt of Congress, and both times his conviction was reversed by the Supreme Court for technical reasons.

Gojack was a supporter of the National Committee to Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs. The Rosenbergs referred to were the convicted atom spies.

Gojack has turned up as a supporter of various so-called civil rights organizations operating in the South, including, besides the Poor People's Corp., the SNCC, the SCLC, and the so-called Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Gojack is reported to have participated in recruiting leftwing students into various civil rights projects in the South.

Another supporter of the Poor People's Corp. is Marc Edelman. This man's full name is Marc Paul Edelman, the first named spelled with a "c," and the last name spelled E-d-e-l-m-a-n. He is sometimes known as Mark Edalman, the first name spelled with a "k" and the last name spelled E-d-a-l-m-a-n.

Edelman is a native of New York City. He lives at 263 Primrose Avenue in Mount Vernon, N.Y., and lists his occupation as a cabinetmaker.

This young man, who will not be 21 years of age until December of this year, is the same Marc Edelman who threatened to burn his draft card at a draft-card-burning demonstration at the U.S. courthouse in Foley Square, New York City, on October 28, 1965, and who actually did burn his draft card publicly during a demonstration at Union Square, New York City, on November 6, 1965, sponsored by the Committee for Non-Violent Action.

Edelman has been described as a member of the staff of the Student Peace Union and a member of the executive board of the Westchester Students for Peace and Civil Rights. Both of these are Communist-infiltrated organizations.

Edelman and four others, who also burned their draft cards at the demonstration on November 6, 1965, were indicted on December 21, 1965, for violation of the Selective Service Act. All of them took the fifth amendment when they appeared before the grand jury for the southern district of New York on December 8, 1965.

This same Marc P. Edelman was arrested on February 1, 1966, by the New York Police Department, and charged with disorderly conduct, in connection with a sit-down demonstration protesting participation by the United States in the war in Vietnam.

Also known as a supporter of the Poor People's Corp. is one Sanford Weinman, of 176 Lexington Avenue, New York City. This man is known to his associates as "Sandy" Weinman. On May 15, 1965, he was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct after he and 25 other demonstrators protesting U.S. intervention in Vietnam had crossed a police barricade and staged a so-called "sit-in" on Fifth Avenue, blocking the Armed Forces Day Parade in New York City.

Sandy Weinman was one of the persons who attended a meeting of the Poor People's Corp. in New York City on April 4, 1966.

Weinman is employed as a salesman for the Poor People's Corp., operating in New York, selling products made by the Poor People's Corp. in Mississippi. According to statements made by Weinman about a month ago, he was then planning to go to Mississippi within 30 to 60 days from that date. Weinman has been heard to say that he was a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. though he has not been so identified by any other person. Though he has sometimes posed as a student, Weinman is actually 30 years old having been born May 3, 1936, at Brooklyn, N.Y.

Ellen Maslow, 26 years old, a native of New York City, who lives at 317 East 19th Street, New York City, works in the New York City office of the Poor People's Corp. and is reported to be in charge of that office.

This is the same Ellen Maslow who was one of 26 demonstrators protesting U.S. intervention in Vietnam who were arrested and charged with disorderly conduct on May 15, 1965, when they crossed a police barricade and staged a sit-in on Fifth Avenue, blocking the Armed Forces Day parade.

Ellen Maslow was one of 145 workers in a so-called "Mississippi summer project" who signed a petition calling for abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, according to a report in the December 15, 1964, edition of The Worker, East Coast Communist newspaper.

Ellen Maslow, formerly worked with the so-called "Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party."

Among the reported donors to the Poor People's Corp. are Theodore Bikel, 3 Washington Square Village, New York City; Leon Davis, president of Local 1199, Drugstore Employees Union, 709 Eighth Avenue, New York City; Corliss Lamont, 315 West 106th Street, New York City; and Albert Mayer, 550 Park Avenue, New York City.

Julie Taylor, a white woman, who lives at 338 East 6th Street in New York City, is a designer for the sewing co-ops being operated in Mississippi by the Poor People's Corp. In private conversations, this woman has called herself a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and has stated that she could not come to Mississippi because if her affiliation with the Communist Party became known it would hurt the cause.

Julie Taylor is also known to have stated that all of the students who were recruited to travel to the South to take part in so-called "civil rights" projects have been members of leftwing organizations or Communist fronts.

Julie Taylor has been reported as stating that she knew Bayard Rustin as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. This is the same Rustin who organized and led the march on Washington, D.C., in August 1963.

Julie Taylor was listed as one of the persons attending a meeting of the Poor People's Corp. in New York City on April 4, 1966.

Len Chandler, a Negro male, and his wife, Nancy, a white female, are on the staff of the Poor People's Corp. in New York City.

Both the Chandlers have been active in the movement against U.S. participation in the Vietnam war, and Nancy Chandler has been heard to say that she and her husband belong to the Communist Party.

Len Chandler has achieved a measure of notoriety as a Negro folk singer. In September 1964, in Battle Creek, Mich., he was a featured performer, along with Dick Gregory, nationally known Negro comedian, in a benefit show advertised as "A salute to freedom" and sponsored by the local chapters of CORE and the NAACP.

Just a year ago, on May 3, 1965, Len Chandler arrived in Nashville, Tenn., for an appearance in a concert at Vanderbilt University, under the auspices of Students for a Democratic Society. The following day, on May 4, 1965, the Nashville Tennessean pointed out in a news story that a year earlier, during the spring of 1964, Chandler had been arrested on charges of breach of the peace and malicious destruction of property, while he was participating in a so-called civil rights demonstration, and that these charges had been dropped in general sessions court. The Tennessean reported that on the occasion of his 1965 visit, Chandler had commented that he felt things in Nashville had improved. On August 9, 1965, Len Chandler was arrested by Metropolitan Police in Washington, D.C., on a disorderly conduct charge, while a participant in the so-called Washington summer action project. He was convicted on this charge, and received a sentence of 20 days in jail or a $25 fine.

This is the same Len Chandler who was listed in posters as one of those who participated in a sing-in for peace in Vietnam, at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on September 24 and 25, 1961.

According to a press release, issued by the John Brown Commemoration Committee of New York, Len Chandler was one of the sponsors of a John Brown memorial pilgrimage to Harpers Ferry, W. Va., on December 11, 1965. The purpose of this pilgrimage was stated to be—

> To mark the 160th anniversary of the execution of John Brown by the slaveholders' government, and to confer there on a new policy of self-defense, self-reliance, and internationalism in the struggle for equal rights through active resistance against the vile racist theory and practice of white supremacy.

In the January 1966 issue or The New Student South, which is published by the Southern Students Organizing Committee, a fraternal group of students for a democratic society, Chandler was listed as one of the folk singers who would "make up the core" of a traveling folk festival, under the sponsorship of that organization.

On March 26, 1966, the National Guardian revealed in a news story that on March 25, 1966, Chandler had been among the speakers at the Lincoln Memorial Temple Congregational Church in Washington, D.C., in connection with the so-called "international days of protest," organized by the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam. This same news story stated that on March 26, there would be a demonstration at the White House followed by a march to the South Vietnamese Embassy.

Len Chandler's wife, Nancy, participated in the Mississippi summer project in August 1964, as a secretary in Jackson, Miss.

Among the reported financial supporters of the Poor People's Corp. are Theodore Bikel, Corliss Lamont, Albert Mayer, and Leon Davis.

Theodore Bikel, according to an article printed in December 1962, in the east coast Communist newspaper, the Worker, was one of those who signed an attack on the House Committee on Un-American Activities for investigating Communist penetration of women's peace groups.

Corliss Lamont, son of Thomas W. Lamont, former chairman of the board of J. P. Morgan & Co., has a long record of pro-Communist and Communist front activity, but has consistently denied being a member of the Communist Party.

Notwithstanding his denials of Communist Party membership, Corliss Lamont has served as chairman of the Bill of Rights Fund, which he operated from his home at 450 Riverside Drive, New York City. In just 1 year, for which figures are available—the period from June 1, 1956, to May 31, 1957—the Bill of Rights Fund made more than $30,000 in grants for cases involving membership in the Communist Party.

Independently of the Bill of Rights Fund, Lamont has aided the defense in various Communist Party cases before the courts. He has defended the Communist Party directly, having signed a letter to that effect, addressed to President Roosevelt, during the period when the Communist Party was supporting the Stalin-Hitler pact.

During that same period Corliss Lamont urged the defeat of a bill to bar the Communist Party from the ballot in New York State.

Corliss Lamont condemned revocation by Queens College of the charter of the American Youth for Democracy, formerly known as the Young Communist League, a Communist controlled organization.

When the so-called Soviet purge trials, characterized by tortured confessions and wholesale executions, shocked the civilized world in the 1930's, Corliss Lamont signed a number of statements in support of those trials.

For many years Corliss Lamont has been associated with organizations whose central purpose was to advance the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States. He has supported various organizations which followed sympathetically every twist and turn of Soviet foreign policy.

Now, let us look at Albert Mayer. Reportedly, the Poor Peoples Corp. is counting on Albert Mayer to be one of its major contributors.

Mayer is reported to have made various contributions to Communist and Communist-front organizations and causes.

In July 1948 he was among those appealed to by the Civil Rights Congress to support the fight against the indictment of Communist Party leaders. The Civil Rights Congress is an organization which has been cited by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive and Communist. Mr. Mayer's response to the solicitation in 1948 is not known. However, it is known that in 1952, Albert Mayer contributed to the so-called "Pittsburg Defense Fund" of the Civil Rights Congress.

Albert Mayer was listed in an edited report of the Cultural and Scientific Congress for World Peace, held in New York City in March 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as one of the conferees. He was characterized at that time as planning and development adviser to United Provinces Government, India. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions is an organization which has been cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

This same Albert Mayer, characterized as "town and rural planner" consultant to the United Nations and adviser on planning to the Government of India, was a candidate for the position of trustee of the Institute of Pacific Relations, in 1953. The Institute of Pacific Relations is an organization which has been characterized as "an instrument of Communist policy" by the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate, as a result of a long and detailed investigation.

Leon Julius Davis, who has also been known as John Arnold Abbott, was born David Lifshitz, which name he legally changed to Leon Davis in March 1938.

On different occasions, Davis has stated he was born in Antopol, Poland, and in Pinsk, Russia. He has variously given his birth date as November 17, 1907, and November 17, 1912. He claims derivative citizenship from his father, Isaac Lifshitz, who was naturalized February 21, 1929; but it is obvious that if Leon Davis was born in 1907, as he has formally stated on more than one occasion, he was more than 21 years old at the time of his father's naturalization. Davis has claimed to have been granted citizenship in Bronx Supreme Court in May of 1927, but this claim cannot be verified from court records.

A sergeant in the Communist Undercover Squad of the Detroit Police Department testified under oath before the Dies Committee, in 1938, that Leon Davis was one of the Detroit Communists who fought in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade during the Spanish Civil War.

Leon Davis has a long list of affiliations, which include the following:

In 1941, the Schappes Defense Committee. Morris U. Shappes was a leading Communist functionary.

In 1942, the Citizens Committee to Defend Earl Browder. Browder was a convicted Communist leader.

In 1942, chairman of a joint meeting sponsored by the Young Communist League and the Wholesale and Retail Industry Workers, CIO at Manhattan Center, New York.

In 1943, reception committee in honor of William C. Foster. Foster succeeded Browder as head of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Davis has been engaged in union activity for many years. He is president of Local 1199, Drugstore Employees Union, and a former president of Local 1150, a retail drug employees union. He was a speaker at the founding conference, and was elected to the executive board, of the Distributive Workers Union, in 1950.

As president of Local 1199, of the Drugstore Employees Union, Davis signed a "Call to a National Labor Conference for Peace," to be held in Chicago, Ill., in 1949. This conference was cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a cooperative undertaking of the Communist Party, U.S.A. and the Soviet Union.

Davis was a recognized leader of the hospital strike in New York City in 1959, which was actively supported by the Communist Party.

In 1948, Davis testified before a Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The purpose of this subcommittee was to investigate communism in New York City distributive trades. Davis, before this subcommittee, invoked the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution as a basis for refusing to answer questions about his affiliations with the Communist Party.

Reportedly, Davis was a member of the Young Communist League of the Communist Party in Hartford, Conn., in the 1920's.

Davis' wife, the former Julia Gaberman, is reported to have worked for the Soviet Government Trading Agency, AMTORG. In August 1951, she was suspended without pay by the New York City Department of Welfare for refusing to appear at an inquiry into her Communist activities; and she was dismissed from her welfare department, as a social worker, in October 1951.

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is living high off the hog today. The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is not exactly poverty-stricken but it is one of the major beneficiaries of the Federal poverty program.

The OEO probably knows, and if it does not know it should know, that some of the activities OEO is supporting in Mississippi are doing more to help the Communist-inspired Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party than to help underprivileged children, or the truly needy.

The OEO probably knows, and if it does not know it should know, that so-called "freedom schools" in Mississippi, under the same general control as the group to which the organization has just given over $5 million, have been teaching the techniques of draft dodging, and the evils of this country's policy in Vietnam.

The OEO probably knows, and if it does not know it should know, that one Freedom School teacher who came to Macomb, Miss., from Chicago has publicly admitted that he taught his pupils that the U.S. Air Force in Vietnam is careful to drop bombs on colored people instead of on white people.

The OEO probably knows, and if it does not know it should know, that one of the founders of the so-called "freedom schools" in Mississippi went to North Vietnam in January of this year for a conference with Ho Chi Minh. That man's name is Staughton Lynd. He took with him to Hanoi another so-called "civil rights activist" who participated in the Mississippi invasion, namely Thomas Hayden, who is also a founder of "Students for a Democratic Society," which is another subversive organization that opposes our Government's efforts.

If you think they are using all of that money only to fight poverty, you are not getting adequate and accurate reports.

A recent meeting of the so-called Freedom Party in Jackson, Miss., provided a classic example of how easily a federally financed program can be made to serve purposes hardly consistent with either what Congress intended to authorize, or even with the most basic democratic principles.

This meeting, billed as the second anniversary meeting of the Freedom Party, was attended by several employees of the Child Development Group, a Headstart program backed by the Delta ministry. This Headstart program I have mentioned in past remarks. A year ago they had the industry to spend over $2 million in a 6-week span, and the accounting for this expenditure is still not complete. On numerous occasions it was discovered that these Headstart funds were used to post bond for so-called civil rights workers arrested for violations of the law.

I will not now take the time to repeat the mountain of evidence about improper activities of the Child Development Group.

This grant was approved even after the Delta Ministry helped sponsor the invasion of the Greenville Air Force Base. The Justice Department declined to bring charges for the crimes committed by this action, claiming they were "petty."

The mere attendance of employees of this group, whose salaries are being paid out of a $5 million grant from OEO, is alone not to be censored. They have the right, as citizens, to participate in political activity. The attendance of these employees is, however, interesting from two other standpoints.

First, they arrived at this meeting in three new cars owned by the Child Development Group and purchased by Federal funds. Certainly attendance of a nighttime political gathering is not official business for a Headstart program.

These cars, two new Plymouths and a new Ford, were certainly not purchased by the taxpayers to provide transportation to the Freedom Party.

Abraham Wells, the driver of one of the cars, who is a Child Development Group employee, has attended similar meetings before driving these cars.

I have it on the best authority that these Headstart program employees have been told pointedly by the leaders of Freedom Party that if they wish to remain employed as area administrators at $120 per week, or as paid teachers, they must actively support the Freedom Party.

Nor is this an idle threat. George Raymond, who is on the board of directors of the Child Development Group, is also a Freedom Party officer. In fact, he is campaign manager for the Freedom Party's candidate for the Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. President, if those responsible can get away with spending for political purposes, and especially for the political uses of persons of subversive intent, a portion of the $5 million granted to this Child Development Group, there is no telling how their success could aid the Communists not merely in Mississippi, but everywhere in the Nation where such infiltration can be successful.

Mr. President, this is not a completely isolated situation. In a way, it is typical. My State is greatly troubled.

Most of the trouble is caused by persons from outside Mississippi, many of them brought into the State by one or another of the many programs and projects which make up a large part of the facade of the new Mississippi invasion.

Classified employees of the Federal Government are not wholly blameless with respect to the fomentation of racial strife, but temporary employees, and consultants, and those who get Federal money through some sort of an intermediary cause far more trouble.

It would be a great help in meeting this problem if there was only some way to control, or at least to screen, the influx of outsiders who live wholly or partly on Federal funds while they stoke the fires of racial conflict in Mississippi.

(At his point Mr. LONG of Louisiana took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as a move in this direction, I believe consideration should be given to limiting appropriated funds which Congress authorizes for the war on poverty so as to prohibit expenditure of any such moneys for salaries or expenses of any person who is not either a classified employee of the Federal Government, a top level executive of a Government department, or a qualified resident of the State in which such person is residing.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 5, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Valerian S. Karcz, national chaplain of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in the beginning didst command light to shine out of darkness, let the splendor of Thy truth and the glory of Thy goodness be reflected this solemn hour, in this historic forum of freedom in Washington, as we mark the anniversary date of Constitution Day of the Polish nation, enhanced in this, the year of the millennium of Christianity in Poland.

On the 3d of May, 1791, the Diet of Poland proceeded to pass a constitution recognizing the equality of all men and extending religious liberty to all, thereby giving to the world one of the great documents of freedom, like the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the American Declaration of Independence. Indeed, it was a symbol of the ideals of democracy and liberty. This significant fact would be reason enough to merit the good will of our great Nation, and Thy blessing, O Lord of nations. But permit us to enshrine this act in the eventful anniversary of the millennium of Christianity in Poland.

Thy providence which reaches from end to end mightily, and orders all things purposefully, did assign an important role to Poland in the year 966, on the day of baptism and in the hour of entrance into the stream of Western European civilization. The valiant people of that land, although harassed by invading hordes, although partitioned and sacrificed to the greed of totalitarian countries, never once failed to carry the cross, nor permitted the torch of freedom to be extinguished. Steadfast in their concept of freedom and of the dignity of the individual under God, they rightly won civilization's acclaim—"The bulwark of Christendom."

And so Heavenly Father, ruler of nations, in whose sight a thousand years are but as yesterday when it has passed, do Thou inspire us with the magnanimity to pause, in moments such as this, to pay tribute to a gallant member in the society of nations, and to hear our prayers that forever the chains of servitude be broken in the land of a courageous people.

Humbly we pray Thy blessing upon all gathered here, who in eagerness joined together, to celebrate another country's greatness. As Lord and Universal Father, who wills to make all men members of one family, help us to see in each other the image of God and the features of our brother, and in the spirit of Thy love effectively to obtain for every person, great or small, of whatever national origin or religious belief, the full and unhampered possession of his heritage. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today, the hearing on traffic safety.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14012) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, KIRWAN, PASSMAN, EVINS of Tennessee, DENTON, STEED, BOW, JONAS, and LAIRD.

AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14012, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Thursday, May 5, to file the conference report on the bill H.R. 14012.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

STATE DEPARTMENT DOUBLETALK

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, as all of us undoubtedly are, about the progress of events in Vietnam. Many steps have been taken to bring this problem to an early end.

That it is complex no one will question. However, adding to the complexity of the problem is the ambiguity of the answers we have so far received.

There are, in this welter of confusion, certain aspects that demand clarification, certain answers the State Department has refused to face up to, that are a bar to moving the conflict to the peace table where the ultimate solution will be found.

It is this diplomatic doubletalk that confuses our people and our adversaries as well. It is time for straight talk, to put on the line where we stand and our conditions for peace. The American people deserve to know where the administration is leading us—into the impenetrable jungle of war or into the fertile fields of peace.

One aspect that could easily be clarified today but which is clouded with uncertainty on both sides is with whom we will negotiate.

As an individual I know that you cannot stop a fight unless you get those involved to agree to stop. I for one believe we must consider all the belligerents in this action as peace table participants, not merely to have their views represented but to physically participate in the peace talks. Our State Department has indicated they see no objection to the NLF views being represented. For many months now in conversations with Ambassador Goldberg, Secretary Rusk, and other officials I have urged that the United States let the world know that we will engage in talks with all belligerents and concerned parties. And let us name the belligerents and concerned parties, including the NLF, Hanoi, and Communist China.

Let us get back to American straight talk and maybe someone will listen.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, under this administration, the people have been denied the right to know. Government officials, in the executive departments and agencies, have deliberately clouded over or withheld altogether the facts that the people should know about our foreign and domestic policies.

Secrecy has become the veil behind which is hidden the information that the people are entitled to have. Because of the farflung secrecy in our Government today, our people do not have the awareness of what is really going on, and this awareness is vital to their freedom.

It is all too true, "what the people don't know will hurt them." The right to know protects the people.

A blindly led people will gladly follow a dictator down any road, and this could happen in America if secrecy continues to be the shadow of deceit. But our Constitution requires that our leaders act in the give and take of the public's review of policies, which this administration has ignored. If we are to keep our form of government, we cannot deny the right to know.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 78]

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baring
Beckworth
Blatnik
Bolton
Bray
Burleson
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Downing
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Feighan
Fisher
Fraser
Fuqua
Griffin
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Herlong
Holifield
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Laird
Landrum
Love
Madden
Mailliard
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Morris
Morse
Morton
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
Powell
Roberts
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Selden
Steed
Sweeney
Thomas
Todd
Toll
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Walker, N. Mex.
Walker, Miss.
Watts
Williams
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

ABDUL WOHABE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10220) for the relief of Abdul Wohabe.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FRANTISEK VOHRYZKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 943) for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 943

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the periods of time Frantisek Vohryzka has resided in the United States since his lawful admission for permanent residence on March 28, 1955, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABRAHAM EZEKIEL COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2696) for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WON LOY JUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1822) for the relief of Won Loy Jung.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEONARDO TUSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4083) for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MICHAEL FAHIM ELIAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4458) for the relief of Michael Fahim Elias.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4458

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michael Fahim Elias shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien minor child of Joseph M. and Nora Daniel, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michel Fahim Daniel may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph M. Daniel, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Michel Fahim Daniel."

GUISEPPE BOSSIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7508) for the relief of Guiseppe Bossio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7508

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the immigrant laws, Guiseppe Bossio shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 1 of the Act of October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1247).

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guiseppe Bossio may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 3, 4, and 5.

On page 1, line 6, strike out "SEC. 2. Notwithstanding" and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOBO TEMEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1414) for the relief of Jacobo Temel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1414

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jacobo Temel may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR O. McNABB

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1256) for the relief of Victor O. McNabb.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MOAPA VALLEY WATER CO., OF LOGANDALE, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2270) for the relief of the Moapa Valley Water Co., of Logandale, Nev.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2270

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Moapa Water Company, of Logandale, Nevada, is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $44,790.16 representing the interest accruing prior to January 1, 1965, on three loans made to the said water company by the Farmers Home Administration in the amounts of $199,556.20, $29,980.72.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$44,790.16" and insert "$44,760.37".

Page 1, line 8, strike "$199,556.20, $29,980.72," and insert "$200,000, $30,000,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the Moapa Valley Water Co., of Logandale, Nevada".

KATHERINE NABOKOFF AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10846) for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and others.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HUBERT J. KUPPER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11251) for the relief of Hubert J. Kupper.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

NORMAN MORRIS RAINS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7354) for the relief of Norman Morris Rains.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7354

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Norman Morris Rains, of San Diego, California, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $4,782.09, the amount of salary paid to him in violation of section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62), while he was an employee of the Navy Department in the period beginning October 21, 1955, and ending September 7, 1956, because of an administrative error. In the audit and settlement of accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said Norman Morris Rains, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA MICHALSKA HOLOWECKYJ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4584) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Michalska Holoweckyj (formerly Mrs. Anna Zalewski).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4584

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Anna Michalska Holoweckyj (formerly Mrs. Anna Zalewski) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of section 204(c) of that Act shall be inapplicable in the case of Mrs. Anna Michalska Holoweckyi (formerly Mrs. Anna Zalewski)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of the Private Calendar.

MRS. MARIA FINOCCHIARO

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the "official objectors" on the Private Calendar. The rules of the House do not permit questions, explanations, or debate during the call of the Private Calendar. Nevertheless, I try to study each bill objectively and equitably.

On February 1, 1966, I objected to H.R. 4211, a private bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE]. I commend the gentleman for his genuine dedication to the cause of his constituent and for pursuing this case so assiduously and conscientiously.

The purpose of the bill was to restore U.S. citizenship to Mrs. Maria Finocchiaro who expatriated herself by voting in Italy in 1946 and 11 subsequent elections.

An act of expatriation by voting in a foreign election requires or involves a swearing of allegiance to that country, a declaration of citizenship in that country, and an implicit renunciation of U.S. citizenship. Such acts may be excused, perhaps, when the vote in a foreign election was cast in ignorance or from importunings of our Government.

Many expatriation cases are presented via private bills. Judgments regarding each individual bill should be understanding and compassionate. I have withheld objection in meritorious cases involving one or two or even three votes in foreign elections. Mrs. Finocchiaro voted in at least 12 foreign elections, however.

The recommittal of this bill does not close the door to U.S. citizenship for Mrs. Finocchiaro. The regular immigration process is open to her. Her desire for citizenship can be fulfilled under present law. Therefore, passage of a private bill to set aside the general law seems unjustified.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 14732.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 829 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 829

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14324) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against section 5 of said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the

House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 829 calls for an open rule with 2 hours of debate waiving points of order against section 5 of H.R. 14324 because that section of the bill contains a provision which will permit the expenditure of appropriations made in prior acts for contracts for architect-engineer services.

The chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics requested this waiver. I believe the Committee on Rules unanimously agreed to that provision. I know of no controversy over the rule itself, and therefore I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], House Resolution 829 will provide a 2-hour open rule for the consideration of H.R. 14324, the annual authorization for the space activities bill. It does waive points of order so far as section 5 is concerned, which has to do, as I understand it, with the architect's fee possibly going over 6 percent on some of these exotic buildings, but it ties it down to the same type of language used in the Atomic Energy Act.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize appropriations for NASA for fiscal 1967 in the amount of $4,986,864,150. It is broken down into three primary divisions:

First, research and development, $4,248,235,000; second, construction of facilities, $94,419,000; and third, administrative operations, $644,210,150.

Major programs included in the research and development portion of the authorization include:

First. Gemini, $40,600,000.

Second. Apollo, $2,974,200,000.

Third. Physics and astronomy, $126,900,000—this includes the orbiting astronomical and geophysical observatories, and the Explorer series of satellites.

Fourth. Lunar and planetary exploration, $227,900,000—this program includes the Surveyor soft-landing program, the lunar orbiter program, the Mariner probes of Venus and Mars, the coming Voyager probes of Mars, and the Pioneer project, designed to study interplanetary environment.

Fifth. Launch vehicle procurement, $132 million, including Scout, Delta, Thor-Agena, Atlas-Agena, and Centaur rockets.

Sixth. Tracking and data acquisition, $265,335,000.

There will be authorized $94,419,000 for construction at space centers throughout the country including the Goddard Space Flight Center, Cape Kennedy, Jet Propulsion Lab, and the Manned Spacecraft Center—Houston.

Congressman VIVIAN, of Michigan, has submitted additional views complaining that last year's congressional directive to distribute geographically NASA research funds and explore ways of further distributing such funds has been ignored by NASA.

Congressman WYDLER, of New York, has submitted separate views concerning the inadequate committee staffing both as to professional expertise and staff responsible to the committee's minority members. He also wants a study of aircraft noise.

Congressman FULTON of Pennsylvania has submitted a very comprehensive minority report. His objections are: First, to the expenditure of $9.1 million to construct a lunar receiving lab at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston for examining material brought back from space. He points out that as we have no information as to what samples will be brought from the moon, we really don't know what kind of a lab is needed. The site selection, supposedly an open question, was weighted toward Houston from the beginning; it is also unclear whether we actually need such a lab. The report names eight facilities already in existence which have much the same equipment contemplated for Houston.

Second, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania objects to the approval of $41.9 million to finance the Apollo applications program, a program not approved by the administration. The program will not begin, if authorized, for some 3 or 4 years, while NASA states the funds are needed in fiscal 1967 to buy extra Saturn vehicles and additional Apollo spacecraft. It is now impossible to estimate how many surplus boosters and spacecraft will be available under the current program, the committee is merely guessing, and wasting $41.9 million. Not one vehicle or spacecraft procured with these funds could be used before 1970.

Third, NASA currently has $11.9 million in unfunded authorizations and $5 million from past years. This year NASA requested $7 million, which the committee reduced to $5.5 million. Mr. FULTON seeks to rescind $10 million of unfunded authorization from previous years.

Fourth, he calls for the creation of an Office of Inspector General in NASA staffed by personnel qualified to watch spending. Almost nothing is being done today except to see that the bookkeeping is straight, not enough in view of the huge amounts passing through NASA.

Fifth, Mr. FULTON restates in greater detail the failure of NASA to follow the congressional directive concerning the need for greater geographical distribution of research contracts.

Sixth, he believes that the Jet Propulsion Lab is laboring under a too regimented situation. Control is needed, but not so as to stifle initiative in experimentation.

Seventh, finally Mr. FULTON objects to placing the Manned Orbiting Lab under the control of the Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from California have any information as to how this $5 billion request compares with expenditures for the same general purposes of last year?

I do not see such information contained in the report.

Mr. SMITH of California. We were told in the Committee on Rules, I believe, that it was a little more. However, I shall have to ask one of the gentlemen on the committee.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It was $4.986 billion. Previously it was just above the $5 billion mark.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER. $5 billion, essentially.

Mr. GROSS. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does my friend, the gentleman from California, have any information as to whether this $5 billion is above or below the budget figure?

Mr. SMITH of California. What was the original budget request?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER. The original request was for $5.012 billion. We reduced it to $4.098 billion, which represents a $26 million reduction.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. First, I would like to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] upon his excellent presentation. The gentleman from California is very knowledgeable on the space program.

The space program is technical in nature, and in detail. It requires a matter of intense study in order to come up with the facts and figures and recommendations upon which the gentleman from California has commented.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from California that during the general debate we shall have available to us the professional staff of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Therefore, if there are any questions of policy, scientific information, or programs, we shall be happy to give to the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union information on those programs, rather than attempting to do it in general debate on the rule because of the technical nature of the questions involved.

If there are policy questions or money questions, of course, they should be answered in debate.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14324) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14324, with Mr. FLYNT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 14324 is to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1967.

This bill authorizes $4,986,864,150. This is an overall reduction from NASA's original request of $26,135,850.

Actually, the committee cut the overall total by $77,735,850, but amended NASA's original request by adding funds to certain programs which we felt were underfunded. Thus, as I have said, the resulting total cut is approximately $26 million.

We are recommending $4,248 million for research and development; $94,419,000 for construction of facilities; and $644 million for administrative operations.

We are providing $40,600,000 for the Gemini program and this will complete this phase of our space program. We have flown eight Gemini flights, with four remaining.

The committee is recommending $2,974 million for the Apollo lunar program. We believe this will peak the Apollo program, and, as we draw nearer to the lunar flight, we are hopeful that the request for funds will decrease not only next year, but in succeeding years.

I will not take time to enumerate our space successes. I am sure you are all familiar with them, but I may say that we are well on our way to making a successful manned lunar landing and return to earth in this decade. Our astronauts have performed extra vehicular activities, that is to say a man has left the capsule and "walked in space."

We have rendezvoused two spacecraft to within one foot of each other, and during the last Gemini flight the Astronauts actually docked in space. These are all stepping stones in the performance of the lunar mission, and I may say that, with the exception of the space walk, they are "space firsts."

I do not for one moment, however, wish to deprecate Russian space accomplishments. The Soviets have a well rounded space program and if we ever had any doubts about their attempting a manned lunar landing, we can dispel them, for it is obvious that their program is pointed, in part at least, to a manned lunar landing. As a matter of fact, their astronauts are busy making public appearances and predicting that they will make such a landing within the next 2 to 5 years.

I might also say a few words about the Russian space program generally. They have had an extremely active and highly successful year in 1965. They launched 52 Cosmos satellites, and that is as many as they launched in all the years prior to that year.

They successfully flew a three-manned spacecraft—voskhod. They placed two communication satellites in orbit and demonstrated their effectiveness. They launched two spacecraft for Venus with one reaching the surface of the planet and the other flying by.

They also launched two proton satellites which are the heaviest in the world to go into orbit, and this pointed up the use of a new launch vehicle with capabilities about double those of the booster they have used in the past.

In addition to the foregoing, the Russians have also now achieved a soft lunar landing. Thus it is entirely clear that the Soviets have a continuing major commitment to a long-term, large-scale program in space. However, as I have said, it would appear that one of their main objectives is to attempt to land men on the moon and to undertake numbers of manned and unmanned flights in earth orbit.

However, I am confident in my own mind that if we continue our progress with the same rate of success we have had in the past, we will be the first Nation to put men on the moon.

I think it is true that we all tend to become so preoccupied with manned space flight that we sometimes do not give enough attention to the excellent work NASA is doing in other space programs.

If I had appeared before the House 7 or 8 years ago and told you that we would soon be communicating by satellites, watching television by satellite, studying weather pictures beamed to earth by satellites, navigating ships and aircraft by satellite, you most likely would have laughed at me.

And yet we are doing all of these things today, and I will wager that each one of you has now taken these far-reaching space advancements for granted. That gives you some idea how rapidly we are progressing with our unmanned space program.

NASA has performed outstanding work in its scientific programs with its orbiting solar observatories, geophysical observatories, explorer satellites, meteorological and communication satellites and its successfully completed lunar and planetary missions.

In unmanned operations using deep space probes, NASA has returned to Earth the first high-resolution, closeup photographs of the Moon with Ranger, and the first and only closeup pictures of Mars with Mariner.

These long-duration flights have demonstrated that NASA can build, launch, guide, and maneuver highly reliable unmanned spacecraft with great accuracy and over distances of hundreds of millions of miles, and bring back useful and important information.

Nearer the earth, NASA's unmanned scientific satellites have returned to earth and delivered to our scientists more scientific data in a single year than in the entire previous history of the space program.

Furthermore, an additional word should be said about our first operational weather satellite. With ESSA I and ESSA II, launched by NASA for the Weather Bureau of the Commerce Department's Environmental Science Service Administration, we are inaugurating regular meteorological satellite operations and demonstrating a major practical use of space technology.

I am also sure everyone knows the results of our pioneering with Telstar, Relay, and Syncom, which have been demonstrated in commercial operations by the Communications Satellite Corps' Earlybird.

Thus to authorize further research and development in these programs, we are recommending $126,900,000 for physics and astronomy; $227,900,000 for lunar and planetary exploration; and $70 million for meteorological and communications satellites.

Now, the committee spent about 5 weeks of hearings going over the NASA budget with a fine tooth comb and as a result the bill was amended in some respects. These changes are all reflected in H.R. 14324.

For example, the committee canceled the 1967 Venus mission and transferred these funds to the Voyager program and the 1969 Mars mission which was originally planned as a flyby. The committee is recommending that this flight be changed to include a small landing capsule so that additional vital information on Mars can be secured.

The committee also added $7½ million additional funds for research and development of the large solid propellant motors and $2.4 million for the Snap-8 nuclear generating system. The committee believes that both of these programs were underfunded, and since both may be essential to future space needs, the additional funds were provided by the committee.

Time does not permit me to go into each of the NASA programs. The committee has filed a 120-page report which fully describes all of the NASA programs in detail. Suffice it to say that the committee believes that the authorization recommended by the committee will provide NASA with sufficient funds to carry out its mission successfully, but without any frills.

And in closing, I believe I can safely say that this year's authorization request is the most frugal ever presented to the committee. It is a "bare bones" budget and any further cuts by the committee would have had the most serious adverse effect on the Nation's space program.

Finally, I want to pay my compliments to those subcommittee chairmen that worked so diligently on this bill.

The Manned Space Flight Subcommittee was headed up by two of our most resourceful members, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO]; the Space Science and Applications Subcommittee by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH]; and the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

These subcommittee chairmen, together with others members of their subcommittees, devoted long hours to those portions of the budget assigned for their consideration, and if it had not been for their dedication to the task at hand, this committee would have been hard pressed to report to you as it has today.

I may say that what I have said to you about the chairmen of the subcommittees, I want to also say about the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. They had their differences, but they reconciled these differences, and they all worked hard and assiduously at the jobs assigned to them.

In due time I will yield such time as these subcommittee chairmen may require to explain those portions of the NASA program which they have worked on.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I am glad to state to the House that our Science and Astronautics Committee, on both sides of the aisle, has worked hard going over the $5,012 million budget for space science and research submitted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year beginning July 1, fiscal year 1967.

As the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, my friend the gentleman from California, [Mr. MILLER], has told the House, we divided the committee on the basis of subcommittees, which have gone into studies in detail of the various subjects.

One of the major items about a program of this size is its very immensity. A $5 billion rate of expenditure in a year is about 1⅓ times the total budget of the entire Federal Government for the last of Herbert Hoover's administration. It is amazing that this amount of money for research and development is being conducted on space, aeronautics, and space-related factors.

We in this country must keep abreast of scientific developments in this country as well as in the world at large. Our very lives and our very security depend on that. For example, we must keep abreast of progress not only on the military level but also on the peacetime and civilian level.

Our Science and Astronautics Committee, under the act of 1958, has jurisdiction over science, research, and development wherever they occur in the Federal Government, whether in hot or in cold war and whether the programs are military or peacetime programs for peaceful purposes within and without the Government. This is likewise true, whether they are corporate, individual, college or university programs.

Another amazing point about jurisdiction of the committee is that it has jurisdiction not only above the earth in the atmosphere but also outside the earth in the universe, in the planetary system in space.

Also directly under this committee is jurisdiction of the moon. What happens on the moon is under the Science and Astronautics Committee.

Likewise, the committee has jurisdiction of scientific research on the sea and the land. We in the Science and Astronautics Committee have jurisdiction of sea research, to determine what can be done and how the programs can be worked out to make sure there is no overlapping and that they are good scientific programs for the development of the resources of all the oceans and the seas.

Would the chairman of the committee agree with me that our jurisdiction is so unlimited we have no beginning and no ending, neither in time nor in space?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know that I could agree completely with the gentleman. We have jurisdiction in space and we have jurisdiction over science. This is very broad. Whether we can usurp those areas which have been assigned to other committees, to other functionaries of the House, would have to be decided, perhaps, by the House itself.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If I could comment on that, I believe the gentleman from California will agree with me that we should not have under our committee the practical applications of research programs, for example, in various areas where specific programs are assigned to other committees. Nevertheless, because of our jurisdiction over science, research, and development, we certainly have the right and duty to look into all of these programs. We should see that among committees and among agencies and bureaus there is no overlapping and there is a scientific and research purpose which is adequately carried out.

Will the gentleman agree with me on that?

Mr. MILLER. I think I can subscribe to that statement.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. This budget has already been cut by our committee in the amount of approximately $26 million from the $5.12 billion. The budget cuts we have made in the committee I believe should be respected by the House. I want to compliment the committee members and especially the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas, Congressman TEAGUE, and with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] handling many of the hearings this time, on its excellent work on manned space flight.

Our committee has the burden of setting the amounts. This means translating the scientific and research programs with very indefinite goals and very indefinite procedures into dollar amounts for a given fiscal year, in order that the NASA can operate on a tight, efficient, and economical budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Now, this task poses quite a problem. It is converting the progress of this country in science, research, and development into a dollar figure.

Our committee likewise feels very good about the fact that there is only a fraction of 1 percent difference from the total budget in space aeronautics and research and development to date under our jurisdiction in variation from what the committee set. What I am trying to say here is this: The committee set the amount in the House and the variation from the final appropriation has been less than a fraction of 1 percent.

So I do think that our committee has taken its responsibility seriously. It has done it without partisanship. I must say it has done it with a good amount of technical competence, also.

I will just give my statement generally now as to how I disagree on some things.

H.R. 14324 authorizes to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $4,986,864,150. For research and development, $4,248,235,000 is requested; $94,419,000 for construction of facilities; and $644,210,150 for administrative operations.

NASA originally requested a total of $5,012 million broken down as follows: $4,246,600,000 for research and development; $101,500,000 for construction of facilities; and $663,900,000 for administrative operations.

The committee reduced the NASA request by $25,135,850, broken down as follows: a $7,081,000 reduction in construction of facilities; and a $19,680,000 reduction in administrative operations.

I think it is important to note that this bill authorizes a NASA budget approximately $180 million less than the appropriation of last year. The history of

NASA appropriation is as follows: Fiscal year 1959, $330 million; fiscal year 1960, $523 million; fiscal year 1961, $964 million; fiscal year 1962, $1,825 million; fiscal year 1963, $3,674 million; fiscal year 1964, $5,100 million; fiscal year 1965, $5,250 million; and fiscal year 1966, $5,175 million.

I say this is a good bill. Yet, as I have indicated, I have taken strong exception to parts of the NASA program of operations and management. I voiced my objections in the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee and before the full committee, and I have included them as dissenting views in report No. 1441 accompanying H.R. 14324.

At the outset I wish to make it very clear that I have been and still am one of the strongest supporters of our national space program in Congress. Since 1958 when I was a member of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration which produced the Space Act, I have fought for a strong and vigorous space program. I have committed myself wholeheartedly to providing for NASA every resource necessary to achieve success.

However, in this fiscal year budget presentation, I am convinced that NASA has made incorrect decisions on economy and in some instances has shown poor judgment. NASA in my opinion has failed to justify properly several of its stated requirements, which I would like to discuss.

NASA requested committee approval of authorization for a lunar receiving laboratory to be located at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, Tex. Its initial cost of construction was to be $9.1 million and it was intended for the receiving, analyzing, handling, and distribution of samples of the lunar surface which will be brought back by our astronauts from the moon.

I find it very difficult to understand the rationale presented by NASA. First of all, the possible dangers from radiation and the need for a special environment in which to handle the lunar samples is cited as specific reason for the laboratory.

I am sure that every Member of this House is aware that this country has constructed and has available through the Atomic Energy Commission many, many facilities completely capable of performing this particular task.

Second. As a matter of scientific fact, the earth is continually being subjected daily to enormous amounts of material from space in the form of micrometeorites that have eventually filtered into our atmosphere and to the earth. These, too, have been subject to radiation from our galaxies and yet they seem to provide no serious radiation hazard.

Third. Why does the material from the lunar surface need to be brought back to the earth? It is entirely feasible that thorough analysis can be accomplished with a minimum amount of equipment right on the lunar surface by our astronauts.

Fourth. What are to me perhaps the most telling arguments—the haste with which NASA has made the decision to construct such a laboratory, the evidence of poor planning in relation to the lunar mission, the fact that five of the nine members of the site selection committee came from Houston—make it apparent to me that very poor management decisions were made and are being made and will be compounded by approval of the laboratory.

If lunar samples are to be brought back by our astronauts for analysis and study not only by NASA but in universities and laboratories located in other parts of the country, then I strongly recommend that means be provided to the recovery task forces to handle this material directly and transmit it directly from the landing site, thereby insuring a minimum of possible contamination.

A total of $41.9 million was requested by NASA for the Apollo applications program. It is my position that this item should not be authorized and should be eliminated from the space program at this time.

First of all, it must be understood that this program is to follow the Apollo lunar landing program after 1970, but now NASA is taking the incredible course of asking money to procure launch vehicles and hardware for this program. NASA has not given to the Committee on Science and Astronautics any detailed planning of the post-Apollo applications program.

NASA itself, it seems, has no clear idea of what those missions will consist of, nor what the payloads will be, or what will be the continuity for such heavy investments as will be necessary for booster spacecraft.

Furthermore, in asking $41.9 million to procure launch vehicles, no consideration is given to the ongoing programs of research in fuels, propellants, engines, and electronics that promise boosters of much greater efficiency than are presently available.

I have long insisted at every opportunity in my 7 years on the committee that substantial and long-range support be given to the development of new propellants and new engines. NASA has continued to push forward slowly in these areas. Yet, they now—this year—ask for millions of dollars to procure vehicles that will be obsolete and possibly inadequate to perform the tasks in space which have not yet even been formulated. I believe I must be adamant in my opposition to requests of this nature until NASA presents to the committee and to the Congress hard and firm details of plans for the Apollo applications program. Until that time it is mismanagement to provide funds to NASA for these purposes.

NASA has also asked for $8 million to support its advanced mission program. NASA's advanced mission program is allied very closely in intent and philosophy to the Apollo applications program. Again, the committee does not have from NASA reasonably complete and thorough planning for the program.

However, I believe that NASA should have money to continue its planning operations. I strongly recommend that $5 million of authorization be deleted from the $8 million requested.

In the past I have supported requests for authorization that had as objectives efficient management procedures and planning to result in improved construction. In an organization as large and geographically dispersed as NASA is, the necessity for further planning and long-range thinking in its construction program is obviously necessary. And the Congress has provided NASA with approval of the committee over the past years of considerable sums.

Yet I find that almost $12 million of authorization remains unused. It has also come to my attention that $5 million of funds appropriated still remain unobligated. This year $7 million was requested by NASA for this account and the committee approved only $5.5 for authorization.

But I still cannot reconcile the unused authorization and unused funds with this year's request. It seems to me the better part of management to utilize the resources at hand before asking for more.

Therefore, I am convinced that the best course is to rescind $10 million of the authorization approved by Congress in past years.

With regard to the nature of NASA's mission in space and the role it was designed to play by the Space Act of 1958, I am convinced that NASA has been downgrading its scientific research and development mission to the point where new discoveries and innovations are looked upon as "upsetting the applecart."

The Space Administration has become so absorbed and engrossed in its mission requirements that it has become principally a supervisor of manufacturing operations and has drained off to those functions its outstanding scientific and engineering talents, thereby depriving the agency, to a large extent, of its research capability.

In other words, we are merely proceeding into space on our space missions using old technologies, old procedures, old devices and are leaving no room for the utilization of new space research achievements.

I do not believe that NASA should seek the security of routine procedures solely for the purpose of avoiding the compromise of a conservative attitude. Space research and development must always remain its prime mission in the conduct of its routine operations.

Another point of objection on my part is the utilization by NASA of its scientific and engineering manpower. I believe that its dramatic growth has caused a situation in which many of these valuable people will not be utilized to their fullest capability.

For instance, the personnel requirements in the Electronics Research Center have increased to an estimated 1,000 in fiscal year 1967. Yet not one building has been built at the Electronics Research Center. Most of the existing personnel are being housed in rented facilities of certainly less than optimum conditions.

I have the strong conviction that similar misuse of valuable personnel exists elsewhere in NASA. I am, therefore, urging that the Committee on Science and Astronautics insist that NASA conduct a manpower survey to determine the efficiency with which scientists and engineers are being used. It is most important in the interest of efficient management that these people be employed as productively as possible.

I also strongly recommend that such a study be conducted by congressional committees such as the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee or by the Government Operations Committee.

My next point of deep concern is the inability of the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Science and Astronautics Committee to be knowledgeable in detail of the activities at NASA centers and field stations located in many sections of the country.

Take the case of the Bureau of the Budget. Only one or two, perhaps three, people have complete control of the NASA budget. It is incomprehensible to me how these few people can be thoroughly knowledgeable of our national space program and make such drastic and far-reaching evaluations as the Administration needs. Yet this is done year after year. It is obvious that their insight into NASA programs can be only a shallow one at best.

In regard to the General Accounting Office, we have not yet received in Congress from the GAO an evaluation of the management of this $5 billion a year agency.

The staff of the Science and Astronautics Committee has a maximum of a few weeks to understand the plethora of detail presented to the committee by NASA and its budget justifications. There is no opportunity for the committee to review technically the NASA programs.

I have strongly recommended for years that the staff of the Science and Astronautics Committee be increased by employing an adequate number of scientists, engineers, and accountants whose sole mission would be to oversee the space program in detail at the centers where it is being conducted, and on a continuous basis. I can see no other way in which the monumental amount of detail NASA presents to the committee each year can be penetrated and understood and synthesized for the benefit of the members of the committee and of the House in reaching decisions on the NASA authorization.

The next major point of concern is the lack of an Office of Inspector General in NASA. It is plain to me and to many other Members of the House that NASA requires a policing authority to oversee the operations of the agency and to make sure that the mission objectives are being properly achieved.

There is no question in my mind that the expenditure of $5 billion each year must, with more than acceptable frequency, result in some inefficient applications. It is vitally important that the Administrator have available to him information on the Agency's operations that can come from an independent and objective source and not for the very people who have the responsibility for carrying out the program.

Many other agencies in Government have an Office of Inspector General and use it with great effect. Those agencies, too, are conducting scientific research and development that will cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Some of those agencies are the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Agriculture.

Those who are opposed to my insistence on the establishment of an Office of Inspector General in NASA say that NASA already has established within its headquarters a cost reduction directorate. This organization has supposedly been functioning to improve management decisions. The fact is that the directorate, only in existence since 1964, has a staff of five people, two of whom are secretaries and the other three are without technical background in science or space research or aeronautics.

While I thoroughly agree that NASA is unique as a Government agency, it is impossible for me to believe that this directorate could possibly do the job it was designed to do with so few people, and located in Washington. It must be obvious that an Office of Inspector General, well staffed and well funded and with its authority carefully and clearly delineated, would be infinitely more efficient and effective in making sure that NASA operations are conducted in the most economical and effective manner.

Last year the authorization bill contained a provision that urged NASA to evaluate its contracts in terms of their national geographic distribution.

It also urged that where possible, and other things being equal, contracts should be let in areas less favored by NASA appropriations than others. The purpose of this was to insure the creation of new centers of scientific and technological excellence and to reinforce those of small stature already existing.

I am thoroughly aware that every agency has the obligation to seek out the sources of greatest possible competence in letting its contracts. I am also aware of the right to expect our Government agencies to get the most for the dollar.

However, a principal source of strength is this Nation's unprecedented leadership in science and technology. It is upon these two areas of human endeavor that the defense of the free world and our unprecedented standard of living are based.

Therefore, the Government has the obligation in our growing economy and burgeoning population to make sure that excellence in science disciplines be reinforced and strengthened in every section of the country, not in just a few localities.

It is true that NASA has achieved a rather broad geographic distribution in its research grants and contracts with universities, colleges, and nonprofit organizations. However, in relation to contract procurement this is a very small amount indeed. It is imperative that the less favored portions of our country should benefit from the dynamic and vigorous character of our space research through contracts placed with organizations which can properly and adequately execute them.

I, therefore, urge and recommend that no later than January 26, 1967, NASA make a detailed report to the Congress on what it has accomplished in meeting these requirements of the last year's authorization act in this matter of geographic distribution of contract awards. Based on that report action should be taken by both House and Senate that will result in a correction of geographic imbalance in NASA expenditures.

Another of my objections to NASA operations is the manner in which the Jet Propulsion Laboratory of the California Institute of Technology is being managed. In order to refresh the memories of my colleagues let me review briefly the history of this laboratory.

Before NASA came into being the Jet Propulsion Laboratory was a contractor of the Army, performing work in the ballistic missile field. When NASA opened its doors for business the Jet Propulsion Laboratory shortly afterward came under its jurisdiction by the transfer from the Army and has been operating under contract almost exclusively as if it were another NASA center.

The Jet Propulsion Laboratory is the principal organization responsible for the development and conduct of the Ranger and Mariner programs. As a research and development laboratory it also had the responsibility for conducting an operational program. In the past, difficulties with the Ranger and Mariner spacecraft occurred with such frequency that repeated failures in the spacecraft seriously compromised the programs.

The Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], conducted penetrating and exhaustive hearings on the Ranger program. As a result its recommendations urged a tighter management control of the laboratory. The effect has been an industrial type of management philosophy and approach that had the effect of tighter planning and realistic discipline.

However, I wish to emphasize again that the laboratory is devoted to science, research, and development. An industrial-type management has the effect of strangling, or at least throttling, the uninhibited atmosphere vitally necessary to the conduct of scientific research. I firmly believe that the time has come to modify such management philosophy. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory has a truly outstanding record of success in the Ranger and Mariner programs. At the same time, we should not return to the old attitudes which caused the original investigation and restrictions.

In other words I think that we must return to a middle-of-the-road management philosophy which will allow the laboratory its atmosphere of scientific freedom and at the same time make it possible for NASA to exercise proper authority over its contracts. By so doing I am firmly convinced that the Nation and the space program will be the beneficiary. I urge that such steps be taken by NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at the earliest possible moment, and that the committee be informed of the actions and decisions taken.

In recent months the committee has been made aware that a space mission clearly the responsibility of NASA has been handed over to the Air Force by the present administration. The manned orbital laboratory has now become a military, not a scientific research and development project. I am thoroughly aware that the Space Act of 1958 reserves to the military those scientific and technical areas of research in space peculiar to the defense and security of the country. I supported that view then, and I support it now.

However, it is incomprehensible to me how a laboratory orbiting the earth for purposes of scientific investigation could in any way be considered a military operation. This [illegible] part of the ad-

[illegible]

sideration of the bill H.R. 14324, with Mr. FLYNT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 14324 is to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1967.

This bill authorizes $4,986,864,150. This is an overall reduction from NASA's original request of $26,135,850.

Actually, the committee cut the overall total by $77,735,850, but amended NASA's original request by adding funds to certain programs which we felt were underfunded. Thus, as I have said, the resulting total cut is approximately $26 million.

We are recommending $4,248 million for research and development; $94,419,000 for construction of facilities; and $644 million for administrative operations.

We are providing $40,600,000 for the Gemini program and this will complete this phase of our space program. We have flown eight Gemini flights, with four remaining.

The committee is recommending $2,974 million for the Apollo lunar program. We believe this will peak the Apollo program, and, as we draw nearer to the lunar flight, we are hopeful that program and our mission in space. I voted in committee to approve H.R. 14324 because, in the main, I know it to be a good bill.

I want the House to know that at the same time I cannot and will not use a rubber stamp. When I am convinced that NASA has made incorrect decisions, has shown poor judgment, and fails to justify properly many of its requirements, then I will raise my voice loud and clear in objection. I do not believe I am being inconsistent when I urge the House to pass H.R. 14324, subject to amendments which I will offer to the House at the proper time.

Another point that I would like to make now is on the cost.

The NASA budget request at $5,012 million for fiscal year 1967, generally represents a tight program in terms of the allocation of resources to the programs that have been regularly approved by Congress as parts of the Nation's effort in aeronautics and space.

At a level under $4.9 billion, I do not believe NASA can restructure its Apollo program moon landing in a form that would not cast the most serious doubt as to its ability to meet the objective of the manned lunar landing within this decade.

At $4.8 billion the moon landing objective could not be met. Below this level of the budget, it would become clear that the Nation had abandoned the concept of developing a well-rounded total space capability directed toward achieving space preeminence. NASA would have to initiate selective terminations of a large number of its major contracts. The time of performance and the target date would be drastically extended. The costs would continue, and the total

They have [illegible] at extremel

highly successful year in 1965. They launched 52 Cosmos satellites, and that is as many as they launched in all the years prior to that year.

They successfully flew a three-manned spacecraft—voskhod. They placed two communication satellites in orbit and demonstrated their effectiveness. They launched two spacecraft for Venus with one reaching the surface of the planet and the other flying by.

They also launched two proton satellites which are the heaviest in the world to go into orbit, and this pointed up the use of a new launch vehicle with capabilities about double those of the booster they have used in the past.

In addition to the foregoing, the Russians have also now achieved a soft lunar landing. Thus it is entirely clear that the Soviets have a continuing major commitment to a long-term, large-scale program in space. However, as I have said, it would appear that one of their main objectives is to attempt to land men on the moon and to undertake numbers of manned and unmanned flights in earth orbit.

However, I am confident in my own mind that if we continue our progress with the same rate of success we have had in the past, we will be the first Nation to put men on the moon.

I think it is true that we all tend to become so preoccupied with manned space flight that we sometimes do not give enough attention to the excellent work NASA is doing in other space programs.

If I had appeared before the House 7 or 8 years ago and told you that we would soon be communicating by satellites, watching television by satellite, I felt that this was a challenging occasion. The House would be launching a tremendous program estimated to cost $20 billion over a period of years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, my feeling was that this House should assume its responsibility, each and every Member of this body, and register either approval or disapproval of the start of the program. When once the Apollo program—the lunar landing program, in the amount of $3 billion, has been embarked upon, it is the duty of each of us to go ahead with the program, especially now when there is more than 60 percent of the $20 billion for this purpose authorized and programed, which will soon be spent.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot turn back now and abandon the field to Russia. We cannot turn back and turn the outer space program over to a possible enemy nation or group of nations.

I say to the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that every Member of this House of Representatives, on the original vote for the authorization of the Apollo moon program in the amount of $20 billion over a period of years, every single Member voted "aye." There was no opposition. Now, however, we find that some people have changed their minds and say "Do not let us waste the money" which is contemplated to be involved.

However, Mr. Chairman, we on the Committee on Science and Astronautics say that contracts have been let for installations to be constructed, and, therefore, we must go ahead.

tific data in a single year than in the entire previous history of the space program.

Furthermore, an additional word should be said about our first operational weather satellite. With ESSA I and ESSA II, launched by NASA for the Weather Bureau of the Commerce Department's Environmental Science Service Administration, we are inaugurating regular meteorological satellite operations and demonstrating a major practical use of space technology.

I am also sure everyone knows the results of our pioneering with Telstar, Relay, and Syncom, which have been demonstrated in commercial operations by the Communications Satellite Corps' Earlybird.

Thus to authorize further research and development in these programs, we are recommending $126,900,000 for physics and astronomy; $227,900,000 for lunar and planetary exploration; and $70 million for meteorological and communications satellites.

Now, the committee spent about 5 weeks of hearings going over the NASA budget with a fine tooth comb and as a result the bill was amended in some respects. These changes are all reflected in H.R. 14324.

For example, the committee canceled the 1967 Venus mission and transferred these funds to the Voyager program and the 1969 Mars mission which was originally planned as a flyby. The committee is recommending that this flight be changed to include a small landing capsule so that additional vital information on Mars can be secured.

The committee also added $7½ million additional funds for research and development of the large solid propellant mo-

Steed
Sweeney
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Toll
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Williams
Willis

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Flynt, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14324 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 345 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I support the program of the United States in space wholeheartedly and particularly this bill, H.R. 14324.

I wish to speak in support of H.R. 14324, the authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1967.

As a Member of this House, and of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and especially as the Congressman of the 11th District of Florida, which includes the Kennedy Space Center of NASA and the eastern test range of the Air Force, I support the space activities of the United States wholeheartedly and this bill H.R. 14324.

This Nation has no more important undertaking than its space program. I

peaceful, later become important militarily. It is as impossible to know now what part the space program and its discoveries will play in our future protection as it was for contemporaries of the Wright Brothers to know that their machine at Kitty Hawk would pave the way for a military weapon of such great importance as the airplane was in World War II.

All reasonable men fervently desire that space may be used for peaceful rather than warlike purposes. But the political forces contending in the world today, make it plainly evident, that the surest way to maintain the peace is through strength. It is imperative that the United States, the leader and bulwark of the free world, become preeminent in space. Military activities of the future are destined to be conducted in space.

Of equal importance is the acquisition of scientific knowledge in this program. Space achievements of this Nation are rapidly increasing our knowledge about our home planet, the earth, the solar system, and the universe beyond. It cannot be doubted that we are on the threshold of great new discoveries here.

The achievements of the U.S. space program in 1965 were impressive. American Gemini teams logged 650 hours in space. They traveled more than 11 million miles in orbit, a distance equivalent to nearly 50 trips to the moon. The goal of placing an American on the moon by 1970 is no longer a dream. The flights of the Gemini spacecrafts have made it a distinct possibility.

A major breakthrough occurred when Astronaut Edward White opened the hatch of Gemini IV and stepped into space. But even this dramatic moment

damage, suffering and loss of human life in the past.

Of great significance in the space effort of the Nation, is the reservoir of knowledge and of trained scientists and engineers which the Nation is rapidly building up. This resource will prove of incalculable benefit of the Nation as the years go by.

Lastly, I think it is of vital importance to men and a nation to have a challenge to face and to meet and overcome. In the past history of our planet, exploration has been one of the great challenges.

While there are still some unexplored portions of our earth, there are none which are not open to man should he desire to go there. Space, the solar system and the universe beyond are the frontiers to be explored today and tomorrow. They constitute the great challenge to men and nations of our time. I do not doubt for one moment that meeting this challenge will benefit this Nation in ways far beyond our comprehension today.

The activities and the spending proposed for the next fiscal year of NASA have been gone over at great length by the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

In my opinion, the bill is a sound one, and I urge its support by my colleagues. I cannot urge this House of Representatives more earnestly or fervently to support this year's authorization for NASA, in this bill, to the end that our great Nation will continue its strong space program, while it will permit us to gain preeminence and world leadership in these frontiers of today and tomorrow.

While my support of this bill is without reservation, there are matters in connection with the space program and the

committee by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Karth]; and the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

These subcommittee chairmen, together with others members of their subcommittees, devoted long hours to those portions of the budget assigned for their consideration, and if it had not been for their dedication to the task at hand, this committee would have been hard pressed to report to you as it has today.

I may say that what I have said to you about the chairmen of the subcommittees, I want to also say about the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. They had their differences, but they reconciled these differences, and they all worked hard and assiduously at the jobs assigned to them.

In due time I will yield such time as these subcommittee chairmen may require to explain those portions of the NASA program which they have worked on.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I am glad to state to the House that our Science and Astronautics Committee, on both sides of the aisle, has worked hard going over the $5,012 million budget for space science and research submitted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year beginning July 1, fiscal year 1967.

As the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, my friend the gentleman from California, [Mr. Miller], has told the House, we divided the committee on the basis of subcommittees, which have gone into studies in detail of the various subjects.

in space.

Also directly under this committee is jurisdiction of the moon. What happens on the moon is under the Science and Astronautics Committee.

Likewise, the committee has jurisdiction of scientific research on the sea and the land. We in the Science and Astronautics Committee have jurisdiction of sea research, to determine what can be done and how the programs can be worked out to make sure there is no overlapping and that they are good scientific programs for the development of the resources of all the oceans and the seas.

Would the chairman of the committee agree with me that our jurisdiction is so unlimited we have no beginning and no ending, neither in time nor in space?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know that I could agree completely with the gentleman. We have jurisdiction in space and we have jurisdiction over science. This is very broad. Whether we can usurp those areas which have been assigned to other committees, to other functionaries of the House, would have to be decided, perhaps, by the House itself.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If I could comment on that, I believe the gentleman from California will agree with me that we should not have under our committee the practical applications of research programs, for example, in various areas where specific programs are assigned to other committees. Nevertheless, because of our jurisdiction over science, research, and development, we certainly have the right and duty to look into all of these programs. We should see that among committees and among agencies and bureaus there is no overlapping and there is a scientific and re-

minutes.

Now, this task poses quite a problem. It is converting the progress of this country in science, research, and development into a dollar figure.

Our committee likewise feels very good about the fact that there is only a fraction of 1 percent difference from the total budget in space aeronautics and research and development to date under our jurisdiction in variation from what the committee set. What I am trying to say here is this: The committee set the amount in the House and the variation from the final appropriation has been less than a fraction of 1 percent.

So I do think that our committee has taken its responsibility seriously. It has done it without partisanship. I must say it has done it with a good amount of technical competence, also.

I will just give my statement generally now as to how I disagree on some things.

H.R. 14324 authorizes to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $4,986,864,150. For research and development, $4,248,235,000 is requested; $94,419,000 for construction of facilities; and $644,210,150 for administrative operations.

NASA originally requested a total of $5,012 million broken down as follows: $4,246,600,000 for research and development; $101,500,000 for construction of facilities; and $663,900,000 for administrative operations.

The committee reduced the NASA request by $25,135,850, broken down as follows: a $7,081,000 reduction in construction of facilities; and a $19,680,000 reduction in administrative operations.

I think it is important to note that this bill authorizes a NASA budget approximately $180 million less than the appropriation of last year. The history of

NASA appropriation is as follows: Fiscal year 1959, $330 million; fiscal year 1960, $523 million; fiscal year 1961, $964 million; fiscal year 1962, $1,825 million; fiscal year 1963, $3,674 million; fiscal year 1964, $5,100 million; fiscal year 1965, $5,250 million; and fiscal year 1966, $5,175 million.

I say this is a good bill. Yet, as I have indicated, I have taken strong exception to parts of the NASA program of operations and management. I voiced my objections in the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee and before the full committee, and I have included them as dissenting views in report No. 1441 accompanying H.R. 14324.

At the outset I wish to make it very clear that I have been and still am one of the strongest supporters of our national space program in Congress. Since 1958 when I was a member of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration which produced the Space Act, I have fought for a strong and vigorous space program. I have committed myself wholeheartedly to providing for NASA every resource necessary to achieve success.

However, in this fiscal year budget presentation, I am convinced that NASA has made incorrect decisions on economy and in some instances has shown poor judgment. NASA in my opinion has failed to justify properly several of its stated requirements, which I would like to discuss.

NASA requested committee approval of authorization for a lunar receiving laboratory to be located at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, Tex. Its initial cost of construction was to be $9.1 million and it was intended for the receiving, analyzing, handling, and distribution of samples of the lunar surface which will be brought back by our astronauts from the moon.

I find it very difficult to understand the rationale presented by NASA. First of all, the possible dangers from radiation and the need for a special environment in which to handle the lunar samples is cited as specific reason for the laboratory.

I am sure that every Member of this House is aware that this country has constructed and has available through the Atomic Energy Commission many, many facilities completely capable of performing this particular task.

Second. As a matter of scientific fact, the earth is continually being subjected daily to enormous amounts of material from space in the form of micrometeorites that have eventually filtered into our atmosphere and to the earth. These, too, have been subject to radiation from our galaxies and yet they seem to provide no serious radiation hazard.

Third. Why does the material from the lunar surface need to be brought back to the earth? It is entirely feasible that thorough analysis can be accomplished with a minimum amount of equipment right on the lunar surface by our astronauts.

Fourth. What are to me perhaps the most telling arguments—the haste with which NASA has made the decision to construct such a laboratory, the evidence of poor planning in relation to the lunar mission, the fact that five of the nine members of the site selection committee came from Houston—make it apparent to me that very poor management decisions were made and are being made and will be compounded by approval of the laboratory.

If lunar samples are to be brought back by our astronauts for analysis and study not only by NASA but in universities and laboratories located in other parts of the country, then I strongly recommend that means be provided to the recovery task forces to handle this material directly and transmit it directly from the landing site, thereby insuring a minimum of possible contamination.

A total of $41.9 million was requested by NASA for the Apollo applications program. It is my position that this item should not be authorized and should be eliminated from the space program at this time.

First of all, it must be understood that this program is to follow the Apollo lunar landing program after 1970, but now NASA is taking the incredible course of asking money to procure launch vehicles and hardware for this program. NASA has not given to the Committee on Science and Astronautics any detailed planning of the post-Apollo applications program.

NASA itself, it seems, has no clear idea of what those missions will consist of, nor what the payloads will be, or what will be the continuity for such heavy investments as will be necessary for booster spacecraft.

Furthermore, in asking $41.9 million to procure launch vehicles, no consideration is given to the ongoing programs of research in fuels, propellants, engines, and electronics that promise boosters of much greater efficiency than are presently available.

I have long insisted at every opportunity in my 7 years on the committee that substantial and long-range support be given to the development of new propellants and new engines. NASA has continued to push forward slowly in these areas. Yet, they now—this year—ask for millions of dollars to procure vehicles that will be obsolete and possibly inadequate to perform the tasks in space which have not yet even been formulated. I believe I must be adamant in my opposition to requests of this nature until NASA presents to the committee and to the Congress hard and firm details of plans for the Apollo applications program. Until that time it is mismanagement to provide funds to NASA for these purposes.

NASA has also asked for $8 million to support its advanced mission program. NASA's advanced mission program is allied very closely in intent and philosophy to the Apollo applications program. Again, the committee does not have from NASA reasonably complete and thorough planning for the program.

However, I believe that NASA should have money to continue its planning operations. I strongly recommend that $5 million of authorization be deleted from the $8 million requested.

In the past I have supported requests for authorization that had as objectives efficient management procedures and planning to result in improved construction. In an organization as large and geographically dispersed as NASA is, the necessity for further planning and long-range thinking in its construction program is obviously necessary. And the Congress has provided NASA with approval of the committee over the past years of considerable sums.

Yet I find that almost $12 million of authorization remains unused. It has also come to my attention that $5 million of funds appropriated still remain unobligated. This year $7 million was requested by NASA for this account and the committee approved only $5.5 for authorization.

But I still cannot reconcile the unused authorization and unused funds with this year's request. It seems to me the better part of management to utilize the resources at hand before asking for more.

Therefore, I am convinced that the best course is to rescind $10 million of the authorization approved by Congress in past years.

With regard to the nature of NASA's mission in space and the role it was designed to play by the Space Act of 1958, I am convinced that NASA has been downgrading its scientific research and development mission to the point where new discoveries and innovations are looked upon as "upsetting the applecart."

The Space Administration has become so absorbed and engrossed in its mission requirements that it has become principally a supervisor of manufacturing operations and has drained off to those functions its outstanding scientific and engineering talents, thereby depriving the agency, to a large extent, of its research capability.

In other words, we are merely proceeding into space on our space missions using old technologies, old procedures, old devices and are leaving no room for the utilization of new space research achievements.

I do not believe that NASA should seek the security of routine procedures solely for the purpose of avoiding the compromise of a conservative attitude. Space research and development must always remain its prime mission in the conduct of its routine operations.

Another point of objection on my part is the utilization by NASA of its scientific and engineering manpower. I believe that its dramatic growth has caused a situation in which many of these valuable people will not be utilized to their fullest capability.

For instance, the personnel requirements in the Electronics Research Center have increased to an estimated 1,000 in fiscal year 1967. Yet not one building has been built at the Electronics Research Center. Most of the existing personnel are being housed in rented facilities of certainly less than optimum conditions.

I have the strong conviction that similar misuse of valuable personnel exists elsewhere in NASA. I am, therefore, urging that the Committee on Science and Astronautics insist that NASA conduct a manpower survey to determine the efficiency with which scientists and engineers are being used. It is most important in the interest of efficient management that these people be employed as productively as possible.

I also strongly recommend that such a study be conducted by congressional committees such as the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee or by the Government Operations Committee.

My next point of deep concern is the inability of the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Science and Astronautics Committee to be knowledgeable in detail of the activities at NASA centers and field stations located in many sections of the country.

Take the case of the Bureau of the Budget. Only one or two, perhaps three, people have complete control of the NASA budget. It is incomprehensible to me how these few people can be thoroughly knowledgeable of our national space program and make such drastic and far-reaching evaluations as the Administration needs. Yet this is done year after year. It is obvious that their insight into NASA programs can be only a shallow one at best.

In regard to the General Accounting Office, we have not yet received in Congress from the GAO an evaluation of the management of this $5 billion a year agency.

The staff of the Science and Astronautics Committee has a maximum of a few weeks to understand the plethora of detail presented to the committee by NASA and its budget justifications. There is no opportunity for the committee to review technically the NASA programs.

I have strongly recommended for years that the staff of the Science and Astronautics Committee be increased by employing an adequate number of scientists, engineers, and accountants whose sole mission would be to oversee the space program in detail at the centers where it is being conducted, and on a continuous basis. I can see no other way in which the monumental amount of detail NASA presents to the committee each year can be penetrated and understood and synthesized for the benefit of the members of the committee and of the House in reaching decisions on the NASA authorization.

The next major point of concern is the lack of an Office of Inspector General in NASA. It is plain to me and to many other Members of the House that NASA requires a policing authority to oversee the operations of the agency and to make sure that the mission objectives are being properly achieved.

There is no question in my mind that the expenditure of $5 billion each year must, with more than acceptable frequency, result in some inefficient applications. It is vitally important that the Administrator have available to him information on the Agency's operations that can come from an independent and objective source and not for the very people who have the responsibility for carrying out the program.

Many other agencies in Government have an Office of Inspector General and use it with great effect. Those agencies, too, are conducting scientific research and development that will cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Some of those agencies are the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Agriculture.

Those who are opposed to my insistence on the establishment of an Office of Inspector General in NASA say that NASA already has established within its headquarters a cost reduction directorate. This organization has supposedly been functioning to improve management decisions. The fact is that the directorate, only in existence since 1964, has a staff of five people, two of whom are secretaries and the other three are without technical background in science or space research or aeronautics.

While I thoroughly agree that NASA is unique as a Government agency, it is impossible for me to believe that this directorate could possibly do the job it was designed to do with so few people, and located in Washington. It must be obvious that an Office of Inspector General, well staffed and well funded and with its authority carefully and clearly delineated, would be infinitely more efficient and effective in making sure that NASA operations are conducted in the most economical and effective manner.

Last year the authorization bill contained a provision that urged NASA to evaluate its contracts in terms of their national geographic distribution.

It also urged that where possible, and other things being equal, contracts should be let in areas less favored by NASA appropriations than others. The purpose of this was to insure the creation of new centers of scientific and technological excellence and to reinforce those of small stature already existing.

I am thoroughly aware that every agency has the obligation to seek out the sources of greatest possible competence in letting its contracts. I am also aware of the right to expect our Government agencies to get the most for the dollar.

However, a principal source of strength is this Nation's unprecedented leadership in science and technology. It is upon these two areas of human endeavor that the defense of the free world and our unprecedented standard of living are based.

Therefore, the Government has the obligation in our growing economy and burgeoning population to make sure that excellence in science disciplines be reinforced and strengthened in every section of the country, not in just a few localities.

It is true that NASA has achieved a rather broad geographic distribution in its research grants and contracts with universities, colleges, and nonprofit organizations. However, in relation to contract procurement this is a very small amount indeed. It is imperative that the less favored portions of our country should benefit from the dynamic and vigorous character of our space research through contracts placed with organizations which can properly and adequately execute them.

I, therefore, urge and recommend that no later than January 26, 1967, NASA make a detailed report to the Congress on what it has accomplished in meeting these requirements of the last year's authorization act in this matter of geographic distribution of contract awards. Based on that report action should be taken by both House and Senate that will result in a correction of geographic imbalance in NASA expenditures.

Another of my objections to NASA operations is the manner in which the Jet Propulsion Laboratory of the California Institute of Technology is being managed. In order to refresh the memories of my colleagues let me review briefly the history of this laboratory.

Before NASA came into being the Jet Propulsion Laboratory was a contractor of the Army, performing work in the ballistic missile field. When NASA opened its doors for business the Jet Propulsion Laboratory shortly afterward came under its jurisdiction by the transfer from the Army and has been operating under contract almost exclusively as if it were another NASA center.

The Jet Propulsion Laboratory is the principal organization responsible for the development and conduct of the Ranger and Mariner programs. As a research and development laboratory it also had the responsibility for conducting an operational program. In the past, difficulties with the Ranger and Mariner spacecraft occurred with such frequency that repeated failures in the spacecraft seriously compromised the programs.

The Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], conducted penetrating and exhaustive hearings on the Ranger program. As a result its recommendations urged a tighter management control of the laboratory. The effect has been an industrial type of management philosophy and approach that had the effect of tighter planning and realistic discipline.

However, I wish to emphasize again that the laboratory is devoted to science, research, and development. An industrial-type management has the effect of strangling, or at least throttling, the uninhibited atmosphere vitally necessary to the conduct of scientific research. I firmly believe that the time has come to modify such management philosophy. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory has a truly outstanding record of success in the Ranger and Mariner programs. At the same time, we should not return to the old attitudes which caused the original investigation and restrictions.

In other words I think that we must return to a middle-of-the-road management philosophy which will allow the laboratory its atmosphere of scientific freedom and at the same time make it possible for NASA to exercise proper authority over its contracts. By so doing I am firmly convinced that the Nation and the space program will be the beneficiary. I urge that such steps be taken by NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at the earliest possible moment, and that the committee be informed of the actions and decisions taken.

In recent months the committee has been made aware that a space mission clearly the responsibility of NASA has been handed over to the Air Force by the present administration. The manned orbital laboratory has now become a military, not a scientific research and development project. I am thoroughly aware that the Space Act of 1958 reserves to the military those scientific and technical areas of research in space peculiar to the defense and security of the country. I supported that view then, and I support it now.

However, it is incomprehensible to me how a laboratory orbiting the earth for purposes of scientific investigation could in any way be considered a military operation. This act on the part of the administration violates both the letter and spirit of the Space Act. It also violates the spirit of the United Nations Resolution 1472 under which nations including the United States and the U.S.S.R. agreed to the principle of peaceful uses of outer space.

It is clearly evident that the manned orbital laboratory, in its concept and in its essence, falls within that internationally established principle. As I have said before, it is clearly the mission of NASA to perform the research and development aspects. This includes not only the research and development to produce spacecraft but also the research and development missions associated with those devices. It also has under its purview in the Office of Space Sciences the exclusive requirement to investigate scientifically and to evaluate the scientific discoveries to be derived.

Therefore, I strongly object to this arbitrary decision on the part of the administration which was made without due consideration by all of the responsible parties involved, including the Congress, and for which no clear justification exists or could possibly be manufactured.

I have touched on 10 points of objection which come from my deep convictions concerning the national space program and our mission in space. I voted in committee to approve H.R. 14324 because, in the main, I know it to be a good bill.

I want the House to know that at the same time I cannot and will not use a rubber stamp. When I am convinced that NASA has made incorrect decisions, has shown poor judgment, and fails to justify properly many of its requirements, then I will raise my voice loud and clear in objection. I do not believe I am being inconsistent when I urge the House to pass H.R. 14324, subject to amendments which I will offer to the House at the proper time.

Another point that I would like to make now is on the cost.

The NASA budget request at $5,012 million for fiscal year 1967, generally represents a tight program in terms of the allocation of resources to the programs that have been regularly approved by Congress as parts of the Nation's effort in aeronautics and space.

At a level under $4.9 billion, I do not believe NASA can restructure its Apollo program moon landing in a form that would not cast the most serious doubt as to its ability to meet the objective of the manned lunar landing within this decade.

At $4.8 billion the moon landing objective could not be met. Below this level of the budget, it would become clear that the Nation had abandoned the concept of developing a well-rounded total space capability directed toward achieving space preeminence. NASA would have to initiate selective terminations of a large number of its major contracts. The time of performance and the target date would be drastically extended. The costs would continue, and the total cost overall would skyrocket.

Each reduction of $100 million in the NASA budget represents about 10,000 man-years of effort by contractors already at work. The termination of such large numbers during a critical year of increased flight activity, with the total NASA program already stretched, would leave NASA no way to maintain momentum and program continuity.

A reduction of more than $100 million in the total NASA authorization would indicate to the NASA-industry-university-Government team that there was no longer a national commitment to space preeminence. It is not therefore possible at this time to outline specific alternate total program plans reflecting different levels of resources; any reduction over $100 million will require a total reassessment of program objectives and of the means that would remain available to achieve them.

I, therefore, have proposed a cut of $66 million in the NASA 1967 authorization budget, $56 million from the current budgeted funds for 1967, and $10 million from the carryover funds previously authorized.

I say in closing that at the time of the first authorization of the Apollo program, I called for a rollcall in the House. I felt that this was a challenging occasion. The House would be launching a tremendous program estimated to cost $20 billion over a period of years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, my feeling was that this House should assume its responsibility, each and every Member of this body, and register either approval or disapproval of the start of the program. When once the Apollo program—the lunar landing program, in the amount of $3 billion, has been embarked upon, it is the duty of each of us to go ahead with the program, especially now when there is more than 60 percent of the $20 billion for this purpose authorized and programed, which will soon be spent.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot turn back now and abandon the field to Russia. We cannot turn back and turn the outer space program over to a possible enemy nation or group of nations.

I say to the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that every Member of this House of Representatives, on the original vote for the authorization of the Apollo moon program in the amount of $20 billion over a period of years, every single Member voted "aye." There was no opposition. Now, however, we find that some people have changed their minds and say "Do not let us waste the money" which is contemplated to be involved.

However, Mr. Chairman, we on the Committee on Science and Astronautics say that contracts have been let for installations to be constructed, and, therefore, we must go ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Forty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 79]

Adair
Andrews,
  George W.
Andrews,
  Glenn
Ashley
Baring
Beckworth
Bolton
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Cleveland
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Dickinson
Diggs
Dorn
Dyal
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Feighan
Fisher
Fraser
Fuqua
Griffin
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Hamilton
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Herlong
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McEwen
Madden
Mailliard
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Morris
Morse
Morton
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
Powell
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rooney, N.Y
Roudebush
Roybal
Scott
Selden
Springer

Steed
Sweeney
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Toll
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Williams
Willis

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14324 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 345 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I support the program of the United States in space wholeheartedly and particularly this bill, H.R. 14324.

I wish to speak in support of H.R. 14324, the authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1967.

As a Member of this House, and of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and especially as the Congressman of the 11th District of Florida, which includes the Kennedy Space Center of NASA and the eastern test range of the Air Force, I support the space activities of the United States wholeheartedly and this bill H.R. 14324.

This Nation has no more important undertaking than its space program. I firmly believe that the nation to first achieve pre-eminence and superiority in space will in turn be the acknowledged leader of the nations of the world.

Here is a frontier where new discovery is always expected and again and again achieved. No one knows what lies beyond the horizon or what new wonders greet every advance.

This Nation cannot afford to follow the Communists in the exploration of this new frontier or merely match their efforts. The United States must lead the way. It is absolutely essential to this Nation to be first in space.

There are many reasons why this is important. First comes to mind the security of this Nation. No one knows exactly what shape the military role of space achievement will be in the future. But it is significant that the present space program of this Nation and Russia grew out of the ballistic missile activities of the two nations. Engines, boosters, and the science and technology that goes into our peaceful and our military space programs are similar, overlapping and inextricably interwoven. They complement and support each other.

Moreover, over the years knowledge and skills in activities at first wholly peaceful, later become important militarily. It is as impossible to know now what part the space program and its discoveries will play in our future protection as it was for contemporaries of the Wright Brothers to know that their machine at Kitty Hawk would pave the way for a military weapon of such great importance as the airplane was in World War II.

All reasonable men fervently desire that space may be used for peaceful rather than warlike purposes. But the political forces contending in the world today, make it plainly evident, that the surest way to maintain the peace is through strength. It is imperative that the United States, the leader and bulwark of the free world, become preeminent in space. Military activities of the future are destined to be conducted in space.

Of equal importance is the acquisition of scientific knowledge in this program. Space achievements of this Nation are rapidly increasing our knowledge about our home planet, the earth, the solar system, and the universe beyond. It cannot be doubted that we are on the threshold of great new discoveries here.

The achievements of the U.S. space program in 1965 were impressive. American Gemini teams logged 650 hours in space. They traveled more than 11 million miles in orbit, a distance equivalent to nearly 50 trips to the moon. The goal of placing an American on the moon by 1970 is no longer a dream. The flights of the Gemini spacecrafts have made it a distinct possibility.

A major breakthrough occurred when Astronaut Edward White opened the hatch of Gemini IV and stepped into space. But even this dramatic moment was soon eclipsed. On December 15, 1965, 185 miles above the Pacific Ocean, man first achieved one of the major space milestones, rendezvous. Gemini VI met Gemini VII at the conclusion of a 100,000-mile race through space at speeds of 17,300 miles an hour.

The seemingly impossible task of placing two spacecrafts, each weighing 4 tons, in separate orbits 1,200 miles apart, and then closing the distance to within 1 foot of each other had been accomplished. Rendezvous is one of the important techniques of space flight and which will be used later in the flight to the moon. The NASA authorization of this year provides moneys for these important, ever-growing programs.

Space activities of this Nation include the great strides we are making in communications. Certainly one of the surest ways of better understanding of each other by the nations of the world is through improved communications.

Then, too, in the field of weather reconnaissance our space program has made new breakthroughs. Here we can look forward to the day when the world will no longer be caught unprepared by weather surprises—the great tropical storms that have caused tremendous damage, suffering and loss of human life in the past.

Of great significance in the space effort of the Nation, is the reservoir of knowledge and of trained scientists and engineers which the Nation is rapidly building up. This resource will prove of incalculable benefit of the Nation as the years go by.

Lastly, I think it is of vital importance to men and a nation to have a challenge to face and to meet and overcome. In the past history of our planet, exploration has been one of the great challenges.

While there are still some unexplored portions of our earth, there are none which are not open to man should he desire to go there. Space, the solar system and the universe beyond are the frontiers to be explored today and tomorrow. They constitute the great challenge to men and nations of our time. I do not doubt for one moment that meeting this challenge will benefit this Nation in ways far beyond our comprehension today.

The activities and the spending proposed for the next fiscal year of NASA have been gone over at great length by the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

In my opinion, the bill is a sound one, and I urge its support by my colleagues. I cannot urge this House of Representatives more earnestly or fervently to support this year's authorization for NASA, in this bill, to the end that our great Nation will continue its strong space program, while it will permit us to gain preeminence and world leadership in these frontiers of today and tomorrow.

While my support of this bill is without reservation, there are matters in connection with the space program and the committee work which should be brought to the attention of this House.

I am deeply concerned by the lack of information the committee has received on Apollo applications: that is to say, what comes after the moon. During the hearings it became evident that plans for such future application of the Apollo moon program were hazy indeed. I feel, and I think this feeling is shared by many of the committee members, that the Science and Astronautics Committee must hold hearings on this matter and as soon as possible. We must have clear reports from NASA and the benefit of testimony from leading aerospace firms and any profound thinkers in the space field to determine what we are going to do after the moon. For whatever this may be, we must begin laying the groundwork. If changes in boosters, propulsion and missions call for changes in our existing hardware, the preparation for these must begin at once.

The other matter which troubles me is the staff situation of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

The space budget has been over $5 billion now for 4 years, counting fiscal 1967, which we are considering here. Certainly there is no more sophisticated or complicated program in all of Government. The expertise of scientists and engineers are needed to adequately supervise the spending of these vast sums.

I believe the Science and Astronautics Committee could perform a far better service to the Congress and the Nation if it would assume a far greater role in supervising and policing the vast spending that goes on in the space business. This is in no way an indication of a lack of confidence in NASA or in the private industry involved. But it is just good business for Congress to check up and supervise with its own staff.

We really do not know if the program can be improved because we are not scientists and engineers and, therefore, do not have the expert knowledge necessary to make proper assessment of what is going on. I can say to this House that we try hard, and have able men on the committee, but we need more staff especially trained in this business.

What we really need are committee staff people out in the field the year round, spot checking on what is going on, sampling here and there the operation and progress of the space agency, the NASA centers, the industry places where the work is going on. The committee members do not have the training to recognize trouble spots even if we see them.

I know of no business, or for that matter, human activity, that does not require checking up periodically to insure top performance. Since the Congress has the responsibility for authorizing and appropriating money, it also has the responsibility for seeing that it is well spent.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics needs a field staff to do this.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14324, authorizing appropriations to NASA for fiscal year 1967.

This is the fifth year that I have appeared before you to advocate the passage of the annual authorization request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This year the committee's recommendation is $200 million less than was authorized last year.

This year, as in the past, I have served as a member of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee and have participated in reviewing NASA's manned space flight activities.

As an indication of the diligence with which we have performed this task, I could point out that we have compiled over 1,200 pages of testimony and supplementary material.

After careful consideration, it is recommended that $40.6 million be approved for the Gemini program and $2.97 billion be approved for the Apollo program.

These amounts will allow NASA to continue its manned space flight activities during this critical period of flight testing, and it represents the peak years of NASA's funding.

The major goals of the Gemini program have now been accomplished, and the $40.6 million allocated for fiscal year 1967 will see the program through to its successful conclusion.

NASA witnesses have told the Committee that it does not expect to require additional funds for this program in fiscal year 1968.

During fiscal year 1966, the notable success that has been experienced in the Gemini program has been highlighted by the 14-day mission of Astronauts Frank Borman and James A. Lovell, Jr., in December 1965, and by the actual rendezvous and docking of the Gemini VIII spacecraft commanded by Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong and David R. Scott with the Agena target vehicle on March 16, 1966.

Both of these achievements represent space "firsts" on the part of the United States which any other nation has yet to duplicate.

In the Apollo program, fiscal year 1966 was marked by continued spacecraft and launch vehicle testing.

In July 1965, the first steppingstone of the Apollo program—the Saturn I launch vehicle—completed its flight testing after 10 launches with a perfect success record.

This was followed in February of this year with the first successful launch of the Saturn I-B launch vehicle demonstrating the compatibility and structural integrity of the launch vehicle with the Apollo spacecraft.

During fiscal year 1967, we will witness the first manned Saturn-Apollo flights and the first launching of the huge Saturn V launch vehicle.

As you may recall, Saturn V is the launch vehicle which the United States will use to achieve the manned lunar landing.

It generates 7.5 million pounds of thrust at lift-off and is capable of placing 285,000 pounds in low earth orbit and of sending 95,000 pounds of payload to the moon.

This is over 10 times as much as anything the Russians have demonstrated to date, and it has a lifting capability of 5 times as much as the Russians' new proton rocket which is expected to be able to place only about 50,000 pounds into earth orbit.

As I have mentioned, fiscal year 1967 marks the peak year for NASA's lunar landing efforts.

The tremendous achievements made by NASA so far give me every confidence that the lunar landing and return will be accomplished this decade.

I believe the men in NASA deserve the respect and admiration of the Congress and the whole Nation as a result of the fine work they have done.

The Congress is now in a position to demonstrate its confidence by authorizing funds for NASA to continue its part in achieving the national goal approved by the Congress in 1961.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the NASA authorization bill, H.R. 14324, for fiscal year 1967.

Mr. Chairman, I come here to report the activities of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, and I shall try not to go over some of the figures which have already been given.

However, I do feel it is important for the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to know that during the course of February and March the Manned Space Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], did visit all of the installations and did have an opportunity to review the activities which are taking place in various places throughout the country. The subcommittee then came to the judgment, all of which are reflected in the report and in the hearings, as to the record of accomplishment at each of our space centers.

It is important for us to recognize that this is the year when we will come to the end of the Gemini program. We have said for some years we would come to this point and this year is the last time you will be hearing the Science and Astronautics Committee on that particular program. The sum requested is $40,600,000. Reference has already been made by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], to the accomplishments of the Gemini program and there is no need for me to go into that any further.

The Apollo program, which will bring us to the moon in this decade, is the largest part of our manned space activity, representing as it does for fiscal year 1967 the sum of $2,974,200,000.

It is worth while for us today to recognize that on this program during this coming year, some 350,000 Americans will be employed at various places throughout the country. Activities essential to the Lunar program continue to take place at Huntsville, Cape Kennedy, New Orleans, Houston, and places all over the country from East to West.

As I say this, however, I think it is necessary to reflect that this, as the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], has said, is the peak year. There will be a downslide from this time on in the funding of the Apollo program. Therefore the Apollo applications program has become an essential part of a continuing space program.

We should recognize that as we have developed this competence—as we have reached the point where this vast number of people are employed throughout the country, we must consider how they will be used in the future. I expect that during the course of debate this afternoon as we get to the point in the consideration of this bill when amendments are offered that the discussion will develop around this point.

The fact is the Apollo applications program, which is the way through which techniques developed in the Apollo program will be used for the future, has been recommended at a figure this year of $41.9 million. However, this figure is a cut from the original amount requested by NASA and was reduced to this sum from $260 million by the Bureau of the Budget.

We, in listening to the testimony on this point and recognizing the importance of keeping open the options so that we would not disturb the Apollo team, the committee feels this is vital and that this sum of money in the amount of $41.9 million be approved. It will, as I said, keep the options open so that next year when Gemini is out of the way and when Apollo activity begins to decrease, we will be able to fund the Apollo applications program as it ought to be in order to keep the national asset which has been developed, so that it will contribute to the growth of this Nation.

The same reasoning applies to advanced missions. This is the area within which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration must do the planning for future programs which, being properly done, will save expenditures in the years ahead as we explore space to a further extent such as additional activities toward Mars, Venus, and the other planets.

The figure here is $8 million which represents a $2 million decrease—again, from the original NASA request—the Bureau of the Budget made the reduction.

We on the committee felt that this sum should not be reduced and that it is an important and vital ingredient of our space program.

I, therefore, felt some concern when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], who has always supported these programs, made reference to the fact that this sum was excessive.

He has been one of the stanchest supporters of the idea that we should expend the money necessary to properly plan for the future. It is in this area of advance missions that we meet such a requirement and I urge support of the $8 million allotted for this purpose.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point.

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I have referred to the $5 million of the $8 million request of NASA for the advance missions program. The point I would make is that we have not had any justifications, plans, projects, results, or presentations regarding this program. Nor did NASA officials come to us and say what they got from the money previously expended, which was many millions of dollars. All I want to know is what the money is going for. I do not want them to get off into blue-sky type of thinking in which people sit in windowless rooms and nothing comes out.

Mr. DADDARIO. I think the record shows that that has not been the case. The fact is that the NASA people have very well documented their position and showed that this was extremely vital, and they described areas where such activities would become extremely important. One such area that quickly comes to mind is the reusable space vehicle, so that instead of insufficiencies which now exist because of limitations on technology, we would develop space vehicles which would go into and out of the world's atmosphere and could be reused time and time again, with the obvious savings that would result.

I believe this has been well supported and that a cut in this amount would be unwise and injurious to the space program, and in the final analysis it would cost the country a great deal of money.

I should like to touch for a moment on construction facilities. We have in the manned space flight program an amount of $54,378,000 for the construction of facilities throughout the country. There was no controversy in this area except in the area of a Lunar Receiving Laboratory, which again the gentleman from Pennsylvania has touched on.

I would like to advise that we showed a great concern in the committee about this. In fact, we turned down the request until NASA came before us, had all the information available, and showed that we could not take a chance in not beginning this laboratory, because it could be extremely harmful to the entire country. As slight as the possibility is there is the danger that we can be contaminated from the moon materials and from the astronauts themselves when they return from the moon mission.

The National Academy of Sciences has looked into it and has recommended that this laboratory be built. The Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare supports that idea—in fact, insists upon it—and it becomes a question not that it needs to be built, but should it be built now and where? It should be built now because our program is going to be successful. We are running on schedule and we must have this laboratory ready for the first lunar landing and return.

On the question of where the facility will be built, I think we made that decision a long time ago when we decided to build the Manned Space Center at Houston. That is where the center of this activity has been developed. It is the place where it can be built at least cost and where it can be maintained at the least expense. It seems to me that that is the important argument to make in cases such as this. It has been properly explained, it has substance, and it is important for us to support it, so that we do not have, for a small sum of money, a defeat in our space program which could not only slow it down but, if the facility were not to be built, could cause a health hazard on this planet.

We have always urged that the manned space part of this budget be controlled very carefully. We have watched it and this year we have made cuts in the administrative operations in the amount of approximately $7 million. We have tried to do it so that it would not prevent proper administration of this program, but rather encourage austerity.

We believe that we can support each of these items. They do, in fact, reduce themselves to support of Gemini as it phases out, and Apollo as it builds up, and peaks off.

It is an important factor for us to consider that we have never in this House, except on one occasion, cut the manned space program budget. That was for a small sum in fiscal year 1964. Until now we have supported the program. I urge and hope that we will continue to support it here this afternoon.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER].

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I will confine my remarks to certain controversial aspects of H.R. 14324—the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1967—which were thoroughly considered by the Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications, very ably and effectively chaired by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

But first let me say, I know I speak for all on the minority side when I salute Mr. KARTH for the excellent job he did as chairman during our 4 weeks of intensive probing into the Space Sciences and Applications programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The most significant and controversial decision our subcommittee made this year was to deny authorization for NASA's proposed Mariner mission to Venus in 1967, and instead to apply that requested authorization of approximately $18 million for fiscal year 1967 to the projects for exploration of Mars.

That change was approved by the subcommittee unanimously, and then again unanimously by the full Committee on Science and Astronautics; and it is contained in the bill before us today.

It is important that the House understand the unanimity of this recommendation by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, because there are rumors that the other body will disagree with the House in this matter, and it may well become a controversial subject for solution in a conference committee. I believe I speak for all members of the subcommittee, from both sides of the aisle, in expressing our strong feeling that our decision is valid and wise, not to authorize the Venus probe, but rather to strengthen the program for exploring Mars.

Mars will be the first test of NASA's extremely complicated and important Voyager spacecraft. It is the project on which this Nation must depend to make detailed studies of the nearby planets in our solar system. For many years to come, our most vital, unmanned missions in space will be by means of Voyager, and we of the committee agree that NASA is wise in placing its emphasis on that program.

We also are impressed and convinced by the testimony of scientists that Mars should be given a first priority, rather than Venus, as the planet where immediate exploratory effort should be concentrated.

It is true that the Russians have been giving tremendous emphasis to their efforts to send space vehicles to both Mars and Venus. They have attempted at least six launches toward Mars and nine toward Venus in the past 5 years. It is evident that they are investing relatively much larger amounts of money than we are in such unmanned probes, much larger than we are likely to approve in the foreseeable future.

But I suggest we should not be tempted or stampeded by that Soviet effort into spreading our planetary exploration efforts too thin and on too scattered a basis. Since our funds definitely are limited, and more limited in fiscal year 1967 than before, I thoroughly agree with the committee's decision that NASA's funds should be concentrated in the direction of Mars to insure success there—rather than risk failure by inadequate funding in scattered efforts.

It was with that philosophy as a basis that we in the committee made a thorough search of NASA's other Space Science and Applications requests, in an attempt to find additional funds which we could transfer to the Mars programs, without increasing the total amount of money to be authorized.

We were successful in locating a total of $42 million which we believe can be wisely transferred and should be transferred.

As previously mentioned, $18 million of that amount we have voted to take by denying NASA's proposed Venus Mariner shot in 1967; $12 million of that will come from the Venus program itself, and $6 million from the amount which would have been required for a Venus launch vehicle.

Another $1.5 million we propose to transfer, by cancelling NASA's planned 5th orbiting astronomical observatory flight. From the launch vehicle procurement account, we believe that $10 million can safely be transferred. From the supporting science, research and technology advanced studies, we believe $5 million can be transferred. From the sustaining engineering and maintenance account, we believe $4 million can be transferred; and from administrative operations account, $3.5 million.

It is by those means that we have obtained the total of $42 million, and we recommend that $20 million of that be used to insure success of the 1966 Mars Mariner probes, a project which is essential as preliminary to the first Voyager shot. The remaining $22 million we recommend should be transferred to the Voyager program itself, to do vital preliminary work, without which the first Voyager mission in 1973 we feel could fail. NASA's own request for such preliminary work during the next fiscal year amounts to only $10 million. We of the subcommittee, during our hearings, became convinced that more than that amount is certainly needed, because of the very complex and difficult nature of the Voyager undertaking.

We are painfully aware that experience clearly shows the crucial necessity for sufficiently detailed advance study and design work in such complex space projects. We believe those failures and disappointments which NASA has experienced in flight projects in the past, those that have been plagued by delays and tremendous additional costs, have always revealed inadequate preparatory work.

We believe that if the Voyager program is worth doing at all, it is worth doing right. We believe the Nation should rightly demand success in that program, therefore we believe this current fiscal year is the best time to insure that success by insuring adequate preparatory preliminary work. We believe it would be false economy to authorize only $10 million for the Voyager in fiscal year 1967. We believe in discovering the problems before hardware procurement has gotten underway, rather than after procurement. We believe that millions of dollars may be ultimately saved by the changes we are recommending in the NASA budget.

Our reasons for adding $20 million to the authorization for the two Mariner fly-by missions to Mars, scheduled by NASA for 1969 are that we consider those Mariner probes of Mars essential to the success of Voyager in 1973. There continues to be great uncertainty regarding the characteristics of the Martian atmosphere, but these atmospheric properties will have an important bearing upon many aspects on the design of the Voyager landing capsule and on the weight of the scientific payload that can be landed on the surface of Mars. The most efficient and economical way to build the Voyager spacecraft is first to acquire this vital data, and then design the capsule lander for the specific atmospheric conditions that will be encountered. Also, a small lander incorporated into the 1969 Mariner program would require NASA to face the sterilization problem, which so complicates the Voyager program. It is not too early to face that problem; in fact, it is imperative that it be faced immediately. The Mariner probe would also give NASA excellent experience in developing a system for separating a capsule lander from the mother spacecraft, which is something never attempted before and which should be attempted before the first flight of Voyager.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some people will say that the Congress has no right to intrude itself into NASA's decisionmaking process, in directing these particular details of the space program. We on the committee have given that matter careful consideration, and we feel very strongly that the changes we have voted in NASA's authorization are an expression of congressional intent and are a valid function of the Congress. We feel very strongly that our proper function legitimately goes well beyond simply accepting or rejecting the programs recommended by the Administration. On this subject, I want to quote the following paragraph from our subcommittee report:

> While we must rely very heavily upon the good judgment and honest evaluations of the experts in the executive branch, this should not preclude our independent appraisal of priorities and alternatives. On the contrary, in those few cases where the committee has reservations regarding specific aspects of the program submitted by the administration, we believe that we can discharge our responsibilities to the American people only if we are prepared to consider alternatives, and to make the hard policy decision that may be required.

Mr. Chairman, it might well be asked why we have not merely killed the $42 million which we propose to transfer, and thus we would save the taxpayers that amount of money, rather than transfer it to the Mars Mariner and Voyager programs. I want to assure the Members of the House and the public that the subcommittee very seriously considered that possibility. We on the minority side were especially insistent that that course be considered. We recognize that wherever we discover NASA proposals which do not seem to us wise or necessary, then we do have an obligation to consider canceling those amounts of authorization completely. We very seriously considered that possibility, but on the other hand we felt so strongly that NASA's proposals had slighted the Mars Mariner and Voyager programs, it was there we decided the $42 million should be used. We believe in the long run we acted for the taxpayers' interest in doing so, because, I repeat, we believe that if the Voyager program is worth doing at all, it is worth doing successfully and it should not be endangered by inadequate funding.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to recognize that this bill represents a substantial reduction from the current level of spending at NASA for space science and applications. This bill provides for approximately $664 million for research and development in those fields, whereas the appropriations for similar activities for the present fiscal year were some $783 million.

That emphasizes the need to place every dollar where it will count the most for America's success in space, and that is why we decided that NASA's proposed mission to Venus in 1967 should not be approved. That mission first appeared in NASA's plans only about 4 months ago and seemed to come about strictly as a reaction to the substantial reductions in the NASA budget required by the Bureau of the Budget. We believe the testimony before our committee indicates this Venus mission was merely an ill-conceived, stopgap type project, only undertaken because of a 2-year delay in the Voyager program, also brought about by the Budget Bureau's cut. The Venus proposal seems to have been offered by NASA as a sort of "make work" program, and that made it easy for us to deny authorization. That is the reason I hope the other body will not reinsert it into the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, and referring to the overall authorization for NASA represented in this bill, let me say that I believe it has received very deliberate and careful analysis by the Science and Astronautics Committee, and I have no reluctance in supporting the recommendations of our committee. I urge that the House approve H.R. 14324.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Karth] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I join in agreement with the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], the chairman of our committee, in support of H.R. 14324, the NASA fiscal year 1967 authorization bill. I may say, too, the gentleman from Ohio, who just preceded me in the well, made what I choose to call probably one of the most profound statements that have been made on the floor today insofar as it relates to this bill, if not perhaps the most profound statement made on this floor as it relates to any NASA authorization bill previous to this time. I not only thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Mosher], for the kind things he said about me but more importantly for what he said about the program.

I certainly agree that this year the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications probably did the most outstanding job they have ever done in scrutinizing very carefully those projects recommended for our consideration by the agency. I do agree with him most completely and enthusiastically about the proper function of Congress to make determinations that may be different insofar as they relate to program actions or programs and policies of the administration or that agency of the Government as it relates to our function as Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, because the gentleman from Ohio did such an extremely outstanding job in explaining what we did, I am going to shorten my remarks considerably from what I had anticipated.

First of all, let me say that the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications considered all of the NASA requests in the unmanned space flight program field, the lunar and planetary field, physics and astronomy, bioscience, the sustaining university program, and all of the launch vehicle procurement and development programs except those used in manned flight. And, of course, the application programs, including meteorological satellites and communication satellites.

Now let me begin by pointing out that the budget dollar amounts for fiscal year 1967 for the Office of Space Science and Applications adds up to approximately $120 million below the fiscal year 1966 level of spending. This is a serious reduction and is resulting in a treading of water or perhaps I should say a buying of time in important programs like the Voyager or the Mars exploration project, the No. 1 priority program of OSSA, as was so ably explained by the gentleman from Ohio.

For the benefit of the Committee, I will break down just a little further the funding levels in the various program areas relating to the fiscal year 1967 requests and the committee action relating thereto.

In the physics and astronomy field for fiscal year 1967, NASA's request is approximately $12 million less than the funding level for fiscal year 1966. The committee reduced that by an additional $5.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, in the lunar and planetary exploration field NASA requested for fiscal year 1967 approximately $53 million less than the present funding level or the funding level for the current fiscal year, to which the committee added $20 million, for a total of about $30 million less than is funded for the present fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, in the bioscience area the budget is approximately $1.5 million less than the current funding level, which the committee reduced by another $2 million.

In the meteorological-satellite area the funds provided for in this bill represent approximately $4.5 million more than the current year funding level.

In the communications and technological satellite field the fiscal year 1967 request is approximately $6.5 million less than the current funding level.

Mr. Chairman, in the launch vehicle development area there is a reduction of approximately $22 million, and in the launch vehicle procurement area the funds provided for herein are approximately $26 million less, which was further reduced by $20 million on the part of the subcommittee and approved by the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, in the sustaining university program there is approximately $5 million less than the current funding level for fiscal year 1966.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Mosher], has already very ably covered the specific breakdown of the fifth orbiting astronomical observatory and the figure of $10 million contained in the launch vehicle procurement area.

There is a $5 million reduction in supporting research and technology in the advanced study area plus a $4 million reduction in the supporting engineering and maintenance portion of launch vehicle procurement.

Additionally, there is an $18 million reduction as a result of the cancellation of the 1967 Venus probe and a $3.5 million reduction in administrative operations.

This did not, as the gentleman from Ohio explained, result in an overall reduction for the Office of Space Sciences and Applications, because the committee felt it wise to commit this money to future programs and more specifically the 1969 Mars Mariner flights and the 1973 Voyager undertaking.

Mr. Chairman, we felt it was very important to do this because there are certain things which we have not successfully done in this country up to this point, such as to successfully sterilize spacecraft, and the separation of spacecraft which is important. The fact of the matter is it is essential to do this, and we have already agreed upon a unilateral basis with the Russians and other countries to do this with reference to the interplanetary spacecraft. A most important area is the long lead time involved for the component parts and communications, which again represents things that we have never done to the extent we must do them in the Voyager program.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, with reference to construction of facilities, we have authorized the sum of $6,322,000, the lowest amount which has ever been authorized or, for that matter, requested by the Office of Space Sciences for a fiscal year authorization.

Mr. Chairman, if there are any questions, I shall be very happy to attempt to answer them.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARTH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. First, Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman and, of course, his committee for the fine work they have done on the space program and to commend particularly the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] for his many fine efforts.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with the emphasis that the Government sometimes places upon its various programs, although I agree we have needed to place emphasis upon the space program.

I believe one program that is overlooked and about which the Congress ought to do something is in the field of oceanography.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would comment with reference to his feelings in regard to this matter.

Mr. KARTH. Yes. I would be delighted to make a very brief comment upon that subject.

I might say that despite my assignment to the Science and Astronautics Committee, I have undertaken, as a personal project, the study of the question of research in the opposite direction; that is, under the seas as opposed to outer space.

Mr. Chairman, I am mindful of some of the predictions that have been made by very learned men in this country as they relate to the short supply of food that all of us will face in the very immediate years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that the experts are saying today that despite the fact we have made great strides forward in agricultural technology, within 10 years, we in this country will not be able to grow more food than what the population of the United States itself will consume.

Of course, this means that the situation on a worldwide basis will be aggravated far beyond what it is today.

It is obvious to me that the only source of food that is going to be in short supply is the source that you refer to—the oceans. I think it is a sad situation really because we really just harvest the oceans—we do not farm them. We have not cultivated the oceans and despite the immensities of the oceans, it is understood by people who are much better informed on the subject than I am, that unless we begin to farm the oceans and pay some attention to that by doing the research necessary in this very vital area, we can decimate the populations or the food supply in the oceans to the point, where it will be so far as the benefits are concerned, negative rather than positive.

I do feel that we ought to increase our attention threefold or fourfold at least in the very near future and I hope that the Congress does not wait more than just another year to do this.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate very much the reply of my colleague and if the gentleman will yield for one further comment, I want to say one of the reasons the Congress is taking a more active interest in oceanography is due in the main part to the chairman of the full Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. It was his leadership as the first chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Merchant Marine Committee that started the Congress to work in this area and I am encouraged by the fact that this interest in oceanography is continuing and the Congress is going to put some emphasis on this program in the development of the seas.

I think to have the interest of those of you who are members of the Space Committee also take an interest in this vital program of the development of the seas means a great deal.

Mr. KARTH. I thank the gentleman.

Let me just take a moment to congratulate the real father of oceanography in this Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE].

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the last two gentlemen who addressed the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], particularly with respect to the work of the space science and applications subcommittee.

I am proud that this committee did face up to some of the responsibilities of the Congress in connection with the oversight of the space program.

I would like to emphasize some of the statements made with respect to the cancellation of the Venus shot. This shot was planned for 1967. It was of questionable scientific significance because it was a dead end program. We are planning nothing further with respect to Venus in the foreseeable future.

The implication of this Venus shot was that somebody had told NASA that they had better do something with Venus because the Russians had. This is no reason for engaging in an expensive scientific experiment—unless it is going to lead somewhere. Even the prestige connected with such a shot is questionable.

The Voyager shot, however, is planned for 1973 and is a very significant program on which our future exploration of the solar system is probably going to be based to a substantial degree.

Some might think that reinvestment of the money saved from the Venus shot in Voyager has resulted in no net saving to the people. Voyager is an expensive program and proper advance research can avoid wasteful hardware mistakes.

All our experience indicates that wise funding of the Voyager shot will save money in the long run and to a substantial degree. Underfunding at this stage could be disastrous in terms of expense as well as in terms of delay. For this reason I wholeheartedly endorse the remarks made by the last two gentlemen in the well of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Advance Research and Technology which I have chaired had under its jurisdiction advanced research, tracking and data acquisition, and technology utilization.

In this area the National Aeronautics and Space Administration asked, through the President, for $787 million. The committee recommended an authorization of some $16 million less than the President's request—a total of $770 million.

Over the past few years I have been deeply concerned that the fundamental research programs of NASA have received steadily decreasing support in the budgets presented. I think it is a rather dangerous trend when we consider that the strength of our space program in the 1980's and the 1990's rest on what we invest now in 1966 in advanced research.

In 1964 the Office of Advanced Research and Technology had $317 million for research and development. In 1965 this figure went up very slightly to $331 million. But in fiscal 1966 there was available $289 million, a big drop, and now requested in the NASA budget for fiscal 1967 is a further drop to $278 million.

This is why the subcommittee which I had the honor to chair looked at these programs very carefully and recommended an increase of $11.8 million in the field of research and development, specifically for the SNAP-8 on-board nuclear electric power generating system, for which we recommended an increase of $2.4 million; for the 260-inch solid rocket propellant booster, for which the committee recommended an additional $7.5 million; and in the highly important field of aeronautics, covering the noise research, vertical and short takeoff landings, and supersonic and hypersonic research, for which we recommended an increase of $2 million, and in the field of technology utilization, for which we recommended an increase of $200,000.

The committee felt that in a number of areas, in tracking and data acquisition and administrative operations, it was possible to achieve economies; therefore, the overall net reduction in authorization recommended was some $16 million. But I believe that at a time when challenging problems are being thrust before us that we are shortchanging our investment in future scientific strength of the Nation when we pare down on advanced research. I repeat that I think this is a dangerous trend.

Last year, during our budget hearings, I posed this question to the head of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology: "How can you possibly continue to cut down on research and technology and hope to maintain strength in the field of aeronautics and astronautics in the future?"

The answer to my question was given as follows:

> I think the answer, Congressman HECHLER, is we cannot maintain that strength if we continue to cut down. I am hopeful that in future years we can return to a higher budget level in advanced research and technology, although I recognize that because of stringent budget limitations and costs of the other part of the program, it is going to be necessary for us in 1966 to accept a somewhat lower budget figure.

This is the reason, then, for the action of the subcommittee, which the Committee on Science and Astronautics recommends to this Committee today, that there be certain increases in advanced research and technology.

I want to say a word about the field of aeronautical research. This is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for which we are authorizing our appropriation today, but we have put most of our emphasis on Space rather than Aeronautics. Out of the close to $5 billion that is being authorized there is asked only $33 million by the President in the field of aeronautical research.

Our subcommittee held very extensive hearings on this subject and we agreed unanimously that in the field of aircraft noise and vertical and short takeoff landings and hypersonic and supersonic research—particularly aircraft noise abatement—this deserved additional attention. The committee unanimously agreed, after some discussion, that $2 million should be voted above and beyond the President's request to tackle the very vital problem of how to suppress aircraft noise.

I wish it could be more, but in discussions with the Office of Advanced Research and Technology, and testimony before our committee, we discovered that this was the maximum amount that could profitably be utilized in a program which NASA could undertake.

The subcommittee thereupon asked for $2 million additional in this highly important field.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, it is with great pride that I support the entire authorization of the committee, as presented so ably by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and by my fellow chairmen of the subcommittees, the Manned Space Flight and Space Sciences, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

I would now like to refer to more specific details of our subcommittee deliberations.

It is a fundamental premise of space exploration that one of the keys to mission success is power, translated into onboard energy to operate spacecraft systems. We have made great strides in developing to a practical stage such devices as solar cells, improved storage batteries, and small power supplies using isotopes. But what is really needed is relatively large and long-lived generating equipment that will be indispensable to operating space laboratories, radio and television transmitting satellites, and extraterrestrial bases located on the Moon, perhaps Mars and elsewhere in space. SNAP–8 is a beginning to provide that capability.

In any event, NASA has yet to show that it is conducting such a development program with vigor and purpose.

I am sure you recall that in the interest of budget considerations and other reasons, NASA eliminated SNAP–8, among other programs, from its budget last year. The Science and Astronautics Committee authorized $6 million then to make sure the project was continued, at least on a survival basis so that the progress so far achieved would not be lost and its momentum terminated. And the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences agreed.

The end result was that NASA continued to support the SNAP–8 project and asked for $5,600,000 this year. Nevertheless, this amount represents a minimum level of effort that continues to make evident the lack of an aggressive approach to that development. As a consequence, the committee asks for an additional $2,400,000 that will be necessary for a thorough testing program.

The second major program area to receive recommended additional authorization was "chemical propulsion." As it has been said many times in the past on this floor another of the keys to success in space is propulsion—thrust—in a wide variety of propulsion devices.

NASA over the past 8 years has worked hard and with impressive achievement to develop a family of rockets with the required variety. It is now enjoying the phenomenal successes of the Saturn I flights, all of them outstanding in accomplishing their objectives. Nevertheless, for the most part, these have been liquid-fueled.

Again, like SNAP–8, I am sure you recall that the 260-inch, 7-million-pound-thrust rocket engine development program was eliminated from last year's budget request. The fiscal year 1966 bill authorized the appropriation of $6,100,000 to keep the 260-inch program alive. Since then NASA has continued the program and has successfully test-fired two short-length boosters. Now the committee believes that a full-length firing should be undertaken and recommends the authorization of $7,500,000 in addition to the $3,500,000 request in fiscal year 1967 by NASA for the 260-inch.

The third major area of advanced research is the aeronautics program.

The United States has begun to push hard its various programs of research and development in aeronautics, such as noise abatement, vertical and short takeoff and landing aircraft, and the supersonic transport. NASA is one of the principal agencies of the Government from which answers to these problems must come.

In view of the ever-increasing problems arising in the aviation industry today as a result of the tremendous growth it is experiencing, and the corresponding responsibilities occurring in NASA, the committee recommends that $2 million should be added to this program, making a total of $35 million.

I referred earlier to Technology Utilization, a program for which NASA requested $4,800,000. In 1958, when the space program began, one of the principal benefits expected to devolve was the great new technologies that would be developed and made available to the Nation's economy.

At that time, witness after witness testifying before the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration stated that a national program of the dimensions NASA inevitably would reach could not fail to produce innovations in technology of immeasurable value to the economy and the security of the country. Such has become the case. However, the transfer of the new knowledge to the industrial community has taken many indirect routes, making necessary the formal, direct processes of the Office of Technology Utilization for the purposes of proper management and the greatest possible dissemination of information.

For the past 2 years, NASA has funded this office at about the $4,800,000 level. Again, the Agency has asked for the same amount this year.

The committee is convinced that the continuing potential importance of this operation to the industrial community is so great that a modest increase of $200,000 in authorization is warranted and recommended, if only to encourage NASA to maintain a vigorous and aggressive program.

NASA presently is operating 8 technology disseminating centers throughout the country. It plans to open 2 more, 1 on the east coast and 1 on the west, making a total of 10 centers.

In view of the $16 billion or more being spent this year by the Federal Government for scientific research and development, it has become obvious that the Government is now the largest producer of technologies in the Nation and, indeed, the world. The task of disseminating the information on new technological developments from all Government agencies has been assumed by the State Technical Service Office in the Department of Commerce under 1965 legislation; it can be assumed logically that it could eventually take over the responsibilities of the Office of Technological Utilization in this area. As a result, the committee has placed a requirement upon NASA in the legislative report on H.R. 14324 that directs NASA to report to the committee by January 1, 1967, to detail how coordination and cooperation with the State Technical Office has been carried out.

The Office of Tracking and Data Acquisition has the responsibility for carrying out what is perhaps the most important function of NASA. It is in this office that the results of NASA's investigations and experiments in space culminate. It is here where all the information telemetered back from space is made intelligible to the scientists who must interpret it.

The tracking and data acquisition network extends to every corner of the globe and represents an exciting worldwide effort that is bringing to the United States immense benefits in the form of international goodwill and cooperation. Support is provided for manned and unmanned flights, for spacecraft, launch vehicles, sounding rockets, and research aircraft. It is also provided for earth orbital and suborbital missions as well as lunar and planetary missions and space probes.

There are three networks presently in operation. The first is the Manned Space Flight network, consisting of 15 stations, 2 of which are instrumented ships. At the moment, the network, which is configured to support the Gemini program is being modified and augmented for the Apollo program.

The next tracking and data system is the satellite network, consisting of both electronic and optical tracking stations.

The third is the deep space network, which has the primary function of providing teaching and data acquisition support for unmanned lunar and planetary space flight. The three stations in this network—in Australia, Spain, and California—will also have the capability of participating in the Apollo program.

Other tracking and data instrumentation systems are operated in support of the sounding rocket program and for flight programs associated with aeronautical research.

NASA requested $279,300,000 to be authorized to support tracking and data acquisition operations. This was $48,200,000 more than the amount allocated for fiscal year 1966. The increase reflects the increase in flight operations over the past 12 months plus the necessity to provide for operations to be undertaken in the near future.

However, the fact is that the program has not utilized all of the funds authorized over the past 3 years. While recognizing that it is virtually impossible to make precise estimates of costs for such a program as tracking and data acquisitions, nevertheless the consistent record of overestimating in this area led the committee to recommend a reduction of $13,965,000, or 5 percent of the total requested in this budget area.

Budget estimates for facility construction totaled $33,800,000. This sum includes $32,100,000 for construction at three research centers: The Electronic Research Center at Cambridge, Mass.; the Langley Research Center at Hampton, Va.; and the Lewis Research Center at Cleveland, Ohio. It also includes $1,700,000 for two tracking and data stations: The Goddard Space Flight Center at Greenbelt, Md., and the Goldstone Station near Barstow, Calif.

Two million dollars was requested for facility planning and design of a proposed NERVA test stand at the joint NASA-AEC Space Nuclear Propulsion Station at Jackass Flats, Nev.

The committee recommends that authorization of the Electronic Research Center be reduced from $10 to $5 million for NASA's proposed fiscal year 1967 program. We feel that sufficient funds are available from prior year authorizations to move ahead expeditiously on construction.

The total amount recommended for construction of facilities is $30,800,000, including $2 million requested for facility planning and design funds.

The total amount requested by NASA for administrative costs of advanced research being conducted at six centers was $188,977,000. The committee reduced the budget request by $9,448,850 by applying a 5-percent reduction of the amounts allocated to each center. This resulted in a committee recommendation of $179,528,150.

The committee is convinced that these centers can absorb this reduction by the application of appropriate management procedures without in any way inhibiting the research programs.

The single area of NASA which carries the greatest significance to the future success of our national space program is the Office of Advanced Research and Technology. It is therefore with great pride that I support this request for the NASA authorization.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14324.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express my support for the NASA authorization H.R. 14324. I will be brief.

The request has been fully scrutinized by the several subcommittees and the full committee as well. In the unanimous opinion of the committee the authorization is reasonable and justified both in total dollars and specific application of these dollars to individual items in the program.

This program has many real values and advantages. Some of these advantages are plainly visible for all to see. Some are not readily identifiable. Much technology has been gained since the inception of this program and I am pleased to say that it has long been NASA policy to provide this technology to industry for the benefit of all our people. The spinoff of the technology has been tremendous. Management techniques in American big business are being reevaluated as a result of the computer use and technology gained from this program for example. I believe it can truthfully be said that health of Americans as a whole will be the biggest recipient of all from this spinoff. I am convinced that the artificial heart, for example, will be perfected as a direct result of the research and development done in the ongoing of this program. It is just around the corner, we are told, and what a great day that will be for us all. Future programs offer real hope in the fields of communication and weather forecasting and control.

In closing let me say that your committee has plowed new ground this year and faced up to its policymaking responsibility in authorizing and accelerating programs it felt deserved additional attention and curbing those which appear to be of little or no value. The rubber stamp is not a tool of this committee.

I urge your support for this authorization.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity. I have asked for this time to ask several questions.

I realize that this is, by its title and nature, a national program, but we all recognize, I am sure, that other nations have talent and resources which can be brought into play in the field of aeronautics and space activities research and development.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or anyone who might like to respond, know to what extent other nations, particularly of the NATO alliance, are participating with us in this NASA program?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very astute question and observation. I am pleased to report that NASA has made great strides in the area of international cooperation.

Cooperation between NASA and NATO nations in the areas of space activities can be divided into five major fields. These are: cooperative satellite projects; use of foreign experiments on NASA scientific satellites; cooperative sounding rocket programs; cooperative ground-based projects; and personnel exchanges.

Cooperative satellite projects normally use U.S. space boosters with satellites built and financed by foreign participants. To date, 5 NATO nations—Canada, France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom—as well as the European Space Research Organization, consisting of 10 participating nations, have participated in this cooperative program. A total of seven cooperative satellites have been launched with eight additional satellites scheduled for launch during the next 3 years.

Four NATO nations—France, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom—have constructed, with their own funds, five scientific experiments for flight on NASA satellites. An additional 11 experiments will be provided by these nations for flights in the next several years on NASA satellites. These experiments are scientific contributions by these NATO nations and represent a savings of several millions of dollars to NASA and the United States.

With regard to cooperative sounding rockets programs, seven NATO nations—France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, and the United Kingdom—have participated financially and scientifically in 43 sounding rocket launches to date, with another 10 launches scheduled for next year. In addition to these, NASA and Canada jointly plan to launch about 30 sounding rockets each year up to June 30, 1970.

Cooperative ground-based projects include the use of NATO national ground stations, equipment, and observers in connection with NASA meteorological, communication, and ionospheric satellites. NATO nations participating in this endeavor at no cost to the United States include all of the nations in NATO except Turkey.

The personnel exchange program includes resident research associateships, international fellowships, technical training, and visits to NASA facilities. This program has involved hundreds of foreign nationals from all of the NATO nations except Iceland and Portugal—including the European Space Research Organization. All personnel costs are borne by the participating nation.

NASA is also cooperating with the European Launch Development Organization in the area of nonmilitary space technology information exchange. This organization consists of Belgium, Italy, France, Germany, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

NATO nations are now spending about $200 million per year on their internal space programs. Exclusive of capital expenditures, these nations are now spending about $15 million per year as their share of cooperative programs with NASA. The current NASA expenditures for these cooperative programs amounts to $12 million annually, again exclusive of capital expenditures.

I am including the following detailed listing and explanation of the entire NASA international cooperative program.

Cooperative satellite projects

Country, name, launch site and date	Vehicle and orbit	Spacecraft responsibility	Experimenters	Experiment description
CANADA				
Alouette I, Western Test Range, Sept. 29, 1962.	Thor-Agena B, near polar, 80°, circular, 1,000 km.	DRTE	Canadian Telecommunications Establishment (DRTE).	Sound ionosphere from above (topside sounder) to measure hour-to-hour electron densities of ionosphere. Determine electron density at height of satellite. Monitor VLF noise in range of 1 to 10 kc./s.
			Canadian National Research Council (NRC).	Measure primary cosmic ray particles outside the earth's atmosphere.
Alouette II, Western Test Range, Nov. 29, 1965.	Thor-Agena B, near polar, 80°; apogee, 3,000 km.; perigee, 500 km.	DRTE	DRTE and NRC	Same Canadian experiments as Alouette I.
			Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC).	Determine electron temperature in vicinity of orbiting spacecraft.
ISIS-1 (International satellite for ionosphere studies), 1967.	Improved Delta, near polar; apogee, 3,500 km.; perigee, 1,000 km.	DRTE	DRTE	Swept and fixed-frequency topside sounders supplemented by 8 additional experiments, 4 Canadian and 4 United States.
ISIS-2, 1968	Improved Delta, near polar; apogee, approximately 4,000 km.; perigee, 300 km.	DRTE	DRTE, NRC, and NASA-funded U.S. experimenters.	Topside sounder plus other experiments to be determined.
ISIS-3, 1969	Improved Delta, to be determined.	DRTE	To be determined	To be determined.
FRANCE				
FR-1, Western Test Range, Dec. 6, 1965.	Scout, near polar, circular, 750 km.	National Center for Space Studies (CNES).	National Center for Telecommunications Studies (CNET).	Simultaneously measure the electric and magnetic components of very low frequency (VLF) radio emissions, and measure electron densities.
GERMANY				
Project 625A-1, late 1968	Scout, near polar; apogee, 2,50 km.; perigee, 250 km.	Federal Ministry for Scientific Research.	Max-Planck Institute for Physics and Astrophysics.	Measure energy spectrum of protons in 1 to 100 Mev. region. Measure omnidirectional flux of protons (6. . 120 Mev.) and electrons (0.3-3 Mev.).
			University of Kiel	Measure energy spectrum of protons in 100 Kev. to 2 Mev. region.
			Max-Planck Institute for Aeronomy.	Measure electrons above 40 Kev. energy threshold. Measure energy spectrum of protons in 135 to 250 Mev. region.
ITALY				
Project "San Marco":				
Pnase I: Wallops Island, April to August 1963.	Shotput suborbital launch	Italian Space Commission.[1]		
Phase II: Wallops Island, Dec. 15, 1964.	Scout, inclination 40°, near circular, 200 to 600 km.			
			School of Aerospace Engineering, University of Rome.	Determine local density of upper atmosphere (phase II) and local density of equatorial upper atmosphere (phase III) by measuring the instantaneous aerodynamic drag on the respective satellites.
Phase III: Towable platform in Indian Ocean equatorial waters, 1966 or 1967.	Scout, inclination 0-3°, near circular, 250 to 300 km.		University of Florence	Ionospheric propagation studies (Faraday rotation technique) using beacon (phase II and phase III).
UNITED KINGDOM				
Ariel I, Eastern Test Range, Apr. 26, 1962.	Delta, inclination 54°; apogee, 1,200 km.; perigee, 400 km.	GSFC	Imperial College, London	Measure spectrum of primary cosmic ray energies and its variations, with Cerenkov Detector.
			University of Birmingham	Measure local electron density with RF impedance probe.
			University College, London	Measure electron temperature and density with Langmuir probe. Measure ion mass composition and temperature with mass spectrometer. Measure energy spectrum of solar hard X-rays. Measure solar ultraviolet emissions (Lyman-alpha).
Ariel II, Wallops Island, Mar. 27, 1964.	Scout, inclination 51°; apogee, 1,350 km.; perigee, 290 km.	GSFC	Meteorological Office, United Kingdom Air Ministry.	Measure atmospheric ozone with filtered photocells and spectrometer.
			Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, University of Cambridge.	Measure Galactic radio noise.
			Nuffield Radio Astronomy Laboratories, Jodrell Bank.	Measure micrometeoroid flux by optical detection of holes formed in a thin metallic film.
UK-3, Western Test Range, early 1967.	Scout, inclination 60°, circular, 550 km.	Royal Aircraft Establishment Farnborough.	Meteorological Office, United Kingdom Air Ministry.	Measure vertical distribution of molecular oxygen in earth's atmosphere.
			Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, University of Cambridge.	Measure large-scale noise sources in galaxy.
			University of Sheffield	Measure intensity of VLF radiation.
			Radio Research Station, Slough.	Measure intensity and geographical distribution of sources of natural terrestrial noise.
			University of Bermingham	Measure electron density and temperature.
EUROPEAN SPACE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION (ESRO)				
ESRO I, Western Test Range, late 1967.	Scout, near polar; apogee, 1,500 km.; perigee, 275 km.	ESRO	Denmark: Technical University; Norway: University of Oslo; Sweden: Kiruna Geophysical Observatory; United Kingdom: Queen's University; Belfast; Radio Research Station, Slough; and University College, London (2 experiments).	Integrated study of high latitude energetic particles and their effects on the ionosphere.
ESRO II, Western Test Range, early 1967.	Scout, near polar; apogee, 1,100 km.; perigee, 350 km.	ESRO	France: Saclay Center for Nuclear Physics; Netherlands: Sterrewacht, Utrecht; United Kingdom: Imperial College, London (3 experiments)—University of Leeds; and University of Leicester and University College, London.	Integrated study of solar radiation and cosmic rays.

---

[1] Italian Space Commission also responsible for phase II and III launchings.

Coordinated satellite projects

Country, name, launch site and date	Vehicle and orbit	Spacecraft responsibility	Experimenters	Experiment description
U.S.S.R.				
Meteorological satellite project, 1965.	Tiros/Nimbus	NASA	GSFC and U.S. Weather Bureau.	(1) Exchange of data gathered by national experimental meteorological satellites over Washington-Moscow communications link.
		Academy of Sciences of U.S.S.R.		(2) Coordinated launchings of national experimental meteorological satellites.
Satellite telecommunications, February 1964.	Thor-Agena B, inclination 82°; apogee, 1,350 km.; perigee, 980 km.	NASA	GSFC and University of Manchester, United Kingdom; Academy of Sciences of U.S.S.R.	Cooperative communications experiments by means of U.S. passive satellite, Echo II.
Mapping of the geomagnetic field, 1965.	Thrust-augmented Thor-Agena, inclination 86°; apogee, 925 km.; perigee, 260 km.	NASA and Academy of Sciences of U.S.S.R.	GSFC and Academy of Sciences of U.S.S.R.	(1) Launching by each country of an earth satellite equipped with absolute magnetometers. (2) Exchanges of processed satellite magnetic-measurement data from national programs.

Foreign experiments on NASA satellites

Country, name, launch site and date	Vehicle and orbit	Spacecraft responsibility	Experimenters	Experiment description
FRANCE				
4 experiments:				
Orbiting geophysical observatories (OGO II, OGO-D), Oct. 14, 1965, 1966.	Thrust-augmented Thor-Agena, inclination 86°; apogee, 925 km.; perigee, 260 km.	Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC).	Service d'Aeronomie, National Scientific Research Center (CNRS), GSFC (coexperimenter).	Measure airglow at 6,300 A, 5,577 A, 3,914 A, and in the near ultraviolet region with photometer.
Orbiting solar observatory (OSO-F), 1967.	Delta, inclination 33°; circular, 550 km.	GSFC	CNRS	Measure self-reversal of the solar Lyman-alpha spectrographic line.
Orbiting geophysical observatory (OGO-E), 1967.	Atlas-Agena, inclination 31°; apogee, 148,000 km.; perigee, 275 km.	GSFC	University of Paris	Determine number, density, and temperature of hydrogen and density of deuterium in geocorona with hydrogen-deuterium cell.
ITALY				
Orbiting solar observatory (OSO-G), 1968.	Delta, inclination 33°; circular, 550 km.	GSFC	University of Bologna	Solar X-ray monitoring and gamma astronomy in the energy range 20-200 kev.
NETHERLANDS				
Orbiting geophysical observatory (OGO-E), 1967.	Atlas-Agena, inclination 31°; apogee, 148,000 km.; perigee, 275 km.	GSFC	Delft Technical Institute	6-counter telescope to measure absolute flux and energy spectrum of cosmic ray electrons.
UNITED KINGDOM				
10 experiments:				
Explorer XX (U.S. fixed-frequency topside sounder), Aug. 25, 1964.	Scout, near polar, apogee, 1,375 km.; perigee, 925 km.	GSFC	University College, London	Measure ion mass composition and temperature with ion mass spectrometer. (Similar experiment on Ariel I.)
Orbiting astronomical observatory (OAO-C), 1968.	Atlas-Agena, inclination 32°; circular, 780 km.	GSFC	University of Leicester and University College, London.	Study the X-ray emission of stars and nebulae and obtain information on the interstellar absorption of He and the heavier elements.
Orbiting solar observatory (OSO-D), 1966.	Delta, inclination 33°; circular, 550 km.	GSFC	do	(1) Measure distribution of total solar X-ray emission over a wide band.
			University College, London	(2) Study solar HE II resonance emission (304 Å).
Orbiting solar observatory (OSO-F), 1967.	Delta, inclination 33°; circular, 550 km.	GSFC	University of Leicester and University College, London.	Measure solar X-ray flux with spectroheliograph.
Explorer XXXI (direct measurement Explorer), Nov. 29, 1965.	Thor-Agena B, inclination 80°; apogee, 3,000 km.; perigee, 500 km. (piggyback with Alouette II).	GSFC	University College, London	(1) Measure ion mass composition and temperature with spherical ion mass spectrometer. (Similar experiment on Ariel I.) (2) Measure electron temperature with planar electron temperature probe.
Orbiting geophysical observatory (OGO-E), 1967.	Atlas-Agena, inclination 31°; apogee, 148,000 km.; perigee, 275 km.	GSFC	do	(1) Spherical probe to measure electron density and temperature.
			University of Southampton	(2) Spark chamber to measure direction of incidence of uncharged primary cosmic rays.
Orbiting solar observatory (OSO-G), 1968.	Delta, inclination 33°; circular, 550 km.	GSFC	University College, London	Study of solar HE I and HE II resonance radiation by means of a twin-line monochrometer.

Cooperative sounding rocket projects

Country and cooperating agency	Number, type of rocket and altitude	Launch site and date	Experimenter and project description
Argentina: Argentine National Commission for Space Research (CNIE).	2 Nike-Cajun, above 90 km	Chamical, Argentina, December 1964.	National University of Tucuman: Measure D and E region electron density and temperature, ion density, and ultraviolet radiation.
	4 Nike-Apache, 90-140 km	Chamical, late 1966	National University of Tucuman: Investigate physical processes producing sporadic E.
	16 Boosted Dart and 10 Arcas, 30-60 km.	Chamical, 1966	CNIE: Project to constitute 1 element of inter-American, experimental, meteorological sounding rocket network (Exametnet).
Australia:			
Department of Supply	4 Skylark, 200 km	Woomera, Australia, September to November 1961.	NASA Goddard Space Flight Center: Measure stellar and nebular ultraviolet radiation in southern skies. Compare with Northern Hemisphere data.
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO).	2 Aerobee 150A, above 120 km	Wallops Island, April to May 1963	CSIRO: Measure VLF radio noise in the ionosphere.
Brazil: Brazilian National Commission for Space Research (CNAE).	1 Nike-Apache, 80 km region	Wallops Island, August 1965	CNAE-NASA Goddard Space Flight Center: Evaluate cosmic ray effects on the lower D region of the ionosphere.
	2 Nike-Apache, 80 km region	Natal, Brazil, December 1965	
	30 Boosted Dart and Arcas, 30-60 km.	Natal, 1966	CNAE: Project to constitute 1 element of inter-American experimental, meteorological sounding rocket network (Exametnet).
	12 Nike-Cajun, 40-100 km	do	CNAE-NASA Goddard Space Flight Center: Measure wind, temperature, pressure and density using "grenade' technique.

***Cooperative sounding rocket projects*—Continued**

Country and cooperating agency	Number, type of rocket and altitude	Launch site and date	Experimenter and project description
Canada: Canadian National Research Council (beginning Jan. 1, 1966).	Approximately 30 NASA-sponsored launchings per year.	Churchill Research Range, Canada, Jan. 1, 1966, to June 30, 1970.	Various Canadian and U.S. experimenters use the range for launching sounding rockets in auroral zone to study atmospheric and ionospheric phenomena.
	6 Black Brant, 100 km	Wallops Island, June to December 1962.	Canadian research agencies: Determine vehicle flight performance characteristics and obtain engineering data on effectiveness of instrumentation. Cosmic ray sensor and magnetometer included. (Churchill Research Range facilities inoperative during this period due to fire damage.)
France: French National Center for Space Studies (CNES).	2 Aerobee 150, 2 Aerobee 150 above 280 km.	Wallops Island, October 1963, September 1965.	National Center for Telecommunications Studies (CNET): Study irregularities in the ionosphere through simultaneous measurements of VLF field strength and local electron density.
	2 French Dragon, 2 French Centaure	Hammaguir, Algeria, April 1964	CNES-NASA Goddard Space Flight Center: Simultaneously measure charged particle and neutral gas temperatures in the ionosphere.
	1 Aerobee 150A, approximately 280 km.	White Sands, N. Mex., November 1965.	CNRS: 1 of several experimenters providing special sampling surfaces to collect and analyze extraterrestrial dust particles as part of Project Luster.
Germany: Ministry for Scientific Research.	1 Aerobee 150A; 1 Aerobee 150A, approximately 280 km.	White Sands, November 1964 and November 1965.	Max-Planck Institute for Nuclear Physics: 1 of several experimenters providing special sampling surfaces to collect and analyze extraterrestrial dust particles as part of Project Luster.
	1 Nike-Apache	Wallops Island, 1966	Ionospheres Institute of Breisach: Variable frequency impedance probe to measure electron density.
India: Indian National Committee for Space Research (INCOSPAR) of the Department of Atomic Energy.	4 Nike-Apache, 150 km	Thumba, India, January 1964	University of New Hampshire: Investigate the equatorial electrojet at the geomagnetic equator by means of magnetometer instrumentation.
	7 Nike-Apache, 150 km	Thumba, November 1963 and January to November 1964.	Physical Research Laboratory: (1) Measure upper atmosphere winds by ground photography of illuminated sodium vapor released from rocket.
	10 Nike-Apache, 150 km	Thumba, 1966–67	(2) Measure upper atmosphere winds by ground photography of illuminated chemicals released from rocket. (3) Investigate relationship between wind shears and sporadic E by combining measurements under (2) above, with electron density measurements. (4) Investigate the equatorial electrojet at geomagnetic equator by means of magnetometer instrumentation.
	2 Nike-Apache, 150 km	Thumba, 1966	National Physical Laboratory: Measure electron and ion densities and lyman-alpha and X-ray flux.
	20 Judi-Dart and 10 Judi-Dart	Thumba, 1964–65, and 1966	Incospar: Meteorological rocket soundings (chaff) supplementing the Indian Ocean expedition.
Israel: National Committee for Space Research.	1 Aerobee 150 A, approximately 280 km.	White Sands, November 1965	University of Tel Aviv: 1 of several experimenters providing special sampling surfaces to collect and analyze extraterrestrial dust particles as part of Project Luster.
Italy: Italian Space Commission	8 Nike-Cajun and Nike-Asp, 80–200 km.	Sardinia, January, April, September, 1961; December 1962.	Italian Space Commission: Measure upper atmosphere winds by ground photography of illuminated sodium vapor released from rocket.
Japan: Japanese Radio Research Laboratories	3 Nike-Cajun, 100–130 km	Wallops Island, April to May 1962	Japanese Radio Research Laboratories and NASA Goddard Space Flight Center: Combine Japanese swept frequency resonance probe with GSFC Langmuir probe for electron density and temperature determination.
	2 Aerobee 150 A, above 130 km	Wallops Island, September 1963.	
	1 Javelin, above 200 km	Wallops Island, October 1964	
Netherlands: Netherlands Organization for Advancement of Pure Research.	4 Nike-Apache, up to 120 km	Coronie, Surinam, September 1965	University of Utrecht, astronomical observatory: Investigation of upper atmosphere equatorial winds by ground-based photography of illuminated soldium vapor released from payloads with simultaneous measurements of ionospheric drift (mitra-method).
New Zealand: New Zealand National Space Research Committee.	1 Arcas and 2 Arcas	Birdling's Flat, New Zealand, May 1963, September to December 1964.	University of Canterbury, New Zealand: Measure wind drift and turbulent diffusion in the D region of the ionosphere by rocket borne radio propagation measurements and by ground-based photography of illuminated aerosol released from rocket.
	1 boosted Arcas, approximately 95 km.	Karikari Peninsula, New Zealand, May 1965.	Range and experiment validation.
	6 boosted Arcas, approximately 95 km.	do	(1) University of Canterbury: Differential absorption with ground-based sounder. (2) NASA GSFC: Electron density by Faraday rotation technique.
Norway/Denmark:			
Norwegian Committee for Space Research jointly with Royal Technical University of Denmark.		Wallops Island:	NASA GSFC with Norwegian participation (Wallops launchings), Norwegian DRE and Royal Technical University of Denmark (Andoya launchings): Measure D and E region electron and ion density and electron collision frequency by radio absorption experiment, faraday rotation experiment, and RF impedance and conductivity probes. Lyman-alpha monitor (Wallops) and energetic particles experiment (Andoya) also included.
	1 Nike-Cajun	December 1961.	
	1 Nike-Apache	June 1962.	
	2 Nike-Cajun, above 90 km	March/April 1963.	
		Andoya, Norway:	
	3 Nike-Cajun	August/December 1962.	
	1 Nike-Apache	September 1963.	
	3 Nike-Apache, above 90 km	March 1964.	
		Andoya:	
	4 Nike-Apache	March/November 1965.	
	2 Nike-Apache, above 90 km	Early 1966.	
	1 Nike-Apache, above 90 km	Wallops Island, 1966.	
	1 Nike-Apache, above 90 km	White Sands, 1966.	
Norwegian Committee for Space Research.	2 boosted-Arcas, up to 80 km	Andoya, December 1965	NASA GSFC and Norwegian DRE: Support for ground-based cross-modulation studies of the ionosphere using Faraday rotation technique.
	1 Nike-Apache, 50–85 km	Andoya, 1966	NASA GSFC and Norwegian DRE: Study the ionic composition of the D region with an ion-spectrometer payload.
	4 Boosted-Arcas, approximately 80 km.	Andoya, mid-1966	NASA GSFC and Norwegian DRE: Study possible relationship between noctilucent clouds and electron density minima using Faraday rotation technique.
Pakistan: Pakistan Space and Upper Atmosphere Research Committee (SUPARCO).	2 Nike-Cajun, 125 km	Sonmiani Beach, Pakistan, June 1962.	SUPARCO: Measure upper atmosphere winds by ground-based photography of illuminated sodium vapor released from payload.
	1 Nike-Cajun, 80–125 km	Sonmiani Beach, May 1963	
	3 Nike-Apache, 125–200 km	Sonmiani Beach, April/November/December 1964.	
	18 Judi-Dart and 14 Judi-Dart	Sonmiani Beach, 1964–1965, 1966	SUPARCO: Meteorological rocket soundings (Chaff) supplementing the International Indian Ocean Expedition.

Cooperative sounding rocket projects—Continued

Country and cooperating agency	Number, type of rocket and altitude	Launch site and date	Experimenter and project description
SUPARCO jointly with British National Committee on Space Research (BNCSR).	2 Nike-Cajun, 80–125 km 4 Nike-Apache, 125–200 km	Sonmiani Beach, April 1965 Sonmiani Beach, 1966	SUPARCO and BNCSR: Measure wind, temperature, pressure, and density using "grenade" technique.
Sweden: Swedish Space Research Committee.	1 ARCAS, 80 km	Jokkmokk, Sweden, August 1961	University of Stockholm: (1) Measure winds during occurrence of noctilucent clouds by optical tracking of smoke trail created by release of aerosol powder from rocket.
	4 Nike-Cajun, up to 100 km	Kronogard, Sweden, August 1962	(2) Direct sampling of noctilucent clouds with recoverable container. Also energetic particles experiment (Kiruna Geophysical Observatory).
	do	Kronogard, August 1963	(3) Measure upper atmosphere temperature, wind, pressure, and density during occurrence of noctilucent clouds by means of rockets instrumented with explosive charges and associated electronics.
	4 Nike-Apache up to 120 km	Kronogard, August 1964	(4) Direct sampling of noctilucent clouds with recoverable container.
	do	do	(5) Measure upper atmosphere temperature, wind, pressure, and density during occurrence of *noctilucent clouds by means of rockets* instrumented with explosive charges and associated electronics.
	1 Aerobee 150A, approximately 280 km.	White Sands, November 1965	(6) One of several experimenters providing special sampling surfaces to collect and analyze extraterrestrial dust particles as part of project luster.
	3 boosted Arcas, approximately 95 km.	White Sands, October to December 1963.	Uppsala Ionospheric Observatory: (1) Measure ion and electron densities in D region of ionosphere.
	1 boosted Arcas, approximately 95 km.	Wallops Island, March 1964	(2) Measure upper atmosphere winds by ground-based photography of sodium-lithium releases from payload.
	2 boosted Arcas, approximately 95 km.	Andoya, March 1965	(3) Measure ion and electron densities in D region of ionosphere from the auroral zone.
	1 Nike-Apache, up to 120 km	do	(4) Measure winds and sodium emissions in Aurorae.
	1 Nike-Apache, up to 120 km	Andoya March 1965	(5) Measure auroral phenomena by observing the effects of an artificial shock wave created by a high-energy explosive charge.
United Kingdom: British National Committee for Space Research.	2 Nike-Apache, up to 120 km	Wallops Island, July/November 1964.	University of Birmingham, University of Illinois and Geophysics Corp. of America: Combine British Radio Frequency Capacitance Probe with Langmuir probe, radio propagation experiment, and energetic particle sensors to check reliability of ionospheric measurement techniques.
	1 Aerobee 150A approximately 280 km.	White Sands, November 1965	Birkbeck College: One of several experimenters providing special sampling surfaces to collect and analyze extraterrestrial dust particles as part of Project Luster.

Cooperative ground-based projects

Project — **International participation**

METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITES

Tiros and Nimbus satellites obtain television pictures of cloud formations and patterns and measure the absorption and reflections of infrared solar radiation by the earth and its atmosphere.

Name	Launch date	Nominal orbits	
		Inclination	Circular
Tiros I–X	Apr. 1, 1960 through July 2, 1965.	48°, 58°, or 82°	Between 425 and 750 kilometers.
Nimbus I	Aug. 28, 1964	80°	1,100 kilometers.

NASA and the U.S. Weather Bureau have provided an opportunity for 2 types of direct foreign participation in weather satellite operation:

(1) Foreign weather services were invited to perform ground-based observations synchronized with satellite photography. Some 40 weather services have taken part in this program using Tiros II through Tiros X.

(2) The automatic picture transmission (APT) subsystem (launched on Tiros VIII and on Nimbus) provided an opportunity for direct read-out of local cloud cover pictures using relatively simple ground equipment. Sets purchased in the United States were operated in France, and at the IIOE headquarters in India. Australia, Canada, Denmark, West Germany, Hong Kong, Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom used equipment designed and built locally, based on NASA APT technical data. Indonesia, Malaysia, and Argentina are constructing sets.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES

Projects Relay, Telstar and Syncom have been designed to determine the feasibility of transoceanic communications via active repeater satellites. These satellites pick up and amplify signals received from ground stations and then retransmit them back to earth.

Name	Launch date	Nominal orbits		
		Inclination	Apogee (kilometers)	Perigee (kilometers)
Telstar I [1]	July 10, 1962	45°	5,600	950
Relay I [1]	Dec. 13, 1962	47°	7,425	1,320
Telstar II	May 7, 1963	43°	10,555	925
Syncom II	July 26, 1963	32.5°	35,900	35,791
Relay II	Jan. 21, 1964	46.5°	7,400	2,129
Syncom III	Aug. 19, 1964	0°	35,790	35,790

[1] Inactive.

Ground stations in the United States, England, France, Italy, Japan, Germany, and Brazil have used communications satellites for cooperative telephone, telegraph, and high-speed data communications experiments since 1963. The first 6 also have held intercontinental television experiments. The first live telephone conversation via satellite between heads of government took place in August 1963 when President Kennedy spoke with Prime Minister Balewa in Nigeria, which hosted the USNS Kingsport as the African terminal for Syncom II in Lagos Harbor. In May 1964, Spain entered the network to carry on narrow band experiments with the U.S. Syncom III in October 1964 carried live television coverage of the Olympic games in Japan. Denmark, Norway, and Sweden began operating a joint receiving facility in November. Canada in early 1966 intends to have a ground station capable of conducting narrow band and television experiments, and India plans to participate in experimental tests as soon as its station is built. Modifications have been made to ground stations in England, France, Germany, and Italy to permit their use with the world-wide commercial communications system developing out of work with these experimental satellites.

Cooperative ground-based projects—Continued

Project	International participation
IONOSPHERIC SATELLITES	
A. Topside sounder satellites (Alouettes I and II, and Explorer XX): Alouette uses a swept frequency sounder system and Explorer XX a fixed frequency system to study the amount of, and variation in, ionospheric electron density.	In addition to numerous United States and Canadian stations, 23 stations in 14 countries have taken or are taking ground soundings coordinated with satellite soundings which permit comparison of top and bottomside ionospheric profiles. The radio and space reasearch station of the United Kingdom Science Research Council is staffing and operating 3 telemetry stations for the acquisition of data from topside sounder satellites. Beginning in 1966, the Norwegian DRE will staff and operate a similar station at Tromso, Norway.

Name	Launch date	Nominal orbit
Alouette I	Sept. 29, 1962	Near polar, circular, 1,000 km.
Explorer XX	Aug. 25, 1964	Near polar, 1,375–725 km.
Alouette II	Nov. 29, 1965	Near polar, 3,000–500 km.

Project	International participation
B. Beacon Explorer and laser tracking satellites (Explorers XXII and XXVII): Explorers XXII and XXVII provide the means for synoptic study of the ionosphere by ground-based observations of radio signals transmitted *from the satellite and for experiments in satellite tracking by laser* beams directed to Explorers XXII and XXVII and returned to ground-based receivers by special reflectors.	61 ground stations in 30 countries plus Antarctica, Hong Kong, and Greenland are carrying our Faraday rotation, scintillation, and doppler differential experiments to measure integrated electron density in a vertical plane between the satellite and a ground station below, and variations *in electron density as a function of latitude, season, and diurnal time.* This is *the largest amount of international participation that has taken place on one satellite project.* In addition to the above, the United Kingdom and France are participating in the laser tracking experiment. Brazilian project RASA: 3 ground stations spanning the geomagnetic equator have been established by the Brazilian Space Commission (CNAE) for special studies of the equatorial ionosphere using Faraday rotation, differential doppler and group delay techniques of analyzing signals from beacon Explorers and other U.S. satellites.

Name	Launch date	Nominal orbit
Explorer XXII	Oct. 10, 1964	Near polar, circular, 1,200 km.
Explorer XXVII	Apr. 29, 1965	Inclination, 41°; circular 1,000 km.

Other cooperative projects

Project	International participation
Scientific and technical information exchange: Exchange of scientific and technical information through documents, microfiche, and computer search materials.	Under a letter agreement of May 1964, amplified in June 1965, NASA provides scientific and technical information to the ESRO/ELDO document service which, in return, furnishes information collected from its member states. Compatibility of facilities makes possible exchange of microfiche and computer tapes. Under informal arrangements, NASA maintains a program of document exchange with 233 institutions located in 41 countries.
Review of space biology and medicine: Preparation and publication of NASA/Academy of Sciences of U.S.S.R. joint review of space biology and medicine.	A joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. editorial board will collect material from both sides in agreed subject areas, assign authors, and arrange for scientific and editorial review. Publication of the final volumes is scheduled for 1968.

Project	Country	Experiments	Experiment description
Airborne solar eclipse observations: Solar eclipse flight on NASA convair 990 in vicinity of Marquesas Islands during May 1965. NASA/Ames Research Center provided project management.	Belgium	Institut D'Astrophysique, Universite de Liege.	Search for faint comets near sun and investigation of H and K lines of calcium.
	Italy	Observatorio Astrofisico di Arcetri, Florence.	Investigate anomalous solar calcium K emission and emission lines in outer corona.
	Netherlands	Observatory of Utrecht, University of Utrecht.	Relate solar limb darkening curves to temperature distribution.
	Switzerland	Eidgenossische Sternwarte, Zurich	Photograph solar inner corona for information on polar magnetic field as function of time in solar cycle.

Personnel exchanges

Program	Purpose	Cumulative participation	
Resident research associateships	Postdoctoral and senior postdoctoral grants for senior foreign scientists, administered for NASA by the National Academy of Sciences, provide for participation in research at NASA centers and JPL for 1 year.	Foreign nationals From countries	130 28
International fellowships	Theoretical and experimental training in the space sciences provided to foreign graduate students at U.S. universities for 1 year with possibility of renewal for a 2d year, on a shared-cost basis. Program administered for NASA by the National Academy of Sciences and designed to contribute to the capabilities of cooperating countries.	Fellows From— Countries Universities	113 17 22
Technical training	Technical training available to foreign technicians and scientists at NASA centers in support of agreed cooperative programs and ground facility operations. Length of training from several months to 1 year. (Training of tracking station personnel under the direction of Goddard Space Flight Center and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Other training principally at GSFC, Langley, and Wallops Station.)	Foreign nationals From countries	234 [1] 18
Visits	Officials and scientists from foreign countries visit NASA facilities in program demonstrating open, peaceful character of U.S. civilian space effort and the opportunities it provides for participation by other countries.	Visitors (approximate) Locations	15,000 [2] 121

[1] Includes the European Space Research Organization (ESRO).

[2] See table below.

FOREIGN VISITORS TO NASA FACILITIES

Afghanistan
Algeria
Argentina
Australia
Austria
Barbados, British West Indies
Belgium
Bermuda
Bolivia
Brazil
British Guiana
Burma
Burundi
Cameroon
Canada
Central African Republic
Ceylon
Chad
Chile
China, Republic of
Colombia
Congo (Léopoldville)
Costa Rica
Cyprus
Czechoslovakia
Dahomey
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Dubai
Ecuador
ELDO [1]
El Salvador
ESRO [2]
Ethiopia
Finland
France
Gabon
Gambia
Germany, Federal Republic of
Ghana
Greece
Guatemala
Guinea
Haiti
Honduras
Hong Kong
Hungary
Iceland

See footnotes at end of table.

FOREIGN VISITORS TO NASA FACILITIES—Continued

India
Indonesia
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Israel
Italy
Ivory Coast
Jamaica
Japan
Jordan
Kenya
Korea
Kuwait
Laos
Lebanon
Liberia
Libya
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malagasy Republic
Malawi
Malaysia
Mali
Malta
Mauritania
Mexico
Morocco
Nepal
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niger
Nigeria
Norway
Pakistan
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Rhodesia
Rwanda
Saudi Arabia
Senegal
Sierra Leone
Singapore
Somalia
South Africa
South Vietnam
Spain
Sudan
Swaziland
Sweden
Switzerland
Syria
Tanzania
Thailand
Togo
Trinidad
Tunisia
Turkey
Uganda
United Arab Republic
United Kingdom
Upper Volta
Uruguay
U.S.S.R.
Venezuela
Yemen
Yugoslavia
Zambia

[1] European Launcher Development Organization (ELDO).

[2] European Space Research Organization (ESRO).

I was in Europe at the European assembly in Brighton. I worked with the people there on the method of organization. We have what is called ESRO—European Space Research Organization—that is, 10 nations of NATO that have joined together for space research.

Likewise, there is a launch vehicle development organization in Europe called ELDO, that is, the European Launch Development Organization.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if, in either or both of these, the United States is involved as a direct participant? Or, are they strictly European?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. They are strictly European but we do cooperate with them. We have information exchanges. They use our boosters to carry their satellites. They use these as "canaries" on the "eagles" we put up.

We do have one program with Canada. We have been very successful. They use our boosters and their scientists design payloads that are compatible, and are in many cases complementary to ours.

As a matter of fact, these programs do save us money, because they are programs for space, investigating the atmosphere as well as the parameter of orbiting vehicles, that is necessary for us to know.

One of the good things about it is that there is a complete exchange of information with the scientific community working as a unit on these programs in the free world.

We actually have an exchange of information program with Russia, although we have no cooperative programs.

India is helping with a launch program at a location where we need one—near not only the geographical but also the magnetic equator which is very helpful to us.

Mr. FINDLEY. Has any thought been given by the committee to placing the program on a multination basis so that the cost perhaps could be more equitably shared by other people than at present?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The problem in that regard is that the United States is quite advanced in space. We have tremendous amounts of funds being used in space compared to the amounts provided by other countries. It would be like hitching an elephant to a rabbit. They must depend upon us largely for the tremendous expenditures for launch facilities and monitoring facilities around the world which we have built. They can, as they progress, take part in programs which could then become cooperative satellite programs, as in the case of Canada. We have done that.

The payloads on U.S. missions are programed by us for particular purposes. For example, with respect to the Apollo mission, we first had to have Project Mercury, with one man, Project Gemini with two men, before the Apollo three-man program. For other nations to fit into something of that nature makes it really too large for their budgets.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, all of us are fascinated by the exploits of our astronauts. We also have a growing awareness of the fantastic scientific know-how, ingenuity, and complicated network of intricate planning which lays the groundwork for our space program. Our approach to solving space problems has been through a coordinated, highly technical but extremely efficient method known as systems analysis.

Now it has occurred to some of us that perhaps we can take this new American expertise, developed through years of patient research and considerable expense, and channel it toward our more serious domestic problems. In other words, approach the problem of a walk in space. Scientists and engineers who have been trained to think in totally new dimensions in order to solve the unique military and space missions brought before them are obviously qualified to help solve some of the chronic national and local problems confronting our society.

I have introduced a bill which would encourage just this thing. It would permit the scientific and engineering manpower of the Nation to direct their new training, knowledge, and skill to the solution of problems here on earth. It would allow our prominent aerospace firms to apply the systems analysis approach to the problem of crime, poverty, pollution, and transportation, as they have to the problems of thrust, orbiting, docking, and reentry. My proposal authorizes the Secretary of Labor to make appropriate grants to States on a matching basis for the purpose of systems analysis and systems engineering approaches to national and local problems. States would be permitted to join together in contracting for the study of mutual problems.

Let me describe briefly how systems analysis might be applied. In essence, this new approach assumes that even the most complex problem is really a series of interrelated, but definable parts. The trick is to define all of the parts, establish the links between them and bring in specialists to attack each area.

The application of the "new knowledge," we might call it, has already proved beneficial in the State of California where four aerospace companies were asked to examine the problems of crime, pollution, information control, and transportation. The completion of these first studies presents significant evidence that space scientists and their systems analysis could be applied to social problems. For example, the California crime study was amazingly accurate in pinpointing the Watts area as a potential trouble spot prior to the time of the actual riots.

Many social and environmental problems are shared by the majority of the States. In my own State of Maryland, nearly 700 people were killed on the highways in 1965, 14,529 youngsters dropped out of school in a recent 1-year period, travel between Baltimore and Washington will increase three times by 1980, and attendance at the University of Maryland will increase from a present 27,000 to 40,000 in the near future. Almost every State faces similar problems and all would benefit from the fruits of this program. The bill specifically calls for the studies to be shared with the Federal Government and the other States.

To me, this kind of joint pooling of talents will make solution of serious domestic problems a realistic goal. I am hopeful that the Congress will act favorably on this bill.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and in support of our Nation's space program. The Science and Astronautics Committee has had a difficult job but they have done it well. The task of examining the space budget is awesome because of the complexity of the individual programs. Continuity of congressional oversight and approval is vital to this sustained effort which necessarily depends on annual funding. The committee has done well because, in this year of conflicting fiscal requirements, the Members have selectively adjusted certain portions of the space program. Keeping both short and long range national goals in mind, the committee has sharpened the NASA budget plan for greater effect in achieving these objectives. I congratulate Chairman MILLER, his subcommittee chairmen and all of the diligent committee members.

It has been a privilege for me to be personally involved with one of the projects which has a key role in future space exploration. I refer to the large solid rocket booster project being carried out in Dade County, Fla., by the Aerojet-General Corp. Now, of course, this project means a great deal to my district. The investment amounts to $23 million of private capital for 74,000 acres of land and modern facilities. We are proud of the skilled scientists and engineers working there.

Within the past year, two half-scale test firings of the 260-inch motor have occurred; a solid propellant rocket almost 22 feet in diameter, delivering over 3.5 million pounds of thrust, the largest in the world. All aspects of the tests were completely successful.

I was pleased that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology, my esteemed colleague from West Virginia, KEN HECHLER, was a witness to one of the test firings. It was, in great measure, due to his courage and foresight that the program survived the pressures of budget constraints in past years.

A few weeks ago, I appeared before his subcommittee to once again fight for the continuation of this development effort. Shortly after my statement, the subcommittee heard a NASA expert testify, and I quote:

> The projected cost per pound in orbit of an all liquid system typical of the systems that we are flying now is in the order of $500 to $600 per pound.
>
> The projected cost of the solid first stage using existing second stages lies in the order of $300 to $400 a pound. The cost difference is in the order of from 50 to 70 percent.

Now I say to you, this is simply what the space program is all about — pounds in orbit. There is no other way to explore space. And we must get these pounds up there—millions of them each year—in the cheapest possible manner.

I have heard other statements which indicate that no further improvement in propulsion is necessary to accomplish the missions which are approved as of today. Very well. But these are not all the missions this country will ever undertake. We will not stop after the lunar landing and retreat from the great scientific and commercial benefits of space. There is no reason not to plan improved booster efficiency for the future just because NASA cannot at this time detail the specific post Apollo goals. Pounds in orbit will be pounds in orbit—why should it cost $600 to place each one up there instead of $300?

Thus it is not only for Dade County that I support solid propellants. It is for the good of the entire space program.

Our Science and Astronautics Committee has once again seen the wisdom of long range planning and has reacted against short term penny saving to add funds to the administration request in this area. The $3.5 million requested for solid rockets has been raised to $11 million in this authorization before us. This increase will allow NASA to conduct a full scale demonstration firing by December 1967 and will provide for needed development of associated systems and controls.

I think it is a wise and important budget adjustment which will pay enormous dividends in the future. For example, the predicted launch rate in the years ahead is about 2 million pounds per year in orbit. If each pound costs $300 less to be placed there, the obvious savings from solid rocket boosters would be well over half a billion dollars each year.

Many of us are often prone to reject changes and cling to the current methodology. Therefore, a full-scale demonstration seems to be essential before future space flight planning will include the solid booster. Perhaps this is the reason for the executive restraint in not pursuing solid propellants more vigorously. But I am thankful that the Congress can and has looked beyond the immediate task. In passing this bill with its augmented program for propulsion advancement, we will assure that the full range of options are ready and available when Americans have landed on the moon and when we are ready to continue to exploit our gains in space.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight conducted hearings on the fiscal year 1967 NASA authorization during February and March. The subcommittee received a complete review of the manned space flight program from NASA headquarters personnel supplemented by field trips and supporting data furnished by NASA centers and industrial contractors.

During my absence Mr. DADDARIO ably chaired the subcommittee hearings, and I wish to congratulate Mr. DADDARIO and all members of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight for the thorough work which they did in examining the NASA program.

The subcommittee traveled to Douglas Aircraft Corp., Huntington Beach, Calif.; North American Aviation, Downey, Calif.; Edwards Air Force Base and the NASA Flight Research Center, Edwards, Calif.; and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif. The chairman and other members of the committee also traveled to the Michoud facility, New Orleans, La., and Kennedy Space Center, Cape Kennedy, Fla., receiving program briefings and tours of these facilities.

The subcommittee has gone into detail on every item in the manned space flight authorization, and has searchingly examined the program.

The Manned Space Flight Subcommittee has approved the 1967 budget request, with only a few changes. In general, the 1967 authorization requests are for continued funding of the existing programs, Gemini and Apollo. The Apollo funding continues at about the same level as last year; Gemini, however, is reduced to $40 million from $242 million last year reflecting the fact that it has reached operational status.

This is a pared-down budget request, with little or no margin. Further reduction would result in a serious gamble in our present manned space flight programs—in terms of both schedule slippages and cost overruns—and would seriously impede our future efforts in space.

YEAR 1965 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The record of American accomplishments in aeronautics and space during 1965 shows it to have been the most successful year in our history. More spacecraft were orbited than in any previous year.

In the space science and applications area, the Ranger series yielded 13,000 closeup pictures of our sister body, the Moon; and the Mariner 4 gave mankind its first closeup view of Mars. Equally important were the contributions of our space program here on earth, particularly in the fields of weather prediction, communications, and navigation. Research and development in our space programs continued to speed progress in virtually every aspect of American science and technology.

In the manned space flight area, five manned Gemini flights were successfully launched. Our astronauts spent more time in space than were flown by all of our manned spacecraft prior to 1965. The five manned flights included a walk in space, and the first rendezvous between two manned spacecraft. In addition, the development of the basic Saturn I launch vehicle was successfully completed, with a perfect record of 10 successful missions in 10 launches.

Since the beginning of this year, NASA successfully launched the first Apollo-Saturn I-B spaceship, on a suborbital flight in February, and accomplished the first actual docking with another object in space on the Gemini 8 mission in March.

SOVIET ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This past year—the year of Gemini, Ranger, and Mariner—is a preface to the coming years of Apollo, stations in space, and essentially voyages to the planets. However, let no one delude himself into thinking that the United States is now ahead of the Soviet Union, or that the Soviets will not win more scientific, technological and ideological victories in space. The competition will continue, and the outcome is still very much in doubt.

Consider the tremendous effort on the part of the Soviets in 1965, during which they launched 52 satellites in the Cosmos series, almost double that of any previous year. During 1965 the Soviets also conducted the first extra-vehicular activity in space, and placed into orbit the heaviest payload by any one to date with the Proton I—a new launch vehicle with over 50 percent more thrust than the Saturn I.

During 1966, the challenge has continued. Already this year the Soviets have soft-landed the picturetaking Luna 9 on the moon; landed a spacecraft on Venus; and have placed two dogs—Blackie and Breeze—into a highly elliptical orbit which took them into the Van Allen radiation belts—560 miles above the earth's surface—for 22 days. During the 23d Congress of the Communist Party in the latter part of March, the Soviets launched their first lunar orbiter attempt. The Soviet challenge in space remains and continues to grow day by day.

INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION

The introduction of supersonic aircraft, nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, ballistic missiles, and other new elements of warfare has created a standoff—so far—in hot wars, which has brought into being a new kind of conflict—the cold war. We have found that cold wars are fought with new strategies and different weapons from the traditional hot wars of past history.

The influence of our technological progress and prowess is and has been one of the deciding factors in keeping the cold war peace over the past 20 years. Technological and scientific capability constitute a basic source of national power. Preeminence in the field is an important instrument in international relations, and influences our dealings with other nations involving peace and freedom in the world.

Our space effort is a vital element in this global competition for technological preeminence, and is increasing our scientific and technological power. Should we fall behind in the area of space technology, we would jeopardize our national interests, on earth as well as in space.

There can be no question but that the Soviet Union considers space as a vital element in the cold war spectrum of conflict. In December 1957, after the launching of Sputnik, former Soviet Premier Khrushchev stated:

> The launching of artificial earth satellites is a kind of culmination of the competition between socialist and capitalist countries. And socialism has won it.

The dramatic recent progress in our space programs—and particularly the successful Gemini flights—has made many people throughout the world conclude that Khrushchev was premature in declaring that "socialism has won it."

Our space program—and manned space flight in particular—is a vital element in demonstrating to the world that the United States is a dynamic, can-do country, able to compete with a formidable rival who has prepared in secret for technological surprise.

In our space programs the world sees a nation of great scientific and technological capability. And I mean, quite literally, "sees," since NASA conducts its operations before the eyes of hundreds of millions of people all over the world. These people do not have to take the word of a scientist or an engineer or a politician. They can say: "I saw it myself."

The manned space flight program is the most dramatic portion of the U.S. space program, and that with the greatest impact abroad. World press reaction to the Gemini flights during 1965, for example, made it clear that few editorialists abroad doubted that the United States had moved into a position of formidable challenge to the U.S.S.R. in space.

Prestige is meaningful, however, only to the extent that it reflects the substance, not the shadow of power. The value of the space effort is that it provides a visible focus of power, evident to all the world, of a broad capability to do whatever is necessary to insure the security of the Nation and the peace of the world.

In space we are using science and technology to build our national competence to work toward a peaceful and better world. The initiatives for peace and justice that we, as a Nation, are able to take all over the world are made possible by our scientific and technological power. And this power is vividly exemplified by our achievements in space.

The forthcoming Gemini and Apollo flights—culminating in the first lunar landing and return—are thus of vital importance to the United States in preserving its position of world leadership.

SPACE VIS-A-VIS VIETNAM

With respect to Vietnam, I would say that the greatest contribution that NASA can make is to continue to succeed in the upcoming Gemini and Apollo flights. I think that this is far more important than any direct financial contributions from the space program.

It is important that we not lose sight of the fact that, in the long run, the most important battle that we are fighting is the struggle for self-determination and peace among the great mass of mankind still trying to determine the shape of its political and economic institutions.

There is no question that the Soviets consider their space feats to be a vital element in their unceasing campaign to prove to the uncommitted world that "communism is the wave of the future." It would thus be well for us to remember that our efforts in space, as well as in Vietnam, are all part of the same global struggle with communism.

We must continue to meet our commitments in Vietnam, and elsewhere, wherever freedom and liberty are threatened, and at the same time continue to do what is required in the Nation's interest in space.

The war in Vietnam has already forced a substantial reduction in the NASA budget for the coming fiscal year. Fortunately, however, thanks to our abundance of resources, it has not yet forced us to abandon our goals and our national requirements in space.

STATUS OF THE PROGRAM—PROGRESS

Earlier I recounted some of the highlights of the past year in the Nation's space program. In that brief account I restricted myself to some of the major launches and flight operations. This, however, by no means provides a complete picture of U.S. progress during the past year.

The past year has been one of increased activity in all areas of the manned space flight effort. The accelerated Gemini program has brought the United States to new levels of operational capability. In addition, key milestones in the Apollo program have been reached in the development and testing of the necessary large launch vehicles and engines, sophisticated spacecraft, and comprehensive ground support equipment. Extensive facilities have been completed or are well along in progress. As I mentioned earlier, the Saturn program was completed with a perfect flight record. And one of the key milestones in the Apollo program—the first flight of the Apollo-Saturn I-B spacecraft—was spectacularly and successfully accomplished in February.

The remaining key milestones in the Apollo schedule for the rest of the decade include: The first manned flight of the Apollo-Saturn I-B space vehicle in 1967; also in 1967, the first unmanned flights of the Apollo-Saturn V; in 1968, the first manned flight of the Apollo-Saturn V; and in 1969, the first manned lunar landing and return.

A major event in the Apollo-Saturn V program—and in the history of rocket technology—was accomplished last spring with the successful first test firing of the first stage of the Saturn V. The full 7½ million pounds of thrust was generated by the cluster of five engines during the 6½-second test. This is five times the thrust of the basic Saturn I.

Later in the year, all three stages of the Saturn V were successfully test fired for their full duration runs.

Similar progress was made during the past year in the development of the Apollo spacecraft, that portion of the space vehicle which will make the actual journey to the moon. This spacecraft is a versatile three-man vehicle, with an extensive maneuvering capability. It is composed of the command module, the service module, and the lunar excursion module, or LEM. The command module houses the astronauts in flight from earth to an orbit about the moon, and back to earth. The service module contains the power supply, and propulsion systems and fuel for maneuvering and making midcourse corrections during lunar flight. The two-stage lunar excursion module separates from the command module in lunar orbit and lowers two of the three astronauts to the surface of the moon. After the initial exploration is completed, it lifts off from the moon and reunites the two lunar explorers with the third astronaut who has been circling the moon in the command module.

Last year, fabrication was begun of the first command and service modules of the type that will be used for the actual lunar landing missions. The lunar excursion module—LEM—development program follows the command and service module by about 1 year, with 1965 a year of component development tests. This year is a year of major ground tests, and next year will see the initial flight tests.

PROBLEMS

Any effort of great magnitude can be expected to have its share of problems, however. The Appollo program is no exception. I think that it would be constructive to briefly review some of these problems.

The second stage of the Saturn V, consisting of five engines, each generating 200,000 pounds of thrust, is the pacing item in the development of the Saturn V launch vehicle and in the Apollo-Saturn V program. Because of its size and its use of liquid hydrogen as fuel, it is the most difficult of the stages to build, and some welding and insulation bonding problems were encountered which caused delays of 2 to 5 months in delivery schedules. Then, last September the structural-dynamic stage failed while undergoing structural tests. Although the test was a success, the stage failed at its ultimate design load and was destroyed, causing the test program to be rephased. Taken together, these problems have placed the second stage in a critical condition in terms of supporting the Apollo program schedule.

The past year has been one of progress in the LEM development program, but also one in which the program was significantly realined. During 1965, major development effort on components was essentially completed, but subsystem development testing fell behind schedule. This created delays in ground test articles and flight vehicles, along with a weight increase that caused considerable concern.

Following a thorough review of these problems, a realinement of the program deleted certain hardware items and reduced the amount of testing on others. A program was initiated to reduce the weight of the hardware. The first LEM flight vehicles are now in fabrication and assembly, although they are still behind schedule.

Another problem involves the activation of the large rocket test facilities in Mississippi. As a result of a combination of circumstances—involving adverse weather conditions—including Hurricane Betsy—and delays in design, manufacturing and deliveries of equipment—it has become necessary to compress a large amount of work into a shorter time period.

Similar problems, although on a larger scale, are being encountered at launch complex 39 at Kennedy Space Center—the Nation's "moonport." Here, components of the space vehicle from six separate manufacturers are meeting with ground support equipment from hundreds of others. All of the newest techniques are being utilized to schedule the arrival of hardware, training and hiring of personnel, and construction of facilities in an orderly manner. Without going into detail, an idea of the size of the task can be gained when you consider that in the vehicle assembly building, for example, 141 lifting devices, ranging from 1-ton hoists to 250-ton high-lift cranes must be installed, serviced, maintained, and operated. The checkout system alone for the Saturn V consists of 7 computers; more than 1,300 cables; 30,000 engineering drawings, and more than 150,000 words of computer instructions. Delivery schedules must be arranged so that all the equipment arrives at the launch complex in a logical sequence for installation.

What is most important, and is a tribute to the highly skilled NASA-industry management team, by employing the most modern management techniques, they have been able to work around these problems and to rephase elements of the program, within the available funds and without lowering the confidence level in the performance of the equipment.

CONCLUSION

The key milestones in the Apollo program are being met on schedule, and the substantial progress made during the past year provides a basis for hope that the Apollo program objectives will be successfully fulfilled.

However, the United States is still behind the Soviet Union in certain important aspects of space power, and this budget will not close it. The most critical gap that we face is in the area of manned space flight.

The program that was initiated in 1961 was intended to meet the fierce competition of the Soviets and to achieve world preeminence in space by 1970. However, in spite of our tremendous progress, the Soviets can do anything we can do in space and are able to perform a number of activities that we cannot do.

There has been no more frustrating experience that this Nation has had to face than to find that we have been unable to close this gap.

The Russians still have more powerful rockets than we do, and can orbit bigger payloads. They have the capability to adopt any option they wish and their capabilities will soon reach a point where they could expect success in an attempt to land men on the moon. In fact, there is more chance today than there was a year ago that they will land on the moon before 1969.

With this budget, it will still be possible for the United States to achieve our national goal of beginning the manned exploration of the moon within this decade, provided we have 100 percent success in every one of the large number of extremely difficult ground and flight tests which are now beginning. The schedule is very tight, with no margin for error. Trouble at any stage, or any major setback—or any cut below this necessary present level of funding—would require a complete reassessment of our target dates and of our ability to meet the goal for a manned lunar landing.

There is every reason to believe that the Soviet space program includes an attempt to land men on the moon, in addition to a step-up in the pace of their manned operations in earth orbit. The United States is not ahead in this serious competition. It will require a strong and increasing effort to prevent the Soviets from forging ahead as the unchallenged leader in space. The side that slackens will see its chances of leadership lost—both in space and on earth—and, once, lost, this leadership would not be easily regained.

The Congress has supported the space program since its inception. The capable leadership of NASA has responded by employing its resources wisely and responsibly, enabling this Nation to make dramatic strides in recent years. We are now past the midpoint in the program laid out in 1961 to achieve space preeminence within this decade. In terms of money, with this budget we will be within the last 20 percent of the total funding requirements for this program. At this crucial point NASA deserves, and needs, the continued support of the Congress. A vote for this bill—at this stage in time—is a vote for an economical program geared to technological growth and national security.

This Nation is big enough and strong enough to do what is necessary—in Vietnam, at home, and in space.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1967. The justifications of this bill are many, and I could not begin to cover them in this short statement. Let me instead comment briefly on several considerations of the manned space flight program, which was reviewed by the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of which I am a member.

The question arises, "What is the return this Nation will receive from the NASA authorization?" This calls for a look at the major objectives of this country's manned space flight program carried out by NASA. Among these is a basic objective to establish man's capabilities in the space environment. The fiscal year 1967 authorization is needed to do this. Another objective is to create a national competence for manned space flight. The fiscal year 1967 authorization is needed to do this. Another objective is to explore and develop the new environment of space. The fiscal year 1967 authorization is needed to do this. Finally, there is the objective to demonstrate and exercise U.S. leadership in space. The fiscal year 1967 authorization is needed to do this.

In considering the recommendations of the Committee on Science and Astronautics on this bill, you essentially must accept or reject the national manned flight objectives to establish man's capability, to create competence, to explore and develop the space environment, and to demonstrate and exercise U.S. leadership in space. For in the judgment of this committee, based upon a grueling examination of the proposed NASA budget, NASA cannot do the job called out by these program objectives without the full authorization as it has been recommended by the Committee on Science and Astronautics. To cut the authorization is to cripple the program. These authorization figures are the minimum needed to do the job. This budget is the result of a hard-nosed assessment of NASA requirements to carry out the manned space flight program. The hardware, the tests, the launches and flight operations are integral essentials for doing the job. Opposition to this authorization can only be opposition to the objectives of U.S. manned space flight.

The second consideration in determining what this Nation will get from the NASA authorization calls for an evaluation of what NASA accomplishes with the dollars funded. This evaluation is best made by looking at NASA's current progress with fiscal year 1966 dollars. The solid record set by manned space flight during the past 12 months is most impressive. Let me review briefly.

The Gemini program of 2-man flights is now moving toward completion late this year, with 4 manned flights remaining on the 12-flight Gemini schedule. From March 1965 to March 1966, six manned flights were completed. Many important Gemini program objectives were reached. To recapitulate, Gemini III showed the soundness of the man-machine system in a three revolution flight. Gemini IV went much farther with a 4-day mission, and the celebrated walk in space. Gemini V was the 8-day long duration flight showing that the Apollo lunar mission flight time was within man's capabilities. Gemini VII went on to establish another new record of 14 days in the space environment. This mission also was part of the historic first meeting in space of two space vehicles, each with its two-man crew. The Gemini IV mission had been combined with Gemini VII to allow man's first space rendezvous in what is now known as the "76" combined mission. The two spacecraft flew together for hours high above earth and the Gemini VI crew had proved the feasibility of the rendezvous technique needed for Apollo. The Gemini VIII flight became another historic mission when the spacecraft rendezvoused and then docked with an Agena target vehicle launched into orbit earlier the same day. A spacecraft malfunction cut short the flight, but even this demonstrated an astounding backup recovery capability that had never been tried by an emergency. And today, final preparations are underway for the Gemini IX flight scheduled for May 17, a mission calling for rendezvous and another extravehicular walk in space.

The progress of Gemini toward national objectives will be furthered by the Apollo program. Apollo will demonstrate our advancing capability with manned flights before 1970 which will go out 250,000 miles from the earth, land on and take off from the moon, and return safely to earth.

The Apollo program is the largest and most complex engineering, scientific, and technological program this Nation has ever undertaken. The past year has been one of extensive ground testing of spacecraft, engines, and stages. All three stages of the Saturn V were test-fired and manufacture of the spacecraft command and service modules for the lunar mission began. The lunar module components were tested for fabrication this year.

The first flight of the Saturn I–B launch vehicle took place on February 26, 1966, launching the first unmanned flight of a production Apollo command service spacecraft. The launch vehicle for the second Saturn I–B flight has been erected on the pad at Cape Kennedy for a scheduled summer launch. This flight will be followed during the next fiscal year by manned flights in earth orbit. Also in 1967 will be unmanned flights of the much larger Apollo Saturn V space vehicle. Manned flights of Apollo Saturn V are scheduled for 1968 in preparation for a manned flight to the moon. Meanwhile, the complex of ground facilities for the Apollo program is reaching operational status.

Both Gemini and Apollo are on schedule. They are achieving the milestones needed to stay on schedule. And they are advancing this Nation as a spacefaring nation, moving steadily toward the U.S. manned space flight goals.

The NASA authorization for fiscal year 1967 is vital to continued progress toward the objectives of our national space program. And NASA has proved its capability in using these funds effectively for sustained progress toward such objectives. I strongly urge passage of this authorization.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of $4,986,864,150, as follows:

(a) For "Research and development," $4,248,235,000, for the following programs:

(1) Gemini, $40,600,000;

(2) Apollo, $2,974,200,000;

(3) Advanced missions, $8,000,000;

(4) Physics and astronomy, $126,900,000;

(5) Lunar and planetary exploration, $227,900,000, of which $34,100,000 is authorized for the Mars Mariner project and $32,000,000 is authorized for the Voyager project: *Provided,* That none of the funds authorized herein shall be expended for the Venus Mariner project;

(6) Bioscience, $33,400,000;

(7) Meteorological satellites, $43,600,000;

(8) Communication and applications technology satellites, $26,400,000;

(9) Launch vehicle development, $33,700,000;

(10) Launch vehicle procurement, $132,000,000;

(11) Space vehicle systems, $36,000,000;

(12) Electronics systems, $36,800,000;

(13) Human factor systems, $17,000,000;

(14) Basic research, $23,000,000;

(15) Space power and electric propulsion systems, $44,900,000;

(16) Nuclear rockets, $53,000,000;

(17) Chemical propulsion, $44,500,000;

(18) Aeronautics, $35,000,000;

(19) Tracking and data acquisition, $265,335,000;

(20) Sustaining university program, $41,000,000;

(21) Technology utilization, $5,000,000;

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisitions, $94,419,000, as follows:

(1) Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts, $5,000,000;

(2) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $710,000;

(3) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, $350,000;

(4) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, Florida, $37,876,000;

(5) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, $6,100,000;

(6) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland and Sandusky, Ohio, $16,000,000;

(7) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $13,800,000;

(8) Michoud Assembly Facility, New Orleans and Slidell, Louisiana, $700,000;

(9) Mississippi Test Facility, Mississippi, $1,700,000;

(10) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, $205,000;

(11) Various locations, $6,478,000;

(12) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $5,500,000.

(c) For "Administrative operations," $644,210,150.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Administrative operations" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

(h) When so specified in an appropriation Act, any appropriation authorized under this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may initially be used, during the fiscal year 1967, to finance work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Administration and appropriate adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11), of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed a total of $88,919,000.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with $10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (12) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate, and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 5. Until June 30, 1967, funds appropriated pursuant to this Act or any prior Act authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for contracts for architect-engineer services without regard to the limitation imposed by 10 U.S.C. 2306(d) on such contracts: *Provided*, That, with respect to each such contract entered into hereafter, the Administrator determines that such contract is for the design of a highly complex research and development facility, which may include collateral equipment, requiring architect or engineering services in addition to those normally required for the production and delivery of designs, plans, drawings, and specifications or in order to safeguard against hazards such as explosion, radiation, or contamination: *Provided further*, That no funds may be used for any above-described architect-engineer contract unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the determination and the basis therefor.

SEC. 6. It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

SEC. 7. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1967".

Mr. MILLER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 1, line 9, strike "$2,974,200,000;" and insert $2,932,300,000, provided that no funds authorized by this Act may be expended for Apollo Applications programs;"

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be brief.

This involves the question of the Apollo applications and advanced mission programs.

My amendment would strike out $41.9 million for the purchase now, for the ordering now, and for the storing on shelves, of the hardware necessary for the post-Apollo programs. These are the programs which will come after the moon landing in the year 1969 or 1970—we do not know which.

My position is that the Bureau of the Budget really took a whack at this particular program, because it borders on the blue sky. The original amount requested by NASA of the Bureau of the Budget was $260 million. I must say the Bureau of the Budget must have not thought very much of what NASA could do following the Apollo program, if it cut the request from $260 million to approximately $42 million.

The Apollo applications program has not, and I repeat not, been approved by the administration, according to testimony presented to the Science and Astronautics Committee. In fact, the administration, when it saw fit to reduce substantially the original request, was certainly giving a vote of little confidence in this program.

NASA witnesses stated that the entire $41.9 million would be used in fiscal year 1967 to buy long leadtime hardware for additional Saturn I–B vehicles and additional Apollo spacecraft. This is beyond the needs of the present moon landing program. We do not know and we cannot possibly at this time estimate how much and how many boosters, spacecraft, and hardware from the Apollo program will be left over. We just cannot guess at it. So why not wait and see how much we will have available from that program.

As a matter of fact, NASA has not determined how many additional boosters, spacecraft, and hardware will be needed for these after-Apollo programs that I am speaking of. Nobody can even guess what these programs will be. We do have an outline of what they would like to consider, but at this time they are very indefinite programs. NASA said the delay in delivering the Apollo applications hardware has already increased its estimated cost by as much as 20 percent. To me this is pure poppycock, because nobody can come up with a figure like that with any reasonable amount of intelligence. I think the costs are speculative and the present program is also speculative. We should really go ahead and look at it again before we buy the hardware.

My position is that the present generation of booster spacecraft and hardware will look like 1914 Fords by 1970. What are we to have? Army and Navy space surplus sales stores on every corner?

The thing I would like to point out, also, is that I have always insisted on adequate research on boosters and advanced rockets and nuclear propulsion. But I do not agree that the U.S. Government, at this time, should be trying to buy hardware for programs we really know very little about or what they are until after we have gotten further along on the moon exploration program.

Therefore, I strongly recommend deletion of the $41.9 million by our committee and NASA from the Apollo applications program.

We should encourage NASA to continue with project definitions. But we should strongly oppose the purchase of any unnecessary shelf-type hardware at this time of budget deficits, war, and inflation.

The United States is advising business at present to forgo unnecessary inventory purchases and defer capital expenditures to assist the war effort, prevent inflation, and ease pressure on the U.S. economy. Then the Government turns around and says that we want to buy this unneeded inventory that we think in some cases or in most cases will be obsolete.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that we should not now buy this large amount of useless, expensive technical inventory which has now no definite use or associated program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania requests permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. I had understood we would get this all over and do it promptly.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. And we will take up another amendment and we will dispose of both of them at one time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California object?

Mr. MILLER. No, I do not object.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We can dispose of them both at one time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will combine another amendment with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask unanimous consent to that effect?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to combine the amendment on the advanced missions program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to add an additional amendment to the amendment which is pending. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will report the additional amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 2, line 1, strike "$8,000,000;" and insert "$3,000,000;".

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania now ask unanimous consent that these two amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there is $8 million in this NASA budget for what one would call the advanced missions program. With reference to the advanced missions program this is the type of thing about which they are just thinking. Previously, we have a lot of money spent upon it. I have seen very little result from this type of program. As a matter of fact, on this bill I previously have said that it is the type of program with no hardware and nothing practical in it. It gets to be purely blue sky with some people sitting in a room without windows and just having a think department.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I believe this program should be tightened up. Therefore, I want to reduce this particular program at this time of budget tightness from $8 million to $3 million, which represents a reduction of $5 million.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment, therefore, says that the request of NASA should be cut by $5 million. I do not believe this money can be well spent in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to delete $41.9 million for the Apollo applications program. As the gentleman has pointed out the Apollo applications program is as yet not an approved program. However, I am sure the gentleman would agree that the planning of future programs must precede the authorization of such programs and it is important to note that funding for Apollo applications was authorized in the previous fiscal year and the gentleman raised no objections at that time to this planning. The Apollo program in fiscal year 1967 will reach its peak of approximately 300,000 man-years of effort and by the time of the first Apollo Saturn I-B manned flight, in calendar year 1967, will have decreased to a level of 250,000 man-years of effort and by the third quarter of fiscal year 1968, when the first Apollo Saturn V manned flight is expected, a total man-years of effort in the Apollo program will have decreased by 100,000 man-years or to two-thirds of the peak effort expected during this coming fiscal year. The vast technical base developed to support our lunar landing in this decade as well as the manufacturing expertise will be rapidly decimated as the lunar landing program reaches maturity. With the major investment which this Nation already has in the Apollo program it is only prudent to provide sufficient and orderly planning to allow the growth of this vast technological, scientific, and manufacturing capability to be employed to give us a return on the investment which we have already made. Apollo applications provides us with this opportunity.

In fact the money approved for this year will not buy additional spacecraft or vehicles but rather provide for the purchase of a limited number of items common to the systems which will necessarily be employed to define, in flight, those experimental areas best suited to exploitation of our space competence in the early 1970's. This in no way authorizes an Apollo applications program per se but allows the maintenance of a number of options in earth orbit, lunar orbit, or on the lunar surface when these programs have been properly defined and presented to the Congress. It would be folly to deny to the NASA the opportunity to plan properly the alternatives available for our next major space undertaking. Recent history has shown that the development of new propulsion and space systems requires 4 to 8 years. If we are to deny NASA the opportunity to plan, and plan well, future programs, then a serious gap can exist at the completion of a successful lunar landing in fruits of the work accomplished in the the Apollo program. In fact NASA must be commended for recognizing that early success in the Saturn I-B and Saturn V programs to achieve a lunar landing could result in at least a small portion of these propulsion vehicles being available at an early date for other missions. If this does occur, it is mandatory that this planning be done, and in fact presented to the Congress prior to the fiscal year 1968 authorization, so that definite decisions can be made on our future space program utilizing $41.9 million for the Apollo applications in the fiscal year 1967 authorization and allow us to exercise this option in fiscal year 1968.

As my colleague from Pennsylvania has pointed out so well, breakthroughs in propulsion, automation, and control equipment will undoubtedly occur as this program progresses. For us to take advantage of this breakthrough, requires an adequate planning base. He further points out the vast potential for the exploration of our solar system, and I must agree that this will be a major venture of mankind in the future. And if we are to have a realistic, efficient, and orderly program for exploration we need to pursue the Apollo applications program as vigorously as possible no later than fiscal year 1968. NASA's request to the Bureau of the Budget for Apollo applications for this year was $260 million and was reduced to $41.9 million. Recognizing this, the committee's stated views, as incorporated in the report accompanying this bill, points out that we must provide this minimum authorization so that the planning will progress and allow the necessary decisions to be made on the future of the national space program and avoid major dislocations and loss of a technical base that is contributing not only to our space program but to the betterment of life here on earth.

Mr. Chairman, as to the amendment which affects the advanced missions program, I would simply like to say that it has been cut already from $10 million to $8 million by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania to delete $5 million of the $8 million request by NASA for its advanced missions program. Let me first draw an accurate distinction between the Apollo applications program planning and advanced missions planning. In testimony before the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee it was pointed out that the office of Manned Space Flight of NASA utilizes the phased project planning concept, and this is discussed in detail in part 2 of the fiscal year 1967 authorization hearings. Phased project planning involves four timed phased steps: First, advanced studies; second, program definition; third, design; fourth, development and operations.

During the first phase, advanced studies, concept and feasibility studies are analyzed. Possible approaches are defined, an engineering assessment is made of these approaches, and research and development technology requirements are identified. Gross schedules and costs are evaluated and favorable and unfavorable factors are determined. An analytical report is developed from this first phase of project planning.

Apollo applications has completed this first phase and entered into phase B of program definition. Consequently, a project type of organization has been established and separated from advanced mission planning. This effort is directed to definite studies for specific missions which could be performed with Apollo and modified Apollo hardware in earth orbit, in lunar orbit, and on the lunar surface. Consequently, work beyond Apollo applications which may be possible in the middle 1970's remains in the first phase of advanced missions study area at this time and is identified separately by NASA for the consideration of the committee and Congress as advanced missions. It is this vital area that my colleague wishes to reduce by more than 60 percent. It should be noted that NASA's request for fiscal year 1967 is $2 million less than the amount of $10 million which was authorized in fiscal year 1966. If the Nation is to maintain an orderly scheduled program and adhere to the rational concept of advanced project planning then it is essential that NASA be authorized the amount of $8 million requested in their current budget. If we wish to assure the progress of future space programs from advanced studies through program definition to design and finally to development and operation the continuity of the planning effort must be maintained. Contrary to the statement of my colleague that advanced missions is purely "blue sky" and represents a "no purpose" think department, the advanced missions planning represents an orderly, well-structured study program and at the request of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, NASA has provided a detailed list of advanced missions studies by category for fiscal year 1965, 1966 and 1967 as well as the accomplishments which have been made in advanced missions studies. A sober, considered reading of this information can lead to only one conclusion; that lack of support for advanced missions is penny-wise and pound foolish and can only lead to increased future costs in determining our national space programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the two amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendments were rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 3, line 18, strike "$13,800,000;" and insert "$4,700,000, provided that no funds authorized by this Act may be expended for a Lunar Receiving Laboratory;".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, you will notice on page 3 of the bill, line 17, there is a subsection marked "(7)". It is the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston, Tex., $13,800,000.

My amendment is not to eliminate the full amount. It knocks out $9.1 million which is for the Lunar Receiving Laboratory, that is, the laboratory which is to be placed at the Manned Space Flight Center in Texas to receive the 82 to 84 pounds of material from the moon brought back by the first astronauts who land there under the three-man Apollo program.

I strongly oppose the decision of NASA as well as the Committee on Science and Astronautics to approve right now the construction of this lunar receiving laboratory. I think it is poorly conceived and it has not been given an adequate amount of study and analysis. First, we certainly must investigate further before we make this tremendous sort of investment in a facility to analyze the extra terrestrial material at one particular geographical point.

I do not agree with NASA that there should be one facility which should be centralized, that it should be located at the Manned Space Flight Center, or that it should be started at this time.

We do not have at this point any of the results of the planned unmanned lunar research mission such as the Surveyor and the lunar orbital programs. They will guide and determine the direction that our future programs are to take.

For example, at this particular point, we could really proceed on the "green cheese" theory of the moon, for all we know about the structure of the surface and the interior of the moon. As a matter of fact, I would suggest that the best place to do the analyzing of the lunar material is right on the moon itself. But in the beginning, of course, we have to begin right here on earth. In that connection, I would suggest that we build and place a facility as near to the splashdown in the Pacific Ocean as we can. Possibly it will be built in Honolulu or the Hawaiian Islands. I cannot understand why NASA would risk putting the capsule, the astronauts, and the material in a van and then transporting them clear across the Pacific by air and part way—about a third or halfway across this country—before they start to analyze the material.

I believe it is a mistake to put together the three items—the capsule, the astronauts, and the materials. It is risking the total research results of our moon mission through one defect in one airplane. If a ship is used, there is the same problem of loading, unloading, and the possibility of contamination of the material itself.

I smile at the possibility of contamination of the earth's surface because one of the Directors of NASA has said that it is one in a million against the possibility of contamination. If anybody can set that figure, he has just pulled it out of the the sky and put it on his head.

May I just tell you how this site was selected. I think it is an example of the wonderful working of bureaucracy, and it always tickles me. NASA appointed a Selections Survey Committee and called it the NASA Site Selection Committee for the Lunar Receiving Laboratory. From the point of view of an intelligent person, the appointment by NASA of five out of nine members of this committee from the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, it is charmingly innocent if five members on the committee come right from Houston, where it has been decided probably ahead of time to put the installation.

It is disarming to learn that the majority of five members would work as a team with two additional members appointed from the NASA Headquarters on this committee.

If we are going to pick outside scientists, perhaps we should pick scientists from the other Government institutions that have facilities for research in this kind of material scientific investigation. We have many of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, may I have 2 additional minutes by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. My point is that it is enchanting to learn that the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston was the site finally chosen. There seems to have been some slight predisposition in that direction, entirely by accident, as top officials of NASA have so adequately pointed out in their testimony before the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

There was no disagreement of any member of the Site Selection Committee. As far as we are able to learn, there was no disagreement even at the time of arguing it out. No one was against Houston, but no one.

My point is that when everyone on a committee thinks alike, some people are not thinking very much; probably not at all. We have other sites that could be used.

For example, the Communicable Disease Center of the U.S. Public Health Service at Atlanta could be used. Or, for example, we could go into many other sites, such as the atomic energy sites. We could go into the Navy sites. We could go to the Air Force sites. We could go into NASA sites as well and select places where this material certainly could be gone over.

I would say that when we start this expansion of the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston into the field of extraterrestrial research on materials, it will then be the center for that purpose. My point is that it should be distributed around this country in various Government sites that we already have.

Second, it should go to corporations, businesses, universities, and individuals. Every geographic center of this country should have an opportunity at this business.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and support his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am compelled by the nature of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to refer to the fact that he in no instance has objected to the need of this laboratory being built. He only poses the question as to where it should be built, and as to when it should be built.

The fact is that the schedule of construction for this laboratory, one which does not exist anywhere in the world, for which there is a requirement, is shown in a chart prepared by NASA, beginning now for the design, and going through 1968, and into 1969, when checkout and training would bring it to the point where it would be ready to do the job necessary to receive the astronauts and the materials as they return from the moon.

The important aspect of this is that the National Academy of Sciences, in 1964, did place this requirement on us. The recommendation of that group was looked at closely. I for one would not take a chance, as remote as the possibility of contamination might be, that such contamination would not occur.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman please point out that the U.S. Public Health Service, which is charged with preserving the health of this country and working against the importation of diseases and contaminants, is intensely interested in this program? It is in part because of their recommendation that this is going forward.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing that out.

As I said in my earlier remarks, the Public Health Service has in fact imposed on the space agency the requirement that this be done.

We can always develop arguments as to where a facility should be built. We can deplore the way in which the committees were put together so that a choice might be made. The fact remains that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration did have a site investigation study. They looked over some 30 installations. They narrowed it down to some eight, which included some of the greatest research centers in the country. They showed that in each of those installations we would have to spend more than we would at Houston, and that the cost of maintenance would range, on the average, from $200,000 a year more than at Houston.

The committee which did the investigation was somewhat overweighted, and on this I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, with personnel from Houston. Yet these are men of integrity. They told us exactly what they did. They showed us what the costs would be, and they pointed out one important additional aspect of this, and that is that at no other center could this work be done without detracting from the mission objective of that particular research center.

There is no question, Mr. Chairman, but that this laboratory is needed, that it should be at Houston, that it should be built now in order to meet our schedule.

I urge this Committee to turn this amendment down and to support the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am no expert on this bill, but what is proposed at the present time, as I deduce from the debate, is to go to Houston, Tex., and construct another building for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Is there no other place in the United States this structure can be located except in Texas?

One of my colleagues says, "Not for the next 7 years."

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes; there are other places it could be built. I have referred to the fact that these were included in the report, and that it would cost more to build them than at Houston, and it would cost more to maintain them. Quite important is the fact that even though they could be built in other areas, they would detract from the missions presently assigned to the other research centers.

It is, however, the assigned mission of the Manned Space Flight Center at Houston to place a man on the moon in this decade, to return him safely to earth, and to take care of him when he comes back. One of the responsibilities is not to have contamination brought back to earth as a result of this program, and it is therefore important to begin construction of this laboratory now.

Mr. GROSS. That sounds good, but whatever happened to the warnings of other years about concentrating Government operations in one place, in Washington, D.C., in Houston, Tex., in Fort Worth, Tex., and so on, and so forth?

What has happened to the danger about which we were told of concentrating all these scientific and sensitive organizations and laboratories in one place? Is there no longer any danger of nuclear warfare? Should not some of this activity be dispersed? This was the story we heard around here not long ago, but evidently no one is worried now about nuclear warfare.

Mr. DADDARIO. I quite agree as to the necessity of spreading our capabilities around. The fact is that the gentleman has brought up some very important points.

As we do attempt to distribute on a more equitable basis throughout the country such facilities as this, we must recognize what is available and what our objectives are.

This is not a new program. It does in fact mesh in with the requirement at Houston. It is a very small part of that operation. It can be performed better there than anywhere else.

It would be, in my opinion, ridiculous to separate it just for the purposes that concern the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. That is the story we hear with respect to the location of all too many of these Government installations. Somehow or other it appears that military establishments and other installations have to be located in Georgia, or Texas and a few other selected States. It is getting to be quite an old story to some of us.

I believe the good things of life ought to be spread around to the greatest number of people. Does the gentleman not agree with that?

Mr. DADDARIO. I agree, as I have said, with the basic concept. I do not think that applies in this instance under these circumstances. The arguments in favor of constructing this facility at Houston are overwhelming. I recommend that we follow the report.

Mr. GROSS. I hope they will not have to drain another lake down there in order to provide a building site. I used to have the facts and figures in mind on what happened at Houston with respect to this NASA business, but they have slipped my memory.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It was amazing to see the factors which gave rise to the site selection, in the order stated.

First, availability of utilities,

Second, accommodations for visitors. That is the reason for selection.

Third, scientific investigation capabilities, and

Fourth, construction, operation and maintenance costs.

It is amazing that they put the availability of utilities and accommodations for visitors, for tourists, first and second. On page 122 of the report the gentleman will find eight sites already in existence which could be modified.

They include everything from Oak Ridge, Tenn., to Los Alamos, N. Mex., to facilities for testing materials that have been subject to radiation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to believe that among all the scientific laboratories built by this Government, at a cost of billions of dollars, there are not the facilities to examine 60 to 80 pounds of dust from the moon and the clothing of the men who man the lunar vehicle.

Moreover, it is almost incredible, with the financial situation that confronts this Government now, that $9 million should be authorized in this bill to provide for the construction of a laboratory which is not likely to be used for the purpose intended for a long period of time.

In view of our financial troubles, I submit that this bill ought to be substantially reduced, and I propose to vote against it unless it is.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to ask a question of the gentleman who was in colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. The gentleman from Connecticut suggested that this is not a new program.

Is this not a new program?

Mr. DADDARIO. No, it is not a new program.

Mr. BOW. Where have we had a program on the dust from the moon in the past?

Mr. DADDARIO. We have not, of course, returned any dust or other materials from the moon as yet.

Mr. BOW. As I understand it from the debate that I heard here, this laboratory is to make some examination of the lunar dust and the material from the moon.

Mr. DADDARIO. The idea is that it be constructed now so that when the first mission returns successfully from the moon the materials can be safely kept in this place and examined in this laboratory.

Mr. BOW. So it is a new program and we have not done it before.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is also important that the men be isolated in this place when they return from the moon to prevent them from contaminating, since that is a possibility, the people of this country.

Mr. BOW. How does the gentleman convince us that this is not a new program?

Mr. DADDARIO. Because it is part of the manned space program and fits into it.

Mr. BOW. It is overall. You are talking about the overall manned space program.

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes.

Mr. BOW. But the particular purpose of this laboratory is a completely new program, is it not?

Mr. DADDARIO. No. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to. I would like to get this cleared up.

Mr. DADDARIO. Can the gentleman conceive that we should run counter to the advice given us by the National Academy of Sciences and the Public Health Service that we have such a laboratory when the men and materials return from the moon, which is an objective established by this House over the course of these past several years?

Mr. BOW. I still suggest to the gentleman that this is an entirely new program and a new project that we are getting into in anticipation of getting to the moon in the next few years. It seems to me this very subject is one of those things that could be delayed, certainly for a year or 2, until we get over the problems facing us now. We do not know what we are getting into. It seems to me that Vietnam is much more important than the question of what we are going to do with the dust that we get back from the moon.

I support the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] on his amendment. Mind you, I am not against Houston. I have great respect and regard for it. I think it is a great city. I think it should go some place else, though, and I think we should begin to divert some of these plants elsewhere around the country.

Mr. DADDARIO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. I will when I conclude this one observation.

I am not making this argument as an attack on Houston, because, as I say, I have great respect for it. I think they have done an excellent job there. It seems to me these laboratories should go elsewhere and that there should be some dispersal of these from a central location. It also seems to me it is not necessary this year to authorize this project when we are now way over our budget. Tomorrow we are going to be much farther over the budget to the extent of $500 million more. If we are going to stop inflation and the possibility of tax increases, the day has come when we have to stop some of these authorizations. It is this kind of an authorization, it seems to me, that we can stop. We can look at it again next year, when we better know what is going on throughout the world. I think this is a mistake, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to be commended for bringing this to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We have done a pretty good job of polluting this earth. I wonder if we should not be concerned about polluting the moon when we get there.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman. I am much more concerned with pollution on the earth than with pollution on the moon. We should be moving forward in that direction and this money should be used for that kind of thing.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has said that we do not know what will happen. It is precisely because we do not know what will happen that we need this laboratory. I urge this amendment be defeated.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will explain that to me, I would appreciate it, please. It is a broad statement. Explain the basis for that.

Mr. DADDARIO. I will be happy to. I think I have already explained the need for the construction of this laboratory. The fact is that we do not know what will happen when these people and materials come back to earth—if they could contaminate the earth.

Mr. BOW. Of course, if we never get to the moon, we will have a laboratory at Houston with nothing to do there.

Mr. DADDARIO. I have more confidence than the gentleman does in this program. I think we will go to the moon successfully and we will return men safely from there. When that has been accomplished, we will have materials which should be of extreme scientific importance.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further at this time. I will yield to the gentleman later. I will say that I hope we will get to the moon and we will be able to bring our men back safely, but I do not think we will do it next year or the year after or the year after that. It seems to me with our fiscal situation as it is in this country today that we ought to be careful of the way we spend money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Bow was granted permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the space program and the amount of money we have been spending on it, it seems to me, is one place where we should support the President in his economy drive, if we wish to attempt to cut down on spending and to reduce the inflationary spiral which is taking place, which represents a 6-percent sales tax we are placing upon the American people through inflation.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of thing we can do through adoption of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], and this is the place to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the gentleman said that he wanted to support the President's program, because this is a part of the President's program.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio wants to stop pollution of the earth, we had better consider what we are going to do with these samples when they come back.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell the Members of the Committee that the astronauts are going to bring back polluted material from the moon any more than one can say that certain polluted materials from earth sources cause disease. However, we know that there is the possibility of this, a greater possibility than we had ever thought.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we know that the National Academy of Sciences—and I know of no group better qualified or more able of making a judgment upon this than that Academy; and we know that the Public Health Service makes this recommendation as to where it should go—and if it does not go to Houston then the scientists from Houston who have studied this problem and who will have to work on it will have to travel from there to a new site.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have continuity in the program, and if we are going to see it fulfilled, then we must follow this course.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes, 21, noes 33.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: Page 10, after line 5, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 7. Of the amounts authorized for Facility Planning and Design in prior years which remain unexpired on the date of enactment of this Act, and for which appropriations have not actually been made, $10,000,000 is repealed."

Page 10, line 6, strike out "SEC. 7." and insert "SEC. 8."

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that has to do with the money for facilities planning and design.

My amendment cuts $10 million out of the money that has previously been authorized and which is presently unappropriated and unspent. There is $11.9 million that has been authorized to NASA for this purpose from prior years that they have not used.

For the current year NASA has requested $7 million for facility planning and design. The committee very wisely cut that to $5.5 million for authorization in fiscal year 1967.

My amendment goes to the part hanging over, $11.9 million, which had previously been authorized in fiscal years 1963 through 1966. No part of this balance has been used, appropriated, or programed, obligated, or spent. It is just hanging there.

My feeling on the NASA budget—sure; give them adequate money, but make it efficient. Do not give them pockets of money of $10 or $11 or $12 million which they do not have any records to show efficient use of the authorization granted for this facility, planning and design.

I might point out to you in the various years from fiscal year 1962 through fiscal year 1966, they had authorized $58.4 million total, of which they have only funded $46.5 million, leaving admittedly $11.9 million—a pocket that they have of money that they could really transfer and use for other purposes.

History of legislation and programing as of Feb. 28, 1966—Status of the facility planning and design account

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Authorized			Funded	Obligated
	Annual act	Reprograming	Total		
1962	10	--------	10.0	10.0	10.0
1963	8	5.4	13.4	13.1	13.1
1964	20	--------	20.0	10.7	10.7
1965	10	--------	10.0	10.0	9.7
1966	5	--------	5.0	2.7	1.9
Total	53	5.4	58.4	46.5	45.4
Unfunded	--------	--------	11.9		

So, my feeling on the current request of $7 million more for NASA, the committee is right in cutting it to $5.5 million.

I had previously pointed out in my remarks that there was $5 million in addition that had been appropriated that had not been obligated. But I am advised as of today that this money which had not been used as of the date testimony was received has now been obligated.

So, we should not consider that $5 million.

If anybody in the room can tell me there is not $11.9 million left over of authorized funds for which there is no funding, I would like to hear it.

As a matter of fact, on June 30 part of it will expire because it will have been hanging for 3 years at that time. If we are going to make NASA run a tight ship and a tight budget, I believe that $10 million of the $11.9 million of unfunded authorization from prior years, 1963 through 1966, should be repealed. I will be the first one to say to them, "If you need more authorization currently, then you may have it—if you can justify it."

This is a matter of a hangover of funds that just collects and it is not money that has been collecting for just 1 year but all through these years. This amendment would just be cleaning up the past records and making for a tighter NASA budget.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, realizing the condition that the gentleman speaks of could exist, this committee amended the Space Act to provide that these unused authorizations—and they are not appropriations—would expire at the end of 3 years. So as the 3-year periods come, this $11 million authorization will expire and move out of the picture.

Mr. Chairman, we did this at that time just to take care of the situation that the gentleman is speaking about. Although there is an accumulation of $11.9 million they would have a very short time in which to try to get appropriations for it.

So, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the law has been placed on the books and it is operative and in effect, I see no necessity for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOW), there were—ayes 23, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 9 after line 23, add a new section 6 and renumber present section 6 as section 7, and present section 7 as section 8:

"SEC. 6. That title II of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is amended by redesignating sections 205 and 206 as sections 206 and 207, respectively, and by inserting after section 204 the following new section:

"'INSPECTOR OF PROGRAMS AND OPERATIONS

"'SEC. 205. (a) There shall be in the Administration an Inspector of Programs and Operations (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Inspector" who shall be appointed by the Administrator (under clause (A) of section 203(b)(2)) and who shall be responsible directly to the Administrator and Deputy Administrator.

"'(b) It shall be the duty of the Inspector to conduct a continuing study, review, and evaluation of the operations and programs of the Administration, with special reference to its contractual relations with industry. In the discharge of this duty the Inspector shall—

"'(1) arrange for, direct, or conduct such reviews, inspections, audits and evaluations of operations and programs being conducted or participated in by the Administration as he considers necessary for the purpose of ascertaining the efficiency and economy of their administration, and of promoting the expeditious attainment of their objectives;

"'(2) maintain continuous observation and review of operations and programs with respect to which he is discharging such duty to determine the extent to which such operations and programs are in compliance with applicable laws and regulations; make recommendations for the correction of deficiencies in, or for improving the organization, plans, or procedures of, such programs; and evaluate the effectiveness of such programs in attaining United States national space policy objectives;

"'(3) review and evaluate all contractual relations or agreements which the Administration has or may enter into with individuals and organizations (profit and nonprofit), and require the cooperation of all such contracting persons and organizations therein;

"'(4) review and evaluate all agreements, arrangements, and liaison which the Administration has or may enter into with other Government departments or agencies; and

"'(5) review and evaluate all executive agreements, arrangements, as well as joint and participating operations and programs the Administration has entered into or may enter into with any foreign government, agencies thereof, either directly or indirectly through any international organizations.

"'(c) The Inspector shall have authority to suspend all or any part of any project, operation, or program with respect to which he has conducted or is conducting an inspection, audit, study, review, or evaluation provided he has first given written notice thereof to the Administrator and Deputy Administrator. Any such suspension shall remain effective until such project, operation, or program, or part thereof is ordered resumed by him or by the Administrator or Deputy Administrator.

"'(d) In carrying out his functions under this section, the Inspector shall use to the fullest practicable extent the auditing, investigation, and inspection facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including those of the General Accounting Office and of the inspector generals of the Armed Forces.'"

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, briefly, the amendment would insert in the legislation a provision for an Office of Inspector General. NASA is a tremendous agency. It has grown like Topsy. It is significant to note that numerous other Government agencies have recognized the importance of utilizing the services of an Inspector General's Office.

For example, those agencies are the Departments of the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Department of State, and, more recently, the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Either those Offices of the Inspector General are needless, useless, and an expense that should not be incurred by the U.S. taxpayers, or we certainly should have an Inspector General of all these tremendous programs in NASA. Why should NASA be the agency working in the same fields as these other agencies, in many instances, without a "policeman" to see how the programs are being run? The same people who are programing NASA activities are also evaluating their progress.

Of course, there is a cost directorate in NASA that was just established in 1964. It is called the Cost Reduction Directorate. It is supposedly for investigative services. But it is only a bug on the wallpaper, on the surface of the problem. It is designed for minor cost accounting matters, to determine if eggs are cheaper on another counter.

I feel we need investigation in depth to provide across-the-board analysis of NASA activities at all levels of management. This indicates that an inspector general type organization, responsible to the top, to the Administrator of NASA, is required.

For example, can you imagine a $5 billion budget that has a cost reduction directorate consisting of only three professional persons, none of whom has any engineering, scientific, or technical background in the space and aeronautics field? There are two secretaries. I do not think they add very much to this investigation. Assigning three nontechnical people to overseeing a $5 billion program, from a management analysis point of view, is like a canary pecking at a mountain. I say it is completely inadequate, and we should have the Office of the Inspector General.

If people ask me, "Congressman, does not the General Accounting Office function? Does not the Bureau of the Budget function?" I would like to say that I believe both of those organizations are deficient in aeronautics and space activities.

My point is this: The Bureau of the Budget has far too few people to give much control over the NASA budget. There are only two or three people in the Bureau of the Budget who have the responsibility to make all major decisions on a $5 billion NASA program. They did this last year in a little less than a week. This type of control can only be superficial.

The General Accounting Office has yet to provide Congress with any meaningful surveys or audits of one of the largest agencies in the Government. I feel that this agency, in this kind of field, technical as it is, is far too bound with past history, emphasizing accounting and bookkeeping practices at the expense of auditing and surveys.

This is not in this bill, but I take strong opposition to Secretary of Defense McNamara moving the manned orbit program under his broad wings in the Department of Defense. Nobody, but nobody, in this Congress knew he was going to do it when, on December 10, 1963, at a news conference, of all places, he announced, without prior notice of any kind, that the manned orbiting laboratory program would be assigned to the Air Force.

Neither the Congress nor the scientific community of the country had any prior notice or inkling that this was to be the case until Secretary McNamara made this bland announcement.

I also oppose the announcement by the President on August 25, 1964, at a news conference, that the program would be worked upon by certain major contractors. This is certainly not the way to do business. It is not appropriate to ignore the existing science and research facilities of the Federal Government without any consultation or authorization by the Congress whatsoever.

It is complete fiction to state, as Secretary McNamara stated, that the MOL is a completely military task, and therefore can be handled by him as Secretary of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the MOL is not a completely military task. It should be under both the National Aeronautics and Space Administration jurisdiction, as well as the Department of Defense.

The announcement by Secretary McNamara makes a fiction and is in direct violation of the expressed intent of the Congress in Public Law 85-568, dated July 28, 1958. There we said specifically that the space research and development should be for peaceful purposes, and that we would not go into space for military purposes, and run the risk of nuclear war from outer space.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for pointing to this unauthorized takeover of this program by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, without notice to the House. I do not believe this had been previously announced to the House. I was wondering under what authorization the Secretary could do this.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. There has been no authorization whatever, nor has there been any previous notice to Congress or to any committee of the Congress.

There was no previous notice to the scientific community, nor any to any one so far as I can find out. It was simply a takeover by Mr. McNamara, when he saw a big bird running around. He grabbed it by the tail and pulled it into the Department of Defense.

Mr. LATTA. Will this not mean a lot of duplication of effort on the part of the Government?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It does make the United States take a position that, on the Manned Orbiting Laboratory, we are working for military purposes alone and not for peacetime purposes, so there is a duplication, when both fields are not covered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I should like to confine my arguments to the amendment, and not to extraneous matter such as the manned orbital laboratory. There were certain people on the gentleman's side who at one time wanted to turn the manned orbital laboratory over to the Defense Department and take it away from this committee. I do not remember the gentleman coming to its defense then. But this is extraneous to the amendment which the gentleman offered, which related to an inspector general in NASA.

The inspectors in the Defense Department were historical offices, going back to the beginning of the Army and the Navy, and naturally this was adopted by the Department of the Air Force. It also slipped over into the Department of State.

But these inspectors handle routine problems which are set out day after day.

NASA has a competent, ongoing organization which is capable of doing the job and which is doing and has done the job.

The oversight subcommittee of the committee has monitored the work which NASA has done, and a great deal has been accomplished in the form of getting the establishment of standards of construction and watching over NASA very carefully.

Setting up a new hierarchy in NASA to report to the Administrator of NASA, appointed by the Administrator, would merely mean taking one of the deputies and giving him a title of Inspector General and perhaps more money.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

I take this time to continue the colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania about the Manned Orbiting Laboratory program.

Specifically I should like to ask the gentleman whether or not there are some plans now afoot, of which he might know, for Secretary McNamara to move this program to California?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Of course, the Manned Orbiting Laboratory will be a polar orbit, and part of the experiments and orbiting vehicles will be launched into a north-south orbit from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California.

The point we are making is that the facilities both of NASA and of the Air Force should be used, and current facilities where they are should be used. I strongly object to moving the entire program out of Florida, where some of it can be done, and moving it all to one place in California.

I feel likewise that under the United Nations Charter we are in a way violating the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space resolution passed by the 14th General Assembly in 1959, when we joined with other nations for the development of the peaceful uses of outer space.

I feel the gentleman's question is an excellent one. He has raised a point as to whether this is being taken over for a purpose other than just development and is being taken over for a purpose that is not for the good of efficiency.

Mr. LATTA. I should like to say further on this, I believe the taxpayers ought to be raising some questions, as are the people in Cocoa, Fla.

I have in my hand a headline from the Cocoa Tribune dated February 22, 1966, which reads:

> MOL MOVE COST GROWS TO $300 MILLION HIGH—DECISION BLAMED ON PRIDE
>
> The Air Force is willing to gamble $300 million of American taxpayers' money on building up Vandenberg Air Force Base for a Titan 3–C rocket to launch the MOL (Manned Orbiting Laboratory).
>
> The military decision to shift 3,000 miles from Cape Kennedy was based on both pride and an argument of necessity, an aerospace industry source disclosed.
>
> The Air Force plans to spend $300 million to develop this capability in California including:
>
> New development of the Titan "core" to handle the 120-inch solid fuel motors increased to 7½ segments on stages.
>
> New facilities for testing the Titan "core."
>
> Construction of new launch facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base to fire the Titan-3–C and also to handle the manned space program.
>
> New propulsion advances within Aerojet-General to accommodate the new missile. Aerojet produces the engines for the Titan's first and second stages and the maneuverable transtage which has experienced failures in its last two flights."

And so forth. If these facilities are going to be duplicated out in California and they are already in existence at Cape Kennedy, I do not think pride and pride alone, should influence the Defense Department to move them to California. I agree with the gentleman from California that this is outside the sphere of influence of his committee. It is something that should, according to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, have been kept in NASA. NASA should not have relinquished this program to the Secretary of Defense without some explanation of the Congress.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will in just a second.

I certainly think this is something that should have been brought to the attention of the Congress. Mr. McNamara has apparently taken over this program without congressional authorization. It seems to me if existing facilities are now being duplicated in California, this is just another $300 million error in judgment by the Secretary of Defense and we should know about it. If this program was to be completed in California, he should have started it there. The Defense Department should not have an alleged $300 million in taxpayers' money invested in Florida and then make a move to California without explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before the debate concludes on H.R. 14324 I think it is appropriate to comment on two rather substantial improvements which are in the NASA authorization bill this year. In previous years I have been critical of both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Science and Astronautics for coming to the floor with bills which required reports to be made by the executive agency involved directly to the committees of the House and the committees of the Senate involved. You will note on pages 8 and 9 of this bill, any reports required to be made in connection with reprograming of funds will be made to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate. This is in keeping with the rules of the U.S. House of Representatives. The chairman of the committee and the members of the committee should be commended for making this correction and this improvement in the legislation. I hope the Committee on Armed Services will follow the lead.

The second item which it is appropriate to comment on is the portion of section 5 on page 9 of the bill which provides an arrangement whereby rather than building up in-house capabilities in architectural and engineering specialties, that NASA will be able to make maximum use of private enterprise for contracting for some of these extraordinary and highly technical services which are required from time to time in the space program for highly complex research and development facilities.

I personally think this is a sound approach and I have supported both of these changes in the NASA authorization bill. I merely took the time to see that the RECORD was clear on these two improvements which have been made in the authorization bill. I might add that I support H.R. 14324.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Illinois, because it was through his efforts and because of his insistence that language was written into this bill so that we would meet the requirement of parliamentary procedure under which this House of Representatives operates. He called this matter to the attention of the committee and did a great deal of work to prove it out, and he is to be complimented because he has been of service to us.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to second what the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] said. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] did a great job in getting this before the committee. The committee was very happy to accept his amendment. I want to let the gentleman from Illinois know of this.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the chairman for his remarks, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words on the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply rise in the interest of comity and equity.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I am one of the few members of the Committee on Armed Services concerned with this question of the manned orbital laboratory, now on the floor.

I believe the statements that have been made in the minority views recognize nothing whatsoever concerning the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee and particularly the headquarters of the U.S. Air Force Space Systems Command and the manned orbital laboratory.

Mr. Chairman, I am not at all sure that any quotation or anything else that has been said previously gave jurisdiction to NASA or the committee that has surveillance over NASA insofar as this body is concerned.

But, Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, it is run from the headquarters of the Air Force Space Systems Command right here at Andrews Air Force Base. If it is a polar orbit, from whence it departs this terrestial sphere to go into orbit, is a small question, and I do not need to engage in that part of the colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, it is extremely unusual for me to rise in defense of the Secretary of Defense. In fact, on many questions I have taken the opposite position. But I do want to point out that this question of jurisdiction involves some things which cannot be discussed, even on the floor of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it is important that our military services maintain jurisdiction and control, and in order to gainsay much that has been said, I quote from pages 136 to 140 in the statement of the Secretary of Defense before the House Armed Services Committee on March 8, 1966, under the heading of "Research and Development VI," subparagraph B, space development problems. Therein it is stated that the Defense space program is an integral part of the much larger national space program; that the work of the armed services and the Defense Department is to complement the work of NASA in other fields in which the Defense Department has already achieved a high degree of technical competence.

And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a simple question. From whence comes most of the astronauts themselves, to say nothing of most of the research and most of the scientists for our national space program and if not for NASA itself?

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary further states as follows:

> First, it must mesh with the efforts of NASA in all vital areas, that is, the Defense and NASA programs taken together must constitute a single, integrated national program. Second, projects supported by the Defense Department must hold the distinct promise of enhancing our military power and effectiveness.

Now, Mr. Chairman, about $1,621 million of the fiscal year 1967 Defense Department budget is requested for the space program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary adds:

> NASA will study the MOL to determine the feasibility of using it for experiments of a general scientific and technological nature. The Air Force will attempt to accommodate these experiments wherever possible as long as they do not seriously interfere with the military objectives.
>
> As in the past, NASA and DOD will continue to work closely to insure that the manned space flight effort of both agencies is fully coordinated and that the program is integrated with the national effort.
>
> The initial MOL astronauts have been drawn from a preselected group of candidates. These men are all military test pilots and graduates of the Aerospace Research Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif. They include both Air Force and naval aviators.

Mr. Chairman, as one privy to armed services posture briefings and intelligence, I cannot stand idly by and see this question overexercised, the jurisdiction altered, or even further floor discussion in open debate in this area.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. I want to thank the gentleman for what he has said. NASA and the Department of Defense do cooperate in this field and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Science and Astronautics have never had a difference in this field. I respect their jurisdiction and in this case—and I think this is what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] referred to when he spoke—I refused to discuss this before the Committee on Rules on the ground that I had no jurisdiction in the field. I am very happy that the gentleman from Missouri has pointed this out.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, having been privy to top secret briefings on this matter, I repeat that it should not be discussed further on the floor of the House.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I really think a clarification is needed. First of all, let me say that the colloquy or the discussion that has taken place here on the manned orbital laboratory program has absolutely nothing to do with the amendment being proposed or offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Second, I would like to say that the amendment in my opinion covers a great deal of territory. As I understand, it was lifted from that language which applies to the Inspector General who has been appointed to serve in the Air Force and while it may be good for Air Force it could well do irreparable harm to NASA.

Further, I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania does have a bill that would accomplish the purpose he seeks to accomplish by his amendment which is today pending before the full committee.

I think this thing is so far reaching Mr. Chairman, and might have such a salutory effect that we ought to really have full committee hearings. At least, Mr. Chairman, we ought to have subcommittee hearings on the proposition that is now before this committee.

I do not think we can intelligently discuss and in fact I do not think we can intelligently digest and understand the effects of this amendment in the few minutes that are allowed without each of us having an opportunity to see it in writing.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. I want to say that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania formally asks for a hearing on his bill, I shall be very happy to put it on schedule and hear it any time after the bills that are now scheduled.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, under those conditions, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. KARTH. Under that condition, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYDLER

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WYDLER: Page 3, after line 2, insert the following: "except that, of the total amount authorized for 'Research and development' by this subsection, the sum of $20,000,000 shall be utilized for the purpose of research on the reduction of aircraft noise [along with the funds allocated to that purpose from the authorization contained in paragraph (18)], and the amounts otherwise made available pursuant to the authorizations contained in paragraphs (1) through (21) shall be adjusted by the Administrator to the extent necessary to make such sum available for that purpose."

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment I am proposing to this bill would simply earmark $20 million of the research and development funds in the NASA bill to do development work on the problem of aircraft noise.

This amendment adds no money to the bill. It merely earmarks funds in the bill for this purpose.

The space program has recently been revealed as a result of many surveys that have been taken in the country as being a program that is very low in public favor.

Many people when they are asked about cutting expenses want to cut space spending first. The reason is that nobody benefits directly from this program and many people cannot see what advantage it is to them.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is incumbent upon us to bring this program closer to the people and to show them some way in which it can benefit them. We often hear there is going to be a fallout as a result of this program—some kind of fallout that will affect the civilian population beneficially. Here is an opportunity to give them some fallout directly that will be of benefit to them. This we can do in this bill by earmarking $20 million for aircraft noise reduction research. I am talking about a kind of aircraft noise that is not just the sound of an airplane passing by overhead. Hearings that I held back in my district last fall gave me medical testimony that this type of noise is so unbearable that it actually has bad physical and mental effects on people who undergo it. These people are demanding that something be done, and I think rightfully so.

There has finally been a recognition that some action must be taken. The time has now come for Congress to act, because if we do not act now in this authorization bill, another year will go by, and I do not think people should be made to wait for another year for Congress to act.

This amount that I am proposing to be put into this aircraft noise reduction research is less than one-half of 1 percent of the research and development funds. It is a small amount compared to the tremendous sums that we are putting into the project of flying a man to the moon and bringing him back to earth and other similar type space programs. But it is an important amount because it will change the whole direction of the research that NASA is now doing in this field. How? Because up to this time we have been doing pure research and development in this area. In other words, we devise a theory of how we can reduce noise, and we do nothing to carry out the theory to see if it works.

It would be similar if we first theorized that we were going to have a Mercury program and then had never flown Mercury, and then theorized the Gemini program and had never flown Gemini, and then we had theorized that we would fly a man to the moon but never flew a man to the moon.

What we must do in this program is to test the theories, according to testimony taken before our subcommittee; a program could be undertaken, and undertaken now, for $20 million. That is why I suggest that sum. We can get action and change our entire approach to this problem this year if we put this authorization language into the bill. That is why I am asking to do so.

The action should be bipartisan. Certainly this should be bipartisan, because the President in his message on transportation to the Congress stated that this is a very important problem. I am going to quote from his message.

He said:

> There are no simple or swift solutions (to the problem) but it is clear that we must embark now on a concerted effort to alleviate the problems of aircraft noise.

To me that means now, and I do not think we should talk about this any more, but we should start to do something about it. That is why I am offering this amendment today, to get the NASA program, to some extent, down to earth where the people will understand what benefits flow from it for them, and they will accept its burdens in a much more willing manner. It will help the entire space program in its acceptability to the general public.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has merit and should be adopted.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and congratulate him.

As my colleagues know, ever since I have been in Congress I have been working for a solution to the noise problem which besets those who live in the vicinity of the large airports of our Nation. Those of us who live in areas surrounding the large airports such as John F. Kennedy International Airport, located in my congressional district, had problems before the advent of commercial jet transportation. With the coming of the jet, the problem was greatly increased. At the time that the problem started in the large metropolitan areas, few people, outside those living in the immediate area, knew anything about the matter and cared very little.

Today the problem is becoming more widespread and we are hearing complaints here in the Washington area since the arrival of the jets at National Airport. And, here at National we have only the smaller jets—imagine the consternation were the Boeing 707 and other jets of this size to come into this airport. Mr. Chairman, we have these larger jets landing and taking off from Kennedy International day and night, and I have constituents living much closer to the airport than any residents in the Washington area live in proximity to National.

In Queens County, N.Y., we have noise abatement procedures which the pilots must fly when weather, wind, and so forth, permit. However, we all know that the only solution to the noise problem lies in controlling the noise at its source, the engine. This can only come about through research.

The sum being set aside through the amendment now before us is little indeed to ask. I say to you, more and more of you are going to face the clamor of your constituents as the airlines convert to jets. These planes will be going into more and more cities in the months and years ahead. Believe me when I tell you that money spent today to lessen aircraft noise will save each of you and your constituents many problems and sleepless nights in the future when these jets come into your area as they surely will.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank my colleague from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for offering his amendment and rise in support of the amendment to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization bill which would set aside $20 million for an intensive program of research into aircraft noise abatement.

The problem of aircraft noise is a very real and pressing one for a considerable number of my constituents. In Milwaukee County two developments have brought the noise problem to a crisis stage.

First. The airport itself has expanded its runways in order to accommodate the large jet aircraft that are being used in greater numbers by the commercial airlines.

Second. As the metropolitan area of Milwaukee has expanded, it is only natural that houses are being built in areas adjacent to the airport.

As the result of these circumstances more and more people are being affected by aircraft noise.

Mr. Chairman, I have received anguished letters of complaint from hundreds of my constituents. Their homes have been shaken, their dishes smashed, and their nerves shattered by the din of passing planes.

It is obvious that immediate steps must be taken to bring relief to these people and thousands of others like them throughout the United States.

I wish to commend the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, and the Committee on Science and Astronautics, for authorizing $2 million in addition to the $3 million requested.

The $5 million should be helpful. This amendment, however, does not add any new funds to the authorization bill. It merely allows a small fraction of available funds to be used to finance research into aircraft noise.

Mr. Chairman, the answer must be found to this problem. The alternative to abating aircraft noise is the payment of damages to those whose property and personalities are affected. This course would undoubtedly cost billions.

The alternative is to conquer aircraft noise itself.

It would be a cruel paradox indeed if by the end of this current decade the United States has conquered space and made a moon landing but has not been able to overcome the deafening blast of noise created by a jet aircraft landing on earth.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment before us today. The solution to the problem may take some time. Yet the problem grows more severe day by day.

It is imperative, therefore, that we begin now to do the necessary work to help preserve the safety and tranquillity of those many American citizens who live in the vicinity of an airport.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my colleague on his amendment and urge all Members to support it.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. I rise in support of the amendment. It is a most commendable proposal, long overdue and vitally needed.

This amendment is what we, who are concerned with the ever-growing plane noise problem, have been urging for many years. It is a realistic breakthrough in an area that tragically has been bogged down for too long.

I do not feel that the issue can wait until a determination is made as to which agency is to handle this problem. Nor do I feel we can afford to wait until a coordinated pattern can be established. We have lost too much time as it is.

Of course we commend efforts toward the realization of a centralized effort in this field. We await the report of the President's task force with eagerness. I would like to see a permanent commission established along the lines of the one proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] on the subject of aircraft noise abatement. But I do not see how any of these commendable approaches can in any way be deterred by the enactment of this amendment. They can only be helped. For whatever advances NASA can make in research and development on noise abatement can only complement the efforts of any future centralized approach. Research in this field by NASA is a most natural course, since this is the Government agency charged with the Government's role in astronautical engineering.

If we are able to make the progress we have in exploring space and in the development of the most advanced scientific goals, it seems to me we can develop the means to attack plane noise. We must have an all-out attack, and this means continuing research and development. This means funds, and this needs action by Congress. We have this opportunity now to get a meaningful start, and I trust this amendment will prevail overwhelmingly. I congratulate and compliment the gentleman from New York for presenting it to this House.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague, from New York [Mr. WYDLER] which would provide $20 million out of the $4,986,864,150 appropriation which would be allocated to NASA under H.R. 14324, for the purpose of finding a solution to the problem of aircraft noise, with the following comments:

According to the first four conclusions of the report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, House Report No. 2229, October 13, 1960:

> 1. A great deal of noise research is underway in the Government, but there appears to be a lack of common orientation except in the armed services through the Armed Forces—National Research Council Committee on Hearing and Bio-Acoustics—CHABA.
>
> 2. Although NASA and FAA are participating members of CHABA, they have not in the past, taken full advantage of this outstanding committee to assist them in orienting their respective programs.
>
> 3. The NASA noise research program has been level-budgeted for the past several years and, according to testimony before this committee, will continue as a level effort, although noise problems are more accute than ever before. NASA appears to have reoriented its noise research program toward investigating the noise problem of manned space flight, the sonic boom phenomenon and the supersonic transport at the expense of solving today's aircraft and rocket noise problems.
>
> 4. More research and development effort is necessary and additional research tools are needed, before a set of noise criteria can be drafted, around which industry can design aeronautical and space flight vehicles.

I am informed that the current amount requested by NASA for the present program—fiscal 1967—of jet aircraft in the field of aeronautical research is $33 million. Of this $33 million, $3 million has been allocated for noise research. This $3 million figure is further divided in two parts: $1.5 million to be used in research concerned with the sonic boom. The other $1.5 million has been directed to aircraft engine and compressor noise research.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics has recommended another $2 million be forthcoming this year to deal with aeronautical research, which would include air dynamics, vertical short takeoffs and landings, and other aeronautical research.

The Committee has suggested in its 1960 report a system approach. Included are:

First. Better aircraft missile and rocket design.

Second. Better engine design.

Third. Better airport planning.

Fourth. New approach to zoning around airports.

Fifth. Revised air traffic procedures.

Sixth. Public education.

The committee was careful to point out that all the avenues listed above must be approached using a set of agreed upon criteria or standards.

I fully support an appropriation to study aircraft noise. On April 21, 1963, I introduced H.R. 14602 which would provide a comprehensive program for the control of all noise. My bill would specifically provide that an Office of Noise Control gather existing data from all other agencies to be used in research concerning the effects of all noise. My statement, H.R. 14602, and related studies appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21, 1966, at pages 8745–8768. Supporting material and additional statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2, 1966, at pages 9470–9477.

It is my firm belief however, that the notable research and admirable work now being carried on by FAA, NASA, and CHABA should be centralized to insure greater efficiency and more benefit to all those interested in the general field of noise abatement.

What is needed is a comprehensive program in dealing with the complex problem of noise abatement. We can no longer afford to go off in several different directions in our effort to reduce excessive noise. Presently, FAA is primarily concerned with noise research from the perspective of where and how the planes fly.

NASA is primarily concerned with the mechanical generation of noise.

With respect to aircraft noise abatement, what we all must be primarily concerned with is developing a central unit of "noise information clearinghouse" where the efforts of all the present agencies working in the field of jet aircraft noise abatement can be combined and coordinated.

One way to accomplish this, as suggested in my bill H.R. 14602, under title II, would be to provide an aircraft noise and pollution control service which could supply the centralization needed at least for aircraft noise studies. Moreover, it could be helpful in formulating and disseminating a comprehensive body of knowledge in the field of aircraft noise abatement and could establish the much needed noise criteria standards.

Finally we must be careful not to merely appropriate a blanket amount to be used for jet aircraft noise abatement. Just in the field of aircraft noise alone we are beginning to realize the need for other abatement studies, for example excessive helicopter noise. Experience has shown us that we need a comprehensive plan or program with specific requirements in order to adequately deal with the complex task of noise control and at the same time insure that money will not be wasted as a result of later duplications in effort.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from West Virginia rise?

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I say emphatically that Congress must take aggressive action to attack the growing problem of aircraft noise. My subcommittee has taken the lead in demanding action. Each year we have provided additional funds for this purpose, and in the current authorization we have added $2 million above the NASA request for this specific purpose. If we now provide 10 times that amount above the President's budget, I am satisfied that it will not be spent.

Mr. Chairman, there are three cogent reasons why this amendment should not be adopted.

No. 1, there must be a clear and definite program in mind. Nobody has the slightest idea how you are going to be able to spend this $20 million. We recognized in the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology of the Committee on Science and Astronautics that the problem of aircraft noise is one which affects communities throughout the Nation. Our committee, after having thorough hearings, voted $2 million in addition to handle the problem of aircraft noise. We insisted that action be taken along the lines of a definite program to suppress aircraft noise.

The head of the Aeronautics Division of NASA indicated specifically that this was all that could be spent, in order to carry out a program. Funds beyond this point would be wasted, and would clearly have to wait on an overall policy decision by the interagency task force which is examining this problem.

I would like to suggest that those on the minority side, who have talked so much about economy, try to figure out how this money specifically is going to be expended. It must be expended through a program, not chasing a will-o'-the-wisp. It is all very well to add funds over the President's budget for student loans, the school milk and school lunch programs, and programs which are already underway and carefully planned. But it is sheer waste to add funds beyond the budget for something that is neither planned, nor for which the agency concerned does not have the slightest idea how to use the funds.

The gentleman from New York quoted the President's message on transportation which was sent to Congress on March 2, 1966. He stopped right before a very key sentence in that message in which the President said:

> I am today directing the President's Science Adviser to work with the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Secretaries of Commerce and Housing and Urban Development to frame an action program to attack this problem. I am asking this group to study the development of noise standards and the compatible use of land near airports; consult with local communities and industry; and recommend legislative or administrative actions needed to move ahead in this area.

A task force was set up, on the second of March, to work on this problem in a coordinated way. This is the second reason why the amendment of the gentleman from New York is not sound. We should not have just the National Aeronautics and Space Administration work on aircraft noise—it is too important to confine to one agency. We have to get the Federal Aviation Agency to deal with what causes noise in the runway approaches and what causes noise in flight scheduling, and so forth. We have to have the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development work on the effect of aircraft noise as it relates to community and urban development.

This must be a national, coordinated effort among the affected agencies. It cannot be done simply by throwing in $20 million, which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has stated in public hearings it cannot spend fully. That is my second argument.

Finally, my third argument is: What effect is this going to have on the space program? Where are you going to squeeze out this $20 million that NASA says it cannot spend?

This $20 million is coming out of research and development. In my opening remarks I deplored the fact that research and development is being squeezed down year after year. Our investment in the future is being reduced. Our investment in the Nation's space strength in the 1980's and 1990's has already been reduced dangerously. And now here is the suggestion that we take $20 million additional out of vital research and development programs, in favor of a will-o'-the-wisp which has not even been clearly defined. This is not a sound way to legislate.

So, Mr. Chairman, for these three reasons—that this does not involve a definite program, that this would take money from valuable research and development, and because we need a coordinated interagency program rather than doing this in a piecemeal fashion—I ask this committee to reject the pending amendment.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I gladly yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, we had before our subcommittee Mr. Charles Harper, who is the Director of the Office of Aeronautics in the department of NASA. Is that not a fact?

Mr. HECHLER. This is correct.

Mr. WYDLER. He testified before our committee, under questioning from me, that NASA could study—and had already studied—the advisability of starting such a program of engineering and noise research, and that such a program would cost $20 million.

Mr. HECHLER. I would respectfully disagree with the gentleman, because on page 196 of the hearings, when asked whether he could use this full amount, the response of Mr. Harper was:

> Mr. HARPER. Well, I think my answer would have to be that it is all we can use, fully use, in a pure R. & D. sense.

Mr. WYDLER. His answer relates to pure R. & D. yes,—that is what we have been doing with this program, year after year: pure research and development, and with no results. We want to get results. To get results we have to have engineering. That costs money. I am sure, of the more than $4 billion that is in the program for research and development, they can find some way to allocate a small part to this matter of such importance to so many people in this country.

Mr. HECHLER. I would say to the gentleman, after investigating it, our committee decided that control of aircraft noise was so important we decided to add $2 to the $3 million already requested by NASA. Therefore, I feel that is adequate and I ask that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

As a member of the subcommittee of which the gentleman from West Virginia who just spoke is a very fine subcommittee chairman, I can recall that in the 88th Congress the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] and I became interested in this subject. The gentleman represents the New York metropolitan area, and I represent the Chicago metropolitan area, where this is indeed a very serious problem of aircraft noise.

We discussed this problem at some length with appropriate witnesses from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and we came to the conclusion that their program was a minimum program and that there really was not the degree of interest or activity in this area of noise abatement that is needed, either from an engineering standpoint or from a technical standpoint.

As a result, we made a motion in the subcommittee which, if my memory serves me correctly, was carried by the full committee and by the Congress. This brought about a reallocation of funds for the purpose of trying to develop the technical capability of reducing jet aircraft noise. Unfortunately NASA did not make full use of this opportunity.

We have arrived at a point, in 1966, where the Congress of the United States is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to develop aircraft which are faster and louder, and we are still, at this point, not applying even a reasonable portion of our resources to see that we do not reach a point at some time in the future when the noise problem will be completely beyond us and, in fact, we shall have brought great harm to the country.

I know my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] has worked diligently on the question of aircraft noise abatement in the Chicago metropolitan area, and I know he shares my concern.

I wish to congratulate the gentleman from New York for his efforts. I am hopeful that the Congress will force the administration to bring about this program, about which they have talked so much for so many years, but on which they have never really embarked and certainly have no real accomplishment to demonstrate.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROVER. I wish to join with my colleague from Illinois in praise of my colleague from New York [Mr. WYDLER]. I reside in Suffolk County, an adjoining county to that of my colleague from New York.

If any of my colleagues is in doubt about supporting this amendment, I should like to invite him to come to Long Island and spend a few hours there, where he can see the very noisy jets coming over the schools and churches every 30 seconds at low altitudes stopping the ordinary living of these people. It is an inconvenience to them, and really a terrible thing.

I compliment the gentleman from New York for grabbing the problem by the tail. I hope he will twist it and get the amendment through. It is vitally needed.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I share the view of my colleague from New York that jet noise is a dangerous menace to the people of the United States, but I differ with him on the approach he is making in search of a solution to the problem. I oppose the amendment for the reasons I shall state.

Last year I addressed the House of Representatives, and included statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on 12 occasions dealing with every aspect of the jet-noise-abatement problem. I sounded an alarm to my colleagues and told them that if they did not have the problem when I spoke last May, they would soon have it. I spoke of the effect upon health. I spoke about the need for coordination, because when I came here in January 1965 I found that there were six agencies doing jet-noise research without agency coordination.

The agencies are FAA NASA, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

At long last the President of the United States, in response to my letter, gave his attention to the problem, and, in the month of October, there was held at the White House a conference on noise abatement under the chairmanship of Dr. Donald F. Hornig, his assistant on science and technology. The report of the conference came out in March of 1966.

The President—the first President of the United States to recognize that jet noise is a national problem—and in his transportation message, the President appointed a task force, and charged it with the responsibility "to frame an action program to attack this problem." I am from a neighboring district to that of my colleague from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

Nassau County residents, agencies, committees, and civic groups have criticized FAA and NASA for what they had been doing in this field when I came here. When I found that there were six agencies all going in different directions I understood why. For the sake of economy, if you will, and for the purpose of getting a business approach to the problem, I introduced a bill to coordinate the activities of all these six agencies in order to seek a final answer to the jet noise problem.

I read in the hearings that NASA does not need any more money for this job. They did not request this money and they did not come forward for that reason with a program. Now let me turn to what my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], mentioned. On page 196 Mr. WYDLER questioned Mr. Harper, of the Office of Advanced Research Technology.

> Mr. WYDLER. Now, will you bring that $2 million figure back to that same—on that same basis for last year?
>
> Mr. HARPER. I believe it was about a 50-50 division between airport noise and sonic boom research last year.
>
> Mr. WYDLER. I'm just trying to get whether the figure this year is the same; more or less?
>
> Mr. HARPER. The figure this year is approximately the same as last year. Yes.
>
> Mr. WYDLER. Now, if I asked you does this figure represent all the money that you can use, fully use in the problem of jet noise suppression, what would be your answer?
>
> Mr. HARPER. Well, I think my answer would have to be that it is all we see we can use, fully use, in a pure R. & D. sense.

I think that answer tells a good part of the story—what would the $20 million be used for? Nobody in Washington, D.C., knows the state of the art. Nobody knows what causes the noise. Nobody has come up with a program to tell us whether you need engine design research or control, or whether you have to redesign the aircraft, or whether you have to have additional buffer zones, or whether we need to give attention to the airfields. I am prepared to tell you today that the President's task force has met and a progress report and statement of the results of that meeting will be announced shortly.

I believe that by coordinating our efforts on a bipartisan basis with the recommendations of the President's task force, and with the results of congressional hearings on H.R. 7981 and H.R. 7982 and related bills we can fulfill our responsibilities and draft a legislative program which will pave the way for real progress in aircraft noise abatement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TENZER. I am glad to yield to my colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York, through whose efforts, I believe, this task force was set up. He has brought this problem to the attention of the White House. He has talked with members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics on a number of occasions urging that action be taken on this problem of aircraft noise. As a direct result of his efforts I believe that the task force to which he refers was set up and included in the President's message on transportation. I commend him on his efforts in this important field.

Mr. TENZER. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his comments. What I am doing here today is suggesting a wise course to follow; it is practical and is financially sound for the Government. It is the only program that we in the U.S. Congress can undertake for the benefit of 195 million people in the United States—a permanent, long-range solution for the menace of jet noise.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in Congress 10 years, and I would conclude today, if I did not know better, that this is the first time anyone has been seriously concerned about the jet noise problem. I assure you, gentleman, that as far back as 1961, when I was a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, this was, indeed, a concern of the Chief Executive of this country at that time and a concern of our committee. Very extensive hearings were held at that time delving into the problem which primarily was centered around the New York and Chicago areas. At that time I concluded after long hearings which involved the carriers, the airport authorities, the FAA, the CAB, and all of the other associated agencies, that there was really no agency that had the authority to protect the people on the ground.

As a result I introduced a noise-abatement bill which would have established a Commission of five members to be appointed by the President of the United States, on a staggered-term basis, to deal with this problem.

Mr. Chairman, we can R. & D. this problem for time immemorial, but we are whistling in an empty barrel unless we provide some authority in a commission which can deal objectively with it.

Mr. Chairman, we have had research program after research program, hearing after heaing, and we have a good idea as to what the problem is.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, a good part of the problem has developed from a lack of foresight and poor planning in years gone by.

I repeat that unless we establish a commission which has authority we can research into the problem from time immemorial and we will find no answer to it.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of the Committee today that this recommendation by the President in dealing with this problem, belated as it is, will have to be concluded by establishing a commission with the authority to deal with these problems.

Mr. Chairman, the private sector has expended a great sum of money over the years in analyzing and evaluating the problems of jet noises. The solution of this problem carries itself into highly technical areas.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that if we are going to do anything more than merely research it—and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] said we have been "squeezing" research—we have become a nation that has spent so much money for research that one agency after another is duplicating projects in the same areas. The great problem involved is the inability to coordinate the facts that have been developed through these research programs.

Mr. Chairman, if we were to establish a commission it would deal with several aspects of the problem. Primarily it would coordinate the findings of research upon which we have expended tremendous sums of money. There are printed results, planning, and recommendations in volumes on this subject now.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that this is the best way to attack the problem.

Number one, the bill would provide that this commission would deal in the areas of research and development in aircraft and engine design, research of design application; the use of noise suppression devices and aircraft operations, covering the operation of aircraft especially in and around airports, and the design, construction and operation and location of airports, and extend all authority—and this is very important—now vested in the Federal, State, and local regulatory agencies. During the hearings we had on the aircraft problem at O'Hare Field, responsibility for the problem was bounced back and forth like a ping-pong ball. One agency flipped it over to the other, and back it would come again. One agency would take the position that it couldn't go beyond safety factors; another, more limitations. We went around and around like a dog chasing his own tail.

Mr. Chairman, unless we develop an agency or commission that has defined authority and responsibility for looking out for the protection of the residents and homeowners, we are never going to make any progress with the noise abatement problem.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman's approach is eminently sound, and I think it is much more preferable to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I believe such a commission is the approach that should be taken, rather than increasing the amount requested here in this legislation through the adoption of a $20 million amendment. There has been absolutely no indication as to how this $20 million is going to be expended.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman in the well has provided a very excellent suggestion as to how this problem can be resolved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I make this request only to say this: that this bill which I have introduced, for whatever merit it may or may not have, and which I reintroduced again in the 88th Congress and which I reintroduced in this Congress—I would invite all Members who have a deep interest in this problem, as I know you have, to review it. I would hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would give it some consideration this year.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

I, too, have been concerned with the problems that are raised by the gentleman's amendment. The city of Atlanta is the proud possessor of the fourth busiest airport in the United States of America. In addition to the wonderful benefits that flow from that airport, there are substantial detriments to many of our citizens.

For instance, the Federal Aviation Agency recently approved, and substantially financed, the building of a new parallel runway. That is a wonderful help to our people.

But located in the area between those two runways are 485 homes—not businesses, or warehouses—but homes. These homes are rendered practically valueless. The FHA, because of its underwriting standards, will not insure those homes. The FAA says, "We cannot acquire that property."

The FAA says that this is an FHA problem.

The FHA says that it is an FAA problem.

Now surely it is someone's problem. And it appears to me that it is the problem of the Congress of the United States.

I, too, have been interested in legislation to try to solve this. Yet, it is very discouraging to hear everyone say, "Well, we need to pass something like this and we certainly need to do something but it ought to be done by some other committee of the Congress"; or, "It ought to be done at some other time"; or, "It ought to be a part of some other organization."

Mr. Chairman, insofar as this Member of the House of Representatives is concerned, this is a time when something can be done. NASA is an agency that does have the technical knowledge and ability to do something about it.

Under the Housing Act of 1965, there is contained a specific section which says the agency director will make a study of what to do about homes located in proximity to airports. That was passed by the Congress of the United States.

When the time came to see what had been done, they said "Well, we do not have any money to do that. We cannot study that problem."

It is just as the gentleman who preceded me said—we have witnessed various dogs chasing various tails, and as a result we have done nothing to help to solve the severe personal problems that come to citizens whose only crime is having an airport built next door to them.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I am enthusiastically in support of this amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the discussion on this amendment puts into proper focus the magnitude of the problem of jet noises not only in America but throughout the world.

In my own district, traffic from the east-west runway of the world's busiest airfield at O'Hare Field spills out over my district.

On many days between the hours of 4 o'clock in the afternoon and 7 o'clock in the evening, there are as many as 270 landings or departures in that 3-hour period. Airplanes are coming in at the rate of every 40 or 50 seconds.

If you do not think this shakes up a neighborhood and has very deep-rooted psychological problems as well as various other problems, you have another guess coming.

I do not know of any other people in this country who suffer as much from the hardship of jet noises than the people of my district who live immediately east of O'Hare Field.

So obviously the discussion here today does indicate the depth of this problem.

I shall support the amendment because I believe $20 million will go a long way toward finding a solution.

I am cosponsoring legislation that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] spoke about to set up a commission. I think that is also a good approach. As you know, the President recently instructed Dr. Hornig, his science adviser, to bring in the entire resources of five major agencies of the Federal Government to start coming up with an answer to this problem immediately.

NASA itself is already doing a great deal. I do not think we can delay any longer. We should use every conceivable resource to find a solution and the money specially earmarked can help.

I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to yield to the chairman of this distinguished Committee on Science and Astronautics to ask him to give us some idea of what NASA is already doing on this problem.

Mr. MILLER. NASA has been active on this problem. This is an interagency problem. It has been studied.

I have in my hand a report of the 88th Congress on investigation and study of aircraft noises that was made following a special allocation to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commission of $150,000.

Now what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] has said and what you say and what the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] has said, every one of us is able to say.

I live under an umbrella not only of an airport but of a naval air station and the matter of jet noises is of vital importance to all of us. I do not think writing into a NASA authorization bill a blanket sum of $20 million to be taken where it can be found and robbing some other function of that agency of money that we have carefully allotted to it is the proper approach to the problem. I believe that the proper approach is the one that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] suggested and the one that you have suggested. The ground work has already been laid in the Hornig Commission setup.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I recently made a study of this subject in the various cities of the country that have jet operations. A conservative estimate shows that the lives of some 20 million Americans have been seriously changed with the advent of the jet age.

I support the commission concept. I am also happy to see the President forcing and pressing these agencies. But I wonder if we could also get a commitment from the Chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics that his committee will indeed continue prodding NASA, which is now doing a great deal of research on the subject, to see if they can come up with a faster answer to a problem confronting 20 million people in our country, and an answer which they desperately need.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, our committee will continue to prod NASA. And we will offer the cooperation of the committee and its staff to the Hornig Commission in an effort to try to arrive at a solution.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. I would like to associate myself with the proposal made by the gentleman from Illinois. I would certainly support the appointment of a permanent commission to study this problem. I live in the shadow of the Kennedy Airfield, and I get a plane every 35 seconds. Perhaps we can also obtain a commitment from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee with relation to hearings on Senate bill 7981 and other bills relating the the subject.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. What the gentleman has said certainly can be done. We have already asked NASA to give us a full report on how the agency could spend $20 million for that purpose. I would be glad to hold hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may be permitted to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Of course, I am encouraged to listen to those statements that you are going to look into this matter. But the point of fact is that we are now passing the NASA authorization bill for fiscal 1967. If we do not act now, it will mean that this request will not be acted on until 1967 for 1968, and you will have to tell those 20 million people—and I do not want to tell them—why they have to wait another year for the Congress of the United States to take this action. That is what we are facing on the floor today.

Sure, I am for the Commission, too, but let us do something we can do now, today, here.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely correct. I think we have a serious, positive commitment. If the $20 million amendment carries, it is that much the better. But I think the whole discussion has served an excellent purpose. We have seen on both sides of the aisle Members rising from all parts of America to speak about the jet noise problem. We know it is a major problem in this country, and I am delighted and proud that so many of us are so deeply concerned with it, as obviously we are.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. Is it not possible that an appropriation could be made when the transportation bills come into the House for this purpose? Did not the President refer to this subject and recognize it as a national problem?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I gather from the dialog that is taking place this afternoon on both sides of the aisle that 20 million people who have had serious problems with jet noises can start looking toward some meaningful and hopeful relief quickly.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. The discussion this afternoon and the debate concerning the interagency nature of the problem is very interesting and pertinent. However, the fact is that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is the agency in charge of research in aeronautical engineering. The question is whether or not we have authorized enough money to that agency to carry out the program. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] has pointed out, according to testimony before the committee this year, it will require $20 million for NASA to conduct a full scale program with thorough research evaluation of the engineering problems inherent in jet noise.

As I walked to the Capitol this morning, the air was filled with the sound of jets. As jets come to La Guardia Field, the same noise is increasingly dampening the spirits of people in Manhattan, Queens, and Brooklyn.

The Science and Astronautics Committee under the able leadership of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], has been concerned with this problem. The aeronautical program has been increased by some $2 million. But we can do more.

Today we have a chance to require the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to do more than it has done to date.

This is a very serious problem. It is a very serious problem for cities all over the country; for those of us who ride in airplanes, and for our constituents who live in the shadow and in the noise belt of these airplanes.

I support this amendment, and I hope we will move ahead. Other investigations and hearings can follow in its wake. The essential question of engineering expertise rests in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The problem has to be solved. How other agencies, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development deal with the effects of noise on the community is very important, but NASA should deal with the jet noise itself and the engineering questions associated with it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to keep the record straight with respect to this $20 million. I read from the hearing record:

> Mr. WOLFF. Would it be your recommendation that if we could make available to you an additional $20 million that you could make great strides in this direction?
>
> Mr. HARPER. Well, I think that alone—and I'm not certain that I'm qualified to make this statement, but that alone without some regulatory activity to force the use of sound control devices would probably not produce results very fast.
>
> However, if NASA were given such support and responsibility, to determine its application, the resulting act would identify it very clearly for the airlines and whoever had responsibility for regulatory pressure just what could be done.

It would help. It would not do it. I just want to call attention to the fact that the amendment would direct that we take $20 million of money that has already been allocated. No money has been set up in this budget for this. That is picking on one, robbing one part of NASA to try to put this over.

This is not good legislation. The gentleman himself did not offer this in committee. Did the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] offer this in committee?

Mr. WYDLER. No, Mr. Chairman. I have been giving this matter a great deal of thought, and I went so far as to have Mr. Harper come to my office to discuss this further, to clarify the testimony.

Mr. MILLER. I asked the gentleman if he offered it in committee, and his answer was "no."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. RYAN. No, I decline to yield further. I simply say in response to the distinguished chairman of the committee that no other agency of the Government I know of has the capacity and agility to reprogram that NASA has. I am sure, if the $20 million is put into this jet noise program, NASA will find a way to do the other programs as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could arrive at some limitation of debate on this? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment terminate at a quarter to five, the last 3 minutes to be allocated to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto terminate at 4:45, with the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of the able chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California?

First, I wish to commend the able gentleman and his committee for the magnificent leadership they have given to the space program, for the Congress and for the country. This is one of the most vital of all the programs which face the country and the Congress today.

What I am very much concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is whether there is enough money for the space program in this bill to assure, as far as we possibly can, that we are going to be ahead of the Russians in getting to the moon, according to our commitment, before the end of this decade?

I have a feeling that we are coming very close to, if we have not already reached or passed, the critical decisions which will determine whether we will succeed or fail in letting the free world make this first accomplishment of putting men on the moon and bringing them back.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, what I am vitally concerned about is whether there is enough money provided by the Congress for success in our space program. I should like to have the able chairman tell the House whether he believes this bill does provide enough money for us to keep our space commitments. If there is not enough money, so far as I am individually concerned, I want some more provided. I do not want somebody to come up later on and say, "In 1967, 1968, or 1969—or in 1966—Congress was to restrictive in the amount of money made available and we did not quite make it."

We know how we felt when Russia put the sputnik in space. I do not want to wake up some morning and find the Russians achieving some comparable propaganda and scientific victory over us.

Therefore, I ask the able chairman whether there is enough money authorized in this bill for our space program?

Mr. MILLER. This is a very frugal program which will allow us to proceed very carefully if we conserve our funds. It is not the amount of money I would like to see in it, but in view of the condition of the country today it is as much as we can hope to get and as much as I feel we can hope to get. I believe it will allow us to meet our commitment but it will not allow us to meet our commitment if we divert the funds which have been carefully examined and use them for something which was not considered fully in the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. In other words, this is what might be called a tight budget.

Mr. MILLER. This is an extremely tight budget. In spite of the statement of the author of the amendment that "it could be squeezed out some place," if $20 million could be squeezed out of the budget then the committee which has been so complimented has not done its job properly, because it has looked carefully for far less than $20 million. It has tried to conserve every dollar.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my utmost agreement in principle with the able gentleman who offered the amendment. I represent a district which embraces Miami International Airport. We have jet noises there. All of us are aware of these problems. But I wonder whether this is the place for us to try to solve the problem.

This is primarily a space program for our country we are working on today. Is that not the most challenging issue facing this House and facing our country today?

Therefore, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Let us go ahead with the space program today as the able committee has prepared it and take up our other problems in other measures in due course.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, all debate will terminate at 4:45, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], the chairman of the committee, is recognized to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that I am quite sympathetic, as sympathetic as any other man on the floor, to the problem of finding a solution to jet noise. This is not the time and this is not the place to do it.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Wydler) there were—ayes 27, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Flynt, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14324) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 829, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WYDLER. I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Wydler moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14324 to the Committee on Science and Astronautics with instructions that it be returned forthwith with the following amendment:
>
> Page 3, after line 2, insert the following: "except that, of the total amount authorized for 'Research and development' by this subsection, the sum of $20,000,000 shall be utilized for the purpose of research on the reduction of aircraft noise [along with the funds allocated to that purpose from the authorization contained in paragraph (18)], and the amounts otherwise made available pursuant to the authorizations contained in paragraphs (1) through (21) shall be adjusted by the Administrator to the extent necessary to make such sum available for that purpose."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 90, nays 271, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—90

Adams
Addabbo
Arends
Bates
Belcher
Bow
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Corbett
Cramer
Curtin
Dague
Delaney
Devine
Dickinson
Dwyer
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Grover
Gurney
Halleck
Halpern
Harvey, Mich.
Horton
Hosmer
Hungate
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Kastenmeier
King, N.Y.
Krebs
Kupferman
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McEwen
MacGregor
Michel
Minshall
Moore
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Pelly
Pike
Poff
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Talcott
Thomson, Wis.
Watkins
Weltner
Whalley
Widnall
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—271

Abbitt
Abernethy
Albert
Anderson, Ill
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Battin
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland

Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Gross
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Huot
Ichord
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watson
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young

NOT VOTING—71

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashley
Baring
Beckworth
Bolton
Bray
Burleson
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Curtis
Denton
Diggs
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Feighan
Fisher
Fogarty
Fraser
Fuqua
Griffin
Griffiths
Hamilton
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Herlong
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Landrum
Love
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Morris
Morse
Morton
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
Roberts
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Scheuer
Selden
Steed
Sweeney
Thomas
Todd
Toll
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Williams
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Curtis.

Mrs. Thomas with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Madden.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Murray.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Irwin.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Love with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Selden with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Baring.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Beckworth.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Vigorito.

Messers BARRETT, BERRY, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and LAIRD changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 349, nays 10, answered "present" 1, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—349

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackie
Mackay
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—10

Brock
Byrnes, Wis.
Collier
Davis, Wis.
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Joelson
Laird
O'Neal, Ga.
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wydler

NOT VOTING—72

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashley
Baring
Beckworth
Bolton
Bray
Burleson
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Curtis
Denton
Diggs
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Feighan
Fisher
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Griffiths
Hamilton
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Herlong
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Landrum
Love
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Morris
Morse
Morton
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
Roberts
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roudebush
Scheuer
Selden
Steed
Sweeney
Thomas
Todd
Toll
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Williams
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Feighan with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Morse.
Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Bray.
Mrs. Thomas with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Roudebush.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Todd.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Vanik.
Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Irwin.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Beckworth.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Matthews.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Love.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO PUT OVER ROLLCALL VOTES FROM MAY 4 TO MAY 5

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes, other than on questions of procedure, which may be demanded on tomorrow, May 4, be put over until Thursday, May 5.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman what is the object of putting over the votes?

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GROSS**. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. **ALBERT**. The reason is that several Members are going to the funeral of the late Senator McNamara, of Michigan. That is the only reason.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

STRONGER CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTION URGED

Mr. **COHELAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **COHELAN**. Mr. Speaker, four times in the last 9 years Congress has passed legislation to guarantee equal rights for every American citizen.

Today, these equal rights still have not been fully achieved. In housing and employment, in voting and equal protection before the law, American citizens are still denied access and opportunity because of the color of their skin.

This discrimination must be ended. It is wasteful and it is wrong.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL

On last Thursday, the President submitted a special message and draft legislation to carry out a pledge made in his state of the Union message 4 months ago.

This legislation is commendatory, as far as it goes. It should and must be passed before another 4 months go by, but it also must be strengthened.

The President was undoubtedly correct when he said:

> No civil rights act, however historic, will be final.

But, at the same time, we are certainly obligated to improve that legislation where it can be improved. We would be negligent if we did not make it as comprehensive and thorough as we possibly can. The magnitude of our task, and its long standing, demand nothing less.

STRENGTHENING AMENDMENTS

The draft legislation proposed last week can be improved, and the legislation which I am introducing today will, I believe, do so. Among other things, it will strengthen the administration's proposal by:

First, providing for the removal of certain cases from State to Federal courts where this is deemed necessary to achieve equal protection of the laws;

Second, granting civil indemnification awards where a person is injured while lawfully exercising rights protected by the Constitution;

Third, extending the provisions of the fair employment practices title of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to State and local government units; and

Fourth, broadening the authority of individuals or the Attorney General to obtain injunctions against violations of constitutional rights, and doing so in advance rather than after the fact.

I believe each of these provisions is necessary if we are to deal practically with present-day problems, and I urge that they be adopted.

OTHER PROVISIONS

I, also, strongly favor the major provisions of the administration bill, which my own measure also includes, to—

First, insure nondiscriminatory practices in the selection of juries in both Federal and State courts;

Second, strengthen the Federal Government's ability to deter and punish those who threaten or injure civil rights worker's; and

Third, declare an effective national policy against racial discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of housing.

NEED FOR ACTION

Mr. Speaker, we have no time to lose. This legislation must be enacted at this session of the Congress.

For 100 years and more, we have sought to insure full citizenship for every American. The promise is still unmet and the pledge is still unfulfilled.

There can and there must be no such thing as second-class citizenship in the United States. This legislation, which carries out many of the proposals and recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, can take us a major step of the way toward completing the major item of our Nation's unfinished business.

GILBERT "CIVIL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1966"

Mr. **GILBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come for us to secure in this country equal justice for all men. Considerations of race, color, or creed must now be removed from every court in this land, without exception.

Let me point out that, though we often conceive of justice to come only from our judicial system, we must remember that that judicial system—directly or indirectly, initially or finally—is responsive to the electorate. Secondly, no one can deny that the bulk of justice is administered, not by the courts, but by the policeman on the beat, by the sheriff, and by the district attorney. These are elected officials; therefore, to secure justice we must, at least, conscientiously and thoroughly concern ourselves with making sure that the promise of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is fulfilled.

I am today introducing a bill dealing with this key problem, as well as treating the discrimination problems of our State and Federal courts. An analysis of my bill entitled "The Civil Rights Enforcement Act of 1966," follows:

My bill is in part composed of the major provisions of three bills that have already been introduced in one form or another, as well as containing several completely new proposals. The bill that is drawn upon most extensively is that prepared by the attorneys for the organizations belonging to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

The second bill is the administration proposal, which is primarily drawn upon for the education and housing titles—as well as for the provisions implementing the recent Supreme Court decisions redefining congressional power to make criminal those acts violating civil rights on account of race or color. However, I have added additional language to the administration's draft of those titles to give additional enforcement support to the housing title and to plug already apparent gaping loopholes in the education title as applied to many States in the South. The substantive provisions of both titles as set forth in the President's bill remain unchanged.

I have incorporated the very excellent provisions of the administration's bill implementing the Supreme Court's decision in the Penn and Rainy cases, which, in very specific terms, make criminal broad areas of exercise of constitutional rights by citizens of the United States regardless of their race or color.

The third, much smaller and more limited bill, is that drafted by the Special Committee on Civil Rights Under Law of the Association of the Bar of New York City.

Initially, I believe it is in order to point out my reasons for preferring the jury selection procedures of the leadership conference bill over those of the administration bill. I agree with the attorney general of Alabama, Richmond Flowers, in his Chicago speech of a few days ago that leaving in the hands of the local southern authorities the discretion as to which particular Negroes shall be placed upon juries will result in "Uncle Tom" juries in State courts.

Moreover, I believe that the use of the voter list for either State or Federal juries—as contrasted with a sampling of the total population—automatically excludes large numbers of Negroes. Even today in Alabama, less than half of the adult Negro population is registered to vote. In addition, the administration's literacy requirement will have most unfortunate results in many areas of the worst discrimination. For example, the very recent U.S. Department of Labor survey in the Mississippi Delta shows that over 50 percent of the adult Negroes interviewed had less than a sixth grade education. Moreover, the administration bill relies far too much upon the unfettered discretion of the Federal district judges, too many of whom in the Deep Southern States have shown themselves, in charitable terms, unwilling to promptly enforce civil rights legislation.

I might note also that the administration bill contains no removal provision, no provisions for civil indemnification of persons injured in the exercise of their civil rights, no provisions to close loopholes in the Voting Rights Act, and no provisions for removal from office of local police officials who commit gross violations of the civil rights of citizens on account of their race, as well as other needed additions to the civil rights laws which I have included in my bill.

The following paragraphs on jury selection deal with the leadership conference bill as modified by my bill:

The leadership conference bill has already been introduced by several Members of both this and the other body. Its provisions are reasonably well known; therefore, I will point out the changes that I have made in the leadership conference bill. As a footnote, I might add that, although there seems to me to be considerable merit to the more automatic approach of the Yale bill, which is a real contribution to our efforts; yet, I believe that a number of its provisions and methods of operation are rather unclear and will cause difficulty. Further revision, however, may well make the Yale bill the better approach.

Initially my bill amends section 106(a) of the leadership conference bill to explicitly provide for assumption of State court selection procedures by the U.S. courts of appeal when the U.S. district courts, as has unfortunately happened so often in many Southern States, refuse to exercise their responsibilities under the Constitution and the laws.

Section 108 of my bill broadens the authority of the Attorney General to challenge jury selection procedures, and related procedures, to include all operations of the State court system put into effect after January 1, 1966, and with the purpose or effect of circumventing any of the provisions of this act. Moreover, the leadership conference bill merely allows the Attorney General to bring action to prevent the circumvention of this act. My bill requires him to bring action and also directs the Federal district court to grant all relief necessary to prevent any circumvention of this act. It seems to me that, at least, these mandatory provisions are called for in view of the scandalous conditions of administration of justice in many Southern State courts. I point out that the Yale bill goes somewhat further—but as to jury selection procedures only—and automatically suspends all changes in such procedures in the affected—principally the Attorney General or the Federal district court for the District of Columbia.

Section 203(a) of the leadership conference bill is amended to allow not only the Attorney General to prosecute criminal civil rights violators in Federal court, but also to permit 20 persons from the discriminated group of the particular county or other jurisdiction to bring about such prosecution. I include this provision believing that it would be an unfortunate omission not to allow those citizens discriminated against and suffering from the maladministration of justice, to secure the enforcement of Federal law in their own county or political subdivision. As was clearly demonstrated by the Yale Law School conference of 2 weeks ago, to vest such discretionary power in the Attorney General alone would be a serious mistake. This was apparently the one point upon which almost all the distinguished participating attorneys agreed. Experience to date with the Attorney General's discretion under the Voting Rights Act has been unfortunate.

My bill also requires the Attorney General to commence prosecution once the statement of 20 persons is filed. Of course, this still does not remove the traditional power of the chief law enforcement officer to nol pross or otherwise terminate the proceedings; but it does place the burden upon him of taking the position that justice can be obtained in State courts.

The special removal provision attached to the basic sections providing for trying State crimes of a racial nature in Federal court are amended to conform to the changes discussed in the preceding paragraph, thereby allowing 20 citizens of the racial group discriminated against in the county or political subdivision involved to remove the State court prosecution to Federal court. This later removal provision merely closes a loophole that would otherwise exist—a loophole which would allow State prosecutors to avoid the basic sections by first initiating prosecutions in State courts.

My bill provides that the statement of 20 persons shall not be subject to review by any court. This, of course, does not mean that the court may not first ascertain one, that at least 20 persons did in fact sign the statement in good faith and understood what they were doing; two, that those persons were members of the discriminated group—or trying to help such group—and, three, that those persons were residents of the county or similar political subdivision.

I removed the time limitation found in section 205(c) which places a limit of January 1, 1975, on the effectiveness of the provisions dealing with Federal trial of State crimes of a racial nature. If the decision in Brown against Board of Education has taught us anything, and if the 9 years since the passage of the 1957 Civil Rights Act has been to any degree constructive, we must sadly conclude that 10 years is simply too short a period to expect civil rights statutes to secure their salutary objectives.

Unlike some of the versions of the Leadership Conference bill which have been introduced, my bill includes the full strength title VI, which provides for the removal by the Civil Service Commission of State or local police officials who commit gross violations of civil rights of citizens of the United States. Moreover, I added the provision, similar to the one I have added elsewhere in the bill, that allows 20 persons from the discriminated group of the political subdivision to initiate the proceedings before the Civil Service Commission. It bears repeating that it would be a grave oversight not to allow a substantial group of those very citizens who must live in the county or political subdivision, and who will be subject to further violence and intimidation, to initiate such a removal proceeding. Indeed, acting as such a group, they are probably the persons most interested in the results of such proceedings—certainly the Attorney General is not nearly so directly interested, and the victim or his widow may be too intimidated to act.

In section 602(3) of title VI, I have made what I consider a technical correction which more accurately sets forth the standard to guide the Civil Service Commission in its proceedings.

The remainder of the provisions, which I will discuss are not included in the Leadership Conference bill at all.

Title VII, section 801, of my bill amends the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by broadening the definition of "voting qualifications or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting" to include:

> (1) any reapportionment, realinement, or redistricting of any election district, (2) any prerequisite or qualification for being (or primary or other process for choosing) a candidate in any election, including any primary, special, or general election or election for party office, and (3) all time limitations for voter registration, qualification as a candidate, dates of holding any election—

As defined in No. 2 above—

> and any other time limitation with respect to the election process.

In the last several months, actions taken by the Mississippi and Alabama Legislatures indicate that large-scale efforts are presently under way to frustrate the clear intent of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Such devices as gerrymandering, which was just used 2 weeks ago by the Mississippi Legislature in altering its Congressional Districts and reducing the potential Negro majority in the district—in which they had earlier had a substantial potential majority—to only a few thousand; invidious redistricting—illustrated by proposed bills in the Mississippi Legislature to force at-large election of Negro candidates in those counties in which Negroes are in the majority in some county election districts—altering qualifications for becoming a candidate to make it much more difficult for Negroes to run for office; and altering the various time limitations dealing with every aspect of the election process in order to militate against Negro participation in any way. The Mississippi Legislature has recently adopted a number of laws with this result. Incidentally, some of the legislation has even been aimed at crippling that State's Republican Party.

Section 802 of title VIII of my bill amends section 6 of the Voting Rights Act to bypass the Attorney General's discretion in sending in Federal examiners. This is done by requiring a somewhat higher standard of proof—that is, 20 complaints under oath instead of 20 written complaints—and by providing for the filing of such complaints under oath directly with the Civil Service Commission. The reasons for doing this are many; however, two of the more important ones should be mentioned. First, the Yale Law School Civil Rights Conference's consensus that the Attorney General should not exercise discretion exclusive of the interested parties themselves, is very important here. Secondly, the requirement of 20 complaints is precisely in line with the definite standard that we set forth in the present language, but which the Attorney General has deemed only advisory. I might add, also, that the removal of the Attorney General's discretion as to the validity of the complaints is at least counterbalanced by the safeguard that the complaints be under oath, and therefore, of course, subject to the penalties for perjury.

It should further be mentioned that this method of basing action upon a specific number of complaints finds some part of its origin in a number of bills introduced last session by some of my distinguished colleagues on the Judiciary Committee from the opposite side of the aisle.

A second major feature of section 802 is the setting forth of the very specific definition of the triggering language "have been or are being denied the right to vote on account of race or color." The definition in my bill includes "harassment, intimidation, unreasonable registration hours, local or other registration conditions, and registration periods limited to other than 45 days prior to election."

An absolutely crucial final feature provides for door-to-door registration throughout the county where 40 or more persons file such complaints under oath with the Civil Service Commission, and for such door-to-door registration whenever 10 or more such complaints under oath from any municipality are filed. A complementary provision provides that five such complaints filed with the Commission from any municipality will require the Commission to place an examiner in that population center.

Title IX of my bill attempts to remedy a problem of long standing in the securing of justice in civil rights cases. A number of States, particularly in the South, have made it extremely difficult for persons prosecuted in State courts for advocating, exercising, or supporting civil rights, to secure their release by the normal purchase of a bail bond or other judicial bond. This difficulty is frequently based upon State and local pressure upon the local bondsman or other representative of the insurance agencies. My bill, in this very limited area, provides for Federal chartering by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation of insurance companies to provide this service. Without this provision, or a similar one, it is difficult for me to believe, in those cases we fail to reach with the other provisions of this bill—and I am convinced there will be many such cases if recent history is any guide, that some such provision will not be absolutely necessary to secure justice for all citizens regardless of race, creed, or color.

Title X of my bill contains, with one minor technical change, the provisions of the Civil Rights Procedure Act drafted by the Special Committee on Civil Rights Under Law of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

Title XI of my bill contains the basic improvement in title III of the 1964 Civil Rights Act proposed by the administration's bill, which gives the Attorney General the power to "initiate"—as distinguished from his present power to "intervene in"—desegregation suits. I added two additional sections designed to deal with the real abuses, particularly in some Southern States, of (one), token integration through the device of dual school systems and, (two), gross gerrymandering of school districts and other such flagrant abuses of the principles of the 1964 act's education desegregation provisions.

Title XII of my bill adopted the well-drafted and salutary housing provisions of the administration's bill and adds two sections giving the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development administrative enforcement powers. This last section is, in effect, a statutory extension of present Executive orders on housing.

Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I conclude by stating the absolute necessity for our securing, without fail, adequate, prompt, and meaningful justice—justice in its fullest sense of all of society's opportunities—to all our citizens without regard to their race, creed, or color. The quest for justice is not moving slowly; we must see that her blindfold is made secure and solid and without danger of falling.

Mr. Speaker, I include a comparison chart which shows the difference between the administration bill, my bill, and all other bills introduced.

Comparative analysis of the proposed Civil Rights Acts of 1966

	Administration bill	Gilbert bill	Leadership Conference bill	Yale Law School bill
I. State jury discrimination:				
A. Required records:				
Scope of requirement	All State courts must keep records	All State courts must keep records	Same as Gilbert bill	All State courts in counties with more than 10-percent Negro population must keep records.
Information required	Only that information required under present State or local procedure.	Name and race of jurors and veniremen; other information specified by State judges.	Same as Gilbert bill	Name, race, and occupation of jurors and veniremen; manner in which any person was excused or excluded from service; other information as specified by the Attorney General.
Retention of present records.	4 years	4 years (when includes above information)	Same as Gilbert bill	Records of past 15 years must be retained.
Financing	Courts must pay the costs	Courts must pay the costs	Same as Gilbert bill	Federal Government pays for the records.
Disclosure	Generally not open to public	Open to public	Same as Gilbert bill	Open to public: Attorney General may direct specific courts to send duplicates of their records to him.
Retention period	4 years	4 years	Same as Gilbert bill	5 years.
B. Supervision of jury selection:				
How imposed	Action by Attorney General or private persons in local Federal court, with only vague and general standards to guide court's discretion.	Action by Attorney General or private persons in local Federal court. Strict review and supervision by court of appeals of Federal district court actions proved for.	Action by Attorney General or private persons in local Federal court.	Certification by Attorney General; where certification not applicable, action in court.
Criteria of supervision	Only general finding by court of deprivation of right to jury service without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or economic status.	Percentage of nonwhite residents in county exceeds by ⅓ or more the percentage actually serving on juries. Within previous 5 years a Federal or State court determined that the county courts discriminate. (Same as Yale draft.) Failure fully to implement recordkeeping requirement.	Same as Gilbert bill	Percentage of nonwhite residents in county exceeds by ½ or more the percentage of eligible nonwhites on venire lists. Within previous 5 years a Federal or State court determined that county courts discriminate. Substantial noncompliance with recordkeeping requirement. Voting rolls abandoned as source of jurors after Negroes put on voting rolls by Voting Rights Act.
Escape clause	Not applicable	1. Prove to local Federal court, before it renders judgment, absence of present discrimination. 2. After local court has issued an order for Federal supervision, prove to District of Columbia court that there is no reason to believe discrimination will recur.	Same as Gilbert bill	1. Prove to Attorney General that any discrimination was sporadic and is unlikely to recur. 2. Prove to District of Columbia court that any discrimination was sporadic and is unlikely to recur.
Method of administration.	To extent applicable, by Attorney General	Administrative Office of U.S. Court selects State juries from area frame sampling list.	Same as Gilbert bill	Bureau of Census provides area frame sampling list and special (Federal) jury commissioners select venire list from area frame list.
Jury qualifications	Retention of State qualifications unless affirmatively found by local Federal district court to promote racial exclusion.	State qualifications abandoned; Federal qualifications substituted. Federal qualifications do not require literacy except when judge certifies need therefor.	Same as Gilbert bill	Special jury commissioners administer State standards. No juror disqualified for failure to pay taxes, own property, or vote.
Changes in State qualifications.	No prohibition on change in State jury qualifications (except to extent implied under the general authority given to local Federal district courts to deal with jury discrimination in general).	Attorney General is required to challenge any change in State qualifications or any other change in court procedures by filing an action in the local courts. Both Attorney General and the court are affirmatively directed to act when such change would tend to circumvent this act.	Attorney General may challenge any change in State jury qualifications by action in the local Federal courts.	No change in State qualifications is effective in a county covered under pt. II unless it is submitted to the Attorney General and he fails to certify that it will result in discrimination.
Nonwhite percentage in county prerequisite to supervision.	Not applicable	10 percent	10 percent	10 percent.
II. Federal jury selection:				
Method of selection	From list of registered voters unless otherwise ordered by the local Federal district court.	Chance selection from sample that includes a representative cross section of the population of the judicial district.	Same as Gilbert bill	Same.
Recordkeeping	Names and records of persons drawn from the jury box, or other device; names of those performing jury service, and the dates thereof; plus other records as required, shall be kept and retained for a period of not less than 4 years.	Same as administration bill	Same	Same.
Enforcement	Review by judicial council of the circuit of only the source or sources of names for the master wheel or other selection device.	District action may be filed in court of appeals requiring court of appeals to supersede the Federal district court in its jury selection function.	Same as Gilbert bill	Same.
Jury qualifications	Both literacy and actual registration as a voter is required.	Neither reading nor writing is required, unless the judge so determines.	Same as Gilbert bill	Same.

Comparative analysis of the proposed Civil Rights Acts of 1966—Continued

	Administration bill	Gilbert bill	Leadership Conference bill	Yale Law School bill
III. Removal to Federal courts:				
A. By defense	No provision	Persons of a minority group, or persons supporting their rights may remove to Federal court whenever there is systematic jury exclusion, denial of franchise, segregation of facilities of justice, imposition of harsher punishment, or use of more onerous bail or parole terms. Any person may also remove when he is prosecuted for exercising freedom of speech, press, or assembly, or petition when advocating or supporting civil rights; he may also remove if his activities are protected by the civil rights laws and he is being proceeded against with such activity. All provisions apply to both criminal and civil actions.	Same as Gilbert bill	No provision.
		The old civil rights removal statute (28 U.S.C. 1443) is also amended to provide for essentially the coverage set out above. However, the formulation used in the amendments provides for more thorough coverage of the desired area, such as, e.g., acts done pursuant to rights granted or secured—as distinguished from protected—by Civil Rights Act of 1964 or other civil rights laws.	This amendment not included in leadership conference bill.	
B. By prosecution:				
Jurisdiction	No provision	The Federal district courts are given original concurrent jurisdiction with State courts of all State crimes where prosecution for such crimes in Federal court is necessary to secure equal protection of the laws.	Same as Gilbert bill	No provision.
Invocation of jurisdiction.	No provision	By filing with district court (1) certificate of Attorney General stating that removal is necessary to secure equal protection of the laws; or (2) statement of 20 persons from racial group subject to discrimination who are residents of the county.	By filing with district court certificate of Attorney General stating that removal is necessary to secure equal protection of the laws.	No provision.
IV. Prosecution in Federal courts of racial crimes:				
Jurisdiction	No provision	Same as jurisdiction under III(B)	Same as jurisdiction under III(B)	No provision.
Invocation of jurisdiction	No provision	By filing with district court certificate of Attorney General stating that removal is necessary to secure equal protection of the laws, or statement of 20 persons from racial group subject to discrimination who are residents of the county. Jurisdiction then becomes exclusive of State courts. Objective standards are provided to determine whether Federal court prosecution is necessary to assure equal protection of the laws. Such standards require that (1) victim be a member of a discriminated group or a person supporting the rights of such a group; and (2) jury discrimination, voting discrimination, segregation of facilities of justice, imposition of harsher punishments in criminal cases, or use of more onerous bail or parole terms be present.	By filing with district court certificate of Attorney General stating that removal is necessary to secure equal protection of the laws. Jurisdiction then becomes exclusive of State courts. Objective standards are provided to determine whether Federal court prosecution is necessary to assure equal protection of the laws. Such standards require that (1) the victim be a member of a discriminated group or a person supporting the rights of such group; and (2) jury discrimination, voting discrimination, segregation of facilities of justice, imposition of harsher punishments in criminal cases, or use of more onerous bail or parole terms be present.	No provision.
V. Use of Federal law enforcement agencies.	No provision	All Federal law enforcement agencies, including Federal marshals and the FBI, are authorized to use all of their legal powers to prevent, as well as to investigate, any offense described in the preceding section (IV). Their authority is also somewhat broadened, both in terms of allowing the enforcement officials to proceed against misdemeanors as if they were felonies and in terms of acting in emergencies without the prior approval of the Attorney General.	Same as Gilbert bill	No provision.
VI. Jury exclusion investigation	No provision	Civil Rights Commission is required to investigate the jury records of all political subdivisions in which it believes there may be racial discrimination. The Commission's findings, after hearing, shall be evidence in court proceedings under the act.	Same as Gilbert bill	Census Bureau, together with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, are directed to make a survey and report to the President and the Congress within 2 years on racial composition of juries in the various States.

VII. Federal offenses	Comprehensive criminal provision punishing with progressive penalties; various activities protected by the Constitution and laws dealing with civil rights of citizens such as voting, school attendance, enjoyment of State and Federal programs and benefits, seeking and enjoying employment from any source, obtaining or using any housing, jury service, interstate transportation, participating in any Federal program or federally financed program, and using or enjoying any goods, services or facilities involved in public accommodations and facilities in interstate commerce.	(Same as administration bill except for deletion of subsect on 502(c) of administration bill.)	Revision of 18 U.S.C. 241 to make it a Federal crime to harm or intimidate persons engaged in exercising their civil rights or in securing the civil rights of others.	Makes noncompliance or interference with jury selection procedures a crime.
VIII. Preventive or injunctive relief.	Injunctive relief may be secured by an individual only to end discrimination in jury selection procedures.	Comprehensive injunctive relief may be asked by either an individual suffering a deprivation because of race or any of his rights derived from the Constitution or laws of the United States or by the Attorney General. Such person or the Attorney General may also request relief from any interference with freedom of speech, assembly, petition, or other expression with regard to such right. These provisions constitute a broad title III.	Same as Gilbert bill	Injunctive relief may be sought by an individual or by Attorney General only as to jury discrimination and related procedures.
IX. Civil indemnification of victims of civil rights violence.	No provision	A Civil Rights Indemnification Board is created within the Commission on Civil Rights. The 3-member Board is appointed by the President with advice and consent of Senate. The Board investigates and hears complaints filed by any injured person who has suffered such injury on account of his race or color while attempting to exercise or while assisting with the exercise of rights derived from the Constitution and laws of the United States. The State and/or local government may be made a party to the hearing. The Board makes monetary awards of indemnification to compensate the victim of the racial injury. The United States has a cause of action in Federal district court against the individual's political subdivision and State responsible for such racial injury.	Same as Gilbert bill	No provision.
X. Removal of State or local officials for gross violations of civil rights.	No provision	The Civil Service Commission is given the power, on petition of either the person injured on account of race or color, or of 20 persons from the discriminated group in the political subdivision, to remove and disqualify from any office the offending State or local police official who has caused such injury or death on account of race or color. Enforcement is in the court of appeals on petition of the Commission.	The Civil Service Commission is given the power, on petition of the person injured on account of race or color, to remove and disqualify from any office the offending State or local police official who has caused such injury or death on account of race or color. Enforcement is in the court of appeals on petition of the Commission.	No provision.
XI. Equal employment opportunity.	No provision	State and local government employees are brought within the coverage of the equal employment title (VII) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.	Same as Gilbert bill	No provision.
XII. Prevention of evasion of Voting Rights Act of 1965.	No provision	The Voting Rights Act is amended to void all laws enacted by those States covered by the act since Nov. 1, 1964, which affect (1) reapportionment, realinement, or redistricting; (2) qualifications for candidates; and (3) time limitations for voter registration, qualifying as a candidate, election dates, and any other such time limitation dealing with the election process.	No provision	No provision.

Comparative analysis of the proposed Civil Rights Acts of 1966—Continued

	Administration bill	Gilbert bill	Leadership Conference bill	Yale Law School bill
XIII. Standards for replacement of Federal examiners and invocation of door-to-door registration.	No provision	Sec. 6 of the Voting Rights Act is amended to require the Civil Service Commission to send registrars to any county covered by the act upon receipt of 20 complaints, under oath, of denial of the right to vote on account of race. Moreover, at least 1 examiner must be sent to each population area in the county in which 5 or more complaints, under oath, have been filed with the Civil Service Commission. If 40 or more complaints, under oath, are filed with the Civil Service Commission requesting door-to-door registration, then the Commission is required to order such registration. Likewise, if 10 or more such complaints are received from a population center, then the Commission must commence door-to-door registration in that area of the county. These provisions remove all discretion from the Attorney General as to the assignment of examiners in the specified circumstances. Moreover, denial of the right to vote on account of race is defined to include harassment, intimidation, unreasonable registration hours, local or other registration conditions, and registration periods limited other than to 45 days prior to an election.	No provision	No provision.
XIV. Federal provisions for bail and other court bonds.	No provision	The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is given the authority to charter insurance corporations to sell bail bonds and other court bonds anywhere in the country when such bonds are utilized in cases coming within the terms of this act.	No provision	No provision.
XV. Injunctions of State court proceedings.	No provision	The Federal courts are given the authority to enjoin State court proceedings designed to deprive citizens of their civil rights, particularly when race, color, religion, or national origin is a factor.	No provision	No provision.
XVI. Prohibition of housing discrimination.	Prohibits discrimination in all housing; enforcement is by private action in Federal district court with discretionary power in court to allow a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing plaintiff; Attorney General may file injunctive action where pattern of practice of housing discrimination exists; jurisdiction is concurrent in either State courts or Federal district courts.	Prohibits discrimination in all housing; enforcement is by private action in Federal district court with mandate to court to allow a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing plaintiff; Attorney General may file injunctive action where pattern of practice of housing discrimination exists; jurisdiction is concurrent in either State courts or Federal district courts. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is directed to issue regulations to enforce an additional statutory provision denying benefits of any Federal housing program to any person violating the provisions of the title prohibiting acts of racial discrimination in housing.	No provision	No provision.
XVII. Amendment of education statutes prohibiting segregation in education.	Authorizes Attorney General to initiate public school desegregation action.	Authorizes Attorney General to initiate public school desegregation action. Prohibits dual school systems based upon race, and outlaws gerrymandering of school districts by requiring that school board justify as reasonable, fair and rational, and not based upon race, any pupil assignment method resulting in racial imbalance.	No provision	No provision.

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO CLARIFY THE RIGHT OF TVA TO SELL POWER TO THE JACKSON PURCHASE RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend section 15(d) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 in order to clarify the right of the Jackson Purchase Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., which is an REA distribution cooperative in my district, to buy power at wholesale from TVA. This bill would remedy a longstanding discrimination and injustice. I believe the merits of this bill are very strong and I should like at this time to explain the unique circumstances which require congressional action in order to avoid hardship to the 11,000 members of this rural cooperative.

Let me start with a little history. In 1959, after several years of legislative debate, Congress authorized TVA to finance its future investment in power facilities by the issuance of bonds in the private money market up to a limit of $750 million. This authorization took the form of inserting section 15(d) in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933. In authorizing TVA to finance itself with bond money, the Congress thought it necessary to impose restrictions on the area which TVA could serve. That area was defined as the area for which TVA and its distributors "were the primary source of power supply on July 1, 1957, and such additional area extending not more than 5 miles around the periphery of such area as may be necessary to care for the growth of the corporation and its distributors within said area."

There were various other limitations which I shall not mention because they are not pertinent. From all of these limitations, however, there were certain specific exceptions in the interest of equity and fairness to permit service to distributors which were not distributors of TVA power on the base date of July 1, 1957. Eleven specific communities were exempted, of which six were located in west Kentucky—Paducah, Princeton, Glasgow, Fulton, Monticello, and Hickman. I might say that in all these cases there was a background of efforts to secure TVA power, and the same thing was true of Jackson Purchase. I might add that all of them are now receiving TVA power except Princeton and Jackson Purchase, and Princeton will begin receiving TVA power in a few months. I believe that Congress took care of every hardship case but one, the Jackson Purchase cooperative. Somehow it got lost in the shuffle. Its plight is now far worse than in 1959 because the addition of the communities I have mentioned to the TVA area, and particularly the city of Paducah, located in the heart of the Jackson Purchase area, has created a situation which strikes at the ability of this rural system to survive unless Congress clarifies its right to buy power from TVA.

I might add that it is by no means clear that TVA could not serve Jackson Purchase under the language of the 1959 amendment, but TVA interprets this language otherwise. TVA's position, as I understand it, is that Jackson Purchase is logically situated to receive TVA power, that it does indeed have the strongest possible equitable claims to TVA service, and that TVA would be happy to serve it, but that it is precluded from doing so by the 1959 law.

The Jackson Purchase service area lies west of the Cumberland River and south of the Ohio River as it makes its big bend before joining the Mississippi at Cairo. In this historic area both the Tennessee and the Cumberland Rivers join the Ohio. Except for the service territory of the cooperative itself, this entire area is dominated by the TVA program. Here near the mouth of the Tennessee is located Kentucky Dam, TVA's largest hydro project and the key to its navigation and flood control program on the Tennessee River. Here also on the Ohio River is located the Shawnee steam plant with a million and a half kilowatts of capacity, one of TVA's largest generating stations, entirely surrounded on the land side by the service area of Jackson Purchase. Immediately adjacent to the Shawnee steam plant is one of AEC's largest installations, the Paducah gaseous diffusion plant, which is served directly by TVA. A few miles away is the city of Paducah itself, now a distributor of TVA power, which serves an irregular area where Jackson Purchase and Paducah distribution facilities interweave and dovetail with each other. A few miles west on the Tennessee River is an industrial customer which TVA serves directly, its premises entirely surrounded by the facilities of Jackson Purchase. To the west again is the Calvert City industrial complex which is one of this country's largest electrochemical and electrometallurgical centers. Here B. F. Goodrich, the Air Reduction Co., Penn Salt Co., and a number of other great industries are served directly by TVA, while the commercial and residential loads in the vicinity are served in part by Jackson Purchase and in part by another cooperative which is a TVA power distributor. To summarize, TVA is the dominant economic force in the Jackson Purchase area, none of which is more than a few miles from major TVA installations or existing points of service. In this respect Jackson Purchase is unique among cooperatives which have been cut off from TVA power by the terms of the 1959 bond amendment as interpreted by TVA.

A situation which was difficult enough in 1959 has become progressively worse. In 1963 the city of Paducah began the distribution of TVA power and inasmuch as the Jackson Purchase area surrounds the city and their customers face each other across streets, highways, and fence lines the rate differential creates a constant discrimination. The same thing has occurred in Calvert City where Jackson Purchase many years ago bought and improved an existing distribution system at a cost of several hundred thousand dollars.

However, a cooperative which buys its power from TVA has built into the city because of the appeal of its lower rates and is getting most of the new residential and commercial growth.

Inasmuch as the Jackson Purchase's service area is dominated by TVA and its power distributors, Jackson Purchase's consumers are continuously confronted with the disparity between their situation and that of their neighbors. The newspapers they read, the TV broadcasts they see and the radio they hear are filled with the low-rate appeals of the TVA power distributors and the merchants who advertise their wares on the basis of TVA's low rates. The discrimination is not only patent and obvious, it is one that is also ever present and unforgettable.

Jackson Purchase consumers can see TVA customers right next door, TVA transmission lines across the street, a TVA steam plant and a TVA hydroelectric dam on their doorsteps, but they are unable to obtain any TVA power for themselves. The discrimination is so important and so impossible to explain or defend that the 40,000 people in the Jackson Purchase service area labor under a constant burden of injustice and discrimination.

The economic consequences of the disparity and discrimination are severe. For example, real estate on one side of a street will sell at a higher price than comparable properties on the other side because a TVA distributor serves the first, while Jackson Purchase serves the second. To take another example, the growing Calvert City industrial complex is creating new power markets, but a major share is diverted from natural locations along the Tennessee River within the Jackson Purchase area. In one case an area served by Jackson Purchase on the north side of Evergreen Street in Calvert City, although it had available city water and sewer service, attracted about 5 percent of the housing and construction development of a comparable area south of Evergreen Street, which did not initially have central water and sewer service, solely because of the power differential. Instead of TVA and its power program serving as a unifying developmental factor in the five-county area in which TVA and Jackson Purchase facilities are intertwined, it is a divisive factor and the cause of economic hardship and discrimination. TVA does not deny or defend this situation but attributes its failure to supply the remedy solely to the restrictive territorial provisions of the 1959 TVA bond amendment.

Service to Jackson Purchase would involve no substantial transmission investment on TVA's part. Existing substations and points of delivery within its area would provide for Jackson Purchase's power needs.

The bill which I have introduced would not, in my judgment, create broad demands to reopen the territorial limitations in the 1959 act but would merely do justice in a unique situation. It would create no new areas of friction at boundaries. For one thing, most of the Jackson Purchase area boundaries are fixed by nature.

On the north and west it is bounded by the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers which are also State line boundaries. On the east about half of its boundry is the broad Cumberland River. On the south and southeast no problems would be created because it is bounded by existing TVA power distributors. Only for a few miles in the northeast corner of its service area is it contiguous with the territory of a cooperative not already served by TVA and here the area is entirely rural and only a handful of customers are involved. The operating zones in this northeast corner are well established and any change would be subject to the jurisdiction of the Kentucky Utilities Public Service Commission. Service by TVA to Jackson Purchase would therefore have no disruptive effect on any other cooperative or upon any private power company.

The economic growth of the Jackson Purchase area is being severely retarded by the lack of TVA power. Jackson Purchase now pays some 160 percent of what the TVA distributors pay for their wholesale power supply and it must pass on this added burden in its retail rates. It cannot possibly compete with the surrounding TVA power distributors in attracting industry to its area or indeed in bringing the full benefits of electrical living to the rural residents of the area. For the latest year available, 1964, the average kilowatt-hour usage of electricity by Jackson Purchase residential consumers is 5,208 kilowatt-hours as compared to the comparable TVA average of 11,147.

This is a bill which would cost the Treasury nothing. TVA has long acknowledged that this area should logically receive TVA power. This bill is supported by the other TVA power distributors which through their association, the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, have passed a strong resolution of endorsement. It is also endorsed by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which passed a similar resolution. Jackson Purchase has a strong claim to favorable consideration and I hope that the Congress will take early action on this bill.

RENT SUNPPLEMENTS FOR LOWER-MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an announcement made yesterday by Housing and Urban Development Secretary Weaver. Secretary Weaver, who is as forthright as the rest of the administration is deceptive, yesterday announced that Congress will be asked to extend rent supplements to lower-middle-income families.

Now, last year, we Republicans told the House that Dr. Weaver really was not interested in making rent supplements a program for truly poor people. In fact, we even quoted Dr. Weaver himself as saying no builder but a builder with a "heart of gold, but head of lead" would build low-income housing under this program. The majority said no. The majority said we were wrong. They offered an amendment that would limit rent supplements to persons within public housing income ceilings.

Dr .Weaver does not like the congressional limitation. He wants to build houses in the suburbs for lower-middle-income people. This is his economic integration scheme in action. We on the Republican side predicted this all along.

Dr. Weaver never tried to hide his true intent, but the administration threw out a zoo of misrepresentations to try and get the rent supplement program started. Now that it seems to be started, the cat is to be let out of the bag once and for all. The administration wants rent supplements for lower-middle-income groups.

We do not have the money to spare to subsidize middle-income group rents. I want to know what the administration is now going to do about the poor people in the slums. Are we going to expand public housing?

I think this proves very nicely that this rent supplement program never should have been passed. We Republicans said at the time it was a Trojan Horse, but the Democrats did not believe us. Now the administration has made monkeys out of the Democrats.

When the Housing Act amendments comes before the House this year, I am going to offer an amendment to eliminate the rent supplement program from the statute books and substitute instead a new urban rehabilitation program and a stepped-up public housing program.

If we do not eliminate the rent supplement program, it will be turned into a vehicle for middle-income housing subsidies. Dr. Weaver can raise rent supplement eligibility as high as public housing income limits, and since he indirectly controls these too, I do not think he will have to come to Congress for any change.

I think the only answer is to get rid of the rent supplement program now before it is too late.

The text of an article in the Washington Post follows:

RENT AID FOR LOWER-MIDDLE-INCOME GROUP TO BE SOUGHT

Congress will probably be asked to extend rent supplements to lower-middle-income families, Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, said yesterday.

The move is sure to arouse strong opposition in Congress. A bill to start helping poor families pay their rent squeaked through the Senate by only one vote last week. And the lawmakers gave President Johnson less than half the money he requested.

Undismayed, Weaver told UPI that there is "a very, very strong possibility and probability" that the administration would ask Congress to make the same kind of rent assistance available to families whose income is too high for public housing but who are too poor to afford adequate private accommodations.

Under the rent supplement program, the Government will pay the difference between 25 percent of a poor family's income and their rent in a decent home.

The administration originally wanted to aid lower-middle-income people—those in the so-called gap between public and private housing—while continuing to take care of poor families in low-rent public housing. But Congress refused to go along, unless the program was redirected to help the poor and not the almost poor.

Even after authorizing rent supplements for the poor, the lawmakers were so suspicious that Weaver might try to help less needy families that for months they refused to provide any money to get the new program going. Finally, last week the Senate went along with the House in appropriating $12 million. Mr. Johnson had requested $30 million.

When asked whether the administration would come back later to get rent supplements extended to lower-middle-income families, Weaver replied that if it is "successful with the low-income segment of the market, there is a very, very strong possibility and probability that it would be extended."

CONGLOMERATE MERGERS THREATEN FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, corporate mergers and acquisitions have virtually destroyed competition in industry after industry. In many of our key industries today one or two giant firms dominate the pricing and marketing of goods to the detriment of competition. As antitrust enforcement has been applied to those mergers eliminating direct competition between corporate giants, a new pattern has developed—the so-called conglomerate merger. While these mergers are justified on the grounds of diversification they really constitute the building of vast economic empires—they are cartels or pools of incredible economic power. Our antimerger laws are specifically designed to meet this type of merger. Unfortunately, however, application of those laws to conglomerate mergers has not been as forceful as it should be.

In an address on April 14, 1966, before the antitrust section of the American Bar Association, Paul Rand Dixon, the honorable and distinguished Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, expressed his enlightened views on this subject. Under permission granted, I include his remarks in the RECORD and urge my colleagues to study them carefully, for they toll a warning bell:

MERGER POLICY AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE COMPETITIVE SYSTEM

(An address by Hon. Paul Rand Dixon)

I

Writing a quarter of a century ago, a noted economist, describing the great merger movement around the turn of the century and the merger movement of the late 1920's, made the following observation:

"In both cases, the enthusiasm for bigger business was closely related to the activities of financial promoters and the willingness of the investment markets to absorb new securities. In both instances, the business community was swept with the belief that size would solve many problems automatically, that 'in union there is strength.' Both were periods of relative prosperity, with trends rising so that their projection made the future bright indeed. And, finally, both were periods in which the shadow of the antitrust laws fell only dimly on the business world. As a result, the slower and more tested processes of growth through plowing back earnings gave way to the excited hypotheses of new security prospectuses." [1]

We are now in the midst of a third great merger movement. And because we are in the "eye of the whirlwind" it is difficult for us to judge its ultimate effects on the structure of the American economy. But it is clear that the current merger movement, by all odds the most prolonged in American history, is massive by any measure of size. The most distinctive characteristic of the present merger movement—or at least the current phase of the movement—is that it involves relatively few horizontal and vertical mergers. Rather, it embraces a relatively new phenomenon, the conglomerate merger.

The very word "conglomerate" is troublesome. The problems and implications it may pose for our system of competitive free enterprise require probing analyses. And whereas in the earlier merger movements "the shadow of the antitrust laws fell only dimly on the business world," today, judging from the not always flattering comments I read in the business magazines, antitrust apparently is no longer a "dim shadow," but rather a white-hot spotlight, to say the least. Some contend that the conglomerate merger problem, itself, has been created by our antimerger efforts—that if our enforcement had not been so vigorous against horizontal and vertical mergers, business firms would not be so engrossed in conglomerate mergers. This is a questionable explanation. For had horizontal and vertical mergers been given free reign between 1951 and 1965, the field of such mergers would have been pretty well exhausted by today, and we would still have the conglomerate merger movement with us. But be this as it may, I suggest it is high time that those interested in preserving a free enterprise economy take a thoughtful pause and ask themselves whether they really want the antitrust agencies to give a free reign to mergers. And I also respectfully suggest that our current merger policy is not the jungle that some commentators would have their readers suppose it is. My use of the "jungle" analogy is not fortuitous.

Incidentally, some of this flattery I have been getting lately has been poorly timed. A few years back when my son was a bit younger he might have been proud to see me cast in the role of "the Tarzan of the contemporary antitrust world." But now his only comment was a bored query as to whether my sophisticated journalist friends are not mixing their metaphors when they also call me a "hairy populist."

But seriously, the Commission and the Antitrust Division are obliged to follow the legislative dictates set out by the Congress under the antimerger statute, which states categorically that we are to examine all kinds of mergers—horizontal, vertical, and conglomerate—to see whether the effect of such mergers may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. I recognize, of course, that it is a lot easier to understand the adverse effects of a horizontal or a vertical merger than it is to see the harm in a conglomerate merger. Most persons can understand how a merger between two substantial firms previously battling with each other in the same market may have an adverse effect upon competition. This not only eliminates the competition between them but shrinks the number of sellers, thereby destroying competition as a process. Similarly, we can readily visualize the anticompetitive effects of vertical mergers which foreclose the opportunities of the nonintegrated firms to secure raw materials or to sell their products. In short, when vertical mergers shrink the "open market" they may have adverse competitive effects including raising the barriers to entry facing new competitors.

But just because conglomerate mergers do not have these same kinds of "obvious" effects does not mean that they may not also be anticompetitive in certain circumstances.

II

The Commission has been giving a great deal of thought to the "conglomerate" merger not only because most of the larger mergers occurring these days happen to be of this type, but also because we want to understand how they influence competition. As I understand the term, a "conglomerate" enterprise is one that does business in a number of separate markets. These separate markets involve different "product" markets, or they may involve separate "geographic" markets in the same product. We have learned to refer to the first as a "product extension" and the second as a "market extension" merger. In either case, a firm selling, say, 25 different products, and one selling a single product in 25 different geographic markets, would both have the essential characteristics; each of them—to quote Professor Edwards—"operates in a series of different markets, in each of which it encounters different competitors and different conditions of demand and supply and thus may be able to charge different prices and make different profits.[2]

The conglomerate acquisition often raises some of the same problems as the more conventional horizontal merger, but with special complications of its own. Take the basic question of whether the acquisition poses a danger of ultimate single-firm dominance, of some form of "price leadership." It is often said that the conglomerate firm—by reason of its general overall superiority of resources, its capacity to "subsidize" local expansion out of profits earned in other markets, and the like—is apt to dominate the local market in which the acquisition occurs, ultimately becoming, if not a monopoly in the classical sense of the word, certainly enough of a "price leader" to impose on the market a price well in excess of a genuinely competitive price.

Then there is the question of whether the merger increases the likelihood that the oligopoly Congress was so concerned about will eventually emerge. Conglomerate mergers are said to pose a double danger on this score. The acquiring conglomerate firm will be susceptible not only to all of the local oligopoly-producing forces, but to a variety of influences stemming from its operations in all of its other markets as well. As a firm expands the number of its markets in which it operates, it begins to encounter many of the same competitors in different areas. This "multiplicity of their contacts" may "blunt the edge of their competition." [3]

One of the reasons firms in a tightly knit oligopoly market may perform anticompetitively is that they are what the economists call "interdependent." They know that they will have to meet the price cut of one of their rivals, and they enjoy a free ride on the price upswing initiated by the industry's price leader. In much the same way conglomerate firms may act interdependently as they meet one another in a series of markets. This will lead to a "forbearance" from competitive rivalry, particularly in price, and the development of soft competition or a "live and let live" course of conduct.

Economic theory and industrial experience suggest other ways in which conglomerate merger may affect competition adversely. As indicated, in certain circumstances such mergers may harm competition by eliminating significant potential competitors, in others, they may raise substantially the barriers to entry confronting new entrants, and in still other situations conglomerate mergers may create opportunities for business reciprocity which may adversely affect competition.

As I said at the outset, experience teaches that these are some of the ways in which conglomerate mergers—defined as mergers between companies that are not direct competitors—may adversely affect competition.

I wish to emphasize that the Commission's approach to the area of conglomerate mergers has been a wholly pragmatic one. We do not start with the assumption that all conglomerate mergers are illegal under section 7. On the contrary, we take the view that the great majority are legal. Quite obviously the business community does likewise, because in spite of our so-called "tough" decisions, merger activity has increased in each year since I have been at the Commission.

This is not to say that we are indifferent to the current merger movement and the ways in which it may be bringing about irreversible changes in the structure of our economy. The Congress has charged the FTC with the responsibility of not only recording the way in which merger movements may be changing the structure of our economy, but with doing something about it when it threatens to erode our competitive system.

The evidence presented in a series of cases before the Commission has demonstrated that under certain circumstances conglomerate mergers may adversely affect competition. I add hastily that most of these cases had been filed prior to the time I came to the Commission. But I inherited, along with all the other current members of the Commission, the unhappy task of studying the long, complicated records developed in the course of these cases. In several of these a majority of the Commission found that the mergers involved adversely affected competition even though the merged companies were not direct competitors in some relevant market.

III

The first of the Commission's conglomerate merger cases to reach the Supreme Court involved the matter of reciprocity. The Commission had felt that reciprocity may distort the competitive process through the use of substantial buying power as a weapon to deny less favorably situated competitors access to the market. Consolidated Foods, a large conglomerate enterprise engaged in food manufacturing, wholesaling, and foot retailing, had acquired Gentry, a maker of garlic and dehydrated onion. The Supreme Court [4] upheld the Commission's view that the acquisition gave Consolidated Foods actual, as well as potential, power to use its position as a buyer to assist its Gentry division in selling its products, and that this power had an adverse effect on competition.

---

[1] Monograph No. 27, "The Structure of Industry," Temporary National Economic Committee, 76th Cong., 3d sess., p. 231.

[2] Edwards, in "Economic Concentration: Overall and Conglomerate Aspects," hearings before Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, p. 36, at p. 38.

[3] Id., 45.

[4] *FTC v. Consolidated Foods Corporation*, Apr. 28, 1965.

Now I shall not replay the Consolidated Foods record here. But I do want to point out that business reciprocity is not a new phenomenon and may have a de minimus effect on competition under certain circumstances. On the other hand, reciprocity may become an extremely significant market strategy to the conglomerate enterprise which buys and sells a large number and volume of industrial goods and services in oligopolistic markets. In this economic environment a large corporation has both strong incentives and opportunities to engage in reciprocal trade. Conglomerate mergers could be both motivated by and result in anticompetitive reciprocity, for the longer the line of products a corporation buys, the greater its opportunity to engage in reciprocity.

Most economists view reciprocity as an alien factor in the competitive process because it eliminates the usual factors underlying buying and selling, namely, price, quality and service. If carried to its ultimate, the practice could result in closed-circuit markets from which medium or small factors are excluded. Thus, oligopoly would be magnified in a sort of circular integration fashion by which purchases of the leading firms would be tied to sales, foreclosing the opportunities of firms without substantial market power to gain access to the inner circle of firms.

In spite of strong criticism of the Consolidated Foods decision in some quarters, I have found no thoughtful businessman who is not concerned with the ultimate implications of this practice for a free market economy. Fortune magazine recently recognized the potentials of reciprocity when it said:

> "Thus trade relations between the giant conglomerates tend to close a business circle. Left out are the firms with narrow product lines; as patterns of trade and trading partners emerge between particular groups of companies, entry by newcomers becomes more difficult."[5]

Indeed Fortune feared that unless such tightly knit trade relation setups were not broken up by technological advances or competition from foreign companies "the U.S. economy might end up completely dominated by conglomerates happily trading with each other in a new kind of cartel system."[6]

IV

The Procter & Gamble-Clorox case[7] brought into clear focus a number of key facets to a product extension type merger. Procter & Gamble, the Nation's largest soap and detergent company, had taken over Clorox, the Nation's largest bleach manufacturer controlling almost 50 percent of the bleach market. In the Commission's view, the decisive factors in the case were that the merger eliminated a leading potential competitor, raised barriers to entry in the already highly concentrated bleach industry, and threatened the survival and competitive vigor of smaller bleach companies.

Procter & Gamble previously had not been engaged in the bleach business, so no competition between Procter & Gamble and Clorox was eliminated by the merger. Nevertheless, the Commission viewed the merger as damaging to competition because certain market advantages enjoyed by Procter & Gamble tended to place the remaining bleach manufacturers in a position where they could not continue to compete effectively and discouraged new entry into the bleach industry.

I shall not recount the factual underpinnings of these findings. The Commission was, as you know, reversed in the Procter & Gamble matter by the Sixth Circuit. But I wish to emphasize two points. First, the product differentiation variable of industry structure plays a crucial role in industries such as this one. It appears to be the main source of market power. Couple that with the fact that Procter & Gamble was able to transfer to Clorox the tremendous advertising discounts it enjoyed in various advertising media and you can see how, on the one hand, other bleach manufacturers might in the long run be excluded from the market, and on the other, the barriers to entry, already very high, could be markedly heightened by the merger—to the point where, as the Commission concluded, "few firms would have the temerity or resources to attempt to surmount them."

The main point I wish to make is that in Procter & Gamble-Clorox, as in our other conglomerate cases, we looked at the record and attempted to predict competitive consequences of the merger. We did not attach significance to "bigness" as such, nor did we rely on any other basis for constructing some kind of per se rule against conglomerate mergers of this type.

V

In 1950 the Commission issued complaints involving the country's four largest dairy companies.[8] Although some of the several hundred acquisitions of these companies involved conventional horizontal mergers, many were of the so-called market extension type. This is a sub-class of conglomerate mergers because the merging companies operate in separate geographic markets.

In its Foremost and Beatrice Foods decisions the Commission found that certain market extension mergers violated Section 7 of the Clayton Act because of their impact on potential competition. The Commission ordered divestiture of several companies and prohibited for 10 years further dairy mergers, both horizontal and market extension, without the prior approval of the Commission. The two cases involving National Dairy Products and the Borden Co. were settled by consent orders requiring divestiture of several companies and 10-year prohibitions against further mergers. The case involving Beatrice Foods is currently on appeal before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The Commission analyzed these mergers within their industrial context. We found that technological and market changes were bringing about a fundamental restructuring of the dairy industry. These forces had already caused the demise of thousands of small companies and dictated the loss of hundreds more. These developments also were raising the barriers to entry. The Commission recognized that it should not and could not do anything about the basic causes underlying much of what was happening in the dairy industry. But it also recognized that superimposed on these changes was an enormous merger movement in which the top 8 dairies alone had acquired over 2,000 dairies. Many of these mergers were removing precisely those firms most capable of weathering the harsh technological and economic storm that was transforming the industry. In the Commission view, several of these mergers had the effect of eliminating leading potential competitors from markets that were already highly concentrated. The Commission ordered the divestiture of these acquisitions as well as several horizontal acquisitions.

The theory behind the Commission's 10-year prohibitions against further mergers by the top four dairies was not designed to throttle mergers as such, nor has that been the effect. On the contrary, this relief was designed to channel the direction of merger activity away from the largest concerns toward the smaller and medium-size companies, many of which must grow to survive and achieve various economies of scale. In fact, since the Commission's first decision in 1962 the rate of merger activity in the dairy industry has continued at a steady pace, although such mergers are now mainly among smaller companies.

I believe experience will demonstrate that these actions have promoted more effective competition on the part of smaller companies while arresting a trend toward monopoly on the part of the industry leaders. And while the test of the statute is a merger's effect on competition, not on efficiency, the Commission's dairy cases appear to have promoted efficiency as well as competition. For while our orders have not stopped small, inefficient companies from leaving the industry by selling out, they have accelerated the growth and efficiency of smaller surviving companies which now find it easier to grow by merger.

VI

The Commission's most recent conglomerate case, In the Matter of National Tea,[9] also involved a series of market extension mergers. Interestingly, both antitrust agencies have recently been criticized for different reasons because of cases involving mergers among food retailers. The Justice Department's case involving Von's Grocery Co. challenges a conventional horizontal merger.[10] The Department of Justice has been criticized in this case for allegedly pushing the law with respect to horizontal mergers "too far." On the other hand, I have been criticized on the grounds that the National Tea opinion represents "A new worst in antitrust."[11] I would like to place both of these matters in perspective.

The Von's merger did not take place in an industrial vacuum.[12] It occurred in an environment of change in which mergers were the order of the day. Since 1948 Los Angeles food retailers with combined sales of over $400 million have been acquired; these involved both horizontal and market extension mergers. There has been an unmistakable merger-induced trend toward concentration in the immense Los Angeles market, and Von's acquisition of Shopping Bag represented the single most important contribution to this trend. The immediate effect of the merger was to make Von's the No. 1 company in the market with a market share of almost 9 percent. Moreover, there were powerful economic forces working toward concentration quite apart from merger. A district court dismissed the case and it is now to appear before the Supreme Court.

The major significance of the case, it seems to me, lies in the fact that it explores and attempts to identify, within the meaning of section 7, the dividing line between competitive and noncompetitive markets.

---

[5] Fortune, June 1965, p. 194.

[6] Ibid.

[7] *In the Matter of the Procter & Gamble Company*, Docket No. 6901, Nov. 26, 1963.

[8] *In the Matter of Foremost Dairies, Inc.*, Docket No. 6495, Apr. 30, 1962; *In the Matter of National Dairy Products*, Docket No. 6651; *In the Matter of Borden Company*, Docket No. 6652; *in the Matter of Beatrice Foods*, Docket No. 6653.

[9] FTC Docket No. 7453.

[10] *United States v. Von's Grocery Co. and Shopping Bag Food Stores*, 233 F. Supp. 976 (D. Calif., 1964).

[11] Fortune, April 1966, p. 111.

[12] Von's, a 27-store chain with sales of $94 million and 4.7 percent of the Los Angeles market, in 1960, merged with Shopping Bag Food Stores, a 34-store chain with sales of $84 million and 4.2 percent of the market. These chains were the third and sixth largest food retailers in Los Angeles. The merger gave Von's-Shopping Bag about the same market share as Safeway.

In his brief before the Supreme Court the Solicitor General admitted that the Los Angeles retail grocery market was not yet a full-blown oligopoly. Instead he contended that this market was at the threshold of oligopoly; that "the combined market shares of the leading sellers was at a level that economists would consider characteristic of at least a loose oligopoly"; that, while concentration had not "reached the stage where vigorous price competition was seriously impaired," it "had reached the stage—which precedes and foreshadows oligopolistic pricing—where a few sellers, by reasons of their size in the market, have emerged as the market's major competitors, have identified each other as the rivals to be watched, and have decided that their own competitive fortunes are to some degree interdependent with those of these rivals."

The key concept here is said to be embodied in the phrase, "have identified each other." Full, impersonal competition ends—and oligopolistic behavior begins—at that point where the number of competitors becomes small enough, and their respective market shares large enough, to make them aware of each other and of their dependence on each other's actions. As the Solicitor put it, the "critical factor in precipitating oligopolistic behavior is psychological." But it is a psychological factor that is believed to be created by an objective, underlying market structure—here, by the fact that eight firms held 39 percent of the market, in a size distribution ranging from 8.9 percent to 2.8 percent.

The Solicitor concluded that the merger should be condemned under a "test of presumptive illegality" since it involved two "direct competitors in [a market] where economic power is still relatively dispersed," but where concentration was increasing, and the merger itself appreciably increased that level of concentration.

There's one further aspect of this case I would like to mention. The National Association of Retail Grocers filed an amicus brief [13] and presented oral argument in the Supreme Court in opposition to the Government's case. Describing itself as "a federation of over 100 State and local food retailer associations," with "approximately 40,000 [grocery store] members," and as a representative of "retail food distributors who conduct small and medium size local enterprises," [14] the association protested the application of more rigorous standards to horizontal than to other kinds of mergers. The substance of the association's argument, if I understand it correctly, is that the "horizontal" acquisition is—if the term is not too inappropriate—the "poor man's merger" route. Giant firms with plenty of money can grow in any direction: they can buy their way into new geographical markets; they can even buy their way into wholly new industries. But the little man is more circumscribed; his horizon is limited to a single market, and any expansion he enjoys will generally have to take place in that market. If a particularly strict rule is applied to horizontal mergers, then the small firm will have been, for all practical purposes, denied the right to grow by merger.

I think it is a fair summary of the association's argument to say that it is urging the Government to "stop picking on us little fellows" and address itself, instead, to the rich man's merger—the conglomerate. This brings us to the Commission's National Tea decision.

The industry developments and merger movement in Los Angeles were but part of the larger picture in contemporary food retailing. Since 1948 food retailers with combined sales of $5 billion have been acquired. This probably makes food retailing the most active area of merger activity in the economy.

The Commission could not ignore this vast merger movement which got underway in the early 1950's. In 1959 it issued its complaint against the National Tea Co.,[15] the most active acquiring food chain. The Commission studied for over 1 year the vast records in this case to determine whether and how National Tea's numerous mergers might affect competition.

The background industry facts in food retailing, as shown by the National Tea record, were not unlike those in the dairy industry. Market and technical factors were bringing about a fundamental reorganization in food retailing. The supermarket revolution made inevitable the demise of thousands of smaller companies. For a variety of reasons, since World War II local retail markets have been tending toward oligopoly, as the number of competitors declined and the share held by the leading companies rose sharply. At the same time there was a substantial trend toward concentration at the national level, where companies are competitors in the purchase of some products. Voluntary and cooperative buying groups were also growing and merging as independent retailers struggled to survive the changes in market organization.

As in the dairy industry, an enormous merger movement was superimposed on top of these other industry changes. This decision is directed at harnessing anticompetitive mergers, not at arresting other inevitable economic changes transforming the industry. Indeed, the record spoke eloquently of the economic facts of life which, quite apart from mergers, were bringing about increasing concentration in local and national markets. A critical point at issue was whether the merger movement, and particularly National Tea's leading role in it, was accelerating the restructuring of food retailing in ways that were not dictated by economic efficiency and which might have a substantial adverse effect on competition. While investigation into matters of efficiency are not a central question in merger enforcement policy, it is clear that National Tea's mergers were not dictated by this motive. On the contrary, the companies acquired by National Tea generally were healthy, profitable, fast growing businesses.

I shall not bore you by replaying the entire decision. But as I emphasized earlier, the Commission has taken a pragmatic view toward conglomerate type mergers. The National Tea record taught us some new things about conglomerate firms—the sources of their power, how they sometimes use this power, and its implications for the competitive process. The record illustrated how four factors may become of crucial importance in achieving market dominance and in influencing oligopolistic behavior:

(1) The absolute size of the conglomerate in relation to that of its "local" competitors; (2) the number of separate geographic markets in which it operates; (3) the market position it holds, and the profit rates it enjoys in its different geographic markets; and (4) the extent to which it and the other major firms in particular "local" markets also meet each other in other geographic markets.

The record showed the following facts. In 1959, National Tea was the fifth largest retail food chain in the Nation, operating more than 900 stores in some 500 cities and towns, with aggregate sales of approximately $794 million. At that time, a majority of the country's retail grocers—and hence a majority of those National encountered in the various local markets it entered—operated only one store, in one town, and had annual sales of less than $100,000. In terms of sales volume, then, National Tea was approximately 9,000 times as large as the bulk of its competitors.

The record permitted an analysis of National's market position in 399 of its 500 city markets. At the bottom, in 48 cities, it had less than 5 percent of the market; at the top, in 29 cities, it had 35 percent or more. And it happened that there was a remarkable correlation between the market share it held in those various cities and the profits it earned in them. Thus, in its overall operation, National's before-tax earnings averaged 2.77 percent of sales.[16] But that "average" figure obscured enormous city-to-city variations. For example, in the 48 cities where it had a market share of less than 5 percent, National had no earnings at all; in fact, it had average losses of some 5 cents on each dollar of sales.[17] In the 29 cities where it held a market share of 35 percent or more, however, its earnings averaged well over 3 percent of sales. And in its single most profitable city, its stores had earnings of approximately 7.5 cents per dollar of sales.[18] This translates into an after-tax return of some 40 percent on stockholders' investment.[19] In effect, the housewives in the cities where National Tea had a substantial market share were subsidizing National Tea's operations where it had small market positions.

As to the so-called multimarket contacts, suffice it to say that National Tea and the country's largest food chains met each other in scores of different markets. They were fellow oligopolists in many of the local cities where National's acquisitions occurred; they were fellow oligopolists in those dozens of other markets as well. In Denver, for example, National Tea, Safeway, and Dillon had 64.1 percent of the market in 1958; in Indianapolis, National and four other chains had 58.8 percent; in Colorado Springs, National and two others had 62.8 percent; in three Michigan towns, National and three other chains had 82.4 percent of those markets. And I think it can be fairly said that this "multiplicity of their contacts" did in fact "blunt the edge of their competition." For example, one of the respondent's officials testified that the other "interstate chains," as he put it, "pretty well shared [National's] opinion" about competition, and hence that his only real competition came from the "local competition which operated more than one store" [20]—precisely the kind respondent was busily buying up.

Very briefly, then, National enjoyed a substantial degree of what the economists call "market power" in a number of its 500-odd markets. In many cities where it had this market power, respondent exercised it in two quite predictable ways: (1) It had higher markups than it was able to enjoy in the cities where competition was still vigorous enough to limit its pricing power, and (2) it was able to exact discriminatory price concessions and promotional allowances from its suppliers—in one area getting more money from its suppliers than it actually spent on promotion. Then, having amassed these noncompetitive profits in its "market power" cities, it could use them to subsidize its expansion, or at least its survival, in cities where it still faced stiff competition. The end result of such tactics might be that it would expand its position in competitive cities until, as the Commission concluded, "it acquires the same kind of pricing power it now enjoys in those other cities where it is already the dominant seller."[21]

---

[13] *United States* v. *Von's Grocery Co.*, No. 303, brief of the National Association of Retail Grocers of the United States, as amicus curiae (Mar. 15, 1966).

[14] Id., at 2.

[15] *In the Matter of National Tea*, Docket No. 7453.

[16] *In re National Tea Co.*, findings of fact, p. 52.

[17] Id., at 54. In those cities, its stores made a contribution (to overhead and profits) of −2.3 percent. The overhead in its various branches ranged from 2 to 4.7 percent, for an unweighted average of 3.4 percent. Id., at 51. Adding this overhead of 3.4 percent to the direct store losses of 2.3 percent would give an average loss of 5.7 percent in those cities where market share is less than 5 percent.

[18] Id., at 52. This city had a contribution to overhead and profits of more than 10 percent. Deducting the average warehouse overhead of 3.4 percent would leave a before-tax profit of at least 6.6 percent of sales.

[19] In grocery retailing, an after-tax return of 1 percent of sales generally figures to an after-tax return on stockholders' investment of over 10 percent.

[20] Findings, p. 15.

Some economists, including the first Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the dean of the economic profession, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, fear that conglomerate-derived market power produces still more monopoly power. As Dr. Nourse sees it, there is "no demonstrable or discernible limit, national or international, at which such concentration of economic power, once fully underway would automatically cease."[22]

Based on this record the Commission majority concluded that the time had come to call a halt—or at least a 10-year pause—to National Tea's growth by merger. Some observers doubtless will conclude that this relief is inadequate and others will find it too severe. Determining adequate and equitable relief is always difficult in section 7 cases. We have won too many hollow victories in section 7 cases. Man cannot breathe new life into victims long deceased. The majority opinion in this case, as in the Commission's dairy decisions, concluded that the most meaningful remedy for National Tea's illegal mergers was to prevent a recurrence of such mergers for 10 years.

Not too surprisingly, Commissioner Mary Gardiner Jones had the last word in this decision. She concluded her concurring opinion in this matter by pointing out:

"It is essential that this trend be halted before competition is eliminated totally. The majority has concluded that divestiture is not necessary here in order to remedy the competitive impairment which has resulted from respondent's acquisitions. I believe with the majority that an injunction imposed on respondent from making further acquisitions will be sufficient to insure that the competitive elements which still survive in this market will not be snuffed out by continued and unchecked acquisitions by respondent in the future."

I hope this summary of Commission policy regarding conglomerate mergers, as I interpret it, indicates that we have taken no doctrinaire view toward such mergers. We have tried, as best we can, to chart a course through the current sea of mergers. We have charted our course on the basis of industrial experience as revealed in the cases before us.

When the Congress passed the Celler-Kefauver Act in 1950 it intended that the act be used to curb the adverse competitive effects flowing from future merger movements. I ask all of our critics, what would you do if you had the responsibility for enforcing this important law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, in times like these? Would you wait until economists developed better and more sophisticated theories of competitive effect? Would you call for more research? Or would you urge that nothing be done on the grounds that what is good for individual businessmen must be good for competition? I can assure you that these approaches are an open invitation for nonenforcement of the act. And as long as I am with the Commission I shall press for the continued pragmatic application of the act to the current merger movement. To do anything less is to invite the indictment of future historians that we stood by wringing our hands in anguished uncertainty the day free enterprise died in America.

---

[21] Opinion of the Commission, pp. 13–14.

[22] Edwin G. Nourse, in "Administered Prices: A Compendium on Public Policy," Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Cong., 1st sess., p. 245, at 255.

AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORTS PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I informed the House that three of our great veterans' organizations, the Disabled Veterans, the American Veterans of World War II, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, had written to me strongly endorsing the Participation Sales Act of 1966. Today I am privileged to add the voice of the largest veterans' organization, the American Legion, to the already growing list of veterans' organizations who are urging the enactment of H.R. 14544.

National Commander L. Eldon James emphasizes in his letter to me, which follows, the importance that this bill has for the continued successful programs of the Veterans' Administration:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1966.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: As national commander of the American Legion, I have been asked to comment on H.R. 14544, the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

I am advised that this bill would authorize Federal agencies administering credit programs to enter into agreements with the Federal National Mortgage Association, whereby that Association would sell to private investors interest-earning shares, known as participation certificates, based upon a pooling of Government loan certificates. I am told that this plan, in effect, would serve to substitute private for public credit.

The Veterans' Administration has since 1964 used this technique to sell a substantial number of its veterans' housing mortgages, under a similar authorization contained in Public Law 88–560. H.R. 14544 would encompass this authorization and extend it to include certain other Federal agencies.

The impact of the proposed legislation upon present VA operations is the primary concern of the American Legion. It is our understanding that the sale of participation certificates under the provisions of this bill would not give the purchasers any control over the programs under which loans were made. The veteran would continue to deal directly with the Veterans' Administration, the agency which administers his housing loan program.

We have been assured by the Veterans' Administration that the provisions of this bill will favorably affect the operations of the VA. Accordingly, the American Legion favors the enactment of H.R. 14544.

Sincerely yours,

L. ELDON JAMES,
National Commander.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S FARM POLICY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the policy of Henry Wallace was to plow under every third row. The Freeman policy is to plow under every third farmer.

Each year for the past 5 years an average of 800,000 farmers leave their farms. They cannot make a decent living.

The lawyer-politician from the great city of Minneapolis, who would be "czar of agriculture," boasts that net farm income increased in 1965. The increase is not from the marketplace. It is from an increase in Government subsidies and, of course, an increase of the farmer's dependence on the Government.

In 1965, direct payments from the Government represented 17½ percent of the farmer's net income. For 1967, it is estimated to increase to 22.3 percent.

The Secretary of Agriculture is supposed to advance the interest of farmers. That is why the Department was established, as was the Commerce Department established to look after industrial and business interests and the Labor Department to look after the interests of labor.

But Secretary Freeman has little or no interest in the lot of the farmer. He is intent upon putting the farmer in an economic straitjacket, making him the victim of the inflation stemming from the administration's loose fiscal policies.

He has dumped corn on the market and announced his great pleasure that the farmer is getting less for his products.

He has initiated a program to encourage production of soybeans and force down prices.

He has had margarine substituted for butter and the import quota for cheddar cheese raised. His obvious intent is to force down the price of dairy products, and make the dairy farmer more dependent upon Government subsidy.

He has the Commerce Department place tight export quotas on cattle hides to force down their domestic prices to benefit shoe manufacturers at the farmer's expense.

He has had the Defense Department authorize the purchase of meats in foreign countries for our military rather than buy from our own farmers.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is not, nor has he been a true advocate of the farmer's legitimate interests. He is against the farmer, not for him. He sacrifices our farmers on the altar of political expediency.

THE DETERIORATION OF CASTRO

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I commented on what is becoming increasingly evident as time passes—that Castro and his mad adventure are coming apart.

Ralph Renick, WTVJ vice president in charge of news, in "Tonight's Editorial," broadcast over WTVJ channel 4, Miami, Fla., reported on April 12, 1966, as follows:

Castro's Troubles Continue To Pile Up

> The arrival in Miami today of a top Cuban Embassy official who defected the Castro regime is another indication of the crisis brewing for the dictator.
>
> Significantly, the defector Tarrab Miranda, a commercial attaché in the Cuban Embassy in London, is a specialist in sugar production.
>
> The one-crop Cuban economy is in big trouble because sugar production is far behind estimates.
>
> The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports Cuban agriculture generally is 15 percent less productive now than immediately before Castro.
>
> Castro's open break with Red China and his rantings about broken trade agreements did not help boost his stock at home or abroad.
>
> The crisis is spreading to every facet of the Cuban regime including the armed forces, the Ministry of Foreign Relations, and the Ministry of Foreign Trade.
>
> Three army majors are among the 100 officers recently stripped of power, jailed, or demoted as Castro fights for stability.
>
> The shakeup has touched many of Fidel's long-time loyal supporters—a sign of deep-seated trouble for Castro. And that trouble is sure to get worse before it gets better. Dr. Castro has cause to worry.
>
> He can't easily dismiss the possibility that his name will be added to a list already headed by Sukarno, Ben Bella, and Nkrumah.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying to realize that U.S. policies supported by our friends in the Western Hemisphere, are bringing about and expediting the inherent failure of a Communist system forcefully imposed on a peaceful and freedom loving people.

POLAND'S MILLENNIUM YEAR

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a thousand years ago a gallant people, the Poles, became a nation. The nation of Poland came into being when the first known King of Poland, Mieszko, received the sacrament of baptism and all the tribes forming the nucleus of the future Polish nation embraced the Christian faith along with him.

Thus it is that this year, on May 3, millions of Poles in this Nation as well as those in their motherland are marking not only the traditional Polish Constitution Day anniversary which dates to 1791 but the millennium of Christianity in Poland and the thousandth anniversary of Poland's founding.

This is an historic occasion. It is particularly appropriate that this year we pay tribute to the Polish people for the indomitable courage they have exhibited in the face of the great sufferings they have known during their thousand-year existence as a nation.

It is now a painfully old story that the Poles were delivered into the hands of the Soviet Dictator Stalin at Yalta. That story must never be forgotten. It bears repeating here now as a reminder that the light of freedom and liberty is easily extinguished when its guardians put on their blindfolds.

Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union invaded Poland September 1–27, 1939, and by treaty divided the country. This was the fourth partition of Poland. Eventually the Germans were thrust out. A Polish Government-in-exile in London was recognized by the United States but the Soviet Union pressed the claims of a Lublin group, the so-called Polish Committee of National Liberation, to which a few members of the London committee were admitted. The Communists were very busy liberating people then as well as now.

The Lublin group became the Government of National Unity, Communist dominated. The United States and Britain first opposed it but compromised when Stalin agreed to "free" elections in Poland. However, there was no international supervision of the elections, and they therefore were completely dominated by the Communists.

The Poles have not succumbed easily to the yoke of Communist rule any more than they were willing to bow before oppressors during the earlier centuries. They are a proud and independent people, and they have a fine heritage.

Many Americans have forgotten that Polish workmen rebelling against harsh working conditions imposed on them by Stalinist extremists rioted in Poznan on June 28–29, 1956. Troops suppressed the riot, killing 44, injuring hundreds and putting 1,000 in prison.

The Polish people are still liberty-loving. They are still a religious people, despite attempts by their Communist rulers to limit the teaching of catechism.

The Communist government of Poland has interfered with the full and free celebration today of Poland's Millennium of Christianity. The government refused to grant visas to German and Austrian bishops who had accepted an invitation to the millennium celebration at Jasna Gora, in Czestochowa. The government also limited visits by American bishops of Polish descent to a minimum.

I hope that the joining by members of Congress and millions of other Americans in the celebration of Poland's millennium will convince the Poles that they have not been forgotten by the free world. There will never be a slackening of our interest in Polish independence.

Let all those in the Congress devoted to the right of free peoples to govern themselves use every possible forum to promote the right of self-determination for the Poles and all the other captive peoples of east-central Europe.

RURAL AMERICA IS UP IN ARMS, MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, rural America is up in arms over the administration's brazen attempts to lower farm prices, and I have joined others in the Congress in conveying this mood to the President.

I have been deluged by calls and letters from farm people in my congressional district in Minnesota, urging me to make their concerns known at the White House. They rightfully want the President to know of their displeasure with continuing actions that threaten to force even more of our food producers out of business. And they want to know why this administration has wrongfully blamed the farmer for increases in the cost of living when the farmer's share of the food and fiber dollar constitutes such a small part of the prices charged over the counter.

There are all too many instances where administration policies have worked against the best interests of the farmer. The Council of Economic Advisors has actually admitted that Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of grains have been used by the Department of Agriculture to lower farm prices. Our dairy farmers and sugarbeet growers are threatened by recent orders to take the lid off foreign imports. At the same time, our own exports of cattle hides were restricted to lower the price of leather, but the cost of a pair of shoes went up anyway. Butter and pork have been taken off the mess tables of our fighting men in the Armed Forces. And if Congress had not acted promptly, milk would have disappeared from our schools and valuable agricultural research would have been halted.

While the administration clamps a lid on farm prices, the production costs on the farm continue to rise, which further limits and restricts farm income.

It is time that the farmer cease being the whipping boy for an administration that finds itself caught in the tightening web of its own unwise inflationary policies. It is a dangerous policy that threatens this Nation's future food supply.

NEW YORK STATE PROGRESS IN WATER POLLUTION

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KUPFERMAN**. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said on the subject of water pollution, but what we have needed is action.

In New York State under Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, we have had action on this subject.

I am setting forth Governor Rockefeller's summary as of April 27, 1966, of New York State Progress in Water Pollution and commend it to my colleagues:

> Governor Rockefeller today described the State's pure waters program as one that "will stand as a major monument of the 1960's to progressive and imaginative thinking and cooperative action in government."
>
> The Governor outlined signs of progress in this program at the 42d spring banquet of the County Officers Association at the Hotel Grossinger at 7:30 p.m. He said he was "deeply gratified" that—
>
> Over a third of the State's municipalities have joined in the program.
>
> Over a fourth of major construction contemplated for the 6-year program is underway or will be this year.
>
> Comprehensive sewerage planning studies for 563 municipalities are either completed, underway or in the pipeline under 166 joint projects involving 100 percent State aid totaling $7.8 million.
>
> Also in the planning area, comprehensive water supply studies for 444 municipalities are underway or being negotiated, again with 100-percent State aid, totaling nearly $2.4 million.
>
> The Governor explained that another program provides one-third State aid for operation and maintenance of sewage disposal plants. Ninety-four such grants totaling $4.8 million have been approved and 55 more applications are expected.
>
> But "the most spectacular progress of all," the Governor told the county officers, "is in the construction of sewage disposal plants and interceptors for 130 municipalities either underway or planned for this year."
>
> These projects will cost $491 million—with State grants totaling $258 million.
>
> Governor Rockefeller also pointed to (1) projects underway that will enable 39 communities to stop polluting New York's rivers and lakes, now being audited for State grants amounting to $79 million; (2) the approval of projects for 47 municipalities, to receive State grants of $95 million, on which construction starts this year, and (3) expected applications for projects totaling $137 million in 11 communities, including $135 million for four New York City projects to start this year with State aid of $75 million.
>
> The Governor also described steps being taken by the health department to enforce antipollution laws in the Capital District, along the length of the Hudson River, and on the Upper Mohawk, the Genesee Basin, and the Erie-Niagara area.
>
> Health department personnel, "working 50, 60, and even 70-hour weeks to prosecute the war on pollution," have won voluntary compliance in more than 95 percent of the cases, according to the Governor.
>
> The pure waters program, as well as programs to enhance the physical environment and recreational opportunities of New Yorkers, are part of broad-scaled efforts to improve the whole human environment in New York State, the Governor explained.

IMPROVING FEDERALLY SUPPORTED RESEARCH AT UNIVERSITIES

Mr. **SKUBITZ**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **DWYER**. Mr. Speaker, the April 29, 1966, issue of Science magazine contains an excellent article by a member of the publication's editorial staff, Mr. Daniel S. Greenberg, on the Bureau of the Budget's recently issued 3-year study of "The Administration of Government Supported Research at Universities." Science is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

This study was conducted by the Budget Bureau, with the assistance of the President's Office of Science and Technology, largely at the urging of the House Government Operations Committee. Its purpose was to improve the management of federally supported research programs while, at the same time, strengthening the Nation's institutions of higher education. It was this same objective that motivated the Committee's Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, on which I have long served as the ranking minority member, to critically evaluate the administration of grants by the National Institutes of Health in reports issued in 1961 and 1962.

I am pleased to see that the Science article gives proper credit to our subcommittee chairman, the very able and judicious gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Fountain] for directing early attention to the need for prudent management of the multibillion-dollar funds voted by the Congress for scientific research. The article states:

> For a long time, it was considered somewhat indecent even to acknowledge the possibility that the post-Sputnik gusher of Federal funds for research had produced situations in which Government grants were not always applied to the purposes for which they were intended. One of the great turning points in this attitude occurred in 1962 when Congressman L. H. Fountain, Democrat, of North Carolina, severely criticized the National Institutes of Health for its manner of overseeing the use of extramural funds (Science, June 7, 1963). Fountain's conclusions stampeded NIH into issuing a grants manual that many scientists considered unduly restrictive. And this, in turn, inspired the National Academy of Sciences to make a study of the Government-science relationship, culminating in a 1963 report titled "Federal Support of Basic Research in Institutions of Higher Learning." In terms of the traditional ideology of the scientific community, the most significant feature of the academy report was its diplomatic acknowledgment that the ethical practices of the scientific community were not altogether untarnished.

The Science magazine article directs attention also to the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Government Operations Committee [Mr. Dawson] to get the Executive Office of the President to develop guidelines for Federal support of research, as recommended by our subcommittee. As stated in the article:

> The genesis of the Bureau's report further reveals the widespread impact of Congressman Fountain's attacks on NIH. As noted before, they led to the Academy study. They also inspired the Office of Science and Technology to undertake the comprehensive study of NIH that resulted in the Woolridge report (Science, Mar. 26, 1965). Fountain can also take some credit for inspiring the Academy to a continued interest in Federal science policies, as well as for tipping off his congressional colleagues to the fact that there is political pay dirt to be found in examining the Government's multi-billion-dollar annual investment in research and associated matters.
>
> It was following Fountain's report on NIH that Representative William L. Dawson, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Government Operations Committee, of which Fountain's subcommittee is a part, suggested that the Office of Science and Technology produce some guidelines for Federal support of research.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place Mr. Greenberg's article in the Record as part of my remarks:

Research Administration: Study Urges Universities To Improve Methods

It is never safe to say that decisive power rests at any one place in the vast Federal establishment. But it is safe to say that a great deal of power rests in the Bureau of the Budget. For it is written in the rulebook that this staff appendage to the Presidency has authority to supervise and control the administration of the Federal budget—which means that the Bureau holds a good length of the Federal purse strings. Consequently, anyone concerned with the financing and administration of academic science has an interest in a 141-page study, 3 years in the works, that was quietly issued this month under the Bureau's imprint.

Titled, "The Administration of Government Supported Research at Universities,"[1] the study ranges over a variety of problems. But its principal significance is that, with one major qualification, it emerges as decisively proscience in addressing itself to the historic problems of reconciling the scientists' insistence upon independence and freedom with the Government's insistence upon careful accountability for public funds. The qualification is that, when the academic and scientific communities develop the means for assuring prudent use of Federal funds, Government bookkeepers can reel up a lot of redtape and generally confine themselves to Washington. The study recognizes that many institutions have developed "reasonably sophisticated management systems," but it also suggests that "improvements are still needed," and that in the absence of improvements, still tighter Federal controls may result.

For a long time, it was considered somewhat indecent even to acknowledge the possibility that the postsputnik gusher of Federal funds for research had produced situations in which Government grants were not always applied to the purposes for which they were intended. One of the great turning points in this attitude occurred in 1962 when Congressman L. H. Fountain, Democrat, of North Carolina, severely criticized the National Institutes of Health for its manner of overseeing the use of extramural funds (Science, June 7, 1963). Fountain's conclusions stampeded NIH into issuing a grants manual that many scientists considered unduly restrictive. And this, in turn, inspired the National Academy of Sciences to make a study of the Government-science relationship, culminating in a 1963 report titled, "Federal Support of Basic Research in Institutions of Higher Learning."

---

[1] A limited number of copies are available, without charge, from the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

In terms of the traditional ideology of the scientific community, the most significant feature of the Academy report was its diplomatic acknowledgment that the ethical practices of the scientific community were not altogether untarnished. Declared the Academy study: "We believe that the understanding of the purpose of the Federal support of basic research by the project grant/contract system is not sufficiently widespread in the scientific community. Grants and contracts are given as trusts to institutions for a purpose, which is substantially as described by the principal investigator in his proposal. The investigator assumes a major responsibility in accepting Federal funds and has an obligation to account for their proper use. Acceptance of a grant commits him to a conscientious effort to achieve its stated purpose; he acquires no other rights to the granted or contracted funds."

The Bureau of the Budget study leans heavily on the Academy report, but at many points it surpasses it in stressing the value of scientific freedom as against the political requirement of accountability for government funds. "There can be no question," the report states, "that recipients of public funds must spend those funds for the purposes for which they are made available; diversion of funds to other purposes negates the basis on which the competitive award was originally made. Yet it must continually be recalled that basic research is by nature unpredictable. The phenomena to be studied and the principal research purpose or objectives can be identified and the general approach and methodology can be described, but the results of the research can only be conjectured. Essentially," the report continues, "the funding agencies are betting on the scientific judgment of the investigators they support."

Applying this attitude to a typically thorny subject, that of grantees changing the direction or subject of their research in midcourse, the report states. "It is fully in the public interest for a university investigator to enjoy the maximum practicable freedom within the phenomenon under study to pursue new research objectives, or to discontinue those no longer promising, without jeopardizing" his support. "The effectiveness of his research output is likely to be enhanced if he has this freedom." With a bow toward the accountability requirement, it adds that the investigator should be required to notify the funding agency of such shifts, but that he should be free to continue with his new line of inquiry unless the agency decides that it is unwilling to support the modified project.

Throughout the Bureau's report there is emphasis on the desirability of shifting the details of scientific administration from Washington to the campus, and of providing the means for greater local flexibility in deciding what is to be researched and by whom. Specifically, the report recommends that when agencies are supporting science for the sake of science, rather than as a means toward attaining specified objectives, they employ a new legal instrument, to be known as a "research agreement," rather than the traditional research grant or contract. Whether this would involve more than a semantic difference is left rather fuzzy, with the recommendation that the details be worked out by the Bureau of the Budget, the Office of Science and Technology, and the granting agencies. But in view of the study's support for local control accompanied by more reliance on institutional, rather than project, grants, the "research agreement" concept is full of interesting implications. Among these is the suggestion that one relatively simple, blanket agreement might encompass all or much of the federally supported basic research at an institution, with campus authorities deciding on most administrative matters. The report simply states that "a single research instrument would permit the Government-university relationship to develop strictly in terms of requirements for getting the research done most effectively while guarding the essential interests of both parties." It adds that "agencies would write a covering agreement with the university specifying the general terms of the Government-university relationship, with specific tasks or projects spelled out within the terms of the overall agreement. The terms and conditions of the agreement, e.g., fiscal and technical reporting, handling of equipment, travel arrangements, et cetera, would be consistent with the unique requirements for the conduct of university research and have the simplicity and flexibility traditionally associated with the grant."

The Bureau report makes it clear that the burden is on the universities to demonstrate that they can develop mechanisms that will make it unnecessary for Federal administrators to poke into campus affairs. But, as a step toward this goal, the Bureau also turns toward the policies and practices of the numerous granting agencies and decrees that they simplify and standardize their ways of doing business with the universities.

To focus responsibility and authority in Federal support of research, the report states that agency program directors should be "preeminent on substantive matters involved in the conduct of research." This recommendation does not necessarily conflict with the desire to enlarge local control; rather, it suggests that when the local authorities find it necessary to turn to Washington, there should be no doubt about who has the authority to handle the matters concerning them. The report adds that, while differing missions require agencies to adopt administrative requirements that suit their own needs, "nevertheless, the case for considerable standardization is now a strong one. The complexities of the present system demand a persistent effort to bring individual agency practices under some common policies which are internally consistent * * * and which are coordinated on a Government-wide basis. This would result in the simplification of administrative regulations and procedures and would simultaneously reduce the administrative workload of the university scientist and administrator." But again, with a view to protecting the universities, the Bureau adds the warning that "compromise reached in the process of standardization can result in every agency accepting every other agency's procedural safeguards. This could prove equally uncomfortable to the agencies and to the universities and actually result in less effective management than now exists."

It is something of a toss-up as to whether the Bureau's prescriptions will be more rapidly followed in the Federal establishment or in the universities. Perhaps the most durable characteristic of Federal research policy is that it tends to evolve in geological time. In part this is because of realization that research is a delicate enterprise and should not be subjected to sudden policy shifts, but there is also a viscosity in the Federal apparatus that tends to gum up any departure from the old way of doing things. Charles L. Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has instructed all Federal agencies to get in step with the recommendations and inform him of their progress by October 1. But whether anyone will even remember all this by October 1 is not an absolute certainty.

As for the universities, their inhabitants are by no means of one mind on the issue of whether the focus of power in research administration should move from Washington to the campus. In the view of many people at the bench, the distant tyranny of a Washington bureaucrat is preferable to the close surveillance of the department chairman. Furthermore, for those in and out of Government who know their way around, there is a good deal of advantage in the Federal science establishment being a complicated, haphazard structure, rather than a rationalized organization governed by standardized policies.

The genesis of the Bureau's report further reveals the widespread impact of Congressman Fountain's attacks on NIH. As noted before, they led to the Academy study. They also inspired the Office of Science and Technology to undertake the comprehensive study of NIH that resulted in the Woolridge Report (Science, Mar. 26, 1965). Fountain can also take some credit for inspiring the Academy to a continued interest in Federal science policies, as well as for tipping off his congressional colleagues to the fact that there is political pay dirt to be found in examining the Government's multi-billion-dollar annual investment in research and associated matters.

It was following Fountain's report on NIH that Representative William L. Dawson, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Government Operations Committee, of which Fountain's subcommittee is a part, suggested that the Office of Science and Technology produce some guidelines for Federal support of research. OST concluded that the Bureau of the Budget would be a more suitable setting for such a study, and it was assigned there, but carried out in close consultation with OST. The actual study, involving detailed examinations of the activities of 7 major Government agencies, 13 universities, and 5 private foundations, was performed by J. Lee Westrate, a political scientist who went from OST to become senior management analyst for science, technology, and education, at the Bureau; Benjamin Selfon, in the Bureau's office of financial management; Laurin Henry, a political scientist who formerly was with the Brookings Institution and now is at the University of Virginia; and David Z. Robinson, a physicist on the OST staff. The close collaboration between OST and the Bureau of the Budget points up one of the political realities of OST's existence. OST is influential not because it intrinsically has power but because it has acquired the confidence of the Bureau of the Budget, and when the Bureau speaks Federal agencies listen.

POLAND'S MILLENNIUM

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of hundreds of thousands of residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin I offer these few words of commendation to Poland on its 1,000th anniversary as a nation.

The millennium—the achieving of 1,000 years of continuous identification as a nation—is in itself a singularly rare and praiseworthy accomplishment. Of far more meaningful significance is the record during that period of contributions the people of Poland have made to a better world, including the major role Americans of Polish descent have played in the growth and progress of America. An attempt to record such contributions would be an impossible undertaking, and to try to touch the high spots would almost certainly result in many serious omissions. It will have to suffice to state that they represent every phase of human endeavor—science, religion, the arts and humanities, government, letters, music, the military, sports, exploration, economics, medicine, atomic research, to cite a partial list.

Two of Poland's greatest citizens are forever linked to the very founding of the United States, and will always have a very special place in the hearts of a grateful America. They were the Polish Generals Pulaski and Kosciuszko, who fought for America in its War of Independence. A town in the Eighth Wisconsin District honors Pulaski as it bears his name.

The year 1966 marks not only the millennium of the Polish nation but the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland. The fact that the Polish Prince Mieszko espoused Christianity in the year 966 was most meaningful, changing Poland from a pagan country to a nation belonging to the great family of Christian Western nations within the orbit of Rome.

Today the national and individual freedoms of the Polish people are shackled by tyrannical communism. Within the next few months the American people, by resolve of the U.S. Congress, will observe Captive Nations Week. May the God-fearing people of Poland and of all nations now in bondage to atheistic communism take renewed courage and strength from the determination of the American Government and the American people to never abandon their goal of freedom with justice for all mankind—until all nations shall again enjoy the right of self-determination as nations and as individuals.

POLAND AND MALI

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I sent the following telegram to President Johnson in regard to shipping to Communist North Vietnam:

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I respectfully urge that you consummate no new arrangements for concessional sales to Poland and Mali under Public Law 480, pending congressional action on the fiscal year 1967 agricultural appropriations bill. House version containing my amendment to bar concessional sales to any nation which deals commercially with North Vietnam or permits its ships or aircraft to be so used is now before the Senate.

The Committee on Agriculture has been informed of a possible sale of tobacco under title IV at cut-rate terms financed by U.S. taxpayers. Red-leaning Mali has received one flour shipment and another is scheduled under title I, which in effect are gifts courtesy of the American people.

I hope, in deference to the House which last Tuesday approved my amendment 290 to 98, you will make no new deals until the facts about trade between these countries and North Vietnam are clarified. Poland claims damages to one of its ships in a harbor near Haiphong on April 19 which strongly indicates that country is supplying the Communists who are engaged in armed conflict with U.S. troops. Mali has exhibited strong sympathies for the Chinese Communists and an investigation should be made to determine whether it is trading with North Vietnam.

POLAND'S MILLENNIUM

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the year 966 showed a world which is drastically different from the world we know today. The empires of the Persians, of the Medes, of the Greeks, and of the Romans, had long since risen and fallen into decay. A new empire that was born in Mecca had spread across Africa and up into Europe through Spain and had been stopped by Charles Martel near Poitiers 200 years before. The Holy Roman Empire, which had been proclaimed by Charlemagne, King of the Franks, and which once extended from the shores of the Atlantic to the eastern boundaries of Hungary, had come apart more than 100 years before. A great Christian civilization had risen in Ireland, had spread to England, and had been destroyed by the invasion of the Angles, the Saxons, and the Jutes. Far across the unknown ocean, the Mayan Empire was coming to the end of its greatest periods; and in the north of Europe, in a country located between the Baltic Sea and the Sudetic and the Carpathian Mountains, the Nation of Poland stepped on to the stage of history when Prince Mieszko united all of the Polish tribes and with them adopted the Christian faith. He was brought into the light of Western Christianity by the love of a good woman, Dobrawa, his Czech wife from the Przemyslide dynasty.

For 1,000 years that Christian faith has remained alive and for 1,000 years that nation has endured while other nations have risen and fallen and some, indeed, have passed almost totally from the pages of history. It would be pointless to review in detail the magnificent history of this great country, but I would be remiss if I did not mention some of the great names and historic events of that history.

Two great dynasties ruled in Poland over seven centuries. They were the Piast and the Jagiellonian, and during the time of these dynasties, Poland grew from an obscure collection of tribes along the Baltic to a great and cultured nation, which more than once became a dominant power in Europe. It grew culturally spiritually, and intellectually.

In Krakow in 1364 there was established, for example, the University of Krakow, the second oldest university in central Europe. It is a university that over the centuries has attracted students from nearly every nation in the civilized world.

As in all of Europe, the Renaissance came to Poland. It came in the 15th century and a whole new development in the intellectual and cultural and spiritual world came about in Poland. Under Sigismund I, who was married to an Italian Princess, the new learning of Italy came to Poland and there was a new birth of the arts in that country. At the end of this period there emerged the poet, Jan Kachanowski, whose rich poetry has earned for him the name of the father of Polish literature.

Over the next several centuries, until the 18th century, Poland remained one of the most significant, cultural, and political entities in all of Europe. From the 18th century, however, there is a dolorous history of war and division with all of the tragic consequences which fall from such troubles. It culminated in 1795 when, with the third partition of Poland, the very name of Poland was stricken from the map of Europe. There is a moment in this period, which all of us should note at this time. One man had arisen to fight against the power of Russia. His name was Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko. He became a symbol of the great tradition of Polish liberty. He called the peasants to rise and to march beside him. He issued a proclamation giving the peasants complete liberty. He liberated Warsaw and Wilno, but on the final battlefield of Maciejowice, he was defeated and taken prisoner by the Russians. This great man is the same Kosciuszko who fought at the side of our own George Washington in the great War of American Independence.

All through the beginning of the 19th century, the Polish people fought for independence. They were not given their independence at the Congress of Vienna. They did not achieve freedom in the uprising of 1830. When they rose in 1863, their hopes for freedom were drowned in a sea of blood. But with the defeat of the Russians, in the Japanese War of 1904, a faint hope for freedom was rekindled in the heart of Poland, and finally out of the carnage of the First World War, Poland emerged as a nation once more.

When the German armies retreated from Poland in 1918, Poland was a nation, but she was a nation beset by trouble. The land was ravaged, the borders were undefined, and the new Soviet Russian nation was moving toward her frontiers. Again, war struck Poland, and from 1919 until the spring of 1921, Poland fought the Soviet Union. She became, therefore, the first nation in the world to take up arms against communism. It would be impossible to describe the history of Poland during the Second World War. It began with the treacherous attack on Poland by Hitler and Stalin. It continued with the awful massacre of the Jews in Poland, who were herded into a ghetto in Warsaw and were systematically starved and beaten to death.

There was one terrible moment in the Katyn Forest when 14,000 Polish officers, the very cream of Polish manhood, were murdered; and it is clear that the murders were committed by the Soviet Union.

Even the end of the war saw further Soviet treachery, as the troops of the Soviet Union approached Warsaw. The people of the city, under General Bor-Komorowski, rose against the Germans in Warsaw to take that city and to hold it until the Soviet troops could occupy the territory. Marshal Stalin knew of this and held his troops outside the borders of the city until the Germans could bring up reinforcements to kill almost 200,000 Poles in Warsaw.

At the Yalta Conference, at the end of the war, Poland was handed over to the Communists. Poland was placed within the Soviet sphere of influence and the Communist provisional government was recognized. The same Communist government is in power today.

But on this day, May 3, 1966, the millions of people in Poland must be looking back over their own 1,000 years of history and must smile at their Communist leaders. They have been enslaved in the past and have risen out of the slavery to complete freedom. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they are already beginning to rise out of this new slavery. The Christianity which came to Poland 1,000 years ago is not dead. It is the same Christianity that haunts and tortures the present Communist rulers of Poland. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to determine whether these leaders worry more about the Soviet Union or about the cardinal in Warsaw; and history is on the side of the cardinal.

Poland is a great nation. Any nation that endures for 1,000 years must be reckoned with in the long view of history. However terrifying it may seem to us today, communism is not even 50 years old as a national power. Communism has a long way to go before it can speak of itself in the enduring terms of Poland. Even today, Poland is inching closer and closer to the Western World. She is a nation which is part of the Western World. She may be chained to the Soviet Union today, but the rust is already eating into those chains and I have every faith that tomorrow those chains will break and Poland will once more emerge as a great Western and Christian nation, a nation that was once the first refuge of persecuted Russian Jews, a nation which sent her sons to fight for our independence, a nation which has enriched the world with a deep cultural, literary, and spiritual heritage—in short, Mr. Speaker, a nation that is the same great nation of Poland, which a thousand years of history tells us will endure long after communism has washed away across the sands of time.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again we rise in this hallowed forum to pay tribute to a people who for a thousand years have followed the path of peace and freedom, the people of Poland. This solemn commemoration of Poland's May 3d Constitution of 1791 has become a cherished tradition since the outbreak of World War II—a tradition which sustains the people of Poland in their devotion to democratic ideals, in spite of the heavy yoke of Communist rule, and assures them that we share their vision of returning to their rightful place as a free nation in a free world.

This year's celebration of one of the most progressive constitutions ever adopted by any nation takes on a special significance because this year of 1966 also marks the 1,000th anniversary of the birth of the Polish nation.

The history of Poland is the history of a heroic people, a people who peacefully welded together into a nation singularly united in language and customs an area stretching from the Baltic Sea in the north, across the verdant plains, to the Black Sea in the south.

Though the winters of tyranny at the hands of conquering neighbors have settled upon this land of our forefathers for long periods over the centuries, the Polish people have never lost their spirit of independence. Thus, time after time, Poland has thrown off the yoke of oppression and, like the life cycle of nature itself, risen again.

Fettered or free, Poland has continued to contribute to the cultural, scientific, and intellectual progress of all mankind. The roster is long and brilliant—Curie, Conrad, Chopin, Kosciuszko, Pulaski, Paderewski, Reymont—to list but a few.

The first Poles arrived in America at Jamestown in 1608. Polish generals were heroes of our own Revolution. Almost 900,000 Polish-Americans served in our Armed Forces in World War II.

And so it has gone, down through the centuries—in Poland or in the new homelands to which they went seeking refuge and freedom, the Polish people have never lost that indomitable spirit that has enabled them to give so much to human achievement.

The Communists who control Poland today would not risk recognition of the devotion of the Polish people to their May 3 Constitution. The Communist concept of government has nothing in common with the ideals it expressed: local administrative and judicial autonomy, free access to possession of land and to public office; absolute religious tolerance; parliamentary responsibility. But these are the ideals, the very foundations, of day-to-day liberty, and with them ever in mind and heart, the Polish people, in spite of despair or defeat, ceaselessly search for a better life and the brotherhood of all men.

Across the majesty of a full thousand years, the flame of faith has never died. It lights and warms the heart of Poland today with all the depth and dedication that marked its kindling a millennium ago.

The Communists may suppress freedom of expression, but they will never extinguish it, not in Poland. They may fear and attempt to proscribe the power of the church, but they will never diminish the Polish faith and prayer. They may limit the numbers of us who may visit the land of our fathers, but they will never reduce—no, not even by one—the messages of hope and encouragement that go forth from our hearts to our Polish brothers.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 175 years old today, is not merely a document in history's archives. It is a vital symbol of assurance that one day Poland will again stand in full freedom and independence. Here in these halls, where we so fully reap the blessings of freedom, we must ever be prepared to support freedom. It is in fitting discharge of that sacred responsibility that we dedicate this celebration of Polish Constitution Day to the abiding faith of the Polish people in the ultimate freedom of man.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois, my dear friend and colleague, for a very touching and a very sincere message on this very important and momentous day.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY IN THE MILLENNIUM YEAR

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege and pleasure for me to join once again with my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This year's 175th anniversary observance is particularly significant since it falls during the millennium year—1,000 years of Christianity in Poland.

As the millennium emphasizes the spiritual heritage of the Polish people, so the May 3 Constitution reminds us of the enlightened political tradition of Poland.

The parliamentary system had existed in Poland for centuries prior to the signing of the Constitution of May 3. In fact, Poland has been called a "nation of parliaments" because of its traditional allegiance to representative government and constitutionalism throughout the centuries of its independent existence.

The Constitution of May 3 was a natural product of this distinguished tradition. It represented a historic milestone in the development of democratic processes both in Poland and Europe in general.

Modeled after our own Declaration of Independence and the French Proclamation of the Rights of Man, the constitution of May 3 guaranteed to the people of Poland the rights and freedoms to which men everywhere have aspired.

Based on the principle that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people, the May 3 Constitution granted freedom of thought, freedom of expression, and freedom of religion in a measure far beyond that which prevailed elsewhere in Europe.

It is truly unfortunate that this spirit of cooperation and tolerance vanished when the Soviet-imposed government shackled Poland. The Stalinist extremists inflicted authoritarianism and repression. Some hope for an evolution within this beleaguered country was anticipated after the October 1965 defiance of Kremlin rule. A new Politburo, committed to development of Polish independence of Russian control was elected, with Wladyslav Gomulka as First Secretary. A return to Poland's traditional respect for individual dignity and rights appeared likely. The new Polish leader released political prisoners, including the Primate of Poland, His Eminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. Unfortunately, this trend was not long lasting. With varying degrees a Communist hard line was reinstituted.

As perhaps never before the intolerance and oppressive nature of the Polish regime has been brought to the attention of the people of America and the world in recent months.

The millennium celebration has turned the attention of millions of people toward Poland. The occasion would have provided the present government with an opportunity to demonstrate its belief in democracy and the liberty of the people.

Unfortunately, it has been an opportunity left unused.

Instead, the government has demonstrated its opposition to the deep religious tradition of Poland and has returned to the Stalinist methods.

One important manifestation of this character has been the refusal of the Communist regime to issue visas permitting prominent clergymen to visit Poland.

It is well known that Pope Paul VI was most interested in visiting Poland during the millennium. The government, however, refused to issue an invitation.

Further, a number of American clergymen who wished to visit Poland for the celebration have been denied visas by the Polish Government.

Among those who have been denied entry are the Catholic hierarchy of my congressional district, Archbishop William E. Cousins and Auxiliary Bishop Roman R. Atkielski. They had been scheduled to lead a pilgrimage to Poland, including a visit to the famed shrine of Our Lady of Czestochowa.

Among many others refused visas were Archbishop John P. Cody, of Chicago, Archbishop John J. Krol, of Philadelphia, and Archbishop John Dearden, of Detroit.

It must be pointed out that the policy statement in the preamble of the Foreign Assistance Act makes it quite clear that "any distinction made by foreign nations between American citizens because of race, color, or religion in the granting of, or the exercise of personal or other rights available to American citizens is repugnant to our principles."

The policy statement subsequently makes the explicit point that any nation which acts in this way should be denied assistance.

It is abundantly clear that the Polish government has violated this principle. By denying visas to American bishops it has practiced religious discrimination. This action on the part of the Polish government may bring about a review of U.S. programs of policies toward Poland.

Certainly this would be the case should the Polish Government refuse to allow the Polish primate, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, to come to the United States this fall as previously planned.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last, May 1, throughout our land, throughout the world and particularly in Poland, the millennium of Poland's Christianity was observed. Today, at the Shrine of Our Lady of Czestochowa on Jasna Gora, the people of Poland, with religious fervor, commemorated this auspicious event.

This morning President Johnson, calling together numerous representatives of the 10 million Americans of Polish descent, formally observed the occasion of Poland's millennium and the constitution of May 3. His message, reviewing the cultural and historical heritage of the people of Poland and reiterating the U.S. Government efforts for greater cooperation and understanding, pointed up the concern that he and the people of the United States have for the plight and the future of the people of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the address of the President at Polish Christian millennium anniversary and signing of proclamation at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in every sense it is entirely fitting and proper that Polish millennium celebrations become a focal point for Polish Americans across this great country. As Cardinal Wyszynski himself has said:

> Having embarked upon the great task (of celebrating Poland's millennium of Christian birth), we emphasize these principles:
>
> 1. The 1,000 birthday of Poland's Christian birth is the anniversary of that supernatural grace which has made us alive in Christ; it is from this source that the purely spiritual character of our understanding must emanate.
>
> 2. The fact of our Christian birth took place in Poland. Therefore, it must embrace the whole nation, as also those who carried the faith to other parts of the world.

It is within this context of understanding, therefore, that Polish Americans everywhere find great meaning in this commemoration. While they reach back into history, however, Americans of Polish descent also turn to the future. And as we look forward our combined hope is that the common heritage which binds the peoples of Poland and the peoples of the United States will ultimately result in the building of new bridges of increased understanding and good will.

It is my hope and prayer that in this historic year a tolerance and understanding will emerge not only within countries but among nations as well. Thereby can we hope to build toward a future of peace and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include within my remarks the address of the President of the United States, made at the Polish Christian millennium anniversary and signing of proclamation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT POLISH CHRISTIAN MILLENNIUM ANNIVERSARY AND SIGNING OF PROCLAMATION

Ladies and gentlemen, today is the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity and nationhood.

It is also the 175th anniversary of a document that holds a place of honor among the noble statements of human rights—the Polish Constitution of 1791.

All men who revere liberty, acknowledge their indebtedness to these landmarks in the struggle for individual freedom.

That is why we have gathered today.

Life has never been easy for the people of Poland. Time and again she has endured the unwelcome intrusion of her larger and more powerful neighbors.

Time and again she has endured suffering and sacrifice, only to recover and rebuild.

In all of this, her proud and resourceful people left an indelible mark on western civilization.

Americans owe a special debt to Poland, for almost two centuries ago her sons joined our own revolution and Polish patriots fought under the American flag.

Nor can we forget the millions of Polish immigrants whose personal faith and tenacious labor helped to tame a continent. Our national heritage is rich with their gifts.

This debt, and our long ties with the people of Poland, give us a special interest in her future.

Twice in this century she has been devastated by war. Yet her people have remained loyal to their ancient faith and to the human values it represents. Even as we meet here today, they are meeting—by the hundreds of thousands—at the historic monastery of Jasna Gora. Led by a great Polish cardinal, they are offering prayers of hope and thanksgiving which reflect their enduring belief in God and in their national destiny.

In Poland, and in other countries in Eastern Europe, new ideas are winning new friends. Windows are opening to the world—only slightly in many places, but they are opening.

And despite the severe limitations on its national freedom—limitations that prevent many Polish-Americans from celebrating this day on Polish soil—the ancient spirit of Poland is not dead. Her people still yearn for a lively future in Europe and among the community of nations.

We see this, for one thing, in economic policy.

Poland, and some of her neighbors in Eastern Europe, are sensing the vigor of individual enterprise.

Men are coming to understand that decentralized decisionmaking is proving more efficient than highly centralized state control. Profits are coming to be understood as a better measure of productivity—and personal incentive as a better spur to effective action on behalf of the national economy.

How hopeful these signs are, we cannot yet say. We can only trust they foreshadow a new reliance upon—if not a new understanding of—the individual as the most important element of society.

If they reflect a willingness to respond to reality—if they signal a readiness to sift ideas for their own worth rather than to dismiss them as politically impure—if they reflect a gradual rebirth of reason and open discourse among men—then seeds exist for genuine confidence that things, indeed, may yet change.

For this reason, it is not vain—on this day of great memories—to speak also of great hopes.

Chief among them is the future of Europe.

So vast are the resources of that continent—so important its policies to the rest of the world—so vital its prosperity to the world economy—that Americans ignore the future of Europe only at the expense of peace and progress on both continents.

Men and nations must labor long to bring to reality—

A Europe free of artificial political barriers that block the free movement of people, ideas and commerce.

A Europe secured by international-inspected arms control arrangements that remove the age-old fears of East and West alike.

A Europe of interdependent friends in which the strength of each adds to the strength of all.

A Europe in which the people of every nation know again the responsibilities and rewards of free political choices.

Not because we have treasure to gain or territory to acquire, but because we have common roots and common interests, the United States seeks to help build that kind of Europe.

It was in that spirit that the Marshall plan was offered 19 years ago; it is still the spirit of American policy.

Our guiding principles are these:

First, our alliance with Western Europe—which we believe is in the common interest of all who seek peace—is a charter for changing needs, not a relic of past requirements.

It was—and continues to be—a basic for security, solidarity, and advance in Europe. It remains our conviction that an integrated Atlantic defense is the first necessity—not the last result—of the building of unity in Western Europe—for expanding partnership across the Atlantic—and for reconciling differences with the East.

As we revise the structure of NATO to meet today's realities, we must make sure that these forward-looking purposes are served—and served well.

Second, we believe the drive for unity in Western Europe is not only desirable but necessary. Every lesson of the past and every prospect for the future argue that the nations of Western Europe can only fulfill their proper role in the world community if increasingly, they act together. From this base of collaboration, fruitful ties to the East can best be built.

Third, we will encourage every constructive enrichment of the human, cultural, and commercial ties between Eastern Europe and the West.

Fourth, we will continue to seek ways to improve relations between the people of Germany and their fellow-Europeans to the East—and to move towards a peaceful settlement of the division of Germany on the principle of self-determination.

Fifth, we welcome growing participation by the nations of Eastern Europe in common efforts to accelerate economic growth in the developing areas of the world—and to share in the worldwide war on poverty, hunger, and disease.

Almost 2 years ago at the George Marshall Memorial Library in Lexington, Va., I said we must continue to build bridges across the gulf which has separated us from Eastern Europe. Since that time, we have taken limited steps forward along what will be a long road.

In Poland alone, for example, we have—

Dedicated an American-financed children's research hospital in Krakow.

Increased support for CARE, Church World Services, and American Relief for Poland in their food and medical programs for hospitals and needy individuals.

Reached an understanding between our National Academy of Science and the Polish Academy of Sciences on an important exchange program similar to the one we have reached with Yugoslavia, Rumania, and the Soviet Union.

Invited Poland to cooperate in our satellite program.

Increased by 44 percent in the second half of 1965 the number of Polish visitors who come to the United States for academic, scientific, and technical purposes.

Increased by more than $200,000 the sale in Poland of American books, newspapers, plays, motion pictures, and television programs. Our international media guarantee program with Poland is the largest in the world.

These are small steps. But, as Cicero once said, "the beginnings of all things are small." From these we will take other steps to help revive the intellectual, commercial, and cultural currents which once crisscrossed Europe—from London to Budapest, Warsaw to Paris, Frankfurt to Krakow, Prague to Brussels.

As one additional step—and as I pledged in my state of the Union message—I am today instructing the Secretary of State to send to the Congress legislation making it possible to expand trade between the United States and Eastern Europe.

The intimate engagement of peaceful trade—over a period of time—can influence Eastern European societies to develop along paths favorable to world peace. After years of careful study, the time has come now to act.

With these steps we can help gradually to create a community of interest, a community of trust, and a community of effort. Thus will the tide of human hope rise.

It is a good occasion that brings us here today.

In issuing this proclamation, I am asking all Americans to join in the observance of historic events which have inspired man's long walk on earth.

May we draw new resolve, even now, from the Polish millennium and Constitution Day.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with my colleagues in this observance of Poland's two great anniversaries: the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, and the millenium of Christianity in that country.

These milestones in Polish history are being celebrated today through the width and breadth of Poland. But they also have great meaning for the millions of men and women of Polish ancestry who live in the United States and in other parts of the world. And for this reason, these anniversaries are being commemorated in the halls of Congress, in my State, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and in other areas of our country.

I think it is fitting that we use this occasion to express our warm regard and admiration for the people of Poland whose courage in times of crisis—whose devotion to their faith—whose love of freedom and allegiance to the democratic principles embodied in their constitution of May 3, have characterized their nation's progress through some very difficult and, indeed, tragic times.

Last year, it was my privilege to head a group of members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who, together with other Members of Congress and officials of the executive branch, traveled to Poland to dedicate the American Research Hospital for Children in Krakow. On that occasion, I had an opportunity to witness in person, the enduring spirit of the Polish people and their great affection for our country.

For one who has come in contact over the years with many persons of Polish ancestry, this was a warm and rewarding experience. For I found that in spite of the ideological differences which divide us today, in spite of the fact that they have lived some 20 years under a Communist government, the people that I met in Poland possessed all the great qualities of humanity, generosity, and love of freedom, which I encountered time and again among my friends and constituents of Polish ancestry.

And I found also that the traditional feeling of friendship—a sentiment that dates back to General Pulaski's and General Kosciuszko's gallant participation in our War of Independence—I found that this friendship for the American people is still very much alive among the Polish people.

On our part, we have tried to reciprocate those feelings. In recent years, when the political climate in Poland changed somewhat, we have tried to give them tangible expression. The Children's Hospital which I mentioned earlier, and which was conceived and carried out as a gift from the American people to the children of Poland, is an instance in point. Our CARE and related food programs provide another example. And President Johnson's statement this morning, which added to his earlier comments about the policy of building bridges, is still another.

As we commemorate the past and honor the 1,000 years of Polish heritage, we must also look to the future—to the day when the people of Poland, secure in the full exercise of freedom, will once again resume the total range of normal economic, social, and cultural relations with their traditional friends to the West.

Looking to that day, I am sorry to see some clouds hovering over the horizon.

A few moments ago, one of my distinguished colleagues made reference to the apparent delays and difficulties encountered by certain American citizens desiring to travel to Poland for the purpose of participating in the millennium celebration.

I have heard similar reports previously and they trouble me. We have made progress in recent years in lowering the Iron Curtain which divided Europe in two. We would hate to see that curtain raised again. Such a development could only reverse the tendency toward more open societies, more normal contacts between Eastern and Western Europe.

Further, we in the United States believe in the individual's right to freedom of travel, so long as this right is exercised in such a way that it does not jeopardize national security and public welfare. And, as mentioned previously, the Congress has declared that any discrimination against American citizens because of race, color, or religion, is repugnant to our principles. It would, therefore, be of some concern to us if a particular group of American citizens were denied entry into Poland because of their religious affiliation or position.

I hope that this matter will be worked out, so that the people of Poland—and their friends abroad—may proceed with the observance of an anniversary which is of considerable significance to many in the Western World.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 1, the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, addressed the Polish Constitution commemoration in Chicago. His inspired and inspiring words express, I think, what we are trying to say here today in celebration of Polish Constitution Day, and I commend them to your careful reading.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the remarks of the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The remarks referred to follow:

I feel privileged indeed to join with the Polish National Alliance, in this observance of Constitution Day and of one thousand years in the life of the Polish nation. To me it is highly appropriate that my participation in this event should be in Chicago, because it is the city in which I was born and grew up—so that I know at first hand how tremendous a part Americans of Polish origin and culture have played in the life and growth of this great city.

That this commemoration should take place—and others like it in many places where Americans like yourselves remember their Polish heritage—is to my mind entirely fitting and proper, and in keeping with the genius of American life. In saying this I speak as one who has always believed passionately in pluralism as one of the foundations of our Nation. To me, like Justice Brandeis, the true test of an American is this: that he does not conceal but affirms his origin; he is proud of whatever it may be; he wears his difference not as a cause of offense to others but as a contribution to the wonderful richness of our country's culture. In the plurality and mutual tolerance of American culture lies one of the great secrets of our strength, and of the freedom which we so proudly profess to the rest of the world.

Some of you may remember that moment of inspiration when President Franklin D. Roosevelt, many years ago, addressed a group of patriotic ladies who were very proud that their ancestors had all come to America in colonial times, and he started his speech with the words: "Fellow immigrants!" It is a greeting that would be appropriate for 99 percent of the American people, and it doesn't much matter whether we are 1 generation or 10 generations away from the old country. The rich cultural diversity of our Nation is a joy and strength to us, and has given new meaning to our national motto, "E Pluribus Unum."

Politically, of course, we are solely American citizens. There should be no place at the polls for Polish-Americans, German-Americans, Jewish-Americans, Catholic- or Protestant-Americans or any other hyphenated kind of Americans. But there is room, and indeed a profound need, for the culture and spiritual heritage of all those whose ancestors came from the Old World to the New. These many strands are all woven into the American tradition.

When we think of America's devotion to liberty we remember what all of us learned in school about the participation in our own Revolutionary War of Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who came to fight in Washington's army because their love of liberty could not be confined to Poland—it was universal. Then, if we have studied a little more history, we may remember Poland's own centuries-long struggle to establish and maintain her national independence against more powerful neighbors. We remember the brief success of the Polish Republic under the beloved Paderewski. Then we know how tragically in our own time the struggle had to be renewed when Poland was invaded and occupied and World War II began. And we do not forget that in the dark days of Poland's underground resistance to Hitler's brutal occupation, the Polish and American nations were once again allies in the battle for freedom.

The freedom we cherish, of course, is by no means confined to the political sphere. Freedom as we conceive it is basically a matter of the spirit; and it is no coincidence that the struggle for political freedom and the struggle for religious freedom have so often gone hand in hand down through history.

Particularly is this the case throughout the history of communism, with its militant antireligious bias. Wherever communism has come to power, militant atheism is preached and very often, forcibly imposed. Poland has been a notable example of resistance to this policy, for there the Catholic faith is so widely and strongly established that the political authorities have had to treat it with respect. Indeed, for 20 years a great part of the Polish people, living under a Communist regime they never chose, have drawn their spiritual strength very largely from their ardent Catholic faith, and from the magnificent, outspoken courage of their great primate, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. It is truly wonderful news that Cardinal Wyszynski plans to visit several cities of the United States in this year of the Polish millennium, and to share in its observance with Americans of Polish origin—and indeed with all American friends of Poland.

Americans and Poles alike will rejoice in Cardinal Wyszynski's visit, not only because of the ancient friendship of our two nations, but because it would appear to be a good augury for greater religious freedom, and indeed every kind of freedom, not only in Poland but also perhaps in other countries of the Soviet bloc. I doubt that any of us would have dared to predict, a short 10 years ago, that such a pilgrimage would so soon become possible.

Yet today we can believe it, because this is but one of many signs of the dawning of new and more hopeful relationships between Eastern Europe and the West.

For a decade after the end of World War II, the channels through which the Poles had maintained historic and beneficial ties with the West were virtually shut. Then, 10 years ago next October, the suppressed aspirations of the Polish people came to the surface with such force that steps were taken to liberalize the political and economic regime. It is no accident that, at the same time, the Polish authorities began to reopen the age-old lines of communication with the West.

We responded to these steps, and our response was designed to bring about further and faster progress in the same direction.

Under the food-for-peace program, American voluntary agencies have been distributing American food products in Poland to schoolchildren, hospitals, and the elderly. With Polish currency earned from the sale of these agricultural commodities—and with the help of private American initiative—the United States has built the most modern hospital facility in Eastern Europe. This institution, a research hospital for children in Krakow, was dedicated last December in the presence of 13 distinguished Members of Congress, some of whom are with us today. We are proud of this hospital and the services it will render. We hope to do more in this and other useful fields.

We have encouraged the development of a stable commercial trade relationship between our two countries. Since 1960 Polish exports to the United States have enjoyed the same tariff treatment that we accord to nearly all our other trading partners. The value of goods exchanged now regularly exceeds $100 million each year, and we hope it will be possible to increase this exchange.

Since 1956, the Polish people have also been permitted a little more freedom in the international exchange of news and ideas. Western radio broadcasts are no longer jammed. The Voice of America is enjoyed daily in Poland by thousands. Since 1959, Ameryka magazine, an illustrated Polish-language periodical produced by the U.S. Information Agency, has been sold and read avidly throughout Poland. In return, the magazine Poland is on sale on American newsstands.

In the field of cultural exchange, hundreds of Polish scholars and scientists have studied or lectured at American universities. Polish students study American literature and learn English from American professors in Krakow and Warsaw. Polish audiences have applauded American symphony orchestras and Olympic athletes, while we have enjoyed Polish dance groups. Later this year, a Chicago museum will display some of the artistic treasures of Poland's past.

Restrictions on travel have been eased. More than 7,000 Poles now come to the United States each year as immigrants. Thousands more have visited us, including undoubtedly many of your relatives. And many of you, I am sure, have been to Poland.

All these are examples of what President Johnson has in mind when he speaks of building bridges to the countries of Eastern Europe. We are seeking to build these bridges not because we approve of communism—but, on the contrary, because we know that in an open encounter between communism and our own free society, we have nothing to fear.

We welcome this liberalization which has been taking place in Eastern Europe, and the assertion of national independence which first manifested itself in Yugoslavia and Poland. We regard this as a healthy development, and we are not surprised to see it occur in the light of the strong spirit of nationalism that has characterized Poland and the other countries of Eastern Europe through all their long history.

It was Khrushchev himself who challenged the West to a peaceful and open competition between his system and ours; and his successors have spoken in similar terms. Rather than reject this challenge as insincere, we have chosen to take it at face value and challenge the other side to demonstrate that they mean what they say. On this basis we continue to propose the greatest practicable degree of open exchange of people, information, culture, and ideas. Thereby we seek to foster the gradual growth of more open and more tolerant societies in place of the rigid, monolithic regimes of the past.

In following this strategy we are, I am convinced, true to our own best traditions of freedom and to our own best interests. There was a time not very long ago, as all of us know, when it seemed all too possible that the all-out hostility of Stalin's Communist empire against the West might lead to still another tragic war. We must be vigilant still, because that danger is not altogether past—but it has receded. And it is likely to recede still further as more and more of the dark places of Communist ideology are opened up to the light of free exchange and free debate.

It is not a rapid and even progress that we can look forward to. In all likelihood it will continue to be slow, uneven, and often frustrating. But when there is hope of righting old injustices not by the lightning blows of war but by the slow methods of peace, then surely, as the old saying goes, "the longest way round is the shortest way home."

You may remember the fable of Aesop in which the sun and the wind argue as to which of them can take a man's coat off. The harder the wind blows, the harder the man hugs his coat around him; but the man himself takes off his coat in the heat of the sun.

Perhaps Sir Winston Churchill had this truth in mind when he said: "Let there be sunshine on both sides of the Iron Curtain and if ever the sunshine should be equal on both sides, the curtain will be no more."

When that time comes, as ultimately it must, no nation will rejoice more than the United States. The peoples of Eastern Europe are kindred to millions of Americans; and it is our fervent desire that the sun of freedom which shines so brightly on our own land should shine equally on them—and indeed on all the peoples of the world.

Particularly today, on Constitution Day in the thousandth year of Polish history, we cherish this hope for Poland. For only as freedom becomes part of the daily life of the Polish people can the word "millennium" take on its fullest meaning.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the observance of Polish Constitution Day in Chicago on Sunday last, Mr. Charles Rozmarek, the president of the Polish National Alliance and the Polish American Congress, drawing upon the experience of the past, urged us to greater action in behalf of freedom in the future. His thoughts were forcefully expressed, and I should like to include excerpts from his address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it so ordered.

There was no objection.

Excerpts From Speech by Charles Rozmarek, President of the Polish National Alliance and of the Polish-American Congress, Delivered at May 3, Constitution of Poland Observance on Sunday, May 1, at 3 p.m., in Humboldt Park, Chicago

Today we commemorate one of the brightest events in man's struggle for freedom, democracy, and justice. One hundred and seventy-five years ago, Poland adopted one of Europe's most enlightened and progressive legislation known as the May 3 Constitution of 1791.

Evil forces of tyranny, frightened by this Polish declaration of freedom, conspired to erase Poland from the map of Europe. Germany, Russia, and Austria partitioned Poland and freedom died in East Central Europe for 150 years.

Today, the destructive forces of communism, whether they be of the Soviet or the Red Chinese variety, constitute an even greater threat to freedom.

In Vietnam, we are now reaping the harvest of evil for our earlier failure to check Communist aggression in Eastern Europe and in Asia. The capitulation to Soviet pressure to force free Poland and free China, our most loyal allies, to accept Reds in their government led to the triumph of communism in those countries.

It was also a terrible mistake to submit to Communist-inspired Buddhist demands for the overthrow of the Diem government in South Vietnam, which was America's most loyal ally. Since that time government after government has been toppled over in South Vietnam. To capitulate again to the Buddhist demands for a new government would only be to the advantage of the Red Chinese.

The Red Chinese are the driving force behind North Vietnam. The Vietcong forces which are now perpetrating internal aggression, terror, and economic and political chaos in South Vietnam are nothing less than an extension of Red Chinese forces. With considerable technical aid from Russia, they are progressively destroying freedom in southeast Asia.

American advocates of restraint in Vietnam are only compounding our troubles. Don't they realize that our anemic action in defense of liberty in the past is the root of our growing woes? A soft approach to the Communist threat in Vietnam would only lead to the fulfillment of Communist aims; the subjugation of all of Asia, Europe, Africa, Latin America, and the eventual downfall of America.

In a recent television interview, the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, explained that three Presidents of the United States—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson made certain commitments to defend the freedom of South Vietnam.

By 1970 Red China will have nuclear weapons capable of hitting the United States. We must meet this peril head on. Are we going to give the Red Chinese an opportunity to develop bombs with which to pulverize us into oblivion? We will pay a terrible price if nothing is done to immobilize Red Chinese atomic installations before it is too late.

The fight in Vietnam has become an issue of survival. We must stand by our President and put forth all our best efforts to help our Government win the war in Vietnam.

Not a softer but a firmer approach to Communist aggression will end the war in Vietnam and will carry with it freedom and peace to eventual triumph over the forces of evil.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are many sparkling pages in Poland's long and uneven history, sprinkled with greatness and glory, with heroism and gallantry. All these testify to a long chain of events which secure an honored place for the Poles in European and world history. The empire which their great King, Boleslav the Great—992–1052—founded, was the first formidable barrier in Eastern Europe against invading Asiatic hordes. In the 15th century it was King Casimir IV—1447–92—who made Poland a vast empire extending from the Baltic Sea almost as far south as the Black Sea. In the 17th century Poland's King John Sobieski—1674–96—saved Europe from the hitherto undefeated Turks by inflicting a crushing defeat upon them at the very gates of Vienna in 1683. These are only a few illustrative cases showing the importance of the people of Poland and of Poland in the history of Europe and the world. In addition to the brave and heroic deeds of these gallant warriors, the Polish people have also been pioneers in Eastern Europe as political reformers. The Constitution which the Polish Diet adopted on May 2, 1791, as a great landmark even in the revolutionary late 18th century Europe.

As a result of the first partition of Poland in 1772 the people of Poland had lost more than half of their country but none of their national spirit of independence and freedom. Late in the 1780's the presence of a new spirit was felt all over Poland, and nearly all Polish leaders were fully conscious of this. That was the new reformist spirit which manifested itself in numerous constitutional changes. The Great Diet—Parliament—which had assembled on October 6, 1788, was composed of various elements, but the Constitution of 1791 that was drafted and enacted was actually the handiwork of the so-called patriots in the Diet.

This memorable document represented a decisive and definite advance over anything of the same nature yet attempted in Central and Eastern Europe. What the French revolution tried to accomplish in a national bloodbath the patriotic statesmen in Poland accomplished by a stroke of the pen. By this Constitution Poland became a constitutional monarchy. Ministerial responsibility was introduced; the intricate and obstructive features of the old system were swept away and many class distinctions were eliminated. The towns were given administrative and judicial autonomy, and a measure of parliamentary representations.

Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the gentry alone were made available to all townsmen. The peasantry was placed under the protection of the law, and religious toleration was established. Provisions were also made whereby periodic reforms could be introduced and other alterations enacted. Judged in the light of the current notion of full and unhampered freedom, and compared with the long list of present-day human rights, the Polish Constitution of 1791 in this light then, world thought, was liberal and progressive and was a real instrument for democratic government. At once it won the admiration of all true liberals of the day. Unfortunately it also brought upon the heads of its framers the fury of foreign rulers who were getting ready for a second partition of Poland.

Before this Constitution was put into force Poland's greedy and grasping neighbors carried out their evil designs. The second partition of Poland took place in 1793, robbing the country of one-third of its territory.

The autocrats of Austria, Prussia, and Russia would not even allow this amputated Poland to go unmolested. Having only whetted their appetite on the first two partitions, they took one more step in 1795 and partitioned what was left of Poland. By this final and fateful robbery on the part of the three autocrats Poland ceased to exist as an independent entity. But that cruel fact did not diminish the spirit of independence among the Poles; that did not deter them from their goals. They vowed to fight their oppressors for the attainment of their freedom, their national independence. For more than 100 years they carried on their fight against heavy and forbidding odds.

At times it appeared that they could not attain success without effective outside help. Their revolt in 1830 was ruthlessly crushed by the superior forces of their oppressors. The rising of 1863 also ended in a veritable bloodbath. Even then the unhappy people of Poland did not despair; they still cherished their freedom and worked for their independence.

Toward the end of the First World War, as Poland's oppressors were being defeated, the people of Poland proclaimed their independence on October 6, 1918. Then for the next 20 years the history of Poland is mainly one of reconstruction and revival. The new Polish state took its place among the sovereign, independent states of Europe and in time became a powerful force in Eastern Europe. Early in 1939, however, as Poland's foes to the east and west gathered strength, her security was threatened. Finally, when the two rival forces of Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany joined hands in the fall of 1939, Poland was marked for destruction.

During the last war the fate of those brave people was most uncertain, and besides losing all, they suffered greatly at the hands of their foes. Their sufferings did not end with the conclusion of the war. Since 1945 they have been saddled with a Communist regime that has proved just as oppressive as their foreign foes. For more than 20 years they have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny, one imposed and maintained by the Kremlin. On this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day we all ardently hope for their delivery from their Communist tyrants and for the establishment of a truly free and independent Poland, free directly or indirectly from outside dictators.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a thousand yesteryears have passed since Poland's baptism as a Christian nation. Her millennial year is an occasion of worldwide celebration as well as a national anniversary.

The Polish nation is nearly half as old as the Christian era itself. Forty generations of Poles have participated in the development of Christian religious, political and intellectual progress. With Poland's admission into the Christian world she became not only a sentinel on the eastern ramparts of Western civilization but a vital, creative force molding the course of the culture itself. The Polish people formulated the first commonwealth of nations in European annals. Our modern day concept of the brotherhood of freemen is also an ancient Polish political theorem.

During her thousand-year history the Polish nation has experienced the triumph of military victory, of great political, intellectual, and cultural achievements, as well as military defeat, partition, and subjugation. It is to be hoped that her enduring heritage of faith and freedom may serve ultimately to free her people from Soviet domination and cause a regeneration of this once great, powerful and independent nation.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join with my colleagues, Congressmen JOHN KLUCZYNSKI, ROMAN PUCINSKI, and CLEM ZABLOCKI, and all the Members of Congress, in commemorating the millennium anniversary of the founding of Poland as a nation. I am happy to salute the people of Poland on this occasion for their courage and their indomitable spirit in nourishing and cherishing the ideals of liberty, for which they are so justly known.

The people of Poland have suffered domination by many nations in these 1,000 years—but through the severest adversities, they have persevered and their belief in the dignity of man has remained unquenchable. Today the people of Poland are under the heel of a Communist regime; and that dictatorial government continues to attempt to throttle communication between the citizens of Poland and the West. Travel from Poland is greatly restricted, and every effort is made to stifle any bonds of friendship with the West which most of the Polish people would like to nurture and expand.

As we all know, the Polish people, through these centuries, have made many significant contributions to the advancement of mankind and the enrichment of man's life on earth—in the areas of science, art, music, political leadership, military leadership, literature, and other spheres, Poland has produced giants, and the world has been enriched by their good works.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the people of Poland will soon be able to enjoy once again the freedom and liberty which they so richly deserve. On this occasion, I am happy and proud to salute them.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, throughout the world, people of Polish descent are observing the 175th anniversary of Poland's Constitution of freedom adopted May 3, 1791. But the year 1966 has greater historic significance for Poles everywhere for it marks the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland. It was in the year 966, during the reign of Prince Mieszko I of the Piast Dynasty, that Christian faith was accepted by the people of Poland. It was the beginning of a new culture to a nation that was already politically and militaristically mature. It was an era of reform for the Poles of the 10th century, and by this action, Poland took the lead in Eastern Europe toward the development of civilization that was practiced by the progressive European nations to the west. In starting this new life, Poland became the influence and inspiration for other Eastern European nations to seek their rightful place in a growing world.

Since converting to Christianity, the history of Poland has been a series of struggles to remain independent and self-governing. Through all of these years of development the Polish people have never become discouraged to give up this fight. It is a part of Poland's tradition and even today, while under the influence of communistic rule, the Poles have not lost sight of their strong desire to release themselves from the bonds of tyranny and once again emerge as an independent, self-governing nation.

Many words have been written about Poland's plight since its emergence as a Christian nation. I could speak for hours about the hardships the Polish people have faced in their struggle for liberty and justice; a struggle that is still going on today. But in observing the millennium of Christianity in Poland and the anniversary of a Constitution adopted in 1791, insuring equal rights for all its citizens, we cannot recognize the meaning of Poland's purposes by merely recognizing the events of its history. It is only by carefully analyzing Poland's history that makes us realize that freedom is the most precious privilege being sought by the Poles.

Poland has continued to develop and progress since it adopted Christianity. It has become a nation of strongly dedicated people, who obtain their strength from their Christian belief. It is this strength that has enabled them to resist their enemies, who have sought to force their own will upon them and break their spirit. And it is through religious faith that the people of Poland today continue to resist their political enemies.

This significant fact is one reason why liberty and justice will never completely succumb to tyranny. It may be suppressed for periods of time, as Poland's history indicates, but a civilized world can only remain civilized by the rights granted by freedom and through religious faith, no matter how it is practiced. Without these conditions an individual's ambitions are suppressed and there is no incentive for social and cultural development. As Daniel Webster said:

> Whatever makes men good Christians, makes them good citizens.

So civilization is the sum total of freedom and Christianity.

Because Poland has been and still is the anchor for independence in Eastern Europe, we, in the United States, must continue to encourage the Poles to achieve self-determination. Their defiance of Soviet domination gives courage to the other oppressed nations. As long as the people of the Balkan countries—Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria—know that the Polish people have not completely given in to the Soviets, they, too, will defy the Soviets and keep them off balance in seeking to rule the world.

Communism is the form of government under which these people are forced to live, but it is not the idealism under which they want to live. As long as they continue to resist complete control of their lives, the torch of freedom will continue to glow in the world, and will become brighter with each passing day.

We, in the free world, have never experienced the fate of the people of Poland. Since becoming a free nation we have been privileged to live as we desire. We are secure against unreasonable searches and seizures of our persons, houses, papers, and effects. We enjoy the right to choose our representatives in government. We can petition the Government for a redress of grievances. No one can forcibly suppress our religious desires, nor how we choose to worship. We educate our children to enjoy what freedom has to offer and all we ask in return is to support, protect, and defend our way of life.

Our vast majority of citizens today have been born and raised under these conditions and they have become commonplace in our lives. As a mighty nation we have security in knowing we can defend ourselves against our enemies. Therefore, we have a tendency to become complacent to the dangers of tyranny, because we have not experienced them and can feel smug and comfortable in our own backyard.

But defense against tyranny, which is communism, should not be our only goal. Not only must we contain communism from spreading its evils over the world, we must seek to weaken its position by encouraging those people under its control to resist the strong-arm rule by which it exists.

Observing the Polish millennium of Christianity and the freedom that Poland once enjoyed gives hope to the people subjected to communistic slavery. By encouraging the spirit and faith of the Polish people to continue to work for their freedom we strengthen the cause of liberty throughout the world. It is through unity of purpose for individual freedom that will one day bring peace in the world, for no atheistic force is strong enough to control human destiny. Through hope and prayer the free world will survive.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, before noon today I had the distinct honor and privilege of going to the White House at the invitation of President Lyndon B. Johnson to witness him sign a proclamation entitled "Commemoration of Poland's National and Christian Millennium." The ceremony took place in the Rose Garden and was attended by Members of Congress of Polish ancestry, and those of us who went to Poland last December to attend the dedication of the magnificent new children's hospital in Prokocim, a suburb of Krakow, built by American counterpart funds authorized by Congress.

Today, May 3, the people of Poland are commanding much of the world's attention as they observe two of the most significant events in Polish history. One is the millennium in which 1,000 years of allegiance to the Christian faith is commemorated. This is a most remarkable accomplishment and one in which the people of Poland justly deserve the plaudits of the rest of the world for tenaciously clinging to their Roman Catholic faith despite partition, occupation by foreigners, and persecution. The other event is the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, which students of Polish affairs have long considered one of the most important documents in Polish history.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly commendable that Members of the Congress and thousands of American citizens have expressed congratulations to the people of Poland as they observe these two wonderful achievements.

It was under the leadership of Mieszko I that Poland adopted the Roman Catholic faith which has characterized it since the year 966. Even today the Polish people have refused to let foreign Communist ideologies divert her from allegiance to the Christian faith which has sustained her through so many trials. And despite restrictions imposed by the Communist-dominated Polish Government in preventing His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, and members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, from journeying to Poland for this religious celebration, the Polish people today gathered at the Shrine of Our Lady of Czestochowa for solemn ceremonies conducted by the Roman Catholic Primate of Poland, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, in commemoration of the Millennial Year of Christianity in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, Poland can look with pride at the anniversary of the May 3 Constitution which was a landmark in Polish history. Its attempt at broadening the political base and allowing for a more workable government is a genuine tribute to the leadership which recognized its responsibility to the people. Despite the fact that Russia did not look kindly on a strong and stable Poland, the King adopted the document, and on May 3, 1791, it was presented to the people. Leaders from all over Poland and throughout much of the world praised the document and expressed support for it. Unfortunately, Russia undertook to crush the country before the Constitution had been given a fair chance to operate. In 1792, Russian soldiers invaded Poland and in a few months the King was forced to abrogate the Constitution. This was but one of the many times Russia has intervened into Polish affairs to prevent any semblance of a stable and progressive Poland.

But despite the burden of a Communist government, today the people of Poland can look back with pride at achievements which few countries can claim. It is, indeed, an honor for me to extend best wishes to the people of Poland as they gather to observe these events. I earnestly hope for the day when the goals of an independent and free Poland will be realized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have occasion in this House to give attention to a good many anniversaries, ceremonies, and events. We have occasion today to help celebrate an extraordinary event—the Polish millennium.

The millennium, for the people of Poland, is both nationalistic and religious. The day chosen for the act of recognition is May 3.

One thousand years ago, to put it briefly, Poland became both a nation and a forerunner in what we call the Western community of nations.

It was not at that time a democracy in our modern understanding of the term. But it had crossed a great divide. It had made the decision on its future that enabled it, in the fullness of time, to stand up and be counted with the democracies as they emerged.

A thousand years ago when Poland joined the company of those who built democracy, the British nation had barely begun its modern history. It was exactly 100 years before William the Conqueror and his Normans moved into the great island kingdom.

The Poles were a nation—a Western-oriented nation—six centuries and more before our own continent was moved out of the stone age.

We must not make a mistake about the present situation of Poland. It is undeniably within what is called the Soviet Zone. But its people are not battered and beaten down and surrendered. They are still part of the Western community. Their history is a remarkable chapter in the common heritage we share.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, Polish Constitution Day, I join with my colleagues in the House to salute the Polish millennium. Nineteen sixty-six marks the 1,000th anniversary of the coming of Christ to Poland.

To understand the indomitable spirit of the Polish—a spirit which has survived 1,000 years of persecution in its stubborn defense of freedom and human dignity—one must study the past. For it is in her magnificent and majestic past that one can gain an insight into Poland's hopeful future.

If history is any teacher, and I believe it is, we can see why Poles throughout the world, in observing the 1,000th anniversary of the coming of Christianity to Poland, are confident in predicting a revival of her past glory and a restitution of her Christian freedom and the resumption of her historic role as humanist and defender of man's right to control his destiny.

In the veins of her children, ten centuries strong, flows the blood of a proud people who stubbornly refuse to compromise with tyranny.

Poland's history is a beautiful chronicle of endurance against man's inhumanity towards his fellow man.

Poland's inspiring Constitution of May 3, 1791, was patterned after the American Revolutionary spirit. Its provisions for placing the peasants under the protection of the law, for abolishing completely their serfdom, and for providing freedom of worship proved too dangerous to Poland's neighbors, who held human dignity in contempt. It was this very yearning for men to be free that provoked the most barbaric partition of Poland and her extinction from the European map for more than a century.

But her spirit refused to die.

The story of Poland is an Odyssey of a heroic people who have inspired man in his struggle for survival for 1,000 years.

It begins in 966, when the first historically known king of Poland, Mieszlo, received the sacrament of baptism. Along with him all the tribes forming the nucleus of the Polish nation were converted to the Christian faith.

It was with the advent of Christianity and the introduction of Western European civilization that Poland entered the political arena of Europe's sovereign states.

Poland ultimately found herself to be the easternmost outpost of Roman culture. It was, at the same time, the Slavic country most exposed to the West and thus most vulnerable to German encroachment. Poland had to play an open and frequently helpless role repelling aggressive forces.

Under these conditions, it was apparent that only a very powerful nation, or one blessed with an exceptionally strong spirit of independence, could possibly survive. The amazing fact is that Poland, as a state, lost its independence for over 123 years as a result of partitioning by Prussia, Austria, and Russia.

Nevertheless, Poland not only survived but preserved her individuality. It is therefore evident that a nation able to overcome such tremendous obstacles was endowed with great potentialities and the ability to develop them.

Through the centuries Poland has written glorious records on the battlefields, and has erected magnificent churches, castles, and dwellings in the face of invasion. Excellent universities flourished, and great literature, music, and paintings flowed from the genius of Poland.

Warsaw, the capital of Poland, in modern times became the symbol of the feat of the Polish nation and its spiritual values. In 1920, during the Battle of Warsaw, the Polish Army repulsed the Bolshevik invaders. In 1939 the gallant resistance of Warsaw against the Nazi invasion was an inspiration to the rest of the world in its fight against the German conquest of Europe. In 1944 the Polish underground started an uprising against the German occupation forces. This resulted in the total destruction of Warsaw.

Today, Warsaw is rebuilt. Not only was a new city created, but the magnificent medieval and Renaissance churches were restored. The people of Warsaw have rekindled their past with great effort.

The people of Poland are not free today. But as we speak in this House today, we are as confident as freemen have ever been that one day, in God's good time, Poland will stand once more among the free nations of the world.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, "Wherever Polish hearts beat, the millennium is celebrated." These words, spoken by Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski a few days ago, should serve as the keynote today.

This is an auspicious week in the lives of all Americans of Polish blood. Not only do we observe the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution but we celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of the year when Poland accepted Christianity and joined her destiny to the West. Ever since, the Catholic Church of Poland has been the sanctuary and the rallying point of nationalist spirit.

When a nation with a thousand-year record of civilized achievement has survived frequent partitions and denials of true statehood and independence, you know it must have a great soul and a great national spirit. Otherwise it would have perished long ago.

What we dream of is the day when the soul will be joined to the flesh—the soul of national spirit and the flesh of national self-determination. Do this and the world will see greatness in the form of a new Poland.

The struggle for freedom makes its mark on a people. The mark on the Polish spirit is patriotism. Having known slavery, the Pole cherishes freedom with a patriotic fervor. The Pole, and the Polish-American, is unashamed to be labeled patriotic.

By our observance, we remind the world of the contributions Poland has made to the development of Western civilization. Moreover, we remind ourselves of the lessons to be learned from Poland's fight for freedom over the centuries.

America's growth was given much of its early push and its continuing sustenance by a great Constitution. Americans should appreciate, therefore, the veneration accorded their own constitution by the Polish people.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 was a progressive document, greatly influenced by liberal movements in England, France, in which it was developed alarmed the and America. Unfortunately, the Polish people were denied the opportunity to live under this constitution. The spirit dictatorship in Russia, just as the attractive example of free spirit exhibited by individual Poles has continued to alarm her totalitarian neighbors down to the present day.

I saw and felt this spirit during my recent visit to Cracow for the dedication of the children's hospital. It is there, ladies and gentlemen. There is a passion for true freedom, just as there was in the 19th century, when there was no Poland except in the memories of the people.

Caught in the fierce vice of Russian, Prussian and Austrian imperialism, the Polish state fell in 1793. Unable during the 19th century to implement their national spirit, Poles took refuge behind the ramparts of nationalism. Unable to express themselves in democratic self-government, Poles found expression in literature, poetry and music. Spiritual development took place in the midst of physical subjugation. To a considerable extent, this is happening today—and the Communist regime has cracked down on poets and writers once again.

One victim of the crackdown is writer Stanislaw Cat Mackiewicz who has written:

> Poland had been a free country and now is in the house of captivity. Sad is the life in captive Poland.

The discontent of the writers is a reflection of the critical attitude of the Polish people toward an unwelcome government.

The people need a rallying point. And the rallying point for all that is dear to Poland and non-Communists is Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski.

As we know, the Polish Communist government, in a naked admission of its own internal weakness, has barred Pope Paul VI from Poland during the anniversary ceremonies. Certainly millions of people would have turned out for the Pope. The regime also barred important foreign visitors during the time of the ceremonies.

The cardinal's tour of the United States is eagerly awaited. What will be the decision of the Polish regime?

If the regime feared internal disturbances on the occasion of a papal visit and feared the contrast between religious and secular crowds, certainly this fear cannot apply to the cardinal's visit to these shores. Americans of Polish extraction, and others, will give the cardinal an extremely warm reception, but the challenge to the Polish Government will not be the same.

I say to the regime soberly and quietly: Do not underestimate the disappointment here if Cardinal Wyszynski is not allowed to come. Do not misjudge the reaction of the Polish-American communities in the 19 cities the cardinal is scheduled to visit, and the reaction of all Americans. Do not take lightly the pressures on Congress such a hostile decision would arouse. Gentlemen, if you do not want your economic, political, and religious problems further complicated, you had better rethink your position. These are the realities.

In critical periods of struggle for the liberty of both nations, Poland and America have helped each other, in some cases with heroes, in other cases with goods.

Kosciuszko and Pulaski, of course, are found in every history book of the American Revolution. On the other hand, it was Woodrow Wilson of the United States who spoke out at a crucial hour, in point 13 of his famous 14 points and demanded the reconstruction of an independent Poland with access to the sea.

A further testament to the cause of Poland in 1919–20 is the courage and patriotism displayed by the 20,000 Poles of the United States and Canada who joined Paderewski in the fight to save newly independent Poland. Think of it. Twenty thousand men gave up their comforts to make that perilous journey in the cause of an ideal.

Like their brothers of 1939, they cherished peace, but not peace at any price. They cherished personal honor more, in the face of heavy odds.

Americans of Polish extraction are "lost" physically to their compatriots in Poland. But we constitute for them a great investment in hope and dreams and ethnic pride. And we do not forget them.

We stand for a Poland free in its religious practices and free in its self-government.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. Since that time, the people of Poland have suffered many national misfortunes, but none have been greater than the conquest of their country by the Soviet Union after World War II.

In the past two decades the people of Poland have been compelled to accept Communist tyranny and all its soul-degrading works. In doing so, the Polish people have unwillingly submitted to a most cruel and inhuman oppression.

The dynamic events of 1956, however, proved to the world that the people of Poland had not lost their capacity to resist an oppressor. The Poznan riots and the upsurge of discontent in October 1956 demonstrated to the world at large that communism in Poland has become a bankrupt system. In a desperate effort to save their regime, the Communists put into power a Communist named Gomulka who understood Polish national sensitivities and could thus take actions that would prevent the total collapse of communism in the country.

It has been a decade since Gomulka's regime came to power. At first, many observers in the West had hoped that this upheaval would have brought a fundamental dislocation of communism in Poland. In one way some of these expectations have been fulfilled: Poland has successfully asserted a type of independence from Moscow that has since become something of a spreading infection, eroding the unity of the Soviet bloc. And we must admit that the Poles have more freedom today than they had in the days of Stalin.

But the fact remains that the Gomulka regime has been and continues to be dedicated to the goals and purposes of communism and that it has used all instruments of power to achieve those ends. In recent months we have witnessed an excellent example of this reality in the actions taken by the regime to suppress the religious celebrations of the Polish millennium. The regime has brought to bear all the power of the state to prevent Cardinal Wyszynski, the Church leaders, and Polish Catholics from celebrating this memorable event in a fitting manner. The cardinal and bishops have been charged with virtual treason and subversion by their invitation of West German bishops, and other church leaders throughout the world, to attend the celebration. Thus far the Pope has been prevented from attending, and administrative action has been taken to frustrate other less illustrious visitors from the West.

This is only one of the many manifestations of the type of tyranny that the Polish people live under today.

However, the Poles are a resourceful, courageous, and imaginative people. I feel sure that they will face up manfully to the attacks on their dignity as human beings.

Happily, the commemoration of Polish millennium falls on the same day as the commemoration of the May 3 Constitution. In the unity of these great events we see at once the traditions that have made Poland and her people great: the Constitution stands as historic evidence of Poland's commitment to freedom and democracy; the millennium stands as historic evidence of Poland's commitment to Western Christendom and Western civilization.

We Americans join Poles everywhere in saluting them on these great historic anniversaries.

In connection with this traditional celebration of the May 3 Constitution of the Polish Nation, and the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of Poland, I would like to include with my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. Charles Burke, Washington representative of the Polish American Congress, which touches upon these two celebrations which are so dear to the hearts of every Pole and of every American of Polish descent.

The letter follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1966.

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HELSTOSKI: Solemn commemorations of Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791 in the U.S. Congress have become a lofty tradition since the outbreak of World War II—a tradition which sustains the faith of the Polish nation in cultural values, democratic ideas and Christian precepts of the Western World and strengthens the will of individual Poles in their homeland and abroad to withstand Communist-imposed travails. Spiritually nourished by manifestations of friendship in the West, the Poles keep the hope alive that their day of deliverance and the return to their rightful place in the free world shall become a wondrous reality.

This year's May 3 observance is of special significance. It converges with the 1,000 anniversary of the baptism of Poland.

By accepting Christianity of the Latin Rite in 966, Poland forever linked her destiny with that of the West and became a creative force in its culture, keeping at the same time centuries-long watch on the eastern ramparts of Christendom.

And there is another vital reason of international importance for making this year's May 3 observance in the U.S. Congress impressive and memorable. As you know, the Communist regime in Warsaw is doing everything within its power to isolate the Polish nation from the West in this millennial year. Visas are being refused to Catholic prelates and other eminent Americans. American pilgrimages to Poland's national shrine at Czestochowa are being canceled. The Communists resort to all kinds of chicaneries in order to discourage tourists from the West. It is obvious that the Red regime in Warsaw is deathly afraid of the influx of Western ideas of freedom and social justice to subjugated Poland. It also is obvious that the Red regime is trying to persuade the Polish nation that the Western World is indifferent to Poland's needs and aspirations.

Our congress could very effectively demolish these Communist sophistries by May 3 and millennial commemorations in both legislative chambers.

The Polish-American Congress, speaking for approximately 10 million Americans of Polish origin, deeply appreciates your past participation in May 3 observances and appeals for your assistance in making the millennial year program in Congress even more impressive and memorable than in the past years.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing concise evaluation of the more important phases of Poland's history.

With highest regards, I am,
Respectfully yours,
CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative,
Polish American Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to digress a little and make some comments on my last two trips to Poland and to the Communist bloc nations.

I have found that in these nations there is rising a new type of communism, unlike that of Russian communism and the Chinese communism. It can be called a "nationalist" type of communism.

New trends are evident everywhere in the transition from agrarian to industrial societies. Economically, there has not been a great deal of change, but there has been a great deal of thought toward an internal transformation which would boost the economy of these nations.

In each country which I visited I heard the same story over and over again, that they are not receiving the trade advantages under the U.S. most favored nation policy and they were feeling the impact economically.

We have no other alternative but to expand this trade to conform with President Johnson's statement, "to build bridges to Eastern Europe—bridges of ideas, education, culture, trade, technical cooperation, and mutual understanding for world peace and prosperity."

In our fight to combat communism, trade can be the most useful weapon which we can inject into the contest.

Throughout the past two decades we were expressing our hopes that someday these "iron curtain" countries would achieve their rightful place in the free world. We now can express this hope in a material way, by expanding our trade relations with them and thus bringing them closer to us and to the Western World.

Under this expanded trade relation, Poland which has always been close to the United States could become a great factor as the pivotal country in the development of this new "nationalist" type of government supplanting communism and thus spreading this doctrine to all the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

With the expansion of these trade relations, each of the nations involved would attain a greater economic posture which could, in the long run, tend to attain better world peace and stability.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy and honored to join my colleagues in observing the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland and also the May 3 Constitution.

What a rich, proud and glorious heritage Poland has left her people—a history bright with courage and a love for liberty that is so strong, it remains the inspiration of the world.

Tyrants have often captured Poland's land, but the spirit of her people has never been conquered—and never will be.

Larger and more powerful nations partitioned Poland—and her independence was lost for over 123 years, but she not only survived, but freedom was regained. And it will be regained again.

Since 966, when the Polish Prince Mieszko espoused Christianity, great progress was made in Poland not only in religion, but in the fields of music, literature, science, art and education.

Some talented Poles have achieved worldwide eminence:

The world will always remember and love the immortal music of Chopin and the moving author Sienkiewicz received the Nobel Prize for "Quo Vadis."

Maria Sklodowska-Curie, born in Poland, discovered radium and Copernicus attained international fame as an astronomer.

Jan Styka's painting, "Golgotha," now in Forest Lawn Memorial Park, Glendale, Calif., is reported to be the world's largest.

The University of Krakow, established in 1364, is central Europe's second oldest university and attracts students from many other lands. And, there are 75 other higher education institutions in Poland, attended by about 170,000 students.

Over 10 million Americans of Polish descent live in the United States and they have enriched this Nation with their hard work, talents, and high character.

Active in governmental affairs because of their deep love for people and democratic ideals, persons of Polish extraction serve at all levels of government, including 1 in the U.S. Senate and 11 in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The valor of Polish-Americans fighting for freedom has also brightened the pages of military history—from the Revolutionary War to World War II, in which 900,000 served. Patriotic, courageous, and heroic, they have always been outstanding fighters.

These qualities, and others, inspired Wybicki to write a song which became a national anthem: "Poland has not perished."

Mr. Speaker, Poland will never perish, because she cannot perish. Poland is indestructible. And, I will never rest until Poland is free.

On this millennium celebration, and the observance of the May 3 Constitution, every American gives their respect, admiration, and love to the indomitable Polish people and their beloved homeland, where 31,500,000 still live and wait in hope of liberation, independence, and justice.

And that day will inevitably come. Poland will be free again.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, 1,000 years ago, Prince Mieszko was born into the Christian faith and with him was born the nation which has become known as Poland; a nation which has served to inspire mankind during these 1,000 years; a nation rich in tradition and accomplishment.

Marie Curie—Sklodowski, Reymont, Chopin—these are a few names that indicate some of Poland's contribution to the world of science, literature, and music.

And, when I think of Polish-Americans, who are part of that potpourri of strong people from whom the greatness of America stems, the name of General Pulaski quickly comes to the fore. Presently, this group of distinguished Americans numbers 10 million, and among the 50,000 members of its intelligentsia, it lists such people as Senator MUSKIE and includes 11 Members of Congress.

These Polish-Americans; and the 31 million Polish people at home can view proudly Poland's role in the history of the world and its part in the progress and achievement of mankind.

Though it is disheartening that the people of Poland should celebrate their 1,000th year of Christianity while subjected to the rule of communism, nevertheless, I am sure that the dark shadow of communism that has so dimmed the land of Poland will not prevail. The strength of its historical past and spirit of its people will one day subdue communism in Poland.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1966, has a special meaning for the people of Poland. On this date the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's Christianization is being celebrated not only in Poland but in the United States and wherever else in the world free men congregate to pay respect to a great nation and her people.

We all have good reason to rejoice with the people of Poland on this anniversary for in this act of union with the West 1,000 years ago Poland was given the opportunity to contribute to as well as share in the benefits and blessings of any Western civilization.

I should like to add my voice, therefore, to those of the hundreds of thousands of Americans of Polish descent and to those millions in Catholic Poland who raise their voices in thanksgiving to God for the blessings of a thousand years. It is the solemn prayer of all free men that in the not too distant future Poland will once again be reunited with the West and take her natural place within the Western community of nations.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, each of us recalls from his American history the aid rendered our American Revolution by citizens of other nations. We honor among our patriots Thaddeus Kosciusko and Kasimir Pulaski, citizens of Poland who gave their services to our struggle for independence.

Kosciusko and Pulaski and all the brave Polish patriots who have risked their lives for our freedom and their own would be deeply saddened by the tragedy of today's Communist rule in Poland. But, they would not lose faith and not cease struggling for a new liberation of the Polish people.

Each May 3 since the outbreak of World War II, the U.S. Congress has commemorated Poland's Constitution of 1791. This is a gesture recognizing the proud Democratic heritage of one of the Western World's oldest, most progressive nations. It is a gesture signifying our faith that this nation which won its liberation from brutal Nazi rule only to be enslaved once again by Soviet expansion will regain the freedom cherished by her people for centuries.

Our commemoration this year has special significance because this is the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's acceptance of Christianity. By accepting Latin Rite Christianity in 966, Poland forever linked her destiny with that of the West and became a creative force in Western culture. Christianity and freedom are entwined in Poland's history and will persist despite Communist persecution.

The hope of Poland is our hope. We were brothers in freedom once; we will be brothers in freedom again. On this millennium of Poland's Christianity, we reaffirm our dedication to the cause of Polish liberation and send our hearts and prayers to the valiant Polish people.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with pride today to observe the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution Day which is observed by Americans of Polish descent and by free Poles everywhere.

It happens this year that this Polish national holiday coincides with the millennium of Poland's Christianity.

It is my great privilege to represent a large group of Polish-American citizens who reside in towns and cities of the Second District in Maine. Thus, I know somewhat of the great faith of the Polish nation and people in cultural values and democratic ideals.

This year's double celebration is marked however by tragic irony in that the Communist regime in Warsaw is doing everything in its power to isolate the Polish nation from the West in this year of celebration. Visas have been refused to Catholic prelates and other eminent Americans.

American pilgrimages to Poland's national shrine are being canceled. The Communists are resorting to all kinds of chicanery in order to discourage tourists from the West from visiting the land of their ancestry.

The Polish American Congress here in Washington points out that the Communist regime might very well be trying to persuade the Polish Nation that the Western World is indifferent to Poland's needs and aspirations.

I raise my voice here to proclaim loudly that we in the United States are not ignorant to Poland's great tradition of democracy and her great love of it and her dedication toward it, therefore, we cannot be indifferent to her aspirations.

Our own American history books are filled with names like those of Casimer Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciusko who served so faithfully in the cause of independence.

The history of Poland, like that of the United States has been of a people attempting to expand the freedom and dignity of man.

The Poles, in their native land, find themselves in a frustrating situation of Communist rule depriving them of the liberties they love so well. We in America, however, recognize their plight and are concerned about their welfare.

We hope and pray, in this time of solemn observance of the Polish people, that they may soon enjoy the liberty and peace they so richly deserve.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is highly significant that the free Poles have chosen as their day of national celebration the anniversary of the Constitution of Poland of May 3, 1791. It is not the day celebrated by the Communist government which today dominates Poland. For the Constitution of 1791—a truly remarkable document—epitomized the soul of a free Poland, the spirit of a people who, remembering a glorious past, were emerging from domination, and were confident of a future of freedom.

That Constitution paid tribute to a noble past. It was designed for a then free Poland. Yet it looked to the distant future as well as to the contemporary scene.

The theme of that Constitution was the love of liberty, the respect for individual freedom—which has been a characteristic of Poland as a nation since its advanced civilization of the tenth century—and the granting of the rights of the individual on the basis of equality. In the preamble is expressed the determination to guard "Liberty and our natural rights—with—zeal and firmness," prizing this liberty and these rights "more than life, and every personal consideration" not only for "our contemporaries" but also for "future generations." This Constitution was, moreover, to be the standard for all the laws and statutes of all future legislatures of Poland. Provision was made for religious freedom, for the civil liberties, for personal liberty, and the guarantee of these liberties by common defense.

It is truly a document for all time. It typifies, also, the enduring faith, hope, and spirit of freedom of the Poles, as alive today as it has been down the centuries.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this year Polish patriots everywhere have two great anniversaries to celebrate. Each year, on the 3d of May, freedom-loving Poles everywhere celebrate the anniversary of the democratic Constitution of 1791. This year they are also celebrating the 1,000th anniversary of the birth of Christianity in Poland.

The conversion of Duke Mieszko I in 966 A.D. is an important date for Western civilization as well as for Polish Christians. For in addition to converting Poland to Christianity, Mieszko's baptism effectively linked the destiny of Poland with that of Western Europe.

Since the date of Mieszko's conversion the relationship has benefited the West as well as Poland. During the last 1,000 years the Poles have made innumerable contributions to the culture and scientific development of the West. Poland has more than contributed its share of fine writers and musicians to the Western arts. Nobel Prize Winner Henryk Sienkiewicz, whose "The Triology" immortalized the wars of 17th century Poland and Jozef Korzeniowski, who is better known to English readers as the great Joseph Conrad, the author of "Lord Jim" and "Victory," are just two of the great Polish authors who have enriched Western literature. Polish history is filled with the names of great composers and musicians, such as Frederic Chopin and the internationally acclaimed pianist Ignacy Jan Paderewski. In fact, Paderewski's personality was so powerful and the Poles love for their musician so great that he was also his country's first Prime Minister when Poland was reunified after World War I.

During the 1,000 years since the beginning of the Polish nation, Poles have also stood in the forefront of scientific advancement as well as enriching the arts. There are few men in history who can be said to have had such a revolutionary impact on the development of modern science as the great astronomer, Mikolaj Kopernik, better known to Americans as Nicolas Copernicus, whose revolutionary conception of the universe placed him over a century ahead of his time and changed the course of human history forever. Perhaps no less revolutionary for the course of science for our own time was the brilliant Madame Curie's discovery of radium, the substance which led scientists up the pathways of the atomic age.

None of this has been easily achieved by Poland. Throughout their glorious history in the arts and sciences, the Poles have struggled to survive against the cruelest possible international environment. Located on a flat plain in the center of Europe, Poland has all too often been the theater of conflict between great powers of central Europe. Even as the democratic Constitution of 1791 was being written—a constitution that would effectively strengthen Poland's national unity without weakening one of the most liberal democracies in Europe—Poland's autocratic neighbors were planning to destroy the democratic spirit before it spread. After a series of bloody battles at the end of the 18th century, Poland was divided among Russia, Prussia, and Austria. And the progressive new Constitution of 1791 was strangled at its birth.

Today Poland suffers under a new form of foreign domination. This time it is the oppression of the colonial empire of Communist Russia. It is to the enduring credit of the Polish people that none of these historical tragedies has either dulled their brilliance nor blunted their faith. Today, as Poland celebrates its 1,000th year as a Christian nation, the spirit of the Catholic Church is stronger than it has ever been. This has occurred despite every effort by Russia's Communist functionaries to effect its destruction. At the same time evidence of the continuing spirit of national unity and democratic ideals among the people serves as a constant reminder of the alien nature of the Communists in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to congratulate Poles everywhere on the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 and the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the strength of a nation lies in the unity and spirit of its people. A thousand years spanning the lifetime of 40 generations have linked the Polish people by a common heritage. Against crushing miseries of war and foreign domination, this national heritage has sustained Poland. It has contributed to the development of a nation that has claimed distinction in intellectual and political achievement.

Polish history abounds with famous names—Chopin, Paderewski, Sienkiewicz, Reymont, Copernicus, Marie Sklodowska-Curie, Pulaski, Joseph Conrad. These names and many more stand as monuments in the world and testify to the genius of the Polish people. They are a part of a people, who have struggled with honor and courage to secure the lifeblood of individual freedom.

On this traditional May 3 Constitution Day of Poland, I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives to commemorate the millennium year of Poland's Christianity. A religious ceremony will be held this day at the shrine of Czestochowa in Poland. We know, as Cardinal Wyszynski has said, "wherever Polish hearts beat, the millennium is celebrated."

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of 1791 marks a most distinct landmark in the modern history of the Poles. It is a constitution which, almost alone in the history of the countries of Eastern Europe, discarded old and antiquated features of governmental machinery and substituted new, progressive and democratic ways. In this respect it was destined to usher in a new, modern era in that part of Europe. At the time it was deemed a necessity by patriotic Polish leaders for their weak, unwieldy and hopelessly decentralized Government of Poland.

This Constitution provided for the curtailment of the powers of the monarchy. The powers of the lower legislative chamber, one elected by the people, were increased at the expense of the powers long held by the upper chamber in the Polish Parliament.

Townsmen were given rights which were denied to them under the old constitution, and class barriers between the bourgeoisie and the nobility were reduced. The peasants were taken under the protection cf the law, thus putting an end to their ruthless treatment by their unscrupulous landlords. Religious toleration was established, and provisions were made whereby the new Constitution could be amended periodically.

In short, Poland was to discard its old and antiquated ways of governmental institutions, and was to embark under this Constitution upon a new path. This represented a great forward leap for the country; the framers of the new Constitution, being energetic realists, did not want to stop at half measures, with stopgap legislation. They meant to provide the country with an as up-to-date constitution as the exigencies of the time demanded, and they were eminently successful in their attempt.

The degree of their success, and the successful working of the Constitution, was not adequately tried and tested. Before this could be done Poland's inveterate and implacable foes seemed determined to put an end to Poland's independent existence by parceling the country among themselves and by imposing their unwanted autocracies upon the Poles.

Unfortunately the autocrats of Austria, Prussia, and Russia were successful in carrying out their evil designs. A few years after the adoption of the Constitution, Poland's independence had vanished, and the unhappy Poles suffered the grievous loss of their freedom. But they were not in despair. They awaited more than 100 years before they could regain their independence and revive the spirit of their Constitution of 1791.

Unhappily they lost their freedom once more in 1939, and since then they have not known freedom and independence in their homeland. Still, they have not given up hope; ever fervently they cling to their ideals of freedom and independence. On the anniversary celebration of Polish Constitution Day I wish them patience, power, and fortitude.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. This year on May 3 the Poles will also celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland.

It is appropriate that both events be celebrated on the same day, for the development of the democratic ideals implanted in the Polish Constitution of 1791 and the growth of Christianity in Poland are complimentary trends. The conversion of Poland to Christianity in the 10th century placed the future of Poland in the mainstream of Western civilization and provided a natural breeding ground for the democratic spirit which burst forth in 18th-century Europe.

In fact, the very development of Poland as a unified nation-state began in earnest with the conversion of Duke Mieszko I to Christianity in A.D. 966. By the 16th century the little kingdom of Duke Mieszko had grown into one of the most powerful states of medieval Europe. Unfortunately, the course of Poland's history since has been fraught with tragedy and frustration born out of its natural setting in the center of the great rivalries of the hegemonic powers of central Europe.

Today Poland suffers under the alien and tyrannical rule of a Communist government foisted on its people by the occupying army of the Soviet Union after World War II. It is to the undying credit of the Polish people that they have not allowed the stifling bonds of tyranny nor the suppression of their religious freedoms smother the spirit of democracy or shake their Christian faith.

On the contrary, the developments of the last decade have shown that the national spirit of Poland is growing stronger every day.

More and more their Communist rulers are finding it necessary to support the growth of nationalism in Poland and to endure the rejection of their secular ideology in favor of Poland's traditional religious heritage in order to preserve the tenuous stability of their illegitimate regime. The Poland of today, thanks to the determination of a courageous people, supported by a long tradition of religious faith and democratic ideals, is already a different place than the Poland of 10 years ago. Thanks to their continuing faith and democratic spirit, the Poland of 10 years hence will undoubtedly be a far different place than the Poland of today.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the millennium of Poland, a country to which the English-speaking world owes many debts.

My colleagues will point out the contributions Poland has made to Christianity, to freedom, to American independence, to science, and to every field of human endeavor.

I wish to mention just one of these fields—English literature. The unhappy geography of Poland, which leaves it without natural boundaries, has for centuries made wanderers of many of that nation's finest sons. One of these wanderers was Jozef Konrad Korzeniowski, a boy who escaped Russian persecution late in the 19th century, and ran away to sea. Jozef Konrad Korzeniowski did not learn to speak English until he was 21 years old. British shipmates found his name hard to spell, harder to pronounce. They shortened it to Joseph Conrad.

The exile from tyranny rose from able seaman to commander of a British ship. At 35, he began writing in his adopted language.

Today, I think it a tragedy that many of my Irish-, English-, and German-American friends do not realize that Joseph Conrad was Polish. The man English literature knows as Joseph Conrad—the author of "Lord Jim," "Heart of Darkness," "Nostromo," and many other superb books—now ranks with Charles Dickens and Ernest Hemingway among the great "English" novelists of all time.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today the world joins in celebrating an anniversary the equal of which it will not again fall to our generation to mark—the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of a civilized nation, Poland.

Although Poland must mark its millennium while under the domination of Communist rulers, its people still feel free and express that feeling of freedom in their observance of religious worship of God.

This deep religious feeling which has characterized the Polish people for the past thousand years began when rulers of the Piast dynasty united the Polish tribes of the Vistula and Oder basins and, in the year 966, Mieszko I, a member of this dynasty, was baptized and, consequently, Poland became a Catholic nation.

Throughout its history as a nation, Poland has constantly been ravaged by wars and rebellions, but the indomitable spirit of its people has resulted in an unbroken history of freedom seeking and religious fervor. Today, while its masters try to enforce godlessness upon Poland and the other countries which they enslave, the Poles continue openly to express their belief in God. While its masters try to quench artistic creativity in Poland and the other countries which they enslave, the Poles continue to express this creativity in their contemporary literature and other forms of art.

In the celebration of their millennium, the Polish people, under the leadership of Cardinal Wyszynski, surge forward to its observance, not only as a national celebration, but as a religious observance to their God, in whom they have placed their faith for 1,000 years.

The history of Poland, particularly its recent history under the domination of the Soviet Union, might well serve as an example to freedom- and God-loving people throughout the world and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call upon all Americans, of Polish descent and otherwise, to take note of this momentous occasion in world history, the millennium of Poland, which is being celebrated today.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to have the opportunity of participating today in commemorating one of the most important dates in the history of mankind: the millennium of Christianity in Poland. While we in the United States are, of course, justly proud of our history and the progress which we have made in the nearly two centuries of our existence as an independent state, there are nations in other areas of the globe whose traditions and history extend back much farther than our own. One of these is Poland, which for centuries was the bastion of Western Christendom in Eastern Europe, and helped to defend that Continent against the hordes which attempted to conquer it from the east.

There is something particularly moving and significant about this anniversary celebration—for it happily combines a religious and a secular event of great moment. We are all aware now that it was 1,000 years ago, in the year 966, that the Polish prince, Mieszko, converted to Christianity and thereupon started Poland down the path to greatness. Assuming a civilizing mission in the east, and entering upon the mainstream of European culture and civilization through its adoption of Latin, Poland created for itself an important niche—not only in the history of Eastern Europe, but in the history of all mankind.

One of the events which contributed importantly to this latter distinction is, of course, the famous Constitution of 1791—whose 175th anniversary we are able to celebrate at this same time. Here indeed is one of the great documents of man—and one whose significance and modernity did not escape the enlightened minds of the time. Enthusiastically acclaimed by the Poles, such men as Edmund Burke of England, the Baron d'Escare of France, and George Washington of our own United States also agreed that it was a most worthy document. Posterity has found no reason to differ with this opinion.

So it is that today we are able to jointly celebrate two of the most significant dates in Polish history. We cannot in the space of a few minutes or even hours do proper justice to the immense contributions which Poland, either as a Christian nation determined to see that the ideals of Christian justice and brotherhood are retained despite the actions of a Communist government, or as a political entity whose citizens have contributed to the civilization of man through their achievements in music, art, poetry, cinema, prose, political philosophy, and the like.

In view of this, permit me to briefly extend my sincere congratulations to the Polish people on this memorable occasion. I am certain that the Communist government which now controls Poland is but a passing thing, and that the two great traditions of Christian and free government will once again assume their rightful place as the principles by which the Poles will rule themselves. It is a rare privilege to participate in the thousandth anniversary of any human institution, and it is refreshing that on this solemn occasion, we can pay our respects to a country that has combined the religious and the secular into a national civilization which is one of the most magnificent of this or any other century.

It is my deep conviction that the millennium of Poland and its people is of great significance to all peoples who value the dignity of man and his aspirations to live in freedom. I join with my colleagues in expressing the hope that Poland will prosper in freedom, and cherish these aspirations throughout its second millennium.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 1,000th anniversary of the conversion of Poland to Christianity as well as the birth of Poland as a nation.

The conversion of Duke Mieszko in 966 A.D. formally and effectively linked the destiny of Poland to that of the Western European civilization. Since then Poland has been a creative force in European culture and a link between Western Europe and the Slavic nations of the East.

The survival of Christianity in Poland becomes something of a wonder when one reflects on the long history of foreign invasions and alien influences to which the Poles have been subjected. Standing on a broad plain in the center of the European heartland, Poland has been ravaged by the invading Mongol armies from the East and buffeted about in the power struggles among the great powers of central Europe. Her survival is all the more amazing for in each instance, regardless of the odds, the Poles have chosen to stand and fight, rather than passively submit to aggression.

Of course, the crowning achievement of the Christian Church in Poland has been its survival during the past two decades of Communisty tyranny. In Poland, as in every country where they have managed to gain control of the government apparatus, the Communists have made the extermination of the nation's traditional religious belief a primary policy objective. In no nation have they been totally successful; in Poland they have failed miserably. In fact, it is to the lasting credit of the Polish people that their faith has grown, rather than died, during this tragic period of Communist oppression.

Despite centuries of foreign invasions and two decades of Communist domination, the people of Poland have held fast to their religious faith and democratic principles. This year, as every year, we commemorate the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 as a symbol of a democratic heritage in the history of Poland. But this time we also have the added pleasure of noting the survival and growth of 1,000 years of Christianity in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to commemorate the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, and to congratulate the Polish people on their 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, by happy coincidence we commemorate simultaneously this year two great events in the history of Poland: The Polish millennium and the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

There is much significance in the commemoration of these two historic occasions. In commemorating the millennium we celebrate the unity of Poland with the West in the conversion of its King Mieszko to Christianity 1,000 years ago. This act had both religious and political significance, for with the conversion of the Polish monarch all of his people were similarly converted to Christianity; Poland was united with Western Christendom, and accepted all the religious, cultural, and political values of Western civilization. By this religious act, Poland would thenceforth be associated with the West rather than with the Orthodoxy of the East, that is to say, Russia and the Byzantine tradition of Greece.

Part of this Western tradition was manifested very early in the adoption of the Constitution of 1791, for this constitution contained the unique ideas and values that are found almost exclusively in the Western tradition of democracy.

It is understandable, therefore, why we in America should join with the people of Poland in commemorating these great historic events: We all share in a common heritage of the West. And so I salute the Polish people and wish them well.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, 1966, is of special significance to the citizens of Poland, as well as millions of Americans of Polish descent. Not only are they commemorating the May 3 Constitution of 1791, but the 1,000th anniversary of the Baptism of Poland.

Few nations can attest to a thousand years of existence, much less of Christian culture, and the civilized world rejoices today with Poland as its proud people solemnly observe the millennium. That the mother country is held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain of communism is a sad fact, but that their spirits are unbroken is a glorious truth. Cut off from their friends and relatives in the free world, restricted in their religious rites and their patriotic observances, the people of Poland look to the Western world for encouragement and fellowship.

I am gratified to state that in the 12th Illinois Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in this 89th Congress, there are many outstanding American citizens, with blood ties linking them to Poland, even as they give full allegiance to these United States. These American citizens come from every walk of life from priest and professor to artisan and agriculturist, from editor and publisher to veteran and yeoman and they have contributed greatly to the progress and prosperity of this Nation.

In their behalf as well as in behalf of the entire 12th Congressional District of Illinois, I am pleased to participate today in the traditional May 3 observance as a sign of friendship for those who work, watch, and wait for Poland's ultimate deliverance.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, each year Members of this House pause to pay tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791 which was adopted 175 years ago today. This year this great day takes on added significance as we commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of Poland.

When the people of Poland embraced the Latin rite of Christianity in 966, the destiny of this great people became inextricably linked with that of the West.

It has been the lot of the Polish people to serve as a defender of Europe against invasions by Mongols, Tartars, and Turks. On two occasions Poles turned back invaders in battles which historians rate among the decisive victories of all time—Jan Sobieski's victory at Vienna in 1683 and the victory over the Bolsheviks at Warsaw in 1920.

The history of this gallant people has been one of great sorrow. Yet, the national character of the Polish people is such that adversity has never overcome their indomitable spirit. Despite repeated conquests and dismemberment by neighboring nations, the Polish spirit remains unbroken.

Today Poland is, as she has too often been, in the grip of tyranny and her government is a creature of the Communist slave empire. The Gomulka regime has done all in its power to crush the Catholic Church and has challenged Cardinal Wyszynski's position as spiritual leader of the God-loving people. Yet, I think no rational person can assume that the Communist masters of Poland will be any more successful than others in the past who have attempted to impose alien ideologies on the tenacious Poles. On this great day it is well for all of us to pause in our deliberations and pray that Poland will again know a new dawn of freedom.

We, in America, owe much to our fellow Americans of Polish extraction who have enriched our culture and defended our Nation in its time of need. It is a fact of our history that whenever a time has come when courage, character, and patriotism are needed, the Polish-American has been in the forefront. Our debt to our Polish-American friends is a great one and all Americans join with them today in the celebration of the 1,000th anniversary of the adoption of Christianity in Poland.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in sincere tribute to the gallant Polish people, who not only today commemorate the 175th anniversary of their May 3 Constitution Day, but also observe the millennium of their embrace of Christianity 40 generations ago. Both their faith and their love of freedom have triumphed magnificently over foreign invasion, conquest and tyranny generation after generation, and throughout their valiant history they have remained indomitable, determined, and dedicated, more strongly than ever, to that faith and love.

It is only fitting that we join them today in celebration of these two great moments in their glorious past, recalling with them the immortal words of their constitution of May 1791:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

And sustaining them in their prayer that justice will ultimately triumph; that the direction of their destiny will once again return to their hands.

It is only proper that we join them in proud recognition of the thousand years of faith which have carried them through unimaginable adversities, and recall the hymn:

Boze cos polske przes tak liczne wieki
Otaczal blaskiem potegi I chwaly.

Przed twe oltarze zanosim blaganie:
Ojczyzne, wolnosc racz nam wrocic panie.

Oh God, who have preserved and kept us
In power and glory for ages past.

We bring our prayers before Thy altar;
Return to us our country and our freedom.

May God soon grant that prayer.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, this is a most auspicious occasion for the Polish people who are celebrating the millennium of their embracement of Christianity on this Polish National Holiday.

I join with my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives at this time in acclaiming the Poles' turn to the West 1,000 years ago. Unfortunately Poland today cannot fully participate in this celebration because she is not free. Further, Poland's jailers have ruthlessly forbidden admittance to that troubled land of church leaders, government dignitaries, and well-wishers from other countries who wished to commemorate this solemn millennium with the Polish people.

I am pleased that the U.S. House of Representatives is paying tribute in this way to the indomitable Polish people who, I am confident, will yet again join the Western community as a truly free and independent nation and will once more actively share its rich political and cultural heritage with us.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Congressman JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, for reserving this time in today's session of Congress to pay tribute and honor to the people of Poland and Polish people throughout the Nation on setting aside 1966 as the millennium year of commemorating the origin of Christianity in Poland.

It was in the year 966 when Poland emerged as a nation. The then Polish ruler Mieszko adopted Christianity as a state religion. Through centuries that followed, Poland's devotion to religious principles and a close national integrity has helped to keep intact the nationality of its people and has given moral strength to Poles everywhere through the centuries of turbulence, strife, and almost continuous battle for freedom and independence.

This year millions of Poles in the homeland, led by the great Cardinal Wyszynski, are celebrating the Millennium Year under great difficulty by reason of curtailments and restrictions on the part of the Communist government now dominating the nation.

This commemoration has not only a religious significance, but also an equally important national and cultural message to the world. It reveals and emphasizes that the Polish people have not given up their fight to preserve Christianity and restore self-government and freedom. In Poland the Roman Catholic Church has been preparing and planning for several years to celebrate the nation's conversion to Christendom 1,000 years ago this year. Religious and patriotic ceremonies on the part of the Polish folks everywhere are scheduled in many parts of this country which will be celebrated today, May 3, known throughout the world as Polish Constitution Day.

The Communist regime in Poland is exerting every effort through deception and power to curtail many public demonstrations on the part of Polish Catholics in celebration of this occasion. Gomulka, the Communist puppet now controlling Poland, has blocked the visit of Pope Paul VI to celebrate the Millennium Mass and is doing everything in his power to stifle religious activity during this 1,000th year anniversary. Visas have been denied to bishops, archbishops, and cardinals invited to Poland for the occasion. The Communist government has gone so far as to stage athletic events, soccer contests, rallies, military parades, et cetera, on May 3 and during the last week of the official church celebrations in Polish cities and towns.

All this activity on the part of a tyrannical government has not diminished Polish enthusiasm during this great year of the millennium of Christianity.

In answer to the activities of obstruction by the Communist government, Cardinal Wyszynski said, "We know that wherever Polish hearts beat the millennium is celebrated."

In spite of the impediments and difficulties during the last 20-odd years of rule by the Communists, the Catholic Church in Poland has actually grown in strength and resistance against governmental impediment and curtailment. Homeland Poland remains 96.5 percent Catholic, but more important is the fact that after 20 years of universal state education, 60 percent of Poland youth still is openly and devoutly religious. This situation has developed by reason of the spirit of religion and Polish patriotism embedded in the minds and hearts of Polish people over the centuries. Polish history is so entwined with the Catholic Church and with religious devotion that not even the Communist tyrannical power can deter its progress. It is astounding to find that Poland, under Communist rule, is today undergoing an intense religious revival.

During the periods in Poland's past history, when the Nation enjoyed freedom and self-government, its people demonstrated an extraordinary ability and talent to progress and expand. Poland was gradually taking its place among the leading nations of the world. Education, industry, agriculture, scientific expansion, advancement in all lines of modern economic improvements took place rapidly when the Nation was under control of its own nationalistic leaders. This progress was so illustriously emphasized during the short period from World War I up to 1939 when Hitler and Stalin, collectively, submerged Polish independence, freedom, and self-government.

I am personally honored today to have Father Valerian Karcz of my home district, the First Congressional District of Indiana, offer the invocation at the opening of today's session of the House of Representatives.

Members of the U.S. Congress on today, May 3, 1966, the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, congratulate Poland and all Americans of Polish descent on the 1,000 years of Polish Christianity.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Congress the occasion of the Polish millennium. On May 3, 1966, the observance of Polish Constitution Day, the eyes of the world are on Poland, and the people of Poland.

While their country is enslaved by the Communist Iron Curtain, the people of Poland feel free, they are God-loving people, and under the leadership of Cardinal Wyszynski, they surge forward to celebrate their millennium, not only as a national observance, but also a religious observance to their God, in whom they have placed their faith for these centuries.

What time is more fitting than spring to commemorate the regeneration of the human spirit and the birth of a nation. What a happy coincidence it is, therefore, that the people of Poland have selected this spring of 1966 to commemorate the Christianization of their country and her formal attachment to Western civilization; for this occasion signifies not only the emergence of nature's beauty, but also the reaffirmation and rededication of Poland to the values and the glory of Western Christendom.

A thousand years ago Poland emerged from the darkness of paganism and entered into the light of Western Christianity. This marked the beginning of a historic development of national growth that has been natural and therefore right. Poland took her place beside the other countries of Europe and accordingly made lasting contributions of Western civilization.

I have used the word "natural" to describe this relationship between Poland and the West because it best describes what has been the character of European development. And by contrast, what has taken place since the end of World War II—the communization of Poland and the division of Europe by an Iron Curtain that has severed this relationship—underscores the "unnatural" situation that exists in Europe today. For Poland is part of Western Europe; her history is one of an evolving natural association with all that we of the West cherish. Whatever measures the Communist regime in Poland takes to maintain a separation, they are doomed by the realities of history to failure.

On this commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution we Americans pay tribute to a great and wonderful people, great in their capacities to contribute to the fullness of Western civilization, and full of wonder in their capacities to withstand the corrosive pressures of tyranny and to maintain their true national image and identity. The hopes and prayers of our Nation are with the people of Poland on this glorious occasion.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in this commemoration of the anniversary of Poland's independence and of the Millennium of Christianity in Poland.

How sad it is that on this great occasion, the people of Poland suffer under Communist enslavement, unable to express the yearning for liberty and the love of independence that has always been the hallmark of the Polish character, and unable freely to worship God in the manner of their ancestors for 1,000 years.

I hope our words will get through to the Polish people and that they will know how fervently we pray for their deliverance.

As in other years, I call attention to my resolution, which would call upon the President to proclaim this day an annual day of observance for all Americans, and similarly issue proclamations on the independence days of other captive nations. This, I think, would have great significance, and I ask that the text of my resolution be included in the RECORD at this point.

H. CON. RES. 71

Whereas the United States of America is dedicated to the restoration of liberty and self-determination for eight hundred million people enslaved by Communist imperialism; and

Whereas there exists in the hearts and minds of Americans a deep sympathy and understanding for the hopes and aspirations of the captive peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate for Americans to keep alive the tradition of liberty symbolized by the historic national holidays of the captive nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States proclaim the following historic dates as days of observance by the people of the United States in their spiritual union with the victims of Communist imperialism and colonialism: January 22 as Ukrainian Day; February 16 as Lithuanian Day; February 24 as Estonian Day; March 3 as Bulgarian Day; March 14 as Slovakian Day; March 15 as Hungarian Day; March 25 as White Ruthenian Day; May 3 as Polish Day; May 10 as Rumanian Day; May 26 as Georgian Day; May 28 as Armenian and Azerbaijan Day; June 17 as East German Day; August 15 as Korean Day; October 10 as Chinese Day; October 26 as Vietnamese Day; October 28 as Czech Day; November 18 as Latvian Day; November 28 as Albanian Day; December 13 as Turkestan Day.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year of 1966 is doubly significant to every Pole. Not only is it the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution but it is also the anniversary of the 1,000th year of Polish Christianity.

Each May 3, as we celebrate Polish Constitution Day, we again affirm the universal fellowship of freemen and the need of all peoples and all nations to overthrow atheistic communism, or any other form of tyranny that a few would impose on the many.

Time and time again, Poland has been overrun by its big neighbors and has had alien rule forced upon it. Unprotected by natural boundaries, it has for many centuries served as a battleground for warring powers and a prize for the victors.

We know the people of Poland are encouraged by our friendship and by our support. We know that the spirit of liberty still lives in the people of Poland. We understand their character and their hopes. We feel, as they feel, the strong bonds between our two peoples. We do not overlook these bonds, and we will not forget them. The cause of the Polish people, as well as ours, is the cause of freemen everywhere who live for the love of liberty.

Our country has been strengthened and enriched by the contributions of Polish immigrants. They have played a great part in our national life from the hardest kind of work in our fields and factories to the higher levels of cultural, intellectual, professional, and political achievements. They have lived and worked for our country, and in time of war they have fought and died for it.

It was because Americans and Poles thought alike that freedom fighters such as Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko decided to come to America and help in the colonists' struggle for their independence.

As our late, beloved President Kennedy said:

> Poland may be a satellite government, but the Poles are not a satellite people.

Our ties with Poland and the Polish people are broad and deep, and they are enduring. America's ties with Poland are with the people—and not with a Soviet-dominated government.

This year over 30 million Poles in Poland and over 12 million Poles scattered throughout the world will celebrate the 1,000th year anniversary of Poland's adherence to Catholicism. This historical event contributed to the spread of Christian civilization well over the globe.

Loyalty to its faith has fortified Poland for years with indomitable resistance to the tyranny of communism in a way to compel the admiration of the world. As it has held fast to this faith, it has served as an example to all nations to uphold Christian belief against ruthless aggression.

Indeed, the millennium of Polish Christianity holds significance for everyone who believes in the dignity of the human spirit and in its aspiration to freedom under God.

Tragically, the past two centuries have witnessed unparalleled disaster for Poland as a nation. But throughout these disasters, the spirit of the people has remained unbowed and unbroken. United by their language, their love of liberty, and their faith, they have defied every effort to destroy or divide them.

It is fitting that we here should continue to pay warm tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past 1,000 years and those who carry on the fight of today. We have no doubt that the sun will rise again on a free Poland when her people will once more be able to practice the national traditions for which she has sacrificed.

The objective of the United States has been—and will continue to be—the return of freedom to Poland and to captive nations everywhere.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a singular honor for me to rise here today to join our colleagues in both Houses of the U.S. Congress, to join the Governors of all our States, and to join with millions of our fellow Americans, in honoring the Polish people for two milestones in their long and noble history.

First, we are celebrating this year, 1966, the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland, and second, 175 years ago on May 3, 1791 the Polish people adopted their now famous progressive Constitution.

The Constitution of 1791, which incidentally never had the opportunity to work for the people, was a daring political experiment that must rank alongside of our own Constitution which had been adopted two years prior, in 1789. The Constitution would have given the Polish people a cabinet-type government with an elected assembly, but more importantly, it would have returned sovereignty to the people. Shortly after the Constitution was adopted the Russians invaded the country, and in the years, 1793 poland was partitioned between Russia and Prussia. Thus ended what the Russians then called a "dangerous novelty."

However, Mr. Speaker, through good times and bad, through dictatorships and anarchy, through unity and partition, through war and peace, through democracy and communism, the Poles have for 1,000 years guarded their faith with passion and love. The devotion of the Polish nation to their faith has brought to themselves and all western man a more noble culture, magnificent literature, a fine civilization, and a vitality of spirit seldom matched; never surpassed.

That astute observer of the American system of government, De Tocqueville, also observed:

> Christianity is the companion of liberty in all its conflicts—the cradle of its infancy, and the divine source of its claims.

Let us hope as we observe the year of the millennium, that liberty and Christianity have a splendid destiny in the future of Poland.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in May 1966, the people of Poland and all their friends throughout the world will celebrate the Polish millennium.

This is a great and solemn occasion. It is, after all, Poland's 1,000th birthday. And it is an occasion that fills us all with a deep sense of pride and affection for this country and her people.

Mr. Speaker, I have entitled my brief remarks to you for this occasion, "The Polish Millennium: A Reaffirmation of Poland's Unity with the West and Friendship with America."

It is, I believe, a fitting subject for this celebration because it symbolizes at once the unity of Poland and America—a unity formed by a common cultural and a common spiritual heritage; a unity sealed by common sacrifices in war and peace; a unity in which each feels a deep interior commitment to Western civilization and all it stands for; a unity made everlasting by a blood relationship that shall always exist so long as both nations live.

POLISH-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

What more can be said on this subject that has not already been said and that you do not already know?

I doubt if there is much that I can say that would really be new on this matter. But this does not detract from the necessity of restating those enduring characteristics of this close and friendly relationship that exists between America and Poland.

It is comforting to all Polish-Americans to reconsider the roots of their heritage in this land of ours.

It is comforting because all feel a sense of just pride in the achievements of their parents, grandparents, and distant ancestors. By honoring our forebears, whatever their national origin, we, as Americans, can all feel an even greater compulsion within ourselves to be a credit to them and to all Americans who have gone before us and who during their brief years on this earth contributed to and participated in the greatness of our Nation's bounty. For we, as their heirs, must now carry forth the responsibilities and tasks of our great world democracy to whom the oppressed of the world look for hope in the future.

I have said that the commemoration of the Polish millennium is a time to reaffirm Poland's historic unity with the West and to reaffirm her friendship with America. To do both simultaneously is not a mutually exclusive task—by no means; for one is the reaffirmation of the other. To speak of a profound bond of friendship between Poland and America is first of all to speak of a common commitment to Western civilization.

"Western civilization"—this is a grandiose and esoteric term, but it is a term, nonetheless, that has much meaning for us all. It is a term that brings together into one idea all those great qualities of the West that Americans and Europeans hold dear—qualities for which many of us have been willing to fight and die so that they would not perish from the earth.

Though Poland is situated geographically in Eastern Europe, it is, nonetheless, a child of Western culture. And both as a contributor to and recipient of Western civilization, Poland has held a place of respect and renown in the annals of world history. This unity of Poland with the West was established 1,000 years ago. In a conscious policy that was directed toward securing Polish national interests as then conceived, Prince Mieszko of Poland alined his nation with Otto I, the ruler of the Holy Roman Empire in the West, married the Czech princess Dabrowka, adopted Christianity for his country, and inaugurated a close relationship with the Pope, giving Poland thereby the special protection of the Holy See.

By these actions taken a thousand years ago Poland was united with the West and hence began the development of a shared historical experience.

What this shared historical experience was I can illustrate by recalling a few events of the past.

One of Poland's great leaders was Casimir III or as he is called, Casimir the Great. During Casimir III's reign—1333–70—Poland experienced a great national revival. In the decades before Poland had suffered from internal division and decimation of its population by wars with her external enemies. On coming to power, Casimir consolidated his royal authority, reformed public administration, judiciary and currency along Western patterns, and among other reforms and innovations promulgated a code of laws known as the Statutes of Wislica. In 1369, Casimir also founded the great Polish University at Cracow which in the later Polish-Lithuanian Jagellonian dynasty became a seminal source of Western thought and influence in Poland. Indeed, in the 16th century Cracow became one of the great European centers of humanist scholarship, Renaissance architecture and art, Polish poetry and prose.

In Stephen Bathory—1575–86—Poland had one of its greatest rulers. Bathory had consolidated Polish dominion over various eastern and western territories, checked Russia's Ivan the Terrible from reaching the Baltic, and among other things reformed the Polish judiciary and founded the University of Wilno in 1579. This university was the farthest outpost of Western culture in the East.

During these centuries, therefore, Poland stood as a centurion guarding eastern approaches to Europe against the barbarian Tatars, Muscovites, and Turks. The world will long remember the gallant John III Sobieski who in 1683 rescued Vienna from the Turks. Indeed, the Poles under Pilsudski played a similar role during 1920–22 when in a victory at the gates of Warsaw they stemmed the tide of the Bolshevik advance into Europe from the East.

The unity of Poland with the West has also been evident in the sphere of culture. Polish culture is distinguished by its 1,000-year-old adherence to Roman Catholicism, for as the dominant religion when Poland became a part of the West, Catholicism provided the conduit for the inflow of Western cultural values into Poland. By its spiritual union with Rome in the 10th century rather than with Constantinople, as was the case with Russia, Poland became an integral part of the larger complex of Western civilization that was then taking shape in Western Europe. During subsequent centuries France had exercised a great influence on Polish cultural development. Henry of Valois ruled Poland for 13 months and then became King Henry III of France. Italy, to a lesser degree, and at times Germany, had also made their cultural impact on the Poles.

The cultural history of Poland speaks for itself. In the 10th century, Polish literature began to develop in Latin, the cultural language of the West. In the mid-14th century, Poland's oldest university was founded at Cracow, and was to become a beacon of Western culture in Eastern Europe. In the 16th century, Poland produced great writers and poets in Mikolaj Rey, the "father of Polish literature," the poet, Jan Kochanowski, and the Jesuit priest, Father Piotr Skarga. In the 17th century, Polish literature had its golden age with Sarbiewski who was recognized all over Europe as one of the greatest Latin baroque poets and was called the "Christian Horace."

In the arts, sciences, and scholarship of the Western World the Poles contributed richly. Such names as Chopin, Paderewski, and Rubinstein in music; Michiewicz, Reymont, and Sienkiewicz in literature; Copernicus and Madam Curie-Sklodowski in science—all are names familiar to the student of our Western civilization.

These are all familiar names to us because Poles and Americans are themselves children of Western civilization. Their mutual identities are unmistakable. For when the Polish people came to America, they brought with them a commonly shared heritage, and in the fullness of their generous souls, they fused all the great values of Poland with those of America.

This great historical development—this fusion of common cultural and social interests—this augmenting of the great values of Western civilization here in America from those rich resources of Poland—all had a profound and lasting effect; for what it did was to establish the foundation for the lasting bond of friendship between Poland and America.

The manifestation of this bond of friendship are evident in two ways; namely, in what Poland had done for America, and in what America has done for Poland.

Let us first consider the Polish contributions.

At the outset I say without equivocation that America can be proud of her citizens of Polish extraction. Ever since the time when the first Polish settlers of Colonial Virginia took up their trade as makers of "pitch, tar, and potash," the Poles have, in ways humble and heroic, small and great, contributed richly to the American civilization.

Every schoolchild in America from the beginning of the Republic until today knows that Poland gave America Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski. Both of these great sons of Poland were soldiers in the cause of liberty, and to the cause of American independence their services, judged by the most objective historian, have been regarded as being worthy of the highest commendation.

The exploits of these two truly great soldiers need no recounting, so familiar are their deeds to all of us. Long have they—their deeds, their ideals, their very beings—become a part of our American heritage, and whenever Americans reflect upon the benefits of democracy and whenever they proclaim to the world the blessings of the American way of life, they pay tribute at once to Poland's great sons of freedom, and indeed, America's great sons of freedom, Pulaski and Kosciuszko.

Since the days of the American Revolution, the contributions of the Polish people to America have been so great they might well be termed without exaggeration, inestimable. At the end of the 19th century and during the early 20th, America's great industrial order was then being developed. During this period men and women of Poland came to this country and they engaged their energies and skills to the building of this new and powerful economic system.

Today, the sons and grandsons of those Polish citizens play a large part in sustaining and enlarging this industrial order—an industrial order that has become so vast and so powerful that it is regarded as the basic source of America's supremacy as a world power.

However, the contributions of the Poles and their descendants to American society are not limited to the industrial field alone. By no means. Americans of Polish extraction can be found in the ranks of America's professional groups, serving with great merit and distinction in medicine and education, law, politics, and government.

But, let me say that the true significance of Poland's contributions to America cannot be fully realized until one considers the contributions of Poland's sons to the winning of America's great wars of the past and present. These men of Poland knew no sacrifice too great to bear so that freedom would survive in its struggle against militarism and tyranny. Those who may walk through the battlefield cemeteries of Normandy, Anzio, Iwo Jima, and the other cemeteries holding the heroes of other wars and military actions—in those quiet, peaceful places they will find mute testimony to the courage and devotion of Poland's American sons to the cause of human freedom.

Under the colors of their own nation Poles have also shared America's burdens against a common enemy. In World War I, a Polish Army was organized in France under Jozef Haller as its commander in chief. In World War II, a new Polish Army, Navy, and Air Force were formed in France, amounting to 80,000 men, after the invasion and destruction of Poland by Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. The Poles fought at the side of Frenchmen until the collapse of France in June 1940. At that time the Polish Government-in-Exile fled to Britain and there formed a new army which later on was to fight heroically in Norway, North Africa, Italy, Normandy, Belgium, and the Netherlands.

It is an historical fact that in the Battle of Britain in 1940, that critical test for the sole surviving European democracy, Polish airmen were responsible for over 15 percent of the German air losses. In all, over 300,000 Poles served abroad in the Allied armed forces during World War II.

This is a most commendable record for a state that did not formally exist. But it comes as no surprise to those who know the Polish capacity for courage and heroism in a struggle for freedom.

It had been the hope of all freemen that after the war Poland would be reconstructed on the principles of democracy. But regrettably, Poland was overrun by the Soviet Red Army, and the Polish spirit of democracy did not have a chance to emerge and direct the destiny of this much-oppressed nation. The Western Allies were faced with an impossible task when the war came to an end.

The Russians commanded all levers of power and authority in Poland either directly by the presence of the Soviet Army or indirectly through the Communist leadership that they imported from the U.S.S.R. to take over the Government. In a matter of a few years, the Communists achieved their goals under this controlled situation and achieved them in a commonly known fashion. Terror and violence were the prelude to Poland's first postwar parliamentary elections in January 1947, making a mockery of the democratic processes. Leaders of the genuine democratic forces were forced to flee Poland as the Communists proceeded with the Sovietization of the country. Within a short time Poland was reconstructed along Soviet lines, and ultimately reduced to the status of a subservient appendage to Soviet power in Eastern Europe.

And what a great price the Polish people were forced to pay by their Communist overlords. Political freedom was nonexistent; the church became the target of the harshest acts of oppression; Polish culture, rich, daring, and colorful, was reduced to the sterile formulae of so-called Socialist realism; the economy of the nation was socialized and structured to serve more the needs of their Soviet masters than the necessities of the Polish people.

In a word, Poland was enslaved.

This period of total repression existed until the political crisis in June 1956 brought on by the uprising in Poznan. This disorder was the prelude for the more fundamental, far-reaching upheaval that took place in October 1956. As a result of this massive demonstration of popular discontent, the Soviets were compelled to grant a greater degree of independence to the Polish Communist Gomulka regime, and the regime in turn was forced to make concessions by loosening their rigid Stalinist controls over the Polish masses.

During the past decade Poland has been able to retain a fairly high degree of independence from Moscow. But, whatever gestures were made toward liberalizing Polish communism in 1956 were in these past years effectively countered by the absolute refusal of the regime to share its power and authority with the masses. Culture remains tightly controlled within the Communist formula of "Socialist realism." The authority of the police had been curtailed, but no genuine freedom of speech was to emerge. Religion continues to be sharply attacked and its practice curtailed in the most subtle ways.

Recently, Poland's Primate Cardinal Wyszynski was not permitted to leave Poland in order to participate in a celebration of the Polish millennium being held in Rome. It is also doubtful whether Pope Paul will be able to accept the invitation of the Polish bishops to visit Poland during its millennium celebration in May of this year. The regime abhors Poland's Catholicism, and it engages in a continuous struggle to reduce its influence among the near totally Catholic Polish population.

In the economic reals, certain gains have been maintained in the area of private enterprise. In contrast to the experience of other countries in Communist East Europe, Poland's agriculture remains largely in private hands. In 1963, the private sector accounted for 89 percent of the total agricultural production and embraced 85.7 percent of the total agricultural land. In fact, the percentage of land in the private sector increased from 77.3 percent in 1955 to 85.7 percent in 1963.

Poland's industrial sector is, of course, predominantly state-owned and operated. In 1963, state-owned enterprises accounted for 89.3 percent of total industrial production and employed 86.2 percent of all industrial labor. Most of the remaining percentage constituted cooperative enterprises. However, the private sector shares in certain Polish industries, the food processing industry being the largest.

Of Poland's 7,255 private industrial units, 3,744 engage in food processing. These enterprises account for over one-half of total private industrial production and over one-third of private industrial employment. Moreover, the private sector shares in the nation's industrial handicraft enterprises. Poland has 97,960 privately owned industrial handicraft workshops employing 163,859 persons.

What these economic figures on private enterprise in Poland mean is simply that in certain sectors of Polish life the people maintain a determined position against total sovietization of their economy. Similarly, in Polish religious life, unrelenting popular support for the church during her periods of conflict with the regime is a manifestation of the Poles' resolve to maintain their dignity as men who wish to worship their God according to the dictates of their own conscience.

Earlier in my speech I described the eternal bond of friendship between Poland and America in a twofold manner, that is, what Poland has done for America and what America has done for Poland. I have given examples of the first part of this equation: for a few moments I would like to summarize what I think America has done for Poland.

The first point that comes to mind is that America had given hundreds of thousands of Polish people the chance for a new and better life in this promised land of ours. Their own homeland, partitioned among the great powers at the end of the 18th century, existed in name only, at least in the hearts and souls of Polish patriots, and during the period of the 19th century until the Polish Republic was established after World War I, the homeland suffered from cruel foreign oppression. America gave Poland's children a refuge of hope and security.

Moreover, the United States played an active role in supporting Polish interests during World War I. On January 8, 1918, President Wilson in his Fourteen Points demanded an independent Poland with free access to the sea and thus elevated Polish concerns to the highest level of Allied purposes.

In the post-World War II period, the United States supported Polish interests to the extent that it was possible. While it acquiesced in Russian acquisition of territory up to the old Curzon line, the United States insisted on German compensation to Poland in the West along what is now the Oder-Neisse boundary.

When the Soviets and their Communist allies in Poland violated rights that were guaranteed under international agreement, the United States lodged vigorous protests.

And when Poland showed the first signs of independent action from Moscow after the October crisis in 1956, the United States offered forms of economic assistance to help the Polish people and to encourage an orientation away from Moscow and toward the West.

And all of you may recall that at the end of 1965 the children's hospital in Cracow was dedicated. This hospital, costing $12 million, was built from American funds.

But these are only the tangible, more concrete types of contributions America has made to Poland. Perhaps, America's greatest contribution lies in the spiritual realm, for we as a nation have never lost faith in Poland and in her capacity to take her place among the nations of the world as a free nation.

Mr. Speaker, in commemorating as we are the millennium of Poland it is well for us to reaffirm the central idea of Poland's unity with the West and her unity and friendship with America.

A thousand years ago Prince Mieszko had brought Poland into a closer relationship with the West as a political act intended to preserve Polish interests from hostile neighbors. This Polish prince brought Poland into the family of Western Christian nations. He made her part of what is now a commonly shared Western heritage. Let us hope that the Communist-governed Poland of today will continue its gradual orientation to the West, for in the last analysis it is in the bosom of Western civilization that Polish interests can be most fully achieved and Poland's destiny in its fullest capacity can be realized.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a genuine pleasure for me to extend congratulations and best wishes to the people of Poland as they observe two of the most remarkable events in their long and vibrant history. They will be commemorating two events which have helped mold Polish character and which the people of Poland as well as her millions of friends abroad can be very proud.

One of the events is that of the millennium in which 1,000 years of allegiance to Christianity will be recognized. Celebrating this event is indeed a tribute to Poland and an indication of the long period in which Poland has played a dynamic and vital role in the affairs of Europe and the world. Unfortunately, godless Communist leaders have refused to cooperate in the celebration. Despite their refusal, however, Cardinal Wyszynski will preside over the program which will have the support of masses of the Polish population and the rest of the world.

In addition to pride felt over their millennium, the people of Poland will also pause to commemorate their celebrated Constitution of 1791. The real significance of that document in Polish history lies in the fact that it was the first time that the ruling class sought to freely expand participation in governing the country to the peasants. The Constitution also sought to make for a more stable and democratic Poland. History was denied an opportunity to judge the document because of Russian intervention in April 1792. Less than a year after the Constitution was adopted Russian soldiers undertook to conquer the country and demand a servile and weak Poland. Russian determination to accept only a weak Poland unfortunately has prevailed to this day, and she has frequently intervened in Polish affairs to make certain that a strong Poland does not emerge.

But how long can the independent and freedom-loving spirit of Poland be suppressed? How long can the heel of communism sit upon the historic ideals of Poland which fostered men such as those who wrote the Constitution of 1791? No one, of course, really knows the answer to these questions. But it is certain that the people of Poland have not forgotten that spirit and idealism. It is certain that one day they will rise up united and reassert their own self-determination. That is a day toward which we hope the people of Poland will constantly strive. The true Poland will yet emerge and reclaim her rightful place in the world.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, millions of Poles now in Poland as well as people of Polish descent throughout the world will join in marking the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in that land.

It will be a positive demonstration of the fact that despite their Communist overlords, the vast majority of the Polish people still remain faithful to their religion and to the Lord over us all.

No lengthy statement or oration on my part is needed. I join my many Polish-American friends in the fervent hope and prayer that their brothers in Poland will be able to be free and will continue to retain their faith and spirit.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, not only the people of Poland but the entire Christian world participates in the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland which is now being observed. Religious observances are held in many parts of the world in honor of the Polish millennium. The adoption of Christianity by the Polish people in the year 966 makes them one of the oldest Christian nations with a proud history, culture, and civilization.

The observance of the Polish millennium coincides this year with the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, one of the great documents of freedom of modern times. May 3 of each year, the anniversary date of that Constitution, has in recent years become a rallying date for the freedom-loving Polish people everywhere to rededicate themselves to the struggle for Poland's liberation.

On the occasion of these two important anniversaries I am glad to join with all Americans of Polish extraction in this country and with their kinsmen in Poland today—a land where true freedom cannot be practiced—in prayer for Poland's early liberation from communism and its rebirth as a free and independent country. We express our deep friendship toward the people of Poland and our moral support for their struggle and their righteous cause.

In observing these two great events in the history of the Polish people, we are pleased to acknowledge their significance to the growth of Christianity and to the development of freedom in the Western World and of civilization generally. It is unfortunate that these anniversaries occur at a time when Poland itself is not free and its people are not able to participate in these observances befitting such a great nation. We hope, however, that in the very near future Poland will be restored to its former glory and that it will take its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Today, May 3, marks the 175th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791. Hundreds of thousands of Americans of Polish descent throughout the United States, over 30,000 of whom live in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, will pause to observe this important anniversary.

This year, the celebration of Polish Constitution Day has a special significance, for it coincides with ceremonies marking the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland to be held today by Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, and thousands of participating Poles, at the famed Marian shrine at Czestochowa.

It was my pleasure to participate in the celebration of Poland's millennium of Christianity on April 19 by delivering a speech in the House of Representatives on this milestone in Polish history, and on April 26 by introducing House Joint Resolution 1120 to authorize the President of the United States to proclaim August 28, 1966, as "Polish Millennium Day."

Today I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues from Illinois in observing Polish Constitution Day; namely, the Honorable Dan Rostenkowski, Democrat, of Illinois, who serves as the whip in the Congress for the Democrats from Illinois, the Honorable John C. Kluczynski, Democrat, of Illinois, who is the chairman of the important Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee, and the Honorable Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat, of Illinois, who is the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee and who has been honored by being selected as general chairman of the All-Chicago Committee To Commemorate Poland's Millennium, as well as my friend and neighbor from Milwaukee, Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who is the ranking majority member of the powerful House Foreign Affairs Committee.

It is entirely fitting that today we should observe both Polish Constitution Day and the Polish millennium of Christianity, for these two events are integral parts of Polish history.

The Poles, in their courageous struggle against the tyranny of their oppressors during World War II, were termed "an inspiration for mankind" by United States President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Their courage is again demonstrated in their determination to celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in their homeland despite the barrage of obstacles and the massive propaganda campaign the Communist government is undertaking in order to deter the Poles and draw world attention away from their celebrations.

When they were about to lose their independence 175 years ago, the Poles graphically demonstrated their courage by taking unprecedented steps to make broad and far-reaching changes in their government structure. These changes resulted in the adoption of the Constitution of 1791 which made Poland a limited monarchy and introduced a responsible cabinet system of government. Parliamentary representation was expanded, and the many class distinctions were wiped out. At the time it was adopted, this Constitution was regarded as a liberal, democratic, and progressive document, the first of its kind adopted in any country in central and eastern Europe, and it strengthened Poland and put the Polish people in a better position to resist their foes.

Soon after, however, Poland was invaded by the Russians and the second partition of Poland took place in 1793, with Russia and Prussia reducing Poland to less than one-third of its original size, and bringing to an end Poland as an independent state.

Although the Poles did not have the privilege to live for long under this Constitution and to enjoy the benefits of freedom it provided, we know they have fought bravely for freedom and independence, and they have enriched the institutions of freedom in many ways. In the American War of Independence, the Polish heroes, Kosciuszko and Pulaski, made a major contribution to our own struggle for liberty and a democratic way of life. While a free Poland has become a thing of the past, the spirit of the Constitution of 1791 lives on in the hearts of the Polish people, and one day soon the dream of freedom for which they have struggled unceasingly and which they have cherished over the turbulent centuries will be realized.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the 1,000th anniversary of the emergence of Poland as a nation focuses attention not alone on the vast contribution her people have made to the civilization of the world but also on the fact that this contribution includes providing to our country many of our most valuable citizens.

An outstanding example of this contribution is found in the 15th District of Texas, I am proud to say, in McCook, an extensive and efficient agricultural area northwest of Mission. Here descendants from these great Poles have proven their heritage of industrious stability by building a farming oasis from the sand and brush of the border area.

As with these friends in McCook, through the years Poland has sent to the United States men and women who have turned their productive energies to the building of their adopted country. Their descendants are found today in virtually every part of the United States.

These Americans of Polish extraction are known to me and to their neighbors as honest, devout, hardworking family people who add to the strength of our Nation.

It is a real privilege for me to join in saluting them with un saludo to the country of their origin.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Polish Constitution Day is a distinct and memorable landmark in Poland's modern history. The drafting and adoption of that Constitution in 1791 by patriotic Polish leaders marked a turning point in the history of that country. By that significant document the Poles effected a peaceful change in the structure of their government without resorting to the bloody and violent measures which characterized the French Revolution. By adopting a liberal, progressive, and popular Constitution they led their countrymen from the feudal paths of the Middle Ages to the broad and bright highways of modern times.

That Constitution contained many provisions which still retain their validity and vitality today. By these provisions the authority of the monarch was sharply curtailed, and ministerial responsibility was established. The intricate and obstructive features of the old system were eliminated. The upper chamber lost some of its preponderant powers and the second chamber, the elective representative body of the nation, was vested with genuine legislative authority. Economic barriers between the nobility and the bourgeoisie were drastically lowered.

The townsmen recovered their judicial autonomy and gained a number of political rights, especially that of admission to many of the higher offices. The peasantry were taken under the protection of the law. And finally, religious toleration was established. The Constitution abolished the worst abuses from which Poland had been suffering for centuries. Through the abolition of the most crying political evils of the old regime, and by granting increased freedom of action to the middle and lower classes, the Constitution of 1791 marked a great advance over all previous attempts at reform in Poland.

Unfortunately, before the Poles had any chance to enjoy the benefits of this Constitution their homeland was divided among the autocrats of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Having thus lost their sovereign existence and national independence, Poles became subjects of alien governments in their homeland, and for more than 120 years they lived under oppressive foreign regimes. Then, toward the end of the First World War, when they witnessed the defeat and disintegration of the governments oppressing them, they joyfully seized upon the opportunity and regained their national freedom. And the birth of the Republic of Poland in 1918 signified also the resurgence of the spirit embodied in the Polish Constitution of 1791.

On the anniversary observance of the Polish Constitution Day, one finds it impossible to omit a reference to today's Poland, which is a far cry from what all patriotic and liberty-loving Poles had hoped it to be. They had dreamed, prayed, and worked for a liberated, free, and independent Poland. We all know that since the treacherous rape of their country at the end of the last war these Poles have not known freedom there.

Though they may be somewhat less oppressed than peoples in other Soviet satellite countries, genuine democracy has been blotted out in Poland by their Communist masters. They are not even allowed, through the deliberate hindrance of their Government, to celebrate the millennium of their Christianization. In short, the fate of these 30 million faithful Poles is tightly tied to the chariot of the Kremlin. But even under such unrelenting oppressions these dauntless souls cling to their noble ideals and observe the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, 1,000 years ago in the year 966, the Polish nation accepted Christianity in the Latin rite with the conversion of Polish Prince Mieszko, and forevermore linked itself with western civilization by culture, tradition and destiny. Christianity, as we all know, began with the birth of Christ approximately 2,000 years ago. For half that time the Poles have been a Christian people. It is difficult to realize the enormity of this fact or the fullness of its meaning.

In those thousand years much has changed in the world, while Poland remained constant and unchanging in her faith. An illustration or two will help to show how enormous an achievement this has been. When Prince Mieszko accepted Christianity in 966, the Roman Catholic Church was ruled by Pope John XIII. Otto the Great had recently become Holy Roman Emperor. The Holy Roman Empire, and indeed the magnificent Byzantine Empire, have long since gone from the face of the earth. At approximately the time Christianity made its first inroads into Poland, the rule of the Sung Dynasty in China began and the Fatimid Dynasty in Egypt started. All of these examples are found today only in history books and tracts, but Christianity in Poland is a living element to most of Poland's 32 million people.

The eyes of millions of people around the world are on Poland today, for it is here the spirit of communism has come face to face with the spirit of Christianity. The Government of Poland knows this, and I suspect it makes them quite uneasy. Nevertheless, the Communist government is making an attempt in this millennium year to prove to the world, perhaps more so to themselves than to others, that the religion of communism is truly the wave of the future, and that the religion of Christ is a ripple of the past.

Judging the future of Poland from its past, both it and Christianity have a magnificent future. By its own acts, the Government has denied entrance to the country, and therefore contact with its own people, of religious leaders from many countries of the world, including the spiritual leader of Roman Catholicism, Pope Paul VI. There is something disquieting, perhaps even disturbing about this, when we realize that Paul, a popular Pope, has been warmly greeted by Arabs and Jews in the Middle East, by millions of non-Christians in India, and by millions of all faiths in New York City. Paul, who pleads for food and for peace, who embraces the spiritual leaders of many churches in a sincere effort to carry out the ecumenical reforms of Pope John XXIII, who has met recently for the first time in history with the Foreign Minister of the Soviet state, is refused an invitation to meet with people who have been Christians for 1,000 years.

Why is the Polish Government so tightly controlling tourism this year? Of what are they afraid? Stalin has already told them the Pope has no legions; indeed he does not. Why has the Government reacted so strongly to pilgrimages, special Masses, and other religious devotions?

We know the answer, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Communists also know it; in another thousand years Poland will still be a Christian nation, and Communism will have gone the way of empires and dynasties that have fallen to the wayside on the road of history.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, each year on May 3, freedom-loving Poles everywhere commemorate the anniversary of the great Polish Constitution of 1791.

The Polish Constitution was signed just 4 years after the ratification of our own great Constitution. In certain respects, its history was quite similar. Like the Articles of Confederation, the chief weakness of the previous Polish Constitution was that its concern with protecting the people against executive tyranny prevented the executive from taking effective action.

Under the previous Constitution, the so-called liberum veto granted every member of the Polish legislature a veto over all proposed legislation. For a nation which had already had a long and unhappy experience with the usurpation of legitimate authority by autocratic regimes, the liberum veto was conceived as the ultimate protection against the tyranny of the executive.

Unfortunately, the weaknesses of this form of Roussellian democracy became quickly apparent. Even among men of like interests, the unlimited veto all too often weakens effective joint action. In the case of a national legislature, which by its very nature represents a cross-section of the major conflicting interest groups of the nation, the unlimited veto becomes an effective block on any real executive or legislative action. The liberum veto was an effective brake on executive tyranny, but its disabling qualities had a divisive effect that allowed other nations to take advantage of Poland's inability to initiate joint action in the face of internal and external crises.

As did the framers of our own Constitution, Poland's national leaders took action at the end of the 18th century to strengthen the executive power of their National Government. The system which evolved, however, was more akin to the British system of government than our own. With a long history of royal succession, the Poles turned to the British model of a constitutional monarchy. The executive power was formally placed in the hands of the King; however, any act of the King had to be approved by the Council of Ministers who, in turn, were responsible to the legislature.

This was quite similar to the working of the British system in the 18th century when the initiatives of the King were subject to the approval of the legislature. Over the last century and a half, the operation of British democracy has evolved to the point where the monarch simply performs a formal and symbolic function. It would be fair to say that, if all had gone well, a similar evolution probably would have occurred in the Polish system.

As we now know, all did not go well. The very effectiveness of the new Constitution infuriated Poland's autocratic neighbor, Catherine the Great of Imperial Russia. Within a year, Catherine had massed her forces to teach a lesson to the "Jacobins of Warsaw," and nip this new spirit of democracy in the bud lest it spread east to threaten her own imperial prerogative.

Among those ill-equipped but courageous patriots who rallied to meet the Russian challenge was the great Polish democrat and national hero, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a man who had already served with courage and resourcefulness in our own Revolutionary War. Now he stood once again, this time on the soil of his native Poland, to fight for the cause of liberty. The Russians were totally unprepared for the determined response of the Polish patriots. Kosciuszko's rag-tag peasant brigade scored a series of astounding victories against overwhelmingly superior forces. It was only when the cream of the Russian imperial forces were finally mobilized and the great leader critically wounded, that Catherine was able to savor the fruits of her aggression.

The Polish Constitution, and with it the spirit of democratic reform in Eastern Europe, was brutally crushed before it could flower. On September 23, 1793, Poland was once again partitioned by its imperial neighbors. The Eastern provinces were annexed by Catherine's Russia and most of what was called Great Poland went to Prussia.

The dangerous novelty which Catherine had so feared was nipped in the bud. But the spirit of liberal democracy and independence did not die. Now, over a century and a half later, another form of Russian authoritarianism watches nervously over its Polish satellite state. For once again the spirit of liberal democracy and independence has begun to grow among the Polish people.

On this anniversary I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to that spirit of independence which characterizes the Polish people.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 1966 marks the 1,000th anniversary of the creation of the Polish nation and of the conversion of the Polish people to Christianity.

Today the Polish people are oppressed by a Communist regime, but their strong and courageous assertion of their continued faith in Christianity and their love of liberty are forces ultimately more powerful than any possessed by the Communist government.

In addition, today, May 3, is Polish Constitution Day—a day we traditionally join with Americans of Polish descent and Free Poles everywhere in celebrating the Constitution of 1791.

We know, Mr. Speaker, of the hopes and aspirations of the freedom-loving Polish people. We all look forward to the day that they once again will have the opportunity, through free elections, to select a government of their own choosing. The spirit of the Polish people has not and will not die. I am confident that they will eventually realize their ambition for a free and independent Poland with a government which truly represents the wishes of the Polish people.

This observance in the House of Representatives today is particularly appropriate. We are commemorating not only Polish Constitution Day. This year, 1966, is the year of the Polish millennium.

Poland's conversion to Christianity began in the year 966 when King Mieszko of the Piast dynasty married a Christian Czech princess named Dubravka. To counter German threats to his land, Mieszko adopted much of Western culture as well as religion. Eventually, he put all of Poland under the special protection of the Holy See.

Boleslaw the Brave, the son of Mieszko, secured for Poland an independent church and organized a number of bishoprics. Mieszko's principality became a powerful and independent kingdom under Boleslaw.

Sometime during the 14th century Poland acquired her most powerful national and religious symbol. The Black Madonna of Czestochowa, reportedly painted by St. Luke, was given credit in 1655 for a Polish victory against Swedish invaders. The monastery of Jasna Gora, where the Madonna was kept, withstood a 40-day Swedish siege. It remains in the monastery today.

On April 16 Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Roman Catholic Primate of Poland, was triumphantly welcomed to the city of Poznan. Thousands of people poured into the streets to greet the great religious leader. He led a cortege which carried a replica of the Black Madonna. State rallies were held at the same time, but by the end of the Communist ceremonies the trickle of persons who had headed down the street toward the cathedral became a great wave. It swelled the crowd around the church to an estimated 10,000.

Thus, religion in Poland is not only holding the allegiance of the faithful, it is a dynamic and powerful force. It is only fitting that we pause today to declare our own solidarity with the great cause of Polish freedom.

Poland's ancient cultural and religious traditions will do much to assure that the aspirations of the Polish people become a reality.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to extend my greetings to the people of Poland in the year of their millennium, commemorating 1,000 years of the uniting of the Polish people and the introduction of Christianity in 966—the baptism of Poland.

This tradition which sustains the faith of the Polish people in cultural values, democratic ideas, and Christian precepts of the Western World, should not go unnoticed. I am honored to offer this message, hoping that it will serve to strengthen the will of individual Poles in their homeland, and elsewhere, to withstand Communist-imposed torments. While Poland is enslaved by the Communist Iron Curtain, the people of Poland are God-loving people, and hopefully surge forward to celebrate their millennium, paying tribute to their God in whom they have placed their faith.

When she accepted the Christianity of the Latin rite in 966, Poland forever linked her destiny with the Western World, and we all should be ever mindful of this.

The aspirations of those millions of Polish people who must desire a restoration of their independence and freedom deserve and will have the continued moral support of America and the free world. They should have the encouragement of all who cherish life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I am honored to say congratulations to the people of Poland, and particularly the Polish people in the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, for many years May 3 has been a day commemorating Poland's adoption of the May 3 Constitution of 1791. This year May 3 has a special significance, commemorating the Polish millennium, the existence of Poland as a Christian nation for 1,000 years.

We in the United States are, of course, very proud of our own revolutionary success and the adoption of our democratic Constitution in the late 18th century. We ought to know that the Polish Constitution of 1791 was the first democratic constitution in Europe. It established the rights of all classes and assured the religious freedom of all groups. The Constitution proclaimed "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." How like the sentiments expressed at this very same time by the framers of the American Constitution.

Unfortunately, soon after the adoption of the Constitution, Poland was attacked and partitioned by its neighbors. The Poles were not as fortunate as we and did not then enjoy the fruits of their Constitution. But the history of Poland, before and after the Constitution of 1791, represents a continuing struggle for a thousand years in which generations of Poles knew the glory of victories and the despair of defeats, yet ceaselessly kept searching for a better life in freedom and the brotherhood of man.

In their heroic struggle against Nazi tyranny, the Poles became, in the words of President Roosevelt, "an inspiration for mankind." Today the Communist regime attempts in every way to isolate Poland from the West. And though Poland is enslaved by the Communist Iron Curtain, the people of Poland, under the leadership of Cardinal Wyszynski, continue to struggle to be free and to celebrate the millennium in its religious as well as its national observance.

Last January, Cardinal Wyszynski was banned from a visit to Rome. The Communist government also this year announced that pilgrimages from the United States, led by bishops of Polish origin, would be limited. Finally the Communist ambassador in Rome declared on March 31, 1966, that Pope Paul had been advised that his intended trip to Poland to attend the 1,000-year celebration would not be opportune at this time. These most recent attempts to subvert the deep-rooted desire of the Poles for religious and political freedom will not stop Cardinal Wyzynski's efforts to reopen his country to free intercourse with the Western democracies.

The sons of Poland have contributed much to the history and culture of the United States. Names like Kosciuszko, Pulaski, Gabreski, Paderewski, Rubinstein, Gronowski, and Muskie fill the pages of U.S. history from revolutionary times to the present day.

I am proud to join the 10 million Americans of Polish origin in celebrating and commemorating the observance of this 1,000-year anniversary. We hope that manifestations of American friendship will serve to encourage the restoration of freedom to those courageous Poles still held in bondage by communism.

Certainly I speak for Americans of all origins when I say that we as a people and as a nation are waiting anxiously for that long overdue day when Poland is once again free and takes its rightful place as a proud, strong, and independent country.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world millions of people are celebrating an event which should be dear to the hearts of all nations of the Christian world. One thousand years ago, in 966, the ruling prince of what we now call Poland embraced the Christian religion. By the act of his conversion according to the Latin rite, a slow process begun a century before was accelerated. Christianity was not previously unknown to the various tribal groups north of the Carpathian Mountains. There had been Christian activity in these pagan groups for years. But, the essential act to firmly implant the creed of the Western World had to be the acceptance of it by the secular authority.

Much as the conversion of Constantine had led to the creation of our western Latin Christian heritage, so, the conversion of the local Polish tribal leader was a momentous event in making that part of Eastern Europe a part of our civilization.

The ruler, Mieszko I of the Piast dynasty, may have chosen to accept the new creed for any of a variety of reasons. But it is generally accepted that all the reasons were in some way or other connected to a very human and ordinary event in his life. He had married the daughter of the Prince of Bohemia in 965. She may have convinced her husband to convert to her faith by her own fine example of the strengths and principles of Christianity. It may have been expected that he would do so as a political act to bring the two realms closer together. Or, there may have been other reasons.

Mr. Speaker, in any case the result was a great change in the lives of the people. The changes can be read in the recorded history of the 40 generations of Polish people which has occurred since that great day a millennium ago. By the conversion the people came into contact with the mainstream of our civilization and culture. They learned of the great features of the Christian faith. To mention just one—although probably the most important one—the belief in the dignity of each human being. This belief has seen vivid expression in the courageous struggle for freedom which has been the lot of Poland for these long and hard centuries.

In gaining access to the spiritual founts of the Christian world, Poland did not just take. She also gave in abundance, to the benefit of all nations. Her contributions in the various arts and sciences are glorious and manifold. She can rightly claim to be one of the main sources of enrichment of our Western culture.

Mr. Speaker, it is fit and proper that we should join with the millions of people of Polish extraction in rejoicing at the anniversary of the conversion of Mieszko I in 966. The significance of this event, more than halfway back to the time of the birth of the Christian religion, is great for all of us. I wish to add my best wishes, along with those of so many others, to the gallant and talented Polish nation. At this time of commemoration, let us pray that the hopes of a better life, for and by man, found in the teachings of the Christian creed, will soon be a real part of the life of a free and independent Poland.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3.

In Poland, the Polish people are commemorating the Polish millennium on this very day, as a climax to celebrations that have been going on during the past 2 weeks.

May 3 has, therefore, special significance for Poland, the Polish people, and their friends, for it is on this day that they are honored for the adoption of Christianity a thousand years ago and for a forthright declaration of the rights of freemen a century and three quarters ago.

I join the Polish people and all their friends everywhere in the commemoration of these great historic events, and I want to associate myself with all who hope and pray for the day when the ideals expressed in these great historic acts will be fully realized in Poland; for when that day comes, Poland will be free.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, on April 16, a strange scene occurred in the center of Poznan, Poland. On a still, wintry cold Saturday afternoon the Communist Defense Minister, Marshal Spychalski stood to deliver another of the government's patented harangues against West Germany and NATO. A crowd of some 20,000 onlookers and curiosity seekers stood quietly and somberly as the Communist Minister shifted his fire from the Germans to the leaders of the Polish Catholic Church.

Spychalski's address had hardly begun before more and more of the onlookers began to quietly depart the square and hurry to the other end of Ulica Tumska—Cathedral Street—where a more important, in fact, a very cherished, event was taking place. Here, at the other end of the street, a long motorcade of Poland's bishops, led by Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the famous Roman Catholic Primate of Poland, was arriving at Fara Church, near the famous Poznan Cathedral.

The word of Cardinal Wyszynski's arrival spread quickly and within a few moments what had been a small trickle of spectators departing the military square for the church turned into a parade of joyous faithful which soon emptied the somber square and totally engulfed the caravan of bishops. Cardinal Wyszynski led a cortege which was carrying a copy of the sacred Black Madonna of Czestochowa from the Cathedral of Gniezno to Fara Church and then, later, to the Poznan Cathedral. Behind the motorcade marched a growing parade of thousands of young people and children carrying symbolic lighted candles and paper lanterns. A joyous roar greeted the arrival of the cardinal in what most observers agreed was the largest turnout for a public event in Poznan since the famous worker's revolt against the Communist regime in 1956.

The embarrassed and endlessly frustrated Communist regime quickly announced that the transfer of the Madonna from Fara Church to the Cathedral on the next day would not be permitted. Once again the people of Poland had dramatically demonstrated where their hearts lay. Never with the Communist functionaries in Warsaw, but always with their beloved church and the memories and dreams of a free and democratic Poland.

Cardinal Wyszynski's procession marked the end of a day of celebrations which had begun in Gniezno to mark the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland. Poland's conversion to Christianity began in 966 with conversion of Duke Mieszko I, shortly after his marriage to the Czech Princess Dubravka. This was Duke Mieszko's first step in adopting the mores of Western civilization to unite his nation and counter the ever-present danger of a German invasion. The duke eventually placed all his lands in the hands of the Pope, thus putting Poland under the special protection of the Holy See.

Poland was granted an independent church during the reign of Miezsko's son, Boleslaw I the Brave, and a number of bishoprics were soon established. Under Boleslaw's strong guiding hand, the principality of Duke Mieszko grew into a powerful and independent kingdom. With the federal union created by alining the kingdom with Lithuania in the 16th century, Poland embarked on a golden age.

Christianity has grown along with the unity of the nation in Poland. The sacred Black Madonna which Cardinal Wyszynski carried from Gniezno to Poznan is itself a symbol of national unity as well as Polish Christianity. The original painting, which is said to have been done by St. Luke, remains in the monastery of Jasna Gora in the city of Czestochowa. When the monastery withstood a ferocious 40-day assault by Swedish invaders in 1655, the Polish defenders prayed to the Madonna for strength and since then the painting has stood as a symbol of the unity of Poland and Christianity.

Poland's history has often been a frustrating and tragic one. Located on a flat plain in the middle of the contending great powers of central Europe, the Poles have all too often found their land invaded by attackers from all sides. When the national leaders of Poland decided to cast a new progressive and democratic constitution in 1791, the autocratic rulers of the great powers of central Europe watched with growing apprehension. Catherine the Great of Imperial Russia decided that this new spirit of democracy which had grown in Poland was a dangerous influence which could threaten the stability of the autocracies of central Europe. For the next few years a fierce battle was waged until the Polish patriots were finally overwhelmed by far larger forces. By the end of the 18th century Poland had been partitioned out of existence by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

The nation was finally reunified after the First World War, only to be partitioned once again with the outbreak of World War II. Since the Second World War, the Polish people have suffered under a new form of tyranny which has threatened the very life of Christianity in Poland as well as Poland's democratic tradition.

It is significant, and encouraging to democratic peoples everywhere, that, despite the centuries of oppression and the tyranny of the Communist rulers of Poland today, the Polish people are once again celebrating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 this May 3 along with the 1,000th anniversary of the birth of Polish Christianity and nationhood. The joyous crowd that greeted Cardinal Wyszynski's triumphant parade a few weeks ago is just the most recent of an endless number of incidents that have demonstrated to all the world that the Polish people will continue to reject the tyranny of their Communist masters and hold to the tradition of Christianity and democracy that marks the Polish heritage.

It is a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to commemorate the May 3d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 and congratulate Poles everywhere on the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity and nationhood.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr Speaker, today the world is honoring a milestone in world history. The eyes of the world are on the millennium of Poland. I salute all Poles everywhere today as they surge forward to celebrate their millennium, not only as a national observance, but also a religious observance to their God, in whom they have placed their faith for all these centuries.

The year 966 is the most significant in the life of the Polish nation because it is the first known historical date of the origin of Poland as a nation.

From the perspective of the thousand-year existence of Poland as a Western Christian country, 31 million Poles at home and 10 million Poles abroad, living all over the world, can view proudly Poland's role in the history of the world and its part in the progress and achievement of mankind. The indomitable spirit of Polish history is a guarantee that that country, currently halted in its progress by a Communist regime, will, in time, regain its independence and freedom.

To understand this indomitable spirit of the Poles—a spirit which has survived 1,000 years of turmoil and persecution in its stubborn defense of freedom and human dignity—one must study its past. For it is in their magnificent past that one can gain an insight into Poland's future.

The tremendous role of the church throughout the thousand years of life of the Polish nation is indisputable. Catholicism is inseparately connected with the national feelings of the Poles. In different eras, the church was the sole visible spiritual power which bound together their nation as a whole.

How many of us will ever be able to forget the gallant resistance of the Polish people of Warsaw against the Nazi invasion? It was an inspiration to the rest of the world in its fight against German conquest of Europe.

One cannot help but marvel that in between her unyielding struggles for survival Poland was able to make so profound a contribution to the cultural development of Europe and the world. Throughout the millennium of their tragedy-filled history, the Poles immeasurably enriched the world in arts and sciences. Poland gave to the world Copernicus, the father of modern astronomy; Marie Curie, who unlocked the secrets of the atom; Chopin and Paderewski in music; and countless others in every field of the arts and sciences.

Poland is once again embroiled in a conflict between a free society and an authoritarian state, between human rights and their denial. Although the Poles are again under the yoke of an atheistic power, their spirit is unbroken and they remain faithful to the principles on which Poland's greatness was founded. The year 1966, Poland's millennium, is a time for renewal and rededication of their beliefs and Christian principles.

The people of Poland possess a tradition which, even now, sustains the faith of the Polish nation in cultural values, democratic ideals, and Christian precepts of the Western World, and strengthens the will of individual Poles in their homeland and abroad to withstand the Communist-imposed travails. Spiritually nourished by manifestations of friendship in the West, the Poles have kept the hope alive that their day of deliverance and the return to their rightful place in the free world shall become a reality.

America owes much to the heritage sent to our shores. May this rich and now 1,000-year-old heritage of the Polish nation bring forth a new understanding and appreciation between the people of America and Poland.

Today is a time to honor all Poles everywhere on their millennium anniversary. In spite of communism, the proud people of Poland have continued their faith and have strived for spiritual and worldly success. I join all Americans today in saluting the entire Polish nation.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1966, is a doubly significant day for the Polish people, who will commemorate the May 3, 1791, Polish Constitution, and the millennial year of Christianity in Poland. We in the United States, who share their heritage of religious and political freedom and tolerance, pay tribute today to the contributions that the Polish people have made for 1,000 years to the faith, the progress, and the good of mankind.

The pages of Poland's history tell the story of a people whose deep devotion to the Christian faith has enriched and preserved a nation for 10 centuries. In this short span of human development, the Polish people have contributed richly to the culture of the human race, to scientific progress, and to the freedom of people everywhere. The names of Polish religious leaders, patriots, statesmen, scientists, writers, and musicians are known throughout the world. Though adversity and persecution have marked the history of the Polish people, their faith in Christian principles, democratic ideas, and cultural values has never wavered, and they continue to inspire all men whose faith and hope are sorely tried.

I join with all the people of the State of Illinois and the United States in honoring this significant day in the history of the Polish people, and express the hope of freemen everywhere that Poland will once again take its rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if a nation's place in history were to be determined solely on the record of the past half century, Poland would be firmly established as a country whose people are among the most courageous, most patient, and most stalwart the world has ever known.

Overrun by the Austro-German Armies in World War I, Poland eventually was able to declare self-independence but scarcely had time to recover from the horrors of the conflict before Germany and Russia invaded and immediately began to partition her territory in 1939. Further changes in the national boundaries were forced upon the Poles by the U.S.S.R. at World War II's end, with no part of the domain permitted to become free of Communist rule since that time.

Despite these tribulations, the spirit of the Polish people remains undiminished, for they are confident that somehow in the years ahead they will once more have an opportunity to breathe the air of independence they have so long cherished.

This year Poland observes her 1,000th birthday, and even in her infant years the bravery and stoicism inherent in the Polish people of our time were being molded in the struggle for freedom. Under Boleslaw the Great, the Poles established the first effective barrier in Eastern Europe against the ferocious Asiatic hordes that sought to invade. And down through the years Poland has refused to be destroyed, asking only for the liberty which God would grant to all men.

Polish warriors played an important role in America's fight for independence, and Polish immigrants had a vital part in the building of our great Nation. Their progeny have included outstanding scientists, musicians, painters, writers, athletes, teachers, and representatives of all other careers and professions.

Today people everywhere who love freedom join in salute on Polish Millennium Day. May this nation live forever, and may her freedom soon return.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant occasions which Congress commemorates annually is Polish Constitution Day. Its significance springs from the fact that the Constitution adopted by Poland on May 3, 1791, represents a landmark in the history of freedom and self-government. As a Member of Congress who is privileged to represent many thousands of constituents of Polish descent, I have been proud to join in this annual commemoration throughout my 10 years in the House.

This year, however, there is added meaning in what we do. This year, we join in recognizing two events of historic importance to Poland and the world: the acceptance of Christianity by Poland 1,000 years ago, as well as the adoption of the most advanced and progressive Constitution in Europe 175 years ago.

These two events are closely related, Mr. Speaker. They represent the cornerstones of Poland's adherence to Western culture and Western concepts of human values. They are the twin foundations of Poland's devotion to freedom and independence. They explain the great influence Poland and the Polish people have exerted on the rest of the Western World. And, together, they comprise the source of the strength and courage and inspiration which have sustained Polish hope and Polish determination during the past 20 years of Communist captivity.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I was deeply gratified this morning to have the opportunity of witnessing the President sign the proclamation entitled, "Commemoration of Poland's National and Christian Millennium," and to receive one of the pens with which the President signed this proclamation.

By nature and by tradition, the church and the state in Poland should always be on the friendliest and most harmonious of terms. In times of freedom, this has been so, for just as the church seeks the spiritual welfare of its people in freedom so does the state, when it is politically free, work for the social, economic, and political well-being of the people. This has been a major Polish contribution.

It is only when the church or the state seeks to impose its arbitrary will on the other that trouble begins. And this is what we have seen in postwar Poland—the tragedy of a godless, dictatorial state seeking to assume power over every aspect of Polish life and, as part of this struggle, attempting to wipe out the church or eliminate its influence in the lives of its people.

It is a remarkable tribute to the Polish people that the state has failed in this respect. Despite its power, despite the fact it has eliminated organized and open political opposition, despite the full support of the Soviet Union, the Communist Government of Poland has not been able to kill religion or intimidate the church or suppress the people's instinctive independence and their determination to act as freemen.

The struggle between the Polish church and the Polish Communist state has reached a kind of climax in this millennial year of Christianity in Poland. Under the leadership of Cardinal Wyszynski, the church has organized a series of special events and religious services to commemorate the millennium. At the same time, however, the Communist government has scheduled conflicting public events for the same places and times, carefully calculated to sabotage the religious observances. Given the power of the Government to organize mass demonstrations, one would assume they would be successful. Yet, from the reports I have received, thousands upon thousands of Polish people have abandoned the Government-sponsored meetings held so far and have instead participated in the religious celebrations. As a number of American newspapers have already pointed out, this experience demonstrates again that the Communist government has not been able to drive a wedge between the Polish people and their church, that the allegiance of the people still belongs to their religion and to freedom.

Nevertheless, the concentrated efforts of the Government to interfere with the church and with the right of the people to practice their religion are cause for deep concern. I was especially incensed at the decision of the Government to take this fight into the area of international relations by restricting the issuance of visas to Americans and Western Europeans who wished to travel to Poland to participate in the millennial observances, and by preventing the Pope and other members of the hierarchy from visiting Poland for this extremely important occasion.

When I first read of the government's decision, Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Secretary of State of the United States urging him to protest in the name of our own Government.

My letter and the State Department's reply may be of interest:

APRIL 7, 1966.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: According to a Reuters news dispatch published in yesterday's Washington Post—a copy of which is enclosed—the Communist government of Poland is planning to restrict the issuance of tourist visas to Americans and other foreign visitors who may wish to attend religious festivities this summer in connection with the commemoration of the thousand years of Christianity in Poland.

Although this is only one step in a comprehensive effort to interfere with the church's celebration of the anniversary, it represents the extension by the Polish Government of its persecution of the church into the realm of international relations. If the Reuters report is true, and I assume it is, since it appears to be based on official Communist sources, then I believe the action should be vigorously protested by our Government.

While every country, of course, has a legal right to regulate the entry of foreign visitors, prevailing international standards emphasize the freedom to travel. The reported action of the Polish Government is obviously designed to deny that freedom to large numbers of Americans as well as Western Europeans who desire to participate in a program of great significance to the Christian world.

I hope, therefore, that you will look into these reports and take any appropriate action to indicate the concern of the U.S. Government.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Very truly yours,
FLORENCE P. DWYER,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1966.

Hon. FLORENCE P. DWYER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. DWYER: The Secretary has asked me to thank you for your letter of April 7, 1966 concerning church-state developments in Poland. A recent newspaper article, enclosed with your letter, reports that the Polish Government is planning to restrict the issuance of visas to American and other Western visitors who wish to attend religious festivities in Poland this year commemorating the millennium of the advent of Christianity in that country. You express the hope that, if the report is true, the Department can take appropriate action to indicate the concern of the U.S. Government.

According to information received by the Department from official Polish sources and elsewhere, it now appears clear that Polish visas will not be granted to 18 American bishops and archbishops who were planning to lead pilgrimages by lay Catholics from all over the United States to religious observances in Poland early in May. There is also evidence to indicate that the restrictive policy adopted by the Polish Government in this regard reflects its position that leaders of the church in Poland, by inviting on their own authority cardinals and bishops from abroad to attend the millennium celebrations, had engaged in activities which were objectionable to and unauthorized by the Polish Government. On the other hand, the Department has been informed by Polish Embassy officials in Washington that hundreds of other American citizens are being granted visas to attend these events within the limits permitted by available transportation and lodging facilities.

As you point out, every country has the legal right to regulate the entry of foreign visitors. There is clearly no sound ground on which the United States can undertake to question directly the exercise of this sovereign right. This has not prevented our Government from reminding the Poles of the damage which a restrictive policy of this nature could have upon Polish-American understanding and to the continued favorable development of United States-Polish relations. I can assure you that the Polish authorities have been left under no illusion as to the negative effect that denial of visas to high American church officials will have upon the view of Poland held by many Americans and their elected representatives. In this connection, U.S. Ambassador to Poland John A. Gronouski indicated to journalists in Warsaw on April 7 that he had discussed this matter informally with Polish officials and other Poles and called their attention to the adverse effects which this would have on U.S. public opinion.

Please call upon me whenever I may be of help to you.

Sincerely,
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

I have been both encouraged by and somewhat disappointed in the Department's response to my letter, Mr. Speaker. Clearly, our Government has expressed its concern about the Polish Government's restrictive measures and has pointed out that the impact on American opinion will be most unfavorable. As I interpret the reply, however, these expressions have been informal whereas I believe the situation is serious enough to warrant official and public protests.

After all, our Government believes in freedom. Together with the rest of the free world, we subscribe to the principle of freedom to travel. The Polish Government may have the political authority to prevent this freedom within its own borders, but it has no moral right to do so, especially in the present situation. If we value freedom, then, we should lose no opportunity to speak out, to let our voices be heard in behalf of freedom. I sincerely hope that our Government will not stop with half-hearted and informal expressions of concern but, instead, use its great influence in world affairs to call attention to this latest injustice and rally the free world behind greater freedom and liberty in Poland.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we can learn a lesson from the courage of the Polish people themselves. They have the most to lose from opposing their Communist government. If they can be brave, then we must be equal to their challenge.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we know, this year marks the millennium of the embracement of Christianity by the Polish Nation. Those of us who have over the years shared the joys and sorrows of the Polish people are pleased to join with them in this anniversary celebration. Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to place before the House an essay by Mr. Stefan Korbonski which eloquently presents a history of this period.

Mr. Korbonski's essay follows:

POLISH MILLENNIUM

(By Stefan Korbonski)

The year 1966 ushers in the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland. If one looks at the spirit of its history and its contribution to the progress and achievements of mankind from the perspective of this anniversary, the following reflections come to mind.

The fact that the Polish Prince Mieszko espoused Christianity in the year 966, was of great civilizational and national, as well as religious significance. It changed Poland from a pagan country to a nation modern for those times, belonging to the great family of Christian western nations within the orbit of Rome.

The adoption of Christianity took the pretext away from neighboring Germanic rulers who attacked Poland under the watchword of converting the pagan Slavic tribes to Christianity. The new religion took hold quickly.

The son of King Boleslaw Krzywousty, Henryk Sandomierski (1135–65), together with his knights, took part in the crusades.

Assuming an important religious mission in the East, Poland achieved in 1386 the conversion to Christianity of Lithuania and Samogitia through the marriage of Polish Queen Jadwiga to Lithuanian Prince Jagiello.

In time the Catholic Church language, Latin, became the official literary and educated-class language in Poland; in Polish architecture in turn the Romanesque, Gothic, and Baroque styles prevailed. The Italian renaissance was reflected in Polish science, culture, and art. Polish youth which sought learning abroad studied mainly in Italy (universities in Padua and Bologna), and in time in France.

MONGOL INVASION

Owing to its geographic position, Poland was exposed to attacks of the Moslems, who sought to conquer Europe, and by warding off these attacks it became a real bulwark of Christianity. When the Mongol hordes invaded Europe from Asia, their way was barred by Polish armies headed by Polish Prince Henryk Pobozny (the Pious).

Although Henryk fell in the battle of Legnica in 1241 together with his knights, the Mongol invaders suffered heavy losses, and were forced to retreat to Asia.

During later wars with the Moslems, the King of Poland and Hungary, Wladyslaw Jagiellonczyk, fell in battle with the Turks in 1444, near Warna, in Bulgaria. And in 1683 King Jan the Third Sobieski who went to the aid of Vienna under siege by Turks won a big victory which put an end to Turkish expansion in Western Europe.

BATTLE OF WARSAW

Poland played a similar role of bulwark of Europe in 1920 when, after the victorious battle near Warsaw popularly known as the "miracle on the banks of the Vistula," the Polish Army led by Marshal Jozef Pilsudski arrested the march of Bolshevik armies on a Germany defeated in the First World War, helpless and anarchized.

This battle, called by Western historians "the 18th most important battle in the history of the world" at that time saved Europe from communism.

Finally, in 1939, Poland was the first to oppose Hitler in his drive to conquer Europe.

Polish resistance in 1939 gave England time to arm, and contributed to the victory over Hitler. Poland played an important role in the Second World War.

BATTLE OF BRITAIN

The historic air battle of Britain in August 1940 was won with the outstanding help of Polish fighter pilots.

The Polish Army was the third largest, after the American and British (the 100,000 strong 2d Corps led by Gen. Wladyslaw Anders—besides an armored division, parachute brigade. Carpathian brigade as well as the more than 300,000-strong underground home army led by Gen. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski, officially considered an allied and combatant army).

Poles fought in guerrilla battles in the country and in Warsaw uprising as well as in the famous battles of Narvik, Tobruk, Arnheim, Falaise, Monte Cassino, Ancona, Bologna and many others on land, sea, and in the air.

And although at the end of World War II Poland found itself under Soviet domination, the same indomitable spirit was revealed in such incidents as the Poznan uprising in June 1956.

SPIRIT OF PROGRESS

During the course of its history Poland became a pioneer in modern internal and external constitutional forms. In 1385, through the marriage of Jadwiga to Jagiello it formed the first union of two countries—Poland and Lithuania—in the history of the modern world. When the Germanic Order of Teutonic Knights continued the German "Drang nach Osten," King Wladyslaw Jagiello defeated it in the battle of Grunwald in 1410. The "Drang nach Osten" was arrested for many years and only stirred again during the reign of the Prussian kings.

When the son of King Zigmunt the Third, Prince Wladyslaw, was chosen czar of Prussia by Russian Boyars, Poland tried to form a union with Russia, but this did not bring positive results. In this period (1566–1632) the Polish Armies under the leadership of Hetman Stanislaw Zolkiewski, occasionally occupied Moscow and the Kremlin.

In 1920, Poland, with future federation in mind, helped Ataman Semen Petlura to form an independent Ukraine, and in a battle with Soviet armies, the Polish forces liberated the capital of the Ukraine, Kiev.

FIRST REPUBLIC

As for internal constitutional forms, from the year 1573 the Polish nobility began to elect its kings, and thus Poland became the first republic, although only nobiliary.

Political freedom flourished, manifested by such outgrowths as "Pacta Conventa," or agreements made by the nobility with the elected kings which imposed various political and financial obligations on them, and "Liberum Veto," which made it possible for only one deputy to parliament (the Sejm) to dissolve the parliament and annul its resolution. (In a sense the veto in the United Nations Security Council can trace its ancestry to Poland in the 17th century.) This led to an anarchy in political life and the collapse of the inner strength of the nation and contributed to the partitions of Poland.

Nevertheless, it was an expression of the spirit of freedom. Finally, the modern constitution of May 3, 1791, did away with this anarchy, restoring hereditary monarchy and a strong government and cancelling the "Liberum Veto." Three years later, on May 7, 1794, Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko issued the Polaniecki Manifesto which served to partially free the peasants from serfdom while during the 1863 uprising against Russia the national government freed them from these duties completely.

COUNTRY OF FREEDOM

During the course of history Poland became the country of religious freedom and tolerance, insured by the Warsaw Confederation of 1573 which guaranteed the free worship of any religion. Arians, Lutherans, and Calvinists, Poles and foreigners, enjoyed this freedom. From the 11th century Jews settled in Poland in their flight from persecution in other European countries. Before the Second World War more than 3 million Jews, enjoying full rights, lived in Poland. Jewish religious life flourished. The most important Hebrew universities and publications were to be found in Poland (Jeszybot in Lublin). The Hitlerite occupation put an end to this—at this time the Polish Jews were exterminated, except for 300,000 hidden by the Polish people, although they were threatened with the death penalty for helping them.

In present-day Poland there is no room for religious tolerances, but nevertheless the Catholic Church and the Polish people successfully oppose the religious persecution by the Communist regime.

SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTION

Poland's contribution to the scientific achievement of the world is considerable. Here may be mentioned the Jagiellonian University founded in 1364, which celebrated its 600-year anniversary a short time ago, the first Ministry of Education in Europe founded on the basis of the Constitution of 1791, or scholars such as Mikolaj Kopernik (1473–1543). Ignacy Lukasiewicz (1822–82) the inventor of the kerosene lamp, a process of distilling oil, and the founder of the world's first oil mine near Krosno; Ludwik Zamenhoff, the inventor of the language of esperanto (1887); and Maria Curie-Sklodowska (1867–1934), Nobel laureate for the discovery of radium.

In the field of literature the following writers gained recognition: Wladyslaw Reymont (1867–1925), who received the Nobel Prize mostly for his novel "The Peasants"; Henryk Sienkiewicz (1845–1916), who also received this prize mostly for his epic "Quo Vadis"; and Jozef Conrad-Korzeniowski, a Pole writing in English, an author of world fame.

In music Fryderyk Chopin (1810–49) is one of the world's best renowned composers; besides him there are Stanislaw Moniuszko (1819–72), Ignacy Paderewski (1860–1941), and Karol Szymanowski (1882–1937). In the theater and cinema Helena Modrzejewska-Modjeska (1840–1909), Pola Negri, born 1897, gained world fame.

POLES IN UNITED STATES

At the time of the Polish partitions, Polish life also began to develop outside of Poland, particularly in the United States, where thousands of people emigrated. Poles took part in the American Revolution.

The first five Poles arrived in America on the English ship *Mary and Margaret* landing in Jamestown on October 1, 1608.

Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko came to America in August 1776, and Gen. Kazimierz Pulaski in 1777, and both of them took part in the Revolutionary War under the leadership of George Washington.

At the end of the war Kosciuszko was called the father of American artillery, and Pulaski, who fell in the Battle of Savannah, was called the father of American cavalry. The American people honor them to this day. Statues of Kosciuszko may be found in the square before the White House, in West Point, and Pulaski's on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, and in many other places. Many towns, bridges, and highways in the United States bear the names of these American heroes.

During the Civil War 168 officers and about 4,000 men of Polish extraction served in the Union Army, among them Gens. Wlodzimierz Krzyzanowski, Josef Karge and Albin Schoepf, and in the Confederate Army there were 17 officers and about 1,000 men of Polish extraction, among them Gen. Kacper Tochman.

Approximately 900,000 Polish-Americans served in the American Army in World War II.

In 1860 the Polonia in the United States numbered 30,000; at present it numbers more than 10 million Americans of Polish descent, and the capital of Polish-American organizations comes to approximately $500 million.

There are more than 50,000 members of the Polish-American intelligentsia (professors, attorneys, judges, doctors, engineers, journalists, etc.). In the present U.S. Congress there is 1 Senator of Polish extraction, EDMUND MUSKIE, and 11 Congressmen.

From the perspective of the thousand-year existence of Poland as a Western Christian country, 31,500,000 Poles at home and 10 million Poles abroad living all over the world can view proudly Poland's role in the history of the world and its part in the progress and achievement of mankind. The indomitable spirit of Polish history is a guarantee that this country, halted in its progress through the Communist regime, imposed on it by force by Russia, in time will throw off its shackles and will regain its freedom and independence.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, today, we commemorate a highly significant Polish national holiday—the 1,000th anniversary of the Polish acceptance of Christianity.

Since the 10th century, the Polish people have centered their lives around Christianity and the Western cultural tradition. In times of war or confusion, the church was the sole power which bound together the nation as a whole. When attempts were made to denationalize the Poles by means of religious persecutions at the end of the 18th century, during World War I, during the following World War II, the church remained steadfast.

Today, in the worldwide struggle of ideologies, the Polish people have remained steadfast in their devotion to the religious faith of their fathers. The light that was instilled in the hearts of the Polish people in the year 966 still burns brightly.

It is fitting that my colleagues in the House and Senate join together in paying tribute to the Polish people on this milestone in Christian history, the worldwide observance of their millennium.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, this year 1966 has been, and will continue to be, a most eventful and historic one for the people of Poland and all her many friends. It marks the observance of 1,000 years of Christianity in that country. Celebrating such an accomplishment is certainly cause for the Poles to feel justifiably proud of this feat. Indeed, this milestone clearly shows Poland's illustrious history to be much older than those of most of the world's nations.

Cardinal Wyszynski of Poland has been a most important figure in the observances and he will play a leading role in the May 3 observances. His inspiration and leadership have been vital in keeping the Poles in harmony with the tenets of their faith.

The background of this event can be traced back to the year 965 when Mieszko I, Poland's first national ruler, married the daughter of a Bohemian duke and in 966 accepted Christianity as his faith. Though he was under no obligation to do so, Mieszko's action proved to be of great importance in establishing Polish stability and power and gradually eliminating paganism.

During these present days of missiles and rockets and races to the moon and beyond, it is certainly reassuring to be able to recognize an institution which has survived a thousand years of man's sometimes erratic behavior. Thus Poland has seen kings and dukes and all manner of governments come and go, but the theme of Christianity which has played a most vital role in uniting the people has continued to grow.

True, Poland has had the misfortune to fall under the yoke of communism. But nevertheless, a large segment of her population has continued to reject the ungodly dogma of communism and has remained true to the church.

In this country, millions of Americans of Polish descent swell with pride as they look over the 1,000-year history of their country of origin. As they feel pride and happiness in Poland's accomplishments, I also wish to express my congratulations and offer best wishes to the people of Poland on a feat which many nations envy.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join our distinguished colleagues today in observing two important events in the history of Poland. While neither of these events are given official recognition by the Communist power which presently rules Poland, they are, nevertheless, deeply embedded in the hearts and minds of Poles everywhere.

It was at this time in 966 that Prince Mieszko I accepted the Christian faith from the West. This event changed Poland from a pagan country to a nation-state which, over the centuries, would rise to great heights and assume the vital role of being the bulwark of the West against the Moslem, Mongol, and other forces which tried to subjugate Europe. History has clearly demonstrated how deep the Christian faith has remained and grown in the Polish people, even though this country has been fought over and divided by its neighbors and has suffered under the tyranny of Nazi and Communist domination.

During this 1,000 years of continuous history, it was on May 3, 1791, that the Polish Constitution was adopted. Faced with possible annihilation by the actions of Russia, Prussia, and Austria during this period, all forces in Poland united behind this new Constitution, which was heavily influenced by our own Constitution.

Although the Poles have been forced to live under the tyrannical rule of several despots, they have a deep and firm love of freedom. This has been clearly demonstrated by the action of Gens. Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Kazimierz Pulaski during the American Revolution and, later, by the Warsaw uprising of 1944 and the Poznan riots of 1956.

The significant contributions Poles have made in the sciences, arts, and letters during their long history are particularly noteworthy. The names of Maria Curie-Sklodowska, Jozef Conrad-Korzeniowski, Fryderyk Chopin, and Ignacy Paderewski are familiar to all of us.

At present there are more than 10 million Americans of Polish descent and they, too, have made important and vital contributions to the growth and development of our Nation. I was very interested to learn that 11 of our colleagues in the House are of Polish extraction.

The Poles have a rich and proud heritage and they face this millennium with renewed faith and a rededication to their beliefs and principles. I am very privileged, Mr. Speaker, to join in this tribute to Poland's 1,000 years of continuous history.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, on the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity and the beginning of Poland as a nation, I salute the ideals of Christianity and freedom which still burn so brightly in the hearts of the Poles. Although this mighty nation has been under the domination of Russia, Prussia, Austria, Germany, and now Russia again, for almost the past 200 years, the oppressors have not been able to extinguish the Christian flames in the hearts of the Poles.

Our Nation will always remember the assistance given to it by Generals Pulaski and Kosciusko during the Revolution, for they helped our Nation at the moment of its birth into freedom. General Pulaski gave his life for our liberty. After the Revolution, General Kosciusko returned to Poland where he led the efforts to throw off the yoke that the czar of Russia had put on his people.

Because of her love of liberty, learned in her home, Marja Sklodowska had to leave Poland when she was a young woman. In later years her discovery of radium with her husband, Pierre Curie, let to an award of the Nobel Prize for them.

Nor are the lovers of liberty in Poland missing from the arts. Paderewski, famed as a pianist, led his government in exile during World War I and became Prime Minister in 1919 upon the restoration of peace. His efforts led to a united Poland after it had been dismembered between Russia and Austria-Hungary.

Pilsudski led the military uprisings that resulted in the overthrow of the Russians and then of the Germans and Austrians in Poland. He refused his election as President in 1926 and, instead, virtually governed Poland from his position as Minister of War until 1935.

The spirit of Christianity is kept alive today in Poland by the gallant example of Cardinal Wyszynski. Thus, 1,000 years after Poland accepted the Christian faith, it is still the Christian leaders who are keeping the traditional ideals of freedom alive today in Poland, even under the domination of the Soviets. The gallantry of her spirit, the depth of her devotion, the magnitude of her sacrifices, and the unlimited source of her unrequited faith are qualities which, in boundless measure, Poland has contributed to immortality.

Today I salute the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity and the beginning of Poland as a nation, and the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3 all America joins with the people of Poland in commemorating two great historic events in Polish history: the anniversary of Poland's Christianization in the year 966 and the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, May 3, 1791.

That these events have a fundamental significance for Poland is self-evident. By the adoption of Christianity, Poland became a part of Western Christendom of Latin Rome rather than Eastern Orthodoxy of the Byzantine tradition. Thenceforth, Poland's historical development was inextricably woven into the fabric of the history of Western civilization. By the adoption of the Constitution of 1791, Poland clearly alined herself with the then evolving constitutional democracy of the West, for in this document lay the seeds for a genuine democratic system of monarchical Poland.

Poles all over the world have good reason, therefore, to be full of pride on the commemoration of these great events today. It gives me a high sense of honor to share with them in this commemoration, particularly since I had the privilege of paying tribute to these events with President Johnson in ceremonies at the White House today. I know I speak for all Americans when I extend my congratulations to all people of Polish heritage on this truly glorious May 3.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in commemorating the anniversaries of two milestones in Poland's history which fall on May 3.

This day marks the 175th anniversary of Poland's famous Constitution of May 3, 1791—a constitution which, in a peaceful manner, reconstructed the government of the Polish nation on the basis of the same democratic principles which are embodied in our own Constitution.

This day also commemorates the millennium of Christianity in Poland.

On this historic occasion, I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations to the people of Poland, and to the millions of men and women of Polish ancestry who live in the United States and in other parts of the world.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express my deep concern about the continuing, unrelenting battle being waged by the present Government of Poland against the church in that country.

During the past year, the subcommittee which I have the honor to chair—the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—conducted hearing about the status of the various religions in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union.

We found in the course of those hearings, and reported to the Congress that in addition to government-sponsored propagation of atheism, there is in Poland an official campaign of interference with the people's right to religious freedom and worship.

The tragic part of this is that the present Constitution of Poland guarantees these very rights to the people of Poland.

As a consequence of this persecution of religious elements, in the words of one witness:

> The institutions of [Communist] Party ideology have quite largely destroyed the institutions, customs, and outlook by which the religious conscience is sustained—the church, mosque, and synagogue establishment, religious education in the school system, and religious mass media. A mere fraction of these elements remains.

The remarks of that witness were directed to the situation prevailing generally in the Soviet Union and throughout Eastern Europe. In Poland, whose population was once predominantly Catholic, a substantial part of the church has managed to survive in spite of the Government's persecution. Also, the faith of a large segment of the population is reported to be as strong as ever. Newspaper reports about the throngs of people who have attended religious ceremonies connected with the millennium of Christianity in Poland support this conclusion.

There is one aspect of the Polish Government's antichurch campaign which is of very special concern to us today:

In connection with the celebration of Poland's millennium, many members of the Catholic clergy in the United States, and individual members of various religious orders, have planned to travel to Poland to join in this observance which is of such great historic and spiritual significance to all Christians throughout the world.

We have received numerous reports that visas are being systematically denied to these religious tourists by the Polish Government.

This policy clearly contravenes the accepted norms of civilized behavior of the international community.

The world has long recognized the right of every country, every government, to make certain requirements of visitors. These may be requested to show, for example, that they have the means to support themselves during their sojourn in a given country and that they will not become public charges. Also, the right of every government to refuse visas to individuals who harbor subversive designs and present a threat to the national security, is fully acknowledged.

These considerations, surely, are not involved in the refusal of visas to American clergy by the Polish Government. This refusal can only be interpreted as a policy of deliberate discrimination, designed to deny a certain segment of our community access to Poland's millennium celebration.

This celebration will continue through August of this year. There is ample time, therefore, for the Polish Government to give this matter further thought. I, for one, hope that what appears as the current policy will be reversed upon reconsideration. Continuation of this policy would show utter disregard for one of the basic principles of civilized behavior, and could certainly affect the future course of our relations with the Government of Poland.

The people of the United States have long cherished warm sentiments of friendship for the people of Poland. During the past 8 years, we have assisted that country with solving its food shortage problem. Only a few months ago, we dedicated a lovely 300-bed hospital for children in Krakow, donated by the people of America to the people of Poland. Also our President has expressed active interest in other forms of "bridge-building" with that country.

Surely we can hardly be expected to continue in these efforts if our initiatives simply produce a slap in the face from the Polish Government.

And I think that the refusal to permit our clergy to enter Poland during this millennium celebration is nothing less than a slap in the face.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that our feelings on this subject will be noted by the Polish Government, and that discrimination against certain Americans because of their religion will come to an end.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 175th anniversary of the first Polish Constitution, a day noted with great pride by all Americans of Polish heritage. On this day 175 years ago, Polish leaders, with the strong backing of the people, formed the first liberal government in Polish history. The Constitution reflected the spirit of the newly sprung liberal movements in America, France, and England.

To Poles all over the world, today is also much more than just Constitution Day. It is the beginning of the observances of the anniversary of 1,000 years of Polish Christianity—the Polish millennium. Today at the Pauline Monastery located atop Jasna Gora in Czestochowa in south central Poland, Cardinal Wyszynski will rededicate Poland to Our Lady of Czestochowa, also known as the Black Madonna. Cardinal Wyszynski will be joined by thousands of Poles and many high officials of the Catholic Church from all over the world. But today's ceremonies are being held under the most difficult of circumstances.

Since 1945 when the Communists took over Poland they have been telling the free world that peace and harmony persist in Poland and they have made a great propaganda point out of freedom of religion. In fact, there is only supression and harassment of religion, no freedom. If the Communists now running Poland did not fear religion so much why would they ban the appearance of Pope Paul at today's ceremonies. Why do they fear this man? They know, as Josef Stalin told them, that the Pope has no divisions. They know, too, that Cardinal Wyszynski is a virtual prisoner, yet they fear him. What do the Communists fear from the Catholic Church? The same thing they fear from any church—the belief that the individual is more important than the state and that eventually he will answer to his God, not his state. Communism cannot hope to survive within such a framework.

The Communists have ruled Poland since 1945. But they have not won Poland. They never will. Need we look any further than to Poznan in 1956 and the workers rebellion to be reminded of the strength of the desire for freedom in Poland?

It is also significant to note, Mr Speaker, that Constitution Day is not a holiday in Poland. It is not, simply because the Communists will not let it be so. They could never admit that the will of the people, as expressed in the constitution of 1791, was capable of establishing a successful, free government. Communism, of any variety, has never been able to hold the minds of free men. Desperate men, in desperate circumstances, have turned to communism only to turn away once the barrenness of the promise was fully realized. Thus, the Soviets have lost the minds of the nations they now hold captive, as eventually they must lose the nations themselves.

By right and desire Poland should be free. And to be so her people will once again need the courage and determination they have shown over the past 1,000 years through a score of wars, partitions, invasions by enemies and betrayal by allies.

It is fitting on this day of historical and religious significance that we also pay tribute to the many contributions made to this country by the sons and daughters of Poland. I do not think this body need be reminded of the services of our own Revolution of Pulaski and Kosciuszko or of the many gallant members of the Polish Legion in the Civil War. I think, too, that we are all very much aware of the caliber of the Polish immigrants who, fleeing oppression, came to these shores in the last century. They have demonstrated a loyalty and capacity for hard work unsurpassed in our history. Today the children of these immigrants are well represented in the arts and sciences as well as the professions. Eleven Members of this body and one Member of the other body proudly claim such a heritage.

There are 10 million Americans of Polish descent living in the United States, almost one-third the population of Poland itself. It is no surprise then that this country feels so closely allied with that European state or that we join with our friends here in prayer for the speedy deliverence of Poland from Communist oppression.

Mr. Speaker, today we congratulate Poland on the anniversary of her millennium and express the fond hope that the next thousand years are happy and free ones.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to join with more than 7 million Americans of Polish descent in celebrating the 175th anniversary of the Polish 3d of May Constitution. This occasion reminds freemen everywhere of that memorable occasion when the people of Poland adopted a great constitution expressing their aspirations for liberty and democratic self-government, only 4 years after the adoption of the U.S. Constitution.

Tragically, the Polish Constitution was not permitted to survive long, but its ideals remain dynamic in the hearts of Polish people everywhere. Even in captive Poland today, where public recognition of this anniversary is not permitted, the desire for true freedom is alive. This has been dramatically demonstrated again recently in the efforts of Polish writers to smuggle out to free nations reports of internal conditions and of lingering hopes for release from bondage. It has been signified in the impressive efforts of the church of Poland to commemorate fittingly the millennial anniversary of the adoption of Christianity by the Polish people.

This brave nation has made many notable contributions to the enrichment of the world in the arts and sciences. Among Polish-Americans there have been countless prominent citizens. They are known as dependable, skilled workers, and good neighbors.

Today the struggle against tyranny continues unabated around the globe. The cause of freedom is being challenged as never before. Freemen must be more firm than ever in their resistance to oppression and in their resolve to protect the liberty for which so many wars have been fought.

Therefore, on this anniversary it is my great honor to pay tribute to a noble people in their determination to regain national freedom, security, and progress.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in the House today in celebration of the anniversary of Poland's May 3, Constitution Day.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 marked the culmination of liberalism and democracy after reactionary forces had held back progress in Poland, and thus rendered it a ready prey to its foreign foes. The Constitution put Poland on the path of progress, and its patriotic, energetic, and realistic leaders hoped that through the modernization of its governmental structure the country would be in a better position to meet the threats endangering its independence.

Under the specific provisions of this Constitution Poland became a constitutional monarchy, and the King could exercise his authority only through his ministers. A responsible cabinet type of government was to be set up. The legislative branch of the Government was revamped, so that the powers of the upper chamber were curtailed while more authority was given to the popular elected lower chamber. The townsmen were given some voice in the Government, and the barriers between the classes were practically eliminated. Religious toleration was guaranteed, and provisions were made for the periodic amendment of the Constitution. All these provisions made Poland's Government one of the most liberal and democratic in all Europe, and the Constitution was hailed by liberals throughout the world.

But the fact that the Government to be instituted under this Constitution appeared far more powerful and efficient than Poland's earlier Governments meant that the country would not remain an easy prey to its greedy foes. For that reason, before the Government could actually get started, Poland's foes attacked her, and finally partitioned her among themselves, so that the unfortunate Poles never had the good fortune to live under the liberal and progressive provisions of their model Constitution. As a matter of sad historical fact, for only two decades, during the interwar years, were they to enjoy the benefits of the spirit of the Constitution of 1791. But that spirit still lives in their hearts and minds, and since 1791 all liberty-loving Poles annually celebrate its anniversary as their national holiday.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in commemorating Poland's millennium.

In 966, when Mieszko I, the first historically known monarch of Poland, adopted Christianity for himself and his country, there was forged a virtually indissoluble link between Poland and Western civilization. Through this act Poland bound her destiny to that of the West, while at the same time building a strong bridge to the culture of the East.

During these 1,000 years the Polish people developed one of the most powerful and enlightened states in history. They experienced the sweet taste of victories, and the bitter sorrow of defeats; the profound joy of intellectual attainments, and the depths of suffering; the ineffable rewards of spiritual progress, and the sustaining power of an heroic faith. Above all, the Poles sustained a passionate devotion to liberty.

During this long and honored history Poland was in the forefront in the development of parliamentary government, and was among the first to develop the concept of unity of nations. At the birth of our own Nation Pulaski and Kosciuszko distinguished themselves heroically in General Washington's army to defend our liberty. Later, Kosciuszko willed his entire American estate for the emancipation of Negroes.

It is significant to note that as we commemorate this inspiring millennium, we also celebrate on this May 3 the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. This great charter of liberty of the Polish people was adopted just 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution.

Unfortunately there is a note of sadness in this commemoration. For we who live in freedom are painfully reminded that the liberty of the Polish people, which was recently trampled under the heel of nazism, continues to be fettered by the tyranny of Soviet communism. But we Americans share with Poles everywhere the sense of pride and accomplishment that they must feel on this 1,000th anniversary of their national state. The occasion reminds us all of Poland's continuing important place in our Western civilization. We extend to her our sincerest wishes that the day will soon return when the Polish people can enjoy these freedoms that are most characteristic of the civilization.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the millennium of Christianity in Poland. In the year 965 Prince Mieszko of the Piast dynasty married a Christian princess from Bohemia. The following year the prince was baptized and the conversion of the Poles to Christianity began.

Celebration of the millennium began April 14 and will extend on through the summer months. The high point of the celebration falls on a great patriotic anniversary, May 3, marking the establishment of the Polish Constitution in 1791.

Mr. Speaker, the present Communist regime of Poland does not recognize May 3 as a national holiday. It is also attempting to frustrate the celebration of the Christianization of the Polish nation.

But 20 years of Communist rule has not dulled the longing for freedom or the strong religious heritage of this gallant nation. The struggle of the Poles under Communist masters has been an inspiration to all captives of communism and a constant reminder to people who possess freedom to prize it highly. Through the voice of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, archbishop of Gniezno and Warsaw, the faith, the courage, and the love of freedom of the Polish people have been made clear to the world. One day faith and courage will bring a return of freedom to Poland.

I note with sadness that the Polish Government has refused to grant entry visas to church leaders throughout the world, including Pope Paul VI, to permit them to participate in this great religious anniversary. Among those excluded are 15 American prelates—including Archbishop Cousins of Milwaukee, Archbishop Cody of Chicago, Auxiliary Bishop Atkielski of Milwaukee, and Auxiliary Bishop Wycizlo of Chicago.

I do not understand why the Department of State has not registered a public protest against this treatment of distinguished American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about building bridges to reach the people of Communist nations. There is no better way to build a bridge to the people of Eastern Europe than by exchanges of visits of religious leaders.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, each year at this time it is customary for Members of the House to join in commemorating the May 3d anniversary of the Polish constitution of 1791—the first constitution of any old world nation that included guarantees of free speech, free press, and democratic institutions.

This year that observance is of special significance because it coincides with the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity. In the year 966 conversion of the Polish Prince Miezko to Christianity led the entry of the entire Polish people to the Catholic Church. It changed Poland from a pagan country to a nation modern for those times.

This week more than 1 million Catholics are expected to throng Czestochowa, Poland's national shrine, to join in the celebration.

Pope Paul VI will not be there, however, the Pontiff had been invited and the Vatican disclosed his wish to attend. But party chief Gomulka and other leaders of the Polish Communist regime barred His Holiness on the ground that the celebration had not been cleared with the government.

In this year 1966 the eyes of the world are on the millennium of Poland. Today while that nation is enslaved by the Communist Iron Curtain its God loving people, under the leadership of Cardinal Wyszynski, surge forward to celebrate the 1,000th year of Polish Christianity.

The history of Poland offers a majestic panorama of 1,000 years in which 40 generations knew the glory of victories and the despair of defeats and continuously kept searching for better life in freedom and brotherhood of man.

In defending Europe throughout the ages, gaining two decisive victories—one at the gates of Vienna in 1683 and the second at the gates of Warsaw in 1939—the indomitable Poles became in the words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt "an inspiration for mankind" in their heroic struggle against Nazi-Communist tyranny that threatened mankind in 1939–45.

In 1944 the Polish underground started an uprising against the German occupation forces but the outcome was disastrous, resulting in the almost total destruction of Warsaw.

Warsaw now is rebuilt and the people of that great city have rekindled their past with great determination despite the Russian imposed regime.

The year 966, when Poland accepted the Catholic faith from Rome and entered the community of Western Christendom, marks the real beginning of Polish history. Today the Poles are still following the moral precepts which their forefathers accepted a thousand years ago. They look forward to this year in 1966 as a time for renewal and rededication of their beliefs and principles.

Today let us offer our heartiest congratulations to the Polish people in all parts of the world on the occasion of their millennial year and on another anniversary of their national holiday.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. It is also the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity.

Throughout the history of Poland as a nation, the Polish people have been devoted to the concept of freedom and national independence. They have fought long and hard to free their nation from oppression and tyranny setting an example for others to follow. It is one of the tragedies of our time that despite the tremendous sacrifice of these courageous people, often marked by bloody conflict, Poland today remains under Communist oppression and the domination of the Soviet Union.

The Constitution of May 3 was modeled after our own Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. It embodied the firm belief of the Polish people that sovereignty belongs to the people, and it provided for the establishment of a modern constitutional monarchy and parliamentary type of government making long strides toward liberty and representative government.

The following declaration within the Constitution of May 3 affirmed this conviction of the Polish people:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The people of the United States have long cherished the friendship of the people of Poland. Today all Americans including the thousands of Americans of Polish ancestry join with the people of Poland on this anniversary of Poland's Constitution in the hope that the day may not be far distant when the Polish people may again enjoy the blessings of liberty in a free Poland in which the principles of Poland's historic Constitution may govern.

I take great pleasure in joining in this commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, we honor today a people who have been carrying on a symbolic and meaningful struggle for freedom for a thousand years. This struggle has been successful in that the people of the world witness daily the continuing battle there between totalitarian atheistic communism and those who bravely seek and secure spiritual guidance from the Catholic Church.

The year 966 is the most significant in the life of the Polish nation because it is the first known historical date of the origin of Poland as a nation. This is the year in which the Poles embraced Christianity. Christianity is inseparably connected with the national feelings of the Poles.

The Catholic Church there has been identified with freedom and spirituality while the Communist state has been identified with materialism and control. In Poland today we have a unique situation: the church exists—with 90 percent of the population Catholics—alongside a Communist government. Freedom and independence burn in the hearts of the 31 million Poles in their native land and they have inspired man with their thousand-year struggle for freedom.

These valiant people, represented so brightly by 1 Senator and 11 House Members in the U.S. Congress, are living the words of Jean Jacques Rousseau, who wrote:

> Poles. If you cannot prevent your neighbors from devouring your nation, do your best to make it impossible for them to digest it.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join today in paying tribute to Polish-Americans and to free Poles everywhere on Polish Constitution Day. It is significant that this year, 1966, marks the 1,000th anniversary, or millennium of Polish Christianity.

This double anniversary provides an opportune time for us to pause and reflect on the many contributions that Poland and her people have made to the world, and to the United States.

Prince Mieszko, of Poland, espoused Christianity in the year 966, marking the change of Poland from a pagan country to a modern Christian nation. Poland became a bulwark of Christianity when the Mongols and later the Moslems invaded Eastern Europe. Poland played a similar bulwark role in 1920, when a Polish Army arrested the march of Bolshevik armies on a Germany which had been left helpless by World War I. Again, in 1939, Poland was the first nation to give serious resistance to Hitler in his drive to conquer Europe. Polish resistance gave England time to arm and contributed greatly to Hilter's ultimate defeat.

The history of Poles in the New World began in October 1608, when five Poles arrived in America on the English ship *Mary and Margaret*, and landed at Jamestown.

Two outstanding Polish military leaders—Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Gen. Kazimierz Pulaski—played major roles in the American Revolution, serving under General Washington. Pulaski was killed at the Battle of Savannah, having given his life for the new American Nation. Kosciuszko is known as the "father of American artillery." Both this great patriot and Pulaski are honored today throughout the United States.

In the Civil War, 168 officers and some 4,000 men of Polish descent served in the Union Army, including three generals. Many hundreds more served in the Confederate Army.

In more recent years, approximately 900,000 Polish-Americans served their Nation in World War II.

Polish-Americans today number more than 10 million including 11 Congressmen and 1 Senator.

I am happy to add my voice today to the many others which are expressing admiration and congratulations to the gallant people of Poland as they mark two important anniversaries in the history of this great nation.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to take part in the commemoration of the anniversary of Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791.

The ties between our two nations and our two peoples remain as strong as our common devotion to freedom. These bonds cannot be broken by the most ruthless efforts of the Communist regime in Warsaw. The place of Poland as a distinct and independent country remains a common goal of our two peoples.

Throughout the centuries Poland made significant contributions toward the furtherance of democratic ideals and the development of modern civilization. Perhaps it is even more tragic when a people who have given so much to the heritage of modern man should now suffer the indignities of a foreign-controlled dictatorship.

It is especially appropriate that we give remembrance to this historic day this year which, as we all know, is the millennium of Poland's Christianity.

At this very hour when our sons are making supreme sacrifices on battlefields on the other side of the earth, let us make it clear to the Communist tyrants that our sons and our people are fighting not only for the people of South Vietnam but for the people of Poland and all men who cherish freedom.

It is a deep honor for me, Mr. Speaker, to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the courageous people of Poland and pledging to them once again, and to their friends and relatives here in the United States our continued efforts toward a better world—a world in which the flag of free and independent Poland shall proudly fly beside our own stars and stripes.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying how proud I was to have been invited by the President this morning to be on hand in the White House rose garden for a special ceremony commemorating this great event and the issuance of a special proclamation by the President. It was a beautiful and moving ceremony, Mr. Speaker, and nothing dramatizes more clearly the important emphasis which our Government places on closer relationship with the people of Poland.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this day commemorates two events, the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, and more specifically this year, the millennium of Christianity in Poland.

In 966 Duke Mieszko, first effective ruler of Poland, married the Bohemian Princess Dabrowka, creating a unified Polish nation and accepting Christianity for the Polish people, who up to that point were still pagans.

The Christian, or more correctly, the Catholic religion has been the foundation stone of Polish civilization since that day. In the early years, churchmen provided the educational foundation of the country, and in Poland's years of greatness churchmen provided the inspiration whereby the Poles fought and saved Europe from repeated Tartar and Turkish invasions. After the partition of Poland in 1795, the church kept alive the nationalism of the people, preserving the greatness of Polish culture and traditions until the country achieved its independence in 1918.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, the church retains its historic role as the defender and leader of the Polish national spirit in that it is the bulwark of defense of the Polish people against their autocratic Soviet-imposed Communist rulers.

As part of my remarks, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the April 30 issue of the Polish American entitled "Poles Celebrate Millennium, Great Constitution."

[From the Polish American, Apr. 30, 1966]

Poles Celebrate Millennium, Great Constitution

People of Polish descent are observing in 1966 Poland's millennium as a Christian state. In May they also celebrate the 175th anniversary of Poland's Constitution of the Third of May 1791.

What was so special about the Constitution, framed at a time when the old Polish Commonwealth was being torn asunder by the three autocratic powers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria?

After Catherine the Great of Russia engineered in 1772 the first partition that deprived Poland of access to the Baltic Sea and much of its central and southern heartland, a great reform movement began. While Russian was at war with Turkey, the Polish Diet met in 1788 to strengthen the republic's political life.

THE FOUNDATION

Groundwork for this Great Diet had been laid by the writings of the educator-patriot, Stanislas Konarski, and a powerful pamphlet ("Warnings for Poland") of another brilliant priest and scholar, Stanislas Staszyc. Their enlightened devotion to democracy—contrasting remarkably with the Western European clergy's then blind loyalty to feudalism—was shared by another priest, Hugo Kollataj (Kollontai), who became the guiding spirit of a republican reform group, the Party of Patriots.

Inspired by the French Revolution's Declaration of the Rights of Man, this group decided to lose no time in writing a new constitution. King Stanislaus August collaborated with Kollataj and a few others in writing and putting it into law. Edmund Burke hailed this "bloodless Polish revolution," contrasting it with the mad extremism of the French revolution.

ABOLISHES MISTREATMENT

The Third of May Constitution crowned the labors of the Great Diet and the whole evolution of Poland's parliamentary system that began in the two-house Diet created in 1493. In a preamble and 11 articles it reformed completely the nation's political, social and administrative life.

The constitution abolished the worst abuses from which Poland has been sick and dying, including the "liberum veto," by which the negative vote of one Diet member could wreck any legislative measure. It ended the election of kings, which had enabled foreign powers to place members of their royal houses on the Polish throne.

The executive power, however, was strengthened by giving the king a council of ministers resembling a modern cabinet. In the legislative branch the chamber of deputies, as the direct representative of the nation, was given preponderance of power over the senate.

ECONOMIC BARRIERS BROKEN

The economic barriers between the landowning nobles and towns people were broken down. The latter recovered judicial autonomy they had enjoyed as early as the 13th century and received the right to high office, magistracies and representation in parliament.

Just as the American Constitution was influenced by Montesquieu's "Spirit of Laws," so also was the organization of the Polish Government. The Poles did not follow blindly the French revolutionaries. The Third of May Constitution was framed to meet peculiar conditions, yet it made possible a new, sound and progressive national life. The authors, by showing a rational sense of moderation and an understanding of the maximum that politics is the "art of the possible," made a compromise between the most liberal trends of the time and the existing conditions in Poland.

They were faced with a poor economic situation and the unpreparedness of the landowning nobility for radical reforms. Also a time factor was posed by the increasing threat of the three surrounding predatory powers. Consequently, the peasant question was only partially solved for fear that radical reforms would provoke opposition from even the more progressive gentry and endanger the whole project.

A NEW IMAGE

This revolution of the 3d of May changed the views of the outside world about Poland. Hitherto, the Poles were held a troublesome and childish people, outlandish in their ideas, and incapable of great and decisive political action. The world now began to take them more seriously. It appeared that Poland could work out its regeneration if only outside powers left it alone.

This political stability and the threat of contagion of its ideas frightened Catherine and her partners in infamy. They hastened a second partition and, after the heroic uprising led by Thaddeus Kosciuszko was crushed by overwhelming forces, a third and final partition removed Poland from the map of Europe until the end of World War I.

Mr. Speaker, as an American of Polish extraction, I am proud of the great history, traditions, and culture of the land of my grandparents. I am also proud of the contributions of Polish-Americans to the growth of the United States. We are especially cognizant of the fact that the people of Poland share with all Americans a desire for legitimate freedom. Therefore, it is consistent with the century-old relationship of the Polish and American people that it be the foreign policy of our country not to subsidize or support the present day Communist government of Poland. Our interest legitimately lies in the aspirations of the Polish people for self-determination. It is obvious that the repeated propaganda theme of building bridges of understanding with the Communist governments of Eastern Europe is a policy which will lead to continued Communist dictatorship in Eastern Europe.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join my colleagues from Illinois and the gentleman from Wisconsin to observe the millennium of Christianity in Poland and the origin of Poland as a nation. Somehow it does not seem proper to use the word "celebrate," inasmuch as the Christian faith and the Polish nation continue to suffer persecution from the Communists.

The United States of America has been independent for 190 years, which makes it a mere child in the family of nations as compared to Poland, whose independence antedates that of all the nations of North America and South America, almost all of the nations of Africa, and even of many nations of Europe.

The religion of Jesus Christ came to our shores with the earliest explorers and inspired the Founding Fathers who established our Republic. Poland, however, has provided a home for Christianity since 966.

During the 10 centuries that have elapsed since Poland became a nation, the Poles have suffered much at the hands of other countries. Students of history are familiar with the three partitions that occurred during the late 18th century, when Russia, Prussia, and Austria carved up the territory of Poland and extinguished its independence for a century and a quarter.

Although Poland resumed its place among the nations of the world immediately after the collapse of the Russian, German, and Austrian Empires at the end of World War I, its freedom was short lived. It became the first casualty of World War II, when the twin totalitarian tyrannies of nazism and communism divided its soil between them.

The final overthrow of the Nazi regime meant liberation for millions of people in other lands who had lived under the yoke of a brutal conquerer, but the inhabitants of Poland did not share in the victory. They merely exchanged one oppressor for another as the Communists took over their land.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the people of Poland, who have through the years of oppression kept alive their Christian faith and remained loyal to their country, will again some day live in freedom. We in America must encourage them in their aspirations for complete independence, just as Generals Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Kazimierz Pulaski aided our infant Republic during the American Revolution.

If colonialism is wrong when practiced by Western European nations on the continent of Africa, it is wrong when practiced by the Soviet Union on the continent of Europe.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to pay two tributes to Poland today.

The first is the commemoration of the 175th anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791, a remarkable document which many authorities count as centuries ahead of its time.

The second is the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of Poland into Christianity, an act which has had a more profound and lasting effect upon Poland and its people than any other act.

The Christian ethic of compassion, of the dignity of man, has shaped the culture, the lives, the art, and the politics of Poland for 10 centuries.

It has served as the inspiration for its musicians and writers, it has helped unlock the secrets of the universe for its scientists and philosophers and has been the prime force in its educational system.

Despite the efforts of their present Communist masters, the people of Poland have not forgotten their beginnings in religion or politics, nor will they do so in the future.

The roots of that nation are too deeply planted in Christianity and in freedom to permit the efforts to suppress the individual and his worth to be more than a moment in history.

We in the United States have been blessed with many of the sons of Poland and their sturdy offspring, and they have made our Nation a better and freer place in which to live.

Some of our most distinguished generals, some of our best athletes, some of our most able politicians and diplomats are of Polish extraction.

Her sons and daughters here in the United States know and enjoy freedom and prosperity, and we all hope that soon these twin blessings will soon return to Poland and its people.

While we commemorate in sadness the suppression of political and religious freedom in Poland today, we contemplate with joy a tomorrow filled with liberty for its people.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, today, we commemorate the 175th anniversary of that great instrument of representative government the Polish Constitution. Born of that exciting period of history when our own Constitution was written, it reflects the desire and thinking of a European people, the Poles, who were in the forefront of the struggle for freedom—and who acted to insure the rights of men. Remember that the great Polish patriot, Kosciusko, thought enough of the subject of freedom under democracy that he gave of himself here in our cause during the War of Independence.

Poland is fundamentally a country in which the parliamentary system is a deep-rooted and age-old tradition. On the 3d of May 1791, one of the outstanding milestones in the evolution of democracy in Europe was marked. Today, Americans of Polish origin will be joining Canadians, Frenchmen, Brazilians, Argentines, and all others who trace their origin to Polish ancestry in celebrating this great occasion.

We might well feel on studying the philosophy of government discernible throughout the Polish Constitution and the Constitution of the United States, that the peoples of both countries drew their inspiration from the same source.

Rule by majority, secret ballot at elections, and religious freedom are outstanding in each of these Constitutions.

It is with sadness today that we honor a country and a people who cannot on this occasion give free expression to the historical and natural bent for freedom. Despite a wider range of liberties, the essential fact remains that Poland is under Communist rule.

We hope, however, that as history has recorded before about the Polish people that someday they shall be able to give free rein to their belief in a Constitution which is for Poland and by the Polish people—grounded in the principles of democratic life understood by freemen everywhere.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this occasion provides an excellent opportunity for all Americans to commemorate a heritage of democracy that we share with the Polish people. Since the start of World War II, the United States has paid tribute each year to Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791. This year's observance takes on added significance, because May 3, 1966, converges with the Polish millenium—the 1,000th aniversary of the Baptism of Poland. In 966, Poland accepted Christianity of the Latin Rite, thus becoming, in effect, a bridge between the East and the West.

Yet, in this year of the Polish millennium, Warsaw's Communist rulers are bearing down in their efforts to sever the religious, cultural, and political ties that have bound Poland to the United States and other Western Nations throughout history.

Neither my home State of Minnesota nor the district I represent, which coincides with the city of Minneapolis, is one of the major population centers for some 10 million Polish-American citizens. But there is a sizable number of Minnesotans of Polish descent in the district, nevertheless. While these people may not be in the majority, they have distinguished themselves as one of the most hard-working, patriotic, and religious national groups in the city.

The Polish-Americans of Minneapolis are very much a part of the mainstream of community life. At the same time, they continue to observe many of the proud traditions of their ancestral homeland, and these observations contribute greatly to the richness of the city's diverse national backgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, one section of the book "One America" is devoted to Polish-Americans in the United States. I would like to insert excerpts from this section in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

General History

The history of Polish-Americans is coextensive with the growth of the United States. Their oldest ancestors can be traced to the *Mayflower* settlement of Jamestown. On the eve of the War of Independence, Polish-Americans had an honored if small colonial ancestry, and were to be found in almost every colony. In the national period of American development, Polish-Americans grew in number and importance. They published their first books, periodicals, and newspapers, organized their first societies, started their first school, and founded their first parishes. They took part in the westward movement. During the years from the end of the Civil War to the close of World War I, Polish-Americans increased greatly in size and influence. Adjusting the essentials of their heritage to the exigencies of their environment, they brought into existence the Polish-American community, the Polonia Amerykanska, which with its churches, schools, societies, and press has been called the Polish immigrants' response to the American social frontier.

Following the close of World War I, the native-born generation of Americans of Polish parentage became increasingly active in the life of its community and its country. Conscious of their Polish ancestry and yet identifying themselves with American society, they grew more and more articulate in literature, music, scholarship, and art.

Since the end of World War II, they have assisted thousands of refugees and displaced persons in becoming an integral part of America, whose life they and their ancestors have enjoyed and enriched for nearly 350 years.

OCCUPATIONS

Over 90 percent of all Polish Americans live in cities and towns. They are engaged in nearly all industries; many are in business for themselves as manufacturers and distributors. * * * Those pursuing farming are to be found in all States but most of them till the soils of Wisconsin, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

RELIGION

The greatest single influence in the lives of Polish Americans, according to many observers, is religion. Perhaps more than any other factor it was responsible for the formation of the Polish-American community, the Polonia. Generally, the parish with its church, school, and societies was the nucleus around which the community started and developed. This was especially true during the years between the Civil War and World War I.

The religion that exercised the most potent influence on the shaping of Polish-American life was Catholicism, the traditional faith of Poland. Polish Americans are, for the most part, Roman Catholics with a deep attachment to the faith of their fathers.

A comparatively small number of Polish Americans belong to the Polish National Reformed Church, or as it is more familiarly known, the Polish National Catholic Church.

Protestants among Polish Americans are few. Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Witnesses of Jehovah support missions among Polish Americans with small success.

EDUCATION

Considerably more than any other Slavic group in the United States, Polish Americans support a large number of educational institutions. Nearly all of these are affiliated with the Catholic Church.

ORGANIZATIONS

There are an estimated 10,000 Polish-American societies and organizations in the United States. They fill a definite need in the community, varying in purpose, appeal, affiliation, membership, scope, and origin. They are devoted to every imaginable activity: religious, cultural, social, beneficial, patriotic, civic, business, and scholarly. Some are purely local, others national in scope; many are affiliated with parish churches, others are wholly independent of religious ties.

THE PRESS

Today several hundred Polish-American publications—newspapers and periodicals—function for an estimated 2 million readers, serving parishes, organizations, and political and business interests.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the gallant Polish people are now commemorating the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of the Polish nation, the millennium of Christianity in Poland. One thousand years equals 40 human generations and represents one-half of our Christian era. Thus, this celebration is a truly momentous occasion. In late April thousands of Poles attended the church's jubilee ceremonies, demonstrating that communism cannot suppress the deeply religious feelings of a great and ancient people.

Roman Christianity helped to give Poland a western cultural identity distinct from that of Russia, which adopted eastern Christianity from Byzantium in 988. This great cultural identity has sustained the Polish people through war, conquest, and partition. It is a powerful and deeply rooted historical force. In each period of Polish history great men have helped to preserve this religious and cultural identity. Today Poland has found a great religious leader, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski.

In Poznan, where the cardinal celebrated an outdoor mass on April 16, tens of thousands of people lined the streets. This powerful human demonstration was testimony to my firm belief that the Polish people will once again triumph over their oppressors, as they have done so many times before in their history.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans look to the day when Poland will be free again. They recall the prayer of General Pulaski as he lay dying for the cause of American freedom:

> I have so much for which to pray: that my country will again be free as this country surely will.

Over the decades and centuries the Polish people have been subjected to a horrifying series of conquests, invasions, partitions, and destruction of their national independence and sovereignty. But never has the spirit of liberty been destroyed in Poland; and it is very much alive today.

Mr. Speaker, the great homeland of Kosciusko and Pulaski, of Chopin and Paderewski, of Copernicus and Madame Sklodowska-Curie shall live in freedom again.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join today in the commemoration of Poland's great Constitution Day, as I have done every year since I have been a Member of this body.

There is special and marked significance to this year's celebration, because this is also the anniversary of the 1,000th year that Christianity came to Poland. Hence, this is the 1,000th year of the acceptance of the Christian religion in Poland in the year 966, over 500 years before America was discovered.

Since that time, the devout, pious people of Poland, aided immeasurably by great and outstanding spiritual leaders of great ability, zeal, and faith, have dedicated themselves as individuals and as a nation to the consecrated worship of the living God.

It should be said that no people anywhere have excelled them in this worship and in their strong, unyielding devotion to their faith, notwithstanding cruel, relentless persecution.

Many punishments have been visited upon the Polish people in the centuries that have intervened, and even today, in this enlightened age, they are the victims of heartless persecution by Communist oppressors, yet nothing can break them in their faith, nothing can quench their indomitable spirit, nothing can force them to give up their practice of worship.

Belief in God and love of freedom have been the dominant notes of Polish history. These are two principal bulwarks of spiritual strength that have been largely responsible for the gallant but bitter struggle that Poland and the Polish people have waged through the years for their homeland and their right to be free.

Those who believe that the Polish people will ever, by force or otherwise, give up the profession and practice of these great principles are only deluding themselves, because the Poles are determined to continue their worship of God, and they are irrevocably pledged to work, strive, and fight for their freedoms.

The people of Poland do not seek to impose their wills upon any other peoples. They only wish to be liberated from the iron grip by which Marxist communism holds them fast. They strive and seek to prevent this organized tyranny from continuing to impose its will on them, their families, their communities, and their nation.

They seek, in a word, to be released from bondage, to be permitted to return to the free way of life, to be free from oppression and the brutal dictates of communism, which denies them in so many instances, the right to life, liberty, and happiness, and deprives them of their God-given rights as free men and women.

The millennial year of Poland's first acceptance of Christianity has seen the intensification of the Communist campaign to destroy all religion in Poland. The enmity against the church and its leaders has been renewed. The Iron Curtain has been pulled down tightly against religious pilgrimages and visits. Distinguished holy personages and leaders have been denied permission to leave the country on important religious missions. Tourism from the West is discouraged and reduced; concourse and contact between Poland and the outside free world throttled.

What could be stronger proof of the fear of the Communists that the Communist system cannot bear the light of day, that when it is exposed to the searching light of democracy and freedom it fades away and withers on the vine. Every strategem is used to try to wean the Polish people away from thoughts of God and freedom but every one of them have been failures. The Polish people are stronger than ever for the concepts of their faith and for freedom, democracy, and justice.

It is the hope of the Communist world that if they can keep the Polish people isolated long enough, and can indoctrinate each young generation with hatred of religion and freedom, that the battles for communism can be won, that in time the people will tire of trying to resist and will surrender to the dictatorial Marxist control.

To the Communist mind, distorted as it is with a power complex of domination, force, compulsion, absolutism, it is logical to assume that steady exposure to Marxism over a period of time and regimented control by force, when necessary, will ultimately break the spirit of the gallant Polish people.

But anyone who knows the Polish people well understands that communism can never break their will, that the passage of time will not weaken, but even strengthen their determination to struggle on, and fight on, until they are liberated, until once again they achieve their rights as free men and women to live under institutions of freedom.

As Americans, we have a special duty to the Poles and to our fellow citizens of Polish descent, whom we so greatly esteem for their contributions to our nation in war and in peace. We must make it clear to them that we stand with them in every word and act designed to bring about the independence and freedom of their oppressed friends and relatives in Poland.

As members of this Congress, elected by the American people, mindful of the origin of our own Nation, and opposed as we are to tyranny, bondage, and oppression, we are resolved to do everything in our power to encourage and sustain the Polish people, to strengthen them in their purpose to be free again, and to help them in every way we can to reach that goal of liberation and self-determination.

This impressive program here today will be a message across the seas to the people of Poland, its leaders and its friends, that the representatives of the American people, not only sympathize with them in their sorrow and ordeal, but are eager to help them to win back the liberties and freedom that have been stolen from them by those who do not believe either in God or the freedom of man.

Let the Polish people persist, and let all those who are behind them in their struggle for freedom persist, until the day when Poland will again find its place in the sun, and be restored once again to the role of a free nation and free people "under God, with liberty and justice for all."

I received two very impressive statements from His Distinguished Excellency Aleksander Zawisza, Prime Minister of the Polish Government-in-Exile in London, in the form of a message from the President of Poland to the Polish nation and a declaration in respect to restrictions on religion in Poland.

I ask that these very illuminating and informative statements be made part of my remarks.

[From the Polish Government (in-Exile), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, London, S.W. May 1, 1966]

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION, ON THE OCCASION OF THE POLISH NATIONAL DAY, MAY 3, 1966

His Excellency August Zaleski, legitimate President of the Polish Republic, addressed the following message to the Polish nation on the occasion of Poland's national day this year:

"One hundred and seventy-five years have passed since the Great Diet—Seym—of the Polish Commonwealth, prizing the political existence, external independence and internal freedom of the nation more highly than life and personal felicity, enacted the reformed Constitution of May 3, 1791.

"The Polish nation was not alone in pinning hopes for a better future to this new Constitution. Writing to King Stanislas Augustus of Poland at the time, Pope Pius VI stated:

"It is indeed difficult even to imagine with what joy this news was received by us and how greatly we are heartened thereby that the Polish nation, a nation so well beloved by us, from these so excellent elements of well-conceived government gives promise of most respendid universal felicity in the near future.'

"Although the partitions of Poland made it impossible to apply the new Constitution in practice, the third of May has always been celebrated by the Polish nation as the national holiday notwithstanding the fact that this was forbidden during various periods by the countries which have dismembered Poland.

"Thus, when Poland recovered her independence, the third of May was proclaimed a national holiday by statutory law.

"Pope Pius XI combined this anniversary with the holiday of the Virgin Mary, Queen of the Polish Crown. More than three centuries have elapsed since King Jan Casimir 'chose the Most Holy Virgin as the patron and queen of his realms.' The Polish nation has never ceased to consider these vows of King Jan Casimir as binding.

"This year, both these great holidays of ours are linked with the celebrations of Poland's Christian millenary, and the regime that now rules Poland by the will of Russia is doing all in its power to prevent the success of this celebration. It can forbid the holding of public meetings; it can block the participation of the numerous bishops and faithful from many countries who intended to proceed to Poland; it can even prevent the Holy Father from visiting Czestochowa—but this regime cannot eradicate from Polish hearts those sentiments which we all have for our native land and the church, nor can it stop us demanding justice for Poland and uniting in prayer for the freedom of our country.

"AUGUST ZALESKI."

[From the Polish Government-in-exile, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, London, SW. 1, April 1966]

DECLARATION IN RESPECT OF THE RESTRICTIONS ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN POLAND

The Council of the Republic of Poland, which carries out the functions of a Parliamentary body in exile, issued in London the following declaration during its session of April 2, 1966:

"The Communist regime, imposed upon Poland by Moscow and kept in power solely by the Soviet Russian protectorate, by restricting the freedom of the primate and bishops to proceed abroad and by willful arbitrary interpretations of the letter sent by the Polish Catholic hierarchy to the German bishops, is striving to produce the impression that the Polish episcopate does not vindicate the Polish-German frontier along the Oder and Neisse Rivers. Yet, this letter not only possesses profound religious and moral significance but also plainly states that the Polish hierarchy in unison with the whole nation occupies the standpoint that the Oder-Neisse frontier is inviolate.

"The perfidious moves of the Communists are uniformly aimed at weakening the church and sapping its position. They are coeval with the millenary of Poland's conversion to Christianity celebrated this year by the Polish nation in the homeland and abroad as the anniversary of the definitive triumph of the Christian faith on Polish soil.

"Particularly painful for the people of Poland and the free Poles in the Warsaw regime's decision to ban the intended visit of Pope Paul VI to attend the millenary celebrations at Czestochowa. This visit of the Pope to Poland would have been the first in her history and undoubtedly a major event of international importance, as were similar visits to India, the Holy Land and New York. The Warsaw regime's action in preventing this visit is harmful to the Polish nation and cannot be interpreted otherwise than as an expression of that regime's submissiveness to its taskmasters in Moscow.

"With its thousand-year-old traditions of statehood and its thousand-year-long attachment to the religion of their forefathers, the Polish people will not be misled regarding the real aims of communism. They know full well that combating the church occupies a leading place in the program of Communist materialistic ideology—so foreign to the spirit and traditions of the Polish nation.

"The Council of the Republic of Poland protests against all the restrictions on the freedom of the clergy in Poland. At the same time, speaking on behalf of the whole nation, whose voice is stifled by an administration alien to the Polish people, the council expresses profound attachment to the Christian faith and the Holy See and declares that the Polish nation is linked with the Catholic Church by indissoluble ties profoundly embedded in the national tradition and character of the whole nation.

"The Council of the Republic of Poland is convinced that the people of Poland fully comprehend the intentions of the Kremlin's agents and will rally all the more closely around the Catholic Church in this millenary year to give still deeper expression to their sentiments and aspirations in accord with the splendid spiritual heritage bequeathed by their ancestors who gave form to the first millennium of Poland's chronicled history."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, marks the observance of the Polish millennium, the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's embracement of Christianity.

Today, Poles, the world over, are standing proud—proud of the milestone in their country's history, proud of the heritage of their nation, and most important, proud of their continuing faith in God, and in His Son, Jesus Christ.

From the very beginning, by virtue of its geographic position, Poland had been a nation beset by conquerors. From the attacks of the Moslems during the Middle Ages, Poland earned the title, "Bulwark of Christianity." Even today, though its people are enslaved by communism, Poland is still the "Bulwark of Christianity." Her people have clung and will continue to cling to their faith in God, and in this faith, will be their salvation.

The Poles are a hardy people, and have had to struggle constantly for their land. Yet, midst their struggles, they have produced some of the world's most beloved musical masterpieces, some of the greatest literature, and some of the most renowned scientific discoveries.

We pay a just tribute to the Poles today. In their hardships, all men can find courage. In their accomplishments, all men can take pride. In their faith in God, all men can find strength. We pray with Poles everywhere that Poland once again, will break the binding chains of slavery and enjoy freedom.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, today it is the privilege of freemen throughout the world to join in commemorating the 1,000 years of the Polish nation. The emergence of Poland as a national entity dates from the 960's and the Christianizing of Poland—the most significant unifying force—took place in A.D. 966. It was the joining of Poland with the Latin rite of the Roman Catholic Church which set the course of Poland's continuing orientation toward the West.

The Polish nation has made significant contributions to the traditions of democratic government from the 15th century forward. Poles of great fame, accomplishment, and valor have enriched and profoundly affected the course of history:

Copernicus, Kosciuzko, Pulaski, Marie Curie, Joseph Conrad, Paderewski, Chopin, Rubinstein, and Cardinal Wyszynski.

There are few among us here who will forget the agony suffered by Poland under the Nazi conquest. Nor will we soon forget the valor and defiance expressed by radio Warsaw as it broadcast its unceasing refrain of Chopin's stirring "Polonaise" in Warsaw's final hours of freedom before the Nazi conquest.

Mr. Speaker, even though today Poland has a Communist government under Russian domination, Poland has such a tradition of its own national entity that communism has in some respects had to accommodate to Poland. Repeatedly, we hear of the strong admiration and affection felt by the Poles for the United States. We salute this nation and we hope sincerely that it may regain its national freedom soon.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1966, the bishops of Catholic Poland, along with hundreds of clergy and thousands of the Polish faithful will assemble at the famed shrine of Our Lady of Czestochowa and there they will in solemn prayer ask for God's blessing on their country and give thanks for the blessings God has bestowed on their country for the past 1,000 years.

The Communist regime has prevented many friends of Poland from sharing in the celebration of the millennium. Only over this weekend we were informed that Pope Paul will not be a pilgrim at this great religious feast because of this restriction and that he has, therefore, appointed Cardinal Wyszynski to act as his representative.

When these restrictions were first announced, Cardinal Wyszynski expressed this moving thought:

> We know that wherever Polish hearts beat, the millennium is celebrated.

I think we can enlarge upon this idea to include all who, like Pope Paul, wanted to share this moment of religious dedication with the people of Poland but were prevented, and to include all others such as we here in America who while not attending the celebrations still commemorate in our hearts this great act of Polish acceptance of Christianity 1,000 years ago.

The significance of this celebration cannot be minimized; for what the conversion in 966 of the Polish monarch Mieszko I meant was the religious, political, and cultural union of Poland with Western Christendom and, therefore, with Western civilization.

Thus, it is no wonder that the Communist regime has done all in its power to thwart the commemoration of the Polish millennium, for what is being commemorated is abhorrent to their souls: Polish Christianity and Polish unity with the West.

This little group of men who wield Communist power in Poland can prevent Pope Paul from visiting Poland and all others who wish to join their Polish friends at this great moment; they can hold rival secular celebrations as a way of undermining the religious significance of the event; they can devise all conceivable restrictive measures, which they have, to reduce the scope of this celebration: all these they can do because they hold political and physical power in Poland. But they cannot halt the natural historical tendency that lies deep in Poland's soul, and that tendency is unity with the West and her spiritual unity with the church of Rome.

And so on this great religious and patriotic feast day for the people of Poland, let us all join in wishing them Godspeed and let us affirm once again our great regard for Poland and her people.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, this year's observance of Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791 bears special significance since it converges with the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of Poland.

Free people throughout the world, along with friends of Poland, are joining in these anniversary events, which call attention to the great charter of this nation, which is regarded as one of the greatest democratic constitutional documents. The document has, however, proved of no benefit to the Polish people who witnessed the partition of their land by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

History indicates that for approximately 20 years, the people of Poland were able to enjoy freedom, as guaranteed by that famous Constitution. This happened between the two great wars.

The guns boomed again when Hitler and his perverse henchmen and Third Reich supermen moved across the Polish frontier and the despair of defeat again took over those patriots who conducted a heroic struggle against great odds. The Soviet Union, too, swept in from the east and began a mass deportation of whole families to the bitter confines of Siberia and its horrible and inhuman slave-labor camps.

How tragic the fact that this July, the Polish puppet government will mark what they call the "liberation" of that country. It is a gross shame that the land of Poland, with its history of defending Europe against the Tartar, Turk, and Mongol, now lives under the domination of the Communists.

The Communist regime is taking steps even now to further isolate Poland from the West during this millennial year. Refusals of visas are but one method being employed to discourage tourists. It is transparent in these actions to halt the influence of Western ideas of democracy and fairness.

In the First Congressional District of Wisconsin, which I represent, a number of residents are of Polish descent. Among them are many who truly know the terrors of war, imprisonment, and slavery. They, and their countrymen who preceded them to America, have made this Nation as great as it is through their individual talents and ambitions.

Therefore, I join countless others in honoring a milestone in history. The eyes of the world are on the millennium of Poland—and our hearts are with the people of Poland.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to commemorate two important events in Polish history. May 3 is the 175th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland in 1791. This anniversary is important in its own right since the Constitution of 1791 was the first democratic constitution in all of Europe. This historic document placed the peasants under the protection of the law and abolished serfdom. It also provided for freedom of religion which has always been an integral and vital part of Polish national life. Indeed the other event now being celebrated in Poland is the 1,000-year anniversary of the establishment of Christianity in Poland.

In 966 the Polish monarch Mieszko I became baptized and led Poland into Western Christendom. The religious commitment of this noble nation is no less strong today even under the burdens imposed by the present Communist regime. This fact was made clear by the tremendous support shown for Cardinal Wyszynski, the spiritual leader of Polish Catholics, during the recent religious celebrations in Poznan marking a thousand years of Polish Christianity.

Nearly two decades of Communist rule have failed to destroy Poland's determination to rule her own destiny. I speak for thousands of Americans in my Sixth Congressional District, who are proud of their Polish heritage when I express the hope and firm conviction that the burdens now affecting Poland will soon be lifted. If 1,000 years of Polish history provides a clue to the future, we can predict with confidence that the Polish people will someday resume their historic role as defenders of man's right to control his own destiny.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, a dramatic episode occurred in the 1966 celebration of Poland's Christian millennium. The incident occurred in Poznan, Poland, where rival observances of this historic event were respectively led by Polish Communist leader, Wladyslaw Gomulka and Poland's Roman Catholic Primate, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. The result of this climactic confrontation, in which the Polish people's overwhelming enthusiastic reception of the Cardinal provoked an exclamation of disgust from an exasperated Gomulka, graphically symbolizes the modern day significance of Poland's 1,000 years of westward-looking Christian nationhood.

Poland's indomitable resistance to tyranny, with its historic roots in Christian opposition to infidel aggression, has marked this nation as the sharpest thorn in Russia's side since the Czarist domination of Poland in the 19th century. Of course, we in the United States need no reminder of the Polish people's devotion to the fight for freedom, and we will not soon forget the assistance they afforded us in our efforts to throw off our colonial shackles almost two centuries ago. The Polish heroes of our revolutionary war, General Kosciusko and Pulaski, have made a lasting impression on the hearts and minds of all Americans, and we are constantly mindful of our debt to the

Polish people and continually seeking to maintain our ties of friendship with them.

It is therefore fitting that we give the fullest recognition and attach the highest priority to the 1966 celebration of the Polish millennium in this country. Our dedication to this object has been shown by Vice President HUMPHREY's visit and address at the huge Buffalo celebration of the millennium in January of this year, and by the U.S. Post Office's issuance of a special commemorative issue honoring this occasion.

We fervently hope that the next 1,000 years of Polish nationhood may be as fruitful as the last, and that Poland's magnificent contributions to the worlds of government, science and the arts may be continued. As we look back upon such valiant generals as Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski, and such gifted artists as Frederick Chopin, and Ignace Paderewski, we can look forward with anticipation to Polish prominence in her second millennium, to her continued example as a bulwark of Christianity and, most significantly, to her return to the freedom and self-determination which is her birthright.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, this date, May 3, marks the commemoration of Poland's Constitution of 1791 as well as the millennial year of Christianity in Poland.

Especially on this day we here, and all Americans, join with the people of Poland in continuing prayer for Polish independence and a renewed pledge to persevere in our efforts toward the restoration of liberty and freedom to Poland and the rest of the Communist subjugated and enslaved nations of the world.

No one who understands the great contribution to our own independence to the immortal Polish heroes of the American Revolution or who has read of the glorious history of Poland in defense of Christian principles can help having tremendous admiration for the courage, patience, and fortitude of the Polish people in their unending struggle to regain their independence.

The Polish people proved, in 1920, that they were among the very, very few in the world who early recognized the planned and determined Kremlin objective of reducing the free world to atheistic slavery. The price Poland paid for her early courageous resistance to Communist attack was catastrophic and the blow was even more severe when it appeared that their allies had turned their heads away from the sight of their cruel and inhuman plight under Soviet tyranny and subjugation. The debt the still free world owes to heroic Poland for her gallant and inspiring stand against the Communist horde 46 years ago yet remains unpaid and will remain a blot upon the moral integrity of all her previous allies and the United Nations until it is paid. That is why we, as just and conscientious Americans, must never relax our efforts to help the Polish people reestablish their freedoms under their own chosen form of government. As a nation dedicated to the democratic principles of personal liberty the U.S. Government has an obligation to unceasingly maintain the right of Poland to her independence and persevere, both as an individual country and a member of the United Nations, in demanding that the Communist leaders grant full freedom and independence to Poland. We can do no less and still proudly call ourselves a Christian democratic nation while we join in prayer that the blessed day will soon come when Poland and all other enslaved nations will once again happily enjoy their personal and national freedom.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in Poland's history there are many memorable and significant events which are observed and celebrated by the Poles as national holidays. But the event which is dear to their hearts and which has a higher claim to their loyalty and devotion is the great event which took place 1,000 years ago, in the year 966. In that year by the marriage of Poland's king to a Christian princess of Bohemia the Poles accepted Christianity as their religion, and the new faith became their state religion.

Since that memorable year Poles have been among the most consistent and devout believers in Christianity. Since then there have been many revolutionary and startling changes in Poland's political, social, cultural, and economic history. Its status in the power scale of European states has had its rise and decline, but all these changes, some of which were more or less forced upon the Poles, did not in any way alter or diminish their unflagging devotion to their Christian faith. On that one issue there was no division among the Poles, and their foes and conquerors, well aware of that fact, did not and could not impose upon the Poles another form of ideology or belief. To this day Poland remains a true home of Western civilization and one of the most admirable examples of Western culture in all central Europe.

This year being the centenary of that great event all Poles, both inside and out of Poland, are planning to celebrate it with due solemnity. The church leaders in Poland had been planning this celebration for several years. Their plan called for the presence of nearly all high church leaders in the Christendom. Having that in mind they had invited church leaders from Germany, and of course also Pope Paul VI. Until recently it was hoped that everything would proceed as planned, and all Poles were looking forward to the climax of this celebration in May. Unfortunately, however, Poland's church leaders were to encounter the bitter opposition of the anticlerical Communist masters of Poland. And the difficulties raised by the Government are numerous, but the most shocking one is that it will not allow the holy father to visit Poland, even on such an unprecedented and memorable occasion. That is the extent of the inhumanity practiced by Poland's Communist leaders. But the celebration will go on as planned, and with the blessing of Pope Paul VI and of the other high church dignitaries who are barred from Poland, the Poles shall celebrate the millennium of their Christianization in a most dignified and solemn manner that should put to shame their tyrannical Communist detractors. On the occasion of the celebration of Poland's millennium I commend the Poles for their steadfastness and fortitude in clinging to their faith.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this year we pay double tribute to Poland on May 3. We honor the anniversary of the Constitution of May 3, 1791—that embodiment of progressive, liberal, and democratic principles significantly chosen by the freedom-loving Poles as the landmark of their history—and we honor also the 1,000th anniversary of the adoption of Christianity by the ruler of Poland and by that country as a whole, in the year 966.

It is not just because of the dates that we make this a double celebration. There is a close link between the two. The Constitution of 1791 is hailed both for its content, its provision for a modern, constitutional democracy, and for the methods of its adoption, which was entirely peaceful. In an age when rebellion and internal revolution were responsible for the birth of such new and democratic governments as those of the United States and France, the Polish people adopted by purely peaceful means a constitution which was hailed by Edmund Burke and others as the beginning of a parliamentary government similar to that of England in benefits to the people.

Moreover, besides the peaceful influence of Christianity which was reflected in the method of adoption of a constitution by the Polish people similar to those of the Western World, there was also a definite link between the West and the adoption of Christianity by the Poles a thousand years ago.

By the conversion of the dynasty and the people of Poland in 966, Poland was brought into the orbit of Christianity.

Adopting the Judeo-Christian concept of man and recognizing the inherent dignity of the individual, Poland became a source of cultural and scientific achievements.

Today the Polish people are struggling with those forces which would orient their genius toward atheistic materialism.

However, the testimony of centuries has shown that the Polish spirit will endure forever and remain faithful to the principles and precepts on which the greatness of Poland has been founded.

The principles of liberty, equality, fraternity, which are hallmarks of the constitutional governments of the Western World, are today the links between us and the freedom-loving Poles.

Today in celebrating Poland's Constitution Day, May 3, and the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of Poland, we honor a strong, courageous people and look forward to the time when once again they will be able to enjoy the full expression of man's most noble aspirations.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, since the early years of World War II Polish Constitution Day has been observed in the House. Many of the Members taking part in today's observance were active participants in those earlier tributes to a gallant people. I am proud to be counted among them.

In those earlier years the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day served as a proper occasion to remind our fellow Americans that free and independent Poland was the victim of the twin tyrannies of nazism and communism. By a cruel turn of fate Soviet Russia crawled into the unbecoming position of ally with the Western Powers, but only after its honeymoon with Hitler came to an end. Fears were expressed then that this strange alliance might lead to a new betrayal of the Polish nation. Those fears were well founded as events of the past two decades demonstrate.

No one who believes in freedom will forget that the disastrous Yalta Conference brought recognition to the so-called Lublin provisional government, a wholly owned fraud of the Soviet Union. Those who today are calling for a coalition government in Saigon to include the Vietcong should be reminded that representatives of our Government agreed to recognize the so-called Lublin government provided that it would be enlarged to include prodemocratic representatives from liberated Poland and the legitimate Polish Government in exile. This was to be a coalition government, to govern Poland until free, unfettered elections could be held. Anyone with a smattering of knowledge knows the tragic results which followed. That alleged coalition government was nothing more than a Russian device to put the Polish nation in Communist chains. Free elections were not held—the Russian stooges in the Lublin government seized dictatorial power and have held it ever since for their masters in Moscow.

This May 3 reminds us of a unique event in the history of the Polish nation. This year marks 1,000 years of Christianity for the Polish nation. On this day, to mark this glorious millennium, many thousands of brave Poles will gather at Jasna Gora, site of the Shrine of Our Lady of Czestochowa, their patron saint. They will do this in defiance of the alien regime now in control of their country. There they will pay tribute to the burning Christian faith which has sustained them throughout 10 centuries—an unbreakable faith which is the real spirit of Poland and her people.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is tied to the Polish cause by historical events known to every American schoolchild. In our struggle to win our national independence we were blessed with the heroism and leadership of many now famous Polish names. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko and Col. Casimer Pulaski won a permanent place in the history of our Nation. Pulaski—father of American cavalry—lost his life in the battle of Savannah in 1779. Kosciuszko, confidant of both Gen. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson returned to Poland after we won our independence and attempted to rid his homeland of foreign occupation and to reunite it in freedom.

We are tied to the Polish cause by strong bloodlines among millions of our citizens. The first Polish immigrants came to our shores in the early days of the Jamestown settlement. These first settlers were joined by millions of others who migrated from Poland to start a new life in freedom. Polish immigrants helped to push our frontiers of civilization westward to California and the Northwest Territory. They helped to build our great country. The ancient culture of Poland is firmly woven into the multicultural fabric of our Nation.

It was natural, therefore, that President Woodrow Wilson, in his 14-point program for world peace, included the reconstruction of an independent Poland as one of the major points. That peace objective was realized on November 11, 1918, after 123 years during which time the name of Poland had been erased from the map of Europe. During all those years of partition and foreign occupation the spirit of the nation was kept alive by the indomitable Christian faith of the Polish people.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has no more proven or dependable allies than the people of Poland in our quest for peace with freedom and justice. They are no strangers to the meaning of human freedom. Their enmity toward atheistic communism and all it stands for is attested to by their heroic stand against it for the past half century. They look to us for help in their struggle to rid their land of the foreign occupiers who have been imposed upon them by force of arms. There will be no peace in Europe until independence and freedom have been restored to the Polish nation.

I salute the people of Poland on this anniversary of their constitution. The Christian world honors Poland on the millennium of their faith. Long live the Polish nation.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to join with my colleagues in commemorating the millennium of Poland's conversion to Christianity. It is indeed a rare occurrence in the history of mankind that one is privileged to participate in celebrating the 1,000th anniversary of a nation; I think we are all deeply aware of the transitory nature of so many of mankind's institutions, and therefore cherish with especial consideration one that has managed to survive the onslaughts of a full millennium.

The year 966 is generally relegated to the so-called Dark Ages by many historians, but in the history of the Polish people it is the beginning of a new age that has illuminated their culture down to the present time. As we are all now aware, a very significant event took place in the 10th century: the Polish Prince Mieszko converted to Christianity, and thereby introduced momentous changes in the history of the Polish people, their culture, and their political role in central and eastern Europe.

Poland was, irretrievably and inevitably, drawn into the orbit of Western civilization. Her great leaders, musicians, painters, artists, writers, and other men of culture and politics have played an important role in the history of Western thought and action. We in the United States, during our own Revolutionary War, were fortunate enough to have two of the finest men Poland has produced on our side—Generals Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Kazimierz Pulaski—monuments to whom have been erected by a grateful American people not only here in the Nation's Capital, but all over the United States.

It is, of course, impossible to document in a few short minutes on the floor of this august body all of the achievements of Poland and her people in these 1,000 years. Indeed, to do so properly, giving due respect to prominent individuals in all walks of life both among the Poles living at home and the millions resident in other countries, would require volumes.

Yet, it is both fitting and proper that we devote this time today in order to pay tribute to Poland's role in Western civilization, and the prominent part it has played in the progress of all mankind. In these 1,000 years, the Christianity of Poland has withstood attacks upon its civilizing mission from all quarters; of course, today it is threatened by the Communist hierarchy which has attempted to dominate Poland since the end of World War II. I think we may be assured that an institution which has survived a full millennium of all that mankind has to offer will also be able to survive this latest threat. I remain firmly convinced that the Communist threat remains a transitory thing, and that one day soon we shall see a liberated Poland once again assuming its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Poland accepted the Catholic faith in the year 966, and that year marks the entry of that great nation into the community of Western Christendom and the real beginning of Polish history. Today, Poles still honor the moral precepts which their forefathers accepted 1,000 years ago.

Once again, the present era finds Poland embroiled in a conflict between freedom and an authoritarian state, between human rights and the denial of those rights. Looking on the whole history of the Polish people, we know that the present trial will not be the last. The story of the new Poland begun after World War I is similar to the story of the heroic Polish army of World War II. The last chapters to these stories have not yet been written.

Though threatened from within and without by the persistent dogma of atheistic communism, the magnificent spirit of the Polish people remains unbroken. Poles remain faithful to the enduring principles upon which that great nation was founded. The year 1966, the year celebrating 1,000 years of Christianity in Poland, is looked upon by Poles as a time for renewal and rededication of their beliefs and principles. The millennium recalls the greatness of the Piast Kingdom, the Jagiellonian Union, and the Royal Republic, and this heritage brings new hope to the hearts of the Polish people. I am proud to have played a role in honoring the millennium by supporting a commemorative stamp to be issued July 1. We recognize and applaud the contributions made by this great and noble people to the forward progress of civilization.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Polish people and their fine descendants, especially those in my congressional district, on the 1,000th anniversary of Poland as a Christian land and as a nation. Over the centuries, Poland has made great contributions to Western culture. It today keeps the flame of freedom and Western civilization alive behind the Iron Curtain. Poles have enhanced the richness of our own country and have made great strides as Americans. I congratulate the sons of Poland on this great landmark in their proud history.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in this tribute to the joint commemoration of the thousandth anniversary year of Catholicism in Poland on this special day commemorating the 175th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

This dual celebration of outstanding national and religious occasions in Polish history is so particularly appropriate because the Catholic religion and Polish nationalism have been so inextricably related during these thousand years and are still so today. Throughout Polish history the Catholic Church has had a main role in the protection of Polish independence and in the preservation of the Polish language and culture.

The first ruler of Poland, whose reign is clearly recorded in history, Mieszko I, descendant of the Piast dynasty, converted to Catholicism in 966. On April 15 and 16, thousands of people from all over Poland came to celebrate the thousandth anniversary of his baptism at Gniezno, which is not only where Mieszko was baptized, but it is also the most ancient episcopal see in Poland and the location of the shrine to St. Adalbert. But today 1 million people are expected to gather from all over Poland and the entire world to celebrate the millennium anniversary of Catholicism in Poland on this 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, in Czestochowa, the location of the shrine to the Black Madonna.

On this thousandth anniversary of the Polish nation we should particularly remember and recognize the varied and rich contributions made by the Polish people to world civilization. Contributions to the arts and to all areas of scholarship have been numerous throughout Polish history whether we recall Nicolaus Copernicus in sciences or Nobel Prize winner Madam Marie Curie; or Frederic Chopin or Artur Rubinstein in music; or Adam Mickiewicz or Stanislaw Wyspiański in literature. These are but a few of the many great Polish men and women who have made outstanding contributions to world culture and knowledge.

I am particularly pleased to extend best wishes to those of my constituents who are of Polish descent. Polish Americans, both in war and during peacetime, have contributed much to the guaranteeing of American security and the securing of a better life for all the people of our country. America has always felt a special tie to Poland and a concern for its freedom and independence. This special relationship has deep roots in our history for the efforts of Polish patriots, such as Count Thaddeus Kosciusko, in the gaining of American independence are well known.

This year many Americans of Polish descent will be visiting Poland and participating in various of the celebration ceremonies. They carry with them the heartfelt greetings of the American people who feel a close kinship with this brave people. It is with great admiration that I join so many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in celebrating the thousandth anniversary of Catholicism in Poland.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, the people of Poland will commemorate two outstanding events in their long and glorious history. One is the anniversary of 1,000 years of Christianity in Poland and the other is the anniversary of Poland's Constitution. I am very proud and honored to extend congratulations and best wishes to the people of Poland and their friends throughout the world as they observe both of those historic events. During the next few moments, however, I would like to make some brief observations on the development and sudden demise of the Polish attempt at government under an enlightened document—the Polish Constitution of 1791.

We Americans have had long experience in living under and interpreting our own Constitution. We value it above all other documents so we can readily understand how the Polish people must have felt when they were presented with what at that time was a most unusual and interesting document. Students of Polish history are well aware of the many pressures, stemming from the issue of stability in Europe, with which the King and the reformminded leaders contended as they drew up their historic document. With the Russo-Turkish conflict nearing its end in 1790, this meant Russia could once again concentrate its efforts on Eastern Europe, specifically, Poland. The patriots, as the reformers were called, did not lose sight of the potential threat from Russia and speed was essential in framing a constitution which would give the country a stable and well-organized government with which to confront expected Russian aggression.

During the evening of May 2, 1791, the text of the new document was read at the Radziwill Palace before members of the Diet who had just returned from the Easter recess. The next day, May 3, the Constitution was read to the people. The immediate response was acclaim and enthusiasm. Expressions of support and approval came in from all over the country; the people were going to have a genuine voice in the Government. For weeks after the initial proclamation tributes came in from domestic and some foreign sources. Edmund Burke, the noted Englishman statesman and writer, commented:

> Humanity must rejoice and glory when it considers the change in Poland.

Later he favorably compared the Polish document with that of British constitutional system. George Washington, the first President of the newly independent United States, commented that "Poland appears to have made large and unexpected strides toward liberty."

The document itself contained items which would have provided for a much more stable Poland. The liberum veto, a procedure by which a single dissenting vote in the Diet could prevent passage of legislation, was abolished. Procedures for succession to the throne were reformed; suffrage was extended to the peasantry. One of the most important features was that of ministerial responsibility similar to that in Britain, which implied that every act of the King had to be countersigned by a minister and that the ministers were responsible to the Diet. As developed in Britain, ministerial responsibility gradually strengthened the Cabinet and the Parliament at the expense of the monarch. Real authority and power rested with the Parliament and its mandate was from the British people. Tragically, Poland was denied a genuine opportunity to test the document, but we are sure that the instrument could have been the foundation for a truly democratic and progressive Poland. Polish leadership recognized defects in its political fabric and undertook to change them. That is certainly a worthier deed than that which the Russians were planning to take against Poland, and have imposed frequently against Poland ever since.

Poland's brief constitutional experiment was brutally crushed by jealously, greed, and treachery of the Russian and Prussian leadership. It was long a Russian policy to keep a weak Poland on its western border. Thus, it was not too suprising that a strong and stable Poland was viewed with considerable hostility by Catherine the Great of Russia. Ostensibly to destroy Poland's Constitution, but really to annex part of Poland for herself, give part to Prussia, and to keep the remainder weak, Catherine ordered her soldiers to invade Poland on April 8, 1792, less than 1 year after the new Constitution had been submitted to the people.

Expected Prussian assistance was not forthcoming and Poland was forced to fight hordes of invading Russians by itself. Polish soldiers put up gallant resistance, but after 3 months of fighting, Russian might prevailed. With this defeat the King was forced to withdraw support from the Constitution which Russia detested.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the House membership will agree with me that the observance of historic days such as May 3 is an opportunity for meaningful rededication. It is a constant reminder of the fact that brave men were willing to express and even die for high and noble ideals like freedom and justice. Today we see a Poland under the yoke of a Communist regime, but we may be certain that one day Poland will regain the right to put into practice the hopes and dreams which the people found so praiseworthy in 1791. It is my cherished hope today that the people of Poland will keep faith and constantly strive for the day when freedom and justice will truly be a reality for each of them.

It is a day, too, when we salute the courage of the Polish people. It is a day to reflect upon the many meaningful contributions that the Polish people have made not only to the cause of freedom everywhere, but their contributions to the freedom of this country. America is a many splendored thing. It is so because it is enriched by the cultures of many people. The Polish people have always been in the forefront of this country's developments with their ideas and their ideals.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, 1966 marks the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's conversion to Christianity. The significance of this solemn event to the Polish people was demonstrated on April 16, when thousands of people flocked to hear Poland's great religious leader, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. They thus showed that the Communist government leaders, despite their opposition to Cardinal Wyszynski and the church, cannot erase the deeply religious sentiments of a great people.

Christianity was introduced into Poland in 966. In that year Poland's first historically known ruler, Mieszko I, married a Christian princess from Bohemia named Dobrava. Mieszko's conversion enabled him to place Poland under the protection of the Pope and thus to stem a threatened German invasion. Mieszko's son, Boleslaw the Mighty, established many Christian bishoprics and extended Polish dominion from the Oder and Neisse Rivers in the west to the Dnieper River in the east.

Poland's religious traditions have helped to link her to the West for countless generations. It is my strong belief that Poland's cultural and religious traditions and her love of liberty and national independence will someday triumph over the forces of oppression. Let us do all we can to hasten that day.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the 175th anniversary of an event in the political history of the world which is well worth recalling. It is the anniversary of the day in 1791 when the Polish nation was given a new and great Constitution. This event was a momentous one in Poland's tragic history. It was also, both in the manner in which it was formed and in its provisions, a lesson to all of us who have faith in the reasonableness of human beings and in their ability to govern themselves well.

The Constitution was created by a group of patriots, led by King Stanislas Augustus, in order to give Poland a more modern and effective government. This was especially needed as there was a growing threat from the Imperial Russia of Catherine the Great. Poland needed some regime which could enable it to stand up to the weaknesses within and the dangers without.

The new Constitution was quite progressive in some areas and conservative in others, but the purpose of the whole was to promote the national welfare. The peasants were given the protection of the law for the first time. The townspeople were restored many of their ancient political rights. The old principle of total unanimity for passage of legislation was abolished. In its place the executive was made implicitly responsible to the legislature. The legislature itself was in a form familiar to ourselves. It was bicameral, with, however, the provision that the upper house was appointive and advisory. The ministers of the executive were liable to dismissal by two-thirds of the lower house.

The executive was not in the mold of the newest type of that era—a president of a republic—but nor was it a return to the traditional despotic ruler by divine right. The Constitution stated that the people were the basis of sovereignty. The king held his throne for life and his heirs could inherit the throne. He was not, however, an absolute monarch.

This radical departure from the past, this admirable submersion of personal prejudices and preferences in governmental forms, this rising to the national need at the moment of peril was an act which we should recall. It showed the truth of the belief that men will put the common good above individual gain. It showed that changes can be made peacefully in governments, even if of a revolutionary degree, when done by reasonable men. The adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791 was truly an inspiring example of our faith in man's political future.

The end of the story is not pleasant. That there are people in the world who do not desire progress and freedom was brutally shown by the invasion and conquest of the revitalized Polish nation by Imperial Russia. This despicable act was taken in order to destroy the new liberal order on Russia's border.

Mr. Speaker, the nature and history of the Polish Constitution of 1791 should show us that man can raise himself and thereby give us renewed hope that tyranny everywhere will someday be defeated. Let me join millions of others in affirming my hope that the commemoration of this great day in Poland's history will help to keep the light of liberty strong in the hearts of the oppressed Polish people and that we may soon see a new free Poland, with the tradition of the Constitution of 1791.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to pay tribute to my colleagues, the Members of Congress of Polish descent, to the millions of Americans with Polish blood in their veins, and to loyal Poles everywhere.

Two celebrations honoring Poland are being observed today. One: May 3 Constitution Day in memory of the day in 1791 when the people of Poland adopted the first democratic constitution to be recognized by a European nation. Their Constitution was modeled after the American document so that the philosophies of government of the American and the free Polish people are strongly linked.

George Washington, the first President of the newly formed Republic of the United States said the Constitution was one of the greatest achievements in Polish history as it made "large strides toward liberty."

It was on May 3, 1791, that the Polish Diet adopted a Constitution which proclaimed to the world that all power in civil society is derived from the people, thus striking a blow for freedom not only in their own land but in other countries in Europe—then, as now, under the heel of tyrants. Unfortunately, Poland is and was surrounded by powerful, acquisitive neighbors, and down through the years her periods of freedom were short. But successive generations of Poles, at home and abroad, have continued to dream and to struggle for liberty. All of us remember, some of us personally, the heroic story of the fight for freedom waged by the Poles in exile in World War II. In that war the skill, daring, and bravery of the Polish forces filled the free world with wonderment.

Of their heroic struggle against Nazi-Communist tyranny, Franklin D. Roosevelt said they were "an inspiration to mankind," and an epitaph in a Polish cemetery in Italy graphically describes these brave men. It says:

> These Polish soldiers, for your freedom and theirs, have given their bodies to the soil of Italy; their hearts to Poland; their souls to God.

These men must not be forgotten. But it is only through action, not words, on behalf of the Poles in bondage today is it possible for us to repay the debt we owe to the Poles who fought for freedom at home and abroad—including in our own War of Independence—down through the centuries.

Commenting on the Polish Constitution, a French writer of the time said:

> In France, to gain liberty, they began with anarchy. In Poland, the nation was given liberty and independence; the respect for the law, for person, and for property was assured, and all this without violence, without murder, solely through the virtue of the nation.

The other event in Polish history to be celebrated today is the millennium of

Poland's Christianity and the beginning of Poland as a nation. The year was 966, when Poland, by accepting Christianity, forever linked her destiny with that of the West and became a creative force in Western culture. Her literature, sculpture, painting, architecture, and learning contributed a series of masterpieces to the common European heritage from that day onwards. Looking back to the thousand-year existence of Poland as a Western Christian country, Poles all over the world can view with pride Poland's role in the history of mankind and her part in the world's achievements. Polish history has been a tragic story of foreign occupation with brief periods of freedom.

But the unconquerable spirit of the Polish people is a guarantee that Poland, at present halted in its progress through the Communist regime imposed by force, will in time throw off its manacles and will regain its freedom and independence. Today the Poles may have a satellite government but Poles will never be a satellite people.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege and pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a people who for a 1,000 years have followed the path of peace and freedom—the people of Poland. This solemn commemoration of Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791 has become a cherished tradition since the outbreak of World War II—a tradition which sustains the people of Poland in their devotion to democratic ideals, in spite of the heavy yoke of Communist rule, and assures them that we share their vision of returning to their rightful place as a free nation in a free world.

This year's celebration of one of the most progressive constitutions ever adopted by any nation takes on a special significance because this year, 1966, also marks the 1,000th anniversary of the birth of the Polish nation.

The history of Poland is the history of a heroic people, a people who peacefully welded together into a nation singularly united in language and customs, an area stretching from the Baltic Sea in the north, across the verdant plains, to the Black Sea in the south.

Though the winters of tyranny at the hands of conquering neighbors have settled upon this land of our forefathers for long periods over the centuries, the Polish people have never lost their spirit of independence. Thus, time after time, Poland has thrown off the yoke of oppression and, like the life cycle of nature itself, risen again.

Fettered or free, Poland has continued to contribute to the cultural, scientific, and intellectual progress of all mankind. The roster is long and brilliant, including such names as Chopin, Curie, Conrad, Kosciuszko, Pulaski, Paderewski, and Reymont, to list but a few.

The first Poles arrived in America at Jamestown in 1608. Polish generals were heroes of our own Revolution. Almost 900,000 Polish-Americans served in our Armed Forces in World War II.

And so it has gone, down through the centuries—in Poland or in the new homelands to which they went seeking refuge and freedom, the Polish people have never lost that indomitable spirit that has enabled them to give so much to human achievement.

The Communists who control Poland today would not risk recognition of the devotion of the Polish people to their May 3 Constitution. The Communist concept of government has nothing in common with the ideals it expressed: First, local administrative and judicial autonomy; second, free access to possession of land and to public office; third, absolute religious tolerance; and, fourth, parliamentary responsibility.

But these are the ideals, the very foundations, of day-to-day liberty, and with them ever in mind and heart, the Polish people, in spite of despair or defeat, ceaselessly search for a better life and the brotherhood of all men.

Across the majesty of a full thousand years, the flame of faith has never died. It lights and warms the heart of Poland today with all the depth and dedication that marked its kindling a millennium ago.

The Communists may suppress freedom of expression, but they will never extinguish it, not in Poland. They may fear and attempt to proscribe the power of the church, but they will never diminish the Polish faith and prayer. They may limit the numbers of us who may visit the land of our fathers, but they will never reduce—no, not even by one—the messages of hope and encouragement that go forth from our hearts to our Polish brothers.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 175 years old yesterday, is not merely a document in history's archives. It is a vital symbol of assurance that one day Poland will again stand in full freedom and independence. Here in these halls, where we so fully reap the blessings of freedom, we must ever be prepared to support freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is in fitting discharge of that sacred responsibility that we dedicate this celebration of Polish Constitution Day to the abiding faith of the Polish people in the ultimate freedom of man.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a thousand years ago Poland and her king accepted Christianity. By this religious conversion Poland became associated with the West and hence took on the religious, political, and cultural values of western civilization.

This was a voluntary act. What a contrast between the Christianization of Poland in 966 and the communization of Poland in the period since World War II. The latter was no voluntary act by the people of Poland. They never accepted communism, but rather communism was forced upon them by the awesome presence of Soviet military power and the Kremlin's manipulations of their Polish Communist agents.

The Communists claim that Poland is part of the Soviet eastern bloc and in the nearly two decades that have passed they have done all within their power to maintain the Soviet Iron Curtain between West and East.

This is, however, an unnatural relationship; for it is a fact of history that Poland is a part of the West. Because the relationship is natural, it is understandable that during recent years the ties between Poland and the West have been growing.

Let us all work for the flowering of this relationship between the Polish people and the West; for they as well as we look forward to the day when Poland will again be closely united with the West as she was a thousand years ago.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a ceremony is taking place today which is of considerable historical and contemporary significance and of personal interest to me. Today at the historic shrine of the Black Madonna at Czestochowa 300,000 Polish Roman Catholics celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of the establishment of Christianity in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues in this House, I represent a congressional district where many Americans of Polish descent live. I have twice visited Poland. On one occasion I had the privilege of visiting the historic monastery of Czestochowa, and talked and dined with the monks who live there. I therefore do not hesitate to say that the ceremony which takes place there this week is a dramatic symbol of the continuing struggle between the Roman Catholic Church of Poland and the Communist government of that country.

One thousand years ago, the man whom history identifies as Poland's first actual ruler, Mieszko I, was baptized into the Roman Catholic Church. At that same time, the first missionary bishop arrived on Polish ground to spread the new religion. Embraced by the overwhelming majority of the Polish people, the Roman Catholic faith has played a highly significant part in the turbulent and often tragic life of the Polish nation.

As Dr. Peter Siekznowicz noted in a document prepared last year for a subcommittee of Congress, "The tremendous role of the church through the thousand years of life of the Polish nation is indisputable. Catholicism is inseparately connected with the national feelings of the Poles. In difficult eras, the church was the sole visible spiritual power which bound together the nation as a whole."

In Poland today there is a continuing struggle between the church and the Communist government. Since 1945, the government, which has employed a variety of tactics, turned to methods of terror. A great number of clergymen were imprisoned and Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Catholic primate of Poland, was placed under detention. But as has been true throughout history, this frontal attack upon religion only encouraged the citizens to close ranks and to intensify their religious life.

Pressure built up under the growing oppression eventually broke out in the form of the Poznan riots of 1956. This uprising forced the Communist Party to release the primate from detention and to set other bishops free. An agreement was entered into in which the Government acknowledged, in the words of First Secretary Gomulka, that—

> The idealistic doctrine will exist for a long time beside the materialistic doctrine.

Unfortunately, this acknowledgment of the political need for a policy of coexistence did not erase the fundamental opposition of the state to the practice of religion.

Since the 1956 agreement, there has been a continuous campaign against the church. Doctrinal teachings have been attacked in Communist propaganda; administrative activities of the church have been hampered; church property has been confiscated, and exorbitant taxes have been imposed.

As the church began laying plans for its celebration of the millennium in 1966, a seemingly innocuous expression of the spirit of ecumenism precipitated a serious clash between the Catholic hierarchy and the Communist Party. In November of last year, the Polish episcopate assembled in Rome during the final stage of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council sent a letter of invitation to the Catholic bishops of Germany in connection with the coming millennium celebration. This letter came under vehement attack from the Communist regime. The party accused the bishops of offering forgiveness of the Polish people for the Nazi crimes of World War II. On the pretext that the content of the letter was offensive to the Polish people, the Government first denied Cardinal Wyszynski a passport to visit the Vatican in January. Subsequently, the Government stated that it would not permit Pope Paul VI to enter the country for the millennium celebration. And it appears that the Government will block Cardinal Wyszynski from making his long-awaited tour of cities in the United States later this year.

The dispute over the letter from the Polish to the German bishops was calmed a few weeks ago by simultaneous publication of explanations in Catholic and Communist journals. This appeared to bring about a cease-fire with clear victory for neither side.

I believe I do not overstate the case, however, when I say that the sending of the letter from the Polish to the German bishops was an event of major significance. For it represented the first time that a non-Communist ideological body inside an Eastern European Communist state has taken the initiative in what amounts to an act of foreign policy. This kind of initiative is intolerable for a totalitarian regime. It may well have been this initiative rather than the content of the letter that was the fundamental cause of the attack upon the letter by the Communist government of Poland.

Conflict between the Communist government and the church of Poland can be expected to continue. The church, for its own part, can be expected to maintain a stout defense of its historical position. For there is no sign of weakening in such statements as that delivered by Cardinal Wyszynski in a sermon at the shrine of the Black Madonna in Czestochowa a few weeks ago:

> We have to stand up before the rulers, princes, and authorities and calmly and bravely proclaim the Gospel.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I note that the New York Times of May 2, 1966, reported that the Polish Communist leader, Wladislaw Gomulka, refrained in his May Day speech from pressing his recent "violent propaganda campaign" against the church. This restraint alone, however, does not mean that the struggle between church and Communist state will end, but hopefully, it may mark an easing of the recent high level of tension.

I also note that today's New York Times reports that President Johnson will soon send to Congress a bill aimed at encouraging trade between the United States and the nations of Eastern Europe. At a time when the United States is getting ready to consider the opening of trade relations with the Eastern European countries, I suggest that it would be most unfortunate if the Government of Poland were to intensify its attacks upon the Roman Catholic Church. Such a course of action would undoubtedly make far more difficult the prospects of increasing trade and other contacts between the people of Poland and the people of the United States.

In expressing concern for religion under attack in Poland, we in the United States are made doubly grateful for the freedom that religion enjoys in our country. The contrast with a Poland where life today is "difficult, hard, and gray," in the words of the New York Times writer, David Halberstam, inspires our prayer that the Polish nation will not have to await a second millennium before Christianity within its borders may enjoy a similar freedom.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, this is a very special week for the Polish people. Not only are they celebrating the millennium of Poland's conversion to Christianity but May 3 also marks the anniversary of the great Polish Constitution of 1791.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago, on the third of May, the Polish people adopted a document which they hoped would unite Poland against her traditional foes—under an improved constitutional government. The Constitution was designed to replace a medieval type of government with a modern constitutional monarchy and parliamentary system.

That such a document was even written was an amazing accomplishment. For the late 18th century was an age of absolute monarchs and dictatorial regimes. The Constitution set up a constitutional monarchy in which the prerogatives of the King were carefully defined. The King's executive power had to be exercised through a Cabinet which was responsible to the Diet, or Parliament. Any member of the Cabinet could be removed at any time by a two-thirds vote of the Diet. The lower House, called the Chamber of Deputies, was given preponderance over the Senate, whose role was mainly advisory.

The Constitution of 1791 had many other forward-looking provisions. The right to vote was greatly extended. The townsmen received a number of political rights and recovered their judicial autonomy. The basis of representation was significantly broadened by opening the doors of the Diet to deputies from the towns. And the peasantry were taken under the protection of the law.

The signing of this Constitution was a great accomplishment in a country where 100-percent agreement had previously been required on every bill adopted by Parliament. It represented a major judicial and economic achievement. Agreement on the need for reform was so widespread that the nobility did not revolt against the reduction of its powers.

But there were others who felt severely threatened by the ideas contained in this great document. Catherine the Great of Russia realized that the Constitution represented a strong resurgence of Polish nationalism and that the loss of imperial Russian suzerainty over Poland was at stake. Russian troops invaded Poland and by 1793 the great Polish nation was partitioned for a second time.

Today the Constitution of 1791 is a threat—it is a threat to those who deprive the Polish people of fair and representative government. The Polish Constitution did not survive very long, but the ideals of freedom and equality which it embodies are vibrantly alive in the hearts of the Polish people. On this day all Americans rededicate themselves to the cause of a free and democratic Poland.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RANDALL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON JOINS WORLD TRIBUTE TO POLAND'S MILLENNIUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson today joined the entire world in paying tribute to the people of Poland who, during the past 1,000 years, have steadfastly defended the basic concept of man's dignity—his right to freedom.

It is most inspiring that the President of the United States, on this 175th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, joined the entire world in paying tribute not only to this historic Polish doctrine which brought a new concept of freedom to the European Continent in 1791 but also to Poland's 1,000 years of Christian and national history.

In a special White House ceremony earlier today, President Johnson spelled out a formula of new hope for improving man's lot in Europe and in the proclamation which Mr. Johnson issued on this historic day. He has given new meaning to Poland's millennium observance. I am pleased to include the President's proclamation at the conclusion of my remarks.

It was in 966, with the baptism of King Mieszko, that Poland embraced Christianity and joined the family of civilized nations.

Poland's indomitable defense of Christianity during these past 10 centuries continues to be a source of inspiration for all mankind.

It is significant that as we meet here today in the Congress of the United States to honor Poland's 1,000 years of Christianity, almost at the same time, thousands of miles away in Poland, the towering figure of a fighting prince of the Catholic Church dominates the 1,000-year celebration of Polish catholicism at Jasna Góra.

In studying the history of Poland, we can readily understand why Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland, confidently predicts that Christianity will survive over godlessness in Europe as his country's second 1,000 years begins.

History proves that those who would impede the Poles will fail. For throughout Poland's 1,000 years others have tried to crush the spirit of the Polish nation and her fervent attachment to Christianity. They, too, have failed.

Poland's deep devotion to Christian principles is the very keystone of her development.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 which we honor today, gave living spirit to those principles and this very constitution, among all the other rights of human dignity, guaranteed the Poles freedom of religion.

The great promise of hope indoctrinated in that constitution are as dear to the Poles today as they were in 1791.

Cardinal Wyszynski is giving living meaning to those principles as he today performs the historic Catholic Mass on Jasna Góra in Czestochowa.

As we assemble here today, more than one million Poles gather at the Shrine of the Black Madonna in Czestochowa to consecrate Poland's profound devotion to her patron saint, the Virgin Mary.

It is, indeed, ironic that while on the one hand the Polish regime has agreed not to interfere with the religious observance taking place in Czestochowa today, it has refused to let American bishops and religious leaders from all over the world join Cardinal Wyszynski in this spectacular rededication of faith at Czestochowa. Such impediments are unfortunate and it is my fervent hope that this same lack of understanding will not impede Cardinal Wyszynski's efforts to come to the United States later this year for a religious manifestation of Poland's 1,000 years of Christianity.

I have every reason to believe that Cardinal Wyszynski will be granted a passport to visit the United States in August to participate in a tremendous religious observance in Chicago and all over America. If bridges to Poland are to be effective, they must be a two-way street.

During this millennium observance there can be no justification for the Polish Government's refusal to let our bishops visit Poland for this particular tribute. We can only hope that as the world joins in paying tribute to the spirit of Poland, her present Government will realize that this whole religious manifestation is a worldwide expression of admiration for the people of Poland and their deep dedication to human dignity.

It is further my hope that the inspiring words by President Johnson calling for closer cooperation with the people of Poland will bring a similar attitude from the other side. Issuance of a passport to Cardinal Wyszynski to visit America is an excellent start.

The history of Poland has a distinct and unique character, compared with the history of the other major countries of Europe. Among the things contributing to Poland's destiny is the fact that the descendants of the Slavic race, who were later to become the Polish nation, settled in the open and mostly lowlands in the basins of the Warta and Vistula Rivers, thus making Poland the farthest Slavic country to the west. Poland's history is colorful, yet tragic—full of good fortune and adversity, but peculiarly of her own.

The countries of Western Europe—Italy, Spain, France, England, and Germany—in spite of their racial, linguistic, climatic, and political differences—nevertheless had two elements in common which had a decisive influence on their histories as well as on their spiritual and economic development. These common elements were the facts that their civilizations began in territories with extensive seacoasts, either on the Atlantic or on the Mediterranean, and that they all originated in territories imbued with, or to some degree influenced by, the great civilization of ancient Rome.

Their geography assured these nations of some degree of political safety and at the same time enabled them to profit from their proximity to each other. To some extent it even gave them advantages in the conquests of the vast territories outside of Europe. Culturally, they were assured of inheriting, first, the magnificent Greek-Roman tradition, and, later the Christian culture of the West.

A thousand years ago, as Poland made its appearance on the stage of history, great nations of Western Europe already had, to a greater or lesser degree, passed through several centuries of evolution. They had a strongly developed and organized Roman Church, Latin as a common language among the better educated people, and large, growing cities.

Because of Poland's acceptance of Christianity from the West, it became an influential participant in the sphere of Western culture. Since, however, Poland received this cultural inheritance late, it also was late in receiving the cultural forces at work during one of the greatest eras in the history of the West—the late Middle Ages. For instance, the social-political movement of feudalism which was common to all of Western Europe, never reached Poland. The material and spiritual elements of the great new civilized West were only partially felt in Poland. Even the medieval art of the West, symbolized in the Gothic cathedrals, which expressed the fervent religious feeling of the times, was met with delayed acknowledgment by the distant country of Poland.

The geopolitical peculiarity of the lands inhabited by the Poles became a very important factor in the history of Poland. These lands were easily accessible from the east as well as the west. Since Poland had no stronghold on the shores of the Baltic Sea, it had no real defense at that point. At the same time, Poland had no access to the ocean itself, where the new Western nations were beginning to exercise their might.

All the above elements determined Poland's history for centuries to come. To these were added the advantages possessed by its neighbors to the east and west. To the west lay the far superior as well as the more populous Germany. For centuries, Germany sought new territories for expansion and resorted to invading lands to the east; namely Poland, through cultural pressures or armed aggression. Poland's neighbors to the east and southeast for centuries were Ruthenia and Moscow, the Tatars and the Turks, which ultimately emerged as a vast united Russia. The peoples of those states were either pagan or Byzantine-Christian, who were hostile to Western culture. Some of them, like the Tatars, were nomads rather than established settlers, who measured their economic wealth in terms of profitable raids on their already established neighbors.

Poland ultimately found itself to be the easternmost outpost of Roman culture. It was at the same time the Slavic country most exposed to the west, and thus most vulnerable to German enroachment from the west. This historic role Poland had to play on an open and, of course, defenseless stage, repelling aggressive forces waiting in the wings of the theater of territorial expansion.

Under these conditions, it was apparent that only a very powerful nation or one blessed with an exceptionally strong spirit of independence could possibly survive. The amazing facts are that Poland as a state lost its independence for over

123 years, as the result of partitioning by Prussia, Austria, and Russia, which were all more populous and wealthier than Poland. Nevertheless, Poland not only survived but, most important of all, it preserved its individuality. It is, therefore, evident that a nation able to overcome such tremendous obstacles, including many disasters and its own mistakes, was endowed with great potentialities and the ability to develop them.

There are many outstanding examples of Poland's courage through the centuries, especially on the battlefields. Here are just two: Grunwald—a victory in defense of the Slavic world, at the start of the 15th century, against the German Order of the Crusaders—Teutonic Knights; and Vienna—a glorious victory for King John Sobieski, at the end of the 17th century, in defense of the West against the Turkish invasion.

Undeniably, a far greater measure of Poland's courage and spirit is exemplified by a rich heritage. Magnificent churches, castles and dwellings were erected and constantly rebuilt, in spite of destructions wrought by aggressive forces. Excellent universities flourished. Great literature, music and painting were cultivated. Remarkable also was the fact that even though Poland was the last country to accept the great Roman-Christian civilization, its contributions to this ideology equaled that of other countries. Poland already in the 16th and 17th centuries produced eminent people in the fine arts, the sciences and politics, such as Kopernik—Copernicus—Kochanowski, Modrzewski, Goslicki, and many others who matched the minds of Western nations.

Warsaw, the capital of Poland, in modern times became the symbol of the fate of the Polish nation and its spiritual force. In 1920, during the Battle of Warsaw, the Polish Army conquered the Bolshevik invaders, who had overrun the country. This victory decided not only the future of Poland, but probably the future of all of Europe as well. This came about because Germany, just emerging from the chaos of its defeat in World War I, was ready for revolution and the eventual fulfillment of the manifesto of the commander in chief of the Red army: "Over the body of Poland, we shall go to the heart of Europe."

In 1939, the gallant resistance of Warsaw against the Nazi invasion was an inspiration to the rest of the world in its fight against the German conquest of Europe. In 1944, the Polish underground started an uprising against the German occupation forces; however, the outcome was a disaster, resulting in the almost total destruction of Warsaw. Today Warsaw is rebuilt. Not only were new districts formed, but the medieval and Renaissance buildings, churches, and palaces were restored. The people of Warsaw have rekindled their past with great effort and determination in spite of a Russian-imposed regime.

Mr. Speaker, on Pennsylvania Avenue, in front of the National Archives Building in Washington, D.C., are two impressive monuments.

On one is carved the inscription: "What is past is prologue."

On the other is carved the inscription: "Study the past."

To understand the indomitable spirit of the Poles—a spirit which has survived one thousand years of turmoil and persecution in its stubborn defense of freedom and human dignity—one must "study the past." For it is in their magnificent and majestic past that one can gain an insight into their hopeful future.

If history is any teacher—and I believe it is—we can see why Poles throughout the world, in observing the one thousandth anniversary of Poland's birth, are confidently prediciting a renaissance of her past glory, a resurrection of her Christian freedom, and a resumption of her historic role as humanist and defender of man's right to control his destiny.

In this millennium year of Poland's Christianity we view her tortured past and at once see why poets and romantic writers of many nationalities, throughout centuries, likened her supreme sacrifice to that of the one she embraced as a nation in 966.

Zygmunt Krasinski, one of the world's great poets and visionaries, described Poland as the "Christ among nations" in his immortal poem Przedswit "The Dawn."

In the veins of her children—10 centuries strong—flows the blood of a proud people who stubbornly refused to compromise with tyranny.

Poland's history is a breathtaking chronicle of endurance against man's inhumanity toward his fellow man.

It is a litany of unparalleled bravery.

Jean Jacques Rousseau described it best when he wrote:

> Poles. If you cannot prevent your neighbors from devouring your nation, do your best to make it impossible for them to digest it.

One cannot help but marvel, then, that in between her unyielding struggles for survival, Poland was able to make so profound a contribution to the cultural development of Europe and the world. "Incredible" is the only word which can describe the monumental cultural contributions of Chopin and Paderewski, of Nobel Prize winners Sienkiewicz and Reymont, of Mickiewicz and Slowacki, of Copernicus, Marie Sklodowska Curie, and many, many more.

The Poles are fundamentally romantics and it is their romanticism which has proved too radical for their warring neighbors throughout the whole of Poland history.

The Poles from their earliest beginnings exemplified the Christian belief that there is more virtue in defending a right than in denouncing a wrong.

Polish writers have long preached doctrines of fundamental justice and equity. During the reformation, it was Modrzewski who evolved the concept of a system based on Christian principles of equality of men before God and before the law. This concept went far beyond the accepted ideas of the time.

It was a form of Polish radicalism that was too far advanced for the tyrants of Europe. It dealt with human dignity at a time when the rulers of Europe resorted to only the most brutal forms of oppression and suppression.

It was Goslicki who first propounded a theory for establishing a commonwealth which was later to become the basis for the American system of government. His works were widely translated into Western European languages and became popular in England. Many historians believe that the signers of the Declaration of Independence were influenced by his work.

It was the very yearning for man to be free that provoked the most barbaric partition of Poland and her extinction from the European continent for more than a century. Poland's inspiring constitution of May 3, 1791, was patterned after the American doctrine. Its provisions for placing the peasants under the protection of law, for abolishing completely their serfdom, and for providing freedom of worship proved too dangerous to Poland's neighbors, who held human dignity in utter contempt. Their invasion of Poland proved too much for even the gallant Poles to withstand, and Poland was partitioned out of existence.

But her spirit refused to die.

The story of Poland is an odyssey of a heroic people who have inspired man in his struggle for survival for 1,000 years.

It begins in 966, when the first historically known King of Poland, Mieszko, received the sacrament of baptism. Along with him, all the tribes forming the nucleus of the future Polish nation were converted to the Christian faith.

It was with the advent of Christianity and the introduction of Western European civilization that Poland entered the political arena of Europe's sovereign states.

America owes much to the heritage Poland sent to our shores. May this rich and now 1,000-year-old heritage of the Polish nation bring forth a new understanding and appreciation between the people of America and those indefatigable sons and daughters of Poland.

In this millennium year, may the spirit of her part be resurrected into a glorious future when Poland, the crown jewel of Europe, may again take her place as a free and major force in the affairs of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's inspiring proclamation calling for a yearlong observance of Poland's national and Christian millennium follows:

Commemoration of Poland's National and Christian Millennium: A Proclamation by the President of the United States of America

May 3 marks an important anniversary for freedom-loving people the world over. It was on this date, 175 years ago, that the patriots of Poland adopted a constitution that stirred the hopes of the Polish people.

But this year, May 3 takes on a significance that is truly unique. It marks the

1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity and Polish nationhood.

Ten centuries ago today, Poland became a part of the community of Western nations. Ten centuries ago today, Poland entered the mainstream of Western thought and Western culture.

It was this tradition that gave birth to the Polish Constitution of 1791. The Christian expression of the dignity of man found its ultimate expression in the cause of freedom and national independence.

It was no accident that this great political document came into being just 4 years after the American Constitution—or that the two were so similar in content and spirit. The same spark of freedom that flared into the American Revolution also burned in the hearts of the Polish people. Our Revolution was theirs, and to these shores, to help in our struggle, came two great champions of liberty: Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Kazimierz Pulaski.

The rest is history: a triumph for America—for the most part tragedy for Poland. Today, after nearly two centuries of struggle, of invasion, of foreign domination, of partition—and always of bravery—love for national independence and for the basic rights of man still lies deep in the hearts of the Polish people.

The spark of freedom has never been extinguished.

And through it all, the historic ties between our two great nations have remained as a symbol of friendship and hope. Today, on this anniversary, we reaffirm that friendship and pledge ourselves to that hope:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim this day, May 3, 1966, as Poland's National and Christian Millennium Day on which we spiritually unite ourselves with the people of Poland and those gathered today at Jasna Gora and wherever they might be observing this historical event. I invite the American people to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities and particularly to join with Americans of Polish heritage in their continued celebrations throughout this memorable year, both in America and in Poland.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 3d day of May in the year of our Lord 1966, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninetieth.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

IS THE WAR ON POVERTY HITTING THE TARGET?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of today's most heated debates is over the question, "Do our military forces fighting in Vietnam have enough ammunition?"

Opinions vary on supply shortages in Vietnam but one fact can not be disputed. Our military men almost always know whether they have hit the target when they expend what ammunition they do have. Post strike reconnaissance is standard practice in an efficient military operation just as post audits and trial balances are essential to the intelligent operation of business.

In another war—the war on poverty—the principal ammunition is taxpayers' money. "General" Sargent Shriver has plenty of ammunition to shoot—and he is shooting it. I would like to think he has seriously concerned himself with trying to find out what he has hit and whether his war with money as a weapon is actually doing any good. But from recent personal experiences with "General" Shriver himself I have real reason to wonder if he cares about his shooting accuracy, or whether he is too busy reaiming more money in new directions to stop and think about what he has hit.

On March 9 I called Mr. Shriver personally and asked him to investigate the serious problems of the Santa Clara County Economic Opportunity Commission, which is responsible for spending more than $3 million in taxpayers' funds in the war on poverty. I told him that the public's confidence in the operation in my district was severely shaken and that the entire effort to help the poor was in jeopardy. I asked him to investigate honestly, believing that as a Representative of more than 600,000 taxpayers I had a right to request a careful post audit of the multimillion-dollar expenditure my constitutents had worked for and entrusted to his management. He promised that someone would report back to me in "a few days."

Perhaps Mr. Shriver's idea of a "few days" is different from mine, or the amount of money involved was not significant enough to warrant investigation—or perhaps, in his opinion, the very high purpose of the war on poverty renders it immune from question. I do not know the reason, but the fact remains that I have received no meaningful or responsive reply from Mr. Shriver regarding the poverty war in my congressional district. To this day my taxpaying constituents have not been accorded the courtesy of a well considered judgment of whether their tax money has been squandered aimlessly or whether Mr. Shriver's barrage of money has really hit the poverty target.

On March 16, Mr. Harry Farrell, a distinguished writer for the San Jose Mercury and San Jose News who was recently given one of the National Headliner Awards at the Atlantic City Press Club convention, started a series of articles on the Santa Clara County Economic Opportunity Commission. I placed these four articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 16, 17, and 21, and each time I pleaded for an honest investigation of the poverty war as it is being conducted in Santa Clara County. I repeatedly stated that an investigation to clear the air was all that could save the program from dismal failure.

I know my speeches on March 16, 17, and 21 were noticed by Mr. Shriver's office because on March 23 Mr. Frederick Hayes, Deputy Director of Community Action for the Office of Economic Opportunity, took note of facts contained in them in his answers to questions which were put to him in hearings conducted by the Poverty Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a portion of the transcript of these hearings:

EXCERPT FROM HEARINGS BEFORE THE POVERTY SUBCOMMITTEE, MARCH 23, 1966 (PP. 910–912)

Mr. GIBBONS. I have been very disturbed about some things I have read there, primarily placed there by Mr. GUBSER about problems in San Jose. When the subcommittee visited San Jose they were in the tooling-up stage and apparently they are having some difficulty organizing their community action agency. I do not know if I am relating this story correctly but the story I read in the record was somewhere along the road when they were organizing one of the community action centers, one of the Outreach workers knocked on the doors of the so-called poor and apparently came to a fraternity house and knocked on the door and a few of the brothers responded and got themselves elected to the board. I do not know how poverty stricken they were.

Having been to college myself, you know how well some of us can be poverty stricken at times while in college.

Frankly, this type of organization technique worries me now. Have any actions been taken in San Jose that would perhaps correct this type of organization?

Mr. HAYES. We are looking into the San Jose-Santa Clara situation at the present time. We do not have a report back that is complete on the situation right now. There has been a change in board membership which has caused some concern there. Part of this quite obviously has been healthy. It has been the intention of the board to include proper poverty area representation.

On the question of the enlistment of the fraternity brothers, I have not gotten an answer on that yet as to what has actually happened.

Mr. GOODELL. How long have you been looking into this situation in Santa Clara?

Mr. HAYES. I guess we asked the regional office to take a look at it about 10 days ago. That is just off the top of my head.

Mr. GOODELL. Have you responded yet to Congressman GUBSER's request that you investigate this?

Mr. HAYES. I am sorry I did not hear you.

Mr. GOODELL. Have you responded to Congressman GUBSER's request that you investigate this situation?

Mr. HAYES. I do not know if a response had gone back to him.

Mr. GOODELL. The last I knew he had not even received an acknowledgment from you on this. When Members of Congress have difficulties like this in their districts, should they not be advised that such an investigation is going on and what you intend to do. If you have been doing it for 10 days I would think by this time somebody could have at least picked up the phone and told him.

Mr. HAYES. I had been under the impression that Mr. Shriver had talked to Mr. GUBSER about the situation. I could conceivably be wrong on that. When I talked to Mr. Shriver about it I had that impression that there had been at least one conversation on this.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that on March 29, Mr. Baxter Omohundro, the distinguished correspondent for the San Jose Mercury and San Jose News Washing bureau, interviewed Mr. Shriver immediately upon his return from an African camera safari. After some confusion Mr. Shriver was able to recall his telephone conversation with me in which he had "promised a personal review of the Santa Clara County controversy."

On March 31, I still had not received a reply from Mr. Shriver, so I wrote him a letter which I now include in the RECORD:

MARCH 31, 1966.

Hon. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: You will recall my telephone conversation with you on Wednesday, March 9, in which I requested a complete investigation of the Economic Opportunity Commission operation in Santa Clara County.

Since that time, the San Jose Mercury-News has published a series of articles which point up the problems connected with the Commission's operation. I have read these articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as evidence of the fact that a thoroughgoing and impartial investigation of this Commission's operation is the only means of saving the poverty program in Santa Clara County from dismal failure.

A request for an investigation has been made by the Economic Opportunity Commission itself and all persons who are familiar with its operation and are active in it.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter which was sent by the Stanford Research Institute to Dr. Stanley Skillicorn, chairman of the Economic Opportunity Commission of Santa Clara County.

It appears to me that the offer contained in this letter is the answer to the obvious and overwhelming need for a complete investigation.

I sincerely urge you to use your influence to bring about such an investigation by the Stanford Research Institute.

With all good wishes, I am,
Yours sincerely,
CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Member of Congress.

With the above letter I enclosed a letter to Dr. Stanley Skillicorn, chairman of the Santa Clara County Economic Opportunity Commission, from a representative of the Stanford Research Institute who offered the services of his organization to conduct an investigation. A copy of this letter follows:

STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
Menlo Park, Calif., March 10, 1966.

Dr. STANLEY SKILLICORN,
Chairman, Economic Opportunity Commission of Santa Clara County, San Jose, Calif.

DEAR DR. SKILLICORN: The need for and desirability of an objective and unbiased investigation of the economic opportunity program in Santa Clara County has received prominent mention in the press. There is real danger that Federal funds may be cut off if an investigation is not made soon. Unfortunately, the emotional and political factors are such that the motivation of any Government or citizen group investigation will be suspect and its efforts degraded by other groups. If the results of an investigation are to be credible and acceptable to the general public and to members of the several interested groups involved, the facts must be collected and analyzed by an independent organization with no special interests and with a reputation of service in similar situations.

Stanford Research Institute specializes in finding, analyzing, and interpreting facts. The institute is an independent, not-for-profit corporation dedicated by charter to "the improvement of the general standard of living and the peace and prosperity of mankind." SRI conducts scientific research and applies sciences in projects of prime national concern and in areas where major contributions may be made to special improvement. The institute has an established reputation in research, as demonstrated by the high percentage of continuing clients—commercial, industrial, government, and foundation—in the United States and in foreign countries.

The management and social systems staff, composed of professional analysts with wide and varied experience in economics, management, sociology, and political science, has had extensive experience in the research and solution of problems associated with passage of the Economic Opportunity Act and the implementation of its provisions at all levels of government.

Much of the data and experience gathered in previous research is available to the staff in future projects. This experience and data bank is one of SRI's most valuable assets in service to its clients.

SRI would appreciate an opportunity to discuss with you the application of our experience and research talents to your current problem. I will telephone you within the next week or you can contact me at 415-326-6200, extension 2388, to arrange a meeting to discuss the problem and to explore ways in which we might be helpful.

Yours truly,
R. L. JOHNSON,
Management and Social Systems.

On April 15 Sargent Shriver finally answered. His long-awaited reply to my telephone call of March 9 is presented herewith:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1966.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: Thank you for your letter of March 31 concerning the Santa Clara community action program.

We recently reviewed this project and found that there have been some difficulties within the community with respect to this program. However, we believe that these problems now are being resolved by the local leadership. The program is moving ahead and is benefiting the poor of the area.

We have brought your letter and Mr. Johnson's to the attention of interested parties, and should corrective action be required by this agency you may be sure it will be taken.

We appreciate knowing of your interest.
Sincerely,
SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is a brushoff which indicates to any person experienced in reading bureaucratic mail that the writer has done little or perhaps nothing to investigate how several million dollars in taxpayers' money have been spent. I think if Mr. Shriver had the slightest semblance of an administrative conscience he would have told me what he did to review the project and what difficulties he found. He would have indicated to me how the problems are being resolved and how the poor are benefiting. As the Representative of 600,000 taxpayers who have contributed the money Shriver is firing in the war on poverty, I have a right to something more than a bureaucratic brushoff.

Since Mr. Shriver's letter has been received, the local wrangling has continued and previously approved programs in Santa Clara County for youth guidance, neighborhood legal service, the all-important job development program, the rural and urban leadership training program, and the library study center program in south Santa Clara County have been eliminated. The purpose of these actions according to the sponsors of the movement is to allow the poor to develop their own programs in each of nine local area service centers. So we are starting all over again to develop programs for the poor which after more than a year and several million dollars later are still undecided.

The problems in my district are not resolved and the poverty program is not moving ahead—in fact it is floundering and getting nowhere because of a continuing argument over who should lead it. Old plans are discarded and vague new ones are dreamed of that the poor will supposedly formulate.

Mr. Speaker, this war on poverty, judging from my experience with Mr. Shriver, is a shotgun war which blasts off in every direction. Nobody seems to be aiming the wads of taxpayers' money which Mr. Shriver is shooting. And furthermore he does not seem to care what he hits. His idea of being an efficient administrator appears to be "Praise Lyndon—and pass the ammunition."

CHAIN BANKING AMONG COMMERCIAL BANKS IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the March 1966 issue of the National Banking Review, a publication of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, contains a very interesting and informative article entitled "Chain Banking," by Prof. Jerome C. Darnell, of the School of Business, University of Colorado. This article is based largely on two studies published in 1963 and 1964 by the House Banking and Currency Committee. These were "Chain Banking: Stockholder and Loan Links of 200 Largest Member Banks," 1963, and "Twenty Largest Stockholders of Record in Member Banks of the Federal Reserve System," 1964.

Professor Darnell, after careful analysis, comes to some very interesting conclusions. Some of the more important are:

Nineteen percent of all member banks of the Federal Reserve System are chain banks and that these banks control 19.3 percent of member bank assets.

The assets of these chain banks amount to $44.71 billion.

Over one-half of the 431 chain bank systems identified by Professor Darnell are made up of banks located in the same county. Thus, these 242 chain systems directly affect the competitiveness of local banking in these counties.

The largest number of banks are linked by bank nominees.

Chain banking is much more widespread than current lists of member-bank stockholders reveal.

The last two points are very important. Because the earlier studies of bank stock ownership by the Banking and Currency Committee revealed that a very large number of stockholders of record in commercial banks were nominees for beneficial owners, that is, they held the stock for the benefit of others as agents, trustees, and so forth, a true determination of the actual ownership of bank stock was not possible without a further study designed to get behind the nominees to the true beneficial owners of bank stock. As Professor Darnell put it:

> The same individuals do not always appear by the same designations in other banks, obscure family ties are not revealed by stockholder lists, and stock may be held in trust accounts or in the name of a bank nominee that does not reveal the identity of the beneficial owner. Despite the use of a broad definition, chain banking is no doubt much more prevalent than is revealed by the data presented in the following pages.

The Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has already begun such a study. The response from those asked to supply information to date has been very encouraging.

I believe such a study, when completed, will reveal the true extent of the ownership relationships among banks, between banks, and other financial institutions and between banks and other types of corporations and other entities. Then, and only then, will we know who really owns the commercial banks in this country.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD at this point Professor Darnell's article:

CHAIN BANKING

(By Jerome C. Darnell)

Although the bank structure has been widely discussed and studied in recent years, one of its aspects, chain banking, has been neglected. Not since the Federal Reserve Board study that presented data for 1945 has information been made available concerning the number and location of chain banks in the United States. At that time there were 115 bank chains consisting of 3 or more banks each, or 522 chain banks representing slightly less than 4 percent of the commercial banks then in existence. These banks held about 3 percent of all commercial bank deposits.[1]

In 1962, WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, urged the Federal Reserve Board to obtain from member banks lists of the 20 largest stockholders of record, together with the number of shares held by each, and any loans made by member banks secured by 10 percent or more of the stock of any other bank. Stockholder lists of the 200 largest member banks, along with loans secured by 10 percent or more of the stock in other banks, were published in 1963.[2] In 1964, lists of the top 20 stockholders of all member banks were made available.[3] The primary purpose of this article is to present a summary analysis of the stockholder lists with the chain banking relationships that prevailed among member banks at mid-1962.[4]

I. CHAIN BANKING DEFINED

There is no requirement for formal, consistent reporting of chain relationships to any Federal banking authority, and without knowledge of ownership ties, it is difficult to ascertain the existence of bank chains or to determine which banks operate in particular chain systems at a given time.[5] There is also the question of a "proper" definition of chain banking. The Federal Reserve Board study applied a definition of "three or more independently incorporated banks" controlled by an individual or group of individuals.[6] Others, however, believe that "concentration in control is indicated quite as much by the joining of two banks as three"[7] or have referred to chain banking in terms of "two or more banks" controlled by the common ownership interests of an individual or group of individuals.[8] Representative PATMAN suggests that chain banking should encompass all common ownership ties (both corporate and individual) that do not fall under the definition of holding-company banking, or group banking.

A broad definition of chain banking was adopted for this study. A chain system was deemed to exist when two or more banks have one or more stockholders in common (excluding banks controlled by registered bank holding companies) provided that: (1) the stockholder(s) in common is among the 20 largest stockholders in each bank, (2) the stockholder(s) in common is a director or an officer in each bank, and (3) if the stockholder(s) in common is not a director or an officer, he owns 5 percent or more of the stock in the bank in which he is not a director or officer. This definition does not specify that two or more banks must be controlled by an individual or group of individuals. It would be virtually impossible to determine from stockholder lists alone when control is being exercised, in view of the hazards of establishing a definitive statement of "control" with general applicability, and of the impossibility of designating any particular percentage that would always insure control. Instead, the basic assumption underlying the definition is that banks with common owners satisfying the three stated conditions have the potential capability of coordinating operating policies and are therefore considered chain banks. Furthermore, by this definition, chain systems may result from the common ownership of corporate entities that are not registered bank holding companies. Thus, all instances of common ownership that would not fall into the category of group banking are covered.[9]

Even this definition of chain banking is not entirely satisfactory. The same individuals do not always appear by the same designations in other banks, obscure family ties are not revealed by stockholder lists, and stock may be held in trust accounts or in the name of a bank nominee that does not reveal the identity of the beneficial owner.[10] Despite the use of a broad definition, chain banking is no doubt much more prevalent than is revealed by the data presented in the following pages.

II. DESCRIPTIVE MEASURES OF CHAIN BANKING

A. Number of chain banks and assets held by Federal Reserve districts

Table 1 shows the number of chain banks by Federal Reserve district location (see data appendix). In 1962, chain banking systems encompassed 1,146 member banks, having about $45 billion in assets. About one-fifth of all member banks and member banks assets exhibited such a community of interest among stockholders. Three districts, the 7th, 10th, and 11th, account for nearly one-half of all chain banks. The remaining chain banks are divided about evenly among eight of the districts, only the 12th district showing a small number. Chain banks represent from 14 to 16.6 percent of the member banks in seven districts. Four districts have 20 percent or more of their member banks operating in chains; the greatest proportion, almost 30 percent, is found in the 11th district. The 12th district has less than 10 percent of its member banks in chain organizations.

There were 526 member banks with one individual owning 5 percent or more of the stock in each of two or more banks. An additional 30 banks were discovered in which a group of the same individuals had combined holdings of at least 5 percent of the outstanding stock in each of two or more banks.[11] Banks joined by 5 percent holdings represent slightly more than 9 percent of all member banks. The largest number of banks linked by 5 percent ownership ties of individuals are found in the 10th and 11th districts. These two districts include States that were almost exclusively unit banking States in 1962.[12] The 6th and 9th districts, in addition to the 10th and 11th districts, had over 10 percent of their member banks joined by common ownership ties of 5 percent or more. The 7th district had a larger number of banks, 70 compared with 47 and 46 for the 9th and 6th districts, respectively, joined in this manner, but the proportion of member banks was only 7 percent.

In general, a similar pattern exists for 10-, 15-, 20-, and 25-percent ownership positions. The 6th, 9th, 10th, and 11th districts have the largest number of banks linked by the various percentage holdings, as well as the largest proportions of member banks linked by these percentages. Each of these four districts has 4.9 percent or more of its member banks joined by the holdings of individuals who own 25 percent or more of the stock in each of two or more banks.

---

[1] Federal Reserve Bulletin, April 1947, p. 463.

[2] U.S. Congress, House Committee on Banking and Currency, "Chain Banking: Stockholder and Loan Links of 200 Largest Member Banks," 88th Cong., 1st sess., Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

[3] U.S. Congress, House Committee on Banking and Currency, Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, "Twenty Largest Stockholders of Record in Member Banks of the Federal Reserve System," 88th Cong., 2d sess., Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

[4] The analysis cannot be extended to all commercial banks because stockholder lists are not available for the nonmember banks.

[5] Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, "Recent Developments in the Structure of Banking," report submitted to the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 10.

[6] Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, "Banking and Monetary Statistics," Washington, D.C.: National Capital Press, 1943, p. 295.

[7] R. G. Thomas, "Concentration in Banking Control Through Interlocking Directorates as Typified by Chicago Banks," Journal of Business, January 1933, p. 3.

[8] Gaines T. Cartinhour, "Branch, Group and Chain Banking," New York: The MacMillan Co., 1931, p. 58; John M. Chapman, "Concentration of Banking," New York: Columbia University Press, 1934, p. 322; and Thomas, op. cit., p. 2.

[9] Group banks are considered in this article to be only those banks controlled by a registered bank holding company. The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 defined a bank holding company as a company that (1) directly or indirectly controls 25 percent or more of the voting stock of two or more banks, or (2) controls in any manner the election of the majority of the directors of two or more banks. Holding companies that fit this category are required to register with the Federal Reserve Board.

[10] "Twenty Largest Stockholders of Record in Member Banks of the Federal Reserve System," p. 3.

[11] The holdings of corporate stockholders were not included in the columns showing various percentages linking banks together. The data refer strictly to "individuals."

[12] A small number of Louisiana and Arizona counties plus about one-half of the State of New Mexico are included in the 11th district, these being the only States in the two districts that allowed branch banking.

Examination of the assets held by chain banks reveals a heavy concentration in four districts (table 2). Nearly 65 percent of the total assets of the chain banks are found in the 4th, 7th, 10th, and 11th districts; chain banks located in the 7th district account for almost one-fourth of the assets. Chain banks account for over 30 percent of the total member bank assets in four districts. Over 50 percent of member bank assets in the 11th district are held by chain banks, and over 40 percent in the 10th district. Five districts have chain banks controlling from 20 to 30 percent of member bank assets. Only three districts—the 2d, 9th, and 12th—have less than 10 percent of member bank assets held by chain banks.

The magnitude of assets controlled by chain banks that are linked by 5-percent ownership shares of individuals is slightly over $8 billion, or 3.5 percent of all member bank assets. Three districts—the 6th, 10th, and 11th—have from 10 to 21 percent of their member bank assets held by banks having common ownership ties of at least 5 percent.

At the other end of the scale, banks joined by individuals holding 25 percent or more of the stock in two or more banks represent about $1.7 billion in assets, roughly 0.7 percent of the member bank assets (table 3). The chain banks in the 6th, 10th, and 11th districts hold the largest amounts of assets in those instances of 25 percent ownership. Banks joined by 10-, 15-, and 20-percent ownership shares of individuals in each of two or more banks account for $5.2, $4.4, and $3.3 billion in assets, respectively. Interestingly enough, districts 1 through 5 and district 12, where statewide or limited branching is predominant,[13] have a small number of banks and small amounts of assets connected by the larger percentage holdings of individuals in two or more banks.

B. Number of chain banks and assets held, by regions and States

The data used to construct tables 1, 2, and 3 have been rearranged by geographic region and State and presented in tables 4 to 7. Tables 4 to 7 also present member bank chains in relation to all insured commercial banks as well as member banks.

Only four States, all located in the Pacific region, have no member banks linked in a chain organization (table 4). In fact, only one chain bank shows up in the entire region, that bank having a common ownership connection with a bank in the west-north-central region. The east-south-central region has the next smallest number of chain banks, with 37. The largest number are found in the west-south-central and east-north-central regions, these regions having 264 and 250 chain banks, respectively. There are 165 chain banks located in Texas, and Illinois has 111. Oklahoma and Pennsylvania rank third and fourth with 82 and 78, respectively.

Four regions—New England, South Atlantic, west south central, and mountain—have more than one out of every five member banks connected by common ownership ties. There are six States in which chain banks represent over 30 percent of the member banks in the State, Rhode Island being the leader with 60 percent. Twelve other States, located mainly in the Midwest, have over 20 percent of their member banks connected in chains.

Chain banks account for 8.7 percent of all insured commercial banks in the country. The largest proportion is found in the Mountain States, where one out of every six insured commercial banks has owners in common. The west north central, east south central, and Pacific regions have less than 5 percent of all their insured commercial banks connected in chains. Over 30 percent of the insured commercial banks in two States, Rhode Island and Idaho, are operating in chain systems; both States allow statewide branch banking. From 20 to 30 percent of the insured banks in New Hampshire, Oklahoma, and Colorado have common ownership links, and unit banking is prevalent in all three States. Fifteen States and the District of Columbia have between 10 and 20 percent of their insured banks in chain systems. In 2 of the 15 States, statewide branching is permitted, 7 permit limited branching, and 6 have unit banking. Thus, of the 20 States where chain banks represent over 10 percent of the insured commercial banks, unit banking prevails in 9, and either statewide or limited branching is found in the other 11.

Investigation of the number of banks in which one individual or a group of the same individuals owns 5 percent or more of the outstanding stock in two or more banks shows that Texas, Oklahoma, and Illinois rank first, second, and third, having 98, 64, and 59 such banks, respectively. However, in terms of proportion of member banks in the State linked by 5 percent holdings of individuals, Idaho has 47 percent and Florida has 30 percent of its banks linked in this manner. Fourteen States—all having unit banking systems with the exception of Idaho, New Mexico, Arizona, and Nevada—have in excess of 10 percent of their member banks connected by individuals owning 5 percent or more of the stock in each of two or more banks. Only seven States—five in the Mountain region plus Florida and Oklahoma—have more than 10 percent of their insured commercial banks joined by at least 5-percent holdings of individuals in each of two or more banks.

Table 5 indicates the number of member banks that are joined by various ownership percentages ranging from 10 to 25 percent—344 banks are connected by at least 10-percent ownership positions; 15-percent ownership links 267 banks; 20-percent ownership joins 227 banks; and 175 are connected by at least 25-percent ownership positions in each of two or more banks. The East North Central, West North Central, West South Central, and Mountain regions consistently have the largest number of banks joined by the various percentage shares of ownership. These regions are composed of States that typically have unit banking; the average-sized banks may be small; and the States tend to be less industrialized.

Turning attention to the regional and State distributions of assets controlled by chain banks, we find that chain banks controlled about 19.3 percent of the member banks' assets (table 2), and about 16.3 percent of the assets of insured commercial banks (table 6) in mid-1962. Slightly over 46 percent of the member bank resources in the West South Central region were held by chain banks, and all other regions, with the exception of the Pacific region, had from 10 to 30 percent of their member bank resources accounted for by chain banks. Six States—Rhode Island, Delaware, Maryland, Florida, Texas, and Colorado—had in excess of 50 percent of their member bank assets held by chain banks. The assets of chain banks represented from 30 to 50 percent of member bank assets in nine other States and the District of Columbia.

A comparison of chain bank assets with the assets of insured commercial banks shows that about $1 out of every $6 of insured bank assets is held by a member bank of the Federal Reserve System that has the potential ability to coordinate its operating policies with at least one other member bank, and in many cases, several banks. In the West South Central States about $3 out of every $8 of the assets of insured commercial banks belong to chain banks. The East North Ceneral, South Atlantic, and Mountain regions have slightly more than $1 out of every $5 of the assets of insured commercial banks held by chain systems.

Rhode Island has 90 percent of its insured commercial bank assets held by chain banks, the highest proportion among all States. Over 40 percent of the insured commercial bank assets in Delaware, Maryland, Florida, Texas, Idaho, and Colorado are represented by chain banks; Delaware, Maryland, and Idaho permit statewide branching, unit banking is the rule in the other three. From 20 to 40 percent of insured bank assets are held by chain banks in 12 other States and the District of Columbia—6 of the 12 have unit banking; the other 6 allow limited branch banking.

As previously noted, member banks that are joined by 5 percent holdings of one individual or a group of individuals in each of two or more banks represent about 3.5 percent of member bank assets. They also account for about 3 percent of all insured commercial bank assets (table 6). The member banks with common ownership shares of 5 percent or more held by individuals account for about 12 and 14 percent of the member bank assets in the West North Central and West South Ceneral regions, respectively. On an individual State basis, there are nine in which these chain banks hold more than 10 percent of the State's member bank assets—Florida is the leader with 30 percent, followed by Oklahoma with 26 percent. Seven of the States have unit banking; Indiana and New Mexico have limited branching.

Table 7 presents a further breakdown of the assets of member banks by ownership shares, i.e., banks linked by the ownership shares of individuals consisting of 10, 15, 20, and 25 percent of the outstanding stock. The regions in which chain banks hold the largest amounts of assets are the East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, and West South Central.

C. Holdings of corporate stockholders

Three hundred and thirteen member banks have stockholders in common that are corporate entities holding 5 percent or more of the stock in each of two or more banks.[14] Of these, 85 also have common ownership links formed by the holdings of individuals.

A summary of the holdings of corporate entities is given in table 8 by type of corporate stockholder and Federal reserve district location of the banks. (Table 8 includes only the member banks that are linked exclusively by corporate stockholders.) Because of the influence of mutual savings banks in the Eastern States, the First Federal Reserve District has the largest number of chain banks that have a connection through corporate holdings. Sixty-two chain banks were found in the first district (table 1), and the holdings of mutual savings banks account for 30 of these. To the extent that State laws regulating mutual savings banks allow them to invest in corporate equities, commercial bank stocks have been one of the more attractive types of equity investments. At the end of 1962, commercial bank stocks accounted for one-third of the equity portfolios of mutual savings banks but represented less than 1 percent of the total assets of mutual savings banks.[15]

---

[13] Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1963, p. 1195.

[14] Eight banks are included in the total of 313 in which a corporate entity owned less than 5 percent of the stock in one of the banks. The basis for determining which member banks are chain banks depended on the stockholder's being a director, officer, or owner of 5 percent or more of the stock. In these eight cases, corporate entities owned less than 5 percent of the stock but nevertheless were designated as "directors or officers."

A comparison of table 8 with table 1 will show that the first district has by far the largest proportion of chain banks joined exclusively by corporate stockholders. The fourth and second districts rank second and third in this respect.

Investigation by type of corporate stockholder indicates that the largest number of banks are linked by the holdings of bank nominees.[16] Ordinarily, nominees are found as stockholders in the larger banks rather than in the smaller ones. As a result, the second and seventh districts, which include the New York and Chicago financial centers, are heavily represented by nominee holdings. In addition, a large number of banks in the fourth district are linked in the same manner. One report has found that 18 percent of the top 20 stockholders of the 200 largest member banks are bank nominees.[17] The same report suggested that nominees are popular as a means of holding stock for the beneficial owners of (1) estates, (2) various types of individual, pension, and corporate trust accounts, and (3) investment management accounts. In addition to the 94 banks represented in table 8 that are joined by nominee holdings, 19 other banks are linked by a combination of nominee and individual ownership shares.

Commercial banks frequently hold the stock of other commercial banks in some type of fiduciary capacity. There are 38 member banks in which another commercial bank appears as a stockholder linking 2 or more other member banks together by 5 percent ownership in each bank. In 27 other instances, commercial banks are 5 percent owners in 2 or more banks, but these banks are also connected by the holdings of individuals.

Although insurance companies find commercial bank stocks to be appealing investments in many cases, they generally do not invest heavily in any one bank. However, there are 11 member banks in which insurance companies own 5 percent or more of the stock in each of 2 or more banks. Twelve other member banks are joined by a combination of insurance company and individual holdings.

Eight instances were found in which the corporate entity linking member banks appears to be a bank holding company, according to the firm name. But in these cases the ownership shares of the holding company in each of the banks are not large enough to require registration with the Federal Reserve Board.

Twenty-two member banks were found in which a corporate stockholder owned 25 percent or more of the stock in each of two or more banks and yet was not a registered bank holding company. Thirteen of these banks were joined by the holdings of the Florida National Bank (plus the stockholdings of other individuals), a system of banks specifically exempted from the Bank Holding Company Act because the ownership arises via holdings of the Du Pont Testamentary Trust that was established in the 1930's. Of the other nine banks, five are joined by the holdings of another commercial bank, two are linked by the ownership shares of an insurance company, and two are connected by a nominee holding.

The assets controlled by the 228 member banks that are linked exclusively by corporate holdings of 5 percent or more in each of 2 or more banks are presented in table 9. Included in the final column are the proportions of district member bank assets held by these chain banks. These chain banks were holding about $19.9 billion in assets compared with about $20.2 billion in assets held by the 434 banks controlled by registered bank holding companies in June 1962.[18] Thus, the member banks of the Federal Reserve System that were linked exclusively by corporate entities controlled 7.2 percent of the assets of insured commercial banks (8.6 percent of the assets of member banks) compared with about 8 percent controlled by registered bank holding companies in 1962.

The magnitude of assets of banks joined by nominee holdings represents over one-half of the total assets, as shown in table 9. Such a finding substantiates the point made earlier that nominee holdings are more likely in the larger banks. Table 9, in conjunction with table 8, reveals that corporate holdings are much more prevalent among banks located in the eastern half of the United States, and in turn, that these banks tend to be larger in terms of assets.

The fourth and seventh districts have 27 and 22 percent, respectively, of their member bank assets held by banks that are joined by corporate stockholdings of 5 percent or more. Next in order are the third district with 15 percent and the fifth district with 12 percent.

D. Number and size of chain systems

Table 10 presents the number of chain systems that were discovered, the size of these systems in terms of number of banks affiliated with a given system, and the Federal Reserve district where the systems were located.[19]

In some cases an arbitrary decision was required in assigning chain systems to a particular Federal Reserve district because the banks in several systems cover two or more districts. In such cases, the following general rule was used. When three or more banks were connected, the system was assigned to the district where the majority of the banks were located. When there were only two affiliated banks located in two districts, the system was assigned to the district containing the bank with the larger amount of assets. If three or more banks were connected with each bank located in a different district, the system was assigned to the district of the bank with the largest amount of assets.[20]

Table 10 shows that 431 chain systems were identified among the member banks of the Federal Reserve System.[21] Nearly one-half of these systems are evenly distributed among the 7th, 10th, and 11th districts. The number of chains range from 22 to 31 in the remaining districts, with the exception of the 12th district, where there are only 5. Around 95 percent of all chain systems have five or fewer banks comprise 85 percent of all chain banks. Nearly 70 percent of all chain systems are made up of only two banks. Of the 67 systems composed of 4 or more banks each, 35 of them are located in the 7th, 10th, and 11th districts. Furthermore, one-half of the 74 systems consisting of 3 banks each are found in those 3 districts. Thus, both in terms of number of banks involved and number of systems, the 7th, 10th, and 11th districts comprise the most important regional areas of chain banking.

E. Percentage of stock ownership linking banks

A distribution of chain banks by Federal Reserve district and by percentage of stock held by the same owner, or owners, of two or more banks is given in table 11. Numerous cases were discovered in which a group of the same stockholders had common ownership in each of two or more banks. When multiple ownership ties of this nature were found, the percentages of ownership were aggregated to provide the percentage ownership for the group.

Five hundred and twenty-nine chain banks, representing 46 percent of all chain banks that are Federal Reserve System members, are connected by ownership interests of less than 10 percent with the other banks in their respective chain systems. Banks having common ownership ties of 25 percent or more account for about 28 percent of the total. About 14 percent of all chain banks are linked with the constituent banks in their respective chain systems by ownership interests of 50 percent or more, the majority of these banks being located in districts 6, 9, 10, and 11.

F. Magnitude of assets

A distribution of chain banks classified by asset size is provided in table 12. The largest number of chain banks fall in the $2 to $5 million category. Only about 8 percent of the chain banks have less than $2 million in assets; at the other extreme, 11 percent have over $50 million in assets. The three categories covering asset sizes between $2 million and $25 million account for nearly 75 percent of the chain banks.

Viewed in terms of the asset size of banks, the population of chain banks is similar to the population of all member banks. Chain banks with assets of $500,000 up to $10 million represent 59.1 percent of the total; member banks falling into these four size intervals comprise 63.9 percent of all member banks. Chain banks with less than $100 million in assets account for 92.7 percent of the population. Member banks with less than $100 million in assets represent 94.9 percent of the population of member banks.

---

[15] National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, "Mutual Savings Banks: Facts and Figures," May 1963, p. 21.

[16] Bank nominees are corporate entities that hold the stock of a bank in some type of fiduciary capacity for the beneficial owners. In some cases the nominee has full power to buy, sell, and vote the stock. At the other extreme, nominee holdings may be purely nominal, and the beneficial owner exercises all prerogatives of ownership. Stocks are held in the name of nominees for various reasons, the most important being that this method avoids delays in the transferring of stock. The endorsement of the nominee is usually sufficient to put the stock in good delivery form. See "Chain Banking: Stockholder and Loan Links of 200 Largest Member Banks," pp. 15–17.

[17] "Chain Banking: Stockholder and Loan Links of 200 Largest Member Banks," p. 14.

[18] U.S. Congress, House Committee on Banking and Currency, "Bank Holding Companies: Scope of Operations and Stock Ownership," 88th Cong., 1st sess., Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963, pp. 131–132. The deposits of group banks in June 1962 were $19.5 billion, representing 8 percent of all insured commercial bank deposits and about the same proportion of all commercial bank deposits. Assuming group banks also held about 8 percent of the assets of insured commercial banks, then we can estimate that group banks would have accounted for about $20.2 billion in assets, or 8 percent of $274.3 billion.

[19] Location by Federal Reserve District is given as a matter of convenience, the reason being that the lists of member bank stockholders were published according to District location of the banks as the primary classification method. State location within a particular District was used as a secondary classification method. As a result, stockholder lists that came from States having banks located in two Federal Reserve Districts were separated according to District location of the banks. Therefore, the bank identification number assigned to each bank in the initial procedure of matching stockholder names identified the banks by Federal Reserve District instead of by State.

[20] No instances were found of an even number of banks in a system with exactly one-half of the banks located in different Districts.

[21] Table 10 shows 1,169 banks as opposed to 1,146 in tables 1 and 4. In 23 cases it was impossible to determine in which of two chain systems the particular chain bank belonged; therefore, in these 23 instances the banks in question were included in each of two systems.

In comparing the distribution of chain banks with all member banks, it is instructive to observe that the proportions of chain banks in the smaller asset ranges, i.e., below $10 million, are not as great as the proportions of member banks. However, beyond the $10 million asset size, the proportions of chain banks are greater in each category than the corresponding proportions for member banks. Two conclusions can be drawn: First, the typical chain bank tends to be slightly larger in terms of assets than the typical member bank; second, chain banking should not be considered an exclusively small-bank phenomenon. Although it is difficult to define "small" and "large" banks, nearly 20 percent of all chain banks have assets in excess of $25 million.

G. Population of location

A distribution of chain banks according to the population of their location is presented in table 13. Almost 75 percent of all chain banks are located in the first five categories representing population centers of 25,000 or less, each of the five having about the same proportion.

The extent to which chain banks can be assumed to offer the only banking alternative in various population centers can be inferred from a recent study.[29] In June, 1962, population centers of less than 1,000 were found to have only one bank in almost 99 percent of the cases. In population centers of 1,000 to 5,000, the proportion having only one bank varied from about 82 percent in States allowing statewide branching to 75 percent in States with unit banking. In cities with populations between 5,000 and 10,000 the probability of having only two or fewer banks was nearly 90 percent in all States, regardless of branching provisions. The population of a city must be about 25,000 before the probability of having three or more banking institutions would be as high as 60 percent regardless of State branching provisions. On the basis of this study, one can infer that about three out of four chain banks face local competition from only one other banking institution. That is, 75 percent of the chain banks are located in population centers so small that the probability of facing competition from more than one other local bank is considerably less than 50 percent in most cases.[30] Perhaps even more significant is the fact that two-fifths of the chain banks are located in areas where the proportion of population centers having more than one banking alternative is small—usually less than 25 percent. By contrast, about 20 percent of the chain banks are located in standard metropolitan statistical areas with populations greater than 50,000—areas which usually have four or more banking alternatives.

H. Chain systems located in one county

Table 14 provides a summary of the spatial characteristics of bank chains and the relative importance of individual chains within their local market areas. Over one-half of the chain systems, or 242 of 431, are composed of banks located in the same county. These 242 systems account for 537 of the 1,146 chain banks.

One might expect chain systems with all members located in the same county to be more popular in States that prohibit branching. To a certain extent this expectation is borne out; Illinois and Texas have unit banking and rank first and second in number of chain systems, with 34 and 27, respectively. But contrary to this pattern, Pennsylvania allows branching within the home-office county and contiguous counties and ranks third with 23 systems. Florida, Michigan, New York, Oklahoma, and Virginia are the only other States with more than 10 systems, and only two of these States, Florida and Oklahoma, have unit banking.

In 81 instances, chain systems were found to hold no more than 20 percent of county deposits. In 69 cases, the proportion was 21 to 40 percent; in 55 cases, 41 to 60 percent; and in 21 cases, 61 to 80 percent. Finally, 16 systems account for 81 to 100 percent of county deposits, several of them individually accounting for all of the deposits in the county.

Briefly summarized, about two out of five chain systems with all of the affiliated members located in the same county hold over 40 percent of the total bank deposits of the county. In some counties, the concentration of deposits in bank chains is very high, and in others the degree of concentration achieved by the largest bank in the area may be several times greater than that of a bank chain.

I. Chain banking among nonmember banks

The discussion up to this point has been concerned only with chain banking among member banks of the Federal Reserve System. One would naturally be inclined to ask the question: To what extent is chain banking pervasive among nonmember banks? In an attempt to provide an estimate of the extent of nonmember chain banking, data published by the Federal Reserve Board between 1939 and 1945 has been utilized. A basic assumption made was that the ratio of member banks operating in chain systems to all chain banks has remained fairly stable since the last data were collected in 1945.

Table 15 furnishes a summary of data on number and deposits of all chain banks from 1939 to 1945. During this period, member banks accounted for a fairly constant share of all chain banks, ranging from 46.7 percent in 1939 to a high of 52.0 percent in 1943. Assuming that member banks still account for about one-half of all chain banks, we can estimate that around 1,150 nonmember banks were operating in chain systems in mid-1962, so that about 2,300 banks were members of chain organizations. This estimated total of banks operating in chain systems in 1962 would represent 17.5 percent of all insured commercial banks.

The ratio of deposits of member banks engaged in chain activities to deposits of all chain banks did not remain as stable between 1939 and 1945 as the ratio of number of member banks operating in chain systems to the total number of chain banks. Member banks held 77.5 percent of all chain deposits in 1939, and reached a high of 88.1 percent in 1943. By 1945, the ratio had declined to 84.6 percent. Since member banks have controlled about 85 percent of all commercial bank assets for several years, member banks operating in chains were assumed to account for 85 percent of all chain bank assets. On this basis, the estimated assets of nonmember banks operating in chains would be $7.9 billion. The estimated total assets of all chain banks would be almost $53 billion, representing 19.2 percent of the assets of all insured commercial banks in 1962.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The publication of the stockholder lists of member banks has furnished an excellent opportunity to examine the common ownership ties among member banks. The findings presented here reveal that the practice persists on a wide scale. We found that 19 percent of all member banks are chain banks and that these banks control 19.3 percent of the member bank assets. Chain banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System represent nearly 9 percent of all insured commercial banks, and they control about 16 percent of the assets of insured commercial banks.

The number of member banks joined by at least 5-percent ownership positions of the same individual or group of individuals in each of two or more banks account for about 9 percent of all member banks and hold slightly over 3 percent of all member bank assets. Examination of banks joined by larger ownership percentages of the same individual or group of individuals shows that less than 3 percent of the member banks are linked by ownership positions as large as 25 percent in each of two or more banks; these banks hold $1.7 billion in assets.

Around 4 percent of the member banks are chain banks in which the only common ownership tie is that of a corporate entity such as a mutual savings bank, another commercial bank, an insurance company, or a bank nominee—owning 5 percent or more of the stock in each of two or more banks. The banks linked together exclusively by corporate entities hold $20 billion in assets, or 8.6 percent of member bank assets.

The typical bank chain is small in terms of number of banks affiliated in each system. A large majority of the systems have only two or three banks. Ordinarily, the larger chain systems are located in States that have unit banking systems. Nearly one-half of all chain systems identified are linked by ownership shares of less than 10 percent.

Almost 20 percent of the chain banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System have in excess of $25 million in assets. It seems reasonable to conclude that the average chain bank tends to be slightly larger than the average member bank, since about 40 percent of the chain banks have more than $10 million in assets as opposed to around 35 percent in the case of all member banks.

On the basis of a study concerning the number of banking institutions per population center, one can conclude that about three out of four chain banks are located in areas where the probability of facing competition from more than one other local bank is ordinarily less than one-half. About two out of five chain banks are located in areas where the likelihood of having more than one bank is small.

The concentration of bank deposits that arises from chain banking is indicated by an analysis of the county location of bank affiliated in given chain systems. Over one-half of the chain systems comprised of member banks of the Federal Reserve System were found to have all affiliated banks domiciled within the boundaries of one county. Systems consisting of as many as five banks were found in which all of the banks are located in the same county. About two out of five chain systems having all the affiliated banks in the chain located in the same county held over 40 percent of the total bank deposits of the county.

Assuming the ratio of member chain banks to all chain banks (as revealed by Federal Reserve Board studies of chain banking between 1939 and 1945) has remained stable, one can estimate that around 17 percent of all insured commercial banks have shareholders in common meeting the criteria of chain banking adopted for this study. These banks would hold about 19 percent of the assets of insured commercial banks.

One of the more obvious conclusions to be drawn from the investigation of common ownership ties presented here is that chain banking is much more widespread than the current lists of member-bank stockholders reveal. For instance, it is practically impossible to identify family holdings, as contrasted with individual holdings, simply from stockholder names and addresses, especially in cases of different family names. And, of course, we have no access to nonmember-bank stockholder lists. Based on the fact that nonmember banks are usually smaller, one would expect chain banking to be equally prevalent, if not more so, among banks not having membership in the Federal Reserve System.

---

[29] See, Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1963, p. 1197.

[30] The only exception to this conclusion occurs in centers with populations between 10,000 and 25,000 that are located where statewide branching is permitted. In such centers, 56.3 percent have three or more banks.

It would be hazardous to assert that chain banking relationships have developed as an alternative to branch banking. Certainly most of the States that allow some form of branching also have chain banks. Yet, there seems to be a discernible pattern in the first six tables of our data which shows that chain banking does exist on a larger scale in the States and regions that have unit banking. Thus, States having prohibitions against branching may only invite some other form of multiple-office banking to emerge.

One might question the policy that requires only corporate entities controlling 25 percent or more of the stock in each of two or more banks to submit to Federal supervision. Many instances can be found of a single individual, or a group of the same individuals, having a similar ownership position of 25 percent or more in each of two or more banks. Yet, in these cases, Federal supervision is not required. The proper criterion for supervision should be the potential for harmful effects to the banking public from common control, instead of the source of that control.

DATA APPENDIX

TABLE 1.—*Chain banking, by Federal Reserve district, June 30, 1962*

Federal Reserve district	Number of chain banks	Percentage of member banks	Number of banks linked by individuals owning [1]—											
			5 percent or more			10 percent or more		15 percent or more		20 percent or more		25 percent or more		
			1 individual	Group of individuals	Percent of member banks	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals	Percent of member banks
1	62	24.4	13	0	5.1	9	2	4	2	4	2	4	0	1.6
2	74	16.4	18	0	4.0	10	0	10	0	4	4	4	2	1.3
3	69	15.1	20	2	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.0
4	74	14.0	18	0	3.4	7	4	3	2	3	0	1	0	.2
5	69	16.4	27	0	6.4	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	.0
6	86	20.0	47	3	11.6	29	9	17	11	17	9	13	8	4.9
7	167	16.6	70	0	7.0	29	14	18	10	14	6	12	6	1.8
8	71	15.0	25	6	6.5	13	2	11	2	4	6	2	4	1.3
9	73	15.5	46	2	10.2	29	3	27	3	23	5	19	7	5.5
10	201	26.3	126	6	17.3	84	21	60	34	40	40	27	30	7.5
11	185	29.3	105	11	18.4	57	9	40	9	34	10	24	10	5.4
12	15	9.3	11	0	6.8	4	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	1.2
Total	1,146	19.0	526	30	9.2	278	66	194	73	143	84	106	69	2.9

[1] Number of member banks in which 1 individual or a group of the same individuals own at least 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 percent or more of the outstanding stock in each of 2 or more banks.

Sources: U.S. Congress, House Committee on Banking and Currency, Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, "Twenty Largest Stockholders of Record in Member Banks of the Federal Reserve System," hereafter referred to as "Twenty Largest Stockholders," 88th Cong., 2d sess., Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964; Federal Reserve Bulletin, May 1963, p. 711.

TABLE 2.—*Assets of chain banks, by Federal Reserve district, June 30, 1962*

Federal Reserve district	Assets of chain banks (thousands of dollars)	Percentage of member bank assets [1]	Assets of banks linked by 5 percent ownership of [2] (thousands of dollars)		Percentage of member bank assets [1]
			One individual	Group of individuals	
1	2,249,214	23.3	66,477	0	0.7
2	3,518,841	5.9	247,497	0	.4
3	2,328,440	20.0	103,957	3,915	.9
4	5,801,269	32.3	139,920	0	.8
5	2,109,928	20.0	190,600	0	1.8
6	3,232,380	25.2	1,103,920	169,298	9.9
7	10,590,319	30.6	1,381,356	0	4.0
8	2,055,075	25.7	241,158	58,883	3.8
9	531,162	9.1	293,569	14,097	5.3
10	4,503,119	43.3	2,158,674	54,104	21.3
11	7,102,965	54.6	1,435,272	294,019	13.3
12	748,943	2.0	183,988	0	.5
Total	44,771,655	19.3	7,546,388	594,316	3.5

[1] Based on member bank assets at the end of 1962.

[2] Column figures represent assets of all member banks in which one individual or a group of individuals own at least 5 percent or more of the outstanding stock in each of 2 or more banks.

Source: "Twenty Largest Stockholders," Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, 1962 ed.; Federal Reserve Bulletin; loc. cit.

TABLE 3.—*Assets of chain banks, by Federal Reserve district, June 30, 1962*

[Thousands of dollars]

Federal Reserve district	Assets of banks linked by individuals owning [1]							
	10 percent or more		15 percent or more		20 percent or more		25 percent or more	
	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals
1	54,374	8,227	22,579	16,637	22,579	16,637	22,579	0
2	75,993	0	75,993	0	41,704	21,060	41,704	7,028
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	77,888	18,050	10,960	5,862	10,960	0	4,793	0
5	34,314	0	7,481	0	0	0	0	0
6	678,978	212,834	424,561	334,256	424,561	250,551	251,459	228,806
7	666,986	157,331	527,820	138,599	131,100	73,244	63,433	118,550
8	175,151	30,804	167,037	8,114	131,015	32,292	103,899	23,272
9	192,037	11,926	185,621	8,643	156,125	25,636	123,258	31,784
10	1,485,742	272,576	787,493	823,881	157,324	1,133,614	132,349	188,459
11	833,223	111,740	734,460	65,820	574,506	72,055	242,645	75,323
12	59,602	4,780	12,261	0	0	12,261	0	12,261
Total	4,334,288	828,268	2,956,266	1,401,812	1,649,874	1,637,350	986,119	685,483

[1] Column figures represent assets of all member banks in which 1 individual or a group of the same individuals own at least 10, 15, 20, and 25 percent of more of the outstanding stock in each of 2 or more banks.

Sources: "Twenty Largest Stockholders," Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, 1962.

TABLE 4.—*Chain banking, by region and State, June 30, 1962*

Geographic region and State	Number of chain banks	Percentage of member banks	Percentage of insured commercial banks	Number of banks linked by 5 percent ownership of [1]— 1 individual	Number of banks linked by 5 percent ownership of [1]— Group of individuals	Percentage of member banks	Percentage of insured commercial banks
United States	1,146	19.0	8.7	526	30	9.2	4.2
New England	62	23.8	15.9	13	0	5.0	3.3
Maine	2	7.1	4.9	2	0	7.1	4.9
New Hampshire	17	32.7	23.9	2	0	3.8	2.8
Vermont	5	16.7	9.6	2	0	6.7	3.8
Massachusetts	30	26.1	18.6	5	0	4.3	3.1
Rhode Island	3	60.0	37.5	0	0	0	0
Connecticut	5	16.7	8.3	2	0	6.7	3.3
Middle Atlantic	161	15.6	12.9	44	2	5.4	5.3
New York	51	15.6	14.0	16	0	4.9	4.4
New Jersey	32	15.7	13.4	2	0	1.0	.8
Pennsylvania	78	15.6	12.0	26	2	5.6	4.3
East North Central	250	16.8	8.6	100	2	6.9	3.5
Ohio	44	12.2	7.7	11	0	3.0	1.9
Indiana	31	13.7	7.1	15	0	6.6	3.4
Illinois	111	21.2	11.3	57	2	11.3	6.0
Michigan	42	19.6	11.4	9	0	4.2	2.4
Wisconsin	22	13.8	3.9	8	0	5.0	1.4
West North Central	148	14.9	4.5	83	7	7.1	2.1
Minnesota	19	9.1	2.8	14	0	6.7	2.0
Iowa	13	8.0	2.0	6	0	3.7	.9
Missouri	28	16.5	4.6	12	0	7.1	2.0
North Dakota	8	20.0	5.2	5	2	17.5	4.6
South Dakota	10	17.2	5.7	8	0	13.8	4.6
Nebraska	29	21.0	7.2	18	2	14.5	5.0
Kansas	41	19.3	7.0	20	3	10.8	3.9
South Atlantic	140	21.7	8.6	64	3	10.4	4.1
Delaware	1	20.0	5.3	0	0	0	0
Maryland	8	13.3	6.2	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	2	25.0	18.2	0	0	0	0
Virginia	38	19.4	12.8	15	0	7.7	5.1
West Virginia	22	20.2	12.3	9	0	8.3	5.0
North Carolina	1	2.9	.6	1	0	2.9	.6
South Carolina	2	6.3	1.4	2	0	6.3	1.4
Georgia	4	5.9	1.1	0	0	0	0
Florida	62	46.6	19.1	37	3	30.1	12.3
East South Central	37	12.1	3.5	11	2	4.2	1.2
Kentucky	15	15.2	4.4	1	2	3.0	.9
Tennessee	9	11.1	3.1	2	0	2.5	.7
Alabama	11	11.8	4.6	8	0	8.6	3.4
Mississippi	2	5.9	1.1	0	0	0	0
West South Central	264	28.4	14.5	157	13	18.3	9.3
Arkansas	12	15.4	5.1	4	2	7.7	2.6
Louisiana	6	11.3	3.1	2	0	3.8	1.0
Oklahoma	82	36.3	21.2	64	0	28.3	16.5
Texas	164	28.7	16.2	87	11	17.2	9.7
Mountain	83	26.5	16.7	54	1	17.6	11.0
Montana	15	17.0	12.3	11	0	12.5	9.0
Idaho	10	58.8	32.3	8	0	47.1	25.8
Wyoming	9	22.0	16.1	4	0	9.8	7.1
Colorado	34	34.7	20.2	17	1	18.4	10.7
New Mexico	11	28.9	18.6	11	0	28.9	18.6
Arizona	1	25.0	10.0	1	0	25.0	10.0
Utah	2	9.5	4.4	1	0	4.8	2.2
Nevada	1	20.0	14.3	1	0	20.0	14.3
Pacific	1	.9	.4	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	1	1.8	.8	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

[1] Number of member banks in which 1 individual or a group of the same individuals own at least 5 percent or more of the outstanding stock in each of 2 or more banks.

Sources: "Twenty Largest Stockholders"; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, "Assets, Liabilities, and Capital Accounts of Commercial and Mutual Savings Banks," report of call No. 60, June 30, 1962.

TABLE 5.—*Chain banking, by region and State, June 30, 1962*

Geographic region and State	Number of banks linked by individuals owning [1]— 10 percent or more: 1 individual	10 percent or more: Group of individuals	15 percent or more: 1 individual	15 percent or more: Group of individuals	20 percent or more: 1 individual	20 percent or more: Group of individuals	25 percent or more: 1 individual	25 percent or more: Group of individuals
United States	278	66	194	73	143	84	106	69
New England	9	2	4	2	4	2	4	0
Maine	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
Massachusetts	5	0	0	2	0	2	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Connecticut	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
Middle Atlantic	12	0	10	0	4	4	4	2
New York	8	0	8	0	2	4	2	0
New Jersey	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	2
Pennsylvania	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East North Central	42	16	29	10	19	12	13	10
Ohio	4	4	2	2	2	0	0	0
Indiana	7	2	3	0	2	0	2	0
Illinois	24	6	21	4	12	10	10	8
Michigan	4	2	2	2	2	2	0	2
Wisconsin	3	2	1	2	1	0	1	0
West North Central	53	13	41	20	26	23	22	18
Minnesota	11	2	11	0	9	0	9	0
Iowa	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Missouri	8	1	4	5	0	5	0	1
North Dakota	5	0	3	2	2	3	2	3
South Dakota	4	1	4	1	3	2	3	2
Nebraska	15	2	13	2	6	7	4	5
Kansas	10	5	6	8	6	6	4	7
South Atlantic	30	7	15	11	13	9	9	
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	23	7	13	11	13	9	9	8
East South Central	7	2	5	0	5	0	5	0
Kentucky	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Tennessee	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alabama	6	0	4	0	4	0	4	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West South Central	94	20	66	24	54	24	35	23
Arkansas	4	2	4	0	4	0	2	0
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	42	10	31	15	25	15	17	14
Texas	48	8	31	9	25	9	16	9
Mountain	31	6	24	6	18	10	14	8
Montana	6	0	6	0	6	0	4	2
Idaho	3	2	2	0	0	2	0	2
Wyoming	4	0	4	0	2	2	0	2
Colorado	12	4	7	6	5	6	5	2
New Mexico	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

[1] Number of member banks in which 1 individual or a group of the same individuals own at least 10, 15, 20, and 25 percent or more of the outstanding stock in each of 2 or more banks.

Sources: "Twenty Largest Stockholders"; FDIC, "Assets, Liabilities, and Capital Accounts of Commercial and Mutual Savings Banks," loc. cit.

TABLE 6.—*Assets of chain banking, by region and State, June 30, 1962*

Geographic region and State	Assets of chain banks (thousands of dollars)	Percentage of member bank assets	Percentage of insured commercial bank assets	Assets of banks linked by 5 percent ownership of—(thousands of dollars)		Percentage of member bank assets	Percentage of insured commercial bank assets
				1 individual	Group of individuals		
United States	44,771,655	19.3	16.3	7,546,388	594,316	3.5	3.0
New England	2,249,214	22.0	18.7	66,477	0	.7	.6
Maine	8,227	1.4	1.0	8,227	0	1.4	1.1
New Hampshire	138,309	38.7	28.0	3,876	0	1.1	.8
Vermont	37,977	16.2	8.0	4,559	0	1.9	1.0
Massachusetts	865,988	14.9	13.5	31,795	0	.5	.5
Rhode Island	921,260	96.3	90.0	0	0	0	0
Connecticut	277,453	12.2	9.7	18,020	0	.8	.6
Middle Atlantic	8,105,545	10.6	10.0	426,619	3,915	.6	.5
New York	2,003,517	3.7	3.6	215,900	0	.4	.4
New Jersey	1,845,158	23.8	21.4	31,597	0	.4	.4
Pennsylvania	4,256,870	28.3	24.7	179,122	3,915	1.2	1.1
East North Central	13,982,286	29.9	25.2	1,504,822	7,051	3.2	2.7
Ohio	3,119,074	26.5	23.7	59,962	0	.5	.5
Indiana	1,240,439	29.4	22.5	452,420	0	10.7	8.2
Illinois	6,271,476	34.7	30.0	850,863	7,051	4.7	4.1
Michigan	3,109,453	32.8	28.9	88,115	0	.9	.8
Wisconsin	241,844	7.4	4.6	53,462	0	1.6	1.0
West North Central	3,759,022	26.2	17.2	1,643,108	42,413	11.8	7.7
Minnesota	148,956	4.3	3.0	71,450	0	2.0	1.4
Iowa	147,861	7.9	4.1	90,273	0	4.9	2.5
Missouri	2,328,971	48.2	33.5	880,999	0	18.2	12.7
North Dakota	63,420	15.5	8.8	24,576	14,097	9.5	5.3
South Dakota	85,642	14.8	9.8	72,772	0	12.5	8.3
Nebraska	262,830	19.0	13.7	76,597	5,285	5.9	4.3
Kansas	721,342	40.7	25.0	426,441	23,031	25.4	15.6
South Atlantic	5,238,959	29.7	21.2	1,246,582	169,298	8.0	5.7
Delaware	334,831	64.7	41.0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	1,138,867	60.3	40.5	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	498,857	30.1	26.9	0	0	0	0
So. Atlantic—Con.							
Virginia	333,852	10.4	8.6	132,916	0	4.1	3.4
West Virginia	184,794	16.0	12.1	40,285	0	3.5	2.6
North Carolina	9,918	.5	.3	9,918	0	.5	.3
South Carolina	7,481	1.0	.6	7,481	0	1.0	.6
Georgia	33,349	1.4	1.4	0	0	0	0
Florida	2,697,010	66.7	46.2	1,055,982	169,298	30.3	21.0
East South Central	844,753	11.7	8.0	52,731	21,028	1.0	.7
Kentucky	554,616	33.3	20.9	4,793	21,028	1.5	1.0
Tennessee	192,924	6.6	5.0	14,141	0	.5	.4
Alabama	78,013	4.1	3.2	33,797	0	1.8	1.4
Mississippi	19,200	2.6	1.2	0	0	0	0
West South Central	8,317,370	46.2	37.0	2,135,797	324,823	13.7	11.0
Arkansas	232,208	22.7	15.3	131,015	30,804	15.8	10.6
Louisiana	339,676	14.1	10.1	94,246	0	3.9	2.8
Oklahoma	865,428	32.7	27.4	687,873	0	26.0	21.8
Texas	6,880,058	57.6	47.8	1,222,663	294,019	12.7	10.5
Mountain	1,988,119	27.2	22.8	470,252	25,788	6.8	5.7
Montana	80,977	10.4	8.9	66,665	0	8.5	7.3
Idaho	316,347	48.5	42.2	47,667	0	7.3	6.4
Wyoming	151,284	37.8	32.2	16,838	0	4.2	3.6
Colorado	1,182,826	59.7	49.4	92,285	25,788	6.0	4.9
New Mexico	110,476	17.6	13.3	110,476	0	17.6	13.3
Arizona	13,324	1.0	.8	13,324	0	1.0	.8
Utah	89,080	8.9	7.8	79,192	0	7.9	6.9
Nevada	43,805	8.9	7.7	43,805	0	8.9	7.7
Pacific	286,387	.8	.8	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	286,387	1.0	1.0	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

---

[1] Assets of all member banks in which 1 individual or a group of the same individuals own at least 5 percent or more of the outstanding stock in each of 2 or more banks.

Sources: "Twenty Largest Stockholders"; Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, 1962; "FDIC Assets, Liabilities, and Capital Accounts of Commercial and Mutual Savings Banks," loc. cit.

TABLE 7.—*Assets of chain banking, by region and State, June 30, 1962*

[In thousands of dollars]

Geographic region and State	Assets of banks linked by individuals owning [1]—							
	10 percent or more		15 percent or more		20 percent or more		25 percent or more	
	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals
United States	4,334,288	828,268	2,956,266	1,401,812	1,649,874	1,637,350	986,119	685,483
New England	54,374	8,277	22,579	16,637	22,579	16,637	22,579	0
Maine	0	8,277	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	4,559	0	4,559	0	4,559	0	4,559	0
Massachusetts	31,795	0	0	16,637	0	16,637	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Connecticut	18,020	0	18,020	0	18,020	0	18,020	0
Middle Atlantic	107,691	0	75,993	0	41,704	21,060	41,704	7,028
New York	44,396	0	44,396	0	10,107	21,060	10,107	7,028
New Jersey	31,597	0	31,597	0	31,597	0	31,597	0
Pennsylvania	31,698	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East North Central	769,597	161,328	595,201	130,408	166,189	105,536	65,636	141,822
Ohio	41,397	18,050	6,167	5,862	6,167	0	0	0
Indiana	247,159	14,375	154,516	0	4,982	0	4,982	0
Illinois	411,102	93,600	405,596	89,243	126,118	87,080	58,451	123,366
Michigan	46,705	18,456	26,719	18,456	26,719	18,456	0	18,456
Wisconsin	23,234	16,847	2,203	16,847	2,203	0	2,203	0

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 7.—*Assets of chain banking, by region and State, June 30, 1962*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Geographic region and State	Assets of banks linked by individuals owning [1]—							
	10 percent or more		15 percent or more		20 percent or more		25 percent or more	
	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals	1 individual	Group of individuals
West North Central	1,286,569	197,398	739,010	532,072	147,447	937,374	137,187	125,194
Minnesota	57,371	9,699	57,371	0	44,868	0	44,868	0
Iowa	0	14,053	0	14,053	0	0	0	0
Missouri	841,577	6,439	535,191	312,825	0	833,655	0	28,267
North Dakota	24,576	0	18,160	6,416	8,752	15,824	8,752	15,824
South Dakota	58,640	2,227	58,640	2,227	51,055	9,812	51,055	9,812
Nebraska	59,606	13,588	52,585	13,588	25,709	33,704	21,656	20,116
Kansas	244,799	151,392	17,063	182,963	17,063	44,379	10,856	51,175
South Atlantic	688,142	198,693	413,742	334,256	406,261	250,551	233,159	228,806
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	9,596	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	17,237	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	7,481	0	7,481	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	653,828	198,693	406,261	334,256	406,261	250,551	233,159	228,806
East South Central	29,943	14,141	23,093	0	23,093	0	23,093	0
Kentucky	4,793	0	4,793	0	4,793	0	4,793	0
Tennessee	0	14,141	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alabama	25,150	0	18,300	0	18,300	0	18,300	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West South Central	1,188,187	200,153	954,903	321,972	739,535	236,234	366,263	144,894
Arkansas	131,015	30,804	131,015	0	131,015	0	103,899	0
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	273,485	59,857	138,964	256,152	83,550	164,179	64,693	74,133
Texas	783,687	109,492	684,924	65,820	524,970	72,055	197,671	70,761
Mountain	209,785	48,328	131,745	66,467	103,066	69,958	96,498	37,739
Montana	22,528	0	22,528	0	22,528	0	16,380	6,148
Idaho	15,797	4,780	12,261	0	0	12,261	0	12,261
Wyoming	16,838	0	16,838	0	10,087	6,751	0	6,751
Colorado	66,920	43,548	36,221	66,467	26,554	50,946	36,221	12,579
New Mexico	43,897	0	43,897	0	43,897	0	43,897	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	43,805	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

[1] Assets of all member banks in which 1 individual or a group of the same individuals own at least 10, 15, 20, and 25 percent or more of the outstanding stock in each of 2 or more banks.

Sources: "Twenty Largest Stockholders"; Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, 1962.

TABLE 8.—*Number and location of chain banks linked exclusively by type of corporate stockholder, June 30, 1962*

Federal Reserve district	Type of corporate stockholder						
	Mutual savings banks	Commercial banks	Insurance companies	Holding companies	Nominees	Other	Number of banks
1	30	0	5	0	2	2	39
2	1	1	2	0	16	5	25
3	0	4	0	0	8	6	18
4	0	6	2	0	15	8	31
5	0	6	0	0	8	2	16
6	0	2	0	3	4	2	11
7	1	7	0	0	21	7	36
8	0	5	2	0	2	2	11
9	0	1	0	0	10	3	14
10	0	2	0	0	5	2	9
11	0	4	0	5	2	6	17
12	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	32	38	11	8	94	45	228

Source: "Twenty Largest Stockholders."

TABLE 9.—*Assets of chain banks linked exclusively by corporate stockholders, June 30, 1962*

[In thousands of dollars]

Federal Reserve district	Type of corporate stockholder							Percentage of member bank assets
	Mutual savings banks	Commercial banks	Insurance companies	Holding companies	Nominees	Other	Assets of banks	
1	891,890	0	54,380	0	15,740	26,210	988,220	10.2
2	23,148	21,406	737,263	0	679,764	375,996	1,837,577	3.1
3	0	115,330	0	0	1,232,106	380,615	1,728,051	14.9
4	0	48,387	19,097	0	2,237,853	2,519,506	4,824,843	26.9
5	0	116,226	0	0	1,150,458	20,266	1,286,950	12.2
6	0	33,815	0	25,176	211,277	153,111	423,379	3.3
7	1,073,207	73,066	0	0	5,476,317	935,681	7,558,271	21.9
8	0	72,493	292,762	0	10,905	41,127	417,287	5.2
9	0	2,548	0	0	135,132	13,651	151,331	2.6
10	0	28,221	0	0	101,356	141,666	271,243	2.6
11	0	16,960	0	39,131	17,442	71,514	145,047	1.1
12	0	0	0	0	262,505	0	262,505	.7
Total	1,988,245	528,452	1,103,502	64,307	11,530,855	4,679,343	19,894,704	8.6

Sources: "Twenty Largest Stockholders"; Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, 1962; FDIC, "Assets, Liabilities, and Capital Accounts of Commercial and Mutual Savings Banks," loc. cit.

TABLE 10.—*Location, number, and size of chain systems, June 30, 1962*

Federal Reserve district	Number of banks affiliated in a given chain system: 2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	11	15	21	Number of chain systems	Number of chain banks
1	12	6	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	22	68
2	23	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	79
3	26	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	70
4	16	6	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	74
5	25	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	70
6	13	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	84
7	47	9	7	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	67	176
8	22	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	68
9	22	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	68
10	43	12	6	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	68	210
11	39	16	5	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	66	185
12	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	17
Total chains	290	74	38	10	5	2	7	2	1	1	1	431	
Banks	580	222	152	50	30	14	56	18	11	15	21		1,169

Source: "Twenty Largest Stockholders."

TABLE 11.—*Distribution of chain banks, by Federal Reserve district and by percentage of stockownership linking banks, June 30, 1962*

Percentage of stockownership	Number of chain banks in Federal Reserve district: 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Number of chain banks	Percentage
0.0 to 4.9	5	20	21	11	20	15	33	18	7	36	38	2	226	19.7
5.0 to 9.9	23	26	29	26	30	12	46	23	18	29	37	4	303	26.4
10.0 to 14.9	14	5	7	12	10	10	25	10	8	13	27	3	144	12.6
15.0 to 19.9	0	7	6	4	3	3	13	4	3	14	15	0	72	6.3
20.0 to 24.9	6	4	1	5	4	9	10	4	4	17	15	3	82	7.2
25.0 to 34.9	4	3	1	7	0	4	12	8	2	24	16	0	81	7.1
35.0 to 49.9	6	3	1	2	0	4	13	2	9	22	14	1	77	6.7
50.0 to 74.9	4	3	1	7	2	12	8	2	18	30	19	2	108	9.4
75.0 or more	0	3	2	0	0	17	7	0	4	16	4	0	53	4.6
Total	62	74	60	74	69	86	167	71	73	201	185	15	1,146	100.0

Source: "Twenty Largest Stockholders."

TABLE 12.—*Number and percentage distribution of chain banks, by asset size and percentage distribution of all member banks, June 30, 1962*

Amount of assets (thousands)	Number of chain banks	Percentage of all chain banks	Percentage of all member banks
$500 to $999	18	1.6	1.4
$1,000 to $1,999	77	6.7	8.3
$2,000 to $4,999	336	29.3	30.1
$5,000 to $9,999	247	21.5	24.1
$10,000 to $24,999	256	22.4	20.3
$25,000 to $49,999	83	7.2	7.0
$50,000 to $99,999	46	4.0	3.7
$100,000 to $499,999	66	5.8	3.9
$500,000 and over	17	1.5	1.2
Total	1,146	100.0	100.0

Sources: "Twenty Largest Stockholders"; Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, 1962; U.S. Congress, House Committee on Banking and Currency, Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, "The Structure of Ownership of Member Banks and the Pattern of Loans Made on Hypothecated Bank Stock," 88th Cong., 2d sess., Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1964, p. 8.

TABLE 13.—*Number and percentage distribution of chain banks, by size of population center, June 30, 1962*

Size of population center	Number of chain banks	Percentage of chain banks
1,000 and under	148	12.9
1,000 to 2,500	175	15.3
2,500 to 5,000	170	14.8
5,000 to 10,000	172	15.0
10,000 to 25,000	172	15.0
25,000 to 50,000	85	7.4
50,000 to 100,000	72	6.3
100,000 to 250,000	46	4.0
250,000 to 500,000	32	2.8
500,000 and over	74	6.5
Total	1,146	100.0

Sources: "Twenty Largest Stockholders"; Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, 1962.

TABLE 14.—*Location, number, size of systems, and percentage of county deposits held by chain systems with all affiliated banks located in 1 county, June 30, 1962*

State	Number of chain systems	Number of banks in systems: 2	3	4	5	Number of chain banks	Number of systems and percentage of county deposits held [1]: 0 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 60	61 to 80	81 to 100
Alabama	2	2	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	1	0
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	2	2	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	0	0
California	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Colorado	5	4	1	0	0	11	1	2	0	1	0
Connecticut	2	1	1	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	16	9	5	2	0	41	6	10	0	0	0
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	34	27	6	1	0	76	18	8	7	0	0
Indiana	8	7	1	0	0	17	2	0	4	2	0
Iowa	2	2	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	1
Kansas	3	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	3	0	1
Kentucky	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0
Louisiana	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
Maine	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0
Maryland	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0
Massachusetts	9	6	2	1	0	22	9	0	0	0	0
Michigan	10	10	0	0	0	20	3	2	3	1	1
Minnesota	4	4	0	0	0	8	2	0	2	0	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri	5	4	0	0	1	13	2	1	1	1	0
Montana	3	3	0	0	0	6	0	2	1	0	0
Nebraska	6	5	1	0	0	13	1	0	4	1	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
New Hampshire	5	5	0	0	0	10	5	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	6	6	0	0	0	12	3	2	1	0	1
New Mexico	3	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	1	0
New York	12	10	1	1	0	27	5	5	1	0	1
North Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0
Ohio	9	8	0	1	0	20	0	2	4	3	0
Oklahoma	12	9	2	1	0	28	2	4	4	1	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	23	21	1	1	0	40	10	12	1	0	0
Rhode Island	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
South Carolina	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 14.—*Location, number, size of systems, and percentage of county deposits held by chain systems with all affiliated banks located in 1 county, June 30, 1962*—Continued

State	Number of chain systems	Number of banks in systems				Number of chain banks	Number of systems and percentage of county deposits held[1]				
		2	3	4	5		0 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 60	61 to 80	81 to 100
South Dakota	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
Tennessee	2	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	1
Texas	27	19	6	1	1	65	7	9	7	0	4
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	13	12	1	0	0	27	0	4	4	3	2
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	5	5	0	0	0	10	0	2	3	0	0
Wisconsin	3	3	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	1	0
Wyoming	2	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	1
Total	242	202	29	9	2	537	81	69	55	21	16

[1] "County deposits" include deposits of commercial banks and mutual savings banks in States where mutual savings banks are located.

Sources: "Twenty Largest Stockholders"; Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, 1962; Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, "Distribution of Bank Deposits by Counties and Standard Metropolitan Areas," June 30, 1962.

TABLE 15.—*Number and deposits of member and nonmember banks operating in chain systems at selected times*

Year	All chain banks				Member banks				Nonmember banks			
	Number	Percentage of all commercial banks	Deposits (millions)	Percentage of all commercial banks	Number	Percentage of all chain banks	Deposits (millions)	Percentage of all chain banks	Number	Percentage of all chain banks	Deposits (millions)	Percentage of all chain banks
December 1939[1]	424	2.9	$883	1.6	198	46.7	$684	77.5	226	53.3	199	22.5
December 1941[1]	455	3.2	1,501	2.1	222	48.8	1,316	87.7	233	51.2	185	12.3
December 1943[1]	454	3.4	2,859	2.7	236	52.0	2,518	88.1	218	48.0	341	11.9
December 1945[1]	522	3.9	4,628	3.1	255	48.9	3,916	84.6	267	51.1	712	15.4
June 1962	[2]2,296	[3]17.5	[2]52,672	[3]19.2	1,156	50.0	44,772	85.0	[2]1,150	50.0	[2]7,900	15.0

[1] Data refer to chain systems composed of 3 or more banks.
[2] Estimated from data derived for member banks.
[3] Percentage of all insured commercial banks.

Sources: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, "Banking and Monetary Statistics," Washington, D.C.; National Capital Press, 1943, pp. 318, 322; Federal Reserve Bulletin, June 1944, p. 615, and April 1947, p. 463; and tables 1 and 2.

RESULTS OF 1966 QUESTIONNAIRE—18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we have just tabulated the results of the questionnaire sent to residents of the 18th District of Illinois, and they clearly indicate our people are unsure of the administration's aims in Vietnam, want a decisive end to the conflict there, are worried about inflation, do not like the way the war on poverty is being waged, and are against higher Federal taxes.

We received nearly 23,000 responses to the 131,000 questionnaires we sent out to district residents. It was revealed that 56 percent of the people polled were uncertain just what the administration's goals are in Vietnam. Some 57 percent would favor a Korean-type settlement of the war, with the 17th parallel being the dividing line between a North Vietnam and a South Vietnam.

A question on the high cost of living drew a whopping 87 percent who said that they considered inflation to be a major problem in the Nation today.

The poverty war drew a 90-percent "thumbs down" vote on a question which asked if they believed that the current poverty program is effective in eliminating the causes of poverty.

The people in the 18th District proved to be economy minded as far as their Government is concerned. They voted 77 percent in favor of cutting back domestic programs to finance the war in Vietnam.

Renticare drew the highest "nay" vote, as 92 percent voted against having the Federal Government subsidize rents for individuals.

Proposals for increasing Federal taxes will not get very far, if the 18th District is a sampling of national opinion, since 91 percent of the people polled said they do not want taxes raised to enable the Great Society to move ahead on its programs for domestic spending.

More trade with Communist-bloc countries and the Soviet Union was opposed by 67 percent.

Federal aid in construction of grade and high schools was opposed by 66 percent of those polled.

Upping the minimum wage to $1.60 and extending coverage to 6 million workers drew a 58 percent "no" vote.

The results of this poll reveal that Americans are concerned about the free-wheeling, high-spending type of Government which prevails in Washington today, but I will continue to plug for economy and a more sensible, sane approach to such problems as the poverty war. Sargent Shriver is not fooling the public with his barrage of statistics—the fact is that the program is horribly expensive for the meager results it has produced to date.

Mr. Speaker, I include the results of this questionnaire at this point in the RECORD:

Summary of 18th Congressional District questionnaire, 1966

1. Do you feel you know what the administration's goal is in South Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes (9,351)	41
No (12,757)	56
No answer (608)	3

2. Would you agree to a Korean-type settlement of the war at the 17th parallel (line established at 1954 Geneva Conference dividing North and South Vietnam)?

	Percent
Yes (12,918)	57
No (8,134)	36
No answer (1,664)	7

3. Do you favor reducing spending for nondefense programs in order to meet the increased war costs?

	Percent
Yes (17,438)	77
No (4,285)	19
No answer (993)	4

4. Do you favor expanding trade with Russia and the Communist bloc countries, as recommended by the President?

	Percent
Yes (6,306)	28
No (15,222)	67
No answer (1,188)	5

5. Would you favor increased taxes in order to move faster and closer to the domestic goals of the Great Society?

	Percent
Yes (1,302)	6
No (20,753)	91
No answer (661)	3

6. Do you consider the increased cost of living and inflation as a major domestic problem?

	Percent
Yes (19,807)	87
No (2,296)	10
No answer (613)	3

7. Do you favor raising the minimum wage to $1.60 and extending the coverage to 6 million new workers?

	Percent
Yes (8,339)	37
No (13,318)	58
No answer (1,059)	5

8. Do you favor the Federal Government's subsidizing a person's rent if his rent is more than one-quarter of his income?

	Percent
Yes (1,072)	5
No (21,051)	92
No answer (593)	3

9. Do you favor Federal aid for the construction of grade and high schools?

	Percent
Yes (7,122)	31
No (14,838)	66
No answer (756)	3

10. Do you think the poverty program is effective in eliminating the causes of poverty?

	Percent
Yes (1,391)	6
No (20,398)	90
No answer (927)	4

1. Do you feel you know what the administration's goal is in South Vietnam?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	41	56	3
Hourly employee	45	53	2
Salaried employee	43	56	1
Businessman	39	59	2
Housewife	41	55	4
Professional	50	47	3
Farmer	33	64	3
Student	61	37	2
Retired	29	66	5
Other	34	60	6

2. Would you agree to a Korean-type settlement of the war at the 17th parallel (line established at 1954 Geneva Conference dividing North and South Vietnam)?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	57	36	7
Hourly employee	52	42	6
Salaried employee	60	36	4
Businessman	58	35	7
Housewife	52	35	13
Professional	63	32	5
Farmer	58	32	10
Student	52	45	3
Retired	49	38	13
Other	56	34	10

3. Do you favor reducing spending for nondefense programs in order to meet the increased war costs?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	77	19	4
Hourly employee	73	23	4
Salaried employee	81	16	3
Businessman	80	16	4
Housewife	65	22	13
Professional	77	21	2
Farmer	78	18	4
Student	72	25	3
Retired	78	17	5
Other	70	23	7

4. Do you favor expanding trade with Russia and the Communist-bloc countries, as recommended by the President?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	28	67	5
Hourly employee	25	72	3
Salaried employee	30	66	4
Businessman	29	66	5
Housewife	20	73	7
Professional	35	61	4
Farmer	27	67	6
Student	36	61	3
Retired	22	70	8
Other	27	64	9

5. Would you favor increased taxes in order to move faster and closer to the domestic goals of the Great Society?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	6	91	3
Hourly employee	7	90	3
Salaried employee	5	94	1
Businessman	5	92	3
Housewife	4	92	4
Professional	8	90	2
Farmer	4	94	2
Student	14	84	2
Retired	6	87	7
Other	7	85	8

6. Do you consider the increased cost of living and inflation as a major domestic problem?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	87	10	3
Hourly employee	85	13	2
Salaried employee	90	9	1
Businessman	88	10	2
Housewife	84	10	6
Professional	86	12	2
Farmer	86	11	3
Student	84	14	2
Retired	87	7	6
Other	83	11	6

7. Do you favor raising the minimum wage to $1.60 and extending the coverage to 6,000,000 new workers?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	37	58	5
Hourly employee	65	31	4
Salaried employee	37	60	3
Businessman	25	70	5
Housewife	36	57	7
Professional	34	61	5
Farmer	19	77	4
Student	44	53	3
Retired	36	58	6
Other	41	51	8

8. Do you favor the Federal Government's subsidizing a person's rent if his rent is more than one-quarter of his income?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	5	92	3
Hourly employee	9	88	3
Salaried employee	3	95	2
Businessman	3	95	2
Housewife	5	91	4
Professional	4	94	2
Farmer	3	95	2
Student	11	87	2
Retired	8	88	4
Other	7	86	7

9. Do you favor Federal aid for the construction of grade and high schools?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	31	66	3
Hourly employee	37	60	3
Salaried employee	27	71	2
Businessman	31	66	3
Housewife	34	61	5
Professional	33	65	2
Farmer	25	71	4
Student	55	43	2
Retired	30	64	6
Other	32	61	7

10. Do you think the poverty program is effective in eliminating the causes of poverty?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	6	90	4
Hourly employee	8	89	3
Salaried employee	3	92	5
Businessman	4	92	4
Housewife	7	88	5
Professional	10	87	3
Farmer	6	90	4
Student	14	84	2
Retired	5	90	5
Other	11	83	6

URBAN MASS TRANSIT PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two bills which address themselves to the complex and pressing problems of urban mass transit.

Mr. Speaker, the cry of essential commuter services in our cities has never sounded so desperate, nor has the need for the Federal Government to come to their aid been more urgent.

Just as the Federal Government has accepted its responsibility—possibly even more than required—by providing millions of dollars in aid to other means of transportation, including airline and merchant marine subsidies and the present large-scale Federal highway program, it must recognize the need to come to the aid of the hard-pressed essential commuter services.

We must realistically face the fact that our cities are growing at an even faster rate than the often cited world population explosion. According to the World Health Organization, mankind has doubled its numbers over the last century, but the world's city population has increased fivefold. WHO tells us that of the world's 3 billion total population, 1 billion live in the cities. In the United States, it is over 70 percent of the population that lives in urban areas.

Statistics indicate that New York City's rapid transit network serves as the largest railway in the world in terms of passengers carried. Approximately 4.5 million persons are using mass transit every day.

As more and more people join the ranks of the city dweller the problems of the urban community drastically increase. As the load which existing urban mass transit systems are required to bear becomes heavier, the efficiency of those systems decreases and their costs steadily mount.

Thus at the present time we live in a modern age, but with an archaic and chaotic transportation system.

There is little question that with the technological know-how of our country together with proper planning we can meet the transportation problems of tomorrow. And I heartily support and join with my colleagues in their effort to meet the needs of the future. But what we must do now is meet the pressing needs of today.

We do not need another transit strike in New York City to point up the fact that our present systems of transportation are inadequate. According to a recent report of the Regional Planning Association, which functions as a nonprofit organization of planners from 22 counties of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, $2.5 billion are needed in the next 10 years to finance improvements necessary as of now in the tristate metropolitan area. Statistics indicate traffic in midtown and downtown Manhattan moves at a pace of an average 8.5 miles per hour. Moreover, the average speed on the expressways is not much faster, and they have been described in rush hours as one long series of parking lots.

Many alternatives have been suggested in the past by local, State, and Federal officials directly and indirectly concerned with the problem, including wider highways, more and bigger parking lots and more stringent regulation and exercise of traffic control.

The unfortunate factor involved in these approaches, however, is that they only forecast the continued expansion of vehicular travel on our expressways, highways, roads, and streets until eventually only expressways, roads, and streets will remain.

The transportation problems of an advancing age do not necessarily have to weave our cities into a web of strangulation. One answer is to strengthen the public transportation facilities in our cities.

President Johnson, in recognizing the need for capital equipment grants and demonstration projects for mass transit, told the Congress less than 2 months ago:

> The Federal Government supports or regulates almost every means of transportation. Our transportation system accounts for $1 in every $6 in the American economy.

The President said, however, pointing to the shortcomings of our system, that:

> It is not good enough when it provides no relief from time consuming, frustrating, and wasteful congestion, when it cannot move passengers to and from airports in the time it takes those aircraft to fly hundreds of miles, when it lays out new freeways to serve new cities and suburbs—and carelessly scars the irreplaceable countryside.

Improved commuter service remains one of the best solutions to the decaying state of our transportation system. Senator JAVITS recently stated that:

> Failure to maintain commuter service would bring about not only intolerable restrictions on the flow of commuter traffic in heavily urbanized areas, but also would result in increasing the burden of already crowded highways and the need for added Federal and State expenditures for highway construction. The loss of four tracks of one commuter railroad would, according to a recent survey, require the construction of 80 highway lanes at prohibitive cost.

President Johnson requested legislation in his budget message authorizing $150 million to finance programs under the Mass Transit Act for fiscal 1968. In my view, this 1-year extension or continuation of the program of fiscal 1966 and 1967 is not going to be sufficient to meet the transportation needs of the urban commuter service in urban areas. The legislation I have introduced recognizes that in recent years the maintenance of even minimal commuter service in urban areas has become so financially burdensome as to threaten its existence. It thus provides for a 10-year recuperation period, through interim assistance, for mass transit companies now engaged in developing plans and carrying out projects to revitalize their commuter operations.

Mr. Speaker, my bill further contains provision for an increase from the present 12½-percent limitation which any one State may receive under the present law.

Presently the highly urbanized States do not receive a just proportion of available Federal funds. The 12½-percent State limitation has long been a black spot of discrimination against the densely populated cities. This is ironic because obviously the crowded cities are the one area in which the help is most needed, and as I have already discussed, the statistical population trends consistently indicate this situation will become increasingly worse.

New York State, for example, contains approximately 9.4 percent of the total population of the United States, and with the 12½-percent allowance New York State seemingly receives its full amount. But because New York State has many cities—especially the city of New York—which are densely populated, in effect the 12½-percent limitation is not warranted.

My bill would increase the limitation of 15 percent in the case of any State in which more than two-thirds of the maximum grants have been made or committed for projects and where the Secretary determines that there is a substantial need for such an increase in order to carry out existing programs.

I have also introduced a bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation. Expert planners have long recognized the need for the flexibility in transportation planning, which I hope this bill will provide.

State governmental machinery is being increasingly forced to recognize the plight of the urban mass transit systems.

While the decision as to whether Federal highway funds are to be used for highways or mass transit will remain in the State capital, I am hopeful that the increasing realization of the advantage to all of meeting the cities' needs will dictate a direction of a large portion of these funds toward mass transit.

Mr. Speaker, we must not fail to meet the demands of our society's transportation struggle in which we are so acutely involved. As Senator JAVITS has said:

> We must stay ahead of the growth of our urban transit needs by developing a far-sighted comprehensive plan for urban mass transit. The Federal Government must, with one hand, help the commuter railroads to stay alive, while on the other hand, it must give a long-term aid so that these railroads may establish a more secure economic position through a capitalization program designed to modernize their facilities.

I believe the legislation which I have introduced today, and which appears in full following this statement, would be a needed step in the direction of meeting our transit needs of today, if not tomorrow.

The two bills I have introduced today follow:

H.R. 14843

A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants on a temporary basis to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas and for other purposes, and to increase the existing limit on the grant funds which may be used thereunder in any one State

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds—

(1) that over 70 per centum of the Nation's population lives in urban areas, and it is anticipated that by 1986, 80 per centum of the population will be concentrated in such areas;

(2) that transportation is the lifeblood of an urbanized society and the health and welfare of that society depends upon the provision of efficient, economical, and convenient transportation;

(3) that for many years the mass transportation industry served capably and profitably the transportation needs of the urban areas of the country;

(4) that in recent years the maintenance of even minimal commuter service in urban areas has become so financially burdensome as to threaten the continuation of this vital service;

(5) that some mass transportation companies are now engaged in developing preliminary plans for, or are actually carrying out, comprehensive projects to revitalize their commuter operations; and

(6) that immediate substantial Federal assistance is needed on an interim basis to enable many mass transportation companies to continue to provide vital commuter service during the period required to overhaul and revitalize commuter operations and to place such operations on a sound financial basis.

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: "In addition to amounts heretofore appropriated to finance grants under this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated for that purpose not more than $300,000,000, nor less than $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; not more than $300,000,000 nor less than $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1968; not more than $300,000,000 nor less than $175,000,000 for fiscal year 1969; and $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1970."

SEC. 3. The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 as sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 respectively, and by adding after section 5 a new section as follows:

"INTERIM ASSISTANCE TO ASSURE ADEQUATE COMMUTER SERVICE IN URBAN AREAS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants on a temporary basis to any State or local public body or agency thereof to enable such State or public body or agency thereof to assist any mass transportation company which maintains commuter service in an urban area within the jurisdiction of such State or public body or agency thereof to defray operating deficits incurred as the result of providing such service to such areas. The amount of any grant made under this section to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any such company shall not exceed two-thirds of the annual net operating deficit of such company as certified by such State or public body or agency thereof and approved by the Secretary. No grant shall be provided under this section to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any mass transportation company unless such State or public body or agency thereof and such company have jointly submitted to the Secretary a comprehensive commuter service improvement plan which is approved by him and which sets forth a program meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for capital improvements to be undertaken by such company for the purpose of providing more efficient, economical, and convenient commuter service in an urban area, and for placing the commuter operations of such company on a sound financial basis. No mass transportation company shall be eligible to receive assistance provided under this section for a period in excess of ten years, except that the Secretary may authorize such assistance for an additional period, not exceeding five years, if he determines that an extension is necessary in order to enable such company to carry out its commuter service improvement plan.

"(b) Assistance provided under this section shall to the greatest extent practicable be coordinated with other assistance provided under this Act."

Sec. 4. The first sentence of section 7(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended to read as follows: "In addition to amounts heretofore made available to finance projects under this section, the Administrator may make available for that purpose from the mass transportation grant authorization provided in section 4(b) not to exceed $35,000,000, which limit shall be increased to $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, to $45,000,00 on July 1, 1968 and to $50,000,000 on July 1, 1969."

Sec. 5. Section 10(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended—

(1) by striking out the semicolon at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ", and the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (4);

(3) by striking out "serving the general public" in clause (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "serving commuters and others", and by striking out the period at the end of such clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; and the term 'mass transportation company' means any private company or public authority or agency providing mass transportation services; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"(6) the term 'annual net operating deficit' means that part of the annual operating costs of a mass transportation company which could reasonably have been avoided by the elimination of commuter service in an urban area, less the annual revenues derived by such company from the provision of such services."

Sec. 6. Section 13 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Section 7 (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Section 8(b)"; and

(2) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided,* That such limitation shall be increased to 15 per centum in the case of any State, if (1) more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted under the foregoing limitation have been made or obligated for projects in such State, and (2) the Secretary determines that there is a substantial need for such increase in order to carry out existing programs meeting the requirements of Section 4(a)."

H.R. 14844

A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Mass Transportation Financing Act".

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Federal-aid highway system apportionment" means an apportionment for a fiscal year to a State under one of the five paragraphs of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code;

(2) the term "Interstate System" means the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways described in subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code;

(3) the term "Governor" means the chief executive officer of a State;

(4) the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico;

(5) the term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator; and

(6) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

ELECTION

Sec. 3 (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator from the highway trust fund for use in each State for urban mass transportation purposes the amount elected to be used for such purposes by the Governor of such State under subsection (b).

(b) The Governor of a State may elect to have all or part of one or more of such State's Federal-aid highway system apportionments for a fiscal year made available to the Administrator for making grants in that fiscal year, for urban mass transportation purposes, to such State or to local public bodies or agencies in such State in accordance with section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Such election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary of Commerce shall by regulation prescribe, within sixty days after the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Governor, pursuant to section 104(e) of title 23, United States Code, the sums apportioned to that State for a fiscal year. In making such election, the Governor shall specify the amount to be deducted from one or more of the State's Federal-aid highway system apportionments in order to make available to the Administrator amounts elected to be used for urban mass transportation purposes.

(c) If the amount which a Governor of a State elects pursuant to subsection (b) to have used in a fiscal year for urban mass transportation purposes in such State exceeds the sum of amounts expended and obligated by the Administrator in such fiscal year in such State from amounts appropriated under the authority of subsection (a), then at the end of such fiscal year such excess shall no longer be available for urban mass transportation purposes and shall, on January 1, of the next succeeding fiscal year, be added to the State's Federal-aid highway system apportionments for the second fiscal year beginning after such election. The addition to each of a State's apportionments shall bear the same proportion to such excess as the amount deducted (under the last sentence of subsection (b)) from the corresponding apportionment for the fiscal year in which such excess occurred bore to the amount elected to be used for urban mass transportation purposes in such fiscal year.

INTERSTATE APPORTIONMENT ADJUSTMENTS

Sec. 4. (a) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "interstate apportionment" means the Federal-aid highway system apportionment for a State's Interstate System as certified to the Governor and State highway department thereof in accordance with section 104(e) of title 23, United States Code;

(2) the term "interstate apportionment adjustment" means the amount by which a State's interstate apportionment is reduced or increased (after certification under section 104(e) of such title) in accordance with section 209(g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956; and

(3) the term "remainder available for interstate construction" means a State's interstate apportionment, less the amount which the Governor of the State specifies, pursuant to the last sentence of section 3(b) of this Act, is to be deducted from that State's interstate apportionment in order to make such amount available for mass transportation purposes.

(b) In the case of an interstate apportionment adjustment, the amount available to the Administrator for urban mass transportation purposes in a State for a fiscal year—

(1) shall not (in the case of a downward adjustment) be reduced by reason of such adjustment, unless the downward adjustment exceeds the remainder available for interstate construction, and

(2) shall (in the case of an upward adjustment) be increased, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, only to the extent that amounts so available were previously reduced under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT TO TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE

Sec. 5. (a) Section 104(e) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "State highway department" the following: "and the Governor or chief executive officer of each State."

(b) Section 104(b)(5) of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Rules, regulations, and standards adopted by the Secretary for estimating the cost of completion of the Interstate System and taking into account all previous apportionments shall prescribe a consistent and equitable procedure for taking into account amounts of apportionments which the Governor of a State has elected to have made available for urban mass transportation purposes under section 3 of the Mass Transportation Financing Act."

(c) Section 104 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) No amount which the Governor or chief executive officer of the State has elected pursuant to section 3 of the Mass Transportation Financing Act to have made available for urban mass transportation purposes in a fiscal year shall be available for expenditure for Federal-aid highways under this title, except as provided in section 3(c) of the Mass Transportation Financing Act."

(d) Section 118(a) of such title is amended by striking out "On and after" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sixty days after".

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT

Sec. 6. (a) Section 209(f)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 is amended by inserting "(1)" before "making expenditures" and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and (2) for the purposes of section 3 of the Mass Transportation Financing Act."

(b) Section 209(g) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "An election by the Governor of a State under section 3(b) of the Mass Transportation Financing Act to use funds for mass transportation purposes shall not be taken into account in making any adjustment under this section, except as provided in section 4 of such Act."

AMENDMENT TO URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

Sec. 7. Section 12 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "section 7(b)" the following: ", and grants made with funds authorized to be appropriated by section 3(a) of the Mass Transportation Financing Act".

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 8. This Act shall take effect upon the first certification of Federal-aid highway system apportionments under section 104(e) of title 23, United States Code, following the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor John V. Lindsay, in his former capacity of Congressman representing the 17th Congressional District, was an outspoken advocate for the improvement of mass transit. He has continued as mayor of New York, to speak for the pressing needs of the millions of commuters who use the subways and buses to get to work each day.

Less than a week ago Mayor Lindsay testified before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on Federal legislation and the plight of urban mass transit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include, at this point in the RECORD, the testimony of Mayor John V. Lindsay:

TESTIMONY BY MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY

I should like at the outset to present my credentials for testifying on the bills before this subcommittee:

First, I am the mayor of New York City.

Second, I am a graduate of the 12-day cram course conducted early this year by the Michael Quill Institute for the study of the interrelationship between collective bargaining procedures and mass transportation operations.

I said only that I was a graduate; the kind of marks I received are still being evaluated.

More seriously, I appear here today as the representative of the millions who ride New York City's bus and subway systems every working day.

The Federal Government, by and large, has either ignored or neglected these people—not only in New York, but in virtually every major American city. The Congress traditionally has viewed bus and subway systems as the sole responsibility of the cities. Yet it has committed billions of dollars in Federal grants to the construction of highway and freeway networks in those very cities.

The freeways have not resolved the strangulation of the commercial core of our cities by traffic; they have, in fact, added to the congestion, noise and pollution. Even worse, the Federal emphasis on highway transportation has solidified the stagnation of mass transit systems by encouraging subway and bus passengers to use automobiles.

It is my purpose today, accordingly, to argue the case for the straphanger.

My testimony consists of three general sections:

The first is a description of New York City's mass transit system; the second is an assessment of the impact upon that system of federally assisted highways; the third consists of an endorsement of the bills introduced by my former colleagues, Senator JAVITS and Senator WILLIAMS.

NEW YORK CITY'S RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

The United States is developing into huge city complexes, among them Boston, New York and Baltimore-Washington. Between Washington and Baltimore, the theoretical boundaries of the historic city have been overrun. Geopolitics tells us the entire eastern seaboard from Boston to Norfolk will be joined in a community of cities well before the end of this century.

Metropolitan New York, the largest of any of the existing city complexes, will stand at the center of this massive concentration of people. Already, 1 of every 10 Americans lives within commuting distance of New York City.

The broad policy question of which this hearing forms an integral part is whether adequate commuting facilities are to be available 25 years from now, and, if so, how they are to be provided. A review of New York's existing public transportation system may contribute to the eventual resolution of that question:

New York City's rapid transit network forms the largest railway in the world in terms of passengers carried. Every weekday, the city's Transit Authority dispatches 8,500 trains along 30 routes and 240 miles of track. They carry about 4.5 million persons. Most of the passengers are en route to or from their place of work. Another 100,000 persons travel on 2,500 transit authority buses every day—a number matching less than 10 percent of the rail system's volume. Thus my testimony will be concerned chiefly with rail transit.

The city's subways transport almost 1.5 billion persons a year. Most of them ride between 7 and 10 a.m. and between 4 and 7 p.m. The destination of the majority is the area of Manhattan Island south of Central Park. To a great degree consequently, many functions of our rapid transit system are frozen in both time and space.

The cost of transporting millions of New Yorkers and commuters are formidable. Almost 26,000 employees are needed to operate and maintain the subways. The subways' operating costs this year, including electricity charges, will total $271 million, about $64 million more than operating revenue.

The bus lines operated by the city transit authority employ another 9,000 persons. Bus operations cost $84 million, and this year the lines will lose about $12 million.

Transit authority expenses, then, are expected to exceed operating revenues this year by more than $76 million.

Operational losses tell only part of the discouraging story: In fairness the city's bus and subway system should also be charged with debt service on the $1.25 billion of debt incurred by the city on their behalf and still outstanding. The principal and interest on this debt amount to $120 million annually.

Even if the city succeeds in meeting the deficit this year, its success will be short-lived; for if present revenue expense and debt service figures are projected over the next 10 years, the transit authority may show a $250 million deficit in 1976.

Although the loans for capital improvements have been sizable, most of the money spent in recent years has been devoted to beating off obsolescence. Despite minor alterations and extensions, the quality of the city's rail service has not improved substantially over the past 25 years.

For example, anyone who has ridden the Lexington Avenue subway line during a weekday rush hour—particularly during the summer—will testify that a second line is a necessity. Yet no progress has been made toward the construction of a parallel line to replace the dismantled Third Avenue "El."

In addition to providing capital funds for the buses and subways, the city supports a force of 2,800 transit police and finances special fare provisions for school children. All three subsidies will cost the city $174 million this year.

In plain terms, the city's supplements to its transit system with no allowance for the effects of inflation amount to some 14 cents per passenger per ride. If the transit system were to be fully self-supporting, the fare undoubtedly would be at least 30 cents today and very likely 50 cents in the forseeable future.

I believe this is the logical point in my testimony to interpose a brief explanation of why New York City has not raised its 15-cent bus and subway fare:

First, a fare increase would strike hardest at the more than 1 million New Yorkers who earn less than $4,000 a year. To them, low-cost public transportation is not a bargain, but an essential condition of employment. It enables the low-paid employee to get to his job.

Moreover, it is not commonly recognized that—with a few limited exceptions—New York's transit system offers no transfers. People who use both a subway train and a bus pay 60 cents to get to and from work.

A 25-cent fare seems reasonable in theory, but in practice it will mean an added expense of $2 a week to those passengers who use both subways and buses each day. Many of those passengers are least able to pay the higher fare.

Second, an increase would drive many passengers away, and the majority of them would turn to automobiles. New York City, I think you will agree, should do everything possible to reduce traffic congestion. A higher fare would have the opposite effect.

Third, even a 25-cent fare would not end the operating loss of the bus and subway system for more than a year and it is highly debatable whether such a fare should be charged at all.

Cheap transportation for its residents is as essential a city service as police protection, welfare assistance, or public education, yet there is no direct charge to the recipient for these established municipal activities. I do not suggest that public transportation be free, but I believe it can be argued forcibly that an economical transportation system is as much in the city's interest as a free school system.

Finally, the subway and bus fare must be evaluated as part of the whole transportation network. The Economic Development Council of New York, an association of prominent businessmen, recognized the complexities involved when it recommended an increase in the fare to 25 cents.

The council advised the increase only "if there is included with this fare increase a zone system with special short-haul and off-peak-hour rates and free bus-to-subway transfers to encourage subway use."

The adoption of zone fares, transfers, and special rates is under study. As long-range improvements, they may prove helpful. Without burdening this record with a detailed exposition on the potential difficulties posed by these changes, I should like to point out one of the many ramifications of fare structure revision:

The distribution of New York City's population reflects a dependence of more than a half-century on a fixed fare for public transportation. As a result, low income neighborhoods are spread throughout vast areas far removed from the centers of employment.

If bus and subway passengers pay zone fares corresponding to the distance they travel, a long-standing ecology will be upset. The effect upon both the employment of the passengers and the revenues of the transit system must be seriously considered before acting. Progress, in this case, may be worthwhile only if it is deliberate.

It should be made clear that our minds are not closed to the possibility that a transit fare increase may be unavoidable. I have related the arguments against a higher fare both in defense of my intention to retain the existing fare as long as it is feasible, and to set forth the consequences of an increase more attuned to the demands of a balance sheet than to the responsibilities of a metropolitan government to its citizens.

Actually, the conditions in New York are such that transit fares cannot in any real sense reflect a direct relationship to the cost or value of the service unless and until a complete modernization, mechanization and further extension of facilities with a gradual revision of fare structure makes it possible.

THE IMPACT OF FEDERALLY ASSISTED HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The postwar use of New York's rapid transit system reached its peak in 1948. East Side Manhattan lost the Els on Second and Third Avenues between 1942 and 1955. With the exception of reconstruction of the Rockaway line after it had been acquired from the Long Island Railroad, no major new subway facilities have been constructed in the past 25 years.

As a result, the changing city has left the subway system in the absurd position of devoting 72 percent of its track capacity to accommodate 30 percent of Manhattan's active jobs in the area west of Sixth Avenue, while only 28 percent of its track capacity lies east of Sixth Avenue to transport people to 70 percent of the jobs.

Between 1948 and 1956 some 400,000 persons stopped using rapid transit facilities, because of job shifts or the increased attractivness of other means of travel—principally private autos.

In 1948, the bus and subway fare was increased from 5 to 10 cents; in 1953 it was raised to its present 15-cent level. During the 6-year period, the 5-day workweek became standard in the city, and television kept people home during the evening. These factors cut transit volumes.

On the highways leading to Manhattan, meanwhile quite the opposite was happening; the sound of bulldozers and concrete mixers was heralding the advent of the automobile age.

Consider these highway construction figures:

During the 9-year period from 1933 when the Triborough Bridge Authority was established to our entry into World War II, a combination of city, State, Federal and authority funds amounting to $242 million constructed 92.8 miles of highways in New York City.

During the first 10 years after World War II, the total spent rose to $411 million. It financed construction of just over 60 miles of roads.

During the next 10-year period ending in 1965 the totals were $701 million and 70 miles of highway.

The total mileage completed to date under both authority, Federal, and State funding stands at 224. The highways cost $1.4 billion. Another 123 miles of highway carrying an estimated price tag of $1.5 billion is under design for New York City.

The impact of Federal, State, and authority-sponsored highway construction, particularly in Manhattan, can be described better with statistics than polemics:

Since 1932, the number of passengers entering midtown Manhattan—which embraces the city's major shopping and amusement centers—has almost doubled. About 500,000 cars cross the rivers into Manhattan every working day, carrying 866,000 drivers and passengers.

The city's transit system, it bears repeating, carries 4.5 million passengers daily. The difference is qualitative as well as quantitative, for although well over one-half of all who travel by rail enter the city during the rush hours, less than one-quarter of the autoists feel compelled to do so. The result is that there is no offpeak lull in midtown or downtown Manhattan; indeed traffic congestion is at its heaviest in the midtown areas between the rush hours at the beginning and end of each workday.

On crosstown streets, those who approach the city at 50 and 60 miles per hour are slowed during the noon hours to speeds under 3 miles per hour. The figures demonstrate the futility of subservience to the automobile in the central city. In midtown Manhattan, at least, the automobile has brought on civic and commercial paralysis.

The motor age may have reached an impasse. Disgruntled motorists who would much prefer to use their cars now are being compelled to use rail forms of transit for comparatively greater convenience. Paradoxically, an improvement in rail services may attract the marginal motorist with a resulting beneficial effect on those who strongly wish to use their cars.

The myth has been fostered that the autoist pays his way in tolls and taxes. It is true, as I have noted, that billions of tax dollars have been used to construct new bridges and highways, most obviously during the past 20 years.

While the motorist may have helped to pay for his highways, he has at the same time created many costs for the community at large.

Freeways remove vast tracts of land from city tax rolls.

The use of city streets for parking in effect subsidizes motorists by as much as $90 million a year.

City departments and agencies concerned with problems caused exclusively by motorists are only partially compensated by income derived from motorists. The city's expenditures for highway and auto-related purposes total $128.3 million this fiscal year. The outlay hardly is offset by motorist-produced revenues of $78.6 million.

Counting only direct expenses, it can be safely estimated that fully $100 million a year, an amount sufficient to cover New York's current transit operating deficit, is not recovered by the city for services and space given over to motorists.

For New York City, this has been the legacy of the automobile age.

The imbalance of the past 20 years in favor of roads must be redressed. The massive capital needs of mass transportation must be supplied. We first must enlarge the present system to carry people where they want to go with a reasonable amount of comfort and speed. At the same time, we must strive to make the present system attractive enough to capture its desired share of the total transportation market.

By "desired share," I mean that share which represents the best use of our resources—time, land, and money. One illustration will explain better than several generalisms.

A mile of new, two-track subway in New York today would cost about $25 million, fully equipped. It would handle 50,000 passengers per hour at peak periods and would not consume any appreciable amount of real estate.

By contrast, a mile of new arterial highway in the city costs at least as much, carries about one-tenth as many people, and consumes about 30 acres of taxable real estate. Once built, operating speeds are about the same and operating costs favor the subway over the private car.

In 25 years the New York subways have not suffered a single passenger fatality due to operational failure. I'll skip the obvious comparison with highways.

A satisfactory program for new subway construction for New York City and its suburbs—with air conditioning and other improvements—would require an expenditure of $4 billion over the next 10 years. The sum represents about 40 percent of New York City's entire capital budget for the period. The outlay is plainly impossible without large amounts of Federal funds.

Federal aid to transportation has proper precedents in the Federal support given at crucial stages to intercity railroads, ocean shipping, aviation, and highways.

I submit that the case today for Federal support of urban mass transportation is equally compelling.

ENDORSEMENT OF S. 2935 AND S. 2804

I shall not at this time attempt to reconcile the different approaches taken in the bills sponsored by Senator JAVITS and Senator WILLIAMS, nor to express a preference for one over the other. I am more directly concerned with the principle, on which each bill is based, that Federal support of mass transportation is essential not only to our cities but to the entire Nation.

Both bills are closely tied to the commuter service provided by mass transportation systems:

Senator JAVITS measure would authorize grants to defray up to 50 percent of the operating deficits of a mass transportation system arising from commuter service. Senator WILLIAMS' bill, similarly, proposes Federal grants to meet up to two-thirds of the operating deficits attributable to commuter usage.

The service given commuters by New York City's public transportation was documented, I believe, in my review of the city's transit operations. In view of the close attention the bills give to commuter patronage, however, I feel obliged to stress the commuter's close involvement with our transportation network.

A widespread misconception envisions the typical commuter as a man in a gray flannel suit who rides the New Haven Railroad from Connecticut to Grand Central Station and either walks or takes a taxi to his office. The picture is unfair to the city's bus and subway system.

Let's examine a few typical commuters who work in Manhattan's central business district.

The first commuter lives on Long Island, works on Manhattan's East Side. His wife drives him to the Long Island Railroad station where he catches his train to Penn Station on Manhattan's West Side. He now takes two subway trains to get to his place of work: the IRT West Side Line to Times Square, then the shuttle to Grand Central Station: and then if his office is much above 42d Street, he may take either the Lexington Avenue subway or a Manhattan Avenue bus.

During rush hours another way for him to get to the East Side eliminates the backtrack from Penn Station. He can take a Long Island train to the Hunters Point terminal in Queens; from there walk up a long flight of stairs and cross the street to the IRT Flushing Line. Upon reaching Grand Central, he must again change trains to travel north or south along the East Side—or walk.

A commuter from Westchester or Connecticut to Manhattan's West Side faces the same problem as the commuter from Long Island to the East Side. Furthermore, he must put up with the storied unpredictability of the New Haven Railroad.

Perhaps the worst traveling problem is faced by commuters who take the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad from New Jersey. A traveler who works in midtown and uses this line is carried to Hoboken, N.J., where he must switch to a ferry or a Port Authority Trans-Hudson train. For all points on Manhattan's East Side and all points north of 34th Street on the West Side, he probably will use a subway or a bus also.

The illustrations only describe the day-to-day dependence of commuters on New York City's transportation facilities. I submit that the dependence goes well beyond the immediate service the commuter can obtain for a token.

Many commuters owe their livelihoods to New York City's rapid transit system. The affluence of Manhattan's business district has its roots underground, in the subways that deliver the bodies and the brains to the steel and glass towers representing the city's wealth.

The subways carry the manpower and the skills needed to maintain and stimulate the economy of a city and of a metropolitan region. When subsidies to the subway system are under consideration, it should be noted that for many years the subways have been subsidizing New York City and the three-State area surrounding it. The present state of the system suggests that the scale of its subsidy to Metropolitan New York has, if anything, been too generous.

I shall conclude quickly: Federal assistance to the Nation's public transportation systems is long overdue; it is vital to the economic health and social well-being of the two of every three Americans who already live in and around our cities.

If Hertz can put the motorist in the driver's seat, the least the Federal Government can do is to give the straphanger a fighting chance at a subway seat.

Thank you for permitting me to testify. New York City wishes you luck in presenting this legislation to the Senate.

THE NEW ACCOUNTING: "RECONSTRUCT YOUR BOOKS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the key provisions of the Opportunity Crusade, H.R. 13378, requires preaudits to insure proper accounting procedures before poverty money is granted to a community action agency. The need for such a requirement would seem obvious, yet money has been shoveled forth from Washington without proper accounting safeguards.

HARYOU, in New York City, is bad enough where the suspended Director has been trying to reconstruct the books for the past 6 months so auditors can find out where more than $600,000 has gone. Los Angeles may be in even worse shape. How many citizens are given the right to reconstruct their books when Internal Revenue calls?

Accumulated evidence indicates gross fiscal irresponsibility, during the first year's activity of the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency—EYOA—the Los Angeles community action agency. OEO, GAO and private auditors have been swarming over EYOA's books for months without announced results. Serious allegations have been made about the financial accountability of the EYOA. It has been charged that:

First. EYOA did not have records identifying where OEO funds had been spent.

Second. Funds had been expended for subcontracts that had not been approved or had been improperly approved.

Third. Funds were being commingled.

Fourth. There has been a lack of supporting documentation for voucher claims.

Following a Subcommittee on Poverty investigation of the Los Angeles poverty program, Chairman ADAM C. POWELL said there is "evidence of mismanagement and fiscal dishonesty in the program." Several OEO audit reports have indicated that Los Angeles records were in "bad shape." In the House hearings this year, Mr. Nathan Cutler, Director of OEO's Audit Division, said the EYOA's violation of letter of credit procedures "could lead to more loose practices than we observed."

Mr. Speaker, it is the obligation of the Office of Economic Opportunity to make a full disclosure of the facts. Waste and diversion of poverty money annoys and frustrates the taxpayer; it infuriates the poor. How can poverty officials explain, for instance, a full-time official in the Los Angeles city school system, William C. Rivera, being paid $75 a day for 28 days—a total of $2,100—by the community action agency during a period when he was supposedly earning overtime pay from the Los Angeles City school funds?

Mr. Speaker, why is it that every other agency of Government must account for its funds, but poverty agencies expect to be given a blank check? It is time the American people were given some answers. It is time the poor, especially, were given some answers. It is time for a true Opportunity Crusade that will minimize such abuses and get the poverty money where it will effectively help the poor.

PARLIAMENTARIANS SHOULD FACE UP TO LOOMING NATO CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this report is my own personal impression of the 1965 NATO Parliamentarians' Conference—NPC—which I was privileged to attend as a U.S. delegate. It was held October 4–9 at the Park Sheraton Hotel in New York City.

Attention centered on a report by the Rapporteur of the Political Committee, Monsieur Boscher, of France. Judging by the speeches which followed its presentation to the Conference, it reflected the policies of the French Government more than a consensus of the Political Committee. It was not approved by the Committee but was nevertheless praised by it and passed on to the plenary session together with two recommendations which were, in general, at odds with its gist.

This strange action is more noteworthy if one is aware that the Rapporteur omitted important matter which the Committee had, at its between-conferences meeting last May, specifically requested him to include, and also that it omitted any reference to four relevant resolutions of the preceding—1964—conference.

Requested by the Committee but omitted by the Rapporteur was the refutation of a ministerial communique of May 1965 implying "continuing progress in political consultation within the alliance," and also an expression of regret concerning the absence of any reference to relations between the Council and NPC "which had done everything in its power to bring about such consultation."

Also omitted was any reference to the Conference's desire to obtain "consultative status" with respect to the NATO Council. This is especially noteworthy because M. Boscher was a member of a special committee established by the Parliamentarians at their eighth—1962—annual Conference "to study and submit recommendations, with the assistance and counsel of the Atlantic Institute on a constitution for a consultative Atlantic Assembly as called for by the Declaration of Paris."

One of the unmentioned prior resolutions recommended discussions among Parliamentarians be undertaken looking toward the creation of an Atlantic Consultative Assembly; another took note of the long outstanding problem of control of nuclear weapons and recommended that all interested governments explore the various proposals in this field and apply certain recognized principles.

Was this indulgent attitude toward the Boscher Report a reflection of widespread concern to avoid possible offense to French delegates or was it the reflection of a consensus which the committeemen were unwilling to express openly lest it offend the United States.

BOSCHER REPORT

In essence the Boscher report concluded that:

First. There is now a permanent division among the allies on NATO's political and strategic concepts.

Second. An integrated defense community is a daring interpretation of the "all for one and one for all" commitment. Military problems cannot be considered objectively and constructively unless the political framework essential for their solution has been mapped out. Nuclear effectiveness requires not partnership but absolute unity of decision.

Third. No country should be placed in the position of risking its existence without having participated in and accepted the decisions which may jeopardize that existence. No member of the alliance should coerce another, and a country's right to be listened to must not be measured by its material or military strength.

Fourth. To be practical, the alliance must consist of two equal partners, one American and one European. The European partner must include Britain, and since European union has not been obtained it must first be promoted. Each of the pillars will be able to decide its own policy but the ties binding them will provide the strongest military deterrent the world has ever known and render intercontinental integration unnecessary.

Fifth. Even a conventional alliance presupposes peacetime coordination of strategic aims and operational planning. Little progress in this respect has been made. Joint operational planning would immediately promote greater unity among the allies. It should include detailed study of practical instances such as a possible revolt by the population of East Germany, and simultaneous attacks on the northern and southern flanks of NATO which are now inadequately defended. Nuclear production and research should be coordinated. The absence of such joint operational planning justifies the existence of national nuclear deterrent forces.

Sixth. The NATO countries cannot remain indifferent to U.S. actions in South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. First, because the governments of the developing countries confuse U.S. policy with NATO policy and second, the policy of armed intervention in non-NATO areas may result in responsibility being laid on all allied countries. Jurisdiction of the alliance must be worldwide—at least, allies with worldwide interests should consult together on such problems. The biggest hazard is that the war in Vietnam will eventually bring about a confrontation of the military forces of China and the Soviet Union with those of the United States.

Seventh. The main problem is the adjustment of NATO to the political and military circumstances of today. The enemy will profit from NATO's divisions and the uncommitted countries will misinterpret the real aim of the alliance, unless the free countries coordinate their policies. Existing opportunities for reorganizing the alliance should be taken without striving for perfection.

Although NATO cannot yet act as a United States of free nations, it must coordinate and decide which are the vital interests which the free world must defend outside of its own boundaries.

NATO REFORM

Submitted separately to the Conference was the report of the Working Party on the Reform of NATO. In essence this report proposes four possible solutions for reforming NATO and suggests the Working Party undertake further research after sensing the will of the Conference.

The first solution proposed is that NATO carry on as at present with certain vital reforms of its present structure. The second is to establish what is called a two-tier system in NATO—one tier of nations which agree to integrate their forces and another of nations which wish to affiliate but not integrate. A third is the two-pillar approach which requires the development of a European defense community including Great Britain, and of course, completely integrated, which would then form an alliance with the United States. Canada is here ignored. The fourth solution is for a French-German union which would then join with other countries such as Great Britain, the United States, and Canada with an integrated high command but no integration of lower echelon forces. Little attention was paid to the fourth in plenary session.

PLENARY DEBATE

There were numerous comments on the Boscher report including a considerable consensus on the following points:

NATO has been effective militarily but not politically.

NATO planning has been superficial and inadequately shared.

Political integration of Europe is a precondition to a stronger Atlantic community.

The Soviet Union is continuing to foster disunity of the NATO allies.

Concrete proposals for reform should replace the present complaints.

RESOLUTIONS AND CRITIQUE

POLITICAL

The Political Committee presented two recommendations and three resolutions all of which were adopted by the Conference without change.

The first recommendation was that "NATO governments keep up their efforts to solve the problem of the coordination of their policies and their forces, the condition necessary to the development of a common military philosophy." It recommended further that special attention be paid immediately to the problem of political and operational planning.

The preamble to this recommendation observes that:

First. There is still a need for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

Second. The strength of the alliance is directly dependent on the efforts "naturally sufficiently combined, coordinated and integrated which each of the member nations agrees to make in the service of solidarity;"

Third. True solidarity must assert itself by implementing ever more strongly in deeds a respect for the principle of equal rights of the nations;

Fourth. Balance in the Alliance can be established only by internal association of the American and European forces.

Fifth. Solidarity of the free peoples must extend beyond the geographical area covered by the treaty.

A companion recommendation approves the existing military organization of NATO and proposes that discussions be continued in the NATO Council on whether or not any changes are required in the basic allocation of responsibilities and burdens in the light of the changes in the political and strategic situation which have developed since its establishment. This is a retrogression from the 1964 recommendation that a study of the reform of NATO should immediately be undertaken at council level.

One of the political resolutions regretted the lack of progress in creating an Atlantic Consultative Assembly, recalled the terms of its 1964 recommendation on this subject—one of those ignored by the Rapporteur—and instructed its Political Committee to prepare a report on the possibility of converting the NPC into an official consultative assembly.

These 1964 and 1965 Conference actions are in sharp contrast to action taken in the 1962 Conference which recommended, in addition to appropriate action by national governments, the appointment of a special committee of the Conference to study and submit recommendations with the assistance of the Atlantic Institute on, first, a charter for a consultative Atlantic assembly; second, its precise powers and functions; third, its association with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and, fourth, creation of a permanent high council and other institutions as called for by the Declaration of Paris.

Apparently the NPC has not recovered from the report of that Special Committee which concluded that "senior OECD and NATO officials" disapproved of its objective—and that a protocol to the treaty would be required.

In this connection it is of interest to recall that in the interim between the first and second Parliamentarians' Conference in 1956, 5,000 members of the parliaments of the 15 NATO countries were polled to elicit their views on cooperation within the alliance. Although less than 20 percent replied, a majority of these favored the establishment of a consultative parliamentary assembly.

Thus after 10 years of operation, the NPC is still essentially talking only to itself and studying the "possibility" of establishing a consultative Atlantic assembly.

A small paradox is discernible here in that the chief obstacle to converting the NPC into a consultative assembly appears to be the desire to have it serve both NATO and OECD. The crux of the obstacle is the fact that OECD includes, in addition to the NATO nations, several nations which object to participating in an assembly which deals with military defense. The paradox arises from the fact that the creation of OECD from the OEEC in 1961 received considerable impetus from the Atlantic Congress of 1959 which was largely sponsored by the NPC.

Another political resolution instructs the Working Party on the reform of NATO to submit its final report at the annual plenary session of the NPC to be held in the autumn of 1966, at the latest.

This Working Party had been established in accordance with a resolution of the previous—1964—Conference in order to contribute to a study of the reform of NATO it recommended be undertaken by the North Atlantic Council. Whether or not the Council did anything on this was not discussed in last October's Conference.

ECONOMIC

In the economic field, important NPC recommendations called for:

One. Conclusion of the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations as scheduled before July 1, 1967, and even further efforts to increase trade between NATO countries.

Two. Western countries to coordinate within the framework of OECD to the fullest extent possible their trade and finance policies toward developing countries—this to be done in such a way as to help the developing countries while at the same time preserving existing international bodies in the field of trade.

Third. Giving authority to the Special Committee on Developing NATO Countries, which was established at the 1964 conference, to set up working parties with representatives from Greece and Turkey of private enterprise and of technical and engineering institutes for the specific projects being undertaken by the Special Committee; and to give authority to the working parties to conduct seminars on the business, financial and legal aspects of economic development and tourism.

The recommendation involving OECD merits special comment. Conversion of OEEC into OECD preempted NATO's broad economic functions. And, so far, more importance has been attached to the inclusion of four non-NATO countries—Ireland, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland; total population about 55 million—in economic collaboration than is attached to strengthening NATO by broadening its functional scope.

Proliferation of overlapping institutions—Benelux, OECD, CE, NATO, WEU, EFTA, EEC, ECSC, and Euratom—it would seem, is not regarded as nearly so dangerous as the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Since there is no organization which brings together parliamentary representatives of all the OECD nations, the

NATO Parliamentarians have been addressing themselves to the OECD just as though they have the same relation to it as they have to NATO. They even asked the non-NATO OECD countries to send observers to the 1964 Conference but this did not happen. And although that Conference recommended to the OECD the desirability of closer coordination between its work and that of NPC's Economic Committee the report of the committee does not mention this—nor the outcome.

Augmenting the authority of the Special Committee on Developing NATO Countries—third resolution above—extends work begun at the 1963 Conference which takes the Parliamentarians beyond the consultative field and gives them responsibilities paralleling those of UNESCO and OECD.

This endeavor was doubtless adopted due to the previous success of the Economic Committee in establishing a $35 million private company to aid in the development of Latin American countries. The new project involves the promotion of private and public enterprise by an agency of the Committee financed by the Ford Foundation. How this accords with the purpose of the NPC—"an informal link between the NATO authorities and the—various—parliaments"—is not clear.

Although the report of the Economic Committee mentioned recommendations of three previous conferences regarding coordination of NATO countries' policies affecting their trade with the Soviet bloc, no action was recommended or taken at this Conference. Pertinent to this was a statement by U.S. Representative CHAMBERLAIN in plenary session that free world trade is double the total Communist bloc trade with North Vietnam.

Neither the report nor the recommendations of the Economic Committee dealt with economic matters of primary interest to the North Atlantic Council, as implied by the functions of NATO's Economic and Finance Division. These are:

First. The nonmilitary aspects of NATO defense organization;

Second. Economic matters of concern to the alliance as such;

Third. Financial aspects of defense by country; and

Fourth. Statistical appraisal of country defense efforts.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL

In the technical field, the Conference recommended:

First. That NATO endeavor to reach international agreement—presumably worldwide—relative to the upper limits of the sovereignty of states, and the lower limits of outer space;

Second. That the NATO organization take action to provide assistance in the field of advanced fishing technology; and that NATO nations give increasing support to OECD, ICNEAF, ICNAF, and ICES in this field—the Scientific and Technical Committee report noted the advanced status of these fishing techniques of Soviet fishermen. The ICES is the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. Its members include Belgium, Denmark, Dahomey, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. The ICNEAF is the International Commission for the North East Atlantic Fishries. It has the same membership as the ICES except that it does not include Dahomey, Finland and Italy. The ICNAF is the International Commission for the North West Atlantic Fisheries. Its members are the same as the ICES, except that it does not include Belgium, Dahomey, Finland, Ireland, Netherlands, Sweden, but does include Canada and the United States.

Third. That NATO nations cooperate in the development of oceanographic research equipment.

The report of the Scientific and Technical Committee noted "that every project put forward by—the STC—has been both taken under advisement by the governments of the member countries and also partly carried out already." However, it provided no clue as to what action stemmed from its incisive 1964 recommendation to "appropriate national and international institutions" to undertake "scientific studies" of the "nature of sources of conflicts in international life." Under "Preparatory Work," it did include a report on "Research on International Conflict" by U.S. Representative PETER W. RODINO.

CULTURAL

In the cultural field, the NPC recommended:

First. That national education authorities and institutions of higher education support the creation of an international university entrance examination and seek mutual acceptance by universities of diplomas and foreign study;

Second. That the NATO Secretariat, as informed by the national governments, provide the Conference with an account of previous years' activities in cultural and information matters;

Third. That educational officials, private foundations and scholars give priority to establishing better educational programs to qualify teachers for study of problems, organizations and ideals of the North Atlantic area;

Fourth. That a study commission be created on the feasibility of establishing a center for training civil servants, and economic and social administrators of all nations—in cooperation with OECD governments.

MILITARY

In the military field:

First. That NATO nations take steps to discover the most promising fields for common production of defense material;

Second. That the NATO Defense College include in its program study of the principles, work and effects of the German School for Military Leadership, Psychology, and Morale, and the German Parliamentary Commissioner for the Armed Forces and similar institutions within the alliance.

The Conference reafirmed its conviction that more must be done to combine the military, industrial, and political resources of the alliance rather than to engage in mutual competition—and establish a special committee on this to report its conclusions at the 1966 Conference.

BUDGET AND ELECTION

A budget of approximately $220,000 was adopted for 1966. The $20,000 increase over last year, was roughly allocated as follows: About $8,000 for additional staff, another $8,000 for premises and equipment and about $4,000 for increased travel and other ancillary administrative expense.

Mr. J. Soares de Fonseca of Portugal, the First Vice President was elected President for 1966 in accordance with the "ladder" system of recent years. Mr. Jean-Eudes Dubé of Canada was elected First Vice President.

By the rules Mr. Moreau de Melen, the retiring President automatically becomes a Vice President and Lord Crathorne of Great Britain retires from the Vice-Presidency. Two other Vice Presidents are Mr. George Kliesing of Germany and Mr. Wayne Hays of the United States. M. Jean Chamant of France was reelected Treasurer.

FOR DELEGATES TO PONDER

Of 23 actions resolved or recommended at this meeting only two were directed to the North Atlantic Council and only one to NATO. In 1964 there were 25 total actions with 6 directed to the Council and 3 to NATO generally. In 1963 these figures were 26, 8, and 3. Will this trend continue?

If the North Atlantic Council pays any attention whatever to the work of the parliamentarians there is little evidence in the speeches, reports and debates of the Conference to indicate awareness of this. Neither did the Secretary General referred to previous action as had been the prior practice. In addition, no representative of the military structure of NATO appeared at this year's conference as has been customary in the past.

Likewise, at this Conference only one recommendation was directed to NATO governments. In 1964 the figure was two and in 1963, three. If this trend continues it may also be expected that future Conferences will not direct recommendations to NATO governments.

If this be the case, to whom will NPC recommendations be directed? At this Conference, eight resolutions were directed to NATO nations—as distinct from their governments. In 1964 this figure was three and in 1963, five. Some recommendations were directed to nations outside NATO, others to agencies of government, still other to private institutions and to scholars.

Although many of the resolutions adopted by the parliamentarians are similar and in some cases almost identical to their previous recommendations, there is a notable tendency in the reports of the committees to omit or gloss over the results of such previous action. This may be due in part to a weakness of procedure as implied by a recommendation of the standing committee at the 1963 Conference to the effect that information on the results of recommendations adopted by it should be supplied to the rapporteurs of its committees within 8 months of the end of the Conference.

The same inference is readily drawn from a Political Committee resolution in 1963, to the effect that a Rapporteur General be appointed to keep the conference and all its committees continually informed of the work in progress and to keep an annual summary and report of the work of the conference and even of the problems and policies of NATO itself. In order to do this, its Secretary General was empowered to recruit additional staff needed to assist in carrying out the reforms. This, of course, depended upon the receipt of additional fiscal resources from the national governments.

Although the NATO Parliamentarians Conference was inspired by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and although some—about 16—of the delegates to the NPC are also delegates to the Council of Europe there are several important distinctions between them. In the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, representatives are apportioned among the nations, are seated alphabetically in semicircular rows facing the chair, and vote as individuals. Groupings tend to be on a basis of adherence to principles.

In the NATO Parliamentarians, there is no evidence of such grouping—the delegations are seated separately around the table by country. Voting power is allocated to delegations rather than to delegates, both in committee and in plenary session.

NPC voting is further complicated by the appointment of numbers of delegates not commensurate with voting strength, thus for example, Belgium with a voting strength of 7 had 4 delegates, France with a strength of 18 had 19 delegates, the United States with a strength of 36 had 18 delegates, Turkey with a strength of 10 had 2 delegates. Of course voting by delegation was never resorted to—at least in public sessions—but even when unanimity does not exist it is difficult to appraise the meaning of the vote. For example, in the one case where there was not unanimity, the vote was 35 for, 16 against, and 2 abstentions. With an uneven distribution of absences from delegations, it is thus impossible from the vote count alone to determine the true nature of the dissent and abstentions.

Within the committees this peculiarity was compounded by a disproportionate assignment of delegates to committees. For example, 17 of the 19 French delegates were assigned to the Political Committee and, if they all attended, a show-of-hands vote could register over three times the voting strength of the delegation in this Committee. Only 4 of Germany's 18 delegates were assigned to this Committee and if all attended, a show-of-hands vote would register 1 less than the German voting strength in this Committee. Other possible disparities of this nature were: Italy, 3 committeemen but 5 votes; United Kingdom, 13 committeemen but 5 votes; and the United States, 5 committeemen but 10 votes.

From the above analysis it is obvious that any voting within committees represents not the strength of a delegation but the intensity of interest in the particular topic in the committee.

Let us examine the continuity of personnel from one conference to the next. All delegates of Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, Portugal, and Turkey had also been present at the 1964 conference, and in addition although four of the Italian delegates had not been present in 1964, they had been present in preceding years. All but 2 of France's 19 delegates and of the Netherlands 9 delegates had been present in 1964.

At the other end of this spectrum, 6 of Germany's 18, 7 of the United States' 18, 11 of the United Kingdom's 18, and 7 of Canada's 9 delegates had not been present in 1964. Thus, except for Germany, it may be seen that the "old hands" of the 1965 Conference tended to be from continental Europe. As a measure of the overall NPC experience of the 1965 delegates it may be noted that of the 133 delegates, 6 had attended in 1964 and 104 had attended in 1963 or before.

Thus it can be said that about four-fifths of the delegates were experienced NATO parliamentarians and two-thirds of the delegates had been present the previous year.

Continuity of committee personnel was also fairly good. Of the 36 members of the Political Committee which met in Paris in May, 26 were still on the Committee at the Conference in November. Of the 14 members of the Economic Committee which met in Paris in May, 10 were still on the Committee in November. Of the 11 members of the Working Party on the Reform of NATO, 10 were still on the Working Party in November.

There were four sessions of plenary debate of approximately 2½ hours each. Debate consisted primarily of the presentation of a report followed by a number of more-or-less prepared speeches. There was little extemporaneous debate except on two minor resolutions. The first dealt with an amendment to the resolution concerning Cyprus and the other an amendment dealing with the resolution on fisheries.

There were numerous eloquent speakers but few of them showed much consideration for listeners who did not know their language. They failed to energize their microphones promptly or spoke so fast that the interpreter had difficulty keeping up. Evidence of this was provided by a delegate who wished to amend one of the resolutions and in his efforts not to miss the opportunity twice spoke prematurely.

In the Political Committee all translation was received on one channel instead of having a channel for English and a channel for French. This caused the listener to be unaware as to who was speaking if in a language different from that of the preceding speaker. In other words, by the time the listener could change channels the name of the speaker had already passed. Similar problems, combined with faulty equipment, made things difficult in the Economic Committee.

All 19 of the resolutions were adopted in about 1 hour; only 2 were debated and even 1 of these was passed unanimously—the debate having been concerned with a mistake in the language. All resolutions but one were passed without dissent and there were only nine abstentions spread over three of the unanimous resolutions. All votes were by voice only, none by delegations and since the number of delegates sent by various countries was not in direct proportion to their prescribed voting strength, and despite further distortion of this by the absence of delegates from specific meetings, the actual votes were hardly representative of the delegations.

In summary, the NATO Parliamentarians Conference seems to be popular and possessed of enough momentum and appeal to keep going, but as yet it has not become a strong influence on NATO policy generally, or on NATO Council action specifically. Nor does it seem to be influential in the national policies of NATO countries.

Indeed, strong tendencies to duck controversies and to deal obliquely with fundamental issues were evident in the October meeting. I am told it was less assertive than some earlier conferences, and this was especially disappointing because a crisis within the Atlantic Alliance was rapidly taking shape. The crisis mounts.

For example, the opposing positions of the Presidents of the United States and France, in regard to Alliance changes, seem more inflexible than ever.

The NATO Parliamentarians Conference provides a forum in which alternatives could be thoroughly, frankly, and openly discussed. The Conference could indeed move into the vacuum caused by executive inaction, hopefully hammer out acceptable courses of action and thus point the way to a better tomorrow.

If converted into an official consultative branch of NATO, as has long been its intention, the Conference would certainly influence the direction of NATO by focussing attention on policy and courses of action widely supported among legislators of the member nations. This should be done without further delay.

CONSERVATIONISTS AGREE LAKE FEES REQUIRE OVERHAUL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, in the subcommittee hearings just concluded in H.R. 13313, and related bills affecting lake and reservoir fees, most of the witnesses appearing before the subcommittee strongly supported H.R. 13313 and the companion measures.

On the other hand, representatives of a number of national organizations in the field of conservation appeared in opposition to the bills, and filed statements reflecting the view that these bills are a direct attack upon the land and water conservation fund.

Most witnesses supporting H.R. 13313 made very clear their position in support of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and their desire to secure legislation consistent with the purposes and the basic spirit of that program.

CONSERVATIONISTS AGREE

It is highly significant that spokesmen for most of the major national organizations opposing H.R. 13313 were in agreement on the point that present lake and reservoir fee policies, as announced by the Army Corps of Engineers, are inconsistent with their understanding of the purposes and provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Some testified to their convictions that these new fee policies are in violation of the specific language of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which prohibits any charge for the use of the waters.

The frankness of leading conservation champions like Dr. Spencer Smith, Jr., Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, Mr. J. W. Penfold, and Mr. Frank Gregg, was appreciated by all members of the subcommittee considering this matter.

Several of these witnesses commented on the usefulness of the hearings, in bringing into focus some of the highly significant questions now under review in the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which has responsibility for the program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. It is highly significant, for example, that current estimates of revenue expected from entrance and user fees of all kinds, under this act, are very much below the estimates of 2 years ago.

For example, Dr. Edward Crafts, Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, estimated the total fee revenues in 1968 would total approximately $22 million—far below the $62 million estimate for fee revenues in 1968 which was supplied by the Department of Interior 2 years ago. On the other hand, Land and Water Conservation Fund revenues from surplus property sales are well above 1964 estimates.

TESTIMONY GIVEN

Here are some of the statements of leading conservation champions, on questioning before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Committee on Public Works, which fully support the need for legislation along the lines of H.R. 13313—although most committee members are in agreement that some revisions in H.R. 13313 are needed to assure the bill as finally passed is basically compatible with the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

Excerpts From the Testimony of Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, Vice President, Wildlife Management Institute, Before the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works, April 27, 1966

Mr. Edmondson. Could I ask you a question at that point, Mr. Gutermuth? If this bill were amended to provide that a person going into one of these developed areas would pay a user fee for a facility like a campsite, that had the developments that you are talking about, the utilities and facilities for campers, or pay a user fee for bathhouses and showers and things of that type, beaches, would it become more acceptable to you?

Mr. Guthermuth. I wouldn't see much objection to that.

* * * * *

I wish that I could have asked this Mr. Pitts from the Corps of Engineers some questions here today. Because I think one of our biggest problems is the way in which they are going to apply this thing.

I don't think that was any intention that they should be charging for somebody for a beach out here if the poorer class of people want to come in here and go swimming in the afternoon in one of these Federal areas. I don't think that was the intention at all. The intent was if they are going to spend a lot of Federal money developing this particular recreational facility here, you ought to charge a little something for it.

* * * * *

In most of these places that we are talking about, you could put your boat in at this corps reservoir and not be concerned with any fee during the entire year. Because the only places they should be charging is where they have made a big substantial development.

* * * * *

In other words, if they are going to build big campsites and all of these things, provide extra special picnic and facilities, extra special now that they are providing for, that a charge would be made in those areas but those areas only. You can go into this reservoir or any other place.

Mr. Harsha. Then as I understand your position, you would have no objection then to the language reading as follows: "No entrance or admission fee shall be collected or received under authority of the Water Conservation Act for entrance or admission to the project area."

Mr. Gutermuth. I think this would perhaps be all right if you could also go a step further by saying something about except in those areas where special services are provided.

Mr. Edmondson. Do you think there ought to be a charge for sightseeing in these recreational areas?

Mr. Gutermuth. No, and I don't think that was the intent in the Land and Conservation Fund Act. All of the national forests of this country are open to the public at all times and there is only one place that is ever intended in the National Forest where there should be a charge under the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and that is where the Federal Government is spending its money to develop recreational facilities for those people who are going to that specific area.

Excerpts From the Testimony of Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., Secretary, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Before the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works, April 28, 1966

Dr. Smith. When this bill (the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act) was under discussion. I never at any time thought that if a fellow wanted to take a fishing boat and go down to the water's edge and fish that there would be any fee charged him for doing so.

* * * * *

I do not think a person who puts a boat on a reservoir is going to have to pay, putting that boat on the reservoir or put it on the water; but if the Federal Government puts X dollars in some of these really elaborate boat-launching ramps and a guy wants to take a boat down there with a 25-horsepower motor on it and use these facilities to go in, I do not see anything wrong with charging him 25 cents to do so.

* * * * *

If you say by putting these admission fees on to go through this particular area establishes it as a prohibition to get to the water, then I do not think under the statutes you could do it. Not as I read the statutes.

* * * * *

I came here with the idea of making a strong proliferation on behalf of the charge of certain fees. While I still defend the concept of fees, at least until we are able to get some of the bulges out to see where we stand, the indications from Corps (of Engineers) testimony yesterday, which I listened to with rather careful attention, certainly does not interpret the statute as we interpret it.

Excerpts From the Testimony of Mr. J. W. Penfold, Conservation Director of the Izaak Walton League of America, Before the Flood Control Subcommittee of House Committee on Public Works, April 27, 1966

Mr. Penfold. I would just like to make one comment, Mr. Chairman, along the line of the discussion in the last few minutes. The Izaak Walton League has supported the fee concept from the very beginning. Our conception of it was that the fees would be charged for special use facilities which some people would choose to use and other people would choose not to use. We have not supported fees for use of reservoir projects, or for national forests.

* * * * *

If you want to drive through that particular campground, and you are not going to stop, and you are not going to use one of these camp spots you don't pick up the sticker, and when you get through looking, you drive out. There has been no charge and no charge involved.

Mr. Edmondson. And if you just wanted to go through one of those areas and look it over and spend a little time sightseeing with your family and not use one of these campsites, you wouldn't be subject to a fee, would you Mr. Penfold?

Mr. Penfold. This is my understanding. No, I can recognize there would be places where this administratively would be extremely difficult. And I would say this, speaking for myself now, that in such an instance, then there should be definite access for the people who do not want to pay the fee or use that developed site for that particular purpose.

Excerpts From Testimony of Mr. Frank Gregg, Vice President, the Conservation Foundation of Washington, D.C., Before the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works, April 28, 1966

Mr. Gregg. I have here, you might notice, which is kind of amusing in view of all the efforts that we have had to go through here to straighten out some of our understandings of the bill, circulars published by the Department of the Army attempting to explain to their field personnel how this program could be administered. It describes the phrase "designated area" where the fees are going to be applied under the fund, and it says that a "designated area is all project lands and waters that are not outleased or operated by others." This is very clearly contrary to the intent of the act, and is very different from what the Reclamation Bureau is doing, because the Reclamation Bureau is under Interior, and BOR (Bureau of Outdoor Recreation) has got a little better handhold on them.

* * * * *

I think it is quite clear to all of us that it is not going to work. It is administratively inconvenient on the corps reservoirs, and the amount of money generated from (sic) the land and water conservation fund is not going to be significant.

Excerpt From Testimony of Mr. Frank Daniel, Secretary of the National Rifle Association, Before the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works, April 27, 1966

Mr. Edmondson. If this bill were to be amended to permit continuation of user fees for facilities, but not permit entrance and admission fees in areas around lakes and reservoirs, do you feel it would be a blow to the program?

Mr. DANIEL. No, I do not, because it has always been my feeling that the intent of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was to direct itself to user fees and not to admission fees per se.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it crystal clear that the bills now pending before the Committee on Public Works on the subject of lake fees are not designed to injure the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

With the amendments being considered by the subcommittee, these bills will help to assure the realization of the major basic goal of the Land and Water Conservative Fund: the opportunity for the American people to enjoy fully the great benefits of outdoor recreation from one end of the Nation to the other, without denial of those benefits to any segment of our people.

That is our basic goal in H.R. 13313, and I hope and trust it will command the support of all Members of this body, once it has reached the floor.

NATO IMPROVING NUCLEAR WEAPON PLANNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense McNamara is to be congratulated for the efforts he and his associates have made toward the solution of difficult problems we have been facing for many years within NATO.

Real progress was made in conferences in Paris and London between a team of U.S. conferees led by Secretary of Defense McNamara and the top ministerial and military leaders of other nations in NATO.

This progress has been made in the direction of strengthening the organization of NATO through greater participation in planning NATO's vital functions, that is, preplanning of tactical strategy in military response against any form of aggression, strengthening and simplifying communications and, most important of all, participation in the policymaking and the decisionmaking processes.

These improvements are far more important in strengthening our mutual military alliance than fruitless debate over hardware schemes such as multilateral force or Atlantic nuclear force.

It might be helpful to review the background history of NATO. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed in 1949 with 11 West European nations and the United States. In 1952 Turkey and Greece were officially added and effective May 5, 1955, West Germany became a member of the alliance. Its purpose was to form a united cooperative military alliance of free nations which would mobilize their collective strength for a shield against Communist aggression. The Soviet Union was warned that an armed attack against one would be considered an attack against all.

In February 1952 representatives of the NATO nations met in Lisbon and agreed upon their individual commitments of manpower and military hardware to the North Atlantic alliance. These military commitments have periodically been revised.

Except for the United States and Great Britain, each nation's contribution of military hardware was to be in conventional weapons. The United States and Great Britain were to furnish nuclear weapons and they were deployed on the sovereign soil of a number of the alliance member nations.

France refused to allow nuclear weapons to be deployed on French soil unless they were transferred to her independent control, which the United States refused to do. France did, however, accept training from the United States in the use of and defense against nuclear weapons for her military personnel. French forces so trained and assigned to NATO and located in Germany have been participating in the NATO nuclear defenses under a two-key type of arrangement whereby the United States maintained custody of the weapons.

None of our NATO allies fully met their Lisbon or subsequent commitments for military personnel, conventional weapons, and weapons delivery systems. Germany and the United Kingdom, however, did come very close to meeting their full commitments. The NATO alliance failed to perfect the organizational structure of NATO for various reasons. The alliance also failed to develop adequate policymaking machinery and decisionmaking procedures.

Due to these failures during the 17 years of the alliance's existence, NATO never fully developed its military effectiveness. Notwithstanding this failure, NATO did have enough cohesion amongst its members to present a united front against Soviet threats of aggression and successfully deterred Soviet advance in Europe. The real power of deterrence rested upon the nuclear power of two members of the alliance—the United States and Great Britain.

However, the U.S. nuclear strength is so much greater than the nuclear strength of Great Britain that for all intents and purposes we can limit our discussion to the U.S. weapons.

By 1966 the United States had deployed in Western Europe more than 6,000 nuclear weapons of several types and assigned them to NATO forces. Through individual bilateral arrangements with our NATO allies, their military forces assigned to NATO have been trained to use and deliver these weapons on enemy targets in the event of war.

In each and every one of these binational cooperative arrangements these nuclear weapons can be used only by mutual consent and in every case the President of the United States retains the final power of veto of such use.

As time passed, certain elements in France and to a lesser extent in Germany began to question the so-called two-key arrangement. France in particular, under President de Gaulle's strong urging, voiced dissent and embarked on its own program of nuclear weapon development. In addition, France withdrew its fleet from the NATO commitment, refused to allow U.S. nuclear weapons to be stationed on her soil, and in various ways brought about considerable disruption in NATO procedures. President de Gaulle's opposition to NATO has now led to notice of French withdrawal from NATO and a request that various NATO headquarters functions and facilities be removed from French soil.

We have no alternative except to comply with France's request to remove the NATO headquarters and other NATO forces from France and relocate it in some other European NATO nation. This we will do in an orderly way in consonance with our allies and at a cost approaching a billion dollars.

Resort on our part to denunciation and bitterness will not solve the problems which face the free world Alliance.

The free world Alliance is still necessary for collective security and for deterrence.

The NATO alliance can live and it can be strengthened without France. An unwilling or disgruntled ally in time of danger is a liability rather than an asset.

While it would be desirable for France to remain as part of a group of cooperative free nations bound together in a common cause, neither the military strength nor the geography of France is vital to a strong alliance between the United States and the other free nations of Western Europe. It is well for us to remember that we had little help from the weak and disorganized and occupied France in our struggle against Hitler and Mussolini in World War II, and yet victory was gained by the Allies.

In an all out nuclear war of the future, national boundaries of one nation in Europe would have little effect on the outcome and the limited nuclear weapon inventory of France would be of no major importance in the outcome.

Our problem then is to do the job of improving the organization of NATO and put into effect the long overdue development of policy and procedures which are vital for successful response in the hour of challenge.

I am confident that the withdrawal of an unwilling and noncooperative ally, far from being a catastrophe, will offer the alliance the opportunity to reassess and reevaluate a situation which has gradually deteriorated.

The blame for this disarray cannot be laid solely against France or any other single nation in NATO. I believe that there has been a failure on the part of every nation, including the United States, to develop the Alliance to a high level of competence and effectiveness.

I would not minimize the difficulties which have beset the alliance. National fears and prejudices in the past have eventually destroyed every multination alliance in the world's history.

Never before in the world's history, however, has there existed the urgency for union of the free against a dictatorship possessed with nuclear weapons.

Never before in the world's history has there existed the need for deterrence against the holocaust of a worldwide nuclear war.

I am aware that the sole veto power of one nation in the alliance and the possession of the tremendous inventory of nuclear weapons by a single power, the

United States, is at the root of the problem of harmony in the alliance.

This is not the time to discuss in the detail needed, the arguments and reasons for the United States not transferring ownership of nuclear weapons to other nations and why the United States should retain veto power over nuclear weapons assigned to NATO.

Our national policy is a policy opposed to proliferation of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear weapon-owning nations, and our statutes prohibit their transfer to other nations. Until that national policy is changed by the Congress, U.S. nuclear weapons cannot be transferred to any single nation or group of nations except in time of war when the President, as Commander in Chief, may authorize their use.

Therefore, it is up to the alliance to work within that bracket of reference—within the limitations of our law.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has long considered this problem of protecting the security of the United States and our allies as our first priority. We believe we have a nuclear weapon inventory second to no other nation in the world in power, in variety and in sophistication. We believe we have delivery systems in the air and under the oceans second to none in excellence and power.

Our nuclear stockpile serves as a defensive shield not only for the United States but for our allies. Our allies' security cannot be maintained unless our security is maintained. Part of that mutual protection is dependent upon safeguarding our superior technology and not jeopardizing highly classified information through wide distribution when little military advantage is to be gained by dissemination of the information to our allies.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy accordingly has strongly opposed transferring nuclear submarine propulsion information and nuclear weapon design information to others. We have, however, always supported the assignment of these military systems to the defense of NATO.

The United States is vitally concerned with protecting the security of the alliance, because we believe that no single nation can pit its strength—great as it may be—against the aggressive power of communism and that is why we believe in the preservation and strengthening of NATO.

To this end we have committed almost 300,000 members of our Armed Forces to stations in Europe. We have deployed more than 6,000 nuclear weapons to Europe and we are committed to defend any invasion of the soil of our European allies in NATO. We have literally expended tens of billions of our dollars to develop our military strength and the military strength of the once shattered—free—nations of Europe, both World War II enemies and allies.

To argue that we might not oppose Soviet aggression as France has argued, is to argue against all our history and all our present vital interest in the preservation of the free nations.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has urged that our State Department and our Department of Defense take every necessary step to strengthen NATO. We have approved bilateral military arrangements with nations in the alliance. We have suggested, and Congress has approved, amendments which allow integration of nuclear weapons into the forces of NATO, while preserving at the same time the right of final decision for their use to the President of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, many improvements remain to be made in the planning structure, policymaking function, and decisionmaking procedures of the alliance.

I believe that the Secretary of Defense—Mr. McNamara—acting with the assistance of our Secretary of State—Mr. Rusk—and with the approval of the President is now moving to take advantage of the opportunity for improving NATO.

The December 1965 meeting in Paris was used by Secretary McNamara to announce for the first time publicly the number of nuclear weapons committed on European soil. This gave to the citizens in Europe for the first time a concept of the magnitude of our European nuclear commitment. At that meeting Secretary McNamara suggested a new top level NATO Committee of Defense Ministers and top military leaders which was formed.

Three working groups have been set up within this new special committee to consider communication, intelligence, and nuclear planning.

A second meeting of the Nuclear Planning Working Group was held in London April 28–29, 1966, and substantial progress was made.

Subsequent meetings will be held in July and August and it is hoped that final recommendations can be made to the 10-nation Special Committee of Defense Ministers in time for action by the North Atlantic Council in December.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks two announcements: The first is the announcement of the Nuclear Planning Working Group of the NATO Special Committee of Defense Ministers in London at the conclusion of the April 28–29, 1966 meeting; and the second is a news release from the Department of Defense under date of April 30, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased at the progress that is being made in coping with the old and new problems in NATO under the leadership of Secretary of Defense McNamara. I believe that he deserves the commendation and support of every American who realizes the value of NATO to the cause of freedom and to the deterrence of nuclear war.

Meeting of Nuclear Planning Working Group, NATO Special Committee of Defense Ministers, London, 28–29 April 1966

The Nuclear Planning Working Group of the NATO Special Committee of Defense Ministers adjourned late this afternoon after 2 days of discussions on tactical nuclear forces and on possible modifications in organization and procedures to improve Allied participation in nuclear planning and in consultation for the possible use of nuclear weapons.

The Ministers' comprehensive discussions were based upon papers prepared by member nations and detailed presentations from Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (SACEUR), and Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic (SACLANT), and key members of their staff, and by the Defense Operations Analysis Establishment of the United Kingdom.

The Ministers agreed that there appear to be sufficient overall numbers of tactical nuclear weapons available to the Alliance in the European area. They propose to develop a program of studies regarding outstanding problems in the area of tactical nuclear warfare.

The Ministers agreed that at their next meeting, which will be held in July, they would consider possible modifications in organization and procedure to permit a greater degree of participation in nuclear planning by nonnuclear nations across the whole spectrum of planning, and to make possible appropriate consultation in the event their use is considered.

The Ministers' deputies will prepare draft recommendations for such arrangements and procedures. A subsequent meeting in the autumn in Italy is contemplated by the Ministers to consider final recommendations to the 10-nation Special Committee of Defense Ministers in time for action by the North Atlantic Council in December.

The Ministers of Defense attending were Kai-Uwe von Hassel, Germany; Roberto Tremelloni, Italy; Ahmet Topalogolu, Turkey; Denis Healey, United Kingdom who was the host for this meeting; and Robert S. McNamara, United States, Chairman. Mr. Manilo Brosio, NATO Secretary General and Chairman of the Special Commtitee, also attended.

Defense Department Statement, Saturday, April 30, 1966

News stories alleging that the United States proposed a shift in NATO defense strategy during the meetings of the last 2 days in London are not correct.

At the meetings in London, the Ministers discussed possible modification in organization and procedures to improve allied participation in nuclear planning. They also discussed ways to strengthen appropriate consultation for the possible use of nuclear weapons.

At no time and in no way did the United States propose a change in the use of nuclear weapons in defense of NATO territory. Secretary McNamara emphasized again as he has before the belief of the U.S. Government that NATO must possess both nonnuclear and nuclear forces adequate to deal with a wide range of threats with the power appropriate to each.

ABSOLUTE LIABILITY IN AIR DISASTER—AN OPEN INVITATION TO SABOTAGE AND FLYING BOMBS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff] may extend his remarks as this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed at reports that the State Department is considering accepting a $75,000 figure on a basis of absolute liability as the sum awarded to survivors of victims of international air crashes.

Last year I called for the renunciation of the Warsaw Convention which, since the early days of aviation, has limited such recovery to a mere $8,300, and was pleased when the State Department last November denounced the treaty effective May 15, 1966. What I favored was liability based on the merits of each case, as is the normal rule in law. I am not, however, unalterably opposed to the $75,000 maximum figure.

What alarms me is the curious effort of the State Department to couple an absolute liability feature to the proposal. Such automatic liability would be an open invitation to sabotage, because survivors of every person on board would be eligible for an almost automatic $75,000, a sufficient sum to tempt a potential killer. Because the substantial sum of $75,000 would automatically be involved, the criminal would not have to take out an additional sum of insurance, thus greatly reducing the risk of his apprehension.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for reversal by the State Department of its decision to abandon the Warsaw Convention. There is even less reason to adopt the principle of absolute liability, which could result in the sacrifice of innumerable lives.

Furthermore, I cannot understand how the State Department can move on this matter unilaterally without consulting the Senate—the body constitutionally charged with advise and consent powers regarding treaties.

Mr. Speaker, further consideration by all parties concerned with this important matter is of vital and immediate importance.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to report on the heartening progress of a most vital and worthwhile program—the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

After a little over a year, the NYC, a strategic part of America's war on poverty, has helped start well over half-million youngsters on the road to brighter, more productive lives.

For many of these disadvantaged young people, the children of poverty, this program will mean the difference between futures clouded with unemployment and despair and futures filled with hope and success.

The NYC, administered by the Department of Labor, provides young men and women 16 through 21 years old with part or nearly full-time work so they may: earn money to continue their education; earn money to resume their education; acquire the work experience so necessary for holding jobs today.

In all cases, enrollees in the youth program receive constructive and rewarding work experience which better prepares them for their adult work lives.

I think the outstanding record of the NYC so far illustrates quite vividly what happens when an aroused nation gets behind a program to help those most in need.

Since the program got underway in January 1965 in Newark, N.J., these heartwarming results have been accomplished:

Public-service jobs have been provided for about 580,000 youths in nearly 1,700 projects sponsored by public and private nonprofit organizations across the country. Two-thirds of these job opportunities were for youths attending school; the other third were for school dropouts.

Of the 300,000 boys and girls who have worked in NYC projects, thousands have gone back to school or on to permanent jobs, the Armed Forces, or other federally sponsored training programs.

Nine hundred and twenty projects are currently in operation, giving opportunities to approximately 270,000 youngsters.

There is no question that the manpower policies being pursued by this administration have contributed largely to pushing unemployment to its lowest point in over 12 years.

This improved employment outlook has affected job opportunities for our young people.

In December 1965, the number of 16- through 21-year-olds out of work was 175,000 less than a year earlier—although their number in the work force rose by 650,000.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz struck a key chord when he recently said:

> Much of the drop in the number of unemployed among these young workers was the direct result of the antipoverty and Manpower Development and Training Act programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, most familiar with the NYC projects which have been in operation in my congressional district. One of the most successful has been the Police Cadet Corps in Newark—a bold and daring approach to the law enforcement problems of the modern metropolis. The city has said, in effect, "Let us take our unemployed, underschooled youth from the streets and train them to fill our law enforcement needs."

Under this unique program, boys receive training in police and security skills under the supervision of Newark police officers. The goal is that these boys will, upon becoming 21 and completing high school at night, take and pass the police department examinations and become full-fledged policemen. The cadets are never used in any area or service where there is an element of physical danger. They are rotated periodically in every branch of the police department and thus obtain training in traffic control, detective work, clerical work, fingerprinting, photography, and so forth.

The cadets have helped to alleviate the manpower deficiencies which exist in the department. And at the same time the program encourages the cadets to continue their education. One-hundred percent of the boys are either attending accredited evening schools or have signed up for high school equivalency examinations.

Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio has stated:

> The 10-percent decline in Newark's crime rate is connected almost entirely with the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

And certainly the Police Cadet Corps has been a key factor in this encouraging development.

Industry and business has shown a ready acceptance of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program as evidenced by the following statements from various leaders in the private sector of our economy.

Mrs. Kenneth F. MacIver, secretary, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.:

> The John Hancock Life Insurance Co. is in complete accord with the objectives of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. We have hired some candidates under (your) program to provide employment opportunities for youths and several of these people have worked out very well. It is our experience that the (Neighborhood Youth Corps) program can work to the mutual benefit of business and the individual.

Mr. G. William Miller, president, Textron Co.:

> It is clear that the Neighborhood Youth Corps is making an important contribution toward providing productive and constructive employees. Textron will be glad to cooperate in finding permanent employment for graduates.

Mr. Alfred H. Drewes, president, National Lead Co.:

> The National Lead Co. supports the objectives of the Neighborhood Youth Corps and is interested in cooperating in the effort to provide job opportunities for these youths wherever possible.

Mr. C. W. Cook, president, General Foods Corp.:

> I am happy to tell you that General Foods does indeed continue to be most interested in the Neighborhood Youth Corps as an avenue for giving young people an opportunity for employment.

Mr. Virgil B. Day, vice president, General Electric Co.:

> I am happy to tell you that General Electric will be pleased to cooperate (with the Neighborhood Youth Corps) in every way reasonably possible in utilizing this newly developed source of manpower. You will be pleased to learn that we already have employed a number of graduates of this program.

Feelings of enrollees themselves tell the NYC story much more meaningfully than statistics. Let me quote from the experiences of a few:

A 22-year-old Newark lad, now working in a zoo, said:

> The NYC is about the greatest thing that ever come. It's something to point all young people in the right direction. I would have been washing dishes or working on and off at something without it. Now, I'll never give up.

An 18-year-old ex-convict from Oklahoma said:

> I am now employed in the oilfields at $1.42 an hour. I doubt that I could have made it without the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

An Illinois boy said:

> Next time I go to an employment office, I will not have to leave the work experience section blank on the application form.

A boy from Boulder County, Colo., said:

> The thing I like best about the NYC program is knowing that people care about what becomes of you.

NYC success stories abound across the country. A study of 8,000 out-of-school enrollees—mostly dropouts—showed that 25 percent found regular employment; 4 percent enrolled in more advanced training programs; 15 percent resumed full-time secondary schooling.

This program has proved itself a highly useful part of our national manpower programs, which, in President Johnson's words "should lead us to a society in which every person has full opportunity to develop his—or her—earning powers, where no willing worker lacks a job, and where no useful talent lacks opportunity."

Regrettably, the NYC is, at this time, able to assist just 1 out of every 10 of the 3 million youngsters who come from poor families—those with gross earnings of $3,000 or less annually.

We are challenged to see that no American boy or girl is denied the opportunity to advance as far as his or her individual talents allow.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is one of the programs that is helping us meet this great national challenge.

PETER FRANCISCO—PROFILE IN COURAGE

Mr. **KREBS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RODINO.** Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, April 24, there took place in Newark a brief but moving ceremony marking the official dedication of a small public garden as Peter Francisco Park. After the invocation by the Reverend Antonio Monteiro, Master of Ceremonies Donald B. Gomes presented Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio, who read the resolution adopted by Newark's Municipal Council to honor the great Portuguese hero of our Revolutionary War. Officials of all Portuguese societies in Newark, as well as representatives of Portugal in New York, participated in the ceremony. The joyous and historic event was organized by a committee whose members were Abilio Esteves, Abel Andrade, Agostinho Barbosa, Antonio Rosa, João Carlos Rendeiro, Abilio Marques, Manuel Sousa, Augusto Reis, David Rego, Anselmo Falorca, and Donald B. Gomes.

Though he refused a commission and remained a private soldier throughout the war, Peter Francisco's remarkable character and courage earned him the respect and friendship of the outstanding leaders of the American Revolution. I am delighted that the city of Newark has acted to enshrine the memory of this great Portuguese American who rendered such valiant and dedicated service to the cause of American independence. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record, following these remarks, a fine article on Peter Francisco which appeared in the April 21, 1966, issue of Luso-Americano, the outstanding Portuguese newsweekly published in Newark:

Peter Francisco: Profile in Courage

(By Edmund Diniz, district attorney, New Bedford, Mass.)

In 1765 Peter Francisco, at the age of 5, was left upon the wharf at City Point, now Hopewell, Va., friendless and alone. The ship which brought him to America immediately set sail and was never heard of again. Sailors and dockhands found that Peter understood a few words of English and could only speak Portuguese. The boy knew his name was Peter Francisco, that he had been separated from his parents, and that the men on the ship had left him on the wharf.

He was taken to Prince George poorhouse and cared for until Judge Anthony Winston, an uncle of Patrick Henry, took him to a place outside of Richmond, in Buckingham County. Judge Winston represented Buckingham County in the Virginia Convention and was one of the patriot leaders. On March 23, 1775, Peter Francisco listened entranced as Patrick Henry delivered his impassioned speech with the immortal phrase, "Give me liberty or give me death." War was soon to come.

In the fall of 1776, at 16 years of age, Francisco joined the 10th Virginia Regiment of continental troops. He was 6 feet 6 inches tall and weighed 260 pounds, with black eyes and black hair, and was exceedingly muscular and strong. He first saw action on September 11, 1777, at Brandywine, Pa. It was here at Sandy Hollow that Francisco met for the first time General Lafayette. Both men were wounded in this battle and became good friends during their convalescence. This friendship was to endure the rest of their lives. In 1824, long after the Revolution, when Lafayette visited America, Francisco accompanied the Marquis on his triumphant tour through Virginia.

Within a month Francisco was back in the lines at Germantown. He was among the Americans who escaped and fled to the New Jersey shore from Fort Mifflin. In June 1778, Francisco was wounded a second time by a British musket ball at Monmouth, N.J. In July of 1779 he was back in the line, ready to attack strong British outposts at Paulus Hook and Stony Point. Again Francisco was wounded.

At Stony Point he entered the fort after Maj. James Gibbon of Richmond, who was the first to enter. After Stony Point he returned to Virginia and enlisted in a cavalry troop and was engaged in many battles in the South under General Gates and General Greene.

Field dispatches of the battle of Camden, S.C., tell of how, the horses having been killed, Francisco moved an 1,100-pound cannon several hundred feet to a new position. It was in this battle that he saved Col. William Mayo's life and then made possible the colonel's escape by presenting him with a British horse, after disposing of its rider, who was attempting to capture Francisco. Colonel Mayo expressed his gratitude later by willing Francisco 1,000 acres of land in Kentucky. He never obtained the land, however, as the Mayo heirs protested the bequest and he refused to press suit.

It is reported that the sword he used in these conflicts was made especially for him by order of General Washington, and was said to have a 5-foot blade. Francisco had complained that the regulation army weapon was too light and too short.

On March 15, 1781, the American and British collided in one of the bloodiest battles of the Revolution. This was at Guilford Courthouse, Greensboro, N.C. On this day, it was reported by Benson J. Lossing, the historian and early authority on the Revolution, how Peter Francisco slew 11 British soldiers before he himself was critically wounded. Finally a British guardsman pinned Francisco's leg to his horse with a bayonet. The steel entered his leg just above the knee, sliced deep almost to the bone and ripped upward. Nearly unhorsed by the shock, doubled with pain, Francisco wheeled out of action, clung to his mount in desperation, and then, losing consciousness, tumbled from the saddle and collapsed on the battleground. He was left for dead but was discovered by a Quaker, given aid, and recovered.

The stories of his fantastic performance on the steps of the Guilford Courthouse became the talk of the Revolutionary Army. William Washington urged Francisco to accept a commission, but he declined, feeling unqualified because he could neither read nor write. Nathanael Greene expressed his admiration by having a handsome razor case especially made for him on which was inscribed: "Peter Francisco, New Store, Buckingham County, Va. A tribute to his moral worth and valor. From his comrade in arms Nathanael Greene." The razor case still exists, preserved in a room with other mementos in the museum at the National Military Park, Greensboro, N.C.

A monument is located at the site of the Guilford Courthouse Battle at the National Military Park. The inscription at the base of the monument reads: "To Peter Francisco, a giant in stature, might and courage—who slew in this engagement 11 of the enemy with his own broadsword, rendering himself thereby perhaps the most famous private soldier of the Revolutionary War."

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts annually proclaims March 15 as Peter Francisco Day. This proclamation came about as a result of legislation filed by me when a member of the Massachusetts Senate. I chose March 15 in commemoration of the Battle of Guilford Courthouse.

Recovering from the leg-splitting bayonet thrust that had almost killed him, Francisco became well enough to travel. The war had moved to Virginia and the stage was set for Yorktown. One day, while he was stopping at Ward's Tavern, in what is now Nottoway County, nine of the British General Tarleton's dragoons burst up the road and surrounded him. One of the dragoons demanded the silver buckles on his shoes. These were a gift of Judge Winston and Francisco refused to give them up voluntarily. When the trooper left his horse and tucked his saber beneath his arms and stooped to grab the buckles, Francisco grasped the hilt, wrenched the saber free, and in almost the same sweeping motion delivered an awesome stroke, splitting the trooper's head and neck in half down to his shoulders. The dragoons rushed at him. One aimed a pistol at Francisco and Francisco went after him with the saber. The trooper fired, the ball grazed Francisco's side, his sixth wound, but one saber thrust severed the hand that fired the shot. Another trooper leveled a gun at Francisco's breast and pulled the trigger. It missed fire. He grabbed the musket and wrenched it from the trooper's hands and knocked him from his saddle. Francisco sprung up on the horse, rose in the stirrups and hallooed, just as if he were really summoning help that was nearby. The dragoons broke and fled in panic in all directions. Francisco fled down a back country road and was able to easily elude his pursuers. This was the last of Francisco's wartime exploits. He saw the British surrender to the Americans at Yorktown.

An engraving depicting the encounter with Tarleton's troopers was first published in 1814 and met with great popular approval. Copies of it adorned parlor walls, North and south, for a generation. The original now hangs in Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

Francisco returned to Buckingham County when the war was over. He opened a small store the next year and later ran a tavern. He had made many friends with the leaders of the American Revolution, George Washington, Patrick Henry, the Marquis de Lafayette, Gen. Nathanael Greene, Col. William Washington, Col. William Mayo, Henry Clay and John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, many of whom have left personal records of his great charm and wit, as of his valor and superhuman strength. His closest friendship was with Lafayette, which began when they were recuperating together after the Battle of Brandywine.

MARRIED THREE TIMES

Peter Francisco married three times, each time into a Virginia family of good standing. In 1785 he married Susannah Anderson, who died 5 years after their marriage, leaving him with a son to whom she left a home and the Cumberland County lands inherited from her father. Two years later he married Catherine Fauntleroy Brooks, a friend of Susannah who bore 4 children, and they spent 27 happy years together at "Locust Grove" before she died in 1821. His third marriage in 1823 was to Mary Beverly Grymes, the widow West, who survived him. There are descendents in Georgia, Virginia, the Carolinas, Massachusetts, Tennessee, and Texas.

In 1825 they moved from Buckingham County to Richmond, where during his last 6 years Francisco served as sergeant-at-arms of the Virginia House of Delegates. The house he left is still standing.

On January 16, 1831, Peter Francisco died in Richmond. The house adjourned in respect and joined with the senate, the Governor and the city council in attending the funeral. The Virginia legislature prepared a resolution of regret. The services were conducted in the hall of the house of delegates by Bishop Channing Moore, and Francisco was buried with honors in Shockoe Cemetery, Richmond, Va.

Just before the turn of the present century, the Daughters of the American Revolution planted in San Francisco's Golden Gate Park 13 "liberty trees," 1 for each of the Original Colonies, each tree nourished by soil taken from the grave of a Revolutionary hero. Virginia's symbol was the chestnut tree, and the earth around its base came from the grave of Peter Francisco.

A portrait by an unknown artist has been preserved and hangs in the executive mansion in Richmond, Va.

A veritable giant, tall and massive, as brave as he was strong, a man described as above all personal prejudice or meanness of conduct, devoted passionately to the cause which he had made his own, there is no more valiant figure in the whole history of America's fighting men than Peter Francisco.

EXPANDING FNMA SECONDARY MARKET OPERATIONS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to take the first step toward equalizing the disproportionate financial position that the homebuilding and real estate industries now find themselves occupying. With other segments of our economy expanding at an ever-increasing rate we find the vital home construction and real estate industries facing the anomalous prospects of depression.

Our preoccupation with finding suitable methods to cool overheated segments of our economy has resulted in policies that have proved discriminatory, and for the most part futile. Last year the Federal Reserve Board chose to raise the discount rate as a means of curbing inflation. Inflation has not been curbed, and the areas that were supposedly to be affected by the raise in interest rates have continued to expand beyond even original expectations.

However, one area of our economy has been seriously affected by the rise in rates. The homebuilding industry suddenly found available money diverted to other areas. The mortgage market suddenly tightened. While FHA- and VA-financed mortgage interest rates remained unreal the discount rates for these mortgages climbed to six points in some areas.

The Federal Home Loan Bank has estimated that demands for new mortgage capital in 1966 will cause a 5- to 10-percent shortage in mortgage money. There has been a rise of one-half of 1 percent on interest rates for construction loans, while the limit a builder can draw money as a percentage of the value of his development has declined. Interest rates for construction loans are as high as 6½ percent in numerous instances. The scarcity and expense of money for homebuilding and buying has resulted in extremely bleak prospects for the construction and real estate industries.

With this background let me now address my remarks to the particular problem with which the legislation I am introducing today will deal. With banks raising their short-term interest rates we find the private sector of the mortgage market unsettled. As a result money moves away from those institutions that could offer and absorb the long-range interest charges. The private sector being unsettled and funds, ordinarily available, drying up, those who ordinarily have other resources have turned to FNMA to purchase their mortgages. This hopefully was to be a temporary solution, but as funds from FNMA became more and more constricted money from the private sector has become even more frozen.

The great increase in demand for FNMA mortgage purchases placed a serious strain on its resources. FNMA's purchases in the last quarter of 1965 represented the largest increase in purchases during any quarter since the corporation began operating in 1954. Purchases during this final quarter of 1965 reached a record high of $405 million while sales declined to a mere $221,000. This compares to the final quarter of 1964 when purchases amounted to $73 million while sales amounted to $12 million. Purchases for the last quarter of 1965 have increased some fivefold over the comparable period for 1964, and the first quarter of 1966 continued the trend of high purchases.

To meet the rising demand resulting from other sources drying up, FNMA made several adjustments reflecting the changing conditions in the money market during the last quarter of 1965 and first quarter of 1966. The availability of FNMA purchases allowed by these adjustments partially absorbed some of the negative elements created by tight money policies in other areas, and allowed, for a time, a somewhat adequate flow of mortgage money to the homebuilding industry.

On April 1 the final blow fell. The demand created by tight money all around placed such a strain on the present capacity of FNMA's secondary market operations that the corporation on April 1 placed a $15,000 limitation on the unpaid principal balance of a mortgage offered for purchase for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage. Until this action FNMA purchases per week were between $50–$70 million. Since the action purchases have been reduced to around $37 million per week. The question now obviously asked is does this really remove FNMA as a vital part of the mortgage purchasing market? Anyone familiar with the realities of the current home market must answer with a categorical yes.

Limiting purchases to $15,000 has virtually removed FNMA from any significant or important role in the area of mortgage investments. For example, in my own home State of California, recent estimates indicate that approximately 90 percent of new residential mortgages are in excess of $15,000. The average FHA-VA mortgage is approximately $20,000; $5,000 more than the FNMA maximum. Certainly the situation all across the country indicates the day of the $15,000 mortgage for the average family purchasing a home is gone.

It is not difficult to understand why the strain on FNMA produced such a ruling. My opening remarks, and the remarks three of my colleagues and I made on March 31, during a special order, clearly outline the conditions that have led to the problem the legislation I am introducing addresses itself to.

In a letter I received just today from J. S. Baughman, the distinguished president of the association, it is pointed out that FNMA purchases of mortgages under its secondary market operations are intended to provide a degree of liquidity for mortgage improvements. The corporation's resources, however, are not without limit and the outlet it furnishes for FHA and VA mortgages can necessarily represent only a small share of the total market for such mortgages. As a consequence of the changes which have occurred in the financial and mortgage markets during the last several months, offerings of mortgages to the association for purchase have been unprecedently heavy and its purchasing activity has been, and is, such as to require some appreciable curtailment of purchasing volume if the corporation is to continue providing a market for some portion of the FHA and VA mortgages that are being originated.

As I pointed out earlier Mr. Speaker, this decision limiting purchases to $15,000 has been detrimental and has removed FNMA from providing the real assistance Congress has intended when it created the corporation in 1954.

These very real conditions have prompted my proposal. FNMA, in light of present circumstances, must be allowed to once again assume a significant and dynamic role on the mortgage market. The bill I am introducing today will accomplish that.

The legislation amends title III of the National Housing Act in order to allow the Federal National Mortgage Association to increase capital and expand its secondary market operations. The bill would essentially permit FNMA to raise up to 15 times the sum of its Treasury stock for use in secondary market purchases. Currently FNMA can only borrow 10 times the sum of stock held by the Treasury.

The legislation would also raise the ceiling on the amount of FNMA stock the Treasury could hold. Presently the ceiling stands at $2,250 million. My bill would raise the ceiling approximately one-fifth, or to a dollar figure of $2,700 million.

This proposal provides FNMA with the necessary resources needed to make the corporation the dynamic institution Congress originally intended, and was before circumstances forced the April 1 decision.

All concerned admit that FNMA's present resources will not allow the corporation to function with the needed flexibility and dynamism so necessary to a healthy economy, and a productive institution. If we allow FNMA to be removed from the picture the last really significant source of mortgage money will have been curtailed.

Is this proposal inflationary? Certainly not. Not when you consider the anomaly of money pushing or depressing the market of the homebuilding industry. While the proposal expands the ability of the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase mortgages through its secondary market operations it affects an area of our economy facing serious depression. Our fiscal and monetary policies must, by necessity, be adequately flexible to deal with the real problems of all segments of our economy. If certain segments of our economy show signs of serious softening, depression, and lag, we must be able to be in a position to remedy the situation with measures that will provide the necessary stimulation. If a segment of our economy poses overexpansion and inflation we must be prepared to take the appropriate braking action.

Across-the-board policies, whether stimulant or depressive, can be dangerous and may result in severe consequences to particular segments of our economy. We need to learn the lesson of selectivity so that conditions now faced by our homebuilding industry do not result from future actions.

My proposal is just such a selective measure. It offers some relief and the possibility of stimulation to a vital segment of our economy that is suffering serious restriction.

FNMA's April 1 decision, although arrived at as a result of circumstances produced by other decisions, also serves as a depressant to an element of our economy that can ill afford additional setbacks.

I ask all my other colleagues to join with me in approaching, on a carefully conceived selective basis, the problems and conditions now being faced by the homebuilding and real estate industries. Let us not lose sight of the whole problem currently facing our economy, but let us not forget in our zeal for concern of the general we may seriously hurt the particular.

We must also recognize that my proposal today is not the entire answer to the problems facing the homebuilding industry. We have the obligation of examining the causes that produced the April 1 decision of FNMA. For while the legislation being introduced today is designed to make FNMA more flexible in its secondary market operations by making conditions available that will allow the corporation to rescind the $15,000 limitation, this is but one segment of the entire problem.

I am hopeful Congress will carefully review and consider all aspects of this particular problem, and give expeditious and favorable consideration to the proposal I am presenting today.

THE FARM LABOR SHORTAGE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, there are many signs which point to the development of a crisis situation in the field of agricultural manpower. Young people are leaving the farms for more attractive opportunities elsewhere; the age of the average farmer in the United States is 58. We already see the very beginning of the long-range effects such a shortage will have on farm production and food prices. Dairy production, for example, is down 7 percent below last year. Leather and beef production is down.

As our population grows, and our food commitments to other countries of the world increase, the pressures on the United States to increase food production will grow accordingly. Yet, it is apparent that the manpower reserve for growing and harvesting our crops is diminishing. The migrant stream is being dried up as industry continues to attract and absorb available manpower. In my own district the New York State, for example, it has become increasingly difficult to obtain workers to harvest the fruit crops. Even those who do come north as migrants quickly leave the farms as they find opportunities in industry. This same situation is repeated elsewhere throughout the country.

As I was told by a top official in the Department of Agriculture:

> The era of food surplus in this country is history now. The times of mammoth carryovers from one year to the next are gone.

The fact is that while we presently have 50 million acres in production reserve, we do not have the manpower to farm this land should it become necessary. As we know, farm population has been decreasing regularly and there are no signs of an upturn.

For these reasons I am today submitting a resolution requesting that the House of Representatives establish a select committee to investigate and study the domestic farm labor shortage and its effects on food prices.

At the present time the farm labor situation is merely a problem. I think it is essential that a thorough study be undertaken now, before the problem grows into a crisis. Delay will be costly. It is my hope that the urgency of this situation will be recognized by the House so that we can act immediately to prevent the labor shortage from interfering with this year's harvest.

TRAGEDY AND WASTE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, award-winning reporter Ben Bagdikian has written an article for the Saturday Evening Post, which graphically describes the tragedy and waste of unemployment.

As the author points out, today unemployment is not the massive idleness of a depression or recession. Nor is it a small or transient problem, particularly in the shattering effect it has on the human beings involved.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include this outstanding and sympathetic article.

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

"I'm Out of a Job, I'm All Through"

(Ben H. Bagdikian)

Mocked by the unparalleled prosperity of their fellow citizens, some 3 million people go without jobs. The Government speaks of improvement, but a dangerous number of Americans cannot keep up with our onrushing technology.

When Albert MacGinn left his house that morning in March of 1963, he had no way of knowing that by nightfall his private world would lie in ruins.

An erect and pink-cheeked man with steel-rimmed glasses, Al MacGinn was the living model of American prosperity, a skilled worker in a nation whose farms and factories were producing at fabulous rates and employing more people than ever before. After 24 years in a growing industry in St. Paul, Minn., he was getting the top wage of $3.55 an hour. When he left for work it was from his own single-family stucco house with a new roof and a modernized kitchen. He drove to work and returned in his own automobile. Al MacGinn had played it by the rule book. He worked hard and he did well. So when he returned home in the gathering dusk of that March evening, his fate seemed so improbable that he found it hard to tell his wife the truth.

"Kathy, I'm out of a job. I'm all through."

She stood motionless for a long moment, then said quietly, "Al we'll get by. You'll be at work again next week."

At supper he announced the news to their five children. They fell into stunned silence. The oldest son, the one planning to start college the next year, said, "Dad, you're the best in the business. The other plants will be calling you up." Everyone agreed. Spirits rose, and the meal ended with something like gaiety.

They all were wrong. Al MacGinn has never again worked at his trade. After bitter months of unemployment he finally got the job he still has today—scrubbing toilets on the night shift of a nearby factory.

But Al MacGinn was luckier than many. According to Government surveys, 3 million Americans can find no work, though they look for it, and more than 2 million who want full-time work can get only part time. Even these official statistics are rosier than reality. They do not tell of skilled men in mid-career who can get only menial jobs. Nor do they show the more than 1 million "hidden unemployed" who are uncounted because they have finally given up looking for work. These and others are ignored in the surveys.

For all these millions and their families the richness of the American economy is worse than meaningless. It only not leaves them without work but surrounds them with the sight and sound of prosperity, increasing their isolation and despair. In a depression, unemployment is at least normal." In boom times, it makes the jobless man an outcast among his neighbors. While almost everyone around him is succeeding, he is failing, often for reasons that are a mystery to him.

Only a person who has experienced the stunning blow of the old job suddenly destroyed can appreciate its force. It is a shock so profound that it damages the victim's will to recover. Sometimes the human destruction is apparent and measurable. Within a few years after the 1954 closing of the Hudson Motor Co., 15 auto workers committed suicide and the marriages of more than 300 workers broke up. Last year, when the Government announced that the Brooklyn Navy Yard would close in June 1966, on-the-job injuries increased 50 percent, off-the-job accidents went up, and the death rate rose.

Most of the suffering, however, is private and unrecorded. Recently this reporter talked with perhaps 150 men who have lost their jobs, and their reactions dramatize their experience.

A 59-year-old millwright: "I was sick 2 or 3 weeks. Couldn't eat, couldn't sleep. In 40 years I had only 7 days lost time, but they announce over the PA, 'That's all.' "

A 45-year-old auto worker: "The day they announced the closing, the guy next to me, he just went blank. He'd worked there 30, 35 years. His wife was an invalid with arthritis, and he had a son and a daughter still in college. He just stood there like someone hit him with a hammer. I practically had to lead him out to the car."

A 49-year-old auto worker: "I saw men cry I'd never seen shed a tear. Grown men standing there with tears coming down their cheeks. Remember, these are tough bastards who'd been through the depression and the war, some of them two wars."

These reactions conflict with the stereotype of the American workingman as a lazy and cynical rate jockey. They also reflect the shock of the suddenly jobless man as he discovers how quickly an interruption in wages can destroy normal family life in the city. Especially for the older worker they suggest that the death of a job disrupts a deep rhythm in life and implies the death of the man.

The unemployment of 1965 is not the massive idleness of the great depression, of course, or even of the recessions of the 1950's. But neither is it a small or a transient problem. It is a faulty part in the economic machine, a malfunctioning gear in danger of mangling itself and crippling the rest of the engine. Already the harsh sounds of this flawed machine have been heard: gunfire from bitter coal miners in Kentucky, the roar of flames during the Watts rebellion in Los Angeles, the shouts of rioters in Harlem and Rochester, N.Y., and Springfield, Mass.

Despite periodic panics and depressions during the last 100 years, the country has never produced a durable solution for unemployment. In the great depression, joblessness reached at least 25 percent. By the end of the 1930's it was still an intolerable 15 percent. (Economists consider 3 percent "tolerable" because at any given moment about 3 percent of the work force is temporarily out of work—men changing jobs, for example, or young people not yet hired for the first time.)

Pearl Harbor brought the grisly full employment of war, when part of the population works at destruction and the remainder supplies the destroyers. The postwar demand for scarce goods kept men busy, but by 1949 the unemployment rate was up to 5.9 percent. The Korean war made jobs, but after that the rate went back to 5 percent.

This year's rate promises to be about 4.5 percent, an improvement due in part to the economic expansion for the war in Vietnam. But much of the change occurred because many of the jobless were soaked up by activities like the antipoverty program and were counted as employed. Yet most of these people must emerge from the special programs to look for work. If they were now counted as unemployed, the total count of jobless would be over 3 million.

Through all the subtleties of statistics it is clear that the normal labor market does not provide a job for every American who needs one.

It is impossible to understand the impact of unemployment by dwelling on the national average of 4.5, or 5, or 7 percent. The idle are not distributed evenly through the Nation but concentrated in bitter masses: among all Negroes, 10 percent; among all the young, 16 percent; among young Negroes, 26 percent. While most of the population enjoys employment and prosperity, there are masses of Americans who, for all intents and purposes, still live in the depths of the depression.

The irony is that those who prosper can thank science, and so can the unemployed. The application of the scientific method to the growing of food and making of goods has produced enormous wealth that has rapidly raised the standard of living. More goods at cheaper prices are available to a larger proportion of the population than ever before in history.

But the same scientific method has denied this standard of living to a portion of the population. It permits new machines to produce goods with fewer human beings at the same time that it has vastly increased the human lifespan. Since 1900 our total population increased 2½ times, and the new standard of living has added an average of 20 years to the lifespan of each of these new Americans. But the new machines don't need all the new Americans.

The most awesome instrument of change for the workingman in our time is the computer that runs an automatic machine. Two years ago, for example, an electronics company bought two computerized devices that automatically wired circuits for radios. The company was able to reduce the circuit-wiring work force from 17 men to 3. Today the company has doubled its production with the same 2 machines, which now do the work formerly done by 35 men. But it still requires only three human beings.

The rise of automation has been so swift that no one knows how many more human jobs it will eliminate. In 1954 there were fewer than 400 computers in use. Today there are more than 25,000, and most of their owners can't find enough work for them to do. So it is impossible to predict how much of the Nation's work could be done by present computers, not to mention the 8,000 computers on order. And there are still other kinds of laborsaving changes. With machinery 1 man can lay down weed-killing chemicals that will do the work that it would take 360 human weeders to do. It is irrational to expect such change to slacken.

The new methods have also changed the occupations of men, changed them so fast that unemployment exists partly because men's experience and schooling, even though it may be better than that of their fathers, is not good enough to keep up with the revolution in technology. The latest edition of the "Dictionary of Occupations" lists 23,000 different jobs in the United States; 6,000 of them did not even exist 10 years ago.

The drift in modern human labor is away from the simple workman to the man who thinks and adapts. Aristotle once said that the educated are as different from the uneducated "as the living are from the dead." A modern Aristotelian who happened to be a Chicago slum kid put it to me, "Man, you got no education, you're dead." In 1950 if a person had gone no further than fourth grade, the odds of his being unemployed were 1 in 12. Today they are 1 in 6.

Let no white-collar worker think he is immune. Already typists, filing clerks, bookkeepers, and even management men who evaluate inventory and place orders are being replaced by computerized machines. In 1960 the Harvard Business Review said that "for every five office jobs eliminated, only one is created by automation."

Yet optimists continue to comfort themselves that the new machines ultimately will make enough jobs for all. They point reassuringly to earlier work changes seemingly as drastic as modern ones—to the introduction of knitting machines into textile manufacturing, for example, during the industrial revolution; ultimately, they say, those new machines expanded employment. They overlook two things. First, the early changes brought massive suffering, with riots and revolutions and wars. Second, these changes came to societies still largely wedded to the land, and the land guaranteed many of the unemployed a source of food and a place to live.

Today the average worker is a city dweller who has many fixed expenses. Even if it were true that machines eventually produce enough jobs—and it has not been true for a long time—his family needs food, shelter, medicine, and a place in the working world not ultimately but now.

Fifty years ago, when the automobile put the blacksmith out of business, the blacksmith left his trade by ones and twos and threes in otherwise healthy towns. Today it is 79,000 jobs lost on the East Side of Detroit in 10 years, or 12,000 lost in San Diego in 2 years, or 7,000 lost in South Bend in 1 year. When this happens, it leaves masses of men jammed explosively together in misery, and it cripples their community.

Industry is organized in gigantic units, partly because such super-units can best afford maximum automation. The giant corporation is not like the local industry a century ago, limited to just one town. Corporations today span the entire country, whole continents, the globe; they move factories thousands of miles, quickly abolish old products and invent new ones and change their work force in multiples of thousands of men.

The new machines affect the life of the community in a new way. In 1913 the equivalent of automation was Henry Ford's assembly line, and in 10 years Ford increased production of his cars from 203,000 to 2 million. This vast jump was possible because, when he started, only 1 American in 100 owned a car, and despite the new efficiency the market rose so much that he increased his work force from 14,000 to 128,000. But in 1950, when Detroit started automating, 1 American in 4 already had a car. Detroit was not able to increase production 1,000 percent, as Henry Ford had, but only 12 percent. The chief effect of its automation was to increase profits and reduce employment 6 percent.

The giant units, the swiftness of change, the packing of people in cities—this all means that the whole system is sensitive to shock as never before. A cutback in automobile production shakes the entire economy and may determine whether Mrs. Albert MacGinn in St. Paul will buy a new refrigerator, how much interest she will pay on a loan, or if her husband will find a job.

It was only indirectly that a machine took away Al MacGinn's job. But it was a machine that kept him from staying in his trade.

Al MacGinn is a sort of Midwest workingman's Horatio Alger. As a youth he worked on his father's farm until one night a new neighbor's horses ran loose, and Al volunteered to round them up. The new neighbor got him a job in St. Paul, and Al worked all through the depression, got married to Kathy in 1938, was laid off 3 months later, but scrounged part-time jobs all over town until he found his present trade. Then he joined the ranks of solid citizens.

After the war, for example, he bought his house and insisted on a short, 7-year mortgage. He was an ideal householder and consumer. First, he paid for the house. Second, he remodeled the basement. Third, he put in a new furnace with baseboard heating. Fourth, he modernized the kitchen. Fifth, he put on a new roof. Since the youngsters would work part-time to help pay for their clothes and tuition in the State university, he expected to be able to make future improvements—new storm windows, insulation, and, in the spring of 1963, a new car. He was a good man to have in the St. Paul economy.

Though he looks and talks like a schoolteacher, Al MacGinn is an expert in the bloody trade of slaughtering cows. He was, in effect, chief surgeon on the cutting-room floor of a packinghouse, a "floorsman." His job was to cut away the hide from 75 carcasses a day, working ambidextrously to avoid nicks in the valuable hide or bruises on the even more valuable beef. His job seemed invulnerable. It takes about 5 years to learn the floorsman's trade, the highest skill and highest pay in a packinghouse. And Al belonged to a union in an industry that is 90 percent unionized.

He remembers the day all this was swept away. "I was skinning out a cow, and someone came out on the floor and said, 'The company's closing up. After today it's all over.' I felt like lying down right next to that cow."

The company for which he had worked 20 years had run aground for several reasons. One was tax trouble. But the main one was that the small, independent packinghouses were having a difficult time keeping up with the big ones that had automatic machinery.

The day after his plant closed, Al went to the big packinghouses in the St. Paul area. He found they either were hiring laid-off workers from plants they had closed elsewhere, or else were stepping up their automation and reducing their own work forces. He also discovered something else. Big packinghouses don't need floorsmen any more. A machine does most of what Al used to do. The operator of the machine can learn the job in weeks and gets 54 cents an hour less than the floorsman he replaces. And he processes twice as many cows a day.

Al MacGinn was desperate. "I tried to sign up at the State employment office for on-the-job training for anything—cook. welder, they had them all posted. They said I was too old. I said, 'Hell, you're making a mistake. I'm only 52.' You know what they said? 'That's too old.'

"I went back to the packinghouse where I worked during the depression washing sheep. I was ready to wash sheep again. The girl said, 'I'm sorry, we can't accept anyone over 40.' I didn't say anything. I just put my tail between my legs and walked out."

Like Al MacGinn, many an older worker is finding out that once off a payroll he is fighting the odds. Thousands of Americans, for example, will recognize this recent conversation between a worker with 32 years of experience and a clerk in a personnel office:

WORKER. Any chance of getting a job? Any job?

GIRL. What's your age?

WORKER. Fifty-seven.

GIRL. I'm sorry, you're too old.

WORKER. Well, what am I supposed to do, lay down and die?

GIRL. I'm sorry.

"After 20 years on the same job," says an unemployed machine operator, "I thought they'd look at my record, but they'd say right away, 'Too old.' I'd lie about my age. I'm 52, but I'd say I was 48, but that didn't make any difference. Do you know, for Chris' sake, when you're 45 years old, you're too old?"

These men are not too old to do their work. They are just too old to get a job.

The American male at age 50 can expect to live 23 more years, but if he loses his job, he may never get steady work again. A year after one large plant closed, the unemployment rate for men over 50 was 2½ times the rate for men 40 to 49.

One reason for this is that at the employment office the older man out of work finds himself competing with younger men. The younger men are better educated. Half of American fathers finished 9th grade, half their sons 12th. Companies seldom fire an older man for lack of education, but once the employer has a choice, he takes the younger, better educated, more adaptable man.

Employers plan for change, even if our employment mechanisms do not. Thirty years ago it was assumed that whatever a factory was making at the moment, it would be making 10 years later, and in the same town. This is no longer a safe assumption. Products, processes, job skills, and locations change Robert F. Mello of the U.S. Civil Service Commission says that 6-year-old Americans now starting school can expect that their vocations—not their employers but their occupations—will change three times in their lifetime. Knowing this, the employer looks for the younger man adept at the reading-writing-math skills that will help him convert his tasks in the future.

The older worker out of a job finds himself in a cruel trap. He has often worked for years building up pension and insurance benefits that he loses when his plant closes. When he applies at a new plant, the boss knows that the older worker's pension and insurance will cost the company more. A common type of pension plan costs the employer $76 a year for a 27-year-old man and $497 a year for a newly hired 57-year-old man. A typical life insurance policy costs $1.32 a month for the worker under 45, and $9.65 for one 55.

The age trap is worse in this generation because there are so many young. In the 1960's the labor force between 45 and 64 will increase 21 percent, while those at the youngest end, 14 to 24, will rise 45 percent. The older man has to compete not only with his own contemporaries but with a surplus of younger men.

Al MacGinn didn't know the statistics, but he discovered the reality. As time passed without a job, he understood starkly what few working families think of: In our time the typical household has become a complicated economic unit with fixed costs (car, utilities, household appliances, high rent, education, modern health care) that do not diminish much when income disappears. Since 1935, average household investment in home equipment has risen 2½ times; in transportation 3½ times; in medical care 3 times. Most of this investment requires borrowing. In 1935 average household mortgage-and-installment debt was $875; today is it $5,000.

Thus when the average man loses his job, or takes drastically reduced pay, he is faced with a catastrophe in his household that will drop him out of his community and maybe even out of working society. It is typical for the family man who has lost his job to switch from roasts to hamburg, to cut out movies, bowling, and beer. But the biggest burden remains.

Al MacGinn took the night job cleaning toilets and left the ranks of the unemployed. He settled for less. A Californian named Herb Minton didn't. Herb Minton isn't "unemployed," but neither is he working. He is one of the Nation's million "hidden unemployed."

Minton is 38 years old, has a wife, a 14-year-old daughter and a 10-year-old son, lives in a $22,000 home with three bedrooms and worked for 11 years in a plant near Los-Angeles. A graduate engineer, he was laid off almost a year ago when a defense contract ended.

He has a problem. His wife's mother is an invalid who needs his wife's almost daily attention. The mother's life is rooted in Los Angeles, and she dreads moving, so the Mintons feel they must stay where they are. He also wants to keep his trade as an airframe engineer. In the months immediately after he was laid off, he wrote about 200 letters of application, registered in specialized agencies and asked his college placement bureau to keep an eye out for his kind of airframe-engineering job in the Los Angeles area. He visited countless plants and offices.

About a month ago he gave up trying. His savings are almost gone. He long ago gave up his first car and is about to give up his second car, which in Los Angels is tantamount to unconditional surrender. He could get a job as an automobile salesman or restaurant counterman, but he knows that if he did, the odds are against his returning to his old profession.

Because of the way the Government makes its employment surveys, Herb Minton is not listed as unemployed. The national statistics on the jobless come from a monthly questioning of 35,000 households in 701 counties. The 550 interviewers for the Bureau of the Census are under strict orders to stick to the precise wording of their questionnaire. For every person over 14 who is not in school or disabled, there are two crucial questions:

1. "Did you do any work at all this week, not counting work around the house?"

If the answer is, "No," the next question is:

2. "Were you looking for work?"

If the answer is "Yes," the person is counted as unemployed in the statistics. If by "looking" he thinks the questionnaire meant physically active in a search, or if he gave up looking during the week, then he answers "No," and he is not counted.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers thinks there are "a million or more" who, like Herb Minton, are out of work and wish to work but who don't get into the statistics. Some think there are 1,500,000. If there are 1,250,000, the true unemployment figure in 1965 was over 5.5 percent. It may be that one of every five people out of work today is not only jobless but, in the ultimate banishment in a computerized society, uncounted. Herb Minton, it must be recognized, could get an engineering job, if he were willing to move, and if he would change his specialty. But he wishes to stay where he is and do what he was trained to do; he can put off trouble, for a while.

So can Michael Mosterelli, an 18-year-old resident of Boston's North End. Mike is a dropout. "My teacher called me a stupid wop," he says. "So I punched him." Mike left vocational school just short of his graduation and without his auto-mechanic's certificate, and now he is out of work, a member of the large demiworld of young unemployed from blue-collar families. Mike's father, an elevator operator, brings home $40 a week; his sister brings the same from her job in a garment shop; an older brother contributes $60 a week from his factory job. The total family income is enough to allow Mike some spending money while he thrashes about indecisively, taking infrequent odd jobs. Yet the time will come when Mike will have to work steadily. By then he will be at a bad age for schooling. He may be doomed as are older men at this moment, to spend his life on the fringes of poverty and unemployment because he has neither the drive nor the knowledge to move in the world of modern jobs.

But Mike's chances are splendid compared to those of Wilfred Jones, for Mike is white and Wilfred is a Negro.

A 15-year-old child of the Chicago slums, Wilfred is banned from school for hitting a teacher. In his tenement, rats run across his bed. For years he watched them and occasionally saw one caught in a trap, but he noticed that even then the rats either chewed off their own legs or else ran off, trap and all. Finally he designed a trap that electrocutes the rodent. "Only thing is, you got to make sure none of the kids touch old dead rat until I takes the fuse out of the box because, man, that rat is hot." Wilfred can build an electric rat trap, but he cannot get a job.

More than a million young Americans of working age live in and around the slums, and while not all of them are unemployed, they are further from constructive work than any other single group. For the formula of unemployment is simple: Come from a poor family; grow up in a nonreading household; attend school less than 12 years; while in school get an inferior education; have a dark skin. Some people escape one or two of these elements, few the whole formula.

The odds against young slum dwellers have declined slightly as racial discrimination has softened and education improved. But the decline isn't fast enough to reach the present generation. Only 13 years ago the median schooling of employed Americans was 10.9 grades and of the unemployed, 10.1—a small difference. In 1964 the employed had 12.2 years, the unemployed 10.9. Schooling that in 1952 was good enough to keep a person employed is now a characteristic of the jobless.

Perhaps the most appalling difficulty of these poorly educated and hopeless youths is that they are jammed together by the tens of thousands in ghettos. They spend their formative years untouched by a civilization where men work at jobs that improve with years, where families provide a stable and encouraging base for growth, and where hard work is rewarded.

Wilfred Jones meets all the requirements of the formula for failure. But the formula applies almost as harshly to Mary Jane Spaulding, a trim, attractive Bostonian Negro who does well in school (A's in algebra and shorthand, B's in English, French and history), and uses "who" and "whom" with unselfconscious correctness. Mary Jane wants to go to junior college after she finishes high school and needs summer work to do it. But she faces one obstacle that Wilfred Jones will never have to worry about. She is a girl.

One day this summer she made the rounds of Boston department stores. It was her 10th job-hunting expedition. (She had also applied at five 5-and-10's, four factories, two greeting-card stores and two employment agencies.) She wore a subdued, well-fitting cotton print dress, the brown loafers of the teenage girl, and her hair in simple flowing style. She carried written recommendations from her school principal, her pastor and a friend of her family, an insurance man.

But Mary Jane, intelligence, smile and all, got no job. She was fighting the most brutal statistics in the almanac of contemporary unemployment, "The 1965 Manpower Report to the President."

Mary Jane, first of all, is a female. Among all females the jobless rate is 6.2 percent, compared to 4.7 percent for all men.

She is 16 years old, and 16- and 17-year-olds have the highest unemployment for any age group—17.1 percent for boys and 18.8 percent for girls.

And she is Negro. All Negroes have an unemployment rate of 9.8 percent, compared to 4.6 percent for all whites. Negro females have an unemployment rate of 10.8 percent (5.5 percent for white females).

And Negro females aged 16 and 17 have the very highest rate of unemployment—36.5 percent. White females of the same age have 17.1 percent.

There is an antipoverty program in Boston for youths from households where the breadwinner makes $4,000 or less. Mary Jane isn't eligible because her father makes $4,420.

White girls from her class at school have applied to some of the same stores she did. The white girls were hired.

When she talks about that, the shy, teenage smile disappears and the liveliness of the eyes hardens. "I thought I wanted to go to college once. Then I thought I'd go to junior college. Now I'm not so sure about that either."

What happened to the beginners' jobs that Wilfred Jones and Mary Jane Spaulding need? The story of corporation Z provides part of the answer. Corporation Z is a mythical company, but its story is based on real circumstances.

The firm manufactures 20,000 items with 1,000 production workers. Then it buys an automated system that can produce 50,000 items with only 400 workers. Corporation Z prefers not to fire the unneeded workers because it would be cruel, it would disrupt community relations and plant morale, and besides it will take time to install the system, and the union might strike.

Normally 25 workers a month die or retire or quit. Normally the company hires 25 men a month to replace them, an important source of employment in Zeetown. Corporation Z quietly stops hiring and installs the new system gradually, unit by unit, over a period of 2 years. At the end of the 2 years the factory is automated and there are only 400 men on the payroll instead of 1,000.

Nobody has been fired. And nobody has been hired.

The next year orders rise to 30,000 items, partly because corporation Z is able to cut its price slightly. An increase in orders has always been an occasion for celebration in Zeetown because more orders meant more men working, more charge accounts at the department store, more gas sold at service stations, more cars sold by auto dealers. But though its orders increased by 50 percent, corporation Z did not hire more workers. It simply turned up the dial on its automatic machine.

This transistorized-computerized fable has something to do with the 1,600,000 men and women under the age of 24 who have no jobs. For not only did corporation Z not employ skilled workers or apprentices to make its products. Faced with a decrease in customers as the number of corporation Z employees decreased, the Zeetown department store hired fewer salesgirls and shipping clerks; the gas station hired no new pump attendants; the auto dealer hired no auto polishers; and so on. The Mike Mosterellis and Wilfred Joneses and Mary Jane Spauldings of Zeetown were out of luck.

Further insight into why they were not hired comes from a look at why Elmer McNeal was.

McNeal, a chunky 29-year-old fellow with hazel eyes, is seen during the day dressed in the chinos, denim jacket, and plastic yellow helmet that mark him as an industrial worker. He operates industrial stills at the Dow Chemical Co. in Midland, Mich., where even applicants for the job of janitor must have a high school diploma and take a battery of intelligence, aptitude, and personality tests. Last year 5,000 took the tests and fewer than 500 were hired.

The company's psychology department (three Ph. D.'s and two B.S.'s) first interview the applicant. Not long ago this was all. But not now. If he looks good, then he is given an arithmetic test ("One-eighth is what part of five-sixths?"); an aptitude test; a personal vocational-interest test; a 12-minute I.Q. test; and the Minnesota Multiple Personality Inventory, which takes 1½ hours and asks 556 questions ("I like to attend social gatherings, Yes or No"; and "I have black, tarry bowel movements, Yes or No").

Why did Elmer McNeal, an applicant for the lowest-paid, lowest-status production job in the plant, have to be so deeply probed? "We need communications skill and responsibility," a company tester says. "Ninety percent of our production workers have to communicate by written messages."

Then why worry about personality?

"We want a guy who is energetic, who wants to get ahead, who has a need for status, who protects his interests and yet shows consideration for others. We like a man who has enough dominance to take responsibility but not so dominant that he will get in conflict with others. We have 6,300 people in 2,500 different jobs here, and our technology is changing all the time. We're looking for the man with the personality and the aptitude for change."

Elmer McNeal passed the tests and was assigned to the company's phenol plant. It covers 2½ city blocks, but one can walk for minutes without seeing a human being. Eight production workers on each shift operate the largest phenol plant in the world. As a packer in the shipping department, Elmer was handed teletype messages like this:

"70–450 lb dr phenol 85 pct soln must meet specs 14–P–1 orig & one copy B/L show code 606320 on drs do not load over 450 pounds net weight."

Elmer was expected to select the proper size and type of drum, look up the coded specifications, and mix an 85-percent solution of phenol using 15 parts of water or inhibitor, depending on the specifications. This is not so difficult. But it is unlikely that 30 years ago this would have been required of the bottom-grade worker in any large industrial plant.

McNeal's present job is not so much physical as nervous. He puts it: "You watch instruments, you detect trouble. You can't guess. You have to know what's going on, so when you start shuting down valves, you know what's going to happen on both sides."

The case of Elmer McNeal illuminates the transformation of the modern workingman. It also illustrates who gets many of the remaining menial jobs, for all the plant's summer boys—temporary employees who do odd jobs like cleaning up and painting—are children of employees, and all of them are college students. The clean-and-sweep job that used to be the traditional entry into production work is now a dead-end occupation captured by the aristrocracy.

Dow is a petrochemical firm, peculiarly suited to automation. But even in the assembly line of Detroit there has been a change. In the 1930's a worker put one part on one car, identical car after endless identical car. "You could be stupid as long as you had rhythm," a union man said. Today the automobile-assembly line still requires rhythm and speed. A delay of ⅒th of a second in a given operation can cause serious trouble. But something new has been added. The automobile buyer can now choose 90 variations in engine, body styles, transmission, and accessories—not even counting variations in body color and upholstery. For the worker on the assembly line there is not just an unending push-tighten-push-tighten. He has to read the order ticket on each vehicle, pick the specified part of several at his position, and then push-tighten. The task does not require a genius, but it is no place for a man who can't read or write or adjust to change.

As for many of those without Elmer McNeal's qualifications—those workseekers who are not high-school graduates with the "proper" personality and the optimum range of intelligence for modern employment—existence is increasingly grim: The life that John Gomes leads is a case in point.

Whether or not Gomes is "unemployed" would depend on the day the survey-taker happened to call on him. Gomes began a recent week at 7 o'clock on a damp and dreary Monday morning, stepping out of the doorway of a gray-shingled public-housing project in Fall River, Mass., to begin what he calls his daily "scouting." He walked down a hillside—he has no car—under yellowing maples until he saw four men in white overalls adjusting a scaffolding on a house. "Need a painter?" "Nah. We're all set, chief."

Around the corner he stopped at a grocery store with a soft-drink decal on the screen door. "You need some deliveries today?"

The owner looked through thick glasses and said, "Try me Friday, John. Stop in and see Harry down at the appliance place. He told me he needs some wiring done." Gomes went to the appliance store and Harry told him to come back Thursday.

Downtown in the State employment office he read the bulletin boards, then went to a man in shirtsleeves behind a desk. "You got the bridge job posted. They need welders."

"Yea, John," the man behind the desk said, "they want three."

You know they won't hire colored if they can help it."

"They said they needed three welders," the man said.

"Yeah, and I've been there 30 times when they posted jobs—painters, carpenters, welders. But I'm stubborn. Give me a card." At the bridge Gomes went to the construction shack where a man in a steel hat looked at his employment-office card and shook his head. "We already filled the jobs."

An hour later it was drizzling and Gomes was at a junkyard. The proprietor looked out through a dirty window at the rusted hulks.

"Jesus, John, it's a hell of a day. But if you want to, cut up that monster back of the shack so's two men can load the pieces onto the truck." Gomes worked with an acetylene torch for an hour and a half and left with $1.50.

On Tuesday he tried 10 places, one of them the appliance store, whose owner had him install three showers in a tenement, and paid him $8 in groceries. On Wednesday he delivered groceries for 10 hours and took home $10 worth of food. On Thursday he installed six electrical outlets for the appliance man and got $5. On Friday he was bartender at a café from 5 p.m. to 1 a.m. and took home $10. While he was tending bar, a customer told him that at the potato-chip factory where he worked two men had received draft notices. So on Saturday Gomes went to the potato-chip factory but found that no hiring was done on Saturdays, and besides the men weren't leaving for a while.

Gomes is 46, a tough, wiry and resilient man. He once earned $220 a week, holding down two jobs, but he has seven children, and when his wife became ill he couldn't hold the two jobs and take care of the children too. He is, from a natural knack for work and the training he received during his Army service, an experienced arc welder, electrician, and plumber. But when his wife was sick, and during her periodic relapses, he applied for veterans' benefits that pay ex-servicemen something like welfare. Gomes is quite insistent that he will not go on regular welfare. "I'm ready to work, any time, anyplace," he says. "I just wish to hell it was steady."

Few would blame John Gomes if he gave up. Thousands have given up, or are on the verge of it. Russell Thompson, for example, a bright young man of 21, is now weighing the merits of decent work against those of another sort of career: "I'm trying to decide right now whether to go into pimping."

Living off the earnings of prostitutes is not a livelihood found in the Department of Labor's "Dictionary of Occupations." But that is because the "Dictionary of Occupations" applies to the world of respectability, and Russell Thompson lives in another world.

He bears a resemblance to Perry Como except that Thompson is Negro. He has the same deceptive air of relaxation and calm, the same neat and casual dress, the same slow talk in articulate language that takes ironic turns. Thompson knows the risks in a career of living off girl friends. But all his life the risks in being "square"—in doing what the prayer book says and doing what teacher says and trusting all the polite things people say—have been greater. He knows more than most young men his age. He was bright in school, so much so that his junior high school principal sent him out of the district to a slightly better high school. But it was only slightly better, still actually a slum school. He learned to drink, and at the age of 14 discovered sex, and was thrashed by his classmates because he answered questions in class.

He had the advantage of an aggressive mother who somehow held her fatherless family together. He had been in the Army and out of the country. He did well in the basic subjects that defeat many slum children. (Many enter first grade seldom having heard a complete English sentence except on television; without the model of adults reading and conversing; without the preschool experience that conveys such abstractions as "bigger" and "smaller" and "round" and "flat.") But like most slum children Thompson knew almost no one in his age group who succeeded in the conventional way. Those who go to college don't go from these neighborhoods. The real achievers—the ones who own the material goods and drive the cars and have the status seen in the televised versions of the outside world—are more often than not the men who, as Thompson put it, "live by their wits." This means a racket—policy numbers, dope, prostitution.

"There's something I learned when I was 16," he said. "You can hit awfully hard with your fists. Four or five of us would go up to a guy and take maybe $70 off him in a couple of minutes just by threatening to hit him. I was lucky. I never got caught. Two of my friends are doing life."

He quit school in the 10th grade. When he returned from the Army, he was turned down for a series of jobs because of his failure to finish school. He took a job unpacking things in a store, but it bored him. Besides, he was attractive to women. He says he could make a minimum of $200 a week if he decides to start pimping.

"Right now I've got three choices. I could apply for a job as a postal clerk on civil service. Or I can go back to the 11th grade. Or I can pimp. I know I ought to finish high school," he said, "but life is tricky. It's so easy to be tricked. You've got to have mother wit to survive, and I think I've got more confidence in my mother wit than I do in the 11th grade."

What will become of the John Gomeses and the Russell Thompsons, of the jobless who try and those who have given up, of those with skills and youth and those without? Optimists can find statistics to satisfy themselves. In the last 10 years, they point out, there was an increase of 10 million jobs in the United States. But there is something for the pessimists too. A dozen years ago there were 2 million unemployed. Today there are about 3 million.

Is the new technology sheer profit for men, as the 10 million new jobs imply, or is it an insidious trap, as suggested by the 3 million missing jobs? Both could be true, which may be why men have argued so fiercely about the theory of unemployment.

While men argue, shameful neglect continues in a country that prides itself on being practical. True, the Government has not been idle. It has stimulated the economy with tax cuts, without which matters would be worse. There is the U.S. Employment Service, but it is run by local rules and deals largely with jobs voluntarily posted and sought, representing a tiny fraction of both jobless men and job openings. There are programs for area development, like Appalachia, to stimulate depressed areas, but these will take years to bring large-scale results, and some doubt that even then the results will be substantial. The antipoverty program has absorbed a few hundred thousand in one capacity or another. The Manpower Training and Development Act has absorbed still others in apprenticeships and retraining. New educational programs attack one of the root causes of future unemployability. All of these together might eliminate unemployment—though serious men doubt that too. But they will, at best, take time, and they will, in any case, turn their beneficiaries back to the labor market better educated and better trained but still looking for jobs. Unless there is a steady and improved growth of new jobs, we could be producing the best educated idle citizens in the world.

Certain obvious measures might help. There is, for example, no running inventory of how many workers with what kinds of skills are in which places looking for work. So, naturally, there is no way of matching open jobs with men looking for those jobs. No national source tells us that there may be 40 steamfitters in Brooklyn looking for work, and 40 steamfitter jobs going begging in San Diego.

And there is yet to be developed a national and widespread procedure for moving jobless men to places where there are jobs. Some union-company agreements pay some moving expenses, but the process in the country at large is still rudimentary. The worker suddenly jobless in mid-career or later seldom finds it easy to move. He may have substantial pension and seniority benefits attached to the closed plant, if it ever reopens, which is why some men spend their lives waiting around closed mines and factories. Or he may have unemployment compensation that ends if he moves. Psychologically the shock of losing a job makes him all the more dependent on familiar surroundings and old friends. Plant closing usually means collapse of the real-estate market, and a man's home often represents his life's savings, cashed in at a fraction of its value if he sells during the slump.

Massive plant closings are part of the mobile corporate structure typical of U.S. industry, but this is the only industrial country that permits large-scale plant closings without early warning. In France the Ministry of Labor can declare insufficient warning an unfair labor practice and impose the penalty of added severance pay for the discharged workers. By contrast, in the United States in 1954, the 12,000 men at the Hudson Motor Car Co. were working innocently in the factory when wives called to say that the radio annnounced the plant was closing forever. Early warnings can be given in this country. International Harvester told the United Automobile Workers 3 years ahead of time that it would close a Chicago plant. The New York subway system gave 5 years' warning of automation in clerical, repair, and other operations, permitting reduction in 7,500 jobs by attrition rather than firing.

Nor is there any systematic way of coming to the rescue of the community struck by the catastrophe of a major layoff. There have been emergency aid projects, as at South Bend, Ind., after Studebaker closed and at the Navy Yard in Brooklyn, but in each case it was a special conglomeration of agencies pushed together after the fact. In England the moment early warning is given of a layoff, official British employment agencies move into the factory and begin the process of finding new jobs, weeks or months before the current jobs end.

Unemployment compensation is the chief instrument that sustains a man between a lost job and a new job, yet it covers only 40 percent of workers. To aggravate matters, some States end unemployment compensation if a man signs up to retrain for a new job. Some cities and counties will even stop welfare payments to such a man. Many of the Government retraining programs have formal requirements unsuited to older workers who, unlike their sons, are not experienced test-takers. In Fort Worth, Tex., the Government program rejected many jobless packinghouse workers for failure to pass formal entry tests, but most of these same men and women took company-sponsored retraining and succeeded.

The best retraining is done while the man is still on a payroll, not after he has experienced traumatic idleness. And the best relocations have been achieved when the worker at the closed plant has a trial period of a few weeks at the new place, after which he can change his mind and return to his former town without having lost whatever benefits he has there. Most stay at the new location, but many more make the move if it does not mean burning the bridge behind them. Retraining, for most men, has meant worse jobs at lower wages than before—better than idleness but at best a fragile solution. It needs as few impediments as possible.

Another problem, growing more severe, is the unemployed worker who faces a prejudice against his age. New pension and insurance plans are needed to remove the burden on employers who might hire him. There could be, for example, a national system of "portable pensions" that would follow the older worker to new jobs and protect him against forfeiting built-up benefits.

But the worst problem is with the young. those who never get hired because there are not enough new jobs at the bottom, or who are unemployable because of their education, habits and attitude, or who face prejudice against their color or religion. The social barriers are dropping, with the civil-rights law and the dissolving of ancient myths about race and nationality. But the attitudes instilled by the reality of past prejudice do not change with the law. There is a generation of Negro youth that grew up realistically assuming that there was no place for them in the outside world, and so no point in being schooled for the outside world. Perhaps the new changes will make it easier for babies born this year, but it will not be so easy for those already born.

For the young kept idle because machines don't need them, there are some minor solutions that many employers and unions have agreed on, at least in principle. The idea of sharing existing work has long been debated. If each worker had an extra week's vacation, the undone work would eliminate all unemployment, theoretically. The trouble is that with the workweek reduced only a few hours and with just time and a half for overtime, it still pays the boss to let the original worker get overtime, rather than hire a new man * * * but in each case it pays him a whole set of fringe benefits. At double time, however, this advantage for the employer disappears.

Even better seems the "industrial sabbatical," the granting of longer and longer vacations with pay as workers get older. The United Steelworkers, for example, has proposed that the experienced worker get 13 weeks of paid vacation every 5 years, a long stretch that would force the employer to hire more men. Instead of taking annual increases in hourly wages, men would take more time off, their vacations getting longer as they approached 65, softening the blow of retirement while making room for younger men.

But sharing existing work isn't enough. The population grows. And thanks to technology, each man each year produces more and thus reduces the need for human labor. The speed at which machines are taking over human work seems to be increasing. In the generation before World War II, the average annual increase in each man's production per working hour was 2 percent. In the 13 years after World War II it was 3 percent, or a 50-percent jump. In the last few years it has been 3.5 percent.

The arguments over how important this is and what to do about it have been ferocious. But at least most men now agree that high unemployment is bad. It was not always so. Not so long ago some men publicly proclaimed unemployment good because it kept wages down and the workingman on his toes. After a century that saw about 25 depressions and severe recessions, plus some revolutions, it was decided that unemployment is not a good thing. Then men debated whether one attacked unemployment by "planning," or whether there was some natural law that made everything come out all right if men would just be patient.

We are about to enter 1966, and that debate is almost over. Things neither came out all right, nor were men patient. The United States, including most of its commercial community, accepts the idea that the rational mind of man, including those of men in Government, may properly be applied to the task of finding useful work for the population.

Most recently the debate has been between two schools with long names and fierce emotions—the structuralists against the antistructuralists. The structuralists believe that men are unemployed because there is something wrong with the structure of society or with the unemployed men themselves. Schools don't turn out the right kind of citizen, the structuralists argue, workers don't get the right training, and national energy is applied to the wrong things. Most business groups and some radical reformers are structuralists, though for different reasons. The United States Chamber of Commerce is structuralist, but so is the unorthodox ad hoc committee on the triple revolution.

The antistructuralists believe that the economic machine is well designed but simply isn't running fast enough. Their answer is to arrange Government spending, taxes and private investment to increase use of industrial capacity, improve the public's purchasing power, and let the resulting activity soak up the unemployed. Most of the leading academic and Government economists are antistructuralists. The main unions, like the AFL–CIO, say, "A blessing on both your houses," calling for both structuralist and anti-structuralist programs.

Today it is safe to put structuralists and anti-structuralists in the same room and even on the same platform. In a peculiarly American way practical programs have blurred theory.

The antistructuralists can point to how big tax cuts reduced unemployment from 6.7 percent in 1961 to 4.5 percent today. But while the administration's top economists officially are antistructuralists, they are less insistent than they used to be, and the administration program is heavily structuralist. The antipoverty program, special manpower retraining, accelerated public works, area redevelopment, Appalachia and other rehabilitation programs are structuralist because they are designed to change the nature of the work force and rechannel national energy. The Government estimates that the 1964 average jobless rate was 5.2 percent and the rate for 1965 will be about 4.5 percent; but if it had not been for poverty and related programs (which took men and women out of the labor force and counted some of them as employed) and increased draft calls, there would have been no substantial change in unemployment.

Part of the structuralist argument had been that because the economic machine is out of joint, there would be shortages of labor in some sectors while there was still unemployment at the bottom. So the antistructuralist solution of turning the machine faster to pick up the unemployed at the bottom would, say the structuralists, only aggravate the problems, causing wages and salaries to rise in labor-short areas creating inflation, leaving millions still idle at the bottom. The first signs of this have appeared. Today there are shortages in some occupations, such as executive secretaries, computer technicians, certain kinds of engineers, teachers and doctors. In 1950 there were 109 physicians in private practice for every 100,000 Americans; today, despite large immigrations of foreign doctors to relieve the shortages, there are fewer than 97 doctors per 100,000. The ratio of dentists to population has dropped 10 percent in the same period. And while there is high prosperity, the country is deficient in such basic things as schools and housing. Over 1,500,000 pupils are badly overcrowded. There is a teacher shortage of more than 100,000. Some 22 million Americans are functionally illiterate. Twenty percent of all private dwellings are substandard.

So it becomes clearer that the economy must grow. But it also becomes clearer that a significant number of people and a significant number of national needs have been untouched by the growing prosperity of the last five years. As more are left behind—as more John Gomeses do their daily scouting in vain, and more Al MacGinns turn to cleaning toilets as a reward for high skill diligently pursued—then the sight of their desperation will unsettle those who today are happily at work, confident in the optimism of a booming economy. Even now many workingmen sense that the grim process that this year took jobs from millions of their fellow citizens—too little education, obsolescence of a trade, a jump in technology—next year can bring catastrophe to them too.

MAY—SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, for the fourth year, the President has proclaimed May as Senior Citizens Month. Celebration of Senior Citizens Month in 1966 is particularly significant in the light of landmark legislation enacted by the 89th Congress providing many new services to the older American and expanding others.

New legislation specifically for older Americans includes medicare and other social security benefits and the Older Americans Act of 1965. In addition, several laws and amendments provide benefits and services for Americans aged 65 and over. They include the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965, amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, and amendments to the Civil Service and Railroad Retirement Acts.

President Lyndon B. Johnson's proclamation of Senior Citizens Month—May 1966—follows:

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH, MAY 1966

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

A basic goal of an enlightened society must be to provide opportunities which enable older people to keep and strengthen their independence and dignity.

For too many Americans, the later years still mean loneliness, idleness, lack of purpose and meaning.

Today we have the tools to change this. We have the power to enrich the lives of older Americans and to benefit from their skills, their wisdom, and their experience.

Nearly 18,500,000 American men and women are 65 years old and over. Each day almost 3,900 Americans reach 65.

For all of them, a new life is now possible. Programs proposed by this administration and enacted into law by the 89th Congress are being launched and expanded in the largest effort on behalf of the aging in our history. Now we can provide greater opportunities for our older Americans to use their abilities and to participate in useful work and rewarding leisure. We can declare a new day for older Americans.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the month of May 1966 as Senior Citizens Month.

I call upon all Federal, State, and local governments, in partnership with private and voluntary organizations, to join in community effort to give meaning to the theme of this special month: "A New Day for the Older American."

Let us make this month memorable by the dedicated efforts of each citizen to provide those benefits and opportunities within community programs which will add satisfaction and dignity to the lives of aging Americans.

I also invite the Governors of the States, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and appropriate officials in other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to join in the observance of Senior Citizens Month.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 1st day of April in the year of our Lord 1966, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 190th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

SANITY ON CHINA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Rusk's recent statement on China before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, reflects an openminded note of optimism with regard to our future relations with Red China. This statement offers an interesting alternative to the extreme positions—either hawklike or dovelike—which are expressed in many sectors of our society, and as this point was aptly made in an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of April 18, I include the article in its entirety for the information of my colleagues:

SANITY ON CHINA

The excellent impression made by Secretary of State Rusk in public testimony on Vietnam before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is matched by the publication of his statement on China, made to a closed session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee a month ago. This is a sane view of the Chinese problem, and one which goes far to set the Vietnamese tangle into perspective.

Mr. Rusk makes it quite plain that the United States does not propose to attack Red China, either through Vietnam or any other region. Indeed, Washington has every intention (as the recent State Department declaration on the admission of mainland Chinese scientists, teachers, and doctors to the United States emphasized) of seeking to normalize relations with Peking wherever that is possible.

This recognizes that there are no perpetual enmities in world affairs. It also points up the fact that the United States is not opposed to Red China because it is Red, but because it is actively hostile to the United States and has pursued a course—in Korea, in Tibet, in India, in Vietnam—of aggression against its neighbors. In other parts of the world as well it has promoted communism by force and fraud.

The United States, then, will help those threatened by Red China while trying to convince Peking that this is a defensive position and does not conflict with American hopes of eventually achieving friendly relations with mainland China.

Will Washington be successful in this dual task? Mr. Rusk was not sanguine about Peking's reaction. This is by no means the first time that Washington has sought to ease the friction between the two nations, only to be rebuffed. Hostility to the United States has become an article of faith in the Red Chinese credo; to change this stand might well be impossible for the present generation of Chinese leaders. But they will not live forever, and their successors may well come to realize that they have more to gain from friendship with America than from using hatred of America as a national cement.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM AT U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been many charges and countercharges concerning the academic program at the U.S. Naval Academy. These sensational charges have been given wide play by the press. Now it is time for us to take a reasoned look at these charges.

One of the top members of the senior class at the Academy is a resident of the Seventh District of Iowa. He represents the excellent caliber of young men chosen to attend our service academies. He has been selected for several top honors at the school and his integrity is unquestioned.

Recently he wrote me about his own feelings and impressions on these current charges. I feel that what he said needs repeating and I want my colleagues to share in the insights outlined in his letter.

The letter follows:

U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY,
April 11, 1966.

DEAR MR. HANSEN: First of all, I want to thank you for your recent letter and comments. I greatly appreciate your kindness and interest.

Secondly, I am writing with reference to a subject which is very near and dear to me Undoubtedly you receive many letters from individuals with personal problems, etc.; however, I believe the nature of this concern warrants your attention and I beg your indulgence.

I am referring to the recent series of articles in the Washington Post (and, I understand, other newspapers across the Nation) concerning the Naval Academy's supposed scandal regarding our academic curriculum.

My first reaction was disbelief and incredulity. This subsided since the story by Mr. Aaron was obviously of little less caliber than the notorious "yellow journalism" of years ago—a play for the spectacular. When the subject kept appearing as front-page copy, however, my concern grew. It is nearly impossible, as you know, to completely cancel the effect of such front-page material, even when it is of questionable validity. I would therefore like to make several comments to you concerning this. I feel a responsibility to you as my Congressman and friend, to do my best to insure you are informed of both sides of the situation. While I have strong feelings on the subject, I hope you will find my comments objective.

As you may know, I presently stand second in my class of 870, am a Trident Scholar, commander of the drum and bugle corps, and have completed majors in the fields of mathematics and physics.

I have been selected as a Burke scholar for postgraduate education at Harvard and/or MIT and most recently, along with 12 of my classmates, I was selected as a Fulbright scholar. I mention these only to indicate my qualifications to discuss the Academy and its academic system. The accomplishments themselves represent only God-given ability.

Mr. Aarons (of the Post) originated his series of articles on the basis of conversations with (1) a member of the accrediting board and (2) several unhappy professors at the Academy. On the strength of these sources he strongly implied or stated that the Academy's academic program was greatly deficient and that the accreditation board's report would condemn the Academy.

I have personally seen the pertinent sections of the board's report released by Admiral Kauffman with the full permission of the chairman of the board. The tone of this report is not derogatory nor condemning but rather full of praise for the Academy and its midshipmen as quoted in part at the end of one of Aarons' articles where it was summarily dismissed by implying it was false since these reports are rarely released prematurely. Indeed, he himself was the cause of the premature release. It does mention problems which the Academy itself voluntarily made known. We would be the most naive institution on the face of this earth if we said we were devoid of problems. It is important, however, to examine these problems in perspective.

First of all, Aarons considers it scandalous that "midshipmen sleep in class." Granted, some do. All midshipmen are required to attend all classes and cannot "cut" as can their civilian counterparts in many schools. Couple mandatory attendance with a very busy, demanding schedule and some inattention is, perhaps, explainable if not understandable. The key point is, however, that this situation is not unique to the Naval Academy—almost every civilian university suffers from the same problem. Moreover, Mr. Aarons states that this is indicative of a general mediocrity and "coasting" attitude which is prevalent among midshipmen. One word describes this—"rubbish."

There are individuals who do not perform to their capacity and motivation is a problem in some cases, but it is most definitely not a generally prevalent attitude.

I believe a more accurate explanation is given by the fact that many of the professors, particularly the younger ones who have just completed their doctorate or master's, come to the Academy with a narrow view. Their life has been concentrated on one facet of the academic spectrum and they cannot understand why each individual midshipman doesn't share their enthusiasm and become immersed in their course, spending a disproportionate amount of time studying it to the detriment of his other five subjects.

Many civilian professors also lose track of the fact the Naval Academy's prime purpose is to produce broadly educated officers who are top leaders, not language experts or the like. While we concentrate on engineering more than any other field, each man receives a broad base on which to build a career as a scholar and leader rather than a technician.

Secondly, "grade fixing." All of a sudden, the bell curve (normalized distribution of grades) which is used in one form or another at most universities becomes "grade fixing at the Naval Academy," instead of the objective measure of knowledge for which it was developed. Admittedly, with the recent changeover from the strict percentage system to the A, B, C, D, F system, temporary controls have been imposed of necessity. This is consistent with our mission of turning out leaders and naval officers and will hopefully be gone by next year. This has in no way, however, produced a mass exodus from the study room or acceptance of substandard work.

There are many other facets of this which have been distorted or colored which I will not touch upon for lack of time and space.

One of the most dramatic refutations of the charges of "deficient education" is found, I believe, in the previously mentioned receipt of 13 Fulbright scholarships by the Naval Academy class of 1966. This is, I believe, a high for any institution to date. Last year a significant number were also won (seven, I believe) as well as a Rhodes scholarship.

Finally, a significant indication is found, I believe, in the indignant disagreement on the part of the student body with Mr. Aarons' articles. I believe you will find this unique in the light of recent student demonstrations. We are the ones who attend classes and live under the system and understand its problems yet I know of none who feels he is being cheated or is cheating the Government by not studying.

Note that this includes many midshipmen who have attended civilian universities previous to entering the Academy. Almost to a man, we are amazed at the distortions and unfounded implications displayed in the spectaculars of the last few days. It seems as if the press is trying to manufacture a scandal comparable to the situation at the Air Force Academy last year. A scandal which, at the Naval Academy, simply does not exist.

I apologize for the literacy of this, it is written hurriedly and in some frustration. It is difficult to reply rationally to irrational charges and sensationalism. I do want you to know how I, and my fellow midshipmen, feel about this situation. There are many other aspects which I would like to discuss with you.

May I extend an open invitation to you to visit the Academy at any time, I am at your disposal. I would welcome the opportunity to see you again as well to show you that we have nothing of which to be ashamed.

It is unfortunate, to say the least, when the reputation of a credible institution is slandered for the sake of selling newspapers. While it is difficult to effectively combat this, it is extremely important that you who are the basis of this and the other service academies be appraised of the situation and confident of our integrity.

If you are in agreement, I would greatly appreciate it if you would communicate your views to your colleagues in the Senate as well as the House.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

Scott Redd.

FRIENDS OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, in Bethlehem, Pa., a civic group, the Friends of the Public Library, held its annual organizational meeting. The friends are a small but dedicated group of private citizens whose great love is promoting the interests of the public library.

Last year, for example, this group served as the catalyzing agents in raising the money and stimulating the community to build a beautiful new library. It is a magnificent story of enlightened community spirit in action.

It began when one of Bethlehem's leading citizens, Mr. Rolland L. Adams, publisher of the Globe-Times, laid down a challenge gift of $250,000. The friends, galvanized by this munificent action, more than matched Mr. Adams' gift at the same time as city and State sources responded to the idea. In all, over $1,500,000 was earmarked for the building which is now rising in a magnificent new civic center in the central part of Bethlehem. More than 8,000 citizens contributed in a tangible way to the project.

With that as background, the friends invited Mr. Burnett F. Anderson, Deputy Director for Policy and Plans, U.S. Information Agency, to give the annual address. And I had the pleasure to introduce Director Anderson. The occasion was also the first day of National Library Week.

Mr. Speaker, in public life I have listened to a great many addresses. But I would have to search my memory for a long time to be able to cite for you a better address than the one Mr. Anderson delivered before the friends in Bethlehem. Not only was it especially apt for the occasion, but also it was delivered with charm and candor. I learned more about USIA from that one address by Mr. Anderson than I have from all the documents I have read.

It may be true, as Director Anderson said, that the mission of the USIA begins only at the water's edge. But Mr. Anderson certainly did a convincing job here on shore. And if USIA's programs abroad are as effective as his own exposition here, then they must be very effective indeed.

Accordingly, so that many more can have the experience of reading his address, I am placing it in the Record at this point.

USIA: The Mission and the Myths

(Address by Burnett Anderson, Deputy Director (Policy and Plans), U.S. Information Agency)

Congressman Rooney, distinguished officers, and friends of the public library, and friends of the friends, thank you, Mr. Rooney, for that generous presentation. I have been asked by our Director, Leonard Marks, to tell you how sorry he was he could not be here himself. His conflict involves an appropriation hearing for the coming fiscal year.

In any event, I am delighted to have this chance to chat with you about my favorite subject—USIA—what we are doing, and some of the things we aren't doing. I'm particularly pleased to be here not only on the first day of National Library Week but under the auspices of the Friends of the Public Library. I must say I am greatly impressed by what I have heard of how many of you here tonight have demonstrated your affection with the hard substance of support.

We in USIA have had a pretty heady and substantial love affair going with books and libraries from our inception. We can hardly claim credit for discovering the felicities of the relationship between man and book.

The ancient Greeks—with their usual facility for putting things pithily—called the library "the medicine chest of the soul."

Mankind has been profiting from that medication for a long time, and has generally been enthusiastic in praise of the prescriptions. But it is interesting to note how many times the bookshelf has been accused of harboring very dubious nostrums indeed.

The greatest best-seller itself of all times—the Bible—seems in fact to take issue with itself in the well known lines from Ecclesiastes: "Of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh."

"I hate books," muttered the highly literary Rousseau, "for they only teach people to talk about what they do not understand."

G. C. Lichtenberg, the 18th century German critic, put the matter candidly enough: "Books, nowadays," he said, "are printed by people who do not understand them, sold by people who do not understand them, read and reviewed by people who do not understand them, and even written by people who do not understand them." Do you suppose he was anticipating the advent of what are now called nonbooks?

Benjamin Disraeli, when he was not popping in and out of the Prime Ministership of

England, whiled away his time turning out a whole shelf of successful novels, and might have been expected to have something kind to say about books. Listen to him: "Books are fatal: they are the curse of the human race. Nine-tenths of existing books are nonsense, and the clever books are the refutation of that nonsense. The greatest misfortune that ever befell man was the invention of printing."

But surely one of the darkest moments in any author's life occurred to poor Edward Gibbon, when he presented a copy of the third volume of his celebrated "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" to the Duke of Gloucester, brother of George III. History has recorded the Royal Duke's comments of that moment—and surely they should stand engraved on the desk of any writer hoping to put his trust in the permanence of literary fame: "What," shouted the Duke, as Gibbon proudly handed him his labor of love, "Another of those damned, fat, square, thick books. Always scribble, scribble, scribble, eh, Mr. Gibbon?"

A remark that scathing from so imposing a royal critic ought—one supposes—to have been the preface to the decline and fall of Edward Gibbon. But books have a way of burying their own undertakers; and today you can still buy a copy of that book, or even see a multimillion-dollar movie version of it. Who remembers the long-fallen and apparently unlamented Duke? (As a matter of fact, it took me a bit of researching to find the exact reference.)

Say what you will about books: curse them, damn them, burn them, blast them—they remain one of the great, indispensable building blocks of civilization * * * and a bookless world would surely be an exact and terrifying synonym for an inhumane world.

In our business in USIA the book bulks large.

In carrying out our mandate to further the foreign policy objectives of the United States, USIA uses every tool and technique of communication. We use ancient Asian morality plays—and avant-garde American art. We publish wall newspapers for neoliterates—and learned journals. We employ traveling village troubadours—and communications satellites.

We use in any given case the best communication medium available to get the right message to the right audience at the right time.

But though we are, and must remain, flexible in our choice of means, one of the best and most enduring instruments of all remains the book.

There are, for example, our libraries, reading rooms, and binational centers: more than 360 points of book lending, in more than 80 countries, stretching from Stockholm to Stanleyville, and from Tokyo to Tegucigalpa.

Every year more than 23 million people visit our libraries, borrowing nearly 6 million volumes, and consulting twice that number on the premises.

Opening a new USIA library is often such an event that crowd control becomes a problem. In Marrakech the response was so overwhelming that library membership cards, limited to 1-day-a-week admittance, finally had to be issued.

After a month's operation of our new library in Nyasaland, only 20 percent of the collection was left on the shelves: 80 percent of the books had been borrowed.

In Calcutta, the USIA library with 20,000 volumes does as much business as India's National Library with more than a million volumes.

To get American books into the hands of important readers in the hinterland, we operate USIA traveling libraries and bookmobiles in some countries.

A village leader in Pakistan, told politely that he had exceeded the number of books a single patron could borrow at one time from the USIA bookmobile, promptly rounded up his nine children and checked out an additional volume in the name of each child.

In Rangoon, a schoolteacher came 18 miles for a book on a topic her class was studying. Seeing related titles on the shelves, she sighed: "Ah, if only I could stay here several days and read these other books. * * *" Told by our librarian that she could borrow the volumes, her incredulous stare of blank disbelief was broken only by the books being placed physically in her hands.

When Turkey began drafting its new Constitution, our library in Ankara was asked for basic works on American democratic institutions. Passages in the Turkish Constitution in force today are based on that reference material.

Indeed, the whole problem with books in many parts of the newly developing world is not that books are not highly esteemed—but precisely the opposite. In some places, they are esteemed much too much.

In Asia, for example, our posts sometimes donate small, select collections of American books to colleges and universities. These books are given such importance that the affair is often an elaborate one, with the rector arranging a formal ceremony of acceptance before the entire assembled student body, complete with garlands of flowers, a high tea, and profuse speeches all around.

But nothing is more frustrating for the USIA officer, checking in for a visit a few months later, than to discover that the books are almost hermetically sealed in locked glass bookcases, in mint condition, untouched by human hand, and unread by human eye. There the books are—proudly on display—clearly regarded with immense esteem; but treasured like a set of crown jewels, rather than used like a set of classrooms tools.

As a matter of fact, the open-shelf system in our USIA libraries is a compelling and contagious example of book accessibility, and more and more libraries abroad are following it.

But there is still another reason we are proud of our USIA libraries * * * and that is because they are attacked so often.

When an emotional mob decides that it is disappointed with the United States—and wants to tell us so—it often picks out the USIA library as the one conspicuous, well-known, and well-liked symbol of the United States on a main street of the city.

Our libraries are attacked, and sometimes burned—not because they aren't appreciated (indeed, the repairs are almost always paid for by an apologetic host government; and sometimes even by spontaneous and unsolicited donations from the readers themselves), but because in the heat of mob passion, the USIA library seems the most obvious and popular symbol of Uncle Sam—and is the U.S. building which most youth know by location.

Uncle Sam, I like to think, could do much worse than be symbolized by a free, open, democratic public library.

The motivation for some of these attacks can be revealing. In Salisbury, Rhodesia, for example, a young African tossed a brick through our library window. The police promptly arrested him, but when they asked him why he had done it, he replied proudly: "Because the tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots."

The quotation, of course, is from Thomas Jefferson. And where had this proud young African read it? In that same USIA library.

I don't think this argues that we ought to take Thomas Jefferson off our USIA shelves. I think it does argue that we can afford a few broken windows—if in the end our libraries can help keep the American message of liberty, freedom, and equality alive.

This great nation of ours being such a kaleidoscope of contrasts and convictions, we have a job keeping the limited book collections in our libraries fully representative. Sometimes American visitors who drop in complain that we have too many of this kind of book—and not enough of that kind of book; or that we cover this point of view, but not that point of view; or that this author is represented, but not that author—and so on.

Some U.S. visitors feel that certain of the American novels on our shelves present too negative a view of American society.

We do indeed work hard at keeping our book collections balanced and representative. And whenever a returning tourist complains that some of the American novelists on our library shelves present too critical a picture of the United States, I like to recall a little story my old friend Robert Penn Warren tells about a conversation he once had with an Italian Fascist who had deserted Mussolini in World War II, and had come over to fight on our side.

Why had he done this? Warren asked him.

"Because of your American novelists," the man replied. "The Fascists used to let us read American fiction because it gave—they thought—a picture of a decadent America. They thought it was good propaganda for fascism to let us read Dreiser, Faulkner, Sinclair Lewis. But you know, it suddenly occurred to me that if democracy could allow that kind of criticism of itself, it must be very strong and good. So I took to the mountains."

I do not want either to abuse your patience nor take advantage of a captive audience to load you with statistics. Nevertheless, some concrete measure of USIA's book and library activities may be useful. Last year, USIA supported the publication of 1,808 editions of American books overseas, in English and translations, in a total of 13,800,245 volumes. This is almost twice the number of books in the New York Public Library. Since 1950, the USIA and its predecessor agency have been responsible for the publication of more than 111 million volumes, in some 12,000 editions, and in languages ranging from Portuguese to Pushtu.

Our libraries contain more than 2 million volumes—about one-fifth of them in the language of the country. All in all, in the last fiscal year, USIA spent some $20 million for books and libraries.

I promised to discuss tonight "USIA: The Mission and the Myths." It may seem anomalous that an executive of an information agency should appear before this highly literate and well-informed audience to describe the work of a Government department for which you are footing the bills. But the fact is that the only people on earth to whom we do not address ourselves, every day of the year, are the people of the United States. You can see a USIA television documentary in Bethlehem, Jordan, but you can't in Bethlehem, Pa. You can borrow books from a USIA library in Ouagadougou but you can't in Wilmington. Our Board of Directors on Capitol Hill wants it that way, and we agree fully that it makes eminent good sense for our mandate to begin at the water's edge.

But if you, our clients may not all be informed on what we are trying to do, our management is under no illusions about what it wants from USIA. We have been given a mission by the Congress in Public Law 402 and by the President as precise, as clear, as straightforward as anything can be in this exciting business, where ideas and beliefs and information and words and phrases and policies—rather than products—are our stock in trade.

We're in business for only one essential reason: to help achieve the foreign policy objectives of the United States by using the tools of information and persuasion.

The first paragraph of our Statement of Mission from the President reads as follows:

"The mission of the U.S. Information Agency is to help achieve U.S. foreign policy objectives by (a) influencing public attitudes in other nations, and (b) advising the President, his representatives abroad, and the various departments and agencies on the implications of foreign opinion for present and contemplated U.S. policies, programs and official statements."

I ask you now to imagine that you're in Washington. You're just coming from the White House in a black Mercury sedan, heading for 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, because the President has just made you Director of USIA. And he's told you, very clearly, that your mission in life is to support U.S. foreign policy objectives. Where do you start?

Fortunately, the rest of the President's mandate gives you exactly the place to start. It specifies nine media which are at your disposal. It tells you that in each of the 105 countries where you work that you have an operating document, a Country Plan, which sets forth with precision the objectives of the United States in that country, the objectives which can and should be supported by information operations, the precise psychological objectives of USIA in that country, the specific audience or audiences we are attempting to reach with each of our basic messages there, and then, but only then, the communications mediums, the techniques, the tools, that USIA will use to reach each of those audiences in that country.

The country plan, soundly devised and applied with discipline, must inevitably make our work responsive to, and in support of, our national objectives.

Twenty-one years ago this year the last major, conventional, declared war came to an end. We still call declared wars, involving large and organized bodies of military, "conventional" warfare. You young men getting your sheepskins this June have no personal memory of conventional war. But how many unconventional wars have you lived through? There have been unconventional wars going all your lives: In Greece, in Malaya, in the Philippines, in Korea, in the Congo, in southeast Asia. Some of you may be going from campus to camp, to learn how to fight unconventional wars. The unconventional war has become the conventional. We need new terminology for the spectrum of warfare.

While we may not have the new terminology, we have, nevertheless, developed policies that reflect the real world of this decade. Our national safety rests not only in the nuclear deterrent and the mass army, but the capacity to deal at all levels of force—all, so long as our deterrent succeeds, below the threshold of nuclear exchange. This rainbow of intensity ranges from so-far peaceful subversion in parts of the developing world to an uneasy, U.N.-enforced calm in Cyprus, to sporadic terrorism in Venezuela, to tribal uprisings in Iraq, and to the blood red of war in South Vietnam.

USIA, the fourth estate of international power, taking its place with the traditional three—military, economic, and political—must and does deal with an equally broad spectrum.

What is this informational spectrum? We look first at what might be called the tranquil blue of a stable and developed ally—independent, thriving, free, conventionally armed, literate—with no subversive threat from within and no present danger from without. With open communications, the free movement of people, ideas, and news, the role of U.S. Information Agency need not be great. No one would suggest that we need to broadcast shortwave to a people well, freely, and completely informed, or pass out pamphlets in competition with a sophisticated daily press, or show films by mobile unit in an effort to attract people from their TV sets to an outdoor showing in the village park. We do need, on the other hand, to be sure that all the facts of U.S. policy are available to those who deal with international affairs, and U.S. Information Agency provides them.

As we move along the spectrum to those countries in the earlier stages of development we find our role to be a changing one. In addition to providing background on and seeking support for U.S. policies and actions we must attempt to prepare the ground for the understanding and the acceptance of a mature member's role in the family of nations. Our information and cultural programs must attempt to play a part in the nation-building process. They must attempt to use communications techniques to persuade the people who are forming the governments in these new nations that basic democratic concepts and proven Western economic practices will best serve their countries' long-range developmental interests. This may involve pumping large numbers of low-cost book translations of key titles into local bookshops and libraries as we have done in west Africa and Latin America, or seminar programs concentrating on discussions of the role of the university in democratic societies as we are now doing in Colombia and Venezuela, or the use of TV soap operas to modify mass attitudes toward change as is presently being done in Peru and Central America. The means will vary according to local problems, potential, and priorities, but our basic role remains the same—to utilize communications media to influence attitudes.

Behind the Curtains, Iron, Bamboo, and Sugarcane, which are varying more and more in their degree of penetrability, shortwave radio is important. The Voice of America is our only means of communication to Red China. And in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the cessation of jamming of the VOA (except in Bulgaria and East Germany) has made radio a more effective tool than ever.

I had a report just a few weeks ago of Russian citizens complaining they had to turn to Western radio—rather than their own media—for news of the literary trials in Moscow.

As you know, we have limited information and cultural exchange agreements with a number of Communist governments, and have just signed a new one with the Soviets. For some years we have distributed the magazine America Illustrated in Russian and Polish versions. We believe it pays to subsidize a monthly magazine in those two countries, but we wouldn't do the same thing in England or Japan.

You also know of the fabulous reception of our exhibits in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. In the last 4 years, more than 7 million people in these formerly even more closed societies have seen a piece of the United States on display, and talked with American guides about this country and our policies. We'll spend a dollar or so a head to give this experience, this heady experience of talking with an American and looking at a dramatic exhibit for a Russian, for a Hungarian, for a Pole—but we wouldn't spend it to take the same exhibit to an open society like Austria or Argentina.

The red end of the USIA spectrum, like the military one, is South Vietnam.

This strange war, unprecedented in its nature and its complexities, has led to perhaps the most unusual development in U.S. overseas information activities since the establishment of USIA in 1953 as an independent agency. The critical importance of the psychological front there was recognized in May 1965, when the President delegated the responsibility for coordinating and directing all U.S. psychological and information activities in Vietnam to the Director of USIA. A completely new U.S. field organization—the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office, which has come to be known by the nigh-unpronounceable acronym JUSPAO—was established to carry out these responsibilities in Vietnam.

JUSPAO combined USIA's operations in Vietnam with the communications media activities of our AID program there, which provides communications equipment and technical advice to the Government of Vietnam. The U.S. military assigned highly qualified officers to JUSPAO, and the Department of State also contributed specialized personnel. JUSPAO began providing policy direction to the psychological warfare operations of our military, to assure common policies and closer operational coordination between U.S. civilian and military psychological actions.

To carry out this wide range of activities, JUSPAO's muscle has been carefully but substantially strengthened over the past months. Its manpower now includes some 160 Americans and nearly 400 Vietnamese fellow workers.

JUSPAO installations comprise a headquarters in Saigon, a printing center, American cultural centers in four major cities, and field representatives operating in every province. JUSPAO also oversees U.S. support for Vietnamese-American cultural centers throughout the nation.

The nerve ends of this entire operation are a valiant and valuable band of men—our field representatives. Some 40 of them aided by over 100 Vietnamese colleagues are now serving throughout the country from the mountainous north to the southern delta. I wish you could meet some of them—as I did in South Vietnam about a month ago—their dedication and morale are an inspiration.

For the most part civilians, these representatives work at the rice roots level under wartime conditions. With a basic mission to move among the people, they must often do so in the sinister shadow of the Vietcong presence. The danger is very real indeed. Only a few weeks ago, one of our Vietnamese staff members, and four employees of the Vietnamese Information Service, were ambushed and murdered by the Vietcong.

The people of JUSPAO use every conceivable means to reach both the population of South Vietnam and the Vietcong guerrillas.

Airplanes drop millions of leaflets asking: "Why do the Vietcong kill innocent, unarmed people? Why are the Vietcong rice taxes so very high? Why do the Vietcong force the people to labor at gun point?"

Hovering helicopters relay recorded appeals to Vietcong guerrillas from their wives and sweethearts to lay down arms and come home.

Traveling drama troups—an ancient Vietnamese institution—bring entertainment to the hamlets as well as a kind of "commercial," for they also speak out the story of attack and subversion from the north and of valiant resistance in the south.

Newly established provincial newspapers, national radio—and now television, posters, and photo exhibits—set forth the Saigon government's efforts to build and to protect a free, prosperous, and peaceful nation.

Offers to welcome back Vietcong to the government side chiu hoi—"with open arms"—have been even floated down rivers on banana tree rafts to enemy-held territory.

These are only a few examples. The program is less than a year old, but we have at least some tentative evidence that it is working. The rate of defections from the Vietcong forces, a prime objective of psychological warfare, has risen very substantially. Even during the current political crisis, defections have continued at a high level (over 450 per week).

So much for our mission; what of the myths? Perhaps we should begin with one that rears its head under various labels and that I call the myth of the facile formula. This slogan solution to our foreign opinion problems has marched under various banners, flaunting phrases like "campaign of truth" and "battle for men's minds" and "selling America to the world" and "winning the cold war" and "psychological strategy for victory."

Many of these slogans not only carry an emotional appeal but do have a certain validity—USIA does indeed deal in truth, and the battle for men's minds goes on, as it has since a question of choice was posed in the Garden of Eden. But our comfort in a cliche is no answer to the Latin American student's questions about alleged U.S. domination of some of his nation's basic industries. Nor to the young African Government official asking about our policies in the Congo.

Like Bullfinch's mythology, USIA has its Janus. This is the two-faced money myth. One face says that we are Midas, eager for gold, profligate with the taxpayer's money, overfinanced, too visible, in a word, fat. Our operating budget this year is just under $155.5 million. That's $50 million less than Procter & Gamble spends to advertise soap. USIA's radio arm, speaking in 38 languages around the clock and providing more than 10,000 hours a week on programs on 3,000 local radio stations around the world, costs us $30.3 million a year. That's $7 million less than the Kellogg Co.'s breakfast food advertising bill. To convey a complex of concepts by motion picture in 48 languages to more than a hundred countries, and television programs for use in 87 countries, we are spending $17.9 million this year. That is just about what the Wrigley Co. spends to sell chewing gum and less than one-third of what Bristol-Myers spends to sell its products.

One year's appropriation for the Department of Defense, at current levels, would run USIA for more than 300 years.

Lest you think I'm crying poor mouth, let me emphasize that I believe the other face of this Janus is the more dangerous. This is the notion that by a gigantic investment in propaganda—a half a billion dollars a year and more has been suggested by some—we can somehow solve all our international problems, win the cold war, dissolve communism from the face of the earth, end military aggression, and settle into peaceful and well-earned retirement from the world scene.

But you know at least as well as I what a facile falsehood this is. Propaganda is no substitute for policy, nor words for action, nor speeches for substance. USIA, however lavishly some people would finance it, is not going to solve the problems of Cyprus, nor balance the books of the United Nations, nor bring order to the Dominican Republic, nor win the war in Vietnam by itself. USIA didn't remove missiles from Cuba, but informed public opinion around the world helped create the conditions which did bring them out. And USIA—documenting the existence of those missiles and the threat they posed to peace—played a great part in mobilizing that opinion. How do you measure this factor in the resolution of great events? That's like Lincoln saying, "What's the most important leg of a three-legged stool?"

Another current fable about USIA is called "nothing but news." Of USIA's nine media, two deal in part in news. A speech by the President, or the Secretary of State, or a Member of the Senate or House is news. How do you want the rest of the world to get it? Excerpts by the commercial news agencies, tuned to the headlines of the day, or the full text, word by measured and considered word, live by radio and laid down by radioteletype in time for the editorial writer to hear and read in full before he reacts? And in time for the prime minister to absorb before he discusses it in parliament? Or suppose it's a demonstration on civil rights. Shall we tell that story to the world accurately, in our terms, with perspective? Or let our detractors tell it their way? Sixteen African countries don't have a U.S. commercial news service. They do have USIA.

Let me hit one more of these myths before we break up—that great big grandpappy of myths about USIA and about the USA in a parlous age. That fable is that somehow, by neglect, or stupidity, or the conditions imposed by our free society, we're losing. Its Casandras have it that the Pavlovians of Red Square have applied the conditioned reflex to all the world—that when it snows in Moscow the nomads of the mideastern deserts shovel. Balderdash. No avowed Communist Party-Marxist, Leninist, Khrushchevian, Maoist, what have you—has ever won a free national election. No Communist country today would dare hold an honest election. How do you think the people of East Germany would register their sentiments about Herr Ulbricht if they had a secret ballot? Who revolted in Hungary? Kids who had never lived under any system but communism. Who's voting with their feet today? More than 10,000 refugees who have just left Castro's promised paradise, and they are still coming by the thousands.

To the propagandists of Moscow and Peking, who are sometimes credited with superior powers, I say that brainwashing, like charity, should begin at home. The great language expert Mario Pei of Columbia University put it more nicely about the Communist world in a Saturday Evening Post article some years ago than I can, but it boiled down to this. There is one simple measurement of who believes what: millions of people behind the Curtains want out, but who's trying to get in?

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we were all treated the other day to an amusing account by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] describing how overzealous officials at the Office of Economic Opportunity confused poverty statistics for Danville, Ill., with those for Danville, Ind., only to find that the statistics failed to apply to anv of the six Danvilles in the country. The gentleman concluded by suggesting that the news media assist in the search by advertising for a Danville "somewhere out there from a Danville somewhere, who believes."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can assure the gentleman from New York that there is a Danville that believes in the war against poverty. This Danville is Danville, Va., a community where, according to 1960 census figures, 3,114 of 12,174 families lived in conditions definable as "poverty."

In fact, on April 22, the day after the gentleman's commentary, the Office of Economic Opportunity announced a grant of $116,652 to the Danville Community Improvement Council to finance a promising antipoverty effort in depressed neighborhoods. Two neighborhood centers are to be established to provide homemaking and house managing service for low-income families.

Four professional staff personnel will be assisted by 17 nonprofessional aids to be recruited from among the residents in the areas. The staff will operate classes in nutrition, child care, sewing and various other homemaking skills and provide counseling and guidance for those who seek it. I regret having to spoil our colleague's advertising campaign, but it would appear that citizens of Danville, Va., have decided that their community will benefit from participation in the war on poverty. I salute their initiative and wish them well.

LOYAL BEATLE FANS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 in the minority views accompanying the National Arts and Cultural Development Act the suggestion was made that eventually the Federal Government would be subventing the Beatles.

I have received a letter, which I make a part of my remarks, which indicates that Beatles' fans are loyal, devoted, and in this case, frustrated. This proves that the Beatles need never seek a grant from the British Government, let alone our own Government; so long as the hundreds of thousands of loyal fans remain as devoted to them as this letter indicates.

Through the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities it is our hope and desire that the ballet, Handel, Brahms, and the symphonies will inspire such fervent adulation.

Incidentally, I hope that the publication of this letter inspires the Beatles, on their next tour of the United States, to reciprocate the loyalty to its fan club in Trenton that the fan club retains for that entertainment group.

The letter follows:

TRENTON AREA CHAPTER
BEATLES (U.S.A.) LTD.,
Trenton, N.J., April 18, 1966.

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
Trenton, N.J.

DEAR SIR: Having reached a pinnacle of desperation, we write to you on a subject totally unrelated to politics. It may appear to be a petty trifle to you, but please try to understand our plight.

Suppose for a moment that you are an American Congressman, which you most obviously are. You love our country. You love her people. You are proud of what the people of this country have done and stood for throughout our nearly 200 years as a Republic. Because of this you work diligently for the betterment and advancement of the country and her people. Would it not seem grossly unfair if you were never allowed to meet and talk with these people. After all, you have devoted a great deal of time, effort, and most of all heartfelt love to them. Perhaps from time to time you would like to find out personally precisely who the people are that you have given so much of yourself to. Honest devotion needs to be expressed; I am sure you will agree.

Now permit me to make a comparison. As officers in the national Beatles fan club, we are to the Beatles as you are to the people of America. We defend them publicly to their foes as you would to the foes of your people. We represent them to others as you represent us to foreigners. We hold their fate in our hands (as fans) just as Congress holds our fate in their hands. We appreciate them as our representatives to Congress must appreciate the American people. We work as hard for the Beatles in our way as you work for your constituents in yours. Seen in this light it is heartbreaking and unfair to shut us from them.

In the past year we have donated endless hours to projects which we felt would reflect a fine image of the men we so look up to. We put our greatest efforts into convincing our members that police at concerts are to be respected and obeyed, and with this we had some success. We have put our best foot forward to the press and to others whose opinions hold some influence, so that they will see that we mirror the group that we admire.

In other words, we worked to remind people that we, the Beatles' fans, are intelligent, tasteful, and discriminating; we do not hand out our respect and admiration haphazardly. Naturally, as in all positions of representation, we are faced with those who refuse to believe what is obviously true, and who put us to some discomfort. Speaking in more concrete terms, we are about to begin a project in conjunction with the USO to aid our men in Vietnam in some small way.

There is much more to our story which only our experienced coworkers and peers can know and understand, but we ask you to believe that we are sincere. Last summer, when the Beatles last visited us we tried to meet and talk to them through every method that we could honestly say we deserved to try, and we were put through quite an ordeal and left without having accomplished our goal. This summer, we feel we must succeed for our own peace of mind. We believe that if we cannot succeed at that which has consumed our greatest energies, we are doomed to be failures in all lesser and equally difficult endeavors.

For these reasons, we come to you. Can you help us in any way at all? Any assistance will be more than greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

BARBARA WILLSON,
President.
BEVERLI BODINE,
Vice President.
PATRICIA PEOPLES,
Secretary.

"KAIULANI" PROJECT TO PRESERVE LAST AMERICAN-BUILT SQUARE-RIGGED MERCHANT SHIP

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 2, 1966, I introduced House Resolution 837, "expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to support for the *Kaiulani* project to preserve the last surviving American-built, square-rigged merchant ship as a museum of our maritime heritage."

In October 1964, the American people were presented with a priceless heritage of America's maritime history by the people of the Philippines. Our good Filipino friends generously donated the hull of the *Kaiulani*. President Johnson formally accepted this gift from the then President of the Philippines, Diosadado Macapagal, on behalf of the American people, during a White House ceremony.

The *Kaiulani*, built in Bath, Maine, in 1899, has had a long and varied career, illustrating several facets of America's maritime history. Originally built for the Hawaii-California sugar trade and later in the California-Alaska salmon trade, the *Kaiulani* ranged the far corners of the world flying the Stars and Stripes.

The *Kaiulani* unfurled her sails in 1941 to make the last voyage of an American-built square rigger around Cape Horn, and later ended up in Australia shortly after America's entry into World War II. In Australia this once proud ship was requisitioned by the Army Transport Service and cut down and converted to serve as a coal barge for General MacArthur's advancing army. As a lowly coal barge the *Kaiulani* followed our troops from New Guinea to Mindanao to Luzon.

At the end of the war the *Kaiulani* was purchased by the Madrigal Shipping Co. of the Philippines, who used her as a log barge until 1964. It is interesting to note that this old American-built hull was earning her own way right up to the time she was donated as a historic relic.

President Johnson assigned the immense and difficult task of restoring the *Kaiulani* to the National Maritime Historical Society, which is doing an outstanding job on an extremely small budget. The Philippine Navy has assisted in this effort by generously donating the use of its ship repair facility at Cavite City for the restoration of the *Kaiulani*. It is up to the National Maritime Historical Society to supply the manpower and the materials to do the job. The director of the National Maritime Historical Society is in the Philippines supervising the restoration of this historic vessel.

The National Maritime Historical Society has financed this project entirely through voluntary contributions from interested Americans and Filipinos, but there is still a big job to be done. This American hull needs American steel to make it seaworthy again, and funds are needed to rerig the vessel.

Upon completion of the restoration, the *Kaiulani* will be sailed with an American crew from the Philippines to the Nation's Capital where she will be permanently berthed on the Washington waterfront as a nonprofit maritime museum and as a monument to the American merchant marine.

As chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am especially proud to play a role in the *Kaiulani* project—for two reasons that are both important to me. First of all, its contribution to our proud maritime history is obvious; and secondly, this project was enthusiastically supported by my distinguished colleague, the late Herbert C. Bonner, the esteemed past chairman of this committee.

The society proposes to dedicate the captain's salon aboard the *Kaiulani* as the "Herbert C. Bonner memorial board room." It will be available to the various maritime organizations for meetings and conferences, and I know of no more appropriate way to perpetuate the memory of a man who worked so diligently for the good of the American merchant marine.

In order to further this worthy project, I introduced House Resolution 837, stating that the *Kaiulani* project deserves the full support of the American people and, particularly, the full support of the American merchant marine.

Unfortunately, many of our citizens, particularly those living away from the seacoasts, do not realize the importance of the American merchant marine to our expanding international commerce and our national security. With the *Kaiulani* serving as a maritime museum in the Nation's Capital, the National Maritime Historical Society will have the opportunity of telling the American merchant marine story to the thousands of young Americans who visit the Capital City each year. This nonprofit voluntary effort is not costing the taxpayers any money.

It truly deserves the support of the American people and the American merchant marine.

HORTON BILL TO CORRECT WEAKNESS IN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT LAWS—SEEKS PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AGE

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed legislation to strengthen present laws prohibiting discrimination in employment. The bill we passed, H.R. 10065, is a great step forward in eliminating discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, and sex by adding "teeth" to the weapons already employed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I was a firm supporter of this legislation; my only regret is that it does not go far enough. There is one additional factor besides race, religion, and sex, which accounts for a tremendous amount of employment discrimination. That factor is age.

Discrimination on the basis of age of the applicant is common in our economy, and I consider it to be a potentially crippling factor to the economic and social health of our Nation. When I speak of discrimination because of age, I am not solely concerned with the employment of citizens over the age of 65 or 70. Very often, despite the talent people of this age have, it is desirable to set compulsory retirement ages in business and in government. There is no justification, however, for denying employment to a well-qualified applicant who is 40 or older, merely because another applicant is younger and is a prospect for a longer career with the employer. Today, over 50 percent of our citizens are 25 years of age or younger, and there is great competition in our economy for qualified young people.

Despite the fact that we citizens over 40 are in the minority, this cannot be allowed to be a factor in judging our value as working people. In many cases, if not in most, workers between 40 and 60 are at the peak of their competence and efficiency, having had the important benefit of 20 or more years of working experience behind them. Discrimination because of age accomplishes nothing more than a tragic waste of human talent. To deny to a man the opportunity to make his own way in the world on the basis of his date of birth is no less wasteful and antidemocratic than to deny him the same job based on his faith or the color of his skin.

As a member of the National Republican Task Force on Aging, I have been very closely concerned with the problem of job discrimination because of age. It is tragic that so many of our citizens are tossed on the economic scrap heap prematurely. All of us must sooner or later join the ranks of older citizens. As we do grow older, the economic pressure of younger men and women in a growing population will grow even stronger. Unless legislation is enacted to prevent this threatened waste of premium human resources, these pressures will prevail, and the economic and social problems connected with aging will grow more and more serious, precipitating a degree of dependency on Government support and welfare that none of us wants.

I regret that no provision for preventing this tragic injustice was included in H.R. 10065. On the first day of this session, I introduced H.R. 11898, a bill which contained many parallel provisions to H.R. 10065, but which included age among the factors to be prohibited as basis for employment discrimination. I am hopeful that the Education and Labor Committee will continue to study my proposal, with an eye toward including this crucial section among laws already enacted to promote fairness in employment practices.

I want to take this opportunity to commend before this great body, the members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, who for over 8 years have been waging a campaign under the slogan: "Jobs After 40." This campaign has secured a substantial measure of support among the States, and over 25 States have enacted legislation prohibiting job discrimination based on age.

More recently, the Eagles have urged the passage of such a measure on the Federal level, and their efforts have been a part of my own motivation for introducing H.R. 11898.

I am proud to join with my colleagues and the members of this far-sighted group in support of this essential measure.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Fraser (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, through May 13, on account of official business.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. St Germain), through May 21, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the 19th World Health Assembly, Geneva, Switzerland.

Mrs. Griffiths (at the request of Mr. Dingell), for today, May 3, 1966, and balance of the week, on account of death in the family.

Mr. Fallon (at the request of Mr. Garmatz), for May 3, 4, and 5, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Patman, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Michel, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Edmondson, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Kupferman (at the request of Mr. Skubitz), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Goodell (at the request of Mr. Skubitz), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Findley (at the request of Mr. Skubitz), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Holifield, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Fino and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Skubitz) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Reinecke in two instances.

Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Stanton.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Krebs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Murphy of New York in two instances.

Mr. Callan.

Mr. Dyal.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Fogarty in seven instances.

Mr. Roybal.

Mr. Cooley.

Mr. Schmidhauser.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1804. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 4, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2363. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Treasury Department, transmitting a list of the negotiated purchases and contracts made by the Coast Guard since October 29, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 230e of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2364. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2365. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 66 Stat. 692; 30 U.S.C.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2366. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of absences of trainees enrolled in institutional training programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2367. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunity for savings by reducing overtime on revetment construction and maintenance on the lower Mississippi River, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2368. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improved coordination of transmission line construction practices of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2369. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of policy guidance strengthened on direct procurement of components needed by contractors in production of weapon systems and other major end items, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2370. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report of backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of March 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2371. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2372. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2373. A letter from the Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, transmitting the annual statistical report "Recreational Boating Statistics—1965," pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-911; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2374. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2375. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission; transmitting the final report of the Civil War Centennial Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-305; 71 Stat. 626; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1469. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TUCK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 693. An act to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 14732. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14825. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, to provide for special programs for older workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 14826. A bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent commission on aircraft noise abatement problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 14827. A bill to amend section 13a(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain intrastate operations or services, in order to extend the time for State action prior to petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 14828. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to increase the funds available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for its secondary market operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 14829. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize additional amounts for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 14830. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the suspension of payments on housing loans when the obligor is a teacher pursuing a full-time program of education leading to a graduate degree, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 14831. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 14832. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to modify the regulatory requirement that the son or daughter of an employee of a Federal agency may not be appointed to part-time, seasonal, intermittent, or other temporary employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 14833. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 in order to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to supply power within certain Kentucky counties; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 14834. A bill to provide and strengthen adult education programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 14835. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to include in the rent supplement program certain housing financed (directly or through loan insurance) by States and municipalities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 14836. A bill to enact the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 14837. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 14838. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 14839. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to prevent the discontinuance of certain commuter operations which could benefit from new governmental programs for the improvement of commuter services, or from the merger of the carrier or carriers responsible for such commuter operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 14840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain charitable organizations from certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14841. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 14842. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14843. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants on a temporary basis to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas and for other purposes, and to increase the existing limit on the grant funds which may be used thereunder in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14844. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 14845. A bill in relation to rates of toll and disposition of income by the city of East St. Louis, Ill., and the city of Chester, Ill., covering the bridges constructed by said cities across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 14846. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 14847. A bill to authorize the payment of allowances to defray commuting expenses of civilian employees of executive agencies assigned to duty at remote worksites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14848. A bill to authorize the payment of allowances to defray commuting expenses of civilian employees at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 14849. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the States of Arizona and California defining a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 14850. A bill to mobilize and utilize the scientific and engineering manpower of the Nation to employ systems analysis and systems engineering to help to fully employ the Nation's manpower resources to solve national problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 14851. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the States of Arizona and California defining a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 14852. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the States of Arizona and California defining a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 14853. A bill to amend section 3 of title 4, United States Code, relating to the use of the U.S. flag, to make its provisions also applicable outside the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14854. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.J. Res. 1133. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H. Res. 840. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the domestic farm labor shortage and its effects on food prices; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

468. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to assembly joint resolutions adopted during the 1966 first extraordinary session, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 14855. A bill for the relief of Jane Rosselin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 14856. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrico I. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14857. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elmer D. Geniblazo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 14858. A bill for the relief of Yee Soon Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14859. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Latoria Jenkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14860. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Licata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14861. A bill for the relief of Francesco Terenzo Parlanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14862. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Serra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14863. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Trupiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 14864. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

385. Mr. KING of Utah presented a petition of the Utah State bar declaring support of H.R. 8188 which deals with deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to certain organizations for study of judicial reform; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Polish Millennium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 1966 marks the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's conversion to the Christian religion. On this occasion I should like to join with the other Members of this body and with the many Americans of Polish descent in celebrating this great event with the Polish people. Although Poland's Communist government has restricted the religious celebration commemorating the millennium, it cannot erase the strong religious traditions of the Polish people.

One thousand years ago, in the year 966, a Polish king named Mieszko I married a Christian princess from Bohemia. As a result of this marriage Mieszko was converted to Christianity and was able to place his lands under the protection of the Pope. This move was extremely important in enabling him to protect Poland from a threatened invasion by German tribes. Mieszko's son, Boleslaw the Brave, took further steps to consolidate Polish dominion and encouraged the spread of Christian missionaries.

In Poznan, on April 16, the continuing vitality of Polish Christianity was evident from the thousands of people who lined the streets and crowded around the cathedral to see and hear Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. He spoke of the legitimate concern of the church with the economic, social, and political life of the nation.

> The church has a mandate to talk about those problems—

He declared.

> It got that mandate from the ecumenical council.

Today, as in 966, Christianity is a bridge between the Polish people and the West. It is my belief that Poland's cultural and religious traditions and her people's love of liberty have already begun to widen and strengthen this bridge. Let us do all we can to help the Polish people in their quest for democracy and national independence.

Poland's Millennium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly an honor and a privilege for me to join my colleagues in extending congratulations to the people of Poland on the occasion of their millennium observance. Not many countries have been endowed with the record of Poland of having survived the rigors of 1,000 years of history and still share very strong ties with the same faith.

Poland's achievements are even more remarkable since she has been burdened since the end of World War II with a Communist regime that has attempted to curtail activities of the church. The current commemoration and messages of congratulations from all over the world is a positive indication of the Communist failure to dampen the spirit of the people of Poland. What people would abandon a faith which has sustained them for so long a time in the face of innumerable threats, both natural and man-made?

For the last few years the relations between the governments of Poland and America have been growing somewhat warmer. This is a trend which can have positive results for both our countries, in keeping with the deep friendship which has always characterized the relationship of our two peoples.

Notwithstanding the increasing friendship between Poland and the United States, it is a genuine pleasure to recognize Poland's millennium as a real accomplishment. As the people of Poland undertake their observances, I extend to them my best wishes through this year and wish them a bright and happy future.

The Millennium of Christian Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the year 1966 has a special meaning for 10 million of our fellow citizens. This meaning should also be noted for all our people, for it deals with an event of profound importance in the history of Western civilization. This year marks the 1,000th anniversary of the establishment of Christianity in Poland. It also marks a millennium of the Polish state. This year millions of people in many nations will be joining the Polish people and their kin living in other countries across the globe in observing many moving and splendid celebrations commemorating the millennium of Christian Poland.

In the year 965 the first historical ruler of what we today call Poland, Mieszko I, married Dobrava, the daughter of the Duke of Bohemia. This princess was a Christian. It was expected that her husband would renounce paganism and adhere to her faith. He did so in the year 966. By his baptism he led his subjects into the Roman Catholic Church. At the time of his conversion the first missionary bishop arrived in the country to spread the new faith and to begin building the organization of the new church. By these acts a large area in Eastern Europe, with all its various tribes and peoples, came into a closer contact with Western civilization, a contact which has continued through the centuries, enriching the common cultural heritage of all nations which comprise this civilization.

The Polish people and their many admirers throughout the world should properly rejoice at the commemoration of these momentous occurrences. We in this country can be especially sympathetic to this memorial to the patriotism of an outstanding Christian people. Our own nationhood owes much to the noble endeavors made in our war of independence by sons of Poland, notably Tadeusz Kosciuszko, "the father of American artillery," and Kazimierz Pulaski, "the father of American cavalry." Our lives have been made fuller by the cultural contributions of Polish giants in the arts such as Chopin, Sienkiewicz, and Joseph Conrad.

It is with great pleasure that I add my sincere best wishes to the courageous and talented Polish people on the millennium of their Christian nationhood.

Poland's Millennium Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with my colleagues in observing today the millennial year of Christianity in Poland. This indeed is an event of worldwide significance. For we are not only reminded that Poland has had close ties with the West for a thousand years and that these ties continue to influence the outlook of the Polish people. We are also reminded by the events that have surrounded Poland's own observation of the millennium of Christianity in Poland, that the forces for change in Eastern Euorpe cannot be snuffed out, and that confronted by these forces, the Communist regime in Poland has revealed itself, as never before, weak, defensive, and fearful.

Today, thousands of devout and patriotic Poles will gather at the Shrine of Our Lady of Czestochowa in Poland to testify to their continuing faith in a persecuted church and their adherence to principles of religious and constitutional liberty that have been intertwined throughout the thousand-year history of the Polish state.

But the Polish Communist government has made every effort to hinder preparations for these ceremonies and to downgrade their significance. They have refused to permit a visit by Pope Paul on this occasion, and have refused to grant visas to thousands of foreigners seeking to attend these ceremonies.

Perhaps most important, they have made every attempt to discredit the movement for reconciliation between Poles and Germans, a movement that was given new impetus by the recent exchange of conciliatory letters between the Polish and German church hierarchies.

What better evidence do we need to document the point that the Polish Communist regime lives on fear—that its very existence would be threatened if it could no longer raise the specter of an ominous threat lying to the West and of undying enmity between the Polish and German nations. But the Polish people know better. No government, no matter how coercive and arbitrary, can wipe out the influence of centuries of history or decree faith out of existence. It is this truth that we reaffirm today as we observe with the Polish people a landmark in the Western history.

Public Opinion Survey Results of Fourth District, Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, in late March I polled the people of Michigan's Fourth Congressional District on several current public issues, including Vietnam, the reliability of Government information, the effect of the cost of living increases, the war on poverty, trade with Russia, and firearms controls.

In round numbers, 138,000 questionnaires were distributed and nearly 14,000 were returned, a response which I would say speaks well for the residents of the district and their interest in public affairs.

Replies were tabulated and compiled by an independent data processing firm here in Washington. In order that the results may be known, I include them at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SURVEY RESULTS

1. Do you feel the United States was right in sending troops to Vietnam in the first place?

	Percent
Yes	59.9
No	34.0
No answer	6.1

2. Did you favor the stopping of bombing of North Vietnam by U.S. planes for 1 month in December 1965, and January 1966?

	Percent
Yes	35.2
No	59.7
No answer	5.1

3. If a satisfactory peace in Vietnam cannot be secured by negotiation in the foreseeable future, which of the following courses of action do you favor most?

	Percent
(a) Withdrawal of U.S. forces even if it would mean an almost certain takeover of South Vietnam by Communist Vietcong	7.7
(b) Increase of U.S. ground troops sufficiently to clear most of South Vietnam of Communist control	33.1
(c) A holding operation by U.S. forces aimed at securing areas now controlled by the South Vietnamese, but not at retaking Communist-held areas	5.4
(d) No increase in U.S. ground forces, but wider use of air and sea power against North Vietnam	27.7
(e) A U.S. attack on Communist China	2.9
(f) None of the above	23.2

4. Do you feel the Federal Government gives the people reliable information on what it is doing?

	Percent
Yes	23.5
No	67.8
No answer	8.7

5. Has your family felt any effects of an increase in the cost of living during the past year?

	Percent
Not at all	3.3
A little	49.1
Very much	45.8
No answer	1.8

6. Do you think the various war on poverty programs have thus far been successful in moving toward the ultimate goal of improving the lot of the very poor?

	Percent
Yes	12.4
No	79.1
No answer	8.5

7. Do you feel the present Congress is dominated too much by the President?

	Percent
Yes	76.3
No	20.2
No answer	3.5

8. President Johnson has proposed to increase U.S. trade with Communist Russia. Do you agree?

	Percent
Yes	38.5
No	54.9
No answer	6.6

9. Do you favor more strict Federal regulations in the sale or ownership of firearms?

	Percent
Yes	50.3
No	46.1
No answer	3.6

10. Should Congress enact legislation to outlaw strikes that affect the public interest?

	Percent
Yes	67.7
No	26.6
No answer	5.7

11. Should our Federal tax laws provide for distribution of a fixed percentage of personal income tax collections—

(a) Back to States?

	Percent
Yes	28.2
No	10.0
No answer	61.8

(b) Back to localities in which collected?

	Percent
Yes	40.5
No	10.7
No answer	48.8

(c) Neither of above. Federal Government to retain all of tax, as at present?

	Percent
Yes	28.1
No	10.9
No answer	61.0

12. Should there be a new Federal Department of Transportation with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet?

	Percent
Yes	27.8
No	56.1
No answer	16.1

13. The President's food-for-freedom plan would lift all farm production controls and

distribute the surplus to needy nations. Do you approve?

	Percent
Yes	61.5
No	28.5
No answer	10.0

14. Do you favor giving the States the right to apportion one house of their legislatures on the basis of factors others than population?

	Percent
Yes	57.5
No	32.4
No answer	10.1

International Cooperation in Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN HEALTH

(Speech by Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, presented before health panel, White House Conference on International Cooperation, Tuesday, November 30, 1965, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

It is a very special pleasure for me to participate in this White House Conference on International Cooperation. I am pleased to be here this morning with such distinguished and expert leaders in the field of international health, and pleased to see so many old friends and acquaintances again. As all of you know, I have long had a great interest in international health affairs, and I am honored by this opportunity to speak to you.

I have read the fine report that the Committee on Health has prepared. I hope this report will become the basis for a far-reaching examination of our international health policies. I believe it will serve as a guide for the establishment of more effective policy in this area.

I caught in this document a sense of impatience with what is now going on in international health. It is a plea for boldness and imagination in approaching the tremendous problems that face the peoples of the world, as millions of them continue to bear the burdens of disease and disability. And I believe this impatience is justified. This Nation, with all its resources and all its wealth, can and should be doing more to help lift these burdens.

This report on international cooperation in health includes a number of recommendations that are worth reflection. They are a fine mixture of the practical and visionary. They are a call to action as well as a statement of principles. I think each of them demands discussion and considered response. We cannot, surely, afford to ignore the issues they raise.

A number of these recommendations deal with problems that have long been on my mind. One, which we all recognize as being of utmost urgency, calls on the United States to support fully the global disease eradication efforts of the World Health Organization. There is no question about our responsibility or our commitment. The President has time and again emphasized our national obligations and I have supported those pledges of aid.

The recommendation also urges us to "take steps toward the creation of a U.S. Disease Eradication Authority."

I am convinced that there is a great need to coordinate the activities of the Federal government and other public and private agencies in the field of disease eradication. We need to bring better order to this effort. We need to consolidate the scattered appropriations in this area.

And we must set our goals high: we must think of eradication, and not simply control. I was pleased to see that one of the first public appearances of the new Surgeon General, Dr. Stewart, was at the Pan American Health Organization's recent seminar on venereal diseases—he's interested in international health, too, you see. Dr. Stewart talked about eradication of disease, and he said: "Disease control, as an intermediate step, is a necessary target. But as a goal it is unacceptable. It implies tolerance of illness and death which are within our power to prevent. It permits satisfaction with partial accomplishment."

Well, partial accomplishment cannot be our goal when we are considering diseases that cripple and kill.

At the White House Conference on Health earlier this month, there was quite a bit of discussion about our need for greater effort in disease eradication. President Johnson, in his message to the Health Conference, also spoke about the need for eradicating disease, increasing life expectancy, and decreasing infant mortality. Although he was talking first of all about domestic needs, his statement has much meaning when considered in an international context. And, as a matter of fact, he did add: "Ours is a great opportunity to advance ideas which will contribute not only to a healthier America, but to a better world."

This recommendation for a Disease Eradication Authority is one of those ideas which will make this not only a healthier America, but a better world. All of us benefit whenever a disease is conquered.

The recommendation calling for a Disease Eradication Authority in the United States has direct bearing on one of the other recommendations in this report—the second, which asks for "an expanded, more activist role in international health affairs" for the Public Health Service. The report envisions the Public Health Service as the supporting agency for the proposed Disease Eradication Authority, and in this way these two recommendations mesh together smoothly.

Sometimes I feel that our system of foreign quarantine, although it has a long and respected record of keeping this Nation safe from imported diseases, is something like the Maginot Line. We're hiding behind it, instead of attacking. We cannot simply defend ourselves from diseases likely to be brought in, we have got to attack them wherever they are.

A Disease Eradication Authority, supported by a strong corps of experienced public health workers, could become an attacking outfit—attacking diseases in this country such as syphilis, tuberculosis, and yellow fever, and providing the coordinated forces needed to attack other diseases abroad.

Recommendation Number Two, calling for an expanded Public Health Service role in international health, also has much bearing on Recommendation Number Three, which asks the United States to enlarge its commitment to increasing the supply of medical manpower and facilities in the world.

I know that my friends in the Public Health Service have more experience and knowledge about disease and medical organization and medical education and community action in health than is found anywhere else in this country, or in very few other countries. I recognize that there are many remaining health problems within the United States, and the Pubic Health Service is being asked to accept increasing domestic responsibilities. I have had some hand in giving them some of these responsibilities, you may remember. Now I want to give them some more. There is much that can be done in international health by this Federal agency. It could be, for example, that the Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, and the Foreign Quarantine Division, might get together in a joint program to train young American physicians and other health workers to fight the quarantinable diseases where they are to be found.

Training in the control of these diseases is largely text-book and laboratory training now. If American health personnel were acquainted with diseases that have long been kept out of the country they could do a better job of fighting them were they to appear here. We have had a number of scares in recent years, and each time we were forced suddenly to realize that we are very vulnerable. With increasing world travel for business and pleasure, perhaps our chances for escaping the importation of a strange disease are only random and statistical.

I am not an alarmist. But I do believe there is a great need for more American physicians to enroll in the school of experience. My medical friends have often said to me that their greatest teachers have been patients—sick human beings have taught them more than the most elaborate colored plates in the most expensive textbooks.

For us to take part effectively in the eradication of disease from the world, and in protecting ourselves from disease, we cannot rely any longer on *traded* knowledge. Our physicians and other health professionals must be able to *share* knowledge through sharing experience. The benefits of this kind of educational emphasis are many: better teaching, better research, better health protection for all.

There is one last recommendation in this report that I want to talk about today—you notice I haven't talked about them all, but have selected certain ones that particularly interest me. I am doing this because I don't want to take up all your time, and because I want to leave something for the rest of you to discuss. I want to hear what you have to say.

The last recommendation of the seven contained in this report has to do with nongovernmental and private organizations in health and their role in international health activities. The recommendation asks that the United States support and encourage the participation of these agencies in such efforts. I think this is an important recommendation; my only wish is that it were put much more strongly than it is, especially in respect to the role of voluntary agencies. It is essential that the efforts we make in international health be coordinated with the voluntary and non-profit health and welfare agencies. It is essential that they be included in our plans for action in this area. It is essential that we take full advantage of their expertise, their humanitarian spirit, their unique place in American society.

For the voluntary agencies are a unique characteristic of our Nation. This form of civic activity goes back to the earliest beginnings of this country. They are a part of the American way of life. Alexis de Tocqueville, writing in the early 19th century, said: "In no country in the world has the principle of association been more successfully used, or more unsparingly applied to a multitude of different objects than in America . . . Wherever, at the head of some undertaking, you see the government in France, or a man of rank in England, in the United States you will be sure to find an association."

A century later George Santayana called this spirit of free cooperation, "the essence of Americanism."

We all know the history of the voluntary movement in this country, how it has grown and prospered, how it has pioneered in areas where government has been too slow or too timid to take action. I believe that in the field of international cooperation in health this powerful force must be used to fullest advantage.

The voluntary agencies can help us to decide what needs to be done; they can help us get public understanding for what needs to be done. They can again lead the government in what needs to be done.

To function most effectively as an elected representative of the people I must know what the people need and want. The voluntary agencies can help me to know.

I hope that this report will be read by all the voluntary agencies in this country. I hope that they will study it and make sure the people of the United States know about it.

I realize that I am violating one of the first rules for a Congressman. I'm posting an open invitation to do some "lobbying"—frankly, I don't get enough of this kind of lobbying and too much of the other kind. I know there are many warm-hearted generous Americans who are concerned about the world and want to do something to help the less fortunate. I want to hear from them and get their ideas.

There is another way to look at this seventh recommendation. Not only can the voluntary agencies interpret the wishes of the people, they can act as trail-blazers for government action in this field of international health—they can do much themselves.

The concept of the voluntary association is an exportable commodity. It is a concept that is little understood and less-used by many other countries. The concept itself needs interpretation and explanation around the world. Here, too, the voluntary associations have a role.

Some voluntary agencies already operate international programs. Some have overseas branches or affiliates. I believe more must be done to expand and broaden these relationships with foreign associations, that a powerful source of citizen participation in the affairs of their countries can be created through such affiliations. And I believe our government can do much to bring about such cooperation, by helping our homegrown voluntaries forge stronger ties with their overseas counterparts.

International cooperation in health is one of the most important tasks which face us today. It is a task that is affected by such world problems as poverty and rising population rates, to be sure; and it is a task that in turn affects these other problems. But much can be done now, and must be done now, with the tools we have—research knowledge, technical expertise, perfected and tested supplies and materials, trained manpower, and public administration experience.

The mood and spirit of our times makes me feel that now is the time we can begin this great task. We are at last aware that without cooperation between nations we shall never achieve our highest ideals—a free world, free from strife, free from hunger, poverty, and misery and free from disease.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, the people of Poland will pay tribute to one of the most famous events of their long and glorious history. I speak of the presentation to the people of the Constitution of 1791, at that time one of the most extraordinary documents of Europe. While Poland will also be observing its millennium of Christianity, which of itself is a most significant event, my remarks at this moment will concentrate on the Polish Constitution. I feel certain that had Poland had time in which to implement and govern under that document, the history of the country would have been greatly changed from what we know.

Our country has had a long and time-honored traditional constitutional system and from it we have realized the greatest freedoms of any people on earth. The citizenry has the power to determine governmental policy. But in Poland prior to 1791 the Polish people had very little direct influence on their own government. However, by 1789 Polish leaders were convinced that reforms were necessary in order to stabilize the country, and so minor differences were subordinated to the higher demand of national interest. It was truly an amazing feat which they accomplished in drafting a document which in its liberalism and conservatism was so contrary to many of their personal prejudices and desires and which were not easy concepts to propose.

When the constitution was presented to the people on May 3 their immediate reaction was approval and support because one of the provisions was suffrage for the peasants. Weeks after the initial presentation the people were still pledging support and voicing gratitude to the King for adopting the constitution. Favorable comments also came from foreign observers with men such as Edmund Burke, of England, and George Washington, of America, among them.

The Polish leadership knew very well that it was imperative that the country be functioning as soon as possible under the new constitution and thereby achieve more stability before Russia was able to concentrate on matters in Eastern Europe, notably Poland. Realities of politics had dictated a Russian policy of always keeping a weak Poland on her western border. Thus Catherine the Great of Russia would not tolerate a stable or prosperous Poland. In April 1792, Catherine's Russian soldiers invaded Poland, and in 3 months the war was over with Russian troops in command.

Observing the scene of Eastern Europe today, we observe the Russian colossus again maintaining control over the puppet Communist government of Poland. But I know that the Polish spirit which demanded change in 1791 is not dead. The spirit of freedom and liberty and justice which caused the 1791 constitution to be written still lives. Poland has overcome too many other hardships to permit this temporary barrier to divert for long their achievement of what others before them have willingly died for.

I salute the patriotic people of Poland as they observe their May 3 anniversary and urge them not to lose faith in their ultimate goal of freedom and liberty. Someday the real Poland will rise once more to reclaim her rightful place in the family of nations.

Fino Introduces Commodity Cost Control Bill To Reduce Agricultural Commodity Costs to Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I have been disturbed in recent years at the way in which the Johnson administration has financially starved the commodity exchange authority which regulates the commodity futures markets. The ups and downs of these commodity futures have a very real impact on prices American housewives pay for many foodstuffs, so administration apathy is no laughing matter.

In recent years, the authority has been given a budget of barely more than a million dollars a year. This is barely more than half the amount that goes to the New York office of the Securities Exchange Commission and a drop in the bucket compared with the overall SEC budget. With this money, the commodity exchange authority is supposed to police markets in commodities on which there were sales in excess of $50 billion last year.

This is gross negligence. The authority was too badly starved for money to begin to do the job required of it by the Commodity Exchange Act.

The General Accounting Office, chief gadfly of administration incompetence, recently reported that as of June 30, 1964, the authority had not once checked the trading pattern on 21 regulated markets having with a combined volume of $34 billion. Three markets—soybean connected—among the fastest growing with a total of $27 billion annual volume had never been examined since their founding. No wonder there is so much commodity profiteering. Perhaps the administration was afraid of catching too many Billy Sol Estes and Bobby Bakers.

Recently, in response to the admitted need to beef up the commodity exchange authority, legislation was proposed giving the authority extensive new powers over commodity trading. Unfortunately, this legislation went too far by providing for cease and desist powers and margin-setting powers. These elements of the bill carried with them the threat of centralizing too much power in the Secretary of Agriculture.

This approach was all wrong. The authority has the weapons it needs to fight its war. What it needs is logistical support and a generous paymaster. The bill I have introduced today includes a few parts of the bill recently considered by the Agriculture Committee; namely, the broadening of the definition of "commodity" and the inclusion of coffee and sugar among the specifically regulated commodities. As a member of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee, I have seen too much profiteering in these commodities to be content to leave them outside of the list of commodities specifically regulated. My bill also defines "manipulation" to require the element of intent lacking in the bill the committee considered.

The key section of my bill would require the authority to investigate the trading patterns of each regulated commodity market thoroughly and regularly. The authority would be given an increased budget for this purpose. The authority would be required to investigate within 6 months any market not investigated since January 1, 1964. The continuing investigation of commodity trading practices should enable the authority to head off commodity price fixing without cease-and-desist and margin-setting power. My bill provides an annual authorization of $500,000 for such investigation.

The last section of my bill represents my discontent with the way the United States fares in the international commodity agreements which have come before the Banking and Currency Committee. These agreements always saddle the American consumer with high prices so that someone else can have low prices or high profits. I am against this sort of thing. The International Coffee Agreement, for one, keeps coffee prices too high. The International Wheat Agreement subsidizes wheat-importing nations—not including us. This agreement puts the U.S. taxpayer in the position of subsidizing Soviet wheat consumption. There is a funny thing about international commodity agreements—where we are exporters, we lose, and where we are importers, we lose. Perhaps it is just that our policymakers are losers.

For my part, I do not like the idea of international commodity agreements where the U.S. consumer gets stuck paying for disguised foreign aid in inflated commodity prices. My bill therefore requires the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the Congress by January 1, 1967, on the impact of the agreements on U.S. commodity prices and consumer prices and the plausibility of an international agency to supervise the international commodities markets in lieu of the U.S. price-inflating international agreements.

I think my bill is double barreled—domestic and international pro-U.S. consumer legislation.

A Blue-Ribbon Year—1965—in California Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it continues to bewilder me how a few persons keep talking about "chaos" in California agriculture after such an impressive year in 1965.

I simply cannot comprehend how anyone can claim California farmers suffered when net farm income last year soared above the $1 billion mark.

By any standards, that represents a most healthy and productive year.

In 1965, net farm income reached $1,015,600,000—a rise of 4.8 percent, or $46.6 million, over the average for the last 5 bracero years, 1960–64.

As a result, California growers showed profits of slightly over 27 percent last year, giving them a blue-ribbon year.

I, therefore, am quite disturbed at a misleading statement that recently was entered into the RECORD. Let me attempt to clarify the situation for the record.

At the outset, the statement says that Secretary of Labor Wirtz and Governor Brown of California terminated the bracero program. This is simply not factual.

As we all know, the U.S. Congress terminated the bracero program by allowing Public Law 78 to expire on December 31, 1964.

After this wise congressional action, the Secretary of Labor fulfilled his public duties by protecting domestic workers and insisting on improved terms of employment.

Today, the entire Nation owes Secretary Wirtz a great deal of gratitude for his courageous and humanitarian stand to improve the lot of seasonal farmworkers.

The statement under consideration, which is heavy on misleading rhetoric and thin on documentation, charges that termination of the bracero program triggered:

First, higher consumer prices; second, a shortage of farmworkers; third, increased imports of farm products from Mexico; and, fourth, increased welfare costs.

Let us review the validity of these allegations one by one.

First, consumer prices. Throughout 1965, the consumer prices of produce remained remarkably stable even though prices of most other products showed increases.

In every month of 1965, the prices of fresh fruits averaged lower than during 1964—the last bracero year.

And, between August 1965 and January 1966, the average retail prices of fresh fruits and vegetables ranged from 1.5 to 6.0 percent lower than during comparable periods the year before. In March 1966, the average price of fresh produce was just 0.5 percent higher than at the same time in 1965.

In those cases where consumers are paying more for agricultural commodities, the reason cannot be traced back to farm labor. The cost of field labor represents a very small percentage of the retail price. For instance, the payment of the criteria wage of $1.40 an hour in California last year roughly added about a penny to the retail price of each unit of most fruits and vegetables.

Second, labor supply. In 1965, the California growers did not suffer serious labor shortages as is evident from the banner year most of them enjoyed. The crops were harvested.

During the year, Americans worked in vastly increased numbers in a wide range of agricultural products, including those which formerly employed braceros.

As a result, domestic farm employment was up by about 20,000 in the summer and fall of 1965 over the comparable period in 1964, accounting for 97.3 percent of the man-years of labor in California's seasonal hired farm employment in 1965, compared to 2.7 percent for contract foreign labor.

Significantly, domestic labor averaged, from 1959–64, just 73.7 percent of total seasonal man-years, while foreign labor totaled 26.3 percent.

Because of an uneven distribution of farmworkers in the Nation, a tight farm labor situation exists in some localities. But, with the unemployment rate among agricultural workers—6.7 percent—running about twice that of all workers, farm workers are most certainly available.

To obtain them, however, growers must stage intensive recruitment efforts, either on their own or through their public employment service office, just as employers in other industries have traditionally done.

California asparagus growers have not done this and they are in trouble. Glen Brockway, San Francisco regional administrator of the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security, recently denied the San Joaquin Farm Production Association's request for 2,500 Mexico workers to harvest white asparagus. Mr. Brockway said the reason for the denial was, in part, that:

> The Association has declined to undertake an effective recruitment program to obtain domestic workers.
>
> It has declined to use the offices of the Employment Service to obtain domestic workers.

If all parties involved cooperate fully, I do not believe we will encounter very many tight labor situations that cannot be relieved through intensive recruitment.

I personally do not foresee any critical labor shortages in California this year. There certainly were not any last year.

Third, increased imports from Mexico. According to U.S. census data, $69.7 million in fruits and vegetables were imported to the United States from Mexico in 1965.

This is a rise of only $2.7 million or 4 percent over the year, compared to an $11 million—or a 19 percent—increase between 1963 and 1964.

In fact, the 4-percent rise in Mexican imports between 1964 and 1965 showed a marked slowdown from the average annual rise of 10.5 percent during the last 5 bracero years 1960–64.

But I would not argue that the termination of the bracero program led to this slowdown.

Fourth, welfare costs. There is absolutely no evidence that termination of the bracero program led to soaring welfare costs in California.

In fact, the evidence at hand is much stronger that welfare costs in California, as in other States, increase in the face of our rapidly expanding population.

For a little keener perspective in the matter, let us compare the welfare costs between California and a State with a fairly comparable population—New York.

In 1960, when the bracero program was in full swing, California's total payments in the Aid for Families With Dependent Children program ran nearly $9 million more than in New York.

Last year, however, the total Aid for Families With Dependent Children payments in California, now the Nation's most populous State, were $12.9 million less than in the Empire State.

In view of these facts, I cannot see how, by any stretch of the imagination, anyone can argue that termination of the bracero program caused welfare costs to "soar."

Furthermore, this statement omitted the crucial point that California, unlike New York, has a 1-year residential requirement to qualify families for this aid.

Regardless of one's vantage point, California agriculture—and, indeed, the entire State—benefited greatly from last year's bountiful harvest.

Last year, realized net income per farm hit $11,160, up 16.3 percent over the annual average for the years 1960–64.

The end of the bracero program means thousands of more jobs for domestic workers—and that millions of dollars remain in our country instead of leaving, improving our national balance-of-payments situation.

And it also means, in spite of the moans of a misguided few, that America has made a historic first step toward bringing agriculture into the mainstream of our economic life.

Let us continue our progress by providing agricultural workers with the same protections and working conditions long enjoyed by workers in other American industries.

Greater New York Dental Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Address by Congressman John E. Fogarty Before the Greater New York Dental Meeting, Monday, December 6, 1965, at New York City

Before beginning my talk itself, I want to join with those who have preceded me in paying tribute to my good friend, Bob Wagner. According to the program of this 41st annual meeting, we are marking tonight two anniversaries: the 100th anniversary of the College of Dentistry of New York University and the 300th anniversary of the City of New York. I would like to add one more commemoration to this and say we are also marking the 12 years of Bob Wagner's service to this city as its Mayor.

The distinguished quality of that service is symbolized by the action for which he is being specifically honored tonight: bringing the benefits of fluoridation to this city's children. I am proud to say that my home state has for years been one of the leaders of the nation in fluoridation, but even we Rhode Islanders have to take our hats off to a man who can, in one fell swoop, bring it to more than 8 million people. It's quite an accomplishment.

I also make mention of this third commemoration in order to assure Bob that he hasn't really been Mayor of New York for all the 300 years of its existence—it just seems that way to him. For the people he has served so well, his tenure in office has been too short.

I am supposed to address myself tonight to the topic, "A Challenging Era for the Dental Profession." I am particularly glad to do so because I firmly believe I was present at the birth of the era referred to in the title. It is my expectation that when American historians in the future look back and divide our time into its dominant themes, they will say that a new, vital era in health affairs began in January of 1961 when the 87th Congress convened and John Fitzgerald Kennedy was inaugurated President of the United States.

That month and that year marked, I believe, the beginning of vigorous, long needed action in all aspects of our health system, action whose impact is still continuing today. For some years prior to 1961, a number of people both in and out of Congress—I was one of them—had been pointing out that this nation was heading into a period where there would be great need for health services, for health professionals to provide them and for educational institutions to train those professionals. We kept urging that a beginning be made then to enable us successfully to meet those challenges that were surely coming. We had had some success. We got some measures through Congress. But as of January 1961, we had not really succeeded in moving forward uniformly on all fronts. When John Kennedy brought to our cause the power of the office he then began to occupy, the tide began to turn in our favor. We reaped many of the fruits of that beginning during the first session of the 89th Congress, which met throughout 1965.

As Dr. Hine has already said, more key health legislation was passed in the first session of the 89th Congress than in both sessions of any Congress in the last decade. There is one aspect to this accomplishment that hasn't been sufficiently noted and that I want to call to your attention tonight as forcefully as I can. It is this: the majority of that legislation was passed by the cooperative effort of members of Congress and representatives of the major health professions. The one obvious exception to this, of course, is that aspect of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 relating to health care of the aged but the tremendous amount of discussion of that measure has tended, most unfortunately in my opinion, to obscure the considerable area of agreement between all of us who are concerned with the health field.

There was general support for extension and liberalization of the community health provisions of the Public Health Service Act. There was general support for enactment of a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for library services and facilities for the health professions. There was general support for extension and expansion of assistance in constructing health professions schools and providing loans and scholarships for students of those schools. There was general support for providing operating assistance to these schools. There was general support for establishment of regional complexes for research and treatment in the fields of heart disease, cancer and stroke. There was general support for authorization of a new administration of aged care and a five-year grant program for community aged care projects. I was proud to have sponsored this last piece of legislation as well as being able to help the other measures I have mentioned find their way to enactment.

And finally, let me note, that the Social Security Amendments of 1965 did not merely enact health care for the aged but also brought into being or improved a number of programs directed toward crippled children, toward needy children, toward the blind, the disabled and the mentally retarded. There is much in these Amendments that has, I know, the strong approval of the dental profession and much that will be of great assistance to your profession in the years to come. Dentistry, of course, has as well a strong stake in a number of the other measures I have been enumerating.

There is, I think, a common thread running through all this legislation. It is a thread with two strands, one of recognition and one of commitment. By recognition, I mean that we are now beginning to take into account some of the changes that have been taking place in our society over the past decades, changes which we have been observing for sometime but whose significance we have not recognized with sufficient clarity.

The great advances made by the health professions in recent history, for example, have led not merely to saving lives that would have otherwise been lost, but to a changing character of the population. We are today a nation of 195 million people, of whom some 77 million are under 21 or over 65. In other words, these two groups, with their somewhat special health needs, constitute nearly 40 per cent of our total population, a higher proportion than ever before. We are now taking this fact into account.

The distribution of our population is also continuing to change as fewer and fewer people are to be found in rural areas and our urban communities become more and more the centers of population. The increased mobility of our people, very much a postwar phenomenon, also has significance for our pattern of health services. We are now taking these facts into account.

And then, there are all of the changes inherent in the rising levels of education achieved by our fellow citizens, the rising incomes of the vast majority of our families and the increased levels of expectation that such improvements naturally bring.

Finally, in this decade of the Sixties, we have become more acutely conscious than ever of the extent to which poverty, hunger and disease still dwell among us and of what they cost not only in terms of productive capacity but, more to the point, in terms of human anguish and misery. One family in five in this nation has an income of less than $3,000, surely poverty by anyone's definition. Of the children in such families, incidentally, about 55 per cent of them have never in their lives been to a dentist.

Now, all of these facts have to do with the first aspect of the common thread running through the legislation passed by the 89th Congress, that of recognition. The second strand of that thread, as I have said, is commitment.

As a nation, I believe we are committed today to a threefold health goal: to prevent as much disease as possible; to control and cure that which we can't prevent and, third, to have a supply of highly qualified health personnel adequate enough that services are accessible to everyone in need.

Our society today is one that believes good health to be not just a precious heritage or a pragmatic goal, but a basic human right. And I think most of us acknowledge that both the public and private sectors of the nation have a role to play in making that right a reality for every citizen, though there are sometimes differences among us as to the nature of each sector's role.

There can be no question that the role of the public sector—specifically that of the Federal government—has grown sharply in the past 15 years. Take the field of health related research, for example. In 1965, some $1.8 billion was spent on health related research. Of this total, 25 per cent came from private industry, 15 per cent came from private philanthropy, voluntary health agencies and miscellaneous sources, and the remaining 60 per cent came from the Federal government.

There is, I know, some concern among many thoughtful people about the extent of the Federal government's role. I do not criticize such concern—indeed, I welcome it—when it is properly founded on accurate information and logical thinking. But there is one great myth current on the subject that I think we all ought to try and avoid. It is the myth that leads some of us to talk about the American people as "we" and the Federal government as "they," as if the Federal government were something entirely apart from and alien to the nation. This is, flatly, nonsense.

The legislative branch of the Federal government is headed by men and women who must, every two years, present themselves to the electorate to be re-hired or fired. Much the same is true of the Executive branch. The President, every four years, must come before the people personally to have his mandate extended or ended. Every two years he goes before the people in a very real if not personal sense when the Congressional elections are held. The Federal government, I would submit, is as much a part of the nation as, say, the steel industry, and has perhaps a surer finger on the public pulse than, say, the television business.

Perhaps this sounds to you as if I'm belaboring the obvious. Frankly, I hope it does because that would mean you are free from the delusions this myth causes. This myth has two types of adverse effect: In some instances, it causes what is called the Birch syndrome, the main symptom of which is foaming at the mouth when the word "government" is even mentioned. I'm not concerned with that type at the moment. The other one, with which I am concerned, affects people who think in favor of Federal action and understand its logicality, but don't like to say so out loud. When the chips are down, they mumble. They tend to apologize for favoring Federal action, to talk around the issue, apparently wanting to mask their support. I see no reason to be so shy. The federal government springs from the people and is part of the people. Its resources are the people's resources and they ought to be taken into account when we talk about solving problems that afflict the people. To favor Federal action in some area or other is nothing more than saying it is sometimes necessary for all our people to act together at one time and with one purpose.

There can be no clearer application of this than in health. I have never seen a study claiming that the people of Georgia are immune from oral cancer or that the people of New Hampshire have no arthritis or that heart attacks are unknown in Kansas.

Albert Sabin happened to do most of the laboratory work on his oral vaccine against polio in Cincinnati and a good deal of the testing took place in Russia. But I don't recall anyone saying it wouldn't work in South Dakota or Tennessee. Most of the work related to the transmissibility of dental caries has taken place in Maryland but if a vaccine results, I think it safe to assume that every state in the nation—probably every nation in the world—will use it.

All of this argues toward the conclusion, inescapable in my opinion, that the Federal government has a strong and positive role in the health field.

This is not to say, of course, that the role of the Federal government is without rules or boundaries. There are stringent rules and whatever abstract worries there may be about the government abiding by them, I have not yet heard of concrete incidents in health that would lead me to believe the government isn't doing so.

Having said this, let me return to what I earlier characterized as thoughtful concern on the part of some people as to the nature and extent of the Federal government's role in health. Let me first make the point that the bulk of the government's effort has been in the fields of research and, more recently, education. In these instances, the traditional division of labor has been that the universities and research institutions of the nation supply the ideas and the workers. The Federal government, for its part, supplies the coordination to block duplication to the degree desirable, reviews applications to see that high national standards are kept in force and, finally, supplies much of the funding. There are exceptions, but by and large this is the way it is being done in research and education. The system has, in my opinion, worked well: it has worked to the benefit of the people and to the benefit of the health professions. I think most observers who are conversant with the facts will agree with that conclusion.

I don't believe, then, that this is the root cause of the concern to which I am referring. I think Dr. Hine, in his remarks, put his finger on the root cause when he spoke of what often seems to those in the private sector to be the great difficulty in mustering the initiative and momentum needed to tackle the challenges that remain to us. I don't disparage that concern. I understand how it arises and how it can sometimes paralyze action.

But it is a serious error, in my opinion, to say that the reason for this difficulty is the activity of the government. I don't believe it is. The difficulty, I believe, is in the very complexity and immensity of the problems we are talking about.

This is a huge nation. We occupy a great part of one of the continents of the world. We have nearly 200 million people. We have a gross national product of nearly $700 billion a year. Consequently, our problems are not small, not easily contained, not readily remedied.

But they must be remedied and they must be remedied in great part by the actions of the private sector, by hundreds of thousands of concerned citizens coming together to plan solutions and plan methods of putting those solutions into effect.

In a sense, I am saying these things to the wrong audience because the dental profession has a remarkable record of foresight in spotting problems and laying plans to meet them.

One example of such activity on your part is in the area of extending accessibility of care. The principle of pre-payment came to medicine some years ago. Its introduction into dentistry is of more recent origin. But its very introduction is a tribute to the foresight and consistent effort of the American Dental Association. Your Association believed the pre-payment principle to be a fact of life, believed that dentistry should take it into account and believed that it was an economically and professionally sound method of extending dental care to more citizens.

By the mid-Fifties, pilot programs incorporating this principle got underway, primarily on the West Coast. Based on their experience, commercial insurance companies came to understand that the American Dental Association had been right all along and began to take action. In addition, the Association began to encourage the development of the dental service corporation. This last action seems to me to be one of the most encouraging and imaginative examples of private sector initiative to be found anywhere in the health field.

I don't mean by that to say that it is an easy road or that no difficult problems will occur in the early years of this movement. But the principle is sound and realistic and I think your profession is most wise in persevering in this effort.

A second example of the dental profession's sense of initiative is the action taken at the recent annual session of the American Dental Association. I had the pleasure of attending some of the deliberations of the ADA House of Delegates this year, as I have in some previous years. As always, I was most impressed with the efficiency and thoughtfulness that characterizes your policy-making body.

The action it took this year to which I am referring—and to which Dr. Hine has already alluded—is the one that pledges a national program of dental care for children. You don't need me to tell you that this is an immense undertaking. But neither do you need me to tell you that it is a necessary one and that if it is not tackled by you, it will be by someone else. Personally, I prefer to see you take the lead; you have the experience, you have the professional competence, you have the commitment.

Again, as with dental service corporations, this program starts you down a road that will have a good many rough spots and detours in the early stages: the matter is simply too complex for this not to be true. But I do want you to know that I—and a good many of my colleagues in Congress—are actively interested in this effort and are anxious to help you succeed in it in whatever way we can.

The point, then, is that the role of the private sector is not shrinking in the health field, no matter what some doomsayers might want you to believe. There are plenty of fields left to conquer, plenty of goals left to be achieved. Dentistry and its sister professions will remain in the vanguard of this nation's effort to bring our health standards to an even higher level than today.

You will especially remain in that vanguard so long as you continue to show the foresight, responsibility and commitment that you have in the past. That is the real challenge facing the dental profession in this new era. My money is on you to be as successful in the future as you have been in the past. Thank you.

Myrtle Knows the Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of my many fine colleagues in Congress to a very excellent book, recently published by a constituent of mine, Mrs. Myrtle I. French of Burlington, Iowa. Mrs. French's book, "Myrtle Knows the Answers," is a warm and moving story of this woman's very human involvement in the lives of the people she has met and their problems.

Mrs. French has dedicated herself to helping all people everywhere. In reading this fine book, one easily realizes how Mrs. French has become No. 1 citizen and official greeter for the city of Burlington as well as one of the best known persons in Des Moines County, Iowa.

I would like to highly recommend this book as an excellent example of the kind of people who have made Iowa the great State that it is.

It's Good Business To Hire the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped met in Washington last week. In an article for America's newspapers, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor urged employers to hire the handicapped, pointing out "it's ability—not disability—that counts."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include Secretary Connor's message:

It's Good Business To Hire the Handicapped

(By John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce)

At a White House ceremony 2 years ago a most competent and talented civil servant reached from a wheel chair to accept from the President of the United States the highest honor that can come to a Government career employee—the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service.

Last summer, President Lyndon B. Johnson swore in a judge of the U.S. Tax Court who has been blind since age 12, but who possesses a remarkable talent for resolving tax equations.

Every day in Washington—and in business offices and factories across the land—handicapped men and women of similar courage, intelligence, and accomplishment are demonstrating that they have what it takes to play a productive role in the conduct of our Nation's affairs.

They work at all occupations, from truckdrivers to business managers, in old and new industries, from farming to space science. And often, through sheer ingenuity and persistence, they surmount serious limitations to be where they are.

Fortunately, more and more employers are beginning to realize that the handicapped make excellent employees.

They may be blind, deaf, epileptic, victims of infantile paralysis or cerebral palsy, cardiacs, or war amputees. But invariably they have developed some special skill, trained harder, pursued more education, or otherwise compensated for their physical impairment in order to find a way to a job, in fair competition with the able bodied, and to a useful place in life's mainstream.

Because of their disability, some may even fit certain jobs better than the able bodied. A Chicago insurance firm finds that deaf mutes, for example, make better than average file clerks because they concentrate so well. Blind workers, with their keen sense of touch, have made superior assemblers, inspectors, sorters, and counters of small parts in such vital industries as electronics, aircraft, and missile production. Cerebral palsy victims have been trained to use precision handtools, and amputees have learned to use prosthetic devices as well as limbs.

In fact, if more employers would take a good look at the physical requirements of jobs in their companies, they would find that many more could be filled ably by the handicapped.

Over the past 20 years the Federal Government has hired more than 200,000 disabled men and women, and many companies such as General Electric, Du Pont de Nemours, Burroughs, Bendix, American Telephone & Telegraph, Bulova Watch Co., Anodyne, Inc., Ford, and W. T. Grant Co., have utilized the handicapped with successful and even outstanding results.

The Caterpillar Tractor Co., winner of the 1963 Employer of the Year Award sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, has 3,000 handicapped workers on its payroll, many of whom have been there 20 years without being involved in an industrial accident, making a first aid call, or requesting an extended absence.

Raytheon Co., manufacturer of electronic equipment and 1964 winner, employs 1,500 disabled, each chosen for his ability to do a job, and independent enough not to need any special treatment.

And Hughes Aircraft Co., employer of a record 6,000 handicapped, boasts that it has safety records, insurance savings, and high production to attest to its hiring policy.

NAM sums up the experience of American business in utilizing the talents of the handicapped this way: Employers know that the handicapped individual who is matched to a job is no longer handicapped.

The fact is that it's very good business to hire the handicapped. There are few jobs they cannot perform in spite of their handicap when they're in the right job. Put to the test, they perform as well or better than their nonhandicapped colleagues in terms of both quantity and quality of work. They have a lower turnover rate, fewer lost-time accidents, favorable attendance records, and they don't cost a company any more in terms of employee investment or insurance. Insurance companies even encourage the employment of the handicapped in suitable jobs, because they have fewer disabling injuries than unimpaired workers exposed to the same work hazards.

At the U.S. Department of Commerce we have handicapped men and women working in a number of important posts. One chairridden economist at the Census Bureau is at the top of his field in corporate statistics. A woman—victim of infantile paralysis—who has seen 25 years of service with the Maritime Administration and its predecessor agencies—is an authority on shipping. And a deaf patent examiner specializing in organic chemistry won an outstanding rating and superior performance award for his brilliant work last year.

Over the past 5 years, the Department of Commerce has bestowed 2 gold medals, 22 silver medals, 6 bronze medals, 73 production awards, 113 outstanding performance ratings, and 129 sustained superior performance citations to handicapped individuals. And not all have college degrees, either.

At a time when our Nation is able to enjoy its greatest prosperity ever, when unemployment is at a 12-year low and talent is in premium demand, it is tragic and wasteful to retain disabled workers on the welfare rolls when they could be on the payrolls and tax rolls.

The disabled don't ask any favors when they seek a place in society as breadwinners and taxpayers. Neither do they come to us untrained, incompetent, emotionally unstable, or otherwise unable to maintain themselves in the work environment. They ask only to be hired on the basis of what they can produce.

If we neglect to open the doors of opportunity to them, we are guilty of wasting our most precious resource—people—and one of our great untapped sources of talent. Who can say that there is not a blind Homer or Milton, a deaf Beethoven, or a deaf Thomas Edison among them, if we do not create an opportunity for such talent to come to light?

Our goal cannot be just one of finding a job for every worker, but as President Johnson has said, it must be one of placing "every worker in a job where he utilizes his full productive potential, for his own and for society's benefit."

Hire the Handicapped? These Businessmen Have

J. M. Bridgman, vice president, Burroughs Corp.: "We are convinced that the employment of the handicapped is not only profitable but in the mutual interest of employee and employer. These employees are proficient and productive, conscientious and loyal."

L. du Pont Copeland, president, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.: "Hiring the physically handicapped involves matching individual abilities to job requirements. In our experience, any extra effort required is justified for employer and employee alike."

Tom Gillick, supervisor of insurance, Hughes Aircraft Co.: "We've found that it really doesn't matter whether a company's workers have two legs, or one, or none. Insurance rates are not influenced. In fact, many insurance companies consider the handicapped a better risk than their ablebodied coworkers."

E. T. Turney, board chairman and president, Anodyne, Inc.: "It's a crime to waste all this potential human talent, and it's a crime not to go looking for it. There are no handicapped people. There are only human beings. Is the man willing to work?"

The AFL–CIO says: "America's handicapped workers are entitled to a chance to prove their merit. Our industries and trades should benefit from maximum employment of their skills. Handicapped workers when placed on the right job are capable workers—productive and efficient."

Symposium on Rheumatic and Coronary Heart Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Address of Congressman John E. Fogarty at the Symposium on Rheumatic and Coronary Heart Disease, Sponsored by St. Barnabas Hospital, New York City, December 10, 1965

Dr. Bailey and honored guests, it was both a pleasure and a privilege to be invited to speak tonight before this distinguished group of internists and cardiologists.

Today, and for the next two days, you will be considering clinical problems posed by rheumatic and coronary heart disease and discussing established, improved, or altogether new approaches to the prevention, diagnosis, and clinical management of these diseases. It is quite likely that the development and clinical evaluation of many of the techniques, tools, and drugs that will be covered here have been aided to some extent by research grants awarded by the Federal government to scientists and clinicians like yourselves.

In fact, some of you may now be grantees or may have been in the past. But, whether or not you have ever received a nickel in Federal support for your own research or clinical activities; yet all of you have benefited, directly or indirectly, from Federal programs in support of health research and so have your patients. The increases in our fund of basic knowledge and the clinical advances that have stemmed from Federal investments in health research are available to you and are frequently used in dealing with the health needs of your patients.

And, by the same token, it is physicians such as yourselves who are ultimately responsible for whatever success crowns any Federal program in medical research. A new heart valve, drug, or surgical procedure developed in the laboratory—whether it be merely a slight improvement or a major advance—becomes of consequence only when it is taken out of the laboratory or medical library and into the wards. Only then does the investment in funds and effort expended in its development begin to pay dividends in the relief of suffering or the saving or prolonging of human life.

As cardiologists and internists, you are key participants in our Nation's battle against its most serious health problem. As casefinders and diagnosticians, you bear the primary responsibility for detecting treatable or potentially curable congenital or acquired heart disease and for bringing the best in current methods of treatment and rehabilitation to bear on cardiovascular problems of the individual and on problems prevalent in both large and small communities.

It is a heavy responsibility and you have borne it extremely well. That today, the medical care available to our citizens suffering from cardiovascular disease is second to none in the world is largely your doing.

That, in providing medical care to our citizens, you be provided with the best diagnostic, therapeutic, and preventive techniques that research can provide is a goal of Federal programs of research support. That there be sufficient numbers of highly trained research manpower to refine and improve existing methods and devise new ones and that there be sufficient numbers of highly trained clinicians to utilize these techniques fully against our Nation's disease problems is a goal of Federal programs in research and clinical training.

Today, our country commands more highly skilled medical research manpower than ever before in its history. And, thanks in large measure to the heavy outlay of Federal funds for health research and training, we have been able to launch and sustain a research assault of steadily increasing scope and intensity on our Nation's major crippling and killing diseases. I am proud that I have been privileged to help in mounting this great offensive.

But when did this great effort against the killing and crippling diseases actually begin and how did it get started? I think we would have to go back to World War II. Medicine, as usual, made great advances in that war: advances born out of horror, death, destruction, and fear. A young Army surgeon, for example, might encounter more varied examples of trauma as a result of one battle than in five years of a peacetime residency and a physician at a military base might see more cases of rheumatic fever in one year than in a life-time of private practice.

And with the war there was also a great need to aid these battle-pressed physicians with better drugs, diagnostic equipment, and greater knowledge on which to base treatment. This led, in turn, to a change in the philosophy concerning the proper role of the Federal government in the support of research and training in the biomedical sciences.

After the war, many leaders in medicine as well as public-spirited citizens wondered whether the great progress made in the exigencies of war could not be carried over into an even more significant effort in peacetime. The answer was obvious. Such an effort could be made—and it was made.

As early as 1944, the Public Health Service Act has consolidated and revised existing public health legislation and provided the legislative basis for postwar programs of the (then) National Institute of Health. Then, between 1948 and 1950, an epoch-making series of Acts authorized the creation of six new institutes. Each was charged with establishing National programs of research and training; developing more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment in specified disease areas; and assisting States and local communities in the fullest application of these methods. In effect, the goal was to mobilize our Nation's health resources in massive, co-ordinated attacks on its pressing health problems.

However, in developing these programs, the enlightened policies adopted by the various agencies of the Public Health Service have also safeguarded the freedom and initiative of recipient investigators and institutions. Through review mechanisms permitting a cross section of top-flight, non-Federal scientists and public leaders to determine the most effective use of Federal funds, the Public Health Service has consistently received excellent returns on its health research and training investments while also eliminating for the recipient of Federal aid much of the red tape which many still seem to think is synonymous with Federal administration.

But let us look at some of the results of these federally-aided programs over the past years. It is a fact that over the past 10–15 years, more has been learned about the cardiovascular system and its diseases than had been learned in all the previous years of medical history. Enough has been learned about the factors that increase the individual's risk of developing coronary heart disease to construct a "coronary profile" that is now helping you physicians spot the coronary candidate early and to initiate measures to reduce his risk. Further, it is now possible for you to do something about many of these risk factors, such as elevated blood levels of cholesterol and other fats, high blood pressure, and others.

For example, elevated blood levels of cholesterol and other fatty substances can now usually be reduced by dietary changes or by certain drugs and hormones. High blood pressure of all degrees of severity can be controlled with any of a number of effective drugs or combinations of drugs. These drugs have reduced by 50 per cent the death rates from hypertension over the past decade and have also reduced mortality from such common complications of hypertension as heart attacks, strokes, heart failure and kidney failure.

Today, victims of heart attacks have a much better chance of riding out the attack, recovering sufficiently to return to their former occupations and activities, and enjoying many more years of life and health than they would have had only 10 or 15 years ago. Anticoagulants, improved resuscitation measures, more effective drugs for countering circulatory crises, assisted circulation techniques to tide the heart over until it is able to assume its circulatory duties; all these increase the victim's chances for life. And clot-dissolving agents, such as Urokinase (uro-KYN-ace) may provide even more effective means of treatment in the near future.

Many stroke victims can now be cured or substantially improved by surgery to remove or bypass clots or atherosclerotic deposits obstructing blood flow to the brain. Others are now benefiting from anticoagulants, drugs that dilate cerebral blood vessels, and other forms of therapy not available just a few years ago. Modern rehabilitation procedures now help crippled stroke victims regain lost bodily function and allow many of them to return to work and to lead more useful lives.

There is probably nothing so heart-rending as a child deprived of anything resembling a normal life, and often sentenced to an early death by congenital heart disease. Fortunately, modern techniques of open-heart surgery can now completely correct or palliate most forms of congenital heart disease. It has been estimated that, with currently available methods of surgery, over 80 percent of the 30,000 or more infants born in the U.S. each year with congenital heart disease could be saved.

Furthermore, with currently available methods of prevention and treatment, another scourge of the young—rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease—could also be eliminated as an important cause of death and disability. Prompt and adequate treatment of strep infections can prevent most rheumatic fever attacks. Even when rheumatic fever does strike, crippling damage to the heart can often be avoided by vigorous treatment with steroids and other drugs. And recurrent attacks can often be prevented by continuous treatment with penicillin or other antibiotics. These measures, coupled with improved surgical techniques for repairing or replacing heart valves damaged by rheumatic fever, have reduced death rates from rheumatic heart disease among children and young adults from 30 per 100,000 population to about 2 per 100,000. This year alone, over 300,000 people are leading normal, active lives who would have died from this condition if the death rates of a generation ago had prevailed.

An area in which further clinical progress is most urgently needed is coronary heart disease. Whereas during the past decade mortality rates for most major cardiovascular diseases have decreased, mortality from coronary heart disease has continued to climb in most segments of the population. However, with intensification of present programs, hopes are high that substantial reductions in mortality from coronary heart disease may be achieved in the foreseeable future.

A major phase of this overall program will be an intensified effort to develop a dependable, artificial heart for the total and permanent replacement of hearts hopelessly damaged by disease or injury. During the past decade, research progress has been so great in this field that development or such a device is predicted within the foreseeable future.

To achieve this goal in the shortest possible time, present Federal programs are being supplemented with a diversified program of grants and negotiated contracts to universities, engineering firms, and other elements of private industry. These will be aimed at solving specific problems in developing materials, pump specifications and designs, power sources, and control mechanisms to be incorporated into the final model for installation in humans. Also being expanded is research and development of assisted circulation techniques and booster pumps to provide temporary support to a failing circulation. This temporary respite may enable the patient's damaged heart to recover sufficiently to resume business as usual. Later, when artificial hearts become available, such a pump could provide hearts damaged beyond recovery with enough circulatory assistance to sustain the patient until an artificial heart could be installed.

It is impossible to predict with certainty how many American lives might be saved each year if an artificial heart were available, but estimates have ranged from 60,000 to hundreds of thousands. With stakes as high as this, can we afford to proceed at less-than-maximum speed toward the attainment of this goal? With the goal now apparently in sight, dare we relax our efforts when the cost of each month's delay may be counted in thousands of lives lost that might have been saved?

I think not, and so do my colleagues in Congress. During the House hearings this year, the immense potential and urgency of this program was underscored by the testimony of numerous distinguished witnesses, many of them scientists who have made major contributions to past and present progress in artificial-heart research. Accordingly, we provided an additional $2.5 million for artificial heart research and development over the amount originally requested by NHI.

As a result, during this fiscal year alone NHI will spend nearly $4 million on the artificial heart program.

Expensive? Indeed it is; and, in all probability, it will get steadily more expensive during the "big push" of the next 5–10 years. We do not yet know how much the development of the artificial heart will ultimately cost. But we are convinced that the potential return in human lives more than justifies any effort and expense that may be required.

Still another major goal during the next five years is an intensified clinical research program relating to the acute phase of heart attacks. As you well know, among patients hospitalized for acute heart attacks, many who appear to have "hearts too good to die" nevertheless succumb, often to complications that might possibly be forestalled or corrected by available methods. However, these complications often develop so swiftly, I am told, that the patient may die before anything can be done.

Evidence is accumulating that mortality among hospitalized heart-attack patients may be reduced through intensive coronary care units combining electronic monitoring of these patients with full utilization of presently available resuscitation and therapeutic techniques. Encouraged by reports from the few units currently in operation, the Public Health Service is assisting in the establishment of such units at additional hospitals and clinics. The goal is to determine whether mortality can be reduced sufficiently to justify and encourage the establishment and operation of similar units in medical centers throughout the country.

Drug evaluation studies will also occupy an important place in the heart program during the next five years or more. Two large-scale studies currently underway are both concerned with evaluating the effectiveness of currently available therapeutic measures in reducing mortality among heart-attack victims.

One is assessing the effectiveness of various lipid-lowering drugs and hormones in reducing recurrent heart attacks and increasing longevity among men who have survived one or more attacks. This study is off to a modest start, but present plans call for the gradual expansion of the study to include up to 55 co-operating institutions and more than 8,000 patients during the next three years. The other is concerned with the clinical evaluation of Urokinase, the most promising clot-dissolving agent developed thus far, against various thromboembolic complications of cardiovascular disease. Hopes are high that Urokinase may turn out to be a major breakthrough against a number of crippling, often lethal complications of atherosclerosis.

Another important study, completed very recently, developed from epidemiological research which suggested that the high-fat, high-caloric diet habitually consumed by most Americans is an important factor in the high prevalence of heart disease among our adults and that our heart-disease mortality might be reduced by dietary changes acceptable to many Americans.

The present study sought to determine whether more than 2,000 volunteers would faithfully adhere to a modified diet over a prolonged period and to determine its effects on plasma levels of cholesterol and other lipids. It will not tell us whether dietary modifications can affect mortality from heart disease; but it should tell us whether a long-term, massive population study that would be required to test this hypothesis is likely to justify the enormous expense and effort involved in such an undertaking. Thus the findings may have an important bearing on future PHS program planning in heart-disease prevention.

Thus far, the dividends resulting from the heavy Federal investment in medical research have been substantial: An enormous store of basic knowledge about the cardiovascular system and its diseases has been accumulated, and an impressive array of clinical advances have stemmed directly from that knowledge. But only when this knowledge and these clinical advances are widely applied by men like yourselves to meet the needs of individual patients do research investments pay more gratifying dividends in terms of human lives saved and salvaged.

Last year, the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke studied the problems still confronting us in these three disease areas and recommended means for reducing the heavy toll in death and disability presently exacted by these disorders. The Commission concluded that this toll could be substantially reduced if advanced diagnostic and therapeutic techniques, already developed and clinically proven, could be made more widely available to our citizens.

The major recommendations of the Commission for bringing this about form the basis for the Heart, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965. The law authorizes a three-year, $340 million program of grants for the planning and establishment of regional medical programs. These grants would provide support for cooperative arrangements linking major medical schools and their affiliated teaching hospitals with clinical research centers, local community hospitals, and practicing physicians serving that region.

The specific design of regional plans and programs would be dictated by the relationships established among these resources. However, such a design might encompass such aspects as coordinated referral of patients, interchange of medical and research personnel, programs of continuing education for physicians, the provision of advanced research and clinical equipment and training in its use, and the development and support of medical teams highly trained in the latest techniques of diagnosis and treatment.

Grants will be made for planning, for feasibility studies, and for pilot projects to assess the value of these co-operative regional arrangements and to provide a base of experience for further development of the over-all program.

The emphasis throughout will be on local initiative in planning and developing programs most suited to the health needs and health resources of a particular region. The success of a regional program will require co-operation of practicing physicians, medical center officials, hospital administrators, and representatives from local chapters of appropriate voluntary health agencies. Each grant applicant, therefore, must designate a group of such representatives to advise him, together with the participating institutions, in formulating and implementing plans for establishing and carrying out the regional medical program.

In developing the over-all program, the Federal government will studiously avoid interfering with patterns or methods of financing patient care, with professional practice, or with the administration of hospitals.

The impact of Federal programs for research and health on the practice of medicine has already been great; and, during the years to come, it is likely to be greater still. Federal funds have helped to support the development of many of the diagnostic, preventive, and therapeutic techniques that many of you use every day; they have assisted in the training of countless new research workers and clinicians; and they are helping to provide this body of highly trained scientific manpower with the weapons needed in the continuing research assault on our major health problems.

You may recall how, in the early days of World War II, America served primarily as the Arsenal of Democracy. In a sense, today we in Congress, through our appropriation of public funds to augment the contributions of private health agencies, industry, and private citizens, help to supply the weapons for the war on disease. We do not tell you how to wage the battle. In fact, in this area as in no other, the Congress relies on the medical profession and biomedical scientists to provide the direction, the formulation as well as the execution of Federal programs.

During House and Senate hearings each year, the testimony of private citizens, physicians, eminent authorities in biomedical research, and directors and staff members of health and welfare agencies is collected, then painstakingly sifted and weighed. On the basis of this counsel, the results of existing programs are evaluated, earlier programs may be re-shaped or abandoned, and new programs formulated as the current needs of clinical and laboratory research dictate.

In essence, then, it is you, more than my colleagues in the House and in the Senate or myself, that indicate the direction that Federal programs in health and research will take. Our job in Congress is never to tell you what to do, but rather to find out what you need in order to do your job, try to supply it, then leave you alone to get on with it. For only in this way will Federal programs in research and health have significance in aiding you in your life-long dedication to bettering the health and welfare of our people.

The William Black Medical Research Building: New Resource for Columbia Presbyterian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE WILLIAM BLACK MEDICAL RESEARCH BUILDING: NEW RESOURCE FOR COLUMBIA PRESBYTERIAN

(Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, dedication, William Black Medical Research Building, New York City, Jan. 3, 1966)

I would like to begin these brief remarks by expressing my pleasure in being invited to attend these ceremonies, and to offer my congratulations and those of my associates in Washington on your accomplishment here. We share your happiness in seeing this fine new structure, the William Black Medical Research Building, come into being as one more strong base from which our never-ending fight against disease and disability will move forward.

Mr. Black needs no tribute from me, but I would like to add my own praise for his open and purposeful generosity in this instance. In his desire to help solve the "riddle of Parkinson's disease and other mysterious afflictions of mankind," he has made available funds totaling over $5 million for this project—the largest single contribution by a living person to Columbia University in its long history.

Mr. Black is a native Brooklynite, who took his engineering degree at Columbia 40 years ago and shortly thereafter, in a move that could have been called "Operation Bootstrap," went into business for himself. Demonstrating those qualities that were to set him apart as a business executive, he quickly adopted the high principles that have since prevailed in his relations with his employees and built up a multi-million dollar business from scratch.

The same principles are evident in his philanthropic activities, whose beneficiaries—in addition to the University—include the Parkinson's Disease Foundation, several other New York City Hospitals, and his home town of New Rochelle.

Mr. Black is one of the new breed of philanthropists, who are deeply convinced that to be useful, philanthropy must be meaningful . . . who would rather see the results of their good intentions with their own eyes than to be memorialized, no matter how discreetly, after their passing. I recall that he has long contended that too much money is spent on unessential things when "we don't have the facilities to take care of all human suffering."

This new research facility will do much to help correct that deficiency and will stand as a monument to his philosophy of life and serve as a permanent reminder of the degree to which not only Columbia, but the main body of American research and medical science is indebted to him.

At the same time I would be remiss if I did not note the assistance of the major foundations, the University Trustees and Trustees of Presbyterian Hospital, the members of the professional staff of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and the many other friends of Columbia Presbyterian who saw fit to contribute to this most worthy project.

Your new scientific resource is so attractive in appearance that one does not initially realize that it is also as modern and as functional as the skills of its designers could make it. As one who has not only had some experience placing one brick on top of another but also has served as one of the architects of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, passed earlier this year, I can say that this building enhances the charm of the Center's older buildings, and yet detracts nothing from the overall dignity of the Center's panorama. And it marks one of the final steps in a sentimental—yet practical—journey that began some 6 or 7 years ago when the Medical Center embarked in its long-range $50 million development program. Here we have an example of urban development at its best—the development of a city within a city—and I understand that a faculty apartment house and a new doctor's private practice building are still to come.

But this is only one side of the coin. More than bricks and mortar, more than gleaming instruments and shining laboratories, this new medical research building represents the determination of your leaders to keep the Center in the vanguard of this country's forward thrust in medical research. It is a physical representation of what can be achieved when dedication and competence are cross-pollinated.

The very quality of your research scientists and their work, your outstanding medical school, and its most able faculty are all factors that have made your research program so productive. In addition, as a leader in the field, the Center has a responsibility in training research personnel and in providing leadership in research which inevitably take it into newly-developing research areas.

It was natural that much more space in which to carry on this kind of promising research and research training would be necessary. It was imperative that it be furnished.

From my long experience as Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, I can almost sense the agonizing consideration the Trustees must have given to the alternatives presented by the possibilities of space rearrangement, by renovation and rehabilitation of existing laboratories, and by additions to the present physical plant. I know, from the same source of experience, that they finally realized that the changing character and exacting requirements of today's medical research made this new building essential.

Presbyterian is the largest voluntary nonprofit hospital in America, which for all practical purposes probably makes it the largest in the world. From its very beginnings, it has been well in the forefront of contemporary social and scientific advancement. For all who visit the Center today, its story—almost a century old—is epitomized on the original tablet which expresses the purpose from which Presbyterian's humanitarian traditions sprang. The tablet states that the hospital exists "for the poor of New York without regard to race, creed or color—supported by voluntary contributions."

In a day when we like to consider ourselves enlightened, many people may have some difficulty in grasping how revolutionary this idea was when James Lenox and his friends transcended the racial and economic segregation of their time and opened Presbyterian to all who might need its assistance.

It was 98 years and one day ago, on January 2, 1868 when Mr. Lenox addressed a circular letter to "such gentlemen in the City as might sympathize with its objects," proposing the establishment of the hospital. He received such a gratifying response that within a month a Board of Managers had been named and Presbyterian was on its way to realization.

That year was to see a great deal more than the beginnings of Presbyterian. On the national scene, President Johnson, trying to carry out Lincoln's policies without Lincoln's political skill, got into trouble with Congress. The conflict culminated with Johnson's impeachment trial for attempting to remove his disloyal Secretary of War in defiance of the Tenure of Office Act. He was tried by the Senate which, after weeks of charges and countercharges, failed of impeachment by a single vote on May 26th.

Four days later, the nation officially celebrated its first Memorial Day.

In 1868, Alva Edison joined the Western Union Telegraph Company, beginning at 21 an inventive career that would gain him more than 1,000 patents.

Admiral Farragut, who had said "Damn the torpedoes!" at the Battle of Mobile Bay, was leading his Eastern Squadron on a goodwill tour of continental ports.

And Christopher Sholes introduced the first commercial typewriter.

There were mileposts for Medicine in 1868, too.

The infectiousness of tuberculosis was demonstration by the talented Frenchman, Villemin, who transmitted the disease in animals.

Dr. Neumann first described the blood-forming role of the bone marrow.

And Julius Cohnheim, the most distinguished pupil of Virchow himself, assumed a professorship at Kiel, beginning an illumination of the functional and experimental study of disease that would make him the greatest experimental pathologist of the modern era. In turn, Cohnheim had brilliant pupils: Ehrlich, Neisser, and an American named William Welch.

Here in New York, its organization completed, the site donated and the necessary funding assured, Presbyterian moved swiftly ahead in the next few years and, on October 10, 1872, the new hospital was formally opened. One particularly astute observer sized it up nicely at the time when he said that "in the light of the then existing conditions a high degree of perfection had been attempted and attained."

In retrospect, these early days of Presbyterian are so intriguing that one is tempted to linger with them. The "First Medical Board," for example, fairly bristles with names of the outstanding physicians and surgeons of the day. But there is not time today and there are more able historians.

One of these was the eminent Dr. D. Bryon Delavan. Most Center people are familiar with his little volume on the hospital's origin; I commend it to all of you who may not have read it. Dr. Delavan's sketches of the giants who labored here are minor masterpieces of observation and objectivity.

Presbyterian Hospital and Columbia University were among the first institutions to pursue the imaginative concepts of men like Dr. Abraham Flexner, who envisioned the dynamic possibilities of academic medicine. Some 45 years ago, the two institutions concluded an agreement whereby Presbyterian became a teaching hospital and the services of Columbia's College of Physicians and Surgeons became available to its patients.

Presbyterian and Columbia were most fortunate in their relationship with men like Edward S. Harkness, whose support enabled the vision to be realized. Aware that the most efficient operations are only a means to an end—a means to give the doctor, the teacher, the research scientist, the nurse the opportunity to do their utmost—Mr. Harkness formed a band of true visionaries in the 1920's to devise a practical method of integrating Presbyterian's eleven general and specialized hospitals, institutes and clinics and the Columbia medical school into a single working unit . . . . a Medical Center.

There is some minor controversy even today as to the origin of this grand concept, but it is a matter of cold fact that Columbia-Presbyterian was the first to realize the concept within a group of buildings specifically designed for the threefold purpose of patient care, teaching, and research.

Since that time, there have been changes of many kinds. Yet, during all these years—through World War II and the temporary fitful calm that followed—through the Korean conflict—through the cold war and in our present involvement in southeast Asia—Center physicians and their associates have continued to compile a proud and significant record of contributing to advances in medical science, medical education, and medical care.

The expansion and further development of a huge medical complex such as this is always an uphill struggle. Today, the Medical Center comes over the brow of one of those hills, and there is no doubt in my mind that the vista coming into view is a most promising one. For, in the scheme of things to come, the new William Black Medical Research Building will provide much critically-needed space for important medical research.

This is as it should be. After World War II there was a tremendous surge in research support—support that continues to grow with each passing year. But only in the last ten years has there been any clear emphasis on support of research construction.

In 1956, page after page of testimony before our Congressional committees overwhelmingly confirmed the conviction that was uppermost in the minds of some of us at the time—that expansion of facilities was essential to any further growth of our national research effort. As a result, Congress passed the Health Research Facilities Act that year, for the purpose of raising the quality and capacity of our research environment, and provided matching funds for construction in both public and non-profit institutions.

The results of this program have been most gratifying. The latest available figures indicate that in its first eight and a half years of existence, it has made 1,263 grants totaling approximately $320 million. The value of the "matching funds" concept is apparent when one learns that the overall cost of the research laboratories financed in part by PHS grants is more than $800 million, and the total cost of the buildings containing these laboratories and other facilities exceeds $1.5 billion.

One of the many key health measures passed by the first session of the 89th Congress extended the life of this fruitful program for another three years, and authorized a substantial increase in its appropriation. Passage of this Act was particularly satisfying at a time when expansion of physical plant for research is so urgently needed throughout the nation.

All of which is central to our ceremonies here today. By providing a suitable area in which your dedicated scientists can perform their research unimpeded, who can tell what impetus may be given to the solution of some of the many problems that face us today in our efforts to prolong the lives and maintain the health of our citizens.

There must be no slackening of pace in this effort. The 89th Congress having established itself as the "Health Congress," certainly intends that there be no slackening of the pace. More key health measures were enacted in the first session of the 89th Congress than in both sessions of any Congress in the past decade. All of these measures—programs for strengthening our supplies of trained manpower in medicine and professions related to health, Medicare, the community mental health programs, the Appalachia regional program, the regional programs for heart disease, cancer and stroke, the vocational rehabilitation amendments, the strengthening of manpower resources through assistance to both the schools and their needy students—had the active support of a public-spirited Congress. All of this we in Congress have been enabled to do because of one thing: the express will of our people. These steps have been taken with a full realization of what this nation could afford—in relation to the Gross National Product and international commitments—to preserve and enhance the strength of its people.

I am frankly concerned at the stories I hear about the possibility of a curtailment of progressive programs for our people because of an increasing commitment in the international area. If we must cut back on domestic spending I would suggest that it be done in some areas other than medical research, where our programs have been built on a very solid base of support for facilities—such as this one—for projects, and most important for the training of fresh scientific manpower. Any cutback in the rate of commitment to this war on disease will have serious longterm effect on the strength of this Nation.

In this age of commitment, I am committed to the pledge I have made to the American people to do all in my power to see to it that our citizens are not denied the waiting opportunities for a longer, happier, and more productive life.

I know that this commitment has the support of this audience and informed citizens throughout the country. I need not ask your continued support; I will simply try to continue to reflect it.

Percy John "P.J." Trevethan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, this week at the Washington Hilton, hundreds of civic and government leaders met to honor Percy John "P.J." Trevethan, the executive vice president, for his 40 years of devoted service to the cause of helping handicapped people. Dr. Trevethan, widely known among his friends and associates as "P.J.," started his distinguished career in 1926 when he became an executive trainee in the Morgan Memorial Goodwill Industries, the mother of Goodwill, in Boston, Mass., under the leadership of its founder, Dr. Edgar J. Helms. He served then as director of the Goodwill Industries section of the Morgan Memorial program until 1946. In that year, Dr. Trevethan left Morgan Memorial to join the national staff of Goodwill Industries of America as assistant executive director, and in 1948 became the executive.

In the course of these years, he has made thousands of appearances, thousands of speeches, many trips and worldwide tours and visits on behalf of programs and projects to help the handicapped. He was a pioneer in the field of sheltered workshops. He has served on dozens of boards and advisory committees of organizations in the field of rehabilitation. He has also received many honors, including the highest awards of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, the National Rehabilitation Association and the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

Society owes a great debt to Dr. Trevethan, who as much as any man took the problem of the handicapped out of the Dark Ages attitude toward giving these people normal, useful lives. The insignia of Goodwill—Good Willie in his fast moving wheelchair—is well known throughout the Nation.

There are now 131 Goodwill outlets in the United States and 27 of them in foreign lands. "Not charity but a chance" has motivated his leadership. He expressed great concern at his retirement dinner concerning the 22 to 25 million persons in the United States who are on the handicapped list.

In June of 1966 Dr. Trevethan will retire from his present position to become a distinguished emeritus leader in the field of rehabilitation.

The Goodwill Industries of America has an outstanding record of helping people to help themselves.

His service was eulogized by Dr. Frank H. Krusen of the People to People Committee for the Handicapped and Mr. Harold Russell—of "The Best Years of Our Life" fame—now Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

This compassionate friend of thousands of handicapped people expressed gratitude to the devoted men and women who give so many hours of volunteer service to the handicapped. We who gathered to honor Dr. Trevethan are grateful that the Goodwill program has now spread from the United States into many foreign nations. My district has a number of the Goodwill outlets and Dr. Trevethan has visited many times in our area. Goodwill does give the handicapped of this Nation an opportunity to become useful citizens.

MacGregor Legislative Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the results of my 1966 legislative questionnaire have now been tabulated. The popular response gives a true indication of public opinion in the Third Congressional District of Minnesota on important public issues.

With the dedicated help of many volunteers, I prepared and mailed a copy of the questionnaire to each of approximately 130,000 homes. The returns were gratifying in that 18,421 people—a response of over 14 percent—gave me the benefit of their opinions. Many respondents, in addition to checking "yes" and "no" answers, added comments which have been of real value to me in providing representation to the residents of suburban and rural Hennepin and Anoka Counties.

The test of successful representative government is an informed, concerned, and alert citizenry. I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that this questionnaire project in 1966, as in past years, proves that the people of my area in Minnesota meet this test.

Following are the results of the questionnaire:

THE 1966 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE, CLARK MACGREGOR, THIRD DISTRICT, MINNESOTA

1. Do you regard our overall effort in southeast Asia to be vital to the interests of the United States? Yes, 79 percent; no, 14 percent; undecided or no answer, 7 percent.

2. Do you support the U.S. objective of fighting "for the principle of self-determination"[1] and the cause of individual freedom in South Vietnam? Yes, 78 percent; no, 15 percent; undecided or no answer, 7 percent.

3. Do you approve of the tactics employed to date to accomplish this objective? Yes,

---

[1] Quoted from the President's State of the Union message of Jan. 12, 1966.

39 percent; no, 46 percent; undecided or no answer, 15 percent.

4. Would you favor a Cuba-type "quarantine" or peaceful blockade to stop the flow of Communist weapons into the North Vietnamese port of Haiphong? Yes, 74 percent; no, 15 percent; undecided or no answer, 11 percent.

5. Do you favor international arbitration of the Vietnam conflict under United Nations auspices? Yes, 62 percent; no, 26 percent; undecided or no answer, 12 percent.

6. Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permits States to prohibit union shop contracts: Should it be repealed? Yes, 18 percent; no, 75 percent; undecided or no answer, 7 percent.

7. Do you favor "a constitutional amendment extending the term" of U.S. Representatives "to 4 years concurrent with that of the President?"[1] Yes, 43 percent; no, 49 percent; undecided or no answer, 8 percent.

8. Do you favor the recommendation that Congress "make it possible to expand trade between the United States and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union?"[1] Yes, 52 percent; no, 34 percent, undecided or no answer, 14 percent.

9. Do you believe that Congress should create a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation? Yes, 34 percent; no, 47 percent; undecided or no answer, 19 percent.

10. Should Congress vote to spend an additional $80 million now to construct and flight-test a new 2,000-mile-per-hour supersonic transport airplane? Yes, 31 percent; no, 53 percent; undecided or no answer, 16 percent.

11. President Johnson has spoken of an urgent need for foreign aid directed toward education, health, and population growth: Do you favor a program "to dedicate $1 billion to these efforts?"[1] Yes, 32 percent; no, 56 percent; undecided or no answer, 12 percent.

12. Do you favor increased spending by the Federal Government on solutions to the problems of water and air pollution? Yes, 77 percent; no, 17 percent; undecided or no answer, 6 percent.

13. Should the Congress vote to authorize and to spend the money "not only to continue but to speed up the war on poverty?"[1] Yes, 20 percent; no, 69 percent; undecided or no answer, 11 percent.

14. Do you feel that the executive branch in Washington is providing adequate factual information to Congress and to the American people? Yes, 15 percent; no, 70 percent; undecided or no answer, 15 percent.

15. Do you favor President Johnson's $2.3 billion program to "rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods"[1] in some of our urban areas? Yes, 21 percent; no, 68 percent; undecided or no answer, 11 percent.

16. Do you favor measures to broaden political participation "through added tax incentive, to stimulate small contributions to the party and to the candidate"[1] of a person's choice? Yes, 35 percent; no, 50 percent; undecided or no answer, 15 percent.

War on Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the major goals of the Great Society is the elimination of poverty and the eradication of slum areas in the United States. Our Government, not only in recent years, but throughout our history, has sought to provide the best possible housing for all of our citizens, regardless of differences in race, creed, and economic status.

And we are making tremendous inroads in this important and extremely difficult undertaking. Indeed, the successful partnership between Government and private sponsors and developers, working side by side in the field of urban renewal, has in no small way aided our "war on slums." Urban renewal projects have brought new and improved housing to thousands of Americans throughout the Nation and have bolstered the well-being and economic growth of hundreds of communities.

The role of the urban developer in this area has been both significant and invaluable. Unlike private residential construction, urban renewal planning must take into consideration the economic, cultural and sociological character of a particular area. The lives of thousands of Americans are altered in some way by every urban renewal program undertaken. It is therefore the responsibility of the urban developer to make certain they are altered for the better—that the urban renewal project provides better housing for these people, adds to the rehabilitation of the community by eliminating existing slums and produces, in its place, a development that will be a credit to the community and an incentive for all who live there.

One urban developer whose knowledge of building and whose dedication to the highest principles of urban renewal has been responsible for bringing thousands of Americans a better place to live and a better way of life is S. Pierre Bonan. Engaged in urban development since 1947, Mr. Bonan is presently engaged in the development of more than $200 million worth of urban renewal projects in the United States.

Most important, the high standards and ethics which he continues to bring to this industry are setting an example for all in the field to follow. His developments—the $17 million University Towers apartment and shopping center in New Haven, Conn.; the $70 million West End apartment project in Boston; the $12 million section of Philadelphia's "Society Hill"; the 66-acre $100 million commercial, industrial, and residential development in Stamford, Conn.; and many others, have become renewal showcases.

Today, Mr. Bonan is one of several sponsors engaged in one of the most ambitious and important urban renewal developments in this country—the $23.4 million Cadman Plaza housing redevelopment in Brooklyn, N.Y. The development, now under construction, replaces 86 different structures, most of them substandard. In their place will rise cooperative apartments for 980 families, surrounded by parks, plazas, shopping facilities, ample parking, schools, houses of worship, and transit facilities.

It is hoped that this beautifully constructed, attractively designed development will not only rejuvenate the Brooklyn Heights section of Brooklyn, but will lead the way for similar projects throughout the borough and New York City. If it does, it will signal the beginning of a major victory in the "war on slums" not only in New York, but in all the major urban centers throughout the Nation, where similar projects are so desperately needed.

Born in New York City, where he received degrees from Columbia College and Brooklyn Law School, Mr. Bonan served with the Pacific Fleet in World War II, before returning home and entering the construction field. Sensing the great need for providing all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or economic standing, with decent housing, he soon entered the urban development field, and has been engaged in this work ever since.

Mr. Bonan is to be commended for offering his unselfish principles, knowledge, and dedication to this important undertaking, which has provided thousands of Americans with better housing and has greatly aided this country's economic growth and development.

Federal Legislation and Opportunities for Developing Programs for the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following speech:

FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR DEVELOPING PROGRAMS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

(Institute on Mental Retardation, Sheraton Biltmore Hotel, Providence, January 17, 1966)

I approach this discussion with a great feeling of mixed emotions—not for the reason that some may suspect; but because it is quite likely that except for the wisdom, the faith, the courage, and the conviction of one man, none of us would be privileged to gather here to evaluate the current state of our progress against mental retardation and other health and social problems. Without the inspiration and encouragement of that one man, I, more likely than not, would never have developed a deep and lasting interest in the problems of the mentally retarded.

I am referring, of course, to the late J. Arthur Trudeau. It is still quite difficult for me to grasp the finality of his departure because he himself was so vital and greatly concerned with the problems of others. And it is for that reason, I suppose, that what J. Arthur Trudeau did here in Rhode Island to stir interest and action on behalf of the mentally retarded and what he did on the national scene will serve as a living memorial to his good works.

And we come to this point in our progress not only inspired by the works of J. Arthur Trudeau but sharply mindful of the tremendous opportunities for service to our fellow man that await us. Therefore, I would like to turn back a bit in history to review some of the progress we have made, and then I would like to chronicle the great opportunities that lie before us.

---

[1] Quoted from the President's state of the Union message of Jan. 12, 1966.

I well recall that evening in 1954 when I was invited to attend a meeting of Rhode Island parents of retarded children. These parents were trying—alone and unaided—to meet a problem they shared in common. United by the tragic affliction visited upon their children, they were determined to do something about mental retardation—and to see that something was done. It was an inspiration to me to attend that meeting, and I returned to Washington with the conviction that something should and could be done to help these distracted parents.

It is no exaggeration to say that ten years ago, when I succeeded in getting the first Federal research funds for research in mental retardation—$750,000 in funds unrequested by the President—mental retardation was hardly recognized as a national problem. Mental retardation was considered hopeless; and so it was feared, and its victims were shut away from public sight and we didn't even have a clear idea how many children were afflicted.

Today, we know that it is the No. 1 health problem among children, afflicting 1,000 times as many children as were polio victims before the development of the Salk vaccine.

Today, we have Federal research programs of considerable dimensions: from the original $750,000 investment, built upon by the Congress and further encouraged by the late President Kennedy, we have now advanced to the point where a total of 120 million dollars was appropriated last year for this research.

Today, we have research accomplishments we can show as a result of this research effort—the screening for PKU, for example—and scientists are developing tests designed to screen infants for 20 diseases like PKU that cause mental retardation in children.

And today, we have Federal support for a variety of programs whose primary purpose is to combat mental retardation in our citizenry all across this nation, in city and village and hamlet.

I have been using the term—"today"—in the figurative sense, but I can say in the literal sense that I have just returned from Puerto Rico where I took part in the official transfer of land to the Federal government where additional work will be done on the normal as well as abnormal conditions of newborn and growing children.

I am extremely proud of the fact that, as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, I participated in the actions of the 88th and the 89th Congress which gave absolutely unprecedented support and funds to aid in the unending fight against mental retardation.

First, let me mention the Social Security Amendments of 1965. This law authorizes money to aid in the training of professional personnel to care for handicapped children including the retarded. It also provides for project grants which will benefit children of low income families.

Projects funded under this law will include those for screening, diagnosis, preventive services, treatment, corrections of defects, and aftercare, both medical and dental, for those covered. No doubt many retarded children and their families will benefit from this section of the law.

Secondly, the Mental Retardation and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1965 has special significance to mental retardation.

This law provides continued funding for the training of teachers of handicapped children, and for research and demonstration projects related to special education. The new law amends one passed in 1963 which provided for fellowships and traineeships to train teachers of retarded and other handicapped children. Under this year's amendments, the program for training teachers has been extended three additional years beyond June 30, 1966—the end of the 1963 law's authorization.

That 1963 law began a new *national* mental health program. It was followed by the 150 million dollar Federal assistance program for the construction of community mental health centers, along with a program to assist the mentally retarded.

And that was followed last year with the 225 million dollar Federal assistance program to allow for help in staffing community mental health centers.

Comprehensive planning, aided over a two-year period by 8.4 million dollars in Federal matching funds, has been completed by all of the 50 States. They are now submitting their final reports on planning activities to the National Institute of Mental Health.

To participate in the program for construction assistance, each of the States had to formulate a centers plan consistent with its comprehensive plan.

Despite the administrative difficulties at State levels in proceeding with both a comprehensive plan and a centers construction plan at the same time—despite these difficulties, great progress has been made.

Indeed, a national mental health program is well underway. A total of 15 State center plans have been approved and 10 additional plans are in various stages of processing by the National Institute of Mental Health. So far, a total of nine individual center construction grants have been made.

I am proud to have been privileged to take part in the passage of legislation to open up the doors for the mentally ill all across this country. And, naturally, as a citizen of Rhode Island, I like to think of my work as contributing to the betterment of life for Rhode Islanders afflicted with mental disease.

On most occasions, residents of our many States appeal to Washington for more Federal assistance. When these pleas are justified—and they often are—these State residents usually say that they are doing their fair share—now what does the Federal government intend to do?

I believe that no one can deny that, here, the reverse is true. As a member of the United States House of Representatives, there is no doubt that the Federal government is doing its fair share. Surely, with State cooperation and local interest, we are ready now to enter a new age—not just for the mentally retarded but for all of the mentally ill.

Let me cite the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963, which was designed to stimulate the States to take steps to help themselves.

Under the legislation, Federal funds will provide one-third to two-thirds of a center's construction cost, depending upon the State's population, the extent of its mental health problem and its financial situation.

The Act requires that each State prepare a plan for the use or its allotted funds. To be successful, the State's plan must reflect the development or plans by individual communities for participation in the program.

Rhode Island has not yet developed a practical plan for action for participating in the Federal program for community mental health centers. But I am told that a plan for centers will probably be submitted within the month to the National Institute of Mental Health.

As I have said, the urgency and pressing need were so great in the United States that comprehensive planning and centers planning were called for at the same time. Admittedly, this is a difficult, double assignment for the States. But let me say here and now that it was the intent of the Congress, based on the best professional advice in the Nation, to modify dramatically the conditions under which the mentally ill are treated. This means a change in the type of facility, a change in the surroundings and environment. And most important, a change from the large, impersonal, and remote institution.

Rhode Island was allotted 50,000 dollars in matching funds for the first full year of comprehensive planning, but the planning process was slow in getting under way, and more than 31,000 dollars of the 50,000 dollars had to be returned to the Federal government unexpended.

Rhode Island is in danger of having the same thing happen to the funds that have been appropriated for the construction of mental health centers. A total of 35 million dollars was appropriated for use nationally during fiscal 1965—but, knowing that such programs take time to develop, the Congress made the funds available for a period of two consecutive years.

Rhode Island's allocated 1965 share was 156,014 dollars and our matching percentage is approximately 50 percent. Thus, to build a comprehensive community mental health center in Rhode Island, the State and community would need to provide only half the cost.

I fully understand that planning takes time; but it is indeed regrettable that Rhode Island has not succeeded in using these Federal funds.

The construction program as authorized in the Centers Act is to cover three years and, just as for the first year, each year's funds will be available for two years. Already the 1966 funds have been appropriated and Rhode Island's allocated share is 225,920 dollars.

Specific recommendations regarding sources, methods and levels of financing a mental health program to take advantage of Rhode Island opportunities in this area, have still to be provided.

In the area of mental retardation, the Governor's Advisory Council on Mental Retardation issued a report last September which was called "The Rhode Island Plan for Mental Retardation." Based upon a year of extensive research, this is a reasonable and progressive plan for an attack upon mental retardation in Rhode Island.

The thirty-seven recommendations of that plan were based upon intensive deliberation, and I would like to add my personal support and endorsement to each of its recommendations concerning research, prevention, clinical services, education and rehabilitation, law and public awareness, and coordination. It seems to me that this plan should serve as a guideline for the State of Rhode Island in fulfilling its obligations to its mentally retarded citizens. But, as the report itself concluded—if I recall the words correctly—"The ultimate value of the plan will depend upon its implementation."

I believe that the parents of retarded children here in Rhode Island have been carrying the burden for the State far too long. For the past 15 years or so—through the efforts of parents and some of their friends—I have seen Rhode Island's pre-school programs, workshops and other programs for the retarded being conducted in basements of churches, abandoned schools, and firehouses and in rented quarters.

Now is the time to propose a large bond referendum—in this session of the general assembly—to carry out new construction for all these programs at the community level. A referendum would—I am sure—be received favorably by the people and would provide the funds to match Federal and, possibly, private grants.

I know that right now the State of Rhode Island has available 200,000 dollars in Federal funds which must be matched—on a 50-50 basis—with private money for just such construction. Again, the Federal government is ready to do its part in this great work.

In the meantime, I am informed that there is a proposal to include 572,000 dollars in Rhode Island's 1965–1966 budget to underwrite the operating costs of the Office of Mental Retardation, to implement day care centers in rented quarters, to support a half-way house, for research, and for other purposes. I understand that the Rhode Island Association for Retarded Children is giving its strong support for this budget request. All the evidence indicates that this is a "must" if the program is to get started, and I hope it will be favorably considered.

In addition, I know that the Rhode Island Association for Retarded Children is supporting the State Board of Education request for 1,000,000 dollars for support at the local level of educational programs for all handicapped children. As I understand it, this amount is needed to carry out the Board of Education's formula for reimbursement of 100 percent of the cost for educating handicapped children, over and above the normal per pupil cost. While the State Law and State Board of Education rules and regulations for the educationally handicapped are mandatory on the local community, the 1,000,000 dollars would go a long way toward speeding up the program and easing the burden on the local community.

I know that 1,000,000 dollars is a lot of money. I know that in discussing all of these programs we are talking about a lot of dollars. But in the last analysis I believe that an attitude of concern for retarded children and adults—for the mentally ill generally—is the most important factor.

This concern was expressed by the President last week in his State of the Union message when he said . . . "I am here to recommend that you . . . bring the most urgent decencies to all Americans. There are men who cry that we must sacrifice. Let us rather ask them, who will they sacrifice? . . . Will they sacrifice the children who seek learning? . . . the sick who need care? Let no one think that the unfortunate and the oppressed of this land sit stifled and alone in their hope tonight. Hundreds of their servants and their protectors sit before me tonight in this great Chamber . . ."

I am thankful that I have the privilege of being among those referred to by the President, and I am equally thankful that I have good people like you who are also concerned with the unfortunate and the oppressed.

None of the Federal programs in any of these areas will be implemented at the State level—in Rhode Island or anywhere else—unless there is an understanding—a real understanding of—the problems of the mentally ill.

We here tonight must carry on without the assistance of one who was outstandingly concerned about his fellow man—J. Arthur Trudeau. I cannot close without paying a last respect to his pioneering work in this field so close to all of us here today. His resources we have lost; his vision—and all that he started so well—we must carry on.

Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days I have spoken of the concern that livestock producers and grain growers have registered with respect to actions of our Secretary against Agriculture and the President to depress farm prices. I pointed out that these actions were very unfair and discriminatory because it is apparent that a rise in farm prices was singled out as the chief cause of the inflationary spiral in the cost of living. Nothing could be further from the truth, and farmers everywhere are very resentful of this charge.

As I pointed out the other day, 40 Members of the House sent a telegram to the President detailing the actions and directives to various departments of Government to bring down farm prices. This complaint to the President was sent last Friday—it must have struck home because according to today's Washington Post, the Secretary against Agriculture yesterday recommended to the Defense Department a resumption of purchases of ham and bacon and other pork products to feed the troops. It was only a couple of months ago that Mr. Freeman had requested the Defense Department to cut purchases of these products by 50 percent in order to bring down the price of hogs.

Also, our Secretary against Agriculture insisted that farm prices are not inflationary—according to the Washington Post article. What a sudden reversal of position because in March he intimated that he took pleasure in announcing a decline in farm prices and that they would continue to decline during the months ahead.

Further evidence that our telegram to the President was on the mark is a report that on Saturday, the day after the telegram was sent, there was a high level meeting held by the Vice President, the Secretary against Agriculture, the Under Secretary against Agriculture, Mr. Schnittker, and others at the request of the President to consider what to do next. Now it seems apparent that our Secretary against Agriculture has been told "Whoa, back up." I might add, "Be careful Mr. Secretary, your slip is showing."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the wire which was sent to the President and a copy of the Washington Post article dated May 4, 1966, "Freeman Urges Pentagon To Reconsider Buying Cuts":

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Your recent actions directed at American farmers and ranchers taken through Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, Secretary of Commerce Connor, and Mr. Gardner Ackley have done and will do little to lower consumer food prices, but will insure financial hardship for many farm families.

Over the years attempts to bolster farm prices have led to large and costly farm programs. Now that farm prices have risen somewhat, you act to undermine the very thing we seek. The actions you have ordered taken:

1. Dumped huge quantities of Government-held stocks of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum at cut-rate prices in order to force compliance with the wheat and feed grain programs and to overexpand livestock productions.

2. Initiated an incentive program for soybeans in order to create a surplus and force down market prices.

3. Ordered an increase in the import quota for cheddar cheeses.

4. Ordered the Department of Defense to substitute margarine for butter and initiated a margarine purchase program for relief donations in place of butter.

5. Ordered the Department of Defense to cut the use of pork by one-half, and authorized the purchase of meat in foreign countries for our military establishments abroad.

6. Directed the Department of Commerce to limit the exports of cattle hides and skins.

7. Made large payments to cotton textile manufacturers to offset a part of the market price for cotton, but let them increase prices of textile goods.

These actions will directly lower prices to farmers, but will not result in significantly lower consumer prices. Depressing farm prices only worsens the farmer's already tight cost-price squeeze. No effective Government action is taken to curb the increasing cost of items farmers must buy to produce our food.

Mr. President, this policy is totally discriminatory against an important segment of our economy gravely injuring a $42 billion industry.

JOE SKUBITZ, ANCHER NELSEN, BOB DOLE, CATHERINE MAY, DURWOOD G. HALL, H. R. GROSS, ALBERT QUIE, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, GEORGE HANSEN, E. ROSS ADAIR, CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., JAMES B. UTT, CHESTER MIZE, JOHN ASHBROOK.

GERALD FORD, LESLIE ARENDS, MELVIN R. LAIRD, JOHN BYRNES, E. A. CEDERBERG, GLENN CUNNINGHAM, RALPH HARVEY, GARNER E. SHRIVER, JOHN ANDERSON, MARK ANDREWS, DON CLAUSEN, GLENN R. DAVIS, ROGERS MORTON.

CHARLES HALLECK, FRANK BOW, PAGE BELCHER, ODIN LANGEN, DELBERT LATTA, BEN REIFEL, E. Y. BERRY, PAUL FINDLEY, LAURENCE BURTON, JAMES F. BATTIN, DAVE MARTIN, ROBERT ELLSWORTH, RICHARD ROUDEBUSH.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 4, 1966]

PORK PRODUCTS CITED: FREEMAN URGES PENTAGON TO RECONSIDER BUYING CUTS

(By Eric Wentworth)

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, in an apparent move to disperse political storm clouds over the Farm Belt, recommended yesterday that the Pentagon consider buying more ham, bacon, and other pork products.

Earlier in the day, on television, Freeman insisted that farm prices are not inflationary and that the Johnson administration is not trying to "put a lid" on them. On the contrary, he insisted, the administration "has been trying to firm and to strengthen farm prices."

BUYING CUT CRITICIZED

A Pentagon directive in mid-February that purchase of most pork products for U.S. troop feeding be trimmed at least 50 percent for 6 months to ease pressure of several grievances among farmers who claim the administration is fighting inflation at the expense of farm profits.

In his "Dear Bob" letter yesterday to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Freeman said hog prices have declined about 20 percent from January's high levels "and pork prices are also down." Though these prices may show seasonal increases in the next 2 to 3 months, he continued, "We expect that prices later this year will be below current levels."

ALSO CITES FRUITS

Freeman also told McNamara that "large supplies" of fruits and vegetables are likely this year and that he would have some recommendations on what to buy later when more details are available. His letter said nothing about expected prices for butter or other dairy products, however. The Pentagon slashed its butter purchases when prices rose.

On NBC's "Today" show yesterday morning, Freeman said the Pentagon was "reacting like the prudent housewife" when it cut back pork and butter purchases. His Department has advised the military for years on food buying.

DEFENDS INCOME RECORD

Freeman insisted the record of rising farm income will help freshman Democrats from the Farm Belt retain their congressional seats come November despite "a lot of demagoguery." At the same time, he said that while farm prices have "strengthened moderately," they are still "far below what they ought to be in relation to the rest of our economy."

Meanwhile the criticism continued, House GOP Whip LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, charged that Freeman's role in administration steps to control farm prices proves the Secretary "sacrifices our farmers on the altar of political expediency."

Freeman met last Saturday with Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and others according to one report the Secretary was urged by some present to actively oppose White House anti-inflation warriors who seek to roll back farm prices. Administration spokesmen called it a routine meeting, one of a series requested by President Johnson, and vigorously denied that it was a secret strategy session to discuss countering White House policymakers.

Association for Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY AT RHODE ISLAND ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH DINNER, CHAPIN HOSPITAL, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1965, AT 7 P.M.

It is always a pleasure for me to address such a group as this, but tonight I feel I must forgo pleasure for duty, and forsake enjoyment for the necessity of looking at stark facts. I intend to use harsh words because I believe the time has come for harsh words—and action.

A new day has dawned for the mentally ill and mentally retarded in the United States.

Unfortunately, the full light of this dawn has yet to reach Rhode Island's mentally disabled.

Two years ago this fall, in response to the eloquent plea from the late President John F. Kennedy, the Congress enacted the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, inaugurating a new national mental health program.

This legislation put into motion many activities which, like a set of gears, are enmeshed—with the proper functioning of each dependent upon all the others.

First there came the process of comprehensive planning by the States for the mental health needs of all their citizens.

Then came the $150 million Federal assistance program for the construction of community mental health centers, along with the program for providing for the mentally retarded.

This year came the $225 million Federal assistance program to allow for help in staffing community mental health centers.

Comprehensive planning, aided over a two-year period by $8.4 million in Federal matching funds, has been completed by all of the 50 States. They are now submitting their final reports on planning activities to the National Institute of Mental Health.

To participate in the program for construction assistance, each of the States had to formulate a centers plan consistent with its comprehensive plan.

I realize it was something of an administrative hardship for each State to proceed with both its comprehensive plan and its centers construction plan at the same time. Ideally, this latter would have evolved from the comprehensive plan; but the need was—and is—so urgent, so pressing, that they were thought to be equally essential and they were carried out simultaneously.

The national mental health program is now well underway. A total of 15 State center plans have been approved and 10 others are in various stages of processing by the National Institute of Mental Health. So far, a total of nine individual center construction grants have been made.

Now, where in all this does Rhode Island stand?

First let me say that I take great pride in the fact that as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives I participated in the actions of the 88th and 89th Congresses to enact these laws.

My pride is based, to an extent, on the enormous steps the laws have enabled us to take in aiding all in this country who need mental health assistance. But the pride is based also on the fact that what I have done I did as a citizen of the State of Rhode Island for the betterment of my fellow Rhode Islanders.

Thus, I think you can understand my disappointment when I say that my own State stands near the bottom of the list when it comes to taking advantage of these opportunities.

This disappointment is intensified by the realization that, especially in this instance, the lack of action is not at the Federal level. On most occasions, as you know, the plea comes from State residents who say they are doing their share, or more, and what does the Federal Government intend to do?

Here, just the reverse is true. I come to you as a member of the United States House of Representatives to say that the Federal Government has provided its share—what do you in Rhode Island plan to do?

This legislation, the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963, was designed as a stimulus. We in Congress had no intention of supplanting local or State programs with Federal programs. We deliberately left it up to the States to take the next steps for themselves.

Under the legislation, Federal funds will provide one-third to two-thirds of a center's construction cost, depending upon the State's population, the extent of its mental health problem and its financial situation. But this money is only enough to interest communities and States in attempting to find additional methods of financing.

The Act's regulations require that each State prepare a plan for the use of its allotted funds. To be successful the State's plan must reflect the development of plans by individual communities for participation in the program.

As I see it, through this system of planning, we are for once, at least, coming up with true cooperation between the Federal Government on the one hand and the States and their communities on the other.

My disappointment with Rhode Island's progress—or lack of it—is actually difficult to describe, for I know there are many individual programs across our State that are actively involved in providing treatment resources for both the mentally ill and the mentally retarded.

A comprehensive mental health plan for Rhode Island has been completed. This plan recommends a permanent Governor's council on mental health with full-time professional and clerical staff. The plan emphasizes the distinctive features of Rhode Island: its small geographic size and the comparatively easy geographical accessibility to mental health services developed within our State.

Because of these features, Rhode Island is in the unique position of being able to establish specialized units providing centralized services for the entire State. For example, Rhode Island would need one specialized unit for autistic children. However, the State would also need a number of different locations to meet its responsibilities for basic mental health services.

This plan, however, has not yet led to a practical plan of action for participation in the Federal program for community mental health centers. While I understand that a plan for centers is in process and will probably be submitted within the month, I cannot understand why Rhode Island was not in the forefront of this national movement.

Look at the States whose centers plans have already been approved—New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Florida, Ohio, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Louisiana, Colorado, California, Washington, South Carolina and Oregon. Why should not Rhode Island be at or near the head of the list?

As I have said the urgency and the pressing need were so great in the United States that comprehensive planning and centers planning were called for at the same time. But this has not occurred in Rhode Island; and not only that, neither planning process in our State has kept to the projected timetable.

As an example, our State was allotted $50,000 in matching funds for the first full year of comprehensive planning, but the planning process was slow in getting underway and more than $31,000 of the $50,000 had to be returned to the Federal Government unexpended.

We are in danger of having the same thing happen to the funds that have been appropriated for the construction of mental health centers. A total of $35 million was appropriated for use nationally during fiscal 1965—but, knowing that such programs take time to develop, the Congress made the funds available for a period of two consecutive years.

Rhode Island's allocated 1965 share was $156,014 and our matching percentage is approximately 50 percent. Thus, to build a comprehensive community mental health center in Rhode Island, the State and community would need provide only half the cost.

But the process does take time; an application for funds cannot be developed overnight. We have only a little more than six months now until the first funds will be lost to us. A year and a half has passed since this money first became available. Why have we not succeeded in using it?

The construction program as authorized in the Centers Act is to cover three years and, just as for the first year, each year's funds will be available for two years. Already the 1966 funds have been appropriated and our allocated share is $225,920.

But specific recommendations regarding sources, methods and levels of financing a mental health program to take advantage of our opportunities in this area are lacking altogether in the Rhode Island comprehensive plan. These must be provided—and soon—by the responsible State officials.

The plan does recommend the development of a model mental health law for Rhode Island to be submitted to the general assembly at its 1966 session. This, too, must be done: Rhode Island cannot continue to lag behind the 25 other States that have already enacted such legislation.

The Governor's council on mental health has recommended an extensive program for expanding mental health facilities in Rhode Island. The council's report also called for the establishment of several new institutions.

According to the council, an estimated 86,000 persons in the State were in need of some form of psychiatric care in 1960, and the council's prediction was that the number could increase to 94,200 by 1970. Last year, approximately 32,800 persons were treated in Rhode Island.

Although the council has not estimated specifically the cost of such an expanded program, it did say that a great deal of money would be involved. But a great deal of money is available to us, if we will only use it. The Government has told us it is ready and willing to match our funds—dollar for dollar in the construction of mental health centers—and it asks only a guarantee in the form of a viable State plan in return for this money.

To be eligible for these funds, as most of you know, a center must offer at least what are called the five essential mental health services: inpatient treatment, outpatient treatment, partial hospitalization, emergency services and consultation and education services. These criteria for centers are far from unreasonable—an emotionally disturbed person should be able to expect to find such services available to him, and close to his home.

Further, amendments to the Centers Act that were enacted this year to provide staffing assistance can help pay for the personnel providing these services during the first 51 months of a center's operation. And what is even more important, this staffing assistance is available to center programs that do not need to build new facilities; programs are eligible for assistance for any new service that they add that had not been provided before.

Here again, the Federal funds are not to be used to lessen the responsibility of the State or the community. They will be available on a declining basis as the center develops its own financial resources.

In the area of mental retardation, the situation is somewhat better; a mental retardation facilities plan for Rhode Island has been submitted to the Public Health Service. And this plan projects 13 facilities for communities in the State, based on a division of Rhode Island into four regions.

But you, as members of the Rhode Island Association for Mental Health, know that plans are nothing without execution. As members of one of the oldest mental health associations in America, you are aware that the Federal Government cannot be the complete rich uncle in providing for our State's needs—nor would you want it to be—and you are aware that your volunteer action cannot be the full action, either.

One of Rhode Island's greatest needs—perhaps her greatest need—is for informed, interested leaders who can recognize opportunity and seize it.

We have had such opportunities in the past, but the truth is that we have simply not taken adequate care of our mentally ill and mentally retarded fellows. We have not taken care of our disturbed children. We have not taken care of our troubled adolescents. We have often ignored mentally retarded children. We have not taken care of the aging citizens whose mental health may be failing. We have done less than our best for those with problems of alcoholism, of suicide, of drug addiction.

Of course, Rhode Island is a small State, but the problems of mental illness and mental retardation are proportionately no smaller in Rhode Island than in any other State. Frankly, I can see no excuse for the lack of action that has typified Rhode Island during the two years since passage of the 1963 legislation.

Our goals are clear. Of this, we can have no doubt. John F. Kennedy did not exclude Rhode Island when he sent his message on mental illness and mental retardation to the Congress in February of 1963. He said:

"This situation has been tolerated far too long."

In fact, as he continued in the message, his words could be used then—as they can today—as a specific indictment of Rhode Island.

The situation "has troubled our national conscience—" he said "—but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution."

In Rhode Island today we can no longer accept the unpleasantness of our situation as a reason for keeping quiet about the mentally afflicted.

In Rhode Island today we cannot postpone action simply because it is easy to do so.

In Rhode Island today we cannot despair of a solution—for we have the tools to fashion a solution. We have only to make use of those tools.

I cannot stand by, watching the other States move ahead of Rhode Island. I cannot allow my State to remain out of step in this National march against the afflictions of mental illness and mental retardation.

Unfortunately, the persons who suffer from these afflictions are unable to band together to demand the improvements, the assistance, the compassion they must have.

We must give voice to those demands for them. And I feel very strongly that this should be the primary task of the Rhode Island Association for Mental Health.

You and I together must make our Rhode Island leaders realize that they have not exercised the use of our modern knowledge, our modern prosperity, our modern benefits either to reduce the incidence of these maladies or to take enlightened and humane care of the persons who are suffering from them.

We are falling behind in Rhode Island. The qualities of leadership that will put us in our rightful place among all the States are vitally needed today. My fervent hope is that we shall soon see these qualities in action.

And my firm resolve is to continue my fight until that hope is realized. I urge you to join with me.

The Cinco de Mayo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the Cinco de Mayo, or 5th of May, is a date revered by the Mexican people. On that day in 1862, a gallant band of Mexican patriots defeated a numerically superior French force at the town of Puebla and momentarily thwarted the greedy designs of Napoleon III upon their homeland.

Let us look briefly at Mexican history in the 19th century in order to understand more fully the significance of the battle of Puebla. After emancipation from Spanish control in 1822, Mexico experienced many difficulties. Changes of government were often accompanied by bloodshed and violence. Several European nations continued to cast greedy glances upon the struggling young nation.

In the early 1860's Benito Juarez was able to establish a liberal government. Yet domestic turmoil accentuated the financial difficulties of his government, which, along with other confiscatory measures at home, refused to acknowledge the foreign debts contracted by its predecessors. This, plus claims for compensation of damage incurred during the Mexican civil strife, gave an easy pretext for intervention.

Three powers were interested in Mexico—Great Britain, Spain, and France, but the operation which finally developed was mainly a project of Napoleon III of France. His motives were complex and somewhat confused, but basically he wanted to create a zone of French influence in Mexico and to please Catholic opinion in France by favoring clerical interests in Mexico.

In October 1861, Britain, France, and Spain agreed to joint action which took the form of occupation of Vera Cruz. Spain and Britain, however, had no such far-reaching designs as France, and, in 1862, they withdrew, leaving the French to pursue their grandiose schemes alone.

About 6,000 French soldiers set out from Vera Cruz to Mexico City to the victory they were sure would be theirs. Yet their confidence was unwarranted, for on May 5, 1862, they encountered a courageous band of Mexican patriots at Puebla, a strategic city halfway between Vera Cruz and Mexico City. When the French general reached Puebla, he chose to send his men into the center of Mexican fortifications, over a ditch and a brick wall and up the steep slopes of the Cerro de Guadalupe. Led by the great leader, Ignacio Zaragosa, the Mexicans flung the French back to Orizaba and the coast. Their valor in the face of superior odds and their heroism led to the creation of Cinco de Mayo as a national holiday for Mexico.

Although halted momentarily by the courageous Mexicans at Puebla, the French ultimately were able to capture Mexico City and to install Archduke Maximilian of Austria upon the throne. Yet, as we know, Maximilian never commanded the allegiance of the Mexican people. What control he did have was limited and totally dependent upon the French troops in Mexico. I am glad to say that with the conclusion of the Civil War, the United States was able to come to the rescue of its southern neighbor. Our Nation refused recognition of Maximilian and demanded that the French recall their expeditionary force. Left to rule on his own, Maximilian was captured by the Mexicans in June 1867, and soon executed.

The 5th of May thus commemorates a day upon which courage and love for their homeland enabled Mexicans to triumph over troops of a foreign power. It is with real pleasure that I join with our Mexican friends in paying tribute to the strength, valor, and patriotism of those men who fought so bravely and so well on that day in Puebla more than 100 years ago. In so doing we also pay tribute to all the citizens of Mexico in whose hearts burn the self-same love of country. In memory of that great day, we extend greetings and warmest best wishes to the great neighbor to the south of us—Mexico.

The Cooley Loan Program: American Free Enterprise Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, because of the wide interest and the numerous inquiries concerning what is known as the Cooley loan program, I have asked for this time to discuss this program in a way that may be helpful to Members of the House in responding to persons who seek information on its purposes and its operations.

At the outset, I will say that I have a feeling of humility, mixed with pride, that this program around the world has come to bear my name.

This local currency loan program, which I sponsored as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, was initiated in 1957 by an amendment to Public Law 480—the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, now known as the Food-for-Peace Act.

The program complements and supplements other foreign assistance activities by stimulating private U.S. investment in friendly, usually less developed, areas of the world. I am proud that it has planted the flag of American free enterprise in many foreign places.

THE PROGRAM

Administration of the program was originally assigned to the Export-Import Bank of Washington. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 reassigned this responsibility to the Agency for International Development on January 1, 1962.

The purpose of the program, broadly, is to promote "balanced economic development and trade among nations" through loans mutually agreeable to the administering agency and to the foreign country whose currency is involved. Certain of the local currencies received in payment for U.S. agricultural products are made available for loans to U.S. firms and their affiliates for "business development and trade expansion" in those countries, and for loans to U.S. as well as foreign firms "for the establishment of facilities for aiding in the utilization, distribution, or otherwise increasing the consumption of, and markets for, U.S. agricultural products." Loans for the production of items which would be exported to the United States in competition with U.S. production are prohibited by the statute, as are loans for the production of agricultural commodities to be marketed in competition with U.S. production.

AID has also recently revised its procedures to provide for Cooley loans to U.S. banks or their affiliates for relending to local enterprises, both U.S.-affiliated and locally owned. It is hoped that such loans will encourage the development and strengthening of credit facilities for small and medium size private enterprises in less developed countries; promote sound development banking concepts and practices; make available increased banking and credit facilities for private enterprise by supplementing with Cooley funds the banks' own resources for medium and long-term investment possibilities; and stimulate wider use and more effective management of Cooley funds.

SOURCE OF COOLEY LOAN FUNDS

Funds for the Cooley loan program are derived under agreements for the sale of agricultural commodities under title I of Public Law 480. Until October 31, 1964, the statute provided that funds allocated to title I's section 104(e) could not exceed 25 percent of the total proceeds of a sales agreement. The law was amended on that date to permit "maximum usable" amounts to be allocated. Legislation now under consideration provides for a transition from sales for foreign currencies to sales for dollars; but it also provides for payment in foreign currencies to the extent the President determines that such currencies are needed for various purposes including section 104(e) loans under the Cooley program.

AID does not have extensive control over the allocation of local currency funds to the Cooley program. They are generated as an incident to Public Law 480; the host country must agree to the uses to which the currencies will be put; and more importantly the other anticipated U.S. Government uses make a large claim on the total currencies to be generated. In some countries, where U.S. holdings of local currencies are so small that it is presently necessary to convert dollars to meet local U.S. Government expenditures, new local currency deposits will be allocated for that priority need. Many countries that are of great interest to U.S. investors are not traditionally importers of U.S. agricultural products, and no sales agreements are made. Nevertheless, when funds are available to meet demand, the program is much appreciated by U.S. investors and is a valuable part of AID's efforts to encourage U.S. investment in the less developed countries.

PURPOSES AND TERMS

In making loans to "U.S. business firms and branches, subsidiaries, or affiliates of such firms," AID requires that affiliation be evidenced by at least 20-percent ownership by a U.S. firm of the applicant's voting stock—and a higher percentage may be required. If the U.S. firm owns less than a majority interest, its other commercial and operating ties to the applicant will be looked to, to determine that the U.S. firm has the power to exercise a significant influence on the applicant's policies and operations.

Loans are ordinarily not made to refinance existing loans or to acquire equity interest in other enterprises. Cooley loans are available to finance working capital costs—except in India, where the Government has asked that we not lend Cooley funds for that purpose—but in many areas AID has found that ample funds are available from local commercial banks for working capital. Because the demand for Cooley funds sometimes exceeds the supply, AID has established administrative norms to favor applicants whose projects have the highest priorities in terms of the foreign country's economic needs. Hence, when demand does exceed supply, AID may limit the use of Cooley funds soley to the acquisition of fixed assets.

Maturities are established in accordance with the nature of the project being financed, and the applicant's projected cash flow. Grace periods are permitted on payments of principal, but not on interest, until facilities become productive; arrangements may be made for acceleration of repayment if profitability exceeds expectations. Loans are made and repaid in local currency, with no maintenance-of-value requirement.

Interest rates are established for each country comparable to the basic rate charged by local development lending institutions or, where such institutions do not exist, based on the existing rate structure for similar projects. Taken into consideration are the attitude of the foreign government, the potentially adverse effects of providing funds at rates lower than the cost of credit to local competing firms, and the danger of fostering uneconomic enterprises through financing at subsidized terms. Within these limitations, however, rates are kept as low as possible to encourage borrowers.

The largest Cooley loan to date has been the equivalent of $22.6 million in Indian rupees to help finance a fertilizer plant. Among the smallest was a loan in the equivalent of $8,000 to a popcornmaking venture in China—Taiwan. Interest rates have varied from 4 percent on a loan to a Colombian affiliate of the U.S. firm to 12 percent on projects in Bolivia and China. The present interest rate in China is 9 percent. Rates on recent loans have been 6.5 percent in Pakistan, 8 percent in Peru, Korea, India, the Philippines and Israel, 9 percent in Colombia and Paraguay, and 12 percent in Bolivia. Loans have run from 3 years to 20 years, but the average is 9 years for repayment with a 2½-year grace period.

PROCEDURES

Application for Cooley loans may be made to the U.S. AID mission in the country concerned, or to the appropriate Regional Bureau of AID in Washington—Bureau for Near East-South Asia, Bureau for Africa, Bureau for Far East, or Bureau for Latin America.

Guidance in preparing a detailed application should be obtained from the AID mission or the AID Regional Bureau in Washington. However in general the application should include the name and organization of the applicant, name of the U.S. affiliate, amount requested, repayment period desired, and a description of the general purposes for which the loan is sought. Required financial data includes the applicant's existing capitalization and additional capital needed to complete the project and, if the enterprise is already in operation, current balance sheet and balance sheets for the past 3 years; profit and loss statements for the past 5 years; and a current cash flow statement together with similar statement for the past 3 years. Pro forma balance sheets and profit and loss and cash flow statements estimated for future years are also required, as is information on all equity investment contemplated and the amount, source, and repayment terms for all other proposed borrowing. Pertinent economic data indicating the benefits which the proposed activity would yield to the enterprise and to the host country should be included and, if the applicant is not a U.S. affiliate, an account of how the facilities to be financed with the Cooley loan will increase the consumption of and markets for U.S. agricultural products.

Prior to final review by AID/Washington, loan staffs in the missions are asked to comment on the project, particularly on those factors relevant to local conditions. Public Law 480 sales agreements also provide a 60-day period for the local government to make a formal statement of "no objection." Final concurrence is obtained from the National Advisory Council, under the chairmanship of the Treasury Department.

PROGRAM TO DATE

From the inception of the Cooley loan program (the first loans were authorized on June 19, 1958) through December 31, 1961, the Export-Import Bank of Washington authorized 176 loans in 19 countries, for an amount in foreign currencies equal to approximately $102.7 million—15th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 87th Congress, 2d session, House Document No. 385. From January 1, 1962, when AID assumed this responsibility in accordance with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, through December 31, 1965, AID authorized 180 loans in the total amount of $196 million—U.S. dollar equivalent.

Very favorable comments have been received from Cooley loan borrowers. An American firm whose affiliate was the recipient of a loan in Indian rupees equivalent to $4 million, advised AID that the loan "was of enormous assistance in establishing a firm financial basis for this project—a $12 million pulp and paper plant—without delay and contributed markedly to its early completion and successful operation." Other U.S. firms have commented that "the filling of the financial gap might otherwise have been impossible," and that the program "has provided most welcome and beneficial aid, particularly to a company of truly international proportions."

AID welcomes interest in this program, and is constantly endeavoring to improve its procedures and to expedite the processing of applications, to be as responsive as possible to legitimate needs of U.S. investors.

The Cooley loan program, as well as other AID programs to assist and encourage U.S. private investment in developing countries, is described in a brochure, entitled "Aids to Business—Overseas Investment"—which can be obtained at no cost from the Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., 20523. That office also issues periodic announcements of local currencies available for Cooley loans, and will be glad to add the names of interested firms to its mailing list for this information.

In the food-for-freedom bill now under consideration by the Committee on Agriculture, the Cooley loan provision has been carried forward without substantial change.

The committee has thus far made two amendments, both of which are in the nature of clarification or emphasis of existing authority in the law. It has stipulated that business firms, both foreign and domestic, shall include cooperatives. It has also put into the proposed language a provision making it quite clear that loans for private housing are to be included in the Cooley loan program.

In its last previous revision of Public Law 480, the committee commented in its report that housing appeared to the committee to be one of the most beneficial uses of these loan funds. In spite of this statement by the committee, very few housing loans have been made and those administering the program appear to be giving preference to other types of business enterprise.

The committee report on the bill now under consideration will comment on this and strongly urge that the use of these funds for low-cost private housing development in foreign countries be given major consideration.

Many Challenges Facing Nation in the Health Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY AT THE DENTAL DEALERS OF AMERICA LUNCHEON, DECEMBER 4, 1965, NEW YORK CITY

It is a real pleasure for me to be here with you at this luncheon and to discuss with you briefly some of the challenges this nation faces in the health field in the coming months and years. There is something of a tendency, I think, when we talk about what needs to be done in the health field to underemphasize the great contribution your segment of the business community makes in bringing the finest quality health care to our fellow citizens. I want you to know that I and most members of Congress aren't guilty of that. We are keenly aware of how much strength you give to our pursuit of an ever higher standard of health in this nation and I am glad to have this opportunity to pay tribute to you for what you are doing.

The topic to which you have asked me to address myself this afternoon is "The Impact of Research on Dental Education." If I were an Irish tenor instead of an Irish Congressman, I would be tempted to set the tone for my remarks by singing you a few choruses of that old Jerome Kern song, "Look For The Silver Lining." Fortunately, it's a little early in the day for me to sing. I would have chosen that particular song for this reason: if the nation faces, as I believe it does, some very serious challenges in moving to meet the health needs of the future, one of the obvious consequences of the actions we take will be a steadily and perhaps even explosively increasing demand for dental equipment and instruments. To put it bluntly: if your business is good now, it ought to be better and better in the years ahead.

I am fully aware, of course, that your interest in the health of the nation is not limited to your concerns as businessmen, legitimate as those concerns are. If your interest was solely in business matters, you probably wouldn't have asked me to talk to you and you certainly wouldn't have assigned me the subject you did.

Thick, heavy books could be—and have been—written on the subject of the impact of research on health education, be it dental or medical. Clearly, in fifteen minutes or so, I can do no more than sketch the barest sort of outline of what it has meant. Certainly, in my view, three plain statements of fact can be made on the subject. First, the impact of research on dental education has been wholly beneficial. Second, the impact of research on dental education is proving to be revolutionary. Third, the impact of research on dental education is just beginning to be felt and will intensify substantially in the years ahead. I want to expand on all three of those statements, but before doing so, I want to talk a little bit about this great nation of ours in order to put our subject into proper perspective.

The United States is a nation of some 195 million people with an annual Gross National Product of some $650 billion and a total labor force of some 75 million men and women. Though we enjoy a median family income of nearly $7,000, other available statistics tell us that one out of every five families is impoverished; that is, has an annual family income of less than $3,000. Incidentally, of the children in such families, nearly 55 per cent have never in their lives been to a dentist.

As a nation, we have, in the past five years, become acutely conscious of the extent to which poverty, hunger and disease dwell among us and of what they cost not only in terms of productive capacity but, more important, in terms of human anguish and misery. As a nation, we are generally agreed that our health goal is threefold: to prevent as much disease as possible; to control and cure that which we can't prevent and, third, to have a supply of highly qualified health personnel adequate enough that services are accessible to everyone in need.

Finally, we live in a society that agrees that good health is not just a precious heritage or a pragmatic goal, but a basic human right. And we acknowledge that both the public and the private sectors of our nation have a role to play in establishing that right, though there are differences among us as to the nature of each sector's role.

In pursuing this threefold goal, we spent in 1964 about $35 billion on health services, which amounts to 6 per cent of the Gross National Product. Nearly 3 million people, or 4 per cent of the total labor force, were engaged either in providing these health services or supporting the provision of them.

Most of that $35 billion represents payment from a member of the health professions in exchange for personal health services within the private practice system. About 5 per cent of it, or some $2 billion, was spent on health related research. In the past fifteen years, health related research has risen from being one-tenth of one per cent of the Gross National Product to being one-quarter of one per cent.

Of the roughly $2 billion spent in 1965 for health related research, 25 percent came from private industry, fifteen per cent came from private philanthropy, voluntary health agencies such as the American Dental Association and miscellaneous sources. The remaining 60 per cent came from the Federal government. As you know, most of the Federal share is funneled through the National Institutes of Health.

Now, I've thrown a lot of facts at you in a short space of time, I know. It's something like a history professor I heard about who went so fast that one student dropped his pencil during the Boston Tea party and by the time he picked it up, Lee was surrendering to Grant and they say the boy never did find out that these were two separate wars.

But all I really want you to do is to keep those facts in the back of your mind while we go on to ask one or two questions that must be asked, I think, before we can talk directly about research and dental education.

The first question is this: Are we, as a nation, spending too much in health research and education? By way of beginning my answer to this, let me bring just one of those statistics back to the front of your mind: Of our Gross National product, about one-quarter of one per cent is spent on health related research, about one-quarter of one per cent is all that we spend to search out the causes of disease and find ways to overcome it.

I don't think that is too much, and in saying this I think I am making one of the understatements of the century. Indeed, a much more appropriate question, it seems to me, is whether it is enough. I am personally inclined to think that we can do more and that we should be doing more. When I say that we could reasonably be spending four times as much as we are, you might think me extreme. But let me put that exact statement in a different way: it would not be inappropriate for this nation to devote 1 per cent of its Gross National Product to health related research. Put in this fashion, I don't think that statement extreme in the least.

A second question must then be asked, I believe, preliminary to our basic discussion. It is this: As I have said, the Federal government supplies about 60 per cent of the funds available for health related research. Is this disproportionate? Does it raise dangers?

In answering this question, the first thing to be done is to counter the current tendency many people have to talk of the American people as "we" and the Federal government as "them," as if the Federal government were something entirely apart from and alien to the nation. This is, flatly, nonsense. The legislative branch of the Federal government is headed by men and women who must, every two years, present themselves to the electorate to be re-hired or fired. Much the same is true of the Executive branch. The President must every four years come before the people personally to have his mandate extended or ended. Every two years he goes before the people in a very real if not personal sense when the Congressional elections are held. The Federal government, then, is as much a part of the nation as, say, the business community and has as sure a finger on the public pulse as does, say, the television industry.

This may sound to you like I am belaboring the obvious. Frankly, I hope it does because that would mean you agree with me that the Federal government springs from the people and is part of the people. Its resources are the people's resources and it is nonsense not to take them into account when we are talking about solving problems that afflict the people. To favor Federal action in some area or other is nothing more than saying it is sometimes necessary for all our people to act together at one time and with one purpose.

There can be no clearer application of this than in health-related research. I have never seen a study claiming that the people of Georgia are immune from oral cancer or that the people of New Hampshire have no arthritis or that heart attacks are unknown in Kansas.

All of this argues toward the conclusion, inescapable in my opinion, that the Federal government has a strong and positive role to play in health related research. I have never been backward about saying so frequently and clearly.

This does not mean, of course, that the role of the Federal government in health research and education is without rules or boundaries. There are stringent rules and whatever abstract worries there may be about the government abiding by them, I have not yet heard of concrete incidents in health that would lead me to believe the Federal government isn't doing so.

All that I have said thus far has been to a degree prologue to some specific comments about the impact of research on dental education. I say it has been prologue to a degree, but not entirely. I'm sure it is obvious from the thrust of my remarks that I have some very definite views on this subject. I began this talk by stating three conclusions; that the impact has been beneficial, was proving to be revolutionary and would intensify in the years to come. I want to take those up now and discuss each one briefly.

That it has been beneficial is the contention most easily dealt with since it is surely the most obvious. You can tick off as quickly as I can a long list of gains we have made in learning more, for example, about the etiology of oral cancer, or periodontitis or even dental caries itself. You gentlemen know even better than I what the fruits of applied research have been in the field of restorative materials and prosthetic devices over the past decade and a half. It would be, I am sure, a most instructive experience for all of us to spend some time leafing through a dental equipment and materials catalogue of 1945—before this country really began to fulfill its commitment to research—and then compare it to a catalogue of 1965.

The second point, that the impact is proving to be revolutionary, is very nearly as obvious, I think. And it is perhaps more true of dentistry than of any other health profession. All of us recognize—and no one could have been more forthright in facing the fact and doing something about it than was the dental profession—that research of the depth and breadth that was going on in some other health areas was largely nonexistent in dentistry for many years. There was no pool of properly qualified research scientists. There was no money to support those who were available or to train more of them. There was no central agency that could be instrumental in keeping scientists in touch with one another and take an overview of activity so that it could move ahead in a cogent and unified way.

The establishment of the National Institute of Dental Research and the increasingly large funding it has received have perhaps not solved these problems, but have clearly made great inroads on them. In this regard, I think tribute should be paid to the unremitting efforts of the American Dental Association to support the creation of NIDR, its being independently housed and its funding. I know I take a great deal of pride in what I have been able to do and look forward to being helpful in the years ahead.

This immense growth in dental research, proportionately greater than in other fields, has made the dental school of today a very different kind of educational institution than it was twenty years ago. First of all, it is much more intimately a part of the total health complex of the university. This is partly because it has more and more faculty members who though dentally oriented, are research scientists and have much in common with their colleagues in the medical school and in the hospital. Secondly, the great advances made possible by research have changed the curriculum of the school so as to produce a dentist who is more rigorously trained than ever before in history, and who is more conscious of the common ground shared by him and members of the sister professions in the health field.

Finally, as I have said, I think we are observing today the beginning of research's impact on dental education and that in years to come it will intensify. Dental research scientists are as you know, nearing breakthrough findings in a number of areas. No one can say precisely in what directions these breakthroughs will lead us, but that they will compel substantial changes is, I think, beyond question.

There is one final comment I feel constrained to make, one that I like to make whenever I discuss research. All of us, I am sure, recognize that research in the health field is not an end in itself. We support research because of the promise it holds out to us, and has already fulfilled in many ways, of being able to give our children, their children and their children's children the priceless gift of a life as free from crippling disease and dehumanizing pain as possible. We have a long way to go before we are in a position to give that gift. We need more and more professional manpower, in dentistry and elsewhere. We need more schools to train young men and women in the health professions. We need more offices, clinics and hospitals to improve the accessibility of care. For example, less than half the people in this nation see a dentist annually. We all know this. We all have known this for so long that it is not shocking to us. But it ought to be shocking in the richest, most powerful nation the world has ever known. It ought especially to be shocking when we think of how many children there are in that group. This is something—the dental needs of children—that the American Dental Association pledged itself to work on at its last annual session and I compliment them on it.

And this is what research is for: to find ways to prevent, control and cure disease. As I said at the beginning, I know as businessmen this prospect of an increasing demand for your products can't help but be pleasing to you. But I know that as citizens you are even more pleased that this effort is going to continue to go forward, perhaps at an increased pace, until we have achieved the health goals we all agree must be achieved. Thank you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Dr. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Enter into His gates with thanksgiving and into His courts with praise: be thankful unto Him and bless His name. For the Lord is good; His mercy is everlasting; and His truth endureth to all generations.—Psalm 100: 4, 5.

Almighty God, Ruler of the universe, the sustainer of life, and the father of all men, unto Thee do we lift our hearts in prayer and in praise. We thank Thee for the gift of life ever fresh from Thy hand, for the blessings of home, for work to do and the strength to do it, for friendships which warm our hearts, for a nation that is free and for our faith in Thee which keeps us strong, holds us steady and carries us through every experience with honor.

May Thy wisdom make us wise, may Thy patience help us to be more patient: may Thy love strengthen us to love others and may Thy forgiveness help us to forgive one another.

Sustained by Thy presence may we walk the paths of truth and love this day, harboring no ill will, but filled with good will growing evermore like Thee who hast revealed Thyself in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night, Thursday, May 5, 1966, to file a report on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1967.

Mr. JONAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

POLISH CONSTITUTION ANNIVERSARY AND POLISH MILLENNIUM

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked one of the most important dates in the long history of the Polish people. It is not only an occasion for celebrating the May 3 anniversary of the Polish Constitution, but affords us an opportunity to reflect on the 1,000 years of Polish life as a Christian nation.

I had the distinct honor of participating yesterday at a White House celebration attended by other Members of Congress and representatives of the Polish-American community. It was inspiring and indeed heartening to see the enthusiasm and devotion which the Polish people displayed toward their national heritage.

I salute these courageous Polish people and especially those freedom-loving peoples behind the Iron Curtain who still hold strong to their faith in someday rejoining their fellow Poles across whatever barriers others may seek to create.

President Johnson is to be commended for taking such creditable note of this occasion and for helping to build bridges of friendship which are a natural part of this Nation's love for its Polish friends.

I am sure all of us look forward to other occasions for publicly demonstrating the strong bond of friendship that links the Polish people throughout the world and all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I again salute the Polish people on the occasion of their millennium and the anniversary of their Constitution.

CINCO DE MAYO

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Cinco de Mayo—the fifth of May—a holiday celebrated in Mexico and by many Spanish-speaking citizens of the United States.

Cinco de Mayo commemorates the day, in 1862, of a great victory by Mexico over the invading French. France fielded a well-equipped, modern army of 6,000 men, yet was defeated at Puebla by a hastily gathered group armed only with ancient muskets. The significance of Cinco de Mayo is symbolic. The battle symbolizes a victory of the human spirit over all military odds.

Today, as we celebrate Cinco de Mayo in my own home district of San Bernardino County, it is well to remember the courage and spirit of the Battle of Puebla. We have seen this military bravery living still, as displayed by our fine Mexican-American fighting men, in two World Wars and Korea and Vietnam. Mexican-American fighting men in the U.S Armed Services earn more than their statistical share of medals—and wounds. Many have sacrificed their lives in Vietnam. On Cinco de Mayo we celebrate the courage of the fighting men of Mexico 104 years ago and the courage of their descendants today.

EXPORT QUOTAS ON CATTLE HIDES AND LEATHER

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the export quotas established by the U.S. Department of Commerce a few weeks ago on cattle hides and leather is one of the most indiscreet administrative actions ever taken by an agency of Government.

It is in direct contravention to the liberal trade policies of this administration.

It aggravates the very serious balance-of-payments deficit of our Nation.

It has had only an infinitesimal effect if any on consumer prices. As a matter of fact, shoe manufacturers have already decided to increase prices despite the controls.

It has had only one apparent effect, that is, to depress hide prices and thus cattle prices received by the American farmer.

This decision, Mr. Speaker, was not only wrong in principle; it was unwise, unwarranted, and downright inane. I call upon the Department of Commerce to stop dilly-dallying around, admit it made a mistake, and revoke this silly and unfair order without further delay.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Baring
Beckworth
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bray
Broomfield
Burleson
Cederberg
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Curtis
Dawson
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Fallon
Farnum
Feighan
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Griffin
Griffiths
Gurney
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Kornegay
Long, Md.
Love
Mackie
Mailliard
Mathias
Matthews
Moeller
Morse
Murray
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Ottinger
Powell
Redlin
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Sisk
Stalbaum
Stephens
Thomas
Todd
Toll
Utt
Vigorito
Vivian
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14745, with Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] will be recognized for 1½ hours. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I have the privilege of submitting for your consideration this afternoon the annual appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and HEW. First I would like to thank the gentlemen on the majority side, Mr. DENTON, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. MATTHEWS, Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, and Mr. FARNUM for the fine support and attention they have given this bill. Also those on the Republican side, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. SHRIVER.

We bring to you a bill today that is a compromise among the members of the subcommittee handling this appropriation. This bill is a sizable one. It is getting bigger every year, and I think it is going to get bigger in the future. The bill we bring to you today totals $10,573,272,500, which is $1,709,713,500 over the appropriation for 1966 and $490,088,000 over the budget requests for 1967 that were considered in connection with the bill. As both the report and the minority views point out, this is at most only about two-thirds of the budget for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for 1967. There is $3.9 billion in the budget that is for going programs whose authorization for appropriations expires at the end of fiscal year 1966 and has not yet been extended. These are the elementary and secondary education program, $1,342,410,000; grants to developing institutions under the higher education program, $30 million; higher education facilities construction programs, $722,744,000; grants for public libraries, $57,500,000; and the economic opportunity program, $1,750 million.

There has been considerable comment by Members, the public press, and elsewhere concerning the fact that this bill is $490 million above the budget request. I would like to point out in the beginning that there are four education items that were increased almost $450 million that account for 90 percent of the amount by which the entire bill is over the budget. These are the vocational education program, which the committee increased $39,250,000; payments to land-grant colleges, where the increase was from zero in the budget to $11,950,000 in the bill; payments to school districts in federally impacted areas under Public Law 874 for which we added $232,800,000; and for student loans under the Defense Education Act, an increase of $157,813,000. All of the appropriations recommended in the bill for these programs are within the limits established in the authorizing legislation, which in every instance passed this House by an overwhelming majority. I think everyone concerned fully expected these increases. I think the vast majority of the American people would approve them, and there is no doubt it would significantly detract from the educational opportunities available to students throughout the country if these increases were not granted. So, Mr. Chairman, the total bill is practically in balance with the budget except for these four items.

In the Department of Labor, the committee made very little change in the budget. The total request was for $696,480,000, a reduction of $11,186,400 below the 1966 appropriations. The committee recommends a further reduction of $10,260,000 most of which is in one item. The request for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and exservicemen was $107 million. The committee has reduced this to $100 million or a reduction of $7 million. This reduction was made solely because of lower unemployment than was estimated at the time the budget was prepared.

Let me say with respect to the Department of Labor programs that I am especially gratified that the record of accomplishments during the year continues to show improvement in performance and in economy of operations.

The committee's action provides resources to cover the training costs of 250,000 people. Out of this resources will be directed to improve the employability and economic status of 165,000 hard core unemployed and for expansion of apprenticeship and on-the-job training.

This kind of training has a high payoff value and it is cheaper. A report from the Department of Labor has this to say about on-the-job training:

> Most of the trainees (about two-thirds) were unemployed before they joined the program.
>
> We estimate that the average on-the-job trainee earns $59 a week during 19 weeks of training, and $80 a week as a full-time worker after his training. Thus the average trainee earns $3,761 the first year.
>
> The cost to the Government of on-the-job training averaged about $495 a trainee in 1965. Some cost more, some less.
>
> According to the Internal Revenue Service the average Federal income tax for married workers with one child who earn $3,761 a year is $211.
>
> Thus, in the first year, a typical on-the-job trainee repays the Federal Government about 43 percent of its total investment in him. Before the second year is over, the Government has been repaid in full.
>
> It has been estimated that those trainees already approved will earn almost $392 million during their first year of training and work, and that their training will cost the Federal Government $51 million—with about $20 million being repaid in taxes during the first year and the remainder the second year.
>
> The business community, along with American labor, has cooperated in making on-the-job training and apprenticeship training an exciting and successful program.
>
> Joint labor-management and labor-sponsored on-the-job training projects covered nearly 6,000 trainees entering apprenticeship-entry and retraining or upgrading programs. These programs were under the aegis of 24 different labor organizations and joint labor-management groups in 28 States.

This is an exciting and commendable record of achievement. On-the-job and apprenticeship training programs are rapidly emerging as the special training instruments best fitted to meet the demands of the present manpower situation in this country.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training's leadership and management of this phase of the training program, in promoting and obtaining the joint cooperation of industry and labor in this program, should be commended. I expect even better results next year.

The Bureau of Employment Security and the State employment security agencies are and should rightfully be the backbone of the Department's counseling, referral, and job placement programs. The State agencies have and are still performing exemplary service to employers, to people seeking work, and aid to people out of work in 1,900 communities of the United States.

Here are come examples of accomplishments last year:

First. The State agencies paid out $2.3 billion in unemployment insurance benefits to over 5 million unemployed.

Second. They have provided special counseling, testing, and referral services to over 420,000 young people over a 10-month period.

Third. They made 6.5 million nonagricultural placements in 1965—a 3.1-percent increase over 1964—and 4.7 million agricultural placements.

Fourth. They placed 1.3 million people age 45 and over; 1.8 million youth under 22 years of age; 287,000 handicapped people and 902,000 veterans.

Fifth. In calendar year 1965 over 1 million industrial and commercial employers called on the public employment offices for services.

Sixth. They have succeeded in reducing the need for importing foreign agricultural workers by 83 percent from 634,000 in 1964 to 110,000 in 1965 all of which means more jobs for domestic farmworkers.

The committee was not happy with the budget proposed for the State employment security agencies and has directed the Department to achieve a better balance within the allocation of the funds recommended by the committee. There especially should be a redistribution of funds to the oldline basic activities which are the essential underpinning to the new responsibilities added as a result of enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Job Corps programs.

To say the least the committee was distressed with the Department's obvious lack of consideration for improving safe work practices for longshore workers and especially in view of the stepped up activity resulting from the Vietnam situation. The same thing is true of the apparent indifference to achieving a shorter timelag in payment of compensation costs to injured Federal workers—the House Education and Labor Committee has also expressed alarm about this situation. The committee has directed the Department to develop positive plans for affirmative action in both of these areas as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, in both the Department of Labor and in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have deducted all of the civil rights programs from every operating agency and have put them all in one place. That is why on page 68 of the report there is shown an increase of $414,000, all for civil rights activities of the Department of Labor.

For the Food and Drug Administration, the budget request was $67,534,000, an increase of $8,735,000 over the amount appropriated for 1966. While this is a substantial increase, the committee felt that it was fully justified in view of the new legislation that this agency has to administer and the continuing increase in the volume and complexity of new drugs.

The next section of the bill is the Office of Education, which I have already touched on in connection with the overall increase in the bill. The committee is also recommending a few reductions from the amounts requested. The bill includes $10 million under title I of the Higher Education Act, for grants to States for community service and continuing education programs, rather than $20 million which was requested. This program has been rather slow to start; in fact, it is still not actually in operation and a majority of the committee thought it would be wise to wait until there was a little experience to review before appropriating the larger sum. The committee also deleted $31,372,000 budgeted for the National Teachers Corps. The amount of funds included for assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, is considerably below the amount appropriated for 1966. However, the $22,937,000 in the bill is the full amount estimated to be necessary to carry out the permanent provisions of the authorizing legislation. The temporary provisions expire at the end of fiscal year 1966. If these provisions are extended, I assume there will be a supplemental appropriation to finance them. The reduction of $2,468,000 from the request for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education is made up of $1,615,000 that was budgeted for civil rights activities and $853,000 for 100 of the new positions budgeted for administering the expanded education programs. The amount allowed in the bill will be sufficient for approximately 340 such new positions.

The increase over 1966 for vocational rehabilitation is almost $100 million. This is practically all directly due to new legislation passed by the last session of Congress. The expanded program will bring rehabilitation services to thousands of people who need them and want them but who would not receive them under the current level of program operations.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill involving many billions of dollars.

It seems to me that the gentleman from Rhode Island is making a very important presentation of this bill and I think the membership should be here to hear it.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently, a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Baring
Beckworth
Bolling
Bolton
Bray
Broomfield
Burleson
Cederberg
Chelf
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Fallon
Farnum
Feighan
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Griffin
Griffiths
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Kornegay
Long, Md.
Love
McEwen
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
Morris
Morse
Murray
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Ottinger
Pepper
Powell
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
St Germain
Springer
Stephens
Taylor
Thomas
Todd
Toll
Utt
Vigorito
Vivian
Whalley
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14745, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 347 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, we were down to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration at the time the quorum call was ordered.

The reduction of $213,000 from the request for salaries and expenses of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the many small decreases in items under the Public Health Service are all due to the consolidation of civil rights activities. These activities were budgeted at a great many different places in the Department. The committee deleted these every place they occurred and has consolidated all funds in the Office of the Secretary. The committee believes that this will provide for a much more efficient and effective program and will make readily ascertainable the level of funding for these activities. I recognize that a period of transition and experimentation will be necessary. A major part of the Department's civil rights effort must be carried out through the regional offices, so the Secretary should have some discretion and flexibility in allocating civil rights personnel to regional offices.

Under the appropriation, "Chronic Diseases and Health of the Aged," the Committee is recommending a $3 million increase over the budget for kidney dialysis centers. The Public Health Service has assisted in establishing 14 such centers but the budget for 1967 did not include funds for any expansion. The fact that most of the 5,000 persons who suffer permanent kidney failure each year can be successfully treated at these centers and the fact that current facilities are only sufficient to treat a few hundred and the rest are simply left to die, indicates to the committee that further expansion is not only in order but is almost demanded. There is also an increase over the budget for this appropriation of $1 million to be used for grants to establish trial programs and demonstrate the benefit of programs for the daytime care of retarded children and adults.

Under the appropriation "Community Health Practice and Research," the committee has added $21 million to the budget for the health professions student loan program. The budget was based on a proposal to transfer this program from direct loans to guaranteed loans. Since it is now obvious that such a change will not be made, at least not in time for next school year, the committee has added sufficient funds to bring this program to the authorized level.

The committee did not make any particularly significant changes in the remaining Public Health Service items up to the National Institutes of Health. I intend to take a little time to discuss the NIH part of the budget and will skip over it for the time being.

The budget for the National Library of Medicine included a fairly substantial percentage increase over fiscal year 1966, most of which was for carrying out the new Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. The committee has increased the budget by $200,000 to start the regional medical libraries program. This program was authorized by the Medical Library Assistance Act to be started in 1966, and was authorized to expand to a level of $2,500,000 in 1967. No good reason was given for the failure of the budget to include any funds for this very important program. The committee also found a considerable need to strengthen the National Library of Medicine's capabilities to disseminate existing information for the use of medical researchers, educators, and practitioners through the medical library network being developed and supported under the Medical Library Assistance Act. However, the Library's current facilities and services for such things as graphic image storage and retrieval, preservation filming, photoduplication operations, and so forth, are not adequate to meet this need. The committee has added $668,000 for this purpose.

The budget for St. Elizabeths Hospital was only sufficient to maintain the current staff. The committee has added funds to enable the hospital to hire 250 additional people to fill the most serious shortages.

The funds included for the Social Security Administration show a considerable increase over 1966 but the increase is practically all directly tied to the new legislation which was enacted by the last session of Congress. Actually, it developed during the hearings that the estimates are overly conservative and a supplemental appropriation will likely be required before the end of fiscal year 1967.

The committee made no changes in the budget for the Welfare Administration except to delete funds budgeted for civil rights activities and funds for 30 of the 60 new positions requested by the Bureau of Family Services for strengthening their regular staff. The committee, as is stated in the report, continues to be concerned about the ever increasing cost of public assistance. The committee is working now on plans for a committee investigation of this matter.

The small reduction of $25,000 made in the request of the Administration on Aging represents the amount budgeted for civil defense activities.

The committee made no change in the budget for any of the items under special institutions and there were no significant changes from 1966 included in the various budget requests. All of the increase for the Office of the Secretary is accounted for by the consolidation of civil defense activities in this office. I have already discussed this and the report is rather complete on the subject. The small reduction in the Office of the General Counsel is accounted for by civil defense activities budgeted in this office.

The relatively small changes included in the budget for the related agencies appeared to the committee to be well justified and the committee has made no change in any of them.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to spend a little time discussing the National Institutes of Health.

The budget submitted on behalf of NIH was once again a great disappointment to me. I cannot understand why, year after year, we get budget requests for the vitally important activities of the National Institutes of Health that make no allowance for carrying forward programs that have such a direct bearing on the welfare and happiness of every man, woman, and child in this country.

I wish that those who are responsible for making up the budget would read the transcript of the hearings on the NIH programs. I wish they would talk with the eminent physicians and scientists who are struggling with the unsolved problems of disease and disability. I wish they would go out and visit—as I have—some of the laboratories in which the battle for better health is being waged. I wish they would visit hospitals and mental institutions to see the tragic scope of the task that still needs to be done.

The investment we, as a nation, should make in medical research must be judged both in relation to opportunity and need. On the one hand, we must take into consideration the demonstrated ability of our biomedical scientists to discover the causes of disease, devise reliable diagnostic tests, and develop more effective treatments and preventive care. On the other hand, we must equally take stock of the many diseases and disabilities whose cause is not known; the unresolved difficulties of diagnosis that sometimes mean that a disease is not discovered until it is too late; the maladies for which no cure and, often not even a mitigating treatment now exists; and the ever-present threats to health which cannot yet be averted.

Modern medicine is still a relatively primitive science. Even the normal functioning of the body is not completely understood—I was surprised to learn during the hearings that new components of blood, which has been studied for centuries, are still being discovered. The contrast that exists between the state of knowledge in the physical sciences and that in the biological sciences is very disturbing to me. I cannot be content with the level of our biomedical research effort when it is true—

That the physicist can tell us how to put a man on the moon, but the physiologist cannot tell us how to prevent a stroke or a heart attack or just a migraine headache;

That the metallurgist can design a shield to ward off the searing heat of a space vehicle's reentry into the atmosphere, but the microbiologist cannot tell us how to ward off the invasion of cancer cells; and

That the geologist can indicate, with reasonable accuracy, where we may successfully drill for oil, but the geneticist cannot predict whether an unborn child will be healthy in body and sound of mind.

It is very disturbing to me that we know more about the nucleus of an atom than we do about the structure of a gene.

We can control atomic energy but we are baffled by the action of viruses which seem to be able to cause disease long after they have apparently disappeared. Yet we are perpetually exposed to these unseen enemies. Not only viruses and bacteria but a host of environmental poisons, many of which have not even been identified, are waiting their opportunity to lay us low.

Every day each one of us must fight a guerrilla war against incipient disease. This is the war I want to escalate.

Despite the great gaps in fundamental biological knowledge, the achievements of medical research are dramatic.

Most of the drugs in use today were unknown to the medical practitioner 20 years ago.

There have been startling advances in surgery which have made it possible to operate on so vital an organ as the heart.

Plastic tubing is now in widespread use to replace damaged arteries.

Electronic devices have been invented to stimulate and control the beating of the heart.

The newspapers last week carried accounts of the first use in a human patient of a device which can take over part of the function of the heart.

Most of the infectious diseases that were common in my childhood are rare today. Mothers have not worried about the threat of smallpox and scarlet fever for years. Rocky Mountain spotted fever no longer takes it annual toll of campers and those who work outdoors in tick-infested areas. Infantile paralysis has at last joined the list of rare diseases.

NIH has just suggested in taking a major step toward the development of a safe vaccine for German measles which in the past 2 years damged some 10,000 newborn babies whose mothers were exposed to this disease during pregnancy.

There is slow but steady progress in lengthening the survival time for victims of some forms of cancer.

While mental health is a growing problem, the number of mental patients who must be kept in institutions continues to decline.

A good example both of the wonders that research can accomplish and of the challenging need for further effort is the so-called artificial kidney. A few months ago I visited the Artificial Kidney Center at Seattle which is now saving the lives of patients whose kidneys have ceased to function. These patients report periodically to the center so that the wastes and poisons normally removed from the blood by the kidneys can be removed by an elaborate machine. This process, known as hemodialysis, holds out the hope of saving the lives of several thousand new victims of kidney failure a year.

I was impressed by this remarkable achievement. I was also greatly saddened by my visit. The hemodialysis machine is complicated and must be operated by highly trained staff. It costs about $10,000 per year for each patient.

At present, the center can only take care of a handful of patients. This means that although research has developed the means for saving thousands of lives, all but a handful of the victims of kidney failure are still condemned to death because the hemodialysis equipment is only in the experimental stage and facilities to care for them are not available.

My conscience would be uneasy, indeed, if I did not do all in my power to speed the day when it will be possible to help all those whose lives could be saved by hemodialysis.

The immediate need is for a major effort to develop a simpler and less costly machine. The aim must be to make it possible for the victim of kidney failure to have a hemodialysis machine in his home which he can operate himself.

But this is not enough. At best, a hemodialysis machine is a poor substitute for a kidney. Work on organ transplantation holds out the hope that it will become possible to transplant a healthy kidney from a donor to a victim of complete kidney failure. This work—especially the search for ways of overcoming the body's rejection of tissue transplanted from another person—must be pressed forward as quickly as possible.

The ultimate solution, of course, is to prevent permanent kidney failure by preventing or curing the diseases which lead to this tragic result. Developmental work on a more practical hemodialysis machine and research on the problems of organ transplantation must therefore be accompanied by continued research on kidney diseases and on the functioning of the kidneys.

I mention my concern over the artificial kidney only to illustrate the significant steps forward that are possible and the extensive and varied work that must still be done on one particular disease problem. Similar opportunities and needs exist in many other areas.

Faced with these opportunities and needs, a timid, mark-time budget for medical research makes no sense. It makes no sense from the point of view of our long-term national interest. It makes no sense from the point of view of the individual citizen.

I am sure that every taxpayer would rather have us spend his tax dollar on health research than on any other Federal activity.

More than 350 years ago the playwright, John Webster, one of Shakespeare's contemporaries, touched the hearts of his audience by having one of his characters say:

> Gold that buys health can never be ill spent.

This is something on which all of us can agree today. In fact, we can be proud that the funds the Congress has made available for health research have been particularly well spent.

Last year the distinguished Wooldridge Committee, appointed by the President to review the NIH programs, said in its report:

> We suspect that there are few, if any, $1 billion segments of the Federal budget that are buying more valuable services for the American people than that administered by the National Institutes of Health.

The question we must answer is how much of these valuable services we want to buy for the American people.

My answer to that is: much more than we have bought so far—as much, in fact, as our hardworking and dedicated scientists and health practitioners can deliver.

I am convinced that we are not investing nearly enough in health research and I am glad to see that some of our most eminent economists agree with me.

Let me quote briefly from the latest annual report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers:

> Such significant indicators of U.S. health as life expectancy, infant mortality, and the incidence of heart disease must cause concern when compared with rates prevailing abroad or when our recent progress is measured against that of other nations * * *. Since 1940, death rates from heart disease and cancer have each increased by one-fourth; the U.S. rate for heart disease is among the highest in the world. Mortality rates among males in the productive age bracket of 40 to 54 years are substantially and consistently higher in the United States than in other industrial countries and almost twice the rate in Sweden.

The report goes on to say:

> Outlays for health are important in building and maintaining a productive labor force as well as in improving the lives of people and the quality of our society. The productivity of American workers could not have reached its present height if, in the past, there had not been investment in medical knowledge, in disease prevention, and in treatment and rehabilitation. Yet the potential return from further health investment remains large.

The Council estimated that in 1963 society lost the potential product of 4.6 million man-years of work as a result of disease and mortality—without even taking into account the much larger losses due to deaths in earlier years of people who might still have been productive.

The total economic loss due to illness was calculated to have been $46.3 billion in 1963.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Leon Keyserling, who served for a number of years as the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, sharply criticized the suggested cutbacks in some of our domestic programs and said that the United States can well afford to spend much more for health, for education, and for welfare. He pointed out that more than 9 percent of our GNP is spent on defense, international obligations, and space technology. Last year we spent just a little over one-quarter of 1 percent on health research.

Mr. Keyserling predicted that during the next 10 years the total value of goods and services produced in this country will rise by more than $200 billion a year and should rise to $1.1 trillion by 1975. He said that in view of these figures—

> It is perfectly preposterous for us to shrink from our prime moral obligations as a Nation because the increased expenditures for the war in Vietnam impose an additional burden upon our economy somewhere in the range of $10 billion to $15 billion.

I agree with him that it is perfectly preposterous for us to think that we can afford to stint on support for health research, medical training, or for doing whatever is necessary to win the war against disease.

I was happy to hear that Secretary McNamara apparently agrees with me, too. A few days ago he said:

> We can afford to do the things we want to do. We are an affluent Nation.

I am sure that one of the things every American wants to do is to protect himself and his family from disease. To strengthen the defenses against disease is the purpose of every one of the programs of the National Institutes of Health. That is the kind of defense program we can all be enthusiastic about.

The committee added $74.8 million to the NIH appropriations. I would have been happier if we could have added twice that amount. The extensive hearings conducted by the committee, which cover more than 1,200 pages of transcript, identified urgent program needs far in excess of the increase the committee has allowed.

The budget estimate included an overall increase for the NIH appropriations of only 4.7 percent over the level of expenditure in 1966. Such an increase is barely enough to cover the normal rise in the cost of doing business which affects the conduct of research no less than it affects other major enterprises. Such an increase makes no allowance for increased costs due to the steadily growing need for more complex, more versatile, and more accurate instruments required for research. Such an increase virtually prohibits any expansion of our medical research effort.

In fact, for two of the Institutes—Cancer and Mental Health—the budget actually proposed a reduction in the amount available for research grants.

The additional funds included by the committee will provide for an overall increase of 10.7 percent in the NIH appropriations which is little enough for a program that supports more than two-fifths of all the medical research conducted in the United States and makes a highly selective but very significant contribution to specialized research conducted overseas.

An increase of less than 11 percent for health research seems modest indeed when compared with a 20-percent rise in corporate profits after taxes, a 12-percent rise in dividends received by stockholders, and a 22 percent increase in farm proprietors' income during 1965.

A total increase of only $132.6 million in Federal expenditure for medical research also seems modest when compared with the record increase of $47 billion in our GNP last year and an expected increase of another $30 billion this year.

The President's optimistic economic report to the Congress notes that—

> Rising consumer income * * * will again largely be devoted to expenditures for better living—

And the report emphasized those last four words.

Surely the wisest and the most satisfying expenditure for better living is a greater investment in medical research. Good health has always been foremost among man's aspirations. In the first century of the Christian era, the Spanish poet Martial wrote: "Life consists not in living, but in enjoying health."

The specific purposes of the additional funds included in the NIH appropriations are described in detail in the committee's report.

A total of $30 million is provided for the regular research grant programs of the Institutes. Nearly $18 million of this amount has been allocated among the various appropriations in such a way that each Institute will have a minimum increase of 8 percent in its research grant funds. The remaining $12 million was allocated among the six Institutes whose immediate needs, as indicated by current estimates of 1966 budget deficiencies, would not be met by a basic 8-percent increase over the amount available in 1966.

As discussed at length in the committee's report, recent studies have shown that an annual increase of 15 percent is necessary to meet the needs of existing research programs resulting from rising costs and the growing complexity of the type of work being done. The funds added by the committee will provide for an overall increase of only 11 percent for the NIH research grant programs.

A total of $37.3 million was added by the committee to restore serious budget cuts for two important programs.

The smaller of these was an increase of $2.3 million to restore the funds available for the third year of the study on the relationship between drugs and heart disease to the level projected in the plans for this 7-year study. The Bureau of the Budget is apparently not interested in this study. In 1965, the Bureau held up the apportionment of the funds provided by the Congress for the study until just before the fiscal year 1966 hearings and included no funds for it in the fiscal year 1966 request. For fiscal year 1967, the Bureau only allowed the same amount that the Congress appropriated last year for the second year of the study despite the fact that the original plans for the study clearly indicated that it would require additional funds to reach its full operating level. The committee has therefore provided these funds. I hope that it will not be necessary for the Congress to override the Bureau's unwarranted resistance to this important project during its remaining 4 years.

An increase of $35 million is provided for the health research facilities construction program. Matching grants under this program have played a major part in building up this country's capability for biomedical research. The present vigor of our research activity and much of the progress made during the past decade were possible only because the Congress had the foresight 10 years ago to launch this program.

Since 1963 the authorized level of this program has been $50 million and that is the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1966. Last year the Congress decided that, to meet our growing need for health research facilities, the program should be expanded. Appropriations totaling $280 million for the 3 years 1967–69 were therefore authorized with the expectation that the budget request for fiscal year 1967 would be for $100 million.

Actually, the budget estimate was for only $15 million although both NIH and the Department had requested the full $100 million. I find this action of the Bureau of the Budget completely inexplicable. No rational testimony was offered in defense of the substitution of a 70-percent cut for an expected request for a 100-percent increase. As this action not only runs counter to the expressed intent of the Congress but will clearly be extremely harmful to further development of our national research capability, the Committee has restored the appropriation to the current level of $50 million.

To meet the needs of approved construction projects at least $140 million would be needed.

I want to emphasize that restrictions on this program do serious damage. Although it is nominally a 50–50 matching program, experience has shown that for every $1 contributed by the Federal Government, non-Federal sources contribute $1.50. Withholding $50 million of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1967 will, therefore, mean that $125 million worth of construction cannot begin. There is also a serious risk that a substantial delay in providing the Federal matching funds will cause the nonfederal matching funds to be diverted to other purposes.

Limitations now imposed on this program will have no immediate effect on medical research. The consequences will be felt 3 or 4 years from now when needed facilities will not be available and when it will be impossible to make up for lost time.

The remaining $7.5 million of the committee's increases are for six specific programs which are fully described in the committee's report.

The sum of $3 million is for creation of several dental research institutes, in various parts of the country, with facilities and programs similar to those of the National Institute of Dental Research in Bethesda. Dental research has lagged behind medical research. Plans for these institutes are well developed and the committee felt that their implementation should not be further delayed.

To inaugurate a national blood program, under the auspices of the National Heart Institute, $1,950,000 is to meet our growing military and civilian needs for particular components of human blood for the treatment of a number of diseases.

The sum of $1 million is to accelerate research and research training on blindness which is a major but somewhat neglected national problem.

To strengthen the research program on the artificial kidney sponsored by the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, $800,000. My personal feeling is that a great deal more should be invested in urgent efforts to overcome the obstacles that now condemn thousands of victims of kidney failure to a preventable death. I strongly urge the Institute to make the most effective use of the funds available to it in this great humanitarian effort.

The sum of $500,000 is to strengthen the activities of NIH's new Division of Computer Research and Technology which is engaged in developing automated clinical and laboratory tests, diagnostic procedures and clinical recordkeeping.

Finally, the committee has provided $250,000 for the Office of the Director, NIH, in the General Research and Services appropriation, to meet the expenses of creating a central administrative framework for developmental engineering programs. The so-called artificial kidney and the experimental artificial heart are merely the precursors of a wide range of new devices which will apply recent engineering advances in electronics, miniaturization, and the creation of new material to the solution of medical problems. The complexities of such a program and the scarcity of people with the requisite engineering skills and understanding of biomedical problems make it undesirable, uneconomical and, probably, impossible to mount and staff separate developmental programs in each of the Institutes that have a legitimate interest in this new field. The Committee, therefore, feels that steps should now be taken, while the administrative arrangements are still fluid, to develop a strong central management to insure the most effective exploitation of this new and very promising field.

The recommended increases in the appropriations for NIH will rectify the most serious deficiencies in the budget request and will add fresh impetus to a small number of very important program activities. The appropriations, as they now stand, are not, in my opinion, optimum in relation to opportunity and need nor are they, in most cases, anywhere near the amounts that could easily be justified. They will, however, enable the vital programs of NIH to continue to move forward.

I have no hesitation at all in saying that the recommended amounts are sound and conservative. I strongly urge that they be approved.

Last year the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] and I collaborated in working out the problems related to cost sharing and we have been discussing this further this year. I think we are in agreement regarding this matter.

Last year the committee modified section 203 in the general provision of the bill in order to simplify and liberalize the payment for overhead cost of grant-supported research projects—the so-called indirect costs. Instead of arbitrarily limiting the indirect cost payment to not more than 20 percent of the direct cost, the new section 203, which has been retained in the bill again this year, specifies that a Federal grant may not equal the full cost of the research project being supported. This provision recognizes the long-established principle that the grant-in-aid relationship requires the recipient of a research grant to make some contribution to the total cost of the project which he has proposed.

The purpose of this section was fully discussed on the floor of this House during last year's consideration of the appropriation. It was, I think, generally welcomed by the House as a step which would create a better relationship between Federal agencies and the grantee institutions where so much of the Nation's research is conducted.

The record makes it quite clear that it was our intent to abolish requirements that forced artificial distinctions to be made between direct and indirect costs. It was our expectation that the revision would result in a simpler and more equitable procedure for funding the costs of research projects.

Section 203 deliberately does not specify that the grantee institution must make any particular percentage contribution because the committee felt that different levels of participation would be justified and appropriate in the wide variety of circumstances that will exist in different institutions and, perhaps, for different projects. The committee also wished to avoid having the Federal agency become involved in elaborate and expensive accounting and auditing procedures or in endless arguments about what is and what is not admissible as an allowable cost. The committee felt that each agency could satisfy itself quite simply that the grantee was, in good faith, making a contribution to the cost of the project. That is all that section 203 requires.

The same provision was written into the independent offices bill and into the Department of Defense appropriations bill. The Bureau of the Budget subsequently issued general instructions which are, I think, in harmony with the committee's intent.

It would appear, however, that the Department of HEW has misinterpreted section 203 and the Bureau of the Budget's instructions HEW seems to think that to comply with section 203 it must require detailed statements of planned expenditures and exercise control over the funds which institutions contribute to grant-supported research projects.

The complaints received in my office since HEW brought its new cost-sharing system into effect a couple of months ago indicate that HEW is using section 203 to complicate and restrict a process which the committee sought to simplify and improve.

I shall take up this misinterpretation of congressional intent with the Secretary and ask him to correct it. I am making this statement so that other Members receiving complaints from institutions in their districts will know that the situation that has arisen was not intended by the committee and is not a necessary consequence of section 203 but is due to the manner in which it is being handled by HEW.

It was certainly not the committee's intent to create the accountants paradise that the HEW regulations will bring into being. The purpose of section 203 is, first, to relieve universities and research institutions of an inequitable financial burden by removing arbitrary overhead requirements and, second, to relieve both the grantee institution and the granting agency of a complex and unnecessary accounting and auditing burden by accepting reasonable evidence that an institution is contributing to the overall cost of a project. The important considerations for the selection of a research project for Federal support should continue to be the quality of the research to be performed and its relevance to agency programs, not arbitrary cost-sharing requirements.

I am confident that the unnecessarily restrictive regulations which have caused the complaints we are receiving can be quickly corrected.

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to say that I agree, as he already knows. All I would like to add is that I hope that this provision is administered so that it will apply equally to all institutions.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks on the items in the bill unless Members have questions.

This appropriation bill affects every family in our country in one way or another. It affects every congressional district in many ways. There is not a dime in this bill of over $10 billion that is going to waste. It is going to help all human beings who are living at this time.

As is always and inevitably the case with a large bill such as this, no individual on the committee is satisfied with everything it includes or excludes. There are several places where I disagree, and especially, places where I think more funds should be appropriated. However, on the whole, I think this is a good bill and one which we can all support conscientiously.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the bill will receive the overwhelming support of this House.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I again congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island as I do every year on this appropriation bill for the excellent manner in which he covered this huge subject. The gentleman from Rhode Island as usual has given the Members of the House of Representatives the benefit of a tremendous amount of information.

I also appreciate the generosity that the subcommittee always shows to the agencies which protect the life, health, and safety of the American people. But, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask you a question. Why was the $3.5 million in planning funds for the seven residential vocational schools scheduled to be built around the country, including one in St. Louis, deleted?

Mr. FOGARTY. There was a difference of opinion in the committee, and this is one of the ways in which the bill was compromised. The other body has always taken the stand that they would not go along with the House action until they found out where these schools were going to be built.

Now that seven areas have been named, I assume the Senate will change their attitude.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. One other question, Mr. Chairman. Do you not feel, as the experts in this field do, that these seven residential schools would serve a much different group from the Job Corps group and would help to meet a need not otherwise taken care of?

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentlewoman, but it is a controversial subject in Congress and in our committee and between both Houses of Congress, and has been for years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I might ask another question?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. On the basis of the excellent testimony given by Dr. Goddard, the new Commissioner of Food and Drugs, do you not agree that we now need a complete overhaul of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require pretesting for cosmetics for safety, pretesting of therapeutic devices for safety and efficacy, and safeguards against accidental poisoning of children by drugs thought to be candy, and much tighter factory inspection, and so on, as proposed in my omnibus bill, H.R. 1235?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not a question for this committee to consider. That question should be directed to the Chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman. I want the RECORD to show, however, that in his testimony before the subcommittee, Dr. Goddard stressed these gaps in the law.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I would like to join the gentlewoman from Missouri in commending the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the great work he has done over the years, and particularly on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have read in the press in recent days of testimony given at a hearing by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which is deeply disturbing. The newspaper dispatch, in a report by the Associated Press, quoted the Surgeon General of the United States as saying:

> There is no evidence of the medicinal effects of wine.

The newspaper story further reported that the Surgeon General, in answer to a direct question, responded:

> There is no evidence to show that wine will cure heart disease—

And further, also in answer to a specific question:

> No, sir, it [wine] will not cure alcoholism.

This story gives a misleading impression of the established and documented role of the uses of wine in medical practice, which I wish to correct.

The State of California, through its wine advisory board, has sponsored research into the medical aspects of wine for the past 20 years or more. These studies have included fundamental and applied research of microchemistry, physiology, pharmacology, and therapy at a number of distinguished universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research centers. They have been directed by scientists and physicians of undoubted competence and integrity. The program, itself, has been directed continuously since 1946 by a pharmacologist who has been nationally recognized for his leadership in this field and is now serving as a consultant on alcohol and alcoholism in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

From this research program, together with studies conducted independently by other investigators, has come substantial evidence of medicinal effects of wine. The investigators have reported in papers and in standard medical and scientific journals and in technical monographs that wine clearly serves as a tranquilizer and, in fact, represents one of the first tranquilizers known to medical men. They have reported that it serves as a sedative and was one of the first sedatives known. They have reported that wine is useful in the treatment of many patients with diabetes, hypertension, and anorexia, malabsorption syndrome and particularly in the treatment of convalescent and geriatric patients as well as in other situations.

These findings have been summarized in a monograph under the title, "Uses of Wine in Medical Practice," and in a newly published book, "Alcoholic Beverages in Clinical Medicine," which fully document the research which I have just described.

In addition, the wine advisory board is keenly aware of the problems of excessive drinking and alcoholism. It has supported long-term studies of the drinking patterns of normal drinkers and alcoholics. These have been conducted in cooperation with the Center of Alcohol Studies, first at Yale and now at Rutgers, and other groups in the United States and with universities and governmental agencies in Italy, France, Sweden, and other countries. From these studies has come the evidence to show that the low rate of alcoholism noted in some groups appears to be closely related to cultural attitudes and physiological factors involved in the traditional use of wine with meals.

The California wine industry has used the utmost care in disseminating the medical research findings. At no time has the wine advisory board or the wine industry in California or any of their representatives made any claim that wine is a cure for heart disease, or alcoholism, or any other disease. The only time such an inference has been applied to these research findings, prior to the testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee, was in a distorted story several months ago in a newspaper of national circulation. Surely there is no evidence, from a careful look at the record, of any claim or inference that wine is a cure for any disease.

I must conclude, therefore, that when the witness was using the word "medicinal" in relation to the uses of wine, he was applying it in the limited sense of "curative" and did not intend the other often understood meanings—"palliative" or "used in treatment."

I would sincerely appreciate it if my distinguished associate from Rhode Island would clarify the misimpressions that may have resulted from the cited testimony before the subcommittee.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I say to the able Member from the State of California that I deeply regret any misunderstanding which may have resulted from testimony before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. At the time the Surgeon General testified before the subcommittee in February, I had read a story about the "medicinal" values of wine in the Wall Street Journal. I have subsequently learned that the story did not completely report the facts as they exist.

At the time of the subcommittee hearing, I was not fully informed on the extensive research that had been conducted into the uses of wine in medical practice. Since then, I have learned of the great amount of competent work that has been done in that field. I concur fully with your statements that this research activity has been a meaningful one, and that the findings have been properly used.

I believe that the use of "medicinal" in the Surgeon General's testimony was strictly in the limited sense of meaning "curative." His response seemed to me to have the same meaning as saying there is no evidence of the "medicinal" effects of aspirin, insulin, any anesthetic, or a host of others, in that none of these is curative although all are unquestionably invaluable in medical practice.

I am also aware that there is much evidence in medical literature to indicate that wine does have physiological effects which, for many patients, may play a useful adjunctive role in the treatment of various diseases, and that many competent physicians are utilizing wine for the alleviation of symptoms. The California State Wine Advisory Board deserves commendation for the support it has provided for many years through its medical research program. I realize it has contributed substantially to providing this evidence.

In addition, I am satisfied that this research program has been conducted with commendable dignity and restraint, and that the board cannot be justifiably censored for a newspaper publication of a distorted report over which it had no control. You may be assured that the integrity of the board, and of the scientific investigators whose work it has supported, is not being questioned in any way.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman on the courage that he displayed during the hearings and in the markup of this bill and in his presentation of the bill to the full committee and to the House.

I served on this committee for a number of years with the chairman. I know that he knows this bill from A to Z, in the most intricate detail. He is very dedicated to the programs embraced in this bill. He has in the past always been a great humanitarian.

But in this bill he has been presented with unusual and exceptionally difficult problems. I know how difficult the problem was. I want to congratulate him for the great courage he has displayed in standing up and fighting for what he and I think was right. He has shown himself to be not only a great humanitarian, but to be a man of great courage.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the committee for its action in restoring certain amounts to impacted areas and National Defense Education Act grants and particularly I want to express the appreciation of those of us who have been working in the kidney treatment field to Representative FOGARTY for his concern and assistance to those suffering from chronic kidney failure.

This problem has been of deep concern to residents of my district in Seattle because one of the first centers using artificial kidneys to save persons whose kidneys have failed was developed by Dr. Scribner at the University of Washington. One of the first dialysis centers was created in Seattle which allowed a limited number of persons who faced certain death to live and continue at their jobs.

The problem, of course, is that this treatment was originally very expensive—averaging over $20,000 per year—and the number of lifesaving units was limited to less than 20. This meant that a combination medical and layman board was required to decide which individuals lived and which ones died. Last November an NBC documentary pointed out the intense tragedy involved in this whole process. The expenses have now been reduced to approximately $10,000 per year and hopefully can be further reduced.

This matter came particularly to my attention in the spring of 1965 when there was presented to me the case of a father of a young family well known to many of us in the area who had stated he would rather die than have his family faced with the costs that would be involved to maintain him.

At that time I introduced H.R. 11289 to authorize the additional construction and development of these artificial kidney machines in centers throughout the United States.

Since that time, through the wonderful assistance of Congressman FOGARTY and others in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, we have worked toward a broader development of the whole area of treatment of chronic kidney failure. In this connection, I have introduced H.R. 14279 and have been pleased to be joined by many of my colleagues with companion bills. I hope that this matter will be acted upon before the end of this session.

Once again I want to express my appreciation to Congressman FOGARTY for the increase in appropriation in the amount of $3 million to establish additional kidney dialysis centers, and the addition of $800,000 to the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases to expand their basic research in this area.

I am hopeful that the new authorization bills which have been proposed will be available in the period of time after fiscal year 1966 to continue the development of this program so that committees will not have to decide who lives and who dies.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we have before us today contains a total of $490 million above the estimate sent to the Congress by the President.

We here in the Congress should be aware of several very simple facts. The first is that the executive branch of our Government is indeed playing tricks with the Congress. Let me point this up to you today as clearly as I can. We have evidence, on a daily basis, of what is happening as far as the Congress is concerned. You gentlemen in the majority and you in the minority should all be concerned about the game that is being played.

I picked up the New York Times the other day, and I saw a story, a kind of background story, which told about the President of the United States condemning the Congress because there was going to be a pay increase for the military personnel. This pay increase was going to amount to 2.8 percent. This was over and above the budget, but the President did not know exactly what he could do about it.

There is an awful lot he can do about it, because his own Secretary of Defense was appearing before the Armed Services Committee just 3 days prior to the appearance of that story, asking for this pay increase for military personnel of almost 3 percent. Yet, the President of the United States does not send up any estimates, any amendments to his budget. Instead, he quietly sends his Secretary of Defense to appear before the Armed Services Committee, to agree to an increase in military pay, but with no budget estimate.

Then we see the stories appearing that Congress is doing this, and the President opposes it. I always assumed that the Secretary of Defense was somewhat responsible to the Commander in Chief. It would seem to me that no one in the Congress should allow that kind of activity on the part of the executive branch to go on unchallenged.

Let us consider this bill, as an example, and the increases in this bill. I believe all Members know what they are.

There is $232 million for aid to impacted schools, and $39 million for vocational education.

By the way, there were a lot of gentlemen and gentlewomen from this Congress who went down to receive those beautiful pens at the White House. They gave away nice pens, and got publicity all over the United States about how vocational education was being improved and how in 1967 we would have a big, massive program increasing the emphasis on vocational education.

When the budget came up here, because older, well-established vocational education does not have the L.B.J. brand on it, it was reduced. But the programs they started, the new starts during this administration, were increased in the budget.

In the area of training there is $1.4 billion in the overall budget, in the area of manpower training. But the increases are all in new programs that have been started by this administration. Any program which was an existing program, long tested, was reduced.

We can point to many examples of this, such as the land-grant college program, the oldest aid to education program, which was started in the administration of Abraham Lincoln. Because it does not have the brand on it of the administration, of the executive branch, what happened? Every dollar was taken out of that in the budget.

I believe it is time the legislative branch exercised some control over these matters. Merely because an item is something the executive branch has started is no reason why we should place our stamp of approval on it.

There are areas of increases—vocational education; land-grant colleges; payments to school districts; the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act, a longtime existing program; the nurse and medical student loan program; the programs of the National Institutes of Health, to carry on the cancer, heart, and stroke amendments of 1966. All these programs have increases over and above the President's recommendations.

I intend to offer an amendment, to see how many people will support the President of the United States on a few of these items, when this bill is opened up for amendment, because I believe we should test his support here in the Congress on a few of these items.

But it seems the executive branch today is not working to decrease any of the items in this bill. The only effort being made here today is to add on the Teachers Corps, which is an administration program, a new start, a new program.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of the Commissioner of Education—all of the power of the executive branch is being applied to go forward with the Teachers Corps program, but the top lobbyists of the administration, who have done so well and who have been so successful in enacting the authorizations for many of these programs, are nowhere to be seen on Capitol Hill today.

The Jack Valentis and the Larry O'Briens and the other men of the White House that have been up here working for authorizations are not up here today working to stay within the President's guideline and the President's budget. They are not up here opposing the impacted area aid program. But they are putting out their press releases on how the Congress is going wild on spending. Still they are encouraging the Congress at every step of the way to go forward with these programs. And let us not forget that this Congress is dominated by a 2-to-1 majority of the President's own party.

Now, if the President of the United States is serious about this matter of expenditure control as far as the public sector is concerned, he would be just as serious about having his people here working to stay within these budget figures that he sent up here as he is to have them increased. It is strange, it seems to me, that today the only effort being made by the executive branch is to increase this bill, that is, to add on to the future score. The only effort being made as far as the public sector is concerned in this battle of inflation and to keep down expenditures has to be made here in the Congress of the United States, because it is not being made in a straightforward manner as far as the executive branch is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

This bill that is before us today is for partial funding of the activities of the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related activities for fiscal year 1967. It should be crystal clear to every Member of this Congress that this bill, although it contains almost $11 billion in general-fund authorizations for expenditure and $33 billion in trust fund money, it only makes up about 75 percent of the funds which we will appropriate for the Department of HEW from general revenues. Now, why is that? It is because there are five major programs that have not been authorized and could not be funded in this bill. What are those? First, the elementary and secondary education program, a total of at least $1.4 billion; the Higher Education Facilities Act, which was passed yesterday but which cannot be funded because it has not passed the Senate and been signed by the President, $722 million; grants to public libraries, $52 million; a part of higher educational activities, $30 million; Office of Economic Opportunity, $1.73 billion.

It seems to me that if we are going to give proper consideration to the funding of the Department of HEW and the activities of that Department of HEW for the next 12-month period, all of these appropriation items should be considered at the same time. Why do I say that? Last year on the Higher Education Act, a major piece of legislation, the money to carry on that program was added to the HEW appropriation bill through an amendment in the U.S. Senate. Not at any time during the consideration of this program was the House given the opportunity to work its will on the appropriations for this program.

Many of you are familiar, I am sure, with the controversy which surrounds title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which is contained in this bill. If any of you have talked to school administrators, you should realize that this particular program in the minds of many school administrators and school people throughout the United States has a lower priority as far as funding is concerned than does the facilities section of NDEA.

Mr. Chairman, in the National Defense Education Act, in the facilities program, the authorization is not fully funded under the appropriations budget.

Under the President's budget, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is fully funded, to the tune of over $1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, when we consider this item, the House of Representatives should have the opportunity of deciding whether it wants to give a higher priority to the facilities section of the National Defense Education Act than it does to title I of the elementary and secondary education section.

But, Mr. Chairman, when we permit the other body to add these items, we give up, we completely surrender, the opportunity for this House of Representatives to work its will, to express its opinion, and to have anything to say about the direction of the funding of these programs.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of the Committee that it is important when we consider the HEW appropriation bill, that all of the educational programs, by title are funded in the same bill in order that the priority which is given to these various items may be considered at one time in the House of Representatives. This is completely impossible at the present time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman suggesting that the Subcommittee on Appropriations should set priorities after the authorizing committee has acted?

Mr. LAIRD. I certainly am. I am suggesting that the House of Representatives should set these priorities which is not now being done.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman suggesting——

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to answer the gentleman's question and then I shall yield further to the gentleman.

The authorization which was set for the facilities section of the National Defense Education Act is no priority, because the President did not even ask for full funding in this particular bill, although your committee authorized it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have surrendered the priority and the establishment of priorities under all of these authorizations to the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I can show proof in every instance to the effect that the priorities are being established by the executive branch. One will find that if it is a present program or a program that has been started within the last 3 years, that is what gives it a high priority. However, if it is an old, existing program, like the Land-Grant College Act, which has been reenacted every year, a program such as the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, this program is cut back and the priority is not established by the Congress.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Kentucky helps me make this point: that the House of Representatives should have something to say about how these priorities are established. There is only one way in which the House of Representatives can do that, regardless of what the gentleman's legislative committee has done, and that is to fund all of these programs in the same bill so that Congress can work its will and establish priorities. You can pass authorization funds day after day, Congress after Congress, and they mean nothing if we surrender this entire question of priorities to the executive branch; and that is what your committee has done and that is what is being done in this bill, because we cannot even consider the National Defense Education Act as it relates to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because that will be added by the other body.

Mr. Chairman, there will be seven Members of this House of Representatives who will sit on the conference committee and establish the priorities. Not another one of the 435 Members of this House of Representatives will have anything to say about it, when it comes to establishing or sustaining funds.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LAIRD. So I am going to make a suggestion.

I suggest that all the Members of the House read the additional views of the minority which start on page 60, and which call to the attention of the House of Representatives the fact that these programs have not been authorized.

We do not want the same thing to happen this year that happened last year when the Senate wrote the ticket on higher education and it was done only by a Senate amendment and did not give the House an opportunity to give any consideration to the appropriations as they applied to all titles in this education bill.

I personally favor more money in the facilities section of the National Defense Education Act. I think that should have a higher priority than title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which is not in this bill today. But there is no way to express that feeling of higher priority in this section because we cannot consider at this time title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Committee on Appropriations is going to wait for the foreign aid authorization. We are going to wait for the space authorization. We are going to wait for all of these other authorizations. But yet in the important area of health, education, and welfare, we find ourselves being told "No, let the Senate move on this as they did last year in this higher education field." I do not think that we in the House of Representatives should yield on this point.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. First of all, I would like to commend the gentleman on the statements he is making. He is giving the House of Representatives some facts and the American people some facts that I think they should have. The question I have in mind is—How are we going to get the facts to the American people? Because as the gentleman has stated, the President is probably going to make a statement after this bill is passed that the Congress increases requests by such and such an amount. We then once again are going to be the whipping boy.

But coming to a point that the gentleman raised which I think really should be emphasized, I refer to the failure to fund the heart, cancer, and stroke research program. Did the gentleman make that point?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes.

Mr. LATTA. You mean after the President of the United States had this signing of the bill down at the White House with all the nationwide publicity to do something about cancer, stroke, and heart disease and after we passed the authorization, then the President comes to the Congress without any request for funds for this program? Is that what he did?

Mr. LAIRD. There is a request for funds in this bill. But I would just like to point out to the gentleman, it is not an increase over the program of last year. I am sure most of us when we received the pens down at the White House thought that there was going to be some sort of increase in this program.

Mr. LATTA. What the gentleman is saying is that actually then the country gets nothing more on this program of research in these three very important areas.

Mr. LAIRD. Let me tell the gentleman that in the area of the National Science Foundation and in the area of the Atomic Energy Commission and in all of these other areas where research is carried on, the budget of the President allows for a 15-percent increase in grants for these various purposes. But this is not true in the area of heart, cancer, stroke, and mental illness. I think the gentleman from Rhode Island will bear out that simple fact—that the percentage increase in these other areas was not granted in this particular area.

The point I was trying to make is that the figures used by the executive branch should not be figures that we immediately feel we have to accept because if you will go over this bill, you will see that the areas that were given the greatest degree of increase were programs that were new starts by this administration.

In existing programs that have been going on for years and in the redirection that we gave vocational education in the legislation that we passed last year, we told the Office of Education that the vocational education program should be redirected. We passed legislation along that line and provided for the funding. I offered an amendment to reduce the manpower training program and to increase the vocational education program which was a going and existing program.

It seems to me that these tried programs should be given priority. Simply because the land-grant college program happened to start at the time Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States is no reason for, in this year of 1966, saying that it is a bad program, and that is not the judgment that should be made by the executive branch on these programs today.

What I would like to leave with my colleagues here today is that we hear a great deal of talk about what the private sector of our economy should do about inflation, the cost of living, and the concern for the dollar. Almost every day the housewife in the home, the farmer in the field, the worker in the factory, and businessmen throughout the country are lectured by representatives of the executive branch about what they can do about inflation and the cost of living. They are told what they should buy and what they should not buy.

My colleagues, it is not this private sector where you can place the blame for the cost-of-living and the inflation that we are experiencing today. It is the spending binge of the Federal Government. Unless the executive branch is willing to stand up and use the same kind of communication techniques with the Members, use the same kind of pressure that they used on a colleague in the U.S. Senate in order to get a vote for a particular motion to put something in a bill, unless they are willing to go forward to carry on this kind of program when it comes down to the hard cases of expenditures and appropriations, unless we are willing to face up to the fact that it is the fiscal policies of the Federal Government that are causing our problems today and that those problems are caused by what the public sector is doing, then we are in for serious trouble.

So I call upon the executive branch of our Government to mean what they say and do what they say, but also to show by their work and their actions that they are not interested only when a program of theirs is cut. They should show that they are also interested in maintaining some degree of fiscal sanity as far as spending in the United States is concerned.

I am going to give Members a chance. The first amendment that will be up will be the impacted aid amendment. We will see exactly how much aid the executive branch gives to the Congress in this area of keeping expenditures and appropriations somewhat in line. If we do well on that, we can continue on down the line. But we will not take up all day today with a lot of amendments. We will start with impacted aid. That happens to be the first one. We will see how we do. We want to give the President and the people who are working for him an opportunity to show how well they can operate on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin have any further requests for time?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island has done an excellent job over the years in the field of health.

He and I are both recipients of some of the fine work that has been done, as other Members of this House have been recipients of things in the past in research and development in the medical field.

I would not want what I say here today to mean that I have opposed research and development in the medical field.

I would not want what I say here today to mean that I have opposed the research and development in the health field. But, I think we are now providing research funds that perhaps cannot be used effectively.

Mr. Chairman, today marks my ninth appearance this year in the well of the House on behalf of fiscal restraint and fiscal responsibility. I have made these appearances because it is meet and right and our bounden duty to protect the economic well-being of our great Nation from the ravages of inflation, from the awesome burden of increased taxation, and from the chains of statutory wage and price controls.

The demand for fiscal prudence is made imperative by the fact that we are at war in Vietnam and by the fact that we are now experiencing considerable price inflation.

It is apparent that the war in Vietnam will not be over for a long time to come. We now have 250,000 troops committed to the fighting in Vietnam and that number may have to be increased to 400,000 or more before a just peace can be reached. The demands for materiel with which to fight this war must necessarily increase as we commit additional manpower over there.

The consumer price index is currently advancing at an annual rate of 6 percent. Such an increase is robbing the poor and those who are living on pensions and other forms of fixed income of their ability to provide for the necessities of life. We are on the threshold of even greater inflation, which will further cheapen our money and reduce everyone's buying power.

That is the condition today. I ask you, what will it be tomorrow and next month and next year and the year after if we persist in going merrily down the road of fiscal irresponsibility—approving low-priority domestic spending programs and appropriating funds for them and for existing but nonessential programs? I think we all know the answer—we shall have the runaway inflation which has destroyed the economic well-being of other nations and which certainly will destroy ours if let go unchecked.

We recognize these ills when they exist elsewhere and to the extent that we have and do lend a helping hand to our free-world allies, we demand that they do something about them. Let me just tell you what we said about one of the countries who gets aid from us:

> In order to reduce the rate of inflation to no more than 10 percent by the end of 1966, [the] authorities are expected to continue their efforts to eliminate the Federal budget deficit, curb wage increases, reduce subsidies to Government enterprises, and maintain credit policies which curb inflation without throttling private enterprise.

That citation is not an isolated one because we have demanded very nearly the same thing from other countries who are recipients of our aid.

Except for the reference to an inflation rate of 10 percent, and we may soon incur such a rate here at home, this citation could apply to our own economic situation. What I do not understand is the fact that we recognize these dangerous economic situations in other countries and either cannot see them here at home or just would not face up to them when they are apparent.

WHAT THE PRESIDENT HAS DONE

The President, his economic advisers, and economists outside the Federal service have all expressed concern about the inflationary pressures that are at work in the economy.

The President has called upon industry to curtail its capital outlays as a means of reducing these inflationary pressures.

He has called upon the housewives of the Nation to defer purchases that are not absolutely essential and to be more selective in their purchases of food and other necessities.

He has decided against starting an addition to the Texas White House as a personal example of deferring not absolutely essential expenditures.

He has delayed starting the construction of some Federal post offices and he has indicated that some nonessential, though desirable, Federal spending will be deferred throughout the balance of this fiscal year.

He has complained that Congress is trying to add $3 billion to his 1967 budget.

He has said that he fears these additions to his budget may force him to ask Congress for a tax increase.

When he signed the cold war GI bill, he issued the following warning:

> I want to call attention, however, and make a most solemn warning about future legislation. Unless we can balance our requests with prudence, and our concern with caution, then we are likely to get our figures back to that $130 billion which came over from the departments.

He has cajoled and needled individual Members of Congress about these budget increases.

But he has also marched Postmaster General O'Brien and his legislative liaison troops up here to do battle to save the funding of the rent supplement program and the National Teachers Corps when it appeared that Congress might not go along with his request.

What has he not done?

He has not sent General O'Brien and his troops up here to help those of us who have tried to make modest cuts that would have reduced proposed appropriations back to his budget request.

He has not seen fit to exercise his constitutional right to veto bills that exceed his budget requests.

In the past, even appropriation bills have been vetoed. As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower vetoed the independent offices appropriation bill for fiscal 1959 because Congress had added about $580 million of appropriations to his budget request. Congress accepted that veto and finally provided appropriations that were in line with the request. President Eisenhower also vetoed the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 because it contained too many new starts and exceeded the President's request. Thereafter, Congress enacted a new bill with an appropriation which was slightly less than the budget request but which still contained all of the new starts. President Eisenhower vetoed that bill but Congress overrode the veto and it became law.

I would suggest that the President either send General O'Brien and his legislative troops back up here to give aid and comfort to those of us who are trying to help the President or that he exercise his veto power on bills, such as the bill before us, that exceed his budget request.

WHAT CONGRESS HAS DONE

The President's pleas for fiscal restraint have largely gone unheeded here in the House. Could it be that Congress wants to overcome the "rubberstamp" label with which it was tagged last year?

If that is the situation, then I think we can all agree that the House has not only overcome but now might well be labeled as "defying the President."

Over the years I have urged the Congress to recapture its constitutional and historical position as a coequal with the executive and judiciary. If it proposes now to pursue its prerogatives as a coequal, then it must also be willing to accept the responsibilities that go with this newly found freedom.

Congress is responsible for providing the ways and means of raising the revenues, appropriating funds to pay our bills, and authorizing Federal programs that promote the general welfare.

If Congress chooses not to follow the recommendations of the President, then it must assume the obligation of coordinating its actions to the end that income and outgo are balanced. And to the extent that we cannot afford all that we desire, Congress must be willing to assign priorities for spending.

This, it has done with little success in recent years and with no success at all this year.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

The membership of the House is made up of 293 Democrats and 140 Republicans. Thus, we on this side of the aisle are outnumbered by more than 2 to 1.

It would follow that the majority party is responsible for the conduct of the House; however, the majority has failed to assume responsibility for the economic well-being of the Nation, and it has gone along week after week adding to the President's budget. That budget was beyond the realm of fiscal prudence when it was submitted and unless the majority faces up to its responsibilities, it probably will be beyond the realm of reason when the President gets all of it back.

You may ask, Who is responsible? Each of us is responsible but much more importantly those responsible are: the distinguished Speaker, the majority leader, the chairmen and majority members of the legislative committees, and the Appropriations Committee, itself. If this budget is to be cut or, for that matter, even held at the level proposed by the President, then it will be up to the leadership on the other side of the aisle to move into the budget area with the aggressiveness and forthrightness that our war and inflationary situations demand.

On several occasions, those of us on this side of the aisle who truly believe in fiscal responsibility have honestly tried to effect some economies in the budget. We have offered modest amendments that would have cut proposed appropriations back to the level of the budget request. We have offered amendments that would have cut back on proposed 1967 spending by a modest 5 percent.

Just in case you do not recall, let me tell you how these amendments were received by the House. The big spenders on the other side of the aisle were here in force and we were shellacked on every amendment. The first time I offered the Bow expenditure limitation amendment, we received the munificent support of 30 Democrat members. The second time, we got all of 17 Democrat votes. I think those votes clearly establish how little Democrat members are concerned with fiscal responsibility.

I hope you will go home this fall and tell your constituents how hard you worked adding fuel to the fires of inflation and how you strived to be certain that the people would be burdened with increased taxes. And if you should travel to Vietnam later this year, I hope you will tell our fighting men over there that it was your free spending actions which necessitated the increase in taxes that will cut their take-home pay, and I hope that you will tell them how you helped inflation along and reduced the purchasing power of allotment checks to their dependents back home.

THE BOW EXPENDITURE LIMITATION

Today, notwithstanding the reportorial conclusions of Mr. Arthur Krock of the New York Times, I shall again offer the Bow expenditure limitation amendment. I am serving notice on each of you that unless there is substantially increased Democrat support for the amendment, then the majority party can assume the entire responsibility for future budget reductions. In that event, I can promise you that I will help deliver the votes for economy provided, of course, that the majority party has the courage to assume a responsible role in the fiscal affairs of our beloved Nation.

Mark Twain once said:

> Always do right, this will gratify some people and astonish the rest.

I hope the majority party will do right with respect to the budget. It will gratify some of us but, oh my, think how many it will astonish.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. I notice a third of the money involved in this appropriation bill goes as grants to States for public assistance. The country supposedly is enjoying extreme prosperity. We have one of the lowest unemployment rates in the history of the Nation. We pulled thousands of young men into our defense services and we have hundreds of thousands more working in defense plants and so on and so forth. How can we justify this large amount of grants for public assistance to States? I see it is $145 million in fiscal year 1966. Yet the building of the so-called Great Society is piling program on program in order to eliminate poverty. How can anyone justify this? Will the gentleman be able to give me an answer to that?

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman. It is very difficult for me to explain this. Perhaps my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who has attended all of these hearings, can give you a better answer than I can to the question. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for that purpose.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and I have listened to these hearings on this particular item. I think this is a good estimate of the amount of money that will be expended by the States. One of the big items here is aiding dependent children and aid to the permanently and totally disabled and aid to the blind and these various welfare programs under the Social Security Administration. These are not in insurance areas and do not include any direct welfare payments to any welfare recipients on direct relief. This includes the specialized categorical programs in which the Federal Government pays the major portion of the costs in the States. I would like to tell the gentleman that old-age assistance is on the decrease, but aid to dependent children is on the increase. I would like to tell the gentleman that aid to the blind and the permanently and totally disabled is about the same as recent years.

In the old-age assistance area we can point to some improvement there with the social security program taking up some of the slack, but this program will continue to be a very major cost item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the gentleman from Rhode Island will agree with me this is a very good estimate of the amount of money needed in the States in these categorical welfare programs under the Social Security Administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman stated the answer to the question correctly. We tried to take action last year by reducing this appropriation by a couple of hundred million dollars on the basis that unemployment was low and all these programs to reduce dependency, but had to make it up in a supplemental. Congress has seven or eight times increased the authorization for public assistance payments.

Then, also, the States in the last few years have changed their laws to increase the payments to these individuals and have made more people eligible for public assistance. As a result, through actions of State legislatures and the Congress itself, we have this figure now.

Mr. Chairman, our committee a year ago planned to make a complete investigation of the rise in costs in this area. However, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], wrote our committee a letter to the effect that they were going into this problem in depth. We thought at that time this was a problem for the legislative committee to handle.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further——

Mr. BOW. I shall be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to add this, because this is a very important section of the bill and there is a great deal of money contained in these items with reference to grants to the States:

Mr. Chairman, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965, the Kerr-Mills bill—all these programs have had a considerable impact upon the amount of money made available to the States under this program. I believe any reductions that would be made in this item in this year's budget would be a reduction which would be meaningless, because you would have to fund them in a supplemental request at a later date. We are matching State programs in this area. Any reductions here, therefore, would not represent meaningful budget reductions.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], a few moments ago made the statement that there was a lack of concern on the part of the majority in limiting expenditures. The gentleman made an effort to justify this statement by citing the fact that when he made a motion to recommit the Interior Department appropriation bill with a percentage factor 30 members of the majority party supported the recommittal motion. And, when the gentleman made a similar motion to recommit the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill, only 17 members of the majority party supported the motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this demonstrates in any way a lack of concern for budget expenditures or a budget limitation upon the part of the majority party. I yield to no man in this Congress in the matter of concern for fiscal responsibility and I have the record to prove it.

On the other hand, I sincerely believe, because I voted against both those motions to recommit, that it demonstrates on the part of the majority party a desire to exercise congressional prerogatives and expend this money appropriated for items for which the Congress wants to expend the money rather than deserting its responsibility and giving this authority to the Bureau of the Budget. I will vote to cut any item or completely remove any item from this or any other appropriation bill if a case can be made to justify it but I will not support a motion to limit the appropriation and expenditures of any agency by this method. To argue, as these recommit motions require to limit the expenditures of an agency to 90 or 95 percent of the Bureau of Budget recommendation and then give sole and complete discretion and authority to the executive branch of the Government to decide which items would be cut or completely deleted, makes a joke of the committee system and Congress. We do not need a Congress if we are going to give the Bureau of the Budget this authority. We have given them too much authority already. I can think of no worse way to legislate than by this method.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, by 1970, 86 million persons will be in the national labor force. The number of teenage and young adult workers—age 14 to 24—who will enter the labor force is expected to increase at a rate of almost 700,000 a year. Our failure to appropriate fully the authorized funds as set forth in the Vocational Education Act of 1963—Public Law 88–210—will most certainly affect the possibilities for success of many of these young and adult workers and consequently will have an adverse effect on the economic well-being of our people and our Nation.

More than ever before in our country's history we need educational facilities to train the technicians, the health workers, the skilled and semiskilled workers, even the very low skilled workers to fill job openings in business and industry. Automation of industry calls for retraining and upgrading of adult workers. The rapidity of changes demands that workers retrain at least from three to five times in their adult lives.

Can we ignore such needs as these? We cannot. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provides for vocational education programs to meet the needs of high school youth; persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study; persons who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining; and persons who have academic, socioeconomic and other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational programs. The act also provides for construction of area vocational education school facilities and ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational programs.

It is estimated that some 6 million persons will benefit from vocational education programs during fiscal 1966–67 at a Federal cost of $260 million. State and local school systems have traditionally shown their belief in this type of training by greatly overmatching the Federal dollars with State and local funds. The average investment of Federal, State, and local dollars is approximately $195 per person being served. This will not be enough to meet the expanding enrollments.

Can we ignore our responsibilities in helping State and local communities to continue to build sound educational training programs to provide for these 6 million people the skilled training they need to secure gainful employment? Gentlemen, we cannot afford to fail our people in their educational needs.

It is no mystery what becomes of students who successfully complete a course of study in vocational education. Public Law 88–210 requires that they have an occupational objective in mind when they enroll in a program; that the instruction includes up-to-date knowledge and skills necessary for competency required in the occupation and that instruction be given in cooperation with potential employers and with the counsel of advisory committees; and that facilities and equipment be in such adequate supply and quality that up-to-date, high quality training can be provided for the occupation.

With the assurance that the training is sound and that occupational goals are being met, a further safeguard is provided in the continuous evaluation of programs and their results at the local, State, and National levels.

A recent study of high school graduates of vocational education programs revealed that about 65 percent enter occupations for which they either were trained or for occupations closely related to their training; that vocationally trained graduates enjoy substantially greater employment security than do other high school graduates; and that vocational graduates have greater accumulation of earning over the 11-year period covered by the follow-up study.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 has provided new direction and stimulants to vocational education programs, which have been successful programs in our public schools since 1917, but the new emphasis toward gainful employment has increased and improved the avenues through which we can meet the needs of an expanding economy.

The area vocational technical school programs, I am proud to say, were somewhat pioneered in my own State of Georgia. We now have 14 schools in full operation with 7 more to be opened this September and 2 others planned. The demand on these schools for technical, trade, health, and business training is so great that we are already planning expansions to four of the existing schools if the full appropriation is forthcoming from this Congress. Failure to appropriate the full authorization under Public Law 88–210 will, in my State alone, mean a reduction in the area school budget of some $1,500,000 in Federal, State, and local funds proposed for use in operation of existing and new schools and for equipping new schools; for teachers and for conducting adult classes.

This reduction would have serious effects on the occupational training of some

6,000 day and evening students who will be enrolled in the 7 new schools and will affect the operation of the 14 schools now operating with an enrollment of 20,000.

Can we deprive a Georgia boy or any other American boy of a starting salary of up to $150 a week in a technical occupation? A total of 16 percent of the graduates of Georgia's area vocational-technical schools in 1965 entered occupations at salaries of $101 to $150 a week. Only 8 percent entered occupations at salaries under $50 a week while 2 percent started at over $150 a week. Of those who complete training, 90 percent are employed in less than a month, 81 percent of them enter occupations for which they had trained, and 86 percent of them go to work within 100 miles of their homes. No wonder labor, industry, and business leaders consider area schools a vital link in their economic security.

If we fail to appropriate the full amount authorized in Public Law 88-210, my State will see a reduction in funds already budgeted for fiscal 1966-67 of $1,214,000 under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and some $373,000 less than was anticipated under section 13 for the work-study program.

The industrial growth of the Nation demands better trained workers with more skills than they have ever needed before in our history, and our citizens, young and old, recognize that they must have this knowledge to compete for employment in the labor market. The enrollment in area vocational and technical schools in Georgia in 1965 was a 135-percent increase over the year before. Can we turn the tide on industrial growth by simply failing to provide the trained workers they need? Do we want to? If we do, it will result in economic disaster.

The Cold War Veterans Act of 1966 will certainly increase the number of young people and adults who will be seeking vocational and higher educational opportunities. With the advent of medicare, projections indicate that our country will need 10,000 new people a month for the next 10 years in health occupations alone.

If this country is to assure domestic tranquillity, provide for common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure itself nationally, trained manpower must be made available to our labor force in ever increasing numbers.

The State-local-Federal relationship sponsored by the Federal vocational education acts is a national effort which can act quickly in times of emergency. It is a sound partnership based on years of successful experience and we know that even the full appropriation of funds under Public Law 88-210 will not do the total job as measured by the needs of all our people. But we must take every step to assure to the best of our ability the continuance of a nation economically and socially secure.

The work-study provision of Public Law 88-210, section 13, provides opportunities for students who would otherwise be deprived of training for a job. Although funds were late coming to this program, some 85,000 students will have been served in fiscal 1965-66 at an average cost of $294 per student. In my own State of Georgia failure to appropriate full funds under the act will mean denying financial aid and educational benefits to about 1,000 worthy young people.

Just listen to some of these actual cases of students now on the work-study program in Georgia—truly an antipoverty measure:

A high school graduate living with mother and older sister who is a barmaid—a total annual income of $2,880;

A 12th-grade graduate studying auto mechanics is one of a family of five with an annual income of $1,200;

An 11th-grader of a family of seven with an annual income of $1,920; and

A 10th-grader in a family of three on relief with an annual income of $648.

These are just a few of the students we are hoping to keep in school; to keep them off the welfare and unemployment rolls and off the streets. On a larger scale failure to appropriate the full amount authorized under the act would mean that in all our vocational programs we would deny some 3,700 high school vocational students, some 1,350 post-high-school students and 1,600 adults the opportunity for occupational training. We must not do this. We cannot afford to do this.

The local school systems and the States cannot carry this burden alone. Vocational education has traditionally been a partnership with the Federal Government. It has been a successful partnership with State and local dollars overmatching the Federal dollars traditionally on an average of $4½ of State and local funds for every dollar of Federal funds.

We must continue the work we have started. We must continue the improvement and expansion of vocational and technical education programs to meet the manpower shortage existing in our Nation and in our States. We must continue to give our full support to the act we passed in 1963. Failure to do this will impede the progress of vocational and technical education programs now underway and planned to meet the vocational needs of our people. We must appropriate the full $225 million authorized by section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the $35 million authorized in sections 13 and 14 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. As one who recognizes the need for the vocational retraining and rehabilitation phase of this bill, I hasten to point out at this time that the gentleman from Georgia who just preceded the gentleman in the well made a very convincing argument for the need to consider the Human Investment Act, which was introduced by several Members of this House several months ago, which would certainly provide an incentive for private industry to engage in this great need for retraining many of our unskilled and semiskilled laborers.

I can only repeat at this time that the gentleman made a very fine argument for this program in the bill, but he also made a fine argument for the great need to consider the Human Investment Act. I hope before too long the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I have the honor of being a member, will give consideration to this, because when we have jobs going begging for skilled and semiskilled workers in this country and still we have unemployment, to implement this program with the Human Investment Act would be the best thing the Congress could do.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as has been brought out so ably by our chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, this bill does come to better than a $10⅓ billion appropriation for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

I call your particular attention to the additional views which appear in the report where we point out specifically that this is really only three-fourths of what we are going to have to appropriate in this coming fiscal year if we are to fully fund all the programs that have been authorized in this field of labor, health, education, and welfare.

By next year this bill will be close to a 15 billion package. It is shocking.

This Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is without a doubt the fastest growing department of Government.

Let me give you a brief rundown of total direct appropriations embodied in this bill over these past few years. What phenomenal growth.

Fiscal year:	*Billions*
1960	$3.942
1961	4.362
1962	5.213
1963	5.435
1964	5.572
1965	7.226
1966 (estimated)	9.875
1967 (this bill)	10.555

Now let us take a look at the area of employment, as of June 30, 1965, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had 87,316 people. By June 30, 1966, that figure will grow to 101,000, and in another fiscal year, 107,500. Following is a very revealing table:

Employment

	June 30, 1965	June 30, 1966	June 30, 1967
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	87,316	101,000	107,500
Department of Labor [1]	9,606	10,042	10,364
National Labor Relations Board	2,215	2,310	2,407
Railroad Retirement Board	1,074	1,039	1,070
National Mediation Board and Railroad Adjustment Board	147	150	150
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	442	443	466
U.S. Soldiers' Home	1,175	1,177	1,180
Federal Radiation Council	4	5	4
Total employment [2]	101,979	116,216	123,141

[1] In addition the Department of Labor State agency employment follows: June 30, 1965, 56,327; June 30, 1965, 60,540; June 30, 1967, 59,729.

[2] Total employment including Labor Department State agency employment: June 30, 1965, 158,306; June 30, 1966, 176,756; June 30, 1967, 182,870.

We have also prepared several tables pulling together figures to show the tremendous growth of expenditures in this HEW field not only by the Federal Government, but by the States, local governments, and private funds as well:

Health, education, and welfare expenditures for the Nation

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Fiscal year	Expenditures from Federal funds	Expenditures from State and local funds	Total expenditures from public funds	Expenditures from private funds	Total health, education, and welfare expenditures	Federal expenditures as percent of total expenditures from public funds	State and local expenditures as percent of total expenditures from public funds	Public expenditures as percent of total health, education, and welfare expenditures	Private expenditures as percent of total health, education, and welfare expenditures
1950	$9,985	$13,008	$22,993	$12,443	$35,436	43.4	56.6	64.7	35.3
1955	14,158	18,069	32,227	18,861	51,088	43.9	56.1	63.1	36.9
1960	24,583	27,620	52,203	29,308	81,511	47.1	52.9	63.9	36.1
1961	27,076	30,788	57,864	31,498	89,362	46.8	53.2	64.8	35.2
1962	30,447	31,857	62,304	33,930	96,234	48.8	51.2	64.8	35.2
1963	32,742	33,800	66,542	36,634	103,176	49.2	50.8	64.4	35.6
1964	35,334	35,823	71,157	39,455	110,612	49.6	50.4	64.4	35.6
1965	39,726	37,691	77,417	42,528	119,945	51.3	48.7	64.5	35.5

Source of Data: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Bulletin, October 1965.

NOTE.—Table does not include housing expenditures.

Per capita health, education, and welfare expenditures in actual prices

Fiscal year	Population (in millions) [1]	Per capita health, education, and welfare expenditures in actual prices					Per capita national defense expenditures in actual prices
		Total	Federal funds	State and local funds	Total public funds	Private funds	
1950	151.7	$234.00	$65.80	$85.80	$151.60	$82.40	$85.50
1955	165.3	308.80	85.40	109.60	195.00	113.80	247.00
1960	180.7	452.00	135.80	153.20	289.00	163.00	252.50
1961	183.8	486.00	147.00	167.50	314.50	171.50	258.50
1962	186.7	515.50	163.20	170.80	334.00	181.50	273.50
1963	189.4	543.00	172.60	178.40	351.00	192.00	278.80
1964	192.1	574.00	183.80	187.20	371.00	203.00	282.00
1965	195.5	612.00	203.50	192.50	396.00	216.00	256.50

[1] Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Health, education, and welfare expenditures as percent of gross national product

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Fiscal year	Gross national product [1]	Health, education, and welfare expenditures as percent of gross national product					National defense expenditures as percent of GNP	National defense expenditures[1]
		Total	Federal funds	State and local funds	Total public funds	Private funds		
1950	$263.4	13.5	3.8	3.8	8.7	4.8	4.9	$13.0
1955	398.0	12.8	3.6	3.6	8.1	4.7	10.2	40.7
1960	503.8	16.1	4.9	4.9	10.3	5.8	9.1	45.7
1961	520.1	17.1	5.2	5.2	11.1	6.0	9.1	47.5
1962	560.3	17.1	5.4	5.4	11.1	6.0	9.1	51.1
1963	589.2	17.5	5.6	5.6	11.3	6.2	8.9	52.8
1964	628.7	17.6	5.6	5.6	11.3	6.3	8.6	54.2
1965	676.3	17.7	5.9	5.9	11.4	6.3	7.4	50.2

[1] Source: Joint Economic Committee, Economic Indicators, April 1966.

I would call your particular attention to the above table showing per capita expenditures for health, education, and welfare in this country for the year 1965 have grown to $612 per person. That is made up of Federal, State, local, and private funds.

I have also included a table having to do with the percentage as it relates to gross national product. Ofttimes we hear, "Look how much we are spending for defense." Actually, when you take the total number of expenditures in the field of health, education, and welfare, whether it comes from the Federal Government, State governments, or private funds, we find that 17.7 percent of the gross national product is made up of expenditures in this overall field of health, education, and welfare, as opposed to 7.4 percent of expenditures of the gross national product in the field of national defense.

It has been brought out in the general debate earlier that the biggest line item in this bill is $3,746 million, for grants to the States for public assistance.

As we pointed out in the course of the hearings, many of us, I am sure, were under the impression that with the enactment of all these Federal welfare programs, these grants from the Federal Government ought to diminish, but the exact contrary has proven to be the case. With the enactment of all these other programs, we still have to continue to increase these amounts to fulfill our obligation to the States in response to legislative enactments of years past.

I am going to support amendments to cut this bill, whether it be 5 percent, or any other arbitrary percentage. We could always get into an argument as to whether or not there should be a selective cut or a cut across the board. We get into an area where we could have a good debate on the pros and cons of these two courses.

Our good subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], knows full well of my position in this respect. All of us revere the gentleman from Rhode Island. We know that he is very sincere in what he espouses in committee and on the floor of the House. His position is well known. While the two of us will probably cancel each other's vote on 90 percent of the legislative bills coming before this House, nonetheless I know he is sincere and we enjoy each other's respect and have a warm affection for one another personally.

We have some very sensitive items in this bill. Who wants to be against cancer research? Who wants to be opposed to doing more research in the field of heart and stroke? Who wants to be opposed to cutting down on communicable disease control? Who wants to be opposed to nursing services? Who wants to be opposed to hospital construction? Who wants to be opposed to the Children's Bureau, to help for the mentally retarded, for the handicapped, for the blind, for the aged, or any of these popular programs?

Who wants to be put in the position on this floor of saying "I am going to cut down on these programs"? The point is it cannot be done on the floor of this House. It cannot be done in the full Committee on Appropriations. It has to be done in the subcommittee. That is about the only place where these items can be held in line. Otherwise floodgates are opened up, and the demagogs can have a field day.

These are all popular programs. I wish there were enough money to take care of everybody's ills, but we just do not have the money to pacify everyone. This is our problem on this committee.

We all know what the efforts of the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], has been in this area. Time after time after time, he will tell a witness coming before our subcommittee, "Are you asking for enough money? I do not think you are doing enough. This is the most conservative budget I have seen sent to our subcommittee."

Well, I am in a completely different position as Members of this House are aware. The point I am trying to get across is that we do have a difficult problem in keeping this bill within reasonable bounds and presenting to you the kind of bill that would meet everybody's wishes and demands.

I am going to support the proposal to make a 5-percent across-the-board cut, because it is the only practical way to make a significant cut in this bill and bring it in line with the budget figure.

I think the proposal for 5-percent across-the-board cut offers sufficient latitude for economy and still not gut any particular program.

Of course, I have reserved in committee to support any selective cutting amendments that might be offered.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, this appropriations bill, H.R. 14745, contains over $10.3 billion for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966. This is a substantial sum—but we only have a part of the total spending picture for these programs before us.

Considerable time has been spent by the subcommittee, of which I am a member, in examining the justifications and receiving testimony from the representative of the various bureaus and departments. We also have heard from other interested individuals and organizations.

However, our work on these appropriations is incomplete. Nearly $4 billion in additional requests await action following authorizations by legislative committees.

There are some important omissions from the multibillion-dollar spending bill before you today. Yet to be funded in fiscal 1967 are the programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; Higher Education Facilities Act; grants for public libraries; other higher education activities; and the so-called poverty program—Office of Economic Opportunity. We are talking about a final total of approximately $14 billion for these programs.

Significantly the committee report acknowledges the dangers in proceeding on a piecemeal appropriations basis. On page 2 of the report you read:

> It is unfortunate that there must be this delay in funding since all of these are going programs and the inability to plan ahead will undoubtedly result in less effective programs and less efficient use of funds.

It seems to me to be just as inefficient to proceed today with only three-quarters of an appropriations bill. That is why I joined in signing the additional minority views and I shall support the recommittal motion. It would seem to be a prudent and responsible action to defer final action on this appropriations bill until the rest of the package comes before the Appropriations Committee.

As expected, Congress is being made the villain by the administration because the fires of inflation are burning brightly.

This appropriations bill restores significant cuts made by the President in Public Law 874, the longtime program of impacted school assistance. I doubt that this congressional action comes as a surprise to the administration. Similar action was taken last week by the House when it restored funds for the school milk and school lunch programs, and agricultural research, soil conservation, and extension programs.

Since the President's budget was submitted in January the mail has been heavy in protest to sudden reductions in such longstanding and time-tested Federal programs.

Public Law 874, under the administration action, was to be cut nearly $164 million. The recommendations for this reduction were based primarily on a report by the Stanford Research Institute. Such a proposal, however, does damage to the intent of Congress. Public Law 874 was created under the concept that where the Federal Government is supplying a national need by putting a Federal installation into a district, the local problem which is thereby created for educating the children of Federal employees, and its solving, should be assisted by providing Federal funds.

This has been an effective program and it has been done without any Federal controls of any kind.

In Kansas, we have many school districts which already have planned their budgets on the basis of receiving their full entitlements under this law. In my congressional district, there are approximately 40 school districts which are eligible for impacted area assistance. If the administration's recommendations were adopted, these school districts would lose $1,309,243 in operating revenues. The State of Kansas would lose approximately $3,700,000 in impacted area assistance in the 1967 fiscal year; and 40 school districts would become ineligible for any aid.

We are well aware of the furor which was ignited by the administration's sudden proposal. The superintendent of the Derby, Kans., public schools has indicated to me that the loss of Public Law 874 funds would cause damage to the educational program there. The ultimate losers in such an economy move would be our schoolchildren. However, local taxpayers who already are overburdened with heavy tax loads would be faced with emergency tax increases.

For example, property owners in Wichita, Kans., would have another 1½ mills added to their tax levy. The superintendent of schools in Leavenworth, Kans., recently wrote to me:

> If recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget are followed, and reductions are made straight across the board to all school districts, Leavenworth stands to lose $187,000 in Public Law 874 funds. To replace these funds from our local property taxes will require an additional property tax of 7 mills.

Other Kansas cities which would be seriously affected include Haysville, Manhattan, Salina, Topeka, Olathe, and Junction City—home of Fort Riley, where many schoolchildren await the return of their fathers fighting in far-off Vietnam.

With the growing military commitment of U.S. military forces into the Vietnam conflict, we know that Federal activities on military installations and defense production facilities will increase steadily. The problems for impacted school districts across the Nation also will mount.

Now out of the blue comes this proposed cutback. The very least the administration could do, in the event it felt that some changes should be made in Public Law 874, would be to give enough advance notice so that on a 5-year program it could be phased out for those areas which no longer really need it. It is unfair and unwarranted to suddenly place the burden upon local taxpayers to make up cuts ranging from 35 to 65 percent in school budgets.

I am sure the administration expected the action taken by the Appropriations Committee in restoring these funds. If Congress is to be blamed for maintaining such educational programs and honoring our commitments, then let it be so.

This bill also fulfills the intent of Congress in the funding of grants to the States under the Vocational Education Act; endowment of land-grant colleges and universities; and student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

Last year amid enthusiastic public support the President unveiled plans for increased Federal support of programs aimed at the dreaded killers—heart, cancer, and stroke. However, this well-publicized Great Society proclamation has not been followed by budget requests which would permit initiating or accelerating research in these areas.

I supported the committee's action in increasing appropriations for many of the National Institutes of Health including the important artificial kidney program and research aimed at the prevention of kidney disease; the work of the National Cancer Institute which is fighting the Nation's second largest killer; and the National Heart Institute. Cardiovascular diseases continue to claim nearly 1 million American lives each year and more than half of these deaths are due to coronary heart disease.

I, too, share the concern of many members of the committee over the rate of growth of appropriations for public assistance grants to the States by the Welfare Administration. The bill includes $3.7 billion for such assistance which is over $143 million higher than the current budget.

Despite the many programs which have been promoted because they would cut down on dependency, and the inclusion of more people under social security, we have seen this program grow from $20 million in 1936, the first year in which grants were made, to next year's record $3.7 billion.

Our subcommittee was advised that the public assistance programs still will not reach all those persons who now live in poverty, because of restrictive State eligibility requirements and assistance standards. It is estimated that as many people need assistance and are not receiving it as those currently on the rolls.

This is alarming, particularly during a period of high economic activity and low unemployment, and it seems in order that the Appropriations Committee should proceed with plans to carry out an investigation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the recommittal motion of the minority members of my committee, not because I am opposed to the appropriations included in this bill. As I have indicated there are many important, worthwhile, and necessary programs within this bill which I have consistently supported.

However, the time has come to declare an end to business as usual and this practice of piecemeal consideration of some very important and costly Federal programs.

Our Nation is involved in a war in southeast Asia which is filled with many uncertainties. We do not yet know the eventual manpower commitment. We do not have a clear estimate of the costs of fighting that war. We are also faced with an escalation of inflation which affects most those we are trying to assist with many of the programs in this bill.

It is time for the administration to face up to the need for setting a realistic set of priorities on nondefense spending programs so that the Congress can act responsibly in the appropriations process. This cannot be done if our committee must bring to the House incomplete budget requests.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

The was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House bill 14745. This is my second year as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare of the Appropriations Committee. I wish again to acknowledge my good fortune in having the privilege of serving on this committee and participating in the review of the appropriation estimates covering many large and vital programs. I have been particularly impressed, in participating in this appropriation process, with the thorough and exhausting examination which this committee has given the appropriation estimates covering the programs represented in this bill here today. Under the leadership of the great chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN FOGARTY, the subcommittee has spared no pains to make certain that the fund requests of the various agencies have been rigorously assessed in terms of the needs for the funds proposed, the value of the programs which they support, and the administrative effectiveness and efficiency which the justifications reflect.

I should like to convey to the House and to the people of the United States that the process of appropriation review carried out by the Appropriation Committees are, in my belief, a clear guarantee that the funds proposed for appropriation are necessary, cover important programs, and will be well spent.

The bill before the House today includes a number of increases above the estimates as submitted to the Congress by the President. These increases are the consequence of a most careful appraisal of the program needs which the funds will support, and particularly clear evidence of unusual opportunity for special effort or progress in areas of great promise and importance as they relate to education and health. I have personally satisfied myself that these increases are warranted and I am in full support of the provisions of the bill as presented to the House today.

I think the Members of the House must be impressed with the scope and intensity of the hearings from which this appropriation bill emerges. The volumes on the desk before you are testimonial to the persistence, vigor, and detail with which the subcommittee and its chairman pursued the examination of the fund requests. In the course of these hearings my interests have been particularly directed toward two matters. In the first place, I made a special attempt to assess the evidences of administrative effectiveness and efficiency reflected by the agency use of the funds appropriated in previous years. In the expenditure of funds of the magnitude which this bill provides, I think the Congress must be assured that agencies have sound administrative and fiscal procedures, that they are making maximum use of new methods and systems which will guarantee the most economical use of public funds, and that, indeed, the funds are carefully directed to the accomplishment of the purposes to which they are appropriated. As is true in any organized set of human activities, there is always room for improvement. However, I have been impressed with the evident concern and effort of the agency heads supporting these appropriation requests for matters of administrative efficiency and effectiveness, and I feel satisfied that there is proper recognition and arrangements to assure the achievement of these ends in the conduct of these programs. I shall continue to direct attention to these matters, both through my activities on the subcommittee and as a personal concern as a Member of this House through discussions with the officials and on-the-job visits to the agencies involved.

The area which has particularly impressed me in the course of the 2 years that I have served with this subcommittee, is the great opportunity for progress in the solution of health and disease problems which can be made possible by the extension of knowledge about technology, new materials, and methods which are emerging from the physical sciences and engineering. I believe this area of activity has great practical significance for advancing both our research and service capability in the field of health and medicine.

During the course of the hearings covering the health programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I made a special effort to inquire into the extent to which advantage is being taken of this new technology in these programs. I am pleased to say there is evidence of considerable progress. The range of this activity is considerable. It involves the more familiar aspects of the use of electronic data processing equipment for the solution of major problems in the management of information, both for scientific and administrative purposes. Emerging here are prospects for great advance in the maintenance and management of medical and other health records arising out of the conduct of medical care programs. Advance of this capability will be of particular importance when the national program of medical care for the aged comes into effect in the forthcoming fiscal year. The possible development of regional health computer centers to provide for storage and effective retrieval of medical record information for a large population group will become ever more important as our improving arrangements for hospital and medical care develop. I note with interest that the report of the President's Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress has the following to say on this point:

> Regional health computer centers could provide medical record storage for perhaps 12 to 20 million people, and give hospitals and doctors in the area access to the computer's diagnostic and other capabilities via telephone line connections. Such regional health computer systems could provide regional data processing for automated clinical laboratories, automation of certain aspects of medical diagnosis, storing and rapid recall of individual health records, and collection and evaluation of important medical statistics. They could help provide better care to everyone regardless of geographic location; reduce unit costs, thereby relieving the economic load on the Nation; provide for a more efficient use of manpower and alleviate the manpower problem that regional medical programs and medicare will intensify.

The further developments of this concept is a matter to which I will pay particular attention during the forthcoming year.

During recent weeks we have had an impressive demonstration of how new technology can change the entire prospect for the treatment of what heretofore has been considered fatal illness. The remarkable effort of Dr. Michael DeBakey to utilize an artificial mechanism to assist a failing heart is but the beginning of development in this area. Impressive as this event was, it is only demonstrative of the potential that exists and the need for an even greater effort to solve the many problems that the use of artificial devices of this kind brings. Members of the House, I am sure, will be interested in reading in detail in the hearings the inquiry of the committee into the state of the artificial heart development.

A comparable development of great importance, one that is in the practical working state at the present moment, is the artificial kidney. This device permits individuals with what heretofore would have been fatal kidney disease, to lead an active life through the assistance of mechanisms for hemodialysis. The device presently available, although successful for this purpose, is still cumbersome and costly. The bill before the House will provide additional funds for the further pursuit of the solution of the existing problems surrounding the development of an effective, efficient, and economical artificial kidney.

The committee was also conscious that it could not stand by and wait for the total solution to these problems—that effort must be made to make more broadly available the existing hemodialysis facilities. Last year the committee added $2 million to this same bill in order to initiate the beginning of a national program in this area. The original budget request submitted to the Congress for this year provided no additional funds for this purpose. The committee was unanimous in its conclusion that this program must be expanded and it added $3 million over the budget request to be used for the establishment of additional kidney dialysis centers. I think the members of the House will agree with me that this is a vital and humanitarian act.

I could go on for some length outlining the areas of promise that emerge from those new concepts and the related technology in their application to the problems of biology and medicine. I am convinced that our committee is serving a vital function in providing particular support for the exploitation of these potentialities. The Members of the House will note that one of the increases included in the bill before it relates to expanding the support for the new Division of Computer Research and Technology at the National Institutes of Health. This new component of the National Institutes of Health was established last year to serve as a focal point for stimulating and developing the application of computer technology and related disciplines—mathematics, statistics, electronic engineering, and systems analysis—to NIH programs. We are all aware that the complex talents and skills required in this area of development are in very high demand. Federal programs suffer badly in competing for outstanding talent in this area. The salary disadvantage which the NIH operates under in attempting to recruit scientists in this area has unfortunately slowed the pace of the development of this Division. You will note in the committee report an expression of the committee's view that every effort should be made to remove arbitrary restrictions which hamper the proper staffing of this important new Division. To continue to encourage the progress that is being made in this area, the committee has increased the budget request for this new Division by $500,000. This increase will permit more rapid progress in the automation of laboratory diagnostic tests at the NIH clinical center and facilitate the fascinating work that is being done in simulating and experimenting with complex mathematical models of biological processes and physiological functions.

Beyond the emphasis given to the further development of computer capability at the National Institutes of Health, the committee has been concerned with the overall advance of bioengineering as a field of promise for medicine and health. The committee heard in testimony that the NIH is in the process of developing a management structure for the administration of programs of this kind. Again the limited availability of high quality physical scientists and engineers poses many problems in the development of these programs. It seems likely that some central kind of organization at NIH will be necessary to make the most effective use of the limited talent in this complex area. It also seems likely that the NIH, comparable to what has been done in defense agencies, will have to make use of a nongovernmental bioengineering organization to contribute to advancing technology, planning, project development, and review and evaluation of programs in this area. The committee is convinced that this effort towards a better management structure should be vigorously pursued and to enlarge this effort has added $250,000 to the NIH budget for this purpose.

These increases are evidence of the careful assessment of need and opportunity which the committee brought to all aspects of the appropriation requests incorporated in this bill. Although these amendments are small, they represent the difference between maintaining the status quo and the opportunity to make a significant forward step.

Out of these many developments emerges another clear need which I should like to emphasize. The significance of mathematics, physiological sciences, engineering for medical research, for programs of health care and medical service and for the conduct of hospitals and other medical care facilities means that the training of the medical scientists, the physicians and the health practitioners of the future must provide for adequate grounding in these technologies. This must be built into the basic educational program for such personnel. Thus the curricula of medical schools, schools of public health and training, programs for health professionals, must emphasize mathematics, computer technology, systems analysis techniques, and other aspects of the new and emerging technologies which are now so essential in both the solution of medical problems and the provision of health services.

In this respect I have been particularly interested in the efforts of the Division of Research Facilities and Resources of the National Institutes of Health to make broad computer and biomedical instrumentation resources available in the medical schools of the United States so that the medical scientists and physicians being trained therein can gain a sophisticated understanding of this new technology. In the forthcoming year I am going to make a special effort to inquire into the manner in which our educational base in health and medicine can be enlarged to bring the benefits of these new concepts to the training of our health manpower and thus to the betterment of the health programs of the Nation.

This review, I hope, will convey to the Members of the House the care with which these programs have been reviewed in the appropriation process, the importance of the increases which have been proposed, and give some indication of the many values which flow from these programs. The expenditure of money here is an investment in human life and capability. Our ability to make this investment is a reflection of the growing economic capability of the Nation. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that there is no better area of human activity in which to invest our growing economic advantage.

I wish again to commend the signal efforts of the great chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], and the other members of the subcommittee in reporting this complex and important bill. It has been a matter of great personal pride and pleasure to me, to have worked with them, in the consideration of these appropriation requests. I trust the Congress will continue its generous support of the programs here represented.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the full appropriations for the federally impacted school districts financial assistance laws, Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, as contained in this bill making appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee I voted to restore funds in the full committee meeting last week for these two important education assistance laws. My Second Congressional District in Massachusetts is federally impacted because of the historic Springfield Armory and the famous Westover Air Force Base in Chicopee Falls, headquarters for the 8th Air Force, Strategic Air Command.

Dependents of military personnel and civilians who live on and off these two installations attend the schools in Springfield, Chicopee, Ludlow, Wilbraham, Hampden, Granby, and South Hadley. School administrators in these communities plan their annual school budgets based on the number of dependents attending classes and the amount of impacted area funds to be received under Public Law 874.

Mr. Chairman, Chicopee School Supt. John L. Fitzpatrick, representing the Massachusetts school superintendents concerned with Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, advised me that if the full appropriation is not restored Massachusetts estimated loss will be $8,177,476. The total estimated loss this year in my own congressional district will be $1,036,316. The loss in Superintendent Fitzpatrick's school district will be more than $400,000 while the estimated loss in Springfield will be an estimated $451,729.

Mr. Chairman, I am also opposed to the administration proposals to change Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. I have expressed my opposition to Chairman Carl D. Perkins' Subcommittee on General Education, and ask that my statement be included at this point with my remarks, along with a letter from Assistant Superintendent Joseph H. Buckley of the Springfield School Department expressing opposition to the proposed appropriations cuts in the impacted school laws:

Public Schools of Springfield, Mass.,
April 25, 1966.

Hon. Edward P. Boland,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Eddie: I understand that the full membership of the Committee on Appropriations will meet on Thursday, April 28, 1966, to vote on whether the amount recommended to the floor to finance Public Law 874 for fiscal 1967 will be $183,400,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, or $416 million which the U.S. Office of Education has estimated it will take to pay 100 percent of the 1967 entitlements.

Were the lesser amount to prevail, there would be a national curtailment of $232,600,000. It is that losses would result as follows:

Area	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	1967 estimated Public Law 874 entitlements under proposed amendments	Estimated loss
Massachusetts	$11,163,468	$2,985,992	$8,177,476
2d district	1,914,880	878,564	1,036,316
Springfield	469,842	18,113	451,729

Your support for the higher appropriation, $416 million, is earnestly requested. Will you kindly advise me as to the outcome of the April 28 meeting.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH E. BUCKLEY,
Assistant Superintendent.

APRIL 26, 1966.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on General Education, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: I appreciate this opportunity to present my views on the extension of two very important public laws affecting my congressional district, Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. I urge that they be extended as they are, and not amended.

I am opposed to the recommendations of the administration for reductions in the Public Law 874 contributions to school districts for operating expenses in federally impacted areas. These recommendations are based on a two-volume study of Public Laws 815 and 874 for the U.S. Commissioner of Education who submitted them to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Public Law 815 provides Federal grants for school construction in impacted areas.

Mr. Chairman, my Second Congressional District in Massachusetts is federally impacted because of the historic Springfield Armory and the famous Westover Air Force Base in Chicopee Falls, headquarters for the 8th Air Force, Strategic Air Command. Dependents of military personnel and civilians who live on and off these two installations attend the schools in Springfield, Chicopee, Ludlow, Wilbraham, Hampden, Granby, and South Hadley. School administrators in these communities plan their annual school budgets based on the number of dependents attending classes and the amount of impacted area funds to be received under Public Law 874. Proposals to make these communities absorb 3 percent of the category A pupils, and 6 percent of the category B pupils are harsh indeed. This would mean that 63 percent of the eligible school districts in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts would lose their entire entitlement, and the remainder would have their Public Law 874 contributions severely reduced. The total estimated loss for the school year 1966-67 in Massachusetts would be $8,177,476.

The estimated loss under Public Law 874 funds to the city of Chicopee for the next school year would be near one-half million dollars. The Chicopee School District estimates that it will receive $1,100,000 in impacted area funds in the 1966-67 school year if the law is not amended. The administration proposal would cut the estimated receipts down to approximately $700,000.

A change in the law would virtually wipe out Public Law 874 funds to the city of Springfield. The Springfield School District estimate under impacted area funds is $469,000 for the 1966-67 school year. The administration proposal amendments would slash this estimate down to a mere $18,000. The administration proposal would also eliminate the Ludlow, Wilbraham, Hampden, Granby, and South Hadley School Districts from receiving Public Law 874 funds.

For these reasons, I am vigorously opposed to these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I know that Superintendent John L. Fitzpatrick of the Chicopee School Department wanted to accept this committee's very kind offer to testify on behalf of the Massachusetts and New England school superintendents on this very important legislation. He is recuperating from major surgery and cannot be with us, but he asked me to extend his warm thanks to the committee for the invitation, and his concern over the administration's proposals. Also, he wants to be recorded in opposition to any cutbacks in the laws. I am including Superintendent Fitzpatrick's letter of opposition to the committee and ask that it be included in the record.

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this bill also carries an appropriation of $3,304,000 for the educational television facilities program. This represents the full amount remaining under the full authorization of $32 million. I understand that there is a carryover of approximately $3.5 million from fiscal year 1966 to 1967. Thus, some $6.8 million will be available in fiscal year 1967 for this program.

Under this program, the Office of Education provides up to 50 percent of all the funds necessary to construct educational television stations. The balance can come from private or State and local public funds. The Office of Education does not require competitive bidding for their funds—only a showing as to how the price was arrived at—negotiation, advertising in local paper, and so forth. The Office of Education makes no requirement for standards of transmitter performance. Any transmitter that meets Federal Communications Commission specifications is suitable, for the FCC specifications are the standard of performance.

Mr. Chairman, there is a gross disparity charged by manufacturers for identical transmitters. Time and again, applicants for grants under the educational television program have purchased equipment—particularly transmitters—that could have been procured much cheaper. The less costly equipment is every bit as good and perhaps better. Approval of such applications by the Office of Education seriously impairs the ability to broaden this program to many interested parties that are willing and anxious to establish educational television.

Mr. Chairman, there is a real need for wide advertising to all manufacturers of television transmitters. Townsend Associates is a small but remarkable builder of transmitters in my congressional district. It is practically impossible for an organization as small as Townsend to have a national sales force that can constantly check local publications for notices relating to local educational television applicants and requesting bids on equipment. It appears that the Office of Education considers the publication of notice in a local newspaper as appropriate public advertising. It seems to me that this is not sufficient notice. How can a regional and relatively small corporation such as Townsend Associates in my district become aware of the publication of such notice? The Office of Education also contends that the requirements under the statute are met by "circularizing three or more competitive vendors." I am informed that there are only three domestic manufacturers of UHF television transmitters—Radio Corp. of America, General Electric, and Townsend Associates. I am further informed that Townsend Associates has never been circularized with respect to submitting bids for ETV transmitters.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that local public advertising does not give fair and adequate notice—further, circularization of builders of educational television equipment under routine requirements is completely inadequate. Thus, Mr. Chairman, the large manufacturers receive an unfair advantage. Their prices are often out of line and have been proved to be so with respect to UHF-ETV transmitters. Consequently, the higher prices deplete the available funds and result in the impossibility of spreading the great advantages of ETV among more communities.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and other committee members and expressed my concern over this problem. The Office of Education has been apprised of our arguments. I deeply hope that a more equitable arrangement can be worked out by the agency and that smaller ETV equipment suppliers will be given more consideration with the consequent savings of many dollars in this area.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the members of this Subcommittee on Appropriations know, I have vigorously expressed my discontent and concern over the President's recommendation to cut out the Federal assistance to the so-called impacted school districts.

Again, today, I will maintain this same position and will vote to support the reinstatement of these funds and against any amendments to cut this assistance. This aid would more properly be described as a payment in lieu of taxes to school districts that are faced with the responsibility of providing education to children of military personnel and employees of military installations. This comes about as a result of the fact that the property of the Federal Government in these areas is not on the local government tax rolls.

Therefore, I have always held strong convictions that this is one area of responsibility the Federal Government must continue to accept.

While I would agree with the statements that the program is being abused in some sections of the country and, in particular, around our National Capital, I am equally certain that certain revisions in the program are necessary to assure those school districts having a genuine impact are adequately protected and the abusers are dealt with accordingly.

In fairness to the school boards, the administrators, and teachers of the impacted school district we must avoid these stop-and-go tactics. I ask you, Is it fair to subject these people to this type of fiscal harassment? The school population in the schools of my district is increasing rapidly because of the escalation in Vietnam. The problems are with them now. They must establish and approve their budgets to meet the educational needs of their respective communities. We must pass this legislation now and then suggest the committee study this impacted area legislation to clear up the unqualified areas. Having reviewed the requests from our First Congressional District schools, I am fully satisfied their requests will withstand any amount of scrutiny.

But I hope we can resolve this problem once and for all so that our school officials can plan their budgetary requirements in a more orderly manner. Certainly they are entitled to this consideration. We have the responsibility to accord them this courtesy.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies includes the full amount estimated to be required to pay 100 percent of entitlements to school districts in federally impacted areas.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14745 and strongly urge my colleagues to approve without reduction the section dealing with payments to school districts under Public Law 874.

I have been opposed to those suggestions for reductions in the budget that would curtail our program to aid federally impacted school districts.

As a former schoolteacher and administrator, I am personally familiar with the value of the program to aid our federally impacted school districts. I am sure most of us here are familiar with the Stanford study which indicated that financial burdens created for those school districts by the establishment of a Federal installation are not restricted to the project's initial impact. A burden added to a school district by a Federal project must be viewed as a continuing one, and a reduction in funds is simply not justified. Nothing is more important than a good education for our children.

I am certain that my colleagues share this feeling with me and that is why I am anxious to see the appropriation for the Federal impact program approved without reduction. Any reduction would seriously affect the program's value. Funds must be increased to meet the rising cost of education and the expansion of our school population. I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this appropriation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the committee bill and thoroughly agree with the committee judgment on increases over the budget for education. It would, indeed, prove disastrous in our impacted area school districts if the full amounts authorized were not appropriated.

The additions recommended for vocational education and defense educational activities also appear to be urgently needed. Reductions in student loan funds, at this time, would work a real hardship on many students. Surely, experience has demonstrated fully that loans in this program are among our Nation's wisest investments in its future?

I regret very much the committee's decision to delete $3,500,000 requested for initiating a residential vocational school program. There is sound justification for this program, and a real need for it.

Members of the committee have reminded me that the House has twice approved appropriations for this purpose, only to have the funds disapproved by the other body. Under the circumstances, the committee has understandably elected to await Senate action on this matter, before acting again on it.

I hope and trust the request of $3,500,000 requested to initiate a residential vocational school program will be approved in the other body, and feel confident it would be approved in conference once that step had been taken on the other side of the Capitol.

You may be sure, Mr. Chairman, that Oklahoma's delegation will be seeking that approval in the other body at the appropriate time, and our failure to press the point here does not reflect any reduced interest in this important program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, may I, at this time, request the Members of this House to approve the appropriations recommended for the Manpower Administration.

This program—started late in 1962—has proven itself.

It has helped the men and women, who—because of technological development and the increased use of automation—found their skills, their means of livelihood, obsolete and who were forced, therefore, to join the ranks of the unemployed.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, were it not for the manpower training program, hundreds of thousands of our people would still be on relief with no hope of ever regaining their self-respect nor their ability to again support themselves.

This program has been accepted, I believe, as a permanent one. Perhaps not officially as yet—but—it has become the one hope for individuals and the one solution, to date, for providing skilled workers for the many new fields of employment.

Through this program the inadequately educated can be taught sufficiently to qualify for occupational training in the needed skills of our economy. We have found that, as our national economy increasingly depends upon the employment of highly skilled employees, our displaced workers cannot hope to receive occupational training without first receiving academic training. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act—the trainee is provided with both academic and occupational where necessary.

Last year alone, 100,000 people completed training under this act.

In my own State of Pennsylvania—we now have over 21,000 in training—we have graduated over 8,000 and of those I am happy to say over 7,000 are again working full time, in newly acquired skills, supporting themselves and their families.

This is just one State, others have equally gratifying records.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to remind the Members of the House that improving amendments were approved for Manpower Development and Training Act just last spring without a dissenting vote.

The Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, will start public hearings next week on additional amendments for this act.

It would seem only logical to expect the Members today to vote approval of the appropriations covering the cost of this program since the act and its provisions were so enthusiastically endorsed last year.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14745, being the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal year 1967.

On page 10 of the report there is what appears to be a relatively unimportant paragraph under title II of this bill, entitled "Payments to School Districts." Actually it has to do with a most important part of the bill. This paragraph points out the bill as reported by the committee includes $416,200,000 or the full amount estimated to be required to pay 100-percent entitlements under the authorizing legislation. Just about everyone knows that the Bureau of the Budget and the President recommended only about $183 million or to state the matter differently the amount in this bill is $232,000,800 above the request. There is no reason to try to escape the fact that about $28 million more was appropriated than for fiscal year 1966.

But, Mr. Chairman, the philosophy of aid to impacted areas aid has been with us for quite a while. The Bureau of the Budget knew of the previous requirements of these school districts that are located near defense installations. In our own congressional district we have a Minuteman missile complex and an airbase as well as one of the most active Army ordnance plants. The need is very clear. The school districts near these installations have no alternative but to expect some Federal assistance because their districts have been overrun by the children of both military and civilian personnel brought into these areas because of such installations.

By whatever description, whether we call it a military struggle or our effort to repel aggression or use the term war, the fact exists that surrounding many defense installations are the families of military personnel who have been transferred either to Vietnam or to other installations preparatory to going to Vietnam. The men have left behind their wives and children. Now is no time to economize by withdrawing support of educational facilities for the children of those who have either been transferred to Vietnam or are on their way to fight for their country.

Some of us believe that a reduction in these funds were recommended by those who made the recommendation, knowing there would be a strong effort to restore these moneys. In this regard let me say that if the time ever comes that we are going to cease providing funds for school districts that are federally impacted, then there should be a clear intention of policy announced well in advance in order that our school districts can plan for the withdrawal of Federal support for children attending their schools. It seems like almost every year there is a struggle or fight over this appropriation. It should not be necessary. It just should not happen each year, but if the time does ever come that there is to be a change in policy, the effective date should be put far enough in advance to let our school administrators plan for a change rather than remain in a state of uncertainty or perhaps I should say a state of suspension, wondering each year whether or not the appropriation will be made in what amount.

Many of the school districts in our congressional district would find it difficult to carry on without this assistance. Some of our school districts are at the limit of their bonded indebtedness. Others are at the limit of their statutory levy.

Mr. Chairman, I have no apology to any of those who say that the addition of this money breaks the line of the President's budget limitations. If that is the charge, it will have to stand. Those of us who are for the addition of money for impacted areas will have to be judged on this and our other actions, taking into account there have been and will be ample instances in which true economies can be exercised rather than this reduction which might or could impair the educational attainments of the children of our military personnel, and which if not restored would certainly put many school districts in a financial bind.

It was reassuring to observe that the results of the teller count revealed those present on the floor were about 5 to 1 against the amendment to override the restorative action of the Appropriation Committee. In other words the effort to cut back these funds to the previous budget figure was soundly defeated, by about 5 to 1.

Those of us who had hoped for a rollcall vote on this important appropriation bill on the day of its consideration are disappointed. A unanimous-consent request previously granted provided rollcall votes on Wednesday May 4, go over until May 5, out of deference for those attending the last rites of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain when a record vote is taken the House will overwhelmingly approve the restoration of the impacted areas money, and pass this bill by a large majority.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14745

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, namely:

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LAIRD

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAIRD moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out and that the bill be referred back to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this motion in accordance with the additional views which are contained in the committee report—I offered a similar motion in the full committee—to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that this bill should not be considered until all of the other authorizations affecting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are ready for funding.

I make this motion to point up the additional views, which are to be found on pages 60, 61, and 62 of the report.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, I will include the text of the additional views at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, we should not allow the Senate of the United States, through amendments to this bill, to have complete control over the funding of these vital programs in the area of higher education, elementary and secondary education, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The Appropriations Committee waits for the authorization for the foreign aid bill. The committee waits for the authorization for the space bill, which involves some $5 billion. Why should not the House of Representatives and the Appropriations Committee wait, in accordance with these additional views, for the $4 billion in authorizations for this bill to be enacted, and then come forward with a bill?

This motion would refer the bill back to the committee, with a feeling expressed by the vote that these authorizations should be completed so that the House of Representatives could start the appropriations for these vital programs.

In general debate I pointed out the problem involved with the elementary and secondary education program as compared with the NDEA program. It seems to me it is absolutely vital that this bill be referred to the committee and that we wait for these authorizations and then proceed in a proper fashion in these important areas of health, education, and welfare.

The additional views referred to above follow:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF THE MINORITY

This bill is just a start on the appropriation requests covering the Federal activities under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. We, the minority members of this subcommittee, are unanimous in our conviction that final action on this bill should be held up by the House of Representatives.

All appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity should be considered at one time. A motion to recommit this bill to committee will be offered so that the Appropriations Committee will have an opportunity to exercise its responsibility of reviewing at one time the entire Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations "package" for fiscal 1967.

The administrative budget portions of this bill represent at most 75 percent of the total general revenue appropriations that will probably be enacted by this session of the 89th Congress. The bill before us contains $10,360,250,500 for the year ending June 30, 1967. It does not contain an additional appropriation of some $4 billion which has been requested for programs already in operation and which will be acted upon by this committee and this Congress in a forthcoming supplemental. (See table I below:)

Table I

[Amounts in millions]

Program:	*Budget request*
Elementary and Secondary Education Act	$1,342
Higher Education Facilities Act	722
Grants for public libraries	57
Higher education activities (portions)	30
Office of Economic Opportunity	1,750
Total	3,901

Table I contains five of the larger items not considered by our subcommittee.

There can be no justification for enacting an appropriation bill that is so demonstrably incomplete.

There can be no justification for proceeding full tilt with "business as usual" on the domestic front in light of the rapidly rising cost of living, the progressively deepening economic crisis and the alarmingly rapid growth of the costs of national security.

Many of the programs contained in this bill are designed to help and assist those less-fortunate members of our society who find themselves in unfavorable economic positions whether through low or fixed incomes, pensions or disabilities, or a variety of other factors that are well known to this committee and this Congress.

It would be an especially cruel joke if the very people these programs are designed to help are instead further burdened by the increasing costs of inflation—an inflation largely caused by a government imprudent enough to step on the accelerator instead of the brake pedal in the apparent hope that the private sector—the housewife, the farmer, the wage-earner, the businessman—will exercise the restraint and responsibility government refuses to impose on itself.

The hidden national sales tax called inflation that each American is now compelled to pay did not just happen.

It was caused.

And the signs did not just appear in the last several weeks.

They have been evident for well over a year.

In our minority views of a year ago on the first supplemental for fiscal year 1966, these signs were alluded to and the necessity for making hard choices on domestic programs in light of increasing national security costs was strongly emphasized. (See H. Rept. No. 818, 1st sess., 89th Cong.) [Not shown in the Record.]

Since that report was written last August, the economic situation in this country has in fact deteriorated:

The wholesale price index rose 1.4 percent during 1965.

It rose one-tenth of 1 percent each week in January 1966.

It rose almost two-tenths of 1 percent each week in February.

President Johnson indicated recently that the cost of living has been rising at an annual rate of some 5½ percent in recent months.

The balance-of-payments problem continues to deteriorate.

The value of the dollar continues to decline.

The average wage-earner in this country—the low- and middle-income citizen—has watched his real wages dwindle, in many cases, even in the face of wage increases.

Why?

Those covered by social security making $6,600 or more a year are taxed on the order of $100 more than they were last year;

Graduated withholding rates which go into effect next week will reduce take-home pay even more;

An inflationary rate of 3 to 5 percent will more than offset the increase in wages which those laborers who adhere to the President's 3.2-percent wage-price guideline will realize;

And the talk of still another across-the-board tax increase is in the air.

We, the undersigned, flatly oppose any further increase in hidden or overt taxes at this time. The lower income groups in our society are already too much overburdened.

Prudent Government fiscal policies—for example, a reduction in nonessential domestic spending—are a better, more equitable and far more just method of bringing about restraint in an overheating economy.

With prospects of an increase—not a decrease—in defense outlays for the foreseeable future, necessity dictates that the Federal Government face up to the hard choices that lie ahead.

This administration must face up to the need of setting a realistic set of priorities of nondefense spending programs so that the Congress, in its wisdom, can reduce dollar amounts in some instances and defer programs in other instances in order to bring inflationary pressures under control. This cannot be done if this committee and the Congress consider budget items for these departments on a piecemeal basis.

Administration spokesmen, Secretary of Defense McNamara among them, have indicated that the war in Vietnam could continue for several years at the present or an even higher level. We all hope this is not so. But, if it proves to be true, the inflationary pressures we are experiencing today will intensify at a rapid rate unless adequate measures are taken now by this administration.

Those adequate measures do not include a continuation of "business as usual" here at home. They cannot encompass the steady expansion of all new, as well as entrenched, programs without grave risk to our economy.

The fiscal 1967 budget is an expansionary budget which, if not reevaluated, will feed the fires of inflation.

All indications are that the 1967 experience will probably approximate the experience of fiscal 1966 where, in the original budget submission, the financing needs of the increased activities in Vietnam were not taken into consideration.

The imprudence and risk of attempting to give national security costs second place in the Federal budgeting process should be all too evident at this time. Reports are becoming all too frequent from Committees of Congress and in the Nation's press about the alarmingly diminishing readiness of this country to meet contingencies other than Vietnam should they arise in Europe, Africa, Asia, or Latin America.

The Congress of the United States is charged with the primary responsibility of determining how large a Federal budget our economy can stand. But this the Congress, even were it willing, cannot do until the Commander in Chief presents to the Congress a realistic estimate of what the total national security costs for fiscal year 1967 will be.

Every Member of Congress is now aware of what members of this committee cautioned against last year in their minority report; namely, that defense needs were drastically underestimated and that to give them second place in Federal budgetary considerations has in fact led to inflationary pressures and an unhealthy economic climate.

The original fiscal 1966 budget request in the defense area was underestimated by more than $15 billion. The defense budget that is before this Congress for fiscal 1967 is underestimated.

The administration sought and was successful in obtaining funding for domestic programs for fiscal 1966 before the true bill for national security was presented to the Congress in the form of a supplemental. It apparently is attempting to repeat that performance for the fiscal 1967 budget.

If the Congress is to discharge its responsibility in this 2d session of the 89th Congress, it cannot proceed with "business as usual" on the domestic front at least until it demands and obtains a realistic assessment from the executive of what additional appropriations will be needed for fiscal 1967 in the area of national security.

Accordingly, we, the undersigned, strongly urge that the Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Bill, 1967, be recommitted to committee until such time as a realistic assessment of national security needs is presented to the Congress and until the additional programs for these departments totaling some $4 billion can be reviewed in one bill by this committee.

We, the undersigned, comprising all minority members of the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, unanimously subscribe to these additional views.

Melvin R. Laird,
Member of Congress.
Robert H. Michel,
Member of Congress.
Garner E. Shriver,
Member of Congress.
Frank T. Bow,
Member of Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 84]

Andrews, George W.
Baring
Beckworth
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Broomfield
Burleson
Cederberg
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Curtis
Diggs
Dowdy
Fallon
Farnum
Feighan
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Holifield
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Kornegay
Leggett
Mackie
Mailliard
Mathias
Matthews
Morse
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Powell
Roberts
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Thomas
Todd
Toll
Tupper
Utt
Vivian
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14745, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 369 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, to return this bill to the Committee on Appropriations. It would be a complete waste of time. It would cost more money.

There is no guarantee from any legislative committee how much further legislation will be forthcoming. We have no idea how long we would have to wait for all the committees to act.

It would be a very unusual procedure to return a bill to the Committee on Appropriations for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

All I ask at this time is that the Members turn down the gentleman's proposal to return this bill to the Appropriations Committee and that we continue with consideration of the bill today and complete action.

The amendment was offered in the subcommittee and was defeated. The amendment was offered in the full committee and was defeated. I hope it will be defeated now.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I should like to ask the gentleman from Rhode Island a question.

I am sure the gentleman realizes there is no intent on my part to jeopardize any of these programs. I tried to make this proposal in the subcommittee, so that we could wait for the authorizations.

I am sure the gentleman from Rhode Island will agree with me that the manner in which we handled the Higher Education Act last year, letting the Senate add all those programs on that side, not giving any one of the 435 Members of the House an opportunity to exercise any control over that program, was not a proper procedure. With only 1 hour of debate, when it comes back in the form of a conference report, that is not the best way to legislate.

Mr. FOGARTY. I say to the gentleman, that was an exception last year. So far as I am concerned it will not happen this year. If the legislative committees act soon, the Appropriations Committee will act immediately and report back to the House, rather than let it go to the Senate. That is what will happen if I have anything to say about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Fogarty and Mr. Laird.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 130.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAIRD

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Laird: On page 17, line 16, strike out "$416,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$180,400,000".

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this is the first amendment that appears in the bill. It has to do with the largest increase over and above the President's budget request, which was included by the full Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the full funding for the impacted aid program was not included by our subcommittee. However, when the bill came before the full Committee on Appropriations these funds were added to this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the 1966 supplemental request, which goes to conference tomorrow, I happen to be one of the conferees, the full funding for the impacted aid program has been included—this full funding—for 1966 to the extent of some $41 million over and above the President's budget. This was included on a motion which I made to that supplemental request, and I put that money in the supplemental bill, because in the school year of 1965–66 these schools are already operating on a budget and were assured by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and were assured by the Congress and assured by the President that in the school year of 1965–66 they would receive 100 percent of entitlement. Because that contract was made with the Federal Government, I felt it was only just and fair to include the full funding for the 1965–66 school year.

Now the question is somewhat different here for 1967. I support the President as far as 1967 is concerned and I hope this House of Representatives will support the President of the United States on this item. Why? This impacted aid program needs to be gone over very carefully and thoroughly by a committee of this Congress. One-third of the money that is being used in this program is going in areas that do not deserve additional aid as far as schools are concerned.

Let me give you an example of the county in which I live while I am attending the sessions of the Congress. Let me tell you about my next-door neighbor who happens to be a dentist. He works in the District of Columbia. He pays the same real estate and income taxes as my other next-door neighbor as far as the State of Maryland is concerned. He pays the same income taxes and real property taxes. My next-door neighbor happens to work for the Federal Government—on the other side. Because he works for the Federal Government, a supplement is paid to the schools for his children. Yet he pays the same real estate tax, and the same income tax.

The major portion of this money is going into these particular types of areas. I think all of us would agree if there is a Federal problem involved—if there is no income tax being paid and if there is no personal property tax and no real property tax being paid, a legitimate case can be made for this supplemental aid. But I believe we should respect the request of the President of the United States that this program be looked into as far as the school years 1966 and 1967 are concerned.

We hear a lot of talk about how the Congress is running roughshod over the President of the United States. The chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations had a prepared statement which he released after the committee marked up this bill. It made headlines in my local paper—that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had said that the Congress was on a wild spending spree and that somehow or other we had to bring Congress under control because they were forcing a tax increase. I am putting that statement in the Record at this point because I think that was sound advice, from the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations that day. But the advice that he gave on that day is just as good advice today as it was on Thursday in his press conference. The advice which was given on that day is just as good today.

The statement follows:

Congressional Actions on the President's 1967 Budget

(Statement of George Mahon, of Texas, Apr. 28, 1966)

I deeply regret it was not possible to hold the line on the President's overall budget requests in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill reported to the House today. Of course, it is sometimes necessary to exceed individual budget estimates but generally the bills are below the overall budget total.

In fact, in terms of ultimate expenditure effect on the Treasury, the increases made in the bill today will not be as great as appear on the face of it. The increase of $155.8 million for defense education direct loans to students was added only because of advice that the Committee on Education and Labor does not plan to report the administration bill that would have converted this loan program to a basis of Federal guarantee of privately financed loans. The risks of the Government would be similar under both methods but, of course, under the direct financing method, the initial appropriation for the loans shows as an increase.

Nevertheless, overall, the bill as reported is $490 million above the President's budget requests.

The question of a tax increase is a touch and go matter. When Congress overrides a budget which in total, in my opinion, is already probably too high—certainly high enough—we are indirectly voting for a tax increase; certainly at a time when the value of the people's dollar is threatened by inflationary pressures, we are inviting a tax increase. Thus, I think it is important that all of us—in and out of Congress—directly link these excesses above the President's budget with the question of a tax increase.

In making his budget the President manifested his concern on this score by trying to balance his requests with some prudence. He did not request full appropriation authorized by the Congress last year for some of the so-called Great Society programs. Something approaching $2.5 billion more would have been needed to come up to the full authorizations for fiscal 1967.

I believe it to be only simple prudence in the overall best interests of the people and the buying power of their dollars, that the Congress make a greater effort to restrain its ebullient tendencies which already have resulted in the House—in bills other than those from the Committee on Appropriations—breaching the President's budget for fiscal 1967 by upwards of $600 million with indications that the total may go even higher. This, to me, is an ominous sign that should cause all Members of Congress to stop, look, and listen.

We ought to resist the urge to add and add to the urge to resist increases. We ought to take a harder line and a firmer position on spending in order to help dampen the flames of inflation and lessen the need for a tax increase. Inflation can do far greater damage to the people's welfare than any of these enlarged programs could possibly do in the way of good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. We could go on offering these amendments one after the other. But we are not going to hold the minority—I realize we are outvoted 2 to 1—we are not going to hold everybody up here all afternoon on a long series of amendments. But if we do well on this one and we evidently have the support of the President of the United States on this amendment—although none of the White House aids are down here working very hard on it here today—I have not seen many of them in the corridors. They have been more concerned about adding to the Teachers Corps than reducing the add-ons. But if we do well on this, we will certainly continue. We are not trying to hold anybody up here this afternoon, but this is $232 million that is involved. Let us see what kind of support we have for this kind of study. The President of the United States has asked for that study. Let us see what happens to this which I think is a legitimate request. I have supported the President of the United States and I think he is right. I supported President Eisenhower when I thought he was right, and when I thought he was wrong I disagreed with him. In this particular case, I think the President of the United States deserves support for this reduction of $232 million.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to comment on the statement of our friend from Wisconsin that he is not going to offer a series of amendments.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. We will have amendment after amendment if we are successful on this. On the other hand, if we find we are just running into a stonewall on this proposition to hold the President's budget I do not think the gentleman from New Jersey would want us to just continue offering futile amendments. In fact, in the committee I offered some 30 amendments in working out this bill. I believe the gentleman from New Jersey understands that thoroughly. This amendment happens to be the biggest add-on over the President's budget, and I just wanted to give the gentleman from New Jersey an opportunity to support the President of the United States.

Mr. JOELSON. During the debate of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I heard talk about "fiscal insanity" on the part of the Democrats. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] was more merciful. He merely charged us with fiscal irresponsibility, and for that we are very grateful. But I am concerned about the blunderbuss 5-percent-cut approach. The reason I suggest that there is not a long series of amendments being offered——

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I cannot yield further. I have only 5 minutes. If I have time when I am through, I will yield.

The reason those amendments are not being offered is that we are dealing with some very, very popular programs. So instead an approach is made, "Well, let's just cut out 5 percent and let the Executive decide." That proposal comes from the Republican Party, which has been bewailing and bemoaning the fact for years that the Executive is encroaching upon the Legislature. Yet they come before us today, as they have in the past weeks, and say, "Let us not exercise our responsibility; let us abdicate it to the Executive. Let the Executive decide how it will spend the money."

If that is good, sound Republican gospel, I think there has been a great change and shift in the party's point of view.

I should also like to comment on the fact that when we had the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill before the House only a few weeks ago there was no attempt made by the Republican leadership to cut 5 percent across the board, and I cannot help but wonder aloud if that was not due to the fact that many of our Republican colleagues have districts that are agricultural in nature.

Only yesterday we authorized $5 billion for the space program, and yet we talk about fiscal responsibility today.

I think my credentials in this respect are fairly good, because I was one of 10 who voted against it yesterday, just as I was one of the 6 who voted against wholesale removal of excise taxes.

So I think what we have had today has been oratorical irresponsibility and political exigency, and I hope we get back to legislative maturity.

If the gentleman from Wisconsin wishes me to yield to him at this time, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. LAIRD. Is the gentleman addressing his statement to me?

Mr. JOELSON. I thought the gentleman desired me to yield to him.

Mr. LAIRD. Earlier in your discussion, when you were talking about the amendments, I was going to give you an outline of the various amendments. I think the gentleman should understand what we are doing here. This is the largest of the add-ons. This was not added on in the subcommittee. I am a member of the subcommittee, and our subcommittee brought this bill to the full committee without this $232 million add-on.

Mr. JOELSON. I would ask the gentleman what, in relation to the proposed 5-percent across-the-board cut, he would want and expect the Executive to do?

Mr. LAIRD. I think the gentleman from Ohio will be offering an amendment relating to that subject. I will debate that amendment at the time it is offered. I do not believe you should confuse the 5-percent amendment with this impacted aid program in which the President has asked for certain reductions. The President of the United States has asked for those reductions.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Huot] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition of the amendment to cut $232,800,000 from the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for aid to federally impacted school districts.

I believe that the proposed cutback in this field would seriously hamper the education of thousands of youngsters throughout the country.

The First District of New Hampshire, which I represent, would lose over $1 million if the cutback is made effective. We have, in my district, many communities dependent upon this aid to educate those students whose parents are employed at nearby Federal installations or whose parents are members of the Armed Forces assigned to New Hampshire bases.

Nearly all of the more than $2 million allocated to New Hampshire in fiscal year 1967 will aid school districts and students in my district. Although $2 million is but a small figure when compared to $416,200,000 asked for by the Appropriations Committee, it is a great amount for the small cities and towns in New Hampshire.

The city of Portsmouth, which encompasses both the famed Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and the Strategic Air Command at Pease Air Force Base, has a population of only 26,000. This particular area receives over $1 million each year under the impacted aid program. Because of this aid, the city of Portsmouth was able to construct a new modern and completely equipped senior high school to accommodate the great influx of students from both military establishments—the results of which benefit all the students in the area.

This same situation also exists in many other communities in the New Hampshire seacoast region. A serious cutback in Federal impacted aid to education funds would leave these local communities "holding the bag" and the only recourse would be to raise the already increasing taxes on property.

The Federal impacted aid program has been a big success, not only in my district, but throughout the country. When such a program is going so well and accepted as a positive move to better education, it seems ill advised to reduce or stop it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot urge this legislative body too much to defeat the committee's amendment and restore these funds. In the long run, it will benefit the complete system of education and subsequently the country as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island seek recognition?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes being reserved for the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this section of the bill which I expect to offer in case the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin fails. Under this request of limitation, will I be precluded from offering the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the unanimous-consent request is limited to this amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would have no objection to the 20-minute time limitation, but I believe the questions should be divided.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I see just four Members on their feet.

Mr. LAIRD. I would have no objection to the 20-minute time limit, but the other request is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, what is the unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. That debate be limited to 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes being reserved to the committee.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I object to that, because that is not a legitimate unanimous-consent request.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thought that each Member would have more than 2½ minutes, because the gentleman from Rhode Island had said only four Members were standing. It seems hardly possible to adequately discuss this matter in only 2½ minutes, but I shall say a word and renew my statement at a later time.

I think we must have an impacted aid program for schools. I do not think the present program is fully satisfactory. I think it should be revised. I think now, as I thought in the committee, that we ought to postpone appropriating action on this program until the legislative committee acts on the matter.

If the House votes for this amendment, and the legislative committee perfects the basic legislation, perhaps we will get an impacted aid program that is much improved. This is my general feeling on it.

I hope the amendment will be supported, not because I am against the impacted aid program, but because I am firmly opposed to the inequities of the present program, on which everyone in this House, as far as I know, agrees.

With respect to Government spending generally, I think that we must be more cost conscious. We must not, in the House, ask the question: Does the program cost money? And, if it does, then embrace it.

I think we need to try to hold the line in spending. I would like to think that the people want to hold the line. I was surprised that, in the Appropriations Committee, certain amendments to the pending bill were not adopted to hold the line in areas which are not as politically important as impacted aid.

Certainly, the President's budget, in most cases, is high enough.

I speak in a very nonpartisan way. But I speak as an American, I speak as a citizen, I speak as a man who represents a district, as a man who believes this country is going too far too fast in some Federal programs, spending too much money, and tending to sometimes overlook the war in Vietnam.

Are we giving the war in Vietnam the high priority that it really should have? Are we unmindful of the fact that it will cost many billions which have not yet been requested? This is an appropriate time to ponder these grave questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as Members of this House know, I have been opposed to Federal aid in the education field, particularly at the primary and secondary level, but one program which I supported in the first instance has been aid to federally impacted areas, at a time when there was no school district whatever in my district which qualified for that aid. I believed there was a legitimate need under the originally conceived proposition of payments in lieu of taxes to those heavily impacted areas where there were defense installations.

As I have seen this program grow through the years, and particularly what has happened in the area surrounding Washington, D.C., which gets practically one-third of the total appropriation, simply because people work for the Federal Government, I am inclined to agree with the President that this program needs drastic revision. Therefore, I supported the budget figure in committee and support this amendment wholeheartedly. I believe it is a good amendment, offered in good faith.

I shall be glad to yield any remaining time to the chairman of my committee, if he wishes additional time to make a point or two. If not, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Abbitt].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not believe anyone would accuse me of being spendthrift, so far as my record in the Congress is concerned, but ever since I have been here I have supported the theory of payments to impacted areas. I feel this is a debt and an obligation of the Federal Government. The impacted areas are caused by Government installations. That condition is brought on by the Government. I feel it is up to the Federal Government to live up to its obligations and duties.

This is an important matter. I agree with our chairman. We should hold the line. I believe my record shows that. I am in favor of holding the line on a lot of these giveaway, spendthrift, welfare programs. However, when it comes to meeting the Government obligation in these impacted areas in educating our children, that is a different matter.

I hasten to say that I am not an advocate of Federal aid to education generally, but with respect to vocational education and impacted areas I believe this is highly important, and I hope the amendment will be defeated. The place to cut expenditures is on these giveaway welfare programs, both domestic and foreign.

The budget abounds with new spending proposals and increases in some older ones in the field of welfare. The budget can be cut and should be, but the place to reduce expenditures is in areas where the Federal Government has not assumed a responsibility or where the value of the programs is in question. No one can question the obligation of the Federal Government when it has enlarged the demands on a local school system through the influx of additional students. I have always supported this principle and feel that the Federal Government should not renege on its responsibility.

By the same token, the vocational education program has been tried and tested for years. It is known to people all over the country for its valuable contribution to the training of our young people—in areas of agricultural education, industrial arts, distributive education, and other fields. Many young people still are unable to go to college and the value of this program is that it trains them in skills which they can use as soon as they leave school. These skills are among those most needed in our national economy, and unless this program is continued to keep pace with the growing needs, a serious deficiency will exist in our education program.

It has been demonstrated that the vocational education program is well run. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the State and local school systems, has exercised no unwanted degree of Federal control or interference. For this reason, I believe it is in the best interest of the Nation, and the children of the Nation, that this program be preserved.

I urge that the House approve the committee's recommendations in these two instances.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. I rise in opposition to the amendment. My colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Porter Hardy, and I represent districts in Virginia which are heavily impacted with governmental installations and military commands.

There may be, as some have alleged here today, areas in this country which receive impacted aid money when they are not entitled to it. I assure you Mr. Chairman that such is not the case in the Tidewater area of Virginia. The money which these districts receive is desperately needed if good education is to be available for an expanding population, the greater portion of which is federally connected school budgets in the Tidewater districts, as well as others throughout the country, have already been prepared and if this expected promised aid is not received, education in this country will suffer a severe and unnecessary setback. I urge my colleagues to vote against this proposed crippling amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOWNING. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Let me commend the gentleman for his remarks. I join him in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most equitable and meritorious programs of Federal financial assistance. It is fully justified by the facts and nearly every Member of this body has heard me express this position in times past.

Mr. Chairman we should soundly defeat this amendment.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I share the sentiments expressed by my Virginia colleagues. This is a Federal responsibility. Uncle Sam has imposed upon the taxpayers of local communities where Federal installations are located a critical burden. Children of employees of such installations are students in local schools. Yet, Uncle Sam pays no local real estate taxes or other local taxes for local school support, and when the Federal employees live on the Federal installation, they pay no local taxes for support of local schools.

Moneys paid by Uncle Sam to local school districts are simply payments in lieu of taxes. To the extent that Uncle Sam is benefiting from local schools Uncle Sam should be willing to pay.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ABBITT yielded his remaining time to Mr. FOGARTY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I believe I made the points needed on this amendment earlier today.

I should like to yield at this time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], for the views which he expressed on the floor a few moments ago.

I also wish to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for offering the amendment.

As the gentleman from Texas said, this effort to modify and to bring up to date the impact aid legislation has been a bipartisan effort so far as the White House is concerned. Former President Eisenhower urged certain changes in the legislation. Former President Kennedy did the same. President Johnson, both in his legislative recommendations and in his appropriation requests, has sought to bring about a change in the law so that there will be adequate support for those schools outside the Washington area which would qualify in a bona fide and legitimate way under the original intent of the law.

I believe it is recognized by the various administrations, both Democrat and Republican, and by Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, that the law today has given too much money in too many instances to some areas which for all intents and purposes do not qualify if we go back to the original intent of the law.

I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I believe we ought to cut back the appropriation in order to bring about those necessary amendments in the basic law, so that we can all support the legislation in a modified and up-to-date way.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we had a commitment for the fiscal year 1966 which covers the school year that is just closing. We have no similar commitment for the school year 1966–67. The way to get a proper revision of this program is to adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. I hope the amendment will be soundly defeated.

I support the action of the Committee on Appropriations in restoring the funds which the Bureau of the Budget proposed to delete and which the pending amendment would reduce. I feel that these funds should be restored if we are to keep faith and keep good faith with the school boards in school districts throughout the United States which have already prepared their budgets and have begun to make their financial arrangements for the operation of schools during the school year 1966–67, in anticipation of this program being continued.

The funds which will be provided in this appropriation bill if the Laird amendment is defeated will be utilized to aid materially in the funding of the school operations for the school year 1966–67 in every district which is affected by Public Law 874.

It would be bad faith to withdraw these funds at this time. This program is sound and it has been tested and proved to be satisfactory for more than 15 years. It must be funded for the fiscal year 1967.

I am glad to yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time. I want to compliment you on your position. I support you and the members of the committee. I would like to see this amendment defeated.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Georgia and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me. I wish to say that I am in full accord with his cogent and eloquently expressed remarks, and that I join with him in urging the defeat of this amendment from across the aisle. I commend him and desire to associate myself with his remarks.

Let me illuminate the difficulties, Mr. Chairman, with examples of what the proposed reduction in Public Law 874 support would mean to school districts in the Sixth Congressional District of Washington, which I am privileged to represent in Congress. Note that I said "would mean," not "could mean." It would happen automatically, because the 874 reduction would come long after school district budgets have been drawn up—the time for budgeting is set by State law—so that all other sources of revenue for the 1966–67 academic year are fixed and there would be no way for a district to adjust except by cutting staff and salaries.

Clover Park School District absorbs a great many children of people assigned to Fort Lewis, McChord Air Force Base, and Madigan Army Hospital. Its enrollment has more than quadrupled in the past 15 years. Of its 13,500 pupils, 61.29 percent are "impact" youngsters. Because of the presence of nontaxpaying Federal installations within the boundaries of the school district, Clover Park's valuation per pupil is $3,426, compared with the Washington State average of $6,119. Clover Park must compete in staff salaries with a district near the top of the statewide list in per-pupil valuation; to really compete, it would be necessary for Clover Park to vote 3¼ times the extra millage levied in the other district, if 874 funds were to be cut as proposed.

On a very specific basis, the proposed 874 reduction would mean that this school district would have to fire 40 teachers. And this in a district which needs more teachers than most, because the impact pupils bring extra problems. Because of the movement of military personnel, the district can count on a pupil turnover of 25 percent per year. In the 1964–65 school year, 5,998 pupils attended district schools less than the full term, and 2,999 left and a like number replaced them. This, remember, is in a school district whose total enrollment is 13,500.

Added to this is the fact that such heavily impacted areas can be educationally depressed areas; the culprit is not poverty, as in most cases, but transience—and, in this case, linguistic difficulties because of an abnormally large percentage of non-English-speaking pupils in the lower grades.

As another example let me cite the school district that serves most of the second largest city in the congressional district which I represent. That is Bremerton, a real "Navy town." It is the home of Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, and consequently of nearly 10,000 civil service breadwinners employed in the shipyard—and of a fluctuating number of the Navy officer and enlisted families.

This condition brings about a situation similar to that of Clover Park district, as I outlined a moment ago. Of the pupils enrolled in this district, 59.4 percent are impact pupils during the current school year. I will not go through Bremerton's problems item by item, for they are identical in form and scope to Clover Park's. Let me just say that the proposed reduction in Public Law 874 is equivalent, in Bremerton, to more than the budgeted capital outlay, or one-half of the maintenance budget, or almost as much as the administrative budget, or a little more than budgeted for transportation and health services. These can hardly be wiped out, or halved as the case may be. What it more likely would mean is the loss of 16 teachers.

What it most certainly would mean, no matter how the problem were solved, would be that Bremerton could no longer maintain an educational program to attract good teachers, nor train students to compete in the rapidly changing areas in education, business, or industry.

In short, Bremerton could not offer an adequate education for the children there, so many of whom are sons and daughters of military personnel who would, I should think, receive at least equal consideration with other Americans in this time of crisis when so much is demanded of military people.

Just to the south of Bremerton, and serving the same military installation, is South Kitsap School District. The reduction would cost this smaller school district eight teachers, $15,000 worth of books, $5,000 worth of instructional equipment, and some operational staff.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the cost of 1 year without 874 funds in these 3 districts, and they are not dissimilar to many other school districts in the congressional district which I am proud to represent, nor to other districts from coast to coast. These three school districts, it might be noted, already are operating on special mill levies which must be voted upon year after year merely for operational purposes. To this already precarious method of financing basic education the additional mill levies which would be necessary if 874 funds were reduced and you get a very gloomy picture of the education we would be able to offer our children. Let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, that these are children of parents who already are making substantial sacrifices for the country in military service—children who in many cases already are educationally disadvantaged by reason of frequent moves and frequent changes in educational exposure because of those moves.

I most earnestly hope that my colleagues will not put these and so many other children like them at a further disadvantage, and will vote to reject this amendment from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER. I, too, want to join the gentleman and thank him for the statements he is making. I support the position he has taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in opposition to this amendment, also. Basically I agree with the contention of my colleague who offered this amendment, that the impacted aid program needs drastic revision. However, it is also true that there are some districts—and, of course, the one I represent in Florida, which includes Cape Kennedy—which do have compelling and legitimate arguments in favor of this program. Presently there are over 51 percent of the students in this county school system in Brevard County that are federally connected. To cut this bill as proposed by the administration, in this particular county would reduce their participation by something like 60 percent and actually create chaos in the school system. This program could stand revision, but a revision that is approached on the shotgun basis proposed here that would vitally hurt the school districts in the country that are legitimately receiving the aid, I do not think is the proper way to do it.

I urge the House to vote down this amendment to cut impacted area school funds.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. Is it not true, however, that while budgets in some school areas were set up on the basis of receiving impacted area funds, as a result of the Primary and Secondary School Act many of these areas are receiving funds through this other program in excess of what they were receiving as impacted area funds that they did not anticipate in their budget? And, therefore, in many instances such funds are actually replacing funds which heretofore were sent into those school districts as impacted area districts.

Mr. GURNEY. In answer to the gentleman's question I would say this, that I am not expertly knowledgeable in this subject sufficiently to answer for other school districts. But I can tell the gentleman that in the case of my own district this is not so. As a matter of fact, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as a result of the abysmally poor formula that we passed in this House of Representatives last year, the school districts in Florida that are doing the most to generate most school funds, which includes the school districts in my own congressional district, receive the least back. So, indeed, these new Federal funds are not replacing impacted aid funds in the district which it is my privilege to represent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the step that we will be taking by cutting in this portion of the budget would be a very serious step.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman of the committee, that there are some inequities in this program. I do not believe anyone denies that.

However, I am getting tired of hearing talk about Montgomery, Fairfax, and Arlington Counties being mentioned as examples of impacted aid programs across this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, under the formula proposed by the administration; that is, by the cutters, permit me to give to the Members of the Committee an example of what would happen. The percentage of cut to Montgomery County would be less than it would be to areas like the China Lake Elementary School District——

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MEEDS. I have no time to yield to the gentleman. I have other points to make.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman is completely wrong.

Mr. MEEDS. It would be less than it would be to the China Lake Elementary School District, which district is located in a naval test ordnance area, and every student is certainly connected, every one of them, with the Federal activity, and as a result thereof the entire tax base is removed from that community.

The State of California is paying, over and above what the Federal Government is paying, for the education of those students.

Mr. Chairman, there is example after example across this Nation. I have several of them in my congressional district where we in the State of Washington are paying considerably more than it is costing to educate those children, paying it from State revenues, because the impacted area funds which we receive do not represent as much as the tax base removal.

While I agree that there are inequities contained in this program, we cannot take a meat-ax approach to the problem. This type of amendment is crucial to our people.

Mr. Chairman, we hear about the war in Vietnam. At one air base in Washington we are receiving more impacted students as a result of the war in Vietnam. We have 450 new students this year because of the war in Vietnam. And, we are expecting to educate those children with the 75-percent cut which is being advocated by these people who are saying "cut these funds out of here."

So, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, a committee that is working on this now and is studying this subject now. I can say to the Members of the Committee that we are finding some inequities, but this meat-ax cut approach is not the way to cure them.

Mr. Chairman, the way to cure these inequities is to straighten out the program.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks as this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of sustaining the current level of Federal assistance to federally impacted school districts. These funds are vital to many school districts in South Dakota.

Under the present makeup of the program, South Dakota receives more than $3.1 million annually in payments to its local districts. It is only fair that these districts receive assistance for educating the children of Federal employees because these funds represent payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned land which is exempt from local taxation.

In my congressional district, the Douglas Independent School District is one of the finest examples of educational quality and progress which has been achieved largely through an excellent use of Federal aid to districts where most of the children's parents live and work on Federal property. Without the aid, the Douglas School District would collapse financially.

The superintendent of the Douglas school system, Mr. Robert R. Spelts, has spent countless hours planning for the coming fiscal year as well as documenting the actual effect in dollars and cents that the proposed change would have on the Douglas school system. This school district educates the children of parents who serve at Ellsworth Air Force Base. The district collects from taxes $57,358 per year and from this program it receives $1,110,074. This district could operate just about 2 days on its tax money.

The staff of the Education Subcommittee has published a committee print with a statistical table, showing the effects of reductions on each of the participating school districts in each of the 50 States. Even a casual glance at this report shows conclusively that every school district will be adversely affected by the proposed cut; some districts might lose up to 60 percent of their current funds under the program.

In South Dakota, for example, the current level of assistance of $3.1 million will be reduced by more than $1 million.

In many cases the school board and the superintendent of schools have been making their plans for the coming year. In many cases, they have hired their teachers, they have set up an intensified effort to try to improve the quality in the various school districts. Out of the blue comes this threat to cut off funds which have already been taken into account when the programs were prepared, the teachers hired, and the decision made to try to upgrade the quality of the schools.

It is an incredibly difficult situation which the school board and the school superintendent should not be required to encounter.

It is imperative that the full appropriation be made for fiscal year 1967, and that no changes be made in this program for future years.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for 3½ minutes.

Mr. **FOGARTY**. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be soundly defeated.

Mr. Chairman, since 1950 when this law was first passed, we have had at least 10 record votes in the House of Representatives to cut back or to amend this act. On every single occasion the attempts to cut back the program were soundly defeated by a record vote of the membership of this House on both sides of the aisle.

The example given by the gentleman from Florida is absolutely correct. In district after district in this country, you are going to shut down schools and you are going to create chaos in the budgets of school districts in some 350 congressional districts that are represented in this impacted area program. This will be at a time when we are trying more than ever before to give kids in our country a decent education.

Our Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed last year even though the programs under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 were authorized for another year. We in this House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote only last year voted to extend this act for 2 more years—1967 and 1968.

If we do not put this money in the bill today as our committee has recommended, we will be breaking our word and we will be reneging on our promise to every school district affected by this legislation. Let us make no mistake about that.

This motion lost in our subcommittee by a tie vote, but all of the members of the subcommittee on the democratic side who listened to all the testimony voted solidly to put this $232 million in the bill in the subcommittee but it was voted down on a tie vote.

We took it up only last Thursday morning in the full committee. We carried it in the full committee by a vote of 30 to 12. I think that indicates what the membership of the House of Representatives is thinking at this time. Even now the Committee on Education and Labor is considering extending this act. Do you think they are going to adopt any of the amendments sent down here by the President? You know what they are going to do. In my estimation they are going to change it and they are going to increase the authorization for this program. When they report it out, it is going to carry this House of Representatives by at least 3 or 4 to 1—as I hope this amendment will be defeated. If we do not defeat it in the House today, then tomorrow on a rollcall vote I will almost guarantee that we can defeat this amendment by at least 3 or 4 to 1 as has been the past experience since 1950 when this legislation was put into effect. Who do we think we are kidding here today? Are we going to try to legislate on an appropriation bill by knocking this money out? That is what you are trying to do—you are trying to take away the responsibilities of the proper legislative committee of the House and assume it in connection with an appropriation bill. Well, you cannot do it and get away with it. I hope this amendment is soundly defeated.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAIRD) there were—ayes 25, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 17, at the end of line 18, strike out the period and insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available for payments to any local educational agency on account of (1) three per centum of the total number of children in average daily attendance in cases of children of parents who reside and work on Federal property, or (2) six per centum of the total number of children in average daily attendance in cases of children of parents who reside or work on Federal property, or (3) local contribution rates not determined in accordance with the first two sentences of section 3(d) of such Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 238(d)), with respect to the areas covered thereby."

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. I make a point of order in that this would be legislation on an appropriation bill, because it would change the basic formula which is contained in the authorizing legislation. It would add confusion to the distribution of these funds. In fact, there is legislation pending before a legislative committee to do just what the gentleman seeks to do by his amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard?

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Chairman, most of the argument of the gentleman from Virginia is not addressed to the point of order. The things he suggests are certainly not points of order. I think it is strictly a limitation upon an appropriation bill, and I believe the amendment is in order.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair notes that the three categories which are set forth in the amendment are merely limitations on an appropriation bill and are proper in its context. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here today by Members who feel that this program should go on, but that there are some inequities in it that ought to be corrected. What I seek to do in the amendment is to correct some of those inequities.

The amendment would not scuttle the program. It would merely bring the program down to where it will be examined. I am advised that the amendment which I am offering is very much in line with the administration's desire as to how the new legislation should be written.

Under existing law payments are made on the following basis:

First. Where parents both live and work on Federal property, payments are made for all federally connected children if they constitute 3 percent of total children in average daily attendance.

Item 1 of the amendment would limit payments for federally connected children in excess of 3 percent of total children in average daily attendance. In other words, if federally connected children constituted less than 3 percent, no payment would be made. If they constituted 5 percent, then payments would be made only on behalf of 2 percent.

Second. Where parents work on or live on Federal property—but not both—payments are now made for all federally connected children if they constitute 6 percent of total children in average daily attendance.

Item 2 of the amendment would limit payments for federally connected children in excess of 6 percent of total children in average daily attendance. If federally connected children constituted less than 6 percent, no payment would be made. If they constituted more than 6 percent, then payments would be made only for those in excess of 6 percent.

This is not a scuttling amendment; it is a corrective amendment. It is a limitation which would be in operation until the Committee on Education and Labor corrects the inequities now existing in the program. Every day we hear people say that the Impacted Aid Act is wrong but we must have it because of impacts. I agree. I think the purpose of impacted aid is correct. I think we have got to take care of federally impacted areas. But we ought to begin now to correct the inequities. This is a time when we can attempt to put some corrective language in the bill in order to give the Committee on Education and Labor an opportunity to bring out a new bill so that we can debate all the inequities that we have seen.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the gentleman from Ohio give us an illustration of a base or an installation that would be affected? As the gentleman knows, I supported the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOW. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the basic law ought to be changed, and I believe what he is doing is right.

Can the gentleman identify an installation?

Mr. BOW. I cannot take any individual installation and explain it to the gentleman, except to say that in all these areas where they go above these amounts there would be a reduction. It would eliminate some of those which are not true impacted areas at this time.

I might say in some of the discussions we have had here about the inequities of this aid, the gentleman is here ready to look after me, as he has done in the past on these bills, my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Let us take taxi drivers at the National Airport who are working for ATA. They drive a taxicab out of the airport. Their children are federally impacted, simply because they are driving taxicabs out of the airport. They do not work for the Federal Government. The ordinary taxi driver in the city does not have federally impacted children. You can go down the list of those who are not Federal employees but are federally impacted; there are many of them. There are many such persons we could reach with this amendment and bring this aid into line with truly impacted situations.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that this amendment would take something away from every impacted area?

Mr. BOW. Yes. That is right.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I have a district which has many which are totally impacted.

Mr. BOW. What percentage of the attendance are impacted?

Mr. HAGEN of California. Total.

Mr. BOW. One hundred percent? Then you would get 97 percent. You are going to object to getting 97 percent?

Mr. HAGEN of California. They have a problem now. In the State of California they could not operate.

Mr. BOW. Under this, you would still be able to get 97 instead of the full 100 percent. It is not as drastic as taking away all the money. The point I am making is that we are trying to correct some of the more glaring inequities now existent in the program.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in part to pose some questions to the maker of the motion. Certainly we are revising the basic law, although it may be parliamentarily correct. I would hope we could detect precisely what it is that he is proposing to do. As I understood, we would take the 3 percent and eliminate that for those districts qualifying.

Mr. BOW. Yes. Those with 3 percent or less would get nothing.

Mr. CORMAN. And for any one over 3 percent, we would deduct the 3 percent?

Mr. BOW. Yes.

Mr. CORMAN. Even in China Lake 3 percent from 100 percent leaves only 97 percent. I take it also this amendment would get us back to the 6-percent requirement for the large school districts; is that correct?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. CORMAN. It is on that point that I wish to address myself, because I would suggest we have been unfair to the large school districts in this Nation for all the time we have had this impacted program.

We worked for a long time to try to correct that inequity. In the school district in Los Angeles, where we have had for a number of years about 5 percent of the students qualifying under the impacted aid program, we have never received one dime because the formula required 6 percent.

What that means, is that the people in Los Angeles have lost approximately $5 million a year that they would have collected if the Federal Government had not held title to almost all of the defense installations in that county.

For us to undo on a simple amendment in an appropriation bill that it took us years to accomplish through the legislative committees of this Congress would be a real disservice to the people in the large metropolitan areas. We have waited long and patiently for the House to correct that inequity of the 6-percent requirement for large districts.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with my colleague in that observation. This is a vast and complex and technical field of support of education. The very distinguished Subcommittee on General Education had this matter under its jurisdiction and study for several years. We are currently engaging in an exhaustive study of the effect of these provisions on individual school districts.

To run in here now with a quick amendment of this kind, to do an across-the-board cutting into these school districts, is like running a patient into the anteroom for surgery, without preparation or even diagnosis. In fact, I might say this amendment would be passed without anesthesia.

This whole field of impacted aid is before our committee right now. The early signs indicate the adjustments we are contemplating would probably require a lot more money, not a lot less money.

I hope that the gentleman's point will be well taken by the House. We have worked long and hard to get deserving school districts under this bill. It ill becomes a member of the Appropriations Committee now to seek to do away with long years of preparation in the authorizing committee by an amendment at this time.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks and for his reference to China Lake.

If I correctly understand the Bow amendments, as a package, they are what the administration proposed, and they would cut the school budget of a very valuable school district about 50 percent.

The children involved are children of high-level scientists, who developed the Sidewinder missile, et al. They live in a remote area. I would say the action proposed would make it impossible to operate that very valuable naval station, if the Bow amendment should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, all of the amendments directed at the amount of money appropriated to implement the program of impact aid to school districts seek to reduce that appropriation in violation of the law establishing the program, Public Law 874.

Seeking to legislate by rider in an appropriation bill or by failure to meet money requirements established by legislation may not always be unjustified but it is certainly unjustified when it creates insoluble planning and financing problems for numerous local government agencies. This is the case with these amendments.

All of them would adversely affect several districts in the area I have the honor to represent and in the case of some of my school districts could result in a total failure of their programs of topflight education. One of these is the China Lake Elementary District. This district is coterminous with the naval ordnance test station which makes no in-lieu-of-tax payment to the district. As a consequence of a total lack of the normal property tax base this district is wholly dependent on a mix of funds from the Public Law 874 program and increments of aid from the State of California. The State program operates on a statewide formula basis and a substantial cutback of Federal funds would not be met out of the State contribution. Therefore the result of a cutback in the Federal contribution would be a failure to provide basic education for the children of some of the people most valuable to our defense effort. Such a failure could only result in their abandoning their government work with an adverse effect on a major military research and development effort.

I strongly urge the defeat of all of these amendments.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Is it not true that the amendment fails to take into consideration that there is a different impact on students of those in the civil service as compared to military personnel? The military personnel have available to them the commissaries and medical and dental care and other things, as compared to others who do not have the same advantages.

Mr. CORMAN. Frankly, I cannot tell all the mischief that the amendment would do. I assume it would do what the gentleman says.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I should point out that this amendment would amend the basic authorizing legislation, a matter now before the general Subcommittee on Education.

An identical amendment is before our subcommittee at the present time.

I will tell the Members what the amendment would do. If the amendment should be adopted, it would put into effect a substantial portion of the total $233 million cut being proposed in H.R. 13160 now being considered in our subcommittee.

School districts would get no payment for federally connected children under category A—children whose parents both reside and work on Federal property—for the number of those children who represented 3 percent of the total student enrollment. On the category B children, where either of the parents works on a military installation or lives on a military installation but not both, the absorption requirement would be twice as great, 6 percent.

We also have pending before the general Subcommittee on Education an amendment which would eliminate the 3-percent eligibility requirement in the present law. I know Members realize what that amounts to. If under present law a school district does not have at least 3 percent of its enrollment consisting of federally connected children it gets no Public Law 874 aid. The 3-percent federally connected requirement would be completely removed by the amendment to H.R. 13160 pending in our subcommittee.

I say that the subcommittee certainly should have an opportunity to work its will on all these amendments. To my way of thinking, the amendment on the floor is purely legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. In fact, I believe the amendment is worse than the previous amendment, which was overwhelmingly defeated. It is worse because it would cause a great deal of confusion as to what each of these school districts would be entitled to.

I made a point of order against the amendment, which was properly overruled, in order to emphasize the fact that this matter was pending before a proper legislative committee, as pointed out by the gentleman from Kentucky, who preceded me.

This involves a complicated, confusing change in the formula, which should have extensive consideration and deliberation by a proper committee. I doubt whether there is any Member on the floor of the House at this time who knows what the effect of this particular amendment would be to the budget next year in his school districts.

I am opposing this amendment, even though it actually will hurt my congressional district a lot less than it will hurt most school districts.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. This amendment will affect every impacted school district in the Nation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Indeed it will.

Mr. PERKINS. This is the recommendation of the Stanford Research Committee, and we have called witnesses in from throughout the country to try to analyze this amendment. In certain areas which have military installations it is going to have a tremendous effect in respect to reducing funds.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I agree with the gentleman. It will actually have a greater effect on the smaller, less impacted areas. My district has approximately 50 percent of its school population as a result of Federal impact. Therefore, it would not lose a large percentage of its impact funds as a result of this amendment and would possibly be in a little better position to absorb the effect of this amendment than many of the school districts. The Washington metropolitan area for quite some time has been used as a whipping boy on this legislation. I regret that some of my colleagues seem to be envious of the beauty and alleged economic health of the suburban communities in the metropolitan area of Washington. They overlook the fact when they point with envy to what we receive from this Federal impact legislation that there are thousands of military people who live in our community. We are glad to have them, because they are good citizens, but they are taken off of our local tax rolls and exempted from payment of the State income tax and the automobile license tax and so on by virtue of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, which is a Federal law. We have living in my congressional district—and I am glad they are living there—over 100 Members of Congress who are exempt from the payment of the automobile license tax and the State income taxes. I do not think they should be taxed, but still the children of these colleagues are going to these schools. So we do not receive tremendous tax benefits due to the fact that this happens to be a Federal area.

Arlington County, for example, has one-half of its real property taxes lost by virtue of federally owned property. The Federal Government owns one-sixth of the land area in Arlington County. If this land were assessed on the same basis as other real property it would double the amount of revenue it receives from real property taxes.

During the past 15 years since the original enactment of Public Laws 815 and 874, the northern Virginia communities have done their share in taxing themselves for the construction of new schools caused by the tremendous growth of the Federal Government in the Washington metropolitan area. In fact, insofar as school construction is concerned the communities have spent approximately five times as much as the Federal Government in school construction costs while approximately 50 percent of the pupils have parents who live or work on tax-free Federal property.

For example, in Fairfax County, during the past 15 years $109 million has been spent for new school construction alone. Fairfax only received $19 million of Federal assistance through Public Law 815 and created a bonded indebtedness of $90 million. In Arlington County the figures are $29 million total construction costs, $5.5 million Federal funds and $27 million local bonds. For the city of Alexandria, $17 million total costs with $635,000 Federal grants and $16,370 bonds.

As stated above, these figures show that there has been a tremendous burden placed upon the communities by virtue of the growth as well as being the result of the Federal impact, and the ratio of Federal assistance is very little.

I wish, therefore, that some of my colleagues would quit begrudging the fact that we have attractive communities surrounding the metropolitan area of Washington, or at least stop showing their envy and enjoy a little more living in these communities with us while they are representing their people in Washington.

I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 85]

Andrews, George W.
Baring
Beckworth
Bolling
Bolton
Broomfield
Burleson
Cederberg
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Curtis
Diggs
Dowdy
Everett
Fallon
Farnum
Feighan
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Griffin
Griffiths
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelly
Kornegay
Mackie
Mailliard
Mathias
Matthews
Morse
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Powell
Roberts
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Thomas
Todd
Toll

Utt
Vivian
Whitener
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 14745, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 372 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, there are two aspects of this amendment which I believe are worthy of our consideration at this time.

The first is the timing of the amendment. We are engaged in whatever we want to call it—a military struggle, a war, or some kind of peace operation in southeast Asia. We have a quarter of a million men in southeast Asia today. Most of them came from military establishments in the United States, and most of them have families who are still living near those establishments. I am glad the families are there. I am glad we are able to provide the children of these men with schools. But can we provide the schools they need if we take away a large part of the support these schools have been receiving in the past from the Federal Government?

I can only cite what I know from personal experience. Near the little city of Killeen there are two divisions stationed at Fort Hood, one of the largest military establishments in the United States. More than 50 percent of the troops making up the regular personnel of these divisions are now gone to southeast Asia. Most of their families and most of their children are still there. They pay no taxes. They cannot support the local schools.

The community obviously is depressed as a result of the absence of the troops who normally maintain the economy of the community. Yet these hard-pressed local people would be called upon at this time to make up the reduction in assistance which the Government has so long provided for those schools. Could we pick a more inappropriate time for such a reduction in governmental assistance?

How are people to maintain schools in a situation of that kind? And yet, this is not an isolated instance. The same thing is occurring all across this Nation. We are not faced with any fine-spun theory of how we should work this out. We know there is only one way to maintain the schools. We know that the continuation of the present program is the only thing which will enable us to maintain decent schools in a great many communities in a great many places. I think we, at least, owe our men in Vietnam a continuation of as favorable educational facilities for their families as they enjoyed before these men were sent overseas.

I believe we ought to take into consideration the fact that we are faced with this situation and faced with it now and that this would be the most inopportune time of the past 15 years to make such a change.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The point the gentleman is making is important. Dozens of witnesses have come before the subcommittee to point out the buildup in the military installations throughout the country. That is one of the problems we must take into consideration in connection with this legislation.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I know that he and his subcommittee are working on the problem.

This points up the next aspect of the situation to which I should like to call attention; that is, the way the author of this amendment proposes to reach the problem. He comes before us with what he calls a limitation on an appropriation bill.

I fear it does come under the existing rule. I am not complaining about the ruling of the Chair. I think it comes under the letter of rule, but the spirit of this thing is exactly the contrary to the clear intent of the rule. The author of the amendment, himself, stood on this floor within 3 minutes after winning his parliamentary victory and said that there were defects in the present law and he proposed to start curing them with this amendment. In other words, he proposed to make changes now in the present law by his amendment. Oh, he had just said it was nothing but a limitation on an appropriation bill. However, when the very author of the amendment comes to you and tells you his purpose is to change and improve the basic law, does it not show that what he really intends to do is to legislate and his interest is not primarily in the amount of money appropriated but his interest is primarily in the basic rules under which this money is to be used? Surely, that ought not to be allowed. We ought to change the rules so that no committee of this House could so blatently violate the spirit of those rules.

This amendment should be defeated not only because it is untimely, but also because it is presented in complete violation of the spirit of our rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 63, immediately following line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1006. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond ninety-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. I am sure that Members are tired, as I am. To borrow a phrase, I have shed blood, sweat, and tears here this afternoon. My head has been bloodied before from trying to bring about these economies. I know what is going to happen to this one, too. The troops just are not here. General O'Brien and the rest of them did not come up the hill. This is the Bow expenditure limitation of 5 percent which would bring spending back to about the level of the budget request.

It should not require any further explanation. I will, however, explain it briefly just in case there is a question in some Member's mind as to what it would accomplish.

The amendment simply provides that the administration may spend in fiscal 1967 only 95 percent of what the President proposed in his budget to spend on the items provided in this bill.

It does not in any way cut the appropriations provided in this bill but it does provide for a 5-percent cut in aggregate 1967 spending proposed by the President for items in the bill.

If adopted, it will have the effect of strengthening the President's resolve to curtail, wherever possible, Federal spending in fiscals 1966 and 1967.

The amendment is worthy of favorable consideration by each Member of the House.

I am not going to debate it any further, but I am going to ask, Mr. Chairman, that it be voted on.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. I can still stand for a few minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Ohio earlier today made an excellent speech to all of us pointing out that when the administration wants to spend more money and when the House or the committee might be disposed to make some reductions, the White House makes a valiant, vigorous, determined effort not only in the Capitol but in all of the office buildings across the street. However, the other side of the coin is that when there are honest and sincere efforts made really to cut the bill back, to the budget recommendations of the President, there is an obvious lack of interest on the part of the White House toward trying to achieve this desirable end.

This is unfortunate, I think, from the point of view of the taxpayers. The President and all of his advisers, including my good friend, the Postmaster General, would be in a better light from the point of view of the public if they would make the same effort on the legislative proposals for reductions as they are apt to do when they are increases.

And, I hope that the pattern of the past will not be repeated in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we could, with some honest help, some sincere help from all of those who work at the White House, have achieved some reductions or at least have held the line. But I see no evidence of any effort of that nature whatsoever.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the Committee at this late hour to debate this amendment.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has offered the amendment to other appropriation bills, and it has been soundly defeated. I hope that the Committee will follow the same example in this instance and vote it down by a resounding vote.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to review for the Members of the Committee the $10.9 billion which is contained in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I believe all of us understand that this $10.9 billion is proposed to come from general fund revenues.

In addition to that there are $33 billion from trust fund revenues for the various activities of the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies.

Mr. Chairman, this is but the first of the HEW appropriation bills for fiscal year 1967.

Because of the procedure we are using here today a second appropriation bill for HEW will be before this House in the not-too-distant future, to fund the Office of Economic Opportunity, to fund the higher education bill, to fund the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to fund the Library Service Act, as well as other programs.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will have another bill before the Congress before we adjourn.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of the funds contained in this bill cannot be touched by the Congress. I believe all of us should understand that the $4 billion which is in the social security programs, other than the insurance program, are categorical programs, such as aid to dependent children, aid to the totally and permanently disabled, aid to the blind, and aid to those who are receiving old-age assistance.

Mr. Chairman, these various categorical programs cannot be touched by the Congress. Any reduction or any cut that we would make in these aids to the various States would not be a legitimate cut. I like to use the word that it would be a phony cut. However, my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] objects to my using the term "phony." So I will say that it would not be a realistic cut.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there are other areas in which reductions could be made. However, I have had experience for 14 years on this subcommittee, and know that the place at which we have to work out many of these cuts is right in our subcommittee, because when we get out here on the floor of the House it is almost impossible on occasion to explain that this program or that program with these very appealing names might be overfunded.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to my colleagues here today that no further amendments will be offered.

We offered the amendment on the impacted aid program, and there was not much support for it. However, I felt that it should be offered, in deference to the President of the United States, and since no one on his side of the aisle would offer it, I did so here on the floor of the House because I thought we ought to have an opportunity to vote. There were not very many Members who supported the President on that particular amendment, and there was not much work done by the White House staff or the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or the legislative liaison division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on these increases that have been added to this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think that it was most unfortunate that my very, very good friend, the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who stood up and tried to support the President on his budget request got virtually no support on the floor of the House on his side of the aisle. I did not hear about a single person from the White House staff going through the halls of the House Office Building trying to urge people on this occasion to save any money or to cut the committee's request in accordance with the President's budget submission. I felt sorry for my friend from Texas.

Mr. LAIRD. I hope you felt sorry for me, too.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I did.

Mr. LAIRD. In closing, I would like to add that I hope we have seen here today a new departure so far as the administration is concerned—that from now on this Congress is not going to be pressured one way or the other on any of these measures that come to Capitol Hill and that in the future all of us on both sides of the aisle will be able to go forward and not be subjected to any kind of executive branch pressure. Because it was very pleasant today to see that the White House had abandoned its highly publicized program of trying to influence the Congress. That was abandoned today by our Chief Executive.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sympathy of the minority leader who points out to the House that when the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations supported the President, only very few Members on the Democratic side of the aisle stood by the President and the gentleman from Texas.

I must say that I saw over on the left—on the Republican side of the aisle—Members applauding and making speeches and voting with those who were likewise opposing the amendment. So the amendment to encourage improvement of the impacted areas program seems to have been overwhelmingly defeated on a nonpartisan basis.

But no one was so naive, I think, as to believe that this amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin would actually be passed. Certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin, who said that it was a test amendment and that he would not offer others if it failed, knew it did not have a ghost of a chance.

It did not have a ghost of a chance because the Members of the House are fearful that their positions on aid to impacted school areas might be misunderstood by the folks back home who might think that the Members were against any impacted areas program.

I do not advocate abandoning the aid to impacted areas program; I advocate improving it. That is what the President is advocating. We can improve it some, I think.

The gentleman from Kentucky pointed out that at this very time the legislative committee is considering certain amendments. My desire was to let the Committee on Education and Labor consider the proposed amendments and when that committee has taken action, we would then provide the appropriations. That would be the orderly way to proceed.

Now, with respect to emissaries from the White House walking the corridors and undertaking to support the President on this issue, I admit I did not stumble over any as I walked down the corridors. But I would like to think that the Members of the House could make sound and appropriate decisions without having to be urged to do so by employees of the executive branch. Legislation is our responsibility.

But I must say in all fairness that the President himself, in my presence, on several occasions urged—and strongly urged—support of his position with respect to this matter.

Further, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner, urged upon me the fullest possible support of his position on his budget. But he did not have many votes here today; the amendment on impacted aid was defeated.

But it seems to me that if an amendment had been offered to reduce the $42,750,000 above the budget for vocational education, it might have fared better. I think the Democratic side of the aisle might have stayed with the President on that and maintained the appropriation at the same level as last year's. Such an amendment, however, was not offered.

Mr. Chairman, on another matter, the bill carries $74 million above the President's budget for the National Institutes of Health. Medical research is a very popular and essential program. The appropriation is about $1.4 billion for the National Institutes of Health, which is about twice what it was 5 years ago. I think that many Members would have been willing to stay with the President on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman let me finish this thought? Since the budget provided $1.3 billion for the National Institutes of Health—which, in my judgment, is all they can reasonably spend, and more—I think an amendment might be offered there. But these things were fought out and decided in the committee.

It does not please me at all to stand here and make these references. I am not wedded to the budget; the budget can be wrong just as easily as Congress can be wrong. There is room for differences of opinion. I realize that people did not wish to be misunderstood as to their attitude on impacted school aid. But what we are doing in raising this bill to such a high level—about $500 million above the President's budget—is to move us one step further toward a tax increase and greater inflation. We have been saying that we are against inflation and against a tax increase. But the prevailing votes on this bill seem to indicate otherwise.

The President has used considerable restraint. We have authorized some $2.5 billion more for the Great Society than the President asked us to appropriate in his budget for fiscal 1967. So he has exercised some restraint in not asking us to vote full funding for all of these programs, and I think this is good.

But what has the House of Representatives done at this session? We must be honest with ourselves. The House has gone above the President's budget in several authorization bills by upward of $600 million as of a recent date and from all indications we are going much higher. Now we are going above the budget in the appropriation bills. That does not alarm some people but it does alarm and concern me, as I believe it does most of you.

I believe that we are moving generally in the wrong direction when we increase such already large requests as have been submitted to us for some of these programs.

I would like to make this point also. We may have to go above the budget in the Defense appropriation bill. I think we probably will. But this is a different matter because we are at war. In this situation, it would seem to me that we could and should pretty well hold the line on nondefense programs.

I think that additional funds will have to be requested by the Executive for the defense effort because of the escalation of the war in southeast Asia, and I just hope we can hold the line a little better in nondefense spending. I hope that what I have said will have a sympathetic ear from the Members of the House of Representatives.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations knows that amendments can still be offered at any time or place to the bill right now.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So I think it would be appropriate, in the light of the gentleman's statement, if someone on the Democratic side would offer an amendment—just one, just one—to take the budget back to the level that the President recommended. This would be an indication of good faith on the part of those who say that the President should be supported. The bill is open for amendment at any point right now, and there are four or five areas in this bill where the committee has gone above the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest—I urge—that a Democrat, just one, offer an amendment to support the President's budget in these instances. The Republicans have offered amendments to support the President's budget in certain items, to help him hold the line he drew in these instances. I would like to see some Democrats, just one Democrat, do this.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking as a political partisan. This matter is of a nonpartisan nature. It is our country, be we Democrats or Republicans. We are moving toward more inflation. Inflation is no respecter of persons or parties—it cheapens everybody's dollars. We are moving toward larger defense expenditures. We are moving toward a tax increase. I think it well to say so as we consider this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his forthright statement on the floor of the House. Already the President is pointing his finger at the Congress and trying to lay the blame at our doorstep. Of course, he has some reason, perhaps, to do so.

Also I would like to say to the President of the United States that he has the right of veto. I hope he abides by his own requests and vetoes some of these bills, if he feels strongly about it, rather than pointing his finger at the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the President will be in much the same position as we are on this bill. This bill covers $10 billion plus, most of which he agrees with and we agree with. There is a matter of judgment involved.

I am going to vote for this bill, although I do not agree with all of it. I think the President will be compelled, as a practical matter, to approve it when it comes to him, though, like some of us, he cannot agree with all the provisions in the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I take this time to make a few comments. In the course of his remarks, the gentleman from Texas said that it was naive to believe that the Congress would not increase certain portions of the budget submitted by the President. He was referring, I am sure, to the impacted school aid portion of the program and several other items in this appropriation bill.

If it was naive for us—and I speak collectively—to think that we could hold the line, I suggest that it was just as naive for the President to submit the budget in this way with these reductions. It was just as naive for the White House to propose a phoney or totally unrealistic budget cut of this kind. The President knows the legislative situation, and when he sends it up here under those circumstances, to say the least, he is naive.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 63, immediately following line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 1006. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond ninety-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House of May 3, further proceedings will be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, is this on the motion to recommit, or on passage?

The SPEAKER. This is on passage.

Mr. LAIRD. That is what I thought, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understood it, the question was on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, it did not appear to me that the motion to recommit had been put to the House.

The gentleman from Ohio was on his feet and the assumption was, from that fact, that he was objecting to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will always try to protect the intent of a Member. Without objection, the question will be on the motion to recommit, and under the order of May 3, that vote will go over to tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair has already announced that under the order of May 3, the vote will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is a teller vote a record vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already passed upon the demand of the gentleman from Ohio who objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present and made the point of order that a quorum was not present on the motion to recommit. The Chair has already passed on that and stated that under the order of May 3, the vote is postponed for further consideration until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, then.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio withdraw his point of order of no quorum?

Mr. BOW. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do at this point.

The SPEAKER. Then, the vote on the motion to recommit will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I would expect the same consideration on this side as was given to the gentleman from Ohio when it was too late on his motion to recommit. I have been standing on my feet trying to get recognized for a teller vote. I would expect the same consideration be given to me as was given to the opposition. I was trying to demand tellers all the time and I was not recognized. All I ask for is the same consideration as was given to the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair has made its ruling that under the order of May 3 further proceedings will go over on the motion to recommit and on the final passage of the bill until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. I never realized a teller vote was a record vote.

The SPEAKER. The point of order that no quorum was present had been made by the gentleman from Ohio. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Rhode Island that that point of order takes precedence.

Mr. FOGARTY. I was trying to get recognized before the point of order of no quorum was made and before the decision of the Chair was made in favor of the gentleman from Ohio and against the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The SPEAKER. The point of order of no quorum, the Chair will state, takes precedence over the demand for tellers and the gentleman from Ohio has made the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. FOGARTY. The only point I make is I think the Chair ruled in favor of the gentleman from Ohio and against the gentleman from Rhode Island. That is the way it seems to me. If the Chair insists on it, there is not anything I can do about it. I just want my views known and expressed. That is the way I feel about it.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recommit is the right of the minority, and if the member of the minority seeks recognition and is qualified, then he is recognized. The gentleman from Ohio pursued his rights in demanding a call by the yeas and nays. An insufficient number rose. The gentleman from Ohio then made a point of order that a quorum was not present and objected to the vote on that ground. The Chair has already made its ruling that under the order of May 3, further proceedings under the call are postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. How am I to know that a quorum is not present?

The SPEAKER. The Chair counted. The Chair is aware of the number.

Mr. FOGARTY. I assumed that the Chair counted the necessary number for a rollcall vote and found an insufficient number arose for that purpose but not for the purpose of establishing a quorum. That was my understanding of the Chair at that time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will repeat for the benefit of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that in accordance with the order of May 3, further consideration at this stage of the bill is postponed until tomorrow on a motion to recommit. That is the status of the matter and there is nothing left which the Chair can say.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I still feel that the Chair has not extended to this side the same consideration which was extended to the other side.

Mr. LAIRD. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Rhode Island, and if the gentleman from Rhode Island desires to proceed, the Chair is very patient.

Mr. FOGARTY. No, Mr. Speaker, I have stated my views and I would like the Chair to know how I feel. That is all.

The SPEAKER. The Chair respects the views of the gentleman from Rhode Island, but the Chair has already made a ruling.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 14745, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

ADDRESSES BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AND SECRETARY JOHN W. GARDNER

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, last weekend the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare visited Georgia's new Fourth Congressional District as guests of the nearly 500,000 citizens who reside in that district in the eastern part of Metropolitan Atlanta.

It was my privilege to accompany them. They were warmly received.

We flew from Washington to Atlanta in 75 minutes in a Georgia-built Air Force Lockheed Jetstar.

This aircraft and the visit were significant.

Georgians at Lockheed Marietta are designing, building, and flying the greatest cargo planes in the world. Our people are able to do this because Georgians have been deeply committed to the improvement of educational opportunities for all our people. The Jetstar is an ornament of their abilities.

The invitation extended by our citizens to these two great national leaders shows our determination to assume the responsibilities of our U.S. citizenship and our desire to understand and support our Nation's responsibilities in the world.

Vice President HUMPHREY made a notable speech to more than 700 public schoolteachers attending the annual banquet of the De Kalb Education Association. Secretary John W. Gardner addressed a citizen's meeting arranged by our Fourth District Citizens Panels for Progress, our grassroots activity, which we have designed to provide a modern counterpart to the old town meeting.

Because of the high quality of both of these speeches I place both in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT DE KALB COUNTY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, ATLANTA, GA., APRIL 29, 1966

It is a pleasure to be here with people who look ahead.

You are engaged in commemorating the past—and commemorating it magnificently—at Stone Mountain.

But your eyes are fixed upon the future—literally, on the stars. For, under title III of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, you have asked for and received a grant to assist in construction of a planetarium and observatory.

This is precisely the kind of innovation which that act—a landmark in the history of American education—was designed to encourage.

This legislation was not intended as an effort by the Federal Government to take over and direct the Nation's schools. Instead, it was designed to give impetus to creative local experiments in education.

That is what I have been telling education audiences all over the country. But I won't dwell on that theme here. I would be preaching to the converted. For I know that you have been and are providing education of excellence and of imagination.

Today, instead, I shall direct your attention to even newer and wider horizons.

Yesterday, we thought of the classroom as confined by four walls. Today, those walls have been opened up to the community as a whole. Tomorrow's challenge is to open them up to the wide world.

This is what President Johnson—who began his career as a teacher—sought to do a few weeks ago with his historic message to Congress on international education.

He said then: "Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of our international relations."

Of course, you knew this all along. But now it has been stated for the first time, by an American President, as national policy.

The proposed International Education Act of 1966 embodies that commitment.

We have known for a long time that the best investment we can make in America is in the education of our children. And we have come to realize that the same thing is true in the developing countries—countries seeking to raise themselves to nationhood against far greater obstacles than we in America ever faced.

Let me take as an illustration, because it is timely, topical, and even controversial, the beleaguered nation of South Vietnam.

In the years we have been working with the people of South Vietnam, we have found that their faith in education is as high as our own.

They will sacrifice anything else to insure a good education for their children. In many villages they have not waited for government help in building schools. They have built them with their own hands.

Since 1954—that is, since South Vietnam attained its independence—the number of students enrolled in elementary schools has nearly tripled. The number of classrooms and the number of teachers have increased at almost the same rate.

The growth in secondary education has been even more dramatic. There are nearly seven times as many secondary students as in 1954 and nearly six times as many teachers.

There were no teachers colleges in South Vietnam 12 years ago. Now there are 5 with an enrollment of almost 2,500 future teachers.

Only a few years ago, hardly any textbooks were used in the elementary schools. And those that existed were crudely done and unattractive. The teaching was mostly by rote.

Now 14 million elementary school textbooks are being printed in South Vietnam and three neighboring Asian countries, and almost 7 million have already been distributed.

The actual writing of the textbooks has been done by teams of two or three Vietnamese author-educators, plus an artist who is generally a graduate of the higher school of fine arts.

The books deal with both urban and rural scenes, and the people portrayed are neither very rich nor very poor. The series of textbooks on health begins with simple down-to-earth lessons on personal hygiene.

The series on civics begins by teaching consideration for others in everyday life, before going on to local and national affairs.

The series on history, while faithful to the facts, is designed to show that, in Vietnam's many centuries of history, there is good cause for national pride.

These textbooks are a source of great satisfaction to the children. They can take them home with them—and, in many cases, they are the first books their families have ever seen.

Because most of Vietnam's present elementary teachers have had no experience in teaching from textbooks, special workshops and seminars have been arranged so that they can learn how to use them most effectively.

In addition to the textbooks, there are plans to provide a total of 10,000 teaching kits—including maps, manuals, charts, feltboards, and mimeograph duplicators—to elementary schools throughout the country.

Each of the 43 provinces will also be provided with motion picture projectors, tape recorders, record players, generators, and transformers.

The initiation of television in Vietnam—the first telecast took place on February 7—offers further opportunities for education.

The plan is to have a television receiver in every classroom, in every elementary and secondary school in Vietnam. They will be used for the teaching of the ABC's, science, mathematics, and the English language.

These are impressive figures, but they are only figures. I wish I could have taken you with me to the typical schools I saw in South Vietnam.

They were not impressive. Some had one room, with brick walls, plastered, and whitewashed. Some had several rooms in a row, built year by year.

Each school had a well nearby for water—a covered well, setting an example for the villagers.

Each had sanitary facilities.

The children were as bright-eyed and lively as any you will see anywhere—and no matter where they came from, they were clean and neatly dressed.

The schools were coeducational, with boys sitting on one side of the aisle, and girls on the other.

There were parents' associations too, much like our own PTA's—except that they hadn't gotten around to concerning themselves with teaching and school administration.

Instead, they were digging wells, applying whitewash, and repairing damage.

To see these schools, I felt, was to see the future of Vietnam.

The Communists seem to fear that this may be so. They have made the schools a prime target. In one province alone 70 classrooms were built in a year—but 56 were dynamited in the same period by the Vietcong.

But let me put this in proper perspective. South Vietnam is just one developing country out of many.

Everywhere, people are no longer content to put up with lives of poverty, disease, ignorance, hunger and despair.

Everywhere they seek a better life, a higher standard of human dignity—for themselves, and, above all, for their children. For, just as in America, their highest hopes center around their children and the schools they attend.

We have a vital interest in this restless two-thirds of the world—if only because its unrest carries with it a threat to the peace.

But we have an even more vital, positive interest. Our interest in the survival and growth in the world of the kind of freedom we ourselves value so highly. For, as Thomas Jefferson so often said, man cannot be both ignorant and free.

And, as he also said, in words that are as pertinent now as they were nearly two centuries ago, our task must be to "educate and inform the whole mass of the people" * * * to "enable them to see that it is to their interest to preserve peace and order * * * they are the only sure reliance for the preservation of liberty."

That is why we are putting aid to education front and center in our international policy, as we are in our policy at home.

Finally, let me make the point that we regard international education as a two-way street. We are as eager to learn as we are willing to teach.

Among the proposals to this purpose, the most novel and imaginative is the establishment of an Exchange Peace Corps, a kind of "Volunteers to America." It will bring men and women here from abroad, many to work in our schools to give Americans a deeper understanding of other languages and cultures.

I have been a teacher of one kind or another all my adult life, and not only in the university classroom where I began.

To be at all effective in American public life, one has to be able to arouse public opinion to the support of policies that need public support. In the broadest sense, a politician must be an educator as well.

Already, the teacher is as important in our international relations as the diplomat or the soldier. Tomorrow may he be even more important.

I hope that, as history is written, our Nation may be known not as a global gendarme, but as a source of light and learning—the modern-day equivalent of the ancient Athens of which Pericles proudly said: "We Athenians throw open our city to the world, and never by alien acts exclude foreigners from any opportunity of learning."

This, then, is the challenge before us: Not only to educate the children of America but also to help bring education to every darkened corner where men still bend under the weight of ignorance. For it is true that freedom cannot live together with ignorance. Between the two, the choice is clear.

THE ROLE OF THE CITIZEN IN TODAY'S SOCIETY

(By John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered at the Glenn Memorial Church Auditorium, Emory University campus, Atlanta, Ga., April 30, 1966)

Speech titles have to be selected early, because programs have to go to the printers. But any speech of mine continues to change and develop right up to the time it is given.

So I often find that I have drifted away from the title, or the title has drifted away from me. But on this occasion, I do not think I have drifted too far. I am going to talk about the citizen—meaning you—and I am going to talk about some of the Federal programs I am concerned with. And then, I will have a few comments on how the two are related.

As many of you know, my concern for years has been with the individual, with how society can best serve the individual, and how we, the citizens can create such a society.

Until recently, I pursued this concern in the relative tranquillity of a philanthropic organization. Like most of you, I was a private citizen. Then the President asked me to come to Washington. That was 8 months ago, and I must say that it has been an exciting time.

We are living in one of the most creative moments of history, a moment when the past is slipping away and the future is being shaped. It is also a difficult and painful moment. Creative times usually are.

I am always surprised to discover how many intelligent citizens are untouched by the excitement of the world that I see and know, and how many are not moved to participate in the events of their time.

Some of these people are overwhelmed by the size and scope of our problems today. It is a natural feeling. It does often seem that we are producing more history than we can consume. But most generations of man since the beginning have been faced with overwhelming problems. What distinguishes us from earlier generations is that we are far more aware of our problems, and far less fatalistic about them.

Another source of discouragement today is the view that there is little the individual citizen can do. Even though he may believe that the problems are solvable, he is likely to doubt that he as an individual can be of help. Again, it is a natural feeling, but I think anyone who is guided by it is too easily discouraged.

It is true that as our society grows larger and more complex, citizen participation is not the simple thing it once was. But the surprising and cheering thing is that the tradition of citizen action is not only surviving, it is growing stronger. And it is more needed than ever.

Some people have assumed that the growth of the Federal Establishment has diminished the responsibility of the individual, the community, and the State. That is certainly not true of the programs administered by my Department.

Let me tell you why.

Our programs deal with people, with a wide range of human needs. They are carried out not only by our bureaus in Washington, but in conjunction with many other institutions: the States and local communities, hospitals and school boards, universities and voluntary organizations. The quality of most of our work ultimately depends on the performance of these non-Federal institutions and agencies. We provide resources. It's their responsibility to use them. The payoff is at the local level.

The Federal Government can't bring about that final result in Washington. Federal laws, dollars, and programs don't teach children nor heal the sick. Teachers teach children and doctors heal the sick—individual teachers and doctors in the schools and clinics of Atlanta and Seattle and Phoenix. This means that to get full benefit from Federal programs, vitality at the local level is essential. In short, you are as responsible for most of the Federal programs as we are.

President Johnson has a name for this deepening involvement of citizens and institutions in the work of government. He calls it "creative Federalism," meaning a creative partnership between the Federal Government and State, local and nongovernmental institutions and agencies.

But it won't work unless there is real vitality at the local end of the partnership—and that's where you come in. You're the only ones who can keep State and local agencies and institutions vital.

Now, I know it is traditional for Federal officials traveling around the country to talk about the achievements of government (especially in even-numbered years). I respect this tradition, and I can tell you that our achievements have been substantial.

But to talk only of achievements would give you a very inaccurate picture of my world. When I get up in the morning, I don't think about our achievements, I think about our problems.

And, after all, they are not exclusively Washington's problems although we are working hard to find answers to them. They are Atlanta's problems. They are the problems of our time.

Let's begin with health. I spent most of this morning at the Communicable Disease Center here, which, as you may know, is an arm of my Department. It's an extraordinary operation, reflecting some of the spectacular advances in the health sciences.

The American people, through their Federal Government, support a gigantic health effort. Your taxes pay for about two-thirds of all the medical research being done in this country today. But research is only the first step toward better health. A step that sometimes seems considerably more difficult is how to make available to all Americans the gains already achieved.

Much of the recent health legislation enacted by the Congress is an effort to do this, to bring the best of modern medical care to the aged, to the poor, to children, to those who live far from the leading medical centers.

In order to accomplish that we have some difficult problems to solve, and by we I mean everyone in and out of government who is concerned with the health fields.

There are already grave shortages of health manpower of all sorts—doctors, nurses, technicians, and so on. How do we recruit them, how do we educate them for careers in a field that is changing so fast? How do we sort out professional and subprofessional tasks so that physicians aren't doing jobs that registered nurses could be doing, and so that neither is doing tasks that subprofessional aids should be doing?

How can we insure that the smalltown doctor has access to the expensive equipment so essential to modern medicine? How do we make it possible for him to keep up with the lifesaving advances in medicine?

There is extensive duplication of health services in most of our metropolitan areas. People don't know where to go for what, and often those who need help most don't even know it is available. How can we better organize and communicate these services?

Thanks to the extraordinary scope of recent legislation, we are now able to tackle these problems with new vigor and imagination. And again it is not a matter of the Federal Government acting alone. The legislation puts us in partnership with State and local agencies, hospitals and universities, voluntary and professional associations, independent laboratories and clinics.

Now let's take a look at the war on poverty. If you don't bother to understand it, the war on poverty can appear to be demagoguery, or routine do-goodism, or just a tired phrase. But if you see how our approach to poverty has evolved historically, and understand how complex the problem continues to be, you will comprehend how courageous and inventive some of the current efforts really are.

Poverty has always been with us, but it is only in recent years in the highly developed countries that there has been sufficient productive capacity to make the elimination of poverty a realistic hope.

As we in this country have worked on it, in my own lifetime, the nature of the problem has changed continuously. What we have accomplished in the past 30 years in gaining control of our economic system is immensely impressive.

But we still have deeply embedded pockets of poverty in a generally affluent society. These pockets—and they contain 35 million Americans—won't dissolve with the waving of an economic wand.

We now recognize that poverty is deeply rooted—in the early deprivation of the child, in his parent's lack of education, in their feelings of resignation and apathy and defeat, in the slum environments that confirm such attitudes, and in the urban disorganization that permits—and promotes—a high rate of social casualties.

How do you get at these things? We are working at them today from all sides and at every level of government. You all know about Operation Headstart, about the Neighborhood Youth Corps, about various occupational retraining and job placement programs. My own Department is deeply involved in many of these efforts, as it is, of course, in vocational rehabilitation of the disabled, in improving slum schools and in strengthening family life.

The fact that some of these efforts give rise to controversy is inevitable. It's inevitable, too, that we shall experience some failures. Everyone wants the Government to be bold and imaginative and infallible—all at the same time. It will never happen. But our approach to the problem today is more broadly based, more inventive, and more honest than anything yet tried.

Now, let's turn to education. In the last 3 years 19 major pieces of legislation have been passed. When President Johnson came to office, we were spending less than $4.75 billion on education. This year we will spend $10.2 billion. A few years ago the Office of Education was a relatively insignificant agency; in the last 6 years its budget has increased 545 percent.

But as in the earlier examples I have given you, I want to take you behind the multibillion dollar figures to some of the human issues we are tackling and I want to talk about problems rather than achievements.

How can we improve the distressingly bad education offered in most low-income areas? How can we overcome the initial educational handicaps of the deeply deprived youngster? What can we do to upgrade the teaching profession and teacher education? How can we better prepare young people for employment? How can we prepare them for lifelong learning? How can we best assist the colleges and universities in this period of rapid expansion?

Thanks to the great legislation of recent years, we are able to make a frontal assault on these problems. And as in all of our other programs, it is a partnership effort, in which we collaborate with all of the States, with the school districts, with the universities, and with professional associations.

I doubt that there has ever been a time in our history when the effort to improve education has been so widely shared. Not only teachers and administrators but school board members, parents, and local officials all over the country have been drawn into the difficult and exciting business of redesigning the educational system.

It isn't a comfortable process for any of them. It isn't supposed to be. But out of it is going to come a better educational system and a better Nation.

A corollary problem we're working on is racial equality. As you know, this is not exclusively a southern issue. It is a national issue, as acute in Buffalo as it is in Birmingham, in Los Angeles as it is in Nashville.

The problem of justice for the Negro has gnawed on the national conscience ever since this Nation was founded. It is in an important sense, the American problem.

We are now committed, as a nation, to solve that problem. Perhaps we were always so committed. Freedom, justice, and equality are not mere abstractions. They are the foundations of this society. What we build upon them can only be precarious if they art not firm and sure. In acting to bring Negroes into the full stream of American life, we are doing what must be done to preserve and strengthen the foundations of our society.

This means moving steadily, progressively toward a single school system. It means the removal of racial barriers in hospitals, nursing homes, welfare agencies, and so on. It means serious and insistent efforts to make inroads on northern de facto segregation.

As in all of the earlier issues I've talked about, we face some large, unsolved problems.

How can we repair the deficiencies of education that segregated schooling has left us? How can we teach tolerance and mutual respect to both Negro and white? How can we heal the wounds of all these years of strife and bitterness?

Residential patterns in all our large cities still enforce the cleavage of races. How can we alter these patterns? How can we build bridges of communications and understanding between the Negro ghettoes of the cities and their predominantly white suburbs?

I know a lot of people in this audience are working on these issues. We need more. We need the best minds, the clearest heads, the warmest hearts. And we need strong, responsible leadership, for people will not go where their leaders will not take them.

If I had the time I'd like to talk to you about a great many more problems that we're at work on—mental illness, aging, juvenile delinquency, problems of addiction, air pollution, home and highway accidents, mental retardation, the safety of new drugs, and so on.

I could show you how every one of these affects intimately the quality of life in our society and more immediately the quality of life in your community.

And that brings me to a final word concerning the purpose of our efforts—the purpose of all our trials and errors and seeking and finding. It is to enhance the individual human being. That is easy to lose sight of because we talk, as we must, of institutions, or processes, of dollars. But their only legitimate purpose is to foster the conditions in which individual lives may be lived humanely.

It is not easy to live the good life in an enormously crowded and complicated world. A lot of rich as well as poor people find it increasingly hard to do so. When we look outward, we see complexity where we yearn for simplicity. When we look inward, all too often we see fragmentation when we long for wholeness.

The world is complex. We must accept that fact and learn to control it, so that as individuals we may be whole and not fragmented. We pass laws and design Government programs to try to deal with complexity, to protect individuals from the buffeting of forces they cannot control. But we should never forget the central purpose of laws and Government programs in a free society. That is to make the world manageable, so that individuals may have the maximum amount of freedom, freedom to grow and develop, freedom to be what they have in them to be, freedom to choose.

No society can properly define for any individual the purpose and meaning of his life. Quite the reverse: the Great Society must create the conditions in which the individual can find his own purpose and meaning in life.

We may fumble frequently in trying to build that kind of society, but our efforts are not an appropriate target for either cynicism or despair.

The American people, and that means you, have tackled some extraordinarily tough problems. Through your elected representatives, you have chosen to face up to some of the realities that comfortable people usually prefer to forget—that in fact many of our children do not have an equal chance, that in fact many of our older people cannot live out their lives in dignity, that we are polluting our streams and lakes and the air we breathe, that most of our cities cannot be a source of pride to a rich and powerful people.

Well, I like the fact that we've tackled the toughest problems we could find. I would never have interrupted my happy and productive life as a private citizen had it not been for my belief that the Johnson administration and the 89th Congress were plunging into the most complex issues in our national life.

I don't underestimate the difficulty of what we're undertaking. We've committed ourselves to a rugged agenda. But it will be a sad day for this great Nation when we get so placid and comfortable that we no longer bite off more than we can chew. That's what this Nation is about.

The history of American education is one long, turbulent record of a nation that wasn't afraid to risk failure or trouble or confusion in pursuit of a goal that at first seemed wildly impractical: to give every American child a chance to develop to the limit of his ability. It is still one of the most radical ideas in human history, yet it grew out of the American soil as naturally as wheat or corn.

In short, difficult assignments are something we've never avoided. President Johnson said recently that the Great Society is going to have to be built brick by brick in the heat of the day and the noise of the marketplace. That will take visionaries who are not afraid of grinding work. It will take dedicated people who understand how complex and challenging the problems really are.

If you are that kind of person you can share in these great efforts. And when you are very old and people talk about the turning point in our society that began in the 1960's, you can say: "I not only remember it—I was part of it."

MISSISSIPPI PROFITS FROM WOODLAND CONSERVATION

Mr. **ABERNETHY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ABERNETHY**. Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues in this body and my fellow countrymen everywhere to know something of the wisdom and stewardship demonstrated by Mississippi farmers and other landowners in the conservation of soil, water, and woodland resources.

We have 74 soil conservation districts in Mississippi and they include all the farms in the State. Seventy-three of the districts have signed modernized agreements with the U.S. Department of Agriculture providing help in the development of soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and other resources in watershed protection and management.

The updating of agreements with the Department of Agriculture is significant, considering that 72,000 district cooperators are involved.

Significant, too, is the fact that 40 small watershed projects have been authorized for planning assistance and 25 of them have been approved for construction and operations.

I claim for Mississippi something extra in conservation work, an accomplishment a little beyond that which can be credited to every State. It is the achievement in Mississippi of woodland resource conservation and the resulting benefits.

Over the past 30 years the Soil Conservation Service and the soil conservation districts have contributed to the development of Mississippi's woodland resources by helping district cooperators prepare and carry out plans for the best use and treatment of their land.

The peak of this activity came in 1954–55 with the planting of 100 million seedlings annually. After a few years during which there was a letup, woodland conservation work was revived and is continuing.

The wisdom of those early years and plantings became apparent between 1962–64 when 47 new wood-using industries were established and 38 similar industries were expanded. Together they employ nearly 7,000 people.

In 1965 three large paper mills, three pine plywood and several other small industries located in Mississippi with a capital investment of over $250 million.

It is estimated by the Mississippi Forestry Commission that production, manufacturing, and sales of wood products contribute approximately $700 million to the State's economy each year, and wood-using industries are employing 40,000 workers.

This surge of industrial development and the accompanying stimulant to the economy is in large part due to the work of the district cooperators aided by the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Conservation and Stabilization Service.

Through the medium of woodland development and conservation Mississippi landowners have reduced land erosion and simultaneously tapped a new revenue source.

This to me is the essence of conservation and I proudly offer it as a conservation example from Mississippi by which many others in our sister States might profit.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY STEWART L. UDALL AT WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. **HALEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALEY**. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a portion of the speech made by the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, the Secretary of the Interior, at the western Governors' conference, Las Vegas, Nev., April 26, 1966, in which Secretary Udall discusses the American Indian situation.

He has called to the attention of the American poeple the sad plight of the American Indians on our Indian reservations, a matter which has been of great concern to me ever since I became a Member of the Congress.

I recommend that my colleagues in the House read the fine address of the Secretary and give us as much help as possible in the programs for the betterment of the American Indians:

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, LAS VEGAS, NEV., APRIL 26, 1966

I have chosen to discuss two subjects today—Indian development and the development of the natural resources of the West.

It would be an untoward event if any Secretary of the Interior appeared before an assembled group of Western Governors and did not discuss natural resources. It is, on the other hand, a rare occasion when any Secretary does discuss the future of our Indian people with a gathering of Governors. However, the time has come for all of us to face up to the failure of many of our Indian programs, and I propose that we confront them candidly here today.

What are the facts about America's Indians in the year 1966? It is not a pleasant picture: the great majority of Indians live in the 19 Western States; most reservation Indians in your States are unemployed or semiemployed; America's Indians have been accurately described as most impoverished minority in America; the housing of our Indian people is, without doubt, the least habitable of that enjoyed by any group in our country.

These facts are beyond dispute. To put it bluntly, the Indian programs and policies of the past have fallen far short of success. This is the brutal truth and the time has come to face up to its implications.

President Johnson's work for eradication of poverty sweeps over all reservations. No one thinks we can do it with one stroke but it is a target.

There has been much soul searching on the Indian issue in recent days. Two weeks ago I spent 3 days in Santa Fe with congressional leaders and top officials of the Indian Bureau discussing the Indian problem. In my judgment we are at a turning point in Indian policy—and the States have a very big stake in the decisions which must be made in the months ahead.

Some of you may say to yourselves "Yes, Indian policy has often failed—and it is all the Federal Government's fault." This, I submit, is a very easy generalization—as easy as the effort of some to pin all the blame on the Indian Bureau.

To be utterly honest about it, all of us have failed—and I fear we will not succeed until we reorient the whole effort and enlist the best efforts of all governments—and the best brains of private industry as well.

It is true that the Indian Bureau might have done a better job—but it has been working with outdated tools and outmoded institutions; it is true that the performance of the Interior Department as a whole has not been adequate; it is also true that the Federal Government has failed to marshal all of the resources available to it to aid our Indian people; and, finally, it may be likewise true that the Secretary of the Interior himself—the trustee and outmoded "white father"—has failed, up to now to provide the leadership needed to lead our Indian people out of poverty and into the mainstream of American life.

Having performed this mea culpa, let me quickly add my conviction that the States and local governments of the West have also failed to do their part to make a new day and a new hope possible for their Indian neighbors.

What are the facts in 1966 about the attitude of State and local governments toward the Indian citizens of their States?

I recognize that several States provide school and welfare service on the same basis as for their other citizens—and some of you may consider my criticism unfair. But to speak in general terms, it has been my experience that many States firmly resist assuming responsibilities for their Indian populations even when these responsibilities rightfully belong to State and local governments; such States consider their Indians Federal rather than State citizens and regard Indian advancement as a 98-percent Federal problem.

Few States have acted to encourage the development of Indian resources; few States have even recognized—much less done anything about—the special education needs of Indian youngsters (in spite of the fact that more than two-thirds of all the Indian children in the country are enrolled in public schools); few States have really encouraged Indians to participate fully in their political life; and many have been indifferent much of the time toward the general welfare of their Indian citizens.

I am not suggesting that all of the Federal Government's responsibilities toward Indians should now be shifted to the States. I am intimating that most of the Western States have done too little too late to aid the cause of Indian development.

Some States, worse, have missed what I believe is the main point—that the economy of every State will be strengthened as the Indians are helped to develop their human and natural resources to the maximum degree possible.

While there is much the Federal Government can and will do, I know very well bringing them into the mainstream of American life will depend more on the Indians themselves, the assistance and encouragement given by their neighbors and the State and local governments in eliminating discrimination and equipping them for modern American life.

In our Federal system almost every function or service provided by Government is a cooperative one involving every level of government to some degree. Whatever may be the trends in other areas, Federal responsibility will decrease and State increase as we succeed in moving the Indians into the mainstream.

Today in several States the most valuable tracts of land for city development are owned by Indians. In some States the most valuable undeveloped farm lands, the best stands of timber, and finest outdoor recreation sites (ski slopes, trout streams, lake fronts, and scenic vistas) are owned by Indian tribes. Development of these assets will be good for the Indians—and good for the States.

During the past year we have sought special legislation to permit the long-term leasing of several Indian reservations which lie at the edges of major western communities. Such legislation, if enacted, would permit urban industrial development to take place on these large virgin tracts. There can be no doubt about the economic contribution of such development to the general welfare of the communities involved. Yet representatives of State and local governments have objected to the proposed legislation and the development which would follow because the Indian land does not, at present, contribute ad valorem taxes to the State. Such an appraisal ignores the fact that Indian resources move into the State stream of commerce, that industrial development on Indian reservations means a bigger payroll for both Indians and non-Indians, and that Indians pay sales, gasoline, and excise taxes which are now the largest revenue sources of most States. Furthermore, such shortsightedness ignores the fact that so long as Indian reservation lands remain undeveloped, the Indians living on them will be dependent upon the Federal Government and their property will continue to enjoy tax exception.

I should like, however, to acknowledge that a few States have taken a militant interest in the development of Indian resources. Governor Sawyer, of our host State, has done much to encourage the development of Pyramid Lake, property of the Paiute Indians—two members of whose council are in this room—and one of America's most beautiful, unspoiled, undeveloped recreation areas, lying only 35 minutes from Reno. And certainly the State of Florida has given all possible assistance in developing the resources of the Seminole. There are other exceptions but in the main the States have either resisted the development of Indian property or shown only passive interest in resource development.

The quickest way to bring Indian reservations into a role which is fully contributory to the economic life of the surrounding area is to develop them.

Indian parents want and deserve the best possible education for their children. To provide that quality education the States must recognize and provide for the special needs of the Indian children or they will continue to drop out or be pushed out—in shocking numbers—before graduation. Here is an opportunity to assist the Indian people in a most meaningful manner.

The States today enjoy the greatest opportunity in history to recognize and to deal with these special educational needs. Public Law 89–10, providing aid for elementary and secondary education, is an act specifically designed for the special educational needs of disadvantaged youngsters in the American public school system. Some of the Western States are receiving large sums of money under this act to provide for Indian youngsters who come from homes where the family income is less than $2,000 per year. During the months ahead I shall be much interested in observing the extent to which the public schools develop educational programs specifically designed for their disadvantaged Indian children. I know that the members of the education staff of the BIA are eager to share with the public school districts the things which they have learned about the special educational needs of Indian youngsters and the means of satisfying those needs. I truly hope that Public Law 89–10 will provide the basis for a much closer relationship between the public and Federal schools which serve Indian youngsters.

In the area of economic development there are also Federal programs which point the way toward a greater assumption of responsibility, by States, for their Indian populations. The Economic Development Act established a means by which States can help Indians and others to develop their resources and to improve their economic lot. To the best of my knowledge not a single State thus far has submitted on its own initiative to the EDA a program primarily planned to assist an economically disadvantaged Indian population. Some reservations do qualify as depressed areas in their own right and from these reservations proposals have come but these were Indian originated—not originated by the States.

Somewhat the same situation prevails with respect to the community action programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Wherever Indian reservations are entitled by law to submit their own community action programs, they have done so. However, the small, unorganized Indian communities, both on and off reservation, have seldom been included by State and local governments in their plans for community action programs.

Through the Economic Opportunity Act, the Economic Development Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the States have been presented with golden opportunities to contribute to the educational and economic advancement of Indian populations, and I strongly urge you to respond to the opportunities and the challenges involved. I am here today to ask you to join with the Federal Government in reviewing the whole area of Indian need and the spectrum of possibilities which are at hand to alleviate Indian poverty and provide a happier and more dignified life for the first citizens of this land.

We are at work now in Washington on new foundation legislation designed to strike off the shackles which have restricted Indian development, to permit Indian tribes to use the tools and institutions of modern corporate management, to grant the Indians entry to the many markets of America—to take a whole series of steps that will enable Indians to move forward, to build viable communities and to enjoy the optimum development of their resources.

I believe that the latter half of the 1960's can be as dynamic a period of development in the field of Indian affairs as has the first half in the field of resource development.

We have worked together on all levels, and since 1960 many dramatic resource development decisions have been made—many bold new programs have been initiated that are transforming the West.

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF NEW CLAD COIN

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Government Operations has just recently released a report—House Report No. 1468, 89th Congress, 2d session—on the Nation's present coin situation. The report, entitled "The Coin Situation" is the third in a series which has resulted from studies by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

The thrust of the earlier reports was directed toward relieving the coin shortage which the country recently faced. The new report's objective is greater efficiency and economy in the coin and coinage operations of the Federal monetary agencies.

Last year the Congress reduced the quantity of silver in the half-dollar from 90 percent of its metallic content to 40 percent. New halves made of clad metals with copper cores were authorized. These greatly resemble the 90 percent silver halves.

The Congress also authorized the minting of dimes and quarters made of clad metals. The outer surfaces are chiefly nickel, bonded over copper cores. They contain no silver. The imprints they bear are the same as those of the 90 percent silver dimes and quarters. Their general appearance, however, is considerably different from our earlier coins. This difference has been sufficient for some to wonder whether the clad coins can do the job for which they were intended, and what the public reaction to them might be. In selecting the metals to be used in the new coins, one of the prime factors considered by the Congress was their ability to operate in vending machines and other coin operated devices. Millions of such machines offering all kinds of goods and services exist in today's world. The Congress was concerned that the new coin would work well in such machines.

A letter directed to the subcommittee, which I received too late to insert in the printed transcript of hearings which preceded the latest report, makes it clear that the new clad coins are doing the job they were intended to do in vending machines. Some 90 million coins are used daily in such machines, and the new clad coins are being used side by side with older coins and are serving the purpose for which they were created. The letter dated April 27, 1966, was received from the National Automatic Merchandising Association is as follows:

NATIONAL AUTOMATIC MERCHANDISING ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 27, 1966.

Mr. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, House Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: Now that the new clad coins have been in circulation for a number of months, I thought you might be interested in how they have worked out in the hands of the public.

Except for those who have a direct interest in the coinage—such as our own vending industry; the numismatists; those concerned with the metallic content of coins, and the coin speculators—the general public has shown little interest in the change. Because the clad quarter, for instance, has the same purchasing power as the silver quarter, the public has accepted it as "the coin of the realm." None of our members has reported any adverse reaction to the new coins.

One of the objectives of the Congress was to provide coins which would prevent confusion and inconvenience to the public. In adopting the clad coins, this objective was accomplished in a most practical manner. The members of our industry Coinage Technical Committee (who manufacture the coin mechanisms used in most coin-operated devices) report that the new clad coins have given them absolutely no trouble.

When the clad quarters were first put into circulation, there were a few newspaper reports that they "did not work in vending machines." Every story was investigated. In each case it was found that the coin mechanism either was not properly adjusted or was dirty. I might add that at our national headquarters we did not receive one letter of complaint on the clad coins from any member of our industry.

Because of production burrs, newly minted coins (whether silver or clad) have always given our industry some trouble. The burrs cause the coin to hang up in the mechanism, and the customer thinks they don't work. Fortunately the burrs wear off quickly and we have no further trouble.

As a result of the experience of our industry, I would say that the new clad coins definitely are serving the purpose for which they were created. I shudder to think of the utter confusion the public would be going through today if the nearly 90 million coins inserted every 24 hours in vending machines alone, would not work.

Sincerely yours,
THOS. B. HUNGERFORD,
Executive Director.

Mr. Speaker, not only are the new clad dimes and quarters working well in vending machines, but there are various indications that they have received public acceptance, despite their slightly different appearance. An Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Mint who testified before the subcommittee gave their opinions of public acceptance, and a recent newspaper item which has come to my attention confirms the accuracy of their views—at least to most North Carolinians.

The First Union National Bank of Marion, N.C., recently polled people across the State on various issues, including whether the new coins might cause a lessening of confidence in our monetary system. As reported by the McDowell News on April 7, 1966, reduction of the silver content of the coins does not seem to bother most North Carolinians.

The full story says:

NEW COINS AND VIETNAM SUPPORT ISSUES POLLED

Reduction of the silver content in U.S. coins doesn't seem to bother most North Carolinians, according to the latest First Union National Bank community opinion poll.

People across the State were asked if the new coins might cause a lessening of confidence in our monetary system and 63 percent said "No." Both men and women were fairly evenly divided, 64 percent of the men and 61 percent of the women voted "No."

Robin Hood, executive officer in charge of First Union in Marion, said teenagers were not as strong in their opinion as their elders. Fifty-six percent thought there was no effect on the monetary system compared to 70 percent of those over 40. Nonsilver quarters were put into circulation last November and nonsilver dimes and 40 percent silver quarters made their debut this week.

THE DETERIORATION OF CASTRO

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in early 1965, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am a member, held a series of hearings on communism in Latin America. The subcommittee's report, entitled "Communism in Latin America," dated April 14, 1965, noted that the economic situation in Cuba was sluggish and likely to worsen.

Since the subcommittee's report, the Nation's press has more and more focused its attention on Cuba and has frequently borne out and confirmed the findings of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. The Miami Herald, with its very capable staff, has been at the forefront in bringing to the Nation's attention the plight of Castro's Cuba.

The Herald is very fortunate to have Mr. Lee Winfrey here in its Washington bureau. Lee is without a doubt one of the most outstanding commentators on the Latin American scene in this country. His keen observations are highly regarded, and often referred to, by other correspondents and by Members of the Congress. In an article entitled "What Cuba Doesn't Ration Isn't There," in the April 28 Herald, Lee has poignantly portrayed the acute shortages which persist in Castro's Communist utopia. The article follows:

WHAT CUBA DOESN'T RATION ISN'T THERE

(By Lee Winfrey)

WASHINGTON.—Seven years after Fidel Castro took power, the ration book appears to be a practically permanent fixture in Communist Cuba.

Eggs, butter, milk, meat, rice and coffee are among the staples whose sale to the 7 million Cubans still is restricted.

In a speech last week, Castro attempted to run the ration book into a symbol of Cuban progress. Speaking on the fifth anniversary of the Bay of Pigs invasion, he said:

"We certainly do have a ration book, and we shall have it for some products for many years to come, but no one in this country can say that he does not have the money to buy what he has a right to buy with the ration book."

Officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, responding recently to questions from a Senate subcommittee, said Cubans currently arriving on the American airlift do not appear to be suffering from malnutrition.

To an American observer, however, the ration list is appallingly long, and the shortage of some items appears to be growing more severe.

Based on reports from inside Cuba, here is a rundown on the state of Cuban grocery shelve:

Eggs: Twelve per person per month in Havana. Unrationed in the provinces. Cuba achieved a sizable increase in egg production last year.

Butter: One-eighth pound per person per month. Unobtainable in Oriente province on the eastern end of the island (Cuba's distribution system is very poor, often leading to local shortages).

Meat: Three-quarters pound per person per week. Cuban cattle are currently thin and many are sick, especially with hoof and mouth disease.

Rice: Three pounds per person per month. The ration was cut in half in January after Cuba quarreled with Communist China, which reduced its rice sales to the island.

Milk: For a family of 5, including children, 1 liter (just over 1 quart) per day. The regime attempts to concentrate on milk distribution on preschool age children.

Coffee: Four ounces per person per week. No longer obtainable in street cafes, an urban fixture in Latin America.

Cheese: Two ounces per person per month, but seldom available.

Vegetables: Three pounds per person per week. This is a total for all vegetables. Onions are available.

Oil and lard: The ration allows 1 pound per person per month of each item. In fact, only one or the other is ever available, never both at the same time.

Fish: Unrationed, but difficult to obtain.

Salt: Unrationed, but only limited amounts available each month.

Canned goods: Unseen since late last year. Cuban groceries are selling fresh produce and meats, nothing in cans.

Baking powder: Unseen for some time.

If Cuban stomachs growl about all this, relief is hard to find. Bicarbonate of soda is not available, either.

Cuban shortages extend to more than food. The island is hard up for clothing as well.

Women's dresses and men's suits are currently unrationed. Men, however, are restricted to two pairs of dress trousers and two or three pairs of work pants per year.

Men's socks are rationed, limited to three dress pairs and three work pairs per year.

Shoes for both men and women are rationed, too, limited to one pair of dress shoes and one pair of sports shoes, mostly canvas, per year The dress shoes are made of poor leather and many are uncomfortable to wear.

Not only are clothes in short supply, but it's hard to fix them up if they get torn.

Cuba got most of its needles and thread from Communist China. Since the quarrel early this year, both have almost vanished from the shops. Zippers are even harder to get.

Considering the state of Cuban haberdashery, it's probably just as well that Cuban houses are dark at night.

One-hundred-watt light bulbs have been unavailable for 2 years. Even 40- to 60-watt bulbs are seldom in stock.

Carlos Martinez, also of the Latin America staff of the Miami Herald, on April 14, 1966, reported:

Cuba's ability to produce sugar has deteriorated to the point that even Russia is unwilling to rely on it, a defecting Cuban Government expert on international trade said here Wednesday.

Miguel Tarrab, 43, is the second major defector in 2 weeks to reveal Cuba's difficult economic position, particularly the failure of the crucial sugar production.

Tarrab calculated that Cuba this year has only enough exports to earn $110 million in hard currency for use in the world market. The figure, he said, includes some $60 million in sugar and molasses sales in the world market.

He compared the $110 million with the $700 million earned by Cuba from its exports in 1959.

"If Castro deliberately had attempted to wreck the economy, he could not have done it so rapidly and so well," said Tarrab at a press conference called by Unidad Revolucionaria, an anti-Castro group.

"What Castro has accomplished through these 7 years is to reduce Cuba's hard currency revenues to one-seventh of their former levels," he charged.

Tarrab was Cuba's permanent representative to the International Sugar Council, the International Wheat Council, and the International Coffee Organization from 1959 to 1966.

He also served during the same period as commercial counselor at the Cuban Embassy in London and head of the market research department at the Cuban commercial office in London.

He attended Comecon (the East European version of the Common Market) conferences on sugar in Moscow, Warsaw, and Prague.

"Fidel Castro not only faces an internal sugar disaster but also an external one which aggravates the crisis from the economic standpoint," he charged.

"Even the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet bloc countries distrust the stability of the regime and seek to avoid dependence upon Cuba as a supplier of sugar to the Communist world," he added.

Tarrab said Cuba tries to castigate Latin American countries that were awarded shares of the guaranteed sugar price quota which Cuba enjoyed from the United States.

He said this is done by dumping sugar on the world market to force prices down. With sugar a key crop in many Latin American countries, a drop in sugar prices is serious to their economic progress.

"Such a thing," said Tarrab, "makes those countries more vulnerable to Communist political agitation and subversion, thus serving another of Castro's purposes."

In London, a U.S. Embassy spokesman said Tarrab "walked into the Embassy about a month ago, made known his wishes (to defect) and several days later he was granted a visa. He left for the States by commercial airline."

Tarrab had these comments on other aspects of the Cuban economy:

Meat: He said while it is tightly rationed on the island, a plan has been prepared to export prime meat and keep the trimmings for Cuba's internal consumption.

Shoes: Also strictly rationed for Cubans; the Government has sent 500,000 pairs to Great Britain to be sold there for foreign exchange.

WORKING MOTHERS

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill on behalf of a deserving group whose very real needs the Congress has given too little attention—namely, the working mothers of this country.

We have in this country some 9.5 million working mothers with children under 18 years of age. They represent 40 percent of all our women workers, whose contributions are so important to the functioning of our economy, including the defense sector.

Approximately 3 million working mothers have children under 6 years of age, who must be cared for during the day either in a paid nursery school, or by full-time domestic help. While some work simply because they prefer to, many do so through necessity. Either their husbands' earnings are low and must be supplemented, or they are among the 2 million working mothers who are widowed, divorced, separated, or abandoned and depend largely on their own earnings to support themselves and their children.

These days, it costs an average of $20 a week, or more than $1,000 a year, to obtain day care for a child through private facilities—public ones are very scarce.

In the face of these realities, the Internal Revenue Act of 1954, under which working mothers pay taxes today, makes an antiquated and inadequate provision for them to deduct expenses of child care. At the urging of the Office and Professional Employees International Union—AFL–CIO—Congress originally wrote into the Internal Revenue Code a provision allowing a working mother a deduction of up to $600 for expenses for the care of one child, and up to $900 total, regardless of whether she has two, four, or six children.

These figures are no longer realistic, for as I have indicated, it costs $1,000 a year for day care of just one child. To provide badly needed relief to working mothers, Howard Coughlin, president of the Office and Professional Employees International Union and as such the spokesman for thousands of working mothers not only in my district but all over the country, has called upon the Congress to amend our tax laws.

I am, therefore, pleased to introduce a bill that removes the present limitations on tax deductions for child care expenses, and allows the working mother to deduct the amount actually spent.

In dealing with the many claims on our attention, let us not overlook the plight of the working mother. We are making provisions in the Great Society program, and rightly so, for the needs of the aging, for the deprived, and the disenfranchised. How can we afford to overlook the needs of millions of working mothers, and of their millions of children?

We allow 27½ percent depletion allowance to conserve our national resources in oil. Can anyone doubt that mothers and children are a national resource deserving at least equal consideration? It is only simple justice that we pass this measure at the earliest possible moment.

THREE DECADES OF RESOURCE IMPROVEMENT

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the impressive soil and water conservation movement in South Dakota, now nearing its 30-year mark, has brought about tremendous achievements in better protection and use of our soil and water resources.

Its work is visibly reflected in more beautiful countryside; in better quality farm crops; in improved economic opportunities throughout the State; and in many other ways.

The Clay County Soil and Water Conservation District, one of the first districts organized in the State, recently celebrated its 25th year of operation. In a special edition of the Vermillion Plain Talk honoring the district on its anniversary, Gov. Nils Boe made these comments about the conservation districts:

> Since the organization of the first district in October of 1937, local landowners have organized 69 districts with over 96 percent of the land and water area of the State within their boundaries. Over 38,000 farmers have signed cooperative agreements with their district. In doing so, they have established to some degree soil and water conservation measures on over 20 million acres of range and farmland. Through the years soil and water conservation programs have been tailored to meet the needs of the individual farms and ranches.
>
> In this area of increasing reliance on centralized government, soil and water conservation districts offer our State the opportunity to strengthen the American concept of self-government. They give free and independent people the opportunity to plan and develop conservation and the use of our two basic natural resources—soil and water.
>
> Those who have worked with and cooperated in the conservation and development of South Dakota's soil and water resources are to be commended. The future growth and success of the program will, as it has in the past, depend upon the leadership and cooperation of the local people within each soil and water conservation district.

I would add my earnest praise to that of Governor Boe for our local resource leaders and their achievements. That these leaders are actively seeking to keep the program moving in the face of changing needs of the present and future is exemplified by their revision of long-range programs in 49 of the districts. The new programs reflect a broadening concept for resource planning and development and set forth a program of action to accomplish their objectives.

After updating their program, the districts entered into new working agreements with the Department of Agriculture. The Soil Conservation Service of this Department has provided vital technical assistance in district activities since the beginnings of the movement. The Congress has seen that SCS and other Federal assistance to districts is strong. It has provided new tools as needed to help spur the conservation movement—the small watershed program, the Great Plains conservation program, and more recently the resource conservation and development projects.

With the increasing urgency for wise land and water use, and with the dedicated interest and eagerness on the part of local resource leaders, it is in the public interest for Congress to continue to strengthen Federal assistance to local conservation efforts.

I salute the conservation districts and their cooperators, and look confidently to the future of our resources in their capable hands.

AZTEC EAGLE FOR SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, this evening I am going to attend, I am sure, with many more of his friends, a reception at the Embassy of Mexico, where our esteemed colleague, the very able majority leader of the Senate of the United States, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, will receive from His Excellency Hugo Margain, the Ambassador from Mexico to the United States, the highest decoration that Mexico will bestow on a noncitizen, the Order of the Aztec Eagle. I want to congratulate President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, the Government and the people of Mexico for the selection of this great American as the recipient of this decoration, for I know Mexico and I know Senator MANSFIELD. I know what Mexico looks for in a man, in a friend. They seek understanding, humility, patience, loyalty, courage above and beyond the meaning of the word itself, desire to do good and repel evil, respect for the past, but tied to aspirations of a better life for mankind in the future. This, Mr. Speaker, is what the heroes of Mexico have exemplified, Juárez, Morelos, Zapata, Madero to name a few. These same attributes I find in Senator MIKE MANSFIELD in my humble observations of his life and his career, both private and public. So that is why I say to President Diaz Ordaz and the people of Mexico, you have chosen well, and I congratulate you for it, and I am happy and proud that you have selected one of our most esteemed and beloved Members of the Congress of the United States.

To Senator MANSFIELD our warm and very proud felicitations for an honor well deserved. I remember on our recent trip to Mexico with President and Mrs. Johnson, at the luncheon given by President Diaz Ordaz he singled out Senator MANSFIELD as a true friend of Mexico; this I concur with and applaud. So I am sure all my colleagues from the House join me in our best wishes to Senator MANSFIELD and our congratulations on this 4th of May 1966 when his name will be added to the other distinguished holders of the Order of the Aztec Eagle. We are grateful to Mexico and proud of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.

A PETITION FROM CITIZENS AND STUDENTS OF MAPLEWOOD GRADE SCHOOL, OREGON

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, some students in my congressional district have requested that I present the following petition to the House. Because they arrived at their decision after long and thorough study, and because the reasons they present are cogent and merit consideration, I include the petition in the RECORD as this point:

Hon. EDITH L. GREEN,
Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the State of Oregon, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.:

We, the undersigned citizens and students of Maplewood Grade School, city of Portland, county of Multnomah, State of Oregon, respectfully request that the following proposed bill be presented to the U.S. House of Representatives for adoption:

"Whereas by act of Congress of 1931, the Congress of the United States adopted, 'The Star-Spangled Banner' as the national anthem of the United States of America; and

"Whereas 'The Star-Spangled Banner' relates in time and place not only to patriotism but to a war spirit of a particular war, to wit: The War of 1812, which may be unduly disagreeable to our long-time ally, Great Britain, and too limited in its naming, as well as too difficult to sing: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved, That by this act of Congress, the national anthem shall henceforth be, and hereby is 'America the Beautiful'."

SIGNERS

Melinda Hawkins, Teresa Gill, Becky Hutchens, Philip Watness, Dennis Rand, Margie Henderson, Tim Peterson, Diane Scinto, Jeff Peyton, Donald E. Walters, Jr., Marilyn K. Burns, Patrick Keef, Doug Hawkins, Lori Hedgecock, Kathy Houck.

Jeff Oaley, Beth Huhn, Dan Howe, Vinnie Lehrer, Ricky Geiger, Lisa Horton, Bere Lindley, Debbie Weber, Erick Gross, Patricia Bither, Debra Phillips, Peggy Eastwood, Lisa Miller.

A WORD TO THE WISE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, much is being heard these days about the rising cost of living and the dangers of inflation which presently harass this Nation's economy. Not only is the United States confronted with this issue, but the British Government must face up to the problem as well.

Two columns by Dr. Melchior Palyi in the Chicago Tribune detail the ramifications of this common danger in the United States and Great Britain, along with hard-nosed, time-tested recommendations as well.

Dr. Palyi knows whereof he speaks as an author and adviser on economic matters and as a consulting economist to a number of well-known financial institutions.

As one well qualified in this field, Dr. Palyi's views certainly warrant careful consideration and widespread dissemination, and for this reason I insert these two recent columns from the Chicago Tribune of April 5 and April 12 in the Record at this point.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 5, 1966]

U.S. PRICE CONTROLS EXIST IN FACT, IF NOT BY NAME

(By Dr. Melchior Palyi)

Pity the President. His vast energies are devoted to the noble goal: To turn America into the Great Society—in which taxes always go down, never up. Now, he is up against it. Pretty soon, he may have to raise taxes; otherwise, the American housewives, aroused by rising living costs, may vote Republican, an awful thing to contemplate.

Of course, there are alternatives among which the President may choose. Instead of raising the Federal tax bite, he could reduce Federal expenditures. Fourteen billion dollars, or more, could be saved in fiscal 1967 by doing the unthinkable—giving up Vietnam. Even more could be saved by postponing the new welfare spending projects this Congress has allowed. The economy could be cooled down somewhat by a Presidential crusade against wage boosts. Promoting Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board to chief executioner of the illusory prosperity, under orders to terminate the monetization of the national debt, would be the most effective way to take the bull by the horns. All of which sounds like advising a would-be suicide to jump in the lake rather than in the river.

PRICES RISE, INDEED

Prices are heading upward, indeed. In the 5 months to the end of last February, wholesale prices were rising at an annual rate of 3.6 percent; in a single month, in February, the cost-of-living index registered a nationwide rise of 0.5 percent. At that, national averages conceal local differences. It is scant consolation for the New York City housewife if consumers in Iowa suffered a much smaller loss of purchasing power than the 0.8 percent punishment they had to take themselves. And few Americans will feel relieved by learning that the whole world is in the throes of the same relentlessly progressing inflation.

In this country, as elsewhere, inflation's progress is measured by index numbers of price averages. As to our official price indexes, the [Republican] minority views, printed in the March 17–18, 1966, report of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, takes them to task. Systematically, these statistical concoctions understate the ravages of the inflationary process. This is true, especially, of the cost of living index of the Federal Bureau of Labor statistics. For example, it allows for quality improvements in durable goods, but omits consideration of quality deteriorations [in services, especially]. Then, too, in the last 9 months, the reduction of Federal excises made the acceleration of prices appear less drastic than it actually was.

TECHNIQUE TO CONCEAL

The much-advertised wage-price guideposts provide another technique by which to conceal the inflation. Camouflaged as standards by which wages and prices are to be adjusted to productivity changes, they amount in reality to price controls. Steel, aluminum, copper, the cigaret industry, and many others have been persuaded by White House pressure to refrain from putting prices on a level consonant with the supply-demand situation in the respective markets. In a large majority of cases, the public never hears about the arm-twisting practices that are applied in the disguise of guideposts in order to force corporations to hold the price line. The inflation is swept under the rug; but the distortions of the price structure and the attending tensions stay with us. They will not fail to take effect, sooner or later.

In all but name we have arrived at price controls—coercion of a "selective" sort, meaning arbitrariness and discrimination. Congress ignores them; and the victimized industries have no recourse to the courts. These controls have no rationale of any sort. Even a cursory consideration of cost developments is neglected. They are substitutes for all around, statutory price-fixing—toward which the Johnsonian system is moving. All around price-fixing is an undiluted bureaucratism, but may turn out to be preferable to the backstairs, secretive arbitrariness of the White House apparatus.

In the meantime, the President can be relied on to find temporizing devices and to shift the responsibility on others. Big corporations are, of course, heaven-sent for both purposes.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 12, 1966]

BRITAIN LABORS UNDER LABOR GOVERNMENT

(By. Dr. Melchior Palyi)

In the critical June–September period of 1965, the Bank of England lost well over $1.3 billion of gold, prime minister Harold Wilson announced recently. Thus he corrected the original announcement of a bare $300 million gold loss. That still was not the whole truth.

In the last quarter of 1965, after the run on the pound sterling quieted down and the bearish speculation was liquidated to a large extent, Britain regained almost $1.2 billion. Yet, less than $300 million showed up in the gold reserve. Practically all of the rest had to be used to repay the "swap" by which the Federal Reserve Bank of New York had saved the pound in its acute crisis, the sharpest since 1931.

That still is not the whole sad story. The $175 million installment due on the American-Canadian postwar loan was "postponed." And during that latest panic, the British authorities sold in New York a billion [exactly $998.4 million] in American securities which it had taken away from its citizens in the early days of World War II.

Note the sophisticated technique of confiscation without compensation: The British savers were not robbed of their capital but "only" of their 300 to 400 percent capital gain.

The financial result of all foreign exchange manipulation and central bank cooperation is that the pound sterling is just about back where it was—after the crisis at the end of 1964. The $2½ billion debt to the International Monetary Fund still is there, repayable before 1970, to say nothing of the "sterling-debt," amounting to $11-odd billion; all of which is loaded on a gold reserve of $3.2 billion at the end of January. (It declined in February by $76 millions.)

PAYMENTS NOT BALANCED

The country's balance of payments still is in imbalance, and so is its budget: by $0.9 billion and $2.6 billion respectively, in 1965, Labor's first full year of reign. But the domestic boom continues, with the money supply rising relentlessly. Living costs are mounting at an annual 5-percent rate (as in the Swedish welfare state where a nationwide general strike is threatening). British Labor is as unruly as it ever was, resisting all mild pressures exerted by its own party to moderate the pay demands and widespread featherbedding practices.

Britain has lost $1 billion of dollar-producing assets; they have been "consumed," used up to pay for excessive imports. And the doubts about sterling's future did not vanish, either at home or abroad. Witness the fragility of spot sterling on the foreign exchange markets; or the fact that time and again the Bank of England has had to support the forward rate, indicating large commitments by people who seek cover against a possible sterling devaluation. Witness, also, the high premium on "investment dollars" that can be used by British residents to acquire foreign [American] securities.

Does the victorious Mr. Wilson expect us to keep bailing out the pound sterling? Nothing can save it short of sharply restrictive money and credit policies—so restrictive as to put out of business the hothouse firms that prosper on inflation and to throw loafing workers on the street.

That means domestic trouble; but the alternative is the devaluation of the pound, accelerated inflation and—a still greater crisis. Whatever Mr. Wilson's intentions are, he will have to contend with the formidable left wing of his own party.

INDULGING RECKLESSLY

So far, the Labor government has been indulging, recklessly in inflationary policies and in business-baiting—on the assumption that we and the continental central banks will have to fill the holes in their foreign payments.

Otherwise, their currency would go down the drain and all other currencies would follow. This is a false assumption; the dollar and the rest could withstand the backwash of a sterling devaluation. In fact, we cannot afford to keep rescuing Britain. Our own payments deficit is rising again. Prime Minister Wilson will have to resort to drastic measure—or else.

AMERICA'S FARMERS NOT FOOLED BY ADMINISTRATION'S DUPLICITY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture, the Defense Department, and other administration spokesmen have been carrying on a ridiculous comedy of errors in dealing with our Nation's farmers. In a steady stream of actions and an unsteady barrage of statements, this administration is exercising almost total control over the agricultural markets. They have dumped thousands of bushels of grain on depressed markets, allowed for the heavy importation of dairy products in competition with domestic supplies, limited income producing cattle hide exports, and cut military purchases of milk and pork products.

If the administration thinks that they are fooling the farmers with this duplicity, they are sadly mistaken. One of the reasons that the farmers in my area are not fooled by the conflicting statements and justifications spewed out by the administration is the excellent reporting of the facts by Nick Kotz through the Minneapolis Tribune. With permission I will include the latest of these articles and pertinent correspondence at this time.

Washington.—Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, Tuesday urged the Defense Department to increase pork purchases—although a Defense official said that Freeman's subordinates only last week advised continuation of a sharp cutback in pork procurement for military feeding.

Agriculture and Defense Department officials were unable to explain the conflict.

The Defense Department in February ordered a 50-percent cut in its pork purchases for 6 months as an anti-inflationary move against high consumer pork prices. The Agriculture Department recommended that action as part of a White House-supervised anti-inflation campaign.

Tuesday, Freeman asked Secretary of Defense McNamara to restore the cuts in military purchases immediately.

Freeman's letter to McNamara was made public by the Agriculture Department and considerable effort was given to bringing it to the attention of the press.

Agriculture Department officials acknowledged that Freeman's handling of the letter was designed to combat farmer unhappiness with the pork purchase cut and other anti-inflationary moves to lower farm prices.

Seldom does one Department head publicly ask another one to reverse a policy that they had both mutually agreed upon, especially when the drive for the original policy came from the White House.

The Associated Press reported that Freeman had been urged to take the offensive as "the farmer's friend" by Vice President Humphrey and others at a Saturday political strategy meeting concerning present farmer unhappiness.

An Agricultural Department spokesman acknowledged that Freeman and Humphrey met Saturday, but said he didn't know the subject of their conversation.

Freeman's May 3 letter to McNamara does not jibe with an April 29 letter which Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance sent to Senator Jack Miller and several farm organization officials.

Miller and the farm officials had asked that the February order cutting pork purchases be rescinded immediately. Vance replied that the Defense Department would reconsider the situation in September, but made it clear that the 6-month cut in purchases would be completed.

Paul H. Riley, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Material Requirements, said Tuesday in an interview that Vance's letter was based on Agriculture Department recommendations.

Riley, who is the operating official who has handled the pork matter, said that Vance's letter was based upon recommendations from Under Secretary of Agriculture John Schnittker and his staff.

Schnittker acknowledged Tuesday in an interview that the Freeman-to-McNamara and Vance-to-Miller letters are not in agreement.

He explained that Freeman's letter would anticipate restoring pork purchases in late July or early August while the Defense Department letter indicated such action would not be considered until September.

Schnittker said he did not know of anyone on his staff advising the Defense Department on the April 29 letter to continue the pork purchase cutbacks.

Freeman's letter to McNamara and Vance's letter to Miller do not differ greatly in their analysis of market conditions.

Vance wrote: "Pig crop reports of the Department of Agriculture indicate that farmers are increasing pork production, but the increase is not expected to reach the market until late summer or early fall. While there has been a recent small decline in prices, production will be seasonally low in the immediate months ahead and prices are expected to remain high."

Freeman wrote: "Hog prices are now about 20 percent lower than in January, and pork prices are also down. Prices may increase seasonally during the next 2 to 3 months, but we expect that prices later this year will be below current levels."

Noting the differences between Freeman's letter of May 3 and Vance's letter to him of April 29, Senator Miller commented: "It looks as though the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. Anyhow there has been a lot of unnecessary damage done to farm prices."

The Defense and Agriculture Departments have tended to shift responsibility for the pork cut order since it became public April 6—7 weeks after it was issued.

Defense Department officials stated they were merely following the recommendations of the Agriculture Department.

Agriculture Department officials said it was a joint decision.

In fact, officials of both Departments acknowledge privately that the decision was made at the White House level as heads of all departments worked with the Council of Economic Advisers to find anti-inflationary actions.

Freeman recommended the specific actions take in January.

"DEAR BOB" LETTER TO M'NAMARA

Freeman said at a press conference that he didn't have anything personally to do with the decision.

On this point, Agriculture Department sources say that the "Dear Bob" letter recommending the cuts was written by Schnittker rather than by Freeman. Schnittker did the work even though Freeman's name appeared on the letter, said these sources as an explanation of Freeman's role.

Department of Agriculture,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, May 3, 1966.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: We have again reviewed the price prospects for certain foods during the remainder of 1966, with the following conclusions:

Hog prices are now about 20 percent lower than in January, and pork prices are also down. Prices may increase seasonally during the next 2 to 3 months, but we expect that prices later this year will be below current levels.

I recommend that you give immediate consideration to increased purchases of pork products for use in military troop feeding in the United States, where the earlier reduction applied. This should include ham and bacon, which were reduced because of abnormally high prices.

The current outlook is for large supplies of fruits and vegetables. We will reexamine the price outlook in detail as soon as there are fairly definite indications as to the size of the pack, and will make recommendations at that time.

Sincerely,

Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1966.

Hon. Jack Miller,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Miller: This is in reply to the April 12, 1966, memorandum signed jointly by you and five members of the pork industry concerning rescission of our February 17, 1966, directive on pork procurement.

We have examined the material you sent us and have further investigated the matter. Pig crop reports of the Department of Agriculture indicate that farmers are increasing pork production, but the increase is not expected to reach the market until late summer or early fall. While there has been a recent small decline in prices, production will be seasonally low in the immediate months ahead and prices are expected to remain high.

As our directive points out, we plan to reexamine the pork supply and price situation in September when pork supplies are expected to increase. At that time, every possible consideration will be given to rescinding that part of our February 17, 1966, directive regarding reduction in the number of pork servings and substitution of lower priced meat items in military troop feeding menus.

Copies of this letter have been sent to Messrs. William Rothenberg, James Nance, Paul McNutt, J. Merrill Anderson, and Ray Holz, the other signers of the April 12, 1966, memorandum.

Sincerely,

Cyrus Vance.

HORTON BILL PROTECTS SURPLUS DONATIONS TO SCHOOLS, HOSPITALS; ALLOWS REDUCED-PRICE PURCHASES BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTING GROUPS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is not widely known that one of the greatest sources of Federal aid for education is the surplus property donation program of the Federal Government.

In addition, because of the similarity of the personal property essential to the functioning of all governmental bodies, much of the surplus property of Federal agencies is useful to local and State governments.

The value of property donated for educational purposes by the Federal Government is estimated to be more than $5 billion. Our local school districts have received typewriters and adding machines for business courses; they have received lathes and drill presses to aid in the training for skilled trades; they have received dishwashers and refrigerators for their cafeterias.

I know that in my own 36th Congressional District of New York institutions have greatly benefited from this donation of surplus Government property. The Very Reverend Charles J. Lavery, president of St. John Fisher College in my district, recently said that the donation program "is one of the better ways in which the Government can aid education and thereby avoid increased bureaucratic costs."

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. One purpose of this amendment is to guarantee the continued level of donation to educational, health, and civil defense institutions.

The need for this clarifying legislation was brought to light last summer by the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations. This subcommittee discovered that the General Services Administration, which is responsible for the donation program, is selling a large amount of excess property that could be used by schools and colleges.

Mr. Robert H. Arnold, president of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, said in these hearings that:

> There are facets of the total donation program which, by their existence, deny schools, hospitals, and civil defense units of many dollars worth of surplus property which is and always will be vitally required in their programs.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for the concern expressed by Mr. Arnold and many school and college administrators is that the General Services Administration is using its authority under section 201(c) of the act to sell excess property to the detriment of the donation program. The donation program was authorized by section 203(j) of the act.

The purpose of my bill is to set forth in unmistakable language the priorities to be followed by the General Services Administration.

My amendment states that in disposing of surplus property GSA must, first, offer the property for utilization by Federal agencies under section 202(a) of the act; second, offer the property for donation under section 203(j) of the act; and third, offer the property for exchange or sale under the authority of section 201(c) of the act.

This order of priority will continue to serve to maximize the use of property by the Federal Government for its own necessary purposes. But in particular it will also protect the donation program which is so vital to our schools, colleges, and hospitals. Educators throughout the Nation will join Dennis Stiles, business manager-treasurer of Roberts Wesleyan College in New York, who wrote me that his institution "has long been an appreciative donee of this program and knows something of its value."

I am confident that the Congress also recognizes the value of the surplus property donation program and will give approval to this amendment to make clear the congressional intent of using the donation program to the maximum benefit of schools, colleges, and hospitals.

The second purpose of my bill is to enable State and local governments, volunteer firefighting and rescue groups, and certain other groups to purchase Federal surplus personal property at reduced prices. Existing law provides that State and local governments may purchase such property at full fair market value prior to the offering of the property for public sale. In reality, this is far from a bargain, since most surplus items are eventually sold to surplus dealers at rates well below full fair market value. Much machinery, clothing, hardware, vehicles, and countless other items that would be useful to State and local governments and other nonprofit groups covered by my bill, are sold to dealers at prices averaging only 6 cents on the dollar of original acquisition cost.

My bill will enable these groups to purchase surplus personal property at 50 percent of full fair market value. This measure, in many cases, will mean the availability of essential equipment to States and municipalities at affordable prices, while at the same time yielding a higher rate of return on surplus items to the Federal Government than it usually receives.

By establishing priority status for the donation program to educational institutions, and by enabling governments and public service groups to purchase surplus material at 50 percent of fair market value, I believe, and I am confident that my colleagues will agree, that we are providing for the optimum beneficial use of this material. By enacting this bill, we are not only promoting education, we are saving local and State tax dollars which would otherwise be spent for similar material at higher prices, and we are achieving both of these benefits at little or no cost to the Federal Government.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF GEN. MILAN STEFANIK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House this afternoon to the fact that today is the 47th anniversary of the death of Gen. Milan Stefanik. General Stefanik, one of the founders of the Czechoslovak Republic, was killed on May 4, 1919, while returning by plane to Czechoslovakia from a conference in Italy. His country suffered a great loss with his untimely and tragic death.

Born in Slovakia, General Stefanik was educated and received his doctorate in philosophy at the Charles University in Prague. In 1902 he went to France where he distinguished himself as an astronomer and did important research in Europe, Africa, and elsewhere. When Europe was plunged into the First World War, General Stefanik, who had become a naturalized French citizen, joined the French Air Force and attained the rank of major general.

With Thomas Masaryk and Edouard Benes, Stefanik formed the Czechoslovakian National Council, which preceded the formation of the independent State of Czechoslovakia.

I therefore join the many Czechoslovak-Americans who pay homage to the memory of this distinguished man who was such a distinguished leader and gallant fighter for democracy and freedom.

FICTIONS ABOUT REDS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg delivered an address to the annual Polish Constitution Day celebration in Chicago.

As I expected, he delivered a message filled with standard cliches of the administration with emphasis on building bridges to the Communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe. Building bridges is the State Department phraseology for coexistence with and appeasement of the Communist dictatorships.

Ambassador Goldberg was not the creator of our foreign policy, but he should have a major voice at least in its application at the United Nations. The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial on Tuesday, May 3, which, incidentally, is the 175th anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, had a very penetrating editorial on Mr. Goldberg's address. Under previous leave I insert the editorial in the Record at this point as part of my remarks:

Fictions About Reds

Chicagoans of Polish extraction Sunday heard some nonsense from Arthur Goldberg, American Ambassador to the United Nations. The occasion was a celebration here of the 175th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791—an instrument which has no standing under the present Communist regime. The anniversary, however, is celebrated as a national feast day.

Mr. Goldberg took the State Department line that certain Soviet satellites, notably Poland and Yugoslavia, have undergone a liberalization of Communist policy which enables them to assert their national independence. His Polish-American auditors have good reason to know this is a fiction.

Nevertheless, Goldberg preached that the Johnson administration's doctrine of building bridges to Moscow's subject satrapies is paying off. He said these associations threw light into the dark places of Communist ideology by allowing freer exchange and debate.

Polish-Americans know how little liberalization there has been under the Communists when Pope Paul has been constrained to abandon his plans for a visit to Poland this month, and Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski was informed by the Communist government that he would not be permitted to visit Chicago in August. He had hoped to join here in a commemoration of 1,000 years of Christianity in Poland.

The Central Europe Journal for April had some comments on the ideas now in fashion with the State Department that liberalization and desatellization were occurring in countries under Communist oppression. A Czech active in cultural affairs said on a visit to West Germany that it is a myth that any intellectual liberty or freedom of expression are allowed in these countries.

Remarking that the current literary cult of "absurdism" in the West sends writers looking for absurd plots, he said that authors in the bolshevik bloc do not have to think up absurd topics because "our conditions are absurd." Any liberalization is within limits drawn by the party at its own convenience. Western optimism, he added, was misplaced because Westerners have no idea of communism in operation. All the sentimental talk about growing liberalization merely strengthens the Iron Curtain regimes and confuses their antagonists.

The same result emerges from chatter to the effect that West-East trade will encourage desatellization by providing bloc nations encouragement to break away from the Communist stranglehold. The people behind the Iron Curtain know that every form of help enables the Communists to solidify their system and strengthen war industry.

A Columbia University student of communism, Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, has dealt with the report of an American trade mission to Eastern Europe, which published a finding in a Department of Commerce organ acclaiming industrial achievement in Poland and Romania. Such results, he said, were achieved through "intense political terror, forced savings extracted from the people, especially from the peasants, and extensive Soviet exploitation."

All Communist regimes are concerned, first and last, with their own security and self-perpetuation. If Ambassador Goldberg does not know that, he has no credentials to pose as an oracle on foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Mr. Goldberg's address and similar cliches being uttered by Secretary Rusk, Ambassador Gronouski, and other administration mouthpieces are an insult to the intelligence of all Americans and especially are an insult to the Polish-American citizens when they suggest that this great land of freedom take the lead in appeasing and subsidizing the Communist governments of Eastern Europe which is indeed a tragic policy.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

TEST BAN TREATY SAFEGUARDS ATROPHY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, almost 3 years ago a treaty was signed by three nuclear powers—the United States, the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom—and numerous nonnuclear countries limiting the conduct of nuclear weapons tests. France, a nuclear power, did not sign and will conduct atmospheric tests in the south Pacific this summer. Red China, another nonsigner, since has become a nuclear power, conducted two atmospheric tests, and is expected to conduct a third and much larger test before the month is out.

Permitted by the treaty are only underground nuclear explosions that do not cause radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted.

FOUR TREATY SAFEGUARDS PROMISED

In order to get such a treaty supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and ratified by the Senate, President Kennedy promised to institute the four safeguards recommended by the Joint Chiefs. These safeguards read as follows:

(a) The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive and continuing underground nuclear test programs designed to add to our knowledge and improve our weapons in all areas of significance to our military posture in the future.

(b) The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology which will attract, retain and insure the continued application of our human scientific resources to these programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.

(c) The maintenance of the facilities and resources necessary to institute promptly nuclear tests in the atmosphere should they be deemed essential to our national security or should the treaty or any of its terms be abrogated by the Soviet Union or others.

(d) The improvement of our capability, within feasible and practical limits, to monitor the terms of the treaty, to detect violations and to maintain our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities and achievements.

These safeguards were reaffirmed in April 1964, by President Johnson.

HAVE THE PROMISES BEEN KEPT?

It is time to take a look and see how well these safeguards promises are being kept.

The initial request for funds to implement them came during the first half of fiscal year 1954. During that year AEC expended $498.3 million for safeguards and the DOD, which was a little slower in getting started, spent $243.2 million.

Now no one should think these safeguards started from scratch. In fiscal year 1962 and fiscal year 1963 the AEC and DOD were conducting both underground and atmospheric nuclear weapons tests. They were maintaining weapons laboratories and facilities. They had an ongoing program for monitoring Sino-Soviet weapons tests and nuclear capabilities. The AEC, for example, in fiscal year 1962 spent $423.7 million for programs that could equate with the safeguards and with atmospheric testing. By fiscal year 1963 the AEC's expenditures had come down to $398.8 million.

The major reason for this reduction is that funding for the Pacific test series, which was instituted in April 1962, after the Soviets commenced atmospheric testing on September 1, 1961, took place primarily in fiscal year 1962.

For the same purposes DOD in fiscal year 1962 spent $158.4 million and in fiscal year 1963, $210.5 million. The total AEC and DOD effort for these 2 years was $582.2 million and $609.3 million, respectively. The comparable dollar totals thereafter are the following: fiscal year 1964, $741.5 million; fiscal year 1965, $745.8 million; fiscal year 1966, $720 million; and proposed for fiscal year 1967, $680.9 million.

The real tests for the efforts made to support the safeguards cannot be made simply by comparing these dollar totals, however, but must come from a more detailed examination of the funding of these programs, particularly in fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1966 and what is planned for fiscal year 1967. These are the years following the initial startup of the treaty safeguards as such, and therefore reveal their trends and characteristics.

These dollar figures are found in the accompanying table containing many details just declassified and here made public for the first time.

Tes ban treaty safeguard costs, AEC and DOD (by fiscal years)

[In millions of dollars. Tenths rounded.]

Safeguard	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1964-67 cumulative
Conduct of underground testing:							
Atomic Energy Commission	159.1	131.5	153.5	175.7	185.1	168.4	682.7
Department of Defense	1.4	13.5	10.6	16.7	28.5	28.5	84.3
Both	160.5	145.0	164.1	192.4	213.6	196.9	767.0
Maintenance of laboratory facilities:							
Atomic Energy Commission	207.0	243.4	263.5	254.0	257.1	245.5	1,020.1
Department of Defense	60.0	52.0	48.9	52.6	53.0	53.0	207.5
Both	267.0	295.4	312.4	306.6	310.1	298.5	1,227.6
Acquisition and maintenance of an atmospheric test capability: [1]							
Atomic Energy Commission	53.2	18.3	75.2	61.8	29.2	22.9	189.1
Department of Defense	42.0	69.0	87.0	69.4	47.2	35.2	238.8
Both	95.2	87.3	162.2	131.2	76.4	58.1	427.9
Monitoring Sino-Soviet actions:							
Atomic Energy Commission	4.5	5.6	6.1	3.7	5.4	5.2	20.4
Department of Defense	55.0	76.0	96.7	111.9	114.5	122.2	445.3
Both	59.5	81.6	102.8	115.6	119.9	127.4	465.7
Total:							
Atomic Energy Commission	423.8	398.8	498.3	495.2	476.8	442.0	1,912.3
Department of Defense	158.4	210.5	243.2	250.6	243.2	238.9	975.9
Both	582.2	609.3	741.5	745.8	720.0	680.9	2,888.2

[1] Includes the exercise of this capability during the fiscal year 1962-63 atmospheric tests.

One most startling and chilling fact disclosed by the table becomes apparent by comparing the average spending for fiscal year 1962 and fiscal year 1963—the 2 years before the treaty—with what the administration proposes for fiscal year 1967—the fourth year after it. To do so one must apply the generally accepted formula of a 5-percent decrease annually in what Government dollars will buy—due to rising costs and general inflation—to the dollar figures of the table. This kind of comparison shows that the actual magnitude of U.S. efforts in 1967, after the treaty, will be something like 10 percent less than in 1962–63, before the treaty.

The accompanying percentage table demonstrates an actual decline in the magnitude of U.S. performance of all safeguard promises. This percentage table takes fiscal year 1965 as the base, or 100-percent year, from which comparisons for later years are made. It factors in the annual 5-percent decline in effort bought by the same number of dollars spent. The percentage table reveals that compared to fiscal year 1965 there was a decline in magnitude of effort in three of the four safeguards during fiscal year 1966 and there will be a decline in all of them in fiscal year 1967.

Percentage change in safeguards program (applying 5 percent annual cost escalation)

[Dollars in millions]

Safeguard	Base year 1965 funding	1966	1967
Conduct of underground tests	$192.4	+5.5	−7.9
Maintenance of laboratory facilities	306.6	−3.9	−12.4
Acquisition and maintenance of an atmospheric test capability	131.2	−55.3	−60.1
Monitoring Sino-Soviet actions	115.6	−1.5	−.8
Total	745.8	−8.3	−17.8

UNDERGROUND TESTING

First, let us look at the AEC's underground test program for a detailed analysis. This is the program that is supposed to be "aggressive and comprehensive" now that zero dollars are going into atmospheric testing because of the treaty's ban.

In fiscal year 1965 AEC spent about 15 percent more for this safeguard than in fiscal year 1964. It appeared from this beginning for the first full year's funding after ratification of the treaty that a solid foundation was being laid for a properly "comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing" effort in underground testing. But the following year's budget—fiscal year 1966, the current fiscal year—evidenced a one-third decline, to about 10 percent, of the previous year's rate of growth. In fiscal year 1967 we find an actual decrease in AEC dollars for underground weapons tests over the previous year, which, of course, must be augmented by the 5-percent escalation factor.

No longer is there a healthy growth in this program. It is being constricted—not only by a reduction in funds, but also by a drop in the amount of testing those funds will buy due to inflationary factors.

The DOD's proposed underground test effort in fiscal year 1967 is $28 plus million. This is exactly the same amount it will spend this year. There was a growth in DOD's expenditures for this item from a level of about $11 million in fiscal year 1964 to about $17 million in fiscal year 1965 and a further growth to $28 plus million in fiscal year 1966. These sums are much smaller than the AEC's input for underground testing. The large growth, or more appropriately, the small initial expenditures by the DOD for this item in fiscal year 1964 and fiscal year 1965 can be accounted for by its early difficulties making meaningful underground weapons effect tests. Many of these difficulties have been overcome. The DOD now should be exploiting the capabilities and not just be letting the program level off in dollars and decline by inflation now that it has learned how to do underground effects tests. The need for effects information is greater than ever and because of the known difficulties in acquiring this information, more effort and not less should be going forward.

I know of no reduced requirements for a "comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing" underground nuclear weapons test program that the safeguards demand and that two Presidents have promised to support. In fact, if one considers the large underground nuclear weapons explosions that the Soviets have carried out and the needs to improve the assumed deliverability or our strategic deterrent weapons and the needs to decrease that characteristic of Soviet ICBM's, the needs for underground testing appear greater and not less.

So sufficient was the concern of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy over this safeguard that it took the unusual initiative of boosting by $10 million the authorization for this purpose asked by the administration for fiscal year 1967. I believe the boost would have been greater if the JCAE had believed a turnaround of the program's decline could be accomplished more rapidly. If this increase is appropriated, it will be of considerable interest to see whether or not the administration allows the AEC to spend it.

MAINTENANCE OF WEAPONS LABORATORIES

The second safeguard, maintenance of our weapons laboratories, also has stagnated insofar as funding is concerned. AEC and DOD funding for weapons research and development at the three weapons laboratories—Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia—jumped more than 10 percent from fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1964 and close to 6 percent from fiscal year 1964 to fiscal year 1965. Since then the trend in both money and effort has been downward. Fiscal year 1967's decline of 12.4 percent less than fiscal year 1965 is the measure of U.S. slackening in effort to insure the continued application of our human resources to the weapons program.

There is, I believe, a very serious cause for concern that a continuation of this attenuation of our weapons laboratory output, as both AEC and DOD budgets contemplate, within a very short time it will lead to a total paralysis of developments in U.S. weapons technology.

Yet, modern nuclear weapons are essential to our strategic deterrent and to our capability to limit damage from surprise attack. Without research and development of a high caliber in nuclear weapons technology, including comprehensive and aggressive underground testing, we will not be able to maintain a modern weapons arsenal. Soviet developments, production, and deployment of hardened silo ICBM's and of an antiballistic missile systems can swiftly negate an unimproved U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal.

Furthermore, should the need arise to deploy an extensive U.S. A–ICBM defense system, that need will be concurrent with a crisis and require great speed in implementation. An A–ICBM system necessarily must be designed around the warhead or warheads available to tip its missile destroying rockets. Safe, sound, and sane planning dictates a major effort to design and perfect such warheads and have them available well in advance of need. This work simply cannot be accomplished in stagnant or declining laboratories.

ATMOSPHERIC TEST READINESS

To achieve a readiness to resume atmospheric testing in the event our national security requires it, should the Soviet abrogate the treaty, or should actions of Red China or others compel it, the DOD and AEC together spent $162.2 million in fiscal year 1964. This fell off to $131.2 million in fiscal year 1965. The understandable reason given for this decreased funding is that the cost of building up to achievement of a readiness is greater than the cost of maintaining it. What is not so understandable, however, is why the cost of maintenance in fiscal year 1967, $58.1 million, is lower by $18.3 million from the cost of maintenance in fiscal year 1966, $76.4 million. The year's decline in effort, when cost escalation is considered, is roughly one-third. It is very doubtful that very heavy capital expenditures for the buildup were incurred in fiscal year 1966. The buildup must have been substantially completed during the previous year. Therefore, the decline in actual effort for the maintenance of this capability scheduled for fiscal year 1967 is a very real and substantial one.

Yet, any abrogation of the treaty by the Soviets or other cause for atmospheric test resumption can only be foreseen under circumstances of critical international tension and crisis. These are the very conditions of expectation which the atmospheric testing safeguard capability should be designed to meet. If we are to maintain a capability at all, it must be for undelayed response with meaningful weapons tests that will demonstrate our readiness not only to test and progress—but also will show that our weapons for offense and defense are, indeed, most modern.

MONITORING SINO-SOVIET TESTS

The dollar funding for the monitoring of Sino-Soviet nuclear capabilities has gone up slightly each year since fiscal year 1964. As a consequence, the level of effort involved has more or less remained stable for this safeguard as contrasted to the others. This circumstance is explained less by an administration desire to maintain properly this safeguard than it is explained by the administration's zest for a relatively reliable underground test detecting system as a prelude to negotiating a total test ban treaty.

The information we acquire from Soviet underground tests about their weapons progress is very limited in comparison to the information from their atmospheric tests that gave us physical samples of test debris for analysis. The needs for such information are greater today, but irrespective of how much is spent on underground monitoring, the means for acquiring it are less.

CONCLUSION

In summary, I believe that the implementation of the safeguards, which started haltingly in fiscal year 1964, and, at best, were continued for a few years statically, are now showing signs of a faltering future. The trend of our effort incontrovertably is downward. New blood and greater efforts must be infused into the safeguard programs. Stagnant or reduced funding will not accomplish that. Annual increases of 5 percent in dollar funding are needed just to keep regularly escalating costs from shrinking the magnitude of the safeguards effort.

Furthermore, the administration must reexamine its test ban safeguards effort in the light of Soviet developments in offensive and defensive nuclear weapons. It can be predicted with confidence that such a reexamination can only show cause for greater efforts, much greater efforts, than are now apparent to overcome Soviet improvements and progress.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I commend our colleague for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and revealing the facts which hitherto have not been available to the membership. I regret that every Member of the House has not been present to hear his very timely remarks.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman. I know his constant concern for the defense of our Nation.

I say to the gentleman, not only the Members of this House should know and understand this information, but I believe the entire American public should be informed. It is a matter of deep concern to their individual health and safety and to the future of our country.

I have tried an experiment with my remarks today. I prepared them well in advance. I gave copies to several newspapers, including the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Washington Star. I did this by way of an experiment, because those particular news media in 1963, at the time the treaty was negotiated, day after day after day assured their readers that these safeguards would in fact protect the security of the United States, and day after day after day in their editorial and news columns they assured the people that the President would keep these safeguard promises, yet they have not had the kindness or the courtesy yet, though they have this information now, 3 years later—while these promises are not being kept, to inform their readers of these facts.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I certainly want to commend the gentleman, who has taken the well of the House and whose knowledge extends so far and whose research has probed so deeply and perceptively into the matter on which he is today addressing the House, a matter which so sorely needs to be brought to the attention of the public.

I am not at all sure that even though the Commander in Chief or the Secretary of Defense are acquitting themselves properly or are even convinced in their own minds, Mr. Speaker, about playing the eternal triangle of the atmospheric nuclear test ban treaty against the need for shelter protection, which is on the second corner of the triangle, or against the need to shoot down enemy missiles and delivery capabilities before they become effective over us and in our own atmosphere on the other corner of the triangle—I am not at all sure that that is confirmed by their own statute. This is truly a time for concern for all America. This is a time for research and for probing. This is a time for informing the public, because, as Lord Byron said over 100 years ago, the informed are easy to lead but difficult to drive, easy to govern but impossible to enslave. I think a great service has been rendered today to this Nation by the gentleman from California in his erudite and succinct comments. I rise in appreciation and I would like to associate myself with his views.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman is very kind and generous and also very wise in what he has hinted at as to what may be the purpose of this intellectual argument about deploying an antiballistic missile defense. Now, you either want that kind of protection against a potential enemy or you do not want that kind of protection against a potential enemy. If you do not want it, you ought to say so. If you do want it, then you ought to come down, if you are the President or the Secretary of Defense, to the Congress of the United States and say, "Give us the money to buy it." The U.S. national interest and possibly its life is at stake. But what do we get? Neither one of those. We simply get a lot of hocus-pocus about playoffs between missile-destroying systems, civil defense systems, fallout shelters, bomb shelters, plus all of the semantics that go with this game that they developed down at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. So we have the issue confused and ambiguous rather than drawn for the people as this kind of discussion ought to draw an issue for an intelligent electorate to decide upon.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I know that he full well recognizes that in the present state of research and development of these antiballistic missile deployments or the antidelivery capability means, that is, the antimissile missile—whether you refer to the Sprint modification of the Nike-Zeus or the Nike X or anything else—it would be at least 4 years hence even if fully implemented and continued at this time. Having been struck down once insofar as the Army action agency is concerned, it seems to me it ill behooves the Commander in Chief or the Secretary of Defense not to continue funding if they feel that it is necessary today in the 1967 fiscal budget, but the Committee on Armed Services in its wisdom has seen fit to restore some of that. It seems to me that bill will be before the House for complete development in the next 2 weeks, and we will be given a chance to work our will on this part. But this has happened in so many cases where Congress is expected to restore the cut funds in order that a budget may be within the obligational authority or indeed the spending authority of the President for any one fiscal year, to say nothing of borrowing from it for supplemental needs.

Does not the gentleman agree with me that if we are to be able to shoot down a missile coming in from an enemy, from any source, that we should work hard and use all of our research and brains and everything else that we have at this time on this problem?

Mr. HOSMER. I believe the gentleman is precisely correct in his assessment of the situation.

However, I do want to say this: If we are to take the Secretary of Defense at his word, as we are continually asked to do, both by himself and others, and if his word is that we do not have a warhead suitable to go on this antiballistic missile system to be used over our heads, if we do not have a clean enough one that we cannot keep our own people from falling victims of fallout, then the first step to be taken is a most vigorous program of developing such a warhead and to achieve it, so that then we can start to design our system around it.

We simply just do not know the "kill" characteristic of a warhead. You have to know its weight, you have to know its volume, and all of those other things before you design the other parts and pieces of a missile system of which the warhead is the heart, and whose characteristics must necessarily determine the other characteristics of the system.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOSMER. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding further because I am one who has long since quit believing the statements of the Secretary of Defense, and have so stated on the floor of this House.

Secondly, would the gentleman from California not agree with me, that regardless of research, it would require exoatmospheric testing under the fire-ball or the electromagnetic testing of any such warhead before we could know the answer to the question that he has so well posed?

Mr. HOSMER. Certainly there is never an assurance that anything will work until it is actually tested under the conditions and in the environment which is exoatmospheric in this case, with which it is supposed to be employed.

You can simulate some of these conditions but you can never achieve them fully in underground testing.

However, since we have obliged ourselves by treaty to limit our testing to the underground—we have banned it in the atmosphere, we have banned it in space and under water—the only place left is in holes underneath the ground. We have to take that with which we have to work and do the job under the circumstances of underground testing.

Now, at the same time, we have facing us this constant yen, desire, effort, or mood on the part of the administration even to rid ourselves of the underground testing. They say, "Well, if you do not have them, and the other fellow does not have them, you are even."

However, Mr. Speaker, you are not only even, I say to the gentleman from Missouri, if you start out even and if anyone wants to look into the record of the last series of atmospheric tests before the limited ban treaty, I believe there is considerable reason for even the layman to conclude that the emphasis which the Soviet Union placed upon its tests very high in the sky and emphasis that the United States did not share in those tests, I believe the conclusion reasonably could be that we are not starting out even on that one.

STOP MEKONG RIVER "BACK-DOOR" AID TO THE VIETCONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have many times in the past months voiced my deep concern over the assistance given the war economy of North Vietnam by ships flying the flags of free world countries. At long last, this past February the administration finally decided to no longer openly tolerate this trade with the belligerent Hanoi regime by blacklisting the free world ships involved from receiving any U.S Government contracts. In placing trade with Ho Chi Minh on the same level as trade with Castro, the world was put on notice that the United States considered this flow of goods detrimental to the efforts being made in South Vietnam to resist Communist aggression. While I remain greatly disturbed over the way that the true nature and extent of free world trade with North Vietnam has been kept from the American people through the arbitrary, unjustified, and self-serving use of secret classifications designed more to protect ineffective policies, rather than our security, I am encouraged by the most recent report which I have seen which indicates a reduction in this traffic. I hasten to add, however, that I will not be satisfied so long as there is one free world ship docking at Haiphong.

CAMBODIAN TRADE: THE VIETCONG'S "BACK-DOOR" AID

Today, however, I wish to speak of a closely related problem; one which, while it is more difficult to measure, I am satisfied has had an adverse effect on our efforts to defeat the Vietcong and promises to become even more of a problem in the future unless drastic action is soon taken. The problem of which I speak is the aid that the Vietcong receives from Cambodia and from free world trade entering Cambodia by the means of the Mekong River through South Vietnam. This is the Vietcong's "back-door" source of supply. It must be closed if we are to avoid a much longer war in South Vietnam just as surely as the "front door" of the North Vietnamese supply routes, and especially the port of Haiphong, must be shut. I regret that here again full information concerning free world shipping on the Mekong River to Cambodia as made available to me by the Department of Defense is classified "secret" and that I cannot properly divulge the particulars of this trade. It is, however, even more regrettable that we apparently have not been doing enough to find out more about this illicit traffic. This is a scandalous situation especially in light of the increasingly hostile attitude of the Cambodian Government toward both South Vietnam and the United States. I am certain that if the American people were fully informed about this situation they would demand quick corrective action.

In my hand I have a secret document which purports to tell the details of this trade including the name and other pertinent information with respect to every ship that traversed the Mekong to Cambodia during 1965. It, however, discloses nearly as many gaps in our knowledge as it does hard information.

According to the Department of Defense, during the first 3 months of 1966, 102 free world ships sailed up the Mekong through South Vietnam * * * with Vietnamese pilots on board to show the way * * * to the Cambodian port of Pnompenh. This figure represents about the same level of traffic as existed during the same period in 1965. For the whole year that amounts to over 400 ships up the Mekong.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a chart indicating the registry of free world ships arriving at Pnompenh during 1966.

Free world ship arrivals in Cambodia at Pnompenh

[First quarter 1966]

Ship registry:	
France	18
Greece	1
Japan	18
Italy	1
Netherlands	3
Norway	3
Panama	48
United Kingdom	10
Total	102

The simple truth is that with more than a ship a day sailing right through South Vietnam up the Mekong River to Cambodia there exists no effective control over this trade to prevent the flow of contraband. The persistent reports of smuggled weapons and supplies which I have seen and heard leaves no doubt in my mind that the Vietcong ultimately derives substantial benefit from this traffic, whether in strategic or nonstrategic goods. I am shocked by the failure to take effective action to stop the flow of these illicit goods along this broad boulevard of traffic in a part of the world with little other transportation facilities.

For an idea as to just how this trade aids the Vietcong we need only read part of a dispatch written by Robert R. Brunn, for the Christian Science Monitor on September 2, 1964.

> Diplomatic sources outline the possible route of the Peking supplies that get to Pnompenh in Cambodia in this way:
>
> "European freighters that regularly unload in Communist China at such ports as Shanghai and Canton then take on crated weapons and material for delivery at Pnompenh.
>
> "These freighters are not necessarily from Communist Eastern Europe. This China-to-Cambodia route is part of the international trade pattern, and the ships could well be British, French, and Japanese as well as Polish or Czech.
>
> "BULKY SHIPMENTS
>
> "Shipments of this kind are so bulky that they must be handled by legitimate brokers in Pnompenh, usually French or Chinese Communist.
>
> "Established for many years, these brokers also import to their warehouses such heavy equipment as sewing machines, appliances, farm pumps, and tractors.
>
> "Western intelligence has traced these Chinese Communist shipments into the Pnompenh warehouses but never sees them move into the usual business channels.
>
> "'They just fade away,' as one observer puts it.
>
> "The assumption is that these shipments fade into the rather vague Communist channels in Pnompenh where they are broken up and sent down the Mekong River across the border into South Vietnam's delta, where the Vietcong controls large regions."

Since that time there has been no reason for concern to lessen over the Mekong River traffic. I have personally seen reports based on studies of numerous data, such as prisoner of war interrogations, which clearly testify to the existence of the aid and comfort the Vietcong receives from this source.

Just a few days ago, on a special subcommittee assignment to South Vietnam for the House Armed Services Committee, I was in Vung Tau, a coastal port at the mouth of the Saigon River, which also controls the passage of these vessels that are transversing the Mekong to Cambodia. One of the reasons I journeyed halfway around the world during the Easter recess was to go to this port for the specific purpose of discussing this problem with proper officials having firsthand knowledge of this Mekong shipping. I wanted to talk with our advisers who are working with the Vietnamese customs officials in order to get many answers to questions about this trade. I even asked to spend an extra day in this area in order that I could be more fully informed with respect to the overall problem. I regret to report to my colleagues that our military people recommended that I not do this because what further information could be had would be meaningless. I was told by a high-ranking naval officer:

> Let me be brutally frank, we have no effective control.

It was made very clear to me that further probing in this area would only cause embarrassment.

Mr. Speaker, unless we face up to the ineffectiveness of our present efforts to check this source of supply for the enemy we can only expect a costlier, bloodier, longer war in Vietnam. There is far too much evidence indicating an unwillingness to take effective action. Undoubtedly in any demanding situation there are always an inexhaustible supply of excuses for not taking action, if one devotes himself to finding them. This can even lead to pretending that the problem does not really exist. For example, in a letter dated January 21, 1966, I was informed by the Department of State that:

> There cannot, of course, be complete certainty that no strategic goods or arms have moved up the Mekong, but it is a situation that is watched very closely. The Government of South Vietnam carefully regulates river traffic under security procedures consistent with rights of navigation on this international waterway. Vessels are turned back if they carry questionable cargoes or if they refuse to permit cargo inspection by South Vietnamese officials.

The refusal of this statement to face the reality of the situation is incredible in view of this country's large and increasing commitments of men and materiel in the struggle in South Vietnam. This attitude is unfortunately all too familiar. It suggests the same "do not rock the boat" approach that was used to justify the failure to take more resolute action to stop free world trade with North Vietnam. The time is long overdue to start "rocking the boats" using the Mekong River that help supply the Vietcong.

THE QUESTION OF CAMBODIAN "NEUTRALITY"

Just what is the nature and extent of the aid and comfort being afforded the Vietcong from Cambodian soil?

There is no doubt in the minds of military leaders in South Vietnam of the use of Cambodian territory as a sanctuary and as a logistical base of support for North Vietnamese and Vietcong units. If any of my colleagues have any questions as to the evidence of Cambodian aid and comfort to our enemy I would simply recommend that they talk to any of our military people close to the situation there.

The supplies reaching the Vietcong are either of Cambodian origin or arrive through the Ho Chi Minh trail complex from the north, the port of Pnompenh via the Mekong River, or the port of Sihanoukville on the Gulf of Siam. However, the aid is taking other forms as well; for instance, while I was in Tay Ninh just a few days ago, a briefing officer referred to a chart on the wall and pointed out three different areas where airfields were located just a few miles across the border in Cambodia which were being used daily for air flights to bring supplies for the Vietcong. We were also advised of another location within the general area that was being used as a training ground for the Vietcong. At that time, I specifically asked the officer if this information was classified and was advised that it was not, so I here and now make this information available to my colleagues and the American people. This raises the question: "If the Cambodians are willing to permit the use of their sovereign soil by the enemies of Vietnam why should the Vietnamese, and why should we, who are making the tremendous effort that we are in support of the Vietnamese, tolerate the use of the Mekong River by a single ship that could even conceivably be bringing supplies of any nature to Cambodia and thence to the Vietcong, whether it be food, clothing, or materials of war?"

The Vietcong can obtain supplies in many ways. First of all, it is not difficult, apparently, for them to simply go into Cambodian marketplaces and buy food and medicine. For more clandestine items the so-called traditional smuggling channels operating across the ill-defined Cambodian-South Vietnamese border can be relied upon. Reportedly, the Vietcong are not hampered by a lack of funds.

The tolerance of this traffic strongly suggests either the inability or lack of desire to take effective action by the Cambodian Government, regardless of its alleged foreign policy of "strict neutrality." In fact, recent statements of the Cambodian Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, clearly reveal his increasingly open support of the Vietcong, reportedly on the grounds that he believes that they will win in South Vietnam. Barely a month ago Sihanouk said:

> The Vietcong * * * asked us to provide them with some rice. We have given this aid to them by closing our eyes, because we and the Vietcong have a common enemy which is U.S. imperialism. It is in this way we have aided them.

We are left to wonder in how many other ways Cambodia has aided the Vietcong simply by "closing its eyes."

We know as well that Cambodian "neutralism" is being further compromised by the increasing dependency of its military forces upon Chinese and Soviet aid. In the same speech, delivered on March 24, 1966, at the Cambodian city of Kratie, Sihanouk stated:

> In recent days, China sent ships carrying arms of all calibers and kinds and a large quantity of ammunition, and these ships have already arrived in our port of Sihanoukville. China will continue to send us arms and ammunition needed by our country. In other words, we have only to ask for aid and we will receive it, for our faithful friend on the other side has agreed to give us plenty.

A new agreement with the Soviet Union will bring in military aid valued at about $2.4 million including five fully armed Mig-17's and an antiaircraft battery for the purpose of "resisting Thai aggression," according to Prince Sihanouk.

The fiction of Cambodian neutrality is more and more recognized. In a column appearing in the New York Times of May 1, 1966, C. L. Sulzberger, in reporting that Cambodia now sends 30,000 tons of rice annually to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese troops, said:

> I have reversed my previous impression and concluded that Cambodia is indeed a sanctuary and supply source for the Vietcong on such a scale that the Phnompenh Government must know it. From the extreme south to Laos in the north, Cambodia is violating its proclaimed neutrality. * * *
>
> I was wrong in what I wrote a fortnight ago from Pnompenh and Western diplomats and military attachés there are being fooled. Cambodia isn't acting in the least bit neutral, no matter what it pretends.

THE MEKONG CONVENTION OF 1954 AND SOUTH VIETNAMESE SECURITY

Since January 1, 1955, the Mekong River has been an international waterway subject to the rights of navigation agreed to by Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam at Paris on December 29, 1954.

In the protocol annexed to this convention, agreed to on the same day, it was stated in article II:

> Navigation of the whole course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues and mouth, must conform to the measures prescribed by the river states, notably matters of sanitation, policy, and customs and for the maintenance of general security.

In late October of 1964, the South Vietnamese Government in order to insure "the maintenance of general security" within its country felt it necessary to take unilateral action to close the Mekong River to Communist flagships, and to free world ships coming from Communist ports or which were known to carry goods of Communist origin to reduce the possibility of war materials being diverted to the Vietcong either along the waterway itself or through Cambodia. The gravity of this action reflects the changed conditions under which the convention of 1954 now exists since it signifies that in the absence of unilateral action by South Vietnam, the convention would constitute a threat to the security of that country.

Unfortunately, as necessary as the restrictions on Communist trade were they have proved ineffective. In the first place, it is still possible for Communist goods to travel up the Mekong in free world ships under charter to Communist countries. Secondly, there exists no effective program of surveillance of cargoes of free world ships, despite persistent reports that weapons still reach the Vietcong from this source. Furthermore, while all ships traversing the Mekong are required to have a Vietnamese pilot and customs official aboard, there has been to date no effective inspection to determine whether the ships' manifests accurately represent the cargo on board.

In view of these facts, what courses of action remain open? Complete inspection of each vessel in view of the time and facilities it would require does not appear feasible. Selective inspection would not adequately eliminate the possibility of contraband.

The only successful way to stop this illicit traffic reaching the Vietcong is simply to close the river to all ocean traffic bound for Cambodia. In other words, I believe that the South Vietnamese Government should be encouraged in the interests of "the maintenance of general security" to abrogate the convention of 1954.

At the Geneva Conference in 1954 Cambodia demanded the internationalization of the Mekong River with its control to be placed in the hands of an interstate commission. In the convention signed at Paris provision was made for such a commission but it has never become operable. Consequently, regulation of the river has been left to unilateral action which in effect means that South Vietnam, by virtue of its geographical position, retains in fact control of the river. In 1956, for instance, the Saigon government closed the river for several months to Cambodian traffic until Pnompenh agreed to establish diplomatic relations, which until that time it had refused to do, on the grounds of its alleged policy of "strict neutrality." That policy, as I have already indicated, has now apparently been replaced by one of open political and economic assistance to the enemies of South Vietnam. Just last week on April 24, Prince Sihanouk, at a ceremony at the royal palace at Pnompenh in which he personally delivered 7 tons of food to a Vietcong delegation, announced that in the near future Cambodia and North Vietnam and the Vietcong would sign agreements setting forth "definite bases for peaceful coexistence between our two countries which have at all times been side by side in fraternity and in respect for our sovereignty and our territorial integrity." Sihanouk added:

> Allow me to thank you for the correct and respectful attitude of our brothers of the National Liberation Front toward our neutrality and our territorial integrity.

Obviously the conditions which existed between Cambodia and South Vietnam when the convention was signed have decisively changed.

It is, I am told, a recognized principle of international law that a treaty becomes voidable according to the doctrine of rebus sic stantibus as soon as it is dangerous to the life and incompatible with the independence of a state provided that its injurious effects were not intended by the two contracting parties at the time of its conclusion.

Closing the Mekong will not, of course, eliminate all forms of aid and comfort reaching the Vietcong through Cambodia. Some of the trade up the Mekong could be expected to be diverted to the ocean port of Sihanoukville. Nevertheless, the strain put upon docking facilities would hopefully put a high premium on all cargo space so that only goods that Cambodia itself required would be imported.

The purpose of the action I recommend is to limit, not expand, the war by reducing Cambodia's participation through available economic rather than military means. The growing commitment of American men and material in South Vietnam demands that a business-as-usual attitude toward Mekong River traffic can no longer be tolerated. The Vietnamese people are locked in a life and death struggle for their very existence. Over 40,000 Vietnamese have been killed in action defending their country. Yes, and more than 3,100 American boys have lost their lives trying to insure the independence of this country, which the parties signing the Geneva accords of 1954 had proclaimed and agreed to respect. With casualties like this, the time has long since passed when the Vietnamese or when our Government should sit back and insist upon the international niceties and the observance of a treaty that subverts the efforts being made to protect Vietnam's very existence.

It is fundamental that supplies are essential for the success of any military operation. So long as the supply lines to the enemy are open, the success of our efforts to assist the Vietnamese remains questionable. Although the port of Haiphong is still open for both free world and Communist ships supplying North Vietnam, the administration finally conceded that something should be done to reduce the flow of goods to Hanoi which benefit the Vietcong and just a few weeks ago belatedly decided to "blacklist" ships sailing to North Vietnam. Something should be and must be done now to stop shipping up the Mekong.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Mekong River Convention of 1954, a copy of the memorandum issued by the Prime Minister of South Vietnam on October 26, 1964, closing the Mekong River to Communist trade, and a copy of the New York Times column by C. L. Sulzberger entitled "Foreign Affairs: Neutral Is as Neutral Does" be inserted in that order at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONVENTION RELATIVE TO REGULATION OF MARITIME AND RIVER NAVIGATION ON THE MEKONG AND OF RIVER NAVIGATION OF THE APPROACHES TO THE PORT OF SAIGON

His Majesty the King of Cambodia, His Majesty the King of Laos, His Majesty the Chief of State of Vietnam, considering the particular geographic configuration of the Mekong in Indochina which makes this river a way of common interest to the three states,

Desirous, within the framework of their friendly relations, of maintaining and consolidating cooperation between their countries, whose economics are interdependent.

Convinced that free navigation on the navigable course of the Mekong is of a nature to develop these economics as well as cooperation of the three states among themselves, conforming to the ends and principles of the charter of the United Nations.

Have resolved to conclude the present convention.

They have called for this purpose as their plenipotentiaries:

His Majesty the King of Cambodia: His Excellency Au Chheun, Minister of State.

His Majesty the King of Laos: His Excellency Leuam Insisienmay, Minister of Finances.

His Majesty, the Chief of State of Vietnam: Mr. Nguyen Van Thoai, Minister of Planning and Reconstruction.

These, after having exchanged their full powers, recognized in good and due form, have agreed to the provisions which follows:

ARTICLE I

On the basis of equality of treatment, navigation is free upon all of the course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues and mouths, situated upon the territory of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam as well as upon all the waterways giving access to the port of Saigon and to the sea.

Regarding the laws and customs regulations of each river state, navigation between Phnom Penh and the sea by the Mekong and the waterways described in the present paragraph is considered maritime navigation.

ARTICLE II

This freedom of navigation is granted freely to States having recognized diplomatically the High Contracting Parties. It becomes effective following the adherence of each State to the protocol annexed to the present convention fixing the conditions of navigation.

Concerning States not having recognized diplomatically the High Contracting Parties, freedom of navigation is subject to the agreement of these High Parties.

ARTICLE III

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to the two others, for one part, to abstain from all measures susceptible of directly or indirectly hindering navigation or rendering it more difficult in lasting fashion and, for the other part, to take as rapidly as possible all desirable arrangements for the purpose of chartering all obstacles and dangers to navigation.

If this navigation requires regular upkeep, each of these High Parties have, to that end, the obligation toward to the other two other to take measures and to execute the necessary works upon its territory as rapidly as possible.

If it is established that some expenses falling to one of these High Parties exceed considerably those required by the needs of its own traffic, it may request of the two others equitable participation in these expenses.

ARTICLE IV

Provided that they satisfy the provisions of the preceding articles, the High Contracting Parties reserve to themselves the right to use upon their respective territory the waters of the Mekong, its tributaries and issues, for industrial and agricultural purposes.

Except for legitimate opposition by one of the High Parties and especially the State territorially concerned, based either upon the conditions of navigability themselves, or upon other vital interests, a river State may not refuse to execute, upon the command of one of the other two High Parties, works necessary to the improvement of navigability, if that or those High Parties offer to pay their whole cost as well as subsequently an equitable part of the increase of the cost of upkeep. The works may not be undertaken while the State on whose territory they will be executed continues its legitimate opposition.

The State charged with executing the work of upkeep may free itself of that obligation by entrusting it to one or to the two other high parties. For works of improvement, the State charged with execution will be free of this obligation if it authorizes the high party or parties requesting them to execute them in its place. The execution of the works by States other than the State territorially concerned will be carried out without prejudice to the latter, of its rights of control over the execution of the works and the preogatives of its sovereignty over the navigable way. The State territorially concerned undertakes, on its part, to assist the executing State with all its power under all circumstances.

ARTICLE V

In the spirit of the present convention and in order to facilitate its application, the High Contracting Parties agree to coordinate their action upon the following questions:

Rules of navigation and police to be established by each of the high parties over the navigable way bearing its sovereignty;

Programs and projects of improvement of the waterways, their works and equipment;

Work projects of industrial, agricultural or other interest to the extent that they are susceptible of creating serious and lasting difficulties to navigation;

Apportionment of the costs of upkeep and new works between the High Contracting Parties;

Questions relative to duties, taxes and assessments of all nature levied by each of the high contracting parties arising from navigation upon the waterways defined in the first article;

All other questions whose common interest shall have been recognized.

ARTICLE VI

A Commission is created called the Mekong Commission comprising representatives of the high contracting parties. This Commission is charged with supervision of the execution of the provisions of the present convention and in assuring the coordination aimed at in the preceding article, notably:

1. Elaborating rules of navigation;
2. Advising the river States of desirable works;
3. Receiving communications of the States on all improvement projects set up by them;
4. Proposing the regulation of tolls and their collection.

This Commission is empowered to receive requests, petitions and recommendations of juristic persons of all nationalities, including the representatives of foreign flags, using the waterways made the object of the present convention, or, upon the request of one of the States of Cambodia, Laos or Vietnam, to conduct a hearing of the same persons.

It addresses its studies and recommendations to the Government concerned.

This commission includes a Secretariat whose seat is at Pnompenh. It will hold its first session in January 1955 and will establish then the roles of its organization and operation.

ARTICLE VII

In case, in the application of the present convention, there should arise litigious questions between the High Contracting Parties which could not be resolved by amicable agreement and by diplomatic means they will submit the dispute to agencies will be provided in an accord on conciliation and arbitration to be drawn up within 3 months from the signature of the present convention.

ARTICLE VIII

The present convention will be ratified.

Instruments of ratification will be exchanged between the Government of the High Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE IX

The present convention will enter into force as of January 1, 1953.

Done at Paris, in three copies, December 29, 1954.

For Cambodia:
His Excellency AU CHHEUN.
For Laos:
His Excellency LEUAM INSISSIENMAY.
For Vietnam:
His Excellency Mr. NGUYEN VAN THOAI.

Interpretative Note

Article 1—Paragraph 2: To avoid any irregular debarkation on Vietnamese territory during passage of vessels between the mouths of the Mekong and the Cambodian frontier, agents of the Vietnamese customs will escort the said vessels between these mouths and the Cambodian frontier.

Interpretative note to articles I and II: The provisions of articles 1 and 2 of this Convention form no barrier to the Navigation of Thai vessels on the portion of the Mekong situated on the territory of Laos in accordance with the France-Siamese Convention of August 25, 1926.

PROTOCOL ANNEXED TO THE CONVENTION OF THE REGULATION OF MARITIME AND RIVER NAVIGATION UPON THE MEKONG AND OF RIVER NAVIGATION OF THE APPROACHES TO THE PORT OF SAIGON

The Governments of the Kingdom of Cambodia, the Kingdom of Laos and the State of Vietnam,

Have agreed to that which follows:

ARTICLES I

In order to benefit effectively from freedom of navigation on the whole course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues, and mouths,

It is requested of the States having recognized diplomatically the States of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, and of the States not yet having recognized diplomatically the States of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, but in whose favor these last have decided, of one common accord, to recognize that freedom of navigation.

That they declare by means of exchange of letters with the States of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, their desire to adhere to the conditions of navigation prescribed by the present protocol.

ARTICLE II

Navigation of the whole course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues, and mouths, must conform to the measures prescribed by the river states, notably in matters of sanitation, police, and customs and for the maintenance of general security.

ARTICLE III

Each river State has the right to subject the transportation of persons and merchandise to certain conditions, provided that these conditions fully respect the provisions relative to equality of treatment.

ARTICLE IV

Freedom of navigation will not be hindered by the laws and national regulations of the river States concerning the import and export of merchandise as well as immigration and emigration.

ARTICLE V

Navigation will be subject, on the basis of equality of treatment to the payment of duties, taxes, assessments and tolls due according to the territorial legislation in force.

ARTICLE VI

The provisions of Articles 2, 3, 4 and 5 are applied without prejudice to those of paragraph 2 of the first article of the convention relative to the regulation of navigation upon the Mekong.

ARTICLE VII

Coastal trade from one port to another situated upon the course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues and mouths is reserved to the national flags of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.

These States reserve to themselves, however, each in that which concerns itself, the right to authorize this trade in favor of the flags of States benefiting from the freedom of navigation upon the Mekong.

Done at Paris in three copies, December 29, 1954, to be annexed to the convention relative to the regulation of maritime and river navigation upon the Mekong and of river navigation of the approaches to the Port of Saigon.

For Cambodia:
His Excellency AU CHHEUN.
For Laos:
His Excellency LEUAM INSISSIENMAY.
For Vietnam:
Mr. NGUYEN VAN THOAI.

[A MEMORANDUM]

REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM, PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE—No. 845–FTP/VP/K, MAT.

Saigon, October 26, 1964.

Subject: Foreign ships or boats transiting the Mekong River in the waters of the Republic of Vietnam.

In order to maintain national security and to control traffic on the Mekong River from the date of issue of this note, the following measures recommended by the Inter-Department Council will be applied until a new order is issued:

1. Foreign ships or boats transiting the Mekong River in the waters of the Republic of Vietnam must request authorization in advance; warships must request through diplomatic channels; commercial boats must request at the local customs service (Tan Chan and Vung Tau). Commercial boats which have recently stopped in a Communist country, or have the flag of the country not recognizing the Republic of Vietnam (annex I, list of nations recognizing the Republic of Vietnam) or carry weapons, ammo or merchandise that can be used for military purposes are not authorized to transit. However, commercial boats carrying ammo or merchandise that could be used for military purposes (annex II, list of merchandise with military characteristics) can request authorization in advance from the Vietnam Department of Defense through diplomatic channels. That list can be changed according to the decision of the Department of Defense or Interior Department.

2. Commercial boats which are authorized to transmit must have a Vietnamese pilot to guide and must be escorted the entire route. Commercial boats must contact local customs service to receive the escort. The escort team will include customs personnel, security police, or servicemen.

The meals for escort teams will be provided by the boat.

Vietnamese pilots will guide it on the Mekong River. The pilot also can guide from Phnom Penh. The Royal Cambodian Government can request monthly in advance from Vietnam public works through diplomatic channels.

3. In suspect cases, qualified Vietnam authorities can control the merchandise, sanitation, customs papers, also the merchandise storages or bring the commercial boat to Saigon commercial port to process as above.

4. Boats are only authorized to navigate in daytime, from sunrise until sunset.

5. At night or waiting for high tide the boats can only anchor at the following places:

My Tho (between KM 54–55 Cu Lao Rong Isle side).
Bai My Thuan (KM 109).
Cao Lanh (KM 147–148).
Tau Chan (KM 219–220).

Department of Foreign Affairs, Department of Defense, Department of Interior, Department of Public Works, Department of Finance, Department of Health are to implement respectively this note.

P. M. KHANH.

Addressee: Secretary of Defense.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1966]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: NEUTRAL IS AS NEUTRAL DOES

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

DAK PEK, KONTUM PROVINCE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The first guerrilla "war of liberation" following World War II was the Greek Communist insurrection. This was put down by Greece's national army with extensive American help and a U.S. mission of military "advisers" under Gen. James Van Fleet.

The Communists received massive aid through Bulgaria, Yugoslavia (which hadn't yet broken with Moscow) and Albania. Furthermore, the guerrillas used frontier regions of Albania as a sanctuary and supply base. The uprising was crushed only after Tito split with the Cominform, closed Yugoslavia's borders, isolated Albania and cut off the insurgents.

South Vietnam's "war of liberation" is similar to that of Greece although on a far, far larger scale. But one problem is identical—a gaping, open flank. In this case Laos plays the Yugoslav role, funneling arms and men from North Vietnam to the South, and Cambodia assumes the Albanian role as sanctuary and base.

IS CAMBODIA NEUTRAL?

Recently I was persuaded in Pnom Penh that Cambodia was trying to be truly neutral in the Vietnamese conflict. I wrote: "Those who are paid to know such things insist Cambodia is not willingly allowing the Vietcong to use this country's territory as a sanctuary or supply route and that any violations are of relatively minor importance."

I was wrong. I have satisfied myself of this on a trip by plane and helicopter along the Cambodian border right up to its juncture with Laos. I visited military positions and remote U.S. Special Forces outposts at Song Be, Duc Co, Dak To, and Dak Pek, in areas inhabited by the following Montagnard tribes: Jarai, Bahnar, Jeh, Sedang, and Hlang. I heard American, South Vietnamese, and Montagnard accounts of what was happening inside Cambodia, a few miles away.

SOURCE AND SANCTUARY

On the basis of this investigation I have reversed my previous impression and concluded that Cambodia is indeed a sanctuary and supply source for the Vietcong on such a scale that the Pnompenh government must know it. From the extreme south to Laos in the north, Cambodia is violating its proclaimed neutrality.

Chief of State Prince Sihanouk broadcast on March 22 that the Vietcong could send their wounded to Cambodian hospitals and when they recovered they would be returned to the battlefield. On March 23 he announced he was furnishing the Vietcong with rice and "we have given this aid to them by closing our eyes because we and the Vietcong have a common enemy, which is U.S. imperialism." Although these statements were omitted from official Pnompenh versions, Sihanouk's speeches were monitored.

The Vietcong's 263 Transportation Escort Groups handles wounded, weapons, and munitions in south Cambodia. Cambodian 25 pounders, artillery not possessed by the Vietcong, fired at the Cai Cai Special Forces camp on April 3, killing one U.S. officer. An impressive buildup of Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops is underway on the Cambodian side of the Chu Pong Mountain massif.

There appear to be three North Vietnamese regiments inside Cambodia around Chu Pong and seven others across the border in Pleiku Province, supplied from Cambodia. This represents at least 25,000 men who came southward through Laos and Cambodia to avoid U.S. aerial attacks. Although the frontier is heavily forested, 14 well-traveled crossing trails have been marked near Chu Pong.

SIHANOUK ROAD

A Cambodian supply route called the Sihanouk Road by Americans has been developed from Siem Pang northward to Laos where it swings eastward and southward toward Chu Pong along a jeep trail. In the vicinity of present North Vietnamese concentrations are scattered elements of the 26th, 23d and 27th Cambodian battalions which would scarcely fail to observe the foreigners. Cambodia now sends 30,000 tons of rice annually to Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops. A staging area between Vietcong forces in War Zone C and the 4th Corps region exists in east Cambodian Svay Rieng. Fleeing Vietcong units take refuge in Cambodia.

BASE OF OPERATIONS

Like Greece's Communists, who maintained headquarters in Epirus on the Albanian frontier, the Vietcong has its principal headquarters about 3 miles from Cambodia where COSVN (Control Office for South Vietnam) is established. COSVN directs the puppet National Liberation Front located nearby. The details are numberless. Near Duc Co an American Special Forces captain was recently killed and his body dragged to Cambodia. At Dak To the intelligence officer wryly comments: "The Vietcong is using Cambodia all over the place." At Dak Pek Montagnards report the southward passage of Communist troops along Cambodian trails.

I was wrong in what I wrote a fortnight ago from Pnompenh and Western diplomats and military attachés there are being fooled. Cambodia isn't acting in the least bit neutral, no matter what it pretends. In no sense do I advocate extending the nasty Indo-China war but I do advocate warning Sihanouk to cease his interference.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join with the gentleman in the well, the distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services from Michigan, who has now again served the Nation well in bringing forward this rocking boat on the Mekong River. Certainly we must do something to rock the boat of the shipping that is going to the nonneutralist countries that are actually supporting our allies and those who are serving aggression in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the report tonight to the effect that the so-called neutralist nations of the world have cut down shipping to the vital Hanoi-Haiphong supply area. I would hope that we would do more to interdict the logistical supplies, thus untying the hands of our over one-quarter million troops that we now have in South Vietnam fighting this aggression.

Mr. Speaker, we can be nothing but proud of our troops, their morale, their esprit de corps, and dedication to keep fighting against aggression. As has been said, Mr. Speaker, if we do not defend freedom in South Vietnam, where would we defend it?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has well pointed out and succinctly stated that we must close our supply lines within our capability regardless of international niceties. It is time that we treaded softly but carried a big stick in eliminating those who would supply the enemy of freedom with the materials of war, to shoot down our own loved ones overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Michigan for what the gentleman has done. I feel he has rendered a great service to the Nation, far beyond those who cast doubt as to the pride we might well have in our Armed Forces in their assigned mission by our Commander in Chief in defending the liberty of these people in southeast Asia.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we know, as members of the Committee on Armed Services, that in the defense of South Vietnam hangs the keystone in the strategy of the defense of all southeast Asia. And, if that is to be defended, then we must not dictate from the Pentagon or elsewhere how the war is to be fought, but we must loose the hands of the men who have had to act with restraint and who have had their hands tied behind them so that we can clean this up at the earliest possible date according to military dictates with the least possible loss of life and hold them from harm and bring them home.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generous comments of my distinguished colleague and assure him that I welcome his support in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that it is beyond my comprehension that this problem is complex to some people. Supply is basic. If there is a struggle of any kind, I do not care if you are fighting with bows and arrows and you run out of arrows you are in trouble. If you are using slingshots and you have not any stones for it, you are in trouble. If you are fighting with snowballs and do not have any snowballs, you are in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, the same is true with reference to atomic bombs, and the same is true with reference to the use of conventional weapons. The same is true in this instance. If the enemy is denied supplies, it is going to shorten the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, we must support the over one-quarter million boys that we have overseas and provide them the logistics and further to shut off every possible valve of supply to the enemy.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, PRESIDENT TRUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Krebs). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege each year at this time since 1959, to join my colleagues here in wishing our beloved former President Harry S. Truman a happy birthday. Mr. Truman, the first citizen of my home city and our State, will be 82 years old on Sunday, May 8.

As President Lyndon B. Johnson has so aptly pointed out, however, Mr. Truman has, indeed, "succeeded in vetoing birthdays."

Harry S. Truman might well have been content at his mature time of life to sit back and reflect upon his remarkable accomplishments as 32d President of the United States. No man has ever been catapulted into this great but demanding Office of the Presidency at a more crucial time in our country's history.

Yet the man from Independence did not falter for a moment. With unsurpassed moral courage, he took hold of the scepter of leadership and guided our Nation into the successful conclusion of World War II.

Harry Truman was not afraid to make the momentous decisions which those trying times demanded of him.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has observed:

> No one has ever faced as many difficult decisions as President Truman. He made them all and he made them right.

Of his awesome decision to use the atom bombs to hasten the end of World War II, Mr. Truman commented on his television series last year in "Decision: the Conflicts of Harry S. Truman":

> I never had any qualms about an instrument that finally ended the war in which we would have had 250,000 to 300,000 of our youngsters killed and 700,000 of them maimed.

It was Harry S. Truman's prompt response to the call for help from Greece and Turkey who were being threatened by Communist aggression, which resulted in the Truman doctrine of 1947 that saved those brave countries for the free world. Historians now classify as "two major milestones in U.S. foreign policy" the Monroe Doctrine of the 19th century and the Truman doctrine of the 20th century. The Monroe Doctrine assured the liberties of all peoples of the American continents, while the Truman doctrine assured the liberties of all peoples living in a free world.

Mr. Truman succeeded, furthermore, in bringing this country into the United Nations, thus fulfilling the cherished dreams of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt for a worldwide organization upon which man's hope for global peace depends.

Chief Justice Earl Warren has called the U.N. "the most meaningful step that has ever been taken toward collective security in the history of man."

In 1950, it was Mr. Truman's unhesitating decision to send troops to Korea which prevented the spread of communism that could have engulfed that part of the world.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY recently noted:

> President Johnson is seeking to accomplish in Vietnam what President Harry S. Truman achieved in his time—to make aggression unprofitable.

But Harry Truman did not seek only to aid free people who were being threatened by aggressors. He had the vision to implement such programs as the Marshall plan which brought much needed aid to the war-torn countries of Europe after World War II; and later the point 4 program of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries which was sorely needed.

President Johnson, in assessing how the ideals of the Truman policy to combat ignorance and hunger and disease among nations has carried through to our present time, said:

> What would the world be like today if President Truman had not launched this program?

Recognizing how Mr. Truman has always been concerned about the welfare of his fellow man, President Johnson flew to Independence last July to sign into law the $6.5 billion medicare bill in the presence of the man who "pioneered the concept of health care for the elderly"—our former President Harry S. Truman. Mr. Johnson stated:

> We haven't forgotten who is the real daddy of medicare. And because of the fight that you started many years ago, 19 million Americans will be eligible to receive new hope and new security when the program begins * * * And 19 million Americans have another reason, another cause to bless Harry S. Truman.

It is gratifying that Mr. Truman's place in history is acknowledged far beyond the members of his own political party. Clare Boothe Luce, that brilliant and often candid Republican leader, had this to say on the occasion of the presentation of a statue of Mr. Truman in Athens, Greece's Truman Square—on Mr. Truman's 81st birthday.

> This [Truman] doctrine, proclaimed in 1947, and soon supplemented by the Marshall plan, certainly saved Greece, Turkey, Italy and France—perhaps all Europe—outside the Iron Curtain. And equally certain, Truman's decision to stand in Korea saved at least half that country—and probably the Philippines and Japan. The Berlin airlift rescued West Berlin from strangulation and absorption by the Communists. These were no mean deeds. Reflecting on them, one begins to ask why is not all of Europe studded with statues of Truman?

In recent years, Mr. Truman has devoted much of his time to the establishment of the Truman Library in his hometown of Independence, Mo. This fine building, which houses over 5 million documents from his administration, as well as other gifts and historical mementos, was built without cost to the Government from funds donated by thousands of people in all parts of the country. Dedicated on July 6, 1957, the library is administered by the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration.

The former President has delighted in conducting students on tours through the building and in personally answering their questions.

> The reason I like to talk to you—

He explained—

> is because I want to impress upon you the fact that it is up to you to maintain the greatest Government in the history of the world—and that is the Government of the United States.

Mr. Truman has always had a great desire for the American public to understand more fully the powers, the duties, and the responsibilities of the Office of the Presidency of this country. "The President's job is really six jobs." In the library's museum of the Presidency is a striking exhibit which illustrates his role as Chief Executive; Chief of State; legislative planner and partner with Congress; head of his political party; Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces; and director of foreign policy.

In expressing his views of the Presidency in a national magazine—Look, November 11, 1958—Mr. Truman marveled at the genius of the framers of the Constitution in creating an office—the Presidency of the United States—which could function as well in this rocket and atoms age as it did in the age of the stagecoach, the sailing ship and the powdered wig.

He noted that most of the powers that a President exercises today are authorized by the Constitution, but that other powers have been built up by customs created by the times, and by events in emergencies met by our stronger Presidents.

An association of historians, national in scope, recently lauded Mr. Truman for his "capacity for decisions" and stated that he brought "new dimension" to the power of the Presidency in foreign affairs.

Early this year the Norwegian Nobel Institute confirmed that former President Truman has been nominated for the 1966 Nobel Peace Prize. The nominating letter stated that:

> Few periods of modern history have been so crucial to the future of world peace as the postwar years (1945–53) when Harry Truman assumed the leadership of the West. Few men can match his record in promoting the brotherhood of man and the association of nations.

With characteristic directness, Mr. Truman once said:

> There is no secret to our main commitment as a nation. It is to keep the peace. That is the heart and soul of our foreign policy.

In January, President Johnson went to Missouri to participate in the inaugural ceremonies of the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace. The center is to be located on the campus of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and will be dedicated to the destruction of the causes of war. A Harry S. Truman award of $50,000 will be given annually as part of the center's antiwar program.

On this occasion, President Truman was cited for his deep concern for and dedication to international peace and cooperation to which he, as President, made lasting contributions.

It was my pleasure to be present at that time, and to hear President Johnson speak one of his favorite quotations from Mr. Truman:

> I have a deep and abiding faith in the destiny of freemen. With patience and courage we shall some day move on to a new era—a wonderful golden age—an age when we can use the peaceful tools that science has forged for us to do away with poverty and human misery everywhere on earth.

It is a high honor and a personal privilege to join with others the world over in wishing Harry S. Truman a very happy birthday. We already know how this world has been blessed by his presence here—as a loyal preserver of man's inherent right to be free, as a courageous and decisive President of our great Nation, and perhaps most endearing of all, as a man who never lost the personal touch of love and concern for his brother man.

IN THE NAME OF JUSTICE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1965, in a press conference statement concerning Vietnam, the President stated:

> We do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of any territory. But we insist, and we will always insist, that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South, or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision. And they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

These are the fundamental principles, both forthright and just, upon which our defense of the valiant people of South Vietnam are based, and which have the support of an overwhelming majority of this Nation's citizens.

To implement this policy as far as possible, the President in the above-mentioned press conference said:

> I have directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today and to present immediately to Secretary General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all of the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam.

This policy of free elections and the use of the services of the United Nations to achieve this end is precisely the position which is embodied in proposed legislation submitted to Congress over the last several years in behalf of the captive nations of Europe, Cuba, and mainland China. This proposal reads in part:

> The President of the United States is further authorized and requested to instruct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to take steps to have placed on the agenda of the General Assembly at the next regular session * * * any measure or measures which would guarantee internationally supervised free elections by secret ballot in the captive nations, and to press for early approval of such measures.

How far has this proposed legislation progressed?

In the preceding Congress similar legislation was introduced by various Members of Congress but died in committee when the 88th Congress ended in 1964.

In 1965, I again introduced this proposal and at my request the House Committee on Foreign Affairs wrote to the State Department for a report. The request by the committee was made in late September 1965, and at this late date I am still waiting for an answer. Meanwhile, millions of human beings, deprived of their God-given rights by cruel and despotic governments, hope for the voices of the free world to plead their urgent cause before the world tribunal.

Not only has the United States by its silence before the world today forgotten the just cause of the captive peoples, but recent developments indicate that we intend to aid and abet their captors in a more positive way by more liberal trade policies with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

Yesterday the Washington Star carried a news item which stated that the President is instructing the Secretary of State to send Congress proposed legislation to promote expansion of trade between the United States and the Communist Eastern European nations. One of the reasons for this proposed drastic departure from long-established policy is to help build a Europe in which the people of every nation "know again the responsibilities and rewards of free political choices," to quote the President from the above-cited Star account.

If we are sincere in desiring that the captive peoples "know again the responsibilities and rewards of political choices," the United States must insist that the cause of the captive peoples and their right of self-determination be brought before the United Nations, and Ambassador Goldberg should be instructed by the President to take the steps necessary to have this issue placed on the agenda of the United Nations for full and exhaustive consideration. Then, two of the steps taken by the President, namely, insistence on free elections and utilization of the services of the United Nations on behalf of Vietnam, will at least focus world attention on the plight of the captive peoples and instill in them a measure of hope for a future freedom in peace and justice.

I insert the item from the Washington Star of May 3, 1966, entitled, "Johnson Orders Rusk To Push Red Trade Bill," in the RECORD at this point:

JOHNSON ORDERS RUSK TO PUSH RED TRADE BILL

(By Garnett D. Horner)

President Johnson said today that he is instructing Secretary of State Dean Rusk to send Congress proposed legislation to promote expansion of trade between the United States and Communist Eastern European nations.

The key feature of the proposal, officials said, would be to give Johnson the authority to extend to the Eastern European countries most-favored-nation tariff treatment—giving their exports to the United States tariffs as low as those given any country on similar products.

"The intimate engagement of peaceful trade over a period of time can influence Eastern European societies to develop along paths favorable to world peace," Johnson said.

Johnson announced the move in a speech in the White House rose garden as he signed a proclamation on the occasion of the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland.

He described the proposed action to expand East-West trade as one step in U.S. efforts to encourage "every constructive enrichment of the human, cultural and commercial ties between Eastern Europe and the West."

The President said the United States wants to help build a Europe "free of artificial political barriers," secured by "internationally inspected arms control arrangements," and in which the people of every nation "know again the responsibilities and rewards of free political choices."

Describing the NATO alliance between the United States and Western European nations as a "charter for changing needs," Johnson emphasized that "an integrated Atlantic defense is the first necessity * * * of the building of unity in Western Europe—for expanding partnership across the Atlantic—and for reconciling differences with the East."

HAD EXPECTED MESSAGE

It had been generally expected that Johnson would submit the proposed legislation to Congress in a special message. His disclosure today that he was instructing Rusk to send the bill to Congress was the first clear indication that it would not go directly from the White House.

There have been reports that Democratic congressional leaders had sought to discourage the President from submitting the East-West trade proposals this year because of indications of opposition in Congress growing out of support of the Vietcong in the Vietnam war by Eastern European Communist nations. But Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, the majority leader, said today that "as a matter of fact, we encouraged him" to submit the proposed legislation.

THE LATE DANIEL R. McIVER

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I lost a long-time friend and the State of Rhode Island one of its most outstanding citizens in the death of Daniel R. McIver. Dan and I had worked together on a number of civic projects over the years but it is particularly in the area of health that he will be most missed.

The Rhode Island chapter of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, of which Dan McIver was honorary chairman, gives some indication of the scope and the worth of his activity in the health field in the memoriam issue of their monthly publication for March 1966. The article is a fine tribute to one who has done so much for his fellow men and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in this statement.

Mr. Speaker, the immortal Shakespeare in his "Julius Caesar" had a line which appropriately describes Dan McIver:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man."

IN MEMORIAM: DANIEL R. MCIVER, JANUARY 10, 1909–FEBRUARY 26, 1966

Multiple sclerosis patients, members of the board of trustees, the staff, volunteers, and friends of the Rhode Island Chapter National Multiple Sclerosis Society were deeply saddened to learn of the death of Daniel R. McIver at the age of 57.

Although a victim of multiple sclerosis since the age of 32, Dan managed to live a full and interesting life.

He served the community in which he lived as president of the chamber of commerce and in his position as president of the Original Bradford Soap Works was known as a wheelchair executive, a position he held with distinction.

His social life was active and varied. He was a past master councilor of the Providence Order of DeMolay and a past State master councilor of the Rhode Island State Conclave Order of DeMolay. He formed many friendships as a member of Warwick Lodge No. 16 F. & A.M., Moslem Grotto, West Warwick Lions Club, the British Empire Club, Landmark Royal Arch Chapter, and the Narragansett Bay Power Squadron. The 52 Club held special pleasure for him.

This was not enough. He had a mysterious disease and 24 years ago very little was being done about it. So he dedicated a part of his life to doing something about it.

In 1953 he organized the Rhode Island Chapter National Multiple Sclerosis Society and was elected its first chairman, and he served in this capacity until the annual meeting in 1958. At this time a new office, that of honorary chairman, was specifically created for Dan in recognition of his founding of the Rhode Island chapter and "thereafter for his years of faithful leadership and guidance to its present growth and attainments." This was a unique honor for Dan and singularly will remain his alone.

He was invited to be a witness before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare by Congressman FOGARTY, chairman. His testimony on February 17, 1956, 10 years ago, brought to the fore the need for intensive and expanding research, not only for victims of multiple sclerosis but for all the neurological diseases afflicting mankind.

He pointed out that up to this time the field of neurology was somewhat the stepchild in the medical field. He urged greater recognition of the men; doctors and scientists, in all neurological fields.

The men on that committee not only listened but took action and are continuing year after year to favorably support the recommendations and suggestions so ably made by Dan at the hearing.

More medical schools are being established, greater advances are occurring in the field of research, and more fellowships are available so that young men studying in the field of neurology can be relieved of financial worry and give all their attention to their work.

As the founder of the Rhode Island chapter, Dan's influence has touched every multiple sclerosis patient in Rhode Island. His conviction and courage in the face of his disability was an inspiration to all who knew him and especially so for the afflicted.

There is no measure to what his efforts have meant to everyone concerned with multiple sclerosis throughout the United States.

He inspired a national committee and pointed the direction they must take in the development of programs of assistance for the hundreds of thousands suffering from neurological diseases.

What greater memorial to Dan can there be than the knowledge that he cared enough and fought and brought to fruition much that will continue to alleviate the suffering of the afflicted?

Daniel R. McIver, a gallant and purposeful man will be missed by all who knew him and loved him. The world cannot help but be a better place for his having lived.

MARION L. OLIVER,
Executive Director.

BILL TO ENLIST NATION'S TAXICAB DRIVERS IN WAR AGAINST CRIME

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill designed to reduce the crime rate in America through a cost-free program. My bill encourages the President to take action through enlisting the support of a fleet of public-spirited citizens who now possess the facilities to render great assistance to our State and local law-enforcement agencies.

I speak of the taxicab drivers and dispatchers of America. These men and women constitute a constantly alert group in every city, moving through the streets and byways. In most areas, taxis are in constant radio contact with their dispatchers. By promptly relaying news of any suspicious incident or infraction of the law, the taxi fleet can notify police of crimes as they actually occur, or when a troublesome situation is brewing. Undoubtedly the apprehension rate would rise and the crime rate would fall.

I am sure that drivers, dispatchers and company managements will be glad to cooperate in a nationwide effort to make our streets and neighborhoods safer, and I look forward to prompt action by the Congress to express confidence in this program.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—BETTER LIGHTING

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke of my intention to introduce a bill requiring the States, in their highway construction programs, to properly illuminate the roads they build. I would like to elaborate further on the desperate need for such lighting.

Although I lament that the research in this field, as in all phases of highway safety, is meager, we do have some positive proof of the benefits of adequate lighting.

In Nashville, Tenn., my neighboring State, the night traffic accident rate declined from 40 to 29 percent following a lighting program, despite a 50-percent increase in motor vehicle registration over the same period of time. A 54-percent decrease in night traffic accidents was noted after the initiation of a comprehensive street lighting program.

The fact that Chicago's Northwest Expressway is continuously lighted over its 16-mile length is alleged to be responsible for the low traffic fatality rate on this highway. In 1961, there were 0.74 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles on the Chicago Expressway, as compared with a national average of 2.3 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles on all expressways.

Between 1953 and 1960, new lights were installed in nine locations in the State of Virginia. A study was made by the Virginia Department of Highways which indicated that the number of traffic accidents at these locations decreased 38 percent and the traffic fatalities dropped 90 percent.

In 1945, a master relighting program was commenced in Kansas City, Mo. During the 3-year period 1945 through 1947, there were 94 pedestrians killed, with 70 at night. An average of 3 percent of the streets had modern lighting during this period. As the lighting program progressed, the number of pedestrians killed was steadily reduced. During the 3-year period 1954 through 1956, only 44 pedestrians were killed, with 13 at night. An average of 90 percent of the streets were relighted by this time. This is a reduction in night pedestrian accidents of 81 percent. Furthermore, traffic volume studies found 25 percent of travel at night for the city as a whole. At the beginning of the lighting program, nearly 80 percent of the pedestrian deaths were at night, versus less than 30 percent in the "after" period. By 1956, the figure dropped to only 19 percent at night. During the entire 12-year period, an estimated 140 pedestrian lives were saved by the modern lighting.

Mr. Speaker, as I am not a candidate, I would like to state categorically that my interest in illuminating our highways and byways is, unbelievable though it may seem, altruistic. It is strictly for the benefit of the farsighted, weaksighted, undersighted, and normal-sighted American driver, who, unlike the owl, does not see by darkness.

THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR—PART IV

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues part IV of "All This Happened," the story of American labor.

This series has been appearing in the Seafarers Log, a publication of the Seafarers International Union, and part IV appeared in the April 1, 1966, edition. Parts I and II appeared in the RECORD of March 30, 1966, pages 7195 through 7199 and part III appeared in the RECORD of March 31, 1966, pages 7348 and 7349.

The article follows:

[Part 4 of a Seafarers Log feature]

ALL THIS HAPPENED: THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR

(NOTE.—In spite of its militancy and powerful organization, the AFL was destined to be plagued for many years by its failure to recognize the importance of organizing the ever-increasing numbers of unskilled workers in the Nation's factories. The close of the 19th century saw big business grow even bigger, with huge corporations merging everywhere into monopolistic trusts of staggering size, pulling in staggering profits, and crushing competition ruthlessly. Federal legislation, such as the Sherman Antitrust Act, hardly disturbed the status quo. Increased mechanization constantly added to the proportion of unskilled workers who remained unorganized—a situation which contributed to the union's defeat in the famous Homestead strike against Carnegie Steel at Homestead, Pa.)

Conditions for American seamen in the mid and late 19th century for the most part, were even worse than the lot of the most ill-treated shoreside worker. Under the complete control of the ship's captain, they could be flogged, imprisoned or starved for the smallest offenses or no offenses at all. For simply quitting his job, a seaman faced charges of desertion. Organizing with other seamen to better his condition could bring charges of mutiny. In addition, the seaman was continually at the mercy of the "crimps"—brokers who virtually controlled the employment of seamen—and who took most of a seaman's meager pay in return for "services." The sailor was caught between bondage at sea and the vicious crimping system ashore.

The early seamen's organizations met with little success. Those representing seamen in the Great Lakes, grain and ore transport trades, were faced with violent opposition from the powerful steel and other trusts controlling these industries. Several of these early lakes unions, such as the Marine Engineers and the Marine Firemen, Oilers and Water Tenders, survived the antiunion agitation of the corporations. Many others however fell victim to the powerful forces employed against them. The Sailors Union of the Pacific, organized in 1891 by Andrew Furuseth, was the first successful major seamen's union and was the forerunner of a national union of seamen.

In July of 1892 the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, an AFL union with 25,000 skilled members, sought to negotiate a new contract. Even before the old contract expired however, the company built a high wooden and barbed-wire fence around the Homestead plant, complete with gun slits and sentry boxes. An across-the-board wage cut was then announced. When the union protested the wage cuts the plant was closed, the workers locked out. Three hundred armed "Pinkerton Finks" were hired by the company, to be imported from Pennsylvania and landed from barges on a nearby river, like an invasion force. They were intercepted by armed workers, however; and a pitched battle raged for 13 hours on the riverside. Seven workers and three Pinkerton scabs were killed and the barges were prevented from landing.

The company then turned for help to the friendly State government, which ordered 8,000 National Guard troops to take over the whole town. The armed troops then escorted over 2,000 scabs into the struck plant. Thus the strike dragged on into a bleak and cold November. Faced with starvation, unskilled workers who had supported the striking union men went back to work. The union was wrecked. Skilled wages were permanently cut 40 percent, unskilled wages even more.

The more the corporate trusts grew in wealth and power, the more indifferent they became to the condition of American workers. Meanwhile, American labor struggled to weld its many separate elements more firmly to resist this growing corporate power. To do this, labor began its first real attempts to organize workers on an industrywide basis instead of on a strictly craft basis. In this way a strike or strike threat would be made not by just one craft or level of workers within an industry, but would be made instead by all the various craftsmen within the industry at once. The employer could perhaps replace one level of craftsmen with scabs, but could never recruit enough strikebreakers to replace all of his workers on all levels.

The first serious attempt at this kind of organization was made by the American Railway Union under Eugene V. Debs in 1894 and resulted in the famous Pullman strike in that same year which, although it eventually failed to achieve its aims, demonstrated the power inherent in this kind of industrywide organization by succeeding in tying up nearly every railroad in the country.

The vast railroad monopolies of the time were noted for their callous disregard for the welfare of their workers. Among the worst of this bad lot was the Pullman Palace Car Co. of Pullman, Ill., near Chicago. Pullman, Ill., was a town named after the company's founder. Employees had to live in company-owned homes, attend a company-owned church, buy in company-owned stores, get their gas and water from company-owned supplies. Rent, food, clothing, services, and other costs were deducted by the company directly from workers' paychecks—and the prices were whatever the company decided to charge. Net weekly salaries of only a few cents were not uncommon for Pullman employees, although the company consistently earned fabulous profits.

The ARU was still in its infancy and not yet ready for a fight when the company slashed wages by 25 to 40 percent with no reductions in company-set living costs. The company head, George Pullman, refused even to recognize a grievance committee of workers. The ARU had no choice but to take action, struck the Pullman plant and issued orders to all its member railroad workers across the country not to handle any Pullman cars. The railroad companies, banded together in the General Managers' Association, reacted with wholesale firings of ARU members. The union then had no recourse but to call a general strike against all the Nation's railroads. Scarcely a single railroad car moved in the entire United States.

The sheer brute force which the railroad monopolies brought to bear on the ARU to break the strike was a sign not only of the power they commanded in the Nation through their vast wealth, but also of the unexpected strength of a union organized on an industrywide basis, even though it was less than a year old.

All the railroads in America pooled their huge influence to break the strike. Thousands of scabs were hired to replace striking workers. The U.S. Attorney General, Richard Olney, was called upon for help by the railroad magnates and complied by swearing in over 3,500 "special deputies" armed with clubs and guns to "protect U.S. mail cars." But it was the railroads who paid their salaries of over $400,000. These armed thugs and goons, recruited from Chicago's dingiest dens, spent most of their time attacking striking workers. Still the ARU held firm. The furious railroad magnates then went straight to the President of the United States for help in breaking the strike. President Grover Cleveland complied by rushing in four companies of the 15th U.S. Infantry. Striking workers were enraged by the appearance of American soldiers and fighting erupted. Stones hurled by workers were answered by rifle bullets and flashing bayonets. Thirty railroad workers were killed in this conflict and many more wounded. But still the ARU held firm.

When all else failed, the railroad operators called on the courts for help in breaking the strike. A Federal Court injunction was issued against the ARU, Debs, other strike leaders and "all others" involved in the strike, forbidding all strike activity, including peaceful picketing by "all and sundry persons whomsoever * * *." It was the "blanket" injunction to end all blanket injunctions. Debs and hundreds of other strikers and strike leaders were arrested and jailed for violating the injunction. Without leadership the strike crumbled and the ARU was destroyed, still in its infancy.

Big business adopted the blanket injunction as its chief antiunion weapon for years to come—it had proved that effective. But American labor had also discovered a potent weapon through the Pullman strike—the industrywide organization of workers. The 19th century closed with labor suffering a serious defeat but learning an invaluable lesson which it would use to great effect during the 20th century.

THE TOTAL WET WAR

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Downing] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, every now and then, one hears a cracking good speech. Last Monday was just such an occasion. Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy, representative and vice chairman, U.S. delegation, United Nations Military Staff Committee, U.S. mission to the United Nations, addressed the assembled corps of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., on "The Total Wet War"—and no speech could be more timely.

Admiral McCain stressed the urgent need to maintain this country as a strong maritime nation with the necessary seapower. Now, this subject is not new to those of us who have been doing everything within our power to focus national attention on what some call the soft underbelly of our national defense. The admiral, however, has approached the problem as matter of factly as it can be done.

Reading the speech does not fully transmit to the reader the compelling urgency of the problem as hearing it from an authoritative source—but, it is the next best thing.

I commend the reading of this speech to all of my colleagues in the Congress, and, under unanimous consent, include it in the Congressional Record:

The Total Wet War

(Presentation by Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy)

Since World War II there have been a number of showdowns with the Communists. Many—the Lebanon crisis, the Formosa crisis, were showdowns at sea.

The first major showdown between the Communists and the United States during what we have come to call the missile age took place at sea. This was the showdown between the United States and Soviet Union during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. It was a showdown at sea because there was no other method of getting missiles into Cuba except by ship.

This Cuban crisis was the first time that American had faced Russian, without third parties such as satellite countries involved. It was an omen of things to come that this confrontation took place on the high seas.

A more recent crisis at sea took place just last September in the Gulf of Tonkin—in the international waters off North Vietnam—U.S. vessels were attacked by hostile craft from North Vietnam. We met the attack with swift but measured response—not only against the hostile craft but also against the bases from which they came. This demonstrated our clear determination to exercise our right to help our ships in international waters.

In referring to our seapower during the Cuban crisis, the late President Kennedy made the observation that "events of October 1962 indicated, as they had all through history, that control of the seas can mean security, control of the seas can mean peace, control of the seas can mean victory. The United States must control the seas if it is to protect our security."

Following World War II, the late Sir Winston Churchill had this to say of another crisis: "Regardless of all else that was happening, the battle of the Atlantic was the dominating factor all through the war, and we viewed its changing fortunes from day to day with hope and apprehension."

These quotes from two great statesmen point up the continuing importance of these oceans in the past, present, and future.

SECURITY RELIES ON STRENGTH ACROSS THE BOARD

There are three basic points that I would like to make on the subject of seapower.

First, we are involved in what I call a total "wet war" with the Soviet Union. This not only includes the naval aspects of the oceans but also the merchant marine, oceanography, and fishing industry.

Second, with any further expansion the Communists must move into those areas which are directly influenced by seapower.

And third, the most profound change in the history of warfare has been the extended inland reach from mobile bases at sea. With the addition in September 1964 of the 2,875-mile-range Polaris ballistic missile, no spot on earth is beyond range of attack from the seas.

But as a prelude and as a foundation I want to emphasize that this Nation today needs all four services and strengths. This means a strong Army and Air Force and a strong Navy and Marine Corps.

Furthermore, wars are still brought to a successful conclusion by a man with a gun on his shoulder taking over a spot with all his attendant heavy equipment which can only be gotten there by ship. There is no scientific innovation on the horizon that foreshadows the slightest change in this simple little statement of fact.

THREE-QUARTERS OF THE EARTH'S SURFACE IS WATER

Three-quarters of the earth's surface is water. Consequently, it just stands to reason that three-quarters of the earth's surface is going to have a predominating influence on the future of the human race.

The oceans will play a growing role in the defense of the free world in the future. Some people would like to see the United States take a decreasing interest in world affairs and withdraw to our "island America." But we are inextricably tied to the nations of the free world for our own mutual benefits and we are directly involved in the defense of 60 of them through either direct treaty or military assistance agreements.

The British used the oceans to unite their great Commonwealth and to do so they maintained tremendous strength in seapower. Today we must also use the oceans in the interest of this great oceanic confederation of nations of the free world if we are to resist the massive onslaught of communism which seeks to rule the world.

Almost three-quarters of the earth's surface is free real estate to use in the defense of the free world. The oceans are the best way our national policy can be projected from our own "island America" without the possibility of international political problems.

If we were to control the seas in wartime, then the Communists would be confined to a limited area of the world. If they gain control of these oceans, then the reverse becomes true.

SEAPOWER'S NEW FOUR-OCEAN CHALLENGE

Future hostilities may require any one of a variety of responses. One is the projection of the combat-ready Marine ashore any place where circumstances may dictate. Because of the geographic, political, and economic factors we are faced with a four-ocean challenge. This new four-ocean challenge not only includes the North Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, but it also includes the Arctic Ocean to the north, and to the southeast there is a brand new strategic ocean area which I have been referring to as the Afro-Asian Ocean, comprising the broad reaches of the South Atlantic and the Indian Oceans.

DISTANT COMMITMENTS REQUIRE FORCE MOBILITY

Longer distances and new conditions put a new emphasis on mobility. From the standpoint of distances, most trouble spots are thousands of miles from the United States. Furthermore, they tend to be in areas in which we have few fixed bases from which to project military power. The primary method by which we are going to get there is by sea.

The Communists are skilled at devising solutions to meet new conditions. One is the leapfrogging technique by which they move to many widely separated areas of the world thousands of miles from their own borders, in their effort to move toward world domination. The importance of mobility is increasing because of these factors.

There are three types of mobility which we derive from these oceans.

First, is geographic mobility. The oceans are a vast highway and we can range from place to place at will.

Second is political mobility. When you use the international waters you do not become involved with problems of national sovereignty.

Third, the oceans give us tactical mobility. Our seaborne striking force can be concentrated as a unit or dispersed in many task groups.

These mobile bases have many capabilities. The aircraft carriers, in effect, are self-sufficient mobile airfields. Mobile strategic missile bases are in the form of Polaris submarines. Our amphibious forces are mobile troop bases and staging areas. All ships have an extensive communications capability but we are now building communications ships which can replace an entire communications station on land. One, the communications relay ship U.S.S. *Annapolis*, is already on station with the fleet. Repair ships provide all the facilities for upkeep and maintenance. This entire complex is supported by tankers and supply ships which give our mobile bases sustained staying power.

Every type of military power can be projected from mobile bases at sea—airpower, gunpower, manpower, and missilepower.

THE PATTERN OF COLD WAR CRISES

A few years ago the areas of cold war crisis tended to conform with a pattern bordering the Sino-Soviet bloc. These crises included the Korean war, the Formosa crisis, the South Vietnam evacuation, the crisis at the northern border of India, and the Berlin crisis. All these trouble spots tended to conform with and were in the proximity of the borders of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

World trouble spots now take form in a new type shooting crisis which extends more than halfway across the world. Of particular interest is the entire Afro-Asian area, the free world's most critical trouble spot at the moment.

On V-J Day, political control over this Afro-Asian area was held mainly by five nations, Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, and Portugal. Most of the problems that arose were settled in five European capitals. Today there are over 40 new nations in this section of the world which complicates the political picture. In Africa alone there are 37 sovereign nations.

As I have previously pointed out, the Communists are particularly interested in these new nations which are sometimes called the underdeveloped countries—both politically and economically.

THE COMMUNIST METHOD IN MADNESS

Obviously there is a method to the madness of these trouble spots. The critical strategic areas involved reveal a pattern and a plan.

All four bottlenecks of world sea trade lie in areas of political unrest and uncertainty—the Panama Canal, Straits of Gibraltar, Suez Canal and Red Sea, and the Straits of Malacca.

It becomes increasingly apparent that these strategic bottlenecks of seapower have received close attention from the Communists.

But they haven't lost sight of the "big picture" either. Their overall strategy places equal importance on the merchant marine aspect of seapower.

Of primary interest to them is the fact that there are more than 9,000 merchant ships steaming in the sealanes of the world every day. Many of these ships are carrying vital raw materials to the United States. If these merchant ships don't get through with their important cargoes, we would be hampered in our efforts to build satellites, B-52's, B-58's, nuclear-powered submarines, automobiles, radios, and many other things that depend on the import of strategic raw materials from overseas. I might add that we would also have to do without coffee, something many of us couldn't stand.

In time of war these merchant ships assume a very important role. In the Korean war 99 percent of everything going into Korea was delivered by ship.

Yet, our own U.S. merchant fleets is in a state of serious decline. American-flag merchant ships carry only about 5 percent of our overseas trade. In other words, we are dependent upon ships of other nations to carry 95 percent of our commerce.

We have less than 550 active merchant ships flying the U.S.-flag engaged in overseas trade, and this fleet is declining by about 4 percent each year. Compare this to the several thousand ships we had at the end of World War II.

We are presently building about 50 new merchant ships of all sizes. On the other hand, the Soviet Union is building 441 new ships. By 1970 the Soviets will be constructing 670 new merchant ships.

Unless the trend changes the Soviet Union is expected to overtake us in the field of merchant shipping in the next year or two.

ANOTHER VIEW FROM THE KREMLIN

Looking at the world from another viewpoint: For the past 15 years the Communists have been seeking to expand to the east and west. In the first few years after World War II the Communists expanded rapidly. They absorbed the so-called satellite nations of Eastern Europe by simply marching in. In the Far East they seized the mainland of China and its 700 million inhabitants.

As a result, the nations of the free world have determined that further aggression means war. With the strategists in the Kremlin looks to the West, he sees Europe as a peninsula surrounded on three sides by water. He knows that with any movement into Europe on his part, he is faced with our fixed base structure in that section of the world in the person of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries as well as the 6th Fleet with its amphibious capability and embarked Marines. In addition, it is possible to deploy other units of the defense establishment from the east coast of the United States by sea to bolster the defenses of Europe.

If the Communists move to the East they immediately encounter our fixed base structure in that section of the world, together with the 7th Fleet and its amphibious capability with embarked Marines, which right now is operating with other forces off South Vietnam. Also there is the possibility of deployment of the 1st Fleet and other units of the Defense Establishment from the west coast of the United States.

If they try to move to the North they encounter the unfavorable climatic and geographic conditions in the Polar Ice Cap.

This leaves only one direction for Red China and Soviet Russia to move—to the south.

Unless restrained, it may be their intention to do just that. The determination of free people in these sections of the world to resist communism in the face of great hardship and danger is worthy of note.

LEAPFROGGING—A TREACHEROUS COMMUNIST GAME

In order to fulfill their ambition of world domination the Communists are leapfrogging to new areas. Both Red China and Russia are active in Africa, and we know what the situation is in Cuba. The pressure in southeast Asia is constant and unrelenting. And, the pattern shows, they are moving into those geographic areas that come directly under the influence of seapower.

Cuba has become the classic example. Considering Cuba from a strategic standpoint and in line with the philosophy of Adm. Alfred T. Mahan, the great champion of American seapower, this Caribbean island is within reach of the north and south trade routes between North and South America.

So I repeat—any further expansion on the part of the Sino-Soviet bloc will mean that they have to move into those areas that come directly under the influence brought to bear from the seas.

We saw this proven in the Korean war when we turned their flanks by the Inchon landing. Our naval striking forces also projected mobile airpower and gunpower on the enemy's flanks. When I was the executive officer of the cruiser *St. Paul* we continually bombarded their lines by steaming up the coastline. Had we not controlled the seas around Korea, and not been able to use our cruisers and carriers and amphibious force, the outcome of that conflict would have been more difficult to achieve.

This same principle applies to the southeast Asian peninsula, the Indian peninsula, the isthmus which connects Africa and Asia and to the European peninsula. In short, the Communists would be faced with all the disadvantages of peninsula warfare without control of the seas surrounding those peninsulas.

One of the significant advantages in the proper military use of these oceans is that there is an infinite number of locations in which we can place our mobile bases around the periphery of the Sino-Soviet Bloc. Moscow and Peking are more than aware of this capability.

THE SUBMARINE THREAT TO SEAPOWER

Let us examine this world situation from still another viewpoint. World War I was a one ocean war and rotated around the North Atlantic. The Kaiser's U-boat campaign came within an inch of licking us because of the importance of the lowly freighter and its strategic cargoes for the prosecution of the war.

World War II was a two-ocean war involving both the North Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. Hitler began World War II with 57 submarines and came dangerously close to cutting the Allied supply lines.

Today the most critical potential military threat to our vital ocean routes is the huge Soviet submarine fleet, because the Soviet Union has over 400 submarines. Over 25 of these are nuclear powered and of the most modern design.

The real significance of this tremendous number rests in the recognition by the men in the Kremlin of our dependence upon the ocean lanes of communication for the survival of the free world. The Soviet submarine fleet has been built specifically to establish a capability of driving a steel wedge down the Atlantic Ocean, cutting the lifeline between Europe and America. If this should happen it would split the Western alliance and pose a grave danger to both sides of the Atlantic.

During the Cuban crisis many Soviet long-range submarines were sent to the Caribbean area. In fact our antisubmarine warfare forces persistently tracked these submarines and some eventually were forced to come to the surface to recharge batteries and make repairs.

The Soviets also have missile-firing submarines. At present these are not comparable to our Polaris submarines since they can only carry a few short-range missiles and must come to the surface in order to fire them. But the Russians are presumably hard at work perfecting a long-range underwater missile similar to our Polaris system. Recent Russian claims at great progress in this area cannot be completely disregarded as propaganda. We must attribute to their technological skills the same potential for eventually developing this sophisticated weapons system as well. Our answer must be an effective antisubmarine warfare capability.

Antisubmarine warfare requires a combination of forces to do the job. Aircraft, surface ships, and submarines are all members of the ASW team. Our ASW forces are built around aircraft carriers which supply fixed wing aircraft and helicopters for patrol and detection. The carrier-based aircraft are supplemented by long-range land based patrol planes.

Destroyers now carry new weapons such as the remote controlled drone helicopter, Dash. Submarines can seek out and destroy enemy submarines in their own environment. The primary mission of our attack submarines is ASW. With the recent development of the antisubmarine rocket, Asroc, this killer submarine concept is becoming an extremely reliable thing.

There are many facets of antisubmarine warfare. The problem goes far beyond the simple detection and destruction of attacking enemy submarines. In the first place, if war should come, we would attack enemy submarines at every available opportunity—in the shipyards, alongside the docks while fitting out, in the traing areas, while en route to the target area, in the target area, and on their way back home again.

Also, the Soviets suffer in the deployment of their subs from the disontinuity of their coastline. Their submarines can only be deployed from four basic areas—from the White Sea through the Skagerrak and the Kattegat, from the Black Sea through the Dardanelles and the Straits of Gibralter, and from the Pacific coast of the Soviet Union through narrow waters between Korea, Japan, and the Kurile Islands. In wartime, we could easily mine many of these narrow waters and also deploy our hunter-killer submarines to lie in wait for the egress of the Soviet submarines.

TODAY THERE ARE FOUR OCEANS

These developments and considerations lead to an obvious conclusion—today our ocean challenges have grown from two to four.

Ocean No. 1 now includes the Mediterranean as well as the North Atlantic and Western approaches to Europe. This is the NATO arc of responsibility.

Ocean No. 2 includes the Pacific approaches to the Asian continent and extends all the way from the Bering Straits to the Straits of Malacca.

Ocean No. 3 takes in the great northern reaches of the Arctic Ocean which for the first time in the history of man can be exploited by seapower because of the advent of the nuclear powered submarine. This was forcefully demonstrated in August 1962 when two of our nuclear subs, the U.S.S. *Sea Dragon* and the U.S.S. *Skate* rendezvoused at the North Pole.

Last winter the Soviet Union announced that one of their nuclear powered submarines had also surfaced at the North Pole. In any future conflict this could easily become a vast silent battleground between opposing submarines.

Ocean No. 4 is the Afro-Asian Ocean and extends from New Guinea across the southern shores of Asia and around Africa. This is a brand new area of importance.

UNITED STATES LOOKS SEAWARD FOR SOLUTIONS

The fact that the United States is no longer self-contained adds to the seriousness of this challenge. We are forced to go outside our continental limits for strategic raw materials. Just to mention a few: Over 50 percent of our cobalt and 50 percent of the free world's copper comes from Africa. Much of our tin comes from the Far East.

Science and technology are now looking seaward for a solution. As the population of the world increases and our resources on land diminish we must look to the oceans for food, fresh water, raw materials, and power. Mankind has always derived food from the oceans in the form of fish. We are now investigating the possibilities of extracting other lifegiving elements which are abundant beneath the surface of the seas.

The Japanese are the leaders in this exploration and are now making palatable dishes from such things as seaweed and algae. U.S. scientists are also studying algae-based food that can be grown and eaten during a long space voyage.

Fresh water supply is becoming a serious problem in certain areas of the United States and will become even more serious in the years to come. Several distilling plants for making fresh water from salt water are already in operation in this country and elsewhere. Witness the highly successful desalinization plant that was recently put into operation at our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for example. The complete plant, installed in less than 150 days, now provides the base with its entire water needs—two and a quarter million gallons a day.

We have the know-how, but the cost is prohibitive. Recent technological developments in the peaceful use of atomic energy may help, but an accelerated effort in this field is a must.

Our resources in some raw materials are rapidly giving out. The oceans are a vast storehouse of raw materials. For instance, rocklike nodules of practically pure raw material have been photographed on the ocean bottom. They range across the entire spectrum from zinc to manganese. All that remains is for science to devise economical methods to unlock the door to this storehouse.

ALL ASPECTS OF SEAPOWER AFFECT OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS

From a geopolitical as well as from a military standpoint we have a profound interest in every section of the world. Consequently, the importance of the merchant marine to the future of the United States will increase in the years to come.

More than 70,000 miles of vital ocean routes unite the free world and bring together its vast resources. These ocean routes are as fundamental to our own survival as eating, breathing, and sleeping are to the human body. They must remain open.

IVAN HAS GONE TO SEA

Ivan too has gone to sea in the interest of Soviet goals because the Russians recognize fully the importance of the oceans to the achievement of Communist ambitions.

Soviet seapower is modern and it is growing. The Soviets have the second largest navy in the world. They have more than 20 cruisers, 160 destroyers and as mentioned before, 400 submarines. Most of her ships have been built since World War II.

One ship of particular interest is the Komar class guided missile PT boat. Some of these patrol boats have been given to Cuba and Indonesia. Some of Russia's cruisers are equipped with surface-to-air missiles and several Red destroyers are armed with surface-to-surface missiles.

Communist China has also embarked on a massive buildup of her naval strength.

There is no doubt that these Communist navies are growing with the object of challenging the U.S. supremacy at sea. The Soviet Union now understands the value of seapower and has come to realize that the Atlantic "bridge" is a vital link of allied strategy.

The Soviet merchant marine is growing by leaps and bounds. She recognizes the importance of the simple, seemingly innocuous looking merchant ship with its vital cargo.

The U.S.S.R., unlike the United States, is almost self-sufficient in raw materials. Yet they have one of the most modern merchant fleets in the world and it is growing rapidly. They have over 1,200 merchant ships today and the signs are that they intend to more than double this fleet by 1970. In 5 years they could have the world's largest and most modern merchant marine. This is in contrast to only 581 merchant ships in Russia in 1954. By 1966 the Soviets may surpass us in ships.

Further, there is a very fine line of distinction between the peaceful uses of a merchant ship and its wartime uses. In fact this line is nearly indistinguishable because the passenger ship, for example, lends itself to warlike transportation of troops. In the Cuban crisis, it was merchant shipping that took the missiles into Cuba and others that took them out.

In the fishing industry, Soviet Russia has invaded every major fishing ground throughout the world and she will soon surpass Japan, if she hasn't already, as the No. 1 industrial fishing country in the world. In that connection Russia has had trawlers operating in close to both of our coasts. Often, these trawlers are equipped with more electronic equipment than one would normally attribute to just fishing.

Soviet Russia has more than 100 oceanographic survey vessels working worldwide. It is apparent that she has in mind not only the future military uses of the ocean depths but also their economic potential, including mining the ocean bottoms for raw materials.

The fact is that we have just scratched the surface in the exploration of the ocean depths. The *Thresher* tragedy in 1963 clearly illustrated that we probably know less about the ocean depths than we do about space.

We have begun to make breakthroughs, however, and one of them has been with the bathyscaphe *Trieste*. The *Trieste* descended to the deepest spot in the oceans, a depth of over 6 miles in the Marianas Trench, in 1960. This trip was just as spectacular from a scientific point of view as the more widely publicized orbiting of the earth.

U.S. FLEETS ARE DEPLOYED AND READY

At present we can boast of the greatest Navy in the world to meet this challenge. Our U.S. fleets are deployed worldwide—the 1st Fleet in the Pacific, the 2d Fleet in the Western Atlantic and the Caribbean, the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and the 7th Fleet in the Western Pacific, where right now it is in the South China Sea. These forces can anticipate trouble and often their timely arrival in an area of tension is enough to deter actual conflict.

MILITARY MIGHT CAN BE PROJECTED FROM THE SEA

Fortunately, our mobile sea bases can perform an important military function. There is no form of military power that we cannot project from our mobile bases at sea. We can project airpower, from our mobile airfields, the carrier. We can project missile power from surface ships and submarines; gunpower from surface ships and the combat-ready marine with his heavy equipment from our amphibious forces.

For these reasons the Navy and Marine Corps are a basic instrument in the execution of a policy of graduated deterrence.

Seapower is ideally suited to execute a defense policy of graduated deterrence. Seaborne striking forces can apply any degree of military power required.

For an example of a show of force without firing a shot take the Cuban crisis; for putting men ashore to prevent trouble as well handle it, we had the Lebanon crisis; for air strikes deep inland look at Vietnam; and if necessary we could engage in any size war with aircraft operating from mobile airfields and the FBM submarines deployed with Polaris missiles.

Today the Navy and Marines Corps have more jobs to do than ever before.

First is the projection of airpower deep inland from carriers. Then there is submarine warfare, and antisubmarine warfare.

Another function is in space. The Navy is in space in many areas, but the best known is its Polaris missile program. Polaris missiles are launched from nuclear powered submarines in the submerged condition. The Polaris has been called "an intercontinental ballistic missile in a hole—and the hole moves."

THE NAVY-MARINE CORPS TEAM

One of the most important functions of our Navy is the projection of the combat-ready marine ashore. This involves the Navy-Marine Corps team which is unique in history because of its mobility and the fact that it can engage in all forms of warfare—land, sea, and air. Furthermore, there is a basic maxim of warfare which the Navy-Marine Corps team adheres to: That is, never separate the fighting man from his equipment.

This team, too, is able to fight at any end of the warfare spectrum.

At one end of the spectrum is the "show of the flag." The bluejackets and marines are outstanding ambassadors of good will. When these boys go ashore in the ports of our friends and allies their outstanding conduct inspires in that country a confidence in us to support them in time of trouble. Our ships can also show the flag in areas where the people have never before come in contact with Americans.

And, as I have pointed out previously, we can continue up the spectrum to putting marines ashore to handle trouble, to fight any type of war.

While I am on the subject of our marines and sailors, I must say that everything I have discussed to this point comes to nothing if the bluejacket and enlisted marine does not do his job. And even in this modern age, these boys must be led properly if they are to perform satisfactorily.

This then brings us to a consideration of leadership; possibly the most complicated yet essential subject in military as well as civilian life. Leadership is the supreme achievement of a successful man. And the secret of good leadership is found in the Holy Bible—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

SUMMARY

In summary, our free use of the seas will play an ever increasing role in the world situation of the future. It is of primary significance that the Communists, who occupy the world's greatest single land mass, should show so much interest in the sea. You might compare the Soviet Union to a magician. While the world focuses its attention on the right hand which is up in the air or in space, the left hand is carrying out an equally important part of the trick and is in the oceanic pocket.

We have had our first major showdowns at sea and we accomplished our national objectives. Recent world events may forecast more showdowns. The next one could come at any time and thousands of miles from the United States.

We must be prepared to meet it promptly and win. This can be accomplished through strong seapower.

BILL TO BENEFIT WORLD WAR I WIDOWS

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, today, a bill to benefit our World War I veterans and their widows by raising the limitation on other income and by increasing the exemption on retirement income.

The increase in social security benefits in January 1965, had the result of reducing the pensions of some of these veterans and this cutback is working a real hardship on them. The difficulty arose in 1964 when Congress, anticipating an increase in social security benefits, approved legislation permitting veterans to deduct 10 percent of their income from retirement plans in determining their income level and eligibility for a veterans' pension. This provision became effective January 1, 1965, and a number of veterans were able to increase their pensions before the social security increase went into effect. Then the 7-percent cost-of-living social security increase, which was passed during the 1965 session, caused the pensions of some veterans and their widows to be reduced or abolished.

Since the income of these veterans and their widows is quite low, any cut in their pensions creates a very real financial hardship. In some cases, a mere increase of $7 or $8 in the social security benefits has meant a loss of $30 to $40 a month in the veterans' pensions.

I have received numerous examples from throughout my district of these cuts. Earlier this year, I asked the county veterans service officers in my district to furnish me with information on the extent of these reductions and based on their reports and letters I have received from individuals, it appears that between 53 and 63 veterans and their widows in my district alone have suffered cutbacks in their pensions.

When we remember that a veteran with dependents must come within the $3,000 income limitation to be eligible for a pension, or a single veteran within the $1,800 limitation, it becomes clear what a reduction in pension can mean. No wonder many of our veterans feel their devotion to their country and service in World War I has been forgotten by an ungrateful government which has failed to insure that they will receive a decent income during their later years.

Although the bill I am introducing today does not address itself to pension rates, it is designed to cover all veterans and their widows who are now receiving pensions and at the same time to assure that no veteran's pension would be reduced as a result of the recent social security increase.

By raising the income limitation by $600—to $3,600 for married veterans and $2,400 for single veterans—as well as allowing veterans to deduct an additional 10 percent, or a total of 20 percent, of their income from any public or private retirement program, this bill would provide a modest and much-needed increase in income for the veterans of World War I and their widows.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for May 5 through May 13, on account of official business.

Mr. CULVER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for May 5 through May 9, on account of official business.

Mr. MACKIE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, to attend the funeral of Senator McNamara.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 11, on account of official business.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), May 2 through May 13, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RANDALL, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 30 minutes, on May 5; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL and to include tables with his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole on the bill H.R. 14745.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. HALL) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter during debate today on HEW appropriation bill.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. CAHILL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. JOELSON.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 943. An act for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 5, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2376. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report on the Dallas Creek project, Colorado, pursuant to the provisions of 53 Stat. 1187 (H. Doc. No. 433); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2377. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the West Divide project, Colo., pursuant to the provisions of 53 Stat. 187 (H. Doc. No. 434); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2378. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the San Miguel project, Colorado, pursuant to the provisions of 53 Stat. 1187 (H. Doc. 435); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2379. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Animas-La Plata project, Colorado-New Mexico, pursuant to the provision of 53 Stat. 1187 (H. Doc. No. 436); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2380. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting the report of Federal contributions program, equipment, and facilities, for the quarter ending March 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2381. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 79–520; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2382. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy of the United States; to provide standards for the issuance, denial, and revocation of passports by the Secretary of State; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2383. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings through consolidation and reduction of certain employment service activities in Wisconsin, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2384. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of research, progress, and plans of the U.S. Weather Bureau for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80–657; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2385. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a report concerning visa petitions approved, according the beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12676. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty; with amendments (Rept. No. 1472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 9339. A bill to protect the health and well-being of the Nation's children by establishing a special summer lunch program; with amendments (Rept. No. 1473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 14050. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 1474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 833. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14865. A bill providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 14866. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide temporary assistance where public school buildings are destroyed by natural causes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 14867. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 14868. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14869. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 14870. A bill to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on American Manpower and National Security; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 14871. A bill to provide that the majority of the membership (including the chairman) of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, shall be composed of members of a major political party other than the political party of which the President of the United States is a member; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14872. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the income tax exemption for interest on State and local obligations shall not be available in the case of certain obligations issued to provide facilities for private business or to obtain funds for investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 14873. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of sea-grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 14874. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a full tax deduction for child care expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 14875. A bill to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 14876. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14877. A bill to increase the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14878. A bill to increase the rate of pension payable to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, their widows, and certain other dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 14879. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 14880. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 14881. A bill to appropriate funds to complete preconstruction planning, to start site acquisition, and to initiate construction of the New Hope Reservoir project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 14882. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 14883. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property, and to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, Indian groups under Federal supervision, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations, at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 14884. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14885. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to raise the income limits with respect to the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and the widows of such veterans, and to permit 20 percent of social security, retirement, and similar payments to be disregarded in determining eligibility for such pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 14886. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of the National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 14887. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts, provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 14888. A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 1134. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.J. Res. 1135. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.J. Res. 1136. Joint resolution to amend section 374(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to permit adjustment of acreages in certification cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 633. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Nation's taxicab drivers should be enlisted in the war against crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 841. Resolution to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 842. Resolution authorizing the printing of the U.S. Defense Policies in 1965 as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 14889. A bill for the relief of Margherita Chiarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14890. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mian Ashraf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14891. A bill for the relief of Angel Orris Amado Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14892. A bill for the relief of Laura Barrios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 14893. A bill to provide for the free entry of an ionosonde for the use of the University of Illinois; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14894. A bill for the relief of Miss Concepcion N. Velasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Osteopaths Now Eligible for Commission in Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have pointed out to the House the failure of the Secretaries of the respective services to implement the provisions of Public Law 84-763.

You will recall that this law gave osteopath physicians the same rights to commissions in the military as allopath physicians. For some reason the surgeon generals and the respective Secretaries have failed since the enactment of this legislation to properly implement it.

Today I received a letter from Deputy Assistant Secretary Shirley C. Fisk, Department of Defense, advising me that the Secretary of Defense, upon completion of his reexamination of the osteopathy question, has concluded that qualified osteopaths can now be effectively utilized in the military medical service. He has accordingly instructed the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to change the regulations dealing with medical officer commissions so that qualified doctors of osteopathy may be accepted for appointment on active duty. It is anticipated that the necessary changes in the regulations concerned will be made within the next 2 weeks.

I am grateful to the Members of the House who joined me in our efforts to correct the inequity that existed and commend the Secretary of Defense and his associates in the Defense Department for this constructive action on their part.

Sea-Grant Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining a number of my colleagues in filing a bill to establish a national system of sea-grant colleges. Its purpose is to provide improved ways to make use of the ocean's vast, virtually untapped resources. The idea is analogous to the land-grant college concept and our belief is that such a program would create the same rapid growth in marine sciences that the land-grant college provided for agriculture.

The bill has five major provisions. The first would authorize funds to be made available to colleges and universities to expand practical education in the marine sciences. In a few instances new colleges might be formed, but ordinarily programs would be founded or expanded in existing institutions with an interest in the sea.

Funds would also be available to support a relatively neglected aspect of our marine science program—applied research. These funds would be used to bridge the gap between the basic research that is now being done and technologically useful developments. This part of the program would pay off quickly in economic terms for this country. Programs that could be supported would be, for example, shellfish research, research in fishing techniques, marine conservation, pollution control, fish farming, and desalination.

Another major program provided by the bill is a service similar to that of the Agricultural Extension Service. It would provide lectures and demonstrations at the local level to disseminate useful information to those working or interested in the marine sciences. The beneficiaries of this part of the program would be not only scientists, but also fishermen, who could learn about new fishing areas, gear, and techniques. Such a program would meet a long-felt need in this country. We have made many advances in the marine sciences but often have been unable to put them to immediate practical use because the ultimate users have not had access to the information.

Development of the Continental Shelf is vital to any national oceanographic program. This bill facilitates use and study of the Continental Shelf by setting aside certain appropriate areas of the submerged lands for the use of participants in the program.

This legislation is designed to encourage the creation and expansion of regional centers of excellence in marine science fields. Such centers would be of enormous economic value to the areas where they are located. The interplay of ideas and pool of technicians and scientists that would be drawn to such areas would foster cross-fertilization of ideas and rapid growth.

Funds for this program would come, not from taxes, but 10 percent of all royalties, rentals, and other sums that are paid to the Federal Government for the use of the Continental Shelf. It is estimated that the total of these royalties in 1966 will be $270 million. This seems to be an appropriate way of financing the sea grant system. Moreover, the funds will be likely to grow along with the program, since exploitation of the Continental Shelf is likely to increase in future years.

Grants could be given not only to educational institutions but also to any public or private agency, any foundation, laboratory, corporation, industry, or even group of individuals which plans to operate a program under the provisions of this bill. The broad range of beneficiaries is in my view one of the bill's strongest points. One of the weaknesses of oceanography in this country has been that it has been largely a government operation. However, this bill would bring in many diverse groups. Our national program will be strengthened by the participation of many segments of our society—each has something to contribute as well as to gain.

On a recent trip to Russia for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I was struck by Russian capability in applied oceanography. My impressions were confirmed by scientists in this country who say that although we still lead the Russians in basic oceanographic research, we are lagging in applied research. Moreover, the Russians appear to have two or three times as many people as we do in the ocean sciences. Each scientist in the Soviet Union has more technicians to back him up than do our scientists. The bill I am filing today would meet three of the most pressing needs of our oceanographic program—particularly in the light of the Soviet challenge—applied research, dissemination of information to users, and provision of more personnel, especially ocean technicians.

To understand how the bill could work, let us take for example a center of excellence in oceanography such as exists today in southeastern Massachusetts, having Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution as its focal point. The fact that this institution is located in an area where the people have historically looked seaward means that interest in oceanography is high.

My office constantly receives requests from this area for information on careers in oceanography, and a number of educational institutions are presently sounding out plans for oceanography curricula. In fact at this very moment I have on my desk a plan proposed by a group of marine scientists and other responsible citizens for a vocational training school for ocean technicians in the Cape Cod area to meet the demands of Woods Hole for such technicians.

Southeastern Massachusetts Technical Institute is a school ideally situated for an oceanography curriculum on the outskirts of New Bedford. It is a young and rapidly growing institution which could provide an invaluable service to both community and country by teaching oceanography. Preliminary development plans for oceanography have just been approved by the trustees. The interest is there—with adequate funding, a great deal could be done.

Another place where oceanography could be developed is in the high schools. A rather unique pilot project has been approved for the town of Falmouth in my district, introducing oceanography into the high school curriculum.

Apart from these educational institutions with an interest in oceanography, there are independent laboratories and businesses with ocean science orientation in this area. The energy, motivation, and talent to build important and imaginative oceanographic programs already exists in southeastern Massachusetts as I am sure it does in other such centers across the country. With this solid foundation the sea grant college system could produce a rapid flowering of developments in the marine sciences.

Education is the key to the sea grant college bill. The education that we provide today will determine the state of our marine sciences tomorrow. On education rests the future of our national oceanographic program.

National Guard Launches Blood-for-Defense Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to speak to this House on numerous past occasions on the invaluable and continuing contribution of the National Guard to the defense of our Nation and to the well-being of each State and its citizens.

This month—May—the Guard has embarked on still another program for which they should be recognized and praised. It has launched a blood-for-defense project to obtain some 250,000 pints of blood from members of the Guard themselves, and from members of their families, over the next 6 months.

Every ounce of this blood will be earmarked for defense use, most of it in the form of gamma globulin and serum albumin, two vital blood derivatives which are being used in ever-increasing amounts by our forces in southeast Asia.

Military stockpiles of these two vital blood components have shrunk under the growing demands of the conflict in South Vietnam, and the National Guard Association of the United States agreed to sponsor this nationwide program among guardsmen to replenish our dwindling stocks.

Cooperating in the program is the American Red Cross, which says that this will be the largest blood donation program ever conducted within a single organization. By way of comparison, the Red Cross collected a total of approximately 13 million pints from all sources throughout the 5 years of World War II, and 7 million pints during the Korean conflict. Now, a single organization, the National Guard, intends to collect a quarter of a million pints just from its own members and families, and if the Guard's past record of performance is any indicator, it will have no trouble in attaining its objective.

The Nation has asked a great deal of its guardsmen in recent months. Nearly 120,000 of these citizen-soldiers are devoting almost twice as much time to their training as they were a year ago. They are doing this to insure their readiness for rapid mobilization and early deployment to an overseas area in case a ticklish international situation requires their presence.

This means that guardsmen in this category are spending the equivalent of 48 full 8-hour days per year on military duties, and these are men, you must remember, who are attempting concurrently to carry on normal civilian lives and satisfy the demands of full-time civilian careers.

A large group of air guardsmen, in the Air National Guard's 25 heavy transport squadrons, are making 75 cargo-hauling flights to South Vietnam each month, and 140 overseas flights to Europe and other parts of the world, in direct support of our Active Forces overseas. These, too, are guardsmen who are carrying on civilian careers and simultaneously performing valuable and vital services for our defense establishment at no small cost to themselves.

On this and past occasions, when the Nation needed their help, members of the National Guard have never failed to give far more of their time and energy and talent than is required by their mission. In volunteering to obtain this huge supply of badly needed blood from their own ranks, then, members of the National Guard are simply perpetuating the tradition of unselfish service which has made the Guard the outstanding military organization it is today.

Food Store Prices Reflect Federal Excesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last month I received a letter from a constituent who explained that it was becoming impossible to sustain his little family on the pension for which he worked so many years. He asserted that since last July roast beef had risen in price from 52 to 75 cents, 5 pounds of sugar from 52 to 75 cents, oleomargarine from 39 to 49 cents, a peck of potatoes from 57 cents $1.05; and a cleaning powder from 49 to 53 cents.

In addition, he said that the shoes he wears went up from $7.95 to $12, a coat from $3.95 to $5.95, and boots from $5.95 to $7.95. While I cannot vouch for the authenticity of these figures, I would not hestitate to defend the writer's sincerity; yet for the purposes of the record I have undertaken just a sample item-by-item survey of grocery store prices as advertised during the third week of April 1965 as compared with those for the same period of this year—same store, same brand names. Here briefly are some results of my study:

	1965	1966
Ground beef	2 pounds, 75 cents	3 pounds, $1.49.
Sliced bacon	55 cents per pound	75 cents per pound.
Boneless beef roast	59 cents per pound	89 cents per pound.
Bananas	10 cents per pound	2 pounds, 29 cents.
Evaporated milk	6 cans, 75 cents	6 cans, 85 cents.
Shampoo	51 cents	69 cents.
Carrots	2 packages, 19 cents	2 packages, 39 cents.
Canned corn	2 cans, 33 cents	2 cans, 45 cents.
Cooking oil	41 cents per bottle	49 cents per bottle.
Toothpaste	57 cents per tube	63 cents per tube.

Those are typical prices, Mr. Speaker, and I have omitted some items simply because the disparity between last year and today is so great that I must check them more closely before convincing myself that the quality of the products are not in some way involved. I quickly point out also that some products have held steady and others have even dipped slightly in price, yet the fact is that most food costs have inclined so sharply that families on fixed incomes are forced to come home with shopping bags that get lighter by the month.

Here, then, is the most convincing argument against wanton government spending that is stoking inflation. Nonessential Federal spending financed by a money supply that has been growing at an annual rate of 6 percent in recent months is the reason why family subsistence is becoming more and more expensive. Under a prudent monetary policy, it would be possible to finance the conflict in Vietnam without driving prices upward; but if we must continue to support bureaucratic orgies without regard to budgetary considerations, then there is no answer but high prices and/or higher taxes.

Congressman Duncan Summarizes Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call attention to the interest the people of the Second District of Tennessee have expressed in national and international affairs. Some 12,000 families and individuals responded to my second annual legislative questionnaire.

The purpose of the questionnaire was to find out what views my constituents have on some major issues facing the Congress.

The answers reveal that the majority of Second District citizens think alike. In the most decisive response over 82 percent said we should reduce our foreign aid spending.

Nearly 3 out of 4 are for cutting back on new domestic programs to help finance our efforts in Vietnam and for escalating the war in Vietnam to include bombing major sites in North Vietnam.

The complete returns to my questionnaire are as follows:

DO YOU FAVOR—

1. Restoring the excise taxes on telephone service and automobiles that were repealed last year?

	Percent
Yes	24.0
No	72.0
No opinion	4.0

2. Increasing the term of a Congressman from 2 to 4 years?

	Percent
Yes	53.2
No	44.1
No opinion	2.7

3. Expanding U.S. trade with Russia and Communist countries of Eastern Europe?

	Percent
Yes	22.8
No	71.9
No opinion	5.3

4. Escalating the war in Vietnam to include bombing major sites in North Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes	69.9
No	20.6
No opinion	9.5

5. Cutting back some of the new domestic programs to finance our efforts in Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes	71.6
No	24.2
No opinion	4.2

6. Further legislation to give the Federal Government more power to enforce civil rights laws?

	Percent
Yes	16.2
No	81.1
No opinion	2.7

7. A new department of transportation for the President's Cabinet?

	Percent
Yes	24.0
No	67.8
No opinion	8.2

8. Enacting laws of international scope as proposed by President Johnson—International Health Act and International Education Act?

	Percent
Yes	22.4
No	66.1
No opinion	11.5

9. Federalizing unemployment compensation which is now completely under the control of the States?

	Percent
Yes	20.5
No	74.9
No opinion	4.6

10. Legislation to outlaw strikes that affect the public interest?

	Percent
Yes	67.7
No	27.9
No opinion	4.4

11. Revision of our tax laws to give States a fixed percentage of the personal income taxes collected by the Federal Government?

	Percent
Yes	64.3
No	26.9
No opinion	8.8

12. Reduction in our foreign aid spending?

	Percent
Yes	82.5
No	13.4
No opinion	4.1

13. Giving States the right to apportion one house of their legislatures on factors other than population?

	Percent
Yes	54.5
No	33.8
No opinion	11.7

NOTE.—Tabulations were made by private auditing firm—not under my supervision or control.

Senator Daniel Inouye's Address at the International Banquet of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening, April 28, 1966, an audience of several hundred people, assembled in the Washington Hilton's International Ballroom, had the opportunity to hear an address by one of this country's most promising legislators, Senator DAN INOUYE, of Hawaii.

Senator INOUYE's address was so moving—and so inspiring—that words cannot begin to adequately express its impact on those fortunate enough to be present. The enraptured audience listened in attentive silence—though at times the Senator's light and warmhearted humor split the hall with laughter.

The Senator was addressing a group of dedicated fellow Americans whose attention and efforts are directed toward assisting the Nation's handicapped through service on the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. In this outstanding group were several residents of the Fourth District of Florida which I have the honor to represent here in this body. Those from the Fourth District included Mr. and Mrs. Ben Fox, Mrs. Ed (Billie) Parodi, Mrs. Dorothy Mertens, and Mr. Jay McGlon.

We in this Chamber can take special pride in Senator INOUYE since he was his State's first Representative in this body. We fondly recall his great and effective contributions during his service here. Now we have witnessed his emergence as an able and dynamic leader in the Senate. I know I speak for many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when I say that I am proud to know—and to have served with—DAN INOUYE.

The Senator's speech follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE AT THE INTERNATIONAL BANQUET OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED, APRIL 28, 1966

Three p.m., April 21, 1945—21 years and 7 days ago. In a blinding flash of a bursting grenade, I thought the world had come to an end. I looked down at my right arm and all I saw was gushing blood, torn flesh, and shattered bones. Although I had been cited for bravery, I was afraid—totally afraid of the future. I could picture myself living a life as a cripple. I was right handed until then, and I had great hopes of becoming a surgeon. But because of my position, I put up a brave facade and smiled when the medics came to assist me. All of the men around me were rather grim, but I assured them that this was just a million dollar wound. Then one of my best friends, with tears in his eyes, told me that I would never play the ukulele again.

Next morning, while lying in bed in a huge hospital ward, I started a new and exciting chapter in my life. At that moment, I was rather bitter and sad because all of my hopes and dreams had crumbled about me.

Suddenly, a nurse came by and asked me if I wanted to smoke. I nodded yes, because I thought that a cigarette would help me dream the impossible dream. She dug into her pocket and came up with a fresh pack of Camels, and nonchalantly tossed it at me. I grabbed at it, and she started to walk away. I cursed her under my breath. I struggled and finally opened the pack. This was the first time that I had opened a pack of cigarettes with one hand. Cigarettes were strewn all over my bed, when I finally got one to my lips unlit.

After a few moments, the nurse came by again and approached me, saying, "I am sorry, you don't have a light." I curtly replied, "That's right." She again dug into her pockets and came up with a book of matches and again nonchalantly tossed it at me and walked away. I was ready to punch her. I struggled and tried to light the match but couldn't quite do it. My leg was in a cast, my midsection was bandaged, and I was strapped down to the bed. She came back again with a smile and asked if I had quit smoking, because I had taken the cigarette out of my lips. I looked at her and said, "I will start smoking if you will light it for me." She replied, "Oh, I thought you knew how to light your cigarette. I will show you how to do it." She took the book of matches and very patiently proceeded to teach me. When I tried it, I found to my great amazement that it was a very simple thing. It was a truly exciting moment for me because I found that I could help myself.

At that moment, this young nurse from Eagle Pass, Tex., taught me, without any eloquent lecturing, that I had better prepare myself to face life without sympathy and pity, and that I had better prepare and train myself to take care of my needs. I shall never forget that day.

It did not occur to me at that moment, but later, I realized that my rehabilitation program began the day after my injury.

Later, I was shipped back to the United States, and there my rehabilitation and training was carried out in earnest.

We were required to take up ballroom dancing, billiard playing, carpentry, and music. I thought I would try the trumpet first, but my instructor told me, after a couple of lessons, that I would never become a trumpet player because my lips were too soft. So, he suggested that I take up piano playing. After a month of lessons, I was ready for my graduation recital. It was a great day for me because of the presence of my ward mates and other fellow patients. I bowed and proceeded to play my graduation piece. It was "Danny Boy." The applause was rewarding.

The next important lesson was driving an automobile. It may be difficult to believe, but I had never driven an automobile until that moment. My parents were rather strict and had instructed that I was not to drive until I reached the age of 20. Since I enlisted in the Army when I was 18, the only thing that I could manuever was a bicycle. So this was an exciting experience for me.

My instructor was a rather unusual GI. He was also a patient, but a specially trained patient. He was one of our Nation's few surviving quadruple amputees; he had lost both hands, and both feet, from the extreme cold of the Vermont mountains. And he, with his hooks, proceeded to give me my first lesson.

With an instructor like that, I just had to learn. It was an inspiring experience.

Then, we were taught how to defend ourselves—and how to conduct ourselves in restaurants.

About 6 months after arriving in the United States, I was finally fitted for my first prosthetic appliance. Day after day, I reported to the special training room to receive training in using my hook. But I was never permitted to keep my appliance until my instructors felt that I was ready. Finally, after several weeks of training, the doctor in charge notified me that I was ready, and very solemnly presented me with the prosthetic appliance. It was a great day for me—it was like receiving a diploma.

That evening, I got together with my friends, and my new arm, and we happily celebrated. Training and rehabilitation continued until the very last day of my hospitalization.

About a month before my departure from the hospital, I was invited to attend a special party given by one of the patients. This patient was paralyzed from his waist down. He was a paraplegic. We all gathered at a local restaurant and had a grand time eating and drinking. He was there with his beautiful, young wife. When we finished our meal, he made a little speech. He said that a few days ago, he was notified by his doctor that he had about 3 months to live. Something had gone wrong with his kidney and bladder, and it was a hopeless case.

He said he had drawn up his will, and he was ready. He said that he was looking forward to meeting us in the next world. He did this very bravely, and with a twinkle in his eyes. He died 4 weeks later.

I cite this experience because this was one of the many times when I was impressed with the feeling that I was truly fortunate. There were those who had lost their sight, and those who were soundless, and there were the multiple amputees and the paralyzed.

After leaving the hospital, I was given the opportunity of continuing my education under Public Law 16, a special program adopted by Congress for disabled veterans. And in 1952, I received my law degree.

Although I am no expert in this business, I was shown many, many times that with proper rehabilitation and training, and given reasonable opportunities, few in this country need be cripples. I realize that the training I received, and the rehabilitation program in which I was privileged to participate, were special. It was financed by the Government and added to a great cost.

At this point, I would like to, after long last, express my gratitude to the men and women of the Army Medical Corps who so very patiently guided me through those trying months.

The activities of your organization are worthy of great support by this Nation, because as I said, with proper rehabilitation and training, and given reasonable opportunities, no one need be a cripple in this world. And I have found from my personal experiences, that a properly trained disabled person is not only a good risk, but could be a great asset to any business organization.

Incidents of accidents are lowest among disabled persons. Very seldom do you hear of a disabled person being involved in an automobile accident. A disabled person is usually one with great patience and perseverance. He is generally one with a pretty good sense of humor, and one who has sufficient courage to face odds.

Yes, as Mrs. Dorothy Devereaux, of Hawaii, once said, after recovering from a painful back injury, "It was a privilege to have been handicapped." It may sound unbelievable to one who is not disabled, but I, too, feel that, although April 21, 1945, seemed like judgment day, today I feel that it was a privilege to have been disabled. It taught me to be patient, to persevere, to laugh. And it opened up new and exciting vistas.

In 1954, I noticed that I began seeing myself in my dreams as having only one arm. Up until then, I had always seen myself with two arms. I knew then and there that my total being, my subconscience, had accepted the fact. It was a great moment for me to realize that I had reached an important high point in my rehabilitation.

Today, from time to time, my constituents approach me with great surprise, indicating that they had never realized that I had lost an arm. This is a great compliment, and I cherish this compliment.

On April 21, 1945, while sad and bitter, I dreamed impossible dreams. On August 21, 1959, 14 years and 4 months later, the impossible dream came true. I stood in the well of the U.S. House of Representatives, raised my left hand, and took the oath of office as Hawaii's first Member of Congress.

Transcript of an Interview Between Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Ray Scherer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a transcript of an interview between Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Ray Scherer, NBC News on NBC's "Today" show, May 3, 1966, regarding the farm income-farm price situation. I recommend it to my colleagues for reading:

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW BETWEEN SECRETARY FREEMAN AND RAY SCHERER ON "TODAY"

Mr. Secretary, every time I pick up the paper you seem to be in greater trouble. Now here is the headline of today's Washington Post; "Ackley calls for restraint on profits." President Johnson's economic advisers bluntly warned businessmen yesterday that they must exercise restraint on rising prices and profits if they expect labor to hold wage demands in check. Now the farmer is a businessman. Isn't the President's economic adviser saying that the farm prices must go down or at least stay down?

Secretary FREEMAN. Ray, the farmer, like the businessman and every patriotic American, is trying to help the President in his courageous struggle to combat inflation and to continue the prosperity in this country. What we have got to take a look at are the cold, hard facts. The facts of the matter are that farm prices are not inflationary. The fact of the matter is that farm prices today are 14 percent below what they were in 1952. Let me say that again: Farm prices are 14 percent below what they were in 1952.

Now wages, every workingman knows, are up. Profits are up. Cost of living is up. But farm prices are 14 percent below what they were in 1952. Many, many people have put the finger, so to speak, on the farmer in this struggle, and the facts don't bear that out. Some of the big city newspapers that are antifarm in their orientation have been belaboring the farmer. And some of the big city politicians have, too. However, it is true that farm prices have come up somewhat since 1960. Farm income has come up even more because of some of our new programs.

Progress is being made, but farm prices are not inflationary.

Question. Mr. Secretary, isn't that exactly the trouble? The farmer seems to think that you are taking pleasure in the fact that farm prices are down. Here you are almost speaking with pride about the fact that they are down 14 percent since 1952. Didn't you, at a news conference on March 31, express pleasure that farm prices have moderated?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, Ray, I certainly did not.

Question. Well, what did you say?

Secretary FREEMAN. What I said was this. I had a news conference and I was making the projection and an explanation of what the food and farm price situation is. In the course of this, I analyzed some farm prices for a couple of commodities. In these commodities, farm prices had jumped, and had jumped to a high level. And they were beginning to moderate. They had jumped up because of extremes in the price cycle and because of weather. They were now moderating and I expressed some pleasure at that fact because extreme, high prices are damaging to the farmer and to the consumer alike. They result in more production—a lot more production—and a price break. That hurts the farmer, and the high price and the swing hurts the consumer.

Basically, the interest of the farmer and the consumer are alike in this. What we need to have and what we are struggling to accomplish—and I might say with some success are strong, fair prices—to avoid these cyclical ups and downs which are damaging to the producer, to the farmer, and to the consumer alike.

I say that we are making some progress because farm income is up. Farm prices have strengthened moderately, although they are still far below what they ought to be in relation to the rest of our economy. And of course our food costs in terms of what an hour of work will buy are sharply down. As a matter of fact, even since 1960, 1 hour of work will buy another quart of milk, an hour of work will buy another loaf and a half of bread, an hour of work will even buy more meat, despite the fact that meat prices have reflected some increase.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you are going to have a hard time convincing the housewife that food prices are down. Isn't the farmer caught squarely in the middle here? Isn't the administration, in effect, trying to put a lid on farm prices?

Secretary FREEMAN. No; the administration, quite to the contrary, has been trying to firm and to strengthen farm prices. Now, I want to make one distinction here, Ray, that is sometimes overlooked on it. Farm prices and food prices are not the same thing. The farmer gets only 39 cents [NOTE.—Secretary Freeman inadvertently used figure of 37 on telecast; 39 percent is correct figure.] (in 1965) out of that food dollar. The balance goes in between (for) all it takes to get that produce, whatever it may be, from the farmer to the table. And here we have had some increases. However, I want to repeat, and I realize that the housewife—this goes for Mrs. Freeman as well—comes home with a pencil a little dulled and a quizzical look in her eyes. The truth of the matter is, the real measure of this is what does an hour of work buy. An hour of work today will buy twice as much food as it would 30 years ago. As I said a few moments ago, it will buy more food than it would just in 1960.

Question. The Pentagon has announced it is not going to buy any more pork, it's not going to buy any more butter. How do you explain that to your farmer friend?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I explain that the Pentagon is reacting like the prudent housewife. When the price of something goes up, then you shop around and tend to buy things that don't cost quite as much. However, when the price of things go down, you buy more.

Back in 1964, everyone will remember that cattle dropped to an alltime low, and there was real disaster to the farmers of this country. At that time, the Department of Agriculture—for needy people—and the Pentagon, bought lots and lots of beef. We spent a couple of hundred million dollars doing it. But then, when the price strengthened, we no longer bought so much. Pork went up to 30 cents—that's pretty high—in the market. The result was, buying moderated. That price now has dropped, and yesterday pork was about $24 to $25 (per hundredweight). That means the price is coming down, and we're watching this very closely and studying it, and I expect, as matters now stand, if my estimates are borne out by careful study, I would recommend to the Pentagon that they go back to buying pork. And I think they will.

In other words, the Government is trying to contribute to that steady but moderate price that is important to the entire economy, and to the farmer and consumer alike—to buy when he needs to strengthen that market price; when that price goes up, why then to soften that buy. And this we do in other things, fruits and vegetables, and I think it is a sound policy in the national interest.

Question. So you say this works both ways?

Secretary FREEMAN. It does work both ways.

Question. Mr. Secretary, I wonder if I might project this situation into the fall congressional campaign. Now, there are a lot of young Democrats from the farm States who came in by very narrow margins, and these freshman Democrats are in danger of not coming back in their sophomore year unless you show them some sympathy, it seems to me. What can you do to help them out?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I'm happy to show them some sympathy, but I don't think they need it. They are a bright, alert, fine young group of Congressmen; they've made a fine record. There is concern; there has been some misunderstanding as you just noted on asking me about this remark that is attributed to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Ray, I couldn't say that I hope farm prices go down. I'd swallow my tongue. I couldn't get it out. I think the President would fire me. He's been fighting for parity of income ever since he's been in public life.

The main thing is—and there will be a lot of demagoguery; this is an election year the main thing is that farm income is up. Farm income is up almost $4 billion over what it was in 1960. Now that's not adequate. On a per capita base, farmers still get only 65 percent of what the nonfarm segment of our economy gets, but that's more than the 55 percent he got back in 1960. And farm income per farm—these are average figures now and don't fit every farm—but farm income per farm is up about 55 percent.

Now, this means real progress, and farmers are making progress—but they've got to make more. That record speaks for itself. Surpluses have been eliminated. We've increased our agricultural exports for dollars to levels that would have been impossible just a few years ago. We continue to increase our efficiency, our productivity. We feed a great part of the world. The American family farmer is the wonder of the world. This record speaks for itself, and I think it will in November, and I think it will help these Congressmen.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in the final minute we have, I wonder if you can tell us where food prices are heading. They are a major factor in the price index, and that, in turn, is a major factor in whether or not the President will have to ask for a tax increase.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, there were—as you point out earlier, and I referred to—a couple of items that jumped up to extremes earlier this year. Those items have moderated; food generally has moderated; production is increasing. Farm income this year will continue strong. Food prices will be about the same as they were last year. The farmer and food will continue to contribute not to an increased cost of living, but to moderation of the cost of living.

If the price of food had gone up as much as the price of other things, why the consumer would be spending billions and billions of dollars more than he is today.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. If we have been a little hard on you this morning, we do sympathize with you as the man in the middle. It was a privilege to have you here.

Israel: The 18th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a very impressive speech delivered by our able friend, Congressman JAMES HOWARD, of New Jersey's Third Congressional District. Congressman HOWARD'S speech was made at the program of Jewish community organizations in Lakewood, N.J., on the occasion of the celebration of Israel's 18th birthday.

The speech, which indicates a deep understanding of Jewish history, follows:

I feel highly honored and privileged to speak before such a distinguished group and participate in this, the celebration of Israel's 18th Independence anniversary. Most of us, I am sure, at one time or another prior to 1948, had often wondered just how long it would be before an independent and sovereign state of Israel would be reborn. Well, on May 14, 1948 that apprehension and wondering was ended when independent Israel was proclaimed. Out of the desert has been created a new and modern state with a tremendous record of achievement over the last 18 years and with a most fruitful future.

I wonder how many of you assembled here have reflected on the character of Judaism which has enabled the Jew to endure for more than 5,000 years and yet triumph in the face of tragedy, pain, torture, expulsion, exploitation, and other degrading acts which man can perpetrate against his fellow man. I have often reflected on that topic, and in addition I like to reflect on the inner strength of Judaism which has enabled the Jews to endure where so many other famous civilizations have faded into history. Max I. Dimont, the noted scholar and lecturer, has estimated that there are perhaps 3 billion people on earth, of whom upwards of 12 million are classified as Jews.

Numerically speaking therefore, they represent less than one-half of 1 percent. Such a small percentage might easily lead one to the conclusion that their overall impact on the world's history would be relatively small or short lived. But obviously that has not been the case. At least 12 percent of all the Nobel prizes awarded in the fields of physics, chemistry, and medicine have been awarded to Jews. Jewish contributions to the world's store of culture and knowledge in music, religion, science, politics, and philosophy among other fields staggers the imagination. Although leaving many great and lasting contributions, some former great civilizations have declined throughout history, never reclaiming the past power and glory that their ancestors once attained. On the other hand, the 5,000-year history of the Jews has continued unabated, though at times they have been in severe danger of outright extinction.

Many other famous and powerful nations and kingdoms have made their appearance on the world's stage just at the time the Jews appeared. Each of us has read of the Babylonians, the Hittites, the Persians, the Philistines—all played their part and then disappeared or declined. Yet today the Jewish nation still lives, a thriving center of democratic and economic accomplishments, stronger and more promising than ever.

Today there are only three groups living that are as old or older than the Jews; the Chinese, the Egyptians, and the civilizations of India. But by comparison their experiences covered only one primary cultural period and their impact on later civilizations has not been as far reaching as that of the Jews. In addition, they were spared the hardship of dispersal and the struggle for survival in foreign lands under sometimes hostile and violent conditions.

We can pinpoint at least three facets in Jewish survival which distinguished the history of the Jews from that of other peoples. First, they have had a continuous living history for more than 5,000 years and have been a strong intellectual and spiritual force for about 4,000 years; second, they were able to survive during this long history for the most part without a country of their own, still managing to preserve their ethnic identity among foreign cultures; and third, their ideas have been expressed in all the major languages of the world. These were but three of the factors that were vital in the survival of the Jews during the Diaspora. But I think there is another factor which we should consider which not only influenced Jewish life, but has had a lasting impact on the world at large. I refer to the role of the Jewish yeshivas or academies of learning.

The story of the founding of these scholarly institutions is a most fascinating and interesting one, and I would like to recount some facets of it now, perhaps in a somewhat condensed manner. For decades the Jewish people had endured atrocities and oppression at the hands of imperial Rome. The Zealots, a political party which demanded a stronger stand against Rome, finally got their wish in the year A.D. 66. This resulted from Roman desecration of the sacred vestments of the high priest and Roman threats of blackmail. The result was the famous Jewish war against Rome. Our concern with the war centers on the period 2 years later when Roman legions had Jerusalem under siege.

One of those behind the walls of Jerusalem was a Jewish leader by the name of Jochanan ben Zakkai, a rabbi-philosopher. He was convinced that if the leaders did not lay foundations for preservation of Jewish learning, Judaism would suffer certain extinction. He envisioned the need for an academy or yeshiva which would carry the torch of Jewish learning. Consequently, he devised a plan in which he was smuggled outside the walls of Jerusalem for a conference with the Roman general Vespasian. Ben Zakkai was given an audience with Vespasian during which he predicted the general would soon be named emperor of Rome. In return for this prophecy, ben Zakkai requested that if it came true, Vespasian would permit the establishment of a yeshiva to teach religious principles.

The prophecy was really a calculated guess, but it came true, and Vespasian allowed the construction of the first yeshiva, which took place in Jabneh, north of Jerusalem.

I have referred to the origin of the yeshiva in an attempt to show two things, an example of Jewish ingenuity and ability to surmount incalculable odds under extreme pressure; and the length of their history, suggesting the staying power of the yeshivas over the years down to this very day. I might also mention their integrating role. It is commonly believed that there were three tools which played a leading role in sustaining Jewish thought and culture during the thousands of years of dispersal; religion, language, and law. The yeshiva's role in the use of those tools can hardly be overestimated. The teachings of the Talmud must also be remembered when we take into account the various factors upon which the Jew could rely during his thousands of years of trial and quest for his own country.

No commendation of Israel's achievements would be complete without recognition of some of the men who were so instrumental in laying the foundation for Zionist movement and the eventual creation of Israel. Zionism itself meant basically a return to Jerusalem, and the concept of such a return had been embedded in Jewish thought since the early years of the Diaspora. The progression from the idea of Zionism to the reality of Israel began about 1860, at which time the messianic concept of a "return to Zion" began to change to the political concept of a "return to Palestine."

I feel certain that you are familiar with such names as Moses Hess, Peretz Smolenskin, and Judah Pinsker, but the founder of the Zionist movement as we know it was Theodor Herzl. He labored vigorously in pursuit of a Jewish state and organized the First Zionist Congress, which was held in 1897 at Basel, Switzerland. That conference was the forerunner of many other conferences, meetings, debates and declarations. But its end result was the May 14 declaration which established an independent and sovereign Israel. We are all aware of the many tragedies and ordeals experienced by the Jews between the 1897 congress and the events of 1948, but the hopes and dreams built up over that half a century were finally realized with the creation of a genuine home for the children of Israel.

Now how do things stand today as we join the people of Israel in observing their 18th anniversary? In the years since independence the achievements by Israel both foreign and domestic have been outstanding. When Israel was first created it had roughly 800,000 inhabitants, of whom 655,000 were Jews. Today she has more than 2.5 million persons, of whom more than 2 million are Jews. Not only have the doors of welcome been thrown open to persons from Europe and the Americas, but immigrants from Asia and Africa have found a warm welcome and a real home in Israel.

One of the most substantial bases upon which independent Israel's nationhood has been built is that of education. Public schools are free and scholarships are available for students otherwise unable to finance their higher education. The schools have also been a leading institution in overcoming past cultural barriers which immigrants had brought from their diverse cultures. Now they are taught to regard themselves as citizens of Israel—one nation; one people.

The country's economic position has vastly improved since independence. The Nation has overcome most of the problems of material shortages and inflation and has taken major steps to integrate all the segments of her population. During the same period Israel has substantially increased its per capita gross national product and its gold and foreign exchange reserves. While the economy is still largely agricultural, the industrial sector has grown rapidly and generous tax benefits and guarantees of convertibility have been extended to attract foreign investments. Israel has not lost sight of the fact that the decline of colonial empires has brought about a vast expansion of newly independent states. Thus, she has undertaken a program of economic and technical assistance which has been highly successful because recipient states realize that Israel has no territorial designs or strings on her foreign aid.

But despite the numerous accomplishments of the Israel nation, she is still treated as an outsider or intruder by her neighbors. This has caused the government to expend vast sums for defense equipment such as planes, radar, and so on. Such large expenditures obviously detract from other sectors of the budget such as education and health, but she has no choice. Currently there are scant indications that her neighbors are willing to accept Israel as a reality, but it is also a certainty that Israel is here to stay. After thousands of years without a home of their own, the people of Israel should not be expected to yield to intimidation or threats from jealous neighbors.

I have not tried to give you a lesson in Jewish history, even though I find the subject very interesting and fascinating. But rather, I have attempted to present a brief sketch which might serve to indicate some of the factors that have been so instrumental in preserving Jewish institutions and identity.

I could hardly find suitable words to describe the social and political and economic accomplishments which have taken place in Israel other than to say to those of you here tonight who have not visited Israel to go there and take a look yourselves. I think it will amaze you. As we express our congratulations and best wishes to the people of Israel, let us not just marvel at their achievements but let us join in supporting their attempts to make Israel the great and glorious country it has been and is once again becoming. By so doing, we shall be helping to strengthen Israel's contributions to the world peace and progress in which all of us have a vital interest.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Robert D. Whitten, D.D., pastor, Westward Baptist Church, Springfield, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, by Thy mercy and long suffering, we call upon Thee today. Thou art a gracious God even as Thou art holy. Correct us as Thou must, but strengthen and guide us by Thy spirit in the labyrinthine maze of governing a strong Nation.

Assist each of these legislators and their associates to share in Thy wisdom, balancing mercy and justice. May their personal courage withstand selfish pressure in the continuing struggle with power. May all compromises be tempered with righteousness.

Let us fear war and useless killing, but enable us to know the pathway to honorable peace—for ourselves and others. Let us strive to treat all men as persons and save us, O God, from denying them their personhood.

Enable each legislator to make real the dream of free men in a free land and in structuring society so as to give opportunity for all to have freedom, let us not eradicate personal responsibility and initiative.

For this difficult and unending task, O Lord, grant to each man strength, courage, and wisdom. We pray in the power of Christ Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 3, 1966, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 3, 1966,

The VICE PRESIDENT, on May 4, 1966, signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 518. An act for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia;

S. 1804. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; and

S. 1924. An act to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit referees from acting as trustees or receivers in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolutions:

On May 2, 1966:

S. 2729. An act to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

On May 4, 1966:

S.J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May 4, 1966, as a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters; and

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week beginning April 23, 1967, as "Youth Temperance Education Week."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jacobo Temel;

H.R. 2270. An act for the relief of the Moapa Valley Water Co., of Logandale, Nev.;

H.R. 4458. An act for the relief of Michel Fahim Daniel;

H.R. 4584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Michalska Holoweckyj (formerly Mrs. Anna Zalewski);

H.R. 7354. An act for the relief of Norman Morris Rains;

H.R. 7508. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Bossio; and

H.R. 14324. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 943) for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jacobo Temel;

H.R. 2270. An act for the relief of the Moapa Valley Water Co., of Logandale, Nev.;

H.R. 4458. An act for the relief of Michel Fahim Daniel;

H.R. 4584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Michalska Holoweckyj (formerly Mrs. Anna Zalewski);

H.R. 7354. An act for the relief of Norman Morris Rains; and

H.R. 7508. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Bossio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14324. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today: Committee on Government Operations, Committee on the District of Columbia, Subcommittee on

Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet out of the city during the session of the Senate on Monday, May 9, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been asked by members of the committee to object to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENTIAL ASSISTANT GEORGE REEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in leaving his post as a Presidential assistant, Mr. George Reedy takes with him the gratitude of the President and the Nation. He has compiled a memorable record of a decade and a half of outstanding public service as an associate of President Lyndon B. Johnson, during the Senate years as well as in the White House.

As a member of the President's staff, George Reedy shared with other Presidential assistants what has come to be one of the most arduous and relentless responsibilities in Washington. As long as his health permitted and beyond, he discharged this responsibility with great conscientiousness and unfailing courtesy. He was invariably helpful to me as I know he was to other Members of Congress in their relations with the White House.

His heart, however, belonged to the press corps. George Reedy, as press secretary for the President, was a familiar and generally affable fountain of information for reporters. If, on occasion, the fountain ran slightly acidotic, I know that it was understood and tolerated by the newsmen. It is a characteristic not uncommon in the press corps, and George Reedy was a member in good standing before entering into Government service.

Mr. Reedy will be greatly missed, I know, by the President and his associates in the White House. His leaving is also a source of regret to all of us who knew him, and he departs with the warmest good wishes of his many friends in the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join the majority leader in his comments regarding Mr. Reedy. He is an excellent journalist, highly respected by Congress and the public generally. He is the kind of person that we need more of; we should have more people like him, not fewer.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Section 1035, Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Deposit of Savings by Members of the Uniformed Services

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Program

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Federal Contributions Program

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program, equipment and facilities, obligations by States, for the quarter ended March 31, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Extension of Authority of Federal Reserve Banks To Purchase U.S. Obligations Directly From the Treasury

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Research Progress and Plans of the U.S. Weather Bureau

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research progress and plans of the U.S. Weather Bureau, for fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Extension of Period During Which Funds May Be Appropriated for Conservation of Migratory Waterfowl

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the period during which the funds may be appropriated pursuant to the act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), for the conservation of migratory waterfowl, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Publications of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its publications entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1964," and "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Privately Owned, 1964" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Commerce.

Authorization for Arming of Federal Aviation Agency Employees

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

U.S. Passport Act

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy of the United States; to provide standards for the issuance, denial and revocation of passports by the Secretary of State; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Safety Conditions in Storage Areas in Government Buildings

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting that affirmative action had been taken to correct certain conditions relating to safety conditions in storage areas in Government buildings in Washington, D.C., as reported by the Comptroller General of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on opportunity for savings by reducing overtime on revetment construction and maintenance on the lower Mississippi River, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through consolidation and reduction of certain employment service activities in Wisconsin, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, dated May 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Animas-La Plata Project, Colorado-New Mexico

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Animas-La Plata project, Colorado-New Mexico (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on San Miguel Project, Colorado

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the San Miguel project, Colorado (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Dallas Creek Project, Colorado

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Dallas Creek project, Colorado (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on West Divide Project, Colorado

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the West Divide project, Colorado (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Civil War Centennial Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Civil War Centennial Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a final report of that Commission, dated April 29, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Third Preference and Sixth Preference Classifications for Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions according third preference and sixth preference classifications to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th legislature thereof, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the Willis subcommittee of the Judicial Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives has admirably performed a most difficult and voluminous task assigned to them, the study of State taxation and its impact on interstate commerce; and

"Whereas, in the course of that study, this committee has disclosed areas in which State taxation should be adjusted to provide simpler and more equitable procedure for taxation of corporations involved and transactions occurring in multistate business operations; and

"Whereas this subcommittee has drafted and presented to the full Judiciary Committee and the House of Representatives, H.R. 11798, which in the opinion of this legislature, goes far beyond the task assigned to the committee; and

"Whereas H.R. 11798, by eliminating sales from the income apportionment formulas applicable to corporations and thereby excluding the State of destination from taxation of revenue of those businesses to which they provide a market, coercing a uniform pattern for sales taxation, and usurping supervision of a broad area of State taxation, interferes with States' freedom of action and simultaneously opens avenues for the inequities which occur from tax competition among the several States; and

"Whereas in the opinion of the legislature of this sovereign State, the proposed legislation threatens the foundations of federalism and the constitutional principles upon which this great Nation was founded: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of this 2d extraordinary session of the 38th Legislature of the State of Idaho, That

"1. The entire membership of the special subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, chaired by the Honorable Edwin E. Willis, be complimented for pinpointing those areas in which administration of State tax laws has created problems for multistate businesses.

"2. The Legislature of the State of Idaho will work toward and achieve solution of these problems by making necessary amendments to our laws, directing our administrators to work with us in achieving this goal and, when necessary, working jointly with other States for equitable solutions.

"3. Problems disclosed by committee study do not warrant the drastic action suggested by committee conclusions expressed in H.R. 11798 which, by limiting State revenue potential and providing the opportunity for structuring of tax havens with resultant accentuation of State tax competition may have a deleterious effect on the very end which it is designed to serve, free and even flow of commerce and economic activity in the several States.

"4. Within a constitutional sphere, the States must perpetuate our Federal system through retention of the operation and supervision of State revenue systems.

"5. The Legislature of the State of Idaho is unalterably opposed, in theory and practice, to H.R. 11798 and the principles of government which it represents and, after full debate and discussion, is firmly convinced that neither this legislation nor any act of a similar nature constitutes an acceptable solution of the problem studied by the Committee and does instead represent a threat to the basic rights of our State under the constitutional principles upon which our government was founded.

"6. The Congress of the United States be petitioned to reject the legislation proposed in H.R. 11798 or any legislation of a similar nature, and that it be further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and every U.S. Senator and Representative.

"Passed the house on the 22d day of February 1966.

"Pete N. Cenarrusa,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 23d day of February 1966.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Dryden M. Hiler,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 11

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to reject H.R. 8282 which in effect provides for eventual domination of the employment security commission by the Federal Government

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas H.R. 8282 contains amendments to the Employment Security Act; and

"Whereas such amendments not only extend coverage to certain groups now excluded by State law and concurrently increases the costs to employers and to the Government; and

"Whereas the amendments in H.R. 8282 also provide appropriations for training State staff and potential staff in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the Unemployment Compensation Program administration and which coincidentally smooth the pathways for an eventual takeover by the Federal Government, or in the minimum a uniformity of thinking which coincides with the Federal viewpoint:

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States oppose and reject H.R. 8282, since its apparent intent is to usurp State sovereignty and extend its domination over a State agency which has demonstrated its competency and efficiency with a minimum of Federal controls. The extension of coverage to those not covered by State law and the increase in cost to employers appears unwarranted based on the facts, and the endeavor to train State personnel is an attempt to conform the thinking of State personnel to Federal thinking on matters of policy which should be determined on the State level.

"2. That the secretary of state of Arizona transmit copies of this memorial to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the President of the U.S. Senate and to the members of the Arizona congressional delegation."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Memorial 10

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to repeal the Baldwin amendment which requires each of the States to have a highway safety program approved by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, enacted by the Congress of the United States, contained the Baldwin amendment which reads:

"'After December 31, 1967, each State should have a highway safety program, approved by the Secretary (of Commerce) designed to reduce traffic accidents and property damage resulting therefrom, on highways on the Federal-aid system.'; and

"Whereas it has been suggested that if voluntary compliance is not forthcoming, the Baldwin amendment may be amended to provide that failure to comply will result in withholding Federal-aid highway funds; and

"Whereas this intrusion into the sovereign affairs of each State may lead not only to Federal drivers' licenses for residents of each of the States, but the requirement of reporting to the Federal Government such other State functions as accident reporting, driver education, highway patrol, and traffic operations:

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States, through its appropriate committees, review the impact of the Baldwin amendment to Federal-State relations, the necessity of such procedures, and the deprivation of each State to govern in a proper sphere of State government. It is further urged that, after such consideration, the Congress of the United States initiate appropriate action to repeal the Baldwin amendment.

"2. That the secretary of state of Arizona is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, and to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Resolution 92

"Joint resolution requesting transfer of jurisdiction over the resources of the Pribilof Islands to the State of Alaska

"Whereas under the Fur Seal Treaty of 1911 the jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the United States over the Pribilof Islands fur seal resource was affirmed; and

"Whereas under the Alaska Statehood Act of 1958 the Federal reservation status for the islands was retained; and

"Whereas under the Alaska Statehoood Act the State of Alaska was to have jurisdiction over its fish and game resources once its ability to assume and maintain jurisdiction had been certified by the Secretary of the Interior; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior did soon thereafter certify as to the ability of the State of Alaska to maintain its fish and wildlife resources; and

"Whereas the State of Alaska is now desirous of and is capable of assuming responsibility for the administration of the natural resources of the Pribilof Islands which are part of the territory of the State of Alaska: Be it

"Resolved, That Congress is requested to enact legislation within the limits of the Fur Seal Treaty of 1911 to transfer jurisdic-

tion over the administration of the fur seal resources on the Pribilof Islands to the State of Alaska; and further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; the Honorable Henry M. Jackson, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Resolution 164

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for enforcement of the provisions of Public Act 835, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936

"Whereas Public Act 835, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, still the law of this land, implements a strong U.S. merchant marine and mandates its adequacy for national defense or emergency; its adequacy for all domestic waterborne commerce and for a substantial part of export and import (foreign) waterborne commerce; mandates vessels constructed in the United States of the most modern and efficient models, operated and manned by citizens under the U.S. flag; and

"Whereas experience prior and subsequent to this act indicates that each component factor cited in the act is vitally necessary to the Nation and to its political subdivisions and the immediate and extended economy and safety; and

"Whereas enforcement of these mandates has become so lax that today U.S. ships carry less than 9 percent of the total U.S. waterborne foreign commerce—because of failure by the Federal Government to support and protect the U.S. merchant marine, providing less support, less protection than is the practice common to all other maritime nations; and

"Whereas the active U.S. merchant marine now consists of approximately 900 vessels—less than pre-World War II strength, and shipbuilding capacity has dangerously dwindled since that period, although the national responsibilities undertaken in the world and the magnitude of dangers confronted are gravely increasing. In contrast, the Soviet Union's maritime strength is equal to, or may now surpass, this Nation's—auguring favorably for their avowed purpose to dominate world maritime power by 1970—and meanwhile the United States allows its maritime force to diminish: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the Senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to urge that the provisions of Public Act 835, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, be enforced, and immediately to pursue every channel of such enforcement rigorously; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the Senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the New York delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"By order of the assembly,

"John T. McKennan,
"*Clerk*.

"Concurred in, without amendment by order of the senate, March 31, 1966.

"Albert J. Abrams,
"*Secretary*."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to Federal funds for agriculture

"Whereas the world food supply is one of the greatest problems facing mankind; and

"Whereas the abundance and great efficiency of food production in the United States has resulted from teaching, research, and extension programs for agriculture in our universities; and

"Whereas the budget recommendation to the Congress by President Lyndon B. Johnson for 1966–67 includes changes that reduce teaching, research, and extension service funds in very substantial amounts; and

"Whereas such funds are designated Morrill funds, Hatch formula funds, Smith-Lever funds, and research facilities funds; and

"Whereas such action will reduce the University of California funds in the following amounts:

"Morrill funds (instruction—agriculture, engineering and chemistry)	$573, 580
Hatch formula funds (research—agriculture)	267, 196
Smith-Lever funds (agricultural extension)	276, 600
Research facilities (agriculture)	54, 556
Total reduction	1, 171, 932;

and

"Whereas these budget reductions will seriously impair agricultural research, teaching, and agricultural extension at the University of California, as well as other universities in the country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California* (*jointly*), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to restore to the Federal budget the funds for teaching, research, and education in the area of agriculture; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to duck hunting

"Whereas during the 1965 duck-hunting season, the daily bag limit of five ducks per day was based on the species involved, including a provision that the daily bag limit could not include more than (a) two wood ducks, (b) two canvas-backs, and (c) in the alternative, three mallards or three pintails or three in the aggregate of both kinds; and

"Whereas such a bag limit created almost impossible confusion among even the most seasoned duck hunters and completely baffled the novice hunter, with the result that large numbers of the supposedly protected species, which were inadvertently killed, were left to go to waste in the field when the hunter determined they would be illegal for that day's bag limit; and

"Whereas proper protection for endangered or depleted species is a legitimate goal in the establishing of bag limits, but if the bag limit is unrealistic or is so difficult in application under field conditions as to actually result in not only unnecessary taking of the species, but also the wanton waste of the bird after it is taken, such bag limit must be revised and other more appropriate means taken for such protection; and

"Whereas State legislatures and fish and game commissions are powerless to solve this problem since they may act only within the framework of prescribed limits established by the Federal Government through the Department of the Interior under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California* (*jointly*), That the appropriate Federal authorities are memorialized, in establishing duck-hunting bag limits, to avoid whenever possible the chaotic conditions created by the 1965 season system of species limits, and instead to devise other means to properly protect endangered species which do not lead to such confusion and needless waste; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to the impact of Federal defense activities on California public schools

"Whereas the establishment and operation of Federal defense activities create an impact on the public schools of the areas adjacent thereto; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has recognized responsibility for the impact on affected school districts through the enactment of Public Laws 815 and 874; and

"Whereas it is now proposed that Congress modify the apportioning formula of the existing laws; and

"Whereas the modification of the existing formulas would result in reduced apportionments to all local school districts serving children in federally impacted areas; and

"Whereas many school districts in the State of California would be so affected by such reduction; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the present formulas be continued separate from any consideration of education aid under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Economic Opportunity Act, or any other Federal proposal for specific aid to education: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California* (*jointly*), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to continue for the 1966–67 school year the vitally needed programs of asistance to public education in Public Laws 815 and 874 by retaining the present apportionment formulas and the present level of aid; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 9

"Joint resolution relative to the continuation of the financial assistance provided to local school districts under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, of the 81st Congress

"Whereas activities of the Federal Government and related military, industrial, commercial, and scientific operations are conducted on an immense and increasing scale within the State of California, have involved the removal from local tax rolls of substantial amounts of otherwise taxable property, and have cast upon local governmental agencies the burden and responsibility of providing governmental services for large and increasing numbers of people employed and otherwise involved in those undertakings, all to a degree perhaps unparalleled anywhere else in this Nation; and

"Whereas the impact and burden of these Federal activities and related undertakings are nowhere more keenly felt than in the many school districts which have been called upon to provide educational services for the thousands of children who are dependents of persons who are employed in or otherwise associated with these operations, and with respect to whom little or no local tax support or fiscal subvention is available to the agencies conducting the schools; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has long recognized the special burdens so imposed upon local educational agencies and has provided substantial financial subventions therefor through legislation embodied in Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, as from time to time amended; and

"Whereas in a considerable number of school districts in this State the impact of these Federal and related activities is so pronounced that any substantial reduction in the subventions afforded under these Federal laws would confront the districts, as well as the State itself, with a major fiscal crisis in financing the continued operation of the public schools involved; and

"Whereas the question of whether or not the subventions being afforded under Public Laws 874 and 815 should be continued is before the Congress, and it is of the utmost importance to major segments of the public school system in California that the subventions be continued at undiminished rates; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the vitally needed programs of assistance provided for in Public Laws 874 and 815; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of California in the Congress of the United States."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 11

"Joint resolution relative to the American Film Institute

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of this legislature that the Federal Government, in establishing the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities, has authorized the creation of an American Film Institute; and

"Whereas such an institute should be located in an area which is synonymous with the development and production of motion picture films; and

"Whereas there is only one city in the world which can meet these qualifications, Hollywood, Calif.; and

"Whereas millions recognize Hollywood as the 'Motion Picture Capital of the World,' for no other area has been so closely connected with the growth of the motion picture business; and

"Whereas it is only fitting that Hollywood, which has supplied the world with so many delightful motion pictures, should be chosen as the location of the new American Film Institute: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary to insure that the American Film Institute will be located in Hollywood, Calif.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to Mr. Roger L. Stevens, the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION

Joint resolution relating to the Ventura Marina

"Whereas the Ventura Marina has been operated by the Ventura Port District as a small craft facility to serve the recreation needs of the people of Ventura County and of the State of California; and

"Whereas the use of the Ventura Marina has been seriously impaired by excessive deposits of littoral sand material in the entrance channel; and

"Whereas the use of the Ventura Marina has been further impaired by turbulent waves and tidal action at or near the entrance channel: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the States of California respectfully requests the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to undertake whatever action is necessary and appropriate to restore and protect the entrance channel to the Ventura Marina; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 12

"Joint resolution relating to beach erosion and pollution in the Miramar and El Granada beach areas

"Whereas, the Miramar and El Granada beach areas serve the recreation needs of the people of San Mateo County and the State of California; and

"Whereas the use of the Miramar and El Granada beach areas has been seriously impaired by severe beach erosion; and

"Whereas the use of the Miramar and El Granada Beach areas has been further impaired by the washout of the Granada Sanitary District main line, with the resultant pollution creating an emergency of considerable magnitude; and

"Whereas the severe beach erosion and pollution of the beach areas require immediate remedial action in order to protect the welfare and health of the people of San Mateo County and of the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to undertake whatever action is necessary and appropriate to correct the severe beach erosion and pollution conditions which exist in the Miramar and El Granada beach areas in San Mateo County; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 89

"Resolution relative to the Marysville Dam and Reservoir project

"Whereas there is urgent need for flood control on the Yuba River, Calif., as evidenced by past flood damages and Corps of Engineers studies of future potential damage; and

"Whereas no flood control storage presently exists on Yuba River, and although the Bullards Bar project, proposed by the Yuba County Water Agency, will provide substantial flood control benefits, it will only partially control the stream; and

"Whereas the proposed Marysville Dam and Reservoir project in conjunction with the Bullards Bar project will provide full flood control on Yuba River as well as water conservation, power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement; and

"Whereas a report of the Corps of Engineers proposing construction of the Marysville project is presently in Washington but has not yet been submitted to the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to take the necessary steps to authorize construction and operation of the Marysville Dam and Reservoir project by the United States and to appropriate funds for early completion of necessary fish and wildlife studies to be conducted cooperatively by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game to determine appropriate measures for maintaining the fish and wildlife resources affected by the proposed project, and subject to favorable findings of this study to thereafter take such steps and to lend such support as may be required to accomplish construction of this urgently needed project at the earliest practicable date; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Army, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

"Attest:

"J. A. BEEK,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO REPEAL SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

"Whereas in order to end the competitive disadvantages of Massachusetts industry with right-to-work States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the

United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, April 5, 1966.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 11, 1966.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO RESTORE IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET THE CUT IN THE SCHOOL LUNCH AND MILK PROGRAMS AS RECOMMENDED BY THE PRESIDENT

"Whereas the present Federal budget presented to Congress by the President of the United States calls for a cutback of $50 million or more in the school milk program; and $19 million or more in the school lunch program; and

"Whereas these programs have brought nutrition to many needy children, who otherwise would be without; and

"Whereas in a land of plenty, a sharing of a small part of the wealth of the Nation through the milk and lunch programs is both commendable and worthwhile: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to put back into the Federal budget the cuts as requested by the President and respectfully requests that the Members thereof from this Commonwealth actively support and work for this restoration of money for these programs; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1966.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

Resolutions adopted by the American Jugoslav Association of Minnesota, relating to access roads in Superior National Forest, and so forth; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Two resolutions adopted by the National Guard Association of California, relating to the merger of certain Army and Air Reserve units with the National Guard, and a reformation of the Reserves of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Eureka, Calif., relating to the prevention of the decimation of the Pacific coast fishery resources; to the Committee on Commerce.

The petition of Dr. J. Ertumas-Eichvalds, Lake Hopatcong, Landing, N.J., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 1143);

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 1144);

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 1145);

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 1146);

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 1147);

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 1148);

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 1149);

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 1150);

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 1151); and

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 1152).

REPORT ENTITLED "INTERAGENCY DRUG COORDINATION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 1153)

Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 27, 88th Congress, as amended, and extended by Senate Resolution 288, 88th Congress, submitted a report entitled "Interagency Drug Coordination," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal; and

Findley Burns, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service; and

Seaborn P. Foster, of Florida, and sundry other persons, for promotion in the Foreign Service.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of one lieutenant general in the Army for special assignment, three generals for retirement in the Air Force, three generals for special assignment in the Air Force, and one lieutenant general for retirement in the Marine Corps. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list;

Gen. Bernard A. Schriever (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force; Gen. Robert M. Lee (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force; and Gen. Jacob E. Smart (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list;

Lt. Gen. William S. Stone (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force; Lt. Gen. James Ferguson (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force; and Lt. Gen. David A. Burchinal (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President; and

Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, to serve in the grade of lieutenant general.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I also report favorably the nominations of 4,309 officers for appointment in the Marine Corps in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Philip N. Austen, and sundry other officers, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Richard H. Amos, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps; and

Norbert H. Adams, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3309. A bill to provide for the prototype construction of a commercial supersonic transport airplane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3310. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benito V. Odulio and his wife, Dr. Brunhilda G. Odulio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3311. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo N. Hernandez, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 3312. A bill to define and regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3313. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize assistance to localities in the planning, developing, and carrying out of neighborhood conservation programs;

S. 3314. A bill to increase the capital-grant authorization under title I of the Housing Act of 1949; and

S. 3315. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to include in the rent supplemental program housing financed under certain State or local programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York:

S. 3316. A bill to discharge the States from the obligation of repayment of money deposited with them under the act of June 23, 1836; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of New York when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 3317. A bill to amend section 416(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAYH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3318. A bill for the relief of Yung Mi Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3319. A bill to provide for a program to advance the humane care, comfort, health, and welfare of laboratory animals used in scientific study; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3320. A bill to extend the benefits of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act to oyster planters; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PREPARATION AND PRINTING OF A HISTORY OF THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 94) to authorize the preparation and printing of a history of the U.S. Senate, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 257) to elect the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO AUTHORIZE PROTOTYPE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMMERCIAL SUPERSONIC AIRPLANE

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the prototype construction of a commercial supersonic airplane and to provide for the financing of its development through funds raised from the general public through normal investment channels.

The Congress already has appropriated about $230 million for research on the supersonic transport. The administration now requests an additional $200 million to complete the design competition and to start prototype construction.

The estimated cost to develop a supersonic prototype is reported to run between $1 and $1.5 billion. Under the circumstances, in excess of $1 billion will be required to complete this task.

Because of the magnitude of this commercial research and development project, some financing assistance from the Government is required. However, it is unreasonable to expect the taxpayer to assume the greater part of this burden when the undertaking can be financed with investment funds obtained from the general public.

Mr. President, what is proposed in my bill are certain principles which are contained in the Black-Osborne report submitted to the President in December 1963. It also contains features proposed by Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., including its plan to finance the supersonic transport project by the sale of $1.5 billion of serial development bonds, carrying a Government guarantee for payment of principal and interest.

The bonds to be issued and sold through investment channels by the proposed Supersonic Transport Authority, a wholly owned Government agency, will not be general obligations of the United States, but in the event of any default in the payment of principal or interest, the United States will guarantee the payment thereof.

The application of this method of financing the supersonic transport development is sound and realistic. It follows the practice engaged in by certain other Government enterprises of issuing debt to the public, rather than obtaining their requirements from the general fund.

The proposed legislation provides that patents, patent rights, and so forth, developed during construction of the prototype will remain the property of the United States until the outstanding bonds of the Supersonic Transport Authority shall have been paid in full. When this is accomplished the inventions will become assignable to private industry.

It is expected that industry will share a portion of the cost of developing the supersonic transport. Under the provisions of my bill, this responsibility is deferred until commercial production of the supersonic transport is in process, when a predetermined portion of the profits realized therefrom can be allocated for this purpose.

Mr. President, my bill offers the following benefits and advantages:

First. It becomes unnecessary to appropriate funds up to $1.5 billion for a project which is not common to the Government's day-to-day business activities.

Second. It embodies guidelines for good management of an unusual and unique Government-sponsored commercial project, gigantic in size.

Third. It provides both Government and industry with a sound and equitable basis for determining the latter's share in the development costs of the transport.

Fourth. It makes possible in the production phase of the supersonic transport the use of usable assets resulting from the development phase.

Fifth. It permits the prime and subcontractors involved in developing the supersonic transport, together with the general public, to participate as stockholders in a private corporation which will produce and sell the commercial supersonic transport.

Today we face a long and hard war in Vietnam. What the financing requirements for this cause ultimately will total, no one can foretell. But, irrespective of the amount that might be required, it will be met by Congress, and on a priority basis.

Aside from our fiscal requirements for defense, the Congress has been asked by the President to appropriate large amounts for many new domestic programs, as well as for those now on the statute books.

Mr. President, I have long supported the appropriation of adequate research funds for the development of the supersonic transport but with the heavy financial requirements because of our involvement in Vietnam as well as other demands, I feel that this alternative method of financing the development of this aircraft is needed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3309) to provide for the prototype construction of a commercial supersonic transport airplane, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REGULATION OF THE PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia.

This bill has been drafted and is endorsed by the District of Columbia Psychological Association.

The purpose of the psychologist's licensing bill is to protect the public from the unqualified practice of psychology, and from unprofessional conduct by persons who are psychologists. Twenty-eight States currently have laws regulating psychology. Legislation is pending or is about to be introduced in eight others. The States directly contiguous to the District of Columbia already regulate psychology. The intention of this bill is to bring District of Columbia regulation of the practice of psychology into line with the legislation which exists in in the majority of States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3312) to define and regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Tydings, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF LOCAL NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage community and neighborhood self-help efforts for rehabilitation of blighted areas. I recommend the authorization of Federal grants to local government bodies of up to one-half the cost of establishing local neighborhood conservation programs. This program would be composed of local citizens organized to clean up and repair their own neighborhood. Federal technical assistance, and the loan of personnel and heavy equipment would be available. This program would also have the important responsibility for recruiting and training a body of community development specalists skilled in urban renewal and rehabilitation work. Selected personnel would be sent by local governments to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for on-the-job training.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3313) to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize assistance to localities in the planning, developing, and carrying out of neighborhood conservation programs, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3313

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION

"Sec. 118. (a) In order to encourage community self-help efforts for the conservation of blighted neighborhoods, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of this title, to enter into contracts to make, and to make, grants to cities, and other political subdivisions of States, to plan, develop, and carry out neighborhood conservation programs. As used in this section, a 'neighborhood conservation program' means a locally prepared program, meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for utilizing local residents of a blighted or deteriorating neighborhood to carry out repair and improvement activities for the rehabilitation of the neighborhood.

"(b) Any grant under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of planning, developing, and carrying out a neighborhood conservation program. Such costs may include administrative expenses incurred in connection with such a program, and expenses incurred in providing materials and equipment for the use of residents of a neighborhood in performing rehabilitation activities under such a program.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to undertake such activities as he determines to be desirable to provide, either directly or by contracts or other arrangements, technical assistance to cities and other political subdivisions of States in planning, developing, and carrying out neighborhood conservation programs. Such assistance may include, without being limited to, suitable training programs, and the undertaking of cooperative arrangements with other Federal departments and agencies in meeting temporary needs for facilities and equipment in the carrying out of such programs.

"(d) The Secretary shall not provide assistance under this section to any city, or other political subdivision of a State, unless he has obtained adequate assurances (1) that the locality will maintain a level of aggregate expenditures for preventing the spread or recurrence of slums and blighted areas (including code enforcement activities) at not less than its normal expenditures for such purposes prior to receiving such assistance, and (2) that the locality has a satisfactory program for the provision of all necessary public improvements in the areas to be benefited by such assistance. Assistance provided under this section shall to the greatest extent practicable be coordinated with other related Federal programs of assistance.

"(e) The provisions of sections 101(c), 106, 114, and 115 shall be applicable to activities and undertakings assisted under this section to the same extent as if such activities and undertakings were being carried out in an urban renewal area as part of an urban renewal project."

INCREASED URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORIZATION TO $1 BILLION FOR FISCAL YEARS 1967, 1968, AND 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

Since the urban renewal program underlies the demonstration city program, and there is presently a backlog of applications involving more than $800 million for capital grant commitments, I recommend an increase of $250 million a year in their authorization. This would provide an authorization of $1 billion for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3314) to increase the capital-grant authorization under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3314

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out all that follows "1965," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and by $1,000,000,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1966, 1967, and 1968."

BROADENED ELIGIBILITY FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT PAYMENTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, for appropriate reference, to modify the definition of "housing owner" eligible for rent supplement payments under the 1965 Housing Act to add those who are presently eligible under certain limited profit housing programs for middle- and low-income citizens. In New York, under the well-known Mitchell-Lama program, a number of significant middle- and low-income housing projects have been constructed. I believe this type of program initiative should be eligible for rent supplement assistance in addition to the 221D(3) nonprofit organizations that are presently eligible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3315) to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to include in the rent supplemental program housing financed under certain State or local programs, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(b) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: "Such term also includes a private nonprofit corporation or other private nonprofit legal entity, a limited dividend corporation or other limited dividend legal entity, or a cooperative housing corporation, which constructs, owns, and operates rental or cooperative housing financed under a State or local program providing assistance through loans, loan insurance, or tax abatements, and which is approved for receiving the benefits of this section."

DISCHARGE OF THE STATES FROM THE OBLIGATION OF REPAYMENT OF MONEY DEPOSITED WITH THEM UNDER THE ACT OF JUNE 23, 1836

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to discharge the States from the obligation of repayment of money deposited with them under the Act of June 23, 1836.

For several years prior to 1836 the United States had been enjoying an era of great prosperity and world trade; the South was producing an abundance of cotton which brought high prices on the world market, and in return was buying items which were subject to a high tariff and brought in an unexpected amount of customs revenue. The West, with an abundance of public lands for sale, swelled the receipts from the sales of public lands to a total in excess of $44 million.

When the surplus in the Treasury continued to increase beyond all expectations the administration of President Andrew Jackson reported that the balance on hand, with the accruing receipts, was "likely for some time to come to exceed the real wants and just objects of the Government for expenditure—"Report of the Treasurer, 1836," page 687—and it was decided to deposit the surplus with the 26 existing States according to the number of electoral votes each had. Pursuant to act of Congress, act of June 23, 1836, chapter 115, 5 Statutes 52, the U.S. Government deposited $28,101,644 with the several States in the form of interest-free demand loans. My own State of New York received $4,014,520.71, which has now been held in trust for 129 years. The act of 1836 did not specify any conditions under which these funds were to be used. The only proviso was that the moneys were to be returned to the Federal Government upon call.

For 74 years nothing further was done by the Congress or the Treasury. Then by the act of June 25, 1910, 36 Statutes 776, the Treasurer of the United States was relieved from further accountability for these deposits. However the States were not discharged. To the contrary, the act provided in part:

> *Provided*, That the credit herein authorized to be given to the Treasurer of the United States shall in no wise affect or discharge the indebtedness of the several States to the United States as is provided in said Act of Congress, approved June 23, 1836, and shall be made in such manner as to debit the respective States chargeable therewith upon the books of the Treasury Department, until otherwise directed by the Congress.

For 56 years now, we have had the strange anomaly of States remaining liable to the Federal Government for the very deposits for which the Federal Government was relieved of accountability.

Prior to June 25, 1910, the Secretary of the Treasury carried the total of the surplus revenues distributed to States in 1837 as part of his cash accountability but labeled it as "unavailable funds of the General Treasury." After the act of June 25, 1910 the Treasury was relieved of cash accountability and Congress was left with the responsibility of deciding what should be done with the deposits.

After 129 years of confusion it is time for Congress to meet that duty and decide whether to demand repayment from the States, or to relieve the States from the obligation of repayment of money deposited with them. Any attempt to demand repayment would create more problems than it would solve. Many of the States have either no record of the money, lost it through improvident loans, spent it on establishing schools, or had their funds liquidated during the Civil War. It would be unrealistic to expect these States to repay after all these years.

The only sensible solution is to wipe these obligations off the books. Since the Treasury is no longer accountable for the debt under the act of June 25, 1910, it is not carried as an asset on the books of the United States. At the present time it is recorded only as a memorandum book entry and the removal of the debt would in no way affect the balance in the Treasury. Nor would it affect the public debt.

It is unfair to permit this confused condition to prevail. Under the act of June 25, 1910, Congress has to resolve this situation. After 129 years of uncertainty, let us clear the record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3316) to discharge the States from the obligation of repayment of money deposited with them under the act of June 23, 1836, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of New York, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

IMPROVED AIR ACCESS FOR SMALLER CITIES

Mr. **BAYH**. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

The amendment would, in effect, broaden the scope of section 416 of the act by assisting the efforts of smaller cities to improve their access to air service.

The amendment would authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant temporary certificates of service to local service carriers along routes which trunk airlines have petitioned for termination of service.

The amendment would have these beneficial effects:

First. It would permit continuation of adequate air service during the extended period—usually 2 to 4 years—in which the Civil Aeronautics Board is adjudicating the petition for cessation of service. This is necessary because by the time a trunk airline has petitioned for termination of service, it has usually reduced its flights along the route in question to the legal minimum of one a day.

Second. It would permit local service carriers to accumulate information based on experience along the route. Thus, when the Civil Aeronautics Board must decide whether to replace the trunk carrier with a local service carrier, it can do so based on facts and figures, not mere assumptions. Let me emphasize that during the temporary period, the local service carrier would not be entitled to any subsidy for the route in question. Rather, it would fly the route on a "use-it-or-lose-it" basis.

Let me cite an example which will illustrate how this amendment would work. In Indiana, Terre Haute is on a trunk line segment between Indianapolis and St. Louis. The once-adequate schedules declined to one flight a day in each direction at quite inconvenient times. The trunk line petitioned the CAB to delete Terre Haute on this flight. During the 3 years involved in deciding this case, the city of Terre Haute had woefully inadequate service, passengers who normally would have used the airline turned to other means of travel to Indianapolis, St. Louis, and elsewhere. No justification could be introduced into the case to show that a local service carrier could generate the passengers needed to operate on this route without requiring subsidy.

Under the amendment that I am introducing today, the CAB would have the authority to issue a temporary certificate to a local service carrier to fly this route during the period when the trunkline petition was being considered. Thus Terre Haute or any other similar city would be able to introduce into the record of the case specific statistics to justify the substitution of another carrier for the trunkline along the route in question. While the case is proceeding, the city involved would enjoy the benefit of better schedules and more frequent flights.

This amendment would in no way interfere with the city's presentation of a case to retain a presently operating carrier. The CAB would have before it the issue of whether or not a present carrier should be deleted. The CAB could decide that the present carrier should remain at the point in question, and could further determine that it should upgrade its level of service.

Mr. President, Congress presently is taking a hard look at the question of subsidy to the local service airline industry. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has conducted hearings on the industry's position in the Nation's pattern of air service. Many witnesses have pointed out the need for strengthening the route patterns of the industry, thus greatly reducing the subsidy requirements of the carriers. All of us are very conscious of the need to reduce any unnecessary expenditure, and look forward to the time when the industry will be able to operate with little or no Federal subsidy but still provide the services to our smaller communities for which the carriers were created.

This amendment would be of great benefit to the cities in their efforts to maintain and improve air service. It would benefit the carriers and at the same time provide information for the CAB insuring that public convenience and necessity are being protected in the deletion proceedings.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in the not-too-distant future, we are going to be confronted with many cases in which trunk airlines may wish to terminate service to smaller cities.

More and more, the trunklines are replacing aircraft suited to short-haul service with jets and other aircraft which make the once-profitable short-haul flights clearly uneconomical.

On the other hand, local service carriers have smaller planes and considerably less overhead. Certainly, they deserve the opportunity, during a trial period, to demonstrate whether they are capable of providing adequate service without loss along routes no longer profitable to the trunk airlines.

The public interest demands it, Mr. President. In the name of every small- and medium-sized city in the United States, I suggest that immediate consideration be given to this amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3317) to amend section 416(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PREPARATION OF A HISTORY OF THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution authorizing the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration to compile a history of the U.S. Senate to be printed as a Senate document.

In 1962, the House of Representatives published as House Document 246 its own history; however, after considerable searching, I have been unable to find a comparable document in the Senate. It appears that anyone interested in the history of this distinguished body must be content with Senate Document No. 64 of the 87th Congress which is a dissertation on the first 14 years—from 1787–1801—of the upper Chamber. I have asked that sufficient quantities be printed so that each Senator will have enough copies for interested constituents.

The Senate has a great history, and I hope that more Americans through the reading of such a book could become better acquainted with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 94) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to prepare, under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, an appropriate compilation setting forth the history of the United States Senate, which compilation shall be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed thirteen thousand additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred shall be for the use of the Senate and two thousand seven hundred shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENTS TO DEMONSTRATION CITIES BILL

AMENDMENTS NOS. 558, 559, AND 560

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I know of few proposals before the Congress this session with greater significance to the State of New York and the entire Nation than the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966.

Yet, I would be unrealistic if I did not say at this point that I feel there is a grave danger that the great potential contained in the principle of comprehensive physical and social renewal will not be fulfilled unless certain changes are now made in the measures as introduced; therefore, I submit the following amendments to the Demonstration Cities proposal:

First. To grant express authority for more than one demonstration project in any one city. Although I do not personally interpret the bill as written as restricting the program to one per city, I wish to make the applicability clear. Each of the boroughs of New York City has sections or neighborhoods needing immediate attention and I do not think that each of these large areas—larger in themselves than most of the other American cities—should be penalized simply because they are part of the larger municipality of New York City.

Second. To channel the available funds to the most critical areas. I recommend a more definitive section setting out the eligibility, in particular to require; (a) the Secretary to determine that a neighborhood is subject to great economic and social pressures and also to require a workable program be submitted by the local community—a similar amendment has been introduced in the House by Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin—(b) that any demonstration area will contain sufficient housing of low and moderate cost, utilizing to the fullest extent possible housing eligible for rent supplement benefits; (c) maximum opportunities for employing residents of such areas who are unemployed or underemployed; (d) fullest utilization possible of private initiative and enterprise; (e) that housing be made available in such a way so as to allow economic integration within the demonstration area.

Third. To increase the demonstration planning funds. I recommend that the proposed $17 million for fiscal year 1967 be supplemented with funds from the urban renewal program grant authorization, not exceeding 1 percent of that fund in any one year. This would amount to $7.5 million in fiscal 1967 if the urban renewal authorization is retained at $750 million; however, if as I propose the urban renewal authorization is increased to $1 billion, the amount available for demonstration city planning would be $10 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments (Nos. 558, 559, and 560) were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PARITY PRICES FOR FARMERS—COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 88

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that today is the last day Senate Concurrent Resolution 88 will remain open for cosponsors.

I am happy to announce that up to the present time, 35 Senators have joined as coauthors of the resolution, intended to end efforts to freeze or roll back farm prices which are below parity.

I, of course, am delighted with the President's announcement today that wheat acreage for 1967 will be increased by 8 million acres—an increase of 15 percent. This will be of great benefit to our wheat farmers and our entire economy. It is a move I have long recommended as a part of our war on world hunger and as a measure to strengthen our farmers.

I am pleased to note, for the RECORD, that the Secretary of Agriculture has advised the Secretary of Defense to resume buying pork, ham, and bacon, and assured him that there will be an abundance of fresh fruits and vegetables.

The unhappy fact remains, however, that the current Agricultural Prices report shows that farm prices dropped from an average of 82 percent of parity on March 15 to only 80 percent on April 15, and are likely to continue to decline unless we not only reverse the unwise actions which have been directed at farm prices recently, but resume the efforts to improve farm income which have been so successful over the past 5 years.

The 35 Senators who have joined in Senate Concurrent Resolution 88 up to this time, Mr. President—and I list them alphabetically—include Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, BARTLETT, BURDICK, CANNON, CARLSON, CHURCH, COOPER, CURTIS, EASTLAND, GRUENING, HARRIS, JORDAN of Idaho, LAUSCHE, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, METCALF, MILLER, MONDALE, MORSE, MOSS, MUNDT, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PEARSON, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, SIMPSON, SYMINGTON, TALMADGE, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL RESOLUTION AND AMENDMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name and the names of Senators BASS, CASE, HRUSKA, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey be added as cosponsors of S. 3181, the bill introduced by Mr. MCCARTHY on April 5 to amend the Internal Revenue Code as regards certain moving expenses paid by an employer to his employee, and that their names be listed among the sponsors at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, through inadvertence, Senators ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, and HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, were not included as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 252 to honor former President Harry S. Truman on his 82d birthday May 8. I therefore request on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] unanimous consent that the permanent record be corrected to show Senators GRUENING and BYRD as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, two weeks ago I introduced Amendment 537, the Fair Warning Amendment, to the Traffic Safety Act now pending before the Senate Commerce Committee.

Since that time, additional Senators have asked to join as sponsors of the amendment, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Amendment 537 all of the following Senators be listed as sponsors: Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COSPONSORSHIP OF CURRENT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the list of cosponsors for Senate Concurrent Resolutions 88 and 93.

These are two concurrent resolutions expressing the sense of Congress that the Johnson administration should follow the clear intent and the letter of the law in making it a national objective that farmers should receive parity prices for their products.

It is regrettable indeed that this course of action has been made necessary. But Congress, under the circumstances which presently exist within the Johnson administration, has no other choice. The administration from the President and the Secretary of Agriculture on down is pursuing a deliberate course to make the farmer the scapegoat for its own reckless fiscal and monetary policies. It is those policies—not the farmer—which have brought about the recent increases in the cost of living.

Recent actions taken by the administration to penalize the farmer are well known to the Senate. In February the Department of Defense, acting on the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, announced it would revise its buying policies for food products, drastically reducing its purchases of pork and butter. The Commerce Department moved to slap export controls on hides. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been engaged in extensive dumping of corn. The Secretary of Agriculture has authorized significantly increased import quotas for sugar and cheddar cheese.

These actions and others have had their desired effect. The latest Department of Agriculture figures tell the sad story. The index of prices received by farmers declined 5 points in the month ended April 15, while the index of prices paid by farmers increased 2 points to a record alltime high. The parity ratio declined 2 points to 80.

Mr. President, both of these concurrent resolutions call on the executive branch of this Government to stop its present market wrecking practices and work for a return to parity for the farmer. One was introduced by a Democrat and the other by a Republican. I am happy to add my name to the list of cosponsors of these resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator's name will be added to the concurrent resolutions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 28, 1966, the names of Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. PELL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3287) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF on April 28, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 3158, THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SUPERVISORY ACT OF 1966

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on April 4, 5, 7, 12, and 14, the Financial Institutions Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on S. 3158, the proposed Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966, which was recommended by the administration.

On April 7 I announced that at the conclusion of the hearings on April 14, they would be recessed because several associations advised me that they had not yet had an opportunity to consult their members fully and to reach a considered position on the bill. I announced at that time that the hearings would be resumed sometime in May.

I should now like to announce that the hearings will be resumed on Tuesday, May 17, 1966, at 10 a.m. in room 5302 New Senate Office Building. I plan to continue on Wednesday, May 18, and hope that it will be possible to conclude the hearings that day.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with S. 3158 are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-3921.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROMULGATION OF UNIFORM CIVIL APPELLATE RULES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce that S. 3254, a bill to allow the promulgation of uniform civil appellate rules, has been referred to the subcommittee for consideration. Any person who wishes to comment upon this bill should communicate his views as soon as possible to the subcommittee at room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN TAX CONVENTIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator ALBERT GORE, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tax Conventions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled on May 12, 1966, at 10 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, to receive testimony on the Supplementary Income Tax Convention with the Netherlands—Executive B, 89th Congress, 2d session—and the Supplementary Tax Protocol with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland—Executive C, 89th Congress, 2d session.

Persons wishing to testify on either of these should communicate with the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations without delay.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 4, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 518. An act for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia;

S. 1604. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; and

S. 1924. An act to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit referees from acting as trustees or receivers in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act.

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 5, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 943) for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, if I were to select the one journalist who enjoys the best reputation and the highest respect of the people of this country, he would be David Lawrence. I have noted over the years that in all his writings he has sought above everything else to maintain the highest standard of accuracy. This, together with the good judgment he has always exercised, has made him one our leading editors and columnists.

Mr. President, on May 3, 1966, the Washington Star carried a column by Mr. Lawrence relative to the CIA which is so typical of his good reporting. This is a column I believe will be of particular interest to all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CIA AND AMERICAN INTERESTS

(By David Lawrence)

Newspaper articles were published recently purporting to reveal details of the system of espionage employed by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. However well intended, if the purpose was to start a crusade in Congress to restrict intelligence operations, this cannot but in the long run damage the interests of the American people.

The Central Intelligence Agency is not authorized to carry on any espionage within this country or to handle internal security problems, as all of these are responsibilities of the FBI. The CIA confines its operations to foreign countries, where, of course, it is subject to local laws as well as the countermeasures of agents of other governments which are hostile to the United States.

Espionage is in many ways dishonorable, but can be justified. To take a simple but far-reaching illustration, the secret acquisition of messages and the breaking of a Japanese code by agents of the United States in the years just prior to World War II enabled our Armed Forces to know in advance details of ship movements. This later played a vital role in naval engagements in the Pacific, particularly in the crucial Battle of Midway, in which the Japanese fleet was defeated.

The cold war is not unlike a hot war in its risks to the safety of the American people. Information about the existence of missile bases in Cuba may have been acquired too slowly, but what was learned did have the effect of enabling the United States to protect itself in time.

The recently published articles were the result of an honest and conscientious reporting effort, though errors did creep in, especially in the inference conveyed that certain committees of Congress are controlled by the CIA. The purpose of the articles, it was asserted, was to fix responsibility and also to tighten control of the CIA by Congress.

But for many years two committees in the House of Representatives and two in the Senate have been taken into the confidence of the CIA and have known about its methods of operation. The members could ask any questions they wished. If these committees, composed of loyal Americans, had felt that the CIA was doing something wrong, they could have long ago transmitted to the President their objections or could have demanded open inquiries and investigations.

One of the fundamental rules of intelligence work is to let as few people as possible know what is going on, so as to guard against leaks and the danger of infiltration or unwitting disclosure of secrets by persons who are not alert to the tricks used by agents of other countries. There would be risks, for instance, in opening up intelligence operations to the staffs of our Embassies abroad or to a lot of officials in the State Department. Some might not withhold from foreign diplomats at social gatherings bits of information considered irrelevant but which might have significant value to the other side. The Secretary of State is, of course, kept informed.

Mistakes naturally are made in espionage and other intelligence activities. So also are errors of judgment committed by generals in the heat of battle. Inefficiencies of the CIA can be discovered and remedied by responsible officials. The President of the United States is, after all, the Commander in Chief of the military forces and the boss of the intelligence system. He is the final judge as to whether a step that has been taken was or was not desirable. Corrective measures can always be applied.

Undoubtedly, the Communists will have a field day when they read some of the published articles about the internal workings of the CIA. It is a tragic mistake to furnish them with this information.

The press of the United States has in World Wars I and II maintained a voluntary censorship. The same system ought to prevail during a cold war, especially when it comes to deciding whether to disclose in print the secret methods used by the American Government in trying to deal with enemy intrigue inside foreign countries. For, whether carried on in Latin America, Europe, Africa, or Asia, the plotting is against the United States.

GEORGE M. COHAN SPECIAL OBSERVANCE IN RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, over this Capitol today floats a flag of 50 stars and a million memories. There would be as many memories as there are voices that ever sang "Over There" and "You're a Grand Old Flag."

For that special flag is flown in tribute to the American who wrote and sang those songs—George M. Cohan.

It is fitting that that Cohan flag should fly over the Capitol—because here, 30 years ago, the Congress of the United States decreed that a gold medal should be struck to symbolize the patriotic contributions of this composer, singer, author, playwright, actor, the embodiment of the American theater in the first 40 years of this century.

Sunday, May 1, was the anniversary of the presentation at the White House of that gold medal to George M. Cohan at the hands of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The ranks are getting thinner of the doughboys who responded to President Woodrow Wilson's call to the colors of April 6, 1917, but "Over There," written in the dedication of that day, will continue to inspire wherever far from home American boys follow that flag in its flight for human freedom.

One of the historic chapters of congressional proceedings, I feel, are the hearings as, 30 years ago, the House Committee on the Library entertained the Cohan Medal Resolution.

War veterans of the Congress were happy to testify and vividly recalled their combat experiences and the inspiration of "Over There." So graphic and compelling were these life stories that the committee included them in its report—a report that can stir memories of great congressional personalities that are no more.

Yet there are Members of that 74th Congress whom we treasure as great Members of the Congress today—CARL HAYDEN, LISTER HILL, RICHARD RUSSELL, EVERETT DIRKSEN, JOHN MCCLELLAN, FRANK CARLSON, WILLIS ROBERTSON, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, JOHN MCCORMACK, JOE MARTIN.

It should be noted that George M. Cohan himself never sought the honor. He turned over all the proceeds of the song to war chests. He never expected any material reward for his share in the morale and material contributions of the theater to war causes in the Cohan years—and they were tremendous. His was a real life satisfaction of the philosophy:

> Let me write a nation's songs and I care not who writes a nation's laws.

But the lawmakers of that 74th Congress found they could make a part of their lawmaking this honor to the writer of songs.

It seems fitting, also, that the Cohan flag should have flown this week which began with Loyalty Day so proudly celebrated in Rhode Island—first of the colonies to declare her independence—which anniversary we observed on May 4—a patriotic week indeed. Sunday, May 1 brought out Rhode Island spirit in parades that were open demonstrations that the "grand old flag" of freedom has three colors—red, white, and blue.

The George M. Cohan special observance this year stems from a special resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly and signed by Rhode Island's Governor.

This is a true call to the colors for every American and especially for the young American of the classroom—that our youth may be imbued with the message, the meaning, the melody of songs that must never grow old if our country is to stay young in spirit and determined in its destiny—if our American homes are to stay secure.

On such an American home, a humble home on Wickenden Street, Providence—a house that was already old at the turn of the century—there is this proud plaque, the start of it all.

It reads:

> Birthplace, George M. Cohan, July 4, 1878, actor, playwright, composer.

The body of the resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly is, in itself, a concise history of the song and dance man, honored by his city, by his State and by his country; and I add it as part of my remarks for the RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF THE RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

George M. Cohan was born in Providence, July 3, 1878, but all his life he considered July 4 as his birthday. He died in New York on November 4, 1942, at the age of 64, recognized as one of the alltime greats of the theater.

His life was the theater and the theater was enriched by his life. He enjoyed outstanding success in all phases; acting, dancing, directing, producing, songwriting and playwriting. He started his stage career as a child, as a member of the "Four Cohans," his family group in vaudeville, and at the age of 15 was writing songs and skits.

George M. Cohan's preeminence in his profession was well established before he was 40; by that time he was a leading producer and had created a popular form of musical play.

During his career, George M. Cohan composed more than 500 songs and musical numbers; wrote and produced 31 plays, within a period of 20 years; produced, owned, controlled, or was interested in, actively or financially, 128 theatrical attractions.

As an actor he was acclaimed for his portrayal of the father in O'Neill's "Ah Wilderness" and as Franklin D. Roosevelt in "I'd Rather Be Right." He probably was most famous for his songwriting efforts, primarily of a patriotic nature, which gained for him international recognition, especially the songs "Grand Old Flag" and "Over There," for which he was awarded a Congressional Medal, on May 1, 1940.

Now, as we approach this anniversary date, a group of interested citizens are forming the George M. Cohan Foundation. This group, loyal Cohanians, are dedicated to the proposition that George M. Cohan's songs and plays, being of enduring and endearing quality shall be sung and performed throughout Rhode Island.

In keeping with the theme of the Fourth of July George M. Cohan Birthday Salute, it would be most appropriate in all official celebrations in Rhode Island cities and towns to include in Independence Day speeches the beautiful thought beautifully expressed by Mr. Cohan in the verse of his famous song "You're a Grand Old Flag."

"We took the red from the flame of dawn
The dawn of a new nation
And the white was the white of the snow
At Valley Forge
The blue was the blue of the free open sky
And the stars were the thirteen sisters by the sea who built their home and called it liberty."

The "Yankee Doodle boy" born on the Fourth of July and born in Providence, R.I., always waved the flag and wrote of the flag inspiringly and reverently because to George M. the flag was always "the emblem of the land I love" and "every heart beats true for the red, white, and blue."

His birthday coincides with the birthday of our Nation. Our country was born of a revolution and patriotic songs joyously celebrate that occasion, an event which yearly marks the rededication to the ideals of 1776.

Another famous native son who also won fame in the theater, our own Eddie Dowling, wrote as a tribute to his great friend, George M. Cohan, "As long as bands play, these stirring melodies ('Over There,' 'You're a Grand Old Flag,' and 'Yankee Doodle Dandy') will quicken the heartbeat of the patriot, and the immortal who penned them came from Providence."

There was a plaque placed on the house of his birth on August 3, 1942, by the Town Criers, and on August 12, 1947, a street of the city of Providence was named in his honor. In 1959, on September 12, a George M. Cohan statue was unveiled in Times Square, New York City, and on July 4, 1965, he was officially honored by his native city with a Cohan concert at Roger Williams Park.

Adequate recognition of the prominence of this native Rhode Islander calls for more than occasional celebrations. State-sponsored musical presentations could well include some of his outstanding works; an annual Cohan concert would be most appropriate; and school orchestras be encouraged to include a number of his compositions in their repertoire.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I merely wish to say that George M. Cohan was the No. 1 man on Broadway. He was literally the best-known figure in the world on Broadway, and I should like the privilege of joining my colleague from Rhode Island in the very fine statement he is making.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, and so the history and melodies of George M. Cohan will live on to inspire wherever the American uniform is worn and the American flag is flown.

THE YEAR OF THE POLISH MILLENNIUM—1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 3, the world honored a milestone in world history. The eyes of the world are on the millennium of Poland. Even now, while Poland is enslaved by the Communist Iron Curtain, Poles throughout the world are celebrating their millennium, not only as a national observance, but also a religious observance to our common providence, in whom they have placed their faith for 40 generations.

The year 966 is the most significant in the life of the Polish nation because it is the first known historical date of the origin of Poland as a nation. In that year, the ruler of Poland, Mieszko, converted his country to Christianity.

From the perspective of the thousand-year existence of Poland as a Western country, 31,500,000 Poles at home and 10 million Poles abroad, living all over the world, can view proudly Poland's role in the history of the world and its part in the progress and achievement of mankind. The indomitable spirit of Polish history is a guarantee that the country, halted in its progress by the present Communist regime, in time will regain full independence and freedom.

To understand this indomitable spirit of the Poles—a spirit which has survived 1,000 years of turmoil and persecution in its stubborn defense of freedom and human dignity—one must study the past. For it is in their magnificent past that one can gain an insight into their hopeful future.

By accepting Christianity in 966, Poland forever linked her destiny with that of the West and became a creative force in Western culture, keeping at the same time centuries-long watch on the eastern ramparts of Christendom. She often found herself as the defender of the freedom of conscience and the spiritual rights of the individual against atheistic onslaughts.

Throughout her 1,000 years, Poland has maintained a tradition which even now sustains the faith of the Polish nation in cultural values, democratic ideals, and the precepts of the Western World. These have continued and have strengthened the will of individual Poles in their homeland and abroad to withstand Communist-imposed travails. Spiritually nourished by manifestations of friendship in the West, the Poles have kept the hope alive that their day of deliverance and the return of their rightful place in the free world shall become a reality.

Poland's history has been a chronicle of endurance against man's inhumanity toward his fellow man. It is a litany of unparalleled bravery. The gallant resistance of Warsaw in 1939 against the Nazi invasion will long be remembered as an inspiration to the rest of the world in its fight against the German conquest of Europe.

The world cannot help but marvel that in between her unyielding struggle for survival, Poland was able to make so profound a contribution to the cultural development of Europe and the world. Throughout the millennium of their tragedy-filled history, the Poles immeasurably enriched the world in arts and sciences. Poland gave to the world Copernicus, the father of modern astronomy, Marie Curie, who unlocked the secrets of the atom, and Chopin and Paderewski in music.

Poland is once again embroiled in a conflict between human rights and their denial. Although the Poles are again under the yoke of an atheistic power, their spirit has remained unbroken and they remain faithful to the principles on which Poland's greatness was founded. This year, 1966, is a time for renewal and rededication of their beliefs.

The Communist government, in its celebration of the millennium, is attempting to discredit anything which might point up the historical role of the church. Yet the role of the church throughout the 1,000 years of life of the Polish nation is indisputable. In different eras, the church was the sole visible spiritual power which bound together the nation as a whole. Today, the Communist government in Warsaw is doing everything possible within its power to isolate the Polish nation from the West in this millennium year. This cannot happen.

America owes a great deal to the heritage Poland sent to our shores since colonial times. Let this millennium be a celebration of the rejuvenation of hope and faith that once again our common heritage of freedom will bring forth a new understanding and appreciation between the people of the United States of America and Poland.

CELEBRATION OF POLISH NATIONAL AND CHRISTIAN MILLENNIUM ANNIVERSARIES: PANNA MARIA, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Tuesday, May 3, 1966, marked the anniversary of an important date in the history of freedom in this world. It was on that date, 175 years ago, that Poland adopted a constitution which gave hope and dignity to the Polish people. The fact that this constitution came only 4 years later than that of America illustrates the close relationship which our two nations have had and in which tradition we continue.

This is also the 1,000th anniversary of the Christianity of Poland, a fact which doubles the significance of this important date in history.

Illustrating the close friendship of the United States and Poland and reaffirming our common goals and kinship, President Johnson issued a proclamation of commemoration for this memorable day in history in a celebration last Tuesday and this body itself passed a resolution saluting Americans of Polish descent and joining with them in the celebration of their anniversary.

At the White House ceremony, Senator MUSKIE, of Maine, presented a mosaic to President Johnson on behalf of all Polish Americans. The mosiac, which is a replica of the Polish Black Madonna in the city of Czestochowa, Poland, was in turn presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson by three representatives from the Texas city of Panna Maria, the oldest Polish settlement in America. The city was represented by Rev. Anthony Matula, Mr. Felix Mika, Sr., and Felix V. Snoga.

Because this mosiac will now be placed in the church in Panna Maria, Tex., I ask unanimous consent that a brief history of this Polish community be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the historical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PANNA MARIA, TEX.—THE OLDEST POLISH SETTLEMENT IN AMERICA

There is hardly another State so cosmopolitan as Texas. It is the "melting pot of the nations" into the caldron of which poured in streams of Irish, German, French, Dutch, and Czechs, all seeking happiness and opportunity. Into the heart of this new State came, too, the pioneering Poles contributing their share to its early development. Panna Maria traces its history from the arrival of 100 families from Upper Silesia, German Poland, who settled in Texas and formed the first colony and parish on the American continent.

As early as 1851, Father Leopold Moczygemba, O.F.M., came to Texas from upper

Prussian Silesia, in search for a land of opportunity and freedom for himself and his fellow countrymen who were suffering and were denied the privilege of freedom to practice their religion. Through his missionary activity, Father Moczygemba made the acquaintance of Mr. John Twohig, who, in 1840 already owned a considerable portion of land in and around the junction of the San Antonio and Cibolo Rivers, a land grant known as Hernandez Grant. In the early part of 1854 Father Leopold and John Twohig spent several days riding over the land and looking at it from various angles. The location above the junction of the two rivers pleased Father Moczygemba, and he entered into a contract whereby he was to settle a large number of Polish families on the lovely plateau, at a point 2 miles north of junction of the two rivers.

Without delay he wrote to his father and others, advising them of what he had found. His instructions were: to organize themselves into groups, sell all they had and come as quickly as possible to the new country. It was an undertaking of no small concern. However, the beginning of October 1854, saw 100 families leaving the land where they had been obliged to slave under their conquerors. It was the first collective and definite Polish emigration to America. After 9 weeks of sailing they landed in Galveston, Tex. The sufferings endured on the voyage, as told by the oldtimers, are beyond our conception. What could the hygienic conditions be on any ship, 100 years ago, especially a small boat crowded with 800 men, women and children, 9 weeks on water. Yellow fever on the Gulf coast had no mercy on the new arrivals at Galveston. Hiring carts on which they piled their belongings and a cross from their parish church, also, the church bell which we still have at Panna Maria, and walking they reached Indianola, 2 weeks later. From Indianola the colonists proceeded in their way northwestward across the fertile coastal plains. How often they must have dreamed of having a home of their own, raise their cabbages and their potatoes; worship their God as they pleased; speak their own tongue and see their children educated and reared as they would have them. But the sufferings they encountered on the sea were nothing in comparison to the sufferings they endured on the land. Few had any money, none had proper nourishment and with the change of climate their bodies were susceptible to the slightest disorder. Many died on the way.

Hopeless and discouraged were they, when they met Father Leopold Moczygemba who had located a site for them on top of a hill where stood a few sturdy live-oak trees which are still in very good condition. This was December 24, 1854. The first Mass celebrated, that first midnight, under the largest of the oaks, was not only a Mass of thanksgiving, but a petition to Almighty God for strength and enlightment to face the hopeless task before them. Father Leopold called this place Panna Maria (Virgin Mary) mindful of the beautiful church of the Virgin Mary in Krakow, Poland.

On September 29, 1856, with the permission of Bishop Odin, of Galveston, Father Leopold Moczygemba, of the Order of St. Francis of Minor Conventuals, blessed the first Polish church in America. This church was replaced in 1878 with a new church which still stands in testimony of the courage, patience, and fervent trust in God of these first Polish settlers. Many interesting events can be told concerning the progress of these early Polish settlers who faced many adversities such as droughts, floods, hurricanes and political upheavals. The many details of these events which transpired in this early Polish colony may be found in the "Centennial History of Panna Maria" (1854–1954) available at Panna Maria, Tex.

The present parish of Panna Maria, named in honor of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, is now a part of the archdiocese of San Antonio, Tex., under the able leadership of Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey. The colony of Panna Maria never held potentialities for worldly greatness either as a town or parish. The present parishioners are landowning farmers well established and have through the years abundantly contributed to the religious, civic, economic, and patriotic needs of the area, the State and the Nation.

President Lyndon B. Johnson is observing Poland's Christian millennium at the White House in the Nation's Capital on May 3. Panna Maria Parish is being honored as the oldest Polish colony in the United States, and by special invitation of President Lyndon B. Johnson, the parish is being represented by the pastor, Rev. Anthony Matula, Mr. Felix Mika, Sr., and Felix V. Snoga at the ceremonies.

THE POLISH MILLENNIUM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this week many of us who are privileged to number a great many Polish-Americans among our constituents—and some of us who do not—will make insertions in the RECORD observing the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland.

All of us, I believe, lament the fact that the Polish Government has refused entry to many eminent churchmen—including Pope Paul—who want to go to Poland to join the celebration. Another among them was Archbishop John F. Dearden, of Detroit.

This was clearly a political decision, made by officials who were balancing adverse international reaction against the stimulus such visits would give to the church that Polish officialdom has no interest in encouraging.

Yet, it is also clear that the Polish Government recognizes that it cannot successfully quench Christianity among a people who have been intensely Christian for so many generations.

I watch this with interest because I was able to see firsthand the condition of Christian belief in Poland during its 998th year.

I attended a Mass in Warsaw. It was not on Sunday; and it was in late afternoon. The church was filled to overflowing. People were standing on the steps outside.

It was the same story in Cracow.

From the evidence of other observers, I think we can conclude that Christianity, and in particular, Catholicism—is stronger in Poland than in any Iron Curtain country.

Indeed, no people evidenced over a longer period greater devotion to Christianity than the people of Poland.

The condition of the church in Poland today, it is interesting to note, is influenced by geopolitical factors not at all unlike the ones that brought Christianity to the area in the first place.

One thousand years ago, the Slavic community in what is now Poland was governed by a Prince Mieszko, who of necessity spent a lot of his time fighting Prussian invaders.

In an effort to cement relations with another anti-Prussian nation, he married the daughter of Boleslaw, the Christian King of Bohemia.

In 966, he also adopted his bride's Christian faith. Christianity, suddenly welcome in the area, spread swiftly among the Polish people.

The interesting thing is that Christianity is now officially discouraged in Poland for some of the same political reasons that impelled its acceptance 1,000 years ago.

Germany is still considered a threat—and for sound historical reasons. The new alliance is with Russia, a nation equally suspicious of Germany, but one that is something less than tolerant of religion.

Polish Government attitudes, for a host of political, geographic, economic, and military reasons, must be somewhat responsive to the Russian point of view.

That government, I would guess, is very hesitant to take drastic repressive action against the church for fear of massive unrest in this devotedly Christian populace.

At the same time, it is made uneasy by the prospect of an inspirational religious celebration.

Christianity, after all, is a principal reason for the Polish people's feeling of kinship with Western Europe and America. And any overt stimulation of this kinship may make the Russians fret.

I know that it is often more fashionable to condemn restrictions of religious freedom than to try to understand them.

But other nations, unhappily, have not shared our success in separating religion from politics.

There is a temptation to cite the Polish Government's action as one more demonstration of the evils of communism, to condemn it out of hand, perhaps even to use that action as justification for some future economic punitive measure.

But I am not sure we would be doing Christianity a service. Any pressures we might apply could be countered by even stronger pressures from the other side.

The Polish Government, very likely, finds it can tolerate the church as long as it can pretend it is not there.

It might be well to judge very carefully how we can best insure religious progress in Poland. What influence from us can best guarantee that churches will remain open, that priests will be allowed to instruct, to preach, to celebrate Mass, and administer the sacraments?

If this is going on now—and from my observations it is—then we should think carefully before we begin to rock the boat.

Christianity is one of the natural forces that attracts the Polish people to the West. Another is the millions of Polish-Americans in this country, who—through letters and visits—help make clear the ideals of the West.

Certainly, during my visit to Poland I was aware of an intensely friendly feeling among the Polish toward this country.

As long as these forces are at work—and effectively at work—we must avoid actions which would diminish their effectiveness.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, all across America this week Americans of Polish descent are celebrating the 175th anniversary of the Polish constitution, and

the millennium of Poland's Christianity. They join with free Poles and peoples of Polish origin throughout the world in reasserting their pride in their ancient homeland. Only in Poland itself is the great poetry of the Polish heart hushed.

It is a tragic irony that in this year of double celebration, the Communist regime in Warsaw is doing everything in its power to isolate Poland from the West. Visas are being refused to Catholic prelates, and American pilgrimages to Poland's national shrines are being canceled.

The Polish American Congress has pointed out that the Communist regime may well be trying to convince the Polish people that the West is indifferent to their needs and hopes for a better future. That is why I want to add my voice to those of the hundreds of thousands of Americans of Polish descent not only in the celebration of Poland's proud 1,000-year-old heritage, but in solemn prayer that Poland will one day again be free, and assume her rightful place in the Western community of nations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the history of a nation certain events occur which channel the course of that nation and by their magnitude dwarf the subsequent events, however great, of their history. This year the Polish nation celebrates the 1,000th anniversary of its conversion to Christianity. In 966, the first historically known monarch of Poland, Mieszko I, threatened by Germanic expansion toward the east, adopted Christianity from Bohemia and placed his lands under the protection of the Pope. This wise and pious act has shaped the course of Poland's history.

Rarely has a nation and a faith been so indivisible. For the last 1,000 years the one has sustained the other. Living constantly in adversity, a small nation marked for conquest by its larger neighbors, Poland has maintained, indeed strengthened its cultural and religious identity. Where lesser nations might have yielded, Poland has stood alone. During these times Poland's deep devotion to Christianity and its ideals has been the bulwark of its faith. Despite the vicissitudes of politics and war, the spirit of the Polish nation has remained free, and the faith of the Polish people ever strong.

That is why the celebration of the millennium of Poland's Christianity has special significance for the 31 million Poles at home, the 10 million Poles living abroad, and the more than 10 million Americans of Polish descent.

We owe a great debt of gratitude to Poland for the people it has sent to enrich the strength of our young Nation. The American of Polish descent has gone on to make his mark in all fields. As an example I point with pride to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey in the House, Congressman HENRY HELSTOSKI. The list of distinguished Polish-Americans is long and their accomplishments impressive.

The indomitable spirit of Polish history, the courage and faith of her people indivisibly allied with the Christian faith as an integral part of their heritage, is a guarantee that this country, in time will fulfill her historic destiny in peace and in freedom.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 3, President Johnson announced that the administration would submit to the Congress this week legislation which would give him discretionary authority to extend "most favored nation" benefits to East European Communist countries. According to news reports, these benefits would be for a limited period, with the President having the authority to withdraw any concession granted under this authority.

It is in the best interest of our Nation that the President is finally taking this step because I believe that consideration of nonstrategic trade with European Communist nations could lead to the establishment of a common and harmonious Western policy on East-West trade and offers the possibility of a substantial reduction in tension with Communist nations.

As early as 1962, I urged the adoption of a detailed Code of Fair Trade Practices by NATO countries as a means to reestablish a common Western policy on this subject. Last September 16, I introduced a resolution calling on the President to send recommendations to the Congress on the changes he felt ought to be made in our laws governing trade with Eastern Europe.

I believe that Congress should grant the President the flexible authority which he is requesting; but I also believe that concurrently with such legislation, the President should also be asked to:

First. Extend most-favored-nation treatment to Communist countries in Europe only in return for agreement by such countries to a Code of Fair Trade Practices along the lines I have proposed.

Second. Undertake a major effort to bring about agreement between the United States and the other principal trading nations of the free world on such terms of fair practice and on the rules and policies with respect to trade to be pursued with European Communist bloc nations.

Third. Help establish an intergovernmental committee on East-West trade to be attached to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD.

Fourth. Order Presidential review of the categories of goods to be considered nonstrategic in East-West trade.

Fifth. Press hard to induce other free world countries to impose a total embargo on trade with North Vietnam.

Sixth. Bring about an agreement on length of credit terms to be extended for exports to European Communist bloc nations.

Only through such a comprehensive program can our trade be fashioned into an effective part of our relations with Communist European nations. I do not believe that the President can avoid a major congressional debate on the whole question of our East-West trade policy by dealing with the issue piecemeal. He may in fact have to settle for less than what is needed and thereby put the United States in no better position than it is today.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article and an editorial from the New York Times of May 4 be printed in the Record, along with the text of the code of fair trade practices which I proposed.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1966]

JOHNSON TO OFFER BILL TO AID TRADE WITH EAST EUROPE—WILL SEEK POWER TO EXTEND THE MOST-FAVORED-NATION POLICY IF HE DESIRES

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—President Johnson announced today that the administration would submit to Congress this week long-promised legislation to promote trade between the United States and Communist nations of Eastern Europe.

The legislation would give the President discretionary authority to extend most-favored-nation benefits to the Communist countries, drastically reducing the tariffs on their exports to the United States.

Under the most-favored-nation policy, a nation is entitled to the lowest tariff that the United States has granted any particular country. Without this benefit, a nation is required to pay tariffs two to three times higher.

Present legislation prohibits granting most-favored-nation tariff benefits to all Communist countries except Yugoslavia and Poland. This tends to place the exports of the nations not so benefiting in an uncompetitive price position. Without the most-favored-nation privilege, exports from a country are subject to the high duties of the Tariff Act of 1930.

AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION

Under the proposed legislation, there would be an important distinction between the most-favored-nation treatment accorded the Communist countries and non-Communist nations.

In the case of the non-Communist nations, the privilege normally is extended virtually automatically for an indefinite period. But with the Communist nations, the privilege would be extended for a limited period, with the President having the authority to withdraw the tariff concession.

Hungary and Rumania already have expressed an interest in obtaining most-favored-nation treatment. Should the legislation be passed, it is believed by American officials, similar requests probably would be received from Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia.

The Soviet Union would present a special problem since any agreement on tariff concessions would raise such unresolved issues as payment of its lend-lease debts.

In making his announcement at a White House ceremonry honoring the 1,000th anniversary of the establishment of Christianity in Poland, President Johnson held out the hope that expanded East-West trade could provide a stepping stone to liberalization of the Communist regimes as well as creation of a broader community of nations within Europe.

"The intimate engagement of peaceful trade—over a period of time—can influence Eastern European societies to develop along paths favorable to world peace," he declared.

By building bridges across the gulf that has separated Eastern Europe and the West, he added, "we can help gradually to create a community of interest, a community of trust, and a community of effort."

A REBUTTAL TO DE GAULLE

In a rebuttable to President de Gaulle of France, Mr. Johnson affirmed the need for an Atlantic alliance built around an integrated military command.

"It remains our conviction that an integrated Atlantic defense is the first necessity—not the last result—of the building of unity in Western Europe, for expanding partnership across the Atlantic, and for reconciling differences with the East," he said.

The emphasis in the President's speech, however, was upon using the Atlantic alliance to bring together the countries of Eastern and Western Europe. He envisioned "a Europe of interdependent friends," free of "artificial political barriers," secured by international arms control arrangements and with "free political choice" for every nation.

The East-West trade legislation was announced by President Johnson—the outgrowth of 2 years of study by the administration and business groups—in his state of the Union message last January. But the White House has held off submitting the legislation because of a feeling on Capitol Hill that the "political climate," particularly in view of the Vietnam war, was not right for the proposal.

CONSIDERATIONS OUTWEIGHED

These considerations we outweighed by the administration's desire to demonstrate, particularly to Eastern European nations, that American policy had not become frozen because of the Vietnam war.

However, there is no hope within the administration for congressional action on the measure at this session.

The President used the occasion of a Polish-American ceremony honoring the millennium of Christianity in Poland and the 175th anniversary of the adoption of a Polish Constitution to announce his step toward "building bridges" to Eastern Europe.

Before an audience of Congressmen of Polish extraction and Congressmen representing districts with large Polish populations, he signed a proclamation proclaiming today to be "Poland's national and Christian millennium day."

In Poland and in other countries of Eastern Europe, Mr. Johnson observed, "new ideas are winning new friends."

"Windows are opening to the world—only slightly in many places, but they are opening," he added.

For its part, the President said, the United States "will encourage every constructive enrichment of the human, cultural and commercial ties between Eastern Europe and the West."

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1966]

TRADE BRIDGES TO THE EAST

President Johnson's announcement that he will send Congress legislation aimed at liberalizing trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union is a welcome implementation of his long-expressed interest in building more bridges to the Communist world. Much of the delay in moving toward extended relations has undoubtedly been linked to the fears of adverse domestic political reaction because of the strain of the war in Vietnam. Yet the dangers created by that conflict actually make it more rather than less important that the United States extend such a hand of friendship to the more reasonable Communist states.

An expansion of mutually advantageous trade between the United States and the Soviet bloc countries cannot help but strengthen the forces on both sides that press for reciprocally beneficial cooperation rather than discord. Substantially to increase that commerce will require at least three basic measures: Ending the discriminatory tariff barriers that now hinder sales of Soviet and most Eastern European goods here; removal of the legal obstacles to extension of normal commercial credits to those countries, and revision of U.S. strategic export controls to put them on a par with the more liberal—and more sensible—regulations in effect in Western Europe and Japan.

The President has now begun the process of making the needed changes, but he will need effective and vigorous support in Congress to make his proposals law at this session. If Congress fail to act positively, the result can only be more cynicism and disillusionment about the United States in the countries involved.

CODE OF FAIR PRACTICES IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

1. Facilitating access to markets: Each government shall permit the entry into and residence and travel within its territory of bona fide foreign commercial representatives and salesmen, for the purpose of the normal conduct of their business, including, inter alia:

(a) Opportunity to procure suitable facilities such as office space, warehouse space, space for the public display of merchandise, and facilitation for the post-sales maintenance and servicing of their products;

(b) Access to importing and exporting interests, banks, insurance companies, publicity and advertising media, and postal and other communications facilities;

(c) Freedom to bring in advertising material and samples, and to disseminate the same within the national territory;

(d) Freedom to bring in or employ locally interpreters, translators, secretaries, accountants, technical experts, and legal counsel.

2. Publication of laws, regulations, and statistics: Each government shall publish promptly all laws, regulations, judicial decisions and administrative decisions affecting foreign trade, and adequately detailed statistics regarding foreign trade, in such a manner as to enable governments and traders to become acquainted with them.

3. Patent and copyright protection: Each country shall observe equitable standards of patent and copyright protection, and shall maintain procedures so that foreign nationals are able in practice to obtain adequate, prompt, and effective compensation for the use of their industrial and intellectual property.

4. Rules on state trading: In a country which maintains any state enterprise with exclusive or special privileges regarding purchases or sales (other than purchases purely for governmental use) such enterprises shall make any purchases and sales involving imports or exports solely in accordance with commercial considerations, such as price, quality, availability, marketability, transportation costs, and other conditions, and foreign enterprises shall be afforded adequate opportunity to compete on an equal basis in state purchases and sales abroad. Such state enterprises shall not claim sovereign immunity with respect to their commercial operations.

5. Switching of procurement: Each government shall insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises shall not arbitrarily change sources of imports for purely political reasons in such a manner as to disrupt the normal marketing arrangements of supplying countries.

6. Reexportation: Each government shall insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises do not reexport a commodity imported from another country at a price lower than that at which it was originally exported, and do not make reexports contrary to the laws and regulations of the country of origin.

7. Dumping and market disruption: Each government shall establish or maintain procedures to insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises do not introduce products into the commerce of another country at such prices, in such quantities, or at such a rate as to cause or threaten serious injury to an established industry in the latter country.

8. Settlement of commercial disputes: Each government shall facilitate the use of arbitration in the settlement of disputes that arise in the course of international commerce. To that end, each government shall avoid taking any action to prevent the inclusion in agreements of provisions for settlement of such disputes in third countries or for the appointment of arbitrators who are nationals of third countries.

9. Consultation: Each government shall accord sympathetic consideration to, and shall afford adequate opportunity for, consultation regarding such representations as may be made by another government with respect to any matter affecting the operation of this code.

RIPON SOCIETY REPORT ON CHINA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me today to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on Communist China by the Ripon Society. The Ripon Society is a group of young Republicans dedicated to infusing the Republican Party with new ideas and new approaches to the problems of American society and U.S. foreign policy.

This Ripon policy statement, "China 1966: Containment and Contact," is the product of 9 months of intensive research. The members of the society have met with leading experts in the fields of Asian policy and national security. The report urges that the United States begin a serious and prolonged investigation of Communist China and United States relations with Communist China. It suggests that we stop thinking in terms of stereotypes and stop using the old rhetorical jargon in our thinking about Communist China. It is a hardheaded report which not only points out the need for flexibility, but also insists on the necessity of the containment policy in regard to Communist China.

The report is very much in accord with my own thinking on this matter. I believe that in the long run we must find some way to get along with the Government of mainland China and that perhaps the most vital step in bringing the Communist Chinese leaders themselves to this conclusion is to maintain our own strength and those of our allies on the periphery of the China land mass and to frustrate Communist Chinese-backed wars of aggression called wars of national liberation. It is necessary in this regard as the Ripon report asserts to bring discussion of these matters to the attention of the American people.

The Ripon Society report has been extremely well received. Along with the report itself, I wish to submit editorial comment and ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA 1966: CONTAINMENT AND CONTACT

(NOTE.—For the past 9 months the Ripon Society has sponsored intensive research relating to relations between the United States and China. Members of the society have met with leading scholars in the fields of Asian affairs and national security policy. From our discussions and research have come a number of conclusions about American Far

Eastern policy. The major lines of our thinking on this matter are presented in this statement.)

The problem of China is as immense and significant as any which presently confronts the American people. The Ripon Society believes that the present generation of political leadership in both major American parties has failed to confront this problem with the creativity, subtlety and flexibility which it demands. On the one hand are the advocates of a rigid policy which would deny the Communist government of mainland China any role whatever in the diplomatic arena. Describing China as a great power bent on military conquest, they would force the United States to frame its response in solely military terms. With some logic they insist that the only way to keep China from military conquests is to make the costs of such conquests prohibitive. They ignore or write off the possibility that China's will to make war could be reduced by building understanding and contact between China and the rest of the world.

On the other hand are those whose passion for a policy of understanding and contact is so great that they overestimate its potential for short-run success. They would have our Government forsake its policy of military containment and allow China certain prerogatives within its historic sphere of influence. They would wisely encourage China to travel a diplomatic road by making that road more attractive. But at the same time they would further increase the attractiveness of the quicker military route by making it less costly to the Chinese people.

It is our belief that both of these approaches are unrealistic and ineffective. The rigidity with which they are frequently proposed results from the context of the bitter foreign policy debates of the late 1940's and early 1950's in which they first arose. Each side has allowed the acrimony of those years to blind it to the insights of its opponent. Extreme advocates of containment are unwilling to see any value in accommodation; extreme proponents of bold initiatives for further contact view all military confrontation as frustrating their aims.

We speak today as members of a generation which did not participate in the debate which followed World War II. We grant that we have experienced certain aspects of the China question less directly than some. But we also believe that this fact may free us to see the tangled matter with less emotion and greater perspective than some of those who have been strongly committed to a single position for so long. It is our conviction that the China problem cannot be adequately understood unless the collective wisdom of both military containment and diplomatic accommodation is appreciated.

* * * * *

CHINA AND CHANGE

It is clear that China will have a major impact on the history of our planet in the decades immediately ahead. Her ancient culture and proud traditions remind us that this is the oldest continuing society in human history. Her large land area, huge population masses, and recently acquired nuclear weapons potential guarantee her future importance.

China's role as an independent and powerful force has grown since the Communists came to power in 1949. For a century before that Chinese history had been marked by internal disunity and humiliation at the hands of foreign powers. For a decade afterward, China's destiny seemed closely bound to that of the Soviet Union. This powerful alliance threw the West on a defensive alert. The Korean war confirmed Western suspicions about the expansionist tendencies of Asian communism. Support for the Kuomintang government which had fled to Taiwan became a symbol of American resistance to this force and of our official desire to displace the Communist government on the mainland.

In the last 17 years the People's Republic has consolidated its power to the point where very few expect the Nationalists to ever retake the mainland. Yet official American policy seems to have held to this vain hope and to the consequent refusal to deal diplomatically with the Communist Chinese. At the same time China has become increasingly independent of the Soviet Union and that independence has recently erupted into open hostility and a threat to break off diplomatic relations. Yet too many Americans (including some administration officials) still speak of a monolithic "Sino-Soviet bloc." We believe that both of these new facts, Chinese power and Chinese independence, must be better reflected in American policy. Pretending that the Communist government of mainland China does not exist will do no good. Neither will a merely sentimental call for understanding and sympathy. Our very best scholarship, information, intelligence, and judgment must be marshaled to meet this difficult challenge. The recommendations which follow are our immediate contributions to the searching reexamination of American policy which must come about.

I. Military containment

We believe that any Chinese attempt to absorb an independent nation or reduce it to a state of vassalage militarily or through internal subversion must be stopped. If force is required, then force must be applied, but carefully and in appropriate quantities. Such principles of military containment were used successfully when the Soviet Union appeared to threaten Western Europe. We recognize that the application of these principles to the Chinese threat must take into account the great social, economic, and political differences between Europe in the 1940's and Asia in the 1960's. But certainly we must not allow the stated Chinese policy of expansion through "Wars of National Liberation" to succeed. This policy argues that violence and terror are legitimate means of promoting the Communist goal. The United States and her allies must maintain the patience and the will to prevent this policy from being successful. An orderly and peaceful world will be impossible unless such doctrines are resolutely opposed and finally abandoned.

II. First steps toward contact

If blocking the military road is the first step to peace, then opening wide an alternative realm of contact is also essential. For unless China can turn elsewhere, she will probably not give up her military methods. Then the result of our containment may only be a mutual escalation of violence which could produce nuclear war. It is true, of course, that American initiatives cannot guarantee Chinese response. There are limits on American policy and it may be that there is nothing the United States can do to modify the stand of Peking. But let us at least reduce the possibility that China will walk the road to war. Let it be a mark of our maturity that we are willing to take the bold first steps toward peace.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the search for contact has focused almost exclusively on only two American actions: diplomatic recognition and support of China's entry into the United Nations. Both steps would represent abrupt changes in American policy, so abrupt that they may be politically impossible. Moreover, both moves might well be viewed as hypocritical maneuvers and would probably produce no more than bombastic rejections from a still suspicious Peking. A full normalization of relations, including an exchange of ambassadors and admission to the United Nations, are desirable goals. They should be looked upon, however, as the result, not the cause, of an improved diplomatic atmosphere.

We believe that the quest for such an atmosphere can be furthered by the following recommendations:

1. Our Government pronouncements must reflect a less hostile attitude. Our tendency to picture China as a villain and outlaw makes it more likely that she will behave that way. We must criticize Chinese policies without insulting Chinese leaders. (The Secretary of State might begin by discontinuing his insistence on calling the Chinese capital by the Nationalist name, Peiping.) Our rhetoric concerning the Soviet Union is much more mature than it once was. Certainly a similar adjustment concerning China would entail no retreat, no loss of face, and it might remind American citizens as well as world opinion of our sense of responsibility and our desire for peace.

2. We must more insistently and more dramatically pursue the goal of increased contact between American and Chinese citizens. Through diplomatic channels in Warsaw and elsewhere, we must continue our attempts to work out an exchange of newsmen, scholars, doctors and cultural groups. The current library exchange program offers a small base upon which to build. The United States might draw world attention to such programs by formally appropriating the funds with which they could be implemented. And if such overtures are again refused, then we must offer the hand of friendship again and again. Chinese leaders and Chinese positions will almost certainly fluctuate from time to time. We must do all we can to encourage a change in the right direction.

3. It is almost certain that the People's Republic of China will be voted admission to the United Nations within a few years, no matter what the United States does, and, for that matter, whether or not Peking requests admission. Accordingly, we believe, it is unwise for the United States to continue to commit her prestige to denying that result. Rather let us maximize our chances to influence conditions under which such an invitation is extended. This does not mean that we have to sponsor or even support Chinese admission. It does mean that we should let it be known that we will not continue in active opposition. The United States would thus demonstrate its desire to see that every opportunity for better understanding is explored.

There need be no loss of prestige in such an action, but rather an indication that a great and secure power does not fear the participation of its detractors in this international organization. Such an action would be much like last year's decision to drop our insistence that peacekeeping dues be paid to the United Nations by all member nations. In that instance the United States showed its magnanimity by rising above a relatively minor consideration so that the United Nations might continue to function.

It is frequently argued that Chinese violations of the United Nations Charter should preclude her acceptance in the organization. Our response is that if the United Nations is to be a meaningful force for peace, then it cannot be viewed as an exclusive club of moral nations. The charter is not so much a standard against which outsiders are judged as it is a goal to which members aspire. Membership in the United Nations should be an encouragement to more responsible international behavior rather than a reward for such behavior.

It is probable, many observers report, that the presence of Nationalist China as a permanent member of the Security Council would prevent the Communist Chinese from accepting membership in the United Nations. The problems involved in settling such matters will probably take a long time to work out. The United States can have as little or as much to do with this process as our leaders think advisable at any particular moment.

But we first must discontinue our rigid opposition to the very idea of Chinese participation.

4. Because the problem of Taiwan and its continued claims to the Chinese mainland is so much a part of all of these matters, the United States must once again review our commitment to that aspiration. What is the extent of the commitment? Are we merely bound to defend Taiwan against aggression or are we committed to support all her ambitions? Is our commitment to support Chiang Kai-shek personally, to guarantee his return to the mainland, or to preserve the integrity of his government? How does this commitment square with our current involvement in southeast Asia? A further complication is the fact that the Taiwanese may some day elect to rejoin the mainland of their volition. The answer to these questions should not call for the abandonment of Taiwan to the overwhelming power of the mainland; but it might well involve rethinking a position which considers Taiwan the only legitimate government of all China.

5. We must prepare the American people for a more flexible trade policy toward China. Certainly an embargo on strategic goods should be continued. But greater trade can build effective contacts and a community of interest which is to the advantage of both nations.

6. The thorny problems of arms control and prevention of nuclear proliferation can never be solved without the meaningful participation of modern China. Again, it may be some time before Peking will agree to such participation, but the United States, together with other nuclear powers, should continually encourage Chinese representation at all international conferences dealing with this matter.

Certainly it would be foolish to expect an overnight change in Chinese opinion once these initiatives are taken. But these overtures must be made nevertheless. As China grows in power and in security, as her economic and social problems ease, she may develop leadership and attitudes which will bring her into a responsible role in the community of nations. There is little for the United States to lose in attempting to encourage such a development. But it is painfully clear that everyone will lose if the Chinese people develop their awesome potential without a corresponding sense of moderation and maturity.

THE REPUBLICAN ROLE

While many Americans still oppose any change in this Nation's attitude toward mainland China, recent opinion polls indicate definite and growing support for greater flexibility. We believe that it is the responsibility of our political leaders to mobilize and encourage this element of public opinion. Unfortunately some of the recent rhetoric of President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, and Secretary of State Rusk have—if anything—discouraged it. It may be that the current conflict in Vietnam has led them to believe that this is not the time to redirect this Nation's opinion concerning the Far East. But it is the essence of the Ripon Society's position that the United States can and must bear the shield of containment in one hand at the same time that we proffer the olive branch of peace with the other. With the shield we discourage the aggressive force which is China today. With the olive branch we seek to encourage the responsible power which might be—and must be—the China of tomorrow.

If the administration fails to encourage the second half of this dual response, then the responsibility to do so falls upon the Republican Party. Republican history reveals a rich strain of realistic and responsible leadership in foreign policy. This strain has not always been the dominant one within our party, and in the last few years it has often been eclipsed, particularly in matters concerning the Far East. But we believe that our party has the resources from which to create principled policies which are imaginative, flexible, and progressive. Republicans can and must fill a leadership vacuum which has developed in the formulation of American policy toward China.

As members of a new generation of Americans and of Republicans we can no longer be silent while vital issues are discussed in a manner which is narrow minded and unimaginative. We can no longer be content with cliches and stereotypes, from either the rigid "right" or the sentimental "left." This most challenging of all current problems can become only more critical if we are bound by the thinking of the past. Even as we hope for a new and more flexible generation of Chinese leadership, so we also suggest that the perspectives of younger Americans should be broadened beyond the rigid points of view which have led to the current impasse.

We know that there are many Republican leaders today who share our quest for an intelligent, forthright, commonsense foreign policy. We believe that the American people are ready to join and support such a quest. The hour is late and the stakes are high. The quest will demand the very best that is in us. Surely it deserves no less.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) News, Apr. 8, 1966]

Getting Through to China

The picture of the United States that emerges from a recent policy statement by the Chinese Communists is like something seen in a trick mirror. Craggy old Uncle Sam, the peace lover, comes out a monster, baring bloody fangs at China.

The editorial in the Red party paper, Jenmin Jih Pao, warns that the United States is preparing to make war on China, and that China must in turn prepare to turn back the "imperialist aggressor."

"This struggle will go on throughout this historical era," the paper declares. And in a final burst of exhortation it says: "With great revolutionary spirit, the Chinese people are determined to struggle against U.S. imperialism for one, two, or even three hundred years until it is utterly defeated and the world revolution is completely victorious."

We don't for a moment believe either that the United States is preparing for aggressive war against China or that the present hostility will endure three centuries. But if the Chinese dogmatists believe it, and act accordingly, the distortion becomes real as the basis of their foreign policy and correspondingly dangerous.

China's isolation from the real world is marked not only in its distorted view of the United States, but in its relations with Russia and with other nations that have tried to be friendly. And even though that isolation is of China's own choosing, some way of opening Red China's eyes to reality must be found.

We don't believe recognizing the Peking regime or clearing its way into the United Nations would speedily accomplish this purpose. The experience of Britain and France, not even to mention Russia, argues that this would be an exercise in futility. But neither is it helpful to match China's virulence in rejoinders of our own, or to argue openly—as some extremists have done—that the only cure for China is a series of well-placed bombs. Such talk merely reinforces China's belief in its distorted image of America.

Time may be the only cure for China's paranoid sickness, and even this hope rests on an uneasy assumption that there is time enough. But there are preparations of a nonwarlike nature that should be made on our part, looking toward a day when change will come.

One such move, surely, is that advocated by the Ripon Society, an organization of young Republicans with headquarters in Cambridge, Mass. The society argues for no radical shift of China policy, but rather for more study of the problem with an open mind. It would have the Republican Party "fill a leadership vacuum" by open review of long-standing policies and a forthright search for methods of increasing contacts with Red China.

The young Republicans see no swift miracle in the offing if such a course is followed. But they add that "there is little for the United States to lose in attempting to encourage" the growth of responsible government in China.

So it seems to us. In fact, the only loss might prove to be the distorted image we ourselves have of China as one result of long-frozen attitudes.

[From the Nation, Apr. 18, 1966]

Life in the Elephant

Appearances to the contrary, there are some new stirrings in the Republican Party: nothing to toss hats in the air about just yet, but worth noting and deserving the encouragement of two cheers. Recently we applauded the initiative of 30 Republican Congressmen who signed a statement calling for an investigation of the draft (the Nation, Mar. 14). Still more recently, a group of 25 Republicans—many of them signers of the draft statement—have issued an excellent position paper on foreign aid. Aid must be based, they insist, on defined criteria "to assure that aid recipients are interested in encouraging broad popular participation in government and development." Unless the people not the regimes benefit, the United States is wasting its money. There is no sovereign road to success in foreign aid; it must be extended on a case-to-case basis, for the circumstances differ so widely that what is practical in one country may be completely useless in another. Increased emphasis should be placed on rural and agricultural development through a more positive food-aid program and aid to agricultural technology. Greater care should be taken in selecting countries to receive foreign aid, with special emphasis on Latin America. We must not insist on carbon copies of Western political institutions, but only on the principle that government-to-government aid should not be extended to any country that fails to show interest in establishing broad suffrage, holding popular elections, and creating a civil service based on merit.

There are other recommendations in the same vein. Another exhibit of interest is the Ripon Society's current statement urging a new China policy. The specific proposals: that the United States should adopt a "less hostile" attitude toward China in official pronouncements (why "hostile" at all?); insistently pursue increased exchange of newsmen, scholars, doctors, and cultural groups; cease trying to keep China out of the U.N.; adopt a more flexible trade policy; encourage Chinese participation in international conferences dealing with nuclear proliferation; and consider "a specific reappraisal of the nature and extent of the American commitment to Nationalist China and to Chiang Kai-shek."

Here again the proposals are not particularly startling but they do represent an attempt to push the party out of the Halleck-Dirksen-Goldwater trenches. Mark Hatfield in Oregon, Charles Percy in Illinois, Mayor Lindsay in New York, and Edward Brooke in Massachusetts are typical of the young leaders who, with the help of the Ripon Society and similar groups, and of the Congressmen who signed the draft and foreign aid statements, could yet bring new life and vitality to the GOP. Caught between the far right and the lethargic center, the GOP needs to fight its way through to the open areas where the people are to be found. Any movement in this direction is a good omen. The elephant is not galloping or trumpeting, but is slowly rising to its knees and may yet run again.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Apr. 11, 1966]

A NEW POLICY TOWARD RED CHINA?

Although its members are Republicans, the Ripon Society does not always voice the sentiments of the Republican Party. Since the members are progressive Republicans it never voices the sentiments of the party's rightwing.

In June 1964, the society circulated a memorandum among Republican moderates and liberals urging a fight against Barry Goldwater's nomination for the Presidency. His nomination, the memo asserted, would result in Republican loss of every State except his own Arizona, and "would bring on wholesale slaughter of the Republican Party."

This prophecy is recalled to suggest that although the Ripon Society (it is small; its largest chapter in the Boston area has about 145 members) is not massively influential, it is worth listening to.

The Ripon Society has now joined those calling for consideration of a new U.S. policy with regard to China. Specifically, it calls upon the Republican Party to "fill a leadership vacuum" in developing a more flexible policy toward Communist China.

ALTERNATIVE REALM

It advocated continuation of a posture of military containment, but also a beginning of "opening wide an alternative realm of contact with Red China." It questioned the reality of the U.S. policy that maintains Chiang Kai-shek's regime on Formosa is the only legitimate government of China, but without proposing abandonment of Formosa to the "overwhelming force" on the mainland.

It would be foolish, the society said, "to expect an overnight change in Chinese opinion once these initiatives are taken. But these overtures must be made, nevertheless. As China grows in power and in security, as her economic and social problems ease, she may develop leadership and attitudes which will bring her into a responsible role in the community of nations. There is little for the United States to lose in attempting to encourage such a development."

Indeed there is not. Neither is there much to gain immediately by it. Red China, estranged even from the Soviet Union just now, has never been more isolated. Even if all objections to admission of Red China to membership in the United Nations were withdrawn today, there is scant likelihood that the Chinese Communists would accept it. There is no indication that in its present mood and under present circumstances, Red China is ready to accept a "responsible role in the community of nations."

In the long run, however, isolation of a major nation cannot be maintained either internally or externally. Neither Chiang Kai-shek or Mao Tse-tung is imperishable, and the United States cannot proceed on the assumption that their rigidities will survive them.

FEDERAL-STATE TAX SHARING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 4 Roscoe Drummond wrote a column critical of President Johnson's concept of "creative federalism" on the ground that the President's concept is expressed in terms of more Federal grants-in-aid to the States, more Federal influence in deciding what State governments ought to do for their people, and more Federal control.

As a way to block this type of Federal-State cooperation Mr. Drummond calls for a national campaign in support of Federal-State revenue sharing.

I am in favor of Federal-State tax-sharing as a means to strengthen the abilities of State and local governments to meet the expanding needs caused by increasing population, rapid urbanization and advanced technology. On October 11, 1965, I introduced a comprehensive bill which would make available to the States $2½ billion by setting up a trust fund into which 1 percent of the current income tax base would be deposited and which would be available to the States and local governments in the fields of health, education, and welfare. The bill has also been introduced by several Members of the House and is pending before the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

Grants made to the State and local governments under my bill would enable these bodies to operate more independently. Local officials would be freer of Federal domination and the spread of a growing Federal bureaucracy may be halted. State and local governments would be in a stronger financial position and a better fiscal balance would be achieved between the Federal, State, and local governments.

Those who may feel that the sort of tax-sharing plan I propose would mean further incursion on State prerogatives certainly acknowledge a possibility; but the choice we face is not between State dollars and Federal dollars, but between Federal dollars bound by strings and funds which are relatively unconditional and can help buttress the capability of State and local governments to carry their responsibilities and not to abdicate authority to the Federal Government due to financial inability to discharge it.

For we have to look to the days and years ahead when the demand for more and better local governments services will increase.

Critics on the one side of the political spectrum are suspicious of the States and seemingly convinced of Federal infallibility; critics on the other side are suspicious of Washington. But mutual suspicions should not produce a deadlock, for this country cannot be governed well unless government is imaginative and active and responsible and works at all levels in a Federal-State system.

I feel that the proposal embodied in the bill I introduced on October 11 can help prepare our governmental system to meet the needs of the coming decades, and can help us to put cooperative federalism into practice for the benefit of all our people.

This is not a partisan matter. It has the support of influential persons and groups in both parties—Walter Heller, a former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, President Johnson's task force under Joseph Pechman of the Brookings Institute, a special task force of the Republican Coordinating Committee, the Governor's Conference, and the Ripon Society. The idea, whether it is in the form of my bill or in another form, deserves immediate consideration by the President and Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Drummond's article, to which I have referred, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 4, 1966]

SHARING THE REVENUES: FEDERALISM AND STATE-ISM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Have no doubt about it, President Johnson's "creative federalism" is going to create more federalism, not more State-ism.

The President will soon send to Congress his message on the subject.

However he defines "creative federalism," there will be more Federal grants-in-aid to the States, more Federal influence in deciding what State government ought to do for its people, more Federal control and a constantly bigger Central Government.

Most people don't like this ever-larger flow of power to Washington but seem to feel that it is hopeless to try to do anything about it.

If the only way to enable the States to provide the public services which are urgently needed—and often long neglected—is for the Federal Government to lay out the plans, provide most of the money and supervise how it is spent, there would be a strong case for doing more of the same.

The price would be heavy—the decay of State government.

But there is another way and now is a propitious moment for the Governors, the State legislatures, and the mayors to mount a national campaign to persuade Congress and, if possible, the President, to support the plan to return to the States a moderate share of the burgeoning Federal revenue.

This is the crucial time to press the revenue-sharing plan for three reasons:

1. The defeat of the Dirksen amendment to dilute the Supreme Court one-man, one-vote requirement for reapportioning State legislatures means that State government will become more responsible and responsive. It will unshackle the State legislatures from a minority veto.

2. The affluent Federal Government has so preempted the sources of tax income that today there is hardly a State which has the resources to do the things needed to be done. Without any increase in the tax rate, Federal revenues are mounting by $6 to $7 billion every year. Most of the States, which critically need to expand spending, are poverty stricken.

3. We are almost certainly at the point of no return. Either we will have a meaningful revenue-sharing plan or the Federal Government will increasingly take over more and more functions that should be done by States simply since the States do not have the resources. In the end this will mean that nearly all political power will rest in Washington and the States will become mere administrative agents.

The revenue-sharing plan has its roots in both parties. Its principal initiators were Walter E. Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under both Kennedy and Johnson and a Johnson-appointed task force on intergovernmental fiscal cooperation. It has been ably advocated by two Republican groups, the Ripon Society and a special task force of the Republican Coordinating Committee. It has been strongly endorsed by the Governors conference, made up of 33 Democratic and 17 Republican Governors.

In a let's-reason-together spirit L.B.J. likes to call on the Governors to support him on such controversial matters as Vietnam and inflation. It might be a good idea for the Governors to reason together with L.B.J. on revenue sharing.

PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES 15-PERCENT INCREASE IN WHEAT ALLOTMENT ACREAGE FOR 1967

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Schnittker has just advised me that within the past 30 minutes the President of the United States announced a 15-percent increase in the wheat allotment acreage for the year 1967.

Let me commend the President for making this decision. It is a timely decision. It will be well received in the wheat producing areas of the Nation. I want to commend the Department of Agriculture for making their decision early this year as it will give the wheat growers ample time to prepare for fall planting.

Personally, I am deeply grateful to the President for increasing this acreage allotment. It is necessary that we have this increased acreage in view of the decreasing surpluses of wheat which have been taking place because of increased exports to underdeveloped countries and other nations of the world.

This decision will be very helpful in supplying wheat for feeding hungry people in many countries on this globe whom we otherwise would have been unable to help. It will also assure our citizens that we will have ample supplies of wheat for any domestic requirements.

As our exports of wheat increase and our domestic use of wheat increases I hope we can secure additional ever increasing use of our allotment acres for full production.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I wish to join the Senator from Kansas in expressing gratitude that the wheat allotment acreage will be increased by 15 percent.

As I understand it, the farmers will not be required now to make the present 15-percent cut before they can receive wheat certificate payments. It means that we will be going back to about the 55 million acreage allotment which we have had in recent years. If the farmers stay within their allotment, they will be eligible to receive the benefits of the program such as wheat certificate payment to assure a price of 100 percent of parity for that portion of their production consumed domestically.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the statement just made by the Senator from North Dakota, who is an outstanding authority on wheat in this country.

The 55 million acres is a figure which we used to have and is one that we should have. I believe that every one will be happy about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join my colleagues in their remarks about the increase in the wheat acreage allotment. The news is very welcome. It will be good for the farmers of the Nation. I also believe that it will be a shot in the arm for the wheat economy of the country and thus good for the entire Nation; I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate today.

Mr. CARLSON. Let me express my appreciation for the remarks of the majority leader.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY ROBERT WEAVER, SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, TO NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE, APRIL 29

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the National Civil Service League held its 12th annual career service awards dinner on April 29. There were 1,500 in attendance, including members of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. The president of the National Civil Service League is the Honorable J. Edward Day, former Postmaster General.

On this occasion, 10 career public employees were recognized for significant contributions to the Federal career service.

The National Civil Service League is a nonpartisan, nonprofit citizens' organization founded in 1881 to promote efficiency in Federal, State, and local government. It is an action-oriented institution representing general citizen interest in improvement of public management and is supported entirely by tax-deductible contributions from citizens, organizations, corporations, and foundations who are concerned with the quality of public administration in our society. Its effectiveness and impact have been attested to by strong endorsements of its value and programs by Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, Truman, and Roosevelt, as well as by countless leaders in private and public life. Membership is open to all who want to participate in the improvement of government.

This year the following were recognized by the league for their significant contributions:

Mary E. Switzer, Commissioner, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Charlotte Moore Sitterly, physicist, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce; William O. Hall, Assistant Administrator, Agency for International Development; Oscar Bakke, Eastern Regional Director, Federal Aviation Agency; Bernard Strassburg, Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; Ellis H. Veatch, Chief, Military Division, Bureau of the Budget; Dwight A. Ink, Assistant General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission; Paul H. Riley, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense; Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary, International Organization Affairs, Department of State; and Franklin S. Brown, Chief, Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission.

On this occasion, the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, delivered an address entitled, "People, Programs, and the Promise of a Great Society." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE, PROGRAMS AND THE PROMISE OF A GREAT SOCIETY

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Civil Service League, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., Apr. 29, 1966)

It is a great pleasure for me to be here tonight, and a singular gratification to join in honoring these 10 dedicated career civil servants, and particularly my colleague of recent days, Dwight Ink. The new Department of Housing and Urban Development is most fortunate to have Dwight's special sort of competence. And the fact that he was able to come to us from the Atomic Energy Commission at this crucial time, typifies a new and vital attitude toward the use of the Federal Government's top career men. No longer are such men slotted irretrievably into one line of bureaucratic succession. In the realization that talents such as Dwight's are rare, indeed, the Federal Government today makes the fullest use of these talents, putting them to work where the need is greatest.

And, I must observe that the needs are great in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This first Federal department since 1953—and the 11th executive department—already has some growing pains. With the expansion of responsibilities has come a commensurate expansion of needs for special skills and abilities.

Tonight I want to talk of these needs, how we propose to meet them, and to share with you some of the problems we have been facing. But first let me provide the background and framework for our present situation.

Few, if any, Federal departments or agencies have ever come into being with such a welter of problems—or such a wide range of potential successes. At the time President Johnson signed the bill creating the Department last September, the Congress had only very recently passed the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, which the President called "the single most important breakthrough in the last 40 years."

This act constituted the most comprehensive piece of legislation for community development in the Nation's history. It embraced programs to meet both the problems of metropolitan growth and central city decay, such as: grants for basic sewer and water projects, neighborhood facilities, advanced land acquisition, urban beautification, mortgage insurance for land development, and the rent supplement program.

These badly needed new programs were just getting underway—with the singular exception of rent supplements, of course—by the end of last year. And then, shortly after the President had appointed Under Secretary Wood and me, he presented to the Congress the Demonstration Cities Act and the Urban Development Act.

The Demonstration Cities Act, in its breadth and scope, comprises the most comprehensive approach to city rebuilding in the Nation's history. And the Urban Development Act offers the best hope yet devised to bring social and economic order out of the chaos of urban sprawl.

All of this legislation, starting with the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, constitutes a striking new direction in the Federal role and a significant extension of the public responsibility. We have come to realize that quality is more than better housing, or even more than a higher standard of architectural design throughout Federal programs. It also means quality in the most democratic sense—the expansion of opportunities for those who have been for too long blocked from the chance to share in our affluent society. It means restoring blighted lives, as well as blighted structures, and it means offering the fullest possible measure of hope, especially to those young people who, while bearing the burden of the slums today, will have to bear the burden of this Nation's promise tomorrow.

And so there has come an extension of our democratic purpose, and a more sensitive aspect to the nature of the public responsibility. It is reflected in such programs as demonstration cities and rent supplements. The latter, as you know, has finally been funded. That action, earlier this week, was a victory for democracy and a beacon of new hope for the disadvantaged.

Given these new programs, and a broader concept of the public responsibility toward 130 million urban Americans, it seems now, in retrospect, only natural that there be a Department of Housing and Urban Development. Yet, as most of you know, it didn't come easy.

Despite the increasingly obvious inadequacies of the old HHFA to meet the urban challenge, it took 5 years of trial by Congress before the Department was a reality. When the President signed the bill, he underscored the thrust of the Department: "We must seek, and we must find the ways to preserve and to perpetuate in the city the individuality, the human dignity, the respect for individual rights, the devotion for individual responsibility that has been part of the American character and the strength of the American system."

And so we have a challenging task in organizing the new Department at the same time we initiate last year's programs and develop fruitful dialogs with the Congress on the subjects of demonstration cities and metropolitan development. We are, in a word, "busy."

There is some advantage, of course, in having a new structure while programs are still freshly formed and malleable to changing demands. A basic objective of the Department is to make all our programs more effective. In our new structure, supervision and direction of the major activities of the Department are delegated to Assistant Secretaries. The grouping of activities, however, is oriented to broad problem solving rather than on the basis of bureaucratic identification.

We are resolved that traditional agencies must be integrated to meet total objectives.

We are also resolved that greater decision-making authority must be closer to problems and people. For this reason, decision-making authority for those HUD programs which are established will be in the regional offices. This is a key departure in Federal programing, but it is essential if we are to make our programs more effective at the community level, which is, after all, where it counts.

These actions, we feel, are consistent with principles of sound public administration and responsive to the needs of urban America.

We have in mind other proposals to reach our particular constituency in urban centers. In recent years there has been a great expansion of Federal, State, and local programs dealing with urban problems. These programs can be used to advantage only if State and local governments, organizations, and individuals have ready access to that information regarding them.

To meet this need, we are proposing under new legislation a program of matching grants to cities under which they can establish effective urban information centers.

Another technique we are considering would be the creation of what we now refer to as metropolitan desks. These desks would be manned by highly trained generalists who would be familiar with the overall housing and urban development situations in specific cities or metropolitan areas.

They would initially provide coordinated administration of HUD programs in their areas. In order to be fully effective, they would work not only with the municipalities, but the State agencies, and with special purpose local public agencies and other metropolitan instruments of government.

We are concerned not only with proper management and coordination of programs and functions within our own Department, but increasingly with interrelationships with other Federal agencies, with State and local institutions, and with private individuals and groups.

Under the Assistant Secretary of Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations, there will be grouped a series of key functions concerned with how HUD relates to other Federal departments and agencies. The President has said: "The new Department will provide a focal point for thought and innovation and imagination about the problems of our cities. It will cooperate with other Federal agencies, including those responsible for programs providing essential education, health, employment and social services. And it will work to strengthen the constructive relationships between Nation, State, and city—the creative federalism—which is essential to progress."

In tackling all of these new administrative chores connected with organization, we are making the fullest use of special task forces and consultants. These groups make recommendations, provide advice and guidance, and, to the extent possible, assist in carrying out the actions required to implement the new organization pattern. One key group, for instance, is now at work on the organization of the regional office structure and responsibilities. As I have already indicated, a much greater share of decision-making authority for the full range of programs will be vested in our regional offices.

I have attempted so far to establish the programmatic and organizational context for the Department. Now let's talk for a few moments about the important part—the people.

If it is to execute the considerable tasks set for it by the President and the Congress, HUD will need a sizable number of imaginative and experienced people with a wide variety of skills—planners, economists, sociologists, social psychologists, public affairs experts, transportation engineers, urban relocation specialists, and community relations people. And we must compete for these with every urban community in the country, as well as with State governments, business and research organizations, and academic institutions.

The recruiting problem is most serious at the middle and upper professional levels because the competition for social scientists is becoming as intense as that for natural and physical scientists. Since the time of sputnik, there have been dramatic and visible accomplishments in the fields of science and technology which have focused the attention of the public and, particularly, the educators, on the needs and opportunities in these fields, but there have been no dramatic social science sputniks to focus our attention and capture our enthusiasm. The people we need are in short supply and great demand.

Therefore, we are faced with the problem of attracting the services of people of high quality and experience in a time of full employment and a booming economy. Fortune this month says that "U.S. business is very much concerned about labor shortages." Well, so, frankly, am I.

We are all aware that at the heart of the problem is the fact that, in many cases, compensation in the civil service at all levels of government is simply not competitive with that of industry. The President has spoken of this many times, particularly in urging the passage of civilian pay raise bills: "Good men are not an expense in managing an operation so vast and as modern as government. Good men are the best investment that we can make." The question of providing this compensation turns on the willingness of Congress to recognize the need for allocating funds to do so, and we must keep them fully aware of this need. I noticed a magazine article recently which had a headline reading "Pay Hikes Are Leaner." It chronicled the sad plight of top industry executives, many of whom got no pay increases at all, and several of whom actually took cuts—in one case, a corporate president suffered a $17,000 pay cut—all the way down to $220,000. Federal officials are protected from that sort of attrition—a dubious advantage.

We must realize that there is a place in the Federal service for more short term personnel. Over the next decades the whole labor market will be disrupted by advances in automation, cybernation, and the use of more rationalized methods of management. These disruptions will be felt not only by the unskilled, but up to the executive levels as well. The trends over these decades will be toward continuing education, training, and retraining for new roles as old ones change or become obsolete. We are becoming a much more mobile nation, not only geographically, but occupationally, and we should take advantage of this. The present tendency is to treat government service as a lifetime occupation. We should devise ways to make better utilization of people like civil engineers, who move from job to job as a way of life, or academics, who might have a summer or a semester or a sabbatical which they would be willing to devote to the government service if recruiting were speedier and procedures less burdensome.

There is a great need right now to make fuller use of the so-called in-and-outers. These are the men who move into key government positions for a few years, then are out for a while—often with a change of administrations—but eventually find their way back again. Historian Richard Neustadt recently wrote of them: "in-and-outers are a political resource to nurture. Their care and feeding should concern our schools of public service not less but more than that of civil servants who remain in career ranks."

I count myself lucky, at this critical time, to be working with such able "in-and-outers" as Bob Wood and Charley Haar, while at the same time enjoying the most able support of career civil servants such as Dwight Ink and Philip Brownstein. But the Federal Government cannot always count on such a happy circumstance, for the needs are multiplying very much faster than the supply of such talents.

Obstacles to making fuller use of our best minds in the urban field must be removed. Certainly we should require high standards of ethics in the name of the public service, but Federal policies regarding conflicts of interest and consultants' fees, particularly, are badly in need of careful reappraisal.

Another approach to this same problem, which becomes increasingly obvious, as the times change and programs become more complex and comprehensive, is the necessity for more training and retraining of staff. Until 1958 we had no authority to send employees to college and graduate school. Now we are able to send five or six each year on full salary. But there should be flexible arrangements made to enable Federal departments to send more people to school for a single semester, or for an appropriate shorter course.

In his state of the Union message this year, President Johnson indicated a new and fruitful direction for the civil service: "I will restructure our civil service in the top grades so that men and women can easily be assigned to jobs where they are most needed, and ability will be both required as well as rewarded." Dwight Ink's appointment emphasizes this new policy, and I personally hope it will become more prevalent throughout the Federal service.

The new direction in Government policy toward dealing with problems in a broad context, makes it imperative not only that there be mobility among Federal agencies and departments, but that this mobility extend to cooperation and exchange of personnel among local, State and Federal bodies. There is already a hopeful trend in this direction, and we should do what we can to facilitate it by equalizing pension and salary benefits. I don't mean simply that it should be made easier for Federal agencies to steal good people away from State or local positions, but that a constant exchange of skills would enlarge the understanding of problems at every level. After all, we creative federalists are urging stronger partnership between government and the people, between public and private enterprise. If this is to be effective we must start by strengthening government at every level.

In closing, let me say that, for all the problems I have cited I believe tremendous progress is being made. The unanswered question really hinges upon the relative magnitude of our capacities to the task before us.

If we are to rebuild this Nation in the next 40 years, with as much housing and related community facilities as has been needed in our whole history, and if we are going to do this in a manner which results in communities of hope and graciousness and dignity, then we face staggering needs in terms of talent and skills.

New challenges call for fresh insights. Broadened responsibilities call for imaginative administration and programing.

The challenge of urbanization is already shaking our society's institutions to their very roots. This most affluent Nation is past the point of tolerating slums, or disease, or illiteracy or social disorganization. Most important, it is past the point of tolerating thwarted aspirations and blocked opportunities.

Let us pledge to work together to reshape our institutions creatively, so that those who follow will be able to say that we of this generation took the first strong steps toward a truly great urban society.

CONTRIBUTION OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR FORCE RESERVE TO WAR EFFORT IN VIETNAM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I continue to be impressed with the very fine contribution being made to the military effort and the emergency in southeast Asia by the Air National Guard, as well as by our Air Force Reserve units. It is a contribution which is not fully realized by the public generally. I should, therefore, like to point out a few of the things which I have recently noticed they are doing.

It was my pleasure recently to visit with the commanders of the Air National Guard transport groups located in Jackson, Miss., and Memphis, Tenn. I was very much impresssed with the remarkable record the officers and men of these squadrons have made and continue to make in their direct and daily support of the war in Vietnam. Although not on active duty, they are voluntarily flying almost as many hours per aircraft per month as the average of comparable active duty units. In response to an urgent request of the Department of Defense, some of the Air Guard squadrons are flying considerably more on a voluntary basis than comparable active duty units.

For instance: In the month of March, regular Air Force units flying aircraft comparable to the Air National Guard flew an average of 3.9 hours per aircraft per day. The Jackson Air National Guard group flew 3.1 hours per aircraft per day, and the Memphis group flew 3.4 hours. Some of their sister squadrons flew well over 4 hours per aircraft per day. They are flying much more than just training missions. These are actually flights into the combat zone, carrying vital cargo such as bomb detonators, badly needed wire barricades, medical supplies, communication equipment, and other necessities. The aircraft and the crews have been under fire many times.

During the month of March, the Jackson group flew three trips to Vietnam and three to Europe, in addition to several aero-medical airlift missions, both in and out of the United States. The Memphis squadron flew five missions to Vietnam and six to Europe during the month of March.

These 2 groups are only a part of the 25 Air National Guard units that are currently flying more than 200 overseas missions each month to assist the Regular Air Force in this emergency. Although some of these flights are to Europe, they nevertheless are relieving Air Force crews and planes of a more modern type to fly badly needed supplies to southeast Asia. Service in support of the Vietnam war is not the first time the Air Guard and Air Reserve have been called on in an emergency.

Within hours after the crisis occurred in the Dominican Republic, the Air Force Reserve C–119's were flying directly into Santo Domingo and continued to do so, carrying important passengers and cargo.

In addition, the Air Force Reserve C–119 units furnished the air drop for training of the airborne brigade that is now in Vietnam and also the airborne brigade that is in the Dominican Republic. These Air Reserve and Air National Guard units have meant much to the welfare of our troops. Moreover, they continue to make an invaluable contribution to our national security.

The reservist and national guardsmen who make these flights continue in their civilian occupations, giving up weekends and holidays, as well as much of their working time. Many of them are attorneys, insurance men, and others who have occupations from which they have taken time to perform this essential service for their country. They and their employers are to be very highly commended for their willingness to do so.

The two commanders, with whom I talked, told me that despite their intense desire to do so, they would be hard-pressed to continue this high level of activity beyond June 30, the date to which they are presently committed.

As we continue to build up our forces in Vietnam, the need for additional airlift will become greater, not less. This further convinces me that the decision to abolish three of the Air National Guard groups and eight of the Air Reserve groups was premature. I commend the Secretary of Defense for his recent action in rescinding the decision to disestablish the Reserve C–119 units scheduled for deactivation this year and next. I urge him also to rescind the current order to deactivate the three Air National Guard units scheduled for deactivation in October of this year. The units are located in Pittsburgh, Pa., Van Nuys, Calif., and White Plains, N.Y., and are also participating heavily in the emergency duty to Vietnam.

Four Air Reserve transport units were abolished last year, and most of the highly trained personnel were lost, as well as the air transport capability which we so badly need.

In the days ahead, we will need a strengthened and improved airlift, of which the Reserve and Air National Guard is a very vital part.

SENATOR FANNIN'S REMARKS AT SENATE PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently, to a group meeting in the Senate restaurant, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] delivered some remarks that were an inspiration to all of us.

I asked him to reduce his remarks to writing, for they reflect his wise counsel and earnestness. They have great spiritual value—which his personality and character also reflect.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the remarks the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] made on this occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Senator Paul Fannin

Baseball has provided me with a theme I want to discuss with you this morning.

Not long ago I read a story from one of the major league camps in Florida. The columnist was interviewing a player who had just joined the team after being traded in the off season.

This particular young outfielder had been hailed as an exciting rookie only a few years back. But somehow, he had never lived up to his potential.

He was enthusiastic, however, about being traded to a team that is expected to be a pennant contender.

"Morale is great on this team," he said, "because everybody has confidence in themselves and their ability. They all have a winning attitude."

Comparing this with his former team, the player said everybody had a negative attitude, even the manager. As he put it, "That negative attitude can sure get you down."

What he said is very true—and not just in baseball.

That story further emphasizes to me the importance of attitude in our lives and the tremendous difference it can make.

Success in all human endeavor, whether it be the work of the mind or the body, springs first from the proper attitude.

If our attitude toward a problem or a challenge is negative, we impose a handicap that virtually assures defeat.

If it is positive and constructive, we have already taken a long step toward success.

In a book, "Leaves of Gold," by Clyde Francis Lytle, we are reminded—the men who try to do something and fail are infinitely better than those who try to do nothing and succeed. And even if we do not at first succeed we have benefited by the experience in putting forth the effort.

It is another measure of God's infinite love for man that He endowed each of us with the ability to develop the proper attitude. He has not placed insurmountable obstacles in our path—even though we often believe He has.

Within ourselves we have the capacity to change our attitudes.

By a conscious act of will, we can determine whether our attitude in any given situation will be positive or negative—optimistic or pessimistic—attractive or repugnant.

As the Bible has taught us, the Lord does indeed know the needs of man and has provided for them.

The Creator who made the universe and all that it contains has not withheld any material or spiritual gifts from us. Just the opposite is true.

We withhold them from ourselves—and suffer frustrations, tensions, and defeats—in our own ignorance.

First in His covenant with the people of Israel—and again for the ages in the teachings of Jesus—God has repeatedly told us what our attitude should be toward life and our fellowman.

He also has given us the key that makes it possible for us to develop that proper attitude.

The ancient psalm tells us that "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." And again in St. Matthew's Gospel we are told: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

In other words, the starting point of all successful human activity is the recognition and acceptance of God's supremacy over our lives.

With this it is possible for us to develop a positive constructive attitude and display it in our lives. Without it, we are doomed to suffer the inevitable defeat of the strictly humanistic or materialistic approach.

That is why communism as a way of life must ultimately fail. That is also why the United States of America will ultimately prevail.

By rejecting God, the Communist adopts a negative attitude. He cannot succeed permanently in his relationships with other men because he rejects the part of God that is in all men.

We need always to remind ourselves that this Nation grew to greatness on its principles, not on its resources. And if we ever abandon our principles, our resources cannot save us.

Our generation has achieved a miracle of material productivity, of efficiency and inventive genius. We have abundance beyond our needs.

But it can all wither and be gone in an instant of divine time if we neglect our religious heritage and the moral and ethical values that stem from it.

We are in constant danger of becoming so involved in the material things that we forget the preservation of those spiritual values which give meaning to our lives and which, in the long run, truly determine material progress.

Like the ancient proverb, we are enjoying the excellence of the fruit so much that we are blind to the care of the tree.

Nor can we plead ignorance about what we must do to properly care for the tree. The teachings of our religious faith are not that obscure or difficult to understand.

What could be plainer than the words of Christ in the sermon on the mount? "So whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them, for this is the law and the prophets."

Just as a child tries to respond to parental love with good behavior, we should try to express our commitment to the Almighty by decent living.

We should remember the counsel of James in his letter to the early Christians: "For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, so faith apart from works is dead."

Having the proper attitude alone is not enough. It will avail us nothing unless we make it come alive through specific acts of compassion and consideration in all of our human relationships.

We have been commanded to do nothing less than this in all of our dealings with our fellow men.

It's not an easy way of life—but it was never intended to be easy.

And for those who make the effort, the rewards are unlimited.

Have you ever noticed, for example, that those who question the practical value of the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule are generally those who seldom try to follow them?

The late Peter Marshall, who served for so many years as Chaplain of the Senate, put it this way in one of his eloquent prayers: "Our Father, when we long for life without its trials and work, without difficulties, remind us that oaks grow strong in contrary winds and diamonds are made under pressure.

"With stout hearts may we see in every calamity an opportunity, and not give way to the pessimism that sees in every opportunity a calamity."

We know that we cannot forfeit our responsibilities to our fellow human beings without also failing our larger duty to God.

We can accept the responsibilities or reject them—but we cannot remain neutral. You cannot sit on the fence when it comes to the commands of Christian living.

We know—even if we cannot always express it clearly—that there is more to life than we can analyze in a test tube or define in a mathematical formula.

We'll never find it, however, with an attitude of "putting in time" or "doing just enough to get by."

Nor will we find it by compromising between what we know is good and evil. We run the risk of becoming so broadminded about our principles that we become flat.

It is interesting to note in this regard that the more we learn about science, the more that knowledge tends to confirm the strength of our religious principles.

On this matter of attitude, for example, the Sociology Department of Duke University conducted an extensive study of factors contributing to human happiness.

After they ran all the material through the computer, the results read remarkably like the social prescriptions contained in the Old and New Testament.

Here were some of the study's conclusions on the proper attitudes for happiness.

Love, honor, faith, hope, charity, loyalty, thrift and practice of religion are necessary ingredients in the formula.

Forgive others, but also forgive yourself for past mistakes and concentrate on doing better in the future.

Incidentally, self-centered people with a materialistic attitude scored lowest in the happiness tests.

Today our hearts and minds are troubled with a multiplication of the ills that have plagued the world for centuries.

Once again our young men are dying for principle in a far-off corner of the earth—and the voices of doubt and confusion disturb us.

However difficult it may be, in the midst of an affluent society, we desperately need more spiritual awareness on the part of everyone.

In these critical times, Valley Forge is a more appropriate guiding symbol for our Nation than the two-car garage.

In a nation that proudly proclaims "In God We Trust," there should be no fearful, negative attitude on the part of its people.

The passage of time diminishes our perspective about crisis. In forgetting our past triumphs, in both war and peace, we tend to magnify the crisis of the present.

Our fighting men know very well—even if some of us tend to forget—that their religious faith is an ever-present refuge in a time of peril.

They know that man truly does not live by bread alone—nor by force of arms—but in the final analysis by the grace of God.

In the performance of their duty under fire can be found an inspirational lesson for all of us at home.

Earlier this month, the body of a young paratrooper from my hometown arrived for burial shortly after his parents had received his last letter.

In it he had enclosed a prayer written by a fellow paratrooper which was popular with his comrades. The title alone is significant.

The prayer is called, "We Never Jump Alone." That's the kind of attitude all of us need to acquire.

As we work at the job in different ways—each with the varied talents God has bestowed upon us—let us remember that the choice really is ours.

Our attitude toward our religious faith and its obligations will inevitably determine our actions toward our fellow men.

Let us see to it that our attitude is correct—and our image can take care of itself.

In conclusion, let me share with you an anonymous little verse which seems appropriate during the demands and pressures of a busy session of Congress:

"The world is a difficult world, indeed
  And the people are hard to suit;
And the man who plays on the violin
  Is a bore to the man with a flute.

And I, myself, have often thought
  How very much better t'would be
If every one of the folks that I know
  Would only agree with me.

But since they will not
  The very best way to make the world look
    bright
Is never to mind what others say
  But to do what you think is right.'

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 257) as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. RANDOLPH of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Committee on Public Works, in lieu of Mr. McNamara, deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

WE NEED A LISTENING POST WITHIN COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the United States needs a listening post in China, and the best manner of securing one would be for our Government to offer recognition to the government of Communist China. I spoke up in the

Senate in favor of that some time back, and this Tuesday I regretted very much that I was in Ohio to cast my vote at the primaries and was not present in the Senate Chamber to listen personally to the fine speeches regarding our Nation's policy toward Communist China made by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN]. At this time I wish to compliment them on the statements they made and to associate myself entirely with the views which they so ably expressed.

On April 20, I spoke in the Senate urging that diplomatic recognition be offered to Communist China and that we abandon our efforts to prevent that government from obtaining membership in the United Nations. It is therefore, extremely encouraging that at long last this most important problem is receiving the public airing that it merits.

Mr. President, the colloquy in the Senate on Tuesday was among the most important discussions to take place in this Chamber in this decade because for 15 years there has been no meaningful political discussion in this Nation of alternatives to our China policy.

We must undertake to seek coexistence; otherwise, we are likely to be confronted with coannihilation.

I know of no other domestic or political issue since the end of World War II which has been considered so politically explosive and which has encountered such a strict taboo. At the same time the establishment of a workable relationship with the Red Chinese government is probably the most important problem facing our Nation today. For better or for worse, what is done regarding this will have a profound influence upon the kind of world in which we and our children and our children's children will be living.

The fact that after so many years constructive suggestions have now been put forth by distinguished Senators of the United States offering alternatives to our present stale, sterile, and antiquated China policy is of utmost importance.

Mr. President, the proposal of the junior Senator from New York and the junior Senator from South Dakota that a commission of distinguished citizens be appointed by the President to make public recommendations for new directions in our China policy is an excellent one and a constructive beginning toward facing international realities and abandoning old myths. It is vital that we have better comunication with the Red Chinese government.

Senators will recall that at the time of the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, when Khrushchev was forced to turn tail and withdraw his offensive missiles from Cuba, had there not been direct diplomatic communication between the United States and the Soviet Union and between the United Nations and the Soviet Union there may well have been a nuclear holocaust.

And yet, in 1933 when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt recognized the Communist Government of the Soviet Unions as an existing government and offered to have diplomatic relations and to have a Russian Embassy here and to have an American Embassy in Russia, there was an outcry at that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this proposed commission, which would be empowered to investigate all aspects of our relationships with Communist China—scientific, cultural, athletic, and tourist contacts; trade; arms control and nuclear proliferation negotiations; and self-determination for the people of Formosa, would be of immense value to our national security and to world peace.

How can we obtain a ban on the proliferation of nuclear weapons if we exclude from such an agreement a nuclear power such as Red China, with one-fourth of the people of the entire world within that country?

There is probably no greater threat to world peace today than the threat posed by the arrogant, hostile Red Chinese dictators, who are violently Communist in the Stalin pattern. Time and time alone will lessen the bitterness they feel toward the nations of the Western World that oppressed China during the 18th and 19th centuries, and around the turn of the 20th century.

In a world populated by nearly 3 billion people, there are obvious shortcomings in the search for world peace and coexistence when a nation containing one-fourth of that population is completely ignored.

There is no assurance nor certainty that were we to offer to recognize Red China and to permit a Chinese Embassy in our country representing that regime and to establish an Embassy in Peking, the attitude of its leaders toward us would become any less intransigent or more cooperative than at present. However, it appears advisable that we face up to the problem of recognition if we hope to restrain the expansion of Red China without war and if we are to have a direct assessment and judgment of Chinese interests and intentions, so vital in this grim period of international anarchy.

At the present time we have to deal with Red China through our Ambassador in Warsaw or through our consul general at Hong Kong. If we had an embassy in Peking, we would have an open window. We would have within China a listening post of Americans upon whom we could depend.

Mr. President, there is nothing to indicate that recognition at this time would either change the oppressive and arrogant attitude of Communist leaders in Peking toward the United States, or halt their dedication to the promotion of world revolution and the ultimate destruction of the capitalistic system. However, time is a great healer.

There should be a basic rethinking by our citizens, the Congress, and among officials of the executive branch of our Government regarding Asia in general, and China in particular, and in the process of doing so we must give serious consideration to extending diplomatic recognition to the Government which effectively holds sway over one-fourth of mankind—740 million men, women, and children.

I urge that a proper policy for our country would be to offer the olive branch of coexistence and peace in the future to China but in the other hand hold the sword of containment. This Nation cannot afford to adhere to that rigid idea that it is unthinkable to permit the very thought of the Peking Government being considered for entry into the United Nations.

Mr. President, our Nation can no longer afford to bury its head in the sand and dream that Red China does not exist or that it will disappear. We must face the facts of international life. We all condemn the outrageous actions and aggressions of Chinese Communists leaders, but here is a de facto government stronger than ever before. We must begin to develop new policies toward dealing with this government that holds effective sway over more than one-fourth of mankind.

Again, I commend my colleagues who took part in the discussion in the Senate on Tuesday on this subject on the outstanding service they have performed for our Nation and for the furtherance of world peace.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION GIVES FACTS, FIGURES, TO SUPPORT SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a number of excellent statements were made by witnesses appearing before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to testify on behalf of the special milk program for schoolchildren. Perhaps the most impressively documented presentation was made by the National Farmers Union. I feel sure that this testimony greatly aided the subcommittee members in reaching their final decision to fund the program at last year's levels despite a proposed budget cut of 80 percent.

I would like to share some of the highlights of the National Farmers Union testimony with my Senate colleagues today. First Mr. Ed Christiansen, testifying for National Farmers Union, points out:

> The school lunch and milk program take up the equivalent of nearly 3 billion pounds of milk production in the form of fluid milk, butter, and dairy products. This is equivalent to 2½ percent of total (domestic) milk production. When it is considered that our surplus production in recent years has only been on the order of 5 to 6 percent of the total production, the effect of the markets provided by the school lunch and school milk programs is more than just of fringe importance.

Of course, the corollary to this statement is the fact that consumption would drop off substantialy if the proposed cutback were implemented—seriously damaging dairy income.

Mr. Christiansen then goes on to point out that the proposed cutback would probably result in an increase in the cost of school milk of from 2 to 4 cents per half pint. This means that schoolchildren will be paying at least $50 million more next year and State and local agencies $18 million more. Of course, heavily overburdened State and local agencies may well not be able to absorb this additional $18 million expense. As a result they may either pass on the cost to the schoolchildren or drop out of the program.

Finally, Mr. Christiansen refers to a Chicago study which showed that a 3-cent-per-half-pint increase in the cost of milk resulted in a 40-percent drop in per student milk consumption. At the same time there was an increase in participation in the rest of the State of 35 percent despite the fact that the price to students was not increased.

All these facts and figures lead to but one conclusion, Mr. President. To cut the proven, dependable, noncontroversial school milk program at this time would be a serious mistake. In fact I intend to fight for an increase in funds for the program over and above the fiscal 1966 level.

LEN JORDAN—AN OUTSTANDING SENATOR

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the people of Idaho can be justly proud of the distinguished record of their junior Senator, my friend and colleague, Len B. Jordan.

Len Jordan is a pillar of strength in the Senate and a dedicated servant of his country, his State, and his party. Idahoans know him as one of the most knowledgeable men in the country on water resources and a fighter for the best interests of their great State. We in the U.S. Senate know him also as an expert on fiscal policy, a man who knows how and where to cut the fat from the overinflated budgets of the Great Society.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent summary of Senator Jordan's outlook and record be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Achievements of Incumbent Republican Senators in 89th Congress: A Gem of a Senator From a Gem of a State—Idaho's Len Jordan

If a State wants an example of how effective a Republican can be in an overwhelmingly Democratic-controlled Senate, it has only to look at the record, and at the man who is the Phi Beta Kappa rancher from Idaho.

And when Len B. Jordan first was sworn in as U.S. Senator from the Gem State, a news account reported he "arrived in the Senate shortly after taking his cattle to market."

This didn't necessarily mean, as some easterners might visualize, that he was on the range roping steers. He has done this thousands of times in the past and can do it today. What the description showed was a born and bred westerner who is at home in the sagebrush, the greasewood, and the salt grass, as well as in the high councils of Government. He is an expert horseman's expert. As one friend said, Len Jordan knows a lot of things, including horses, prairie rattlesnakes, and jackasses, and knows how to deal effectively with each.

Senator Jordan has been on his own since the age of 15. He has one of the most successful, colorful, and diversified careers of any U.S. Senator. He knows the problems of a farmhand as well as those of a businessman, or rancher, or cowpuncher, or a college student needing money, or scholar, or Governor, or veteran. He is or has been all of them. As the friend said, Len Jordan knows about a lot of things, but there is one he doesn't know (unless he reads this). It is how one of his senatorial colleagues describes him. Declares Kentucky's Senator Thruston B. Morton:

"Len Jordan is a gem of a Senator from a gem of a State."

That is how another Senator from a State, 2,500 miles away, salutes Idaho and its citizens. Why such respect is shown Idaho can be seen in just one short statement of conviction contained in a speech by Senator Jordan:

"The basic responsibility of any man in public office is just this: to make every effort to represent as truly as he is able the people who put him there. Government's role as I see it is to act in responsive partnership with citizens in the furtherance of each man's aim for personal self-respect. I am persuaded that public officials should tie their thinking not to the consensus of the governing but to the consent of the governed. I see this concern as the touchstone of progressive Republicanism."

His belief is the result of more than 20 years of service associated with the common concerns and interests of Idaho's people. The past and future of Idaho are closely linked to natural resource matters and Len Jordan long has been recognized as an authority in this field. In the Senate, he has actively engaged in sponsoring, supporting, and helping to shape a wide variety of legislation aimed at perfecting resource management, promoting the concept of multiple-use development, and protecting natural values.

Some of the reasons for all of this: Senator Jordan is at home in the great Sawtooth Range as well as on the miles of farmlands of Idaho which once were desert. He is at home on Baldy Mountain where there is great skiing; at home among the sheepherders as they move from one pasture and altitude to another; at home among the Indians; at home watching with a sharp eye a log drive on the Priest River or the fishing in Lake Coeur d'Alene and Little Redfish Lake; in silver, lead, and other mines; or in the streets, stores, and business houses from Blackfoot and Boise and Pocatello to Twin Falls, Lewiston, and Grangeville.

This is the land of Len Jordan's home State; bigger than all of New England. It is one of the most diversified and decentralized of States (estimated to have some 800 units in local government). And Len Jordan is diversified enough to go with it all.

Thus, if the Nation wants to know how a Republican U.S. Senator makes himself, his State, and its citizens felt in a solid Democrat national administration, it has only to look at the record of this same rancher who also has been an international economic adviser and on international water resource boards.

In just this one broad area of natural resources, Senator Jordan has either been responsible for, or worked upon such congressional legislation as the Water Resources Planning Act, the national water research program, the Nez Perce National Historic Park, increasing needed tax deductibility for mineral exploration costs, key amendments to the wild rivers bill, limitation of lead and zinc importation, rural water supply systems, the Dworshak Dam, the Lower Teton Dam, the Ririe project, and the broadening of the Small Reclamation Projects Act.

Early in 1966, Senator Jordan began work in the Senate on measures for the southwest Idaho development project, the southeast Idaho water project which includes Lynn Crandall Dam, preservation of the Sawtooth Mountain scenic area, and expansion of the Nation's system of mainline forest conservation roads.

He has spoken out in the Senate this session for increasing support to wheat research and forestry research, for correcting inequities in terminal and county loan rates which discriminate against wheatgrowers in some areas, for a free livestock industry unencumbered by restrictions on hide exports, for expediting grain and forest products marketing through stimulation of boxcar construction and for adequate support to Soil Conservation Service programs.

Senator Jordan's involvement with resource conservation management and development has been both firsthand—as in the days when he operated a Snake River sheep ranch near Hells Canyon—and from a policy making vantage in varied responsible positions of public service. President Eisenhower chose Len Jordan to head the International Joint Commission working out agreements with Canada on boundary water problems relating to the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Columbia River Basin Treaty. In the Senate he serves on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels. Senator Jordan has said he sees his efforts on this committee as part of a lifetime commitment to the goal of comprehensive management of the Nation's land and water resources. "To allow the waste of resources in this day," he has asserted, "is a crime of omission against future generations. We must implement resource preservation and development programs which are as broad and encompassing as our foresight will allow. We must use our resources wisely so that those who follow us will commend us for our stewardship."

One reason why Len Jordan hasn't been defeated in a statewide election, and why he has received some of the largest pluralities ever given any candidate in his State, may be due to help from a remarkable family. His brilliant wife is an author of several books, one a national best seller just past its fourth printing. If she ever wanted to do speechwriting, there is a suspicion in Washington, D.C., she could put some of the ghostwriters in the White House to shame when it comes to writing fact or fiction. They have three children. The value of an education was stressed to all three. All are college graduates with advanced study. The two boys are graduate engineers. And, the Jordans are now grandparents. Still another factor, in the success of Len Jordan in representing Idaho, has been in a smooth-running, knowledgeable office organization.

Senator Jordan approaches public problems with keen intellect which made him a Phi Beta Kappa while he was working his way through college, his colleagues say. He also is a team player: he was a college varsity football star.

As a student, his interest was economics and he has put this scholarly interest to work over the years not only in his private careers and on State problems but at the national and international levels as well. Under Mr. Eisenhower, he served as a member of the International Development Advisory Board, which explored the economic aspects of foreign aid. He also went to Afghanistan as the head of a team of U.S. engineers and economists to survey plans for economic development in that country. He is now a member of the Joint Economic Committee. He always has urged that Government apply the same control and discipline to its spending policies which it asks of the private sector of the economy. He has insisted that the role of Government should be one of stimulating rather than replacing private initiative.

In his views incorporated into the minority statement in the Joint Economic Report, he argued for reduced Government spending as the means to stop inflation. He has sponsored or cosponsored the Human Investment Act for job training, various proposals for a tax credit for educational expenses, continuance of the Small Business Administration as a separate agency, and a program for better distribution of Federal research and development funds to States.

Other fields of Senate work include Len Jordan's membership on the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. He also fought for a constitutional amendment permitting the people of each State to make their own decision on the composition of one house of their legislature. He voted for GI benefits for our fighting men in Vietnam. He has opposed the concentration of power at the Federal level implied by the false economies and cutbacks in long-standing programs which have few Federal strings attached—such the the land-grant college program, agricultural experiment station program, school milk and school lunch programs, impacted area education funds, and the farm extension service. The cuts were asked by the Johnson-Humphrey-Freeman administration in order to make way for additional money for fancy new and untried Great Society domestic programs in wartime. Senator Jordan says:

"My job as I see it is to give the interests of the people of my State an advocate in Washington. I try to make Idaho's concerns my concerns and to fit these considerations into the wider context of national affairs. I think this is what representative government is all about and essentially what the Republican Party stands for."

Exactly 3 years ago this week, Senator Jordan delivered a major address in which he said the two-party system was a "fourth check in our constitutional Republic" in addition to the well-known legislative, executive, and judicial branches. He said if there were only one political party in this country, then: (1) The words of our Constitution would be nothing more than that—just words; (2) the three branches of our Government would not operate as checks and balances against each other; (3) our country could become stripped of individual freedoms even as are Communist Russia and Red China.

One of the criticisms sometimes heard about a minority party is that it is always against—never for. To this, Senator Jordan replied: "How can you be against one thing without being for its antithesis? Every time a person is against inflation he is of necessity for sound economic principles and fiscal integrity." He listed many other examples, and concluded: "If anyone has the urge to criticize a minority party for always being against—for always appearing to be on the negative side of the ledger—one thing can be remembered: 8 of the 10 Commandments begin with the words "Thou shalt not * * *.'"

TELEVISION PROGRAM ENTITLED "I AM A SOLDIER"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by him and an article published in the Twin City News of Batesburg-Leesville, S.C.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Russell of South Carolina

I should like to call special attention to a national television special to be shown this weekend. It is the story of the professional soldier. This presentation entitled, "I Am a Soldier," is narrated by Capt. Theodore Danielsen, of Batesburg, S.C., whose career it illustrates. I know that we all share Mrs. Danielsen's pride in her son's devotion to his country and duty, and I am pleased to insert in the Record an article which appeared in the April 28, 1966, issue of the Twin-City News, Batesburg-Leesville, S.C.:

[From the Twin-City News, Apr. 28, 1966]

Capt. Ted Danielsen on National TV Show

A national color television special shown on Sunday, May 8, Monday, May 9, and June 12 will be of special interest to local citizens. Entitled, "I Am a Soldier," the program is illustrated by the career of Capt. Theodore Danielsen, of Batesburg. It is the study of why a man becomes a professional soldier in the 20th century and is one of a "Saga of Western Man" series on ABC–TV.

Ted, as he is known in the Twin Cities is a company commander of the 1st Cavalry Division in Vietnam. The program will focus entirely on his role, and through him, the roles of those around him. Cameramen and crew of ABC spent 3 months in Vietnam filming actual guerrilla warfare. Nothing was staged and it is a true documentary film with Ted acting as narrator with only his voice heard on the hour-long program. He has been in New York since March 15 redoing the commentary because of the many interferences occurring during the filming. Ted returned Wednesday to Batesburg and will leave Saturday by plane for Vietnam to complete his tour of duty.

No mother could ask for a more wonderful Mother's Day gift than the one Mrs. Helen Danielsen will receive, seeing her in son in color over television. Although stationed on this date in Vietnam, it will be next to having him home in person. On Sunday evening, May 8, the film will be shown from 8 to 9 p.m. on WOLO, channel 25 of Columbia. On Monday night, May 9, it will appear on channel 6 of Augusta beginning at 10 p.m. On June 12, it will rerun on channel 25 from 4 to 5 o'clock.

Ted graduated from the Batesburg-Leesville High School in 1954, attended Clemson College for 2 years and graduated in 1960 from West Point. Following ranger school at Fort Benning and paratrooper school at Fort Bragg, he volunteered for duty in Vietnam where he spent 13 months before returning in 1963 as an adviser at Fort Benning. At Benning, he was assigned to Air Assault which is the now famous 1st Cavalry Division (Airborne). In 1965, he volunteered again for duty in Vietnam where he returned for another 12 months. He is the recipient of the Bronze Star. It was in August 1965 that he was contacted by the Department of the Army which chose him to do the film, "I Am a Soldier."

The film was shot in about 7,000 locations with the ABC crew traveling along with the troops, suffering the same hardships, walking, flying, and going into action with them. It is a film which will be viewed by TV watchers over the Nation but especially by the people of Batesburg-Leesville.

The 1st Cavalry's duty in Vietnam is to provide reconnaissance and security for larger units, participate in stability in low and midintensity operations and control an area including its population and resources. When the film is shown, Captain Danielsen will be again in Vietnam with the 1st Cavalry which has been involved in some of the biggest fights, most notably the battle in the Ia Drang Valley.

Captain Danielsen, the son of Mrs. Helen Danielsen and the late Heyward Danielsen, is married to the former Miss Cynthia Lane of Myrtle Beach. He has two brothers, Danny, who is manager of the Columbia Ambulance Service, and Allen, who is in Polaris submarines of the U.S. Navy, stationed at Charleston.

And what does Ted think of the service? He has been a soldier for 6 years and in his words: "I'm going to stay in for 30 and if I like it, I might make a career out of it." Because of Capt. Ted Danielsen, and the many others like him, America can be proud.

Ted can be sure that when the film appears for the first time on Mother's Day, this community will share his moment of glory and those in his company. Batesburg-Leesville can be proud that one of their own native sons stands so tall.

SENATOR ERVIN RECIPIENT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD OF THE GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I had the honor of attending the annual George Washington Award banquet of the American Good Government Society in Washington last Sunday evening, May 1, 1966.

It was an unusual honor for me because my distinguished colleague, Sam J. Ervin, received the Good Government Society's George Washington Award on this occasion.

It was a moving experience to see hundreds of Senator Ervin's friends from throughout the Nation together on this occasion for the purpose of his receiving this outstanding award.

Earlier this week, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] placed in the Record his introduction of Senator Ervin and the remarks he made in connection with his presentation of the award.

I want the record to show, Mr. President, that I join with his other colleagues and with the people of North Carolina in congratulating Senator Ervin on his receiving this award for the truly outstanding and unselfish public service he has rendered for a quarter of a century.

THE 82D ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a great honor to rise today to recognize the 82d birthday of Harry S. Truman, former President, former Vice President, former Senator, and one of the greatest men this Nation has ever produced.

He is loved and admired by all in this Chamber today. He is the favorite son of Missouri.

Few men in modern times have done as much as President Truman for progress in the United States and peace around the world.

Even since his last birthday, the United States has achieved some of the goals he dedicated his life to: Medical care for the aged, repeal of the poll tax, voting rights for all Americans, aid to elementary and secondary education.

The man who in 1945 was cast into national leadership of the most powerful nation in the world wasted no time in proceeding with the task of building the peace.

Just 2 weeks after assuming office, and with the war still raging in Europe and Asia, he presided over the first conference of the United Nations, an association of nations which he hoped would make a future peace not only possible, but certain.

After the war ended, President Truman undertook perhaps his greatest challenge: helping a prostrate Europe reconstruct in such a way that the antagonisms that had led to two great World Wars would disappear from the continent. He initiated the Marshall plan for economic assistance which was designed to help refashion all of Europe, including the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, into a free community of prosperous and independent states. Along with the point 4 program of technical assistance, the Marshall plan complemented a peace settlement with Germany and Japan which was designed not to enfeeble the defeated powers but to restore their vitality and to enable them to rejoin the postwar community of free nations. Today the success of these endeavors speaks for itself.

Although a man of peace, President Truman acted with strength and integrity to protect the independence of threatened nations. The Truman doctrine provided the assistance and reassurance urgently needed by Greece and Turkey in 1947. An attempt to smother the freedom of West Berlin was defeated not with arms, but with a dramatic airlift of the materiel of peace. When aggression finally was launched across the border of South Korea, President Truman mobilized the power and resources of the United States behind the collective action of the United Nations to successfully suppress the aggression and restore peace to Korea.

Few periods of modern history have been so crucial to the future of world peace than the postwar years when Harry Truman assumed the leadership of the West. Few men can match his record in promoting the brotherhood of man and the association of nations.

As one sign of the growing recognition of his tireless search for peace, a Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace was established by ceremonies which I attended in Independence, Mo., recently. President Johnson and many other leaders attended this historic event. The Center will be situated in Israel. Also launched at that ceremony was a $50,000 Harry S. Truman Peace Award to honor outstanding achievement in the cause of peace. Fitting as this might be, it is even more fitting that he receive the highest honor for the promotion of peace among nations that the people of the world can bestow. That is why I submitted the name of Harry S. Truman for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the resolution calling on the Senate to honor Harry Truman this Sunday, I know I speak for all people in my State in wishing this great Missourian, this great American, this great world statesman a happy birthday.

NOMINATION OF TAPLEY BENNETT, JR., TO BE AMBASSADOR TO PORTUGAL

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, within the near future, it is anticipated that the Senate will act upon President Johnson's nomination of an able career diplomat and my illustrious fellow Georgian—the Honorable Tapley Bennett, Jr.—as Ambassador to Portugal.

"Tap" Bennett will take over his new assignment after serving with great distinction and under the most trying circumstances as our Ambassador to the much-troubled Dominican Republic. Ambassador Bennett was at his post of duty in Santo Domingo when last year's bloody civil war erupted, and it was his considered assessment of the crisis and timely actions that may well have prevented the loss of American lives and a Communist takeover on the island.

I do not want the record of Ambassador Bennett's service in Santo Domingo to close without expressing my appreciation for the outstanding job he has done as our country's official representative in that land. He has labored diligently and without fanfare to help the common people of the island to better their economic lot in life. He has laid the groundwork for future advancement of the country in many ways, among them the introduction of modern farming methods and techniques.

In his tour of duty in Santo Domingo, Ambassador Bennett made it his business to travel to every part of the island and to visit and talk with the people of every community and every walk of life. He probably is the only U.S. Ambassador to have achieved this distinction.

Mr. President, an excellent article on some of Ambassador Bennett's efforts and achievements in the Dominican Republic appeared recently on the editorial page of the Atlanta Constitution. The article, written by Constitution Editor Eugene Patterson, is a fitting tribute to Ambassador Bennett as he assumes his new assignment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 7, 1966]

TAP BENNETT HAS SOWN WELL

(By Eugene Patterson)

As Georgia's Tap Bennett ends his turbulent tour as Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, at least some of his dreams for that country are taking form. "Seeds sown in the ground will produce more than bullets shot in the streets," he has told the farmers in all 26 provinces.

It was he who had to call in the marines when mobs were shooting the pictures off his Embassy walls. Yet out of his own Georgia boyhood, when his dairy cow won him a 4–H prize, he developed and holds firm to a belief in agriculture and education as the first building blocks of a nation.

And while the world has been preoccupied with the politics of a few bullet-pocked blocks of Santo Domingo, Ambassador Bennett has continued his patient work on the land. Seven out of every ten Dominicans live on the land. They went on working and building while the capitalenos were shooting up Santo Domingo last summer.

An array of U.S. aid programs proceeds. Technicians from Texas A. & M. are all over the country directing work. In a recent speech at Sabaneta, Bennett noted that 19 agricultural extension stations will be operating by year's end. The Ministry of Agriculture is decentralizing and setting up regional offices where the farmers are.

They are bringing onto the land tractors, fertilizers, insecticides, demonstration fields, and seed laboratories. Better strains of cabbage, lettuce, tomatoes, garlic, and pepper are being developed, along with mango and avocado trees that will produce two crops a year.

Cattle are being vaccinated. Farm wives and children are joining U.S.-style farm clubs. Hundreds of youths are entering free secondary education. Bennett recently inaugurated, at Sabana Palenque, the 17th school constructed under CARE auspices. In his speeches, delivered in Spanish, he stresses the same points again and again to the Dominicans:

> Make the fields produce more food; the food will improve the health and welfare of the people; it will reduce the need to spend money on importing of food; it will lead to exporting of farm products, and that will earn money to pay for the goods that do have to be imported. This is the way to obtain a better life.

Until the seeds Bennett has planted take root, the Dominican Republic can only stumble from crisis to crisis. But the sowing has gone steadily on in the hinterland outside Santo Domingo.

Neither the extreme right nor the extreme left really want elections. The United States still hopes to get the country to a vote on June 1. Meanwhile American policy under Bennett has done more than shield the people from bullets shot in the streets. It has sown many seeds in the ground.

MAJOR GUIDELINES OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the first speech of Mr. Jack Hood Vaughn, as Director of the Peace Corps, has come to my attention. It states well the major guidelines of the Peace Corps for the next 5 years or so, as well as its accomplishments during the last 5 years.

Mr. Vaughn in this speech, delivered at the University of Michigan, said he may end up running a revolution because:

> Successful Peace Corps volunteers cannot help but teach that change is possible, and what is more, that change is not a fearsome unknown, but a responsibility to be shared and encouraged by the governments of lands in which they serve. They also spread the word that peace invites adventure, mobility and self-expression.

In such work, Mr. Vaughn adds, there is true social revolution.

Such a valuable social revolution is desirable, Mr. President, and I, for one, hope the Peace Corps can, indeed, continue to be a major factor in bringing it to realization. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Vaughn's first speech as Director of the Peace Corps be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POST-AND-PEASANT OVERTURE

(Speech delivered by Peace Corps Director, Jack H. Vaughn, at the University of Michigan, Feb. 28, 1966)

Early in my recent service at the State Department, I reported to my friends the custom of President Marco Robles, of Panama, who took evident delight in calling me "El Embajador campesino"—the "Peasant Ambassador." Furthermore, I told my friends that the label surely stuck—for on several occasions I heard myself referred to around the halls of the Department as "That peasant."

I have no quarrel with such a label. But I think they ought to add another one—for my Latin friends also understand how deeply I cherish their own love of the poetic tradition. So, if I am to be a peasant, let me also be a poet.

With that thought in mind, moreover, I claim the right to title this, my opening address in a new assignment, as a "poet-and-peasant overture."

The University of Michigan was my home for 7 years. As usual, I find warm familiarity here in Ann Arbor. I am discovering that you can go home again, if you take heart from it.

But in a very special sense, I do not come here alone.

A significant part of the Peace Corps has been nurtured in this university.

It is not just because the spirit of the Peace Corps first took shape here. Equally important is that the Peace Corps has drawn heavily upon this university in building a sound tradition.

Ten thousand students listened here in the early morning darkness while John F. Kennedy challenged them and a generation of their fellow Americans to a new kind of service. Over 330 Michigan students have accepted that challenge—ranking the university fifth among all the hundreds of schools and colleges from which volunteers have entered Peace Corps service. Two hundred and seventeen volunteers have been trained here for programs in Thailand and Iran.

When the Peace Corps visits the University of Michigan, truly, it is homecoming. And on this special day—the eve of our fifth anniversary—I can't tell you how good it is to be home. I would fool no one if I tried to conceal the sense of very personal excitement I feel today. Rather I come to share that excitement with you—for so many of you, and this city and this university are essential parts of whatever I have tried to do before, as you will be part of the tough job to come.

Even though I were a stranger to the Peace Corps, I could not underestimate the task.

But I have known the Peace Corps and loved its challenge, from the beginning. And I have served under its first boss. No more exciting man ever drove an organization into being with more devotion, more selfless conviction, more generous understanding of his own fallibility, more mature compassion for anyone willing to work even half as hard as he.

Following Sarge Shriver around the Peace Corps was bracing. Following him as its leader is a bit shattering.

Yet I feel today as I did when we began 5 years ago. There is a yearning to be started in earnest. In the spirit which surrounds the Peace Corps, and which has been preserved in its entirety through these years, there is the sure confidence in a worthwhile job to be done. To have an opportunity now to lead it makes me very, very humble—but then, I like to think I always was humble, until the bell for round 1.

Some words of the late President Kennedy speak best for me now. He spoke them in his stirring inaugural, and I have always thought he meant them to be shared by all who would become part of the New Frontier. He said:

"I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

I tell you now that the task to which we shall turn tomorrow is not a task of administration in a bureaucracy.

Nor is it a major experiment in education, nor a novel phase in international relations, nor even a special kind of foreign aid.

It is not nursing, nor community development, nor agricultural development, nor a host of other services to which volunteers turn when they arrive overseas.

All of the energy, the faith, the devotion which we in the Peace Corps bring to our service, serves a single cause.

That cause is peace.

I offer no catch phrase, no word of excitement, no torch.

I speak of peace, and I mean in peace the hard, gritty job of grappling once and for all with complex issues affecting our very salvation.

When the Peace Corps serves in the cause of peace, moreover, it means that men and women grapple hardest at the very level where results count: where people live, and must survive.

Readily, we acknowledge the difficulty of survival in war. How odd, then, that we fail to appreciate the difficulty of survival in peace.

Let me make clear that I am not merely propounding the virtues of peace. Indeed, war itself often makes off with the name of virtue, and every people need but read the newspapers of their own land to see what violence is exacted in virtue's name.

Moreover, the politics of violence is cruelest for what it masks, for when the dead are buried, the living have gained nothing. We have seen in Ghana, and the Dominican Republic, and in a dozen Vietnams, that progress for mankind can never really be measured in causes and coups, but in precious inches of human understanding and enlightenment, scantly noticed, grudgingly surrendered from ignorance and despair, toiled after, missed and sought after again.

We are but 5 years on the job. Yet we have gathered some insights. Together with the thoughts of other men, perhaps we can give back to our Nation more than fair return in hope, through what we have learned. Indeed we must, right now, lest significant opportunity for lasting peace go on escaping us into the future, as tragically as it has in the past. The terrible price paid by our generations in death, in the destruction of property—and worse, in the denigration of the human spirit—that price entitles us to some thinking, and to a glimpse at remedies if remedies exist, for if mankind has already thought its way clear of gravity, certainly we can begin to think our way clear of untimely graves.

I suggest we begin by taking a stern look at peace.

I believe it was Rochefoucald who said that "peace is war conducted by other means."

Cynical? Perhaps not, if you will accept that what has passed for peace throughout most of modern history has been a rosy mask concealing a malignancy.

We seem able to spot "phony war" fast enough. What about "phony peace"?

I think we might start by admitting that peace can indeed be a weapon. It is a weapon when it is just a state of mind which is an alternative to war—a cessation of violence. In such case peace is a method, part of an arsenal, an instrument of war. It is a significant pause.

We tend to safeguard such peace. Yet I submit that to safeguard peace is to admit its peril.

Peace needs no safeguard when it needs no spokesmen.

Real peace needs little vigil. Moreover, I suggest that peace has no lasting value, little merit, and hardly any utility, if it attracts any attention at all. I believe that real peace is the freedom to be totally unconcerned about war.

Peace should encourage genuine freedom of action: freedom to be restless without fear; freedom to be adventurous, to take risks, to grow, to stir, to match wits with nature and with our fellow man; freedom, if you will, to become civilized.

Yet, there is a nameless terror in such freedom—and if we can define it, we may be on the trail of our tragic malignancy beneath the surface of peace.

I think that Peace Corps volunteers are able to confirm through firsthand experience what thoughtful men like Sidney Hook and Eric Frome were able to perceive years ago: There is a fear of freedom. In the mobility which freedom suggests, there is also insecurity. Such insecurity takes its toll at every level of human existence—yet it strikes with greatest terror upon the poorest and least educated in any land.

Then does peace bear bitter fruit—when a mass of people find they have no options to better their life; nor any hope of security from their own government, while they learn enough of self-improvement to create new options; when a small, entrenched class cling to every advantage.

For people who cannot share abundance, peace has no value—no utility. All the more readily then, will they support the little wars and bear the international crises which spur income at home, or at least take their minds off their troubles. All the more readily, moreover, will they listen to the man who has all the answers—the man with the system, all buttoned up and ready to go. If there be no utility in peace, give me pray, the security of order. Call it any name you wish, including "freedom" if that's your style. In such times, words have little importance, for as President Johnson said last week at Freedom House:

"What does freedom mean—when famine chokes the land, when new millions crowd upon already strained resources, when privilege is entrenched behind law and custom—when all conspire to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?"

I have said the cause we serve is the cause of peace. Yet there is a modern dilemma inherent in our service: We have grown up, you and I, believing that peace is virtuous of itself, and because it is virtuous, it deserves guardians.

I suggest that peace, in and of itself, is anything but virtuous. In this day and age, human progress demands the service of men and women who will lend virtue to peace itself.

Truly made virtuous, it will need less guardians.

To such ends, we serve.

No better description of our work can be found, that in the President's words last week: Indeed, I commend them to the attention of every Peace Corps volunteer now in service, to men and women thinking of Peace Corps service, and to every person and organization associated with us in the years ahead. The President said,

"You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies, will change them.

"Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, eager—to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom.

"They will be able to look beyond the four essential freedoms.

"To the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature.

"To the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become, to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease.

"To the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being."

Such has been the essence and object of Peace Corps service during the last 5 years.

I pledge here and now that it will continue to be so, for as long as I serve in the office I am about to undertake.

I may end up running a revolution: Successful Peace Corps volunteers cannot help but teach that change is possible, and what is more, that change is not a fearsome unknown, but a responsibility to be shared and encouraged by the governments of lands in which they serve. They also spread the word that peace invites adventure, mobility, and self-expression.

In such work is true social revolution, and we shall be proud to share in it.

I say "we" shall be happy to share in it—because if there is to be valuable social revolution, our volunteers surely will have a hand in it. The staff will just have to try to keep up with them.

Volunteers have been out ahead of us from the beginning—and there is no reason to believe that the situation will change much.

I began an address to a group of new volunteers, once, by telling them that I wished I were part of the group—but that for people like me, thrills were now vicarious. One of them responded—"Well, from those of us whose thrills are still more precarious than vicarious * * *."

Volunteers showed us the way, with regard to some very fundamental considerations about the nature of their service.

At the outset, we thought we might be preparing a kind of junior foreign service officer. Training showed it. We talked about the organization of the Department of State, the tactics of power politics, the impact of nuclear weapons in policy planning, NATO and nullification.

The volunteers called it "GATT-and-gobbledygook."

And so it was. In short order they taught us (is it not always the case between teacher and student?)—they taught us that they needed to learn how to relate to people. Their tools were the language of their land, and knowledge of their trade. Training had to stress cross-cultural working problems, and the nature of the people among whom volunteers would serve.

We have shared the results of our lessons with you here at Michigan, as we have with the faculties of the hundreds of other universities and institutions in which volunteers have been trained. We found that in most cases the new ideas in training were right at home with current trends among you. Volunteers need to learn by active participation—on jobs, in seminars and conferences. Traditional academic disciplines had to be ignored.

As a result, universities have been encouraged to get off the campus and into the problems of our own society. I am convinced that as our universities break through the ivy wall which has separated them from the community, education for effective social service such as the Peace Corps will become an integral and important part of university life.

During the first 5 years, volunteers have led us to understand them in terms of their own satisfaction on the job. They showed us that they were happier and less anxious about themselves, the further away from the big cities and capitals they were assigned.

Moreover they showed us very early their work improved with every step we took to remove barriers and distances between themselves and the people among whom they served. Accordingly, jeeps disappeared in favor of shoe leather, for if Joe walked, Harry walked, too.

At every turn, it was the volunteers who gave us new courage. They infected us with their enthusiasm. Looking backward, we never should have been surprised, for it was they who responded to John Kennedy's challenge.

Do you recall his words? Let me repeat them for you, for they have as much meaning today as they did in October of 1961, and they are enriched, moreover—for the profound results they wrought.

He asked, right here:

"How many of you are willing to spend your days in Ghana as technicians or engineers? How many of you are willing to work in the Foreign Service and spend your life traveling around the world? On your willingness to do that, not merely to serve 1 or 2 years in the service, but on your willingness to contribute part of your life to this country, I think will depend the answer whether a free society can contribute. I think it can and I think Americans are willing to contribute. But the effort must be far greater than we have ever made in the past."

Those who took up the challenge have been at once the medium and the message of our service to the cause of peace.

And people get the message. Where we had gone in hesitation, to learn if volunteers would be invited, we now have trouble keeping up with demand.

Where the first volunteers met with resentment and derision, their replacements are hard put to reassure their host country colleagues that yet other replacements, and still more volunteers will follow after.

Forty-nine nations have followed, with volunteer services of their own.

Yet the job is only just begun. The call is barely answered.

The cause we serve is massive. The challenge will await us, for years to come.

I am honored to begin, tomorrow, where Sargent Shriver leaves off. I pray that when some day, the Peace Corps looks back upon its fruitful and exciting history, Shriver and Vaughn will just be two of a long line of serviceable people, learning more and more each year from a growing host of volunteers. So perhaps it will not surprise you, now if I tell you that I am going to resign the job—some day.

I surely shall.

And at that time, I believe I shall be expected to do so in writing.

You of this university, with whom I have shared so much of my own life—and you who have shared so much of yourselves with the beginning and growth of the Peace Corps—share with me now a drafting job.

Let us prepare my letter of resignation. Moreover, let us contemplate, as we work it out, what kind of a testament we shall leave to those who follow in this very special work.

Let us try to envisage what the Peace Corps may have begun abroad, and what it may have repaid, to our fellow Americans. When shall we date it? Well, let's go for broke: Late in 1971.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My 27th professional bout has come to an end.

Over 100,000 American men and women have served in the Peace Corps since its inception, 10½ years ago. Peace Corps volunteers have served or are now serving in virtually every village in what is still the developing world. Volunteers are serving throughout Eastern Europe, as authorized under the amended legislation. Volunteers are also serving in all of Vietnam.

As you are aware, Mr. President, we have been moving of late into nations which we have agreed to call nations on the move—noted, as a rule, for governments that care about what happens to their people—whether they care about the Government and people of the United States or not.

I am pleased to point out that through the reverse Peace Corps program, qualified persons from over 40 nations are now working and teaching in communities throughout the United States, at salaries commensurate with local practice.

Former grammar school students of the very first Peace Corps volunteers have just come to voting age in many nations—and the results are showing very favorably as elections are held. Meanwhile at home, the first children born to Peace Corps volunteers serving overseas are learning foreign languages from reverse Peace Corps teachers serving in our schools. Also they are learning history, government, and international affairs from Peace Corps veterans who know whereof they teach.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I understand that you have been wondering what to do, yourself, with the new year approaching. My wife and I have something in mind ourselves. Perhaps we could all enter the same training program? In this connection I am pleased to note that the eldest of the approximately two dozen grandchildren of Joseph and Rose Kennedy will be finishing school soon. We have sent them the necessary forms.

The Foreign Service entrance examination is now fully adjusted to comprise three essential elements: a written test, an oral examination; and 2 years successful service as a Peace Corps volunteer. Similar changes in the Federal service entrance requirements will be completed before the end of this year.

No hardship and other bonus allowances are paid to any U.S. civilian employee overseas, no matter with what agency they serve. All commissaries have been dismantled, and employees find and pay for their own housing.

Through a long process of reexamination, we have developed a fruitful and satisfactory relationship between the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development, recently renamed Agency for International Peace, backing dollars with people where the combination can be truly of value.

The vigorous program of community service which has marked university life in recent years has continued to flourish, and we are proud to have shared in such work. Moreover returned volunteers now comprise such a substantial part of the academic community that I believe we may look forward to continued rewards for the Nation, in this regard.

Particularly encouraging are fresh signs of a growing belief among most Americans that this Nation is rich enough, and possessed of enough spirit, to assure almost every citizen an opportunity to devote several years of his or her life to volunteer service of one kind or another. In this regard, it is with considerable pride that I report the enlistment in the Peace Corps of the entire graduating class of 1971 from undergraduate schools of the University of Michigan, including both platoons of the football team. Moreover our own internal organization at Peace Corps headquarters has grown so efficient that virtually every Spanish-language major is headed for Latin America.

Finally, Mr, President, I commend to your attention an aspect of Peace Corps service which is not new, yet which holds increasing importance as we are able to look back over a full decade of achievement: the Peace Corps is beginning to return heavily on the investment of the American people.

It is doing so, through the men and women who have served in it.

These men and women possess a quality of mind and spirit—a resiliency, a maturity—to match great responsibilities far beyond old expectations.

In our Great Society, Mr. President, Peace Corps volunteers are great citizens.

Several years ago, Mr. President, we spoke of the Great Society as "a place where the meaning of man's life matches the marvels of man's labors." Peace Corps volunteers have indeed found very special meaning in their lives. Having done so once, they appear emboldened to new challenges at home. They seem to escape the problem of conformity, and they seem able to lead others away from conformity, as well.

From within themselves, Mr. President, they seem to have resolved answers to President Kennedy's memorable words:

"Ask not what your country can do for you—Ask what you can do for your country."

Unlike so many others, moreover, they seem to have borne in mind other words from that passage:

"Ask what together we can do for the freedom of man."

Respectfully submitted, and thank you.

JOINT COMMISSION ON MENTAL HEALTH OF CHILDREN

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on Monday I attended a ceremony that was small in size, but which, I feel sure, will have big results. It was the ceremony marking the launching of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen made the formal presentation of the grant under which the Commission will operate to its president, Dr. Reginald Lourie. I spoke a few words to the distinguished group of child health experts present.

The Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health—on whose recommendations so much of the Community Mental Health Act was based—complained that it lacked the time and funds to study the problem of emotionally disturbed children. And a conference held in 1963 by the American Academy of Child Psychiatry and the American Psychiatric Association urged that a national survey be conducted under the leadership of representatives of the entire spectrum of child-care professions in the field of mental illness and health—looking to the formation of a national program to control child mental illness and secure the wherewithal to carry out such a plan.

Subsequently, I introduced legislation in the Congress to set up a group which could carry out such a survey. It was established under an amendment to the Social Security Amendments of 1965, known as medicare.

Now the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children—a group whose members command the respect of professional colleagues and of officials across the Nation—can start its work. Its challenge is to develop and present to the Congress a specific, thorough, imaginative, constructive program in the field of child mental health.

Mr. President, such a program is desperately needed. There are half a million seriously emotionally disturbed children in this country—and only about 2 percent are receiving the treatment they need. Sometimes the tragic results affect many more than the child involved or his family. This was brought home to me especially when I read the Warren Commission report. For it was a fact that the assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was mentally ill. And his illness was brought to the attention of the authorities in New York when he was 13 years old. Had Oswald received the treatment he needed—had society not allowed him to slip through its fingers—President Kennedy might be alive today.

I have great hope for the new Commission. I know my colleagues who helped get it underway—notably the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—share this hope.

We wish the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children well as it starts its great work. We look forward to its report.

NEED FOR ELECTORAL REFORM—SUPPORT FOR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the April 27 issue of the Canova Herald newspaper, Canova, S. Dak., the respected editor held in high esteem by his newspaper colleagues in my State, Dean Trippler, whom I also am pleased to count as a good friend, discussed in his editorial columns the need for electoral reform.

His editorial refers to Senate Joint Resolution 12, a proposed constitutional amendment which I have introduced and is cosponsored by 10 other Senators. Hearings were recently held on this proposal along with other measures and I am hopeful that the Senate will have an opportunity this session to consider electoral reform.

In his editorial, Mr. Trippler notes:

> This district system (as proposed in S.J. Res. 12) would make the President the man of all the people and would reduce the effect of improper election practices, exaggerated influence of individuals and groups in control of block votes and eliminate the unfair system of having votes of large minorities cast opposite to their wishes.

That one sentence, Mr. President, explains as well as anything I have seen why electoral reform of the type recommended in Senate Joint Resolution 12 is needed and why early enactment can transform our system of electing Presidents into the type of system that is truly responsive to the people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from the Canova Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR EQUAL REPRESENTATION

An underlying objective in the creation of our form of government, and one which has avoided many abuses of other forms of government, was to achieve diffusion rather than concentration of government power.

The present operation of the electoral college system results in a concentration of power in certain parts of our country. In order to achieve a better balance, a constitutional amendment aimed at choosing Presidential electors by districts comparable to the system of choosing Members of the House of Representatives is recommended.

Under this proposal (S.J. Res. 12) each voter, no matter where geographically located, would have the identical privilege of voting for three Presidential electors, two on a statewide basis, and one from the local district. Such a diffusion of power and influence would cause the choice of presidential candidates, the framing of platforms, the conduct of conventions and campaigns, as well as the conduct of governmental affairs, to be directed on a truly national basis.

This district system would make the President the man of all the people and would reduce the effect of improper election practices, exaggerated influence of individuals and groups in control of block votes and eliminate the unfair system of having votes of large minorities cast opposite to their wishes.

We commend its serious consideration by the Congress of the United States.

TRUTH IN LENDING PROTECTION FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I strongly commend the Department of Defense for its issuance yesterday of a revised directive on "Personal Commercial Affairs," which orders into effect the truth-in-lending disclosure requirements contained in my bill, S. 2275. The Department's establishment of this basic protection of servicemen as consumers, borrowers, and installment borrowers is 100 percent in line with President Johnson's program for consumer protection and his endorsement of truth in lending.

The heart of my truth-in-lending proposal is disclosure of the cost of credit both in dollars and as an annual rate on the unpaid balance. The Defense Department directive requires full disclosure by lenders and sellers of the annual rate charged for financing the obligation. Banks and credit unions with offices on a military post must conform to this requirement before executing a loan, credit agreement, or contract. Others who sell or loan to military personnel will have to make full disclosure in dollars and as an annual rate if they expect the assistance of the military department in collecting debts owed them by servicemen and women.

This protection for our 3 million servicemen and women and their families should be welcomed by all Americans, and both by borrowers and ethical lenders alike. The enforcement of the requirement that the annual rate be disclosed will put the lie to the claims made by the opponents of truth-in-lending that it is impractical or impossible. The Department has issued as part of the directive a table for computing the approximate annual percentage rate on level payment loans which is easy to read and which may be used to calculate the annual rate under the directive. If the lender or seller wishes, however, he may use a more precise actuarial calculation based on standard annuity tables.

In the case of revolving or open-end credit accounts, if the seller or lender wishes to have the help of military channels in collecting a debt, he must disclose the periodic rate and its annual rate equivalent, and the balance to which it is applied to compute the charge.

This addition of truth-in-lending protection to the directive issued by the Department last fall is a strong and needed protection for our servicemen and their families. It is a wise and just step.

I today call upon all the agencies of the Federal Government to examine this directive and to institute the same protections for their civilian employees where lenders ask the Government as the employer to help in the collection of debts.

Perhaps this action may jog Congress into action and lead it to pass my truth-in-lending bill which has been put in cold storage within the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate for the last 6 years.

Mr. President, the procedures established in this directive illustrate so well the ease with which truth in lending disclosure can be complied with that I ask unanimous consent that the directive, along with the attached table and disclosure forms, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[ASD(M), No. 1344.7, May 2, 1966]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

Subject: Personal commercial affairs.

REFERENCES

(a) DOD Directive 1344.7, "Personal Commercial Affairs," September 29, 1965 (hereby reissued as set forth herein).

(b) President's message of March 21, 1966, "Consumer Interests" (H.R. Doc. No. 413, 89th Congress).

(c) DOD Directive 1344.1, "Solicitation of Life Insurance on Military Installations," March 3, 1964.

(d) DOD Directive 1344.6, "Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance," April 15, 1964.

(e) DOD Directive 1000.9, "Credit Unions Serving DOD Personnel," August 27, 1965.

(f) DOD Directive 1000.10, "Credit Unions Serving DOD Personnel on Overseas U.S. Military Installations."

(g) DOD Directive 1330.9, "Armed Services Exchange Regulations," January 6, 1956.

(h) Joint regulations, "Armed Forces Disciplinary Control Boards" (AR 15-3, DSAR 5725.1, BUPERSINST 1620.4, AFR 125-11, MCO 1620.1, COMDTINST 1620.1), March 12, 1965.

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this directive is to reissue reference (a), and in furtherance of the President's message reference (b), to prescribe general Department of Defense policy regarding the solicitation and sale of goods, services, and commodities on military installations by dealers, tradesmen, and their agents, to safeguard and promote the welfare and interests of military personnel as consumers, and to set forth the conditions under which DOD may extend assistance in the collection of debts, wherever incurred, from members of the Armed Forces.

II. APPLICABILITY AND SCOPE

(a) This directive is applicable to all components of the Department of Defense, to those desiring the privilege of conducting commercial transactions with military personnel on military installations (including controlled housing areas), and to those who seek assistance in the processing of debt complaints against military personnel, particularly those in which consumer credit has been extended.

(b) For additional provisions governing on-base solicitation for certain specialized types of commercial enterprises see the following DOD directives:

1. Life insurance companies and their agents, reference (c).
2. Automobile insurance companies and their agents, reference (d).
3. Credit unions, references (e) and (f).
4. Commercial facilities authorized by the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps exchanges, reference (g).

As used herein, credit unions refer to those authorized by references (e) and (f).

(c) The provisions of this directive relating to processing of debt complaints involving consumer credit transactions do not apply to companies furnishing utility services, milk, laundry, and related delivery services in which credit is extended solely to facilitate the service, as distinguished from inducing the purchase of the product or service. For additional exceptions see section X. E.

III. COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

(a) The solicitation and transaction of commercial business on military installations with members of the Armed Forces may be permitted at the discretion of the military commander, provided such solicitations and transactions conform to applicable regulations and do not otherwise interfere with essential military activities. No person has authority to enter upon and transact commercial business as a matter of right.

(b) Because of his broad responsibilities to maintain discipline, protect property and safeguard the health, morale, and welfare of his personnel, the installation commander may impose reasonable restrictions on the character and conduct of commercial activities. Of special concern is the need to assure that members of the Armed Forces are not subject to fraudulent, usurious or unethical business practices, and that reasonable and consistent standards are applied to each company and its agents in conducting commercial transactions on the installation. The word "company" as used herein, includes any commercial organization, company, group or other type of legal entity.

(c) Those seeking to transact personal commercial transactions on military installations in the United States, its territories and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico will be required, upon demand, to present to the installation commander or his designee documentary evidence that the company and its agents meet the licensing requirements of the State in which the installation is located, and that they also meet any other applicable regulatory requirements imposed by civil authorities (Federal, State, county, or municipality). For ease of administration, the installation commander may issue temporary permits to agents who meet these requirements and who frequently conduct commercial activities on the military installations. Permanent installation passes will not be issued for this purpose.

(d) Those seeking to transact personal commercial transactions in foreign countries will be required to observe the applicable laws of the host country and upon demand to present documentary evidence to the installation commander or his designee that the company and its agents meet the licensing requirements of the host country. If the company and its agents also conduct business in the United States, they must also present upon demand, documentary evidence that they meet the licensing requirements of the State in which they conduct their principal business.

(e) Armed services exchange facilities will be approved as authorized by reference (g). No other exclusive franchise or concession will be awarded for on-base solicitation and sale of goods, services and commodities to military personnel without the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower). All existing exclusive franchises or concessions of this nature will be referred to the ASD (Manpower) for review. This limitation will not apply to service and supply contracts related to base operations.

IV. SUPERVISION OF ON-BASE COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

(a) The solicitation of military personnel and their dependents will be conducted on an individual basis, preferably by appointment, in such locations, and at such hours as the military commander may designate.

(b) A conspicuous notice of installation regulations will be posted in such form and such place as to give notice thereof to all those conducting on-base commercial activities. Insofar as practicable as determined by the military commander, those conducting on-base commercial activities will be presented with a copy of the applicable installation regulations and advised that disregard of the regulations will result in the withdrawal of solicitation privileges.

(c) The following solicitation practices are prohibited:

1. Solicitation of recruits, trainees, "mass" or "captive" audiences, and transient personnel.
2. Solicitation in areas utilized for processing or housing transient personnel; solicitation in barracks occupied as quarters; or the making of appointments with or soliciting military persons in an "on duty" status.
3. The use of official identification cards by retired or Reserve members of the Armed Forces to gain access to military installations for the purpose of soliciting.
4. Procuring, or attempting to procure, or supplying roster listings of DOD personnel for solicitation purposes.
5. The offering of unfair, improper and deceptive inducements to purchase or deal.
6. Practices involving rebates to facilitate transactions or to eliminate competition. (Credit union interest refunds to borrowers are not considered a prohibited rebate.)
7. The use of any manipulative, deceptive or fraudulent device, scheme or artifice, including misleading advertising and sales literature.
8. Any oral of written representations which suggest or give rise to the appearance that the DOD sponsors or endorses the company, its agents, or the goods, services and commodities it sells.

V. DENIAL AND REVOCATION OF ONBASE SOLICITATION

(a) In furtherance of a commander's responsibilities, he shall deny or revoke permission to a company and its agents to conduct commercial activities on the military base if such action would further the best interests of the command. The grounds for taking this action shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Failure to meet the licensing and other regulatory requirements prescribed by section III(c), or section III(d).
2. Commission of any of the solicitation practices prohibited by section IV(c).
3. Substantiated adverse complaints or reports regarding the quality of the goods, services or commodities solicited, the manner in which they are offered for sale, and the method and terms of financing.
4. Personal misconduct by a company's agents or representatives while on the military installation.
5. The possession of or any attempts to obtain allotment forms.

(b) The decision as to whether the denial or revocation action shall be limited to the agent, or whether it shall also be extended to the company he represents, shall be dependent upon the circumstances of the particular case, including among others, the nature of the violations, their frequency, the extent to which other agents of the company have engaged in such practices, and any other matters tending to show the company's culpability.

(c) Upon denying or revoking solicitation privileges the agent and the company he represents will be promptly notified of the reasons, orally or in writing. If the grounds for the action bear significantly on the eligibility of the agent and the company to hold a State license or to meet other regulatory requirements, the appropriate authorities will be notified. If the grounds for the action are such that the denial or revocation action should be extended to additional military installations, the installation commander will make his recommendations to the military department concerned after affording the company the opportunity to show cause why it should not be so extended. If so approved, and when appropriate, the order may be extended to the other military departments by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), following consultation with the military departments concerned.

VI. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND ADVERTISING POLICIES

(a) The military departments shall maintain information and education programs for the purpose of providing members of the Armed Forces with information pertaining to the conduct of their personal commercial affairs (consumer credit and financing, insurance, Government benefits, savings and budgeting). The services of commercial agents, including loan or finance companies and their associations may not be used for this purpose. The services of representatives of credit unions, including associations of credit unions, may be used for this purpose provided their programs are entirely educational in nature. Educational materials prepared by outside organizations expert in this field may be adapted or used provided such material is entirely educational in nature and does not contain or refer to any particular commercial product, service, or company. In addition, such experts in the field of personal commercial affairs may provide expert advice to those conducting such educational programs, but may not take parts in orientation lectures or individual counseling.

(b) The local military commander will also make qualified personnel and facilities available for individual counseling on loans and consumer credit transactions in order to encourage thrift and financial responsibility and promote a better understanding of the wise use of credit. Legal assistance programs will continue to encourage individual military members to seek advice from the judge advocate or their own lawyer before making substantial loan or credit commitments. The counseling service and the orientation lectures should include information regarding the need for a full disclosure of the terms of the agreement, how finance and interest rates are quoted and computed, the standards of fairness which should be observed, and the DOD forms available for this purpose. See section IX, and attachment A.

(c) The Department of Defense expects that commercial enterprises soliciting military personnel through advertisements appearing in unofficial military publications will voluntarily observe, or will be requested by the publisher to observe, the highest business ethics in describing goods, services and commodities and the terms of sale (including guarantees, warranties, etc.). If credit terms are offered in such advertisements, a clear statement of the total cash price as well as the total cost of credit, including all charges, should be shown clearly in the company's advertisements. If time payments are shown, the number of payments, the amount of each, and the time period should also be shown in order that the reader can easily compute the dollar cost of the loan.

VII. EXERCISE OF "OFF-LIMITS" AUTHORITY

(a) In appropriate cases a military commander may use the services of the Armed Forces Disciplinary Control Board to investigate reports that cash or consumer credit transactions offered military personnel by a business establishment are usurious, fraudulent, misleading or deceptive. Should it be determined that the commercial establishment engages in such practices, that it has not taken corrective action upon being duly notified, and that the health, morale and welfare of military personnel would be served thereby, the Armed Forces Disciplinary Control Board may recommend that the offending business establishment be declared "off limits" to all military personnel. The procedures for making these determinations are set out in reference (h).

(b) A Secretary of a military department or the Secretary of Defense, upon receiving information that a company conducting cash or consumer credit transactions with members of Armed Forces on a nationwide or international basis is engaged in widespread usurious, fraudulent, or deceptive practices, may direct appropriate Armed Forces Disciplinary Control Boards in all geographical areas in which these practices have occurred to investigate the charges and take appropriate action.

VIII. INDEBTEDNESS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

(a) A member of the Armed Forces is expected to pay his just financial obligations in a proper and timely manner. A "just financial obligation" means one acknowledged by the military member in which there is no reasonable dispute as to the facts or the law, or one reduced to judgment which conforms to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C., app. 501 et seq.), if applicable. "In a proper and timely manner" means a manner which the military department concerned determines does not, under the circumstances, reflect discredit on the military service.

(b) However, the military departments are without legal authority to require a member to pay a private debt, or to divert any part of his pay for the satisfaction thereof even though the indebtedness may have been reduced to judgment by a civil court. The enforcement of the private obligations of a military member is a matter for civil authorities.

(c) Those desiring to contact a military member about his indebtedness may obtain the member's address by writing to the locator service of the military department concerned and enclosing $1.50 as a fee for the service.

IX. STANDARDS OF FAIRNESS AND FULL DISCLOSURE BY LENDERS AND SELLERS

(a) The Department recognizes that a great majority of those engaged in making loans and extending credit to military personnel deal fairly and justly. Attachment A describes the principal standards (pt. I) which are considered to characterize fair and just dealing with servicemen, and itemizes the information (pt. II) which the serviceman needs to know in order to be fully informed on the terms of the contract. Adherence to these standards and disclosure of this information in advance places both parties squarely on notice of their respective obligations, discourages improvident loans, and reduces cases of default.

(b) Those who sell or loan to military personnel are expected to subscribe to the standards of fairness and to make full disclosure before the loan or credit agreement or contract is executed. Because banks and credit unions operating on military installations owe a special responsibility to deal fairly with those assigned to or employed on the installation, they must conform to the requirements of attachment A before executing the loan or credit agreement or contract.

(c) The itemized information required in part II of attachment A may be presented to the serviceman in the form most convenient to the seller or lender, as long as all of the information is disclosed and a copy is provided to the borrower.

X. PROCESSING DEBT COMPLAINTS

(a) With the growth of borrowing opportunities and consumer credit, the military departments have been called upon, with increasing frequency, to provide assistance in the processing of debt complaints growing out of such transactions. While many of these requests involve loan and credit transactions which are fair and reasonable, others involve transactions in which the full cost of credit has not been stated simply and clearly in advance. Further, some of these transactions levy exorbitant charges and other unreasonable obligations against the military debtor. Under such circumstances, the Department will not use its facilities and personnel in processing such debt complaints through military channels. For the purpose of this directive, lenders also include all financial institutions (such as centralized charge systems) which, although not a party to the original transaction, seek assistance in the collection of debts.

(b) In all loan and credit transactions subject to this directive the military department concerned will refer letters charging military members with indebtedness through military channels to the debtor only under the conditions set forth in 1 or 2 below.

1. Lenders and creditors completing attachment A before executing the loan or credit contract must submit a copy of part II (Full Disclosure) and part III (Certificate of Compliance) to the commanding officer of the military member concerned or, if unknown, to his military department for forwarding to the military member concerned.

2. Those not executing attachment A before consummating the loan or credit contract (or who are unable to produce a copy thereof signed by both parties) must submit an executed copy of part II (Full Disclosure) and part III (Certificate of Compliance). Requests for assistance which fail to meet these requirements and which are not modified after the sender has been so notified, will not be acted upon.

(c) Those claims in which there is questionable compliance with these requirements, or in which the cost of the loan or credit, including all finance charges, although stated, appear excessive or exorbitant, will be referred to the officer responsible for such consideration and disposition as may be appropriate. Before deciding on a proper course of action, the appropriate officer will give the creditor an opportunity to demonstrate (1) that the finance charges conform to the law of the State governing the contract and (2) the extent to which the finance charges and rates conform to the prevailing rates and charges for similar consumer credit transactions.

(d) Additionally, the fact that a particular claim is exempt from the requirements of Full Disclosure and standards of Fairness under (e) below (e.g., an open-end or revolving charge account), does not foreclose the right by the debtor to question service charges and other finance charges and to negotiate a fair and reasonable settlement.

(e) The following types of dept complaints are not subject to the processing requirements of (d) above; claims by accommodation endorsers, comakers or lenders against the party primarily liable on obligations not intended to benefit the accommodating party through payment of interest of otherwise; contracts for the purchase, sale, or rental of real estate; claims in which the total unpaid amount does not exceed $50; claims for support of dependents; claims based on a revolving or open-end credit account if the account shows the periodic rate and its annual rate equivalent and the balance to which it is applied to compute the charge; or purchase money liens on real property (this does not include other liens on real property and related obligations such as those which represent obligations for improvement or repair).

XI. RESPONSIBILITIES

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) shall be responsible for the administration of the provisions of this directive and assure its effective implementation throughout the DOD.

XII. EFFECTIVE DATE AND CANCELLATION

(a) This directive shall be published in the Federal Register and shall become effective July 1, 1966. Reference (a) is hereby superseded as of that date and reissued as provided herein.

(b) As an exception, any debt complaints received prior to August 1 which conform to the "collection procedures" and attachment of reference (a) will be processed. After that date, lenders or creditors seeking assistance must comply with the terms of this directive.

XIII. IMPLEMENTATION

Within thirty (30) days of the date of issuance the secretaries of the military departments shall submit to the ASD (Manpower) two copies of their implementing regulations.

CYRUS VANCE,
Deputy Secretary of Defense.

[Attachment A, No. 1344.7, May 2, 1966]

PART I—STANDARDS OF FAIRNESS

1. No finance charge contracted for, made, or received under any contract shall be in excess of the charge which could be made for such contract under the law of the place in which the contract is signed by the serviceman. In the event a contract is signed with a U.S. company in a foreign country the lowest interest rate of the State or States in which the company is chartered or does business shall apply.

2. No contract or loan agreement shall provide for an attorney's fee in the event of

default unless suit is filed in which event the fee provided in the contract shall not exceed 10 percent of the obligation found due. No attorney fees shall be authorized if he is a salaried employee of the holder.

3. In loan transactions, defenses which the debtor may have against the original lender or its agent shall be good against any subsequent holder of the obligation. In credit transactions, defenses against the seller or its agent shall be good against any subsequent holder of the obligation provided that the holder had actual knowledge of the defense or under conditions where reasonable inquiry would have apprised him of this fact.

4. The debtor shall have the right to remove any security for the obligation beyond State or National boundaries if he or his family moves beyond such boundaries under military orders and notifies the creditor in advance of the removal, of the new address where the security will be located. Removal of the security shall not accelerate payment of the obligation.

5. No late charge shall be made in excess of 5 percent of the late payment, or $5, whichever, is the lesser amount. Only one late charge may be made for any tardy installment.

6. The obligation may be paid in full at any time or through accelerated payments of any amount. There shall be no penalty for prepayment and in the event of prepayment that portion of the finance charges which have inured to the benefit of the seller or creditor shall be prorated on the basis of the charges which would have been ratably payable had finance charges been calculated and payable as equal periodic payments over the terms of the contract and only the prorated amount to the date of prepayment shall be due. As an alternative the "Rule of 78" may be applied, in which case its operation shall be explained in the contract.

7. No charge shall be made for an insurance premium or for finance charges for such premium unless satisfactory evidence of a policy, or insurance certificate where State insurance laws or regulations permit such certificates to be issued in lieu of a policy, reflecting such coverage has been delivered to the debtor within 30 days after the specified date of delivery of the item purchase or the signing of a cash loan agreement.

8. If the loan or contract agreement provides for payments in installments, each payment, other than the down payment, shall be in equal or substantially equal amounts, and installments shall be successive and of equal or substantially equal duration.

9. If the security for the debt is repossessed and sold in order to satisfy or reduce the debt, the repossession and resale will meet the following conditions: (a) the defaulting purchaser will be given advance written notice of the intention to repossess; (b) following repossession, the defaulting purchaser will be served a complete statement of his obligations and adequate advance notice of the sale; (c) he will be permitted to redeem the item by payment of the amount due before the sale, or in lieu thereof submit a bid at the sale; (d) there will be a solicitation for a minimum of three sealed bids unless sold at auction; (e) the party holding the security, and all agents thereof, are ineligible to bid; (f) the defaulting purchaser will be charged only those charges which are reasonably necessary for storage, reconditioning, and resale and (g) he shall be provided a written detailed statement of his obligations, if any, following the resale and promptly refunded any credit balance due him, if any.

10. The contract may be terminated at any time before delivery of the goods or services without charge to the purchaser. However, if goods made to the special order of the purchaser result in preproduction costs, or require preparation for delivery, such additional costs will be listed in the order form or contract. No termination charge will be made in excess of this amount. Contracts for delivery at future intervals may be terminated as to the undelivered portion, and the purchaser shall be chargeable only for that proportion of the total cost which the goods or services delivered bear to the total goods and services called for by the contract.

[Attachment A, No. 1344.7, May 2, 1966]

PART II—FULL DISCLOSURE

A copy of this form or its equivalent should be provided to the serviceman in advance of executing the contract, and must be submitted with requests for debt processing assistance.

A. IDENTIFICATION

1. Borrower's name and address:

----

2. Creditor's name and address:

----

3. Name and address of creditor (if known) to whom the obligation is or will be payable, if other than above.

----

4. Has creditor any financial ties with, or right of recourse against seller in event of default? Yes ( ) No ( )

B. CONTRACT TERMS

1. Quoted cash price of goods or services, or total amount of cash advanced........................ $----

2. Ancillary charges from which seller or lender receives no benefit, and which would be paid if this were a cash purchase: taxes; auto license fees; filing or recording fees paid or payable to a public official, etc.:

(a) ------------------------------ ----

(b) ------------------------------ ----

(c) ------------------------------ ----

Total ancillary charges.......... ----

3. Total cash delivered price, or total amount of credit extended (1+2).......................... ----

4. Less down payment or trade-in allowance........................ (----)

5. Unpaid cash balance to be financed (3−4).................... ----

6. Finance charges which benefit the seller or creditor, or entities in which either has an interest. These are charges which would not be made if this were a cash purchase:

(a) Official fees for filing or recording credit instrument........................ ----

(b) Charges for investigating creditworthiness of borrower........................ ----

(c) Insurance premiums (life, disability, accident, health, other)........ ----

(d) All other charges for extending credit.................. ----

Total finance charges.................. ----

7. Total amount to be repaid, in accordance with terms of agreement (5+6)........................ ----

8. To be repaid in — monthly installments, of $——— each, with the first payment to be made on ——— (date).[1]...................... ----

9. The finance charges expressed in approximate annual percentage rate (see reverse side and attachment B.) All lenders and all sellers who regularly engage in credit sales must complete this item. (Percent)...................... ----

C. CALCULATION OF APPROXIMATE ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE[2]

1. Total finance charges ((b)6)........ $----

2. Total amount to be financed ((b)5) .... $----

3. Finance charges per $100 financed (divide 1 above by 2 above and multiply the result by $100)...... $----

4. Number of monthly payments ((b)8)........................ ----

5. Determine annual percentage rate by using either:

(a) DOD annual rate table (attachment B). This table will give an approximate annual percentage rate based on the actuarial method. These approximate rates will differ from precise calculations by no more than ¼ percent at the left end of the table and not more than 1½ percent at the right end of the table. Read down the left column of the table to the number of monthly payments (4 above). Read across to find between which pair of columns the finance charge per hundred (3 above) falls. Read up and find the approximate annual percentage rate at the head of the pair of columns (percent).. ----

or

(b) A more precise actuarial calculation based on standard annuity tables (percent)............ ----

Repayment terms if other than level monthly payments:

----

[1] Explain on reverse side if amount is to be repaid in other than level monthly payments.

[2] For purposes of this calculation, it is necessary to determine the number of equal monthly payments which would be required during the period of the contract, regardless of the actual repayment terms specified.

[Attachment A, No. 1344.7, May 2, 1966]

PART III—CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

(If attachment A is executed before the obligation is incurred.)

I certify that (1) the standards of fairness (pt. I) have been applied to the loan or credit obligation to which this form refers, (2) a full disclosure of the terms of the obligation has been made by execution of part II or its equivalent, and (3) that a copy of this disclosure was furnished to the borrower (or debtor), whose signature is also indicated below, before the obligation was incurred.

Signature of borrower

Signature of creditor

(Date)

(If attachment A is not executed before the obligation was incurred.)

I certify that (1) the standards of fairness (pt. I) have been applied to the loan or credit obligation to which this form refers and that the unpaid balance owing has been adjusted in accordance therewith as reflected in an executed copy of part II, or (2) that the standards of fairness were applied at the time the loan was made and no adjustment is required in the transaction as indicated by the executed copy of part II.

Name of borrower

Signature of creditor

(Date)

Department of Defense

Table for computing approximate annual percentage rate for level monthly payment plans

Example: Finance charge=$38; total amount to be financed=$250; number of monthly payments=24.

Solution:

Step 1—Divide the finance charge by the total amount to be financed and multiply by $100. This gives the finance charge per $100 of amount to be financed. That is, $38÷$250×$100=$15.20.

Step 2—Follow down the left hand column of the table to the line for 24 months. Follow across this line until you find the 2 numbers between which the finance charge of $15.20 falls. In this example $15.20 falls between $14.66 and $15.80. Reading up between the 2 columns of figures you will see that the annual percentage rate is 14 percent. For the purpose of this directive the annual percentage rate is the rate appearing at the head of the 2 columns between which the finance charge per $100 of total amount to be financed falls. (If the finance charge per hundred falls exactly on a tabular value, the lower percentage rate may be used.)

Number of level monthly payments	Approximate annual rate																								
		5%	5½%	6%	6½%	7%	7½%	8%	9%	10%	11%	12%	13%	14%	15%	16%	18%	20%	22%	24%	26%	28%	30%	33%	36%
	(Finance charge per $100 of balance to be financed)																								
1	$0.40	$0.44	$0.48	$0.52	$0.56	$0.60	$0.65	$0.71	$0.79	$0.88	$0.96	$1.04	$1.12	$1.21	$1.29	$1.42	$1.58	$1.75	$1.92	$2.08	$2.25	$2.42	$2.62	$2.88	$3.12
2	.59	.66	.72	.78	.84	.91	.97	1.06	1.19	1.31	1.44	1.57	1.69	1.82	1.94	2.13	2.38	2.63	2.88	3.14	3.39	3.64	3.95	4.33	4.71
3	.79	.88	.96	1.04	1.13	1.21	1.29	1.42	1.59	1.76	1.92	2.09	2.26	2.43	2.59	2.85	3.18	3.52	3.86	4.20	4.53	4.87	5.30	5.80	6.31
4	.99	1.10	1.20	1.31	1.41	1.51	1.62	1.78	1.99	2.20	2.41	2.62	2.83	3.04	3.25	3.57	3.99	4.41	4.84	5.26	5.69	6.11	6.65	7.29	7.93
5	1.19	1.32	1.44	1.57	1.69	1.82	1.95	2.13	2.39	2.64	2.89	3.15	3.40	3.65	3.91	4.29	4.80	5.31	5.82	6.34	6.85	7.37	8.01	8.79	9.57
6	1.39	1.54	1.68	1.83	1.98	2.13	2.27	2.49	2.79	3.08	3.38	3.68	3.97	4.27	4.57	5.02	5.61	6.21	6.81	7.42	8.02	8.63	9.39	10.30	11.22
7	1.59	1.76	1.93	2.09	2.26	2.43	2.60	2.85	3.19	3.53	3.87	4.21	4.55	4.89	5.23	5.75	6.43	7.12	7.81	8.51	9.20	9.90	10.77	11.83	12.88
8	1.79	1.98	2.17	2.36	2.55	2.74	2.93	3.21	3.60	3.98	4.36	4.74	5.13	5.51	5.90	6.48	7.26	8.03	8.82	9.60	10.39	11.18	12.17	13.36	14.57
9	1.99	2.20	2.41	2.62	2.83	3.05	3.26	3.57	4.00	4.43	4.85	5.28	5.71	6.14	6.57	7.22	8.08	8.95	9.83	10.70	11.58	12.47	13.58	14.92	16.27
10	2.19	2.42	2.65	2.89	3.12	3.35	3.59	3.94	4.41	4.88	5.35	5.82	6.29	6.77	7.24	7.96	8.91	9.88	10.84	11.81	12.79	13.77	15.00	16.48	17.98
11	2.39	2.64	2.90	3.15	3.41	3.66	3.92	4.30	4.81	5.33	5.84	6.36	6.88	7.40	7.92	8.70	9.75	10.80	11.86	12.93	14.00	15.08	16.43	18.06	19.71
12	2.59	2.87	3.14	3.42	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.66	5.22	5.78	6.34	6.90	7.46	8.03	8.59	9.45	10.59	11.74	12.89	14.05	15.22	16.40	17.87	19.66	21.46
13	2.79	3.09	3.39	3.68	3.98	4.28	4.58	5.03	5.63	6.23	6.84	7.44	8.05	8.66	9.27	10.20	11.43	12.67	13.93	15.18	16.45	17.72	19.33	21.26	23.22
14	2.99	3.31	3.63	3.95	4.27	4.59	4.91	5.39	6.04	6.69	7.34	7.99	8.64	9.30	9.96	10.95	12.28	13.62	14.97	16.32	17.69	19.06	20.79	22.88	25.00
15	3.20	3.54	3.88	4.22	4.56	4.90	5.24	5.76	6.45	7.14	7.84	8.53	9.23	9.94	10.64	11.71	13.13	14.57	16.01	17.47	18.93	20.41	22.27	24.52	26.79
16	3.40	3.76	4.12	4.48	4.85	5.21	5.58	6.13	6.86	7.60	8.34	9.08	9.83	10.58	11.33	12.46	13.99	15.52	17.06	18.62	20.19	21.76	23.75	26.16	28.60
17	3.60	3.98	4.37	4.75	5.14	5.52	5.91	6.49	7.27	8.06	8.84	9.63	10.43	11.22	12.02	13.23	14.85	16.48	18.12	19.78	21.45	23.13	25.25	27.82	30.42
18	3.80	4.21	4.61	5.02	5.43	5.84	6.25	6.86	7.69	8.52	9.35	10.19	11.03	11.87	12.72	13.99	15.71	17.44	19.19	20.95	22.72	24.51	26.76	29.50	32.26
19	4.01	4.43	4.86	5.29	5.72	6.15	6.58	7.23	8.10	8.98	9.86	10.74	11.63	12.52	13.41	14.76	16.58	18.41	20.26	22.12	24.00	25.89	28.28	31.18	34.12
20	4.21	4.66	5.11	5.56	6.01	6.46	6.92	7.60	8.52	9.44	10.37	11.30	12.23	13.17	14.11	15.54	17.45	19.38	21.33	23.30	25.28	27.29	29.81	32.88	35.99
21	4.41	4.88	5.35	5.83	6.30	6.78	7.26	7.97	8.94	9.90	10.88	11.85	12.84	13.82	14.82	16.31	18.33	20.36	22.41	24.49	26.58	28.69	31.36	34.60	37.88
22	4.62	5.11	5.60	6.10	6.60	7.09	7.59	8.35	9.36	10.37	11.39	12.41	13.44	14.48	15.52	17.09	19.21	21.34	23.50	25.68	27.88	30.10	32.91	36.32	39.78
23	4.82	5.33	5.85	6.37	6.89	7.41	7.93	8.72	9.77	10.84	11.90	12.97	14.05	15.14	16.23	17.88	20.09	22.33	24.60	26.88	29.19	31.53	34.48	38.06	41.70
24	5.02	5.56	6.10	6.64	7.18	7.73	8.27	9.09	10.19	11.30	12.42	13.54	14.66	15.80	16.94	18.66	20.98	23.33	25.70	28.09	30.51	32.96	36.05	39.81	43.63
25	5.23	5.79	6.35	6.91	7.48	8.04	8.61	9.47	10.62	11.77	12.93	14.10	15.28	16.46	17.65	19.45	21.87	24.32	26.80	29.31	31.84	34.40	37.64	41.58	45.58
26	5.43	6.01	6.60	7.18	7.77	8.36	8.95	9.84	11.04	12.24	13.45	14.67	15.89	17.13	18.37	20.24	22.77	25.33	27.91	30.53	33.18	35.85	39.23	43.36	47.54
27	5.64	6.24	6.85	7.46	8.07	8.68	9.29	10.22	11.46	12.71	13.97	15.24	16.51	17.80	19.09	21.04	23.67	26.34	29.03	31.76	34.52	37.31	40.84	45.15	49.52
28	5.84	6.47	7.10	7.73	8.36	9.00	9.64	10.60	11.89	13.18	14.49	15.81	17.13	18.47	19.81	21.84	24.58	27.35	30.15	33.00	35.87	38.78	42.46	46.95	51.51
29	6.05	6.70	7.35	8.00	8.66	9.32	9.98	10.97	12.31	13.66	15.01	16.38	17.75	19.14	20.53	22.64	25.49	28.37	31.28	34.24	37.23	40.26	44.09	48.77	53.52
30	6.25	6.92	7.60	8.28	8.96	9.64	10.32	11.35	12.74	14.13	15.54	16.95	18.38	19.81	21.26	23.45	26.40	29.39	32.42	35.49	38.60	41.75	45.73	50.60	55.54
31	6.46	7.15	7.85	8.55	9.25	9.96	10.67	11.73	13.17	14.61	16.06	17.53	19.00	20.49	21.99	24.26	27.32	30.42	33.56	36.75	39.97	43.24	47.38	52.44	57.58
32	6.66	7.38	8.10	8.82	9.55	10.28	11.01	12.11	13.59	15.09	16.59	18.11	19.63	21.17	22.72	25.07	28.24	31.45	34.71	38.01	41.36	44.75	49.05	54.29	59.63
33	6.87	7.61	8.35	9.10	9.85	10.60	11.36	12.49	14.02	15.57	17.12	18.69	20.26	21.85	23.46	25.88	29.16	32.49	35.86	39.28	42.75	46.26	50.72	56.16	61.70
34	7.08	7.84	8.61	9.37	10.15	10.92	11.70	12.88	14.45	16.05	17.65	19.27	20.90	22.54	24.19	26.70	30.09	33.53	37.02	40.56	44.15	47.79	52.40	58.04	63.78
35	7.28	8.07	8.86	9.65	10.45	11.25	12.05	13.26	14.89	16.53	18.18	19.85	21.53	23.23	24.94	27.52	31.02	34.58	38.18	41.84	45.56	49.32	54.09	59.93	65.87
36	7.49	8.30	9.11	9.93	10.75	11.57	12.40	13.64	15.32	17.01	18.71	20.43	22.17	23.92	25.68	28.35	31.96	35.63	39.35	43.14	46.97	50.86	55.80	61.83	67.98
37	7.70	8.53	9.37	10.20	11.05	11.89	12.74	14.03	15.75	17.49	19.25	21.02	22.81	24.61	26.42	29.18	32.90	36.69	40.53	44.43	48.39	52.41	57.51	63.75	70.11
38	7.91	8.76	9.62	10.48	11.35	12.22	13.09	14.41	16.19	17.98	19.78	21.61	23.45	25.30	27.17	30.01	33.85	37.75	41.71	45.74	49.82	53.97	59.24	65.68	72.25
39	8.11	8.99	9.87	10.76	11.65	12.54	13.44	14.80	16.62	18.46	20.32	22.20	24.09	26.00	27.92	30.85	34.80	38.82	42.90	47.05	51.26	55.54	60.97	67.62	74.40
40	8.32	9.22	10.13	11.04	11.95	12.87	13.79	15.19	17.06	18.95	20.86	22.79	24.73	26.70	28.68	31.68	35.75	39.89	44.09	48.37	52.71	57.12	62.72	69.57	76.56
41	8.53	9.45	10.38	11.32	12.25	13.20	14.14	15.57	17.50	19.44	21.40	23.38	25.38	27.40	29.44	32.52	36.71	40.96	45.29	49.69	54.16	58.70	64.47	71.53	78.74
42	8.74	9.69	10.64	11.60	12.56	13.52	14.50	15.96	17.94	19.93	21.94	23.98	26.03	28.10	30.19	33.37	37.67	42.05	46.50	51.03	55.63	60.30	66.24	73.51	80.94
43	8.95	9.92	10.98	11.87	12.86	13.85	14.85	16.35	18.38	20.42	22.49	24.57	26.68	28.81	30.96	34.22	38.63	43.13	47.71	52.36	57.09	61.90	68.01	75.50	83.14
44	9.16	10.15	11.15	12.15	13.16	14.18	15.20	16.74	18.82	20.91	23.03	25.17	27.33	29.52	31.72	35.07	39.60	44.22	48.93	53.71	58.57	63.51	69.80	77.50	85.36
45	9.37	10.38	11.41	12.44	13.47	14.51	15.55	17.13	19.26	21.41	23.58	25.77	27.99	30.23	32.49	35.92	40.58	45.32	50.15	55.06	60.06	65.13	71.60	79.51	87.60
46	9.58	10.62	11.66	12.72	13.77	14.84	15.91	17.53	19.70	21.90	24.13	26.37	28.65	30.94	33.26	36.78	41.55	46.42	51.38	56.42	61.55	66.76	73.40	81.53	89.85
47	9.79	10.85	11.92	13.00	14.08	15.17	16.26	17.92	20.15	22.40	24.68	26.98	29.31	31.66	34.03	37.64	42.54	47.53	52.61	57.78	63.05	68.40	75.22	83.57	92.11
48	10.00	11.09	12.18	13.28	14.39	15.50	16.62	18.31	20.59	22.90	25.23	27.58	29.97	32.37	34.81	38.50	43.52	48.64	53.85	59.15	64.56	70.05	77.04	85.61	94.38
49	10.21	11.32	12.44	13.56	14.69	15.83	16.98	18.71	21.04	23.39	25.78	28.19	30.63	33.09	35.59	39.37	44.51	49.75	55.09	60.53	66.07	71.70	78.88	87.67	96.67
50	10.42	11.55	12.70	13.84	15.00	16.16	17.33	19.10	21.48	23.89	26.33	28.80	31.29	33.82	36.37	40.24	45.50	50.87	56.34	61.92	67.59	73.37	80.72	89.74	98.96
51	10.63	11.79	12.95	14.13	15.31	16.50	17.69	19.50	21.93	24.40	26.89	29.41	31.96	34.54	37.15	41.11	46.50	51.99	57.60	63.31	69.12	75.04	82.58	91.82	101.28
52	10.84	12.02	13.21	14.41	15.62	16.83	18.05	19.89	22.38	24.90	27.45	30.02	32.63	35.27	37.94	41.99	47.50	53.12	58.86	64.70	70.66	76.72	84.44	93.91	103.60
53	11.05	12.26	13.47	14.69	15.92	17.16	18.41	20.29	22.83	25.40	28.00	30.64	33.30	36.00	38.72	42.87	48.50	54.26	60.12	66.11	72.20	78.41	86.31	96.01	105.94
54	11.26	12.49	13.73	14.98	16.23	17.50	18.77	20.69	23.28	25.91	28.56	31.25	33.98	36.73	39.52	43.75	49.51	55.39	61.40	67.52	73.75	80.10	88.19	98.13	108.29
55	11.48	12.73	13.99	15.26	16.54	17.83	19.13	21.09	23.73	26.41	29.13	31.87	34.65	37.46	40.31	44.64	50.52	56.54	62.67	68.93	75.31	81.81	90.09	100.25	110.65
56	11.69	12.97	14.25	15.55	16.85	18.17	19.49	21.49	24.19	26.92	29.69	32.49	35.33	38.20	41.11	45.53	51.54	57.68	63.96	70.36	76.88	83.52	91.99	102.38	113.02
57	11.90	13.20	14.52	15.84	17.17	18.50	19.85	21.89	24.64	27.43	30.25	33.11	36.01	38.94	41.91	46.42	52.56	58.84	65.25	71.78	78.45	85.24	93.90	104.53	115.41
58	12.11	13.44	14.78	16.12	17.48	18.84	20.21	22.29	25.10	27.94	30.82	33.74	36.69	39.68	42.71	47.32	53.58	59.99	66.54	73.22	80.03	86.97	95.82	106.68	117.81
59	12.33	13.68	15.04	16.41	17.79	19.18	20.58	22.70	25.55	28.45	31.39	34.36	37.37	40.42	43.51	48.21	54.61	61.15	67.84	74.66	81.62	88.71	97.75	108.85	120.22
60	12.54	13.92	15.30	16.70	18.10	19.52	20.94	23.10	26.10	28.96	31.96	34.99	38.06	41.17	44.32	49.12	55.64	62.32	69.14	76.11	83.21	90.45	99.68	111.03	122.64

NOTE.—The values in this table have been computed by the actuarial or annuity method which conforms to the U.S. rule.

MAYOR JAMES E. WALLACE, GLENS FALLS, N.Y.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, on March 17, James E. Wallace, the former mayor of Glens Falls, N.Y., died in the city to which he had dedicated his life and his work. His death was a great loss to the people of Glens Falls who had known and loved him for his vigorous attention to the problems of his city and for his warm and humorous personality.

The Glens Falls Times called him "one of the best loved and most highly respected men of the day." He was elected mayor in 1964 after serving 2 terms as councilman-at-large and 2 years as chairman of the city planning board. During those years, he was extremely active in the program that has led to the city's urban renewal developments. As mayor he served under the provisions of a new city charter which increased the duties of the chief executive.

In addition to his public responsibilities, he was a leader in his church and in fraternal, political, and business circles.

Mayor Wallace decided not to run for reelection last November for reasons of health but even in retirement he continued to demonstrate his keen and active interest in the affairs of his city. He will be missed by all of us who had known him and known of his outstanding leadership.

I extend my most sincere sympathy to his wife, Lillian Brady Wallace, and to the people of Glens Falls on the loss of this fine man.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post, columnist Joseph Kraft offered an insight into the nature of South Vietnam and its politics—split geographically, religiously, and historically. It is a complex mosaic, as he points out, not easily lending itself to easily grasped understanding by outsiders. It is a mixture of forces, not a division between two political parties or more, as we are accustomed to.

Mr. President, one of the impressions I gained while recently in Vietnam was that we must accept their complex political system. We must realize, moreover, that the ferment underway there, the interplay between these factions and groups, represents a jockeying for position of political influence. This, Mr. Kraft has pointed out in his cogent article. And it is this, Mr. President, which I think we must take as a good sign. This ferment, this unrest, does indeed represent an attempt by the various groups in South Vietnam to gain for themselves the most advantageous position possible in the coming government. A year ago, there was little such ferment. The fact that it exists today, I think, represents a realization on the part of the Vietnamese themselves that things are looking up—the Government of South Vietnam will be worth controlling because that nation's future has been given some life.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kraft's column be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1966]

Vietnamese Crisis—I

(By Joseph Kraft)

Saigon.—The most recent Vietnamese crisis brought to the surface all the complex social and political currents that the war and its drumbeaters tend to suppress. Indeed, precisely because these elements have been eclipsed in the past, their sudden outcropping now tends to catch Americans by surprise and to fill them with alarm and confusion.

But while the denouement remains in doubt, the outbreak and development of the crisis followed a logical course. They are subject to analysis in subsequent columns dealing with the two chief forces at work—the Buddhists and the Catholics.

First, however, I must try to describe the mosaic of Vietnamese policies. For it is a subject in which interplay is everything—a case of minority politics, a matter of action, reaction and counteraction by tiny groups. Indeed, in its basic elements, its geography, its history, its beliefs, South Vietnam is a divided country—"a huddling together," as Hazlitt once said of Shakespearean tragedy, "of fierce extremes."

Geographically, the basic division in South Vietnam is between the center and the south. The center, once known as Annam, is the coastal plain stretching from the 17th parallel down the outskirts of Saigon. It happens to include—in Da Nang, Ankhe, Cam Ranh Bay and Nhatrang—the main American air and sea bases. It is a region of tiny parcels of relatively poor land, much subject to salination by repeated incursions of the sea. Though the population is only 3 million and though fish are plentiful, central Vietnam cannot support itself.

The south, or Cochin China as the French called it, includes Saigon and the delta of the Mekong River and its many mouths. The delta region is one of the great rice-producing areas of the world and Saigon its entrepôt. Though the combined population amounts to perhaps 8 million people in normal times, the south produces a large export surplus.

Historic difference tended to follow geographic lines. Central Vietnam has been the heartland of the country, the site of the imperial court, a center of Buddhist studies and the historic seat of strong resistance both to Chinese pressure from the north and to French pressure from the south. Its elite is a traditionalist elite, looking back with nostalgia to the days of complete freedom from foreign presences and thus highly nationalistic, even xenophobic—especially in its attitude toward other regions of Vietnam that have accommodated more easily to foreign presences.

The south was a frontier province for the center, settled late and, as usual with frontier provinces, in rather large holdings. The French invasion of the last century found easy pickings in the south, notably with the large landholders. The native elite that emerged from the process tended to be relatively well off economically, civilized in the French manner and totally divorced from the uneducated peasant masses.

Not surprisingly, differences in belief are in harmony with the geographical and historical divisions. The harsh, traditionalist xenophobia of the center has found its purest expression in the Buddhist revival led by the famous Bonze Tri-Quang. A similar Catholic attitude was reflected in the family of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem, although more recently the Catholics of the center have averted to the more self-effacing role of a heavily outnumbered minority. Before World War II, some of the same xenophobic spirit was channeled into two parties—the Dai Viet, or Greater Vietnam Party, and the Vietnamese Kuomintang, or Nationalist Party—which still have strength in the center.

In the south, leadership in the cities tended to fall into the hands of the French-educated local notables. The colonialist atmosphere dissolved native Catholicism, and even more Buddhism, to the point of decay. Among the peasantry they developed several revivalist groups—notably the Hoa Hao and Cao Dai sects. The mixture was further thickened after the Geneva Conference of 1954, when hundreds of thousands of Catholic refugees and some leading Nationalist politicians fled from Communist North Vietnam and settled, mainly around Saigon.

All of these forces have been jockeying for position ever since then. While the war has tended to submerge their activities, they have made themselves felt in every change of regime, beginning with the overthrow of the Diem government in 1963. Now the political forces are out in the open. The important question over the next few months is whether they will yield chaos and a running down of the war effort or a kind of consensus that could lead to an organized settlement.

A SPORTSMAN—AMBASSADOR OF GOOD WILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the field of sports has long offered many avenues of international cooperation, the Olympic games being the most notable example. I was privileged myself to participate in an international regatta at Henley, England, many years ago. Today I am pleased to join the many friends of Fritz H. Wiessner in paying tribute to a great American mountaineer and a New Englander by adoption, who has been doing a great deal in his own way to foster understanding between mountain climbers in the United States and in Europe.

Fritz Wiessner, one of the most brilliant climbers the world has produced, immigrated to the United States from his native Dresden in the late 1920's. He brought with him rock-climbing skills that were virtually unknown in the United States, and, what is more important, an unbounded enthusiasm. He instilled in a small group of American sportsmen a love for this sport which they in turn propagated among others. He instructed them in techniques and disciplines so that they might scale the most difficult precipices in complete safety. Thanks largely to Fritz Wiessner's pioneering spirit and to the enthusiasm he generated, American rock climbers are today respected and even envied by many hundreds of thousands of mountaineers and would-be mountaineers throughout the world. Without the spirit of Fritz Wiessner, it is doubtful that the United States would ever have sent out a successful expedition to Mount Everest, or that American climbers would ever have made the first ascent of any one of the world's great peaks of 8,000 meters' elevation.

Fritz Wiessner is now in the twilight of his climbing career, but he remains as dynamic as ever. Each year he visits old climbing comrades in Europe, makes new friends among the leading alpinists of younger generations, and thereby acts, in private capacity, as an invaluable link between the mountaineers of the Old World and the New. It is largely thanks to Fritz Wiessner that American mountaineering has come of age; it is almost entirely thanks to him and a very few others that this fact is recognized and appreciated by the foremost climbers of Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and even of the Iron Curtain countries. Invaluable, too, was the assistance he rendered to the American Armed Forces in World War II as a consultant in mountain warfare and in cold-weather equipment.

American sportsmen are indebted to men like Fritz Wiessner for their courage and perseverance in developing a great sport and in promoting international fellowship in an outdoor activity which should know no national boundaries.

BIG BROTHER—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is not my intention to carry on a running battle with the Internal Revenue Service on their many activities which tend to invade the privacy of our American taxpayers. But it seems that every morning's mail brings another case to my attention.

This time, Internal Revenue Service agents in my home State of Missouri attached a bank account of a couple from Steelville, Mo., and took out their money to pay for unpaid 1964 income taxes. The only problem was that the couple whose money was taken had already paid their taxes and had never owed any money. Apparently, this was just a case of mistaken identity; however, only after a Member of Congress brought this to the attention of the Missouri District Director was an apology made to the couple.

Mr. President, big brother exists in many forms, shapes, and sizes. I ask unanimous consent to insert the correspondence of this case at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEELVILLE, MO.,
March 25, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I would like for you to find out for me if an Internal Revenue man has the right to go into a bank and take money out of a person's account for income taxes not paid in 1964. Also shouldn't the person whom they are taking it from be called by the bank to make sure they have the right party?

The reason I ask this sir, is because this week I went to cash a check and one of the men in the bank asked me if I had been notified of money being taken out of our account. I said no, why should anybody take money out of our account? He then told me that an Internal Revenue man had come in demanding $166 for income taxes in 1964. I explained to the teller that my husband and I had already paid ours and had proof of it.

The teller then went back and got a copy of the invoice. I looked at the name and address, and immediately knew that they had the wrong person. The bank put our money back, but frankly I'm worried about my money now. If they have done this once they might do it again.

This fellow has exactly the same name, same middle initial and lives in the same town we do. This fellow is single and our account is a joint one. It looks like to me that a good Internal Revenue agent would have checked closer to a detail like that.

It made me furious to know that the bank did this and didn't even phone me. They know us well enough to know we don't try to escape paying our bills.

Is there anything we can do to make sure this doesn't happen again?

I told the bank to be sure to put down our box number maybe that would help.

Thank you for time.

Sincerely,

MRS. JAMES A. FARRAR.

MARCH 30, 1966.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES FARRAR,
Steelville, Mo.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. FARRAR: I have your letter of March 25, 1966, in which you advise me of the gross negligence evidenced apparently by employees of the Internal Revenue Service. I can indeed appreciate your position in this matter. As a result I have today contacted the District Director of the Internal Revenue Service. The enclosed copy of a letter to Mr. E. O. Bookwalter will be self-explanatory.

It is a pleasure to be of this service to you.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1966.

Re Mr. and Mrs. James A. Farrar, Box 2, Steelville, Mo.

Mr. E. O. BOOKWALTER,
District Director,
The Internal Revenue Service,
Department of the Treasury,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. BOOKWALTER: The enclosed true copy of a letter from the above captioned will be self-explanatory.

It is difficult to place the blame in a matter of this nature, but I do hope the example presented in this incident will be sufficient for more thorough investigation on the part of Internal Revenue Service employees.

It would be my thought that your office owes a letter of genuine apology to Mr. and Mrs. James Farrar.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Member of Congress.

FIRING UP THE FDA

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have today filed a report of the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Interagency Drug Coordination." It is a report on the activities of the Federal Government in drug research, regulation, clinical use, and purchases growing out of extensive hearings on this subject conducted by the then senior Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT HUMPHREY.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization I am submitting this report inasmuch as the background work was done by our predecessor—the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations. I pay tribute to the Vice President whose good works as Senator continue to make themselves felt through reports such as these. And I want to say a word of commendation for Mr. Justice Cahn and the late Louisa Pearson whose diligent efforts and hard work made development of this document possible.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD following my remarks an article by Jonathan Spivak in yesterday's Wall Street Journal regarding the good work of Dr. James Goddard, the new head of FDA. As a Senator, HUBERT HUMPHREY spoke many times of the need for brilliant leadership in FDA. I feel that it is not coincidental that such leadership now exists in FDA under Jim Goddard. The article raises the question whether a "tough" boss of FDA can survive. I am confident that so long as Lyndon Johnson is President and HUBERT HUMPHREY is Vice President a man like Goddard—who puts the public interest first—need not worry.

The protection of the consumer is a legitimate concern of the Federal Government. The question of the purity and safety of our foods, drugs, and cosmetics is in reliable hands so long as Jim Goddard is Commissioner of FDA.

When I was Governor of Connecticut I asked the U.S. Public Health Service for assistance in determining the capability and attitudes of the drivers of my State. Dr. Goddard—than a Public Health Service official—came to Connecticut and helped us set up a Connecticut motor vehicle study. I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a brief sketch of the history and development of that study.

There being no objection, the article and sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 4, 1966]

FIRING UP THE FDA: NEW CHIEF DR. GODDARD TAKES RISKS TO STIFFEN REGULATORY PROCEDURES—HE INVITES ENMITY OF FIRMS, PHYSICIANS BY ADVOCATING NEW CURBS ON ADS, LABELS—"WHO ELSE DOES PUBLIC HAVE?"

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—Dr. James Goddard, the Nation's bold new Food and Drug Commissioner, is gambling.

He is risking retaliation from politically powerful pharmaceutical firms by embarking on a rigid regulatory regime and calling the companies nasty names to boot.

He is inviting antagonism that he can ill afford from the Nation's physicians by intruding in their prescribing practices with super-strict labeling that limits drug use.

He is creating upsetting uncertainty at the Food and Drug Administration, which he took over January 10, by supplanting oldtimers and established administrative arrangements with new people and, he hopes, more efficient management methods.

The doctor's underlying aims seem irreproachable. "There is no question in my mind; our greatest effort is always protecting the public. It must be. Who else does the public have?" he declares emphatically.

His prescription: Rigorous regulation combined with superb scientific work. If he succeeds in supplying this, patients, physicians, and pharmaceutical firms alike should be satisfied. Only safe and eminently effective products would be available to the public; prompt, precise information on drug hazards would be furnished to physicians; the Government's far-ranging food and drug controls would be instantly and impartially applied to all companies.

A praiseworthy prescription, to be sure. But Dr. Goddard may have trouble filling his own bill. Or he may overplay his hand.

There is no dispute between Washington and corporate headquarters over the need for these improved drug-industry practices: More careful experimental testing on humans; better scientific proof of product claims; more restrained and accurate advertising. But company executives insist self-regulation is the remedy.

Dr. Goddard, in contrast, believes the FDA must lead the way, and its regulatory policies in the months ahead are certain to provoke continued controversy. While specific steps are difficult to predict, the broad areas of the Commissioner's concern are clear.

"Over-the-counter" drugs (those sold without prescription), which might be misused by consumers despite careful labeling, will be tightly limited. One substance already under review is phenacetin, a pain-killing component of many "OTC" compounds, such as the familiar "APC" tablets. Phenacetin can cause kidney damage in overdoses.

PROMOTION RESTRICTIONS

Promotion of prescription cold-cure mixtures of antibiotics and other compounds such as antihistamines and decongestants will be restricted to eliminate claims the FDA would regard as excessive and unscientific.

Advertising claims for all prescription drugs will be subjected to stern scrutiny. In a weekend speech to the American Association of Advertising Agencies' annual meeting in Scottsdale, Ariz., Dr. Goddard insisted: "We cannot tolerate false claims in advertising of drugs." He offered three examples: A promotional campaign for a tranquilizer which, he said, erroneously stated it could relieve depression; claims for an inflammation-relieving oral enzyme that were based on tests on a handful of patients; and a campaign that in his view depicted a special-purpose antibiotic as a general-purpose one. Dr. Goddard contends nearly one-third of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association's 142 member firms (the industry's leaders) are suspect of questionable promotion practices.

Beauty aids, such as nail hardeners, which actually alter the structure of the body, will be considered drugs and regulated rigidly. If classed as cosmetics, these products are exempt from advance marketing clearance.

FOOD MINIMUMS

FDA food standards, which establish minimum amounts of key ingredients in cake mixes, canned foods and other prepared products, will be issued aggressively, and not merely in reaction to industry proposals aimed at making product labeling more convenient. On the list for early action are frozen fruits and fruit concentrates, frozen vegetables, some fishery products and fruit juices.

The economic impact of FDA-proposed food standards could be great. Witness the prolonged industry protest against a suggested rule that peanut butter contain at least 90 percent peanuts.

The $1 billion-a-year health food business also is in for closer regulation. Dr. Goddard soon will issue in final and perhaps toughened form a long-proposed regulation to limit labeling and promotional claims of vitamin and mineral mixtures and other diet supplements. The agency insists there is no proof that such supplements are essential to health if an individual eats a well-balanced diet.

Most significant, Dr. Goddard has given a go-ahead for a long-pending review of the effectiveness of as many as 5,000 drugs approved for sale prior to 1962 (in those days the agency passed on safety of new drugs only). These compounds include most of the drug industry's major sellers: Cortisone, digitalis, the anticoagulants, tranquilizers, appetite depressants and many others.

The companies fear the Commissioner will sweepingly rule out drugs which now are widely prescribed by the medical profession despite lack of solid proof of their effectiveness. Dr. Goddard will be hardnosed but, he says, not unreasonable.

"We will not engage in the practice of saying, 'we don't need that drug,'" he declares. "We have to see that labeling does indeed show toxicity as it is known and that claims are limited to proven ones."

If drug firms can't submit the required evidence of effectiveness, Dr. Goddard will demand additional, and expensive, testing to justify continued marketing. It is expected that many firms will forgo unsubstantiated claims, or even withdraw slow-selling products from the market, to avoid the expense of extra testing.

The drug industry already experienced a gamut of emotions toward Dr. Goddard: Initial enthusiasm, then cautious concern, rising resentment, and now nearly outright antagonism.

"I think his statement on irresponsibility (of the drug firms) was fine, but he has to apply it to himself," snaps one executive. Another protests: "His flamboyant pronouncements to the press can only hurt the public." A third asserts, "The crucial question is, does he keep on a dictatorial, ukase course?"

Most drug company executives probably would accept and even applaud a tough, self-sufficient FDA leadership that soothes congressional critics of the agency and the industry. But they fear the Commissioner may overdo his proconsumer campaign. At least one industry leader already has registered his unhappiness at the White House and more are certain to do so.

NO DIRECT CHALLENGE YET

So far, however, there has been no direct challenge to any of Dr. Goddard's regulatory actions. The companies may be reluctant to engage in protracted legal squabbling with him at this early stage. Some of the products involved are small sellers, anyway. But the Commissioner's cohorts insist the deterrent is the rightness of his regulatory stands. "I think he has chosen an area where if the facts were put in court the companies would look silly," comments an associate.

In any case, the obstacles facing the agency in its total task are immense, and the new Commissioner may be creating new ones.

The FDA's assignment to regulate the marketing of $125 billion a year in food, drug, and cosmetic products far outstrips its resources, officials contend. The agency's $63 million budget request to Congress for the coming fiscal year, though an increase over this fiscal year falls $20 million short of what it feels is needed. Yet Dr. Goddard is eagerly emphasizing expanded enforcement and promising prompter processing of the agency's mounting paperwork.

A low scientific reputation and the drudgery of drug review work have long complicated the FDA's efforts to recruit first-rate medical officers. So, too have pay scales that fall short of doctors' potential earnings in private practice or drug-industry labs. To fill the shortage, Dr. Goddard is borrowing about 125 young doctors who are satisfying their military obligations by 2-year hitches in the Public Health Service. FDA veterans fear it will take overly long to teach these "draftees" enough to aid the agency. Some industry executives are even more affronted. "It's like sending a bunch of Boy Scouts to do a marine's job," says one.

ROOM AT THE TOP

Moreover, the FDA is decimated by upper-echelon retirements. These vacancies offer Dr. Goddard a golden opportunity to install his own noncareer men, but at this critical juncture, the agency is desperately short of able, experienced officials. It has only three at the top: General Counsel William Goodrich and Associate Commissioners Winton Rankin and Kenneth Kirk. Dr. Goddard's personnel quest outside the FDA is dismaying the veteran civil servants who had hoped for promotion. Yet his tight grip on agency affairs may discourage the recruitment of the strong-minded men he wants as subordinates.

Within the agency, despite the reservations, plaudits for Dr. Goddard predominate. "He's the finest thing that's happened to FDA," exults Dr. Arnold Lehman, a top-ranking scientist. A regulatory man commented: "He's got guts—a ruthless, ambitious, tough, smart guy. Where it leads you in a sensitive area like food and drug is either straight up or straight down."

Oldtimers agree, certainly, that Dr. Goddard differs drastically from his predecessor, George Larrick, though both are men of unquestioned personal integrity. The new Commissioner delegates authority sparingly, decides swiftly, acts aggressively and shuns any deference to business. Mr. Larrick let the FDA's five bureau chiefs run their own bailiwicks, proceeded patiently, and usually sought to conciliate conflicts between consumers and industry.

AN IMPATIENT MAN

The 42-year-old Dr. Goddard, who came to the FDA after a meteoric career in the Public Health Service (during which he picked up an ulcer), is impatient. He is impatient with the drug industry for not seeing the "reasonableness" of his demands, and impatient with his own agency for its decision-making delays and scientific shortcomings.

He has personal charm, a keen capacity to deal with press and politicians, and an ability to inspire loyalty and respect among old associates. He is superbly self-confident and does not easily yield to pressure.

He had few direct dealings with industry in his last post, as head of the Public Health Service's prestigious communicable disease center in Atlanta, which keeps tabs on the spread of infectious disease in the United States. But earlier, when on loan to the Federal Aviation Agency, Dr. Goddard helped best the airlines in a bitter battle to curtail flights by aging pilots. He shows similar starch in dealings with the drug companies. (Perhaps the security of tenure as a rear admiral in the Public Health Service's semimilitary officers corps enhances his feelings of independence.)

All the same, supporters worry about Dr. Goddard's chances of survival. "No Food and Drug Commissioner is as powerful as the pharmaceutical industry. If he keeps up this way he'll go and it will be a tragedy," comments one Goddard sympathizer. Another says "We might just end up with a Commissioner who lasts only a year." The key question could be the depth of President Johnson's devotion to the consumer, at the possible cost of some business support.

Among the industry's complaints are these: Dr. Goddard publicly threatened Merck & Co. with possible prosecution for alleged drug-testing irregularities, blemishing the firm's fine reputation. Yet the FDA did not have on hand sufficient evidence to proceed legally and may never get it, the industry contends.

The Commissioner's initial announcements in the press of drug recalls and seizures unnecessarily alarmed patients whose well-being depended on continued use of the questioned compounds, the industry contends. Subsequently, at a cost of $40,000, the FDA mailed out advance notification to 286,000 doctors before announcing restrictions on certain drugs used against heart disease.

Other steps have been impolitic. Dr. Goddard's brutally critical maiden speech to the drug firms was delivered at a time when the Health, Education, and Welfare Department was quietly soliciting the firms' needed support for important food and drug law changes.

The clearest controversy, however, arises from the Commissioner's reversal of the easy-going regulatory approach of Dr. Joseph Sadusk, Jr., FDA's former medical director. Dr. Sadusk, who was supported by the drug industry and the American Medical Association, believed in liberally labeling drugs with safety warnings, wherever necessary, but not in removing them from the reach of physicians. He reasoned that the doctors eventually would determine the effectiveness of products by their prescribing decisions.

BANNING SOME DRUG SALES

Dr. Goddard disagrees. "I don't think the individual physician can make a scientific appraisal of efficacy based on seeing patient after patient," he insists. Hence, in only 2 months, he has banned the sale of hundreds of antibiotic-containing cough lozenges as ineffective; removed from market Hoffman-La Roche Inc.'s "Madricidin," a cold remedy, and CIBA Pharmaceutical Co.'s "Elipten," an antiepilepsy drug, on grounds of lack of safety and efficacy; and told doctors to use "short acting" sulfonamide compounds before prescribing the more toxic "long acting" variety.

This aggressive approach has long been urged by some legislators, many medical researchers and some higher-ups in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. But it is opposed by the AMA and many practicing physicians, who deeply resent FDA interference in their prescribing prerogatives. Last week in a Chicago speech, AMA President Dr. James Z. Appel declared: "The manner in which the agency suddenly seizes drugs and accompanies this activity with alarming language tends to create an atmosphere of hysteria. It * * * will inevitably exert a deleterious influence on the effective use of drugs by the physician."

Certain Dr. Goddard's course may be taking the FDA toward dangerous shoals. The need for drug recalls is frequently not black and white; scientific judgments can vary and delicate decisions must be made as to whether stringent warning labels will suffice. Originally the FDA banned Smith, Kline and French Laboratories' antidepressant Parnate because of dangerous side effects, but physicians' protests that it was a significant aid in preventing suicide of the severely depressed led to its reinstatement with restrictive labeling.

Now the drug firms, whose image has suffered from hostile congressional investigations, may be able to fight the FDA in the name of the private physicians. "We have learned to have a rather high opinion of the medical profession," says one drug company executive. "We're alarmed to see it being replaced by the judgment of a relatively small group of doctors in Washington."

But the companies' recurrent dream of speedy FDA regulatory actions may impel cooperation with the Commissioner. Industry publicly praised Mr. Larrick but privately fretted furiously at discouraging delays during his tenure. Dr. Goddard has promised to wipe out within a year the backlog of 250 drug marketing applications he inherited and process the new ones with only a few months' delay.

If he can deliver, the drug firms probably will forgive much of his tough talk and action. "We are impressed with his energy and his expressed desire to improve the functioning of FDA," declares Dr. Theodore Klumpff, president of Winthrop Laboratories, a subsidiary of Sterling Drug, Inc.

Brief Sketch of History and Developments in Connecticut Motor Vehicle Study

(By the Epidemiology and Surveillance Branch, Division of Accident Prevention, March 15, 1966)

During a 3-year period (1960–62) approximately 17,000 drivers in the State of Connecticut were given a physical screening examination and a driving attitude questionnaire.

Their subsequent driving experience is being observed for a period of 5 years. (The 5-year period has expired for about 35 percent of the participants.)

The study is continuing to find, code, and place on punch cards all motor vehicle accidents that are reported to the State's motor vehicle department. At the end of this follow-up period the study will have a 5-year (from screening) record of the participants' accidents. The data collected consists of the date and hour of the accident, number of injuries and fatalities, number of motor vehicles involved, location of the accident (as urban intersection, curve, bridge, etc.), type of accident (as collision between motor vehicle and pedestrian or vehicle overturned, no collision), direction of travel (as turning left, backing, etc.), light conditions, weather conditions, and condition of road surface.

At the completion of the follow-up period, the records on the department of motor vehicles' computer will be searched to find violations, court actions, points given, suspensions, and reinstatements.

Thus a complete motor vehicle history will be available on all participants.

Various measures of the motor vehicle history as number of accidents, points, suspensions, and so on will be compared with the results of screening, medical history, and physicians' diagnosis to determine if there is a relationship between motor vehicle accidents and the medical conditions.

A detailed analysis of many characteristics of the individual and his motor vehicle history will also be undertaken. Thus some of the factors associated with particular types of accidents may be found.

The screening process included an attitude test. An attempt will be made to relate the results of the tests to the motor vehicle history in order to prepare scoring keys and to perfect scoring keys already in existence.

FEDERAL ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS ARE BYPASSING AMERICA'S SECOND LARGEST MINORITY GROUP: THE MEXICAN-AMERICANS OF THE SOUTHWEST

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the most forgotten minority group in America is the 4 million Americans in the Southwest and West who are of Spanish-Mexican ancestry. It is tragic that at a time when nationwide attention is focused upon eradicating poverty, this group of Americans is being largely bypassed. The situation has been chronicled recently in two highly respected publications of differing political views—the conservative Wall Street Journal and the liberal Progressive magazine.

An article in the March Progressive entitled "Poverty Behind the Cactus Curtain" shows how the veto power granted to local power structures and to the Governor of Texas has been used to thwart the intent of Congress, has been used to thwart the will of the people that Congress intended should be given self-help by the act, and has been used to render the act largely ineffective in certain areas of my State.

The article tells about Floresville, the hometown of a well-known Texas politician, a town in which "he still has his ranch and business headquarters 35 miles south of San Antonio. Floresville has no poverty program yet. Father Virgil Elizondo, the town's Catholic priest, complained that a group he headed had several times applied for community action projects and a Neighborhood Youth Corps without success. 'The poor here are getting poorer, and those who have done well move to San Antonio,' the priest said. Some of those who have moved come home occasionally to check on their cattle and crops. The people who have to stay in Floresville, and many of them are Mexican-Americans, are not so fortunate; no one comes to see how they are faring."

It is understandable that the power structures of these areas would resist change. They like things the way they are. The well-to-do live well, and labor is cheap. They like the services of inexpensive maids in the house and inexpensive laborers in the yard. It is understandable that they would resist having a Neighborhood Youth Corps project which wished to pay a $1.25 an hour wage, because at this rate many of the children would have been making more than their parents. So the project was vetoed by the Governor.

However, this is not in keeping with the American way of life, which includes providing all Americans with equal access to economic advancement. If the economic opportunity program is to reach into these communities in which the power structure is resisting change, then we shall have to have more energetic leadership from OEO. Perhaps the Economic Opportunity Act will have to be amended to require OEO to carry out the mission of going into these communities and making contact with the local leaders who are interested in bettering the lot of the Mexican-Americans who live there. It is becoming obvious that in south Texas, as well as in many other areas all across the United States, there is substantial resistance to the idea of economic betterment for Americans who are below the poverty line.

I think this resistance is based upon the mistaken belief that efforts to assist the have-nots will mean taking something away from the haves. I do not consider this to be the purpose, and I do not see how it can be the effect of the act. The effort is to give a little more of the pie to those who have least, not to take anything away from those who already have a large chunk. We can do this because we have an ever-growing pie to split up.

I call upon the people of Texas, the local governments in Texas, the State government of Texas, and the OEO to make greater efforts to recognize and do something about the plight of the 4 million Mexican-Americans of the Southwest who are to too great an extent being ignored in the Nation's current effort to eradicate poverty.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the articles from the March 1966 Progressive and the May 3, 1966, Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

[From the Progressive, March 1966]

Poverty Behind the Cactus Curtain

(By John Rogers, a San Antonio newspaperman whose articles have appeared in the Texas Observer and other publications)

* * * * *

The administration's progressive programs which offer a measure of relief to the poor in most areas of the country have no more chance of early success in south Texas than they do in the farm regions of Mississippi. The reason is the same: the local system of economic and political power which seeks to keep Great Society benefits from reaching the poor. The Anglo power structure of south Texas parallels closely the white structure of the Deep South, with similar stifling results. As in Dixie, the few Texans who hold the economic, political, social, and religious reins are not about to let them go. They protect their hold primarily by keeping the Mexican-Americans politically and economically submerged.

The Anglo leaders like having to pay no more than $8 a week for a maid, $5 a day for a field hand, and 40 cents an hour for a warehouseman. In most south Texas communities the majority of the population is Mexican-American, but rarely does the majority have any say about who is on the city council or the school board. This is the way it is, and this is the way it is going to stay; no Federal program will be permitted even a chance to change the system.

One difference between Mississippi and south Texas is that the latter's million Mexican-Americans remain the forgotten people they were 25 years ago when Dr. George Sanchez, of the University of Texas, so labeled them in the title of his book about this sorely neglected minority. Contrast this with the Negroes of the South whose struggle for civil rights has aroused the national conscience; they at least have hope of one day overcoming poverty. Not so the Mexican-Americans.

The forgotten people live in a few cities and many towns and villages all over 30 counties along the lower Texas gulf coast and the Rio Grande and as far north as San Antonio.

During the warm months, many migrate across the fields of Texas and the Midwest, seeking work. Others—those who live in the cities and towns—do the menial jobs historically done by minority groups and the unskilled. A few get jobs in retail trade, government, and the scant industry that exists in the area. But wages are substandard and they have little security. Last winter the 600 employees, mostly Mexican-American, of one of San Antonio's few manufacturing concerns, a refrigerator fabricator, conducted a strike that won a 5-cent wage increase to $1.68 an hour. The International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, which represented the workers and had had a contract with the plant for 8 years, thus scored the first industrial union strike victory in south Texas since the so-called right-to-work law was passed by the Texas Legislature in 1948.

The children of Mexican-American migrant farm hands go to special schools only between November and April. They are the most deprived element of a forgotten people—the median educational level of Mexican-American adults in south Texas is 5.7 school years. Forty-four percent of the adults are illiterate. Almost that percentage of Mexican-Americans exist in family units that have a total income from man, wife, and children which is below the poverty line of $3,000 a year.

Yet in most of the south Texas communities in which these submerged Americans live, not one penny has been spent on their behalf through the war on poverty, the Housing Act, the Education Act, or any other Federal program intended to develop opportunities for the poor. And in those communities where some Federal money has been used, the projects are meager.

San Antonio, the poorest major city in the country, does have a poverty program. During the first year of the program the city received about $2.6 million in Federal money, mostly for Headstart and Neighborhood Youth Corps projects. But San Antonio has 230,000 poor people—most of them Mexican-Americans; this is two-thirds as many poor as Chicago, which has received almost $25 million. Twenty-nine percent of San Antonio's 600,000 people—compared to 10.6 percent in Chicago—live on family incomes of less than $3,000.

San Antonio's behavior is fairly typical of the south Texas resistance to Federal aid for the underprivileged. Months after the first war on poverty funds had been authorized by Congress, the San Antonio city administration had done nothing to avail itself of the money. It moved into the poverty program only after several young union members and settlement house workers threatened to organize their own independent community action program, without any local sanction, and apply for Federal funds. The city, fearing these would-be poverty fighters might one day become a political organization, was forced to set up its own poverty agency and absorb the young activists by naming them to its many-membered board of directors.

Headstart and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs actually were proposed and approved by the Federal Government before the city's poverty agency was functioning. Since then, the city administration has been extremely successful in blocking additional proposed projects. Recently the city was ordered by Washington to reorganize the poverty agency's board to include more poor people.

But while the city's strategy was to delay and "review" various poverty proposals, the San Antonio primary school district's response was blunt; it simply said "No." It refused a Neighborhood Youth Corps project because, according to school board president, George Guthrie, a contractor, "The $1.25-an-hour wage (to be paid corpsmen) would wreck the city's economic structure. The students would be getting more than their parents." The Catholic Church stepped into this gap and sponsored its own youth corps for 1,000 high school youngsters.

As backward as San Antonio is in combating poverty, it is far ahead of other areas of south Texas. Laredo, on the Rio Grande, is 80 percent Mexican-American and the poorest city in the Nation, without exception. Laredo has a per capita income of only $937. This border city finally received approval for a community action planning grant of less than $60,000. Laredo had stalled for months before coming up with an action committee formula that was acceptable to the Federal administrators. Grants were repeatedly denied because the committee excluded poor people—who make up more than half of the population.

In rural areas of south Texas the picture is even drearier. Starr County, on the Mexican border, has a per capita income of $534—and no poverty program other than a Neighborhood Youth Corps sponsored by the schools. The average income of the 17,000 persons in Starr County—1 of the 20 poorest counties in the country—is $700 a year less than the average income in the State of Mississippi, and from $1,000 to $1,500 below the per capita income of the people of any State in the Appalachia region. Even San Antonio, the largest and most prosperous (if you can call it that) city in south Texas, has a lower per capita income than the poorest of the Appalachian States.

At the time the bill to aid the economy and the people of the blighted areas of Appalachia was being debated in the House, Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, who has been fighting the power structure in his area since he was elected to the San Antonio City Council 12 years ago, called for massive aid for south Texas similar to the Appalachia program. However, GONZALEZ, who represents only one of the counties of south Texas, stood alone; fellow Congressmen from the region speak and vote in the House for the power system that runs south Texas.

Representative GONZALEZ told an audience in San Antonio, "My hands are tied. All we can do in Congress is pave the streets; the local people have to drive down them."

Simply stated, President Johnson's programs are doomed—as far as south Texas and the Mexican-Americans are concerned—because the political bosses, the economic chieftains, and the wealthy and middle-class Anglos oppose efforts that might reduce the poverty of Mexican-Americans.

A few of the politico economic bosses of south Texas—such as George Parr, who after numerous scrapes with the Internal Revenue Service and other Federal agencies, remains the "Duke of Duval County"—have achieved some national notoriety. But most of the local bosses operate their small and effective political machines behind what the Mexican-American political leader Albert Pena calls the "Cactus Curtain," which hides from national attention what goes on from San Antonio south to the Rio Grande.

Pena recently charged that "a reign of terror" had descended upon the Mexican-Americans of Crystal City, which 2½ years ago was shaken by the election of an all-Mexican-American city council. With his charges supported by a number of affidavits from Crystal City residents, Pena said the Mexican-American leadership there had been jailed, and beaten and harassed in other ways, by the sheriff and other Anglos. He asked for a Federal civil rights investigation, but nothing happened.

Besides his accusations of terror tactics, Pena complained of a news blackout regarding such incidents. One problem is that "mass communications" in south Texas are spread thin. To make matters worse, three of the area's daily newspapers are owned by the Hoiles Freedom Newspapers chain, which in the past has advocated abandoning public education as well as other socialistic institutions. Most important, the other newspapers in the area are an integral part of the power structure. None is particularly sympathetic to the cause of the poor Mexican-American.

As if the Mexican-American of south Texas does not have enough troubles with the political bosses, an antagonistic or indifferent press, and the built-in handicaps of being brown, speaking a foreign language, and being extremely poor, in the few cases when he does seek help through Federal programs he must run still another gauntlet—the veto power of the various levels of Texas government.

In Robstown, an agricultural community near the gulf coast—described by one resident as relatively liberal "because who can be conservative in a place like this?"—community leaders organized to seek war on poverty projects. So far, the town has not even received initial funding. Its proposals repeatedly have been rejected by the county poverty coordinator as unworkable, although they were copied from programs already in existence in other communities.

In Mathis, not far from Robstown, a political coup last spring changed the city's government with the election of a progressive Anglo newcomer and two Mexican-Americans to the city council. The town's power structure, not to be thwarted by an election, has organized a tax payment boycott so that the insurgents will have no money on which to run the city government. The power structure had made no attempt to get war on poverty projects; the new town council already has submitted several proposals.

The local veto is only one obstacle which the citizens concerned with poverty in south Texas have to clear. The Governor's veto is even more potent—or at least it was until last fall when Congress took some of the sting out of it by including a provision allowing the Director of the OEO to override Governors' vetoes.

Gov. John Connally received national attention last spring when he vetoed a war on poverty project. So did Gov. George Wallace of Alabama. Connally's veto was slapped on a $381,000 Neighborhood Youth Corps project proposed by the Texas Farmers Union. It would have provided summer employment for high school students from 33 school districts in 8 counties of south Texas. In his veto message, Connally charged that the Farmers Union was "quasi-political" and that only two of the school districts that would have been involved, through use of their school grounds, actually wanted the program. This veto undoubtedly discouraged other possible sponsors that could expect to be looked upon with disfavor by the Governor. During the summer the Texas AFL–CIO accused Connally of delaying decisions on other proposals for summer projects, thus killing them by pocket veto.

Governor Connally's hometown of Floresville, where he still has his ranch and business headquarters 35 miles south of San Antonio, has no poverty program yet. Father Virgil Elizondo, the town's Catholic priest, complained that a group he headed had several times applied for community action projects and a Neighborhood Youth Corps without success. "The poor here are getting poorer, and those who have done well move to San Antonio," the priest said. Some of those who have moved, like Connally, come home occasionally to check on their cattle and crops. The people who have to stay in Floresville, and many of them are Mexican-Americans, are not so fortunate; no one comes to see how they are faring.

* * * * *

Ironically, it was a fledgling Mexican-American political organization, the Political Association of Spanish-Speaking Organizations (PASO), which had an opportunity to defeat Connally in 1962. He was then running against a field that included the incumbent Governor, Price Daniel; all-out Liberal Don Yarborough (no relation to the Senator); and several other candidates. Before the Democratic primary, PASO chose to endorse Daniel instead of Yarborough, apparently out of political expediency. But surprisingly, orator Yarborough ran second to Connally in the primary and faced him in the runoff. PASO endorsed Yarborough then, but the change seems to have confused many Mexican-Americans.

PASO sprang from the Viva Kennedy Clubs, organized in 1960 in Texas by Albert Pena, which ROBERT KENNEDY has credited with carrying Texas for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket by a thin plurality of 46,000 votes. The role of PASO shrunk in the last statewide contest within the Democratic Party as Connally votes inundated repeat-opponent Don Yarborough. PASO is struggling now to get back to its feet. One recent PASO tactic has been to criticize community power structures for not participating in Federal poverty and educational programs. Its effectiveness has been limited.

The 1 million Mexican-Americans in south Texas need a political voice if they are to benefit from the Federal programs which should be available to the many who need them, but which are ambushed somewhere on the long road between the county courthouse or city hall and Washington. Even more than the theoretically available projects, these forgotten people need a massive, federally financed and operated program aimed at south Texas. This should include projects to end illiteracy, provide housing, hospitals, and clinics, job training, and, above all, jobs that will pay Mexican-Americans a decent living wage.

All of these avenues to the Great Society are now closed to them.

* * * * *

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 3, 1966]

OVERLOOKED MINORITY: POVERTY AND PREJUDICE OFTEN BLIGHT THE LIVES OF MEXICAN-AMERICANS—MANY IN THE SOUTHWEST CLAIM BIAS IN JOBS AND SCHOOLS—INCREASED MILITANCY SHOWN—A HOUSE FOR MR. HERNANDEZ

(By Ray Shaw)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—Manuel Vasquez shoos aside a stray dog and relaxes on the steps of his tarpaper-covered shanty here. "If I work 2 days a week, I am lucky. Sometimes my children go to bed hungry. My wife is sick. I wonder," he asks bitterly, "who cares?"

Mr. Vasquez, a slight mustached man of 34, has known only hard times since arriving in this country from Mexico with his parents in 1937. He gave up on school after spending 2 years trying to pass the fourth grade. Last year, as a $1 an hour pick-and-shovel man and occasional farm laborer, the father of five earned less than $1,500.

Mr. Vasquez's plight isn't unusual among the 4 million persons of Mexican ancestry clustered in the Southwest and West. They are the Nation's second biggest disadvantaged minority, outnumbered only by Negroes. Often handicapped by a lack of job skills, inadequate schooling and language problems, Mexican-Americans assert that they nevertheless are being largely ignored in the broad effort underway in the Nation to improve the lot of the impoverished.

Some outsiders agree that the Mexican-Americans' complaints have considerable justification. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., head of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, calls them the "most neglected, least sponsored, most orphaned major minority group in the United States."

BEGINNING TO STIR

There are signs, however, that the Mexican-Americans' problems are due for increasing attention. Much of the impetus is coming from the Latinos themselves, who obviously are learning some lessons from the Negroes' militant drive for equality. "Mexican-Americans are beginning to stir, to protest, to show their feelings of dissatisfaction," says Albert Pena, Jr., a Bexar County (San Antonio) commissioner. "They want action."

Here in San Antonio, where some 300,000 of the city's 700,000 residents are of Mexican extraction, charges fly that public schools and city departments discriminate against Spanish-speaking employees. In San Jose, Calif., Mexican-Americans recently took to the picket line to protest what they contended was the local antipoverty officer's inattention to their needs, a complaint that has also been made by Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles. And charges of police brutality against Latinos are hurled periodically in Denver.

Mr. Roosevelt's equal employment commission has also felt the wratn of disgruntled Mexican-Americans. Thirty Latin delegates stormed out of a conference sponsored by the commission in Albuquerque the other day, claiming bias by the commission in hiring its fair employment enforcers. The leader of the walkout chided the agency for having only 1 Mexican-American enforcement officer and insisted that the commission's size and duties warranted the hiring of as many as 20.

As these stirrings suggest, Mexican-Americans and Negroes share some of the same problems.

AT THE BOTTOM OF THE HEAP

Most Mexican-Americans are near or at the bottom of the economic heap. In Texas, median income of Mexican-American males is only half that of "Anglos," as non-Latin whites are called hereabouts. In States where they are concentrated—Texas, California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado—Mexican-Americans usually lag even behind Negroes in years of schooling, with some 30 percent of the Spanish-surnamed male adults being categorized as "functional illiterates" because they have less than a fifth grade education.

Mexican-Americans also complain of widespread job bias. Mr. Roosevelt says his commission is aware of 800 national companies with operations in the Southwest and West that don't employ a single Mexican-American.

But unlike the Nation's 20 million Negroes, who are spread over much of the country, Mexican-Americans are a regional minority. As a result, their status generally attracts little notice in the Nation as a whole. "The Mexican population of the Southwest * * * is little known on the east coast and not much better understood in the Southwest itself," says Democratic Congressman EDWARD R. ROYBAL, a Mexican-American from California.

Despite the generally depressed economic plight of Mexican-Americans, sociologists and others who have studied the group say that it actually embraces rather wide extremes in income, social acceptability, and culture—probably more so than is the case with other minority groups in this country. There even are differences in ancestry. Most of the Latins in the Southwest—the bulk of whom are U.S. citizens—either emigrated from Mexico themselves as farm laborers or are the offspring of relatively recent immigrants. But many Latins in New Mexico are descended from Spaniards who settled in the State in the 16th and 17th centuries, though today they usually are lumped with Mexican-Americans.

FARM JOBS DECLINE

Both the real Mexican-Americans and the New Mexican variety mostly have stayed fairly close to the Mexico-United States border, although there is increasing resettlement within the Southwest itself—particularly from the poverty pockets of south Texas to industrialized southern California. This resettlement stems largely from declines in farm jobs as a result of mechanization. Los Angeles County's Mexican-American population now numbers about 800,000, up from 375,000 in 1950.

Some well-educated Mexican-Americans have moved into what sociologists term the "Anglo world." But many others, fiercely proud of their Mexican heritage and culture, have sought to retain these at the same time they were trying to fit into a strange environment in other areas of life. Often Spanish has continued as the basic language in the home, typically located in the "little Mexico" neighborhoods of southwestern communities. "The result," says one sociologist, "has been a collision of two cultures—and until recently the Mexican one was dominant."

Gradually the pattern is changing. "For the first time Mexican-Americans are being brought out of the ghettos, and they're finding identification with a different way of life," says the Reverend John S. Wagner, executive secretary of the San Antonio Roman Catholic Bishop's Committee for the Spanish-Speaking. With this is coming growing unrest and dissatisfaction with the old order.

In the small east Texas town of Edna, Mexican-Americans threaten picketing unless an Anglo-operated barbershop, one of three in the town, starts accepting Latins as customers. The other two barbershops also formerly refused service to Mexican-Americans but changed their policy under pressure from Edna's Latins. A Mexican-American delegation at Fort Lupton, Colo., north of Denver, recently called on the town government to end what it claimed was a double standard of justice in the community—Anglo offenders assertedly were being treated more leniently than Mexican-Americans. In Denver itself, the police department has agreed to Mexican-American demands that booking clips on prisoners drop the term "Spanish" or "Mex" in favor of "Caucasian."

Education is another sore point. San Antonio has been caught up in a squabble over claims that public schools fail to meet the special needs of children of Mexican descent and slight Mexican-Americans in favor of Anglos in filling teaching and administrative jobs. Both charges have been denied by the school system. On another point of contention, the system contends zoning is responsible for the existence of three elementary schools within one six-block area—one whose students are predominantly Anglo, another Mexican-American, and the other Negro.

GRUMBLING IN LOS ANGELES

In Los Angeles, Mexican-Americans fume publicly over the amount of antipoverty money being poured into the Watts area to help Negroes. "Our people are being ignored in favor of rioters," grumbles one Mexican-American leader there.

Employment, however, is attracting much of the attention. San Antonio's Roman Catholic archdiocese, citing what it considered evidence of widespread bias, decreed last year that its institutions wouldn't purchase goods or services from firms unless it was convinced the companies didn't discriminate against Mexican-Americans—and, indeed, made an active attempt to hire them.

The AFL–CIO and Teamsters have launched union-organizing efforts among Mexican-American agricultural and industrial workers in south Texas. The predominantly Mexican-American National Farm Workers Association, after an 8-month strike against grapegrowers in central California, recently won recognition as the sole bargaining agent for Schenley Industries, Inc., vineyard workers—a rare case of successful unionizing among that State's farmworkers.

Federal employers are also hearing from Mexican-Americans. The dismissal of a Spanish-speaking civilian employee at the Army's White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico brought four Pentagon officials to investigate complaints of discrimination at the base. The discharged worker was reinstated after the investigators rapped the base for its dealings with Mexican-American employees.

Despite these signs of militancy, Mexican-Americans still have a long way to go before they match the vigor of the Negro rights push. So far there are no Mexican-American equivalents of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People or the Congress of Racial Equality. Leadership of Mexican-American communities usually is splintered, and even where they have numerical superiority they frequently are unable to act as an effective political force.

Moreover, there is some disagreement among Mexican-Americans themselves as to the need for an all-out drive for equality. Says one Mexican-American business leader here: "Give Jose an education and he gets a decent job; with a job he can afford to live in a good house in any neighborhood he chooses. All of this will take care of itself in due time."

Nevertheless, due time isn't soon enough for many Mexican-Americans. "We're fed up with getting the short end of everything," declares James J. Rojo, a 32-year-old Denver barber. Like many Mexican-Americans, Mr. Rojo sees the Federal antipoverty program as providing hope for a quick step forward. But so far antipoverty warfare offers more hope than help, it's asserted.

"Mexican-Americans look to their immediate needs—jobs and houses—and they feel the poverty program isn't providing it," contends San Antonio's Father Wagner.

LAREDO GETS GRANT

Recently the Office of Economic Opportunity announced a grant of $2 million to Laredo, Tex., to be spent on making the community a demonstration city in the war on poverty. According to Federal figures, the border community of 65,000 people, 80 percent of them Mexican-Americans, is the Nation's most depressed city, with half the families there getting by on less than $3,000 a year. Much of the money will go toward setting up neighborhood multiservice centers offering child care for working mothers, family counseling, health services, and recreational facilities for youngsters.

On a smaller scale, the antipoverty program already is making headway in a Mexican-American settlement on a mesquite-dotted hill 12 miles west of San Antonio. The area, fancifully named "Meadow Wood Acres" several years ago by a developer who sold lots there but did not build anything on them, was little different from countless other Mexican-American communities until a few months ago. The houses were mere hovels, some with dirt floors. None had running water or indoor plumbing.

Today the 80 houses in the community are one by one being torn down and replaced with modest stone and brick homes with bathrooms, running water and electricity. Meadow Wood Acres' residents already have built themselves a 32- by 80-foot community center in which preschool youngsters attend classes and housewives learn cooking, sewing and other household skills.

To date the Government investment in all this has been only $71,000, which has gone to pay 15 men in the community $1.25 an hour for construction work. The lumber and other building materials going into the project were scrounged from buildings being demolished in San Antonio and at nearby Lackland Air Force Base.

Fred A. Deyo, a white-haired retired Air Force colonel employed by the antipoverty program to head the project, beams as he shows a visitor the changing face of Meadow Wood Acres. "These proud people don't want charity—just a chance," he says. Mr. Deyo, who is not a Mexican-American himself, hopes this summer to more than triple his construction force and sharply step up the building of houses.

Besides providing improved living conditions, the undertaking is giving the Mexican-American workers new skills. "Four of my hands have already learned enough to land permanent jobs in San Antonio that pay from $1.75 to $2.50 an hour," says Mr. Deyo.

For Andres Hernandez, a 45-year-old truckdriver, the change is welcome. Standing outside a one-room tin shack in which he formerly lived with his wife and four children, he points to his new five-room house nearby. "A house like that you don't get easy," he says with a smile. "My children, they will have it better than me."

THE NEED FOR SENATORIAL SABBATICALS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, about a year ago I put forth the idea, both in the Senate and before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, that Members be given periodical interludes in which to update their knowledge and insights. I called these Senate sabbaticals, meant as periods in which we could study the big picture, as it is so often called.

Reading the Sunday column of Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, Mr. President, I was struck again by the need for such opportunities. Mr. Reston, for those who may have not read his column, alleged that the so-called big picture is not being looked at carefully enough, or often enough, either by the leaders of our government and our society or by the American people. America, he says, is busy "taking care of the kids and going to work and the supermarket," while the leaders of American life, in government and elsewhere, "are so overwhelmed by the problem of doing things that they have little time left to think about what they are doing."

There is, in my view, no quarreling with that statement. Just such a view led me, last year, to propose sabbaticals for Members of this body. It is in this light, Mr. President, that I refer Senators to Mr. Reston's column. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION PREOCCUPIED BUT NOT WITH WORRIERS, GRUMBLERS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—This is a great country for worriers, grumblers, and protesters. No great nation in history ever had so little to worry, grumble, and protest about at home, or did so much of all three. It is hard on the nerves, but probably good for the soul.

"Gradually but unmistakably," Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT said the other day, "America is succumbing to that arrogance of power which has afflicted, weakened and in some cases destroyed great nations in the past. * * * It is showing some signs of that fatal presumption, that overextension of power and mission, which brought ruin to ancient Athens, to Napoleonic France, and to Nazi Germany."

Worriers on the other side abound. Joe Alsop and Bill Buckley, who usually worry about each other, are united on the proposition that the timidity of power rather than the arrogance of power is America's danger, and so it goes.

America is a big word. It is not going along with either FULBRIGHT or Alsop—probably doesn't know either of them exists; it is taking care of the kids and going to work and the supermarket. It is neither arrogant about power nor timid about the use of power.

There is a problem here—a serious problem if the American people will go along with either expanding the war or abandoning the war—but it is not merely a problem of what to do but of deciding how to decide what to do, and the people who are worrying about this are probably closer to the heart of the problem than anybody else.

The main problem is that the leaders of America—not only in Government but in the universities, the churches, the big corporations, the newspapers and the television networks—are so overwhelmed by the problem of doing things that they have little time left to think about what they are doing. Operations dominate purposes. The practical men have taken over from the ideological men, and this has many advantages, but pragmatism may be misleading us.

The Under Secretary of State, George W. Ball, defined the problem the other day before the American Society of International Law. "Pragmatism," he said, "is the course of least resistance. It is easy, and tempting, to become absorbed in the operational aspects of foreign relations and to ignore the longer term implications of policy."

John W. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was making the same point long before he came into the Johnson Cabinet. "Very few of our most prominent people," he has written, "take a really large view of the leadership assignment. Most of them are simply tending the machinery of that part of society to which they belong. The machinery may be a great corporation or a great Government agency or a great law practice or a great university.

These people may tend it very well indeed, but they are not pursuing what the total society needs; they have not developed a strategy as to how it can be achieved and they're not moving to accomplish it."

This is precisely the problem in the American Government today, though Gardner was not directing his remarks at the President. But it is true. He is worrying, as is Under Secretary Ball, about the main thing, and two points should be made about this. First, all the other worriers, though they differ about policy, would agree about this confusion of purpose in Washington; and second, very little is being done here about it.

As a matter of fact, the question in Washington is not why the President doesn't listen to FULBRIGHT or Alsop—both may very well be wrong—but why he does not get down to this vital question of purpose defined so sharply by his own men whom he respects and trusts.

It is not only that there is confusion here between operations and objectives, between ends and means in Vietnam, between going for "victory" in southeast Asia or for a negotiated settlement, but that there is a confusing gap within the Government between what is said and what is done. Speeches are speeches and policies are policies; one is often quite different from the other; and it is not at all unusual for the President to congratulate an adviser on what he says and then ignore the man's main point.

Pray silence, then, for the worriers and the grumblers. The problem is not to silence them or even to follow them, or to appease the hawks one day and the doves the other in the hope of consensus, but to listen and decide the larger question, not of operations but of objectives. And this is precisely what is not being done.

DEDICATION OF RESTON, VA., ON SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1966

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I take pleasure in bringing to the attention of the Senate the forthcoming dedication of Reston, Va., on Saturday, May 21. This new town is a landmark in planned community development and is already serving as a model for future development programs throughout the United States.

The ever-increasing migration from farm to city has created many problems for our urban areas. Today's cities are so vastly overcrowded that they are finding it increasingly difficult to carry out their dual function of serving both the inner and outer lives of their inhabitants.

Irritants such as traffic jams and lack of parking space prevent many of us from taking advantage of much of the recreation cities do provide. Slums, air pollution, and all of the other problems connected with too rapid urban growth are close to overwhelming us with their magnitude.

According to Lewis Mumford in his book "The City in History":

> The chief function of the city is to convert power into form, energy into culture, dead matter into the living symbols of art, biological reproduction into social creativity. The positive functions of the city cannot be performed without creating new institutional arrangements, capable of coping with the vast energies modern man now commands: arrangements just as bold as those that originally transformed the overgrown village and its stronghold into the nucleated, highly organized city.

Today, only 18 miles from the center of Washington, D.C., we have what is known as a new town—Reston—in the heart of Fairfax County in my own State of Virginia. When completed, it will comprise a series of seven villages to be located on 7,100 acres of Virginia countryside which, by 1980, will house nearly 75,000 citizens.

Reston is a part of the year 2000 plan of the National Capital Planning Commission which hopes to channel Washington's increased population.

Reston was conceived largely through the dreams of one man, Robert E. Simon, Jr., who worked on the principle of "the better the environment, the greater the productivity."

His idea was to create a self-contained city in the country where people could live and work and play; where they could escape from the crowding and the noise, the commuting and the parking problems, and all the other aggravations typical of so much of our daily living.

With this thought in mind, the developers of Reston have strived to make it attractive to industry, have planned outstanding sports and leisure facilities, and are offering a variety of cultural activities.

Our Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Stewart Udall, highly praised this new community not long ago and said that he thought it was a noble experiment. The Secretary added:

> I think Reston is offering a sane and gracious milieu in which civilization can grow.

I congratulate Mr. Simon for the planning, imagination, and good taste that has gone into creating one of our country's most progressive new communities.

I would also like to say that the support given to the Reston plan is a tribute to the cooperation of hundreds of people, as well as the citizens and officials of Fairfax County who helped to make this community possible.

Mr. President, Williamsburg, Va., has long been a showcase of American history. Now we have the new town of Reston to serve as a showcase for the future.

I should like to quote one of our eminent citizens, who I believe has caught the spirit of this new community. August Heckscher, director of the 20th Century Fund, and former White House adviser on the arts, said of Reston:

> My own belief is that Reston stands for a quality which men will long reaffirm as necessary to the communities they live in.

OMBUDSMAN FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, for more than a month now, the Washington Evening Star has been running a daily column entitled "Action Line." I have followed this column with extreme interest, and I would like to take this opportunity to publicly compliment the Star for their idea. This column, by its own admission, is designed "to help Washington area residents find solutions to personal and community problems and to answer thorny questions." I believe they are succeeding.

The residents of the District do not have a Congressman, a mayor, or even a city councilman to turn to when problems arise. As the problems of the District grow more complex and sophisticated, it becomes essential for these residents to have elected officials represent them in matters of local concern. For this reason, I voted for the Senate-passed home rule bill, and will continue to support principles of local self-government.

But even when home rule becomes a reality here in the District of Columbia, it is my opinion that good government requires two additional elements. First, a free press to watch and keep check on that government. I am pleased to report that our freedom of information bill is now nearer to becoming law. When it does, the press will be able to obtain the necessary information to continue its function.

Second, I believe that some form of ombudsman must be created here in the District. The ombudsman is a form of citizen's defender, the man who fights city hall. In the near future, I intend to propose a bill which would create such an ombudsman. And it is for this reason, Mr. President, that I enjoy reading the "Action Line" column in the Washington Evening Star. This column is today our ombudsman. It helps our local residents when they have their troubles with local government, for it cuts away the bureaucratic redtape and gets—what its name implies—action. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the introductory column from the Evening Star, dated March 23, 1966, and a sample column dated April 26, 1966.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Mar. 23, 1966]

ACTION LINE COMING: NEW COLUMN IN STAR TO HANDLE PROBLEMS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AREA CITIZENS

A new action-and-information service, designed to help Washington area residents find solutions to personal and community problems and to answer thorny questions will start next Monday in the Star.

The service will be carried out through a daily column to be known as Action Line. It will try to get answers, solve problems and cut redtape.

Through Action Line, the Star will answer the questions that beset all of us. It's for readers who aren't quite sure where to turn. It's for locating a relative. It's a helping hand and a friend.

That's what the Star hopes Action Line will mean to Star readers.

In a word, readers will ask the questions. The Star's reporters will try to find the answers.

HOW LINE WILL WORK

Here is how Action Line will work:

If you want to get in on Action Line right at the start, you can write a letter or postal card today with your query. Just address Action Line, the Washington Star, Washington, D.C., 20003.

In a few days, you will be able to telephone your queries. Action Line will have its own number and telephone queries will be accepted Monday through Friday between 3 and 9 p.m. An electronic secretary will record the question.

The recording will advise you to start with your name, address and telephone number and to limit your query to one minute. It might be helpful to write out something before you start dialing to make sure the entire problem is explained while you are on Action Line.

As soon as the Star knows the exact time when the Action Line telephone will be in operation, the special number will be announced. Telephone calls should not be made to the Star but to the Action Line number as soon as it is announced.

When Action Line's telephone lines start operating, a large volume of calls may create a busy signal. In that case, a letter will be just as effective.

ANSWERS TO START MONDAY

The answers will start appearing in Action Line next Monday.

Naturally, with the expected volume, the Star won't be able to print an answer to every question. All questions will be studied by Action Line's editors, however, and queries likely to interest the most readers will be printed daily.

The likely volume of calls and letters will make it impossible for the Star to supply personal answers or individual acknowledgements.

The question posed by one reader and answered in Action Line may also help neighbors up and down the block. For instance, suppose you tell Action Line you've been losing quarters in the neighborhood laundromat and can find nothing on the machine advising where to ask for a refund. Your neighbors may have been having the same trouble, so whoever calls or writes Action Line first will be performing a service for the whole neighborhood—with an assist from Action Line.

Now, what sort of questions should you ask. The answer is simply this: What's bothering you? The same headache may be bothering a lot of other people, because we all live and work in the same city.

The query could be more personal. Again, you're not alone. It could be a question of what to do if a new highway is about to cut through your property. Or it could be getting gypped by a furnace repairman who messes up your basement but doesn't repair. Or it could be a question of having been talked into buying something you didn't want in the first place. Action Line will either try to get the problem straightened out or suggest where you can seek help.

So if you feel as if you're being pushed around, Action Line will be ready to help you. Just think of Action Line as a friend. Action Line will try to make good on that friendship any time you write or telephone.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 26, 1966]

ACTION LINE

(NOTE.—Action Line serves Star readers by getting answers, solving problems and cutting redtape. Write to Action Line, the Washington Star, Washington, D.C., 20003, or telephone LIncoln 3–7474 between 3 p.m. and 9 p.m.)

Mrs. E.L.B.: "The residents of the 2500 block of 36th Street SE. collectively and individually have reported the sinking, broken sidewalks in our block. The District filled in some of the places on the sidewalk with black oily cinders and this does nothing but add to the disreputable appearance. We were told this was temporary for safety. No amount of trees, flowers or shrubs will make up for this unsightly sidewalk. How can we get the work done?"

Look out of your window. Action Line called James Spelman, chief of the street division of the highway department, who ordered concrete repairing of your sidewalk. The job is now completed.

Mrs. V.R.B.: "I would like to know what would have to be done to get the street in my neighborhood repaved or resurfaced. I have been in this block for 18 years, and the only thing that has ever been done is to fill the holes with something (I'm not sure what) that comes right out when it rains. I am referring to the 5400 and 5500 blocks of B Street SE."

Highway officials promised Action Line that they will apply surface treatment to the two blocks this week as long as the weather holds up. Repaving requires a budget request. Officials told Action Line that they hoped to include the two blocks in their next request. In the meantime the holes should remain filled even in rainy weather with the surface treatment, a combination of sprayed oil and slag, Action Line was assured.

D. A.: "A visit to the zoo on Sunday, April 17, disclosed two problems that warrant attention: (1) Although trash cans were generally provided, those in front of the feeding facility were running over. (2) Food is served at one location only. During warm weather, why not use mobile canteens in three or four locations and license ice cream vendors to sell in the park?"

The trash cans are emptied twice during the day, but zoo officials weren't prepared for the huge crowds that have hit the zoo since Easter, and on the Sunday you visited the park, there were problems keeping up with the trash. Trash collections will be stepped up as the zoo takes on summer help, Dr. Theodore Reed, zoo director, assured Action Line. As for the food concessions, Reed has no intention of allowing vendors in the park. "This is one of the few public places you can bring your kids and not be barraged with 'Poppa, buy me a hotdog' all day," he said. Additional refreshment areas on the grounds are planned, and if all goes well, the first one will be ready in mid-July.

J. R. M.: "There is a traffic light that needs to be adjusted at 6th Street and Virginia Avenue SE. Evidently, it has been twisted, and it caused me to have an accident. Can Action Line have it taken care of?"

Action Line was promised by the office of the District Traffic Engineer that the trouble would be rectified at once.

Mrs. E. M.: "Each year, the 'Prelude to Taps' show, a magnificent performance, is presented by the Army, and each year I am unable to secure tickets for my family to attend. How far in advance does one have to request tickets? Also, why does one have to give his GS grade or military rank when securing tickets for the Marine Barracks parades? Does this smack of snobbery?"

"Prelude" was presented by Fort Myer's 3d Infantry earlier this month, and tickets were dispensed on a first-come, first-served basis. The military show should be given about the same time next year, with the ticket office opening 1½ to 2 months in advance. You'd do well to call Fort Myer early next year to find out exactly when the ticket office opens, then write or telephone for tickets as soon as it does. The Marines do ask for military rank or GS number when a person calls in for tickets for the Barracks parades, but they don't consider it snobbery, just giving rank its privilege. The parades are a military show, and the higher-ranking military men get special seating. This carries over to civilian Government employees, who are given the equivalent of a military rank for these purposes according to their grade.

R. W.: "How many times does the light on top of the Washington Monument blink per hour?"

Action Line called Walter C. Fisher, of the Visual Guidance Section of the Federal Aviation Agency, who said that towers have a normal blinking rate of 40 times per minute, or 2,400 times per hour. These lights are controlled by a mechanical device and the blinking rate may vary from as low as 12 blinks per minute, or 720 an hour, he said. However, most beacons will blink at a rate of close to 40 times per minute.

Mrs. K.: "A Maryland bank refused to let me turn in my child's savings stamp book for a bond. This is the first time this has ever happened to me. Why?"

Some banks exchange savings stamps for bonds and cash the stamps later at the post office as a special service to their customers. Others require the customers to cash in the stamps themselves before buying bonds.

SPEAKING OUT

B. L. M.: "I have something to say concerning ambulances going up 27th Street SE. which is a very busy street. I realize they have a job to do, and there are quite a number of fire engines that go up the street, too. My complaint is that it's bloodcurdling enough to hear an ambulance go with the siren, knowing that someone's in worse trouble than I'm in, but when the drivers seem to want to play a tune with that siren, it's just too much—it reminds me of a child practicing a piano or something. And it's almost impossible to get any sleep in warm weather, when the windows are open."

E. C.: "I just want to make a comment about what happened at the White House with all those Democratic women there. I am ashamed to say that I'm a Democrat, reading what they did, and everything—crowding and pushing and kissing the President and all that. It's a disgrace. At least, you would think he could be treated with respect—and they should act like ladies."

PLEASE NOTE

Action Line's staff will study every inquiry or request for information, but the number of calls and the volume of mail are so great that it isn't possible to answer, or even acknowldege, every question. We're sorry.

Be sure to use Action Line's special number—LI 3–7474—not the Star's regular number, so that your query can be recorded. If Action Line's phones are tied up, a letter or postcard will be equally effective. But please don't enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope, as answers can be given only in this column. These will be chosen for general interest.

Remember, Action Line wants to protect every citizen's right to be treated fairly by government agencies—local, State, or National. If you are confronted by a problem of this type, call of write Action Line. And please give a phone number at which you can be reached in case additional information is needed.

CONVENTION ON THE SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES—A NEW HOPE FOR DEVELOPING NATIONS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the economic growth of the less-developed countries is a task to which this Nation has committed vast billions of dollars. In spite of public and private investment over the last 20 years, poverty and population growth continue to outpace the rate of increase in the gross national product and personal living standards of most developing nations.

Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr, in a speech on April 16 before the annual New England Conference on Legal Problems pointed out that the constructive needs of these nations continues to exceed public and private investment.

Unfortunately, the rate of private U.S. investment in developing countries is slower than in other areas of the world. Mr. President, this is attributable to the political and economic uncertainties which beset private investors in these areas. Frequently what appear to be sound, viable business opportunities become uneconomic ventures because of conditions and regulations adopted by the foreign governments. These sometimes unnecessary preinvestment conditions can lead to delays and often the withdrawal of private investment plans, as was the case with plans of a group of companies to build new fertilizer facilities in India.

Steps must be taken to minimize misunderstanding between private investors and foreign host governments before developing countries can expect meaningful massive capital flows. A solution will not be easy to find. Foreign governments face a dilemma—they recognize the need for foreign private investment and technology but fear the real or imagined charge of economic exploitation. However, it is increasingly clear to all parties that this paradox must be solved if private investment is to fulfill its potential role in developing countries. In fact, it can be argued that without an improvement in the climate of understanding between the potential investor and the foreign government no real economic gains can be expected.

One hope for achieving this new understanding—or a new hope for developing countries—is the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes which the Senate is now reviewing.

If ratified, the Convention will be the first instrument established to arbitrate investment disputes between private citizens of one country and the government of another. It will provide a framework for defining the mutuality of interests between parties, and help lift the curtain of uncertainty which now characterizes many investment ventures in these areas.

Under Secretary Barr argues that the Convention may be an avenue to increased private investment in developing areas and enlarge the role of private enterprise in the fight against world poverty. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Hon. Joseph W. Barr Before the Fifth Annual New England Conference on Legal Problems, Boston Bar Association, Boston, Mass., April 16, 1966

The two decades since the end of World War II have been notable in a multitude of ways, not the least of which has been the dramatic growth of the world economy. World production has grown at an exceptional rate, and world trade and investment, both trouble spots in the 1930's and 1940's, similarly have shown dramatic increases.

There has, however, been a consistently disturbing feature in this hopeful picture: the inability of most less-developed countries to attain a rate of economic growth measured against population increase that promises to raise standards of living to reasonable levels anytime soon.

Through four administrations since World War II the United States has maintained a strong and imaginative foreign assistance program. After the dramatic reconstruction of Europe, the focus of our programs shifted from Europe to the less-developed nations of the world. Billions of dollars have been spent to assist countries in Latin America, in Asia, and in Africa, not only by the United States, but by other industrial nations and by various international organizations.

The progress—in terms of growth rates—as noted by President George Woods, of the World Bank, has been impressive. But in terms of overcoming poverty, the problem remains huge.

Mr. Woods underlined the discrepancy that can exist between achieving a good rate of economic growth and escaping from poverty in a recent issue of Foreign Affairs.

"Almost two-thirds of the world's population live in underdeveloped countries; but they have only one-sixth of the world's income * * *. In the period 1950–54, the rate of increase in their gross national product approximated 5 percent. But in 1955–60, it dropped to 4.5 percent; and in 1960–64, it was 4 percent. When allowance is made for population growth, per capita income in about half the 80 underdeveloped countries which are members of the World Bank is rising by only 1 percent a year or less. * * * The average per capita income in this lagging group is no more than $120 a year. At a 1-percent growth rate, income levels will hardly reach $170 annually by the year 2000."

The implications are plain and sobering:

"If present trends are allowed to continue, there will be no adequate improvement in living standards in vast areas of the group for the balance of this century. Yet, over the same period, the richer countries will be substantially increasing their wealth. In the United States, for example, the present per capita income of about $3,000 a year will if it continues to grow at the current per capita rate, reach about $4,500 by the end of the century. In other words, one group's per capita income will increase over this period by $50, while America's will increase by about $1,500."

In a recent study made by the staff of the World Bank, it was estimated that over the next 5 years the developing countries could put to constructive use something like $3–$4 billion more each year than they are currently receiving from all sources—that is, from governments on a bilateral basis, from the international institutions on a multilateral basis, and from the private economy. Obviously, whether or not these figures are precise, the remaining need for capital is very large, and the private sector must be heavily involved.

Parenthetically I might add that we face somewhat the same situation in our own country. In the past year I have gradually perceived the outlines of the looming capital requirements to meet what I would call the environment gap which is developing in this country.

In the main the environment gap is associated with the urbanization of our society, and its mechanization. It is becoming apparent that we can no longer safely ignore the urban-associated problems—the pollution of our streams and our air and the disposal of incredible amounts of waste; the sheer problem of getting to work, and its relation to mass transit; and the problems of our urban ghettos. It has been facetiously suggested that we might be the first nation to put a man on the moon while in our cities we are standing ankle deep in garbage. This is patently ridiculous. A nation with our imagination, economic might, and cultural ambition, will demand and will get a reasonable and decent way of life in our urban centers, but in the process truly staggering sums of money—and not only money, but also human energy and talent—may be required.

The solution may be to involve the private sector as deeply as possible in efforts which have a public orientation. In this country the private sector can make a tremendous contribution in these areas, and it may be that this offers one important approach to the problems of the developing nations as well.

However, the fact is that over the past 4 years the increase in direct U.S. investment in the developing areas of the world has been small in relation to needs and in relation to the outflow of investment capital to some other places. For Latin America, the total value of direct investment by U.S. firms increased from $8.2 billion in 1961 to $3.7 billion in 1964. For Africa, the totals are $1 billion in 1961 and $1.6 billion in 1964. For Asia, the totals are $2.4 billion in 1961 and $3 billion in 1964. Thus, in a 4-year span the total increase in these three developing areas of the world totaled $1.7 billion or somewhat over $400 million per year, during this time. By contrast, direct investment in Europe increased from $7.7 to $12 billion in this same period—an increase of $4.3 billion, or about $1.1 billion a year.

The Treasury has been alert to the search by the U.S. Government for ways of increasing U.S. private investment in less developed countries. In the tax field, this concern was reflected in the 1962 Revenue Act, which extended special tax treatment to investment in these countries; in the interest equalization tax legislation, which exempted such investment from the tax, and in the fact that tax treaties recently negotiated with several of the less developed countries included a 7-percent tax credit for U.S. investment in those countries. The Treasury also operated the foreign tax assistance program to help less developed countries strengthen their tax administration—and thus help to improve the climate for investment.

Recently we have taken a significant new step in this vast but crucially important area—the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes. The Convention, which the United States signed last year and which we are expecting to be ratified very soon by the Senate, will establish a center associated with the World Bank to arbitrate investment disputes which arise between private citizens or corporations of one country and the government of another country. The Convention gives promise of the establishment of the first effective special institution to settle such disputes. The basic purpose, of course, is to help create an atmosphere of greater mutual confidence between private foreign investors and less developed countries which, hopefully, will lead to an increasing flow of private capital into these regions during the next decades.

Admittedly, this is a difficult problem with a host of complicated variables, but it is right and prudent to regard private investment, and particularly the great multinational corporations, as a most potent and promising vehicle outside government to breathe economic life into the less developed nations. The expansion of world trade, the freedom of money to flow where most needed across national boundaries, the stimulating effects of broadening competition and the spread of technical and organizational knowledge—these are the hallmarks of multinational business, and these are the developments which have helped to bring an expanding, more integrated and efficient economic structure to the West since 1945.

The question today is: Will the multinational corporations succeed in playing their vital role in the less developed world?

In my own mind, there is no doubt that these enterprises are capable of playing a prominent role in the economic advance of the less developed countries. Whether they will in fact perform up to their capabilities in this respect remains an unresolved question. One point is clear, however. If a positive solution is to be achieved, and the right sort of atmosphere for investment created, the initiative must be taken by the governments of all interested nations, both the developed and less developed alike.

In effect, this is what has happened, in the case of the Convention for Settlement of Investment Disputes.

The Convention will enter into force after it has been ratified by 20 member governments of the World Bank. At the moment it is still in midstream: 25 member governments, including the United States, have signed the Convention, but only 4 have so far ratified it. We expect ratification very soon, and I am happy to say that we have found a good deal of support for the Convention, both in Congress and in the business and financial community generally. While it is undoubtedly true that almost any international agreement concerning private foreign investment is likely to be politically sensitive among capital importing countries, I am confident, particularly in view of the consultations and negotiations conducted by the World Bank, that many such countries will ratify the Convention.

During the last year my international experience as Under Secretary has brought me into contact with the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. From this rather brief exposure, I have come to sympathize with and understand the problems which confront both the private investor and the developing nations. The leaders of many developing countries face extremely difficult political and economic choices. As politicians, they must produce the economic improvements which they have promised their people.

However, this is a goal which will be reached only with massive capital flows from outside, a fact which also raises thorny political problems for the developing country's leader. If he seeks to create an especially attractive climate for large-scale private investment, he may be accused of leading his country down the road of so-called neoimperialism. There may be pressures to impose burdensome controls on foreign business enterprises or to expropriate their holdings altogether on the grounds of economic exploitation, or insufficient contribution to the development of the local economy.

Often the political realities belie the economic facts. A foreign business enterprise may have created hundreds of new jobs, provided housing for its employees, schools and recreational facilities for their children; but in the real world, economic forces never operate in a vacuum. Social and political overtones are constantly present—exercising their influence on economic decisions.

But on the other side, the international corporate executive faces complicated problems and decisions as well. He is charged with the responsibility of investing the funds of his shareholders and he must ultimately be concerned with making sound investment decisions. He must gage the political climate, assess the possibility of economic controls or outright expropriation; and once his investment has been made, the executive has to live with the operation and deal with any new political and economic circumstances which may arise.

Thus, the new convention for settling investment disputes offers a significant new opportunity for bridging the gap between the investor and the developing nation. For virtually the first time a company willing to invest and a nation which is prepared to accept the investment will have the opportunity to resolve their difficulties in a dignified and reasonable manner before an impartial, international panel of arbitrators.

More immediately important, perhaps, is the possibility which the convention holds out for the investor and the leaders of the accepting nation to sit down before the investment is made to define those matters which they would agree to submit for any future arbitration. This gives assurances on both sides and provides a greater measure of security to the transaction than has hitherto been the case. What is more, I think that as the convention operates over a period of time, we can look forward to the emergence of a new body of case law to guide nations in both avoiding and settling investment disputes. And finally, the forum which is provided for by the convention may also serve to move investment disputes from the political to the legal arena. At a time of considerable sensitivity between the developed and developing nations, I think this can only be regarded as an important step forward.

Economic development presents the developed world with a multifaceted challenge which over the years will require imaginative responses at a number of levels in both the public and private sectors of society. I believe that the convention, while admittedly tentative and exploratory, represents just such a response. It opens a constructive avenue in a sensitive and extremely complicated area. What is more, it offers the hope that as time passes the great potential of the private sector will be brought increasingly to bear on the field of international economic development.

A KNOWLEDGEABLE ALASKAN'S VIEW OF THE GOLD MINERS' PLIGHT AND WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT IT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held, on May 4, a very informative and useful hearing on legislation which has been introduced to revitalize an enormously important industry of the United States—the gold mining industry. Testimony was directed primarily to two bills, S. 1377, which I introduced during the first session of this Congress, and S. 2562, a bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN]. Both measures are designed to establish, in effect, parity for gold miners, by establishing a system for compensating the only American industry having the price at which it can sell its product set arbitrarily by the Federal Government. Since 1934, the price of gold has been officially established at $35 an ounce—the price set by Executive order of President Franklin Roosevelt. The price has never been allowed to change. Republican and Democratic administrations alike have insisted on maintaining it.

However, all costs of mining gold have increased at a rate reflected by the rise in the Consumer Price Index of 125 percent since 1940.

The members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who come from States once prosperous because of gold mining activity believe the Federal Government, which arbitrarily set the price of gold, should be required to compensate gold miners who cannot operate under conditions of ever-increasing costs of doing business.

We have tried repeatedly to enact legislation that would accomplish this objective. However, our efforts have been repeatedly and conclusively thwarted because of the obstinate objections of the Treasury Department, meekly followed by the Department of the Interior and other executive agencies of the Government.

Again, at this most recent hearing the Treasury Department sounded the keynote for the testimony of the Interior Department and the Commerce Department. The bills are opposed because, it is claimed, any compensatory legislation for gold miners would result in international financial panic, and various unimaginable and horrendous dislocations of international relations.

The Department of the Interior did report that it has given thought to the plight of the gold miners and presented, as its cure for the problem, intensified research and development of exploration and mining techniques with a view toward reducing costs of gold production.

The gold mining industry was well represented by men of extensive experience in and understanding of gold mining and its problems and prospects. They gave excellent testimony which will be a source of useful facts and ideas for further study by Members of Congress in considering further efforts to enact legislation to aid gold miners.

Everyone of these experienced gold miners expressed the view the Interior Department plans fall woefully short of meeting the real needs of the gold mining industry. Appreciation of the Department's good intentions was acknowledged, but not one expert witness thought these would suffice.

Mr. Charles Herbert, deputy director of the Department of Natural Resources of the State of Alaska, and formerly a successful gold miner and territorial legislator, represented my State at the hearings. Pointing out that it is ironic that manufacturers of gold products are, in effect, subsidized by the fixed price of gold at the expense of gold miners, Mr. Herbert raised some very interesting questions concerning the role of the gold mining industry in the U.S. economy. As the facts and thoughtful ideas of Mr. Herbert's testimony are particularly useful to all concerned, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his testimony before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES F. HERBERT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERALS, MATERIALS, AND FUELS OF THE SENATE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON S. 1377, S. 2562, AND SENATE RESOLUTION 83

I have been the deputy commissioner of the Alaska Department of Natural Resources for the past 3 years. Prior to that time I had been a gold mine operator and consulting mining engineer.

Until quite recently I had either opposed or had given only mild support to various suggestions for a subsidy to gold mines. However, I have carefully reviewed all gold subsidy proposals and the arguments for and against subsidies, largely as these appear in reports of previous hearings before this subcommittee. Today, I am convinced that there are only two alternatives: to subsidize domestic gold operations sufficiently to bring domestic gold production up to industrial consumption in this country, or to restrict domestic consumption to an amount of gold equal to that produced by domestic mines.

This is certainly not an original conclusion; it has been expressed frequently by the chairman of this subcommittee, members of the subcommittee, and distinguished witnesses. Nevertheless, all proposals to remedy the imbalance between production and use of gold have been vigorously attacked by knowledgeable people. Perhaps the answer to these attacks may be found in State of the Minerals Industry, a report of the hearings by this subcommittee conducted on May 9 and 10, 1963. On page 207 of that informative volume, Mr. William D. McGuigan, assistant general manager—engineering, of the Stanford Research Institute, states:

"A really good idea will usually have the following properties: (a) It will change existing practices by at least a factor of two; (b) it will attract competent and creative scientists to work on it; (c) it will be opposed by most of the experts and organizations already in the field; (d) it will seldom come from people or organizations who have been working in the field for more than 5 years."

The subsidy proposals before you fit these criteria almost perfectly.

(a) They are intended to increase domestic gold production by at least a factor of two.

(b) They have attracted the attention of the foremost lawmaking body in the world, the U.S. Senate.

(c) They are opposed by the U.S. Treasury Department and the U.S. mint and all of the experts attached to these august organizations.

(d) They come, not from specialized gold interests, but from men elected to serve the interests of all of the people.

I doubt if any legislative proposal has had equally impressive endorsement.

It is well known that gold production in the United States is dropping to historically low levels, at the same time that industrial use of gold is breaking all previous records. Is there any business in the world in which sales are climbing as rapidly as the sales of industrial gold, depicted in chart A, while at the same time production is dropping? Is gold the single exception to the universal rule that when sales exceed production increased prices are inevitable?

(The charts referred to in this statement are not printed in the Record.)

Chart A shows the remarkable rise in industrial use of gold. This steady increase since 1955 is certain to continue since the demand for gold jewelry is now higher than ever before and important nonjewelry uses, which alone account for all of the gold produced by U.S. mines, are growing. A new, hard gold alloy, is expanding the use of gold for contact points in the electrical and electronic industries; gold plating is essential for some components of spacecraft; gold plated bearings are used on high speed electric motors; gold films on glass reduce ultraviolet rays without impairing transparency; a superconducting gold alloy has been developed.

What is happening to gold sales in the United States is repeated all over the world and, in addition, the universal desire to own gold is being partially met, in spite of multitudinous restrictions on its sale. It is estimated that the world's annual nonmonetary consumption of gold is well in excess of three quarters of a billion dollars a year.

Here in the United States, as chart B indicates, industrial consumption of gold, after allowance for reclaimed gold, is about three and a half times as great as U.S. production. In any business, when sales exceed production sharp price increases reduce sales volume until sales and production are in balance. However, gold is at the mercy of the experts, against whom Mr. McGuigan warns, and they rule that restrictions on the amount of goods that travelers may purchase outside this country, special taxes on foreign investments by U.S. citizens and discouragement of expansion of U.S.-owned plants in other nations will permit unrestricted sales of gold to industry.

Quite apparently, the gold-using industry is considered to be more important than the convenience of travelers or the expansion of U.S. investment and business abroad. In fact, this industry, instead of facing restrictions aimed at reducing the outflow of gold, is supplied from the very gold supplies that the Treasury Department supposedly guards so well—and at a price that represents a heavy subsidy.

The industrial users of gold can supply all of their needs of gold from the Treasury at the depression-level price of $35 and sell their product in a market that is about two and a quarter times as high as it was in 1940, the year of greatest U.S. gold production. Chart C illustrates the relationship between the total amount paid in the United States for industrial gold and the value of that gold after adjustment to prices in the markets in which the gold products were sold. It is easily refutable nonsense to pretend, as some have done, that present prices of articles manufactured from gold do not reflect a sharp advance in the marketplace valuation placed on the gold content of the manufactured products.

For many years in Alaska a simple, solid gold ring has been popular. This ring, known as the Sourdough Ring, is an inexpensive stamping without stones of any kind. Its value is nearly all in the gold itself. In 1940, this ring could be purchased at retail outlets in Alaska at prices that varied from $10 to not more than $12. Today, the least expensive price is $26.95 and it ranges to $35.

On the 19th of April of this year, the Wall Street Journal took front page notice of the boom in earring sales, quoting an earring maker as saying, "Demand last year was just fantastic and it's continuing this year." Also quoted was a buyer of fine jewelry for John Wanamaker's in Philadelphia, who said, "Now they are starting to buy expensive earrings. This will become a gigantic thing when they start buying solid gold."

There is no question but that the users of industrial gold are benefiting from a subsidy. Perhaps their access to monetary gold and the price subsidy are truly in the national interest. In hearings before this committee on July 16, 1963, Mr. Robert M. Krementz, first vice president of the Manufacturing Jewelers and Silversmiths of America, insisted that after a $35 ounce of gold had gone through his hands it would bring several hundred dollars in the foreign market and thus immensely benefit our troublesome balance of payments.

If this be so, then the Nation should continue to subsidize gold fabricators, but I suggest that a shift of burden is in order. The present subsidy does not cost the Government a dime. Gold produced in the United States must be sold to the U.S. mint, or to a licensee, at $35 an ounce, otherwise it becomes subject to seizure; the Mint's gold is then resold at the same $35 an ounce. But the gold producer who is required to sell at $35 an ounce must purchase his needs in a market where prices are equivalent to a $78 price—a price that, by law, is available only to the fabricator of gold. Mr. Krementz' ounce of gold that will bring him several hundred dollars is not the gold miner's ounce. The law is most explicit on that point.

Consequently, the United States enforces a producer-paid subsidy.

Producer-paid subsidies are not exactly new. Many centuries ago, the ancient Chinese emperors required that all copper mines deliver their products to the emperor at a fixed price. Perhaps we should expand and modernize the idea. Copper in this country is now, with considerable difficulty, held down to a price of 36 cents. Why not roll it back to the 11½-cent price of 1940; and kick lead from 16 cents down to 5 cents; pig iron from about $60 to $18? Producer-paid subsidies on the base metals and iron would benefit far more people than the present producer-paid subsidy on gold. Furthermore, they would benefit the Government, who is a large customer, and would obviate the need for some existing expensive subsidies now paid by the Government. Construction differential subsidies to American shipbuilders have cost the United States $504 million over the last 5 years—an amount that surely could have been saved by enforcing 1940 prices on copper and steel.

Of course, there might be very few copper, lead, or iron producers who could survive as subsidizers, but we note that a few gold mines continue to struggle along under an identical price burden.

In Alaska we find that the gold price burden is borne by many who can least afford it. In 1940, Alaska produced $26 million in gold; last year the State's production was $1,500,000. This loss of nearly $25 million in income fell largely on the people of the northern and western parts of our State—Eskimos and Indians who in 1940 were valuable workmen, carpenters, machinists, mechanics, dredgemasters, traders, and airplane pilots. The able president of the senate of the first legislature of the new State of Alaska was an Eskimo from western Alaska.

This problem received attention in the December 1965 report to the President's Review Committee for Development Planning in Alaska which in volume I, page 95, states:

"Economic development in Alaska is concentrated along the narrow coastal belt from southeastern Alaska to Kodiak and Bristol Bay, and inland along the so-called rail belt area. The vast expanse of land north and west of the rail belt area has seen very little development, and most of this is the remnants of the early mining and trading days, with a sparse sprinkling of newer military installations.

"Westward Alaska would present no urgent problem of development if it were not for the native populations—Aleuts, Eskimos and Indians—who inhabit the area and are faced with the difficult transition from a primitive use-subsistence economy to a modern way of life. The Federal Government has extensive programs for these citizens but it has not been able to do the job rapidly enough because economic activity in the area has tended to decline rather than increase. As a result, we find the native population surviving on a mixture of use-subsistence economy, supplemented by a few jobs, but principally by relief checks. Housing standards are deplorable and are, clearly, the worst in the Nation. One village, Wade-Hampton, is officially described as the poorest community in the United States.

"There can be no solution to the problem which does not include the development of a viable economy in the area which can afford the people the opportunity to earn a decent living, acquire adequate housing, and live as the rest of Alaska's population does."

It is clear that the producer-paid subsidy enforces poverty and despair; it demands a waste of land and of the people who have lived on that land for centuries. We in Alaska earnestly request the Congress to shift this heavy burden of subsidy from our people to the Nation.

NOMINATION OF JAMES M. NABRIT TO BE DEPUTY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the nomination of Dr. James M. Nabrit as Deputy U.S. Representative to the United Nations is an excellent choice.

In a recent editorial, the Washington Post pointed out that "during his season on leave from the presidency of Howard University, Dr. Nabrit already has added to his reputation for conciliation, coolheadedness, and quiet good sense."

The paper adds:

> The country is fortunate to have his services.

I wholeheartedly agree.

Since the editorial praising the new successor to Ambassador Charles W. Yost will be of general interest, I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1966]

NABRIT AT THE U.N.

> Nomination of Dr. James M. Nabrit to succeed Ambassador Charles W. Yost as deputy U.S. representative to the United Nations is a welcome promotion for a respected Washington educator. During his season on leave from the presidency of Howard University as a member of the American delegation Dr. Nabrit already has added to his reputation for conciliation, coolheadedness, and quiet good sense. The incidental fact that he is a Negro has perhaps made his explanations of American policy more convincing; but his selection for the heavy responsibility for backstopping Ambassador Goldberg is based on merit.
>
> Happily Ambassador Nabrit will retain his connection with Howard through extension of the leave of absence—although if his assignment is prolonged this could become a problem for the university. Meanwhile, the country is fortunate to have his services. The wide diplomatic experience of the man he succeeds has made Ambassador Yost a pillar of strength in a role that has been essential but often out of the limelight. Already one of the country's seven career ambassadors, Mr. Yost has earned many good wishes upon his retirement to join the Council on Foreign Relations.

DEATH OF SENATOR PAT McNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to the memory of our beloved colleague, Senator Pat McNamara. His death at the close of a long and distinguished career is a sad loss to those who knew him and to the country he served so well. In his two terms in the Senate he fought with courage and with vigor for progressive legislation, and at the time of his retirement he could look with pride on what he had been able to accomplish. He was one of the most ardent supporters of sound medical care legislation, and the medicare program now in effect will serve as a living monument to his memory. As chairman of the Senate Committee on the Aging, on which I have had the honor to serve with him, he showed his great concern for the well-being of our elderly citizens.

A true friend of labor and a man who knew from experience the importance of the labor movement, he nevertheless served all the people, not just one particular interest group. As he said of himself, "I am pro-people, I do not plead guilty to labels."

My sincere sympathy goes to his family and to his many friends at this sad time. But I know that they will take comfort in looking at the accomplishments of Senator Pat McNamara who died full of years and wisdom, and as a man who had earned the respect and affection of all who knew him.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Nation and the Senate have sorrowed in the loss of Senator Patrick McNamara, of Michigan. The finality and bitterness of his passing for Senator McNamara's family and friends is softened only by the legacy of achievement which he left.

Many of my fellow Senators enjoyed the privilege of serving with this immensely effective legislator far longer than I. They would be the first to concede that his personal warmth and professional wisdom lightened their burden and illumined their way. It was my honor to serve in the Senate with Pat McNamara during the greatest testing time for liberalism in this century—the 1st session of the 89th Congress. The effect of what was done in this institution last year may not be fully visible for decades to come. But if that effect should be the enlargement of opportunity for personal and societal betterment, a sizable debt will be owing to Pat McNamara. For he was very much a product of the common people, and his brilliantly intuitive grasp of the shape of tomorrow was firmly grounded in the problems of today.

I share with his bereaved family, his friends in the Senate, and the Nation the sadness which his passing leaves. I will miss Senator McNamara, but I will also long remember him.

PROPOSED MEETING OF LATIN AMERICAN LEADERS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star thinks well of the idea of a summit meeting of Latin American leaders, as proposed by President Johnson during his trip to Mexico.

The paper says:

> The tremendous welcome given Mr. Johnson by Mexican President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz and 2 million of his people apparently has convinced our President that the time is nearly ripe for a summit meeting with all the hemisphere chief executives.

The Star states that "high-level meetings will go far to impress on the Latins that the United States is firmly with them in the fight against political and social woes."

The editorial is of much interest and I therefore ask permission my colleagues to have it included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 25, 1966]

ON A LATIN SUMMIT

> One good abrazo is worth a thousand words in the Latin-American scheme of things, as the Mexican people demonstrated with their astonishing enthusiasm during the visit of President Johnson.
>
> The tremendous welcome given Mr. Johnson by Mexican President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz and 2 million of his people apparently has convinced our President that the time is nearly ripe for a summit meeting with all the hemisphere chief executives. White House aids have indicated Mr. Johnson now approves the idea and doubtless the meeting will take place later this year somewhere in Latin America.
>
> The importance of the projected summit meeting does not lie in measurable results. There will be no new treaties beyond those currently being negotiated with Panama and changes in the charter of the Organization of American States. There will be no new promise of aid.
>
> The real significance will be, to a large degree, a thing of sentiment. The President's first feelers on a Latin summit early in 1965 got a rather cold reception. This probably was due in part to the fact that the Latins did not yet know Mr. Johnson very well and had not recovered from the shock of John F. Kennedy's assassination.
>
> A year ago, at the time of the Dominican intervenion, the Johnson image probably sank to a new low in Latin America. But once that shock was over, his stock began slowly but steadily rising. He scored heavily at the Rio Conference of OAS Foreign Ministers by declaring the Alliance for Progress would go on indefinitely. He gained further stature by opening U.S. doors to refugees coming in on the Cuban airlift.
>
> But the clincher probably was the anger aroused in Latin America by the Communists at the Tri-Continental Conference in Havana, where they boasted of their timetable for violent subversion in a number of Latin nations. By contrast, the United States was making it clear that our Dominican aim is to insure a return to constitutional government and then speedily remove our troops.
>
> Thus, the atmosphere has cleared and relations are growing steadily warmer. Since form is often more important than substance with Latins, President Johnson undoubtedly will cement good relations even further with a personal visit to one or more Latin capitals.
>
> A Johnson visit or a summit meeting, of course, will not of themselves eliminate hunger, provide jobs, build houses and schools or wipe out dictatorships of the right or left. But high-level meetings will go far to impress on the Latins that the United States is firmly with them in the fight against political and social woes.

SERIOUS EFFECTS OF THE FOOD CRISIS IN INDIA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we continue to receive reports in India on the serious effects of the food crisis in that country, and on the efforts which India is making to bring about a rapid increase in agricultural production. Two particularly informative articles appeared on Sunday in the Washington Post, which give increasing evidence of the need for us in the United States to reshape our food-for-peace program to adequately meet world needs.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles, "India Tries To Close Fertilizer Gap," by Warren Unna, and "India Rationing Grows," by the same author, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1966]

INDIA TRIES TO CLOSE FERTILIZER GAP

(By Warren Unna)

> NEW DELHI.—A stench is beginning to arise from India's fertilizer problem, caused by politics as well as economics. Fertilizer is regarded as the key to improvement of the nation's sluggish agricultural and food programs, and they in turn are the key to success for the fourth 5-year plan, which is just starting.
>
> The foreign aid discussions in Washington between Indian Minister of Planning Asoka

Mehta and U.S. Government and World Bank officials hinge on the soundness of the 5-year plan and on what India is prepared to do to attract the foreign capital needed to build nitrogen fertilizer plants.

"Socialist" India, during the last days of the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, and now under Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, has made major concessions to attract private capital.

But American oil firms, which have the kind of kitty it takes to invest in fertilizer plants, have been raising the ante on what they expect in return. And leftist members of India's ruling Congress Party, such as former Defense Minister V. K. Krishna Menon and former Mines and Fuel Minister K. D. Malaviya, are warning in Parliament about a "sellout" to Western financial imperialism.

REASON FOR APPREHENSION

This push and pull is threatening India's chances of attracting enough capital to build the plants in time to pace the agricultural step-up. Some highly placed people in and out of the Government now doubt that India will attract the necessary investment at all.

India has neither the hard currency foreign exchange nor the trained technicians to do much on her own. Recently, the Government decided to give up waiting for private money and to borrow expensive short-term funds from Italy to build Government-owned, or "public sector," plants at Durgapur in West Bengal and at Cochin in Kerala.

On the point of American oil firm investment, from the Indian viewpoint, there is reason for apprehension. An American oil combine variously represented by Gen. Lucius D. Clay and the Bechtel Engineering Firm of Oakland, Calif., proposed to build five nitrogen fertilzer plants in India with an investment of $155 million.

But every time India tried to meet the American terms, the ante went up. First, a guaranteed free price and distribution market was wanted—and India granted it. Then the Americans wanted a guarantee that the Indian Government would buy the fertilizer the company couldn't sell at a fixed price.

Finally, when the combine demanded that India also agree to concessions for crude petroleum distribution, the Indians said never mind. Top officials of the World Bank and the U.S. Agency for International Development assured the Indians that they had done the right thing.

STANDARD OIL PROPOSAL

Now a group affiliated with Standard Oil of Indiana is negotiating to build a big fertilizer plant in Madras. At first, the group wanted free distribution and price rights. In a major policy move last December, India granted this in order to attract further investment. Now the oil company is asking that there be no other fertilizer plant or addition licensed in the state of Madras.

Armour, the Chicago meat firm, in combination with the Indian industrial house of Birla, is negotiating for a fertilizer plant in Goa and reportedly wants similar assurances that there be no new plant competition within the two neighboring States of Mysore and Maharashtra.

To add to India's apprehension, the World Bank has asked the Government to consider abandoning the planned use of naptha, a petroleum byproduct which India has in abundance, as a fertilizer base in favor of ammonia, which is siphoned from wasted natural gas from Western oil properties in the Middle East.

The potential American investors, of course, have a case in wanting to be sure of their investment. India's target of a 2.4 million ton nitrogen fertilizer production capacity by 1971 is ambitious. An oil company board of directors in the United States needs hard convincing that the Indian farmer is so anxious for fertilizer that his demand will rise by 25 to 35 percent a year for the next 5 years.

But American as well as Indian experts contend that the farmer is convinced that fertilizer will help his crop and see no end to his demand for it. On the average, Indian farmers use 3 pounds of fertilizer per acre while it is 55 pounds in the United States, 125 pounds in Taiwan and 275 pounds in Japan.

India plans to send a team of officials abroad to try to "sell" fertilizer investment.

Prime Minister Gandhi, doing her best to knock down political criticism at home, said last Sunday in a nationwide broadcast: "The fear that we are likely to be dominated by foreign capital is absurd. Two-thirds of the fertilizer capacity proposed to be established by the end of the fourth plan will be in the public sector * * * Is there a country today which needs nothing from others?"

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1966]

India Rationing Grows—Shopowners Feel Pinch; Bachelors Hardest Hit

(By Warren Unna)

New Delhi.—The real victim of food-short India's rationing program is the bachelor living on his own in a big city.

Monday evening now is cerealless in India's cities of over 1 million population. This means that no hotels or restaurants are allowed to serve anything made of wheat or rice—the staples of the Indian meal—after 3 p.m.

A bachelor has to scrounge his meal from family friends with kitchens. And more often than not he is asked to loan his ration card to the family so that they can draw enough grain to compensate.

GENEROUS RATION

Not that the actual ration isn't generous. Here in India's capital, an adult is permitted a ration of 4.4 pounds of grain a week. The pinch comes on hosts with unexpected guests. It takes 48 hours to obtain a temporary rationing card for the guest and the guest usually has departed by the time the rationing inspector arrives.

About 95 percent of the residents of areas in the capital's lower middle income neighborhoods now are drawing their full rations, and about 85 percent of those in the upper middle income groups.

Since Delhi is a city of well over a million, it came under the first phase of the Government rationing program, begun at the end of last year. Government-supervised rationing, at controlled prices, now is being extended to cities of over 300,000 in population and, within a few months, to cities with over 100,000. India has 107 cities with a population of over 100,000.

READIER ACCESS

The theory is that smaller communities, near the source of food on the land, have readier access to the grains and so have less of a distribution problem. However in villages badly hit by the current drought, the worst of the century, Government "fair price shops" have been established as well.

"Fair price" is an apt name. For black-market wheat now is selling for 50 percent more than that under Government control, and black-market rice for 100 percent more. Even so, it has been estimated that some 882,000 pounds of coarse grains, and some 331,000 pounds of wheat and rice now are being smuggled into Delhi daily.

Rationing has been tough on the private shopowner. Here in Delhi, for instance, there used to be 350 wholesale grain traders, 5,000 licensed and 10,000 unlicensed retailers and 600 grain brokers. Now most of them are out of business.

The few who have elected to stay on in Government-licensed fair price shops as a "lok seva," or public service, acknowledge that they really hope to prevent old customers from running off to black-market shops. One proprietor here in the capital made a profit of only $151.15 from last December 8, when his ration accounts began, until the end of the fiscal year, March 31. And this didn't include the cost of hiring extra hands to run the ration shop.

Indian shopowners readily admit that it has been the speeded-up American grain shipments which have enabled them to supply their customers, and at such a rate that queueing up is generally infrequent.

But they hasten to add that the bread-like chapatti pancakes they make from imported wheat harden when not eaten immediately.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in recent years the Congress has enacted strong civil rights legislation which has had a significant impact in eliminating racial injustice from many areas of American life. But as President Johnson said last August when he signed the Voting Rights Act:

> No Civil Rights Act, however historic, will be final. We would look in vain for one definitive solution to an injustice as old as the Nation itself—an injustice that leaves no section of the country and no level of American life unstained.

The proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 is directed at several areas where racial injustice and inequality still persist. These areas are:

First. The jury box—where all Americans are entitled to serve without discrimination on account of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, or economic status.

Second. Public schools and public facilities—where discrimination has been illegal as a matter of law but persists in some places as a matter of fact.

Third. The houses where many of our citizens are forced to live in deprived conditions because they cannot leave the racial ghettos and live where they choose.

Fourth. The enjoyment of activities protected by Federal laws which is still denied to citizens by intimidation and terror.

Title V of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 is designed to bring to justice those persons who would seek to frustrate by violence and threats of violence the free exercise of federally protected activities. This title does not supplant the primary duty of the officials of each State to uphold the law. But it grants the Federal Government effective power to bring criminal prosecutions where local officials are either unwilling or unable to prosecute effectively crimes of racial violence. The other reason for permitting the Federal Government to act is that it is Federal rights which are being interfered with—and no government can afford to leave to others who may be unwilling the task of carrying out its own laws.

The enactment of title V will reaffirm for all that the rights we have so recently granted are real and that interference with their enjoyment will not be tolerated. I urge prompt enactment of this bill.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which is S. 3283.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3283) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of an especial situation which has arisen concerning the distinguished senior Senator from Utah, who was supposed to lead off the morning hour, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be recognized for 20 minutes, regardless of the rule of germaneness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

ACCEPTANCE OF POWER VERSUS ARROGANCE OF POWER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss today a basic question of the foreign policy of the United States.

At a time when our diplomacy seems to be reaching maturity in certain areas, its critics are deeply pessimistic. At a time when the American people are learning to live with crises and to understand that it may be necessary to fight what we hope will be limited conflicts in order to avoid world wars, critics speak of "war hysteria" and militarism. At a time of U.S. acceptance of power, of the burdens and responsibilities of power, a distinguished leader in Government sees us in danger of acting from an arrogance of power.

I am sure that those who are critical in this way would expect and welcome vigor equal to their own in the present foreign policy debate, and indeed, welcome the debate itself.

I hope, Mr. President, that we may have an opportunity to debate this issue. One of the principal authors of these views, Senator FULBRIGHT, with whom I have talked, is presently engaged in various speeches elsewhere. But I have great hope that sometime in the next few weeks it may be possible to debate the problem of "arrogance of power" versus acceptance of power on the floor of the Senate.

I am putting forward my thesis, just as Senator FULBRIGHT has put forth his thesis, in the hope that this may engender a full scale foreign policy debate—with the purposes of informing the American people and strengthening our policy abroad.

Hence, with full personal respect for the critics, I am presenting some views of my own.

The Nation properly listens to Senator FULBRIGHT not only because he is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, but because he is a public figure with a fine reputation for intellectual distinction.

But the impact of the phrase "arrogance of power" is not limited to specific aspect of U.S. policy. It gives the impression of an overall attack, and, therefore, challenges the very foundations and motives of that policy, without offering viable alternatives. As a consequence, the valuable points in it—designed to give us a sense of humility and spirit of inquiry—have not received the sympathetic attention they deserve at policymaking levels.

I, too, believe in restraint, but I believe we have exercised restraint. I, too, urge a spirit of inquiry, and I have called for full congressional debates on our policy toward Communist China and Vietnam. I, too, have criticized when our foreign policy has been unwise, as in our intervention in the Dominican Republic before OAS consultation; or when we have not done enough as in economic and social reform for Vietnam. I have repeatedly urged our acceptance of the National Liberation Front as an independent negotiating party at Vietnam peace talks, and have also proposed unconditional negotiations with Communist China in such a context. I have, moreover, said that we should accept the results of free elections in South Vietnam. But, I believe that our bipartisan foreign policy since World War II, has been basically sound. I also believe that our motives have been an "acceptance of power" not an "arrogance of power."

The "arrogance of power" thesis, in attacking the very heart of that policy, falls short in two vital respects: First, it is largely negative and offers no guidelines for action; and, second, in concentrating only on crisis situation, it tends to ignore the rest of the landscape of international relations. Policy must have a positive basis, and it should rest on a full picture of events.

EXAMINATION OF THE THESIS OF "ARROGANCE OF POWER"

To see if the "arrogance of power" theme of U.S. actions abroad has policy relevance, we must first try to understand the meaning of the phrase.

Senator FULBRIGHT is concerned that the United States will trod the well-worn path of the historic great power, that we will follow the road of conquest and domination as did ancient Athens, Napoleonic France, and Hitler Germany, and that in the process our own society will become militarized, intolerant, and subject to war hysteria.

I see little basis of comparison between the present policy of the United States and those nations of the past mentioned by the Senator. Was it an attempt at conquest and domination when the United States fathered the Marshall plan, or encouraged the growth of regional organizations such as the European Common Market, or developed our foreign aid and technical assistance program and such concepts as the Alliance for Progress, or moved to put our security on the line in defense of the free world with alliances such as NATO? Are U.S. troops in Vietnam there for the purpose of conquering this small country?

The answers are plainly no.

It seems that the most difficult thing to understand in political affairs and certainly in the world of nations is good intentions. In the political realm, man's inclination is to seek out selfishness or to create it where none exists. The point is that the United States has had power to dominate others—the evidence is that we have exercised great restraint in applying that power. The evidence is that we gave much with little expectation of tangible return.

The United States has, at times, overstepped its bounds and made mistakes as in the Bay of Pigs invasion and the lack of OAS consultation before the intervention in the Dominican Republic. But, it is one thing to criticize judgment and expose errors and miscalculations, and another to question motives.

An "arrogance of power" criterion tends to be of the either-or variety. Either our policy toward Communist China is all right or it is all wrong. Either our presence in Vietnam is justifiable or it is completely without foundation. My own feeling is that certain aspects of both of these policies can be criticized and could be improved, but that there is no need to undercut the whole policy at the same time.

But, when Senator FULBRIGHT criticizes our foreign policy, I believe he also has another meaning in mind—that of cautioning the United States against overconfidence and overcommitment. Such warnings are useful, and it is well to remind our policymakers of limitations and dangers but warnings properly given are not policies themselves.

I wish to add that I believe that Senator FULBRIGHT serves another great purpose in calling to the attention of the Senate its responsibility to advise and consent, and especially to "advise."

To say that we should be wary of overconfidence and overcommitment is not to say where we should be confident and where we ought to be committed and to what degree. In international affairs, interests change and develop all the time. It is difficult to predict in advance how important a specific situation will be. As situations emerge, we often find that what formerly was insignificant has become a testing ground.

For example, we saw the mistake of trying to define interest too clearly before the fact in the case of the Korean war. Just prior to the outbreak of fighting in June of 1950, Secretary of State Acheson—for whom I have very high regard, and who has been more often right than wrong—announced that Korea was not included in the U.S. defense perimeter. Some believe that this statement gave encouragement to an already conceived Communist design. Whether or not it did, the point is that commitments cannot be foreclosed before the fact, and that interests cannot be defined in the abstract.

Of course, it is up to the people of the United States at election time to express their approval or disapproval of the way in which the President determined those interests. I believe that in the current case of Vietnam, the American people do endorse our commitment there. There is agony in having to send our own boys to Vietnam, but there is a deep and mature recognition by the American people that it is a job that has to be done. Certainly, we not only have the will to make that commitment, but the strength to accept criticism of it at home. These are signs of a strong and, indeed, vital democracy.

It is my contention that U.S. bipartisan foreign policy since World War II has been based on an acceptance of power, not an "arrogance of power." Further, our willingness to accept our responsibilities as a world power, and our determination to make effective use of that power, are beginning to show some concrete results. I would like to delineate these positive signs in order to draw a more complete picture of contemporary international affairs.

POSITIVE SIGNS IN WORLD AFFAIRS

There is no denying present difficulties and trouble spots. The conflict in Vietnam shows few signs of abating. Communist China persists in its vow to instigate more so-called wars of national liberation. NATO is being buffeted by the challenges of President de Gaulle. But there is no reason to focus solely on these events, as if they were the only events of importance. Another side of the story remains to be told.

DEVELOPING NATIONS: A NEW AWARENESS

The critics maintain that the developing nations have rejected democracy in favor of material progress, and imply that our policies in these areas have resulted in an ever-increasing feeling of anti-Americanism.

I disagree on both counts. Our relations with these new nations are not exactly what we would want them to be, but they are showing signs of improvement. Moreover, I believe that the leaders of these new nations are beginning to realize that there is no necessary contradiction between democracy and material progress.

After World War II, the United States fostered and welcomed the independence of the former colonial territories. National self-determination has always been a cardinal principal of our approach to foreign affairs.

Having gained their independence, these new nations developed a kind of nationalism that was more concerned with condemning their former rulers than it was with progress in their own countries. In time, this nationalism turned against the United States as well. Despite our efforts in their behalf, we became the symbol of prosperity and strength in their eyes—a symbol which they both admired and attacked.

These new nations professed a policy of neutralism or nonalinement as between the United States and the Soviet Union. In practice, however, they tended to side almost automatically with the Soviet Union. This situation is now changing. It is changing because of the growing awareness that there was great danger and little return in this relationship. The people of these new nations began to recognize that the real threat to their security and independence came not from the West, but from the Communist world. A number of attempted Communist coup d'etats furnished the proof.

The result has been the emergence of a genuine policy of neutralism—a real desire to be masters in their own houses, to be beholden to no one. Accordingly, many of these nations have encouraged the United States in its efforts in Vietnam. They recognize that our action there could be a deterrent to Communist power plays in their own countries.

There have also been a number of internal changes in these new nations that give cause for hope. Many of them have been plagued by one-man, doctrinaire, leftist dictatorships which neither gave hope for future free elections nor evinced any signs of fiscal responsibility. Little economic growth and runaway inflation have been characteristic of these dictatorships.

Recent events in Africa where the overthrow of certain governments which had become economically bankrupt and too much under Chinese Communist influence were greeted by immense African approval. Ghana is an example of this. Indonesia, where the overwhelming number of Indonesians have risen up in support of the army's efforts to prevent a Communist takeover, has been another example.

U.S. WILL AND PURPOSE

The critics seem to believe that the United States has become too eager to use military power, that the hawks are gaining in influence, and that there is a definite danger of the United States forcing a showdown with Communist China over Vietnam. I agree that every conflict is fraught with further dangers, and that in particular we should exercise due restraint in respect of Vietnam in order not to precipitate a confrontation with Peking. But it is one thing to be aware of risks and quite another to let these risks paralyze our will and demoralize our purposes.

Ever since 1945, states who opposed the principles and interests of the United States have been continually testing our will—probing to find our weak spots, trying to discover some U.S. commitment that might not be kept. No sooner did the war end, than we were forced to talk tough to prevent the takeover of Iran by the Soviet Union. This was followed by a long line of confrontations that have become indelible in our minds: the Communist war in Greece, the Berlin blockade, Korea, Lebanon, and Cuba, to name the major ones.

U.S. foreign policy has never been opposed to change per se. We see nothing sacred in the status quo for its own sake. In fact, our country has been and still is a central force for reform and we do have our own revolutionary tradition. But, the United States is against attempts to change the status quo by force—by aggression whether direct or indirect. When a government, facing such aggression, has requested our help—and help could practically be given—we have generally responded.

It is my belief that our participation in the Vietnam struggle will go a long way toward convincing aggressors that the United States will not abandon those who are attacked. Vietnam is, after all, remote from our own shores and a small country, yet, we have sent large numbers of our own troops in there to help. This cannot fail to have an impact on the calculations of the aggressors.

Moreover, the Communists are beginning to have serious problems of their own. The Sino-Soviet split is not simply over ideological dogma; it is a struggle to see who will dominate the Communist world. There should be enough mutual recrimination in this split to keep the Communists busy tending to their own problems and creating fewer difficulties elsewhere.

THE GROWTH OF REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A vital aspect of the international landscape which the critics often overlook is regionalism.

One of the most hopeful signs of progress, to me, is the growing appreciation of the necessity for, and the benefits of regional cooperation. The idea and the practice of regionalism has interposed itself between the realities of nationalism and the hopes of internationalism. Regionalism represents the new realism in the solutions to current international problems.

Regional economic, technical, and defense groups, I believe, are in line with the major fact of the post-World War II world—interdependence. Indeed, regionalism is an acknowledgment of the fact that nation-states are interdependent and of their need to pursue common objectives jointly with the minimal surrender of sovereignty. It is now a truism that certain problems can be tackled more productively by several nations than by going it alone.

Under the aegis of articles 51 and 53 of the United Nations Charter, regional organizations have been springing up on all continents. The U.N., in fact, has set up councils to correspond to and promote these regional groups. In our own hemisphere, there are three major regional organizations: The Rio Pact, the Latin American Common Market, and the Central American Common Market. The latter, in particular, is making great strides. In addition, the very successful ADELA investment company, which funnels private capital from Europe, the United States, and Japan to Latin America on a regional basis, gives me special satisfaction because of my role in initiating it. Asia, with the Colombo plan and the new Asian Development Bank, is also moving toward regional approaches. Also very encouraging is the progress being made in Africa under the Organization for African Unity.

Standing at the head of all regional efforts are the European Common Market and NATO. The success of these is a continuing tribute to the foresight of the Western Nations. NATO and EEC have become so engrained, so solid, as ways of life for their members, that not even the challenges of President de Gaulle have been able to tear them apart.

VICTORIES IN THE BATTLE OF PHILOSOPHIES

Perhaps the most crucial differences between the critics of our policies and myself, lie in the question: Who is prevailing in the cold war? The critics seem to believe that the principles of the United States are not faring well, and see signs of deepening crises. There will, of course, be crises in the future; international relations, because of the fact of national sovereignty will invariably be marked by such crises. But I am more optimistic about our ability to manage these situations and more optimistic about the triumph of our principles.

Underpinning the whole cold war is the confrontation of the democratic and totalitarian philosophies, the struggle for the minds of men. It seemed to some pessimists that communism was the wave of the future, that it had all the answers, and that the people of the world really preferred it to democracy. These pessimists are being proved wrong.

In the beginning, we could not expect the peoples of the world to know what communism was. They had to learn about it for themselves. Communist Parties were proposing a whole kit of necessary reforms, and these parties seemed to be the only way to bring about change, the only alternative to despotic feudal oligarchies.

In time, the people learned that the Communists rarely delivered the reforms, and the new reforms they did make, cost the people themselves far too dearly. Communism forced a complete break with local traditions, with private ownership patterns, and allowed no opposition and no free speech or religion. One form of dictatorship had been traded for another.

There is even a growing realization that the free enterprise system can meet a lot of the people's problems now. The market economy, supply and demand, is now being seen as a better and more efficient indicator of private wishes and public needs. Even the Soviet Union and other Communist countries have instituted capitalist reforms along these lines.

Given knowledge and a real choice, people will always prefer freedom to slavery. We are beginning to win the battle of philosophies; it will be the biggest victory of all.

Mr. President, we will not win if we become preoccupied with immobilizing self-criticism. While we must criticize when and where necessary, we should also look to the positive side—to our contributions and sacrifices—and be proud that we have accepted the responsibilities of power.

I thank the majority leader for his very gracious courtesy in allowing me to make this speech out of order.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule restricting the number of committee staff members having floor rights be waived for the Senate Banking and Currency Committee staff members during the consideration of S. 3283.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be granted 20 minutes, out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM—CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, recent political events accent the tangle of complexities in South Vietnam. They show once again that an extensive commitment to another country must be based on nothing less than the most discerning judgment—judgment compounded of old wisdom and new knowledge of the world as it really exists.

The United States recently joined the Republic of Vietnam in declaring together the two countries' "determination in defense against aggression, their dedication to the hopes of all the people of South Vietnam, and their commitment to the search for just and stable peace." These are the words of the February 8 Declaration of Honolulu. In vague but hopeful generalities, the words tell why our soldiers are now fighting in the thick of jungle growth, why U.S. personnel try to help bring security, schools, and sanitation to peasants in far-flung villages, and why the U.S. Government is engaged in a whirl of diplomatic contact about the situation in southeast Asia. For there are three aspects of the U.S. effort in South Vietnam.

The military aspect of the war grows steadily. Counting last week's reinforcements, there are now over 250,000 American combat troops fighting alongside some 700,000 South Vietnamese soldiers. The U.S. Air Force is heavily engaged in both the north and the south. During the past year about 1 ton of bombs has been dropped for each Vietcong fighting. As Americans pick up newspapers these mornings, more often than not their eyes are drawn to front-page accounts of bombing missions that have resulted in destroyed installations, factories, and powerplants.

The Secretary of Defense has suggested that we Americans are an odd people, for we do not take sufficient pride in our military capabilities and accomplishments. Perhaps he has a point. Certainly our Nation has developed incredible powers of destruction, which must be maintained in this nuclear age. Yet, each day we observe the powerlessness of sheer power as we hear and read about the unfulfilled needs and aspirations of the villagers of South Vietnam. Eighty percent of the people live in the villages. These people must feel at one with their Government, if their Government is to stand. So the villages are the object of the second aspect of the U.S. effort to help South Vietnam.

"Pacification" is the term used to describe the intensive program aimed at bringing back into the government fold villages now under nominal or exclusive Vietcong control. All aspects of rural development are included.

The first step is to provide security against local guerrillas. Villagers must have assurance that they will be left alone before they rebuild a road to connect their village with the one nearby. They need peace to make full use of a water pump they have obtained after months or even years of waiting, and they must be secure to take advantage of a new schoolhouse, with a teacher to whom their children can come freely each day.

Many of us flinch instinctively at the word "pacification." The terms calls to mined earlier attempts at pacification that failed—most notably Diem's strategic hamlet program, an attempt to turn villages into armed camps that could defend themselves against local guerrillas. Hastily organized and badly managed, the program barely got off the ground.

But this time, we are told, the United States, along with the South Vietnamese, is concentrating resources and personnel as never before, in order to win back the countryside. The aim is to steal the revolution from the Vietcong.

General Thang, South Vietnam's Minister of Rural Reconstruction, heads the program, which has administrators at the provincial, district and local levels. The plan is to start this year with four small areas that have recently been cleared by American and South Vietnamese troops. Forty-man political-action teams, trained in a rigorous course of instruction, will come into the villages in these areas to help provide security against local guerrillas and to propagandize for the Government. They will do everything they can to build up the Government's image in the eyes of the villagers by lending a hand in the fields, the schools, and wherever else their assistance is needed. The political-action team is to be followed by a six-man census and grievances team, basically aimed at finding out who is pro-Government and who is not. This team also gathers, as a basis for action in the future, villagers' complaints against the Government and against their village, district, and provincial chiefs. Then comes a 12-man civilian expert team from the provincial chief's office. It consists of a teacher for the school, national police agents, and experts in agriculture, livestock, and other fields.

A village will be considered pacified when it is secure enough for the cadres to leave, and when villagers have elected their own committee of elders, who will take their village's problems to district and provincial officials in the future. It is hoped that 900 out of South Vietnam's 12,000 hamlets held by Communists will be pacified by the end of the year, and that the number will grow by leaps and bounds during the following period. The United States will foot the bill of around $70 million for direct financing of pacification this year, and many times this sum to pay the import bill for goods that will assure the countryside, as well as the cities, of material things despite the war.

The third aspect of the American effort in Vietnam is the search for peace through diplomacy. Certainly President Johnson is bent on doing everything he can to bring about a peaceful solution of the conflict. He has initiated much of the diplomatic activity directed toward this end. All other serious efforts have his blessings. The President's peace offensive has reached across the continents to some 115 countries. He has offered time and again to sit down "anywhere, at any time" to hold "unconditional discussions" on Vietnam. The President has also taken the conflict to the Security Council of the United Nations.

Russian Premier Kosygin visited Hanoi, and Lord Chalfont, the British delegate to the disarmament talks in Geneva, met with the North Vietnamese Chargé d'Affairs in Moscow. We have seen reports of letters from Hanoi to other governments—including France, India, and Algeria—asking that those nations try to bring peace to Vietnam. Premier Fanfani of Italy tried to get our Government and Hanoi to exchange views. U Thant, Secretary General of the U.N., has been tireless in his efforts to foster communications between parties. And Pope Paul has searched consistently for the path to peace. His moving appeal to the United Nations "No more war, never war again," will always be remembered. We understand that much of the Pope's recent, unprecedented discussion with Russian Foreign Minister Gromyko was devoted to Vietnam.

Time and again we are told that the purpose of the first two aspects of the U.S. effort is to bring the third aspect to fruition. We must help strengthen the position of the South Vietnamese so they will have bargaining power at the conference table. The argument runs that a strong military response will convince the Vietcong they cannot win through force of arms. At the same time, the peasants will support and identify with the government if they are secure from the threats and reprisals of the Vietcong—if their basic needs are met, and if their justified claims are heard and acted on by a government that cares. After all, in this war the enemy lives among the people—and only the people can identify the enemy. Both South Vietnamese and American troops generally depend on the villagers for intelligence information.

The hazards of fighting this war—a war that defies quick resolution by bombs, and runs free from the traditional restraints of battlelines—have been described often and in depth. All of us can appreciate full well the complexities of the challenge. For when a purely military solution to a problem is possible, a relatively quick solution can be brought about.

But it takes time—much time, along with extensive resources and technical personnel—to build a basis for social and economic progress.

We know from the experience of other developing nations that at best the road to social and economic progress is long and winding. But in South Vietnam there are three factors that make it an especially hazardous route.

First, the country is shrouded in a grassroots war. Too often at night insidious tentacles of death and destruction reach out to turn the daytime's work of construction into a heap of rubble. For some 20 years now, war has consumed the energies of men and the bulk of resources that could have brought improvement to the lives of millions in South Vietnam.

The second factor is the involvement of outside forces—North Vietnam and the United States. Modern history abounds with examples of countries that want and accept assistance from a foreign power and then regard such helpers as intruders in their national lives—as we are regarded by many South Vietnamese, and, as we are learning, North Vietnam's new forces are regarded by the Vietcong. To have a foreign hand around is to have another hand to blame for problems and hardships, even if—or perhaps because—it is the hand that tries to help. Countries, after all, are comprised of people. And people instictively cling to their privacy, their independence, and the conviction they can take care of themselves.

American money and arms, products and personnel have kept South Vietnam afloat for a long while now. Yet, the United States has neither the intention nor the desire to become a colonizing power. The fact of the matter is that the U.S. presence is a makeshift crutch—a crutch that is kept from lending its full support because of political instability. This is certainly the most crucial and disruptive factor in the Vietnam scene.

On March 10, the military junta headed by Premier Ky—supposedly a caretaker cabinet—dismissed Lieutenant General Thi, commander of the 1st Army Corps, and virtual overlord of the five northernmost Provinces. Two days later the Buddhist leaders took advantage of the unrest caused by General Thi's dismissal and launched a drive to force the military regime to step down in favor of an elected civilian government. Buddhist-led demonstrations, with strong anti-American overtones and placards reading "Ky must go," erupted in several cities. In early April, the central government lost effective control in the northern regions. After sending a regiment of marines to Da Nang, Ky was finally forced to give in to Buddhist demands, and to set a date for elections.

But Buddhists have not been the only demonstrators in South Vietnam. Students by the thousands have poured into the streets of many cities, demanding civilian rule. Large Catholic demonstrations, decidedly anti-Communist and pro-American in tone, have also taken place.

Political crises and civil disturbances of this magnitude have resulted in a slowdown of both military operations and pacification programs. We have seen many reports from Vietnam indicating this. Several days ago, Secretary John Gardner, talking of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's role in the new intensive education program in South Vietnam, said on a national television program:

> Political instability of this intensity is bound to affect any effort of this type.

And Secretary of Defense McNamara, describing the sharply reduced scale of military operations during the past few weeks, said last Monday:

> The tempo of military operations has been adversely affected by political disorders.

But beyond hurting the efforts for war and peace, political instability paralyzes the country, saps it of sufficient strength to determine its own future, and negates the basic thrust of our efforts in South Vietnam.

What, then, is responsible for this political instability?

The fabric of South Vietnamese society is pulled taut to the breaking point by the stresses and strains of contending personalities and factions. There are no political parties as we know them in America. The people have not had the benefit of a legal framework and political institutions. They are, instead, governed by the military junta of Premier Ky—a junta which follows the pattern of 9 years of Diem's reign and the nine coups that followed. The South Vietnamese have never known the unifying influence of symbols and institutions—or a traditional loyalty to a way of governing they can approve.

But now the South Vietnamese want—and deserve—something more. They want to be represented at the decision-making level of government. There is no simple way to describe the people of South Vietnam—for they are composed of a collection of groups and interests, set apart by divisive factors that intertwine and interact at so many points it is impossible to keep the vital threads untangled. Yet these threads must be balanced and woven into some form of political system that gives expression to the needs, desires, and aspirations of the people.

What are the most significant divisive factors to be considered?

We hear most about religion. The Buddhists comprise a large portion of South Vietnam's 16 million people. They claim to speak for three-quarters of the South Vietnamese population, but this may be an exaggeration. In any event, the Buddhists agitate in favor of the democratic process because free elections would give them a far larger voice in relation to Vietnam's Catholic minority.

The religious controversy has roots deep in the history of Vietnam. Its complexities are heightened by the fact that the Buddhists are also divided among themselves. The venerable Thich Tri Quang—the most militant leader who spearheads the anti-Government movement—would like dominant influence, if not direct control, in the Government. Ambitious and fiercely nationalistic, Tri Quang has indicated on at least one occasion that he would like to see Vietnam free of all foreign influence.

The Buddhists have several elements in their favor. They are highly disciplined and tightly organized. They are skilled at directing demonstrations and have a regional base of support in the central coastal plains north of Saigon. In their demand for an elected civilian government, they have an appealing political program—in a country where military rule has been discredited by corruption and incompetence. The Buddhists have also indicated to their war-weary countrymen that they are anxious to find a peaceful solution to the conflict with the Vietcong.

There are other religious groups that must be considered. Neither the Cao Dai or the Hoa Hao appears to have any significant influence at the national level, but they are very influential in the provinces where their adherents are concentrated.

Vehement nationalism, seen in a leader like Tri Quang, is a crucial factor. It is strong among both the military "young Turks" and in the large student movement which tends to identify with the Buddhists—though the students' main hope and prime concern is to find Vietnamese answers to Vietnam's problems. Nationalism is a powerful force that sets apart the younger generation from the French-educated mandarin class, which held political power after Diem took over the government in 1954.

Another divisive factor is regionalism. Under the French, what is now North and South Vietnam was carved into three divisions: Tonkin in the north, Annam in the center, and Cochin China in the south. But the Geneva agreements in 1954 established the 17th parallel as a demarcation line between North and South Vietnam. The latter is therefore made up of Cochin China and the southern part of Annam. Deep-rooted antipathies and rivalries have long existed between these areas—a factor that any political system must take into account.

The division between the urban population and the people of the countryside is of utmost concern, especially in this time of war. Only 20 percent of South Vietnam's 16 million people live in urban centers, but they are the most literate and vocal elements in the country. The urban dwellers now rule the political scene. This fact, along with a succession of incompetent and often dishonest central government administrators at the provincial level, has discouraged the peasantry from identifying with, and therefore supporting, the government in Saigon. These are the divisive tendencies. Are there unifying trends? Is it—will it ever be—possible to unite South Vietnam?

To simplify the enormity of the efforts necessary to accomplish this end would be a gross disservice to our Nation and to the truth. For the fact of the matter is that there are no easy answers.

Yet every elected official—every concerned individual citizen—has both the right and the obligation to analyze the issues and contribute constructively as we search collectively for a solution to the dilemma of Vietnam.

Let me clearly state my belief: No solution to the problems of Vietnam is possible without political stability—which must in turn be based on institutions which can accommodate the conflicts between divergent groups within the society of Vietnam. Such institutions have developed in the West over the course of the centuries. South Vietnam faces the incredible task of compressing the political experience of generations into several months.

Such institutions can be developed in many ways—but surely the elective process offers the most immediate method, and the most fruitful prospect at this time.

Writing from Saigon, R. W. Apple, Jr., stated in the Tuesday, May 2, New York Times:

> A few Americans here, confronted by their conviction that the elections must take place at all costs and by the difficulties in insuring that this happens, have been driven to propose that U.S. troops be sent in to block any attempted coup.
>
> But this is a minority view. Most of the activists are convinced, and some others hope, that hand-holding, doorbell-ringing, lavish amounts of patience, and firm public statements will do the job.
>
> "If it doesn't," one diplomat said, "our position here will be pretty gloomy, so it's worth a big effort."

There is no question that the effort is justified. But more than "hand holding, doorbell ringing, lavish amounts of patience and firm public statements" is necessary.

The elections must be held. But let us face reality. Under the supervision of the Ky government, the results would be challenged and rejected by the other elements of the Vietnam power struggle. Elections supervised by the Buddhists—as Tri Quang has proposed—would be equally unacceptable to the military, the Catholics, and other groups. Pollwatchers supported by the United States alone would also be unsatisfactory. The tides of colonialism have long since receded, leaving a residue of strong suspicion of Western man.

There is a clear need for objective outside supervision of the forthcoming election. That kind of supervision and that kind of objectivity can come only from an international presence.

There is no magic method that will assure the international presence needed—we must work, and work hard toward that goal.

First. We must request that a special session of the United Nations General Assembly be called.

Second. We should introduce in that special session a resolution requesting that United Nations observers be assigned to the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam.

Third, and most important. We should lend the full prestige of the United States to this effort. I can think of no better way to present the case to the U.N. than in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson—who has demonstrated time and again his unswerving devotion to the cause of peace.

The elections should be held within areas which can reasonably be secured against violence and intimidation, and where the U.N. observers can gain access to assure impartiality.

We must work toward the establishment of a strong—stable—and independent government in South Vietnam. Let us at least recognize that the elections offer the chance to begin.

If the government resulting from the forthcoming elections asks the United States to leave South Vietnam, there is no question in my mind that we must respect that request. But if the resulting government continues to desire our assistance, we have an equal obligation to comply—and a far better opportunity to be effective.

The equation is not complicated. Political stability, based on a representative government which responds to the desires of its people, is the key to a successful solution in Vietnam. No amount of bombs or bullets alone can assure success. We could commit a million men—stamp out the Vietcong—and yet gain a pyrrhic victory. The end we seek in Vietnam must never be military in nature. We cannot become a colonial power.

But with political stability and social and economic reforms, we stand a chance of ending the war and restoring peace to South Vietnam.

The current much-publicized pacification program stands on a tenuous base.

First. It encounters suspicion at the top—for too many leaders feel their futures are endangered through the growth of a popular movement. Since the leaders are not elected—since they came to power by force—and since they can never be sure of the support of their people, they fear a loss of power if a representative government comes into being.

Second. The pacification program encounters suspicion at the bottom—for among the people of the countryside it too often represents the intrusion of the central government they did not choose. There have been promises and false starts before and one can understand the reluctance of the peasant to commit his fortunes and future to an uncertain cause.

Yet pacification is still the best—indeed the only—way we have discovered to bring about the social, economic, and political strength and progress necessary to build a stable society. Upon its success hinges the future of South Vietnam.

The success of the program in turn depends on the solidity of its base—and representative government can give the program the solid support it needs. If the peasant is assured that he plays a role in the policies of his government, his suspicion of that government decreases. If the central figures of government know that their future depends on the people—then their support of a program to help the people will be assured.

As it becomes possible to hold supervised elections in additional areas of South Vietnam, those elections should be held in order that the government continue to reflect the aspirations and desires of the Vietnamese people. This is a logical, realistic path to a solution in South Vietnam.

I think this path also points out a military lesson. The element of the struggle in Vietnam that should be escalated is the pacification program. The military must always serve as the arm of the political. We must get back to the original premise of our involvement in South Vietnam. It is not an American war—it is a South Vietnamese war. We are in Vietnam to help—not to conquer.

A few months ago, I proposed that we call on our initiative a preliminary conference on Vietnam. The President has indicated his desire to wait on the initiative of others. I disagree—but I respect his judgment. If we are to wait for others—if, as it appears, we must continue to wait for a response to our general call for negotiations—we must at least insure that our efforts are directed toward the proper goals.

I do not think we can repeat too often that those goals must be political, economic, and social. We must help to build a stable society in South Vietnam. It is time we recognized that the proposed elections are an opportunity as well as a challenge. It is time we committed the United States to the success of those elections. And it is time that the United States define its role and its desires before the United Nations in the person of its President.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISED PROCEDURES FOR DESTRUCTION OF UNFIT FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1308) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. The first sentence of section 324 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 1) is amended by inserting "except for the cancellation and destruction, and accounting with respect to such cancellation and destruction, of Federal Reserve notes unfit for circulation," immediately after "of all Federal Reserve notes,".

SEC. 2. Paragraph (d) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(d)) is amended by inserting "except for the cancellation and destruction, and accounting with respect to such cancellation and destruction of notes unfit for circulation," immediately after "To supervise and regulate through the Bureau under the charge of the Comptroller of the Currency the issue and retirement of Federal Reserve notes.".

SEC. 3. The third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 413) is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting: "Federal Reserve notes unfit for circulation shall be canceled, destroyed, and accounted for under procedures prescribed and at locations designated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Upon destruction of such notes, credit with respect thereto shall be apportioned among the twelve Federal Reserve banks as determined by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

SEC. 4. (a) The first section of the Act of June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 127, 12 U.S.C. 121a), is amended by inserting ", other than Federal Reserve notes," immediately before "so redeemed shall be forwarded to the Comptroller of the Currency for cancellation and destruction.".

(b) Section 2 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 122a) is amended by changing "in proportion to the amount of Federal Reserve notes of each Federal Reserve bank in circulation on the 31st day of December of the year preceding the date of redemption, and the amount so apportioned to each bank shall be charged by the Treasurer of the United States against deposit in the gold-redemption fund made by such bank or its Federal Reserve agent" to read "as determined by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System".

SEC. 5. The Comptroller General of the United States shall audit the cancellation and destruction, and the accounting with respect to such cancellation and destruction, of any currency of the United States unfit for circulation, regardless of who is responsible for, and regardless of who performs, such cancellation, destruction, or accounting. The Comptroller General shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records which he deems necessary to facilitate an effective audit pursuant to this section.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

S. 1308 was recommended by the Treasury Department, and I introduced it by request on March 1, 1965. After a hearing, the bill was reported on August 2, 1965, and it passed the Senate on the next day. The bill was rewritten by the House and, as amended, was passed by the House last Monday without any objection being raised.

I have now received a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board recommending that the Senate agree to the House amendment. I ask unanimous consent to insert this letter in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1966.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have asked for the Board's views with respect to the amendment to S. 1308 adopted by the House. This legislation is urgently needed, as you know, to avoid inefficiency in destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and the Board recommends that the Senate agree to the House amendment.

Sincerely yours,
WM. McC. MARTIN, Jr.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I might add that the Treasury Department has advised me that it approves the amendment and recommends prompt enactment.

At the present time unfit Federal Reserve notes—worn out, cut, torn, and so forth—must be brought from the 12 Federal Reserve banks to Washington for verification, sorting, and destruction. However, arrangements were made in 1953 so that unfit silver certificates could be verified and destroyed in the 12 Federal Reserve banks under regulations and procedures described by the Secretary of the Treasury. This arrangement saved about $500,000 a year in shipping costs alone.

With the virtual elimination of silver certificates under recent legislation and the substitution of $1 and other Federal Reserve notes, these savings can no longer be effected.

The proposed legislation would immediately save about $800,000 a year—$500,000 for shipping unfit $1 Federal Reserve notes to Washington, and $300,000 for sorting Federal Reserve notes out among the 12 Federal Reserve banks. In addition, it is anticipated that an additional $400,000 or $500,000 a year would be saved by destroying unfit Federal Reserve notes of higher denominations than $1 in the Federal Reserve banks.

The House has made extensive editorial changes in the text of the bill. The only substantive change that was made was to insert a new section 5, expressly requiring the Comptroller General to audit the cancellation and destruction of unfit U.S. currency and the accounting therefor.

In my judgment, this bill should be enacted immediately so that we can at once take advantage of the prospective savings of $800,000 a year which we hope will soon rise to $1,200,000 a year.

Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1308.

The motion was agreed to.

FRUIT AND VEGETABLE GROWERS FACE SHORTEST FARM LABOR SUPPLY IN YEARS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I noted, on the Associated Press ticker tape just outside the Senate Chamber, a dispatch which so fully expresses the actual facts with reference to employment and the difficulty of farmers in getting reasonable numbers of people to handle their crops that I shall read the dispatch into the RECORD:

CHICAGO.—The president of the Nation's largest farm organization said today fruit and vegetable growers face the prospect of the shortest supply seasonal farm labor in many years.

Charles B. Shuman said that with the unemployment rate down to 3.7 percent "there simply is not enough slack in the available labor force to meet the seasonal farm labor demand."

He said farmers are happy about the low unemployment rate "but we must face the fact that this reduces the availability of workers to harvest fruit and vegetable crops."

Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said some fruit and vegetable growers "are running into trouble with their bankers who are not willing to make loans for crop production unless farmers can demonstrate the ability of finding labor."

He said the present farm work force of 800,000 will have to be tripled by June to meet the demand.

Mr. President, that completes the Associated Press dispatch.

By way of comment, I wish to say that I think every thinking person in this Nation knows that there is substance to the statement of President Shuman, except one, and that is Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz.

I regret very much that he continues his adamant point of view under which he is withholding normal and adequate supplies of labor—unemployed labor from Canada, Mexico, and the British West Indies—which is required by fruit and vegetable people to produce and harvest their crops.

I remind him that there has been no more acceptable form of mutual foreign aid in the past, and there is no more acceptable form available now, than to allow the people who are unemployed in these friendly nations adjoining us—some of which are just across the border from our Nation in Canada and Mexico, and some removed by a few miles of water, as in the case of the British West Indies—to come in to help, to make sure that our farmers can have an adequate supply of labor to produce and harvest their highly perishable crops.

The remarks of Mr. Shuman, speaking as he does for an organization with over 1¾ million farm families as members, are worthy of notice. They should command the respect and attention of the entire Nation.

So far as I am concerned, I hope that they will finally get the attention of the Secretary of Labor, who for so long has been taking such an intolerable position over that which should be his position if he expects to bolster production of needed crops and food produced by growers of fruit and vegetables in this Nation.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3283) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senate is considering the proposal of the Treasury Department, S. 3283, to give the Government the right to sell participation certificates backed by the loans held by a number of Federal agencies and to use them as collateral.

The bill is rather complicated, and the Senator from Utah has found it difficult to understand the implications of some of its ramifications. He is not sure now that he really understands them. I feel that it is unfortunate that the Senate has been trying to act hastily with respect to the proposed legislation. I am sure that even the 48-hour delay since this matter was discussed last Tuesday has provided an opportunity to improve the bill and to eliminate some of the problems that have been recognized by both sides.

In my discussion today, I shall attempt to explain to the Senate my understanding of what the bill does and what it means. I shall present my discussion from two points of view: I shall discuss how I believe the law would operate if the bill were passed. Then I shall talk about some of the possible consequences of that operation and, from my point of view, some of the pitfalls of which we must be aware.

We start with the realization that the Federal Government has been engaged for many years in the business of making direct loans to individuals, corporations, municipal bodies, and agencies of various kinds. Based on the table that was included in the RECORD on Tuesday, 51 agencies are now making these loans, and, at the latest date of inventory, these agencies hold approximately $33 billion worth of loans. The interest rates on those loans vary from 2 percent on the REA loans, which is less than half the cost to the Government today to borrow money, to more than 5½ percent, which is approximately equal to the present market price.

These problems are continuing. In other words, the agencies are still making loans. The $33-billion figure may have been true for one particular day, but it is undoubtedly higher today, and it will become higher in the future.

In the meantime, Congress is looking at other problems which conceivably might increase the variety and number of these loans.

In his testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, under questioning, Under Secretary of the Treasury Barr estimated that by the end of fiscal year 1967—which means by July 1968—the volume of these loans outstanding could exceed $39 billion, an increase of roughly $6 billion above the present total.

This situation results in a drain on the Treasury and on the budget. In order to offset the drain, the administration proposes to use these loans as collateral—not to sell the loans, as has been done in the past, but to use them as collateral—and to issue against them what might be called mortgages. These obligations would be in the form of participation certificates, which would mature in 6 to 10 years, with an estimated average of 7 years.

In one sense, I should not use the word "mortgage," because any person who bought a participation certificate would not buy the right to come to the Treasury and foreclose on the security. Actually, he would buy a right to an income, which would be determined in a way I shall discuss shortly. He also would buy the right to an effective, complete guarantee by the Federal Government that his interest would be paid and that his principal would be paid when it was due.

In this way it is better than a private mortgage, but in essence it has the same characteristics because the Treasury is going to tie up this collateral, these loans, and hold them as security for the payment of the certificates it issues against the collateral. As I understand it, the way this is proposed to operate is that these agencies would be given the power to turn over to the Federal National Mortgage Association a block of these loans and the FNMA would be given the power to accept them in trust.

The bill provides that the title would be deemed to have passed to FNMA. I believe the title should actually pass and not merely be deemed to have passed. I believe an amendment to that effect will be offered and accepted. This is one of the improvements that we have made in the bill over the last 48 hours.

FNMA, which was originally set up to be a secondary loan for home mortgages guaranteed by FHA, would now become a kind of investment agency which would take assets and loans from other Federal agencies as though they were its own, gather them into groups, and then issue new indebtedness against them.

The loans would remain the property and the responsibility of the Federal Government, and a new kind of paper would come into being.

One of the things that has concerned me, and on which I am not sure that I have a clear answer, is whether FNMA could accumulate these loans from a number of agencies, join them in the same pool, and issue certificates against a variety of loans. I am not sure whether it is proposed to take loans from separate agencies and make separate pools out of them. I do not know that that is vital, but I hope we can clear the matter up before we finish our work on the bill.

I ask the Senator from Maine whether, as a matter of policy, the practice is to be adopted that the Treasury propose to mix loans from various agencies and put them in the same bundle, or does the Treasury propose to build homogeneous pools with loans from a single agency?

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe the accurate way to answer that question is that the Treasury would not like to foreclose mixed pools. By leaving the door open to this possibility, they might be able to make the issues of participation certificates more attractive to the market.

Mr. BENNETT. It is an open question.

Mr. MUSKIE. It is an open question, and it is desired to keep it as a possibility.

Mr. BENNETT. If each pool, regardless of how it is set up, were to become security for a participation certificate or for a number of certificates, and if the man who bought the certificate had no right to go back on the collateral, then obviously the Federal Government would have the responsibility. The bill recognizes that and the administration accepts it.

If any single loan in the pool were to become bad, it must be replaced by a good loan. I can foresee that this replacement process will become almost continuous, if not for that reason, then for the reason that there will be different maturities on the debt obligations in the pool. Constant management would be required, and it is proposed that that management be with the originator of the direct loan placed in the pool.

The government agency would hold the original notes. It would service them. It would have the obligation to collect the interest and principal on those notes. If some note were to become bad or mature, the Government agency would have the obligation of replacing that note in the pool with a note of equal value. If collection were to become a problem, if the debtor had a problem in paying his interest or principal when due, it would be the Federal Government agency that he would have to deal with, and not with the holder of the participation certificate.

Having created the participation certificates, the Federal Government proposes to go out in the money market and sell them. It is my understanding that they expect to sell them through a professional private underwriter just as private bond issues and private equity stock issues are sold. Whether it will be a single company or individual or a syndicate remains to be seen. It will probably be a syndicate.

That would mean that somebody must buy the participation certificates. There would be bidding or at least negotiation on the price. The participation certificates would undoubtedly bear a fixed rate of interest. However, their effective yield would vary as the money market varied.

These participation certificates would be negotiable. They would be bought and sold in the money market by investors, and the effective rates would vary as the market rate varied.

The certificates would be negotiable and would not be redeemable by the Federal Government until maturity.

It is my understanding that, in effect, as soon as the certificates are sold, the Federal Government would not be interested in who bought them. In many respects these would become replacements for the long-term standard Government bonds that have become so difficult to sell.

It is true that the phrase "full faith and credit of the United States" is not used in these investment participation certificates. But anyone who realizes that the Federal Government effectively guarantees that the interest and principal will be repaid and guarantees that the collateral can be kept effective by agreeing to replace any bad collateral can realize that these have a guarantee equally as valid as if the full faith and credit of the United States were pledged. The only real difference is a tax difference.

By this device the administration would get an opportunity to go into the long-term money market for money, which privilege is now denied, with respect to its normal long-term bonds because we have a 4¼-percent interest ceiling on long-term bonds, and the interest level on long-term securities in the market today is so much higher than that ceiling that the Government cannot sell its bonds.

This leads us into the problem which we faced in Congress for a number of years. Some of us feel, and I am one, that the 4¼-percent ceiling is archaic, that it is a nuisance, that it is an unnecessary barrier. It is felt that if it is possible to get around the ceiling by this kind of device there is no reason why we should not step up like men, take off the ceiling, and let the Government sell its bonds directly on the market without going through this long, roundabout way.

I know why we do not do that. It is because the administration wants to preserve the image that it believes in low interest rates. If the Government supported the idea of raising the ceiling on long-term bond interest, this action would be considered by many of its supporters as being a retreat from a principle.

So now we retreat from the principle through the back door instead of through the front door.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware, for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is not this refusal of the administration to remove the archaic 4¼-percent ceiling in reality resulting in monetizing our national debt in that they are being sold as short-term securities?

Mr. BENNETT. It has two effects. I wish to be fair: This is a problem with which every administration wrestles. The calendar tends to run pretty fast when you owe money. When you issue a 10-year bond, 2 years later it is only an 8-year bond; or when you issued a 6-month note, 3 months later it is only a 3-month note. So the problem of maintaining the average term of the debt is a difficult problem. The Senator is correct. There are three things that could be done. I have mentioned only two. We can raise the interest ceiling, or we can do what is being proposed now; or the Federal Government can sell its bonds at a discount, which is an admission of weakness. This administration has done that, in order to get around the 4.25-percent ceiling.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Another way they get around it is through the sale of Government bonds with less than 5-year maturity.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So they are selling those at 5 percent when in reality they could have sold, on the same day, a 20-year bond for 4.50 to 4.75 percent. They are not only monetizing the debt but also paying a higher interest rate to do it and to preserve an image of being for low interest rates.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the feeling of the Senator from Utah. I think this 4¼-percent interest ceiling has become a kind of symbol, a kind of shibboleth. That was fine 30 years ago, when the Government was paying 2 percent for money, or 20 years ago, during World War II, when it was monetizing the entire cost of the war and paying one-half or one-fourth of 1 percent for money. But it does not seem to be realistic at the present time.

I should like now to turn to the question of how much money we are talking about. In the committee, we were told that there are approximately $33 billion worth of loans that would be subject to this bill. Between now and the end of fiscal 1967, $6 billion more of such loans would probably be made, making a total of loans outstanding, then, of approximately $39 billion.

But if this bill is passed, they expect to sell between now and the end of fiscal 1967 approximately $8 billion worth of these participation certificates, so that they will reduce the net investment in such loans to $31.5 billion.

But, actually, they will still hold $39 billion worth of loans, and be responsible for them.

There is a difference between these loans and the bonds. The things I am about to say represent the heart of my objection to the bill. These participation certificates represent long-term borrowing which is not under the official debt ceiling. So this is a device by which the Government can get money to finance its deficit without putting any pressure on the debt ceiling.

I have already indicated that these certificates are not bound by the interest ceiling, as are long-term bonds. So they get around that roadblock; and because they will not show up plainly in the figures quoted to show the condition of the operating budget, whether it is a deficit or a surplus, that figure which can be presented to the American people as a measure of the deficit will be distorted by the amount of the value of participation certificates sold in any one fiscal year.

Next year, the administration says, it intends to sell $4.7 billion worth of these participation certificates. In his budget message, the President took that into consideration—assuming this bill would be passed—and said he expects to have a deficit of only $1.8 billion. Of course, the situation in Vietnam has already destroyed that hope, but I wish to eliminate that from consideration for the moment.

If the President's figures had been accurately estimated, and if we had gone through in terms of deficits without participation certificate sales, his deficit would not have been $1.8 billion; it would have been $6.5 billion. I am not accusing the President of deliberately attempting to deceive the American people, but I am concerned that before this system goes into operation, some method should be set up to tell the American people how many of these participation certificates were sold, and what their effect was on the announced deficit. The use of this device will prevent direct and factual comparisons between the deficit in the years in which the device is used and in other years in which it was not used, by tending to understate the latter.

Much was made, on Tuesday, of the fact that the proposal will increase the cost of financing the Federal debt. I shall not labor that point again. There is general agreement that it will increase the cost; there is disagreement as to how much. The Budget Bureau says from 25 basis points to 35 basis points, which means from about one-quarter to one-third of 1 percent. The figures show that sale of participations recently represented an increase of more than six-tenths of 1 percent. But nobody will disagree that the costs will be increased.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As to the cost, I found it interesting to review the debate that took place when this same issue was before Congress in 1959.

At that time the man who was then serving as majority leader of the Senate—the same man who is now in the White House—emphasized that the cost would exceed six-tenths of 1 percent if this procedure were utilized to liquidate the assets. So I am quoting the best authority in the country: the man who is now the President of the United States.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the figures, so far, bore him out. I would be willing to give him the benefit of the doubt and say that we must look to the future for the actual answer, but so far as the previous experience and present experience is concerned, it is approximately six-tenths of 1 percent.

(At this point, Mr. KENNEDY of New York took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I stated at the beginning that I was disturbed over the speed with which the bill was being handled, because there is one item on which I have not been able to get information—and this is a typical problem: An agency now owning Federal loans, say the Small Business Administration, turns over some of its loans to FNMA, and FNMA issues participation certificates against them, sells them, and gets the money.

Presumably, it turns the money over to the agency whose loans it mortgaged. What effect will this have on the capacity of that agency to turn around and reloan the money? How much of the money with respect to each agency would, in effect, have to go into the Treasury for uses other than loan purposes?

The only answer I can get is that the rules are different for each agency. The problem is so complicated and it would take so long to get an answer that we cannot supply it in time for this discussion.

This is an important problem and I hope before too long that we will get that answer set forth clearly.

Are we expanding the lending capacity of the agency; and if so, how?

Or, are we setting up funds which will go back into the Treasury and be made available for other spending purposes?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am asking the question for my information. On reading the report, I gathered that if the participation loans were approved by the Appropriations Committee, the money that would be received, agency by agency, could be used to expand lending power, or be sent back to the Treasury, so that each agency would have its own discretion. Is that not correct?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; that is correct. The money that would come in from the sale of participation certificates would have the same value as appropriated funds to each agency. But, the condition under which the agencies can use their appropriated funds—the limitations—are quite different. As I say, the administration just said, "We cannot answer your question in the length of time you have before your meeting."

Mr. DOMINICK. Just taking two agencies for the purpose of clarifying my own thinking, is it my understanding that this would increase the scope of the administrators of foreign aid to make loans around the world without Senate approval?

Mr. BENNETT. The foreign aid loans are included in the authority granted by the bill, but administratively they will not be included in the program, as I understand it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Fine. What about REA?

Mr. BENNETT. REA loans are included also—that is to say, REA is one of the 51 agencies included in the bill; but the administration has made it clear that if they sell participations they will not include any REA loans. That is also a matter of policy.

Mr. DOMINICK. That policy could be changed.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; that policy could be changed.

Mr. DOMINICK. In other words, there is nothing in the bill itself which would prevent the REA or any other agency from doing this if they are included within the 51 agency group. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. As the bill now stands, that is correct. I also have the understanding that an amendment will be accepted which will clear that up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe it is correct to say that as the bill was reported by the committee it did give them authority to sell REA bonds.

In our colloquy the other day I cited a specific example of the $3¾ billion loan we had for the British Government in 1945—2-percent bonds of which approximately $3 billion is still due. Under this bill we could discount those bonds or sell them, although I understand that since that was pointed out the day before yesterday they would now be willing to accept amendments to strike it out. Nevertheless, the bill, as it was sent down by the administration and ramrodded through the committee and onto the floor of the Senate, it did give them such authority to sell these bonds, and apparently it was their intention to do so if we had not caught it in time.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Delaware. This helps my thinking a great deal.

Mr. BENNETT. In the bill as it came from the committee, this permission was available because the agencies are among the 51 to which I have referred, but, as I say, it is my understanding that the administration will accept an amendment to the bill to straighten out that problem.

I should like to talk briefly about the effect of this proposal on private borrowers and private lenders. I have already commented on the Government as lender and borrower, but I want to expand on that, too.

Let us look at the situation of the private borrower. More and more of our fellow citizens and our instrumentalities, both official and semiofficial, are discovering that the Government has a loan program usually at subsidized interest rates which will enable them to do what they want to do without paying the market price for that money, or without facing the judgment of a lender who has got to lend money on risk and has got to make sure that his judgment is right.

Thus, on this basis, I believe that passage of the pending bill would encourage more and more people to come to the Federal Government to borrow money. It will encourage the Government to expand its loan programs, because the administrators of those programs can say, when they come to Congress for increased authorizations, "Well, sure, it does not matter how big our loan program gets. We can always sell participations against it and the net investment of the Government will not be increased."

Let us look at the lenders to the extent that these loans will be the borrowing by small businesses, individuals, small local borrowers. The local banks will begin to lose more and more of their customers when these customers go to the Federal Government for their money. The local bank will lose control and interest in the loans that are made. Instead of being in the banking business, they will begin to move more and more into the investment business, because they will be investing in a piece of paper with a guaranteed rate of interest and a guaranteed return.

This could weaken the service of our American banking system to its communities and make them more and more a passive money manager than an active lender.

I know that there are many kinds of bankers. There are bankers who have always been passive, but, fortunately, in many communities in this country there have been active bankers who have taken the leadership in developing local enterprises, local projects and programs to help the community.

To me, this situation is a very real threat to the banking industry. Government rules could replace private judgment. This could make it so that there would be no opportunity for a man to say, as a banker said to me once, "Well, it may be a poor risk, but it is a darn good loan and will be good for our community."

I hate to raise this ugly specter, but we are opening the door more and more to political decisions as to who will get the loans and who will not, because it is obvious from the present situation that there are more people who want loans than there is money to supply them, and somebody has to set up the priorities. Since the Government is essentially political, I think it does not take too much imagination to discover that under certain circumstances the priorities will be decided on some basis other than the value of the loan to the community.

Much was said the other day about the program that was instituted in the Eisenhower administration, and I am not going to open up that can of worms again, unless somebody makes me, but I would like to point out this difference. There have been previous programs whose purpose it was to get money invested in loans back into use by the Federal Government. In those cases the loans themselves were sold. The man who bought the loan had to manage it, became familiar with it, serviced it, and it was just as if he had gone out and established a new loan.

The securities still had Government guarantees, so the risk was minimized to that extent, but he had to get it, to service the loan, and make the collection. Actual sales of loans were involved. The volume of total loans in the Federal Government's hands went down.

Under this proposal, of course, the volume of loans in the Government's hands will remain the same or rise. There is an offsetting piece of paper against it. So the net investment will go down, but not the total in the hands of the Government.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not have the figure on the proportion of the direct loan sales that are with recourse to the Government and those which are made under some kind of Government guarantee or insurance but I think the bulk of the direct loan sales do carry a continuing obligation for the Government. So to that extent the total obligations to the Government are not reduced. The direct loan paper is reduced to the extent that direct loan sales take place. I only wanted to point out that those participation sales involve a guarantee, and in that sense are a continuing liability. So I think the analogy ought to go to direct sales with recourse to the Government.

The record of the hearings, at page 97, contains a table showing the Export-Import Bank sales from fiscal year 1961 to fiscal year 1965. The total amount from 1961 to 1965 without recourse amounted to $284 million. The remainder amounting to about $1.5 billion were with recourse. Whether or not this reflects a pattern as to other agencies, I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad the Senator brought that fact to our attention, because we want to get the record clear.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is the Senator from Utah at liberty to yield for a few questions at this time?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do have today a very accepted way of investment that is referred to as mutual funds, which funds take in amounts of money and buy selected stocks and issue certificates against those stocks.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that about comparable with this situation, where assets of other agencies in the form of direct loans are put in a common pool and these participation certificates are issued?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, in respect to which you refer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now my question: Is it correct to say that the buyer of a participation certificate does not get a title to any specific loan or any specific security?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct. One does not get any title to a specific loan. In that respect it is like the mutual fund concept.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I saw a little statement in the report about the interest rate. I do not know that it was nailed down. The point has been made that it would cost more this way than by direct Treasury financing. Does the Senator have a comment on that?

Mr. BENNETT. I believe it is agreed by all that it will cost more. The extent of the difference will depend on market conditions. We argued much about that on Tuesday. The Treasury is prepared to admit it will cost somewhere from one-quarter to one-third of 1 percent. I think the recent record shows it may well reach one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So it is conceivable that it will cost more than by direct Treasury borrowing?

M. BENNETT. There is no question about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On pages 18 and 19 of the report there is listed a group of agencies or programs showing direct loans and also guaranteed and insured loans. Of this number, Is it correct to say that only the direct loans are the ones that would go into the pool?

Mr. BENNETT. I think I know the list the Senator is looking at. It was assumed, when that list was published, that any loan outstanding which was in the possession of any of these agencies could theoretically be subject to the terms of this bill and become part of the pool.

To be fair to my friends on the other side, I should say they are willing to accept an amendment which will restrict the agencies which may participate in the pool.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That restriction, however, was not proposed until after some of us objected a couple of days ago and it was emphasized that even the British loans made in 1945 amounting to $3¾ billion, could, under this bill be discounted in the New York banks. I understand the administration agreed to accept an amendment to eliminate this. What else is in it I do not know, but the Commodity Credit Corporation is included in this bill. The Commodity Credit Corporation is already bankrupt. Of course, with a Government guarantee even a worthless note can be sold.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point in the colloquy?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I think both the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Utah are correct in saying that as the bill came out of the committee, and as it was presented, it covered obligations of around $33 billion, subject, however, to this control: That these participations would have to be approved by specific authorization acts, which would go to the specific appropriations committees.

I made it clear on Tuesday that there was no intention on the part of the administration to include foreign aid loans or British loans or some other loans, including the REA loans.

Coupled with that other control in the bill, that the appropriations committees must pass on it, I think the restrictions were much more significant than has been suggested up to this point in the colloquy.

However, in order to clarify any doubts and to conform with the actual program the administration had in mind, the amendment to which the Senator from Utah has adverted will be offered, and I think that will cover programs that include a direct loan portfolio of $10,971 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I would like to have an explanation of these amendments first. I have no objection to the Senator finishing his remarks, but this bill was rushed onto the floor without proper consideration. It was in the committee for only 2 days. We are dealing with authority involving $33 billion. I would like an explanation of these amendments before I enter into any agreement.

I hope the Senator from Utah will finish his remarks so that we can get an explanation of the amendments.

Personally, I think it would be wise if we learned what else is in this bill. If the committee now recognizes that there is about $20 billion in it that they are willing to take out, which is about two-thirds of the original bill, how much more is in there that neither the committee nor I know about?

Would it not be wise to take this measure back to the committee, have it studied further and then bring it back to the floor, at which time we can proceed with a more orderly discussion of the bill?

I am not trying to cause any undue delay, and to show that I am not trying to preclude a vote, I am willing to agree now that when it comes back we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate.

However, I think that the Senate should have a chance to study the measure in amended form. We are not dealing with millions of dollars but billions.

As I understand it, the administration now agrees to change this measure from $33 billion to $10 billion. That is a wonderful step in the right direction, but how do we know that there is only $10 billion, $5 billion, or $20 billion left?

It would be far better if the bill were to go back to the committee. The committee could report the measure next week. We are told that the administration is not planning to utilize this authority for another 12 months. One week would not make much difference. I would be willing to have it reported back on a day certain next week with the unanimous consent to consider it that day.

Again I emphasize that I am not trying to preclude the right to vote on the bill, but the Senate should know for what it is voting.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I was in colloquy with the Senator from Illinois. I did not intend to interrupt him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is included for State Department, Agency for International Development $8,997 million. That includes the loans that have been made over a period of time directly to underdeveloped countries, in large part.

As I recall, some of those loans were made with a grace period of 10 years on payment of interest of a quarter of 1 percent, and then on a 40-year basis, as in the case of loans made to Ghana to build a powerplant and dam on one of the major rivers there.

Just imagine buying a participation certificate involving loans for a 40-year period with a long grace period, and virtually no interest, on what, for practical purposes, I call concealed grants.

What does the administration propose to do about some kind of prospectus, so that a purchaser may have a little brochure to tell him what kind of paper is in this pool and the terms and conditions of the paper?

If, perchance, one is interested in buying through a mutual fund, he is given a list showing that it holds so many shares of Aluminum Company of America, so many shares of Standard Oil, and so many shares of this and that. Complete information is given on what is in the portfolio, so the investor will know.

What does the administration propose to tell the people? What does it propose to tell the prospective investor as to what these loans will buy?

Mr. BENNETT. As far as the Senator from Utah knows, no definite, official statement has been made by the administration on that point, but unofficially, I have been given to understand that it is the intention of the Government to enter into a contract with a typical private investment banking firm, skilled in the selling and underwriting of securities, of which this would be a typical one. I assume that if they make such a contract, when the private agency goes into the market to sell the security, it will be brought under Securities and Exchange Commission regulations, and it will be required to furnish the prospectus to which the Senator has referred.

But there is nothing in the bill that requires it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is an assumption.

Mr. BENNETT. That is an assumption.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the salespeople of the underwriter will say that the Government of the United States is behind these participation certificates. That begins to assuage the apprehensions of people. They say, "Oh, well, if the Federal Government is behind this, I have no concern about it."

I believe that in the interest of candor there has to be something in the bill to require the administration to tell what they are selling. People may think they are buying something, and it will be a pig in a poke, unless one is willing to accept the word that the Federal Government is behind it.

We had this problem once before. The Senator from Utah may remember the days of the joint land banks.

Mr. BENNETT. I was not in Congress in those days.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was. I remember those days. That paper went down to nothing. That was a pretty sorry business for the investors who held those bonds. There came a hue and cry because of certain language in the law as to whether or not they were or were not absolutely guaranteed by the Federal Government. Then, they discovered they could not collect and the bonds went down, and down, and down. These investors in good faith were left to hold the paper and take the loss.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The agency will service it. All they will have will be a Government bond, which is guaranteed by the pledge of FNMA, that if there is a default they will make the payment, backed up by borrowing from the Treasury.

My question is: In what denominations are these bonds going to be sold? They will bring 5¼ percent to 5½ percent. Will the average American citizen be able to buy this 5.35-interest-rate Government bond, or will they as some have suggested, be issued in denominations not lower than $50,000 denominations, which would preclude the American public from it?

We are selling series E bonds at 4.15 percent interest. If they are to pay 5¼ percent to 5½ percent why not let the little fellow buy it and get this extra 1 percent?

We should not exclude the American people. I think that the law should be explicit as to exactly what is intended.

Mr. BENNETT. This bill gives FNMA, the trustee for these pools, unlimited power to secure funds by borrowing from the Federal Treasury to make good any loss or any potential loss. This is also checked in advance by the Appropriations Committees. They cannot issue any participation certificates until the Appropriations Committees have authorized it.

This particular feature of the bill was written in on the House side at the request of the minority—this right of the Appropriations Committees to ride herd over the issuance of these certificates.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That right they should have. But the point is, at the time when the appeal is made to the public to buy these participation certificates, how much information will they have as to precisely what they are going to buy? An investor might say, "Not on your life. I do not get so much as a security to show for the money I am going to invest. The Government keeps the assets. All I get is a participating certificate."

Mr. BENNETT. Just a piece of paper.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the agency that made the loan in the first place is going to service the loan and collect the money.

Mr. BENNETT. FNMA would service the loan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is not my understanding.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct, I was thinking of something else.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My question is: Are the bonds to be limited to $50,000 minimum denominations, or will they be reduced to $1,000 denominations so that the average Joe Doakes can buy them and get aboard this gravy-train?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah does not have that information. I asked an official of the Treasury the specific question about the $50,000 figure and was told that there would be bonds of much smaller denomination than that. But when I asked him how small, I was told that the decision has not been made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what I was told. I think it is a decision that should be made before we vote.

After all, if the Government, in its great benevolence, is going to pay an extra 1 percent or six-tenths of 1 percent in interest rates more than is necessary on a Government-guaranteed bond and if the average investor knows that there is no difference between a direct Government bond and a Government-guaranteed bond, why not let Joe Doakes, the man in the street, receive the benefit of the extra one-half percent? Why confine the privilege to one bank in New York?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. May I maintain my right to the floor and yield to the Senator from Maine, so that he may question the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Very well. I hope that the Senator from Maine can answer the question.

Mr. MUSKIE. I shall be happy to answer it.

Since the Senator appears to prefer the sale of loan paper directly, there is nothing in the proposed legislation which would prohibit the continuation of direct sales of loans and they are available in the denominations that are on the books. Those denominations cannot be reduced. They are on the books and in the portfolio. If they happen to be in small denominations, the small investor is free now to purchase them.

The history of direct sales of loans is that the interest is even higher than it is on the participation-certificate sales. So the Senator's hypothetical investor could make more money by buying the obligations that are now available in the Government's portfolio of direct loans, and at better interest rates.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Maine says that they will be sold based on what is on the books. My question is: What is on the books?

Mr. MUSKIE. They are already there. If the proposed legislation is not passed, they are there. I am talking about the direct loan paper that is in the portfolio now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking of the participation certificates in this particular bill. Will they be sold in denominations as low as $1,000, or will they be limited to $50,000? The Senator from Utah indicated he could not find out. In what denominations will they be sold?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator already has his answer to that question from the Senator from Utah. My interjection was for the purpose of suggesting to the Senator from Delaware that the investor about whom he is concerned in his question would have the opportunity to get this loan paper at higher interest rates than would be available in the participation sales program, and in denominations to suit his purse, if they are available in the present portfolio. So the investment opportunity that the Senator is seeking is now available.

With respect to the program covered by the bill——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. MUSKIE. May I finish?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps my point is not clear.

Mr. MUSKIE. The point is clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. FNMA sold some participation certificates about 3 months ago. How low were the denominations of those certificates?

Mr. MUSKIE. I could not answer that question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then we are back where we started.

Mr. MUSKIE. If for the next 6 months the committee held the hearings that the Senator is proposing, I could not conceivably memorize the details that the Senator is seeking with respect to the sales of all the certificates. I do not have that answer.

I am saying to the Senator that in the direct loan portfolio now—and I cannot tell him what is in it—there are $33 billion worth of certificates. In the direct portfolio now, I am sure that a variety of denominations is available to investors who wish to make that kind of investment.

The Senator has raised a question. My only effort was to try to suggest that here is an investment opportunity comparable with the one which is available to the Senator's hypothetical investor. That is my only point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. recently sold a sizable bond issue, and in the advertising appearing in the Wall Street Journal it was stated that these bonds would be in denominations as low as $1,000. In almost any bond issue of any major corporation the Securities and Exchange Commission requires that the corporation indicate the lowest denomination at which the bonds can be bought.

My question is this: Under this bill it is proposed to sell as much as $33 billion worth of bonds. In what denominations are they to be sold? Will they be in $1,000 or $50,000 denominations, or only in $1 million quantities? Certainly this is a proper question. It is a question that any corporation in America would have to answer before it could float a bond issue in the manner that is proposed by the bill. It is a question that is answered by the U.S. Government in all its direct sales of bonds.

I thank the Senator from Utah for yielding.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this is another open question: In what denominations and in what market? The Senator from Utah has assumed that the denominations would be large and that they would be sold in the major moneymarkets, for no other reason than that the cost of breaking the certificates down into $100, $500, and $1,000 units, and then disposing of them and trading in them, would be very high.

The claim has been made that this program would bring in private money to replace public money in the loan programs. To me, this is based on a fallacious assumption, because the Federal Government never gets any money that is not private money. It was private money that either paid the taxes or bought the bonds that provided the funds that made the loans. Now that the loans have been made, it is proposed to have private money come in and take them out again. One kind of private money would be replaced with another, or one kind of obligation would be replaced with another.

Another weakness in this situation has to do with the use of the money after the participation certificates had been sold. This brings us back to the fact that through the sale of these certificates, or the direct sale of the obligations, we could distort or conceal or destroy the opportunity for direct comparison on the cost of government. In a sense, we would be selling permanent assets or long-term assets for current expenses. That would be like selling the furniture to pay the grocery bill. It is the sort of thing people do when they try to live above their income.

I would feel better about the situation if the administration had assured us that it was prepared to tell us what the effect would be with respect to each succeeding budget. I shall propose an amendment which would require a special report to Congress as to the impact on the budget.

When this question was raised in the committee, the Director of the Budget pulled out a document and said, "Well, the figures are already here." But they are buried deep in a special analysis of Federal credit programs and never become related to the actual budget figure that appears in the headlines of the newspapers, and I am eager to relate them. We shall discuss that subject later.

To many people in this country—and the number is surprising, in terms of my experience, since the bill was introduced in the Senate—this proposal appears to be a gimmick to conceal the true operating budget figures and to prevent comparison. From now on, it would be a permanent program, spreading over the agencies that are finally included in it.

At the moment, I intend to vote against the bill, not because I think it is dishonest or immoral, but because I am concerned about and object to the speed with which it has been rushed through the committee and is being rushed on the floor and I object to leaving unanswered the remaining questions that I think should be answered.

I expect the bill to pass. Perhaps the bill will be passed more or less on a party line. As a Republican, I can read all kinds of sinister ideas into the program. We have been hearing talk about a potential tax increase in order to dampen the effects of threatened inflation. The bill would provide the administration, according to its plan, with $4.7 billion without a tax increase and without an increase in official borrowing under the debt ceiling limit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, I am not on the committee. I should like to get certain information.

Does the bill provide in any way what the interest rate would be that the Government would pay to the buyers of the certificates in the pool?

Mr. BENNETT. They would be sold on the open market. The rates may vary from certificate to certificate. As I understand it, the certificates would be turned over to a professional underwriting individual, firm, or syndicate and would be treated the same as the distribution of any private issuance of debt would be treated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Based upon the interest rate that the Government is getting from the mortgages which it holds, is it reasonable to anticipate that the interest rate that the Government would have to pay on the certificates would be greater than the interest which it collects?

Mr. BENNETT. I have no way of knowing because I do not know which loans would be placed in the pool. However, as the bill stands now, it is possible—although the administration says that it will not do so—to place the REA loans in the pool. The difference in that case would be the difference between 2 percent and whatever rate of interest the certificates would sell for, which is assumed to be somewhere above 5 percent.

Some loans might go into the pool which loans are now earning an amount approximately equal to the rate of interest for which these certificates would have to be sold. Therefore, we would have a whole range from the REA figure of 2 percent up to some loans on which we can assume there would be no difference in interest rate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 20 of the report there is the statement:

> Testimony offered by the Budget Bureau suggested that the differential may be as low as "25 to 35 basis points," or an additional 0.25 to 0.35 percent.

Does that mean the differential in the interest rate?

Mr. BENNETT. That is the differential between what the Treasury has to pay in order to borrow now, and what it would have to pay if it were to use this device.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean an increased cost of between 0.25 and 0.35 percent.

Mr. BENNETT. Let us agree that there would be an increase in interest cost. Only experience would determine what the amount would be. That would be the outside limit, one way or the other.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I point out that the most recent sale by FNMA shows that they paid an interest rate of 5.3 percent. This was a little more than six-tenths of 1 percent higher than the amount which the Government could have borrowed the money for if it had issued its own notes.

The Treasury claims that it will only be 0.25 of 1 percent or 0.35 of 1 percent, but history shows that it has paid about 0.5 of 1 percent interest over and above what they would have paid if they had financed the issue in a normal manner.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It can be assumed that the interest rate which the Government would have to pay on the certificates would be in excess of the interest rate which it would collect on the security.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct in all instances.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is no question about that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. We are talking about two different things. On the one hand, we are talking about the difference in interest rate that the Government might have to pay if it were to sell its own bonds in a normal manner and the interest rate that it would have to pay if it were to sell participate certificates.

The other problem would involve the difference between the interest rates earned by the notes which are security for the certificates and the interest rate of the certificates. That difference in rate has already been created. It was created in a very real sense when the Government made the original loan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the interest rate limitation which is applicable to the bonds sold by the Government apply to these certificates?

Mr. BENNETT. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is presently 4.25 percent?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct. I said earlier that in my opinion this would be a very useful device to make an end run around the 4¼-percent limit. That limit would not apply because this would not be a Government bond.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would this become a debt of the Federal Government, as contemplated by the prohibition which the debt ceiling places on the right to borrow?

Mr. BENNETT. This would be outside the debt ceiling.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it would be outside the interest-rate limitation and outside the debt ceiling?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct. I have tried to point out that, because of that fact, unless specific explanation is made, its effect on the earned deficit or surplus would be to minimize any deficit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was substantially the identical issue before the Senate in 1959 and was action taken on the matter at that time?

Mr. BENNETT. This is not identical. There were no participation certificates in 1959. The Treasury proposed to exchange 4 percent VA-guaranteed mortgages held by FNMA for 2¾-percent Treasury bonds which were outstanding and which were nonmarketable.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean that the man would earn 1¼ percent through that process.

Mr. BENNETT. The bonds did not have a market because they were not transferable, but since they were 2¾ percent, their face value was higher than the remaining balance of the VA mortgages.

The Treasury Department exchanged VA mortgages of $188,328,000 for bonds having a face value of $192,151,000 in one exchange. In the second exchange, they traded $131-plus million of these mortgages for $129.7 million of bonds. The purpose of this transaction was to permit FNMA to continue its activities. It is estimated that the loss of income to the Government, including the servicing cost of 1 percent, was approximately $6 million. However, on the other side, the difference in the face value of the FNMA obligations and its exchange was $5.6 million. So the net difference was only $0.4 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For what period of time was this bill before the committee for study?

Mr. BENNETT. In 1959?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, the pending bill.

Mr. BENNETT. This bill was, I understand, before the House committee 1 day, and it was before the Senate committee 2 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was introduced on the 27th of April in the Senate. It was reported on the 28th of April. Those are the dates shown on the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. We had hearings before the bill was introduced.

Mr. BENNETT. We had 2 days of hearings in the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Of course when the hearings were held the committee was talking about something that did not exist.

Mr. MUSKIE. It existed in the form of the House bill, which was before us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the Senate bill was introduced on the 27th, reported on the 28th of April, and brought up for consideration the first day of this week. There certainly has not been an adequate opportunity for Senators to familiarize themselves with this bill. For that reason even the proponents of the legislation are finding out that there is much in the bill which they themselves and the administration never intended.

Mr. MUSKIE. I differ with the Senator. I will be glad to expand on it later.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, may I yield so that the Senators may have a colloquy?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We will have plenty of time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am almost ready to yield the floor, but I understood the minority leader had another question he wished to ask, and I see he has come into the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, obviously the effect of this legislation would merely be to incur another debt when these participation certificates are sold, since they are guaranteed by the Federal Government.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct. This is another form of debt, in order to achieve the same effect on the Treasury. If they did not use this form, they would have to issue an equivalent number of standard, regular bonds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That raises the second question: How do they propose to style this debt? Will it be a contingent debt, or do they have some other name for it? Or will it be listed along with the regular public debt, under the Second Liberty Loan Act?

Mr. BENNETT. It is outside the debt ceiling; so if the debt ceiling relates to the listing under the Second Liberty Loan Act—a point upon which the Senator from Utah is not completely informed—then it would be outside of that listing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So we owe it, but it is not listed as a part of our regular public debt?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So under that arrangement, when the Government sends out any kind of balance sheet which says, for example, "The public debt presently is $323 billion," that is not the truth, after all, if we fail to list this somehow or other, and let the people know what the debt really is.

Mr. BENNETT. This would not be included in that figure. Of course, the administration has many billions of dollars of debt that are not listed under that figure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is the unfunded debt, for instance, and the commitments that have been made, which in my judgment and according to the latest figure run up to $943 billion.

But I wish to know where this amount will be listed. We did enact a statute, early this year, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], to obtain a balance sheet on this Government, showing assets and liabilities. It is taking the Treasury quite a while to put that together, but when it is completed, it will be the first time in the history of this country that we will be able to have a look at a consolidated balance sheet showing what we have and what we owe.

I am interested in knowing where, in that balance sheet, this is going to show up. The distinguished Senator from Delaware remembers very well when the Senate Finance Committee dealt with that bill and finally approved it, and it was approved also by the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the purpose of this bill the mechanics are such that it would not be included as part of the national debt. It would not show up on the balance sheet as an expense when reported to the American taxpayers at the end of the year.

Conceivably, if the bill is passed in the form in which it came from the committee, in the form in which it was sponsored by the administration, they could sell this $33 billion worth of assets, apply the money received to the general revenues, spend it, and it would not show up as expenditures; nor would it show up as a part of our national debt.

In other words, if this bill passes it would be mathematically possible for the present administration for the next 3 years to spend $10 billion a year more than it is taking in and to report to the American people that they have balanced the budget in every one of those years.

The President in his message to Congress made much of the fact that we need truth in packaging and truth in lending. I agree; we do need some consideration in those fields. But we also need truth in Government. Let us tell the American people the truth as to what is being spent by this administration.

I would like to quote just one sentence: "The purpose of this proposed bill is to achieve a balanced budget by selling off capital assets of the Federal Government. Such a balance would be fictitious and fiscally impossible."

This is not my quote. I am quoting from a statement of the party of the man now in the White House when a similar proposal was made in 1959.

Mr. **BENNETT.** Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois asked me a question. Other discussion has intervened. If he will repeat his question, I shall try to respond to it promptly.

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** I think that was about the question. I merely wish to know whether the American people are to be told what our debt really is. If we have $10, $20, or $30 billion of debt which is not listed or included in the public debt figures, there is a rather ugly word for that kind of practice which perhaps I should not use.

Mr. **BENNETT.** Mr. President, I have one final point, which almost requires no statement, because we have seen it demonstrated in the past few minutes here in the Chamber.

I think when this bill is passed, our friends on the other side of the aisle could be handing the Republicans a very effective campaign issue.

On that note, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope that the manager of this bill will concur in the idea of recommitting the bill, taking it back to the committee, and working out whatever corrections they wish to make. I would be willing to agree that the bill could be reported back on a day certain, whether it is next week or the week after or whenever they feel they can do it.

I would further be willing to agree at this time that when it is reported back it comes back under a unanimous-consent agreement for limitation of debate, let us say 2 hours on each side, so that the bill could be considered the day after it is reported back, or whatever day the leadership wished to bring it up. I am not trying to delay a vote on the proposal. I believe that whether I am for a bill or not its proponents are entitled to a vote, but I do question the wisdom of trying to amend this multibillion-dollar bill on the floor of the Senate.

It admittedly covers, for example, the British war debt. In 1945 this country loaned the British Government $3.75 billion. The most recent report, issued last June, shows that $3,149,059,000 is due on that note. It is a 2-percent note.

Under this bill as reported by the committee and before the Senate today we could sell participation certificates on that note, pay, we will say, 5 percent or 5½ percent on it, and put that note up as collateral but with the guarantee of payment by the U.S. Government. Why pay this extra 3 to 3½ percent to subsidize the difference in the interest rates?

That is an unsound proposal. The administration ran for cover as soon as it was exposed. One official in the Treasury Department argued that they did not intend for it to be in the bill; however, the chairman of the committee just now said he knew what was in this bill; so I presume other people did know it was there and intended it to be.

But, nevertheless, this is a perfect example of how unsound this proposal is. We are speaking of billions of dollars. I doubt if there are very many men in the country who understand a billion dollars. Certainly I am not one of them.

But to reduce this to layman's language, suppose a man has a $1,000 note representing money he has loaned to some friend on the side which is secured by a mortgage against his farm, or perhaps it is just a plain outstanding note.

The operating expenses of his family exceed his income so he goes to the bank and arranges to discount the note by signing as endorser on the note. He receives $1,000, puts it in his regular family income, and proceeds to spend the money. Can he say that for this particular year he has a boost in his income, and can he then spend this $1,000 more than he earns and still say that he has a balanced family budget? Theoretically, he does not owe the money unless the note is defaulted. This is the same procedure before us today. We can discount notes of the CCC—$2 billion. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a Government corporation and is already $7 billion in the red. According to the last June 30 report CCC had borrowed from the Treasury $13,539 million. Its inventory assets were listed at $3,892 million. That includes the cost of their commodities at full value, including storage costs.

In addition it had loans of $2,494 million. These loans represented money the CCC borrowed from the Treasury. Now under this bill they would sell the notes, take the money, and instead of paying the Treasury from whom they borrowed the money, they would put it in the general revenue and spend it on Great Society programs, conceivably to help balance the budget. This is a poor method of keeping books. This is fiscal irresponsibility, and those are the words used by a man who was once the majority leader and is now in the White House when this subject was discussed a few years ago. At that time, I agreed with him that it was fiscal irresponsibility, the only trouble is that he has changed his mind since entering the White House.

We should not finance the Federal Government with any such irresponsible method as this. We need more truth in Government so far as the American taxpayer is concerned.

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. DOMINICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Listed on page 18 is the Rural Electrification Administration, showing direct loans of something over $4 billion. Those loans were made at 2 percent. If we put all that in the pool and then sold the certificates—and let us assume that they sell for 5½ percent—on every dollar of an REA loan, we would be losing 3½ percent; is that not correct?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** If we put enough in here, we can go broke that much faster. It is like the fellow who sells suits under cost. When I said to him, "How do you do it?" he said, "That is because I sell so many of them." That is exactly what is involved here. Put in more of this 2 percent paper and we will lose 3½ percent on every dollar. I cannot think of a faster or a better way to go broke than doing just that.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The strange thing is that we can go broke without the American people realizing it, because to the extent we sold $1 billion in notes in this manner, we would reduce the deficit as it is reported at the end of the year, and accordingly we would reduce the national debt by that much. We would not, however, have reduced the obligations to the U.S. Government to make good on that $1 billion. The only thing we would have done would be to eliminate it from the bookkeeping.

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** That is correct.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** I have not analyzed this situation, but when we make a loan to the REA at 2 percent, when we borrowed the money at 3¾ percent, let us say, to make the loan, we would immediately lose 1¾ percent; but now we take the securities which the REA has given to us and on which they pay us 2 percent, and we sell certificates which cover these REA securities in a pool and we pay, let us say, 3¾ percent on the certificates; is that not correct?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. We would be paying 5.3.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** Five and three-tenths.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Five and three-tenths.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** That means we would lose 1.75 percent on the initial transaction and will now lose an additional 3.5 percent in the second transaction; is that not correct?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. No—not exactly.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** I have not calculated it.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. If we now lose 1.75 percent on the initial transaction our loss will be increased about double. We would be losing the difference between 2 percent and the 5.3. We would be losing 3.25 percent on that particular loan instead of 1.75.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the fact is, we would be losing the difference between the interest rate that we collect on the securities which we bought and the interest rate that we have to pay on the certificates? Is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] pointed out, we would be doubling the loss and going broke faster under this method.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to summarize again some of the questions I asked the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. First, the debt ceiling is not applicable to the sale of these bonds because it is not a debt.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The sale of the participation certifications is outside the so-called statutory debt limit. It is the same as if the Senator or I discounted a note at the bank and then said that we do not owe the money because it was not a direct loan.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But that would not be counted as part of the national debt.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I see——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Just a minute——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I really cannot keep silent while this talk is being bandied back and forth about REA loans being involved, because if the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Ohio will look at the hearings on page 96, they will find a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Schultze, dated April 29, addressed to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], which states in part:

> I can assure you that in no event under the legislation now before your committee will any participations be sold in any REA loans.

Now, for Heaven sake, let us keep the discussion to the point and not take up utterly extraneous issues.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is correct as to that statement being in the record. But the authority to sell these REA bonds is in the pending bill. The point I make is, if they do not intend to sell them then why did they ask for the authority in the bill?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The authority is in the bill. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator knows that in earlier colloquy, which took place an hour and 15 minutes ago, I made it clear that an amendment would be offered which would exclude REA loans, which would exclude foreign-aid loans, and which would exclude other foreign loans, and include a little under $11 billion of the $33 billion portfolio. Most of the arguments the Senator has made since that time have related to this point. If the Senator is interested in killing time by discussions of this character extraneous to the issue which is now before the Senate, I shall be glad to stay here as long as the Senator wishes; but I believe that it should be made clear now—because it may have been forgotten in the hour and 15 minutes which have elapsed since the earlier colloquy to which I have referred—that what the Senator is talking about is not going to be acted upon in the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let me say this. The point I make is, that the authority is in the bill. They tried to put through the bill in a hurry. And had it been voted on 2 days ago, as attempted, it would still be in the bill. I repeat the authority is in the bill to sell the full amount of $33 billion. There is no question about the authority. The Senator from Maine who is in charge of the bill, states that he will offer an amendment to exclude it. Certainly he cannot exclude that which is not in the bill. The point I am making is: Why did they ever seek such wide authority in the bill in the first place?

They have a tabulation of the items in the committee report. I did not write this tabulation for I am not on the committee—but the tabulation shows that under the bill the administration seeks authority to sell $33 billion worth. There is no argument on that. Since we began the debate and pointed out the complete absurdity of selling bonds, such as the British loan, the CCC, and the REA loans, I understand that there will be an amendment offered that will remove these items from the bill. I am glad that they offered to straighten this out, but the point is—and let us get it straight—this authority is in here now, and an effort was made to keep it in there. If the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. LAUSCHE. The point that I am trying to make is——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is out of order.

Mr. MUSKIE. I will be glad to cover this at greater length subsequently, but I wanted to make it clear that what we are talking about is not relevant to the issue——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is out of order. Let the Senator from Delaware determine to whom he shall yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thought the Senator from Delaware had yielded to me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It seems to me that the louder the voice the quicker the recognition.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, I yielded to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is what I understood.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The principle I was trying to establish, whether it was the British loan or the REA loan, is that there will be an added cost to the Federal Government if the program is adopted. What the exact amount is cannot be foretold except through the statement made by the Director of the Budget that it will be either one-fourth of 1 percent or thirty-five one-hundredths of 1 percent.

My second question is, Is it likely and is it probable that if these additional funds are obtained through the disposition of assets, instead of spending through the collection of current taxes, there will be increased spending?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no question but that that is the whole purpose of the bill. It is the purpose of the administration to carry its increased spending programs forward without showing a deficit on the books, and it would temporarily relieve the necessity for increasing taxes to that extent. We would be financing the cost of the Great Society programs by selling this Government's assets. As I pointed out before, it is like a farmer selling a part of his farm to pay for current living expenses in the hope that some day he will have a greater income. This is wrong. If it is done the American people ought to know what we are doing. We are liquidating some of our assets in order to spend more money today.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the adoption of this bill be more costly to the American people than a program of selling bonds?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly; there is no question about it. The lowest estimate made is that the additional cost will be one-quarter of 1 percent. An estimate has been made all the way from one-quarter to seven-tenths of 1 percent. The most recent rate of FNMA is an extra six-tenths of 1 percent. But even that additional one-quarter percent will mean an additional cost of $5 million annually for each $1 billion of the participation certificates sold not only for 1 year, but for all the years they are outstanding. So we are dealing with extra costs of at least $50 million a year for the next 10 or 15 years. This is wholly unnecessary because the loans can be financed at a lower cost.

The cost does not go to the benefit of anyone except the bankers. I do not know what the title of the bill is, but perhaps the administration should call it a poverty program for the administration's banking friends.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What becomes of the important subject of deficit financing if the Government contemplates financing Government expenditures by the sale of its capital assets and refuses to levy taxes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Government would be deceiving the American people as to the true cost of its programs. Some day, when the last of these assets is gone, we will wake up with a shock, disturbing to all of us.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was it not contemplated when these lending agencies and guaranteeing agencies were established that as the funds were collected back, the funds would be used for the purpose of reducing the debt which was incurred in financing the lending and credit guaranteeing agencies?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, and that is the heart of this whole argument. When these loans were made the Goverment borrowed to finance them, and it was contemplated that when they were repaid the money would be used to pay off the bonds that were issued to borrow the money to finance these programs. Now it is proposed, to sell these notes and put the proceeds in the general revenues. This will help avoid raising extra taxes now yet still let them keep spending. I think we are inviting a chaotic situation at a later date. Chamberlain went to Munich to obtain what he thought was peace for his day. The administration in advocating this measure here today is equally shortsighted.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was with interest that I listened to the manager of the bill say that there would be an amendment presented for the elimination of foreign aid loans, British loans, REA loans, and others. In due time I propose to interrogate the Senator on that subject.

What I wish to ask about now is whether the 3-percent housing loans, some of which are FNMA and some of which are FHA, will be included? If they are included as a basis for these participation certificates, it will mean that, as a Government, we will be drawing 3 percent on those moneys and will be paying 5 percent or more plus a service charge. In due time I shall interrogate the Senator from Maine on that point.

However, in the colloquy it was said it was irrelevant to discuss REA loans, British loans, and foreign aid loans, because an amendment will be proposed, and accepted by the majority, to exempt those. This Senator cannot understand why it is irrelevant.

I have reviewed the extent of the hearings on this bill. It was said there were 2 days of hearings. I presume those days were April 26 and April 28. I would like to ask the Senator from Maine if there were hearings other than those on this bill or subject in recent days or weeks.

Mr. MUSKIE. There were hearings on those 2 days to which the Senator has referred, and then on S. 2499, which includes the same principle, there was a hearing——

Mr. HRUSKA. I am not interested in that——

Mr. MUSKIE. I thought the Senator was interested in whether there was a hearing on a comparable subject. If he is not interested, why does he ask me the question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I did not ask for that information. The Senator from Maine said there were hearings prior to the introduction of the bill. My question was whether there were other hearings.

Mr. MUSKIE. I said there were 2 days of hearings on the bill, one on the day before it was introduced and one on the day after it was introduced. I was trying to provide the Senator excess information. I apologize for having made that effort.

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no need to apologize. The Senator is always generous with his information, and I am grateful to him.

My question was not for the purpose of being unfair to the committee. I would observe that reference to the hearings will show there were two witnesses on that first day, both proponents of this bill. On the first day the hearing opened at 10:05 and lasted approximately 2 hours. The second hearing ran from about 10:05 to 11:11, or approximately 1 hour. With this large amount involved, I do wonder how many million dollars a minute that would be. The mortgage banking witness stated that he was notified about the hearing at 9:15, which certainly did not give him much time. Here we have proposed a radical departure from our present fiscal and monetary policy, and there are only four witnesses who testified, two officials of the Government on April 26, and two on April 28, one of them not a banker, who appeared for a total time of 1 hour and 6 minutes.

So the relevancy of the colloquy is that with this meager record of a hearing, we have a bill involving huge sums of money.

I want to say to the Senator from Delaware that if he persists with a motion to recommit the bill to the committee, perhaps it can be ascertained if there are additional billions of dollars that would be involved. Perhaps the executive would like to inform us. Certainly the taxpayers and the American people should know. I subscribe to his statement. I agree there should be truth in packaging and truth in lending. But when it comes to Presidential messages, then we are in the dark as to truth in Government in disclosing our true fiscal picture.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his contribution. He has pointed out the fact that hearings held on the 28th, the second day, lasted about 1 hour. The bill was only introduced the day before. The Senator knows that when bills are introduced they do not come back until 10 or 10:30 the following day. That means that the hearings were practically over before the bill arrived. One witness said that he was notified to testify at 9 a.m. This means that he did not even have a copy of the bill before he came down to testify. This is highly irregular.

There were practically no hearings in the House of Representatives on this $33 billion proposal.

Certainly, it is not out of line to ask that this bill go back to committee. I would be willing to make a motion, but rather than making a motion to send it back to the committee I would like to have an agreement with the manager that he will agree to its return and report back whatever findings and recommendations the committee may have.

We are told under this bill that they are not proposing to use any of these funds until next year; therefore, there is no reason why it has to be steamrollered through. However, I am very much encouraged by the fact that we have been promised that amendments will be offered to delete $20 billion, or two-thirds of the proposed authority that was originally asked for in this bill. That is progress, but at the same time this is not the place to deal with amendments concerning $10 billion and $20 billion each.

How many more billions of dollars are in the bill that neither of us know about? Apparently neither do members of the committee. Some members indicate they did not know that REA loans were included.

When the Senator from Nebraska said this just a moment ago, a member of the committee took exception to our discussing REA loans because he did not know they were in the bill. But they are a part of this bill.

Under the bill, $4 billion in REA loans—2-percent notes—and $2,115 million worth of notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation could be sold.

Under this bill they could sell not only $3 billion of the British war debt, but in addition there are $8,997 million worth of loans made by the Department of State under AID which could be sold.

Are those to be sold? If so, what kind of situation would we be in? We cannot collect interest now on many of these loans. Yet we would have to pay 5.5 percent on their resale.

There are many questions that should be clearer to the Senate when we vote.

I asked if these participation certificates are Government-guaranteed obligations. The answer was "yes." But they did not know if they would be sold in denominations of $1,000 so that the average John Doe could buy one of these high-interest-bearing bonds, or whether they would be in the minimum amounts of $50,000 or $1 million bonds, available only to a select crowd. Those answers are not here, and they should be here. They can be here only by the committee's obtaining an answer from the administration before we vote on the bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I have here the report of the other body on this particular bill. I am not talking about the principle. We do not enact principles in this body any more than they do in the other body. We enact specific bills.

The minority views contained this statement:

> These views are for those who may wonder why a committee of the House of Representatives must report to the House after 3 hours of public testimony a bill whose gestation period in the Bureau of the Budget was at least 3—perhaps as long as 6 months.

By the time it was reported by the House committee, after 3 hours of hearings in the committee, and the time we reached the floor here, as of today, we find two-thirds of the loans that originally were involved in this bill pared away and only $10 or $11 billion left.

I ask the Senator if there is not some reasonable likelihood if there were further scrutiny of the remaining $10 or $11 billion, whether or not there would be a likelihood of even further reduction or greater safeguards in this legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think there could and I think it would be well to have more study. I point out again that this has been a highly irregular procedure when 1 day of hearings were held before the bill was introduced, and the second day hearings were held before the bill came back from the printer. Surely we are not in that great a hurry. There must be something in here that the administration did not want us to discover. If they had been successful in steamrolling this through last Tuesday they would have had it through with the authority for the full $33 billion. Already by our debate we have knocked out over $21 billion.

I appeal to the manager of the bill to take this bill back to the committee without making a rollcall vote necessary; but to take it back to the committee with the understanding that they will rewrite the bill and delete those provisions they now admit should not have been in the bill in the first place; and then report the bill back after hearings.

I wonder if the Senator from Maine would not agree to such a procedure?

Mr. MUSKIE. I take it that the Senator is awaiting an answer. I would be glad to say what I have already said to him personally.

In the first place, I can only speak for myself, and I have not made any such amendments as the Senator suggested have been made.

This bill involves points upon which Senators on the Republican side of the aisle and Senators on my side of the aisle have agreed; relatively few amendments and nothing involving the kind of major surgery of which the Senator speaks.

The major amendment involved is simply implementation of the program which the President spelled out in the same detail as is found in the amendment, which we are introducing when we have time, and the programs that are to be covered.

The President's letter of transmittal was dated April 20, 1966. It spells out the loan programs which were to be included in the next fiscal year if this legislation is enacted.

The major amendments, which we were about to introduce when the Senator from Delaware has finished, simply incorporate what has been the intention right along. There is no new intention whatsoever.

We have offered the amendment for the purpose of reassuring the Senator from Delaware and others that we meant what the President said in his letter of April 20.

The Senator says because we offer an amendment to reassure him that that offer is evidence in and of itself that the bill needs major surgery. Perhaps we should not undertake to make amendments to develop a meeting; of the minds and consensus to the extent we can.

The amendment is offered in a helpful way, trying to reassure the Senator that what the President said on April 20 was what the President meant and what the agencies would do if it is enacted.

The other amendments are relatively minor.

Three offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] are technical amendments involving nothing like major surgery.

The most important of those three is an amendment designed to place before Congress annually a record of what transpired under the program in the preceding year. This does not involve major surgery, as I see it.

There is one other amendment which I think was originated by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], undertaking to set a limit of 1 year on this authorization. The Senator from Utah and I agreed to the modifying amendment to set a limit of 2 years.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Will the Senator repeat the last statement?

Mr. MUSKIE. I said that the amendment originally suggested to me by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would have placed a minimum of 1 year on the authorization. I agreed to accept the amendment, provided the Senator would modify it so as to provide for 2 years. We are prepared to accept that amendment. This does not involve major surgery.

So we have considered and discussed with the Treasury all the points that have been raised prior to today by the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Delaware, and other Senators, and we are prepared to offer amendments now to implement them. No other difficulty requiring major surgery on the bill has been brought to my attention.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we are told that some of the amendments are just minor and technical but——

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, that is not at all an accurate paraphrase of what the Senator from Maine said. The record speaks for itself. I spoke of the major amendment, and I described it at some length. I did not call it minor or technical, and the Senator from Delaware knows I did not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will control his blood pressure.

Mr. MUSKIE. My blood pressure is about the same as that of the Senator from Delaware, and will remain at that level. I submit to the Senator that he is in no position to read what is in this Senator's mind. I suggest that he confine himself to what is in his own mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I make no effort to read what is in the Senator's mind.

The bill as it was reported carried authority to sell $4 billion of the REA loans. I am reading from the report. We are told that that will be deleted.

The bill as it is reported provides authority to sell $2,115 million worth of Commodity Credit Corporation notes. We are now told that this item will be deleted.

The bill as reported by the committee provided authority to sell $8,897 million worth of Department of State or AID loans. We are told that that item will be deleted.

I also understood that the amount of the British loan would be deleted. I intend to obtain the proper understanding on all these items before we vote on this bill.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion and ask that it be given immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The motion will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] moves that S. 3283 be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on this motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the bill contain a limitation on the dollar quantity of the bonds that may be put into the pool?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The limitation under the bill, as I have been apprised by all authorities concerned, is $33 billion, as the bill was originally reported. Now we are told that the limitation will be modified downward. As to around $11 billion. We need another committee report to state exactly what will be left in the bill.

I am glad to get this $20 billion reduction which means that two-thirds of the first required authority will be eliminated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield, so that I may ask a question of Senator MUSKIE?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the understanding of the Senator from Maine as to whether there is a limitation on the dollar quantity of the bonds and securities that can be put in the pool?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield so that I may answer the question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. The proper answer to the Senator's question involves two points: First, what would be authorized? Second, what is planned to be done under the authorization?

On the authorization, the bill as now written would cover roughly $33 billion worth of loans. Under the bill as it would be amended, if and when we reach the point of amending the bill, the authorization would cover programs involving $10.9 billion worth of loans.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the amendment requiring a 2-year limitation also be included in the bill?

Mr. MUSKIE. I have that amendment ready to offer, yes.

With respect to what would be used under the authorization, it is planned, and has been planned right along, as indicated in the President's and in the administration's communications to the committee, in fiscal year 1967—that is the next fiscal year—to program $4.7 billion worth of loans. Of that amount, some portion—$1.8 billion or $1.9 billion—could be sold in this way under existing law. Actually, under the authorization we are considering now, of the $4.7 billion that it is planned to program next year, $2.8 billion would be added by the proposed legislation.

These are the best figures I have.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, at this point the Senate may be interested in a little current history.

The companion bill in the House has been before the Committee on Rules today, and that committee adjourned without giving the bill a rule. The inference is that the Committee on Rules will consider the bill again, no sooner than 1 week from today; so if it would be more effective for the Senate to recommit the bill to committee and make the proposed changes, in effect the other body has given us practically 1 week to do so.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield, I wish to ask him a question or two.

Mr. MUSKIE. I shall be delighted to answer.

Mr. BENNETT. First, let the Senator from Utah say that if the bill is recommitted, the committee will have an opportunity to examine all the proposed amendments. If the bill is not recommitted, the amendment will be discussed on the floor of the Senate and disposed of there.

On Tuesday, I gave to the Senator from Maine a number of amendments to the bill that I thought should be considered. He graciously had them checked, and we have now reached a satisfactory arrangement as to most of them. However, the Senator from Utah has just become aware of the answer given by the Treasury to his proposed amendment on page 4, which would strike these words:

> The effect of both past and future sales of any issue of beneficial interests or participations shall be the same, to the extent of the principal of such issue, as the direct sale of the obligations subject to the trust.

I am sure the Senator is aware of the amendment, but I wish to discuss with him the answer the Treasury gave regarding its implications, in order to determine whether I have the same understanding of the meaning of that answer.

Mr. MUSKIE. Would the Senator pause for a moment, until I get my copy of that answer?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Is the Senator referring to the language on page 4?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; lines 7 to 10.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. As a background for our discussion, let me read the answer of the Treasury Department so that the other Senators can hear it. It reads:

> The purpose of the provision which this amendment would delete is to make absolutely clear that a sale of a participation in a pool of loans is the same as the direct sale of a loan, and should be treated as a direct sale of a loan in the Government's accounts.

I assume that there is a difference between the two. I continue to read:

> The provision is included to avoid the contention which might be made that as long as the Government retains the paper evidencing the loan, even though it has sold an interest in the loan to someone else, the total face amount of the loan must remain a charge against any limitation placed on the total amount of loans which may be made.

Then the letter goes on to make an illustration as follows:

> The effect of the provision can best be illustrated in the case of FNMA. The total amount of mortgages that FNMA may purchase, or commit itself to purchase, under its special assistance functions is limited, currently to approximately $3,700 million. Whenever FNMA (special assistance functions) purchases a mortgage, or agrees to purchase a mortgage, the face amount of that mortgage is charged against the total purchase authority, and the available purchase authority is reduced.

I think that is perfectly clear.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. I continue to read from the letter:

> When a mortgage payment is made, or when a mortgage is sold, the charge against the purchase authority is reduced, and the purchase authority is restored. If FNMA bought a participation in a mortgage (as it has authority to do), the amount of the participation bought would be charged against the purchase authority, even though the Government did not take possession of the paper evidencing the underlying loan.

I can understand that. I continue to read:

> If the participation were subsequently sold, the charge against the purchase authority would be reduced.

We are talking about participation in a particular, single loan and not about an issuance of participation certificates.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. I continue to read from the letter:

> This provision insures that a participation sold by FNMA is considered in the same way as a participation bought by FNMA.

That is perfectly clear to me and I have no question about it. I continue to read from the letter:

> If this amendment were adopted and this provision were eliminated from the bill, the action might be interpreted as congressional intent that a sale of participations in an asset was not to be treated in the same way as a direct sale of the asset.

To the extent that they are referring to participation in single loans, I have no problem. However, I suggest a hypothetical situation that could exist under the bill, and this is what gives me a problem. Suppose that agency X has an authorization limit, not an appropriation limit, of $100 million, and suppose that it is loaned to its limit so that it has no further authorization available.

If this bill were to pass, and the agency were to take $12 million of its loans and place that amount in a pool and sell participation of $10 million against that, would that action free $10 million? Title would not pass to the loan.

Would that action create a situation in which the agency could actually have $110 million worth of loans outstanding because it has sold $10 million worth of participation, and could the agency thus break through the authorization ceiling?

The purpose of my amendment was not to interfere with FNMA participation—I do not want to use the word "involvement"—in a joint loan program with somebody on the outside with respect to a single loan. I hope this bill will not be interpreted to the point at which it can be used to break through authorization ceilings.

Mr. MUSKIE. I probed this question rather thoroughly myself because many programs with different substantive laws or charters are involved.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. I found that it was most difficult to categorize them with respect to the question—the very proper question—that the Senator asked.

I shall try to give an answer that is as responsive and as understandable as I can on the basis of my understanding of what has been told me.

The question basically that the Senator asks is whether the proceeds of these participation certificates can be used by the lending agency for additional loans.

Mr. BENNETT. Beyond the authorization ceiling.

Mr. MUSKIE. I wish that the Senator would withhold that part of the question.

Mr. BENNETT. All right.

Mr. MUSKIE. The question the Senator asks is whether the proceeds of these participation certificates would be available for additional loans. My answer is that it would depend completely upon what the program's basic legislation provides.

There are two broad categories that I think we can distinguished on this point. First, there are programs in which there is a ceiling on the total amount of the outstanding loans. Second, there are programs in which there is no ceiling, but in which there is a limit on the amount of new loans that can be created each year. There are these two broad categories.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to clarify those two categories. Is the Senator referring in the second category to a kind of moving ceiling?

Mr. MUSKIE. For example, in the Farmers Home Administration and the academic facilities program, two of which would be included under the bill when the amendment is agreed to, there is a stated amount of new loans that are authorized each year.

Mr. BENNETT. It would grow by increment rather than by ceiling.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct with respect to that, as I understand it; that the increment cannot be enlarged by the proceeds of participation certificate sales from existing loans. Do I make that clear?

Mr. BENNETT. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. MUSKIE. So as to that category of loans, which covers two of the eight programs which are involved, the answer to the question of the Senator is "No."

Now, with respect to programs which have a ceiling on the total outstanding loans, there is a different answer. Let me list those which are involved. They are the Small Business Administration, college housing, FNMA, Export-Import Bank of Washington, public facilities, and VA direct loans.

With respect to Small Business Administration, the answer is "No." This has been the position taken by the SBA in its interpretation of its lending authority, so that even on the direct sale of these loans, it does not regard the proceeds of such direct sales as eligible for new loans without authorization from Congress.

So that with respect to SBA the answer is "No." With respect to the other five programs, the answer is the same as it would be for direct sales of these loans, and direct sales of course can be with or without recourse.

As to the direct sales with recourse to the Government, which are comparable in terms of the continuing Government liability, the answer is the same as it would be under the pending bill with regard to the sale of participation certificates.

Now, with respect to sales of these loan papers without recourse, those cannot be used—I think I am correct on this—under existing law to renew or to enlarge the lending authority and, of course, would not be covered under this legislation.

Now let me see if I can summarize what I have said to the Senator. His basic question, as I understood it, was whether or not the proceeds of the sales of participation certificates can be used for new loans.

Mr. BENNETT. Above——

Mr. MUSKIE. Well, whether it is above or below the ceiling is something that is argumentative.

Mr. BENNETT. All right; leave that out.

Mr. MUSKIE. If we leave that out, it depends upon, first of all, whether or not there is a ceiling on the agency's total outstanding loans. If there is no ceiling, and the agency's program is governed by limits on the amount of new loans that can be made each year, the sale of certificates cannot be used to enlarge those limits.

With respect to SBA where there is a ceiling on total outstanding loans, the proceeds of the sale of participation certificates cannot be used for new loans. With respect to other agencies where there is a ceiling on total outstanding loans, they would be treated under this legislation in the same way that the proceeds of direct sales of the loan paper would be treated.

Mr. BENNETT. This leads me to wonder whether we should not have more language in the bill to deal with the problem. That is a very simple statement; but behind the statement are two or three variations of treatment.

Mr. MUSKIE. May I make one other point before I forget it?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. It is a point that I think is very pertinent on the question which the Senator has raised. Under the bill, the Widnall amendment requires specific appropriation acts to authorize the creation of participation sales pools to be implemented under this act. As the Appropriations Committee considers requests from the administration for specific authority, which the Widnall amendment requires, the facts—bearing upon the point that the Senator has raised—will, of course, be taken into consideration, and the Appropriations Committee can decide to what extent the requests made by the administration for authority are to be limited or reduced by the law bearing upon the use of proceeds of such sales in the agencies involved.

Mr. BENNETT. I think I understand the Senator's explanation. But the Senator from Utah really wonders whether we should not write these distinctions into the bill, rather than depend on a very simple phrase which, on its face, is not clear and requires a very careful explanation every time somebody reads it and asks, "What does this mean?"

Mr. MUSKIE. The difficulty with writing it into the bill, as the Senator knows, is that there are as many charters as there are programs, some 51 in all. There are about 10 under this bill. To try to capsule the existing state of the law with respect to each agency would, I think, entail an impossible legislative task.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator made it clear that there are essentially two categories of agencies, those that operate under a ceiling and those that operate under annual increments; and then we have a subclassification—those that are sold with recourse and those that are sold without recourse.

If this is an accurate and complete analysis of the problem we are facing, that does not seem to me to be insuperable.

Mr. MUSKIE. Whether it is accurate or complete, of course, depends upon this Senator's expertise and understanding of this field. I have not tried to mislead the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. I am well aware of that.

Mr. MUSKIE. I have spent a good deal of time attempting to get the facts so that I could answer this question, which I expected to be asked, as clearly and precisely as I could. But as to further legislation dealing with this point, I think it depends upon whether or not the Senator wishes to change the present state of the law. I think if we wish to change the basic state of the law on it, there are probably two approaches: First, to amend each of the substantive statutes involved, or second, an across-the-board, meat-ax approach which may produce undesirable results.

The intent of the bill—and this I can state clearly—is that as to those programs where the proceeds of the sales of direct loans can be used for new loans under present law, it is the intent of this bill that the proceeds of the sale of participation certificates could be used to the same effect.

Mr. BENNETT. As though they were sales of the loans themselves?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is correct. In those programs where that is possible now, that is the intent of this bill.

Whether or not such proceeds are in fact used for new loans can be controlled by the Appropriations Committees in the first instance, at the time that they authorize the sale of the participation certificates for the pool arrangement that is proposed; and, second, of course, the agency itself may choose not to use the available funds for new loans.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that. But let me return to my original question, and limit it with respect to those loan programs that are governed by a ceiling which has been set by law—which the Senator identifies for me as the Small Business Administration, College Housing, FNMA, Export-Import Bank, Public Facilities and VA direct loans.

Is it not theoretically and in effect actually possible that, since the Federal Government is to retain title to the loans, the actual volume of loans in the agency's portfolio can have a face value higher than the ceiling?

Mr. MUSKIE. Well, as the Senator knows, under another amendment that he has proposed, which he will offer and to which I have agreed, the legislation will provide that title will have passed to FNMA. I think that was the effect of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. All right.

Mr. MUSKIE. Title will have passed to FNMA.

Mr. BENNETT. But FNMA is in this list.

Mr. MUSKIE. FNMA as trustee with respect to agencies outside itself.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes. I still return to the question: Are we creating a situation under which, as far as the record goes, the actual face value of loans held by FNMA as trustee or held by FNMA for its own sake, or any other agency governed by a ceiling, the actual dollar volume of the loans in the portfolio will be higher than the ceiling?

Mr. MUSKIE. That depends, of course, upon what accounting method a given Senator prefers.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Under the present state of the law, when paper is sold on direct sales, with recourse to the Government, that paper is not listed as part of the national debt.

Mr. BENNETT. It is gone. It has been sold.

Mr. MUSKIE. But still the Government is obligated. It is sold with recourse to the Government if the paper goes bad.

So the situation I am talking about, under the proposed legislation, would be exactly the same. The accounting, presumably, should be about the same, because it is a contingent obligation of the Government.

Most of the loans will be repaid—at least the history is that most of them have been—so that the liability of the Government is contingent and much smaller than the face amount, and there is participation by the private sector.

How is this paper to be accounted for? Different Senators will have different preferences. Schedule E of the budget, which now discusses, in 13 pages of detail, the Federal credit programs, presumably would continue to disclose what is happening under this program.

Then, in addition, another amendment which will be offered by the Senator would require reporting to the Congress, so that the information would be available to us.

The Senator and I both regret that it is not possible to show the budget of the

United States on a single page. It would be possible at a glance to see the total assets of the Government, the total liabilities of the Government; but minor as are the financial operations of the Senator from Maine, I cannot show mine on one page. Therefore, I believe that most of the space is taken by liabilities rather than by assets. Nevertheless, it is a difficult thing to do.

(At this point Mrs. Neuberger took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I appreciate the desire of the Senator from Utah—and I concur and support it—that we try to make the record of what we are doing under these programs as clear as we can. Unfortunately, because of the details involved and the number of programs and the variations involved, if we were not to tell the whole story, we would be deceiving the American people because we would be hiding the variations and the details.

How do we compromise between full disclosure which will give so many details as to be confusing, or partial disclosure? When we get to that point, what do we disclose or what do we not disclose, which would perhaps give a clearer picture to the extent that it would ignore the details and thus be slightly inaccurate—I do not use the word "deceptive," but "inaccurate."

The problems of accounting are not simple. We should try to make the accounting as simple as possible, of course, but should recognize that we cannot make it as simple as we might like.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the help of the Senator from Maine in discussing this problem. I am still puzzled and a little bothered. Perhaps, with a little time, we could find a solution which would make this clearer; but, as of now, I still feel that on the basis of the standards of present accounting, we will find ourselves facing a situation in which we will have to decide how much margin we still have under the ceiling. I believe that it would be simpler if we could find some kind of system by which the selling of participation certificates, while we still hold the assets, would not impinge on this problem of, "Have we bumped our head against the ceiling?"

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has the floor, but I will be glad to yield the floor at this time.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I will take the floor then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, in 1959, there was before the Senate a bill embodying the principle substantially as it appears in the pending bill today. President Eisenhower contemplated and proceeded to exchange mortgages held by FNMA for Government bonds so that he would have moneys to finance 1960 operations.

A resolution was submitted in the Senate condemning President Eisenhower's program of disposing of FNMA securities at a return less than would be obtainable by the Government if it continued possessing them.

In 1959, with 56 other Senators, I joined in disapproving what President Eisenhower had a right to do. The vote was 56 to 29. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] disapproved of the President's program, and I disapproved.

My question to the Senator from Maine is: If, in 1959 I disapproved of the disposition of FNMA mortgages for the purpose of financing current operations, can I consistently vote today to support President Johnson's proposal that he dispose of Government securities in FNMA or other organizations to finance current operations?

Mr. MUSKIE. Of course, that is a question which the Senator from Ohio will have to decide for himself. There may very well have been changes in the Senator's view of the problem, changes in the problem itself, and changes in market conditions then and now. Perhaps other conditions are different now than they were then, and the Senator from Ohio might wish to take them into consideration which conceivably would lead him to a different conclusion. That is a question for the Senator to determine.

We had an interesting colloquy on the floor on Tuesday on this point of consistency, with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], and I agree that the vast majority of Senators, on both sides of the aisle, are still inconsistent with the issue which has been raised.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, in 1959, the Senator from Maine stated that President Eisenhower was wrong in what he was trying to do, but today he argues that President Johnson is right in trying to do the same thing which was wrong when recommended by President Eisenhower. Is the answer that conditions have changed?

Mr. MUSKIE. Again, the Senator from Ohio missed a very enlightening discussion of the position of the Senator from Maine which took place on Tuesday afternoon, wherein was raised the same question which the Senator is now raising. I must say, on the record, I am inconsistent. The Senator from Delaware asked me why I take the position that I take now. The answer I made to the Senator is that I have been further exposed to the problems which have become more aggravated since 1959. The problem keeps climbing, so I finally have come to the conclusion that it was necessary to do something to devise some reasonable uses, which I outlined to the Senator from Ohio, as I did to the Senator from Delaware on Monday. That is the record. I can be accused of partisan expediency. Whether I am or not will depend upon how credible my explanation is to the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, the only reason I raise the issue is that the Senator from Maine threw me into consternation a short time ago——

Mr. MUSKIE. I did that privately, not publicly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He talked to me about taking an inconsistent position. The fact is, I opposed President Eisenhower's proposal and today I am opposing President Johnson's proposal. I will be consistent on the item—that is, I take the position that we cannot start selling capital assets to finance current operations; we cannot start selling assets to avoid deficits; we cannot start selling capital assets to escape the limitations on the right to incur debts on the ceiling adopted by the Congress which now is $328 billion; nor can we do so to escape the interest limitation of 4¼ percent which is now allowed to be paid on the borrowing of money.

Madam President, I wish the record to show that I was greatly relieved after the Senator from Maine said, "You are inconsistent," to go to the record and find that I am completely consistent.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe that I should say, partly in justification of myself, and partly to reassure the distinguished Senator from Ohio, that what I might say in private was only to "needle" him. However, the record is something different from what I would say in private, seriously to challenge his record. It is not my intention to make any such challenge to him. There were a number of votes on the issue. I suppose an interpretation of those votes, of mine and of the Senator's, or anyone else's, could involve considerable controversy, as to whether a Senator is consistent or not; but that is not my purpose. The Senator's vote would be consistent with his 1959 vote on the merits of the bill, if he were to vote against the administration's proposal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I want to concede to the Senator from Maine that, finally, we have to decide whether there are new circumstances, because of the war in Vietnam, that might require a different vote in 1966, when we are acting on President Johnson's recommendation, compared to the vote which was cast when we were voting on President Eisenhower's recommendation.

But as for myself, Madam President, whether it was Eisenhower, the Republican or Johnson, the Democrat, my vote will be consistent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I have the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will wait for the Senator from Maine to conclude.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to comment on my remarks, I yield to him to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, may I address myself to the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, for the life of me, I cannot understand why Senators should insist that the Federal Government should engage in deceptive bookkeeping.

Take my State. Moneylenders make small business loans. They are permitted to charge 3½ percent a month. That works out to about 42 percent. With carrying charges it sometimes amounts to 100 percent a year on loans.

Those moneylenders do not want to compete with any legitimate Federal loan. They do not want the Federal Government to lend money to the small businessman or a poor man. So they contrive this method to show that the Government lends money to the REA, so that an electric line may be built; or to a small businessman, to help him stay in business, no matter how distressed he may be, so he can cut down his complete loss. It is put down on the books as though the Government had lost every cent of that loan.

The Government has not lost money. It may lend it at 3 percent, and may earn 5 percent on that money, and get most or all of that money back. But our lenders' friends, headed by that great institution, the Federal Reserve Board, want it written as though the Government had lost every penny of that loan. In the way our friends who back the moneylenders would like to get it on the books as if every penny of that loan had been lost.

With ingenuity, contrivance, and genius, they want it to appear that the money lent to poor people, every penny of which may be paid back by an honest, poor man, amounts to a loss of millions of dollars.

They and their lender friends, some of whom make the magnificent sum of 100 percent per year in interest, want it to appear that the Government is losing money because it makes the loans. Wonderful. If I were working for those moneylenders, I would be working hard to make people believe the same thing.

On the other hand, if I were trying to help a little businessman, a farmer, a small fellow trying to get a powerline so he could have an electric light in his home, then I would do my best to make it appear that that loan was not lost; that what the Government did was borrow money from the public, which includes that particular person, and loaned it to that little fellow, who wanted to improve his condition.

Certain Senators can engage in this mischief and do all they want to continue to do what has been done through the years and have an act passed by the Congress to say that this country is $325 billion in debt and has not 1 penny of assets; but we are the richest Nation in the world.

If one wants to borrow from a bank, he goes to a bank, and lists his assets first, and then he lists his liabilities. Then the liabilities are subtracted from the assets, and they show his net worth, and the banker will check out those assets.

By the time the banker subtracts one column from the other, the borrower ends up with having quite a bit, and he can be loaned a lot of money on that showing.

Our friends on the other side stand up and fight for the moneylenders who make 100 percent interest per year on the poor man who wants to bury his mother. By the time he gets around to paying his debt after 5 or 6 years, and having it refinanced, he ends up having paid the full cost and still owing more than what the original loan was on the day he buried his mother.

What are we trying to do? We are trying to say that if money is owing, the Government will be able to sell that note, so that the small businessman can be helped, so that the man who was in a "tight," who needed some money, who might have a little cotton gin in my part of the country, who could not get money from any bankers, who was trying to protect his creditors, who could have gone into bankruptcy, but did not want to, who was fighting to stay in business and pay off his debts in an honest way, who was willing to work himself down to a frazzle so he could stay in business, would be able to get a loan. Instead of a small bank going broke, for example, to the detriment of the people who own some of that bank stock, this small businessman gets another chance to make a living and pay off his honest debts.

How do we do that? We say, "Take the note. We will guarantee it. If you cannot make it, we will pay it off. Then we will sell the note and guarantee that the buyer will get every penny that the note states."

Here is another fellow. We will pay off the creditor. We will pay off the note. Everybody will be better off.

What is the only objection? Some of our friends on the other side of the aisle who represent moneylenders, who get handsomely rich off these people, say, "We must get rich, and every time the Federal Government helps a poor man, whatever is loaned to him must be counted as adding to the public debt and counted as a liability. Do not count the assets."

That is all we are talking about.

If we want to do so, we can even see to it that when a poor man is in a tight spot, he cannot borrow money from the Government. But if we want to help the small businessman, if we want to help the poor little fellow who is trying to pay off his honest debts, we should stand by our friend, the Senator from Maine, and stand up for the Small Business Administration, for the little man, and try to bypass all this complicated argument that is produced by the money lenders and their friends that when the Government lends money it should be considered as if it had lost every penny of it.

Why do they want it that way? Because if they can keep the Government from making loans, the loan sharks will be able to make a 100-percent return per year on their loans to these same hard-working Americans.

We talk about honest bookkeeping. This country is the richest nation in the world. Does anyone know of any country whose bonds yield a lower interest rate than ours? We are the richest nation in the world.

Our people are too well informed and they are too sophisticated to believe those stupid arguments that we are poor.

Now, we hear the Senator from Delaware stand on the floor and make speeches that if we want to help the small business people we must increase the national debt by that figure, even though they pay it back.

I hope that some day we will engage in honest bookkeeping, and we will set up an account, when we loan somebody money or if we borrow money, to show the difference in what we are paying them and what they are paying us. If we are subsidizing them, all right; that is what we are doing and we are willing to pay it.

On the small business loans we lost some money and we were happy to do it.

We are standing by the working man and the little man, the kind of people we Democrats represent. I hope that we will stand up and fight for these people.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I listened with a great deal of interest and amusement to the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana. I always enjoy them even though they do not have anything to do with the issue that is before the Senate today.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a fundamental question. The Senator comes from Delaware. One group elects him in Delaware. I assume that the best people in that State are informed, and they do not need small business loans. The people who vote for me in Louisiana do. I represent a different class of people.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Again I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I always enjoy his remarks and I shall yield to him any time he wishes.

This measure does not affect one iota the amount of money that could be loaned under the small business program. The only question before the Senate is the fact that some $33 billion worth of these loans have already been made. The Government holds the notes and now wants to sell them and apply the proceeds to pay daily expenses of Government.

The question before the Senate is: Will the Government sell those notes under participation certificates, put the money in the general revenue; and spend it as though it were additional income?

There are $33 billion worth of assets in small business, the REA, and various other agencies, and if the bill is passed or it was reported, the Government could, under the authority of this bill, sell this $33 billion worth of assets, put the money in general revenue, and conceivably for the next 3 years spend $10 billion more than it was taking in, and report to the American people that there was a balanced budget. That would be a deceitful practice.

The Senator from Louisiana and Senators on his side of the aisle made statements about the moneylenders getting rich in 1959 when President Eisenhower suggested this on a much smaller scale and I joined them in opposing the measure.

I quote one authority as to what this bill does:

> The purpose of the proposed bill is to balance the budget by selling off assets of the Federal Government—

That statement was made by a member of your own party, the majority leader, who is now the President of the United States. Both the Senator from Louisiana and I agreed with him in 1959.

Why does the Senator from Louisiana defend an action he condemned so bitterly only 7 years ago?

I still agree with that statement. It is fiscal irresponsibility. It is not truth in government; it is nothing but a windfall for the bankers as it was described in 1959. They will get an extra six-tenths of 1 percent in interest.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator for a question or for a speech.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator would like to help the rank-and-file people of this country; would be willing to join me in an effort to reverse the action of the Federal Reserve Board when it increased the rate of interest, in order to see if we cannot save this Government that $3 billion, and save the kind of people who work for a living about three times that much, or about $10 billion? Would he be willing to join in that effort? If he would, I think we might get somewhere.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am always interested in proposals of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Delaware will be the next chairman of the Committee on Finance when the Republicans take over.

I would be curious to know if he would be willing to join me in making that fight so that the people can pay a lower rate of interest, which is as much as 7 percent on housing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will reply to the Senator in the same manner as I did when he argued against interest rates under the Eisenhower administration. By the way, interest rates are higher today than they were then by 1 percent. Money is a commodity. As long as there is a greater demand for money than there is an available supply, the interest rates are going to go up. The best way to cut back interest rates is to stop deficit spending by the Federal Government, so that we will not have to borrow so much of it and be in competition with private industry.

As long as the Federal Government insists on spending $6 billion to $10 billion more than its income, it will have to go out into the money market, and there are bound to be higher interest rates.

Since 1961 this administration spent $36 billion more than it took in. That is $500 million a month deficit for every month since 1961. When the Government runs a deficit it has to borrow that money.

The way to cut back is as President Johnson suggested the other day, only he did not go far enough. He said that if the cost of pork chops is too high stop buying them. I say if the cost of money is too high, stop spending it, and then you will not have to borrow so much.

The President insists that the reason he cannot cut spending is because Congress is increasing appropriations. That may be true. There is only a minority of us trying to hold the line, but why does he not veto these bills?

I will join in raising a collection to buy a box of veto pens to send to the White House so the President can veto these bills.

But as long as the President keeps signing every spending bill I am not interested in his pious statement as to how much he is against spending. The only way to stop spending is to veto the bills. In Congress the only way to stop spending is to vote against the proposal. The way to bring down the interest rate is to stop deficit spending.

I will gladly join the Senator from Louisiana if he wants to make the effort and I suspect I will be leading the way.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman showed us how to keep interest rates low back at a time when demand was very high. They were viciously criticized by the moneylenders. I have not heard the Senator criticize them.

As far as I am concerned, I would like to keep interest rates low.

A man and his wife today who sign a mortgage have to pay 20 percent more by the time they get through paying for their home than they paid under the Truman administration. That is a big penalty to pay.

I would like to see the interest rate go back to where it was under those two Presidents. We had control then, in time of war. We had regulation acts to limit consumer buying on what one could buy in wartime.

As far as the rank and file of people were concerned, under those two Presidents they had a real interest in the money borrower, the little fellow, and the rate of interest was kept low. If they signed a 30-year mortgage, they could pay it out, and they were protected by a President who was on their side.

The Senator can be sure I will support any effort made to reduce interest rates. I did not hear him say that.

He did refer to various other things, such as putting taxes on them and engaging in various tactics, but I did not hear him say that he would use his best efforts to reduce the interest rate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The only way to reduce interest rates is to remove the cause for the interest rates being higher; that is, cut down on the demand. If there is too much air in a tire, it is not corrected by pumping in more air.

President Johnson recognized this at a recent conference at the White House. He appealed to the businessmen to cut back on plant expansion and the elimination of every project possible. He asked the housewives to cut back on their spending, but he failed to say that he would lead the way and cut back on Government expenditures.

He is insisting on the Federal Government continuing every Great Society program that he ever had. Perhaps some of these plans are meritorious but they can wait until we have won the war in Vietnam.

It is necessary to cut back when the money is not available. The President, rather than appealing to the businessman alone, would do much better to lead the parade and say, "I am going to cut back on Government spending. You join me." I would like to see him lead the parade. Instead, he is saying, "I want you to cut back, but I want the extra money you save so that I can spend it."

This is a situation in which we all have to cut back on some programs. I would have to agree to cutting back on programs in the State of Delaware, the Senator from Louisiana would have to agree to cutting back on some programs in Louisiana, and we would have to wait until the money was available to spend. Let us face it—we do not have the money today, when we are fighting a war in Vietnam.

I am hoping that my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, will join me in this proposal for economy, because I think he has struck at the heart of the question. Cut back on spending.

If the President is disappointed with what the members of his party in Congress are doing, and if he will veto those bills, we in the minority will sustain his veto and save him from the spendthrift policies of some of his own party.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My recollection is that there was a great deal of spending when Franklin Roosevelt was President and when Harry Truman was President. Notwithstanding that spending, a little man could borrow money and finance a home at low interest rates. The same was true of people who had to borrow money generally.

The Senator from Delaware gives me lengthy answers. From my point of view, all we are saying is that we would like to lend some money to some little fellow, a small businessman, who cannot borrow money at all. We would like to give him an honest, decent loan at the going rate of interest. In order to do that, we would like to sell some of the notes we presently hold.

It is fine to engage in semantics, but it boils down to one thing: The Senator would like to say that every time the Federal Government goes to the aid of a poor man, a farmer, a small businessman, every dollar that is borrowed is to be regarded as a loss, presumably never to be collected.

What we are saying is that if a note is sold for what it will bring, the Government will get back that much money. To that extent, we refute the Senator's presumption that the money never will be repaid.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I have followed the discussion with a great deal of interest. The arguments of the Senator from Delaware are much more persuasive to me, particularly because he has premised his case on the same arguments that he used in 1959.

I was not a Member of the Senate in 1959, but recently I saw some figures, issued by the Federal Government, indicating that in 1960 a person could buy a house for $12,000. But in 1965, 5 years later, as a result of the inflation which has grown during the 5 years of this administration, that same home costs $13,300.

In addition, the inflation that ensued during those 5 years brought the interest rate up. At the present time, a person who buys a $13,300 home with say, an 80 percent, 20-year mortgage, will spend $1,700 more in interest.

So as the result of the fiscal policies of this administration, a home that cost $12,000 in 1960 now costs $3,000 more.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. In a moment.

The Senator from Louisiana talks about poor people. The poor people are the ones who are getting stuck the worst with the inflation that has been caused by the so-called fiscal policies of this administration. The President has said that inflation hurts worst those who can least afford it—the poor people.

If the Senator is really concerned about poor people, why does he not put into effect fiscal policies that will stop inflation? Unless that is done the poor people will become poorer. It does not make any difference if their wages go up a little. It will be more than offset by inflation. That is why the President, the Senator's President, said what he said.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us consider the man who borrows $7,000. Everyone knows that when inflation struck, the first thing that went up was wages, so his wages doubled or more than doubled. That meant that so far as his income was concerned, the burden of the mortgage was half what it had been. As far as he was concerned, he was benefited by inflation. As a matter of fact, he probably paid it off and was done with it because of the increase in wages.

It was all I could do, as chairman of the Finance Committee, to defeat amendments to automatically raise payments just this year and thereby prevent the social security payments from going up, with a resulting progression of inflation.

One amendment was offered on the Senator's side of the aisle—the Republican side—and another was offered by a Democrat.

The Senator says that when inflation hits, the cost of living goes up and the social security payments suffer. If wages go up by more than that amount, then the wage earner actually wins. Inflation does not always hurt a poor man. If his wages go up, the price he is paying on a mortgage is actually reduced by inflation. If inflation takes 3 percent from his purchasing power and he is paying 7 percent, and if his wage goes up by 3 percent, then he should be paying only 4 percent, this puts him back at the 4-percent rate, provided his wages went up when inflation hit.

The Senator from Iowa should tell us whether he is for the moneylender or for the borrower. We are talking about making money available for borrowing by the man who needs it.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator has been making a big fuss about the poor man, the borrower, and the moneylender. I do not know of much difference on either side of the aisle on this point. There may be a lot of demagogic speeches on this subject, but I do not believe any Senator wants the borrower to pay an excessive amount of interest, any more than he wants the lender to receive an excessive amount of interest.

The Senator from Louisiana tried to cover the point I made by assuming that a poor man's wages have gone up twice. If he is attempting to beg the question, nobody will win that argument. The point is that that is not what is happening to many hundreds of thousands of such people. As a matter of fact, last year, when the social security tax was increased 7 percent, the proposal sounded good to the social security pensioners; but even with that increase, they do not have as much purchasing power as they had in 1958. Think of the hundreds of millions of dollars of cost to that segment of society as a result of the inflationary dollars of this administration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] offered that amendment. He said if the cost of living went up, the social security payment would go up. It was all I could do to head off that amendment and try to be fiscally responsible. The point is that Congress has increased the social security payments to offset the increase in the cost of living.

Mr. MILLER. It was not offset even with the 7-percent increase. That is the trouble.

During the consideration of the medicare bill last year, the Senator from Iowa proposed an amendment to give the social security pensioners an automatic cost of living increase, but the Senator from Louisiana would have none of it, even though he knows that group of people can least afford to bear inflation.

I want to make this point, Madam President; then I shall yield the floor. The pending measure sounds to me as though it will aggravate a high-interest situation.

In my State of Iowa money is terribly tight at the present time. Businessmen would like to expand their plants to provide more job opportunities for people. Many people need loans in Iowa today. Many farmers need loans. We now propose to lay a foundation for taking private money out of the private sector and putting it into the public sector, into Government participation certificates.

I think it will make money even tighter. I believe that, regardless of one's philosophy on whether we should sell assets to help pay for operating expenses, this is perhaps the worst time at which we could engage in this kind of activity.

If the Senator from Louisiana has people in his State who are interested in getting loans to help them get along in farming or in small business, I suggest to him that the interest rate will get higher if this bill passes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I accept the challenge, and on an appropriate occasion, I shall offer an amendment to reduce interest rates. If I get a majority on the Republican side of the aisle, I will clap my feet in the air.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Prouty
Simpson
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—45

Bayh
Bible
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Douglas
Ellender
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Church
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hayden
Kennedy, Mass.
Magnuson
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Murphy
Nelson
Pearson
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Sparkman
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I should like to take this opportunity to make two corrections in the committee's report—Senate Report No. 1140, 89th Congress, to accompany S. 3283.

At page 4 of the report a section-by-section analysis begins. The heading reads "Section-by-Section Analysis of H.R. 14544." It should read "Section-by-Section Analysis of S. 3283." The same incorrect reference to H.R. 14544 appears in the fourth paragraph on page 6.

Another misprint occurred at page 9 in the course of the statement of "Changes in Existing Law," made in accordance with the Cordon rule.

At the 13th, 14th, and 15th lines of paragraph 2, a sentence begins, "The Association may be named." The introductory part of the sentence, down through the end of line 15 should read as follows:

> The association may be named and may act as trustee of any such trust and, for the purposes thereof, the title to such obligations shall be deemed to have passed to the Association in trust: *Provided*, That."

It seems appropriate to note these corrections in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD rather than incur the expense of a star print.

I should like to make note of the fact that the committee held its second and concluding hearing on this bill on Thursday. The printed record of the hearing and the committee report were available Monday morning. In view of the exceptional haste in preparing the 98-page record and the report, the occurrence of two misprints can readily be understood.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, section 8 of the proposed Participation Sales Act authorizes a study of the feasibility, advantages, and disadvantages of direct loan programs compared to guaranteed or insured loan programs. After studying the proposed legislation, I have come to the conclusion that we would perhaps be wiser to enact section 8 and hold the rest of the bill until we see the results of that study.

UPWARD PRESSURE UPON INTEREST RATES

Two effects of this legislation disturb me very much. First is the effect upon interest rates. It appears that the legislation will exert upward pressure upon interest rates. In this regard I would like to read one paragraph of a letter from Charles E. Walker, speaking for the American Bankers Association:

> In addition, we are concerned with the impact of the implementation of the program contemplated under H.R. 14544 and the demands it will place on the money and capital markets at a time when private demands for funds are active and strong. From the standpoint of timing, such a program could be better implemented at a time when the banking system and long-term investors are actively seeking earning assets because of a limited availability of such in the private sector. The proposed Government agency financing may very well have a considerable rate impact in the market. So long as economic conditions continue expansive and private demands for funds are heavy, the agency financing will exert upward pressure on interest rates. This pressure could be felt in the market for direct Treasury obligations and rate adjustments could take place in that sector. The sheer magnitude of the administration's program—$3.3 billion in this fiscal year and $4.7 billion next year—raises the question as to whether all of the Government agency funds can be raised in this time interval.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the American Bankers Association be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: The American Bankers Association desires to take this opportunity to express its views on H.R. 14544, a bill to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an effective and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies and for other purposes, which we understand will shortly be under consideration by your committee.

Inasmuch as H.R. 14544 has been introduced to carry out a definitive policy decision of the administration, we are not expressing any comments on such policy decision. Nevertheless, we are concerned about certain aspects of the legislation as outlined below.

H.R. 14544 provides a mechanism for financing the Treasury through the issuance of securities by the Federal National Mortgage Association representing beneficial interests or participations in certain loans made by various agencies of the Government. The Government agencies responsible for administering the loan programs which will be utilized as a basis for the issuance of participation securities will retain custody, control, and administration of the obligations securing the participation certificates. FNMA will promptly pay to the agencies whose obligations form the basis for the issuance of participations the full net proceeds of any sale of such beneficial interests or participations to the extent they are based upon such obligations or collections. Such proceeds will be dealt with as otherwise provide by law for sales or repayment of such obligations. In most cases, this will make the proceeds available for new loans to the extent authorized under existing programs.

In my letter to you of February 28, 1966, with reference to S. 2499, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, we expressed our concern about certain implications of that bill which we believe also applies to H.R. 14544. We desire to restate such comments, in part, as follows:

1. The type of transactions envisaged seem to us to be simply another type of deficit financing, rather than a genuine substitution of private for public credit, but at interest rates higher than is effected in the usual manner through sales of Treasury obligations. Although no serious objection could be made to this alternative type of financing of itself, the higher interest cost that is likely to be incurred should be of concern to both taxpayers and the Congress.

2. Debt operations of the type authorized in H.R. 14544 bypass the public debt ceiling and the interest rate ceiling on new issues of Treasury securities with maturities beyond 5 years. Our purpose here is not to defend the arbitrary manner in which these limitations can impinge on budget spending and Treasury debt management. But we do believe strongly that the issue of our relaxation or elimination of these limitations should be confronted directly in the Congress and not bypassed through alternative methods of financing.

In addition, we are concerned with the impact of the implementation of the program contemplated under H.R. 14544 and the demands it will place on the money and capital markets at a time when private demands for funds are active and strong. From the standpoint of timing, such a program could be better implemented at a time when the banking system and long-term investors are actively seeking earning assets because of a limited availability of such in the private sector. The proposed Government agency financing may very well have a considerable rate impact in the market. So long as economic conditions continue expansive and private demands for funds are heavy, the agency financing will exert upward pressure on interest rates. This pressure could be felt in the market for direct Treasury obligations and rate adjustments could take place in that sector. The sheer magnitude of the administration's program—$3.3 billion in this fiscal year and $4.7 billion next year—raises the question as to whether all of the Government agency funds can be raised in this time interval.

The Government agencies that have been regular borrowers in the market for many years (such as Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal home loan banks, Federal land banks, FNMA, etc.) have increased their borrowing demands both in terms of magnitude and frequency of borrowing. This borrowing has already become more expensive in relation to direct Treasury obligations and the spread in rates has widened as a consequence. The rate spread could widen further as enlarged Government agency borrowing reaches the market, particularly if this increases the frequency of borrowing operations. On some recent occasions, it has appeared that the Government agencies were competing among themselves for funds and have had to pay a higher rate in the market because of this.

Section 2(b) of H.R. 14544 amends section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act by giving FNMA authority to issue securities under the new program "notwithstanding any other provision of law." We believe it is essential that the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to issue securities as contemplated under H.R. 14544 be made subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in order that such transactions be handled with utmost care so as not to disturb market financial processes more than is absolutely necessary.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. WALKER.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, testimony was received on this point from the Farmers Union, which feels that the legislation would adversely affect farmers borrowing from the Farmers Home Administration. As it is, many banks which lend farmers money through FHA-insured loans also make additional, uninsured loans to the farmer. This is done because of the initial relationship between the farmer and the bank which is created through the FHA-insured loan and because of the margin of safety which the FHA-insured part of the total amount borrowed gives the bank. The Farmers Union pointed out that a banker would be loath to lend money for housing and tractors if all he had to do was pick up the phone and buy a participation at 5½ percent which was guaranteed and which could be sold or held at his discretion.

I ask unanimous consent that the Farmers Union memorandum be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS UNION MEMORANDUM ON H.R. 14544, THE PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

1. The purpose of this legislation is to get the Federal Government out of the lending business. According to Budget Director Schultze, the Federal Government should not act as a bank; all Federal lending programs and assets should be taken out of the Federal Government and turned over to private business.

2. The Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended and the Association is given authority to issue "participations" which shall be guaranteed as to principal and interest by agencies of the United States.

3. The head of any executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States is authorized to set aside a part or all of any obligations held by him. The agency "shall guarantee" to the trustee timely payments thereof.

4. The "trustee" which would issue the "participations" is the Federal National Mortgage Association which gets investment bankers to handle the paper and sell the participations on the public money market. The bill indicates that all of the funds raised by the sale of the participations shall be turned over to the agency or trustor. The trustee is the mortgage association commonly referred to as "Fannie Mae." These are the principal provisions of the bill.

5. Here is what will happen: The loan agency which might be Farmers Home, Housing, or Small Business, or any one of the lending agencies, must, we believe issue these participations if the administration so desires. The language says specifically of the agency "he is authorized to set aside all or part of an obligations held by him." We believe the effect of this language will be mandatory.

6. First, the lending agency will turn over the loan papers to "Fannie Mae" and as a result participations will be issued. The New York banks and others will underwrite them, "Fannie Mae" having decided that they are salable and worth their face value. Interest rates or effective yields, we asume, will be agreed on by "Fannie Mae" and the bank and other underwriters.

7. Example: The agency and Fannie Mae decide to lump together papers held by farmers homes, small business, and housing agencies, totaling, say $1,500,000, the participations are then sold on the public market for 6 percent plus a servicing fee. We do not believe that the rate will be much lower, since 90-day Treasury bills now stand at 4.7 percent, and prime securities are around 5 to 5½ percent. Suppose that the loan paper held by the agency on which the participations are based, average 4 percent. It is evident that the Treasury will have to make up the difference. In other words, there will be a subsidy of 2 percent.

8. Aside from costing the Federal Government additional money which the banks will pocket, the issuance of guaranteed paper will have an adverse effect on the home mortgage institutions. A banker would be loath to lend money for housing, tractors, etc., if all he had to do was pick up the phone and buy a participation at 5½ percent which was guaranteed and which could be sold or held at his discretion.

9. Savings and loan associations under the law are not allowed to share in these participations; however, to compete with this new money market they will have to raise their interest rates or else go out of business and the general effect will be, of course, together with the other operations mentioned, to raise interest rates all along the line.

10. A final point should be made. Hometown bankers and even relatively large banks are having a tough time because of the policies of the Federal Reserve Board. They are having to pay a 4½-percent discount rate and are in competition with institutional moneylenders who, under the ruling of the Board, may get 5½ percent on time deposits. Another factor is the fact that reserves in the banks have reached a minus figure. The Federal Reserve Board has been selling securities on the open market thus decreasing liquid reserves of the banks. The result has been to bring about a very tight, high interest situation.

INCREASED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, the second thing about this bill that disturbs me is the increased cost to the Federal Government. A table appearing on page 90 of the hearings estimates that the increased cost to the Government of the participation sales that would be made through this bill would be $20,592,000 in 1966. In 1967 it would be $29,571,360. The total extra cost to the Government for 15 years is estimated at $381,336,720. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATE OF ADDITIONAL COSTS TO GOVERNMENT OF FUNDING THROUGH PARTICIPATIONS

Total estimated additional cost of participation sales during year of sale of $2,185,000, or 0.624 percent of principal amount.[1]

Recurring annual expense for 15-year estimated maturity of participation certificates is $2,185,000 (less underwriter's expense of $1,155,000) or $1,030,000, which equals 0.294 percent of principal amount.[1]

Fiscal 1966 sales of $3 billion times 0.00624 equals $20,592,000.

Fiscal 1967 sales of $4 billion times 0.00624 equals $29,571,360.

Recurring annual expense for both equals $8 billion times 0.00294 percent times 14 equals $331,173,360. Total for 15 years: $381,336,720.

We believe there is a reasonable expectation that the difference between Treasury borrowing costs and rates on participation certificates will widen from the 0.25 used in this example as the quality of loans in the pool declines—actually, or in the investor's opinion.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am going to vote for the bill, Madam President, which is so strongly requested by the administration. But I do so with considerable misgivings. I urge the Secretary of the Treasury to make a thorough study of this whole matter under the authority granted him through section 8 and come back to Congress with an exhaustive, objective report in 6 months, when we shall have another look at the subject.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, as soon as the floor situation is clarified, I shall offer five amendments. I should like to give the Senate some idea of what to expect. I have five amendments which I shall offer in behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and one amendment with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. I shall offer them en bloc. I understand that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will wish to ask a few brief questions bearing upon these amendments. I understand further that the Senator from Utah will wish to have a colloquy on another point.

The entire process, I hope, will consume not more than 20 minutes. It might stretch to a half hour. At that point, we will have a rollcall vote on final passage, unless some other unexpected developments take place.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think we will take more than 10 minutes. I hope not.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Maine submitting his amendments at this time?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Madam President, I send to the desk five amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and that they be considered en bloc.

---

[1] Using figures from Government Accounting Office report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are as follows:

On page 2, delete line 25, and on page 3, delete lines 1, 2, and 3, and substitute therefor the following:

"(2) Subject to the limitations provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, one or more trusts may be established as herein provided by each of the following Departments or Agencies:

"Department of Agriculture: Farmers Home Administration;

"Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education (with respect to loans for construction of academic facilities);

"Department of Housing and Urban Development (including the Federal National Mortgage Association);

"Veterans' Administration;

"Export-Import Bank;

"Small Business Administration.

"The head of each such Department or Agency, hereinafter in this subsection called the 'trustor', is authorized"

On page 2, strike lines 3 through 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) by striking out the words 'offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages in which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof' in the first sentence thereof and by inserting 'and other types of securities, including any instrument commonly known as a security, hereinafter in this subsection called "obligations," in which any Department or Agency of the United States listed in section 302(c) of this Act,'"

On page 3, line 17, strike out "be deemed to have passed" and insert in lieu thereof "pass".

On page 5, line 8, beginning with "Any" strike out all through the period in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Any such authorization shall remain available only for the fiscal year for which it is granted and for the succeeding fiscal year."

On page 10, line 7, after "Sec. 8." insert "(a)".

On page 10, after line 16, insert the following:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall each year make a report to the Senate and House of Representatives setting forth—

"(1) the net increase or decrease during the preceding fiscal year (A) in the aggregate principal amount of obligations acquired by the executive departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States which may be subjected to a trust under section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, and (B) in the total amount of outstanding beneficial interests or participations in such obligations; and

"(2) the extent to which the sale of such beneficial interests or participations reduced the deficit or increased the surplus realized by the Government in its operations during the preceding fiscal year."

Mr. MUSKIE. These amendments, Madam President, would do these things:

One amendment would reduce the coverage of this bill from the $33 billion of outstanding direct loans in the Federal portfolio, involving some 51 agencies or programs, to a little less than $11 billion, involving 6 agencies.

Mr. BENNETT. Six.

Mr. MUSKIE. Six agencies. Those agencies are listed in the amendment as follows: Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, with respect to loans for construction of academic facilities; Department of Housing and Urban Development, including the Federal National Mortgage Association; the Veterans' Administration; the Export-Import Bank; and the Small Business Administration.

The second amendment would limit the authorization contained in this bill to 2 years. This is an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], which I have cosponsored.

The third amendment, offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], would require reporting the activity under this bill to the Congress each year. The Senator from Utah may wish to describe it in greater detail.

There is another amendment, which is a technical amendment on the question of the passage of title from the lending agency to the Federal National Mortgage Association.

The amendment which I offer in behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] clarifies that point, to make it clear that title passes.

Those are the amendments now being considered, which have been carefully reviewed by Senators on both sides.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the Senator state whether, in this condensed form, the authority does or does not cover REA or RTA?

Mr. MUSKIE. It does not cover rural electric or telephone loans made by the REA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator said he has conferred with Senators on both sides. Has he conferred with the chairman or ranking members of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, with reference to the Farmers Home Administration?

Mr. MUSKIE. I have not; no. But the legislation has been——

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I happen to be a member of that committee, and I have heard nothing of any conference on this subject. I also happen to be chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations which handles agricultural appropriations; and I am not prepared to say, with reference to the Farmers Home Administration, that this is good policy.

If the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] or the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] have been conferred with, and have agreed that this is good policy, that is something else. But as far as I am concerned, I have heard nothing of this item. I hope that the distinguished Senator will advise us whom he has conferred with on both sides of the aisle with respect to this particular agency.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield? This is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. MUSKIE. May I say to the Senator, the agencies I have described have been covered by this bill from the moment it was introduced. No question such as that suggested by the Senators has been raised in discussion of the proposed legislation until this moment.

When I said that there had been conferences with other Senators, I meant conferences with other Senators involved in the debate on the proposed legislation on the floor of the Senate during the last 2 days. This includes the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Nebraska, and the Senator from Delaware, all of whom raised questions which are involved by the amendments which we have reviewed with them, and which we have checked with the Federal agencies involved in order to try to bring to the Senate a responsible judgment on the validity of the amendments.

If there is a basic question on the bill itself which concerns the Senator from Florida and the Senator from North Dakota, I wonder why it has not been raised before. I have not conferred with any Senator about a question of which I was unaware.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator probably is justified in feeling that all Senators should know what is included in the bill. It happens that I have been busy today in three or four other committee matters. I was busy yesterday on similar matters. Today, among other things, I sat in the conference committee on the Supplemental Appropriations bill, and have been in hearings all afternoon on the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee. Then, since that committee adjourned a few minutes ago, I have been talking with some agricultural people about my duties as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that other Senators not on the Banking and Currency Committee can have no possible way to know about the heavy coverage of this bill unless it is called specifically to their attention. When the Senator stated that he has conferred with Senators on both sides of the aisle, I started out believing he had talked with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], or both of them, or the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Apparently, he has talked with no one who has any special knowledge of the agricultural situation. I therefore want the Senator to know that the Farmers Home Administration administers many different classes of obligations. Although it does deal with many different types of loans affecting farmers, some of these new type loans recently authorized under new legislation deal with problems that do not relate to farmers at all, necessarily, but with small communities and even country clubs. I had notice day before yesterday from the Farmers

Home Administration that they just granted a loan for a water system to a golf course in my State.

To bunch all these together and say that they can liquidate these obligations and then pursue their very great field of activities, almost unregulated by Congress, is something that I would not wish to agree to at all.

I hope that the Senator will withdraw this particular field of activities from the bill.

The Farmers Home Administration deals with many different types of direct and insured loans. It has long since departed in a clear way from its original field of activities and objectives which were to help tenant farmers buy their properties; to help small farmers enlarge their properties; and also to help farmers build their barns and silos and things of that kind; and for production loans.

If we were limited to that kind of activity now, I would have little, if any, objections, now. But I do not think the Farmers Home Administration should be turned loose to borrow from wherever it can get funds, as against this tremendous outstanding file of obligations in a dozen different fields. I would not want that authority to be granted at all without a very close and very thorough study by the people who know something about the business of this very variegated—if I may use that word—agency.

Thus, if no one having any comprehensive knowledge of the operations of this particular, important agency has been conferred with or consulted at all, I would have to object rather strenuously to the inclusion of that file of securities within those involved by this act.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, I can say that the Senator from Nebraska is not in a position of authority in the fields to which the Senator from Florida refers. I am not on the Agricultural Legislative Committee. I am a member of his very illustriously chaired Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. An effort was made by the committee to get a limitation in the very field to which the Senator refers, however, and the Senator from Maine, who is the Senator in charge of the bill, has agreed to accept this limitation.

Originally subsection 4, page 5 of the bill, read as follows:

> Beneficial interests or participations shall not be issued for the account of any trustor in an aggregate principal amount greater than is authorized with respect to such trustor in an appropriation Act.

Then comes the language which I understand is to be amended:

> Any such authorization shall remain available until used.

That was what was known as the Widnall amendment and was included in the House bill at the instance of the gentleman from New Jersey. An amendment that would be accepted is this: The last two words in that second sentence would be stricken, and the following language would then be a part of the bill as amended:

> Any such authorization shall remain available only for the fiscal year for which it is granted and for the succeeding fiscal year.

So that there is, first of all, the necessity for an authorization and it is that authorization that applies to any participation in one of these pools during that fiscal year and the following fiscal year, rather than indefinitely until it is used. To that extent, an effort has been made to build a fence and use some braking power on an otherwise unlimited use of the participation pool procedure.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the fact that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has endeavored to bring that much of a limitation into the bill. My objection goes a good deal further than that, because we have just finished, in our subcommittee, having hearings on the request of this agency, and they are requesting greatly increased appropriations—I do not recall the exact amount now, but it is a large increase, including large increases for these new fields—for supplying small water plants to folks who are not farmers at all but merely happen to have their home or business either in the country or in towns of not more than 5,500 population.

Their field of operations is simply immense—almost unlimited—and to say that they can pyramid or pile up this kind of fund in the way intended by the pending bill, as I understand it, is something of which I could not approve at all.

If it were limited, as I say, to those loans which have to do with the original purpose of the Farmers Home Administration, which were excellent and which I have always strongly supported and helped to liberalize greatly through the years, as those members who have served on various committees assigned to it know.

I would feel kindly disposed toward inclusion of the Farmers Home Administration, provided there were written into the bill the limitation suggested by the Senator from Nebraska which made congressional control complete and continuous; but to say that their whole field of securities can be hypothecated and that they can take that money and build up this tremendous field which they have made possible by, I think, an injudicious act of Congress, I could not give consent to that.

I would have to ask that the bill go over until tomorrow morning to give me an opportunity to present in some detail my feelings on the question of including the Farmers Home Administration within the scope of the bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. My citation of the proposed amendment which has been accepted or on which indication has been made for acceptance, was not to dispute or to controvert the position taken by the Senator from Florida.

I cited it only to show some effort had been made to limit somewhat, the rather broad and unlimited procedures contained in the bill as introduced. There was no intention to suggest that that amendment would in any way deal with or satisfy the remarks which the Senator from Florida has made and has made so well.

His record on the type of thing to which he refers is well known in this Congress and elsewhere; but it is not covered and it is not specifically the objective to which I referred.

Mr. HOLLAND. I reiterate my strong approval of the intention of the Senator from Nebraska and the coverage of his amendment. I call attention to the fact that it does not really go to the scope of my objection, which is another point. We have recently embarked on new programs, which are on trial, and here in the very beginning of them we are asked to expand them immeasurably in the Appropriations Committee, and we are expanding them in the field of coverage and in the legislative field. Perhaps that is wise, but, on top of that, to say that we can pile up these securities and, ad lib, pyramid them, as anyone may wish to do, is something different.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. This bill does not, as the Senator said in his last sentence, permit anyone, ad lib, to take the securities and pyramid them as much as might be wished.

On the point of who was consulted in connection with this bill, I shall be very glad to give the Senator such information as I have. There are some 51 agencies or programs listed as direct loan programs. The administration undertook to contact those which might be involved in those programs or those who might be concerned or interested in the legislation with respect to the FHA program and the Farmers Home Administration. Both the Treasury and the Budget Bureau contacted the chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and discussed it with him. Presumably they received no objection.

In addition, the Bureau of the Budget has written a letter, which may be of interest to the Senator, to Hon. W. R. POAGE, dated May 2, 1966, which reads:

> DEAR MR. POAGE: I understand that you are concerned about the manner in which the insured loan programs of the Farmers Home Administration are to be treated under the Participation Sales Act of 1966 (H.R. 14544).
>
> The programs of the Farmers Home Administration, as authorized by the Congress, will in no way be adversely affected by any provision of H.R. 14544, nor by any action that it is proposed to take under that bill. On the contrary, the proposed bill will make a positive contribution toward financing the credit programs of the Farmers Home Administration.
>
> The agency will continue to operate both the agricultural credit insurance program and the rural housing insurance program as in the past. When the paper generated in these programs can be sold to the private market on favorable terms, this will continue to be done, as it has been done in the past.

May I say, parenthetically, as could be continued to be done without passage of this bill, with reference to $1.9 billion of direct loans. The approximately $2 billion of loans could be sold in this way without passage of the proposed legislation before us.

To continue with the letter:

> When the Farmers Home Administration is not able to place its paper directly on terms comparable to those on the participation certificates issued by the Federal National Mortgage Association, then Farmers Home will pool its loans and arrange for FNMA to sell certificates of participation in that pool.
>
> If it should become possible later to sell the loans in the pool directly to private investors, the bill provides a procedure by which loans can be withdrawn from participation pools and a corresponding amount of participation certificates retired by purchase in the market.

May I say, in addition, that in the bill as introduced in the Senate, S. 3283, which is before us, positive control is given to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, requiring specific authorization of the total principal amount of certificates of participation which can be issued in behalf of any agency. That is a specific authorization that is required in an appropriation act.

Those are safeguards in the legislation. This is the impact upon the Farmers Home Administration program, as described by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to Representative POAGE.

As I have said, this legislation was discussed by the representatives of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for that statement.

I am looking now at page 18 of the report. I see, as I am not surprised to see, that there is no division made at all in listing the securities held by the Farmers Home Administration between those directly involved with their very sound original purposes and their recently, newly authorized activities, which are new and very venturesome. The table simply lists the total amount held by the Farmers Home Administration on the day the bill was prepared, I assume, in the amount of $1,990 million. That is in direct loans. That is in notes.

As to what part of them would lie in the scope of activities that are not new, and as to what amount would lie in the scope of activities that are highly new, venturesome, and admitted to be on a kind of trial-and-error basis, I do not know. The fact is not disclosed in the listing.

I am referring to page 18 of the report, under the heading "Direct loans." That means paper for direct loans made, and the amount is $1,990 million. This is no inconsiderable amount, considering the fact that in recent years, we have not only entered into new programs, but also have given this agency insurance power. The Farmers Home Administration program has already been granted guaranteed and insured loans in the amount of $727 million, which would indicate that the Farmers Home Administration has not been at a loss for ways in which to make good loans. It should not be at a loss to do so, but we want Congress to have some continuing control over the new programs. This same activity is now asking for greatly expanded lending power as to where the loans can be made. This has been brought out in the course of recent hearings before the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman, and of which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] serves as ranking minority member.

We know this is the situation. My feeling is it is unwise to include approximately $2 billion of securities now already made within the scope of the bill.

I hope the Senator will be willing to do one of two things: either to remove this particular agency from the list of those included—he has apparently omitted 40 agencies already—or else let this matter go over until tomorrow morning, so I can show the Senate some of the facts and figures relative to the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In closing, if Congress has been kind to any agency, it has been the Farmers Home Administration. They were brought into numerous new fields, such as housing for the elderly, increased housing for rural people, whether they were farmers or not; and financing all activities, bringing recreational activities in the country areas, and these that I mentioned a while ago, putting in water plants and similar systems in connection with activities that have no relationship whatever to agriculture, but simply happen to be either in the country or towns up to 5,500 in population.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This would include housing in all towns and cities up to 2,500 population. It would include direct loans and insured loans. It seems to me that this is going a long way in the field of agriculture.

When we only represent 7 percent of our total population, I suppose we do not count any more, especially in a day when agriculture is condemned by top people in the administration for providing food and fiber at prices as low or lower than we did 20 years ago. This at a time when the costs of farm operations have increased sharply year after year with no end in sight.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

I have spoken unduly long on this matter but I feel keenly about it.

I have supported very strongly the Farmers Home Administration and I remember other Senators have also on this floor. We have liberalized three times under my chairmanship the activities of this program. It is well recognized we have tried to help legitimate country people in many ways.

I did not support one or two of these latest ventures because I thought they were getting so far away from any relation to agriculture or agricultural activities. But I have supported everything else in the scope of the activities of this committee. I have supported it year after year and our committee recommended that we increase the figures recommended in the other body so that they could reach other people.

But when it comes to turning over this entire field of securities regardless of where they came from, the Senator from Florida would not want to see that done. Rather than have it done he would want it carried over until tomorrow morning so we can get more factual information as to what is involved in connection with this activity.

I thank the Senator for his courteous answers to the points that I raise.

I wish I could agree wholeheartedly with him. I might say if he limited his request to those activities of the Farmers Home Administration in the field of long tradition I would have little objection. But when he makes one request covering all of their activities, including these expanded, highly liberal, and heretofore untried fields of activity, it goes a long way from any legitimate interest of agriculture. I cannot stay with him on that at all.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, may I ask one question?

Mr. MUSKIE. May I respond to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. COOPER. My comment would probably take care of it.

I notice one of the amendments offered would reduce the number of agencies to six or eight.

Mr. MUSKIE. Six agencies.

Mr. COOPER. The bill would include six agencies. I ask this question.

If participation certificates were sold in the FHA or any of those agencies, could the proceeds of those participation certificates be transferred between the six agencies or would they be required to use them in the agency which issued the obligation?

Mr. MUSKIE. The proceeds would go back to the lending agency which owned the loan in the first place.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood that was the case. That was not my point at all. My point was between the various activities carried on within the particular agencies. Apparently there is no differentiation between them. I have distinct reservations about some of the new activities carried on by the Farmers Home Administration.

We were told a few days ago that applications had been filed in connection with some of these newer activities running up to about four times the appropriation of last year. I will get these figures in detail for tomorrow morning, if necessary.

It seems to me we are going very far afield trying to meet every need arising from some legitimate development. There are needs in towns of up to 5,500 population. I admit that. There are needs of people who want to establish a golf course or yacht club. In the case of a little community in Destin, Fla., which is sandy, but quite attractive—and where I go to fish every chance I get—there are only a few trees that can be grown in that area, much less agricultural crops. And yet that is one of the places marked for granting of a loan to accomplish some of these highly desirable new community developments, having no relation whatever to agriculture. It is located on Choctawhatchee Bay, removed 4 or 5 miles from the mainland, where nothing but a few hardy trees could grow.

Things have gone so far afield from the original purpose of FHA. I protested them. My committees have authorized some of the enlarged activities and I stood by the committee because I thought the majority had some meaning. I know every member of the committee—because I talked to them sooner or later—had misgivings about these new programs.

One of the things proposed was putting in a water system in a community for elderly people. This has no more relationship to agriculture than the Senate Chamber does to the production of wheat in the State of North Dakota, which is so ably represented by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

And yet, they were going in these projects and putting in facilities because those people who went in these new areas and bought lots might find it difficult to establish a basis for credit unless we take care of them.

That is the situation that prevails because of this new activity. I hope that we can limit anything we do by way of refinancing to the Farmers Home Administration.

I hope we can limit it to proven fields which benefit the farmer such as tenants, small farmers, and people who wanted to rebuild their homes, or a barn that has been burned.

I do not believe that we ought to let them refinance and refinance.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am sure the Senator is concerned over bringing up all of these programs under the agriculture budget, which totals some $7 billion, over one-half of it having little relationship to agriculture, and through this means safeguard the refinancing of a considerable part of its lending activities.

It looks like we are not to be consulted as to how programs are to be financed in the future.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I would be happy to answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota, if he will let me do it.

Talking about golf course loans, let me say to the Senator from Florida that under this bill as written, if passed, before any program involving golf course loans can be financed, this legislation comes before the Senate Appropriations Committee and it cannot be implemented under this program unless the Senate Appropriations Committee specifically authorizes such a program. This is what the legislation provides.

This bill does not give anybody the right to take the securities into the open market, behind the back of Congress, and to pyramid in an unhealthy amount the authorization for the program. The Senator from Florida would have specific supervision over the financing of programs involving the golf course loans or any of the others that he does not like. That is the purpose of the amendment—to give the Senator control. A blank check is not given to anybody under the provision of this bill; none whatsoever.

I understand the concern of the Senator. The fields he mentioned are experimental fields, which are to be entered into carefully, which are to be supervised carefully by Congress, and which ought not to be expanded undesirably or unwisely.

I agree with the Senator on this point. But the bill gives the Senator that control. The administration cannot pool a single golf course loan for participation sales without the specific authorization and the specific legislation approved by the Agriculture Committees of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that this type of legislation ought to be considered by the committees that are well acquainted with the subject.

When the Farmers Home Administration loan was set up with a revolving fund, they came before our committee. We considered the proposal very carefully, and we gave that administration the right, under specific limitations, to set up the fund. Perhaps it was unwise, but we set it up, it is working, and I believe it is working reasonably well. But to have this kind of proposal for hypothecating securities from every source of activity, to bring in that money, and then to use it again in something I do not see at all.

I hope the Senator from Maine, through the action of one committee, will not attempt to override or bypass or ignore the jurisdiction of another group of committees.

I do not have the honor to be a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but I do have the honor and responsibility to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the legislative committee. I am the second-ranking member of that committee and the chairman of its most important subcommittee. I have the honor of being a member of the Committee on Appropriations and of being chairman of the subcommittee that deals with agriculture and related appropriations.

I am sure that every Senator serving on those two committees will bear out my statement that I have been highly friendly to the Farmers Home Administration in almost every particular and have built it up very largely—perhaps too largely—from the small basis on which it operated at the time that I came into these two positions of responsibility.

I think it is a wrong approach to this situation to allow a committee which has no knowledge at all of the methods of operation of an agency, with all its far-flung branches, responsibilities, and fields of action, to make the determination with reference to the hypothecation of all its paper and move ahead with its business in an unrestrained way. We should have an opportunity to examine the proposed legislation and to examine the testimony that we have just completed taking, to see just what is being requested now. We largely increased their insurance power just last year.

Mr. MUSKIE. The proposed legislation does not affect that.

Mr. HOLLAND. It does not affect it, but the reason I make that statement is that there is a very large field to service. Demands are made on them. Congress set up their revolving fund, and they have that to draw upon. We have increased their appropriation in every respect but one or two, with my full consent, approval, and recommendation.

But to pass the proposed legislation, without knowledge on the part of anyone who is familiar with this operation and the way in which the agency serves so many different activities—some of them having no relation whatsoever to agriculture—I believe is wrong. When I compare it with other activities that are listed here, I see a great basis for difference.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator has made his point, and has made it clearly, as to anything that would be done, or any action that would be taken, under the bill if enacted.

The specific limits which, as I understand, apply to all types of Farmers Home Administration loans would be absolute limits which could not be enlarged upon by the bill, nor could the administration recommend its enlargement. The limits are established by the committee and by Congress and cannot be expanded. All that can be loaned in the programs which concern the Senator from Florida are the specific amounts authorized by Congress on legislation introduced into Congress and referred to the Senator's committee, wholly independent of this action.

It is apparent that I have failed to explain the bill as clearly as it should be explained. All I can say in summing up my response to the Senator from Florida is that the fears he has expressed—and I certainly sympathize with the reasons that prompted him to express them—are in no way supported by anything that is in the bill, as I understand it, and I say that to him in all honesty.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand the concern of the Senator from Florida that all bills that affect his committee do not necessarily come to him. I see proposed legislation all the time that goes to other committees of the Senate and in which committees of which I am a member have some interest. Fifty-one programs are included in this bill. Is the Senator suggesting that committees having jurisdiction over each of those programs should separately conduct hearings on legislation of this kind before the Senate can act?

The administrative agencies have taken every step possible, well in advance, to inform Senators with special interests about the provisions of the bill.

The safeguards are here. The Senator from Florida ought to be reassured by the safeguards that are here. This matter is in the palm of his hand, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There is nothing I could do, if the bill is passed, that would divert any of these programs from the attention of the Senator from Florida. There is nothing in this proposed legislation that would give the President such power. The Senator from Florida would have the first look and the last look at legislation that would be proposed to implement this authorization, if it is enacted.

Five amendments are pending before us en bloc. These amendments would not affect the question proposed by the Senator from Florida. The Senator from Delaware wishes to ask some questions about the amendments.

If we could dispose of the five amendments and the discussion in which the Senator from Delaware wants to engage, perhaps by the time we are through with that the Senator from Florida in one way or the other might have received enough information so that he would be reassured as to the point he has raised.

Would it meet with the approval of the Senator from Florida if we were to turn now to a discussion of the five amendments so that I might engage in a discussion with the Senator from Delaware and perhaps dispose of the amendments?

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I am willing to turn to any business which the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill wishes to bring up. However, I shall strenuously object to any vote on the bill tonight. I serve notice of that because I do not understand at all that it would encompass the limited field that the distinguished Senator believes. I do not understand that this has been referred to people who know about the Farmers Home Administration. If it had been referred to anybody, it should have reached me, as one. I am not hurt by the fact that I was not reached. Others could have been reached on the matter. However, apparently it has not been referred to anybody, either on the majority or minority side, on the Senate subcommittee that handles agricultural appropriations.

Madam President, to make my point abundantly clear—and I am afraid that my distinguished friend has missed my point, instead of my missing his—there are several agencies listed here which we would need to include within the purview of the bill, which do a simple business compared to that done by the Farmers Home Administration. For example, there is the Veterans' Administration, which makes housing loans and other types of loans. However, the loans are all to veterans and are all within a very circumscribed field, whereas the Farmers Home Administration is not proscribed in its lending to agricultural people or objectives at all. It has a very broad field of operations. Some of its operations are frankly on an experimental basis now, as has already been stated by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maine.

While the Senator from Florida is perfectly willing to proceed with the matter and go ahead in any manner suggested or directed by the Senator in charge of the bill—who is amply able to say where he wishes the discussion to go—the Senator from Florida would still oppose any action on the bill until he has had a chance to look further into the matter.

I hope that no move will be made to go further than to make a statement on it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I state to the Senator from Florida that it is my intent to undertake to get a vote on the five amendments which are now pending, which vote I expect to be a voice vote, unless the Senator objects, after we have completed our discussion. It will not be a vote on final passage. It will be a vote on the five amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I reserve the right to ask for a live quorum when we have had a discussion on the first amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I think I understand what the amendments would accomplish, but I want to get it clear in the RECORD.

The bill, as reported by the committee, provided for the authority to sell approximately $33 billion worth of securities. It is my understanding that the amendments now being offered would eliminate from the bill the following programs, and I should like to enumerate them if the Senator will follow me and see if I am correct. Commodity Credit Corporation under the bill has $2,115 million of securities which could be sold. That amount would be eliminated if the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. REA has $4,072 million in securities which could be sold under the pending bill. However, agreement to the amendments would eliminate those.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the State Department, AID, there is an item of $8,907 million worth of securities that could be sold under the authority of the bill. Agreement to these amendments would eliminate that authority.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is an item under Treasury Department, "Foreign loans," $3,763 million, which includes the British war debt and others. Do I understand that agreement to the amendments would eliminate those from being sold?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. College housing has listed under the bill $1,927 million in notes. Could these be sold if these amendments are adopted? Would that amount be eliminated by agreement to these amendments?

Mr. MUSKIE. The college housing loan is $2,170 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have it listed as $1,927 million.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Maine gave the Senator from Utah a listing of loans under HEW.

Mr. MUSKIE. College housing is under HUD.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it Federal National Mortgage Association, or is it HUD, including FNMA?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is this list here which I shall have printed in the RECORD later.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I understand that college housing would not be eliminated by agreement to these amendments?

Mr. MUSKIE. That would be included under the program. Would it be helpful if I were to read the loans included in the amendment, or would the Senator prefer to proceed in his own way?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am trying to cover this list. The Department of Commerce has two items, $126 million and $109 million. The Defense Department has $79 million listed. Do I understand correctly that all three of those items would be eliminated?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would the $139 million in loans to District of Columbia be eliminated?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall now recapitulate these items to be eliminated from the bill. That is $2,115 million, Commodity Credit Corporation; $4,072 million, REA; $8,997 million, AID, the State Department; $3,763 million, Foreign Loans, under Treasury Department; $126 million and $109 million, under the Department of Comerce; $79 million under the Defense Department; and $139 million under loans to District of Columbia. Would all of those amounts be eliminated if the amendments were agreed to?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct. I think we have mutually identified the programs that the Senator is discussing, and, to the best of my knowledge, they would be eliminated.

I believe it would be helpful to list those programs that are covered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That would be of assistance. There were a few others such as the OEO, $17 million, and other miscellaneous items that I did not enumerate, all of which will be eliminated. However, it is my understanding that the total is approximately $21,500 million to $22 billion that would be eliminated by agreement to these amendments, and that would leave a little less than $11 billion in the bill if the amendment were agreed to. Am I correct on that point

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of the loans and other financial assets owned by Federal agencies which would be covered by the bill if amended by the pending amendment.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Outstanding loans and other financial assets owned by Federal agencies for which participation sales would be authorized by sec. 2 of S. 3283—Estimates as of June 30, 1966

[In millions of dollars]

Agency and program:	
Department of Agriculture: Farmers Home Administration	2,054
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education—Academic facility loans	66
Department of Housing and Urban Development: Federal National Mortgage Association	1,427
Federal Housing Administration	490
College housing loans	2,170
Public facility loans	206
Public housing loans	[1] 59
Housing for elderly or handicapped loans	[1] 151
Urban renewal loans	[1] 214
Public works planning advances	[2] 63
Veterans' Administration:	
Direct loans	498
Vendee loans	370
Small Business Administration	1,072
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2,091
Total	10,971

[1] Limited future sales or private refinancing of some of these loans may prove feasible (but will probably require (a) larger discounts or supplementary payments than previously planned, (b) removal of statutory prohibitions on sales, or (c) volume sufficient to warrant sales effort).

[2] No feasible method of making sales of these advances is now apparent (because repayment is contingent on actual construction of the project).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I think our tabulation is in agreement. I had not mentioned Department of the Interior reclamation loans of $90 million, which were eliminated. I merely wished to get the record straight, so that we would understand just what we have taken out of the bill and what we have left in.

To summarize it again, by accepting these amendments we will have reduced the total authority under this bill to sell Government assets from about $33 billion to between $10½ billion and $11 billion.

I thank the Senator from Maine for his cooperation. This is a major step in the right direction. I personally regret we cannot go further, because I still think this is a bad principle in financing. It is far more expensive to the taxpayer and does not give the American people the true picture as to the exact deficit; because, to the extent that even this $10 billion is sold, it will have the effect of reducing the national debt by that much, and it will also have the effect of reducing the reported expenditures. This is misleading the taxpayers as to the true expenditures.

For those reasons, I shall not support final passage of the bill. As I stated before, I opposed this legislation in principle when it was first proposed in 1959, and I oppose it today for the same reason. What is greatly needed in this country is more truth in Government, giving the American people the real truth as to the cost of their Government's operations.

I will not be a party of such deception as this bill proposes.

However, we have made progress by eliminating at least two-thirds of the original intended coverage of the bill; and for his cooperation in achieving that much, I again thank the Senator from Maine.

In this connection, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Star, describing the recent sale of FNMA offerings, entitled "Record Interest Set for FNMA Offering," which points up rather dramatically the additional interest which this type financing will cost.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD INTEREST SET FOR FNMA OFFERING

Federal National Mortgage Association today offered $250 million of 14-month, 5.3-percent secondary market operations debentures at $99\frac{29}{32}$ to yield 5.38 percent, highest yield in FNMA's history.

The issue will be dated March 10 and mature on May 10, 1967, and will be issued in coupon form only, in denominations of $1,000, $5,000, $10,000, $50,000, and $100,000.

Proceeds will be used to redeem $107,850,000 of 3½-year, 3.75-percent debentures maturing March 10, 1966, and to repay borrowings from the Treasury for secondary market operations.

The yield on today's offering is the highest borrowing cost in FNMA's history. The previous high of 5.35 percent was set in December 1959. The agency marketed $150 million of 1-year, 5-percent secondary market operations debentures last January 25.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article appearing in the Washington Star of May 2, 1966, written by Mr. Eliot Janeway, entitled "Johnson Resourceful in Tax Alternative."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON RESOURCEFUL IN TAX ALTERNATIVE

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—Whatever President Johnson's critics may fault him for they can't deny that he is resourceful. Certainly, the gimmick he's relying on as an alternative to higher taxes is an artful one. It calls for the sale of Government assets to private investors.

What puts the authentic L.B.J. stamp on this maneuver is that it gets the President off the horns of the trilemma confronting him. Horn No. 1 is fiscal: the rising cost of the Vietnam war has run the Government out of money, and it needs more than even the boom is bringing in at current tax rates.

Horn No. 2 is political. The rising cost of living and of doing business has alerted consensus-taking politicians to the danger of adding the higher cost of Government to the burden of inflation-pinched taxpayers. All hands agree, for example, that Johnson's political losses from plumping for emergency war taxes would erase most of his winnings from civil rights and related victories. The political answer to the fiscal question comes through loud and clear: If the administration needs money for Vietnam, any way to raise it is smarter and safer than by emergency taxes.

BORROWING IS PROHIBITIVE

Horn No. 3 is prestigious: The rising cost of money has made borrowing prohibitive for everybody—including even the Government. To finance the war by borrowing would therefore be bad business, but it would also be bad public relations.

For Johnson has been building his image of prudent progressivism by pointing with pride to his modest budgetary deficits and by contrasting them with the Eisenhower and Kennedy deficits, which mushroomed into $12-billion failures of political finance. Neither the Eisenhower image nor the Kennedy image led the public to expect business management from either personality, and the temper of the times did not particularly require it.

But the public does expect Johnson to pass the pragmatic test and so does the emergency that had developed in Vietnam. A "Johnson deficit" in wartime of the proportions of the peak peacetime Eisenhower and Kennedy deficits would look bad, and it would be bad.

NEW TRIPLE PLAY

Hence L.B.J.'s shrewd new asset-selling triple play. It will get him off the hook fiscally by flooding the treasury with a bigger cash windfall than a preliminary war tax would have brought in. It will get him off the hook politically by finding the money needed for Vietnam without taking it from the taxpayers. And it will get him off the hook prestigiously because the substitute he has hit on for borrowing is selling, which means that the deficit won't go up even though billions will be raised without raising taxes.

Admittedly, financial purists will object that cash raised by the selling of assets is not bona fide income which balances expenditures and really avoids deficits. But, in terms of the practicalities of political image merchandising, L.B.J. has pulled off another one of his miracles. He can continue to point with pride to his businesslike management, and the customers won't start complaining.

NOT TO JOHNSON

At least to him, for while the administration's new asset-selling device does get Johnson out of his immediate fiscal political and prestige trilemma, it does not get the economy out of the 1966 money squeeze. On the contrary, the administration's new money-raising deal will give the screw another turn—in fact, the cruelest turn yet.

In order to make room in the liquidity-parched private sector for the billions in Government paper the administration proposes to dump on the money market, a suitable incentive will have to be provided. This means that the rate of return on Government-backed investments will have to rise again—the column believes to above 6 percent and, quite possibly, to 6½ percent, an interest-rate level which Congress would never authorize the Government to pay on new issues. A 6- to 6½-percent rate on Government issues is a peril point rate for the entire economy, beginning with the already suspect stock market.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Janeway article outlines very clearly the reasons why this proposal was made in the first place, and points out the danger which can result from its adoption.

Again I thank the Senator from Maine for his cooperation. We have made progress as the result of the debate of the last 2 days. I only wish we could have convinced the administration to go the whole way, and defeat the measure entirely.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I wish to touch upon the questions raised by the Senator from Florida just briefly. I say at the outset, I appreciate the constructive nature of most of the discussion this afternoon. On occasion there has been more heat than light on both sides, which is understandable when we are dealing with a controversial question; but I think there is sufficient record for Senators' consideration and enlightenment, and I am grateful for the cooperation of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

On the point raised by the Senator from Utah, I think it will be very useful for Senators reading the RECORD tomorrow to refer to the colloquy between myself and the Senator from Utah earlier in the afternoon, when he raised the question of to what extent, if any, the proceeds of the sale of these participation certificates could be used for new loans. I shall not undertake to repeat that colloquy, which was lengthy, but it reflected the fact that we have a diversity of programs with a variety of basic statutory authority, which precludes a simple "yes" or "no" answer to that question.

But I think it is possible to give a simple "no" answer with respect to the programs of the Farmers Home Administration, because a "no" answer is applicable. As I understand those programs, there is specific ceiling, or a specific authorization each year for each program for new loans. As the Senator from Utah will recall from the colloquy earlier in the day, it is my understanding that when that is the case, the proceeds of the sales of participation certificates cannot be used to enlarge the authority granted by such specific authorizations. Does the Senator from Utah recall that to be the substance of our discussion earlier, or at least my side of it?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah does so recall it.

Maybe we could nail it down if I asked the Senator another question. Since it is the understanding of the Senator from Maine that the proceeds of sales of participations from programs of the type that depend on annual increments of lending authority cannot be used to increase that authority, what happens to the money from those participations? Does it go into the Treasury?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes, it does.

Mr. BENNETT. The money from sales of those participations goes directly into the Treasury, and has no further effect on the lending capacity of the agency?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes, through repayment by the agency of its obligations to the Treasury. To the extent that there is unused lending authorization, the funds can be used to implement that authorization, but cannot be used to add to the authorization.

Mr. BENNETT. I think that may help to clarify the point.

Mr. MUSKIE. Does the Senator from Indiana have a question?

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, if I may ask the Senator from Maine, as I understand, when these participations are sold, instead of the money going back into the general fund for general purposes, the funds will be earmarked specifically for the agency from which the original amounts were taken into the pool. Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. As a practical matter, the proceeds go to the Treasury, and they are credited to the agency.

Mr. HARTKE. Can they be used for other purposes?

Mr. MUSKIE. To the extent that they are not used by the agency legitimately and appropriately under its spending programs, for cash, and so on—the same purposes for which money is otherwise obtained from the Treasury for the agency's spending programs—they are available to the Treasury for the general cash needs of the Government, just as the proceeds of Treasury borrowing would be, the same way that postal revenues or cash from any source would be.

Mr. HARTKE. Then exactly the contrary is true; although the funds are earmarked for the agency, they can be used for any purposes whatsoever, as any other revenue going into the general fund?

Mr. MUSKIE. Not used as revenue. As cash that is available. It is available in asset form one minute, and in cash form the next minute. It is available, as cash, for general purposes.

Mr. HARTKE. The difficulty arises because there is no capital budget; I understand that. But my understanding was that the funds would be earmarked by the Treasury for the agency involved. That is not true, then; there is not even a separate account established within the fund itself?

Mr. MUSKIE. There are bookkeeping accounts between the agencies and the Treasury now, on which the proper entries would be made, as I understand it. The agency, however, has additional borrowing authority available for future use when needed.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes. There are separate accounts kept now for them.

Mr. MUSKIE. Well, the entries would be made on those separate accounts.

Mr. HARTKE. But can the funds be withdrawn from that account, under the authority of this bill?

Mr. MUSKIE. Whenever an agency needs cash to carry on its program, I assume it goes to the Treasury for that cash from its unused borrowing authority. This cash will have been commingled; it is available, the same as any other cash.

Mr. HARTKE. Of course, this is merely a bookkeeping transaction, and the whole purpose is to obviate the necessity of increasing the debt limit?

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not agree with that. If I may state it very simply—and that is the only way I can state these issues—it is this: We have here some assets, and they are assets that were charged off, when they were acquired, as though they were operating expenditures of the Government. Those budget dollars, which were not really expenditures and never will be, or at least 90 percent of them never will be really expenditures of the Government, are frozen. They cannot be used, and the money cannot be spent for any other purpose.

So now the intent is to take private dollars and substitute for those budget dollars, so that we can use them. Since we have charged—and I think improperly—the initial loans against our spending or operating budget, when we recover the proceeds of such a loan, it seems to me we have a right to offset that figure, which was placed against the budget, with an offsetting receipt.

That is what it amounts to.

(At this point Mr. INOUYE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. HARTKE. Not correspondingly listing, though, an increase in the national debt as a result of selling these participations.

Mr. MUSKIE. Not now, when we sell this loan paper directly, which we have authority to do and which we have been doing for over a decade.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand.

Mr. MUSKIE. When we sell these loans directly and get the proceeds of them, this reduces our borrowing requirements.

Mr. HARTKE. Let us come back to this point: The truth is, if we did not sell these items, we would have to do one of two things; namely, either tax the people in order to raise additional funds, or borrow funds, or borrow the money to make a direct dollar-for-dollar transaction, so far as the public is concerned.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator poses a question as though, somehow, this was an alternative to those two.

Mr. HARTKE. I think there is more to it than that.

Mr. MUSKIE. There must be an alternative, a proper transaction to recover for which the dollars have been tied up.

Mr. HARTKE. But if we did not take this alternative, we would either have to increase taxes or increase the deficit, dollar for dollar.

Mr. MUSKIE. I would not say that necessarily follows. If we wish to follow that line of argument, I can accept that precise analysis, but I will say, if it were not done, the alternative would have to be to request borrowing from additional sources to get revenue. But to say, dollar for dollar, it would be exactly the same, I am not prepared to accept that conclusion.

Mr. HARTKE. It seems more expensive, because we pay a premium——

Mr. MUSKIE. There is another alternative which is more expensive, and that is direct sales of assets, which we have authority to do without legislation. That is more expensive.

Mr. HARTKE. The point is, if we move in this fashion, we are bound by the 4¼ percent interest limitation.

Mr. MUSKIE. We can borrow in the short-term market, if we wish to pay interest rates.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand.

Mr. MUSKIE. We are talking about alternatives available to us under existing law.

Mr. HARTKE. This is an expensive alternative.

Mr. MUSKIE. It depends on what we call expensive. There has been considerable discussion in the last 2 days of what the spread is. If we are talking about long-term Treasury borrowings, which we cannot make—under existing circumstances—in law, then we are limited to short-term Treasury borrowings. Thus, we are comparing the results of short-term Treasury borrowings and long-term maturities on participation certificates which may very well be less expensive than Treasury borrowings.

Mr. HARTKE. I believe that perhaps the Senator from Maine is right, for the reason that the Treasury has boxed itself into this position. That is why I intend to support the bill, because it is the only alternative to getting out of a bad situation.

Last week, the Federal Reserve System stated that money is as tight as it has ever been. This is reflected in the current newscasts coming over the ticker this afternoon. I have seen three items within the spread of about five situations here. One of them is the announcement by General Motors that they are cutting back drastically in the production of their automobiles. The second is that there is a renewed wave of selling which clobbered the stock market, and the third is that FNMA stated tonight that it purchased a record $797.8 million in mortgages during the first 3 months of this year because of the tight money market.

Mr. President, this tight money market which has been instituted by the Federal Reserve Board under William McChesney Martin has gotten the Treasury Department into a tight squeeze. I am interested in helping out. However, the real answer is to go back to the Federal Reserve and start talking sense to them down there. When that has been done, perhaps we can start going in the right direction. The difficulty is, these are very bad signs. I do not know what caused them. I am not going to say that they are the result of tight money. The items on the ticker, Nos. 153, 154, and 155, to which I have referred, may be some of the things to which the administration was referring as some of the horizons which were not too bright.

Let me assure the Senator from Maine that I intend to support the measure, but I believe that the policies being pursued at the present time can only aggravate the situation.

Let me ask one more question of the Senator from Maine: When they attempted to sell the export-import issues, approximately $750 million, and the subscription was for less than half of that amount, is that true?

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not have the answer. I would have to get that.

Mr. HARTKE. Let me say that it is true; that I know it is true.

Mr. MUSKIE. Then the Senator should not have asked me that question.

Mr. HARTKE. The point is, I wanted to state that as a premise for my question.

Mr. MUSKIE. I assure the Senator, I am not trying to embarrass him.

Mr. HARTKE. Of course not. I am not trying to embarrass the Senator from Maine, either. I know the answer to the question, which I asked in the Finance Committee.

Admitting that this is true, and I have the record in my hand, if the Senator from Maine would like me to read it, the point is that to the extent they were not sold, the Secretary of the Treasury indicated it would increase the deficit of the United States to that amount—to the extent of $350 million. Is this true? Let me go ahead and say that it is true, and I will answer the question. The point is, if we do not wish to sell the $4.7 billion, where are we going to get the money, then? Does the Senator have any suggestions on that?

Perhaps that question should be left unanswered. I think probably that is the best way to leave it.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the three items, Nos. 153, 154, and 155, which came over the Senate's ticker this afternoon.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[No. 153]

DETROIT.—There had been previous slowdowns or shutdowns in various GM units, but these were due to things like supplier strikes or a railroad strike.

Disclosure that three GM plants—Chevrolet in Ypsilanti, Mich., and Van Nuys, Calif., and a GM assembly plant in South Gate, Calif.—worked only 3 days this week, while an Atlanta, Ga., plant was on 4 days, came as a surprise to the rest of the industry.

American Motors has been plagued by such shutdowns in recent months but it worked a regular 5-day week this time while GM was having difficulties. Chrysler was on a 5-day week and Ford had 10 of its 17 assembly plants listed for overtime work this Saturday.

GM's cutback announcement came shortly after reports of the four auto companies showed April sales totaled 761,606 cars, off the 799,102 April pace of a year ago.

Sales for the opening 4 months of the year were 2,963,292 cars, again behind the 2,991,609 units sold in the comparable 4 months last year.

[No. 154]

NEW YORK.—A renewed wave of selling clobbered the stock market late today, knocking it down to its lowest level of the day at the close.

A heavy wave of selling was triggered initially by news of General Motors production cutbacks. That, combined with confusing statements from Washington about the possibility of a tax boost, were cited as factors in the decline.

The day began with a moderate rally but the GM news reversed this.

[No. 155]

WASHINGTON.—The Federal National Mortgage Association said tonight it purchased a record $797.8 million in mortgages during the first 3 months of this year because of the tight money market.

Value of the 61,739 mortgages was almost double the previous record set during the last 3 months of 1965, FNMA reported.

First quarter purchases of mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration or insured by the Federal Housing Administration compared with the sale of only six mortgages, valued at $62,000, FNMA said.

During the October-December quarter of last year, Fannie Mae bought 34,271 mortgages for $405.4 million.

In its secondary market operations, FNMA buys FHA and VA mortgages when mortgage money is scarce on the private market. The money Fannie Mae pays private lenders for the mortgages is in turn used by the mortgage bankers for new loans.

Fannie Mae sells mortgages to private lenders when mortgage money is plentiful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966.

S. 3283 would establish a new means of refinancing Federal spending which will be costly—which will deceive the American taxpayer as to the true status of the financial condition of the Government, and which will have far-reaching implications for the future conduct of governmental activities.

The purported objective of this legislation is to promote private financing of governmental credit needs and to replace public credit with private funds. The bill would authorize participating departments and agencies who presently have direct loan programs to enter into trust agreements with the Federal National Mortgage Association whereby FNMA would sell participation certificates based on a pool of Federal loans. These certificates would be sold to the investing public at prevailing market interest rates.

HIGHER INTEREST RATES

Mr. President, there are numerous reasons why this bill should not be enacted.

First is the fact, openly conceded by the measure's proponents, that this bill would mean increased cost for Government borrowings. The following table appears on page 20 of House Report No.

1448. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of yields on FNMA participations and nearest comparable U.S. Government securities as of Mar. 16, 1966

FNMA participation certificates			U.S. securities, nearest comparable issue			Excess yield of FNMA certificates (percent)
Coupon rate	Maturity	Percent yield	Coupon rate	Maturity	Percent yield	
5.40	1967	5.40	3⅝	1967	4.83	0.57
5.45	1968	5.45	3⅞	1968	4.90	.55
5.50	1969	5.50	4	1969	4.87	.58
5.50	1970	5.50	4	1970	4.92	.58
5.50	1971	5.50	4	1971	4.94	.56
5.50	1972	5.50	4	1972	4.99	.51
5.50	1973	5.50	4	1973	5.03	.47
5.50	1974	5.50	4⅛	1974	5.05	.45
5.50	1975	5.50	4¼	1974	5.02	.48
5.45	1976	5.45	4¼	1974	5.02	.43
5.45	1977	5.45	4¼	1974	5.02	.43
5.40	1978	5.40	4	1980	4.70	.70
5.35	1979	5.35	4	1980	4.70	.65
5.30	1980	5.30	4	1980	4.70	.60
5.25	1981	5.25	4	1980	4.70	.55

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this table indicates very clearly an interest rate differential average one-half of 1 percent over current Treasury borrowings.

This differential will mean added and unnecessary borrowing costs amounting to $5 million per year for each billion dollars of participations sold.

BUSTED BUDGETS CAN BE BALANCED

S. 3283 would establish a new system of subsidized financing, the main effect of which will be an effort to turn deficits into surpluses.

For example, let us consider the pending budget for fiscal year 1967. The administrative budget for fiscal 1966 contemplates a budget deficit of $1.8 billion. However, to achieve this low figure the administration proposes to sell $4.7 billion of its financial assets. Over $4 billion of this so-called sale is to be achieved by participation sales. The proceeds, since they will be reported as "income" though in reality a liquidation of capital assets, will then be used to offset expenditures that otherwise would have to appear in the budget. This means that, if these sales are not made, the budget deficit would be $6 billion in place of $1.8 billion. By using the scheme contemplated in this bill, the administration could easily have wiped out its $1.8 billion deficit and could have come to Congress indicating that we would have a surplus rather than a deficit. All that would be necessary was to have a projection of additional participation sales amounting to $1.8 billion.

In other words, we are merely authorizing bookkeeping juggling and manipulation to make a mockery of the administrative budget.

DECEIVING THE PUBLIC ON THE DEBT

In the same fashion in which budget expenditures can be juggled, the same technique can be applied to the Federal debt limit.

To be sure, the Government would still have the indebtedness represented by the participation certificates of FNMA. However, these certificates are outside of the Federal debt limit. Thus, by using the unlimited authority of FNMA to draw on the U.S. Treasury to finance these borrowings, significant portions of the Federal debt can be refinanced and taken outside of the Federal debt limitation.

INCREASED FEDERAL SPENDING

With deficits being converted to surplus and pressures being taken off Government spending to be within current debt limitations, the way would be cleared for more and more Federal spending in all areas to take up the slack left by this phony financing. There would be an open invitation to Congress to support spending programs which would otherwise be eliminated or substantially reduced.

THE REPUBLICANS DID IT—WHY CAN'T WE?

Mr. President, proponents of this bill have argued that the proposal here is nothing more than an extension of practices inaugurated by the Eisenhower administration. It is true that in fiscal year 1960 FNMA did exchange $311 million of its low interest mortgages for $316 million of nonmarketable Treasury investment bonds owned by the public, but this was a straightforward action in which the mortgages were sold on a competitive bid basis and paid for by bonds held by investors. The bonds acquired by FNMA were then turned over to the Treasury and canceled. Treasury then reduced FNMA's indebtedness by a like amount. There was no circumvention of the budget in this transaction. Incidentally, in the Senate the Democratic majority passed a resolution which expressed its disapproval of the plan.

Proponents of this measure also cite a House Ways and Means minority report of 1963 and indicate that the Republican signatories of that report endorsed this kind of financing. However, there was a significant and very vital difference. The comments in that report were directed at actual sales of marketable assets. No comments were directed to the so-called participation sales. The House Republicans did not endorse this program then and they are vigorously opposed to the program now.

HASTY ACTION

Mr. President, this bill is being ramrodded through Congress with only the scantiest of consideration being given to it. One day of hearings was held in the House committee. Only two administration witnesses were heard. No representatives of the commercial financial world were heard nor were their views solicited. Essentially the same tactic was followed on the Senate side. A Senate committee hearing was held on April 26 in which two administration witnesses were heard. On the following day, S. 3283, the subject of the hearing, was introduced. On the following day, April 28, another hearing was held in which two witnesses were heard. The only industry witness testifying in either House of Congress on the bill presented his statement with less than 1 hour's notice.

S. 3283 was ordered reported from the Senate committee on the same day. So here we have the spectacle of a bill involving billions and billions of dollars, affecting multifarious Federal lending programs, being given less consideration by Congress than most persons give to buying a used car. A total of about 3 hours of committee hearings served as foundation for reporting the bill.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have indicated, I cannot in good conscience support this measure.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today we are being asked to consider the Participation Sales Act of 1966, S. 3283. As Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph Barr said in his testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee:

> This bill would provide an efficient and orderly method for liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies and would help to promote private financing of Federal credit programs.

To me, this particular piece of legislation represents a major and permanent change in the method of financing the operations of the Federal Government.

And because this legislation does represent such a change, I feel there is an uncertainty as to the intent and purpose of the bill, as well as its timing and effect upon our national economy.

I can see the sale of these participations as having a twofold effect upon our national budget. The first being in the field of revenue. Beginning in fiscal 1967 some $4.7 billion worth of participations of pooled Government loans will be sold to the private sector of the economy. This means that almost $5 billion in revenue will be coming into the general fund of the Treasury.

At first I questioned the intended use of these funds. I waited to be sure that the funds received from the participation sales would not be used for other purposes, for example, helping to finance the war in Vietnam.

But Treasury officials have made assurances that if the Small Business Administration or the Veterans' Administration, or any of the other lending groups that are pooling their loans are successful in selling these participations, then the money received from the sales will be credited to their account in the general fund.

It is our duty to make sure that the Congress does not lose control of the expenditure of these funds. Because, after all, gentlemen, we are talking about almost $5 billion in ready cash that could be used for any purpose. But, as I stated above, the Treasury Department assured me that these funds will be credited to the accounts of the Small Business Administration, or the VA, or the FHA, for their use only.

The second effect the sale of these participations would have upon the budget is in the realm of bookkeeping. When you sell $4.7 billion worth of participations in Government guaranteed loans, you immediately decrease the loan liability you carry on your books by a like amount. This means that the contingent liability side of the Federal budget will be decreased by almost $5 billion. You have not actually lost the liability you undertook when you guaranteed these loans, but in effect you have passed that liability on the buyers of the participations in the loan pools. And, incidentally, you have also decreased any prospective deficit in the budget by a like amount.

As I understand the procedure outlined in the bill relating to the sale of the participations, the buyers of the participations will be paid back their principal and interest as the Government is paid the principal and interest on the loans in the pool.

Since these participations are not backed by the full faith and credit of the Federal Government, the private investor assumes some risk when he buys one. For this reason the participations will have to be made attractive to the private investors. How attractive I would not want to guess. All I can do is recall the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury Fowler when he appeared before the Finance Committee to testify in behalf of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. Our discussion centered around an attempt by the Export-Import Bank to sell some $700 million worth of their own participations. I would like to read that portion of the testimony into the RECORD:

> Senator HARTKE. Now, we have just gone through a nice experiment on that with the Export-Import Bank situation.
>
> Secretary FOWLER. We have found the Export-Import Bank—they offered $700 million of participation at a rate of 5½ percent to commercial banks, and a little more than half, $360 million, was taken up by the banks.
>
> Senator HARTKE. This was for 18 months, is that not correct?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. Put-and-call feature at that point.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Put-and-call feature at 18 months and the rate was 5½ percent?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. Correct.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Which is a substantially high rate for this type of obligation.
>
> Secretary FOWLER. It was higher than it had been through——
>
> Senator HARTKE. Higher than we had ever offered before, and yet the public response to that was less than half; is that not true?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. That is right.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Now, how do you account for that?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. Money is tight.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Money is tight, is it not; very tight and getting tighter?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. Well, money is tight. Whether it is getting tighter or not is a judgment I will not make.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Now, is money tight partially as a result of the action of the Federal Reserve Board in your opinion?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. I think that the primary cause of the tightness of money is the greatly increased requirements for credit and the desire for credit on the part of many elements in the economy.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Some places are rationing credit; is that not true?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. As we both know, the policies of the Federal Reserve Board in handling the various facets of monetary policy have a very important and significant relationship to the tightness of money. Therefore, in a sense, you could say the total complex of policies of the Federal Reserve Board against the background of the very large demand for money result in what we call a tight money situation.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Now, as a result of this offering only being partially sold, this was quite a disappointment to the Treasury, was it not really?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. I would not characterize it as quite a disappointment. The Export-Import Bank went out trying to find a market for this paper. We were willing to sell under the terms that Mr. Linder announced. We were willing to sell and would have been pleased to sell $700 million. We did not have the expectation that the total amount would necessarily be sold.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Well, now, how much of this $4.7 billion does the Treasury anticipate that it will not be able to sell?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. I have no estimate of that as of now. This looks ahead for 18 months and I do not know what the situation in the market will be during that 18-month period.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Senator HARTKE. Now, back on this $4.7 billion. As I understand, you said now, just to get us back where we were, at this time it is impossible to say whether or not the participation will meet the same fate as the $700 million offering of the Export-Import Bank.
>
> Secretary FOWLER. That is right. Although it would certainly be our expectation that we would be able to market the securities on suitable terms between now and June 30, 1967.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Does the Secretary anticipate that they will have to be offered at a higher rate than the 5½ percent?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. I have no anticipation along that line, one way or the other.
>
> Senator HARTKE. Or at a shorter term?
>
> Secretary FOWLER. I have no anticipation along that line either.
>
> Senator HARTKE. But if you wanted to make them more attractive, that would be one——
>
> Secretary FOWLER. One way to——
>
> Senator HARTKE. One of two ways to approach that situation.
>
> Secretary FOWLER. That is correct.

In keeping with the matter at hand, I note on page 43 of the hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that the largest single item making up the $4.7 billion of participations to be sold are Export-Import Bank loans of $975 million. The money market conditions in effect at the time of the tax hearings have not changed. In fact, they have gotten worse. And yet the Treasury Department continues to ignore these warning signs of high interest rates and continues to compound the difficulty.

So this brings up the question of how attractive the participations will have to be made in order to sell them. And also how much of an additional interest cost will have to be borne by the taxpayer. The New York Times estimated that it would cost the Government between $30-$44 million over the next 2 years, and the interest cost would continue to grow as more of the participations are sold.

The overall questions raised by the increase in interest rates last December 6, 1965, is a separate matter, but one which should nevertheless not be ignored in this context.

But what I wanted to stress here today is that these participations will have to bear a premium interest rate to be sold. A rate far in excess of the interest being earned on the loans in the pool. In drafting the bill, the administration has attempted to cover this "interest gap" by obtaining the approval of the two Appropriations Committees for the added interest costs prior to the sale of the participations. It seems unfortunate that the Government has worked itself into a position where it has to pay literally exorbitant interest rates to sell its obligations.

And finally, what effect will these sales have upon the availability of funds in the money market? Money is the tightest since the end of the Eisenhower recession back in 1960, according to the Federal Reserve Bulletin. Rather than ease the strain upon the availability of funds in the United States, the administration seems intent upon further restriction of that supply. This is what the sale of these participations will do. We have already enacted the corporate speedup on income tax payments, and the speedup of personal income tax withholding which helped to dry up available funds. Now, on top of the already overburdened money market operations, the passage of this bill removes $4.7 billion of available funds out of the private sector for use in the public sector.

This further constriction of the funds available to the private sector can only result in higher interest rates. It is a never ending upward spiral being encouraged by the actions of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the able Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has developed clearly the issues drawn by the pending proposal, as now amended. The bill has my support. I believe there is value in reading the editorial in the Newark Evening News on the President's request for permanent authority to broaden private participation in the Government's multibillion loan business.

The paper points out that this "would not be an innovation in Federal finance," and adds that "sale, on a limited scale, of Government financial assets originated in the Eisenhower administration and has since been national policy."

It is the opinion of the paper that "the pool sales certainly would have an anti-inflationary affect by draining off several billions from the economy."

The editorial bears on the issue and, I ask permission of my colleagues to include the article in its entirety in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Apr. 23, 1966]

U.S. Loan Pool

President Johnson's request to Congress for permanent authority to broaden private participation in the Government's multibillion loan business would not be an innovation in Federal finance. Sale, on a limited scale, of Government financial assets originated in the Eisenhower administration and has since been national policy.

The administration's purpose is to expand the sales. The legislation would authorize creation of a giant pooling of Government holdings in about 100 lending programs. Participations in the pool would be sold to individual investors, as well as financial institutions such as banks and insurance companies.

The pooled loans would include those made for a variety of purposes, among them private housing, education, college dormitories and small businesses. The device is already in use by the Veterans' Administration, Federal National Mortgage Association, and the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Johnson's hope to sell $4.7 billion of loans through the pools in the next fiscal year may, however, be delayed in Congress which is split on the proposal along party lines. His explanation that the sales would "permit us to conserve our budget resources by substituting private for public credit" is precisely the reason a number of congressional Republicans have attacked the plan.

They see the proposal as a bookkeeping expedient to make his budget look good. In effect, proceeds from the pool sales would show up as a reduction in Federal expenditures. Thus, instead of the $6.5 billion deficit Republican critics now foresee for the budget, the red ink could amount to only $1.8 billion as Mr. Johnson estimated in January.

Another major objection is the added cost to taxpayers. Presumably the pool participations will be sold at a higher rate of interest than the original loans. The most recent sale of FNMA certificates, for example, provided yields up to 5½ percent.

Republican objection to the higher interest rate is not quite according to form. In surprising contrast, is acceptance thus far of Mr. Johnson's proposal by the cheap money bloc led by Representative Wright Patman, of Texas, chairman of the House Banking Committee.

If Mr. Johnson succeeds in keeping the deficit down by means of the pool sale, or even the simple method of reducing actual spending, he would, of course deprive the GOP of an issue in the November election. Yet whatever virtues or shortcomings his proposal may have, the pool sales certainly would have an anti-inflationary effect by draining off several billions from the economy.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment on page 2, just adopted, be reconsidered, so I may propose a modification.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be an order to offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The adoption of the amendment is reconsidered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I would like to modify the amendment that we adopted, on page 2, which listed the programs specifically which would be included under the provisions of the bill that has to do with Farmers Home Administration loans, to restrict them to loans for farm ownership, rural housing, and crop production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the change.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. MUSKIE. I would be happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will state the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification of the amendment will be stated.

The **Legislative Clerk.** In the amendment on page 2, subsection 2, following the words "Farmers Home Administration," it is proposed to delete the semicolon and insert the following: "(with respect only to loans for land acquisition, rural housing, and crop production) ;".

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this will further restrict the authority and reduce it somewhat from the $10.9 billion.

This is a further restriction, and, therefore, I congratulate the Senator. I hope that we can restrict it further. However, this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has mixed feeling about this, but he has only agreed to this amendment, so far as he is concerned.

This would restrict the hypothecation of paper in the hands of the Farmers Home Administration to that acquired by reason of direct loans only for three traditional and normal activities of the Farmers Home Administration; namely, land acquisition, crop production, and rural housing.

That leaves out the emergency loans which are approximately $100 million right now. It leaves out soil and water loans which are small in amount now, but which the agency is trying to increase greatly in scope of activity.

It leaves out loans for recreational development. It leaves out all other, what I would call, untried experimental loans that are being made, such as housing for elderly, and other type loans which really are new and untried, or have no legitimate connection with agriculture.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would like to have the Senators understand two things. First, this agreement is made only for myself; and, second, I recognize the fact that this leaves three of the largest groups of securities under the coverage of the bill.

I think there is more case for leaving those three under the bill. That is the reason why I have agreed to do it.

I wish to put a note of warning in the debate at this time. It is my belief it will be found that this class of securities will not be highly useful when it comes to hypothecation. I remind the Senate that every dime recommended by the Farmers Home Administration in its traditional activities is on a substandard loan.

In other words, if a person who wishes a loan can get it from a commercial bank he cannot borrow from Farmers Home Administration.

If he can get it from Farm Credit Administration he cannot borrow from the Farmers Home Administration. That being the case, everybody knows that their portfolio of securities is a portfolio of substandard securities, and I think it is the least useful one of the group of securities included in the provisions of this very broad bill.

I am willing for the Farmers Home Administration to remain in the bill, provided the activities in the bill are limited to these three traditional fields of operation.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. What type loan is included in the category "land acquisition"?

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that it would include the original Bankhead-Jones purpose loans of helping a tenant acquire his farm and later extension of that under which small farmers have been helped to enlarge their holdings to reach an economic size for production.

That is my understanding. If the Senator from Maine has a different understanding I would be happy to have him state it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Would it be for agricultural purposes as opposed to newer purposes of land acquisition?

Mr. HOLLAND. My purpose and hope was to confine it to traditional activities for agricultural purposes. I do not know if that is the word. It is limited to that. We could not get a copy of the bill.

I am willing to state for the record my understanding of the amendment.

This would confine it to land acquisition. It would confine the paper to land acquisition that is within the original scope of helping the tenant to acquire his farm or helping him to enlarge his uneconomical farm. It is not for recreational use or those uses not within the original purview of the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. HRUSKA. That description as part of the legislative history will be helpful.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can speak only for myself. If the Senator from Maine has a different point of view, he can explain it.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Florida stated my understanding of the provision. It includes farmownership loans, direct operating loans, and rural housing loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3283) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is a rollcall now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before we have the yea-and-nay vote, I would like to ask the majority leader about the program for the remainder of the day and the remainder of the week if he can presently tell us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the voting on the pending measure completed, that will finish business of the Senate for today. Then we are going over until Monday, at which time we will take up various bills out of the Armed Services Committee and attend to other matters as they may arise.

Sometime next week the Atomic Energy Commission authorization will be taken up by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore].

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I inquire about the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We hope that that bill may be ready next week, as well as the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, but we are not absolutely certain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3283) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in 1959 I voted against a proposal substantially identical to the one that is before the Senate tonight. President Eisenhower sought to dispose of capital assets in order to procure liquid dollars with which to operate the Government. His program was opposed. I voted against his proposal because I thought it was unsound to sell capital assets in order to finance current operations. Today, President Johnson is asking for the same right that was embodied in the program of President Eisenhower in 1959.

I voted against the proposal of President Eisenhower, and I shall vote against the proposal of President Johnson. I disagree with the proposal that it is possible to finance current operations by selling capital assets. It is wrong in the home, it is wrong with the individual, and it is wrong with Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico, [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Bible
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Douglas
Ellender
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Muskie
Neuberger
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—22

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Simpson
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—38

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Church
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hayden
Kennedy, Mass.
Magnuson
McGovern
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Murphy
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Young, Ohio

So the bill (S. 3283) was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], handled the participation sales measure with skillful and articulate advocacy of the highest order. At once vigorous and diplomatic, his presentation of the proposal assured Senate approval.

The success was characteristic. It was achieved by clear and convincing explanations of the proposal's effects, obviously broad knowledge of its various provisions, and sharp appreciation of the issues involved. But these are the capacities applied to all legislative measures handled by the distinguished Senator from Maine.

He is a Senator whose service in this body has been characterized consistently by a devotion to excellence which is unmatched. This is especially true when his great talents are devoted to the handling of legislative proposals as they come for action to the Senate floor. So today, his handling of this legislation attests amply to the high quality of the service he renders. Witnessed was a ready grasp of the complex technicalities of the measure coupled with a profound analysis of its financial consequences. Such a combination assured the success of the proposal. Such an achievement is just one more in a long line of great contributions by the Senator from Maine.

As always, we are grateful to other Members of this body whose diligence and strong efforts were responsible to a large degree for favorable Senate action on this measure today. Outstanding was the contribution of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] whose faithful presence on the floor during most of the consideration of the proposal was joined frequently with his typically brilliant support to assure success. Also, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] added his capable efforts to obtain Senate approval. So too, the efforts of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]—that knowledgeable chairman of the Committee on Finance—helped to achieve success.

But cooperation also played an important role in obtaining orderly and efficient action. To those Senators who joined to oppose the measure but who nevertheless sought not to impede its disposition, we are indebted. Commendation thus goes to the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the ranking minority member of the committee, whose generous cooperation is always appreciated. Similarly, the senior Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], joined by the very able minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and others, were characteristically sincere and strong in their opposition; characteristically too, they were fair in assuring orderly disposition.

Finally, we are once again grateful to the Senate as a whole for another achievement obtained swiftly, yet orderly, and with mutual respect for the views of all.

ADMINISTRATION FAILURES IN VIETNAM WAR

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, every thoughtful American is disturbed about the failures of the administration in reference to the Vietnam war.

American boys have been committed to fight in a far-removed place where the odds are most difficult. It is indeed tragic that our fighting men should have to contend with any shortages whatever. This country is capable of better support for our fighting men than they are receiving. It matters not what the shortages are, nor what the particular circumstances are.

Individuals in the House and Senate, devoted to the cause of bringing about peace and staying out of war, have time and again raised serious questions concerning the policies, decisions, statements, and record of the Secretary of Defense. Reading what is said on all sides of this controversy raises a question of credibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial by Robert Hotz from the May 2, 1966, issue of the magazine, Aviation Week & Space Technology.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CREDIBILITY GAP WIDENS

(By Robert Hotz)

Congressional criticism of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has risen in an unprecedented crescendo during recent weeks over a wide variety of issues including management of the Vietnam war, development of new manned bombers and the combat readiness of U.S. forces not already committed to southeast Asia. Unfortunately, Mr. McNamara's replies to these critics have been characterized by an increasing flow of invective and irrelevant statistics that carry the arguments off tangentially from the points at issue.

For a man who has always publicly prided himself on hewing to the facts wherever they may fall, Mr. McNamara made some amazing statements in his recent 3-hour testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Since Mr. McNamara has retorted "baloney" to some of his critics' allegations and "shocking distortion" to others, we feel it only fair to point out some of the significant "baloney" and distortion in Mr. McNamara's dazzling performance before Senator FULBRIGHT's committee.

Mr. McNamara, in attempting to answer charges of bomb shortages in Vietnam, told the committee:

"The reason why they [USAF] thought 750-pound bombs were surplus in 1964 was that nobody contemplated that the B-52s, designed for nuclear operations, would be carrying out 750-pound conventional bombing operations. * * * The use of B-52 bombers, not in nuclear operations but in dropping 750-pound bombs 50 at a crack, was never conceived of."

SAC BOMBING PROFICIENCY

This is simply not true. Strategic Air Command trained both its B-47 and B-52 crews on a quarterly basis from 1958 through 1961 to keep proficient in dropping iron bombs from internal bomb bays. The requirement was dropped in 1962 but resumed in 1963 at the insistence of Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, then SAC commander. In March 1964, General Power intensified SAC crew training with iron bombs and in May 1964, initiated a program to install external racks to increase the iron bomb load on some B-52s. Actual tests of this configuration began at Eglin AFB in August 1964. When escalation of the Vietnam war in 1965 produced an urgent requirement for large quantities of iron bombs to saturate targets in short periods of time, the SAC B-52 crews were already trained and equipped to do this job.

Mr. McNamara emphasized to the committee that the 1,600 U.S. military helicopters now in Vietnam are more than all U.S. forces had when he became Secretary of Defense and more than either the rest of the free world has or are in the combined Sino-Soviet inventory. This is perfectly true, but it conveniently ignores the fact that this Vietnam force level has been achieved only by stripping modern helicopters from other U.S. combat forces. It overlooks the pertinent fact that Mr. McNamara for several years drastically cut Army budget requests for helicopters on the ground that they would not be needed. He is now pouring money into a crash helicopter production program that proves more conclusively than any words that the Army's judgment on helicopter requirements was far more accurate than Mr. McNamara's.

Similarly he explained the tremendous demand for 2.75-inch rockets in Vietnam as due to the Army's discovery there for the first time that it needed armament for its helicopters. The fact is that the Army has been trying to develop armed helicopters since the early 1960's, only to be denied the dollars by the Secretary of Defense. Because of this the Army helicopters in Vietnam still carry jury-rigged armament, and the first purchase of a helicopter specifically designed and developed with armament was not authorized by Department of Defense until 1966.

KOREAN WAR SURPLUS

Another statement that will shock those who have been in the defense business a great deal longer than Mr. McNamara was his assertion to the Senate committee that "it is really immoral to spend $12 billion of this Nation's resources for surplus as we did during the Korean war," and that he intends to buy everything needed for Vietnam but not one thing more. Again Mr. McNamara conveniently overlooks the fact that in the Korean war this country mobilized not only to combat the North Korean and Chinese armies in Korea, but also to meet the possibility of Russian intervention and a third world war. By this action, President Truman and his defense chiefs unquestionably averted the outbreak of another general war and discouraged the spread of Soviet aggression to Europe.

If Mr. McNamara really believes it is possible to fight and win a war killing the last enemy with the last bullet as the last soldier eats the last can of beans in the quartermaster's stores, this Nation faces serious trouble ahead. Events have already proved that some of Mr. McNamara's military judgments have not been as sound as he imagined. But if he persists in trying to budget the Vietnam war or any other military confrontation with the goal of emerging with no surplus materiel, he will actually be budgeting shortages in combat equipment for the future. War is an illogical and wasteful enterprise that inevitably defies the efforts of man to calculate its fury precisely.

Almost 2 years ago we warned that a credibility gap was widening between the events transpiring in Vietnam and the versions of them that Mr. McNamara was dispensing to the American people. Mr. McNamara's recent exercises in revising history and attempting to dazzle his congressional critics with irrelevant statistics are further widening this credibility gap. Unfortunately, this is the very time that the increasing U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war requires the clearest public understanding of this military effort and the foreign policy on which it is based.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT—AMENDMENT NO. 537

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fine editorial from the Washington Post of May 2, 1966, entitled "Next," recommending the inclusion of Amendment No. 537 in the Traffic Safety Act legislation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1966]

NEXT?

In April alone, the public has learned that:

Lincoln has told dealers to recall 40,000 Continentals to repair a braking defect.

Buick told dealers last December to recall certain 1964 models for a possibly troublesome brake condition.

Chrysler Corp., told dealers in November 1964, to recall certain Plymouths, Chryslers, and Dodges for a welding job on a steering bracket.

Ford told 30,000 owners of 1965 cars that their ride could be improved by a change in the rear suspension, not saying that their cars could go out of control if a suspension arm broke.

Dodge recalled 17,500 cars for a throttle change, not saying safety was at stake.

Chevrolet told dealers last July to recall 16,000 models for a faulty front door latch.

GM has just told dealers to recall 1,500,000 Chevelles and Chevrolets with Powerglide transmissions because the throttle could stick.

Pontiac recalled 80,000 1961 Tempests considered too lowslung to clear possible road obstacles.

Buick found that some 15,000 1963 Specials had fenders that could cut their tires, but made no effort to recall them for repair.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, has introduce an amendment to the administration's traffic safety bill that would require auto manufacturers to notify owners and dealers at once of new-car defects that might involve safety. Another amendment, by Senators ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, and ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, would require manufacturers to give copies of communications with dealers about defects to the Secretary of Commerce or Transportation; the Secretary would be empowered to issue public warnings. Mr. RIBICOFF has also requested—and received—the manufacturers' agreement to supply a complete list of product defect warnings issued since 1960.

The administration's bill does not touch the critical matter of defect reports. The Mondale and Ribicoff-Kennedy amendments ought to be added to it.

AMBASSADOR AVRAHAM HARMAN'S SPEECH AT GREEN GABLES COUNTRY CLUB, DENVER, COLO.—RESPONSIBILITY OF FREEMEN

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of hearing His Excellency Avraham Harman, Ambassador from Israel to the United States, deliver an inspiring and thought-provoking address. He was talking at the United Jewish Appeal dinner at the Green Gables Country Club in Denver, Colo. Besides giving weight to our traditional American concept of liberty he added new insight into its true meaning with his descriptions of the responsibilities all of us face as freemen. Not only was his talk down to earth, it was thoroughly refreshing in its honesty, humor, and sincerity. Mr. President, I think all of us would profit immensely from reading Ambassador Harman's remarks, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR AVRAHAM HARMAN AT GREEN GABLES

Senator ALLOTT, Senator DOMINICK, Governor Love, Mayor Currigan, consuls, distinguished ladies and gentlemen; your allied campaign in the past two decades, has been helping to build up your own community, your own needs, all the while helping to assist Jews outside the United States.

In the past 21 years, since the end of the war, you have seen the greatest movement of Jewish people in the history of the world. During this period, 1.6 million Jews have migrated from the countries of their birth in search of freedom—freedom as human beings, freedom as Jews.

And 1.3 million of them have come to my country, which almost 18 years ago declared its independence, and fought for that independence against attack with three major purposes in mind: The first was to break open the doors, into which all Jews, denied their rights and identity as Jews, could find conditions in which they could be free.

That door has held open, and it will always be held open.

The second purpose was to create objective conditions whereby our ancient civilization and faith could recreate itself in freedom. Let me say one word in explanation of that purpose.

All of us here tonight remember what the Nazi period did to the Jewish people in terms of human sacrifice. Six million Jews, out of a total of 18 million that lived in 1939, did not emerge from the Nazi period alive.

But in an historic sense, the real loss which our people suffered at the hands of nazism was the destruction of over 30,000 organized Jewish communities in central and eastern Europe. Communities which, for many, many centuries, had been the heartland of Jewish faith, tradition, and culture.

We, who labored to create the State of Israel and those who proceeded us in the last three or four generations, foresaw that this might happen and one of our essential purposes was to create conditions in Israel which would insure the unbroken and creative continuity of our faith and our experiences as people for all time to come.

We've been trying these last 18 years to achieve that purpose. We haven't achieved it completely, but we've laid strong foundations.

The Hebrew language has been revived and is spoken today in Israel as the mother tongue of our children, and is the language of instruction in our schools and universities.

And there has been, during these last 18 years, a great upsurge in Jewish religious life and in Jewish learning. I believe that will continue.

Our third purpose, in achieving our independence, was to do what free people everywhere want to do. To use our independence in order to enlarge the horizons of liberty for each individual citizen.

Independence is not an end in itself as many of all of the newly independent countries in the world are finding out. You dream of your freedom, and you fight for it, and you always have to defend it against threats of aggression and against attack.

But when you achieve your independence, and you see your national flag go up for the first time, you discover that what you've got is not paradise, but the key to paradise.

One of the first letdowns of every independent country, a few months after it obtains its independence is that the citizens discover that their taxes go up. Of course, they go up. Because, having won self-responsibility and the capacity to chart their own course and future, they want to do things, and they discover very much to their chagrin, that everything you won costs money and has to be paid for.

To enlarge the freedom of the individual, who is the source of origin of society, and not the subject of the state is the philosophy that we have been trying to pursue in Israel these last 18 years.

Taking the hard road of democracy, which is the most complex and difficult form of social organization man has ever devised, yet one of the most durable, because it rests on the self-discipline of human beings who respect each other and each other's rights—we found through our short experience, that this is the sure road—hard though it may be, involving compromise and different people living together.

Let me say a word or two about those people whom you helped go through the open door of Israel in the last 18 years. We've let them all come in, as the Bible describes the exodus of Jews from Egypt in ancient times—the old and young, the sick and the lame, and the blind.

Entire communities have transferred themselves to Israel, about half of them from Europe, from the remnants of nazism, and about half of them from North Africa and the Middle East, all held together by their common purpose and common aspirations.

We received in Israel in this floodtide of immigration people who would never have qualified for admission into any other country in the world. That's our pride because we felt we owed an obligation to them.

There are people with open cases of tuberculosis. There are heads of families physically incapable of earning a living for themselves. When they came into Israel, fewer than 1 percent of these 1.3 million people were farmers, but all of them needed to eat. And fewer than 2 percent of them had earned their living previously in the building trades, but all of them needed a roof over their heads. What we've had to do in Israel these past 18 years is to produce an occupational revolution among these people.

We've transplanted them to new careers, to new types of work and disciplined them into a democratic society, because most of them who had come from Europe came from countries which had seen democracy brought to the ground. And those who had come from North Africa and the Middle East came from countries where democracy had never been practiced.

This has not been an easy course, and we have not completed it. You don't complete a job like that in 18 years, but we've laid foundations. Israel today is producing 70 percent of all the food its people eat, and it is exporting surpluses of other foods, particularly citrus and other fresh fruits and vegetables.

Its economy is not yet self-sustaining, because in addition to remaking a people, we've had to try and remake an ancient and a bruised land. The whole of the Middle East is in this condition. We live in a part of the world which is not sustaining in 1966 the same size population that it sustained 2,000 years ago.

Israel is a greatly lived-in part of the world, greatly used and greatly abused. We are trying to build a new society in Israel as are our neighbors throughout the Middle East in the ashes of buried civilization. That takes time.

And it will take some time before our economy is self-sustaining, providing the standard of living which you need to maintain a democratic society. The standard to which we aspire is the standard of Western Europe. That kind of standard is needed to guarantee the perpetuity of democratic institutions.

But I think that we've found a road—in agriculture, and in the last 10 years, in industry. We've found skills among some of our new immigrants and we've put them to work. We've found some resources in our soil and we're beginning to put them to work. We've harnessed whatever we have in water resources and we've brought them to places where there is arable land. We look forward in the 1970's to the great breakthrough of making desalted water work for us in order to enrich human life.

That's the road we've traveled up to now. No problem has been finally solved but firm and unshakable foundations have been laid. Those 1.3 million people whom you have helped so admirably—and whose basic human needs you have taken care of, healing the sick and the broken, providing educational tools for children, extending first aid to the early settlers of Israel—those people today are a proud people earning a livelihood for themselves, enriching themselves and their new land. And there are more on the way.

The creation of the State of Israel has eliminated the question of, Where can a Jew go who wishes to escape from the suppression of freedom?

There is a question facing Jews in some countries of how they can get out. And they are coming out. The world isn't monolithic. And times do change. And new circumstances come therefore. And it's a matter of tremendous significance that those who are waiting for a chance know if they can get out they've got somewhere to go—that your helping hand is waiting to assist them on the way.

In the last 5 years, 250,000 people have come into Israel, more are entering every year, because they have the same instincts and the same yearning which brought your fathers and grandfathers to this land of liberty in which you live. Israel bears witness to one of the great lessons of modern history—that the human yearning for freedom is deathless, unshakable, and irresponsible and that it will wait its time and find a way out.

People ask me: When is Israel going to have peace? We're surrounded by countries that tell us they plan to destroy us, wipe us off the map and drive us into the sea. We are not insensitive to these threats. We don't treat them lightly. We don't think they can be realized. And we mean to do everything within our power to insure they do not.

If I were asked to sum up the policy of my country, I think I would do it in terms that you would recognize. First, that we want peace and we have kept the minds and hearts of our people wide open for peace. And we always do that.

We would like to see disarmament in our area. And it ought to be easier than achieving it on a global scale. Because, thank God, the lethal weapons in the modern armory are not manufactured in the Middle East. They are imported. And we'd like to see a condition developing in which those who have flooded the Middle East with weapons in the last 10 years will understand the risks that they have created by doing that. We would like to see an arrangement involving countries that manufacture arms and the countries in the Middle East to get this armament or, at any rate, to see to it that the arms don't escalate further.

But until that happens—and while these massive injections of arms are coming into our area, we have to balance them, not gun for gun, not plane for plane, because we have no purpose of aggression. We don't want to conquer anyone—or acquire additional territory. And, therefore, what we need in Israel is nothing more than a minimum sufficiency of strength to deter aggression. And if aggression is launched against us, to meet it and throw it back.

It's a very difficult problem. And a very burdensome one. We'd like to see that burden lightened by regional disaramament, by mutual inspection and control. But as long as that desire on our part is not reciprocated, we mean to keep that minimum sufficiency of deterrent strength whatever it costs us, in economic terms, and whatever the burden on our manpower and on our womanpower. Because, in Israel, all the boys go into the army for 26 months, and all the girls go into the army for 20 months. And when they leave the army they are all in the reserves. The boys remain on call till the age of 49 and the girls on call until they are married or till the age of 34 or 35.

That's our way for compensating for our small numbers, and insuring if we are attacked we will be able to defend ourselves. Let me say this—this policy of deterring aggression has been working. We've had these threats year in and year out ever since we've been in existence. Since 1957 there has been no war. The arms have escalated, but there has been no explosion. And we believe that the objective can be maintained, pushing it off until councils of reason prevail.

And there are signs that maybe councils of reasons are at work. In 1965, we have the head of an Arab state—not a Middle Eastern state—but an Arab state saying throughout the Middle East that this doctrine of destroying Israel is no longer realistic.

May I say, in conclusion, our situation in Israel is not all that unique. We live under conditions of armistice. We signed four armistice agreements with our four Arab neighbors 17 years ago between January and July of 1949. And those agreements require us to move forward from armistice to peace. And so far they have not been prepared to do that.

But in a real sense, the whole of our world since 1946 has been living in a condition of armistice and not of peace. Peace is not just the absence of shooting. It's a positive state of affairs. It should designate positive and constructive relations of mutual trust between states. This is not the situation of peace in which year by year the nations of the world are spending scores of billions of dollars on defense.

This situation of armistice that prevails throughout the world has one great advantage. It isn't total war. And it isn't shooting. The one condition of human affairs which is intolerable is total shooting. It's not consistent with the continuation of human existence. I understand why people are fed up at times. I understand why people at times are nervous, why they'd like to see quick solutions. Why they ask, "What is the United Nations doing?" Why can't we enter paradise immediately? We are not living in that kind of a world, but don't let's discount it.

The tremendous achievements of the freedom loving nations of the world since the end of the war are that through their strength, and through the strength of their economies without which you cannot have strength, they have succeeded in avoiding the explosion and in giving potential aggression reason to pause.

And, that's what's opened up the hope for the future of mankind. Edging forward to it, inching forward to it—painfully—and in this nerve-wracking situation of twilight in which we live which is neither peace nor war. And in that sense, our situation in the Middle East is a reflection of the times in which we live.

ADMINISTRATION'S DRIFT AND DELAY ON INFLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have been trying all day to make a brief statement on the inflationary situation in the Nation, and am glad that I now have finally been recognized to speak.

As the Senator from Indiana has just pointed out, the ticker is full of stories on what the administration is not doing concerning this problem.

President Johnson yesterday said that "disquieting signs are beginning to appear in the economy," the administration's anti-inflationary actions to date are still characterized by drift and delay.

The fact is that these disquieting signs have been evident for many months, and the job now is not really to head off inflation, but to minimize the damage already inflicted on our economy by the lack of early and effective action on the fiscal front.

The President charged his Advisory Committee on Labor-Management policy to find new methods of maintaining economic prosperity while assuring stability, and I applaud this. The President's request to the Advisory Committee seems to indicate that he is not yet really ready to face this issue of inflation. I feel that we should always be ready to search out new techniques to provide for the health of our economy.

As I have said many times in recent weeks, I feel that—in view of the demands on our economy due to the war in Vietnam—only a modest tax increase—an increase in the area of between 5 and 7 percent across the board—in combination with a reduction in nonessential expenditures, can halt the definite inflationary trend. Inflation, of course, is the most ruthless and heartless tax collector of them all. I am gratified to read accounts in this morning's newspapers to the effect that William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has also said that a tax increase is the only logical way to prevent further harm to the economy—and it is.

One gathers from the remarks made at the annual meetings of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that Chairman Ackley and Secretary Connor are concerned about inflationary pressures and the possibility that Federal spending may go higher than anticipated. But they see no need to adjust Government fiscal and monetary policies at this time. What they do suggest is that profits may be going too high and that the business community must exercise responsible moderation and restraint. But the administration's attempt to put primary blame for the inflationary pressures on the private sector carries ominous overtones which could impair confidence and kill the economic expansion. Their position is also no substitute for a Government policy that would directly alleviate price pressures in the private sector.

It should be clear by now that our present policy is exacting a high and inequitable cost on the American people. The most immediate cost is sharply higher prices. In the first quarter of the year, consumer prices rose nearly 3.6 percent at an annual rate and the wholesale price index rose 5 percent at an annual rate as compared with over-the-year increases of 2 percent and 3.6 percent in 1965. The signs of inflationary pressure are also discernible in the rise in the gross national product, the increased prices for industrial commodities surveys of business spending plans and the increase in imports over exports. Moreover, the evidence presents little reason to expect a slowdown in the rate of increase in the cost of living in the months ahead.

The same people in the administration who tell us that they have tamed the business cycle are permitting the growth of distortions and excesses which could well lead to a future recession and high unemployment.

The administration's efforts thus far have been meager and halfhearted when compared to the dimensions of the problem. Such an abdication of economic leadership could threaten the Nation's prosperity, endangering the hopes for building a Great Society at home and undermining our country's foreign economic policies.

Now, developments in the Vietnam war are casting doubts on the expectation that defense expenditures will level off in the second half of the year. Should defense spending continue at the recent rate, or increase, gross national product projections will have to be raised again.

The inflationary threat to the stability of our economy and our balance-of-payments outlook was recognized by both the majority and minority members of the Joint Economic Committee in their annual report issued on March 17. Both Democrats and Republicans on the committee urged stronger fiscal action to curb inflations.

Specifically, the majority suggested enactment of a standby tax increase and suspension of the investment tax credit.

The minority stressed the importance of reducing low-priority and nonessential Federal spending.

For my part, I feel that if nonessential spending cannot be reduced sufficiently to do the job—which I estimate calls for taking between $5 to $6 billion out of the economy—then taxes will have to be increased. The amount of a tax increase can be reduced by such expenditure reduction.

Except for further exhortation by the President and reported efforts to modestly reduce Government spending, no other action has been taken against inflation by this administration since the Joint Economic Committee issued its recommendations. A number of prominent economists, including Prof. Paul Samuelson, have urged anti-inflationary action, including a tax increase. Most economists appearing before the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy late in March strongly recommended expenditure reductions or deferrals or a tax increase ranging from $5 to $10 billion.

The time when anti-inflationary fiscal action would have had its maximum impact probably has already passed. Even if spending were sharply cut or taxes raised today, the country would pay the price of inaction in the form of substantial price increases over the coming months. The country has already paid too heavily for the administration's policy of drifting with the economic currents. We must now act on reduction of expenditures and a modest tax increase, or we will pay a heavy penalty later.

Mr. President, as long ago as March, the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee, on which I have the honor to be the ranking minority member, urged exactly the strong fiscal action which I am urging again today in order to curb inflationary trends. The only one brave enough in the administration to say it is William McChesney Martin. So far as Chairman Ackley of the Council of Economic Advisors and Secretary of Commerce Connor are concerned, they point out the dangers but are inhibited by the administration from urging what they know—as well as I do—must be done about it.

Therefore, Mr. President, we can all make brave speeches about the Vietnamese war and back the President, but someone has got to pay the bill. I do not want to see it paid by the erosion of the standard of living of the American people because we do not have the courage to face it with a modest tax increase.

I rise tonight to urge this point. I think it is long overdue. I think we are running grave risks if we do not do so. I think it is useless to ask the Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy to find new ways. The President should act. He prides himself on being brave when it comes to choosing alternatives. He should be brave enough to do it now. I think there are enough Senators here who are willing to stand up and be counted on this issue.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, except for the reservation as to an immediate need for a tax increase, I want to applaud the Senator for what he has said, because, no matter how one figures it, inflation is the biggest robber of the poor and is the worst and cruelest hardship we can work on anybody.

I sincerely hope that we could defer the necessity for the prospect of an increase in taxes by reducing expenditures. If we did the latter, it might turn out that a tax increase might not be necessary, although I agree with the Senator from New York that if we proceed on the course we are presently on, we are going to have to face a tax increase this year.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague for his helpful intervention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various insertions in the form of news articles be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 5, 1966]

CAN THE ECONOMY BE MANAGED?

(By Walter Lippmann)

Conservatives, who oppose the idea of a managed economy, have always based their case ultimately on the frailty of human nature. As against liberals, who generally take a rather more optimistic view of mankind, conservatives have argued that the Keynesian managers could not be trusted to manage when unpopular measures were required.

The conservatives have insisted that the economy will be mismanaged if it is placed in the hands of politicians who depend on popular elections rather than subjected to the impersonal gold standard, guarded by central bankers who are taught from childhood to expect to be unpopular. The politicians would expand the economy, because that is the popular thing to do, until the boom bursts in a sharp depression. It is, the conservatives argue, against the nature of politicians and of the mass of their constituents to restrain a boom even though it has become inflationary.

We are now witnessing a practical test of the conservative argument. The country is still enjoying the longest period of sustained prosperity in its history, but there are now unmistakable signs of an inflation—the demand for goods is pressing against the available supply.

The inflation is still regarded as mild in that the rise of consumer prices has not yet reached 3 percent per annum. But as Mr. Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said this week, "if consumer prices—and industrial profits—should continue to rise at the recent rate we would have to expect larger wage increases in 1967, and the dreary price-wage spiral would begin to turn." Mr. Walter Heller, the architect of the Kennedy-Johnson prosperity, has just told us that while this year the gross national product may be expected to grow by $14 to $16 billion each quarter, the economy cannot produce more than $10 to $11 billions more without an inflation of prices.

Figures like these have convinced most of the leading economists, such as Dr. Heller and Professor Samuelson, that measures should be prepared immediately, to reduce the excess demand for goods and services. Their advice is being resisted by the administration which is hoping that something will turn up to save it from asking Congress for higher taxes before the election in November. This resistance of the politicians to the advice of the experts is precisely what conservative critics of the new economics have always said would happen.

The administration has, to be sure, promised to ask for restraining taxes if clear signs of inflation appear. But the proof that their eyes are on the elections rather than on the health of the economy is that they are not preparing the new taxes, which take a long time under our legislative process to prepare. Thus, unless the administration acts soon, just when those taxes may be most needed, perhaps by midsummer, they will not be ready.

The administration has been mistaken before in the matters. It was mistaken as recently as January when it offered the country a budget which seemed to promise to give us both guns to fight a successful war in Vietnam and butter to carry on the Great Society, without a rise in taxes and without an inflationary deficit. The administration argument in January has already proved to be based on a miscalculation. It promised an administrative budget deficit of only $1.8 billion. At the end of last week the Budget Bureau is reported to have advised the President that Congress has insisted on additional civilian expenditures which add at least another $3 billion to the deficit.

Furthermore, the guns-and-butter promise of January assumed that the major part of the Vietnamese buildup would be over by midsummer of this year. Secretary McNamara has just told us that the buildup must be bigger and must continue longer than was originally estimated, and he has refused to set a limit on numbers or in time.

Thus the inflationary forces are gaining strength. This accounts for the great effort made by the administration to persuade workers not to ask for higher wages, businessmen to cut investment and restrain profits, and consumers to refrain from making purchases. They are asked not to act as the inflationary situation demands or makes possible.

The attempt to do by propaganda what should be done by monetary and fiscal measures is unfair and it will not work. In the recent past when there was as yet no excess demand, the use of voluntary measures was well justified, especially when there were involved semimonopolistic industries and very big unions which have much control of prices and wages.

But today when the inflationary condition exists and prices are rising, it is unreasonable to ask individuals not to defend their standard of living or not to take in the profits that inflation opens up to them, to act by the exhortations of the President rather than by their own estimates of their own economic interests.

When these exhortations work at all, they may well penalize the more public spirited and conscientious people of the Nation. They are a poor substitute for laws which apply to everybody. What is more, they confirm the pessimism of the conservatives that political democracy cannot be trusted with the management of public affairs.

MARTIN URGES A TAX RISE IN A BREAK WITH JOHNSON

(By H. Erich Heinemann)

William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the quasi-independent Federal Reserve Board, said last night that a "simple, clean-cut, across-the-board increase in taxes," both corporate and personal, would be the "logical way" to deal with the inflationary problems posed by the Federal Government's present budget deficit.

Taxes should be increased, Mr. Martin said, despite the "political problems" that might be involved in so doing.

Mr. Martin, who has long been regarded as one of the Nation's leading financial conservatives, thus appeared to challenge directly President Johnson's judgment that the case for a tax increase at the present time was not a compelling one.

This is the first time that a member of the quadriad that the President consults regularly on economic matters—Mr. Martin; Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, and Charles L. Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget—has broken publicly with the administration on the question of whether or not there should be a tax increase.

Mr. Martin also broke with the White House last December in voting to increase the Federal Reserve discount, or lending rate, to 4½ percent from 4 percent. This move has since been welcomed by most administration spokesmen.

The Federal Reserve Chairman made his remarks in the course of an off-the-cuff address at the closing banquet of the Eighth International Savings Banks Congress at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel here.

Mr. Martin implied, though he did not say so directly, that if the administration did not move to increase taxes, the Federal Reserve would be forced to act on its own to combat inflationary pressures.

If it did, it would presumably do so by further reducing the availability of credit in the economy, and thus further increasing the level of interest rates, which are already at the highest level since 1929.

"When there is no other weapon at hand," Mr. Martin said, "then there is a place for monetary policy."

But Mr. Martin, who was first appointed to the Reserve chairmanship by President Truman in 1951 and has served in the post longer than any other man, made it plain that he would prefer that monetary policy not have to bear the full burden of slowing the booming American economy.

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1966]

PRESIDENT ASKS PANEL TO SUGGEST INFLATION CURBS—CALLS CONTINUED PROSPERITY WITH ECONOMIC STABILITY A CRUCIAL REQUIREMENT—DISTURBING SIGNS CITED—LABOR-MANAGEMENT GROUP IS URGED AT WHITE HOUSE TO SIFT ALL ALTERNATIVES

(By David R. Jones)

WASHINGTON, May 4.—President Johnson, observing that "disquieting signs are beginning to appear" in the economy, asked a top-level labor-management panel today to suggest ways to prevent inflation.

Mr. Johnson asked the reconstituted President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy to "consider the crucial domestic issue of the day—the maintenance of our unparalleled prosperity with economic stability."

"I ask you to look at this problem not from the standpoint of labor or business," he told the 21-member body. "I want you to ask yourselves: If you were President, what would you do?'

Mr. Johnson specifically asked the panel for its "views and constructive suggestions" on such "critical problems" as the effectiveness of his program of voluntary restraint, and the role of business and labor in such a program.

OTHER PROBLEMS LISTED

He also listed as critical problems the role of all levels of Government at such a time, proper tax and monetary policy, the role of the anti-inflationary wage-price guideposts, and methods to maintain stable costs for essential services, such as medical care, that are pushing up the cost of living.

Meanwhile, businessmen attending the closing session of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce annual meeting here voted by a margin of 18 to 1 for reduced Federal spending, rather than a tax increase, as an anti-inflation measure. The delegates also opposed voluntary or compulsory Government curbs on foreign investment as a long-range solution to the balance-of-payments deficit.

The President's comments on the economy, apparently heralding an intensive review that could lead to new methods for controlling inflationary trends, were made in the White House.

Mr. Johnson spoke to the labor-management group at the outset of its 2-day meeting with such top administration officials as W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor; John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce; and Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

The Committee, composed of labor, management, and public members, was formed by President Kennedy in 1961 and used by him as a forum on economic affairs. The Committee fell into disuse under President Johnson. Today's meeting was its first in 18 months.

Mr. Johnson appeared to be going to considerable lengths to convince the Committee that he valued its advice. He met members at a White House dinner last night. The group met all day at the White House except for lunch at the Department of Commerce.

The President told the group today that the questions he posed "cannot be fully answered at the end of 2 days of meetings." But he said he wanted it to consider the matters because the Nation faced "new problems" as an outgrowth of prosperity.

Among the "disquieting signs" that Mr. Johnson listed were a 2.8-percent rise in consumer prices and a 4-percent rise in wholesale prices in the last 12 months, indications that wage increases are "substantially above" prior years, shortages of skilled labor, and public concern about the cost of living.

Some favor higher taxes, others favor wage and price controls, and "a few look to even higher interest rates" to combat these trends, the President observed.

"But I want you to consider all of the facts and all of the alternatives," he added.

There has been speculation that suggestions may emerge from the 2-day session for deemphasizing the administration's wage-price guideposts and seeking alternative means of combating inflation.

The Committee's seven labor members are strongly opposed to the guideposts, which they consider unfair to unions. Some business and public members on the committee also have reservations about the concept.

The administration did not appear to be going into the meeting with any fixed proposals, however, and informed sources said it was not likely that the guideposts figure would be altered. The guideposts call for wage settlement equal to the 3.2-percent long-term rise in national productivity and specify that industries with greater productivity should cut prices.

The labor-management committee will devote this 2-day session to inflation problems, but it is expected to meet often in the future to consider other matters. Mr. Johnson earlier this year asked it to look into manpower problems, but it has not yet studied that subject.

The attitude of the Chamber of Commerce delegates toward a tax increase as an anti-inflation measure was indicated in an informal opinion poll of 543 of the 3,218 voting delegates.

The delegates also indicated in the poll that they would overwhelmingly favor imposing an increase on both corporation and individual income taxes, rather than on either taxpayer group alone. They voted 217 to 114 in favor of a broadly based general excise tax, rather than a Federal tax increase, but 212 said neither was needed.

The delegates unanimously accepted a policy committee report declaring that "restrictions on the free movement of private goods and capital is not the solution to the balance-of-payments problem."

Chamber officials said the stand was prompted by concern that the voluntary restraints might become permanent.

Ray R. Eppert, president of the Burroughs Corp., who is chairman of the chamber's international committee, told delegates they could be thankful that President Johnson's program of restraint on overseas investment was voluntary and not compulsory.

"But these measures are nothing more or less than aspirins which will only alleviate and not cure the headache," he added.

The resolution urged an improvement in the Nation's export surplus as a corrective measure, rather than restraint on movement of goods and capital. It emphasized the chamber's view that American business should not be called on to operate for long periods "in ways that do not maintain it fully competitive with international business."

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1966]

ECONOMISTS SEE IMPACT

DETROIT, May 4.—Federal efforts to slow the economy and halt inflation are beginning to have an impact, a panel of four economists agreed here today.

The analysis came at the closing session of a convention of the National Association of Purchasing Agents.

Those on the panel were Prof. Paul McCracken, of the University of Michigan, a former member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; Prof. Jules Backman, of New York University; Martin R. Gainsbrugh, senior vice president of the National Industrial Conference Board; and E. F. Andrews, chairman of the Purchasing Agents Association's business survey committee.

Among their predictions were these: The rise in prices will begin to plateau later this year; consumer spending will slow up; retail prices will peak in about a month, then slack off, and it is unlikely that the capital-spending boom, now ebbing slightly, will create excess capacity.

Professor McCracken criticized what he called the failure of the Federal Government to use some of its fiscal and monetary controls to slow inflation. "It remains to be seen if we have regained control in time," he said.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 5, 1966]

FOWLER URGE BANKERS DENY SOME REQUESTS FOR LOANS TO REINFORCE TIGHT-MONEY POLICY

WASHINGTON.—Treasury Secretary Fowler called on bankers to reinforce tightened monetary policy by denying some loan requests and a Federal Reserve Board member suggested that he'd like to see inflationary pressures fought by a tougher administration fiscal policy.

Mr. Fowler, the administration's top fiscal official, made his comments in a speech at a dinner in Charlotte, N.C., honoring the heads of the American Bankers Association, the Association of Reserve City Bankers and the Mortgage Bankers of America. James L. Robertson, a member of the monetary policy-making Reserve Board, crossed over into fiscal policy in a speech to the Bankers Club of Chicago.

The Treasury Secretary's admonition to bankers had been hoped for by industry leaders seeking fresh emphasis on voluntary credit restraint lest the Government impose more precise credit-rationing standards on them.

Mr. Robertson's remarks, which included a call for firmness on both the tax and monetary sides, were considered particularly significant because he was one of the three Board members who unsuccessfully voted against the Board's discount rate increase last December. He hinted that the current monetary curbs on bank lending abroad may be proven unnecessary before long, but also proposed a standby tax that could be applied to restrict all kinds of private capital outflow in the future.

Secretary Fowler quoted Archie Davis, ABA president, who had remarked that the banker "must use every skill at his command to allocate his lendable funds to the most economically justifiable uses—which, under these circumstances, mean credit uses that will help curtail rather than augment inflationary pressures." Mr. Fowler said, "I applaud him," for the comment Mr. Davis made earlier this week at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting.

Mr. Fowler declared that it is "essential" at this time that "bankers weed out the less productive, the less deserving, the speculative loans." He also said he commends Mr. Davis for speaking out against banks "bidding away" savings from other financial institutions and expressed "hope that this message is carried home effectively to all our Nation's bankers."

Mr. Robertson said that policymakers "are currently obliged to curb demand so as to keep it in line with the expansion of available resources." In the last 12 months, he said, the economy has gone from underemployment to "perhaps beyond sustainable full employment to a state of emerging inflationary pressures." Because of these "radical changes," he said, it is necessary to review policies.

"No longer do we need to keep interest rates low to stimulate domestic investment," he said. "On the contrary, we need to restrain investment, which is running ahead at an excessive rate." And, he said, "no longer do we need to accelerate growth in our national income."

Stating that banks are increasingly below the voluntary ceilings set for balance-of-payments purposes on their loans to foreigners, Mr. Robertson said that if current money and credit trends continue, "we may find that capital outflows are discouraged quite independently" of the program and of the interest equalization tax on Americans' purchases of foreign securities from foreigners. "If and when this happens, and in sufficient magnitude, we should be prepared to dismantle unneeded selective restrictions," he said.

But if the current restrictions were ended, Mr. Robertson said it would be desirable to have standby measures available. Particularly, he suggested a tax similar to the interest equalization tax that he said "should be flexible and should cover all forms of capital outflow, especially to fully developed countries."

It should, he said, "be capable of being raised or lowered or taken off altogether by Executive action." The interest equalization tax of up to 15 percent on certain foreign securities does not apply to the direct investment of U.S. corporations in foreign affiliates that comes under a separate voluntary restraint program run by Commerce Secretary Connor, who has strongly opposed any suggestions for applying a tax to such capital movements.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 9, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 5, 1966:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officer of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade of commander:

Roderick M. White.

The following-named officer to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy as an assistant professor with the grade of lieutenant commander:

John B. Mahon.

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

Robert V. Raftovich
Carlton F. Meredith
Walter R. Glenning
Paul C. Shearer
Chester R. Wawrzynsk
Andrew D. Webb III
Neal A. Nicholson
William B. Watkins

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Joseph B. Coyle.
John P. DeLeonardis, Jr.

The following-named persons to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of ensign:

Anthony Charles Alejandro.
Kenneth John Allington.
Stephen Lewis Anthony.
Roswell William Ard, Jr.
Furman Stewart Baldwin, Jr.
John Dana Bannan.
Robert Louis Barnes.
Edward Joseph Barrett.
Steven Loyal Benson.
Joseph Oscar Bernard.
Raymond Evan Beyler, Jr.
Earl Alexander Blanton.
Ronald Dean Blendu
Michael Theodore Bohlman
John George Busavage
Paul Edward Busick.
Robert Clark Byrd.
John Edward Byrnes, Jr.
Anthony Ronald Carbone.
Philip Joseph Cardaci.
John Charles Carney, Jr.
Benjamin Maurice Chiswell III.
Clifford Eugene Clayton, Jr.
Jonathan Collom.
Gary Lyndon Cousins.
Edwin Manuel Cox.
Douglas Woods Crowell.
Edward Clyde Cummings III.
Thomas George DeVille.
Thomas Roe Dickey.
Harry Hamlet Dudley.
Robert Scott Duncan, Jr.
Thomas McDonald Dunn.
James Bowman Ellis II.
Robert Joseph Faucher.
John Robert Felton.
Paul Alfred Flood.
William Edward Fox, Jr.
Raymond Bertram Freeman.
Dennis Ray Freezer.
Allan Phillips Fulton.
Peter Anthony Gabele.
Douglas Frederick Gehring.
Charles William Gower.
Michael Channing Grace.
Philip Joseph Grossweiler.
Jeffrey John Hamilton.
John Herbert Hanna III.
William Harry Hawley III.
Jerald Howard Heinz.
Edward Alan Hemstreet.
Vernon Christopher Hipkiss.
Kenneth Claude Hollemon.
Joseph Robert Hoosty.
Harold Frederick Hoppe.
Edward John Jason.
Walter Lee John.
Gary Brian Johnson.
David Allen Jones.
Patrick Vance Kauffold.
Robert Gregg Keary.
Theodore Brian Kichline.
Harvey Grey Knuth III.
William Albert Kucharski, Jr.
Stephen Albert Kull.
Charles Oscar Laughary, Jr.
William Arthur Lehmann.
Imants James Leskinovitch.
Nesbit Cannon Lofton.
Adrian Wayne Longacre.
John Edward Lord.
Marcus Lafayette Lowe III.
Ronald James Marafioti.
John Charles Maxham.
William Kent May.
Leslie Manson Meekins.
Alphons Richard Melis III.
Ronald Comer Mers.
John Francis Milbrand.
Harold Eugene Millan, Jr.
Warren Eugene Miller, Jr.
Leo Anthony Morehouse, Jr.
Robert William Mueller.
Donald Francis Murphy.
William Frederick Nettell.
Richard Paul Oswitt.
Dennis Walter Parker.
John Leslie Parker.
Richard Emile Pevser.
Robert James Philpott.
Donnie David Polk.
James Thomas Read.
Thomas Hazen Robinson.
Thomas Raymond Roche III.
Jose Elvio de Assis Rodriques.
Raymond Andrew Ross.
Dennis John Shaw.
John Edward Shkor.
Gerald Dwain Sickafoose.
Merle James Smith, Jr.
Eric John Staut.
William Henry Stockton II.

Michael Wayne Taylor.
Harry Wayne Tiffany.
Gerald Lee Underwood.
Donald Harry Van Liew.
Jack Steven Webb.
Kenneth Edgar Williams.
Donald Albert Winchester.
Stanley Winslow.
Paul Barton Withstandley II.
Donald Bernard Wittschiebe.
Richard Walter Wright.

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4:

Charles J. Albanese
George A. Knapp
Mark Fitton, Jr.
William H. Bellow
Frank H. Steinheiser
Jay E. Law
William H. Fraser.
John H. Olsen
John H. Coppens
Eugene B. Cox
Robert E. Mooring
Donald O. Nelson
Charles W. Wicks
William E. Miller
Fred Permenter
George E. Rongner
Hugh B. Houston
George E. Carriveau
Donald E. Phillips
Karl M. Ashby
Elmer E. Johnson
John H. Bettis, Jr.
Maurice T. Hedgecock
James F. McLaughlin
Bob Nelson
Edward Eaton
Paul R. Cornell
Howard R. Tarr, Jr.
Eugene K. Kindschi
Joseph J. Bookout
John Rekuc
Harold R. Margrave
Leo Frey
Gordon W. Ault
Eric G. Bragg
Leonard L. Bouler
Clifton Cuthrell
Albert V. Carver
Mack E. McGuffin
Hubert F. Midgett
Hull O. L. Tanner
John E. Simpson
Wilson F. Jones
Claude A. Broadus
James D. Toler
William A. Shaffer, Jr.
Roy M. Schwanakamp
Robert L. Walters
Darrel "B" Sinift
Joseph F. Baranowski
Edmund A. Novak
Jerome R. Morton
Richard R. Anthony
Jack W. McDonald
Charles F. Potter, Jr.
William Muessel
George R. Brower
Euclid L. Wade
Eugene W. Darcy
Dorris L. Steele
Eugene R. Lockhart
Richard A. Krueger
John G. Schwelm
Ernest N. Yaroch
Duane A. Force
Joseph C. Waldrop
Daniel L. Knauss
Jack G. Smith
Charles W. Oldham
Mortimer Jeffords

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3:

John F. Olsen
Robert G. Keim
Claud W. Ashcraft
William E. Ellingsworth
Arnold I. Cousins
Jack P. Morgan
Donald B. Goodwin
Gordon L. Sims
Walter L. Martin
Charles A. L. Linder
George A. Saunders
Emil Capinha
William E. Whaley, Jr.
Robert L. Armour
Donald S. MacKenzie
Charles R. Corbett
George M. O'Brien
Marvin D. Henderson
Robert G. Carnilla
Alfred K. Rausch
Edward L. York
Francis W. Kelly
Douglas H. Derr
Robert L. Thompson
James E. Smith, Jr.
Ellsworth N. Slater
Richard J. Kilroy
Warren B. Barrett
Marvin J. Portwood, Jr.
Elwood T. Elder
Patrick J. Flynn, Jr.
Dewey E. Sutton
Parker J. Pennington
Charles D. Mills
James K. Beebe
John T. McGilly
Colt Rodgers
Cluese Russell
Robert E. DeMichillie
Charles R. Wilson
James H. Tyner
Charles R. Finn
Harry F. Sanborn
John R. Alford, Jr.
Albert R. Bennett
Paul R. Harp
Raymond J. Gorman
Earl A. Ericksen
Robert A. Jones
Richard R. Terhune, Jr.
Charles F. Coolidge
Robert C. Hilker
Corus G. Bough
Eugene E. Doyle
Earl L. Dickson
Glenn E. Basham
John A. Marino
Robert A. Murrell
Arthur M. McIver
Omer L. Foster
Franklin L. Fountaine
Donald E. Dean
Dale T. Butler
Lyman R. Oliver, Jr.
Frederick R. Cooper, Jr.
Charles D. Pearson
Richard D. Bundy
Robert Casale

Harry V. Walker
Thomas E. Hilton
Gerald E. Palmer
Stephen Peckiconis
William T. Vanderberg
Richard A. Gill
Lennox A. Johnson
John H. Weichert
Ivan B. Aiken, Jr.
Donald D. Luedke
John W. Gates
George P. Spaniol
Blanchard M. Pierce
Marlan H. Murphy
Truxton W. Payne
Robert D. Goodenough
Dalton L. Burrus
Elwyn C. Evans
Richard E. Eastman
John D. Kakalia
Louis DeBernardi
Robert D. Bowen
Richard J. Harding
William Chestnutt
Stanley W. Mead
Francis V. McMahon
Charles W. Brandon
Fred E. Grombacher
Sewell G. Loggins
Jesse E. Sparks
Forrest W. Ringsage
Earl R. Schattenberg
George E. Prather
William H. Bacon

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2:

Francis N. Harrell
Delbert L. Hemphill
Gareth H. Stephenson
Samuel C. Brown, Jr.
Harold D. Peck
Wilbur L. Matthews
Thomas E. Wassum
Orville O. Sullivan
William F. Hiller
James O. Alexander
Michael J. Schiehl
Leonard E. Engel
William F. Westell
Billy B. Weimer
Ernest G. Smith
John R. Stanley
Wayne J. Lange
Edward J. Sitarski
Joseph B. McCarthy
Roy H. Jernigan
Charles H. Studstill
Edward F. Magee
Robert D. Hedgpeth
Theodore J. Polgar
William L. McVey
Raymond G. Pullen
Glen W. Patterson
Frank R. Adams
Richard L. Luna
Daniel B. Miller
Kenneth H. Kester
James C. Flowers
Melvin F. Gouthro
John K. Jenkins
Edward A. McGahan, Jr.
Gilbert Aguilar
Lionel F. Crossman
Frank H. Kubiak
Jacob L. Marinelli
Glenn D. Cecil
Fred H. Fletcher
James G. Gillis
Bemon C. Ray
Forest G. Broome
James A. Shepard
William L. Wathen
Benjamin F. Kennedy
James W. Kidney
Albert K. Finne, Jr.
Oliver W. Brannan
Boyd J. Davis
Michael J. Urucinitz
Melvin J. Girardin
Max H. Hinkley
David C. Oeschger
Paul K. Wines
Douglas D. Dvorak
Charles B. Branch
Larry E. Sartin
Paul A. Roberts
Floyd L. Booren, Jr.
Donald B. Erisman
Jack A. Lang
George A. Rylander, III
Ralph Sponar, Jr.
Walter L. Adams
Warren G. Gaugh
Glendon F. Pert
Paul J. Balzer
Joseph E. De Costa
Taft C. Pilcher
George L. Kelly
Richard G. Stonehouse
George W. Fenlin
Wade R. Bickel
Bill A. Miller
Philip W. Wiseman
Lester W. Reid
Thomas L. Wofford
David L. Dawson
Johnnie L. Hair
John L. N. McCrimmon
Fulton C. Norvell
Theodore A. Thomas
Perry E. Crosson
Ammon C. McDole
Charles B. McSwain
Allen R. Gulau
Belton B. Gray
Joseph E. Correa
James E. Jordan
Charles H. Baudry
Chester S. McCreary
Joseph F. Croghan
Grady S. Hardison
Lenwood M. Quidley
Carl W. Vetzel
Donald R. Boyd
James D. Doherty
John McCracken
Robert A. Shell
Edward Baker, Jr.
James W. Amos
Merle H. Revels
George R. Rump
James B. Boyd, Jr.
Edward G. Mackey
Charles O. Poellinger
William Aliff
William A. Cobb
Joseph Lodge
Arnold P. Ziemian
William A. Strickland
Paul H. Cooswell
Jack H. Starr
Donald E. Schwarz
Randolph O. Grady
Wayne L. Tertstra
William R. McVey
Eugene W. Jeter, Jr.
John G. Ryan
Donald J. Husel
James K. Easter
Charles T. Pettitt
Raymond Boyce
David B. Triggs, Jr.
Glenn F. Peterson

The following-named officers to be appointed permanent commissioned warrant officers in the chief warrant officer grades indicated in the Coast Guard having been recalled to active duty from the temporary disability retired list.

Chief warrant officer, W-3

John G. Schwelm.

Chief warrant officer, W-2

Carl F. Baker.

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant (jg.):

Francis N. Harrell
George A. Blann
Brent Malcolm
Stanley E. Bork
Willis W. Lawrence III
Robert C. White
James V. O'Neill
Robert F. Doughty
Paul G. Smith
Frank H. Chliszczyk, Jr.
Alvin W. Sumner
William N. Rohrer
Joseph J. Polockow, Jr.
John M. Lewis
Marvin E. Wilmoth
John F. Overath
Robert H. Stracener
Charles J. Robinson
George E. Ellis
Daniel R. Irving
Paddy G. Rogers
Paul J. Swisher
Preston H. McMillan
Herbert L. Johnson
Thomas L. Young
Thomas H. Godwin
Wallace S. Worthington
William S. Ricks
William S. Vinson
Ronald W. Williams
Donald C. Myers, Jr.
Melvin L. Sellers
William W. Carothers
Douglass R. Herlihy
Richard E. Bruce
Arthur L. Ruedisueli
Laurence J. Murphy, Jr.
Robert E. Beatty
James F. Van Vranken
Edward Stadnicar
Walter C. Parker
Donald C. Hibbard
Vernon A. White
William T. Foran
Ted G. Walters
Cassius Lisk

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, FR1623, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

Gen. Dean C. Strother, FR591 (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, FR1082 (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of general under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles S. Abbot
Arthur P. Abel
Peter B. Abell
James E. Acker
Edgar W. Adams
Kenneth K. Adams
Merchant S. Adams
Robert B. Adams, Jr.
Frank H. Akers, Jr.
H. Gordon Akst
Alfred D. Alleman
Layton S. Allen, Jr.
Stephen D. Alley
Frederick D. Ameel
David B. Amerine
Ben L. Anderson, Jr.
William A. Anderson
Paul Andruchow
James B. Angel
William S. Antle III
Steven M. Arendt
Andrew C. Arje
Gavin D. Arnold
Farlin W. Arrington
James C. Arthur
Richard C. Aubrey
Ronald C. Bach
Richard L. Badger
Leo J. M. Baird
Dennis Baker
Reynald A. Bald
Robert F. Bandy
Frank Barbero, Jr.
Richard H. Barchi
John W. Barnes, Jr.
Peter A. Barnett
Richard T. Barnette
Carl F. Barnhart
William S. Barr
Thomas J. Barry
Jon H. Barton
George M. Bates
LeRoy Bates
Scott R. Baum
John S. Beachy
John H. Beakes, Jr.
Robert E. Beal
Timothy R. Beard
Andrew C. Beck II
Robert L. Beck
George L. Becker
Gered H. Beeby
James B. Beesley
Roy M. Bell
Robert C. Bellas, Jr.
Crawford L. Benedict
Sterling N. Bennett
Steven K. Berg

Laurence M. Bergen, Jr.
Donald F. Berkebile
Kelly R. Berkline
Joseph P. Bernier
Thomas R. Bernier
Craig R. Betts
Roger B. Bickel
David S. Bill III
William F. Bina III
William B. Birkmaier, Jr.
Paul W. Bixler
James H. Blakeney
Frank M. Blanchard, Jr.
Walter C. Blekicki
Gary R. Blinn
Roland D. Blocksom, Jr.
Thomas E. Blount, Jr.
Thomas H. Bock
George Bockhold, Jr.
Richard A. Bona
Robert J. Bosman
Robert D. Bowenkamp
Cecil A. K. Boyd II
James R. Boyette
Thomas C. Boyhan
David W. Boyle
Thomas J. Boyle, Jr.
Philip A. Bozzelli
Terrence J. Brady
Robert J. Branco
Neil M. Brennan
Robert G. Brice
John R. Brinser
Christian W. Brix, Jr.
Nicholas G. Brooks
Robert A. Brooks
Anthony W. Broomall
Manfred N. Brosee
Michael I. Brown
Richard E. Brown
David L. Browning
Alan R. Bruggeman
Thomas E. Brunk
Peter K. Bryan
Franklin S. Bryant
Lee W. Bryant
William J. Buchanan
Victor P. Buckley
Paul S. Buege
Michael T. Bugelski
Peter G. Buletza
Gerald D. Bunch
James F. Burger
Bryan J. Burke
Joseph J. Burke
Harold J. Burkhart
James R. Burkhart II
Franklin Burkhead, Jr.
Roger A. Burnett
Eugene C. Burnham
Robert S. Byerly
Albert W. Caiazza
Dwight B. Caldwell
Patrick A. Callahan
Brent A. Canaday
Richard F. Carlberg
Edward J. Carlson
Russell C. Carlson
Rodger B. Carter
William K. Castle, Jr.
Michael L. Ceruzzi
Nicholas J. Cetta
Michael S. Chandler
Michael R. Chapman
Ronald W. Chapman
John R. Charles
Robert L. Cheek
Chester A. Ciccarelli
Kevin D. Clancy
Guinn G. Clark
James R. Clark
Thomas A. Clark
Thomas F. Clark, Jr.
Joseph D. Clarke IV
David L. Claude
William B. Clayton III
Marshall C. Clegg
Mardis M. Coers
Charles E. Coffin III
Jacob Cohen, Jr.
Otis R. Cole III
James S. Coleman III
Donald V. Colley
Robert F. Collins
George R. W. Conn
John M. Connolly
Dennis R. Connor
Curtis B. Cook
Clark R. Cooper
Larry M. Copeland
Paul D. Copenbarger
Paul S. Cotter
James H. Cowardin
Carlton P. Crabtree
Charles R. Cramer
John O. Creighton
William R. Crenshaw, Jr.
Howard L. Crisp
Charles E. Cronan, Jr.
Brian S. Cronyn
Dennis A. Crosby
Michael E. Cuddington
Michael J. Daley
Beverly A. Daly
Arthur C. Darden, Jr.
George F. Dawe, Jr.
Franklin J. Day
C. Michael Dech
David C. Denney
Patrick J. Dennis
Richard J. Denton
Jimmy G. DePoy
Victor A. DeSantis
William J. DiFilippo
Gary L. Dimmig
Louis R. Dirienzo
Marvin M. Dodge
Paul H. Donaldson
Michael J. Donley
Walter P. Donnelly, Jr.
William P. Dornsife
Hubert "G" Dorsett
Curtis R. Dove, Jr.
John B. Downey
Dennis M. Doyle
Thomas V. Doyle
John B. Drake
John J. Draper III
Donald G. Droz
Wayne D. DuBois
Scott B. Dudley
Frank G. Duserick
Bruce P. Dyer
John D. Earhart, Jr.
William B. Eisenhardt
John R. Ellis
Robert L. Ellis, Jr.
Thomas H. Ellison
Robert G. Elwell
Robert H. Emery
Steven W. Epstein
Donald E. Eshleman
Harvey L. Esty
Thomas I. Eubanks
Clinton J. Farmer
Richard K. Farrell
DeLany Fawkes
Joseph W. R. Felty
Thomas R. Felger
Paul T. Ferenchick
Michael E. Field
Daniel F. Finn
Lawrence E. Fish
Gary W. Fiske
David A. Fitch
Thomas A. Fitzgibbons
Brian A. J. Flatley
James W. Fleming
Morris C. Foote
Joseph G. Forrester II
John R. Forsythe
David L. Francis
Anthony M. Franzitta
John T. Frederiksen
John A. Fredrickson
Paul G. Friedman
Peter M. Frikker
Walter J. Fritschner
Michael A. Fritz
Larry A. Froistad
Bruce C. Fryar
Edward I. Futch
Wilhelm M. Gabber
Raymond E. Gadberry, Jr.
William T. Gaffney
James J. Galvin
Raymond Garfield, Jr.
William R. Geib
Francis W. Gibbons
James F. Giblin, Jr.
Thomas L. Gibson
Lawrence D. Giddings
Tommy H. Giles III
Robert P. Gill
James H. Gillard
Harold J. Gillogly, Jr.
Webb R. Gilmore
Thomas "J" Gingrich
Peter A. Ginsburg
Robert T. Golden
Leroy A. Gooding
Ian S. Gordon
George T. Goryanec III
Robert B. Gosline, Jr.
Donald N. Grace
Harold E. Grant
Gary R. Gray
Howard H. Greengard
Frederick M. Gregg II
John S. Gregg
William D. Griffith
Thomas H. Grim
John L. Grostick
Charles R. Grutzius
David L. Gurgel
Ronald K. Gurley
Paul E. Halberstadt, Jr.
Russell D. Hale II
James R. Haley
David T. Hall
James D. Hall
Robert L. Hamilton, Jr.
Reginald G. Hammond
William C. Hancock
Wayne R. Hanley
Randall W. Hardy
David L. Hartsfield
Douglas N. Harvey
Michael D. Haskins
Donald B. Haslett
Joseph J. Hasson, Jr.
John R. Hastreiter
Francis M. Hayes, Jr.
Martin J. Healy
Richard E. Helm
Francis K. Helmsin, Jr.
Richard J. Hempey
Alan R. Hendershot
Harry G. Henderson
Robert M. Henzi
Henry F. Herrera
Wayne E. Hicks
Walter M. Higgins III
Thomas L. Higgs
Raymond K. Hill
Roger B. Hill
John H. Hiltabidle
David P. Himchak
Roy E. Hitt, Jr.
Richard R. Hobbs
Christopher M. Hoch
John R. Hoddy
Jerome B. Hodge
Karl T. Hoepfner
Kenneth L. Hoff, Jr.
Andrew L. Hogg, Jr.
Robert S. Holbrook
Michael R. Holland
Eugene J. Holler, Jr.
Lloyd T. Holley
Stanley R. Holm, Jr.
Robert S. Hood
William A. Horn
James A. Hough
Buford F. Howell
Harry M. Howton
Stephen S. Hoxie
Paul M. Huber
Thomas B. Huffman
Frank C. Hughes
Herschel Hughes, Jr.
Kirby E. Hughes II
Robert C. Hull
Richard L. Hulse
Andrew W. Hunt, Jr.
Myron Hura
Ronald J. Hurlock
Duncan N. Ingraham
George W. Iwasko, Jr.
John D. Jackson
Benjamin R. Jacobi
Dennis P. James
Donald R. Jamison
Peter J. Janulis
Charles E. Jenkins
William L. Jeremiah
Charles M. Jessico, Jr.
Charles E. Johnson
Curtiss D. Johnson
Paul A. Johnson
Paul N. T. Johnson
Pierce J. Johnson
Robert F. Johnson
Robert G. Johnson, Jr.
Robert C. Johnstone, Jr.
Charles E. Jones III
Charles R. Jones
Gerald H. Jordan
Robert L. Jordan
David W. Josephson
Alan "W" Judelson
Stephen F. Kalosis
Gary R. Kamp
Leonard "K" Kane II
Robert F. R. Kanive
James R. Kappes
Carl F. Kauffmann
George T. Kaye
Walter V. Kazlauskas
George E. Keefe, Jr.
Robert M. Keeley
James J. Kelley, Jr.
James P. Kelly
Jay W. Kenty
Donald S. Kern
Gerald L. Kerr III
Raymond J. Kerwick
Thomas C. Kildebeck
Sidney J. Kilgore III
Grant P. Kimball
Thomas K. Kimmel, Jr.
Roland E. King, Jr.
Kenneth J. Kirby
John D. Kish
George A. Klein III
David J. Klinkhamer
Gerald W. Knott
Nickolai S. Kobylk
David J. Kokoruda
Albert H. Konetzni, Jr.
John F. Kopplin
Michael T. Korbet
Stephen J. Kowalick, Jr.
John D. Kuechle, Jr.
Jerome B. Lange
Ronald L. Lassiter
Donald F. Lathen
Donald G. Latta, Jr.
Douglas E. Law
Bruce E. Lechner
Peter J. Leniart
William N. Leonard, Jr.
Dennis K. LeRoy
Thomas M. Letter
James R. Levinson
James C. Lewis
Robert H. Lewis
Thomas M. Lewis
George W. Lineburg, Jr.
John H. Ling
Ralph H. Lipfert
Thomas D. LoMacchio, Jr.
James A. Long III
Jams M. Loome
James M. Lopacinski
Manuel R. Lopez
John J. Lorden, Jr.
Peter S. Lothrop
David E. Lovelady
Kenneth D. Lovett
Raymond L. Lueneburg
William D. Lundberg
Frederick R. Lutz
John D. Lynch
James D. McCague
Carl P. McCullough
Ralph R. McCumber, Jr.
Richard D. McDonald
Gordon R. McDonnell
David B. McElvein
Owen C. McFadden, Jr.
Robert B. McGehee
Charles A. McGibbon
John D. McGoldrick, Jr.
Bennette D. McGraw
John D. McKendrick, Jr.
Patrick J. McKenna
Edward A. McKenney
Brian D. McKenzie
David E. McKie
James B. McLendon
William J. McMenamin
Michael J. McQuaid
Ronald R. Magnuson
Jerome T. Maher, Jr.
James E. Maitland
Harold V. Maixner, Jr.
Elbert S. Maloney, Jr.
Joseph Mandich
James A. Maniscalco
Dennis R. Manskar
Thomas F. Marflak
Frank J. Markowski, Jr.
Michael L. Markusic
William T. Marsh, Jr.
Richard L. Martens
Port R. Martin
Ricard W. Martin
Thomas G. Martin
Paul W. Martineau, Jr.
Charles A. Martinek
Charles P. Mason III
John H. Mason
William H. Massicot
Jan D. Matthews
David W. Mattis
Ronald L. Maxwell
Douglas E. May
James D. Maynard
Michael B. Meloney
Corwin G. Mendenhall III
James E. Menke
Joseph P. Metro, Jr.
Richard L. Michaux
Richard D. Miller
Stephen A. Miller
William A. Miller, Jr.
Kenneth B. Mills
Joseph K. Minton
Tom L. Mintum
Ralph M. Mitchell, Jr.
Joseph S. Mobley
Floyd L. Mock, Jr.
John E. Moffat VI
Mikkel Moller
George W. Montgomery
George M. Moore
Fred P. Moosally, Jr.
Edward E. Morgan
Vernon M. Morgan
Warren E. Morgan, Jr.
Philip J. Morrill
Milton D. Morris
Ralph R. Morris
William T. Morris III
Dale H. Moses
David W. Mosier, Jr.
Albert J. Motta, Jr.
Patrick M. Muldoon
Daniel J. Murphy, Jr.
Thomas E. Murphy
Timothy A. Murphy
Robert E. Murray
Harold J. Mynett
Michael E. Naber
John R. Naye
Thomas B. Nesbit
John W. Nichols III
Samuel T. Nicholson
Steven D. Niss
Franklin L. Nolta
Rodney W. Norris
Robert M. Nutwell
Michael A. Odening
Walter T. Ogar III
Myron L. Ogden, III
Richard W. Ogden
Edward J. Ohlert
Thomas S. O'Keefe, Jr.
Curtis W. Olsen
Richard A. Olsen
Robert G. Oman
Michael J. Omohundro
John A. Orcutt
Dennis P. O'Reilley
William S. Orser
Michael G. O'Shea
James T. Owens III
Thomas P. Oxford
Anthony J. Palazzo, Jr.
Eugene A. Parchinski
Leonard A. Parker, Jr.
Jerald L. Parsoneault
David A. Patch
Tommy E. Payne
Orland J. Pender, Jr.
Robert C. Percival
Jimmy B. Persels
James T. Petillo
Paul M. Petrucka
Charles G. Pfeifer
Joseph F. Phelan
William L. Phillips, Jr.
Edgar L. Pitman II
Russell E. Planitzer
Robert B. Ploeger
Richard A. Plotkin
Charles M. Polanski
Thomas J. Porter
John B. Posoli
Stephen C. Potter
James M. Powell, Jr.
William P. Powell
Oliver K. Power III
David C. Prickett, Jr.
James G. Prout III
Don S. Puckett
Edward K. Pulsifer
Russell A. Puppe
Martin J. Quinn
Neal A. Quinn, Jr.
David J. Quirk
William M. Radcliffe, Jr.
Thomas C. Ragland
Kenneth N. Rauch
Warren A. Rawson, Jr.
John S. Redd
Christopher M. Reddington
John E. Reeb
Terry L. Reeder
Frederick M. Reinhart
Rodney P. Rempt
Tom H. Reynolds, Jr.
Theodore L. Rice
Beverly T. Richardson
David W. Richardson
Dennis A. Rigstad
Lorenzo A. Rivamonte
Kenneth C. Robertson
John H. Rockwell III
Antonio J. Rodrigues
Ross F. Rogers III

Stephen F. Rohrkemper
John R. Roland, Jr.
Richard E. Rollins
Sentiel A. Rommel, Jr.
John R. Ronchetto, Jr.
Alan M. Roodhouse
Jay T. Rorick, Jr.
Donald Rowe
Gilbert V. Royal, Jr.
Thomas C. Runkle
Ulf W. Runquist
Carl J. Ryan, Jr.
James J. Ryan
Michael R. Ryan
David J. Sadd
Leland C. C. Sage
Daniel Salinas II
Richard C. Salmon
James C. Sanders
Robert T. Sanders
Ace J. Sarich
John D. Savage
Francis S. Scalcucci
Robert R. Scarbrough
Raymond H. Scheerer
Paul B. Schlein
Gary E. Schmidt
David W. Schnibbe
Ernest L. Schoolfield
Danny E. Schuder
Richard J. Schwering
Orlin R. Scrivener
Kinchen J. Searcy
Jay A. Sears
Scott L. Sears
Steven S. Seiden
Andrew L. Sekan
Theodore C. Seward, Jr.
Noah P. Sexton II
James O. Shannon
Harry G. Sharp III
Patrick J. Sheedy, Jr
Leonard G. Shelton, Jr.
Granville Sherman III
Scott J. Shields
Steven D. Shrawder
William M. Shubert, Jr.
Frank Shyjka
Brian B. Sibold
Richard W. Sidney
John F. Sigler
Richard F. Silloway
Robert T. Simmons
William A. Simmons
Andre C. Simonpietri, Jr.
Jon M. Sinisi
Robert V. Smart
Thomas J. Smisek
Frank L. Smith
Kenneth C. Smith, Jr.
Michael D. Smith
Richard W. Smith
Richard P. Snaider
John W. Snyder, Jr.
Luther W. Snyder, Jr.
William T. D. Snyder
Andrew P. Sosnicky
William H. Spadafora
Roger C. Spayde
Daryl C. Spelbring
Robert W. Spencer
Clayton H. Spikes
Arthur W. Staecker
Robert J. Stankowski, Jr.
Richard W. Starostecki
Stoughton Sterling III
Joseph S. Stewart II
Lawrence "L" Stewart
Jack F. Stinnett
Donald G. Storck, Jr.
Laurence R. Stott
Paul F. Strain
Henry W. Strickland
James L. Strouse
John J. Sulfaro
James V. Sullivan, Jr.
Phillip G. Svalya
James M. Swartwood
Michael J. Sweeney
Francis M. Swientek
Alan W. Swinger
Benjamin Tappan, III
Robert J. Tarr, Jr.
Alan P. Tattersall
Hugh M. Taylor
Royce D. Taylor
Rufus L. Taylor, III
William E. Taylor, Jr.
Robert L. Temme, Jr.
Terry J. Terebessy
Harry A. Thaete, III
Douglas E. Thompson
John R. Thompson
Robert E. Titcomb
Dale N. Titus
Andrew N. Toriello, Jr.
Bruce N. Touve
Michael T. Tracey
Wilbur C. Trafton
Howard F. Trodahl
Marvin H. Tucker
Perry W. Ustick, Jr.
Bruce L. Valley
Douglas D. Vaughan
Robert N. Verratti
Richard P. Vidosic
William J. Vorwald
Charles F. Votava, III
James I. Wade
Keith A. Wagner
Peter E. Walberg
David M. Walker
David R. Walker
Robert S. Walker, IV
Thomas H. Walker, Jr.
Reuben H. Wallace, Jr.
Thomas L. Walls
William H. Walls
Charles R. Walts
Charles E. Waterman
Donald Weil
William W. Weissner
William H. Wendell, Jr.
John F. Whalen, III
Mark W. Wheeler
Joesph R. White
Robert D. White
Michael A. N. Whittemore
Stephen G. Wieczorek
Joel A. Wier, III
Clifford A. Wiese
Francis E. Wiggers, Jr.
Joseph L. Wiggins, Jr.
Marvin B. C. Wiles
Gregory B. Williams
Richard P. Williams
Thomas J. Williams, Jr
Thomas P. Williams
John C. Williamson
James V. Williford
Lance A. Wilmarth
John F. Wilson
Donald L. Winners
Ronald C. Witt
Robert R. Wittenberg
Thomas R. Wolsoncroft
Kenneth C. Wood, Jr.
William A. Wood
Raymond D. Woolrich
George M. Wright
Peter W. Wright
Ronald F. Wurster
Bruce D. Wyman
Brian W. Young
Donald M. Young
Anthony F. Zalinick, Jr.
Paul J. Zando
Armand A. Zeddies
Lester G. Zick
Philip E. Ziegler
Steve M. Zientek
William M. Zondorak
Garrett A. Zopf
Robert D. Zvacek
Dennis L. Zveare

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edward L. Brubaker
William J. Cochran
Ross J. Doubleday
Lawrence J. Early, Jr.
William V. Hickey, Jr.
William F. Higgins, Jr.
William F. Johnson, Jr.
Frank B. Keller
Charles E. Kelley, Jr.
Joseph W. Kinsey
Samuel A. Lincoln III
Jan C. Lingle
Wayne R. Lynn
Francis L. Maloney, Jr.
Kevin W. McCook
Harold K. Melton
Phillip G. Norton
Michael B. Parks
Anthony J. Sarno, Jr.
John T. Scudi
Gary Siegel
Ronald E. Smith
Michael D. Stafford
Robert E. Whitlock

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas A. Cooney
Jeffrey B. Fesler
Michael L. Hoff
James E. Koons
Quentin J. Larsen
Stephen T. Leubecker

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Andrew A. Blanchard
Neal T. Clary, Jr.
James R. Elsesser, Jr.
Willard J. Haley
Ronald L. Keiser
Jesse H. Keyes, III
Robert A. Krol
Louis A Manza
Richard J. Morisky
Murrel C. Scott, Jr.
Ronald F. Stevens, Jr.

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles A. Alcon
Joseph T. Bagby
Charles W. Baker
Jackie C. Ballew
Robert J. Baumhardt
Robert G. Belcher
Robert W. Benzin
Ernest F. Bishop
Victor F. Boone
Thomas P. Broderick
Norval L. Broome
Michael E. Brown
Lawrence L. Brownley
David C. Burbank
Hugh A. Burkett
Jerome P. Burkett
Raymond S. Burns
Larry F. Byard
Roger W. Byron
James M. Callaghan
Joseph R. Capute
Lee A. Carpenter
Ross H. Carson
George P. Chalke, Jr.
Jack "C" Clark
John Merideth Clark
John Maclean Clark, Jr.
John W. Clinton
Wendell R. Collins
Glenn G. Coltrane
David P. Courts
William N. Creasser, Jr.
Donald M. Cress
Lawrence A. Cross, Jr.
Gerald W. Day
Lawrence C. Dearth
William O. DeHart
Stephen E. Dollar
David B. Donaldson
Roy K. Driver
Dennis G. Drummond
Gary D. Edmondson
Howard C. Evans
Leslie F. Evans
Frank C. Ferdon
David M. Ferreira
Alan E. Fisk
Gerald E. Flowers
Jerry L. Foote
William R. Fullerton
Ronald H. Godwin
William A. Goodrich
Robert L. Gonding
Pedro Gonzalez
Daniel B. Haggerty, Jr.
Robert C. Hahn
Joe M. Halliburton
Thomas J. Hallinan
Errol D. Hamann
Cleon L. Hartzell, Jr.
Phillip I. Harvey
James Hendrickson
James A. Hoffmeyer
Robert A. Hoskins
Stephen T. Howard
James F. Howick
James O. Jackson
Larry J. Jordan
Benjamin E. Julian
Warren L. Kirchhevel
Emil J. Krejci
Terrance L. Lattin
Richard A. Lines
George W. MacPherson
Walter C. Marsh
William R. Marsh
James W. Mason
Robert D. Mason
Fleming Mauney
John S. Maxwell
William H. Maxwell
Edward F. Messina
Wayne M. Miller
James F. Mohan
Ralph L. Mondy
James R. Murray
Elmer J. McDowell
Robert M. Nelson, Jr.
Kenneth L. Nichols
Ronald W. Norman
Donald B. Norvey
Irving L. Olden
Joseph R. Osani
Philip W. Parish
William G. Paulsen
Jack L. Pedersen
George W. Petering
William T. Phillips III
Bradley A. Pinz
Glenn P. Poiencot
Felix M. Reynolds
Paul D. Rice
Kenneth L. Ries
Frances D. Robison
David G. Rubright
Jack C. L. Ruppel
Eugene J. Sabaitis
Leonard Sadauskas
Thomas D. Sawyer
John F. Scholl
Dale E. Schultz
Robert J. Schwechten II
James D. Shaddix
Royal E. Sheeley
Richard P. Shearer
Raymond R. Shook
Kenneth R. Sinness
James A. Sladek
Billy J. Smith
Donald L. Smith, Jr.
Ronald E. Smith
William H. Smith
Harold G. Stanley
Ronald W. Starr
Charles J. Steenburgh
Larry W. Steinman
Jay C. Stuart
Robert A. Sullivan
Charles L. Swain
Terry N. Tanber
Arthur S. Tarro
Billy B. Taylor
Norman R. Thompson
Reuben T. Thonerfelt
Wendel W. Toedter
Grant C. Totten
Donald L. Urbani
William H. Walker
Douglas E. Ward
Karl R. Weigand, Jr.
Kenneth H. Weinzapfel
Jack L. Wells
Robert D. White
Thomas R. Williams
Martin B. Wilson
Ralph E. Windle
Billy B. Wise
Bobby G. Wise
Robert W. Wolf
Norman H. Wolford
Gordon L. Wood, Jr.
Harry H. Wooden, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Pierre E. Biron
Patrick W. Flynn
William R. Hudgens

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Frederick R. M. Deane
Robert L. Fulwyler
Reynold T. Larsen
Dwight K. Oxley III

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Harvey J. DeMaagd
Jimmy L. Gowan
Maurice L. Moskowitz
Michael O. Murphy
Charles E. Nye
Russell W. Pratt

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John W. Bell II
Edgar R. Blount, Jr.
Carl G. Fischer, Jr.
Earl J. Fleegler
Jerry "M" Herron
James S. Kelley
Benjamin Lee
Christopher S. Smith
David R. Thorning

Robert W. Koch (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard B. McCoy
Charles S. Huttula

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bruce M. Elliott
William W. Roberts
Carl W. Streicher
David H. Thompson

The following-named (U.S. Navy officers) to be reverted to permanent chief warrant officers W-3, and temporary chief warrant officers W-4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Harold L. Bridenstine
William R. Chadwick
Edward R. Crawfoot
Warren H. Crawford
Frank E. Lyle
Arthur L. Schelling

The following-named chief warrant officers to be appointed chief warrant officers W-3, in the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John H. Briody
Burrell E. Duncan
John W. Ellis, Jr.
George W. Glabb
Milton T. Hatchcock
Meredith D. Jacobs
Joseph Kremsner
Coy L. Layel, Jr.
Harry W. Meyer
Lawrence B. Yarbrough

Offie L. Drennan, U.S. Navy retired officer to be a permanent chief warrant officer, W-4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named civilian college graduates (dental intern program) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert P. Mills, Jr.
Ronald S. Fenn
John D. Yavorsky

The following-named Naval Reserve officers (dental intern program) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John E. Grubb
William T. Payne
John A. Stob
John M. Carroll
Michael F. Cassidy
Allen L. VanNess
Michael J. Erickson
Michael P. Haines
Jeffrey H. Harnett
Mark E. Simons
Michael T. Ridley
William C. Guard
Mack E. Coker
Robert C. Hirst
Jerome P. Rothstein
Howard C. Giles, Jr.
Roger P. Masella
Thomas P. Baglio
Philip W. Shoemaker
Stanley Schaeffer
Robert G. Bissell
Ralph H. Carey
Robert L. Kjome
Kenneth O. Carneiro
Alan Fegarsky
Crawford E. Foy, Jr.
Lawrence B. DiBona
David L. Pfeifer
Walter W. Sepe

The following-named civilian college graduates (dental intern program) selected as alternates, to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Clinton D. Griffin, Jr.
Runar D. Johnson
Dennis R. Nosek

The following-named Naval Reserve officers (dental intern program) selected as alternates, to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bruce M. Elliott
Michael C. Rodbro
John W. Bailey
E. Julian Caldwell
Michael H. Golden
Kent L. Taylor
Jerry H. Hidlebaugh
Henry T. Long
Kenneth W. Bueltmann

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

Commander, Line

Robert H. Nicholson
Harland B. Cope

Commander, Medical Corps

John Caruso, Jr.

Lieutenant commander, Line

Elighue G. Hanson
Daniel W. Anderson

Lieutenant commander, Medical Corps

Richard H. Barrick
Elihu York

Lieutenant commander, Chaplain Corps

James J. Hogan

In the Marine Corps

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas E. Albright
David T. Brown
James M. Phemister
Richard S. McConnell
John B. Toy

The following-named (Army Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bernard F. Halloran
Samuel C. Kelly III
Lawrence C. Reifsnider

The following-named (U.S. Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Vance Baker
Earl T. Bowers, Jr.
Constantinos T. Brown
Elkanah J. Burns, Jr.
Ronald L. Buschbom
Markham B. Campaigne
Patrick G. Carroll
Justice M. Chambers, Jr.
Larry V. Chmiel
Stephen P. Clark
John W. Consolvo, Jr.
Alfred G. Cordes
William V. Cowan III
Raymond C. Daley
Larry A. Dean
John W. Doherty
John P. Emmett, Jr.
William V. Erickson
Manuel Estela
Helmuts A. Feifs
Andrew R. Finlayson
Carlton W. Fulford, Jr.
Henry P. Giedzinski
George W. Gorman
Perry H. Graves III
Bruce E. Griesmer
James W. Groulx
Eugene R. Hardman
Ronald J. Harnett
Harold B. Hauptfuhrer
Bruce A. Heitz
Peter M. Hesser
Stanley M. Holmes, Jr.
Robert D. Huie, Jr.
John S. Hyde
Dennis D. W. Jackson
Christopher P. Jameson
Jack D. Jewell
John M. Kelly
Ronald R. Kersey
Joseph W. Kim III
Bobby R. Light
Samuel R. Marrone
Dean H. Matzko
William G. McBride, Jr.
Edward G. McMenamy
Warren R. McPherson
Arthur F. Millard
Kenneth W. Moore
Richard J. Muller
Gary L. Newkirk
Henry R. Nothhaft II
Peter W. Oatis
Warren B. Partain, Jr.
Guy A. Pete, Jr.
Dennis A. Peterson
Weller A. Phillips III
Ross N. Reeves III
Clarence E. Richards, Jr.
Alex F. Roland
Hugh A. Ronalds
Billy E. Russell
William O. Schwarz
Edward A. Smyth
Robert L. Spooner
Jack W. Stephenson, Jr.
Myles C. Still
Thomas D. Stouffer
John M. Suhy
James D. Swinson, Jr.
Joseph K. Taussig III
Charles D. Tebrich
William F. Thompson
Chauncey D. Venuto
Charles W. F. Warner
Buford B. Wiley, Jr.
Richard G. Wilmes
William C. E. Wolfe
William F. Wright
Michael C. Wunsch

Anton N. Fassino for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Dean R. Aggers
Otto T. Althoff III
Ralph S. Bates
Albert J. Beveridge
William B. Black
Donald R. Brandl
Richard C. Brassington
Cleo M. Chambers
Louis A. Chatelle
Frank A. Cox, Jr.
Richard D. Cusick
Ernest M. Davis
Marvin D. Deaton
Charles H. Dowling
William E. Duke
John B. Emeney
Ronald F. Fisher
Jack R. Henderson
Clomer J. Holloway
Theodore R. Jacobson
Jimmie R. Janke
Donald C. Jarvin
Earl M. Jennings
Arney M. Johnson
Carl R. Johnson
Dan E. Johnson
Harold B. Johnson
George P. Kenniston
Edward P. Loftus
Robert L. Lord
Ray D. MacPherson
Raymond B. McClure
John J. Mikulsky
William T. Moore, Jr.
Charles L. Morrow
Robert L. Norton
James S. Paulk
Paul E. Redmann
Walter A. Reeves
Edward P. Rolita, Jr.
Robert L. Rose
Stanley C. Skrobialowski
Samuel E. Stote
Elmer L. Thomas
George B. Ward
Price I. Watkins
Jackie D. Whitaker
Joe H. Willer
Richard D. Wise

The following-named warrant officers for temporary appointments to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Abrams, David Patrick, O83934.
Acosta, Louis, O79177.
Adams, Robert Luther, O83935.
Albert, Bruce Morgan, O83936.
Albright, Walter Leroy, O85604.
Allen, James Phillip, O91342.
Allen, Kenneth Earl, O79178.
Allen, Lloyd, O89141.
Amberson, William David, O91368.
Amick, Dewey Edward, O79474.
Anderson, Joseph Christian, O58241.
Andre, John William, O49287.
Anti, Raymond Lawrence, O83938.
Arendale, John Lee, O89144.
Armitage, George Lee, O49833.
Arthur, Robert Jairus, O91340.
Atiles, Louis C., Jr., O87024.
Atwood, Robert Earl, O85605.
Baer, Robert Arthur, O81490.
Bagley, David Leland, O85606.
Bailey, Willard Eugene, O83940.
Baker, George William, O81409.
Baker, Paul Richard, O79184.
Baker, Robert Carol, O81491.
Ballance, Samuel Milton, O90005.
Bangs, William Lester, O82746.
Barkhouse, Walter Emery, O85607.
Barnes, James Marion, O87026.
Bartell, Harold Edward, O83944.
Barton, Charles Russell, O85608.
Baschnagel, Walter Thomas, O79185.
Bates, Joseph Francis, O89146.
Bayse, Daniel Luey, O89148.
Beasock, Kenneth Udell, O91347.
Beck, Bobby Lynn, O91332.
Beggs, Bernard Franklin, O91453.
Beier, John Clifford, O85609.
Beiling, Francis Joseph, O85610.
Bell, Eugene Orman, O85611.
Bell, Timothy Charles, O87029.
Bemish, Richard Orville, O91355.
Bentley, Harry Louis, O90006.
Benton, William Carl, O91387.
Berdine, Virgil Marion, O87030.
Beresford, Eugene Hancock, O85765.
Berger, Donald Joseph, O64100.
Berglund, Alfred Carl, O90512.
Berrey, Charles Henry, O61777.
Biggers, William Allen, O87031.
Billick, Robert Millsc, O89149.
Bishop, John Warner, O60002.
Bjornaas, Forrest Richard, O59940.
Blake, James Theodore, O83948.
Blake, Mason Gary, O89150.
Blount, Earl Carlton, O83950.
Boatwright, Dave Earl, O90008.
Bodree, Eugene Arthur, O81494.
Boggs, Okey Lemon, O85766.
Bokholt, William Monroe, O89152.
Bolen, Glenn Ellis, O85613.
Bolson, James Matthew, O91327.
Bonifay, Robert Lawrence, O83952.
Book, Paul Richard, O87032.
Booze, Delmar George, O87033.
Bovee, William Burton, O83953.
Bowen, Eugene Arnold, O79188.
Bowen, Henry Edward, O82997.
Bowman, Leonard Lynn, O90009.
Bracken, Wallace Deal, O61316.
Braden, Norman Dale, O87035.
Bradley, Robert Glenn, O83955.
Brandt, George H., O79189.

Bray, Shella Russell, O87036.
Bream, Philip Allan, O89153.
Brehm, Arthur Robert, O91351.
Brennan, Edward Joseph, O81495.
Bridges, Robert, O81497.
Bridges, Lionel Homer, O87037.
Brown, Charles Oscar, O79190.
Brown, Donald Earl, O85767.
Brown, Edwin James, O87038.
Brown, Gerald Victor, O91370.
Brown, Harry Atwood, O89154.
Brown, James Edwin, O85768.
Brown, Palmer, O91392.
Bruch, John Newman, O90010.
Buck, William Leachman, O87039.
Buelow, Frederick Allen, O83959.
Bugbee, Duane Merle, O91329.
Bunn, Marcus Leon, O90011.
Bunting, Jerry Evans, O79191.
Burch, Verle Everett, O83829.
Burgett, Ernest Aubrey, O83960.
Burns, James Manix, O83961.
Burns, Kenneth Richard, O81470.
Burris, Kenneth Floyd, O87042.
Burtscher, Johnnie Dyer, O90012.
Bushey, Charles Julian, O89156.
Bushnell, Louis George, O85619.
Butler, William Bradley, O90013.
Byrnes, Ronald Francis, O72144.
Bytof, Clarence, O90014.
Caldwell, William, O91356.
Callahan, Howard Lee, O82743.
Cameron, Donald Ray, O87043.
Campbell, Charley Mack, O89157.
Cantrell, Harold Eugene, O81432.
Cantrell, Bryan Kenneth, O83964.
Capelle, Paul Wilford, O79193.
Capps, Darl Gene, O79194.
Carey, Richard Lee, O89159.
Carlisle, Rayon M., O83965.
Carlton, Eugene Elmer, O89158.
Carmody, Edward Emmett, O89160.
Carpenter, James Earle, O82742.
Carr, William Dixon, O83966.
Carr, William Ronald, O91440.
Carrington, John Hardy, O85621.
Carroll, Thomas Lawrence, O91349.
Cartmill, Lloyd Junior, O85622.
Castonguay, James John, O87044.
Catanzaro, Leonard Joseph, O83963.
Caudill, Oscar Leon, O81435.
Caulfield, Thomas Joseph, O85624.
Caussin, John Joseph, O91412.
Caylao, Alex Hernandez, O89161.
Cedoz, Russell Charles, O91363.
Centers, Norman Bowen, O91328.
Champion, George William, O79196.
Chapman, James Franklin, O91452.
Charles, Maurice Alfred, O82721.
Chavers, Wayland Dale, O87045.
Chen, Robert Leon, O81434.
Chesnut, Bobby Gatlin, O85625.
Christenson, Howard Junior, O85626.
Chytka, Lawrence Joseph, O82741.
Cipolla, Henry Joseph, O89163.
Cipperly, William John, O83968.
Cisneros, Philip Clark, O81499.
Clancy. William Jerome, O87047.
Clark, Jessie Ross, O83969.
Clark, Kenneth Ronald, O91437.
Clark, Roy Lee, O66776.
Clem, Kenneth Willard, O79201.
Cline, Charles Mandred, O89164.
Colbert, Jarrett, O83970.
Cole, Bobby Donald, O89165.
Coll, William Patrick, O89166.
Collier, Donald Edgar, O87049.
Collins, John Leroy, O81437.
Collura, Joseph, O90017.
Combs, William Dennis, O90018.
Compton, Dale Leon, O83971.
Connell, Floyd Robert, O90019.
Connly, Robert Austin, O81500.
Connolly, John Leo, O68406.
Conrardy, William Carter, O85630.
Constantine, Stephan Lawre, O89167.
Cook, Darrell Hampton, O83972.
Cooke, Curtis Valentine, O85770.
Cooper, Charles Leslie, O81438.
Cox, Billy Joe, O91408.
Cox, Robert Daniel, O81501.
Coyle, Edwin James, O79205.
Craig, Alvin Leo, O64483.
Creamer, Charles Edmond, O91446.
Crews, Ellis Lee, O89169.
Crosier, Allen Duane, O87054.
Crouch, Jerry Lange, O81439.
Crum, Ralph Warren, O85633.
Culp, Leo V., O81474.
Culver, John McMunn, O91432.
Cummings, John Dwain, O83974.
Cummins, Philip Trent, O89170.
Curtis, Charles Evans, O90021.
Curtis, Harry Freeman, O85634.
Cutshall, James Joseph, O90022.
Dalbey, Rolland Melvin, O57291.
Damon, Carl Byron, O89172.
Daniels, Robert Lew, O91377.
Daniel, Alonzo Norton, O90023.
Darnell, James Monroe, O89173.
Darner, Trever Earl, O89174.
Darou, Ronald Bernard, O81503.
Darracott, John Franklin, O89175.
Darroch, Robert George, O83975.
Daubenspeck, Frederick E., O83976.
Davidson, William Lannes, O85772.
Davies, Ralph Donald, O85637.
Davis, Carroll Craig, O83977.
Davis, Delmont Irvin, O81442.
Davis, James Harold, O81443.
Davis, James Schofield, O83979.
Davis, Muriel, O45231.
Davis, Raymond Alvin, O82739.
Davis, Vaughn Clifford, O89176.
Dawson, Samuel Lewis, O91324.
Dean, Paul Arnold, O83980.
Deaver, Ralph Weldon, O87055.
Decherd, David Winston, O91447.
Delacqua, Raymond John, O48522.
Denison, Charles Fremont, O87056.
Desjarlais, Roland Adeland, O87057.
Devitt, John Robert, O23752.
Dexter, Harold Eugene, O83981.
Dierker, Henry Allen, O89177.
Dietz, Robert Gerald, O79217.
Dileva, Robert Frank, O87058.
Dill, Henry Edgar, O91462.
Dilley, George W., O91483.
Diamaio, Edward, O89178.
Dimuzio, Camillo Anthony, O83005.
Divis, James Henry, O87059.
Dobon, Peter, O87060.
Dodd, Robert Doyle, O85641.
Dodge, Ronald Leroy, O90024.
Dohse, Gunther, O91301.
Donley, Paul Judson, O87062.
Donovan, James Robert, O91312.
Doorack, Robert Joseph, O85774.
Doran, Bernard Raymond, O79218.
Douglas, Kenneth Malcolm, O83982.
Dow, Arnold Henry, O81444.
Doyle, Duane Roger, O79220.
Doyle, James Andrew, O81445.
Doyle, John, O87063.
Doyle, Teddy Joe, O81462.
Duer, Arthur Mapp, Jr., O74074.
Dufriend, James Max, O89180.
Duncan, Emmett Doran, O79224.
Dyberg, Richard Herbert, O85642.
Dye, Nellis Craig, O81410.
Early, Archie Lee, O85821.
Edelen, Kenneth Dwayne, O82845.
Eicher, Charles Duane, O83985.
Eller, Henry Rudolph, O82709.
Ellis, Billie Ray, O87065.
Ellis, Bruce Wallace, O83004.
Ellis, John Patrick, O87066.
England, Joe Hal, O79226.
England, Phillip Leon, O69209.
Eriksson, Dale Lennarth, O91411.
Eubank, William Earley, O82706.
Evans, Thomas Edward, O87067.
Eveland, William Leroy, O89181.
Fabricius, Gerald Dwane, O87068.
Fager, Wendel Paul, O79227.
Fain, Robert Lee, O85643.
Fairchild, Guy Ronald, O81379.
Favaron, John Travis, O82708.
Favreau, Robert Dudley, O79228.
Feaselman, Charles Herman, O81414.
Fellhaus, James Charles, O90025.
Fenwick, George Walter, O79229.
Ferguson, Raymond Edward, O79230.
Ferris, Richard Louis, O91445.
Fetchko, John Bernard, O79231.
Fifer, Billy Jacob, O79232.
Fischer, George Alan, O79234.
Fischer, Harold Rudolf, O89182.
Fitts, William Anderson, O90026.
Fitzgerald, Stuart William, O85644.
Fitzpatrick, Jimmy Dean, O89183.
Flanagan, Philip Eugene, O82688.
Flanigan, John Norlee, O81506.
Flanigan, Wesley Elmer, O89184.
Fleming, James Paul, O87071.
Fleming, William Edward, O91318.
Fletcher, Fredric Lowell, O89185.
Flom, William Florian, O85645.
Flood, Henry Douglas, O85646.
Flynn, George Regis, O85647.
Fogg, Donald Leroy, O85648.
Folsom, Clyde Wilbur, O79236.
Ford, Wayne Hinson, O69422.
Fortin, James Earl, O89186.
Foster, Ronald Lee, O81507.
Fountain, Billy Vernon, O89187.
Fraiser, Martin Stewart, O81508.
Frakes, Lee Wayne, O87072.
Frazier, Harold Williams, O83991.
Frazier, Jack Edward, O85649.
Freburger, Hamilton Presto, O60069.
Frederick, John William, O82847.
Freeman, Bobby Sam, O81469.
Freeman, Peter Edwards, O82707.
Freeman, Billy Ray, O87073.
French, Alvin Eugene, O83992.
French, Richard Emmett, O90028.
Frickle, Frank Joseph, O85650.
Fry, William Rudolph, O89189.
Fuller, David Debs, O85651.
Funk, Howard Edmund, O83993.
Fyles, William Albert, O89190.
Gabriel, Billy Keith, O79237.
Gage, Cecil Odell, O83994.
Gajewski, Francis Joseph, O60577.
Galbraith, Joseph Clair, O90029.
Galbreath, Bobby Frank, O70303.
Galvin, Eugene Andrew, O82778.
Gant, Frederick Deshong, O90030.
Garcia, Clarence David, O83995.
Gardner, Thomas Russell, O79238.
Gardner, Kenneth Maynard, O83996.
Gardner, Lawrence Roy, O91417.
Garibay, Antonio Flores, O79239.
Garner, James D., O82775.
Garrett, Carl, O79120.
Garris, Rhyne Eugene, O90031.
Garvey, William Francis, O60093.
Gates, Phillip Edwin, O69772.
Geiske, John, O90032.
Gentemann, James Lowell, O85653.
George, Leonard Eugene, O81509.
George, Marvin Jack, O83997.
Ghia, Frank Joseph, O81510.
Gibson, Ernest Leroy, O79242.
Gilbert, William Edward, O85654.
Gildea, Michael Joseph, O91352.
Gillespie, George Eugene, O85655.
Gipson, Carroll Sentell, O83998.
Giusto, Donald Stephen, O85775.
Goguen, Albert Alphonse, O81475.
Golab, Alfred John, O83099.
Golowski, Stanley Anthony, O85656.
Gordon, Robert Donald, O81471.
Gordon, William Henry, O84000.
Gover, Dan Stewart, O90033.
Govier, Thomas Edward, O91341.
Grabenbauer, Wayne Edward, O90034.
Granata, Peter Joseph, 069423.
Greenlaw, Donald Bryan, O85657.
Greenleese, William Ernest, O64626.
Gregorious, Eugene William, O84001.
Gregory, Donald William, O87075.
Greisen, Bruce Raymond, O89195.
Griffin, Joseph Allen, O85659.
Griffin, Kevin James, O85658.
Grinager, Vernon Leland, O81416.
Groom, Robert William, O76642.
Grose, Lester Ralph, O79249.
Grove, Ralph Martin, O89196.
Guelich, James Henry, O89197.
Gustin, Walter William, O81512.
Guthrie, Clarence Luther, 1079251.

Gwaltney, William Jay, O79252.
Haines, Edward Roy, O89198.
Hall, Morton Leon, O84002.
Hamelback, Walter D., O91435.
Hamilton, Carl Dean, O56634.
Hammond, Glenn Robert, O87076.
Hancock, Troy Washington, O85661.
Handley, Clarence Irvin, O82769.
Hanevik, Robert Harold, O87077.
Hankinson, Robert Charles, O84003.
Hapgood, William Robert, O91361.
Happy, Robert Eugene, O91366.
Hardie, Richard Allen, O81513.
Hardt, Arthur Lewis, O91401.
Hardy, James Williams, O87079.
Harmon, Tommy Allison, O84004.
Harris, Billy Marion, O81515.
Harris, Richard Lee, O89199.
Harris, Robert Edwin, O90036.
Harris, Walter Rutland, O16518.
Harrison, Ronald Cooke, O79255.
Harry, Lawrence Elexious, O59046.
Hart, Robert Howland, O81468.
Hartkopf, Albert Irving, O81467.
Hartman, Donald Edwin, O81526.
Hase, Herbert George, O87081.
Hassen, Lyle Craft, O79256.
Haugley, Lorell Joseph, O90037.
Hawkes, Lawrence Duncan, O81466.
Hayes, William Rankin, O84006.
Haynes, John Leroy, O79127.
Hazlett, Donald Lewis, O79257.
Head, Joe Murray, O60113.
Hebert, Allen Joseph, O89200.
Hedrick, Charles Thedford, O89201.
Heitzman, Larry Gene, O89202.
Helber, Lawrence Neal, O81419.
Heller, Frederick Paul, O89203.
Hemlepp, William Michael, O89204.
Henderson, Charles Herman, O88740.
Hendrickson, Kenneth Jack, O85663.
Hennon, Franklin Rae, O90038.
Henry, Carl Jennings, O85664.
Herd, Douglas Rodger, O84007.
Heusner, Robert Allen, O79260.
Hickey, William Charles, O85665.
Hiester, Wellington Andrew, O79262.
High, Roger Douglas, O82994.
Highhouse, Frederick Flori, O91426.
Hill, Albert Herold, O91333.
Hill, James Enoch, O85666.
Hill, Thomas Austin, O88743.
Hill, William Peter, O82773.
Hobbs, Comer Earl, O89208.
Hodgins, Edward Francis, O81465.
Hodgson, Donald Wayne, O82776.
Hoffman, Danny Richard, O83001.
Hoffman, George James, O91379.
Hoffmann, Ronald George, O84008.
Holiman, Ralph Lyn, O85667.
Hollis, James Francis, O79264.
Holmberg, Eugene Stebbins, O84009.
Holt, Paul Leo, O81420.
Hosek, Louis Otto, O82720.
Hoskins, Rowland Ray, O91421.
Houck, Harvey Dewey, O84010.
Houggard, Byron Leslie, O79265.
House, Donald Cloyce, O85669.
Howard, Donald Leroy, O89209.
Hoy, Jack Raymond, O87083.
Hufnagel, Edward Anthony, O79266.
Hughes, Edward Marion, O85670.
Hughes, Ralph Charles, O91428.
Humm, Edmond Richard, O79267.
Hutton, John William, O79144.
Ingram, Walter Edward, O85671.
Jabs, Walter Leon, O91467.
Jackson, Buddy Kenneth, O91303.
Jeremiah, John Bernard, O45823.
Johann, Joseph Aloysius, O79272.
Johnson, Robert Wesley, O74195.
Johnson, Richard Wesley, O80473.
Johnson, Wesley D., O82844.
Johnson, Laverne Everett, O85779.
Johnson, Carl Olless, O85778.
Johnson, Stanley Perry, O90039.
Johnson, Vernon John, O91358.
Johnston, Bobby Merrell, O87087.
Jones, Clarence Hoover, O90040.
Jones, Edward Thomas, O84014.
Jones, Henderson Boyd, O87088.
Jones, James Walter, O76621.
Jones, Morris, O89215.
Jones, Reginald Lionel, O90041.
Jones, Richard Duane, O72632.
Jones, William Albert, O85672.
Jordan, Joe Thomas, O90042.
Kaczinski, Marcellus Joseph, O81477.
Kammeier, Cyril Leo, O81422.
Kane, Gerald Thomas, O91313.
Karr, James Tilden, O90044.
Karrer, Joseph Jacob, O76641.
Kasson, George Phillip, O91371.
Kasten, William, O87089.
Katz, Robert Edward, O87090.
Kearley, Arthur Maxwell, O89217.
Keglovits, Edward Joseph, O91407.
Keller, Richard Squires, O81423.
Kelly, George William, O91362.
Kelly, James Robert, O79276.
Kelly, Thomas Patrick, O89219.
Kelly, William Donald, O67779.
Kemick, Gerald Thomas, O89220.
Kendall, James Eugene, O85674.
Kendall, Ronald Richard, O87093.
Kennedy, William Gilchrist, O91326.
Kenner, George Forester, O79278.
Kerr, Howard Ewing, O81424.
Kerr, Richard Allen, O76788.
Keyes, Roy Charles, O79281.
Kimble, Ralph Raymond, O85675.
Kindler, Gary Leigh, O81531.
King, Ben Weir, O89221.
Kinnear, John Harold, O85676.
Kipick, Mike, O90046.
Kirchmeier, Robert Theodore, O89222.
Kirk, Paul Charles, O81425.
Kirkland, Golden Chester, O84018.
Klesyk, Francis, O85677.
Kling, Harry Adolph, O84019.
Klingensmith, Harold Arthur, O91402.
Knocke, James John, O87094.
Knox, Richard Douglas, O85678.
Kobel, William Lowe, O81532.
Kohler, William Charles, O81447.
Kondo, Herbert Shiro, O84020.
Kramer John David, O91109.
Kramer, Vernon Scott, O44106.
Krantz, Everett Watson, O89224.
Krieger, Edward Thomas, O79285.
Kromis, Emanuel John, O90047.
Labby, Charles Emanuel, O82734.
Laboissiere, David John, O91369.
Labounty, Norman Frederic, O90048.
Ladner, Claudie John, O84021.
Lake, Donald Leon, O90049.
Lake, James Edward, O84022.
Lamb, Michael Ross, O91425.
Lambert, Frank Alfred, O79288.
Lambert, Leon, O90050.
Lamberth, Scott Murray, O91397.
Lamontagne, Robert Normand, O85680.
Lane, John Samuel, O91427.
Lanis, Howard George, O89226.
Larson, Duane Dean, O89227.
Larue, Billy Bob, O79289.
Latham, Julian Sturgis, O88741.
Lawler, Eugene Douglas, O90051.
Lawrence, Charles August, O85681.
Lawrence, Thomas Jay, O91419.
Lea, Franklin Sherman, O85683.
Lee, Earl Columbus, O84026.
Leedle, James Myrl, O85684.
Legere, Alfred Henry, O91400.
Lenhart, George Elmer, O90052.
Lenhart, Richard Allen, O91389.
Lepore, William Peter, O87096.
Lesh, Thomas J., O84028.
Levengood, Joseph Carl, O87097.
Lewis, Samuel Pleasant, O89229.
Lewis, Willard Raymond, O87098.
Lichty, Randall, Wagner, O79291.
Liebert, Karl Francis, O84029.
Lindsey, Joel Franklin, O84030.
Lisenby, William Edmund, O79292.
Little, John Ross, O91429.
Little Roy Franklin, O84031.
Llewellyn, William Donald, O85685.
Loehr, Curtis Junior, O89230.
Logar, Michael Frank, O89231.
Long, Boyzy Cornelius, O89232.
Long, Charles Edward, O79293.
Long, Donald Whitney, O82827.
Long, Lowell Dean, O89233.
Loof, Charles John, O79294.
Losey, Charles Edward, O79125.
Lowell, Joel Kenneth, O89234.
Luedtke, Dale Curtiss, O91300.
Luke, David Ashley, O91430.
Lunn, Carl Kenneth, O87100.
Macfarlane, Robert Wayne, O79296.
Macgeary, Fred Ernest, O85780.
Machado, Enrique Limon, O87102.
Mackenzie, Robert Bernard, O84033.
Mackey, David Gene, O91404.
Macy, Ronald Tilton, O84034.
Madsen, Alfred Louis, O82710.
Maguire, Paul Brine, O79298.
Main, Stanley Wilbert, O76635.
Mallard, Ira Taft, O85688.
Malnicof, Harry Beck, O87103.
Manion, Jimmy Lee, O90055.
Marcum, George Leroy, O81517.
Markowski, Frank Gabriel, O91390.
Marlow, Donald Richard, O87104.
Marnon, John Joseph, O81518.
Marshall, Alvin Folly, O81380.
Martin, Joseph Mitchell, O81519.
Martin, Ronald Andrew, O89236.
Marzioli, Joseph, O81520.
Mason, Wayne Bernard, O89237.
Massarotti, Dante Anthony, O76739.
Massey, Allen Winslow, O90689.
Mathis, Don Eugene, O89239.
Mathys, Dale Alvin, O89240.
Mattox, Leon, O79299.
Maxwell, John, O91382.
Mayer, Robert, O90056.
Mayes, Ronald Joseph, O85689.
Maynes, Robert Lee, O81522.
Mazzei, Edmund Joseph, O87105.
McAfee, Marvin Kraig, O89241.
McAlister, John Thomas, O82733.
McAvoy, Paul Owen, O87106.
McCallum, John Edwin Berry, O82771.
McCauley, Benjamin Duke, O82732.
McDeavitt, Richard Lee, O91418.
McGraw, John Joseph, O90059.
McIlnay, Bernard Lance, O84038.
McIntosh, Roger Alfred, O87107.
McKee, Dennis Thomas, O65484.
McKee, Larry Estle, O81382.
McKnight, Thomas Andrew, O90000.
McLaughlin, Robert Joseph, O91372.
McMakin, John Francis, O82731.
McNamara, William, O76633.
McNulty, Jerry Walter, O84040.
McPeak, Melvin Eugene, O81464.
McVey, Lavoy Don, O91424.
McWhorter, Robert James, O79304.
Meech, Wayne Allen, O91448.
Meisner, Donald Eugene, O81383.
Mellon, Bruce, O84041.
Mendoza, Raymond Aguayo, O81480.
Merritt, Jimmy Milam, O82730.
Messinger, Gene Val, O89242.
Meyers, Gary Gene, O87108.
Meyers, John Leonard, O87109.
Meyers, Richard Blain, O89243.
Miles, John James, O79306.
Millang, Harvey Bertrum, O26529.
Miller, Don Paul, O89245.
Miller, Jacques Lyman, O87111.
Miller, Robert S., O85791.
Milliman, Glenn Perry, O79308.
Milliron, Robert Elvin, O85691.
Millis, Dorne Arlen, O87112.
Mino, Michael John, O89246.
Mitchell, Mack Edward, O57303.
Mitchels, William Lawrence, O64530.
Mix, Tom Adrian, O84043.
Mobley, Perry Andrew, O90061.
Moe, Harold John, O91438.
Moffitt, Kermit, O82779.
Montana, Douglas Wayne, O79310.
Moody, Johnney William, O84044.
Moore, Bruce Kenneth, O91364.
Moore, Henry, O89247.
Moore, Theodore Mervin, O89248.
Moran, Richard Charles, O87114.
Morgan, Franklin Michael, O91455.
Morgan, Grover Kenneth, O91423.
Morgan, Roger George, O65995.

Morgan, William Arthur, O89249.
Morrill, Alan Lee, O85695.
Morris, Stanley Stewart, O53332.
Morrow, Joseph Maxwell, O85696.
Mort, James Harry, O89250.
Mossey, Donald John, O89251.
Moyer, Samuel Lee, O84046.
Mucci, Anthony, O79313.
Mulford, Randolph Mustian, O85697.
Murphy, Michael William, O89252.
Murray, Peter James, O81538.
Murry, Joseph Arnold, O87118.
Myers, Paul Alexander, O79317.
Nailor, Richard Anthony, O87119.
Nelson, Delbert Leroy, O60671.
Nelson, Monte Vollers, O87120.
Nelson, William Harvey, O90062.
Newell, Charles Alfred, O81539.
Newman, Ronald Dale, O79318.
Nicholas, Billy Dean, O85698.
Nichols, Robert John, O90063.
Nicklin, Richard Forrest, O85699.
Nicolai, Peter Wayne, O79319.
Nimmow, Donald Duane, O87121.
Noonan, William, O79320.
Noonkester, Henry Elvin, O74647.
Norwood, Richard Hiram, O85700.
Novak, John Peter, O91336.
Nowicki, Norbert John, O81540.
Nyenbrink, Henry Wilmer, O79321.
Oakley, Howard Clark, O79322.
O'Brien, Thomas Michael, O81541.
Ockuly, Eugene John, O64516.
O'Connor, Patrick Robert, O82729.
Oehlers, Roy Melvin, O84052.
Oetting, Robert Henry, O89259.
Offutt, Charles Weaver, O83837.
Olsen, Almart Hill, O91391.
Olsen, James Gerald, O79324.
Olson, Robert Duwayne, O91398.
O'Neil, Donn Lee, O83002.
O'Rourke, James Michael, O81542.
O'Shields, Tommy Stanley, O89262.
Osterberg, Richard Rodney, O84053.
Owens, Billy Warren, O87122.
Paige, Joseph John, O79128.
Pallo, Mathew, Jr., O81449.
Palmer, Leonard Everett, O64535.
Panicali, Louis Vincent, O81543.
Panknin, James Dean, O89263.
Parker, Charles Donald, O87123.
Parker, George Richard, O74076.
Parretti, Lawrence, O74054.
Parry, Fred Richmond, O87125.
Paschen, Charles Walter, O79326.
Patton, Robert Frank, O64572.
Pearce, Arthur Romania, O79328.
Pearson, Charles Richard, O91306.
Pedersen, Charles Lindberg, O85702.
Pedlar, Dean Caleb, O84055.
Pelletier, George Arthur, O87128.
Peltzer, Benson, O79329.
Penman, David Thomson, O84056.
Perry, Jimmy Royce, O89266.
Peterson, John Edward, O85704.
Pettit, Kenneth Eugene, O90065.
Petty, Robert Homer, O85706.
Phillips, Bruce Martin, O53042.
Pierse, Donald Eldon, O79332.
Pinola, Tony Ralph, O91335.
Piontek, Edward, O60687.
Pippin, James Roberts, O85707.
Pitts, Robert David, O89268.
Pollmiller, Lawrence Archi, O90066.
Pollock, William Whalen, O91460.
Ponder, Carl Nathan, O91388.
Pontillas, Robert Glenn, O87132.
Pope, Robert Eugene, O79334.
Porter, Bebe Britton, O79335.
Porter, Richard Louis, O87133.
Posthuma, Henry, O89269.
Powell, William Harrell, O84058.
Prato, Sam John, O79336.
Pratt, Donald Leftrage, O81547.
Pretsch, Donald Charles, O82728.
Price, Robert Franklin, O89270.
Priddy, Sanford, Jr., O91323.
Puricelli, Russell Antoni, O85708.
Quest, Herman William, O89271.
Quill, Lewis Robert, O89272.
Radford, Garland Lee, O91365.
Rafferty, Cleon Herbert, O85783.
Rafferty, Michael Edward, O91360.
Raines, Arvel Hyder, O90067.
Rainwater, Gerald Kirkley, O81463.
Raley, Jerry Arnold, O91416.
Ramseur, Joe David, O90068.
Ransom, Morris Edwin, O82697.
Rasile, Robert, O85709.
Rawlins, Malcolm Storey, O82696.
Ray, Thomas Wayne, O85710.
Raymer, Erwin Orson, O82986.
Raymond, Dale, O79338.
Raymond, Joseph Charles, O87134.
Redican, Thomas Edison, O79339.
Reed, Doyle Richard, O81387.
Rembish, Stanley Joseph, O89275.
Rentz, Homer Aurand, O85711.
Rexroade, John Dwight, O91314.
Reyer, Alfred Joseph, O85712.
Rhodes, John Lloyd, O84060.
Rhodes, Larry Eugene, O89276.
Richardson, Donald Forrest, O85713.
Richmond, Arthur Dale, O89277.
Richter, Robert Edward, O91406.
Riggs, Charles, O82695.
Riley, Carroll James, O87136.
Riley, William Earl, O85715.
Ring, Paul Edwin, O89278.
Ringler, Dean Ralph, O82694.
Ripa, Sebastiano Francisco, O90071.
Ritter, Harold Lewis, O85716.
Robbins, John Ray, O91434.
Robertson, Emmett Lee, O89279.
Robinson, Clarence Aubrey, O84061.
Robinson, Ronald Lee, O89281.
Roettger, Raymond Joseph, O89282.
Rogers, Robert Dale, O87137.
Romano, Robert John, O87138.
Rosenthal, James Harvey, O81389.
Ross, Leonard, O84063.
Rotchford, Edward Patrick, O85718.
Roth, John William, O91393.
Rouse, Albert Connell, O81549.
Rousseau, Donald Francis, O81481.
Rowe, Guy Field, O91384.
Rundle, Randolph Keim, O82722.
Runkle, Roger Lockhart, O87139.
Russell, Richard Samuel, O60439.
Russell, Leonard Dodge, O91320.
Sable, Ivan Richard, O81390.
Sakert, January Thomas, O79346.
Salum, George David, O91465.
Sampson, Gerald Hilbert, O89284.
Sanborn, Richard Sherwood, O82693.
Sanchez, Milton, O82764.
Sanders, Richard Kenneth, O84065.
Sanders, Stanley Fancher, O85719.
Sanderson, Stephen Hollist, O82692.
Sands, Charles Louis, O82770.
Sanford, Eugene Day, O89285.
Sansom, Howard Dravo, O62174.
Sarver, Edmond Stephen, O85720.
Satterfield, Marion Gerald, O89286.
Savage, Charles Willie, O85721.
Savoy, Daniel Ray, O90072.
Sawyer, Harry Emory, O61391.
Sayre, Orville Leroy, O85722.
Scalzo, Salvatore Joseph, O85723.
Scarborough, Neil Harris, O81551.
Scheidemantel, John Louis, O69612.
Scheller, Leroy Alvin, O89287.
Schiraldi, Anthony Paul, O85724.
Schlack, Carl John, O91309.
Schlitz, Leonard Louie, O89289.
Schlondrop, William Christ, O79349.
Schmid, Adolph, O85725.
Schneider, Roger James, O81392.
Schooler, Bill Morris, O91461.
Schwarz, Frank Henry, O81552.
Scott, Norvel Marion, O84067.
Selleck, Albert Lawrence, O81554.
Shaffer, James Allen, O90073.
Shank, Paul Samuel, O79350.
Shaughnessy, Joseph Benedi, O89291.
Shea, Robert Edward, O79085.
Shepherd, Thomas Carroll, O81484.
Sheppard, William Francis, O79133.
Sheridan, Thomas Joseph, O89293.
Sherry, Homer Glenn, O89294.
Shoffner, Mann, O32476.
Shore, Richard Gordon, O85789.
Shutak, Emil Michael, O82690.
Siemasko, Paul Robert, O82689.
Siemion, Daniel Leo, O84069.
Simmons, Warren Andrew, O89295.
Simolin, Roy Erick, O85727.
Simpkins, J V. O82951.
Skalski, Stanley Aloyisus, O84070.
Smiley, Pierce Leverne, O79132.
Smith, Blakeslee Adams, O60348.
Smith, Carroll Jay, O90075.
Smith, Charles William, O72209.
Smith, Darrell Max, O61411.
Smith, David Maurice, O82772.
Smith, Don L., O85728.
Smith, Donald James, O89296.
Smith, Frank Ellsworth, O84074.
Smith, George Michael, O85729.
Smith, George Wesley, O91441.
Smith, Harold Wilmot, O81555.
Smith, Herbert Sherman, O91456.
Smith, James Gordon, O82952.
Smith, Melvin Leon, O89297.
Smith, Ronald Ray, O84075.
Smith, William Charles, O79353.
Snellings, Sidney Lockhart, O87143.
Snooks, Donald Jon, O89298.
Snow, Richard Wendell, O85731.
Sojourner, Fletcher Brabha, O89299.
Soltes, Anthony Joseph, O47399.
Sousa, Ronald Louis, O89300.
Southall, James Barney, O90077.
Spahr, Edward Joseph, O79142.
Sparks, Alan Jay, O85732.
Spears, Leo Earl, O91383.
Spiker, Robert Elwin, O84076.
Spillane, Raymond Joseph, O81488.
Stafford, Donald Eugene, O81394.
Stanford, T. J., O89301.
Stavros, Peter Nick, O84078.
Steger, Robert Allison Jos, O84079.
Steinken, William Theodore, O84080.
Stephenson, Jack Edgar, O90078.
Stevens, Danny Holdsworth, O91394.
Stewart, James Nathaniel, O89303.
Stockman, John Arthur, O89304.
Stokes, Donald, O89305.
Stone, Joe William, O79356.
Stone, Thomas, O82850.
Stoner, Raymon Earl, O81395.
Stoops, James Miller, O89307.
Stout, Raymond Howard, O91463.
Stowell, James Howard, O79357.
Strassenberg, Donald Ernst, O91410.
Strayhorn, Kenneth Eugene, O81396.
Striker, Frederick Hilliar, O81557.
Stroup, Guy Sheldon, O79358.
Struwe, Lawrence Tenney, O89309.
Stuckey, William Harris, O89310.
Sutherland, Frank Ramsay, O79360.
Sweeney, Allen Morton, O91331.
Swisher, Charles Earl, O89311.
Tandle, Thomas Joseph, O85733.
Tarry, William Edward, O89312.
Taylor, Charles Clement, O79361.
Taylor, Kenneth Eugene, O66090.
Taylor, Robert Thayer, O81559.
Taylor, Thomas Frederick, O79362.
Terhorst, Kenneth Christop, O81397.
Thacher, Robert Morton, O76618.
Thacker, John Lawrence, O85734.
Theriot, Jimmy Roland, O84086.
Thomason, James William, O81398.
Thomas, Edgar Daniel, O85735.
Thomas, Stanley Barto, O89314.
Thome, Richard Alan, O91466.
Thompson, Gary Ralph, O87146.
Thompson, James Glenn, O89315.
Thornton, Joseph Oscar, O90079.
Thrailkill, Allen Brown, O79363.
Tidwell, Edwin David, O79364.
Timmons, Richard Kasper, O82711.
Tinney, John Garner, O85736.
Tinsley, Hubert, O46313.
Tobin, Harry Jordan, O84087.
Tofft, Charles Nelson, O91415.
Tomlinson, Jerry Lee, O91457.
Toney, Edgar Allen, O89316.
Toth, Francis Anthony, O85738.
Toval, Ferdinand Anthony, O89317.
Tracey, Robert Lee, O81561.
True, Charles Gilbert, O87147.

Tucker, Fred, O89318.
Tucker, Jacques Eaton, O85740.
Tucker, Robert Berry, O89319.
Tucker, Willie Rola Milton, O76636.
Turner, Thomas William, O50368.
Usher, Lloyd Jerome, O84091.
Vanamburg, David Edmond, O82724.
Vanantwerp, Lloyd Harold, O90080.
Vance, Kenneth Randall, O81562.
Vanderdoes, Nicholas Corn, O81399.
Vanderhoof, Rex Frank, O81401.
Vandermark, Joseph Daniel, O90082.
Vanhoose, Donald Lee, O89320.
Vaserberg, Morton, O87150.
Veater, Jimmie, O85741.
Voltz, Richard Alvin, O89321.
Walaconis, Donald Bernard, O91442.
Waldenville, Alan Weldon, O79369.
Waldvogel, Irwin Franklin, O82725.
Walker, Norman Jesse, O84092.
Walker, Williard Clayton, O91317.
Wallace, Richard Herbert, O85742.
Wallace, Virgil Enoch, O85744.
Wallace, Robert Howard, O85743.
Wallace, William James, O89322.
Walls, George Oscar, O76615.
Walls, William Bradley, O81404.
Walters, Bud Ray, O83047.
Walter, Lowell William, O81405.
Waltzer, Robert Alan, O91802.
Ward, Joseph Elmer, O89323.
Waters, Calvin Rodney, O84094.
Watson, Eric Percy, O84096.
Watts, Avron Jackson, O89324.
Watts, John Charles, O84097.
Weare, Everett Albert, O89326.
Weatherly, Richard Eugene, O79370.
Weaver, John Franklin, O84098.
Weaver, James Perry, O91468.
Weber, David Cary, O79371.
Welch, Jerry Houston, O89326.
Welch, William Harris, O81448.
Wells, Glenn Tildon, O60214.
Wenglare, William Robert, O84099.
Wenrich, John Lewis, O85746.
Wentworth, Lloyd Martin, O91353.
Werbinski, Kenneth Lawrence, O91450.
Wheeler, Charles Daniel, O85747.
Wheeler, Paul Kelly, O90084.
Whelchel, Leonard Arlie, O79134.
Whisnant, Donald Lee, O84100.
White, Billy Keith, O89328.
White, Louis Leslie, O79374.
White, Thomas Anthony, O81406.
White, Vance Earl, O84101.
Whitehurst, Charles Bernar, O89329.
Whitten, Dale Jerald, O91403.
Wickens, Alan Edward, O87152.
Wiggs, Robert Nelson, O91344.
Wilbur, William Joseph, O83003.
Wilcoxen, Edward Earl, O89330.
Wilder, Jack Allen, O87153.
Wileman, Charles Robert, O89331.
Wilhelm, Murray Ray, O91405.
Wilkinson, James Virgil, O91321.
Williaford, Cecil Raymond, O81446.
Williams, Robert Farrell, O81407.
Williams, Saville Leon, O82726.
Williams, Wilbur Carl, O89332.
Willis, John, O79066.
Wilson, Donald Theodore, O83835.
Wilson, David Claude, O89333.
Wincensten, Bruce Merlin, O60312.
Wire, Sydney Michael, O87155.
Woidyla, Wilfred Paul, O91422.
Wolfe, Howard Clark, O84104.
Wolfe, James Frank, O50370.
Wood, Charles Randall, O91302.
Wood, William Henry, O81565.
Worcester, Floyd Barter, O79378.
Worley, Bascom Claude Sine, O89336.
Wright, Clyde Vernon, O85749.
Wright, James Edmond, O84105.
Wright, Robert Calvin, O89337.
Wright, William Clinton, O87156.
Wulfeck, Floyd Charles, O89338.
Wylde, Clark Hoffman, O89339.
Yetter, Miles Milton, O64472.
Yoder, Robert Hugh, O87157.
Yon, Veo Secondo, O55781.
Young, Earnest, O91330.
Zeferjohn, David Arthur, O87158.
Zettler, George Alfred, O85750.
Zimmerman, Norbert Anthony, O74041.
Zimmerman, James Marold, O87159.
Zorens, Roger Dion, O91464.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God who made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things.—Acts 17: 24, 25.

Eternal God, from whom cometh all things good and true, in the quiet of this moment we open our hearts unto Thee. Thou art everywhere, Thou art everywhere present, and now in the silence of this moment we would find Thee and would be found by Thee. Breathe on us, breath of God, fill us with life anew, that we may love what Thou dost love, and do what Thou wouldst do.

Strengthen Thou our faith, renew our courage, make us great in goodness and good in greatness that we may triumph over wrong and conquer every evil intention. Put beneath us, the leaders of our beloved land, Thy strong foundation and send us forth our vision clear, our faith confirmed, and our spirits strengthened to be Thy loyal and loving children. So we would open our hearts to Thy transforming presence.

O Spirit of the Living God,
Thou Light and Fire Divine;
Descend upon our land once more
And make it truly Thine!
Fill it with love and joy and power,
With righteousness and peace,
Till Christ shall dwell in human hearts,
And sin and sorrow cease.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to recommit the bill H.R. 14745, the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 63, immediately following line 6, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 1006. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "nays" appeared to have it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 143, nays 236, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—143

Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson

Dole
Dorn
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
May

Michel
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pelly
Pickle
Poff
Pool
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Watkins
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—236

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Belcher
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland

Bolling
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Cohelan
Conte
Corman
Craley
Daddario
Daniels

Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein

Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Purcell
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—53

Baring
Beckworth
Brademas
Burleson
Celler
Clark
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Culver
Curtis
Dawson
Dowdy
Edwards, La.
Fallon
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gilligan
Grabowski
Griffin
Griffiths
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Jacobs
Kee
Kelly
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Matthews
Morse
Murray
Randall
Roberts
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Scheuer
Scott
Smith, N.Y.
Thomas
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Watts
Williams
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walker of Mississippi for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mr. Randall for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Gilligan against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana, with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Fraser with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Dawson.

Mrs. Thomas with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Williams.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr Beckworth with Mr. Clark.

Mr. KUNKEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 355, nays 27, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—355

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—27

Andrews, George W.
Bow
Brock
Cabell
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Dorn
Findley
Ford, Gerald R.
Gathings
Goodell
Gross
Hall
Hutchinson
Jones, Mo.
Kunkel
McClory
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Minshall
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Schneebeli
Todd

NOT VOTING—50

Baring
Beckworth
Brademas
Burleson
Clark
Clevenger
Collier
Colmer
Conyers
Culver
Curtis
Dawson
Dowdy
Edwards, La.
Fallon
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gilligan
Griffin
Griffiths
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Jacobs
Kee
Kelly
Mailliard
Mathias
Matthews
Morse
Murray
Randall
Roberts
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Scott
Smith, N.Y.
Thomas
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Williams
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Hardy with Mrs. Thomas.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Beckworth.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Roberts.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Fallon.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Matthews.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Williams with William D. Ford.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Tuten.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation be permitted to sit during general debate on Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

McNAMARA WAS FIGHTER

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a number of Members of the Michigan delegation to the U.S. Congress paid our last respects to a great U.S. Senator and, myself included, had the sad duty of accompanying President Johnson on a brief trip to Detroit to attend the funeral ceremonies honoring our late and beloved senior Senator Pat McNamara, our friend and distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, on the previous day, the Ann Arbor News published an editorial obituary in honor of Senator Pat. It pays tribute to him in a way that, I feel sure, speaks for many of us, both in the Michigan delegation and in the entire Congress. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial from the Ann Arbor News, for Tuesday, May 3, 1966, in the RECORD at this point:

McNAMARA WAS FIGHTER

No one could ever accuse Senator Pat McNamara of shying away from an unpopular stand or of turning to the kind of fence-straddling that some politicians resort to when the going gets rough. This is not to say that Senator McNamara viewed the world in black-and-white terms; rather, the Michigan Senator spoke his piece when he was moved to speak (which wasn't often) and left to his colleagues the rambling speeches and lengthy discourses which have won for that august body, the Senate, the nickname "Cave of Winds."

In short, you always knew where Pat McNamara stood on an issue and even if he didn't say much, he had his beliefs and he fought for them. Not so long ago his friend, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, rose in the Senate and, gesturing toward McNamara, said that there sits a Senator "in whom there is no guile."

He came up through the labor movement as a pipefitter and to say that Senator McNamara was prolabor is to understate the case. He sponsored or supported many key pieces of social legislation and he used his position as chairman of the Public Works Committee to oversee the passage of Great Society legislation.

Senator McNamara was a battler not necessarily for causes or ideas, but for people. And to Senator McNamara, who left to others the rhetoric and the nicely turned phrase, it was the people who counted most.

Mr. Speaker, prior to our return in late afternoon from this trip, four calls of the House occurred, each being quorum calls only. By agreement of the House, of May 3, all calls for recorded votes on legislative matters were put off until today, so that those attending the funeral ceremonies, myself included, could participate also in the recorded votes. Thus we missed no calls for recorded votes.

However, Mr. Speaker, we did return in sufficient time to be present just at the close of debate on H.R. 14745, the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Labor for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966. This bill, which we have just voted on the past few minutes, increased amount of funds to these Departments, compared to last year and to the President's budget request.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for H.R. 14745, but with serious reservations. All of us in the Congress agree that cuts must be made now in requested Federal expenditures if we are to have any real hope of completing the year without either an accelerating inflation or a tax increase.

An item of nearly a half billion dollars was contained in this bill, for aid to so-called federally impacted school districts. This amount is a quarter of a billion dollars more than the amount requested by President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the established policy that local school districts should be compensated for the extra costs which they incur to provide education to students whose parents live or work on Federal installations. The Federal Government should pay these excess costs, because the Federal Government traditionally does not permit itself to be assessed for local property and other school taxes, as are local employers or residents. But the program has gotten out of hand.

Within the last year an intensive study of this subject was completed by the Stanford Research Institute, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The institute was asked just what costs justifiably should be reimbursed. I have been told that the President's recommendation for a reduced budget allocation was based on this study. The study clearly and carefully shows that, in many, many school districts, Federal impacted area payments far exceed the actual excess costs attributable to the Federal impact. The report states:

> We can conclude that the present method of payment results in wide discrepancies among districts, with many districts receiving large windfalls, and a smaller number receiving payments less than necessary to meet the local burden.

For years, the Bureau of the Budget has been trying to cut this program back to eliminate the windfalls. President Eisenhower first attempted to do so in 1958. President Johnson has continued the endeavor.

In the face of this year's rising expenditures, I believe it would be wise for the President to withhold at least a significant fraction of the funds appropriated, and encourage him to do so.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CINCO DE MAYO

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the great friendship which has been displayed by the people of Mexico during President Lyndon B. Johnson's recent trip to Mexico City is of special note this year when so much strife and dissension is evident in the Dominican Republic and we continue to have poor relations with Cuba.

The friendliness we are blessed with from below the border is too often taken for granted. Today, on Cinco de Mayo, I would like to salute this great nation to the south, and recall some of the history surrounding the 5th of May.

This date is celebrated throughout Mexico each year in honor of a great Mexican victory over the French in 1862. The holiday is not to be confused, however, with Mexican Independence Day—the 16th of September—which commemorates the day in 1810 when Martin Hidalgo, a parish priest, issued a ringing declaration of Mexico's freedom from Spanish rule.

Mexico's revolt against Spain was complete by 1822, but internal dissension and European efforts to reacquire Mexico plunged the vast nation into almost continuous chaos. Thus it was that Mexico's first liberal regime, under Benito Juarez in the early 1860's, encountered serious difficulties both at home and abroad.

A great number of self-exiled Mexican conservatives informally assembled at the French Court and appealed successfully to the imperialistic intentions of Napoleon III. Napoleon acceded to their wishes, occupying the Mexican port of Vera Cruz with the aid of the British and Spanish. Their pretext was the collection of debts and the restoration of order to insure the safety of their numerous citizens plying commercial and mining trades throughout Mexico.

A large force of French, Spanish, and British arrived in Veracruz in December 1861. The United States was deep in the throes of the Civil War at the time, which made support of the Mexican Government impossible, even against such a clear transgression of the spirit and letter of the Monroe Doctrine.

By April 1862, the Spanish and British withdrew their forces, now fully aware of France's greater intentions. Six thousand French soldiers, under General Laurencez, marched toward Mexico City to the victory they were sure would be theirs against a motley, volunteer force of Mexicans equipped merely with muskets which had been captured from the French at Waterloo.

The French confidence was unwarranted. On the 5th of May, the Mexican forces hurled them back at Puebla—a strategic city almost equidistant from Veracruz and Mexico City, often the scene of important battles in Mexican history.

Although the French lost nearly a thousand soldiers and much pride, they were able in succeeding years to capture the Mexican capital. Their stay was brief, however, for by 1867 Maximilian, whom they had placed upon a contrived Mexican throne, was executed.

The significance of the Cinco de Mayo celebration is the fact that the spirit and indomitable independence of the hearts of the Mexicans who turned the French away on that day lives on.

They eventually liberated their great nation from foreign domination and achieved a justifiably strong sense of national consciousness and pride. The United States has a neighbor of which we can be extremely proud and we join them, today, in honoring the courageous band of defenders who fought and won this day in 1862, as well as those who died in this defense.

Also, we are proud of those Mexicans who have chosen to come to the United States, and their dependents, for the great contributions so many have made to our society, displaying the same strength of character as their forebears did on the 5th of May.

TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY VOTE OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO RULE STATE AND NATIONAL LAWS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1966, I introduced House Joint Resolution 1124. My introductory remarks and text of the bill are found on page 9154 of that day's Record.

Responses to this proposed constitutional amendment from my colleagues, members of the bench and bar, and the press have been most encouraging.

Among these responses is an editorial in the Dallas Times Herald of April 29, 1966, which I submit for the Record and for the information of my colleagues as follows:

Cabell's Court Idea Logical

There is much logic in Dallas Representative Earle Cabell's proposal that a two-thirds majority vote of the U.S. Supreme Court be required to rule State and National laws unconstitutional.

Representative Cabell has introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to make the change. But to become effective, the proposal must travel a long and rocky road. It must first be passed, of course, by a two-thirds majority of the House and Senate and then ratified by a three-fourths majority of the States.

Nevertheless, the Court's many close decisions in recent years on questions of far-reaching importance to every citizen of this Nation should, it seems to us, be a strong recommendation for the Cabell idea.

In light of the momentous 5 to 4 decisions of recent years—the latest being the decision invalidating the Arizona loyalty oath for State employees—it is difficult to credit the proposition that the five-man majority was unquestionably right and the four-man minority unquestionably wrong. A one-vote majority margin in a body of nine men striking down laws passed by large elective assemblies such as State legislatures and the Congress of the United States seems decidedly disproportionate.

Especially does the two-thirds majority proposal make sense in view of the Supreme Court's greatly expanding function as a legislative body. If the court is to continue to make the law—and it undoubtedly will—as well as to interpret it, then it is not too much to ask that a minimum of six men of the nine make the determination. This is true, no matter how capable the men or how justified they may be in the conclusions they finally reach.

As Representative Cabell said on the floor of the House: "Why should an act of the Congress, after due process of legislative study and debate, be subject to overturn by five members of the Court, and in many cases, an actual minority of that court? Why should an issue involving an entire State, or even the well-being of the entire Nation, be resolved by five or less members of the Supreme Court?"

These are highly pertinent questions, and the resolution offered by Representative Cabell, in our opinion, provides a cogent answer.

FLOOD CONTROL APPEARS MANY YEARS IN FUTURE

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Dallas Morning News columnist, Gene Ormsby, entitled "Flood Control Appears Many Years in Future," which appeared April 30, 1966. As you know, Dallas has suffered one of its severest floods in its history last week and was subsequently proclaimed a disaster area. The damage to the area runs into millions of dollars, but far more tragic is the loss of lives which stands at 19 persons and is feared that total will rise. I feel Mr. Ormsby's article gives a precise picture of the status of the Dallas flood control program as it stands now and the grave necessity for funds to be approved by Congress for preconstruction planning for the Trinity River project.

The article follows:

Flood Control Appears Many Years in Future

(By Gene Ormsby)

New flood control projects which could considerably reduce chances of flooding in areas of Dallas which suffered flood damage this week may be many years away, an Army Corps of Engineers source said here Friday.

And for most flooded areas in the north part of the city, which have been among the hardest hit by the deluge, new flood control measures by the city of Dallas are not feasible, a city official said.

Several Federal projects are included in the Trinity River comprehensive development plan which could eliminate much of the flood threat to such places as Roosevelt Heights in South Dallas and an area off Harry Hines Boulevard in the hard-hit North Dallas section.

Another element of the comprehensive plan is a Duck Creek project, which would prevent such damage as it inflicted on Garland Thursday and Friday.

The plans are all part of a $910,750,000, multipurpose project for development of the water resources of the Trinity River Basin authorized by Congress in the omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965.

The act authorizes development of a comprehensive plan for navigation, flood control, water supply and related purposes.

So far, $200,000 has been authorized to restudy the navigational economics, but no funds have been approved for preconstruction planning on any part of the project.

A corps source said if an optimum amount of construction funds was available every year beginning July 1, the entire project could be completed in the early 1980's.

One element of the project is extension of Dallas Floodway, which could bring relief to presently flooded Roosevelt Heights. The proposed downstream extension of the Dallas Floodway would provide additional floodway length of about 9.7 miles along the Trinity River. It would end at the mouth of Five Mile Creek.

A proposed Elm Fork Floodway would connect with the Dallas Floodway at the confluence of Elm Fork and West Fork and could reduce flood danger at part of an area off Harry Hines, along with other areas.

Channel improvement and enlargement only would extend to the Lewisville Dam outlet works and upstream along Denton Creek to the outlet works of the Grapevine Dam. The total improved length along Elm Fork would be about 21.8 miles and along Denton Creek about 8.9 miles.

Under the Duck Creek project, a section of the creek in the vicinity of Garland would be realined and enlarged to provide sufficient within-banks capacity to contain the normal flood.

Dallas Public Works Director H. H. Stirman said city flood control measures, such as drainage improvements, could not be justified for the hard-hit northern quadrant of the city.

He said if such facilities prevented a flood in one deluge they might not contain an even greater one which could occur later.

Since the flooding has not come from a stream or tributary of concern to the Corps of Engineers, the city would have sole jurisdiction over providing any flood control facilities, a corps spokesman said.

> He added, however, that Congress has authorized the corps to study the White Rock Creek watershed.
>
> He said the corps office here has "excellent coordination and cooperation with the city."
>
> More serious flooding was prevented by existing flood control facilities, the corps source said.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight May 7 to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Resolution 827.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FARMERS TO PLANT AN ADDITIONAL 7.7 MILLION ACRES OF WHEAT THIS FALL AND NEXT SPRING FOR 1967 HARVEST

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a press release from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, said today that U.S. farmers will be permitted to plant an additional 7.7 million acres of wheat this fall and next spring for harvest in 1967.

He forecast a substantial increase in farm income as a result.

The Secretary announced a 15-percent increase in the effective national acreage allotment for 1967 crop wheat—from 51.6 million acres in 1966 to 59.3 million next year. The effect will be to increase the allotment for each wheat farm in the United States by about 15 percent.

The new allotment is the largest since 1961. It will mean that wheat acreage on most farms in 1967 will be at a level equal to the period of 1955 through 1961. Said Mr. Freeman:

> The strong demand for wheat exports both for dollars and for food assistance programs has reduced our stocks sharply. For the first time in 13 years, our June 30 carryover will be under 600 million bushels." Six hundred million bushels is about 1 year's supply for domestic food consumption and seed.
>
> Stocks will be further reduced during the coming year despite good crop prospects. With continued strong demand in the market, and more acres of wheat, farm income will be substantially increased.

Production in 1967 is expected to range between 1.5 billion and 1.6 billion bushels, depending upon yields and other program features to be announced later. This compares with a 1966 wheat crop presently estimated at about 1.4 billion bushels.

Secretary Freeman said the allotment announcement was being made earlier than usual this year so that wheat producers would have every opportunity to make their plans for the 1967 crop. The action came also in response to suggestions by Members of Congress, during debate last year on the 4-year Agricultural Act of 1965, that early announcements be made once a long-term wheat program was enacted.

The Secretary explained that there are, in effect, two acreage allotments for wheat under the law. The basic 1967 crop acreage allotment applicable to most wheat farms in major wheat-producing States is 55 million acres, compared with 47.8 million acres this year. Another allotment of slightly more than 4 million acres will be available to producers who planted small acreages under previous legislation which gave farmers an opportunity to plant wheat in excess of their farm allotment, up to 15 acres. The comparable total in 1966 was 3.8 million acres.

As in previous years, eligibility for price support loans and wheat marketing certificates is contingent upon the producer planting within his allotment and complying with other conservation or program provisions. However, because of the increased allotments, no acreage diversion will be required for the 1967 crops.

Further details of the 1967 wheat program, including State and farm allotments, price support, and marketing certificates will be announced shortly, but no later than June. Farmers can expect to have their 1967 farm allotment notice by July 1.

Mr. Speaker, I know that American wheat farmers are happy to learn this. I congratulate the Secretary on his management of surpluses in such a manner that he was able to get the surplus down to less than 600 million bushels carryover, which is the least for a long time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to applaud this action of the President. I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma was present at the White House on March 30 when the President of the United States briefed members of the Agriculture, Appropriations, and the Foreign Affairs Committees on the details of the new relief program for India that he was to send to the Congress later that day.

At that time I pointed out to the President the need for some relaxation of controls on our wheat farmers if we were to continue to drawdown on our wheat reserve stocks by such programs and especially since we have already suffered a drawdown on these stocks in the last 3 years of approximately 800 million bushels. Our reserves during this period have dropped from approximately 1.4 billion bushels to below 600 million bushels.

This new India commitment by the administration will cause another 250 million bushel drawdown on these wheat reserves, bringing them far below the 600 million bushel reserve that the Department of Agriculture has maintained to be absolutely necessary for our own protection. At the March 30 meeting at the White House, Secretary Freeman indicated that this necessary reserve could be maintained without a relaxation of some of the controls on production that are being lifted today by the President. I am glad that the President has seen the need for some action in this area and has ordered a 15-percent increase in the 1967 wheat acreage allotments. However, I feel that in view of the soft red winter wheat supply and demand situation, controls on this wheat should be lifted completely. To continue controls on this class of wheat seems ridiculous, but I applaud the President's action nonetheless.

POLAND'S MILLENNIUM

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 3, President Johnson signed a proclamation entitled "Commemoration of Poland's National and Christian Millennium." In recognition of the many thousands of my constituents of Polish blood in the Second Congressional District, and in tribute to their contribution to our progress throughout history, President Johnson invited me to be present at the White House when he signed the proclamation. One of the pens President Johnson used in signing this historic document he gave me for presentation to the Honorable Stanley Zima, Democratic committeeman of the 10th ward in Chicago, a Presidential commission I shall execute this weekend.

While President Johnson was signing this proclamation, I found myself reviewing some of the contributions people of Polish blood had made to the United States. At Jamestown, Va., the stalwart strength and courage of the Polish settlers supported John Smith through many trying times.

Generals Kosciuszko and Pulaski fought beside Washington in our war for independence. They helped train our troops for the battlefield.

During our Civil War, Polish officers and troops fought for the preservation of the Union, while Polish nuns cared for the dying and the wounded on our battlefields.

In World Wars I and II, in Korea, and in Vietnam, American boys of Polish blood answered their country's call to make the world safe for democracy.

Lt. Julian Olejniczak, son of a steelworker from the 10th ward in Chicago, whose story of heroism was told in the Saturday Evening Post, is one of many heroes of the war in Vietnam whose forefathers came from Poland.

Americans of all faiths joined in celebrating the millennium of Christianity in Poland.

May 3, 1966, also marks the 175th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. Four years after the adoption of our Constitution, Poland drafted one with a political philosophy similar to ours. The partition of Poland by Russia prevented Poland from flourishing as we did under ours, but the Constitution of 1791 shows us that the spirit of liberty and independence which has inspired us is in the hearts and minds of the people of Poland.

As we look forward to the second millenium for Poland, it is with confidence that the courage, the determination, the love of liberty in the Polish people will witness a fruition in their homeland, as well as in the land of their adoption.

Ten of our colleagues in the House are of Polish blood, four from Chicago, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, the Honorable John C. KLUCZYNSKI, the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, and the Honorable DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, two from Wisconsin, the Honorable ALVIN E. O'KONSKI and the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI and two from Michigan, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL and the Honorable LUCIAN NORBERT NEDZI. It was especially fitting that the chaplain of the House on May 3 was from Chicago, the Reverend Valerian S. Karcz, national chaplain of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, whose prayer at the opening of the session on that happy anniversary date, gave inspiration and spiritual strength to all the Members.

APPOINTMENT OF A FARM ECONOMIST TO THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, history indicates that anything the Council of Economic Advisers has done to help the economy has been offset by stupid speeches and magazine articles that reflect a lack of understanding of some industry. These speeches and articles are too often accepted as administration position by enough people to scare the industry.

Mr. Ackley, the present Chairman, has been no exception. He, like others before him, has apparently become convinced that the country cannot run without his weekly pronouncements. This would not be quite so bad if he would not insist upon talking about agriculture. His statements on farm prices and problems have contained such erroneous basic assumptions as to indicate that he would not even know a flaxseed from a corncob. He has done much to distort the position of the administration toward farm problems.

Agricultural economics is a special field and the usual measurements of cause and effect do not apply to agriculture; but, there is no agricultural economist on the Council of Economic Advisers.

It seems to me that Mr. Ackley's demonstration of lack of competence in the agricultural field, upon which he insists upon talking, pinpoints the need for Mr. Ackley to be replaced by an agricultural economist who would have the good sense to refrain from expounding on other subjects and writing magazine articles.

The very least that is needed is for the President to secure an agricultural economist to advise at the White House level.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I heartily applaud the sensible analysis just made by my colleague from Iowa, Congressman NEAL SMITH. As Congressman SMITH has pointed out, Gardner Ackley pontificates periodically about agricultural economic policy but he knows nothing about farm problems. He knows nothing about the serious economic problems that our family farmers have experienced in past years. I strongly support Congressman SMITH's statement and join with him in asking for a thorough reorganization of the Council of Economic Advisers. The most immediate step that should be taken is the appointment of a man trained in agriculture economics and with practical experience in the problems confronting our agriculture producers.

DOROTHY FULDHEIM'S "I LAUGHED, I CRIED, I LOVED"

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Fuldheim not only is a household name in Cleveland, she is a household personality—probably more of us watch Dorothy's sparkling, controversial television news program than any other.

Now, with the forthcoming publication of her book, "I Laughed, I Cried, I Loved," we will share this witty and attractive news commentator with the Nation.

I have known Dorothy for a number of years and never cease to marvel at the wide range of her knowledge, her spontaneity, her uncanny ability to probe to the heart of an issue.

I am looking forward to reading her book and am delighted to know that through it she will be introduced to an even larger audience. The public is bound to admire and respect this unique and brilliant newswoman as we in Cleveland do.

I include the following article from the Cleveland Press of May 3:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, May 3, 1966]

DOROTHY LAUGHS, CRIES

(By Beatrice Vincent)

"I wish I could say I sweated over every word," says news commentator Dorothy Fuldheim, patting the blue and white cover of her soon-to-be published book. "It would sound so good.

"Actually, writing it was as easy as tumbling off a log.

"I worked on it nights and weekends at home—never rewrote a word.

"When I say 'wrote,' I mean I typed it—with two fingers. I had never typed before in my life."

What with this method of typing—and a mind that works faster than two fingers can go—Miss Fuldheim's first manuscript looked a bit pixyish.

But, with the aid of an accomplished typist, she turned a faultless copy of "I Laughed, I Cried, I Loved" over to World Publishing Co. 6 months after she started.

It will be published tomorrow.

After almost 20 years on the TV screen, the WEWS personality is so well known that she is "Dorothy" to most of her viewers—a fact that she enjoys.

Cab drivers are her special favorites.

"I talk to them," she says, "and I listen to them. I know how they are going to vote.

"That's how I foretell election results—and I am never wrong."

Never one to pull her punches, Miss Fuldheim has strong views on everything—and she gives them.

At the station, she has a completely free hand.

"I am paid for my judgment and discretion," she says.

She has a phenomenal memory, does all her own research, never uses notes.

She admits the lack of notes can be dangerous, since once a word has been uttered on TV it cannot be recalled. But she reads widely and trusts herself to remember accurately.

Everything she does is done on a grand scale.

She has an enormous wardrobe—adds about 75 dresses a year.

She has a large house—"I like space"—with three libraries.

Even her working day is enormous—10 hours at the station, dozens of lectures sandwiched in where they will fit.

It is not the kind of life that would appeal to a homebody.

But to a woman whose stage is the whole world, it seems only natural.

ACTION BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], our distinguished majority leader, concerning wheat plantings, I hope that the wheat produced by the increased acreage will not be peddled to the Russians at bargain prices.

Mr. Speaker, the action by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in now calling upon Secretary of Defense McNamara to resume the purchase of pork products for the armed services is a subterfuge that will not fool the American farmer.

The record is clear that only about a month ago Freeman joined with McNamara, in an action directed by President Johnson, to drastically slash Government purchases of pork. This has already caused substantial damage to the agricultural economy and the farmers bitterly resent it.

How much longer will the producers of the food and fiber of this country tolerate decisions made in closed door sessions such as that of last Saturday when Vice President HUMPHREY and Freeman got together and decided to try to take Freeman off the hook on which he had hung himself?

AID TO VIETCONG

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday under a special order, I spoke of the problem of the "back-door" aid the Vietcong derives from Cambodia and from free world ships traversing the Mekong River through South Vietnam en route to the Cambodian port of Pnompenh. I included in my discussion a chart provided me by the Department of Defense which showed that during the first 3 months of this year 102 free world ships used this international waterway and I estimated that the level of traffic indicated that this trade amounted to more than a ship a day, more than 400 arrivals in Pnompenh a year. This morning I received further declassified information from the Department of Defense which provides a breakdown of this traffic for all of 1965 by month and by flag and I include it in the RECORD at this point.

Free world ship arrivals in Pnompenh, Cambodia, in 1965

Flag	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Panama	17	17	21	17	13	19	20	20	20	15	15	14	208
United Kingdom	5	3	4	4	1	2	5	4	4	1	2	3	38
France	11	10	8	12	2	------	4	9	11	10	3	5	85
Liberia	------	------	------	------	1	1	2	------	------	------	------	------	4
Japan	4	4	6	3	6	3	8	5	4	4	3	1	51
Greece	------	------	1	------	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	2
Netherlands	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	------	1	1	1	13
Norway	1	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	3
Yugoslavia	------	------	1	1	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	3
Italy	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	1	------	2
Indonesia	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	1
Total	41	35	42	38	26	27	41	39	40	31	25	25	410

This information shows that there were 410 free world ship arrivals in Pnompenh during 1965. Unfortunately, the details of this trade, as much as we know of them, still remains classified for reasons which I believe are not very reasonable. These ships sail right through South Vietnam for 150 miles with a Vietnamese pilot on board to show the way. It is difficult for me to understand why the names of these ships should be kept from the American people. Anyone sitting on the banks of the Mekong can obtain that much information. The South Vietnamese people know about these ships, the Cambodians know about them, the Communists undoubtedly know about them. The American people are the only ones who apparently are not to know about them.

The time is long overdue when the scandalous nature of this trade in all its aspects should be made public and effective action taken to close this source of supply to our enemy. It is a situation that cannot and should not be hushed up.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, shortly before rollcall No. 87 was taken I was called off the floor on a matter of importance to my district, and I did not return in time to vote. I ask that the RECORD show had I been present I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 833 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 833

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 89, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Agriculture is authorized to send not more than four members of such committee and two staff assistants to attend a conference of agricultural attachés from the Latin American area at Guatemala City, Guatemala, to be held May 11 to 17, 1966.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this matter involves one of the usual travel resolutions, and I shall not consume any great amount of time.

The resolution provides for the usual annual trip of a small subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture to visit the city of Guatemala, where is held the annual convention of the representatives of Latin American countries in respect to agricultural problems. It has been the custom for them to go. It is being brought up at this time, because the conference will take place beginning May 11.

They will need to go. I see the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GROSS, standing on on his feet, so I am glad to yield to him for any question he may have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman from Virginia have any idea as to what is to be discussed in Guatemala?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. There is nothing specific about it. We never put in the resolution what they are going to discuss, but they are going to discuss agricultural problems.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope it would amount to something more than some of the other junkets that are taken.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have not had any complaints about junkets with respect to this particular annual visitation.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an annual affair that is being held in Guatemala, or do they go to other places around the world?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. This is confined to Guatemala.

Mr. GROSS. It is held annually in Guatemala. Is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on that?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, I attended one of these conferences with a former distinguished Member of the House, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Smith, in Bogotá, Colombia. The place where these meetings are held among the agricultural attachés varies from year to year, but I will say to the gentleman they are very serious meetings, dealing with agricultural trade and outlets for American products in Latin American countries and with other common agricultural problems. They are not junkets. They are necessary trips, it seems to me, in connection with the performance of the duties of the Committee on Agriculture in carrying out its responsibilities to the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Virginia will yield further, this administration calls on the farmers to help develop export markets and then, for instance, very quickly jerks the rug out from under them by cutting down on the export quota on hides. This will cost the farmers of Iowa alone an estimated $12 to $14 million a year just in the loss of income from the hides of animals they sell for slaughter. If that session is going to last long enough down in Guatemala, I would suggest the delegates take Secretary of Agriculture Freeman with them. He does not seem to be doing the American farmer much good. And they might include the Secretary of Commerce, who cut down the export quota on hides. And maybe the President could find it possible to take the trip. Perhaps he would not issue so many suggestions to housewives to buy cheaper cuts of meat and that sort of thing. By the way, I understand they served prime filet mignon steaks when they staged that $1,000 a plate political fundraising dinner in Houston, Tex., which the President attended a few nights ago. I also understand they are not cutting down very far on the quality of meat over at the White House. I hope that in the Guatemala meeting something will be said in behalf of the American farmer who is being punished these days.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his constructive suggestions.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple resolution in accordance with our established policy. I know of no objection to it, and I urge its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader what will be the legislative program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend yield to me for the purpose of responding to his inquiry?

Mr. MIZE. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, we have finished the legislative business for this week and will ask to go over, after the announcement of the program for next week.

Mr. Speaker, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of May 9 is as follows:

Monday is District day, and there are six bills:

H.R. 13558, regulation of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia;

S. 1611, transfer of certain functions from the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 14205, preservation and use of Old Georgetown Market;

S. 2263, to provide for five additional judges for the District of Columbia court of general sessions;

H.R. 9824, to amend District of Columbia Life Insurance Act of 1934; and

H.R. 13703, Technical Amendments to District of Columbia Code.

Also, on Monday there is scheduled for consideration the bill H.R. 14732, for fiscal year 1967.

For Tuesday, the program is as follows: The Independent Offices Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1967.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

H.R. 14544, the Sales Participation Act of 1966; and

S. 2499, Sale of Participations in Small Business Administration Loan pools. Both this bill and the previous bill will be brought up, if rules are granted.

Also there is scheduled H.R. 14088, Military Medical Benefits Act of 1966, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

S. 1098, to alleviate national freight car shortage, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON submitted a conference report and statement on H.R. 14012.

POLISH MILLENNIUM

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on the great event the Polish people throughout the world are currently celebrating. This is, of course, the Polish millennium which marks the introduction of Christianity into Poland, as well as the establishment of Poland as a nation.

One thousand years ago, a prince named Miezko the First united several Polish tribes populating the Oder and Vistula River basins of central Europe, and in 966 he introduced Christianity into his court. This move by the leader of the newly born Polish nation gave the new state links with Western Europe and hastened its rise among the great nations of the continent.

The celebration that is going on now—1,000 years after the momentous steps taken by Miezko the First—shows to the world the indomitable spirit of the Polish people—a spirit that has survived 1,000 years of turmoil and persecution in a stubborn and enlightened defense of freedom and human dignity.

Owing to its geographic position, Poland has over the centuries been subjected to harassment and attack. Poland rightly won the title of "the bulwark of Christianity" in these wars, and also sent the flower of its youth to the crusades to uphold the honor of Christianity. Down through the centuries the Poles have fought to remain a free and independent nation, developing its own culture and heritage.

The contributions of the Poles throughout the world are well known. Where would we be today without the great music of Chopin and Paderewski, or the scientific efforts of Copernicus, or of the Nobel Prize winners, Sienkiewicz and Reymont?

And in this country—the United States of America—there is a well-deserved appreciation of the contributions the Polish people have made to develop and improve this country of ours. The first five Poles arrived in America on the English ship *Mary and Margaret* which landed at Jamestown, Va., on October 1, 1608. From these first five men has come a legacy of which we can all be proud.

The success of our fight for independence from Great Britain is due to a great extent to the efforts of General Kosciuszko, who has been called "the father of American artillery," and General Pulaski, who gave his life for his adopted country during the Revolution.

During the Civil War 168 officers and more than 4,000 men of Polish extraction served in the Union Army, and in the Confederate Army there were 17 officers and about 1,000 men of Polish descent. Approximately 900,000 Polish-Americans served in the American army during the Second World War, and our Polish allies fought alongside our men in the decisive battles of Western Europe following the invasion of Normandy.

This week, when we join with our Polish-American friends in celebrating this great event, we can be thankful for the contributions the Polish-Americans have made to this country. They are a proud, strong and independent people, and their hopes, struggles and desires deserve our sympathy and attention.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 81, I was absent, attending to congressional duties in my home district. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on that rollcall.

CIVIL SERVICE TASK FORCE REPORT: AMEND THE HATCH ACT TO PROTECT THE CAREER EMPLOYEE

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House GOP task force on the civil service, I am pleased to announce that the task force has completed its initial review of its area of responsibility and has for introduction today a bill aimed at closing a very serious loophole in the enforcement of the Hatch Act.

Cosponsoring the bill with me are my task force colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman Joel T. Broyhill; the gentleman from Kansas, Robert Dole; the gentleman from Iowa, H. R. Gross; and the gentleman from New York, Carlton J. King.

The basic aim of this bill is to shutoff completely the illicit shakedown of Federal employees for political contributions and also to insure that those in the departments and agencies who attempt such shakedown activities will get their just desserts.

As the law is currently written, the wrongdoers in the "excepted" or schedule C and supergrade positions have, practically speaking, immunity from the consequences of the Hatch Act; while on the other hand, those in the rank-and-file classified service who commit the very same violation would be subjected to severe penalties. Why? Because present law discriminates against the rank and file of Federal employees in the competitive service in that it establishes a double standard for the enforcement of the Hatch Act. By the Civil Service Commission's own admission, "there is no language in the Hatch Act that fixes responsibility for the enforcement of the prohibitions against the political activity of Federal officers and employees." Instead, present practice divides enforcement between the Civil Service Commission and the employing agency which means, in effect, that the Commission assumes enforcement powers only over the employees in the so-called competitive civil service while the employing agency maintains enforcement jurisdiction over the expected service employees—which includes schedule C political appointees and supergrade positions.

Ironically, the Civil Service Commission does investigate alleged infractions of the act but can itself move only against those personnel on the lower rungs while disciplinary action against those in the excepted positions is left to the whims of the employing agency—in effect, the Secretary or agency head, who probably appointed the offender in the first place and who is himself a political appointee. Thus, a severe inequity or double standard is created whereby an employee in the lesser grades could be fired—as required by law—for an offense which was also committed by a higher official in the same agency who most probably gets off unscathed or in all probability gets rewarded with a promotion for party loyalty.

The task force bill would end this division of enforcement responsibility along with its inherent weakness and discrimination by fixing complete enforcement responsibility with the Civil Service Commission for all Federal employees alike.

The dire need for the task force bill is pointed up by a classic case which recently developed when I brought to the attention of the Civil Service Commission a well-documented case of illegal political fund solicitation in the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture. Both the CSC and the FBI investigated and found the charges to be correct. There were four employees of the REA involved—three in the excepted service and one in the lower classified category. The CSC drew up charges against the one classified employee over which it had jurisdiction. The statement of charges resulted in the resignation of that employee. However, the three other offenders who are in the excepted service today remain unscathed because the authority charged with enforcement, the Secretary of Agriculture, refused to move against them even though the CSC and the FBI substantiated the charges. We have reason to believe that the classified employee may have been acting under orders from his superiors in the excepted service who—sad to relate—have not also felt the ax. The task force bill would see to it that the CSC has complete enforcement responsibility thereby taking from the employing agency any responsibility for enforcing the Hatch Act. To continue to leave such responsibility in the hands of the employing agency is like assigning the rabbit to guard the cabbage patch.

The enormity of the problem which this task force bill attempts to correct is immediately brought to mind when one considers that there are more than 370,000 out of a total of about 2,500,000 employees who are potentially immune from the consequences of the Hatch Act for lack of proper enforcement. This means that there are a potential 370,000 employees in the Federal service who are in a position to collect funds from their subordinates and coworkers in the various agencies and still—practically speaking—avoid the legal consequences because the Civil Service Commission has no jurisdiction over them.

Under the task force bill, nearly all of the 370,000 mentioned would come under the enforcement powers of the Civil Service Commission. No longer would they have virtual immunity from the penalties of the Hatch Act due to the inaction of the employing agency.

This is an election year and the fundraising season is fast upon us. No doubt the "bagmen" in the various Federal departments are already making the rounds fervently tapping their subordinates for contributions.

Time is of the essence and our task force will urge that immediate hearings be held on this important bill looking toward quick enactment and, hopefully, thus assuring greater protection for our Federal employees from increasingly frequent and bold political extortion.

OUR FAMILY FARM SYSTEM

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the American dairy farmer is the latest segment of American agriculture to be shot down in flames by an administration hell bent on destroying the remaining remnants of our family farm system. As a result, I have submitted a statement to the U.S. Tariff Commission, which is holding hearings on the Presidential proclamation to increase the import quotas on cheddar cheese.

This is just plain foolishness when the President announces an increase of a million pounds of imported cheese, as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, on the very same day that the Secretary announces increases in dairy support prices. On the one hand we are told that the dairy farmer is among the lowest paid of all producers and on the other hand that imports of cheese are needed to hold down prices.

I note that the demand for milk was finally beginning to catch up with the supply. So the administration then acts to further depress prices, a move that will only succeed in scuttling the Nation's dairy industry and place it in the unreliable hands of foreign nations that only seek access to our markets when they have surplus production. The Secretary of Agriculture announced increases in the support price of milk at a level below the current market price, which he referred to as a floor for the year. The action to open the doors to foreign dairy imports makes that floor a ceiling beyond which the American dairy industry can never hope to escape. With the Nation's dairy farmers already going out of business due to 50-cents-an-hour income, the rest of the family dairy farmers will be out of business before long.

I have warned of unwarranted dairy imports for a number of years, and have urged the administration to use the control features of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to restrict such imports. Not only has the administration repeatedly failed to use section 22 to curb imports, but has actually used it as a device to increase the flow of agricultural products into the United States, completely contrary to the intent of Congress. I note that voluntary agreements to limit imports on Colby cheese have not been renewed. The rate of frozen cream imports has been increasing again this year. Dairy products of all descriptions cross our borders, in many cases with no restrictions at all due to the ability of foreign producers to effectively circumvent the few controls that are left. And the administration does nothing—until an American farmer stands a chance to make an honest dollar.

The American farmer should storm the White House and the Department of Agriculture for the shabby treatment he has received from this administration—an administration that would have eliminated school milk and valuable agricultural research, an administration that has now opened the doors for dairy and sugar imports, clamped restriction on U.S. cattle hide exports, dumped corn and other grains on the American market, and restricted butter and pork for use by our fighting men in the Armed Forces—all for the ultimate purpose of lowering prices to our farmers, who remain the lowest paid of all Americans. It is a national disgrace that must be corrected if we are not to wake up some morning to find American agriculture depressed to such a level that there no longer is an incentive to produce the food and fiber that our citizens have learned to take for granted.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAPITAL, LABOR, AND MANAGEMENT

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert E. Williams, president of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., delivered an address at the College Economics Professors' Seminar at Pomona College, Calif., on May 10, 1966. His address, dealing with the relationship between capital, labor, and management, is most timely, and follows herewith, along with a brief note regarding the seminars:

THE SEMINARS—WHAT ARE THEY?

Believing that it would be of mutual benefit some 5 years ago the American Iron & Steel Institute launched a continuing series of 2-day seminars for professors of economics and business administration at colleges and universities centered on steelmaking centers.

The aim of these seminars has been to bring together college professors and steel industry executives for the free discussion of the economic problems of the industry and their solution, including problems which arise from industrial relations, Government relations, the export-import situation, technological advances and, of course, our joint interests in the education of young men by our colleges and universities from which the industry must draw its leaders of tomorrow. In short, we seek to create a better understanding between the academic and business communities.

The first such seminar was held at the general headquarters of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. in connection with Youngstown University and, since that time, seminars have been held at Lehigh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Northwestern, Washington University of St. Louis, Xavier, and Cincinnati Universities, Wayne State, American University, New York University at Buffalo, and the University of Delaware.

The seminar at which this address was delivered was held jointly by the University of Redlands and Claremont Men's College at Pomona, Calif. Other seminars are planned this year at Notre Dame, University of Chicago, and in the Houston, Tex., area.

ANATOMY OF THE CREATIVE DECISION

(Address by Robert E. Williams, president, the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Pomona, Calif., March 10, 1966)

This is certainly a fine way for business people and professors to get together to discuss items of mutual interest in such a pleasant atmosphere as a college campus. I am greatly impressed with the genuine interest and active participation on the part of the academic fraternity as they explored the economics of the steel industry, and it was of much satisfaction for me to see the willingness on the part of you educators to recognize the necessity of a free exchange of ideas between those in business and those in the academic profession.

I am all the more convinced of this when I remember that education is the most important source of human enrichment in both an economic and a broader sense. Education increases our ability to enjoy more things more, to live more richly, more creatively, and in greater harmony with ourselves, our environment, and our fellow man.

As you move along the inspiring pathway of American history, you quickly discover the reason for the greatness of this Nation. It is the genius of the individual. It is the genius of the competent businessman who combines labor, capital, and raw materials to produce a vast outpouring of goods to enrich the lives of the masses. It is the genius of the workingman, whose labor, self-discipline and thrift are vital to the creation and operation of modern industry.

It is, and in great part, the genius of the devoted teacher who inspires youth to greatness.

It is to the younger people that we must look, and increasingly so; but we hear a great deal about this group not looking forward eagerly to jobs in business. An insurance company advertising agency study has concluded that in general teenagers seem to feel that businessmen are dull and narrow and that business as a career is confining and lacking in opportunity for independent thought and action. What they seem to fear is depersonalization and what they see is a lack of opportunity for self-expression.

CREATIVE DECISION—WHAT IS IT?

If this is true, you may very well ask, "What has this to do with my topic this evening?"

First, I will try to define the creative decision for you. Second, I will construct a mechanical problem which we in industry face and which begs a creative decision. And, finally, I will make some suggestions as to how the academic and the business communities can, working together, create the right kind of environment in which truly effective creative decisions can be made.

So what is a creative decision?

We can call decisionmaking creative to the extent that one or more of the following conditions are satisfied:

First, if the product of the thinking has novelty and value either for the thinker or for his society;

Second, if the thinking is unconventional in the sense that it requires modification or rejection of previously accepted ideas;

Third, if it requires high motivation and persistence, taking place either over a considerable span of time or at high intensity;

Finally, if it deals with or solves a problem which, initially, as it was posed, was a vague and ill-defined problem, so that part of the task of the creative decisionmaker was to formulate the problem itself, and give it structure.

MANAGEMENT—WHAT IS IT?

What is management?

It means different things to different people, depending upon where you put the emphasis on the words in the same definition. To say "management is getting things done *through other people*," is quite different from saying that "management is *getting things done* through other people."

If I didn't know that the author of that comparison was James Hayes, dean of the School of Business Administration at Duquesne University, I'd say that it was written by the same advertising account executive on Madison Avenue who talked the automobile people into advertising that "you should not drink while driving," and at the same time convinced his liquor account that they should promote the message that "you should not drive while drinking," proving that while scientific management seems to us a force for good, it should not be regarded as a panacea for curing all industrial and social ills.

Now to the specifics of the mechanics of a problem.

INPUT VERSUS OUTPUT

An increase in wages can come from one of two places fundamentally. It can come from increased production—that is, increased output per man-hour—or it can come from some redistribution of existing output. Increased output per man-hour is frequently called labor productivity simply because it has man-hours of work in the denominator rather than units of capital, or units of all input taken together. But any factor of production can be responsible for an increase in output per man-hour. This increase is not something uniquely attributable to labor.

One may get increased output per man-hour because workers are working harder or because they are more skilled. The latter is much more likely since it goes hand in glove with advancing technology, which simultaneously reduces output of physical effort and increases the results of the application of existing worker skills. But one can get it in other ways, too. We, in the steel industry, for example, have increased output per man-hour by upgrading the quality of raw materials we put into our furnaces. Any one of the factors of production can have a part in causing an increase in output per man-hour. And usually, more than one factor is involved. It may be a factor as oblique and nebulous as an improvement in internal communications. Even in the steel business, everything is not tangible, or black and white, just gray, and this, alone, accounts for our increasing need for more creative decisions.

Suppose we assume that shares of labor and shares of capital, for the purpose of measuring units of output per man-hour have, somehow, become definable and fixed. If this were true and provable, then we would have one very definite advantage. For, if wages were tied to output per man-hour, a stable level of prices for the final product would be possible if, of course, it were not for some other factors that suggest themselves to us—factors like measuring such inputs as the marketing effort to move the steel and then adding to this, if it is measurable, the cost of the marketing effort to move the automobile or the refrigerator or the electric toaster. This is why those people who strongly urge a policy that somehow ties productivity and wages together are being unrealistic. This is what I mean when I say we have the need here for a creative decision.

IMPACT ON PRICES

Nice as such a formula may appear to be at first glance, consider this: If we have an industry in which the output per man-hour is rising very much more rapidly than the average, and if our goal for the economy as a whole is a stable price level, then, in that industry, prices should be falling, in dollars and cents. This has happened in black and white television and the same reasoning may be applied to the new color television. But do we want to say to the people who make color television sets that they should have their wages tied to productivity since as volume expands, their productivity is going up very rapidly?

Take your jobs, for example. You are teachers. If we were to consider your salaries in the light of the impact on them of advancing technology, what would be the impact of the teaching machine? If your worth is to be measured in terms of the number of students turned out per man-hour, what would this mean? If we did, we would be measuring your productivity in the very manner in which some say we should. The number of pupils taught per year seems to be going down because sophisticated educators, those with the know-how of cause and effect, recognize that everyone gets more good out of a small class where individual attention can be featured than does one from a great big class.

PAY CUTS FOR TEACHERS?

Well, the type of policy we have been discussing means that we should give dollars and cents pay cuts to teachers because the number of pupils taught per teacher per year is falling and this, it seems to me, would make it very difficult to keep good teachers in your profession. So what is the answer? We had better start working on a creative decision, one that will lead you to face the problem of how to convince administrators that your work, as teachers, must be evaluated qualitatively, not quantitatively, and that such intangibles as excellence and dedication become a part of the denominator when yardsticks are established for measuring your inputs.

Then there is the theory that has been advanced in more recent years that wage increases ought to be tied to national increases in productivity, thus freezing labor's share of the income; the size of the cut of pie never gets any larger.

And all of the questions which I have already raised are further complicated by labor's dedication to the goal they like to express in a single word, "more." More, I suppose, can best be defined for this purpose as something greater in quantity than presently exists. Consider, too, that President Kennedy's first economic report in 1962 suggests that, if wages are voluntarily frozen by bargaining out an agreement tying advances to national productivity, the parties may be free to rebargain the size of the cut of pie, within the framework of constant prices. This is not a creative decision, because it apparently overlooks the truism that if the pie gets bigger someone has to pay for it, or if its size remains the same and labor's slice gets bigger, someone else's slice has to get smaller.

CLINICAL OR CREATIVE?

Why not try the clinical approach or, if you prefer, the statistical approach, which theorizes that, where there is a shortage of labor in the market in an occupation or an industry, then the wage increase should be more than the national average in productivity; where there is a surplus of labor in the market, then it should be less. It also says that, where unions have been very successful in the past in bargaining, and have gotten their wages to a higher than average level, future increases should be less than the average and, in the reverse situation, more. My point is this: To rely on clinical or purely statistical data in the area of wage determination is to limit, if not eliminate altogether, any room for freedom of action in arriving at a creative decision.

Up to this point, we have been examining wage determination and productivity. Let us not lose sight of the fact that so-called fringe benefits are a part of payroll costs and thus further complicate the wage determination problem. Let us take a brief look at what is happening here.

THE BILL WE MUST PAY

There are many signs of the new upward direction. Some are built into the comprehensiveness of the 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act. Retirement benefits were increased 7 percent across the board, with a minimum increase of $4 a month. The average hourly worker with a wife can now retire at almost half pay.

Employee security costs to American industry stood at $16.1 billion in 1965 just in payments to the Government for social insurance, and this is to reach $26.5 billion in another 10 years. Employer payment for retirement benefits of their own are now $10.4 billion. Indicated for 1975 is $23.6 billion. Employer payments to welfare benefits are now $5.1 billion, and are expected to reach $9.2 billion in 10 years. The total tab that industry is picking up today is $31.6 billion annually, and it will be $59.3 billion in 1975.

If anything calls for creative decisionmaking, this assuredly does. Perhaps the creative decision that is most pressing is how does one create all that money?

What causes this upward push in the first place? There are some basic, underlying factors which we can isolate:

The growth rate in the labor force.

A fairly stable level of unemployment as the labor force grows.

A reduction in the number of hours worked per week.

A continuing rate of creeping inflation of 1.5 percent per year, compared to the present growth rate of 1 percent.

NEEDED GROWTH RATE

Thus, if we are to reach the predicted level of gross national product—$1 trillion in another 10 years—we will need a growth rate of 4.2 percent per year in constant dollars, or 5.7 percent per year in dollars inflated at the rate of 1.5 percent per year. Growth in compensation on this basis alone will mean that the 1975 figure will be 155 percent of the 1965 figure and, if one adds 1 percent per year to compensation to take care of promotion and seniority increments, the 1975 compensation will be 170 percent of 1965, and will require a growth rate of 5.5 percent per year, compounded annually. And this is clearly an inflationary figure.

This has some very significant implications for management and creative decisionmakers.

Fast rising costs will require greater operating efficiencies.

The cost of employee benefits will probably rise at least as fast as straight compensation.

There will be fewer hours of productive work over which benefit costs can be amortized.

Because of the above, the economic pressures to automate will become even more pressing in another 10 years than they are today because (1) it will be profitable to use machines to replace men, and (2) there will be too few people to lead and supervise large groups of employees.

THE CREATIVE MAN DEFINED

If this is a nightmare, can we, as managers, and you, as educators, transform it into a pleasant dream? How do we tool up to do this?

First, what kind of man is capable of making the creative decision? What kind of anatomy does he have? Whatever the answer, does it not apply to professors as well as to businessmen? It should, if professors are to create the right kind of environment in which to study business. I would say the following are common to both creative types, whether they be in business or in education.

His emotions are purposeful. This man plans his emotions in a manner calculated to enhance rather than hinder his effectiveness as a boss or as a teacher.

He is perceptive of human qualities. He seeks those circumstances which enable him to function at his best, and avoids situations where his deficiencies detract from his total effectiveness. Above all, he values human dignity in himself and in others.

He resolves conflict. He will not give in to anger. Rather, he defines the problem and devises the method of resolving the conflict in order to achieve organizational goals in the most effective manner.

PRIDE HE CANNOT AFFORD

He values humility. Pride is a luxury he cannot afford. He is openminded, responsive to suggestion, alert to change, and enthusiastic about progress. He is no pushover, however, for he will alter an opinion, reverse a course of action, or modify a prior judgment.

He regards success as temporary. He wastes little time in taking bows for his exploits, but seeks to apply his achievements to other relevant areas. He views personal triumph as transitory. Success is a journey, not a destination.

He is realistic. He cooperates with the inevitable. He judges subordinates in terms of total performance, not just seniority, loyalty and personal observation. He understands that people have their limitations and changing the shape of the mold will not always change the shape of the man.

It follows, then, that in training for business management, I would like to see attitudes as well as knowledge imparted. Do we want men who never stick their necks out, who accept the current situation as it is, and who would rather think of 40 ways something cannot be done than of one way in which it just might be done? Or do we want men who are always on the lookout for better ways of doing things? Men who have the old entrepreneurial spirit that was current in the industry when it began?

We must choose, and conduct our training accordingly. For my part, I am sufficiently attached to the old school, to prefer the entrepreneurial type of organization man, and I think one can be a prime mover without being a disturber and a troublemaker. An innovator need not be "agin" everything, or convinced that everyone—especially top management—is doing everything wrong now. He needs merely to realize that there is always the possibility that something might be done better.

FIVE VITAL FUNCTIONS

To attack any problem in the hope of arriving at a creative decision, the modern senior executive must succeed in five vitally important procurement functions: The procurement of capital; the procurement of material; the procurement of manpower; the procurement of knowledge; and the procurement of loyalty.

Failure in any one of these procurement objectives can mean failure to solve the problem.

There is another area which should be included in any examination of the background for teaching creative decisionmaking in business. I will enumerate its elements, without going into detail. I am talking primarily, now, about communications, and this is what I have in mind:

BACKGROUND ELEMENTS

Focus on the job, not the man.

Use language that subordinate managers will understand.

Use valid units of performance measurement.

Stress the important objectives, but don't entirely overlook the subordinate.

Emphasize realism, not precision.

Keep management principles always in the picture.

In reference to the last point, we managers should always remember, and so should you professors when you teach management, that it makes no sense to bend good management practice in order to produce what appears to be a neat *set of objectives.* It is, or should be, axiomatic that sound management principles shape the objectives—never the other way around.

Take stock of corporate needs. What type of employees will be needed? How many? At what pay levels? Working under what kind of a personnel structure?

Lay out a long-range program that will implement the objectives as they have been defined.

Set up benchmarks. What steps should be taken? When? If this is done, and at the right time, where will this move us? How far will we be away from where we want to be at any given time in the future? Avoid detours.

Finally, call on that extra creative effort and use it to make sure that the program is consistent with other phases of corporate planning.

CHANGE DEMANDS ATTENTION

These questions call for the application of as much creative talent as does the one you face concerning specialization versus generalization in the field of business education. All of us need to turn our attention to these changes.

I have just cited a number of problems which call for creative decisions, answers which have yet to be made. Let me cite one in which creative decisions were made, and list some of the beneficial results. To do this, we must go back to the end of World War II.

For 20 years, American industry had lived with this constant, unrelenting, overriding driving pressure of rising costs. In the normal course of events in a profit and loss economy, industry would recover these added costs by doing what comes easiest—raise its prices. But these were not normal times, and industry, calling on its powers of creative decisionmaking, chose not to do it that way.

In the first place, there was such a buildup of productive capacity within a few years, both domestic and foreign, that something called competition set in. Where there is that much competition, one does not raise prices capriciously. Then, in addition, there were increases in costs that were so huge and so sudden that it was just out of the question to try to match them with higher prices. The result, you all know—the cost-price-profit squeeze.

CUT COSTS, INCREASE VOLUME

So, instead of raising prices to four times the current level, which is about what would have been required, industry applied its creative decisionmaking and followed the other course of action open to it—cutting costs and increasing volume. It began a program of modernizing old productive capacity, of building new and more efficient capacity, of researching and developing new and better products and methods, of reducing unit costs by increasing productivity, and of improving marketing and management techniques.

The steel industry's outlay alone in this effort has been well over $1 billion per year, just for capital improvement and new plants.

This whole program cost billions of dollars, true, but it was the only answer to inflation. And it did something more than counteract rising costs. It improved the standard of living of the whole country, and it laid down a whole new industrial base for the Nation. Entire new industries and technologies were created as a result—atomic energy, radar, television, jet propulsion, wonder drugs, transistors, automation, computers, plastics, synthetic fibers, lighter and stronger steels, to name a few things, you, of course, already know about.

The real wage of the American worker almost doubled in 20 years. The price of the average dishwasher fell from $250 to $221 in 20 years, and that of a room air conditioner from $406 to $215. And the quality of these products rose to new heights.

ERA OF CREATIVE DECISION

And all of this was accomplished through creative decisions and self-regulation. In the future, these years should be recognized as the era of the creative decision.

So much for the mechanics of the problem to be subjected to creative decisionmaking. How does it all relate to you?

A creative response to new challenges demands the close and serious cooperation of men of affairs and of scholars and thinkers in our colleges and universities. Education is not intended to make lawyers or clergymen, soldiers or schoolmasters, farmers or artisans, but it is to develop men.

There are still some specifics I wish you would keep in mind. Rapid social and technological change imposes new demands on business management today. To keep pace with these demands, every effort should be made to improve business educations, which is a vital part of a modern system of higher education.

Businessmen and educators should seek every opportunity to encourage young people planning business careers to acquire the kind of education that will serve them well throughout their lives.

To supply the large numbers of personnel and wide variety of skills required by business, both graduate and undergraduate business schools must reappraise their objectives, methods, and results.

EDUCATION IS LIFELONG

Business education cannot stop at either the undergraduate or the graduate school level; it must be a continuing, lifelong process.

Greater efforts must be made to solve the critical problem of how to develop managerial ability and the quality of leadership; educators and businessmen should work together to find better answers to this problem.

More top students should be attracted to business education and to business careers.

The faculties of business schools need to be strengthened, and the quality of teaching should be materially improved.

Doctoral programs in business, the primary aim of which is to develop business teachers and researchers, should be expanded, and more top students should be attracted to such graduate work. Experienced businessmen should be drawn upon by the business schools as advisors, seminar leaders and lecturers. Business schools should draw more heavily on the talent and experiences of business executives in their teaching programs.

My next point should get immediate and ready acceptance. Faculty salaries should be raised. The skills of the good business school professor should not be too readily attracted away from education, and research, either on a full-time or too heavy a consulting basis. The social and economic contribution of the outstanding business teacher and researcher is of great value, and deserves more adequate compensation.

EMPHASIZE RESEARCH

Research in graduate schools of business should receive strong emphasis and support.

The business schools and the business community should work to develop a relationship comparable to that of the best professional schools and practitioners in other fields.

Under the influence of each other businessmen and educators will gain greatly. Education will gain some of the excitement, tension and realism of business; business will gain perspective, insight, and the stimulus of new knowledge and new ideas.

Educators have a very large part to play in achieving a widespread understanding of basic economics among students, government officials and the general public. Don't we need more basic economic education to make the rules and then to accommodate them? If the answer is "yes," who will supply the means by which it may be obtained? A creative question of the first order in itself. Well, John Coleman, now of the Ford Foundation and formerly dean of the Division of Humanities and Social Sciences at Carnegie Tech's Graduate School of Industrial Administration, has answered this question, and in a rather searching way. What Dr. Coleman has said is worth quoting:

"I confess to a grave concern over our widespread economic illiteracy. To a greater extent than I had believed, economic thought in this country—where individual decisions still count for so much—is a distressing blend of fears, superstitions, clichés, and black and white answers.

"The blame for this state of affairs must rest with those of us who are professional economists. We have failed to make our subject sufficiently interesting and understandable to induce most Americans to study it. In a society facing transitional problems and with less and less time to adjust to folly, this is a dangerous state of affairs. Today's historians can be temperate in their judgments about the economic behavior of Americans in the 1930's; there was little economic wisdom to guide them. But tomorrow's historians will surely be harsh in their judgments if we fail, through too great fears and too little vision, to use the economic wisdom available to us. The stakes are high; an effective use of our total resources to bring new concepts of plenty into being. Funds will be poorly used unless we, as educators, get on with the job of learning more about learning. No matter what we teach, we have an obligation to keep abreast of what learning theory can tell us about the most effective ways to do our jobs." That is a very sound observation by Dr. Coleman.

LONG-RANGE OBJECTIVES—STEEL

There are some long-range objectives that business and education can help each other reach. Here are a few of the things that we, in the steel industry, want to do:

Keep on improving the steel industry.

Maintain and increase the freedom of enterprise that has given us the opportunity to be what we are, where we are.

Maintain a high record of ethics in the industry.

Continue to emphasize individual responsibility and accountability.

Those are heritages of the past. What about the future?

The steel industry needs a higher rate of return.

We need to keep administrative expenses in check.

We must take into account, more than ever before, the impact of our decisions on the economy in general.

And we must meet and beat our competition, at home and abroad, in whatever form we find it.

Let me emphasize that we would like to have our business teachers as our allies in our attacks on these long-range objectives.

I believe that if professors can convey to the students a realistic picture of what the steel industry is like, they can be made to see that it isn't just the old fuddy-duddy of the economic world but an industry with a glamour of its own.

A TIME FOR A CHANGE

To sum up, just what are our responsibilities in a free society which, in less than a lifetime, has witnessed so many revolutionary changes? More than 2,200 years ago a philosopher said: "For everything there is a season—a time to break down and a time to build up—a time to keep silent and a time to speak—a time for war and a time for peace." If there is a time for everything, then, is the time not now for one more change, to keep pace with change—a change from the mechanical decision to the creative decision? If this is true, what are the problems to which we should be addressing ourselves? Now is the time to discuss them. Now is the time for their solution. Now is the time for decision. Now is the time for action. Eugene Grace, one of the truly adventuresome steelmakers of America said: "Thousands of engineers can design bridges, calculate strains and stresses, and draw up specifications for machines, but the great engineer is the man who can tell whether the bridge or the machine should be built at all, where it should be built, and when."

In a world dedicated to improving the economic welfare of hundreds of millions of persons who are in poverty, business enterprise becomes a major center in a nation's life. The efficiency of production, the values of enlightened management, the widespread distribution of income to the masses, the opportunities given to individuals for economic progress, and a dedication to the primary objectives of a free competitive society all become of prime importance and all require endless creative decisions.

IDEAS OF THE WEST

If widespread economic progress depends upon the organization of relatively large business enterprises, the world will adopt mass production, mass distribution, mass communication, and mass education. Fortunately, these are ideas of the West, and especially the United States. Other nations may not accept our form of government. They may advocate centralized government with a minimum of freedom for the people. But they will be compelled to adopt the basic ideas of Western business and educational organization if they are to meet the desperate economic needs of their people. As they go about this, they may also find that these institutions flourish best in a society where men have the opportunity and incentive to develop their talents, where they are at liberty to make the creative decision consistent with the needs of the people, which are, in themselves, creative.

We need educators and businessmen who are willing to keep on worrying and thinking about competition in business. We also need them to do this in order to make genuine improvements in our competitive system.

In short, gentlemen, we need each other.

NASA AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I support the NASA authorization bill, H.R. 14324. Unfortunately, I have to vote "present" on final passage of this bill because I intend to offer a motion to recommit in an attempt to get some action on the problem of aircraft noise for the people suffering as a result of this unsolved problem.

I do support the space program authorization in this bill.

Actually, the argument over the need for the space program has become to a large extent academic. We have reached the point of no return in our commitments to get a man to the moon and return him to earth. Most of our current spending is for this program. The total spending for this program will approach $20 billion. We have spent about half of that, or $10 billion to date.

I personally am of the opinion that with Russia competing in this race and as a matter of national security we cannot afford to be anything other than first in space.

I also wish to join my colleague, Congressman FULTON, in objecting to the location of the proposed Lunar Laboratory in Houston, Tex. I do not believe this is the proper or best site for the laboratory and believe that the reasons given for its location there were ones that were thought up after the decision was made to locate it there had been made.

Finally, I wish to reemphasize my concern with what appears to me will be an exact duplication of space efforts in the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I am speaking about the efforts that both Government agencies will make in connection with manned earth orbit activities. Duplicating facilities for launch, tracking, and recovery are about to be undertaken at the cost of billions of dollars. I support the MOL concept but I also realize that much of the expertise necessary to make it successful is located in NASA. I believe a bold new approach is necessary in interagency cooperation if we are to have the benefits of both programs with the cost of but one.

I know that the Committee on Government Operations in the House of Representatives has expressed great concern over this matter and that the NASA Oversight Committee has promised to keep a close watch on the developments of these two programs. This will help but I do not believe that anything other than duplication will result unless some new organizational approach is made to make one program out of the two.

Apollo applications and MOL should be merged and emphasis should be put on using the Apollo capsule for all work in earth orbit by man.

With these reservations and warnings, I support H.R. 14324.

DISTORTION OF NOBLE GOALS

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age when many people are talking in terms of goals, it is good to recall that these goals are often used as a cover for purposes far less noble such as the bald acquisition of power, suppression of opposition and personal glorification. Assertions of possible political manipulating in the poverty program might in time prove to be still another example of meritorious goals distorted. In a letter to the editor of the Chicago Tribune this point was well illustrated.

Does this sound like anyone you know?

I include the above-mentioned letter to the editor of the Chicago Tribune in the RECORD at this point:

> "We shall banish want; we shall banish fear. The essence of national socialism is human welfare. National socialism is a revolution of the common man, rooted in a fuller life from childhood to old age. National socialism means a day of abundance at home and a better world order abroad."
>
> The quotation is from a speech by Adolf Hitler nearly 30 years ago.
>
> Is history to repeat, only worse? This time it could be America.

FACTS ON RHODESIAN ISSUE FOR FILING

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 I inserted in the RECORD a column by Andrew Tully which was critical of the handling of the Rhodesian issue. Fortunately, there are many others who are bringing to public attention many questionable aspects of this case. One of the first to raise objections was former Senator Barry Goldwater in a column which appeared in Human Events on December 18, 1965. M. Stanton Evans, author and editor of the Indianapolis News compares the smear treatment now being applied to some Rhodesian supporters with that used during the Katanga crisis. Lyle Wilson, of United Press International, in a column appearing in the Ashland Times-Gazette of April 21, 1966, explores the legality of the U.N. oil blockade.

I include the three articles mentioned above in the Record at this point:

[From Human Events, Dec. 18, 1965]

Rhodesian Boycott Illustrates U.S. Foreign Policy Failures—The United States Quickly Joined This Boycott but Our Allies Still Defy Us by Trading With Cuba and North Vietnam

(By Barry Goldwater)

Our prompt response to Great Britain's appeal for a boycott of Rhodesia—whether you agree with the boycott or not—highlights the failure of Great Britain and most of our allies to respond with similar good faith when it is our fat, not theirs, that is in the fire.

Just look at the difference. When Great Britain said jump, we just asked "how high?" Our rejection of Rhodesian sugar shipments, even when those shipments were on the high seas, was so prompt that it almost preceded the request.

On the other hand, we have been trying to get our friends, Great Britain included, to cut off supplies to and sales from Cuba ever since the missile crisis—a crisis, incidentally, which threatened the entire world and not just the climate of one section of one continent, as with Rhodesia.

What has been the result of our pleas in regard to Cuba? British exports to Cuba rose from about $6 million worth in 1963 to a husky $27 million worth last year. Our other allies have done just about the same.

France's trade with Cuba jumped from $4 to $49 million worth in the same period. Canada went from $15 to $57 million, Japan from $3 to $34 million.

Free-world ships made 76 calls on Cuban ports in the first 4 months of this year. Of that number, 33 were by British ships, according to records on file at the U.S. Maritime Administration.

In the past 2 years there have been 844 free-world trips to Cuban ports, some 40 percent by ships flying the British flag.

Even harder to take at this bloody time in our history are the free-world ships, particularly ships of Great Britain, which have been carrying cargoes to the ports of North Vietnam. No matter what the cargoes comprise, they are aiding the Vietnamese war effort. In short, they are helping to kill American soldiers as well.

Representative Paul Rogers, Democrat, of Florida, has charged that in the last half of last year alone a total of 201 free-world ships, almost half British, carried Communist cargoes into North Vietnamese ports.

Beyond helping haul the goods of war and other supporting material into North Vietnam—to the hands of the free world's active enemies, to the men who are killing free-world soldiers—various of our allies are trading directly with North Vietnam. The figures are not huge, but they are significant for a wartime situation such as this—just as significant as trading with Japan and Germany on December 6, 1941.

France last year exported about $2.5 million worth of goods to North Vietnam and expects to do about as well this year. Italy and Germany also have sold to the Vietnamese at an annual rate of better than $1 million each.

The Rhodesian boycott raised many immediate questions of reciprocity in this matter of economic warfare and about the relationship of our policies with those of our allies. Above all, it raises the very serious question of how well we share common purposes these days.

So far it seems a sadly one-way street.

[From the Ashland Times-Gazette, Apr. 21, 1966]

United Nations Oil Blockade Is Illegal

(By Lyle Wilson, United Press International)

The United Nations' sanction of force to block seaborne oil supplies for rebellious Southern Rhodesia is an urgent invitation for Portugal to appeal to the International Court of Justice.

The U.N. Security Council's blockade authorization was a bad move. Worse, it established a dangerous precedent. British warships have already imposed the oil blockade on Monzambique, a West Africa colony of little Portugal. The blockade is aimed at shipping variously bearing the Greek and Panamanian flags. It is reasonable to believe the U.N. authorization and the British blockade would not survive judicial examination.

Strong measures such as use of force are set out in chapter VII of the U.N. Charter in situations involving threats to the peace, breach of the peace of aggression. That is the precise language of the charter. Unless there is a finding of such, the provisions for use of force shall not apply.

It would be interesting to have from the Security Council a statement identifying the threat, breach, or act on the part of Southern Rhodesia that triggered authorization of the use of force in the case of Southern Rhodesia.

There would be dispute about that, of course. The Afro-Asian members of the United Nations would contend that Southern Rhodesia had threatened the peace, had breached the peace and maybe even had been guilty of aggression by means of a go-it-alone decision to withdraw from the British Commonwealth.

The United States is alined firmly with the Afro-Asians and with the British. A good subject for an hour's debate in the U.S. Senate would be a demand for an explanation from the Johnson administration of the manner in which it determined that Southern Rhodesia had committed the act necessary to legalize the use of force.

Like as not, the debate would demonstrate that the United States was much motivated in the Security Council by an eager desire to appease the Afro-Asians and most especially the Africans.

In any event, the armed interference with the seaborne commerce of a Portuguese dependency is an urgent invitation for an appeal to the International Court of Justice. Portugal and Southern Rhodesia might find they have the law on their side. They might even be able to claim damages from the United Nations. The whole incident is fit for Gilbert and Sullivan.

Unfit for any musical comedy nonsense is the bad precedent in which the Security Council has entrapped itself. There is a major source of oil apart from Portugal's West African colony. That major source is the Union of South Africa which borders on Southern Rhodesia.

The Union is not a great power but neither is it a pinpoint little state like Portugal for which the big powers seem to have no regard whatever. But if it is legal to deny delivery of oil in Mozambique to prevent its movement on to Southern Rhodesia, how about delivery of oil to the Union for a similar ultimate destination blockade?

[From National Review Bulletin]

At Home

Former USIA Director and Assistant Secretary of State Carl T. Rowan, recently turned political columnist, has issued a warning against malign forces seeking to stir up sympathy for anti-Communist Rhodesia.

Assorted racists, fear merchants, and superpatriots, Rowan says, are trying to upset America's enlightened policy of helping the British crush Rhodesian independence. So potent is the diabolism of these plotters that they just "might make an already timid State Department even more tremulous in dealing with the vital problems of Rhodesia and the rest of Africa."

The particular target of this onslaught is a group called the American-African Affairs Association (550 Fifth Avenue, New York), headed by Negro leader Max Yergan and National Review Publisher William A. Rusher. The stated purpose of the organization is to convey to the American people essential facts about developments in Africa, untainted by the political and social dogma which saw fit to exalt recently deposed dictator and Marxist Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana as an example of progressive leadership.

To Rowan, the American-African Affairs Association is "largely a reactionary reincarnation of the Katanga lobby—a sort of reactionary Who's Who in America." The Katanga lobby, in case you have forgotten, was an agency whose chief purpose was, in Rowan's description, "to force the U.S. Government to acquiesce in an effort by Moise Tshombe to steal mineral-rich Katanga away from the rest of the Congo." (Tshombe was the popularly elected anti-Communist president of the province he was "stealing" from the Congo's pro-Communist ruler, Patrice Lumumba.)

Among the reactionary trustees and associates of the American-African Affairs group are novelist John Dos Passos, Prof. Thomas Molnar, Prof. Ernest van den Haag, former Congressman Walter Judd, journalists Henry Hazlitt, John Chamberlain, and Ralph de Toledano, Negro Editor George Schuyler, and Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer—as scurvy a lot of sidewinders as Carl Rowan ever laid eyes on.

Among the activities of these disreputable folk have been an in-depth study of Red Chinese influence in Africa, a survey of Nigerian politics by African authority Elspeth Huxley, and a forthcoming paper by Prof. K. A. Busia, former political leader in Ghana. They also had the cheek to send a three-man factfinding mission to Rhodesia to see what was happening there—instead of taking, as any respectable person would, Carl Rowan's word for it.

In December 1961, while serving in the Kennedy State Department, Rowan delivered a speech attacking what he described as "the Katanga lobby." He charged evil machinations by representatives of Katanga—then under U.S.-subsidized attack through the aggression of the United Nations—and implied that American support for Tshombe was traceable to payoffs by the Katanga government. The Katanga information chief in New York, Rowan said, "by spreading around at least $140,000 over the last year * * * has got some extremely vocal help in dispensing a string of myths and misinformation about Katanga and the Congo."

Rowan went on to describe opponents of the U.N. aggression as racists, reactionaries, and kooks—exactly as he is attempting to do now concerning those who oppose the British-United States effort to topple the regime in Rhodesia. But when called upon to account for these reckless statements before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, he was unable to back them up.

Questioned closely by Senator Thomas Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, and Committee Counsel, Jay Sourwine, Rowan hemmed and hawed about his Katanga lobby assertions, and confessed that when he charged the Katanga government with "spreading about at least $140,000 over the last year" he had not bothered to check out what he was saying with figures available at the Justice Department. The subcommittee found the latter charge false on the facts and determined that Rowan's below-the-belt insinuation of purchased sympathy for Katanga was also false.

The truth was that the Katanga Information Office had spent $40,000 in the last quarter of 1960, including the cost of setting up its office, and $100,000 in 1961, not all of which had been expended when Rowan made his charges. This was a good deal less than is spent by most foreign information offices, and less, proportionately, than had been spent by the agents of the central Congolese government trying to subjugate Katanga. Despite that fact and despite the additional item that the central Congolese government's office in the United States had failed to register with the U.S. Government as it was required to do by law (it did register when a public outcry was raised), Rowan had no criticism to offer to that quarter.

On the Rowan allegation that dissent from the aggression against Katanga came from extremists, the subcommittee concluded: "Mr. Rowan offered no evidence to back his charge that support for President Tshombe came primarily from an amalgam of political extremists * * * Mr. Rowan was not prepared to place anyone in any of his several extremist pigeonholes."

Thus the performance of Carl Rowan when, required to back up charges, made by him in an official capacity, he spoke under oath before a congressional committee. The record is not such as to suggest Rowan should be given much credence when, in the role of journalist, he repeats the show all over again after a 4-year layoff. That it has been attacked in such terms by such a spokesman is, in fact, just about the best recommendation we can think of for the American-African Affairs Association.

M. STANTON EVANS.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S INSTANT RECESSION IN THE BUILDING INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration's tight money policy and its discriminatory use of credit restrictions has fashioned an economic disaster in my home district of Santa Clara County, Calif. It has pulverized one segment of our local economy and created a situation as serious as any hurricane, flood, or earthquake. This catastrophe has not been caused by Mother Nature running wild, but by a coldblooded economic act of the Johnson administration. It is a policy in which the administration persists long after its mistake is evident to everyone who wants to see the truth.

Mr. Speaker, these administration policies have caused an instant recession in the homebuilding industry of Santa Clara County and much of California, one of our major sources of employment.

On March 31 of this year, President Johnson, in pleading with a delegation of U.S. mayors to curtail capital investment, said:

> I wanted to add two little rooms to a house that we have down home that we will occupy some of these days, but I asked Mrs. Johnson last night to defer those two rooms because the construction people who would be working on them would be very much in demand.

Mr. Speaker, the President's words may have applied to Texas and there may be a shortage of construction people there, but it is certainly not true in my congressional district where carpenters, plumbers, bricklayers, lathers, laborers, electricians, and others are experiencing a real recession.

The building trade unions tell me that there is a 15-percent unemployment rate right now in their ranks. Before the blitz, there were 24,000 people employed in the construction business in Santa Clara County. A 15-percent unemployment rate means almost 4,000 people out of work. Some estimates of unemployment are much higher. These men are not unemployed because they are unskilled; not because they do not want to work; not because there is no demand for their services and the products they produce, but because their jobs were deliberately taken away from them by a bumbling administration that has selected one industry—the building industry—and one area—the west coast—to bear the brunt of fighting inflation its unwise policies have caused.

I understand that this is not only happening in my county, but in other high cost building areas in California and some other States as well. It is almost as if certain areas have been selected as the victims of instant recession.

Remember that the men who have been thrown out of work by the Johnson administration's "instant recession" are good solid citizens. They are buying homes, cars, furniture, and appliances. Perhaps they have sons and daughters going to college. When Dad is suddenly thrown out of work, pretty soon the television goes back, the car is repossessed, the tuition money is not forthcoming, and maybe potential teachers and scientists are thrown out of the educational system and onto the unskilled labor market. Their plight can produce economic fallout which could envelop the entire Nation.

The real irony of the situation is that the same administration, at the same time, in the same county, through another of its bureaucratic arms is pumping taxpayers' money into a poverty program. The purpose of this program supposedly is to educate and uplift the poor and retrain them so that they can take their place as carpenters, plumbers, and electricians and earn better wages. So, at the same time it is trying to educate and help the poor find jobs, the administration is creating a new class of unemployed and blessing them with instant poverty. This piece of economic engineering is unexcelled in the history of government mismanagement of the public's affairs. I charge that this administration in its efforts to fight inflation has created as its main weapon a two-headed beast. It is pulling in two directions at once and is getting exactly nowhere.

Now just how did all this come about? Well, the other day, two of my constituents in the building industry called on an economic adviser to the President to tell him of their problems and ask his help. He admitted to them without shame that the administration has used the building industry to manipulate the economy—that the purpose was to control inflation because they were worried that the lid was about to blow off the economy. Now why did they pick on the building industry to use as the scapegoat? Because it was so easy to manipulate.

The Federal Government has iron controls on the country's credit system. They control interest rates in banks and savings and loan associations, and just about regulate where the money will flow in our economy. On the one hand, the Federal Reserve Board has allowed commercial banks to pay up to 5½ percent interest on certificates of deposit, while on the other hand the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has refused to allow the savings and loan associations to pay any more than 4.85 percent on savings deposits. The great reservoir of credit the building industry uses for land and construction loans resides in savings and loan associations. They are the prime source for its financing. Now, this higher interest rate in the commercial banks caused a tremendous withdrawal of deposits from savings and loan associations. In the first quarter of 1966, over $300 million left the savings and loan associations in California alone. Today the builder who wants to buy some land and build some houses in my district receives the same answer from all of his traditional sources of funds, "We are out of money." And, if he does find some, it is at interest and discount rates so high as to make homebuilding prohibitive. In a few months when the subdividers and builders who are still operating run out of the commitments which they are now using, the entire homebuilding industry in my district will, for all practical purposes, be shut down.

So, what has happened to that money? The commercial banks are loaning it out on high rate, short-term loans to consumers to buy more TV's, autos, furniture, and so forth, and to corporations to expand their inventories and plants. Banks, as a rule, are simply not interested in lower interest real estate loans, or the relatively troublesome construction loans when they can make their funds earn more by making other types of loans. The savings and loan associations, being limited by law to loaning on real estate, were the only source that the building industry could turn to for funds. Now the unrealistic interest rate restrictions have dried up savings and loan deposits and the homebuilding industry is practically starved to death for lack of its principal sustenance—credit. At the same time, the fires of inflation are fed by the diversion of funds into consumer credit channels; thus increasing the demand for consumer goods and causing just the opposite effect that the administration started out to achieve.

So it seems the administration's economic geniuses saw a fire burning, considered the remedy and decided the only way to stop the fire was to throw something wet on it. So, they looked around and picked up a bucket of the first available liquid they could find. It turned out to be kerosene. The fire is burning faster and all they are saying is, "We are watching it closely." The trouble with this administration is that it has too many theorists and not enough firemen.

But, that was not all. The administration's economic undertakers had still another spike to drive into the coffin of California's homebuilding industry—the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—which has for some time bought and sold FHA loans, and has consequently influenced the price paid by private investors for these loans, announced on April 1 that the ceiling on FHA loans they would purchase would be reduced from $30,000 to $15,000. Since California is a high-cost area for construction, far higher than the rest of the nation, this has effectively eliminated FNMA buying of FHA home mortgages. The private investors had already left the mortgage market to seek higher returns on their money in other types of loans. So, this action just about killed off FHA mortgage financing in my county, and most of California. Alaska and Hawaii were excused from the $15,000 limitation because they were such high-cost areas. I submit that California or at least a good many areas in California have just as high land and construction costs as these two States. The median priced home in the present inventory in my home county is $23,000. This means that the median FHA loan is almost $22,000. There are less than 12 percent of the homes now in the county's inventory which could possibly qualify for an FHA loan at the present limitation—$15,000. In all fairness, California at least should be added to the other two States and the limitation again raised to $30,000.

There is still one more way the Government is hurting what is left of the homebuilding industry and that is by overbuying of lumber. I am told that one cabinet making concern that normally uses between 1,200 and 1,800 pieces of plywood per month is now able to get only 100. Its sources say the Government is taking all the rest. One lumber mill is said to be furnishing the Government 98 percent of its production. Lacking enough cars to ship it, they are using cattle cars and lining them with paper. Apparently, this material is going into the defense effort. Our building industry has no quarrel with such use if it is truly being used. But, they suspect that such huge quantities of plywood and lumber cannot possibly be used all at once. If it is being used as received, that is one thing. If it is piling up on docks and warehouses, waiting for transshipment, that is another. The building industry would like to be sure that the drastic curtailment of their supply and the resultant high prices are necessary and not just whimsical.

Now what can be done about these three grave injustices to our homebuilding industry? First of all, the administration's economic experts should admit they have failed. The scientific method prescribes first creating a theory, then experimenting and testing it, and then abandoning it and trying something else, if it doesn't work out. I submit that the attempt to control inflation by manipulating the credit system has totally failed and, in addition, is on the brink of destroying one of the great important industries of this Nation—one which brings employment and prosperity to hundreds and thousands of taxpaying citizens. If the administration does not reverse its vicious policies, it could well start a recession snowballing throughout the whole economy. They say arsenic can cure a headache as easily as aspirin, but the side effects are pretty drastic. I submit that the administration's economic experts are hooked on arsenic and they had better take the cure quickly.

After admitting failure, here is what must be done immediately to get our homebuilding industry back on the track.

First. Increase the ceiling of the interest rate payable by savings and loan associations to allow them to compete with the commercial banks for deposits and return their ability to finance the homebuilding industry, which is their primary and in fact their only function.

Second. Raise the ceiling on the amount allowable for FNMA to purchase individual mortgages from $15,000 to $30,000, in California and any other high cost States. At the same time, some method of increasing the authorization ceiling for FNMA must be found so that it has ample funds with which to operate. At the present time, $91 million in FNMA stock can be sold to the U.S. Treasury. Since FNMA can purchase mortgages in the secondary market in an amount equal to 10 times its outstanding stock, this means that if the administration were to immediately move, FNMA could purchase $910 million more in mortgages. This could be of considerable help in the present crisis.

Third. Release any lumber to the market which is unnecessarily stockpiled by the Government.

These three steps may not be all that is needed, but they would be a fine start.

I submit that the economic measures the administration has applied and which have had such a drastic and unexpectedly severe effect on this one industry can be reversed. The hand that turned off the switch so fast can turn it on again just as quickly. In trying to kill a fly, the administration has used a sledgehammer. All it has to do is lay the hammer down and pick up a flyswatter. We all agree that inflation must be controlled. But, let us control it intelligently. The means used so far were conceived in ignorance, born in confusion and are being nurtured in arrogance and blind stubbornness. Those who are responsible should be taken out of their typewriter-ribbon world and sentenced to 3 or 4 months in the real world where a man and his family are not merely statistics, or paper dolls to be played with by computers, but real live human beings who get hurt badly when the administration's expert inflation-fighters deliberately and in cold blood fire into a crowd of innocent bystanders.

BUILDING ANOTHER INTER-AMERICAN BRIDGE

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVicker] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, this January I had occasion to travel to Central America on an assignment from the Foreign Affairs Committee to represent the United States at installation of the new U.S. Director of Regional Office Central American and Panama, and to make a firsthand study of the Central American Common Market. I also became aware of a unique institution known as the binational center.

A binational center is an autonomous, nonprofit organization, dedicated to cultural exchange and mutual understanding, and self-sustaining income received principally from English classes. These centers are administered under programs of the U.S. Information Agency, although not as official agency dependencies.

A binational board of directors, chosen by center membership, formulates policy. The U.S. Information Service provides teaching, library and other materials, sponsors cultural activities, and assigns staff officers to administer the center's overall program of library services, cultural activities and teaching of English. Binational centers, the first of which was founded in Argentina in 1927, are located in all Latin American nations. They contribute significantly to communities where they are located, and have become one of the most effective of the USIA's overseas activities.

The binational center in Guatemala City is named Institute Guatemalteco-Americano, and is popularly known as IGA. Long a cultural and linguistic bridge between the United States and Guatemala, IGA, in a very real sense, fills a deeply felt community need. Thousands of Guatemalans participate in IGA's activities. The Institute continually strives to satisfy constantly growing demands placed on its English teaching resources. Greatest demand is for teachers of English. They are badly needed to aid in effecting these programs. Over the years the center has been forced to rely on resident Americans to do their teaching of English. Through association with IGA, an American teacher fresh from our country can make significant contributions to an invaluable cultural program while advancing himself professionally. This contribution is in direct support of objectives of both the Guatemalan and U.S. Government.

I would like to put forward a plan to not only aid the binational centers in Guatemala, but to assist Denver teachers professionally, aid our Nation abroad, and perhaps set precedents that will spread to other school districts throughout the Nation. This plan would establish a system whereby teachers from the metropolitan school district of Denver would be able to teach English as a foreign language at U.S. binational centers in selected foreign countries for at least 1 year during periods of sabbatical leave. I proposed this plan to officers of the U.S. Information Agency in Guatemala during my visit.

They have agreed to a pilot program to be undertaken this year with the binational center in Guatemala City. Here will be a metropolitan Denver effort, and, if successful, a major program bringing our people and language to areas where they can do all concerned the most good.

With attendant values accruing to both schools and teachers, my plan offers opportunities to learn at firsthand the cultures of some of our world's most fascinating nations. It will be directly coordinated with teachers through my congressional office, the USIA and the binational center. A strong point of this entire program is that it will not require additional offices, layers of bureaucracy, sets of rules and regulations, or additional employees. This entire program can and will be handled through facilities already existing in my office. No further expense will be inflicted upon the public or government at any level.

Under my plan's pilot program this year in Guatemala, candidates would be expected to have the following qualifications: First, holding of an undergraduate degree or higher in one of the following fields: English, Spanish, linguistics, Latin American studies, education, sociology, anthropology, archeology, economics, political science, library science or journalism; second, minimum of 3 years' teaching experience; third, good health. Proficiency in Spanish is not necessary.

Teachers would be expected to accept a position for 1 full year, to teach 25 hours weekly, and to take an active part in the institute's program of activities. Based on the teacher getting a sabbatical stipend from the school district, the 1 year grant would include a stipend from the binational center of $2,400. Round trip tourist-class air travel would also be provided, although driving down through Central America would be highly recommended as an unparalleled experience. If necessary, and with institute approval, teachers may supplement incomes by obtaining additional employment while in Guatemala. Teachers are also free to use leisure time in any research projects catching their fancy. IGA will lend every assistance in obtaining entree for them wherever possible. The grant would also include 4 weeks' leave during the course of the year. Grants would begin in late June, starting with several days of orientation at the Institute.

With the approval of the local school board, I suggest having a screening process with all districts taking part. Superintendents will be focal points for this process. An official from the binational center in Guatemala City will come to Denver to confer and aid in making final teacher selections.

No one is going to make money out of serving down there. No one will receive formal degrees from any institution as a result of time spent and lessons learned. What may possibly occur is merely this: some very dedicated, educated people from the Denver area will go down to a nation where we desperately need friends, and teach many of these people our language. They will live in this country and learn of and with it. When they return, they will know they have pushed back the frontiers of ignorance concerning America. They will know there are people in a nearby land who think a bit differently about America because of their efforts. They will be richer as a result of having given of themselves to people who are hungry for what they have to give—knowledge and friendship. It is strictly a giving experience. Receiving will come naturally, and hopefully, this project will set an example that should spread. It is not a program conceived by a group of isolated administrators sitting around a table trying a calculated experiment. Rather it is as close to a spontaneous people-to-people program as one can find today—one designed to reach out to others. If, like Topsy, it just grows, then Denver and its citizens will have found another key to the lock on the door of human enlightenment and brotherhood.

TAX TREATMENT OF TRANSFERS OF RIGHTS TO COPYRIGHTS AND LITERARY, MUSICAL AND ARTISTIC COMPOSITIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a transfer of property—other than by gift, inheritance or devise—consisting of all or substantially all rights to a copyright or composition by any holder of the copyright or composition shall be considered the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for 6 months.

Under my bill the transfer would be considered the sale or exchange of a capital asset regardless of whether or not payments in consideration of the transfer are payable periodically or contingent on the productivity, use or disposition of the property transferred.

The transfer, however, would under my bill only be considered the sale or exchange of a capital asset if, at the time of such transfer the composition or other property has been substantially completed and applies only for one copyright or composition a year, as selected by the taxpayer.

Under our present tax structure all authors or owners of copyright property are discriminated against.

For example, take the case of a writer who has two nephews, and decides to give both of them presents of about equal value. Suppose that the writer gives nephew A $50,000 worth of stock in X company, which represents the amount the writer paid for the stock and its present worth. Suppose, further, that the writer gives nephew B the motion-picture rights in his or her book, also worth $50,000. At the end of 6 months nephew A goes to his stockbroker and sells his $50,000 worth of stock in X company for $100,000. And nephew B decides to sell his movie rights to a motion-picture company, also for $100,000.

Then comes April 15, tax day. Assuming that neither nephew has any other income, nephew A has a capital gain of $50,000 on which he pays a 25-percent capital-gains tax, or $12,500. Nephew B, however, has $100,000 which for him is ordinary income. His tax under the 1954 Internal Revenue Code would be about $70,000. The difference between the tax paid by nephew A on his sale of company X stock and that paid by nephew B on his movie rights to the new book is about $57,000.

In the words of Harriet F. Pilpel, a prominent New York City attorney specializing in copyright law and an acknowledged expert in the field:

> If, as many of us believe, the real wealth of America lies in the minds of her creative people, it makes very little sense to tax them in this discriminatory manner.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent a district which is the culture center of the United States and includes the heart of the entertainment industry. As Representative from the 17th Congressional District I speak in Washington for, among others, all of New York's Broadway theaters and most of those off Broadway, for the music companies, broadcasting studios, publishing firms, and art galleries. Among my constituents are some of the cultural, entertainment, and theatrical truly greats—authors, composers, publishers, artists, actors, producers, directors, and critics.

I am further privileged to have been associated with the field of copyright law for many years having been chairman of the Copyright Committee of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, a charter member of the Copyright Society of the U.S.A., a professor of copyright law at New York Law School, and the editor of books on the subject.

It is my firm belief that an author should be accorded the benefits of capital gains treatment for his creations in the event of sale. This is a benefit enjoyed by an inventor or the owner of a patent, and after examination of the legislative history of the Internal Revenue Code it becomes evident that there is no basis for inferring an intent to favor one group over the other.

Just as there are special provisions for the patent holder geared to induce and stimulate inventive activity, I believe our laws should stimulate literary, musical, and artistic composition.

Mr. Speaker, this country took a significant step when on September 29, 1965, President Johnson signed the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965—Public Law 89-209, Statute 845. One of the sponsors of this legislation was my predecessor, now mayor of New York City, the Honorable John V. Lindsay. For the history of this provision, see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1966, pages 7663-7667.

It is entirely consistent with the stated purposes of that most significant legislative step that we must recognize our obligation to all of the authors, composers, and artists in this country, to fulfill our promise of equality and justice for the arts. Those who give us our great culture should also have the economic benefits which our industry has.

Let us now take the concrete step of ending the economic discrimination against those authors and composers of literary, musical, or artistic compositions which exists under our present tax structure.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 14903

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1221 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining the term "capital asset") is amended by striking out paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(b) Section 341(c)(2)(B) of such Code (relating to collapsible corporations) is amended by striking out "section 1221(5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1221(4)".

(c) Section 1231(b)(1) of such Code (relating to property used in the trade or business) is amended—

(1) by striking out subparagraph (C),

(2) by inserting "or" at the end of subparagraph (A), and

(3) by striking out ", or" at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

Sec. 2. (a) Part IV of subchapter P of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules for determining capital gains and losses) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 1250. Sale or Exchange of Copyrights and Compositions.

"(a) General Rule.—A transfer (other than by gift, inheritance, or devise) of property consisting of all substantial rights to a copyright or composition by any holder thereof shall be considered the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months, regardless of whether or not payments in consideration of such transfer—

"(1) are payable periodically over a period generally coterminous with the transferee's use of the copyright or composition, or

"(2) are contingent on the productivity, use, or disposition of the property transferred.

"(b) Limitations.—

"(1) Work must be substantially completed.—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a transfer only if, at the time of such transfer, the composition or other property has been substantially completed.

"(2) Only one copyright or composition a year.—If, during any taxable year, the taxpayer makes transfers described in subsection (a) with respect to more than one copyright or composition, subsection (a) shall apply only to transfers so described with respect to the one copyright or composition selected by the taxpayer. Such selection shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe. Such a selection once made may be changed only with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

"(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Copyright or composition.—The term 'copyright or composition' means a copyright or a literary, musical, or artistic composition.

"(2) Holder.—The term 'holder' means—

"(A) any individual whose efforts created such property, or

"(B) any other individual who has acquired his interest in such property in exchange for consideration in money or money's worth paid to such creator prior to substantial completion of the copyrighted work or of the composition, if such individual is neither—

"(i) the employer of such creator, nor

"(ii) related to such creator (within the meaning of subsection (d)).

"(d) Related Persons.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any transfer, directly or indirectly, between persons specified within any one of the paragraphs of section 267(b); except that in applying section 267(b) and (c) for purposes of this section—

"(1) the phrase '25 percent or more' shall be substituted for the phrase 'more than 50 percent' each place it appears in section 267(b), and

"(2) paragraph (4) of section 267(c) shall be treated as providing that the family of an individual shall include only his spouse, ancestors, and lineal descendants.

"(e) Cross Reference.—

"For special rule relating to nonresident aliens, see section 871(a)."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1250. Sale or exchange of copyrights and compositions."

(c) Section 871(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on nonresident alien individuals) is amended by striking out "and section 1235" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1235, and section 1250".

(d) Section 1441 of such Code (relating to withholding tax on nonresident aliens) is amended by striking out "and section 1235" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1235, and section 1250".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to transactions occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act in taxable years ending after such date.

AGING RESEARCH AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in 1960 the Federal Aviation Agency, in view of its own interests, instituted a program in aging research. One of the objectives of the program was to identify a useful estimate of the overall status of an adult human being as an aging individual. A second objective was to identify medical guidelines which would indicate when deterioration of performance capabilities caused by aging cancels the benefits of experience, judgment, and acquired skills.

A population of subjects ranging from 20 to over 60 years of age has been acquired. For the last 5 years annual intensive examinations have been carried out on these subjects. These examinations are designed to detect early signs of impaired physiological function. By refinement of existing diagnostic techniques and the development of more sophisticated bioinstrumentation, greater predictive value is becoming available in the evaluation of the individual as an aging human being.

In view of the advantages available in a medical center well established in physiological research, the investigators were placed in GSA-leased and FAA-equipped laboratories at Georgetown University Medical Center. By the utilization of existing facilities in the medical center, the availability of broad range consultative services from university and hospital staffs, the participation of the Government scientists in teaching programs related to their investigative fields, an economically sound and scientifically satisfactory program has been developed with significant output to the research community.

Of unusual merit in the evaluation of this multidisciplinary program are the cardiovascular studies, which incorporate intensive and unique measurements of heart function which have already shown predictive value in the early detection of cardiovascular disease not disclosed by conventional diagnostic methods. The refinements of these techniques have great significance in the area of preventive medicine.

The pulmonary studies are designed to develop a body of information regarding the effects of respiratory diseases so that insight may be gained into those factors which may promote or accelerate such diseases, and how such factors relate to the function of other organs, particularly the heart and brain. The studies also demonstrate the effect of aging upon respiratory function and its impairment upon performance capabilities of the individual.

The neurological research has advanced greatly the predictive evaluation of the cerebral vascular circulation, as has been acknowledged recently by the presentation of the S. Wier Mitchell Award for Neurological Accomplishment by the American Academy of Neurology to one of the neurologists of the staff.

These evaluations, with those of vision and hearing studies and biochemical observations, when correlated with performance capabilities, offer a realistic approach to the appraisal of the status of man based on physiological data rather than on chronological age. The ultimate predictive value of these findings will afford a sound basis for occupational selection, preventive medical programs and contribute significantly in the guidance of community health programs.

The Federal Aviation Agency, in order to consolidate their research programs, has decided to relocate this research activity now working in the Georgetown University Medical Center, to the Aeronautical Center in Oklahoma. The removal of the Georgetown program from this geographical area, will necessarily interrupt the continued observation of this population, who for the most part are residents of the Metropolitan Washington area, and who have displayed a high degree of interest and motivation as volunteers in this aging study. The potential of the program as currently conducted warrants its continued support in its present location so that the effort and expense of the collection of 5 years of data already procured may effectively be utilized by the medical community as a significant segment of a longitudinal aging study which, as it continues, can effect at an earlier date the goals of aging criteria.

GEORGETOWN CLINICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

What is it?

A small clinical research institute established by the Federal Aviation Agency in 1960 at the Georgetown University Medical Center. It occupies approximately 5,000 square feet of space in the Kober-Cogan Building, with an additional 1,000 square feet to be made available soon in St. Mary's hall. This space is leased by GSA. The current lease, subject to renewal, expires in July 1967. In addition, the Institute utilizes certain hospital space for the conduct of part of its studies, and on a monthly rental basis acquires animal house facilities.

Why was it established?

To conduct research that would provide a useful estimate of the overall status of an adult human being as an aging individual, and to identify medical guidelines which will indicate when decreasing performance capabilities, caused by physiological decrements, cancel the benefits of experience, judgment, and acquired skills.

Who does this?

Twenty-one Federal Aviation Agency scientific personnel and six administrative personnel, under the direction of Arthur E. Wentz, M.D. The six laboratories, furnished and equipped by the FAA, including the following physiological disciplines: cardiovascular, neurological, pulmonary function, visual and auditory, pharmacological, and biochemical, and behavioral sciences. These are supported and their instrumentation serviced by a biophysics and electronics laboratory. The creative capability of the personnel of this laboratory, working with the physiological scientists, is utilized in the development of instrumentation to accommodate new diagnostic techniques.

How is this accomplished?

First. By a multidisciplinary evaluation made annually by the most sophisticated techniques available, and by research methods developed to afford refinement of these techniques so that they may have greater predictive and prognostic value.

Second. By the analysis of the physiological and/or pathological data, and its correlation with the individual's performance capability and operational record.

Third. By the cross-correlation of the analyzed data to identify significant factors of an aging rating of the individual based on physiological information.

Why was it established at a university medical center?

First. To insure the validity of research findings to be furnished to a regulatory agency.

Second. To afford a clinic and hospital population for controls and specific project study.

Third. To augment the instumentation facilities of a necessarily limited space.

Fourth. To preclude the necessity of acquisition by the Institute of X-ray, hematological and chemistry laboratory facilities necessary to the accomplishment of projects, by using those already established in the medical center, on a contract basis.

Fifth. To have the ready availability of an unlimited range of medical consultants to augment the Institute's professional staff.

Sixth. To offer to Government scientists the stimulation afforded by an academic environment and their participation, on a time available basis, in teaching programs of the medical center.

What has been done?

Since the inception of the program, over 2,000 individuals have been examined at the institute. From this number an appropriate population of all classes of pilots and air traffic control personnel, ranging from 20 to over 60 years of age, requiring airman certification, have been identified for continuing study. By the conclusion of the current calendar year, over 300 of the subjects will have had five or more consecutive annual examinations, and over 200 will have had at least three consecutive annual examinations. Additional subjects will be added in appropriate age categories to bring the population for the longitudinal studies to a total of 750 subjects.

Lack of statistical support has precluded a complete evaluation of the 5 years of data collected. However, scientific information yielded by the studies has provided material for the presentation and publication of over 30 scientific papers.

Justification for the continuation of the program in its current location: First, to preserve and utilize the data collected to date, which represents a significant segment of a longitudinal study; second, to take advantage of continued observations on a population which is readily available to the locale of the existing Institute, and whose interest and motivation in the research program is reflected in an encouragingly low attrition rate over a period of 5 to 6 years; third, to maintain a program which is unique in that it affords an example of Government-supported personnel integrated into and working effectively in the academic environment of a university, and where a program scientifically satisfactory is being accomplished economically with its maximum utilization of scientific personnel and sophisticated expensive bio-instrumentation; fourth, to retain the interest in aging research studies of a group of scientists who have worked effectively in that area of research for several years.

Budget

[Approximate]

Instrumentation requirement	$300,000
Fiscal requirement (36 man-years)	550,000
Current fiscal provision (28 man-years)	428,000

INTEREST GENERATED TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMERS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest generated in my legislation to establish a Department of Consumers, thus giving the American consumer an effective voice in the highest councils of the Federal Government.

The Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has held hearings on the bill, H.R. 7179, in Washington on April 19, and in New York City on April 29.

I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statements in support of the measure, made at the New York City hearings, by the Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Senator from New York; Hon. Louis J. Lefkowitz, attorney general of the State of New York; and Hon. Frank D. O'Connor, president of the city council of the city of New York. In addition, I would like to set forth at this point an editorial entitled "Consumers in the Cabinet", which appeared in the May 3 edition of the New York Post.

The testimony and the article follow:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY ON H.R. 7179 (DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMERS) BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS HEARINGS AT NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 29, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here this morning to discuss the proposal for establishing a Department of Consumers in the Federal Government. And I want to pay special tribute to you, Mr. Chairman, for the great effort that you have made in studying consumer problems and for your foresight in introducing the bill which we consider today.

It is particularly appropriate that these hearings be held in New York State because it was here, under the administration of Averell Harriman as Governor, that consumer interests were first given the special attention of an independent office in a State government. Dr. Persia Campbell, whose testimony I believe you will hear later this morning, was the director of that office. State after State, and the Federal Government, too, have been guided by her work on behalf of consumer interests and especially by her work with Governor Harriman.

Her work, and the excellent work of Assistant Secretary of Labor, Esther Peterson, at the Federal level, as well as the work of this committee, have dramatized consumer problems to the point where the idea of a Federal Department of Consumers is now receiving serious public attention. The fact is, of course, that none of us will be very surprised if Congress does not establish a Department of Consumers during the current session or even during the next Congress. But, remembering the long struggle to establish the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the equally long fight to create the Department of Housing and Urban Development, we know that we must begin now to focus on the problem if we are to succeed later. We must begin to organize consumer groups in support of this legislation and we must carry the debate concerning the proposal to the country. We must do these things because the American consumer will never be properly protected against unsafe and unfair conditions until we create a Cabinet-level Department with a full set of protective legislation under its jurisdiction.

Four years ago President Kennedy sent a special message to the Congress about consumer problems. He began it by reminding us that "consumers, by definition, include us all." In saying that, he recognized that consumer interests are so broad that we will never succeed in protecting all of them in a single institutional structure. But he laid down a fundamental challenge: to find the means by which the four basic rights of the consumer could be protected—the right to be safe, the right to choose, the right to be informed, and the right to be heard. In my judgment, meeting that challenge as best we can ultimately depends on our creating an institutional framework for action—a Department of Consumers endowed with effective enforcement powers. That is why we must begin working toward its creation now.

The fact that there are at present 33 Federal agencies engaged in 296 consumer protection activities is strong support for H.R. 7179. As long as consumer protection is not focused as the major responsibility of a single agency, as long as consumers lack effective and direct representation in the highest councils of the Federal Government, they will not have the protection they need and deserve.

Particularized interests have found effective representation in the structure of the

Federal Government. The Department of Commerce represents businessmen; the Department of Agriculture represents farmers; the Department of Labor represents workers. In addition, these interests have found further strength through articulate, well-financed and effective lobbies. But consumers, who are by definition the largest single interest group in the country, have not had equal representation in either the executive or the legislative branch of the Federal Government. What H.R. 7179 proposes and what I support is to give consumers the voice and representation they deserve to have.

Through Esther Peterson, President Johnson has taken a great interest in consumer matters. But no statute gives her or anyone else the power to speak for the consuming public before administrative agencies. No statute gives Mrs. Peterson or any other official a voice for the consumer equal to that of the businessman or the farmer or the worker in the executive branch of our Government. H.R. 7179 would do these things and redress the imbalance of power.

Of course one original purpose of the regulatory agencies was protection of consumer interests. Yet it increasingly occurs that the consumer's voice before these agencies is drowned out by the competition of one more particularized interest or another. Why shouldn't young people who will be enticed to smoke by cigarette advertising be spoken for when the tobacco interests are heard so clearly? Why shouldn't the users of electricity be heard when the giant utilities are spoken for so effectively? Why shouldn't those who borrow from banks be heard as well as the financial institutions themselves? Why shouldn't the purchasers and viewers of the television sets be heard as well as the spokesmen for the networks and the manufacturers? Why shouldn't those who pay exorbitant prices for drugs be heard as well as the drug manufacturers? Why shouldn't the airline passengers be heard as well as the airlines? It is not easy to organize the consumers so that their point of view can be consistently and effectively set forth. But a Federal department, specifically charged with that obligation, could give the consumer the voice he needs, in the regulatory process.

Both the White House and Congress have reflected a growing concern as to how to obtain better representation of consumer interests. The recent congressional investigation of auto safety is an illustration of the growing legislative concern, as is the legislation that is emerging from that investigation. Senator Douglas, of Illinois, has been a strong advocate of truth-in-lending legislation, and Senator Hart, of Michigan, has been an equally strong champion of truth in packaging legislation. The Office of Economic Opportunity has funded programs for consumer education, recognizing and trying to do something about the fact that the poor always pay more.

The common law concept of caveat emptor—"let the buyer beware"—is, unfortunately, still with us in 1966. But better protection of buyers would mean better protection for sellers as well. The loss in sales to legitimate business because of counterfeit brand-named goods alone runs to over $2 billion per year. The individual consumer is hardly powerful enough to fight the deceit and misrepresentation of the unscrupulous merchant. The efforts of better business bureaus have been helpful. The programs and laws of several of the States have made a difference. But the fact remains that the cost of consumer fraud requires a national effort if it is to be overcome.

Under the terms of this bill the Department of Consumers would have the responsibility of preparing programs to inform and educate consumers. That kind of consumer education is in the best tradition of our free enterprise economy. Furthermore, the department would act as a national clearinghouse for complaints. It would coordinate and dispense important consumer information to the general public and to local and State governmental bodies concerned with the problem. It would conduct economic research and surveys. In the process of doing these things, the department would help achieve the best protection possible against abuse of the consumer—namely an educated and informed public.

I am especially concerned about the protection of the poor. The disadvantages of the poor extend to every contact they have with the world of commerce. The quality of their food is lower and the prices they pay are often higher; the interest rates they pay are higher; they are more often the victims of the high pressure tactics of deceitful salesmen. And they are the most frequent casualties of the various laws that protect the producing interests of our society: the poor suffer again and again through the entry of default judgments against them, through the repossessing of merchandise, and through misuse of landlord and tenant laws.

If the Department of Consumers would undertake this special concern—the concern for the poor and their special problems as consumers—that alone would be sufficient justification for its existence.

There is one feature of Congressman Rosenthal's bill which deserves further mention. I speak of the provision that would permit the Secretary of the proposed new department, acting through a special consumer council, to intervene as a party before any Federal regulatory agency when economic interests of consumers are involved. I believe we should not wait for the enactment of the bill before experimenting with that concept. Perhaps the President, by Executive order, could authorize the Special Assistant for Consumers Affairs to appear in administrative proceedings so that we can have some experience by which to judge the value of this proposal.

But the main thing I would emphasize today is the need for all of us in Government to focus more on consumer problems, and the great value of H.R. 7179 as a vehicle for stimulating greater activity on behalf of the consumer. I was interested to read about the reaction of one business executive to the recommendation by the National Commission on Food Marketing that a Department of Consumer Affairs be established. The executive commented that such a department would be "nothing more than a wailing wall—and modern-day America does not need one." If a "wailing wall" means giving a voice to the consumers of this country, if it means giving a forum to those who have been deceived and defrauded, if it means protecting the poor, if it means permitting the American buyer to be informed and educated about his purchasing decisions, then I disagree with this executive's view that modern-day America does not need one. We not only need one; it is long overdue.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you for your leadership on this matter. One day *your efforts will have been a major* reason why a Department of Consumers will exist to represent the American consumer in the councils of his Government.

Statement of Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz Before the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee on Government Operations, April 29, 1966

For far too long the consumer has had too little voice and too little weight in Government.

The consumer is the star-performer in America's economic picture. Yet, it is appalling to me to see reports almost every day detailing the shocking scope of the chicanery and deceit which is used to dupe the consumer and defraud him of his money.

Since 1957, when I became attorney general, one of my chief concerns has been the protection of the public against a fringe element of shady promoters whose chief aim seems to be to cheat the public in the sale of goods and services. To fight the war against these individuals, and it may well be called a war, there has been enacted on my recommendation numerous statutes in New York State to provide a greater measure of protection for the consumer and the legitimate businessman.

But the fight against consumer frauds no longer can be completely waged on the local and State level. It is a problem of nationwide proportions and must be met with broad programs of action on the Federal level. For this reason, I am happy to support and urge the passage of H.R. 7179 which would establish a Department of Consumers in the Federal Government and give Cabinet status to such a department.

As long ago as June 1960, in a letter to the members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I urged that Congress take action to create such a department and I am gratified that your committee is giving the matter its consideration.

Consumer spending each year for goods and services amounts to hundreds of billions of dollars. It is an accurate barometer of the health of the Nation's economy. For, whether our Nation has a good year or a bad one in terms of prosperity depends to a large extent on the consumer. When he is defrauded he is inclined to retrench on his purchases, with the result that the economy suffers and even the businessman who carries on with integrity is a victim. The consumer who is victimized by fraud is inclined to take his wrath out unjustifiably on merchants for generally he does not take the trouble to discern whether it was the gyp merchant or the reputable businessman who duped him.

It is all the more significant that the Federal Government is giving serious consideration to the creation of a Department of Consumers because many of the slick promoters are of the hit-and-run variety who, after saturating one area with their shoddy goods and services, literally pull up stakes and move on to greener pastures, many times moving their location from one State to another.

With this peripatetic problem facing those who are concerned with consumer protection, I would also urge that serious consideration be given to the establishment within the Department of Consumers a clearinghouse of information on frauds of all kinds, an information center, so to speak, which would compile data relating to these shady operators and the schemes and devices used to bilk the public.

Such a clearinghouse could function in a manner similar to the way in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation compiles records relating to criminals and criminal activities resulting from prosecutions. It would provide an invaluable source of information for law enforcement departments and other State agencies and business and trade associations which are waging the fight for business decency. Then the scheming promoter who is forced out of one State will find that his record has preceded him to every other area where he may seek to set up shop.

I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to appear before your committee today and I hope that H.R. 7179 will be enacted by the Congress at an early date.

Statement of Hon. Frank D. O'Connor, President of the New York City Council

No topic is closer to my heart than the subject of consumer protection. Too long has the ancient concept of caveat emptor, let the buyer beware, prevailed in the public marketplace and the conduct of its business.

For 10 years as a district attorney there was therefore no more satisfying work than helping to prevent and failing that, to prosecute or to expose, as well as the law allowed—those cynical modern medicine men who try to fleece the American public of their hard-won money almost every hour of the day, every day of the week.

Barnum had a famous statement that there is a sucker born every minute. While that statement is too cynical, perhaps a restatement of it might be more useful and closer to the truth. For our purposes here, on occasion anyone regardless of his education or sophistication or experience can be cheated in this complicated society of ours. Local and State governments in a few States like New York, California, and now in Connecticut have demonstrated, on various levels, awareness of this problem of consumer vulnerability.

In New York City, for example, we have had legislation dealing with fradulent business practices on our books for many years. The city council has continued to study ways to strengthen our statutes. For example, within the last 2 weeks we held public hearing on a council bill that would forbid certain deceptive advertising practices. One of the first assignments that I gave my staff when I assumed my present office was the study of strengthening consumer legislation in the administrative code of the city of New York.

We must recognize that, however energetic we may wish to be on the local level, there are limitations to the ability of local officials to deal with the problem of consumer protection. For a close examination will show that consumer protection is one of the broad issues of our complex society that cuts across all State and municipal boundaries and that affect all levels of government. Like air pollution, like conservation of natural resources, like transportation, the problem of consumer protection requires cooperative action by all levels of government—local, State and Federal.

Our economy is national, not local, and goods are produced for a national market. We must turn for help to the State and to the Federal Government. I am delighted that Congressman ROSENTHAL has so clearly seen the Federal responsibility for action on a national level and commend him for his bill.

The problem of consumer protection is broader than the elimination of fraudulent or deceptive practices and the Rosenthal bill recognizes this fact. The bill recognizes, first, that the consumer is too often unrepresented and unheard in the councils of government. The Rosenthal bill would create a consumers department and thereby give a representative of the consumer direct access to the highest levels of the executive branch of government. It would charge a particular department with special responsibility for protection of the consumer's interest. This is a solution that has ample precedent in Federal Government. The Labor Department, for example, represents the interest of working people and the agriculture department represents the particular interests of farmers. All groups that are represented in the executive branch of the Federal Government by the Cabinet-level positions are highly organized at the present time, however weak they may have been when the need was felt for the special protection that a Cabinet-level department affords. The largest unorganized group in our society is the consumer, and surely he needs the same representation extended to better organized groups, especially, in an era of spiraling consumer prices and increased taxation. The consumer dollar is and will be more and more precious as time goes on.

May I say, parenthetically, that we have the same problem of representation in New York State. When Governor Harriman was elected in 1954, he appointed a special consumer counsel and Dr. Persia Campbell, whom you have heard today, served very well in that capacity for the 4 years of the Harriman administration. In that administration, the consumer representative thus had direct access to the Governor and was able to advise the Governor and the legislature on broad questions of consumer protection.

At the present time, we have no consumer counsel in our State, and the function of consumer protection is scattered among several departments. This situation is analogous to that in the Federal Government. When the agencies dealing with a function are so scattered, we may properly raise not only the question of access to the highest areas of policymaking, but also the question of the coordination that is necessary to produce a unified policy. I believe that consumer protection is important enough to deserve both access and unified policy. President Kennedy's Consumer Advisory Council summarized the problem well in their 1963 report:

"One lesson that may be learned from past experience in consumer representation is that such representation, to be effective, must be permanent, well-staffed, continuous and at a high level."

A matter of deep concern for me, as an elected official of the city of New York, is consumer education. This is an especially pressing problem for us because of the presence in our city of large numbers of poor and relatively unsophisticated people. They often do not know how to spend their money wisely and effectively in a complex urban society. One study of this problem was accurately titled "The Poor Pay More," I believe that if one aim of our national war on poverty is to put more money into the pockets of poor people, another aim should be to prevent money from being taken out of the pockets of any of our consumers by modern medicine men.

I am also concerned, as a former legislator, with the problem of a continuing review of consumer legislation. Those of us who have served in legislative bodies know that the Congressman or the State legislator is often overwhelmed by the volume of legislation with which he is required to deal. A department that could comment from a consumer's point of view on legislation, that could propose new consumer protection legislation on a continuing basis, would be invaluable.

A particularly important function that would be served by the Federal department of consumers is the representation of the consumer's interest before Federal regulatory agencies and in the Federal courts. We in New York City have a deep interest in the activities of these Federal agencies. To mention only two homely examples, the wholesale price of the natural gas used by the New Yorker to cook his food, is set by the Federal Power Commission. The thousands of commuters who daily come into New York travel on railroads regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is almost a truism that the consumer cannot obtain legal and expert advisers that, say, a public utility can employ to represent their interests. The Rosenthal bill would provide such professional assistance and thereby restore an approximate balance of power between consumers and producers.

Of course, we in New York State should not ask the Federal Government to provide representation in interstate commerce if we refuse to provide a similar representation of consumer interests in intrastate commerce. I advocate the establishment of a consumer's counsel in New York State that would perform functions on a State basis similar to those that would be performed on a national basis by the proposed department of consumers.

It is unfortunate that the major State agency presently operating in this area, the Bureau of Consumer Frauds and Protection, has a mandate extending only to fraudulent practices and sharp dealing. Certainly it has done fine work in individual cases, but the problem of the consumer is broader than fraud and its prosecution and any legislation that might ensue.

The President's Consumer Advisory Council summarized the consumer's rights in this fashion:

1. The right to safety, that is, the right to be protected from outright fraud, characterized by the shift in our thinking from "caveat emptor—let the buyer beware" to "let the buyer be assured."

2. The right to be informed—the right to have labels on packages that help the consumer, not confuse him; the right to a truthful statement of the real interest charged on loans, and so forth.

3. The right to choose, the right in a free market where prices and standards are not set by monopoly control.

4. The right to be heard, the right to effective and able representation at all levels of government.

This bill of rights of the consumer will serve for a long time as a statement of our goals. The Rosenthal bill is a long step toward the achievement of those goals, and I would hope that the local levels of government would respond to the challenge in the same creative manner.

[From the New York Post, May 3, 1966]

CONSUMERS IN THE CABINET

A consumer lobby, made up of representatives of 33 national organizations, is on its way to formal organization in Washington. The sponsors intend to furnish the consumer, too long an underdog in government, with a loud bark and a formidable bite.

This joint effort is overdue and we hope it will also improve the changes of a House bill to establish a Cabinet Department of Consumers.

As Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, pointed out during hearings on the bill, there are now 33 Federal agencies operating 296 separate consumer-protection programs. KENNEDY, State Attorney General Lefkowitz, City Council President O'Connor, and several consumer groups all endorsed the bill.

The only objector was Senator JAVITS, Republican, of New York. He endorses the idea of a Cabinet department for consumers, but contends that a stronger Department of Housing and a new Department of Transportation are more immediate goals.

We don't see his point. The Senate hearings on automobile safety and the fight confronting sponsors of the truth-in-packaging legislation both demonstrate the need to supply the consumer with the same Cabinet status that labor, agriculture, and business enjoy. He is too often the forgotten man.

VAN SINDEREN GIFT OF "BAY PSALM BOOK"

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a noteworthy act of private charity has made the Library of Congress and the Nation the custodians of one of the great treasures of American literature.

Mrs. Adrian Van Sinderen of Washington, Conn., in an act of notable generosity has delivered to the Library one of the few existing copies of the "Bay Psalm Book." This is a landmark volume in American literary and publishing history. It is a priceless cornerstone for the whole Library collection of notable American books.

The Nation is indebted to Mrs. Van Sinderen for this public-spirited act and future generations of Americans will be able to peruse this venerated book as a result of her thoughtfulness.

I am pleased to include herewith a fuller summary of this noteworthy event which was prepared by the Library of Congress:

> Mrs. Adrian Van Sinderen of Washington, Conn., has placed in the custody of the Library of Congress the last copy remaining in private hands of the famed "Bay Psalm Book" of 1640—the first extant book known to be published in English-speaking North America. Only 11 copies survive from the original edition.
>
> Mrs. Van Sinderen will retain ownership of the book during her lifetime but will bequeath the book to the Library of Congress. Accompanied by members of her family, she placed the rare volume in the hands of L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, in a brief ceremony in the Librarian's Office at 11 a.m. on Monday, May 2. Present were her daughter, Mrs. Donald Henry; her son, Alfred W. Van Sinderen, and his wife; and Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN of Connecticut.
>
> Printed in Cambridge, Mass., in 1640 by Stephen Daye, the "Bay Psalm Book" has as its proper title "The Whole Booke of Psalmes Faithfully Translated into English Metre." Of the 11 surviving copies, 10 are already in public institutions; 6 of the 10 are complete, although only 2 of them are described as "perfect" by Zoltán Haraszti in "The Enigma of the Bay Psalm Book" (1956).
>
> Mrs. Van Sinderen's copy is one of only five copies retaining their original binding and is bound in calf. Like three of these five copies, it lacks the title page and several leaves. The volume was acquired by her father, Alfred T. White of Brooklyn (1846-1921), at auction in 1894. It was once owned by clergyman Thomas Prince (1687–1758) of Boston, a friend of Cotton Mather and a bibliophile who accumulated five copies of the "Bay Psalm Book" for his library; to him, Haraszti attributes part of the credit for the fact that as many as 11 copies have survived.
>
> The two copies described as "perfect" are in the John Carter Brown Library in Providence, R.I., and in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, England; the first of these two retains its original calf binding. Of four other "complete" copies, two are in the Boston Public Library, one in the Yale University Library, and one in the New York Public Library. Three incomplete copies—which lack the title page and several leaves but retain their original bindings—are in the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Mass.; the Huntington Library in San Marino, Calif.; and the Rosenbach Foundation in Philadelphia; the American Antiquarian Society's copy is bound in vellum and the other two in calf. Another incomplete copy, rebound in 1900, is in the Harvard College Library.
>
> Mrs. Van Sinderen's volume will be kept in the Library's Rare Book Division.

CLARIFICATION OF THE STATUS OF NATIONAL GUARD CIVILIAN TECHNICIANS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, I introduced H.R. 14841, a bill to clarify the status of National Guard civilian technicians by declaring that they are employees of the United States, and as such, are eligible for all the rights and benefits of employees of the United States.

My bill is identical to the draft version submitted by the Department of Defense and introduced by Congressman HÉBERT. I add my wholehearted support to this legislation because I am vividly aware of the grave problems which exist because these civilian technicians, in effect, have no identifiable, and, therefore, responsible employer.

There are some 38,000 technicians working for the Army and Air National Guard in the several States and Puerto Rico. Their job is to care for the material, equipment, and armament of the National Guard. A condition of their employment is that they must be members of the National Guard as well as its employees, and so loss of membership with the Guard results in loss of employment. The major purpose in making it clear that the technicians are Federal employees arises from the fact that at the present neither the Federal Government nor the States acknowledge them as employees.

The technicians are hired and fired by the State Adjutants General, but their numbers and compensation are fixed by Federal authorities, they care for Federal property, they are paid directly by Federal finance officers from Federal appropriated funds, and they are governed in the main by Federal regulations. However, the Comptroller General of the United States has consistently held that National Guard technicians are not Federal employees. Yet the Department of Labor considers them covered by the Federal Employees Compensation Act. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that the technicians are not Federal employees within the meaning of the Federal Tort Claims Act. In my own State of New York, the courts there have held that the technicians are not State employees for the purposes of the State's civil service laws. The point of H.R. 14841 is to make it clear that the technicians are in law as well as fact Federal employees.

To my way of thinking, the failure in the past to clearly define the status of the civilian technicians makes its greatest impact on the normal fringe benefits that all of us have come to consider part and parcel of employment. It should be easy to see that no defined employer is going to cause trouble in this area.

New York's National Guard technicians are presently neither employees of the State nor employees of the Federal Government. Consequently they can look forward to neither Federal civil service retirement nor State retirement. Fortunately, the Federal Government does pick up the tab for the employer's share of the social security tax. So the technicians do have social security protection. In addition to this, they do accrue retirement credits as a result of their military service. For the technicians, these benefits are payable at age 60 on the basis of 20 or more years of military service. For example, a sergeant major, E–9 rating, will receive $1,600 per year with 2 years of active duty and 18 years of nonregular creditable service. An E–7 rating, the old master sergeant, with 2 years of active duty and 18 years National Guard duty, will get $60 per month. With 28 years of National Guard duty his retirement check would be $102 per month. This is all very good, but in a State like New York, where the technicians do not participate in the State retirement system, the technician at age 60 has only his military retirement to live on until he becomes eligible for his social security. To my way of thinking, this sort of treatment is intolerable and it should be corrected.

The Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems, in its report to the President this year, made this recommendation:

> Since National Guard technicians perform essentially Federal functions, necessary procedural changes should be effected by statute to provide formally for their Federal appointment and supervision. Their resulting formal designation by statute as Federal employees would entitle them to Civil Service Retirement Act credit for all past National Guard technician service.

In discussing the recommendation, the Cabinet Committee pointed out that the technicians constitute the full-time nucleus of key personnel assigned to the Guard. The Committee pointed to the fact that the technicians perform essentially Federal functions, but they are denied the benefits of Federal employees and that in the majority of States they are also denied the benefits of State employees. Then the Cabinet Committee stated:

> National Guard technicians should not thus be left in a legal no-man's land bereft in many cases of retirement coverage. The basic national security mission they are employed to perform clearly warrants enactment of legislation formally designating them as Federal employees for all purposes.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the Armed Services Committee will find time in its very heavy schedule to give this legislation early consideration.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN BANKERS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, as the RECORD indicates, I was out of Washington yesterday attending a meeting in which three distinguished North Carolina bankers were honored. This was a unique occasion, for it paid tribute to the leaders of the three leading banking organizations in America and it marked the first time three men from a single State has held these positions simultaneously.

It was a privilege for me to help pay tribute to Archie K. Davis, of Winston-Salem, president of the American Bankers Association, Addison H. Reese, of Charlotte, president of the Association of Reserve City Bankers, and Charles C. Cameron, of Raleigh, president of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America.

The occasion was highlighted by an address by the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, the Secretary of the Treasury.

While in North Carolina yesterday, I also had the opportunity and the privilege to attend groundbreaking ceremonies for one of North Carolina's newest and largest industrial plants, a new $40 million glass fiber manufacturing facility Pittsburgh Plate Glass is constructing at Lexington in Davidson County, N.C.

SPECIAL CENSUS IN CONNECTION WITH VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, under special order of the House, I made reference to a letter I had written to the Director of the Bureau of the Census and a number of questions I posed to the Census Bureau regarding a special census conducted in connection with the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I have now received a reply from the Honorable A. Ross Eckler, which is responsive to my questions. Director Eckler has made a full and honest reply to my queries and with permission granted I place the text of his letter to me in the RECORD so that other Members may have the opportunity to read his answers to my questions.

The letter follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, D.C.

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KORNEGAY: This is in reply to your letter of April 5, in which you raise some questions about the finding regarding the percentage voting in the presidential election in Guilford County in November 1964. I believe your questions are all answered in the following statement regarding our procedures, which provides some additional information that should be helpful to you.

The special census provided information on the total population, by age, as of March 1966. By comparing these figures with the figures from the 1960 census, which were also by age, an estimate of the population of voting age in November 1964 was prepared. This was then divided into the number of persons who voted for President in November 1964. As was pointed out to a member of your staff by Mr. Kehres of my staff, the legislative history of the act shows that this was the figure we planned to use, rather than the total number of persons who voted in the 1964 general election.

In the special census, we made no effort to determine the number of persons who were eligible to vote by virtue of having met residence or other requirements. No effort was made to include persons who may have been eligible to vote by absentee ballots. The act specifically refers to persons of voting age and omits any reference to eligibility to vote, although consideration had been given in the Congress to alternative definitions of the population base to be used in making the required computation. The questionnaires called for the quarter and year of birth of each individual. From these entries we computed the ages of the people enumerated.

In the special census we used the standard rules of residence which have been used in all of our population censuses for many years. Persons are enumerated where they usually reside. Persons in institutions such as prisons are counted at the institution. College students are counted where they are living while attending college. We made no effort to identify college students as such. The majority of college students are below voting age. Some of those who are of voting age are no doubt legal residents of the county and are living in their own homes or the homes of their parents.

The cost of the special census of Guilford County was approximately $75,000. The cost of all of the special censuses which were taken in North Carolina in connection with the Voting Rights Act is approximately $350,000. As has been noted in several instances, many of the communities gained from having an up-to-date census. We were interested to learn that there was some criticism in Forsyth when we announced that some of the special censuses which we had expected to take would not be necessary.

Special censuses were taken in those counties in which the estimates which could be made when the act was passed were so close to the 50-percent mark that, in view of the margin of error of these estimates, we concluded that it would be improper to certify counties on that basis. The percentage voting in Guilford County in 1960 was 49.9 percent. The first estimate for 1964 was a figure that was just below 50 percent. Under the circumstances, we believed that it was only proper to wait until we had the more reliable and up-to-date basis for the required estimates which would result from a census. The situation was similar in 23 other counties in North Carolina, 3 counties in Arizona, and 2 counties in California. Accordingly, funds were requested from the Congress to permit special censuses in these counties.

The questions on basements have no connection with voting rights. They were included because some time ago we were asked to assist the Office of Civil Defense in conducting surveys of basements in private homes. We agreed that in those areas where we were taking special censuses, the most economical way would be to add these questions to the regular schedule, with the small added expense to be borne by the Office of Civil Defense. (Last year we took a total of 429 special censuses, covering approximately 9.7 million persons in 24 States.) Since the information needed by the Office of Civil Defense could be collected without making an additional survey, this is an economical way of meeting their needs. It was decided that this same procedure should be followed in those counties in which special censuses were taken in connection with the Voting Rights Act.

The letter from Mrs. Gardner raises a number of questions in addition to those which you raised. We did not ask whether the home was owned or rented. The questions on number of children and their ages, and on the number of adults living in the home were standard questions to identify all persons living in the home. Information was secured about each person living in the county at the time of the census, including children. It has been our experience that this is the most effective way of getting a count of all persons in a given group, such as persons of voting age. To have asked only about persons of voting age, rather than listing each person separately, would have led to an undercount of the population of voting age.

Special censuses are ordinarily undertaken only at the request and expense of the community, county, or State requesting them.

Enclosed is a copy of the act. Section 4(b) specifies the responsibility of the Director of the Census in this connection.

Subsequent to the passage of the Voting Rights Act, the Attorney General identified 21 States which maintained tests or devices. The Director of the Census was required to determine for each of these States whether less than 50 percent had voted. In seven of these States (Alabama, Alaska, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia) a determination was made by me that less than 50-percent voted in the presidential election of 1964. For the remaining States (14), determinations were made for counties, since the States percentage who voted in 1964 was more than 50 percent.

North Carolina contained the largest group of counties that potentially would fall under the purview of the act. Estimates of the population of voting age as of November 1964 were, therefore, prepared for all counties in North Carolina using the Bureau's customary estimating procedures based upon births, deaths, and measures of migration. Initially, it was determined that in 26 North Carolina counties less than 50 percent of the population had voted in the 1964 presidential election. These were so certified.

As pointed out above, this left a number of counties for which I concluded that special censuses would be required to permit me to fulfill the responsibilities which had been assigned to me. I so reported to the Secretary of Commerce and then requested the necessary funds from the Congress.

The act requires me, as Director of the Census, to establish only a mathematical relationship. I was not directed to make any finding as to discrimination, and I have not made such a finding. I am aware that once I have published a finding as to the proportion of persons of voting age who voted, the law provides that there will be certain consequences, and that the Attorney General may take additional action.

The procedure for exempting a county which has been certified under the act is detailed in section 13, Public Law 89-110.

If we can be of further assistance in this matter, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

A. ROSS ECKLER,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

VIETNAM

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, so that there can be no confusion or doubt as to the stand which I have taken in regard to the Vietnam conflict, I am sending the following report to my constituents in the 29th Congressional District of California:

On August 7, 1964, I voted for the Tonkin Bay resolution, submitted to the Congress by the President following the attack on U.S. forces by North Vietnamese torpedo boats. At that time, I said:

"I am of the very firm conviction that the peace and freedom which this country is dedicated to achieve in South Vietnam will not be achieved by the gradual escalation of this unfortunate war."

At that time the United States had about 18,000 troops in Vietnam—ostensibly as advisers. Today we have a quarter of a million troops engaged in active combat, plus a massive air and naval force. We are still no closer to either peace or victory than we were then.

I also suggested then—21 months ago—that instead of broadening the war we should be seeking, and supporting, the full-scale intervention of the United Nations—an intervention which we belatedly asked for a year and a half, later in January 1966.

On February 8, 1965, in a speech before the House of Representatives, I suggested that the southeast Asian area be neutralized through the creation of a U.N. "zone of peace" and that a Southeast Asian Development Bank be created through which economic aid could be channeled. Subsequently, the administration did propose such a development bank, and the bill authorizing our participation was signed into law on March 16, 1966.

At about the same time as I delivered that speech, the United States began the bombing of North Vietnam. The continued bombing makes much more difficult the achievement of a negotiated peace.

In another speech a few days later, on February 24, 1965, I said:

"The realities of the world today force us to recognize that our country is not all-powerful; that our national will cannot prevail in every situation; and that we may even be wrong in our evaluation of what is desired by, or desirable for, the citizens of other countries."

In the hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs a year later, this same view was expressed by some of this country's leading diplomatic figures, including George Kennan and former Generals Gavin and Ridgway. Additional emphasis has been given to this point by the recurrent mass demonstrations in South Vietnam displaying anti-U.S. sentiments.

On May 5, 1965, the President asked for a supplemental appropriation of $700 million to continue the buildup of U.S. forces in South Vietnam. I voted against that appropriation, and at the same time made a speech calling for the adoption of a constitution and the holding of free elections in South Vietnam, so that the people of that country could determine for themselves the course they wished to follow. Instead of following that procedure, we continued to embrace the military dictators we had placed in office. Today, these military dictators have been forced to accede to such elections under massive public pressure and the United States has been reluctantly dragged along against its will.

I said in that speech:

"Mr. President, you have said that you 'will never be second in the search for such a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.' I beg you to consider what I am saying here, for I know that with your vision and desire for peace you can do far more than what I am supporting. And, when you come to the Congress with a request for $700 million for such a program—a program that points toward the goal of a world free from war—you will find me fighting for it."

On August 2, 1965, just after the President announced new steps in the escalation of our war efforts in South Vietnam, I made another speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, pointing out again the mistakes we were making in that unfortunate country. I concluded my speech with the following remarks:

"I desire that my country be the voice for freedom, justice, and economic progress in the world. I believe that our success in that role will do immeasurably more to roll back communism than will our support of petty dictators around the world, our devotion to a crumbling status quo that claims to be anti-Communist, and our willingness to allow our foreign policy to be controlled by the machinations of the CIA.

"I desire that my country lead the way toward a new world, a world based on law and respect for individual human beings. This is the road to victory today—not just victory for the United States, but victory for mankind. The other road, which is the road followed by all the great empires of the past—the road of power exercised for the sake of power and national honor—leads but to oblivion."

As 1965 drew to a close I made two major statements spelling out my position on Vietnam. On November 27, in Washington, D.C., before 25,000 people assembled at the Washington Monument, I offered my suggestions as to how we might bring an end to the war by negotiation. On December 2, I issued a position paper to the press summarizing briefly my views on Vietnam. In this statement I said:

"I accept and support the basic objectives set forth by the President—that we intend to resist and defeat any military solution by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong), and that we are willing to unconditionally negotiate a solution to the conflict at the conference table. I do not advocate a unilateral withdrawal of American troops or a surrender of South Vietnam to North Vietnam by negotiation or in any other way."

However, the United States, while calling for peace through negotiation, has continued its course of military escalation, and has refused to recognize and accept the minimum conditions necessary for realistic negotiations. The Ky government, which we maintain in Saigon, has not only refused to consider negotiations of any sort, but, much like the situation in Korea 13 years ago under Syngman Rhee and in Formosa under Chiang Kai-shek—has called for complete defeat of the enemy, destruction of his cities, and the invasion of the Chinese mainland. This country, to a disastrous extent, is being manipulated in its basic foreign policy by a handful of petty tyrants who cannot maintain themselves for 1 day in their own country without the massive commitment of U.S. military and economic aid.

During 1966 a growing number of Congressmen have called on the President for an end to escalation, for intervention by the United Nations, and for a more realistic negotiating position. The President, seeking a course between the extremes of all-out war and unilateral withdrawal, has not yet found a satisfactory answer. He ordered a pause in bombing and a flamboyant peace drive around the world, but made no basic changes in the U.S. negotiation position. He finally permitted the Vietnam problem to be presented to the U.N. Security Council, but ordered a resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam at the same time. He accepted the goal of free elections for a civilian government in South Vietnam, but was caught unprepared by the Buddhist demand for action now.

The impact of the Vietnam war, which is still not a war, has grown with frightening speed. Ten billion dollars a year, moving up toward $20 billion, has been committed to it. At the present time this amounts to a yearly cost of approximately $50 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Taxes are being increased or speeded up. Prices are rising. The casualty figures are increasing month by month.

Congress is not asked to determine the policy of our country as to continued escalation. We are not even asked to declare war, although only the Congress has the power to declare war under the U.S. Constitution. We are only asked to appropriate more and more money, to enact more and more controls, and to raise more and more tax revenues. At the same time, we are provided with less and less information and, if possible, less and less justification for our involvement in a bloody civil war 8,000 miles away—a war which would have ended years ago if we had not attempted to control that country—a war which even the people we are supposed to be helping no longer seem to want.

It is not enough for a Congressman to merely complain to his constituents, or his colleagues, or even the administration, that he is not happy with the course of events in Vietnam. It is his responsibility to use his vote, as provided in the Constitution. Therefore, during the first few months of 1966 I have used my vote to oppose further escalation in Vietnam. I have voted against the supplemental military appropriations for 1966, against the supplemental foreign aid appropriations for 1966, and against the tax increases to finance the war. I plan to continue to vote in this manner as long as I am a Member of Congress.

More than 2 months ago, before the outbreak of Buddhist-led demonstrations, I told my colleagues in the House of Representatives, as I voted against the $4.8 billion supplemental military authorization for Vietnam:

"The contradictions of the U.S. course in Vietnam may soon be apparent for all our people and all the world to see. The political leaders of this country have contended that our efforts in Vietnam have been motivated by a desire only for the freedom of the people of that country. We are publicly committed to accept the free choice of the people of South Vietnam as to the kind of government which they desire. For 16 years, however, U.S. policies have prevented the expression of that free choice, despite all our protestations to the contrary. When the day comes that that choice is expressed—and that choice repudiates the United States and its hand-picked military dictators—the people of this country will be entitled to ask the question: 'Why have we labored and sacrificed so much, and in vain?' "

That day may be coming sooner than I thought at that time. For now it appears that we will have an election soon in the areas which are presumably under the control of the government we are helping. It is very likely that these people will elect a government which will seek peace by direct negotiation with the National Liberation Front. If this is the result of an election held among the 50 percent or less of the population that we are supposed to be helping, what would be the result of an election held among 100 percent of the people of South Vietnam? The answer is so obvious

that even those advisers whose professional and political fortunes have been invested in almost a generation of mistaken policies will be unable to escape the consequences.

As a Congressman with two sons serving in the U.S. Navy, I am deeply concerned about how their lives are committed on behalf of this great Nation. They would give their lives, as any of us would, in defense of this country and in defense of the freedom of our allies or of the principles which we hold dear. However, to give those lives in support of policies which I believe are wrong, where no vital interest of this country is involved, and where the people we are helping evidently do not want us, is the surest way to destroy all that we have sacrificed for over the years.

CUTTING DOWN TRAFFIC ACCIDENT DEATHS AT NIGHT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking recently of the need to illuminate our highways, and every evening, when the shadows of darkness fall, I am reminded again that while darkness prevails, over one-half of the traffic accident deaths in our Nation will occur.

The difference between daylight and nighttime is dramatically illustrated by figures. The customary unit of street illumination intensity is the horizontal foot-candle. On a bright sunny day, the roadway receives about 9,600 foot-candles of illumination. Under bright moonlight, which exists only a few nights in each month at best, the figure is 0.02 foot-candles, or one-half millionth as much light. The human eye is a truly wonderful instrument, in its ability to distinguish features across such a broad range.

For ordinary reading, we need at least 30 foot-candles on the page, and for close work, at least 70 foot-candles. For outdoor night sports, such as baseball, more than 100 foot-candles are needed on the playing field.

Illumination levels for streets and highways, I am told by the experts, can be much lower than the above figures for reading and playing sports. The task for the driver to see and for the pedestrian to see requires less precision. The driver should, however, be able to discern a potential hazard, at a sufficient distance to recognize, react, brake, and stop his vehicle. The distance required to stop a vehicle increases, of course, with speed. Similarly, the distance from which the driver can see an object, judge distance and movement, and discern signs varies with the amount of light on the object and on the roadway.

But there are also other factors, such as frequency of occurrence. A street in a business area would have far more pedestrians, for example, crossing the roadway than would a residential side street. It would also have more traffic and more distractions, such as decorated store windows, neon signs, and other attracting features, than does the neighborhood street. In such a downtown area, more illumination is needed to clearly separate the street from its surrounding objects.

In addition, there is the problem of background brightness. As the range of brightness in the driver's field of view increases, his ability to see is decreased. This is familiar to every driver, when, for example, he drives out of bright sunlight into a tunnel or long underpass. The eye must adapt to the change, but we all have "built-in" human limitations. And, unfortunately, like everything else, these limitations increase with age. A uniform level of illumination reduces the problem.

An additional factor that must be considered is glare. We all know that the glare of oncoming vehicle headlights at night can temporarily blind us. By illuminating the roadway, the effect of this glare is greatly diminished.

The minimum levels of roadway lighting, to afford reasonable seeing ability, within economic practicality, and this latter point I stress because I am aware of the value of the dollar and the expenses currently facing our Government, have been developed by the Institute of Traffic Engineers and the Illuminating Engineering Society and presented as the American Standard Practice for Roadway Lighting by the American Standards Association on November 7, 1963. As explained in their report to the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives recently, these minimum levels vary by the type of street or highway being lighted.

For the lighting of residential side streets, an average illumination of 0.2 foot-candle—10 times moonlight—is specified. This level will provide reasonable traffic safety on such low-volume and low-speed streets, and will have the additional benefit of reducing night crime.

On major arterial streets, traversing business areas, a level of 2 foot-candles is needed to compensate for greatly increased traffic, pedestrians, and background distractions such as signs, used-car lots, side streets, and stores. Various other levels between these limits are needed for intermediate degrees of traffic volumes, speeds, and abutting land use.

Along expressways and freeways, the seeing task is slightly changed. There are normally no pedestrians, although I was amazed to learn that 17 pedestrians were killed on the Chicago freeway system during 1963 and 1964. There are no driveways and no parked cars, other than those out of commission or in accidents. There are no traffic signals to artificially stop the flow of traffic, except that congestion on many sections does produce momentary stoppages. Despite the expensive and generally well-engineered design features of our freeways, accidents do occur. The rate per vehicle mile of travel is of course much lower than for surface streets and older type highways.

But speed on our expressways is far faster than on other roads, and decisions must be made faster based on farsighted vision. Lighting levels have been specified therefore which are felt to be appropriate to the traffic and seeing task problems facing the freeway driver. For urban freeways, about 1.4 foot-candles minimum is recommended, and for rural freeways, about 1 foot-candle. At interchange locations, these intensities should be increased by 50 percent.

For comparison, some of the lighted California freeways have been reported to have only 0.2 to 0.35 foot-candle. The lighted Chicago freeways have only 0.6 to 1 foot-candle. The lighted Detroit freeways have only 0.6 to 1.2 foot-candles. It should be noted that a difference exists in the accident rates under various levels of freeway lighting. Generally speaking, the better lighted freeways show a lower night accident rate.

In addition to the level of lighting needed for traffic safety, the uniformity—that is, even coverage—of surface illumination is important. For all but the residential streets, a uniformity no poorer than 1 to one-third is specified. This means that at no point should the illumination be less than one-third the average illumination.

There is an urgent need for the adoption of these minimum standards for all our streets and highways. Their current guide specifies only 0.6 foot-candles and uniformity ratios as poor as one-sixth and even one-eighth. At the speeds of freeway night travel—45 to 65 miles per hour—safe stopping distance requires long advance discernment of ramp locations and curvature, main freeway curvature, roadside obstacles such as bridge piers, guardrails, and signposts. These requirements often exceed the normal range of headlights. By proper lighting of the freeway, the glare effect from oncoming headlights is also greatly reduced. Lane lines and shoulder curbs can be better discerned, especially during inclement weather. Under low levels of light, and with poor uniformity, night accidents will occur more frequently.

Mr. Speaker, I am harping on this subject because someone must. In this session of the Congress we are going to pass the most significant piece of legislation to provide for the safe travel of the American public in the history of the Nation, and I am all for it. But we must not fail to recognize that a major element in the safe passage of the driving public, which I would guess includes just about every person in the country, is vision, and without it our other efforts may well be wasted.

FOUNDER OF MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the anniversary so sacred to the memory of mothers, it is with great pleasure that I have asked unanimous consent that the following material be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to validate Miss Harriett S. Lee as one of the founders of Mother's Day.

Back in 1903 the State convention of the Native Daughters of the Golden West was held in Red Bluff, Calif. It was at this convention, to which Miss Lee was a delegate, that she presented the following resolution:

> *Resolved*, To amend Constitution Grand Parlor, article XIII, section 24, by including Mother's Day as one of the special days of the Order NDGW.

The resolution was adopted.

Miss Harriett Lee, one of Woodland, Calif.'s pioneer educators and former superintendent of schools for Yolo County, addressed the State assembly in 1935, at the invitation of Miss Eleanor Miller, Assemblywoman from Los Angeles, to tell the assemblymen of the beginning, growth, and spirit of the day.

In 1909, Miss Lee had a resolution introduced in the California State Legislature which set 1 day a year aside for honoring California mothers. It was passed and Gov. James N. Gillette proclaimed the day.

Miss Lee was one of 8 girls in a California pioneer family of 13. All of her sisters were teachers. At one time five of them, Helen, "Hattie," Jennie, Mattie, and Mary, taught in Yolo County, Calif. Miss Lee began teaching in 1879. She retired in 1927. The last 12 years of her career she served as superintendent of schools. She had long been a member of the county board of education.

On July 1, 1951, death stilled the warm, brave heart of Miss Harriett S. Lee.

After thorough research by the Library of Congress in Washington, Miss Harriett S. Lee was indeed one of the first founders of Mother's Day.

Let us salute a great educator and a fine woman in officially recognizing her as one of the first founders of Mother's Day.

The aforementioned material is as follows:

Data Concerning Harriett S. Lee, Founder of Mother's Day in California

[From basement of State capitol]

Assembly journal, May 13, 1935 (Friday p. 3193–3194), Mother's Day observance, California State Legislature, assembly chamber, State capitol. Guest of honor included Miss Harriett S. Lee, founder of Mother's Day in California.

Assembly journal, May 9, 1941 (p. 2811, 67th legislative day), recess at 10:45 a.m. on motion of Mr. Lyon, that the assemble recess until 2 p.m. for the purpose of participating in a Mother's Day program in the assembly chamber.

Governor Gillette proclaimed the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day in 1909 but no proof as the first proclamation on record in the State capitol basement files is 1918.

[Newspaper followups]

Examiner, May 9, 1914, small item on declaration.

May 13, 1923, page 13N (85/1): "Mother's Day started in Philadelphia the second Sunday of May 1906. Miss Anna Jarvis lost her mother through death. So deep and lasting was grief that a few friends the following year united to send her letters on the anniversary of her mother's passing. Others heard of it and the second year she received thousands. In 1913 Congress passed an act officially recognizing the second Sunday in May as an annual day for mothers."

Chronicle, May 5, 1935: Governor Merriman's proclamation. May 12, 1940, page 10: Mother's Day mentioned in events of day.

San Francisco Call, April 25, 1909 (microfilm):

"GILLETTE ASKS STATE TO OBSERVE MOTHER'S DAY. ISSUES PROCLAMATION FOR MAY 9 TO BE KEPT IN CHURCHES

"SACRAMENTO, April 24.—Governor Gillette issued a proclamation today setting apart Sunday, May 9, to be observed as Mother's Day.

"These are his words:

"'I hereby desire to call the attention of the citizenship of our great State to the fact that while I have no authority of law to issue a proclamation setting apart a day for this purpose, I request that the second Sunday in May be observed in all churches of the State as Mother's Day.'"

Proceedings of the Annual Session of the Grand Parlor of the Native Daughters of the Golden West

June 1903, page 515:

"Suggestion 28, that the Grand Parlor add a section to article VI, constitution, Grand Parlor, reading: 'Special days of the order shall be observed as follows: Pioneer Day, September 9; Flag Day, first regular meeting in October; Thanksgiving Day, on the meeting nearest the day; Arbor Day, in the springtime; children's birthday party, date left to the choice of individual parlor; Memorial Day, the first Sunday in May.

June 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 1905 (19th annual session), page 679:

"MOTHER'S DAY RESOLUTION

"*Resolved*, To amend Constitution Grand Parlor, article XIII, section 24, by including Mother's Day as one of the special days of the order NDGW.

"HARRIETT S. LEE,
"*Grand Trustee.*
"LAURA J. FRAKES,
"*Grand Secretary.*

"Moved by Louise M. Roussel, Bonita Parlor No. 10, seconded by Leah Wrede, Calaveras Parlor No. 103, that the resolution be adopted. Carried."

(The scrapbook pages came from Viola (Mrs. Bernard H.) Schulte, of Carmel, who is a niece of Miss Lee and who Miss Lee lived with until her passing.)

[From the Daily Democrat, Mar. 3, 1966]

Woodland Launches Mother's Day Drive

(By Charles S. Paynton)

Woodland today launches its official campaign to obtain nationwide recognition of this city as the birthplace of Mother's Day and of the late Harriett S. Lee as its founder.

Months of research on the part of the members of the publicity and public relations committee of the Woodland Chamber of Commerce have resulted in the compilation of a formidable array of documentary material to support the claims of this city as the "birthplace of the annual Mother's Day observance."

Acceptance in Yolo County of Miss Lee's role in the founding of Mother's Day is not new. For many years, the former Yolo County educator has been recognized without question as the founder.

From a neighboring Sacramentan, Everett Udall, member of the Governor's statewide historical commission, active in both the Sacramento city and county historical societies, came the suggestion that Woodland do "something about its claim to fame."

Udall spoke last October at a combined luncheon meeting of the Woodland Chamber of Commerce and the Yolo County historical society. He told his Yolo County audience that Woodland had an "unexploited bombshell in the nature of an event of historical significance."

Jack Harmonson, Woodland area manager for Pacific Telephone, and William O. Rose, Woodland office manager and a vice president of Title Insurance & Trust Co., went to work for the chamber of commerce, seeking the documentary evidence to establish officially what Woodland always has claimed—that the idea of an annual Mother's Day observance was born in this city, the brainchild of one of Yolo County's most illustrious educators.

Already tentative plans are underway to make Mother's Day on May 8 an event of unusual significance in Woodland this year. Dick Klenhard, executive manager of the Woodland Chamber of Commerce, says a plaque may be placed at that time. Still unanswered is the question of whether the late Miss Lee had a piece of property which she owned in Woodland which might be used as a site for the contemplated plaque.

From the files of the Democrat the chamber of commerce researchers have taken many accounts of the early Mother's Day observances sponsored and furthered by Miss Lee.

On April 27, 1926, the Democrat published a story written by Ross Marshall, International News correspondent, which stated in part:

"Founding of Mother's Day, now nationally observed, was recalled by Miss Harriett S. Lee, of Woodland, participating in the observance of Mother's Day conducted by members of the State legislature and State officials in the assembly chambers of the State capitol Friday morning.

"Miss Lee, originator of Mother's Day, told how 32 years ago (in 1894) she called to her little classroom in a Woodland school the mothers of her pupils in recognition of motherhood, an observance which has spread as one of the most solemn observances in the Nation.

"The Native Daughters of the Golden West, by resolution endorsed the observance, and in turn, Miss Lee recalled, Governor Gillette by proclamation called for statewide observance. Then years later, President Wilson proclaimed Mother's Day as one for national recognition."

The birth of Mother's Day officially dates from 1903. In that year, the delegates to the State convention of the Native Daughters of the Golden West, assembled in Red Bluff, approved a proposal made by Miss Lee that parlors throughout the State proceed to set aside a day to honor mothers and that proper programs be held.

Six years later, the observance had become so general in California that Governor Gillette by official proclamation set aside second Sunday in May as Mother's Day in the State.

Documentary evidence concerning the Woodland claim to Mother's Day include from the journal of the California State Assembly for May 13, 1935, the notation: "Mother's Day observance, California State Legislature assembly chamber, State capitol; guests of honor included Miss Harriett S. Lee, founder of Mother's Day in California."

From the State library came a newspaper clipping stating that "Mother's Day started in Philadelphia the second Sunday in May 1906. Miss Anna Jarvis lost her mother through death—so deep and lasting was grief that a few friends the following year united to send letters on the anniversary of her mother's passing. Others heard of it and the second year she received thousands. In 1913, Congress passed an act officially recognizing the second Sunday in May as an annual day for mothers."

The event mentioned in the above newspaper clipping took place in 1906, 3 years after Miss Lee had presented her proposals to the Native Daughters of California, many years after the former Yolo County superintendent of schools had held her first Mother's Day observances.

The documentary evidence which Harmonson and Rose have assembled include stories on the 92d birthday anniversary of Miss Lee and of her death shortly afterward on June 30, 1951. In all of the articles, she is listed as the "founder of Mother's Day." Other stories tell of the opening and dedication of the senior elementary school in Woodland which perpetuates the name of the former educator and again she is given unquestioned credit as being the Mother's Day founder. The Orange Pearl, student publication of Woodland High School, expressed regret in an issue of May 4, 1926, that "Miss Lee would not be a candidate for reelection as county superintendent of schools."

As the guest of State legislators, Miss Lee atended sessions of the assembly and the State senate always recognized according to the clippings, as the founder of Mother's Day.

Woodland Chamber of Commerce officials are confident they now have the documentary evidence to prove their claims—that here in Woodland the idea of Mother's Day was born, that from this city the observance which was originated by Harriett S. Lee was spread throughout the State and the Nation until in 1914 it was proclaimed nationally by President Woodrow Wilson.

And today, the city launches its campaign to obtain official acceptance throughout the 50 States of Woodland as the birthplace of Mother's Day.

[From a Sacramento Newspaper May 14, 1923]

Yolo Woman Is Held Originator of Mother's Day—Miss Harriott S. Lee Started Movement at Woodland and Red Bluff; Native Daughters Seek Recognition

Steps to establish for all time that Mother's Day, observed over the country in homage to America's motherhood, had its inception in Superior, Calif., are being taken by the Grand Parlor of Native Daughters of the Golden West.

It is claimed Miss Harriett S. Lee, Yolo County superintendent of schools, originated the idea of setting aside 1 day each year to honor "the hand that rules the world," and presented it to the grand parlor in convention at Red Bluff, just 20 years ago.

FIRST IN WOODLAND

It is held the first Mother's Day was celebrated by Woodland Parlor of Native Daughters. The observance attracted considerable attention in the Yolo County capital, and Miss Lee, who had suggested it, was sent as a delegate to the Red Bluff convention. There she told of the success of the plan in Woodland and offered it for adoption by the grand parlor.

Following the first statewide celebration, Mother's Day became widely recognized. Thoughts of home played on the heartstrings of distant children, and telegrams and letters to faraway mothers soon followed in large numbers. The idea spread throughout the country.

In view of its wide-spread recognition, the Grand Parlor of Native Daughters now has started a move to establish the credit for its origin.

Miss Lee is a past president of Woodland Parlor of Native Daughters and still takes an active part in the activities of the order.

[From a Sacramento newspaper, May 14, 1923]

Mother's Day

(By Joe Beamis)

Sunday will be observed as Mother's Day, and like many of these special days, we will observe it without much thought as to how it started or who was responsible for it. But it so happens that Mother's Day, which will be observed over the Nation this Sunday, was originated by a Woodland resident who still lives among us. She is Miss Harriett S. Lee, former Yolo County school teacher and county superintendent of schools. Although there were two other claimants for the honor of being originator of the observance, Miss Lee's claim of being responsible for the present nationwide observance is generally accepted.

It was back in 1903 that the State convention of Native Daughters was being held in Red Bluff. It was at this convention, to which Miss Lee was a delegate, that she suggested the Mother's Day observance. The proposal met with instant favor, and parlors throughout the State proceeded to set aside a day for that purpose and proper programs were held, honoring the mothers of Native Daughters. Six years later, in 1909, that observance had become so general throughout California that Governor James N. Gillette, by official proclamation, set aside the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day in California. With that act, the observance won statewide recognition outside the ranks of the Native Daughters.

Then, 5 years later in 1914, President Woodrow Wilson issued the first national proclamation setting aside a day for the honoring of mothers throughout the United States. Significantly, the national day was made to coincide with the California observance, and today the second Sunday in May remains as the official Mother's Day of the Nation. So, from a humble suggestion at a Red Bluff convention in 1903, has come a significant day that is observed each year throughout the Nation. It is a day that has a particular appeal to all, for respect and love for mother is one of the prevalent traits in all of us. It is an occasion that causes us to think back to our mothers, and humbly acknowledge our indebtedness to them. With Mother's Day set for this Sunday, let us all be sure that we do our part to remember mother, and at the same time pay tribute to the Woodland woman who had the thoughtfulness and inspiration to suggest the annual observance.

[From Espario, Yolo County, Calif., Apr. 30, 1966]

Miss Lee Withdraws

The announcement of the county superintendent of schools, Miss Harriet S. Lee, that she will not again stand for reelection is the most severe commentary on our county government ever made. An opportunity was given to pay for the services of this office in proportion to its importance, but that opportunity was not taken. There is not a voter or other citizen in the county who takes a decent pride in its standing who is not willing to retain a valuable public servant and pay him according to his worth. Why such voters and citizens will allow the important office of county superintendent of schools to become vacated by one of the best trained and most efficient superintendents in California, simply by refusing to provide for proper clerical aid, is a question the people of Yolo County should seriously consider. When unlimited money is advanced for every whim of the people regarding special courses in the schools, special agents, special equipment, all somewhat questionable in value as real educational service, and a beggar's dole handed to the most important officer in the county—calling it then a salary—then there can't be nerve left in the public tongue to criticize the school system.

The public will get just what it pays for. If it desires good schools for its children, it will not get them by offering to the most important school officer in the county a wage which no well-trained educator can afford to take.

Miss Lee has for many years given distinguished service to her county's schools. Her remarkable energy and cultivated mind have left the genuine stamp of a thoroughbred on all those many lives with whom she has associated and upon whom her influence has fallen. The loss of the county in losing her guiding hand in educational policy cannot be measured in money and no excuse worth stating can be offered those who might have made it possible for her to remain in office.

Lee School Dedication Held Here—Civic and Fraternal Groups Attend Rites

Dedication ceremonies were held yesterday afternoon at the new Harriett Lee Elementary School on West Street, named in memory of the woman whose many years of service as teacher and as county superintendent of schools, won for her the love and respect of thousands of Yoloans.

City officials, representatives of schools, civic and fraternal organizations, and friends and relatives of the late Harriett Stoddard Lee attended the ceremonies held under the large oak trees on the school lawn.

The Dingle School band provided opening music. Members of Yolo Post No. 77 of the American Legion presented the colors, and the invocation was delivered by the Rev. Willard Rand, Jr., pastor of the Methodist Church.

Among the many guests were Mrs. Mary Lee Pettit, of Visalia, sister of Miss Lee; Mrs. Bernard Senuite, Miss Lee's niece, and her husband, of Carmel; and Col. C. S. Stoddard, nephew of Miss Lee, and his wife, of Pebble Beach.

Mrs. Pettit, who once taught school in Yolo, was the first teacher of Mrs. Katherine Fitz, principal of the Lee school.

Mrs. E. J. Elston, history and landmarks chairman of the Woodland Parlor, No. 90, Native Daughters of the Golden West, of which Miss Lee was a charter member, delivered a memorial eulogy.

She described the late educator as one "whose deep love of children endeared her to children throughout the county."

Mrs. Dorothy Minges, Native Daughters civic participation chairman, presented the Bear flag to Mrs. Fitz.

The mold of a dedicatory plaque was unveiled by Mrs. Jean Pitts, president of Woodland Parlor, and held by W. K. Cobb, city superintendent of schools.

The plaque will be inscribed: "Dedicated to the youth of Woodland in the memory of Harriet Stoddard Lee, 1859–1951, teacher, county superintendent of schools, and founder of Mother's Day in California. Dedicated October 17, 1954, by Woodland Parlor, No. 90, Native Daughters of the Golden West."

Ceremonies To Honor Late Yolo Educator

Dedication of the new Harriett S. Lee School on West Street will take place Sunday at 3 p.m.

Open house will be held in the new building following the ceremonies which will be opened with music by the Dingle School band under the direction of William Linford, instructor.

Presentation of the colors by Yolo Post No. 77, American Legion will be held. Bill Doty is the post commander. The invocation will be delivered by the Rev. W. J. Rand, Jr., pastor of the Methodist Church.

Introduction of guests will follow. Several high officials of the Native Daughters of the Golden West are expected to attend.

Mrs. E. J. Elston, history and landmarks chairman of Woodland parlor, No. 90, NDGW, will deliver a memorial eulogy for the late Miss Harriett S. Lee, former county superintendent of schools for whom the new building was named.

Mrs. Dorothy Minges, civic participation chairman, Native Daughters, will present the Bear flag to the school. Unveiling of a plaque will be handled by Mrs. Jean Pitts, president of Woodland parlor.

Miss Henrietta Toothaker, past grand president of the Native Daughters and a local teacher, will lead the singing of the "Hymn to California."

Dedication of the building will be made by George M. Bogart, chairman of the Woodland Elementary School Board. The presentation of the keys will be followed by adjournment.

The late Harriett S. Lee, 1 of 10 children born to pioneer parents who came to California from Illinois, was educated in the Woodland public schools, Hesperian College and the Teachers' Preparatory School in Sacramento. She began her teaching career in the Lee school district in Sutter County.

She was appointed to the Yolo County Board of Education in 1892 and served for 12 years as county superintendent of schools, retiring in 1927.

Miss Lee was active in club and lodge work and was a charter member of Woodland parlor, Native Daughters. She was the instigator in establishment of Mother's Day in the State of California and sponsored the bill presented to the legislature to set the second Sunday of May as Mother's Day. The bill was signed by Governor Gillette. In 1914, President Woodrow Wilson signed a bill making the second Sunday in May a national holiday. In 1935, Miss Lee appeared before a joint session of the State legislature and was given official recognition as the founder of Mother's Day in California, Mrs. Elston says.

The Harriett S. Lee School is a modern type school designed as a functional learning center for the education of elementary schoolchildren. In the master development plans for Woodland schools it is contemplated the school may someday be expanded to serve as a junior high school.

Mrs. Katherine Fitz is the principal.

All members of Yolo Post, No. 77, American Legion who can arrange to be present, are asked to attend the flag presentation. They are requested to wear their Legion caps.

Local Woman Recalls First Mother's Day to Assembly

(By Ross Marshall)

Founding of Mother's Day, now nationally observed, was recalled by Miss Harriett S. Lee, of Woodland, participating in the observance of Mother's Day conducted by members of the State legislature and State officials in the assembly chambers of the State capitol Friday morning.

Miss Lee, originator of Mother's Day, told how 32 years ago she called to her little classroom in a Woodland school the mothers of her pupils in recognition of motherhood, an observance which now has spread as one of the most solemn observances of the Nation. A prize was given that day to the mother with the whitest hair. Costumes were varied, Miss Lee telling how she had to persuade some mothers to come anyway, although they told her, "they had nothing to wear."

STATEWIDE OBSERVANCE

The Native Daughters of the Golden West, by resolution endorsed the observance, and in turn, Miss Lee recalled, former Governor Gillette by proclamation called for statewide observance. Then, years later, President Wilson proclaimed Mother's Day as one for national recognition.

Miss Lee pleaded for more respect on the part of present-day children for their mothers.

"Thirty-two years ago I was discussing women's suffrage with one of my boy pupils and I asked him if he wanted his mother to vote," Miss Lee said. "He replied, 'She hasn't got sense enough to vote.'

SEEKS NEW ATTITUDE

"It seemed to me right then time to do something to change this attitude on the part of children toward their mothers and that was the motivating influence that caused me to observe the first Mother's Day."

An inspiring tribute to the pioneer mothers of California also was delivered by Miss Lee, who has had a long career as a teacher and superintendent of schools in Yolo County.

Gov. Frank F. Merriam urged that the American mother cherish for her children the right to be equitably governed. He said the greatest contribution that lawmakers as well as the people generally can make to the mothers of California is to conduct our affairs to make a mother's ideal effective among the peoples of the earth so that individual good will, national tranquillity and world friendship may prevail.

Assemblyman Eleanor Miller presided as chairwoman in an assembly chamber decked with huge floral pieces. Speaker Edward Craig of the assembly and President pro tem William Rich of the senate spoke briefly. Miss Miller read poems of appreciation of motherhood and songs dedicated to motherhood were offered by a trio and vocalist.

[Apr. 27, 1926]

Miss Harriett Lee Plans To Quit Post at Close of School Office Term

Because of the inadequate salary allowed her by the law, Miss Harriett S. Lee, Yolo County school superintendent for 12 years, is to retire from office when her present term expires January 1, 1927.

Definite announcement to that effect was obtained today from Miss Lee.

The salary received by the superintendent is $2,300 a year. Out of that sum she must pay for the hire of a deputy. No fees are received for work done as a member of the board of education.

TEACHERS GET MORE

The wages are less than are received by three-fourths of the county's teachers, whose responsibility and hours of work are much lighter.

Miss Lee is the second of present corps of county officials to make the decision to quit at the end of the present term because of small wages. R. P. Wallace, auditor, has not changed his mind about retiring.

SALARY ADVANCE FAILS

The present grand jury's failure to recommend the amendment passed by the legislature and up to the Governor for a signature and which would have provided an increase in the salaries of Miss Lee and Wallace, prompted these two officials to quit.

The work in the superintendent's office has quadrupled since Miss Lee took office 12 years ago. The salary has not changed.

Miss Lee's future plans are unsettled. "I can work at most anything and be better rewarded than I am now," said the superintendent today.

GENERALLY PRAISED

Educators over the country have praised the administration of Miss Lee. Trustees in the various districts of the county claimed that she was to have no opposition for reelection, so successfully has she conducted the affairs of her office.

With the retirement of Miss Lee, Miss Stacy Armstrong, at present the general rural supervisor of schools, may decide to become a candidate.

Politicians claimed here today that Miss Lee is the first school superintendent of Yolo County to retire voluntarily since John Goin quit in the eighties.

[July 1, 1951]

Miss Hattie Lee, 92, Dies; Funeral Services Tuesday—Death Ends Active Career of Beloved Local Schoolteacher and Mother's Day Founder

Death has stilled the warm, brave heart of Miss Harriet Stoddard Lee.

The end came at 11:45 o'clock yesterday morning in a private nursing home at Pacific Grove. With her in the closing hours of her life were her sister, Mrs. Mary Lee Barnhart, of Visalia, and Miss Lee's niece, Virginia Lee Schulte, of Carmel.

Miss Lee was one of Yolo County's oldtime beloved teachers. For 48 years she had been identified by the public school system of this county as either a teacher or a county school superintendent, which position she held for 12 years, having retired in 1927.

She was the originator of Mother's Day in California and one of the first to suggest its national observance.

Funeral services for Miss Lee will be held at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon at Kraft Bros. Chapel. The Reverend Charles Leachman, of the Episcopal Church, will officiate. Interment will be in Woodland Cemetery.

Miss Lee was in robust heath up to about 3 years ago when her heart weakened and gradually her condition became worse. Last June 14 she again suffered a severe stroke of paralysis and since that time she had been in a critical state, although her mind was strong and alert to the end.

"Hattie" Lee, as she was so fondly known to hundreds of her friends and former pupils, celebrated her 92d birthday at the nursing home last February 25. On that occasion she received 98 congratulatory cards and telegrams and scores of letters from lifelong friends and men and women whom she had taught in the local schools.

HER ONE REGRET

One of the letters came from a friend who had been in her class in the South Putah School 70 years ago.

Among the visitors on her birthday was Curtis Clifford, prominent San Francisco insurance executive. Prompting the surprise call of Clifford and the spontaneous remembrance from so many friends was an inconspicuous news item which appeared in Herb Caen's column in a San Francisco newspaper. For some years she had hoped to some day have the opportunity to apologize to Curtis Clifford for having punished him in her classroom a half century ago for a disturbance which she thought Curtis was responsible for. She later discovered that she was wrong. She worried about it and always prayed that she might see him and ask for forgiveness.

"Then," she said softly, "I can die happy." Clifford's friendly visit relieved her troubled, sensitive conscience.

Among the many birthday notes which amused her the most was one sent by Walter Baker, a Woodland lumberman whom she taught 51 years ago. He wrote that she owed him an apology for not having paddled him enough.

A PRIZED ORCHID

An orchid that she wore rather haughtily was pinned on a birthday bed jacket sent to her by another admirer. The posy was a thoughtful remembrance from the distinguished San Francisco attorney, Hartley F. Peart, another lifelong local friend whose late mother, Mrs. Sophia Elizabeth Peart, was also a Yolo County school superintendent.

Still another birthday gift that contributed to her happiness came from her "little Willie Longrus. He was the oldest of the fine Longrus family and I think it is all of 60 years ago that he was in my class," Miss Lee told her friends.

The messages of cheer and comfort came from men and women in all stations of life.

FIVE TAUGHT HERE

Miss Lee was one of 8 girls in a California pioneer family of 13. Her father—Milroy Griffith Lee—arrived in 1849 from Virginia, her mother in 1853 from Massachusetts. They met in Nicolaus, Sutter County, and were married there. Hattie was a native of Nicolaus.

All of Miss Lee's sisters were teachers. At one time five of them, Helen, Hattie, Jennie, Mattie, and Mary, taught in Yolo County.

Miss Lee began teaching in 1879. The last 12 years of her career she served as superintendent of schools. She had long been a member of the county board of education.

Mis Lee retired in 1927. She lived in the spacious Gable residence at 659 First street until she moved to Carmel in 1947. There she made her home with Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Schulte until she decided that because of her failing health she might become a burden to her kinfolks and it was better for her to live alone. Mr. and Mrs. Schulte were as attentive and faithful to their aunt as though she were their mother.

STARTED MOTHER'S DAY

Miss Lee had an interesting story as to how California gained a 5 year headstart on the Nation in celebrating Mother's Day. At the beginning of the century she was discussing women's suffrage with a class of boys and girls. One of the boys stated that he was against the proposal. Miss Lee asked him if he didn't think his mother should have as much voice in government as "bums of the streets."

"No," he said, "she hasn't sense enough."

Weeks later her class was decorating a chair which was to serve for the woman selected by Miss Lee's pupils as queen of the day. When the mother was chosen, Miss Lee selected as an escort for her the boy who felt his mother didn't have sense enough to vote.

It was in 1909 that Miss Lee succeeded in having a resolution passed in the California Legislature for honoring mothers. Governor James N. Gillette proclaimed the day.

Acting on a congressional recommendation, President Woodrow Wilson, 5 years later, set aside May 13 as Mother's Day over the Nation.

Miss Lee was honored by the State legislature 10 years ago when, upon invitation, she addressed the senate and the assembly in joint session on Mother's Day.

NDGW PIONEER

While Miss Lee was a part of this country's school system for nearly half a century and was responsible for many educational improvements of her time, she was also active in civic, community and political life. She was a charter member of the Woodland parlor of Native Daughters of the Golden West and for many years was an officer of the grand parlor. Especially was she proud of her NDGW 50-year pin. She also was a member of the Woodland Shakespeare club for many years

She had that singular good fortune of living to a great age with unimpaired mind and knowledge. Her own sense of humor was quiet and sparkling. Her memory was extraordinary.

As often as her eyesight would permit she read and was especially fond of good poetry. One little poem, reflecting her courage in the face of death and her hope in the future, that she particularly liked to recite in the sunset of her own life was composed by her late sister, Mattie. It reads:

"When I look from the summit of life's last hill
Down in the dusk of the twilight still
My heart sings high and I earnestly pray
That I may know fully the new strange way.
I will go gladly, the last is the best,
God and the stars will guard my rest."

Miss Lee's sense of humor was instinctive. She delighted in telling anecdotes which punctured pomposity and deflated dignity.

HER SURVIVING KIN

Her most immediate survivors are two sisters, Mrs. E. J. (Jennie) Fraser of Eugene, Oreg., and Mrs. Mary Lee Barnhart of Visalia. Four nieces and two nephews to whom she was devoted and upon whom she left an imprint of independence and knowledge are Miss Brownell Fraser, a professor of art in the University of Oregon; Mrs. Janet Fraser Slaughter, Milwaukee; Mrs. Donald (Marion Lee Pettitt) Grant, Visalia; Mrs. Schulte, Carmel; Jack Lee, an actor in Hollywood; and M. G. Lee, Pacific Grove.

Two of her late brothers, Maj. John G. Lee and Marshall Lee, are well remembered here. The former was a township constable and influential in military circles as captain of old Company F and renowned as a pistol shot. After leaving Woodland, Marshall Lee acquired fame as a vaudeville star and ventriloquist.

PARENTS PIONEERS

Miss Lee's father, Milroy Griffith Lee, was born in 1832, in Washington County, Ill., and became a farmer. In 1848 his three brothers, Abner, Wilson, and James, went to Mexico and fought in the Mexican War, coming to California when hostilities ceased.

They purchased land in Nicolaus in Sutter County. In 1849, James Lee returned to Illinois for his family and, upon coming back to California, took his brother Milroy Griffith Lee with him. It was about this time that gold was discovered in California.

Marrying at 21, Griffith went to the Cherokee mining district where for a few years he conducted a livery stable and catered to the miners.

Upon returning to Nicolaus, he bought a large farm from the Government but later purchased a small tract near Woodland and made his future residence here, primarily because he wanted better school facilities for his children.

About 1873, he purchased and operated the first steam thresher in Yolo County. Griffith died here in 1877. Griffith's father, George Washington Lee, also a farmer, came west to Nicolaus in 1852, and was Sutter's first county clerk. Griffith's mother, Mahala, a native of Tennessee, died while crossing the plains with her husband and left a family of seven boys and three girls.

MOTHER BORN IN ILLINOIS

Miss Lee's mother was Abigail Stoddard Lee who was born in Ogle County, Ill., in 1838, the daughter of Thomas Adams Stoddard, a stonecutter. He crossed the plains with his family in 1854 and settled with his family in Yuba City where, for many years, he operated the Yuba City Hotel. Later, he and his family moved to Yolo County.

Upon the death of her husband in 1877, Abigail Stoddard Lee was left with 10 children, the youngest being 2½ years old. She found time to be active in community affairs and was a prominent member of the Congregational Church, participated in Eastern Star, and at the age of 75 officiated as president of the Woodland Shakespeare Club. She died here in 1917.

Miss "Hattie" Lee was educated in Woodland Public School, Hesperian College, and the Teachers' Preparation School in Sacramento. Her first classroom experience was in the Lee School District in Sutter County, from where she transferred to the old Franklin School District, now known as the South Putah District, near Davis.

Then, she came to Woodland and continued as a public school teacher. She was appointed to the county board of education in 1892—the first woman to be named to that board. From 1898 to 1914 she served as vice president of Woodland schools.

TRIBUTE FOR "HATTIE"

The late Supervisor William O. Russell, writing in 1940 in the "History of Yolo County," paid the following tribute to Miss Lee:

"It may be said that Miss Lee is naturally a psychologist; this explains why she is revered by both sexes and all ages. Her keen understanding and sympathetic heart were shown on behalf of all the adults in laying the foundation for Mother's Day. But she has gone further and advocated something fraught with meaning for the adolescent generation. She wants establishment of the old-fashioned 'beau parlor'—to permit courtship under proper conditions—at home."

Yolo Sponsor of Mother's Day Is To Visit Assembly

Woodland (Yolo County), May 8.—Miss Harriett S. Lee of Woodland, who is recognized as one of the originators of the Mother's Day idea, has accepted an invitation to speak before the State assembly Friday afternoon.

Miss Lee has been asked to go to Sacramento by Miss Eleanor Miller, a Los Angeles assemblywoman. Miss Lee will be accompanied by Mrs. John H. O'Donnell, the wife of the assemblyman from this district.

ADDRESS WILL BE MADE

The Woodland woman will tell the legislators of the beginning, growth and national recognition of the idea. Miss Lee claims to have suggested honoring mothers at a convention of the Native Daughters in Red Bluff in 1903. In 1909 Gov. James Gillette proclaimed the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day. In 1914 President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed a national Mother's Day.

Miss Lee does not claim to be the sole originator, but she is credited with being among the first to advance the idea of setting aside 1 day of the year for a special tribute to the mothers,

Frank E. Hering of South Bend, Ind., a former president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, generally is credited with having originated the idea of a national observance of Mother's Day in an address before a gathering of Eagles in South Bend, February 7, 1904. The observance of the day was made obligatory on subordinate lodges of the Eagles.

Harriett S. Lee To Be Mother's Day Speaker Before State Assembly

Miss Harriett S. Lee, of Woodland, who is recognized as one of the originators of Mother's Day, will address the State assembly Friday afternoon to tell assemblymen of the beginning, growth, and spirit of the day.

Miss Lee is appearing in the assembly at the invitation of Miss Eleanor Miller, assemblywoman from Los Angeles, and she will be accompanied by Mrs. John O'Donnell, of Woodland, wife of Assemblyman O'Donnell and past president of the Woodland Native Daughters parlor.

Miss Lee, former superintendent of schools for Yolo County, has been a leader in the Native Daughters for many years, and in 1903 while attending the State convention at Red Bluff she suggested the lodge delegates that the organization sponsor Mother's Day.

Not only was it taken up by California parlors but the observance became so general that in 1909 Gov. James N. Gillette proclaimed the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day. The California observance was followed by others throughout the country and in 1914 President Wilson made the day a national one.

For years the Woodland parlor of NDGW has had its Mother's Night, the 1935 affair to be held Thursday evening, and it is the custom to have Miss Lee as toastmistress.

State officials will join with assemblymen Friday in observance of the day, and special features are being planned for an outstanding program.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. King of Utah, for May 6 through May 15, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. Tunney (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for May 5–10, on account of official business.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for Thursday and Friday, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders *heretofore entered*, was granted to:

Mr. MCVICKER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. FARNUM), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. MIZE), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TODD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIZE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. MORRISON.

Mr. HANNA.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 9, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2386. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 14012, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1476). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14921. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 827. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966; without amendment (Rept. No. 1478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 14895. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States, to provide standards for the issuance, denial, and revocation of passports by the Secretary of State, and other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 14896. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States, to provide standards for the issuance, denial, and revocation of passports by the Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 14897. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 14898. A bill to reclassify certain positions in postal field services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 14899. A bill to amend item 709.10 of the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 14900. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide mortgage insurance, and authorize direct loans by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine or dentistry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14901. A bill to amend section 333 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans who serve 2 or more years in peacetime shall be entitled to a presumption that chronic diseases becoming manifest within 1 year from the date of separation from the service are service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14902. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to modify the regulatory requirement that the son or daughter of an employee of a Federal agency may not be appointed to part-time, seasonal, intermittent, or other temporary employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14903. A bill relating to the tax treatment of transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 14904. A bill to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14905. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 14906. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 14907. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14908. A bill to increase the rate of pension payable to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, their widows, and certain other dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 14909. A bill to provide for the designation of certain Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 14910. A bill to provide for Civil Service Commission enforcement of section 9 of the Hatch Act with respect to all officers and employees of Federal agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 14911. A bill to provide for Civil Service Commission enforcement of section 9 of the Hatch Act with respect to all officers and employees of Federal agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 14912. A bill to provide for Civil Service Commission enforcement of section 9 of the Hatch Act with respect to all officers and employees of Federal agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 14913. A bill to provide for Civil Service Commission enforcement of section 9 of the Hatch Act with respect to all officers and employees of Federal agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 14914. A bill to provide for Civil Service Commission enforcement of section 9 of the Hatch Act with respect to all officers and employees of Federal agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 14915. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 14921. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 1137. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 843. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to support for the Kaiulani project to preserve the last surviving American-built, square-rigged merchant ship as a museum of our maritime heritage; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. Res. 844. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the domestic farm labor shortage and its effects on food prices; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 845. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 14916. A bill for the relief of John Kitanik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 14917. A bill for the relief of Maria and Andreas Tselos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 14918. A bill for the relief of Faye Walters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 14919. A bill for the relief of James R. Dickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 14920. A bill for the relief of Marie del Carmen Bermudez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fino Introduces Bill To Nullify Effect of Union Busting Unfair Practices in Union Representation Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is aimed at letting unions organize and represent for purposes of collective bargaining workers in plants where the union in question has been defeated in a collective bargaining representation election by unfair practices on the part of the employer. Under these circumstances, my bill would oblige the National Labor Relations Board to order the employer to bargain with the union as if it had won the election.

I do not believe my bill would be opening up a Pandora's box because I am confident that the National Labor Relations Board would only order the employer to bargain with a defeated union where the facts showing unfair labor practices as being responsible for the union's defeat were extremely clear.

I believe that giving the NLRB power to order employers to bargain with unions under these circumstances is necessary if unionization is to have a fair chance in some of our more rural and undeveloped States. If unions cannot enjoy the benefits my bill would give them, then in many of these States we will continue to see unions unfairly deprived of victory in representation elections, with employers accepting the inexpensive and innocuous penalties imposed upon them for their unfair labor practices. Certainly these employers will pay to avoid unionization.

My bill will make certain that labor's rights cannot be violated and then paid for like a parking ticket. Under the Fino bill, fines and penalties will no longer, in situations which warrant tough measures, suffice to buy off unionization.

I am hopeful that the Congress will give this legislation its most favorable consideration, but if the callous disregard of the majority for labor legislation to date is repeated, this Congress is more likely to see punitive labor legislation passed than to favorably consider a bill like mine.

Let's Face Facts About Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the time has come to speak out bluntly about inflation and the terrible dangers it poses for our economy. Last year, I warned the House that we were facing a real danger of creeping inflation. At that time, I urged that prudent action be taken to cope with the situation; little was done. Now the creep has become a brisk walk, and I fear that this in turn will become a disastrous gallop unless responsible action is taken.

Today's vote by the House was neither prudent nor responsible. It passed the $10.5 billion Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill by a vote of 354 to 27. I voted against final passage of this bill. I voted for a 5 percent across-the-board cut. I voted for a motion to recommit the bill back to the Appropriations Committee.

Why? Quite simply, because I feel it was an inflationary bill, given our present economic conditions, even though it contained many programs valuable to our society. Because the bill as it emerged from the Appropriations Committee had an additional $1.2 billion added to it, over and above the President's original budget request. Because the 1966 national income budget already has a deficit of $2.2 billion, and there is no way of telling accurately by just how many billions the budget will be out of balance in 1967. Because I agree with the Appropriations Committee chairman, Congressman MAHON, who remarked in yesterday's debate:

> We have been saying that we are against inflation and against a tax increase. But the prevailing votes on this bill seem to indicate otherwise.

The remarks of the distinguished chairman are accurate. In a period of inflation, it is inexcusable to take the easy route of expediency; the stakes are simply too high. To stop inflation, you either cut appropriations and exercise budgetary restraint or you raise taxes to overcome the deficit. I fear the Congress has been taking the easy—and dangerous—route. Repeatedly, the Congress has chosen to talk about the dangers of inflation and then to vote to increase appropriations, while at the same time denying any need for a further tax increase. I simply cannot accept this point of view.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the opportunity and responsibility with which we are faced. We can either continue the sound and vigorous growth of an economy free from inflation, or we can hurl the Nation into the boom-and-bust cycle which proved so disastrous in the depression.

Remember what happened from 1960 to 1965: The greatest uninterrupted peacetime expansion of any economy in history. Look at the figures, all of which are put in 1958 constant dollar terms to insure consistency. Since 1960, our gross national product—the total of all goods and services produced in the country—has increased from $487 billion to over $633 billion, an increase of $146 billion in a little over 5 years. By way of contrast, this 5-year increase equals the size of our entire economy in the mid-1930's. Other figures are equally striking. Per capita disposal income—that is, income after payment of taxes—has increased 28 percent in a little over 5 years, from $1,883 to $2,260 at present. Weekly wages, farm income, corporate profits, and business investment are all at new highs. On top of this, our economic growth has enabled us to finance the start of vitally important programs to remove inequality and develop our society.

By contrast, let us look at the evidence of inflation in recent months. The wholesale price index is up nearly 4 percent over a year ago. At present the cost of living is rising at a rate of around 5½ percent. This is well over the 3.2 rate judged acceptable by the administration. All these price increases mean that each dollar earned by each person in America buys less. In the long run a general inflation could spell disaster.

I am afraid that the passage of this inflated bill reflects the attitude of the Congress: Spending will continue to go up when local or special interests are involved. But this attitude cannot determine our economic policy. We in the Congress must accept the responsibility to face the facts. If spending continues to go up, we must consider raising taxes to stop inflation.

Some months ago, I made a suggestion that suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit which was used in the early 1960's as a stimulant to the economy might offer a useful way to control inflation. I proposed that this tax credit be suspended for 1 year, on a graduated basis which favors small businesses but which also controls some of the pressures which are pushing the inflation along. I intend to introduce such a bill shortly, in order to serve as a basis for debate—debate not only over the specific provisions of the bill, but also over the entire issue of responsibility in our Nation's finances. If by its introduction, Congress is led to a thoughtful and responsible consideration of the issues, much will have been accomplished.

I feel strongly that a tax increase is not as desirable as balancing the budget through limiting expenditures. But if the Congress feels—as it appears to feel at present—that expenditures cannot be reduced below prudent levels, then it must be brought to realize that a tax increase is the only other alternative means of achieving a balanced budget. And a balanced budget is the only real means of preventing an inflation that could wipe out all the progress so recently made. If the Congress decides to spend more, in a period of inflation, it must also realize that a tax increase is the only means of increasing the income to finance the expenditures.

In the end, the issue comes down to a very simple question: Are we responsible and levelheaded enough to do what must be done to avoid the boom-and-bust cycle which led to the depression which so many of us remember with so much pain? The Congress must not avoid its responsibilities. Continuing to spend more and more in the face of an inflation, without an offsetting tax increase, will most certainly bring us to boom and then quickly to bust. I believe this cycle must be avoided, and I hope the Congress will have the wisdom to face the facts squarely.

Disquieting Signs in Our Economy and the HEW Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last night President Johnson spoke of what he called the disquieting signs in our economy. Mr. McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board spoke of a "moderate across-the-board tax increase."

We just had an opportunity to do something about these "disquieting signs" in our economy with the vote on the motion to recommit to cut back 5 percent in Labor-HEW funds. Since 1960, this appropriation has grown from $3.9 billion to over $10.5 billion, a 267 percent increase. And this, mind you, is only 75 percent of what ultimately will have to be appropriated for the balance of fiscal 1967 to fully fund programs expected to be, but yet unauthorized, by the appropriate legislative committees.

Several of us pointed out in our minority views on this appropriation bill yesterday the additional price tag will be at least another $4 billion.

The proposed 5 percent cut would simply have pared some of the fat off HEW, would probably increase its efficiency, and if passed may have made it easier for President Johnson to sleep a little sounder tonight.

"Old Realities and New Myths" Gives Us Excellent Reasons Why the United States Is in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a very fine, perceptive article on America's actions and policies in South Vietnam and our Nation's goal of world peace for all time. The article was written for Impact Magazine of Vanderbilt University by my distinguished colleague and good friend from Louisiana—the Honorable Hale Boggs, majority whip of the House of Representatives.

Representative Hale Boggs has done a splendid job of separating myth from reality in our policy toward southeast Asia and Communist China. I commend him for this incisive article, and I recommend it to all my fellow colleagues.

His article was a contribution to the discussions on national issues and problems held at the annual impact symposium on the Vanderbilt University campus. The symposium was held on April 1–2, 1966, and prominent figures from throughout the Nation and the world came to Vanderbilt's campus in Nashville, Tenn., to participate in the weekend seminar.

Congressman Boggs' article, "Old Realities and New Myths," follows:

Old Realities and New Myths

(By Hale Boggs)

(Note.—The author, U.S. Representative from the Second District of Louisiana (New Orleans), is majority whip of the House and chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy.)

On February 22 of this year, I was on the floor of the House, listening to my lovely colleague from Hawaii, Congresswoman Patsy Mink, recite President George Washington's famed Farewell Address of September 17, 1796, to the citizens of our young Republic. It is tradition in both the House and the Senate that Washington's Farewell Address be delivered each year on his birthday (February 22) and that no regular business be conducted on that day.

As Mrs. Mink read this famous address, I pondered on the words, wondering how best to make them applicable to today's world. One theme was emphasized in the speech: that of maintaining strict neutrality in the affairs of the Old World (Europe)—of avoiding any alliances with one country or group of countries in opposition to others. European nations were always engaged in bitter intrigue, quarrels and warfare. Besides, the 16 States of the new United States of America were far removed from Europe, protected by a vast Atlantic Ocean, Washington had noted.

"Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon a foreign ground?" Washington had said.

When Mrs. Mink read those words, "Why quit our own to stand upon a foreign ground?" I thought of our country's direct involvement in the war in Vietnam. For a moment, I wondered how these words—this admonition of President Washington—could apply to the world we live in today. Washington had addressed his advice and counsel to his fellow countrymen almost 170 years ago—and he had spoken wisely for the young America of that day—but his recommendations probably would be far different in the latter half of the 20th century.

Washington undoubtedly would have taken a different view now, I thought.

Of myself, I asked: What is America's new global challenge? What course must we pursue today and in the decades ahead to safeguard that liberty and freedom we hold so dear?

The answer should begin with a recitation of why the United States once again has chosen to "quit our own to stand upon a foreign ground"?—specially, to stand in South Vietnam. For Vietnam represents our immediate global challenge. Our success or failure there will determine whether we shall maintain or abdicate our role as leader of the free world and maybe ultimately whether we shall survive as a nation.

The United States has not sought to assume the arduous and heavy mantle of world leadership—and we seek no material gain for doing so. But destiny and circumstances have thrust it upon us, and meet it we must, meet it we will.

The righteousness of our course and our goals for the people of South Vietnam are made all the more emphatic and vivid by a personal visit to that stricken land. Such a visit it was my pleasure to make last December. What I heard and saw there—from both the officials of our Government and those of South Vietnam—has imbued me with a firm conviction in our cause.

If we could put aside the humanitarian and moral aspects of our involvement in South Vietnam (which we can't do)—if we would dare to lay aside our firm belief in the right of the people of any nation to choose freely and without fear their own form of government and their own leaders (which we won't do)—the fact still remains that it is in the best interests of our own country to remain in South Vietnam until a just and honorable peace is attained for the people of South Vietnam.

Thus, we are not at all in disagreement with the Father of our Country in his Farewell Address. For Washington offered specific admonitions and suggestions for policy and courses of action for the young Republic, and he did so in the best interests of the United States at the time. But his recommendations were designed for a far different world, I thought.

Then, why are we in Vietnam? Why are Americans fighting and dying there?

In summation, we are there not only because it is right, but also because we wish to avoid the inevitable horrors of world war III. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk noted recently on a television program with me, "we must hold on to the lessons we learned from before World War II because we're not going to have the chance to draw many lessons from world war III—there won't be enough left to do so." In short, we must act with firmness and purpose now, and this we are doing in Vietnam in order to prevent world war III .

You have read recently that much of American foreign policy should be changed to meet what were termed "old myths and new realities." In truth, I believe that our foreign policy is best served by following the old realities and discarding the new myths.

The first new myth is that communism is now quiescent and has lost its militant and aggressive character. But the old reality—the truth—is that the Communist world, particularly Red China, is still predatory. Communist States, particularly Red China, plan to move into and conquer their less powerful neighbors. It is Communist China today, more than the Soviet Union, which casts covetous eyes around her, particularly at the small nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia. The method now employed is called a "war of national liberation," but this is merely a transparent cloak to disguise infiltration, subversion, espionage and sometimes outright overthrow of the existing government.

The second new myth is that resistance to aggression is an outmoded policy no longer necessary or useful in the world of the late 1960's. The old reality—the truth—is that the United States and the free world must continue to defend freedom around the globe, and to assist States, like South Vietnam, that wish to be free, but lack the power to combat their aggressive Communist neighbors.

The other hard reality is that if we fail in the task we have so boldly performed so well for 20 years, the inevitable result will be the same as with Prime Minister Chamberlain's ill-fated appeasement of the late 1930's.

So by resisting aggression now, we are providing the only possible path to achievement of a lasting peace for all mankind.

Finally, there is the new myth that the United States is a "paper tiger," that this great country will prove unwilling to bear the burden of world leadership. The old reality—the truth—is that we have demonstrated our resolve to bear this burden for over a quarter of a century. Today, President Johnson and the majority of the Congress and of the American people are showing their determination to continue to pay the necessary price "to assure the survival and the success of liberty," as President Kennedy stated in his inaugural address.

Therefore, I submit that America's immediate challenge is to obtain for the people of South Vietnam a just and honorable peace so that they may freely choose their own form of government. Secretary Rusk said on our television show that "people in the Communist world (in Eastern Europe to be exact) have told me themselves that the No. 1 question in the world today is how to move Peiping to peaceful coexistence."

Nothing points up this challenge more decisively than the worlds of President Kennedy after Premier Khrushchev agreed to withdraw the Soviet missiles from Cuba. I recall this experience as vividly as any of my life. You remember that Congress had just adjourned (October, 1962) and most of us had gone home. Then President Kennedy, after learning of this very grave threat to our country and the whole world, summoned back to Washington all the Congressional leaders. For one terrible week our Nation looked down the nuclear gun barrel. Then on the Monday after the Sunday in which Khrushchev wrote his letter to President Kennedy, indicating his capitulation and his readiness to withdraw the missiles from Cuba, President Kennedy said to us:

"We have resolved one of the great crises of mankind. The military threat of Russia is now receding. The threat now will come from Communist China when she develops the hydrogen bomb."

Two years later, almost to the day, gathered in the same room were almost the same people, including the leaders of the Congress. This time we were there to hear President Johnson and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff brief us on the explosion of the first nuclear device by Communist China. Many questions were directed at Secretary Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. One prevailed above all the others.

What threat does this pose to the free world? The answer came back, sharp and clear: Very little as of now, because of the Chinese lack of a delivery system for nuclear weapons; but a very major and dangerous one 10 years or more from now, barring no change in the aggressive and militant leadership now dominant in Red China.

Throughout this briefing my mind kept going back to President Kennedy's statement: that the world would be relatively safe until such time as Communist China develops the hydrogen bomb and a delivery system for it.

So the immediate task is to secure for the people of South Vietnam a just and honorable peace, under freedom and justice.

But the ultimate challenge—the ultimate goal—is to secure for all mankind a genuine, lasting peace. Man is making great strides in conquering space, combating and reducing disease, prolonging life, providing more education for more people, and realizing other advances in many spheres of human activity.

I think that President Kennedy best summed up what we mean about world peace, when he said, in one of his greatest speeches, given at American University, in Washington, D.C., on June 10, 1963:

"What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans, but peace for all men and women; not merely peace in our time, but peace for all time."

Let's Improve Children's Films

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on March 29 I was privileged to address the second symposium of the First International Children's Film Festival. The festival was held in Santa Barbara, Calif., and attracted noted authorities and interested persons from around the world.

The festival was a great success, and has established patterns and direction for the future. Under the sponsorship of the Brooks Foundation, the many concerned with providing quality film material for our young people have taken a significant step forward.

I am optimistic that in the very near future this embryonic youth film industry will become a major element in our rapidly growing educational material industry. Few can deny the potential of such an industry in providing creative and challenging material designed to support and supplement the quality and depth of our educational programs.

The festival has encouraged all who participated. Significant and concrete steps are now being taken to initiate a national, and, yes, an international, dialog designed to create an imaginative, dynamic and positive youth film program.

The address I made on March 29, is part of that dialog and I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues interested in providing worthwhile and educationally challenging film productions to the youth of America, and the youth of the world.

The material presented in speech format below was included in a symposium discussion during the festival:

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF BETTER FILMS FOR CHILDREN

I am particularly pleased to be participating with, and speaking to such a distinguished assemblage of concerned persons interested in the substance and quality of film material now available for viewing by our children. The work being done at this First Annual Children's Film Festival will prove significant in providing foundations for the development of a youth film industry.

I intend to discuss the subject of the role of the Government and Government's contribution to the development of films and particularly films for children. One of the prime responsibilities of the legislator is to make decisions about how to allocate resources of the society to meet its needs. This, in turn, necessitates some value judgments about the needs of the society, and of course, there is conflict every step of the way. As in any field of endeavor, it is necessary to determine what the needs are, what the priorities among them should be, what resources are available, and finally, how and where to apply the resources. There is always a lot of competition among these various needs for priority in the application of resources.

In relation to children's films, it is necessary to ask what needs the society feels in relation to children, and what resources there are for meeting these needs.

But before that happens, we run into the question, why should the Government get into the act? The touchstone for answering this question is usually the Constitution, the organic law of the land, to which we go to find out where our guideposts are. Within the Constitution, the invitation to Government to participate is found, in modern times, in the welfare clause, concerning the general welfare of the land. Behind that lies the principle, found in English common law, of the relationship of the sovereign, whether king or constitutional government, to its people. Throughout history, Government has been looked upon as a parent; we have the Latin patria, the German fatherland, the Russian motherland; the relationship of parent to child is part of the basic role of government.

Out of this has come a number of accepted techniques for the interjection of Government into problems. If you look at the Government's parental role, it is immediately apparent that there will be a special relationship of Government to the child, the real child, in society. Moreover, there will be a strong tendency for the Government to concern itself with the child who is handicapped, ill, or mentally retarded.

In relation to Government participation in children's films, it will make a big difference whether these films are looked upon as entertainment or as one of the tools of society by which it can educate or motivate children. This distinction must be made early, because the outcome in terms of Government participation will depend in large part on which of these things you say you are trying to do.

Referring again to the Constitution, there are limitations on Government, and one limitation that acts very strongly in any area of communication—and film is one area of communication—is the right of free speech. If you are looking at the film as a tool, the limiting effect of the free speech provision is not so strong as in the area of film as entertainment, where people want to have a greater feeling of freedom. Where film is used as a tool for teaching, it is considered as already circumscribed by a discipline and, therefore, already limited. When it is entertainment, there is no such limitation, and people do not want it to be limited by an agency such as Government. If we understand this distinction, we can avoid a lot of arguments and complications about Government participation.

The question could be asked, Aren't these contexts pretty much a matter of how you want to define what you are doing? Isn't it possible to assign almost any film to the instructional category, as a learning experience?

The judgment is made pragmatically. There has to be a demonstration of precise usage. You can't assign a film to the category of education on the basis that it might be so used; if all you have is the possibility of educational use, the legislator is likely to decide that the film should be classified as entertainment.

In committee work that I have done, the question has been raised: Isn't it true that you would like to teach courage, perseverance, or patience, as values? Why, then, should not a film that has these things as part of the story be acceptable as pure educational material? Not so. The fact that that is deducible in an analytical way does not get you over the threshold. The legislator assumes that almost any interesting material will have some educational fallout, but he wants to know in what specific educational program it is going to be used, and by whom.

We had a good example, where a film was introduced as appropriate for teaching preschool children about sex or about parental roles. It dealt with mouth-breeding fish and protection of the young by the parent, who carried them around in her mouth. Certainly, this film could be described as an educational film about such subjects.

If it could have been identified as an educational film about fish, it might have been quite acceptable. But you do have to specify the use you intend to make of the film and the population for whom it is intended. And then you have to test it to see whether it is an effective tool.

Of course, we mustn't be misled into trying to make a dichotomy between education and films that are entertaining. One would hope that education would not be devoid of entertainment, just as one would hope that entertainment films would not lack all educational value. One of the most difficult tasks of the legislator is to draw these lines that really do not exist. He must be flexible and pragmatic about these decisions. Sadly, however, his constituency tends to look at these things as though they were black and white. The decision has to be made according to the context. It is one of the real legislative problems. The legislator, if he is flexible and pragmatic, is likely to be accused of inconsistency, but he doesn't want consistency as much as he wants good sense.

The importance of films for children can be seen in the fact that nothing is so important for their social development as the art of communication; without it they remain isolated in society. The film industry both entertains them and helps them to become better communicators in society, but I am not satisfied, up to the present, that films are playing the right role or playing it as dynamically as possible in this second area. Too many children are attending or watching films that are completely inappropriate for them, some lurid, some violent. Many organizations are demanding that the standards be raised, but here the question of how far the government can go comes up immediately.

It is distressing that the use of the film as an instructional tool has been far more developed in the advertising field, to sell soap or cigarettes, than to develop greatly needed skills in the children. Government could undertake programs to develop the instructional use of this great tool and art form.

I think you could find some role for the film to play in teaching anything that a complete educational system could present. Conversely, I do not think that any area should be taught by film exclusively. Film has to play its part along with other methods. Now, if by intangibles you mean something like moral values, I think films would help there, as with attitudes, motivations, and social skills. But I have seen very little evidence that film is being used in any of these areas, and I was 6½ years in the education committee of the Assembly of California, and 2 years as its chairman. They have visual aids, of course, but they are so mundane and lacking in sharpness as a tool, that it would be like trying to do modern farming with nothing but a shovel. The possibilities of this tool have not been appreciated.

Some questions must be offered at this point.

Is it the role of the legislator, or whose role is it, to decide what attitudes need to be shaped by use of some of the advertising techniques? For example, we might develop a total marketing campaign on the proper attitude toward study, and repeat the theme on billboards, in magazines, and radio and TV spot announcements. Who could ever get any agreement on which attitudes should be shaped and how?

I don't think you are going to get any agreement on things like that.

A lot of attitudes are being shaped right now, and we have no general agreement on the subject. What Government can do is encourage the development and use of better tools in this area, as it does in other technological endeavors such as the conquest of space. Without the infusion of Federal funds, what would have happened to the space program, or the development of transcontinental railroads? I am saying not that Government ought to decide what the end product should be, but how much effort ought to be encouraged in a field of activity. If we encourage and support research in the use of films to shape attitudes, out of this encouragement and support will come some end product. Ultimately, there will be a consensus among qualified people as to what is worth while and what should be pursued. I am not going to prejudge that. I think our role ends with encouraging innovators, so that the people who are defending the status quo will have to give ground and adopt better ways of doing things.

Now, what about marketing these films?

What possibilities are there for a constructive contribution by the commercial film producer? Through what channels could his product reach the children it should reach? And to what extent would the Government have to participate to make this possible?

The Government is going to be reluctant to support commercial activity because of the probable criticism that it is playing favorites with the taxpayer's money. Or supporting an activity of questionable social value. On the other hand, there is hardly an endeavor in this society that has not been supported by Government funds at one time or another: the railroads, the airlines, banking, oil drilling, you name it; if they are doing well, I'll show you the hand of Government with a very strong assist. But in each of these cases, it had to be established first that it was in the public interest to support these activities. In the area of films, a presentation would have to be made to the Congress along the following lines:

We do have a problem in the attitudes of our young people and in their developing skills that will make them constructive members of society. Part of the cause of this problem is that we have not been giving young people, both in their formal schooling and in their entertainment that has an educational function, the right materials.

Then the legislator would say: we can seek to upgrade these materials under our authority to set standards. If we are going to have the Government setting standards for what goes into women's lipstick, why not for what goes into our children's minds? This is the kind of approach you would have to use to get the Government involved. After new standards have been set, then the Government can encourage the people involved in this kind of production to meet the standards. Part of the encouragement is the carrot, the rewards.

One kind of reward is the tax benefit, which the producer gets for doing the work the way the Government wants him to; another reward is the outright grant, to upgrade the performance so that it will meet the new standard; or the Government can put its credit behind your financing; or the Government can give you a contract to produce films of the kind it needs to do a certain job. These are the ways in which it has been done in the past.

Are there similar models in other countries, in which government has been involved in filmmaking?

In any modern country you can find some mix of government and private financing of filmmaking. In some countries the government owns a large part, or all of the film production, as in Korea, where the Government makes films to attract tourists. Almost any country outside of the United States has encouraged the immigration of film companies by giving them tax shelters, from property or income taxes. Unfortunately, this kind of encouragement very seldom implies the application of any standards of quality; these governments have been interested only in the monetary size of the activity, not in the quality of the product. In Italy, for example, the criterion is the number of dollars the film industry can bring in.

What sort of legislative possibilities are there here in a program where the Government would subsidize the production of films and their exhibition on television for a stated period judged long enough to determine whether any popular demand for this new kind of film, whether educational or entertainment, could be generated in the audience, mainly of children but also of their parents, and then after that period of time the producers would have to go on their own without support?

First, you have a terrific defensive mechanism in both the television and theater exhibitors. They see anything new and different as a threat to their systems of distribution, organization, and profit. They are very sensitive about these things. A naive outsider does not understand what the effects of changing the film fare may be on, for example, the financial arrangements.

Nevertheless, it seems to me that this is within the historic role of Government—to encourage the innovator, to underwrite the heavy risk undertaking, in some endeavor that has a demonstrated potential value and is in the public interest.

One possible avenue for the exhibition of these new films is the educational television channel.

This is the obvious and most productive channel to follow, especially for Government supported film production, where the Government must be protected from taking on an improper role, or a role that will provoke excessive criticism.

I have tried to get the PTA, and the churches to pass out notices that high quality films are available in the local theaters. The turnout is not very encouraging. The fact that a thing is desirable and fun does not give it ready acceptance. When we tried to introduce square dancing in some recreation centers, the children hung back; they thought it was square; they didn't want to take a chance on not being "in." There has to be persistence in introducing these new things to children. They may be highly receptive, once you get across the threshold. Many innovators take the initial response as a final rejection, and they do not persist. But in the child there is a conflict; he wants the new thing but he doesn't want to take the social risk of being the first one.

One approach we have taken to trying to close this gap is to interest people to whom the children is a consumer, like candy manufacturers, to present some of these better things for a long enough period to allow some acceptance to grow in the child.

These standards that are the status quo are not unchangeable. They aren't set by magic. Somebody is the manipulator. We ought to do some manipulating of our own, to raise the standard. The status quo is not a natural phenomenon like the winds and tides; somebody started it, and we can change it. It may have served the purpose of somebody's profit or position or power, but we can make it serve purposes we care about today, if we become activists and don't just passively accept what we are handed.

Its just like inertia, in physics. You have to supply a new push, or things will keep on going the way they have been going in the past.

Those of us who have the opportunity to introduce something new to the young people ought to realize that we have to make it relevant to them. We have a tendency to believe that we understand children because we were children once ourselves or we have children. But children are very much a product of their own environment, and their environment is not the same as ours was. If we are going to reach them, we have to see their environment as they see it. We may want to teach children the old, valid principles, like courage, endurance, and honesty, but we have to put them in a context that seems alive and real to the child.

We have talked this afternoon about a very important social problem, which is the failure to make creative and constructive enough use of a great technological resource, which is pictures that move and talk, whether they are on video tape, or film, or whatever. This failure is not apparent to everybody. It isn't apparent to the general public. It isn't particularly apparent to the commercial producers, distributors, and exhibitors, because other things, such as level of profit, are more apparent to them; though they may see that something is lacking, they may not feel they can do anything about it, because of their other motivation. So we have established the existence of an important social problem.

We also see that some very strong and active multiple leadership is going to be needed to bring about the changes that those of us who have vision—and we can all congratulate each other here on being in that group—see as desirable, at least certain directions that we ought to go in.

This leadership can come from an individual. It can come from a legislator, or even from the legislature. It can come from a private foundation like the Brooks Foundation, or from some other private foundation that might help out in some kind of a developmental program. It can come even from the commercial interests themselves, if you catch them at a weak moment, or find out some way to influence them or to appeal to their profit motive. It can come through educational channels, particularly the university, I think, though we haven't talked about that today. This leadership is going to have to be stirred up from as many sources as possible. If this can be done, then the Government has a role which will be acceptable to these other elements and will not be subject to excessive criticism, because the Government will not appear to control things. The Government, of course, has to be very careful not to appear to be the only agency doing something.

I think the development of better children's films has pretty well got to come out of the same kind of complex social interaction that other things have grown out of in the past. The creative and constructive efforts come from various sources.

It is the purpose of this festival, to encourage exactly this kind of complex interaction, to involve all of the elements of the society that we have been talking about, and any others that are relevant, in a constructive program, or a number of constructive programs, to do exactly this.

Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the tabulation of results of a questionnaire which I distributed among the residents of my district in mid-March. I have received about 9,000 replies. Again this year, the responses reflect careful thought on the issues and I attach the results for the consideration of our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD:

RESULTS OF MY QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTED AMONG THE VOTERS OF THE 23D DISTRICT, MARCH 1966

Vietnam (last year I asked this same question first on my questionnaire. I asked it again this year to see is there is any shift in opinion):

1. What policy do you favor in Vietnam?

	Percent
(a) Expand the war and go all out to win	25
(b) Continue administration policy of supporting South Vietnam including limited bombing attacks in North Vietnam, as a way of achieving satisfactory settlement	28
(c) Restrict efforts to South Vietnam and negotiate best settlement possible	22
(d) Withdraw U.S. forces from Vietnam	15
(e) Other (specify)	11

(Responses ranged from urging an "escalate-or-withdraw position" to urging inclusion of NLF in U.N.-sponsored negotiations.)

Last year's results were:

	Percent
(a)	20
(b)	38
(c)	19
(d)	13
(e)	10

2. Have the President's efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement been:

	Percent
About right?	47
Too much?	10
Too little?	43

3. Four-year term for Congressmen: The President has suggested changing the term of office of Congressmen from 2 to 4 years. Do you agree?

	Percent
Yes	54
No	36
Undecided	10

4. Medicare: There are a number of suggestions for additions to this program. Please mark the two you think are most desirable:

	Percent
(a) Include cost of prescription drugs as part of basic coverage	30
(b) Eliminate requirement that senior citizen pay the first $40 of the hospital bill	16
(c) Eliminate requirement that senior citizen pay $3 per month for medical insurance (hospital insurance is free)	9
(d) Increase the number of days of hospitalization permitted	23
(e) Extend coverage to persons under 65 who are receiving social security benefits	16
(f) Other (specify)	6

5. Crime: Would you favor Federal assistance to cities to help with training and strengthening the police force?

	Percent
Yes	62
No	27
Undecided	11

6. Narcotics: A proposal has been made to make drugs or drug substitutes available to addicts under supervision of hospitals or doctors as a way of permitting them to lead useful lives and to prevent the narcotics sellers from preying further upon them. Do you think this is a good idea?

	Percent
Yes	74
No	27
Undecided	11

7. Federal Expenditures: If some Federal programs have to cut back because of the cost of the Vietnam conflict, which do you think should be reduced?

	Percent
(a) Space program	24
(b) Highway construction	13
(c) Veterans benefits	6
(d) Agricultural subsidies	25
(e) Antipoverty program	15
(f) Aid to education	4
(g) Other (specify)	13

["Other" included people who wrote in that they wanted cuts in Vietnam war costs; foreign aid; welfare programs, etc.]

8. Parks and recreation: Which of the following types of parks do you think are the most useful and necessary?

	Percent
(a) Parks in scenic rural areas, with overnight facilities	11
(b) Large city parks to provide green spaces	21
(c) "Sitting parks" with benches and walkways	28
(d) "Vest-pocket" parks in vacant lots, possibly paved over to permit children's sports	34
(e) Other (specify)	6

["Other" concentrated on the need for improved safety and maintenance of existing parks.]

[NOTE.—In the case of questions 4, 7, and 8, the percentages indicate relative popularity of items marked.]

When You Believe Underground Nuclear Test Cheating Can Be Spotted Either You Have Not Got the Word, You Are in a State of Euphoria or Both Conditions Apply and You Are Working for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 I wrote a letter to the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency complaining about erroneous and misleading talk at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva by the acting U.S. negotiator, Adrian S. Fisher, who doubles in brass as ACDA's Deputy Director. The letter is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 19 at pages 8450–8451.

Mr. Fisher wrote a letter in reply to mine. It is reproduced below along with my response:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1966.

HON. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: Since Mr. Foster has returned to Geneva and I am presently the Acting Director of the Agency, I am taking the liberty of replying to your letter of April 13 commenting on my April 4 statement at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference.

The main complaint in your letter is that my statement might be misunderstood to place higher confidence than is justified in the fission-product, gas-analysis technique for use in on-site inspections carried out under a comprehensive test ban treaty.

My statement was a further elucidation of President Johnson's representation to the Conference when it began this year that "the United States will require only that number and kind of inspections which modern science shows to be necessary to assure that the treaty is being faithfully observed." My primary purpose was to justify the U.S. requirement for onsite inspections to verify a comprehensive test ban. As you know, the Soviet Union and its allies say that no such inspections are required. Some non-Communist members of the Conference have questioned whether onsite inspections would even be useful in providing evidence of treaty violation.

The main point of my speech was to show that such inspections could be useful, thereby supporting the United States position against Soviet attack and nonalined questioning. I used the gas-sampling technique as one aspect of the inspection process to demonstrate that inspectors might indeed find specific evidence of a test if one had occurred.

I expressly refrained from saying that these gases would always be found after an underground test. I pointed out, however, that if, and only if, there were onsite inspections would detection of gases be possible. A potential violator would have to consider the risk of detection, for if the gases were found, that would be unambiguous evidence that a nuclear test had occurred (assuming, of course, as the inspectors would be able to find out, that there was no reactor in the inspection area).

Also, when I said that there would be "no question of 'unclear' or 'suspicious' events," I was not speaking in a context limited solely to gas-sampling techniques. I was referring to the improved position with regard to identification that would result from onsite inspections and the reassurance that would follow inspections for which totally negative results were obtained. In short, my statement means that if onsite inspections were carried out and no evidence of a test were forthcoming, other parties would be assured. Given a good overall probability of finding a violation, which probability would include the utilization of demonstrated technical capabilities, if the Soviet Union let us in to make inspections and no evidence of a test were found, assurance would be achieved.

The factual information for my conclusions was derived from the cable which you quote. The conclusions were drawn naturally from that factual information and from general knowledge of the problem. I do not believe analysis of my statement supports your concern that it lends itself to an overrating of the fission-product, gas-sampling technique. To my knowledge, no statement by any other delegation reveals such a misunderstanding. Interventions by Swedish and Soviet bloc representatives which followed my statement showed awareness that the United States continued to insist upon onsite inspections to verify a comprehensive test ban.

You state that the weakness of the gas-sampling technique "is demonstrable by trying to imagine just how many air, water and ground samples onsite inspectors would be required to take over an area ranging from 350 to 1,000 square miles—which is that area to which the closest possible pinpointing of a suspicious underground event could be made from long-range seismic signals traveling at uncalibrated speeds from the event to detectors in a multicontinental network."

Present technology provides a good probability of locating seismic events within an area of about 250 square miles unless unknown anomalies exist in the times for seismic signals to travel through the earth in particular areas. Insofar as our ability to locate seismic events is concerned, the "Longshot" experiment in Alaska is of considerable significance. While normal travel time analyses failed to locate the event within 15 miles, refined analyses removed a considerable fraction of the travel time anomalies which accounted for this error. With the quantity of seismic data available, Longshot was located by this means to within 6 miles of its true origin.

Furthermore, in accordance with a basic purpose of Longshot, its results have given us a calibration point for this area, so that events there could be routinely located within an approximately 250 square mile area. Calibration data also exists for many other locations of interest throughout the world and techniques are available for extending this calibration to other areas as desired.

Moreover, not all points within such an area are going to be considered suspicious. A nuclear test requires considerable human activity, the evidence of which cannot be completely concealed. An inspection team might not be able to tell that any particular sign of human activity was or was not associated with a test.

But it would be able to tell that some sort of activity had occurred and therefore that this was a site from which a gas sample should be collected. ARPA research indicates the number of possible sites in typical hypothesized inspection areas could be covered by an inspection team taking gas samples within the time contemplated for an inspection.

Finally, you suggested that the term "comprehensive test ban" is a misnomer since testing at levels below a few kilotons could still be carried out and stand no chance whatever of detection.

We now have the capability to construct a system of monitoring stations outside the Soviet Union having good probability of detecting events in the Soviet Union equivalent to an explosion of a kiloton and higher in the geological formations likely to be used by a wouldbe violator. This is similar to the detection estimate for the system with control posts in the Soviet Union which was agreed to in 1958 at the time President Eisenhower first authorized U.S. negotiators to seek a comprehensive test ban treaty. (See Report of the Conference of Experts, Aug. 21, 1958, "Documents on Disarmament," 1945–59, pp. 1090, 1109.)

The United States has believed since 1958 that a comprehensive test ban treaty would be in the national interest. As the 1958 estimates indicate, we have always recognized that no detection system could detect all violations. We believe, however, that violations which would have a significant impact on the strategic balance could not be carried out without our becoming aware of them. For this reason, we have no hesitation in using the expression "comprehensive test ban," as President Johnson did in a 1964 letter to Chairman Kosygin.

While you may disagree, we have always concluded that the advantages of an adequately verified comprehensive test ban outweighed the risks involved. The main advantage, as President Johnson described it in his 1966 message to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, is that "the perils of proliferation would be materially reduced by an extension of the limited test ban treaty to cover underground tests."

Since you have inserted your letter to Mr. Foster in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I respectfully request that you do the same with my reply.

Sincerely yours,

ADRIAN S. FISHER,
Acting Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1966.

Mr. ADRIAN S. FISHER,
Deputy Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FISHER: On April 27 I received your April 22 reply to my letter to Mr. Foster regarding your April 4 speech to the 18-nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva. It seems the Washington mail service is a little slow.

You are correct in assuming that my main purpose in writing to Mr. Foster was to point out that your statement regarding the gas-analysis technique in the on-site inspection process was an overstatement of what the facts justified and thus could be misunderstood by other delegations to the ENDC and by newsmen. Indeed, much of the reporting of your speech shows that it was, as you would now indicate, misunderstood. I will quote again the Associated Press dispatch of April 4 from Geneva:

"GENEVA, April 4.—The United States made public today details of a plan said to guarantee that onsite inspections could catch any violation of a treaty banning underground nuclear tests.

"Chief U.S. Delegate Adrian S. Fisher told the 18-nation disarmament conference the system involves analysis of fission-product gases which slowly leak to the surface after such an explosion. Fisher claimed such gases could only result from a nuclear explosion and analysis of the surface would soon show whether the country concerned had cheated.

" 'This would make it impossible for a country to get away with secret tests by thoroughly cleaning up the surface of the explosion area to deceive on-site inspectors, he said.' "

Clearly the impression the newsmen received in Geneva is contrary to what you state was your intent. I am happy, therefore, to have your present elucidating remarks pointing out that your major purpose was to demonstrate the need for onsite inspections in connection with a treaty to ban underground nuclear explosions. I must say, however, that in reading the Swedish delegate's speech of April 14 which is, at least in part, a response to your April 4 speech, I see no evidence of your having convinced that delegate of the necessity for onsite inspections.

In fact, Mrs. Myrdal's insistence on the "verification by challenge" would seem to indicate a lack of appreciation as to the effect of delays in making an onsite inspection. Perhaps a greater degree of candor on the part of the United States with regard to steps that can be taken to cover up evidence of a nuclear explosion would have been more convincing.

Returning now to your current letter, you state that "Present technology provides a good probability of locating seismic events within an area of about 250 square miles unless unknown anomalies exist in the times for seismic signals to travel through the earth in particular areas." I do not know how to quantify "good," but I can assure you that a 50 percent probability is not my idea or most people's idea of what is "good" when our national security may be at stake. You also speak of unknown travel time anomalies, as if these are rare. I recall that every time we detonated an underground nuclear explosion in a new location—New Mexico, Mississippi, and most recently, Alaska—we have found anomalies in the seismic travel times that were unknown before. In the vast area of more than 12 million square miles that are under the control of the Soviet Union and Communist China, there are undoubtedly many areas that give rise to anomalous travel times. The Soviet Union alone has 8,660,000 square miles.

You speak of the considerable importance of the "Longshot" event in our ability to locate seismic events and, in particular, how initial analysis failed to locate this event within 15 miles (an area of 707 square miles, by the way), but that analysis of the anomalies removed the error. This means, of course, that we knew exactly where we shot the event, and when we used this information to establish what the seismic travel time anomalies were, we brought down the circle of location to 113 square miles. Knowing where we shot Long Shot, I'm surprised we couldn't have done even better.

I would like to call your attention to some technical facts regarding the seismic location of the Long Shot event, of which apparently you are not aware. The unclassified report on Long Range Seismic Measurements on Long Shot dated January 5, 1966 and prepared for the Nuclear Test Detection Office of the DOD's Advanced Research Projects Agency shows the following: When the seismic data were limited to long range seismic stations and the Vela observatories (the best we know how to build and this includes the 500 element array in Montana), the location of Long Shot was off by 63 kilometers (40 miles). This is an area of more than 5,000 square miles. When all stations were used—including some very close in—the location made was down to 26 kilometers (16.3 miles, an area of 830 square miles).

Interestingly enough, however, considering the seismic data of "all stations," the analysis shows Long Shot to have been at a depth of 76.2 kilometers (this is more than 47 miles deep). Now everyone knows you can't fire a nuclear explosion that deep, and so Long Shot would have been interpreted as a natural seismic event, not even being suspected of being nuclear, on the basis of "all stations." I am certainly concerned with such data having to be used as a basis for deciding on a violation of an underground test ban treaty.

A similar story with regard to seismic data location is true for the Salmon event, detonated in Mississippi. It had been estimated for that event that even with travel time corrections, the 90 percent confidence ellipse turns out to be 950 km.^{2} (371 square miles).

In contrast to the technical facts known about our capabilities to detect and locate seismic events (not even mentioning identification) in areas for which we obviously do not have good seismic data, the views you present are clearly unwarranted overstatements of our abilities.

I do, as you indicate, disagree with you with regard to a comprehensive test ban treaty. The reasons are simple. We cannot adequately verify such a treaty on the basis of an unwarranted amount of optimism and a handful of on-site inspections. To go into such a treaty without a better capability than we now have is a danger to our Nation's security.

You have asked that your letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am inserting your letter and this reply.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Charles Robert Harrah, minister of the Colonial Church of Bayside, Bayside, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth.—Psalms 8: 1.

Our gracious Heavenly Father, whose name is most excellent in all the earth, we heartily praise Thee and thank Thee for all that Thou hast done for us throughout every moment of our lives.

We dare to come before Thee this morning, not because of our faithfulness unto Thee, but because of Thy faithfulness unto us. Thus do we adore Thee and commit ourselves to Thy sovereign power and careful watchfulness over all things in heaven and on earth.

Continually grant, we beseech Thee, unto our President, Thy servants here and in the Senate, their advisers, assistants and colleagues in every department of the Government of this great Republic, to all the people of our beloved Nation, and indeed, to all mankind, the saving knowledge of Thy eternal grace revealed in Jesus Christ our Lord, in which knowledge there is wisdom and strength to properly pursue public duty and private living, and in whose blessed name we also pray for earthly peace and the realization of Thy kingdom come—on earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 5, *1966*, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 4, 1966:

H.R. 1903. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons and James R. Simmons.

On May 5, 1966:

H.R. 13369. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3283. An act to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1308. An act to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on May 5, 1966, approved a prospectus for the construction of the following projects, which prospectus was transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

Nebraska, Lincoln: (1) Post office building, (2) courthouse and Federal office building and parking facility.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress, Chairman.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY ADDRESSES ASSOCIATED PRESS ON OUR ROLE OF WORLD LEADERSHIP

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, the Vice President of the United States delivered an important address before the Associated Press in New York.

I do not believe the role that this country seeks to play in the world today, our progress in foreign and domestic affairs up to the present, or the goals we envision for the future have ever been stated more clearly or eloquently.

Identifying the three major tasks confronting us as the pursuit of peace, narrowing the gap between the rich and poor nations, and sustaining the American economy so that it can bear the burden of our commitments, the Vice President has given clear and concise answers to these and other questions.

The views of Vice President Humphrey are always of great interest to Members of the Congress and everyone throughout the Nation. So that all may have the benefit of his wisdom concerning the critical issues of the day, I place the full text of his remarks at this point in the Record:

Remarks of Vice President Humphrey Before the Associated Press, New York City, April 25, 1966

It is always a risk to speak to the press: They are likely to report what you say.

Today I will take that risk. For I have some thoughts I am quite willing to have repeated.

Today our America stands as the most powerful, the most prosperous, and the freest Nation in the history of the earth.

And in our power, wealth, and freedom, we stand as leader of the Western World.

As a nation cautioned from the first against entangling alliances, this role is not an easy one.

And, indeed, to many other nations of the world we remain a relatively unknown quantity.

For it has been only in recent years that we have ventured into the world with any real seriousness.

And thus we hear questions asked: Are we overreaching ourselves? Will we tire of our tasks? Will our economy be able to support the burdens we carry at home and abroad? Are we equal to the role of world leadership?

Fair enough questions they are.

For the answers affect the great majority of nations and the great majority of the world's peoples—not only because of the weight of our power, but because of the things we stand for. In Tom Paine's words: "The cause of America is in great measure the cause of all mankind."

In the final analysis, the questions asked about us can only be answered by how we measure up to the challenges before us.

Today we face three great and interrelated tasks in the world: the pursuit of peace; the effort to narrow the gap between the rich and poor nations; and the necessity of sustaining an American economy able to carry a thousand future burdens here and around the world.

Our search for peace finds its best expression in our support for the kind of world envisioned in the United Nations Charter—a world where large and small nations might live alike in harmony without threat of external coercion.

No nation has done more for peace than has ours since World War II. The U.N., the Marshall plan, Point Four, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, the Asian Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, Food for Peace, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—these have come from initiatives worthy of our position of leadership.

These have come from our search for peace.

But other initiatives, too, have come from our search for peace: Firmness in Berlin; aid to Greece and Turkey; the founding of NATO, CENTO and SEATO; resistance to aggression in Korea; the determination that nuclear missiles should not be introduced into the hemisphere.

For we have long since learned that peaceful development cannot exist in an environment of violence, aggression, and fear.

Today peace is at stake in Asia.

Peace is at stake in a hundred thousand Asian villages, in the struggle of peasants against a millennium of poverty, disease and despair.

Peace is at stake in a tortured South Vietnam, in the struggle against the classic power tactics of communism.

We must not lose the peace in either struggle.

That is why we have committed once more—as we have had to do before—men, money, and resources to help the nations of Asia help themselves toward security and independence.

It won't be easy. It will be frustrating and at times heartbreaking. But, if we are not to deny our leadership, if we are not to deny the principles in which we believe, we must stay and see it through. And the free nations of the world need to know that we have the vision and the endurance to do so.

Those who threaten their neighbors in Asia should know it too. They should know that we will resist their aggression.

But they should also know that we bear no consumptive hate against their people, that we have no design on their sovereignty. We look only toward the day when all nations may choose to live in harmony with their neighbors—when they may turn together their energies to building a better life for their people.

For this is, after all, the second great task before us: The desperate need to narrow the widening gap between the rich and poor nations of the world.

I give you the words of Pope John 23d in his encyclical Mater et Magistra:

"The solidarity which binds all men and makes them members of the same family requires political communities enjoying an abundance of material goods not to remain indifferent to those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery, and hunger, and who lack even the elementary rights of the human person.

"This is particularly true since, given the growing interdependence among the peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic and social inequality among them persist.

"We are all equally responsible for the undernourished peoples. Therefore, it is necessary to educate one's conscience to the sense of responsibility which weighs upon each and everyone, especially upon those who are more blessed with this world's goods."

We sit here today comfortably examining this situation. But for the disinherited and left out of this world, it is no matter for examination: It is a matter of day-to-day survival.

Today there are families spending their last day on earth because they haven't the strength or health to keep going.

But those who remain—and you can be sure of this—those who remain will take to the streets—they will turn to any master—they will tear the fabric of peace to shreds, unless they have some reason to believe that there is hope for life and hope for justice.

To put this on a more immediate and practical level, let me call to your attention the foreign aid request now before the Congress.

The expenditure for the first year of the Marshall plan was about 2 percent of our gross national product, and 11½ percent of the Federal budget. Today—thanks to the growth of our American economy—our foreign aid request is for only .29 percent of our gross national product and about 1.9 percent of the Federal budget—that is, about 2 cents out of every tax dollar. Yet we hear the same doubts and complaints today that we heard 20 years ago.

If someone has a substitute for foreign aid, I'd like to hear about it. The investment we make in foreign aid—in preventive medicine, if you will—is certainly less than that necessary to treat the symptoms of massive economic crisis and disorder and, yes, of war.

The Marshall plan saved Western Europe and the peace. It created a great new economic market for us.

But there is more: the revived nations of Western Europe have not only repaid their Marshall plan debts, they have already provided more aid to the developing countries than they ever received from us.

The rewards can be just as great tomorrow in other continents.

If there are questions asked about our ability to meet this task, I think they must be answered affirmatively and without equivocation.

We do not seek to do this task alone nor should we. But how can we expect others to follow if we do not lead?

President Eisenhower described the third great task we face today: "The firm base for the problem of leading the world toward the achievement of human aspirations—toward peace with justice in freedom—must be the United States."

We must fashion an America so strong, so free, so able to lead, that there may be no question about our purposes or our endurance.

Basic to this is the necessity of building an economy of growth, and opportunity, yet stable in time when it is tested.

I need not remind this audience of the Communist belief—I suppose some of them still hold it—that the United States was teetering on the brink of economic chaos * * * that it was just a matter of time until our production lines would grind to a halt, until an army of unemployed would seize the state, until economic warfare among the Western nations would open the door to communism.

I think by now some of the Communist doctrinists have come to realize that Lord Keynes was speaking to them as well as others when he wrote: "Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist."

The American economic miracle is the world's greatest success story.

Last year alone we increased our gross national product by $47 billion, increased our total personal income by $39 billion, and increased our Federal cash receipts by $8½ billion.

All this did not happen by accident.

Part of it is certainly due to the influence of Mr. Keynes and the so-called new economics.

But I believe the basic, underlying reason behind our economic success is this: There is today a creative partnership for prosperity among those in our society who used to think of themselves as natural antagonists.

We are dispelling old myths.

How long has it been since we've heard old empty labels such as "labor boss" and "economic royalist."

The fact is that American government, business and labor are increasingly united in the premise that a stronger and better America will be to the common benefit of all.

Among other things, we are united in our determination to accomplish something that no nation has previously dared to try: To make every citizen in our society a full and productive member of our society.

And so today we make national investments in our country and in our people—investments in productivity, in opportunity, in enterprise, in greater social justice, in self-help.

That is what our Great Society programs are all about.

Education, medical care, war against poverty, programs of retraining and redevelopment, better cities and transportation, an even more productive agriculture, yes, equality at the ballot box and before the law—these are the most basic investments of all in an America able to keep its commitments both at home and abroad.

As the President has said so often, it is not a matter of a Great Society of fulfillment of our international responsibilities. It is not a matter of guns or butter, foreign aid, or domestic education. They are tied together and you cannot separate them.

If we can build a society operating on all its cylinders, others in the world may have some hope of doing the same. If we cannot, what hope may others have?

To make our free system work—to sustain it—to keep our pledges all the while: This indeed is the way to erase any doubts the world may have about our ability to fulfill the responsibility of leadership.

In closing, may I say a word about the nature of that responsibility.

Leadership in today's world requires far more than a large stock of gunboats and a hard fist at the conference table.

Leadership today requires more than the ability to go it alone—although we must not be afraid to do so when necessary.

Leadership today requires understanding of the problems we face, of the resources at hand, and of the objectives we seek.

It requires the ability, perhaps even more, to lead and inspire others—to lead and inspire in a sense of common enterprise.

For as strong and rich as we may become, our goal of a just and peaceful world will never be achieved by America alone.

It will be achieved only when the resources of strong and weak, rich and poor alike are allocated, in the most efficient manner possible, to challenges that are far too great for any one nation or group of nations to attempt to overcome.

This, then, is the test of ourselves: Not to march alone, but to march in such a way that others will wish to join us.

I will add one caveat: In none of this should we expect either friendship or gratitude.

We have already eaten breakfast to the accompaniment, in our morning newspapers, of too many "Yankee Go Home" signs, too many riots, too many denunciations of ourselves to believe that leadership can reward us with international laurel wreaths.

I think the most we can expect is this: That those who question us will one day find no reason to question; that in the world there may be no doubt that Americans have the vision, the endurance, and the courage to stand and see it through for what we believe in.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTOMOBILE AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the question of automobile and highway safety is a matter of concern we all share. I am, however, shocked by the implications resulting from recent congressional hearings and news reporting on this subject that the automobile manufacturers are not concerned about the safety of their products. These companies are continually on the alert for possible mechanical defects and are quick to remedy them. A reading of recent news reports regarding the recall of cars for the correction of defects, most of them very minor, leaves the impression that labor and management are careless in the manufacture of their products. This just is not true. The industry should be commended for its diligence in correcting any known defects. I am amazed that they are not more numerous considering the millions of cars produced and the complicated manufacturing required. Probably no industry today has better quality control than that found in the auto industry.

I can foresee an unfortunate economic impact unless this whole problem is placed in its proper perspective. We are all interested in making, not only our cars but highways as well, as safe as humanly possible. The facts will indicate, however, that the real villain is the driver. Human errors can never be totally eliminated but we must place greater emphasis on safe driving. This in cooperation with the manufacturer's attempts to build safer cars and the design of safer highways can do much to reduce traffic fatalities and injuries.

It is time this entire problem be realistically approached and the hysteria recently generated by publicity seeking individuals be quieted before irreparable damage is done to our economy.

APPOINTMENT OF BERNARD BOUTIN AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

The was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Bernard L. Boutin as Administrator of the Small Business Administration represents the initial step toward the restoration of the Small Business Administration and its programs. From his credentials, Mr. Boutin seems to be eminently qualified for this position. I believe I speak for every Member of this body when I state my extreme pleasure at the President's announcement in filling this long vacant position, and in the appointment of one whose years of successful public service presage a better day for the agency.

The appointment of a capable and dynamic Administrator was urged months ago by the minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business and the minority leadership of the House of Representatives. It would appear that at this late, but hopefully not too late, hour, our request has been granted.

Mr. Boutin, in assuming his new post, faces an extremely difficult task to rebuild the agency to the fine organization it once was known to be. Most urgent of the many tasks before him is the restoration of the business loan program, the major responsibility of SBA. This program, contrary to the specific direction of the Congress, has been radically altered and virtually abandoned. The business loan program should operate and receive applications for the maximum amount as provided by law, which is $350,000. It should not operate and receive applications based upon some suggested administrative ceiling as to amount. It should be specifically understood that the Congress desires this business loan program to operate upon the basis that the Congress enacted it. If additional funds are required, then additional funds should be requested. It behooves Mr. Boutin to restore this vitally needed assistance to the Nation's 4.7 million small businesses.

The diminishing proportion of Government purchases from qualified small businesses, due in part to the cessation of procurement set-aside assistance is a matter of extreme concern to small manufacturing and service businesses. Renewal of SBA as the voice of small business, fostering the efforts to obtain a great share of Government procurement, is essential.

Other problems of major importance exist; Employee morale is known to be at rockbottom, the heavy demands upon the agency due to disaster administrative services, the growing demands of the present economy. Under proper and aggressive leadership, each of these problems can be met.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Mr. Boutin should once and for all settle the question, and by this appointment, I believe the President has given us the assurance that the independent status of SBA will be preserved. Those of us who argued strongly against the suggestion of merging the interests of the small business community with the interests of the big business community in the Department of Commerce stressed that it would indeed have been a tragic error. Therefore, Mr. Boutin's appointment argues well with the minority in more than one respect.

It is our sincere hope that he may prove, and I sincerely hope he does, the capable and dedicated leader the agency so desperately needs, and I suggest that Mr. Boutin resist all efforts that may be suggested that he preside over the dissolution of this agency, which is the small business spokesman in government.

Mr. Boutin's assignment is obviously difficult; however, he presents new hope for small business. He is most welcome.

THE REVEREND CHARLES ROBERT HARRAH

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today this House has been privileged to hear the opening prayer by the Reverend Charles Robert Harrah, minister of the Colonial Church of Bayside. Reverend Harrah is a distinguished member of the clergy. He is esteemed by his parishioners and fellow churchmen; he is admired and beloved by the community wherein he serves and where he has been recognized as an outstanding leader in community affairs. I am honored indeed, Mr. Speaker, to have so great a human being as a constituent and one whose dear mother, I should point out, Mr. Speaker, is a constituent of our distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Yes, I am proud indeed that my colleagues have had the opportunity to hear these words of inspiration and blessing today.

THE 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, last month, in my home city of Dallas, Tex., the Air Force Association held its 20th annual convention, which I was pleased to attend. One of the most outstanding events of the convention was the Secretary of the Air Force luncheon at the Sheraton-Dallas Hotel, at which I was privileged to be seated next to the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. J. P. McConnell. Both General McConnell and I were quite impressed with the invocation given by Msgr. William F. Mullally, of St. Louis, Mo. We agreed that his inspiring message should be shared with all Members of Congress:

Incomprehensible Creator, the true fountain of light, and only author of all knowledge, vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, to enlighten our understanding and to remove from us all darkness and ignorance. Bless those who teach, and those who are taught, those who lead, and those who follow, so that what they teach and learn and direct and accomplish, may redound to Thy honor and glory.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that tomorrow, in addition to the program already announced, a conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill will be called up.

AID TO IMPROVE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 437

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Seven months ago, Public Law 89–10, providing massive aid to improve elementary and secondary education, went into effect. At that time we called upon leaders of education in States and local school districts to translate this financial assistance into educational services for the millions of disadvantaged children in our schools: the children who desperately need additional attention if they are to overcome the handicaps of poverty.

I am happy to transmit to you the first report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Their comments on the progress which has been achieved by States and local schools reveal that educators from all levels of Government are working together to provide equal educational opportunities for all.

I am particularly encouraged by the major focus of activities identified in the report: to improve language skills in the early years. Nothing could be more fundamental than this work in assisting children who have been denied normal educational opportunities through poverty or neglect.

The commission members have not failed to point out areas in the program that need additional attention. I have pledged that every effort will be made to meet these problems—and I am confident that the Congress will join in these efforts.

We have begun a major campaign to solve a longstanding problem. The first year of this work has proved that we are on the right road, but we still have far to go.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1966.*

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REGULATION OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 13558) to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, registration of certified public accountants, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13558

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known and may be cited as the "District of Columbia Certified Public Accountancy Act of 1965".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "certified public accountant" means a person who is the holder in good standing of a certificate of certified public accountant issued under the laws of any State or Territory of the United States authorizing him to practice as a certified public accountant in such State or territory. A "certified public accountant of the District of Columbia" is a person who is the holder in good standing of a certificate of certified public accountant issued under the Act of Congress approved February 17, 1923, as amended (42 Stat. 1261, ch. 94), or who is the holder in good standing of a certificate of certified public accountant or of an endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant issued pursuant to section 6 or 8, respectively, of this Act authorizing him to practice as a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sitting as a board or their authorized agent or agents.

(c) The term "Board" means the Board of Accountancy.

(d) The term "person" includes partnerships, corporations and associations as well as natural persons.

(e) The term "he" and the derivatives thereof shall be construed to include the word "she" and the derivatives thereof.

SEC. 3. (a) No natural person shall assume or use the title or designation "certified public accountant" or the abbreviation "C.P.A.", or any other title, designation, words, letters, or abbreviations tending to indicate that such person is a certified public accountant, or is likely to be confused with "certified public accountant" or "C.P.A.", unless such person is a holder of a certificate of certified public accountant. No natural person shall engage or hold himself out to the public as being engaged in the practice of public accountancy as a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia, unless such natural person is the holder of a certificate of certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or an endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant as provided in sections 6 and 8 of this Act.

(b) No partnership shall assume or use the title or designation "certified public accountants" or the abbreviation "C.P.A.'s" or any other title, designation, words, letters, abbreviations, sign, or device tending to indicate that such partnership is composed of certified public accountants, unless such partnership is registered as a partnership of certified public accountants under section 10 of this Act.

(c) No corporation shall assume or use the title or designation "certified public accountant" or the abbreviation "C.P.A." or any other title, designation, words, letters, abbreviations, sign, card, or device tending to indicate that such corporation is licensed as a certified public accountant or likely to be confused with "certified public accountant" or "C.P.A."

(d) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit any person, partnership, or corporation from practicing public accountancy either gratuitously or for hire: *Provided*, That such person, partnership, or corporation does not assume the title of "certified public accountant", or the abbreviation "C.P.A." or any other titles, designations, or abbreviations likely to be confused with "certified public accountant" or "C.P.A."

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered to establish a Board of Accountancy, composed of three certified public accountants of the District of Columbia, to serve as their agent and to delegate to such Board of Accountancy any of the technical and professional functions vested in the Commissioners by this Act. Each of the members of the Board of Accountancy shall be registered in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of this Act and, at the time of appointment to the Board, shall have been engaged in the practice of public accountancy as a certified public accountant for a period of not less than ten years, at least five years of which shall have been in the District of Columbia. The requirements of the preceding sentence shall not apply to those persons who are members of the Board of Accountancy on the date of enactment of this Act. The length of terms for Board members shall be three years and no person shall be appointed to the Board for more than two terms. The Commissioners shall have the authority to determine from time to time the amount of compensation to be paid to Board members.

The Commissioners may remove any member of the Board of Accountancy for neglect of duty or for other sufficient cause.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners are authorized to adopt from time to time such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including, but not limited to, rules of professional conduct and grounds for denial, suspension, or revocation of any certificate, endorsement, or registration applied for or issued under this Act. The Board of Accountancy shall make recommendations to the Commissioners concerning the adoption of such rules and regulations. No such rules or regulations shall be adopted until after the Commissioners shall have held a public hearing thereon.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioners are authorized to issue a certificate of certified public accountant of the District of Columbia to any applicant furnishing to the Commissioners satisfactory proof that he has the following qualifications:

(1) Is at least twenty-one years of age;

(2) Is a citizen of the United States, or has declared his intention of becoming such citizen;

(3) Has actually and continuously resided in or has been domiciled in the District of Columbia or has been regularly employed in the District of Columbia on a continuous full-time basis for a period of not less than one year immediately prior to the date of filing an application, or, in the case of an employee of a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants registered to practice in the District of Columbia, has been a bona fide resident of a foreign country for a period of not less than eighteen months immediately preceding the date of filing an application and is not qualified to be examined and to receive a certificate of certified public accountant in the State of last residence solely because of the aforesaid residence abroad;

(4) Has had the education and experience specified in section 7 hereof;

(5) Has successfully completed an examination in accounting and such related subjects as prescribed by the Commissioners;

(6) Is of good moral character; and

(7) Has paid all required fees.

(b) Applications for certificate of certified public accountant by examination approved prior to the effective date of this Act by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, created under prior law, shall be regarded as applications filed under this Act, and the terms and conditions governing carryover credits for having passed a part of the examination in effect at the effective date of this Act, shall control with respect to such applications.

(c) A person who holds a certificate of certified public accountant issued under the laws of the District of Columbia on the effective date of this Act shall not be required to obtain an additional certificate under this Act, but shall otherwise be subject to all the provisions of this Act and such certificate shall, for all purposes, be considered a certificate issued under this Act and subject to the provisions hereof. The holder of a certificate of certified public accountant which is in full force and effect, shall be styled and known as a certified public accountant and may also use the abbreviation "C.P.A.".

SEC. 7. (a) Commencing on the effective date of this Act and for one year thereafter the educational and experience requirements shall be:

(1) Completion of a four-year course of study at an approved high school, or the equivalent of such a course of study, and

(2) Completion of a resident course of study satisfactory to the Commissioners at an institution, junior college, or school of accountancy, or combination thereof, of not less than sixty semester hours of which a minimum of thirty semester hours shall have been in accounting theory and practice, in auditing, and in commercial law as affecting accountancy, and the remainder of the semester hours shall have been in subjects satisfactory to the Commissioners, and

(3) Not less than one year's experience satisfactory to the Commissioners in the full-time employment of a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or of any State or territory of the United States, regularly engaged in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant, or in the full-time employment of a firm of certified public accountants all the partners of which are certified public accountants of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States, and said firm is regularly engaged in the full-time public practice as certified public accountants.

(b) Commencing one year from the date of enactment of this Act, the educational and experience requirements shall be:

(1) (A) Completion of a four-year course of study at an approved high school, or the equivalent of such a course of study, and

(B) Completion of a resident course of study satisfactory to the Commissioners at an institution, junior college, or school of accountancy, or combination thereof, of not less than sixty semester hours of which a minimum of thirty semester hours shall have been in accounting theory and practice, in auditing, and in commercial law as affecting accountancy and the remainder of the semester hours shall have been in subjects satisfactory to the Commissioners, and

(C) Not less than four years' experience satisfactory to the Commissioners in the full-time employment of a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States regularly engaged in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant or in the full-time employment of a firm of certified public accountants, all the partners of which are certified public accountants of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States, and said firm is regularly engaged in the full-time public practice as certified public accountants, or

(2) (A) Completion of a four-year course of study at an approved high school or the equivalent of such a course of study, and

(B) Completion of a resident course of study satisfactory to the Commissioners at an institution, junior college, or school of accountancy, or combination thereof, of not less than ninety semester hours of which a minimum of thirty semester hours shall have been in accounting theory and practice, in auditing, and in commercial law as affecting accountancy, and the remainder of the semester hours shall have been in subjects satisfactory to the Commissioners, and

(c) Not less than three years' experience satisfactory to the Commissioners in the full-time employment of a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States regularly engaged in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant or in the full-time employment of a firm of certified public accountants, all the partners of which are certified public accountants of the District of Columbia or of any State or territory of the United States, and said firm is regularly engaged in the full-time public practice as certified public accountants, or

(3) (A) Completion of a four-year course of study at an approved high school or the equivalent of such a course of study; and

(B) Completion of a resident course of study satisfactory to the Commissioners at an institution, junior college, or school of accountancy, or combination thereof, of not less than one hundred and twenty semester hours with a major in accountancy satisfactory to the Board, or what the Board determines to be substantially the equivalent thereof, and

(C) Not less than two years' experience satisfactory to the Commissioners in the full-time employment of a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States regularly engaged in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant or in the full-time employment of a firm of certified public accountants all the partners of which are certified public accountants of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States and said firm is regularly engaged in the full-time public practice as certified public accountants.

(c) Commencing with the effective date of this Act, the Commissioners may, upon recommendation of the Board of Accountancy, except for any required year of certified public accountant employment as set forth in subsections (b) (1) (C), (b) (2) (C), (b) (3) (C) of this section, one and one-half years of actual and continuous experience of any person (1) in auditing the books and accounts of other persons in three or more distinct lines of commercial business in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, or (2) in a combination satisfactory to the Board of the experience described in (1) above together with auditing the books and accounts or activities of three or more governmental agencies or distinct organizational units in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and reporting on their operations to a third party, to the Congress, or to a State legislature, or (3) in reviewing financial statements and supporting material covering the financial condition and operations of private business entities to determine the reliability and fairness of the financial reporting and compliance with generally accepted accounting principles and applicable Government regulations for the protection of investors and consumers. Nothing in this subsection shall be interpreted as precluding consideration of Government experience for recognition under this subsection.

(d) In general, the educational and experience requirements specified in this section shall be those in effect on the final date for accepting applications for the examination for which the applicant first sits, but the Commissioners may permit exceptions to the general rule in order to prevent what they determine to be undue hardship to applicants resulting from changes in the educational and experience requirements made by this Act.

(e) The Commissioners are authorized and empowered to alter, amend, and otherwise change the educational and experience requirements specified in this section at any time, but in altering, amending, or changing said standards the Commissioners shall not be permitted to lower the same below the standards herein set forth.

SEC. 8. (a) The Commissioners may, in their discretion, waive the examination specified in section 6 of this Act and may issue an endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant, renewable periodically but no more frequently than annually, to an applicant who—

(1) is a certified public accountant of a State or territory of the United States, or who is the holder of a certificate of certified public accountant, or the equivalent thereof, issued in any foreign country, provided the requirements for such certificate are, in the opinion of the Commissioners, equivalent to those herein required; and

(2) meets the qualifications specified in clauses (1), (2), (4), (6), and (7) in subsection (a) of section 6 of this Act: *Provided, however,* That an applicant who is a certified public accountant in good standing of a State or territory shall not be required to meet more extensive educational and experience qualifications than those required by the District of Columbia at the time when such applicant was granted his certificate of certified public accountant by such State or territory; and

(3) declares his intention under oath of opening and maintaining or being employed in an office in the District of Columbia for the purpose of engaging in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia.

(b) The holder of endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant, in full force and effect, shall have all of the privileges of the holder of a certificate of certified public accountant issued under section 6 of this Act and shall be subject to all of the provisions of the Act.

SEC. 9. Every certified public accountant engaged in or who proposes to engage in the public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia is hereby required to register periodically but no more frequently than annually with the Commissioners. A certified public accountant in the District of Columbia employed in the District of Columbia by another certified public accountant registered under this section or by a partnership of certified public accountants registered under section 10 of this Act, shall be regarded as a certified public accountant engaged in public practice and shall be required to register. Failure of a certified public accountant or registrant to apply for such original or renewal registration shall deprive him of the right to engage in or continue to engage in the public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant unless and until he subsequently applies for and obtains such registration.

SEC. 10. (a) A partnership which maintains an office within and engages in the full-time practice of public accountancy or a partnership which may hereafter wish to practice as such in the District of Columbia, may apply for registration, renewable periodically but no more frequently than annually, with the Commissioners as a partnership of certified public accountants, provided it meets all of the following requirements:

(1) Each partner thereof is a certified public accountant in good standing of the District of Columbia or of some State or territory.

(2) At least one partner or the resident manager thereof is a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia engaged in the full-time practice of public accountancy in the District of Columbia.

(3) Each partner thereof engaged in public practice as a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia is a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia.

(b) A registered partnership of certified public accountants, and only such partnership may use the title "Certified Public Accountants" and the abbreviation "C.P.A.s" in connection with the partnership name in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 11. After notice by registered or certified mail and reasonable opportunity for a hearing, the Commissioners are authorized and empowered to revoke, or suspend for not more than three years, any certificate, endorsement, or registration issued by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of this Act, or to refuse to grant or renew, any certificate, endorsement, or registration applied for in accordance with the provisions of this Act, or may censure the holder thereof if the applicant or holder thereof violates the rules of professional conduct or other rules and regulations adopted pursuant to this Act, or for other sufficient cause: *Provided,* That said denial, suspension, or revocation shall be made only upon specific charges in writing. A certified copy of any such charge and at least twenty days' notice of the hearing of the same, shall be served upon the holder of or applicant for such certificate, endorsement, or registration.

SEC. 12. The Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered in connection with any hearing conducted pursuant to authority contained in section 11 of this Act, to subpena any necessary witnesses, books, papers, records, and documents. Any such hearing shall be considered an investigation of a municipal matter within the meaning of the Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 591; D.C. Code, sec. 1–237).

SEC. 13. After notice and hearing are given as provided for in section 11 of this Act, the Commissioners may revoke or suspend the registration of a partnership or may censure a registered partnership for any of the causes described in section 11 of this Act, or for any of the following additional causes:

(1) failure to maintain the qualifications prescribed by section 10 of this Act;

(2) the revocation or suspension by the Commissioners of the certificate or endorsement of a certificate of certified public accountant of any partner; or

(3) the cancellation, revocation, suspension or refusal to renew the authority of the partnership or any partner thereof to practice public accountancy in any State or territory.

SEC. 14. The Commissioners shall adopt and prescribe administrative procedures for public hearings for the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a certificate, endorsement, or registration.

SEC. 15. Upon application in writing and after hearing pursuant to notice, the Commissioners may issue a new certificate or endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant to a person whose certificate or endorsement of certificate shall have been revoked, or may permit the registration of a partnership or of a practicing certified public accountant whose registration has been revoked.

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this Act shall prohibit any natural person not a certified public accountant from serving as an employee of or an assistant to a certified public accountant or a partnership of certified public accountants.

Nothing contained in this Act shall prohibit a certified public accountant or a partnership of certified public accountants of another State from temporarily performing specific accounting engagements in the District of Columbia on professional business incident to regular practice outside the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That such temporary practice is conducted in conformity with the rules of professional conduct promulgated by the Commissioners.

SEC. 17. Any person who violates any provision of section 3 of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Commissioners have reason to believe that any person is liable to punishment under this section, they may refer the facts to the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia, who may cause the proper proceedings to be brought, if, in his judgment, such as warranted. Prosecutions for violations of any provision of section 3 of this Act shall be conducted in the court of general sessions for the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

SEC. 18. The use, display, or uttering by a person of a letterhead, listing, card, sign, advertisement, directory classification, or other printed, engraved, or written instrument or device, bearing a person's name in conjunction with the words "certified public accountant" or "certified public accountants" or any abbreviation thereof, shall be prima facie evidence in any action brought under section 17 of this Act that the person whose name is so displayed caused or procured the display or uttering of such letterhead, listing, card, sign, advertisement, directory classification, or other printed, engraved, or written instrument or device, and that such person is holding himself out to be a certified public accountant or partnership of certified public accountants.

SEC. 19. All statements, records, schedules, working papers, and memorandums made by a certified public accountant or by a partnership of certified public accountants incident to or in the course of professional service to clients, except reports submitted to clients, shall be and remain the property of such certified public accountant or partnership in the absence of an express agreement between such persons and the client to the contrary. No such statement, record, schedule, working paper, or memorandum shall be sold, transferred, or bequeathed, without the consent of the client or his personal representative or assignee, to anyone other than one or more surviving partners or new partners of such persons.

SEC. 20. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or to any circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this Act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Act are declared to be severable.

SEC. 21. The Commissioners are authorized and empowered, after public hearing, to establish, abolish, increase, or decrease, from time to time, fees and charges necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering the provisions of this Act. All funds derived from fees and charges collected relevant to the administration of this Act shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 22. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of revenues of the District of Columbia such funds as may be necessary to pay the expenses of administering and carrying out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 23. The Act entitled "An Act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved February 17, 1923 (42 Stat. 1261), as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 24. This Act shall take effect ninety days after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

1. Page 1, line 5, strike out "1965" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

2. Page 14, line 16, strike out "in" and insert in lieu thereof "of".

3. Page 14, lines 20 and 21, strike out "shall be regarded as a certified public accountant engaged in public practice and".

4. Page 14, line 21, immediately after "shall" insert "also".

5. Page 19, strike out line 1 and insert in lieu thereof "the District of Columbia court of general sessions in".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill—to be known as the "District of Columbia Certified Public Accountancy Act of 1966"—is to repeal present law—approved February 17, 1923, 42 Stat. 2161, District of Columbia Code, title 2, section 901—and set up new, improved, and modern standards for certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, to conform to those in most of the States. Thirty States now require higher qualifications for certified public accountants than does the District.

The present law providing for the regulation of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, and which created a Board of Accountancy in and for the District of Columbia, has been on the statute books without change since its passage in 1923, over 43 years ago. Most of its provisions have been outmoded as a result of developments in the profession and of changes in economic, social, and political conditions during the period since its adoption.

The primary purposes of the proposed new law are: First, to establish residence requirements for the taking of the examination for certified public accountant in the District of Columbia; second, to raise the education and experience requirements for eligibility to take such examination; third, to provide for the recognition of accounting experience gained in self-employment or with the Government; fourth, to provide for the certification of a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia by endorsement of his certificate from another jurisdiction; fifth, to provide for the registration of practicing certified public accountants; and sixth, to provide for the licensing in the District of Columbia of partnerships of certified public accountants where the partners who reside in the District of Columbia are certified in this jurisdiction and the other partners are certified in some State.

Existing law either fails to provide such requirements, or its provisions are inadequate with respect thereto.

The reported bill, in the judgment of your committee, eliminates these shortcomings.

PUBLIC INTEREST

It is in the public interest to raise the standards governing the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia so that they may be generally equivalent to those that now prevail over the major portion of the United States.

CPA standards are important to the public because the practice of certified public accountants constitutes a professional function intimately affecting the public interest. Business management, stockholders, credit and investment analysts, banks and other financial institutions, legislators, Government agencies—all must depend on certified financial reports. The CPA certificate is a mark of professional competence, integrity, and independence.

If an auditor's opinion, certifying that a financial statement fairly presents the position of a company is signed by a CPA, it means—

First. That the statement has been examined by a person who is fully qualified to express an expert opinion;

Second. That enough supporting evidence has been examined to justify the opinion;

Third. That the statement has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles; and

Fourth. That the auditor stakes his reputation on the soundness of his opinion.

The public's confidence in the ability and the integrity of the CPA must be continuously justified by the maintenance of high standards such as this bill provides.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

At a public hearing before your Subcommittee No. 4 witnesses were practically unanimous in support of this legislation. Your committee was advised that such legislation has been under consideration for over 8 years by the District of Columbia Board of Accountancy and by others in the public accounting profession, and that it has the overwhelming support of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia. The bill is deemed urgent and necessary by the Comptroller General of the United States; it is endorsed by the Securities and Exchange Commission; and recommended by over 15 State societies of certified public accountants.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, through their spokesman at the hearing and in correspondence, have stated that they are in accord with the purposes of this legislation. In fact, they recommended a number of specific amendments to improve the bill, which your committee adopted and which are contained in the reported bill.

The Commissioners further recommended that the committee consider general enabling legislation covering over 20 professions and occupations, including physicians, dentists, dental hygienists, nurses, practical nurses, physical therapists, optometrists, pharmacists, podiatrists, veterinarians, certified public accountants, architects, barbers, persons participating in boxing contests, cosmetologists, plumbers and gasfitters, steam engineers, professional engineers, real estate and business chance brokers and salesmen, undertakers, and electrical and refrigeration and air-conditioning contractors.

No bill has been introduced incorporating these proposals. However, in view of the number of professions and occupations included therein, it would take months of hearings and committee consideration before any determination thereon could be made by your committee. Further, your committee at this time has reached no decision to delegate to the Commissioners the revision of the various acts governing all these professions and occupations. Hence, it was the judgment of your committee to defer any conclusion as to general legislation until some more appropriate opportunity. Meanwhile, a fair case having been presented on behalf of the local certified public accountants for revision of their law, your committee finds no reason to postpone action on this specific legislation awaiting some possible action later on the general legislation referred to.

CONCLUSION

It is the judgment of your committee that the proposed legislation will protect the public interest by increasing the educational and experience requirements for certified public accountants in the District of Columbia to reasonable levels; it will make it easier for CPA's of the District to obtain reciprocity registration in other States; it will prevent the District from being used as an instrument for evading the legislative standards of the States; and it will simplify the work of the Board of Accountancy by providing for registration of all CPA's practicing in the District.

MY BILL IS LIMITED TO CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed new law is of the permissive type—that is, it does not deal with public accountants other than certified public accounts—as is the 1923 act.

The District of Columbia Board of Accountancy advised your committee that it was of the unanimous opinion that the licensing of public accountants would create confusion and unnecessary and undesirable dual standards for the professional practice of public accountancy. The Board also concluded from conferences within the profession and other conferences with representatives of the business community that there was insufficient evidence of public need to warrant such licensing.

QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY

In recognition of the fact that the duties and responsibilities of Board members require substantial experience and exposure to the problems and aspirations of the profession, as well as the public interest, the bill—section 4—requires that each member of the Board of Accountancy shall have been engaged for at least 10 years in public practice as a certified public accountant, at least 5 years of which shall have been in the District of Columbia. This provision is similar to exiting laws as they apply to other professions; for example, the Board of Examiners and Registrars of Architects and the Board of Registration for Professional Engineers.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

The bill provides that applicants for the District of Columbia CPA certificate by examination must be residents of the District of Columbia or be employed therein for a minimum period of 1 year.

Under present law, the Board is required to examine all qualified applicants who are citizens of the United States no matter where they live or are employed.

Since all the States and territories of the United States now have duly constituted boards of accountancy which give the uniform CPA examination as does the District of Columbia, there seems to be no reason why the District of Columbia should provide facilities for examining applicants and issuing CPA certificates to those who do not reside or work in the area. In some cases, this now places the Board in the position of being the vehicle for the circumvention of the laws and regulations of other States, because some nonresident applicants for the District of Columbia certificate do not qualify for the examination in their home States.

Also, testimony before your committee was that experience has shown that many nonresidents who receive the District of Columbia CPA certificates use them as the basis for obtaining certificates from other States by reciprocity. These certificate holders do not live or practice in the Distict of Columbia and, accordingly, do not need District of Columbia certificates. Moreover, such persons are apt to be beyond the reach and control of the District of Columbia Board of Accountancy. It is understood that all or nearly all the States and territories have a residence requirement of applicants.

EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE

The education and experience requirements of present law are a high school education or equivalent, plus first, a diploma from some recognized school of accounting and 1 year's experience in the employment of a practicing certified public accountant; or second, 3 years' experience in the employment of a practicing certified public accountant, or third, 5 years of public accounting experience as a sole practitioner.

The reported bill—section 7—sets new requirements as follows:

A transitional period of 1 year after enactment, during which the requirements would be high school education or equivalent, at least 60 semester hours of study in an accountancy course, and 1 year's experience in the full-time employment of a practicing certified public accountant.

After that 1 year, the requirements may be met from a choice of the following combinations, added to high school education or equivalent:

First. Completion of a course of study of not less than 60 semester hours and 4 years' experience in the full-time employment of a practicing certified public accountant; or

Second. Completion of a course of study of not less than 90 semester hours and 3 years' experience in the full-time employment of a practicing certified public accountant; or

Third. Completion of a course of study of not less than 120 semester hours and 2 years' experience in the full-time employment of a practicing certified public accountant.

Raising the training and educational requirements for the CPA certificate is the principal means of furthering the standards of the public practice of the certified public accountant. The ever-increasing complexities of our economic environment require that the certified public accountant be more versatile and proficient than ever before.

Thirteen States now require an applicant to have obtained a college degree: Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, and West Virginia.

Thirteen other States have enacted laws requiring a college degree after a specified future date—generally 1967: Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Four other States require at least 60 college hours: Alaska, Iowa, Maryland, and North Carolina.

Thus, there are 30 States which have educational requirements greater than those required by law in the District of Columbia, and virtually all the States have more extensive experience requirements than the 1 year required under existing law in the District. Therefore, not only is it in the public interest to raise the requirements here but also it will only be a matter of time before a District of Columbia certificate of certified public accountant will not be recognized elsewhere if we do not keep pace with the States.

RECOGNITION OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTING AND GOVERNMENTAL ACCOUNTING EXPERIENCE

Under present law the experience requirement can only be met by, first, completion of a minimum of 1 year's employment with a practicing certified public accountant or a firm of certified public accountants; second, not less than 5 years' continuous self-employment in auditing the books and accounts of other persons in three or more distinct lines of commercial business.

Existing law does not authorize the Board of Accountancy to accept experience gained during employment by the Government. Some Government experience is of the type which prepares a prospective applicant for professional practice as a certified public accountant. Where this is the case, it should be recognized.

Under the bill—section 7—the experience requirement to sit for the CPA examination can be met by, first, employment with a practicing certified public accountant or a firm of certified public accountants; or, second, suitable experience in auditing the books and accounts of other persons in three or more distinct lines of commercial business in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards; or, third, a combination of the foregoing experience together with auditing the books and accounts or activities of three or more governmental agencies or distinct organizational units in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and reporting on their operations to a third party, to the Congress, or to a State legislature; or, fourth, in reviewing financial statements and supporting material covering the financial condition and operations of private business entities to determine the reliability and fairness of the financial reporting and compliance with generally accepted accounting principles and applicable Government regulations for the protection of investors and consumers.

Nothing in this provision, the bill states, shall be interpreted as precluding consideration of Government experience for recognition hereunder. In fact, the language of the original bills—H.R. 7624 and H.R. 9815—in this regard was changed by your committee upon the recommendation of the General Accounting Office, to permit full consideration by the Board of Accountancy of the experience of Government accountants, as shown in three above. Already a number of the States which require experience recognize the professional nature of the General Accounting Office work and accept General Accounting Office experience meeting eligibility standards required for their CPA certificates. Many of the GAO professional staff have already obtained their CPA certificates on the basis of General Accounting Office experience. Three hundred and ninety-one GAO staff members are holders of the CPA certificate, and 61 others who have passed the required examination will receive their certificates upon completion of their experience requirement.

The Securities and Exchange Commission reported to your committee that the above-referred-to provisions of the bill would make it possible for accountants employed by the Commission who regularly review financial statements filed with the Commission to fulfill the experience requirements referred to, and that this would be a long-needed improvement in the law as it would recognize what it believed to be a wide variety of high quality experience obtained by accounts employed by the Commission.

The Federal Government has become a major user and stimulator of independent audits. Inquiry to 26 Federal agencies reveals that 38,000 audits are stimulated or used each year by these agencies in 53 separate programs as compared with about half that number of engagements just 5 years ago. The Securities and Exchange Commission alone uses 11,825 such audits annually. Other major users include Housing and Home Finance Agency, Interior Department, Small Business Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and Farm Credit Administration.

ENDORSEMENT OF CPA CERTIFICATES ISSUED BY OTHER JURISDICTIONS

Under present law, the Board of Accountancy may, and does as a matter of policy, waive the examination otherwise required and issue District of Columbia certificates to qualified holders of State certificates who want to practice as CPA's in the District of Columbia on a full-time basis. No distinction is made in the form of certificate issued in such cases from that issued to applicants who have passed the examination given by the Board.

The bill—section 8—provides that CPA certificates will be issued only to those who pass the examination given in the District of Columbia. However, qualified holders of certificates of other States would be granted reciprocity through the medium of endorsements, renewable periodically, attachable to their original certificates. No change in principle with respect to reciprocity is involved.

REGISTRATION OF PRACTICING CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

At present, the Board of Accountancy has no means short of complete periodic circularization of all certificate holders—which procedure was carried out by this Board for the first time about 6 years ago—of knowing what CPA's are in practice in the District of Columbia. It has been stated that perhaps the majority of District of Columbia certificate holders are either nonpractitioners or nonresident practitioners.

The bill—sections 9 and 10—provides for registration of CPA practitioners, including partnerships, with the Board as a condition precedent to public practice.

Your committee believes the law must be implemented with some such provision to enable the Board to discharge the continuing responsibilities imposed on it. It is not enough for the Board to exert control over those who enter the profession; it is legally as well as morally bound to protect the public and other practitioners against those in practice who may violate the law and generally accepted standards of professional practice and conduct. In order to discharge the latter duty, it goes without saying that the Board must know who is in practice.

It is understood that registration, such as is provided for in this section, is required of other professional people in the District of Columbia. Many jurisdictions in the United States also require registration of certified public accountants.

CPA FIRMS WITH NONRESIDENT PARTNERS

Under present law, firms having partners who are not District of Columbia certificate holders, but who hold CPA certificates in other jurisdictions, are not permitted to practice as CPA's in the District of Columbia. As a result, such firms classify themselves in the District of Columbia telephone and other directories and practice here as "public accountants."

The bill—section 10—remedies this situation by permitting firms to practice as CPA's provided all partners are CPA's of some State, and resident partners or resident managers are CPA's of the District of Columbia.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Remaining sections of the bill provide authority for rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the law.

Others deal with revocation and suspension of certificates, endorsements, and registrations; hearings, notice, procedure, and review; reinstatement; acts declared unlawful; ownership of working papers; repeal of the present law and other legal matters. These matters are not adequately dealt with in present law.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be permitted to insert their remarks in the RECORD immediately after each bill is passed today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 9824) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1132, as amended, 77 Stat. 347; title 35, section 410, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) is hereby amended by striking therefrom the first sentence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the reported bill is to amend section 11 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended—title 35, section 410, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition—to permit insurance companies to make prompt public announcement of their financial standing.

STATEMENT

Under the insurance laws of the District of Columbia, domestic and alien insurance companies are presently prohibited from advertising or publicly announcing their financial standing except in exact conformity with the last preceding statement filed by them with the Superintendent of Insurance. Financial statements are required to be filed by March 1 each year for the year ending the preceding December 31. Statements are customarily filed on or shortly before March 1 each year.

Under the law as presently in force, an insurance company is precluded from making public announcement or advertisement of its financial standing for a given year until 2 months after the year ends. An extreme case may be cited as an example: if a company were to publish an advertisement or otherwise publicly announce its financial standing at any time prior to March 1, 1966—when its statement for 1965 is required to be filed—it would be constrained to publish only that information in the last annual report filed with the Superintendent—March 1, 1965—which would cover only the year ended December 31, 1964.

The public interest is best served when the companies can publish interim statements of current financial figures. No purpose is served by requiring the publication of outdated information which is from 1 year old to 14 months old.

The proposed amendment to section 11 of chapter II abolishes the requirement of publishing or advertising anachronistic data pending the filing of the statement for the most recent year ended. It would permit updated reporting to the public by allowing insurance companies to publish interim reports of operations and financial standing.

PRESENT LAW

The provision of present law—title 35, section 410, District of Columbia Code—which is deleted by this bill, reads as follows:

> Every advertisement or public announcement and every sign, circular, or card issued by any domestic, foreign, or alien company doing business in the District representing its financial standing shall exhibit the amount of the capital stock actually paid up in case, the assets owned, the liabilities, including therein the premiums and loss reserves required by law, and the amount of surplus, and shall correspond to the next preceding verified statement made by such company.

Your committee is of the view that the public is properly protected against false or misleading statements through other provisions of present law vesting in the Superintendent of Insurance power to revoke or suspend a company's certificate of authority to do business should it misrepresent its status. This is because section 6, chapter II of present law—title 35, section 405, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition—remains unchanged. Pertinent provisions thereof are as follows:

> The Superintendent shall have power to revoke or suspend the certificate of authority to transact business in the District of any company which has failed or refused to comply with any provision or requirement of chapters 3–8, or which—
>
> * * *
>
> (k) has made, issued, circulated, or caused to be issued or circulated any estimate, illustration, circular, or statement of any sort misrepresenting either its status or the terms of any policy issued or to be issued by it, or the benefits or advantages promised thereby,

or the dividends or shares of the surplus to be received thereon, or has used any name or title of any policy or class of policies misrepresenting the true nature thereof.

HEARING

At a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 4 on October 7, 1965, enactment of this legislation was urged by representatives of the outstanding domestic life insurance companies and by a representative of the District of Columbia Commissioners. No opposition to the bill has been expressed to your committee.

The favorable report of the Commissioners is set forth in full in the committee report—House Report No. 1479.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H.R. 13703 to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13703

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 19–308 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "survivors" and inserting in lieu thereof "survivor".

SEC. 2. Section 20–2301(b) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "The United States attorney for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13703 is to make certain technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code.

The need for these amendments arises because of errors in connection with the codification of titles 18, 19, 20, and 21 of the District of Columbia Code as enacted during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, act of September 14, 1965, Public Law 89–183.

Section 1 of the bill corrects an error made in the codification of section 19–308 of the District of Columbia Code, by striking out the word "survivors" and inserting the word "survivor" to conform with the provision of the existing law at the time the codification was undertaken.

Amendment in section 2 of the bill is to correct a reference to a section of the District of Columbia Code in the act of November 8, 1965, Public Law 89–347. Early in the 89th Congress, the House of Representatives approved legislation which was finally enacted on the above date. In the interim between action by the House and action by the Senate, title 20 of the District of Columbia Code was recodified and the section reference contained in the pending legislation was repealed and a new section designation was given in the codification. The amendment provides the proper section reference for the act of November 8, 1965.

Favorable report of the Commissioners on the proposed legislation is as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, April 5, 1966.

HON. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 12966, a bill "To make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code." The purpose of the bill is to correct certain errors in phraseology inadvertently made in the codification, under Public Law 89–183, approved September 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 785), of part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations."

Section 1 of the bill amends section 19–308, District of Columbia Code, by striking the word "survivors" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "survivor", so as to make clear that in the case of a person who dies intestate leaving no child, or descendent, his entire estate is to be distributed equally between his father and mother or the surviving parent. The singular form of the word was used in the corresponding provision of law formerly found in section 18–708, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, and no substantive change was intended in the codification thereof.

Section 2 amends section 20–2301(b), District of Columbia Code, by striking out "The United States attorney for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia". The amendment provides that the Corporation Counsel shall be made a party to any petition filed, pursuant to subsection (a) of section 20–2301, for the appointment of a receiver for the property of absentees and absconders from the District of Columbia. The substitution of parties provided by section 2 of the bill was, in fact, believed accomplished by section 10 of the act approved November 8, 1965 (79 Stat. 1309; Public Law 89–347), which made a similar amendment to former section 20–701, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition. However, section 20–701 had already been repealed by the act of September 14, 1965, and reenacted as section 20–2301, effective January 1, 1966. Section 2 of the bill is designed to remedy this oversight.

Section 3 of the bill provides effective dates for the amendments made by sections 1 and 2.

The Commissioners recognize the necessity for the clarification of law provided by the proposed technical amendments and recommend that the bill be passed.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

PRESERVATION AND USE OF OLD GEORGETOWN MARKET

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 14205) to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14205

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the real property, together with all structures thereon on the date of enactment of this Act, described as lot 800, square 1186, of the District of Columbia, commonly known as the Old Georgetown Market, is hereby declared a historic landmark, and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to preserve such property as a historic landmark and to operate and maintain it as a public market, except that the Board is authorized to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the use of a portion of such property as a museum to be operated by the Secretary in connection with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. Such property shall not be used under authority of any provision of law for any purpose not provided in this Act, unless (1) such law is enacted after the date of enactment of this Act and (2) specifically authorizes such property to be used for such other purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of legislation which would restore the Old Georgetown Market to the function for which it was deeded to the District of Columbia in the first years of the past century, and which, in addition, would recognize the worth of this structure as a historical site.

As the committee knows, I sponsored similar legislation, in the interest of the farmers of Virginia who have brought their produce to Washington for many years; and, despite the suggestion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that this type of merchandising was out of date, and not to be encouraged, have found a ready market.

The committee, in its hearings, found, as its report has reflected, that there not only continues to be a market for the produce of these farmers—from Virginia and Maryland—but that there also is an acceptance of a merchandising center for their wares close to one of the residential areas of the highest value in the city.

It is in recognition of this fact, I am sure, that the committee has brought to the House a bill to return this worthy old structure to the purpose for which it was intended—that of a public market—which not only honors the deed under which the property passed into public ownership, but also, recognizes the present acceptance of a facility of this kind in Georgetown.

Additionally, I should like to compliment the committee on its amendment of the various bills introduced to include a feature providing for a museum function in the structure. The old building not only could be restored to its original use under this bill but also could serve as a visitor center for the historic Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, which is located only a few yards behind the building.

On behalf of the Virginia farmers—and I know my Maryland colleagues join in the interest of their farmers—I want to compliment the committee on its careful consideration of this legislation, and on the form of the bill which it has brought to the floor—and which I support.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in today's age of exploding scientific miracles, there seems to be a concerted rush to automate everything from combs and can openers to entire factory complexes. Sometimes, in our zeal for the fastest, the biggest, the superefficient, we forget that there is still room in many cases for the so-called "old ways" which may not necessarily be the best ways, but which still may offer their own unique advantages.

I think we have such a situation in the nearly worldwide disappearance of the old farmers' market concept. Even the internationally known Les Halles in Paris has finally succumbed to the inevitable march of progress and the encroachments of the supermarket. Right here in Washington we have the opportunity today to preserve what is believed to be the oldest public market on the eastern seaboard, the Old Georgetown Market on M Street.

One of the District of Columbia measures we are considering today would preserve the market at the same time declaring it a historic landmark, to be converted in part for use by the Department of the Interior for a museum in connection with the C. & O. Canal.

The bill would insure that District of Columbia residents and our area farmers would be able to avail themselves of the unique advantages of a permanent farmers' market in the increasingly rare atmosphere of our historic past. I support H.R. 14205 and urge my colleagues to save this 160-year-old link with the past.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, while it is true that this bill bears my name, many of our colleagues indicated their enthusiastic endorsement of this positive idea by themselves introducing companion bills aimed at the restoration of the Old Georgetown Market.

This bill, H.R. 14205, would restore the Old Georgetown Market to its former use as a live, useful, and colorful marketplace wherein the fresh farm produce from the nearby Virginia and Maryland farm communities could be marketed firsthand. Additionally, a portion of the restored market would be used as a museum portraying the historical aspects of this venerable marketplace which dates back to the year 1802. This bill would require the District government to restore to active use this property in Old Georgetown which was deeded in perpetuity to the District of Columbia with the firm stipulation that this property be used solely as a public market; the deed is quite clear on this point.

The numerous witnesses—farmers and District citizens—who appeared before your committee convincingly attested to the need for such a market outlet for farm and specialty produce from the nearby farming areas. Your District Committee unanimously agreed.

Mr. Speaker, the sole opposition to this bill was offered by the District Commissioners who felt that the market would not pay for itself. Their contention is arguable. Nonetheless, the Commissioners did see merit in preserving it as a market museum and historical landmark. Now, it seems to me that if money can be had to restore the market as a historical landmark, why not restore it to active, colorful and productive use? The need is there. The income from rentals would help amortize the $185,000 which the District government estimates it will cost for alterations and repairs. As far as paying customers are concerned, many District civic groups and private citizens appeared before your committee with the appeal that the market be usefully restored and assured the committee that patronage would not be lacking. The Georgetown Citizens Association—for instance—certainly a group hypersensitive to any facility which might possibly mar the historical traditions and architecture of Old Georgetown, testified that it strongly endorsed the preservation of the Old Georgetown Market—not only as a historical landmark but also as a useful, functioning enterprise. The Georgetown Association, as did others, expressed the solid conviction that patronage for the market would not be lacking and that the very fresh produce trucked in from the nearby farms would be a most welcome treat for the tables of our District citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia is full of quiet, beautiful and restful museums and galleries dedicated to the arts and to the past—and rightly so. But, here we have a rare opportunity to combine the best of both worlds—historic restoration combined with a living and productive contact with the here and now.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when both farmers and consumers generally need help, I strongly urge my colleagues to act favorably on this very desirable bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] to call up any bills reported from his subcommittee.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL JUDGES TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND INCREASE RETIREMENT SALARIES OF CERTAIN JUDGES

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 2263) to establish a traffic branch of the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2263

An act to establish a Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 11 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by adding immediately after chapter 11 of such title the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 12—TRAFFIC BRANCH OF COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

"Sec.
"11-1201. Establishment of branch.
"11-1202. Judges; assignments.
"11-1203. Sessions.
"11-1204. Jurisdiction; powers.

"§ 11-1201. Establishment of branch

"The Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions is hereby established as a branch in the criminal division of the courts.

"§ 11-1202. Judges; assignments

"The Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall consist of two judges of the court, who shall serve in that branch during their tenure of office. The chief judge of the court may, if he finds the work of the Traffic Branch will not be adversely affected thereby, assign any of the judges of the Traffic Branch to temporarily perform the duties of any of the other judges of the court. The chief judge of the court shall also have the authority to assign any of the other judges of the court to serve temporarily in the Traffic Branch if, in the opinion of the chief judge, the work of the Traffic Branch requires such assignment.

"§ 11-1203. Sessions

"The Traffic Branch, with at least one judge in attendance, shall be open for the transaction of business every day of the year (including night sessions), except Saturday afternoons, Sundays, and legal holidays.

"§ 11-1204. Jurisdiction; powers

"The Traffic Branch and each judge sitting therein shall have the same jurisdiction over, and exercise the same powers in connection with, offenses arising out of violations of laws or regulations of the District of Columbia relating to the operation, licensing, registration, inspection, or parking of motor vehicles; the regulation and control of motor vehicle traffic; the issuance, suspension, or revocation of motor vehicle operating permits; and motor vehicle safety responsibility, as that lawfully had or exercised by the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions on the date immediately preceding the effective date of this section."

SEC. 2. The Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall have jurisdiction over all offenses arising out of any such violations referred to in section 11-1204 of the District of Columbia Code pending in the Court of General Sessions on the effective date of section 11-1204 of the District of Columbia Code.

SEC. 3. Section 11-904 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "section 11-1103" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 11-1103, 11-1203,".

Sec. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 11-902 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "fifteen associate judges" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty associate judges".

(b) Two of the judges appointed to the additional positions authorized by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section to section 11-902 of the District of Columbia Code shall, during their tenures of office, serve as judges of the Traffic Branch of the Court of General Sessions.

Sec. 5. The table of contents of part II of the District of Columbia Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure", is amended by inserting immediately after

"11. Domestic Relations Branch of
Court of General Sessions___ 11-1101"

the following:

"12. Traffic Branch of Court of
General Sessions__________ 11-1201".

Sec. 6. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

1. Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 11-902(a) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out 'fifteen' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty'.

"Sec. 2. Section 11-1701(a) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

" '(8) A judge receiving retirement salary pursuant to this section shall be entitled, for any period for which he performs full-time judicial duties under this subsection, to receive the salary of the office in which he performs such duties, but there shall be deducted from such salary an amount equal to his retirement salary for such period.

" '(9) A judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals or the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions who has retired prior to the effective date of section 306 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 shall receive an increase in the retirement salary to which he is otherwise entitled under this section in the same percentage as the increase in salaries provided in section 306(i)(2) and section 306(i)(3) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 for judges who are serving on the effective date of such section 306 on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.'

"Sec. 3. The increases in compensation authorized by the amendments of this Act shall be retroactive to July 1, 1964."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a few questions.

Does this bill propose five additional permanent judges; or does it propose to make possible the use of retired judges—or does it propose to do both?

Mr. WHITENER. I will say to the gentleman, the bill does provide for five additional judges in the court of general sessions of the District of Columbia.

As to the second inquiry, under existing law retired judges of the court of general sessions are subject to recall for duty as members of that court. However, under existing law there is a limit of 90 days that a retired court of general sessions judge may be required to serve.

This bill would have the effect of permitting retired judges who spend their full time or a portion of their time to be compensated for their service.

Mr. GROSS. So that this bill would provide for five additional permanent judges. The authority already exists for calling in retired judges, as I understand it, but the call is circumscribed by the inability to take care of the retirement pay; is that not correct?

Mr. WHITENER. The situation we now have is that there is one judge who has been retired for some time and for the past 2 years he has held court on a full-time basis without compensation other than the retirement pay that he earned prior to his retirement.

I might point out to the gentleman, knowing of his interest in financial matters, that this is one area in which there is no cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now that raises an interesting question—no cost to the taxpayers. Because fines are levied, you say that compensates for the costs of these judges or more than compensates for them. I read that in the report. But how about charging off some of the revenues collected by way of fines to pay police officers who arrest the culprits in the first place, thereby providing the courts with the business from which the revenue is derived? I do not believe it is quite as simple as saying that because a judge levies a fine that his salary and all other costs are being paid out of revenue collected.

Somebody had to get the criminal or the culprit there in the first place or the court would not have that opportunity. I think the costs of law enforcement officers should also be given some consideration.

Mr. WHITENER. Let me say to the gentleman that one of the sources of revenue of the court of general sessions is from the civil side of the court where the law enforcement bodies no not necessarily come into play.

If the gentleman will remember, a few years ago we passed legislation here which increased the jurisdiction of the court of general sessions from $3,000 to $10,000 in civil actions. At the time we did not increase the judicial manpower. This increase in jurisdiction has resulted in a tremendous increase in the civil proceedings in the local court and at the time we had our hearings the statistics were rather startling, that the court has been able to do as well as it has.

I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the orderly administration of justice requires an adequate amount of judicial manpower, and without passing this legislation, we would further add to the unfortunate situation which exists.

Mr. GROSS. It was not so long ago that one of the judges of the court system in the District of Columbia publicly stated that some of the judges were not working the hours that they ought to be working; that it was hard to find some judges in their courtrooms after 3:30 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, if I remember the newspaper accounts correctly.

Did the committee go into this and, if so, did they find that all judges are spending the hours we could reasonably expect the judges to hold court?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. I will be happy to answer the gentleman in the words of Chief Judge John Lewis Smith, of the court of general sessions, who testified before the committee as follows:

Judge Smith. I might say, as far as the court of general sessions is concerned, our judges are authorized 36 days' leave a year. That is computed on the basis of their availability for Saturday assignment. They work a five-and-a-half-day week. Ordinarily we would be entitled to 26 days' leave. We do not take a recess during Easter. We work a staggered schedule during Christmas holidays. We discontinue civil and criminal jury trials only. All our statutory courts are in operation all through our Christmas holidays. But, as a practical matter, our judges take an average of 21 days' leave a year.

Mr. GROSS. Aside from that, will the gentleman agree with me that if they are not continuing the operation of their courts beyond 3:30 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, they are not spending the time that we should reasonably expect them to spend in their courtrooms?

Mr. WHITENER. From my experience in the courts, I do not think you can operate courts on a timeclock basis. Many circumstances arise which call for early recessed courts from day to day. There are many occasions when judges might call a court into session early in the morning. There are some judges who take an hour for the luncheon recess, others who take 2 hours, and some in between. I just do not believe that you can——

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is an attorney; I am not an attorney. How many hours a day does the gentleman think a judge ought to spend on the bench?

Mr. WHITENER. Down my way, in the actual trial of cases in cities, we usually go from 10 o'clock to 12:30, and from 2:30 to 4 or 5 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. I was astounded by a statement of one of the judges in the District of Columbia that some of the judges were leaving, I believe, around 3:30 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon; that it was difficult to find certain judges operating after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. It seems to me that with the heavy backlog of cases, which the report indicates, they ought to be on the job. I call the gentleman's attention to page 4——

Mr. WHITENER. May I interrupt the gentleman to say this. We have no evidence before our subcommittee which would indicate that they are not on the job.

Mr. GROSS. I refer to the last sentence on page 3 and carrying over into page 4, which indicates that for the first 6 months of the current fiscal year, there were 45,285 criminal cases filed as compared with 39,137 in the same period last year. Can these figures possibly be correct? This represents almost a 16-percent increase in criminal cases in the District of Columbia in a 6-month's period. Can this be correct?

Mr. WHITENER. Of course, the gentleman understands that these figures include the traffic offenses, which are rather numerous.

Mr. GROSS. Even so——

Mr. WHITENER. I do not know that we have a breakdown which would satisfy the gentleman as to the nature of the cases. Certainly some of them are serious offenses. Some of them are traffic offenses.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman that this is a situation officials of the District of Columbia should find difficulty in boasting about or trying to alibi out of.

Mr. WHITENER. Of course, I am sure the gentleman did not mean to imply that the Committee on the District of Columbia is trying to alibi crime.

Mr. GROSS. Not at all, but these figures are shocking. I am glad the District of Columbia Committee put them into this report, because I think they are most revealing.

Mr. WHITENER. Also we can commend the Police Department for the splendid work they are doing in the apprehension of those engaged in crime.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman, but there is something left to be desired as to responsibility on the part of some citizens of the District in view of the fact that such a situation exists.

Mr. WHITENER. I agree with the gentleman in his last remarks.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of S. 2263, as amended, are twofold as follows:

First. To authorize an increase in the number of associate judges in the District of Columbia court of general sessions from 15 to 20. This is designed to expedite the administration of criminal justice, thus lending aid to the war on crime in the Nation's Capital, and also to provide the citizens of the District of Columbia with swift justice in civil cases;

Second. To bring the compensation of the retired judges of the District of Columbia court of appeals and the District of Columbia court of general sessions in line with the pay raises granted, as of July 1, 1964, by Congress to all the other judges of these courts. It is the opinion of your committee that such legislation is necessary and appropriate in order that the same salary ratio between active and retired District of Columbia judges under present law be retained.

I. AUTHORITY FOR ADDITIONAL JUDGES

BACKGROUND

The District of Columbia court of general sessions is unique in that it performs judicial functions which would normally be handled elsewhere by both municipal and State courts. It is required to dispense justice in criminal cases in the nature of misdemeanors and also to hear most civil cases in which damages up to $10,000 are sought. This court operates in two divisions, civil and criminal, and is further organized into the landlord and tenant court, traffic court, the domestic relations branch, and the small claims and conciliation branch.

At present, the District of Columbia court of general sessions is beset with serious and substantial caseloads and docket delays in both the civil and the criminal divisions. Despite the best efforts of the chief judge and the associate judges, the court has not been able materially to diminish this problem, even though crash programs have resulted in short-term reductions of docket time. The problem is simply a shortage of judicial manpower adequate to cope with the problem, which results from the coincidence of a number of factors.

In 1957, the rate of incidence of crime in the District of Columbia was at an all-time low. However, the ratio has risen steadily since that time, and in 1965 reached its highest point in the history of the city. This increase is continuing steadily during the present year, with the figures each month setting a new shameful record in the number of criminal acts committed in the Nation's Capital. A considerable number of these offenses are misdemeanors rather than felonies, and hence are assigned to the court of general sessions.

Prior to 1963, the present District of Columbia court of general sessions was designated as the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and its civil jurisdiction was restricted to those cases in which not more than $3,000 in damages was sought. However, Public Law 88–60, approved July 8, 1963 (77 Stat. 77), changed the name of the court and also increased its jurisdiction to include all civil cases involving damages up to $10,000. Prior to that time, all civil cases in which damages in excess of $3,000 were sought were assigned to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Despite this extensive new jurisdiction which was thus vested in the court of general sessions, with the inevitable result of a substantial increase in the caseload, no increase was authorized in the number of judges for the court. Thus, the court of general sessions has been laboring since that time with a judicial staff which had been established in 1956, consisting of one chief judge and 15 associate judges.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

During the past 10 years, there has been an increase of 61,169 cases filed annually in the court of general sessions, which represents an increase of 35.08 percent in the caseload. Over the same period, the annual collection of fees, fines, and forfeitures has increased by $2,546,434.74, or 117.15 percent.

In fiscal year 1965 alone, 235,535 new cases were filed in the criminal and civil divisions—an increase of 9,403 cases over the number filed in fiscal year 1964. Fees, fines, and forfeitures totaled $4,720,010.80, an increase of $550,523.01 over the comparable figure for fiscal 1964. During the first 6 months of fiscal 1966, 122,621 new cases were filed—an increase of 8,937 cases or 7.86 percent over the corresponding period of the previous year. Fees, fines, and forfeitures totaled $2,426,996.77—$158,243.29 more than in the first 6 months of fiscal 1965.

ESTIMATED COST

It is estimated that the annual cost of adding five new associate judges to the court of general sessions, including supporting personnel, will be $398,665.70. However, it should be noted that the court is one of the few self-sustaining branches of the local government. In fiscal year 1965, court revenues—fees, fines, and forfeitures—totaled some $4,720,010. During the same year, the operating expenses of the court amounted to only $1,981,642. Thus, it is anticipated that the full cost of expanding the court will be more than met out of revenues developed by the court.

CONCLUSIONS

Your committee feels strongly that a clear need exists for increasing the size of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, in order to guarantee to all parties before the court the swift and equitable administration of justice in all cases, civil and criminal.

The constantly increasing volume of cases coming before this court, in the opinion of your committee, has reached a point which prevents the proper disposition of the cases by normal procedure and also prohibits the satisfactory preparation of cases by attorneys for the Government in the public interest. This problem has become intolerable and must be resolved.

It is the belief of your committee that more expeditious handling of the caseload of the court of general sessions will prove an important weapon in the war against crime in the Nation's Capital. Further, more rapid disposition of all cases will aid materially in solving the problem of witnesses' lack of cooperation or departure from the jurisdiction because of numerous continuances of cases set for trial. Also, this will effectively reduce the man-hours spent by police in court and thus return more police to the streets for the all-important work of crime prevention.

It is the conviction of your committee, supported by the unanimous testimony of reliable witnesses, that the acquisition of the five additional associated judges which this bill will authorize, will enable the District of Columbia court of general sessions under the proven administrative skill of the present chief judge to cope effectively with the judicial responsibilities incumbent upon it. Accordingly, your committee earnestly hopes that the bill will receive favorable action by this body and that the additional judges may be appointed without undue delay.

REASONS FOR AMENDMENTS

As passed by the Senate on August 24, 1965, S. 2263 contained two major provisions which are not included in the bill as amended and reported by your committee.

The first of these provisions would have established a separate traffic branch in the criminal division of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, to be served exclusively by two of the five new judges authorized by the bill. The bill as passed by the Senate would have permitted the chief judge to assign these two traffic court judges temporarily to other branches of the court of general sessions when such assignment would not adversely affect the work of the traffic branch, or to assign other judges of the court to serve temporarily in the traffic branch when the work in the traffic branch required such extra manpower. However, this limited authority would not permit the usual rotation and assignment of these two judges by the chief judge, as is presently authorized on a regular basis for all judges, into all branches of the court.

At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 5 on March 14, 1966, the chief judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions expressed objection to this provision, and particularly to the requirement that two of the new judges authorized by the legislation be assigned permanently to the traffic branch. He expressed the view that it would be a serious mistake to infringe in any way upon the flexibility of assignment of all the associate judges according to the shifting needs of the court, as this system of rotation and assignment is in accord with sound principles of judicial administration and highly essential to the effective operation of this court. Further, the chief judge expressed the opinion that it would be very difficult to obtain the services of any new judges of desirable caliber if they were offered exclusive assignment to the traffic branch. In this connection, the witness pointed out also that not one of the present 15 active judges in the court of general sessions has expressed a willingness to accept a permanent assignment to the traffic branch, and that past experience as chief judge has convinced him that judges perform most efficiently when assignments are rotated.

On this subject, the chief judge received unanimous support from all the other witnesses, who represented the U.S. Department of Justice, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the American Bar Association, and the District of Columbia Bar Association.

The second of these provisions deleted from the bill by your committee would have required the traffic branch to hold a set schedule of night sessions.

The traffic branch of the court was established by the Traffic Act of 1925, and since that time there has been a full-time judge operating in this area. There was a night court in operation from 1925 until 1929. At the end of this 4-year period, however, inquiry by the appropriations committees of the Congress as to the effectiveness of this night court brought forth the opinion of the chief judge that there were not a sufficient number of people coming into the night sessions to make them worthwhile. As a result, night sessions of the traffic court were discontinued at that time and have not been resumed.

As a matter of fact, the chief judge has the authority to order night sessions of any branch of the District of Columbia court of general sessions whenever he deems it expedient to do so. However, there has been very little necessity for such night sessions. In fiscal year 1965, for example, out of 26,000 cases filed in the small claims and conciliation branch, only 58 requests were made for night trials. These were disposed of by one night session per month.

The traffic branch meets regularly 5 days per week and on Saturday mornings, and its docket is current at the present time.

In view of these facts, it is the opinion of your committee that a requirement of night sessions for the traffic branch on any regular basis would serve no useful purpose and thus would involve a needless expense, and that the additional five associate judges which this bill would provide will enable the chief judge within his present authority to administer the court to the satisfaction of the public interest.

Also in this connection, all the witnesses at our hearings concurred with this view, and in fact expressed approval of the entire bill as amended and reported by your committee.

II. INCREASE COMPENSATION OF RETIRED JUDGES

The 16 judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, and the 3 judges of the District of Columbia court of appeals are all included in the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964—H.R. 11049, passed by the Congress. However, through inadvertence, no provision was included therein to cover the two retired judges—one in the court of appeals and one in the court of general sessions. Inasmuch as each of these judges has continued to perform active service in the two courts named, it is felt that in fairness and justice they should be entitled to a proportionate raise in their compensation.

By the reported bill, those judges who have heretofore retired will have their retirement salary computed under the same formula and at the new rate of compensation as will be the case with judges who may in the future retire under Federal Employees Salary Act—Public Law 88-426. In other words, there will be, and in the opinion of your committee there should be, no difference in the status of presently retired judges and judges who may retire in the future, at least insofar as such retirement occurs under the existing law.

In addition, when retired judges are called upon to perform full-time judicial duties, under this bill they will receive active duty salary of the office in which they perform such duties.

BACKGROUND

The Consolidation Act—Public Law 512, 77th Congress, 2d session—approved April 1, 1942, provides—in section 11—for retirement of judges after serving 20 years or more, with compensation in equal monthly installments in the sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge on the date of such retirement that the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the total of 30 years.

Paragraph (b) of the same section provides that any judge receiving retirement salary may be called upon by the chief judge of either court to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him for a period up to 90 days in any year. But there is no provision therein for full salary for active duty pay.

Your committee believes that it has been firmly established by the Congress that Government employees, whether judicial, military, civilian, or other, should receive full pay when performing full active duty.

The fact of the matter is, as stated, that both the retired judges have continued to perform active service, and one of them has given full time on the bench for the last 2½ years, due to court vacancies, sickness, and vacations, and, of course, neither has received the compensation of a full-time judge, even though he has worked full time. The reported bill would obviate such injustice.

Except for the provision giving full salary for active duty, this bill is identical to H.R. 12198 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House on August 11, 1964—House Report No. 1726—and to H.R. 1066, which passed the House on February 8, 1965.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act relating to the composition of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and to increasing the retirement salaries of certain judges, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING CERTAIN FUNCTIONS FROM U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1611) to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1611

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 561 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1279), as amended (sec. 1-504, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "United States District Court for the District of Columbia or a judge thereof", and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent."

SEC. 2. Section 563 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1279), as amended (sec. 1-506, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended to read as follows: "Each notary public shall file his signature and deposit an impression of his official seal with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent, and the Commissioners or their designated agent may certify to the authenticity of the signature and official seal of the notary public."

Sec. 3. Section 572 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1280), as amended (sec. 1–515, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "United States District Court for the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

Sec. 4. Section 573 of the Act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (sec. 1–516, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent".

Sec. 5. The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 13 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia", approved May 28, 1924, as amended (sec. 2–513, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting a period in lieu thereof, and striking the remainder of the sentence.

Sec. 6. Sections 877, 878(b) and 878(f) of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1333), as amended (secs. 48–101, 43–302, and 48–306, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), are amended by striking "clerk of the United States District Court for", and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of".

Sec. 7. (a) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate in the District of Columbia the traffic in, sale, and use of milk bottles, cans, crates, and other containers of milk and cream to prevent fraud and deception, and for other purposes", approved July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 809), as amended (sec. 48–201, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "clerk of the United States District Court for" wherever that term appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of".

(b) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize associations of employees in the District of Columbia to adopt a device to designate the products of the labor of their members, to punish illegal use or imitation of such device, and for other purposes", approved February 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 50), as amended (sec. 48–401, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking from the second sentence "clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the clerk", and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Recorder"; and by striking the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "A certified copy of the drawing may be obtained upon the payment of $1 for each certification.".

Sec. 8. Subsection (a) of section 15–101, District of Columbia Code is amended by striking from clause (1) the word "or"; by striking from clause (2) "District Court—", and inserting in lieu thereof "District Court; or"; and by inserting immediately following clause (2) the following:

"(3) civil division of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, if the judgment or decree was rendered on or after the effective date of this clause—".

Sec. 9. (a) Subsection (a) of section 15–102, District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking from clause (2) the word "and"; by striking from clause (3) "forfeited—" and inserting in lieu thereof "forfeited;"; and by inserting immediately following clause (3) the following:

"(4) recognizance taken by the criminal division of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, or judge thereof, from the time when it is declared forfeited (if the forfeiture occurred on or after the effective date of this clause); and

"(5) judgment or decree rendered in the civil division of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions after the effective date of this clause—".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 15–102, District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking "after being forfeited," and inserting in lieu thereof "forfeited prior to the effective date of subsection (a)(4),".

Sec. 10. Subsection (a) of section 15–132, District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking "(a) A" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) (1) Except as provided by section 15-101, a"; and by inserting at the end the following:

"(2) A judgment entered on or after the effective date of this paragraph in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions may not be docketed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The provisions of this title relating to enforcement of judgments, executions thereon and writs and proceedings in aid of execution thereof, are applicable to judgments entered on or after the effective date of this paragraph in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions."

Sec. 11. Section 15–310, District of Columbia Code is amended by striking from the first sentence "An" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) An"; by striking from the second sentence "It" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, it"; and by inserting at the end the following:

"(b) An execution issued on a judgment entered on or after the effective date of this subsection in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions may be levied on real estate."

Sec. 12. Section 15–311, District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking from the first sentence "The writ" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) The writ"; and by inserting at the end the following:

"(b) A writ of fieri facias issued from the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions upon a judgment entered in that court on or after the effective date of this subsection may be levied on legal leasehold or freehold estates of the debtor in land."

Sec. 13. (a) Sections 1288, 1290, 1291, and 1293 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1392), as amended (secs. 30–106, 30–108, 30–110, and 30–112, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), are amended by striking "United States District Court for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

(b) Section 1288 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1392) as amended (sec. 30–106, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is further amended by inserting at the end of the following: "The clerk of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and such deputy clerks of the court as may, in writing, be designated by the clerk of the court and approved by the chief judge, are authorized to celebrate marriages in the District of Columbia."

(c)(1) The fifth paragraph under the heading "Hygiene and Sanitation in the Public Schools" under the caption HEALTH DEPARTMENT" in the first section of the Act entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes", approved February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1285), as amended (sec. 30–115, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is repealed.

(2) The clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall transfer all marriage records in his custody (including marriage records transferred from the health department) to the clerk of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

(d)(1) Paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (14) of section 15–706(e) of the District of Columbia Code are repealed.

(2) Chapter 7, title 15, District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

§ 15–717. Marriage license and related fees

"For each marriage license, the fee shall be $2; for each certified copy of a marriage license return, the fee shall be $1; for each certified copy of applications for marriage license the fee shall be $1; and for registering authorizations to perform marriages and issuing certificate, the fee shall be $1.

"The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions may, by rule of court, increase or decrease fees provided by this section."

(3) The analysis of chapter 7 of title 15 preceding section 15–701 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by inserting at the end:

"15–717. Marriage license and related fees."

Sec. 14. Subsection (e) of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, authorize appropriations, and for other purposes", approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as added by the Act approved June 4, 1943 (57 Stat. 100, 109, 110), as amended (sec. 46–304, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking from the second and from the penultimate sentences "clerk of the United States District Court for" and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of".

Sec. 15. (a) Sections 1238, 1239, and 1241 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384, 1385), as amended (secs. 38–102, 38–103, and 38–105, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), are amended by striking "clerk of the United States District Court for" and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of".

(b) Sections 1238 and 1246 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384, 1386), as amended (secs. 38–102 and 38–110, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), are amended by striking "clerk" and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds".

(c) In addition to fees otherwise provided for, the Recorder of Deeds shall charge and collect the following fees:

(1) for filing and recording each notice of mechanic's lien, $1;

(2) for entering release of mechanic's lien, 50 cents for each order of lienor; and

(3) for each undertaking of lienee, 75 cents.

Sec. 16. The Act entitled "An Act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens", approved June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 990, 991), as amended (secs. 38–202 and 38–305, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking from sections 2 and 5 "clerk of the United States District Court for" and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of"; and by striking the second sentence of section 5 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Recorder of Deeds shall index the same in the name of the injured person and shall charge and collect a fee of $1 for recording, indexing, and releasing the lien so filed."

Sec. 17. Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 6323 of subchapter C of chapter 64 of the Act entitled "An Act to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States", approved August 16, 1954 (68A Stat. 779; 26 U.S.C. 6323), is amended to read as follows:

"(3) With recorder of deeds of the district of columbia.—In the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, if the property subject to the lien is situated in the District of Columbia."

Sec. 18. Section 6 of title I of the Act entitled "An Act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 673, 674), as amended (sec. 47–1406, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "clerk of the

United States District Court for", and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of"; and by striking "said court" and inserting in lieu thereof "the United States District Court for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 19. Paragraphs 16 and 18 of section 15–706(e), District of Columbia Code, are repealed.

SEC. 20. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this Act are authorized.

SEC. 21. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which is at least ninety days after the date of approval of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

1. Page 3, line 4, strike out "877, 878(b), and 878(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "878b, and 878f".

2. Page 10, strike out lines 9 through 13, and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 17. (a) Section 6323(a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:".

3. Page 10, immediately after line 17, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) Section 548a of the Act approved March 3, 1901 as added by the Act of April 27, 1945 (59 Stat. 100), is amended by striking 'SEC. 548a.' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'SEC. 548a. (a)' and by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

"'(b) The Recorder of Deeds shall accept for filing any notice of Federal tax lien or any other document affecting such a lien if such notice or document is in the form prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate and could be filed with the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The fee for each such filing with the Recorder of Deeds shall be the same as the fee charged by the Recorder of Deeds for filing a similar document for a private person. The Recorder of Deeds shall bill the district director of Internal Revenue on a monthly basis for fees for documents filed by such district director. Any document releasing or affecting any notice of Federal tax lien which has been filed with the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia prior to the effective date of this Act shall be filed with such clerk.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill—submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia—is to transfer a number of functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia.

The functions transferred by the terms of this bill are all of a nature which are not customarily performed by a U.S. district court, but rather by a local court or by some local administrative agency.

The bill, in providing for the transfers of functions, carries out specific recommendations contained in a study submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, and which such committee directed be made pursuant to House Report No. 1708, 85th Congress. The study and the recommendations included in such study were prepared by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and the government of the District of Columbia.

FUNCTIONS TRANSFERRED

Notary public: The bill designates the District Commissioners, in lieu of the clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, as the depository for filing papers, records, signatures, and District of Columbia court of general sessions, rather than the U.S. district court, to remove a notary public for cause.

Trademarks, trade names: Designates the office of the District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds, in lieu of the clerk for the U.S. district court, as the depository for filing trademarks, trade names, labels, and brands.

Judgments: Makes extensive changes respecting the docketing of judgments and decrees rendered in the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

Recordation of liens: Designates the Office of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia in lieu of the clerk for the U.S. district court, as the depository for mechanics liens, Federal tax liens—United States Code, section 6323—District personal property tax liens, District of Columbia unemployment compensation tax liens, and hospital liens.

Marriage licenses: Transfers from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the court of general sessions, the function of issuing and recording marriage licenses, licensing persons to celebrate the rites of marriage, and fixing the fees in connection with the issuance thereof. Also authorizes the transfer from the U.S. district court of all marriage records to the custody of the clerk of the District of Columbia court of general sessions. Provision is also made for the said clerk and the deputy clerks of such court, when designated by the chief judge, to celebrate marriages in the District of Columbia, which follows the practice now provided for in Maryland and in several counties in Virginia.

Optometry: Relieves the U.S. district court of the responsibility of receiving for filing certified copies of optometrists' registrations. Retains the Department of Occupations and Professions of the District of Columbia government as custodian of such records.

COST OF LEGISLATION

Our committee is advised that the enactment of S. 1611 will involve some additional cost to the District government. The District of Columbia Commissioners estimate that the cost will amount to approximately $13,856 for the first year, and that such cost occurs as the result of marriage license and lien recordation functions being transferred to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to the Office of Recorder of Deeds.

AMENDMENTS

In addition to the technical amendments to section 6, your committee amended section 17 of the bill as passed by the Senate to authorize the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia to receive for filing Federal tax liens and related documents so that the forms prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury for use by the Internal Revenue Service could be received by the Recorder as they are in other jurisdictions.

Thus, the Recorder of Deeds shall accept for filing any notice of a Federal tax lien or other document affecting such a lien when it is on such form and bears such signature as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The charge made by the Recorder of Deeds for such filing shall be the same as the fee for filing of a similar document by a private person. On a monthly basis, the Recorder of Deeds shall bill the District Director of Internal Revenue for fees for documents filed.

Where any notice of a Federal tax lien has been filed with the Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia prior to the effective date of this act, any document releasing or affecting such notice of Federal tax lien shall be filed with the clerk of such court.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

On June 9, 1965, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia held public hearings on S. 1611. Representatives of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the District of Columbia Bar Association testified in support of the bill. Letters recommending enactment of this proposed legislation were received by your committee from the Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, from the chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. Approval was expressed also by the Judicial Conference of the United States during its session on March 18, 1965. Your committee is aware of no opposition to the enactment of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 846, Rept. No. 1485), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 846

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14732) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 846, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 846?

The question was taken, and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 846.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, N. Dak.
Bandstra
Baring
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burleson
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Culver
Curtin
Curtis
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Giaimo
Goodell
Grabowski
Greigg
Griffin
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hall
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Helstoski
Herlong
Hull
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Leggett
Long, La.
McCarthy
McDowell
McEwen
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Monagan
Morgan
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Philbin
Pickle
Powell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Rumsfeld
St Germain
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Scott
Shipley
Slack
Stafford
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Whalley
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wolff

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 278 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 846 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14732, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

H.R. 14732 would authorize appropriations for the AEC for fiscal year 1967 for operating expenses in the amount of $1,964,128,000, and for plant and capital equipment in the amount of $295,830,000, making a total authorization of $2,259,958,000.

The Atomic Energy Commission's authorization request for fiscal year 1967, as originally submitted, called for authorizations of $1,978,820,000 for operating expenses, and $295,500,000 for plant and capital equipment, making a total requested authorization of $2,274,320,000.

Later the AEC transmitted a proposed amendment to section 106 of its authorization request, which increased the request for plant and capital equipment by $500,000. The Commission's amended total request, therefore, became $2,274,820,000.

You will note that the amount authorized in H.R. 14732 is $14,862,000 less than the amount requested by the AEC.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will go into details of the bill during debate, and I urge that House Resolution 846 be adopted in order that the bill H.R. 14732 may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule which would make in order the consideration of this bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1967.

Hearings on this bill were begun, before the committee of which I am a member, on last January 25, a day after the President's budget message had been received. Those Members who have read the report will see that in over 20 hearings, consuming more than 42 hours, all of the aspects of this bill have been thoroughly discussed by witnesses representing both industry and the Government.

Because it is my privilege to serve not only on the Committee on Rules but also on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to take just a moment to pay tribute to the distinguishd chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield], who I believe deserves the real appreciation and tribute of this House for the dedicated work he has carried on not only in connection with this bill but also in connection with all the oversight functions of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As the gentleman from Texas said, this bill does carry with it a slight reduction in the amount which was requested in the budget for the Atomic Energy Commission.

One question which has been put to me today—a question which I know is of great interest to many Members—is, What does the bill do so far as the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator is concerned? Actually, there is very little money in the bill for that purpose; I believe there is $2.2 million to carry on some design studies. It will not actually provide for the architect and engineering or construction work which ultimately will be required if this accelerator is to be constructed.

I believe this is a sound authorization bill. The hearings were full and complete.

I believe the House should overwhelmingly today approve not only the rule but also the authorization bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14732) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14732, with Mr. Burke in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 14732, is to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1967. Pursuant to section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Joint Committee has considered the authorization for both operating and plant and capital equipment funds for the AEC for the next fiscal year. Our committee has considered this subject exhaustively over a period of 7 weeks. At the conclusion of our hearings the Joint Committee reviewed the AEC's requested authorization and filed a comprehensive report which recommends a number of changes in the AEC's request, and offers policy guidance to the executive branch in a number of important areas.

H.R. 14732 was reported out by the Joint Committee without dissent. It represents the unanimous judgment of Members from both sides of the aisle and from both Houses. As chairman of the Joint Committee I am confident that this is a prudent authorization bill.

The bill provides for the following authorization for the AEC:

For operating expenses	$1,964,128,000
For plant and capital equipment	295,830,000
Total authorization	2,259,958,000

This represents a reduction of about $15 million from the amount requested by the AEC. By way of further comparison, the total AEC authorization recommended by our committee for fiscal year 1967 is $295,563,000 less than the authorization recommended by our committee and approved by Congress for fiscal year 1966. In general, the AEC's program has been characterized by substantial declines in the amounts requested and authorized for the raw materials, special nuclear materials, and weapons programs, whereas the AEC's other programs have continued at about the same funding level, or increased.

Section 101(a) of H.R. 14732 would authorize appropriations of $1,964,128,000 for operating expenses for the AEC's major programs. I would like to explain several highlights of the committee's recommendations with respect to this authorization.

First. In the nuclear weapons program, the committee recommends the addition of $10 million to the AEC's authorization request. The additional funds are needed for the AEC's underground nuclear weapons testing program, to help assure an effective, comprehensive, and aggressive program. I should note that even with the $10 million increase recommended by our committee, the AEC's total weapons program operating costs for fiscal year 1967 would be $53,400,000 less than the amount approved by Congress for fiscal year 1966.

Second. In the reactor development program, the committee has recommended a net reduction of $365,000 from the AEC's operating fund request. In this connection I wish to report that major changes have taken place in the civilian power reactor development program in the past year. As of January 1, 1965, there were approximately 1,000 megawatts of nuclear-powered electrical generating capacity in full operation in the United States. This amounted to about one-half of 1 percent of our total installed electrical generating capacity.

During 1965, orders were placed for approximately 4,700 megawatts of additional nuclear-generating capacity, about one-fifth of the total generating capacity ordered during this period. Moreover, during just the first 4 months of 1966, utilities announced firm contracts for the addition of approximately 3,700 megawatts of nuclear-generating capacity, approximately one-half of the total generating capacity additions announced during this period. In addition, plans have been announced for the construction of 1,600 megawatts more capacity, for which firm contracts have not been executed. All of the announced nuclear capacity additions were boiling and pressurized water reactor types.

The significant increase in the number and size of nuclear reactors ordered is encouraging. It is also cause for particular vigilance. In our report, the Joint Committee has urged the nuclear industry to give the closest attention to design and construction factors, in order to assure that requirements are met and that a high degree of reliability is built into these plants so that they will become, in the minimum period, economical additions to utility systems.

As I have stated, our report on the AEC's authorization bill summarizes increases in planned additions of nuclear-generating capacity in the last year. We think this is a significant increase in such a new technology.

Some have expressed concern that the growing application of nuclear power will result in a decrease in the use of coal-fired powerplants. I think the history of our growth in overall needs for power clearly shows that we will need all the power we can get from all sources. For example, the data put together by the National Coal Association show that in 1964 we consumed 479 million tons of coal while in 1965 we consumed 510 million tons, which is an increase of 6.4 percent in 1 year. The March 1966 issue of the Mining Congress Journal contains an article which factors in the growth of nuclear power and states that coal consumption is expected to double during the period between 1960 and 1980.

I recently heard of a report prepared for internal use by the General Electric Co., which may be causing people in the coal industry some concern. I got in touch with Mr. James Young, vice president of the General Electric Co., to find out what this matter was about. He told me that it concerned a study which had not gotten the attention of the responsible people in his organization and was based on erroneous assumptions. Due to these erroneous assumptions the erroneous conclusion was reached that coal demands would drop to zero by the year 2060. I asked Mr. Young to write me a letter explaining this, which I am including in the RECORD at this point:

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.,
May 9, 1966.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding there has been circulated a General Electric report entitled "Energy Inputs to United States, 1800–2060," that concludes that the demand for coal will go to zero by the year 2060.

As I mentioned to you on May 7, 1966, this report was produced by a GE long-range planning component, not associated with the divisions of the company responsible for our energy business; nor was it reviewed by the management of these divisions, as is the normal policy. The report was produced for internal consideration; and was inadvertently released.

The avowed intent of the report was to evaluate the domestic energy demand in all sectors, and the associated distribution of supply from the competing energy sources, for 1800 to 2060. The conclusions reached do not agree with the company position relative to the demand for coal and resulted from largely erroneous assumptions without regard to the realities of the future environment.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. YOUNG,
Vice President and General Manager, Atomic Products Division.

The past year has also witnessed a continuing shift in emphasis away from Government support of light water reactors being offered on a commercial basis. The Government is now concentrating its research and development program on the more advanced reactor types, particularly the fast breeder reactors. These are the reactors which truly hold forth promise of providing this Nation and the world with a limitless supply of energy. In order for nuclear power to contribute significantly to the solution of our long-term energy needs, it is essential that breeder reactors be developed. AEC's budget request for this year contains a significant increase for fast breeder reactor development work. The committee vigorously endorses an increased level of effort in the fast breeder reactor program, and urges the Commission to complete its formulation of this program at the earliest practicable date.

During our authorization hearings we were also informed of an increase in private industrial support of fast breeder reactor development. The committee has strongly encouraged nongovernmental support of work in this field, and increased commercial competition. We hope this trend will continue.

The Joint Committee views the civilian reactor development program as a dynamic one requiring changes in effort as progress is made. The new developments which have occurred in the last year or so—such as the sharp increase in the number of power reactors ordered and progress in the fast breeder area—are cause for an updating of the overall program plans which have provided guidelines for the Government's efforts. For this reason, the committee has urged the AEC to update its 1962 report to the President on the civilian nuclear power program. It may well be that such a review would show that increased effort is called for in certain areas—such as fast breeder work.

In this connection, the committee has asked the Commission to reconsider the advanced converter reactor program, under which a number of reactor concepts have been supported. One of these concepts is the heavy-water, organic-cooled reactor. Although approving the full amount requested by the AEC for heavy-water, organic-cooled reactor development for fiscal year 1967, including $2 million requested for preliminary architect-engineer work on a prototype, the committee has cautioned the AEC to continue to maintain the closest surveillance and direction of this work, and to eliminate effort not directly required to establish the technical feasibility of using this concept for the competitive generation of power.

Technical problems have also been experienced with the other two reactor concepts being developed as part of the AEC's advanced converter program. These concepts are the seed-blanket reactor and the high-temperature gas-cooled reactor. As explained in our committee's report, the seed-blanket reactor program has been reoriented from a cooperative demonstration project to a research and development base program. A significant amount of information has been developed by Admiral Rickover concerning this concept during the past year. Admiral Rickover also continues to have confidence that a successful seed-blanket breeder core design can be developed. The potential benefits to be derived from breeding in a uranium-thorium fuel cycle, with a light water reactor, are very great and the committee has approved this reorientation. With respect to the high-temperature gas-cooled reactor program, our committee's report observes that careful attention should be given by the AEC to all relevant technical and economic data before any decision is made to proceed with construction of a reactor prototype.

In this respect, I should like to reiterate our committees' views that the AEC's civilian nuclear power program is a development program which is intended to ascertain the advantages and disadvantages of particular reactor systems. Successes or failures of particular projects cannot accurately be predicted in advance. If they could, there would be no need for the project in a development program. The committee's main concern is that the AEC outline all of the data that are developed in the various phases of the program and base its future actions on the technical and economic facts which are learned. Lines of effort which do not appear to be feasible or promising, or which do not offer significant advantages over alternate systems should be promptly dropped.

Included in the AEC's reactor development program is the sum of $500,000 for study work on the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant vessels. The Joint Committee is disappointed that the AEC and the Maritime Administration still have not completed their evaluation of the application of nuclear power to merchant vessels. Accordingly, research and development effort cannot be supported at this time and further efforts must be limited to studies. The AEC recently reported to our committee that the executive branch is still studying this problem to determine if the potential benefits are worth the costs involved. The committee was informed that if the study indicates that effort in this field was justified, and if an agreement is reached with the Maritime Administration on the objectives of such a program, research, and development effort involving actual systems and hardware will be initiated. During our authorization hearings, representatives of the maritime industry asked for an opportunity to testify concerning the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant ships. The committee stated in response to this request that hearings would be held as soon as possible. Subsequently, industry representatives asked that the proposed hearings on nuclear merchant ships be deferred. The Joint Committee has, therefore, postponed immediate hearings.

Third. In the physical research program, the committee has recommended authorization of the full amount requested by the AEC. I would like to emphasize in this connection that 42 percent of the Commission's physical research budget is for high energy physics research, which is a frontier research program. As our committee report pointed out last year, high energy physics is an expensive program which is national in scope and not related solely to the mission of any one agency. Operating costs of $109.8 million are projected for fiscal year 1967. The AEC is acting as the manager of this national research effort, and the Joint Committee agrees with Dr. Donald F. Hornig—the President's science adviser—that the AEC is uniquely fitted to carry out this management role. However, our committee wishes to reiterate our intent that desirable expansion in the Nation's high energy physics program shall not be at the expense of other vital AEC activities.

I wish to add for the information of the Members that included within the high energy physics budget is the sum of $2.2 million for continued advanced accelerator design studies for the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. However, the AEC has not requested, nor has the committee authorized, funds for engineering design or construction for the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. The AEC is at present evaluating the six locations for this accelerator that were recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.

Fourth. For the biology and medicine; training, education, and information; and isotopes development programs our committee has recommended cuts totaling over $2 million. We believe these important programs can continue at an effective rate notwithstanding these reductions.

Fifth. In the Commission's plowshare program, involving peaceful use for nuclear explosives, the Joint Committee has added $1.5 million to the AEC's budget request for the conduct of an experiment involving a contained underground nuclear explosion to demonstrate the feasibility of increasing natural gas production. Our committee believes there are significant advantages to be derived from this experiment, which is to be conducted on a cost-sharing basis with private industry. If this experiment is successful it can point the way to substantial increases in our natural gas reserves, and in revenues to the Federal Government from the leasing to private industry of Federal lands containing natural gas deposits.

I will now summarize very briefly the remaining sections of H.R. 14732.

Section 101(b) authorizes $246,530,000 for plant and capital equipment obligations for the AEC.

Sections 102, 103, and 104 are general provisions similar to those contained in previous AEC authorization acts.

Section 105 would amend the AEC's Authorization Act for fiscal year 1958 by extending for an additional year—to June 30, 1967—the date for approving proposals under the third round of the AEC's cooperative power reactor demonstration program.

Section 106 would increase by $49,300,000 the amounts authorized for certain projects approved in prior years. This amount is included within the total authorization for the AEC which I mentioned at the outset.

Section 107 would amend the AEC's fiscal year 1966 Authorization Act by rescinding the authorization for the large seed-blanket reactor cooperative project, except for funds heretofore obligated. As I have already said, our committee feels that continued research and development work on the seed-blanket concept is warranted.

Mr. Chairman, we on the Joint Committee are fully mindful of our responsibilities to Congress and the people of this country when we consider a matter of such vital importance as the AEC's authorization bill. This bill provides funds to insure our continued preeminence both in the military and the civilian uses of atomic energy.

I reiterate that H.R. 14732 was reported out by the Joint Committee without dissent, and I urge its enactment in its present form.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. In connection with that line of thought on the part of the gentleman from California what agency or what program is responsible for information with respect to the equipment of satellites for instance with nuclear warheads and the ability to detect nuclear warhead satellites—to detect them and perhaps to explode them in space?

What agency, what committee, and what program has the direct responsibility for this?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The Department of Defense is responsible for stating the requirements for detection equipment. Those requirements, if they are in the field of research and development, will be conducted under research projects in the Atomic Energy Commission laboratories, to the greatest degree possible. In some degree there might be a development program in the laboratories of the Department of the Air Force. However, there would be close coordination by both. The eventual manufacture of the hardware would be a request of the Department of Defense, which request would go to the regular Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how about the research and development for the detection of such a device put in orbit by an unfriendly country or any other country for that matter?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, we have certain satellites which gather intelligence at this time that are actually in orbit. But most of their intelligence is in the way of weather intelligence and certain photographic ability as well as meteorological data, and that sort of thing. We have equipment developed by the AEC laboratories which is flown in satellites to detect nuclear explosions in space. We have not at this time developed a satellite that can detect whether a nuclear weapon is aboard an orbiting satellite.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the subcommittee which handles these research and development projects.

Mr. PRICE. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I can assure the gentleman from Iowa that this matter is being worked on by both the AEC and the Department of Defense. However, unfortunately, it is the type of matter which we cannot go into in detail, except I shall be very happy to discuss it with the gentleman from Iowa later.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further—I do not expect to get any specific details on the House floor with respect to this matter. Is NASA involved in this too?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. NASA is a civilian agency and they are involved in weather satellites and that sort of thing. Of course, in the developing of weather satellites, that is, weather satellites which can be used for civilian purposes, the data obtained is available to the military agencies as well.

Mr. GROSS. I greatly hope that we are making progress in this field. It seems to me this is far more important than any trip to the moon or landing on the moon. I think we ought to dedicate a lot of effort to this, and to some system of detection and some system for disposing of any weapons, any nuclear weapons, that may be put in space by some country—and certainly if they are put in space by some unfriendly country.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I assure the gentleman that the Member now speaking in the well of the House shares that view 100 percent and we are watching it closely.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], the ranking member, and all other members of the committee for bringing to us such a constructive report. At the same time that I am commending the members of the committee, of course, I wish to commend the staff, because the staff has placed in this report all the information that is necessary to understand what is being done in this particular field, as well as what is proposed to be done during fiscal 1967.

I think it is one of the most constructive reports that has been put out from time to time. As the committee has considered this legislation and has considered the appropriations which will be made under the authority that has been granted in this legislation, it seems to me that any Member who is interested should be able to get his answers from this report, to any questions he may have in this field.

I wish to join my colleagues from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in urging enactment of H.R. 14732, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the next fiscal year. As the chairman of the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Raw Materials, I also wish to discuss an important aspect of the Commission's budget; namely, the uranium procurement program.

Since 1946, the AEC has spent about $5.4 billion to purchase uranium from domestic and foreign sources. This material represents a great national asset which does not deteriorate in stockpile. The vast majority of this material has been used in connection with the military aspect of the atomic energy program. However, an increasing amount is being used for civilian purposes, primarily in central station nuclear powerplants. In all cases of civilian nuclear powerplants, the Federal Government is paid on a full cost recovery basis for uranium consumed.

I believe the Government's uranium procurement program has been a successful one in terms of fostering the development of a natural resource. During and immediately after World War II, the United States was a "have-not nation" as far as uranium was concerned. However, as a result of a number of incentives offered by the AEC—and resulting large-scale exploration activities by private industry—substantial deposits of uranium were discovered in this country and this vitally important material was made available for military and civilian uses.

Deliveries of uranium to the AEC have declined every fiscal year since 1960, and will continue to do so in 1967. By December 31, 1970, the AEC uranium procurement program is scheduled to end.

During the course of the committee's authorization hearings, we received considerable testimony from the AEC and others concerning domestic reserves of uranium, and requirements for uranium stemming from the rapidly expanding civilian nuclear power program. The statistics of nuclear power growth are obviously very significant from the standpoint of our uranium reserves. A large increase in these reserves is necessary to support forecast civilian power requirements. However, the history of the uranium program illustrates how the law of supply and demand can result to the discovery of substantial new deposits of valuable materials.

The apparent need for a large increase in uranium exploration activities, supported by private industry, is recognized by all concerned. Our committee believes this is a facet of the atomic energy program for which private industry should now bear the primary responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my support of H.R. 14732.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I should like also to express my appreciation for the work of the staff and my appreciation for the cooperation that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], the ranking minority member, and the members on his side of the aisle gave to the hearings, the consideration of the bill, and the marking up of this legislation.

The bill has received full consideration by Members on both sides of the aisle, and it is a bill that I think we can all be proud of and report to the Congress without reservation.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to take this opportunity to commend my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and the ranking Republican on our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], and also the staff, who have worked so hard on this bill. This is a bill that every Member of the Congress can support, and I am particularly grateful to the chairman for all the hard work that he has done on this legislation.

The Joint Committee has reported out H.R. 14732 unanimously. I fully support this recommendation. I would like to take this time, moreover, to call to the attention of the Members of the House an important initiative that the Joint Committee took in connection with the AEC's request for funds for fiscal year 1967.

Included in the AEC's activities is a program for the application of nuclear explosives to peaceful purposes. This is known as Project Plowshare. The Joint Committee has pointed out in its report on this bill that such peaceful applications can contribute significantly to the U.S. economy and that these capabilities, once developed, can be made available by the United States to other nations to assist them in their excavation projects and in the development of their resources.

One of the important things that we believe nuclear explosives can accomplish is the breaking up of huge tonnage of subsurface rock. Such fracturing of underground rock may lead to the recovery of large quantities of gas, oil, and other mineral resources that we cannot presently recover economically by conventional means.

As an example of what this may mean, I would like to point out that in the western part of these United States there exist geological formations that contain great quantities of natural gas. However, most of these reservoirs cannot be stimulated by conventional means to give up this natural gas in an economical manner. The Atomic Energy Commission, its Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and the Bureau of Mines, together with the El Paso Natural Gas Co., have studied the means of applying nuclear explosives to the stimulation of these presently unproductive gas fields. They have concluded that it is feasible and safe to conduct an experiment to determine whether nuclear explosives can assist in the economical recovery of such gas. Their studies have indicated that the best place for such an early experiment is the pictured cliff formation in northern New Mexico.

The AEC requested funds from the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1967 to carry out this experiment, but the Bureau of the Budget did not allow this request to be submitted to the Congress. In 2 days of hearings on March 11 and 15 the Joint Committee went into detailed hearings with regard to this experiment, which is known as Project Gasbuggy. Let me tell you about one of the things that we discovered during the course of our hearings. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and responsible for seeing that not only our present generation but future American generations as well have the natural resources they need to carry on a secure and vital economy, has written to the AEC in the following words:

> If nuclear explosives can be used to stimulate production by fracturing rock in * * * deep, thick, low-productivity reservoirs, as our engineers are convinced, significant increases in recovery can be effected. We estimate that, in Rocky Mountain reservoirs alone, the total increase in production may be as great as 317 trillion cubic feet. This is a greater quantity of natural gas than our present proved reserves of 281 trillion cubic feet.
>
> A total of 317 trillion cubic feet of natural gas has a potential value of about $35 billion. Many of the Rocky Mountain gas reservoirs to which nuclear-explosive stimulation might be applicable are on Federal land, from which the Government derives royalties. Funds received from leasing Federal lands for petroleum and natural gas include bonuses, land rentals, and royalties. An exact relationship does not exist between such receipts and the wellhead price, but the average is about one-eighth the wellhead price. Thus the potential income to the Government would exceed $4 billion.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that there is an immense economic potential in the use of nuclear explosives for stimulating the production of natural gas. There is also the promise that a successful experiment in Project Gasbuggy with nuclear explosives will lead the way to economical recovery of oil and other natural resources as well. In view of these facts, the Joint Committee has taken the initiative in authorizing for the Plowshare program for fiscal year 1967 an additional amount of $1½ million so that the Commission may go forward with plans for the conduct of the Gasbuggy experiment, in cooperation with the El Paso Natural Gas Co.

Now, the total cost of this project, which it is anticipated will be spent over a 2-year period, is $4.7 million. Let me point out, however, that the El Paso Natural Gas Co. is willing to contribute $1½ million of its own in drilling, technical, and other logistic services in order to see this experiment come to fruition. Let me assure you that the El Paso Natural Gas Co. will not receive any information from this experiment that is not also made available to every other gas or oil company that wishes to have this information. This cooperative effort by El Paso Natural Gas Co. is just another example of constructive and enlightened self-interest that can contribute to all. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that such enlightened self-interest is what this country needs more of.

This is a challenging and very important project that can benefit every citizen of the United States. I hope it will have the full support of this House.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, will the Chair advise how much time I have consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has consumed 21 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire and consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with other members of the committee in commending to the House the prodigious efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] and the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer], the respective chairman and ranking House minority member of this committee, for the fine, outstanding work which they have done relative to this legislation.

The members of the Joint Committee on both sides of the aisle support H.R. 14732, which would authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1967. In this connection I would like to address my remarks to three general subjects, as follows:

First, accelerators: H.R. 14732 contains $150,000 for research and development to support the work of the 400-million-electron-volt linear electron accelerator for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Last year we authorized $4.6 million for construction of the machine, for which MIT is presently selecting a site. This work is in the medium energy physics program.

This House has also heard a great deal about the proposed very large accelerator—the 200 billion electron volts. Authorization for the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator is not, as our chairman has told you, in this year's AEC request nor in the Joint Committee's recommendations.

I wish to add a few words about existing accelerators, particularly one of the high energy accelerators in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Two great universities—Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—operate for the Atomic Energy Commission and for the Nation's high energy physics program the Cambridge electron accelerator. This accelerator is, and will be until the Stanford linear accelerator becomes operative later this year, the largest electron accelerator in the United States. The electrons in the beam of this accelerator have an energy of 6 billion electron volts.

Last summer there was an unfortunate and tragic fire at the Cambridge electron accelerator that originated from a hydrogen bubble chamber used in experiments with the accelerator. Repairs have now been made to the experimental area and the Cambridge accelerator is again contributing to man's advancing knowledge of the structure of the particles in the nucleus of the atom.

The scientists at the accelerator have plans to produce beams not only of electrons, but of positrons as well. Positrons are particles having the same mass as the electron, but they are of opposite charge. That, is they have positive charges instead of the negative charges of electrons. These positrons and electrons will be accelerated to high energy in opposite directions in the accelerator. In the collision of these charges—which will represent the equivalent of more than doubling the energy of this machine—will be found new particles or photons of high energy, which are capable of probing the atom's nucleus in perhaps a new dimension.

You may ask, why make this effort? The efforts of scientists at Cambridge, and at other laboratories with high energy accelerators, are helping to assure that the United States stays in the forefront of physics research. We must remember that physics research in the 1930's led to nuclear fission. If physics research in the 1960's and 1970's were to produce similar dramatic results, the United States should learn about these results first. In the meantime, we will learn more about the source of nuclear energy—the nucleus of the atom—and we will educate physicists at such great institutions as Harvard and MIT who can and will contribute to all facets of our growing, sophisticated technological economy.

Second, naval reactors program: The bill before us contains $97,400,000 for development work on nuclear propulsion plants for both surface warships and submarines. The naval reactor development program which the committee has supported throughout its history has been one of our most successful research and development programs.

The Joint Committee completed a review of the naval reactor program in January of this year. The hearings have been published under the title "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program," dated January 26, 1966. The foreword to this hearing contains a summary of the committee's views on nuclear propulsion for warships.

We are still encountering a reluctance at certain levels in the Department of Defense concerning the utilization of nuclear propulsion. The Armed Services Committee, of which I am the ranking minority member, has taken some steps to break the bottleneck concerning the utilization of nuclear propulsion in naval warships. The bill we reported out last week recommended the addition to the authorization request of two nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier escort warships. Therefore the bill we reported out last week includes a nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier, two nuclear-propelled frigates, and five nuclear-propelled attack submarines. The authorization of these ships will provide our Navy with the warships which will assure our leadership for the decades which will follow.

The important thing to remember, I believe, is that the development work that the Congress supported throughout the years has made it possible for us to have the unparalleled security that our Polaris missile submarines, nuclear-propelled attack submarines, and surface warships provide. We must continue to have this vision which is reflected in the bill before us to continue the support of development work to further our lead in the nuclear propulsion field.

Third, food irradiation program: The bill under discussion provides $2,200,000 for the AEC's food irradiation program. Of this amount, $500,000 is for wholesomeness studies which come under the sponsorship of the Biology and Medicine Division. The remaining $1,700,000 is allocated to the Isotopes Development Division for the purpose of carrying out irradiation of fruits and marine products, marketing studies, and the design and provision of radioactive sources for use in the program.

Initially $1,870,000 was requested for the isotopes development portion of the AEC's food irradiation program. However, in view of urgent work needed on SNAP devices to be provided by the Isotopes Development Division for use by NASA and DOD, a small cutback to a level of $1,700,000 was made in the request for the food irradiation program.

Information derived from the food program continues to provide favorable indication that program goals for the preservation of fruits and marine products will be achieved. Work is continuing on the provision of both fixed and mobile irradiators for use in the program. In particular the Hawaiian food irradiator now under construction is expected to be completed by the end of calendar 1966. This irradiator will permit the irradiation of significant quantities of mangoes, papayas, and other products native to the State of Hawaii. An important element of the Hawaiian program is the disinfestation of fruit products so that they will be acceptable for shipment to the mainland.

Mobile irradiators are currently being installed in fishing ships, one to operate out of Gloucester, Mass., and the other to operate out of Baton Rouge, La. The Gloucester mobile irradiator will be used for a variety of marine products while the irradiator aboard the ship operating out of Baton Rouge will be used principally for the irradiation of shrimp.

The Federal agencies involved in the food irradiation program have been working toward the development of a cooperative project with industry which would call for the construction and operation of a pilot irradiation plant. There is still some hesitancy on the part of private industry to commit itself to significant investments in this technique of food preservation. In large part this can be attributed to the fact that very few products have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration—to date only bacon, potatoes, and wheat products.

Petitions on other foods with appropriate backup data have been submitted but no additional approvals have been forthcoming. I can understand the need for careful scrutiny of the data to insure that the food is palatable, nutritious, and has no undesired side effects. I believe, however, that human nature is such that the standards applied to irradiated foods will be far more stringent than those applied to foods preserved by other techniques. I personally have had an opportunity to consume a variety of irradiated food products and almost complete meals consisting of irradiated food. I am convinced that the AEC in its food pasteurization program and the Army in its food sterilization program will obtain the necessary information to show beyond a reasonable doubt that selected foods can be preserved by irradiation in a controlled manner which will assure an acceptable and wholesome food product.

The money allotted in this bill for the AEC's food irradiation program will permit continuation of the program at a reasonable development pace. This application represents a splendid example of the atom working in a peaceful manner with the goal of providing a unique preservation method which can permit curtailment of the present high percentages of waste in the handling of food products not only in this country but throughout the world.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire and consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in my earlier remarks when we had under consideration the rule on this bill, I paid a well-deserved tribute to the chairman of the Joint Committee. I also wish to include in my remarks the ranking Member on our side of the aisle, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], who has been consistent not only in his attendance at the hearings on this bill, but most helpful, I know, in the suggestions, advice, and the counsel that he has offered during the formulation of this legislation.

I repeat what I said earlier, that this is a good bill; that it does deserve the overwhelming support of the Members of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to say a few words about one aspect of the AEC's program that I believe was not dealt with by the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee in explaining the principal features of this bill. I refer to the AEC's joint research and development program with Euratom.

As many of you will recall the Congress in 1958 enacted the Euratom Cooperation Act, under the authority of which the United States and the six nations of the European Atomic Energy Community established a 10-year joint research and development program. The program, consisting of two 5-year periods, runs from 1959 to 1969 and involves the construction and operation of nuclear reactors selected by the AEC and the Community, to be built within the Euratom countries. During the first 5-year program, which terminated in January 1964, a total of $22.5 million was authorized and appropriated. The AEC currently contemplates a spending level of approximately $5.6 million—including fiscal year 1967 costs—during the second 5-year program. The level of expenditure of the second 5-year program is somewhat below what was originally contemplated; however, this decline is consistent with the AEC's domestic program relative to the development of light water cooled and moderated reactors.

Occasionally, Mr. Chairman, we hear complaints voiced in this Chamber that our cooperation with foreign nations is sometimes a one-way street leading out of this country. Mr. Chairman, this program is hardly susceptible to that criticism. Each and every dollar that the United States has spent on this program has been matched by our cooperating Euratom partners. In addition, all moneys contributed by the United States are spent within this country. Furthermore, the results of the coordinated research program in Europe and in the United States redound to the benefit to all participants in the program.

The program, I might add, has been a productive one. Three reactors are in operation or under construction under the program: SENN in Italy, KRB in Germany, and SENA in France. It is significant that none of the three reactor projects has requested fuel element guarantees from the United States as authorized by the Euratom Cooperation Act.

In closing I would like to point out that the same spirit of cooperation that has characterized the joint program with Euratom is exemplified by the SEFOR reactor project now under construction near Fayetteville, Ark. This facility is of vital importance to the AEC's fast breeder reactor development program. While not part of the United States-Euratom joint program, this experimental facility is being constructed by American private industry in cooperation with the AEC and with major financial contributions by Euratom and West Germany's Karlsruhe Research Center. It is my hope and that of the Joint Committee that there will be substantial additional cooperation with Euratom, both here and abroad, which will further the advancement of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to compliment the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the ranking minority member of that committee. Their devotion to duty in this technical, difficult, and detailed matter is almost beyond belief. Without their able work and their devotion to duty, it would have been a well-nigh impossible task.

Mr. Chairman, the new activity, the experiment, and the research in this great field is opening up new vistas that were undreamed of only two decades ago. We now have, not only in this country but in some other countries of the world, a power new to man. Its effects and uses are almost without limit.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is pleased to report generally on the progress which has been made in the development of civilian nuclear power. As indicated in the committee's report, the past year has brought about a major increase in plans to utilize nuclear energy. In the past year alone orders were placed for 4,700 megawatts of additional nuclear power capacity. In all the preceding years orders were placed for only 3,500 megawatts of nuclear power.

Our investigation in the development of civilian nuclear power appears to be paying off. We have for the first time available to us an addition to fossil fuels which are our primary source of energy. As pointed out in the committee hearings, with the growing needs for energy there is a growing market for all types of fuel in our future. For example a recent article in the Mining Congress Journal, which factors in the growing use of nuclear energy, points out that coal consumption is expected to double between 1960 and 1980.

We have reviewed the civilian nuclear power program in considerable detail during consideration of the AEC authorization bill. We concentrated on development projects for which additional support may not be justified. The committee looks upon the atomic energy program as a development program which requires changes as progress is made. The committee in its report endorsed the weeding out of concepts which did not measure up to the competition. The committee recommended a yardstick for the evaluation of advanced systems in the nuclear power program. The committee stated that it believes before any new concept can be justified to move forward into the construction phase with Government support, there must be a clear showing of substantial economic and technical advantages over alternate concepts. Application of this yardstick to civilian nuclear power projects in the past year resulted in the termination of two research and development projects—the experimental gas cooled reactor and the Hallam sodium graphite reactor.

The committee also, in light of the major changes which have taken place in the last few years, asked for an updating of the objectives of the civilian nuclear power program. We believe that the civilian nuclear power program has been a dynamic program, and we want to keep it that way. Our action to update the program objectives and asking for a technical review of a number of the projects is aimed at accomplishing this.

One of the development projects in the civilian nuclear power program is the organic reactor project located in Piqua, Ohio. During our hearings I closely examined the Atomic Energy Commission witnesses relative to developments in the Piqua reactor project. The Piqua reactor is the only organic-cooled power reactor that we know of in the world. The Piqua project is a research and development project with the object of demonstrating the utility of a new kind of reactor coolant for civilian power reactors. As a research and development project, AEC assistance was justified and has been provided for the project. The Government, in cooperation with the city of Piqua, has provided $23 million worth of Government assistance for this research and development demonstration project. We are learning a great deal from the Piqua reactor. Some of the things we are learning about this concept look favorable while others look unfavorable.

I was also pleased to learn from the Commission that the reactor operating staff of the city of Piqua is doing an excellent job and is contributing much to our knowledge concerning this reactor project.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss briefly a proposed nuclear power project which is not included in this authorization bill but which I understand is under active consideration and to inquire of the chairman of the Joint Committee of the procedure to be followed, if and when negotiations for the proposed project are completed, in making Federal funds available for it.

I refer to proposals for construction of 150-million-gallon-per-day water desalting plant by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, with substantial financial support from the Department of Interior's Office of Saline Water and the Atomic Energy Commission. Heat for the desalting plant would be provided by a 1,600,000-kilowatt nuclear plant. As I understand the proposal, the AEC would contribute from $12 to $15 million toward the cost of the nuclear plant in the form of a direct subsidy.

According to all of the information which I have been able to gather about this proposed project, the nuclear plant would be a light water reactor of the type which are being built or planned by private utilities in increasing number. Because these light water reactors have clearly passed out of the experimental stage and into commercial electric power production, the AEC, prodded by the Joint Committee, has adopted a policy of not extending any further direct subsidies of any kind to them. In other words, these light water reactors must now stand on their own feet.

In view of this established national policy of not granting further subsidies to light water reactors, I am disturbed over reports that AEC is now proposing to resume the subsidies for this California plant. Frankly, I can see no justification for departing from our established policy. If the water desalting project is needed in southern California, and must be tied to a nuclear plant, then the full cost of the powerplant should be borne by the sponsors. I am unalterably opposed to using the water desalting program as a back door through which Federal subsidies can be funneled, despite the adoption of what appeared to be a firm national policy to the contrary.

Therefore, I should like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee, to explain to me, if he will, the procedures which must be followed before any Federal funds can be committed for this project. Does the AEC have authority to agree to a contract without the approval of the Joint Committee of the Congress on this particular project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The question, as I understand it, is: Could the AEC go ahead with this project without the authorization of the Congress? My answer is "No; they could not."

There has been no request for an authorization for this project brought to our committee. If there is a request for an authorization brought to our committee, we will hold hearings at which the gentleman or any other person who is interested may testify.

Subsequent to that, we would make a determination in the committee as to whether we would ask for an authorization or not; and, if we decided to, we would bring it to the floor, where there would be adequate discussion of the matter.

Mr. MOORE. In response, the chairman has indicated the regular processes must be followed. There must be an authorization and an appropriation, and we can be assured that no action will be taken until there is such a request for authorization.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Any construction for such a project as the gentleman has described would have to be authorized by the Congress and funded by the Congress.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this has turned out to be a rather appropriate day for consideration of this authorization for some $2.25 billion to carry on the activities of the AEC for the next year. This is the day the Red Chinese have exploded their third nuclear device. They exploded their first October 16, 1964, their second May 14, 1965, and the third today, about 12 months later.

The news report indicates Radio Peking claims their bomb contains thermonuclear material. Of course, that claim can be evaluated at a later time. Assuming it is true—and I would imagine it probably is—it would be logical for a country in that state of nuclear development to work on the beginning of a hydrogen bomb.

This points up the fact that we do live in a dangerous world.

Peking claims, among other things, that the developments in atomic weaponry they are carrying on are "to protect the peace of the world." I rather doubt, if indeed the objective is to protect the peace of the world, that it will be very efficacious in so doing via this route. I also feel that this route undoubtedly is not the one any sensible nation in these times would pursue to protect the peace of the world.

The limited test ban treaty was signed about 3 years ago. I made a speech about that last week, indicating on May 4 that the several test ban safeguards which were at that time promised for the protection of the national security of the United States may not be carried on as vigorously as the discussions of the promises in 1963 indicated. I believe it essential that the program of safeguards be carried on and be carried on vigorously.

These safeguards include a continuing aggressive underground test program. They include the maintenance of our weapons laboratories as going operations. They include the maintenance of a capability to resume atmospheric testing if the national interest requires it. They also include the monitoring of tests carried on by other countries.

This test of the Red Chinese undoubtedly, as was its predecessor, was carried out in the atmosphere. Our monitoring efforts will proceed now as the days go on to attempt to determine exactly what those people did. That is all to the good. This is carrying out a safeguard. As a matter of fact, of the four safeguards monitoring is the one that has been kept and maintained at a reasonable level in relation to the kind of work being carried on in that area before the limited test ban was signed 3 years ago. Probably the reason we can ascribe for this is less to have a capability to monitor tests as promised than it is to establish some kind of monitoring system to be used to police a total test ban treaty which apparently, according to the testimony of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense given to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is one of the high-priority objectives of the present administration of our Government. Nevertheless, as I pointed out last week, there has been a drop of around 8 percent in our effort in the conduct of underground tests. For that reason the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy includes in this authorization bill $10 million more than was requested by the administration. I truly hope that that extra amount of money will be appropriated and that it will be spent. Certainly it is in the only area of testing available under the treaty where, if we are to make progress at all in meeting the weapons competition of other nations, we can go forward with experiments. Therefore, we have to spend the necessary money to take care of this need.

The committee intends that the safeguards shall not stagnate and that resources be available in fiscal year 1967 to assure the continuation of an aggressive and comprehensive underground test program. Weapons tests are essential to the development of modern nuclear weapons for the U.S. strategic deterrent. The evidence coming out of the Soviet Union is that they have developed and are producing and deploying hardened silo ICBM's and an antiballistic missile system. The United States must, therefore, enhance its offensive and defensive strategic weapon systems. The developments for accomplishing this cannot take place without a continuous effort in the Commission's weapons laboratories, together with greater efforts in the testing program.

Very important also in this regard is the fact that it takes months to drill the holes necessary for underground testing. The supply of such emplacement holes is dwindling. It is necessary, therefore, to expend funds in fiscal year 1967 to assure that emplacement holes and other necessary long leadtime resources will be available for crucial and important tests that the laboratories will have to perform in fiscal year 1968. We cannot allow a failure to fund in fiscal year 1967 to delay tests that may be critical in the following year.

On maintenance of our laboratories it appears that our effort has dropped somewhat. Likewise on the maintenance of an atmospheric test readiness capability. At this particular moment these are not areas which could this year, this month, affect the fate of the Nation, but certainly if there is a continuation in this slackening of our safeguard efforts, if the downtrend is allowed to continue, inescapably we will reach a point where the neglect of this kind of effort can seriously impair the national security of the United States. Let us take but one of this kind of safeguards and see what might happen. Take that of the operation and maintenance of our weapons laboratories. You either have a weapons laboratory that is filled with enthusiasm and has attracted and retained brilliant minds or you do not. There is no "pretty good" weapons laboratory. At one point or another, although you may continue to spend money, unless you spend enough, what you do spend will not buy anything of value by way of nuclear weapons progress. It is much like the situation of underground nuclear tests.

In connection with the safeguard for readiness to resume atmospheric tests, I think there is a disagreement between myself and the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission as to just how much test equipment you need—the question is, for example, do you need one set of aircraft to go up and collect samples, or should you have two or three sets of aircraft each to back up the other? That kind of question has not been really discussed and argued and debated. I myself, as I indicate, do not think our effort in that area is sufficient simply because if and when we do have to resume atmospheric testing, it will be under conditions of total crisis and grave emergency.

We just cannot afford not to have our testing equipment duplicated and triplicated and ready to go.

Mr. Chairman, those are some of the questions and types of things that your Joint Committee on Atomic Energy tries to think about as individuals and as members of the committee responsible to the rest of the Congress for the custodianship of this large effort of the United States of America.

And, Mr. Chairman, I know that my chairman, in the remarks that I have made, may disagree with me in some details and opinions, but I know he will agree with me when I say that I feel that no group of men of the House and of the other body, charged with a grave responsibility, attempts to exercise that responsibility more soberly and with greater dedication than do my fellow members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express to each of them my gratitude for that patriotic service to our country and for the pleasure it is to serve with them in carrying out this responsibility.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman to yield because I believe I can say almost without reservation that we are in accord on the serious things which he has brought to the attention of the Congress. There might be some difference in judgment as to degree, but there is very little on the principles that he has enunciated.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of his deep interest in this matter of testing that the committee has, at his suggestion, added $10 million to the underground testing program. We added it for the purpose of the AEC using it for underground testing. Therefore, we hope the funds which were authorized will be granted by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, this Joint Committee on Atomic Energy functions in a unique way, in my opinion. There is such a small amount of partisanship involved in it that I have been unable to find it.

Mr. Chairman, we have worked at all of these different problems in a completely bipartisan way and in a manner in which our best collective judgment would dictate to be in the interest of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express a particular satisfaction that I have with reference to the time and the effort which the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has put into his work on these complicated details of a program of this magnitude.

Mr. Chairman, I am sincere in saying that I know of no one on the committee who puts in any more time than does the gentleman from California on these problems. I look to the gentleman for advice and consultation frequently, because of his deep knowledge of the matter.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the other gentlemen on the committee who have attended our hearings and have given us the benefit of their study and their judgment on these important matters.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of our committee, and in relation to his remarks about me personally, I must say that I only follow his example in carrying out the work of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In reading the report, it is difficult to ascertain how the money for this purpose is being spread over the country.

Am I correct or am I incorrect in assuming that a large share of this money is going to the Far Western States; or is it being spread out over the country as I think it ought to be?

Mr. HOSMER. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, he has rather caught me unprepared because in the committee we have never attempted to allocate funds on a geographical basis or even considered geography in arriving at these various expenditures. We do the work where the capability exists to do it. I do know and I do recall now that considerable work is done at one of the universities in the gentleman's own State of Iowa, the institution where Professor Van Allen is located. I think perhaps there are other places in Iowa but so far as being able to identify any proportion or any portion or any allocation of any of this budget on a sectional basis, I simply can be of no assistance to the gentleman from Iowa. But I will yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] at this point.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is extensive work that is going on in the Ames Laboratory in Iowa. It is work that is very valuable to the Commission and it has been going on for many years.

I think I can give you a little more of the feeling of this possibly. As the gentleman probably knows, there are a number of big installations in the country.

There is the Savannah River installation in the State of Georgia.

Of course, we will be glad to furnish a breakdown of this to the gentleman if he wants it.

Also in South Carolina there is a big operation.

There is a big operation at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Then in the State of New York there is the Brookhaven Laboratory and the Argonne Laboratory in Illinois.

There is considerable work being done in New Mexico and in the State of Idaho.

This involves a little over $2 billion. The breakdown by atomic energy program can be found on page 2 of the report. The biggest part of it is for raw materials, special nuclear materials and weapons. That amounts, as I am looking at it here, to over $1 billion made up of raw materials $163,015,000; special nuclear materials $354,228,000; weapons $639 million.

That is more than $1 billion or more than half. Most of that is for the purchase of uranium from the Western States and the fabrication of weapons at the Sandia Laboratory in New Mexico and the Los Alamos Laboratory.

There is also work being done in Nevada which is underground test work.

Then in the State of Idaho we have quite a large amount of work being done at the naval laboratory at Idaho Falls, Idaho.

So I would say that the gentleman is right that a considerable amount of this money is spent in some of the Western States. But there are peculiarities of terrain and wide expanses of desert where these dangerous tests take place and where these laboratories which are working with dangerous materials are isolated away from the population and, of course, we must take them to a place such as that. Thickly populated States could not do that work.

Then at Hanford, Wash., we also have a large facility for the making of plutonium.

There are a number of places scattered over the United States.

Mr. HOSMER. It would be well to add the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, part of which is located at Berkeley and part at Livermore, Calif., that carries on a good deal of the work. As a matter of fact, this is the laboratory in which plutonium was first identified and from which some of the work that later got into the Manhattan project was originated.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. These are in the nature of laboratory and experimental and research type operations rather than fabrication or mining, milling, and weapon fabrication operations which is done in these other places.

Mr. HOSMER. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Could I ask the chairman of the committee a question? My question has come up as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. That is in relation to the materials that will come from the moon.

In the current budget there has been a proposal under the Science and Astronautics Committee for a Moon Materials Research Laboratory in Houston, Tex. My question is this: Why could not we use the existing facilities, such as the Atomic Energy Commission has at various parts of the country, to do the inquiring into what these materials might be? The reason I say that we should use some of the Atomic Energy Commission Laboratories is that they are experienced in materials that have been subjected to high radiation and, of course, they work in the atomic energy fields. The moon materials, because there is no atmosphere on the moon, will probably have been subjected to decay because of radiation over millions of years.

What is the reason that none of these materials can be in any way researched in the Atomic Energy Commission Radiation Laboratories because in all, when the Apollo program is accomplished, there will simply be 82 to 84 pounds of material?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say the gentleman from Pennsylvania is much more acquainted with the program of space exploration than I am.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman look into it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have the finest laboratories that there are in the world for the analysis of materials. We have had to have them because we have given hundreds of millions of dollars for the radiation of material of different kinds. I would assume that the quantity of material that might be obtained on the moon and returned to our laboratories would be small, and I do not believe it would tax the facilities of our scientists to analyze that material. I will be glad to look into the matter and consider any information that Mr. Finger, the manager of the space projects, will bring to us.

Mr. HOSMER. I would say also to the gentleman that at the present time the AEC laboratories, because of their capability and excellence, are being used by various other departments and agencies of the Government to carry on necessary research. As the gentleman explained the moon materials program, I am certain there would be no difficulty in it being handled by the AEC, subject, of course, to further checks so that we could reassure the gentleman with certainty.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Could I compliment you both on your statements, because we are now in a position under NASA where the proposition is to build an entirely new laboratory and, of course, we would then have to build an entirely new scientific team as well to staff the laboratory when, as a matter of fact, the Atomic Energy Commission already has the radiation installations, research materials, and laboratories as well as the personnel, and I think the scientific personnel grouping is the most important.

Mr. HOSMER. Yes; and I might say to the gentleman that not only does the AEC have the physical laboratories and materials but they have had long experience in operating this kind of effort, which, indeed, is an important factor when the success of the effort eventually comes through.

We know that the National Science Foundation, which is not really an operational group, nevertheless took on Operation Mohole to dig a very deep hole through the earth's crust. It just did not have the contracting experience, did not have the operational and executive experience, and consequently the program today is in serious danger of withering at the pocketbook.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is a very good point. NASA does not have the experience in atomic energy research that the Atomic Energy Commission has had, and yet this will be a whole new laboratory built under NASA, staffed by NASA, and working in the same field that you people are already experienced in, both in contracting and in scientific personnel.

My point is this. It is not that you can do it in each one of the installations without some modification. We do not know what the new material is.

Another point is, we have not yet finished the Surveyor and the research programs to see what new material there might be, prior to the Apollo program, so it is just a guess at this point what this laboratory should be. If the committee will bring up some sort of a report for the Congress, it will be very much appreciated.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman for bringing up this subject.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the colloquy just had between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I would hope that the members of the Appropriations Committee will take note.

I see the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] are on the floor. I hope they will take note and ask the Atomic Energy Commission for a report on the availability and competence of the laboratories to take care of this work. An authorization of some $9 million was approved by the House despite an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I hope they will probe this matter thoroughly with the objective of saving the taxpayers the substantial bill of expense of constructing still another laboratory that apparently is unnecessary—on the basis of this conversation. I hope the Appropriations Committee will delve deeply into this before making any money available for such purpose.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on page 18 of the report I notice that $40,833,000 is requested for a high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor. A few months ago, at Oak Ridge, over $100 million had been spent on the development of a reactor.

I would like to ask if there is any similarity between this requested project and the one that was abandoned at Oak Ridge after $100 million had been spent. The abandonment was made 2 or 3 months ago.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the only similarity between them is that they were both to be cooled by gas. The other internal workings, really complicated internal workings, of the reactors involved are quite different.

It became apparent that the approach, which was, indeed, an experimental one being taken at Oak Ridge, was not promising or suitable for our commercial reactor programs. Therefore, in its wisdom the Commission recommended to the committee that the project be dropped, and that concentration be made on the alternate approach, which seems to have more opportunity for ultimate commercial success, but which itself has not been proved out.

The money that is in here at the present time will prove or disprove whether this particular high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor is worthy of the Nation's additional effort.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I had understood that there was a similar project and facilities, and that money had been invested in this project, and that this facility could be continued and used for this same project. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will secure the Joint Committee authorization hearings, in part 2, page 706, there is a complete treatment of this subject matter in great detail, covering several pages. I think he will find an answer to any question he might ask.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has explained, there is some similarity between these reactors, but actually they are completely different in their approach to the problem.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Our committee's consideration of this authorization bill has been characterized by close cooperation by all members and as the chairman of our committee has pointed out, our report on this bill was unanimous.

I will not attempt to restate the major provisions of the bill, which have already been explained. However, I would like to call to the attention of the Members several AEC programs which are of great importance to our national security and general well-being.

Included within the AEC's budget, in the so-called SNAP program, is the sum of about $45 million for the development of energy sources for satellites and other space applications, as well as a variety of terrestrial uses.

The terrestrial SNAP program includes power and heat generators for deep sea applications, surface applications and small power sources for use in a cardiac pacemaker.

As a part of its space SNAP program, the AEC has under development a plutonium 238 radioisotopic powered electricity generator—known as SNAP-27—which has been selected for use in the Apollo program as a power source for scientific equipment to be left on the surface of the moon by U.S. astronauts. In addition, the AEC at the request of the Department of Defense has studied and reported favorably on the feasibility of a polonium 210 radioisotopic powered device—known as SNAP-29—to meet a special DOD application.

The committee is encouraged by recent indications that user agencies are showing increased interest in radioisotopic SNAP devices for space applications. More importantly, this interest is evidenced by specific indications of requirements for the developed systems.

With respect to the Commission's plowshare program, involving the application of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes, I want to point out that the committee believes some very significant benefits are available to this country from this use of atomic energy. One major incentive for plowshare has been to apply nuclear explosives to the excavation of large-scale earthmoving projects, such as highway cuts and canals. The carrying out of such projects depends on the development of devices and techniques that will permit large scale use of nuclear explosives without producing amounts of radioactivity that could be harmful to the health and safety of people living in areas adjacent to the excavation, or anywhere.

In the past few years progress has been made in the development of nuclear devices for plowshare purposes. However, the demonstration of the ability to create craters by means of nuclear explosives, while containing most of the radioactivity produced, necessitates experimental excavation programs. Two such experiments were planned for fiscal year 1966. In spite of the assurances given to the Senate in 1963 during the hearings on the limited nuclear test ban treaty—that plowshare cratering experiments could be performed—the fiscal year 1966 planned experiments have not been carried out. Data from such experiments are critically needed by the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission for their consideration of the route and means of construction for the proposed sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

As our committee noted in its report, we were disappointed and concerned that the cratering experiments planned by the AEC for fiscal year 1966 have not taken place. During Senate consideration of the limited nuclear test ban treaty in 1963, it was our understanding that AEC cratering experiments to further plowshare developments would continue.

These important experiments should not be canceled or unnecessarily delayed by an unwarranted interpretation of the test ban treaty. It was never intended that underground nuclear explosions contributing amounts of radioactivity to the atmosphere so small that only especially sensitive instruments can possibly detect the individual radioactive atoms, would constitute a violation of the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

I believe the other significant matters concerning H.R. 14732 were adequately covered by the gentleman from California. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a sound authorization bill here and I urge the Members to approve it.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14732, the bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1967. I would like to make some remarks on an important national research program—the high energy physics program—that is managed by the Atomic Energy Commission for the Nation. Members will recall that last year President Johnson submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a report covering this national research program entitled "Policy for National Action in the Field of High Energy Physics."

The President pointed out in that submittal that:

> The fundamental nature of high energy physics makes it one of the most important fields of basic science. We must continue to explore it vigorously and to maintain our national leadership.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in its current report on H.R. 14732 points out its strong support for the past and current efforts of the Commission to keep the United States as the world leader in this foremost frontier of physics research.

We are all aware of the successes of nuclear reactors for naval propulsion and electrical generation. These successful accomplishments did not occur overnight. They have a long history in the realm of basic science research. Nevertheless, in spite of our success in harnessing the energy of the atom's nucleus, scientists still do not fully understand the nature of the atomic nucleus and the forces that hold the particles in the nucleus together. I am sure that the knowledge which we will acquire from high energy physics research will provide us with a better understanding of nuclear forces. This knowledge can not only contribute to the development of a better nuclear technology but also to the advancement of other technologies, perhaps some not even dreamed of today.

During the coming fiscal year a new accelerator, the highest energy electron accelerator in the world—the Stanford linear accelerator—providing electrons with 20 billion electron volts of energy will come into operation. Large accelerators, some new and some old, are the tools the scientists use to explore the nucleus of the atom. Because of the complexity and massiveness of these accelerators, the costs of high energy physics are very large; not only the costs of building the accelerators but also the costs of continuing to operate them and to do research with them.

The Joint Committee is authorizing $109,800,000 for operations and research with these multibillion-electron-volt accelerators for fiscal year 1967. While this is a large sum of money, it is still some $40 or $50 million less than was projected in the President's policy report submitted last year. Those projections would indicate that the costs of high energy physics will be going up.

For fiscal year 1967 the Commission has not requested and the Joint Committee has not authorized the engineering design or construction of the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. The President's budget, however, for fiscal year 1967 does point out that as soon as a site is selected a request for funds to construct this accelerator will be made. The Commission has testified to the Joint Committee that it will make its selection within 3 to 6 months after it receives the report of the National Academy of Sciences Site Evaluation Committee. That report was received by the Commission on March 21, 1966.

We cannot, as yet, point today to any direct contributions from the high energy physics program to our economy or our military security. Nevertheless, we should note that the early accelerators, having energies of less than one-thousandth of the current large accelerators, did provide the basic information that led to the discovery and development of nuclear fission. It is much too early to tell whether our current efforts will have equally dramatic effects in the future, but it is important that if such dramatic effects should be possible, that the United States be the first to learn about them and not let others make such significant discoveries without our ability to pursue such an effort. The Soviet Union is engaged in the construction of a 70-billion-electron-volt accelerator. This is more than twice the energy of our largest accelerator, the 33-billion-electron-volt AGS located at the Brookhaven National Laboratory in Long Island, N.Y.

Included in this year's authorization for high energy physics are funds to permit the construction of a new injector for the Brookhaven AGS accelerator which will make it possible to increase the intensity, although not the energy, of this accelerator by a factor of 10. This change will permit a more effective experimental program and broader utilization of the accelerator.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to call to the attention of the Members of the House that recently the 12.5-billion-electron-volt accelerator at the Argonne National Laboratory, in my home State of Illinois, produced the track from which researchers at the University of Michigan, working in conjunction with Argonne scientists, were able to find a new elementary particle. This particle is designated N* (3245). The 3245 means it has a mass of 3245 million-electron-volts or about 3⅓ as times as heavy as the proton—heavier than any found heretofore. While I cannot talk about the scientific significance of this discovery, I do wish to point out that scientists have been most excited about this discovery and how it may fit in with current theories in high energy physics. It is thus gratifying to know that accelerators of even modestly large energies are still capable of making important contributions to this field.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman on the other side if he has any other speakers. We have no further requests for time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Sec. 101. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of $2,210,658,000 as follows:

(a) For "Operating expenses", $1,964,128,000.

(b) For "Plant and capital equipment", including construction, acquisition, or modification of facilities, including land acquisition; construction planning and design; and acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, $246,530,000 as follows:

(1) Special Nuclear Materials.—

Project 67-1-a, isotopes process development laboratory, Savannah River, South Carolina, $2,000,000.

(2) Atomic Weapons.—

Project 67-2-a, diagnostic chemistry building addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, California, $1,600,000.

Project 67-2-b, weapons production, development, and test installations, $10,000,000.

(3) Reactor Development.—

Project 67-3-a, fast flux test facility (AE only), $7,500,000.

Project 67-3-b, modifications and addition to S1W reactor facility, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $10,000,000.

Project 67-3-c, research and development test plants, Project Rover, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, and Nevada, Test Site, Nevada, $2,000,000.

Project 67-3-d, fast neutron generator, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $1,900,000.

Project 67-3-e, heavy water organic cooled reactor (AE only), $2,000,000.

Project 67-3-f, modifications to reactors, $3,000,000.

(4) Physical Research.—

Project 67-4-a, low energy accelerator improvements, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $400,000.

Project 67-4-b, accelerator improvements, zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $2,000,000.

Project 67-4-c, accelerator and reactor additions and modifications, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $800,000.

Project 67-4-d, accelerator improvements, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley, California, $1,550,000.

Project 67-4-e, accelerator improvements, Cambridge and Princeton accelerators, $1,850,000.

Project 67-4-f, accelerator improvements, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, California, $400,000.

(5) Biology and Medicine.—

Project 67-5-a, biology laboratory, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington, $5,000,000.

(6) Isotopes Development.—

Project 67-6-a, alpha fuels environmental test facility, Mount Laboratory, Miamisburg, Ohio, $3,000,000.

(7) General Plant Projects.—$39,325,000.

(8) Construction Planning and Design.—$2,000,000.

(9) Capital Equipment.—Acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, $150,205,000.

Sec. 102. Limitations.—(a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsection 101(b) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsection 101(b)(5) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start a project under subsection 101(b)(7) only if it is in accordance with the following:

(1) For community operations, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $100,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be $10,000.

(2) For all other programs, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be $100,000.

(3) The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101(b)(7) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 per centum.

Sec. 103. The Commission is authorized to perform construction design services for any Commission construction project whenever (1) such construction project has been included in a proposed authorization bill transmitted to the Congress by the Commission and (2) the Commission determines that the project is of such urgency that construction of the project should be initiated promptly upon enactment of legislation appropriating funds for its construction.

Sec. 104. When so specified in an appropriation Act, transfer of amounts between "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be made as provided in such appropriation Act.

Sec. 105. Cooperative Power Reactor Demonstration Program.—Section 111 of Public Law 85-162, as amended, is further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1966" in clause (3) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1967".

Sec. 106. Amendment of Prior Year Act.—(a) Section 101 of Public Law 89-32 is amended by striking therefrom the figure "$2,555,521,000" and substituting therefor the figure "$2,604,821,000", and subsection (b) thereof is amended by striking therefrom the figure $294,745,000" and substituting therefore the figure "$344,045,000".

(b) Section 101(b)(5) of Public Law 89-32 is amended by striking therefrom "Project 66-5-e, alternating gradient synchrotron conversion, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York (AE only) $2,000,000," and substituting therefor "Project 66-5-e, alternating gradient synchrotron conversion, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $47,800,000."

(c) Section 101(b)(5) of Public Law 89-32 is amended by striking therefrom the figure

"$1,200,000" for project 66-5-h, meson physics facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico (AE only), and substituting therefor the figure "$4,200,000".

(d) Section 101(b)(6) of Public Law 89-32 is amended by striking therefrom the figure "$2,000,000" for project 66-6-c, land acquisition, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, and substituting therefor the figure "$2,500,000".

SEC. 107. RESCISSION.—Section 106 of Public Law 89-32, except for funds heretofore obligated, is rescinded.

Mr. **HOLIFIELD** (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14732) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 846, he reported the bill back to the House.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **HOLIFIELD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. **HOLIFIELD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, the Whip Notice lists H.R. 14544—the Sales Participation Act of 1966—as a bill that may be before the House for consideration later this week.

This is one of the most far-reaching bills that will be before the House in this Congress. If enacted, it would permit billions of dollars of financing of Government spending programs completely outside of the administrative budget and outside of the debt limit.

It is legislation which should have the most careful scrutiny of the Congress. This has not been done by our committee and hence it will be necessary to explore the issues at stake as best we can, if and when the bill is on the floor of the House.

The bill would authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—to sell participation certificates on behalf of many other Government agencies. Up to the present time, FNMA has sold four issues of participation certificates, aggregating $1.6 billion, for its own account and for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The most recent issue was an offering of $410 million participation certificates of March 16 of this year.

The prospectus in connection with this offering provides valuable information as to how the program works. This information should be of help to Members of Congress and I place a copy of the last prospectus at this point in the RECORD:

PROSPECTUS: $410 MILLION PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES IN THE GOVERNMENT MORTGAGE LIQUIDATION TRUST, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, TRUSTEE

(Dated Apr. 4, 1966—due Apr. 1, as shown below)

Timely payment of principal of and interest on the participation certificates is guaranteed by the Federal National Mortgage Association, a corporate instrumentality of the United States. (See letter of the Secretary of the Treasury appearing later in this prospectus regarding availability of funds for such guarantee.) The participation certificates are not obligations of and are not guaranteed by the United States.

The participation certificates are serial certificates issued in registered form only, in denominations of $5,000, $10,000, $25,000, $100,000, $500,000, and $1 million. The amounts, maturities, interest rates, and offering prices of the participation certificates are shown below. The principal, together with the last installment of interest, is payable at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York upon presentation at such bank and surrender of the certificates. The interest is payable by check, semiannually, on October 1 and April 1 in each year. The participation certificates are not redeemable prior to maturity.

The participation certificates are issued by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, under the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust established by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as trustors, pursuant to amendments which became effective September 2, 1964 to the National Housing Act and sections 1820 and 1823 of title 38 of the United States Code (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended). In connection with the issuance on November 2, 1964, July 1, 1965, and December 1, 1965, of an aggregate of $1,200 million of participation certificates (of which $1,170 million are now outstanding), the trustors set aside on their books an aggregate of not less than $1,755 million principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. At the close of business on January 31, 1966, the aggregate unpaid principal amount of such mortgages so set aside by the trustors amounted to approximately $1,690 million and the aggregate amount of cash, U.S. Government and Federal Agency securities (at market value) held by the trustee approximately $61 million. In connection with the participation certificates offered hereby, the trustors have set aside on their books not less than $530 million aggregate principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. The trustors have agreed to pay to the trustee the principal and interest payments received from all such mortgages. All outstanding participation certificates have equal and proportionate benefits under the trust indenture, as supplemented. (See more complete information under "Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust" and "Maximum of Outstanding Certificates" appearing later in this prospectus.)

The mortgages have not been transferred and assigned to the trustee. In the trust indenture, as supplemented, the trustors have transferred their rights to receive future payments of principal and interest under such mortgages, which transfer will be completed upon receipt of such payments by the trustee. The participation certificates represent beneficial interests in the obligation of the trustors to pay over to the trustee such future principal and interest payments and beneficial interests in such payments when received by the trustee and in other assets held by the trustee. (See more complete information appearing later in this prospectus.)

Interest on the participation certificates is not exempt from Federal income taxes.

The $410 million principal amount of participation certificates offered hereby will be offered at 100 percent of the principal amount thereof, plus interest accrued thereon from April 4, 1966, will have serial maturities in the amount of $20 million on April 1 in each of the years 1967 through 1976 and $42 million on April 1 in each of the years 1977 through 1981, and will bear interest at the rates set forth below:

	Interest rate
Years:	*Percent*
1967	5.40
1968	5.45
1969	5.50
1970	5.50
1971	5.50
1972	5.50
1973	5.50
1974	5.50
1975	5.50
1976	5.45
1977	5.45
1978	5.40
1979	5.35
1980	5.30
1981	5.25

It is expected that the participation certificates in definitive form will be available for delivery on or about April 4, 1966.

MORGAN GUARANTY TRUST CO. OF NEW YORK.
MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH, INC.
SALOMON BROTHERS & HUTZLER.
THE FIRST BOSTON CORP.

The date of this prospectus is March 16, 1966.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

History and business

The Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) was incorporated on February 10, 1938, pursuant to the then title III of the National Housing Act. Under that act FNMA was a wholly owned Government corporation and borrowed operating funds almost entirely from the U.S. Treasury. Its business consisted then as it does for the most part now of the purchase and sale of mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration and, since 1948, mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a secondary market for such mortgages. After the enactment of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, an act of Congress, approved August 2, 1954, FNMA became a mixed ownership corporate instrumentality of the United States. In connection with its secondary market operations it has issued nonvoting preferred stock and nonvoting common stock. The preferred stock is held by the Secretary of the Treasury and the common stock is held by the public. The Charter Act empowers FNMA (1) to conduct secondary market operations in home mortgages consisting of purchases and sales of such mortgages (the "secondary market operations"), (2) to perform special assistance functions in the purchase of mortgages as authorized by the President of the United States or by the Congress to assist in financing home mortgages in instances where established home financing facilities are inadequate (the "special assistance functions") and (3) to manage and liquidate certain mortgages (the "management and liquidating functions").

Separate accountability is imposed by the Charter Act with respect to the secondary market operations, the special assistance functions, and the management and liquidating functions. Thus, each of the operations has its own assets, liabilities, and separate borrowing authority. The operation of each of the three functions is complete, separate, and distinct from the others. The special assistance functions and management and liquidating functions have no recourse to the capitalization of the corporation obtained from the sale of its preferred stock and common stock in connection with its secondary market operations.

Pursuant to amendments of the National Housing Act and sections 1820 and 1823 of title 38 of the United States Code (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended), which became effective on September 2, 1964, FNMA and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as trustors and original beneficiaries, created as of October 1, 1964, the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust with FNMA as the trustee. The amendment to the National Housing Act also authorized FNMA in its corporate capacity to guarantee payment of the principal of and interest on participation certificates (the "certificates") issued in accordance with the terms of the trust.

FNMA, a corporate instrumentality of the United States, was from 1950 to 1965 in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. As of November 9, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 89-174 which created the Department of Housing and Urban Development, FNMA was transferred to that Department as a corporate entity and as a corporate instrumentality of the United States.

Government mortgage liquidation trust

The trust is under and in accord with the fiduciary powers vested by section 302 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act in the corporation, under its management and liquidating functions, being created by trust indenture dated as of October 1, 1964, and supplemented by the first, second, and third supplement to the trust indenture, dated as of June 1, 1965, November 1, 1965, and March 1, 1966, respectively. FNMA is the trustee of the trust. The beneficiaries are the holders of certificates from time to time outstanding as well as the trustors, but certificate holders, having equal and proportionate benefit one with another, enjoy complete preference, priority, and distinction over the trustors as beneficiaries or otherwise. The trustors that created the trust are FNMA and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the trust indenture provides that the trust may be opened for the issuance of additional certificates on the basis of mortgages then set aside for the trust and other assets held by the trustee and additional mortgages set aside by the above trustors or any department or other agency of the United States.

In connection with the issuance on November 2, 1964, July 1, 1965 and December 1, 1965, of an aggregate of $1,200 million of participation certificates (of which $1,170 million are now outstanding), the trustors set aside on their books an aggregate of not less than $1,755 million principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. At the close of business on January 31, 1966, the aggregate unpaid principal amount of such mortgages so set aside by the trustors amounted to approximately $1,690 million and the aggregate amount of cash, U.S. Government and Federal agency securities (at market value) held by the trustee approximated $61 million. The $1,170 million outstanding certificates have serial maturities of $30 million on November 1 of each of the years 1966 through 1974, and of $35 million on July 1, and of $25 million on December 1 of each of the years 1966 through 1980.

In connection with the certificates offered hereby, the trustors, pursuant to a third supplement to the trust indenture, have set aside on their books as of March 1, 1966, not less than $530 million aggregate principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. The trustors have agreed to pay to the trustee the principal and interest payments received from all of the above mentioned mortgages. The mortgages have not been transferred and assigned to the trustee. The trustors retain full title to and ownership and control of the mortgages, collecting all interest and principal payments thereon and forwarding them to the trustee. However, should there be a default either actual or imminent in the payment of outstanding certificates, the trustee, in its discretion, is authorized to require the transfer of the mortgages into the corpus of the trust and under the control of the trustee for protection of certificate holders. In the trust indenture and the first, second and third supplement thereto, the trustors have transferred to the trustee their rights to receive future payments of principal and interest under all of the above-mentioned mortgages which transfer will be completed upon receipt of such payments by the trustee. The certificates represent beneficial interests in the obligation of the trustors to pay over to the trustee such future principal and interest payments and beneficial interests in such payments when received by the trustee and in other assets held by the trustee.

Proceeds from the sale of the certificates offered hereby will be paid to the trustors and will be applied by them to reduce amounts borrowed from the U.S. Treasury or otherwise to reduce the use of U.S. Treasury funds.

As payments on the mortgages are received from trustors, they will be held by the trustee and will be used to pay principal and interest on the certificates. To the extent that payments exceed the amount needed for principal and interest on the certificates, funds may be held in the trust and invested as part of the corpus, or the trustee, in its discretion, may return to the trustors any funds which it deems to be surplus.

As an incident to the trustee's consent to the sale or conversion of mortgages by a trustor or for purposes of compliance with the maximum limitations on outstanding certificates described below, the trustee is authorized, in its discretion, to require the setting aside of additional mortgages, the payment of cash or securities into the trust or the purchase of outstanding certificates.

The trust indenture defines mortgages to include "deeds of trust, vendors liens, security deeds, installment sale contracts, and other types of security instruments."

A copy of the trust indenture and of the first, second, and third supplement thereto may be obtained from the trustee or the underwriters.

Maximum of outstanding certificates

Under the trust indenture, FNMA, as trustee, is empowered to issue certificates to the public, provided that the aggregate amount of certificates outstanding at any one time not exceed 80 percent of the aggregate of the outstanding principal balances of the mortgages set aside for the trust and other assets held by the trustee. Similarly, with respect to each trustor, the aggregate amount of certificates outstanding at any one time as to such trustor shall not exceed 80 percent of the aggregate of the current outstanding principal balances of the mortgages set aside for the trust by such trustor and other assets held by the trustee attributable to such trustor.

As required by the trust indenture, maximums on amounts of outstanding certificates, including the certificates offered hereby (based on the aggregate principal balances of mortgages set aside for the trust and other assets held by the trustee as set forth above), have been established by the trustee, as follows: with respect to the trust as an entirety, $1,580 million aggregate principal amount of certificates (consisting of the certificates presently outstanding and the certificates offered hereby), $665 million of which is with respect to the trustor, FNMA, and $915 million of which is with respect to the trustor, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. No assurance is given that the ratio of principal amounts of certificates outstanding after this offering to aggregate principal balances of mortgages set aside for the trust and other assets held by the trustee will be maintained throughout the life of the trust. Such a change may come about by the issuance of additional certificates based on additional mortgages set aside for the trust on a ratio different from the above or because the above maximum is changed by determination of the trustee as permitted by the trust indenture or for other reasons, subject always to the observance of the 80 percent ratios referred to above.

Guarantee of payments due

Payment of all certificates, as to both interest and principal, at the times specified therein, is guaranteed by FNMA, and to that end the trust indenture provides as follows: "Payment of all such participations shall be and is hereby guaranteed by the Federal National Mortgage Association, in its corporate capacity, under section 306 (Management and Liquidating Functions) of the aforesaid corporate charter." Each certificate offered hereby will bear a guarantee endorsement.

FNMA borrowing authority—U.S. Treasury

FNMA, in its corporate capacity under section 306 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, may issue to the U.S. Treasury its general obligations in an amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable FNMA to carry out its "Management and Liquidating Functions" (and with no limitation as to amount) including performance of its obligations under its guaranty of the timely payment of the principal and interest on the certificates. The Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations so issued.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it will make loans to FNMA, if needed, to implement the aforementioned "guarantee of payments due" provisions as stated in the following letter:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, May 28, 1965.

Mr. J. S. BAUGHMAN,
President, Federal National Mortgage Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BAUGHMAN: I have your letter of May 24, 1965, asking whether the timely payment of interest and repayment of principal, when due, on participation certificates (whenever issued) in the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust pursuant to the corporate guarantee of the Federal National Mortgage Association under its management and liquidating functions, are functions for which the Association may properly borrow from the Treasury.

It is the opinion of the Treasury Department that the Association may properly borrow from the Treasury for the foregoing purpose. Accordingly, the Treasury will make loans to the Association under the procedures provided for in subsection (d) of section 306 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, to enable the Association to meet its guaranty of the payment of principal and interest on the participation certificates.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

FNMA has agreed with the underwriters that in the event it is called upon at any time to make good its guaranty of the payment of principal and interest on the certificates, it will, if necessary, in accordance with section 306(d) of its charter, apply to the Treasury Department of the United States for a loan or loans in amounts sufficient to make payments of principal and interest.

FNMA, pursuant to its management and liquidating functions, is also authorized, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue its obligations to the general public to the extent that the aggregate amount of such outstanding obligations does not exceed FNMA's ownership, free from any liens or encumbrances, of cash, mortgages and certain securities under its management and liquidating functions, the proceeds from such issuance to be used in reduction of the debt of FNMA to the Treasury under these functions. No such obligations are now outstanding. This authorization to issue obligations to the general public is separate and distinct from the power to issue its obligations represented by guaranties, which power is subject to no such limitation on amount.

General

Transfers—Denominational Exchanges

The certificates are freely transferable and assignable, but the trustee is responsible only to the registered owners thereof as their names and addresses appear on the transfer books of the trustee.

Such transfer books are maintained on behalf of the trustee by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The registered ownership of certificates may be changed on the transfer books and denominational exchanges may be effected, by presentation of the certificates to be transferred or exchanged to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, without charge to the owner by the bank. The transfer books will be closed for 10 business days preceding any interest and principal payment dates prescribed by the certificates.

Procedures Governing Registration, Transfer of Certificates

For the protection of registered owners of certificates, the trustee has adopted procedures to govern the manner in which certificates may be registered, transferred, assigned, exchanged as to denominations and presented for payment. Such procedures are the same, insofar as applicable, as the regulations of the U.S. Treasury Department governing registered obligations of the United States as contained in Treasury Department Circular No. 300. Generally, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York will act for the trustee in these matters. Each certificate, when issued, must include the identifying number of the registered owner as a part of the registration. This number is the appropriate taxpayer identifying number as required on tax returns and other documents submitted to the Internal Revenue Service. A copy of circular No. 300 may be obtained upon request from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the Treasury Department, the trustee, or the fiscal agent of FNMA.

Legality of Investments

The certificates are lawful investments and may be accepted as security for fiduciary, trust, and public funds under the control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof, and are eligible as collateral for Treasury tax and loan accounts. National banks may deal in, underwrite, and purchase for their own account the certificates without regard to the limitations generally applicable to investment securities.

Tax Status

The income derived from the certificates does not have any exemption, as such, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The certificates are subject to Federal estate and gift taxes. The Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act does not contain any specific exemption with respect to taxes now or hereafter imposed on the principal of or interest on the certificates by any State, or any of the possessions of the United States, or by any local taxing authority.

Examination and Audit

FNMA is examined by its own internal auditing staff; and in accord with the Government Corporation Control Act, it is audited for each fiscal year by the U.S. General Accounting Office. Reports of such fiscal year audits are made annually to the Congress and are available to the public.

Management

FNMA operates under its corporate officers and a Board of Directors of five members. The officers of the corporation are authorized to act for and on behalf of the trust. Pursuant to the FNMA Charter Act and Public Law 89–174, approved September 9, 1965, the Board of Directors consists of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who is chairman ex officio, and four other duly appointed members. The principal office of FNMA is located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Financial Statements

The mortgages set aside for the trust had aggregate unpaid principal balances of approximately $1,690 million as of the close of business on January 31, 1966. In connection with the participation certificates offered hereby, the trustors have set aside on their books not less than $530 million aggregate principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. Of this total amount of $2,220 million approximately $1,013 million represents mortgages of the trustor, FNMA, and approximately $1,207 million represents mortgages of the trustor, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. At the close of business on January 31, 1966, the aggregate amount of cash, U.S. Government and Federal agency securities (at market value) held by the trustee approximated $61 million. Financial statements are prepared by the trustee not less often than annually. A registered owner of a certificate may obtain such statements from the trustee upon request.

Legal Opinions

The legality of the certificates offered hereby will be passed upon by Mr. Robert Newton Reid, General Counsel of FNMA, and by Messrs. Brown, Wood, Fuller, Caldwell & Ivey, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y., counsel for the underwriters. The then Acting Attorney General of the United States rendered an opinion, dated October 2, 1964, to the effect that "the trust indenture and the participation certificates to be issued under its provisions are valid and legally binding undertakings of the Association (FNMA), both in its corporate capacity and as trustee, and of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs."

Notice

The statements herein with respect to the certificates, the trust indenture and the first, second, and third supplement thereto are subject to the detailed provisions of the trust indenture and such first, second, and third supplement, copies of which may be obtained from the trustee or the underwriters, and the statements made herein are qualified in their entirety by reference thereto.

Notwithstanding anything herein contained, the certificates, as stated on the cover page of this prospectus, are not obligations of and are not guaranteed by the United States.

Underwriters

The certificates are offered by the underwriters when, as and if issued and accepted by them and subject to their right to reject orders in whole or in part.

Name and Address of Underwriter

Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

Salomon Brothers & Hutzler, 60 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

The First Boston Corp., 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.

Bankers Trust Co., 16 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

The Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

First National City Bank, 55 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association, 300 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., 20 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

The First National Bank of Chicago, Dearborn, Monroe, Clark and Madison Streets, Chicago, Ill.

Blyth & Co., 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Eastman Dillon, Union Securities & Co., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Discount Corp. of New York, 58 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

Goldman, Sachs & Co., 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

Lehman Bros., 1 William Street, New York, N.Y.

White, Weld & Co., 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

First National Bank in Dallas, 1401 Elm Street, Dallas, Tex.

Harris Trust & Savings Bank, 111 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

The Northern Trust Co., 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Security First National Bank, 561 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

United California Bank, 600 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Bache & Co., Inc., 36 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

W. H. Morton & Co., Inc., 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.

New York Hanseatic Corp., 60 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

Wm. E. Pollock & Co., Inc., 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Chas. E. Quincey & Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

Briggs, Schaedle & Co., Inc., 44 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Alex. Brown & Sons, 135 East Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Md.

Dick & Merle-Smith, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Francis I. du Pont & Co., 1 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

R. W. Pressprich & Co., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

Second District Securities Co., Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Underwood, Neuhaus & Co., Inc., 724 Travis at Rusk, Houston, Tex.

Wood, Struthers & Co., Inc., 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.

Ball, Burge & Kraus, 1414 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

F. W. Craigie & Co., Inc., 616 East Main Street, Richmond, Va.

Dempsey-Tegeler & Co., Inc., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

R. H. Moulton & Co., 510 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION.
(As trustee and in its corporate capacity)
By J. S. BAUGHMAN,
President.

Date of Prospectus: March 16, 1966.

AWARD BY YOUNG MEN'S BUSINESS CLUB OF GREATER NEW ORLEANS TO THE HONORABLE HALE BOGGS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, the able majority whip, was recently honored by the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans. Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD, the resolutions conferring honorary life membership in that organization upon our colleague:

Whereas the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans, pursuant to the authority vested in its membership by the club's constitution and bylaws, has heretofore honored many outstanding citizens who have contributed in various fields of endeavor to the advancement of our community, State, and Nation; and

Whereas HALE BOGGS has been a member of the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans for almost 30 years, and during this period of time, he has demonstrated outstanding leadership and ability in the field of public service; and

Whereas Congressman BOGGS' entire adult life has been devoted to public service, from his first election to the Congress of the United States in November 1940; and

Whereas honesty, hard work, commonsense, and constructive action, have been the hallmarks of Mr. BOGGS' service in the Congress and because of his dedication and leadership he has contributed greatly to the tremendous growth and prosperity which our area is enjoying today; and

Whereas the principal accomplishment and highlights of Mr. BOGGS' career are as follows:

1. He holds the third-ranking post in the House, and the highest position ever attained by a Louisianian in the House since the State was admitted to the Union in 1812;

2. He is the third-ranking member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, which originates and acts first upon all legislation dealing with taxes, tariffs, and trade, social security and related matters. As the third-ranking member of this important committee, he sits on all House-Senate conference committees appointed to write the final form of all tax, tariff, trade, social security, etc., legislation;

3. He is the chairman of the House-Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy which conducts periodic reviews of the scope and course of our Nation's foreign economic and foreign trade policies; and as chairman of this subcommittee he directed the conduct of extensive hearings in 1961 which engendered public and congressional support for the passage of the vital Trade Expansion Act of 1962—the latest reciprocal trade agreements act enacted by the Congress;

4. He was a member of the President's Commission to Investigate the Assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy;

5. He is a vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee (since 1955) and he was the parliamentarian of the 1964 Democratic National Convention;

6. He is a founding member of International House of New Orleans, and he was the organization's first executive secretary;

7. He is the recipient of the 1957 Thomas F. Cunningham Award from International House in recognition of the invaluable service he has rendered for the United States and Latin America by his "sound, constructive interest in the liberalization of world trade;"

8. He is the recipient of the Mississippi Valley World Trade Award for 1956 in recognition of his continuing efforts to foster the growth and development of trade and commerce through the Port of New Orleans and the entire Mississippi Valley;

9. He is the recipient of the International Order of Merit of the City of New Orleans in 1958; he is the third person ever chosen as an honorary member of the International Association of Ports and Harbors (1964), this honor bestowed upon him for his constructive good works in promoting world trade;

10. In national legislation, he is the author of the Boggs-Daniel Narcotics Code of 1956 which has helped to reduce the illicit possession and sales of narcotics, particularly to minors; he is the author of the financing provisions of the Interstate Highway System which has saved the American taxpayers millions of dollars, and the author of many improvements to the national tax structure in his service on the Ways and Means Committee. In other areas of legislation Mr. BOGGS is the coauthor of every reciprocal trade agreements act enacted in the past decade; coauthor of legislation making possible construction of the Mississippi River to gulf tidewater channel which already is enhancing the expansion of trade through the port of New Orleans, and of many other flood control and inland waterways projects in south Louisiana. He also is very interested in enacting a national permanent program of disaster insurance for the American people. Such a national program, if approved as Mr. BOGGS wishes, would provide homeowners in south Louisiana and across the Nation with the opportunity to purchase Government-supported insurance for floodwater damage to property. Such a development would provide the citizens of the New Orleans area and south Louisiana with needed financial protection from floodwater damage which they did not have when Hurricane Betsy struck. Progress is being made on a study ordered by Congress in the Hurricane Betsy legislation to determine the feasibility of a Government-supported, national program of disaster insurance, and Mr. BOGGS is working with officials of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development on this study: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That HALE BOGGS, in recognition of his many and various distinguished achievements in the field of public service have conferred upon him honorary life membership in the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans, with all of the rights, privileges, and benefits thereunto, appertained.

RETURN OF FEDERAL TAX FUNDS TO STATES FOR EDUCATION

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which, if enacted, will provide to the States additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States.

The young people of our Nation are our greatest asset. It is these children of today who must ultimately mold the destiny of America. Providing the best available facilities for elementary and secondary education for all our children, as well as college, is an investment in the future of our Nation. It is an investment in which all Americans have a vital share.

The bill I am introducing will return to the States Federal tax revenue which the States will expend in accordance with their own determination of greatest need. About half of the fund created for this purpose by the proposed legislation, the educational assistance trust fund, would be returned to the States based on the number of students enrolled in their respective public schools. The other half would be allocated on the basis of the individual "effort index" of each State—the percentage of gross personal income being spent on education.

The problem of improving our elementary and secondary schools and assuring salary levels for teachers to staff these schools adequately can only be solved through providing to the States the funds necessary for this purpose.

Federal aid to education with encroaching Federal control of our State and local school systems is not the answer.

Our system of government was designed to maintain a balance between Federal, State, and local governments. Passage of legislation for the return of Federal tax revenue to the States to finance their school systems in accordance with their own determination of need would go a long way toward restoring this balance in the area of education.

I sincerely hope the Members of this Congress will give careful consideration to the concept of sharing Federal revenue with the States to assist State and local government in the area of elementary and secondary education, and will join in support of this legislation.

THE DETERIORATION OF THE CUBAN ECONOMY: CLARENCE MOORE REPORTS ON CASTRO'S PROBLEMS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the May 4, 1966, issue of the Times of the Americas—the only English language newspaper published in the United States and dedicated entirely to Latin America, is further confirmation that U.S. policy toward Communist Cuba is having a very telling effect.

The article appeared under the byline of the newspaper's distinguished publisher, Mr. Clarence W. Moore, who has long been recognized as an expert on Latin American affairs. Having published the Times of Havana in Havana for a number of years, his views are constantly being sought, and heeded, by Members of the Congress, newspaper correspondents, and other parties interested in the Latin American scene. The Times of the Americas continues the same courageous policy that Clarence Moore displayed as publisher in Havana while fighting Castro and communism and upholding the democratic principle of a free press.

The above-mentioned article is a vivid portrayal of the problems besetting the Cuban economy and is based on an interview the author had with two recent Cuban defeotors. Since the latter had been top economists in the Cuban Government until just a few weeks ago, their observations are firsthand and, I believe, of interest to all our colleagues. For this reason, I would urge all of our colleagues to take a few moments to read Mr. Moore's article. Because of his expert background, knowledge, and experience his recorded general impressions are more meaningful. The article follows:

The Easy Chair

(By Clarence Moore)

Sitting next to Paco Prieto 1 day last week in downtown Miami, and surrounded by a group of Cuba's outstanding business leaders in pre-Castro days, I listened to two recent defectors talk of Cuba. Both Miguel Tarrab and Jorge Alemany had been top international economists in Castro's government until a few weeks ago. They spoke candidly and without reserve. It was extraordinarily interesting to hear fresh Cuba talk from knowledgeable sources. Here, in a simple list, are some of the general impressions I got from their answers to questions that day:

1. The sudden zoom in 1963 sugar prices bailed out Cuba's small crop. There were noticeable signs of returning prosperity with European luxury items creeping back into store windows. Fidel wasted money at that time in unbelievably foolish ways but people were encouraged to observe a slight return to good living.

2. The plunge in 1965 sugar prices was somewhat counterbalanced by a larger 1965 crop.

3. Now it is 1966 with prices down, production down. Nothing is on the horizon to save Castro from certain disaster. Along with this comes a tightening of civilian control which causes still more discontent. Cubans had noted a slight increase of tolerance, or at least decrease in oppression, during the 1963 improvement period. Now it is all gone. It will not come back.

4. Castro needs something to tell the people. What he has is sugar, the only viable program in today's Cuba. All other programs such as cattle and coffee have failed and there are no other sensible programs even on the drawing board. So Castro pushes a single item: 10 million tons by 1970. He will never reach it, and there are dozens of reasons why he will not. But he needs a rallying cry and sugar has to be it.

5. Even worse, the more sugar he gets, the worse off he is, Cuba had hoped to become the world supplier of sugar for Communist countries and Castro had even invented a swingy slogan to accompany such a campaign. But Communist countries have their own sugar, and may even become exporters in the next few years as their crops increase. Only Russia can remain a purchaser, and Russia's net sugar position cannot be truly deciphered from its many statistics. But it has trouble taking today's sugar. There is no chance that it could take another 5 million tons by 1970.

6. It is impossible to defend Japan's posture as one of Cuba's biggest sugar customers. They will buy less this year, but their presence in the picture can only be explained by commenting on the general lack of connection between money and principle.

7. Castro's picture must become bleaker with each year, and there is nothing that Castro can do to reverse the process.

There was a wealth of information from two men who knew and they spoke quite willingly of the future of Cuba, answering the most obvious question—"how long"—as if it were the easiest. They say it won't be long. That it can't be long. Disaffection mounts, the people never bought communism as a concept and never intended to have it the way it is. The farmers, they noted, are just beginning to get the idea of what it is all about after 7 years and it is not what they bargained for. They don't like it. It can't last long.

PRESENTATION OF AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD TO HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR., OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, our minority leader, the Honorable Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan, and Senator Samuel J. Ervin, of North Carolina, were presented the George Washington Award by the American Good Government Society on May 1, 1966, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. Mr. Ford was presented his award by his longtime friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. George Mahon, of Texas. The remarks of Mr. Mahon and Mr. Ford follow:

Remarks of Hon. George Mahon, of Texas, on Presentation of American Good Government Society George Washinton Award to Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan, May 1, 1966

It was quite a number of years ago that "Jerry" Ford traveled the glory road in college football. Those were the days when the ball was round and the foot was more important than the arm. The incomparable Ford was selected by his teammates as the leader of the great University of Michigan squad. His teammates in Congress are still selecting him as leader. It, therefore, can be documented that football is good training for the broken-field running and blocking of opponents so essential to political life.

While Mr. Ford is now the Republican leader of the House, it is obvious to me that he has set his cap for the speakership. All that must be done is for the people to overturn the Democrats in the House of Representatives. This I do not want to see happen. Personally, I prefer a southerner as Speaker—John McCormack, of south Boston.

Thus, it worries me that your society has selected "Jerry" Ford for this high honor tonight. It indicates to me that you think we Democrats are threatened with defeat and you are trying to jump on the Ford bandwagon at just the right time.

While I am not advocating Mr. Ford for the speakership, I am compelled to admit that it would not be a complete disaster for the country if his ambitions should be ultimately realized.

It has been said that there is nothing in a name, but I reject that thought. Ford comes from Grand Rapids, and it is now a proven fact that he is a grand fellow and that he has been rapid in his progress up the political ladder. The name Ford has been prominent since the days of the model T. Fords have always run rather well, regardless of the model, and "Jerry" Ford is the top of the line.

In the Scriptures we are told that the Apostle, Paul, in his years of preparation in the city of Tarsus, sat at the feet of Gamaliel. Ford has sat for years at the feet of Everett McKinley Dirksen.

Under Dirksen's tutelage, Ford has indeed made great progress. As you know, Dirksen has not spared the rod, although he has applied it with delicacy and loving care. I doubt that these comeuppances have been upsetting to Jerry Ford. At times I suspect they are staged. I reason it this way, that Ford has felt that he could not lambaste us Democrats for being rubberstamps for L.B.J if he, himself, were a rubberstamp for E.M.D.

This is not to say that logic and consistency are essential to political progress.

Jerry is a devoted family man. In fact, the principal reason for his election to Congress at 2-year intervals is the love and admiration which the people of his district have for his lovely wife, Betty. The people of Michigan have every reason to love Betty and Jerry, too.

I count it in his favor that he is a Yale man. The Harvard people have had a lopsided advantage in Washington for years, and I have been glad to see a Yale man come to the fore. We need a balance of forces not only in military matters but in politics as well.

Thomas Carlyle remarked on one occasion that the history of the world is but the biography of great men. Tonight we are enlarging upon a chapter in the biography of one of our leading citizens who is himself now actively writing that chapter of his still young, but already distinguished, career.

Jerry came to Congress in 1949, and in a brief span of years he has written a brilliant record in such fields as national defense and science and astronautics.

He was named by the President to serve on the blue-ribbon Warren Commission to investigate the assassination of the late President Kennedy, and he served with distinction.

In 1949, he was selected as one of America's 10 outstanding young men by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. In 1961, he was honored by the American Political Science Association with their Distinguished Congressional Service Award.

He became the Republican leader in the House of Representatives last year. These honors were, of course, only made possible by the people of Michigan who have kept him in Congress by their support through the years.

I am pleased to be permitted to make this presentation on behalf of the society, not only because I count Jerry Ford as a cherished friend and an able leader, but because in honoring him we also have an opportunity to honor the Father of this great country.

Washington, in his Farewell Address, spoke of the spirit of party in governments by popular will. Although cautioning moderation and restraint, he spoke of it as a fire not to be quenched, yet demanding a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame. Jerry Ford is seeing to it that the political fire is not quenched. Edmund Burke said, "He that wrestles with us strengthens our nerves and sharpens our skills. Our antagonist is our helper."

Great things lie ahead for Jerry Ford in the realm of Government. He will deserve them all. He will continue to measure up to the highest traditions.

I take great pleasure in presenting, on behalf of the American Good Government Society, one of its 1966 George Washington Awards to the distinguished minority leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan.

Resolution of Tribute and Honor to Gerald R. Ford

Statesman and patriot, lawyer, and congressional leader, has served the people of Michigan and the United States upward of 20 years—as officer in aircraft carrier combat operations and aviation training, rising to lieutenant commander in 4 years; almost 18 years in the House of Representatives, 14 on the Committee on Appropriations and 7 on the Republican policy committee. He achieved the high post of minority leader in January 1965.

His industry and talents, his reverence for the American constitutional system, his long experience with appropriations for defense and foreign operations, have fitted him to strengthen American institutions. Under his leadership the small Republican minority has had major impact on such administration measures as medicare, public housing, social security, and immigration.

Gerald R. Ford is a resolute foe of the enemies of liberty. He is champion of all that has made the United States of America the most powerful and prosperous country in the annals of mankind.

Acceptance Speech by Hon. Gerald R. Ford

Mr. Mahon, Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, honored guests, and good friends all; may I express my heartfelt appreciation for having been selected to receive the George Washington Award of the American Good Government Society. This honor is especially satisfying to me when I look back to January 1965. It was then I was elected minority leader of the House by the landslide margin of 6 votes—73 to 67. It is really gratifying to me—here tonight—to be a unanimous choice for something.

I am happy to accept this award from the hands of my good friend, George Mahon, of Texas. Let me tell you a little secret. When the Good Government Society trustees told me I was to receive this award, they asked me who I wanted to make the presentation, and I picked George—another unanimous choice—for many, many reasons.

George and I have been friends for a long time. He became chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee the year I took my seat in Congress—1949. I went on the Appropriations Committee in 1951, and George taught me much of what I know today.

George is a great Texas Longhorn. And one of the things I appreciate most about him is that, unlike a fellow Texan who lives at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, George has never given me a real hard time.

I became the senior Republican on the Defense Subcommittee in 1959, and for years George and I worked together most harmoniously to build our Nation's military security—who says I can't get along with Texans?

George has said so many nice things about me tonight I am positive he didn't clear his speech with the White House or my good friend, Bob McNamara, either.

In looking over the list of previous recipients of Good Government Society's George Washington Award, I noted with pleasure the names of my colleagues, Wilbur Mills and John Byrnes. Both have had a major role in drafting most of our present-day tax legislation.

With the problems of April 15 just past and some new problems just beginning this very day—higher income tax withholding rates, you know—it seems appropriate to tell you a story about the spirit of independence that burns in the breasts of thousands of our taxpayers.

Last year a high-ranking official in the Bureau of Internal Revenue called my attention to a small blank square in the upper right-hand corner of our Federal income tax forms. Printed beneath the square is the strict directive from the Internal Revenue Service—"Do not write in this space."

"Jerry," the Internal Revenue official told me, "it's amazing how many people get through making out their returns, take another look at that space and in a fit of anger scrawl across it: 'I'll write any darn place I please.' "

We are indebted to rugged individualists of this stripe. It is this spirit of independence that has made America great.

It is a great pleasure to me to see so many people from Michigan in the audience here tonight.

There are thousands of other fine people back in the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan who have seen fit to send me to Congress ever since I ran mighty scared for a seat in the House in 1948. I've been running scared ever since. Needless to say, I am extremely grateful to the people of my district for giving me the privilege of serving them. And I want to thank them, too, for this award, because without their support I wouldn't be standing here tonight.

I want to thank, too, my mother, Mrs. Dorothy Ford, who is here tonight from Grand Rapids. I am deeply indebted to my lovely and loyal wife, Betty, who may even be getting to like politics a little bit and certainly is a tremendous help to me in my role as minority leader.

The fact that I have survived in the House for nine terms shows that all you really need to be successful in politics is an allegation of virtue, a moderate amount of hard work, and lots of luck.

This is my 18th year in Congress. The American Good Government Society is presenting these awards for the 14th time, having begun the tradition in 1953 by honoring two great Americans—Mr. Republican, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, and a strong advocate of economy in government, former Democratic Senator Harry F. Byrd.

Allow me at this time to heartily commend the American Good Government Society for its devotion to the principles of constitutional government and to strengthening the American democratic system.

There is no fixed formula for good government. It is really something of a miracle that we have fared as well as we have. That miracle has been shaped from the dreams of people who fled from the Old World to the New in quest of something precious called freedom.

Freedom is still the essential ingredient today—the never-to-be-forgotten element that pervades the constitutional form of government which has made us a proud republic. It is the hallmark of a system designed to make government the servant and not the master of the people.

It is fitting that the American Good Government Society's annual awards should be made in the name of George Washington.

George Washington is sometimes viewed as an aristocrat, the proud landowner, a rather cold and austere man. In truth, he was dedicated to the democratic process. He helped kindle the miracle that has lighted the American political scene since the Revolution that gave birth to this mighty Nation.

Perhaps relatively few people know that George Washington was so idolized by the colonists that he could have become a military dictator or a monarch in this country when the Revolutionary War ended. There were powerful persons who wanted to crown him king and make the new Nation a monarchy. But Washington rejected such proposals, went to Annapolis, and formally resigned his commission as commander in chief of the Revolutionary Army. Thus it was Washington who in the first instance determined that our Nation should become a republic.

Good government follows no fixed formula but it flows—as the Good Government Society knows—from adherence to this country's established constitutional system, from the good sense of the American people, and from men like Washington—men who provide this country with moral leadership in a time of crisis, men who unselfishly give of themselves so that freedom, law and order, good government, shall flourish.

Again, may I express my appreciation for this scroll symbolizing your recognition of one individual's small efforts in the cause of good government, hoping that during my years in Congress I have rendered service that makes me worthy of it.

DRAFT INVESTIGATION

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, some 11 weeks ago, on March 1, 30 Members of this body called for a congressional investigation of the Selective Service System, to insure that it is as well designed to meet our national manpower needs now as it was when we initiated the draft 25 years ago. The statement was well received by the public, but it has not stirred any detectable interest in the Congress.

Vietnam is not an isolated incident. The fact that the draft has had a continuous existence for the past 25 years is itself expressive of the kind of world in which we live. An involuntary wartime device designed to meet the crisis of the early 1940's may have been reasonably well adapted to the chronic manpower drain of the cold war, or it may not; but any institution which strikes at the freedom of a select group of young men, which has an impact not only on the security of the country but also on its educational policy, its agriculture, its manpower training, should be a direct and persistent concern of the Congress. It is time we examined this institution searchingly, before it becomes a political issue, with the long-term needs and best interests of the country in view. This should have happened before draft calls were doubled last August. It should not be put off any longer.

Nor should this be left to the executive branch again, as it was 2 years ago. At that time calls for a careful reassessment of the draft met with a Presidential statement that the Secretary of Defense would reexamine the Selective Service to be sure its methods and the long-term manpower goals of this country coincide. To my knowledge, no report of this reexamination has yet been made public. Beyond this, both major presidential candidates in 1964 pledged an early end to the draft. In light of this recent history, it is clearly our responsibility, as the representative branch of Government, whose individual members daily struggle with draft problems in our home districts, to take the initiative to insure that a full and careful investigation be made so that we can certify to the American people that Selective Service, from the Director at the top to the local draft board in which so much discretion is vested is fair, efficient, and a limitation on our liberty necessary in this troubled world.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S AGRICULTURE POLICY

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration has been using the farmer as a whipping boy for its own inflationary policies, and has been trying to pin the blame for rising living costs on American agriculture. Never has a case been better documented, as we have pointed out many times in the recent past.

While the Secretary of Agriculture has been depressing grain and livestock prices by dumping Government-owned commodities on the market, and expressing pleasure as prices drop, the administration's domestic fiscal policies have been pushing farm production costs to record heights.

While on one hand, the administration sets a 3.2 percent guideline for wage and price increases in the rest of the economy, on the other it increases cheese and sugar imports, restricts hide exports, and sharply curtails purchases of pork and dairy products by the military, thus reducing the income of dairy, hog, and cattle producers.

This war on agriculture is dangerous, inequitable, and completely unjustified. We, the Members of the House Republican task force on agriculture are today introducing a resolution calling on the administration to immediately stop its discriminatory activities against American farmers and ranchers, and instead, employ every facility within its power to advance the best economic interests of American agriculture.

This resolution can and should be supported by every Member of Congress. Farm prices are now at 80 percent of parity, and the farmer is earning only about 60 percent as much as his city cousin. The administration's widespread attack on American agriculture, if not stopped at once, will seriously endanger this country's future food supply. This in itself is a major reason why city Congressman as well as Members from rural areas will certainly want to support our resolution. We strongly urge every Member of Congress to do so.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all my colleagues may have the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the merits of the task force resolution, I include it at this point in the Record:

H. Con. Res. 635

Whereas the present administration is using American farmers and ranchers as "scapegoats of inflation":

(1) by domestic fiscal policies which unduly increase farm production costs, such costs having increased 15 percent since the year 1952; and

(2) by market price manipulations which have decreased prices received by farmers, such prices having decreased 6 percent since the year 1952 with the result that the April 1966 parity ratio stands at only 80; and

(3) by failing to recognize that increased consumer prices have not been caused by farmers, such consumer prices having increased 16 percent since the year 1952; and

(4) by recommending and seeking to implement drastic cuts in Congressional appropriations for vital agricultural programs that serve the national interest such as the school milk, school lunch, land grant colleges, and others; and

(5) by the Secretary of Agriculture dumping huge quantities of grain upon the domestic market in order to break and depress grain and livestock market prices; and

(6) by the Secretary of Agriculture's expressions of pleasure with the fact that the prices of farm products had dropped recently; and

(7) by the Secretary of Agriculture's action to increase imports of raw sugar into the United States, such action being designed to lower market prices for U.S. sugar producers; and

(8) by the Department of Commerce action of March 7, 1966, imposing restrictions on the export of cattle hides, calf and kip skins, such action causing lower domestic livestock prices, notwithstanding subsequent increases in shoe and other footwear prices; and

(9) by a large and unilateral increase in Cheddar cheese imports without seeking or attempting to secure reciprocal trade concessions from other nations to expand U.S. agricultural exports overseas; and

(10) by a sharp curtailment of purchases of pork and dairy products by the Department of Defense; and

(11) by permitting or condoning price and wage increases for other segments of the national economy;

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that in the public interest the Administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free-world prosperity.

TAX FREEDOM DAY

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I introduced legislation to make May 1 a national holiday in celebration of the freedom of the American taxpayer to keep the fruits of his labor. This is the first month of 1966 when a taxpayer can call a dollar his own. Before May 1, every paycheck of 1966 has gone to pay some form of taxes. In other words, the average American's tax load is one-third of his income.

The originator of the movement to establish a national tax freedom holiday is a neighbor and constituent of mine from Winter Park, Fla., Mr. Dallas L. Hostetler, executive director of the Florida State Retailers Association.

Mr. Hostetler's long interest in taxes stems from the fact that his association's prime objectives are the encouragement of good government, sound and prudent fiscal policy, and less waste and extravagance. This holiday, which he has proposed and for which I have attempted to get official national sanction, has won for Mr. Hostetler the Freedoms Foundation George Washington Honor Medal Award.

In connection with his studies Mr. Hostetler has come up with some interesting facts. He points out for instance that much of our tax expenditure is in hidden taxes. Prices of items such as bread, milk, cars, gasoline, and telephone service represent not only the cost of the item, but a myriad of taxes along the way of their distribution and sale.

He cites over 150 different taxes on such varied items as a suit of clothes and a bar of soap and over 50 taxes on a loaf of bread. At this rate, he predicts, "dollars to doughnuts will soon be an even bet."

As a cause for much of this he points further to the growth of the Federal bureaucracy which has multiplied itself at several times the rate of the population.

Two of Mr. Hostetler's favorite quotations are from the writings of John Stuart Mill and Thomas Jefferson and I would like to commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

In his essay on representative Government, John Stuart Mill had this to say:

> A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions; in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it.

On the subject of debt, Thomas Jefferson said:

> I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

PANAMA CANAL: 1966 ENCYCLOPAEDIA AMERICANA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on April 26, 1966, I quoted an article on the Panama Canal by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired, former captain of the port, Balboa, C.Z., 1941–44, in charge of marine operations in the Pacific sector of the canal and former head of the Isthmian Canal Studies, Navy Department, 1946–49, in the 1966 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I have read another highly pertinent and informative article on the same subject written by Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., Governor of the Canal Zone and president, Panama Canal Company, in the 1966 edition of the Encyclopaedia Americana.

Written by officers of different training and backgrounds of experience, the two articles deal with the canal question from different viewpoints and thus serve, in some respects, to complement each other.

In the section of Governor Fleming's article on "American Work on the Canal," I note the statement that, after the resignation of John F. Stevens and the appointment of Col. George W. Goethals to succeed him as chairman and chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, "the project was completed with Army engineers." In the interests of historical accuracy as to this point, it should be observed that the reorganized Canal Commission as of April 1, 1907, consisted of the following:

Lt. Col. George W. Goethals, C.E., U.S. Army, Chairman and Chief Engineer; Maj. David D. Gaillard, C.E., U.S. Army; Maj. William J. Sibert, C.E., U.S. Army; Rear Adm. Harry H. Rosseau, C.E., U.S. Navy; Lt. Col. William C. Gorgas, M.C., U.S. Army; Jackson Smith, a civilian; Hon. Joseph C. S. Blackburn, also a civilian, and who was succeeded by Maurice H. Thatcher, a civilian, in charge of civil affairs of the Canal Zone.

During most of the construction era, the engineering work was organized into three major divisions, with Major Sibert in charge of the Atlantic; Major Gaillard, of the central, and Mr. Sydney B. Williamson, a civilian, of the Pacific. The greater portions of the lower professional positions in these divisions were held by civilians. Thus, the work was completed with a force consisting not only of Army and Navy engineers but as well of civilian engineers and officials.

The indicated article of Governor Fleming follows:

[From the Encyclopaedia Americana, 1966 edition]

PANAMA CANAL

(By Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., U.S. Army)

The Panama Canal is a lock-type ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama in Central America. It connects the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Built and operated by the United States under treaty with the Republic of Panama, it lies within the Panama Canal Zone, a strip of land approximately 10 miles wide that bisects the Republic and is granted to the United States in perpetuity. From Cristobal breakwater at the Atlantic terminus to a point opposite San José Rock at the Pacific end, the channel is 51.6 miles long. From shore to shore, the distance is about 40.3 miles. The channel's minimum depth is 37 feet (in Balboa Harbor, on the Pacific, at low tide) and its minimum width is 300 feet.

The canal was opened to commercial traffic on August 15, 1914. It has shortened the voyage between Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States by as much as 7,000 miles and has become a vital factor in the world's commerce.

This discussion of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone is divided into the following sections:

1 Description of the canal.
2. Canal Zone.
3. History.
4. Bibliography.

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE CANAL

Basically, the canal consists of sea level channels at each end which are separated from and connected to an elevated midsection 32 miles long by three lock systems. These locks serve the dual purpose of raising and lowering ships to and from sea level and damming up the water at Gatun Lake, which forms the midsection.

Route: The canal follows a zigzag course running generally northwest to southwest. At the Atlantic end it begins in Limón Bay, an arm of the Caribbean Sea, and runs nearly due south to Gatun locks, which have three successive sets of parallel lock chambers through which ships are raised or lowered between sea level and Gatun Lake. The surface of the lake ranges from 82 to 87 feet above sea level. The channel turns southeast, passing approximately through the middle of the lake, which is about 20 miles wide. It then enters Gaillard Cut, formerly known as Culebra Cut, 8 miles long and from 300 to 500 feet wide, which snakes through the Continental Divide. At the end of Gaillard Cut, Pedro Miguel locks, with a single set of parallel chambers, raise or lower vessels between the level of Gatun Lake and the level of Miraflores Lake, whose surface is 54 feet above sea level. About 1½ miles below Pedro Miguel locks are Miraflores locks, with two sets of parallel chambers, which raise or lower ships between Miraflores Lake and sea level. Beyond Miraflores locks the channel runs to its Pacific terminus in the Bay of Panama.

Locks: Constructed of concrete, the parallel lock chambers of the canal are separated from each other by common center walls. The successive chambers in each lane are separated by massive steel gates which swing open to permit a ship to pass from one chamber to another. Then the gates close to permit the water level to be raised or lowered to match the next level. Ships are towed through the locks by electric locomotives, commonly known as mules, but make the rest of the canal transit under their own power. The larger ships sometimes are assisted by tugs as they enter or leave the locks.

Each chamber in the locks is 1,000 feet long and 110 feet wide. The water employed to fill and empty the lock chambers is fed by gravity through large culverts in the sides and center walls of the locks. This water finally flows down from Gatun Lake into the sea as the chambers empty. A complete ship transit from ocean to ocean results in the release of 52 million gallons of fresh water from Gatun Lake into the ocean. Abundant rainfall on the isthmus during most of the year maintains the lake at the desired level. During dry periods, the Gatun Lake water supply is replenished by water from Madden Lake, 9 miles up the Chagres River from the point where the river flows into Gatun Lake at Gamboa.

Gatun Lake: This artificial lake was formed by damming the Chagres River at Gatun, near the Atlantic coast, with a combination of Gatun locks and Gatun Dam, the largest earthen dam built until that time (1907–12). The lake covers about 165 square miles and was said to be the largest artificial body of water in the world until the construction of Hoover Dam (Arizona-Nevada) and the consequent formation of Lake Mead (1936). The supplemental reservoir of Madden Lake was created in 1935 with the building of Madden Dam. Besides supplementing the Gatun Lake water supply, the Madden Lake reservoir water is used to generate hydroelectric power and control floods on the Chagres, which had occasionally interfered with ship traffic in the canal.

Traffic and tolls: Except for the restricted channel through Gaillard Cut (the so-called "big ditch" section of the waterway), the canal can handle continuous two-way ship traffic. In Gaillard Cut, safety considerations require that ships of certain sizes and types must travel without meeting or passing another oceangoing vessel.

The limitations imposed on ship sizes by the locks and the channel depth, maintained at 42 feet through Gatun Lake and Gaillard Cut, prevent a number of the world's largest vessels from using the canal. Most of these superships are tankers, ore vessels, grain carriers, and warships.

The vast majority of the world's ships, however, can make the passage. The number of transiting commercial vessels of more than 300 Panama Canal net tons rose from less than 5,000 yearly in the mid-1920's to almost 12,000 yearly in the mid-1960's.

Tolls for use of the canal are based on Panama Canal net tons, computed on the basis of 100 cubic feet of revenue space. The toll rates (90 cents a ton for laden vessels and 72 cents a ton for ships in ballast) are virtually the same as when the canal was opened. Average tolls are about $5,500 for oceangoing commercial vessels. Using the canal rather than circling South America may save shippers 10 times the cost of the passage.

2. CANAL ZONE

The Canal Zone extends generally 5 miles on each side of the Panama Canal from deep water in the Atlantic Ocean to deep water in the Pacific and includes the area to the 100-foot contour line around Gatun Lake and to the 260-foot contour line around Madden Lake. Its area is 557 square miles (647 square miles including tidal water). It is, in effect, a U.S. Government reservation. No private business is permitted except that which is directly related to the operation of the canal, and, with few exceptions, only persons working for the U.S. Government may reside in the zone. Population: (1960) 42,122.

The Canal Zone is divided into the districts of Balboa (population 30,623) on the Pacific side, and Cristobal (11,499) on the Atlantic side. The principal towns are Rainbow City (population 3,688); Gamboa (3,489); Balboa (3,139), capital of Balboa district; and Paraiso (3,113). Cristobal (817) is the capital of Cristobal district. The administrative center of the Canal Zone is Balboa Heights (population 118), adjoining Balboa near the Pacific end of the canal.

Physical features and climate: The topography is broken and hilly, with the continental divide roughly parallel to the Pacific coast and about 10 miles inland. Geologically, the country is principally volcanic in origin. It consists of a relatively weak rock formation cut by numerous faults and intermixed with water-deposited formations of fine clay silts. See section 3. History (American work on the canal): Problems of the Work.

The climate is typically tropical, with high humidity and an even temperature ranging from 73° to 87° F. The record high is 98° F. and the low 59° F. Average annual precipitation on the Atlantic side is 130 inches. Rainfall decreases progressively southward across the isthmus to 69 inches at Balboa. The year is divided into well-defined wet and dry seasons, the wet season beginning in April and ending in December. Rainfall is heaviest in October and November. The driest months are February and March.

Transportation: Highway crossings of the canal are provided by the high-level Thatcher Ferry Bridge over the Pacific entrance, opened in 1962, and a narrow swing bridge at the north end of Gatun Locks on the Atlantic side. The Panama Railroad, built with private U.S. capital (1850–55), now part of the Panama Canal Organization, operates coast to coast in 1 hour and 20 minutes.

Administration: The Governor of the Canal Zone is appointed by the President of the United States, subject to confirmation by the Senate. He is automatically President of the Panama Canal Company, which operates the canal and the railroad. He is responsible for such civil functions as police and fire protection, postal service, schools, health, immigration, and customs. The president traditionally has named the Secretary of the Army as his representative in operating the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company. As a consequence, the Governor-President of the organization reports directly to the Army Secretary on governmental matters and to a board of directors on Company affairs. The Secretary of the Army appoints the directors of the Company, thereby assuring a unity of administration over both the operation of the canal and the civil government of the Canal Zone.

Education: School attendance is not compulsory for children living in the Canal Zone. Separate United States and Latin American school systems are maintained. The former, attended primarily by U.S. citizens, are modeled after school programs in the United States. Spanish is emphasized as a language course. The Latin American schools are attended by non-U.S. citizens and are comparable in curriculum with the schools in Panama. The curriculum is in Spanish, and English is taught as a language course.

Finance: The Panama Canal enterprise, consisting of the canal company and the zone government, is self-sustaining and operates at no cost to the U.S. taxpayer. The Panama Canal Company is a Government corporation operating out of its own funds. It is expected to be self-supporting from tolls revenue and revenue from incidental services. In addition to financing its operating costs, which include depreciation, the Panama Canal Company is obligated to pay annually to the U.S. Treasury: (1) interest on the net direct investment of the U.S. Government in the Company at interest rates determined annually by the Secretary of the Treasury; (2) the net cost of Canal Zone Government; and (3) $430,000 of the $1,930,000 annuity paid to Panama, as last increased under the terms of the 1955 treaty between the Governments of Panama and the United States.

The Canal Zone operations and capital program are financed initially by congressional appropriation. The Canal Zone Government makes charges for certain services to other agencies and to individuals for school tuition, hospital services, and similar functions. All revenues received are paid into the U.S. Treasury. The difference between expenditures and revenue, plus depreciation, or the net cost of the Canal Zone Government, is paid into the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company out of its revenue.

Military and scientific activities: The Canal Zone is the headquarters for the Southern Command, which directs the U.S. military effort over 7.5 million square miles of the Latin American land mass. It also is headquarters for the U.S. Army Forces Southern Command, for the Southern Command, for the U.S. Navy Forces Southern Command, and for the U.S. Air Forces Southern Command. These military units all operate schools for Latin American students. The U.S. Army conducts the jungle warfare and Inter-American Geodetic Survey activities. The U.S. Air Force conducts the jungle survival training. The Inter-American Police Academy at Fort Davis is under the Agency for International Development. The Smithsonian Institution operates a biological area on Barro Colorado Island in Gatun Lake. The Middle America Research Unit at Ancon (within the Gorgas Hospital complex) is under the National Institutes of Health.

3. HISTORY

Early history: The search for alternative avenues of commerce from the Western World to the Far East began after 1453, when the Turks seized Constantinople and the great land routes to India and the Orient were closed to Christian Europe. Christopher Columbus, on his fourth voyage (1502) in quest of a water route, was told by natives on the east coast of Central America of a "narrow place" leading to another sea, which he interpreted as meaning a narrow strip of water leading to the Indian Ocean. Vasco Núñez de Balboa also heard the story of a water route. Seeking it, he explored the Isthmus of Panama and discovered the Pacific Ocean (Sept. 25, 1513). Thereafter, the hunt for a water passage to the South Sea, as he had named his discovery, engaged many explorers along the coast.

Credit for first proposing an interocean canal has been given to Alvaro de Saavedra Cerón, cousin of Hernán Cortés, conqueror of Mexico. To him also has been attributed the suggestion of four possible routes—across the Isthmus of Darién, the Isthmus of Panama, Nicaragua, and the Isthmus of Tehuantepec in southern Mexico—all of which became objects of study in the 19th century. Emperor Charles V (Charles I, king of Spain) was favorable to the project, but his successor Philip II abandoned interest.

The idea of an interoceanic passage persisted, however, and received new impetus when the peoples of Central America severed their political connection with Spain in 1823. Interest was stirred in the United States. In 1826 a New York City merchant, Aaron Palmer, contracted with the new confederation of Central America to build a canal but could not raise the $5 million estimated cost. President Andrew Jackson sent Charles Biddle to examine possible routes in Nicaragua and Panama; Biddle ignored Nicaragua, and his negotiations in Panama collapsed.

Focus on Panama: El Camino Real, the Spanish trade route across Panama, had long been used to transport goods between the Old World and the west coast of the Americas. Commerce from Europe commonly used the Chagres River to the head of navigation about halfway across the isthmus, and then Las Cruces Trail to the Pacific Ocean at the city of Panama. After the Mexican cession of California to the United States and the discovery of gold there (1848), the commercial necessity of a transisthmian canal became urgent. Several prospective enterprises were halted by political difficulties.

In 1850, American interests began to build the Panama Railroad, linking the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the isthmus. This route was opened in 1855. It stimulated travel across the isthmus, and soon regular shipping lines made the railroad terminals ports of call. The need for a canal became increasingly apparent. The American Civil War (1861–65) and its aftermath prevented further planning of canal construction by U.S. citizens for several years. Before Americans were ready to consider it again, the French had undertaken to finance and engineer the project.

French enterprise: In 1876, Vicomte Ferdinand Marie de Lesseps, the builder of the Suez Canal, became head of a committee that proposed to make a thorough isthmian canal survey; a private company, the Société Civile Internationale du Canal Interocéanique du Darien, was then formed and undertook the survey. In 1878, Lucien N. B. Wyse, representing this company, obtained from the Government of Colombia, of which Panama was then a part, a concession of the exclusive right to build and operate a transisthmian canal for a period of 99 years.

Before deciding on the location and type of canal to be built, this company invited an international congress to discuss the subject in Paris in May 1879. The congress had 136 delegates, of whom 11 were from the United States. It decided that it was feasible to build a sea-level canal across Panama with terminals at Limón Bay on the Atlantic side and the Bay of Panama on the Pacific side. Construction cost was estimated at $240 million.

The Compagnie Universelle du Canal Interocéanique, with Vicomte de Lesseps as president, was organized August 17, 1879 (finally incorporated in 1881), to build the canal. It purchased the Wyse concession for $2 million and began making surveys. At first the company was capitalized at $80 million in shares of $100 each, open to public subscription. This subscription failed, but another issue in 1880 was successful. This time the initial capital was fixed at $60 million. De Lesseps approved a plan submitted by the technical commission he had appointed, which recommended a sea-level canal estimated to cost $168.6 million, to be completed in 8 years.

Work began in February 1881, but engineering problems, the inroads of tropical disease, and the scarcity of skilled labor soon magnified the task. By mid-1885 the French had excavated far less than they had hoped to accomplish in 4 years, and it was evident that the original plans could not be completed. In France there was harsh criticism of the project and of financial manipulations involved the company. In 1887, in a drastic shift of plan, the French decided to build a lock-type instead of a sea-level canal; the next year de Lesseps resigned and the French Government appointed three receivers to handle the affairs of the enterprise. A new company, the Compagnie Nouvelle du Canal de Panama, was organized in 1894 with a capital stock of $13 million, or 650,000 shares of $20 each. To gain a time extension, 50,000 shares were given to Colombia, leaving about $12 million working capital. Assets and property of the old company were transferred to the new. After a favorable report from a commission of 11 engineers named to investigate the project, excavation proceeded slowly, but apparently without hope of ultimate success.

U.S. interest: Public sentiment in the United States had begun to favor a transisthmian canal under American control. The 68-day voyage of the battleship *Oregon* from San Francisco, Calif., to Key West, Fla., through the Strait of Magellan to join the Atlantic fleet in the Spanish-American War dramatized the need for a canal. But judgments differed. Many members of the U.S. Congress favored a Nicaraguan route. Directors of the new French company emphasized to the U.S. Government the merits of the Panama route, submitting to President William McKinley in December 1898 the full report of the company's technical committee. In 1899, after authorization by Congress in March to investigate the best route for a transisthmian canal, and with a stipulation that such a waterway should be under complete control of the United States, President McKinley appointed the Isthmian Canal Commission. This group studied the French project in Paris and Panama and tried to ascertain the terms on which the United States might acquire its property and rights. When no clear statement could be obtained, the Commission reported in November 1901 in favor of the Nicaraguan route. This report caused a stir in France. The company's president resigned, and under his successor an offer was made to the United States to sell its property and rights for $40 million. In this altered situation, the Isthmian Canal Commission made a supplementary report approving the Panama route.

Diplomacy and legislation: A diplomatic obstacle hindered the building by the United States of any transisthmian canal. The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850 with Great Britain bound both parties not to control exclusively or to fortify any such canal. In 1900, U.S. Secretary of State John Hay negotiated with the British Ambassador, Julian Pauncefote, 1st Baron Pauncefote, a treaty permitting the United States to build and own such a canal but not to fortify it. Public indignation, echoing in the U.S. Senate, doomed this agreement, but in 1901 a second Hay-Pouncefote Treaty gave the United States all rights over a canal, including that of fortification.

On June 28, 1902, Congress approved the Spooner Act, which authorized President Theodore Roosevelt to acquire the rights and property of the French company for $40 million if Colombia would cede a strip of land across the Isthmus of Panama, which the United States would control for the canal route. If these conditions were not met, the act provided, the President should approach Nicaragua.

On January 22, 1903, Hay persuaded Tomás Herrán, Colombian Chargé d'Affairs in Washington, to sign a treaty giving the United States the rights to build, operate, and control a canal in Panama. This was ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1903 but was rejected by Colombia in August. On November 3, 1903, a revolt in Panama created an independent nation. On November 6, the United States recognized the new Republic, and on November 18, Hay signed with Philippe Jean Bunau-Varilla, who had become Panama's Minister to the United States, a treaty which made possible the building of the Panama Canal. It was ratified in Panama on December 2 and by the U.S. Senate on February 23, 1904. See also Panama—History (Independence). [Not shown in RECORD.]

By article 2 of this treaty, the Republic of Panama granted to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of a zone of land and water extending approximately 5 miles on each side of the center line of the canal. In article 3, Panama granted the United States all the rights, power, and authority within the Canal Zone which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory, to the exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority. For this the United States was to pay Panama $10 million and annual payments of $250,000 beginning in 1913. These annuities were increased later. See section "Later History."

American work on the canal: On May 4, 1904, in a historic ceremony at the city of Panama, the French rights and properties were purchased by and formally transferred to the United States. Included was a quantity of machinery which proved to be serviceable. Preliminary work was begun at once, but was hampered by bureaucratic confusion. The chief engineer, John F. Wallace, who had achieved much in spite of the obstacles, resigned in June 1905 and was replaced by John F. Stevens.

An inhibiting factor in these early days was indecision as to the type of canal to be built. Work had started on the plan for a lock-type canal, as approved by Congress in 1902, but engineering reports in 1904 and 1905 recommended return to a sea-level project. Stevens, however, favored the lock type, and the debate was carried into the Senate. On June 15, 1906, Congress finally approved a high-level lock canal. The digging proceeded, but Stevens resigned in 1907 and President Theodore Roosevelt reorganized the Canal Commission, naming Lt. Col. George W. Goethals, of the U.S. Army Engineers, commission chairman and chief engineer of the canal. Under Goethals' direction, the project was completed with Army Engineers.

Problems of the work: The American engineers inherited the excavation done by the French, which amounted to 78.1 million cubic yards of earth, but only about 40 percent of this cut should be used for the new canal. The magnitude of the task was increased by the soft character of some formations to be dug, particularly in the Culebra (later Gaillard) cut area, where serious earth slides occurred. One in the Cucaracha formation later in 1913 delayed the canal opening about 10 months.

Manpower: The recruiting of labor caused grave difficulties, and the human cost of the project was an impressive testimonial to the perils of the work. The United States had as many as 40,000 persons employed on the canal at one time. During the 10-year construction period more than 6,000 persons lost their lives.

Public health: The prevalence of disease, especially yellow fever and malaria, had been a major hazard to the French enterprise. By energetic measures against the disease-carrying mosquitoes, Col. William Crawford Gorgas, chief sanitary officer of the Panama Canal Zone from 1904 to 1913, succeeded in virtually eradicating yellow fever and reducing drastically the toll of malaria. Modern sanitation methods, which he introduced, achieved vast improvement in general public health. In 1906, deaths from disease were 39.29 per 1,000 employees; by 1914 the rate had been cut to 7.04 per 1,000.

Later history: By terms of the treaty for the settlement of differences (Thompson-Urrutia Treaty) between the United States and Colombia, signed in April 1914, Colombia agreed to recognize the Republic of Panama in return for an indemnity of $25 million and special isthmian transportation privileges. The treaty was ratified in 1922.

Two major treaties relating to the canal and the Canal Zone have been concluded between the United States and Panama since 1903. The General Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation in 1936 increased the annual payment by the United States to $430,000. The Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation of 1955 raised the payment to $1,930,000.

Future plans: Since its opening in 1914 the canal has undergone many improvements. The steady growth of its traffic, which is expected to reach maximum capacity before 1980, has stirred debate over the direction which its future enlargement might take. A 1960 report favored improvement of the lock canal pending replacement by a sea-level canal. In 1964, President Johnson said that the United States would seek to build a sea-level canal in Panama or in a nearby country.

The program of widening Gaillard Cut from a minimum channel of 300 to 500 feet continued, and the project was expected to be completed in 1970. Initial planning began on building a storage dam across the Trinidad arm of Gatun Lake. The Trinidad Dam would provide for future water requirements by impounding approximately 430,000 acre-feet of water. The 50-year-old lock-towing locomotives have been replaced by larger, faster, and more powerful locomotives. Also, considerable progress has been made on developing new procedures for overhauling the locks so that the period of single-lock operation during an overhaul would be approximately 24 hours instead of a matter of weeks.

See also American expansion policy; canals—major canals (Panama Canal); Clayton-Bulwer Treaty—events leading to the treaty; Colombia—15. History (Republic); Commerce—4. Interstate commerce (rates); France—31. History: The Third Republic, 1870–1940 (stabilization of the republican system): Threats to the regime; Hay-Pauncefote Treaty; Latin America—28. World affairs (independent Latin America): Isthmian trade routes; Monroe Doctrine—The doctrine as national dogma and biographical articles on principal figures mentioned. [Not shown in RECORD.]

4. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Congrès International d'Etudes du Canal Interocéanique, "Compte rendu des sèances du 15 au 20 mai 1879" (Paris 1879); U.S. Senate, Report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1899–1901 (Washington 1901); Wafer, Lionel, "A New Voyage and Description of the Isthumus of America (Cleveland 1903); annual reports, the Isthmian Canal Commission, governor of the Panama Canal and Panama Canal Company-Canal Zone Government (Balboa Heights, C.Z., 1904–); "Canal Record, Panama Canal Record and Panama Canal Review" (Balboa Heights, C.Z., 1907–); Anderson, C. L. G., "Old Panama and Castilla del Oro" (Washington 1911); Arias Madrid, Harmodio, "The Panama Canal: a Study in International Law and Diplomacy" (London 1911); Bunau-Varilla, Philippe, "Panama: the Creation, Destruction, and Resurrection" (New York 1914); Bakenhus, R. E., and others, "The Panama Canal" (New York 1915); Bennett, I. E., History of the Panama Canal" (Washington 1915); Sibert, William L., and Stevens, John F., "The Construction of the Panama Canal" (New York 1915); Goethals, George W., compiler, "The Panama Canal," 2 vols. (New York 1916); Gorgas, Marie D., and Hendrick, Burton J., "William Crawford Gorgas: His Life and Work" (New York 1924); Bishop, Joseph B., and Bishop, Farnham, "Goethals: Genius of the Panama Canal" (New York 1930); Miner, Dwight C., "The Fight for the Panama Route" (New York 1940); Mack, Gerstle, "The Land Divided" (New York 1940); DuVal, Miles P., "And the Mountains Will Move" (Stanford, Calif., 1947); id., "Cadiz to Cathay" (Stanford 1947); Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, 1st session (Balboa Heights, C.Z., 1947); Panama Canal Company, rules and regulations governing

navigation of the Panama Canal and adjacent waters (Mount Hope, C.Z., 1952–); Lee, William Storrs, "Strength to Move a Mountain" (New York 1958).

NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **SAYLOR.** Mr. Speaker, the history of America can be traced in its rivers. The earliest explorers from Europe first pierced the New World's wilderness via its water courses, and these were our country's first arteries of commerce. The Hudson, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, and the Potomac, the mighty Father of Waters and its great tributaries that drain the vast Midwest, the wide placid Rio Grande, the wild, coveted waters of the Colorado, the rushing Columbia in the Northwest, and a thousand lesser but romantic rivers in between—these waterways still are basic to the economy and the culture of our Nation. We have harnessed most of them. We have transformed and diverted them. We have polluted nearly all of them, in the process transforming ribbons of beauty into channels of filth.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is something intrinsic to the American character to be found in our Nation's unruly, untamed, natural rivers. There is something of La Vérendrye and Champlain and of Daniel Boone and Lewis and Clark in all of us that helps to guarantee that Americans will never yield our freedoms at home nor bow to the oppressor abroad.

Today we have only a few rivers left in the free-flowing, wild, and unspoiled condition that challenged and inspired our forebears. We propose now to set portions of them aside for preservation, as precious bits of our natural heritage—practically outdoor museum pieces.

The President of the United States has called for legislation to establish a national system of wild rivers. What would be the value of such a system in this age of big cities and vast technology? Why keep some scenic rivers? Hear an answer by one of America's conservation leaders, Mr. Carl W. Buchheister, the president of the National Audubon Society.

Mr. Buchheister wrote in Audubon magazine, May–June 1965:

> There is something that is both exciting and soothing to the human spirit in a clear, running stream.
>
> The water sings a varied song as it converses with the rocks, thunders in the rapids or whispers to the alders. The fish that rise to a lure in such a stream are special fish, as any angler knows. The cares and tensions of human society evaporate for the man steering a canoe through its chutes, and no sleep is so refreshing as a slumber in a tent or sleeping bag on the banks of a wild river.
>
> The voyageurs used such streams to ply their romantic traffic through the wilderness. Lewis and Clark were inspired to some of the most lyric passages in their journals by the beauty of the rivers they ascended and descended in their historic passage.
>
> To save some of the unspoiled, natural streams that we still have left for refreshment of the spirit and body of man isn't exactly a revolutionary idea. It is rather an obvious extension of the principle already established in our national park and wilderness systems, but it is an overdue extension.

Mr. Speaker, the President spoke vividly and movingly of the need for a wild rivers system in his conservation message of February 8, 1965, when he said:

> Those who first settled this continent found much to marvel at. Nothing was a greater source of wonder and amazement than the power and majesty of American rivers. They occupy a central place in myth and legend, folklore, and literature.
>
> They were our first highways, and some remain among the most important. We have had to control their ravages, harness their power, and use their water to help make whole regions prosper. Yet even this seemingly indestructible natural resource is in danger.
>
> Through our pollution-control programs we can do much to restore our rivers. We will continue to conserve the water and power for tomorrow's needs with well-planned reservoirs and power dams. But the time has also come to identify and preserve free-flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway a memory.
>
> To this end I will shortly send to Congress a bill to establish a natural wild rivers system.

But the study team named by the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to survey the possibilities and to prepare a draft of appropriate legislation must not have been listening to their President. Or they grew fainthearted and beached their canoe before they reached the rapids. The draft bill that was transmitted to the Congress was at best a timorous approach.

It recommended only six streams, or segments of them, as worthy of prompt protection in a wild rivers system, and it listed only nine others for study. It proposed no classification as to relative naturalness. Except for setting aside the licensing authority of the Federal Power Commission—which is basic—on the first six, it offered little protection for the streams it proposed to preserve.

Little wonder that the administration draft lay for a long time in the House before any Member was moved to sponsor it. The other body finally passed a version of the draft in S. 1446, but it is a weak-kneed measure that I could not in good conscience support.

Mr. Speaker, the conservation of the natural resources of America cannot be achieved by half-baked measures.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a strong scenic rivers bill (H.R. 14922) designed to meet the concerns that have been voiced by such outstanding conservation organizations as the American Whitewater Affiliation, the National Audubon Society, the Wilderness Society, the Environmental Research Institute, the Sport Fishing Institute, the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, the Sierra Club, Trout Unlimited, and the Natural History Society. Regarding the inherent weaknesses of S. 1446, H.R. 14922 will provide the American people with a true scenic rivers system—it classifies certain rivers at once as scenic rivers and provides the guidelines for additions to the scenic rivers system.

I am introducing an adequate national scenic rivers bill.

It proposes scenic river status now to all the streams, or segments thereof, so designated in the measure passed by the other body, and nine others in addition to these seven; namely, the Green River in Wyoming, the Klamath in California, the Missouri in Montana, the Skagit in Washington, the Flathead in Montana, the Hudson in New York, the Wolf in Wisconsin, the St. Croix in Minnesota and Wisconsin, and the Suwannee in Georgia and Florida.

It directs the Secretary of the Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to put each of these rivers into one of three classes or categories, according to the degree of wildness, accessibility by roads, and shoreline development that characterizes each. It directs the appropriate Secretary to administer the streams accordingly.

S. 1446 contains no such protective system of classification. This is an omission that would lead inevitably to an erosion of the beauty and wildness of the most unspoiled of the streams.

My bill also provides a mechanism for reclassifying a scenic river to a higher category when it shall have been restored and improved in natural, scenic, and recreational values.

My bill names 66 streams that will be studied for potential, future additions to the system, and unlike S. 1446, which sets no timetable for the studies, it directs the Secretaries to consult with the States and to complete the necessary surveys in 10 years.

My bill sets aside the authority of the Federal Power Commission to license dams on all of these rivers until, in the case of each, the executive branch has completed the study and Congress has had a chance to act upon the recommendations.

Unlike S. 1446, my bill provides that mines now in operation or started later on existing mining claims within a scenic river area shall be subject to regulations designed to prevent water pollution and undue scarring of the landscape. Such protective provision in the measure approved by the other body would apply only in the case of mining claims filed after the date of the enactment.

Recognizing the importance of mineral prospecting and mining to the welfare of the United States and to the economy of the communities affected, my bill specifies that any mining claim hereafter perfected within the scenic rivers system, and any patent issued for such claim, shall convey title to the mineral deposits and the right to use so much of the surface and the surface resources, including timber, as are reasonably required for the prospecting and mining operations. Title to the surface of the claim, however, will be reserved to the United States in order to protect the values that are important to the purposes of this act.

My bill provides for the acquisition of lands in fee—but only such lands as are absolutely essential to the purposes of the act—within a belt 1 mile from each shore of the stream. A strip only 300 feet from either side of the stream, as authorized in S. 1446, is so inadequate as to border on the ridiculous.

Under my bill, scenic easements may be taken for purposes of the act within a belt 2 miles wide from either bank of the river. This compares to the totally inadequate one-fourth mile authorized in S. 1446.

Like S. 1446 my bill encourages the States to act within their own powers to establish and protect Scenic River Areas. But my bill adds one additional provision that is vital: It proposes to set aside the Federal Power Act with respect to any such scenic river that is preserved by State legislative act. Without such provision, a State may try in vain to save a free-flowing stream.

Like S. 1446 my bill neither expresses nor implies any claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws. It would in no wise affect the jurisdiction of the States with respect to fish and wildlife. It expressly denies any intent, purpose or provision to alter, amend, appeal, construe, interpret or modify, or be in conflict with, any interstate compact made by any States which contain any portion of the National Scenic Rivers System.

Finally, my bill contains one other important provision. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct periodic surveys and studies to secure basic ecological data and other information needed for the continuing preservation and management of a National Scenic Rivers System.

When enacted this legislation will be another giant step forward in protecting a portion of our American heritage.

As a part of my remarks, I wish to incorporate the provisions of my National Scenic Rivers Bill, H.R. 14922:

H.R. 14922

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Scenic Rivers Act."

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that some of the free-flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people. The Congress also finds that our established national policy of dam and other construction at appropriate sections of the rivers of the United States needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof in their natural and free-flowing condition, to protect the water quality and shore environment of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes. It is the policy of Congress to preserve, reclaim, and make available for the benefit of all of the American people, selected parts of the Nation's diminishing resources of free-flowing rivers. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Scenic Rivers System to be composed of the areas that are designated as "scenic river areas" in this Act, and the additional areas that may be designated in subsequent Acts of Congress. It is not the intent of this Act to require or to authorize acquisition of all lands within the exterior boundaries of scenic river areas but to assure preservation and proper management of the land, water, wildlife, outdoor recreational values, and scenic resources. Areas designated as "scenic river areas" by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be classified and administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act unless the subsequent Acts provide otherwise.

Classes of scenic river areas

(b) A scenic river area eligible to be included in the system is a free-flowing stream, tributary, river, or section thereof and the related adjacent land area that possesses unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. Every scenic river in its free-flowing condition, or upon restoration to this condition, shall be considered eligible for inclusion in the National Scenic Rivers System and shall be classified, designated, and administered as one of the following:

(1) Class I Scenic River Areas—those rivers or sections of rivers that are free of impoundments and inaccessible except by trail, with watersheds or shorelines essentially primitive, and water unpolluted. These would represent vestiges of primitive America.

(2) Class II Scenic River Areas—those rivers or sections of rivers free of impoundments, with shorelines or watersheds still largely primitive, and shorelines largely undeveloped, but accessible in places by roads.

(3) Class III Scenic River Areas—those rivers or sections of rivers which are readily accessible by road, or railroad, with some development along shorelines and which may have undergone some impoundment or diversion in the past.

NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The following rivers, or segments thereof, and related, adjacent lands, most of which are public lands, as depicted on maps numbered "NSR–SAL–1000, NSR–CLE–1000, NSR–ROG–1000, NSR–RIO–1000, NSR–ELE–1000, NSR–CAP–1000, NSR–SHE–1000, NSR–GRE–1000, NSR–KLA–1000, NSR–MIS–1000, NSR–SKA–1000, NSR–FLA–1000, NSR–HUD–1000, NSR–WOL–1000, NSR–StC–1000, NSR–SUW–1000," are hereby designated as "scenic river areas":

(1) Salmon, Idaho—the Salmon from town of North Fork downstream to its confluence with the Snake River and the entire Middle Fork.

(2) Clearwater, Middle Fork, Idaho—the Middle Fork from the town of Kooskia upstream to the town of Lowell; the Lochsa River from its junction with the Selway at Lowell forming the Middle Fork, upstream to the Powell Ranger Station; and the Selway River from Lowell upstream to its origin.

(3) Rogue, Oregon—the segment extending from the Applegate River to the Route 101 highway bridge above Gold Beach.

(4) Rio Grande, New Mexico—the segment extending from the Colorado State line downstream to near the town of Pilar, and the lower 4 miles of the Red River.

(5) Eleven Point, Missouri—the segment of the river extending from a point near Greer Spring downstream to State Highway 142.

(6) Cacapon, West Virginia—entire river and its tributary, the Lost River.

(7) Shenandoah, West Virginia—the segment of the river located in the State of West Virginia.

(8) Green, Wyoming—the segment extending from its origin in the Bridger Wilderness Area south to its confluence with Horse Creek.

(9) Klamath, California—the segment extending from the Scott River downstream to near the town of Klamath Falls.

(10) Missouri, Montana—the segment extending from Fort Peck Reservoir upstream to near the town of Fort Benton.

(11) Skagit, Washington—the Skagit River from near the town of Sedro Woolley upstream to the Gorge powerhouse near the town of Newhalem; the Cascade River from its mouth to the junction with its north and south forks and up the South Fork to the boundary of the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area; the Suiattle River from its mouth to the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area boundary at Milk Creek; the Sauk River from its mouth to the junction with Elliott Creek, and the North Fork of the Sauk River from its junction with the South Fork of the Sauk to the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area boundary.

(12) Flathead, Montana—North Fork from the Canadian Border downstream to confluence with Middle Fork; Middle Fork from headwaters to confluence with South Fork; and South Fork from its origin to the Hungry Horse Reservoir.

(13) Hudson, New York—the Hudson River from mouth to source, including tributaries.

(14) Wolf, Wisconsin—the segment reaching from the confluence of the Hunting River downstream to the town of Keshena.

(15) St. Croix, Minnesota and Wisconsin—beginning at the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, and extending upstream to the dam near Gordon, Wisconsin, and its Namekagon tributary.

(16) Suwannee, Georgia and Florida—entire river from its source in the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia to the gulf and the outlying Ichetucknee Springs, Florida.

Said maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Following further study, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within one year after enactment of this Act, classify these scenic rivers and sections thereof into one or more of the three classes designated in this Act as Class I Scenic River Areas, Class II Scenic River Areas, or Class III Scenic River Areas.

Federal-State planning for additions to system

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, after consultation with interested Federal agencies, are directed to consult with the Governors and officials of the States in which the rivers listed below are located to ascertain whether a joint Federal-State plan is feasible and desirable in the public interest to conserve segments of these rivers. They shall submit to the President, within three years of the effective date of this Act, their recommendations for inclusion of any or all of them in the National Scenic Rivers System, and the President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate:

(1) Buffalo, Tennessee—the entire river from its beginning in Lawrence County to its confluence with the Duck River.

(2) St. Croix, Minnesota—St. Croix River downstream from the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, to its confluence with the Mississippi River.

(3) Niobrara, Nebraska—the main-stem segment lying between the confluence of Antelope Creek downstream to the headwaters of the proposed Norden Reservoir east of the town of Valentine, and the lower eight miles of its Snake River tributary.

(4) Susquehanna, New York and Pennsylvania—the segment of the Susequehanna River from a dam at Cooperstown, New York, downstream to the town of Pittston, Pennsylvania.

(5) Allegheny, Pennsylvania and New York—the segment extending from the Allegheny Reservoir upstream to its source.

(6) Big Blue, Indiana—the segment extending from its confluence with the Ohio River east of the town of Leavenworth upstream to near the town of Salem.

(7) Little Miami, Ohio—the segment of the Little Miami River in Clark, Greene, Warren, and Clermont Counties from a point in the vicinity of Clifton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of Morrow, Ohio.

(8) Little Beaver, Ohio—the segment of the North and Middle Forks of the Little Beaver River, in Columbiana County, from a point in the vicinity of Negly and Elkton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of East Liverpool, Ohio.

(9) Pine Creek, Pennsylvania—the segment from Ansonia, Pennsylvania, to Waterville, Pennsylvania.

(10 Delaware, Pennsylvania and New York—the segment from Hancock, New York, to Matamoras, Pennsylvania.

(11) Clarion, Pennsylvania—the segment from where it enters the Allegheny River to Ridgway, Pennsylvania.

(12) West Branch Susquehanna, Pennsylvania—the segment of the West Branch Susquehanna from Clearfield, Pennsylvania, to Lock Haven, Pennsylvania.

(13) Little Tennessee, Tennessee—the segment from Chilhowee Dam to its confluence with the Tennessee River near Lenoir City.

(14) Buffalo, Arkansas—the entire river from its source in Newton County to its confluence with the White River.

(15) Colorado, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, Nevada, California—the entire river from its headwaters to its outlet in the Pacific Ocean.

(16) Columbia, Montana, Washington, Idaho and Oregon—the segment of river from the Canadian River to its outlet in the Pacific Ocean.

River basin planning for additions to system

(c) Similar reviews and recommendations for preservation of the following rivers shall be made to the President within ten years of enactment of this Act. Recommendations on one-third of these rivers shall be made within five years of the enactment of this Act; recommendations shall be made on not less than two-thirds of these rivers within seven years after the enactment of this Act, and on the remaining rivers within ten years after the enactment of this Act.

Animas, Colorado.
Ausable, New York.
Big Fork, Minnesota.
Big Hole, Montana.
Black Warrier, Alabama.
Blackfoot, Montana.
Cache la Poudre, Colorado.
Cheat, West Virginia.
Connecticut, New Hempshire.
Cumberland, Tennessee and Kentucky.
Deschutes, Oregon.
Feather, Middle Fork, California.
French Broad, North Carolina and Tennessee.
Gasconade, Missouri.
Gila, New Mexico.
Greenbrier, West Virginia.
Gros Ventre, Wyoming.
Guadalupe, Texas.
Hoh, Washington.
James, Virginia.
Kern, North Fork, California.
Linville, North Carolina.
Little Wabash, Illinois.
Madison, Montana.
Manistee, Michigan.
Methow, Washington.
Mullica, New Jersey.
Namekagon, Wisconsin.
Oklawaha, Florida.
Penobscott, East and West Branches, Maine.
Pere Marquette, Michigan.
Potomac, Maryland, Pennslyvania, West Virginia, and Virginia.
Queets, Washington.
Sacramento, California.
St. Joe, Idaho.
Salt, Arizona.
San Juan, Utah and New Mexico.
Savannah headwaters, Georgia and North Carolina.
Shenandoah, Virginia.
Smith, California.
Snake, North Fork, Idaho.
Tangipahoa, Louisiana.
Teton, Idaho and Wyoming.
Upper Iowa, Iowa.
Wacissa, Florida.
Wapsipinicon, Iowa.
White, North and South Forks, Colorado.
Wind, Wyoming.
Yellowstone, Montana and Wyoming.
Youghiogheny, Maryland and Pennsylvania.

(d) In all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, consideration shall be given by all Federal agencies involved to potential scenic river areas, and all river basin and project plan reports submitted to the Congress shall discuss any such potentials. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make specific studies and investigation to determine which additional scenic river areas within the United States shall be evaluated in planning reports as potential additions to the scenic rivers system.

Other additions to the system

(e) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the President from time to time their recommendations for inclusion in the National Scenic Rivers System of any other river or segment thereof. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate.

(f) Recommendations made under this section shall be developed in consultation with the States, those Federal agencies which normally participate in the development of recreation plans and comprehensive river basin plans, any commissions established pursuant to interstate compacts the assigned responsibilities of which would be affected, and commissions or other bodies which may be established for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan for the river basin within which the contemplated scenic river area would be located.

Each such recommendation shall be accompanied by (1) expressions of any views which the Federal agencies and States and interstate commissions consulted pursuant to the foregoing may submit within ninety days after having been notified of the proposed recommendation; (2) a statement setting forth the probable effect of the recommended action on any comprehensive river basin plan that may have been adopted by Congress or that is serving as a guide for coordinating Federal or Federal and State programs in the basin; and (3) in the absence of such plan, a statement indicating the probable effect of the recommended action on alternative beneficial uses of the resources of the basin.

(g) Whenever it is proposed to add a river or segment hereof to the National Scenic Rivers System, and the river or segment runs through non-Federal land, recommendations with respect to its addition and with respect to whether it should be wholly or partly acquired, protected, and managed pursuant to exclusive State authority shall be made to the President by the Governor of each State concerned. Such recommendation to the President shall be accompanied by or based upon a general State plan which assures the effectuation of the purposes of this Act in perpetuity. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the designation of such river or segment thereof as a part of the National Scenic Rivers System and the administration of such area by State authority, together with such draft legislation that he deems appropriate.

Need for land acquisition

(h) Any recommendation for an addition to the National Scenic Rivers System shall indicate the extent to which land will need to be acquired by the State and by the Federal Government, and the extent to which the acquisition of scenic easements or other interests in land may be an adequate substitute for the acquisition of a fee title.

ADMINISTRATION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) After classification and designation of the scenic river areas described in section 3 (a) and (b), they shall be administered in a manner agreed upon between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, or as determined by the President.

(b) Scenic river areas designated by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be classified and administered by the Secretary of the Interior, except that when the scenic river area is wholly within, partly within, or closely adjacent to, a national forest such area shall be classified and administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless it is also partly within, or closely adjacent to, an area administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in which event the scenic river area shall be classified and administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, or as directed by the President. The Secretary charged with the administration of a scenic river area or portion thereof designated by this Act or by subsequent Acts may agree with the Governor of the State for State or local governmental agency participation in the administration of the area. The States shall be encouraged to cooperate in the planning and to assume the administration of such scenic river areas where they include State-owned or county-owned lands. Any Federal land located within a scenic river area may, with the consent of the head of the agency having jurisdiction thereof, be transferred to the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary for administration as part of the scenic river area. Any land transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as part of a scenic river area in connection with the National Forest System shall become national forest land.

(c) Within the exterior boundaries of a scenic river area or portion thereof under his administration the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands or interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, That lands owned by an Indian tribe may be acquired only with the consent of the tribal governing body. In the exercise of his exchange authority the Secretary of the Interior may accept title to any non-Federal property within a scenic river area, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within the State in which the river or segment thereof flows, except lands within the National Park System, or the National Wildlife Refuge System, which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The properties so exchanged shall be of approximately equal fair market value. If they are not of approximately equal fair market value, the Secretary of the Interior may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary of Agriculture, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may utilize authorities and procedures available to him in connection with exchanges of national forest lands. Any such lands acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture within or adjacent to a national forest shall upon acquisition become national forest lands. Money appropriated for Federal or State purposes from the land and water conservation fund shall be available for the acquisition of property for the purposes of this Act. As used in this Act the term "scenic easement" means the right to control the use of land (including the air space above such land) for the purpose of protecting and preserving the scenic view from the river and the shore environment for the purposes of this Act.

(d) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands by condemnation, for the purpose of including such lands in any scenic river area, if such lands are located within any incorporated city, village, or borough within such area, when such entities shall have in force and applicable to such lands a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(e) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may exercise any authority to acquire county-owned lands within any scenic river area without the consent of said county as long as the county is following a plan for the management, zoning, and protection of such lands that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(f) Wherever the power of condemnation has been conferred by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands in fee title by condemnation within an area which may not extend more than one mile on either side of the stream, tributary, or river, and only such lands as are essential to the purposes of this Act. Either Secretary may acquire by condemnation for scenic easements, or other interests in land other than fee title, an area which extends no more than two miles from either side of the stream, tributary, or river.

(g) A scenic river area shall be administered for the purposes of water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values contributing to public enjoyment. Lands acquired within each scenic river area shall be classified by the administering Secretary according to the present or desired type of land use to be allowed there: as Class I, Class II, or Class III Scenic River Areas.

(1) Commercial timber harvesting shall not be allowed within Class I Scenic River Areas; commercial timber harvesting shall be permitted within one-half mile of Class II and Class III areas where it is found to be compatible with the maintenance of scenic vistas from the stream and its banks.

(2) No new roads shall be constructed within Class I Scenic River Areas; no new roads paralleling the stream shall be constructed closer than one thousand three hundred and twenty feet of rivers within Class II Scenic River Areas.

(3) Public road access through new road construction shall be allowed only within Class II and Class III Scenic River Areas, as well as landings and other structures related to recreational use of these scenic river areas.

(4) Grazing shall not be allowed within Class I Scenic River Areas; grazing, and improvements necessarily related to it, shall be allowed, subject to regulation by the administering agency, in Class II and Class III Scenic River Areas.

The Secretary of the Interior, in administering such areas, may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the National Park System and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for recreation and preservation purposes, and the conservation and management of natural resources, as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture, in administering such areas, shall utilize the statutory authorities relating to the national forests in such manner as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of his Act.

(h) Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture a scenic river area previously administered as Class II or Class III has been sufficiently restored and enhanced in its natural scenic, and recreational qualities, such area may be classified to a higher status Class II to Class I, or Class III to Class II or Class I) and thereafter administered accordingly.

STATE AND LOCAL WILD RIVERS

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is directed to encourage and assist States to consider, in their comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans and proposals for financial assistance for State and local projects submitted pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, needs and opportunities for establishing scenic rivers. He is further directed, in accordance with the authority contained in the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Organic Act (77 Stat. 49), to provide technical assistance and advice to, and cooperate with, States, political subdivisions, and private interests, including nonprofit organizations, with respect to establishing scenic rivers.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is directed in accordance with the authority vested in him to assist, advise, and cooperate with State and local agencies and private interests with respect to establishing scenic rivers.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no dam or other project shall be constructed, operated, or maintained, or authorized to be constructed, operated, or maintained, (1) in any scenic river area, (2) in any of the scenic river areas subject to review under section 3 (b) and (c), or (3) in any scenic river area established in accordance with State law by a State or political subdivision thereof, by (A) the Federal Power Commission, (B) the Secretary of the Army, (C) the Secretary of the Interior, or (D) the Tennessee Valley Authority, unless the Congress shall, by law enacted after this Act, specifically authorize such dam or other project.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the applicability of the United States mining and mineral leasing laws within the National Scenic Rivers System, except that all prospecting, all mining operations, and all other activities on a mining claim perfected after the date of this Act, either before or after the issuance of patent, and all mining operations and other activities under a mineral lease, license, or permit hereafter issued, shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of national forest lands, may prescribe to effectuate the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That any mining claim affecting lands within the scenic rivers system hereafter perfected under the United States mining laws, and any patent issued for such claim, shall convey title only to the mineral deposits and shall confer upon the holder of the claim only such rights to the use of the surface and surface resources as are reasonably required for carrying on prospecting or mining, subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the patent for any such mining claim hereafter perfected shall reserve to the United States all title to the surface of the claim and the products of the surface, subject only to the patentee's rights to use the surface of the claim and the surface resources to the extent reasonably required for carrying on prospecting and mining consistent with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Any patent so issued shall recite these limitations. All such regulations shall provide among other things for safeguards against pollution of the river.

(c) Any portion of a scenic river area that is within the National Wilderness Preservation System, as established by the Act of September 3, 1964 (Public Law 88-577), shall be subject to the provisions of both the Wilderness Act and this Act with respect to the preservation of such scenic river area, and in case of conflict between the provisions of these Acts the more restrictive provisions shall apply.

(d) The head of any Federal or State agency administering a scenic river area shall cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior, and with the appropriate State water pollution control agencies, for the purpose of eliminating or diminishing the pollution of waters within a scenic river area.

(e) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(f) Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States under other provisions of law with respect to fish and wildlife.

(g) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify or be in conflict with any interstate compact made by any States which contain any portion of the National Scenic Rivers System.

(h) A State shall have rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access by such State to the beds of navigable streams, tributaries, or rivers (or segments thereof) which are vested in the State, in case such beds are located in a scenic river area.

(i) Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such streams for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

(j) The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included a scenic river area shall be unaffected by this Act to the extent that such jurisdiction may be exercised without impairing the purposes of this Act or its administration.

SEC. 7. In order to provide basic ecological information needed for management purposes, trends and changes in river resources; and in order to provide scientific and up-to-date information for the preservation and management of the National Scenic Rivers System, a systematic evaluation of scenic river recreational resources will be conducted periodically by the Secretary of the Interior. Such evaluation shall include the gathering and analysis of data on water quality, pollution, the status of fish populations and aquatic organisms, fish habitat, game populations and shore habitats, recreation use, recreation impact, appropriateness of access, management procedures, developments, watershed condition and trend, and other data needed to evaluate the resources. The method used shall be sufficiently uniform as to permit comparisons of the same river area from time to time and to be of value in comparing one river area with another. The information gathered for evaluation should be collected with a view to utilizing it in long range management of the various classes of scenic rivers. The evaluation methods should be prepared by trained fishery and wildlife biologists, ecologists, and other appropriately trained scientists.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

MRS. INA BEAUCHAMP HALL, 1966 NORTH DAKOTA MOTHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, last week, I considered it a great pleasure to escort the 1966 North Dakota Mother of the Year, Mrs. Ina Beauchamp Hall, Parshall, N. Dak., to the Star Spangled Awards Dinner of the American Mothers Committee, Inc.

Mrs. Hall, the mother of nine children, is an associate home extension agent, employed by the Extension Service of North Dakota State University. A check with the Department of Agriculture shows that she is the first home extension agent in the United States to receive a Mother of the Year title.

Another first for Mrs. Hall is the fact that her sister, Mrs. Margaret Breuer, of Emmet, N. Dak., was named North Dakota Mother of the Year in 1956. Never before in my State had sisters been honored with this title.

Mrs. Hall, who lives on the edge of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, has developed, on the reservation, homemaker groups for adult women, as well as 4-H programs currently involving 250 boys and girls.

Despite the responsibilities of rearing nine children, Mrs. Hall has devoted herself unstintingly to community affairs. The Community Development Club of Parshall was organized at a meeting in her home. Believing that old Indian skills and crafts should be preserved, she displayed leadership in establishing a successful fall fair on the reservation in which Indians have the opportunity to exhibit their handiwork. An advocate of improving educational opportunities, she recently established a study hall and library in Parshall for children who find it difficult to study at home.

Mrs. Hall richly deserves the recognition she is receiving as North Dakota Mother of the Year, and I am proud of her.

CATV AND COPYRIGHT REVISION

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on the Judiciary has been engaged in a series of executive sessions on H.R. 4347, for the general revision of the copyright law. A pressing issue in the revision is whether and to what extent community antenna television systems should be liable for copyright infringement when they retransmit without permission a broadcast containing copyrighted material.

At the same time, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been engaged in hearings and study of the problems of communications law presented by CATV activities.

Our Copyright Subcommittee has reached agreement on certain amendments to H.R. 4347, to be recommended to the full committee, which would define the status of CATV operations under the copyright law. Because of the importance of the subject and its relationship to matters now under active consideration by the Commerce Committee, the subcommittee has communicated its conclusions to the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] and has made this communication public. For the convenience and interest of the Members, I am also inserting it in the Record, together with a draft of legislative language that would effectuate the subcommittee's proposal.

The letter to Chairman Staggers and the draft read as follows:

May 5, 1966.

Hon. Harley O. Staggers,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington. D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: As you know, Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on the Judiciary is engaged in a series of executive sessions on H.R. 4347, a bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code. One of the most important and controversial of the issues posed by the revision is the copyright status of transmissions by community antenna systems.

Under H.R. 4347, as introduced, commercial CATV systems would be fully liable for copyright infringement whenever they retransmit without permission a broadcast containing copyrighted material. After extensive consideration of the arguments made during the hearings and the legal and public policy issues involved, the subcommittee has reached agreement on certain amendments which would substantially change the bill to be recommended to the full committee.

The subcommittee is, of course, aware that your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been engaged in hearings and study of the problems of communications law presented by CATV activities. It has been our purpose, as far as possible, to resolve the copyright issues raised by CATV without trenching upon the area of communications problems. Because of the importance of this question and its relationship to the active consideration now being given by your committee to measures that would define the status of CATV systems under the Communications Act, we have decided to announce our conclusions on this particular question at this time. The following is a broad simplified summary of what will necessarily be a complex statutory provision.

For the purpose of this summary, "CATV" refers to commercial services that intercept off-the-air transmissions of programs originated by others and retransmit them to paying subscribers by wire connections or the like, without altering their content, originating programs themselves, or making special charges for particular programs.

The subcommittee's proposal would divide CATV activities, upon the basis of geographic and other characteristics, into three broad categories or "areas" which we call "white," "black," and "gray." In very general terms, the subcommittee proposes to exempt CATV operations from copyright if they are entirely in the white area; make them fully liable if they are in the black area; and subject them to limited liability in the nature of a "reasonable license fee" if they are in the gray area.

Under the subcommittee's proposal, the white area embraces CATV retransmission solely within the radius of the area served by the primary broadcaster (in effect, its "grade B contour") to fill in gaps or improve bad reception caused by technical interference. Example: A system operating solely within New York City and retransmitting New York City stations only.

The black area embraces retransmission beyond the area served by the primary broadcaster into an area already served by one or more other broadcasters, none of whom is licensed to carry the same program. Example: A system bringing a New York City station's broadcast of a motion picture to Philadelphia subscribers when no Philadelphia station is licensed to broadcast it.

The gray area embraces retransmissions beyond the area served by the primary broadcaster into an area already served by another broadcaster who has a license to carry the same program; or into an area not served by any primary broadcaster.

The subcommittee believes that in the so-called white area where the CATV operation is merely a "fill-in" or "master antenna" service, operating solely within the area served by the primary broadcaster, the impact of the CATV operation is primarily to expand the audience by which the value of the copyright owner's license to the primary broadcaster is measured.

Where, on the other hand, the CATV operation occurs in a black area, i.e., where it extends into an area within which there are broadcasting facilities but the copyright owner has not granted his authorization for any transmission, the unauthorized retransmission by CATV could destroy a market and result in direct, immediate damage. Here the subcommittee would impose full liability for infringement of copyright, including injunctive relief.

Intermediately, in the gray area situation, where the copyright owner has already licensed the use of his work in the area, or there is no broadcaster to license, there is no direct loss of market exclusivity. There is, however, an uncompensated free ride at the owner's expense. Advertisers will not pay for viewers living outside their area, and CATV service in these areas may keep out local broadcasters who would pay. Here, the subcommittee believes that a reasonable license fee best meets the equities.

Beyond this allocation of different rights and remedies for the white, black, and gray areas, the subcommittee's proposal takes into account the arguments of the CATV operators as to the difficulties of obtaining advance clearances and the dangers of unlimited liability for statutory damages in this field. It proposes, with respect to CATV operations in the black area, to impose full liability only if the operator proceeds with the unauthorized retransmission after having received advance notice from the copyright owner. If the owner does not provide advance notice, the retransmission would be treated as if it were in the gray area.

As for CATV operations in the gray area, the subcommittee proposes to withhold the possibility of an injunction or statutory damages, and limit the operator's liability to a "reasonable license fee" to be fixed by the court in the absence of agreement. However, in order to induce negotiations, the proposed amendment would provide the court with discretion to triple the recovery if it finds that the infringer failed to accept a reasonable offer, or to withhold any recovery if it finds that the copyright owner had refused to accept a reasonable offer.

It should be emphasized that the subcommittee's proposal is directed solely to a prospective solution to the community antenna problem under the general revision of the copyright law. It is not intended as the expression of any opinion as to what the present law is under the 1909 statute or as to how the courts should ultimately decide that question.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Robert W. Kastenmeier,
Acting Chairman for Copyright Revision, Subcommittee No. 3.

---

§ . Limitations on Exclusive Rights: Secondary Transmissions.

(a) Certain secondary transmission exempted.—(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (b) and (c), the secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work is not an infringement of copyright if:

(A) the secondary transmission consists entirely of relaying the primary transmission to the private rooms of a hotel or other public establishment, and no direct charge is made to the occupants of the private rooms to see or hear the secondary transmission; or

(B) the secondary transmission is made solely for the purpose and under the conditions specified by clause (2) of section 109; or

(C) the secondary transmission is made by a common carrier who has no direct or indirect control over the content or selection of the primary transmission or over the particular recipients of the secondary transmission, and whose activities with respect to the secondary transmission consist solely of providing wires, cables, or other communications channels for the use of others.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c), but subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work is not an infringement of copyright if the secondary transmission is made by a governmental body, or other nonprofit organization, without any purpose of direct or indirect commercial advantage, and without any charge to the recipients of the secondary transmission other than assessments necessary to defray the actual and reasonable costs of maintaining and operating the secondary transmission service.

(3) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c), the secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work is not an infringement of copyright if the secondary transmission is made for reception solely within the limits of the area normally encompassed by the primary transmission.

(b) CERTAIN SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS FULLY ACTIONABLE.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c) and of clauses (2) and (3) of subsection (a), the secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work is actionable as an act of infringement under section 501, and is fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 506, if:

(1) the content of the particular primary transmission is in any way altered by changes, deletions, or additions during its secondary transmission; or

(2) the secondary transmitter, within one month before or after the particular secondary transmission, originates any transmissions to those members of the public to whom it also makes the secondary transmission, except for no more than one transmission at any one time of weather and news reports; or

(3) the secondary transmitter, within one month before or after the particular secondary transmission, makes any separate, direct charge for any particular transmission it makes to those members of the public to whom it also makes the secondary transmission; or

(4) the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly outside the limits of the area normally encompassed by the primary transmission, and

(A) the secondary transmitter, at least one month before the date of the secondary transmission, has not recorded in the Copyright Office, in accordance with requirements that the Register of Copyrights shall prescribe by regulation, the identity and address of the person who owns the secondary transmission service or has power to exercise primary control over it, together with the name and location of the primary transmitter; or

(B) the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly within the limits of an area normally encompassed by one or more transmitting facilities, other than the primary transmitter, if:

(i) within that area no such facility is authorized to transmit the same performance or display of the work, and

(ii) the copyright owner has given written notice to the secondary transmitter, in accordance with requirements that the Register of Copyrigths shall prescribe by regulation, at least ten days before the primary transmission, that the copyright owner's authorization is necessary for the secondary transmission.

(c) LIMITATIONS ON LIABILITY FOR CERTAIN SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS.—(1) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), in the following cases involving a secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work, liability of the secondary transmitter for infringement under section 501 does not include the remedies provided by sections 502, 503, and 506, and its liability for the remedies provided by sections 504 and 505 is limited as provided by clause (2) of this subsection:

(A) Where the secondary transmission comes within the scope of paragraph (i) of subclause (B) of subsection (b)(4), but the copyright owner has not given notice as provided by paragraph (ii) of that subclause; or

(B) Where the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly outside the limits of the area normally encompassed by the primary transmission, not including an area covered by subclause (B) of subsection (b)(4), and

(i) the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly within the limits of an area normally encompassed by a transmitting facility, other than the primary transmitter, if such facility is authorized to transmit the same performance or display of the work on the date the secondary transmission is made, whether or not such authorized transmission is made on that date; or

(ii) the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly within the limits of an area not normally encompassed by any transmitting facility.

(2) In any case coming within the scope of subclauses (A) or (B) of clause (1) of this subsection, the infringer's liability under section 504 does not include any of the infringer's profits or statutory damages, and the copyright owner's right to recover actual damages is, except as provided in subclauses (A) and (B) of this clause, limited to recovery of a reasonable license fee, as found by the court under the circumstances of the case.

(A) Where the court finds that the infringer has refused or failed to accept an offer of a license, in writing and signed by the copyright owner, in which the license fee stated was reasonable under the circumstances of the case, it may in its discretion increase the recovery under section 504 to a sum of not more than three times the amount of a reasonable license fee, to which may be added a discretionary award of costs and attorney's fees under section 505;

(B) Where the court finds that the copyright owner has refused or failed to accept the written offer, accompanied by a tender, of a license fee that was reasonable under the circumstances of the case, it may in its discretion award costs and attorney's fees under section 504 to the infringer, and may reduce or withhold an award of a reasonable license fee under section 504.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section, the following terms and their variant forms mean the following:

(1) A "primary transmission" is one made by the transmitting facility whose signals are being received and further transmitted by the secondary transmission service, regardless of where or when the performance or display was first transmitted.

(2) A "secondary transmission" is the further transmitting of a primary transmission simultaneously with the primary transmission.

(3) The "area normally encompassed" by a transmission comprises the entire geographic area within the radius that the transmitter's signal is expected to reach effectively under normal conditions, including any parts of the area within that radius that its signal fails to reach effectively because of terrain, structures, or other physical or technical barriers. Where such geographic area has been designated by Federal statute or regulation for other purposes, the Register of Copyrights may, by regulation, make such designation applicable for purposes of this section.

WILL THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MAKE FINAL ITS PERSONAL COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS DIRECTIVE?

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last week the Department of Defense published a revision of its 8-month-old personal commercial affairs directive. This directive sets guidelines for businesses selling or extending credit to servicemen and seeking military assistance in collecting the debt if the serviceman fails to honor his obligation.

The original directive was published last September but was not put into force because Defense Department lawyers felt it was vague and ambiguous. After reading the latest directive, I can only conclude that the Department of Defense lawyers are vague and ambiguous.

Mr. Speaker, before going any further, I want to go on record with a prediction. I congratulate the Department of Defense for the portions of the directive which have been strengthened through revision. However, I predict that the Department of Defense will not adopt in a finalized form all of the provisions of the directive which would hamper the activities of loan sharks and sharp-practice finance companies. And, I sincerely hope that the Department will not accept as final those portions of the directive which contain obvious loopholes.

Perhaps the most glaring loophole in the directive involves the submission of full disclosure forms when a contract involving a serviceman is signed. The directive provides that on-post credit unions and banks fill out these forms at the time of the transaction. However, all other credit extenders are not required to fill out the full disclosure forms at the time of the transaction, but are required to make the full disclosure if the credit extender asks for help from the military in collecting a debt which a serviceman has failed to honor. How can the Department of Defense call this section full disclosure if no disclosure is made at the time of the transaction?

It has come to my attention that not all credit extenders plan to fill in the full disclosure section at the time of the transaction but will be quick to fill out the necessary documents when they want help in collecting the loan. This procedure may be of great benefit to the credit extender but will offer little in the way of assistance to a serviceman.

I strongly urge the Department of Defense to reconsider its stand on this point and require all credit extenders to make full disclosure at the time of the contract signing.

There are some circumstances where this might prove unfair to the credit extenders—such as the business firm which only occasionally handles a military contract. In addition, it might work a hardship on firms who lend to a civilian who later enters the Armed Forces and then falls behind in his obligations. In these cases the Department could provide rules for exception. But to provide an overall out for credit extenders not only creates a loophole, but publicizes it with a virtual flashing neon light.

In addition, the rewrite directive does not provide the Secretary of Defense with the power to declare a firm off limits on a worldwide or nationwide basis, if he feels the offense is serious enough. The original directive did provide this power. Now such a broadscale, off-limits designation would have to be reached on a locality-by-locality basis, a time-consuming operation that would not provide servicemen throughout the world with adequate protection.

There are other portions of the directive which are not satisfactory, but I will not take the time of this body to go into them, since the Department of Defense has made it clear it is not interested in making it any tougher on loan sharks. If the Department of Defense really cares, why does it not take off-limits action against companies which are abusing the servicemen? Certainly, it does not take a wordy—or perhaps worthless—directive to accomplish this task. The Department of Defense needs to go no further than thousands of legal assistance officers throughout the country to find out which companies are taking advantage of our men in uniform.

Nearly 2 months have passed, Mr. Speaker, since the Department of Defense published a directive which would establish overseas credit unions. At the time the directive was signed, it was suggested that a task force be established to educate overseas commands in the methods of establishing credit unions. The Department of Defense has dragged its feet in this area and has done little to encourage the formation of such a task force. Despite repeated inquiries by the Banking and Currency Committee, the Department appears to be no closer to the opening of overseas credit unions than it was at the time the directive was signed.

I would further like to bring to the attention of this body that on March 16 of this year I wrote to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara asking that these overseas credit unions be officially designated "Patman Plan Credit Unions," since it was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the esteemed chairman of the House Banking Committee, who offered the plan which ultimately led to the Department of Defense directive. It was my feeling that by naming these credit unions after this great American, it would be, in some small way, a fitting tribute to his outstanding work on behalf of credit unions. However, the Department has not seen fit to answer my letter although my office did receive a phone call last week stating that they are working on an answer. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that nearly 2 months is an adequate time for the Department of Defense to answer a Congressman's letter.

No one would be happier than I if the Department of Defense would remove from the latest personal commercial affairs directive all of the loopholes that I have mentioned and leave intact those provisions which protect our servicemen. I do not feel that it is too much for the Department of Defense to put the welfare of our servicemen ahead of the welfare of loan sharks.

PATRICK V. McNAMARA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I sadly add my voice today to those who mourn the death of Michigan's senior Senator, Patrick V. McNamara, who announced only recently that he would not seek reelection, and that he was calling an end to a Senate career of 12 years. Death has now robbed him of the opportunity to enjoy the years of retirement that he so richly deserved.

Senator Patrick V. McNamara was a truly great American, a dedicated statesman who fought hard for the principles in which he believed. He was an honest, straightforward man, who spoke to the point, and who had no use for sham and hypocrisy.

He began his career as a pipefitter at the age of 18. By the time he was 21, he was president of a pipefitters and plumber union local. His devotion to the labor movement was one of the guideposts of his life. He was president of Pipefitters' Local 636 in Detroit from 1937 until 1955, and was vice president of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor from 1939 until 1945.

During World War II he was Rent Control Administrator for the Office of Price Administration for a three-county area, and in 1946–47 he served on the Detroit City Council. In 1949, he was elected to the Detroit Board of Education, where he served until his election as Senator in 1954.

In the Senate, he rose through seniority to become chairman of the Public Works Committee, ranking member of the Special Senate Subcommittee on Aging, and chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Poverty. Through his work on these committees, Senator McNamara used his vision and understanding to enrich the lives of countless Americans for generations to come.

Among a rich legacy of achievements, "Senator Pat" was particularly proud of the Older Americans Act of 1965, which created an Administration on Aging, and the medicare program, for which he battled for many years.

All who knew him will miss Senator McNamara. We will miss his outspoken integrity, his unfailing cheerfulness and his boundless optimism.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy on their great loss. I know they take comfort in the thought that he lived a long and full life, and that his name will be honored for all time as that of a great and dedicated American.

COMMUNITIES IN ACTION

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this month the first issue of Communities in Action was published by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is described as a periodical account of the war on poverty. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues in this House because it appears to me to be a noteworthy effort at telling the story of the war against poverty, including the criticism for and against.

To illustrate the quality of the writing found in this first issue of Communities in Action, as well as its objectivity, I would like to insert in the RECORD two articles. The first, "Sorry, Wrong Number," explains some of the difficulties of communicating with persons in the lower income groups. The second article is entitled "Nobody Wants Welfare." Written by Ralph Mathews, Jr., it tells of the work of Walter Dawkins, a young grassroots organizer of the poor. This article contains what I consider to be a highly significant statement from Mr. Dawkins who discusses what he calls the national mistake of most of the early adult training programs for hard-core unemployed people:

> Right here in the city of Newark at a much earlier stage of the antipoverty program this national mistake was illustrated by the fact that the people who got the money and the facilities to train poor people were always people out of the community, people downtown so to speak.
>
> When the poor communities looked around it was the same downtown people getting the facilities and then saying to the poor, "Come to us, we'll teach you and get you to read." For the poor it was the same old question of those people.

Both articles are extremely worthwhile, and I hope they will be read as widely as possible. In fact, I hope the entire magazine will be read as widely as possible. Frankly, one does not expect interesting, thought provoking, critical reading to be found in Government publications. Communities in Action is a refreshing change.

Sergent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Russell B. Roberts, editor of Communities in Action, and the rest of the staff have my congratulations and sincere good wishes for many more issues of this excellent new magazine. With unanimous consent, I am inserting the two articles at this point in the RECORD:

"SORRY, WRONG NUMBER"—COMMUNICATION AND THE POOR

The candidate in an election of a community action board knocks on the door. As soon as the door opens she begins her pitch—"you ought to be interested * * * this is something different * * * you have a real interest in being represented * * *." Then, just before the door is slammed in her face, the potential voter she tried to interest waves a welfare department envelope with an election notice enclosed: "Are they going to cut off my check next month if I don't vote for you?"

In a metropolitan neighborhood, a survey shows that 80 percent of the residents don't know where a neighborhood center is located. It has been operating a block or two away for over 6 months.

In a small Midwestern city, a community action agency official shakes his head at a handful of people who turned out for a meeting designed to explain the new war on poverty program. "I don't understand it. Both papers carried an announcement of the meetings." And a block worker replied, "Who reads the paper?"

By and large, when it comes to any kind of mass communication with the people we exist to work with, war on poverty programs get a "sorry, wrong number."

It should not be a surprise, nor should it be a cause for embarrassment or alarm. This situation, recently emerging into sharper focus, really underlines the completely different character of community action. Obviously, one of the reasons that more traditional approaches have failed to be completely effective is this very communication gap. And by now it should be equally obvious that to a startling degree, a meaningful participation of the groups and areas to be served will be measured by our success in closing that gap.

Just as Headstart has triggered a whole new concept of preschool education and Job Corps has revealed a vast potential for skilled people bypassed by traditional education structures, so too, community action must evolve new techniques of communication. The vast available expertise in mass communication or public relations has developed largely as a result of market studies, audience surveys and readership polls. But the people with whom we are concerned have been largely ignored as a market and thus little has been done professionally to research effective communications with them.

In certain areas, some publications, some stations have a segment of this specialized audience. They tend to be selective about the material they use; they are, understandably, as specialized in editorial judgment as in audience.

The burden is on the peddler. The community action agency which wants exposure for its message in such media cannot expect response with a carbon of the same release that goes to the daily paper or the promo the network radio station uses to qualify for its FCC public service record.

Foreign language newspapers—though they will usually do their own translation from English—want specifics. They want stories that have a special interest to their readership. To get their response, we have to know their audience, take the time to get familiar with their interests, learn what they feature. And, in many areas, that's a job which can be tedious and time consuming; but worth the effort.

The same is true for radio stations. Since the resurgence of radio after the TV-induced doldrums of the 1950's, many radio stations have built highly specialized, loyal audiences based on limited but specific programing. Again, standard market data lags behind. To give them the kind of material they find usable requires local study, research, and a substantial rewriting of the standard radio handout.

In the same fashion, the rural weekly, small in circulation, and the farm-oriented radio station, with a low rating, often hold sway over an intensely loyal audience. To a surprising extent, their audiences overlap the ones we're missing.

As a result, the one-release-reaches-all-media mentality has to be abandoned. To do our job well, we have to match message to media in a method as sophisticated, in its own way, as the most highly specialized scientific agency.

Conventional media don't work. The plain fact is that this large part of the American population does not read the papers avidly, follow the news on TV or get predigested opinions from weekly news magazines. Instead, insulated by a whole complex of educational and environmental factors which we are in business to change, their information comes from far more direct and personal sources.

Many of the members of our audience have come to trust the information they get from neighborhood personalities as far more reliable than the press. The friendly neighborhood bartender or familiar laundromat operator frequently have much greater credibility than the most prestigious reporter or knowledgeable commentator.

While the more successful practitioners in the business of mass communications have become habitually dedicated to reaching thousands of people through relatively few outlets, the most successful community action agencies will become adept at reaching fewer people through many more outlets. The adaptation, painful as it may be, must be on our part, not on the part of our audience.

To the degree we can get information about our neighborhood centers and our programs into those channels of communication, we will have participation. It will inevitably be a process of experimentation; it will demand imagination and innovation on the part of community action directors and information specialists. It involves getting closer to the neighborhood, depending far more on the nonprofessionals in this profession and paying a great deal more attention to the laundromat than the library.

Many community action agencies have already developed promising techniques involving such varied operations as periodic meetings with bartenders, gospel singers in flatbed trucks. But, a whole sheaf of new approaches will have to come.

It's up to us to be heard on the telephone poles as well as on television, in the supermarket checkout line as well as on the radio. And simply because no one else has bothered to penetrate this "market" does not absolve—but rather intensifies—our obligation to get there.

OEO has an interest. It can do research, make suggestions and exchange experiences. But it will eventually be the information officer in the local community action agency who will, with colleagues around the country, put together the accepted textbook on new and imaginative ways of getting to the neglected audience. Without an exchange of information—without somebody's routine practice becoming someone else's exciting new idea—our problem will suffer from the same neglect that has left it the stepchild of commercial researchers.

Behind everything we do lies a hidden time bomb. The greater the gap between our communication with the routine audience and that which we create for our new audience, the more Americans might understandably say, "The poor don't care."

The concept of community action has been built on the opposite premise. But if we fail to get the word out to our audience of potential participants as well as the observers whose support we solicit, then we fail. If we fail to close the gap between traditional communication and the people whose problems promoted our existence, then we would but repeat the error of the man who questioned the U.N. because it has so many people in it who speak foreign languages.

Generally, the mass media—press, radio, TV, magazines—has given an unusual amount of attention to war on poverty programs. Most Americans, whose understanding and support we so vitally need in every community, are beginning to know what we are about and can be expected to respond accordingly. But that support has to be matched—just as does the success of the initial communications job—by support and involvement of the people served.

Nobody supports something, even for his own good, if he never heard of it.

"NOBODY WANTS WELFARE"—A PROFILE OF NEWARK'S BLAZER TRAINING PROGRAM

(By Ralph Matthews, Jr.)

Walter C. Dawkins, a young grassroots organizer of the poor, hates public welfare handouts as much as any such conservative. His program to get people off relief into steady jobs should be good news to taxpayers.

Dawkins, 31, is founder-director of Newark's Blazer work training project, an experiment in poverty that takes people directly from the welfare rolls—people previously considered unemployable—and trains them quickly to get jobs that will hold firm despite increased automation.

Blazer is a part of Newark's growing catalog of weapons in the war against poverty and is financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The first 200 students have begun classes. Local sociologists are hopeful Blazer will help people at the bottom of the economic barrel move toward meaningful work and life styles.

The Blazer project is nationally significant for two very compelling reasons:

It has the potential to slash public welfare expenditures;

It is a program conceived, organized, and administered by the poor themselves.

Both premises make it a program to be studied closely by community action agencies throughout the States and territories.

"WILD MAN"

Walter Dawkins, a wiry, energetic young man, is the spirit of Blazer. Critics call him the "wild man of poverty." His champions consider him a metropolitan St. George slaying dragons of apathy which lurk along the trail of the frontlines of the poverty war.

A former schoolteacher and social worker, Dawkins knows firsthand of the denigrating effect of public welfare on people who want to lift themselves into the mainstream of American affluence. He frankly recalls being a welfare baby himself in his hometown of East St. Louis, Ill.

"My mother was a recipient of welfare," he recalled, "as my father died when I was 2 years old." Mrs. Dawkins, a woman of spirit, determined to kick the public assistance pattern as soon as she could. By the time Dawkins entered elementary school he and his brothers were free and clear of it although he was a witness to what welfare did to other families much of his life thereafter.

"My hometown has always been a slum area," he said. "It was compared with Chicago and often called "Little Chicago." I was a part of all the street fights, the gangs, the athletic teams and the successes and failures of the academic system along with all the other guys.

"I lived in the East End, called Polack Town, a section akin to Harlem in New York. Everything went in Polack Town. We lived in a building called 'The Brick,' one long building 2 stories high with 20 families of poor people."

LIKE ZOMBIES

Dawkins remembers with a trace of bitterness that many of his neighbors lived from welfare check to welfare check but seethed with a quiet rage all the while because "nobody wants welfare, not really, it's like being a zombie, you just sit and wait for transfusions in shape of a check in the mail."

The welfare check, Dawkins grew up recognizing, was simply a way of keeping the brakes on people, a form of social control, an emasculation of spirit, a confession of the community's failure to meet its responsibility to the more disadvantaged of its members.

"When we designed the Blazer work training program," he said, "We kept in mind that there is a hard kernel of pride and a need for self-respect in even the most economically deprived people. Blazer is working to reach that spirit in poor people, to break through their surface apathy and help them help themselves get moving."

Prior to the Blazer work program, initiated last fall, Dawkins had operated a volunteer agency (the Blazer Youth Council) that worked to rehabilitate members of Newark's toughest teenage crime gangs.

When his volunteer agency presented the work training project to city and Federal Governments, Dawkins found that while OEO was ready to get the idea launched immediately, he felt the city was dragging its feet on coming up with funds to match the OEO grant.

Rather than wait for redtape to unsnarl, Dawkins with characteristic zest, rallied his friends, associates (including some of those same tough teens from the Blazer Youth Council) and hit the sidewalks of Newark on a fund-raising campaign.

Blazer volunteers went into pool rooms, saloons, set up shop on poverty area street corners, were everywhere in fact. In short order, they raised the necessary money and the Blazer work training project was ready to begin.

"The war on poverty is too crucial to this society's survival for us to wait around," Dawkins said of his crash collection. "We just took our program to the people of Newark and they came up with the money."

COMMON TOUCH

This sense of purpose and urgency that Dawkins inspires confounds a lot of people in Newark used to more conventional approaches. It also has caused several collisions between Dawkins and an assorted host of enemies. But even his most adamant foes grudgingly admit that Walter is a genuine grassroots leader. "Oh, Walter has the common touch all right," a former Blazer Council member has commented. "He is one of the few intellectuals in the country, perhaps, who can completely relate to the poor. He is at home in a gospel church or a teenage rock and roll record hop or a slum tavern, and he can get people to move * * * without them feeling he's ever talking down to them. He can motivate people that traditional social workers can never communicate with * * * the only thing is he is so keen on his work sometimes he leaves others with the feeling he has a patent on poor people and no one else has his expertise."

A friend explains Dawkins' drive this way: "His whole life these last 5 years has been Blazer, first with helping delinquents and now with training folks to get jobs. Most of this time he has worked without money—don't ask me how he kept above water—but now that his dream is reality, he takes a stark view of the world. With him, either you are a friend of Blazer or an enemy. Walter doesn't feel he has time to make subtle distinctions."

For a time a will struggle of classic proportions seemed to be shaping up between an impatient Dawkins and cautious officials of the U.S. Community Corps, Newark's central antipoverty agency. UCC had the responsibility for seeing that Blazer met all administrative procedures required under the Economic Opportunity Act.

One UCC staffer who worked closely with Blazer during its founding, after a set-to with Walter in January, reported wearily: "We have no doubt Dawkins is a brilliant program planner, it is a case of his seeing our view as we are trying to see his. I keep suggesting that he leave the administrative details to us so he will be free to direct the program but he hangs right in there with us." For a time, it seemed even an innocuous item such as hand soap for the lavatories might have touched on a crisis had Dawkins decided liquid soap better met the needs of the poor.

STUDENT UNITY

This was the same week Dawkins had led his new student body through a Blazer assembly meeting which ended with the students voting half of the program's executive committee out of office. It was a wild, exhilarating session which shook local community action leaders into an all-day series of meetings on what to do with Dawkins but ended with the students, all hard-core unemployables, unified, proud, and determined to make Blazer a success. "This was the first time in their lives," Dawkins said afterward, "that many of these people had ever taken a stand or participated in a democratic meeting, and actually saw that their vote could count."

The issue on which Dawkins brought his new students together was fundamental to his concept of motivating the poor. "Some of our council members were middle class, cautious; and the students sensed they would take forever to get the project moving. Remember these students are at a do-or-die point in their lives. If they don't get training for jobs through Blazer they know it's the end of the line for them. They want to make good, it's their last chance. So what happened was they voted out the slowpokes."

These initial, perhaps necessary skirmishes, have lost their steam. The Blazer project is settled in its workshop building in central Newark and the program is moving.

Just how is Blazer structured?

Dawkins explains it this way: "The Blazer Coordinating Council of Youth Development is a nonprofit corporation composed of three distinct bodies: an executive committee which is an advisory group to the trustees and their membership. A trustee board and the third body, the general membership comprised of people from the Newark community at large interested in this city's poor.

"This is the parent body which created a work-training project for a student body of 200 persons from the rolls of city welfare. These students, all adults, are being trained in four basic areas, upholstery, floor polishing and surfacing, automotive repair, and food preparation.

"Each of these four training areas is further subdivided. This means simply that upholstery, for example, has in it furniture upholstery, slipcovers, and drapes. And so on. For each trade.

SURVEYED JOBS

To determine what kinds of vocational training would most quickly provide jobs for Blazer students, the Blazer staff, Dawkins said "went to the Area Redevelopment Corp. in the city of Newark and checked their statistical data on job openings and fields where workers cannot be automated out of jobs * * * in fields of constant need.

Federal and State job protection data was also studied. Dawkins is keenly aware of the implications of automation and feels that in training people for jobs that "will hold up at least into the 1970's, is as far as anyone in vocational education dare go."

The Blazer workers then checked their job data with local industries and the final four-trade curriculum is a result of agreements on jobs are available by both labor experts and employers.

Once Dawkins and his staff knew what the labor market was like they tackled the problem of teaching people who had been able to hold steady jobs in the past or had unfortunate schooling experience if any schooling at all.

His own experience as a community organizer had much earlier led him to conclude that most adult training programs for hard-core unemployed people had failed in the past because of what he calls "a national mistake."

"Right here in the city of Newark," he said, "at a much earlier stage of the antipoverty program this national mistake was illustrated by the fact that the people who got the money and the facilities to train poor people were always people out of the community, people downtown so to speak.

When the poor communities looked around it was the same downtown people getting the facilities and then saying to the poor come to us, we will teach you and get you to read. For the poor it was the same old question of "those people" again.

NATIONAL MISTAKE

The mistake really was in not housing the program right within the community where the poor could participate.

Dawkins is very firm in his insistence that traditional social workers and educators have failed miserably in their missions.

"If you are really going to involve the poor on various levels, the communications barriers must be broken down. We felt and saw that this was a part of what the Government was saying when it launched the war on poverty and traditionally (in education and other social areas) there has been a complete lack of communications. In Newark and elsewhere."

And so Blazer's second concern was a teaching method that would really communicate with poor people, involve and not patronize them at any step of the process.

The answer: assembling a staff of teachers and teacher aids that in the director's words: "were from the poor areas who use the same terminology and had the same broad basic understanding of what poverty really is."

Dawkins' theory that qualified instructors could be found at the grassroots level was quickly borne out as Blazer under guidelines set down as UCC began screening applicants for teaching jobs.

For instance, we found a mechanic who had been on the rolls of the welfare for a year but who had something like 20 years' experience in automobile repair. When the man came to see us as a student he was rescreened by our staff, sent before the personnel committee, and won a job as assistant instructor.

SET AN EXAMPLE

His educational background might be no more than sixth-grade level but he does have 20 years of experience in a specific field. With a capable instructor above him, he has a real chance to help himself get off relief and stay off and set an example for students, poor like himself.

The Blazer Student Council is the dynamic that Dawkins believes will insure success of the program and he rates this as importantly as curriculum and qualified instructors.

You can't just take in 200 people on welfare and say all of a sudden we're going to make you employable and give you a job. That cannot be the scope. If you begin there you are finished from the start.

The No. 1 thing is to straighten out the students' psychological approach to his problems. That's the purpose of the Blazer Student Council. Through the therapy of meeting with other people he gains a self-inspiration and determination to do for himself, to never go back on the rolls of welfare. When he gets to this point and looks to see how far down he was before beginning classes and participating in the council, the student begins to go through a thought process like this: "Well there ain't no need for me to be on welfare in the first place. I can do a job, and I don't want to be on welfare in the second, and when this is over I'll never go back."

By giving students a say in their destinies through the council, it is Dawkins' theory, self-esteem is raised to the necessary level where "when you place him on a job, his chances of staying are 80-percent greater than if you just train him."

NEXT CRISIS

The Blazer School has been operational 3 months now. The real test of the concept, Dawkins realizes, comes when the first wave of students are placed on jobs.

Will some students fall into past patterns of ineffectiveness? Absenteeism, drinking, and other syndromes of unemployables?

"You can't end it with students once they get jobs," was his answer. "Your program must include a well-thought-out followup. Again the Blazer Council is most important. When a student leaves school his council membership continues. He is expected to come back to membership meetings, to donate money to the matching funds and counsel other students who will follow his same training path.

"This is a vital and healthy relationship. The graduate student, often for the first time in his life, has a measure of progress to be proud of. This pride developed through Blazer keeps him on the job and he returns to show the membership his self-sufficiency. 'Look, I ain't off the job and I ain't back on the rolls of welfare, I'm doing what you really set out to help me do.' "

OPEN DOOR POLICY

To that end the Blazer staff works long hours, after classes counseling students with problems of home and family that would affect the quality of their classwork unless resolved. Dawkins and instructors are quick to note any sign of faltering by any student and an open door policy is in force with all professionals on staff.

"We want every student to feel sure that any time anything bugs him we are here to listen, advise, and act."

As a case in point, Dawkins told of a student, father of a teenage boy, who was obviously troubled.

"He came to me. I didn't go to him. That's one of our fundamentals that students' problems don't go unheard. Once they find out you mean business they bring all kinds of problems, from soup to nuts.

"Anyway this man suspected his boy was on narcotics or getting close to it. So we immediately moved to act. We talked him into night school, but he's got to do something during the day and he should be in the Neighborhood Youth Corps or some local training component which is what we are trying to crash through by tomorrow."

It is this concern for each student, finally, that is the foundation Blazer hopes to build from.

Dawkins, unruffled, as enthusiastic as ever, envisions a time when other communities would want to share the knowledge and approaches now being shaped in Blazer, Newark.

"It is the hope and scope of the Blazer program that it might become a national training academy of the poor. I'd hope that some of the staff members who made this program go, after we give the Government a chance to look at it and see where it works or fails in various areas, would go to other communities to help set up similar programs."

INTERNATIONALIZING OUTER SPACE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the House that the President has taken a very progressive and forward step when he has instructed our Ambassador to the United Nations to approach the rest of the world through the United Nations in trying to establish a barrier against the use of the moon or outer space as a place of contest for the nations of this world. He has asked that these areas be internationalized and we follow in space exploration that principle which has been established already with respect to the use of nuclear weapons.

This is a great step forward by the President, and we in the House should appreciate it, and commend him for it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 13, on account of official business.

Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 13, on account of official business.

Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 13, on account of official business.

Mr. HUTCHINSON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 9, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for May 9 through May 16, on account of official business.

Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD to include extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BERRY.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1308. An act to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2387. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of determinations relating to deferment of the 1966 annual construction charge payment due the United States from the Okanogan Irrigation District, the repayment contracting entity for the Okanogan project, Washington, pursuant to the provisions of 73 Stat. 584; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2388. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of an order entered in the case of a certain alien found admissible to the United States pursuant to the provisions of section 212 (a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2389. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 5, 1966, the following bills were reported on May 6, 1966:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9824. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended, without amendment (Rept. No. 1479). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 13558. A bill to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, registration of certified public accountants, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 14205. A bill to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 13703. A bill to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1611. An act to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No, 1483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2263. An act to establish a traffic branch of the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges; with amendments (Rept. No. 1484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 9, 1966]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 846. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14732, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1485). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9167. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 14810. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, to authorize additional amounts for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems; without amendment (Rept. No. 1487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITE of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7402. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Chamizal Treaty National Memorial in the city of El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1160. An act to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2307. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin project, Washington; with amendments (Rept. No. 1488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1483. A bill for the relief of the John V. Boland Construction Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido; with amendments (Rept. No. 1490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11940. A bill for the relief of Fred M. Osteen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12315. A bill for the relief of Anthony A. Calloway; without amendment (Rept. No. 1492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12884. A bill for the relief of John R. Sylvia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7026. A bill for the relief of Nathan Levine; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11253. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 1495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14922. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a national scenic rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 14923. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 14924. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 14925. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 14926. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 14927. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1950, authorizing the Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 14928. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 14929. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 14930. A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 14931. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14932. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to representation elections the results of which have been changed by unfair labor practices; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 14933. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 14934. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for highway safety research and development, certain highway safety programs, a national driver register, and a highway accident research and test facility; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 14935. A bill in relation to rates of toll and disposition of income by the city of East St. Louis, Ill., and the city of Chester, Ill., covering the bridges constructed by said cities across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY (by request):

H.R. 14936. A bill to authorize the acquisition, transfer, conveyance, and lease of certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 14937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny deduction for rent, taxes, or interest incurred for the use or occupancy of an industrial plant financed by tax-exempt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14938. A bill to authorize the Department of State through the Agency for International Development to encourage and assist colleges and universities in the establishment, strengthening, and maintenance of programs on foreign development and for their provision of research, education, training, advisory and technical assistance, directly or in cooperation with foreign universities, in connection with programs of assistance to developing nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14939. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 14940. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 14941. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14942. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 14943. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14944. A bill to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 906), as amended, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 14945. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 14946. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14947. A bill to amend title I of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 14948. A bill to amend the charter of the Disabled American Veterans to provide for an annual audit of its accounts by the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 1138. Joint resolution to establish a commission which shall conduct on the Capitol Grounds a program depicting historical events by means of son et lumière; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 1139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the Supreme Court to declare any provision of law unconstitutional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 634. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Con. Res. 635. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLE:

H. Con. Res. 636. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H. Con. Res. 637. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H. Con. Res. 638. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Res. 847. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed transfer of the Army and Air Force Exchange Services from New York City; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

469. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the removal of restrictions on the movement of merchandise in highway vehicles on Alaska and British Columbia ferries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

470. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the preservation of Morro Rock as a historical site, natural landmark, and public park; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

471. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the construction of experimental fish protein concentrate plants; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

472. Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Federal center for research into the cause, prevention, control, and treatment of alcoholics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

473. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to the integrated development of the beneficial uses of the waters of the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14949. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nguong Thi Tran (formerly Nguyen Thi Nyuong, A13 707-473 D/3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

386. By the SPEAKER: Petition of International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, San Jose, Calif., relative to situs picketing legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

387. Also, petition of Building and Construction Trades Council, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to situs picketing legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

Bishop Paul V. Galloway, Arkansas area of the Methodist Church, Little Rock, Ark., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, we ask Thy care for these who are committed to Thee and our Nation.

Give them wisdom, great faith, and creativeness. Bless them, their families, those who work in their offices, and the States from which they come.

Let the light of Thy presence be upon them and within them. Bless our President and Vice President, our Congress and all who give themselves to our Government and institutions. Bless our men and women in the armed services at home and abroad—and all forces of righteousness, reconciliation, and redemption.

Help us to know that Thou art here and that Thy concern is for every person in every land.

On land and sea, and in sky and hearts may Thy name be revered and our people united in purpose and direction.

In Thy love and life we would live and serve now and always. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARRIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 5, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 5, 1966, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) to provide for the designation of the week of May 8–May 14, 1966, as National School Safety Patrol Week.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 437)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Seven months ago, Public Law 89–10, providing massive aid to improve elementary and secondary education, went into effect. At that time we called upon leaders of education in States and local school districts to translate this financial assistance into educational services for the millions of disadvantaged children in our schools: the children who desperately need additional attention if they are to overcome the handicaps of poverty.

I am happy to transmit to you the first report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Their comments on the progress which has been achieved by States and local schools reveal that educators from all levels of government are working together to provide equal educational opportunities for all.

I am particularly encouraged by the major focus of activities identified in the report: to improve language skills in the early years. Nothing could be more fundamental than this work in assisting children who have been denied normal educational opportunities through poverty or neglect.

The commission members have not failed to point out areas in the program that need additional attention. I have pledged that every effort will be made to meet these problems—and I am confident that the Congress will join in these efforts.

We have begun a major campaign to solve a longstanding problem. The first year of this work has proved that we are on the right road, but we still have far to go.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1966.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1308) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1107, H.R. 13365.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSAL OF METALLURGICAL GRADE CHROMITE FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13365) to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1143), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This measure would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 885,000 short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite ore now held in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national and supplemental stockpiles except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of metallurgical grade chromite ore is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the ore is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite ore by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The material to be disposed of is excess to stockpile needs. The bill as submitted to the Congress would have permitted the disposal of 2,300,000 short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite (chromite ore equivalent) which would include ferrochromite. The House of Representatives in considering the measure considered it unwise to authorize the disposal of ferrochromite at this time as such a release would be completely disruptive to the market. The committee concurs with the House in the regard.

The total inventory of metallurgical-grade chromite (chromite ore equivalent) is 6,244,712 short dry tons. The present stockpile objective is 2,970,000 short dry tons. The excess of 3,274,712 short dry tons consists of 985,646 short dry tons in the DPA inventory and 2,300,000 short dry tons covered by H.R. 13365; 885,000 short dry tons of the excess is in ore form, and the balance is in the form of ferrochromium.

Metallurgical grade chromite

Metallurgical grade chromite is an ore consumed in the metallurgical industries, principally for steel products. The ore is hard and lumpy, with a small amount of fines, varying in color from browned-black to black.

The ore is converted to ferrochromium and chromium metal which in turn are used to produce alloy steel and other alloying agents. The addition of chrome to steel imparts qualities of hardness, tensile strength, and resistance to heat and corrosion. Chrome is essential for certain types of stainless and alloy steel, having important uses in the petroleum and chemical industries, and in internal combustion engines and marine equipment.

The United States is dependent upon imports for the supply of this ore. The major sources of supply for the United States are Turkey and Southern Rhodesia.

The average acquisition cost of chromite ores and concentrates was $50.55 per short dry ton. The current market value is about $30 per short dry ton.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the metallurgical grade chromite now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF ACID GRADE FLUORSPAR FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13367) to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1144), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This measure would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 32,000 short tons of acid grade fluorspar in lump form now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of acid grade fluorspar is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the ore is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal of acid grade fluorspar in lump form by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

As indicated above the acid grade fluorspar in lump form covered by this measure is excess to the stockpile requirements. The bill as submitted to the Congress would have permitted the disposal of 236,773 short dry tons of acid grade fluorspar now held in the national and supplemental stockpiles. Most of the acid grade fluorspar in the stockpile is a concentrate which has been finely ground. The House of Representatives, in considering this measure, became convinced that the domestic fluorspar industry was suffering a severe economic strain. Mere authorization for disposal would tend to further depress the domestic industry. The House report further states that there was industry consensus, however, that the release of acid grade fluorspar in lump form would satisfy the current shortage of this type of fluorspar in the domestic market and would not upset the domestic fluorspar industry. The Senate committee agrees with the views of the House in this regard.

The total inventory of acid grade fluorspar held by General Services Administration now stands at 1,144,090 short dry tons. The present stockpile objective is 540,000 short dry tons, and in addition, 350,000 short dry tons have been credited to the metallurgical grade fluorspar objective. The excess of 254,090 short dry tons consists of 17,317 short dry tons in the Defense Production Act inventory and 236,773 short dry tons covered by H.R. 13367.

Acid grade fluorspar

Acid grade fluorspar is a crystalline or massive granular mineral containing at least 97 percent calcium fluoride. Except for a very limited supply of cryolite and the very low fluorine content in phosphate rock, fluorspar is the only source of fluorine for industrial use. Most of the acid grade fluorspar in the stockpile is a concentrate which has been finely ground.

Although the United States has been the world's largest fluorspar producer, domestic consumption far exceeds output and Mexico (principally), Italy, and Spain are the main foreign sources.

Acid grade fluorspar is used to make hydrofluoric acid. Important products requiring larger quantities of hydrofluoric acid in their production are aviation gasoline and synthetic cryolite. It is also used as a flux in the melting of aluminum and magnesium during alloying and in the refining of scrap aluminum and magnesium.

The average acquisition cost of the stockpile inventories of acid grade fluorspar was $46.69 a short dry ton. The current market price is about $45 a short dry ton.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the acid grade fluorspar now held in the national stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF BISMUTH FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13368) to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1145), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 212,300 pounds of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of bismuth is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national and the supplemental stockpiles is excess to requirements and not because the bismuth is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the disposal proposed is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of bismuth covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of bismuth held by GSA now stands at 3,812,315 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 3,600,000 pounds. The excess of approximately 212,300 pounds is covered by H.R. 13368.

Information on bismuth

Bismuth is a brittle, hard, and easily powdered metal. It is produced as a byproduct from the smelting and refining of copper and lead ores. Peru, Mexico, Bolivia, Canada, and the Republic of Korea are the major suppliers of bismuth in ores and concentrates. Several other countries, such as Japan and the United States, are large producers of refined metals from imported raw materials. It is used for low-melting (fusible) alloys such as are found in a number of safety devices as plugs for compressed gas cylinders, automatic sprinkler systems, firedoor releases, electrical fuses, and ammunition solders. The other major use of bismuth is as an ingredient in the manufacture of a wide variety of medicinal compounds.

The average acquisition cost of the stockpile inventories of bismuth was $2.134 per pound. The current market price is approximately $4 per pound.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the bismuth now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF PHLOGOPITE MICA FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13371) to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1146), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately $3,765,000 pounds of phlogopite mica splittings and approximately 205,640 pounds of phlogopite block mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of phlogopite mica is based on a determination that the quantities of this material in the national and the supplemental stockpiles are excess to requirements and not because the phlogopite mica is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantities of phlogopite mica covered by this bill are excess to stockpile requirements. The total inventory of phlogopite mica (block and splittings) held by GSA is 5,288,239 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 1,317,000 pounds. The excess of approximately 3,970,000 pounds is covered by H.R. 13371.

Information on phlogopite mica

Mica is a group name for a number of minerals which have a characteristic structure permitting easy separation into thin tough sheets. Phlogopite mica is softer than muscovite but will withstand higher temperatures. Special uses for phlogopite block mica include insulating material in soldering irons and high-temperature coils, liners in proximity fuses, transformers, and heater elements. Phlogopite mica is obtained from the Malagasy Republic and Canada.

The average acquisition cost of the phlogopite mica planned for disposal was $1.36 per pound for the block and $1.06 per pound for the splittings. The approximate current prices for the block range from $0.50 per pound to $1.90 per pound, duty paid. There are no published prices for splittings.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the phlogopite mica now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF MUSCOVITE MICA FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13373) to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1147), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 6,772,000 pounds of muscovite block mica, approximately 528,000 pounds of muscovite film mica, and approximately 22,666,000 pounds of muscovite mica splittings from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of muscovite mica is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national and supplemental stockpiles is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of muscovite mica covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of muscovite mica (block, film, and splittings) held by GSA is 66,581,281 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 30,200,000 pounds. The excess of 36,381,281 pounds consists of 29,966,000 covered by H.R. 13373 and the remaining excess is from the Defense Production Act inventory.

Information on muscovite mica

Mica is a group name for a number of minerals which have a characteristic structure permitting easy separation into thin, tough sheets. They vary from clear to black. Ruby muscovite has the best dielectric properties. Block mica is the thicker sections ranging from seven-thousandths of an inch upward. Film is split from block to a variety of predetermined thickness ranges. Mica splittings are thin layers of mica with a maximum thickness of twelve ten-thousandths of an inch, split by hand from block mica. There are three principal forms of strategic mica (block, film, and splittings) and a number of qualities and grades.

Mica is used as dielectric supporting elements in electronic tubes, mica capacitors as insulation in motors and other electrical apparatus. Splittings are easily bonded to cloth and glass fabric or build up into plates of any desired thickness or dimensions. Tape and cloth made from mica splittings are used as insulation for field coils and transformers and other electrical coils and devices operating at elevated temperatures.

The principal sources of mica are India and Brazil.

The approximate acquisition price per pound of muscovite block mica in the national and supplemental stockpiles was $2.60; for film, $5.60; for splittings, $1.04. The present market value per pound, depending on quality and grade range from $2 to $9 for block; $1 to $12 for film; and is $1.20 for splittings.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the muscovite mica now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF RHODIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13578) to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1148), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 618 troy ounces of rhodium (Rh content) from the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of rhodium is based on a determination that there is no longer a need to stockpile this material and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The 618 troy ounces of rhodium (Rh content) covered by this bill consists of the entire supply of this material in the stockpile as there is no longer a need to stockpile this material.

Information on rhodium

Rhodium is a metal of the platinum group and is intermediate between platinum and iridium with respect to hardness, toughness, and melting point. It maintains freedom from surface oxidation.

Rhodium has a lower specific electrical resistance than platinum or palladium. Scientific instruments, jewelry, and precision instruments for the measurement of the physical properties of corrosive liquids are plated with this material. Electric contacts plated with rhodium are used for radio and audiofrequency circuits because of freedom from oxidation and low-contact resistance.

U.S. production of rhodium is limited. The primary sources of the material are the Republic of South Africa, Canada, and Soviet Russia.

This bill authorizes the disposal of approximately 618 troy ounces of rhodium now held in the national stockpile. This quantity includes 173 ounces of rhodium in sponge form and about 445 ounces of rhodium alloyed with platinum.

The approximate acquisition cost of the rhodium is about $126.54 per troy ounce. The current market price for rhodium in sponge form is reported at $197 to $200 per troy ounce. The platinum-rhodium alloy is in wire form and has no quoted market price.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the rhodium now held in the national stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF THORIUM FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13579) to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1149), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 3,500,000 pounds (thorium oxide content) of thorium nitrate from the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of thorium is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the supplemental stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of thorium covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of thorium nitrate (oxide content) held by GSA is 3,965,461, pounds. The present stockpile objective is 500,000 pounds. The excess of approximately 3.5 million pounds is covered by H.R. 13579.

Information on thorium

Thorium is used commercially with tungsten or nickel in electrodes in gas-discharge lamps. Some of its compounds are used in luminous paints and in flashlight powders. It is also compounded with nickel to produce high-temperature alloys. The Atomic Energy Commission is a significant user of thorium in the conversion of fissionable uranium. The chief sources of thorium nitrate are Brazil, India, Africa, and, to some extent, in the United States.

The average acquisition cost of the thorium inventory was $2.08 per pound of thorium nitrate. The current market price is about $1.86 per pound of thorium nitrate.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the thorium now held in the supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF AMOSITE ASBESTOS FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13580) to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1150), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 15,170 short tons of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of amosite asbestos is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national and supplemental stockpiles is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of amosite asbestos covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

Information on amosite asbestos

The total inventory of amosite asbestos held by GSA now stands at 55,170 short tons. The present stockpile objective is 40,000 short tons. The excess of 15,170 short tons is covered by H.R. 13580.

Asbestos is a name applied to a group of naturally fibrous minerals. Amosite asbestos is characterized by long, coarse, resilient fibers, which are difficult to spin. It is more resistant to heat than crocidolite or chrysotile. It varies in color from gray and yellow to dark brown with fiber lengths up to 6 inches. The Republic of South Africa is the only commercial source of amosite asbestos.

Amosite asbestos is used in manufacturing woven insulating felt, heat insulation such as pipe covering and marine insulation board. The long fiber amosite is used principally in the manufacture of thermal insulation.

The average acquisition cost of the amosite asbestos was $245 per short ton. The current market price is about $241 per short ton.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the amosite asbestos now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF RUTHENIUM FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13663) to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1151), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 15,000 troy ounces of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of ruthenium is based on a determination that there is no longer a need to stockpile this material. Consequently express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirements for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The 15,000 troy ounces of ruthenium covered by this bill consists of the entire supply of this material in the supplemental stockpile as there is no longer a need to stockpile this material.

Information on ruthenium

Ruthenium is a gray or silverlike, nonductile metal of the platinum group. It is alloyed with platinum and palladium to produce a hard corrosion-resistant metal. The high melting point, hardness, and brittleness limit the satisfactory working of ruthenium mechanically.

United States production of ruthenium is limited. The primary sources of the material are the Republic of South Africa, Canada, and Russia.

The approximate acquisition cost of the ruthenium in the inventory was about $37.30 per troy ounce. The present market value is $55 to $60 per troy ounce.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the ruthenium now held in the supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF VANADIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13774) to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1152), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 6,450 short tons of vanadium (V content), and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of vanadium is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of vanadium covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of vanadium (V content) held by GSA is 7,865 short tons. The present stockpile objective is 1,400 short tons. The excess of approximately 6,450 short tons is covered by H.R. 13774.

Information on vanadium

Vanadium is a pale gray metal with a silvery luster. It occurs in combination with other minerals or metals, including uranium and phosphate rock. It readily alloys with steel. When added to steel it toughens and strengthens it—forming hard carbides which are retained at high temperatures. Vanadium increases tensile strength without lowering ductility.

The greatest percentage of all vanadium is consumed by the steel industry in the manufacture of high-strength structural steels, tool steels, and wear-resistant cast iron. It is also used in combination with other alloying materials such as nickel and aluminum.

U.S. vanadium ore is mined principally in the Colorado Plateau as a coproduct of uranium. Other sources in the United States are South Dakota, New Mexico, Idaho, and Utah. Foreign sources of supply are Finland, Republic of South Africa, and South-West Africa.

The vanadium for disposal is stockpile quality material in the form of vanadium pentoxide. The approximate acquisition cost of the vanadium pentoxide inventory was $1.18 per pound. The average price received for similar vanadium pentoxide sold by GSA in February of this year was approximately $1.22 per pound.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the vanadium now held in the national stockpile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for assuring expeditious Senate action in these stockpile proposals. Their vitally important nature falls squarely within the national interest. These two Members of this body deserve a great deal of credit for giving the measures swift, yet full committee consideration and for seeing that successful action would be achieved today. To both go our thanks for their continuing excellent work in this field.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, U.S. Army, to be a lieutenant general.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, to be lieutenant general on the retired list.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service and in the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

APPOINTMENT OF THE HONORABLE BERNARD BOUTIN AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in public statements today, I have commended the appointment of the Honorable Bernard Boutin as Administrator of the Small Business Administration. President Lyndon B. Johnson announced his selection over the weekend and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business with a vital interest in the stability and health of the smaller businesses of West Virginia and the Nation, I am gratified.

In my statement through West Virginia news media, I declared that I would urge the Senate to act promptly to confirm the appointment of Mr. Boutin, because his organizing ability and leadership talents are needed by the Small Business Administration.

Mr. President, I do urge early action on confirmation of the executive nomination of the gentleman from New Hampshire whom President John F. Kennedy brought into the Federal Government as Administrator of the General Services Administration. In that position, Mr. Boutin performed vigorously and capably.

After a period of return to private enterprise, Mr. Boutin was brought back into Government, President Johnson having appointed him Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, where his performance was of high quality.

In my Public Works Committee and Labor and Public Welfare Committee duties—and in my service as a Senator from West Virginia—I have been privileged to work cooperatively with Bernie Boutin in both his GSA and OEO assignments.

I feel that President Johnson made a wise decision in selecting him to head the vital Small Business Administration.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the national commander, Civil Air Patrol, Ellington Air Force Base, Tex., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1965, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION OF SAN JOSE, CALIF.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Human Relations Commission of the City of San Jose, Calif., relating to the granting of the right of collective bargaining to agricultural farm workers, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 3321. A bill for the relief of Patrick Quisenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 3322. A bill to declare that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3323. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of certain civilian guards at the U.S. Naval Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3324. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 3325. A bill to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONTOYA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 3326. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a Talented American Senior Corps; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 28, 1947, AS AMENDED

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended. This amendment will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

This proposed legislation is important to the cattle producers throughout the United States. Considerable work has been done to combat this problem, but much more is needed as we look to the future.

Let us review the status of the program as it stands today.

SOUTHEAST SCREW-WORM PROGRAM

In fiscal year 1958, a cooperative program to eradicate the screw-worm from the Southeast was initiated in the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. The major screw-worm eradication work was completed during fiscal year 1960 with great economic benefits to that region of the Nation. The primary source of spreading infestations each year to States north of Florida was the overwintering area in southern Florida. This area is surrounded on three sides by water and to the north by a climate which does not allow native screw-worms to survive the winter. The presence of these natural barriers against reinfestation contributed greatly to the success of the Southeastern eradication program.

When major eradication was completed in the Southeastern States it was necessary to protect them from reinfestation. A line of inspection stations was established for this purpose along the Mississippi River to prevent the movement of screw-worm infested animals from the Southwestern States. Maintenance of this protective line required as much as $750,000 annually in Federal funds without cost-sharing by State or local sources for 4 fiscal years—1961–64. The eradication of the screw-worm from the Southwest made it possible to discontinue this inspection line beginning in fiscal year 1965.

SOUTHWEST SCREW-WORM PROGRAM

Cooperative activities were inaugurated in February 1962 as a 3-year trial eradication program to eliminate screw-worm flies in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, and concurrently to determine the requirements and the economic feasibility for establishing and maintaining an artificial barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies along the Mexico-United States border that would prevent screw-worms from Mexico from entering screw-worm-free areas of Texas, New Mexico, and States north and east. This has been accomplished.

Maintenance of this barrier is considered to be a Federal responsibility because program operations must be conducted largely within the Republic of Mexico, with the consent of the Mexican Government. Because screw-worms from Mexico can readily migrate across the international boundary, the northern limits of the barrier zone must extend into southern Texas and New Mexico but the distance depends upon various seasonal and climatic influences. Moreover, the barrier is in the same category as the cattle fever tick buffer quarantine zone along the Rio Grande supported by Federal funds.

The Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1966 made available approximately $2,800,000 for maintenance of a barrier. The major cost-sharing requirement for maintenance of the barrier zone was eliminated from the appropriation language. However, in keeping with congressional intent, the cooperators are required to continue matching the cost of production, irradiation, and release of flies needed to eradicate outbreaks in the freed areas north of the barrier zone.

STATUS OF SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

In the fiscal year 1966 agricultural appropriation bill, Congress made available $1 million for the Federal share of full-year costs of a program to eradicate screw-worms in Arizona and California and to extend the screw-worm barrier west to the Pacific Ocean. The Conference Report No. 1186 on the bill stated that as much as $600,000 in matching funds would be provided by State or local sources, making a total of $1,600,000 for this extension of the screw-worm barrier program. The extended program was initiated with supplemental funds of $100,000 provided under the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965. These supplemental funds made it possible to start eradication activities in May 1965 at about the time of heavy screw-worm migrations from Mexico into the United States, thus preventing the usual screw-worm buildup in Arizona during the late spring. This favorable position made it possible to eradicate the native screw-worm population from Arizona and in California in one season. Even though there are areas where the pest can live all winter, not a single screw-worm was reported in Arizona between December 15, 1965, and March 23, 1966. Department scientists have just completed a thorough review of field data and have determined that a period of 11 weeks of freedom from screw-worms is sufficient to prove that the native population has been eradicated. Eradication has been accomplished when, after a period of absence of cases, any new cases which occur must be introduced from outside the eradicated areas.

PROGRAM OF FUTURE OPERATIONS

With the eradication of native screw-worm populations in Arizona and California, the sterile screw-worm fly drop has been concentrated further south in the barrier zone to reduce the heavy native screw-worm populations in northern Mexico south of Arizona and, thereby, further reduce the number of screw-worms that can migrate into Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and other States during the summer of 1966.

For maximum effectiveness the barrier zone from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean must be maintained as one operation. The maintenance of any portion of the barrier zone is dependent upon the proper maintenance of adjacent portions in order to protect all States.

The prospect of a continuing high annual cost to maintain New Mexico, Texas, and States to the north and east free from screw-worms, makes it essential to find means of reducing the cost and, at the same time, prevent the introduction of screw-worms into the United States. An extensive field survey of the situation is being conducted throughout the Republic of Mexico south of the existing artificial barrier zone as far as the Mexican-Guatemala border to determine the problems. Mexico is cooperating in this survey.

This survey is designed to obtain information not presently available relating to first, areas in Mexico favorable to screw-worm breeding; second, natural population densities during different seasons of the year; third, favorable resting areas and dispersal patterns; fourth, varying husbandry practices in different areas of Mexico; and fifth, economic losses in Mexico.

Preliminary results of the survey confirm our earlier opinion that eradication of screw-worms from Mexico is feasible and that an effective barrier can be maintained across the narrow part of Mexico at a fraction of the cost of the present location. After completion of the survey a proposed program, with estimated cost, will be developed for consideration by the two Governments.

The Department does not have authority to cooperate with Mexico in screw-worm eradication. Under Public Law 8, Congress authorized the Department to cooperate with Mexico in the highly successful foot-and-mouth eradication program. The attached proposed amendment would extend this authority to include screw-worm eradication. With such authorization the Department would be authorized to consider a joint program proposal, after which discussions would be held with the Congress.

Mr. President, I request that this bill lie on the desk through Saturday, May 14, for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 3325) to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

AMENDMENT NO. 561

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in recent months it has come to my attention that important health, education, and welfare programs are being placed in jeopardy by an effort on the part of certain Federal officials to correct so-called racial imbalance in the States. I hasten to add that the Federal officials are not solely responsible because they are laboring under legislation, the provisions of which are vague and easily misunderstood. For this reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of an additional title to S. 3296, the administration's proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966. I request unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the ambiguities of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is necessary to avoid further submission of Federal officials to the pressures of outside forces which have compelled them to perform quasi-judicial functions and to allow them to concentrate on their statutory duty.

At the outset, I want to emphasize that this amendment is not intended to change the intent of Congress in enacting title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. On the contrary, it is designed to implement that intent. It is not designed to diminish the decisions of the Federal courts; rather it is designed to rely on those decisions in applying the sanctions of title VI. Nor is it designed to permit unlawful discrimination—it only assists in defining such discrimination.

My amendment would redesignate title VI of S. 3296 as title VII thereof, and redesignate sections 601 and 602 thereof as sections 701 and 702, respectively. Immediately after title V the following new title is inserted: title VI—Civil Rights Act amendment.

This amendment amends title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It would provide in section 606(a) that no funds can be withheld under any Federal program until a constitutional or statutory violation has been committed by the recipient of the benefits of such programs. Furthermore, such violation must be established by substantial evidence.

Subsection (b) provides simply that in making a determination with respect to alleged violations the particular Federal agency must follow the same procedural requirements as in the case of all other administrative adjudications. In the future, the recipient of such benefits must be accorded not only notice of the intention to withhold funds but also the opportunity to be heard and to present evidence in its own behalf.

Subsection (c) provides that in order to support a determination of discrimination it must be shown that there has been an affirmative intent to exclude or the necessary effect of exclusion of individuals from benefits on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

The purpose of this subsection is to negate the application of purely mechanistic and statistical criteria in the determination of discrimination.

Subsection (d) is a protective feature of the rights of potential beneficiaries and prohibits any Federal agency from exercising control over any school, hospital or other institution under the provisions of this title for any purpose other than to provide equal opportunity for access thereto by individuals without regard to race, color, or national origin. Furthermore, this subsection will insure that no class of individuals shall be deprived of the privilege of determining voluntarily whether or not to avail themselves of any benefit provided by any program or activity financed or partially financed by the Federal Government.

Section 601, which is the heart of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, would be left untouched by my amendment. It provides:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The remaining, implementing language of the title, however, brazenly transfers to the Executive the lawmaking power of Congress, and in doing so leaves the definition of discrimination and the application of sanctions to the uncontrolled discretion of agency officials. Congress has meekly surrendered the control of the Federal purse strings to the "equal opportunity officer" of each agency which he may use to effectuate his own notions of sociological progress.

And what has been the result? Not only have many officials predictably taken full advantage of their new power, but indeed some have usurped far more than was given them by the act.

I will mention three examples in North Carolina, only to illustrate how this legislative and judicial power which officials have assumed has resulted in the distortion of the original Federal programs they are charged with administering.

An adult basic education project in Charlotte, under which 1,400 Negroes and 170 whites in a total of 91 classes were being taught to read and write, was threatened with termination by the Office of Economic Opportunity because of alleged de facto segregation and so-called racial imbalance in two classes. This threat, without complaint from any local organization or individual, was made under the provisions of title VI.

In another North Carolina city, a hospital is at this moment under threat of losing Federal funds because nonwhites do not comprise as large a percentage of the patient load as is the percentage of the nonwhite population of the city. There is no allegation of discrimination or segregation in the staffing, in employment, or in the assignment of patients to wards and rooms. The only allegation is that the local populace does not become ill and choose the threatened hospital according to racial quotas.

Finally, there is the example of the Office of Education integration guidelines recently published for the South. There is no pretense in the language of the guidelines that their purpose is to prevent either discrimination or State-supported segregation. The whole thrust is so-called racial balance in pupil and teacher assignment according to percentages.

These mindless threats and fatuous guidelines cannot be remotely reconciled with the language or the legislative history of title VI or with the unlawful conduct—as defined by the courts—that was intended to be condemned. Two brief statements confirm this.

The best authority on congressional intent of any legislative act is the floor manager of the bill, and the floor manager of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was the then assistant majority leader, Vice President HUMPHREY. In developing the legislative history and articulating the intent of the act, the Vice President stated in 1964:

> While the Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration. The busing of children to achieve racial balance would be an act to effect the integration of schools. In fact, if the bill were to compel it, it would be a violation, because it would be handling the matter on the basis of race.
>
> The bill does not attempt to integrate the schools; it does attempt to eliminate segregation in the school systems.

The Vice President meant that the act was designed to eliminate segregation by legal compulsion. His words echoed those of the Federal courts as stated in Briggs against Elliott:

> It is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided * * *. It has not decided that the Federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the States. It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What is has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains.
>
> Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination.

But in not one of the instances I recounted in North Carolina did the Federal official responsible follow either the mandate of the 1964 act or the mandate of the Federal judiciary, or that of the specific poverty, education or health program he was to administer.

In Charlotte, the poverty program official stated his purpose was to "promote maximum cross-cultural experience," according to his euphemistic, sociological jargon. The education of hundreds of illiterates, 90 percent of them Negro, was to be sacrificed to the overriding imperative of so-called racial balance. His integration program was of more importance than his poverty program. It was not those who administer nor those who voluntarily teach who would have been hurt—only those to whom the ability to read and write would have been denied.

If the incidence of sickness among nonwhites does not increase sufficiently and more Negroes do not come to our hospitals, so that, thereby, funds are cut off, it is not the hospital trustees nor the staff that will be hurt. It will be the charity patients whom the hospital can no longer afford to treat and many of them are not white. Such tragically insane policies, which completely subvert the purpose of our health-care legislation, cause one to wonder if "all what's nailed down is comin' loose," as the Angel Gabriel said to the Lord in the great play, "Green Pastures."

Such a thought is surely confirmed by the new school desegregation guidelines. In them there is this:

> The racial composition of the professional staff of a school system, and of the schools in the system, must be considered in determining whether the students are subjected to discrimination in education programs.

And one education official, in explaining these obtuse rules, said:

> Race may have to be taken into account in future assignments so as to achieve an integrated balance of staff.

These statements fly blindly in the teeth of every Federal judicial decision concerning equal protection of the laws handed down in the last 20 years—decisions which state unequivocally that race cannot be a constitutionally permissible consideration in the enactment and enforcement of Federal and State laws. To our Office of Education, the Constitution is no longer colorblind. On the contrary, race is the primary consideration in the ground rules of its great drive for so-called racial balance. In ignoring the decisions of the courts, the guidelines equally ignore the intent of title VI. In fact, the sudden emphasis on so-called racial balance among classroom teachers violates the express language of section 604, which States that nothing in the title shall be construed to authorize action by any Federal agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

And, again, who is hurt when a school system fails to achieve a so-called balance satisfactory to Federal officials? Not the school board; not the teacher. The only ones who lose are the students whom the Federal aid to education was designed to help and who have no control whatsoever over assignment policies. Yet the Federal Government would deny to those legally helpless students the equal protection and equal assistance which Federal law provides to all others.

As education bills are brought up in this body, we are admonished time and again that Federal control of schools is not the intention. I have accepted the assurances in good faith. Just last week the Vice President assured us that Federal aid was intended to—and should—strengthen local school systems. I accept this too. But, Mr. President, this is not the current course of Federal aid, for the program has been twisted into a club held over the heads of all southern school officials and used to enforce Washington's notions of acceptable integration progress.

The amendment I introduce today will prohibit such nonsensical interpretations of their own power under title VI as some Federal officials have divined. It will accomplish this by defining section 601 according to the intent of Congress, and the decisions of the Federal courts; if it is adopted, title VI, in the future, will be implemented according to the intention of Congress and not the whim of bureaucrats who are not answerable to the people for their sociological follies.

If my amendment is adopted, every American will be subject to the same guidelines and can ascertain what those guidelines are. No longer will "discrimination" mean something different in 1 year from what it means in the next as is presently the case. No longer can the title be applied in one section of the country and not in another, without the protections of due process, as is presently the case. No longer will free choice be allowed by one department or agency and not by another, as is presently the case.

Mr. President, I ask all Senators to consider this amendment carefully, for I intend to press it. I am confident that fundamental fairness and equal justice require its enactment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 561) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

On page 35, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new title:

"TITLE VI—CIVIL RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENT

"SEC. 601. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 606. (a) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the termination of, or the refusal to grant or continue, any Federal financial assistance for any cause other than a violation of a provision of the Constitution, or an affirmative provision of a statute of the United States, which has been established by substantial evidence.

" '(b) No rule, regulation, or order which may result in the termination of, or the failure to grant or continue, any Federal assistance shall be placed in effect unless it has been adopted after proceedings taken in compliance with the requirements of sections 4–10, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003–1009).

" '(c) A determination under this title to the effect that discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin exists, has existed, or in the future may exist, in the administration of any program or activity shall require a showing by substantial evidence that in the administration or operation thereof conditions or requirements are, have been, or may be imposed with affirmative intent to exclude, or with the necessary effect of excluding individuals from participation in the benefits of such program or activity solely upon the ground of race, color, or national origin.

" '(d) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize any Federal department, agency, or officer to issue any rule, regulation, or order for the purpose or with the effect of—

" '(1) controlling or regulating the administration or operation of any school, hospital, or other institution for any purpose other than to provide equal opportunity for access thereto by individuals without regard to race, color, or national origin; or

" '(2) depriving any class of individuals of the privilege of determining voluntarily whether or not to avail themselves of any benefit provided by any program or activity, or of the facilities of any school, hospital, or other institution'."

On page 35, line 17, strike out "TITLE VI", and insert in lieu thereof "TITLE VII".

On page 35, line 19, strike out "SEC. 601", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 701".

On page 36, line 2, strike out "SEC. 602", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 702".

AMENDMENT TO S. 985, TRUTH IN PACKAGING

AMENDMENT NO. 562

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, consideration of the so-called truth-in-packaging bill, S. 985, has been prolonged in the Commerce Committee for a number of reasons, but it is now scheduled for further consideration at another executive session slated for tomorrow.

While there is, I believe, unanimity on the part of the committee that a bill is desirable to increase protection of the consumer and to make it more readily possible to judge comparatively between products in the same line through a rationalizing of weights and measures, there has not been unanimity on the question of how best to achieve this goal.

A central question revolves around the desirability of giving a mandate to such agencies as the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration to prepare and enforce certain regulations in this field. The proposal presently before us in a committee print modifies the original bill by incorporating the voluntary standards procedure of the Commerce Department as a means of setting standards, which would then be incorporated in regulations of the agencies.

This, I believe, is likely to fail of the objective intended, since the end result is very much the same except for the interjection of an intermediate step. The amendment I am proposing I offer as a bridge between the very real needs of consumers for an effective bill and the desire of some manufacturers for maintaining the status quo. It puts a greater responsibility on the voluntary standards procedure, which was revised last December and which incorporates provisions for an active consumer role in the process, a role which is pleasing to the President's Committee on Consumer Interests. Under the amendment, the voluntary standards procedure would be the mechanism by which standards are set, but it would also carry an element of compliance through a certification of the adhering industry people, who would be eligible to display a "seal of good packaging practice" as a result.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed amendment may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an explanation prepared for and already circulated to members of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 562) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beginning with line 12, page 7, strike out all to and including line 7, page 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) Whenever the promulgating authority determines with respect to a particular consumer commodity that the undue proliferation of the weights or quantities in which such commodity is being distributed for retail sale is shown to impair or to be likely to impair the ability of consumers to make comparisons of performance or value including price, the promulgating authority shall publish such determination and the findings upon which it is based in the Federal Register. Unless within sixty days after the publication of such determination as to a particular consumer commodity, a representative group of the producers or distributors of that consumer commodity shall have requested the Secretary of Commerce to develop a voluntary product standard for such commodity under the procedures of development of voluntary product standards established by the Secretary pursuant to section 2 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 272), the promulgating authority may request the Secretary of Commerce to develop such voluntary product standard. The promulgating authority shall through such of its employees as it shall designate participate in the development of the voluntary product standard for the particular consumer commodity.

"(e) Whenever any voluntary product standard has been established and published as to any consumer commodity, the Secretary of Commerce shall transmit to the appropriate promulgating authority (1) a copy of that standard, and (2) one or more lists setting forth the names and addresses of the manufacturers and distributors who have then or thereafter signified in writing their acceptance of that standard. Each manufacturer and distributor who has so signified his acceptance of that standard shall be entitled to display upon labels affixed to, and packages containing, that commodity a seal of good packaging practice which shall be designed by the Bureau of Standards. The introduction or delivery for introduction into commerce, by any person of any consumer commodity bearing a label, or contained in a package, upon which such seal of good packaging practice is displayed shall constitute for the purposes of this Act a violation of this Act if such commodity is not introduced or delivered for introduction into commerce in compliance with the voluntary product standard established for that commodity pursuant to subsection (d)."

The explanation presented by Mr. HARTKE is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF HARTKE AMENDMENT (S. 985)

ANALYSIS

1. Substitutes new section 5 (d) and (e) for section 5 (d), (e), (f), and (g) (committee print pp. 7–11).

2. Retains provision for promulgating authority to make a determination that ability of consumers to make comparisons is impaired by undue proliferation of weights and quantities, publish notice in Federal Register. Addition: Federal Register notice would include statement of basis on which findings are made as well as the notice itself.

3. If industry group does not request Secretary of Commerce for voluntary product standard procedure within 60 days, promulgating authority may do so. In any case, it will participate in development of the standards through its own designated employees.

4. When the voluntary standard has been set, the promulgating authority will receive from the Secretary of Commerce a copy of the standard and lists of those who have given written acceptance of it. These will be entitled to a "seal of good packaging practice" to be designed by the Bureau of Standards, for use on packages and in advertising.

5. The voluntary standards are not made a part of the promulgating authority regulations.

REASONS FOR THE AMENDMENT

1. The section 5 procedures, despite incorporation of the voluntary standards process, do not eliminate objections to the old 3(c) procedure but make them if anything less acceptable. It extends the number of stages through which the process extends, and ends with the same result of mandatory standards.

2. There is an inherent problem in the fixing of mandatory regulations revolving around the possibility of innovation. In order to comply with the regulations once fixed, a company might have to be much delayed in securing approval and thus lose the market advantage of innovation. This has been a major objection from the beginning.

3. Present section 5 procedures open the door to long legal processes which could delay for a great length of time the effective institution of the regulations. The voluntary process is quicker, potentially.

4. Instead of the mandatory "stick" the amendment offers as a compliance inducement a certification "carrot" in subsection (e).

5. The voluntary procedure is highly approved by Esther Peterson's office. Its revision last December has made it what they believe will be a much more effective instrument for consumer protection. Its consumer strength is indicated by these facts:

(i) Initiation of the request may be by "any group of manufacturers, distributors, consumers, users, or testing laboratories" as well as State or Federal agencies.

(ii) The Standard Review Committee, which comes into operation after setting of a standard, under the regulations (Federal Register, Dec. 10, 1965) includes by definition "consumers or users."

(iii) The procedure attains flexibility through a Standing Committee, following standard adoption, "to receive and consider proposals to revise or amend the standard" as changing situations may indicate. Its membership "shall have an equal balance among producers, distributors, users and consumers" together with "other important interests" such as State or Federal agencies.

6. Standards under the Procedures are voluntary, but the addition of the certification provision leads to signature by those who conform, a binding signature whose violation constitutes "a violation of this act." The result is, to a considerable degree, a self-enforcing standard.

MANDATORY PROVISION CAN BE ADDED IF VOLUNTARY PROCEDURE FAILS

1. Legislative oversight is provided (sec. 8) by reports from the Secretary of Commerce to Congress. (While not a part of the prepared amendment, it is suggested that the January report should cover the preceding calendar rather than fiscal year as now stated.)

Fear has been expressed that interminable delay might ensue after the calling of a standard-setting conference, failure for 2 or 3 or more years to do more than meet and fail to agree.

The January 1968, report to Congress should reveal whether this is happening. If so, it is then possible to amend the law to incorporate the deleted mandatory promulgating authority action now in the committee print.

2. There is no question now but that action is essential in the areas of consumer abuse. The affected companies are aware of this, and would prefer to act on their own even under the prod of aroused public opinion and the threat of Federal mandate than to have the standards set by predominantly Federal action. The procedure proposed in the amendment will preserve that freedom, but by indicating (as should be done in the committee report and legislative history) that stronger action will follow the failure of voluntary opportunity, together with the certifying provisions of (e), there will be provided very strong incentives for the success of the voluntary procedure.

SUMMARY

In sum, by adopting the proposed resolution we will effectively stimulate the consumer protection we seek, but will do so while retaining the greatest possible freedom—with the background threat of compulsion if this voluntary opportunity is not fulfilled by the industry people.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 3303, introduced by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and lying at the desk for cosponsors, be permitted to remain at the desk through Wednesday, May 11.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHOOL MILK BILL HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, most of my Senate colleagues are aware of the fight I have been making daily on the floor of the Senate to save the special milk program for schoolchildren. Every working Senate day since we convened in January I have spoken out on this floor against the administration's proposed 80 percent cutback in the school milk program.

This fight is definitely beginning to produce results. I was gratified when 67 of my fellow Senators joined me in sponsoring a bill to make the school milk program permanent. This legislation also increased Federal funding for the program.

I was heartened the week before last when the House of Representatives decided to appropriate $103 million for the program in the face of the administration's suggestion that funds for the program be cut by 80 percent to $21 million. Although I intend to work for an increase in that figure as a member of the Appropriations Committee's Agriculture Subcommittee this is an excellent beginning.

However, it is only a beginning. Unless my bill to make the school milk program permanent is passed, the present program will expire on June 30, 1967. Of course, it is possible that legislation similar to mine could be introduced in the 90th Congress—next year—considered and passed by both Houses, and signed into law by June 30, 1967. However we all know how difficult it is to expedite action at the start of a new Congress with its multitude of housekeeping chores.

This is why I am especially pleased to be able to report that the Holland Subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee will be holding hearings on this legislation on Thursday and Friday of this week. As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator Holland has been a valued friend of the school milk program over the years. He has consistently supported amendments that have been introduced in subcommittee to give the program enough funds to meet anticipated growth. Now he has once again shown his strong support for the school milk program by scheduling these hearings despite a very crowded and hectic schedule.

Mr. President, I hope that some of those cosponsoring S. 2921 will see fit to appear in person, or file a statement, in support of the legislation. This would be a great help in insuring speedy Senate action.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2512, THE NOLO CONTENDERE BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will begin hearings on S. 2512, the nolo contendere bill, on Wednesday, May 11. Additional hearings will be held later in the session. Those wishing to testify on the bill should notify Thomas C. Williams, assistant counsel for the subcommittee.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that hearings will be held on S. 3296, the administration's Civil Rights Act of 1966, and six other civil rights bills as follows:

S. 2923, providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes.

S. 3170, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain classes of removed cases and to provide injunctive relief in certain cases, and for other purposes.

S. 2846, to protect civil rights by providing that it shall be a Federal offense to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any of his civil rights; by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; and for other purposes.

S. 2845, to provide for the selection of qualified persons to serve as jurors in each U.S. district court without regard to their race or color.

S. 1654, to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, to specify the punishment if personal injury or death results from a violation of such sections.

S. 1497, to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence, and for other purposes.

The hearings are scheduled to begin June 2, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to the bills should communicate with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach has been invited to be the subcommittee's first witness. Other witnesses who will be invited will include Governors of the 50 States, Members of the Senate, public school officials, representatives of civil rights organizations, representatives of the real estate trade, experts in constitutional law, and other interested persons.

It is the subcommittee's intention to obtain the testimony of the best qualified experts representing a cross section of opinion on these bills. I am confident that, with careful consideration, we can compile a record upon which the Senate can base an intelligent debate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3169) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special program for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped spouses and children of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following concurrent resolutions and resolutions:

Authority of April 27, 1966:

S. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities: Mr. Aiken, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Church, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Symington, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

Authority of April 28, 1966:

S. Res. 252. Resolution extending birthday greetings to the Honorable Harry S. Truman upon the occasion of his 82d birthday: Mr. Aiken, Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bass, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hill, Mr. Holland, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Morse, Mr. Morton, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Smathers, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

Authority of May 3, 1966:

S. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution providing that no Federal agency take any action to discourage parity prices for any agricultural commodity: Mr. Curtis, Mr. Hruska, and Mr. Morton.

S. Res. 256. Resolution relating to United States denunciation of the Warsaw Convention: Mr. Bass, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

Statement by him regarding the artificial water recharge system of Minot, N. Dak.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech delivered at Widen (W. Va.) Arts and Crafts Fair, May 7, 1966.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE IN VIETNAM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the outstanding and truly excellent medical care being provided Army personnel in Vietnam under the high standards laid down by the Surgeon General, Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton.

The U.S. Army Medical Service in Vietnam has the mission of providing effective medical support to the U.S. Army troops and other U.S. military and civilian personnel in Vietnam.

In accomplishing this mission the U.S. Army is proving that it is one of the finest military medical teams in the world. Complete, close, and continuous medical care and treatment are provided to all supported military and civilian personnel. The members of this dedicated team of highly trained professional and technical personnel are located at all echelons of command from the forward combat areas to the most rearward enclaves, insuring that our most precious commodity, the individual soldier, is provided immediately responsive, effective care and treatment.

The soldier wounded in Vietnam has the benefit of methods and materials far superior to those available a few years ago. The mortality among the wounded reaching a hospital in Vietnam is the lowest in history. In January 1966, it was 2.8 percent, of which the majority occurred within 24 hours of hospitalization. The mortality rate after 24 hours was only 1.2 percent. These splendid data may be attributed to many factors involving planning, logistics, and professional capabilities. I will mention a few of these factors.

Helicopter evacuation is used for practically all of the casualties for transportation to a hospital. The more seriously wounded usually reach a hospital within 1 to 2 hours after wounding and have been known to reach a hospital in less than an hour. This is exceedingly important in the overall low mortality rate.

Whole blood is available in abundant quantity, not only in hospitals but in division clearing stations and at times even in battalion aid stations. Infusion of blood for the critically wounded continues during helicopter evacuation to a hospital.

There are adequate numbers of fully trained general and surgical specialty surgeons, the great majority of whom are career officers, trained in the programs of the Army Medical Service, and therefore familiar with working within the military framework so that each is familiar with the primary mission of the surgeon in a combat zone and the indicated staging of the surgery of the battle wounded.

At least one, and in some hospitals two and three, well trained anesthesiologists provide anesthesia for the critically injured during surgery, aid in preoperative resuscitation, and participate in the postoperative treatment in the recovery or intensive care units.

Our most significant disease problem in Vietnam today is that of malaria. The incidence of this disease increased last fall concurrent with the buildup in troop strengths in Vietnam. The malaria encountered in Vietnam has demonstrated decreased susceptibility to treatment with synthetic antimalarial drugs. Fortunately, these cases usually respond to further treatment with quinine. As a result of this experience we have embarked on an all-out effort to find new drugs that will be effective in the suppression and treatment of malaria. New regimens are also being tested and a multimillion-dollar research effort is well underway.

United States combat troops in Vietnam are a highly mobile force which operate in and out of very restrictive terrain. Casualties resulting from these operations must be evacuated by a responsive mobile force capable of operating in the same terrain and under the same conditions. The Army Medical Service is meeting this challenge with helicopter air ambulance units in direct support of the combat soldier. Casualty pickups are being made at the place where the injury is incurred and many times while the combat operations are still in progress. The fact that a soldier can be evacuated from the place of injury to a medical treatment facility within minutes not only helps the morale of the fighting man, but has been one of the important factors in reducing the mortality rate to the lowest of any war in history. Approximately 90 percent of all casualties in Vietnam are evacuated by helicopter. Army Medical Service helicopters are averaging over 4,000 patient evacuations per month. Vietnam helicopter evacuations have already surpassed the total helicopter evacuations made during the entire Korean war.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, General Heaton and all his associates are to be highly commended for their splendid work in this field. The Army Medical Service personnel in Vietnam deserve special tribute and commendation for their dedicated service. It is because of their work that General Heaton was able to assure me that "no U.S. Army soldier in Vietnam today lacks required care and treatment."

General Heaton is not only a truly great administrator, he is an outstanding active surgeon and a highly dedicated soldier and American.

All Americans, and particularly our fighting men in Vietnam and their loved ones at home, can be reassured and comforted by the high standards of medical care being provided and by the fact that no avenue of medical support is being overlooked or left unattended.

Mr. President, if I may have one additional minute, I wish to point out that excellent medical support not only exists in Vietnam and the immediate supporting hospitals in the Pacific area, but the more severely wounded are returned to the continental United States and placed in hospitals all over the Pacific side of this country, as well as back here in Walter Reed and other hospitals in the United States, where several hundred of them are now receiving excellent attention.

Let me point out quickly that the Army is not the only one. These exceptional medical services are found in the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines, and they do a splendid job. It does happen that in the war in Vietnam the Army is carrying a greater part of the load because they are the ones in combat and also because to a degree, they are taking care of the men on the immediate battlefields. These things do not just happen. It is with the greatest pride that every American can look at the record and have the finest assurance that if their loved ones are in Vietnam, they are being very well looked after.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield gladly to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I associate myself fully with all the comments which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Miracles are being performed today by the men and women in the Medical Corps of the several U.S. military services, those intrepid people who bind up the wounds of Americans who have fallen in defense of freedom in southeast Asia and around the globe elsewhere.

Speed and skill in medical treatment in all the services have reached new highs. Great new hospitals have been erected here and in the far Pacific. Mobile hospitals are in South Vietnam. Particularly on this occasion, I am glad to join the Senator from Mississippi in paying a full meed of respect to the Army Medical Corps, from the world-renowned Walter Reed Hospital in Washington to its selfless activities across the seas.

I have, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, particular reason to be acquainted with the distinguished soldier who is Surgeon General of the U.S. Army—General Heaton. He is a great American, a great soldier, a great physician, a great surgeon, and a great administrator, who has successfully discharged his responsibility over this farflung, worldwide corps with all its skills in medicine and in surgery by which personnel in the Army are miraculously cared for.

I venture to hope, on this occasion, that the people of the United States, and the men and women in the U.S. Army, may have the benefit of General Heaton's continuing service for many years in the future.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me to make these comments.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I certainly share those views and hopes with the Senator from California.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' RETIREMENT AND ANNUITY FUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1101, H.R. 11439, be made the pending business at the conclusion of morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11439) to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President there will be no business on the pending legislation, but it will be the pending business tomorrow when those most interested will be on hand to take it up.

WORLD COPPER CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, historically, the mining of copper has been an extremely important element in the economy of the State of Montana, and for much of the West. Therefore, the status of the industry throughout the world is of considerable concern to those of us who represent the Treasure State. In the past several decades, the industry has been plagued by many boom and bust periods. The London market is far too high and I believe that a time has come to attempt to reach some form of international agreement on production and prices. It was with this thought in mind that I proposed a world conference, on a recent visit to Butte, "the richest hill on earth."

I feel that there is a strong possibility that copper may be pricing itself out of the market because these inflationary prices are stimulating the greater use of substitutes for the red metal.

This situation has developed since Chile raised the price to 62 cents and Zambia increased its price to equal that of the London exchange rate.

Incidentally, according to the New York Times this morning, Peru has joined the parade. These are tremendous increases. This trend can be dangerous. If this continues it will be extremely difficult to maintain a 36-cent-a-pound price in this country while the rest of the world goes way beyond. Incidentally, I want to state that the domestic copper producers—Anaconda, Phelps-Dodge, Kennecott, and the rest—have been most cooperative with the Government in its endeavor to keep the price of copper from going out of sight. Releases of Government stockpile copper help to alleviate the U.S. situation for a time but, unfortunately, our domestic producers cannot increase production to meet demand. Other metals such as aluminum and steel can be produced at higher levels to meet demands but this is not the case in the instance of copper.

Stability in the market is a requirement for continuous production and stable employment. This stability means prosperity to copper-producing areas of my State, as well as in other sections of the country.

This is something that might very well be handled at a world conference to discuss the adoption of an agreement on production designed to avoid "ups and downs" in an industry which can thrive only on a stable production-pricing system. This proposal immediately raises questions of international cartels and violations of antitrust laws but I hope that the experts within the Department of Justice will understand the gravity of the problem and cooperate on this matter.

It would be my suggestion that the administration take the initiative in calling a world conference for this purpose. The stability of one of the major mining industries is at stake and, as always, its effect on the economy, as a whole, will be of the highest significance.

WE SHOULD OFFER DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the recent hearings on China conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations clearly indicate the need for better communication between the United States and Communist China. The Peking government has for 17 years ruled some 740 million men, women and children—nearly one-fourth of the world's population. The establishment of a workable relationship with the Red Chinese Government is one of the most important problems facing our Nation today.

China will be incapable for many years, if then, of developing weapons necessary to challenge our security. Nonetheless, it is the most powerful nation in Asia and in years to come will have a profound influence upon the kind of world in which our children and grandchildren will be living. There is probably no greater threat to world peace today than the threat posed by the arrogant, hostile Red Chinese dictators who are violently Communist in the Stalin pattern. Time alone will lessen the bitterness they feel toward the nations of the Western world that oppressed China and degraded the Chinese during the 18th, 19th, and around the turn of the 20th century.

The time has come for the United States to recognize the Red Chinese Government. Nations, like individuals, should not ignore the facts of life. Recognition of one nation by another never means approval of the ruling regime of that country. Offering diplomatic recognition and reestablishing our Embassy in Peking would be a step toward world peace and could not possibly bring harm to our country.

Today we must rely on our consul general in Hong Kong and on Great Britain, France, Canada, and other nations that recognize Red China to relay to us information about that government. Hong Kong, incidentally, was taken from China at the end of the opium war which England declared on the Chinese Government because the Chinese tried to prevent the English from profiting by traffic in opium to the injury of the Chinese people. At the same time, there are many vital problems facing mankind that cannot be resolved without direct communication with the Peking regime.

Our allies, including neighbors such as Canada, have recognized Red China and are prospering by trade with that country. In 1964 Chinese trade with non-Communist countries exceeded $2 billion. Very definitely, American producers and manufacturers should be permitted to sell to Red China at world prices for gold whatever the nationals of that nation may wear, eat, drink, or smoke.

Throughout the cold war period that followed World War II, we maintained diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. During the Cuban missile crisis when the late great President John F. Kennedy forced Khrushchev to turn tail and withdraw his offensive missiles from Cuba, the fact that we maintained diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and that there was rapid communication between our President and Khrushchev helped avert a nuclear war.

We should continue to recognize the Government of Taiwan under corrupt warlord Chiang Kai-shek, who took over Taiwan and slaughtered some 17,000 defenseless Formosan men, women, and children. Should the arrogant rulers of Communist China refuse to open diplomatic relations on that account, their scorn would result in a propaganda victory for the United States.

In speaking out for diplomatic recognition of China, let us recognize the facts of international life and speak for that generation of Americans who did not participate in framing our present China policy.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON FARMERS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, in the May issue of Nation's Agriculture appeared a series of questions and answers under the heading, "Our Biggest Business Problem Is the Cost-Price Squeeze on Farmers."

Questions were directed to our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who serves as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also on the Joint Congressional Committee on the President's Economic Report.

I ask that these questions and very illuminating answers be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON FARMERS

Question. As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and also the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee, what do you think is the major problem facing the Nation's farmers today?

Answer. I believe our farmers face the same problems as all other Americans—the complexities of life in the atomic age, war in Vietnam, inflation at home, and an increasing dependence on a capricious Federal Government. But the greatest problem facing farmers is the continuing cost-price squeeze, which is preventing the agricultural sector from sharing fairly in the national net income and forcing a more dangerous ratio of farm debt to farm assets.

Question. What has been happening to farm prices?

Answer. Generally farm prices have not been moving up in proportion to other prices. This is shown by the parity ratio. In December 1960, parity was 81. Until February of this year, there was only one month when parity equaled this figure; and most of the time it ranged between 74 and 78. It rose to 83 in February of this year and then dropped back to 82 for March. According to the New York Times, the Secretary of Agriculture "expressed pleasure" over this decline and predicted that the average price of all farm products should be 6 to 10 percent lower in the fourth quarter of the year. I do not share this view.

Question. Aren't some farm prices stronger than they have been?

Answer. Yes. Using a ratio based on a 1957–59 average of 100, the index of agricultural prices published by the USDA shows that by March of this year the average for all farm products had risen to 112. This average figure takes into account 81 for food grains, 107 for feed grains, 119 for oil-bearing crops such as soybeans, 123 for meat animals, 108 for dairy products, and 110 for poultry and eggs. But it should be emphasized that the overall increase from 100 to 112 has not kept pace with the increase in prices for nonagricultural items. That is why parity has been so low.

Question. What has been happening to farm costs?

Answer. The index of prices paid by farmers published by the USDA shows that by March of this year (using a ratio based on a 1957–59 average of 100), prices paid by farmers had increased as follows: wages, 127; taxes, 165; interest, 232; seed, 110, and family living items, 110.

Question. Why has interest increased so much?

Answer. This is due in part to increased interest rates. But it is mostly due to the $14.8 billion increase in farm debt over the past 5 years—from $26.2 billion to $41 billion.

Question. Why have farm costs increased?

Answer. A major factor in the increase is inflation. The purchasing power of our dollar has been going down. In 1939, the dollar was worth 100 cents. A little over 5 years ago it was worth 46.6 cents. It is down to nearly 43 cents today. When this happens, wage earners naturally ask for more wages. All of their dollars are worth less, so they need more dollars. And very often wage increases will provide a cushion against future slippage in the dollar. Some labor-management contracts contain an escalation clause under which wages automatically go up as the consumer retail price index goes up and the purchasing power of the dollar goes down. Price increases frequently follow.

Farm land prices have been going up rapidly, and inflation contributes to this. Some people invest in farm land as a hedge against inflation. Others buy farm land for speculation, figuring that inflation will boost the price and they will be able to make a profit, with only capital gains tax to pay. And these inflation-minded groups naturally compete with farmers seeking to consolidate into larger units. More debt, interest, and taxes are sure to follow.

Question. Who is responsible for inflation?

Answer. Let me start out by saying who is not responsible. It isn't the wage earner who asks for more wages. It isn't the retailer who asks for higher prices. It surely isn't the farmer who seeks better prices. These are merely the symptoms.

Inflation is the result of the supply of money (including credit) increasing faster than goods and services are increasing. The foundation for this is laid when a majority of the Members of Congress vote to spend billions and billions of dollars more than your Federal Government takes in, year after year. One can blame the executive branch of the Government for asking for too much spending in relation to our national income, but the responsibility for doing so is squarely on the legislative branch of the Government, which votes the appropriations and the revenue measures.

During the last 5 years, a majority of the Members of Congress have run your Government $31 billion deeper into debt, and this has been accompanied by $51 billion of inflation. Inflation takes more purchasing power away from our people than anything else except the Federal income tax.

Question. Are you in favor of inflation rather than taxes as a means of the Government's taking away the purchasing power of the people?

Answer. There are few Members of Congress who would say they are in favor of inflation. What counts particularly is how they vote on appropriations bills. In other words, it's deeds and not words that count. I not only am opposed to inflation, but my voting record will show that I have voted against some appropriations measures and for reduction of others in an effort to stop deficit spending.

Question. Why are you opposed to inflation?

Answer. Because it is the unfairest way to take purchasing power away from people. It hurts those the most who can least afford to bear it—especially our younger people, who find the costs of higher education going up, the expense of maintaining a young and growing family harder to meet, and the cost of buying a home and going into farming or a business most discouraging; and our older citizens living on fixed pensions, insurance, and savings.

Agriculture, which is a basic industry, is usually damaged more by inflation than any other. I realize that my views are not shared by those who classify themselves as members of the "new economics" school of thought; but I refuse to accept the theory that we have to have inflation in order to prosper.

Question. Are you opposed to increasing expenditures of the Federal Government?

Answer. With our increasing population, we can expect the total of Federal expenditures to increase. I am more concerned about bringing revenue and expenditures into a reasonable balance, so that the foundation for further inflation will not be laid. However, there is no question but what some Federal expenditures are excessive. For example, it has recently been revealed through the efforts of Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, that it cost the taxpayers $11,251 per enrollee in the Job Corps for the year 1965—this in the face of an estimated cost of $4,500 per enrollee at the time the program was being debated in Congress 2 years ago. Many of us voted against the program—even with the $4,500 figure—because we represent parents who are having a difficult time raising $1,500 a year to send children through college.

Question. What can farm organizations do about the cost-price squeeze?

Answer. They can promote more efficient farming practices, research, and improved marketing of farm products. They can, through testimony before the Congress by their representatives and, particularly, through contacts (personally and by letter) by their members with Senators and Congressmen, assist in the very important task of moulding sound farm legislation.

A good many farm organizations, of course, provide cooperative purchasing and marketing activities for their members; and many of these have been highly successful.

Question. What can individual farmers do about the cost-price squeeze?

Answer. Most farmers are doing a good job of farm management now. They must, of course, remain alert to changing conditions and practices. They ought to support a farm organization whose policies they generally agree with, because organized effort is the most effective. However, they should always remember that their Congressmen and Senators are responsible to them and that good letters, setting forth the writer's own views, are effective. If more voters would keep an eye on the voting records of their Congressmen and Senators with respect to deficit spending, we wouldn't be having inflation.

L.B.J. WISE TO HOLD OFF ON TAX HIKE RECOMMENDATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, these who have been critical of the administration for not calling for a big across-the-board tax increase should take a long hard look at the George Shea column in this morning's Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Shea makes an impressive case that inflation may be going through its last gasps.

Of course, the future is always cloudy. None of us can predict with real assurance. But the hard facts of basic commodity prices—especially those that normally lead price performance generally—suggest that those who flatly predict a big inflation are likely to be wrong.

Also, as Shea points out, the bond market has been dropping steadily and is near a record low. The stock market has been falling—some 90 points on the Dow-Jones index since last February.

Heaven knows, this kind of performance is anything but inflationary.

Mr. Shea is especially telling when he writes:

> Nor are the downward-pointing signs confined to securities. Some commodities have turned down too. Althcught statistics of copper supply and demand still suggest there is a real shortage of the metal, its price in the free London market has fallen from the equivalent of more than 90 cents a pound earlier this year to below 70 cents.
>
> The price of lead last week was reduced here, likewise to adjust to a decline in London. A Government index of so-called sensitive industrial commodities—staples which tend to move up or down earlier than other commodities—is down below 119 percent of the 1957–59 average from a high of 125 percent reached in mid-March. And the Dow-Jones index of commodity future, after touching a high above 140 in January was below 135 last week. The Dow-Jones index of spot prices is still close to the year's high reached in April, but spot prices are normally responsive to current supply-and-demand conditions, whereas futures represent an attempt by traders to read the trends that lie ahead.

Mr. Shea points out that the housing construction industry has been declining for a couple of years—and seems unlikely to recover vigorously in the face of tight money, that in spite of widespread predictions of a bigger auto year than ever, fewer autos were sold in April this year than last.

Sure, the eminence of the economists lined up for a tax increase is impressive. But Senators should not forget that the economic future can rarely be foreseen clearly, and now the indicators are especially mixed.

All of which once again underlines the wisdom of the administration's policy of caution, of hammering where it can to keep prices down—but avoiding what could turn into an economic catastrophe—a big tax increase just as prices are about to level off and the economy is about to slack off anyway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by George Shea be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The debate over whether the Federal tax bite should be increased in order to fight inflation makes the business headlines almost daily. Almost no one seems to recognize the possibility that actually a turn toward deflation may already have started, or that the policy question to be determined soon will be what to do if the deflation becomes severe.

True, the debaters do see ultimate deflation as the danger. That is, those who want to raise taxes say, in effect, that the inflationary trend needs to be curbed lest it get so out of hand that severe deflationary measures will have to be taken, leading to a serious recession. The opposite view is that the inflationary trend isn't strong enough to require a tax boost and that a tax boost might bring on a recession right away. But both agree there is a clearly inflationary trend now.

Of course, there are many signs of continuing boom. Wages and numerous prices are still going up, industrial production rises month after month, new orders are at record highs, employment is also a record, and such all-embracing figures as total personal income and gross national production expand ceaselessly. But the number of signs that point to deflation is surprisingly large.

One such sign is the past year's decline in the bond market, with its accompanying rise in interest charges borrowers must pay. As has been shown in this space previously, such declines in the past have usually been followed by downturns in both the stock market and business. Furthermore, the latest drop in bond prices has pushed interest rates to the highest levels in 40 years or more. Such a severe movement can hardly be disregarded.

There is a tendency to discount its importance because some banking figures seem favorable, notably the trend of loans and of the Nation's money supply. The money supply consists of currency in people's pockets and demand deposits in commercial banks, and except during the first 2 months of this year it's been rising strongly for a good many months. Rising money normally accompanies rising business.

But the rise in money supply reflects rising loans. When banks make such loans they do it by setting up new deposits for borrowers. And the rising loans, by using up the credit resources of the Nation, are the basic cause for the rise in interest rates.

In turn, a growing shortage of credit resources, which naturally is reflected in falling bond prices as well as rising interest rates, is the classic cause for the declines in stock prices and business which usually ensue. There can be shortages of credit just as there can be shortages of men or materials, and if they get severe enough they are just as likely to depress business.

Now a sharp drop in stock prices has duly followed the decline in bonds, even though business is still strong. The behavior of stocks is another of the signs pointing toward possible deflation. In itself it represents deflation of stock values.

Of course, it must be conceded that this decline at present is only about as steep as that of 1965 and is smaller than the one of 1962, neither of which was followed by lower business. However, neither of those declines was preceded by any such deep drop in bond prices as we've seen this time. The current deflation of securities values is more pervasive.

Nor are the downward-pointing signs confined to securities. Some commodities have turned down too. Although statistics of copper supply and demand still suggests there is a real shortage of the metal, its price in the free London market (which affects the open-market price here) has fallen from the equivalent of more than 90 cents a pound earlier this year to below 70 cents.

The price of lead last week was reduced here, likewise to adjust to a decline in London. A Government index of so-called sensitive industrial commodities—staples which tend to move up or down earlier than other commodities—is down below 119 percent of the 1957–59 average from a high of 125 percent reached in mid-March. And the Dow-Jones index of commodity futures, after touching a high above 140 in January, was below 135 last week. The Dow-Jones index of spot prices is still close to the year's high reached in April, but spot prices are normally responsive to current supply-and-demand conditions, whereas futures represent an attempt by traders to read the trends that lie ahead.

Furthermore, not all business trends are upward. The housing construction industry has been producing gradually declining numbers of dwelling units in the past couple of years. The last few months this trend has leveled off rather than continued to drop, but it certainly has shown no tendency to turn up thus far.

The automobile industry is another where trends are in doubt. Earlier this year auto leaders were predicting with no seeming reservations that 1966 would be another year of rising sales of new cars. Now that April has shown lower sales than April 1965, with no special offsetting reasons such as were relied on to explain January and February declines from a year earlier, the industry's prognosticators maintain 1966 is going to be as good as 1965. That in itself is a change to less optimism.

These varying signs of possible weakness in the general economic background may be misleading, as were the stockmarket declines of 1965 and 1962. Let us hope so. But on the other hand they may prove to be forewarnings.

Yet the public attitudes of the economic managers reflect no awareness of these unpleasant possibilities. A similarly short vision has been noticeable at past critical turns in the economic tides, a fact which raises a basic question about the validity of all theories of economic management by central direction. Like the proverbial military generals, economic managers seem to have a tendency to fight the wrong wars at the wrong times.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY AGAINST INFLATION MAKES SENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there has been widespread partisan criticism of the administration because prices have been rising for the past 2 or 3 months. Some economists and newspaper commentators have denounced the administration for failing in effect to slam on the inflation brakes.

Several times, Mr. President, I have detailed the many actions taken by President Johnson and his administration to stop rising prices.

The most recent evidence that price rises may be beginning to moderate, is not decisive, but it is encouraging. Prices may level off without the rough medicine of a tax increase.

One of the most thoughtful, concise, and competent analyses I have seen of the prospects for price stability has been composed by Prof. J. William Fredrickson, of North Park College in Illinois.

Professor Fredrickson brilliantly summarizes the reasons why runaway inflation is unlikely and why the administration's approach has been about right.

I ask unanimous consent that the Fredrickson article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL THERE BE INFLATION? NO

The recent discussion of the state of economy in the popular press has for the most part stressed the danger, if not the probability, of serious inflation. It has been popular to criticize the Council of Economic Advisers for underestimating the degree to expansion in aggregate demand to be expected and to castigate the administration for hesitating to call for an additional tax increase.

In collecting materials relating to this issue from a variety of sources, I have become aware that an alternative conclusion can be drawn from the evidence and that this conclusion can be powerfully supported. This paper is an attempt to state the case for the alternative conclusion in the strongest possible terms.

J. W. FREDRICKSON.

PROPOSITION

Price levels will stabilize and will not continue to advance at unacceptably rapid rates. An inflationary spiral will not get started. The fear of inflation will recede. A further tax increase will not be necessary.

SUPPORT

1. Rises in the wholesale price index and the consumer price indexes orginate in temporary conditions in limited sectors of the economy which are in the process of correction.
2. Other economic indicators point to the existence of soft spots in the economy.
3. The analysis of the current performance of the economy overestimate expansionary forces and underestimate contractionary forces.
4. Administration policy is probably more effective than it is generally believed to be.

EVIDENCE FOR INFLATIONARY PRESSURE

Widespread concern about the present danger of price inflation rests on four pieces of evidence. (1) Unemployment has fallen to 3.7 percent of the labor force. (2) National defense expenditures have shown the influence of the Vietnam war, creeping upward in the fall months and leaping upward by 10 percent in December of last year. The defense buildup is expected to proceed rapidly in the first half of 1966. (3) The wholesale price index rose from 103.3 in July, 108.9 in December and jumped to 112.0 in January. The Consumer Price Index in December was 111.0, up 2.2 over the previous December. (4) Surveys of business plans for investment in plants and equipment in 1966 are running well above last year and exceeding anticipations. A U.S. Government survey in January–February put the figures at 16 percent above last year, and private surveys have yielded even higher figures.

The analysis which concludes that inflation is a threat puts these pieces of evidence into the following pattern. The fall of the unemployment rate tells us that the economy is approaching full employment, which constitutes the limit of its capacity to produce goods and services. (Many economists regard a range between 3 and 4 percent unemployment as the practical benchmark of capacity. The Kennedy council of economic advisers set 4 percent as a provisional target rate—the lowest we can go under present circumstances.) When the full employment capacity limit is reached, additional spending cannot be matched with further increases of output. Competition for scarce commodities, raw materials, and labor will bid up prices and wage rates. This is the classic origin of price inflation.

With the economy at the capacity level, increasing defense expenditures constitute the additional spending which can begin to drive price levels upward. In this situation the sharp increase in the wholesale price index is regarded as the first sign that the process is beginning. The conclusion follows that the economy is on the brink of a more rapid rise in prices and beginning to slip.

The final push would be given by the sharp rise in business investment in plant and equipment projected in the surveys of business intentions. To pile this swollen investment demand on top of Government demand for defense in an economy already at the limit of its capacity will insure the development of an inflationary momentum.

Such is the case for imminent inflation and the basis for calls that taxes be increased immediately.

COMMENTS ON THE EVIDENCE

The four pieces of evidence may not be as signficant as they have been made out to be. At least they bear alternative interpretations which reduce their weight as portents of inflation.

First, no one really knows whether an unemployment rate of 3.7, or 3.5, or 3, really represents the capacity limit of the economy. A few year ago we were told that structural changes in the economy had made it impossible to reduce unemployment below, say, 5 percent; the balance were unemployable. On the other hand we can observe the economies of Western Europe operating at unemployment rates of 2 percent or less. It is worth noting that while the rate for men, 20 years of age and over is about 2.5 percent, the rate for teenagers of both sexes is 12. Unemployment rates are also higher for minority groups, but both minority groups and teenagers have benefited more than proportionally from recent gains in employment. As the labor market tightens these groups will benefit still more. As it stands the labor Department has just said, "No overall labor shortage exists in the U.S. today but there are some imbalances between supply and demand." It should also be remembered that the labor force grows by a million and a quarter a year, so that the capacity limit is a rising limit which yields growing quantities of goods and services even with a constant unemployment rate.

Second, the impact of Vietnam expenditures can easily be exaggerated. Up to November 1965, monthly defense expenditures were scarcely above the figure for December 1964. They went up a half billion in December, about a 10 percent increase. As a percentage of GNP, defense expenditures continued a downward trend prevalent since 1962. For the figure was 7.5 percent of GNP compared with 8.4 in 1964. In the next 2 years it is expected to rise to 7.6. We tend to forget that GNP, is now about twice as large as it was during the Korean war; a similar level of expenditure would put far less pressure on the economy. (During the Korean war period defense expenditures went from nearly 5 percent of GNP to 13½ percent.) Whatever the degree of pressure exerted by rising defense expenditures, there is a school of thought holding that their impact on the economy has already been felt when the increases were announced last fall. If this is the case, the actual outlay of dollars will not have much more effect.

Third, the rise in the price indexes originates in and is concentrated in the farm and food sector of the economy. According to Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, "The largest single factor in this was an inadequate production of pork in the latter half of 1965 and early 1966. The effect has spread into beef, eggs, poultry, and so on." So the price signals have come from a specific condition in one part of the economy, not from general advances all along the line.

The gap in pork production is on the way to being corrected, and the effects of this will be in the leveling out of food prices and possible in some declines. As an indication that this reading of the price indexes is correct, the wholesale price index held steady in the March figures recently released. Preliminary figures suggest that April will also be steady or even down a little.

Fourth, while heavy capital spending does, of course, contribute to the size of a boom, projection of such spending by itself does not guarantee that the spending will occur. George Shea, of the Wall Street Journal, points out that several times in the recent past, actual spending has fallen short of optimistic early year estimates. He argues further that spending for plant and equipment moves with corporate profits after taxes and suggests that the trend toward higher profits is leveling off. The growing scarcity of credit and high interest rates reinforce the conclusion that projections of sharp gains in capital spending are less than ironclad assurances that such spending will occur.

EVIDENCE OF SOFT SPOTS IN THE ECONOMY

So strong has been the emphasis on the evidence for a dangerous inflationary situation, that little stress has been given toward certain other indicators which point in the opposite direction.

In the private sector there are three pieces of evidence which bear watching as an indication of growing slackness in the economy. Housing starts are not rising with the rest of the economy in spite of growing population, and rising interest rates should have some effect in further slowing down residential construction. Seasonally adjusted retail sales have been wavering and have recently been down a little. Consumers have been saving a larger percentage of their disposable income; the ratio has risen from 4.88 in the second quarter of 1965 to 5.63 in the last quarter.

In the public sector the deficit which constitutes the stimulative pressure on the economy has been declining in spite of rising defense expenditures. In December 1965, net receipts were greater than Federal expenditures. For the first 6 months of 1966, rising expenditures will be more than matched by growing revenues. Fiscal 1967 (July 1966–June 1967) is expected to produce a virtual balance in the cash and national income budgets.

These indications of some soft spots in the economy support the notion that scruting of the evidence for inflation suggest: that while the economy is approaching the capacity limit it is not about to explode into uncontrolled inflation.

NEGLECTED POINTS OF ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Discussion of the current state of the economy generally omits mention of two propositions in economic analysis which point to elements of resiliency in the response the economy to increasing aggregate demand: The capacity effect of investment and the tendency of tax receipts to rise with rising GNP.

It is true that high levels of business investment in plant and equipment have a powerful effect through the multiplier on incomes and on the level of aggregate demand. It should also be remembered that the same investment increases the capacity of the economy to produce goods and services. The high and rising levels of capital investment in recent years have resulted in growing increments in the amount of goods and services available to satisfy increasing demand. This means that the next few months will see new capital installations begin to make their contribution to a growing volume of goods and services in response to the pressure of demand.

The tendency of tax receipts to rise with rising GNP is familiar to students of fiscal policy as one of the automatic stabilizers of the economy. With no change in tax rates, the growing volume of goods subject to excise taxes will yield higher revenues, as will higher incomes subject to corporate and personal income taxes. It is estimated variously that between one-fourth and one-third of the dollar increment to GNP will flow to Government in increased tax yields. As has been noted, increasing receipts in the first half of 1966 are expected to outpace the growth of expenditures, including Vietnam. The rise will continue in the second half of 1966, and the increase in total Federal tax receipts for 1966 is in the order of several billions of dollars.

POLICY MEASURES

Discussion of potential inflation and what to do about it has centered on proposals for a further tax increase as a means of reducing the pressure of aggregate demand on prices. Such an emphasis minimizes other policy measures in the modern tool kit of devices for influencing the economy and tends to overlook the delayed impact of policy measures already taken. Action has been taken and is being taken over a wider range of policy alternatives than is generally realized. The impact of some of these measures is only now beginning to have an effect, and some important effects may not show up for some time yet. A review of the policy measures now in operation suggests that current policy may be adequate and that it would be premature to impose additional restraint at this time.

1. Monetary restraint was invoked by the Federal Reserve Board action in December raising the rediscount rate to 4.5 percent, the highest in 36 years. Interest rates are at record highs. Banks are beginning to ration credit. Borrowers are finding it harder to get loans even at higher rates. The money supply is growing at only half of the rate of recent years. (Beryl Sprinkel, of Chicago's Harris Trust & Savings Bank, has shown a remarkable correlation between changes in the rate of growth of money supply and the pace of the economy.)

The results are beginning to show, and not only in the weakness of housing construction. A number of State and local governments have had to postpone or cancel projects because of the high cost of borrowed money. Consumer installment credit extended declined in February for the third month. These may be only the first indications of the gradual impact of monetary restraint; in the 1959–60 experience it was 9 months after the rediscount rate was raised to 4 percent that a general decline in business activity began.

2. Fiscal policy measures currently are aimed at removing the net stimulus from the public sector of the economy by arriving at an approximate balance of the national income accounts budget during 1966. Anticipated increases in expenditure are offset by increases of revenues from three sources: the impact of 1965 budget actions, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, and the normal growth of revenue at high employment.

Scheduled increases in payroll taxes for social security which went into effect on January 1 are expected to yield about $6 billion in additional revenue. This would be partially offset by liberalization of benefits raising transfer payments by $2 billion, leaving a net rise of $4 billion in the amount drained out of the income stream. The 1966 tax adjustment would add another $3.5 billion to Federal revenue. Together with normal growth of revenue at $11.5 billion, the total additional revenue would amount to more than enough to offset the anticipated rise in expenditures of $17.5 billion.

The 1966 Tax Adjustment Act is nicely calculated to produce its maximum effect early in 1966 without a change in the basic tax structure. Reform of the withholding system for individual income taxes, rescheduling of corporate tax payments, and placing self-employed social security payments on a more current basis will reduce disposable income by about $2.5 billion during 1966 when the restraint is most needed. The postponement of the scheduled excise tax cuts for 2 years will restore nearly $1 billion of revenue in the current year. These adjustments will have their maximum effect quickly during the period in 1966 when the influence of defense expenditures will be largest.

Treasury reports on the first quarter indicate that tax collections are running higher than expected and that the budget deficit for the current fiscal year could be reduced by a noticeable amount.

3. The wage-price guideposts have been an important element in the administration's policy mix for promoting stable growth. Although the guideposts have been under fire from both labor and business, an impressive case can be made for the importance and effectiveness of the guideposts. Such a case was made by Senator PROXMIRE on March 14, in which he outlined 10 situations over the past 4 years in which the public suggestion of standards for noninflationary wage and price levels had influenced the outcome. In addition he argues theoretically for the proposition that the guideposts are a policy instrument which can influence price and wage decisions of big labor and big business which

are not reached by monetary-fiscal restraint, but which often set the pace for the rest of the economy.

In the current situation the existence of the wage-price guideposts can help to avoid the launching of an inflationary wage-price spiral based on what may be temporary pressure on certain sectors of the economy. In the future as we learn to live with what is really a new situation—long-term operation of the economy at near capacity—they may become even more important.

4. A new element in economic policy is the effort of the administration to see that every Government action that can have an impact on supply or demand is coordinated into a broad ranging anti-inflationary campaign. The simplest way to support this statement is to list and illustrate the types of action.

(a) Stockpile releases. Aluminum, copper, and a considerable number of other commodities accumulated in strategic stockpiles are being sold to relieve supply shortages.

(b) Sales of surplus agricultural commodities. Corn from Government surplus stocks has been sold at an increasingly rapid rate in recent months. Prices have dropped since mid-February, and this is expected to encourage livestock production which in turn would help bring meat prices down.

(c) Goverment purchases. The General Services Administration has suggested to suppliers that substitutes be used for scarce commodities such as copper and leather. Defense procurement officials are examining their entire purchase list for possible substitutes, particularly food products, and have ordered a 50-percent reduction in pork purchases for consumption of the Armed Forces in the continental United States.

(d) Expenditure restraint. The President has requested that his Cabinet hold expenditures a billion or more below authorized budget levels.

(e) Food distribution programs. The Department of Agriculture is substituting margarine for butter in food distribution programs, thus releasing butter to the commercial markets.

(f) Export quotas. The Commerce Department has imposed export controls on cowhides that will hold exports at 11.5 million hides, 2.5 million less than last year.

In a sense these measures constitute an unprecedented process of Government letting its left hand know what its right hand is doing and getting them to work together in the interests of relieving inflationary pressure. Programs which have operated in the past to support prices are now being used to avoid price increases.

5. Another new element in administration policy is the concerted efforts of high Government officials, led by the President, to influence private decisions by persuasion. Speeches by Cabinet members, private conversations, presidential phone calls, and perhaps most significant, an early April White House dinner for 150 leading businessmen, have carried the anti-inflation message emphasizing the need for restraint in plant expansion. Post dinner responses from those present indicate that a significant number of leading businesses are preparing to reduce their investment in new plant and equipment from the levels originally planned. Since an unexpected large increase in planned capital spending is one of the principal sources of expected inflationary pressure, such a result could be of great help in avoiding the excessive expansion of aggregate demand in 1966.

The case for the proposition that there will be no inflation may be summed up as follows:

1. The evidence of the economic indicators is mixed. Along with signs of weakness in the economy.

2. The signs of developing pressure are concentrated in specific sectors of the economy, and there are indications that they arise from temporary conditions in those sectors.

3. Two frequently overlooked aspects of our high growth economy will provide built-in contrainflationary forces: rising capacity resulting from high levels of investment in recent years and the normal growth of Federal revenues.

4. Administration policy for the control of inflation—the traditional monetary fiscal measures supplemented by guideposts, administrative action, and executive persuasion—is increasingly being recognized as forceful and well aimed.

POSTSCRIPT

There is even a case lurking in the background of this analysis for the proposition that after the period of maximum inflationary pressure subsides in mid-1966 there is a real danger of a slump. George Shea of the Wall Street Journal is sounding this note, and the U.S. News & World Report recently pointed to seven instances of business slumps following within months after the restriction of credit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASHINGTON'S OPPORTUNITY IN TODAY'S AFRICA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Graham Hovey, who is a man I have known for a number of years, and who was a highly competent professor at the University of Wisconsin and commentator on the University of Wisconsin radio station in Madison, has had a very distinguished and interesting career. He served on the Minneapolis Tribune and is now on the editorial staff of the New York Times.

This morning the New York Times has published a most interesting, thoughtful, and helpful article written by him on our opportunity in Africa.

Mr. Hovey points out that we are winning in Africa, although it has not made news. Somehow, we always hear the gloomy side. He points out that in African country after country which had been hostile we are ahead, and that the Soviet Union and Red China have been losing ground.

As one African specialist says:

> We are winning everywhere * * * we are winning in spite of ourselves * * *.
>
> Less than 10 percent of American foreign aid goes to Africa; this amount was down $100 million this year from 1962 and most of it goes to four or five countries. Africa still accounts for less than 5 percent of America's foreign trade and investment. Of 20 countries getting 92 percent of all American aid in fiscal 1967, only five are in Africa; of eight countries getting 84 percent of American development loan funds, only one—Nigeria—is African. None of the five countries receiving 93 percent of what the administration calls "supporting assistance" is African.
>
> They concede that the European governments should bear more of the burden than the United States in their former colonies. But they say that with no residual colonial interests the United States can encourage essential regional developments cutting across the borders of former British, French, and Belgian colonies.

This kind of opportunity is rare. This seems to be a good time for us to move to try to encourage that kind of regional cooperation and progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful article by Graham Hovey be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington's Opportunity in Today's Africa

(By Graham Hovey)

More by accident than effort, the United States at the moment enjoys its best relations in a long time with nearly every country of Africa north of the Zambesi. The standings of the Soviet Union and Communist China have never been lower.

Will Washington be interested enough and flexible enough to seize this opportunity for constructive actions to assist orderly economic and political development and cooperation?

Or will an administration preoccupied with Vietnam and understandably giving higher priorities to Latin America and an Atlantic alliance in disarray merely mark time in Africa until the next Congo-type explosion?

RECEPTIVE REGIMES

Specialists say the present opportunity in Africa is unusual and cannot last indefinitely. If moderate, pragmatic regimes in key countries, now receptive to discreet American advice and help, cannot demonstrate social and economic advance they will be swept away. And the next round of upheavals is likely to bring in extremist regimes, borrowing tactics and perhaps ideology from Peking.

Military coups in three important countries of Central and West Africa—the Congo (Léopoldville), Ghana and Nigeria—have brought in leaders who seek friendship with their neighbors and cooperation with the West. To the north, the coup in Algeria at least replaced a chronic revolutionary meddler and implacable enemy of the West.

COMMUNIST AGENTS OUSTED

In east Africa, Jomo Kenyatta has driven Oginga Odinga into the political wilderness and booted out some of the Soviet bloc and Chinese agents who furnished resources to the former vice president. Kenya pursues its own brand of African socialism, which allows a major role for private enterprise and investment from abroad.

Next door in Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, whose survival appeared doubtful a year ago, presides over what seems to be the most stable and most democratic government in east Africa, even if Communist China remains the biggest foreign benefactor for his 5-year plan.

"We are winning everywhere," exclaimed an American specialist recently, viewing African events in a cold war context.

"We are winning in spite of ourselves," said his companion, having in mind such facts as these:

Less than 10 percent of American foreign aid goes to Africa; this amount was down $100 million this year from 1962 and most of it goes to four or five countries. Africa still accounts for less than 5 percent of America's foreign trade and investment. Of 20 countries getting 92 percent of all American aid in fiscal 1967, only 5 are in Africa; of 8 countries getting 84 percent of American development loan funds, only 1—Nigeria—is African. None of the five countries receiving 93 percent of what the administration calls supporting assistance is African.

Many Africans view the replacement by a career foreign service officer of the flambouyant but dedicated G. Mennen Williams as Assistant Secretary of State for Africa as merely symbolizing the decline, long ago evident, of official American interest in their continent.

African specialists want more of many things: American aid, technical and planning assistance, capital investment, imports of African goods, support for commodity agreements, and credits to cushion single-crop economies against violent price fluctuations. Above all, they ask for evidence of a more constant interest in the new Africa's problems.

They concede that the European governments should bear more of the burden than the United States in their former colonies. But they say that with no residual colonial interests the United States can encourage essential regional developments cutting across the borders of former British, French, and Belgian colonies.

With Kwame Nkrumah gone, a chain of friendly states under moderate leaders now stretches around west Africa's hump from Sierra Leone to the Congo. Here may be a unique opportunity for the kind of regional cooperation that alone can make some of these struggling states viable.

A recent First National City Bank study reported a "brighter picture of steady economic development" in Africa and added: "The majority of African leaders recognize the great need for private capital to speed development and are endeavoring to create or preserve an economic climate favorable to investment."

PREMATURE OR WRONG?

Last year for the second time a touring Chou En-lai called African countries ripe for revolution. The revolutions since then were hardly the kind Mr. Chou had in mind, but the question for which the United States will help supply the long-range answer is: Was the Chinese Communist Premier only premature or will events continue to prove him wrong?

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the University of Kansas has just concluded a week's program celebrating its centennial year.

Time magazine in a recent issue carried an article which truly and factually describes Kansas University, and I quote in part:

> What strikes most visitors when they first go to KU is the beauty of the 900-acre, tree-covered campus, atop a hill called Mount Oread, curiously rising out of the prairies around the town of Lawrence. If he tarried longer, the visitor is impressed by the million-volume library, the small classes, the spectacular wildlife diorama that Kansas inherited from the Chicago World's Fair of 1893, the extension courses for prisoners at Leavenworth Penitentiary (favorite subjects: Abnormal psychology and sociology of deviant behavior), the big medical school in Kansas City, Kans.
>
> Over the past 8 years, Kansas had harvested six Rhodes scholarships, almost as many as Princeton or Yale, and 106 Woodrow Wilson scholarships for postgraduate study in the past 10 years. An honors program exempts the top 150 students from classload limits, lets some students carry as many as 28 hours per semester and whiz through college in little over 2 years.

During centennial week, many outstanding citizens from over the Nation visited Kansas University and participated in the program. One of the outstanding speeches was delivered by Dr. J. Mark Hiebert, chairman of the board, Sterling Drug, Inc., and a member of the University of Kansas Council for Progress. The address is entitled, "Public Responsibilities of the Manufacturer of Prescription Medicines."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The centennial of the University of Kansas falls in a year that may be memorable in the annals of medicine and pharmacy, and of the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry of the United States. It will be known to senior citizens as the year when medicare started. It will also be known as the year when, for the first time, more than 1 billion prescriptions were filled in the pharmacies of America.

This huge number of prescriptions symbolizes the responsibility of the manufacturer in his task of producing efficacious medicines of high quality and safety. These prescription medicines cannot be bought over the counter and can reach the public only through intermediaries—the experts, members of the medical profession. There is no parallel to this situation with any other commodity, in which the industry supplies, the doctor prescribes and the patient consumes, with the doctor figuratively watching over the patient's shoulder to evaluate the effect and the safety of the product.

One billion prescriptions is equivalent to five prescriptions for every man, woman, and child in our country. They add up to more than 8,000 prescriptions for each of the 120,000 registered pharmacists in the United States; and to approximately 50 prescriptions per day, every day of the year for the 53,000 community pharmacies. Think of the impossible situation we would face if, as less than a generation ago, each prescription—either original or refill—had to be individually compounded by the pharmacist.

These prescriptions represent America's biggest bargain for they bring comfort, health and life to itself to untold numbers. The entire billion prescriptions filled in 1966 will cost the American people only one-sixth the estimated cost of landing the first American on the moon.

Moreover, the cost of the billion prescriptions will be a prime investment. They will substantially reduce the economic loss due to illness. They will reduce to a fraction the cost of hospital care and of illness by reason of the speedier recoveries they make possible. In this connection, it may be useful to recall the testimony before a congressional committee given in 1959 by Dr. James A. Shannon, Director of the National Institutes of Health:

"The cost of some of these modern drugs is high, but it can be looked on in another way—that is, if you use these very potent drugs properly. Today I would guess $3 worth of penicillin can be substituted effectively for 2 or 3 weeks in the hospital with lobar pneumonia, with an incidence of empyema in about 10 percent, and with a death rate of no less than 5 in the healthy young adult. No pneumonias are cured with $3 or $4 worth of penicillin," Dr. Shannon observed.

The ability to fill 1 billion prescriptions in a single year reflects progress in science, advances in medicine, discoveries by pharmaceutical manufacturers, sophisticated production technology and the availability and the professional skills of the Nation's pharmacists. Almost 95 percent of the prescriptions today are produced in their entirety by pharmaceutical manufacturers. Clearly, a billion prescriptions could not be filled if an overwhelming number of them required compounding by the pharmacist.

An interesting fact about these prescriptions is that they will include, for the most part, the 587 new single chemical entities introduced in the period 1941–63, of which the United States firms originated 321, or 61 percent of the total. There has been a falling off in the introduction of new chemical entities since the new drug amendments of 1962 were enacted by the Congress. It is to be hoped that this is only a temporary condition.

There is much more to the billion prescriptions than quantitative statement. All of us have heard recitals of the diseases overcome in our time by men of science, medicine and pharmacy, working individually or associated with industry or with nonprofit institutions. Today's newborn child will happily miss most of the illnesses to which we were exposed. Some of them are cataloged by Sir Derrick Dunlop, the distinguished physician who heads the Safety of Drugs Committee of the United Kingdom. In the Harrington lecture, he said: "The advent of the sulphonamides heralded the therapeutic explosion in the 1930's. Since then the mortality from gastro-intestinal infections, the chief cause of infantile deaths, has fallen by over 80 percent and that from pulmonary infections by nearly 70 percent, while the mortality from tuberculosis, meningococcal infections, mastoiditis, and venereal disease all show similar or greater declines.

"Diphtheria, from which as late as 1940 there were 2,500 fatal cases in England and Wales alone, has disappeared," Sir Derrick continued. "Typhoid, typhus, tetanus, cholera, plague, yellow fever, rabies, smallpox, measles, whooping cough, and polio can be prevented; many tropical diseases such as malaria (once the world's most prevalent disease, afflicting an estimated 800 million population) have been controlled; and the lives of patients suffering from diabetes and pernicious anemia can be preserved and considerable relief given to sufferers from hypertension, arthritis, asthma, and many nervous and mental disorders.

"The list is far from comprehensive," Sir Derrick said, "and makes inadequate mention of the relief from suffering which the purely symptomatic use of modern drugs confer. Doubtless the all-round improvement in social conditions has contributed to these remarkable results, which since 1930 have added 10 years to our average expectation of life; but in this country (United Kingdom) the use of modern drugs, including bacteriological products, has been a more potent factor."

This from Sir Derrick Dunlop. Here is another view of the benefits of medical progress. It is presented in a study by Arthur D. Little, Inc., on the social and economic benefits of the pharmaceutical industry in the United States.

The report estimated that 4,400,000 people of working age were alive in 1961 who would not have been if 1935 death rates had continued. This means that in 1961 61 people out of every 1,000 in the civilian labor force would have been dead if the mortality rate of 1935 had not been reduced. The Little report noted also that "there are more than 2 million working age survivors (in 1961) who, if the 1935 death rates had continued, would have been a victim of just four diseases—tuberculosis, syphilis, influenza, and pneumonia."

The therapeutic explosion of our time has provided still other benefits. For example, two-thirds of the patients being admitted to mental hospitals today are discharged in the first year, a marked improvement over the experience of only a few years ago. And Kansas is in the forefront of progress in the treatment of mental illness. Today, through the use of modern drugs and psychiatric care, 75 to 85 patients out of every 100 admitted to mental hospitals in this State will be discharged within a year. This is even better than the national average.

It would be less than frank for me, a native Kansan and one-time student at the University of Kansas, to leave you with the misimpression that all is perfect in the wonderfully exciting and personally satisfying world of pharmaceutical discovery and manufacture. We confess to human fallibility; we have made errors—and I hope we succeed in omitting to make the same errors again. But I think we have a right to responsible perspective in the evaluation of our industry's achievements.

Please do not misunderstand. There is always room for improvement—in our industry and everywhere else. Criticism can be most helpful in guiding such improvement, but we ask, at the same time, for a fair and balanced appraisal of the values supplied by the health professions and the health industries. Presenting the American pharmaceutical industry as in a distortion mirror gives, at the very least, aid and comfort to our competitors abroad and to this extent lessens our ability to contribute to U.S. foreign exchange. Based on my travels overseas, it seems to me that continued attack on the American pharmaceutical industry is producing a decline in the opinion in which the American people are held by peoples and their leaders in other lands.

We appreciate that the pharmaceutical industry of today is quite different from that of a generation ago. We used to have botanicals, galenicals, infusions, extracts, mixtures, and pills. Modern drugs are highly potent. They can be, and often are, lifesaving; but, by comparison with the medicaments of yesteryear, the margin between therapeutic dose and toxic dose is substantially narrowed. In the discharge of his responsibilities, the manufacturer of pharmaceutical products must never forget this.

Responsibility of the manufacturer, the subject of this paper, is a theme I have thought about as medical student, physician and business executive. During this period—which coincides, roughly, with what is often referred to as the golden age of medicine—the responsibilities of the manufacturer of pharmaceuticals have multiplied.

I have already referred to our fundamental responsibility for quality, efficacy, and safety, within the limits of practical possibility in the light of current technology. I should add that the judgment of efficacy cannot be left solely to the experience of a handful—even of specialists. Rather, it should represent the collective judgment and experience of the medical profession.

As to the manufacturer, he has a major function of creating through research more and more lifesaving and health-preserving medicaments, and ever larger assortments of products in order to increase the choices available to the physician and thereby to serve the individual requirements of specific patients.

He should bring to the attention of the physician all new developments that may favorably affect the health of his patients.

It is equally his responsibility to alert the physician to undesirable and unanticipated side effects, contraindications, new indications when permitted by law to do so, dosages and the like.

If product error occurs, he must notify the medical profession immediately; and, if safety is at stake, he must withdraw the product at once.

It is our responsibility as an industry to adapt our policies and practices to the higher standards made possible by science and technology, and to regulation by Government. This is the 60th year—the diamond anniversary—of the enactment in 1906 of the Pure Food and Drug Act. It was the first law of its kind in our country and represented the public's response to the quackery of the times. The subsequent enactments by Congress—the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act of 1938, the Durham-Humphrey law and the new drug amendments of 1962, among others, reflected the public's increasing concern arising from the higher potency of modern medicines.

If the pharmaceutical manufacturer is not to be overburdened by statutes and regulation, he must practice self-discipline in his day-to-day operations.

Looking broadly at the national health picture, it seems to me that the total responsibility for the health of our population is shared by many—by government, the professions, the sciences, industry, the universities, the hospitals, all the health agencies public and private. In the exercise of this responsibility by all who share it, distrust must give way to faith, suspicion to confidence, prejudice to objectivity.

Turning to safety, government, industry, the professions and the public are properly concerned about the reduction of risk. I have already referred to the built-in safety of prescription preparations by virtue of their being prescribed for patients by expert intermediaries—the physicians.

There is, to be sure, an element of risk in every type of product. There is risk in every action of people. There is risk in life itself, from the moment of birth onward through the entire life span. It is urgent that risk be minimized to the greatest extent possible; but it is no more possible to attain zero risk than to find the end of infinity.

In fact, safety consists in the judicious balancing of benefits and risks. This judicious balancing happily resulted in the eradication of that cruel crippler, polio. Dr. Leonard W. Larsen, president of the American Cancer Society and past president of the American Medical Association, recently disclosed that early batches of polio vaccine were found to contain a virus that produced cancer in hamsters—a virus which has since been removed. But he reminded the American people that "in removing greatly dreaded plagues from the list of lethal diseases, we had to take chances that sulfa drugs and antibiotics would not subject patients to deadly allergies and other diseases."

Safety has other dimensions of critical importance. Safety requires the courage to say "yes" to a new drug as well as the judgment to say "no." The "yes" answer is urgent when it can mean safety from imminent probable death.

Individual safety is also the responsibility of the individual. Safety should be built into the automobile; but it is still the man behind the wheel, urging forward some two tons of metal and glass, that determines ultimate safety on the highway. There is no known way of eliminating personal carelessness by legislation. This requires education, continual education, of the users of many kinds of useful products having a risk quotient. Medicaments on the markets are acceptably safe when used as directed on the label or by the physician. Danger develops in one's own home when useful products—be they medicines, kerosene, powerful detergents, insecticides, whisky, even common salt—are misused or abused. Danger develops when these products—any and all of them—are placed where children of tender years can get at them.

As to the evaluation of medicines for efficacy and safety, the computer is not the final and perfect answer, useful though it is. What the physician feels and perceives at the bedside of his patient may not fit into the square, or oblong or round hole of the punch card; but his observations are often a surer guide to the usefulness of a particular medicament for a particular patient. In the interest of the patient—that individual so unique that there is not another entirely like him in the whole wide world—we must be careful lest the sicentific pendulum swing too far in the direction of mechanistic technology.

The United States has an enormous pool of talent—in Government and in industry, in the professions and in the sciences. Can the Government, without abdicating its statutory responsibility, avail itself of the skills of experts outside of Government to contribute to the appraisal of the therapeutic efficacy and safety of new entities on their way to becoming medicaments? Might not the outside experts have some advisory role? If a useful way could be found, the public interest, I believe, would be well served.

We have come two-thirds the way along the lane of the 20th century. In that period, life expectancy has increased by 75 percent, from 40 years in 1900 to slightly more than 70 years today. What can we look to by way of further extension of life expectancy during the final third of the century? The answer lies in what all of us—you and I, the lawmakers and administrators, the scientists and the members of the healing professions, and the public—do with the knowledge we have, with the talents and energies that reside in us, to increase knowledge and to apply it courageously and intelligently, to the art, the science and the joy of living.

I presume on the hospitality of Sir Derrick Dunlop's paper to close with this quotation from it, with which I heartily associate myself:

"Operating under the profit system, the pharmaceutical industry has made enormous contributions to our society. Indeed, nearly all the valuable new drugs of the last 30 years—penicillin and streptomycin are notable exceptions—have been discovered in the manufacturers' laboratories. Since the October revolution in 1917 the State-owned industry in the U.S.S.R. has not produced a single new drug of therapeutic importance. We must therefore be careful not to kill the goose which has laid so many golden therapeutic eggs by excessive bureaucratic restrictions—still less by nationalization."

Thank you for the privilege of permitting me to participate in the pharmacy colloquium during the university's centennial observance, and thank you for listening.

THE HEINEMAN SUCCESS STORY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are few industries in this country that have had a rockier or tougher road than the railroads. When a railroad is able to show a profit, it is rare good news; and when one shows an increasing profit, it is even more welcome news.

But when a road that has been a money loser is able to show sharply increasing profits, it should be clear that there is something like business genius at work.

This is the fortunate fate of the railroad that has more miles of track in my State of Wisconsin than any other—the Chicago and North Western.

The Chicago and North Western has enjoyed the leadership in the past 10 years of Mr. Ben Heineman. Heineman was born in Wausau, Wis. His hard and successful work have made Wausau and Wisconsin proud and grateful.

In 10 years as a top officer of the Chicago and North Western he has not only brought the railroad clearly into the black, with a healthy profit of more than $16 million, but he has greatly improved the prospects for this railroad in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on Ben Heineman's remarkable job with the North Western Railway, which appeared in the March 21, 1966, issue of Railway Age be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. & N.W.'s Spectacular Comeback: The Heineman's Decade-Long Stewardship of the Chicago & North Western Has Seen the Road Move From Red Ink to Large Splashes of Very Solid Black Ink

Chicago & North Western and Chairman Ben W. Heineman complete a memorable decade together April 1.

And what a decade it has been. Investors no longer cringe when they think of the C. & N.W. shares in their portfolios. In the 10-year period, the road has gone from a very red $5.5-million loss in 1956 to a solid $16 million net in 1965.

Further, the turnaround in results is only part of the good news coming out of the new North Western nowadays. The road's employees, shippers, commuters and shareholders also have rising expectations from such assets as—

C. & N.W.'s plant and car fleet. It has respectability such as it has not had for years.

Mergers in the making.

C. & N.W.'s commuter service. Record revenues and earnings in 1965 from the road's suburban operations at Chicago promise to get even better. Trends so far in 1966 indicate growing rush-hour and non-rush-hour traffic.

Diversification: Prospects for increased earnings from C. & N.W.'s entry into chemical manufacturing are very bright.

Ben W. Heineman himself. There are those who insist he is C. & N.W.'s single best asset.

Ten years at C. & N.W.'s have not abated one whit Heineman's conviction that the rail industry future "is unlimited and will eclipse the great railroading years of the 19th century." Perhaps more pertinent to what happened at C. & N.W., Heineman has a passion for dispassionate analysis and a taste for action based upon such analysis.

C. & N.W.'s drive to hold and reduce rates and to work out economically attractive rate-service-equipment combinations that make competition and gain tonnage over the long haul reflect that kind of managerial insight. C. & N.W. hunted for ways to reduce rates when many carriers were unsure of the approach needed to deal with shrinking profit margins.

GRIM NEWS AT C. & N.W. IN 1956

When the curtain went up on the new North Western 10 years ago, only the leading men in the cast (and possibly the shippers, among such onlookers as employees, shareholders, financial experts, other railroad men, and the public) felt a comeback was even possible.

C. & N.W. news in early 1956 was enough to discourage even determined optimists. Aside from the loss of $26 million in passenger operations the year before, the road lost $8 million overall the first quarter of 1956 and $11 million by midyear. C. & N.W.'s previous management, while making good moves—retiring uneconomic branch lines, reducing employment, dieselizing, buying substantial numbers of new cars, probing merger possibilities with Milwaukee, ordering bilevel commuter equipment and installing welded rail—had not been able to halt C. & N.W.'s downward slide.

C. & N.W. sought rate increases in the early fifties as an offset to ballooning costs, especially labor costs. None of it seemed to have had much effect on overall results. "Everything we did seemed to turn up two other things that desperately needed action," recalls a C. & N.W. veteran. "We were being bled at a thousand places by people and practices that were hard to get at."

SAVING PENCIL STUBS

The old switchman's tag for C. & N.W. (the Cheap & Nothing Wasted) was actually quite inaccurate. While saving string and pencil stubs was an art in many lonely Iowa and Wisconsin stations (a magazine carried a story in the early fifties about an agent at a one-man station who had saved two drawersful of pencil stubs from his work of 42 years), there was internal and external waste. It is now apparent there was outside waste because of missed opportunity as the road tried to pry apart the narrowing gap between revenues and expenses by seeking rate increases. Shippers weren't buying and the competition kept capturing vital chunks of C. & N.W.'s tonnage.

On the inside, C. & N.W. was a road that gloried in having the world's largest freight yard at Proviso (a yard that some experts figured was 50 percent waste space), and an LCL house that could house 700 cars at a time—for traffic that C. & N.W. handled at a substantial loss. Serious problems were getting more acute with every wage increase. C. & N.W. was already burdened with the highest ratio of wages to revenue in the industry. There were, for example, more than 500 crossing flagmen on the payroll. There were hundreds of one-man stations scattered over the C. & N.W. system that could not be economically justified.

The C. & N.W. annual report for 1955 is an interesting document. It noted that the board of directors had requested that the president call in outside accountants to audit the company's financial statements for 1955. "This was a forward step because no such audit had ever before been undertaken," the report told C. & N.W. shareholders. In the same statement appears what must be one of the most curious phrases ever to appear in a railroad report: "the board recognizes what is known in railroad circles as deferred maintenance."

GOOD NEWS IN A FOOTNOTE

That same annual report carried the best news beleaguered C. & N.W. shareholders had gotten in years. In a footnote at the bottom of page 2 appeared the information that, on March 2, 1956, Ben W. Heineman was elected chairman and chief executive officer and that Clyde J. Fitzpatrick (then operating vice president of Illinois Central) had been elected president of C. & N.W.—effective April 1, 1956.

On that April Fools' Day in 1956 began a decade of C. & N.W. that was to see the road achieve a dramatic comeback, make Heineman a leading industry figure (he first appeared in the industry in 1950, as attorney for a group of Chicago Great Western stockholders) and make C. & N.W. one of the most publicized railroads in the country.

C. & N.W. MADE GOOD COPY

The struggle to straighten out the wobbly C. & N.W. of 1956 was chronicled in most major newspapers and financial journals—many times over. Even literary journals like the Saturday Review, Atlantic and Harper's have treated their audiences to highly entertaining (if somewhat simplified) accounts of the Heineman-Fitzpatrick struggle to right the listing C. & N.W.

Most of the stories, however, focused upon the merger maneuvering of Heineman (now recognized as one of the most astute industry strategists to come along in years), the rebuilding and success of the road's commuter service at Chicago, and on the 1962 Telegraphers' strike, when Heineman stood eyeball to eyeball with Telegrapher Chief George E. Leighty and refused to back down from his principles. It was a moment when Democrat Heineman, with his taste for books, avantgarde art and all, made even the flintiest of the industry's conservative chieftains sit up and take notice.

One of the funniest (and sincerest) tributes ever given to Heineman came after the strike, in the Chicago Traffic Club bar. A portly, extremely Republican railroad vice president told his guests that Heineman handled the strike "just as well as if he'd been a Republican."

But, by and large, stories about C. & N.W. dealt with relatively minor aspects of the road's reformation. The business and financial press generally made much of the merger moves and the up-and-down progress of C. & N.W.'s financial performance and share prices. The newspapers focused primarily on the unusual news coming out of C. & N.W.'s commuter operations, merger talk and on the attractive human-interest angles that can be developed from such a complex, articulate man as Heineman.

SHIPPERS KNOW REAL STORY

Of the various audiences that have read about and watched C. & N.W. during the last decade, probably only C. & N.W.'s men and the road's shippers are aware of C. & N.W.'s larger and more important accomplishments in the last 10 years. They are the ones who know about the rate reductions, the new equipment, the improved schedules and services, the new power, the industrial parks, the new port facilities, the upgraded plant and the aggressive marketing that marked the new management's quest for internal efficiency and external effectiveness as a competitor.

Selected 10-year operating and financial data for Chicago & North Western

	1965	1964	1963	1962 [1]	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Operating revenues……thousands of dollars	227,589	220,811	218,923	196,961	218,117	207,282	213,350	215,127	218,483	225,787
Operating expenses……do	181,152	182,075	179,093	169,218	176,849	178,580	182,887	178,234	186,670	198,211
Net railway operating income or (loss)……do	15,516	12,400	11,318	(630)	10,746	(1,263)	3,124	8,861	5,470	131
Other income……do	7,453	5,684	7,035	8,861	2,582	2,832	2,445	2,258	1,937	1,919
Income available for fixed charges……do	28,073	18,084	18,353	8,231	13,328	1,569	5,569	11,119	7,407	2,050
Fixed charges……do	9,004	6,923	6,791	6,997	7,213	5,710	5,420	5,260	4,784	4,540
Contingent interest……do	3,005	3,038	3,038	3,038	3,039	3,039	3,039	3,039	3,039	3,039
Net income or (loss)……do	16,064	8,123	8,524	(1,804)	3,076	(7,180)	(2,890)	2,820	(416)	(5,529)
Average number employees during year	14,423	15,252	15,883	16,075	16,505	17,311	18,229	18,449	20,933	24,795
Diesel locomotives……units	729	729	734	744	747	759	693	701	700	710
Freight train cars	43,423	42,065	41,737	41,838	43,426	44,308	40,581	41,239	40,712	42,346
Passenger train cars	279	296	413	447	471	633	802	853	957	1,085
Capital expenditures……thousands of dollars	47,418	30,075	23,321	15,936	21,313	26,883	25,382	25,704	21,240	32,356
Long-term debt including current maturities……do	295,769	225,795	224,173	225,896	235,497	242,364	217,853	220,734	212,380	219,976
Miles of road operated	10,362	10,432	10,462	10,547	10,702	9,521	9,284	9,309	9,297	9,362

---

[1] Data for 1962 reflect effects of 30-day telegraphers' strike.

A security analyst sums it up this way: "The merger news is all talk and hope, the commuter business, when all is said and done, is still only 6 percent of C. & N.W.'s business. But the road's shippers and freight tonnage are where the real turnaround at C. & N.W. was accomplished. That's where the road's real strength has been a-building. Where else do you think Heineman got the money, leverage, and credit to go bidding for Rock Island? Or to buy a $90 million chemical corporation when he decided on some contracyclical diversification for C. & N.W.?"

ACTION AT THE TOP

Contact with shipper requirements and competitive realities was quick once C. & N.W.'s new managers took over 10 years ago.

There was a lull for a few weeks after Heineman and Fitzpatrick moved into adjoining offices in C. & N.W.'s executive suite. Then the astonishing activity at the top began. It was to continue unabated for 10 years. It is still going strong and, if anything, is stepping up as the road continues to hack at internal inefficiency and improve its competitive position against trucks and barges operating in C. & N.W. land.

For weeks Heineman, with his quick, incisive intelligence, and Fitzpatrick, the practical, hard-boiled operating chief of IC whom Heineman had chosen to be C. & N.W.'s president, were everywhere on the railroad—evaluating men, plant, machines, operations, equipment, and organization.

A C. & N.W. trainmaster wrote to a journalist friend during that period: "The new chairman has an uncanny knack of asking questions that make you feel uneasy. Mr. Fitz doesn't say much, but he scribbles lots of notes." So began what has proved to be one of the most memorable collaborations in the history of railroad renovation.

MEETING PROBLEMS, HEAD ON

Little more than a month after they moved in at C. & N.W., Heineman and Fitzpatrick began making the tough decisions that were to become mileposts on C. & N.W.'s comeback journey. The quick, resourceful response to the road's problems illustrates both the magnitude of C. & N.W.'s trouble and the tough, analytical framework within which the road's new management energetically set out to restore some luster to what was once one of the bluest of blue-chip railroads in the United States.

On May 10, barely 6 weeks after the new management took over, C. &. N.W. retired 116 steam engines and announced that all freight and passenger service was dieselized through more efficient scheduling of the road's 710 diesel locomotives. A few days later, reorganization of the road's operating department swept away the posts of four district superintendents and placed operations on a divisional rather than a departmental basis. (In later years, after C. & N.W. pared down to competitive weight by reducing employment from 27,000 employees in 1955 to about 14,500 in 1965, it was not often noticed that the road had made even sharper cuts in supervisory and middle-managment ranks than it had among contract workers.)

In quick succession, decisions were made to expand track rehabilitation, bridge and roadbed programs; to install new accounting and reporting procedures; to reorganize the road's industrial development department and purchasing department; to shut down a third of giant Proviso yard (and release about 74 acres for eventual industrial development); to build a $6 million freight-car shop at Clinton, Iowa (to replace 14 obsolete facilities) and to bring in highly qualified new men wherever there were not men suitable for promotion.

PLUGGING THE LEAKS

With passenger operations resulting in a $26 million deficit in 1955, and with an $11 million overall C. & N.W. deficit in mid-1956, Heineman recalls, "We put tourniquets on everything in sight." Associates say that during those first few tense months there was some concern lest there not be enough cash to meet payrolls in the 3d quarter.

On October 25, 1956, 7 months after C. & N.W's new management took the railroad in hand, the railroad made the first of a series of moves to plug the cash leaks caused by passenger trains. In an unprecedented move, it petitioned the Wisconsin Public Service Commission for permission to take off 21 trains, pleading the loss of $2 million annually. In return it offered to buy new equipment to improve other trains. It was the first big move against passenger losses and was to be characteristic of dramatic C. & N.W. action that that reduced passenger losses from $23.4 million in 1956 to $1.6 million in 1965.

HITTING A LOW

The road's working capital declined from a meager $2.1 million at the end of 1955 to $47,417 at the end of 1956. The $5.5 million deficit at the end of 1956 forced the new management to suspend payment on C. & N.W.'s second mortgage bonds and on sinking fund requirements that were payable only if earned. Cash brought in by sale of scrap and real estate made it seem that C. & N.W. was staying alive by cannibalization of its own assets.

Hope stirred early in 1957. When the year began there were a lot of new faces on the C. & N.W. The average age of the road's executive officers was 48.6 years, compared with 55.3 years at the start of 1956. The railroad pushed industrial development of 6,200 acres near Peoria, Ill., announced a $5 million program to automate crossings, discontinued its free LCL pickup and delivery service (which was losing $1.5 million annually), bought a quarry to insure a supply of reliable ballast for its stepped-up roadway programs, bought the Litchfield & Madison for $8 million, hired outside research experts to survey C. & N.W.'s real estate, began expanding TOFC service, created a motor carrier division to handle its expanding TOFC traffic and pushed programs in South Dakota and Minnesota for central agencies to replace the network of inefficient small stations that were draining C. & N.W.'s resources. The central agency setup was later applied to the road's extensive network of stations in Iowa, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and other States and, ultimately, it led to the telegraphers' strike of 1962.

GETTING TO THE CORNER

At the end of 1957, one could hardly say that C. & N.W. had turned the corner. But the road was getting into the corner's neighborhood. The $5.5 million loss of 1956 was virtually eliminated, even though operating revenues dropped more than $7 million. And, during that first full year of plugging up C. & N.W.'s cash leaks, the new management began to focus on the railroad's outside problem—the competition.

Said Heineman, 18 months after becoming chairman of C. & N.W.: "We have the unalterable conviction that the industry as a whole has been suffering from persistent erosion of its proportion of total intercity freight. While there are many contributing causes for the gains recorded by competing modes of transportation, not the least of these are the many railroad rates fixed at unrealistically high levels without regard to competition." The statement was a tipoff to C. & N.W.'s competitive strategy from then on.

SEEK OUTSIDE HELP

C. & N.W. began going to the outside for help when it needed answers to real estate, market, and passenger problems. The road has, over the years, spent thousands of dollars buying the services of professional researchers and consultants to get to the heart of problems in iron-ore movements, industrial park location, commuter data of all kinds, diversification, and other problems where C. & N.W. felt it best to get advice from independent specialists.

Says a spokesman, "It's dangerous to have fixed notions in some areas when you're about to commit substantial effort and capital. We at C. & N.W. don't merchandise to please ourselves. That's why we so often call in outside research firms. They're more hardheaded and are less apt to get emotionally involved."

In 1958, the railroad cut 24 hours from its Chicago-west coast schedules (via its UP and SP connections). It dismantled its 21-acre freight house at Proviso, began systemwide training of sales personnel, and continued to attack internal inefficiency by pushing central agency systems. C. & N.W. secured approval from the Illinois Commerce Commission for a package of proposals on its commuter operations that were to result in a completely modernized service. The road also substantially boosted plant upgrading, equipment acquisitions, and car-repair programs.

Of equal significance in 1958, however, were reduced rates C. & N.W. installed on intrastate shipments of corn, oats, and soybeans in Minnesota—and its application for rate reductions on interstate shipments of corn, sorghums, and soybeans to Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Sioux City, Omaha, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Peoria markets. Multiple-car rates on pulpwood were announced. Freight train schedules were again tightened. C. & N.W. pressed tax claims against the United States. They were to prove important in the road's rehabilitation.

The railroad established a foreign trade department (in response to the St. Lawrence Seaway) and published a foreign trade handbook to inform C. & N.W. men and Midwestern shippers on the terminology and techniques of foreign trade for proper use of the seaway.

Orders were placed for an additional 36 doubledecker commuter cars (costing $5.6 million). C. & N.W. announced a $9 million rehabilitation program for 8,000 freight cars, the beginning of a series of massive programs and equipment acquisitions that were to result in reduction of C. & N.W.'s per diem deficit from $6.5 million in 1955 to $764,000 in 1964.

THE BETS LOOKED BAD

For a road that zigzagged above and below the breakeven point all the way into the early sixties (the $1.8 million loss in 1962, the last deficit year, was attributed to the telegraphers' strike that year), C. & N.W. pushed some muscular capital spending programs from the very beginning. Programs stayed in the $21 to $26 million range (except for the strike year) until an upturn in revenues enabled C. & N.W. to spend $30 million in 1964, more than $50 million in 1965 and announce a record $66 million in capital improvements for 1966.

In retrospect the capital spending moves before the upturn look inspired, but at the time they looked like bad bets to many in the industry, the financial community, and to the investing public. When Heineman and Fitzpatrick took over at C. & N.W., the road's common stock was selling at around $27 and the preferred around $37. By mid-1962, fading of confidence by the investing public could be seen in the abandonment of C. & N.W. by the investment trusts and other institutional buyers. C. & N.W. common was selling for $8.75 a share.

C. & N.W. SHAPES UP

If misgivings existed in C. & N.W.'s stark, ultramodern executive offices, they did not reflect in either the direction or tempo of the road's internal or external action. C. & N.W. accelerated consolidation and elimination of facilities, getting rid of unnecessary tracks around terminals, tearing up unneeded tracks in small towns, and passing tracks too short to hold modern era trains. Stations were closed by the hundreds, reducing maintenance substantially. Stations on lines where passenger service was eliminated were torn down and the land turned to other uses. Management appropriated money ("Even when it hurt," recalls one C. & N.W. officer) for mechanization of track work—$11 million worth of machines—and stepped up programs wherever programs could quickly pay for themselves.

Chairman Heineman's conviction that "price moves merchandise" was the ruling axiom in C. & N.W.'s external moves as the fifties closed. C. & N.W. began making competition with incentive rates on butter, reduced rates on iron ore, livestock, lumber, coal, corn, and many other commodities. The moves held—and in some cases substantially increased—tonnages of C. & N.W.'s 10 largest revenue producing commodities. Pressure was constantly applied to reduction of passenger losses. Passenger train miles were reduced from 8.6 million in 1955 to 1.2 million by 1965.

INTERNAL OPTIMISM HIGH

Expansion of the road's commuter operations (as the C. & N.W. probed the possibilities for profit from this unlikely direction) came right after the start of 1960 when the road announced a $29,554 profit on 1959 commuter operations. The road converted 45 locomotives for push-pull operation, and ordered 116 more bilevel coaches for such operations, giving it a fleet of 200 modern, double-deck coaches.

The road reduced grain rates on points west of the Missouri River, again expanded its industrial development department, scrapped whole fleets of obsolete suburban and passenger cars, reduced rates on iron ore to offset competition from foreign ores, agreed to buy 1,500-mile Minneapolis & St. Louis for $20.9 million, handled the first bulk cargo (inedible tallow) through Navy Pier at Chicago and kept pressure on regulatory agencies for reduction of losing passenger trains.

In mid-1960, testifying before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, Heineman cited what must have been a substantial factor in C. & N.W.'s decline in the post-World War II years: In the 13 years from 1947 through 1959, cumulative losses from passenger train operations on C. & N.W. totaled $287 million.

Later in 1960, Heineman, in a speech, deplored the lack of coordination in planning metropolitan transportation that forces commuter operations to compete with public funds. He offered to sell C. & N.W. suburban facilities rather than enter such competition. It was an offer he was to make even after the service became profitable. Just a few weeks ago, just after it was announced that C. & N.W.'s commuter trains produced a $1.38 million net in 1965, Heineman told a Boston audience he would sell C. & N.W.'s commuter operation "lock, stock, and barrel" rather than compete with public money.

MORE IN EARLY SIXTIES

Computers, microwave, massive car-rebuilding programs, additions to the commuter fleet as passengers increased, reduced rates and a systematic upgrading of suburban stations and construction of a $1-million TOFC terminal at Proviso were highlights of progress internally and externally at C. & N.W. up to mid-1963, when Heineman and C. & N.W. made headlines everywhere by deciding to fight moves by Union Pacific for control of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific. C. & N.W. filed application for control of Rock Island, made a counteroffer to Rock Island's shareholders, and began what is proving to be the noisiest, most complicated fight for control of a railroad that the industry has seen in many years.

The road cleared up interest arrearages on its bonds. It reinstated preferred dividends as Christmas of 1963 neared. Profits of $203,000 for 1963's commuter operations were included in C. & N.W.'s net income of $8.5 million from railroad operations that year.

MORE MERGER ACTION

As 1964 got underway, C. & N.W. announced more unit coal trains, sold lakefront land in Milwaukee and spent $1.3 million dredging and constructing a facility at Escanaba, Mich., enabling deep-draft vessels to load there.

In mid-1964, Heineman's outspoken convictions about the need for consolidation of midwestern rail systems (based upon plans formulated by industry experts during the depression era) began to show up in C. & N.W. moves to consolidate with neighboring railroads. C. & N.W. and Chicago Great Western announced they were negotiating terms for merger. By September 1, both C. & N.W. and CGW boards approved the merger terms that had been worked out. Exactly 2 weeks later C. & N.W. and Milwaukee announced agreement on plans to merge. The C. & N.W.–CGW merger plan was recently approved by an ICC examiner (Railway Age Mar. 14, p. 7).

At year's end, C. & N.W.'s board declared a $3 dividend on common stock to be made quarterly in 1965 on 1964 earnings (which came to $23 million, including special credits from sale of real estate and refunds of State and Federal taxes amounting to $15 million). The road posted a $706,000 profit on its commuter operations at the end of 1964.

LAST YEAR, DIVERSIFICATION

C. & N.W.'s gains could be gaged early last year when it announced $45 million in capital improvements (this was later increased to more than $50 million). C. & N.W. bought abandoned Chicago North Shore & Milwaukee right-of-way in Kenosha and in Illinois, and continued its attack on competition and internal inefficiency. Last March, C. & N.W. and Milwaukee approved merger terms. Rates on corn in the Midwest to export markets via the St. Lawrence Seaway were cut.

On June 14, C. & N.W. announced it had agreed to buy the Velsicol Chemical Corp. for $90 million, and was endeavoring (successfully, as it turned out) to buy 230,000 shares of Michigan Chemical Corp. (a Velsicol subsidiary) at $33 per share so that it could file a consolidated return.

By late last year, C. & N.W. was back in the thick of the contest for control of Rock Island when the Interstate Commerce Commission approved its application for authority to make its existing exchange offer available to Rock Island shareholders who hold Union Pacific certificates of deposit. By late last year, too, C. & N.W. saw a substantial group of other midwestern railroads—including Milwaukee, Santa Fe, Missouri Pacific, Frisco, and other roads—also opposing Union Pacific control of Rock Island.

CHANGE IS RELATIVE

By 1966, C. & N.W. was shaping up—fast. The road's shares are now bought avidly by investors convinced that C. & N.W. and its remarkable chairman are on the way to bigger, better, and more profitable years ahead. The road's internal reworking is hardly over. As one veteran observer puts it, "A railroad takes a long time to go downhill, and it takes just as long to build it up again." But the road is handling its trains economically and building capability at an accelerating clip.

Early last January, C. & N.W.'s $66 million capital improvement program, largest in the company's history, caused a stir. The program, noted Heineman, "will enable us to accelerate our program of tailoring our services to the needs of our customers, and also help increase our overall operating efficiency, thereby enhancing our ability to maintain or reduce our present level of freight rates."

NOW, FASTER PROGRESS

Massive equipment purchases and equipment rebuilding programs from 1962 to the present have had a dramatic impact upon C. & N.W.'s once-ancient car fleet.

The road has placed orders for two RCA Spectra computers and for an IBM 360. Additional hotbox detectors are being added to C. & N.W.'s main lines. A $6 million elevator capable of holding 5 million bushels of grain at Superior, Wis., will be completed this spring and leased to Continental Grain.

C. & N.W. is leasing, in a single order, more than 2,000 radio units and equipping all locomotive cabs, cabooses, and 170 way stations with two-way radio. As part of the program (aimed at developing greater efficiencies in operations over the road as well as in yards), head-end brakemen will also have portable walkie-talkies to use when they must be down from the cab.

WHAT'S AHEAD?

One commodity that is not in short supply at C. & N.W. these days is know-how. Larry S. Provo, C. & N.W.'s vice president, finance, notes that while progress is still needed in many areas of C. & N.W.'s operations, "We nonetheless have already made operations sensitive to management control and competition. That makes progress more possible.

"If we did not have a thing to do in the next 10 years but consolidate with CGW and Milwaukee, that would be a great accomplishment in itself.

"We expect good results from our diversification. Chemicals have a much greater growth factor than railroads. A growth of 15 percent per year is not unusual in the chemical industry.

"Above all, more accurate decisions are ahead. It has been difficult to arrive at decisions because the industry is so large and complicated. We used to have 25 percent facts and 75 percent judgment enter into decisions. We hope to see that reversed one of these days. We've already come a long way. We're honing down the decision-making process here at C. & N.W."

NEED FREEDOM TO REACT

Heineman, a man who has done much to make the long-range approach more common, thinks prospects are bright for railroads generally and C. & N.W. particularly—if there is no business downturn, if concerted industry action unfreezes the rate apparatus.

"When business slows down, whether in the shirt business or any other business," he says, "there is a natural tendency to cut prices. Our trucker and barge friends are all able to make 'instant bargains' to haul bulk commodities. The railroads cannot unless they get legislative relief. If, when a downturn comes, railroads do suffer—as they may—it will be because of the rigidity of the price structure upon us but not upon our competition."

NOT ALL ROSES

Another C. & N.W. officer, noting that he feels C. & N.W. is still a marginal property, admits the past 10 years were not without errors of commission and omission. "Sure, we've made our share of bad moves—and some of them were beauts. No one can ever say definitely what value we missed by not making certain moves we could have made. We are painfully aware of the cost to C. & N.W. of moves we did make that we shouldn't have made. We made some costly mistakes, for example, with reduced fares on through passenger trains. We'd have done better to raise the fares.

"But, the important thing is that we react to facts—and we make a determined effort to get the facts. We've done a lot. We've got a lot to do. You can't say we're passive about events here at C, & N.W. We're moving."

A TASTE OF SUCCESS

C. & N.W., having written a dazzling comeback story, begins 1966 with vitality, ideas and momentum. Its management is young and has had an exhilarating whiff of success. That's a magic mixture.

RAILROADS MUST AGREE ON WHAT IT IS THEY DO WELL

Ben W. Heineman has been described as a professional problem-solver. He had problems enough to solve at C. & N.W. the past 10 years. Many railroad men—and all C. & N.W. shareholders—think he handled them brilliantly.

He caused a stir among railroad men in the Midwest late last year when he made a problem-solver's stab at prescribing for maladies that afflict the industry. He called for railroads to "analyze clearly the problems and opportunity of the industry" and to have the "toughness of mind and basic courage to make clear to the public, to the Government, and to our coworkers what such analysis discloses to us."

Heineman said competition forces the industry to be price conscious: "Some railroads still believe rate reduction to meet truck competition is unwise because in reducing rates to meet 10 percent of competition they also reduce rates on 90 percent of a given commodity. The hope is that by doing nothing, the competition will go away. Competition doesn't go away. It increases."

The rail industry, says Heineman, has carried a great deal of "fat.". Stripping it off "will permit us to absorb cost increases in labor and materials for longer than our competition is able to absorb them.

"We must agree on what we do well. Then we must cut the fat to permit us to do it at the lowest possible price. Then we will be able to rebuild our volume on a sound basis and again be adding employees—on a sound basis."

Heineman wants agreement on "the important objectives of the industry. * * * This great industry must come as closely as possible to having a unified voice and objective. If we are granted the wisdom to arrive at a consensus, a genuine consensus, as to what the course of this industry should be, and are granted in addition the courage not to be diverted from this, but to stay with it despite all conceivable challenges and obstacles—we'll be a great industry for a long time to come."

Asked what such an industry consensus ought to include. Heineman reiterated his previously expressed strong feeling that the industry ought to make clear to Government, public and to itself that trucks and barges do not carry passengers at a loss and neither can railroads if they are to perform basic functions to the country's benefit.

But, importantly, Heineman thinks the industry ought to achieve—

Agreement, generally, that price is the essence of competition, and that the industry must have the right to reduce rates.

Agreement on car ownership—as to who is obliged to own what kind of cars and in what quantity.

Agreement on a central system, perhaps a separate, jointly owned computer company, with basic responsibility (and authority) for equipment distribution.

Agreement on a unified approach to changing work rules in the industry.

Some kind of internal consensus on mergers "would be helpful. It would be difficult but not impossible to achieve."

Achieving agreement in these areas would, he thinks, enable railroads to solicit the support of shippers, labor, and the public and to present to Congress a program which all strongly support. "If the approach is forceful and united enough, shippers and the administration will support it."

Obstacles to such a consensus are—

The difficulty of getting railroad presidents together. "And even if you do get them together, you're not likely to get much done because the homework will not have been done."

The strong individualism prevailing among industry chiefs. "Responsible, as they should be, for their companies, they tend to look pretty closely at short-range difficulties rather than at long-range benefits."

Heineman sees strong staff work as a way around some of the obstacles. "Agreement might be possible if staff work was done well. There should be at least a year of preparation by first-rate people putting problems in focus. Meetings would be a waste of time without such preparation.

"Above all, there has to be desire and motivation before such a consensus can be achieved. Objectives on a national, unified basis are necessary to get the fat out of operations and to put a fine edge to our competitive capability.

"But before we can even make a beginning an industry group has to sit down and examine the feasibility—and value—of such a consensus."

EDUCATION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations will soon make its recommendations, and the Senate will consider the continuation of our foreign aid program. One of the most important elements of foreign aid, and perhaps the element of most lasting significance, is assistance to education.

On April 16, former Senator William Benton addressed the American Academy of Political and Social Science on the subject of "Education as an Instrument of American Foreign Policy." This address is another example of Senator Benton's consistently wise counsel, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Education as an Instrument of American Foreign Policy

(By William Benton)

Back in the late summer of 1945—just before V-J Day—I was summoned to the service of the State Department; summoned in the fine old sense of commanded. I was to be an assistant secretary. This was in the days when there were only four assistant secretaries authorized by Congress and we had considerable standing in the city.

During my early weeks in the Department, I attended a lecture given by one of our distinguished Foreign Service career officers—later U.S. ambassador to several countries. He told us that the most significant act in international relations is the crossing of the border of one nation, without permission, by the troops of another nation.

More recently, another distinguished career officer—several times an ambassador—was asked by a Senate committee to describe the qualifications of an ideal American emissary. The single most important qualification, he replied, is the ambassador's professional judgment on when to threaten the use of force.

Here are two examples of a classical view of diplomacy. Today, however, the diplomat worried about threatening the use of force would be well advised if he headed for the telephone; the hot line isn't there to be ignored. New conditions have forced a new diplomacy.

To what extent is the new diplomacy taking over? To what extent is it clearly recognized? These seem suitable questions to raise with this academy.

When I joined the postwar State Department, I was to be in charge of the new diplomacy. This included the war-spawned activities of the OIAA, the OWI, the OSS, and other vibrant overseas agencies. It encompassed all of the Department's informational activities, domestic as well as international, including what became the Voice of America. I was also in charge of American participation in UNESCO and, indeed, of all the Department's so-called cultural activities, including the exchange of professors and students. Further—believe it or not—I was responsible for nothing less than the reeducation of Germany and Japan. Although I did not know it on the day of my command, I and my new diplomacy were not welcomed by the classical practitioners, those of whom it has sometimes been said, they are honest men sent abroad to lie for their country.

An early impulse was to call upon my old friend from the Midway, Harold Lasswell. As most of you know, Harold is a kind of one-man academy of political and social science. He knows practically everything about everything. Beardsley Ruml once called him the best educated man in America, and by this Beardsley meant the best educated man he had ever educated in his days dispensing largesse for the general education board. At my request and for the special benefit of Congress, Dr. Lasswell abandoned his famous polysyllables and condensed the factors involved in international relations into four five-letter words. The first word was "force"—the use or the threat of armed might. The second was "deals"—meaning diplomatic arrangements. The third was "goods"—meaning economic dispositions. The fourth was the relatively new diplomacy—"words"—the open covenants openly arrived at—meaning, more precisely, propaganda, or, to use less propagandistic words, meaning information and culture in all their forms. That fourth was the great newly recognized field—my special area—important everywhere in the world but made especially important in some areas by the rise of educated electorates. Dr. Lasswell was its prophet; he was and is to the best of my knowledge the leading theoretician of international propaganda. He gently reminded me that one of the principal functions of "words" in international relations was to "economize on the use of force." Force remained the fundamental.

The title assigned me for my speech today, "Education as an Instrument of Foreign Policy," suggests that a fifth five-letter word should now be added to Harold Lasswell's quartet. The new word is "teach."

This in no way minimizes force, deals, and goods as instruments to be manipulated in the pursuit of foreign goals. Perhaps it only emphasizes that words—particularly those words and images that can fairly be called educational—will play proportionately a greater role. However, I am less sanguine of their impact than I was 20 years ago. I am less hopeful of quick progress through the new diplomacy.

Many of us then were confident, and somewhat in a hurry to prove it, that Understanding with a capital "U" could prove an answer to many of mankind's ills. We persuaded ourselves to the belief that as there were fewer misunderstandings in the world there would be fewer tensions to be relaxed and fewer relations to be improved. This seemed a recognizable goal within a realizable future.

I startled the State Department by arguing that the United States should welcome at least 50,000 foreign students a year.

There were 10,000 here then, in 1946. I wrote an article in the Ladies' Home Journal entitled "Our Best Weapon—Exchange Students." One sentence in that article was based on my observations in a prewar visit to Shanghai. It read, "It is said that 40 percent of the leading civil servants in China have studied at American universities." Three years later the Communists had seized China's mainland. Today there are 90,000 foreign students here in the United States. It's wonderful; and I still argue that exchange students are a potent weapon. Should I still argue they are our best?

Has UNESCO, which has sought Understanding with a capital "U," actually contributed to peace, or even understanding? The UNESCO General Conference in November of 1964 set up a special round table to meet at the next Conference in November of this year to discuss how UNESCO has and can contribute to peace. This is in tribute to UNESCO's charter and in commemoration of its 20th anniversary.

In the 20 years UNESCO's program has undergone a swing of roughly 180° in orientation. We who pioneered UNESCO at the London Conference in 1945, where we wrote the charter, were anxious first to help repair war-devastated schools, universities, and libraries. (To that end I personally gave $75,000 of the 1945 printing of Encyclopaedia Britannica.) Our longer range perspective was focused on the more developed countries. Like the old Institute of Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations, UNESCO proposed to concentrate largely on the advanced countries. It would construct "the defenses of peace in the minds of men" where, traditionally, wars began. The big wars didn't begin in the underdeveloped countries.

Not foreseen by us in London was the trend that today puts more than 90 percent the UNESCO's program into helping the relatively underdeveloped countries. Can our projected UNESCO round table on peace demonstrate that this encourages peace? I hope so. But the viewpoint must be very long range. Surely it will be easy to demonstrate that the UNESCO program embraces education as an instrument of foreign policy. Yes, the word "teach" is now paramount in UNESCO. But the "defenses of peace"—those to be constructed remain on the horizon. Education holds no quick promise of peace or even of understanding.

Still, the promise is there—even if it does not warrant an immediate or massive educational crusade. One formidable obstacle to any such crusade, very easy to understand, confronts us in the literacy figures. Seven hundred million adults—4 out of every 10 of the world's population—can neither read nor write. The number is increasing. Does this then warrant a vast worldwide campaign? Unfortunately, we are not yet ready. We don't know how to make it stick. When we do, I shall favor it. Promising starts have been made. UNESCO is sponsoring a spatter of experiments. What we learn from them we hope to expand, ultimately on a world basis. The so-called new techniques are being applied in some areas. But where choices must now be made at the adult level—and they must—I feel that first priority must go to the education of people who are being trained for jobs. Thus, it is now better to take the illiterate factory worker and teach him to read and write so that he may become a foreman than it is to stretch our present goals to the masses of illiterate peasants. Two years ago Minister of Education Torres Bodet told me that 50 percent of all Mexican children drop out of school after the first grade. But even if they didn't in many communities there are no books. Torres Bodet's goal was 50 books for every community schoolhouse. In Brazil, in most of the 50,000 primary schools, largely taught by teachers with only an elementary school education, there are few if any books. These two illustrations from these two relatively advanced countries show the complexity of the literacy problem.

How then shall the United States pursue the promise? Last autumn President Johnson signaled the wave of the future for U.S. policy, and doubtless stimulated the suggested title of my speech today, in his speech at the Smithsonian Institution. This former Texas schoolteacher had already earned himself a secure place in the history of American education by sponsoring the great congressional acts of 1965 which will raise to $10 billion a year the total Federal money going into domestic education. In the Smithsonian speech he preempted center stage in world education. The President said:

"The men who founded our country knew that once a nation commits itself to the increase and diffusion of knowledge the real revolution begins. It can never be stopped.

"We know today that certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth: that ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace; that the conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms; and that the knowledge of our citizens is the treasure which grows only when it is shared."

President Johnson concluded his speech with his outline of a program of five points.

Rene Maheu, Director General of UNESCO even before these points had been cabled to me as the U.S. member of UNESCO's Executive Board which was then meeting in Paris, read them point-by-point to the Board as a statement of historic importance. Here is the President's projected five-point U.S. policy:

First, to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions.

Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.

Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, and works of science and imagination.

Fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problem of mankind.

Shortly after his Smithsonian speech, President Johnson hammered home his theme in a speech to the bankers. He startled them by coolly suggesting that education is more important than money. Rene Maheu also read this to the UNESCO Board.

The President then set up his task force to prepare the recommendations for Congress. Was its Chairman the head of the Office of Education? Not at all. Was he the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare? No. He was the Secretary of State.

In February, the President implemented the findings of the task force by calling upon the Congress to establish a Center for Educational Cooperation. Is this a center for encouraging cooperation among the 50 States as Dr. Conant has recommended? No, it is not, even though such a center is manifestly needed. The President informed the Congress, "Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes * * * it must be at the heart of our international relations." The eyes of the Center are thus to be fixed in large measure outside our own borders.

(The President's new initiatives in international education also anticipate a "Council on International Education"; the creation of a corps of education officers in the U.S. Foreign Service; further stimulation of exchanges with students and teachers of other lands; direct support of countries struggling to improve their educational standards, including the development of new techniques for basic education and assistance in the teaching of English; and finally, building new bridges of international understanding through conferences and through the increased flow of books and audiovisual materials.)

The President's February message—which will shortly come before Congress for action, and will deserve your support—further suggested the establishment of what he called "binational educational foundations." When the President greeted Madam Gandhi, he proposed creation of the first such Foundation, an Indian-American Foundation, "to promote progress in all fields of learning in India." This was no airy gesture. The President proposes to put behind the new foundation $300 million in blocked rupees accruing from sales of food to India under Public Law 480.

We Americans are by no means alone in sensing these new directions. For example, every year the Soviet Union produces 100 million books in English, French, German, and Spanish—with major emphasis on English.

(There are 41,000 teachers of English in the Soviet Union and the Russians seem reasonably resigned to the fact that English and not Russian has become the world language of science, and that English, not Russian, is becoming the auxiliary language of nation after nation. If anyone wonders why the Britannica bought the Merriam-Webster dictionary, I can assure you it was not merely to help our subscribers understand the polysyllabic articles you and Lasswell write for the Britannica—and our salesmen do indeed expect to sell a dictionary with every set. But it was also to promote English throughout the world—and of course to profit thereby.)

These 100 million Soviet books are not limited to Marxist-Leninist propaganda. Many are texts by Soviet authors in physics, chemistry, geology, biology, medicine and engineering. These are made available to students at low cost—at most nominal cost compared with the prices of American texts in the same fields. India and Brazil are notable areas for distribution of such English-language texts. Recently I heard a report about a startling example of Soviet enterprise. An American professor, appointed by an Egyptian university to teach a course in American civilization, found that the books he assigned his classes weren't available in Cairo in American editions. But, according to the report, Soviet manufactured English-language books about America were plentiful.

Such a direct attack is not the only way the Soviet Union applies this aspect of the new diplomacy to foreign policy. Ten years ago I wrote an article for the New York Times magazine entitled "The Cold War of the Classrooms." This article was based on the first of my five trips to the Soviet Union. Last month I published a book titled "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," based on the latest of these trips. Ten years ago and again today I have described the gauntlet the Soviets have flung at us in education. This, in my view, may prove to be their great challenge. It has been made by them most openly—and avowedly—and I would add most honestly—as a proposed test of the worth of our two social systems. "Follow our educational model," the Soviets cry to the underdeveloped nations, "and you, too, can pull yourselves up by your bootstraps."

In my judgment the Soviets have one undeniable advantage over us in education: they appear to have greater faith in it than we do, and they work harder at it. Their conception of the aim of education is of course wholly different: they aim at service to the state, while we hope to aim at the development of the individual to his highest potential powers. They have not yet achieved our degree of universality, particularly at the secondary school level. But the measure of their concentration—both in the party and government and by the individual—is breathtaking. The vocabulary standard for a Russian fourth-grade youngster is twice that of an American. Pupils entering 10th grade, having had 9 years of mathematics, tackle calculus while ours are still floundering with solid geometry or trigonometry. The Soviet budget for education—which equals its budget for defense—represents 15 percent of gross national product, compared with our 5 percent.

Let me give you an example of the grim Soviet devotion to education. Last September the periodical Sovetskaya Kultura complained that only 7 percent of the time on Soviet TV is devoted to entertainment. The author, one Victor Slavkin, says, "Of course I don't count such things as animated cartoons in a program on health education as entertainment." He concludes with a protest, "The viewer should not be considered a patient who wishes some medicine, nor a schoolboy to be seated at a desk."

Russia's present plans for television call for setting aside one entire network for education, extending from Leningrad to Vladivostok. This is not intended as a means of so-called "enriching" of primary and secondary school courses—which, in effect, is what most of our daytime ETV programs turn out to be. The new Soviet ETV network is to concentrate on advanced education in evening or prime hours. It will be integrated with correspondence techniques and the students will get periodic time off from their jobs to attend the universities. It will be devoted to training in medicine, engineering, and other advanced disciplines. The head of Soviet TV explained to me, "We have plenty of teachers and we thus don't need TV's help in the 10-year schools. We need more engineers even though we are now graduating three times as many as you are. Further, we shall command the help and leadership of our top scholars and academicians in developing our TV courses. We shall give diplomas with the same standing as those of our universities and research institutions."

Does such Soviet dedication to education have any implications for our foreign policy? What do you think? Doesn't this question apply particularly to the potentialities of the new techniques of education? Here at home as well as in President Johnson's proposed program outside our borders, I see high hope in the use of radio and television, in programed self-instruction, in films and filmstrips, and language laboratories. Everyone admits that there is no perfect substitute for a good teacher. But where are there enough good teachers? Our country has pioneered in the development of the new techniques, and Prof. Wilbur Schramm of Stanford, is now pioneering through UNESCO in the study of their application in the developing countries. But the application both at home and abroad promises to be painfully slow.

Recently my friend Prime Minister Harold Wilson sent Lord Goodman to me armed with the recent British white paper which proposes a TV channel dedicated to a new "University of the Air." The projected courses are to rival in quality those at the British universities. Isn't it a certainty that such courses will be exported? Should they not even be exported to the United States? Indeed, perhaps the greatest hope for us in the United States—in our efforts to use the great new medium of TV for "the public interest, convenience, and necessity"—and most notably for education—perhaps our greatest hope lies in the lessons to be jammed down our throats from the use of TV by the British, the Italians, and the Japanese who are now in the forefront—yes, and also the Russians. Can't an assembly of scholars like this one dare to hope that our American people won't tolerate great progress in the use of TV for education abroad in contrast to continued neglect and apathy at home?

Prof. C. E. Beeby, for 20 years Minister of Education in New Zealand, later Assistant Deputy Director of UNESCO, still later Chairman of UNESCO's Executive Board, and now at Harvard, has written:

"In the period between the two wars we had discovered that education could be a force in social change, but except in totalitarian countries, the change of which we spoke was a staid and stately process that bore little resemblance to the kaleidoscopic events in Africa and Asia over the past decade."

The evolving countries have told us the "staid and stately" pace in education just won't do in these times even if we are prepared to tolerate it at home. James Reston recently wrote:

"Wherever (Washington officials) look in the developing world they find much the same situation—the gap widening between the rich industrial nations of the northern climes and the poor industrial nations of the southern; vast corrective programs dealing with the effects of poverty and illiteracy, but scarcely touching the causes, and everywhere in these poor lands human fertility outrunning human ingenuity."

India's current 5-year plan uses the following words:

"Education is the most important single factor in achieving rapid economic development and technological progress and in creating a social order founded on the values of freedom, social justice, and equal opportunity."

President Johnson has used the phrase "the gospel of development."

Even those nations today which turn their backs on the gospel are eager for development. Education is the key. It is also the only solid basis, as India insists, for freedom, social justice, and equal opportunity. Who then in this scientific group can deny that it thus must be a central concern in the development of our foreign policy?

Unhappily, almost by definition the gospel of development—the so-called revolution of rising expectations—will be accompanied by conflict and dissension. But there will be little hope of resolving the conflicts, and of achieving peace in our century, unless the world makes heroic efforts in education—sustained, imaginative, and ever-greater efforts.

Thus education is destined to become a characteristic form of America's involvement in world affairs. I agree this is an optimistic view of the future. I give it to you political scientists whose work is often permeated by pessimism under the guise of realism. I leave you as you adjourn your important conference with this optimistic view. Can we call my view other than optimistic since education is indeed an end in itself? It is the very essence of the American dream. It is now as well a means to many ends. Some of these will increasingly guide the conduct of our foreign policy. For this, I am thankful.

PATRICK V. McNAMARA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, if one's greatness is measured by his character and integrity and by the courage of his convictions, then truly Pat McNamara was a great man.

A man of very humble beginnings, he began his life working with his hands and, although he later held one of the highest offices of this Nation, he never forgot his early associations with men and women of labor. He never succumbed to the temptations of power and the vanity of prestige. He was concerned with the plight of the elderly, the ill, the uneducated, and the youth of our Nation. He was truly a friend of the forgotten underdog.

If one's greatness is measured by the warmth of his heart and the milk of human kindness which flows through his veins, then truly Pat McNamara was a great man. Although he was a man of huge physical proportions, he responded to the cries of a little infant and was concerned with the plight of helpless animals. He was truly a compassionate person.

Pat McNamara was truly one of the finest men I have met along life's pathway. In his passing, our Nation has suffered a great loss, but because of his presence in this world, our Nation today is a greater and much better place. Our Nation will miss him and I will miss him.

INFLATIONARY TRENDS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, indicative of the increasing concern throughout our Nation over inflationary trends are the comments expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Friday, April 22, edition of the Pratt, Kans., Tribune.

This thoughtful piece, entitled "From All Points of the Compass," emphasizes the paradoxical effect on our economy of vast Federal defense and welfare programs. I would commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM ALL POINTS OF THE COMPASS

Inflation news is coming in from all the points of the compass nowadays.

For instance, says a Herald Tribune News Service dispatch, wholesale prices took a big jump in February, according to the Department of Labor. It was the biggest for any February in all of 16 years. And it "lifted the closely watched price inflation barometer 4.1 percent above its year-ago level."

Government spokesmen, the report goes on, express the hope that the wholesale price index may soon stop its upward surge. Just about everyone will concur in that. But, as past history has proven, this may turn out to be whistling in the dark, and the forces which are now shouldering prices and costs upward may prove irresistible.

The ordinary citizen, worriedly watching further degradation of the dollar can only hope for the best. Each of those dollars buys a little less each month. And there can be small doubt that this will continue so long as we attempt to fight a major war, declared or undeclared, and with it carry on welfare programs of unprecedented scope and cost. It cannot be too often repeated that in this way we create new classes of poor at a time when a major governmental purpose is to combat and eliminate poverty.

A SOUND VIEW

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the "sound view of Vietnam," held by Secretary Freeman has been lauded by the Denver Post.

The Post quotes Freeman as saying that "agriculture is the key to lasting victory in Vietnam," and the paper adds:

More and more, this is being accepted as truth. Military effort, by itself, is not enough. Only a sweeping modernization of the Vietnamese economy—particularly in the rural areas—will achieve the lasting victory we seek.

Because we are concerned about the "second front," and because this editorial on the subject is most informative, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Freeman Has Sound View of Vietnam

Orville Freeman's view of the problem in South Vietnam differs little from that held by other members of President Johnson's Cabinet. Nevertheless, having recently toured rural areas of South Vietnam as an expert observer, the Agriculture Secretary gives an impression of persuasive credibility.

He believes, in the words he used in addressing the National Farmers Union convention in Denver, that "agriculture is the key to lasting victory in Vietnam."

More and more, this is being accepted as truth. Military effort, by itself, is not enough. Young peasant volunteers must be organized in a concerted program aimed at opening up what Freeman calls a "second front" in the long Vietnamese war.

The military fight for territory has made some progress. But only a sweeping modernization of the Vietnamese economy—particularly in the rural areas—will achieve the lasting victory we seek.

President Johnson expressed this view in the Declaration of Honolulu, which followed his conference in Hawaii with leaders of the South Vietnamese Government. Johnson's Agriculture Secretary gave the Declaration full support in his Denver speech last week.

Rural uplift is not new. But the effort needs to be so much greater than we have hitherto been willing to hazard that it amounts—at the very least—to a major shift of emphasis in the Asian war.

The reason for the difficulty is that ongoing programs are hard to maintain in the face of hit-and-run terrorism by the Vietcong. Secretary Freeman said the 1,500 village chiefs killed in South Vietnam during the last few years are equivalent "in the United States to assassinating 60,000 American mayors and county commissioners."

Obviously it is difficult to bring progress. Few villagers want to volunteer for the firing squad.

Nevertheless, this is what must happen. Progress and modernization must be made so attractive that the South Vietnamese people are willing to take the gamble because they are convinced the Vietcong represent only bloodshed and repression.

The $275 million aid package now before Congress, plus expanded aid to be sought in the next fiscal year, is the first installment in the sweeping program aimed at escalating rural progress in the war-torn country.

We believe, as does Secretary Freeman, that this will be money well spent. Military effort alone will not get the job done; a combined effort has a good chance of bringing peace to southeast Asia.

Perhaps the program envisioned by Secretary Freeman—improved agricultural technology, education, land reform and an upgrading of rural life generally—will someday produce a pattern of peaceful development which can spread from South Vietnam to other underdeveloped nations. That would be a marvelous bonus, indeed, because the killer in other countries—the specter of famine—poses a threat which is far more deadly in its implications than the Vietcong.

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS FOR MICRONESIA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it was with a deep sense of personal interest and satisfaction that I note that the Department of the Interior and the Peace Corps have announced plans to recruit, train, and assign as many as 750 Peace Corps volunteers to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—Micronesia.

On March 21 of this year—more than a month and a half ago—I urged the Secretary of the Interior to seek the services of Peace Corps volunteers for Micronesia which the Interior Department administers. In my letter to Secretary Udall, I stated that it was "not only proper but a matter of priority that the Micronesians receive urgent assistance from the Peace Corps." Specifically I referred to the need for improving education, medical and health services, economic development, and other activities.

Secretary Udall responded to me at that time by saying that "your proposal is indeed intriguing and we shall want to study it very carefully."

It was my concern over the failure of the Interior Department to utilize Peace Corps volunteers long before now which prompted me to write to Secretary Udall. For it has been evident for some time that the Interior Department has not come to grips with the many problems of this far flung and underdeveloped area of the western Pacific.

I am very pleased, therefore, that the Interior Department now agrees with my proposal to use Peace Corps volunteers in the Trust Territory. I am doubly happy that both the Interior Department and the Peace Corps are moving with unusual swiftness to carry out my proposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks the texts of my letter of March 21 to Secretary Udall and his acknowledgment to me; a fact sheet issued by the Peace Corps titled, "Peace Corps and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—Micronesia;" and a news article from the Washington Post of May 7, 1966, titled, "Pacific Islands Showplace Is Peace Corps Aim."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1).

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is a matter of deep pride to the people of Hawaii that the training of the Peace Corps volunteers for Micronesia will take place in Hawaii. Hundreds of Peace Corps volunteers have been trained for service in various Asian countries at the Hilo campus of the University of Hawaii and at the Peace Corps camp in Waipo Valley operated by the university, both located on the big island of Hawaii. The experience already gained by the Peace Corps staffs in Hawaii will be of great value in training the prospective volunteers for the trust territory.

The Peace Corps volunteers will give the Micronesians the kind of practical assistance they need and have asked for—in education, community development, public health and public works. The volunteers will thereby help the trust territory people build the social, economic and political basis for self-government.

As the Micronesians progress, they will be better able to decide the type of political status they wish for themselves. Looking toward this eventuality, I introduced in the Senate, on August 18, 1965, a resolution which would open the way for the trust territory to be included in the State of Hawaii if the people of Hawaii and the trust territory are in favor of such inclusion.

The assignment of Peace Corps volunteers to the trust territory will go a long way toward preparing the Micronesians to decide their future status. I am, therefore, very pleased and enthusiastic over this development.

Exhibit 1

March 21, 1966.

Hon. Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In line with my general concern for the status of the people of Micronesia, I am writing to recommend strongly the use of Peace Corps volunteers in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

There is a clear and current need in the Trust Territory for the type of services which the Peace Corps can render. As High Commissioner M. W. Goding said in addressing the opening session of the first congress of Micronesia on July 12, 1965, at Saipan: "There is a tremendous job that remains to be done. Many of the problems we face might be described as being typical of any growing but undeveloped economy. One of the most challenging problems and one that will require bold and imaginative approach lies in improving living conditions, in supplying adequate medical services and educational opportunities for people in the more remote and thinly populated islands of the Territory."

Commissioner Goding thus noted that while some progress has been made, a great deal of work lies ahead in improving education, medical and health services, economic development, and other fields. Volunteers of the Peace Corps have been notably successful in helping people help themselves in these activities in underdeveloped areas elsewhere. They can render invaluable services to Micronesians if assigned there.

Since the well-being of the Trust Territory people is a responsibility of the United States, and more particularly of your Department, it would seem to me not only proper but also a matter of priority that the Micronesians receive urgent assistance from the Peace Corps.

If there are legal, technical, or other reasons why Peace Corps volunteers cannot be assigned to the Trust Territory, I wish to be fully advised on this matter and would appreciate information as to what steps can be taken to overcome such obstacles.

May I hear from you at your earliest convenience.

With warm personal regards and aloha, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Hiram L. Fong.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1966.

Hon. Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Fong: I am acknowledging your letter of March 21, in which you propose the use of Peace Corps volunteers to assist the Micronesian people.

Your proposal is indeed intriguing and we shall want to study it very carefully. We shall be writing you further on this subject at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

PEACE CORPS AND THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (MICRONESIA)

WHAT IS IT?

The trust territory consists of 2,141 islands spread over 3 million square miles of the Western Pacific. Taken from Japan in World War II, the islands were placed under a United Nations trusteeship in 1947. Their administration was assigned by mandate to the United States, which in a string of bloody battles, had driven the Japanese out of them.

WHAT IS MICRONESIA?

This is the name given to those Pacific island occupied by the Micronesian peoples, seafaring first cousins to the Malays. Greater Micronesia includes the Gilbert Islands, which are under British administration. Otherwise, Micronesia and the trust territory are the same—embracing the Marianas, Marshall, and Caroline Archipelagos. Guam, the largest of the Marianas, is not included in the trust territory since it became an American possession in 1898, when it was ceded to the United States by Spain.

WHO ARE THE MICRONESIANS?

They include most of the 88,000 inhabitants of the 97 populated islands of the trust territory. (Two of these islands, Nukuoro and Kapingamarangi, are homes for another people, the Polynesians.)

They speak nine separate Micronesian languages with dialectical variations. They came to Micronesia in prehistoric times, probably sailing their great oceangoing outrigger canoes from lands lying to the east. They were already settled in the Marianas when Ferdinand Magellan discovered them for the West in 1521.

WHERE IS MICRONESIA?

Mili, the westernmost of the Marshalls, is less than 100 miles east of the international date line. More than 3,000 miles farther east, Tobi in the western Carolines lies off the northern tip of New Guinea. Almost 2,000 miles northwest of Tobi, the remote and uninhabited Farallon de Pajaros juts its rocky peak out of the ocean less than 700 miles from Japan.

In all the huge expanse of water included in Micronesia (larger than the land area of the United States), only 687 square miles are above sea level.

WHAT ARE THE PRINCIPAL ISLANDS?

Saipan and Tinian in the Marianas became the sites of B-29 bases in World War II from which Japan was regularly bombed. The *Enola Gay* took off from Tinian on the fateful day when it dropped to atom bomb on Hiroshima. Bikini, in the Marshalls, was the site of America's first H-bomb explosion.

In preparation for World War II, the Japanese constructed major fortifications on Yap and Truk in the Carolines. The American assault against the Japanese brought the names of other islands to the attention of the world—Eniwetok, Kwajalein, Ulithi, the Palaus.

WHY IS THE PEACE CORPS GOING TO THE TRUST TERRITORY?

The Micronesians asked for Peace Corps volunteers—for teachers, engineers, surveyors, health experts, agricultural extensionists, draftsmen and persons who know how to organize and run cooperatives. And that is what the Peace Corps plans to send.

WHEN WILL VOLUNTEERS GO TO MICRONESIA?

Two waves of volunteers are now planned. The first, to arrive by October 1966, will begin programs in elementary education and community development, public health, and public works. The second, to begin in January 1967, will concentrate on secondary education, cooperative and credit union development, agriculture, public administration, communications and transportation. These two waves will involve as many as 750 volunteers. Others will follow later.

WHERE WILL THEY TRAIN?

The prospective volunteers will take their training at the Hilo campus of the University of Hawaii and at the Peace Corps camp in Waipio Valley operated by the university. Their training conditions will simulate as far as possible their later working conditions.

WILL THE PEACE CORPS PLAY A SPECIAL ROLE IN THE TRUST TERRITORY?

In his May 5, 1966, letter to Peace Corps Director Jack Vaughn, President Johnson said: "I will be asking the Congress to approve the Department of the Interior's omnibus legislation which seeks to improve the capital budget of the territory and to raise the level of the Interior Department's continuing effort in the territory. However, I see the Peace Corps role as a very special kind of effort being separate and apart from the daily tasks of civil administration."

This "special kind of effort" will lie at the heart of a fresh attempt to fulfill America's responsibilities in the trust territory. It will seek to improve the conditions of life for the people of Micronesia.

Finally, it will help build the material and spiritual circumstances in which the people of the trust territory can intelligently and successfully—and in the not-too-distant future—chose their own form of government.

[From the Washington Post]

PACIFIC ISLANDS SHOWPLACE IS PEACE CORPS AIM

(By Bryce Nelson)

Several hundred Peace Corps volunteers will be sent to the U.S.-administered Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in an effort to make them "a showplace for the world," the administration announced yesterday.

Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, declared that the United States already had done much for the trust territory but that "We have to do better than we have done, very frankly."

U.S. administration of the 90,000 people, who live in the 2,141 Micronesian islands scattered across 3 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean, has been under increasing criticism in recent years, both domestically and at the United Nations. The United States was given trusteeship over the area in 1947 by the U.N. after defeating the island's former trustees, the Japanese, in World War II.

COMPLAINTS FILED

Last spring, health officials in the islands sent a petition of grievances to the U.N. Trusteeship Council.

The Council responded by asking the World Health Organization to send an investigating mission to the area last fall. The report, which listed shortages in health facilities and personnel in Micronesia, will probably be discussed by the Trusteeship Council in late June.

Goldberg conceded yesterday that there had been some criticism at the United Nations and added, "We as Americans have to have always our tradition of decent respect for the opinions of mankind, and we are manifesting that respect by the attention we are paying to the subject."

Goldberg said yesterday that the commitment of Peace Corps volunteers to Micronesia symbolized the U.S. "determination to discharge our full responsibility as trustees."

In the 19 years of the U.S. trusteeship, there has never been an election to determine the wishes of the Micronesians as to the status of their islands. In a letter sent to Peace Corps Director Jack Hood Vaughn and dated May 5, President Johnson declared, "Ultimately the people of Micronesia must decide what their future status will be."

NO ELECTION TIMETABLE

Goldberg said yesterday that there had been no timetable set for elections but that the administration hoped to "achieve this as rapidly as possible."

The Peace Corps action was announced at a three-man press conference at the State Department by Goldberg, Vaughn, and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, whose Department is charged with administering the territories.

To supplement the Peace Corps effort, Udall announced that his Department was sending legislation to Congress to substantially increase the amount of money the Interior Department spends to aid the trust territory. Udall pointed out that the current annual budget was $17 million and that the annual expenditure was only about $7 million until 2 years ago. Udall said that his Department currently had 300 employees in the trust territory.

Vaughn said the number of volunteers to be sent to Micronesia was as yet undetermined but that he thought that several hundred would be sent in October. The second group of volunteers will be sent next January. Peace Corps officials indicated that the total number would probably be about 700.

REENLISTMENT ALLOWED

To help gain volunteers for Micronesia, the Peace Corps will allow current volunteers to reenlist to work in a different project for the first time. Volunteers have sometimes been allowed to reenlist to work in the country to which they were originally assigned, but they have never been allowed to change countries prior to this time.

The project also will mark the first assignment of Peace Corps volunteers to territory administered by the United States.

The Peace Corps begins a crash recruiting program Monday at approximately 62 colleges in order to obtain volunteers before the students begin their final examinations and leave for their summer vacations.

The Peace Corps has already prepared its recruiting pamphlet for the Micronesian project. It is entitled "The Peace Corps Goes to Paradise" and begins: "Tropical islands. Enchanted evenings. Swaying palms and sun-kissed maidens."

But the brochure also is quick to point out the "problems in Paradise": "Understaffed schools. Bad roads. Insufficient medical facilities. Inadequate water and sanitary facilities. An island territory that has to import seafood."

THE GROWING SHORTAGE OF TRAINED PERSONNEL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the most serious problems confronting our country in the field of health is the growing shortage of trained personnel. The Congress has already taken steps to meet this need by passing legislation such as the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Nurse Training Act, and the Vocational Education Act. Presently before the Congress is the Health Manpower Act designed to provide more medical technologists, biomedical engineers, dental hygienists, and other college-trained specialists.

Although these Federal programs are making a valuable contribution, there is a great need for complementary local action. I am, therefore, particularly pleased to note an outstanding example of such initiative in my own State directed at a solution to the critical shortage of trained nurses. Knowledge of this local effort came to me in the form of an editorial in the Journal of the Arkansas Medical Society, condensed and reprinted in the Arkansas Gazette.

The editorial, written by Dr. Alfred Kahn, Jr., describes a plan originally conceived by Mrs. Mildred Armour, head of the Arkansas Baptist School of Nursing, and later adapted in the form of a proposal of the Pulaski County Medical Society.

Because this article shows the productive imagination which can be generated when local groups address themselves to the responsibilities and needs of their communities and professions, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTOR DEFINES AND EXPLAINS NURSE SHORTAGE, SUGGESTS POSSIBLE SOLUTION

(NOTE.—Dr. Alfred Kahn, Jr., of Little Rock wrote the accompanying editorial in the Journal of the Arkansas Medical Society. It has been edited to make it somewhat shorter. In Little Rock, the scarcity of nurses is such that St. Vincent Infirmary has had to close a 27-bed ward, an unprecedented action.)

(By Dr. Alfred Kahn, Jr.)

Despite the fact that there have been signs for a long time that hospitals were short of personnel to carry out patient care, the full impact has not reached the public and the physicians in this area until the crisis was on us. This is often the case in other walks of life and, in fact, the critical nature of the situation often is of value in that it prompts strenuous and concerted activity to remedy the situation.

The so-called nursing shortage probably should be redefined. What is meant by this is the lack of trained personnel to do bedside care of the patient. The reasons for this fall into two categories: The acute problem and the long-range problem.

Unfortunately, most of the discussions about the lack of bedside personnel have had to do with the acute shortage. This so-called acute shortage simply means that there are barely enough registered nurses in this area to keep the hospitals in what one might term "a state of compensation."

Basically, the cause is the critical lack of nurses. However, superimposed on this are some acute problems, which have caused the nurses to leave the hospitals.

SALARY FOREMOST OF ALL PROBLEMS

Foremost among these problems is that of salary. After 3 years of nursing training, many nurses can get more money by going to a Veterans' Administration hospital or into a physician's office than they can obtain by working in a hospital. In a world of free economy it has always been the policy that the worker has a right to try and obtain the best salary which he can get. And yet $350 per month, after 3 years of training, is better than many young college women get with a degree and after 4 years of training. This is no attempt to say that $350 is the right amount to start nurses at.

One of the major complaints of nurses is that they would like to have weekends off; many nurses do not want to work night or split shifts; all of these things are reasonable but they add to the problem of staffing the hospital. There are other irritating seemingly minor problems, which have entered into the overall acute picture and turned nurses away from the hospital. These include frequent change of assignments, association with less trained personnel in the care of the patients, etc. In other words, the short-range problem is one of "making do" with barely enough nurses.

SEMANTICS ADDS TO THE SITUATION

A long-range problem of the so-called nursing situation has to do with semantics as much as anything else. Twenty-five or 30 years ago the standard worker on the floor of the hospital was the so-called trained nurse. This individual had 3 years of training and, during her training years, she worked on the floors of the hospital in a manner similar to a graduate trained nurse. As time has gone by, the trained nurses have understandably tried to raise the standards of their group. This has resulted in an attempt to have their graduate nurses, in as many instances as possible, have a college degree. The result of this is that these individuals are equipped to do administrative work as well as to perform nursing functions. Now rather than just a graduate trained nurse, what we have is a medical administrator with a degree.

UPGRADING POLICY BOTH GOOD AND BAD

This upgrading policy has resulted in two things: A lack of nurses to perform the functions which they formerly did, and a highly trained individual capable of doing administrative work and who might prefer to do it to bedside care.

In the long range it would be better if these highly trained folks were replaced in the hospital by a new category, technically trained to take care of patients and not so interested in administration.

This is not intended to reflect on the desire of the current nurse program to upgrade themselves and who are in a certain sense changing their hospital function. On the other hand, the long range program should take cognizance of this change and immediately have an explosive expansion in the schools which train young women to take care of patients at the bedside.

POSSIBLE PLAN TO SOLVE CRISIS

The Pulaski County Medical Society has felt the nursing shortage acutely and, as a result, has had some exploratory meetings with interested parties. At one of these meetings, J. A. Gilbreath (Arkansas Baptist Medical Center administrator) suggested the following plan, which is an adaptation of one proposed some months ago by Mrs. Mildred Armour (head of Arkansas Baptist School of Nursing).

The plan is aimed at conserving teaching personnel. It was suggested that since most paramedical personnel have the same basic didactic needs, that a formula be worked out whereby there is a year's course in anatomy, physiology, chemistry, etc., which would be identical for nurses, technicians, etc. At the end of the first year, if any of these individuals desire to stop their training, they would be qualified as a 1-year nurse technician.

Some individuals might want to take 2 years' training.

It is important to point out that if this individual is in the nurse training plan, she would be performing bedside nursing in moderate amounts; this is a necessary aspect of the program for both the hospital and the individual. Lastly, some individuals would want to take 3 years' training and receive a designation equivalent to a graduate nurse technician or some other appropriate designation.

For this plan to work in a satisfactory manner, there would have to be some means of licensing these officials on a statewide basis if not on a national basis. Thus, the trainee could obtain employment at the proper level of competence in any hospital throughout the State and, if this plan were used nationally, the trainee could be employed in other States at an equal stage of training.

This plan need not to be in conflict with the so-called registered nurse training program but would be an additional training program [for] specialists in bedside care with emphasis on practical nursing rather than on college-type education as advocated by the existing registered nurse associations for their members.

CHANGING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on the last day of April, the distinguished American and, I am proud to say, fellow Kansan, Alf Landon, spoke before the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters on the momentous changes taking place in policies and decisions of governments around the globe and their interacting impacts—with special emphasis directed to the impact of and the impact on our Nation's international position.

Because Governor Landon's comments are both thoughtful and timely, I ask unanimous consent that his recent address be printed at this point in the RECORD so that all of us might have the benefit of his observations in the vital and tension-ridden areas of international relations which necessarily dominates so many of our considerations these days.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(By Alf M. Landon, Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters, Pittsburg, Kans., Apr. 30, 1966)

I am going to attempt briefly to clarify the impact on the United States of our international position on momentous changes taking place in policies and decisions by governments throughout the world—a world that has been made smaller due to modern transportation and communication—also a world growing bigger as nations develop in Africa-Asia and the great countries to the south of us. There are more undeveloped natural resources and land in that great area than in the rest of the world put together.

Just as the printing press brought about revolutionary changes in economic and political life in the Old World in the Middle Ages—so is the radio today—with its transistor—revolutionizing economic and political life for the illiterate peoples of the modern world from pole to pole.

It is interesting that the first grab made in all attempts to gain control of a government by force today is the radio station as the center of communications—instead of the transportation center. The radio station is the only means of reaching the people of a country involved to convey the political objectives, ideals, and motives of the leaders of the new crowd.

It is also interesting to note that radio in those countries has not changed the style of presentation by the speakers—like it has in America. In our country, it has eliminated the old-fashioned type of oratory. The limitations of radio and television time compel the speaker to put his thinking down in a manuscript so that he says in much less time what he is talking about than did the stump speaker up to the event of the radio.

Of course, there still remains the question of getting to the point that he's trying to convey. I remember the old story of two men listening to a candidate speaking from the back of a wagon on a street corner. Finally, one said to his neighbor, "What's he talking about?" The other fellow answered, "He don't say yet."

The great blackout through the failure of electric power over a wide area in the Northeast probably would have been our country's greatest domestic tragedy if it had not been for radio stations maintained by auxiliary power and radio transistors.

The confusion and uncertainty existing in Washington and throughout our great and beloved country—because of conflicting statements by the Johnson administration on its Vietnam policies—is being currently noted and vigorously protested by leaders of President Johnson's own party—in and out of the Congress—and the situation is coming to a head.

I am only going to mention Vietnam as it relates to the world in the area of our foreign policies.

We have our President saying our objective is remaking that little unhappy country in our own image.

We have his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, saying at the last meeting of NATO in France, and before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that we are in South Vietnam in extension of our containment of communism policy for America's and the free world's interest and in commitment of our obligations as a member of SEATO—Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

We have our President asking for aid and assistance from other signatures to that treaty.

Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Korea, and Thailand have responded in varying degrees. Therefore, all these governments will of course have a right to expect to be consulted regarding any negotiations that include Hanoi and the Vietcong.

Now Premier Ky has called—at our prodding and encouragement—two conventions to draft the first constitution in all South Vietnam's history preliminary to the first general election in all its history on August 15.

We have President Johnson's glowing description of the Vietnamese Government and Great Society that is going to emerge—with our aid—from that election—which is to be a free expression of the Vietnamese people's will.

I do not believe the situation in South Vietnam is stable enough to sustain that overly optimistic statement.

The President is reported to be warning administration circles to be prepared for the possibility that a new civilian facade of that government might not continue the war for South Vietnamese nationalism.

With the Vietcong completely occupying most of South Vietnam and able to arouse the rest—with the pressure the military juntas army and the organized Buddhists can and will use at the polls on election day in the areas they control—how can there be any semblance of a free election—or a fair election?

Then the big question is whether the Vietcong will be a part of any civilian government. If they are—that means sooner or later a Communist take-over of that government. Secretary Rusk said in February before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "To suggest that they (the Vietcong) represent the aspirations of the Vietnamese people is absurd."

Yet—Arthur Goldberg—America's Ambassador to the United Nations—when asked 3 weeks ago if the Vietcong were to be included in the planning for the first constitutional South Vietnamese Government—answered. "That is an academic question."

Secretary of Defense McNamara—2 weeks ago before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—said—in answer to Senator GORE—that he did not object to the Vietcong taking off their uinforms and voting in their pajamas.

It should be remembered that 24 hours or so after Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's statement in February in favor of settling the Vietnamese war by a coalition government that included the Vietcong—Mr. Moyer, the President's press secretary, said there was no broad difference between Mr. Johnson and Senator KENNEDY. Both agreed that any coalition government would have to be ratified by a general election.

At that time, Vice President HUMPHREY rightly compared letting the Vietcong in the South Vietnamese Government to letting a fox in the chicken coop. There would be no chickens left. Or to an arsonist in the fire department.

If that coalition government including the Vietcong occurs, neither the containment policy nor the objectives of the Great Society itself will be attained.

Momentous decisions are building inside and outside of South Vietnam that can well be a turning point in all Asia. The key question is political. That is the participation of the Vietcong in the new government.

Little Vietnam—a country of only 15 or so million population—has no strategic military or economic value—no natural resources—compared with Indonesia. The most important event in all Asia since the Chinese nuclear bomb in October 1964, is the recent nationalistic revolt against Communist domination in Indonesia. That country—with the fifth largest population in the world—stretching out for 3,000 miles—with immense natural resources—is the strategic key to southeast Asia.

It is obvious that the answers to questions raised on our South Vietnam policy are not simple. It is obvious they are complex and many peoples are involved.

There is a growing urgent call for an "agonizing reappraisal of our Vietnam policies."

I believe that is too narrow a focus. I do believe there is urgent need for a realistic reappraisal of our present foreign policy and international relations, where crucial decisions are building up the world over in the light of the changing foreign policies of our allies and friends who are joined with us in the common defense of freedom and democratic processes of government from domination by communistic tyranny.

Let us now look briefly and objectively at recent major developments with momentous implications announced in the foreign policies of two of our closest allies.

First there is France. I do not share Secretary of State Rusk's optimism on President de Gaulle's dismissal of NATO forces from France—even though all the other NATO governments are sticking together so far.

Secretary Rusk recently said: "Fourteen nations, comprising 450 million people possessing massive military power, will not be paralyzed by the attitude of France."

Pulling out the American airfields and backup military bases and supply depots in France creates a crucial military logistic problem. Our main supply lines for our 250,000 American soldiers now stationed in West Germany cross France from French ports.

Even though all the other government members of NATO are willing to make their countries available—at the best we would have jerrybuilt logistic supply lines to West Germany that for sure would be vulnerable in time of war or threats of war.

Political decisions involved are equally important. According to the AP account of its interview with the French Foreign Minister, he "stressed that France intends to remain a part of the North Atlantic Treaty signed in 1949. France is divorcing itself only from the military organization which was set up after the treaty went into force and was not specifically mentioned in the pact. The United States does not draw this distinction between the treaty and the military organization, saying that a linking of the two is essential."

Now, let us take a good look at the changes Prime Minister Wilson has announced in England's foreign policy in his recent white paper. I quote from Joseph C. Harsch, long head of the Christian Science Monitor's London bureau and now on its Washington staff:

"Britain has clearly opted out of the world salvation business. There is not one word, one whiff, one faint smell of ideological Armageddon in the whole of the white paper.

"It would be difficult to draft two more different views of the world and responsibility to it than the one in the British white paper and the other in the recent pronouncements of President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk in Washington.

"The Johnson-Rusk papers assume a world locked in grim ideological conflict. Mr. Wilson's white paper assumes a reasonably stable world in which the most important part, Europe, is for the moment quiet and relatively safe. The rest, Asia and Africa, is unsettled, but not of major concern.

"Washington and London are on divergent paths."

Analyzing the changing world around us, U Thant—Secretary General of the United Nations—said a few weeks ago:

"One lesson we can draw from the Vietnamese crisis, and for that matter from developments in many parts of the world today, is the fact that nationalism is still the most potent force in the life of a people. Whether you assess the situation in Vietnam or Syria or Ghana or Indonesia or elsewhere, I think historians may draw one conclusion: That nationalism, more than any political belief or political ideology or political conviction, is the most potent force in the life of a people.

"This applies equally to Africa or to Latin America or even to Europe. I think it is misleading to think primarily in terms of political ideologies in the context of the newly emerging nations."

So we find President de Gaulle, Prime Minister Wilson, and Secretary General of the United Nations U Thant—agreeing that nationalism is the basic motivating foreign policy of all the governments in the world—while American foreign policy is still based on past concepts.

The nationalistic trend in the world is not a question of whether we like to see that or not. There isn't anything we can do about it. It simply is a drastic change in international relations the world over. Whether it is good or bad—we must adjust our foreign policies to it.

Nationalism is forcing a complete reversal in the Soviet's foreign policy based on control and domination of international relations for all the Communist bloc. More and more, the erstwhile Russian colonies are asserting their independence of the Soviet in both domestic and foreign policies. Therefore, the Soviet is forced to modify its international relations—as it has been forced to swing toward the individual incentive profit motives of capitalism by the failure of the Marxian-Lenin theories to work in that field also.

China—after its break away from Russia—struck out on its world conquering plans based on the old Marxian-Lenin theory of "decadent democracies and capitalistic principles." It accused Russia of being a traitor to the original Communist theories of conquering the world by force.

Despite the fact that China has met with one disastrous defeat after another in the rising tide of nationalism in Africa and Asia—despite the failure in its attempt to dominate those countries through subversion, murder and assassination, which reached a climax in Indonesia—and despite the fact that it is today practically isolated from the rest of the world—China shows no signs of changing its foreign plans of world conquest.

The United States has ignored this development of vigorous—enthusiastic nationalistic trend all over the world.

Our international objective throughout our entire history has never been one of conquest and domination—like that of Russia and China. Rather, it has been to raise the standards of living—to spread the democratic processes by education—by technical training—by the greatest economic aid program the world has ever known.

As a matter of fact, this new nationalism is a horse of a different color from the old dynastic political and military ambitions and colonial policies that infected the old world for many centuries.

This new nationalism is not threatening the world's peace—except as Russia and China attempt to use it to foster their Marxian-Lenin theories of world conquest.

Russia has found those theories will not work any better in foreign policies than they have in domestic policies. Chinese leaders must be revaluating their position in the world today.

Infiltrating the Vietcong in the South Vietnamese Government is the only place where they can get at least a color of victory in world affairs.

Therefore, the adjustment in our international relations does not require the drastic reversal in our policies that it demands for Russia and China. The only adjustment we need is to recognize its existence—that it is not the threat to world peace—unless China or Russia use it for their purpose of world domination. So far, it has worked the opposite to wreck that goal.

Isn't it high time that we Americans realized we are isolating ourselves from countries whose agreement and support on international positions and policies we need?

I believe all three of our last Presidents have missed opportunities for influencing the establishment of a stable and therefore peaceful world. General Eisenhower with his "brinkmanship"; Mr. Kennedy with his "grand design"; and President Johnson with his negative rejection in October 1964, of China's proposal for a meeting of the five nuclear powers preliminary to a meeting of all the world governments for discussing abolition of nuclear weapons. France and Russia accepted. England did not, although that reversed all the previous political and personal positions of Prime Minister Wilson.

We must not allow differences with France and England to grow. We must seek to mobilize the unity of the free world—even though that requires a readjustment on our part of differing views of responsibility for a reasonably stable world.

The NATO countries need us. We need them—including France. To let existing divisions in NATO grow unresolved is to court disaster for all. This is no time for mutual polemics or satirical comments between France and America—two of the key countries in the economic and peaceful life of the world.

The latest case in illustration of the need to readjust our international relations is the resignation last Tuesday of nine representatives of the great countries to the south of us on the Alliance for Progress panel. They resigned in protest against U.S. domination.

They need the United States of America. America needs them. They are close to home on this hemisphere.

However, America's military power must be maintained second to none. It is extremely useful and necessary in maintaining a balance of power still essential to preventing world war three.

That does not mean that the world's peace can be kept only by military force. It does mean that it is a great help in stabilizing situations.

I am increasingly concerned about America's position in the major developments that are taking place in a fermenting world—in which we seem to be getting every day closer to some irreversible position—and the fragmentation of the free nations bloc—as we have come seriously close in Vietnam.

I believe that the world's problems can be kept manageable for peace by sound pragmatic policies that are based neither on overreliance on military power—nor the millennium claimed for the United Nations—nor the illusions of free elections in the midst of terror.

Big spending in foreign aid programs is not a substitute for equity in a foreign policy.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN WILL NOT SEEK REELECTION

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened by the news that my good friend and esteemed colleague, Congressman Leo O'Brien, of Albany, N.Y., will not seek reelection this year.

Hawaii has had many great friends. History will some day record that Leo O'Brien was one of our greatest friends.

When Congressman O'Brien leaves Congress at the close of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, he will have completed nearly 14 years of faithful service to the people of New York's 29th Congressional District, to the people of the State of New York, and to his Nation. He will be remembered for all his good works by many countless thousands of people, and he will be forever remembered by the people of Hawaii as the stalwart defender and advocate of Hawaii's bid for statehood.

Leo O'Brien had the distinction of serving as the floor manager of the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills.

Therefore, Mr. President, may I, in behalf of the people of Hawaii, say mahalo to Leo O'Brien, and to wish him the very best in the years to come.

Leo O'Brien is truly one of the finest men I have ever met along life's pathway.

Mr. President, recently John Hall, a young man who covers Hawaiian matters in Washington for the United Press International, described his day with Leo O'Brien. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hall's article, as published in the Honolulu Advertiser, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This Time "The Irishman" Means It

(By John Hall)

Washington.—"It's sort of a cry-wolf proposition," Leo O'Brien said, with that straightforward permanently creased Irish smile. "I've said I'm going to quit so often that nobody pays any attention. But I mean it this time."

The newspapermen had started calling him that morning after the story of his retirement broke in Albany.

Now it was 2 p.m. The buzzer on his office phone was still ringing regularly.

"Hello Dick * * * Yes, it's true * * * the thing is that one of my grandchildren grew a foot while I was away last time. They're always out skiing or something on weekends when I'm home. I want to be there to see them grow inch by inch.

"Annoyance," the moonfaced Irishman said thoughtfully, as he hung up the phone and straightened a stack of papers on his desk in the Rayburn Building. "Annoyance was what got me into the statehood fight. In 1955, Clair Engle was chairman of the Interior Committee and Clair took the statehood bills away from my subcommittee. He wouldn't let me hold hearings—did it himself. The bill went to the floor and got recommitted overwhelmingly.

"The following year, Clair handed me that tired old rubber ball that had been bouncing futilely down here for 40 years. You know, the theory always had been that Hawaii should be admitted first because it was more prosperous. But I decided to take that cart and—hold on a second.

"Hi, Tom * * * pretty good. Yeah, that word veteran gets me. I quit the newspaper business because they were calling me a veteran reporter. Now they're calling me a veteran Congressman."

"Now, let me see * * *. So I decided to put that cart before the horse and make it run * * *. Make Alaska the needle and Hawaii the thread. Hawaii was terribly annoyed * * * but we got the Alaska bill on the floor and, after 6 days of debate, it passed. Of course, Hawaii couldn't be turned down then. And the next year, in 1959, Hawaii was admitted.

"Everybody was afraid of any implication of communism in Hawaii. Of course, it wasn't true. But we just couldn't get the bill through, so we did it backward and it worked.

"I came down here in 1952. Did you know I was scooped on my own election? I had to stay on as a reporter at the statehouse. I was running because I was the only one who knew anything about the bills that were pending. I was elected on April Fool's Day. On election night, my editor messaged 'Opposition reporting you elected.'

"Anyway, I came down here and they tossed me on Interior. If there is one committee remote from my district, it was that one. But I figured there were a lot of ambitious, western guys on there and I would move fast. I did, and in 6 years I was second ranking member and chairman of the Territories and Insular Affairs Committee."

The phone was buzzing again.

"Charlie, how are you? * * * Yeah, I want to go soak up some friendship * * *. Well, I enjoy the rumors and it might be smart to get someone from upstate to run. But this has no connection whatsoever, although I don't know a better way of being with your family than being Lieutenant Governor. It's the best form of social security. But 32 years with a title, then to go back to 'Hey, you * * *' I don't know * * * this even sounds phony to me, as a former reporter, but I just want to be with my family. Maybe I'll do a little writing, some TV work if anyone wants me. Thanks, Charlie * * * bye.

"Well, anyway, I'm proud of the part I had in the statehood bills. But you know, dealing with individuals is just as important a part of being a congressman. One night the doorbell rang and a fellow asked for my help. He'd been accused of deserting the Army—the poor fellow couldn't read or write. His bedridden, domineering mother had told him he had been discharged. He didn't have a friend. I went down to his court-martial and they gave him 6 years at hard labor, just because I was there. I finally got it commuted to time served and the poor fellow is back with his family."

FACTS (UNPLEASANT) ON FARM PRICES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with parity dropping another two points in April we confront a situation where parity prices for farmers are down to 80 percent and still the attacks on American agriculture continue to be made by this administration in an effort to blame our farmers and ranchers for the fast burning fires of inflation which are destroying the purchasing power of our American dollar.

However, the facts and figures available from the various agencies of our Government indicate with complete clarity that American agriculture is actually the victim rather than the villain of the inflation which the reckless spending programs of this Johnson administration have stimulated.

In this connection, a significant and factual editorial from one of the great newspapers published in the heartland of America's agricultural area provides some thoughtful reading. I commend it to the Congress and the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., entitled "Facts on Farm Prices" be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ON FARM PRICES

The Farm Journal for May points out some facts and figures which should be informative to city folk as well as farmers. They were gleaned from reports of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

For example:

The prices farmers received for all products in 1965 were 8.93 percent below the prices of 1947-49.

Consumers in 1966 are spending 18.2 percent of their disposable income for food, as compared to 20 percent 5 years ago.

Food prices in retail markets are 17.1 percent higher than in 1947-49, but costs added after the food items leave the farm have increased by 41 percent.

In the period from 1947 to 1949 to 1965, weekly wage rates to labor have gone up 107 percent, and prices of things farmers buy have increased by 28.3 percent.

All of which leads to some wonderment as to why the President should blame food prices for inflation, and makes enigmatic the Secretary of Agriculture's recent expression of pleasure that "farm prices in certain key items have moderated" from "cyclical highs which have accounted for most of the consumer food increases."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL PROJECT—S. 2721

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, just last week I was honored with the opportunity of addressing the student body at George Washington University on the occasion of its annual Law Day ceremonies. In my opening remarks I noted the general theme of Law Day for this year, "Respect the Law—It Respects You," and pointed out that in recent years it has become increasingly apparent "that the law is a respecter of persons—that the law as administered in this country often operates to favor the rich litigant over the poor litigant," and that "this favoritism tends to be a built-in factor of our legal system of any adversary system in fact."

Therefore, in pursuance of this thought today, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the fact that in recent years the spotlight of inequitable treatment of the poor in our legal system has been focused upon the inequities and injustices inherent in our present financial bail system. Indeed, the system's many critics have long decried the anachronism whereby the primary and often sole criteria for an accused's pretrial release is the price of a bond or a bond premium, when it has been evident for some time that factors other than financial consideration may give greater assurance of the accused's return for trial and allow the poor and rich man alike to obtain his pretrial release based upon conditions justly imposed by law without a price tag.

Since 1961, through the efforts of many lawyers, judges, and public officials throughout the country, research and demonstration projects have been set up at least in 50 major cities in our Nation to test the theory that strong community ties provide a good and safe assurance of a defendant's return for trial, and that therefore he can be released on bail without requiring a traditional financial bond.

As a result of an extensive study of the bail system in the District of Columbia in 1962 by the junior bar section of the District of Columbia Bar Association jointly with the Judicial Conference for the District of Columbia Circuit, a bail project was established to conduct such a demonstration in the District of Columbia.

This project, funded by a Ford Foundation grant to Georgetown University, has been in actual operation in the courts of the District of Columbia since January of 1964, and through periodic reports since then it has demonstrated beyond question the reliability of the community tie factor as a reasonable alternative to the traditional financial bond system in assuring that qualified defendants will return for trial.

Most recent statistics indicate that the District of Columbia bail project has recommended the release on personal bond to the courts of over 2,290 persons charged with felonies and misdemeanors, and that the courts have accepted approximately 85 percent of these recommendations, allowing almost 2,000 persons to be released without the necessity of having to pay a price for their pretrial freedom.

In the careful recording of the program's operational statistics, the District of Columbia bail project reports that 56 persons, or approximately 2.9 percent have failed to make required court appearances after release on personal bond. However, it is interesting to note that 44 such defaulters have been returned to custody, 38 of whom were rearrested in the Washington, D.C., area. There has been extensive coverage of this project's activities both in the local and national press media and it appears that it has been overwhelmingly accepted in the District of Columbia.

Congress has already recognized the need for reform of this unfair monetary bail system and has incorporated the substantive aspects of bail reform measures tested by the District of Columbia bail project and more than 50 other similar type projects throughout the country, in legislation now pending final enactment.

Last September, the Senate passed and sent to the House the Bail Reform Act, S. 1357, which in essence requires all Federal courts, including the court of general sessions for the District of Columbia, to give greater priority to personal recognizance releases and other types of conditional releases short of the traditional financial bond releases.

Just a few days ago, this bill was approved by the House Judiciary Committee and it appears that final passage will not be long delayed.

It should be noted, however, that S. 1357 indicates broadly to the Federal courts the basic guidelines for determining an individual's qualifications for personal recognizance or other nonfinancial conditional releases. It requires the judicial officer in making such a bail determination to take into account from available information: the nature and circumstances of the offense charged, the weight of the evidence against the accused, the accused's family ties, employment, financial resources, character and mental condition, the length of his residence in the community, record of convictions, and his record of appearances for court proceedings or flight to avoid prosecution or failure to appear at court appearances.

Unquestionably this legislation will be a great step forward in assuring the American people of equal justice under law by providing much of the needed improvement in the administration of criminal justice in our courts and thereby eliminate a major part of the area of favoritism which I spoke of at George Washington University.

What is now apparent, however, is that the Bail Reform Act will require certain machinery to properly effectuate the legislative reform goals intended. In short, in order for the courts to make rational determinations with the guidelines set forth in S. 1357, it will be necessary to obtain quickly and efficiently all the necessary background information concerning the accused. It would be folly to suggest that the already overworked and understaffed judges of our Federal courts, especially in the District of Columbia and more specifically in the court of general sessions, now have the time and facilities available to them to investigate adequately the accused's family background and history and all the other information required to properly implement the dictates of the Bail Reform Act.

Mr. President, what is needed is already in active use today in our Federal City in the form of the District of Columbia bail project. For, in addition to this project's great work in testing and establishing the reliability of the community tie and nonfinancial condition thesis, it has also demonstrated more than adequately that the very machinery used by the project in its experiment can be and is the necessary adjunct to the Bail Reform Act.

In May of 1965, the Judicial Conference for the District of Columbia Circuit, which was greatly responsible for initiating this fine project, went on record as urging Congress to enact legislation to provide a proper vehicle to effectuate the experimentally tested procedures on a permanent basis. A bill, S. 2721, which incorporates such a proposal has already been introduced in the Senate and is now being considered by the District of Columbia Committee. This bill provides for the establishment of a bail agency in the District of Columbia, and if enacted into law, the courts of this city would have the necessary arm outside the adversary system to gather and verify factual data concerning defendants for the purpose of making proper bail determinations. Hearings have already been held on S. 2721 and it is my understanding that these hearings produced no opposition to it.

Recently President Lyndon B. Johnson in a special message to Congress urged the speedy enactment of this legislation. Therefore, I add my voice to those of the many other persons who have gone on record favoring the enactment of this legislation.

Recently it has been announced in the Washington newspapers that the District of Columbia bail projects grant will expire in September 1966, and it is already cutting back on its much needed services in the courts. Unless Congress acts to establish a permanent bail agency which will assume the very worthwhile functions already begun by this project, I believe that much of the bail reform intended by S. 1357 will not be carried out in the District of Columbia.

In the past few months, I made two special trips to the District of Columbia jail for the purpose of personally inspecting its much publicized overcrowded facilities. These visits made it perfectly clear to me that there is a pressing need to alleviate these overcrowded conditions and the most immediate remedy certainly has to be to effectuate the release of more people awaiting trial who are now languishing in that jail for long periods of time because they cannot afford bail or bond premiums.

Accordingly, I must urge that the Senate District Committee consider S. 2721 as a matter of priority, that it be approved by the committee as soon as possible, and passed by the Senate at the earliest possible date.

THE ULTIMATE BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, this is No. 743,096,481, formerly known as the junior Senator from Missouri, rising to the floor. Before I begin my remarks I want to compliment my good friend and colleague, No. 2,675,030,666, formerly known as the senior Senator from Rhode Island, for those excellent remarks just made. I also want to point out to Senator No. 6,438,772,194 that he is in error. I have recently spoken to my constituents, Nos. 714,346; 348,642; 743,821; and 348,643, and they have assured me on this point.

Mr. President, before I create another man from Mars scare, I want to clarify my last statement. Recently, we have been warned that a Federal Data Center is being planned, into which all information about our individual citizens will be fed. Our citizens will lose the little individualism they now have, and they will become merely a number which can be fed into this computer. One scientist, Dr. Orville G. Brim, Jr., head of the Russell Sage Foundation, has called this central agency that would pool all the public and private records on our citizens a Government dossier bank. Dr. Brim commented that:

> There is no doubt that we can run the society better with this information, but doing this would well be in conflict with all our fears of having privacy.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure intends to study this so-called Federal Data Center very carefully. Somewhere along the line toward Government efficiency we must cease pushing our citizens into the computer.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article on this subject which appeared in the recent May 16, 1966, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 16, 1966]

A GOVERNMENT WATCH ON 200 MILLION AMERICANS?

Your life story may be on file with the Government before long, subject to official scrutiny at the push of a button. That's the trend.

It can lead to a data bank in Washington, storing up facts on everybody's records on schooling, jobs, taxes, arrests, other information.

Alarms are being sounded about the growing interest of the Government in private lives of its citizens.

A record of every important fact about every individual in the Nation, from the cradle to the grave, is gradually being built by Government.

Now there is talk of a Federal data center into which all or part of this information could be fed.

Here in one place could be a dossier bank on each of the Nation's nearly 200 million people. That bank would grow with the population and the growing volume of data on each individual.

Press a button and out could come the life story of any person, to be used for purposes of the Government.

Here could be tax records, records of any brushes with the law from traffic violations to indiscretions in youth or old age, school records, records of any personal transactions involving the Government.

Possibilities of abuse are described as extensive.

Even now, there are reports that income tax information—supposedly inviolate—is used at times to bring pressure on men in public office or businessmen who may not cooperate with men in high office.

It is promised that a data center for Government will be hedged about by assurances against abuse.

It is recalled, however, that Government promises often prove not to be permanently binding.

When the social security program was enacted 30 years ago, there was assurance that the social security number of an individual would be used only to identify his account.

Today the social security number is on most tax returns. Banks and businesses use people's social security numbers when reporting interest and dividend payments to the Internal Revenue Service. That number has become a universal identification number around which the lifetime record of every individual can be built.

Plans taking shape for the 1970 census suggest an interest in obtaining much more information about individuals, including possibly, their religious affiliations. The promise is made that this information would be kept inviolate.

However, some officials feel that the temptation would be to feed census information, coded to a person's social security number, into the Federal data center.

The trend in all government—local, State, Federal—is to centralize information on individuals.

Fingerprint files of the FBI now total more than 167 million. A nationwide system of crime reporting is being built around communication circuits and electronic computers.

Into the FBI, too, flows information about many individuals in a wide cross section of society. Much of this information is in "raw" form—unevaluated.

This question is asked: Could information of this type, much of it gossip, find its way into a central computer mechanism of the Government?

The Federal Government itself is moving its police power into wider and wider fields.

The number of FBI agents is to be increased, if President Johnson has his way, to step up enforcement of civil rights laws. Businessmen are finding Government more and more directly involved in policing their labor relations and their hiring practices.

Reports multiply involving more and more individuals.

All can be fed into the vast complex of computers that Government is building and now is thinking of centralizing.

WHY SOME ARE ALARMED

The potentials of this whole developing trend are alarming to a growing number of individuals who are aware of what is happening. This alarm grows from the possibility of abuse in a period when the Government shows what has been described as an expanding tendency to use its power against individuals.

Some in business recall how FBI agents swept into steel company offices in 1962 demanding records without a search warrant. President Kennedy, the night before, had used TV to attack this industry's announced price increase.

Other businessmen are aware of instances in which the Internal Revenue Service used the most modern techniques for "bugging" private conferences.

Information gathered in these and many other ways, say those who are concerned, might be fed into a computer system to build a dossier bank on individuals.

The growing use of computers by the Government brings this warning from Dr. Roger Revelle, director of Harvard's Center for Population Studies: "What happens to the citizen when his identity and every detail of his life are coded and classified in the Government's computing system? * * * Not only does it become impossible to cheat even in a piddling sort of way on your income tax, it becomes impossible to do almost anything without the Government knowing about it, and knowledge is liable to lead inevitably to control."

Dr. Orville G. Brim, Jr., head of the Russell Sage Foundation in New York, has dubbed a central agency that would pool all the public records on each citizen a "Government dossier bank."

Dr. Brim makes this comment: "There is no doubt that we can run the society better with this information, but doing this could well be in conflict with all our fears of having privacy invaded."

Dr. Brim would have the Government separate the identity of individuals from the mass of statistics it collects. "We must protect the individual against the chance of raiding parties by unscrupulous politicians," he says.

A New York sociologist puts the potential danger this way: "To the extent that knowledge is power, he who has access to dossiers has power."

TASK FORCE AT WORK

Proposals for a Federal data center have been made to the U.S. Budget Bureau by two private study groups. The idea now is being considered by a top-level task force appointed by President Johnson.

Initially, the proposed data center would pull together in one place all the statistics collected by more than 20 Federal agencies. Among the major departments: Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Reserve Board.

A survey shows that these agencies have 100 million punch cards and 30,000 computer tapes crammed with information about people and business.

A data center, it is argued, would bring more efficient recordkeeping for the Nation. At present there is said to be much overlapping and waste in collection of statistics and reports.

Material fed into computers at the data center would be available within Government and to business, research groups, and State and local agencies.

Precautions would be taken in the data center so that Federal officials would not make available any confidential material, according to officials.

HELP FOR PHYSICIANS

Also under consideration within Government is an idea for a medical data bank. This would set up on computer tapes the medical histories of all Americans. At the push of a button, a doctor could get the complete file on a patient—his illnesses, operations, shots taken, and the like.

This comment on a medical data bank was made by a doctor who knows about proposals to set one up:

"It would be a great thing. Computers do not forget the way patients often do. Material being fed into a data bank could help us spot an epidemic almost as soon as it got started."

But, again, dangers are cited of possible misuse of a medical data bank. As one doctor put it—

"Let's assume an individual had a nervous breakdown years ago, with subsequent complete recovery. Or even that the person contracted a social disease in his youth.

"Is this medical record to pop out of a computer at the touch of a button, say, by that person's employer? What might such medical information mean to an unscrupulous politician out to 'get' an opponent? Rigid safeguards would be needed to protect information in any medical bank."

Government officials say the idea of a medical data bank is still in the dream stage. However, one agency in Government already is sounding out computer manufacturers for cost estimates on equipment that would be needed.

OUT-OF-DATE DATA?

A major concern that is voiced about any data center is that it might contain out-of-date or questionable information that could prove harmful. As an example, a law professor is quoted recently as saying:

"I have filled out hundreds of detailed questionnaires on former students. My verdict on the emotional adjustment of a student I saw only in class may affect him for the rest of his life. It's damned unfair."

From a computer manufacturer's representative: "People change, yet there is the real possibility that records in a central file wouldn't be updated. Thus a bureaucrat passing on an application for a license, say, could turn down the applicant on the basis of something that happened years before, but which has no validity now."

A business executive worried about the trend toward central files tide to computers comments: "It is not going too far to see emerging the outlines of an all-knowing, all-seeing Government—Big Brother. Will college admission officials or employers eventually be going to a Government bureaucrat for clearance on young people under consideration?"

At bottom, the big worry is not the use of computers by Government. It's recognized that recordkeeping in today's complex world has reached the point where information can only be efficiently handled by high-speed computers.

SAFER ON TAPE?

"No one wants to wreck the machines that bring progress," says a Columbia University professor. He adds: "Information stored on a computer tape could be safer than material now in a file drawer.

"Codes can be devised so that computers will divulge information only to qualified recipients. Even among agencies of the Government there could be 'blocks' put into the computer system to prevent swapping of information—such as is now done to prevent Census Bureau material from getting into the hands of the Internal Revenue Service."

Still, growing numbers of people are concerned that safeguards on a central file could break down, that people in places of power would be able to get around restrictions. The most intimate details of people's lives might then be used for purposes much different from those intended.

Privacy of the citizen is seen as a protection against abuse of power. And a growing number of people see proposed data banks as posing a potential threat to that privacy.

Computers make it possible to set up central files on nearly 200 million Americans of the present and the added millions of the future. A Federal data center, now being proposed, would be built around the computer.

Washington today spends almost $2 billion each year in operating computers and adding to its battery of nearly 2,500 computers.

Capacity to record, store, compare, and analyze bits of information is practically unlimited.

To show the speed involved: In 20 seconds a man with a pencil can add two 12-digit numbers.

A man with an adding machine can do 10 such sums in 20 seconds. A pioneer computer pushed that up to 100,000.

Latest computers will do 160 million such computations in 20 seconds.

It's the potential for keeping track of every move of every individual through a Government computer center that is causing warnings to be sounded.

One phase of the growing trend toward policing by Washington of all Americans is emphasized by a Senator. EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, put it this way:

"I must report to you that the right of privacy—the right to go into your home without the fear that someone is secretly watching your every move, the right to talk freely with your attorney, your banker, or your wife without the fear of a hidden recorder or transmitter—this right is today being dangerously and recklessly ignored and violated."

The Senator revealed: "Our investigations of Big Brother tactics by Federal agencies have turned up some really incredible things.

"For example, the fact that the Post Office was turning over first-class mail to the Internal Revenue Service, which, in turn, opened the letters.

"The Internal Revenue Service runs a snooping school where the agent's graduation present is a set of lock picks. This school is still in full operation.

"A retired officer of the Federal Narcotics Bureau told us that all of his agents wiretap, regardless of State and Federal law.

"One year ago the IRS told us they did not have 'bugs' in conference rooms where attorneys meet with clients. Then, after my investigations, they admitted they had a few. * * * After we did some more investigating, they admitted that in 22 cities they had bugged conference rooms and, in 10 cities, conference rooms with see-through mirrors that permit agents to spy on taxpayers.

"We found * * * one private company which had sold nearly $100,000 worth of snooping equipment to 10 Federal agencies. Most of these Federal agencies had absolutely nothing to do with national defense or national security."

If the Government does set up a central file or dossier bank of personal data on people, there will be a huge store of information at hand to feed into it.

It will only be necessary to comb the records already gathered by public agencies—Federal, State, and local—and assemble these records in one place. Most people probably would be surprised to know how much information is on file about them. For example:

Census data: Every census gathers more detailed data than the preceding one. In 1960, controversy developed over questions about incomes and other personal data. Even more information will be sought in 1970.

Taxes: In files of the Internal Revenue Service there are the most minute details of people's private affairs. Nobody has any secrets from the tax collector.

Social security: In these files are data on 160 million people, living and dead.

Bank accounts: Federal agencies supervise banks and have access to records of deposits and other data.

Fingerprints: The FBI has more than 167 million sets of fingerprints.

Armed Forces: Detailed records, showing all manner of information on the millions who have served in the military, are in the official files.

Security: Extensive files are gathered on people who apply for any of the 3 million Federal jobs requiring security clearance.

Police: Millions of Americans are in the files of the police for various reasons, including offenses or indiscretions of long ago.

Schools: Courses, grades, I.Q.-test scores, personality profiles, teachers' evaluations—all this is only a portion of the records kept on those who go through school.

Drivers: The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has a master file, on computer tapes, of all drivers whose licenses have been suspended or revoked because of involvement in a fatal accident or drunken driving.

That's just a sample of the data now kept on people. More detailed information is being compiled all the time. With computers and central files, it would be the work of a split second to tap this store of data on almost any person in the country.

FRANCIS BELLAMY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Francis Bellamy, clergyman and editor, led a full and varied life of 76 years: a Baptist minister for 12 years, serving successively as pastor of three churches; staff member and contributor to the Youth's Companion and to various other publications for another 12 years; advertising editor with Everybody's Magazine for 11 years; and advertising account executive for a final 6 years before his retirement. This was a life of service and achievement, marked by concern for social welfare, for the education of youth, and for political responsibility. Francis Bellamy's talent for concise statement, and his heartfelt passion for his native land, fused once in that noble and powerful statement for which his name is remembered today, the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. This statement, as Bellamy composed it for the national public schools celebration of Columbus

Day in 1892, sponsored by Youth's Companion, read:

> I pledge allegiance to my flag—and to the Republic for which it stands—one Nation indivisible—with liberty and justice for all.

Today we have altered the phrase, "my flag," to "the flag of the United States of America," and we have added the words "under God." Otherwise, the pledge remains as Bellamy wrote it, and this pledge, and the spirit of loyalty which it inspires and expresses, stands today as a lasting memorial to the great soul and penetrating mind of Francis Bellamy. It is fitting that this Nation, to which he wrote so fine a tribute, should rejoice upon the anniversary of his birth on May 18, 1855. I therefore wholeheartedly concur in the movement to declare May 18, 1966, Francis Bellamy Day.

MORE CHANGES, MORE CHANCES—A SPEECH OFF THE BEATEN TRACK

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, occasionally among the thousands of speeches heard in Washington each year, there is one so off the beaten track that it surprises, delights and cheers us. Such a speech was one given recently at the Magazine Publishers Association by Edward Weeks, the editor who made the Atlantic Monthly important reading for all of us over many years.

It concerns first the art of tombsmanship, a subject not recently discussed on the Senate floor but close to Mr. Weeks' heart because of his recent retirement. I defy any one to read it without smiling. A hearty laugh will follow when one reads his account of "naked diplomacy" during the Teddy Roosevelt administration and his description of one man at one desk in the State Department in 1937 "trying to cope with the riptide of Russian aggression."

Editor Weeks gives us an idea to brood over when he quotes Sir Oliver Franks on the danger of a diplomat being away from Washington at the moment that this country "wakes up and finds itself in agreement." He gives examples of the part magazines play in bringing the Nation's readers to "that instant of crystallization" of sentiment. He shows us some of the ways "our national confusion" gets resolved. He closes with a sentence about the United States which I believe any Member of the Senate—any official in a democracy—will cherish:

> Gentlemen, if there is a more fearless and independent body of readers anywhere in the world, I would not know where to find it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD. I commend it to Senators. It is quite evident that our friend of the Atlantic Monthly—even in his "entombment"—maintains the knack of slipping a solid gold nugget into what seems only enchanting froth.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE CHANGES, MORE CHANCES

(By Edward Weeks)

Mr. Stein, honored guests, fellow publishers, and editors, I trust you all noticed how sympathetically Mr. Stein lowered his voice when he came to my retirement. In no country in the world is the art of tombsmanship, the act of public embalming, so beautifully displayed as in the United States. It is true that the Soviet Union for a number of years spectacularly embalmed two of its national heroes, Lenin and Stalin, and when they found that Stalin's record would not wash they had him removed in the dead of night, and narrowed their display to one.

But in America every leader in his profession, every business executive, even an editor, as he passes the cutoff point of 65, is entombed, with a burst of fireworks. For an interval he is feted at receptions; he is given a Paul Revere bowl; his portrait is unveiled, there are banquets at which things are said about him which he may believe but his wife never—and then, like Stalin, he quietly sinks into the shadows. Not the Egyptians, not the Russians, not the Chinese will ever rival us at tombsmanship—and part of the artistry is that it is all wrapped up and over within a month.

Speaking of entombment may I divert your attention for a moment to the State Department. My friend, the former Ambassador William Phillips, is today one of the oldest living graduates of State; he began in 1903 as a private secretary to Ambassador Rufus Choate in London and his next post took him to Peking under our Minister, Mr. Rockhill. In his book, "Ventures in Diplomacy" Bill Phillips writes that when he began his duties in Washington 60 years ago the entire personnel of State numbered 167 persons and the diplomatic mail was delivered by an ancient Negro messenger who placed the envelopes in wire baskets hanging on the outside of the office doors, the baskets being marked, "Secret" and "Confidential." Teddy Roosevelt was then President and as Phillips played good tennis and liked to walk he was soon a member of what was called the "Tennis Cabinet." In the intimacy of the White House he heard T.R. tell of a tramp he had just taken with M. Jusserand, the French Ambassador. When they reached Rock Creek the President proposed that they swim across: he stripped, plunged in and was soon on the other bank. Whereupon the Ambassador followed suit but when he sputtered out of the water, like Teddy in the buff, it was seen that he had forgotten to remove his brown kid gloves. That happened 60 years ago in the days of what we might call, "naked diplomacy."

In 1937 when another Roosevelt was President we were seeking to persuade the Soviet Union to repay us for the American investments which had been confiscated during the revolution and our policy was based on a blend of martinis and soothing sirup which it was thought would make the Russians amenable. Indeed, the faith in F.D.R.'s influence over Stalin was such that the Russian division of the State Department was reduced to a single room containing two desks: at one desk sat the man who was in charge of our affairs with Poland; at the other sat George F. Kennan, a well-qualified but solitary diplomat who did not believe in the efficacy of soothing sirup. It seems hardly credible that less than 30 years ago we had one man at one desk trying to cope with the riptide of Russian aggression.

Today, although I am sure there are times when President Johnson must wish he could tell General de Gaulle to go jump in the Potomac, our Executive can no longer indulge in that form of "naked diplomacy". Nor does our State Department, now having a personnel of 15,000 in Washington, delegate the Russian problems to one man at one desk. I have used those two vignettes to illustrate how great a change has overtaken us since Pearl Harbor; never in history has a nation been obliged to accept such untested responsibilities as we have taken on in the past two decades.

In this world of urgency and peril, of belligerency and caution, of generosity as spontaneous as the Marshall plan, and of destruction as cynical as the defoliation in Vietnam, the magazine editor, like the members of Congress, must deal in futures, must live with crises which admit no quick solution, and must everlastingly seek for explanations his people will understand. To this task we must bring both vigilance and humility. And on Monday mornings which I find the most exhilarating in the week we bring something else: the realization that the more changes that occur the more chances we have of strengthening our American destiny.

A few years ago on the occasion of Walter Lippmann's 70th birthday the corps of journalists tendered him a luncheon at the National Press Club. It was not an entombment for everyone realizes that Walter is not replaceable. His response on this occasion is worth recalling:

"Last summer while walking in the woods and on the mountains where I live I found myself daydreaming about how I would answer, about how I would explain and justify, the business of being opinionated and of airing opinions reguarly several times a week.

"Is it not absurd, I heard the critics saying, that anyone should think he knows enough to write so much about so many things? You write about foreign policy. Do you see the cables which pour into the State Department every day from all parts of the world? Do you attend the staff meetings of the Secretary of State and his advisers? Are you a member of the National Security Council, and what about all those other countries which you write about? Do you have the run of 10 Downing Street, and how do you listen in on the deliberations of the Presidium of the Kremlin? Why don't you admit that you are an outsider and that you are therefore by definition an ignoramus? How then do you presume to interpret, much less to criticize and to disagree with, the policy of your own Government, and for that matter of any other government?"

And he closed with words so honest and so searching that they brought a rising acclaim:

"If the country is to be governed with the consent of the governed, then the governed must arrive at opinions about what their governors want them to consent to."

We editors are always straining to reach the moment of crystallization, when readers will look up from our pages and say, "Yes, that is exactly what I think. That writer has added the whole thing up correctly." I remember hearing Sir Oliver Franks, when he was the British Ambassador in Washington, comment on the differences between the British and American democracy. He said, "One of the first things a diplomat in your country learns is not to be away from Washington for too long. You people have your own singular way of making up your minds. Things drift along in a seemingly aimless fashion in Congress and your commentators and editorial writers at many points of difference, and then all of a sudden one bright morning the country wakes up and finds itself in agreement. A consensus has been arrived at and the design accepted as if it came down from on high. A diplomat should not be away from your Capital when that moment occurs."

The magazine editor plays a powerful part in bringing readers to this instant of crystallization: it is his unique opportunity to provide the summation of a point of view. Each of us works this out in his own way. In the spring of 1940, in my third year as editor of the Atlantic, I heard that Nehru, president of the Nationalist Party in India, had been jailed by the British and I assumed that since he had time on his hands he might do a little writing for us. So I invited him to do an article on the India which he saw emerging when the war was over. Only the British would have passed on such a request to a political prisoner, and only the British would have released to me the firmly reasoned, impassioned declaration of Indian independence which Nehru wrote. Even today Nehru's words have a bite as you can tell from this brief quotation:

"The tragedy is that Britain should have encouraged, and should continue to encourage, disruptive and reactionary tendencies in India in order to preserve her imperial interests. She will not preserve them, for they are destined to go, but they will go in hostility and conflict if no better way is found. The day when India could submit to external impositions is past."

The only thing wrong about this article was my timing; for it appeared in print less than a month before Dunkirk and when people had time to reflect they were so concerned with the future of Britain that they had small thought for the future of India. The Daily Worker was the only American periodical to notice Nehru's declaration of independence and they reprinted it in full without asking permission. Yet had I published this very same article at the war's end in 1945, it would have come far closer to the moment of truth.

But at the war's end there were two of my rivals who were unerring in their timing. When Harold Ross sent John Hersey to Hiroshima to do an anniversary article on that terrible cataclysm and then devoted an entire issue of the New Yorker to this shocking, pitiable story, he touched the American conscience to the quick. And when in July of 1947 Hamilton Fish Armstrong, the editor of Foreign Affairs, persuaded Mr. X, the nom de plume of George F. Kennan, to define "The Sources of Soviet Conduct"—and how they might be contained by the free world, that article paved the way for an agreement on "the containment policy," which has endured to this day.

The more changes, the more chances there are for an editor to resolve our national confusion. That is what John Fischer of Harper's did with the penetrating article, "The Illusion of American Omnipotence" by D. W. Brogan. It is what Max Ascoli did in the Reporter with his two unsparing articles on the China lobby. It is what James Shepley of Life did with his article, "How Dulles Averted War," which held some surprising confidences of John Foster Dulles, then the Secretary of State, and incidentally coined the word "brinkmanship." It showed us what Dulles' policy was good for—and where it was dangerous.

There is a bit of the missionary in every American and in our zeal to defend the free world we sometimes forget that our right arm, our power to defend, can only be as strong as our heart is strong here at home. Let me call to your minds the more striking magazine articles which have warned us of how vulnerable we are. People will long remember those irrefutable papers which foretold, in the New Yorker, the destruction of our balance of nature by the pesticides, the series on "Silent Spring" which Rachel Carson wrote as she was dying of cancer. People are still talking about the issue of Scientific American which Gerry Piel published last fall depicting so vividly the plight and the hope of our great cities just at the moment when we were setting up a Department of Urban Affairs. Every magazine has been engaged in the struggle for civil rights. I take a partisan pride in the articles on "The South and the Southerner" which Ralph McGill, at my urging, wrote for the Atlantic; I listened when James Baldwin describes "The Fire Next Time"; and I took a vicarious pride in that penetrating symposium on "The White Problem" which John Johnson put together in "Ebony" in August of 1965.

Some of our troubles like that of Watts in Los Angeles are too intricate and too stubborn for any immediate solution and in such cases we keep the pressure steadily applied. This is what Gardner Cowles has done so effectively in Look. That trenchant article, "Three Who Died," was the work of a three-man Look team, and it is the best summation of why those convulsive Negro riots occurred. It is like Mike Cowles' editorial philosophy that you do not let matters stand after one such survey; he believes that the steady and continued exploration of a dangerous subject will provide the cumulative understanding we need. There are others who share Mike's conviction: think of Barbara Ward and of how steadfastly she has appealed for aid other than weaponry for the more vulnerable new nations. Think of James Bryant Conant and how patiently and with what illumination his articles have helped to raise the standards in our public schools.

I said earlier that editors face their responsibility with vigilance and humility. It is a humbling business to try to scan the future. "The future," says Walter Lippmann, "is not predetermined in any book that any man has written. The future is what man will make it; and about the present, in which the future is being prepared, we know something, but not everything, and not nearly enough." In our struggle for truth I think you will agree that we are aided by the most conscientious and responsive body of readers this Nation has ever known. For 43 years I have been studying the reading habits of Americans. I remember how complacent we were in the golden twenties, how little concerned with what was going on in Europe. I remember how self-centered and resentful we were in the depths of the depression. I remember how slow we were to rouse ourselves against Hitler's terrible threat in the late thirties.

History has a way of sending us telegrams. Some of these telegrams are a shock, but we read them and take them to heart; others seem so shocking that we throw them away unheeded. History sent us two portentous telegrams in the 1930's. One was from John Maynard Keynes, and when we had had time to study it and to understand what he meant by deficit financing, we found the answer to unemployment and a defense against the alternating booms and depressions which had wracked this Nation for 150 years. The second telegram which was even more shocking and which we did not heed came to us from Hitler in the form of "Mein Kampf." The first translations of "Mein Kampf" reached us in 1933 but not until years later, not until 1939 did we read the complete text and realize that he really meant what he said.

Editors and readers alike, we have become a very different people since 1946. Our electorate listens to the televised news in the early morning and again before supper. It follows the newspapers closely, not just the sports page, the murders, and the comics. Since 1946 our electorate has shown an insatiable demand for history, for the best thinking on foreign affairs, and for fearless, unsparing explanation of what we must do about civil rights, conservation, the use of drugs, the pollution of air and water, the ratlike corruption that always gnaws at the American fabric. Gentlemen, if there is a more fearless and independent body of readers anywhere in the world, I would not know where to find it.

PROPOSED TREATY ON OUTER SPACE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun carried a cogent editorial this morning in support of President Johnson's proposal of a treaty governing the use of outer space.

The President has rightly seized the initiative by proposing the development of such a treaty now, rather than waiting until after the expected problems arise.

I do not believe that anyone would benefit from proliferating our earthbound conflicts into outer space. On the other hand, the advantages of cooperation in space exploration are significant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Baltimore's Sun's editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE TREATY

President Johnson's appeal for a treaty to prevent space explorations from posing "serious political conflicts" is historic and welcome. He is quite right in saying that now, on the eve of actual ventures to the moon and beyond, is the proper time to establish rules for the conduct of nations in space. We hope he is correct when he says "the time is ripe" for agreement on those rules.

Only the United States and Russia have the capacity for space voyage at the moment, but that will not always be. It is to the advantage of both nations, and to the advantage of all the others who will follow in developing the necessary technology, to outlaw war and narrow national exploitation in space. Much of the modern bloody history of western man stems from the colonial conflict that followed the discovery of the "new world." Those conflicts were not prevented by the two great powers of another day dividing up the spoils between them. The knowledge and possible riches of the planets are tempting, and the best time to agree that those riches belong to all is now, prudentially in advance.

The strategic implications of national control of the moon, the planets and space are still murky—but still ominous. The President rightly asks agreement on the proposition that no weapons of mass destruction be stationed by any nation on celestial bodies. If the major powers could agree to that now, it would be a further step toward stability, as logical and promising as the partial test ban treaty.

For scientists the benefits of space cooperation are obvious. Presently there is much duplication of effort and priorities of a nonscientific nature often are imposed on programs because of political pressures.

For the taxpayer, too, there would be benefits from cooperation. The space program is enormously expensive and will continue to be, but it could be much less expensive if there were no military-political necessity to conduct so much of it on a crash basis.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, Dr. W. E. Davis, a Baptist minister from Newport, Ark., is—like many of us—concerned about the rapid proliferation of pornography in America today.

Dr. Davis, founder and director of the Clean Literature Crusade expresses his concern in the following words:

> America's moral stream is being polluted daily by the filthy-fingered pornographers who fling their filth and vend their vice from every newsstand in America. Yet, when one dares to protest their moral pollution he is accused of censorship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article entitled "Clean

Literature Crusade Launched by W. E. Davis," printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Clean Literature Crusade Launched by W. E. Davis, Newport Minister

(By W. E. Davis)

America's moral stream is being polluted daily by the filthy-fingered pornographers who fling their filth and vend their vice from every newsstand in America. Yet, when one dares to protest this moral pollution he is accused of censorship.

Cutting out from society the cancerous growth of pornography is not censorship. Cleaning out the Augean stables of America is not censorship. On the contrary, this is cleansing America, this is protecting the American people and the American home as much as fighting on the battlefields of the Nation for the security of our coastlines.

America has a moral consciousness which needs to be aroused and activated. Sir, at this very moment, an enemy, as potentially pernacious as bombs from Peking, rockets from Moscow, or missiles from Havana, is spreading its poison through the body of our United States. This foe is all the more deadly because it is not even recognized as a threat to the ultimate safety of our country.

Yet the sad and oft-repeated lesson of history teaches us that in vain does a bronze shield defend the heart of a country if the innermost core of the nation's heart is eaten away by the dry rot of immorality.

So it is in our cherished country today, The purveyors of pornography and vendors of vice pose as deadly a threat to our national survival as the most dangerous weapon in the armory of communism.

A house of sand will become a sturdy structure in comparison to the fragility of our civilization if the mortar of moral fiber is withdrawn from between the stone blocks of our National Temple.

Entire civilizations have been built or destroyed by the effects of books. The reading of a good, clean book, such as the Bible, will have a beneficient effect upon society. At the same time, the reading of a bad, dirty book, such as "Mein Kampf," will have a baneful effect upon society.

Yes, we as Americans, are living in a time of tremendous moral crisis. This moral crisis is evident in many phases of American life, but perhaps there is no areas wherein it is better illustrated than in the field of literature.

For example, the latrine literature advanced by the National Council of Churches advocating a "new morality"—found wide acceptance in the religious world. The pursual of this pornographic propaganda has produced the theological theory—"God is dead."

Likewise, in our schools and colleges, boys and girls have drunk the drippings from depraved minds until today demonstrations desecrate the "land of the free and the home of the brave."

Literature, it seems to me, has an obligation to uplift, not to degrade. This is especially true of the material presented to young minds in their formative stages. In the minds of the generation which will one day lead our Nation, we have an obligation, a moral obligation, if you please, to inculcate an appreciation for the best our society has to offer, not a morbid interest in its more sordid aspects.

To a great extent, a literate nation is what it reads. Our reading material directs our thoughts. Our thoughts, in turn, direct our actions. Our actions congeal to form our habits. Our habits mold our very characters.

Arnold Toynbee is reported to have said, that of the 21 civilizations which have arisen and vanished, 19 fell from internal decay.

So, my interest, sir, is not censorship, just a concern about the moral foundation of America. It is a sad commentary upon the lofty profession of journalism when any individual will editorially erode the moral foundations of our "Great Society."

May I conclude by saying—"Extremism in the defense of decency is no vice. Moderation in respect to morality is no virtue."

THREAT TO PROJECT MOHOLE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the immediate and unfavorable reaction which resulted from the action of the House Appropriations Committee last week in disapproving funds for Project Mohole. Specifically, I refer to two editorials from responsible newspapers expressing concern over the future of the project. One editorial appeared in the Honolulu advertiser last Saturday; the other in the Washington Post this morning. Both make a strong case for continuing this scientific project as a matter of national interest.

As one who has long supported Project Mohole, I take the view that the project should be continued—that its potential for providing mankind with new and needed scientific information about the earth's structure outweighs the costs involved.

I quote from the Honolulu Advertiser's editorial:

> It is possible to sympathize with the Representatives in their enormous task of trying to squeeze waste out of a $14 billion money bill for 23 Federal agencies. We wish them luck so long as the cutting and pruning are judiciously exercised and those projects tossed on the scrap heap are truly expendable. That is good Government.
>
> But we are budgeting billions for space exploration. It is deemed in the national interest to do so and to land a man on the moon by 1970. It makes no sense, therefore, to eliminate the one project afoot that may tell us what matter we will find out there and how to cope with it.
>
> A kill in funds now would kill the entire program—"As if we had never started," said Dr. George P. Woollard, head of the Institute of Geophysics here at the university and spearhead of the Mohole project—$30 million would be down the drain.
>
> It seems at this moment when the spending of Federal funds is being examined so critically, we may find that we cannot afford not to go ahead with Mohole.
>
> If what the scientists say is true about its value to the space program, we shall have to come back to it eventually—behind the Russians?—at a time when the cost could be billions, not millions.

I commend the Honolulu Advertiser for stating the case for restoring funds for Project Mohole so clearly and cogently.

The Washington Post editorial also advances convincing arguments against abandoning the project. I ask unanimous consent to have the Post editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 9, 1966]

Project Mohole Stymied

Project Mohole, an ambitious but uncertain scientific attempt to pierce the earth's crust, has become a victim of the war-spurred congressional economy drive. The House Appropriations Committee has denied it funds for fiscal 1967. Even though there is reason for concern about Mohole on both cost and management counts, a complete cutoff of money risks the loss of the funds already invested.

The ambitious plan to drill through the earth's crust 30,000 feet under the Pacific Ocean off Hawaii has caught the imagination of world scientists. It is exciting to speculate about what might be learned from samplings taken so deep in the earth. Moreover, if the huge unanchored drilling platform planned for Mohole actually works and if the drilling process itself works, they may be of great assistance to the oil industry as its offshore exploration moves to deeper waters.

But there are three reasons for doubt about Mohole. First, the prospective cost has risen sharply. Estimates now are about $80 million and some authorities foresee a total of as much as $130 million—substantially more than envisaged even last September when the administration's scientific advisers gave their final approval. Second, there is a feeling within Congress that the project has been mismanaged by the National Science Foundation, which was not originally constituted as an operational agency. Third, Mohole's principal champion, Representation Albert Thomas, of Texas, died in February, and there seemingly is no one else with the same interest in pushing appropriations for it. Thus critics and skeptics have an open field.

Yet it would be a pity to abandon this effort to learn more about the environment of the planet on which we live—especially when there is still so much attention to the mysteries of outer space. Complete withdrawal from the Mohole project would mean writing off an investment of some $50 million. Perhaps the requested new appropriation of $19.6 million is excessive; but cannot enough be provided to keep the project on a standby basis so that it may be resumed at a more favorable time? Surely the scientific community and the White House ought to urge reinstatement of enough funds to keep Project Mohole cranking in low gear.

COMMUTER TRAIN CUTBACK IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I make no comment on the legal aspects of the New Jersey Public Utility Commission's decision in the Erie-Lackawanna case. But its practical effect is clear. Railroad commuter service in our metropolitan New Jersey-New York region is about to be reduced still further.

By now everyone should know that you cannot help ailing railroads by lopping off a few—or many—trains. Invariably the effect is to accelerate the downhill slide by driving the ever-shrinking band of patrons to other, more convenient, more dependable means of transportation.

Commuter passenger service will survive only if the commuter can be attracted back to the trains. But to do this will require providing frequent, reliable, on-time, comfortable trains and safe, clean, attractive terminals.

This, in turn, will require, as I long have urged, the development of a unified, balanced transportation system to serve the whole region, not just a few parts of it. And it now seems clear that we can no longer avoid the conclusion that such a coordinated system can be provided only by a competent, bistate or tristate agency.

A LESSON IN COURAGE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure to pick up a paper and read a sports column like the one written by Merrell Whittlesey in the Thursday, April 21 edition of the Evening Star.

Under the heading, "Orioles' Bat Boy Gives Lesson in Courage," Merrell Whittlesey has written the story of Jay Mazzone, 12-year-old son of a Maryland State trooper who is bat boy for the visiting clubs at Memorial Stadium in Baltimore.

When he was only 2, Jay was nearly burned to death. Now he has hooks for hands, and skin has been grafted over much of his body. These handicaps do not get in his way, however, and he asks no favors. He performs his duties as bat boy with energy and efficiency, and has gained the admiration of all visiting players.

Merrell Whittlesey is to be commended for bringing the story of Jay Mazzone to the public's attention as an example of great courage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 21, 1966]

ORIOLES' BAT BOY GIVES LESSON IN COURAGE

(By Merrell Whittlesey)

Visiting ballplayers in Baltimore's Memorial Stadium have a gentle, sober reminder this season that base hits, errors, and earned runs are not the most important things in life.

The bat boy for the visiting clubs is Jay Mazzone, 12-year-old son of a Maryland State trooper who was burned close to death when he was 2½ years old. Jay has hooks for hands—his were burned off above the wrists in a fire in his back yard—and has skin grafted over much of his body.

But this spry youngster carries his cross with distinction. The ball players eye him with sympathetic interest when they first spot him, but both Yankees and Senators took him to their hearts. They flip his cap, pat him on the back, and watch him with admiration.

Jay is not looking for sympathy. He cares for the bats with the hooks he uses for hands in a professional manner. He doesn't need any reminders. Jay is on top of every play, in batting practice and during the ball game.

He takes off his school clothes and dons his baseball uniform, with the No. 1 on the back, without any help. For the first two games of the Yankee series last week, his dad was there to tie his shoes. But his father was on duty during the third game and Bobby Richardson, the Yankee second baseman, observed the youngster tying his shoes with the hooks and offered to help.

But Jay said no thank you, sir, and tied them himself. But he said last night before the Senators' game that Mr. Richardson and Bobby Murcer, the young Yankee shortstop, were extra nice to him, and he remembered them and Mr. Crosetti, the coach.

Frank gave Jay a half-dozen new balls and a ball autographed with all the Yankee names. The youngster was very appreciative.

The players appear reluctant to ask Jay about his accident, but he is not backward to those who overcome their hesitance.

He and his brother were playing in the backyard of their home in Pleasantville, N.J., where their father at the time was a city policeman. They were near a trash pile which had kerosene cans on it, played with the can, and the kerosene spilled over Jay's snowsuit.

Then he was too close to the fire. A spark ignited the suit and he went up in flames. For a month it was touch and go as to whether he would live. Skin was grafted from the few unburned parts of his body, his dad gave skin from his legs, back and stomach, and Jay pulled through.

Jay's family moved to Baltimore 4 years ago when his father was named to the Maryland State Police force and last year a friend of his father wrote to the Orioles and Jay was invited to try out for bat boy. He served one series for the Tigers and one for the Orioles. This year he was told the visiting clubs were his own.

Jay is a sixth grade student at Sinclair Lane school, where he asks no favors.

He plays on an organized football team and uses foam rubber padding for hands. He is a right fielder on a baseball team and uses a special glove with a hook apparatus. He swims, plays table tennis and knows how to use a rifle.

In the basketball season he is a ball boy for the Baltimore Bullets.

Jay said that Coach George Susce and Bobby Saverine were particularly attentive to him among the Senators, but all of the players seemed nice, although he had them on two losing nights.

"He hustles every minute," Gil Hodges said last night, with admiration. "Look at the bats, every one in place. If there is a loose ball, he grabs it in his hook and tosses it to somebody.

"I was watching him during our first game and in an idle moment he grabbed a bat and was pounding on a resin bag, handling the bat just as though he had hands."

Jay has a locker in a corner of the visiting clubhouse. He changes clothes without help. Earlier he brought a candy bar from the clubhouse to the bench, peeled off the paper with his hooks, and held it in the cold steel frames as he ate it.

The ballplayers watch him quietly and his courage makes baseball seem awfully unimportant.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS RETIREMENT AND ANNUITY FUND

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate Calendar No. 1101, H.R. 11439.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11439) to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes, which has been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Effective", to strike out "the first day of the third month which begins after the date of enactment of this amendment" and insert "December 1, 1965,"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "such effective date" and insert "December 30, 1965,"; in line 9, after the word "month", to strike out "latest published on the date of enactment of this amendment," and insert "of July 1965"; and on page 5, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect December 1, 1965.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: SYMBOL AND SUBSTANCE

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, President Johnson's visit to Mexico last month demonstrated once again the strong bonds between the United States and Latin America, the enormous good will and affection for the United States that can be found to the south.

It also demonstrated that even in the midst of crisis in Vietnam and difficulties in Europe, the President of the United States does not forget that to the south are lands of 230 million people, with whose future we are and must be intimately concerned.

And most important, the President used this occasion to remind all the people of the Americas—North and South—that the United States stands unequivocally for democracy and for social justice; that—

> We will not be deterred by those who tenaciously or selfishly cling to special privileges from the past, and and we will not be deterred by those who say that to risk change is to risk communism;

that the alliance is nothing less than a "social revolution."

These are welcome words, beyond question a commitment to the ideals of the Alliance which must help to still the doubts of any, in Latin America and the United States, who question the depth and duration of those ideals.

What the President has done, however, is no signal for others of us, in the government and elsewhere, to relax our own efforts. Rather, it is a challenge to all of us to move forward, beyond the principles he has so clearly enunciated; to help turn his words into action; to apply these principles to the complex and difficult problems that are the face of reality in Latin America.

For the greatest danger confronting the Alliance for Progress is that its great exhortations to economic progress, to social justice and democracy, may become, in the press of day-to-day demands, no more than words. The charter is no precious talisman, to be taken from its case and exhibited periodically; it must be *used*. Its ideals must pervade every aspect of our policy. It must govern not only the necessarily infrequent acts of Presidents—but the daily actions of every member and part of the U.S. Government with responsibility in Latin America.

It is to the detailed working out of the President's policy—the great efforts and hard choices ahead—that I address myself today; to discuss some of the areas in which we must concentrate our attention, the areas on which the President touched so eloquently in Mexico City.

But before discussing specific problems, there is one element of our policy that must be clear—one constant thread running through all our days:

That we associate ourselves with the aspirations of the Latin American people for a better life—for justice between men and nations—for the dignity of freedom and self-sufficiency. These demands are in part material; above all, they are demands of the spirit.

But we must realize that the demands of the spirit—the demands for justice and a sense of participation in the life of one's country—are the essential precondition to material progress. The dispossessed and the landless will not strive and sacrifice to improve land they do not own, in whose proceeds they do not share. Parents will not sacrifice to insure education for their children, the children themselves will not study, if the schools to which they go end in the third grade, and if they are considered unfit for admission to higher grades. Individual entrepreneurs will not flourish in a closed society, a society which reserves all wealth and power and privilege for the same classes, the same families, which have held that wealth and power for the last 300 years.

We will understand the demands of justice—and help to meet them—only by a renewed consciousness and dedication to our own heritage, to the dreams of liberty and justice which have sustained this Nation since our birth in revolution less than two centuries ago.

Without this spirit, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, all our efforts will be useless.

With this spirit, no matter what the obstacles, any material poverty can be overcome.

I. THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

THE CHARTER

Five years ago this spring, President Kennedy called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress, "a vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work and land, health, and schools—techo, trabajo y tierra, salud y escuela. And he proposed "a vast new 10-year plan for the Americas—a plan to transform the 1960's into a historic decade for democratic progress."

That proposal was accepted by all the Latin American nations—except Cuba. In August of 1961, at Punta del Este in Uruguay, 20 nations signed the charter of an Alliance established on the basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy the common aspirations of man. The charter pledged efforts at development—setting a target of at least 2.5 percent per year growth in income per person. But it was far more than a promise of economic development. In addition it pledged—

A more equitable distribution of national incomes, raising more rapidly the income and standard of living of the needier sectors of the population;

Diversification of national economic structures, to reduce dependence on a limited number of primary products;

Acceleration of industrialization, particularly of capital goods, to increase productivity; storage, transport, and marketing;

Comprehensive agrarian reform, with a view to replacing latifundia and dwarf holdings by an equitable system of land tenure so that, with credit, technical assistance, and improved marketing, the land will become for the man who works it the basis of his economic stability, the foundation of his increasing welfare, and the guarantee of his freedom and dignity;

The elimination of illiteracy and a sixth grade education for all school-age children;

Improved health, including new water supply and sewage services for 70 percent of the urban and 50 percent of the rural population;

Expanded housing and public services for urban and rural population centers;

Stable price levels, but always bearing in mind the necessity of maintaining an adequate rate of economic growth; and

Cooperative programs designed to prevent the harmful effects of excessive fluctuations in foreign exchange earnings derived from exports.

And the United States pledged at least a billion dollars a year of assistance of all kinds, to help make these changes possible.

THE ROOTS

This Alliance for Progress was a response to the demands of the 1960's; its roots run deeper and further in time. In the past, the United States had acted as "protector" of hemispheric stability—intervening militarily in Latin American nations 21 times just in the period 1898 to 1924. And too often our great strength was used, not to advance the freedom and aspirations of the Latin American people, but in the name of stability, to protect our short-range economic interests.

Military intervention ended with the Good Neighbor policy; the last marines left the Caribbean in the 1930's, and relations improved through inter-American cooperation in World War II.

But in the years following World War II our attention, energies, and resources were largely concentrated on the great and urgent task of rebuilding Europe and working for the containment of, and then a just and stable peace with, Soviet power. Latin America was neglected and ignored. In the 15 years after the war, we provided $30 billion to Europe; $15 billion to Asia; but only $2.5 billion to our own hemisphere, to help the declining economies of an entire underdeveloped continent. We were content to accept, and even support, whatever governments were in power, asking only that they did not disturb the surface calm of the hemisphere. We gave medals to dictators; praised backward regimes; and became steadily identified with institutions and men who held their lands in poverty and fear.

In the late 1950's the failures of this policy, or lack of policy, erupted into anti-Americanism and the growth of communism. Our Vice President was mobbed and stoned in Caracas. Communist revolution—caused less by Castro and his band in the Sierra Maestra, than by the bloody and corrupt tyranny of Batista which we supported to the moment of its collapse—took power in Cuba; and his defiance of the United States received the secret admiration of many who hated communism, but rejoiced to see the discomfort of the huge and seemingly callous giant to the north.

Thus were we awakened from what Roberto Campos called the perilous lull. Latin American leaders seized the opportunity to press for change: President Kubitschek proposed a great Operation Pan America; revolutionary statesmen like Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela and Eduardo Frei in Chile received new strength in their own countries, and new recognition from the United States. In August of 1958 we had agreed to the creation of the Inter-American Development Bank and, in the Act of Bogotá, committed ourselves to take some tentative steps toward social reform. Now, in 1960, Congress authorized $500 million for a Social Progress Trust Fund to be administered by the new Bank.

And the stage was set for the great adventure—the Alliance for Progress—an Alliance whose goal was nothing less than to lift an entire continent into the modern age; receiving not only the blessings of its technology and the abundance of its economy; but above all, seeking human dignity and personal freedom, living in the ideal that all men deserve an equal chance to share in the blessings of this world.

This was the difference between the Alliance and all our previous relationships with Latin America. President Kennedy saw that what was important was not the statistics of economic development, but the human and spiritual reality behind them. It would matter little that a nation's economy grew by some millions of dollars, if those dollars were not used to improve the lot of the dispossessed and hungry poor. No material improvement would bring dignity to the lives of men unless other men treated them with the respect and dignity that are the due of citizens in a just and democratic state. And there could be no lasting peace in the Americas unless relations between all the American nations were founded in deep and genuine respect, for the hopes and rights and future of the people in every part of the hemisphere.

As President Kennedy saw, the Alliance was not and could not be a program of U.S. assistance, but a cooperative effort among all the nations of the Americas. It embraced not simply economic progress, but social justice, political freedom, and democratic government. It was an attack not just on poverty, but on the oppression and exploitation of man by man which had too long been the ruling pattern in the hemisphere.

This was a pledge of revolutionary change, for Latin America as well as for the United States. But the need for change was not universally accepted, either in Latin America, or in the United States; nor, despite President Johnson's efforts, is it universally accepted today.

There are still those who believe that stability can be maintained, and communism defeated, by force of arms; that those who have waited three centuries for justice can wait another so that old privileges may be preserved; that the economic machinery of the 20th century can be developed and managed by social structures which were outmoded in the 18th.

But there can be no preservation of the status quo in Latin America. The central question before us is not whether we can prevent change, but, as President Kennedy put it, whether "man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by free men, working within a framework of democratic institutions."

To appreciate the force of that question, and the meaning of the choices ahead, it is first necessary to look at what is in Latin America; at its geography and resources, the legacy of the past and the stirring currents of the future.

II. BACKGROUND FOR CHANGE

I returned from Latin America with impressions and emotions as varied as the peoples and places of that vast continent.

For it is varied; each nation has its own institutions, its own history, its own dream of the future. Income standards, education, numbers and composition of population, the quality of life and living—all vary greatly within and between nations.

Still they share many characteristics in common. And foremost among these is the feeling of admiration, respect, and deep affection which their people arouse in the visitor. In the words of the Mexican economist Victor Urquidi:

> These people have endured three centuries of colonial rule, a hundred years of civil war, invasion and various forms of organized bloodshed, a good deal of exploitation by domestic landowners and foreign investors, the effects of the world economic depression of the thirties, and, more recently, the hot and cold wars of the great world powers—and, throughout it all, an almost intolerable amount of corruption and repression.

Even today, they cling to life with a precarious hold; it is as if they were not of the land, but only on it. Life is short, the works of man seem impermanent; it is for some as if Pizarro came only an instant before. Governments sometimes seem to come and go almost at random, and the dynamics of change may seem entirely arbitrary: a civilian government may infringe on army privileges; or the navy may come into conflict with the army, or two branches of the army with each other; or a popularly elected President may go mad, or the army remove another for alcoholism.

Political labels, to the eye of a North American, are confusing, and make uninformed judgments dangerous. Latin Americans themselves are sometimes bedeviled by the overlap and contradictions between parties or factions. There is a "right" of the past, of the old landed oligarchy, and a "right" of the present, of business and commerce. There are popular forces of reaction, for example Peronism; there are popular forces of democratic progress; and there are popular forces of Marxist socialism or communism.

The divisions and antagonisms may be as great between the two kinds of right-wing forces as they are between left and right. There are similar antagonisms between the popular forces; and the former dictators Odria in Peru and Peron in Argentina got the votes of the poor slum dwellers through government programs for their benefit, though neither one was either democratic or progressive, and each repressed even mildly Socialist parties of the left. And many political factions, in this many-faceted politics, have their own military allies—too often ready to seek by force a predominance not conferred by the electorate.

Inflation—the cruelest of taxes on the tenant farmer and the unorganized worker—is in some countries endemic, and the savings of millions may be almost wiped out in a year. Yet even such harrowing uncertainty does not touch millions of Latin Americans who live entirely outside the money economy.

HAZARDS OF GEOGRAPHY

The continent has not been physically conquered. The distances between places are immense; 745 miles from Guayaquil in Ecuador to Lima, Peru; then 1,600 miles more down the west coast to Santiago; to Buenos Aires another 706 miles; to Rio de Janeiro, 1,200 more; and from there to Caracas another 2,810.

And between many of these places lies almost nothing—nothing but mountains and deserts and vast plains or jungles. Chile is 2,630 miles long; just over 8 million people live there, nearly 3 million in and around the single city of Santiago. It is as if the population of New York City were strung out from Goose Bay, in Labrador, to Key West, with the Rocky Mountains less than 100 miles from the Atlantic. Capital cities, which may hold one-third or even one-half of their countries' populations, often sit like islands in midocean, cut off by a hostile Nature from contact with each other or with the world outside.

This is true between countries. Peru and Chile are neighbors; they are separated by a great desert on which no men live. Between Chile and Argentina rises the great cordillera of the Andes; between the cities of Brazil and those of Venezuela or Peru are the unexplored jungles of the Amazon. But isolation and insularity are the rule even within nations. Peru, for example, is a seacoast nation, with an advancing export economy based on marine products. It is also a mountain nation, a place of scattered inaccessible villages where peasants have never heard of the United States—where even the word "Peru" has no meaning. And it is a nation of Amazon jungle beyond the mountains, a jungle which is no closer to the thoughts of Lima than to the thoughts of Washington or Indianapolis.

As Walter Lippmann has incisively pointed out, this geography has severely limited progress in the past, and still does today. Economic integration is handicapped because it is cheaper to ship goods from Europe than across the Andes. The Indians of the altiplano, the high plain of Peru, live almost as if the conquistadores had never left, or even come, in part because from their village it may take weeks of lonely journey to reach the capital, Lima. Millions of peasants are apathetic because their miserable poverty is the only way of life they have ever seen. The aimlessness of much of Latin American politics must result from the severe limits the land places on the possibilities of action upon which a meaningful political life must focus. And the extent to which Latin American governing classes have lacked concern for the welfare of their people probably results in part from the fact that people and places of misery have seldom seemed like parts of the same country in which the more fortunate lived.

THE LEGACY OF THE PAST

The people of Latin America struggle with more than the hazards of geography. They live also with the inheritance of history—as Teodoro Moscoso has written, a history of conquerors,

> who sought above all the gold and the many other riches of the new world. * * * They established in their new world, * * * the authoritarian rule of the elite which was the mode of government at home. * * * Indians in the Western countries and Negroes on the shores of the Caribbean and the Atlantic were serving as workhorses on plantations and rocky farms while the landlords enjoyed the finer things in life. * * * They produced bananas, sugar, wheat, meat, metals, and other food and raw materials that industrializing nations in Europe and North America were eager to buy. In short, economically they were very much like the African and Asian possessions of the European powers.

There are many legacies of this colonial period. One is the basic economy of much of Latin America—dependence on single commodity exports, relative lack of industry, absence of a mass market, prevalence of government monopolies. A new group of entrepreneurs, often the most progressive and liberal members of their communities, and a similar group of public servants, typified by Raul Prebisch of Argentina and UNCTAD, Hector Hurtado of Venezuela, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria of Colombia and the CIAP, Roberto Campos of Brazil, and many others, have worked to reform this system; its prevalence in spite of their efforts attests to the strength of the past.

But the past lives, more importantly, throughout the social structure: in education systems designed for a social elite; in concentrated land ownership; in constitutions which in some areas may effectively disenfranchise 80 percent of the electorate; in a feudal disdain for productive investment and for the hard work that is the lot of the majority.

POVERTY

The final legacy of this pattern of development is poverty and degradation and want, the statistics of which have become almost a litany.

Income per person is often less than $100 yearly; the average for all of Brazil is at most $300 and may well be less; 60 percent of the people of El Salvador have incomes of less than $55 a year.

Ignorance is standard in nearly all the countries; in Colombia, for example, only 60 percent of all children enter the first grade—and 90 percent of these have dropped out by the fourth grade. Fifty percent of all Latin Americans are illiterate.

Disease and malnutrition are almost everywhere; half of all the people buried in Latin America never reached their fourth year.

To travel in Latin America, to see the terrible reality of human misery, is to feel these statistics with stunning force.

In Recife, there are people who live in shacks by the water in which they dump their refuse and garbage; the crabs which feed on that garbage are the staple of their diet.

In fields nearby, men cut cane in the broiling sun from dawn to dusk, 6 days a week—and take home $1.50 for their week's labor; children under 16 make half as much; the minimum wage of 60 cents a day is not enforced. In some of their villages, and in others which we visited, 7 out of 10 children die before their first birthday—and there are primary schools for only one-quarter of those who do survive. In other villages nearby, a new factory has contaminated the water supply—and the mortality rate for children and adults is catastrophic.

In Peru, outside Cuzco, we met men working their landlord's fields for 45 cents a day, a good wage in an area where others must work 3 days with no pay beyond the right to cultivate a small mountainside plot for themselves. They had never heard of President Kennedy or President Johnson; they had never heard of the United States; they did not know the name of the President of Peru; and they spoke no Spanish, only the Quechua tongue of their Indian ancestors. In one village, I was introduced as the President of Peru—because, according to our Peace Corps guides, the mayor said he had dreamed, shortly before, that the President of Peru was coming to his village.

And everywhere, in and around every major city, were the slums—incredible masses of tin or tarpaper or mud huts, one room to each, with what seemed like dozens of children coming out of every doorway. Called barriadas in Lima, poblaciones callampas in Santiago, villas miserias in Buenos Aires, favelas in Rio de Janeiro, and ranchitos in Caracas, all are the same—vast numbers of peasants who have come to the cities in search of a better life, but find no work, no schools, no housing, no sanitary facilities, no doctors—and all too little hope.

And in Peru, Brazil, and in other countries of Latin America are the Indians not only cut off from the outside world but frequently their own political structures, desperately crying out for the help that will bring them into the 20th century.

These are some of the obstacles which confront the people of Latin America. Yet they have endured. They have sustained a faith in democracy and the value of the individual. They have, as the world saw last month in Mexico, kept a great fund of friendship and admiration for the people of the United States. They have produced some of the finest artists and poets of our time. And they have preserved a spirit of spontaneous gayety and humor, even in the midst of adversity, that is a lesson to all of us elsewhere in the world.

But we should not be surprised. For greatness is also part of the legacy of Latin America.

It is a legacy of civilizations—Mayan and Aztec and Inca—built before the white man came, whose buildings and treasures still thrill the eye.

It is a legacy of the proud and audacious men who came to conquer a continent—not with great armies, but with bands of a few hundred.

It is a legacy of men like Fra Bartolomeo de las Casas, who began a crusade for the welfare of the Indians in the 16th Century.

It is the legacy of Hidalgo and O'Higgins and San Martin and Bolivar—the liberators who caught the fire of our own revolution and sought liberty and equality for all men in the Western Hemisphere.

NEW WINDS BLOWING

These legacies, this spirit, are alive today, perhaps more than ever before. Everywhere we traveled, the ideals of independence and freedom and justice are a moving, active force. Everywhere, it is this legacy which is thrusting forward, the future seen plainly on the faces of the people.

Latin America is poor. But Venezuela's gross income is already on a par with Southern European levels of a few years ago, and is rising every year.

Latin America is short of trained people. But in Brazil and Chile and Peru, the "new men," economists and engineers and administrators, are stretching their considerable talents in the cause of progress.

Latin American politics have too often been restricted to upper class involvement. But in Chile and Venezuela and Peru, we saw democratic parties speaking for the majority of the people and acting in response to their interests; and in every country men and parties are dedicated to new progress—and to ancient ideals of justice.

For Latin America is on the move. Every legacy of the past, every state of rest, is under assault by the forces of change.

We saw change in the barrios of Caracas, where Peace Corps-type projects of community organizations and self-help are being carried on by an Accion force made up primarily of Venezuelans.

We saw change in the countryside of Chile, where agricultural workers are organizing unions to better their wages and working conditions, and ultimately to secure land for themselves.

We saw change in Sao Paolo, where new industries and new prosperity have built a boom city as contemporary as anything in the United States.

We saw change in remote villages in Peru, where students are working with poor peasants to build schools and housing and public facilities.

And we heard of change everywhere—from Bolivia, where 400,000 people have come down off the high plain, following a new road into the jungle to clear and cultivate new lands; from Minas Gerais in Brazil, where other thousands are following the new roads to Brasilia; from the mouth of the Orinoco in Venezuela, where a new Pittsburgh is rising.

This is the progress that is beginning in Latin America; but still for most Latin Americans there has been little progress, little fulfillment. The old dreams of freedom and justice, independence and democracy, have received a new form and new life in the charter of the Alliance; but the obstacles to progress have not been overcome.

To achieve the ideals of the Alliance, the aims which President Johnson expressed so well last month, there must be, as he said, a social revolution.

For there cannot be steady jobs and housing and economic security; there cannot be schools for all the children; and there can be no democracy, or justice, or individual dignity without revolutionary changes in the economic, social, and political systems of every Latin American nation.

And these changes the people of Latin America are determined to have. The coal miners in Concepción, laboring 5 miles under the sea for $1.50 a day—the mothers in Andean villages where schoolteachers tell the children that their parents' tongue is the speech of animals—the canecutters and laborers watching their children die—the priests who see the teachings of their church violated by the lords of the land—these people are the engines of change in Latin America.

These people will not accept this kind of existence for the next generation. We would not; they will not. There will be changes.

So a revolution is coming—a revolution which will be peaceful if we are wise enough; compassionate if we care enough; successful if we are fortunate enough—but a revolution which is coming whether we will it or not. We can affect its character; we cannot alter its inevitability.

But to say this is only the beginning; the question is now how the revolution is to be made and guided.

At the heart of the revolution, underlying all hope for economic progress and social justice, are two great and resistant problems—education and land reform. Both education and land reform are needed for economic growth. No amount of capital, no purely economic measures, can bring progress unless each nation has the trained and skilled people to do the work of modernization and change. Nor can any industrial economy be built on a failing, inadequate and obsolete system of agricultural production.

But these are far more than economic measures. No matter how rich or powerful a nation may grow, children condemned to ignorance, families enslaved to land they cannot hope to own, are denied the dignity—the fulfillment of talent and hope—which is the purpose of economic progress. Progress without justice is false progress—and a false hope. Thus education and land reform must be at the heart of our concern for change in Latin America; and among the highest priorities of Latin American Governments themselves.

III. LAND REFORM

THE NEED

Unproductive agriculture is probably the major factor in Latin American poverty. As a continent, Latin America does not feed itself. Sorely needed foreign exchange is spent to import food—$140 million for 8 million Chileans alone. Insufficient nutrition saps the strength and productivity of many of the hemisphere's workers.

Over half the continent is engaged primarily in farming (in contrast to the United States where farmers are less than one-fifteenth of the labor force). Much of the labor of the subsistence farmers of Latin America is relatively wasteful; often they cannot feed themselves decently, let alone produce surpluses. By contrast, agriculture has provided the greater part of increases in our own productivity and wealth; agricultural productivity has risen 6 percent yearly, as against about 2 to 3 percent in manufacturing.

The lack of productive employment on the land reverberates throughout Latin America. Children drop out of school because of their poverty. Manufacturing languishes because there is no mass market. The cities receive great new influxes of people who apparently feel that poverty in the city is at any rate more exciting than poverty in the countryside.

In short, no solution to Latin problems is possible without great progress in agriculture.

This was recognized by the charter of the Alliance, which called for comprehensive agrarian reform; by President Kennedy, who placed it at the head of his efforts for the Alliance; and again by President Johnson in Mexico City. And it is recognized throughout the nations of Latin America, where land reform is in the forefront of public attention.

But still the Inter-American Bank tells us that the fundamental pattern of the agrarian structure has not changed in the past few years; food output per person is just where it was 5 years ago.

Toward this vital goal of the Alliance, we must make greater progress.

LAND REFORM: THE ELEMENTS OF A PROGRAM

True land reform requires much effort, of many different kinds.

First, land must be redistributed. Many Latin American farmers are really laborers who own no land at all; they have neither the incentive nor the means to increase production. Of those who do own land, the great majority farm less than 10 acres, which are likely to be of poor quality. Throughout Latin America, it is estimated that more than 70 percent of the landowners control less than 4 percent of the land. Ninety percent of all land is controlled by less than 10 percent of the landholders; and there are nations in which less than 1 percent of all landholders control nearly 70 percent of the land.

Thus, one family in Peru owned over 300,000 hectares, or 741,000 acres—an area nearly as great as the State of Rhode Island.

The smallest plots, the dwarf holdings, can build up no capital—for fertilizer, for machinery, for better seeds; their poor and unschooled owners are largely ignorant of better farming methods. But neither have the great latifundia often been more productive per acre than the smaller holdings. Most owners are absent. Their workers are uneducated and underpaid, with little incentive. The very size of the estates has allowed their owners to become wealthy without substantial capital investment to increase productivity. In Peru, for example, haciendas of over 2,500 hectares are one-tenth of 1 percent of all farms, and hold 60 percent of all the acreage; yet they cultivate less than 5 percent of their land—as against smaller farms which cultivate half or two-thirds of their area.

For these reasons the charter of the Alliance called for the replacement of latifundia and dwarf holdings by an equitable system of land tenure; it recognized that redistribution of land, to create adequate family-size farms and cooperatives, must be the basis of a productive and efficient agriculture.

It was recognized also that redistribution of land is essential for the dignity and freedom of the man who lives on it. Like the framers of our own Constitution, the framers of the Alliance believed that an independent, propertied yeomanry would be the surest foundation of democracy and political stability. And surely we in the United States—a nation built on private property—will understand the importance of assuring the widest possible opportunity for the ownership of private property in other nations.

Land redistribution is a complex and difficult task. Efficient use of land must be rewarded and inefficient use penalized; complicated formulae may have to be devised to take account of such factors as whether land is irrigated. The method of compensation for land which is taken for redistribution will usually present serious difficulties. And the lack of a basic system of recording land titles, or even determining who actually owns land, can delay distribution for years.

Moreover, redistribution may well result, in the short run, in lowered agricultural productivity, and lowered food shipments to the cities—creating additional hardships for city dwellers and additional obstacles, such as inflation, to economic development. Further, many of the farmers of the hemisphere are unprepared for independent ownership; and it would be tragic if we were now to repeat the history of land reform in Mexico, where much land distributed in the 1920's was sold off to large holders within 20 years.

Yet for all the problems, all the difficulties, land must be redistributed. Over the long run, it is an essential step toward a productive agriculture. But it is much more. Land reform is the essence of human dignity and democracy in Latin America. To give land to the man who works it is to give him, for the first time, a degree of security—something more than subsistence living—a place to stand for his rights as a citizen, a share and a stake in the society around him. As our own Daniel Webster said in 1820:

> The freest government, if it could exist, would not be long acceptable, if the tendency of the laws was to create a rapid accumulation of property in few hands, and to render the great mass of the population dependent and penniless. * * * Universal suffrage, for example, could not long exist in a community where there was great inequality of property.

The question then becomes, what else we must do to make redistribution work. What are the additional needs of an agrarian reform program?

Fences, seed, fertilizer, machinery, livestock—these are as important to farm output as the land itself. But Latin American smallholders have neither these things nor, as a rule, access to agricultural credit with which to buy them. Farmers must be instructed in the use of their land and tools; but there are no land-grant colleges, no extension agents or advisers, to help the new farmer to make his land more productive.

And when he produces more, the farmer will have to send it to market. But agricultural marketing is also in a rudimentary state; only the relatively few cash-crop plantations have convenient and direct access to markets, and there is much to be done by way of standardizing grades and prices and quality, and creating a structure of middlemen between farmers and consumers which can assure a fair price to the farmer, not taking all the profit for themselves; all these are essential to a modern agricultural market.

To make a real land reform—to build an agricultural system which will feed these nations and support their farmers—will therefore require the creation of a new institutional structure. Agricultural credit, training for farmers, extension services, new networks for transportation and distribution—all these are difficult to build; but all must be created.

Next, the geography of Latin America must be overcome. For there is simply not enough acreage under cultivation. In Peru, for example, there is under cultivation about one-half of an acre per person. President Belaunde has set an average of three-quarters of an acre per person as a target. But even this is far from the U.S. average of over 2 acres per person under cultivation. Given the low productivity of land in Latin America, Peru would need to more than quadruple its present acreage under cultivation in order to match our food output per person.

Increases of anywhere near this magnitude will require a great colonization effort east of the Andean Mountains—in that part of Peru, three-fifths of its territory, which is part of the Amazon Basin. And this in turn will require efforts of many different kinds. Roads are the first priority; but schools and housing and other facilities will also have to be built for any new settlers. More basically, we do not yet know how to raise many crops in the Amazon Basin; temperature and rainfall levels have so far prevented systematic colonization. Thus major efforts at research in tropical agriculture are necessary; and even after new techniques are developed, it will be necessary to instruct tens of thousands of farmers in their use.

In summary, then, "land reform" must be far more than an attractive slogan. Real improvement in Latin American agriculture, and in the lives of those who till the soil, requires decades of effort—economic, educational, and social. It requires a commitment and it requires action—and that action must come now.

LAND REFORM: POLITICAL

But these efforts are only part of what is required. Land reform requires a great political effort; for it is, at the root, a political question: of the will and determination to reform the basic social and political system of a nation.

Land is the principal form of wealth in Latin America; its possessors, while by no means all-powerful, still are highly influential everywhere, and naturally resistant to reform. Large-scale land redistribution necessarily implies major changes in the internal political balance of many Latin American countries—away from oligarchy and privilege, toward more popular government.

Improvements in the educational system, also vital to comprehensive land reform, would also work great changes in the political balance. Representation of any area in the Brazilian Congress, for example, is based on total population. But illiterates are ineligible to vote; and in some areas, dominated by large landowners, up to 80 percent of the people are illiterate. This illiteracy gives to the established groups in these areas great leverage in the Congress; there is a vested interest against educational improvement.

Establishment of agricultural credit institutions for farmers may threaten local rural moneylenders—or established urban banking interests. Channeling higher education resources into agricultural service and improvement would mean denying to middle- and upper-class students some of their present monopoly on university study, and limiting their opportunity to take liberal arts and law courses.

All these changes, the essential components of a serious land reform program, raise basic social and political issues. Nearly all will be as difficult to resolve as basic issues within our own country, now and in the past—States rights, slavery, tariffs, economic reform. All require the creation of new institutions and patterns of behavior. All will give rise to basic divisions in the countries affected—at the root, the question, "Who governs?"

Thus there is no such thing as "pure" economic development in Latin America. Development depends on change—on new balances of wealth and power between men, on new justice in the courts of the market. Economic development requires hard political decisions; it therefore depends on political leadership, political development, political change. A better life for the people of Latin America can only come out of progress toward a better, more democratic political and social structure.

WHAT WE CAN DO

There are two ways in which the United States can help to accelerate comprehensive land reform in Latin America.

First, we can help with material assistance, in money and technology—for the training, schools, personnel, equipment, and roads which, as I have described, are necessary.

Agriculture, like any other industry, requires investment. All but a few Latin American nations are desperately short of investment capital; this we can help to supply.

We can help with technical assistance. In Venezuela, for example, 1 year's work by agricultural technicians taught farmers to increase their corn yields from 1,000 to 2,300 kilograms per hectare; they expect to reach 4,000 kilograms per hectare. But this experiment required a ratio of 1 technician to 30 farmers; to duplicate it throughout the hemisphere would require a million agricultural technicians.

Clearly, we do not have this many trained people. But we do have far greater resources than we now are using.

Our agriculture has been built, not by government, but through the work of the land-grant colleges, the State extension services, the voluntary associations such as the Grange and the 4–H clubs and the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union. We have made a first step toward using these State and local skills in a partnership between Chile and California and other similar partnerships of the Alliance.

But this is only a beginning. We could directly involve these institutions and individuals in the work of development—for example, by subcontracting our agricultural development program in a specific country to a single State or group of States. Through their own extension services, and the volunteer groups, they could supply managers for our AID funds. Without creating great new bureaucracies, we could secure the service—the energy and devotion and skills—of tens of thousands of Americans on less than a career basis.

In the long run, of course, all these jobs should be done by Latin American technicians; and we should help to train as many as are required. But Americans can help, on a short-term basis—and, given the opportunity, I believe they will.

Second, we can help Latin Americans meet the political challenges of land reform—above all, by clearly identifying and associating ourselves with the forces of reform and social justice. In nearly every Latin American nation elections are fought on the basis of the Alliance and its ideals; the great partnership that is the Alliance gives substantial weight to the opinions and feelings of other men and governments in the hemisphere. Strong association of the United States with land reform will everywhere help its supporters, and make others more reluctant to oppose it.

The basic work of reform, of course, is and must be for the people and governments of each Latin American nation. There are limits to the role the United States can play; I will discuss those limits later. But we can help; and we certainly can help by not extending our material and moral support to those who actively oppose necessary political, economic, and social change, including the comprehensive land reform which is at the heart of development efforts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is an unusual and welcome speech. The Senator from New York has not only set forth appropriate goals but he is also spelling out in detail many hard, tough facts, unapproved but highly relevant to an understanding of South America.

I am particularly delighted at the Senator's linking of land reform and education.

I ask the Senator if it is not true, that to achieve effective land reform it is very important that the kind of education which is necessary for farmers to be productive be made available to Latin Americans? Would not the county agent system, which has been so enormously successful in this country—and the agricultural extension courses be immensely helpful to a successful program of land distribution among farmers? Is it not true that if farmers get land and do not have the ability, education, and training to enable them to utilize modern agriculture techniques, there not only could be an inability to produce but political reactions against the resultant rise of food prices?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. I think that that is the heart of it.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin. If we concentrate only on redistribution of land and do not take other steps, so that when land is redistributed and a farmworker takes over some land and does not know how to till the soil, or use any of the more modern techniques to make his land productive, I think we are going to be in greater difficulty.

There is going to be an adverse reaction in the country and particularly in cities where a large portion of the population lives because food prices are going to go up. There is going to be an adverse reaction in the countryside because people are not going to get the benefits they expected.

The promise to them is not going to be fulfilled unless we take the other steps. At the same time we have land redistribution we must take the steps to make sure that those people who work with the land know how to use it and deal with it: We must make sure they are educated enough to use modern techniques that must be made available to them. An example of this would be how to use fertilizer.

The present Presiding Officer [Mr. HARRIS] and I traveled in the same area in Brazil last fall, and there we saw individuals working land 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, for $1.50 a week, with no possibility of educating their children or owning the land in the future, and without the kinds of agriculture training they need to become useful citizens, or for their families to become useful citizens.

In my judgment, and I am sure in the judgment of the present Presiding Officer, as I have talked to him, this situation is going to be catastrophic, not only for that country but for the entire hemisphere.

As we concentrate on the problems of Vietnam and other problems that appear to be more explosive at the moment, I hope that we do not ignore this part of the world which is going to be so meaningful, not just for the Senator from Wisconsin and myself, but those who take over in this country, after we leave.

If the people in these countries feel that they have no future, that the land does not belong to them, that the society does not belong to them, and they cannot obtain a reasonable opportunity for their children in the future, in free institutions, they will move in different directions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am somewhat surprised, and I do not question the Senator's assertions, but I am surprised to find on page 11 the following statement:

> This is the progress that is beginning in Latin America; but still for most Latin Americans there has been little progress, little fulfillment.

I had thought that statistics which I have seen for 1963, 1964, 1965, and a projection for 1966, indicated an increase in productivity in Latin America that has exceeded the goal set by the Alliance for Progress—not by much, but by a little, and that the per capita increase has also been somewhat better than had been expected.

Has this income been so badly distributed that most Latin Americans have been left out?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is one of the problems. Statistics are only numbers—they do not measure improvement in the lives of the poor. Also some countries have done much better than other countries.

If one were to look at the overall average he might be somewhat encouraged, since a good number of improvements have been made. But the population has grown so rapidly in many of these countries that the output per individual has not increased over the last 5 years.

I am going to talk about the expanding population within Latin America and some things that I believe need to be done about it.

With all of the effort we have made in the problems of Latin America, we have not gotten our heads above water because of the fact that many of these programs have not been so successful as they might have been; second, that the benefits have not been distributed properly; and third, the explosive population growth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I welcome the reference of the Senator both in his text and in his off-the-cuff remarks indicating a revolution is coming and the indications of that revolution. We have seen the terrible implications of revolution in Cuba. We realize what a threat that kind of bloody Communist revolution is to this country and to citizens in Wisconsin, New York, and other States. If the revolution is not orderly, if it is not in the democratic direction, it is very likely to be in the other direction. The other direction could constitute a real threat to our security.

I also appreciate the Senator's realistic emphasis on the obstacles which we face; that this is not a situation where we can simply say we are for land reform and support some kind of government program or appropriation which would distribute land. The New York Senator stresses the point that it will require new institutions and new patterns of behavior, and change will require new struggle.

Unless we realize that there are going to be setbacks, and a lot of division in this country, as well as in South America over this kind of program, and a lot of dispute here about whether or not we can proceed in this kind of necessarily revolutionary way, I think we will not achieve what we wish to achieve.

I believe it is important that we recognize that it is going to be a long, tough, hard road. There will be setbacks and discouragement certainly for a while. We can expect to be at times in conflict with the government in authority in some Latin American nation over these objectives.

Unless we realize that, and are prepared for it, we may not have the heart to continue to help. This will take years, decades of patient, painstaking, costly, dangerous work for this country; but the the alternative to this peaceful revolution may be a Cuban revolution on a continental basis, or a Vietnam military action against Communist subversion costing billions of dollars and many lives.

I believe it is most helpful that the Senator referred to what happened in Mexico. There was land redistribution, but in a few years the land was repurchased by large estates. Unless land reform is accompanied by a well-integrated program of agricultural training, transportation improvement, agriculture credit, and a number of other things that take time and patience, we will not help the Latin Americans to overcome the enormous obstacles that their countries face.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that as we realize the tremendous problems in Latin America, certainly Mr. Castro and those who are associated and identified with him also realize them. But for them, these problems create a potential for unrest and division.

In a broadcast from Havana in the last few weeks, a dozen countries were named in which Castro and communism are going to make a major effort, through violence, to overthrow the existing governmental structure.

We have a moral responsibility—and some people may take issue with this—because of our gross national product of approximately $700 billion and because of the level of affluence that exists in this country.

Half the people of Latin America die before the age of 4 because they do not have enough to eat, because of lack of decent water, because of no doctors. I do not think we can live in isolation from these problems that exist elsewhere in the world. We have that responsibility.

Beyond that, we have a problem of self-interest. We are spending now at least a billion dollars a month in Vietnam to kill people and to fight a war. What we are talking about here is funds for the whole of Latin America, to help them to help themselves. What we are talking about here, at this juncture, is the expenditure of money equivalent to that spent in 3 or 4 weeks in Vietnam, to help the people of Latin America to help themselves.

From the standpoint of our moral responsibility and our self-interest, we should head off what is likely to occur in the countries of Latin America during the next few years. This can be accomplished by taking the steps to which I have referred.

In traveling through Latin America, one is impressed by the fact that something can be done. It is not a situation in which one becomes discouraged. There are problems and difficulties, but something can be done. The leadership and direction of the United States and the interest of this country in the countries of Latin America are required in order to attain these goals. We cannot become interested in Latin America only at the time another Castro arises. If the Latin-American countries can only attract our interest, our concern, our leadership, and our direction by having another Castro, then it will be too late.

We learned our lesson during the 1950's. Castro's rise was not caused just by negligence on the part of this country. What brought about Mr. Castro and communism in Cuba was our support of Batista; and Batista, not Castro, was the major cause of communism in Latin America. The question is whether or not we learned the lesson of the fifties, so that we can apply it to the sixties. Are we learning the lesson of southeast Asia, so that we can apply it to Latin America?

This is the time we should take steps to head off difficulties 5 years from now. If we do not, we will not be able to head off these difficulties. If we say we do not have an emergency in Latin America and therefore we are not going to pay attention to that area and are not going to take the necessary steps, then we are going to pay for it in spades, in my judgment, for many years in the future.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

IV. EDUCATION

THE NEED

Education is the second major problem embracing both progress and justice. And it is of primary importance to Latin America—as to every nation.

Education is not only important to understanding the world and each other—it is the key to the future, the foundation of progress in the modern world. No nation, not one, has entered the ranks of modern economic society without trained and educated people to run the factories, manage institutions, guide the government, draw plans. Without them all the money and loans are worthless.

Education is the key to progress of another kind: like land reform, it is a passport to citizenship. As Horace Mann put it:

> A human being is not, in any proper sense, a human being until he is educated.

Men without education are condemned to lives as outsiders—outside political life, outside the 20th century, foreigners in their own land. Men who are illiterate cannot read newspapers, or instruction manuals, or even the road signs by which we guide our footsteps. Even for those who can read, further education is the key to social and economic mobility and freedom; there can be no career open to the talents without the education which develops talent.

But education, the key to progress, is sadly lacking in Latin America. There are not nearly enough trained and educated people to run the machinery of modern society. And the illiteracy of 50 percent of all Latin Americans inhibits progress of all kinds—economic, social, and political.

Popular education, in the sense in which we understand it in the United States, is only beginning in most countries. The Latin American nations have made great efforts to build schools and add teachers in the last 5 years, increasing enrollment in primary schools by 6 percent yearly, and secondary enrollment by more than 10 percent a year.

But statistics of improvement can be misleading. The school-age population is also mushrooming—so that, in some countries, there are more illiterates now than there were 5 years ago. In rural Peru many primary schools do not go beyond the first grade; in none of the five countries we visited were there schools available for all children above even the third grade. And dropouts, due in large part to poverty, illness, and lack of facilities, make the top of the education pyramid narrow indeed. Of 1,400 Brazilian children, for example, 1,000 enter the first grade, and 396 the second. Of these, 169 finish the fourth grade; 20 complete high school; 7 enter some form of higher education institution—and perhaps 1 of the original 1,000 who entered the first grade will finally graduate from the university. That is 1 out of 1,400 Brazilian children. Even in Argentina, where 10 percent of the college-age population are enrolled in universities, only 4.9 percent of those who do enter the university leave it as graduates.

Quality standards also are often low. In Peru less than one-third of elementary school teachers have any professional training—and 15 percent themselves are only elementary-school graduates. Even in the universities throughout the hemisphere, professors can teach only part time, and must hold outside jobs to live. In Buenos Aires, at the best medical school in Latin America, 1 microscope and 1 cadaver must be shared by 40 students.

And the educational resources available are not sufficiently directed toward the task of development. Fully 20 percent of university students study law; an equal number study medicine; more pursue a classical liberal-arts curriculum. Less than one-twentieth of the students are preparing for work in the critical field of agriculture, and too few prepare for work as engineers or teachers. Secondary schooling is academic, directed at university entrance—though only a small fraction of those who attend secondary schools ever enter college—and does not provide the skilled and semitechnical manpower which is needed in the factories and workshops of the continent.

The production of the educational system, in sum, is a very small group of professionals at the top; all too few middle-level workers, without vocational training; a great mass of the semieducated and semiliterate; and tens of millions, adults and children, without any education whatever.

PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Improving educational levels is by its nature a gradual process; there is no short cut. To teach more children, we need more teachers; to get more teachers, we need more college and high school graduates; to have more graduates, we need to teach more children.

The United States can help this process with money and with people. Already, Peace Corps volunteers teach thousands of children, and help many local communities to build schools. Many of our universities aid universities in Latin America; some have established branch campuses there, to advance the exchange of faculty, of students, and of ideas. U.S.-donated food feeds hundreds of thousands of students, and U.S. assistance has built thousands of new schoolrooms throughout the hemisphere. All these efforts can and should be intensified, especially efforts to build educational institutions, as by aid to departments of education. I welcome President Johnson's new emphasis on education in our international development programs.

There is a type of educational assistance which we have not yet made available to Latin America; I urge that efforts to make it available go forward with all possible speed. In the last few years, our universities and industry have developed dozens of new educational techniques—teaching machines, educational television, programed instruction. No one contends that these machines are all there is to education; but they can make a major contribution to learning where teachers are in short supply and poorly trained. We should now investigate the applicability of our new techniques to education in Latin America, especially at the primary level. And we should help Latin Americans acquire and use whatever, out of our educational inventory, will be of help to them.

I would point out that not all these resources will be found in universities. One of Latin America's greatest needs, for example, is for subprofessional medical personnel, to work in the remote rural areas. The greatest body of such personnel that we have developed are the medical corpsmen of the armed services. I suggest that we now explore ways in which the trained technicians and experience which have been developed in the military can be made available to Latin America, so that they may develop medical technicians competent to meet the most pressing needs of people in areas without doctors. But our money or teachers or techniques or administrators can do only the smallest part of the necessary job.

We can help make school available to more people. But more schools will not themselves erase the poverty which largely causes the overwhelming dropout rates. Keeping more children in school, therefore, requires major improvements in the lot of the poor: comprehensive land reform in the countryside, and increased employment in the cities. Without such economic progress and social reform, great new investments in education will largely be wasted; all must go forward together.

Moreover, the aid we offer will not be used unless Latin Americans themselves make hard political decisions—decisions to open education to a far wider proportion of their people, and not reserve it as a privilege of the more fortunate few. In some countries, such as Brazil, for example, secondary schooling is mostly private, and universities are supported by the States. Thus, those who can afford to pay for high school are given free higher education; but most of those who cannot pay for secondary schooling do not get even that. For this policy to be reversed—the state to pay for high school and possibly a different policy to govern fees for university study—is a political decision for democracy, which is a Latin American responsibility.

Above all, improving education requires decisions by those now receiving an education to contribute their time and work to the education of their countrymen. This elite—the university students—are the key to better general education, as they are to every other hope for progress in their society. But this is another problem.

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

"Problem" because it is just that. Part of the problem is politics. The University of Caracas has for some years been the center and command post of Communist terrorism in Venezuela; other universities elsewhere are also centers of extremist politics. We need only note what has been happening at the University of Mexico City. Fidel Castro was not the first Latin American revolutionary to come out of student politics—nor will he be the last. One Latin American president told me that the students were his second most serious source of difficulty. And one of the most disturbing moments of my 3 weeks in Latin America was when a group of Communist students burned the American flag.

Not all student activists are extremist or irresponsible. Many Latin American students have in the past given their lives for independence and freedom. Many others have come to lead their nations toward reform and progress, such as Presidents Betancourt and Belaunde and Frei. There are activists today, building schools and roads and clinics and houses, the first generation of Latin American students to soil their hands and bend their backs. There are Peruvian students working in the slums of Lima and in the Andean villages. Some Chilean students are the backbone of the Peace Corps-type programs in their own country. And I saw Venezuelan students working in community-action programs in the barrios of Caracas.

But those who are radical and not active are far more numerous than those who are active—whether extremist or constructive. And in this combination of extreme speech and little action is great danger for their countries, and for the United States.

The primary danger is that the real problems of Latin America, which depend greatly for their solution on these very students, will go unsolved.

A second danger is that extreme speech will contribute to further political and social instability.

And a third danger is that the social problems aggravated by inaction will be blamed upon the United States.

I saw this happen again and again in my travel last fall. Students in Peru blamed the United States for the military coup in Brazil. Students in Venezuela blamed the United States for the weakness of the OAS. Students in Chile blamed the United States for their border quarrel with Argentina. And students everywhere blamed the United States for poverty and stagnation in their own countries. Repeatedly, I had to state the simple fact that what the United States did would mean far less to their countries than what they themselves could do.

What are the roots of extremism among the sons of a class which has been privileged for 300 years?

Partly, it is simple nationalism. For most of their history, the upper classes of Latin America have neglected their own nations, preferring to enjoy the benefits of a cosmopolitan European culture. But the post-World War II period has seen a resurgence of national feeling all over the globe and the birth of dozens of new nations from the former colonies of the great powers. It is not so easy, now, to be without a nation in which to take pride. The Latin American countries are weak and poor and not "modern." They suffer badly, in the eyes of their young men, by comparison with the United States.

To demand sweeping change is to be "modern"; to be anti-United States is not only "modern," but brave; to be Marxist is to be at once anti-United States and intellectual.

A second reason is the obvious demand of justice. No man is insensitive, and young people are particularly sensitive, to justice: to the demands of the landless and the sick and the untaught. The manifestoes of leftwing students in Latin America, in fact, are often less advanced in many respects than the platform of the Democratic Party in the United States, or than the Conservative Party in England. It is often a measure not of themselves but of their societies that these students are cast in the role of extremists.

But more than anything else, I think, these students are what they are out of the desire "not only to equal or resemble, but to excel"; the desire which John Adams said "next to self-preservation will forever be the great spring of human actions." The students I saw seem to have sensed that their societies, as presently constituted, have not enough room for achievement; that they have inadequate opportunity to establish themselves on the great stage of public affairs, to dare and to achieve for their countries and for their posterity.

STUDENTS: WHAT WE CAN DO

There is much we can do to help the students of Latin America, and to help ourselves with these students.

First, we should extend all possible help to the improvement of their education generally: through financial assistance, to improve their university facilities and faculties; through help for the creation of entirely new universities; through assistance for secondary schools to aid their preparation for college.

Second, we should devote greater thought and effort to conveying to these students the truth about the United States. Partly this is a matter of learning how to talk to them. We tell them, for example, that we have a "capitalist" economy, and that they would do well to follow our example. But this does not mean to them what it means to us; to them, "capitalism" stands for the rapacious and irresponsible colonial economy of their history, and 9 out of 10 of them say they are opposed to it. We should find a better way of describing our own society—one which more accurately conveys to them what the facts are here. And we should be clear in our own minds about what our society represents, what we personally believe about our society, and what it stands for. I think John Buchan, Lord Tweedsmuir in his autobiography gave an impressive definition of "democracy."

He said:

> Democracy, the essential thing as distinguished from this or that democratic governments—was primarily an attitude of mind, a spiritual testament, and not an economic structure or a political machine. The testament involved certain basic beliefs—that the personality was sacrosanct, which was the meaning of liberty; that policy should be settled by free discussion; that normally a minority should be ready to yield to a majority, which in turn should respect a minority's sacred things. It seemed to me that democracy had been in the past too narrowly defined and had been identified illogically with some particular economic or political system such as laissez-faire or British parliamentarism. I could imagine a democracy which economically was largely socialist and which had not our constitutional pattern.

But words or messages will work no magic changes among Latin American students. I know that, ever since the onset of the cold war, we have been urged to develop a concise, exciting American manifesto—a platform which would compete with the simple rousing calls of the Communists. But what matters about this country cannot be put into slogans; it is a process, a way of doing things and dealing with people, a way of life. There are two major ways of telling others what this country is really about; to bring people here, or to send Americans abroad.

We should, therefore, expand our programs to send students and teachers of all kinds to Latin America and to bring Latin American students to the United States. This is more, I would add, than a matter of opening places in universities here.

Too often, students who do come here have little contact with the substance of our life. There are thousands of Latin American students in New York City alone. But programs to help them understand us—to meet not just with other students, but with government officials, and labor and business and community leaders, and ordinary citizens outside New York City—these programs are too often scattered and fragmentary, or even nonexistent. And the same situation holds true all across the country. I urge that we give increased support and encouragement to such programs; not in a spirit of salesmanship or propaganda, but in an honest effort to help these students see our own blemishes along with our assets, and the ways in which we are dealing with our problems. They will appreciate our candor. And I have confidence that the overall picture they receive can only be a positive one.

One concrete step we can and should take is the establishment of centers of study and meeting for Latin American students in the United States. Where any one should be located is less important than that it is established.

Third, we should give to the youth of Latin America a full chance to participate in the building of their continent. That chance is available to some; but the students of Argentina, for example, have no organized opportunity to serve in Peace Corps type work, though many have expressed a desire to do so. I therefore propose that consideration be given to urging more Latin American nations to form their own peace corps—a step which Brazil has just taken and a form of which has been taken in Peru, Chile, and Venezuela. But I believe we should go further. We should consider also the formation of a multinational hemispheric peace corps in which Americans from both North and South could join for work in their own or other American countries, as well as in the United States. The Peace Corps has shown that young people can make a difference—to individuals, to communities, to whole nations. It has given to thousands of young Americans an opportunity for direct action in support of their ideals; and a hemispheric peace corps can and should do the same for Americans south of the Rio Grande. I would hope that our own Peace Corps would become clearly aligned with it; the two corps should work together.

The benefits of such participation would be as great for us as for them. It could add to the efforts of our Peace Corps, and to the work of such groups as the International Volunteer Service and the Papal Volunteers, thousands of eager workers, thoroughly knowledgeable about Latin America. If our young people joined in this effort they could give to their Latin American compatriots a far improved knowledge of the United States. And such a corps might one day become the nucleus of a true hemispheric community.

Fourth, we should permit all those—students, professors, writers and others—who wish to come to this country to do so, regardless of whether their political or economic views are in agreement with our own. Too often, we have even denied entry to distinguished Latin American scholars, working with U.S. universities, because of their supposed political views. But the theory of our Constitution, as we hope will be the theory of other constitutions, is that, as Justice Holmes said:

> The best test of truth is the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the marketplace.

We need not fear the presence of dissenting voices, whether of our own citizens or of Latin Americans or others. And our willingness to listen—and to let even our critics see our strengths and our weaknesses—will, not only be a clear demonstration of our own basic faith in our veracity and our ideals, but will in my judgment, make a distinct impression on the students and young intellectuals of Latin America.

Fifth, let us preserve always a sense of perspective and balance in our judgments. There is, on the extreme left, a highly disciplined, highly motivated minority. But even these students are not necessarily Communists, and we should neither unduly bemoan their victories nor trumpet their defeats. When I was in Indonesia in 1962, the mass of students were, if anything, more vocal in their anti-Americanism and Marxism than the students I saw in Latin America. Yet the same Indonesian student organizations, perhaps many of the same individual students, led anti-Chinese and anti-Communist demonstrations in 1965 and 1966—and helped oust the China-oriented Foreign Minister and install the Nationalist-neutralist army in power.

The students had not suddenly become pro-American or even anti-Communist; but they saw foreign-supported communism as a threat to their national independence, and reacted as strongly as they would have if the United States had tried to dominate their country.

Among those students who are bitterly critical of the United States, even among those who call themselves Communists we should not abandon our efforts. During my Latin American tour, I spoke to the students of the University of Santiago. The only students opposed to my speaking were not the orthodox Communists, but the militant Chinese-oriented group; they threw eggs and tried to shout me down for 25 minutes. Other students, standing up for my right to be heard, threw these extremists bodily out of the hall. Many of the students who remained, indeed many of those who threw out the Communists, were highly critical of the United States. But they would fight to listen to a representative of the United States speak and answer their questions and defend his country against their accusations.

The next night, at Concepción, a hundred extremists, better organized, were able to prevent me from speaking. But they did so at the cost of alienating most of the rest of the students, and exposing the weakness of their position. At a meeting before my appearance, I told the extremist students I would admit that the United States had made mistakes; challenged them to debate their case before their fellow students and asked whether they would admit their wing of the Communist Party had ever made a mistake. Their answer was "no" to the debate and "yes" to the question—they said their mistake was not making a revolution in Chile. These replies had a profound effect on the other students present.

Let me add one final point. We should not become discouraged because of these incidents. That is exactly what the Communists wish to accomplish. They realize that rudeness, disorder, violence receives considerable publicity in the United States. They are also aware that people in the United States become disturbed and concerned and wonder whether our efforts of friendship are worthwhile.

Let me say I believe our efforts are productive. In Concepción tens of thousands of people poured out into the streets in a demonstration of friendship. They know about the United States—and they represent the feeling of the people for this country. Less than 100 students out of 1,000 caused the disturbance that evening. And before the night was out they were involved with anti-Communists in a pitched battle which raged for several hours. I would not regard the students of Latin America as "lost" to their countries or to the hemisphere as a whole.

We just cannot permit a well-disciplined, articulate vocal minority to intimidate or discourage us. If we stand up and demonstrate that we are prepared to meet them face to face, that we will not be intimidated, that we will talk with them; that we will exchange views with them; that we will debate them; yes, even that we know some students who believe in freedom of speech who if they wish it will fight them—we shall be successful; not immediately perhaps, but, given the wisdom of our other policies, slowly and inexorably.

These students are the future leaders of their countries. They do have a great reservoir of patriotism and idealism, and a basic belief in the importance of the individual. They are worth listening to, and worth talking to with patience and candor; they are worth, in fact, all the time and effort we can spare. It is easier to talk to government officials, or to businessmen, or to other North Americans; and too often, only one or two members of an entire Embassy staff ever talk with students. I urge instead that all members of our embassies, as well as the many U.S. officials and citizens who travel in Latin America, try to achieve some personal contact, some dialogue with individual students and student groups.

UNIVERSITIES AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES

It should be apparent that the universities of the United States have a great contribution to make—to Latin American education, agriculture, and public administration; to the Alliance for Progress; and thus to the national interest of the United States. But revelations of recent months, even days, show that the sincerity and prestige of our universities have been seriously compromised by arrangements with agencies of the U.S. Government.

The first of these was a study named "Camelot." The Department of the Army commissioned this study from a group at American University. The Army, with intelligent foresight, was attempting to find out what social, economic, and political factors might influence the growth or decline of insurgent movements. But the Army was not the proper agency to do the study; and the study itself, designed by the university, seems to have been so clumsily drawn as to antagonize any self-respecting Latin American. One does not, for example, ask a Latin American political leader—for that matter, any political leader—how he feels about his parents. The study was to have been conducted in secret; when the news inevitably leaked, U.S. university studies throughout Latin America came under hostile suspicion as tools of the Pentagon.

The embarrassment of Camelot has now been compounded by the revelation that a Michigan State University mission in Vietnam was a cover for the CIA, and that the respected Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology was set up in part with CIA funds. Surely, every U.S. university mission, all over the world, will now be suspect—impairing, to some unknown degree, their ability to function as scholars and teachers.

It was for just this reason that the center at Massachusetts Institute of Technology has announced that it has severed its connection with the CIA; not because it felt that its academic integrity was compromised, but because of the suspicion and distrust that was unavoidable abroad.

In large part, we in the Congress must bear responsibility for this situation. Camelot was undertaken by the Army because far more research funds are available to the Army than are appropriated to the Department of State, or AID, or other nonmilitary institutions. The same shortage of research funds to nonmilitary agencies was also the reason why CIA funds were given to Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I support the new policy which gives to the State Department, and to the Ambassador in each country, control over U.S. Government-sponsored research abroad. But the problem of universities becoming identified with undercover and military agencies will continue so long as those agencies have the great preponderance of foreign research appropriations. The Department of State, and the Agency for International Development, should therefore seek major increases in their research budgets, with corresponding reductions in such budgets for the military and the intelligence agencies.

And we should now take such administrative steps as are required to insure that intelligence agencies do not use our universities as covers or tools. Unless we now take unequivocal action, the universities will not be of great further use to the CIA in any case; we must try to salvage their reputation for serious academic work.

For the truest test, the surest message, of our nature and our principles will be found in what we do. We will not build respect for our academic institutions, or traditions of university independence, by using them for intelligence work. And exchange programs or even shared work in projects in slums and villages will be ineffective, in the long run, unless we maintain our commitment to progress, justice, and freedom—in Latin America and at home—to the ideals of the Alliance and to our own tradition. More than anyone else, the students of Latin America will be watching.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. I may want to make a comment later on as to the other aspects of the Senator's excellent address, but I should like to comment briefly now, and ask a question or two about this subject.

Let me say that while the Senate as an institution may from time to time engage in discussion dealing with foreign relations matters which are already in a crisis stage, I believe that the Senate rises to its highest responsibility in the field of foreign relations, under its constitutional directive, to advise and consent in this area and to assist in the making of policy, before the subject reaches the crisis stage.

I feel that Latin America is of the greatest importance to the future of the United States and to the peace and security of the world. The Senator from New York, not only through his interest in this area of the world during the time he served in the administration of President Kennedy, and through his recent tour of South America, but also through this first of his two addresses on the floor of the Senate on this subject, will help very much to focus the attention of the people of this country on the importance of Latin America to them.

It could be summed up—and this is what the people in this country need more and more to know—there, as elsewhere in the world, in five or six words; namely, "desperate, downtrodden people will rise." If the history of our country, or of the world, teaches anything, it is just that.

I believe that the Senator has very well stated what must be the prime base of our policy, what is, fortunately the case under the Alliance for Progress, that simple, economic aid without real revolution—political, economic, and social revolution—will come to naught, and that the things we do must all be focused in that direction.

To me, that is the heart of what the Senator has stated to this moment in his excellent address. Those are things which the people of this country must understand, that we must take an interest in Latin America, that it is not only an affront to our conscience that the people down there are so downtrodden and desperate, but also our own enlightened self-interest is involved. Unless we appeal to those deprived people, they will rise up in revolution until they shake the foundations of our own peace and security. I stated at the beginning that the Senator has brought these points home in his speech. It is something we need to understand.

I am particularly taken by the Senator's comments about the students in South America, the force that they are, and the explanation he has given as to their general attitude and feeling—which worry some of us perhaps more than it should. But I believe that we must do as the Senator suggests, take a greater interest in them.

I believe that idealism has become the pragmatism of our day. I believe that there exists in the minds of the students in Latin America the same kind of feeling, the same kind of desire to be of assistance to other people which existed in this country when President Kennedy came forward with the Peace Corps idea.

I believe that one of the major benefits which perhaps will come from the address of the Senator from New York is the idea of a multinational, hemispheric Peace Corps.

I therefore wish to ask the Senator—I know that he talked about it as he visited the student groups in South America—what sort of reaction he received from students to the idea that they themselves might be an instrument for greater justice in their own countries and surrounding countries?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma. Let me first comment on the remarks he made at the beginning, the way he summarized what I believe to be the basic problem that we have to deal with in Latin America, and what will govern our relationships there.

I say that even if we appropriate $2 billion, $3 billion, or $4 billion, unless we have this idealism, unless we accept the fact that people will advance their lives, and we identify with that, the money will be wasted. Anyone who feels that because Latin America lacks the financial help from the United States it does not progress, in my judgment, makes a major mistake. That is not what the problem is basically. The basic problem is that what we have to do—here in the United States, all of us, especially the Federal Government which has that particular responsibility—is to realize that there is a revolution now going on down there, and we must identify ourselves with that revolution.

Let me say that I was impressed with the friendliness of the people of Latin America toward the United States. We have preached to them the dignity of the individual, the fact that we want to help them lead their own lives and to determine their own destinies. We have told them about our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

However, that does not mean very much to a father who cannot get a job, to a father who must work on a farm for 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, for only $1.50, or a man who sees half his children die before they reach the age of 1. Look over Latin America as a whole, and we see that half the burials that take place there are in coffins less than 4 feet long, because those who died were under the age of 4.

We must recognize these facts, and identify ourselves with them. We must put ourselves in their shoes. We would not accept such conditions in this country. The Senator from Oklahoma would not accept them. I would not accept them—neither would anyone else in this country, no matter how many persons came to us and preached about free institutions and democracy and how awful communism is.

We can say that communism does terrible things, that there are no free institutions under communism. But how can it be any worse there, where men and women and their children are mostly illiterate, and they cannot vote in an election, because there are no schools and there is no way to receive an education? But we go down there and tell them about the dangers of communism, that they must be for democracy because communism is so dangerous.

What does that mean to them? It would not mean anything to the Senator from Oklahoma. It would not mean anything to me. I see the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the Chamber—the chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee, who knows more about this subject than any of us—and I know it would not mean anything to him, or to anyone else in this country who has any feeling for his family, let alone his country.

That is what we are facing. We have come to a crossroad. We must either move down and give some attention to this problem and realize that this is the kind of society we want to be identified and associated with, that this is the kind of leadership we plan to give the rest of the world, or we must move back and decide that we will stay in the United States and not be concerned about the rest of the world, nor give it leadership.

We should make that decision, one way or the other. We cannot go half way. Therefore, I know that what the Senator from Oklahoma has stated is absolutely correct, that we must identify ourselves and relate ourselves to the fact that a revolution in Latin America is coming, and will come, either with free institutions, or with extremism on the left or right—which will eventually end in extremism of the left which, in my judgment, will be communism.

As I said earlier, I think we have the responsibility because it is morally right to do so. As was said at one time, we cannot save the few who are rich if we are not willing to help the many who are poor. Unless we do not take that kind of step, we are headed for catastrophe.

Mr. HARRIS. I was wondering if the Senator would comment on the challenges he issued, about which I read in the Spanish language newspapers, with regard to the students in Latin America.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think the answer is that they have a great interest in doing something. Just as in the 1950's here in the United States, there was a need for a vehicle for idealism so that is true now in Latin America.

In time of war, people are asked to go out and fight and, if necessary, die for their country, whether it be a democracy or some other kind of government. Then they come back from the war and into the community. If they have an education, they are able to get a good job, earn a good living, and try to provide a better life for their children.

I think it is the idealism that they feel for their fellow citizens that exists there. President Kennedy pointed it out in 1961. That same feeling exists in Latin America today, and what they really need is a proper vehicle to use that idealism.

In Brazil we heard complaints that in the United States we emphasize the concept of financial gain. As I went out to the villages, saw students working there from the United States, but I very rarely saw students from local colleges. I said, "If you feel so strongly about it, why are you not out there working for the people?" The fact is that they must have a vehicle that is organized, such as VISTA is organized, and as other vehicles are organized to help people. In the last week, I have learned that in that country they have organized a peace corps, which I think will be very effective.

So it was very plain to me, and I was was struck by the fact that, so far as the student is concerned, it is idealism that motivates him; he wants a better society for the people in Latin America. If there were some vehicle established for him to express that idealism, he would be better equipped to help the people.

Anyone who has gone to a university, who has any conscience at all, has a feeling for those who have not had that opportunity and a feeling that he wants to make some contribution.

I had the convictions while in Latin America that if we helped them to fulfill their expressions, with their talent, energy, and experience the people there would gain, as well as the people in other countries, and the people of the world.

Mr. HARRIS. I also wanted to comment on the Senator's statement with regard to land reform. I agree that, while it is true that as a result of land redistribution, there is the probability that in many areas production in agriculture will go down initially, the primary benefit of land reform and redistribution will be a change in the political balance, because unless one now has political influence in the government, he is not going to get much change in education, for example, and that person is not going to have much influence in the government as long as he is only a serf in a feudalistic system.

I think it is imperative that we understand that land reform, as indicated in the Senator's speech—which I am sure will receive wide report and I am confident will be read by people in South America—is one of the central ideas of the Alliance for Progress, and key part of that program.

When I was in Argentina, I read a good deal of what happened to the Senator in Concepcion, and at other meetings of that type, particularly one other meeting at Santiago. I read and heard about what took place while I was in Argentina, and also later when I was in Chile, after the Senator was there. The upshot was that these things were a plus for us, a boost for our image, because it indicated to the people that we favor open debate and that the minority critics were fearful of open discussion. It also indicated that the Senator stood for free and open debate, and that most of the people there did not countenance the activity carried on by a minority there.

I talked with some students in Santiago and I found they were totally ignorant of the fact that we were pushing for land reform. Of course, it was being advocated by President Frei, they said, but they almost refused to believe that we were pushing it.

They said, "Oh, you say you're for land reform, but when these measures get before the Parliament here, the landed people, who have great access to the press, will say it is the first step toward communism and your people will finally oppose it."

Can the Senator tell us authoritatively that we cannot have substantial progress in the Alliance for Progress unless there is progress in one of its basic tenets, which is land reform, and that this is and will be the strong position of our Government?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not think there is any question that we believe, that that is what we stand for. I think it has been indicated quite clearly by the U.S. Ambassador to Chile. I think, however, it is important that we keep that in the forefront of our minds, that we do not lose track of the fact that land reform is a central part of the Alliance for Progress. What is of some concern, may I say to the Senator from Oklahoma, is that the Alliance for Progress may become just an aid program, a bilateral arrangement between the United States and a particular country to aid and assist that country. That was not the basis of the Alliance for Progress concept. It was to be a joint effort on behalf of the United States and Latin American countries, working together.

Second, it was not to be merely an aid program for financial assistance, but was to be part of a social reform, of which land reform was to be an important part. I think it is important that we keep pumping hard at that concept and that we do not emphasize how much money we provide; that it does not become a foreign aid program only; that we do not get merely to a bilateral aid program between the United States and countries of Latin America.

The Alliance for Progress, the relationship of the United States and the Latin American countries, in my judgment, requires a soul and heart. The land reform proposal provides that. Our interest is to improve the lives of the people in Latin America, and not just the economic, social, and political ruling classes.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say one last thing? I do not want to keep the Senator from New York too long. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations, I was particularly interested in the Senator's statement with regard to universities and their connection with intelligence agencies.

I think the Senator is quite right. There must not be any connection between intelligence agencies and social and behavioral science research in foreign countries by American universities. I think further that such research, while it can be helpful to us and the host country in the formation of policy, ought to be "civilianized," either through the State Department or AID, as the Senator suggested.

I would like to have the comment of the Senator. Perhaps it should be some new apparatus in the Government. Since Defense, which now largely finances this kind of research, has funds available for this kind of research, such new apparatus might use beginning funds from other agencies for this type of research. Thereby we might civilianize this type of activity, which we need to do, because we already have too much of a militaristic image in Latin America.

I think that programs such as Camelot or Simpatico aggravate that situation and make it worse.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator. I thought about where it could be placed, and I thought about the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has had much experience in research.

There is a difficulty, and I do not have a closed mind—perhaps the Senator's committee could go into it further—but the fact is that they had so obviously little experience in other countries, it might be difficult for them to do it. I came back and suggested that it be handled in some way through the State Department. There might be a better way to deal with the problem. I was not able to resolve it in my own mind. Perhaps if the Senator from Oklahoma holds hearings he could look into the matter to see if there is a better way.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. There might be a better way to deal with it than I have suggested.

Mr. HARRIS. As a part of that last question, I note what the Senator has said on page 17 of the text which I have, which says:

> But we can help; and we certainly can help by not extending our material and moral support to those who actively oppose necessary political, economic and social change, including the comprehensive land reform which is at the heart of development efforts.

It has been my concern—and I use the conversation I had with students in Santiago as an example—that while we do believe in these basic principles of change, we are not getting that fact across to the people themselves. I believe that there have to be more dramatic ways of bringing that fact to the attention of the average person with whom we must identify in Latin America.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator mean by that statement which I just read, even though it might be a little difficult in certain cases, perhaps we might withhold aid from an administration or perhaps types of aid from an administration which did not believe in the types of programs which the Alliance for Progress puts us on record as favoring?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I am suggesting to the Senator, and to the Senate.

First, I think the entire idea of the Alliance for Progress and the aid aspects of that program is to improve the lives of people there.

Therefore, if the financial assistance that is to come from the United States is going to achieve that purpose, the heart of the effort must be land reform plus education. If they have not established a system within a country to bring about necessary land reform or to improve education, the money, in my judgment, is going to be lost. It is not a question of cutting off the funds. The point is that kind of waste was not the purpose of the Alliance for Progress or of the assistance program. I think it is fraud to give assistance or funds when the money is going to be wasted or go to a few wealthy and powerful individuals in the country. I believe that is a grave mistake and identifies and associates the United States with the wrong group in Latin America.

It would be self-defeating and a waste of money and cause us immeasurable harm.

I wish to say one other thing to the Senator before he takes his seat. In his opening statement he talked about the idea that we frequently respond to crises in the United States. I would like to have the comments of the Senator from Oklahoma, who was in Latin America at the same time that I was, about how important it is that we can make a difference in Latin America.

Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly do agree. I would say that when I talked with the distinguished Senator from New York after he came back from Latin America and told him that I came back rather depressed, he said that he was not so depressed, but was optimistic. Then he said, in explanation, that he felt there were things we could do, and therefore, that he was optimistic, although depressed by some of the facts.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I could not agree more. There are things that we can do and must do, which the Senator is bringing to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Would the Senator agree that the things we can do, we can and must do now?

The Senator and I might stand up in the Senate 2 or 3 years from now and it might be too late to do some of these things.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree with the Senator. We must not wait, otherwise we are going to go from crisis to crisis, from the Dominican Republic to Vietnam. We are called upon now to do things in a preventive way.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. We can see in our policies, perhaps in Vietnam or other areas, that if we had taken steps maybe a decade, or 3, 4, or 5 years prior to the present time, the situation would be quite different than it is.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am suggesting that there are steps that can be taken dealing with the problems of Latin America.

I think that the foremost reason to do it, in my judgment, is that we have a responsibility to help because of the kind of country we are. Second, not looking at it from that point of view, I hear the word "pragmatic" used so frequently nowadays—we are looking at it for our own self-interest. The time is now. What we might do now, from a monetary view, would save 10 times as much financially.

If we had dealt with Cuba and Batista in the fifties we would not have to worry about Castro. What made communism in Cuba was the policy of the United States during the fifties. It was not the fact that we had some support for Castro when he came from the mountains, but the relationship which we had with Batista at that time.

Now we can take steps to head off crises in the future. That is why I thought the point that the Senator made was so excellent.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the Senator for his statement and for yielding to me. Also, since I quite agree with his thesis, just stated, I commend him for what I believe to be a landmark and monumental speech in this field.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from New York that in my opinion this is the most important speech that has been made on Latin American problems in this body and in this country since President Kennedy initiated the Alliance for Progress program and made his last speech, in which he gave an accounting of what the Alliance for Progress was doing and what he hoped for it.

I think this speech updates the Alliance for Progress program in a clear statement of its objectives.

The Senator from New York has said the things about the Alliance for Progress and its objectives that have needed saying since the last great address of President Kennedy on the subject to which I referred.

I hope that this statement of the Senator from New York will be caught by the media of information in this country. It is a very basic statement, if we are to have the proper understanding of the Alliance for Progress and if we are to have the reexamination of the program that I believe is so sorely needed.

When the Senator from New York points out that the great danger is that the Alliance for Progress will be looked upon as just another aid program, he goes to the heart of the present problem that confronts the future of the Alliance for Progress. The reason for this situation, and the blame for it, rests in part on our country, but at least in an equal part—and I am afraid more than an equal part—on our neighbors in Latin America.

In some of our recent international conferences with Latin American officials, a tendency has developed on the part of many Latin American leaders to make a false assumption which stems from the time when President Kennedy was still a member of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs. In that subcommittee the seeds of the Alliance for Progress were sown, before Senator John F. Kennedy went to the White House as President. Many of the Latin American leaders forget what the purpose of the Alliance was. It was not designed primarily as a so-called dollar aid program. Yet, in listening to many Latin American leaders in conferences these days, one cannot escape the conclusion that many of them think that that is the primary purpose of the program.

The Senator from New York has pointed out ably in his speech today, as did President Kennedy—as we tried also to do at the time of the Bogotá Conference, which was the forerunner of the action that was taken in the Senate committee, and as we subsequently tried to point out at the time of the Conference at Punta del Este—that the Alliance for Progress is designed to be of assistance to the democratic leaders in Latin America, as they are developed, to bring about the necessary social, economic, and political reform that must be achieved in many of those countries if the danger of communism is to be met.

This is basic to an understanding of our foreign relations with Latin America. That is why it is very gratifying to hear the Senator from New York say what I have heard this afternoon, statements that I have felt for a long time needed to be said. They need to be said over and over again.

Our problem is to help people. Our problem is to use our largess to the extent that we provide dollar aid. However, of even more value to Latin America, we should provide for the exportation of our techniques, of the information that we can supply them, of the skills that can come from the people in our country. If we export the skills of people in our country by way of exchanges with Latin America, we can do more for Latin America than any number of American dollars.

I have become concerned from my discussions with many Latin American officials recently because they apparently think the American dollar is the answer. The American dollar, improperly used, can cause much more trouble than help.

What we must do is to accomplish what President Kennedy envisioned. When President Kennedy was a Member of the Senate and was a member of the subcommittee of which I am the chairman, we talked time and time again about this matter. We have to export to Latin America something more precious and worth much more than just American dollars. We have to export techniques, and an understanding of our economic system.

I do not mean to make a speech, but the Senator from New York is responsible for these remarks. He has stimulated them. I have tried to live with this problem. There was a need for someone to say what the Senator from New York has said this afternoon.

We must consider what we can do, in addition to aiding them with money and sending to them the information, the skills, and the techniques that will help them to develop their own free society. We cannot export a free society to them. We make the mistake, in our foreign affairs, to try to export our free society. It cannot be done. Freedom has to grow in their own soil, in their own culture, among their own people.

I am glad that the Senator from New York stressed in his discussion this afternoon the point that the Alliance for Progress must not become a program of mere dollar aid. I am glad the Senator from New York said some other things in his speech that needed to be said.

I hope our Latin American friends will take note. I hope that when they take note, they will realize what a very good friend of theirs has said.

One of the difficulties of speaking in the Senate is that a Senator's comments might be interpreted as not a complete endorsement of something that is occurring in a Latin American country; then the Senator is considered unfriendly to that country.

The fact is that those of us who are trying to make the Alliance for Progress work as it was originally envisioned by President Kennedy are friends of Latin America. I say to the people of Latin America that in my judgment they do not have a better friend in the Senate than the Senator from New York.

The Senator from New York spoke of the educational problems in Latin America and the reactions of the students there. We must say to those students, as the Senator from New York has said, that they have to do more than they are doing in their countries in order to bring about the implementation of the ideals about which they talked to Senator KENNEDY when he was in Latin America and engaged in open and frank discussions with them.

There should be not only American young men and women in a Peace Corps in Latin America. There should be an American and Latin American Peace Corps, including students from all Latin American countries. With this kind of combined Peace Corps, the day will be hastened when the changes will be achieved about which the Senator from New York has spoken. I am glad that the Senator from New York spent as much time as he did on the need to meet the educational crisis in Latin America.

I say dogmatically—because it is a dogmatism that cannot be successfully challenged—that there is no hope for the development in Latin America of what we consider economic and political freedom for the mass of the people of Latin America because of the rate of illiteracy that presently prevails. Economically and politically free people cannot be developed out of ignorance. They have to be educated at least to the level of literacy.

This brings me to the International Education Act of President Johnson. I enthusiastically support this act so far as its objectives are concerned. The Senator from New York is a member of my subcommittee, as is the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is in the Chamber. Our subcommittee will conduct extensive hearings in connection with this act. We shall do everything we can to help the President implement it into legislative form. It may need some revisions.

The Senator from New York made some suggestions this afternoon in regard to the bill. What we do in American universities and colleges in preparing to be of help educationally in Latin America is only a small part of the job. It is important. It provides for the training of personnel. We must provide facilities to which they can send students to be trained in the programs so that they can go back to Latin America and help. That is very important.

The President has in mind, and has said so very clearly, that he, too, recognizes, however, that the other part of the coin is the development of an educational program at the mass level in each of the Latin American countries.

I happen to think—maybe out of bias—that that is far more important than the program at the level of our colleges and universities in the United States. But I want them to go forward together.

We are not doing as much under the bill as I think we can and should do in connection with the mass educational programs.

In each one of the Latin American countries I think that the literacy program ought to go forward along with the program in the United States. I hope that when we get into our hearings we can be helpful to the President in making a record that will support and strengthen the bill so that it will not be limited, as it is limited now for the most part, to the so-called U.S. domestic aspect of international education program.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. In my speech I mentioned the possibility of furnishing in Latin America, to lower grades particularly, some of the advanced techniques we have been developing and which we have discussed so thoroughly and completely before our committee. It was based on the hearings, in which we discussed the effort that had to be made among disadvantaged people in the United States, that I raised the question as to whether some of the techniques and information which was being developed in the United States could be correlated and made available in Latin America.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the Senator in his speech pointed out some of the techniques involved in the entire subject of literacy courses that could be conducted by television and, to some extent, even by radio or by visual aid. I think that we should try to do that. I do not think that we should wait to attack the literacy problem in Latin America until we develop the U.S. domestic aspect of the President's international education program, although I am all for that.

The Senator mentioned universities and intelligence agencies in a section of his speech. It so happens that last week, at Wayne State University, I spoke at an institute sponsored by four universities. But those who came to the institute came from all over the United States. The president of the institute is Prof. John Gange of the University of Oregon. It is a large group of political scientists.

I was asked to lecture on the very subject matter that the Senator from New York has covered in this part of his speech dealing with universities and intelligence agencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the lecture that I gave at Wayne University on the night of May 5, in which lecture I discussed the subject that the Senator from New York has raised in his speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. I said in the first paragraph of the lecture:

> It has been suggested that I talk to this meeting on the subject of the gap between academic research and foreign policy. But at the risk of being topical and taking a short-term view, I would rather talk about a factor in this relationship which worries me much more. It is the extent to which academic research and opinions about foreign policy are polluted by Government sponsorship.

I discussed Camelot in the lecture. I discussed the situation that had developed at MIT, and in that respect I pointed out that in the late fifties our subcommittee—and President Kennedy was then a Senator from Massachusetts on my subcommittee—$150,000 had been appropriated by the Senate for the subcommittee to make a study of United States-Latin American relations growing out of unfavorable incidents in Latin America.

Similarly the full committee had undertaken a study of the foreign aid program, using the same system of contracting to many academic individuals and institutes.

The first proposal of the Senate was that there be an investigation of our Latin American policy in 1958. I asked that it be changed to a study instead of an investigation. I then moved in the committee that the $150,000, or most of it, be used to enter into contracts with universities, research foundations, and centers of recognized authorities on Latin America to have them prepare for us a series of monographs that would be helpful to use to set forth the findings of fact and the recommendations as to what Congress and the administration should do in regard to possible changes in foreign policy.

The then Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts seconded my motion and made a strong supporting speech urging its adoption. The Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously adopted the procedural recommendations.

It was out of those studies and recommendations—as President Kennedy told me on several occasions that he took them to the White House when he went there—that he went to work and formulated the great Kennedy Alliance for Progress program.

One of those studies for the full Committee on Foreign Aid was prepared by MIT. I want to say on the floor of the Senate today that it was a good study. It was prepared by men at MIT who were competent to prepare it. But as I pointed out in my lecture the other night at Wayne University, we did not know that the division of MIT that conducted the study came into creation under a CIA grant. We do not know today how many more of the studies on foreign aid and Latin America were done by academic or private agencies subsidized by CIA, AID, and the Defense Department.

I do not think, at least when the contracts are let as we let that contract, that such an obvious fact should be kept from us.

I pointed out in the lecture that as a result of what has really developed now, not only in the academic world but also outside of the academic world, we should let the reader beware, let the public beware, let Congress beware, and let all of us beware of these studies that are recommended out of the universities unless we know where the funds come from to finance the center or the professor making the study.

I do not think that Congress should continue to support the CIA, and I said in my lecture, the Defense Department and also the State Department, in financing, undisclosed to the people and to the country, these so-called academic research studies because they make them suspect, and they are bound to be suspect.

The Senator from New York said that he would give some thought as to how this type of work should be done, and I am all for that. The Senator suggested the State Department—and that may be most appropriate—in reply to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], stating also that he had given some thought to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That should be studied further. But I think there is another suggestion, to which I have been giving a considerable amount of thought, that needs to be considered. I am not so sure that we should not set up a national foundation of international research study somewhat in the format of a National Science Foundation, and we have a whole series of Federal foundations.

I am not so sure, in order to guarantee their independence, to guarantee their objectivity, to free them from any suspicion that they may be connected with the CIA or the Defense Department or the State Department, and therefore their point of view may not be completely objective, but that we ought to have an independent foundation to conduct what should be independent studies. But I have reached no final conclusion about it. I am happy that the Senator from New York spoke out on this matter, because he knows, as I know, that the academic world is greatly disturbed. I wish he could have seen the reaction I received from outstanding scholars in this country following my lecture the other night, when they came up and said they were sure I had no idea of the great controversy going on within the academic world today because of the views held by many about these federally financed research studies, whether by the American University in this city, or Michigan State University, or Massachusetts Institute of Technology—which, as the Senator mentioned, has now discontinued its past relationships with CIA because of the criticism it was arousing. They said, "If you knew how we really feel, you will know how welcome your remarks were here tonight. The Federal Government ought to follow a procedural course of action that will take America's universities out of the realm of the suspect."

And they are suspect today. We have a right, now, when we receive a report from any American university relating in any way to the American military or the American foreign policy, to ask the simple questions, "Who finances your center or program? What were your instructions? What review was your report subject to?"

As an old academic man myself, I commend the Senator from New York on what he has said on that subject, because I am sure he will find that that part of his speech will exercise a terrific impact on American academic life.

One further word. I wish to say that at the beginning, it was never contemplated that the Alliance for Progress program should be a military aid program. The military aspects of our aid to Latin America were never intended, in the first place, to be encompassed in the Alliance for Progress program. I think that is very important, and I stress it again today.

Yes, a certain amount of military aid will be needed. But we have too many leaders in some Latin American countries who seem to think the greatest weapon we can send them for meeting the challenge of communism is military aid. It is my opinion that the military aid we have sent them has, in many instances, played into the hands of the Communist threat in Latin America, rather than tending to subdue it.

Whatever the views of others may be, I only wish to say, as I close, what I said at the beginning: the Senator has made a speech this afternoon which updates the Alliance for Progress. It is a most appropriate speech to be read in connection with the last speech on the subject made by President Kennedy, and I hope all Members of Congress and officials in the State Department, the Pentagon, and the CIA, as well as the leaders of the Latin American countries, will read the Senator's speech, contemplate it, and comprehend it; and then see what can be done to carry out the great idealism it expresses.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] spoke of idealism as being pragmatic. I know of nothing that is more pragmatic than an ideal put to work. That is all the Senator has asked for in his speech. We have some great ideals in this country in the field of foreign policy. However, of late we seem to have given them an opiate; they are not alive, not vigorous. They are asleep. I hope the Senator's speech will serve to awaken some of them, because that is what I interpret its purpose to be.

EXHIBIT 1

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION, WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY, DETROIT, MICH., MAY 5, 1966

It has been suggested that I talk to this meeting on the subject of the gap between academic research and foreign policy. But at the risk of being topical and taking a short-term view, I would rather talk about a factor in this relationship which worries me much more. It is the extent to which academic research and opinions about foreign policy are polluted by Government sponsorship.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recently concluded a series of hearings on the Vietnam war and China policy in an unprecedented effort to ventilate ideas and opinions that will go beyond official policy on these subjects. It was especially true in the case of China that we relied heavily upon academicians, since the absence of trade, cultural, tourist, and political relations narrowly confines the extent of public knowledge and expertise about mainland China.

No State Department or other Government witnesses appeared, primarily because they declined to appear in public session. But even so, it soon became evident that much of the institutional work on Chinese and Asian affairs is sponsored or subsidized to some degree or other by the foreign policy agencies of the Federal Government. The Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department and its foreign aid agency, and the Department of Defense spend tens of millions each year for academic research. Beyond that, we have encountered the problem of professors who appreciate—as do you—that expert knowledge of foreign policy requires a familiarity that often must be obtained by working for a foreign policy agency if not full time, then at least as a consultant.

The influence of present or potential contracts, and of present or potential "consultantships" is one of the problems that will grow as academicians are brought into foreign policy formulation. It will grow for the Congress and the public, too, as we seek judgments of international affairs that will be unencumbered by association with the agency that devised the policy under review.

PROBLEM OF INDEPENDENT FOREIGN POLICY OPINIONS

I would like to take you to a few examples of the difficulty this relationship poses for some of us in the Senate. The Foreign Relations Committee has a special responsibility, in my opinion, not only to consider the evidence and testimony presented to us by the Department of State, but to consider also the shortcomings in a given policy. In the latter 1950's, we undertook one review of the foreign aid program by contracting with several universities and private consulting agencies to survey various aspects of foreign aid. The Latin American Subcommittee, of which I am chairman and was then, did the same for Latin American policy.

The role of private enterprise in aid, aid activities of other free nations, and of the Communist bloc, the objectives of U.S. economic assistance, and our military assistance program were among the subject matter surveyed in the foreign aid study. Commodity problems in Latin America, problems of Latin American economic development, and Soviet bloc activities in Latin America were among the topics surveyed by contract for my subcommittee.

We know now, but did not know then, that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies, which received one of these contracts, had been founded a few years before primarily through a CIA grant. The MIT Center did the survey of the economic objectives of foreign aid. I was reminded of this study just a few days ago, when the CIA man in charge of the Michigan State project was quoted as saying "there is nothing sinister in using foreign aid as a CIA cover nor in using universities as CIA covers." We still do not know how many other of our contractors received financial support from CIA, DOD, or other Federal agencies in the foreign policy field.

This week, MIT announced that it would drop its CIA contracts. According to its director, Max Millikan, its contracts related to research on Communism and China. The amount of cash represented by current CIA contracts for the MIT Center is classified.

I may say that if we on the committee were gullible then, we are not so gullible now. During the China hearings, it became the practice to ask each witness the extent of his personal relations with Government agencies, and the extent to which his institution was subsidized by Government agencies. As Senator FULBRIGHT put it to one: "I am trying to find out how independent a witness you are."

This particular witness was both a university faculty member and a leading analyst for a Washington institute financed almost entirely by the Defense Department. Indeed, one man who has been in and out of the Defense Department, the academic world, and private institutes, explains that the relationship is so incestuous that it scarcely matters which payroll he is on.

MICHIGAN STATE AND VIETNAM

By far the most dramatic of these episodes has been the Michigan State adventure in South Vietnam. I will not go into the facts of that project, which are now widely known. But it is a matter of increasing concern that the Michigan State administrators seem to view the role of their Center for International Programs not as an educational program but as an operations arm of national foreign policy agencies. The coordinator of the MSU Vietnam project, Stanley Sheinbaum, who caused the facts of that project to be published, draws a conclusion from them that must be considered, whether his discription of what transpired is questioned or not. He states:

"The Michigan State professors performed at all levels. They advised on fingerprinting techniques, on bookkeeping, on governmental budgeting and on the very writing of South Vietnam's constitution. One was even instrumental in the choice of the President of South Vietnam. But in all this they never questioned U.S. foreign policy which had placed them there and which, thereby, they were supporting.

"The following article on MSU's involvement in Vietnam is merely a case study of two critical failures in American education and intellectual life today. The first and more obvious is the diversion of the university away from its functions and duties of scholarship and teaching. The second has to do with the failure of the academic intellectual to serve as critic, conscience, ombudsman. Especially in foreign policy, which henceforth will bear heavily on our very way of life at home, is this failure serious.

"For this failure has left us in a state of drift. We lack historical perspective. We have been conditioned by our social science training not to ask the normative question; we possess neither the inclination nor the means with which to question and judge our foreign policy. We have only the capacity to be experts and technicians to serve that policy. This is the tragedy of the Michigan State professors; we were all automatic cold warriors.

"On every campus from Harvard to Michigan State, the story is the same. The social science professor, trained (not educated) to avoid the bigger problems, is off campus expertising for his Government or industry client whose assumptions he readily adopts. Where is the source of serious intellectual criticism that would help us avoid future Vietnams? Serious ideological controversy is dead and with it the perspective for judgment."

I hope that Mr. Sheinbaum is wrong in saying that controversy is dead. The teach-in movement last year on many campuses—which I encouraged and in which I participated on several campuses including the University of Oregon—encourages me to think it is not dead. The teach-in a year ago at Rutgers was reported in the campus newspaper with an outpouring of enthusiasm, not so much for what was said as for the all-night faculty-student intellectual free-for-all which led one student to say of it: "This was the first time I felt that I knew what a real university is."

But there is a price for independence. In the period of 1959, 1960, and 1961, the University of Oregon and Oregon State University both received foreign aid contracts in Asian countries. It was given to the University of Oregon to advise on economic planning by South Korea, and to Oregon State to advise on agricultural education techniques in Thailand. Both groups were highly critical of the performance of the local government, and of AID for extending aid, anyway. "Political reasons" were overriding. The contracts were not renewed, for AID does not care to employ persistent critics any more than anyone else does. But it was the findings of these two schools with which I have close ties that prompted me to begin looking into aspects of foreign aid that I had not previously considered.

Perhaps my personal reaction was the only result of these contracts at the time. But I am only now beginning to feel that the whole question of employing academicians for this job deserves rethinking. How many university groups sacrifice their contracts for these intellectual conclusions and how many become the action arm for the program in order to sustain the contract?

ACADEMIC RESEARCH ABROAD

Another example that aroused many of us on the Foreign Relations Committee last year was the Camelot episode. It was not until local repercussions in Chile had come to the attention of the American Ambassador that we knew American University was under contract to the Department of the Army to study social conditions in Chile that might lead to unstable political conditions. In layman's language, the purpose of Project Camelot and others like it is to survey a country to get a line on its potential for revolution, and how it can be headed off or countered. Last summer we were given to understand that between 40 and 50 of these studies in foreign countries were being financed by the military agencies.

Camelot was canceled, and an agreement was entered into between the State and Defense Departments that henceforth the studies would proceed only upon the approval of the State Department.

But the Special Operations Research Office at American University continues for this purpose. Its Director described its purpose as: "the relationships with the peoples of the developing countries and deals with problems of aiding in the orderly process of social change and national development which is of concern to the U.S. Military Establishment."

For studying the "orderly process of social change and national development which is of concern to the U.S. Military Establishment" the Army budgeted $2,463,000 to the Special Operations Research Office in fiscal year 1966. In both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic the orderly process of social change and national development has required large numbers of U.S. troops, for it is the Military Establishment's idea of what is orderly that is coming to dominate American foreign policy in the undeveloped parts of the world.

And for this the academic world is being drawn in not to advise but to implement. The entire Defense Department budget for research on behavioral and social sciences came to nearly $23 million in fiscal year 1966. The CIA budget is classified. But these sums cannot help but raise the question of the independence of the results they produce.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

It is into this picture that the administration has brought its proposal for a new International Education Act, and to discuss this aspect of academic research and foreign policy I shall put on my hat as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, to which the bill was referred.

Its short title is: "To provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research."

The purpose of the bill is to provide Federal assistance to institutions of higher education to strengthen their international studies programs at the graduate level. The bill carries no specific amount for this purpose, but we are told that about $10 million a year is expected to be spent under it.

The objective is laudatory. But will the results be laudatory? That is the question we are going into in our subcommittee when we take up this bill. Does it mean that another $10 million will be added to the existing funds for Defense and CIA research? Does putting the Office of Education in charge of allocating the money mean the centers so financed will remain reasonably pure in their research activities? Or does the permission contained in the bill to "utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government" mean that the graduate centers so aided will merely become another front for the CIA and the DOD?

There are some of us who feel that aid to education through the Office of Education, as distinct from a grant or contract for a specific purpose from the Defense Department, AID, or CIA, may be sufficiently divorced from special purposes and sufficiently free from ties to a particular policy to be worthwhile. But the bill will have to be much more carefully drafted than it is now if that result from it is to be achieved.

These remarks admittedly have dwelt on the dangers of directly subsidized academic work in foreign policy. They have not gone into the virtues of such subsidies, and I think there may be some in that public knowledge in these fields is advanced. I hope I have not left you with the idea that I have no confidence at all in the intellectual freedom of the academic world, for I continue to regard it as one of the central and stalwart elements in the checks and balances of our free society.

What I would like to emphasize above all is the problem of public knowledge of the source of these Federal funds, and the purpose for which they were advanced. It is the acceptance of published findings and opinions by a people—and a Congress—unaware of their financial backing that I feel constitutes the danger to foreign policy formulation. And it is an emphasis and preoccupation with operations rather than scholarship and teaching that constitutes the danger to our educational institutions from extensive governmental support.

Acknowledgment of sources, however, raises questions beyond those of financial support. Last week, Senator FULBRIGHT called to public attention the leading article in the Nation's most respected foreign policy publication, the Foreign Affairs Quarterly, which argued that the Vietcong should not be included in any negotiations in Vietnam because it is a Communist front for Hanoi. The author was described by Foreign Affairs as a "student of Asia." I wonder how many of you here who are students of Asia, as I am, could publish in Foreign Affairs on that basis. But this particular student of Asia, George Carver, Jr., is also a leading Vietnam expert of the Central Intelligence Agency, a part of his qualifications that was not mentioned by Foreign Affairs.

In his letter to the Central Intelligence Agency, Senator FULBRIGHT raised on behalf of the committee the following issues as to the role of Agency employees in engaging in activities designed to influence foreign policy attitudes in the United States: "Was Mr. Carver encouraged by the Agency to write this article? Did the author use information available to him only by reason of his employment? Did the Agency approve the article? Would the Agency have approved the article if it had been critical of administration policy? Would their employee have been free to write a critical article for publication; and why was his official connection with the Government not made public? How many other Agency employees have written articles in their field of interest for publication in the United States without attribution? How is this kind of activity related to the role of the Agency as an information gathering institution?"

The CIA's explanation was that Foreign Affairs requested the article. But it had nothing to say about the implication that the public was exposed to a vital argument of American policy without knowing who was really responsible for it.

What is coming out of all this is a growing attitude of "Let the reader beware." Let the public beware, let the Congress beware, that anything it reads these days is reasonably free from the intellectual baggage of direct self-interest.

These are some of the doubts that I must express to you on the subject of academic research and foreign policy. I have not resolved them at all, and in fact, have probably not thought them through, from the standpoint of foreign policy formulation.

From the standpoint of higher education, I do believe that the desire of educational institutions to become operating arms of foreign policy is leading to bad practices and bad results. That may be foreign policy, but it is not education.

I would like to see the academic community survey this subject itself. I would like to hear the pros and cons of the criticisms I have made. I would like to feel that there is some recognition within the academic social sciences of the dangers involved in Federal financing, and that perhaps some self-policing is in order.

The "credibility gap" between Government and governed is already wider than is safe for our free institutions. More than any others, the academic community should be on guard against this gap because the efficacy of intellectual freedom requires not only a speaker but a listener. The audience of the academic community consists of the student and the public. To the extent that either audience becomes cynical and unbelieving, academic research will lose its impact on the formulation of foreign policy.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Oregon. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, he has had much experience in such matters, and I particularly appreciate his remarks concerning the history of that subcommittee, and the service thereon of Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, which ultimately led to the Alliance for Progress program, and how, as a result of the interest thus created in his mind, much progress later resulted. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTOYA. I commend the Senator from New York, not only for what he has said today, but also for having taken the time to visit in Latin America during the recess and talk with students, men on the street, and people in government there, thus creating a good impression for the United States, and helping persuade the people of Latin America to believe that we, as a people, are interested in Latin America.

I have hurriedly read the speech just delivered by the Senator from New York, and I must say in all candor that it is a great speech. It contains many suggestions which, if adopted, will constitute guidelines for a proper blueprint for dealing with Latin America in the future.

Lately, because we have been busy with the Vietnam war, we have not done enough to create and keep open lines of communication between our country and Latin America. And somehow, we have been led to believe that the Yankee dollar is an adequate means of communication. I think history has proved that the Yankee dollar is no such thing. We need people-to-people communication.

Many reforms are needed in Latin America to improve its standards of living. For instance, let us take the case of Mexico. Mexico has made great strides, but it tackled the problems of education and the problems of distribution of land on a parallel basis; and thus Mexico has been able to upgrade the living standard of these people, and they have progressed.

Mexico, furthermore, knows how to deal with the Communist problem, and has dealt with it successfully, in spite of the fact that recently there was an uprising at the University of Mexico.

I say to the Senator from New York that as a results of my visits to Latin America, I have concluded that something which is very important to creating a good image for the United States there is the image of our President. I recall the image that President Roosevelt created in Latin America. That image was transferred to the people of the United States. Then I recall the declaration of President Kennedy on the Alliance for Progress. The people of Latin America revered him, and still do. That reverence has been a carryover from his declaration.

I am anxious, as I know the Senator from New York is anxious, that our country do something affirmatively other than passing out dollars through the Alliance for Progress. Many things need to be done in education, in agrarian reform, in agricultural research, and in communication. I think the Senator will agree with me that in traveling through Latin America, if one visits the bookstores, one can find many books that have been placed there, at a very minimal cost, by the agents of Peking or Moscow. The United States has made very few books available to those bookstores, or even the libraries in Latin America. We do have a publishing house in Mexico City, but I do not believe that we are publishing enough books, nor making them available at low cost throughout Latin America, so that people there may learn about our country, and may understand that our motive is to improve the lot of our neighbors, and not to enrich ourselves through the process.

I commend the Senator from New York for his splendid statement and the great contribution he has made in this particular field.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his remarks, and also for pointing out a very important matter which deals with the field of communications and our ability to talk and work with the peoples of Latin America.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret very much that I was called from the Chamber at a time when the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] was completing his remarks and I did not get back until he had concluded.

I should like to express my complete endorsement of the carefully documented survey the Senator from New York has made of the situation in Latin America. The Senator's keen powers of analysis are evident throughout this survey, which was based upon his trip through Latin America last fall during which he talked with a great number of individuals in places of leadership in Latin America.

I share his views as to the necessity for a massive program of land reform and education, if the objectives of the Alliance for Progress are to be achieved.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that there is no real justification for further military aid to the nations of Latin America, but that there is a great need for further economic, social, and technical aid.

The Senator from New York, I understand, will complete his remarks tomorrow, at which time he will discuss the programs of economic assistance. For the moment, I should like to reiterate the point which I have already made in the Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to the utter inadequacy of the foreign aid bill which it is now considering. I hope to be in the Chamber tomorrow when the Senator from New York makes his comments as to the need for additional economic aid.

To my way of thinking, the American people have got themselves in to a cul de sac with respect to foreign aid. Our neighbors overseas have no domestic constituencies. It is not popular in Pennsylvania, in Alaska, in Florida, or in Maine, to advocate taking taxpayers' dollars and spending them for social and economic purposes overseas. Yet the rich nations are getting richer every year, and the poor nations are getting poorer every year. In terms of, first, a sense of compassion and, second, in terms of a sense of enlightened self-interest, I am strongly of the view that the richest nation the world has ever known is acting in a niggardly, uncompassionate, and unenlightened way in cutting down, year after year, the amount that it is spending on foreign aid, not only in gross terms, but also in terms of a percentage of the gross national product.

I am utterly unable to understand why the Congress in general, and the Senate in particular, and the President—influenced no doubt by the political difficulties of passing through Congress an adequate authorization or an adequate appropriation for foreign aid—should have been unwilling to respond to this moral, to this social, to this economic challenge—and, indeed, I say again, to this challenge of self-interest.

For the time will come, if we constantly cut down on our commitments toward land reform, toward education, toward economic improvement of the underdeveloped countries—and I speak not only of Latin America, but also of the countries of Asia and Africa—when the United States will have precious few friends left in the world. In fact, if I may say so, for a variety of reasons we are well on our way to that unfortunate situation right now.

In my judgment, what is needed more than anything else is an intensification of the education of the American people and of Congress to the vital necessity for expanding the extent of our contributions to the underdeveloped countries of the world—contributions of an economic and social nature.

I share to the highest degree the views of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who believes that to the maximum extent feasible foreign assistance should be multilateral, that is, it should be extended through international institutions, and not bilateral in terms of agreements between ourselves and particular countries.

Nevertheless, as a pragmatic matter, it must be clear that we have been quite unable to persuade the other relatively well-to-do nations of the world to bear their share of the burden.

I wish that it were otherwise. I would hope that we would be able to make our contribution through IDA, through the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, through the Inter-American Bank, and through the newly established Asian Bank.

As Senator FULBRIGHT has well said, "You never see signs on walls saying 'World Bank go home'."

For that reason I share his views on the desirability of making as much of our aid as possible multilateral. But in some way, in some manner, this aid must go to those countries before it is too late, and they become places where there are heard curses not loud but deep, while the most opulent, affluent, and compassionate nation the world has ever known turns its back on its obligations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LOCATION OF 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, for two decades the United States has led the world in the science of nuclear energy. We have pioneered in the peaceful uses of the atom. We have taken the lead in urging the world to adopt international measures against the spread and use of nuclear weapons.

We are now getting ready to build a 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator, the world's biggest atom smasher. It will be a vital tool for our understanding of nuclear matter. It will help keep the United States ahead in the nuclear science race.

We are going to build it. The question is where?

During the past year we have trusted the Atomic Energy Commission with the job of answering this question.

When the Commission asked for site proposals last year, communities all over the Nation responded with suggestions for 200 sites in 46 States.

Mr. President, never before in the history of Federal construction programs has the Government had so many offers, so many sites to choose from.

But Mr. President, something has gone wrong. What began as a search for the best site has turned out to be a miserable deception.

The National Academy of Sciences has interfered and the good faith of all those who submitted site proposals has been violated.

From my State there were four proposals for sites in Kansas City, Joplin, St. Louis, and Flat River. The first three were among the final 85 reviewed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Academy of Sciences. While all four were rejected, let no one misunderstand me. Of course, I was disappointed. Of course, I thought the proposals from my State were outstanding and deserved to be among the final six. Many Missourians made a tremendous effort to win this accelerator, and share the concern I am expressing today. But the deception I am talking about affects the whole Nation. It affects the future of our high energy research program. It affects our success in the nuclear energy race.

Mr. President, I am bringing this whole matter before the Senate today because I think the American people have a right to know what happened. They should know the facts and Congress should know the facts.

Before the end of this session the Atomic Energy Commission is going to be asking Congress to approve a site for the new accelerator. And they are going to ask us to authorize construction costs totaling $375 million. I think it would be a great tragedy, a great setback in our nuclear programs if the Commission proceeds to choose from a list of sites which fail to meet the basic physical requirements which the Commission itself set forth last year.

When the Commission asked for proposals, they issued official criteria on which these proposals should be based. These criteria were submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and are printed in the committee's hearings. These criteria were given to all the communities where proposals were being drawn up. These criteria were given to the press and have appeared in whole or in part in papers and magazines all across the country. I have a copy right here in my hand and I am going to put it in the RECORD where everybody can see it once again.

Mr. President, every proposal submitted to the Commission was based on these criteria. Organizations and local governments spent hundreds of hours and thousands of dollars measuring themselves against these criteria.

Every proposal was submitted in the belief that the best man will win. But thanks to interference by the National Academy of Sciences, the best man has about as much chance of winning as the North Pole has of melting before tomorrow morning.

What a shame it is that the Atomic Energy Committee turned the site evaluation over to the National Academy of Sciences. For no sooner had the National Academy taken over, than it adopted an entirely new criterion for judging the sites. The Academy admits this on page 7 of its 44-page report. And, as if this were not enough, the Academy report firmly states they "assigned paramount importance to this new criterion."

This is an alarming development. By refusing to stick to the original AEC criteria, by changing horses in the middle of the stream, the Academy has picked six seriously inadequate sites. They have recommended to the AEC six sites—Ann Arbor, Brookhaven, Chicago, Denver, Madison, and Sacramento—of which not a single one satisfies more than five of the eight major AEC criteria. Three of the six recommended sites fail to meet half of the eight major criteria.

If you ask the National Academy why they did this they will tell you they are "assured that the sites have suitable physical properties." This is the way the report puts it.

But when you sit down and read this report you find plenty of evidence that they were not sure—not sure about the sites they are choosing, not sure whether the sites live up to the basic requirements of the accelerator.

On the matter of electric power, the AEC set forth clear and vital requirements. This instrument will take tremendous amounts of electrical power. The proposed power supply, for instance, must have at least 10 times the capacity needed by the accelerator. Yet the Academy states "a detailed study would be needed" to determine if they could ever get adequate power at the Denver and Madison sites. At present the power supply at both sites is hopelessly inadequate.

The Academy is willing to take a costly gamble on two sites which fail to meet minimum standards. Yet the Academy rejected many other sites with plenty of electric power to offer.

What made the Academy think it could ignore a vital factor like power?

When the Atomic Energy Commission first asked for proposals they stressed the importance of proximity to a major airport having frequent service to major U.S. cities. That is actually one of the criteria.

But what did the National Academy come up with?

They came up with Sacramento, Calif., which does not have a major airport and is 2½ hours driving time from the San Francisco airport. They came up with Madison, Wis., which the report actually admits "offers only limited direct airline service to major cities except for Chicago."

And, as if that were not enough, they came up with Brookhaven which is 1½ hours from a major airport.

Now, the Atomic Energy Commission has told us all along that there will be teams of scientists flying to and from the site each day. The report itself even states that most of the research at the accelerator will be carried out by visiting scientists.

But for some reason, the Academy insists on recommending three sites which are painfully hard to get to—sites which will increase travel time and cause the waste of thousands of valuable manhours through delay and gross inconvenience.

Mr. President, anyone who reads the Academy's report will see immediately that the Academy had very little concern about construction costs. In fact, on page 3 of the report they state:

> It has not been the purpose of this committee to estimate the costs of construction and operation at various sites.

Well, now, I wish the Academy would tell us who is looking at the construction costs? Who is trying to find a site where the American taxpayer will not be burdened by unnecessary expenses?

At Ann Arbor the report states:

> The bedrock is reported to vary from 200 to 300 feet. * * * Deep foundations such as piles will be required for support of the magnet ring and in critical experimental areas.

At Brookhaven, we find the proposed site is located on a "glacial outwash plain, underlain primarily by sands and gravels to the depth of nearly 200 feet." At Denver we find the report stating:

> The terrain is rolling and considerable excavation will be required.

At Sacramento, there is little, if any, excavation material above bedrock and thus the excavation for the instrument would require blasting. The report admits that in the case of Sacremento "the principal drawback in the site is the shortage of soil materials in the vicinity that could be used for shielding."

The original criteria set forth by the Atomic Energy Commission did not include climate. But in November, the Commission submitted to the National Academy a revised criteria list. This new list did specifically include climate.

The Commission and the Academy agreed: below-freezing weather could "increase costs and decrease efficiency in the experimental areas during the severe part of the winter."

In fact, Mr. President severe weather would mean a loss in operating costs of $1 million per week based on the $60 million annual operating budget.

Yet, in spite of this warning, which site did the Academy pick?

They picked Denver and Madison which both have more than 160 days a year with below-freezing weather. On top of that, Denver has an average of some 59 inches of snowfall every year—snowfall which brings traffic in the area to a complete standstill.

Mr. President, it does not take a construction engineer to realize that at these sites there will be added cost for the American taxpayer.

The Academy said it was not very concerned with construction costs.

Why did not the Atomic Energy Commission reprimand the Academy for this attitude? After all, the Atomic Energy Commission had given its word to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. They had given their word to the Congress. And they had given their word to hundreds of Americans drawing up site proposals.

Mr. President, I submit that unless this whole massive deception, this violation of good faith, is corrected immediately the American taxpayer is going to be asked to pay millions of extra dollars for construction, with the possibility of delay in getting the accelerator built, and extreme inconvenience for thousands of scientists and technicians who will use the accelerator when it is completed.

Mr. President, the more I read the National Academy report and the more I review what has been said by the Atomic Energy Commission, the more alarmed I become.

What we expected the Academy to do was to select a site that is physically ideal for the construction of the accelerator.

But the Academy refused. They refused to recognize that the American people expect economy from their Government.

And instead, they substituted a subjective criterion which holds about as much water as a fisherman's net.

The Academy says that it placed "paramount important to the considerations that affect the recruiting of personnel."

Fantastic as it seems, the Academy actually believes that unless they build this accelerator in one of these six sites, they will not be able to attract the scientists and engineers needed for construction and operation.

Can anyone imagine that a scientist would refuse to work at the most important research installation in his field just because it is not at Denver, Madison, Sacramento, Chicago, Ann Arbor, or Brookhaven?

The Academy says, "Oh, but Senator, the scientists would like to live in Denver and they already live near the other sites. If we put it where there are no high energy physicists, or if we put it where there is no fabulous recreation attraction, these men and women will not come."

What if we find some who like water skiing instead of snow skiing, or quail hunting instead of duck hunting?

They might as well tell me our scientists have suddenly gone soft, that they are no longer the great Americans you and I know them to be.

It was the Atomic Energy Commission that built the Los Alamos weapons research laboratory. Did they have any trouble attracting scientists to go out there?

It was the Atomic Energy Commission which built the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee. Do they now propose moving Oak Ridge up to Denver or Brookhaven or Madison or Sacramento because the scientists prefer not to move to Oak Ridge?

Mr. President, I submit that scientists will go to the Arctic, the equator, or anywhere on earth if it is necessary to pursue their research. Yet today, no one is asking our high energy physicists to go anywhere like the Arctic or the equator. All we are asking is that they go to a site where the aceleator will be the least burden to the American taxpayer and a site which will provide the maximum benefit for the whole Nation.

Mr. President, this is not the only speech I will make on this subject. I can promise the Senate that I will attempt to bring to the public's attention all of the facts on this matter. The Congress and the public must know. They have a right to know.

When all the questions and facts are laid before this body, I hope the Atomic Energy Commission will reject the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences.

And do not let the AEC tell us they are bound to accept the recommendations of the National Academy. They are bound only to be accountable to the people. They are bound to follow the directions of the President and the Congress. The sooner they understand that, the better off they will be.

I think it is in the national interest that the AEC make a complete review of all the proposed sites, not just the six that the National Academy selected. Without such a review I am convinced that great damage will be done to our nuclear research program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the document entitled "Considerations Involved in Siting a Major New Accelerator."

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSIDERATIONS INVOLVED IN SITING A MAJOR NEW ACCELERATOR[1]

1. GENERAL

A national laboratory having as its principal research instrument a 200- to 300-billion-electron-volt accelerator will have a staff of approximately 2,000 people. The resident staff will include professional scientists and engineers who will be responsible for the design, construction, and operation of the accelerator and its associated facilities, and research scientists whose principal function will be carrying out the long term research program in collaboration with visiting scientists, particularly from university users groups. The site must be so located that management can mobilize and maintain the necessary specialized staff, both resident and nonresident, to accomplish effectively the goals of the research project.

---

[1] Submitted by Commissioner G. F. Tape to Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, on Apr. 1, 1965. Also appeared in AEC press release dated Apr. 28, 1965.

It is difficult to establish priorities or weights among the various technical, economic, and social criteria that can be described. Some items, of course, are absolutely essential such as acreage requirements, the availability of adequate power, the proximity of adequate transportation, etc. On the other hand, other items such as foundation requirements of deep piles versus shallow piles, one-pass versus recirculating water systems, tunneling versus cutting and filling for shielding the magnet ring, etc., cannot be categorized absolutely and are subject to some compromise in order to maximize the potential of each site.

In other words, there will be trade-offs between the technical and other factors in order that overall efficiencies and economies can be obtained.

2. LAND

(a) Sufficient acreage, in the continental United States, should be available to meet both initial and long range expansion requirements (depending upon shape and topography, 3,000 acres is tentatively estimated as minimum for a 200-Bev. proton accelerator).

(b) The land should be owned or be reasonably available to the Federal Government.

(c) The terrain and substructure should have load-bearing capacity adequate to insure stable foundations for both the accelerator and the other associated facilities.

(d) The site should be reasonably level to minimize expensive excavations.

(e) Sites with serious seismic activity, faults or loose joints in bedrock are to be avoided; however, it is unlikely that many sites will be eliminated solely on this basis.

3. UTILITIES

(a) The ready availability of electric power at the site sufficient for a demand load of several hundred megawatts is required.

(b) The ready availability at the site of an adequate supply of cool, clean water is desirable. Since closed recirculating water systems can be used and may be preferable technically, it is unlikely that many sites will be eliminated solely on this basis.

(c) The economics of power and water acquisition and especially subsequent operational costs will be a factor.

4. ENVIRONMENT

(a) Proximity to a major airport having frequent service to major U.S. cities is necessary to provide easy access and minimum travel time for university users and other visiting research personnel.

(b) Adequate surface transportation facilities are necessary for movement of goods and transport of personnel.

(c) Proximity to a commercial industrial center which includes adequate coverage of special needs in electronics, electrical and precision mechanical equipment will ease problems of recruiting technical support and in obtaining specialized supplies.

(d) Proximity to other broadly based research and development activities will provide opportunities for desirable interaction of scientific and engineering personnel.

(e) Sufficient housing and community facilities must be available to accommodate the permanent operating and research staff of several thousand people and the transient staff of several hundred.

(f) Proximity to a cultural center that includes a large university will provide intellectual and cultural opportunities attractive for staff and families.

(g) Regional wage and cost variations as well as labor surplus areas are factors.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the document setting forth eight major considerations, entitled "200-Billion-Electron-Volt Accelerator Laboratory Siting Factors."

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR LABORATORY SITING FACTORS

The evaluation factors for siting the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator as originally submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are recast and further highlighted in this document in order that the Commission be able to make a final selection.

The principal objective in the factors governing the choice of a site is the contribution to the capability and effectiveness of the Nation's research in elementary particle physics. The site must be so located that management can mobilize and maintain the necessary specialized staff, both resident and nonresident to accomplish the research goals.

The siting factors have been categorized as follows:

I. Land suitability.
II. Utility availability.
III. Construction cost.
IV. Operation cost.
V. Transportation.
VI. Colleges and universities.
VII. Communities.
VIII. Other considerations.

I. LAND SUITABILITY

(A) Sufficient acreage, in the continental United States, should be available to meet both initial and long-range expansion requirements. Depending upon shape and topography, 3,000 acres is estimated as minimum for a 200-billion-electron-volt proton accelerator. Availability of additional land contiguous to the site described should be considered.

(B) The land configuration and dimensions should be capable of accommodating the accelerator and associated facilities. One and one-quarter miles is taken as the least linear dimensions with acceptable topography.

(C) The land should be owned by or be reasonably available to the Federal Government. Cost of the non-Federal land should be considered.

(D) Compatibility of present use of the land and of the existing capital improvements with an accelerator laboratory should be considered.

(E) The site should be reasonably level to minimize expensive excavations. The maximum elevation differential should be no more than 100 feet.

(F) The surface and subsurface soils should have load-bearing capacity adequate to insure stable foundations for both the accelerator and the associated facilities.

II. UTILITY AVAILABILITY

(A) Distance of power from site and the ready availability of electric power at the site must be sufficient for a demand load of 200 megawatts initially and increasing gradually to 300 megawatts.

(B) Impact on the electrical distribution system as it affects the availability of electrical power in the quantities necessary for efficient operation of the accelerator laboratory should be considered.

(C) The need for reliability of electrical power requires that the power source be an interconnected system.

(D) The ready availability at the site of cool, clean water should be considered. The initial minimum usage rate is estimated to be 2,000 gallons per minute, assuming the use of a recirculating system. Eventually the water requirements will be 4,000 gallons per minute.

(E) Natural hazards, including seismic, hurricane, tornado, snow, rain, temperature, winds and dust affects construction costs. Natural hazards bear upon construction costs by way of affecting problems of stability as well as insulation and covering construction costs.

III. CONSTRUCTION COST

(A) The effect upon construction costs due to existing facilities such as buildings, utilities, and roads should be considered. The utility of existing site facilities should be gaged in relation to the new laboratory to assess construction cost savings.

(B) Soil movement and load-bearing capacity affects accelerator associated construction costs. The requirements of accelerator stability must be accounted for in addition to the conventional construction requirements.

(C) Elevation differential affects construction cost. The elements involved are the relative costs of cutting and filling, as well as the effects of elevation differentials on earth stability which in turn affects construction cost.

(D) Tunneling cost advantage over cutting and filling, if any, should be considered.

(E) Cost to cope with elevation of water table should be considered. The variation of level and variation with time of the water table affects earth stability and is to be associated with drainage construction costs.

(F) Cost to bring electric power to the site should be considered.

(G) Cost to bring water to the site should be considered.

(H) Regional wage and cost variations as estimated by construction cost type indices should be considered.

(I) Depth of bedrock as it affects the stability of the accelerator and the associated facilities should be considered.

(J) Depth and variation in level of the water table as it affects earth stability in the vicinity of the accelerator should be considered.

(K) Seismic activity as it affects the strength and movement of soils should be considered.

IV. OPERATIONAL COST

(A) Electric power cost taking into account regional variations is an important consideration.

(B) Water cost taking into account regional variations should be considered.

(C) Existing and planned technological capabilities and facilities on the site area contribute to reducing operational costs. Include existing machine shops, electronic shops, maintenance and service shops, etc.

(D) Existing and planned technological capabilities and facilities in the vicinity of the site area contribute to reducing operational costs. Proximity to a commercial and industrial center with a well developed research and development base affects operational cost.

(E) Natural hazards affect operational costs. Include seismic disturbances, tornadoes and hurricanes as they affect operating costs.

(F) Climatic operational costs. Include heating, air-conditioning, water cooling, snow removal, etc., as they affect operational costs.

(G) Soil movement and load-bearing capacity relative to operational cost should be considered. Costs to realine experimental facilities associated with preventative maintenance programs and emergencies, can be large.

(H) Regional wage variations and labor relations affect operational cost.

V. TRANSPORTATION

(A) Proximity to a major airport having or planning to have frequent service to major U.S. cities is desirable to provide easy access and minimum travel time for university users and other visiting research personnel.

(B) Availability of adequate surface transportation facilities for the movement of goods and transport of personnel should be considered.

VI. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

(A) Proximity to colleges and universities should be considered.

(B) Strength of graduate and undergraduate programs in the physical sciences and the liberal arts available to the staff and their families is an important factor.

(C) Potential scientific and engineering interaction between the universities and the accelerator laboratory, and the relative merits of the impact of local university elementary particle physicists and engineers upon the work of the accelerator laboratory should be considered.

(D) Potential training of accelerator laboratory staff including availability of coursework and night classes for professional growth of the laboratory staff should be considered.

VII. COMMUNITIES

(A) Proximity of sizable communities within an hour's commuting time of the accelerator laboratory. A minimum population of 50,000 is required to assimilate the 2,000-staff member families and the transient staff.

(B) Availability of housing for the laboratory staff and laboratory visitors in important. The growth record of the community and its capability of adapting to change should be considered. Guest facilities in the communities should be available.

(C) The quality and adaptability of public school systems including the growth record and community interest in education are important.

(D) Availability of medical facilities. The adequacy, growth record, and community support of medical facilities are important.

(E) Churches, entertainment, recreational and other cultural facilities such as museums and libraries should be available.

VIII. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

(A) Consideration should be given to the special responsibility of the AEC for its own laboratories and the advantages of effective utilization of present AEC facilities.

(B) Consideration to the establishment of a new center of excellence. The impact of the accelerator laboratory on a local university makes possible the transition to a new level of performance. Desirability of broadening the educational base of the Nation should be considered.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I intend to comment on his remarks. If he wishes to stay, I would be happy to have him listen.

Mr. President, the 200- or 300-billion electron-volt proton smasher, which has been under consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission for some time, may well be before Congress this year for financing, or it may be that a decision will not be made in time for financing this year.

I believe that the National Academy of Sciences and the Atomic Energy Commission have considered and have had before them applications for some 185 locations in the United States for this particular project.

It is, of course, a desirable project from the standpoint of any State, and recently all but six sites were eliminated by the Atomic Energy Commission. Those six sites have been under visitation by members of the Board, the Atomic Energy Commission, by their staff of experts, and by others.

When I speak of this I believe I speak with some firsthand knowledge inasmuch as I was present at the visitation by the Atomic Energy Commission at the site close to Denver less than a month ago. So that when I speak of this, I speak of a matter with which I am familiar, and not of something I am conjuring out of the air.

First of all, I want to make it clear, Mr. President, that it may well be or could be—although I hope not—that Colorado would not be the final selection of the Atomic Energy Commission as to this site. It could just as well be that one of the five sites other than Colorado would not be the final selection of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Nevertheless, it would not occur to me to downgrade any of the sites included at the present time—Ann Arbor, Brookhaven, Chicago, Denver, Madison, Sacramento—or the people associated with them, nor any of the facilities offered by the sites, in the illusory concept that I would in any way be helping to locate the plant in the State of Colorado.

I want to comment on certain remarks that the Senator from Missouri has made, and I want to lay them out cold, because either he does not know what he is talking about, or he has never been to Colorado, or he has never bothered to do the necessary research. His must have been only very casual research, to have made his remarks so meaningless.

First of all, let us consider the power supply, which he says is "hopelessly inadequate" in Denver. I was present at the visitation of the Commission in Denver, and they asked many questions about the power supply. The graphs which were placed before the members of the Commission showed double lines of service, which are now almost complete, to the area under consideration. The members of the Commission seemed completely satisfied with this showing.

The criteria indicates that approximately 200 megawatts would be required. In this connection the Public Service Co. of Colorado has a large system of generating plants interconnected with high voltage transmission lines concentrating in the Boulder-Denver area, with a total at the present time of 1,000 megawatts. The total system capacity is in excess of 1,240 megawatts. A pump storage project now under construction will add 300 megawatts in 1966.

In addition, it is no secret that a large nuclear plant is planned for the area immediately north of Denver, which would greatly expand even this large amount of power.

As a matter of fact, there is not one iota of evidence here, or anywhere else, to support the statement of the Senator from Missouri: "the Denver and Madison sites, both have a hopelessly inadequate power supply." I know nothing about Madison, and I would not do anything to downgrade our sister State of Wisconsin, even if I did.

The item alleged by the Senator from Missouri about power is completely out of the ball park. I think he completely misunderstands the facilities that are available. The Public Service Co. of Colorado is unmatched anywhere in the United States with respect to the forward looking technology it has applied to the electrical supply system for the service areas that it supplies.

Incidentally, this would not be the only plant, if it were built in Colorado, that the Public Service Co. would supply on a double line basis and some of these plants are critical to the welfare of the United States.

Originally there were eight criteria. However, our people used 10 even more critical criteria, which were not put together by the AEC or NAS. I shall discuss some of them, one by one.

One of the requisites in the original call of the AEC was proximity to a major airport. Mr. President, there is not a finer airport in the United States than the Denver Airport. One can alight from a plane in the Denver Airport, rent a car, and drive to this site within 30 minutes, without ever approaching the speed limit. How do I know this? Because we did it less than a month ago, in the company of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There is now available at the site one paved road. But if the site were selected, I think the more obvious solution would be to black top about 4 miles of road directly off the interstate highway, and it still would take less than 30 minutes for anyone arriving on a plane to reach the site.

It is true that this is not flat bottom land, but apparently the Atomic Energy Commission did not want flat bottom land on which to construct the bevatron. We discussed the details of the amounts of excavation that would be required for the construction of the bevatron and the kinds of materials that would have to be moved for its construction. The amounts of materials did not seem to be of particular concern to the commission at that time. It is a fact that a high-water table in interference with the activities of the bevatron never can be a problem at this site.

The Senator from Missouri says that there are 169 days a year in Colorado on which the temperature is below freezing. In his prepared text—or at least in the news release from his office—he said that Denver and Madison have 160 days of severe weather annually, which would cost the U.S. Government $1 million per week. In his statement in the Senate, he said that Denver had 59 inches of snow, and that that "practically brings panic." Here, again, I say to the Senator that I do not know, speaking off the top of my head, what the actual snowfall in Denver is. It was only today that I learned that he was to make his speech. Whether it is 59 inches or any other amount, I have lived in Colorado all my life, and I have never seen the time when snowfall caused panic anywhere in the State.

As a matter of fact, we have towns like Fraser and Aspen, places from 8,000 to 12,000 feet high in the mountains, in which we have the great and glorious ski country which the Senator seems to envy so much.

It is true that those parts of our State get cold. We not only get large amounts of snowfall, but we also pray for them in the wintertime because it means good skiing, a wonderful tourist season, and also the lifeblood of our State for our farmers in the summertime.

The implication of what the Senator says is that on 160 days out of the year the weather in Colorado is so severe that it would be impossible to operate.

Mr. President, I want to say a couple of things about the weather. I expect that I have flown between here and Colorado not less than 120 times—and perhaps 150 times—in the last 12 or 15 years. In all of those flights, I have been weathered out only one time.

If the weather were the kind that the Senator describes, certainly they would not put $5, $6, and $7 million jets down on the airport in snow that is 3 or 4 feet deep. The circumstances themselves just do not justify the statement of the Senator. If the Senator had ever taken any trouble to investigate, he would know that they did not. If he had ever gone to Colorado in January and seen people working in their yards in their shirt sleeves, as I have on hundreds of occasions, he would know that while we often do have snow in the wintertime—and we never regret it at all—the snow is so dry there that often the snow simply sublimates into the air. We often have a 4- or 5-inch snowfall in the morning, but we have great difficulty in finding any of that snow in the evening except under a few bushes.

Mr. President, I want to add one thing with respect to transportation. One of the criteria put on this particular subject by the Atomic Energy Commission was that the operation be close to some large universities doing work in astrophysics.

I should like to say for the benefit of the Senator from Missouri that within 25 minutes by high-speed, four-lane, separated highways there is the University of Denver which has gained preeminence and outstanding recognition by NASA and many other institutions in the field of science. Within an hour, at the maximum, there is the University of Colorado which has great capability in nuclear physics and physics of every kind.

Immediately north, and still available by four-lane highway, is the great Colorado State University with a similar professional and scientific capability.

Mr. President, two of these institutions can be reached from this site without ever going through any kind of a traffic light. Of course, that situation is not true with respect to the university in downtown Denver.

In addition to that, we have our own great Colorado School of Mines, the only really true separate mining school in the Nation today, one of the great schools of this country, with a great scientific capability in this area.

Our people were not just whistling in the dark when they put in an application and spent many hundreds of man-hours preparing the most detailed reports for the Atomic Energy Commission. However, when the flat statement is made here that we simply do not have the power supply and when the statement is made that we have 160 unfavorable days a year and 59 inches of snow which practically brings panic, my friend does a disservice to a sister State which I think does not do service to him. I do not know what particular place in his own State made application for this project, but whatever place it was, I am sure that it had good reason for making application and some reason for thinking that it could fulfill the criteria.

I want to say now, that I hope our chances of success do not rest upon the denegration and downgrading of another State in the Union. If these statements by the Senator from Missouri were based on actual facts, it would be an entirely different situation, but they are not based on facts. For that reason, I think the remarks of the Senator do a great disservice to him and to my State of Colorado.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I have listened to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado, with some concern.

I realize that in speaking on matters of this kind, after the development has been created, a Senator is always laying himself open to the statement that it is "sour grapes" because his State did not win.

I stated that Missouri was not selected. I have no intention at any time of downgrading Colorado or the State of any other Senator. But I am concerned about the entire program on a national basis.

As I pointed out in the earlier stages of my statement, certain criteria were set out that we were to follow and go by. These criteria were to serve as our guidelines. That is what not only Missouri but also many other States did. Then we woke up at the last moment and found that the guidelines were changed.

It raised a question in my mind, not that I have any thought that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado, or other Senators from States in which sites were selected, would do the least thing wrong. They did present their best side and they are entitled to do that, and I would expect them to do it.

The Senator from Colorado always does that for his State, and he does a very able job of it. But when the Senator implies that we have not done any research on this and do not know what we are talking about, and when he bases his statement that this is entirely proper on the fact that it is done by the Atomic Energy Commission or the National Academy of Sciences, then I must say that the Senator from Colorado himself has done no research.

Mr. ALLOTT. Can the Senator name a time or date when the snowfall in Denver practically brought panic?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Yes. It just so happens that the people doing the research on this are from Denver and from Colorado. Those are the words that were called to my attention not later than 5 minutes ago.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not know who those people are. Can the Senator name them?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator takes great issue with the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission and other people with authority have done this. Let me read what they say. If the Senator wishes to call them liars, that is his privilege. I do not know them, but this is what the National Academy of Sciences report states:

> The climate in Denver is characterized by a wide variation between day and night temperatures. The daily maximum temperatures, even in winter, tend to be above freezing, but temperatures drop sharply at night. Similarly, summer daylight temperatures are typically higher, the humidity is low, and nights are cold. Average daily maximums above 90 occur about 41 days each year.

I guess those are the days on which people are in their yards in their shirt-sleeves.

I continue to read:

> Daily minimums on the average are below 32° on 161 days a year.

That is what the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Academy of Sciences report states. I do not know them, but these are the people who are making the rules and that is what they say about the conditions which exist there.

I am not trying to downgrade the State of Colorado. I do not know on what basis they make their selection.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator yield while I read the official Weather Bureau temperatures for Denver?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Yes, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. ALLOTT. The daily maximum—and I am reading, starting in January. I shall read the maximum, the minimum, and the mean.

In January, it is 43.1, 16.8 and 30.

In February, 45.6, 19.3, and 32.5.

In March, 50.9, 24.8, and 37.9.

In April, 60.5, 34.3, and 47.4.

In May, 69.5, 43.8, and 56.7.

In June, 81, 53, and 67.

If the Senator wishes to say that the temperature varies between the day and the night, I would have to agree with him. Of course it does, because in the summer time we have temperatures over 90 degrees, and yet a blanket is commonly used at night for sleeping. That is why it makes such a delightful place, and why they like to live there.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator realizes, of course, that when the temperature drops below freezing, below 32 degrees Fahrenheit, this atom smasher cannot operate at capacity; and when it does not, that may cost us $1 million more per week based on the $60 million annual operating budget. The Senator is not telling me that there are fewer than 160 days per year that the temperature drops below freezing?

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree with the Senator. But I should like to ask the Senator if he knows that this atom smasher will be completely underground and thus, to a great extent, completely unaffected by temperatures.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I only know what the National Academy of Sciences, upon whose report the Senator bases his argument, says. They say it falls below 32 degrees 161 days of the year, and they say the average annual snowfall is 59 inches. That is what they say. I thought that would be from the horse's mouth, for me to go get their figures. They are the ones making the decision. I only wonder what they are basing that decision on.

Mr ALLOTT. I do not quarrel about the 59 inches of snowfall per year. We will take it and be happy to get it, every year in the century.

But I do wish to say I have never seen the time that the snowfall in Denver caused panic. As a matter of fact, we have in the State of Colorado at least a dozen mountain passes, all of which approach an altitude between 11,000 and 12,000 feet, and those passes are used constantly by people the year around, never being closed more than 3 or 4 hours, at the most, at any time; and many of the people do not even use snow tires.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator has a beautiful State and a great State. I am mighty proud that one of the mountains out there is named Long's Peak. I only wish I could say it had been named after me.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator had been there early enough, we might have done it.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. There is one other matter I should like to call to the Senator's attention. He mentioned power, that we had not done any research on that. Let me read once more what the National Academy of Sciences says about the power out there. I did not intend to go into all this detail about the Senator's State, but these are their words, what they say. After the Senator's statement about how much power they have, here is what the people making the decision say—and I want to know how they can make decisions on this basis:

> A detailed study would be needed to determine whether the power transmission system which would supply the area will have sufficient capacity to insure acceptable voltage and frequency stability under all possible load conditions. The board of water commissioners has committed the city and county of Denver to supply the required amounts of water.
>
> Denver is an attractive growing city with a population of more than half a million. The communities east of Denver in the direction of the site are good residential communities. The area offers adequate cultural opportunities. Schools are good. Recreational facilities are excellent. Industrial services in the Denver area are diversified enough to support the project.

Those last statements are in the Senator's favor; but they do say there is some question about the power to be supplied there.

There is one other matter. The Senator is justly proud of his schools, as we are in Missouri, and as I am sure people are in every State. I am sure the State of Colorado has great schools.

But what did the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Academy of Sciences, who are deciding the matter, say about it? And I should like to know, after what they did say, how they could reach the decision they did.

They mentioned that the University of Denver is 20 miles from the site, the University of Colorado at Denver, 20 miles, and the University of Colorado at Boulder, 40 miles.

Then they add:

> The sixth site, Denver, Colo., has neither the university strength nor the existing design group that is considered desirable.

I do not know those things. That is what I am reading from their report. And the more I read this report, about not only this but the other sites considered, the more I wonder upon what basis they could make such a determination.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator read correctly from the report of the Atomic Energy Commission. I think they are in error about that, and I should like to comment. Since the Senator has raised the problem of water, I do not think anybody in the world knows as much about their water supplies as some of our Western States. I do not mean just Colorado, I include all of our Western States, because we have to study and work on it, to take care of the problem.

The report says:

> Domestic water will be required at an installation employing up to 2,000 people; and cooling water will be required for a synchrotron requiring approximately 200 megawatts of electrical capacity.

In this particular area, both the city of Aurora and the city of Denver have been able to guarantee, and we have developed, the water to fully supply everything that the proposed installation could possibly need.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I say to the Senator, I do not raise any questions about the water. We only raised the question about the power and about the schools after the Senator mentioned those matters, and about the temperature and the snow.

I do not wish to be critical of the Senator's State. I want to make that clear if I can. This is not an attempt to be critical of the site chosen, but it is an attempt to see the overall picture. The people have made these statements, but I cannot determine the basis upon which they made their selections. They have changed the rules on us, because those are the things the Atomic Energy Commission said were important, and that the decision had to be made on those bases.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let us talk about power a moment. In addition to the things I have mentioned concerning the Public Service Co., the Bureau of Reclamation and the Public Service Co. of Colorado are now engaged in working out a joint plan for additional facilities; so as to power, I do not think the Senator can justify his statement in any respect with respect to the power.

Then, as concerns the weather, I simply wish to say to the Senator that when he says the snowfall is 59 inches a year, and there are 160 days a year with below freezing weather, which practically brings panic, he is going clear outside the ball park.

PROGRESS IN THE SOLUTION OF THE POPULATION PROBLEM—PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FAR-SIGHTED LEADERSHIP

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, where do we stand today in relation to the dissemination of birth control information upon request at home and overseas?

Today, I am pleased to report that we are moving slightly ahead to help bring our world population and our food supply into attunement.

This past week has been historic. Private citizens, the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the House Committee on Agriculture here in Congress have taken steps aimed at helping solve the population explosion by means acceptable to individual belief.

On May 5 and 6 more than 1,000 participants from across the Nation, representing 65 national organizations, met in Washington, D.C., to attend the National Conference on Family Planning: Partners for Progress. The conference, sponsored by Planned Parenthood-World Population and Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington, turned out to be a historic first conference on family planning. It was, I suggest, a good preliminary for a White House Conference on Population which should be preceded by well-planned State conferences.

I had the privilege of speaking before the men and women attending the conference, and I ask unanimous consent that the summary of recommendations forthcoming from the conference appear at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, these recommendations touch on the pressing need to extend our domestic programs, our assistance to other nations, our research, our training and education, and on the general problem areas.

Said the recommendations in conclusion:

> The clear message of this conference is that planning is an urgent issue in the United States and throughout the world, and that we have the knowledge and the resources to get the job done within the foreseeable future through a creative partnership of public and private institutions.

The national conference included panels on a variety of subjects of general interest. I ask unanimous consent that the program and panels and panel members appear as exhibit 2 at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Further, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the available list of participating organizations and the available names of the international sponsors council appear at the close of exhibit 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2A.)

WISE AND FARSIGHTED LEADERSHIP

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the man who deserves the praise of mankind for his wise and farsighted leadership on the issue of population is President Lyndon B. Johnson. On 20 occasions he has spoken publicly on this urgent issue and his eloquent exhortations have concerned the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations, the need for our making bold and daring response to go to the root causes of misery and unrest, the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth, and he has thereby given positive mandates to the executive agencies for positive action. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his 20 public statements appear in the RECORD at the close of my remarks as exhibit 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we see welcome indications that the executive departments are budging slightly from their previous inadequate approaches.

On Monday, April 11, 1966, the Department of State's Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, the Honorable Thomas Mann, when he testified before the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures at the 27th public hearing on S. 1676, announced that he was naming a Special Assistant for Population Matters.

It is with deep regret that I learned this morning of the untimely death of Under Secretary Mann's special assistant for population matters, Mr. Robert W. Adams. He had started to take progressive and forward-looking action in this field and was in the process of cabling our embassies overseas to make certain they knew what our Government's policy was in regards to the dissemination of information concerning family planning. Further, Mr. Adams was requesting the embassies to let him know what the individual countries were doing in this area.

I hope the work he was initiating can be carried forth as he would have done.

On Thursday, May 5, 1966, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Under Secretary, the Honorable Wilbur Cohen, announced that Secretary John Gardner was naming a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Science and Population who would work directly under his Assistant Secretary for Science and Health, Dr. Philip Lee. As I told those persons attending the national conference last week, I hope this budge is the beginning of a longer stride forward. It would appear this action comes as a result of further investigation into the problem by Secretary Gardner following his appearance before the subcommittee on April 7 when he did not think the changes necessary. In any event, these are long-needed changes.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also announced that it was holding regional and State meetings on population and that it had appointed a task force to consider a national conference on population.

I do want to give assurance that the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures intends, while continuing its hearings on the population crisis, to watch closely the extent of change and meaningful activity in this area by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as well as other pertinent executive agencies. The subcommittee will look hopefully for signs of such increasing activity and will be more than happy to accord the Departments full credit when such signs become more visible and results tangible.

HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE MOVES HISTORICALLY

We of the Congress can with pride applaud the action of our colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture who last week approved the world war on hunger by expanding broadly America's food-for-peace program and by encouraging other nations to become self-sufficient in food production.

The House Agriculture Committee recognized legislatively for the first time in the history of the Congress the world population explosion relationship to the world food crisis, by providing that the food-for-freedom program would encourage and assist those activities related to population growth which are undertaken by recipient nations.

A major provision of the bill which amends and extends Public Law 480 authorizes the use of foreign currencies for family planning if the recipient nation wishes.

This concept was proposed to the House committee by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] who believed that making available soft currency funds generated by the sale of surplus American food abroad for programs of family planning, maternal and child health, and child nutrition is sensible and logical. And so it is.

When he introduced his amendments in March, Representative TODD suggested that if the 89th Congress moved forward legislatively in the area of family planning it would be remembered far more in this context than in any other. He is correct, and I believe that Representative TODD may properly be called a successful pioneer legislator in this field. Certainly the approval of this legislation will mean that the doors are open a little wider to help us solve the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations.

They will open wider still this Tuesday, May 10, 1966, when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] holds hearings on S. 2993, introduced by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] which proposes to provide long-overdue Federal funding for family planning clinics, private or public, in communities where they are desired.

Many books have been written about the population explosion. I hope that persons interested in the problem have had the opportunity to read a book written by the ecologist Dr. William Vogt of New York City entitled "People! Challenge to Survival." It contains some grim reminders of what will happen to our beloved earth and to our quality of life if we do not take steps to bring people and resources into better alinement.

EXHIBIT 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(Presented by George N. Lindsay, chairman, Planned Parenthood-World Population, at final plenary session, National Conference on Family Planning, May 6, 1966)

This has been a historic National Conference on Family Planning and an exciting one. On Wednesday, we saw the repeal of the Nation's last remaining restrictive law on birth control. Yesterday we heard of a major step forward in the policy of the Federal Government in the domestic field, and today, in the action on the House Agriculture Committee on the food-for-freedom bill, we have learned of a similarly promising breakthrough in our ability to help nations overseas. We can feel some satisfaction that these developments are not entirely unrelated to our conference.

All of us have worked hard for 2 days. We have had the privilege of hearing from some of the most knowledgeable physicians, scientists, health and welfare administrators, religious, business, and political leaders in the United States.

The highlight statistics themselves tell an impressive story: More than 1,000 participants, including representatives of 65 national organizations; 84 panelists; 8 major addresses. The groups participating in this conference comprise one of the most representative arrays of national organizations ever brought together under private auspices in this Capital. Surely this distinguished assemblage augurs wells for the great partnership of public and private effort which will be necessary to meet the world population crisis and U.S. family planning needs.

There have been no formal resolutions at the conference and not all participating organizations would necessarily be in agreement with all the recommendations for a positive forward program which have been made in the various panels and addresses. The significant contributions of organizational representatives to our deliberations, however, have made clear that Americans of diverse beliefs and viewpoints share a deep common concern over this issue. In this summary we have attempted to distill the sense of the discussions as a broad framework for continued creative collaboration.

Running through all of the panels and addresses has been the basic concept that the right to high-quality family planning services is a fundamental human right which enlarges the individual's opportunity freely to make basic, lifesaving choices. In the spirit of the movement for emancipation which Margaret Sanger launched a half century ago, this conference has been committed to two central propositions: First, that family planning is a personal and private matter which must remain entirely free of outside coercion. Second, that parents' voluntary decisions in this area can only be made when competent medical services are actively offered and made accessible to all with dignity and without discrimination. It is the task of our pluralistic service system, encompassing a variety of health, welfare, religious, and educational institutions in both private and public sectors, to work together to make these goals a reality without further delay.

There was overwhelming agreement on two major program emphases:

1. In the United States, we face a considerable backlog in the provision of family

planning services. This backlog is the result of long standing deficiencies in our medical care system and of widespread discrimination in the provision of health services to the poor. At the same time, the United States has the resources, capacity and obligation to face this backlog forthrightly and to provide, within the foreseeable future, competent family planning services to all families that need them and want them. The services should be offered with the aim of enhancing individual freedom of choice in regard to family size and child spacing. A variety of methods must be made available to guarantee that the family can choose a technique consistent with personal or religious beliefs.

2. In the United States, we presently have the resources, capacity and obligation also to provide far greater assistance—financial and technical—to nations overseas which require and request help in this field.

The extension of family planning was seen as decisive to the success of efforts to reduce poverty both at home and abroad. In addition to its intrinsic importance in helping poor couples and poor nations to help themselves, reports from many communities made clear that the initiation of family planning services can be instrumental in improving the general health services available to the poor and in opening up many new opportunities for employment of the poor in creative subprofessional jobs.

Although our existing knowledge and experience provide an adequate base for immediate and rapid expansion of programs at home and abroad, there is a continuing and pressing need for the extension of our fundamental knowledge in the area of fertility and infertility, and for further testing, experimentation and development of new medical techniques and improved methods of delivering this service.

At the same time, there is an immediate as well as a continuing need to train the physicians, scientists, nurses, social workers, administrators and subprofessional workers who will be required in these programs. Therefore, considerable expansion of educational and training efforts at undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate levels will be required, as well as a wide variety of inservice training programs.

Perhaps one of the most extraordinary developments of this extraordinary conference was the clear and heartwarming demonstration that the dialogue between the major religious faiths has been transformed into a true working partnership for the enhancement of world and family health, welfare and freedom.

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

In keeping within President Johnson's characterization of family planning as one of four critical domestic health problems demanding special attention, the panels yesterday and today attempted to define the scope of the need, assess the adequacy of current programs and project feasible means of meeting these needs. There remain substantial groups of Americans for whom family planning services are not currently available. The economically, culturally and geographically disadvantaged are deprived of adequate care in this field, as they are still deprived of other types of health care. It has been estimated that approximately 5 million fertile impoverished women are not pregnant or seeking a desired pregnancy at any given time, and that only one out of ten currently has access to competent family planning services. Low-income parents want as few children as higher-income parents—or even fewer—and respond in significant numbers when quality family planning services are made available with dignity and skill. To provide competent services to these families will require an estimated $100 million annually. Legislation to earmark the necessary Federal funds to augment local public and private funds for this program has been introduced by Senators TYDINGS, GRUENING, CLARK and others; but whether through new legislation or through the already existing administrative authority residing in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the allocation of such funds, this relatively modest amount, in terms of our total national health budget, is needed for family planning services over the next 5 years. Federal and State funds should be made available on a matching basis specifically to make programs possible in local public and voluntary hospitals, health departments and suitable voluntary agencies.

Family planning must receive higher priority among the Nation's health services. The gap between the overwhelming professional consensus and existing programs must be closed without further delay so that family planning enters the mainstream of American medical practice. Federal, State and local governments must take leadership, in cooperation with private agencies, to establish and maintain an adequate network of family planning services.

Among the specific recommendations for domestic programs were the following:

1. Rapid establishment of comprehensive free or heavily subsidized post-partum family planning clinics in every public and voluntary hospital with an obstetric service, as the most efficient and economic base for an adequate network of services.

2. Massive expansion of family planning clinics operated by health departments, with special attention to the needs of rural areas.

3. The rapid implementation of the new forward-looking policies announced yesterday by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department must assign its best resources to this program and should call for the inclusion of voluntary family planning services in any comprehensive State health plan utilizing Federal matching funds.

4. Higher priority to family planning in the war against poverty: Encouragement of a family planning component in all community action programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide neighborhood-based services in the heart of poverty areas, and removal of arbitrary restrictions on eligibility for service, such as the limitation on use of OEO funds to purchase family planning supplies only for married women living with their husbands.

5. Sufficient trained staff and consultants in both HEW and OEO to provide on-the-spot technical assistance to local hospitals, health departments and community action programs in the organization and delivery of family planning services.

6. Planning at Federal, State, and community levels to coordinate public and private programs, guarantee comprehensive coverage and secure better deployment of manpower and improved use of facilities.

7. Special attention must be directed to social, health, and educational services that meet the needs of adolescents. Acceptable programs must be devised with proper safeguards, to assist our young people in reducing the incidence of out-of-wedlock births and early marriage necessitated by pregnancy.

ASSISTANCE TO OTHER NATIONS

The United States must provide substantially greater assistance to the developing nations to help them reduce their rates of population growth which threaten to nullify all efforts for economic and social development. Such assistance should be given at the request of the recipient nation and should be integrated into comprehensive aid for general economic and social development.

While there has been progress in U.S. aid in the population field during the last several years, much more can and must be done. Among the recommendations were the following:

1. Larger expenditures for assistance on family planning programs, similar to the proposal of the White House Conference on International cooperation that the United States make available up to $100 million annually over the next 3 years to help other countries implement these programs and strengthen national health and social services necessary for their support.

2. The United States should forthrightly make known to recipient countries that counterpart funds in sizable amounts can be utilized to help finance family planning programs in those countries, as authorized in the amended food-for-freedom bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee today.

3. The U.S. Government, in cooperation with the United Nations and other international organizations, private organizations and universities, should encourage the substantial expansion of facilities for education and training of U.S. and foreign personnel in all aspects of the population problem and the implementation of family planning programs.

RESEARCH

If the population problem is, as the President put it, second only to the search for lasting peace in its importance for the future of mankind, this priority remains to be reflected in the allocation of scientific resources in the United States. Almost every other field of scientific and medical interest—space, cancer, heart disease, blindness, mental health, and so on—commands a considerably larger share of Federal research funds than the $2 million which Secretary Gardner stated will be spent this year for research directly related to the regulation of human fertility.

There was agreement that the time has indeed arrived to correct this situation. With our scientific capability and financial resources, it is indisputable that one of the most significant contributions we can make to the solution of the population problem throughout the world is through massive research to discover methods of fertility control suitable for use in different nations and cultures and acceptable to all faiths; to determine optimum patterns for implementation and administration of family planning services; to illuminate the factors which condition family size preferences; and to explain the relationship between population growth and economic development. It was suggested that the global population explosion is of such urgency as to require a crash program in which the great strides forward in biological knowledge are applied to this field.

1. An aggressive, large-scale program should be initiated by the Federal Government and private institutions to recruit scientific investigators to work in this field. Appropriate incentive programs, such as fellowships, professorships, and career development awards, should be established on a broad scale to insure that enough workers in the scientific disciplines involved are attracted to the field.

2. This year's appropriation for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development should be increased substantially to allocate a minimum of $25 million, specifically and categorically, for research directly related to fertility control.

3. Federal funds and energetic leadership should be provided to establish an appropriate number of major institutes throughout the country within the next 5 years for the interdisciplinary study of human reproduction, fertility, and family planning.

4. Special emphasis should be placed on research to increase the acceptance and reliability of method, and to discover and make available other new techniques of fertility control.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION

To carry out these programs will require thousands of trained workers—physicians, nurses, social workers, scientific investigators, administrators, planners, minister-counselors, clinic aids, community workers, and other subprofessional workers. In addition, the next generation must be given adequate opportunity to learn about population dynamics, human reproductive and fertility regulation. Such education should be made available to children at the earliest ages, consonant with their level of comprehension.

At the present time, education on family planning and population dynamics is inadequate in the Nation's professional schools and almost nonexistent in the Nation's colleges and high schools. Specific recommendations in this area include:

1. A coordinated program involving the major professional groupings—the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Public Welfare Association, the American Nurses Association, the National Association of Social Workers, and the religious groups—to insure the inclusion of comprehensive material on family planning and population dynamics in the curriculums of the relevant professional schools, and to develop intensive programs at the postgraduate level.
2. Regional training institutes for the diverse professional groupings, financed by the Federal agencies with responsibilities in this field (Public Health Service, Children's Bureau, Office of Economic Opportunity).
3. An extensive training program, conducted jointly by the operating agencies and appropriate educational institutions, to train persons for subprofessional jobs in family planning clinics and the community education program associated with them. It has been estimated that the equivalent of 55,000 full-time jobs would be created in domestic family planning services alone. Such a training program should receive high priority in the war against poverty.
4. A major effort, involving educational and professional organizations and private foundations, to integrate appropriate material on population dynamics, reproductive physiology, and fertility control in high school and college curriculums.
5. Development by the Public Health Service of mass educational materials on population dynamics and family planning for all Americans.
6. Special training for clergy and ministerial students to equip them to counsel parishioners in this field.

GENERAL

Additionally, there were several more general proposals. It was felt that the dialogue among the major religious groups which has developed in this field during the last several years demonstrated beyond doubt overwhelming agreement on the necessity for family planning, as long as personal beliefs are respected in these programs. It was evident that the dialogue will be intensified to deal with such questions as the moral issues associated with more widespread use of family planning and the need to involve all segments of the religious community in the social action and cooperation that will be necessary to provide family planning help to those most in need. Interfaith cooperation and mutual understanding in this field is not only desirable but has indeed become a moral imperative. The need for increased attention by the schools, the churches and other institutions to the total fabric of family life was also emphasized.

Similarly, the dialogue among business leaders and economists on the relationship between various rates of population growth and the future of the economy must be continued and broadened. Questions were raised as to the quality of life in an overcrowded America if present growth rates continue. The first order of business was seen as the extension of competent family planning services to those Americans now deprived of them, but it was clear that a major educational effort must be initiated now to alert all Americans to the threat posed by rapid population growth. We need more systematic exploration of the diverse factors influencing the family size preferences of individual parents and the potential tension between these individual desires and overall social needs.

In sum, then, the clear message of this Conference is that family planning is an urgent issue in the United States and throughout the world, and that we have the knowledge and the resources to get the job done within the foreseeable future through a creative partnership of public and private institutions.

EXHIBIT 2

PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY PLANNING: PARTNERS FOR PROGRESS

(Sponsored by Planned Parenthood-World Population and Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington, May 5–6, 1966, Shoreham Hotel)

Honorary sponsors council: Dwight D. Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, cochairmen; John Cowles, Sr., Lewis W. Douglas, Marriner S. Eccles, Milton S. Eisenhower, Arthur S. Flemming, Harry Emerson Fosdick, J. Kenneth Galbraith, Christian A. Herter, George F. Kennan, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, Hermann J. Muller, Arthur W. Radford, John Rock, Elmo Roper, Whitney North Seymour, Lewis L. Strauss, Henry M. Wriston.

MAY 4

Advance registration, upper lobby, 5:30–8 p.m.

MAY 5

Registration in main lobby west, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Hospitality, lower lobby, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Film showings—Ambassador Room, 10 a.m. to 11 a.m.

Margaret Sanger "The Engagement Ring," the Planned Parenthood story.

Opening luncheon, Blue Room, noon

The Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Presiding: Donald B. Straus, chairman, P.P.-W.P. executive committee.

Plenary session, Ambassador Room, 2 p.m.

Keynote address: The Honorable JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, U.S. Senate.

Chairman: George N. Lindsay, chairman, P.P.-W.P.

Concurrent panels, 3 to 5 p.m., research, Executive Room

Outstanding scientists will discuss the role of the Federal Government and the scientific establishment in enlarging research in the fields of reproductive physiology, fertility, contraceptive technology, family size motivation, and the social, economic, and cultural effect of population growth.

Franklin T. Brayer, M.D., director, Center for Population Research, Georgetown University.

Philip Corfman, M.D., program associate for population, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

E. James Lieberman, M.D., consultant, child psychology, National Institute of Mental Health.

Clement L. Markert, Department of Biology, Yale University.

John Rock, M.D., Rock Reproductive Study Center.

Sheldon J. Segal, director, Biomedical Division, Population Council.

Anna L. Southam, M.D., program specialist, reproductive biology, the Ford Foundation.

The Chairman: Richard L. Day, M.D., medical director, P.P.-W.P.

Foreign aid, Tudor Room

U.N., U.S. and foreign government leaders and demographers will discuss how we can better help other countries to help themselves meet the social and economic crises that are being brought about by the population explosion.

Robert W. Adams, special assistant to the Under Secretary for economic affairs, Department of State.

Edgar Berman, M.D., Chief Health Consultant for Latin America, Agency for International Development.

William V. D'Antonio, chairman, Catholic Committee on Population and Government Policy.

Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., chairman, Population Crisis Committee.

Stephen Enke, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense.

Frank W. Notestein, president, Population Council.

Robert S. Smith, Associate Assistant Administrator for program, Agency for International Development.

The Honorable PAUL H. TODD, JR., U.S. House of Representatives.

H. E. Radomiro Tomic, Ambassador of Chile.

H. E. Humberto Lopez Villamil, Ambassador of Honduras to the U.N.

Chairman: J. Mayone Stycos, director, international population program, Cornell University.

Domestic programs, Ambassador Room

The expanding role of Government in supporting birth control services through health departments, hospitals, the antipovery program, etc., will be discussed by Federal authorities and health and welfare leaders.

Leslie Corsa, Jr., M.D., director, Center for Population Planning, University of Michigan.

Arthur J. Lesser, M.D., Deputy Chief, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Sar A. Levitan, the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

George N. Lindsay, chairman, P.P.–W.P.

Mollie Orshansky, Division of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration.

Richard A. Prindle, M.D., Assistant Surgeon General of the United States.

Alvin L. Schorr, Deputy Chief, Research and Plans Division, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Chairman: Arnold Maremont, former chairman, Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Reception, Ambassador Room, 6:45 p.m.

To honor the distinguished Members of the Congress, and the officials of the U.S. Government who have recognized the importance of responsible parenthood throughout the world.

Fiftieth anniversary banquet, Regency Ballroom, 7:30 p.m.

Address: The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senate.

Presentation of the Margaret Sanger Award in Human Rights to the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., by Cass Canfield, chairman, governing body of International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Presiding: George N. Lindsay, chairman, P.P.–W.P.

MAY 6

Regislation, main lobby west, 9 a.m.–5 p.m.

Hospitality, lower lobby, 10 a.m.–5 p.m.

Plenary session—Empire Room, 9 a.m.

Keynote address: "Public Policy at the Grassroots," Alonzo S. Yerby, M.D., commissioner of hospitals, New York City.

Chairman: Alan Guttmacher, M.D., president, P.P.–W.P.

Concurrent panels, 10 a.m. to noon

Hospital services—Diplomat Room

The directors of family planning services at leading public and voluntary hospitals, hospital administrators, and other professionals will discuss how hospital-based services can help meet the need for birth control in the United States.

David G. Anderson, M.D., University of Michigan Medical Center.

Gail V. Anderson, M.D., senior attending physician, Los Angeles County General Hospital.

Ernest Lowe, M.D., chief medical officer, Obstetrics and Gynecology Department, District of Columbia General Hospital.

Bernard J. Pisani, M.D., director obstetrics and gynecology, St. Vincent's Hospital, New York.

Nicholas H. Wright, M.D., U.S. Public Health Service officer, Emory University Medical School, Atlanta.

Chairman: Gordon W. Perkin, M.D., associate medical director, P.P.–W.P.

Public health programs, Forum Room

Public Health officials, professionals and educators will discuss the expanding role of public health departments in meeting communities' family planning needs.

Joseph D. Beasley, M.D., Material and Child Health Section, Tulane University School of Medicine.

William Cassel, M.D., chief of maternal and perinatal health, California State Department of Health.

Elizabeth C. Corkey, M.D., assistant health director, Mecklenburg County N.C.

Murray Grant, M.D., director of Public Health, District of Columbia.

David M. Heer, assistant professior biostatistics and demography, School of Public Health, Harvard University.

Mrs. Anne G. Huppman, executive director, Planned Parenthood Association of Baltimore.

Robert Stepto, M.D., Chicago Board of Health.

Chairman: Johan W. Eliot, M.D., assistant professor population planning, University of Michigan School of Public Health.

Poverty programs, Empire Room

Some 18 antipoverty programs throughout the United States now include birth control. Representatives from some of these programs, economists, and social welfare leaders will discuss the effectiveness of family planning in the War on Poverty.

Lisbeth Bamberger, acting chief, Health Division, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity.

James G. Banks, executive director, United Planning Organization, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable JOHN CONYERS, JR., U.S. House of Representatives.

Evelyn Hartman, M.D., director, Maternal and Child Health, Minneapolis Health Department.

Frederick S. Jaffe, vice president, P.P.–W.P.

Lawrence Maze, M.D., director, Family Planning Program, Homer Phillips Hospital, St. Louis.

Mrs. J. R. Modrall, board member, Office of Economic Opportunity, Albuquerque.

Ray Tardy, Sheldon Complex Community Action Program, Grand Rapids.

Chairman: Rev. Eugene Callendar, chairman of the board, Haryou-Act, Inc., New York City.

The religious consensus, Tudor Room

Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen, theologians, and philosophers will discuss the moral implications of expanded birth control programs; and the growing involvement of the religious community in social action necessary to provide family planning help to those most in need.

Rev. Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., professor of law, Georgetown University, and director, Institute of Law, Human Rights and Social Values.

Louis Dupré, associate professor of philosophy, Georgetown University.

Rev. William H. Genné, director, Commission on Marriage and Family, National Council of Churches of Christ.

Rabbi Joachim Prinz., president American Jewish Congress.

Dr. Carl F. Reus, director of research and social action, the American Lutheran Church.

Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, director, Interreligious Affairs, American Jewish Committee.

Chairman: Rev. Richard M. Fagley, Executive Secretary, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

Luncheon, Palladian Room, noon

The Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

The Honorable Katherine B. Oettinger, Chief, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Presiding: Charles Horskie, Advisor (to the President) for National Capital Affairs.

CONCURRENT PANELS, 2 TO 4 P.M.

The business consensus—Tudor Room

Businessmen and economists will discuss growing corporate concern about the population problem here and abroad; social and economic consequences of unchecked population growth, and the relationship between the denial of family planning services to the poor, and the growth of the economic dependency.

Richard L. Breault, associate director research, Task Force Economic Growth and Opportunity, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Richard C. Cornuelle, executive vice president, National Association of Manufactures.

William V. D'Antonio, chairman, Catholic Committee on Population and Government Policy.

Martin R. Gainsburgh, vice president and chief economist, National Industrial Conference Board.

Harvey C. Russell, vice president, Pepsi-Cola Co.

(Other panel members to be announced.)

Chairman: Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., commerce and industry chairman, P.P.–W.P.

Americans' tomorrow—Diplomat Room

The rapid growth of U.S. population with its attendant problems of urban sprawl, water and air pollution, overcrowded schools, traffic jams, etc., is the result of "planned" three and four-child families by the middle-class and well-to-do. Leading authorities will discuss what can be or should be done to help couples recognize the possible consequences of even moderate-sized families to the "quality of life" for tomorrow's Americans.

Robert C. Cook, president, Population Reference Bureau.

Louis Dupré, associate professor of philosophy, Georgetown University.

Ray Lamontagne, associate, John D. Rockefeller, 3d.

Leonard Lesser, general counsel, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.

William T. Liu, associate professor, sociology; and director, Institute for Study of Population and Social Change at Notre Dame.

The Honorable William H. Robinson, program consultant, Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

Paul Lester Wiener, professor of urban planning, Columbia University.

Chairman: Donald B. Straus, president, American Arbitration Association; chairman, Executive Committee, P.P.–N.P.

The professional consensus, Empire Room

Representatives of leading medical, social welfare, family planning, public health, and nursing organizations will discuss the vital stake of the professions in expanding knowledge, training and action about population, and family planning in their ranks.

Leslie Corsa, Jr., M.D., chairman, Program Area Committee on Population and Public Health, American Public Health Association.

M. Edward Davis, M.D., president, American Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians.

James R. Dumpson, first vice president, American Public Welfare Association; associate dean, School of Social Work, Hunter College.

Elizabeth Edmands, R.N., assistant professor, population and family health, the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health.

Jesse W. Johnson, assistant director, Health and Welfare, National Urban League.

Alan I. Levenson, M.D., staff psychiatrist, National Institute of Mental Health.

Joseph P. Martin, M.D., board chairman, Bell Center Birth Control Clinic, Cleveland.

Jules Pagano, Director, Adult Education, Office of Health Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Chairman: Mary S. Calderone, M.D., executive director, Sex Information and Education Council of the United States; former medical director, P.P.-W.P.

The response of the public, Forum Room

Nine out of ten of the Nation's poor families who need birth control are, in effect, denied it. Panelists will discuss the birth control attitudes and practices of those now without birth control help.

Do they want it? Will they use it? What kinds of services are needed?

Donald J. Bogue, director of the Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago.

Mrs. Marjorie Schumacher, executive director, Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington.

Christopher Tietze, M.D., director of research, National Committee on Maternal Health.

Charles F. Westoff, Office of Population Research. Princeton University.

Mrs. Charles F. Whitten, Michigan Welfare Board.

Chairman: Mrs. Naomi T. Gray, field director, P.P.-W.P.

Plenary session, Empire Room, 4 to 5 p.m.

Summary of panel recommendations:

George N. Lindsay, chairman of Planned Parenthood-World Population.

Closing remarks by Alan F. Guttmacher, M.D., president of Planned Parenthood-World Population.

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

(Partial list)

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

The American Assembly.

The American Association of University Women.

American Association on Mental Deficiency.

American Bar Association.

American Civil Liberties Union.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Americans for Democratic Action.

American Ethical Union.

American Friends Service Committee.

American Jewish Committee.

American Jewish Congress.

The American Lutheran Church.

American Medical Association.

American Nurses' Association.

American Public Health Association.

American Public Welfare Association.

Arrow, Inc.

Board of Christian Social Concerns, the Methodist Church.

Catholic Council on Civil Liberties.

Central Conference of American Rabbis.

The Child Welfare League of America.

The Choate Foundation.

Community Service Society.

Congress of Racial Equality.

The Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.

Family Service Association of America.

Haryou-ACT, Inc.

Institute for Study of Population and Social Change at Notre Dame.

International Convention of Christian Churches.

Lutheran Church in America.

Margaret Sanger Research Bureau.

Medical Committee for Human Rights.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

National Association of Manufacturers.

National Association of Social Workers.

National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

National Conference of Christians and Jews.

National Education Association.

National Federation of Catholic Physicians' Guilds.

National League for Nursing.

National Medical Association.

National Social Welfare Assembly.

National Urban League.

Population Crisis Committee.

Presbyterian Interracial Council.

Protestant Episcopal Church.

Resources for the Future, Inc.

Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.

Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

State Charities Aid Association.

Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.

The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Young Women's Christian Association.

INTERNATIONAL SPONSORS COUNCIL

(Partial list)

Representative BROCK ADAMS; Chief S. O. Adebo, Ambassador Nigeria to U.N.; Conrad Aiken; Mohsin Alaini, Ambassador Yemen Arab Republic to U.N.

George V. Allen, president, Tobacco Institute; D. W. Ambridge, board chairman, Abitibi Power & Paper Co.; J. Amonzegar, Minister of Health, Iran.

Dillon Anderson; Robert O. Anderson, chairman, Atlantic Refining Co.; Stratis G. Andreadis, chairman, Commercial Bank of Greece.

F. S. Arkhurst, Ambassador of Ghana to the U.N.; Sverker C. Astrom, Ambassador of Sweden to the U.N.; John Bardeen;* Jacques Barzun.

Fernando Belaunde Terry, President of Peru; Thomas Hart Benton; L. V. Berkner, director, Southwest Center for Advanced Studies; Sarah Gibson Blanding.

Konrad E. Bloch;* Joseph L. Block, chairman, Inland Steel Corp.; Edward E. Booher, president, McGraw-Hill Book Co.; Lord J. Boyd-Orr;* Lord Russell Brain.

Walter H. Brattain;* Benjamin Britten; Pearl S. Buck;* Ralph J. Bunche;* Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

Sir F. MacFarlane Burnett;* Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, Partner, Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; Chester Carlson; Senator FRANK CARLSON; Sir James Chadwick.*

Ilka Chase; Stuart Chase, Carlos Chavez; Lieu Chieh, Ambassador of China to the U.N.; Brock Chisholm, Former Director-General, WHO.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK; Kenneth B. Clark; Sir John Cockcroft;* Lord George James Cole, chairman, Unilever.

Gershon B. O. Collier, Ambassador Sierra Leone to U.N.; James Conant; Aaron Copland; Thomas Corbishley, S.J.

Carl F. Cori;* F. H. Corner, Ambassador New Zealand to the U.N.; Norman Cousins; Gardner Cowles; Dana S. Creel.

Frederick J. Crosson, Director of General Program, Notre Dame; Sir Henry Hallet Dale*; Henrik C. P. Dam.*

William V. D'Antonio, Notre Dame; Ossie Davis; John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College; Edwin Dickinson; Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

Senator PETER DOMINICK; Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN; John Dos Passos; James R. Dumpson; Louis Dupré, Georgetown University.

Mohamed Awad El-Kony, Ambassador United Arab Republic to U.N.; Byron K. Elliott, Chairman, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Representative ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH.

John F. Enders;* Orhan Eralp, Ambassador Turkey to U.N.; Morris L. Ernst; Senator PAUL FANNIN; James Finn, editor, Worldview; John Fischer.

Representative O. CLARK FISHER; R. G. Follis, chairman, Standard Oil Co. of California; Emerson Foote; William Friday, president, University of North Carolina.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT; Radomir Geric, Assistant Secretary for Health, Yugoslavia; William F. Giauque.*

Weldon B. Gibson, executive vice president, Stanford Research Institute; Donald A. Glaser;* Representative EDITH GREEN; Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

Representative HARLAN HAGEN; Otto Hahn; Oscar Handlin; Gaylord P. Harnwell, president, University of Pennsylvania; Michael Harrington.

Harlan H. Hatcher, president, University of Michigan; Werner Heisenberg;* Katharine Hepburn; Ben M. Herbster, president; United Church of Christ.

Christian A. Herter, Jr.; Walter R. Hess;* Jaroslav Heyrovsky*; Hudson Hoagland, William Ernest Hocking; Paul G. Hoffman.

Jerome Holland, president, Hampton Institute; Sidney Hook; H. Mansfield Horner, chairman, United Aircraft Corp.; J. K. Horton, president, Southern Cal. Edison Co.

H. Stuart Hughes; Langston Hughes; Robert M. Hutchins; Andrew Huxley;* Sir Julian Huxley; Robert S. Ingersoll, chairman, Borg Warner Corp.

Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE; Senator JACOB K. JAVITS; J. Hans D. Jensen;* John H. Johnson, publisher, Ebony; Shidzue Kato, Senator, Japan.

Jefferson W. Keener, president, B. F. Goodrich Co.; Urho Kekkonen, President of Finland; Edward C. Kendall;* John Cowdery Kendrew.*

James R. Killian, chairman, M.I.T.; Martin Luther King;* George B. Kistiakowsky; Hannes Kjartansson, Ambassador Iceland to the U.N.; Otto Klineberg.

Douglas M. Knight, president, Duke University; Arthur Kornberg;* Sir Hans A. Krebs;* Leon Kroll; Joseph Wood Krutch; Polykarp Kusch.*

Willis E. Lamb, Jr.;* Ralph Lazarus, president, Federated Department Stores; Robert Lazarus, chairman, F. & R. Lazarus & Co.

Roger Lewis, chairman, General Dynamics Corp.; Alexis S. Liatis, Ambassador Greece to U.N.; Ulla Lindström, Minister of Technical Assistance, Sweden.

M. Albert Linton; Fritz Lipmann;* Walter Lippman; Alberto Lleras Camargo; Sir Ben Lockspeiser; John L. Loeb; Louis E. Lomax.

Bishop John Wesley Lord; Archibald MacLeish; Neil H. McElroy, board chairman, Procter & Gamble Co.; Senator GALE W. MCGEE.

Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, William L. McKnight, board chairman, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; Edwin M. McMillan *, Marya Mannes.

Giacomo Manzú, Archer J. P. Martin *, Peter Brian Medawar *, Guiseppe Medici, Karl D. Menninger, Gian Carlo Menotti, Robert K. Merton.

Senator LEE METCALF, Darius Milhaud, Representative CHESTER L. MIZE, Waldemar Molinski, College for the Study of Catholic Theology, Berlin.

Theodore Monod, Institute of France; Ashley Montagu, Douglas Moore, Edward P. Morgan, Representative THOMAS G. MORRIS, Senator FRANK E. MOSS.

Reuben H. Mueller, president, National Council of Churches; Hermann J. Muller *, Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Lewis Mumford, Willian P. Murphy *,

Gunnar K. Myrdal, Burudi Nabwera, Ambassador of the Republic of Kenya; Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Allan Nevins, Philip John Noel-Baker *.

John H. Northrop *, Frank Notestein, Michael Novak, James F. Oates, Jr., board chairman, Equitable Life Assurance Society.

Sir Duncan Oppenheim, chairman, British American Tobacco Co.; J. Robert Oppenheimer, Fairfield Osborn, Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER.

Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, Iran; H. Bruce Palmer, president, National Industrial Conference Board; Vijayalakshmi Pandit, Member of Parliament, India.

Rosemary Park, president, Barnard College; C. Jay Parkinson, president, the Anaconda Co.; Hugh B. Patterson, Jr., publisher, Little Rock Gazette; Linus C. Pauling *.

Sir Denning Pearson, chief executive, Rolls-Royce Limited; James A. Perkins, president, Cornell University; Max Ferdinand Perutz *, Bishop James A. Pike.

Gregory Pincus, Walter Piston, Kenneth S. Pitzer, president, Rice University; Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

C. B. Powell, publisher, the Amsterdam News; Donald C. Power, chairman, General Telephone & Electronics Corp.; Rabbi Joachim Prinz.

Harold Quinton, chairman, Southern California Edison Co.; Sir Chandrasekhara V. Raman *; J. Saunders Redding, Tadeus Reichstein *, Walter Reuther.

Dickinson W. Richards *, David Riesman, Frederick C. Robbins *, David Rockefeller, Representative James Roosevelt, Representative BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

Lessing J. Rosenwald, Zenon Rossides, Ambassador of Cyprus to U.N.; Richard H. Rovere, Representative DONALD RUMSFELD, Bayard Rustin, Jonas E. Salk.

Irving Salomon, board chairman, Royal Metal Manufacturing Co.; Carl Sandburg, Frederick Sanger *.

Henry B. Sargent, president, American & Foreign Power Co.; Representative JAMES H. SCHEUER, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Mark Schorer, Emilio Segrè *.

Frederick Seitz, president, National Academy of Sciences; Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, Ambassador of Nicaragua to U.N.; Harlow Shapley.

Roger L. Shin, dean of instruction, Union Theological Seminary; William Shockley *, Alan Simpson, president, Vassar College; Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON.

Gerald A. Sivage, president, Marshall Field & Co.; C. R. Smith, board chairman, American Airlines; Sir C. P. Snow, Wendell M. Stanley *.

Ernest Lyman Stebbins, dean, School of Hygiene and Public Health, the Johns Hopkins University; Julius Stratton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Jack I. Straus, chairman, R. H. Macy & Co.; Anna Lord Strauss, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Hays Sulzberger.

Albert Szent-Györgyi *, Shigeki Tashiro, board chairman, Toyo Rayon Co.; Edward L. Tatum *, Deems Taylor, Harold Taylor.

Prince A. Taylor, Jr., president, Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church; A. Hugo Theorell *, Norman Thomas, Virgil Thomson.

Lord Alexander Todd *, George J. Tomer, Ambassador, Syrian Arab Republic to U.N.; Charles H. Townes *, Arnold J. Toynbee, Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS.

---

* Nobel Laureates.

Representative Morris K. Udall, Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Harold C. Urey *, Mehdi Vakil, Ambassador, Iran to U.N.; Mark Van Doren.

Bruno Visentini, chairman, Ing. C. Olivetti; Mr. and Mrs. DeWitt Wallace, James D. Watson *, Lagroua Weill-Hallé, Paul Weiss, Thomas H. Weller *.

Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., chairman, Pitney-Bowes; Fred L. Whipple, director, Smithsonian Astrophysics Observatory; George H. Whipple *.

John F. White, president, National Educational Television; Paul Dudley White, Jerome B. Wiesner.

Francis O. Wilcox, dean, School of Advanced International Studies, the Johns Hopkins University; Maurice H. F. Wilkins *, Roy Wilkins.

Erwin H. Will, board chairman, Virginia Electric & Power Co.; C. Vann Woodward, Senator Ralph Yarborough, Alonzo S. Yerby, Whitney M. Young, Jr.

Representative Arthur J. Younger, Karl Ziegler *, Sir Solly Zuckerman.

Exhibit 3

Statements by President Johnson Concerning Population

1. State of the Union address before Congress, January 4, 1965: "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources."

2. The 20th anniversary of the United Nations at San Francisco, June 25, 1965: "Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world. Let us act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth."

3. Swearing-in ceremony of John W. Gardner as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in Rose Garden, the White House, August 18, 1965: "This administration is seeking new ideas and it is certainly not going to discourage any new solutions to the problems of population growth and distribution."

4. Text of letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant at Second United Nations World Population Conference opening in Belgrade, August 30, 1965:

"My Dear Mr. Secretary General: The U.S. Government recognizes the singular importance of the meeting of the Second United Nations World Population Conference and pledges its full support to your great undertaking.

"As I said to the United Nations in San Francisco, we must now begin to face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying population. Our Government assures your conference of our wholehearted support to the United Nations and its agencies in their efforts to achieve a better world through bringing into balance the world's resources and the world's population.

"In extending my best wishes for the success of your conference, it is my fervent hope that your great assemblage of population experts will contribute significantly to the knowledge necessary to solve this transcendent problem. Second only to the search for peace, it is humanity's greatest challenge. This week, the meeting in Belgrade carries with it the hopes of mankind."

5. State of the Union address before Congress, January 12, 1966:

"That is what I have come to ask of you.

* * * * *

3. "To give a new and daring direction to our foreign aid program, designed to make a maximum attack on hunger, disease, and ignorance in those countries that are determined to help themselves, and to help those nations that are trying to control population growth.

6. "I will also propose the International Health Act of 1966—

"To strike at disease by a new effort to bring modern skills and knowledge to the uncared-for suffering of the world—and by wiping out smallpox, malaria, and controlling yellow fever over most of the world in this decade;

"To help countries trying to control population growth, by increasing our research—and by earmarking funds to help their efforts."

7. Ceremony held at the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, January 20, 1966, Independence, Mo.:

"We will increase our efforts in the great field of human population. The hungry world cannot be fed until and unless the growth in its resources and the growth in its population come into balance. Each man and woman—and each nation—must make decisions of conscience and policy in the face of this great problem. But the position of the United States of America is clear. We will give our help and our support to nations which make their own decision to insure an effective balance between the numbers of their people and the food they have to eat. And we will push forward the frontiers of research in this important field."

8. Foreign aid program message to the Congress, February 1, 1966:

"Yet today the citizens of many developing nations walk in the shadow of misery—

"Half the adults have never been to school;

"Over half the people are hungry or malnourished;

"Food production per person is falling;

"At present rates of growth, population will double before the year 2000.

"These are the dominant facts of our age.

"They challenge our own security.

"They threaten the future of the world.

"Our response must be bold and daring. It must go to the root causes of misery and unrest. It must build a firm foundation for progress, security, and peace."

9. "Only these people and their leaders can—

"Invest every possible resource in improved farming techniques, in school and hospital construction, and in critical industry;

"Make the land reforms, tax changes, and other basic adjustments necessary to transform their societies;

"Face the population problem squarely and realistically;

"Create the climate which will attract foreign investment, and keep local money at home."

10. "In many other countries food output is also falling behind population growth. We cannot meet the world food needs of the future, however willing we are to share our abundance. Nor would it serve the common interest if we could."

11. "We stand ready to help developing countries deal with the population problem.

"The United States cannot and should not force any country to adopt any particular approach to this problem. It is first a matter of individual and national conscience, in which we will not interfere.

"But population growth now consumes about two-thirds of economic growth in the less-developed world. As death rates are steadily driven down, the individual miracle of birth becomes a collective tragedy of want.

"In all cases, our help will be given only upon request, and only to finance advisers, training, transportation, educational equipment, and local currency needs.

"Population policy remains a question for each family and each nation to decide. But we must be prepared to help when decisions are made."

12. "Technical cooperation: This request—$231 million—will finance American advisors and teachers who are the crucial forces in the attack on hunger, ignorance, disease, and the population problem. The dollar total is relatively small. But no appropriation is more critical. No purpose is more central."

International Education and Health Acts message, February 2, 1966:

13. "We have committed ourselves for many years to relieving human suffering. Today our efforts must keep pace with a growing world and with growing problems."

14. "Therefore, I propose a program to—

"Create an international career service in health;

"Help meet health manpower needs in developing nations;

"Combat malnutrition;

"Control and eradicate disease;

"Cooperate in worldwide efforts to deal with population problems."

15. "Food production has not kept pace with the increasing demands of expanding population."

16. In part 5, the President carefully spells out his proposal "to cooperate in worldwide efforts to deal with population problems:

"By 1970, there will be 300 million more people on this earth. A reliable estimate shows that at present rates of growth the world population could double by the end of the century. The growing gap—between food to eat and mouths to feed—poses one of mankind's greatest challenges. It threatens the dignity of the individual and the sanctity of the family.

"We must meet these problems in ways that will strengthen free societies—and protect the individual right to freedom of choice.

"To mobilize our resources more effectively, I propose programs to—

"1. Expand research in human reproduction and population dynamics. We are supporting research efforts through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, AID, and the World Health Organization. I am requesting funds to increase the pace and scope of this effort. The effort, to be successful, will require a full response by our scientific community.

"2. Enlarge the training of American and foreign specialists in the population field: We are supporting training programs and the development of training programs through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and AID. We will expand these programs at home and abroad.

"3. Assist family planning programs in nations which request such help: Here at home, we are gaining valuable experience through new programs of maternal and infant care as well as expansion of private and public medical care programs. Early last year we made clear our readiness to share our knowledge, skill, and financial resources with the developing nations requesting assistance. We will expand this effort in response to the increasing number of requests from other countries."

War against hunger message, February 10, 1966:

17. "Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in death rate."

18. "A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on international health and education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem."

19. Domestic health and education message, March 1, 1966:

"FAMILY PLANNING

"We have a growing concern to foster the integrity of the family, and the opportunity for each child. It is essential that all families have access to information and services that will allow freedom to choose the number and spacing of their children within the dictates of individual conscience.

"In the fiscal 1967 budget, I have requested a sizable increase in funds available for research, training and services in this field. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development will expand its own research and its grant program to study human reproduction. The Children's Bureau and the Office of Economic Opportunity will support family planning to the maternal and infant care programs in local communities when requested. State agencies will be aided by Federal welfare funds to provide family planning services to mothers."

20. Economic aid to India message, April 1, 1966: "The Indian Government believes that there can be no effective solution of the Indian food problem that does not include population control. The choice is now between a comprehensive and humane program for limiting births and the brutal curb that is imposed by famine. As Mrs. Gandhi told me, the Indian Government is making vigorous efforts on this front."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by Senate May 9, 1966:

Small Business Administration

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Donald Opie McBride, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1975.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 9, 1966:

Department of State

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Findley Burns, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

U.S. Air Force

The following officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be generals

Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, FR1519 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Robert M. Lee, FR590 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Jacob E. Smart, FR592 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be generals

Lt. Gen. William S. Stone, FR1039 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, FR1530 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. David A. Burchinal, FR1936 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

U.S. Army

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, U.S. Army.

U.S. Marine Corps

May 5, 1966

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233, effective from the date of his retirement.

In the Diplomatic and Foreign Service

The nominations beginning W. Michael Blumenthal, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending James A. Smith, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 29, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Seaborn P. Foster, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, and ending Murray David Zinoman, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 25, 1966.

In the Marine Corps

The nominations beginning Philip N. Austen, to be colonel, and ending Thomas Zalewski, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 19, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Norbert H. Adams, to be second lieutenant, and ending Donald L. Zumwalt, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 25, 1966.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Entrance Fee Policy Needs Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important pieces of legislation recently passed by Congress was the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The law marked a great stride forward in a comprehensive program for developing recreational areas in the United States. I supported this bill which received almost unanimous endorsement from the Congress.

There are, however, several points that need to be ironed out in connection with the language of the bill. Particularly in light of the recent announcement by the Corps of Engineers to charge entrance fees at recreational areas at Federal reservoirs, does it become imperative that Congress take a second look at the fee policy which is one of the key features of the land and water fund.

On four Federal reservoirs in my State of South Dakota the fees will be initiated on May 30. There is, however, before Congress, in particular before the Public Works Committee, a bill which would exempt those Federal reservoirs which are not deriving more than half of the benefits in the form of recreation. Since all Corps of Engineers projects are designed primarily for conservation and flood control purposes, it would mean no fees could be charged at recreation areas on corps reservoirs. The bill H.R. 13313 must be passed before the May 30 deadline at which time fees will be collected.

These fees would tend to discourage the second largest industry in South Dakota, tourism, because most of the adequate sites for launching boats and for just viewing the reservoirs will be under the "chargeable" category of the present law. Where there are facilities such as hydraulic boat launches and showers or other developed facilities, it is only fair that some type of user fee be charged. But an admission fee does not seem equitable with the purposes of the current law.

Hopefully, Congress will act soon on H.R. 13313, which clarifies the current law, clears up an important omission of the original law, and yet does not disrupt the intent and purpose of the Land and Water Conservation Act in any way.

The Artificial Water Recharge System of Minot, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1966

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, thanks to some ingenuity in planning, and the scientific and technical skills displayed by representatives of the U.S. Geological Survey, the North Dakota Water Commission and the city of Minot, N. Dak., that city today appears to have temporarily solved a serious water supply deficiency problem.

In 1963–64, the water level in aquifers—subsurface, water-bearing rocks—in the Minot area, which provides the water supply for nearly 51,000 people at Minot and the Minot Air Force Base, was declining rapidly and approaching a critical level. A serious water shortage was considered imminent. The problem: how to "recharge" the water supply.

A geohydrologic and artificial recharge study was undertaken by the North Dakota Water Commission and the city of Minot, and Wayne A. Pettyjohn; of the U.S. Geological Survey's Water Resources Division in Bismarck, N. Dak., was named as project leader. Pettyjohn is a ground water geologist.

The study, which began in November 1963, showed that Minot's ground water reservoir would provide only about 3 million gallons of water per day without additional water-level declines. The city required an average of nearly 4 million gallons per day. Test drilling indicated that no additional ground water sources capable of large yields were present in the Minot area.

To halt the rapid water-level decline, an artificial ground-water recharge system was considered in which water would be diverted from the Souris River into a "spreading" basin where the water would rapidly filter downward to the natural ground water reservoir. Tests indicated a potentially good area for the construction of a recharge site at the extreme west end of Minot. However, because of the small area of available land, a new system of recharge had to be developed.

Following a period of experimentation, a recharge facility was constructed whereby untreated water is pumped from the Souris River to a rectangular basin about 70 by 125 feet, and nearly 35 feet deep.

The lower few feet of the site consists of sand and gravel, and the upper part is clay. Connected to the basin is a Y-shaped canal system. The canals were excavated in clay to a depth of 7 to 10 feet. In the canal system, are thirty-six 30-inch, and four 72-inch-diameter, gravel-filled bore holes ranging in depth from 20 to 30 feet. The lower feet of the bore holes are in dry sand and gravel, and the upper part is clay. The dry sand and gravel represent a part of the ground-water reservoir that was "dewatered" with the lowering of the water level.

Water is pumped from the Souris River to the large pit, and when the pit is full, water flows along the canals and into the bore holes. The water that filters through the bore holes reaches the ground-water reservoir and raises the water level.

The recharge system adds between 3.5 and 4.5 million gallons per day to the underground reservoir. Minot is now pumping about 40 percent of the daily water requirement from the Souris River and the remainder from the ground-water reservoir. Consequently, artificial recharge is adding to storage at least 2 million gallons per day that would normally flow as waste water down the Souris River. The water added to underground storage can be used in times of drought when the Souris River is very low.

The water level in the Minot ground-water reservoir has risen, in places, more than 20 feet since artificial recharge was first started in June 1965.

The cost of the bore hole type of artificial recharge is considerably less expensive than other conventional recharge methods if the geology permits this type of construction.

This cooperative effort on the part of local, State, and Federal representatives demonstrates what can be done to meet an immediate and pressing problem. This, however, is only a temporary solution. The long-range answer to the city of Minot's water supply problem can and will be found in supplemental water from the Garrison diversion project authorized by the Congress.

A preliminary open file report entitled "Geohydrology of the Souris River Valley in the Vicinity of Minot, North Dakota," by Wayne A. Pettyjohn, U.S. Geological Survey, Bismark, N. Dak., is being prepared and is expected to be ready for examination at Geological Survey offices before the end of this month.

Women's Club and Community Action Associations of Clay County Combine at Widen, W. Va., in Presenting Successful Arts and Crafts Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is being engendered in West Virginia, as in much of the Appalachian region, a movement to bring to the fore the heritage and traditions of Appalachia. Consistent with this activity there is emphasis on the development of programs and methods of fostering the excellent handiwork and craftsmanship which is found in the region.

Last fall, I was privileged to participate in the statewide Mountain State Arts and Crafts Festival initiated at Cedar Lake in Jackson County, W. Va. During its life, that fair was visited by more than 10,000 persons interested in observing and procuring items of unique mountain culture, crafts, and art forms.

Last Saturday, I was the guest of one of the contributing community components of the statewide Cedar Lakes festival when I visited the Widen Arts and Crafts Fair in Clay County. It was a truly inspirational experience in a community which formerly was a prosperous hub of profitable coal mining and timbering, but which has suffered considerable from obsolescence.

Yet, Mr. President, Widen Women's Club—now reduced to 17 determined, enterprising, and skillful ladies—and the hardy and resolute members of the 25 community action associations of Clay County combined to sponsor a superb fair. The display of mountain art and handcraft was such as to assure that the Widen and Clay County booth at the forthcoming statewide arts and crafts fair at Cedar Lakes will be among the most interesting and attractive. And those of the Widen fair's products to be displayed and sold by concessionaires at the Summersville and Sutton Reservoirs will doubtless be in demand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my speech at the first annual Arts and Crafts Fair of the Widen Arts and Crafts Center.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH AT THE FIRST ANNUAL ARTS AND CRAFTS FAIR OF THE WIDEN ARTS AND CRAFTS CENTER, WIDEN, W. VA., MAY 7, 1966

It is a genuine privilege to join with you at this first annual arts and crafts fair, sponsored by the Widen Women's Club and the Community Action Associations of Clay County.

Public acceptance and appreciation of the arts and crafts fair movement has been enthusiastic and outstanding. Many of these events have been so successful that they have been continued on an annual basis, just as you plan to continue the arts and crafts fair here. A tangible example of the attraction of these efforts to display West Virginia's unique mountain culture, crafts and art forms is the fact that in 1 year the Cedar Lakes Arts and Crafts Fair was visited by more than 10,000 persons. Residents of our Mountain State and also people from numerous States of the Nation attended. It has been brought to my attention that from the hundreds of articles on display here there will be selected exhibits to be shown at the statewide Cedar Lakes festival.

In developing this program, the organizational efforts of the Widen Women's Club, local community action associations, various art, craft, and business groups have been highly commendable. I am aware that your organization has been entirely financed by local contributions, in keeping with the traditions of the independence and hearty spirit of our mountaineer forebears.

There are gathered here artisans and craftsmen representing the entire spectrum of pioneer handicraft as well as outstanding examples of more modern artistry.

It is my understanding that your activities have attracted so much attention in Clay and neighboring counties that the State department of commerce has arranged to have these products sold by concessionaires at the Summersville and Sutton Reservoirs. In addition to providing an added source of income for many of you, this distribution will afford an opportunity to show thousands of persons from other States the distinctive handiwork and skills passed from generation to generation of mountain folk.

The march of time and the results of an automated society regrettably have necessitated the elimination of much of our primitive crafts and arts. However, it is my belief—which I am sure you share—that we are witnessing a revitalization and revival of past artistic forms and cultures so that the unique skills of earlier generations will not be lost, but will be preserved for the education and enjoyment of others.

There is an awareness in America of the importance of preserving the rich heritage which is ours. The Congress enacted legislation last year, which I cosponsored, which provides for the establishment of a National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities.

One of the provisions of this law especially meaningful is the section which authorizes a one-time grant of $25,000—with matching requirement—to States for establishment of a State agency on the arts and crafts. I am happy to report that we moved ahead of the provisions of the law and, under the guidance of Governor Hulett Smith, established a West Virginia State Arts Council. Again, we have an example of the progressive spirit of the mountaineers, manifesting itself in this notable event. West Virginia is now qualified for and has submitted an application for a $50,000 grant from the national foundation to assist in programs and services to provide facilities in the arts to communities and people in the State. The implementation of the provisions of the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 will result in considerable stimulus to the spread of cultural appreciation and attainment in our State and in other States as well.

Many persons believe—and wrongly so—that this legislation does not include the development of arts and crafts festivals such as we enjoy here. You may be assured that the definitions within the law do include folk art and projects in the craft arts.

In addition to this progress, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities has been involved in detailed discussions with the Appalachian Regional Commission toward the development of programs and methods of fostering the excellent handiwork and craftsmanship which is found in the 12 States comprising the Appalachian area. This is in no way an effort to intrude on established arts and crafts centers. It is only an endeavor—and a vital endeavor—to bring to the fore the regional heritage and traditions of Appalachia for the enjoyment of all citizens. And, this coordination with the Appalachian Commission does tie in effectively with the precepts of regional economic development. It can provide means of supplementing individual income and the development of profitable tourist attractions.

In a broader sense, the Nation, under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson, is engaged in an expansive campaign of beautification and conservation.

The Widen Arts and Crafts Fair constitutes a wholesome involvement in these efforts.

The President has called for an allout effort to make beauty and conservation and the preservation of our heritage the responsibility of business, private groups, all levels of government and, more importantly, of every citizen. He has reminded the Congress and the people that for centuries Americans have drawn strength and inspiration from the grandeur of their country—a fact which is familiar to West Virginians.

At the heart of this new conservation is the concept of balance. In the past, conservation has too often been viewed as an unequal battle between a few nature lovers and the implacable forces of city growth and industrial development. However, the realization has gradually developed—and the President's unprecedented messages to Congress on this subject are expressions of that realization—that a partnership can and must be effective.

Today, more than 7 out of every 10 Americans live in urban surroundings. There can be no romantic or pastoral escape from that basic reality, and herein lies our challenge. The challenge of conservation in our generation is to develop a proper balance among our various necessities—the need to earn a living; to enjoy the advantages of urban life and the equally desirable advantages of recreation in some reasonably accessible place; to have sparkling rivers, remote valleys and scenic beauty to visit if we choose; to protect wildflowers, forests, rivers, and other natural resources for the future.

It is not true that any two of these necessities must be diametrically opposed. It is not necessary to destroy scenic beauty in building a road. It is not necessary to pollute a river to such an extent that it kills the fish in order to have an industrial plant in which men and women can make their living. There is no necessary conflict between preserving areas of untrammeled wilderness and also establishing expanded facilities for mass recreation. There is no necessary conflict between preserving the individual craftsmanship and handiwork and the products of an automation-oriented society.

This broad challenge of conservation and beautification has been translated into proposals such as the Highway Beautification Act which I authored in the Senate, legislation on wild rivers and scenic areas, and the arts and humanities law.

But it is citizen participation in events such as the Widen Arts and Crafts Fair which is providing the groundwork for the widespread regeneration of public interest in beauty, history, and the rewarding cultural heritage which is ours.

West Virginia has surely been blessed with natural beauty, scenic attractions, and citizens who possess distinctive skills and crafts. We are proud of our legacy of pioneer independence and creativity. We are determined that our State will be at the forefront of the drive toward building a better America—a land of opportunity where we strive to encourage productivity, progress and prosperity for all.

I am confident that the Widen Arts and Crafts Fair will continue to make meaningful contributions to that end.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

Rev. Emory S. Ellmore, pastor, Nimmo-Salem Methodist Parish, Virginia Beach, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the many blessings which Thou hast given to our country that we may use them to Thy service. We thank Thee that Thou hearest our prayers as we call upon Thee.

Bless these Members of the U.S. Senate, and endow them with a right understanding, and pure purpose. Help them to rise to the larger sentiments of public good and human brotherhood. Bless all our citizens from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same. Stretch forth Thy hand of protection to guard our land and grant that we may be devoted to Thy service and defended by Thy power. Of Thy goodness give us, with Thy love inspire us, by Thy spirit guide us, by Thy love protect us.

Unite us all in Thy common blessing and may the knowledge of Thy righteousness and Thy love reign in all our hearts, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. INOUYE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 9, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1611. An act to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 2263. An act to establish a Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 9824. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended;

H.R. 13558. An act to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of

Columbia, including the examination licensure, registration of certified public accountants, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13703. An act to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code;

H.R. 14205. An act to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14732. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 9824. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended;

H.R. 13558. An act to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, registration of certified public accountants, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13703. An act to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code; and

H.R. 14205. An act to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works, and the Committee on Banking and Currency, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader, has that been cleared with the minority?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SENATOR DIRKSEN'S ACCIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last night, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] entered Walter Reed Hospital for the physical checkup which he undergoes periodically. During the early morning hours, while leaving his bed, Senator Dirksen fell and broke his hip.

This morning, he is to undergo surgery to reduce and set the fracture. It is my understanding that he will be hospitalized for 2 or 3 weeks and will require crutches for some time thereafter.

We tend to take for granted the presence in this Chamber of the gracious minority leader. His stamina, his voice, his manner, his charming uniqueness have become as familiar to us and as accepted a part of our routine as the ever-present clock over the Presiding Officer.

Senator Dirksen, is, indeed, a most vigorous and rugged man. But he is, as we all are, vulnerable to the inclemencies which beset the human species. That is something which we would do well to remember after the shock of this accident has passed and when the ever-accommodating and willing minority leader returns to our midst.

It is a source of great regret to all of us that Senator Dirksen must be subject to the discomfort and pain of the injury. It is reassuring to know, however, that Mrs. Dirksen will be nearby to comfort him. According to my understanding, the President has stopped for her at Knoxville on his way from Texas and is bringing her back to Washington.

I know that the Senate joins with me in welcoming Mrs. Dirksen's soothing presence in this situation. It will aid in fulfilling our wish that our colleague will have a most expeditious and efficacious recovery. Senator Dirksen will be missed greatly in the Senate even for the short time that he is expected to be away. Nevertheless, we do want him to take as much time as he needs, however much it may be, not only for a complete recovery but for a well-earned rest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. How characteristic of the very gracious and able majority leader to speak as he has just spoken concerning the leader of the minority in this Chamber, and how accurately he has described the feelings of each Member of the Senate.

Everett Dirksen will be hospitalized for 2 to 3 weeks. I spoke by telephone with the Walter Reed Hospital 2 hours ago, as preparations were being made to set the fracture which he most regrettably sustained.

During the period that he is absent from the Chamber, he will continue to know precisely what is taking place in the debates here in the Senate and in the committees in which he has a particular interest. I simply rise to speak on the Record the hope that each of us has, that with the grace of the Supreme Being, a unique American leader and a great Republican leader will speedily mend, and then will return to carry on his great efforts in behalf of the American people.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think I can express, as has the Senator from California, the appreciation of all Republicans, and without doubt the appreciation of all Members of the Senate, for the kindness of the majority leader in his expression of sympathy in connection with the accident which the Senator from Illinois suffered in the hospital about 3 o'clock this morning.

As stated by the Senator from California, the latest report, which we received a very short time ago, is that the operation has now been completed. I believe Senator Dirksen is in the recovery room, for whatever intensive care is necessary, and the doctors seem to be of the firm opinion that no complications are evident at the moment.

We do expect to have him back soon. He is, indeed, a valiant warrior in the forefront of his party's battles, and in the forefront of the battles of the American people for their rights and for the future of our country and its progress. We all wish him the best of luck and a speedy recovery. I think we can well anticipate, with a normal recovery, some rather pithy and descriptive remarks from him, when he comes back, about his experience in the hospital, and we probably will all be not only regaled but much better educated about hospital procedure when he returns to his labors and his duties. I do not mean to be facetious about that, but just practical, because, as we all know, Everett has a descriptive capacity which leaves not much to doubt when it comes to matters of that sort.

But, seriously, on this particular day, when we know that he is not comfortable and has undergone this accident and this operation, we wish him well. And I may say that we will discuss this a little further. We will have a Republican policy committee meeting at 12:30 today, and perhaps a conference for a very short time, and I feel quite confident that the majority leader, with his customary courtesy and consideration, will indulge us just a little if we may be 15 or 20 minutes late for certain activities after the lunch hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. I share with my colleagues the concern and solicitude being felt over the painful injury that our colleague, the minority leader, has suffered. It is unfortunate for him because he has suffered a number of other physical ailments, but we know that he has risen above them all, and has devoted himself to his duties in the Senate for the welfare of his State and country.

His absence will be felt by all of us. It will also be felt by the country because there is no issue, major or minor, which has come before the Senate to which he has not directed his great mental faculties, his oratory, and his humor—all with benefit to the people of the country.

Let me use a phrase we use in Kentucky, that I hope he will soon be back with us "sound in limb and voice."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore announced that on today, May 10, 1966, the Vice President signed the enrolled bill (S. 1308) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States in Favor of the Establishment of the U.S. Public Health Service Alcoholism Center in Boston

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson in his message to the Congress of the United States on the health needs of the Nation called for the creation of a $20 million Federal center for research into the cause, prevention, control, and treatment of alcoholism; and

Whereas alcoholism is the major cause of mental illness in Massachusetts and the primary cause of 50 percent of our highway death toll; and

Whereas the educational and medical resources available in the Boston area to work in conjunction with Federal authorities is unequaled anywhere in the entire country; and

Whereas the religious community in Boston and throughout Massachusetts has achieved an outstanding degree of unity of thought and action in aiding alcoholics and their families to cope with the problems of alcoholism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary for the establishment of the U.S. Public Health Service Alcoholism Center in Boston; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted, April 21, 1966.

William C. Maiers,
Clerk.

Attest:

Kevin H. White,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

By Mr. HARTKE:

A resolution adopted by Local Union No. 22, of the International Association of Bridge, Structural & Ornamental Iron Workers, Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the enactment of House bill 10027, relating to situs picketing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. Hayden), from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 14215. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1154).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Coast Guard. Since these names have previously appeared in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Roderick M. White, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3327. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve the programs under such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Metcalf):

S. 3328. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the disposal of certain medical materials and supplies whenever the remaining storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies is too short to justify their retention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3329. A bill for the relief of Maria Jordan Ferrando; and

S. 3330. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3331. A bill for the relief of Tommie Shou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3332. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal facilities, and to otherwise assure humane care and treatment of laboratory animals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hill when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3333. A bill for the relief of Manuel J. Tavis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 3334. A bill for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. Tower):

S. 3335. A bill to authorize the construction of extensions of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex., operation and maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3336. A bill to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS (for himself and Mr. Cooper):

S. 3337. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to facilitate the extension and improvement of rural electric and telephone service, and to strengthen and stabilize rural electrification and telephone systems by supplementation of the existing sources of Federal financing as provided by titles I and II of the Rural Electrification Act, to furnish additional sources of capital funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bass when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3338. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect horses shipped in interstate commerce to determine if such horses have been subjected to inhumane treatment for the purpose of affecting or altering their natural gait, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CLEAN WATERS ACT OF 1966

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a comprehensive water pollution bill, entitled the "Clean Waters Act of 1966." This bill is the fourth bill in a comprehensive package of water pollution control legislation which includes S. 2940, on waste disposal research; S. 1908, on ship pollution; and S. 1479, on detergent pollution.

My State of Wisconsin has a great stake in preserving its water resources. We have more than 8,000 inland lakes, a great number of outstanding river systems, some of the choicest wild trout streams, and hundreds of miles of Great Lakes shoreline on Lake Michigan and Lake Superior. These water resources constitute some of Wisconsin's most vital natural resources. They provide the backbone of a tourist and recreation industry which is worth close to a billion dollars a year to our State. They provide the water supply which is vital to our communities and to our expanding industries.

Because of our water resources, Wisconsin is an important world port. The harbors of Milwaukee and Superior are visited by ships from throughout the world, and this international trade is one of the backbones of Wisconsin's healthy economy.

Yet today, these precious water resources—in Wisconsin as well as in the rest of the Nation—are threatened as never before.

Every one of the resources I have mentioned—the crystal pure lakes in our remote north woods; the tumbling, frothing Flambeau River; the scenic St. Croix River which forms our boundary with Minnesota; the famous Four Lakes in Madison which have made our University of Wisconsin campus world famous; beautiful Green Bay, playground for yachtsmen and vacationing families from throughout the Nation; even vast Lake Superior and Lake Michigan—every one of these water resources is marked for destruction over the next decade or two, unless we act promptly to save them.

As you know, Lake Erie is already well on its way to becoming a polluted swamp. Southern Lake Michigan is so badly polluted that experts believe it may be 100 years—if ever—before it can be reclaimed. Bathing beaches have been closed for years along Lake Michigan, and the blight is steadily spreading up the western shore. In Green Bay, a tide of pollution is moving up the bay, year by year, ready to engulf and destroy millions of dollars in recreational resources. Dense clouds of algae are forming along the western shore of Lake Michigan, choking water intakes and providing a grim warning that the cancerous explosion of algae which is killing Lake Erie is also well advanced in Lake Michigan. At the far end of Lake Superior, the biggest and purest fresh water lake in the world, the Superior City Council is facing a pollution crisis, and scientists are sounding the first warnings of a river of pollution oozing out into this sparkling lake, soiling the shores of the Apostle Islands wilderness and depositing green scum on the scenic beaches of northern Michigan.

Pollution is a very complex problem which involves our whole way of life and our way of doing business. We cannot simply turn a valve and shut it off. We must attack it from many different angles in many different places. Consequently, we need a number of different pieces of legislation.

First of all, we need a comprehensive bill to deal with the great flood of municipal and industrial pollution which is so vast as to dwarf all other pollution problems. I think this bill meets the municipal pollution problem.

BILL IS OUTLINED

Most important is the feature of this bill which makes the construction of sewers and sewage treatment facilities a national responsibility with a No. 1 priority. The bill provides 90 percent Federal financing for any approved municipal project involving sewage collection and treatment. It would make up to $3 billion a year in Federal funds available to get this job done expeditiously.

The pollution crisis is deepening so rapidly that the Federal Government cannot any longer sit back and insist that other units of government solve the problem. The fact is, the job is not being done and never will be done unless we make this an urgent responsibility of the Federal Government. If the building of interstate highways is a task so urgent as to require 90 percent Federal financing, certainly the saving of our Great Lakes and our river systems is equally urgent and equally national in its significance.

At the present time, the Federal Government provides about 30 to 40 percent of the cost of municipal sewage systems, with a total authorization of $150 million a year. Many communities do not bother to apply for grants because they cannot raise the additional 70 percent of the cost from their overburdened property tax systems. Many of which do apply must wait for long periods to receive money because there are no grant funds available.

Additionally, there are various restrictions on the use of grant funds. Grants cannot exceed $1,200,000 for systems serving one municipality and $4,800,000 for systems serving more than one municipality. The Federal share of the costs of a large municipal system may thus be far below 30 percent. Also, at least half of the first $100 million appropriated must be used for grants to cities of 125,000 or less in population. As a result of these two restrictions, large municipalities with serious pollution and financial problems may not receive equitable treatment in the distribution of grant funds.

Thus, despite the fact that the present program of Federal grants has greatly accelerated the construction of municipal sewage treatment facilities, it is not adequate to do the job. Paul W. Reed, Chief of the Construction Grants Program, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, stated in May, 1965:

> In spite of the marked increase, construction has still not reached the level necessary to bring the municipal waste pollution problem under control during the present decade.

The Federal Government cannot continue to hide behind complicated grant restrictions and ceilings while our waters are being destroyed. We must step in to finance the job because that is the only way it ever will be done. This bill is designed to do that by providing 90 percent Federal cost sharing and a $3 billion authorization for unrestricted grants to municipalities.

SHARE CAN REACH 92 PERCENT

This bill offers still further incentives to hard-pressed but conscientious communities. If the State agrees to pay half of the community's share of the project—which is 10 percent of the total cost—then the Federal Government would pay an additional 1 percent. And if the project is a part of a comprehensive pollution control plan, the Federal Government would pay another 1 percent. So the Federal share could reach as high as 92 percent, and there would be no reason for any community to fail to install necessary sewage treatment facilities.

The feature of the bill which makes Federal grants available for all aspects of sewer construction and treatment—not just for treatment—is also important. This will encourage communities, where it is feasible to do so, to extend their sewer lines to nearby communities and to individual industries. It will lead to better coordinated sewer systems in our expanding communities.

A further incentive in the bill is a $1 billion loan fund, from which communities could borrow money temporarily to help meet their share of the costs.

NEW ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM

Another major feature is a new enforcement system. Since the present enforcement system was enacted in 1956, there have been a number of accomplishments. There have been 37 different enforcement proceedings. All of them have been successful in that they have brought together State, Federal, municipal, and industry representatives and have produced agreement on a pollution abatement program for a critical area. These proceedings have involved about 1,200 municipalities and an equal number of industrial plants. The measures for pollution abatement resulting from them will cost $1.8 billion, and will clean up 7,000 miles of rivers. I think we should continue to make the best possible use of this system.

However, Murray Stein, chief enforcement officer of the Water Pollution Control Administration, has stated that his office maintains dockets on 220 instances of interstate waters which require attention and that there are about 28,000 instances of intrastate waters which should be looked at. Thus, although accomplishments under the present enforcement procedure are impressive, much more needs to be done than can or is being done. Mr. Stein stated in June 1963:

> I don't know that we are doing very much more than about holding our own. We are certainly not spectacularly wiping out the pollution problem in this country.

And in May 1965, he stated:

> I am afraid that we have not won this war yet. For every battle we win, we lost one on another front.

James Quigley, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administrator, also testified last year that the agency was limited to working on the most grossly polluted waters, and that it might be 20 to 25 years before it could get to presently clean waters such as the St. Croix River—and by then, he conceded, it might be too late.

We need an enforcement system that will guarantee prompt action to clean up pollution anywhere before it destroys a water resource. We do not have that today.

As you know, under the present system, the Federal Government can initiate enforcement proceedings only if it can prove that pollution is interstate in its effects and endangers public health and welfare. This is extremely difficult, even in cases where commonsense indicates that it is quite obviously true. In fact, it is so costly and so difficult to prove that it is almost never undertaken.

If interstate pollution cannot readily be proved, the Federal Government must await an invitation from the Governor of a State, or a group of Governors. Even if this big hurdle is overcome, the procedure followed thereafter is extremely slow and a State municipality or an industry which wants to drag its feet can often do so for many years—during which time pollution continues to mount.

While continuing to use this system to the greatest possible benefit, we must devise a faster, more flexible enforcement system which can be brought to bear promptly against almost any form of pollution which occurs anywhere in the country, whether it is large or small in its consequences.

This bill would encourage every State to establish water quality standards and a plan to implement and enforce them by providing up to 90 percent of the cost of establishing standards and plans, and it authorizes $100 million for this purpose. Any pollution which violated or threatened to violate these water quality standards would be grounds for enforcement action by the State. It would not be necessary to prove a threat to public health and welfare, but merely the violating of these standards. The States would retain the primary responsibility for enforcement, just as they do today. But in those cases where States failed or refused to act, we would have the machinery available so that the Federal Government could act. We would no longer have to sit back and wait 20 or 25 years before an irreplaceable river was grossly polluted to such an extent that we would be invited to try to save it.

Federal enforcement regions would be established in major river basins, with ample authority, personnel and facilities to handle enforcement problems in their region. A national pollution surveillance system would continuously monitor all interstate and navigable waters and quickly reveal developing pollution situations. Pollution by any party which reduced or threatened to reduce the quality of water below the established standards would be subject to enforcement proceedings.

STRENGTHENED RESEARCH PROGRAMS

This bill does a number of other things. It increases from $5 million a year to $100 million the funds available for research into water pollution and sewage treatment methods. It increases from $20 million to $100 million the funds available for research and demonstrations in combined storm-sanitary sewers and any aspect of municipal sewer systems.

One thing lacking in this bill which I offer today is a system of incentives to industry to install greatly improved sewage and waste treatment facilities. Now being drafted is another bill to provide direct Federal grants to industries, along with fast Federal tax writeoffs, to encourage industry to pay the high costs involved in treating their wastes rather than simply dumping them into our public waters.

This bill also will provide a kind of pollution tax, to levy specific financial penalties against those firms which choose to continue polluting our public waters.

Industry will be helped in meeting its pollution problem by this bill, however. The liberal construction grants program will enable municipalities to tie industrial facilities to the municipal sewer system, and the expanded research programs will attack the problems of treating and disposing of the many new forms of industrial wastes which continue to appear.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanation, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3327) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve the programs under such act, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3327

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Clean Waters Act of 1966."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

"SECTION 1. (a) The Congress declares—

"(1) that the pollution and degradation of the water resources of the Nation has attained alarming proportions and will become increasingly worse in the future, seriously threatening and damaging the quality of human life and the growth and survival of all living things;

"(2) that the efforts of Federal, State, and local governments to prevent and control water pollution, while substantial and of increasing effectiveness, are not adequate to avoid the water pollution crisis which will soon confront the Nation;

"(3) that the States and municipalities have the primary responsibilities and rights for preventing and controlling water pollution, and that to assist them in fulfilling these responsibilities and rights, the Federal Government should provide technical services and financial aid to them;

"(4) that since water pollution and its effects often extend beyond the boundaries and exceed the financial, technical, and legal resources of individual States and municipalities, and they are theretofore not able or fail within a reasonable time to prevent and control pollution, the Federal government must then promptly assume the responsibility for doing so;

"(5) that each individual has a right to water resources for living which are free from pollutants which detract from their usability to him and adversely affect his health and welfare;

"(6) that no individual or group has a right to pollute water and that all individuals and groups bear the responsibility for any water pollution and pollution-related damages which he or they have caused;

"(7) that steps to control and prevent pollution of water resources should not contribute to pollution of air and soil, but should be part of a general effort to prevent and control water, air, and soil pollution;

"(8) that the advanced scientific, technological, and industrial capabilities of the Nation, including systems analysis and systems engineering, must be fully exploited to control and prevent water pollution; and

"(9) that water is an indispensable natural resource which must be carefully conserved and exploited to protect and advance the health and welfare of the Nation.

"(b) The purposes of this Act therefore are to enhance the quality and value of the Nation's water resources, and to establish a national policy for the prevention and control of water pollution by—

"(1) streamlining and strengthening the organization and administration arrangements for the implementation and enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act;

"(2) encouraging and assisting in comprehensive and flexible water pollution control planning by States and municipalities;

"(3) encouraging and assisting in the formation of interstate and intermunicipal water pollution control agencies, and the adoption of uniform water pollution control laws by States and municipalities;

"(4) providing funds, technical advice, and other assistance to States and municipalities for the planning, construction, and operation of sewage collection, treatment and disposal systems; and

"(5) financing, assisting in, encouraging, and carrying on research, investigation, development, and demonstration in water resources and water pollution control.

"(c) The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare shall administer this Act through the Administration created by section 2 of this Act.

"(d) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States."

SEC. 3. The heading of section 4 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and subsection (a) of such section are amended to read as follows:

"INTERMUNICIPAL AND INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and by the municipalities for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved, and, so far as practicable, uniform State and municipal laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States and municipalities for the prevention and control of water pollution."

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may, upon request of any State water pollution control agency, interstate or intermunicipal water pollution control agency, municipality, or community, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate or intermunicipal agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view of recommending a solution of such problem: *Provided,* That in the case of a community, municipality, industrial plant, or intermunicipal agency, the Secretary shall arrange for the participation in such investigation, research or survey, of the water pollution control agency of the State in which the community, municipality, industrial plant, or intermunicipal agency is located."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, and for each succeeding fiscal year, $100,000,000."

(c) Such section is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Secretary is hereby authorized to request from any Federal department or agency, and such department or agency is directed to grant, the use of any sewage collection, treatment or disposal installation or facility for the purpose of testing and evaluating new methods, procedures, and equipment for water pollution control: *Provided,* That in the judgment of the department or agency concerned such test and evaluation work will not disrupt, disorganize, or in any way interfere with the normal activity, operations, and functioning of such agency or department: *Provided further,* That any expense incurred in such test and evaluation work above and beyond the normal and usual expense of operating the sewage collection, treatment, or disposal installation or facility shall be borne by the Secretary."

SEC. 5. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency, to any qualified private agency, group, company, institute, or individual, or to any public or private university or college for the purpose of—

"(1) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, or

"(2) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate new or advanced features of sewage collection and treatment systems, including joint industrial-municipal systems, and new or advanced sewage treatment and water purification methods, processes and facilities, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith."

(b) The first sentence of subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, and for each of the next nine fiscal years, the sum of $100,000,000."

(c) Such section is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) For the purpose of generally guiding, and facilitating the collection and exchange of results and other information regarding, research and development on the problems and solutions to the problems, of combined storm-sanitary sewers, the Secretary shall organize an intergovernmental committee on combined storm-sanitary sewers. The committee shall include as members (1) a representative of his department designated by the Secretary, who shall serve as chairman; (2) representatives of State and municipal agencies, Federal government agencies, and interstate and intermunicipal agencies, engaged in significant research, development, or other work on the problems of combined storm-sanitary sewers, appointed by the Secretary; and (3) other persons appointed by the Secretary who in his opinion would make a contribution to solving the problems of combined storm-sanitary sewers."

SEC. 6. Section 7 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"WATER QUALITY STANDARDS AND PLANS

"SEC. 7. (a) (1) With the objective of abating and preventing water pollution, and preserving and enhancing the quality of the Nation's water resources, the Secretary shall encourage each State, and each interstate water pollution control agency having the necessary authority, to adopt before June 30, 1968, water quality standards and a plan for the implementation and enforcement of such standards, applicable to the navigable and interstate waters within such State or within the purview of such interstate water pollution control agency, and in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(2) Standards of water quality shall be such as to protect the public health and welfare, enhance the quality of the water for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational, agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses, and serve the purposes of this Act.

"(3) Water quality standards plans, in addition to establishing standards of water quality, shall—

"(A) provide for the administration or for the supervision of the administration of the plan by the State water pollution control agency, or, in the case of a plan submitted by an interstate agency, by such agency;

"(B) provide that such agency will make reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act;

"(C) set for the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the plan and in its administration;

"(D) provide for extension or improvement of the State or interstate program for prevention and control of water pollution;

"(E) provide such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan.

"(b) (1) If the Governor of a State or a State water pollution control agency, or an interstate water pollution control agency, files, within six months after the date of enactment of the Clean Waters Act, of 1966, a letter of intent that such State or such interstate agency, after public hearings, will before June 30, 1968, adopt water quality standards and a water quality standards plan in accordance with subsection (a), and if such standards and plan are established in accordance with the letter of intent, and if the Secretary determines that such State or such interstate agency standards and plan are consistent with subsection (a), such standards and plan shall thereafter be applicable to the navigable and interstate waters in such State or within the purview of such interstate water pollution control agency.

"(2) If a State or an interstate agency does not (A) file a letter of intent or (B) establish water quality standards and a water quality standards plan in accordance with subsection (a), or if the Secretary or the Governor of any State or any interstate water pollution control agency affected by water quality standards and a plan established pursuant to subsection (a) desires a revision in such standards or plan, the Secretary may, after reasonable notice and a conference of representatives of appropriate Federal departments and agencies, interstate agencies, States, municipalities, and industries involved, promulgate water quality standards and a water quality standards plan in accordance with paragraph (2) of subsection (a) applicable to the navigable and interstate waters in such State or within the purview of such interstate water pollution control agency.

"(3) If at any time prior to 30 days after standards have been promulgated under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Governor of any State affected by such standards petitions the Secretary for a hearing, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the water quality standards will take effect, before a Hearing Board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State which would be affected by such standards shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the Hearing Board. The Department of Commerce and other affected Federal departments and agencies shall each be given an opportunity to select a member of the Hearing Board and not less than a majority of the Hearing Board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while participating in the hearing conducted by such Hearing Board or otherwise engaged on the work of such Hearing Board, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notice of such hearing shall be published in the Federal Register and given to the State water pollution control agencies, interstate agencies, and municipalities involved at least 30 days prior to the date of such hearing. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the Hearing Board shall make findings as to whether the standards promulgated by the Secretary should be approved or modified and transmit its findings to the Secretary. If the Hearing Board approves the standards as promulgated by the Secretary, the standards shall take effect on receipt by the Secretary of the Hearing Board's recommendations. If the Hearing Board recommends modifications in the standards as promulgated by the Secretary, the Secretary shall promulgate revised regulations setting forth standards of water quality in accordance with the Hearing Board's recommendations which will become effective immediately upon promulgation.

"(c) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, and for each succeeding fiscal year, $100,000,000 for grants to States and to interstate water pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining water quality standards and plans as provided by subsection (a), including the cost of training personnel for State and local water pollution control work.

"(2) The portion of the sums appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for a fiscal year which shall be available for grants to interstate agencies and the portion thereof which shall be available for grants to States shall be specified in the Act appropriating such sums.

"(3) From such sums the Secretary shall make grants of up to 90 per centum of the cost of establishing and maintaining water quality standards and plans, the amount—

"(A) for any State to be determined by the Secretary on the basis of financial need and the extent of the water pollution problem, and allotted by him to the respective States according to such regulations as he shall devise; and

"(B) for any interstate agency to be determined by the Secretary on such basis as he finds reasonable and equitable, and allotted by him according to such regulations as he shall devise, but such regulations relating to the portion of the cost of carrying out the interstate agency's plan which shall be borne by the United States shall be designed to place such agencies, so far as practicable, on a basis similar to that of the States.

"(4) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing, finds that the water quality standards or the water quality standards plan established by the Governor of a State or a State water pollution control agency, or an interstate water pollution control agency, under subsection (a), has been so changed that it fails to comply in whole or in part with the requirements of such subsection, he shall notify such State or such interstate agency that no further payments will be made under this subsection (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made for the part of the standards or plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments to such State or such interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or shall limit payments to parts of the standards and plan in which there is no such failure).

"(5) If any State or any interstate agency is dissatisfied with the Secretary's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Secretary, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(d) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (c) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Secretary shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State or to each interstate agency under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State or the interstate agency and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Secretary may find necessary.

"(2) The Secretary shall pay to the State or to the interstate agency, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid such State or such interstate agency for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State or such agency for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Secretary may determine."

SEC. 7. Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, community, or interstate or intermunicipal water pollution control agency for the construction of sewage collection and treatment systems, including completion and improvement of existing systems, their extension to residential areas and industrial establishments not included in them, and the formation of intermunicipal systems, to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters, and for the purpose of reports, plans and specifications in connection therewith.

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations:

"(1) no grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive plan developed pursuant to this Act;

"(2) grants for projects shall be made in the amount of 90 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary: *Provided,* That if a State agrees to pay 50 per centum of the balance remaining after the Secretary has established the amount of the Federal share, that share shall be increased by the Secretary by an amount equal to 10 per centum of that balance: *Provided further,* That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost: *Provided further,* That, in the case of a project which will serve more than one municipality the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable, allocate to each municipality to be served by such project its share of the estimated reasonable cost of such project, and shall then apply the limitations provided in this clause (2) to each such share as if it were a separate project to determine the maximum amount of any grant which could be made under this section with respect to each such share;

"(3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring that the system possesses the flexibility and capacity for expansion necessary for adapting it to future needs and demands, and for proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the system after completion of the construction thereof; and

"(4) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water quality standards plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 7 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial and water pollution control needs.

"(c) In determining the desirability of projects and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Secretary to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of the project to the public interest and to the public necessity for the project, the contribution of the project to the improvement of water quality and the preservation and enhancement of water resources, and the use by the applicant of comprehensive regional or metropolitan area planning. The sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (d) for each fiscal year shall be allotted to the States by the Secretary, in accordance with regulations, as follows:

"(1) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and

"(2) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income of the United States by the per capita income of such State bears to the sum of such quotients for all the States. All sums in excess of $2,000,000,000 appropriated pursuant to subsection (d) for each fiscal year shall be allotted by the Secretary from time to time, in accordance with regulations, in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all States. Sums allotted to a State under the two preceding sentences which are not obligated within six months following the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of projects which have been approved by the State water pollution control agency under subsection (b) (1) of this section and certified as entitled to priority under subsection (b) (4) of this section, shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States having projects approved under this section for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds: *Provided, however,* That whenever a State has funds subject to reallocation and the Secretary finds that the need for a project in a community in such State is due in part to any Federal institution or Federal construction activity, he may, prior to such reallocation, make an additional grant with respect to such project which will in his judgment reflect an equitable contribution for the need caused by such Federal institution or activity. Any sum made available to a State by reallotment under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act. The allotments of a State under the second, third, and fourth sentence of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section. For purposes of this section, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest decennial census for which figures are available, as certified by the Secretary of Commerce, and per capita income for each State and for the United States shall be determined on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, and for each of the succeeding five fiscal years, $3,000,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section. The sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"(e) The Secretary shall make payments under this section through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project for which the amount was paid. As used in this section the term 'construction' includes preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of projects, the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action necessary to the construction of systems; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of systems; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of systems.

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant made under subsection (b) of this section by an additional 1 per centum of the amount of such grant for any project which has been certified to him by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered under State or local laws or interstate compact to perform metropolitan or regional planning for a metropolitan area within which the assistance is to be used, or other agency or instrumentality designated for such purposes by the Governor (or Governors in the case of interstate planning) as being in conformity with the comprehensive plan developed or in process of development for such metropolitan area. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'metropolitan area' means either (1) a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, except as may be determined by the President as not being appropriate for the purposes hereof, or (2) any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof.

"(g) The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects for which grants are made under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing for the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C., secs. 276a through 276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(h) Any State that shall use the proceeds of bonds issued by the State, county, city, or other political subdivision of the State for the construction of one or more projects which otherwise would be eligible for a grant under this section may claim payment of any portion of the sums allotted or reallotted to it under this section to aid in the retirement of the principal of such bonds at their maturities, to the extent that the proceeds of such bonds have been actually expended in the construction of one or more of such projects. Such claim for payment may be made only when all of the provisions of this Act have been complied with to the same extent and with the same effect as though payment were to be made to the State for a project for future construction, and the Federal share payable with respect to such project shall not exceed the amount which a grant could have been made under this section for such project.

"(i)(1) Upon application the Secretary may make a loan to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency which he has agreed to make a grant to pursuant to this section, for the purpose of helping to finance its share of the cost of construction for which such grant is made. Any such loan shall be made only (A) after the Secretary determines that such State, municipality, or agency has made satisfactory provision for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works being constructed after completion of such construction, and (B) if such State, municipality, or agency shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Secretary determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this section. Loans pursuant to this subsection shall bear interest at a rate which the Secretary determines to be adequate to cover the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made pursuant to this subsection.

"(2) Loans pursuant to this subsection shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Secretary to be appropriate but not exceeding forty years.

"(3) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection but not to exceed a total of $1,000,000,000. No loan or loans pursuant to this subsection with respect to any one project shall exceed an amount equal to 10 per centum of such total."

SEC. 8. Section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"ENFORCEMENT OF WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT AND PREVENTION

"SEC. 10. (a) (1) The discharge of sewage into interstate or navigable waters within or adjacent to any State or States, or into tributaries of such waters, which reduces or threatens to reduce at a future time, the quality of such waters below the water quality standards established pursuant to section 7 is subject to permanent abatement and prevention in accordance with subsection (b), as administered by the Secretary through the organization created by this section.

"(2) The Secretary shall establish as an independent part of the Administration established by section 2, an Enforcement Division (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Division') to conduct all of the scientific and technical, as well as the administrative, legal, and investigatory functions necessary to carry out subsection (b). The Secretary shall designate major river drainage basins, or parts of such basins, as water pollution abatement and prevention enforcement regions (hereinafter in this Act referred to as 'Regions'), employing economic, demographic, political and other such criteria to determine the extent and boundaries of each such Region. Each Region shall have an enforcement organization which shall possess the authority, responsibility, staff, and resources to administer and apply fully within the region the provisions of subsection (b).

"(3) The head of the Division shall be appointed, and his compensation shall be fixed, by the Secretary, and the Secretary shall delegate to him authority and responsibility for the administration and application of subsection (b). The head of the Division shall obtain the administrative, professional, technical, and clerical staff of the Division from within or outside the Department as directed by the Secretary and authorized by law; and he may delegate any of his functions to, or otherwise authorize their performance by, any person assigned or detailed to the Division.

"(4) For the purpose of detecting, measuring, and tracing pollutants which are degrading or threaten to degrade the quality of interstate or navigable waters or tributaries thereto, below the standards established pursuant to section 7, the Secretary shall maintain, by such means and procedures as he considers appropriate, a system for surveillance of all interstate and navigable waters. This surveillance system shall be used primarily for enforcement purposes, although it may also serve such research purposes at the Secretary shall direct.

"(5) The Secretary is hereby authorized to make and enforce any rules and regulations, and establish any offices, functions, and activities not specifically authorized herein, which he considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(b) (1) Reports or complaints that the discharge of sewage is degrading, or will degrade at some future time, the quality of some portion of interstate or navigable waters, or of tributaries thereto, below the standards established pursuant to section 7 shall be received by the Secretary, by the head of the Administration, the head of the Division, or the head of a Region within the Division, from the surveillance system established by subsection (a) (4), from the Governor of a State, a State water pollution control agency, an interstate water pollution control agency, the governing body of a municipality, an intermunicipal agency, or from a private organization, agency, or individual. The head of the Region within which the alleged degradation of water quality is occurring, or, in the event that two or more Regions are involved, the head of that Region in which are located the major sources of sewage responsible for the alleged degradation of water quality, shall initiate and carry through the enforcement proceedings established by this subsection.

"(2) Upon the receipt of a report under paragraph (1), the head of a Region shall notify the Governor of the State involved, and such other public and private organizations as he considers appropriate and as the Secretary may direct. He shall also immediately undertake a preliminary study and investigation to determine the existence, character, scope, and sources of the degradation of water quality alleged in the report. If he determines, on the basis of the findings of this study and investigation, and in no case more than 45 days after the receipt of the original report, (A) that the degradation of water quality alleged in the report is not occurring, or that it is occurring, but that the party or parties discharging the sewage responsible for this degradation have undertaken a program which, in his judgment, will abate and prevent the degradation of water quality within a reasonable period, he shall so inform the party which submitted the report, the Governor of the State involved, and such other public and private organizations and agencies as he considers appropriate, stating in full the findings of the study and investigation which support this conclusion; (B) that the degradation of water quality alleged in the report is occurring and that no program which will abate and prevent the degradation of water quality within a reasonable period has been undertaken, he shall convene at a convenient location, and after a 15-day notification to participants, a conference of public and private agencies and organizations involved, and such other parties as he considers appropriate, and shall serve as its chairman.

"(3) The conference shall consider the findings of the study and investigation undertaken to substantiate the report of water quality degradation, and such other information as may be placed before it by any of the participants. It may also request that additional studies and investigations be conducted, and hold public hearings. Within 30 days after it has convened, the conference shall prepare and issue a conference report which shall (A) specify in detail the scope, character, and sources of, (B) determine and assign responsibility for, and (C) present recommendations regarding the steps to be taken to abate and prevent the discharge of sewage causing the degradation of water quality which the conference was convened to consider.

"(4) On the basis of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this conference report, and within 45 days after it is issued, the head of the enforcement region responsible for the enforcement proceedings shall issue abatement and prevention orders to the party or parties designated in the conference report as being responsible for the sewage discharges causing the degradation of water quality to take action to permanently stop such discharges, including the construction, improvement, and expansion of any aspect of a sewage collection and disposal system; he shall also indicate in such orders the period of time within which such actions must be taken and completed.

"(5) The head of a Region within which is located a party to which an abatement and prevention order is directed shall assess, through the water quality surveillance system established by subsection (a) (4), by direct inspection of premises and installations, and by other means, the progress of such a party in fulfilling the terms of the order. If he concludes that a party is willfully failing or neglecting to fulfill the terms of an order directed to it, and the party is not appealing the order to the Secretary under paragraph (6), he shall request a United States district attorney to bring suit on behalf of the United States to secure compliance to the order.

"(6) Any party subject to an abatement and prevention order under paragraph (4), or the Governor or the water pollution control agency of the State in which such a party is located, may appeal to the Secretary for relief from all or any part of the order. The Secretary shall establish within the Office of the Secretary a permanent appeals advisory board, staffed by competent persons appointed by him, to advise him on the disposition of appeals from abatement and prevention orders. When an appeal is referred to it, the advisory board shall review the conference report and the abatement and prevention order based on it as provided by paragraphs (3) and (4). It may also request additional information and hold public hearings. It shall then make a recommendation to the Secretary for the disposition of the appeal. Upon receiving the recommendation of the appeals advisory board, and in no case more than 45 days after the appeal is received, the Secretary shall (A) reaffirm the original abatement and prevention order, in which case the responsible Region head shall proceed according to paragraph (4); or (B) he shall direct the Region head who issued the original abatement and prevention order to amend the order, or to consider it for amendment, and for this purpose the Secretary may further direct him to reconvene the conference provided by paragraph (2). If an amended order is issued, the responsible Region head shall then proceed according to paragraph (4).

"(c) (1) In administering this section, every effort shall be made to encourage and assist the States and municipalities, interstate and inter-municipal agencies, and private agencies and organizations, to act to detect, prevent, and abate pollution under the provisions of this and other Acts, but action under the provisions of this section shall not be deferred when they fail to do so reasonably and promptly.

"(2) Enforcement proceedings under subsection (b) may be terminated at any point when it is determined that the party or parties involved have undertaken a program which will abate and prevent the degradation of water quality within a reasonable period."

SEC. 9. (a) Section 13 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out paragraph (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The term 'sewage' means water-diluted and water-borne wastes of all kinds from domestic, public, commercial, industrial, and agricultural buildings, installations, and operations, and from public streets and highways.

"(d) The term 'collection and treatment system' includes related drainage, feeder, trunk, lateral, and interceptor pipelines, treatment works, pumping stations, outfall pipelines, conversion facilities, and all ancillary pipelines, structures, and equipment involved in collecting and treating sewage."

(b) Such section is further amended by redesignating paragraphs (d), (e), and (f) as (e), (f), and (g), respectively, and by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(h) The term 'intermunicipal agency' means an agency of two or more municipalities established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the State in which they are located, or any other agency of two or more municipalities, having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the control of pollution of waters."

SEC. 10. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective on and after July 1, 1966.

CLEAN WATERS ACT OF 1966—A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AS AMENDED

(Would amend sections 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13.)

(Amendments would be effective July 1, 1966.)

Present law	*Proposed amendment*
SECTION 1	
(a) Purpose of the act is to enhance the value of water resources and establish a national policy for water pollution control.	(a) Congress declares that water pollution is seriously threatening the quality of human life and the survival of all living things; that efforts of Federal, State, and local governments are inadequate to control pollution; that States and municipalities have primary responsibility for pollution control, and the Federal Government is to give them technical and financial aid; that the Federal Government must act to control pollution when the States and municipalities fail to do so; that the individual has a right to pure water resources; that no individual or group has a right to pollute and all must bear responsibility for pollution; that water, air, and soil pollution must be controlled together; that advanced scientific and engineering capabilities must be used to control pollution; and that indispensable water resources must be carefully conserved and exploited.
(b) In exercising its jurisdiction over the waterways to control pollution, Congress recognizes the primary responsibilities of the States, and intends that the Federal Government provide financial and technical aid to States, municipalities, and interstate agencies, and support and conduct research. The act is to be administered by the Secretary through the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2.	(b) The purposes of the act are to enhance the value of water resources and establish a national policy for water pollution control by strengthening implementation and enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; encouraging pollution control planning by States and municipalities; encouraging interstate and intermunicipal compacts and uniform State and municipal pollution control laws; providing financial, technical and other assistance to States and municipalities for sewer system construction; and financing, encouraging, and carrying out research work and demonstration projects in water resources and water pollution.
(c) The act does not impair the right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters of the States.	(c) The act is to be administered by the Secretary through the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2. (d) The act does not impair the right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters of the States.
SECTION 4	
(a) Secretary to encourage cooperation, uniform laws, and compacts among States regarding water pollution.	(a) Secretary to encourage cooperation, uniform laws and compacts among States and municipalities regarding water pollution.
SECTION 5	
(b) Secretary may investigate water pollution problems at the request of a State or an interstate agency.	(b) Secretary may investigate water pollution problems at the request of a State, an interstate or intermunicipal agency, or a municipality or community, with the State participating in the investigation.
(d) Authorizes $5 million per fiscal year to a total of $25 million for pollution and treatment research.	(d) Authorizes $100 million for pollution and treatment research for subsequent fiscal years. (g) Secretary may use the sewage collection and disposal facilities of Federal installations for pollution and treatment research and demonstrations.
SECTION 6	
(a) Secretary may make grants to States and municipalities, and to interstate and intermunicipal agencies, for research and demonstration work on the problem of combined storm-sanitary sewers.	(a) Secretary may make grants to States and municipalities, and to interstate and intermunicipal agencies, and to private groups, organizations and individuals, for research and demonstration work on the problem of combined storm-sanitary sewers, and on advanced sewage collection and treatment systems, including combined municipal-industrial systems.
(c) Authorizes $20 million per fiscal year for current and 3 succeeding fiscal years for research and demonstration work.	(c) Authorizes $100 million per fiscal year for the next 10 fiscal years for research and demonstration work. (d) A committee is created to guide and coordinate research and development work on combined sanitary-storm sewers with members from Federal, State, and local governments and private groups and organizations.

CLEAN WATERS ACT OF 1966—A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AS AMENDED—Continued

Present law	*Proposed amendment*
SECTION 7	
(a) Authorizes $5 million per fiscal year through fiscal year 1968 for grants to States and interstate agencies to assist them to meet the cost of establishing and maintaining adequate measures (plan) for water pollution prevention and control. (f) Establishes administrative criteria for pollution prevention and control plan. (g) Secretary may stop or reduce grants when a State or interstate agency changes its plan so that it no longer meets the established criteria. A State or interstate agency may appeal such action by the Secretary to a U.S. court. (h) Federal grants under subsection (a) shall not be less than one-third or more than two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining a plan.	(a) Secretary is to encourage each State and interstate agency to establish before June 30, 1968, water quality standards and a plan to implement and enforce them, which adhere to use and administrative criteria set forth in this subsection. Such standards and plans will apply to the interstate or navigable waters within the purview of the State or interstate agency. (b) If a State or an interstate agency does not establish such standards and plan, the Secretary may do so after holding a conference of appropriate public and private parties. The Governor of a State may appeal standards and a plan so established by the Secretary to a hearing board convened for that purpose. The Secretary shall revise the standards and plan according to the recommendations, if any, of this board, after which they will become effective. (c) Authorizes $100 million per fiscal year for the next and succeeding fiscal years for grants to States and interstate agencies of up to 90 percent of the cost of establishing and maintaining water quality standards and plans. The Secretary may reduce or stop grant payments if a State or an interstate agency changes its water quality standards and plan so that they no longer meet the criteria established by this section. A State or interstate agency may appeal such an action by the Secretary to a U.S. court.
SECTION 8	
(a) Secretary may make grants to States and municipalities, and interstate and intermunicipal agencies, for projects for construction, improvement, and extension of treatment works and ancillary facilities, and outfall and interceptor sewer lines.	(a) Secretary may make grants to States and municipalities, and to interstate and intermunicipal agencies, for projects for construction, improvement, and extension of treatment works and ancillary facilities, interceptor, collection and outfall sewer lines, and any other aspect of municipal sewer systems.
(b) Grants made in amounts up to 30 percent of project costs, but not to exceed $1,200,000 for single, and $4,800,000 for multiple, municipality projects.	(b) Grants made in amounts of 90 percent of project costs, without an absolute ceiling. An additional 1 percent provided if a State pays 50 percent of the non-Federal share of project costs.
(d) Authorizes $150 million per fiscal year for the current and one succeeding fiscal year for grants. At least $50 million of each fiscal year appropriation must be used in grants to municipalities of 125,000 or less in population.	(d) Authorizes $3 billion per fiscal year for the next 6 fiscal years without restriction on grants with respect to municipality size.
(f) Grants increased by an additional 10 percent of the grant amount for projects which are a part of a metropolitan or regional plan.	(f) Grants increased by an additional 1 percent of grant amount for projects which are a part of a metropolitan or regional plan.
	(h) Municipalities may recover through grants under this section funds previously expended for projects. (i) Establishes a loan fund from which the Secretary may make low-interest loans to States and municipalities, and intermunicipal and interstate agencies, to help them meet the non-Federal share of project costs. Authorizes funds up to a total of $1 billion for this purpose.
SECTION 10	
(a) Pollution of interstate or navigable waters which endangers the health and welfare of any persons subject to abatement enforcement proceedings under this section.	(a) Pollution of interstate or navigable waters which reduces or threatens to reduce water quality below the water quality standards established under section 7 is subject to abatement enforcement proceedings under this section. The Secretary is to establish an independent pollution abatement enforcement Division within the Water Pollution Control Administration, and enforcement regions in major river basins or parts thereof. Each region shall possess an enforcement organization with full authority, responsibility, personnel and resources for enforcement work within the region. The Secretary shall also establish a national water quality surveillance system for all interstate and navigable waters for enforcement and research purposes.
(b) State and interstate pollution abatement action not to be displaced by Federal enforcement action under this section except through a court order.	(b) Reports of pollution may be sent to the Secretary, or the head of the Administration, the division, or a region, by any governmental or private group or individual regardless of the sources, character, or interstate or intrastate effects of the pollution. After notifying the States affected, the head of the appropriate region undertakes a study of the reported pollution. If he finds that pollution is occurring, and that no progress toward abating it is being planned or made, he convenes a conference of public and private agencies and other parties involved, and serves as its chairman.
(d) In the case of interstate pollution the Secretary may, at the request of a State Governor or pollution control agency, or, with the permission of the State, a municipality, call a conference of the State and interstate agencies affected, who may bring other representatives. The Secretary may also call such a conference on the basis of studies-investigations he conducts. In the case of intrastate pollution, the Secretary may call such a conference only at the request of a governor. (e) If the conference determines that pollution exists and that no progress toward abating it is being made, the Secretary shall recommend abatement action to the States. (f) If the recommended action is not taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing before a hearing board appointed by him from among Federal and State agency representatives. If the board determines that pollution is occurring and that progress toward abating it is not being made, it recommends appropriate measures to the Secretary. The Secretary sends these recommendations to the parties responsible for the pollution, and to the State and interstate agencies affected.	

CLEAN WATERS ACT OF 1966—A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AS AMENDED—Continued

SECTION 10—continued

Present law	*Proposed amendment*
(g) If action to abate pollution is still not taken, the Secretary may, in the case of interstate pollution, ask the U.S. Attorney General to bring suit to gain abatement. In the case of intrastate pollution, he may so proceed only with the written consent of the Governor of the State involved.	The conference considers reports and other evidence regarding the reported pollution, and issues a report detailing the character and sources of, and responsibility for the pollution, and making recommendations for abating and preventing it. On the basis of the conference report, the region head issues pollution abatement enforcement orders to the responsible parties named in the report, specifying appropriate abatement action and a time period for compliance. The region head subsequently assesses by various means the progress made by responsible parties in meeting the terms of the abatement and prevention order. If he concludes that the order is not being fulfilled, he may ask a U.S. district attorney to bring suit to gain compliance, unless the order is being appealed under further provisions of this section. Any party subject to an abatement and prevention order, or the State in which any such party is located, may appeal an order to the Secretary. The Secretary shall establish within his office a permanent appeals advisory board, and such appeals shall be referred to it. The board reviews the conference report on which the order was based, and other evidence, and makes a disposition recommendation to the Secretary. The Secretary either reaffirms the original order or, with a view to amending it, directs the region head to reconvene the conference which issued the report on which the order was based. (c) Federal pollution prevention and abatement enforcement action under this section shall be undertaken only when and where the States, municipalities, interstate or intermunicipal agencies, or private parties, fail to act under this and other acts. Enforcement proceedings may be terminated at any point when it is determined that the parties involved have taken action to abate and prevent pollution.
SECTION 13	
(c) Defines the term "treatment works" as meaning the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alterations thereof.	(c) Defines the term "sewage" as meaning water-diluted and water-borne wastes of all kinds from domestic, public, commercial, industrial, and agricultural buildings, installations, and operations, and from public streets and highways. (d) Defines the term "collection and treatment system" as meaning related drainage, feeder, trunk, lateral, and interceptor pipelines, treatment works, pumping stations, outfall pipelines, conversion facilities, and all ancillary pipelines, structures, and equipment involved in collecting and treating sewage.

BILL TO STOP WASTE OF PHS MEDICAL SUPPLIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, during the past year the Public Health Service has been forced to destroy $19 million worth of medical supplies—supplies that could have relieved human suffering and misery had they been used before their useful life expired on some storage shelf.

This is only the beginning. A year ago the Public Health Service estimated that $62 million worth of these stored supplies had deteriorated, or would do so in a few years, to the point that they are unfit for human use. With each passing year, Mr. President, additional millions of dollars worth of supplies become dated and must be destroyed.

These needed supplies are stored in more than 2,000 locations around the country as part of our civil defense stockpile. Most of them are part of the so-called packaged disaster hospitals—200-bed hospitals that are not available for current use but are kept in waiting for a disaster.

In these hospitals and in other types of storage are medicines, including antibiotics, and rubber gloves, adhesive tape, bandages, aspirin, medical equipment of all kinds. In short, everything that is needed in a hospital of that size, and it is all slowly deteriorating.

Mr. President, I am not challenging the packaged hospital plan or the Public Health Service for its administration of it. I am challenging the law—yes, the law—that is forcing the health service to leave these medical supplies on the shelf until they are no longer fit for human use. I propose to change this restrictive law so that these vitally needed materials can be taken out of storage before their shelf life expires and be used by other Government agencies, sold as surplus or donated to public or private nonprofit health organizations.

The problem is that these supplies were bought and stored as a precaution against some future disaster. There is no way in which the Public Health Service can allow their removal until their storage life has expired and they must be destroyed.

I am proposing for myself, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to allow these medical materials to be designated "excess" a short time before their shelf life is ended. As excess, the materials would be made available through the General Services Administration to any Government agency that might use them—including the Defense Department and the Veterans' Administration.

There have been serious difficulties encountered whenever the Public Health Service has attempted to transfer to other agencies any materials no longer required by its stockpiling programs. There have been questions raised about the packaging, the size, the stock numbers, and how the Public Health Service was to be reimbursed for this excess stock.

However, under pressure from the Federal Procurement and Regulation Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, headed by a cosponsor of this bill, Senator DOUGLAS, and the Comptroller General, this somewhat dismal picture has begun to change. There is some evidence that the Public Health Service, working in conjunction with the Defense Department, the Veterans' Administration, and the General Services Administration, may be able to see that these supplies are used by other Government agencies. An interagency committee is now working on this, and within the last 6 months, about $4 million worth of supplies has been accepted by other agencies.

But I am told by officials of the Public Health Service that interagency rotation will not insure the full use of the presently excess supplies. Nor could the materials that would be released under my bill be entirely disposed of in this manner.

So whatever portion other Government agencies cannot use will be designated surplus and disposed of either by sale—or more likely—through donation to public and private nonprofit hospitals, clinics, and similar institutions.

There are numerous State and private nonprofit medical organizations which could benefit from such donations. There is ample precedent for giving assistance to these groups, and here we have an opportunity of assisting them by allowing utilization of items that otherwise would be destroyed.

Some of the supplies could well be used by American organizations which operate medical facilities overseas in conjunction with our foreign aid programs. The Agency for International Development has expressed interest in this possibility.

The costs of this program would be minimal. The only direct cost to the Government, in most instances, would be the cost associated with the fact that items would have to be replaced a little more quickly than if left in storage for their full shelf life. The recipient would be responsible for the cost of delivery of any donated supplies.

In this day and time, when we are making so great an effort to improve the medical care our people receive, it seems criminal to me that $19 million worth of medical equipment and supplies have had to be destroyed in the last year when they should have been used to heal the sick. But the Public Health Service had no choice. This legislation will give them a choice. It is my belief it will insure that this reprehensible, but presently mandatory practice will be stopped.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record, and lie on the desk until May 16 so that Senators who wish to do so can add their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 3328) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the disposal of certain medical materials and supplies whenever the remaining storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies is too short to justify their retention, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Proxmire (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3328

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) (1) Whenever the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (referred to hereinafter in this subsection as the 'Secretary') determines that the remaining storage or shelf life of any medical materials or supplies stored for national emergency purposes pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98 a-h), or the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2251–2297), is of too short a duration to justify their continued retention for national emergency purposes, such materials or supplies shall be considered for the purposes of section 202 of this act to be excess property. If such materials or supplies are not transferred to any other Federal agency pursuant to section 202 of this Act, they shall be made available for disposal pursuant to this section as surplus property. Whenever practicable, the Secretary shall make such determination at such time as to insure that such medical materials or supplies can be disposed of in compliance with this subsection before their shelf life expires and they are rendered unfit for human use.

"(2) Whenever the storage or shelf life of any medical materials or supplies stored for national emergency purposes, pursuant to the Acts referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, has been extended as the result of retesting, the Secretary may make as to such materials or supplies the determination described in paragraph (1) within 30 days after the date on which the storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies has been extended.

"(3) The Secretary shall inform the recipients of medical materials or supplies made available for donation pursuant to this subsection of the estimated remaining storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies, and whether the original estimated storage life thereof has been extended as the result of retesting.

"(4) The United States shall not be responsible for the safety, freshness, or effectiveness of any medical materials or supplies donated pursuant to this subsection, and the Secretary shall inform all recipients of such materials or supplies of that fact."

(b) Section 402 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 512), is amended by—

(1) Inserting, immediately after the section number "Sec. 402.", the subsection designation "(a)";

(2) Striking out in the first sentence thereof the clause designations "(a)" and "(b)", and inserting in lieu thereof the clause designations "(1)" and "(2)", respectively; and

(3) Adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe pursuant to this subsection, any executive agency having in any foreign country any medical materials or supplies which, if situated within the United States would be available for donation pursuant to section 203(p) of this act, may donate such materials or supplies without cost, for use in any foreign country, to medical or health organizations which are qualified to receive such materials or supplies under section 203(p) of this Act."

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPROVEMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMAL FACILITIES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record, and lie at the desk for the rest of this week, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to join as sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 3332) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal facilities, and to otherwise assure humane care and treatment of laboratory animals, introduced by Mr. Hill, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3332

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Laboratory Animals Act".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. It is the policy of the Congress, and the purpose of this Act, to assure humane care and treatment of laboratory animals and to assure an adequate supply of high-quality animals available for medical research purposes by (1) authorizing special assistance to institutions using laboratory animals in construction or renovation of laboratory animal facilities, and (2) by providing for the establishment of standards for the proper care of laboratory animals.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF LABORATORY ANIMAL FACILITIES

Sec. 3. So much of section 706(a) of the Public Health Service Act (relating to the amount of grants for construction of health research facilities), as follows the semicolon is amended to read as follows: "except that—

"(1) in the case of a grant for construction of any facility which the Surgeon General determines is to be used (primarily or exclusively) as a laboratory animal facility for research, or research and purposes related thereto (including research training), in the sciences related to health, such amount may not exceed 66⅔ per centum of the necessary cost of construction as determined by the Surgeon General, but the total of the grants for any fiscal year to which this clause applies may not exceed 25 per centum of the sums appropriated for grants under this part for such year;

"(2) in the case of any other grant for a facility which the Surgeon General determines is to be used for research, or research and purposes related thereto (including research training), in the sciences related to health, such amount may not exceed 50 per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as determined by him, or, in the case of a multipurpose facility, 50 per centum of the part of the necessary cost of construction which he determines to be proportionate to the contemplated use of the facility for research, or research and related purposes, in the sciences related to health."

STANDARDS FOR LABORATORY ANIMAL FACILITIES AND CARE

Sec. 4. (a) Effective July 1, 1967, no grant, loan, or contract may be made by any agency of the United States Government for research in the United States involving the use of laboratory animals unless—

(1) the laboratory animal facilities of the person applying for the grant or loan, or offering to enter into the contract, as the case may be, (A) are accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, (B) in the absence of such an approved accrediting body or if such a body has not had an opportunity to examine the facilities of the applicant, are found by the agency to meet such standards for laboratory animal facilities and for care of laboratory animals as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe or approve, or (C) in the case of laboratory animal facilities which by reason of no, or an insufficient, period of operation or for any other reason are not so accredited and are not found to meet such standards, are (or will be) such that the agency determines there is reasonable ground to expect that they will be so

accredited or will meet such standards within a reasonable time; and

(2) such person has provided for the review of policies and procedures governing the care and treatment of laboratory animals in such laboratory animal facilities, for the purpose of assuring that laboratory animals are used in such facilities only for legitimate scientific or educational purposes, and that sound and reasonable policies and procedures are followed in the care and treatment of laboratory animals in such facilities, including policies and procedures designed to protect the animals against unnecessary pain and suffering, and such review is made by a committee on animal care and utilization composed of two or more scientists associated with such facilities, or with the organization or institution of which such facilities are a part.

(b) Any agency of the United States Government having laboratory animal facilities shall comply with the standards prescribed or approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and with the requirements imposed by paragraph (2) thereof.

(c) Standards under this section relating to laboratory animal facilities or the care of animals (including standards prescribed or approved for purposes of subsection (a) (1)(A)) shall be prescribed or approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but only after consultation with agencies of the United States Government concerned.

(d) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make, on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, grants to or contracts with any body approved by him as provided in subsection (a)(1)(A), to assist in meeting the costs of such body in carrying out the function of accreditation provided for in this section.

EFFECT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN

SEC. 5. The provisions enacted by this Act shall be subject to the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1966.

A BILL FOR THE AMERICAN CANAL AT EL PASO, TEX.; A PART OF THE CHAMIZAL BOUNDARY RELOCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and my colleague [Mr. TOWER], a bill to authorize construction of extensions of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex. This irrigation canal replacement is requested to complete the series of public facility projects in El Paso contemplated as a part of the boundary relocation involved in the settlement of the Chamizal dispute with Mexico.

Enactment of this bill will allow construction of a new American-Franklin Canal some 13 miles long, of a size to assure U.S. water users their share of the Rio Grande water allocated to them by the United States-Mexican Treaty of 1906. Part of the proposed new canal is being constructed as a necessary part of the Chamizal boundary relocation; this bill authorizes construction of the remaining needed sections.

Of special importance to me is the fact that this new canal will be completely fenced for its entire length. The old canal, now to be replaced, runs through the city of El Paso, and is inadequately equipped to restrain children from attempting to swim in its waters. This lack of protection has been a source of tragedy for many El Paso families over the years. I am assured that the construction plans for this new canal include complete fencing the length of the canal. This desirable improvement alone is enough to justify the project, but the project is well justified in its conservation of scarce water.

U.S. water users have suffered serious shortages of water in the Bureau of Reclamation Rio Grande project above and below El Paso, Tex., during the past 15 years. The shortages have been in part due to the fact that although the entire supply of water originates in the United States, a portion of the supply—up to 60,000 acre-feet per year in years of normal runoff, is allocated to Mexico by the Treaty of 1906. Such reduction in supply to U.S. users for international causes should be repaired to the extent practical.

Estimating the value of waters conservatively at $20 per acre-foot, the total value of the water which could be saved amounts to $420,000 per year. The annual cost of the proposed canal extensions, including amortization over 50 years with interest at 4½ percent and operation and maintenance, amounts to $250,000, or about $12 per acre-foot. The economic justification and practicability is, therefore, favorable by a benefit-cost ratio of 1.7 to 1.

This bill is a companion to H.R. 13015, introduced by Representative RICHARD WHITE of El Paso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3335) to authorize the construction of extensions of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex., operation and maintenance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. TOWER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President. I rise to join my distinguished colleague from Texas in sponsoring legislation to extend the American Canal at El Paso.

It is important that this legislation be authorized, Mr. President, to assist our Nation in fulfilling its 1906 Water Treaty Commitment to Mexico. The proposal would effect construction of a 13-mile extension of the canal to reduce water losses amounting to at least 21,000 acre-feet per year.

Under the 1906 treaty, up to 60,000 acre-feet per year—during normal runoff—are allocated to Mexico. This has resulted in a serious shortage of water during the past several years in the Rio Grande reclamation project bordering El Paso.

The sandy bottom channel of the Rio Grande in this area is responsible for serious losses of water amounting to between 11,000 and 50,000 acre-feet, averaging 27,600 acre-feet during a normal year.

Under the present proposal to line the channel, water savings amounting to at least 21,000 acre-feet per year would be realized.

The 21,000 acre-feet saved would provide at least one-third of our water commitment to Mexico from the Rio Grande.

There is a very great need, Mr. President, for prompt enactment of this legislation so that construction can immediately begin on the canal. In 8 of the past 15 years, the water supply for users in the Rio Grande reclamation project was only 60 percent of their requirement, and in 4 of the years only 16 percent of the requirement was realized. As could be expected, serious losses have resulted on farms in the area dependent on this water supply.

It is estimated that the cost-benefit ratio of the project is 1.7. This is, in my opinion, definitely on the conservative side. I believe that the project is well justified and while it will result in abundant water savings now, it will represent an even greater value within the next several decades.

TO PROHIBIT THE INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF HORSES THAT HAVE BEEN ABUSED FOR THE PURPOSE OF ALTERING THEIR NATURAL GAIT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in recent months, the Nation's attention has been focused upon inhumane treatment of domestic dogs and cats. We were all sickened by the article in Life magazine which showed intolerable cruelty to dogs in, I am ashamed to say, Baltimore, Md. All animal lovers are gratified that the House and Senate have held hearings on the problems of dog-napping and humane treatment of laboratory animals.

There is another problem of cruelty to animals which has recently come to my attention, which also requires corrective legislation and which the pending bills do not cover. I refer to the widespread abuse of the beautiful Tennessee walking horse for the purpose of affecting its natural gait.

Most of us at some time in our lives have attended a horse show and thrilled to these magnificent animals proudly prancing around a show ring. The Tennessee walking horse's back stride is long; its front feet barely touch the ground. As a matter of fact, our President's favorite mount, when he is on the ranch, is one of this fine breed.

Unscrupulous owners and trainers of Tennessee walking horses have discovered that if the horse's front feet are sore he will lift them quickly from the ground, shift his weight to his sound hindquarters and take the much desired long-striding step. This soreing usually is done by using chains or tacks inside the quarter boot or by applying a burning agent to the pastern, the area just above the hoof. These agents vary, but the most common are an oxide of mercury salve, known as "creeping cream," and an oil of mustard mixture, called "scooting juice." Another technique, recently adopted, is to drive a nail into the tender part of the hoof. This is more difficult to detect but equally effective and painful.

These despicable practices are condemned by responsible organizations and by some State legislatures. The Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' and Exhibitors' Association of America officially prohibits the soreing of Tennessee walkers for show purposes, and published a notice, effective September 15, 1964, announcing that "due to flagrant violations by exhibitors" it will take disciplinary action. The American Horse Show Association also prohibits the showing of horses "equipped with artificial appliances, such as leg chains, wires or tacks, blistering or any other cruel and inhumane devices."

My own State of Maryland and other States, including Tennessee, have statutes that prohibit the showing of horses that have been tortured or cruelly treated.

I regret to say, Mr. President, that the rules and regulations of the horse associations and even the State statutes have been more honored in the breach than in the observance. An article by Alice Higgins in the January 11 issue of Sports Illustrated, a story by Mr. George Coleman in the January 6, 1966, edition of the New York World Telegram and Sun, and statements by Mr. H. M. Oler of the American Humane Association and Mrs. Pearl Twynne of the Virginia Humane Association all attest to the fact that the deplorable practice of soreing Tennessee walkers is widespread. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Honorable Buford Ellington, former Governor of Tennessee and a member of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association, pleaded with the president of that organization 6 years ago to "clean up our own house," before legislation becomes necessary. His letter reads in its entirety:

MARCH 10, 1960.

Mr. GLENN TURNER,
President, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association, Lewisburg, Tenn.

DEAR MR. TURNER: I am sure you can understand my concern and the concern of many of our farmers, horse breeders, showmen and those in general that love and look on the Tennessee Walking Horse as the finest breed in America.

As a member of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association and in my official capacity as Governor, I am tremendously concerned about the adverse publicity that has been given to our association, our breeders and all others concerned. Such publicity does not only affect the guilty, but will greatly affect the acceptance of the Tennessee Walking Horse to the general public. I want to plead with you that we "clean up our own house." I have known for some time the desire and honest efforts of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association and its officers to take proper action to correct the situation. May I commend and congratulate you on your efforts.

I have been associated with the Tennessee Legislature—directly or indirectly—for the past six sessions. During each of those six sessions there has arisen the possibility of legislation being passed to curb some of the things that have been brought to light in recent publications. And, I insist that unless we can receive the cooperation of the exhibitors, breeders, trainers, judges, and all others concerned, legislation will be passed or our present laws strengthened to deal with it in our next session of the legislature.

I believe our association would prefer to work out its own problems raher than turn them over—through the legislature—to other organizations and groups to handle. I pledge you my full cooperation in taking whatever steps are necessary to remedy the situation in which we find ourselves, and it is my sincere hope that we will be able to do the job within our own association.

Sincerely,

BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Governor.

A number of representatives of humane groups in my own State of Maryland, as well as others, have tried to put an end to the deplorable practice of soreing a fine animal for show purposes. They have met with little success. I think it is time to consider legislation to outlaw this practice.

The bill I introduce today will prohibit the interstate shipment for the purposes of competition of horses that have been abused for the purpose of altering their natural gait. Since the shows of Tennessee walking horses attract animals from many States, this would be an effective method of curbing this deplorable practice of cruelty to animals.

I ask that the bill and the Maryland and Tennessee statutes be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3338) introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3338

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it shall be unlawful for any person to transport or ship, or cause to be transported or shipped, or to receive in interstate commerce any horse whose legs or hoofs have been made sore, after the date of enactment of this Act, for the purpose of affecting or altering the natural gait of such horse. The legs or hoofs of a horse shall be considered to have been made sore if chains have been used in a manner designed to break the skin surface of the horse, or if a blistering agent has been applied internally or externally to the horse, or if burns, cuts, or lacerations have been inflicted on the horse, or if a chemical agent, or tacks, nails, or wedges have been used on the horse, or if any other method or device has been used which causes intense physical pain to the horse when walking, trotting, or running.

(b) Any person guilty of violating this Act shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such inspections of horses transported in, or intended for transport in, or which have been transported in, interstate commerce as he deems necessary to determine if the provisions of this Act are being violated. In carrying out the provisions of this Act the Secretary shall utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the existing personnel and facilities of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a violation of this Act has occurred he shall inform the Attorney General of such violation and the Attorney General shall take such action with respect to such violation as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act the term "interstate commerce" means commerce between a point in any State or possession of the United States (including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) and any point outside thereof or between points in the same State or possession of the United States (including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) but through any point outside thereof.

The articles presented by Mr. TYDINGS are as follows:

CODE OF TENNESSEE

39–420. Misdemeanor. Horse shows—injuring front legs or hoofs of horse for competition unlawful: It shall be unlawful for any owner or exhibitor of horses to make the front legs and hoofs of such horses sore for the purpose of competition in horse shows and other similar events by inflicting burns, cuts, lacerations, or other injury or pain upon the front legs or hoofs of said horses by the use of blistering compounds (commonly referred to as "scooting juice"), sharp-pointed instruments and other devices or drugs (acts 1957, ch. 66(a) 1).

39–421. Disqualification of tortured horse at horse show—reports to manager and district attorney: It shall be the duty of all persons designated and acting as a ringmaster of any horse show or similar event to disqualify any horse determined by the ringmaster to be suffering from abuse or torture resulting from the causes set out in (a) 39–420 from further participation in said show and to make a report of the same, including the name of the horse, the owner of said horse, and the exhibitor of said horse, to the manager or chairman of said show, who in turn shall report the same in writing to the district attorney-general of the county wherein the incident occurred for appropriate action (acts 1957, ch. 66(a) 2).

39–422. Violations by owners, exhibitors, ringmaster of any horse show or other event, or the failure of the manager or chairman of said show to perform the duties required of such officials by article 39–421, shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by fine and imprisonment in the county jail or workhouse as in other misdemeanors (acts 1957, ch. 66(a) 3).

CODE OF MARYLAND

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Article 27, section 61. Injuring, etc., of race horse, etc.: Every person who willfully and maliciously interferes with, injures, destroys or tampers with, or who willfully sets foot, instigates, engages in or in any way furthers any act by which any horse used for the purposes of racing, breeding, or competitive exhibition of skill, breed, or stamina, is interfered with, injured, destroyed or tampered with, or any act tending to produce such interference, injury, destruction or tampering, whether such horse be the property of himself or another, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, punishable by imprisonment in the Maryland Penitentiary for a term of not less than 1 year nor more than 3 years. (An. Code, 1951, sec. 78; 1939, sec. 71; 1937, ch. 11.)

[From Sports Illustrated, Jan. 11, 1960]

THE TORTURE MUST END

(If the American Horse Shows Association has nerve enough, it can stop abuse of the Tennessee walking horse right now.)

(By Alice Higgins)

No sportsmen have practiced such systematic cruelty to horses for the sake of a blue ribbon as is being perpetrated today. Shamefully brutal treatment of the Tennessee walking horse is generally practiced by breeders, trainers, and exhibitors and is tolerated by the SPCA, a society founded primarily to protect the horse. Worst of all, it is ignored by the American Horse Shows

Association, the governing body of the sport, which is currently meeting in Detroit. I say worst of all because the AHSA could stop most of it this week if it chose to do so.

When I first described these abuses (Sports Illustrated, July 23, 1956), I was optimistic that measures were going to be taken to halt this horse torture. The various associations concerned piously expressed a desire to aid in the cleanup, rolling their collective eyes heavenward—apparently to avoid the ugly sight of quarter boots covered with blood, for they have taken no real action and the situation is now far worse than it ever was.

The quarter boot, designed to protect the horse against injury as he executes his unique running walk with its long-reaching hind stride, is still being used either to injure or to cover up deliberately inflicted injuries. Unfortunately for the breed, it was discovered that if the horse's front feet are sore he will lift them quickly from the ground, shift his weight to his sound hindquarters and take the much desired long-striding step. This "soreing" usually is done by using chains or tacks inside the quarter boot or by applying a burning agent to the pastern area, which is covered by the boot. These agents vary, but of the two most common, one, an oxide of mercury salve, is known as creeping cream, and the other, an oil of mustard mixture, is called scooting juice. The so-called big lick so coveted for show ring purposes is now almost completely the "sore lick."

One walking horse breeder hotly asserts that most of the recent world champions were made with a hot iron. A few others, among them the president of the American Walking Horse Association, H. Karl Yenser of Washington, D.C., are also incensed. Yenser recently sent an open letter to his Members which read in part:

"The feeling against the continued soreing and chaining of horses has reached a point where something must be done to correct it. * * * Perhaps getting back to more closely defined gaits as a standard for judging would do the job. * * * Exhibitors have decried the use of inhumane devices for years and yet allowed their trainers to continue their use. Judges have been criticized for tying [placing] 'sore' horses, and yet the judge's hands were tied. In my own personal experience if I had disqualified all of the sore horses shown in front of me, I am afraid I would have wound up many times with no horses in the class to judge. So I, too, am guilty of accepting, even though I did not condone, the 'sore lick.' I know, too, that every Walking Horse judge has been confronted with the same situation.

Yenser received some lively and approving response from his membership. But C. C. Turner, of Broadway, Va., a vice president in Yenser's organization and also a vice president of the powerful Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association, received anonymous and abusive mail after acting as a judge at Dallas. Turner removed the boots in the ring and examined the horses for soreness. He judged the class accordingly, with the sorest farthest down the line. Apparently awakened by this show of courage, the SPCA attempted to intervene, but J. Glenn Turner, boss of the Dallas show and president of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association (and no kin to C. C. Turner), refused to allow an ASPCA inspection.

EXPEDIENCY VERSUS PRINCIPLE

Recently C. C. Turner and John H. Amos, chairman of the executive committee of the TWHBA, plus the other directing officers, held a meeting to seek agreement on corrective recommendations to be proposed at the current Detroit session of the American Horse Shows Association, which controls more than 400 recognized shows. Amos advocated the complete elimination of boots and severe punishment of owners or trainers who use any torture device. (Some defenders of the boot contend its elimination would lead unscrupulous trainers to drive nails or wedges into the tender frog of the hoof, a method of soreing difficult to detect.) But as is so often the case, the interested parties were forced to act on the low ground of expediency rather than the lofty plateau of principle, and one of those compromises was reached that seem to satisfy all sides and actually settle nothing.

The group agreed to recommend a new boot that reveals the front of the hoof, protects the tender coronet band, and, because of an extra long hinge, drops back when the horse is at rest to expose the pastern area for inspection. The only other recommendation—that a judge be authorized to penalize or even disqualify offenders—would, even if adopted, amount to no more than a tap on the wrist in a situation where a hard blow to the heart (perhaps I should say pocketbook) is indicated.

And even these mild suggestions may not get into the new rule book of the American Horse Shows Association. For one thing, J. Glenn Turner, who is no enemy of the trainer, has been selected as the new chairman of the Walking Horse Committee for the AHSA. Turner has never shown any disposition to change the present rules, which are either so vaguely worded as to be uninterpretable, or simply misstate the situation. For example, the rule book says: "Horses must be serviceably sound." Under present practice, that means only that if they don't fall down they can show. The book also says: "Judges shall disqualify horses equipped with artificial appliances such as * * * leg chains, wires or tacks, blistering, or any other cruel and inhumane devices. * * * White boots may be used, but they shall be subject to examination by show officials." Which officials? In practice, the manager leaves the job to the steward (the person who must be present at every recognized show to see that the association's rules are upheld), and the steward passes the buck right back to the manager or to the show veterinarian or to the judge. If, by some chance, an offender is caught he is disqualified from the class, but he is free to ship his horse off to the next show.

If the AHSA had the nerve to make the punishment fit the crime, a lot of trainers would be on crutches. The trainers, of course, blame pressure from the owners, and the owners say the trainers are at fault. (One owner quoted his trainer: "Just don't watch while I put the boots on—you'll feel better when you ride up to get that ribbon.")

So, despite the courage of men like Yenser, C. C. Turner, and Amos, there is little to be hoped for from the self-interested, ribbon-seeking trainer or owner. That leaves the matter squarely in the hands of the American Horse Shows Association, which has yet to enforce or even clarify its own tepid rules. If the AHSA at its current meeting fails to redefine its rules, make clear who is responsible for enforcing them and provide stringent penalties for offenders, a few courageous show managers are ready to drop the walking horse division entirely. This may seem a drastic remedy, but the various walking horse societies have had ample time to clean their own stable. They have failed to do so. The AHSA must have the courage to do it for them.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, Jan. 6, 1966]

TORTURE STILL GOADS THE WALKING HORSE

(By George Coleman)

The Tennessee walking horse cruelty is set to hobble into the 1966 annual convention of the American Horse Shows Association opening at Lexington, Ky., a week from today.

There's a new rule that's supposed to hogtie any trainers messing around with walking horses: "Any horse foaled after January 1, 1965, with scars around the coronet or pastern area (just above the hoof) is ineligible for competition." Plus, "the use of any substance on the coronet or pastern area which is evident during show performance is prohibited * * *."

For 5 years, since this newspaper and Sports Illustrated exposed the bloodly business, the AHSA has been passing noose-tightening rules and the cruelty continues.

A MATTER FOR RHYME?

At that time despite published photos of horses bleeding to the extent of staining the tanbark of show rings, the AHSA officers didn't believe what they saw. The late Adrian Van Sinderen, then AHSA president, at the 1960 convention whitewashed the cruelty with a 32-line poem in his report:

"If you desire a saddle horse,
A horse that's sure to please
Just buy yourself a walking horse,
And ride along with ease * * *."

But before the 3-day meeting ended the AHSA took its initial halting steps to curb the torture of the walking horse. Three months later at the Nashville (Tenn.) TWH breeders' annual dinner, Tennessee's Gov. Buford Ellington told 500 owners and trainers, "Either you stop messin' with walking horse cruelty or I'll chase every last one of you over the Great Smoky Mountains." Everybody smiled.

A TYPICAL PENALTY

Despite dozens of anticruelty rules in the AHSA book, the cruelty goes on. Here's an example why: Three trainers were found guilty of showing bleeding horses at Kansas City's American Royal Horse Show. So the AHSA directors suspended the three for 3 months until April 1, 1966, during the winter time when the horsemen wouldn't be showing anyway. That's a penalty?

In the walking horse, the longer and higher the stride, the better the ride and performance. Instead of taking months to teach the animal and being content with its best, the trainers apply a burning mercury ointment above the hooves. Soon the flesh is blistered.

On top of the hooves go upside-down cups of rubber called boots and inside the boots on top of the blisters are tacks. As the boots and tacks rub the flesh rawer, the horse, to relieve the pain, barely touches the front feet to the ground. To keep his balance he increases the back stride. That's the way some show ribbons are won.

THE NEWEST DODGE

The latest trick is deliberately to drive a nail, in shoeing, into the horse's foot. That accomplishes the same result as the burning ointment and tacks. And there's no rule in the AHSA book about a nail in the foot.

STATEMENT BY MR. H. M. OLER, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION AND THE CHATTANOOGA, TENN., HUMANE EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY

(At the national celebration of the walking horse, Shelbyville, Tenn., Sept. 4, 1965)

I arrived at the horse show on Friday night, August 28, 1965.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 29, 1965

My first experience was seeing a sore mare. She was very stiff and sore and could barely walk.

I saw the blacksmith applying some chemical to a horse's hoof. The horse reacted violently to the pain. When the owner saw my identification, he took the horse and rode off. I could not follow and could not get the identity of the owner.

The horses were used constantly wearing heavy chains which tore their pasterns badly wearing the hair off—some were bleeding.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1

I saw a man cut a walking horse's foot at the coronet band with a razor blade, and rub salt in the wound. I asked him what he did that for, he did not answer and when he saw my identification, he rode rapidly away.

Every night at the horse show, the horses were shown stiff and sore. After working and getting warmed up, they did not show so much stiffness. However, after standing, they moved sore after being judged. This seems to be routine.

In one class one of the exhibitors who had not been pinned, or tied, was angry and he jumped the gate (about 2 feet) out of the ring without getting permission to leave and without waiting for the gate to be opened. A policeman told me that when the rider got outside, he hit the horse in the head in anger.

H. M. Oler,
Humane Agent, Humane Educational Society of Chattanooga, Tenn.
(Representing the American Humane Association).

Statement by Pearl Twyne, Humane Officer of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies

I arrived at the horse show on Thursday, September 2, 1965.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, ABOUT NOON

The first thing I saw was a black mare, later identified as the same one seen by Mr. Oler. This mare was so sore that she painfully set each foot down and quivered. She had to cross a small, shallow ditch, she spraddled and could not make it. I took pictures. The man leading her had to pull and yell at her to force her over the ditch.

I walked around the stabled area where the walking horses were kept. I saw a groom of the Circle R stables rubbing a liquid out of a bottle on the pastern area of the forefeet both fore and aft. There had been a purple colored dye on the feet, but the groom rubbed so hard that the color disappeared and a large raw spot appeared over the coronet band in front, and it became sore in back. The horse was crosstied and could not get away. I asked the groom what the liquid would do, and he replied that it made the horse sting. The horse was swinging its foot back and forth. As I watched the horse assumed the typical walking horse stance.

I saw the same thing at barn No. 28, no name on the stall.

I saw walking horses being warmed up. They were all moving with the sore lick and were very stiff.

THURSDAY EVENING, SEPTEMBER 2

Class 41—No. 625, Ebony's Image—received the first ribbon. In my opinion the horse was very sore. I was sitting in the reserve section of the stadium and Mr. Oler was standing at the entrance. We both marked our individual programs, and we agreed (separately) that this yearling was very sore. We both thought that the entries in the class (Championship Walking Yearling) had been sored. We were unable to get the services of any veterinarian in the State of Tennessee to work with us, and did not have a veterinarian to confirm our opinions.

Class 43. Owner-amateur, walking mares, any age. All horses were sore to varying degrees. When the class was told to line up for judging, and were requested not to remove the boots until requested to do so, the grooms rushed in to brush the horses, and many of them threw dirt on the horses feet. I have seen this happen in many shows and it was done to hide the blood and chafing.

Mr. Oler and I both agreed that No. 137, Go Boy's Dream; No. 140, Lady Godiva; and No. 337, Go Boy's Miss Nassau (one of the sorest in my opinion I have seen) were all sore. When No. 337 was pulled up, she almost fell. After being cooled when she moved her hocks were bent under at an absurd angle and pointed outward. No. 943, Miss Sun Glo and No. 960, Shadows Golden Girl were very sore in my opinion and that of Mr. Oler's.

Class No. 45 walking geldings, 4 years old and over.

No. 1191, Sun's Dark Demon was so sore and in danger of collapsing that a retired veterinarian sitting next to me remarked that the horse was either exhausted or overly sored and should have been removed from the class. But No. 1191 was kept in the class when the others (eliminated from competition) were dismissed. He was forced to work excessively around the ring in his condition. He was placed sixth, and the people around me gasped as they thought the horse would fall in the ring.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3

In the morning about 8 a.m. until 1 p.m., Mr. Oler and I walked around the grounds and I took both moving pictures and still shots in color. We saw the same conditions of sore walking horses being warmed up.

Specifically, one of the cruelest acts I have seen was done on the black mare that Mr. Oler and I had both seen earlier in the show. The one that was so sore. She was being dragged into the blacksmith, inching her way. She was in such pain that when the blacksmith's helpers was trying to remove her fore shoes, she closed her eyes, breathed hard, tucked her hind feet far in front of her, moaned and tried to lie down. She was cross tied and her trainer and/or her owner, jerked her and yelled at her. She stood swaying, breathing hard. They started to cut her feet, and I have never seen a horse with its feet cut so deep or the frog cut as this mare. They were down in the quick. A woman standing next to me had tears on her cheeks and she said "How can they do this?" She walked away. That mare was kept tied there from 3 to 4 hours. I walked away and came back several times. I could not bear to see them cutting her sore feet so deeply.

Mr. Oler came back after I left and he saw one blacksmith (or his helper) take up an electric torch, ground it on the mare's shoe (off side). A twitch had been put on her lip, and they burned her foot. They poured water on the foot and it steamed. Then they plunged the foot into a bucket of water. The owner and/or trainer held the mare's head throughout this torture. When the mare was led back to her stable, No. 21 in barn 52, Mr. Oler followed and when the mare had to be led down an incline to the stable, she could not walk but slid down trying to protect her forefeet. Later I saw her being worked in a ring with a young woman on her. I took moving pictures of her being ridden. When the woman saw me taking the pictures, she saluted me and left the ring. We could not find her, the mare, or the trainer afterward. Many people standing around in groups were commenting on the pitiful condition of this mare. She gave a beautiful performance of a show walking horse, flowing barely touching the ground with her forefeet.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 563

Mr. BIBLE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 7, line 10, after the word "Reclamation" insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided further*, That not to exceed $918,000 shall be for assistance to the Tularosa, New Mexico, School District No. 4 for construction of junior high and high school facilities, and to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school".

Mr. BIBLE also submitted an amendment (No. 563), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 14215, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

S. 3306—THE NEED FOR INCREASED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION—ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to the fact that this is the last day that S. 3306 will remain open for cosponsors.

It is imperative that we recognize the need for increased agricultural production, not only to meet growing world demand but also to meet our own national security needs. This proposed legislation would create a meaningful and sound agricultural commodity reserve program serving the national security needs and promoting and protecting the interests of our farmers. This program would be achieved in a simple and direct manner without upsetting existing agricultural laws.

Mr. President, I am happy to announce that seven Senators have joined as cosponsors of this bill up to this time. The cosponsors, listed alphabetically, include Senators Dominick, Hickenlooper, Hruska, Jordan of Idaho, Mundt, Scott, and Young of North Dakota.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of May 3, 1966, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 3304. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled: Mr. Long of Missouri.

S. 3306. A bill to provide for establishing and maintaining reserve supplies of agricultural commodities for national security and other purposes: Mr. Hruska and Mr. Scott.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on the following nominations:

Francis M. Wheat, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission;

Donald Hummel, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

H. Ralph Taylor, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The hearings are scheduled to be held on Wednesday, May 11, 1966, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with these nominations are requested to notify Matthew Hale, Chief of Staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-3921.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 10, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1308) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR HASTINGS OF DELAWARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I announce to the Senate the death last night of Senator Daniel O. Hastings, who served as a Member of this body from December 10, 1928, until January 3, 1937.

Senator Hastings was long active in Republican political affairs in Delaware both before he was appointed to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator T. Coleman du Pont in 1928 and after he returned to the private practice of law in Wilmington following the completion of his service in 1937.

Although Senator Hastings was not a native Delawarean, he moved to Wilmington from Somerset County, Md., in 1894, at the age of 20, and later attended the law department of Columbian University—now George Washington University—here in Washington. He was admitted to the bar in Wilmington in 1902 and continued in the practice of law in that city until just a few years ago.

Two years later he became a deputy attorney general, then served as Delaware's secretary of state, following which he was appointed an associate justice of the State supreme court. Senator Hastings served as city solicitor in Wilmington from 1911 until 1917 and as a judge on the Wilmington municipal court from 1920 until 1929.

On December 10, 1928, he was appointed as a Republican Member of the U.S. Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator T. Coleman du Pont. Two years later he was elected to complete the unexpired term and was reelected to a new 6-year term which ended on January 3, 1937.

Senator Hastings, who celebrated his 92d birthday on March 5, was one of the best known and well-loved political figures in Delaware.

In a political career which spanned half a century, Senator Hastings contributed greatly to the growth of his adopted State and the Nation. The people of Delaware have lost a distinguished statesman, and those of us who were fortunate enough to know him have lost a valued friend.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I join my colleague in expressing my deep sorrow on the passing of former U.S. Senator Daniel O. Hastings, of Delaware.

Senator Hastings lived a long and active life, and most of his life was involved in the governmental affairs of his community, State, and Nation. He is best remembered for his service in the U.S. Senate from December 10, 1928, to January 3, 1937, but before that and after that he contributed greatly of his judgment and energy to the affairs of Wilmington and the State of Delaware.

I knew him as a friendly, sincere man whole interest in Government and his fellow citizens continued even in his advanced age. He was remarkable for the activity he displayed even when he reached the age of 90.

We are fortunate that Senator Hastings took time in his later years to write a brief history of Delaware politics from 1904 to 1954.

In the conclusion to this book, Senator Hastings writes:

> With the experience I have had in politics, and the age I have reached, I am wondering whether General MacArthur's statement about the "soldier" might not apply to the man who has been active in politics, to wit: "The old politician never dies, he just fades away."

In Senator Hastings' case I would like to emphasize that his interest and activity never flagged, and he always remained a valued counselor.

Mrs. Boggs and I express our deepest sympathy to members of Senator Hastings' family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from today's Wilmington Morning News on the death of Senator Hastings printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMER DELAWARE SENATOR HASTINGS DIES AT 92—CAREER SPANNED 60 YEARS

Former U.S. Senator Daniel O. Hastings, 92, died last night at 8:30 in Foulk Manor on Foulk Road where he had been a guest since March 13.

Senator Hastings lived at the Plaza Apartments, 1303 Delaware Avenue.

His career spanned more than 60 years in public office and private law practice. But a country schoolteacher was credited for helping to build the foundation for his success.

His life was full of paradoxes. Senator Hastings wanted a legal career but a role in politics was pressed upon him.

Reared a Democrat, he became a Republican. Up to 1930, he held public office 25 years, but had never been a candidate in an election. He was a justice in the State's highest court before he was a Wilmington court judge.

He was born in Somerset County, Md., March 5, 1874, son of Daniel H. and Amelia Ellen (Parsons) Hastings.

Senator Hastings went through a grade school in the county, but decided against further education when he reached high school at Crisfield, Md.

However, his teacher, Miss Estella Marshall, persuaded him to continue with his schooling, explaining the opportunities open to a trained mind. The Senator often credited Miss Marshall for starting him off in the proper direction.

A private tutor, Prof. Charles F. Eastman, was responsible for his precollege education.

In 1892, Senator Hastings went to Washington to clerk in a railway office for $25 a month. His hours were arranged so he could prepare for a law course. Within 16 months he had mastered a preparatory course to enter Columbian University (now George Washington University).

To help defray his college expenses, he worked as a stenographer in a law office and as a clerk in the office of the chief engineer of the War Department.

At 24, he married Garrie L. Saxton of Dover.

He was admitted to the Delaware bar in 1902.

Senator Hastings formed a law partnership with Henry C. Conrad, and after practicing for only 2 years, he won appointment as deputy attorney general of Delaware.

The appointment came largely as a result of his performance as defense counsel in a number of murder trials. He filled the deputy attorney general post for 4 years.

Gov. Simeon S. Pennewill appointed Senator Hastings as Delaware's secretary of state on January 19, 1909, for a term of 4 years. He resigned, however, on June 16 of the same year, to accept an appointment as associate judge of the superior court, resident in New Castle County for a 12-year term. As an associate judge he also sat as a member of the then State supreme court.

Previous to the present Delaware supreme court, established in 1951, the highest court in any particular case consisted of those judges of the superior court and the court of chancery who had not sat upon that case at the trial level. The present supreme court is composed of the chief justice and two associate justices.

On January 17, 1911, Judge Hastings resigned from the judiciary and took over as special counsel for the Delaware General Assembly.

From July 1, 1911, to July 1, 1917, he served as city solicitor of Wilmington.

Upon the death of Wilmington Judge Philip Q. Churchman, Gov. John G. Townsend, Jr., urged Senator Hastings to accept the judgeship of municipal court. He accepted and served until 1928.

Some friends were chagrined because he became a city judge after sitting as an associate justice of the State's highest court at 35, the youngest justice in Delaware history. Judge Hastings, however, declared it the creed of his public career never to refuse a position simply because a better post might be in prospect.

On December 10, 1928, he was appointed by Gov. Robert P. Robinson to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of U.S. Senator T. Coleman du Pont. In 1930 he was elected a U.S. Senator, defeating Thomas F. Bayard, his Democratic opponent.

Senator Hastings was one of the first and most persistent critics of the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In 1936, he was defeated in a bid for reelection by James H. Hughes. During the campaign, Senator Hastings attacked the Roosevelt family and the President's proposals to enlarge the U.S. Supreme Court.

At a rally of Brandywine Hundred Republicans during the campaign, Senator Hastings declared the Federal Social Security Act discriminated against the young man in favor of the older man and pledged if reelected "to get rid of the iniquitous law."

After his defeat, he returned to the practice of law in Wilmington. He was senior partner of the firm of Hastings, Taylor, and Willard when he died.

He became counsel for stockholders of Pennroad Corp. in suit against the Pennsylvania Railroad for $95 million damages, a suit in which others joined, but he was senior of the many attorneys and took the leading part in the trial of the case. They won a verdict for $22,100,000. Both sides appealed, leading to a compromise settlement of $15 million.

In 1960, he assailed the city towaway law claiming the towing away of cars when the drivers were about to drive them away as a "distressing and disgraceful situation" and needed correction.

He told the Sons of the American Revolution in 1951 there were no hopes of peace through the United Nations nor through peace talks with Russia. He charged that the U.N. was just as helpless as had been the League of Nations.

Senator Hastings continued to take an active interest in political life until his final illness, and wrote frequent letters to the editor of the News-Journal papers.

In October 1964 he urged the appointment of Associate Justice Daniel F. Wolcott as chief justice of Delaware (this was later done) and the appointment of Chancellor Collins J. Seitz, to the State's highest court.

More than a year later he pressed for the appointment of Seitz to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals (President Johnson subsequently made the appointment) and took Pennsylvania's two Senators to task for favoring a Pennsylvania lawyer for the post.

When he was 90, Senator Hastings wrote a book including reminiscenses of 50 years of State politics. Entitled "Delaware Politics, 1904–1954," the 67-page book contained many anecdotes and numerous stories about political leaders of both parties during that time.

Mrs. Hastings died February 1, 1930, leaving two children, Elizabeth Ellen (Hastings) Fletcher, and Daniel Jr. On October 17, 1931, Senator Hastings remarried. His second wife is Elsie Saxton, a sister of his first wife. She survives.

His private business interests embraced the Interstate Amiesite Co. of which he was president, General Precision Corp., 20th Century Fox, and Pennroad Corp.

At one time he owned Woodburn, the celebrated haunted house of Dover, now the Governor's House, occupied by Gov. Charles L. Terry, Jr.

His hobbies included golf, horses, and hunting dogs. He once played 90 holes of golf in 2½ days. He was also interested in raising purebred Holstein cattle on the farm he had owned near Dover.

He was a member of the Young Men's Republican Club of Wilmington, Union League of Philadelphia, the Sons of Delaware, the Historical Society of Delaware, Wilmington Club, the Wilmington Country Club, Wilmington Lodge, No. 307, B.P.O.E., the University Club, Maryland Society of Delaware, the Westchester-Biltmore Country Club, the Bedford Club, Armstrong Lodge, No. 26, A.F. & A.M.; Delaware Consistory, Eden Lodge, No. 34, I.O.O.F.; Cherokee Tribe, No. 4, I.O.R.M.; Modern Woodmen of America; Ancient Order of United Workmen; the Bankers of New York, the Burning Tree Golf Club of Washington, D.C., the Metropolitan and other clubs.

He was a member of the Methodist Church.

Survivors are his widow, his son of Greenville and his daughter of Glencoe, Ill., five grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

VIETNAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Wilmington Morning News of May 7, there was published an article by Mr. Henry J. Taylor entitled "Viet War Will Be Lost in Washington."

This article makes some interesting comments on the background of our becoming involved in southeast Asia, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Viet War Will Be Lost in Washington

(By Henry J. Taylor)

By every conceivable measure of relative power, mighty America's war in Vietnam should have been over and done with long ago.

A few dates tell a great deal about its conduct. They are more reliable than Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's Alice-in-Wonderland publicity handouts.

President Kennedy was inaugurated January 20, 1961. On that day, only 77 U.S. military men were in South Vietnam, and all were serving only as advisers. The Pentagon confirms this.

The Bay of Pigs invasion occurred April 18, 1961. Ninety days later, President Kennedy sent 12,000 troops to Vietnam, reportedly to show, after the Cuba debacle, that the United States was not a paper tiger.

It was a fateful decision, and it was the beginning of the war commitment—now 5 years old.

Today we have 255,000 men in Vietnam, not including the great 7th Fleet. The absolute cream of the U.S. Army is there. The Marine Corps elite regiments are there along with the very best of the U.S. Navy and Air Force. Even our vast Strategic Air Command, not designed for such missions, is employed nearly around the clock.

Nevertheless, on January 13, 1964, heavy Communist units stood 35 miles from Saigon, and they remain where they were 2 years ago.

On February 5, 1962, Secretary McNamara stated: "By every quantitative measure, we are winning the war in Vietnam."

On December 2, 1962, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Arthur Sylvester said to the Sigma Delta Chi journalistic fraternity's Deadline Club in New York City: "It's the inherent right of the Government to lie to save itself."

On June 21, 1963, Mr. McNamara made his "winning the war" statement of the previous year all over again.

On June 22, 1964, Gen. Paul D. Harkins, returning from command in Vietnam, stated: "I think the military situation is coming along fine now." This was an apostasy, tragic to observe, General Harkins was peddling that pap under McNamara's censoring eye.

On October 3, 1964, after going to Vietnam four times, each time "to review the situation," Mr. McNamara announced: "The major part of the U.S. military task in Vietnam can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of training personnel."

On February 3, 1965, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge said: "If we were as successful in the civil-political area as we are in the military situation in Vietnam, we'd be on our way now."

On August 1, 1965, we staged our first Vietnam engagement. This was at Chu Lai—9 months ago. It spread to the first bloody encounters in the Ia Drang Valley. Today we still control neither Chu Lai nor the Ia Drang Valley.

On August 5, 1965, President Johnson retaliated for attacks against our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin by bombing North Vietnam. Nearly a year later we're still hearing how successful our bombings are—and we're still bombing, bombing, bombing.

On December 1, 1965, Mr. McNamara announced: "It will be a long war."

Every one of Mr. McNamara's successive troop estimates throughout the years was as wrong as the next one. First he said 12,000 would do the job, then 24,000, then 40,000, then 75,000, then 150,000.

On March 3, 1966, at an angry press conference, Mr. McNamara ticked off a figure of 235,000 as needed. Then on April 20 he announced that 255,000 are there. And is there any end in sight?

The heroism and morale of our troops and fliers who are fighting and dying is nearly incredible, God bless them. And let me give you, for the first time in print, an added slant on fine Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

At the request of an important midwestern publisher, President Johnson and Secretary McNamara secretly called General Westmoreland home to brief the American Newspaper Publishers Association convention in New York the week of April 25. General Westmoreland replied: "Sorry, but I can't leave the job."

It was commonly agreed in Algeria that if the French lost that war it would be lost in Paris, not Algiers. If we lost the Vietnam war it will be lost in Washington.

RED CHINA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently many articles have been written and much has been made on the floor of the Senate concerning the advisability of changing our policy with respect to Red China.

I came across a newspaper article the other day, published in the Washington Post of April 28, written by a British novelist, Frank Tuohy, who has been teaching in Japan and who recently made a trip through Communist China. The article is entitled "China's Hate of United States Traced to Need for Suitable Target."

Mr. President, this is worthwhile reading, not only because it indicates a firsthand observation after travel in that country, but also because it gives some idea of the problems that we in the Western World are facing with regard to trying to put over our conception of morality and ethics in an oriental frame as evidenced by the Red Chinese.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have just referred printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

China's Hate of United States Traced to Need for Suitable Target

(Note.—The author of this article is a British novelist teaching in Japan, who recently made a trip through Communist China.)

(By Frank Tuohy)

Peking.—Signs of anti-American feeling are everywhere in China, yet I feel there is something fishy about it all. If the Americans did not exist, the Chinese Communist Party would have to invent them.

Take the following scene, for example:

An old man is lying on the ground, and an officer with a stock whip is flogging him. A young woman dashes forward to help, but is seized by two soldiers. The officer turns with a fiendish snarl and snatches her baby from her. The woman breaks free, but two more soldiers cross their rifles with fixed bayonets in front of her. Raising the child, the officer hurls it down onto the crossed bayonets. The woman shrieks. Grinning, the officer draws a revolver and shoots her.

The officer is American, the mother and baby Vietnamese. This gruesome scene starts off the Chinese film "Victory Is Just Ahead," which I saw in Canton. The American officer, called J. Waston, is played by a Chinese in a false nose.

REASONS BEHIND HATE

Why do the Americans have to be presented like this?

First, the Chinese believe that they have been especially marked out for American detestation since 1949. One of the "remolded capitalists" of Shanghai, used to turning on his opinions for foreigners, was quite definite about it:

"The Americans have bullied us too much * * *. In 1950 they bombed plants in Shanghai and have made more than 400 intrusions. Why should we Chinese have aggressive designs on other countries when there is so much to be done here?"

Further embellishments are added to this general picture every day: China's sudden loss of friends in Ghana and Indonesia is due to CIA plotting; all American moves for peace in Vietnam are a hoax.

Secondly, in spite of diplomatic setbacks, China still wishes to appear the leader of revolutionary movements against imperialism and neocolonialism all over the world.

The breakdown of the relationship with Cuba is still a traumatic experience which has not been adjusted to. Deprived of the Cubans, China looks elsewhere for oppressed peoples to lead. Flagged maps of the United States show spots of "student-worker" protest as though these were Chinese outposts in a battle.

My objection that many of the protesting American students were Christians and pacifists was brushed aside.

Thirdly, the Americans play an important role in the thoughts of Chairman Mao Tse-tung. "The struggle of opposites is ceaseless." Thus there will always be a struggle between the party and the reactionaries. This struggle will never come to an end, socialism will never be transformed, and communism may be postponed forever.

Thus the devil will always be with us and, at present at any rate, the Americans fit the role better than anyone else. Why? Because they are the most powerful nation in the world, they are unrepentantly capitalist, their military bases still encircle China; and in Vietnam they are fighting an "antipeople's" war.

U.S. COWARDS AND SADISTS

In films, in plays and operas, the Americans are represented as long-nose, knock-kneed, whip-cracking cowards and sadists. They date back to Uncle Tom's Cabin. The technological nightmare of modern warfare is almost completely ignored, Hiroshima and Nagasaki are unknown names. In short, the atom bomb is another "paper tiger."

When I reminded a Chinese that China, too, possesses a bomb, I was told: "China will never use it."

This was the typical comment on the bomb in China, and I concluded that the Chinese doubt that the Americans will use it either. Posters show tiny, cowardly Americans fleeing from enormous Vietnamese; children draw pictures of bayoneted Johnsons; but the image of the mushroom cloud is hard to find in China.

TERMINATION OF PUBLIC LAW 78—THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the termination of Public Law 78, the bracero law, brought forth warnings by many Senators that our domestic agricultural program would be harmed. As pointed out last fall, these predictions generally turned out to be true.

However, during the debates on the bracero program, little was said about the effects that termination would have on our neighbor to the south.

I remember commenting on this problem when we last enacted the 1-year extension of the bracero law, and pointing out what a fabulous way it was to provide necessary aid to Mexico.

The U.S. News & World Report, of May 2, 1966, published an article which indicates that a floating population of 3 million restless and underprivileged farmhands has dangerously decreased the stability of Mexico and has created a potential vacuum which could be open to Communist influence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, how serious the situation is or to what extent it is due to termination of the bracero program, I am not in a position to say. The recent takeover of the University of Mexico by its students, who were successful in ousting some of those who were operating the university, and other problems, give some evidence of the unrest and instability existing there.

Most certainly, when we have a program such as the bracero program, which is on a carefully oriented basis for providing not only work but also income which some of these people can bring back to their own country, it is obvious we want to alleviate some of the problems that are referred to in the article.

I believe that the article is worthy of the consideration of the Senate, and it is my hope that Senators will read it. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the article, entitled, "Under the Lid in Mexico: Makings of an Explosion" printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Under the Lid in Mexico: Makings of an Explosion

(Are the Communists deliberately baiting a trap for Mexico? That's the fear as unrest increases because of a lagging program of land distribution. Peasants, more and more, are trying to take the law into their own hands, seizing farmland that is privately owned. And there is growing evidence that they are egged on by trained Communist troublemakers.)

Mexico City.—The enthusiastic welcome for President Lyndon Johnson here in mid-April tended to obscure a growing feeling of uneasiness in Mexico.

The uneasiness, developing over many months, arises from the fear that this country's landless peasants have been singled out by the Communists as a means of stirring up trouble throughout the country.

Red agitators are openly exploiting unrest among the peasants.

What is causing concern is that Mexico has a floating population of about 3 million restless and underprivileged farmhands. And a land distribution program operated by the Government to help deal with this problem is running out of productive land for the peasants.

One estimate is that, even after all available land has been handed out, there will still be 2 million heads of families eligible for acreage but unable to get it.

HUNGRY SQUATTERS

In this situation, officials are disturbed by a growing tendency of land-starved peasants to move in as squatters on the land of independent farmers, many of whom can barely scratch a living for their own families out of the undernourished soil.

Recently bands of squatters seized plots in Tlaxcala State, east of Mexico City. Some of them carried banners that said: "Since the Government and the Agrarian Department do not do us justice, we are doing it for ourselves."

Police and soldiers removed the squatters, and arrested 25. Several others told authorities that they had been misled by agitators.

Mexican officials are reluctant to use force against the squatters except as a last resort. Most of the squatters, authorities are convinced, are confused, desperate people who are trying to get food for their hungry families.

Per capita income for Mexico as a whole is over $350 a year, but many farm families try to make do on less than $100 a year. The minimum wage for farmhands in Mexico is well under $2 a day, but cases are reported of workers who get less than 50 cents a day.

AFTER THE REVOLUTION

Before the revolution of 1910, there were some 8,245 large ranches and only 48,000 small farms in all of Mexico. Eleven ranches are said to have covered about 250,000 acres each. About 90 percent of all the rural families were completely propertyless.

Fifty-six years after the revolution, Mexico's land has been divided into many small holdings. There are now more than 1 million privately owned farms. And 2.2 million formerly landless peasants have been given small plots by the Government in the form of "ejido" grants—a kind of communal ownership.

Ejido lands may be worked either jointly or as individual plots, but the workers are not permitted to sell or mortgage the property. It may be handed down from father to son.

EXPROPRIATION SYSTEM

The Government, to get land for its peasants, set up limits for the size of private holdings. An individual farmer had the right to keep 250 acres of irrigated land; 500 acres of unirrigated land, or the amount of land needed to maintain 500 head of cattle.

All land above these limits was subject to expropriation if a landless community within a 4-mile radius petitioned the Government for an ejido.

Mexican property owners, figures reveal, received in compensation only one-half of 1 percent of the total value of their land. Foreign owners lost 79 million acres under the land reform program. Payment to American owners took place only after long and difficult negotiations between the Mexican and United States Governments.

Mexico's land is hostile to agriculture. Of the total land area of 485 million acres, only about 72 million acres is considered adaptable for farming. Yet, under the land-reform program, more than 125 million acres has been distributed among peasants.

On the whole, Mexican agriculture since the Revolution has been successful, however. Farm yield is more than four times what it was in 1930. The country is now practically self-sufficient in all major foodstuffs, and it derives more than 50 percent of its export earnings from the sale of farm products—

chiefly cotton, coffee, tomatoes, cattle, meat and sugar.

On the darker side, Mexico's population, which was 15 million in 1910, now has reached 42 million and is growing at an annual rate of more than 3.5 percent. Some peasants have as many as 10 to 15 children.

Only about 15 percent of the peasants in the Ejido program have title to their lands. Without a title, they find it hard to get bank loans to buy fertilizer, seed and equipment. Young people tend to drift away from farms to the cities.

MILLIONS JOBLESS

Unemployment in rural areas much of the year is estimated at 3 million people, who live from hand to mouth or are sustained by handouts from relatives. In the past, when Mexican farm labor was admitted to the United States as "braceros," it was from this group that they were recruited.

As wanderers in search of employment and land of their own, these farmhands are largely responsible for the growing number of cases of "squatting" and clashes with police and soldiers. With little to lose, this group of Mexicans is most readily affected by the propaganda of agitators.

"It doesn't matter whether the agitation comes from the right or the left," says a Mexican economist. "The peasants now are ripe to follow anyone who shows the way."

A veteran foreign observer agrees, saying: "A potential for mass violence is now present in Mexico which can be exploited by anyone who tells the peasant to pick up a gun."

Indications are that the spontaneous unrest in the countryside is falling under Communist influence, despite efforts of the Mexican Government to silence, disperse or imprison agitators. Authorities are convinced that Red agents from Castro's Cuba have been at work in Tlaxcala and in Chihuahua, a State bordering southwestern Texas and New Mexico.

TARGET FOR RED DRIVE

A sudden outbreak of street demonstrations and destruction of private property in several of Mexico's northern cities has many Mexicans speculating about whether their country was secretly designated as a target for subversion at the big conference of Communist leaders in Havana last January.

Among Mexicans who attended the conference were delegates from the direct-action National Liberation Movement and the Independent Peasant Center, both cozy with the Reds.

U.S. officials here, who have been watching the population explosion and unrestricted land distribution whittle away at Mexico's over-all economic progress, are very concerned about the country's future.

The United States already has made two $20 million loans to Mexico to provide additional farm credit. It was the U.S. hope that Mexico would increase the present rate of delivering property titles to peasants in the Ejido program, so that the peasants would be eligible for credits and have new incentives for making improvements on their farms.

At the present rate, however, it is estimated that it would take 200 years to survey the land and grant titles to the waiting peasants.

The Mexican Government, in the opinion of experienced observers, has up to now adopted a head-in-the-sand attitude toward its farm problems. President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz in election-campaign speeches, warned that the landless peasants would have to be told that there was no more good land left to distribute. Yet, more than a year after President Diaz Ordaz took office, leading officials of his administration are still talking of large-scale land distribution.

CITIES VERSUS RURAL AREAS

Political blind alleys appear each time the government considers measures to help the peasants. Any diversion of public funds to the countryside means less money for projects in the cities.

Conditions in the cities may be, comparatively, much better than in rural areas, but, with the exploding population and daily arrival of new peasant families, there is already a staggering shortage of housing, sanitation and jobs. Starving the city, to feed the countryside would result in angering the labor unions and shopkeepers, thereby alienating the political strength of the government.

An honest approach to what has gone wrong with Mexico's land-reform program, it is realized, would result in bringing to the surface of all the faults of the Ejido system. Many Mexicans now consider it a failure, but insist that an internal upheaval would be touched off if the government even hinted that it planned to modify the Ejido system—an instrument of the revolution—because in the long run it had not provided the economic answers to Mexico's farm problem.

A PEASANT EXPLOSION

In September, 1961, a nationwide uprising of peasants swept through Mexico from its frontier with Guatemala to the U.S. border.

Evidence uncovered by the government at that time indicated that both Communist and rightist elements had been involved for months in a conspiracy to spur discontented peasants into anti-government demonstrations and attacks on army posts.

After armed forces moved quickly to put down the revolt, government officials estimated privately that casualties in the fighting had been 52 dead and 130 wounded. More than 500 peasants were arrested following the outbreak, but were later released.

Five years later, while the government still promises more land distribution to the restless peasants despite the fact there is none to give away, worried Mexicans are more fearful than ever of a rural explosion.

For the United States, a growing possibility exists that the normally peaceful condition across the Mexican border may suddenly become unstable.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I have an amendment on the desk which I propose to offer to the pending business, the District of Columbia teacher bill. After the morning hour is concluded, I hope to bring up my amendment after the Republican policy lunch, and will ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it, if I can get the necessary consent of my colleagues in the Senate.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the assertion that it is the duty of all citizens to obey all laws without regard to whether they deem them just or unjust seems to constitute absolute and incontrovertible truth. Nevertheless, its validity is being disputed nowadays by some clergymen and some civil rights leaders.

The press informs us that at its recent meeting in Montreat, N.C., the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, which is commonly called the Southern Presbyterian Church, adopted a resolution approving the doctrine of civil disobedience "as a last resort."

This action enables one to understand what the Angel Gabriel meant when he spoke this line to the Lord in the play entitled "Green Pastures":

> Everything what's nailed down is coming loose.

The Presbyterian Church has always been a bulwark of government by law. As one who gives his religious allegiance to this church and knows the lesson taught by history that there can be no liberty on this earth apart from government by law, I am deeply distressed by what the resolution of the general assembly says. I cannot believe it reflects the minds and hearts of the thousands of Presbyterians I have known and loved since my earliest years. It certainly does not reflect mine.

When all is said, the resolution declares that professing Christians have a God-given right to disobey laws they deem unjust. This declaration cannot be reconciled with government by law. It is, indeed, the stuff of which anarchy is made. It endows each person with absolute authority, allegedly divine in origin. to disobey any law he deems unjust according to any vague standard his own will may erect.

I do not believe that this attempt to make God an aider and abettor in crime finds support in the teachings of Christianity. I do not claim to be a theologian. I am merely a sinner who looks to the King James version of the Bible for religious guidance.

I find these plain words in I Peter, chapter 2, verses 13–15:

> Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake—for so is the will of God.

Besides, the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke make it plain that Christ Himself emphatically denied the validity of the civil disobedience doctrine when the chief priests and the scribes sought to entrap Him into saying that the Jews had the right to disobey the Roman laws requiring them to pay taxes to Caesar and thus "deliver Him unto the power and authority of the governor." As recounted in the 20th chapter of Luke, the chief priests and scribes put this question to Christ:

> Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Caesar, or no? Christ replied: "Shew me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it?" They answered and said, "Caesar's," and Christ said unto them: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's, and unto God the things which be God's."

While authority to establish moral laws belongs to God, the authority to enact laws governing the conduct of men in an earthly society undoubtedly belongs to Caesar.

There is no excuse, moreover, for any Americans to resort to illegal means to obtain any rights to which they believe they are justly entitled. This is true because all laws regulating their conduct in society are made by legislative bodies chosen by the people, and the right to petition these bodies for any rights belongs to all men.

I wish to say something more concerning rights which the resolution of the general assembly calls inalienable rights. All rights of this nature are guaranteed to all men by Federal and State constitutions, and courts of justice are open at all times to punish or redress their denial and compel their observance.

I make an affirmation which is subject to no exception or modification. While the crimes they seek to justify under the civil disobedience doctrine are ordinarily petty misdemeanors rather than felonies, the right of clergymen and civil rights leaders to disobey laws they deem unjust is neither greater nor less than the right of the arsonist, the burglar, the murderer, the rapist, and the thief to disobey the laws forbidding arson, burglary, murder, rape, and theft.

The News-Journal of Raeford, N.C., published a sound editorial on this question in its issue for April 28, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD LAW BE BROKEN?—CHURCH SAYS YES

The Presbyterian Church in the United States this week, approved civil disobedience "as a last resort" and warned against racial discrimination within its churches.

The first action, in effect, placed the Presbyterian Church alongside the Roman Catholic, Episcopal and other churches in the matter of civil rights, although Presbyterians generally are not as liberal in that regard as are Catholics, Episcopalians and others.

Civil disobedience is a controversial concept apt to confuse the law-abiding citizen who also insists that all Americans have inalienable rights. It has been practiced in this country almost exclusively in the civil rights movement and has been the primary tool of Dr. Martin Luther King and other civil rights leaders.

Civil disobedience, they have said, is perfectly all right as long as the law one is breaking is wrong in the first place. The Presbyterian Church has agreed, in effect, but with these limitations:

"This measure can be justified only under most pressing necessity * * *. But when such a situation prevails the church may properly support those using this means to obtain for themselves those inalienable rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator."

The church's assembly, in session this week in Montreat, prefaced its declaration with an affirmation of the church's belief in the rule of law. But the report said that in circumstances where some persons are unable to obtain their rights through the law, then civil disobedience may be countenanced.

This compromise with the rule of law, we feel, is a foolhardy, if not a dangerous thing. After all, the equality promised in the Constitution is "equality under the law," and the Constitution for almost 200 years has proved an ample protector of Americans' rights.

The church, no more than an individual, is not competent to declare what is an unjust and unfair law. The proper place to test the constitutionality of law is in the courts.

But the church does not confine its approval of civil disobedience to the seeking of rights guaranteed by the Constitution, but "those inalienable rights which all men are endowed by their Creator."

This raises a rather interesting question. Has the Master endowed us with more rights, or less than are guaranteed by the Constitution, which is not presumed to be divinely inspired?

Obedience of the law cannot be spelled out in such gray tones as "under extreme circumstances." It is highly desirable that the law be totally observed, like the abstinence from sin. Breach of the law should not be condoned by the church under any circumstances, however extreme; for generally speaking one cannot break the laws of man without transgressing against the laws of God.

TRANSACTION NO. 1—HIGH-INTEREST POLICY OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today, I invite the attention of the Senate to an unnecessary payment of $2,800,000 in interest charges by the Federal Government. This results from the Federal Government's selling debentures through Fannie Mae at an interest rate of 5½ percent when regular Government bonds with the same maturity are readily salable at 4.8 percent.

Last week, the Johnson administration attempted to ram through the Congress authority to sell $33 billion of our assets with intentions to use the proceeds therefrom to defray the normal operating expenses of the Government.

If successful, this would have made it possible for the administration over the next few years to spend $30 billion more than its income and deceive the American people by still reporting a balanced budget. In addition, those of us who opposed this deceitful method pointed out that it would cost the Federal Government substantially higher interest. While we were successful in reducing this authority to sell our assets from the requested $33 billion, the administration was successful in getting authority to sell around $10 billion of these assets during the next 2 years. They already had authority to sell some of these assets, but this legislation represented an additional $10 billion. These assets consisted of mortgages held by the Federal Government under its various lending agencies and were to be sold through FNMA, better known as Fannie Mae.

Today, the administration is making its first transaction since this backhanded procedure of financing its expenditures was approved by the Senate by selling $400 million in FNMA Government-guaranteed debentures. To prove to the American people just how unnecessarily expensive this Great Society gimmick will be to the taxpayers, it is my intention to run a continuing tabulation on each sale as it is made in the coming months, along with a computation of the additional interest rates that are paid.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a notice published in the Wall Street Journal of May 10 listing this sale of $400 million 12-month, 19-day debentures at an interest rate of 5½ percent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Wall Street Journal, May 10, 1966]

BOND MARKETS: FANNIE MAE $400 MILLION DEBENTURE PRICED AT DISCOUNT TO YIELD RECORD 5.5 PERCENT A YEAR

WASHINGTON.—The Federal National Mortgage Association priced today's $400 million issue of debentures to yield a record 5.5 percent annual interest.

The 12-month, 19-day securities are being offered at a discount price of $99.95 per $100 of face value, thus raising the yield to investors above the stated face interest rate of 5.45 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today's Wall Street Journal quotes regular U.S. Government notes with the same maturity of May 1967 at an interest rate of 4.8 percent. This represents an additional cost to the Government of .7 percent, or a total of $2,800,000 additional interest to go down as, what can best be described, the Great Society's high-interest rathole.

U.S. FARMERS NOT GETTING RICH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report carries an article entitled: "U.S. Farmers Getting Rich?"

Although most of the article is devoted to the income of two or three of the Nation's biggest and most efficient farmers, the concluding few paragraphs tell an interesting story.

It reads:

> In summary, the answer to the question of whether farmers are getting rich or not depends upon what kind of farmers you are talking about.
>
> Economists agree that the large farm and ranches, with adequate capital and good management, do quite well.
>
> How many of the Nation's 3.4 million farms fall in this class?
>
> The U.S. Department of Agriculture's estimates show 437,000 farms with gross income of more than $20,000 a year. Average net income on these farms in 1964 was $10,835.
>
> That income, say the Agriculture Department economists, means that the operators of top farms, on the average, are getting wages comparable to those of a skilled factory worker. And in addition they are getting a reasonable return on their investment.
>
> There still remain 3 million farmers, many of whom are getting neither a reasonable return on their investment nor wages comparable to those paid to a factory worker.

Mr. President, consider this statement. Actually, it is shocking. The one farmer in eight whose superlative management ability, heavy investment, and topflight efficiency has placed him at the pinnacle of this most efficient of American industries is getting wages comparable to a skilled factory worker.

At the peak of the greatest period of economic prosperity in our history, Mr. President, this is grossly unfair. As I disclosed on the floor last April 28, even among the super elite among farmers—those grossing over $40,000 per year—more than one-fifth of these farmers received a net income of less than $3,000 per year, and of course found themselves in the poverty class.

And what about the 8 out of 9 farmers whose farms yield less than $20,000 per year? These smaller farmers still include the most efficient farmers anywhere on earth—and throughout the history of the world—and, of course, these farmers—for all their efficiency, for their long, long hours of work, their investment—in spite of the fact that the inefficient farmers long ago left the farm, still the great majority of these remaining farmers are earning incomes close to the poverty level.

The answer to the U.S. News question, "Are farmers getting rich?" is an emphatic "No."

In considering farm legislation and anti-inflation legislation, we should keep this clearly in mind.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. NELSON. I commend the Senator for his comment on the dairy farm situation. As the Senator is well aware, in the State of Wisconsin, which we both represent, we have been losing dairy farms in the leading dairy farm State, at the rate of 14 farms a day. Since 1952, when we had 130,000 producers in Wisconsin, the number has dropped to under 80,000, which is the most rapid liquidation of any kind of producer in the history of this country. These are not inefficient farmers. As indicated on the posters at auctions, these are substantial farmers, those with 30, 40, and 50 milch cows.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. A study was made in Wisconsin in three areas of the State, in the areas where the highest rates were being earned on investment. In the three areas studied, it showed the farmers were earning 84 cents an hour. Of all the farmers of the Nation, the dairy farmer is one who has suffered most, when he is one of the most efficient of all the farmers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank my colleague for his statement, and for bringing out that figure in the area of Wisconsin where the dairy farmer is earning the most, showing that the income based on invested capital was 84 cents an hour. That is far less than the minimum wage. As the Senator from Wisconsin pointed out, these are the most efficient dairy producers in the world. The inefficient farmers have long ago left the farm.

These dairy farmers have an average investment of capital amounting to $50,000. They work long hours, 7 days a week. The cows have to be milked every day, 7 days a week. I think it is shocking that this should happen to the dairy farmers of our country, in view of the great contribution they have made to the prosperity of our country.

MEANS TEST ASPECT OF SCHOOL MILK PROPOSAL CRITICIZED IN HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one aspect of the Department of Agriculture's 1967 appropriation request that was given great consideration by the House Appropriations Committee was the proposed 80-percent cutback in the school milk program. And one aspect of this cutback that came in for heavy criticism was the means test that the redirection of the program, as a result of the cutback, would impose on the families of children who wished to participate in the program.

Perhaps no single witness before the House Appropriations Committee's Agriculture Subcommittee did a better job of commenting on this problem than Representative Richard H. Poff, of Virginia, who harked back to the days when the Kerr-Mills means test was at issue. I would like to quote from his remarks at this point:

> I remember some years ago a great outcry against a so-called means test incorporated in the Kerr-Mills program. It was said that the inclusion of such a poverty test foredoomed the total program to total failure. It was said that people truly in necessitous circumstances would be reluctant to apply for medical assistance if required to submit to an examination of their total income and total assets. Yet, that very same technique is to be imbedded in another program which affects the health and training of young people. The proposed cuts would be accomplished by restricting program benefits to those determined to be poverty victims. If the proposal should be accepted I can assure you that many who are truly indigent are also truly proud, so proud that they will deny themselves milk and food before they confess their own poverty by making an application. This means, of course, that the cut would hurt those who need the help most.

The House heeded this admonition as well as many other pleas for full funding of the school milk program. I intend to do everything I can here in the Senate to see that the program continues and prospers in its present form.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING, OR A COMPUTER IN EVERY POCKETBOOK?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a study that was recently reported in a Milwaukee Journal editorial indicates that there may soon be a computer in every pocketbook. The study showed that 33 young married women failed in more than 2 out of every 5 supermarket purchases to select the most economical packages.

The editorial points out that "other tests and surveys seem to confirm that as merchandising competition mounts, consumer confusion compounds." One answer to this confusion is the computer I referred to early. But a much sounder, more sensible answer would be quick congressional action on Senator Hart's truth-in-packaging bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the Journal editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Truth in Packaging

> In a supermarket test conducted recently by Eastern Michigan University, 33 young married women failed in more than 2 out of every 5 purchases to select the most economical packages. They were simply confounded by the plethora of packages: Economy, king size, jumbo, giant labels.
>
> Another survey disclosed laundry detergents on sale in 28 different weights, ranging from 13 ounces to 20 pounds.
>
> Other tests and surveys seem to confirm that as merchandising competition mounts, consumer confusion compounds. President Johnson recently urged legislation for "simple, direct, accurate, and visible" information on the nature and quality of ingredients, prevention of strangely shaped containers, and provision of reasonable and appropriate weights standards. Senator Hart, Democrat, of Michigan, has long sought truth in packaging.
>
> Congress ought to act promptly. Otherwise, housewives may soon need pocket computers to help get them through the week's shopping.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Rumanians have lived in their homeland on the eastern half of the Balkan Peninsula for many centuries. They have tilled its fertile soil and were so well rewarded by bountiful nature that for a long time Rumania was regarded as the breadbasket of Europe. These energetic people have lived in freedom, and have done their utmost to safeguard their independence. But in this they have not always been successful. Early in modern times the Ottoman Turks overran and conquered the country, and made it a province of their empire. Until the mid-19th century the Rumanians lived under the crude and cruel Turkish regime. On numerous occasions they rebelled against their oppressors, but they were unsuccessful in their attempt to regain their freedom until the late 19th century.

In 1856, at the conclusion of the Crimean War, the European powers effectively restrained the rule of the Ottoman Sultan over Rumania, and two autonomous principalities were created. Later these two principalities were united under one ruler. Still later, in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78, the Rumanians had their golden opportunity, and they took full advantage of it. On May 10, 1877, when there was little danger from the Turks, they proclaimed their independence, which a few years later, in 1880, led to the founding of the Rumanian Kingdom. The momentous proclamation of May 10, 1877, was of such significance to the Rumanians that they have always observed its anniversary as their national holiday, Rumanian Independence Day.

Since those distant days Rumanians have had their calamities and vicissitudes. They endured indescribable hardships during the war, hoping that in the end they would have their reward, but as so many other nations in Eastern Europe, they were rudely shocked and grievously disappointed. They were enslaved by Communist totalitarianism, and they still suffer under the tyranny imposed and maintained by the Kremlin. But even under such abominable conditions the Rumanians have not given up their hope for freedom, and they still cling to the spirit of May 10, 1877, the spirit of their Independence Day.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Rumanians constitute the largest ethnic element in the Balkan Peninsula, and their homeland is the second largest of all Balkan countries. In addition the country is the most fertile part of the Balkan Peninsula, possessing abundant natural resources. The Rumanian peasants for centuries held their own against their adversaries. But with the coming of the Ottoman Turks early in modern times they were unable to do this. The country was overrun, made part of the Ottoman Empire and for nearly four centuries the Rumanians lived as subjects of Ottoman sultans. But the Rumanian people were never reconciled with their subservient lot, and wanted to regain their freedom and national independence, but all their efforts failed and they patiently waited for the opportune time. That time proved to be in 1877.

The Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 was raging in the Balkans, and the Rumanians rose in revolt against the Turks, joined the Russians and proclaimed their independence on May 10 of 1877. At the end of that war Rumanians were assured of their independence, and this was guaranteed by the principal European governments. Thus May 10 became a real landmark in Rumanian history and has become a Rumanian national holiday.

It is one of the sad ironies of Rumanian history that while they had regained their freedom almost 90 years ago with the aid of Czarist Russian forces, at the end of the last war they were treacherously robbed of their freedom and independence by the Government of Communist Russia. Since then, for more than two decades, these people have not enjoyed freedom, although there are a few signs recently that they may be acting with some independence. Held down by the Communists as their heartless taskmasters, they hope and pray for their full liberation and freedom. On Rumanian Independence Day all their friends and sympathizers echo the genuine patriotic sentiments of the Rumanian people, and look forward to their liberation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, time after time, during 400 years as subjects of the Ottoman sultans, the proud and freedom-loving people of Rumania revolted and time after time they were beaten back and subjected to the cruelest punishment for their attempts. Finally, on May 10, 1877—89 years ago today—the indomitable spirit of this courageous people prevailed and they were able to declare themselves a free and independent nation. What a tragedy it is though that such gifted and courageous people, living in one of the most fertile lands of Europe, were not destined to retain that freedom and independence for even a century.

It was Rumania's misfortune to border the Soviet Union and that fact of geography caused them to be caught up in the early stages of World War II and made them one of the first victims of Soviet aggression in the days immediately following that holocaust. There 17 million Rumanians remain today, again cruelly dominated by an oppressive conqueror.

But, in spite of the chains of despotism and tyranny, the glow of freedom still burns brightly in the heart and soul of Rumanians, whether in the homeland or fortunate enough to be in one of the free nations of the world. In New York, because the people of the homeland can no longer commemorate the day that honors the achievement of Rumania's independence and the founding of its kingdom, thousands of people with strong ethnic ties to that nation will join in a celebration to bring to the day the honor it deserves.

Let us here, in this Chamber of freedom, join with these thousands in the prayerful hope that we shall all see the day again, and soon, when their brothers in the homeland can join together in the streets of the cities and towns of the country of their heritage and rejoice that freedom has once again been achieved.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SCOTT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA YOUNG REPUBLICANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on April 25 the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] addressed the District of Columbia Young Republican organization. In his talk he proposed a future course for the Young Republicans that should be noted throughout the Nation. Senator SCOTT has served our party well as national committee chairman, as national committee counsel, and now as vice president of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

Basically, he told the Young Republicans to be guided by the progressive, forward-looking principles of the Republican Party, which in the best sense have been the traditional principles of the Republican Party. Such speeches as the one Senator SCOTT made should bring new enthusiasm, new ideas, and renewed initiative to our party.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN THE U.S. SENATE AUDITORIUM BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA YOUNG REPUBLICANS

I think the Young Republicans generally ought to be praised for many of their programs, for instance, the YES–ACTT program (Youth Enlists Support Through American Train and Trucks) where, with others, YR's helped collect 100 boxcars of food, clothing, and medicines for South Vietnam.

But on the other hand we have incidents such as the toleration by too many YR's of the Rat Finks in New Jersey, a tiny minority of bigoted, immature young hellions who parade the ghosts of unspeakable horrors.

Mr. Robert L. Asher in an article in the Washington Post of April 10, 1966, states that new DCYR leadership "has discovered the common man in the District and plans to energetically seek their support and votes."

But we are confronted again with this strange dichotomy in YR actions by the Los Angeles County YR's who "read out of the party" Senator THOMAS KUCHEL—senior Senator from California and minority whip of the U.S. Senate.

Another good thing is the YR's plan to hold one of their meetings in the near future at Howard University "to take the DCYR's to the Negro population, and actively solicit their support and memberships."

But again there is the strange dichotomy in the fact that an admitted member of the John Birch Society was recently editor of the DCYR's official newsletter and, under his leadership, the club publication termed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 a Communist plot.

One of the good things, again, is the Southeast Settlement House project of the DCYR's which takes Republicans into areas of the city where our image needs the most help.

But on the other hand there was the riotous 1963 YR national convention which resembled "hell week at high school." I may add that I was there.

One of the good things at the 1965 YR convention was that the platform called for a tuition tax credit program to advance higher education.

But that same platform called for withdrawal from the 1963 limited nuclear test ban treaty which was supported by 25 out of 33 Republican Senators. In other words, the YR's were taking a position contrary to three-fourths of the Republican Senators who, in turn, represented only one-third of the U.S. Senate, therefore, taking a position supporting one-fourth of one-third. Your own new math will tell you quicker than I that you had a yen for destructiveness at that time.

Another of the good things is the good YR voter registration drives and your valuable efforts at the polls.

But on the other hand, you had that convention in Miami last year where one-way plane tickets were provided by certain groups for certain delegates to the convention, with return tickets provided only after they had voted the right way.

In the past the YR's in Wisconsin brought teenagers into the regular YR machinery solely for the purpose of voting control. Wisconsin's 12 delegates to the past YR National Convention were made up of 6 husband-and-wife teams.

Then there was that misbehavior when Governor Romney was here talking to you. The Republican Coordinating Committee was meeting that day. We were entitled to expect that the press would carry a good story on what our Governors were doing—Governors Scranton, Romney, Hatfield, and others. Instead of that, what we got was the bad news of Young Republicans misbehaving because bad news always outplays good news in the communications media.

Now the YR's are capable of civic paint-up, clean-up, safety, and hospital drives, things that all people admire as fine contributions to community welfare. But you are capable also of things which do you no credit, which go on your record, and which will not help your future careers, in my judgment, unless the Republican Party aims to be composed in its main body of similar hellions, which I deplore as a possibility.

One nationally syndicated column described that San Francisco YR Convention as a "nightmarish experience" * * * "degenerated into high decibel screaming, stamping, and booing."

There was a report that somebody tried to shove someone into one of the large jardinieres at the Palace Hotel—a hotel I am familiar with—and I suggested at the time, somewhat wryly, that your next meetings ought to be held at hotels with somewhat smaller jardinieres.

But why am I concerned? Why do I meddle? I think because too many people already have been trying to advise certain elements of the YR's that if they can find some way to top the immature activity of 1963 they may somehow be able to prevail again with a new program of disaster for the Republican Party. It is my hope that by illumination, elucidation, and argumentation that we may be able to avoid a much not-to-be-desired outcome.

I have served the party as national chairman and national counsel. I'm now vice chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee. I know that what's done by any Republican organization reflects upon all Republicans, and I know that the YR's could do more for your party, for your country, for yourselves than you are doing now.

Don't tolerate the political brain-twisted deviates in your midst. I don't mean to eliminate differences of opinion which are healthy for the organization. I'm a first amendment type. I believe with Chief Justice Hughes that freedom of speech is not for the thought we love, but freedom for the thought we hate, but it does not have to be elucidated in a hateful manner, accompanied by violence which the Supreme Court has not yet endorsed as far as I am aware.

Don't confuse political trickery with parliamentary skill. Don't confuse sharp practices with smart politics. Some of you know I wrote a book, "How To Go Into Politics." Some of you here may wish and wait for the sequel, which will be some time in coming: "How To Get Out."

Don't make these organizations paper clubs—which was done as far back as 1949—and don't permit rotten-borough schemes such as we saw at a New England conference.

Don't use the Marxist tactics of coming early to organize and staying late to tire out the opposition.

Don't allow the people who win elections to be counted out. Don't take the attitude that no election counts unless you win it. Remember, there will be another day. If you lose, lose fairly, lose decently, lose honorably, and then you are entitled to seek to win the next time around.

But, for heaven's sake, once you have lost, accept defeat without creating such furors as to bring shame upon the senior members of the organization and to destroy our carefully laid tactics to secure the greatest possible publicity, as on the occasion when Governor Romney was here at the Republican leadership conference, and also talked to you. All of us Republicans had hoped for good publicity from the leadership conference, but some people in the YR's, table toppers, those addicted to riot and civil commotion, proceeded immediately to cancel out all the good effects of this plan of the Republican National Committee because they deemed this a good time to riot after Romney. Now if that was your slogan, you'd better get another.

And don't allow quickie meetings with insufficient notice to persons who are entitled to participate so that control falls into the hands of those who do not represent your membership.

Don't go power mad. We're all in this business. It's a power business, an accumulation of power groups, of power politics, but it ought to be used in the decent sense of the term, that power comes from public opinion and public backing and not from backroom intrigues and petty trickery.

After you enter American public life you are expected to adhere to the basic American standards of fair play, and when contests are settled, contestants should join together for the common good.

Don't waste your time fighting over control of every minor unit of the organization. The responsibility of the YR's is to advance the cause of the whole party.

And I tell you now, and I tell you here, that if you are able to run your own affairs, you should run them. But if you become unable to run your own affairs, there exists the power in the Republican National Committee to establish a youth directorship to run them. I hope we don't come to that. I hope you don't get to be what the Young Democrats are—a powerless group of stooges and front people and sons and daughters of leading Democratic politicians in Washington, called together on occasion to adopt resolutions previously prepared for them by the Democratic hierarchy.

You are better than that today, and you can be much better than that, so don't go so far that you provoke the Republican Party generally into determining that you aren't responsible people because I believe that in the majority and on the whole you are, but I hope I am making some of you so darned mad that you will rethink some of your views. I hope I am making some of the rest of you so concerned and so involved that you'll go out and fight, as moderates so often hesitate to do. Such nice people—the middle-of-the-roaders—who so often hate to fight for their convictions.

We need you. We need you for what you were in 1952, and 1956, and 1960. And I stop there in the interest of decency. But we need you. [Applause and one loud boo.] Go right ahead and boo. I'll take time out. Anybody else want to boo? That's the voice of dissent I spoke about.

We need you to tap the high schools and the college campuses, to bring the vitality and dynamics of youth there.

We need you to tell us more about the needs and aspirations of those 35 million junior executives, new intellectuals, young marrieds, and others in the age group from 21 to 35, which before many years will constitute almost half of the country's population.

We need your energies to carry out the service projects of useful community action.

We need you to lead us to victory in the big urban areas the way young men led the Republican Party to victory last year in New York, in Philadelphia, in Louisville, and in the Ohio cities.

We need you to give us better representation among minority and ethnic groups.

We need you because you represent the generation that will lead this party in the near future, and if you lead it properly, our party will also lead the Nation. All things are possible here for you if you have the will to do these things, the will to make these things count.

But let me say to you, I understand you are about to discuss Rhodesia. I would much rather see you discuss Southwest Washington or Southeast Washington. Why must some of you go so far in your evident desire to further alienate the Negro as to slate a debate on Rhodesia when all around you—all around you—is human suffering, disadvantage, underprivilege?

All around you are problems crying for solution. All around you is the cry for equality, equal justice under law, the dignity of man and all the other things that you ought to be getting excited about.

All around you are things the Democrats are not doing. You ought to be ready to leapfrog the Democratic present into the Republican future, as Clare Booth Luce says.

You ought to be ready to seize the challenges of the future. You ought to be prepared to seize them right at your doorstep. But you are going to debate Rhodesia so as to alienate such Negroes as still may hopefully retain some membership in your ranks.

Go ahead with your program of self-destruction if you will. While you're doing it, why don't you come out for Nasser, too? Then you might be able to alienate another group. And if you hold a meeting in a back room, you will alienate some more. And after a while there'll be so few of you that you'll have what you want—a tiny, little smoke-filled room of the white, Anglo-Saxon, superprivileged country club set. If that's what you want, you're not in the Republican tradition.

I say to you that what's good for the country is good for the Republican Party, and there's no objection to our finding it out. If you want to win, it seems to me that what's good for the Republican Party had better be good for the country.

A southern Republican candidate for high office, a very nice and able and friendly man said to me the other day, "We are going to get the Negro vote in my State." I said to him, in all amiability, "Not unless you change your present strategy." I hope to have a further talk with him because I believe the hope of the party in the South, as elsewhere, is a party which appeals to all of the people of a community and which gives them free choice, free option, and which does not say to any part of a community, you are eligible for our party or organization or you are not.

There is a great future for the Republican Party in the Southern States. I am a southerner born. I have never been a Democrat because I learned to read. I have never been a New Dealer because at the age of around 3 I learned to dress myself.

But I was born in the South and I know this problem. I know that in the State of Virginia they are approaching it with respect for the problem itself, respect for the necessity of appealing to all of the voters. When they run a man like Linwood Holton they are acting constructively in Virginia.

And in many of the Southern States we Republicans have been acting constructively and have been carrying Southern States, but we aren't going to do it if we pick up the low ground as fast as the Democratic Party abandons it, and if we allow the Democratic Party to preempt all the high ground around because we are so afraid of contaminating ourselves with new thought, new programs, new action, and new people.

Speaking as a moderate, the moderate needs to have audacity to be acceptable. Perhaps the moderate Republican approaches problems from a more conservative perspective; the Democratic moderate from a more liberal perspective. The fact that they at times meet on common ground is not me-tooism. It is time to put away the tired old notion that to be real Republicans we must be as different as possible from our opponents. There's no more sense in that view than in the idea that we must be for vegetarianism, fluoridation, or free love because our opponents are not.

We have to be possessed of abundant enthusiasm. I recall how much in the last year people have been saying the Republican Party needs to be a party of inclusion and not of exclusion. Ladies and gentlemen, I said that in a speech on the first day of March 1959, at the Republican assembly at Coronado, Calif.—over 7 years ago. I was pleading for what we didn't get in 1964 and for what we had better get in 1966 and 1968 if we are going to win.

We have suffered the worst defeat this party has ever been subjected to. Is there hope for the future? Yes; I think that the future is ours if we'll go out and take it. I think Republican victory is on every hand. I think it is almost inconceivable how many positions Republicans can win in 1966 and 1968 if we go out and work as a unified party to get them.

Now you will say, if he wants a unified party, why does he scold part of it?

I do that because I am asking you to do something which we all have a right to ask ourselves to do. I speak to you as a former isolationist. I speak to you as a man who once spoke of "liberty versus socialism." I speak to you as a man who went all over this country saying the only real danger to us was the danger of Communist infiltration. I speak to you as somebody who rode the ancient cliches of the past too far into the future to suffer the tolerance of the majority of this country.

Of course communism is bad, and of course it's menacing, and of course we're fighting it. But let us for once come up with some ideas of our own. Let us think of some imaginative alternatives in foreign policy, some imaginative proposals in domestic policy.

I, who admit freely many mistakes, ask you not to make the mistakes your seniors made. Not to make the mistakes that many powerful Senators of the past and many powerful Representatives made. Not to walk into the future with your hands tied behind you adhering only to the ancient adages of the past. Free yourselves. Free your minds. Answer the question, what is truth? And find out. But you are not going to find out if you spend all your time around the barrooms and the hotel rooms trying to figure out how to put the shaft to somebody else.

Let's get on with it. What I'm saying is let's behave. We've had our problems. Your senior Republicans have done some ridiculous things and all of us have made mistakes, grievous mistakes. We've lost elections which we shouldn't have lost. We've made decisions that have cost us Congressman after Congressman out of some failure to be willing to assess the exact nature of that congressional district or that State.

Time after time we've lost. But we have a new chance. Don't make our mistakes. And don't out-do yourselves trying to make new and better mistakes worse than ours.

I'm not here expecting you to like me. I had to make a decision to come down here and expect you to—in the name of heaven, in the name of your country, and in the name of the Republican Party—start thinking. Start thinking about what you do. Is it right? Will it help the country? Is it good? Can we afford it? Should the Republicans advocate it? And let's, for heaven's sake, have the courage to stand up and to fight for our convictions. Once we have decided to behave ourselves, let's train our weapons against the real opposition—the Democratic Party.

Thank you for letting me come here and be so frank. Thank you, I hope, for trying to understand that what I am doing is to try to lance these carbuncles of dislike, intolerence, hatred, bigotry, and mutual trickery.

"LEADERSHIP INSTEAD OF INTRIGUES"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SCOTT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on April 16 Senator SCOTT spoke at my alma mater, Yale University, before the National Student Leadership Conference sponsored by the College Republican National Committee. In an address entitled "Leadership Instead of Intrigues," Senator SCOTT pointed out the need of young Republicans—and all Republicans, for that matter—to pursue the same constructive approach in politics that they have shown in their civic responsibilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SCOTT's statement be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR SCOTT URGES MORE YOUNG REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSTEAD OF INTRIGUES

There are 32 million Americans in the voting age group of 21 to 35. That is more than the number of people who voted for the Republican presidential candidate in 1964.

One would think that the Republican Party would be very much concerned about reaching those young voters. And it is.

One would also think that the Young Republicans, as the established arm of the party among the young, would be a force within the party, the rallying ground for young voters, and the key to victory. But it is not.

The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in the strange dichotomy that has afflicted Young Republican activities in the past several years.

The Young Republicans, which are capable of constructive organization like this National Student Leadership Conference, are capable also of bizarre hotel room intrigues which are so destructive of representative organization in the Young Republicans.

The Young Republicans are capable of civic paint up, clean up, safety drives that all people admire as important contributions to community welfare. But the Young Republicans are capable also of the riotous 1963 national convention, which resembled hell week at high school, and which made people wonder whether they wanted those young leaders in their communities at all.

The YR's are capable of YES/ACTT—youth enlists support through American Christmas train and trucks—where, with others, they helped collect 100 boxcars of food, clothing, and medicines for South Vietnam. I am especially proud of the role played in that effort by John Acton, head of the Pennsylvania YR's and his devoted followers.

But other YR's tolerate the Rat Finks, a tiny minority of immature hellions who sing unfunny songs. These songs humiliate religious and racial minority groups, parade the ghosts of unspeakable horrors, and violate the sensibilities of all Americans.

Even at the most recent Young Republican National Convention in Miami, the platform reflected that strange dichotomy: It called for a tuition tax credit program to advance higher education, which is a forward-looking proposal endorsed by almost all Republicans. It also called for withdrawal from the 1963 limited nuclear test ban treaty. In the U.S. Senate, Republican Senators voted 25 to 8 for ratification of that treaty. I was one of those voting to ratify.

I am very much concerned with those developments among the YR's because I have been a Republican all my life, have served the party as its national chairman, and am now vice chairman of the Republican senatorial committee. I know that whatever is done by any Republican organization reflects upon all Republicans and I know that the Young Republicans could do much more for us senior Republicans than they are doing now.

We need you to tap the high schools and the college campuses to bring the vitality and dynamics of youth into our party.

We need you to tell us more about the needs and aspirations of those 32 million junior executives, new intellectuals, young marrieds and others in the age group from 21 to 35.

We need your energies to carry out the service projects of useful community action.

We need you to lead us to victory in the big urban areas the way young men led the Republican Party to victory last year in New York, Philadelphia, and Louisville.

We need you to give us better representation among minority and ethnic groups.

We need you because you represent the generation that will lead this party in the near future, and if you lead it properly, our party will also lead the Nation.

SGT. JAMES P. MONAGHAN—AN AMERICAN SERVICEMAN IN VIETNAM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Eugene Patterson, editor of the Atlanta Constitution.

Mr. Patterson tells the story of an American serviceman—Sgt. James P. Monaghan, of the U.S. Special Forces—who is on his third voluntary tour of duty in Vietnam.

After an interview, Sergeant Monaghan said:

> I know exactly what I'm going back to, and I believe those people are worth it.

His moving account of his duty in Vietnam will be of interest, I feel sure, and with this in mind I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VIEW FROM A SHAU

(By Eugene Patterson)

"When I put on the green beanie," said Sgt. James P. Monaghan, gesturing with his U.S. Special Forces beret, "I knew what I might be signing up for." He got it—mortar fragments through his left shoulder at A Shau. That was during his third voluntary tour of duty in Vietnam.

He is shortly returning, at his own request, for a fourth.

Two metal pins secure his damaged shoulder

His home is in Philadelphia. He is waiting for Vietnam orders at Fort Bragg. He is visiting Atlanta and came by to register a quiet protest about some of the war stuff he is reading in the press.

"They wiped out your camp at A Shau," I said.

"Yes," said the husky, freckled-faced young man. "I lost some friends there."

What was on his mind? "I just thought the people ought to be a little prouder of the American troops out there," he said, surveying me levelly. "They're doing the job. They may not have licked Charlie yet. But they're kicking his * * *."

Are they really doing that well? "They are. And they're doing it the way they have to—out in the bush, hunting him down. You know we're making progress because the South Vietnamese people are bringing us intelligence. They're telling us where the VC ambushes are. They were afraid to do that when they thought Charlie would win. Now they think we'll win."

Will we? "We've got to," he said. "If we lose face now, no Asian can believe in this country again. Some people back home don't seem to understand how important that is. I don't care anything about all those global arguments. This is one place, one time. We said to those people. 'Do you want to be free?' They do, and we said all right. We've got to deliver. And we will. Right out in the bush. All we need is troops. Forget bombing Hanoi. What does it get you, killing a lot of civilians?"

What about the antigovernment demonstrations out there? Sergeant Monaghan shrugged "Hue's a hick town," he said. "Saigon and Da Nang are the big cities. But people in those cities haven't any idea what's going on. The war's out in the bush. Those demonstrators are about like the peace demonstrators in Washington. I don't think they speak for the country." He showed no resentment.

Why is he going back? "I believe in this war," he said quietly. "Have you ever seen a man who has never had a full bowl of rice? Have you ever seen a 13-year-old kid with his hand cut off, or a schoolteacher with a stake driven through her, lengthwise? That's how Charlie makes his politics work. I don't like that. We can't make our politics work that way. So what we've got to do first is knock Charlie off their backs. Then they'll choose their own way. We can help fill up the rice bowl."

I told him to be careful. "If I don't get back," he said, standing up quietly—a stocky little American with paratrooper wings on one side of his chest and the Purple Heart on the other—"you just remember, I know exactly what I'm going back to, and I believe those people are worth it."

LAW DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Law Day was the occasion for a speech by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], at the George Washington University Law School on Monday, May 2, 1966.

Senator BREWSTER discussed at length the advantages which rich litigants have over poor litigants in our system. The poor, moreover, are often unaware of their legal rights and are often, in Senator BREWSTER's words, "sitting ducks for those unscrupulous enough to take advantage of their ignorance."

My own experience as a lawyer, as U.S. Attorney for Maryland, and as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee confirms Senator BREWSTER's judgment that the great inequities in our system must be removed.

I know many of my colleagues will concur in Senator BREWSTER's insistence that legal services to the poor must be met in the interest of justice. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion of the full text of Senator BREWSTER's speech at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW DAY SPEECH BY SENATOR DANIEL B. BREWSTER AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, MONDAY, MAY 2, 1966

It is a wise idea to step back from the law books, the briefs, and the motion papers to reflect on the broader aspects of the law. Law Day is set aside for that purpose, and I appreciate your inviting me here to participate in your annual observance of this day.

The rush toward examinations will begin here shortly. The daily demands on the students, on the lawyer, and on the lawmaker frequently make it hard to see the forest for the trees. I hope that my remarks this afternoon will stimulate some thinking about certain broad problems in our legal system and the contribution which you, as lawyers or future lawyers, can make to the solution to these problems.

"Respect the law—it respects you." This is the Law Day theme. It calls to mind the axiom "The law is no respecter of persons."

But it has become increasingly apparent in recent years that the law is a respecter of persons—that the law often operates to favor the rich litigant over the poorer litigant. This is not a criticism of our juridical system or our law enforcement officials. I believe they are working conscientiously to secure justice for all our citizens.

The heart of the difficulty is economic. It lies in the existence of poverty in an otherwise wealthy nation. Poverty and an adversary system of jurisprudence combine to disfavor the poor.

Many of our people cannot afford attorneys' fees. Others are not aware of the availability of legal services. In fact, legal advice is not readily available in many of our poorer neighborhoods.

Most tragic of all is the prevalent ignorance of their legal rights manifest among the poor. These many thousands of unfortunates are unaware of the legal restrictions on the activities of landlords, money lenders, credit departments, and others with whom they deal. As a result, they who can least afford to be cheated are like sitting ducks for those unscrupulous enough to take advantage of their ignorance.

A recent survey which sampled heads of families in the impoverished sections of Baltimore revealed some startling facts. Sixty-four percent of those interviewed had never consulted a lawyer. Almost half viewed the costs of attorneys' fees as a major obstacle to obtaining legal advice. Ten percent said they had no idea where to go to obtain a lawyer.

The neighborhood legal services program sponsored here in Washington by the United Planning Organization has provided an additional dramatic indication of the unmet demand for legal services:

1. Three thousand five hundred indigent clients received assistance from the neighborhood legal services during its first year of operation.

2. Eighty percent of back rents and installment payments—many of them exorbitant and often illegal—have been saved.

3. Neighborhood legal services has obtained dismissal of 55 percent of the criminal charges against its clients.

Beyond the question of legal advice and representation for the poor, there are separate problems connected with the procedural and substantive aspects of the law itself.

There are great inequities in the bail system. People who are fortunate enough to be able to afford bail when they are arrested need spend only a few hours in jail, while poor people may often be forced to spend months behind bars awaiting trial.

Having recently visited the District of Columbia jail and observed firsthand the incredibly poor conditions, I can assure you that imprisonment is a terrible experience for anyone. Recently there has been considerable investigation into the effects of our bail system, including a long and detailed experiment here in the District. We hope that this newly awakened interest in the bail problem will lead to more equitable treatment.

Another indication of the trend towards insuring equal justice for rich and poor alike is to be found in the series of Federal and State court decisions emphasizing the rights of all citizens before and during trial.

In the historic *Gideon* v. *Wainright* decision, the Supreme Court held that indigent defendants had a right to counsel during trial in every court in the land. More recently, this decision has been extended to include the right to counsel during certain phases of pretrial questioning by the police.

The reaffirmation of the right to freedom from arbitrary arrest and search and seizure also has an important impact on the rights of the poor, since police are far more likely to make dragnet arrests of slum dwellers than of doctors or lawyers. They are also more inclined to make illegal searches of tenements than suburban mansions. Whether or not one agrees with every one of these decisions, the trend of emphasizing the equality of legal position of all our citizens is encouraging.

There are thousands of indigents in this city and in most of the other major cities of the United States. Programs of legal aid are not likely to run out of potential clients. The only limit will be the availability of funds—and of lawyers, like yourselves, who are willing to devote some time to this most pressing task.

As long as poverty continues to exist, lawyers must be concerned with its effects on the administration of justice. The final and most desirable solution obviously lies in the elimination of poverty, and I have every hope that the current programs being carried forward by the Office of Economic Opportunity and many other Federal and State agencies will be successful in this regard.

At the same time, it would be unrealistic to assume that the Great Society can be achieved overnight. For the immediate future, we must consider carefully and seriously the best methods of providing equality before the law to our less fortunate citizens.

There is more or less general agreement that legal services should be expanded, and directly into the areas where the potential indigent beneficiaries live, but there are still differences of opinion as to how the program should be carried out and by whom.

The importance of legal aid is only now beginning to be appreciated. Private arrangements for legal assistance to the indigent have been in effect for many years. Some Government-backed programs, supported either by the Federal or local governments, have also been established. But last year, an important new step was undertaken by the Office of Economic Opportunity, which directs the war on poverty. OEO, realized that unavailability of legal services can be a severe handicap to equal opportunity for the poor, and has begun to offer funds to programs designed to provide such services.

This development of Government-sponsored legal aid has raised serious questions for the legal profession. It has embroiled us once again in the continuing controversy over the proper roles and functions of Government and of private-professional endeavor.

I am not here to settle the arguments which may be made. I am here to tell you that the demand for legal services to the poor must be met in the interest of justice. I am here to tell you that the consequences of a failure to meet this demand and to meet it in a timely way might well be fatal to our traditions of law and order.

I am here to remind you of something else—to remind you that history shows, where private and professional efforts fail, the Government almost always steps in. There are lessons to be learned by the legal profession from the experiences of the medical profession in the matter of medicare and currently from the food and automotive industries in respect to their products.

A careful, critical, and courageous self-evaluation of our own industry and its product combined with prompt action to meet the current and future requirements of our whole society is what is needed now.

If this is a challenge to the bar to participate with renewed vigor in providing legal advice and representation to those who cannot afford to pay for it, then let it be so. For, though our courts have manifested a deep concern for the rights of the poor and our lawyers have cooperated in these efforts, we still have a long way to go.

The most important contribution to this movement can be made by you—by law students, professors, and practitioners. You can and you must spearhead the advance of equal justice by giving of your understanding, your knowledge, and your time. In this way, you can be sure of participating in, not being victimized by, a contemporary revolution.

You can help to insure that the law will respect you and that all our citizens, rich or poor, will respect the law and the lawyer too.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, former Gov. Alf Landon, of Kansas, submitted a memorandum to the Republican coordinating committee of March 10, 1965. Among the items presented was a statement in reference to conflict of interests which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Conflict of Interests

(Memorandum to Republican coordinating committee meeting of Mar. 10, 1965)

The vast expansion of government throughout the economic life of our Nation demands a strong and workable conflict of interests statute. A statute covering both the giver and the taker of all gifts, loans, fees, or commissions, whether in cash or in kind.

Such a statute should apply to all echelon of the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government and their staffs—not only during their terms of public service, but for 5 years thereafter. It should also apply to members of their families and any partnership, firm, family corporation or limited trust agreement.

Men are willing to sacrifice their lives in the Armed Forces of our country. The traditions of public service without reward—except honor—reach back to the beginning of our great and beloved Republic. We believe they are still valid.

The attempt to avoid the appearance of conflict of interests by arrangements that cover only the limited period of public service is a pitiful sham. The Republican Party should lead the fight to curb these present and potential abuses.

CONGRATULATIONS, COMMISSIONER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a change in leadership is a proper time for reassessment and rededication. New leaders mean new spirit and new ideas.

The new leader at the Bureau of Indian Affairs is Robert LaFollette Bennett, a man we Alaskans like to claim as our own. As was proper, consideration of Mr. Bennett's nomination by the Senate prompted discussion of BIA programs, past, present, and future. His nomination also prompted praise and support for the man who was to become the first Indian to head the Bureau since 1875.

The extent of the nationwide support is indicated by the large number of congratulatory messages sent the new commissioner.

I have already expressed my strong support for the new commissioner. I would like to emphasize that support by asking unanimous consent that congratulatory messages sent the new commissioner be printed in the Record.

I also ask unanimous consent that remarks by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, at the recent BIA conference at Santa Fe, be printed in the Record. Secretary Udall's remarks are a commitment of support for the new spirit and new ideas to be generated by the arrival of a new BIA commissioner.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Girl Scouts of the
United States of America,
New York, N.Y., March 28, 1966.

Mr. Robert LaFollette Bennett,
Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: I am happy to send you my sincere congratulations upon your appointment by President Johnson to the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The Girl Scout organization is proud of its long association with the Bureau. We are especially pleased that a memorandum of cooperation between our two organizations will soon be sent to all of your officers thrughout the country as well as to all of our Girl Scout regions and councils. It is our hope that this reaffirmation of friendship will foster closer relationships in the future.

I send you my best wishes for success in your new office.

Sincerely yours,

Louise A. Wood,
National Executive Director.

State of Alaska,
Department of Commerce,
Anchorage, March 25, 1966.

Mr. Robert L. Bennett,
Bureau of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: It gave me a thrill to read where you have been nominated for the Commission's appointment in Washington, D.C. I am sure that the Congress, in their wisdom, will act fast and favorably in this because of your splendid record.

Since I have been appointed Director of Air Commerce under the Public Service Commission and moved to Anchorage, I have missed the personal contact with the coastal passengers that I enjoyed in my flying duties. I am sure that Cleota is as thrilled and happy as Maxine and me. Please extend to her my very warmest regards. And Bob, to you I want to send my most heartfelt congratulations on this nomination. I will look forward to seeing you both in Washington on my next trip and then, perhaps I will be able to take advantage of the raincheck you extended me for our last dinner engagement.

Kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,

Quentin L. DeBoer,
Director of Air Commerce, Alaska Public Service Commission.

Alaska Native Brotherhood,
Juneau, Alaska, March 30, 1966.

Hon. Robert L. Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The ANB and ANS camp No. 2, Juneau congratulates you on your recent appointment as Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Best wishes for a productive and fruitful administration.

Respectively,

Amos Wallace,
President.
Stella Martin,
President.

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1966.

Mr. Robert LaFollette Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: I was pleasantly surprised to read about your recent nomination to be the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs. When I think of your birthplace on the Oneida Indian Reservation in Outagaimie County it brings back fond memories of the days I played golf at the Oneida Golf and Riding Club—I outsliced everybody.

May I wish you every success in your new assignment.

Sincerely yours,

LaVern R. Dilweg.

Indian Council Fire,
Chicago, Ill., March 26, 1966.

Hon. Robert L. Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: We have been happy to read of your "ascendancy" to the position of Commissionership.

This is not only an historic event; it is one that will reflect great credit upon the Indian people as well, and upon your own successful and contributing career.

We wish you well and pledge you our cooperation.

Sincerely,

Willard LaMere,
President.

Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee,
Lapwai, Idaho, March 31, 1966.

Hon. Robert L. Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Commissioner Bennett: The Nez Perce Indian Tribe of Idaho salutes you and extends its most cordial felicitations on your appointment as Commissioner.

We are thrilled that an American Indian now heads the important agency of our Federal Government dealing with the complex problems facing our Indian people in this supersonic age. Few, if any, have ever attained this high post with a background of experience and leadership in the administrative field such as yours. In addition, we know that you will approach the Indians' problems from an inherent and sympathetic viewpoint.

Many of our members had the good fortune to become acquainted when you were in Lewiston for the National Congress of American Indians. All of us await your earliest return visit as our "Chief."

Our tribe stands ready at all times to assist you as you lead the crusade for protection of Indian rights and the attainment of the American Indians' just role in the Great Society.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Richard A. Halfmoon, chairman; Richard M. Ellenwood, secretary; Jesse Greene, assistant secretary treasurer; Harrison Lott, member; Joseph Samuels, member; August A. Wilson, vice chairman; Phil D. Typos, treasurer; Moses Thomas, chaplain; Frank W. Penney, member.

Miama, Fla.,
March 29, 1966.

Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

Following message sent to Senators Smathers and Holland this date:

We would appreciate your support of the nomination of Robert L. Bennett as Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Mr. Bennett's long dedicated service to Indians and his understanding of their problems, we believe, qualifies him for this high position.

Buffalo Tiger,
Chairman, Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida.

Seattle, Wash.,
March 26, 1966.

Robert L. Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my personal congratulations on your recent appointment.

Having worked with you in the affairs of the Tlingit and Haida Indians I know that with your personal qualifications your appointment will assure fair and equitable treatment and the greatest benefits to all Indians. May I wish you continued success in your new endeavor.

Thradore R. Denny,
Tlingit and Haida.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1966.

Hon. Robert L. Bennett,
Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: Commissioner: I am happy to learn that the President has nominated you for the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

I am familiar with the fine job that you have performed with the Bureau. Let me take this opportunity to congratulate you on this outstanding nomination and to assure you of my support.

Sincerely,

E.S. Johnny Walker.

The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation,
Dixon, Mont., March 24, 1966.

Hon. Robert L. Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: It is with pleasure that we learn of your appointment as Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Your background of many years at all levels of the Bureau and your racial heritage undoubtedly make you the best qualified Commissioner the Bureau has had in many years.

We are looking forward to cooperating with the Bureau in the programs you, undoubtedly, will be instituting for the betterment of the Indian people.

We wish you every success in your new position and we want you to know that the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes through its Business Council pledges its support to your administration.

Very truly yours,

Lyman Trahan,
Chairman, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes.

Band of Mission Indians,
March 25, 1966.

Commissioner Robert Bennett,
Bureau of Indian Affairs,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: Upon the occasion of having lunch with you in Washington during my last visit with tribal delegates from the Agua Caliente Band, I concluded that making you a Deputy Commissioner would be beneficial for all Indians. Hence, I now emphatically offer my congratulations to you upon your new role as Commissioner of Indian Affairs through which the benefits to the Indians can be even greater.

Please allow me to wish you the very best of good fortune and many years of outstanding service.

With kindest regards,

Raymond C. Simpson.

Assistant Commandant,
U. S. Coast Guard,
March 21, 1966.

Hon. Robert L. Bennett,
Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: I noted with great interest a recent news item stating that you had been nominated by the President to be the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Please accept my sincere congratulations on your nomination. Your recognition has been well earned.

Sincerely,

W. D. Shields,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard.

Executive Council of the
Episcopal Church,
New York, N.Y., March 25, 1966.

Hon. Robert Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: We extend to you our heartiest congratulations upon your appointment as U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs. You have served in the Indian Service with deep concern, commitment, effectiveness and distinction. You are prepared in an amazing way for this new and demanding task.

We know also that you are well aware of how difficult an assignment this is, and that no mortal can be fully prepared for what is ahead. Be assured we stand ready to be of whatever help and support we can at any time and circumstance. Our prayers are with you.

This letter is sent on behalf of the presiding bishop and all of us in the executive council of the Episcopal Church. I add my own personal good wishes for a good life for you and your family in Washington and I look forward to our continued association in behalf of American Indian welfare.

My esteem and personal regards,

The Reverend Doctor
Clifford L. Samuelson,
Executive Officer for Special Field Ministries.

Washington, D.C., *March 18, 1966.*

Robert L. Bennett,
Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.:

My heartiest congratulations on your nomination to post of BIA Commissioner. Cannot envision a finer choice by the President and know the Senate will feel the same. Best wishes for your future success. Regards

Ralph J. Rivers,
Member of Congress.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.
March 24, 1966.

Bob L. Bennett,
Office of Bureau of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.:

The All Indian Pueblo Council of New Mexico has authorized me as its chairman to contact you with regard to the Senate confirmation of Mr. Robert L. Bennett as Commissioner of Indian Affairs. It is our opinion that President Johnson's selection of Mr. Bennett an Oneida Indian from Wisconsin is a wise and judicious choice of a man who has demonstrated exceptional ability in Indian affairs administration. We sincerely solicit your active support of Mr. Bennett's confirmation by the Senate as Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Sincerely yours,

Domingo Montoya,
Chairman of the All Indian Council.

Standing Rock Sioux Tribe,
Fort Yates, N. Dak., March 15, 1966.

Mr. Robert Bennett,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: First, I want to congratulate you for reaching the highest position in the Indian service and speaking for my Sioux people and myself, we are proud of you.

After 6 years absent from the tribal council, I am again one of their members and I must say it is shocking to find the mismanagement of our administration in both the general and rehabilitation program. Most of our council members are more interested in the money they receive in attending the meetings and boozing it up. Since coming back to the council I find the chairman and the rehabilitation manager most of the time on a drunk and there seems nothing we could do about it. It is my honest opinion that the superintendent should step in and correct the condition that has got out of hand.

It was embarrassing to me when Mr. Sonosky visited us to have the chairman on a week drunk and even had the gall to appear at the office in that stupid condition. Maybe Mr. Sonosky is encouraging these tribal officials and council members boozing it up. After all he is an attorney for the tribal council.

At my age I would like to see something progressive done for my people and unless the Bureau officials take the bull by the horn and correct the present conditions we will continue to go back to our primitive ways. I do not believe we have dedicated workers among our Bureau employees, they are more interested to see if they can get a promotion or a transfer in some other area, than to think of the needs for our people. We hear so many times the Bureau is only here to look after the land problems of the Indians. This is a wrong statement as I know they have their hands in every activity of the Indian people, whether it be money, welfare, family trouble, etc., they are always there to interpret regulations, whether there be one or not. So it is my opinion that stern action by the Bureau is required now days to put our Indian people as well as the members of the council on the right path. Unless this is accomplished I see no bright future for our people. We have more employees now than we ever had, and what do the Indian people on the reservation have? Nothing. We have more chiefs than Indians in the Bureau. Rather than getting myself all worked up I had better stop.

I know Mr. Bennett you will be an asset to the Indian Bureau as well as the Indian people, as you know the weak and strong points of the Indians, you know reservation life, you know the thinking of an Indian, with all these knows you have advantage over other Commissioners. You have my full support in anything you might promote for our people. I know the Standing Rock Indians will support you in every way.

I just had to write you as a friend and let you know my feeling on these wrong doings.

Respectfully yours,

James McLean.

The Vice President,
Washington, March 21, 1966.

Mr. Robert LaFollette Bennett,
Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: Congratulations on your nomination as Commissioner of Indian Affairs. We welcome you to this very important assignment.

The betterment of the social and economic conditions of our Indians should be a matter of primary concern. As Senator from Minnesota, I spent a great deal of time trying to improve conditions of our Indians in Minnesota. I know that you have been doing the same throughout the country and especially in your native area of Wisconsin.

If there is ever anything I may do to be of assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Hubert H. Humphrey.

State of Alaska,
Office of the Governor,
Juneau, March 21, 1966.

Mr. Robert L. Bennett,
Commissioner, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: Thank you very much for your letter of February 14, with enclosure, giving your reason for deciding to finance cannery operations at Klawock rather than Hydaburg this year.

I was very happy to hear of your promotion to Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I extend to you my heartiest congratulations. With your qualifications for the position, Bob, I feel the Bureau has made an excellent choice.

Kindest personal regards to you, your wife and family.

Sincerely,

William A. Egan,
Governor.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1966.

Hon. Robert L. Bennett,
Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: Just a quick note to congratulate you on what I understand is an established fact, that you will be the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

While this is a terrific responsibility I think the best man is getting the job.

My congratulations and my pledge to do everything I can to help lighten the burden of this responsibility.

With my kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. Y. Berry.

Nedrow, N.Y.,
March 13, 1966.

Dear Mr. Bennett: I just read of your new appointment in the newspaper, and wish to you a continued success in this field, not only from myself but from the other enrolled members of Oneida's residing here in New York State. If you or your family ever decide to come hame to the tribal property here, I would be more than happy to show you of what is left here.

A Mr. George Shattrick will be in Washington on March 15 and has an appointment with Mrs. Zelma Barrow. I would suggest, if you can find time to go over and see Mr. Shattrick. He is one of the lawyers who is going to represent us in our case against New York State, and you would find this a very appreciative meeting. In the future, I will direct my letters to your office. I did meet with a Mr. Norbert Hill, of Wisconsin, in Chicago and Norbert came here to Syracuse, N.Y., to meet with the attorneys. Mr. Hill has told me about you and it seems that through all of this conversation I feel I know you personally. So from all of us, we wish the best of health, wisdom, and achievement of your goals and desires.

Very truly yours,

Mr. Jacob Thompson,
President, Oneida Indian Nation.

Ronan, Mont.,
March 31, 1966.

Hon. Robert Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: We have been informed that you have been appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Your appointment appears to us to be of great value to the Indian people because of your long experience in working with Indians.

We want you to know that at a special session of the Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board in Helena, Mont. on March 25, 1966, the board voted to pledge its cooperation and support of your administration of the Bureau.

We are looking forward to working with you and we want to express our appreciation to the Secretary of the Interior for your appointment as Commissioner. Please accept our congratulations.

Sincerely yours,

Leo Sias,
Secretary-Treasurer, Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board.

Faulkner, Banfield,
Boochever & Doogan,
Juneau, Alaska, March 16, 1966.

Mr. Robert L. Bennett,
Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: I am enclosing a copy of House Joint Resolution No. 89 introduced by the State Affairs Committee on March 14. I am sending this to you in the event that something occurs prior to passage of the resolution obviating the need for it. In that case you might not receive a copy, and I thought you might like a copy for your files.

My best to you and Cleota,

Sincerely yours,

Avrum M. Gross.

Boy Scouts of America,
National Council,
New Brunswick, N.J., March 21, 1966.

Dear Bob: Sincere congratulations and good wishes upon your appointment as Commissioner of BIA. It is good news indeed and needless to say we who have had the pleasure of knowing and working with you are delighted. I know you will do a creditable job and that great strides will be made under your leadership.

Am here in Phoenix today—en route to Los Angeles and Portland.

Regards.

Ray W. Swezey.

Governors' Interstate Indian Council,
April 4, 1966.

Hon. Robert L. Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Bureau of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Commissioner Bennett: Congratulations on your nomination for the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

We would be quite honored if you would accept the invitation to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to be our guest speaker at the June 10, 1966, noon luncheon. Please refer to the letter of February 28 to Philleo Nash. Would you cover the subject requested or would you prefer to outline changes and/or new policies and objectives of the BIA?

You will note that very few Federal employees were invited to participate due to the memberships' request that participation be confined to the State level. I do not share this general feeling as most Indian work and programs are sponsored by BIA and we need to be informed concerning your work. For this reason I feel that your presence is greatly needed at the meeting.

If you can be present on June 8, I would appreciate your participation in the education discussion group.

Our best wishes in your new position and I shall look forward to your acceptance to be with us on the 19th GIIC National Conference.

Yours very truly,

Walter W. Broemer,
Chairman.

American Friends Service
Committee, Inc.,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 14, 1966.

Robert L. Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Bureau of Indian Affairs,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Commissioner Bennett: On behalf of the American Indian program of the American Friends Service Committee, I would like to congratulate you on your appointment as Commissioner of Indian Affairs and to wish you well in your very difficult and challenging new job. Several AFSC programs have benefitted in the past from your cooperation and helpful consideration. If there is anything we can do to help make your task of improving Federal services to American Indians easier, please do not hesitate to call on us. I am sure you will, in turn, be hearing from us on occasion.

We share the hopes of American Indians across the country that the years ahead will bring increased prosperity and opportunity for them. We look forward to working in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to help turn their hope into reality.

Sincerely,

Pam Coe,
National Representative, American Indian Program.

University of South Dakota,
Vermillion, April 21, 1966.

Robert L. Bennett,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bennett: First of all, please accept my congratulations on your new position. I am sure the officials concerned chose wisely.

The committee on arrangements for our annual conference on Indian affairs has asked me to invite you to attend and be one of our speakers. The conference will take place May 5, 6, and 7. The theme this year is to be "Indian Community Action Programs and Their Impact" in relation to Indian reservations.

There will be a dinner meeting on the evening of Friday, May 6, and this would be the most appropriate time for you to deliver an address. In this way you would not have to attend the full conference, if you did not choose to do so.

If you are unable to come, the committee asked me to suggest that you designate someone like Bob Pennington to take your place. As you know, Bob, too, came from this area and might enjoy returning.

I am asking Mr. Tony Luscombe, the Assistant Director of the Institute of Indian Studies, to call you by telephone after you receive this letter to facilitate making the arrangements for the conference. We can meet a speaker either in Sioux Falls or Sioux City, if it is desired to do so.

I hope you will be able to come, for all of us would enjoy renewing our association with you. Kind regards.

Yours very truly,

Elbert W. Harrington,
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences.

Department of Northern Affairs
and National Resources,
Ottawa 2, April 6, 1966.

Mr. Robert L. Bennett,
Acting Commissioner, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: I was very pleased to receive your letter of March 30. We were quite surprised in Canada to hear about the quick change in the Bureau because we knew that you had only recently moved to Washington from Alaska.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment to this important post. It was clear to all of us when we met you in Scottsdale that despite your heavy responsibilities as area director in Alaska you were destined to assume even greater burdens. On behalf of everyone in Indian Affairs in Canada I wish you the very best in your new assignment. Above all, I hope you will continue to enjoy the good health so necessary to enable you to face the heavy demands of your office.

I have no immediate plans to be in Washington but if the occasion does arise I assure you that it will be a pleasure to visit with you. May I say that you are equally welcome in Canada, and if time should permit please come to see us. We might even arrange some weekend fishing if this should interest you.

Yours sincerely,

R. F. BATTLE,
Assistant Deputy Minister (Indian Affairs).

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.
April 15, 1966.

ROBERT L. BENNETT,
Commissioner, Indian Affairs, Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.

The entire membership of Military Sea Transport Union join with the unlicensed crew of the USNV *North Star Three* in congratulating you on your appointment as Commissioner of Indian Affairs as Juno area Director for the Bureau. We recognize that you are well acquainted with the problems of your high office and are confident that the destiny of our Indian brothers is in capable hands.

JOSEPH J. LEAL,
Secretary-Treasurer, Military Sea Transport Union.

FORT BELKNAP COMMUNITY COUNCIL,
Harlem, Mont., April 8, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT BENNETT,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: We wish to offer our congratulations to you on your appointment as Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

We have been informed of your past experience in working with the Indian people, and this will certainly be of value to you in your new position.

We wish to extend an invitation to you to visit us at Fort Belknap whenever your duties will permit. We are looking forward to meeting you and working with you.

Again our congratulations.

Sincerely,

DORANCE HORSEMAN,
Chairman.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF ABERDEEN,
Mobridge, S. Dak., April 22, 1966.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT BENNETT,
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BENNETTS: The enclosed clipping was taken from the McLaughlin Messenger, McLaughlin, S. Dak. and it is nice to see that you have such a congenial revival, particularly with BEN REIFEL and also our Senator, KARL MUNDT.

I have been thinking of writing you congratulating you on the appointment to the Office of Bureau of Indian Affairs Commissioner which is a remarkable citation and responsibility for you.

At this time, it is a pleasure to think that we have known you during your stay in South Dakota and it personally gives me hopes. Considerable work remains unfinished in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and your position in itself I think, presents a challenge to you.

I personally wish you will sustain in your efforts to alleviate numerous problems existing and that providence will be kind to you and be helpful to you in your attempt to help the many needy Indians on the respective reservations.

I am very familiar with the program and needs on the Standing Rock Sioux and the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservations. You, likewise, are thoroughly familiar with their needs and will be in a position to be helpful.

We hope we can be of help to you in your services in the future.

Sincerely,

W. DAN HEUPEL,
Vice President and Manager.

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT HIS BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS CONFERENCE, SANTA FE, N. MEX., APRIL 14, 1966

I did not come out here to give speeches. I came to listen more than to talk, and therefore I would like to make the opening remarks in the form of a beginning of a discussion rather than a set speech.

I plan to meet with the National Congress of American Indians tonight and I hope that my meeting with them is a free-for-all.

I think we are at a crucial turning point in terms of Indian administration and Indian affairs. I think that the time of the taking on of responsibility of a new Commissioner is always, in a bureau as big and important as this one, the time to sit down and reflect about policies and about where we go from here.

We cannot in the field, as in almost any other field, make policy and implement it on our own, particularly policy requiring new laws or appropriations. The Congress is our partner. We invited six or eight of the top congressional leaders to join us for these discussions. Congressman REIFEL is here. He is more one of you than anybody else in Congress, and I am delighted that he is going to be here for all 4 days. It is a great tribute to his devotion to the cause of Indian people, his willingness to come here and spend his time.

Senator ANDERSON will be joining us tomorrow and be with us most of that day. As the senior member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and one who has had a long acquaintance with Indian problems, a lot of what I know about Indian affairs I learned from him.

Senator JACKSON, chairman of the Senate committee, and Congressman ASPINALL, chairman of the House committee, felt that it would be wise—and we concurred—to send to this meeting the committee staff people who handle Indian legislation. We are delighted to have Jack Taylor and Jim Gamble. We welcome them to participate in these talks.

I want to make one thing plain to all of you. I know that the Indian Bureau has been kicked around in recent days. I know that some of you may feel at this point that you are damned if you do and damned if you don't, and so why stick your neck out? Let me offer this advice to you: Those of you who have worked with me and with Assistant Secretary Anderson and others know that we welcome critiques from all personnel. I hope this is one of the hallmarks of my administration. Criticism is always welcome. As I have said before, the man that I admire most—he might be a superintendent or an area director—is someone who tells me to my face that I am wrong and proves it. I welcome any comments, any observations, that you may have. That is one of the reasons for having this behind closed doors so we can have the freest possible discussion. As far as I am concerned, those of us at the head table are going to form our judgments of you by the contribution you make and the judgments you make. We want the freest possible exchange. I hope we break down into informality—get on a first-name basis. Let's have an old fashioned free-for-all in the exchange of ideas. We will expect the Congressman and the Senator to pitch right in.

I want to say a few things about Bob Bennett, who was confirmed yesterday unanimously as new Commissioner. Confirmation of this man is very significant for the Bureau. This is the first time that any of us can remember that there has been a career Commissioner. Most of the time, as far back as any of us can remember, the Commissioner has not been selected from within the Bureau. He has been selected for a number of reasons, usually political, and we have had good ones and bad ones, weak ones and strong ones. I happen to think that Philleo Nash was one of the strong ones. In the main, his administration made good marks. But now we have a Commissioner who is two things: himself an Indian, and a product of the career service. I think this is a tribute to Bob Bennett and I expect great things of Bob Bennett.

I made some rather foolish remarks when I was selected as Secretary of the Interior. I now look back and realize that I sometimes took the role of being my own Indian Commissioner. Having had more than a passing interest and experience in Indian affairs for 6 years as a Congressman, I thought I knew more than I did, and I even thought that maybe one time I might even undertake that role. Bob, I want you and your staff to know that my job as Secretary is not going to be to try to be the Indian Commissioner. I think that if I, and Harry Anderson, and the others of the secretariat, do our jobs right in backing you up, and making you the best Commissioner of this century, this is our objective. It is up to you to revitalize and reinvigorate the Bureau, to give new leadership to the Indian people, to give the type of leadership to the American people that will enlist the most effective possible cooperation from all segments of our system.

So we selected—the President and I—Bob Bennett as Commissioner because we felt that he was the best, or one of the best. I have liked what I have seen of Bob Bennett and I have had my eye on him longer than he knows. I liked the way he landed on his feet in Alaska and put some of the critics of the Indian people on the run in the very beginning. He said something rather significant the other day—that if a superintendent or area director did his job right, he probably would not be particularly popular with the Indian people. He said that, in making and carrying out the tremendous decisions that have to be made, it is necessary at times to push the Indian people themselves to make decisions, although this does not always make for popularity. But above all, the superintendent should seek to do what is right for the Indian people.

I hope that you will, as a Commissioner, be more interested in progress than popularity—the progress of the Indian people. I know that is your idea and concept and I want to reiterate that my job is to help you do the best possible job as Commissioner.

The President has approved a reorganization plan, as all of you know, that would transfer to the Department of the Interior the water pollution control functions now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This reorganization will take effect on May 10. I think in terms of giving the Department a new mission, a broad new role, of making the Department a Department of Natural Resources—that this is the most important decision any President has made since the Department was created in 1849. I am given to making rash statements on occasion. I have said that, if this new responsibility came to the Department, I expected to personally spend as much as 20 to 25 percent of my time on water pollution. I also made the statement that, to get you launched properly and to get the type of new interest that I would like to see in Indian affairs, I would spend more time this year on Indian affairs than I have spent in any of the other 5 years. One of my assistants said if I didn't watch out I wouldn't have any time left.

I think this is a very crucial point in Indian administration. I want to do what I can to support you. There are limitations to this, I know. And I know there has been the attitude in the past that the Secretary is too busy and should not be bothered and doesn't want to be bothered by Indian problems.

This has not been the case. It is not the case. And we are ready to spend whatever time is necessary.

I am going to be more critical of those who take the view that the Secretary himself and the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretary should not be involved. One of the last things that I did yesterday, was as a result of a suggestion from one of the tribes and their lawyer. It was to call on the president of a major corporation of the country to help them establish a new private enterprise on one of the Indian reservations.

I expect at the Washington level to be seeing many of you in my office and in your offices with great frequency in the weeks ahead. Let me say a few things at this point about the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I want to make it plain at the beginning that in the main I am satisfied with the performance of the Bureau. However, as I said in my speech in Washington a few weeks ago when Mr. Bennett was nominated, I think there is room for improvement, and in some areas we can make some very substantial improvement. We are here today to talk about how we can make improvement, not only in terms of how the Bureau does its business—because this is not merely a problem of making day-to-day decisions but some new laws are needed—new programs are needed. I imagine one of the reasons the BIA ends up so much of the time as a scrapegoat is that it is easy to criticize. You don't have to criticize an individual—the Secretary or an area director—you simply say the Bureau of Indian Affairs is to blame. I think one of the most interesting things, Jim, I want to be very frank today about my own reaction to the Senate report that was filed earlier this week on Mr. Bennett's nomination. I think there are some points in that report that deserve to have been made, and that are very legitimate criticism. I think that maybe some of the criticisms that were made should have been made at me or the Department rather than the Bureau. I am willing to take such criticism.

I don't want to argue with the Senate report. Two weeks ago we spent 2 hours with them behind closed doors. Congressman HALEY was there, the Commissioner, and I, and Jim Gamble, and 8 to 10 Senators. They came and they stayed. We had a real let-your-hair-down session. It was a very good session. I think the Senate report might have been better. I am not criticizing it in that respect. I think we are all agreed that the big question is not of arguing over the mistakes that may have been made in the past, but where do we go from here?

Admit that we can quicken the pace of programs. I admit that the Department, not the Bureau but the Department, has not made some decisions that it should have made.

But it is going to be a very fruitful discussion to get in a dialogue where we are discussing old arguments. I would rather see this conference and our dialogue with the Congress, from this point on, not one of recrimination, but one with a constructive and positive approach. Let's see if we can frame new relationships with Congress, with the Indian leaders, and the Indian people in such a way that we can achieve the result that I think everyone is agreed upon. I don't think, in terms of long-term policy, that there is any great disagreement between me and most of the Members of the Congress.

What new laws and programs are needed? I think this is the real creative area. My own criticism of the Bureau in terms of my own working relationship with it, is that I think at times it is lethargic. I would like it to be more responsive and quick.

One of the criticisms I have had of the Indian Bureau in the past is that it seemed to have a time clock of its own and it is hard to get the feeling that anything is urgent. I think it is this responsibility, this feeling that certain things are urgent, that is needed.

The Bureau has so many responsibilities. Unlike the other bureaus in my Department which have relatively easy jobs—running a national park, building a dam—you have the toughest job in the Department. You people, I would say, have one of the toughest jobs in government. You have to be generalists, and you can't be specialists. If any of you are specialists, you are not very well qualified.

I think that the Bureau has been like an army, spread thin over a very broad front. We do need to reorganize and concentrate with a great deal of effort in some areas. I want very frankly to discuss the whole water front because I think there is room for improvement all the way down. I think in terms of Congress. I served in the Congress for 6 years and I served on the Indian subcommittee. Congress itself can and should put forth more time and effort. There are very few Congressmen that have spent the time Congressman HALEY has spent getting out in the field, and I hardly think this is the fault of the Indian people themselves. How many times have they sat down recently with their Senators and Congressmen, have gotten them to the reservation and have gotten them involved? I think we can have a better dialogue and better relationship with the Congress. I think there is a responsibility both ways, by working closer together. I want to be careful, having been a Congressman, to criticize Congress. They are part of the cutting edge. I'm surprised in a way, I look back over the last 12 years that I have been involved, how little initiative has come from Congress of new ideas, new legislation. I don't say there hasn't been some, but there has but very little. Congress itself could give more time and attention. BEN REIFEL is present here for the 4 days of this conference. I asked him to come for maybe 1 or 2 days, but he came for 4. This is an indication of the type of interest we have to have from Congress. As far as the Indian people themselves are concerned, I think they have been too content at times to make the Bureau a scapegoat. This is a game which they all play. There has been too much timidity. The leadership has been weaker than it needs be. I think that our Indian people must realize that the way to progress in this country is usually that of boldness and taking of risks, not of timidity. And I think that there is a lot of room for improvement, and I will discuss this more specifically with the Indian people this evening at the meeting of the National Congress of American Indians.

Several States and local governments are also responsible. Here is an area where there is room for improvement. There is more here than anywhere else. The attitude of most of the States and local governments still is "The Indian people are not our problem; let the Federal Government take care of them." How do we build a bridge of getting the Indian people involved with mainstream America if we have to contend with attitudes like this? I think there has been progress made—I have been involved in some of it—with some of the State Governors. I remember, 5 or 6 years ago at Navajo, a big dispute arose, the legislature was going to pass some ridiculous law, and someone suggested going up and talking with the Indian people. They did that—the first time it was ever done—and the whole situation completely changed. We need a lot more of that.

If the States are to assume more and more some of the functions and responsibilities that the Federal Government carries, we are going to have to work more closely with them. And what about the American business community and the American academic community? Have they done their part in terms of the American Indian people? Everyone weeps for the American Indian but how many have put blood, sweat and tears in helping the Indian people? I wonder if this isn't a fertile field where we can reach out and bring the finest minds of the universities and big business. I will get more specific on this later. If we have failed to make progress—if we have failed to move as fast as we should—there is enough blame to go around. Unless all of the different elements that I have mentioned are willing to do their part, I don't think the Bureau and Department can do it all. I know we can't, you know we can't. Let's be frank about it. There is enough work for all of us to do if we work in concert.

But the thing that has, I think, done more to put all of us here on the spot and to challenge us is what has happened in the last 5 years in this country of ours. This is the thing that disturbs me most of all and challenges me most of all. I think basically the task force report of 5 years ago is completely sound. We may need to move beyond it and update it, but look at the new waves that have washed ashore in the last 5 years. Our country has moved into an unprecedented period of peacetime prosperity. The increase in our gross national product in the past 5-year period has been larger than the total gross national product of most nations in the world. It has been that phenomenal. There has been an increase in income, in business products, yet in that period of rising economy the poverty question of which the Indian people are only a part, becomes more and more embarrassing. This is the reason President Johnson 2 years ago declared the war on poverty. This is an inconsistency that is intolerable in a country as rich and wealthy and powerful as ours. The place we have really failed is in seeing that we are a different country than we were 5 years ago.

The Indian people should be tied into the great things that have been happening.

That is a special challenge to you, the Congress, and all the rest of us. No longer are the laws that might have been good 5 years ago necessarily appropriate now. For example, the Indians have had and do have the highest unemployment rate in the country, and I don't think we can be satisfied to bring it from 46 percent to 42 percent or whatever it might be. (I suspect we don't really know what it is and I will get back to that later.)

I think the Federal Government and the State and the local governments, if we are to really do something, will have to spend more money. This year, of the several budgets I have been involved in, was our first hold-the-line budget we had to prepare. The overall increase for the Department was very small and some of the big glamour programs of the Department got cut back. The only program where there was an increase was the Indian Bureau. The increase was for Indian schools. I simply ask any of those wondering if we are spending too much money on the Indian people, where do you begin to cut? Someone says we are spending too much money. Which of the money is it that they would cut? Schoolteachers? Roads? Let's get off the defensive on some of these things.

Just one rather dramatic fact. You talk about the development of the resources of this country. The Indian people have large land areas, some not the best, but some good. We have a reservation near here, the Navajo, as large as the State of West Virginia. I asked for the comparison of money spent on roads on Navajo and West Virginia last year.

	Million
Navajo	$3
West Virginia	161
	Road miles
Navajo	1,800
West Virginia	32,000

You can say that West Virginia has a population of 3 or 4 or 5 million or whatever it is, and that in Navajo it is 100,000 and therefore there should be a difference. But you can take this and go right down the line.

Because as I read it—and I spend more time under this President in bearing down on budgets and so does my Under Secretary—I got to know more about budgets than I ever expected to. If we really want to do something about Indian development, it may be that the key to this is not simply looking to the Federal Government, that the big thing is to get the Indians into the money markets of the country, to the banks, into the economic mainstream. We will spend time on this while we are here.

So we do have a whole new focus, Bob. And I think it is a great challenge to you, to all of us here. Because we have a President who believes that having pockets of poverty in a country like ours is intolerable, a President who has an almost mystical belief in education. If you really give a first-rate education, then you can lick poverty. This is the President's philosophy.

I am not sure we have had the money to have a system of first-rate education. We have not been able—and I testified on this a few weeks ago—to get Indians in the big new quality education legislation that the Congress passed a year ago. We are a year behind. This would be giving us 7 to 8 millions for special enrichment programs to help these children who are so seriously disadvantaged. I will say tomorrow in our press conference what we are going to do in this field. I think maybe it is just as well that we be candid with ourselves and sort of pick ourselves up off the floor because we have no way to go but up.

Forget the past—where do we go from here? Get a smile on our faces and discuss things here and in the future in a way that will enable us to come up with creative new solutions.

I think the Indian people and the Bureau need new tools, new opportunity, new programs, building on the foundations that we have built on the past. I want to say one thing about our new partner in the Indian business, the Office of Economic Opportunity. It has been charged that we were going to kick the OEO people off the reservations and I do wish our friends would talk to us before they misconstrue our remarks. I will discuss that because I think we need a lot more candor in our relations with the Indian people themselves. I think any good superintendent ought not to regard the OEO as an intrusive force and a divisive force in the picture. Take them in stride. And I think maybe having OEO in our midst makes us rethink things. Maybe they can help fill some of the gaps.

I think we want to develop teamwork—that we coordinate efforts. Part of your job is going to be to establish better working relationships with Sargent Shriver and OEO. I was with him at lunch yesterday. He is a good friend of ours.

We are going to have better relationships with some of the health people and the education people in HEW. Our relationships with the health people have been excellent. We have to have better bridges to other Bureaus in this Department and in other parts of the Federal Government. There has been too much of a feeling that the problems of the Indian is a problem of the Indian Bureau. We need to marshal the resources of the Federal Government in education, housing. Then if we fail, we fail as a Government, not just the Indian Bureau.

The problems are more subtle and we do need new patterns of teamwork. I will tick off some of them here:

There is the question of the reorganization of the Bureau. I want to discuss that with you, and I think we have reached some tentative judgments on this that will enable us to move more effectively in light of the new responsibility, the new focus on Indian problems. The question has been raised, too, with regard to the recruitment, training, and assignment of personnel in the Bureau. I have been wondering, particularly when I look at the organizations in my Department with the best esprit de corps—the Park Service, for example, they have two or three very good schools for their top personnel. They have one at the Grand Canyon, and one at Harpers Ferry. These are training programs. This is in part where the esprit de corps and the expertise develop. In terms of how you recruit and train and assign and assess performance, what can we do that would improve things?

The Indian Bureau needs a constant infusion of new blood—it might come from Peace Corps returnees. I talked to Jack Vaughn about this Tuesday. I think, as a group in terms of their idealism, their esprit de corps, the more of these young people we can get, the better.

We have got to discuss a very big subject: Where we are going from here in terms of tribal government, tribal responsibility. We have very exciting ideas that have already been put forth on this.

Then there is the question of development of Indian resources. This is one of the biggest challenges we face. When one looks at Indian resources today and one asks himself the question what IBM or A.T. & T. or Standard Oil of New Jersey would do if they owned this particular piece of land and these resources and you look at what we have done because of a lot of shackles we operate under, it is almost as much difference as between maximum and minimum.

I am convinced this is an area where we can get some home runs. We may need some new laws and some new help. I think the Indian trusteeship way that we have operated in the past has been like having hobbles and handcuffs on at the same time. How can a man swim like that? I hope to get congressional support for new ideas.

Why shouldn't Indian people do like IBM with a piece of mortgaged land? The thing that encourages you most is when you see a tribe on the move and an attorney with a creative mind and a superintendent who is gung ho—let me illustrate this in terms of realizing maximum return rather than minimum return by the Indians. An example of it is at Colorado River Reservation in Arizona. But what do we do? Just lease the land out and get a little rent? Or do we do it in the maximum way? You can't mortgage Indian land. Why shouldn't Indians mortgage their land? This is the key to get into the money markets of the country. But they say it involves risks. Sure it does. Each of us who owns a home that is mortgaged runs a risk. Life is full of risks. The tribes say, what if we borrowed money and developed the land and had our own people use it, what would be the difference in the economy? The difference is probably 5 or 10 or 20 times the return. The tribe possibly leases to a development corporation and the corporation pledges it to the bank and roundabout through the back door we get mortgaging going. Maybe the Indian people and the lawyers are going to back away saying they don't want to do this. I simply suggest and this is one of the things I am going to talk to the Indian people about this evening.

The time has come to operate on our hopes instead of our fears. Why can't we pass a few laws and untie our hands and for the first time operate on the basis of hopes and assumptions that everyone will work together? This is the American way, this is the secret of success in this country. We dared to do anything we thought we could do even if someone thought it was impossible.

As I think that the Senators and Members of the House realize the land trusteeship problems of the Federal responsibility have been in many ways one of the most inhibiting things. It has been inflexible, rigid.

I am not at all sure whether we can develop proposals and get together with them with the congressional leadership. I wish I could be optimistic in my usual way. I am optimistic. Maybe we can do it. If we can't do it, I think it means that we will inevitably fail in one of the big tasks we face. The Indian resources, as all of you know better than I, range everywhere from Palm Springs to the poorest reservations that have really the worst—the lowest—standard of living in the United States. And yet we could single out 10 or 12 reservations with very good resources, some of the best in the country, for development—and not a major corporation in this country that would not take resources these Indians have and increase the value 10 or 20 times in the next 20 years. But can we do this for the Indian people? If we can't, then the American way of doing things is not used to benefit the first Americans.

This is the thing that really challenges you. How do we develop new techniques, the opportunity to enable tribes which have in terms of people-land ratio, to make their estates more valuable? Here again we have been shackled with the rigidity of our rules and present policy. Let me give you an example. Charles Luce told me about this. He is attorney for the Umatilla Tribe. When one of the big dams on the Columbia River was built and the tribe received a large settlement, the ones who remained on the reservation and who wanted to further develop their reservation resources came up to me with what was a very creative idea—this was 67 years ago. They wanted to take the money and, instead of dividing it up per capita, to buy out the interests in the Indian reservation of those Indians who no longer lived on the reservation and who would prefer in that period to take cash. This, of course, would make the reservation more viable. The Bureau of Indian Affairs said there was no way to do it. Indeed there was not at the time. But how can you solve economic and human problems unless you can solve problems like this?

Another thing we have to discuss is statistics about the Indian people. Nothing makes the Bureau look more inept than the lack of basic statistics. When a question is fired at you regarding unemployment or school dropouts and the number of children in or out of school, and our answers are imprecise, nothing gives a worse impression. Without adding new employees, I think we can set up a system of systematically gathering data. We have had 5 years of unprecedented growth in our gross national product. To what extent have Indian people shared in this? No one can tell you. No one knows.

Senator ANDERSON has some ideas on the subject, and others do, too. How do we involve the leadership of the American business community in Indian problems? How do we get Walt Disney and Standard Oil interested in developing Indian reservations? Can we do this?

I come finally, after this wandering discussion, to the close of my remarks. I propose that from here on we operate—let's put the past behind us—although we have got to deal with some problems, let's have the Bureau and Department operate with optimism and hope and let's make this one of the most creative periods, if not the most creative period, in the history of the American Indian people and their problems. Let us be the ones who are always out front taking the initiative. Let's propose laws and ideas and programs, and work with State and local governments. If we can't establish the kind of dialog with the Congress to get laws passed, if the American business community won't, let the failure rest there. I proposed that at this conference and in the days and weeks ahead, as far as I am concerned, the best thing I have seen on paper coming to this conference came from one superintendent and one area director. I am ready to listen to the rest of you.

ROBERT H. LEVI—OUTSTANDING CITIZEN OF MARYLAND

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to call attention to the recent efforts of an outstanding Maryland citizen—Mr. Robert H. Levi. Mr. Levi, who is president of the Hecht Co., has once again demonstrated that he is one of Maryland's most active civic leaders through his outstanding job as head of the State's U.S. savings bond program.

On May 1, 1966, the U.S. Treasury celebrated the 25th anniversary of the savings bond program. During those 25 years, 40 million families have purchased over $152 billion in U.S. savings bonds. On May 1 Mr. Levi met with President Johnson to help mark the anniversary of what Mr. Levi called "the program which has made millions of our families investors and partners in our Nation's constant struggle for a world dedicated to peace." The meeting with the President marked a high point for the civilian leader of America's star-spangled savings program in the State of Maryland. On this occasion Mr. Levi, along with the leaders from Virginia and the District of Columbia pledged his continuing effort to encourage full participation by every citizen in the program as "a sound investment in democracy."

Mr. Robert Levi should be warmly commended for his unselfish public service work in this most important field. I am pleased to have this opportunity to do so today.

HOW'S THAT, MR. FREEMAN?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is not only in the so-called farm belt of the great Middle West that Secretary Freeman and President Johnson are being called to account for their totally unjustified efforts to depress farm income as an anti-inflationary device.

The farm revolt against an administration which not only fails to do anything to raise farm family income below the alarmingly low rate of 80 percent of parity to which it has now declined but actually expresses its pleasure over recently declining prices of livestock and other farm products has spread to every corner of rural America.

A recent editorial in the Mobile Register, published in Mobile, Ala., supplys a case in point. It is entitled, "How's That, Mr. Freeman?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this hard-hitting editorial from a great Dixie newspaper printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW'S THAT, MR. FREEMAN?

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman rushed out the other day to declare himself "pleased to report that net farm income in 1966 will exceed $15 billion, according to our latest estimates. This is about a billion dollars higher than 1965."

That turned out to be either a case of Secretary Freeman putting his foot in his mouth or opening his mouth just in time for Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, to cause him to wish he had kept it closed.

Senator MUNDT followed up by fastening a "farm price depressing policy" label on Mr. Freeman and saying the "record reveals that since Secretary Freeman took office more than half a million farms have disappeared and about 2½ million men, women and children have left the farming population."

He predicted that "this year approximately 100,000 more farms will evaporate from the face of rural America."

These remarks of Mr. MUNDT were merely the beginning of his verbal sharpshooting at Mr. Freeman.

"We hear much about a fine organization known as the FFA—Future Farmers of America," said the South Dakota Senator. "It is unfortunate that under Secretary Freeman and (presidential) Economic Adviser Ackley, FFA now stands for the 'Forgotten Farmers of America,' insofar as a great many areas of this country are concerned."

What was that Secretary Freeman was saying about farm prosperity? Or is he still trying to extricate his foot from his mouth?

FATE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on several occasions, specifically on January 27, February 18, March 2, March 9, and March 15 of this year, I have spoken of the growing concern in this country in regard to the fate of the Small Business Administration. One of the most disturbing situations that I have expressed previously on the floor of the Senate was the lack of an Administrator of this vital agency.

Therefore, it is with pleasure that I greet the announcement by President Johnson of May 8 that Mr. Bernard Boutin, Deputy Administrator of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been appointed as the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. Without a question Mr. Boutin has demonstrated himself to be a dedicated public official who, I am sure, will be an extremely capable Administrator of SBA. At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a biography of Bernard Boutin, the new Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF BERNARD L. BOUTIN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

PERSONAL

Born: Belmont, N.H., July 2, 1923.

Married to the former Alice M. Boucher, Laconia, N.H.

Ten children.

Home address: 6505 Valley Court, Falls Church, Va., 22042.

EDUCATION

Belmont, N.H., public schools.

Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1942–43.

St. Michael's College, Winooski, Vt., Ph. B. (cum laude), 1945.

St. Michael's College, Winooski, Vt., LL.D. (honorary), 1963.

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS

Deputy Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, appointed by President Johnson, October 5, 1965.

Executive vice president, National Association of Home Builders, November 1964–October 1965.

Administrator, General Services Administration, appointed by President Kennedy, November 27, 1961.

Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration, appointed by President Kennedy, January 23, 1961.

Mayor, city of Laconia, N.H., two terms, 1955–59.

President and treasurer, Boutin Insurance Agency, Laconia, N.H., 1945–63.

Partner, Boutin Real Estate Co., Laconia, N.H., 1945–63.

Partner, Busy Corner Store, Laconia, N.H., 1956–59.

APPOINTMENTS

The First Lady's Committee for a More Beautiful Capital City.

The President's Committee for Equal Employment Opportunity.

National Small Business Committee.

The Cabinet Committee on the National Stockpile.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

The President's Ad Hoc Committee on Disposal of Federal Surplus Lands.

The President's Ad Hoc Committee on Architecture for Federal Buildings and Government Office Space.

The President's Advisory Council on the Arts.

ORGANIZATION

Past president, New Hampshire Municipal Association.

Chairman, Laconia, N.H., Airport Authority, 1955–59.

Past New Hampshire State deputy, Knights of Columbus.

Former national director and State president, Saint Michael's College Alumni Association.

Former vice president, Laconia, N.H., Chamber of Commerce.

Former director, Laconia, N.H., Rotary Club.

Former trustee, Laconia, N.H., hospital.

Past exalted ruler, Laconia, N.H., lodge of Elks.

Member, St. Jean Baptiste Society.

AWARDS

Award of excellence for outstanding and meritorious service to the Home Building Industry of America, Crestline Manufacturing Co., 1966.

Top performer in the field of housing, House & Home magazine, 1965.

Outstanding service as administrator of General Services Administration, Contracting Plasterers' & Lathers' International Association, 1965.

Certificate of appreciation, Missouri Conference, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1965.

Distinguished Service Award, General Services Administration, 1964.

Commendation, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, 1964.

Alumni Association Award for outstanding achievement in the field of government, the Catholic University of America, 1963.

Annual award, Saint Michael's College Alumni Association, 1959.

Certificate of Commendation, the National Guard, 1957.

Honorary society, Delta Epsilon Sigma, 1945.

Mr. PELL. So at last we have made a beginning and I would hope that Mr. Boutin's appointment would be just the first in a series of progressive steps by the Administration, which would lead to the revitalization of an agency which has done more to assist small business than any other facet of our Government.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I note with pleasure the enactment into law of the Small Business Act Amendments of

1966, which took place last week, for this legislation, which I supported in the Senate—it was passed by voice vote by this body—will allow the Small Business Administration to set up two entirely separate revolving funds, one for business loans and another for disaster loans. This, of course, will prevent the disruption, in fact, the cessation of the business loan program, which has occurred when disasters have struck communities which are substantial in size. This legislation increases by $125 million the authorization of loans that the Small Business Administration may make. The administration has projected in its budget for fiscal year 1967 that the SBA make available about $725 million in loans, guarantees, and other commitments to the small businesses throughout this country. This financing is more than four times what the agency accomplished in fiscal year 1960.

However, even with these two significant beginnings, the appointment of an Administrator and the enactment of the Small Business Act Amendments of 1966, SBA is still without adequate financing. On March 15, I rose on the floor of the Senate to support S. 2499, which proposes to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the sale of participation interests based on pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration. This legislation, for which I voted, passed the Senate on that day and is now awaiting a rule by the House Rules Committee so that action can be taken on it by the House of Representatives. It is interesting to note that President Johnson in his remarks at the signing ceremonies on May 2, 1966, concerning the Small Business Act Amendments of 1966, said:

> The reason we have asked so many Members of Congress to come here this morning is because this is basically and essentially an idea of theirs. This is a congressional program. Its interest is there, it was nurtured there, it was born there, and they watch over it zealously.

Mr. President, I am proud that President Lyndon Johnson has so clearly stated the interest of the Senate and the House of Representatives in SBA. You can be sure my colleagues and I will continue to press for an effective Small Business Administration.

I am concerned, however, about the immediate future in regard to small business. In a recent publication entitled, "Lawyer's Weekly Report, What's Happening in Washington," published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., there was reported results of a special interview with Richard E. Kelley, Deputy Administrator for Investment for SBA. According to this publication Mr. Kelley appraised the financing outlook in the following manner:

> The money squeeze is especially heavy on small businesses.

It went on to state that marginal and smaller customers are weeded out by banks and insurance companies in favor of the larger and more stable companies. The cost of money, when available, is rising considerably. This publication went on to say that Mr. Kelley thinks the little fellow will be paying a minimum of 6¾ to 7 percent simple interest when he can get the money, which is, in effect, 1¾ to 2 percent over the prime rate of 5 percent for better small concerns. Probably, he will have to pay more. Mr. Kelley also pointed out the demand will continue to rise for compensating balances of up to 20 percent. The small businessman will have to show better justification for loans, as to proposed use of loan proceeds, ability to repay and supporting documentation. Mr. Kelley also thought that call penalties will be standard on longer term loans and more security will be required.

Mr. President, I would think that these above remarks by the Deputy Administrator for Investment for the Small Business Administration are ominous, in view of the fact that SBA has yet to continue its direct loan program. I wish Mr. Boutin well, but I would also hope that he would immediately address himself to this situation.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE "FRANCIS SCOTT KEY" LAUNCHED

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the largest nuclear submarine, launched April 23, 1966, in Groton, Conn., has been named the U.S.S. *Francis Scott Key* in honor of one of Maryland's great citizens and patriots.

On the occasion of this launching, Mr. David G. Bress, the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, delivered an address which I found most illuminating. Before coming to the Senate, I had the privilege of being U.S. attorney for Maryland, and I note with special interest that Francis Scott Key also was a U.S. attorney. Indeed, he was Mr. Bress' predecessor—by 133 years—as U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion of Mr. Bress' address in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID G. BRESS, U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AT THE LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. "FRANCIS SCOTT KEY" (SSBN-657), GROTON, CONN., APRIL 23, 1966

I am indeed grateful to the Secretary of the Navy for having invited me to address you today on the occasion of the launching of this great ship—the *Francis Scott Key* (SSBN-657). It is most appropriate that the ships of this invincible arm of our Navy, the fleet ballistic missile submarine, our largest nuclear submarine, should be named in honor of America's great patriots. It is a signal privilege for any American to be officially called upon by his Government to participate in honoring one of our great patriots. That privilege has been extended to me today because I now serve as the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, the same post held over 120 years ago by the patriot whom we honor today. The pleasure of having that privilege is increased by the fortuitous circumstance that my youngest brother, Cmdr. Allyn Bress, USN, is one of the naval officers here who participated in the design and construction of this great ship.

The *Francis Scott Key* is the 40th—in our arsenal of 41 fleet ballistic missile nuclear submarines—and the first to have the national anthem as its very own song.

Francis Scott Key is, of course, popularly known for his writing of our national anthem. This alone would entitle him to a prominent place on any list of distinguished Americans. It is perhaps less well known that Key was by profession a lawyer, and this, I think, makes it even more appropriate that his name be borne by a mighty ship whose contribution of might is an important factor in our effort to maintain peace in the world today. For the function of law is to ensure that disputes between men or nations are settled by peaceful means, rather than by battle. In his more than 40-year career at the bar of justice, Francis Scott Key was constantly engaged in the work of promoting domestic peace.

Key was born in 1779 on his family's estate in Maryland. After graduating from St. John's College in Annapolis, he studied law and opened his law office in Frederick, Md., in partnership with his brother-in-law, Roger Taney, who later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Shortly after his marriage in 1802, Key and his family moved to Georgetown, part of the newly created District of Columbia. There, Key gradually became a prominent member of the local bar. His law practice was general—he represented private citizens and corporations in both civil and criminal matters; the affairs of his clients were inextricably involved in all aspects of the expansion of the Capitol of the burgeoning Nation. Although he had a large commercial practice, Key's concern for the welfare of the individual is reflected in his representation of many Negro slaves in their "petitions for freedom."

The writing of the Star Spangled Banner came about indirectly because of Key's prominence as an attorney. In 1814, during the British attack on Maryland, a prominent Maryland physician, Dr. William Beanes, was captured by the British at Upper Marlboro. Key was delegated by friends of the doctor to attempt to negotiate his release. With the consent of President Madison, and bearing a flag of truce, Key proceeded to Baltimore, where he joined an American colonel in charge of the exchange of prisoners. They proceeded to Chesapeake Bay on a small merchant ship in search of the British fleet and were received aboard a British warship where they conferred with a British admiral and general who were, at first, opposed to releasing Dr. Beanes. However, when Key presented letters from the British wounded, who had been left behind in Washington by the British general, describing the kind treatment they had received as prisoners from the Americans, Dr. Beanes was thereupon released. Key, Dr. Beanes, and the American colonel were then returned to the merchant ship which the British kept under close guard in Baltimore Harbor so that it would not dock and thereby prematurely disclose the intended British surprise attack on Baltimore which was about to take place.

On that night, which was September 13, 1814, the British fleet opened fire on Fort McHenry, the fort which guarded the Baltimore Harbor. Throughout the night, Key paced the deck of the merchant ship, anxiously awaiting the dawn and the outcome of the battle. Shortly before daybreak, the bombardment ceased. Key fixed his glass on the fort. The American flag, still flying, became visible with the first morning light. Delighted, Key immediately jotted down on the back of an envelope the first draft of the poem, the Star Spangled Banner, which he completed that evening. This poem, set to music previously sung in American patriotic songs, quickly gained popularity, and has continued thereafter to thrill all Americans for over a century—even though it was not officially designated as our national anthem until 1931.

Following this rescue mission, Key returned to his law practice and continued in it until 1833 when President Jackson sent him to Alabama to negotiate a settlement of a dispute between the State and Federal

Governments over the Creek Indian lands. It was also in 1833 that Key was appointed by President Jackson as the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, a post, incidentally, which his son also held about 20 years later. Then, as today, the U.S. attorney for this District has a unique burden; it is his duty to prosecute both offenders against the national interest and those who infringe upon the personal privacy of citizens. During his 8 years of service as U.S. attorney, Key prosecuted all crimes committed in the District of Columbia, including an attempted presidential assassination and an attempted destruction of the Treasury Building by arson. Thus, whatever the nature of the offense against the peace of society, Key performed his duty to maintain the civil peace and order on the domestic scene. This he did by making certain that those who threatened to disturb that peace and order were sufficiently made aware of the likelihood of punishment as to constitute a deterrence of such conduct.

And this, of course, in an international sense, is precisely the purpose of the fleet ballistic missile submarine which we launch today. It is very significant that it will bear the name of a man who achieved peace and order by the deterring effect the power and duty of his office had upon those bent on violating the peace. Although armed with nuclear missiles, the Polaris submarine's task is not to wage war but rather to preserve peace. This deterrent system is quite young. Six years ago there were no Polaris submarines in our fleet, and now the Polaris has reached vigorous maturity with many successful patrols, not one of which has been interrupted by any material failure. Successful firing of Polaris missiles from submerged submarines has now become routine. Even as an ex-Navy man, I am amazed at the capabilities of submarines such as this—submarines which can remain submerged for over 2 months at a time, which can travel almost undetected underneath any sea, and which carry missiles that can strike at any point on the face of the earth. Unlike land-based forces, these ships are not vulnerable to destruction by surprise attack. Because of their flexibility and maneuverability, the power to retaliate against any aggressor is assured to us. It is this that makes the Polaris submarine perhaps the greatest force for peace in the world today. For what nation would be so reckless as to begin a nuclear war, aware that however devastating its first blow, there would still remain, somewhere under the sea, 41 American patriots carrying missiles capable of effective retaliation against the aggressor wherever he may be. It is now well accepted by the experts in national defense and foreign policy that the fleet ballistic submarine with its 16 nuclear ballistic missiles is the greatest deterrent in keeping world peace.

Our homage and thanks are extended to the scientists and engineers whose skill and imagination developed this ship and the management and labor who built it. Not the least important factor in the deterrent effectiveness of the *Francis Scott Key* is the men who will man her, the gallant, highly skilled blue and gold crews. It is the willingness of these contemporary American patriots to participate in alternative 2-month long patrols that will keep the *Francis Scott Key* at maximum readiness at all times.

And so we now wish Godspeed to the newest member of our nuclear navy, the *Francis Scott Key*. Her mission will be to preserve the peace of our world—and may she achieve that mission and thus insure that the great heritage of our Nation will endure—and guarantee, in her namesake's immortal words, that the Star-Spangled Banner, may forever wave, "Over the land of the free and the home of the brave."

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEWPORT, R.I., URGING INVESTMENT IN U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a resolution of the city of Newport, R.I., my home city, urging the citizens of the community to invest in U.S. savings bonds and thus to assist the Federal Government in its effort to curb inflation. I note with satisfaction that their resolution results directly from appeals made by the President and Vice President of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 54-66 of the Council of the City of Newport

Whereas the President of the United States has expressed his deep concern over the growing threat of inflation, and at a recent Conference of the National League of Cities urged municipal officials to join with the administration in fighting this trend by exercising restraint in spending and capital investment; and

Whereas in furtherance of this appeal, the Vice President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey, has called upon city officials to assist by way of using their influence to persuade local citizens to buy U.S. savings bonds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Newport does hereby urge the citizens of Newport to invest in U.S. savings bonds and thus assist the national administration in an effort to curb inflation; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution signed by the Honorable Dennis F. Shea, mayor of the city of Newport, and countersigned by the city clerk, be transmitted to the Office of the Vice President, Hubert H. Humphrey, and to the congressional delegation from Rhode Island.

Dennis F. Shea,
Mayor.
John F. Fitzgerald,
City Clerk.

STAIRWAY TO DISAPPOINTMENT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an address by the Russian writer, Valeriy Tarsis, delivered at the National Press Club luncheon, Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, May 10, 1966.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Stairway to Disappointment

(Address by Valeriy Tarsis, at the National Press Club luncheon, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, May 10, 1966)

It probably will interest you to know who I am? I must admit that this question intrigues me too. For several months now I have traveled all over the world, making risky, head-spinning journeys through the width and breadth of time and space. In these perigrinations in many mirrors I saw vivid reflections of my soul and I am bewildered.

The soul of a Russian poet is broad and impulsive. It is given to meditation and fantasy. It thrives in the air of freedom and simply cannot exist without it. The poet's soul is unable to lie, nor can it be creative without truth and justice. It is in such atmosphere that I craved to live.

It is only in the West, and especially in America, that I realized with great sadness and horror that I have not been living before—just existing. I was suffocating in a cell without light or air. Now my only consolation and justification before God's judgment and my own conscience is that I did not side with evil. I refused to submit to the dictates of a ruthless government. I did not betray my ideals.

I grew up in a world that has been brutally deceived by cheats and oppressors. They duped and enslaved the people in the name of freedom and the brotherhood of men. Dazed and daunted the people were made to follow their treacherous shepherds—to nowhere. Like a lost herd, blinded by foul weather, one-third of the world population is driven by them today onto a slippery, dangerous path along the very brink of a precipice. I saw and understood the threat, and I felt that I had to shout a warning to mankind.

For this the Soviet Government labeled me a traitor, a criminal, and finally, proclaimed me insane. Then it stripped me of my citizenship.

My life was not an easy one. I was not born with a silver spoon in my mouth. When I think of my early childhood, I smell the stench of paraffin oil and onions. I grew up in a petrol warehouse belonging to the Nobel brothers, and a thin onion soup was the main daily meal at our table. Yet, even then I was full of dreams and illusions, and I did not even suspect at that time that there could exist a stairway to disenchantment.

Although my father was a humble storekeeper, he too was a romantic dreamer. He traveled far into the kingdom of illusions. Unfortunately, his dream led him away from God into the embrace of revolution. Yet, this long-awaited revolution brought him only misery, a broken heart, and, finally, death behind the barbed wire of a concentration camp. It is then that I began my descent down the stairway to disappointment.

Just before the outbreak of World War II, I considered writing an extensive literary chronicle of Stalin's period. It was at this point that the process of my rebirth became final. When I looked around and saw the cruelty, beastiality, corruption and lies which—like a cobweb—enveloped Russia ever tighter and tighter, I felt I could not longer follow the path of the kowtowing, servile Soviet writers. I felt a physical urge to face them all as an uncompromising foe.

I knew I had to tell the truth about those terrible years, when millions of the best people were suffering in jails and concentration camps; when even children stopped smiling; when it seemed that the sun itself will never shine over Russia again. The urge to describe all this became obsessive, irresistible. I knew this was my duty under God.

Almost a quarter of a century had passed. A quarter of a century that paled the horrors of the Inquisition. To think only that during the bloody purges of 1937 more people died in 1 month than throughout the whole 250 years of the Inquisition. A monstrous machine of mass extermination was developed in the Soviet Union. Life turned into hell.

Then came the war. At its very beginning, people in Russia imagined that the Germans wished to fight only against communism, and many Russians met them with bread and salt as liberators. But the Nazis came to conquer the Russian land. When the people realized this, the whole nation rose on its hind legs and chased the invaders back to Berlin. I spent the war as a war correspondent. I talked with hundreds of soldiers and officers. And they all told me the same thing: They did not fight for Stalin and communism. They fought for Russia—only for her.

Since the war the people's discontent with the Communist system grew ever stronger and stronger. In the recent years this resistance expressed itself in mass riots, strikes, and demonstrations: as in the riots of Novocherkassk, Tbilisi, on the Donbass; as in the strikes which flared up in Odessa, Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities; as in the demonstrations of youth last April and December; as in the circulation of anti-Communist writings and clandestine magazines.

A semiclandestine organization of young poets, writers, and artists known as SMOG works successfully in Russia today. The word SMOG is composed of the initial letters of Russian words: Smelost (courage), molodost (youth), Obraz (image), and glubina (depth). SMOG is the vanguard of an immense number of nonconformists and breakers of the Communist rules. The young people no longer want to tolerate the Communist tyranny and the fetters of socialist realism, which is neither socialist, nor realist. It is merely a collection of cliches for the literary sycophants of the regime to follow.

The Russian people are no longer taken in by these falsifications. The people are now squaring their shoulders in battle. They are becoming evermore determined to shake off the shackles of a half-century of slavery. Like a Phoenix rising from the ashes, a free Russian literature is slowly being born. It is not by accident, therefore, that the first literary underground in post-Stalin Russia was named Phoenix.

For 20-odd years I wrote and kept my works in a trunk under lock, as did many of my friends, hoping that Stalin would die. At last that precious hour came. Khrushchev replaced Stalin. The personality cult of the Georgian tyrant was replaced by the personality cult of the Ukrainian boor. I realized that one could no longer hope for a change. I reached a decision and sent my manuscripts abroad. Since then I was able to experience on my own skin the workings of the Soviet democracy.

One day the telephone rang in my apartment. At the other end of the line was the secretary of the party committee of the Union of Soviet Writers, Sytin. This oily voiced, old hypocrite muttered: "Valeriy Yakovlevich, we have decided to help you. Come around Monday, at noon, to the party committee and we shall talk about everything."

I arrived promptly at the appointed hour. Sytin came out somewhat dazed to meet me in the lobby. He stuttered and stammered. "You know, these comrades want to talk to you. They also want to help you."

"Which comrades?" I asked.

"Well, you know they are from the Committee of State Security."

I looked at him with open disgust, while the thought flashed through my mind, "So it has finally come to this. I am in the claws of the KGB. This is some help."

At that moment two men came out of the office. One was tall and somewhat bald; the other—a small man with a protruding paunch—was Mikhail Ivanovich Bardin, who all those years worked on my case.

I was showered with accusations. I was supposed to be guilty of all deadly sins, and was threatened with being shot. At that time none of my books had as yet been published abroad. Suddenly Bardin barked out to me: "Your position is very grave. Should one of your books appear in the West, we shall arrest you and you'll be tried with utmost severity."

The tall bald one began to shout at me. But I was totally resigned. I was prepared to die, if need be.

"You may shoot me," I said. "But what will you shoot? This stale hunk of human flesh—my body? But how about my soul, and my books? These you can never reach. They are abroad, and very soon they will appear in many languages. So shoot me, if you will, any time."

The meeting, obviously, did not work out the way they wanted. Half-an-hour later I walked out from the Palace of the Soviet Writers. I knew the die was cast.

My friends in the West tried to persuade me to have the "Bluebottle" published under a pen name. I flatly refused. I knew that in the battle of ideas one must fight with an open visor. Moreover, it was important for me to show that not all Soviet writers are servile cowards, that there still is gunpowder in the powderflasks of the Russians.

Soon after the appearance of the "Bluebottle" in London, I was arrested and shoved into a lunatic asylum. In my "Ward 7" I described my experiences there. I can only add that my stay in the Kaschenko Mental Hospital is for me one of the most treasured pages of my biography. There, as in a mirror, I saw all Russia—my great and ill-fated motherland, upon whom the Communist villains have thrust an iron straitjacket.

When under pressure from the West I was released from the mental institution, the first thing I did was to break with the party and the Writers' Union. But to leave the party at one's own choice is not an easy thing. For nearly a year I was summoned to different party departments for negotiations. Finally, a character, name Zaytsev, brought me a document from the Regional Committee which said that I was expelled from the party for behavior unworthy of a Communist. Again lies, again hypocrisy. The party simply could not admit that anybody could of his free will part with this illustrious organization.

Then the Soviet democrats began to starve me. I was unable to get any job. My family and I were doomed to die of hunger. Had I not been receiving aid from the West, I would have simply starved to death.

Meanwhile, events developed quite differently from what the Soviet authorities would have liked. When I came out from the mental hospital there was only a handful of young defiant literati. But when I left Russia there were hundreds of them. And thousands all over the country listened to them, applauded them, and followed them.

Russia is breeding the bards of revolution. I am happy that I, together with my friends, were the first swallows of an approaching spring. A meeting I had not long ago with one of my friends from ward 7 must surely be a prelude to something significant.

One day my doorbell rang. I opened the door. A tall young man stood in the dark corridor. His answer to my questioning glance was a wide smile, as if sunrays had lighted his face. He threw his arms around my neck. We talked of the days spent together in ward 7. We talked of our friends and, of course, of the future of Russia. Then during a pause my friend said in his slightly muffled voice:

"Much of what you have said, there—in the ward, has reached our ears. I have not come with empty hands. Many young people in my town share our ideas, and many of them are ready to fight."

Perhaps, I will best express the feelings which animate the young generations in Russia today, if I stop here to quote four lines from a verse written by one of my young SMOGist friends. He, too, was locked up in a mental institution. He, too, was persecuted and proclaimed insane.

"We had scarcely opened our mouths,
Coughing quietly into our handkerchiefs:
We have used up and ruined half of Russia
Let us now bury the Bolsheviks."

And now to conclude I wish to say this: It is thanks to the reaction of world opinion, to the men and women of the press, to the insistence of famous people—academicians, Nobel Prize winners, prominent writers and philosophers, such as Lord Bertram Russell, Arthur Miller, and many, many others that I owe my escape from the claws of Communist hangmen. For the sake of my brave colleagues Sinyavsky and Daniel; for the sake of the young saplings of Russia's literature—the writers and poets of SMOG; for the sake of all the Russian people—protest, protest, protest. Do not give in. Insist, demand.

The strong voice of protest is a great force. It will bring closer the victory of freedom-loving men over the enslaving cohorts of communism.

God will help us.

WORK BEGINS AT COLUMBIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star carried an article by Dan Hamrick last Friday which describes some of the fascinating background which is leading to the creation of an entire new city between Baltimore and Washington.

This is a story which is just beginning to unfold—one that should serve to inspire the Nation's planners and builders.

The new city of Columbia is today the dream of a prominent Marylander—James W. Rouse. Tomorrow, it will be the home of 110,000 people of all ages and variety of occupations.

Columbia is an experiment in the soundest tradition of American enterprise. Its success will prove that it is profitable to develop a pleasant urban environment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place the article, "Work Begins at Columbia," in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New City: Work Begins at Columbia

(By Dan Hamrick)

The bulldozers move in this month to start transforming 10 percent of Howard County, Md., into a new city called Columbia.

As of now, Columbia exists mainly in the mind of one man—James W. Rouse.

But if all goes according to plan, it ultimately will be a model community of 110,000, lying almost midway between Washington and Baltimore.

Rouse, 51, one of the Nation's most successful mortgage bankers, has taken a major interest in problems related to urban decay, urban renewal and urban sociology.

He has urged builders and sociologists to get together to meet the problem of a U.S. population growth projected at 70 million over the next 20 years.

The Rouse plan is to build Columbia by 1980, to spread its housing and industry over an area larger than Manhattan or Washington, and to offer all its residents the more attractive features of rural, village and urban life.

A survey by the Rouse company showed that one of the fastest growing areas in the United States is the corridor between Washington and Baltimore.

Nowhere else are there two cities so large (4 million people in the two metropolitan areas), and so close together (35 miles from center to center).

Rouse sold his concept to some financial institutions not noted for taking chances. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. put up $23 million. The Chase Manhattan Bank and the Teachers Insurance & Annuity Association of America joined later to raise the total to $50 million.

A sales talk no less persuasive was directed at landowners—many of them people who had fled the cities and were determined to keep the cities from overflowing into the countryside. In 9 months, in 160 separate transactions, Rouse bought 15,200 acres—10 percent of the county.

Zoning restrictions which would have made Columbia impossible were rescinded after Rouse convinced county commissioners that an influx of people was inevitable and the only question was how to accommodate them.

How to accommodate them? That was the question probed in depth by experts in scores of fields ranging from community structure to communications, from library systems to lake engineering, from energy systems to ecology, or relations between man and his environment.

The planners came to some unconventional conclusions.

For instance, they said transportation tends to tyrannize.

Take the school bus. What if a child needs to get to school earlier one day? Stay late another?

By placing an elementary school in each neighborhood and by traversing roads with underpasses and overpasses, a child could walk to school without fear of traffic. And it was so ordered.

The plan for Columbia calls for 1 of every 4 acres—a total of 3,649—to be open space. There are to be five lakes, three golf courses, riding trails and picnic grounds.

More than 3,000 acres were set aside for commercial and industrial use. One industrial tenant already has been signed.

The dwelling units—clustered and spaced on 7,411 acres—are to range from garden apartments to 10-acre estates.

There are to be 500 to 600 families in a neighborhood 5 or 6 neighborhoods in a village and 9 villages in the city.

The sections are to revolve around a town center containing a sheltered, air-conditioned shopping mall, a hotel, office buildings and a theater, served by a system of tiny buses running at 5-minute intervals over their own roads.

The bus system would eliminate the shopping problem encountered by a wife in a one-car family in suburbia when the husband drives to work. Also each neighborhood will have its own up-to-date general store.

Located near each elementary school will be a neighborhood center with a nursery to free the housewife for errands or for coffee with neighbors.

The junior high and senior high schools will be placed next to one another in the village center, so they may share a gymnasium, auditorium and library.

These are some of the ways Rouse and his staff devised to eliminate duplication and waste. Another is to lay all sewer lines at the start rather than tear up the earth and lay them as the community grows.

And this leads to Rouse's main concern: Profit. And he puts it: "This was no residual goal. It was our prime objective."

THE WARSAW CONVENTION—
SENATE RESOLUTION 256

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two recent New York Times newspaper articles, relating to Senate Resolution 256, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being *no objection, the articles* were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
May 7, 1966]

ATTACK SPURRED ON WARSAW PACT—AIRLINE GROUP ACCUSED IN LIABILITY CONTROVERSY

(By Tania Long)

The dispute over the U.S. continued participation in the Warsaw Convention reached a new intensity yesterday in an atmosphere that grew increasingly bitter.

An important group of lawyers who oppose the withdrawal of this country's denunciation of the treaty, which sets international air liability, virtually accused the International Air Transport Association of misleading the State Department by misrepresenting the position of some of the airlines.

And two leading pilots who are also lawyers, announced they would urge the pilots' organizations they represent to refuse to fly in the event the United States does rejoin a convention it denounced last November on the ground that it provided insufficient liability coverage for international airline passengers.

Both groups have charged that the proposals under which the United States intends to reenter the convention would lead to sabotage of aircraft and the murder of hundreds of innocent passengers. The proposals call for an increased liability limit of $75,000 and the establishment of an absolute liability principle under which the airmen reached in Montreal earlier this week.

CLAUSE CAUSES TROUBLE

It is the absolute liability clause that has drawn most of the fire and led to the rejection by five American air carriers—including United, National and Delta airlines—of the terms of the new liability agreement reached in Montreal earlier this week.

The charges against Air Transport Group were made in a telegram to Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann, with a copy sent to Knut Hammarskjold, director general of the association, which represents 100 airlines. It said:

"Reports reaching us indicate major foreign airlines, including British Overseas Airways Corp., attached important reservations to absolute liability $75,000 plan. Reservations not made known by IATA to State Department at Montreal meeting. Further understand that BOAC requested that reservations be made known to other airlines, which IATA did not do. BOAC reservations included exclusion of all acts of third parties, including sabotage BOAC position and perhaps others being misrepresented in IATA communications to airlines and to State Department.

CALLED NONSENSE

"Further illustrates need for public hearing demanded by Senate resolution signed by 26 outstanding Senators. Urge State Department demand IATA produce all communications between IATA and airlines on this subject in last 3 weeks for State Department and Senate hearing."

The telegram was signed by Lee S. Kreindler, chairman of the aviation law section of the American Trial Lawyers Association and a leading legal authority on air liability.

The lawyers' charges were described as "absolute nonsense" by Julian Gazdik, general counsel to the airline association, in a telephone interview from the Montreal headquarters of the air transport association.

"We are always careful never to misrepresent anything," he said, "especially in such a delicate assignment as this has been."

He asserted that BOAC was the first carrier to signify its assent to the new terms. He had just received a cable from London stating: "BOAC has compiled your cable. Signed agreement in post." According to another source in transport group, acceptances have also come in from Varig, Irish International and Sabena.

Mr. Gazdik said that when BOAC was first sounded out on the liability terms proposed by the State Department, the airline expressed a reservation regarding the absolute liability coverage in cases of sabotage.

But he pointed out that the new terms purposely exclude saboteurs or their heirs from claiming damages resulting from accidents due to bombings.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 9, 1966]

AIRLINES CLARIFY LIABILITY ACCORD—ATA SAYS FACTS HAVEN'T KEPT UP WITH RUMORS

(By Tania Long)

The Air Transport Association of America will issue a memorandum today that it hopes will clarify some of the complex issues involved in the proposed new liability agreement under the Warsaw Convention.

The United States and the airlines serving on international routes are negotiating for an updated convention that would raise the carriers' liability limit from the $8,300 set in Warsaw in 1929 to a more realistic $75,000.

The decision as to whether the United States goes along with the new terms will be made this week, and there is considerable pressure on the administration from both advocates and opponents.

The proposed agreement is strenuously opposed by a group of lawyers for whom Lee S. Kreindler, chairman of the aviation law section of the American Trial Lawyers Association, is chief spokesman. It is also opposed by some of the pilots.

SABOTAGE FEARED

The groups have said that the plan calling for absolute liability of up to $75,000 a passenger is an invitation to sabotage.

The lawyers assert, furthermore, that an artificial limit for death or injury goes against the American principle of justice. No limit exists on domestic routes and each case is judged on its merit, they point out.

The controversy has reached the floor of the Senate. GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, supported by 25 cosponsors, introduced a resolution urging the administration to hold full public hearing before withdrawing its denunciation of the Warsaw Convention.

The denunciation is due to take effect next Sunday. The administration announced its withdrawal from the convention when the airlines refused to increase the liability limit to $100,000. It has since agreed to remain within the convention with a $75,000 limit, provided certain conditions are met.

ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION

The memorandum of the Air Transport Association, the trade organization of the Nation's scheduled airlines, sets out the new terms in detail because, a spokesman said, things have moved so fast that inevitable errors of interpretation have been made and the actual facts have not kept up with the rumors.

It makes the point that the agreement is a most unusual one, since the carriers have undertaken to pay up to $75,000 for each passenger without being proved guilty of negligence. Under U.S. law, the memorandum says, liability is imposed on a carrier only if a passenger can prove that the carrier was at fault.

Then, in countering various statements that have been made about what the new terms would or would not do, the memorandum says:

"The agreement does not provide for an 'automatic' award of $75,000 for each victim. A claimant will recover only damages proved in court. Thus, he could collect anywhere from nothing to an unlimited amount.

"A carrier must be proved guilty of willful misconduct—i.e., reckless or intentionally harmful conduct—for damages above $75,000 to be recovered.

"The agreement does not provide an inducement to saboteurs. Claims benefiting saboteurs are expressly excluded. (Opponents reply that it is not always possible to identify a saboteur.)"

The State Department last week issued a 6-page memorandum on the new agreement.

MEDICAL CARE IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and as a Senator from West Virginia, I am frequently the recipient of mail from relatives of servicemen serving in Vietnam. I am sure that the other Members of the Senate are similarly contacted by the wives, mothers, and other family members of soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen serving in southeast Asia. Often concern is expressed over the health and medical care being accorded these fighting men.

In an effort to be of service in providing general information on this subject, I discussed it in a special radio interview with Lt. Gen. D. Heaton, the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, who is, incidentally, a native West Virginian, having been born in Parkersburg, Wood County. General Heaton's remarks on the subject of medical care for American fighting men in southeast Asia were impressive, both because of the dedicated spirit revealed when he spoke of the tasks which he and his medical people are performing and because of the encouraging report which he relayed.

I ask unanimous consent that my radio interview with General Heaton be printed, in transcript form, in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the radio interview was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Today I have as my guest, Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, the Surgeon General, Department of the Army. General Heaton is a distinguished medical officer; and, while serving as commander at Walter Reed Army Medical Center here in Washington, he personally operated on such famous patients as President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. More recently, he was responsible for the care and treatment of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur while he was a patient at Walter Reed.

General Heaton has been decorated by our Government a number of times, including the occasion when he was honored for his able handling of mass casualties during the surprise Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor at the beginning of World War II.

Question. Speaking of mass casualties, General Heaton, how do our American casualties so far during the hostilities in Vietnam compare with those experienced during World War II and the Korean conflict?

Answer. Well, Senator Byrd, first, I am very honored to be here with you today; and, in answer to your question, I must say at the outset, we are meeting today not the full range of weaponry in Vietnam that we did in World War II and in Korea. Therefore, we can say that our wounds aren't quite, in some instances, as devastating as those in the past two wars. Moreover, our casualties who enter hospitals have a far less mortality rate than in World War II and in Korea. I will give you figures such as 4.5-percent casualty rate in World War II; 2.6-percent casualty rate in Korea; and, in Vietnam today, it is running between 1 and 1.2 percent.

Question. How do you account for this improvement, General?

Answer. We account for it, first, reminding you again of the lack of the overall range of weaponry, and, No. 2, the very speedy evacuation of our casualties upon receipt of the injury to our forward hospitals by way of the medical ambulance helicopters. I think that that coupled with the fact we have placed in the front hospitals very, very competent surgeons more than explains the tremendous reductions in the casualty rate.

Question. Are there any shortages of materiel or personnel necessary for the accomplishment of your medical mission?

Answer. I am very pleased to tell you, sir, that we have encountered no shortages of important materiel, and, certainly, we are extremely well staffed with personnel.

Question. Well, now, how do the medical problems of this war differ from those in Korea or during World War II? You have already mentioned one aspect of the difference.

Answer. Our problems in Vietnam today are a little different than in World War II and Korea, if based only on the malarial situation. You have heard, I am sure, and everybody, about our problem with malaria. It is the falciparum malaria, we call it. It does not respond to our weekly tablet which we thought would prevent all malaria and still does with the vivax type malaria. However, we are doing a lot of research on this and I am happy to tell you that we believe that we are coming up soon with a drug to not only prevent the falciparum malaria, and also, if the malaria does develop, it will considerably ameliorate the disease.

Question. Are we helping the civilian population with their medical problems?

Answer. We are doing a great deal with the civilians. You remember President Johnson is quite concerned with this. We have established what we call a Milphap team—doctors and nurses to work in civilian hospitals in the 43 Provinces. We, also, you will remember, have medical members of the special forces team and such as that.

Question. Well, General Heaton, you would say then that the overall medical situation concerning our troops in South Vietnam today is very much improved over what it has been in past wars?

Answer. Senator Byrd, it is tremendously improved, and I would like every mother and father and wife to know that we left no avenue overlooked or unattended. They can be sure that their boys are receiving the best possible care.

Senator Byrd. Well, General Heaton, our people are appreciative of this, and I am very grateful for your presence today and for your message to my constituents, because I feel that it is a message that is encouraging.

IS THERE NEW HOPE FOR OUR INDIANS, ESKIMOS, AND ALEUTS?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in an interview with William Steif in yesterday's Daily News, Secretary Udall confessed that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has "in the main been a failure," despite the expenditure of $1.5 billion over the last 10 years. I could not agree more. What has transpired in the past, under the guise of benevolence and paternalism, regardless of how well intended, is a disgrace which can no longer be ignored.

Mr. Udall plans to remedy this failure by suggesting legislation for the next Congress. I know I can speak for other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as for myself, when I say we have had enough of the empty promises of the past, and are in no mood for further procrastination.

Apparently, the Secretary is finally contemplating action to improve the position and the opportunities of these original Americans who have so long been kept in a semiprimitive condition by Federal bureaucracy and misguided policies conceived at the top of the Bureau.

The plight of the natives of interior Alaska calls for a new policy which will enable them to enter the mainstream of American life in the third quarter of the 20th century. To this new approach by the Secretary, for which I am grateful, I pledge my complete cooperation and wholehearted support. But prompt and thoroughgoing reform and corresponding action are imperative. While we are spending billions of dollars abroad to help the underprivileged of other lands it is high time we made similar efforts in behalf of an important segment of our own people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Steif's interview be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Udall's Solution—Private Investment Could Aid Indians

(By William Steif)

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall thinks the "big new money" to bring the Nation's 380,000 reservation Indians out of poverty must come from private investors, not Uncle Sam.

Mr. Udall, in an interview, offered ideas on how he expects to carry out President Johnson's order to "ramrod" solutions to the Indian problem.

First he confessed the Bureau of Indian Affairs has "in the main been a failure" despite spending more than $1.5 billion in the past decade.

BIA failed, he said, because of "the old, rigid concept" under which it regarded itself as trustee for the Indians, and gave them no responsibility.

Mr. Udall summed up his task as "upgrading Indian leadership and putting it in a position to make more decisions."

Mr. Udall said educated Indians could hardly wait to get off the reservations, thus draining off leaders. But if investments developed opportunity of the 50 million reservation acres, educated Indians would stay, or have reason to return.

Specifically, the Secretary said he would concentrate first on housing.

Ninety percent of all reservation housing is substandard, and Mr. Udall said Federal housing people "traditionally haven't been interested because of their urban focus."

Another major focus will be persuading industry to invest on the reservations.

The Secretary is skittish on termination of BIA aid to the Indians.

He said every tribe and reservation should be dealt with on an individual basis; some tribes may have to be lured off their unproductive lands into towns, while other tribes' rich lands would be developed.

LEGISLATION

Mr. Udall is trying to pull together a legislative package which the administration would introduce early in 1967. It could include—

An heirship bill which would solve the dilemma of thousands of Indians owning tiny slivers of land.

Basic law on what Indians would be eligible to share in claims payments and how Indian tribal rolls would be closed.

A special law to let individual Indians be terminated from BIA dependency by tribal purchase of their rights.

Loan guarantee laws and alternate kinds of nonprofit corporations distinct from tribal councils; the nonprofit firms would be able to mortgage land, issue tax-free bonds, and take part in normal business ventures.

Mr. Udall is looking to closer ties with Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity and Eugene Foley's Economic Development Administration, since the average Indian family's income is $1,500 a year—lowest of any group of poor in the Nation.

But Mr. Udall also recognizes Indian education must be upgraded, and hopes to shift much of this work to the States.

BOUTIN, AN EXCELLENT CHOICE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the President has made an excellent choice in the appointment of Bernard Boutin as Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

This is an important post. The Small Business Administration brings help, assistance and encouragement to the Nation's small businessmen who must compete in the marketplace with the giants of industry. Over the years the businessmen of Alaska have benefited greatly from the guidance and the cooperation of Small Business Administration officials.

The Small Business Administration offers low-interest, long-term loans to the victims of natural disaster. We of Alaska have good reason to know how valuable this help can be. Alaska's recovery from the March 27, 1964, earthquake was rapid and sure. Without the dedicated and able help of the Small Business Administration this recovery would have been less rapid and much less sure.

Now with the appointment of Mr. Boutin the Administration has an able, experienced director who will continue the agency's tradition of efficient service to the Nation's businessmen. Mr. Boutin with his experience as Administrator of the General Services Administration and in private enterprise is well qualified for the post.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business I congratulate the President on his appointment and I wish Mr. Boutin well in his new assignment.

ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, having been a former Foreign Service Officer and State Department civil servant, I have always been interested in the administrative practices of that Department. In the past I have taken a position whenever I could seeking to simplify and streamline the administrative practices and concentrate the functions in the hands of as few individuals as possible. In this connection Deputy Under Secretary of State Crockett has sent me a most interesting letter summarizing the Department's handling of administrative and practical functions in recent years. My regard for Under Secretary Crockett is great. He is a man of rare ability and talent who is seeking to do the best possible job that he can.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Crockett's letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 16, 1966.

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: Your concern about the size and conduct of the Department's administrative and operational functions necessitates my summarizing for you some of the most salient facts regarding this operation.

For several years I have had the major responsibility for this function. Consequently, I have devoted my constant attention to the problems which surround the operational programs and administrative services which have increased in direct proportion to this Government's expanding foreign programs. Although I am the first to admit the need for added improvements and for even greater efforts to effect economies in the operations of the Department both at home and abroad, I am proud of numerous achievements which my colleagues and I have made over the past months.

I am sure you will agree it is significant that in spite of the broadened functions of the Department and in spite of a greatly accelerated increase in administrative requirements to meet the vast expansion in missions, particularly in Africa where 28 new embassies have been established since 1961, the Washington end of our administrative job is being performed with 268 fewer people today than was true 5 years ago. The overall staffing of the Department of State at home and abroad is 14,458 today, as compared to 14,053 in 1961. This, too, is a management accomplishment of some merit in view of the increased scope and tempo of our substantive operations.

I believe you will agree, too, that the move which was initiated under my direction a year ago to abolish the Bureau of Administration and thus eliminate layers of supervision is significant not only because of the resulting economies and the reduced personnel, but because of the improved managerial arrangements which have pinpointed responsibility and accelerated decisionmaking.

Our efforts to reduce to a minimum the costs of supervision, as well as our efforts to eliminate some of the consulates and to reduce the size of others, have resulted in significant savings and improvements. Our success in obtaining consular agents serving gratis in areas where consulates were closed assures us of adequate continued attention to the most basic of our consular requirements.

These accomplishments, along with a few others that I can only highlight, have had the fullest support of the Secretary as well as the President and Members of Congress.

Because of your own firsthand experience as a former officer in the Foreign Service and because I value so highly your sympathetic support and your special insight into our operating problems, I want to summarize briefly some of the things we are doing to improve our extremely complex operations.

Our administrative structure is big, but so is the job for which we are responsible for doing. Few Americans realize the extent to which the Department of State has grown. Today we must provide administrative services not only to the Department itself but to its 112 embassies, 2 legations, 67 consulates general, 85 consulates, 7 missions, and 6 special offices along with AID, USIS, Department of Defense, and other groups. We also must serve the U.S. missions to the U.N., the AOS, and U.S.-based special purpose offices, along with passport and shipping agencies, refugee centers, investigative offices, the Foreign Service Institute, and special career training facilities overseas.

Not only do these figures of our overseas establishments now totaling 279 represent a marked increase in numbers, but each year we have had to assume increasing responsibilities for the requisite administrative support of all the agencies represented at these posts to the point where we are now assuming virtually the total burden of such services at 30 posts. The types and kinds of administrative services have been greatly expanded. However, through effecting certain consolidations and resorting to various economies, the Department now can and does provide on a worldwide basis these services. The most important of these services such as housing, commissaries, medical facilities, recreation, and rest opportunities, overseas school programs, and officer training now function on a consolidated or regional basis along with the already consolidated functions such as auditing, communications, shipping, and supply.

It is with justifiable pride that I repeat that furnishing administrative services to the increased numbers of posts and the expanded programs has been accomplished with the net of 268 fewer people. If it had not been for having to assign 96 additional persons to nondeferrable improvements involving such essential activities as communications, training, and security, our gross reduction in force would have amounted to 364 employees which I am sure you will agree is a significant number.

I have only alluded to the administrative support required of the Department for U.S. agencies. I would like to cite the following illustrations to give you some idea of the magnitude of this increasing requirement.

In Bonn we support the representatives of 36 U.S. agencies or major components; in Paris and Rome 32 each; and in London, 21.

Other typical embassies will have 10 to a dozen supported agencies or groups including AID, USIS, Peace Corps, Agriculture, Army, Navy, and Air Force missions and attachés.

Even at our smallest and newest embassies in Africa we must extend our administrative support responsibilities to AID, USIS, Peace Corps, and a Defense attaché.

I am sure you are aware of some of the factors which influence the size of our administrative establishment, yet over which we have no control.

Because of our greatly expanded activity in the African area, our increased attention to the American Republics area incident to the Alliance for Progress and the recent events in Vietnam, it has not been possible to hold overseas employment to the 1961 levels and moderate increases have been allowed. Most of these increases, however, have stemmed directly from our (reimbursable) administrative support responsibilities to other agencies.

I have mentioned my own belief in the need to effect greater economies and for improvements in administrative structure and programs. This is more than a belief. I can say in all modesty that I have dedicated myself to the achievement of a less expensive, smaller, and more productive establishment capable of meeting the Department's actual and potential administrative requirements. All of the members of my staff serve on various committees and task forces alongside the representatives of the functional bureaus to obtain greater economies and improvements. We have initiated and are intensifying a program for the utilization of the skills and backgrounds of more than a hundred of America's business and professional leaders to help us as advisers on a score of administrative improvement projects as well as to continue serving on our Foreign Service inspection teams and selection boards.

In addition to the increased attention being given by our chiefs of missions and their senior officers, our Foreign Service inspectors, a very carefully chosen group, take a "hard look" at each post approximately every 2 years. Each inspection team now includes a senior officer of demonstrated administrative competence, and his special scrutiny covers administrative organization, operations, and staffing. In the rare instances that inspection teams have found overstaffing, we have taken prompt corrective action here in the Department. Much more often the inspectors report understaffing to some degree. Our inspectors frequently report hard working, highly motivated staffs, frequently devoting voluntary (generally uncompensated) overtime in order to keep current with essential tasks.

I apologize for the length of this letter and I regret that even so I have been able to outline only a few of the efforts and achievements we have succeeded in making over the past months. I hope that I have been able to demonstrate to your satisfaction that our administrative establishment has been kept in a reasonable relationship to the management and administrative tasks confronting the Department. I hope, too, that I have demonstrated the degree to which the Secretary and all of his principal officers are sensitive to the question of size and the need to have a minimal staff to the maximum extent possible.

I shall be happy to discuss these matters with you or to furnish you with more detailed information if you desire.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CROCKETT.

RISE IN FOOD PRICES IS NOT THE FAULT OF THE FARMERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, too often the rise in consumer food prices is blamed on the farmer, who actually has had little to do with the rise. The temptation to put the blame on the farmer is too often succumbed to by everyone in this Nation, although the farmer is actually not sharing in our prosperity.

Caught in this squeeze between public opinion that they are the cause of the rise in prices and the rise in prices that the farmers themselves must pay, the farmers are the ones that suffer.

Because this point was very well made in a recent Dallas Times Herald editorial on Monday, May 2, 1966, entitled "The Farmer Needs Defenders," I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER NEEDS DEFENDERS

Somebody, and more than one somebody, ought to come to the defense of the farmer in this casting about for culprits responsible for the increase in food prices.

If he is not being charged directly, he is certainly being tried and convicted by implication, for the most recent woes of the housewife in meeting her budget problems.

The administration, actually led by, of all people, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, has snatched at this farm product price increases as one politically popular excuse for inflation.

The Secretary of Agriculture recently "was pleased to report" that farm prices have moderated from what he said were cyclical highs which accounted for most of the consumer food increases. He had some other statements to make which inferentially saddled the farmer with the responsibility for increased food costs.

He did not mention in his statements that the farmer for years has been left far behind other industries in achieving a fair income on his investment and work. The Secretary might also have mentioned in passing that food prices have long been, and still are, one of the best bargains available in the cost-of-living list. These prices comparatively have stayed well below the prices of many items which the modern American family considers a part of its living costs.

But back to the farmer and Mr. Freeman's misleading comments on the cause of food price increases.

Quoting from the Farm Journal, which in turn quotes directly from the President's Council of Economic Advisers of the U.S. Department of Agriculture:

Prices received by the farmer for food in the USDA's "market basket of foods" in 1965 were still 7.3 percent below what he received in 1947. The housewife this year is spending for food 18.2 percent of the family's disposable income as compared with the 20 percent she spent 5 years ago.

It is true, as Farm Journal points out, that the price of food in the USDA's "market basket" has risen 17.1 percent over 1947 (even though the farmer is getting less). The increase—small though it is, compared to many other cost-of-living items—is the result of an increase of 41 percent in costs after the food leaves the farm. Meanwhile, since 1947, weekly wage rates to labor have increased by 107 percent. Things farmers must buy have risen in price by 28.3 percent.

LAW IS NOT SELF-MADE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor of April 21 carried a column by Erwin D. Canham entitled "Law Is Not Self-Made." Mr. Canham directed attention to the dangers to our society resulting from acts of civil disobedience, so-called. He pointed out that civil disorder is too often excused by some sociologists as being therapeutic, but Mr. Canham correctly stated that this kind of psychology is dangerous. He also stated, quite properly, that disorder and the assertion of personal anarchy can only harm the causes they would serve, and that the answer to them is a firm enforcement of the law.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

LAW IS NOT SELF-MADE

(By Edwin D. Canham)

How far will civil disobedience go in the United States?

The latest evidences are dramatic:

Several hundred persons, including some respected intellectuals, pledge in a newspaper advertisement to break the laws and refuse to pay their Federal income taxes.

Boys here and there burn their draft cards.

A small but loud group break up a big antipoverty conference in Washington and all but drive Sargent Shriver, the Administrator of the Federal program, from the room.

Such fruitage has been forming for some time. It began, we know now, with sit downs and lie downs and other physical protests in the civil rights cause. Many sympathized with the cause and hence did not object very vigorously to the civil disobedience. The tendency was to recall Henry David Thoreau's overnight in the Concord jail and to refer to the Boston Tea Party.

PRICE OF SOCIETY

It is apparent now that civil disobedience can go very deep. It can erode the structure of society. And it has to be stopped.

The free world prides itself on being an individual-based society. But both words are important: individual and society. They are the two sides of the same medal. And the individual cannot opt himself out of society. That produces anarchy. We all have to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's.

It is really appalling that eminent college professors, among others, should believe it proper to insist they have a right not to pay taxes because they oppose certain governmental policies, and to insist it is all right if they give the same amount of money to a private organization.

They must know that such positions are completely untenable. Even as protest, or as headline getting, there is no virtue whatsoever in flaunted illegality. When the individual sets himself up as the ultimate judge of what is legal and what is not, he would erode all order.

PURPOSE HINDERED

The campaign of civil disobedience has gone from bad to worse. It has not yet been checked. It harms greatly the cause of legitimate protest. It transfers the argument over Vietnam from the issue of administration policies to the issue of civil disobedience. The protesters will thereby defeat their own cause.

So, in the poverty dispute, the small, disorderly groups who drove Mr. Shriver from the hall and forced the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, the eminent church leader, to adjourn the meeting, prevented the conference from taking and approving sound positions. The issue turned from measures against poverty to measures against disorder.

You would almost think that the world forces which seek to weaken the United States from within invented and carried out such tactics. Perhaps they had something to do with them. But basically, it would seem, the strategy of civil disobedience grows in the thought of zealous idealists and emotionally disturbed minority groups.

DISORDER HARMFUL

Disorder—even such fatal disorder as the Watts riots—is being upheld by some sociologists as therapeutic. The screaming frenzy of individuals who burn and loot is described seriously as a useful outlet for long-repressed emotions. This kind of psychology is dangerous.

The rest of us, of course, have a lot to understand. We need to comprehend, and make some allowance for, the emotionalism which grips long-suffering racial groups. The horrors of war in which innocent peasants are victims can sear deeply into sensitive and noble consciences. The very times are unsettling. They produce despair and violence, first rhetorical and then actual.

But disorder, lawbreaking, and the assertion of personal anarchy can only harm the causes they would serve. The answer to them is even, compassionate, but firm enforcement of the law upon which most of society has agreed. The total framework of the great community in which we live—the Nation, State, and the brotherhood of man—must be preserved. Its essence is law.

LAW DAY ADDRESS BY JUDGE THURMAN ARNOLD

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last week, the Nation over, we marked Law Day—set aside to pay respect to the principle that there should be a rule of law. In my hometown, they called upon an ex-mayor to return and address a Law Day gathering at the arts and sciences auditorium on the campus of the University of Wyoming. Judge Thurman Arnold, the speaker, needs no introduction from me, Mr. President, but his remarks on Law Day, 1966, at Laramie, Wyo., are worthy of serious consideration and I do desire to call them to the attention of the other Members.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Judge Arnold's speech, as it appeared in the Laramie Daily Boomerang, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THURMAN ARNOLD'S LAW DAY SPEECH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is a verbatim account of the "Law Day, 1966" speech delivered by Judge Thurman Arnold to a Monday morning audience at the arts and sciences auditorium.)

LAW DAY, 1966

This is not my first experience as a speaker on Law Day. Years ago, shortly after the ceremony of Law Day had been established by the American Bar Association, I was called on to speak before the Memphis Bar Association. I spent some time preparing what I thought was a provocative and thought-compelling speech, beginning on a note of warning and ending on a note of hope. I've forgotten what my subject was. In any event, before the dinner I was interviewed by reporters from the Memphis newspapers. The first question they asked me was what I thought of Law Day. I replied, "Well, American Lawyers are used to being bored. They not only can take it but they always come up for more. Therefore, I personally regard Law Day as nothing more than a harmless nuisance."

There was an embarrassed silence. Finally, the member of the bar who was responsible for my indroduction said, "Judge Arnold, don't you know that this is Law Day and that we invited you out here to speak on it?" To say that I was embarrassed is putting it mildly. I turned to the reporters and said, "I really have put my foot in my mouth this time. I hope you will protect me and consider my remarks off the record." They all laughed and said they would. That evening I made some preparatory remarks about what a sacred institution Law Day was and followed it with my speech on something else. It all went off well enough but I didn't sleep much that night. In the morning I rushed downstairs for the papers. You can imagine my relief when I found that the reporters had kept their faith. There wasn't a word in any of the papers reflecting my scurrilous and sacrilegious comment on Law Day.

Since that time I have had a change of heart about the significance of the American Bar reserving 1 day a year to celebrate the principles as old as the Magna Carta, that there should be a rule of law to which all men owed respect, and symbolizing this ideal once a year by an appropriate ceremony.

We need this ceremony today because we are living in a lawless age, an age when actual disobedience of the law became necessary to awake the public to the evils of racism. However, the idea of civil disobedience proved so attractive that it has become a national nuisance. Every newscast on television has pictures of somebody disturbing the peace and obstructing traffic in favor or against something or other. Students feel that they are behind the times unless they are protesting against the rules and regulations laid down by their elders. By making nuisances of themselves they think they are aiding the cause of a better society. On the conservative side there is an equal number of crackpots wanting to impeach the Chief Justice of the United States.

Robert Hutchins has just published a symposium explaining and endorsing the philosophy of civil disobedience. I do not say that such a philosophy does not have a place in our scale of values. But the philosophy of civil disobedience is strong medicine which should be taken in very small doses. As an antidote it is fitting that we celebrate today a different ideal—the principle of respect for law.

Few of you will remember that happy decade of the 1920's. It was a period of certainties both in law and economics. We had made the world safe for democracy by winning the First World War to end all wars. We had at last achieved a perfect society that operated automatically provided legislatures did not interfere by passing social legislation. We knew that if private property was protected the automatic rules of something referred to as "capitalism" would assure us permanent peace and prosperity and the elimination of poverty and social discontent. Private property meant in those days the freedom of great corporate empires to do as they pleased. If these great empires were not interfered with individual human rights would take care of themselves. Darwin's law of the survival of the fittest would solve the problem of weak and underprivileged individuals by eliminating them. The Constitution of the United States was there to save us from the folly of legislatures in the event that they were seduced by demagogs into an undue interest in human rights as above property rights.

We had no more need of a ceremony such as Law Day than we had for one celebrating Newton's law of gravity. Our favorite ceremonial day then was Mother's Day. We felt that mothers needed more appreciation than they were receiving but our Constitution expressing self-evident principles of private property could take care of itself.

These were the fixed beliefs of our educated voters at the time we entered the Great Depression. Roosevelt's speeches in his first campaign held these same convictions. He charged Hoover with responsibility for the depression because he had not balanced the national budget.

It soon became apparent that social legislation of a kind heretofore unknown in our traditional thinking was essential to meet the desperate economic situation which confronted us. A conservative and embittered majority on the Supreme Court saw in that legislation a threat to every freedom that Americans cherished. The American Bar Association denounced all efforts to put human rights above property rights as unconstitutional. Mr. Justice McReynolds in his dissent in the gold clause case drew the applause of all right thinking people. He said (referring generally to the power claimed by the President's whole New Deal program):

"Nero undertook to exercise that power. Six centuries ago in France it was regarded as a prerogative of the sovereign. It seems impossible to overestimate what has been done here today. The Constitution is gone. The people's fundamental rights have been preempted by Congress. Some day the truth will be seen."

By 1937 there was such a cloud of unconstitutionality cast by a bitterly divided Court over every New Deal measure that the administration of the New Deal program became impossible. Principles which were taken for granted today were then denounced by all right thinking persons as socialistic. The Liberty League was formed to denounce Roosevelt's new unconstitutional philosophy. The educated voters of America were overwhelmingly against the President. Recent poll studies show that if the vote had been limited to college graduates every single Republican candidate for President would have been elected who ran during the four terms of the Roosevelt administration. The fog of unconstitutionality which enveloped the whole New Deal was so thick that no regulatory law could be enforced until it had passed the scrutiny of the Supreme Court, a process which threatened to take years. Roosevelt was thus forced into a direct attack on the Supreme Court of the United States—the Court packing plan. I remember those days well. The fury of the educated citizens in the United States rose to incredible heights. Roosevelt was booed as an apostle of lawlessness by the students when he visited Harvard.

Nevertheless, the Court packing bill came so near passing that Chief Justice Hughes, who had been a constant dissenter from the decision that had paralyzed the Government, was able to frighten the irreconcilable majority of the Court. Justice Van Devanter retired. Justice Roberts abandoned his extreme position and declared a new Agricultural Act constitutional. It became no longer necessary to pack the Court. Out of the Court fight a new Constitution emerged.

Its emergence was gradual. For a period until the appointment of Chief Justice Warren a majority of the Court, under the influence of Justice Frankfurter, decided to play it safe. The Supreme Court stopped vetoing social and economic legislation. But the Court became a purely negative body concerned more with its own safety from public criticism than with the protection of the liberties of the individual citizen. Under this protection Senator McCarthy rose to power. He frightened both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations into establishing procedures by which citizens were tried and condemned as subversive on secret evidence without the American contitutional right of confrontation and cross-examination.

Dorothy Bailey's conviction for disloyalty by a loyalty board on secret evidence was affirmed 4 to 4 by an equally divided Court. From then on McCarthy had carte blanche. The Supreme Court had miserably failed in its duty. Every Government official, indeed every teacher or writer, was made to realize that his career might be ruined and a badge of infamy pinned on him on secret evidence by faceless informers.

It was not until the appointment of Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the United States that our new Constitution began to be a positive force dedicated to the principle of human rights. I believe that Chief Justice Warren will go down in history with Marshall as one of the two greatest Chief Justices. Out of the bitter struggle after his decision on integration the South is today beginning to accept the hitherto unpleasant fact that Negroes are citizens of the United States.

But perhaps the boldest and most successful principle ever to emerge through a Supreme Court decision is that voters in rapidly developing urban areas shall have an equal influence in determining State legislation as voters in rural areas. Had the Supreme Court timidly refused to enforce the principle of one-man, one-vote—had it declared this to be a political problem which could be solved only by an amendment to the Constitution—we would have been caught for the next 20 years in a rotten borough system where a minority could veto legislation adapted to the needs of the majority. And this, I think, would have been the end of States' rights because our States would have been unable to exercise them. Without the reapportionment decisions the Federal Government would have been forced to pre-empt the field of State government because our State legislatures dominated by a reactionary minority of voters could never have solved the explosive problems of growing urban society.

And with respect to the civil rights of individuals accused of crime the Warren Court has an equally great record, though often by 5 to 4 decisions. No longer can the police elicit a confession from an indigent and mentally retarded person under arrest as a result of days of insistent questioning. No longer can convictions be obtained where the accused is not represented by counsel. No longer can public servants be forced to take vague loyalty oaths which may later bring them into trouble because they hold unpopular opinions.

Nearly 30 years have passed since Roosevelt introduced his Court packing plan. During that period the Supreme Court had first changed from a frustrating force hampering all government legislation to a purely negative institution which gave free rein to McCarthyism. Today a new Constitution has emerged protecting the civil liberties of citizens from the power of intolerant bigots and defending the rights of indigent and ignorant persons accused of crime to a fair trial, and guaranteeing the right of a majority of our voters to prevail over a minority in an election. The Constitution today resembles more closely the vision of the constitutional father than it did before the Warren Court.

We have less occasion today to celebrate our achievements in establishing a rule of law and justice in international affairs. At the end of the Second World War we had faith that international law could be formulated and enforced by the United Nations. But the cold war proved that the United Nations, useful as it may be as a common meeting place for both friendly and hostile powers, can never be a positive instrument to create the principles of international law and enforce them.

The United Nations could not help us when Russia decided to install nuclear weapons in Cuba. We had to risk an atomic war to prove to Russia that we meant what we said. And it may well be that the bloodless victory that followed the cold battle of Cuba will go down as one of the most significant in world history. I believe that this battle convinced the world that no lawless nations will ever be permitted to establish a military base in the Western Hemisphere unless they want to start an atomic war.

A different kind of challenge confronts us in Vietnam. In meeting that challenge an entirely new international policy has been announced by President Johnson. We have stated that we do not desire to isolate communism. After long years of opposition we are willing to admit China to the United Nations if she will come in. We are even willing to allow Vietnam to choose a Communist system of government or to admit the Vietcong to a share in that government if this is done by the free choice of the people in an election. We are no longer afraid of Communist ideology, we are solely concerned with stopping the conquest of small nations in Asia through the force of Communist arms.

This is a revolutionary change from our philosophy of only a few years ago. Then the United States had divided the world into good guys and bad guys. We dispensed military aid to any country which would oppose communism in principle. We withdrew our aid if we did not like the ideas of the Government which was receiving it. With respect to China, we established a strong military base in Formosa which we extended to Quemoy and Matsu. We deluded ourselves into thinking that Chiang Kai-shek was capable of reconquering China. Under the Truman administration we financed the dropping of bombs on the Chinese mainland.

President Eisenhower announced that he was going to unleash Chiang Kai-shek if China did not behave. We stopped all trade with China in the belief that we could bring that government to her knees. We asked nations of the world to isolate China, which they refused to do. The bitter reaction of China was to be expected. It regarded the existence of a strong military force in Formosa with outposts in Quemoy and Matsu as we regarded a strong Russian military force in Cuba. The difference was China couldn't do anything about it.

Then we would not negotiate with China, we would not let China into the United Nations, we were opposing Communist ideas everywhere and falling into the trap of supporting military dictatorships as a result. We even were obsessed with the insane delusion that the Communists by infiltration in our Government, schools, and colleges were strong enough to overthrow the U.S. Government itself.

No system of international law can be based on preventing the spread of ideas or creeds. A policeman who arrests you for what you think, not what you do, does not represent the rule of law which we are celebrating here today. The period we have been going through resembles the ideological battle between Catholicism and Protestantism during the wars following the reformation. Philip of Spain wrecked his empire in senseless wars and persecutions by attempting to oppose the spread of the Protestant religion in Europe. That same kind of religious warfare has been our announced policy for years. To have expressed 10 years ago the policy announced today by President Johnson would have ruined the career of any Government official. The professors who testified before the Fulbright Committee on the folly of isolating China would have been hauled before an un-American Activities Committee and lost their jobs.

Owen Lattimore, a great Far Eastern expert, had been adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. He resigned and returned to this country. He wrote that the Chinese revolution had to be reckoned with as a powerful force in Asia. Although he thought China was too weak to engage in aggression outside of the Far East, within that sphere it was a force we must recognize. He spoke against the isolation of China. What happened to him? He was denounced as a spy by McCarthy; he was prosecuted for years by the Department of Justice. The U.S. Government succeeded in ruining him financially and might have succeeded, if it had not been for the courage of a great Federal judge—Judge Youngdahl—in putting him in the penitentiary.

Today we have lost our fear that foreign creeds and ideals can destroy the U.S. Government. Our emerging foreign policy is based on reality and not delusion. We have announced that the keeping of the peace is the burden of America under principles of international law which leave every country free to choose its own government.

There are those who say that the United States cannot be the world's policeman. But the world desperately needs some police force to establish order out of the present chaos. The mantle has fallen on us.

If we are not the world's policeman, who will be? Certainly the United Nations has proved completely impotent at that task. It is equally certain that no alliances with smaller nations is going to give us anything more than token support from a few and open opposition from others. To carry that burden we have determined to make the American flag respected in the 20th century as the British flag was respected in the 19th century.

In the 19th century Kipling was the poetic spokesman for British international policies. He wrote:

"Never was isle so little, never was so sea
so lone,
"But over the scud and the palm trees an
English flag was flown."

Then the Four Winds sang, all with the same refrain. For example, the East Wind said:

"What is the flag of England?
Ye have but my reefs to dare,
"Ye have but my seas to furrow,
Go forth for it is there."

Today we have learned the lesson that Great Britan learned in the 19th century—that it is the function of a dominant world power rather than a consensus of lesser powers to take the lead in establishing world order. Great Britain did that in the 19th century. It was under the protection of the British navy that the United States could announce and enforce the Monroe Doctrine. Throughout the 19th century it was the power of the British Empire that gave the world some semblance of international order. The British called it at that time, "The white man's burden." It was a costly burden when England undertook to police the world. Great Britain's actions were not always just, but its world policy did achieve its end. By compelling respect for the British flag England succeeded in giving life and vitality to the ideals embodied in the international law of that time.

We have been forced, perhaps as a result of the inevitable march of events, perhaps as a result of costly blunders in the past, to choose Vietnam as the place to demonstrate to the world our adamant policy in favor of peace and against international chaos and disorder. There is no use now in wringing our hands over blunders, particularly in the light of the fact that no one can agree who made them or just what they are. It is my own belief that these blunders were inevitable in a time when any politician who talked realistically about compromise with communism would have been defeated.

The hope for revival of international law in world affairs lies in the fact that we recognize that fighting an ideological war, cold or hot, is folly. Today our policy is simple and realistic. We believe that the sooner we can convince the lawless nations that they cannot spread disorder and violence throughout the world without facing our military power, the sooner we obtain world order under international law.

It is significant in evaluating the strength of the democratic way of life that this consensus was reached as a result of public debate before Senator FULBRIGHT'S committee which began on a note of bitter criticism of the war in Vietnam.

Seldom has there been a more dramatic illustration of the function of free speech and unfettered criticism as a means of dissolving a national issue. There were those who bitterly complained that men like Senator MORSE and Senator FULBRIGHT were encouraging the enemy and should, therefore, be silent. They were wrong. We should be grateful for the debate that resulted. Today, because of the Fulbright hearings, the President has been able to reverse the former policy followed since President Truman that it is the duty of the United States to isolate Communist powers and to fight communism with a big C wherever it rears its head. Without the Fulbright hearings this change of policy would have encountered intense political opposition. We now know where we are going.

There are those who say that we have not the resources to enforce principles of international law. This is nonsense. The percentage of our gross national product tied up in Vietnam by the war is infinitesimal compared to any war in the past—large though it be in dollars. And as for the future: In 1960 our gross national product, which is our only real national wealth, was $541 billion. In 1965 it had risen to $677 billion. In 1970, it is conservatively estimated to be $825 billion, and in 1975 it will exceed $1 trillion, all estimated in 1965 dollars.

Keeping the American flag flying as a symbol of international order over the world will be far less burdensome to our economy than keeping the English flag flying was in the 19th century. The world is too small to permit lawless aggression just as this country is too small to permit racism in Southern States. The international law of the 20th century will be the gift of the United States to the world.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA'S EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT IN THE FIELD OF MINING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the University of Alaska, situated 4 miles east of Fairbanks, began its life in 1923 as the Alaska Agricultural College and School of Mining. Mining has always been a major subject in that farthest north institution of higher learning and it performs its teaching function in this field admirably.

An interesting article entitled "Profiles in Mineral Industry Education—University of Alaska," written by Donald J. Cook, head of the department of mineral engineering, appears in the Mining Congress Journal for April 19, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFILES IN MINERAL INDUSTRY EDUCATION—UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

(By Donald J. Cook, head, department of mineral engineering)

The main campus of the University of Alaska is located approximately 3 miles west of the city of Fairbanks on a natural promontory which commands a magnificent view of the Tanana Valley and the Alaska Mountain Range to the south, Mount McKinley, the highest peak in North America, located 160 miles to the southwest, often presents a spectacular view from this vantage point.

As the only public institution of higher education in the State, the university has the responsibility of supplying continuing education over a vast geographic area and a wide range of educational needs. This is accomplished through the main campus at college and six community colleges located at Anchorage, Juneau-Douglas, Ketchikan, Sitka, Matanuska-Susitna, and the Kenai Peninsula. In addition, evening and off-campus courses are conducted through the division of statewide services. Such classes are offered in many cities throughout the State and on military installations at Elmendorf, Fort Richardson, Adak, Eielson, Fort Wainwright, Kodiak, and Fort Greely. Current enrollment consists of 1,613 at the main campus, 1,224 in the six community colleges and, 1,352 in the evening and off-campus courses.

The main campus is easily accessible by railroad, automobile or airplane. The Alaska Railroad links the two major cities of Fairbanks and Anchorage and terminates at the seaport of Seward. The Alcan Highway connects with the Alaska highway system to allow automobile transportation from the other continental states through Canada to the Fairbanks and Anchorage areas. This is supplemented by the Alaska Ferry system, which services cities along the southwest coastal regions from Prince Rupert, B.C. at the south terminal, to Haines and Skagway as the northern terminals. The International Airport at Fairbanks provides facilities for major jet airline service with state, national and international connections.

SCHOOL ESTABLISHED IN 1917

By an act approved in 1915, the U.S. Congress reserved land in the Tanana Valley and granted it to the Territory of Alaska for support of a territorial college and school of mines. The territorial legislature in 1917 accepted this grant of land and created The Alaska Agricultural College and School of Mines. This corporation, under the direction of a board of trustees, appointed Charles E. Bunnell as its first president; it was dedicated and formally opened with an enrollment of six students in 1922.

In 1935 the Alaska Agricultural College and School of Mines became the University of Alaska under the direction of a board of regents. At this time, the university was granted accreditation by the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools. The geological engineering and mining engineering curriculums are accredited by the engineering council for professional development.

With the rapid growth of student enrollment, professional staff, and physical plant facilities needed to serve all the public educational requirements of the entire state, the university was reorganized in 1960 to include six academic colleges and the division of statewide services. The academic colleges include: arts and letters; behavioral sciences and education; biological sciences and renewable resources; business, economics and government; earth sciences and mineral industry; and mathematics, physical sciences, and engineering.

The university's instrumental facilities are augmented by research units which include: Alaska Agricultural Expriment Station; Alaska Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit; Geophysical Institute; Institute of Arctic Biology; Institute of Marine Sciences; Institute of Business, Economics and Government Research; Mineral Industry Research Laboratory; Arctic Research Laboratory, Point Barrow; Alaska Water Pollution Control Laboratory; Arctic Environmental Engineering Laboratory; and Institute of Water Resources Research.

GRADUATE PROGRAM IS AVAILABLE

With the university-wide reorganization into six academic colleges, the school of mines, located in the Alfred H. Brooks Memorial Building, became the college of earth sciences and mineral industry, consisting of the departments of geology and mineral engineering. Within this framework, the college offers programs leading to the B.S. degrees in geology, geological engineering, and mining engineering. Graduate programs leading to the M.S. degree are available in the fields of geology, mineral industry management, and mineral preparation engineering. A Ph. D. is offered in geology and a professional degree, mining engineer, may be earned by engineering graduates of the college.

The department of mineral engineering of the college places emphasis upon engineering as it applies to the development and exploitation of mineral resources in the education and training of the undergraduate and graduate students who will be tomorrow's leaders in this industry. To this end, the curriculum is designed to provide a sound foundation in the basic sciences and engineering sciences, analysis, and design needed for creative thinking and application of engineering principles in solving practical problems and in advancing technology. In addition, a background in the humanistic-social sciences and communication is emphasized to prepare graduates for assuming their responsibilities in civic affairs as well as in the industry.

A curriculum, in order to offer a challenging and comprehensive educational program must have a well balanced faculty for progressive instruction. There are six full-time staff members in the instructional and associated research program of the department. Several are registered professional engineers and each has had practical engineering experience to augment the theoretical concepts of his academic training. The faculty members have diverse areas of specialization which results in continual upgrading of the academic and research programs.

Major progress has been made within the department and the university relative to instrumentation and equipment necessary in laboratory facilities of a modern mineral engineering program. These include: X-ray diffraction and spectrometry; emission spectrograph with full-scale recording microphotometer; electron microscope; ventilation laboratory; beneficiation laboratory with bench scale and pilot plant equipment; geochemical and geophysical exploration equipment; and IBM 1620 and 360 computer facilities.

RESEARCH EMPHASIZED

A research program leading to the development of Alaska's mineral resources must be continued at an increased rate to assure a vigorous and dynamic development of this industry. Through its framework of professional personnel and physical facilities, the university has the responsibility not only for teaching, but also for research and for service to prospectors and mine owners, if the mineral industry is to assume its basic role in Alaska's growing economy.

Realizing that current investment in minerals research is a sound practice that will pay dividends in the future, the 1963 State legislature established the mineral research laboratory to function in conjunction with the academic activities of the department of mineral engineering. This facility is dedicated to the expansion and diversification of the mineral economy of the state through a program of applied and basic research.

The association of instructional and research programs, in which faculty members are encouraged to have joint appointments, results in: a continual improvement of the undergraduate and graduate courses of study; the development of new educational areas within the total mineral industry discipline; an increased educational growth of the students by their participation and association; and a stimulating influence on the teaching and research efforts of the professional staff. Present and future interests of staff members are in the areas of mineral exploration, mining operations, mineral benefication, mineral economics, coal utilization, rock mechanics, and computer applications.

FINANCIAL AIDS AVAILABLE

Financial aid for the needy and industrious student is available in many forms. Numerous scholarships are awarded annually to students of the university by various individuals and organizations, with some of these designated specifically to students enrolled in the College of Earth Sciences and Mineral Industry. The university also has several loan funds to which a student may apply for financial assistance in emergency situations. Part-time employment on both a steady and intermittent basis is available on and off campus for those students who find it necessary to underwrite some of their expenses.

Summer employment within the industry has reached the stage where requests for student employees for prospecting and exploration programs can no longer be met by the available students within the college. Accessibility of aid and job opportunities are such that a student with the proper ambition and incentive can finance his college education.

OTHER MINERAL PROGRAMS OFFERED

In keeping with its functions of service and continuing education throughout the entire state, the University of Alaska, through its Division of Statewide Services, presents many credit and noncredit educational programs and special services. One such program of mining extension courses gives basic training to interested persons in various phases of the mineral industry. These noncredit courses, usually taught by graduates of the college of earth sciences and mineral industry, are presented each year in various communities throughout Alaska, and are designed to present the practical aspects of geology, mineralogy, prospecting, exploration and mining.

A mineral technician program has been initiated in the department of mineral engineering for training of native Alaskans as technicians in the many facets of the mineral industry. This program, financed by the Employment Assistance Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, currently involves a 9 months' training program for 15 Eskimos of the Seward Peninsula area. Participants of this program have been tentatively guaranteed employment by a major mining company upon successful completion of the course of study. Future plans call for the expansion of this program into a 2-year associate degree curriculum in mineral technology.

FUTURE PROMISING

Since a basic mining industry is recognized as vital to the economic growth of the State, the university administration and the State legislature have always fostered the policy of supporting the academic and research facilities of this college. Recent increased activity in the minerals field in Alaska indicates that an expansion of these programs can be anticipated with a growing and challenging future for its graduates.

Technical competency and versatility is indicated in the past educational roll of the college when viewing the professional positions of a representative list of alumni:

Eskil Anderson, vice president, Grandview Mines and Little Squaw Mining Co.

Earl H. Beistline, dean, College of Earth Sciences and Mineral Industry, University of Alaska.

Richard A. Downing, commissioner of public works, State of Alaska.

Charles Herbert, deputy commissioner of natural resources, State of Alaska.

Stanley Lefond, staff geologist, Diamond Alkali Co.

Robert Marovelli, Mine Examination and Exploration Engineer, U.S. Bureau of Mines.

Patrick H. O'Neill, executive vice president, International Mining Corp.

William O'Neil, mining consultant and vice president, University of Alaska Board of Regents.

Joseph Riendl, owner, Geophysical Consulting Service.

Peter O. Sandvik, geologist, International Minerals and Chemical Corp.

Raymond L. Smith, president, Michigan Technological University.

Harold Strandberg, mine owner and Alaska State legislator.

Bruce I. Thomas, mine examination and exploration engineer, U.S. Bureau of Mines.

Bert W. Varnell, assistant chief metallurgist, Reisner Metals Inc.

James A. Williams, director, Division of Mines and Minerals, State of Alaska.

Ernest Wolff, assistant professor of geology, Colorado State University.

MARTIN LUTHER KING SUPPORTS VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING LEGISLATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last Thursday I was privileged to keynote the conference on population problems sponsored by Planned Parenthood-World Population. The highlight of the conference was the banquet, at which the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., was presented the Margaret Sanger Award.

Dr. King was, unfortunately, unable to be present, but his lovely wife accepted the award for him and read the remarks he had prepared for the occasion. Dr. King's statement is both eloquent and significant. Its eloquence shines forth from every paragraph. In careful, measured tones, Dr. King describes the striking similarity between Dr. Margaret Sanger's fight for recognition and the Negro's struggle for equality.

The significance of Dr. King's remarks is that he puts to rest, I hope once and for all, the canard that those who advocate voluntary family planning are somehow seeking to limit the proportion of Negroes in our country.

Dr. King wisely points out that all poor, both black and white do not plan their families:

> The Negro constitutes half the poor of the Nation. Like all poor, Negro and white, they have many unwanted children. This is a cruel evil they urgently need to control. There is scarcely anything more tragic in human life than a child who is not wanted. That which should be a blessing becomes a curse for parent and child. There is nothing inherent in the Negro mentality which creates this condition. Their poverty causes it. When Negroes have been able to ascend economically, statistics reveal they plan their families with even greater care than whites. Negroes of higher economic and educational status actually have fewer children than white families in the same circumstances.

He categorically rejects the notion that the Negro can achieve greater political strength through greater numbers.

> Some commentators point out that with present birth rates it will not be long before Negroes are a majority in many of the major cities of the Nation. As a consequence, they can be expected to take political control, and many people are apprehensive at this prospect.
>
> Negroes do not seek political control by this means. They seek only what they are entitled to and do not wish for any domination purchased at a cost of human misery. Negroes were once bred by slave owners to be sold as merchandise. They do not welcome any solution which involves population breeding as a weapon. They are instinctively sympathetic to all who offer methods that will improve their lives and offer them fair opportunity to develop and advance as all other people in our society.

These are some of the highlights of his statement, but the entire text well merits careful study. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. King's statement be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT DELIVERED BY MRS. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., IN BEHALF OF THE REVEREND MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1966, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY PLANNING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

During the past several weeks the press has been filled with reports of sightings of flying saucers. While we need not give credence to these stories, they allow our imagination to speculate on how visitors from outer space would judge us. I am afraid they would be stupified at our conduct. They would observe that for death planning we spend billions to create engines and strategies for war. They would also observe that we spend millions to prevent death by disease and other causes. Finally they would observe that we spend paltry sums for population planning, even though its spontaneous growth is an urgent threat to life on our planet. Our visitors from outer space could be forgiven if they reported home that our planet is inhabited by a race of insane men whose future is bleak and uncertain.

There is no human circumstance more tragic than the persisting existence of a harmful condition for which a remedy is readily available. Family planning, to relate population to world resources, is possible, practical and necessary. Unlike plagues of the Dark Ages or contemporary diseases we do not yet understand, the modern plague of overpopulation is soluble by means we have discovered and with resources we possess.

What is lacking is not sufficient knowledge of the solution but universal consciousness of the gravity of the problem and education of the billions who are its victims.

It is easier for a Negro to understand a social paradox because he has lived so long with evils that could be eradicated but were perpetuated by indifference or ignorance. The Negro finally had to devise unique methods to deal with his problem and perhaps the measure of success he is realizing can be an inspiration to others coping with tenacious social problems.

In our struggle for equality we were confronted with the reality that many millions of people were essentially ignorant of our conditions or refused to face unpleasant truths. The hard core bigot was merely one of our adversaries. The millions who were blind to our plight had to be compelled to face the social evil their indifference permitted to flourish.

After centuries of relative silence and enforced acceptance we adapted a technique of exposing the problem by direct and dramatic methods. We had confidence that when we awakened the Nation to the immorality and evil of inequality there would be an upsurge of conscience followed by remedial action.

We knew that there were solutions and that the majority of the Nation were ready for them. Yet we also knew that the existence of solutions would not automatically operate to alter conditions. We had to organize, not only arguments, but people in the millions for action. Finally we had to be prepared to accept all the consequences involved in dramatizing our grievances in the unique style we had devised.

There is a striking kinship between our movement and Margaret Sanger's early efforts. She, like we, saw the horrifying conditions of ghetto life. Like we, she knew that all of society is poisoned by cancerous slums. Like we, she was a direct actionist—a nonviolent resister. She was willing to accept scorn and abuse until the truth she saw was revealed to the millions. At the turn of the century she went into the slums and set up a birth control clinic, and for this deed she went to jail because she was violating an unjust law. Yet the years have justified her actions. She launched a movement which is obeying a higher law to preserve human life under human conditions. Margaret Sanger had to commit what was then called a crime, in order to enrich humanity, and today we honor her courage and vision for without them there would have been no beginning. Our sure beginning in the struggle for equality by nonviolent direct action may not have been so resolute without the tradition established by Margaret Sanger and people like her. Negroes have no mere academic nor ordinary interest in family planning. They have a special and urgent concern.

Recently, the subject of Negro family life has received extensive attention. Unfortunately studies have overemphasized the problem of the Negro male ego and almost entirely ignored the most serious element—Negro migration. During the past half century, Negroes have migrated on a massive scale, transplanting millions from rural communities to crammed urban ghettoes. In their migration, as with all migrants, they carried with them the folkways of the countryside into an inhospitable city slum. The size of family that may have been appropriate and tolerable on a manually cultivated farm was carried over to the jammed streets of the ghetto. In all respects, Negroes were atomized, neglected, and discriminated against.

Yet the worst omission was the absence of institutions to acclimate them to their new environment. Margaret Sanger, who offered an important institutional remedy, was unfortunately ignored by social and political leaders in this period. In consequence, Negro folkways in family size persisted. The problem was compounded when unrestrained exploitation and discrimination accented the bewilderment of the newcomer and high rates of illegitimacy and fragile family relationships resulted.

For the Negro, therefore, intelligent guides to family planning are a profoundly important ingredient in his quest for security and a decent life. There are mountainous obstacles still separating Negroes from a normal existence. Yet one element in stabilizing his life would be an understanding of, and easy access to, the means to develop a family related in size to his community environment and to the income potential he can command.

This is not to suggest that the Negro will solve all his problems through planned parenthood. His problems are far more complex, encompassing economic security, education, freedom from discrimination, decent housing and access to culture. Yet if family planning is sensible it can facilitate or at least not be an obstacle to the solution of the many profound problems that plague him.

The Negro constitutes half the poor of the Nation. Like all poor, Negro and white, they have many unwanted children. This is a cruel evil they urgently need to control. There is scarcely anything more tragic in human life than a child who is not wanted. That which should be a blessing becomes a curse for parent and child. There is nothing inherent in the Negro mentality which creates this condition. Their poverty causes it. When Negroes have been able to ascend economically, statistics reveal they plan their families with even greater care than whites. Negroes of higher economic and educational status actually have fewer children than white families in the same circumstances.

Some commentators point out that with present birth rates it will not be long before Negroes are a majority in many of the major cities of the Nation. As a consequence, they can be expected to take political control, and many people are apprehensive at this prospect. Negroes do not seek political control by this means. They seek only what they are entitled to and do not wish for any domination purchased at a cost of human misery. Negroes were once bred by slave owners to be sold as merchandise. They do not welcome any solution which involves population breeding as a weapon. They are instinctively sympathetic to all who offer methods that will improve their lives and offer them fair opportunity to develop and advance as all other people in our society.

For these reasons we are natural allies of those who seek to inject any forms of planning in our society that enrich life and guarantee the right to exist in freedom and dignity.

For these constructive movements we are prepared to give our energies and consistent support, because in the need for family planning, Negro and white have a common bond: and together we can and should unite our strength for the wise preservation, not of races in general, but of the one race we all constitute—the human race.

THE NEED FOR REFORM IN LATIN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, when I addressed the Senate recently on some of the problems which face the democratic governments of Latin America, one of the things I pointed out was the need for reform in the universities.

For some time, it has been well known and well documented that many Latin American universities are centers for Communist agitation.

An excellent survey of this problem appears in the May issue of Elks magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article, written by Charles W. Wiley and Richard J. Bocklet, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Latin Campuses: Study in Red

(By Charles W. Wiley and Richard J. Bocklet)

"Make no mistake—the Communists have launched a major campaign to conquer South America." The speaker, a high ranking officer, is an expert on insurrectionary warfare with the U.S. Southern Defense Command based in the Panama Canal Zone. "But this war is different. The enemy thinks not only in terms of companies and battalions, but in university clubs and student organizations. Communist student leaders are the captains in their order of battle."

After careful study of the situation in Latin America, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, in an introduction to a Senate report, stated: "Although writers and commentators have been prone to skirt the issue, the Communists have succeeded in massively infiltrating the student movements in Latin American countries."

Secretary of State Dean Rusk warned the Organization of American States at a conference in Rio de Janeiro that Latin America was "not yet free from the same threat of a 'war of liberation' [such as the one] raging in Vietnam."

Senator Strom Thurmond, in a recent speech on "The Threat of Communism to Latin America," made clear the importance of the situation to the United States: "However much so it may sound, this subject is not one of just academic relevance to you or to any American citizen. The subject is remote, if at all, only in a geographic sense. It has a very direct and immediate bearing on your future.

"The intensification of the Communist threat in Latin America, and the disproportionately heavy allocation of resources dedicated by the Communists to Latin America, is a direct consequence of the geographic proximity and the strategic economic and political relation of Latin America to the United States."

The Communists know that it takes more than a Castro hiding in the hills to carry off a revolution. They realize that their "spontaneous uprisings" must be carefully organized and expertly led, for which the leadership rarely comes from among the peasants and slumdwellers who supposedly are the backbone of a revolution.

It is important to recognize, too, that university students in Latin America (and most of the rest of the world) are not like students in the United States. Here, they are preparing themselves for a satisfactory place in society that, by and large, they want to preserve. But in "underdeveloped" Latin America, it is not difficult for agitators to convince students that they have a stake in changing the system.

To comprehend the nature of the danger south of the border, one must give primary consideration to what's going on in the universities, traditionally the centers of unrest.

Based on numerous interviews with Communist and non-Communist students, professors, and university officials throughout Latin America, we found, on separate trips covering the entire area, that Reds have captured many university student bodies and have made deep inroads in nearly all. Security officials and experts on communism confirmed our findings.

Students are both the shock troops and the officer cadre of the Communist Latin America command in its campaign to conquer the Western Hemisphere's soft, southern underbelly. This growing army of young men and women numbers in the tens of thousands—with up to 20,000 presently undergoing training in Cuba, the Soviet Union, East Europe, Red China, and Vietnam.

Students on many Latin American campuses openly proclaim support for the guerrillas and for the downfall of the Government. They are the background of rebel movements, and guerrilla ranks usually swell during vacation months. In the cities, students carry on terrorist campaigns. They rob banks and other businesses to finance guerrilla operations, kidnap wealthy citizens, plant bombs, and assassinate police and Government authorities. U.S. embassies and American-owned businesses are special targets of student terrorist attacks.

One Latin counterintelligence officer responsible for keeping track of Communist penetrations in the universities, told us: "We didn't take this problem seriously for a long time—too long. We thought of our radical students as 'children passing through a phase.' But suddenly we realize that many of our 'children' are trained killers, organized to take over our country. The big question is whether we've made the discovery in time to turn the tide."

One of his colleagues warned: "I hope I'm wrong, but I'm convinced that you North Americans will face the same problem in the future."

For many years Latin students, especially freshmen and sophs, became radicals as an outlet for adolescent exuberance. There was little guidance or organization, and no realistic future outside the university for communists. Most of the student extremists of the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's are moderates today. But the picture is changing.

Campus recruitment and the use of students for the Communist cause is now a smooth operation, well directed and organized. While it is still true that many students recruited into Communist ranks as freshmen start slipping away in their junior and senior years, the number who stay on the Red path through college and beyond is steadily increasing. The cry "Revolution" is no longer an empty call to arms.

Communist leaders and guerrilla chiefs throughout the continent are heroes on the campus, and future leaders are the primary target of Communist recruiters in the universities. Student agitators who can whip up anti-Government and hate-U.S. demonstrations on cue from the Communist hierarchy will probably do just as well later organizing peasants and poor urban workers for the Red cause. Students who can instigate bloody riots that not only embarrass but sometimes threaten governments, as has happened in nearly every Latin American country, possess a talent that is crucial for the success of Communist revolutionary plans.

Miguel Rotalde, former mayor of Peru's main port of Callao and, until recently a Minister of Government, said flatly: "The universities are the main source of Communist action in Peru." Rotalde made the statement last year, just after Peru was forced to declare a state of siege because of Communist guerrilla and terror activity.

Once a student has proven himself on campus he has carved out a future with the Communist Party. In some cases he will be allowed to do postgraduate work at party expense. Many will be given military training to operate in the hills as guerrillas. Some will be assigned to jobs in labor unions and the communications media. Since the Communists have long established themselves in the Ministries of Education, they are often able to place graduates in important teaching posts in high schools and universities. Through party-arranged jobs or heavy subsidization from Red funds, the young Communists achieve a much-sought-after stability in a generally precarious economic situation.

Communists, because of their training and resources, are even more powerful than their actual numbers would indicate. Democratic forces lack the dedication and organization of the Reds. Most students, although non-Communist, find little time for politics, and the field is left wide open for the extremists.

Students follow world events, often colored by Communist propaganda, and many feel that history is on the side of communism. Castro is the symbol of that tide in Latin America. But events anywhere on the globe can also influence the situation. Every Vietcong victory speeds up the bandwagon, and a U.S. retreat in Vietnam could trigger a hemispheric "war of national liberation."

Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of Alabama, warned in a recent speech: "The aggressors' target is not simply the sphere of southeast Asia. It is the Western Hemisphere. Were we to take the easy course in Vietnam, we would soon be faced with Vietnam-type subversion and aggression by Communist and Communist-inspired enemies of freedom throughout Latin America.

"As chairman of the House Subcommittee of Inter-American Affairs, I know the volatile nature of that threat. The Communists and their friends in Central and South America—encouraged and aided by Peking—would need only the indication that the American will to resist in Vietnam was weakening. We would then witness a quantum jump in the Communist technique of so-called wars of national liberation. Our own hemisphere would be the battlefield."

Latin students look to Fidel Castro for inspiration and guidance. His own revolution took its ideological base and leadership from Havana University, and this enhanced student revolutionary prestige throughout the continent.

The Castro influence on radical Latin youth is illustrated by a statement of Americo Martin, former president of Central University's Federation of Students, in Caracas: "We want to do the same as Castro * * *. Cuba showed the way all the other Latin countries must go."

Vilma Espin, wife of Fidel Castro's brother Raul and a member of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party, put it in more direct anti-U.S. terms. In a Moscow speech, she boasted: "If small Cuba, 90 miles from North American imperialism, has been able to maintain its revolution, all nations can do so."

Cuba provides a meeting ground for all Latin American Communists, and many broadcast to their countrymen via Radio Havana. Students consider it a mark of distinction to have spent time in Castro Cuba. Travel to Cuba is through Mexico—the only Latin American country that maintains air service to Havana. From there, many continue on to other Communist countries.

Another route to the U.S.S.R., Eastern Europe, and Asia is through Paris, where visas are issued—but not stamped into students' passports. It is an open secret that campus Communists—sometimes professors, or even deans—provide forged travel documents to students wishing to go to Cuba or behind the Curtain.

Communist money from Moscow, Havana, Peking, and elsewhere pours into Latin America, much of it for student activities. For example, a Central Intelligence Agency report to Congress revealed that Castro alone has pumped over $1 million into just one country—Venezuela—for subversive purposes.

The Red bloc often outbids Western nation, including the United States, in offering scholarships and other privileges to promising students. Standards for study behind the Iron Curtain are much lower than for study in the United States, and in addition to scholarships ranging up to 7 years, roundtrip transportation is provided, plus room and board, books, clothing, and some entertainment allowances.

At Red bloc universities, Latin students are trained in Marxist-Leninist doctrine, agitation, infiltration tactics, sabotage, and terrorism. Guerrilla warfare schools are the speciality of Castro Cuba, with an increase from 10 in 1962 to more than 30 in 1965, according to U.S. Intelligence reports. Usually reliable reports place the number at more than 40 today.

Thousands of "graduates" have returned to their countries, some to infiltrate the labor movement, government, and mass communications; others to organize peasant uprisings and terrorist activity. They have even established contact with dissident young military men in some countries, the most notable being Lt. Marco Antonio Yon Sosa in Guatemala. After the failure of a leftist coup, Yon Sosa fled to the hills where he leads guerrilla forces, made up of a good number of students.

Trained Communists assigned to the universities become "professional students," and often remain in school until their late thirties or early forties. Paid Communist functionaries, who devote full time to their jobs, are responsible for recruiting new members, seeing that Communists and sympathizers get the important student and faculty positions, and general organizational work.

They use the campus as a platform from which to agitate in every phase of the nation's life. Communist slogans and posters are splattered everywhere. Campaigns may cover almost any subject. Perennial ones include demands for expropriating American-owned property and the release of jailed subversives. Often, the agitation leads to student demonstrations—usually against the government or the United States—and, if the Communist organizers do their job well, bloody riots.

The activity of the professional student leaders is well financed, and they receive other outside help such as propaganda material and expert advice. Massive amounts of free or cheap Communist pamphlets and books are available for distribution. Mimeograph machines are ready to quickly turn out leaflets to stir up support for candidates, demonstrations, protests, etc. Professionals, trained in agitation, prepare this material, and it is nearly always clever, with a single major point that can be easily grasped.

The non-Communist forces are seldom as well organized or financed—and often are not organized at all. And even when local anti-Communists make the effort, it is very infrequently that they are in the same league as the Reds.

The United States hasn't fully accepted the challenge. In dozens of programs we have aimed at improving economic, social, and political conditions. We have tried, often successfully, to attract students to our way of life through scholarships and other education programs. But we haven't trained professional organizers to cope with Communist agitators, and they are as desperately needed as technicians and doctors.

One of the answers to this problem may well be a U.S.-based "Freedom Academy" that would teach nonmilitary people from free world countries how to fight Communists in their particular fields. The Cold War Council, a bipartisan organization of outstanding Americans concerned with Communist political warfare, reported at congressional committee hearings on the academy bill: "Training citizens of other nations is a key factor in achieving free world security." A freedom academy bill narrowly missed congressional passage last year.

Meanwhile, the privately sponsored Freedom Studies Center is nearing completion outside of Boston, Va. With similar aims, it could make a solid contribution in this field. Among those cooperating in the various projects of the Center are the American Security Council, the American Legion, and a large number of universities and other educational organizations. It is administered by the Institute for American Strategy.

The battle is already being fought on the labor front. The AFL–CIO has training programs for Latin American trade unionists that have contributed to many victories of free labor over Communists.

The general political and economic atmosphere on nearly all Latin American campuses has given the Communists a big advantage in attracting young people. The "right" on the political spectrum in most universities is equivalent to left-liberal in the United States and is considered reactionary. Conservatives, or even moderates or "middle-of-the-roaders," as we use these terms, are almost unheard of. Moving left, the spectrum passes the Communists and reaches the extreme radicals who are even more extreme than the Peking-line Communists.

Paradoxically, the Reds often have less trouble winning over "right-wing" students than the radicals who want immediate, all-out revolution. They try to convince the extremists that careful groundwork and preparation must be undertaken before revolution has a fair chance of success; that infiltration and working through front groups is necessary. Many, aflame with impetuous revolutionary zeal, cannot be slowed down, and in some cases they have gained control of student groups by calling the Communists reactionary.

Paralleling the split in Communist Parties throughout the world, Latin Red students are divided into pro-Moscow and pro-Peking groups, the latter in the ascendency. But despite splits within Communists ranks, they usually unite on major issues. During a crisis, such as in the Dominican Republic, they work side by side. They seldom lose sight of the main objective—the Communist conquest of Latin America.

Despite rampant leftism, the United States has some latent support on Latin American campuses. This comes generally from the more nonpolitical students, who seldom air their views in public. Those who do are not fiery public speakers and are rarely in student leadership positions. Some student leaders describe themselves as "democratic"—but this does not mean pro-American. They frequently criticize the United States, but also refuse to accept Communist dictation. They feel that both communism and capitalism have equally undesirable aspects.

This thinking was characterized at the Fourth Latin American Congress of Students (LACS) held in Natal, Brazil, in October 1961. When they couldn't dominate the Congress, delegates from Communist-dominated student federations walked out. Those remaining, representatives of 10 democratic federations, issued a press statement on their position: "The Latin American student body has firmly stated its attitude of open struggle against the imperialist domination exerted by the United States over Latin America. It has also made clear that it will not permit oppression by one great power to be replaced by the domination of another, the Soviet Union, which already turns its ambitious eyes to Latin America with obvious voracity."

On the faculty level, it is imprudent to express sympathy for the United States. With a precarious tenure system, few teachers will risk bucking the leftist and Communist trend on campus. Rectors and deans, who are elected with student support, find themselves in the same situation. A teacher or dean publicly defending the United States faces retaliation that can destroy his career.

In one Latin American university the rector was forced out recently because his criticism of the United States-Dominican intervention wasn't strong enough. This fear of being labeled "Yankee supporter" runs to the top of the political structure. To avoid being charged with being an American puppet, by his enemies, most political leaders, even those who are friendly to us, will occasionally throw jabs at American policy.

Over the years, communism has been skillfully pictured as the champion of popular aspirations while capitalism is automatically associated with the status quo and against all change. For a student to proclaim himself a Communist simply means, to many, that he has dedicated himself to the fight for social and economic justice.

On campus, leftist glibly link free enterprise with self-seeking profiteering, while communism is presented as having a "social conscience." Communism is the opposite of this cold-blooded "capitalism"—not of freedom. To be anti-Communist on campus is to be procapitalist.

This concept of free enterprise generally holds true among the teachers, too. Schooled on heavy doses of Marxism, they just naturally expound it in their classrooms. Many of them regard Marxism as a science and are quite oblivious to the political aspects of it, and it is considered sophisticated among teachers to be Marxists. Said one Latin professor: "Communism is even more attractive to the intellectuals and the middle class than to the poor rural masses."

The status of the university in Latin American society makes it fertile ground for political intrigues. The Spanish legacy has given the university the task of forging national leaders, and it has great prestige in the community. Students are looked up to as the vanguard of the future.

In only the last two or three decades, Latin America has been shifting educational goals from the concept of an elite to a mass-based society. While the United States transformed the educational aim of its universities many years ago, Latin America is still suffering the throes of change. With free tuition, the majority of the students are from poor families, many of them not prepared for college. All these factors are a help to the Communists.

Reds, capitalizing on the traditional autonomy of Latin American campuses, have turned universities into sanctuaries for wanted subversives and depots for weapons. Students openly brag of the arsenals they have established in their dormitories and of the production-line procedures they have for turning out Molotov cocktails.

When student activity becomes intolerable, university autonomy is sometimes forgotten by government authorities, and the campus becomes a battlefield between police and Communist-led students. The resulting bloodshed and antigovernment propaganda works to the advantage of the Communists, often outweighing whatever gains were achieved by the raid.

The veteran workhorse of international communism, Dolores Ibarruri ("La Pasionaria" of Spanish Civil War fame), has outlined the Communist blueprint for using students:

"Conquer the students as much as possible, as they are a very great force. * * * The students are those who best suit our purposes, because they always struggle to win. * * *

"A half dozen clear ideas will suffice to inflame the students. Tell them that they are intellectuals, and that they must shout in favor of peace, and that they do not want more wars. And promise them scholarships and free trips and aid in order to advance life."

And, "* * * congratulations to the students, who are advancing together throughout the entire world, and who are the vanguard."

The warning is unmistakably clear; we must face the challenge squarely or risk disastrous consequences. The entire hemisphere is threatened by students who are cunningly led into doing the work of Moscow and Peking. It is easier to inflame destructive revolutionary passion than to sell realistic democratic answers to very complex problems. But ours is the only road that ultimately will bring to the majority of Latin Americans, including students, what they seek.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1106, S. 3293.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3293) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill, S. 3293, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 14732, which was passed by the House of Representatives on May 9. It is identical to the companion bill S. 3293.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 14732) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the purpose of H.R. 14732 is to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1967. This proposed legislation was reported out unanimously by the Joint Committee, and was passed by the House yesterday. It represents the unanimous judgment of members of our committee from both sides of the aisle and from both Houses. Mr. President, I believe this is a prudent authorization bill which provides for the essential activities in our atomic energy program.

The bill provides for the following authorization for the AEC:

For operating expenses	$1,964,128,000
For plant and capital equipment	295,830,000
Total authorization	2,259,958,000

This represents a reduction of about $15 million from the amount requested by the AEC. By way of comparison, the total AEC authorization our committee has recommended for fiscal year 1967 is $295,563,000 less than the authorization approved by Congress for fiscal year 1966. The AEC's program has generally been characterized by substantial declines in the amounts requested and authorized for the raw materials, special nuclear materials and weapons programs, whereas the AEC's other programs have continued at about the same funding level or increased.

For example, AEC's support of fast breeder reactor development has increased fairly substantially this year.

Section 101(a) of H.R. 14732 would authorize appropriations of $1,964,128,000 for operating expenses for the AEC. I shall explain briefly several highlights of the committee's recommendations in this connection.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM

The committee recommends the addition of $10 million to the AEC's authorization request for operating costs for the nuclear weapons program. The committee recommends that the additional funds be added to the AEC's underground nuclear weapons testing program, to help assure an effective, continuing, and aggressive program. Even with the $10 million increase recommended by our committee, the AEC's total weapons program operating costs for fiscal year 1967 are estimated to be $53,400,000 less than the amount approved by Congress for fiscal year 1966.

REACTOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The committee has recommended a net reduction of $365,000 from the AEC's operating fund request for the reactor development program. Although the dollar change recommended by our committee is relatively small, our report contains a number of important points which I would like to summarize briefly.

Major changes have taken place in the civilian power reactor program in the past year. As of January 1, 1965—the end of the first decade of significant development effort on civilian power reactors—there were approximately 1,000 megawatts of nuclear powered electrical generating capacity in full operation in the United States. This amounted to about one-half of 1 percent of our total installed electrical generating capacity. Approximately 2,500 megawatts more of nuclear generating capacity were on order or in various stages of completion.

During 1965 orders were placed for approximately 4,700 megawatts of additional nuclear generating capacity. This constituted about one-fifth of the total generating capacity ordered during this period.

Moreover, during just the first 4 months of 1966, utilities announced firm contracts for the addition of about 3,700 megawatts of nuclear generating capacity. This was about half of the total generating capacity additions announced during this period. In addition, plans have been announced for the construction of 1,600 megawatts more nuclear capacity, although firm contracts apparently have not yet been executed. All of the announced nuclear capacity additions were boiling and pressurized water reactor types, of the kind which are increasingly coming to be known as conventional light water reactors.

The dramatic increase in the number and size of nuclear reactors ordered is encouraging. It is also cause for particular vigilance. Accordingly, in our report our committee has urged all segments of the nuclear industry to give the closest attention to design and construction factors, in order to assure that all requirements are met and that these plants will become, in the minimum period, economical additions to utility systems.

Our committee is pleased to report on this progress which has been made in the development of civilian nuclear power. It would appear that our national investment in this program is beginning to pay rich dividends. We have for the first time available to our Nation an addition to fossil fuels, which are our primary source of energy. As pointed out in our committee's hearings, because of our burgeoning needs for energy there is a rapidly expanding market for all types of fuel in our future. For example, a recent article in the Mining Congress Journal, which factors in the growing use of nuclear energy, points out that coal consumption is expected to double between 1960 and 1980.

The past year has also seen a continuing shift in emphasis away from Government support of light water reactors being offered on a commercial basis. Our committee has recommended and encouraged this trend for several years. The AEC is now concentrating its research and development program on the more advanced reactor types, particularly the fast breeder reactors. These are the power reactors which truly hold forth promise of providing us all with a limitless supply of energy. In order for nuclear power to contribute significantly to the solution of our long-term energy needs, it is essential that breeder reactors be developed.

The AEC's budget request for fiscal year 1967 contains a significant increase for fast breeder reactor development work. The committee vigorously endorses an increased level of effort in the fast breeder reactor program, and urges the Commission to complete its formulation of this program at the earliest practicable date.

I want to emphasize our committee's view that the development of fast breeder reactors is a large-scale, long-range endeavor which must call forth our best efforts. The technical problems to be solved in this field are numerous and exceedingly difficult. We must expect some disappointments and hard sledding along the way. In this connection, our committee believes that a highly skilled, dedicated AEC staff to direct and coordinate the efforts of both industrial contractors and Government laboratories is essential to assure efficient progress in this vital national program.

During our authorization hearings we were informed of an increase in private industrial support of fast breeder reactor development. Our committee has strongly encouraged nongovernmental financial support of work in this field, and increased commercial competition. We are hopeful this trend will continue, and will lead eventually to a truly competitive fast reactor industry.

In this connection, the committee has asked the Commission to reconsider its advanced converter reactor program, under which a number of reactor concepts have been supported. One of these is the heavy-water organic-cooled reactor. Although we recommend approval of the full amount requested by the AEC for heavy-water organic-cooled reactor development for fiscal year 1967, including $2 million requested for preliminary architect-engineer work on a prototype the committee has cautioned the AEC to continue to maintain the closest surveillance and direction of this work, and to eliminate effort not directly required to establish the technical feasibility of using this concept for the competitive generation of power.

Technical problems have also been experienced with the other two reactor concepts being supported under the AEC's advanced converter program—the seed-blanket reactor and the high-temperature gas-cooled reactor. In this respect, I should like to reiterate our committee's views that the AEC's civilian nuclear power program is a development program intended to ascertain the advantages and disadvantages of particular reactor systems. Successes or failures of particular projects cannot accurately be predicted in advance. If they could, there would be no need for the project in a Government-supported development program. The committee's main concern is that the AEC outline all of the data that are developed in the various phases of its program and base its future actions on the technical and economic facts which are learned. Lines of effort which do not appear to be feasible or promising, or which do not offer significant advantages over alternate systems should be promptly dropped.

The Joint Committee views the civilian reactor development program as a dynamic one requiring changes in effort as progress occurs. The new developments which have taken place in the last 18 months—such as the sharp increase in the number of power reactors ordered and progress in the fast breeder area—are cause for an updating of the overall program plans which have provided guidelines for the Government's efforts. For this reason, the committee has recommended that the AEC update its 1962 report to the President on the civilian nuclear power program. It may well be that such a review would show that increased effort is called for in certain areas—such as fast breeder work.

MERCHANT SHIP REACTORS

The AEC has requested $500,000 for studies of the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant vessels. Our committee is disappointed that the AEC and the Maritime Administration still have not completed their evaluation of this application of nuclear power. In light of these facts, we cannot recommend support of research and development efforts at this time, and AEC's work in fiscal year 1967 must be limited to studies.

The AEC recently reported to the Joint Committee that the executive branch is continuing to study this problem to determine if the potential benefits from application of nuclear propulsion to merchant ships are worth the costs involved. The committee was told that if the study shows effort in this field is justified, and if an agreement is reached with the Maritime Administration on the objectives of such a program, research and development work involving actual systems and hardware will be initiated. Representatives of the maritime industry testified during our authorization hearings and asked for an opportunity to offer additional testimony concerning the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant ships. The committee stated in response that hearings would be held as soon as possible. Subsequently, industry representatives asked that the proposed hearings on nuclear merchant ships be deferred. The Joint Committee has therefore postponed immediate hearings.

PHYSICAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

The committee has recommended authorization of the full amount requested by the AEC. I wish to add for the information of the Senate that included within the high energy physics budget is the sum of $2.2 million for continued advanced accelerator design studies for the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator. However, the AEC has not requested, nor has the committee authorized, funds for engineering design or construction for the 200-Bev. accelerator. The AEC is at present evaluating the six locations for this accelerator that were recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.

BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE; TRAINING, EDUCATION AND INFORMATION; AND ISOTOPES DEVELOPMENT

Our committee has recommended cuts totaling over $2 million in AEC's requests for funds for this work. We believe these important programs can continue at an effective rate notwithstanding these reductions.

PLOWSHARE PROGRAM

The AEC's Plowshare program concerns the development of peaceful uses for nuclear explosives. The Joint Committee has added $1.5 million to the AEC's budget request for this program, to provide for the conduct of an experiment involving a contained, underground nuclear explosion to demonstrate the feasibility of increasing natural gas production. We believe there are significant advantages to be derived from this experiment, which is to be conducted on a cost sharing basis with private industry. If the experiment is successful it can point the way to substantial increases in our natural gas reserves, and in revenues to the Federal Government from the leasing to private industry of Federal lands containing natural gas deposits.

I shall summarize the remaining sections of H.R. 14732.

Section 101(b) authorizes $246,530,000 for plant and capital equipment obligations for the AEC.

Sections 102, 103, and 104 are general provisions similar to those contained in previous AEC authorization acts.

Section 105 would amend the AEC's authorization act for fiscal year 1958 by extending for an additional year—to June 30, 1967—the date for approving proposals under the "third round" of the AEC's cooperative power reactor demonstration program.

Section 106 would increase by $49,300,000 the amounts authorized for certain projects approved in prior years. This amount is included within the total authorization for the AEC which I mentioned at the outset.

Section 107 would amend the AEC's fiscal year 1966 authorization act by rescinding the authorization for the large seed-blanket reactor cooperative project, except for funds heretofore obligated.

Mr. President, I reiterate that H.R. 14732 was reported by the Joint Committee without dissent. It was passed yesterday by the other body, and I urge its approval by the Senate today.

I shall be happy to answer any questions from Senators who are interested in the authorization bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I fully support the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the AEC's fiscal year 1967 authorization bill, H.R. 14732. Our committee's consideration of this matter has been characterized by a spirit of close cooperation in the national interest, which is certainly as it should be in a program of such vital importance.

I particularly wish to call attention to our committee's recommendation that the AEC weapons budget be increased by $10 million to provide for additional underground nuclear weapons testing work. This effort is vital to our national security, and should be carried on without restriction due to a lack of the requisite funds.

I invite the attention of the Senate to a statement by Mr. Philip Sporn, which appears in the authorization hearing record of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, part 1, page 561.

Mr. Sporn has been a leader in the electric power industry for many years. He is also a vice chairman of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc.

I commend Mr. Sporn's statement to anyone who is interested in some of the basic factors involved in technical and economic comparisons between nuclear and conventional electric power production.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I simply wish to express my support for H.R. 14732.

I think we have a sound authorization bill here. I believe our distinguished vice chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], has adequately pointed out the tremendous growth in orders for nuclear powerplants during the past year or so. Obviously these growth statistics are very significant from the standpoint of our uranium reserves. It would appear that a very large increase in our domestic uranium reserves is called for to meet these expanding nuclear power requirements. Our committee feels that the necessary exploration and development work can and will be supported by private industry.

Mr. President, I reiterate my support of this authorization bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] unfortunately will not be in attendance on the Senate today. The Senator is in Albuquerque because of the death of his wife's mother. He asked me to furnish his views on the following topics covered in H.R. 14732; the naval reactor program, the weapons program, and the construction of a biology laboratory at the Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Wash.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered printed, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON

NAVAL REACTOR PROGRAM

The bill now before the Senate contains the authorization of $97,400,000 for the naval reactor development program. This program, which extends to both surface warships and submarines, has long been supported by the committee and has been one of the most successful of its research and development programs. Only today Admiral Rickover returned from the final trials of our 59th nuclear submarine, the *George Washington Carver*. This Polaris submarine will soon be at the frontlines of our defense, contributing to the security of the free world.

The committee has summarized its views in this critically important area of nuclear propulsion for warships in its recently published hearings entitled "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program." I recommend to my colleagues that they consider carefully the views expressed therein.

Both the Senate and House Armed Services Committees added nuclear ships to the authorization request of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1967. This was a most significant and necessary step in the attempt of Congress to provide this country with the best naval defense possible—nuclear propulsion in naval warships. Congress has always taken the lead in applying our preeminent position in the nuclear power field to our warships.

This bill provides the basic ingredient for our success in the nuclear power field. What I am referring to is the research and development funds which are authorized in this bill. The naval reactor research and development program, under the outstanding leadership of Admiral Rickover, is our only way of keeping ahead in this vital field of technology.

WEAPONS PROGRAM

Secondly, and importantly, I would like to comment on the action of the Joint Committee in recommending the addition of $10 million to the $639 million requested by the administration for the conduct of the AEC's weapons program. Of the amount requested, approximately $396 million is intended for implementation of the four safeguards instituted at the time of the ratification of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Paraphrased, these four safeguards are:

(a) Conduct of a comprehensive aggressive and continuing underground nuclear testing program;

(b) Maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities, competently staffed;

(c) Maintenance of the capability to resume atmospheric testing should this be deemed essential in our national interest or should the treaty or any of its terms be abrogated by the Soviet Union; and

(d) Improvement in our capability to monitor activities and to detect violations of the test ban treaty.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in authorizing an additional $10 million to the weapons program, has identified this amount as an intended addition to the underground weapons testing program. The committee holds to the view that it is essential to assure that there are sufficient funds available so that the Atomic Energy Commission, through its laboratories, can carry out all necessary testing activities during the forthcoming fiscal year, preparing itself particularly in terms of long leadtime work so that the underground weapons testing program will proceed without delay during this and subsequent years.

BIOLOGY LABORATORY

The subject bill contains authorization for the construction of a biology laboratory at the Pacific Northwest Laboratory at a cost of $5 million. This is a much-needed facility to permit scientists to carry out work concerning the effects of nuclear radiation on biological systems. The work is to center in areas of inhalation toxicology and large animal metabolism. This is an important part of a coordinated program in medical research carried out under the supervision of the Commission's biology and medicine division.

The handling of radioactive material necessary to our national security, and for peaceful purposes as well, requires that the Commission conduct an energetic program to increase basic knowledge of the effects of radiation on living systems and for the purpose of solving the practical health and safety problems which we encounter as a consequence of the beneficial use of atomic energy.

I am very pleased to see the Commission proceeding with this project and I foresee that the work carried out there will be a significant contribution to our fund of knowledge in the field of medical research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 14732) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 3293 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 3293 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the efficiency and ease with which the AEC authorization obtained Senate approval today can be attributed only to its splendid handling by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. But the accomplishment is routine. Success is assured for nearly all measures supported by his articulate advocacy. So again we thank him for another great contribution.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the unfinished business been laid before the Senate today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been laid before the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS RETIREMENT AND ANNUITY FUND

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 11439.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11439) to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia Teachers Retirement and Annuity Fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. BIBLE. With that consideration, I shall be happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call to roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the pending business is H.R. 11439. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, H.R. 11439 is a legislative effort to provide 1,620 retired District of Columbia schoolteachers and their survivors the same retirement benefits as the Congress authorized 1 year ago for 700,000 Federal civil service retirees and their survivors. All other District of Columbia employees and retirees have had increased retirement benefits approved for them, with the majority in the Federal Civil Service Act of 1965 and the District policemen and firemen having an automatic retirement escalation provision written into their basic salary law by the Congress some years ago. Therefore, if we are to treat all employees and retirees whose salary and retirement benefits are governed by the Congress, it is desirable that the District teachers be included as this bill provides.

Basically, this legislation does two things: First, affords teachers of the District of Columbia public schools the same increases as in annuities based upon increases in cost of living provided for all civil service retirees in Public Law 89-205, such increases based on the Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and, second, provides, in addition to the cost-of-living adjustment, an additional increase of 6½ percent in a retirement annuity of those teacher retirees whose annuities commenced on or before October 1, 1956, and an additional increase of 1½ percent for those retirees whose annuities commenced after October 1, 1956.

Actually, the amended formula, as provided in this bill, will accelerate the cost-of-living adjustments on a timely basis for teacher retirees similar to those already provided civil service employees.

An amendment to H.R. 11439 was adopted by your committee providing for the annuity increases to be effective as of December 1, 1965. This retroactive provision was felt to be necessary in order to assure the District teacher retirees being accorded the same benefits as those extended to civil service employees 1 year ago.

Actually, the total effect of the bill would be to give a combined increase of 11.1 percent to those retirees whose annuities are based upon the law in existence on or before October 1, 1956, and 6.1 percent to those retirees whose annuities were computed under the liberalized formula made applicable after October 1, 1956, by the 1956 retirement amendments to the District Teachers' Retirement Act. These two increases are comparable with those given civil service retirees by the Congress 1 year ago.

Mr. President, the increased retirement benefits provided in this bill will assist all retired District of Columbia teachers and particularly those retirees and survivors who, as elder citizens, are caught between rising prices and fixed incomes.

The bill has a price tag of $182,000. That will be the cost of the enactment of the legislation.

The bill came out of the committee unanimously, with a suggested amendment that I am sure will be discussed under the additional views filed with the report by the very distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. President, have the committee amendments been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc, with the understanding that the text will be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc, and the bill is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished chairman for getting this bill reported by the committee and to the Senate as expeditiously as he did.

It is my opinion that the bill takes a step forward in correcting some very bad inequities in the annuities affecting some of the District of Columbia retired teachers.

After all, as the chairman well knows, and as we have discussed many times on the floor, one of the great attributes we have in this country is the human resource found in our youth and our educational system is vital to their development. Anything we can do to encourage getting capable people into the teaching field will be beneficial to the whole course of the history of this country.

One of the problems we have had before us for a number of years has been the career impact of teaching. The question has been, "Are you going, when you are through, to be of sufficient affluence, or whatever one may call it, to be able to live like a reasonable human being when you get through your productive life?"

Obviously, in the teaching field this is one of the most important criteria to look at when one gets into the middle years of teaching.

It seems to me the effort to try to keep pace with the cost-of-living in the various retirement systems has been a worthwhile effort.

As I said before, I think the chairman has done an excellent job, and I am happy to support the bill.

I do, however, want to alert the chairman and say once again, as I said earlier today, that I shall be holding a quorum call in order to have enough Senators here so we can have the yeas and nays on my proposed amendment, which is now printed and is on the desk of each Member of the Senate.

This amendment is not a complicated one.

Unfortunately, because of prior legislative action, Congress has created a special class of retired teachers in the District of Columbia. They have taken people who have worked very hard in the education field throughout their lives, and they have said that those who retired prior to October 1, 1956, are in an inferior class, and that those who retired after that date are in a superior class, from the point of view of the amount of compensation that they will receive for the services they have rendered.

The purpose of my amendment is to attempt to equalize, as best we can, the two classes, not by the normal way of equalization, as I have seen it operate in government—by depressing the ones that are on top—but by trying to raise the ones with serious financial problems to a point where they can live a little more comfortably than at the present time.

I do not wish to speak at great length on this matter, but perhaps we could have a colloquy to some degree on the bill, with reference to its effect without my amendment.

It is my understanding that if we pass the bill even without my amendment we will be trying, at least to some extent, to equalize some of the present differentials between the two classes. Is that correct?

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator from Colorado is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. Am I also correct in saying that it will not result in the degree of equalization that some of us would like; that there would be still a differential between the two classes?

Mr. BIBLE. I am sure that is correct. That is the reason why the Senator from Colorado, during the afternoon, will introduce an amendment to attempt to change that situation.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is my understanding that one of the changes in the present bill is the index by which cost of living increases are to be determined. For the RECORD, could the Senator furnish some explanation on that point?

Mr. BIBLE. In order to implement a cost-of-living increase in the annuities of teachers comparable to that already provided civil service retirees, the bill changes the definition of the term "price index" in the present District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Act from the annual average of the Consumer Price Index over a calendar year to that published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The bill also defines the "base month" as the month used in determining that the price index warrants a cost-of-living adjustment.

On the basis of these changes in existing law, the cost-of-living formula is geared to a more sensitive monthly indicator in lieu of the existing average calendar indicator that has proved from past experience to be too inflexible to bring about timely annuity increases on the basis of rising cost of living. The amended formula, as provided in this bill, will accelerate the cost-of-living adjustments and provide timely adjustments in annuities for teacher retirees similar to those already provided civil service employees. It is anticipated that it will result in all annuitants receiving an increase of 4.6 percent, effective as of December 1, 1965.

In reducing that procedure to language more easily understood, the attempt of the committee was to bring it into conformity with the retirement features written in at the time the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act was considered last year. The effect is to give to those who retired after 1956 a retirement increase of 6 percent. Those who retired prior to 1956 would have an overall increase of some 11.1 percent.

I think that that is the sum and substance of the efforts of the committee.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the chairman. I think that that clarifies the RECORD on that point.

I had the privilege and opportunity of presenting to the committee—not on the floor, but at least to present to the committee—a proposal in bill form last year by which we would have set up in the District of Columbia a completely separate school district. We would have had elected trustees in this proposed school district, who would be school board members. They would have had authority to raise their funds in the District of Columbia for the purpose of operating their schools.

Unfortunately, the bill did not progress even though I tried to offer it as a proposal in connection with home rule which we considered both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

It seems to me that the most pressing problem that we have in the District of Columbia at the present time is the school system. It also seems to me that focus of interest on this problem is by trying to care for the needs of the teacher personnel in the District of Columbia.

I have been working in the educational field not only in the District of Columbia, but also through service on the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for some time. I have been doing a great deal of reading on the problems that have been created in various school districts by the social instability that is now present in various areas of the country. Certainly we have, to some extent, a similar problem in the District of Columbia.

There is an interesting article in one of the publications I have read on the situation in the school district of New Rochelle in New York. I do not know whether the chairman has had an opportunity to read that article or not. The teaching ability of the teachers there was almost paralyzed at one point, because of the unrest, emotional problems, lack of discipline, and instability in the entire school system of New Rochelle.

They now believe they have developed a system which will help to resolve the various problems. However, most certainly we have some of those same problems in the District of Columbia. These problems make teaching very difficult and most certainly anything that we can do to encourage people to stay in this very difficult but very gratifying field should be developed to the utmost.

One of the things that I would like to do is to be able to make sure that when people go into the teaching field in the District of Columbia, and they have rendered long and dedicated service to the District and to the country by virtue of their teaching, they will be able to get a reasonable retirement income so they can subsist in a viable and reasonable way during their retirement years.

Mr. President, I shall reserve the specific statement on my amendment until after more Senators have arrived in the Chamber so that they can hear my speech.

If it is agreeable with the chairman, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum now in the hope that a sufficient number of Senators may come to the Chamber. I shall speak for 7 or 8 minutes and then we can vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado wish to offer his amendment at this time?

AMENDMENT NO. 556

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Chair. I do.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 556.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 556) is as follows:

On page 5, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of any other law, the annuity of each retired employee who on the effective date of this Act is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity of less than $3,000 per annum from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund based on creditable service of twenty years or more which terminated on or before October 1, 1956, shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide for each such retired employee an annuity of $3,000.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'creditable service' means service creditable for retirement purposes under the Act entitled 'An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia', approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended.

"(c) The increases in annuities provided by this section shall be paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund."

On page 5, line 4, strike out "3" and insert "4".

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I shall take just a few moments to explain my amendment before we vote. I do not want to unnecessarily delay any Senators.

My amendment would provide a minimum annuity of $3,000 to a very small group of District of Columbia retired teachers, those who retired prior to October 1, 1956, and who had 20 or more years creditable service at the time of their retirement.

Most of the teachers who would be assisted by my amendment are very old, and some are living in a virtual state of poverty. The unfortunate circumstances that this small group of teachers find themselves in has developed because of the disparity between the treatment afforded teachers who retired prior to October 1, 1956, and those who retired later.

This situation has been created by our own legislative action when we changed the retirement system in 1957. On June 4, 1957, the 85th Congress approved Public Law 85-46, a bill to amend the act for retirement of public school teachers of the District of Columbia. The bill provided a more liberal formula for computing the annuities of teachers and officers retiring from the District of Columbia Public Schools.

That law was made retroactive to October 1, 1956, but it contained a restrictive clause stating that the amendments did not apply in the case of teachers who had retired prior to the effective date of October 1, 1956. As a consequence, inequities have developed which work a severe hardship on those teachers who retired prior to October 1, 1956, and their plight presents a unique set of circumstances warranting special consideration.

Since the passage of Public Law 85-46, there have been two increases in annuities which have applied to persons who retired prior to October 1, 1956. However, these increases have kept pace with neither the annuities or subsequent retirees nor have they kept pace with the increased cost of living.

As a result, teachers who retired prior to October 1, 1956, find themselves living on annuities which are shockingly inadequate. The teachers who would be affected by my amendment are all between 69 and 90 years of age. They are obviously well past the age where they can expect to obtain really remunerative employment of any kind to supplement their retirement income. Thus they are primarily dependent, and in many cases entirely dependent, upon their retirement annuities.

I am informed that, out of a total of 200 retired teachers who would be assisted by the amendment, 20 receive less than $158 a month.

I have been informed that the conditions under which many of these retired teachers are forced to live are at best depressing and in some cases downright degrading. There are some 641 teachers now living who retired prior to October 1, 1956. However, only 200 of those 641 teachers would be affected by the provisions of my amendment. These 200 retired teachers do not have the funds with which to formulate any kind of a telegram campaign, nor do they have a large lobby. Their cause must rest on the conscience of each Senator.

Mr. President, I have received some examples of the low incomes these teachers received which were obtained through a questionnaire sent out by the Retired Teachers Association in an effort to get further facts on the living conditions of some of these people. I believe that some of the facts presented will be of interest to the Senators.

One teacher, who served for 23 years and has no social security, is receiving a total of $131 a month. She has returned to South Carolina where she now lives with her relatives.

Another teacher worked for 25 years, but she cannot remember the dates, accurately. She was evidently unable to answer the questionnaire clearly, according to the notation which I have. She is receiving $158 a month.

Another retired teacher, 84 years of age, served for 30 years as a teacher in the District of Columbia. Her husband died 30 years ago, leaving her to raise her family. It is indicated that some members of her family are helping her now. She is receiving only $163 a month as her retirement pay for her 30 years of service.

Another teacher, 70 years of age, worked as a teacher in the District of Columbia for 32 years. She is now receiving $180 a month. She said that she retired early because her aged aunt required nursing. She lives in an efficiency apartment, the rent of which has been increased twice since 1963.

There is another who served 20 years, getting $182 a month, and another who served 28 years, and who is getting $183 a month.

Mr. President, all of the 200 retirees covered by this amendment have given 20 years or more creditable service to the District. Many have given 30 years or more, and some have given more than 40 years' service to the District of Columbia public schools.

These teachers have given long and dedicated service to the schoolchildren, and they deserve to live in some measure of dignity during their retirement. All the teachers affected by this amendment have made substantial contributions to the teachers' retirement fund. Many of these teachers taught 30 or more years ago, when, for example, in 1926, the beginning salary for an elementary teacher was only $800 a year, for a junior high teacher $1,000 a year, and for a senior high teacher $1,200 a year.

At the same time, many of these teachers were paying as high as 8 percent of their salaries into the teachers' retirement fund. When the restrictive clause was written into Public Law 85-46, the teachers who had taught while salaries were still very low were the ones who lost the benefit of the more liberal formula adopted for teachers who retired after October 1, 1956. Again I would point out that this is another clear example of an inequity which has worked to the detriment of those teachers, but which was and is totally beyond their control.

It is a very interesting thing, Mr. President: Here is a clear indication of the problems that people have who are trying to live on retirement as the cost of living goes up and up and up. Here are teachers who were putting 8 percent of their total pay into a retirement fund, with the belief that when they completed their service and had the right to their fund, they would be in a standard of living phase which would be parallel, at least, to what other retirees were receiving, and which would be commensurate with a dignified way of life and with the service which they had performed. And yet, because of the tremendous escalation in the cost of living we have had in this country—these teachers find themselves in a desperate situation.

The arguments which have previously been advanced against the amendment have not been based on its desirability as such, or the obvious need of the retired teachers affected by the amendment. Rather, it has been said that the acceptance of the amendment would affect the comparability of the Teachers' Retirement Act to the Civil Service Retirement Act. It has been argued that historically the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Act has closely paralleled the Civil Service Retirement Act, and that the proposed amendment would not be compatible with that concept.

As desirable as that policy may be, with all due deference to my fellow Senators on the other side of the aisle, I do not see that this argument has any bearing on the circumstances presented by the situation which we are facing here. I would agree that as a general policy on overall programs, it is undesirable to set absolute minimums in retirement programs. But I feel that we have here a unique and special set of circumstances warranting the establishment of such a minimum, and it would not be, nor should it be, construed as establishing a precedent.

It is an interesting thing that what we are really trying to do—or what I am trying to do in this amendment, together with those who will support it—is to say that an inequity which has been created by legislation by Congress should also be corrected by Congress. If it takes a floor in order to do it, then we should establish the floor, to make sure that these teachers can live in dignity and in some type of humane circumstances during the remainder of their lives.

To sum up my initial statement on this proposed amendment: It would affect only 200 retirees, 200 individuals living as retired teachers and who have given 20 years or more of service in the District of Columbia schools. All of them are between the ages of 69 and 90. All receive less than $3,000, and many receive much less than $3,000 per year. All of the retirees contributed to the retirement fund; yet, because of the restrictive clauses which we wrote into the act, they are not getting as much as the teachers who retired after October 1, 1956.

We hear a great deal of talk about the so-called poverty level, which has been arbitrarily set at $3,000. It would seem to me that if any group deserves some assistance in achieving the $3,000 poverty level, it is the group covered by this amendment, who have given their lives trying to do something about improving the education and capabilities of the people in the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital. This group has contributed more to society, by comparison, than many groups which we have assisted in reaching the so-called poverty level. It would be unfortunate if we would dismiss the obvious need of this small group of long-time teachers with the callous statement that because a minimum annuity has never been set in the past, we cannot now give this particular group some small measure of relief.

It seems equally wrong to dismiss their need on the ground that we must keep the two retirement funds comparable. The special set of circumstances which have victimized this small group of retired teachers would seem to make the comparability argument totally inapplicable in this case.

So I would say, Mr. President, with real conviction—this being a matter that I have worked on and developed during the process of the hearings—that there is nothing inherently wrong about the proposed amendment. There is something inherently right about providing a floor at which a group of people can live decently as human beings; and there is most certainly something particularly right about this, where all are trying to do is to assure that they may fall within the poverty class, the point at which, under the poverty program, we are trying to assist a lot of people to reach who never benefited society in any way up to the present time, but who we hope will hereafter, with the plans and programs being put into effect.

Let us at least give these people the opportunity of spending the few remaining years of their lives, their sunset years, in some type of dignity in this country.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on the Dominick amendment to H.R. 11439.

It is a great tragedy that in the District of Columbia so many young people are deterred from becoming teachers because of the financial crises which would confront them upon retirement. In the 1930's and 1940's and even into the 1950's, teachers in the District of Columbia received an alarmingly insignificant salary. Many received as little as $1,200 per year. It is on these salaries that their present retirement income is based.

Yes, Mr. President, a few short years ago teachers in the District of Columbia were receiving as little as $100 per month, from which their contributions toward their retirement plan were deducted.

In 1957, Congress enacted retirement legislation substantially increasing the annuities payable to those retiring after October 1, 1956. The amendments virtually ignored the pre-1956 retirees.

H.R. 11439 proposes to grant those pre-1956 retirees a substantial cost-of-living increase. I am wholly in accord with this proposal. But, I must remind my colleagues that 10 years have elapsed since the pre-1956 retirees were first disadvantaged. During this time these retired teachers have been asked to survive on as little as $157 per month, something slightly in excess of $1,800 per year. No prospective cost-of-living increase can adequately compensate these important members of our community for the losses they have sustained over that 10-year period.

The Dominick amendment proposes to guarantee all pre-1956 retirees having 20 or more years of service an annuity floor of $3,000 per year. Actuarially, the cost of this proposal is slight. The group benefited by the amendment is self liquidating. The District Commissioners estimate the annualized interest cost to support the additional liability created by this amendment to be on the order of $33,000.

The Dominick amendment propounds a principle which I am persuaded is necessary to do fundamental justice to a group of citizens from whom society has made great demands, but to whom it has offered little succor in their hours of need. What could be more elemental than for this Congress to say to these disadvantaged retired teachers, "For your many years of service to the community, we will provide you a floor of protection against want."

Mr. President, many retired teachers in the District of Columbia support invalid parents, children, brothers, or sisters. Yet, for all their years of service to the people of the District—their long hours and low wages—their poor working conditions and the prospect of a grim future—the present retirement system, based on their contributions, often pays them less in annuities than they might receive from welfare. It is hard for me to find justification in any system which provides greater support for the welfare recipient than a retired teacher under a contributory plan. If there is to be any pride, any dignity, any decency in teaching, then I say the retirement program must assure the teacher of a living annuity based upon a subsistence floor.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has published a "modest but adequate" budget for elderly couples in the District of Columbia. The last available computation is for 1959 when such a couple's needs were stated as $3,047 per year. Even in light of 1959 prices, nearly 60 percent of the retired District of Columbia teachers are living on annuities of less than what is necessary for such a "modest but adequate" existence. Since 1959, the cost of living index in the District of Columbia has increased 9.3 percent, putting an additional economic pressure on those retired teachers now in their hour of greatest need.

The Dominick amendment would set such a floor for teachers with at least 20 years' service and, in my judgment, would install a firm foundation and fundamental underpinnings to a very necessary program.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado on his interest in and dedicated service to the teachers of the District of Columbia, and I urge my colleagues to adopt his amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I want to thank the Senator for his support. I know how interested he has been in this problem for a long time, and I certainly want to thank him for the statement which he has made on behalf of the amendment. I was particularly interested in the Senator's statement regarding the annualized interest. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say $33,000?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. This is a small price to pay for doing something for the teachers.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator. Once again, let me commend him for attempting to render this great service to the people who so desperately need it.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I rise to outline briefly the objections of the committee to the proposed amendment of the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Vermont.

Obviously, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado has great appeal. It had great appeal to me as a member of the committee, one who, ever since I have been chairman of the committee, has done everything possible to improve the lot of the teachers in the District of Columbia, both salarywise and retirementwise.

It is for that reason that we reported the bill with substantial increases for their retirement—a retirement which is well-earned and well-deserved.

It is for that reason also that the majority of the committee reported the bill before the Senate today.

The amendment suggested by the Senator from Colorado was carefully considered by the committee and was rejected on the ground that it would set a possible precedent for all others who were similarly situated within the Civil Service Retirement System.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado, irrespective of its motive in providing a fixed floor for District retired teachers, should be defeated if the Congress is to treat on an equal basis those employees whose salary and retirement benefits are governed by the Congress. Your committee, in executive session, considered this same amendment and rejected it, and I quote from the committee report:

> The committee felt it would be unwise to depart from the traditional Federal employees' retirement policies to include a minimum retirement annuity, irrespective of its overall desirability. Congress considered Federal employee retirement policies in 1965 when it improved retirement benefits of civil service annuitants, but did not see fit to adopt a flat minimum annual annuity.

Mr. President, I do not believe that this bill for District of Columbia teachers should provide a vehicle for Congress to plow new ground in the Federal employee retirement area. If this precedent were to be set, as envisioned by the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, then certainly the 700,000 civil service retirees and survivors around the country would properly believe they should be entitled to an automatic lump sum floor on their annual retirement benefits. Obviously, such benefits would in no way equate themselves with the retirement contributions of the employee and in some respects would not be equated to his length of service.

If the $3,000 fixed floor for each retired District teacher were to be established as a pattern for the Congress to follow in all retirement programs over which it has control, then certainly, the Congress must take an in-depth look at the whole matter. For an example, statistics as of today show that approximately 125,000 civil service annuitants with 20 years' service or 25 percent of the total civil service annuitants nationally are receiving retirement benefits of less than $3,000 per year.

This would be the comparable retiree group among District of Columbia teacher annuitants that would be paid at least $3,000 per year under the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, it may be true that the Congress should consider whether Federal civil service retirees should receive a $3,000 annual minimum. However, as Civil Service Commission Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., advised our committee on February 18, 1966:

> It could conceivably mean an unsound departure from the existing concept of relating teachers' annuity amounts to length of service and salary received.

Federal civil service retirement is an earned annuity system based on an employee's salary and his length of service. That system, at least up until this time, has not been looked upon as a substitute for social security payments, old age benefits, or welfare payments. In short, these retirement benefits have not been a Government dole but represent benefits earned by the employee during his productive years and comparable to retirement systems in private industry.

I am aware that an administration proposal is now before the Congress suggesting that Federal civil service retirement benefits be tied to social security payment ratios. However, up until this time, this departure from the ordinary retirement concept has not proceeded very far.

If the Congress desires to consider an entirely new phase of employee retirement benefits, then I believe a study in depth by those committees in the Congress having direct jurisdiction over Federal employee salary and retirement legislation should be carried out.

It is true that not a great many persons would be affected in this particular amendment. I believe the figure of 200 is accurate, but the number affected throughout the entire system would be in the neighborhood of 125,000. How many there are in the Nation's Capital, I am frank to say I do not know exactly, but certainly there are many thousands who receive less than $3,000 and I know that they would feel they would be discriminated against.

There might well be merit in the proposal, but it is merit, as I see it, which should be considered across the board insofar as the entire civil service retirement system is concerned.

The price tag of the Dominick amendment is initially in the neighborhood of $94,000 per year, I believe. The cost of the present bill to the District of Columbia government annually is in the neighborhood of $182,000, both to come from the District of Columbia's appropriated funds. The retirement system is based upon contributions and length of service, and on the salaries of employees.

It seems to me that if we are to start to meddle with that established formula, we can well put the entire system in difficulty. Today, of course, there is before Congress a proposal to attempt to tie Federal civil service retirement with social securement payment ratios. That is still in committee. It has not been considered. I would suggest to my good friend the Senator from Colorado—and he has been a most helpful member of the committee—that we wait and see what the general action will be in this field before moving forward.

I am just as sympathetic for the case of the teacher as is anyone else. I feel that is true of the other members of the committee. I think our record will show that. But I feel that this is no place to embark on such a departure.

For those reasons I resist the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I shall not take much longer. I merely wish to make a few observations on the statement made by my distinguished friend.

In the first place, we are not considering all the civil service retirees, the 700,000, mentioned by my distinguished colleague. So it would not have the substantial impact suggested. We are dealing with only 200 people.

Second, we are dealing with a different retirement system. We are dealing with a system under one part of which some employees were retired before October 1, 1956, and under which others retired after that date. That is a distinction which was created by legislation.

As time progresses, by reason of natural mortalities, the effect of my amendment will automatically disappear into the realm of history. Because of that fact, because of natural mortality in the course of time, those who retired before October 1, 1956, will not continue to receive those benefits indefinitely. In the meanwhile, we will have made this one effort to correct this inequity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick].

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 74 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Magnuson
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Tower
Tydings

NAYS—39

Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Cannon
Ellender
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hill
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Russell, Ga.
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—32

Aiken
Bass
Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Fulbright
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Lausche
McCarthy
McIntyre
Miller
Morton
Moss
Neuberger
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Symington
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Dominick's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 11439) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the passage of this measure which adjusts the annuities now paid District of Columbia teacher retirees, the Senate witnessed the highly able advocacy of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible]. Both vigorous and sincere, his presentation of the measure was largely responsible for its success. It represents one of many achievements obtained by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

To the distinguished junior Senators from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] and Vermont [Mr. Prouty] goes high commendation for fine cooperative support. Their selflessness—so typical—permitted action on this measure without unreasonable delay, yet with full deliberation.

The Senate is once again to be thanked for another achievement obtained orderly and efficiently.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1401) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 14, 28, 30, 31, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 25 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall insert in the RECORD an explanation of the conference report.

I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not observe in the Chamber the presence of the ranking minority member [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. PASTORE. I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It is absolutely acceptable to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the Senator indicate for the record what, if any, changes of major importance took place in the conference?

Mr. PASTORE. The total amount agreed upon is $2,788,143,303, which is $232,667,600 under the budget estimates; $223,270,735 over the House; and $13,082,700 under the Senate version of the bill.

The following is a brief summary of the major actions taken in the conference report.

The House accepted the Senate amendment providing $30 million for the emergency credit revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration; which is for disasters.

The House accepted the Senate amendment of $140 million for the Asian Development Bank. That originated in the Senate.

A total of $65 million was provided for the President's Disaster Relief Fund, instead of the $75 million proposed by the Senate and $45 million allowed by the House.

There is a compromise on that item. There was a reduction of $10 million on the budget estimate.

The bill includes $2,500,000 for storm damage rehabilitation in Samoa; and $294,904,000 for postal operations, as proposed by the Senate, which is $25 million over the House. That, too, originated in the Senate.

Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the amount that was included in the bill for the Asian Development Bank?

Mr. PASTORE. One hundred and forty million dollars.

Mr. KUCHEL. One hundred and forty million dollars?

Mr. PASTORE. One hundred million dollars is on call. It is not a cash payment. Twenty million dollars and twenty million dollars are for direct obligations. As a matter of fact, it is a condition precedent to our participation in the Bank.

Mr. KUCHEL. And it constitutes the fulfillment of our requirement under the agreement?

Mr. PASTORE. It certainly does.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 25.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the budget estimates, the House and Senate allowances, and the amounts agreed to in conference for each item in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER I				
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION				
S. 85	Emergency credit revolving fund	$30,000,000		$30,000,000	$30,000,000
	CHAPTER II				
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
383	Federal payment to District of Columbia	2,300,000	$1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
	OPERATING EXPENSES				
383	Public safety	(1,249,200)	(1,249,200)	(1,249,200)	(1,249,200)
	Overtime	(806,000)	(806,000)	(806,000)	(806,000)
	Wage board employees	(16,700)	(16,700)	(16,700)	(16,700)
	Increased pay costs	(426,500)	(426,500)	(426,500)	(426,500)
383	Parks and recreation	(210,600)	(210,600)	(210,600)	(210,600)
	Overtime	(20,400)	(20,400)	(20,400)	(20,400)
	Wage board employees	(82,500)	(82,500)	(82,500)	(82,500)
	Increased pay costs	(107,700)	(107,700)	(107,700)	(107,700)
	Total, Chapter II	2,300,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
	CHAPTER III				
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS				
S. 85	Asian Development Bank	140,000,000		140,000,000	140,000,000
	CHAPTER IV				
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
	NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY				
S. 85	Operation and maintenance of properties	12,000		12,000	12,000

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*—Continued

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER IV—Continued				
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued				
	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM				
380	Salaries and expenses	12,681,000	10,180,000	12,681,000	12,000,000
	Increased workload	*(11,594,000)*	*(9,093,000)*	*(11,594,000)*	*(10,913,000)*
	Increased pay costs (civilian)	*(902,000)*	*(902,000)*	*(902,000)*	*(902,000)*
	Increased pay costs (military)	*(185,000)*	*(185,000)*	*(185,000)*	*(185,000)*
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
S. 85	General operating expenses	$3,000,000		$3,000,000	$1,000,000
383	Compensation and pensions	288,000,000	$288,000,000	288,000,000	288,000,000
383	Readjustment benefits	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
383	Disaster relief	75,000,000	45,000,000	75,000,000	65,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
380	Rent supplement program (*contract authority*)	*(30,000,000)*	*(12,000,000)*	*(12,000,000)*	*(12,000,000)*
	Appropriation		100,000	100,000	100,000
	Proviso relating to local official approval		*Language*	*Language*	*Language*
	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD				
S. 85	Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	Language		Language	Language
	Total, Chapter IV	383,693,000	348,280,000	383,793,000	371,112,000
	CHAPTER V				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT				
383	Management of lands and resources	1,495,000	1,495,000	1,495,000	1,495,000
	Fire suppression, etc	*(1,000,000)*	*(1,000,000)*	*(1,000,000)*	*(1,000,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(495,000)*	*(495,000)*	*(495,000)*	*(495,000)*
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS				
383	Resources management	755,000	755,000	755,000	755,000
	Fire suppression, etc	*(186,000)*	*(186,000)*	*(186,000)*	*(186,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(569,000)*	*(569,000)*	*(569,000)*	*(569,000)*
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE				
383	Management and protection	1,307,000	1,028,000	1,245,000	1,028,000
	Fire suppression	*(245,000)*	*(245,000)*	*(245,000)*	*(245,000*
	Additional staffing for new facilities	*(279,000)*		*(217,000)*	0
	Overtime compensation	*(42,000)*	*(42,000)*	*(42,000)*	*(42,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(741,000)*	*(741,000)*	*(741,000)*	*(741,000)*
383	Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	924,000	827,000	892,000	827,000
	Maintenance staff for new facilities	*(97,000)*		65,000	0
	Wage board increases	*(724,000)*	*(724,000)*	*(724,000)*	*(724,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(103,000)*	*(103,000)*	*(103,000)*	*(103,000)*
383	Construction	1,169,000	900,000	1,169,000	1,169,000
S. 85	Construction	542,000		542,000	542,000
383	Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
	OFFICE OF TERRITORIES				
S. 85	Administration of territories	2,500,000		2,500,000	2,500,000
	BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES				
383	Management and investigations of resources	203,000	148,000	193,000	148,000
	Pesticides research	*(55,000)*		*(45,000)*	0
	Increased pay costs	*(148,000)*	*(148,000)*	*(148,000)*	*(148,000)*
	BUREAU OF SPORTS FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE				
383	Management and investigations of resources	763,000	658,000	712,000	658,000
	Pesticides research	*(105,000)*		*(54,700)*	0
	Wage board increases	*(180,000)*	*(180,000)*	*(180,000)*	*(180,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(478,000)*	*(478,000)*	*(478,000)*	*(478,000)*
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	FOREST SERVICE				
	Forest protection and utilization:				
383	Forest land management	9,635,000	9,635,000	9,635,000	9,635,000
	Fire suppression	*(7,500,000)*	*(7,500,000)*	*(7,500,000)*	*(7,500,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(2,135,000)*	*(2,135,000)*	*(2,135,000)*	*(2,135,000)*
383	Forest research (*increased pay costs*)	610,000	610,000	610,000	610,000
383	State and private forestry cooperation (*increased pay costs*)	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
	FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW				
S. 85	Salaries and expenses	29,000		18,000	18,000
	NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION				
383	Salaries and expenses	68,000	18,000	68,000	18,000
	Printing costs	*(50,000)*		*(50,000)*	
	Increased pay costs	*(18,000)*	*(18,000)*	*(18,000)*	*(18,000)*
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
383	Transitional grants to Alaska	876,000	876,000	876,000	876,000
	Total, Chapter V	26,421,000	22,495,000	26,255,700	25,824,000

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*—Continued

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER VI				
	LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY				
383	Trade adjustment activities (*by transfer*)	*($10,000,000)*	*($1,000,000)*	*($1,000,000)*	*($1,000,000)*
383	Salaries and expenses (*by transfers*)	*(1,043,000)*	*(1,028,000)*	*(1,028,000)*	*(1,028,000)*
	Increased workload	*(805,000)*	*(790,000)*	*(790,000)*	*(790,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(238,000)*	*(238,000)*	*(238,000)*	*(238,000)*
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS				
383	Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(614,000)*	*(614,000)*	*(614,000)*	*(614,000)*
	Increased workload	*(350,000)*	*(350,000)*	*(350,000)*	*(350,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(264,000)*	*(264,000)*	*(264,000)*	*(264,000)*
	Total, Department of Labor	*(11,657,000)*	*(2,642,000)*	*(2,642,000)*	*(2,642,000)*
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
383	Expansion and improvement of vocational education	950,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
383	Vocational student loan insurance fund	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
383	Elementary and secondary educational activities	184,000,000	184,000,000	184,000,000	184,000,000
383	Higher educational activities (library assistance)	11,000,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	11,300,000
380	National Teacher Corps	13,200,000	10,000,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
	Proviso limiting Federal funds to 90 percent of any teacher's salary		Language	Language	Language
	Proviso requiring approval by State educational agency		Language	Language	Language
	Payments to school districts		41,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000
	VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION				
383	Grants to States	39,000,000	39,000,000	39,000,000	39,000,000
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
383	National Library of Medicine	4,175,000	4,175,000	4,175,000	4,175,000
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION				
383	Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged	367,800,000	125,800,000	125,800,000	125,800,000
383	Payment for military service credits	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000
	WELFARE ADMINISTRATION				
383	Grants to States for public assistance	381,000,000	381,000,000	381,000,000	381,000,000
	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS				
383	Gallaudet College: Salaries and expenses	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000
383	Howard University: Salaries and expenses	216,000	216,000	216,000	216,000
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
383	Office of Field Administration:				
	Salaries and expenses	27,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
	By transfer	*(68,000)*	*(53,000)*	*(53,000)*	*(53,000)*
	Increased workload	*(59,000)*	*(30,000)*	*(30,000)*	*(30,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(36,000)*	*(36,000)*	*(36,000)*	*(36,000)*
	Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	1,106,442,000	902,528,000	902,028,000	902,028,000
	RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD				
383	Limitation on salaries and expenses (increase)	*(1,075,000)*	*(1,075,000)*	*(1,075,000)*	*(1,075,000)*
	Total, Chapter VI	1,106,442,000	902,528,000	902,028,000	902,028,000
	CHAPTER VII				
	LEGISLATIVE				
	SENATE				
	Payment to widow of deceased Senator				30,000
----------	Inquiries and investigations			200,000	200,000
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
----------	Payments to widows of deceased Members		90,000	90,000	90,000
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
	Capitol Buildings and Grounds:				
415	Capitol Grounds	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000
	Total, Chapter VII	17,000	107,000	307,000	337,000
	CHAPTER VIII				
	PUBLIC WORKS				
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
	Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers—Civil:				
383	Operation and maintenance (general)	7,350,000	7,000,000	7,350,000	7,350,000
	Hurricane damage repairs	*(4,230,000)*	*(4,230,000)*	*(4,230,000)*	*(4,230,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(3,120,000)*	*(2,770,000)*	*(3,120,000)*	*(3,120,000)*
383	Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies	7,750,000	7,750,000	7,750,000	7,750,000
	THE PANAMA CANAL				
	Canal Zone Government:				
383	Operating expenses	404,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
	Overtime	*(145,000)*	*(145,000)*	*(145,000)*	*(145,000)*
	Increased pay costs	*(259,000)*	*(155,000)*	*(155,000)*	*(155,000)*

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*—Continued

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER VIII—Continued				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
S. 88	Upper Colorado River Storage Project (*by transfer*)	(*$3,600,000*)		(*$1,400,000*)	(*$1,400,000*)
	Southwestern Power Administration:				
383	Construction	520,000	$520,000	520,000	520,000
	Total, Chapter VIII	16,024,000	15,570,000	15,920,000	15,920,000
	CHAPTER IX				
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS				
383	Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	500,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
383	Payment to foreign service retirement and disability fund	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
	INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS				
383	American sections, international commissions	32,000			
	Total, Department of State	577,000	495,000	495,000	495,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
383	Fees and expenses of witnesses (limitation increase)	Language	Language	Language	Language
S. 88	Fees and expenses of witnesses (*by transfer*)	(*200,000*)		(*200,000*)	(*200,000*)
	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM				
383	Support of U.S. prisoners	500,000	475,000	475,000	475,000
	Total, Department of Justice	500,000	475,000	475,000	475,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
S. 85	1967 Alaska Centennial	4,600,000		4,600,000	4,600,000
	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES				
S. 85	Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center	160,000		160,000	160,000
	PATENT OFFICE				
383	Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	Printing	(*395,000*)	(*395,000*)	(*395,000*)	(*395,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*605,000*)	(*605,000*)	(*605,000*)	(*605,000*)
	Total, Department of Commerce	5,760,000	1,000,000	5,760,000	5,760,000
	THE JUDICIARY				
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICE				
383	Salaries of judges	220,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
383	Fees of jurors and commissioners	1,165,000	1,165,000	1,165,000	1,165,000
	Total, the Judiciary	1,385,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS				
383	Salaries and expenses	468,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
	Special study	(*442,000*)	(*399,000*)	(*399,000*)	(*399,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*26,000*)	(*26,000*)	(*26,000*)	(*26,000*)
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (OFFICE OF EDUCATION)				
383	Civil rights educational activities	3,250,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION				
383	Salaries and expenses	742,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	Increased workload	(*690,000*)	(*448,000*)	(*448,000*)	(*448,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*52,000*)	(*52,000*)	(*52,000*)	(*52,000*)
	Total, Chapter IX	12,682,000	7,260,000	12,020,000	12,020,000
	CHAPTER X				
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
	(Out of the postal fund)				
383 and S. 88	Operations	296,904,000	269,904,000	294,904,000	294,904,000
	Increased mail volume	(*82,000,000*)	(*57,000,000*)	(*82,000,000*)	(*82,000,000*)
	5-day workweek for postmasters	(*9,500,000*)	(*9,500,900*)	(*9,500,000*)	(*9,500,000*)
	Improve parcel post	(*2,000,000*)			
	Terminal leave payments	(*6,193,000*)	(*6,193,000*)	(*6,193,000*)	(*6,193,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*197,211,000*)	(*197,211,000*)	(*197,211,000*)	(*197,211,000*)
383	Transportation	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
383	Plant and equipment	3,106,000	3,106,000	3,106,000	3,106,000
	Total, Chapter X	321,010,000	294,010,000	319,010,000	319,010,000

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*—Continued

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER XI				
414	Claims and judgments	$10,251,798	$10,251,798	$10,251,798	
S. 87	Claims and judgments	576,885		576,885	$10,828,683
	Total, Chapter XI	10,828,683	10,251,798	10,828,683	10,828,683
	Title I, total	[1] 2,049,417,683	[2] 1,601,751,798	[3] 1,841,412,383	1,828,329,683
405	TITLE II.—Increased pay costs (*see* Table II)	[4] 971,393,220	963,120,770	[5] 959,813,620	[5] 959,813,620
	Grand total	3,020,810,903	2,564,872,568	2,801,226,003	2,788,143,303

[1] Includes $208,768,500 for increased pay costs.

[2] Includes $208,314,500 for increased pay costs.

[3] Includes $208,664,500 for increased pay costs.

[4] Includes $838,850 for Senate items.

[5] Includes $750,850 for Senate items.

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*

	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
SENATE				
Compensation of the Vice President and Senators	$8,065		$8,065	$8,065
Salaries, officers and employees	643,105		543,105	543,105
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate	7,425		7,425	7,425
Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
Senate policy committees	9,940		9,940	9,940
Automobiles and maintenance	840		840	840
Inquiries and investigations	116,865		116,865	116,865
Folding documents	945		945	945
Miscellaneous items	20,065		32,065	32,065
Total, Senate items	807,250		719,250	719,250
Joint items:				
Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures	945	$945	945	945
Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
Joint Economic Committee	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy	8,250	8,250	8,250	8,250
Joint Committee on Printing	3,750	3,750	3,750	3,750
Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	10,530	10,530	10,530	10,530
Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy	655	655	655	655
Joint Committee on Defense Production	2,160	2,160	2,160	2,160
Total, joint items	35,290	35,290	35,290	35,290
HOUSE				
Compensation of Members	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500
Office of the Speaker	3,155	3,155	3,155	3,155
Office of the Parliamentarian	2,755	2,755	2,755	2,755
Compilation of Precedents	270	270	270	270
Office of the Chaplain	410	410	410	410
Office of the Clerk	41,230	41,230	41,230	41,230
Committee employees	103,000	103,000	103,000	103,000
Sergeant at Arms	28,205	28,205	28,205	28,205
Doorkeeper	43,745	43,745	43,745	43,745
Postmaster	13,825	13,825	13,825	13,825
6 minority employees	3,175	3,175	3,175	3,175
Majority floor leader	2,340	2,340	2,940	2,940
Minority floor leader	1,940	1,940	1,940	1,940
Majority whip	1,565	1,565	1,565	1,565
Minority whip	1,565	1,565	1,565	1,565
Printing clerks	430	430	430	430
Technical assistant to attending physician	385	385	385	385
Official Reporters of Debates	6,880	6,880	6,880	6,880
Official reporters to committees	6,940	6,940	6,940	6,940
Legislative counsel	7,970	7,970	7,970	7,907
Members' clerk hire	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000
Special and select committees	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Coordinator of information	3,675	3,675	3,675	3,675
Revision of the laws	730	730	730	730
Speaker's auto	330	330	330	330
Majority leader's auto	330	330	330	330
Minority leader's auto	330	330	330	330
Miscellaneous items		19,000	19,000	19,000
Total, House items	1,152,680	1,171,680	1,171,680	1,171,680
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
Office of Architect of the Capitol: Salaries	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900
Capitol Buildings and Grounds:				
Capitol buildings	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Capitol grounds	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Senate office buildings	31,000		31,000	31,000
Senate garage	600		600	600
Capitol Power Plant	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Total, Architect	118,500	86,900	118,500	118,500
BOTANIC GARDEN				
Salaries and expenses	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS				
Salaries and expenses	283,000	256,700	256,700	256,700
Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses	51,500	51,500	51,500	51,500
Legislative Reference Service: Salaries and expenses	67,000	62,200	62,200	62,200
Distribution of catalog cards: Salaries and expenses	65,300	65,300	65,300	65,300
Books for the blind: Salaries and expenses	7,300	6,600	6,600	6,600
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600
Total, Library of Congress	477,700	445,900	445,900	445,900

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*—Continued

	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued				
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE				
Office of the Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses	$70,800	Language	Language	Language
Total, legislative	2,668.220	$1,745,770	$2,496,620	$2,496,620
THE JUDICIARY				
Supreme Court of the United States: Salaries	41,000	41,000	41,000	41,000
Care of buildings and grounds	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Customs Court: Salaries and expenses	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
Court of Claims: Salaries and expenses	13,300	13,300	13,300	13,300
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:				
Salaries of supporting personnel	818,000	818,000	818,000	818,000
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Expenses of referees (special account)	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Total, the Judiciary	1,057,300	1,057,300	1,057,300	1,057,300
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
The White House Office: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(85,000)*	*(85,000)*	*(85,000)*	*(85,000)*
Bureau of the Budget: Salaries and expenses	131,000	131,000	131,000	131,000
Council of Economic Advisers: Salaries and expenses	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
National Security Council: Salaries and expenses	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Office of Emergency Planning: Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies (*by transfer*)	*(6,000)*	*(6,000)*	*(6,000)*	*(6,000)*
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: Salaries and expenses	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	162,000	162,000	162,000	162,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
Economic assistance:				
Administrative expenses, Agency for International Development (*by transfer*)	*(980,000)*	*(980,000)*	*(980,000)*	*(980,000)*
Administrative and other expenses, Department of State (*by transfer*)	*(42,000)*	*(42,000)*	*(42,000)*	*(42,000)*
Total, funds appropriated to the President	*(1,022,000)*	*(1,022,000)*	*(1,022,000)*	*(1,022,000)*
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
Agricultural Research Service:				
Salaries and expenses:				
Research	2,402,500	2,402,500	2,402,500	2,402,500
Plant and animal disease and pest control	1,268,500	1,268,500	1,268,500	1,268,500
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
Extension Service: Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(64,000)*	*(64,000)*	*(64,000)*	*(64,000)*
Farmer Cooperative Service: Salaries and expenses	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
Soil Conservation Service:				
Conservation operations	2,608,000	2,608,000	2,608,000	2,608,000
Watershed planning	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
Watershed protection	585,000	585,000	585,000	585,000
Flood prevention	1600,00	160,000	160,000	160,000
Great Plains conservation program	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000
Resource conservation and development	46,000	46,000	46,000	46,000
Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses	246,000	246,000	246,000	246,000
Statistical Reporting Service: Salaries and expenses	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Consumer and Marketing Service: Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs	1,905,000	1,905,000	1,905,000	1,905,000
Foreign Agricultural Service: Salaries and expenses	178,000	178,000	178.000	178,000
Commodity Exchange Authority: Salaries and expenses	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000
Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses	268,000	268,000	268,000	268,000
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses	202,000	202,000	202,000	202,000
Rural Community Development Service: Salaries and expenses	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Office of the Inspector General: Salaries and expenses	145,000	145,000	145,000	145,000
Office of the General Counsel: Salaries and expenses	102,000	102,000	102,000	102,000
Office of Information: Salaries and expenses	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
National Agricultural Library: Salaries and expenses	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000
Office of Management Services: Salaries and expenses	59,000	59,000	59,000	59,000
General administration: Salaries and expenses	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Forest Service: Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	964,000	964,000	964,000	964,000
Total, Agriculture	13,051,000	13,051,000	13,051,000	13,051,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
General administration: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	89,000	89,000	*(89,000)*	*(89,000)*
Office of Business Economics: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	50,000	50,000	*(50,000)*	*(50,000)*
Bureau of the Census:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	320,000	320,000	*(320,000)*	*(320,000)*
1964 Census of Agriculture (*by transfer*)	110,000	110,000	*(110,000)*	*(110,000)*
Business and Defense Services Administration: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	125,000	125,000	*(125,000)*	*(125,000)*
International activities:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	160,000	160,000	*(160,000)*	*(160,000)*
Export control (*by transfer*)	100,000	100,000	*(100,000)*	*(100(000)*
Transfer to Customs	*(33,400)*	*(33,400)*	*(33,400)*	*(33,400)*
Office of Field Services: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	90,000	90,000	*(90,000)*	*(90,000)*
Coast and Geodetic Survey: Salaries and expenses	510,000	510,000	510,000	510,000
National Bureau of Standards: Research and technical services (*by transfer*)	500,000	500,000	*(500,000)*	*(500,000)*
Weather Bureau:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	1,200,000	1,200,000	*(754,000)*	*(754,000)*
Salaries and expenses			446,000	446,000
Research and development	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Meteorological satellite operations	48,000	48,000	48,000	48,000
Maritime Administration:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	222,000	222,000	*(222,000)*	*(222,000)*
Administrative expenses (limitation)	*(200,000)*	*(200,000)*	*(200,000)*	*(200,000)*
Reserve fleet expenses (limitation)	*(22,000)*	*(22,000)*	*(22,000)*	*(22,000)*
Maritime training (*by transfer*)	38,000	38,000	*(38,000)*	*(38,000)*
Bureau of Public Roads: Limitation on general administrative expenses (increase)	*(950,000)*	*(950,000)*	*(950,000)*	*(950,000)*
Total, Commerce	3,662,000	3,662,000	1,104,000	1,104,000

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*—Continued

	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY				
Military personnel:				
Military personnel, Army	$222,100,000	$222,100,000	$222,100,000	$222,100,000
Military personnel, Navy	182,600,000	182,600,000	182,600,000	182,600,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	42,400,000	42,400,000	42,400,000	42,400,000
Military personnel, Air Force	227,600,000	227,600,000	227,600,000	227,600,000
Reserve personnel, Navy	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Reserve personnel, Air Force	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
National Guard personnel, Army	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
National Guard personnel, Air Force	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Retired pay, Defense	71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000
Operation and maintenance:				
Operation and maintenance, Army	33,400,000	33,400,000	33,400,000	33,400,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	1,054,000	1,054,000	1,054,000	1,054,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	27,600,000	27,600,000	27,600,000	27,600,000
Operation and maintenance, defense agencies	14,356,000	14,356,000	14,356,000	14,356,000
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Court of Military Appeals, Defense	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
Total, Defense—Military	863,521,000	863,521,000	863,521,000	863,521,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
Department of the Army:				
Cemeterial expenses: Salaries and expenses	67,000	67,000	67,000	67,000
Corps of Engineers—Civil: General expenses	385,000	385,000	385,000	385,000
Ryukyu Islands: Administration	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
The Panama Canal: Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general and administrative expenses (increase)	*(137,000)*	*(137,000)*	*(137,000)*	*(137,000)*
U.S. Soldiers' Home: Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay (increase)	*(146,000)*	*(146,000)*	*(146,000)*	*(146,000)*
Total, Defense—Civil	492,000	492,000	492,000	492,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
Hospital and medical care	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000
Foreign quarantine activites	212,000	212,000	212,000	212,000
Indian health activities	1,355,000	1,355,000	1,355,000	1,355,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital: Salaries and expenses (indefinite)	685,000	685,000	685,000	685,000
Social Security Administration: Limitation on salaries and expenses	*(8,037,000)*	*(8,037,000)*	*(8,037,000)*	*(8,037,000)*
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(18,000)*	*(18,000)*	*(18,000)*	*(18,000)*
Surplus property utilization	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	3,042,000	3,042,000	3,042,000	3,042,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
Federal Housing Administration:				
Administrative expenses (limitation)	*(75,000)*	*(75,000)*		
Nonadministrative expenses (limitation)	*(1,575,000)*	*(1,575,000)*	*(575,000)*	*(575,000)*
Public Housing Administration: Administrative expenses	405,000	405,000	405,000	405,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Bureau of Indian Affairs:				
Education and welfare services	1,202,400	1,202,400	1,202,400	1,202,400
General administrative expenses	103,000	103,000	103,000	103,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Salaries and expenses	68,000	68,000	68,000	68,000
Office of Territories: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	102,600	102,600	102,600	102,600
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,510,000
Bureau of Mines:				
Conservation and development of mineral resources	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Health and safety	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000
General administrative expenses	22,000	22,000	22,000	22,000
Office of Oil and Gas: Salaries and expenses	16,300	16,300	16,300	16,300
Fish and Wildlife Service:				
Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife: Salaries and expenses	8,500	8,500	8,500	8,500
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:				
Management and investigations of resources (*by transfer*)	*(86,800)*	*(86,800)*	*(86,800)*	*(86,800)*
General administrative expenses	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands (appropriation of receipts)	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: General administrative expenses	34,300	34,300	34,300	34,300
National Park Service: General administrative expenses	57,000	57,000	57,000	57,000
Bureau of Reclamation: General administrative expenses (*by transfer*)	*(241,200)*	*(241,200)*	*(241,200)*	*(241,200)*
Bonneville Power Administration: Operations and maintenance	173,000	173,000	173,000	173,000
Southwestern Power Administration: Operations and maintenance	25,300	25,300	25,300	25,300
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses	109,800	109,800	109,800	109,800
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000
Office of Water Resources Research: Salaries and expenses	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Total, Interior	4,160,200	4,160,200	4,160,200	4,160,200
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
Legal activities and general administration:				
Salaries and expenses, general administration	75,000			
Alien property activities limitation	*(7,000)*	*(7,000)*	*(7,000)*	*(7,000)*
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	165,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals	647,000	647,000	647,000	647,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses	3,735,000	3,735,000	3,735,000	3,735,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses	1,782,000	1,782,000	1,782,000	1,782,000
Federal prison system: Salaries and expenses	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000
Total, Justice	7,489,000	7,244,000	7,244,000	7,244,000
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
Manpower Administration: Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (*by transfer*)	*(87,000)*	*(87,000)*	*(87,000)*	*(87,000)*
Office of Manpower Administration:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(66,000)*	*(66,000)*	*(66,000)*	*(66,000)*
Manpower development and training activities (*by transfer*)	*(25,000)*	*(25,000)*	*(25,000)*	*(25,000)*
Wage and labor standards:				
Bureau of Labor Standards (*by transfer*)	*(39,000)*	*(39,000)*	*(39,000)*	*(39,000)*
Women's Bureau (*by transfer*)	*(11,000)*	*(11,000)*	*(11,000)*	*(11,000)*
Bureau of Employees' Compensation: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(59,550)*	*(59,550)*	*(59,550)*	*(59,550)*

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*—Continued

	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued				
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(242,000)*	*(242,000)*	*(242,000)*	*(242,000)*
Bureau of International Labor Affairs: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(15,000)*	*(15,000)*	*(15,000)*	*(15,000)*
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(71,000)*	*(71,000)*	*(71,000)*	*(71,000)*
Office of the Secretary:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(35,000)*	*(35,000)*	*(35,000)*	*(35,000)*
Federal contract compliance program (*by transfer*)	*(7,000)*	*(7,000)*	*(7,000)*	*(7,000)*
Total, Labor	*(657,550)*	*(657,550)*	*(657,550)*	*(657,550)*
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
Administration and regional operation	2,050,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
Administration of foreign affairs:				
Salaries and expenses (appropriation)	1,337,400	1,337,400	1,337,400	1,337,400
By transfer	*(1,422,600)*	*(1,422,600)*	*(1,422,600)*	*(1,422,600)*
International organizations and conferences: Missions to international organizations (*by transfer*)	*(59,000)*	*(59,000)*	*(59,000)*	*(59,000)*
International commissions:				
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(17,000)*	*(17,000)*	*(17,000)*	*(17,000)*
Total, Department of State	1,337,400	1,337,400	1,337,400	1,337,400
TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	138,000	138,000	138,000	138,000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	2,043,000	2,043,000	2,043,000	2,043,000
Bureau of Narcotics:				
Salaries and expenses	80,000			
By transfer		*(80,000)*	*(80,000)*	*(80,000)*
Bureau of the Public Debt: Administering the public debt	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
Coast Guard:				
Operating expenses	9,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
By transfer		*(5,000,000)*	*(5,000,000)*	*(5,000,000)*
Retired pay	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Reserve training	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
Internal Revenue Service:				
Salaries and expenses	381,000	381,000	381,000	381,000
Revenue accounting and processing	3,472,000	3,472,000	3,472,000	3,472,000
Compliance	10,305,000	9,305,000	9,305,000	9,305,000
Office of the Treasurer:				
Salaries and expenses	60,000			
By transfer		*(60,000)*	*(60,000)*	*(60,000)*
U.S. Secret Service: Salaries and expenses, guard force (*by transfer*)	*(11,000)*	*(11,000)*	*(11,000)*	*(11,000)*
Total, Treasury	28,289,000	22,149,000	22,149,000	22,149,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
Federal Aviation Agency:				
Operations	9,500,000	9,500,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	62,000	62,000	62,000	62,000
General Services Administration:				
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service:				
Appropriation	806,000	806,000	806,000	806,000
By transfer	*(55,000)*	*(55,000)*	*(55,000)*	*(55,000)*
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	336,000	336,000	336,000	336,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service (*by transfer*)	*(135,000)*	*(135,000)*	*(135,000)*	*(135,000)*
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator (*by transfer*)	*(33,000)*	*(33,000)*	*(33,000)*	*(33,000)*
Veterans' Administration:				
General operating expenses	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Medical and prosthetic research	365,000	365,000	365,000	365,000
Medical care	17,456,000	17,456,000	17,456,000	17,456,000
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses:				
Appropriation	528,000	528,000	528,000	528,000
By transfer	*(15,000)*	*(15,000)*	*(15,000)*	*(15,000)*
Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses (increase)	*(28,000)*	*(28,000)*	*(28,000)*	*(28,000)*
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review: Salaries and expenses	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses	346,000	346,000	346,000	346,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:				
Limitation and administrative expenses (increase)	*(75,000)*	*(75,000)*	*(75,000)*	*(75,000)*
Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (increase)	*(6,000)*	*(6,000)*	*(6,000)*	*(6,000)*
Federal Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses	68,000	68,000	68,000	68,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Federal Trade Commission: Salaries and expenses	312,500	312,500	312,500	312,500
General Accounting Office: Salaries and expenses	535,000	535,000	535,000	535,000
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Salaries and expenses	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Interstate Commerce Commission: Salaries and expenses	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000
National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses	548,100	548,100	548,100	548,100
National Mediation Board: Salaries and expenses	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000
Renegotiation Board: Salaries and expenses	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Small Business Administration: Salaries and expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Smithsonian Institution:				
Salaries and expenses	453,000	453,000	453,000	453,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	66,000	66,000	66,000	66,000
Tariff Commission: Salaries and expenses	46,000	46,000	46,000	46,000
Tax Court of the United States: Salaries and expenses	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
U.S. Information Agency: Salaries and expenses	1,461,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	1,005,000
Total, independent agencies	40,048,100	39,592,100	38,092,100	38,092,100

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*—Continued

1	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
(Out of District of Columbia Funds)				
Operating expenses:				
General operating expenses	(*$325,800*)	(*$325,800*)	(*$325,800*)	(*$325,800*)
Health and welfare	(*920,500*)	(*920,500*)	(*920,500*)	(*920,500*)
Highways and traffic	(*95,900*)	(*95,900*)	(*95,900*)	(*95,900*)
Sanitary engineering	(*253,000*)	(*253,000*)	(*253,000*)	(*253,000*)
Total, District of Columbia	(*1,595,200*)	(*1,595,200*)	(*1,595,200*)	(*1,595,200*)
Total, title II	971,393,220	963,120,770	959,813,620	959,813,620

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I inquire of the majority leader what his plans are for the rest of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no further business will be transacted today. However, I understand that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] will resume his very important speech, begun yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been completed, the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is hoped that on Thursday the Senate will take up the Department of the Interior appropriations bill.

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE SUBJECT OF BIRTH CONTROL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the request of Mrs. David R. Mogilka, coordinator of the South Side Mothers Reverence for Life Group of Milwaukee; Mrs. Alvin Emmons, and Mrs. Ray Kuffel, coordinator and assistant coordinator, respectively, of the Civic Awareness Group of Greater Milwaukee, I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF MRS. DAVID R. MOGILKA, COORDINATOR OF THE SOUTH SIDE MOTHERS REVERENCE FOR LIFE GROUP OF MILWAUKEE; MRS. ALVIN EMMONS AND MRS. RAY KUFFEL, COORDINATOR AND ASSISTANT COORDINATOR, RESPECTIVELY, OF THE CIVIC AWARENESS GROUP OF GREATER MILWAUKEE

For the past 19 months, we have been actively engaged in opposing Government involvement in the matter of birth control. This effort was initiated when the Planned Parenthood Association of Milwaukee, applied for Federal funds under the antipoverty act. Because of the actions of an aroused citizenry and the opposition of duly elected public bodies, this application has not been approved.

It was not sufficient, however, to oppose Government involvement on the local scene alone since it became apparent that programs involving almost every phase of birth control were being implemented nationally—quietly and swiftly and behind the scenes—despite known and demonstrated opposition and with an apparent lack of legal authority for the disbursement of public moneys for said programs. Note the following examples:

1. Economic opportunity act—over 18 projects funded:

(a) Nowhere in the provisions of the EOA of 1964, Public Law 88–452 is there a mention of, discussion of or referral to birth control projects in any form as possible programs for implementation.

(b) "There's no possibility the bill would allow any such thing (birth control)" promised the EOA floor manager in the House last year. (Newsweek, Sept. 13, 1965.)

(c) An amendment by Senator JOSEPH CLARK approved only by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee was to grant official sanction to birth control projects already approved by the OEO. This amendment was never brought to the floor of the House.

(d) Authority for birth control grants under EOA is supposed to be found in a 1965 amendment which added the words "but not limited to" after the word "including" in reference to types of projects under section 205(a) of the EOA. (Communication from Richard S. Granat, Office of General Counsel, OEO, Oct. 21, 1965.)

2. U.S. Department of the Interior: Birth control information and devices available to the Indians and Eskimos by directive of the Secretary of said Department.

(a) Program justified by Secretary Stewart L. Udall on the basis that it is in line with a May 5, 1965, report of the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences. (News release and directive of Secretary of the Interior, June 2, 1965.)

(b) Program justified by Secretary Udall on the basis that it is in line with President Johnson's state of the Union message relating to the population problem. (Communication from Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Aug. 12, 1965.)

3. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Programs are being implemented and Federal money is being disbursed under broad interpretation of authority under existing laws. Note: Use of Federal money for contraceptives to 15-year-old unmarrieds in Chicago.

(a) On January 24, 1966, HEW Secretary John W. Gardner quietly issued a directive that put the United States in the business of offering contraceptives and birth control instruction not just to families but to all American women, wed or not. (Newsweek, Apr. 11, 1966.)

(b) Mrs. Catherine Oettinger, head of the Federal Children's Bureau, told an audience in Boston a few weeks ago that her department had a "clear mandate" from the President to support birth control programs.

4. United Nations: Eighteen-nation population commission has swung into action without majority approval and despite the fact that in 1962 a similar proposal was defeated in the U.N. Assembly.

5. Agency for International Development (AID): Considerable groundwork has been established for an extension of family planning activities in the United States and abroad on the basis of a directive of AID Director David Bell.

(a) This groundwork was laid looking toward subsequent congressional approval of family planning under foreign aid. (Memo by AID to White House Conference, Nov. 29, 1965).

(b) Dr. Edgar Burman, birth control specialist in the Latin American Bureau, cited provision enacted in 1963 which allows "research into problems of population growth" as the authority for AID action, but admitted that AID activities go beyond commonly accepted definition of research and argued that AID's counsel believed that the provision allowed a loose interpretation.

(c) Dr. Burman contended that a public announcement of AID's increased emphasis on family planning had been made last March by AID Director Bell. AID officials admitted that no public statement had been made. Director David Bell simply had issued a field directive to AID personnel. (John H. Sullivan in the National Catholic Reporter, December 15, 1965).

(d) Congressman ZABLOCKI has challenged the AID's authority so much so that Senator FULBRIGHT has deemed it necessary to introduce an amendment which "specifically authorizes the use of economic assistance funds, on request, to furnish technical and other assistance for the control of population growth". (Apparently this authority does not now exist.)

Together with the implementation of programs it became clear, as Russell Shaw reported in February 1966, that a vigorous publicity and propaganda campaign was mounted to create an atmosphere of approval and consensus for Government birth control with the series of Senate hearings conducted by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, on proposals to create population offices headed by assistant secretaries in HEW and the State Department, being a major factor in this drive. Testimony, in the form of a letter dated August 31, 1965, was presented by the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Member of Congress, Fourth Congressional District, Milwaukee, to the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, chairman of Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, on behalf of Mrs. David R. Mogilka, for inclusion in the hearings relating to bill, S. 1676, 89th Congress, 1965. The testimony reads as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
August 31, 1965.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE GRUENING: Pursuant to the suggestion in your letter of August 19, 1965, to the Honorable CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, I am submitting the following statement to your honorable body and I am respectfully requesting that it be entered and made a part of the record as though it were in fact read by me at your hearings relating to bill S. 1676.

In the first instance, I would like to register my vigorous and unalterable opposition

to bill S. 1676 which provides for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes. I am not only speaking as a mother, citizen, and taxpayer, but I am also voicing the sentiments of the almost 6,000 persons whose signatures were submitted in opposition to a local project for Federal funds for birth control clinics under the antipoverty act. Two thousand of these signatures came from the south side mothers in the 4th congressional district in Milwaukee and 4,000 were submitted by the civic awareness group of Greater Milwaukee. In passing, I might indicate that the common council of Milwaukee passed a resolution in opposition to the use of Federal funds for a birth control clinic and the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors also voiced its opposition.

The involvement of the Federal Government in this area of extreme privacy and intimacy clearly oversteps the reasonable boundaries of governmental authority. Interference with the fundamentally natural autonomy of the family as a social unit leads only to the destruction of the family as a basic unit of society with the accompanying disaster not only to our governmental structure but also to the individuals involved.

Further, specific provisions of bill S. 1676 relating to population data and its compilation constitute a duplication of governmental activity. Such statistics are now readily available from the population census as taken by the United States and at least 150 countries or areas. As you know, a census reveals not only the basic demographic trends such as population growth, internal redistribution, urbanization, and alterations in the age and sex structures, but also provides knowledge of changes in the nation's occupational and industrial composition, in its level of living, education and employment and in its regional and group differentiation. It is used further in the computation of birth and death rates, in the making of life tables and in the analysis of economic development cycles. Future trends can be estimated and military and economic manpower potentials, consumer needs, school requirements, growth in metropolitan areas, potential costs of social security measures and requirements for highways, utilities, parks, water, and health services can be projected.

I am sure you are aware, that at least 150 countries or areas have collected individual data on more than 2 billion persons, and that the U.N. not only encourages countries to take censuses, but also sponsors regional statistical committees. In the reporting a census by China in 1953, the last large part of the world was removed from demographic darkness. It is generally agreed that the population of the entire world is known with a great degree of accuracy and that the structure and patterns of change of populations, including socio-economic characteristics, are widely understood. In 1963, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare increased its commitments for research on human reproduction from less than $3 million to more than $6 million annually.

In the face of the ready availability of this monumental statistical information—and I refer your honorable body to the September 6, 1965, issue of the U.S. News & World Report for ample samples—it becomes abundantly clear that there is no need for further additional agencies to gather more statistics. Any expenditure in this regard becomes only a waste of taxpayers' money.

The other provisions of this bill, S. 1676, which deal with the use of Federal money for the dissemination of birth control information and materials are totally unacceptable because of the conflict with the moral code of a large segment of the population. The use of artificial methods of birth control is contrary to the moral principles of and is personally offensive to a substantial group. There is no question that government must be concerned with, responsible for and ever watchful about the morals of its citizens. Will the laws now reach down to the lowest common denominator of human behavior?

The "birth controller" advocates action contrary to the principles of conduct which have been implanted in the nature of man by God and expressed in what we call the natural law. As Dr. John Marshall states in his "Medicine and Morals," this natural law "is not an arbitrary code which applies to one particular religious denomination or to one era of human history. It is an integral part of creation, being, as it were, built into its structure." The evil of destroying the life of an unborn child then is not just a matter of some ecclesiastical decision; it is basically and fundamentally wrong.

It would follow then, that if the natural law is the plan by which man is intended to live and act in order to secure proper development and fulfillment of his nature, continual flouting of that plan cannot but be detrimental to man as a whole. So much so, that if more and more men continue to live in conflict with this natural law, it becomes only a matter of time before our way of life is destroyed. Each chip in the armor of our morals of society contributes to the eventual downfall and destruction of that society. This downfall then becomes inevitable because ethics are not simple rules of conduct which change from one generation to the next but are unchanging principles upon which any healthy society must be based.

But how mundane the cries of the birth controllers have become. Not enough space. Not enough food. Too many people. There is not a periodical or a newspaper that at one time or another has not taken up the hue and the cry. The latest innovation are car stickers. I personally observed a California licensed car in Salt Lake City sporting a sign which read: "Trouble parking? Support Planned Parenthood." And what are they really saying? "We want this land for ourselves. We want this wealth for ourselves. We want all the world has to offer for ourselves. We do not want 'hordes' of people. We do not want our standard of living threatened by having to give to the less fortunate. We want to gather all the wordly goods to our bosoms and hang on to them—they are ours." This "birth controller" who was given the precious gift of life in trust now refuses to pass it on and is violating that trust.

And how does he propose to do this? With whatever means of birth control become the most feasible or perhaps the most lucrative. Let us consider the so-called pill. The Johns Hopkins University Clinic has withdrawn the pill from use because they do not want to be medically responsible for the occasional serious complications associated with this method. Serious disorders including complete or partial blindness of varying duration, swelling of the optic nerve, sudden bulging of the eyeballs, dizziness, severe headaches, blurred or double vision and unexplained bleeding are being reported by doctors. A release from London states that Baroness E. Summerskill, life peeress, said in the House of Lords that permission for further sale of the pills should be withdrawn because of possible side effects such as thrombosis. Further, a release from Stoke-on-Trent, England, states: "The Dunlop Committee, the British Government's 'watchdog' on drugs, has received a report indicating that contraceptive pills may have been responsible for a blood clotting that resulted in the death of a woman 6 months after she had started taking the pills. The inquest was on Mrs. Jean Rowley, who died from blood clotting. The pathologist who presided at the inquest declared that it was impossible to deny the possibility that taking the pills had contributed to the development of the condition that caused her death."

Despite all this evidence, a February 3, 1965, Wall Street Journal article stated that "the expansion of public birth control programs has provided a major new market for drug companies selling contraceptives. It's estimated that the industry this year will sell $4 million worth of oral contraceptives to Government birth control programs." This represents only a part of the total market for the oral contraceptive and does not even consider the sales of mechanical devices, etc. I pose this question to your honorable body, "Who are the real beneficiaries?"

In May of this year, one of the officers of the Planned Parenthood Association stated that "it is wrong to make as much income on selling of contraceptives as we do" and in the next breath advocated the use of contraceptives for the unmarried on the theory that "it is easier to teach contraception than chastity." Dr. Guttmacher, president of this federation feels that parents themselves are becoming more sophisticated. He was reported as saying, "They know for example, that their son or daughter must go to college equipped with contraceptives." Are you, honorable members of this committee, such sophisticated parents?

Pronouncements of policy action by officers of the Planned Parenthood Federation are becoming increasingly alarming. Consider for a moment, if you will, the following: Dr. Edward T. Tyler, president of the American Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians said that their Los Angeles clinic gives oral contraceptives to the unmarried teenage girls if they bring a note from their mother. Dr. Gordon W. Perkins, associate medical director of Planned Parenthood World-Population, said that girls as young as 13 are given birth control pills in New York, Los Angeles and other cities and that high school and college girls are taking oral contraceptives to prevent an interruption of their studies with an unwanted pregnancy. "After all", he said, "this is just a reflection of the new campus morality". Further, it is a matter of record that voluntary sterilization and efforts to legalize abortion are part of the over all plan of this federation.

Consider further, if you will, parts of the American baby code as expounded by Margaret Sanger, founder of the Planned Parenthood Association. "A marriage shall in itself give husband and wife only the right to a common household and not the right to parenthood. No woman shall have the legal right to bear a child and no man shall have the right to become a father without a permit for parenthood". As recently as February of this year, this founder was quoted as saying that Americans would be much more acceptable when they go abroad to work on the problem if we could get our Government to approve it—perhaps under such terms as population control. Is bill S. 1676 spelling out this philosophy?

Bear with me while I refer you again to the September 6 issue of the U.S. News & World Report. Note if you will the breakdown of the family unit is regarded as the prime cause of the problems presented by the studies undertaken by the Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Complete statistical information is available making further study only redundant. I submit that the program of birth control as proposed by the provisions of this bill will only serve to break down further all semblance of any kind of stability. Are you, honorable members of this committee, willing to assume the responsibility for setting this into motion?

Truly, this is not idle talk nor unsubstantiated statements. Allow me to refer you to the countries where the dissemination of birth control information and materials is widespread and has been operative for a period of time. I ask you, "What is the percentage of success?" Let us first look to Sweden where there has been widespread dissemination of birth control information. This easy access has resulted in general immorality and a high increase in the incidence of venereal disease. We have in Sweden a situation in which the Protestant groups are appealing to the Catholic groups to unite to start teaching the Ten Commandments again."

In India an announcement by the Prime Minister of Health indicated that the results of a 10 year birth control project costing millions of dollars was a failure. The reason for this failure may well lie in the observation of a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi who stated that birth control was a negation of the Hindu way of life and a defeat of spiritual and ethical values.

In West Germany, 400 doctors, including 100 gynecologists, have signed a petition deploring the sexualization of modern society and warn that if unlicensed sexuality becomes a public policy, "the free world and the underdeveloped countries will inevitably be led to catastrophe and an important argument will be provided for the development of a worldwide, nonwhite racial front of the proletarian people."

Now let us look at Japan. Until recently great pronouncements were made about the success of the birth control program there. The honorable members of this committee are well aware that the form of birth control employed in Japan to make this program such a resounding success was abortion. But what has happened? Recent information and reports from Japan have taken a turn. Efforts are being made and pleas are widespread to enact legislation to make abortion illegal again. Consider if you will this picture as reported. A group of children were playing in a side ditch covered with water somewhere in Osaka. Suddenly they discovered that they were stepping on dead little babies. Police investigation revealed the fact that there were about 50 dead foetuses from 4 to 10 months. Someone from a legal abortion clinic just did not bother to deliver them to the crematory but dumped them in the nearest ditch. Further, though health reasons have been given as the greatest reason for proceeding with abortions, statistics now being revealed indicate that 2 million women have been injured in their health as a result of an abortion having been performed. The complications are causing concern. The incidence of extra uterine pregnancies following an abortion have risen 400 percent. Also, Professor Inoue states that there is a high incidence of abortion in the 20- to 24-year-old group and that the suicide rate in this group is all out of proportion to that of other age groups and nations.

Mention might also be made about countries in Western Europe who find that because of birth control programs, they are now forced to import labor. But we do not need to go out of our own country for examples. Turn your gaze, if you will, toward that great midwestern city of Chicago, where Federal funds have made the distribution of birth control pills possible also to the unmarried 15 year old girls. Paul Harvey reported recently that it has become necessary to open 21 evening clinics for the treatment of venereal disease there. I say to you, honorable gentlemen of this committee, for every birth control clinic that you will make possible, be prepared to open two clinics to treat VD.

Further, throughout the United States, even though there is resistance to the establishment of these clinics for birth control, reports indicate that an epidemic of venereal disease is raging. Paul H. Hallett points out that Federal health authorities estimate that there are 130,000 new cases of infectious syphilis in the country every year and that VD is a contributing factor to 1,000 deaths a month. He states further that health officials have reported a steady rise in the number of new syphilis cases each year since 1957. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that the national cost of syphilis alone is $100 million annually, and that Public Health experts agree that the increase of sexual license among young Americans is the prime cause of the sharp rise in the incidence of this disease in that age group. Despite this many private social welfare groups, as well as State and communal welfare offices are helping unmarried teenage girls overcome restraint caused by a concern over pregnancy by giving out birth control pills.

Are you, honorable members of this committee in agreement with the minister from California who stated that since we can do nothing about the morals at least we can stop them from having babies?

What is the answer? Is the problem too many people? Dr. George Carter of Johns Hopkins University states that it would be possible to stand all the men and women and children now living in the world in one county of a small State like Maryland. Not enough space? Granted that men are leaving the land and pouring into the cities. This creates heavily populated cities and wide open and wilder land. In the last 5 years, I have personally visited Canada, the Northwest United States, the east coast, the Southwest and this summer the West. Not only I, but our entire family, have been amazed at the hundreds and hundreds of miles of wide open land in every part of our country and Canada. The cities are crowded but our land is wide open. There are experts who state that there is in fact more open space today than there was a hundred years ago and today we have better and faster ways of getting there if we really want to go.

Not enough food? This is the greatest paradox of all here in America where we are using less and less land to produce more and more food. A casual trip through the wheat country will bring out the inescapable fact that the surplus storages are monumental. Add to this the $1.5 billion paid to farmers annually not to produce and this argument suddenly has a pretty hollow ring.

For every alarmist about the rate of population growth you will find an expert who takes the opposite stand. Dr. Carter points out that knowledge is far outpacing population and it is through knowledge that there is power to support people. He feels that population is lagging far behind what our knowledge makes it possible to feed, clothe and house on a very good standard. Then, why is this not so? Simply because this knowledge is now very unevenly distributed and some of the most pressing problems are in areas where knowledge is least developed and widespread.

I am sure that your honorable body is well aware of the efforts that are being made to equalize this situation. May I refer to the Academy of Food Marketing at St. Joseph College, Philadelphia, Pa., and to its founder, James O'Connor, as an example. Mr. O'Connor maintains that lack of food is not the problem in the world. There is enough food. It is rather, the lack of sound, modern marketing and distribution methods that cause the problems. He points to Latin America where in some countries half the food rots because of poor storage or distribution methods. He feels that there is need for trained warehouse and storage techniques and that young men could be trained to take their place in this endeavor. More importantly even, he feels that these men could be imbued with the understanding that man is his brother's keeper, and that this would help the hunger problem. His answer was the formation of the Academy of Food Marketing and he has at the moment a program underway in Bogota, Colombia, where 2,400 children are fed daily in a cafeteria equipped by the Academy's Founders Club and operated with U.S. surplus foods and the American know-how in operation, maintenance and food disposal is being taught. This is but one project. There are others. The honorable members of this committee are very likely aware of the work being done in Brazil and other countries.

What about this matter of life? Dr. Schweitzer held that every person has a will to live, that it is evil to destroy life or hinder its development, that it is good to further and sustain life and that all life in every form has value. Pearl S. Buck puts it aptly when she says that men and women are responsible for their seed and that the famous pill cannot end that responsibility which must include the responsibility for the unborn child, the possible child. Our own President, in an address at the Johns Hopkins University early this year, summed up this position in a dramatic and inspiring way when he said: "We may well be living in the time foretold many years ago when it was said: 'I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.' This generation of the world must choose: Destroy or build, kill or aid, hate or understand. We can do all these things on a scale never dreamed of before.

We will choose life and in so doing we will prevail over the enemies within man, and over the natural enemies of all mankind."

The choice is clear and ours to make. What will it be? Passage of this bill would mean pursuing a course of negative and destructive programs committed to antilife. You would, honorable gentlemen, be extending a hand, but it would be a grasping hand, taking and keeping everything unto itself with no regard to the morality of the means used and ending only in downfall and destruction.

I present to you the other alternative. Extend your hand. Let it be an open hand extended in sharing, recognizing the dignity of man, working toward the proper development and fulfillment of his nature and ending in his destiny to inherit the earth. As elected officials, the burden of leadership in this regard rests squarely on your shoulders. Defeat of this bill will truly pave the way not only to a Great Society but also to a good society.

May I extend my appreciation to each and every member of this committee for the opportunity to be heard. May I hope also that in hearing you have listened?

Sincerely yours,

GENEVIEVE MOGILKA

Mrs. David R. Mogilka.

Perhaps it is more than coincidence that this statement should be read to your honorable and august body today, just a few days after Mother's Day, when your ears must still be ringing with the traditional tributes paid to mother. Allow us, honorable gentlemen, to speak to you not so much as citizens, but as mothers. Your very own mothers would agree that there can be no greater fulfillment in life than to join with the Creator in creating a new life. The first born is a profound miracle but no less a profound miracle is a subsequent child, no matter what number. How could the birth of a child ever be something that must be avoided at all costs, even to the point of murdering the unborn? How saddened and dismayed any true mother must be this day to see the erosion of moral and spiritual values surrounding motherhood.

Honorable gentlemen, you are surrounded and engulfed by staggering and ominous statistics regarding population growth. Dire warnings are being sounded. But look again, honorable Senators. Are these not the vested interests coming to motivate you to action that will be financially beneficial to them? Ask yourselves, if you will, who is pushing the use of the intrauterine device and then ask yourselves who holds the rights to this device. We need not tell you, honorable gentlemen, that the "pill" represents a million-dollar business. The May 9, 1966, issue of U.S. News & World Report points out the magnitude of the operation of just four pharmaceutical houses. We ask you, honorable gentlemen, who is really the beneficiary?

The birth controllers are clamoring for more and more Federal involvement at home and abroad. But what are the facts? Allow us again to refer your honorable body to the May 9 issue of the U.S. News & World Report which states that in fact the birth rate has declined sharply in recent years and that every indication is that it will continue to decline, so much so that not only must all projection be revised but also all planning for the future. Further, a Capitol report in March 1966, in the State of Wisconsin by John Wyngaard states that "virtually all of the major State service agencies have set their planning sights on an expectation of a continued high number and rate of births. There is now reasonable ground for belief that their requirements for the future won't be as difficult as they had previously thought." The honorable Members from the State of Wisconsin are well aware of the fact that there is a real danger that a congressional seat will be lost because of the decline in population.

Now what about the foreign countries and their acceptance of birth control?

You, honorable gentlemen, have been bombarded with the apparent clamoring for birth control by these countries. Allow us to present to you the other side of the coin, so to speak, which very often is not brought out. According to the Milwaukee Journal of April 21, 1966, the Association of French-Speaking Doctors of Canada has called for a halt to the Canadian distribution of intrauterine birth control devices because the devices could prevent the growth of a fertilized egg in the uterus and this would be disguised abortion. Further, on December 13, 1965, the Chicago Tribune reported that the chairman of Burma's revolutionary council, Gen. Ne Win, said that he is strongly against birth control, that men everywhere should strive to produce more food and that there could be enough food to feed the world's population if only everyone worked harder to grow more food. He asserted that those advocating population control are saying in effect, "We are already born. You, the still unborn generation, don't come to share our food."

On March 6, 1966, the Chicago Tribune reported that Melbourne doctors have expressed alarm at the disastrous drop in Australia's birth rate. Since the introduction of contraceptive pills is seemingly responsible for this drop, they have asked for a policy that would remove economic and social obstacles to parenthood by granting marriage loans and by increasing maternity allowances and child endowment. Dr. Victor Wallace, a Melbourne specialist who has been in practice for 47 years, asserted that the use of contraceptives has gone too far and has become a threat to the future of Australia. He said, "We could build a great civilization here if we had the will to do so, but we are in danger of losing this country to an aggressive Asiatic power. We are weak and vulnerable because we have failed to reproduce our kind sufficiently and prepare our defenses adequately".

Michael Denningan reports in the Chicago Tribune of April 17, 1966 that in France there is little chance of changing the law of 1920 which forbids all publicity in favor of birth control and the sale or manufacture of female contraceptive devices. There is need to build up the French population, but even here a struggling French family planning movement is exploiting ways and means around the law for women.

In Korea, Father Jerome Bruening, S.J., in his "Have You Had Your Rice Today," reports that the ugliest of the ugly Americans in Korea is the person handing out contraceptives. These are but a few of the examples that bring out the other side of the story. There are many more, if only the whole story could be told.

Down what path is Government involvement taking the United States? Will we, honorable gentlemen, adopt Denmark's plan of voluntary compulsion whereby couples applying for a marriage license and found likely to transmit a serious hereditary defect get no license unless they agree to sterilization? (And who makes the decision about the possible transmittal?) Or will the United States do as the provincial officials in China do? They are reportedly withholding food and clothing allowances from parents who have more than three children.

But this could never happen in the United States, you say. It not only can happen but already has happened. We are sure that the honorable Senators are well aware of the amendments that have been introduced which demand a birth control program as a prerequisite for foreign aid. Is the United States not saying, "Oh, we will feed you, but you must permit us to eliminate you and finally destroy you."

Beyond and above all this, however, another very serious question can be raised. What is the legal liability of the U.S. Government in cases of complications or side effects resulting from the use of the pill or the intrauterine device under a government supported program?

The antilife forces unleashed in our country and in the world today are succeeding, with their tools of birth control and contraception, to destroy the moral fiber of many people. Allow us to point out that at the University of Wisconsin, the student health service admits to distribution of birth control pills to unmarried students even though State law prohibits this. Physicians "wink at the law" in cases of coeds stating they plan to be married soon, although admittedly there is no effort to check the fact of the imminent marriage. Is this our philosophy today to change even the moral law when things get difficult? Can we tear down criminal and moral law just to make things easy?

Government exists for the welfare of those governed. Permit us, honorable gentlemen, to direct the same question that George A. Flores of London, England, directed to an official of India. "How does a government expect to achieve economic growth while the birth control propaganda strives to decimate the ranks of future producers as well as consumers? Yes, honorable gentlemen, how does a government do this?

Honorable gentlemen, we have come to Washington from Milwaukee, Wis., and we are making this statement because our great concern is the heritage we are leaving our children. Someone once said that in projection into the future it is not as important to have a sense of prophecy as it is to proceed on right principles.

We say to you, honorable gentlemen, employ the right principles and the future will take care of itself.

If the antilife forces are permitted to flourish and if negative and destructive programs of prevention and limitation of life are permitted to continue, will we have to conclude that the best science can come up with as a solution is the murder of the unborn resulting in almost certain national suicide? But then, why eliminate the young who may have some potential? Perhaps, rather concentrate on those who have already outlived their usefulness; will this be the next step?

The birth controller looks upon people only as a problem. This great United States should be able certainly to see in any person a great resource and find that any growing and expanding population is but a challenge which can be met with great moral strength.

SENATOR DOMINICK SUPPORTS COLORADO BEVATRON BID

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] apparently felt constrained to make some remarks about the cities being considered as finalists in the site selection program of the Atomic Energy Commission for the 200-billion-electron-volt-proton accelerator. The Senator discussed the six cities under consideration which include Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven, N.Y.; Chicago, Ill.; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis., and Sacramento, Calif. In his discussion of these potential sites, the Senator indicated the disapproval of each of the cities for a variety of reasons. I will leave it to the Members of the Senate more familiar with Ann Arbor, Brookhaven, Chicago, Madison, and Sacramento to discuss the points raised concerning those cities but would like to comment briefly upon his reference to my State capital, Denver, Colo.

Specifically, the Senator from Missouri charged that Denver was not an appropriate site because of a severe climate, adverse topography and insufficient electrical power. All of these charges are ridiculous and clearly indicate a lack of familiarity with the true conditions in the Denver area.

As my distinguished colleague from Colorado, Senator ALLOTT, clearly pointed out in rebutting these charges, Colorado has long been admiringly referred to as the climate Capital of the Nation. In fact, the crisp, clean sunshine-filled air has been one of the main selling points in bringing industry into the Metropolitan Denver area. The snowfall which Senator LONG referred to as causing panic in the State is, in fact, a part and parcel of the State's lifeblood. The snow pack in the mountains not only provides the best skiing in the Nation and creates a tourist mecca throughout the winter months, it also enables extensive irrigation for the State's millions of acres of farmland. I doubt if there is a State in the Union that is less adversely affected by snowfall.

I doubt whether there is any State in the Union where people take snowfall, when it is on their streets and in their yards, with more equanimity and some considerable delight over figuring what it will do to benefit their water supply.

In fact, with the exception of some high mountain roads, Colorado's highways are rarely shutdown because of snow. Not only are the highways kept constantly open by well-trained and efficient highway crews, but also they are actually clean and dry several hours after the end of a snowfall because of the evaporative phenomenon which is a result of the high altitude and low humidity.

Senators will remember the chaos and complete shutdown of the Federal Government in Washington during the past winter following a snowfall of only 16 inches. Colorado could have 16 times 10 and the only resulting panic would be the mad rush to our fantastic ski slopes.

I am at a loss to understand what the criticism of the Senator from Missouri of the Denver area topography is based upon, since the land under consideration is almost ideally suited for construction of the bevatron. As a matter of fact, it hapens to be located—a part of it, at least—in my own home county. I know the area intimately, and there could not be a better site, from the point of view of size and the point of view of topography. The amount of excavation required in the Denver area, in order to level the land, would be no greater than would be required in any of the other cities under consideration.

I suspect, from looking at the speech of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, that he simply had failed to recognize where this site is, as proposed by Colorado. It is not in the mountains. It is in the flat land east and slightly south of Denver.

Insofar as the Senator charged that there is an insufficient supply of electrical power available, I would simply say it is an inaccurate statement. As Senator ALLOTT indicated in his remarks, the criteria calls for approximately 200 megawatts and before the year is out, the Denver area will have more than twice that amount available.

Mr. President, while both Senator ALLOTT and I are highly enthusiastic about the prospect of the bevatron being located in our State, we have been extremely careful and cautious in speaking out on behalf of Colorado because we felt it improper to turn this important project into a political football. Our Governor, John Love, has been working diligently on behalf of our State's entry into this competition and we have done everything possible to assist him within the bounds of propriety.

When I say we have been doing this, I mean that we have been working as a team, within our delegation, working with the Governor. We have been attempting to present to the AEC and to the other evaluators the facts which would show that we either do or do not meet the criteria which they have established as the basis upon which this site for a bevatron will be chosen.

It may interest the Senate to know that the Governor has called a special session of the State legislature for the sole purpose of assuring that the State's responsibilities will be fully upheld and its resources completely behind the program if Colorado is ultimately selected. The cooperation of members of both parties of our State legislature indicates the depth of enthusiasm and unanimity felt among our State leaders for this program.

I am sure the comments from the distinguished Senator from Missouri were well intended, although in the instance of Colorado, completely erroneous. I hope he will have the opportunity to visit the area to see these points for himself in the near future. If he were to visit the area, I would be happy to escort him over the terrain.

I told the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I was going to make a statement today and he said, "Go right to it. I have no objection." So that I am not trying to be critical in any way. I simply am attempting to set the record straight and to make sure that the allegations which were made are corrected promptly, so that we will not have any misunderstanding on the part of Government agencies or the people at large.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: SYMBOL AND SUBSTANCE

V. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in speaking to the Senate yesterday, I said that land reform and education, the major components of social justice and development in the hemisphere, rest on the people of Latin America. They must make the reforms, elect the leaders, and provide most of the resources needed. The Alliance is their revolution. It cannot be imposed from Washington or by citizens of other lands. If they are willing to work and sacrifice to yield up old privileges and shape new institutions, our help can be of decisive importance. If they are not willing to do these things, then all our effort and money will be as sand cast into the sea.

Yet, understanding this, we must also understand that the acts and attitudes of the United States—the wealthy and omnipresent giant of the hemisphere—are of vital importance to the expectations and dreams of our 200 million fellow citizens of the hemisphere.

Nowhere is this more true than in the Alliance effort for economic development, the pledge to eliminate the material misery of Latin America, believing that freedom can fully thrive only when men have cast aside the chains of hopeless poverty. That effort embraces our own program of assistance, the need to assure consistent and sufficient export earnings, the stimulation of responsible private enterprise, and the need to meet the danger of the unchecked growth of population, as well as the enormously increased efforts for education and land reform of which I have already spoken.

U.S. ASSISTANCE

It is clear that our own program of aid, resting as it does on the unparalleled generosity of the American people, is still far too small to meet the commitments of the Alliance.

We now authorize about $1 billion of public funds for aid to Latin America each year. Of this, only $400 million represents development loans on liberal terms; the balance consists of surplus food shipments and businesslike project loans from the Export-Import Bank.

Latin America's greatest present economic need, however, is foreign exchange. In all but a few nations, foreign exchange shortages restrict industrialization and agricultural investment, help to cause inflation, and involve governments in tortuous manipulation of the financial system. George Woods, President of the World Bank, has said that the underdeveloped world has a foreign exchange shortage of $3 to $4 billion annually. And the CIAP, the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress, has estimated Latin America's share of this shortage at $1 billion yearly after all assistance and private enterprise investment is counted.

Our present direct assistance meets less than one-half of Latin America's foreign exchange assistance needs.

And our worldwide economic assistance program of which it is a part is only one-third the effort, in proportion to our wealth, that the American people made 15 years ago. In these 15 years, the income and wealth of the United States have risen far faster than income in the developing nations. But we contributed to economic development, 15 years ago, 10 percent of our Federal budget—nearly 2 percent of our gross national product. And to meet the greatly increased needs of the 1960's, we contribute only 3 percent of our Federal budget—one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product. This is, I point out, a much smaller proportional effort than is made by France, by West Germany, or by Great Britain.

I believe the American people will support a greatly increased aid effort—an effort equal in sacrifice to what we were willing to do 15 years ago. Instead, therefore, of decreasing the amount of effort we are making to one-third of what we were doing 15 years ago, I believe it is required now, in the sixties, that we increase our effort.

I believe that we are ready to recognize that foreign aid is not a "giveaway"—rather that it is both a moral obligation to fellow human beings and a sound and necessary investment in the future. We are incomparably richer than any other nation, now or in the history of mankind; our wealth is as great as that of all the rest of the non-Communist world put together. I believe we are ready to use this wealth for the benefit of all men. And I believe we are ready to recognize that millions saved now can mean billions lost 5 or 10 or 20 years from now, and that the human cost of delay is incalculable. Time after time, in these uncertain and dangerous years, we have reaped the consequences of neglect and delay, of misery and disease and hunger left too long to fester unremedied—in Cuba, in the Dominican Republic, in Vietnam. As President Kennedy said:

> If we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich.

I therefore propose that we now commit ourselves to a major increase in our development effort, perhaps doubling the amount of capital aid over the next few years. We cannot spend additional large sums at the moment; but we should pledge now to assist in a realistic way in meeting the needs in the years ahead, as they make the efforts to help themselves—the sacrifices and reforms that are essential. And it might be well to remember that the most we are suggesting is what would be the equivalent for all Latin America of the cost of approximately 4 weeks of the struggle in Vietnam.

And in this connection, I strongly commend President Johnson's pledge, delivered through Secretary Rusk at the Rio de Janeiro meeting last November, that the United States would continue its assistance to the Alliance through the decade of the 1970's. This pledge gives Latin Americans a basis on which to make their plans for the future; and it demonstrates that the United States is a partner of the Alliance for the duration. Let me also say that I hope the prosperous countries of Western Europe would join the overall effort of assistance to Latin America.

EXPORT EARNINGS

Yet even greatly increased assistance will be inadequate if we fail to find ways to assure to the Latin American economies sound and expanding export earnings. No modern economy is sufficient unto itself; all, even the highly developed nations of Europe, must export to live. But the exports of Latin American nations have traditionally been dominated by single commodities and thus have been highly vulnerable to shifts in a few world prices.

In Brazil, for example, 54 percent of export earnings come from coffee. Petroleum products are 87 percent of Venezuelan exports. Uruguay's livestock industry—beef, wool, and hides—account for 89 percent of its exports. Bananas are 56 percent of Ecuadoran exports, 34 percent of Honduran.

This dependence on single products has led to unhealthy boom-and-bust cycles in many Latin American economies. Bolivia has risen and fallen with the price of tin, Chile with copper, Brazil and others with coffee, Venezuela with oil. To take a single example: Venezuelan growth was 1.7 percent in 1961, 6.3 percent in 1962, 4.1 percent in 1963, 8 percent in 1964—largely as a consequence of the ups and downs of the world petroleum market.

Efforts to reduce such fluctuations have led in recent years to calls for the stabilization of world commodity prices through international marketing and production controls; one agreement in which the United States joined, on coffee, did check a steady decline in prices from 1960 to 1963. But efforts to extend this principle to other commodities have not been successful. And even the Coffee Agreement may be subject to heavy pressure from unchecked overproduction.

The United States stands ready to reach agreements on other commodities—perhaps sugar, cotton, and cocoa. But we must recognize that commodity agreements are, and can only be, a part of a comprehensive program to insulate the Latin American economies from short-run fluctuations in export earnings. For while many individual Latin American nations depend heavily on a single commodity, most depend on different commodities—so that a dozen or more agreements, shared in by many nations on other continents, might be necessary to protect them all. Some commodities, like bananas, are highly perishable and cannot be protected by ordinary agreements. Further, these agreements—whatever their immediate benefits—still encourage continued reliance on a single commodity and subsidize the continuance of the old economic and social order. And they cannot protect against long-term declines in the world prices of raw material.

We must therefore pursue more effective and lasting solutions to the problem of fluctuating export earnings in Latin America.

First, we should seek improved machinery for making up in cash the foreign exchange shortages caused by short-term fluctuations in export earnings. There is wide discussion, led in large part by the CIAP and its Chairman Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, as well as by President George Woods of the World Bank, of improvements in the mechanism of the International Monetary Fund—and any such improvements will be most welcome. But the IMF may not be able or ready to meet the full needs of Latin American development.

We should therefore explore the creation of special Inter-American machinery (perhaps under the aegis of the IADB) to meet emergencies, on an ad hoc basis, by providing necessary foreign exchange on a subscription or other appropriate basis. We should indicate to the CIAP, and to the economists of the Americas, our willingness to participate in a sound scheme and call on them to present plans for reaching this end.

Second, we should seek the soundest long-term solution within each Latin American nation and in the hemisphere as a whole.

Within each nation, it is necessary to diversify exports. Peru's rapid growth, for example, can be traced in large part to its newly diversified foreign trade: exports of fishmeal, the largest item, are 25 percent, copper 15 percent, cotton 14 percent, sugar 10 percent. Here the critical need is the building of exports—industrial, agricultural, and mineral—which in turn requires the increased foreign exchange assistance which I urged above. Just in the last decade, three economies—Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong—have moved into positions of steady expansion of export earnings on a sound basis. Two—Korea and Taiwan—have received large amounts of direct U.S. assistance, which has made it possible to build manufacturing export industries; and Taiwan's growth is now self-sustaining, requiring no further assistance. This experience can and should be duplicated throughout Latin America.

But here as elsewhere, the most significant part of the task is for Latin Americans themselves. This is the creation of an internal market—a market for their products within their own countries which at once affords them economies rising out of increased production, and lessens the dependence of production and employment on foreign demand over which they have no control.

A wider "internal" market can come in part from integration of the Latin American economies—from a lowering of trade and tariff barriers throughout the hemisphere as they have been lowered in the highly successful Central American common market.

But the greatest part of the expansion of internal market is not a matter of trade barriers between countries; it is a question of class barriers within countries. Small internal markets are the inevitable result of social and economic systems in which wealth is concentrated in the hands of the few—in which investment is made only in the cities, and not in the countryside—and where the great majority live at a level of bare subsistence. Widening internal markets—like land reform, or education, or indeed any major progress in Latin America—will require a conscious effort at lessening social and economic inequalities, ending the isolation and poverty of the masses of the people. Without that change—without that social revolution for which President Johnson called—no economic assistance or devices will be successful.

DEVELOPMENT: PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, THE UNITED STATES, AND LATIN AMERICA

Government alone—whether through aid or improved patterns of trade—cannot meet the desperate need of impoverished lands for capital and skills and technology. Private enterprise, both that conducted by Latin Americans and that created by foreign investment, can provide an important and even critical stimulus to growth and increasing human welfare. This was recognized by all the American nations in the Charter of Punta del Este.

THE NEED

Of the $2 billion annual inflow of capital which the framers of the Alliance projected would come from abroad, direct private investment from the United States was to contribute $300 million. Considering that U.S. investment during the 1950's had averaged about $400 million annually, this was not an overambitious aim. But it has not yet been reached; in fact in 1962, U.S. business liquidated $32 million more than it invested, and by 1964 our investment was still only half the $300 million target.

This is a serious development. First, private industry is the primary source of investment capital in all the developed nations; it is potentially the major source of development capital for Latin America. Second, private enterprise is also the principal repository of the technical and technological skills which Latin America needs. Without sustained private investment from abroad, the aims of the Alliance will be far more difficult—perhaps even impossible—to achieve.

For one need only reflect on the new prosperity of Peru, for example, which comes in large part from a fishmeal industry created by U.S. investment; or the growth of Venezuela, with its petroleum and steel complexes; or just the advertisements by Latin American governments, offering substantial inducements to foreign enterprise, to know that foreign capital can be of great benefit to Latin America. U.S. investment accounts for a major part of Latin America's manufacturing plant, and employs a million Latin American workers.

Still our investment there, in recent years, has lagged; and the reasons are not difficult to discover.

In 1961-62, there was a real fear of Castroite action throughout the hemisphere. Then and now, instability—from rightwing coups and their aftermath as much as from the left—has plagued many countries. Government regulation of prices and profits, particularly in the extractive industries and in public utilities, has become more stringent, sometimes to the point of unreasonableness. Repatriation of capital and profits has often been restricted. And all this has taken place while Europe and the United States have offered investment opportunities greater than ever before.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT: AN APPROACH

Clearly, this is a situation one would wish to change. Equally clearly, however, it must be for each nation to decide how much foreign investment it wishes, and on what terms it will be admitted to do business. This is not just a matter of national sovereignty, nor of Latin American sensitivity to foreign investment. Rather it is the best basis for an expanded inflow of foreign capital in the future.

In my judgment, it is when a nation and its citizens are confident that they have full control over their own economies that they will be free to deal with foreign investment reasonably and equitably. So long as that control is in doubt, they will be forced by every principle of nationhood to test it—by harassment, by threats of expropriation, by denying price or rate increases however justified. But the greater their control, I think, the greater will be the freedom and thus the participation of foreign capital.

The proof of this paradox is in Mexico, which over the last 30 years has established firm control over all foreign investment. Under the Mexicanization laws, foreigners are discouraged by heavy tax burdens from owning more than small minority interests in the sensitive extractive industries; and effective inducements are offered to all businesses which are 51 percent Mexican-owned. Ever since 1940, the Mexicans have known that they were masters in their own house. The result is that private foreign investment is sounder and safer in Mexico than perhaps anywhere else in the hemisphere. And its participation in the Mexican economy continues to grow.

Business itself can also do much to protect itself and improve the general investment climate. Sustained efforts to sell equity shares in the local market—to hire, train, and systematically upgrade local employees in managerial jobs; to provide clinics and housing and other services to their 1 million workers—all these have already done much to improve the position of U.S. business in many parts of Latin America. Shifting from extractive industries to manufacturing is also helpful. This process has been going on. And, with the help of such organizations as the Council for Latin America, headed by Mr. David Rockefeller, improvement should continue. But more can and should be done.

I therefore propose that the U.S. business community formulate a Uniform Code for Foreign Investment in Latin America. Such a code might lay down voluntary guidelines for U.S. firms, in accordance with the charter of the Alliance, on such matters as recognition of labor unions, opportunities for local capital participation, training of Latin Americans for executive positions, equalization of pay for equal work performed by U.S. and Latin American citizens, fair return rates, and repatriation of capital.

Many of these standards are already followed by the majority of American businesses making investments in Latin America; but I do not think that that fact is as widely known as it should be. I think by the establishment of a general code, followed by most of the American businesses which have invested or will invest hereafter in Latin America, we could diminish much of the criticism that presently exists of American business practices in those countries, as well as some criticism, by intellectuals and students, of the private enterprise system.

I think the establishment of such a code could be very helpful. I do not suggest the establishment of a code as a criticism of what has gone on in the past; I suggest the establishment of a code to deal with some of the problems I anticipate in the future.

Such a code, perhaps worked out in consultation with CIAP or individual governments, might make it easier for both the companies and the governments to reach agreements satisfactory to both. And we might look to the day when Latin American governments and United States business operating in the hemisphere would create permanent machinery for arbitration of any disputes.

I sent a copy of this suggestion to the Council for Latin America, and they sent me in reply, a telegram, which I should like to read into the RECORD, stating that they are making a study of the suggestion.

It says:

> In accordance with the request that you made to the CLA Board of Trustees on May 5 we have reviewed the proposal contained in your Senate speech on "Latin America and the Alliance for Progress" regarding a "uniform code of foreign investment in Latin America." In view of the imminence of your delivery of the speech we wish only to note that we would be glad to cooperate with you and other appropriate offices in the exploration of this idea.

I believe that this is a thought which is worthwhile exploring for American business. It might be helpful for the future. It is important that we have this kind of investment within Latin America by the private enterprise system. It is also important that this investment be governed by the country itself, and that the citizens of Latin America, who have an interest in these matters, understand how U.S. business is operated within their countries.

U.S. business can also do much to assist, with technical, managerial, and other skills and personnel, Latin American private enterprise—which is even more important, in the long run, than what U.S. business does. In this regard, the efforts of ADELA, which my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], has done so much to forward, deserve support and encouragement.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT: THE PROBLEM OF EXPROPRIATION

The most difficult problem regarding U.S. business is expropriation or other action threatens its interests.

Expropriation, to us, seems a dangerous and self-defeating course for Latin Americans to pursue. Where it is carried out without adequate compensation, it directly injures foreign investors—usually a U.S. corporation, and its stockholders—and is contrary to generally accepted international law. By discouraging private foreign investment, it makes economic development more difficult. Where, as often happens, the government undertakes the management of the expropriated industry, the result is often great inefficiency, overloaded payrolls, artificial price structures, and a general loss to the economy of the nation; this has been the case, for example, with Bolivian tin, and Argentinian and Brazilian railways.

For these reasons, Congress has taken the position that U.S. aid must be withdrawn when expropriation is not accompanied by compensation which is prompt, adequate, and effective. And the Department of State has, in certain cases, curtailed aid even before expropriation takes place—as, for example, in the midst of negotiations over compensation.

From the viewpoint of Latin Americans, however, things are very different; if our policy is to be effective, we should clearly understand their view. Latin Americans often feel that most foreign companies have long since recouped their original investments—in other words, that the companies would be ahead without compensation of any kind. This is particularly their feeling with regard to foreign owners in the extractive industries—oil, minerals, metals—which are also criticized as depleting resources essential to their future. And few Latin Americans can fail to be sensitive to their history—to the fact that, for centuries, their mineral wealth was taken by a small privileged minority, to be sent abroad to the coffers of Spanish kings and then to the banks of Europe.

For most of the sins and crimes of foreign companies in the past, we do not regard ourselves as responsible—nor should we. In Argentina, for example, Great Britain was the dominant foreign economic power until 20 years ago. Yet we have succeeded to all the hostility and resentment once directed at British private investment; just as elsewhere in the continent we have succeeded to historic grievances against the Spanish, or against the privileged class within Latin America.

In Peru, an American oil company has been embroiled in a dispute with the Government for several years. Some Peruvians contend that the original concession—made to a British company—was fraudulently obtained. And they allege that the oil company—before passing into its present American ownership—failed to pay proper taxes to a prior government. The American company regards itself as what, in other areas of our law, is known as "a good faith holder in due course"; it paid for what it has in full, to the prior owner. But many Peruvians see the company, past and present, British and American, as one entity, a foreigner which has unjustly taken tens of millions of dollars out of their country. No further return to the company, in their view, is either necessary or just.

Given such disparate views of right and reality, which almost guarantee disagreement, it is necessary to clearly define our goals.

The United States wants to protect the interests of U.S. firms and shareholders; to encourage Latin Americans to look favorably on further private investment, both domestic and foreign; to aid Latin America's economic, political, and social development; to further friendship and cooperation with the Latin American nations.

What we must realize is that these aims may conflict with each other—indeed, that dogged pursuit of one may make the achievement of others impossible.

In our dispute with Peru, for example, certain aid funds, including those for President Belaunde's Cooperacion Popular project, were held up. This is a project for Peace Corps-type work by Peruvian students in the depressed rural areas of Peru; students go into the villages to stimulate self-help projects for schools, roads, housing, and so forth. By all accounts, it has been highly successful; the kind of project contemplated by the Alliance for Progress, the kind of project which the Alliance for Progress would ordinarily give its full support.

President Belaunde therefore turned to the United States, asking $16 million in aid.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at this time, when our attention is being so monopolized by southeast Asia, it is important we bear in mind that we tend to overlook other areas where American interests and our whole world's interest are equally—or more—at stake, and where we must continue the development of a free and dynamic society.

Latin America, where a scant half decade ago President Kennedy inaugurated the Alliance for Progress, is such an area. President Johnson has sought to keep our interest there. In fact, the only country he has visited since becoming President, has been Mexico—where he received a stupendous welcome.

Because of the unpleasant fog of events in far off Vietnam, we have not given the thought and concentration we should give to the problems close at hand—in our own hemisphere.

I congratulate the Senator from New York on his speeches concerning Latin America. His sparkling, probing, and searching trip there, not too long ago, evoked an interest and intensity of reaction which demonstrated just how volatile our southern hemispheric neighbors are.

In studying the speeches of the Senator from New York on Latin America, I realize the amount of work, research, and thought that have gone into them. I extend to him every congratulation on taking the initiative and expressing in his speeches the views that he does.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his kind remarks. I thank him also for the interest he has shown in this subject, and I expect that we will work together closely on it.

But the Peruvian Government was then negotiating with the U.S.-owned oil company on such matters as royalty payments, allowable prices, and claims for past taxes; and the company contended, with a substantial amount of justice, that the Peruvian demands were unreasonable and would make it impossible to continue operation.

Here the Department of State took a hand; it held up funds for Cooperacion Popular as well as other aid projects, to make the Peruvians more "reasonable." Now it is important to realize that no expropriation or confiscation had taken place; that no act of Congress required that funds be held up in advance of uncompensated expropriation by the Peruvian Government; and that President Belaunde was at all times under considerable nationalist pressure to expropriate the oil company, though he wished only to negotiate more favorable price, royalty, and tax arrangements.

This policy, in my judgment, was wrong. It was wrong for Peru; and I have learned that the same policy was put into operation in dealing with the same kind of problem in Argentina. So the result was, for approximately 2 years, both in Peru and Argentina, important aid projects under the Alliance for Progress were held up because the private U.S. companies were not able to reach agreement with the representatives of the governments of Argentina and Peru.

The programs which were held up were potential sources of great democratic reform, strength, and stability—the essence of the Alliance and of our own national interest. The pressure, moreover, made expropriation a more serious nationalist issue, which was used to criticize President Belaunde for not standing up to the United States more vigorously—as is shown by the fact that the principal rightwing newspaper was an outspoken advocate of expropriation.

Earlier this year, the policy was reversed, and aid given to Cooperacion Popular. This was an intelligent and statesmanlike decision, for which the administration deserves great credit. But the effects of the delay will be felt far into the future.

Most significantly, in the same year that aid to Cooperacion Popular was held up, our military assistance deliveries to Peru nearly doubled—from $5.2 to $10 million, more than to any other Latin American nation. I am sure our policymakers did not intend this result; but I am equally sure that many Peruvians thought we favored arms over social reform.

Because the Peruvian Government was unable to reach an agreement with the American oil company, the programs under the Alliance for Progress which would permit the building of schools, roads, and increase educational possibilities, projects which would help assist Peru's economy, were held up. We held up that kind of assistance while we doubled military assistance to Peru during that same period of time. I think that was most unfortunate. When I traveled in Latin America in November of last year I felt it was most unfortunate that we had followed that policy. I am happy it was reversed at the beginning of this year.

In the longer run, future private investment may have been seriously prejudiced. For private enterprise has been further identified with foreigners and with domination by the United States.

This case should be contrasted with the results of a different policy in Mexico. Toward the end of the continuing Mexican revolution in 1938 Mexico nationalized all foreign oil companies. For a time, the use of economic sanctions, perhaps even force, were considered to compel full compensation. But as the dispute dragged on into 1940, when we were concerned with possible Axis penetration of the hemisphere, President Roosevelt settled it on terms quite favorable to Mexico.

One result was to help secure our southern flank throughout World War II. A second result was that the Mexican revolution came to terms with the United States, and our relations have been consistently good. And now, a generation later, not only is Mexican private industry expanding in importance; but U.S. firms, paying due respect to Mexican political supremacy, operate there without serious economic hindrance. And Du Pont has been invited into junior partnership with the Mexican Government in the ownership and operation of the oil industry nationalized just a generation ago.

Another example of a more realistic policy—in this case not Government policy, but that of American business—can be seen in Chile. There President Frei reached a settlement with U.S. copper companies, under which the Chilean Government is to become a major partner in their operations; the companies are to establish plants for fabrication of finished products; and output is to be expanded with substantial tax concessions. What is important about this settlement is that it was reached by the companies themselves, without cutting off aid or other pressure from the U.S. Government.

These examples, I believe, demonstrate that expropriation should be handled just as are other questions of private U.S. investment. The essential need is for U.S. business to reach its own accommodations with Latin American governments, paying full respect to their sovereignty and national independence. Aid should not be withheld to force special advantages for U.S. business. And even where business is expropriated without compensation satisfactory to the owners, the absolute requirement of present law that aid be cut off is harmful. I would far rather see the cutting off of aid left to the discretion of the President, who can use it as part of the arsenal of diplomacy for which he alone is responsible.

In 1962, when the assets of the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. were seized in Brazil, we were fortunate to be able to secure compensation for the company before the law required that assistance be cut off. I was personally involved in the negotiations with President Goulart. It was apparent that if we had been forced to cut off aid—if aid had not continued through the negotiations—those negotiations would probably not have been successful.

In the last analysis, withdrawing aid is not a policy, but the failure of policy; the aim of creative business and creative diplomacy is to insure that withdrawal in retaliation for expropriation never becomes necessary. And American businessmen and statesmen have shown that this aim can be achieved.

POPULATION: GROWTH AND CONTROL

All these efforts to stimulate economic growth must be informed by an awareness that population growth threatens to eat up our gains as fast as they are made.

Latin America is growing faster than any other part of the world. In the continent as a whole, population is rising by 3 percent yearly; in several countries it is rising by 3.5 percent. At present rates of growth, the United Nations estimates that Latin America will have a population of 363 million in 1980—an increase of more than 50 percent over 1965.

Population growth seriously handicaps Latin American progress. Food production, for example, has increased 10 percent in the last 5 years—in absolute terms. But this increase was directly matched by population growth, so that each person has no more to eat than he did 5 years ago, and the level of nutrition is completely inadequate.

The same population growth which negates progress in agriculture dilutes progress in gross income. Venezuela, for example, grew by 5 percent annually between 1960 and 1964, but her population grew by 3.7 percent yearly, and per-person income growth was less than 1.5 percent. Peru, where income rose by an average of 7.7 percent annually in 1960–64, had a per-person growth rate of only 4.5 percent. Chile's population grew slowly for the hemisphere, at 2.3 percent yearly; but even this cut a 4.4-percent gross product rise to one of 1.9 percent per person. In rural areas of Guatemala, with population growth of 3.1 percent in recent years, per-person income actually declined by almost 5 percent from 1950 to 1964. Except for Peru, these figures are far below the Alliance goal of 2.5-percent annual increase in per-person national income. And even Peru cannot be sanguine when its growth is so diluted.

Some Latin Americans, nevertheless, do not regard their burgeoning populations as a danger:

> Most of the countries—

Says a United Nations report—

> look on the prospect of population much larger than the present as a challenge but not as a burden.

After all, they say, Latin America has a population density only one-half as great as the United States, one-tenth as great as Europe; surely more hands are needed for the work of development and for the colonization of the interior.

But facing the facts as they are, the rapid increases in population are not colonizing the interior—we do not know if that is possible or profitable at the present time or in the near future—instead they are coming to the cities where there is not enough work for them. Moreover, the population increase seriously handicaps efforts to improve educational levels, to provide decent housing, to raise Latin American living standards in dozens of other ways. Just as among poor people in our own country, large poor families have a far more difficult time raising children. After development, there would be more force to underpopulation arguments; but the problem of Latin America is not now that its people are too few.

These facts have been recognized by many people in Latin America. Polls have shown that most women want only 3 or 4 children; we know that in some Latin American cities, 1 out of 4 women has had an induced abortion; and 12 Latin American governments sent official delegates to the 1964 meetings of the International Planned Parenthood Foundation.

I believe we should provide assistance to any nation which decides that family planning and population control are in its national interest.

To make such assistance more helpful, we should now accelerate our own research into population control device and techniques. Every effort should be made to inform the Latin American governments and people: on what assistance is available; on how to plan sound population control policies and programs; and on what the consequences can be of various courses of action or inaction.

But I would caution that we cannot force Latin Americans into such policies. There are already deep suspicions in Latin America that, as one of them says, "the rich nations who worry about population growth are concerned about reducing the number of Puerto Ricans, Hindus, Negroes, Chinese, and Mexicans; or else, of certain classes and social groups, like the poor, the working class, or the Catholics. But they do not worry, for example, about the increase of Aryans, of Protestants, or of Rotarians."

This argument, in my judgment, is unsound; in fact, it is the advanced and fortunate nations and groups which now practice the most active population-control policies, on an individual basis. But it does illustrate a barrier of suspicion which confronts our efforts dealing with the growth of population.

We cannot, therefore, attempt to compel Latin Americans to practice birth control; this would only inflame suspicions that we seek to keep them underpopulated and weak. But we should stand ready to help; we should encourage any efforts they undertake to make themselves more aware of their problem; and, while recognizing that the decisions must be made freely by Latin Americans themselves, we should help them make the decision that is truly in the interest of their people and serves the goals of the Alliance.

VI. THE POLITICS OF THE ALLIANCE

Capital resources, investment, education, land reform, and all the rest are essential to the creation of a modern state. They will be the program of any developing country, anywhere in the world, which is engaged in the painful and arduous search for economic progress and social justice. In Latin America, however, those achievements are sought within a framework of political democracy and individual freedom. The Latin American nations are Western nations. Unlike many others, they share values and traditions, history and religion with the countries of Europe and with the United States. Their intellectuals, leaders, and peoples have been nourished on a belief in freedom.

That freedom has often been denied. They have suffered more than their share of despots, dictators, and oligarchical rule. But from Bolivar to the present, democracy and freedom have been a goal, a rallying cry and a belief. Democracy is what Latin Americans want. It is what they intend to have. And it is what we must help them to achieve.

For this was the test to which all the American nations pledged themselves in the Charter of Punta del Este: whether men can achieve progress with freedom, whether rapid transition to the modern age is possible within the sometimes cumbersome but always liberating forms of democracy. And this is why our policy must always be directed toward the strengthening of full representative democracy in every country in this continent.

Of course, the choice and struggle is for the Latin Americans themselves. But we must also realize that our acts can have an enormous influence on the third great pillar of the Alliance—the politics of democratic development.

THE PROBLEM OF POWER: THE UNITED STATES THROUGH LATIN AMERICAN EYES

The United States can never seem neutral to Latin Americans. Partly this is because the United States is so powerful; most Latin Americans sincerely believe that we ordain most of what happens in the hemisphere. For the United States looms over the continent in a way that is difficult to appreciate from the North. The Dominican Republic is only one of many crises this Nation has experienced in the last several years; but it is the one issue which is raised with an American visitor by Latins of all political persuasions. We regard it as an isolated incident, an ad hoc response to a unique threat; they see it as a reminder of the past and a harbinger of the future, a threat to every principle of national independence and self-determination; just as in the past the Bay of Pigs invasion seemed to many to signal a new type of threat from the North.

We seldom think of overseas oil operations as important factors in our economy; but in Peru, an impasse in negotiations between the government and a U.S. oil company brought a slowdown of our development assistance; the same was true in Argentina; and the Venezuelan economy depends in large part on oil company decisions on whether to sell from their fields there, or from the Middle East.

The price our housewives pay for coffee is perhaps a matter for a few minutes' casual conversation; but a small drop in the price we pay would cancel out much of the benefit of our development aid to Brazil each year; and our allocation of sugar quotas can swing economies in several nations.

These are but examples of the many ways in which Latin America is directly dependent on events and decisions made in the United States; circumstances of the greatest importance to them, which they feel powerless to affect or alter.

And because these actions are of great importance to Latin Americans, they assume that we realize and intend every consequence of our acts. They often try to read far too much into particular policy or decision. If we recognize a government, they assume that we approve it. If we give assistance to a nation's army, many assume that we desire a military takeover.

Latin Americans, whose governments are deeply intertwined with business, do not distinguish between private acts—decisions about investment, market prices, and so on—and the decisions of government. So the U.S. Government, in their eyes, is directly responsible for every facet of Latin American economic relations with the United States.

Now we know that the United States is not omnipotent—that we often act, or fail to act, by mistake or inadvertence—that we may recognize or deal with a government simply because it is there, and assist it because it is the best of alternatives, none of which is wholly satisfactory. And we know that most economic decisions in the United States are made by private parties, not by the Government.

These are things we know, but many Latin Americans do not appreciate; they see us in their terms, just as we tend to look at them in our terms. And the essence of a foreign policy is results—which means that we should be concerned not just with our own judgment of our motives and actions, but as much with the judgments of those with whom we deal.

This is not to say that popularity should be the standard of our actions. Indeed, there have been many occasions in the past, and will be others in the future, when our judgment of national interest, or even the best interests of others, will be decidedly unpopular; and on those occasions we will simply have to stand unpopularity. But throughout our history, we have maintained that "decent respect for the opinions of mankind" which the Declaration of Independence professed. And we owe the deepest solicitude for the views of our partners in the unique experiment of the Alliance for Progress.

Every decision we make which affects Latin America, therefore, should receive close and knowledgeable attention at the highest levels of government. We must learn to deal with our hemispheric colleagues in a manner which, at least, accepts their definition of an issue's importance. We will not thereby come to agree with them on every decision, nor will we thus "solve" our problems in Latin America. But we will at least not fail to do so through carelessness and lack of effort.

Some years ago, John Foster Dulles went on a mission to Latin America. His hosts said to him, "Good to have you here, Mr. Secretary." "You shouldn't feel that way," Dulles replied, "for I go only where there is trouble." If the policy of paying attention only to trouble were ever to return, then there would be trouble enough for generations to come.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE INTERNAL POLITICS OF LATIN AMERICA

With these considerations in mind, what should be our role in political and social change in Latin America?

To what extent can the United States influence social and political change in Latin America? To what extent is it legitimate for us to do so—or fail to do so?

Should we deal with people only through established governments? And, most difficult of all, what should be our attitude and policy toward undemocratic governments, or those which resist necessary reform?

The last is the most obviously controversial. In the last decade—as earlier in Latin American history—many governments have been overturned in military coups. Just since the inauguration of the Alliance in 1961, elected or other constitutional governments have been overthrown, or prevented from taking office, in Honduras, Peru, Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, Guatemala, and Ecuador. Almost every Latin American government lives under threat of such military action; only Mexico has avoided it in the last 30 years, though other governments have contained the power of the military.

It is contended, by some, that governments established by military coup are so contrary to the spirit of the Alliance that all U.S. aid and assistance to such governments should cease; to others, these governments are a force for stability and order, and should be the object of our unstinting support. For the reasons which follow, I regard the question as one of much greater complexity.

The essence of our attitude was restated by President Johnson, who said that the United States "reserves its special friendship" for progressive, democratic governments—and, last month, that "despots are not welcome in this hemisphere."

But to say that the United States must reserve its special friendship for the forces of democratic progress does not answer all questions. It is easy, in Venezuela or Chile or Peru, to know whom to support; in each, a bona fide democratic government shows the purpose and promise of effective reform. But this is not the case in every country; and we must realize that every country presents a unique situation which must be confronted on its own facts.

BRAZIL: A CASE HISTORY

Take the example of Brazil, which has stirred great debate, in Latin American and in the United States. There Janio Quadros was elected President in 1960; Joao Goulart, a survivor from the party of former dictator Getulio Vargas, was elected Vice President—though he was opposed to Quadros, and received a minority of the popular vote. Quadros resigned as President a few months after his inauguration, and after 2 weeks of uncertainty and crises, Goulart became President.

But his government—by any standards—was disastrous. Inflation soared for 3 years, reaching over 80 percent in 1963; by early 1964, it was progressing at an annual rate of over 100 percent. Corruption was endemic; Goulart, his brother-in-law, and friends became some of the largest landowners and richest men in the country. No Communist himself, he thought to ride the tiger, and placed many in high posts in government and in the government-controlled labor unions. Only at the end of his term was there even a demagogic effort at land reform; no reforms in taxes were ever attempted. As President Kennedy's special representative, I visited him in 1962 to state that our aid funds were being entirely dissipated, that they were having no effect on the lives of the Brazilian people; but no reforms were made.

His failure to deal with inefficiency and corruption led finally to revolution: to a military coup supported by large numbers of the urban middle classes, and by many civilian politicians. Goulart was thoroughly discredited, and few were sorry to see him go. The direct causes of the military move were enlisted men's revolts, first in the air force and army and later in the navy, encouraged by Goulart, which threatened military powers and officer prerogatives. But it was widespread popular discontent which weakened Goulart and enabled the army to move.

The military secured from Congress the election of Gen. Humberto Castello Branco as President, with a government of highly able technocrats—economists and engineers. And hundreds of the principal political figures of Brazil were either jailed or prohibited from engaging in politics.

The new Government moved, through 1964 and 1965, to control inflation; to build up Brazil's shaky economy; and to set targets for reform. In October 1965, further, more drastic changes were made. A new Institutional Act established a Presidential power to override and disregard the Congress; the old splinter parties were banned, the Government attempting to consolidate them into two parties; more people were deprived of their political rights. At the same time, a new presidential election was announced for 1966—not, as in the past, by popular vote, but by indirect vote of the Congress—and President Castello Branco announced that he would not run to succeed himself.

What kind of balance sheet can be drawn up for the present Government of Brazil? Clearly, it tore the fabric of constitutional legitimacy to take over the Government; equally clearly, the previous Government did not enjoy popular support, and the country had been plunging into chaos which itself might have led to an extreme and illegitimate solution.

This new Government suppressed many of the old political figures; yet President Castello Branco defied powerful elements of the army to allow prominent opposition candidates to be inaugurated as Governors of the States of Guanabara and Minas Gerais after free elections in 1965. And a colonel who agitated against the Governors' inaugurations was jailed.

The new Government promulgated a strict decree to control the press; yet it permits widespread criticism in the newspapers.

It removed and banned from political life the Director of SUDENE, the U.S.-supported agency for social and economic development in the impoverished northeast, and others of Brazil's ablest young reformers. Yet it pledged, for the first time, a fixed proportion of Federal revenues to SUDENE; it has diminished the influence of some of the vested economic interests throughout the country; it is moving toward real tax reform and enforcement; and it secured a constitutional amendment authorizing payment for expropriated land in bonds rather than cash—a step essential to land redistribution—and sponsored comprehensive land reform legislation; neither of these steps had been taken by the previous Government.

In sum, the new Government has made considerable steps forward, and considerable steps backward; it seems, on balance, a far better government than the one it replaced; yet it is still far from the constitutional democracy which is its stated objective, which most Brazilians desire, and which I believe is the desire of President Castello Branco.

And in Latin American eyes, rightly or wrongly, we bear a heavy responsibility for its existence. Less than 3 weeks before the coup, it was reported in the press that, in private administration councils, our Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs said that the United States would not automatically oppose every military takeover in the hemisphere. We recognized the new Government very quickly, within 3 days of the coup, and 3 months later gave it a special loan of $50 million. We became heavily identified with the new Government and its development program. And we continue to give it large amounts of economic assistance, which are critical to its present economic program.

There have been suggestions that we cut off aid to Brazil; I believe these suggestions are wrong. Cutting off aid would not benefit, but would harm, the people of Brazil. It would be sharply resented by the many Brazilians who support the present government; and indeed, in my judgment, by many who do not. The Alliance for Progress was not meant to be—and could not be—a means for the United States to determine the government of every American nation. As President Johnson said, we do not "seek to impose on others any form of government." The governments of Latin America are for the people of each Latin American nation to determine; their struggles, and their political conflicts, must be their own. Independence and responsibility are not given or taught; they can only be learned by practice—including the practice of making mistakes.

All this does not mean, however, that the United States should uncritically accept military coups or undemocratic governments—much less that we should become identified with them. Instead we should make clear our commitment to democratic institutions, and continue to work for progress and reform.

PRESSURE TOWARD DEMOCRACY

What does this mean in our relations with a government such as that of Brazil—remembering, at the same time, that each case must stand on its own facts, and each nation on its own traditions and beliefs?

First, we should express our strong support for those forces which are working for free elections and a return to full representative democracy, and for actions which lead to that goal. President Castello Branco, as I have said, has worked to insure that the military abide by the results of elections; but there has been, and is, opposition to this course. In this situation, the expressed opinion of the United States, and of the other nations of Latin America can make a difference—in my judgment, a major difference.

Second, we should maintain a relationship with the forces of reform, even though they are not in control of the government, and may actually be repressed by it. Students—union leaders—progressive businessmen—these, in the long run, will be more important to the future of their nation than will generals or admirals. We cannot ignore them simply because they may be at odds with the government of the day.

Third, we should confine our identification to those acts of the Government which are in accord with the ideals of the Alliance—projects of social reform in the impoverished northeast, improved education, land and tax reform—which will contribute to political democracy and social justice. We should also continue our assistance for programs of general economic development, for the general benefit of the Brazilian people; but we should make clear that we do not wish to be associated with acts of political dictatorship, and not identify ourselves with a government which engages in such acts. We should, in short, talk less about the virtues of the Government—and more about what it does.

In this connection, I draw the attention of the Senate to the New York Times for Monday, May 9. A report from the excellent correspondent Juan De Onis states that "renewed signs of military intimidation of opposition" are feeding public discontent with the Government.

For example, three members of Catholic University Action, a student organization headed by the great Dom Helder Camara, archbishop of Recife, have been held in military prisons for 35 days, without the presentation of any charges or contact with their families. They appear to have been imprisoned because their patron, the archbishop, refused to celebrate a mass in connection with the anniversary of the military takeover 2 years ago, and because their student publication had been critical of the present Government's education policies.

Clearly, these are internal acts of the Government of Brazil. They are the concern of the people of Brazil, and we have no right to interfere in their internal affairs.

But in my judgment, Congress, the executive branch of the Government, and the people of the United States as a whole must be seriously concerned. For through the Alliance for Progress and through other aid programs, the United States provides substantial assistance to the Government of Brazil.

Such acts as have just occurred within Brazil were not contemplated by us or by other nations of the Alliance when the charter was signed 5 years ago.

I believe it would be helpful for us to express our concern about activities of this kind. I favor giving assistance to Brazil. I believe we should continue to supply aid or assistance to Brazil. But we should also make it quite clear that we do not condone the actions that have occurred in this particular case. If the individual students are guilty of some violation of the law of Brazil, they should be tried and there should be a public disposition of the case. However, the facts reported by Juan De Onis in the New York Times reveal that three students have been locked up now for 35 days without any charges having been made against them, and their major crime seems to have been an association with the Archbishop of Recife. I believe that anybody who has been to Recife, in northeast Brazil, cannot help being impressed by the efforts for democratic social reform which are being made by the Archbishop.

There are other means to help democracy in Brazil and throughout the hemisphere. The conduct of American business firms operating there can make a difference—whether in a quiet luncheon with a Cabinet Minister or in a fair wage settlement or in recognition of a labor union. Our labor unions, through their Latin American affiliates, can also influence opinion. The opinions of the bankers to whom a government turns for loans, or of the U.S. professors it hires to teach in the universities, or of the U.S. press—all these can have an influence.

These are not strange devices. They are, indeed, the standard means by which opinion and action are influenced within our own country. They are not spectacular; they should not, and will not, work changes in governments overnight; they will not always produce the changes we desire. But these must be the essence of politics in the American community of nations—the politics of the Alliance for Progress; a politics not of coercion, but of persuasion, under a banner of shared ideals.

From time to time, more drastic steps may be proper. A coup against democratic government, supported only by force, may well be the occasion for withdrawal of aid. Thus, after military coups in Honduras and Peru in 1962, we suspended all assistance programs and refused recognition until definite commitments to free elections and respect for civil liberties were made by the military governments. Those commitments were made and kept, and led to the election of the progressive Peruvian Government of President Belaunde in 1963.

I understand from some of the conversations that I have had with representatives of the State Department who have responsibilities in the field of Latin American affairs that these representatives of the State Department were critical of the actions taken by President Kennedy and his administration in 1962. They have stated, informally at least, that that practice would not be followed in the future. I should hope that the practice will be followed.

The kind of policies which were followed by the Government in 1962 were very effective in Latin America. They indicated clearly to the Latin American people how we stood on these matters. That is the correct procedure to follow. The efforts we made in Peru and Honduras in 1962 were very effective in helping to establish governments which responded to the will of the people.

In some cases, collective sanctions by the Organization of American States may be appropriate. Or, in the narrow and limited situation where a legitimate government is overthrown by naked force directed or supported from abroad, more drastic steps, on a collective basis through the OAS, may be required. But, in the overwhelming majority of cases, we must rely on the people of the Americas themselves, supported by political action such as I have suggested, to move toward the goals of the Alliance.

AID AS A WEAPON: FOREIGN POLICY

There is a temptation—one to which we have sometimes given in—to use our great power and our aid to force agreement from other nations, or to punish them for their disagreement. This temptation is most obvious in matters of foreign policy and the cold war: whether a country voted in the OAS to approve our action in the Dominican Republic, or perhaps whether it recognizes Communist China or votes for its admission to the United Nations. These are matters of considerable importance to the United States. It is understandable that officials in the Executive Branch or Members of Congress or others in the country would feel that nations which fail to stand with us are not reliable allies and should not receive U.S. assistance.

But this feeling, so understandable in the passions and excitement of the moment, can only be harmful over the long run. We expect our Government to reflect the feelings of our people. Latin Americans expect the same from their governments and deeply resent any government which seems less than fully independent in its decisions. One Latin American President put it to me succinctly: "If you want a government that says always 'yes, yes, yes'," he told me, "you will soon have to deal with a government that says always, 'no, no, no'."

VII. THREATS FROM LEFT AND RIGHT

The forces of progressive democracy in Latin America have many enemies and obstacles. They are under attack from the right and the left—from those who would sacrifice justice to preserve the past and from those who would heedlessly impose bloodshed and dictatorship to hasten change. I would like to discuss briefly two of the most pervasive obstacles to democracy in Latin American countries—the Communist threat and the interference with constitutional processes by some of the Latin American military establishments.

THE COMMUNIST THREAT

There should be no mistake—the threat of communism in Latin America is real. But there are many mistakes made about this threat—mistakes of fact, mistakes of judgment, and mistakes of action. And if the threat is not to become reality, we cannot afford mistakes.

At the outset, we must realize that communism means different things to Americans on different sides of the Rio Grande. When we think of communism, we think of the Berlin wall, of Hungary, of the liquidation of the kulaks and the repressions of thought which did not end even with the passing of Stalin. But to Latins, these are faraway matters, and our confrontation with the Soviet Union is largely irrelevant to their concern.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union are powerful, rich, and advancing; the Latin American nations, by comparison, are weak and poor, their development and progress uncertain. Latin Americans are aware only dimly of the past crimes of the Soviet or Chinese rulers; the magnitude of these iniquities is diluted by distance. The shortcomings of the United States—which are in no sense equal in the moral balance—are yet more apparent to Latin Americans because we are closer and because we affect them directly.

Communism in Latin America, furthermore, is not simply a conspiracy to take power, financed and supported from abroad, although both the U.S.S.R. and China are directly helping Communist movements in many places in the hemisphere. It also has an appeal for many who seek a nonexistent shortcut to economic progress and social justice.

And as an interpretation of their experience, Marxism has strong appeal to many Latin Americans. They have, after all, been exploited for generations; capitalism to them means foreign domination, or a system in which their own privileged classes create monopolistic enterprises with which to rob the nation. Communism says that capitalism must fall. Some, therefore, see communism as the answer to many of their most pressing social problems. For some, this is most true of Chinese communism, which adds to traditional Marxist theory the prediction that the poor southern half of the world will eventually encircle and vanquish the more fortunate north, and offers to all an alliance against the fortunate half in which we live.

This alliance has been accepted by only a small minority—small guerrilla bands in Peru, terrorist groups in Venezuela, small groups of intellectuals and students elsewhere.

But their small numbers do not make these groups harmless. In Venezuela, for example, the elections of 1963 were carried out with the greatest difficulty in the midst of terrorism; Caracas still resembles in many ways a city under siege by hostile forces. More significantly, these groups are often more disciplined and active than the forces of democratic reform; and, all too often, they are the only group showing apparent concern for improvement in the lot of the landless peasant or the urban slum dweller.

There is a village in the Andes where only one person has ever come to say that he believed in land for the peasants. That one man was a Communist; and now many of these villagers call themselves Communists, too, since they are in favor of land reform. That is the great danger of subversion in Latin America: that if we allow communism to carry the banner of reform, then the ignored and the dispossessed, the insulted and injured, will turn to it as the only way out of their misery.

And I regret to say that some of our actions, and those of some Latin American governments, have helped the Communists to do this. For many years, the established order in Latin America has referred to all efforts for reform and justice, as Communist. This, of course, only strengthens the false Communist claim to represent the forces of progress and democracy; and the claim is further strengthened when such leaders as President Frei of Chile, President Leoni of Venezuela, and President Belaunde of Peru—all democratic reformers, all stout fighters against communism—are referred to by rightwing Latin American circles as Communists.

This we must clearly understand. Communism is not a native growth in Latin America. Given any meaningful alternative, its people will reject communism and follow the path of democratic reform and membership in the inter-American system. But if we allow ourselves to become allied with those to whom the cry of "communism" is only an excuse for the perpetuation of privilege—if we assist, with military material and other aid, governments which use that aid to prevent reform for their people—then we will give the Communists a strength which they cannot attain by anything they themselves might do.

President Johnson's Mexico City address set what must be our policy: "We will not be deterred," he said, "by those who say that to risk change is to risk communism."

COMMUNISM ARMED: INSURGENCY AND ITS COUNTER

President Johnson also said:

> The threat * * * from communism cannot be met merely by force. We will continue to concentrate our assistance mainly in economic and social fields * * *. We are encouraged that democracy flourishes in countries such as Mexico where expenditures for education and development are high.

One aspect of this problem, however, requires more direct discussion and action: armed insurgency and terrorism.

Even a government of true reform is not invulnerable to armed force; bombs and bullets can terrorize and intimidate even citizens who are thoroughly loyal to their government. In the present circumstances of most Latin American nations, moreover, tens of millions of people, whatever efforts are made in their behalf, will continue to have substantial grievances for many years to come; some may explode into violence and insurgency. And there is throughout much of the Latin American countryside a tradition of freebooting violence and banditry, which organized terrorists may recruit to their own banners.

If governments are to move toward progress and freedom, they must be able to defend themselves against internal attack. In Venezuela in 1963, for example, a relatively small group of terrorists, through shootings and bombings, was able to raise serious doubts as to whether the elections could be carried out. The challenge was defeated; the election was held; and for the first time in Venezuelan history, an elected President succeeded a President who had himself served a full legal term. This outcome was due in large part to the competence of the Venezuelan police—who proved able to contain the terrorists without such use of excessive or indiscriminate force as to alienate the general population.

That this result was possible was due in large part to the counterinsurgency training program initiated by Venezuela 3 years before, in the midst of another crisis. In 1961, terrorist activity, supported from Castro's Cuba, was at a peak. President Betancourt was threatened on two sides: by the terrorists themselves; and by the army, which was close to taking over in the name of public order.

A special crash program was then begun by Betancourt and Venezuela to combat the insurgency. Police were trained, among other things, in mob and riot control; in infiltration of subversive organizations; in fast communications. The immediate crisis was surmounted; and the groundwork was laid for the successful election of 1963.

Why was this special effort needed, in a country with large and powerful armed forces?

The answer lies in the special nature of counterinsurgency. Counterinsurgency is not a military problem; a military answer is the failure of counterinsurgency and often the beginning of full-scale civil war. The essential character of military force, in an insurgency, is that it is undiscriminating in its application—and too powerful in its effects. If a terrorist is in a village, napalm or artillery or machine guns cannot be used on him without abandoning the first duty of a government—the duty to protect its people.

Therefore, the major counterinsurgency force must be civilian police, trained to minimal and discriminating use of force—police whose instinct is for the peace of the city and not the peace of the grave.

But I wish to emphasize—and it cannot be overemphasized, as we face more of these problems in the years ahead—that there is much more to controlling insurgency than the training of police and controlling the military. Insurgency aims not at the conquest of territory, but at the allegiance of men. And it can be countered only by capturing the allegiance of men. That allegiance, in the Latin American countryside, as in other threatened parts of the world, can be won only by positive programs of social justice; by land reform; by schools; by honest administration; by roads and clinics and labor unions and even-handed justice, and a share for all men in the decisions that shape their lives. Counterinsurgency might best be described as social reform under pressure.

Any effort which disregards the base of social reform, and becomes preoccupied with gadgets and techniques and force, is in my judgment, doomed to failure. Counterinsurgency is not a miracle detergent, which whisks away Communists from any country. Its techniques are useful and valuable only when the government is carrying on a real program of social reform—a program which meets the basic responsibilities of a government, and the basic needs of its people.

However obvious as this lesson might appear, there are some within our own government, as well as some leaders of other countries, who have not recognized its teachings. For us, this failure will be costly; for others, around the world and not just in Latin America, this mistake will be their last.

COMMUNISM, INTERVENTION, AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Here I would say a few words about our intervention in the Dominican Republic. It is not my purpose to rake over the rights and wrongs of the incident. But certain things must be said; for there are lessons to be learned—and the Dominican Republic will be a major element in our relations with Latin America for years to come. Everywhere I went in Latin America, this was the first question asked me; not just by students, but by reporters, by businessmen, by government officials.

First, let us not delude ourselves. The intervention in the Dominican Republic has seriously damaged our relations with Latin America. Its effect will not be readily apparent in good times, such as President Johnson's visit; but unless it is offset by vigorous positive action, it will be brought up at every difficult period in the future. Most Latin Americans do not believe that the revolt was Communist-inspired or directed. Even if they did, they do not concede any right of the United States to intervene unilaterally apart from the OAS.

Second, what is now most important is what we do in the future. The damage is not irreparable, and can be more than offset by positive social and economic programs along the lines set out by the President in Mexico City. In the Dominican Republic itself, to the people there and in the rest of Latin America, we can demonstrate that our purpose is not to suppress popular government, even if we disagree with it. Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, one of our ablest diplomats, has done a great service to the United States, and to the Dominican Republic, by steering the OAS forces on a firm and steady course of protecting order and paving the way toward free elections. We must continue this course: by assuring that free elections are held, and supporting the results, whoever comes to power. And we also have a special responsibility to help rebuild the strife-ravaged economy of the country. Throughout my trip to Latin America, I stressed that our objective was free choice for the people of the Dominican Republic—that we had no territorial demands or interests, and would abide by any choice made by the Dominican people. I believe if we can be successful in this endeavor, we shall offset much of the damage that has been done.

Third, we must realize that we cannot put down disorder everywhere in the hemisphere, and concentrate instead on programs of social improvement which will minimize disorder. It is one thing to send 30,000 troops to an island nation of 3.6 million, of whom a few thousand were under arms in a single major city. It would be something else, indeed, to attempt the same thing in a country like Brazil, larger than the United States, with a population of 80 million; or Argentina, with 24 million people and vast expanses of plain; or any of the nations of the Andean fastness.

Fourth, we should make it clear that we will not take such action in the future without serious and precise consultation with the Organization of American States. We may further wish to explore means to strengthen the machinery of the OAS for dealing with future crises. But we probably cannot press for successful action now; several of the larger nations are convinced that a strengthened OAS might be only a tool for U.S. intervention in their internal affairs. And nations such as Peru, Chile, and Venezuela would rather deal with their subversion problems unaided than subject themselves to multilateral intervention by nations like Argentina and Brazil.

And there is another lesson to be drawn from the Dominican Republic. The greatest success for nations, as for individuals, is found in truth to themselves. We did not build the United States on anticommunism. The strength of our institutions, the energy and talent of Americans, come out of our long struggle to build a nation of justice and freedom and happiness. Ours is the strength of positive faith; we need neither to hate nor fear our adversaries. Let our emphasis be, then, less on what the Communists are doing to threaten peace and order in Latin America—and more on what we can do to help to build a better life for its people.

THE MILITARY

The other principal obstacle to progressive democracy in Latin America is the deeply ingrained habit of intervention in politics by the armed forces of many Latin American countries. At one time such interventions often took the form of military dictatorships designed to retain political power for an indefinite period. But since the wave of revolutions in the 1950's, which swept most of the generals from office, military intervention has, for the most part, taken a new form. It is used to depose civilian leaders who are distasteful to the military; or, at times, to their allies among the reactionary forces of a particular country. After a period of time, the country is then returned to civilian rule more acceptable to the military.

The military has also changed in its composition in recent years; once the preserve of the oligarchy, it is now largely made up of sons of the middle class, who see it as an attractive and prestigious career. These new officers have brought new focus to the military's interest in politics; in some countries, the army has sought to play a modernizing—if not a democratizing—role.

Still the day and the danger of military dictatorship are not over. Though we should recognize that the military have been an important force for order in some situations, yet many a Latin American leader must live in constant awareness that he is watched from the barracks, that a misstep may bring the tanks to his door. Under such circumstances, the establishment of democratic traditions and constitutional process becomes difficult in the extreme.

THE WASTE OF THE MILITARY

For whatever its short-run effects, military intervention only creates instability over the long run. Constitutions are obeyed out of practice and habit; every military takeover breaks the structure of consensual obedience, encouraging others to seek change through force rather than by democratic persuasion.

Those who would look to the military as the source of long-run stability and friendship for the United States should look instead to history. Military leaders, such as Col. Juan Peron, have often been as demagogic, and as ready to bid for popular support through anti-U.S. acts, as civilians. And the most stable country in Latin America, with a sound currency and a stable and reasonable policy toward U.S. investment, is Mexico—which virtually abolished its army in the aftermath of revolution 30 years ago.

And the military absorbs resources that would be better used elsewhere. Some of these resources are material. While arms expenditures are low, compared to the more developed countries, some countries devote substantial sums to military items for which there is not a real need. The budgets of many Latin American governments contain nearly as much for arms as they do for capital budget investment—on the roads and dams and schools that are essential to development. Argentina, for example, spends 15 percent on arms as against only 17.7 percent for capital investment; the Dominican Republic, before the revolution, 17.8 percent on arms and only 15.7 percent on capital investment.

A further waste is in the young men who go into the Army—men whose energies and talents would be far better used in the economic and political life of their countries. And the final waste is in the other young men who go neither into the Army nor into civilian politics, because they regard their politics as ineffectual. I sat in a party in one Latin American capital last fall among a group of distinguished men. We heard one of them, a general, calmly discussing whether the Army would allow a certain governor to take his office if he were elected by the people. The answer was negative.

WHAT CAN WE DO

The question, therefore, is not whether the role of the military should be diminished, but how. The primary responsibility, of course, belongs to the Latin Americans themselves. But we can help them. And we must not, by careless or undue aid to the military, hinder Latin Americans in their efforts to eliminate the military's role in their politics.

The first step we should take, as I said earlier, is to make clear that we are firmly opposed to military intervention in government.

The second step we can now take is to reevaluate the amount and quality of our military assistance. Grant assistance to Latin America is not great; in 1964, it was $51.4 million, 50 percent of it in counterinsurgency equipment—small arms, jeeps, communications. But some of our aid is in forms which only encourage greater expenditure, of little relevance to the problems of subversion which are the only major threat to these nations' security. For example, we loan warships to several nations. The ships are free; but they must be manned, and operated, and sometimes modernized. And the dynamics of interservice rivalry insure that whatever opportunities for arms spending we offer will be accepted.

Moreover, we should carefully weigh the internal political consequences of any proposed military assistance. It is one thing to aid a Venezuelan Army which must combat Castroite terrorism; it is quite another thing to make jet planes available to an air force which has never seen action except against its own government or other service branches.

Third, we should lead the way toward cutting down arms sales to Latin America. Of the needlessly advanced weapons in Latin America, most were purchased, not donated by the United States. And it is arms purchases, not grants, which use up valuable foreign exchange.

As we are the major supplier of military arms, we should make the major effort to cut down arms purchases—in Latin America and around the world. This will require cooperation with our European allies; thus we made one recent fighter plane sale largely because the French firm which manufactures the plane under license would have sold the airplane if we had not. But cooperation comes out of leadership—which we must be willing to exercise.

Fourth, we should exercise our influence in support of efforts for Latin American disarmament. Such efforts would help to eliminate that part of arms expenditure which grows out of national rivalries. It would, over time, help to diminish military intervention in politics. And it could furnish a model and a testing ground for other disarmament efforts—in Africa, in the Middle East, eventually perhaps in Europe and Asia.

This is most notably true in the area of nuclear weapons.

Nineteen Latin American republics, under United Nations auspices, are working in a preparatory commission for the denuclearization of Latin America. Their work is going forward, under the leadership of Chairman Alfonso Garcia Robles, of Mexico, and Vice Chairman Jose Sette Camara, of Brazil. But there is a serious obstacle in the way of agreement. Cuba has thus far regrettably refused to join any agreement on a nuclear-free zone; and some nations of Latin America are understandably reluctant to sign such an agreement with Cuba outside it.

But the spread of nuclear weapons cannot increase the security of any American nation. Those who are concerned with possible nuclear weapons in a Communist Cuba should remember how swiftly and firmly the whole hemisphere acted, through the Organization of American States, to remove a nuclear threat from Cuba in October of 1962. And there can be no doubt that the OAS would again act to prevent any nuclear threat from Cuba in the future. We should, therefore, strive for a nuclear-free zone even if Cuba elects not to join it—even if Cuba remains outside the treaty and outside the inter-American system. For the insecurity and possible destruction that would follow the introduction of nuclear weapons into this continent could be to the advantage of no nation and no cause.

Fifth, we should attempt to work with the many Latin American military officers who come to the United States for training—to help them acquire the spirit of nonpolitical military service which has been so important to our own political development; and to help them also understand the necessary difference between the patient ways of civilian politics and the direct action of war. We spend fully one-fifth as much to train foreign military personnel here as we do for all the operations of USIA; yet we do not, apparently, pay enough attention to whether they leave these shores with a proper respect for the constitutional processes we seek, through all this effort, to defend. For all too many of the young officers who have intervened in politics, in Latin America and elsewhere in the world, have been trained in the United States.

Sixth, we should use our military aid to help Latin American armies move toward a role in the great task of economic and social development. In many nations of the developing world, the army has played a significant role: educating its young recruits, building houses and roads and schools in remote rural areas. I saw some of this being done. But the effort should expand. The armies of Latin America could and should turn their energies to such objectives in this hemisphere. Technical assistance might be sought from the most successful of these development-oriented armies, that of Israel.

Finally, and most importantly, we must realize that the solution to the military problem lies in a solution to the basic problems of Latin America. Here as elsewhere, it is essential that the full influence of the United States be exercised on behalf of the basic reforms which improve the life and opportunities of the mass of Latin America's people—which build the power of democratic civilian institutions, in political parties, in labor unions, in rural cooperatives. That, in the end, is the source of true stability.

CONCLUSION

It was to all these problems—to the need for fundamental economic and political and social change—that the Alliance for Progress was addressed. What progress have we made in these 5 years? In sum, it is this:

Economically, the Alliance is moving—but it is not moving fast enough. Governments are working—but they are not working hard enough. The United States is making a contribution—but in many ways, not enough.

Francis Bacon said, "Hope is a good breakfast but a lean supper." The ideals of the Alliance stirred men's hearts and minds throughout the continent; now, 5 years after it began, not enough has been done to fulfill these hopes and keep the passion, imagination, and commitment alive and growing.

The Alliance when it was created was given a heart and a soul. The Alliance, to be successful now and in the future, requires both.

Now President Johnson has recalled us to the task in which we joined at Punta del Este. And it is in support of that call that I have made certain proposals. While they do not constitute a comprehensive program—the Alliance itself is the comprehensive program for the future of the Americas—they do represent some of the steps I feel we must take if we are to fulfill the promise of the Alliance.

Above all else, we must be associated, in every way, through a broad array of attitudes and policies, which should infuse the acts and decisions of the U.S. Government and every individual U.S. official, with the goals of human dignity, social justice, and political democracy toward which economic and material progress is only a means.

No matter what we do in the economic field, if we concentrate only in the economic field, if we concentrate only on economic progress, there will be no lasting benefit, and it will not work. We must have social progress and social reforms; the people of the United States must be identified with the aspirations of the people of Latin America.

If we fail to take that step, no matter what economic progress we make, we will be unsuccessful in our relations with the people of Latin America and we will be unsuccessful in dealing with the problem.

This is the heart and the core of any program we undertake. It was the heart and the core of the idea of President Kennedy in the Alliance for Progress in 1961. If we are to be successful in the rest of the 1960's, and successful in preparing for the 1970's we must have that same spirit infuse all our programs, or we are going to have disaster.

We must stand with the men and women and parties who themselves stand for these goals. And we must increase our stress on the need for basic social reforms as a condition of full participation in the Alliance for Progress.

This spirit must suffuse every one of the specific actions and proposals I have made.

That spirit must infuse all of the programs advanced by the administration. It must be present in all the programs I am about to suggest. Without that kind of spirit—and on occasion I feel that spirit is either lacking or that we fail to feel its importance—no matter what else we do in our relationships with Latin America, no matter what other programs we develop, we shall be unsuccessful.

We must understand that the people of Latin America are like the people of the United States. What they want, what they demand, are dignity and justice for themselves and for their families.

Mere economic aid is not enough. We shall not be able to buy the people of Latin America any more than we are able to buy the people of any other part of the world. We may be able to buy a few of the people, just as we may be able to buy a few of the people in the United States, but the people of Latin America have the same kind of spirit, hope, trust, and desires for the future that the people here in the United States have. That fact must be recognized as we develop any of these programs and policies, if we expect success.

I cannot stress that enough. I stressed it yesterday. I stress it today. It must permeate everything. That spirit must permeate all of these programs if they are to be successful.

In summary—I spelled them out in detail, but I shall summarize them now—these are:

In the area of economic development:

First, to support our own Peace Corps, which has done immeasurable good, and increase our program of economic assistance to Latin America, perhaps doubling the amount of capital aid over the next few years, the equivalent of a month's spending in the war in Vietnam.

Second, to assure, through commodity marketing and other common arrangements, and through diversification of exports, a steady and regular flow of export earnings to the Latin American nations.

Third, to encourage responsible private investment which is essential to the development of Latin America. This can be done through strong investment guarantee and loan programs; by a voluntary and privately drafted code for foreign investment establishing business practices which would be fair both to private industry and to the country involved; and by discarding the practice of using aid programs to insure any form of special treatment for American companies.

Fourth, to make increased financial and technical assistance available for population control programs in all Latin American countries which desire to conduct such programs.

In the blending areas of economic development and social justice:

Fifth, to stimulate and help comprehensive programs of land reform—helping to provide money and knowledge for technical assistance; agricultural credit; tools, equipment, and fertilizers; and all the other components of a modern productive agriculture. The volume and the quality of agricultural assistance can be increased by delegating programs of agricultural development in particular countries to individual States of the United States—calling upon their universities, private groups, and governments to directly administer U.S. efforts in particular countries. And throughout we should make clear and actively work for our dedication to the principles of land redistribution and reform as set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este—to the ideal that every man should have the chance to own the land he works.

Sixth, to assist education in Latin America by accelerating our assistance to school systems which will make basic skills and literacy available to the majority of the population, by strengthening universities, especially in those technical and engineering skills essential to development, and helping to create entire new universities freed from the shackling traditions and directions of the past.

Seventh, to improve understanding by Latin American students both of the United States and the problems of their own countries through increased exchange programs, a hemispheric Peace Corps, a policy of freely admitting Latin American visitors to this country regardless of their previous political sympathies, and trying to find new ways of permitting young Latins to share—with their skills and labor—in the work of development in their own countries.

In the all-important area of political development—the drive toward representative democracy and individual freedom.

Eighth, to discourage intervention in the constitutional processes of Latin American countries by reserving full assistance for those governments which are democratically elected or have become irrevocably committed to specific steps for the early establishment of democratic government. In addition, we should make it clear that neither recognition nor aid will be freely given to government established by force and unwilling rapidly to restore constitutional government; realizing that any such policy must take its color and form from the facts of the particular situation.

Ninth, to concentrate our military assistance on preparing Latin American armed forces for the task of counterinsurgency against Communist guerrilla movements, but recognizing that the best and most effective counterinsurgency effort is social and political progress and reform; and to work toward an international machinery for dealing with the threat of Communist revolution in Latin America.

Tenth, to discourage military intervention in Latin American politics, both by our general attitudes and policies, and by specific steps including reduction of military assistance, greater stress of democratic politics and constitutional traditions in the training of Latin American officers, reduction of arms sales, helping to negotiate disarmament agreements among the countries of Latin America, and creating a nuclear-free zone in Latin America.

Eleventh, to improve understanding of Latin America among our own people through direct aid to American schools and universities, including the creation of additional centers of Latin American studies in the United States.

These principles, these guides to action, do not, of course, cover the entire field of our relations with Latin America. Yet they can, I believe, bring us closer to the ideals and goals of the Alliance for Progress as expressed by President Kennedy and, most recently, by President Johnson in Mexico.

These guidelines are part of the immense web of relationships and responsibilities which link the countries of this continent.

From the beginning of our history we have been aware of the special intimacy and promise of the American Republics. In 1822 President Monroe recognized the independence of several Latin American states, proclaiming that "the revolutionary movement in the Spanish provinces excited the sympathy of our fellow citizens from its commencement. The provinces belonging to this hemisphere are our neighbors."

Almost half a century later William Seward related Abraham Lincoln's prophecy that foreign powers would not easily be able to dominate Latin America in the century to come, "while," he said, "population is so rapidly increasing, resources so rapidly developing, and society so steadily forming itself upon principles of democratic government."

In the years of that century, now concluded, there have been times of darkness and anger and arrogance, as well as brighter years of good will, understanding and help. Yet the same principles—the same dreams—guide our action that first moved a young America to rejoice at the independence of its neighbors, and a war-torn America to shield those neighbors from hostile forces; respect for independence, the development of resources for the welfare of all the people, and the growth of democracy. In this respect the Alliance for Progress is rooted in the deepest and most enduring sympathies and experience of the American people.

Those basic principles have demanded policies steadily growing in complexity and in the burdens they placed on the United States. First it was enough to simply offer protection against foreign power. Then, under Roosevelt, we recognized the sovereign dignity of every Latin American state and formulated the array of treaties and agreements which make up the modern inter-American system. Finally, with the Alliance for Progress, the belief in political equality was extended to common responsibility for economic and social and human progress.

Grounded as it is in present necessities, such a goal, like all great human enterprises, rests on a vision, a dim but stirring design for an entire hemisphere. It is the promise of a people spread across two continents liberated for the human fulfillment which is the animating purpose of Western civilization; and of nations strong and self-confident enough not only to live secure in their own independence but to share the obligations of the Western community—of Europe and the United States—to the entire globe.

To accomplish this spacious purpose will require growing programs of assistance and reform, difficult political judgments, painful sacrifices. And all of these will demand practical wisdom, administrative ability, and a willingness to act realistically in the light of circumstance and interest alike. But it will also require something more. We cannot buy or plan or manage this vision into existence. We must believe it and create and then hold fast to those beliefs and dreams, however strongly the urgencies of the moment tempt us from that path. For economic development, social reform, education, land reform, and all the rest are like the shadows of Plato's cave, only the material cast of the great realities of human freedom. No matter how brilliantly we build, how generously we pour forth our treasure, how wisely we use our power, if we neglect the reality behind the act then we will surely fail. Leadership in freedom cannot rest on wealth and power. It depends on fidelity and persistence in those shaping beliefs—democracy, freedom, justice—which men follow from the compulsions of their hearts and not the enslavement of their bodies. We must cope with real dangers, overcome real obstacles, meet real needs; but always in a way which preserves our own allegiance to the principles of the Alliance. Otherwise we will preserve the shadow of progress and security at the expense of the substance of freedom in the New World.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have not been present to hear the Senator's speech today, but I read in the RECORD, that portion of his speech given yesterday, and I wish to commend him for it. The honorable Senator from New York, laid out some excellent ideas for the improvement of U.S. assistance to Latin America.

In the course of that speech he mentioned the effectiveness of the programs of the Partners of the Alliance as being a good first step in our policies. To illustrate the truth of his statements and to point up the success of the Partners of the Alliance programs, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the projects produced by the Texas-Peru partnership be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Texas/Peru—Project information

	Evaluation
23 Small self-help projects implemented by high school students	$3,700
17 electric generators provided by Texas Electric Cooperatives (including transportation)	7,500
40 university scholarships (10 presently in use)	29,200
Open heart surgery on a Peruvian newsboy from Lima and girl from Iquitos. Total costs including postoperative period of room and board	10,000
20 "Little libraries" from Texas Federation of Women's Clubs	2,300
1,200 feet new 1-inch steel cable for suspension bridge (including transportation)	1,000
Small amp-champ generators	625
Wheelbarrows, picks, and shovels for Navan self-help road project	125
Texas Rehabilitation Association provided equipment for Peruvian Institute	300
Elkins Radio Institute of Dallas provided equipment for Peruvian Rehabilitation Institute	340
Funds for Rio Tambo suspension bridge (Marcus, 250)	515
Materials for Moche 4–H Club program	100
Exchange Club of Lubbock assisted with funds for mimeograph machine for jungle school	193
Funds for summer camp and library project, E. Marcus	300
Technical assistance to electric cooperative	500
50 Ampules bull semen	300
East Texas chamber provided school desks for rural school	800
Hereford Rotary Club provided books for Callao miners' home	125
Arrangements for separate visits of mayor of Cuzco, mayor of Puno, cattlemen and others in various areas of Texas	(1)
Arrangements for Peruvian gold exhibit and the World of Peru photographic exhibit	(1)
Special training program for Peruvian rehabilitation specialist	2,000
Total costs including subsistence provided by Texas partners	59,923

[1] NVA: No value assigned.

Values assigned do not include: (1) U.S. committee administrative costs; (2) transportation of people and goods in partners State; (3) contributions in kind such as room and board; (4) public information including brochures, newsletters, and media coverage, and (5) program contributions by Latin American partners committees.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator from New York for the study he is giving to Latin American problems, and the contribution he is making to our good neighbor relations with Latin America.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Texas, as always.

RURAL ELECTRIC AND RURAL TELEPHONE SUPPLEMENTAL FINANCING

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and myself, a bill to provide for a supplemental financing program for rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives. Rural electric and telephone systems are faced with persistent demands for service from new customers and improved service for present users. In the last 5 years alone a total of 1,250,000 new users have been added to these systems. Average rural consumption of electricity has doubled in the last 10 years, rising at a rate of 7.1 percent per year. The average rural subscriber to an REA financed telephone system is making three times as many calls as he did when he first obtained dial service. The Rural Electrification Administration estimates that electric and telephone systems will need $11 billion of new capital in the next 15 years, more than double the loan authorizations approved during the last 15 years.

Because the low density of population is still a prime handicap of rural service, it costs much more to provide quality electric and telephone service in rural areas than in the typical urban areas, in that there are fewer people to use and pay for each mile of construction. For instance there is an average of only 3.5 consumers per mile of line on REA financed electrical systems as contrasted with an average of 33.2 consumers per mile on the lines of class A and B commercial power companies. Average annual revenue of a REA financed electrical system is approximately $460 per mile compared with $7,164 per mile for urban based power companies. Similar problems also burden rural telephone systems. For instance, the average subscriber density for REA telephone borrowers is 4.5 per mile contrasted with 15.9 telephone subscribers per mile for the independent industry and 40 subcribers per mile for the Bell system companies. Annual revenues amount to only $390 per mile for REA borrowers compared with $2,300 per mile for the independent telephone industry.

Increasing demands on the Federal budget to finance defense and the educational, health, poverty, and other needs of our expanding population make it unlikely that the increased capital needs of the rural electric and telephone systems can be met fully through direct loans provided for entirely in the Federal budget. This is amply illustrated by the case history of the current fiscal year's financing of these type systems. For instance, a backlog of loan applications and anticipated applications is expected to reach $764 million by July 1, 1966. We appropriated last year only $402 million to meet these requirements; and, under the budget proposals for the fiscal year 1967, a total of $132 million of these funds was recommended to be held back by the Budget Bureau. The obvious inadequacies in providing electricity and telephones for our rural citizens are apparent. It is necessary, therefore, to find some means of enlisting capital outside the present budget for rural electrification and rural telephone loans.

This bill is designed to meet that need by establishing a Federal electric bank and a Federal telephone bank, both of which will utilize both non-Federal and Federal funds and will eventually become entirely privately owned, operated, and financed corporations. This measure would, therefore, not only meet the need for capital outside of Federal budget resources but would provide it at usable interest rates without destroying the basic concept of REA financing at the 2-percent interest level.

Mr. President, this bill has the full endorsement of both the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the National Telephone Cooperative Association. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be permitted to lay on the desk for a period of 10 days to permit additional Senators to join in its sponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 3337) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to facilitate the extension and improvement of rural electric and telephone service, and to strengthen and stabilize rural electrification and telephone systems by supplementation of the existing sources of Federal financing as provided by titles I and II of the Rural Electrification Act, to furnish additional sources of capital funds, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BASS (for himself and Mr. COOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BASS. I am happy now to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] who is cosponsoring this bill with me today.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] in introducing today a bill to provide a means of supplemental financing for rural electric cooperatives. The Senator from Tennessee and I serve on the Subcommittee on Rural Electrification and Farm Credit of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which will consider this proposal and the recommendations which the administration is expected to make.

The proposal that the Senator from Tennessee and I introduce today is designed to carry out the program adopted by the National Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, which was approved at their annual meeting in February. I was pleased to speak at that meeting in connection with this subject. I outlined in my address the principal features of the bill that has been introduced today.

The Rural Electrification Administration has submitted to Congress a similar bill, which has been introduced in the House and which I understand will be introduced in the Senate. I know that the Senate subcommittee and committee will hold full hearings and that both bills will be considered thoroughly.

In introducing this bill, I do not prejudge any specific proposal of it or any other bill. However, the bill which the distinguished Senator and I introduce today is a serious one. Inasmuch as the administration has proposed a supplemental financing plan, it is important to have the comprehensive proposal of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association before our committee, because the subject of the adequate financing of rural electric cooperatives is vital to the existence of the rural electric program. It is vital in the matter of providing adequate electrical energy to their customers, and it is vital to the growth of rural America.

In 1954, at the time of the Dixon-Yates dispute, I proposed in the Senate that the Tennessee Valley Authority be authorized to finance its needs by the issuance of its securities rather than by depending upon congressional appropriations. I recommended to President Eisenhower that he propose to Congress that such authority be given to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I was a member of the Committee on Public Works, which considered and recommended to the Senate the TVA self-financing bill which became law.

Now I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] in proposing a bill for the benefit of rural electric cooperatives. Although this bill is not identical with the TVA Self-Financing Act, it embodies generally a similar idea, one which would enable rural electric cooperatives to secure supplemental financing from other than Government sources.

I am proud that the Kentucky Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives was the first in the Nation to propose that the cooperatives, through their national organization, conduct a study of the best methods of financing the continuing orderly growth and development of the rural electric system.

I join in sponsoring this bill as an expression, also, of my continuing confidence in the cooperative rural electric and rural telephone systems, and as an expression of my faith in the future of the REA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the address I delivered at the 24th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, on February 14, 1962.

I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in the introduction of a bill which I believe is important to the future of rural electric cooperatives.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVIDING ADEQUATE FINANCING FOR THE FUTURE

(Address by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER at the 24th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Feb. 14, 1966, Las Vegas, Nev.)

I am much honored by being invited to speak at this annual meeting of this association. It seems just a short time ago that I had the honor of speaking to you when I spoke to this convention in Dallas, but it has been 8 years.

It is also a great pleasure to be in the company of many of the pioneer supporters of rural electrification, whose efforts and devotion have brought light and power to areas once dark and cold.

In 1947—when I was in the Senate for 2 years—I first met Clyde Ellis in a fight we joined in for TVA. In the years that have followed, I have watched him work and fight for REA, and I know that we are happy that he is up, well, and fighting again.

I am especially happy to be here in the company of the friends—my fellow Kentuckians who are delegates—for we have worked together—and because they have contributed so much to Kentucky and to the welfare of its people.

In this audience are men and women who have been associated with the struggles and success of REA. You would be the first to know that its work is not done, for its record of success has paradoxically confronted REA with a new problem and a new challenge. It is to provide the means and the institutions to finance adequately the needs of the rural electric systems in the future. The immediate concern of the REA electrical systems is, of course, with the fiscal Federal budget for fiscal year 1967 which begins on July 1, 1966, and ends on June 30, 1967.

The war in Vietnam is the overriding issue and concern of our people. We are concerned about its extension. And we are above all concerned about the security of our young men. It also has its influence on domestic issues. And it has had its influence upon the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967. You know the budget problem. Briefly, the applications for loans that will be on hand at the beginning of the next fiscal year—and that means on July 1, 1966—are expected to total $675 million. But the President's budget recommends only $220 million for fiscal year 1967, plus $50 million carried over from the current year. And in addition to this sharp reduction for next year, the appropriations for this fiscal year were ordered withheld, and if these budget recommendations are approved by the Congress, it will mean that there will be available for REA loans in this year $270 million and in the next year $270 million. Two hundred and seventy million dollars cannot meet the needs of the rural electric systems. It cannot meet them by half, and we in the Congress understand this.

I know and you know that provision for defense needs must come first, but I believe that the appropriations committees of the House and the Senate will ask the Congress to restore a portion of these funds. While I can only speak for myself—I think I reflect the sentiment of your friends in the Congress—in saying that we will restore substantial portion for REA needs for the coming fiscal year.

But while the budget for this fiscal year and next is the problem immediately at hand, the discomfort of this budget is just a symptom of a larger problem before this convention. It exposes in plain, harsh terms the problem of financing the future needs of the rural electric systems. Nothing could have illustrated this problem, I think, more sharply than the influence of Vietnam on the budget.

I know it has been said that the President's budget "cut the heart out" of the REA program. Yet this is not a new problem for you. You remember that, during World War II, REA loan funds dried up, and at the time of the Koreah war, President Truman was required to reduce REA funds for defense needs. But this does demonstrate again the risk of depending wholly on the annual budgetary and appropriations processes of the Congress. The vulnerability of your budget needs applies to every program, but it becomes a matter of special concern to REA as it needs the assurance of adequate funds year by year to match the consequent upward trend of rural power use.

The second consideration which REA must take into account is that you are entering a new era of competition for Federal funds. I can give several illustrations.

Since REA was established 30 years ago, the United States has become an increasingly urban nation. Seventy percent of our population now live in towns of 2,500 or more, and it is estimated that, by the year 2000, four out of every five Americans will live and work in the cities. I would prefer that this not be true, and I am sure that many of you would, but we cannot escape this movement. The Congress has recognized it and last year it created a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, and we know that it is the intention of this administration—and inescapably will be the concern of future administrations—to give a high priority to programs designed to reach the enormous problems of the cities—housing, urban renewal, slum clearance, water, delinquency, and education.

The proposal to establish a Department of Transportation—and by naming these, it doesn't mean that I am for them all—the proposal to establish such a department indicates the need of new transportation systems and, inevitably, their great cost.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I know that experts estimate that the cost of water pollution control, including increased Federal assistance, would require $20 billion in the next 5 years.

The problem of water, itself, will be one of great concern by 1985. Last year, it seems almost incomprehensible, that in the space of a few months a great city like New York could be shut off from power and be suffering from water shortages.

Federal aid to education is increasing at every level. In 1985, 51 million elementary, 20 million high school students, and 8 million college students will be knocking at classroom doors. It has been estimated that the expenditures for elementary and secondary education alone will amount to $12 billion in the next decade. As I think of going back to Washington where appropriation hearings have already begun, I can illustrate the problem of competition for funds in other ways.

REA is not the only well-established and widely supported program whose funds were reduced in the President's budget. Such well-known programs as the school lunch and school milk programs, funds for the land-grant colleges, agricultural statistics, marketing services, and others were cut back, and these involved only a single agency—the Department of Agriculture. And I have said, it is not only competition from old programs, but it is the demands for new programs that are getting under way, which have had their effect in influencing the budget restrictions on REA loan funds.

But the base—the root of your need for assured capital is the central fact of the growing demand for electricity, and the necessity of maintaining the orderly growth and development of rural electric systems. Many people inquire—and some are not the truest friends of REA—why with 98 percent of the Nation's farms reached, it is necessary to provide funds for loans to rural electric co-ops. You know the reasons, but they need to be told to your patrons and to our urban neighbors. One reason for continued financing not to be forgotten, arises from the original purpose of the act, to reach rural people who do not have power and light. It is the proud record of REA that most farms are now electrified. But the obligation still remains to rural people factually in isolated areas and their schools, churches and businesses now without electricity.

But even when every farm and rural area is reached, REA members and the public must remember and recognize an essential fact: That power demands are growing, and these demands must be financed, and are entitled to be financed, just as the growth of the private utilities must be financed.

REA consumers, like their urban neighbors, have the right to enjoy increased use of household appliances. And power has enabled farmers, in the face of a diminishing supply of farm labor, to operate efficiently and to continue to supply the American people, and I may say, a great part of the world, with ample food at low prices.

It is very interesting to know today that the farmers of America are the only sure source of food and fiber, not alone for the people of our own country but for the needy peoples of the world.

The demand for electricity in this country, according to the Federal Power Commission, is doubling every 10 years, and the areas and members served by your rural electric co-ops are an inseparable part of national growth and change.

The Rural Electrification Administration has estimated that the increased demands for energy would cost a total of $8.2 billion to $9.5 billion in new capital between now and 1980. That is 1½ times the entire amount of money loaned under the Federal REA program from 1935 to date—and it will be required over a period only half as long.

These forecasts of increased consumption bring this great convention to a great issue. It is how you will find the means and the institutions of securing adequate capital for loans to finance the cost of transmission facilities, necessary generating facilities to supply the electric needs of your consumers. You are confronted with this question: Can these increased capital needs be supplied fully as they have been in the past by appropriations of the Federal Government, or will it be necessary for the rural electric systems to obtain supplemental capital from sources other than the Federal Government, from private investors?

Because the record of the last few years demonstrates that the Bureau of the Budget has not requested, and the Congress has not authorized, sufficient loan funds to meet even the current requirements of the rural electric systems, I believe legislation to authorize means of supplemental financing must be provided.

You very wisely asked your association 2 years ago to undertake a study to determine the future capital needs of REA. And I may say here that I am very proud that our Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corp. foresaw this problem 6 years ago when it passed a resolution supporting such a study. I understand that the results of this study were released last August, discussed, and generally approved at your regional fall meetings and a revised supplemental financing program is now before you. The heart of its findings were that even if there were no war or competition of large new programs, and even with generous financing by the Federal Government, the capital needs of your cooperatives yet could not be met alone by Federal appropriations. And so it seemed to me, at least as one friend of REA, that appropriated funds by the Government must be supplemented with private capital supplied by private investors. The question is how to achieve this result while maintaining the control, the ownership and the purposes and objectives of REA.

I am not going to attempt today to discuss the details of the supplemental financing plan because it is proper that this should be done by your officers and those experts who have made the study. Briefly, you know, it is proposed to create a Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems, following generally the pattern of the Intermediate Credit Banks and Banks for Cooperatives of the Farm Credit Administration. It has several essentials which it seems must be agreed upon.

First, it would provide a means to maintain the present 2-percent loan program for those systems that have not yet attained financial strength to reach their objectives without this source of funds.

Second, it includes the provision of funds at a higher rate—which would attract private investment.

And a third essential part of the plan is that it would maintain financial control in the hands of the Government and eventually in the hands of the cooperatives, and would safeguard and preserve cooperative ownership of the systems.

We are familiar with the farm operating loans made by the cooperative production credit associations. Their operation is somewhat similar to this proposal, and it has worked well. Nearly 500 farmer-owned PCA's now hold 35 percent of the capital stock of the Intermediate Credit Banks, and the system is providing funds at a reasonable rate for their needed expansion.

And under the plan before you, borrowers from the bank would purchase its capital stock, cooperatives would help provide the capital investment of the Federal Government through the repayment of existing REA loans, and as the investment of the cooperatives grew, ownership of the bank would pass into the hands and full control of the cooperative members.

The provision of funds, both Federal and private, through such a plan would make your programs less vulnerable to unforeseen budgetary crises, would separate it at least in part from the competition of new programs for funds, and would be designed to meet the need for expansion by turning your sound economic growth into a resource which would attract private capital investment to rural electric systems through the Federal bank.

It seems to me urgent that your association should consider, and at an early date approve such a plan, for until your association acts, I do not believe that any action will be taken by the administration and by the Congress, and time is the essence for the rural electric programs.

I serve on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and, under the chairmanship of Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, on the Farm Credit and Rural Electrification Subcommittee. Very little thought has been yet given in the Congress to supplemental financing for rural electric cooperatives, although we are concerned about the shortage of financing under the Federal budget. Like any other new proposal, it will take time to be understood, debated and accepted, and of course its passage would require the approval of the administration.

I suggest that this problem has another aspect. Because the Budget has cut REA funds, and also impounded funds, it seems to me incumbent on the administration and on the Congress to press vigorously a sound and constructive plan for supplemental funds.

If the Congress is assured that a supplemental financing plan is seriously proposed, which will require time to be enacted and come into effect, it could be argued on sound grounds that Congress has the obligation to provide a reasonable level of loan funds to be made available during the period of transition.

I cannot know fully what reception any supplemental financing plan may meet in the Congress. But I have had experience in one such plan. There is a parallel with the TVA Self-Financing Act of 1959—which was the subject of my remarks to you 8 years ago. It grew out of the demand for growth within the TVA system, and finally the recognition that Congress had not provided and would not provide, the increasing funds which TVA needed.

In 1954, I proposed self-financing for TVA. Several of us introduced self-financing measures. I served on the committee which, under the leadership of Senator Kerr, of Oklahoma, finally developed the TVA Self-Financing Act. Senator Kerr was skillful and resourceful, a great fighter, and one of the most effective Members of the Senate. But it took 4 years for the enactment of the TVA Self-Financing Act.

While I have drawn this parallel, I do not want you to be discouraged. Some have thought self-financing more applicable to TVA because it is an integrated system. But REA cooperatives have an unusual record of management, of repayment of loans, and of efficiency which would undoubtedly attract additional capital from private sources which, I believe, would make the plan sound.

And TVA, while it is a national and international institution, finds its chief support in the Congress from regional States, while your support in the Congress is broader, for the work of REA extends into nearly every State.

The Congress has demonstrated again and again its appreciation for the REA program, and what it has done and is continuing to do. And I believe it is fair to say that this attitude is rooted in the knowledge and experience of Members of Congress that the REA people represent a cross section of our country, that they are alert and successful businessmen, and that they have proved and that they live their community leadership.

I believe that you will succeed in securing approval of whatever supplemental financing plan you may adopt. You will succeed because you will bring forth a sound plan. You will succeed because 1,000 farmer-owned cooperatives and 5 million rural families must not be denied the power they need. You will succeed because whenever you have had a job to do, you have done it.

It is important that REA members and the people of the Nation who are not REA consumers should remember a primary fact. It is that light and power would have never come to some farmers and rural families—and in all cases would have been delayed—except for the REA program. Your local cooperatives, your national association, and the work of hundreds of your people, have lightened farm burdens, brought more equal opportunity to farm people, and increased the richness of their lives.

Not long ago I had the opportunity to talk to a great historian, Arnold Toynbee. We talked about the problems of developing nations who have little tradition of democratic experience or leadership. I asked him how these people, without this experience, could be trained in the way of democratic institutions and values.

He said he had given great thought to it and that one of the best sources of education and teaching of these people would be to provide for them cooperative programs in the form and tradition of the rural electric cooperative program where they could experience the practice of democratic institutions and democratic values.

I am happy again to meet with you and to salute a group of men and women who, I believe, represent our country, its traditions, and the great democratic strength of our Nation.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I express my sincere appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his cosponsorship and help in guiding the bill. I know of his long interest and active participation in assisting rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives, and also of his work in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Both the Senator from Kentucky and I have served in Congress for many years. I served on the Committee on Agriculture in the other body, and I know, as does the Senator from Kentucky, of the great problem that has existed for many years to provide adequate financing for rural electric cooperatives, particularly at a rate of interest they can afford to pay.

I also commend the Senator from Kentucky for his work on the plan for the self-financing of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Both the Senator from Kentucky and I now serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. His assistance there will be invaluable in guiding to final determination and approval the proposed legislation we are introducing. I express appreciation for his support and interest.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate from today until noon on Thursday next, the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills; the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President and the House of Representatives; and committees be permitted to file their reports.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 12, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 10, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The following-named persons to be Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Housing and Urban Development:

H. Ralph Taylor, of Connecticut.
Don Hummel, of Arizona.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Dr. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God is not far from each one of us, for in Him we live and move and have our being.—Acts 17: 28.

O Thou in whom we live and move and have our being, without whom no one is strong, no one is good, we pause in Thy presence once again to lift our hearts to Thee in prayer. We need Thee, our Father, we need Thee as we confront the problems of this day, as we endeavor to meet the challenges of this hour and as we seek to make wise use of the opportunities of this moment. Grant us wisdom, grant us courage for the living of these days that we fail not man nor Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile.

A TRAGIC LOSS

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania, Montgomery County, and the Republican Party have suffered a shocking and tragic loss. Montgomery County Republican Chairman and Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board Member James E. Staudinger, and Pennsylvania Attorney General Walter E. Alessandroni and Mrs. Alessandroni died in the crash of their chartered plane in western Pennsylvania.

Jim Staudinger was one of the most able Republican county chairmen in the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The constructive influence of the party in Montgomery County is due primarily to Jim Staudinger's unceasing efforts. He was an able and dedicated Republican. He constantly worked to unify and strengthen our party. His loss is deeply felt.

Walter Alessandroni had won well-deserved admiration and respect for his brilliant and untiring devotion to the duties of his office and to the betterment of the Republican Party. Many people shall remember him as being in the finest tradition of public service. That his wife, Ethel, always with him on important occasions, should have been with him on this fateful trip, makes our loss all the more tragic.

Mrs. Schweiker and I, and so many Pennsylvanians, have lost three close and devoted friends, and our deepest sympathy goes out to their families in this tragic hour.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANK SUPERVISION, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FELICITATIONS TO THE HONORABLE CARL ALBERT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that he has a very busy schedule ahead of him, I think it appropriate to take just a minute to wish our distinguished majority leader a happy birthday. Our great majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], works so closely and so diligently and is so dedicated in his work with all of us that he has earned the esteem and affection of all Members of this body. I hope despite the difficult time we may have before the day is over—not that I am expecting anything except success—I hope that CARL ALBERT will have a happy birthday indeed.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Louisiana yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Of course, the gentleman from Louisiana knows I join in the best wishes that he has expressed on behalf of my very good friend and most able colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader. However, on my own let me extend to CARL ALBERT my very best on this birthday anniversary.

As to the other comments of the gentleman from Louisiana, I will pass no judgment on that except to say we plan to win and will make every effort to do so.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

"ORVILLE'S ORGY"

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about something that I term "Orville's Orgy."

Forty Members of Congress yesterday received a 732-word telegram from Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman in reply to 1 communication—also, unfortunately, a wire but at the cost of only 80 cents a Member divided up among the 40 signers—protesting the manner in which he is administering his Department's $4 billion farm subsidy programs. Our message was about half the length of the reply.

We apparently got under the Secretary's skin to such an extent that he forgot all about President Johnson's admonition to Cabinet heads that they must economize. Western Union officials tell me that the 40 telegrams cost $60 each, making a total cost to the taxpayer of $2,400.

The President will have to turn all the lights off in the White House for quite a while to make up for this particular splurge by Orville.

Mr. Freeman's office is only about a mile from Capitol Hill. Regardless of the merits of his rebuttal to our charges, it could have been presented in letters delivered through the mails or by one of the 8,000 Department of Agriculture employees in Washington. I cannot say that I am any more impressed by the 732-word telegram than I would have been by a letter. I readily concede that we in Congress should also have used the mails, rather than Western Union, and that is what I assumed we were doing when I joined the protestants.

FARMERS WANT PARITY—NOT COSTLY ADMINISTRATION PUBLICITY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DOLE**. Mr. Speaker, in Secretary Freeman's 7-page, 730-word telegram, costing an estimated $2,400, sent to me and 39 colleagues yesterday, he said that the 40 signatories to our recent request urging the administration to give fair treatment to farmers, had on 5 key votes voted against the farmer 87 percent of the time.

I have no idea what votes the Secretary selected for his survey, but strongly disagree with his rating system.

Was a vote to restore the 80-percent cut in the school milk program as recommended by Secretary Freeman a vote against the dairy farmer?

Was a vote to restore budget cuts in the school lunch, land-grant college, Farmers Home Administration, REA, and conservation programs as recommended by Secretary Freeman a vote against farmers?

Was the recent vote in the House Agriculture Committee to adopt my resolution requesting reconsideration of the Department of Commerce action imposing export restrictions on cattle hides a vote against cattle ranchers?

Was a vote against mandatory strict controls on feed grain farmers a vote against the farmers? A substantial portion of the Secretary's own political party rejected his recommendations on this subject.

Was a vote against the mandatory strict control wheat certificate plan turned down by over one-half of 1.2 million wheat farmers voting in the 1963 referendum a vote against farmers?

Was a vote for the extension and amendment of Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, a vote against farmers?

Was a vote to deny concessional sales under Public Law 480 to nations which are actively assisting our enemies in North Vietnam a vote against farmers?

Was the introduction and support of both House and Senate resolutions to implement fair treatment for farmers and ranchers in the marketplace a vote against farmers? Apparently the majority leader of the Senate did not think so.

And so it goes—Secretary Freeman, by handpicking five votes which suit his political fancy, has presented a totally inaccurate record of my position and my colleagues' position on agricultural legislation.

The American farmer has every right to ask if there is a place for him in the administration's Great Society. The farmer alone cannot bear the full burden of inflation and it is encouraging to note that administration leaders are finally recognizing this fact.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S REPLY TO THE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include the complete text of the telegram referred to.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the concern of my good friends on the Republican side over the telegram which the Secretary of Agriculture sent to them because it makes clear that at no time in the history of the United States has American agriculture done so well. At no time has farm income been so high in relation to the entire economy. At no time have surpluses been cut back so decisively.

Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 40 of our distinguished colleagues from the other side of the aisle sent a telegram to President Johnson complaining about certain agricultural actions which they said "undermine the very thing we seek." Mr. Speaker, they were not very explicit in their telegram about what they seek, and, after examining their voting records on important farm legislation in the last 5 years, I am at a complete loss to say what they seek. A majority of them did not cast a single "yes" vote in all that period for the five major farm bills which have resulted in the greatest gains in history for the American farmer.

Yesterday Secretary Freeman replied to their telegram. He, too, expressed doubt about the objectives of those Members of Congress who have voted only 13 percent in support of major farm legislation in 5 years. The 40 Members who signed the telegram to the President had an opportunity to cast nearly 200 votes in total in support of these 5 important bills, yet with all these chances to help the farmers they voted for the farmer only 27 times in all.

In his reply to our colleagues, the Secretary of Agriculture recounts the inspiring story of U.S. agriculture. What a change from the sad and dreary state of agriculture in the late fifties. For example, the income gap between farmers and nonfarmers has narrowed by nearly 20 percent since 1960. As the Secretary points out in his telegram, it is the continuing objective of the administration to keep agriculture on the rise. President Johnson and Secretary Freeman are doing their utmost to improve farm income and the farmer's way of life and they are succeeding in this great and noble effort.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
May 9, 1966.

Your recent wire to the President offers an opportunity to look once again at the remarkably successful record of U.S. agriculture. I welcome the opportunity and thank you for it.

All Americans can be proud of our farmers and their awesome ability to overcome drought, hail, flood, wind, and other vagaries of nature and to produce the most abundant and nutritious supply of food in history.

Those in other countries—friend and foe alike—stand in awe, envy, and thankfulness too that our farmers are able to feed this Nation superbly and yet to produce enough in addition for hungry mouths all over the globe.

The American farmer, working with this administration and a majority of the Congress, has acted these past 5 years to develop farm programs that have brought about amazing results.

It is dramatic and exciting, when you look back at the dismal state of agriculture at the end of the 1950's, to compare today—1966—with 1960.

Gross farm income is up nearly $10 billion.

Net farm income is up nearly $3.5 billion.

Net income per farm is up more than 50 percent.

Per capita farm income is up 50 percent.

Major farm prices are up: Beef steers and heifers up $2.10 per hundredweight since 1960. Hogs up $9 since 1960. Corn up 12 cents a bushel since 1960. Soybeans up 72 cents a bushel since 1960. Manufacturing milk up 52 cents per hundredweight since 1960. Eggs up 9 cents a dozen since 1960.

Acreages of rice, soybeans, barley, and wheat are up. A 15 percent wheat acreage increase has been announced for 1967.

Loans to rural electric and telephone systems are up 26 percent.

Exports are up to the highest point in history.

Loans to rural families and rural communities to improve their way of life are up from $300 million to $1 billion.

A few things are down. They are:

Surpluses.

Taxpayer costs for storage and handling of surpluses.

The percentage of take-home pay needed to buy food.

And, the public standing of those who opposed the farmer, the Congress, and the administration in building this record of farming success.

This administration's unexampled record of success in agriculture is essentially the result of five major legislative acts since 1960. The 40 Members of Congress who signed the wire to the President had an opportunity to cast nearly 200 votes, in total, in support of these important bills for the farmer. However, with 200 chances to help the farmer, you voted "Yes" only 27 times in all. A mere 13 percent of your votes for the farmer—87 percent against him.

That is not a record to write home about. Not if you have farmers in your home district.

Yet you said, in your message to the President, that the administration "acts to undermine the very thing we seek."

Obviously you don't seek the positive gains accomplished by the legislation you rejected—the higher farm income and higher farm prices, greater farm acreage, increased agricultural exports, and all the other benefits for the farmer.

What do you seek?

You complained about dumping stocks of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum. Certainly you know that we sold these grains to meet domestic and world needs. Storage costs were lessened, and farmers' prices remained well above support levels. This was not true before 1960.

You charged erroneously that we raised the support price for soybeans "in order to create a surplus and force down market prices. Certainly you know that our soybean stocks are down to a 3-week supply, and the price of soybeans has gone up 10 to 20 cents a bushel since the announcement.

What is it you seek? To build new surpluses of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum, and create artificial shortages of food for our people, and hold down exports?

Should incentives be denied for soybean production, thus creating a shortage and causing wild fluctuations in price—and profits for speculators? Is that what you seek?

American agriculture has experienced an unprecedented period of progress in the period 1961–66. The income gap between farmers and nonfarmers has narrowed by nearly 20 percent since 1960. Even so, farmers have a long way to go before achieving income parity.

And it is the continuing objective of this administration to keep agriculture on the rise.

Let me tell you what we seek.

We seek your support in this effort.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN PROVISIONS IN THE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 848, Rept. No. 1498), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 848

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, all points of order against the provisions contained under the heading "National Aeronautics and Space Administration" beginning on page 29, line 18, through page 32, line 2, are hereby waived.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 848, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 848?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 848.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Smith], pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule would make in order consideration of certain phases of the independent offices appropriation bill which was filed on May 5. H.R. 14921, which was filed on May 5, passed the House of Representatives but has not yet passed the Senate. Therefore, the Appropriations Committee has requested that a rule be granted making in order consideration of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration appropriations for this fiscal year.

I have no further requests for time. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I concur in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young]. This is a necessary procedure in order that the bill can be considered this afternoon, the appropriation bill, because the authorization bill has not as yet been finally acted upon. So we will have to waive points of order so far as they might apply to the language commencing on line 18, page 29, through to the end of that particular section on line 2, page 32.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I hope that it will not become a precedent that the Appropriations Committee asks for rules on bills. I hope the legislative committees will get these bills in their proper sequence.

But in this particular instance it would be futile, it seems to me, to wait for the Senate to act, since the House has acted on its authorization bill.

So I support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we shall not request rules on appropriation bills in the future.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H.R. 14012, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1476)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21, and 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 53, and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 9, 14, 25, 28, 30, 31, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52.

George Mahon,
Michael J. Kirwan,
Otto E. Passman,
Joe L. Evins,
Winfield K. Denton,
Tom Steed,
Frank T. Bow,
Charles R. Jonas,
Melvin R. Laird,
Managers on the Part of the House.

John O. Pastore,
Spessard L. Holland,
Carl Hayden,
Richard B. Russell,
Allen J. Ellender,
Lister Hill,
Milton R. Young,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Karl E. Mundt,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which provides $30,000,000 for the "Emergency Credit Revolving Fund," Farmers Home Administration.

CHAPTER II

District of Columbia

Amendment No. 2: Changes chapter number.

CHAPTER III

Foreign operations

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $140,000,000 for "Asian Development Bank" as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

Independent offices

Amendment No. 4: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $12,000 for the "National Capital Housing Authority" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $12,000,000 for the "Selective Service System" instead of $10,180,000 as proposed by the House and $12,681,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $1,000,000 for "General operating expenses" of the Veterans' Administration instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $65,000,000 for "Disaster relief" instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment authorizing use of nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for special studies, with an amendment limiting such expenses to $500,000.

CHAPTER V

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 10: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $1,028,000 for "Management and Protection, National Park Service," as proposed by the House instead of $1,245,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $827,000 for "Maintenance and Rehabilitation of Physical Facilities, National Park Service," as proposed by the House instead of $892,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $1,711,000 for "Construction, National Park Service," as proposed by the Senate instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to provide $2,500,000 for "Administration of Territories, Office of Territories."

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $148,000 for "Management and Investigations of Resources, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries." as proposed by the House instead of $193,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $658,000 for "Management and Investigations of Resources, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife," as proposed by the House instead of $712,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Related agencies

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $18,000 for "Salaries and Expenses, Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $18,000 for "Salaries and Expenses, National Capital Planning Commission," as proposed by the House instead of $68,000 as provided by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 19: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 20: Inserts language proposed by the Senate relating to the time period during which the funds appropriated will be available.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22: Delete language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $9,500,000 for "National Teacher Corps" as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER VII

Legislative branch

Amendment No. 24: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide $200,000 for "Inquiries and Investigations," and $30,000 for payment to the widow of a deceased Senator.

CHAPTER VIII

Public works

Amendment No. 26: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $7,350,000 for "Operation and maintenance, general Corps of Engineers," as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to provide $1,400,000 for "Upper Colorado River storage project, Bureau of Reclamation."

CHAPTER IX

Department of State

Amendment No. 29: Changes chapter number.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which inserts an appropriation of $200,000 for "Fees and expenses of witnesses."

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which provides an appropriation of $4,600,000 for "1967 Alaska Centennial."

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $160,000 for "Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center" as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 33: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $294,904,000 for "Operations," as proposed by the Senate instead of $269,904,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XI

Claims and judgments

Amendment No. 35: Changes chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37: Appropriate $10,828,683 to pay for certain claims as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,251,798 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II

Increased pay costs

Legislative Branch

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: Appropriates $750,850 for various Senate items as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Amendments Nos. 40 through 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendments which provide that the funds are to be derived by transfer.

Department of Defense

Amendment No. 52: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Amendment No. 53: Provides increase of $575,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration, as proposed by the Senate instead of increase of $75,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses as proposed by the House.

Federal Aviation Agency

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the House,

GEORGE MAHON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
TOM STEED,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 89]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Baring
Brademas
Burleson
Callaway
Carter
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Corman
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Grabowski
Griffin
Hanna
Helstoski
Henderson
Holifield
Hull
Hutchinson
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Macdonald
Mailliard
Mathias
Michel
Moeller
Monagan
Morgan
Morse
Moss
Murray
O'Hara, Mich.
Pickle
Powell
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Sullivan
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Utt
Vivian
Watson
Williams
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 357 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on March 29 the House passed the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1966, providing something in excess of $2.5 billion for various agencies of the Government. The bill, as it passed the House, was below the budget requests by nearly $249 million and the final version before us today is more than $232 million below the total budget estimates considered by both the House and Senate.

When the bill went to the other body, additional estimates of $207 million were submitted directly to the Senate. The major items which were added in the other body were based on the additional estimates and I do not think they will be controversial in the House.

First, $30 million was added for the Farmers Home Administration to meet emergency credit needs resulting from Hurricane Betsy, floods in the north-central area, and similar disasters in other regions. This was agreed to unanimously in conference.

The other body added $30 million for the disaster relief fund due to storms, floods, and other natural disasters. The conference agreement adds $20 million to the House amount, for a total of $65 million. The other body added $140 million for the Asian Development Bank, which was authorized by Congress in March of this year. It was too late for that estimate to be considered by the House.

For the Alaska Centennial, in which there has been considerable interest in the Northwest, the other body added $4.6 million; and this was agreed to in conference.

The Post Office Department, finding itself unable to cope with the unanticipated increase in the volume of mail, made a request through the Bureau of the Budget for an additional $25 million; this was, likewise, approved.

Of course, the largest category of money in this bill is in title II—more than $900 million to finance the civilian and military pay increases voted by the Congress after the submission of the budget last year. It was mandatory that these additional funds be provided.

The total amount required to take care of the additional pay costs was much in excess of this, but by transfers and economies and adjustments otherwise, the total amount of new appropriations needed was reduced to a little over $950 million.

With respect to the items which were considered by both bodies, the conference amount is only $1.2 million above the House bill, and is $13 million less than the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, we trust that this will be the last supplemental or deficiency bill presented to the House for fiscal year 1966. A fiscal year 1967 supplemental bill will probably be considered much later in the session.

I will place a comparative statement with respect to the conference report in the Record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Comparative statement of conference action compared with budget estimates, House bill and Senate bill, the 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966

Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I							
Ch. I. Agriculture	$30,000,000		$30,000,000	$30,000,000		+$30,000,000	
Ch. II. District of Columbia	2,300,000	$1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	−$1,050,000		
Ch. III. Foreign operations	140,000,000		140,000,000	140,000,000		+140,000,000	
Ch. IV. Independent offices	383,693,000	348,280,000	383,793,000	371,112,000	−12,581,000	+22,832,000	−$12,681,000
Ch. V. Interior	26,421,000	22,495,000	26,255,700	25,824,000	−597,000	+3,329,000	−431,700
Ch. VI. Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare	1,106,442,000	902,528,000	902,028,000	902,028,000	−204,414,000	−500,000	
Ch. VII. Legislative	17,000	107,000	307,000	337,000	+320,000	+230,000	+30,000
Ch. VIII. Public works	16,024,000	15,570,000	15,920,000	15,920,000	−104,000	+350,000	
Ch. IX. State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	12,682,000	7,260,000	12,020,000	12,020,000	−662,000	+4,760,000	
Ch. X. Post Office	321,010,000	294,010,000	391,010,000	319,010,000	−2,000,000	+25,000,000	
Ch. XI. Claims and judgements	10,828,683	10,251,798	10,828,683	10,828,683		+576,885	
Total, title I	2,049,417,683	1,601,751,798	1,841,412,383	1,828,329,683	−221,088,000	+226,577,885	−13,082,700
TITLE II							
Increased pay costs	971,393,220	963,120,770	959,813,620	959,813,620	−11,579,600	−3,307,150	
Grand total	3,020,810,903	2,564,872,568	2,801,226,003	2,788,143,303	−232,667,600	+223,270,735	−13,082,700

Mr. BOW. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with this conference report. There are items, of course, that I think are much too high, but I think the conferees did the best they could.

There is one particular item I do not agree with, and that is an investigation to be made by some professors into the building and loan institutions of the country. I think there should be an investigation, but I do not agree with the idea of turning the investigation over to three professors. I think it should be done by a different group of people. That is something we can take up later.

Generally, Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the conference report.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the conference report, and I signed the conference report, but since the signing of the conference report there have been several questions asked about the language on page 12 of the bill, because of the discussion that took place in the other body.

This has to do with the National Teacher Corps. This language was inserted in the bill by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare. The first proviso states:

> *Provided*, That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 percentum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps.

I believe this language is very clear. It indicates beyond any question of doubt that a 10-percent local contribution will be necessary before a teacher is placed in any local school district.

But concerning the next proviso there seems to be some misunderstanding. Just so there can be no misunderstanding, this was also a proviso offered by me in the committee:

> *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

This language is very clear. It provides for the approval of each program, on an individual basis, by the State educational agency prior to the time any teacher is assigned by the Office of Education. This does not mean the State must approve an overall State program or State plan.

So that there can be no confusion about this, I thought it was necessary for us to have this colloquy on the floor of the House today.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LAIRD. Does the gentleman from Texas agree that this is very clear?

Mr. MAHON. This is my understanding of the 90-percent proviso.

Mr. LAIRD. And of the approval by the State superintendents or State educational agencies?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. This is my understanding of the intent.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Farmers Home Administration

For an additional amount for the "Emergency Credit Revolving Fund," $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses

Included in the expenses of any functions of supervision which shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses, as stated in the third proviso under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1966, are expenses necessary for special studies of the savings and loan industry to be completed by December 31, 1968, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), which may be of any duration not beyond such completion date.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses

Included in the expenses of any functions of supervision which shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses, as stated in the third proviso under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1966, are expenses (not to exceed $500,000) necessary for special studies of the savings and loan industry to be completed by December 31, 1968, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), which may be of any duration not beyond such completion date.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Administration of territories

For an additional amount for "Administration of Territories", $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

SENATE

Contingent expenses of the Senate

Inquiries and Investigations

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and investigations", $200,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

SENATE

For payment to Mary L. McNamara, widow of Patrick V. McNamara, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $30,000.

Contingent expenses of the Senate

Inquiries and Investigations

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and investigations", $200,000.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

(28) BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Upper Colorado River storage project

For an additional amount for "Upper Colorado River Basin fund", $1,400,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Loan program", Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 17, line 20, strike out the following:

"In addition to the amount heretofore made available in the appropriation under this head for the current fiscal year for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), not to exceed $25,000 shall be available in such appropriation for such compensation and expenses."

And insert in lieu thereof:

"For an additional amount for 'Fees and expenses', including not to exceed $25,000 for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Salaries and expenses, general legal activities', fiscal year 1966."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 18, line 17:

"1967 ALASKA CENTENNIAL

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Alaska Centennial Act of 1966, including administrative expenses, to remain available until June 30, 1968, $4,600,000, of which not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available for grants to the State of Alaska, and not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the Centennial celebration."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc the amendments numbered 40 through 51.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 30, line 24: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 31, line 4: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 31, line 8: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 31, line 12: ", to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 31, line 16: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics,' Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 31, line 20: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966,".

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 32, line 1: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966, of which $33,400 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs;".

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 32, line 7: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 32, line 13: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 32, line 17: "of which $754,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 33, line 2: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966, of which $200,000 is for administrative".

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 33, line 7: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 34, line 18:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

"The limitation contained in section 606 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1966, on the funds available for the operation of overseas dependents schools is hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by Public Law 89-391".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14921, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as we begin consideration of this bill, the independent offices appropriation bill of 1967, I want to take a moment to pay a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late colleague and beloved friend, the gentleman from Texas, Albert Thomas—the longtime chairman of this subcommittee.

This is the first time this bill has been presented for more than a decade that it was not presented by Albert Thomas. He was a great chairman and a great leader and we all miss him.

Let me also pay a tribute to my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations—the dedicated, hard-working colleagues who have contributed immensely to the discussions, the deliberations, and the decisionmaking necessary to bring this bill to the floor. I refer to my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY]; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO], and the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS]; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL]; and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

This bill represents a consensus of the views of all of the members of our committee.

All legislation is a compromise. This process of reaching a consensus is, as all of you know, at the heart of our legislative process. It is from this crucible of debate and compromise and discussion that this independent offices appropriation bill of 1967 has come for your consideration.

We bring before you a bill that was unanimously approved by our subcommittee.

SIGNIFICANT BILL

This as a significant bill—an essential bill in terms of vital programs and services provided for our people.

The various regulatory agencies funded under this bill serve to protect the American consumers in many ways:

Travelers in the air and on the land;

The public viewers and listeners of television and radio;

The buyers of stocks and securities on the open market; and

The users of gas and electricity, among others.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, concerns the growth of our cities; the health and housing of our citizens; the safety and protection of our families in civil defense.

This bill provides an umbrella of protection over virtually all dimensions of American life. For example:

The Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board protect the American people by regulating airline and air-carrier services, promoting air safety and air transportation, as well as assisting in construction and operation of the Nation's airports.

The Federal Communications Commission regulates and supervises the radio and television industry in an effort to insure that these media will be operated in the public interest.

The Securities and Exchange Commission regulates the sale of stocks and securities in the open market. Full disclosure is required in the public interest.

The Federal Trade Commission shields consumers from unfair and deceptive trade practices and fraud in the marketplace.

The General Accounting Office keeps an eagle eye on the operations of our Government—in fiscal matters—to assure adherence to law in the public interest, as directed by Congress.

Appropriations for the Veterans' Administration carried in this bill provide for the greatest veterans' benefit program of any nation in the world.

These include education and training, housing, homeownership, insurance, compensations and pensions, hospital and medical care.

Under this bill, in appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, we are continuing the exciting programs of space exploration with its vast new gains in knowledge, and the tremendous "spinoff" in industrial growth and scientific development.

Under this bill we are funding the broad range of programs of the newly created Department of Housing and Urban Development—programs to strengthen and rebuild our cities and towns and communities across this great Nation.

TOTALS

Our committee considered budget estimates totaling $14,319,611,291.

The committee is recommending and the bill carries an appropriation totaling $14,013,799,000.

We have reduced and cut the budget estimates by $305,812,291.

I repeat—we have made cuts and reductions totaling more than $300 million.

Furthermore, this bill is $373,059,300 under corresponding appropriations for the current year.

CUTS AND REDUCTIONS

So, we have made significant cuts and reductions.

Appropriation for 1966 (not realistic)	$16, 413, 358, 300
Budget for 1967 (on comparable basis)	14, 319, 611, 291
Bill (reduction only $300 million)	14, 013, 799, 000
Cut (urban renewal not included)	2, 399, 559, 300

I would point out further that there are 97 line items of appropriations contained in the bill; and that in 63 instances the amounts are below the current budget for those line items.

In no instance does the bill exceed the budget request.

I repeat—in no instance does the bill recommend amounts in excess of budget requests.

While some of the annual appropriations bills which we have recently considered exceed the budget—it may be refreshing that this bill is below the President's budget requests.

I would point out, in this same vein, that President Johnson has sent directives—guidelines to all the agencies, directing them to hold down expenditures.

In the main, these agencies have presented tight budgets. And we have tightened them still further.

I can assure you that this independent offices appropriation bill for 1967 represents a bedrock budget.

Mr. Chairman, time will not permit a detailed discussion of all the items in this bill. Our committee is ready and willing to give every Member all the information needed on any item in the bill.

However, I do want to highlight some of the larger items in the bill:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The total amount recommended in the bill for the Federal Aviation Agency is $901,831,500. This is a reduction of $6,154,500 from the budget estimate—and an increase of $38,921,000 over 1966.

However, I want to emphasize that reductions have been made in all programs of the FAA with the exception of the supersonic transport program which I will discuss in more detail in a moment.

This committee has been providing advance funding for grants and aids to airports for our States and municipalities on a matching basis for a number of years.

Last year we appropriated $71 million in advanced funding for this purpose. The budget proposed to rescind $21 million of this amount. However, we have not made this cutback. The funds are being held and retained where grants for airport construction can be made as needed.

There is great interest in this program—and the recommended cutback has not been made in this instance.

With further references to the funding of the supersonic transport program, we have made the decision to go forward in this important field. The Nation must move forward in this phase of aviation if it is to remain competitive with other nations and maintain the lead in aviation for the United States.

We must not march up the hill and back down the hill. We must continue funding this program.

We are entering the third phase of the research and development of the supersonic transport. There are now two engine contractors—General Electric and Pratt & Whitney—and two airframe contractors—Boeing and Lockheed—currently engaged in the design competition phase.

Midway through fiscal 1967, a detailed evaluation will be conducted for the purpose of selecting one engine and one airframe contractor to construct a prototype aircraft of a single design.

This prototype will be flight-tested for approximately 100 hours. The supersonic transport will be the largest and the fastest aircraft ever built, and will serve to keep our Nation ahead in the field of aviation.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Another major item in the budget includes funds for the General Services Administration. We are recommending $553,890,000, which is a reduction of $74,610,000 in the budget estimate, and a reduction of $34,441,250 from appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The major reductions have been made in the GSA construction program. We consider 36 proposals for construction of public buildings and we recommend $101,565,000 for 32 projects throughout the country.

The committee has not approved, at this time, four projects proposed in the Washington, D.C., area.

These include the FBI Building, the Tax Court, the Labor Department Building, and the Secret Service Training Center in Beltsville, Md.

I should like to point out that we are building a new FBI Building at this time—the FBI Academy at Quantico, Va. This bill includes $13,059,000 to complete construction of this facility. The committee did not think it wise and prudent to proceed with construction of two FBI buildings simultaneously.

In addition, there continues to be some question about the design and site location of the second FBI building.

There also continues to be some concern about the best method of constructing the Labor Department Building. Our committee heard testimony from owners of the property where the proposed new building will be constructed. The owner-contractor proposes to build this building on a lease basis. At the end of a designated period the building would be donated to the Federal Government under this proposal.

Our committee also has denied funds for construction of the Tax Court at this time and the Secret Service Training Center in Beltsville, Md., as it was felt that these projects could be deferred another year.

We are recommending $11,694,000 for sites and expenses for future building projects construction.

A Federal building project, which is needed, is not now authorized for Oxford, Miss. From information supplied my committee, a building for Oxford is listed among the first to be considered for appropriation when a general authorization bill is passed by the Public Works Committee.

The present building at Oxford, I am advised, is about 85 years old and wholly inadequate for the needs of the Federal court. The General Services Administration should proceed—and is urged to proceed—with a survey for an adequate site for a new building with some of the funds appropriated.

NASA

For the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the committee considered budget estimates totaling $5,012 million.

The committee is recommending $4,950 million—a reduction of $62 million from the request for fiscal 1967—and $225 million less than the funding for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, it has long been decided that the space program should be funded at a rate of approximately $5 billion a year.

We should not have great peaks and valleys in funding this program—but on an orderly basis.

We must continue to provide funding on a constant consistent basis.

The current funding—here proposed—will enable NASA to move forward in an orderly, logical, planned program of space exploration—efficiently and without waste.

As we all know, the groundwork for extensive space travel is being laid by the programs we are funding today. And just as important: the foundation is being laid for mastery of space. This is also most important—important to our national defense.

We have come a long way since the days of sputnik when there was great national concern about our lag in the bid for control of outer space.

There was concern for our Nation's security.

Today we are all proud of our great space team—our courageous and skilled astronauts. They have captured the imagination of most of the world—as well as the hearts of their countrymen.

I want to report in summary that NASA teams have successfully launched 100 unmanned space flights—we have successfully launched 12 manned flights.

In addition, there have been 47 unmanned flights that, while not completely successful, have supplied some information of value to the space program.

We have now advanced from the Mercury program, with its startled monkeys hurtling through space, well into the Gemini program, and early in the Apollo program, with giant Saturn I and Saturn V rockets waiting in the wings to be launched, and to play their dramatic roles in further advances in space exploration.

We are approaching the phase that will involve manned lunar landings.

The committee has been informed that in most respects our space program is second to none. It may be that the Soviets surpass us in rocket power and thrust—one phase only.

While we have made gains—gains in which we are all proud—we certainly must not rest on our laurels. We must go forward with this program.

And so our committee recommends almost the full funding of NASA's research and development program. The reductions recommended are in the construction of new facilities and in administrative costs.

The budget estimate called for $101,500,000 for construction of new facilities. We are recommending only $75 million.

This is a reduction and cutback of $26,500,000 from the budget request.

We have not denied any specific project. However, as the report states, the committee is not impressed with the immediate necessity of funding all of proposed construction projects at this time. Some of these facilities relate to operations after accomplishment of manned lunar landings. We feel that projects in that category can be deferred. We leave to NASA the selection of construction priorities.

The reductions we have made will not delay progress.

There are simply projects which the committee believes are not of the highest urgency.

Reductions in this program are recommended as follows: $1.6 million reduction and cutback in research and development—leaving a total of $4,245,000,000 which the committee feels is sufficient for the next fiscal year; $26,500,000 was cut from the requests for financing construction of new facilities, as mentioned previously, leaving a total construction budget of $75 million; $33,900,000 was cut from the request for administrative expenses, leaving a total of $630 million for administration and for operation of research centers and other offices and installations.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

This is the first budget for the Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The new Department currently is undergoing reorganization and extensive consolidations of functions are underway.

With the passage of the Housing Act of 1965 the Congress added many additional functions to the new Department.

This new Department has a large budget—and larger budgets can be expected.

The committee considered budget estimates totaling $710,488,000.

The committee recommends $635,085,000—a reduction and cutback of $75,403,000.

This Department has a wide diversity of programs—urban planning, urban renewal, public housing, college housing, rent supplements, mass transportation, neighborhood facilities grants, open-space land grants and urban beautification, grants for water and sewer facilities, and public facility loans, among others.

I should like to point out that this Department has 33 programs—including 18 new or expanded programs added by the Housing Act of 1965. In addition, 12 studies are proposed in this bill.

The creation of this Department of Housing and Urban Development is in itself a recognition of the tremendous change taking place in our country as the country grows increasingly concentrated and urban.

We need to recognize the need for broad-based development—for a balanced development in both our big cities and small towns in America.

Secretary Weaver has assured me that emphasis will be placed on development of both of these sectors of our great Nation—Big City America and Small Town America.

I want to point out that this bill does not include appropriations for urban renewal grants as no funds were requested. This program is being funded by direct appropriations on a 2-year basis. Funds are available for grants for the current year. We anticipate consideration of a supplemental request for urban renewal funding later this year.

The committee recommends $30 million for grants to States and municipalities and small communities to help finance surveys and urban renewal planning.

The program of public works planning advances provides interest-free advances to States and local public agencies for planning public works projects.

We are recommending funds for a number of studies, including housing and building codes studies, tax policies, and also urban housing studies.

In addition, we are recommending $17 million for neighborhood facilities grants and $55 million for grants to States and local governments and agencies for acquisition of land in urban areas for parks, recreation, and urban beautification.

We are recommending an appropriation of $100 million for water and sewer grants—the full budget request and estimate.

These grants finance the cost of construction of water and sewage facilities on a 50-50 matching basis. There is a great demand for this program as cities and towns across the Nation undertake basic facility improvements.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The Federal Housing Administration—FHA—is charged with the responsibility of administering the rent supplement program—as well as 25 active FHA mortgage insurance programs.

Sixteen percent of the new homes constructed in America are insured under FHA.

Forty percent of the new homes in the Nation, that sell for $17,500 or less, have been financed through FHA.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

The budget recommended $35 million for contracts in the second phase of the rent supplement program. The budget also recommended $3 million for payments pursuant to contracts.

The subcommittee approved $20 million for contracts and $2 million for payments.

The full committee struck this item out of the bill. There are no funds in this bill for the rent supplement program. I understand an amendment will be offered to restore the funds for the rent supplement program.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The bill would provide $250 million for payment of annual contribution to local public housing authorities—$10 million less than the budget estimate.

There are 630,310 public housing units in the United States with more than 4,100 projects under management by the Public Housing Administration.

Testimony before our committee shows that there certainly exists a great need for public housing, as well as the rent supplement program to help Americans mired in poverty secure decent homes in which to live.

We have not caught up on the housing needs of the Nation.

There is a tremendous job yet to be done.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The committee considered a budget estimate of $525 million for the National Science Foundation. The bill recommends an appropriation of $479,999,000—the same amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

This sum will support a broad spectrum of scientific activities ranging from course material for testing science teachers in primary and secondary schools to support of the research of some 15,000 scientific workers—including some of our most renowned scientists.

The recommended appropriation would also provide for operation and development of four national research centers.

The National Science Foundation is extending its grants and aids to a greater degree to smaller institutions for various scientific courses and studies. This is an encouraging trend.

The subcommittee recommended—and the full committee approved—we are deferring of further appropriations for Project Mohole at this time. This is a very costly project with marginal and questionable benefits—a project of low priority.

In view of the world situation and the pressures and demands on our budget—priority funding—the committee feels that this is not the time to expend huge sums of money to dig a hole.

The cost of the Mohole project has already greatly exceeded the original estimate and promises to increase still further. Current estimates are that the Mohole project will cost somewhere between $80 and $115 million.

Over a period of the next two or three decades the cost would be over half a billion dollars. No funds are included in the bill for the Mohole project.

Certainly this is one project that can be deferred.

CIVIL DEFENSE

We are all concerned with civil defense.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we are making great strides and tremendous progress in our civil defense program.

We are funding this program at a consistent level.

The budget request was for $133,400,000. The committee approved $101,100,000—a reduction of about $32 million.

This, as I pointed out, is in line with appropriations for prior years.

Let me cite some tangible results achieved to date in the civil defense program.

For example, we have 143 million shelter spaces marked.

A total of 70,800 facilities have been stocked with supplies sufficient to provide food for 65 million people for 8 days.

A total of 56,800 radiological monitoring stations with trained monitors have been set up.

A warning system has been established with 1,000 contacts throughout the Nation.

Civil defense has established 2,000 emergency operating centers and an emergency broadcasting system of 2,000 stations across the country. Five hundred and forty of these have emergency power sources.

Our stockpile of medical supplies totals $200 million—including 2,500 portable disaster hospitals of 200 beds each.

Four thousand communities in 50 States have an organized and ongoing civil defense program—covering about 80 percent of our population.

Thirty separate agencies of Government are concerned with civil defense.

So it is apparent that this program of civil defense has come a long way. It is apparent that we have a strong, broad base upon which to continue to build for the future.

In view of these facts, Mr. Chairman, I believe that civil defense is well funded.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

The function served by this Council headed by the Vice President is to advise and assist the President, as he may request, in matters relating to programs and policies of the United States in the fields of aeronautics and space. The committee recommends the budget estimate of $525,000 to provide a small staff for this purpose.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

The committee considered a budget estimate of $5,096,000 for salaries and expenses of this Office for a staff to advise and assist the President in the direction of nonmilitary defense programs of the United States. The committee recommends $4,700,000, which is $396,000 less than the amount requested.

The budget estimate for telecommunications is $2,270,000 and the committee recommends $1,500,000. An overall reduction of $770,000 is recommended in the bill.

The bill contains $4,450,000 for civil defense and defense mobilization functions performed by nine Federal agencies under delegations of authority from the President. This is $371,000 less than the budget estimate and $1,000 below the current appropriation level.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Office provides advice and assistance to the President in developing policies and evaluating matters related to science and technology. The budget contains $1,360,000 for this purpose. The committee has approved the sum of $1,200,000. This is $130,000 more than the current year and $160,000 less than the budget estimate.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

The budget estimate of $15 million to replenish the President's emergency disaster relief fund is recommended. The amount is substantially less than the $120 million provided in the current fiscal year due to a number of declared disasters of unusual severity. Should this experience reoccur in 1967 additional funds will be required.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

An appropriation of $1 million is recommended for salaries and expenses of this Commission for 1967 to continue the preparation of plans and services related to regional economic development of the 12-State Appalachian area. The Commission is composed of the Governors of these States or their representatives and a Federal Cochairman appointed by the President. The amount approved is $110,000 less than the budget estimate and $128,000 less than current year obligations.

This should be adequate to continue the excellent progress of the new and important work of this Commission.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The committee considered a budget estimate of $12,222,291 for salaries and expenses of the Board in 1967 and recommends $11,600,000. This is a reduction of $622,291 from the amount requested and an increase of $437,250 over 1966.

An appropriation of $63,500,000 is included for airline subsidy payments instead of $67 million as proposed in the budget. Funds in the bill reflect a reduction of $17,670,000 from the funding level of 1966. The increasingly favorable earnings position of the airline industry occasioned by the rapid growth of passenger traffic provides substantial possibilities for subsidy reductions.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The budget estimate proposes $28,332,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission and the committee recommends $27,500,000, an increase of $628,800 over 1966 and $832,000 less than the budget estimate. The Commission proposes to finance all administrative expenses of insurance, health benefits, and retirement programs from the appropriate trust funds within a single administrative expense limitation. This will permit simplification of administration and will finance administrative costs of the retirement program out of the civil service retirement and disability trust fund in a manner similar to arrangements currently applicable to employees' life insurance and health benefits programs. The budget proposes the transfer of not to exceed $6,160,000 and the committee has approved $6,100,000.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The $17,338,500 recommended for salaries and expenses of this Commission is the same as 1966 and is $181,500 less than the budget estimate.

This Commission is currently investigating the rate structure of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—a most important case.

Revenues paid by telephone users last year alone amounted to almost $3.1 billion. The FCC has been able to negotiate a reduction in rates of the Bell System applicable to night, Saturday, and Sunday service resulting in savings to the public of $100 million annually. A further examination and investigation of the telephone rate structure is continuing by this Commission.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

This agency operates on funds raised from its member institutions which it supervises and regulates. We have approved an increased limitation on funds for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The committee considered a budget estimate of $14,288,000 for salaries and expenses of this Commission and recommends $13,650,000 which is a reduction of $638,000. With the precedent now established by the Supreme Court decision in the Permian Basin case, the Commission should be in a position to proceed more expeditiously in its natural gas rate cases in the public interest.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

For the FTC we are recommending an appropriation of $14 million for fiscal year 1967. This is one of our important regulatory commissions and its functions and services in the public interest must continue unabated and unimpaired.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The committee recommends $48,500,000 for necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office for next year. This is a reduction of only $300,000 in the budget estimate. The committee has no intention to curtail the activities of this agency. On the contrary, it desires to give the new Comptroller General of the United States every support he needs to aggressively pursue his responsibilities.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The bill carries an appropriation of $27,759,000 for fiscal year 1967 for salaries and expenses of this Commission. This is the same amount as the budget estimate and represents an increase of $219,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

An appropriation of $2,477,000 is included in the bill for the Renegotiation Board as proposed in the budget. This is $53,000 less than the appropriation for 1966 and will provide a staffing level slightly below that of the current fiscal year. This agency, in reviewing Government contracts in excess of $1 million has been able to effect refunds and savings, by Board proceedings and by voluntary actions, since the inception of the Board totaling some $2,158,495,552 which sum has been covered into the U.S. Treasury.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The bill carries an appropriation of $17,250,000 for this Commission, which is a reduction of $300,000 from the amount requested for 1967. Substantial increases have been provided in recent years for this Commission and the committee is of the opinion that the Commission should reprogram more of its funds into critical areas of higher priority work, including the Securities Act amendments.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

With the increased activities of local draft boards and the increased number of selectees occasioned by the Vietnam buildup, the committee has approved the full budget estimate of $51,940,000 for operation of the Selective Service System. While the number of draftees continues to be debated, it is evident at this time that this funding will be required in 1967.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Veterans' Administration appropriation represents the largest item in this appropriation bill. The funds in the bill reflect our country's continuing commitment to build the most comprehensive veterans' benefits program in history.

The budget proposed an appropriation for all programs of the Veterans' Administration of $5,959,024,000—the bill carries an appropriation of $5,957,307,000—a reduction of only $1,717,000.

A reduction is recommended in only two items: A reduction of $217,000 in medical administration costs; and a reduction of $1,500,000 in grants for construction of State nursing homes. All other programs are fully funded.

These include an appropriation of $1,265,437,000 for veterans' medical care and hospital programs.

An appropriation of $4,374 million for compensation and pensions.

Our recommendations also include $42,400,00 for readjustment benefits.

Increases are included in the bill for veterans' insurance programs and research, among other benefits.

I should point out that this bill—this appropriation—does not include funds with which to implement the new GI bill enacted into law in March of this year. This bill created 4 million new veterans eligible for benefits.

CONCLUSION

These, Mr. Chairman, are some of the highlights of our committee's recommendations—in this independent office appropriations bill.

It is obvious to me that a review of programs of these agencies, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development, are a mirror of American life.

They reflect many of our country's problems and underline the necessity for providing these funds to endeavor to solve them.

They reflect many facets of our country's progress.

They reflect a need for proper regulation to protect our national interest and the public interest.

A great American of the last century once said, and I quote:

> If our Republic were blotted from the earth and from the memory of mankind, and if no record of its history survived, except a copy of our revenue laws and our appropriations bills for a single year, the political philosopher would be able from these materials alone to reconstruct a large part of our history and sketch with considerable accuracy the character and spirit of our institutions.

Certainly this is true of this, the independent offices appropriations bill for 1967.

This bill is a catalog of progress. It is a reflection of our civilization. It is an indicator of tomorrow.

This bill reflects an often-quoted statement of Abraham Lincoln, who said—and I quote:

> The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done—but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities.

This bill reflects the thinking of Thomas Jefferson, who said—and I quote:

> The care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government.

And this bill reflects the thinking of President Lyndon B. Johnson, who said—and I quote:

> If ever there has been a time when the full force and strength of the government of the people should be mustered and mobilized for the services of the people—that time is now.

Mr. Chairman, this bill serves the Nation's needs. This is a good bill. It is a vital bill. This is a bedrock budget. This is a needed and essential appropriation.

I urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, under general leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a summary table of the bill:

Independent Offices appropriation bill, 1967—H.R. 14921—Comparison of the appropriation for 1966 and the estimates and amounts as passed the House for 1967

Agency or item	Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Passed the House	House action compared with— Appropriation, 1966	House action compared with— Budget estimates, 1967
National Aeronautics and Space Council	$525,000	$525,000	$525,000		
Office of Emergency Planning	10,600,000	12,187,000	10,650,000	+$50,000	−$1,537,000
Office of Science and Technology	1,070,000	1,360,000	1,200,000	+130,000	−160,000
Disaster relief	120,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	−105,000,000	
Appalachian Regional Commission	[1] *(1,128,000)*	1,110,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	−110,000
Civil Aeronautics Board	92,332,750	79,222,291	75,100,000	−17,232,750	−4,122,291
Civil Service Commission	123,398,000	128,999,000	128,160,000	+4,762,000	−839,000
Federal Aviation Agency	862,910,500	907,986,000	901,831,500	+38,921,000	−6,154,500
Federal Communications Commission	17,338,500	17,520,000	17,338,500		−181,500
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	[2] *(17,354,000)*	*(18,160,000)*	*(18,160,000)*	*(+406,000)*	
Federal Power Commission	13,530,000	14,288,000	13,650,000	+120,000	−638,000
Federal Trade Commission	13,862,500	14,009,000	14,000,000	+137,500	−9,000
General Accounting Office	47,435,000	48,800,000	48,500,000	+1,065,000	−300,000
General Services Administration	588,331,250	628,500,000	553,890,000	−34,441,250	−74,610,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	27,540,000	27,759,000	27,759,000	+219,000	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5,175,000,000	5,012,000,000	4,950,000,000	−225,000,000	−62,000,000
National Capital Housing Authority	49,000	37,000	37,000	−12,000	
National Science Foundation	479,997,000	525,000,000	479,997,000		−45,001,000
Renegotiation Board	2,530,000	2,477,000	2,477,000	−53,000	
Securities and Exchange Commission	16,442,000	17,550,000	17,250,000	+808,000	−300,000
Selective Service Systems	61,250,000	51,940,000	51,940,000	−9,310,000	
Veterans' Administration	6,001,226,600	5,959,024,000	5,958,807,000	−42,419,600	−217,000
Civil defense (DOD)	106,780,000	133,400,000	101,100,000	−5,680,000	−32,300,000
Civil defense (HEW)	[1] *(9,788,400)*	10,430,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000	−430,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development	2,651,208,200	710,488,000	637,085,000	−2,014,123,200	−73,403,000
Federal National Mortgage Association	[2] *(8,800,000)*	[2] *(9,100,000)*	[2] *(9,081,000)*	[2] *(+281,000)*	[2] *(−19,000)*
Federal Housing Administration	[2] *(92,180,000)*	[2] *(100,350,000)*	[2] *(95,500,000)*	[2] *(+3,320,000)*	[2] *(−4,850,000)*
Total appropriations	16,413,358,300	14,319,611,291	14,017,299,000	−2,396,059,300	−302,312,291

[1] Obligation of prior year funds brought forward.

[2] Corporate funds available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee and his subcommittee for bringing this bill to the floor. Usually I do not do this, as the gentleman will recall, and instead I talk about 5-percent cuts across the board. I shall not offer a 5-percent cut across the board amendment on this bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to see that the bill has a total of $305 million less than the budget estimates, and a reduction of $373 million from appropriations for 1966. The gentleman's subcommittee has done an excellent job. In no instance has the committee gone over the budget request on any item. That is unusual this year.

As I look at the cuts the gentleman's committee has made, I see they are genuine cuts. They represent actual savings from the budget estimates.

I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee, the gentleman from North Carolina, and all the members of the subcommittee, as well as of the full committee, for bringing this kind of a bill to the floor. If we continue to bring them in under the budget and not over the budget, I believe we will establish some fiscal responsibility in this Government.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my friend for his comments.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is not considered good form for members of a committee or of a subcommittee to exchange compliments on the floor of the House, but there are exceptions to all rules. I believe the facts of the case and the circumstances today warrant an exception.

I should like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], who assumed a responsibility most men would have shied away from; that is, the responsibility of trying to fill the shoes of one of the great men of our generation, one of the greatest and most able Members this House ever had. I refer, of course, to our beloved late colleague, Albert Thomas, of Texas.

I do not believe I have ever known a man in the House who had a better mastery of this subject than Mr. Thomas had when he handled the subcommittee. There was not a detail about the budget with which he did not familiarize himself. He was able on the floor to answer all questions that 434 other Members might ask.

So it is not any discredit to the gentleman from Tennessee to remark that there were those who wondered whether there was anyone on the committee who could fill the shoes of Albert Thomas when he so tragically passed from the scene earlier this year.

I should like to say that the members of the subcommittee who watched the gentleman from Tennessee take over the responsibilities of the subcommittee, who saw the way he handled the witnesses—and we heard 125 witnesses in the consideration of this bill—the diligent study he gave to the bill and his preliminary homework, the uniform courtesy with which he always handled the witnesses and the courtesy with which he dealt with the members of the subcommittee, were greatly impressed by the gentleman's performance.

I am sure the other members of the subcommittee would join with me in publicly complimenting him on the manner in which he filled the breach and measured up to the high responsibility he assumed under really adverse circumstances. I think he deserves the thanks and appreciation of the Members of the House, and especially the members of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as the country for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

As has already been said in the colloquy between my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], this is one bill that no one downtown can criticize for being above the budget. We were, or I at least was, and I speak now for myself, a little concerned at criticisms leveled at Congress and at the Committee on Appropriations for having the temerity to increase specific items in bills previously considered this year. We bring you a bill today which is $305 million under the budget. It is $373 million below the corresponding appropriations made last year. Not a single budget item has been increased. All of the changes, as will be apparent, were reductions. There are 63 line item budget reductions in this bill and not a single increase.

The table on the last page of the report would indicate that this bill is a couple of billion dollars under the corresponding bill of last year, but while that is technically true, in order not to be misleading, we have explained it in the report. I commend the report to the careful attention of the Members. Actually, as I have said, the bill is $373 million under last year's appropriations, although technically it is more than $2 billion under. However, you have to understand that this apparent discrepancy is made up of three items—mass transportation grants, urban renewal grants, and airport construction grants.

Last year we inaugurated a policy of advance funds for 2 years for all three of these items. That was in order to take care of long leadtime items. Congress appropriated 2-year funds in each of these categories. So no request was made in this year's budget for 1967 funds, because they are available out of appropriations made last year. For example, no funds were requested here for urban renewal, because $725 million is available from last year's funds for urban renewal.

I would like to explain that the committee was faced with this situation with respect to urban renewal: If we do not insist on a supplemental budget request for 1968 funds in order to continue 2-year advance funding, there will be no funds for 1968 and the agency will revert to the former policy of the back-door spending, that is, going to the Treasury for contract authorization. However, we have been assured by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that a supplemental request will come up for urban renewal for 1968 funds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, last year the Congress provided $71 million for airport construction grants and aid for airport construction.

The administration in its budget this year asked that the $21 million be rescinded. The action of the committee merely eliminated the request to rescind the $21 million. Therefore, the entire $71 million appropriated last year is available and further appropriations will, of course, have to depend upon and await further authorizations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Or would the gentleman prefer to make his statement and then yield?

Mr. JONAS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much longer is this unconscionable deficit going to continue in the operation of Dulles Airport, a deficit of between $6 and $7 million a year?

Mr. JONAS. I would, if the gentleman will permit, like to defer discussing that until I finish my statement and then I shall yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL], who is the aviator on the subcommittee. He is our expert on aviation problems. He has made a study of this particular section of the bill, and I feel he can respond to questions concerning airport construction, FAA budgets, and so forth better than anyone on the subcommittee.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Do I understand that there was in the President's budget an intention expressed to cut back on the program of airport development and expansion and that as far as the action of this committee is concerned, however, it has not gone along with this proposal for a cutback, so that the normal plan of development of airports, as was contemplated last year, will continue on the same basis upon which the plans were then made?

Mr. JONAS. It would continue for 1967. That will exhaust the authorizations and further authorizations will have to be approved before additional funds can be appropriated.

The action of the subcommittee simply eliminated the rescinding language which would have cut back the funds from $71 to $50 million.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Well, the gentleman mentioned in connection with urban renewal that the problem as it might relate—as far as that program is concerned—to 1968 would be resolved through a supplemental appropriation.

What is the situation as far as airport developments in fiscal 1968 are concerned?

Mr. JONAS. Well, new authorizations will be required.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me in order to respond to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The sum of $71 million was appropriated last year to provide 1 year advance funding for airport grants. The Bureau of the Budget recommended rescinding $21 million. The subcommittee did not accept this recommendation. So this fund will be available for grants-in-aid to airport construction on a matching basis for this coming year. At the end of fiscal year 1967 additional authorization will be required before further appropriations can be made.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Oh, I see. In other words, you do not have a basic legislative authorization?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Therefore, this is a different situation here as compared to the urban renewal projects insofar as 1968 funds are concerned?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my appreciation to the chairman and members of this committee for their consideration and action relating to the grants-in-aid for airports.

The recommendation to rescind the $21 million, if accepted by the committee, would have seriously jeopardized the plans of States and local communities for the development of airports in the well established orderly manner.

Many cities and counties throughout the Nation have been acquiring land for airport construction purposes with the full expectation that the Federal matching funds would be available.

In particular the general aviation type airport facility would suffer if the committee had not acted as you did. In writing to the FAA Administrator, he advised me that general aviation expansion would be specifically jeopardized if this committee did not reject the recommendation to rescind the $21 million.

With business taking to the air in increasing numbers, no community will be "on the map" unless they can provide aviation access for the flying businessman. The committee by their action today has recognized this need.

As to the future, I believe it will become increasingly necessary to better coordinate the airport planning among all three levels of government. As a member of the House Road Subcommittee, I have constantly stressed the overwhelming need for a balanced road, highway, and freeway system throughout the Nation. While this applies to surface transportation needs, I would also admonish the Members that we have an equal responsibility to work closely on the organization and development of a balanced system of airports throughout our Nation. Certainly, each city and county should move toward the adoption of up-to-date airport master plans, navigation easements contiguous to airports are necessary and in general prepare for the expanding requirements of general aviation.

It seems that most of the emphasis has been placed on space and supersonic aviation objectives, which are understandably important, but we should never forget the short-run feeder airlines, the air taxi operators, and general aviation users who are carrying the business leadership of our Nation. As we seek methods of expanding the economic development of this great country, I can only hope we have men in Congress who will continue to recognize their role in helping our business community meet their appointments on schedule by improving the communications and airport facilities of Hometown, U.S.A.

The County Supervisors Association of California, the National Association of Counties, and the California Association of Airport Executives have all asked me to intervene on their behalf to support the position that I have just stated, because of my personal aviation background.

In particular, I want to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. MINSHALL] for his interest and help in this matter. His personal knowledge and expertise in the field of aviation has certainly provided us with an understanding and sympathetic ear on this very important Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. JONAS. The decision of the subcommittee, which was approved by the full committee, to make these substantial reductions in budget requests was based upon a number of considerations. There is the need to curtail new spending authority wherever possible in order to make the financing of the increasing cost of the war in Vietnam less painful and less inflationary, as well as the importance of holding the contemplated deficit as low as possible in order to prevent the Government from competing with other users of capital funds for the available investment funds in existence today.

I noticed in this morning's paper, for example, that Fanny May is selling some debentures, its latest issue, that will yield 5½-percent interest. These are obligations that have the full faith and credit of the United States behind them.

We are all painfully aware that interest charges are going up dramatically, to such an extent, I am informed by the homebuilders in my part of the country, that mortgage credit money is rapidly drying up. This is a dangerous situation. Unless it is corrected, it may involve getting us into a real economic downturn. I do not think we can afford to let the homebuilding industry dry up for lack of mortgage credit. Of course with increased interest costs the cost of homeowning goes up just as the cost of bread, bacon, and all the other necessities of life have gone up in recent years due to the inflationary forces at work in our economy.

This action on the part of our committee was an effort to strike a blow against those inflationary forces and in an effort to hold down Government borrowing to make up whatever deficit will occur next year as low as possible.

I have already said that considerable criticism has been levied at the Congress and at the Committee on Appropriations this year because in certain instances budget items have been increased and I, for one, have been anxious that that criticism not be justified so far as this bill that we are now considering is concerned.

But in view of these criticisms, I think it important to call attention to those who will read the RECORD and to those who are present in the Committee of the Whole today and who are interested, a few comments that I think are pertinent.

We should keep reminding ourselves, and we should be careful that the public is made aware, of the fact that funds appropriated by the Congress in bills such as we have before us today do not have any direct relationship to the spending that will go on next year.

What we are doing in this bill is granting new obligational authority to the executive departments of the Government. We are not directing that this $14 billion will be spent. Unless there are restrictions as to the years in which the money can be spent, the executive branch of the Government has wide discretionary authority not to spend all of the money appropriated for a given year in that given year—and can carry over the funds.

This can be illustrated by the action taken last December by the Secretary of Defense who deliberately froze or elected to defer the spending of $600 million appropriated by this Congress to provide what had been represented to the committee as being necessary and important facilities in military establishments around the United States, including I might add a number of troop housing support facilities such as BOQ's, family housing and other support activities for our military personnel.

Those funds were frozen or the decision was made by the Secretary of Defense not to spend them despite the fact that they had been justified by service witnesses before the committee as being absolutely necessary for the security of the United States or for the maintenance of morale among our Armed Forces.

The ink was hardly dry on that order of the Secretary of Defense declining to spend $600 million, as I have just said, before the President in his budget now under consideration was asking Congress to appropriate $35 million to be added to $30 million previously requested to be extracted from taxpayer John Smith to help pay the rent of his next-door neighbor.

In other words, while the administration with its right hand, acting through the Secretary of Defense, was refusing to spend $160 million which had been appropriated to build 8,500 family housing units for the families of servicemen, the same administration with its left hand was asking Congress to appropriate $35 million plus $30 million to provide rent subsidies for a certain specific class of civilians of the United States.

If there were not any fundamental reasons why the rent subsidy plan should be defeated, that alone is sufficient, in my judgment, to cause its defeat, because I do not think the servicemen in uniform ought to be the only people who are being required to make sacrifices because of this unfortunate war in which we are involved in Vietnam.

This fact alone makes it crystal clear that the President has wide authority to control the level of spending in any given year. So if the agencies downtown do not know how to defer use of the new obligational authority conferred in this bill or any previous bills passed by the House against which criticism was levied, I am sure they can find out how to do it by asking Mr. McNamara.

I would like to comment now about the general budget under consideration, and I am not going to undertake to discuss item by item the provisions in the bill, because the gentleman from Tennessee has ably done that, and the report is available for all who care to read it. We have undertaken in that report to explain the actions of the committee.

But there are certain things about this budget that really mystify me, that are hard to understand.

For example, despite all the calls for economy emanating from downtown, this budget includes travel funds amounting to $1,700 million, an increase of $400 million over funds provided for travel last year. This bill before you today, the independent offices appropriation bill, calls for $79 million in travel funds for the 23 agencies covered, and they are all civilian—no military involved. Imagine, $1¾ billion for travel. We hear a great deal of criticism of Members of Congress who make trips occasionally, and some of the criticism is justified, of course. In some cases the trips are valuable to enable Members to find out things that they need to know to better discharge their duties. But I do not hear any criticism in the press or otherwise about a budget that has $1,700 million for executive travel in it.

I repeat. Just this one little bill before you today has $79 million in travel funds in it.

This budget calls for an increase of 45,000 jobs but only 5 are for the Bureau of Narcotics. It calls for $170 million in new public building construction, although the President only a few weeks ago called upon industry to cut back on its plans for expansion, even though new job creating facilities were involved.

It calls for $89 million for open space and urban beautification grants.

It calls for $91 million for highway beauty, which is more than is provided for highway safety—more money for beauty and less for school lunches and milk and highway safety and narcotics control.

It calls for $1,750 million in new funds for the poverty program, but less than Congress authorized for vocational education—less for payments to school districts, less for school lunch and milk programs, and less for cancer and mental health research.

What a budget: more money for beauty and less for health. The most you can say for this budget is that it is the biggest in history. It is notable for putting many last things first and many first things last.

I am indebted to our former colleague, NORRIS COTTON, now the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, for this story, which he uses to illustrate his feelings with respect to this budget. He says that an Irishman was forced to testify about the delivery of illegal whisky to one Jake Smith, but denied knowledge of what was in the container. The prosecutor asked, "Was it not labeled whisky?" The Irishman replied, "It said 'rye whisky' on one end of the bottle, and 'Jake Smith' on the other end. How was I to know which one was in the bottle?"

You have to really analyze this budget to know what is in it.

I am not going to go into the details of this budget for reasons already stated. In my opinion it is a good budget and a sound one. It was carefully considered in the committee, and makes substantial cuts in the budget. I recommend it to this Committee of the Whole, and hope for its approval as submitted.

In case efforts are made on the floor to increase any funds provided in the bill, I would like to remind the Members of the Committee of just a few facts:

First. We continue to lose gold at an alarming rate. Some of the loss, no doubt, is attributable to lack of confidence in our ability or willingness to practice fiscal responsibility. The gold loss during the last 12 months was $778 million. Our gold reserves are now down to $13.6 billion.

Second. The national debt continues to rise. It is now $3 billion more than it was a year ago. The carrying charges are $12.7 billion a year, more than a billion dollars a month just for interest.

Third. Spending continues to rise. During the first 10 months of this fiscal year, there was withdrawn from the U.S. Treasury the sum of $117 billion as compared with $103 billion in withdrawals during the comparable period last year, an increase of over $14 billion in 1 year.

While withdrawals from the Treasury during these last 10 months amounted to $117 billion, Treasury receipts during that same period were only $106 billion, an excess of withdrawals over receipts of $10 billion in just 10 months.

Fourth. During the first 300 days of fiscal 1966, your Government spent money at the rate of $390 million every day, $16 million every hour, or $267,000 every minute.

I hope you agree with me that the time is at hand when we should stop fanning the fires of inflation, stop the profligate spending of taxpayers' money, and start thinking about putting our fiscal house in order. If we do not do it, we are in for trouble.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins], and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas], have thoroughly and adequately explained this bill.

The report of the subcommittee is an excellent one, and I believe it details fully the action taken by the subcommittee.

As the gentleman from North Carolina has done, I wish to pay my respects to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins].

The gentleman from Tennessee himself called attention to the fact that this is the first time in 16 years this bill has been brought to the House without the leadership of our late beloved colleague from Texas, Mr. Albert Thomas. As all of us have come to realize and to know full well, Mr. Thomas was one of the great giants of his time in this Congress. I am confident that he could be classed as one of the alltime giants of any Congress.

To follow Mr. Thomas in bringing this bill to the floor is akin to following a Mantle or a Mays or a Maris. But the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] has done that well. He has done it with great credit. He has performed his work admirably, spending long hours in committee to fashion a good bill.

All of us on the subcommittee who have served with him and who have served with him in this Congress congratulate him for his dedication, for his spirit, and for his knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper place and at the proper time I intend to offer an amendment to restore the rent supplement program. I do not believe there is a Member of the House who does not understand what the amendment is all about. President Johnson has described the rent supplement program as the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city.

In my judgment, this program of private housing built by private industry for nonprofit, limited dividend, or cooperative sponsor organizations is one of the most important, if not the most important, legislative tool which has been conceived for providing housing for low-income families in communities which heretofore have not been able to afford the housing.

Mr. Chairman, I believe deeply in the worthwhileness of this program. I believe that it offers a great potential in meeting the complex and difficult problems of providing safe, decent, and sanitary housing to the great mass of the American people who need it the most.

A decent home and a suitable environment for every American—that was the goal which was set forth in the national policy in the Housing Act of 1949.

Mr. Chairman, for nearly 30 years we have been engaged in a program of public housing to attain the objectives of the fine words embraced in that act. We have made great strides, for today there are 610,000 dwellings housing 2.6 million people, and almost 193,000 additional dwellings are in various stages of development. When completed, they will raise the total to 803,000.

The program serves the small as well as the large communities. More than half of the communities now involved have populations of fewer than 5,000 people, but the majority of the dwellings are in the larger urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, these are impressive figures, but they are not enough. As many as 40 percent of the people in many of our urban ghettos still live in totally inadequate housing—dirty, rat infested, without adequate plumbing or heat in the winter. There are still 8.5 million families who live in dilapidated, substandard housing.

So, Mr. Chairman, a new approach is needed—a bold approach. It is embodied in President Johnson's recommendation of the rent supplement program.

I would direct the attention of the membership of this House to the hearings. On page 1635 of the hearings are listed names of some of the witnesses who appeared before our committee in support of this program. These witnesses, I believe, constitute a cross section of the religious denominations of all America. They are Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, of all kinds. Mr. Chairman, these are the people to whom we should listen, with respect to this program, for these are the people who have been working with the low-income groups all their lives.

These are the people who have been laboring in the vineyard of the Lord. These are the people who are close to the problems of those who live in unsanitary and indecent housing.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the Members will just refer to the testimony given by these distinguished churchmen, they will realize why this committee and the Subcommittee on Independent Offices recommended an appropriation of $20 million. This $20 million was $15 million less than that requested by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Just an hour or so ago the House started this program with a $12 million appropriation in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1966. My amendment will fund it for fiscal year 1967. In my judgment, the effort of a minority of the Members of this House to scuttle this program and remove the $20 million which was recommended by the Subcommittee on Independent Offices would, I am sure, destroy the program completely.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope when this amendment is offered the majority of the members of this committee will support the amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Massachusetts referred to the hearings and to a list of various church organizations supporting the rent supplement program; that is, the overall program. It has been called to my attention that these fine groups supported this program but did not support the segregation amendments which I understand the gentleman is going to incorporate with his amendment providing for the $22 million.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman from Massachusetts is a realist and he will include the provisos with the amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. And you are going to include these provisos. I understand they change the opinion of some of these groups as far as the program is concerned.

Mr. BOLAND. But I think that under the circumstances all of the witnesses who testified and were members of these church denominations would be willing to take the amendment with the provisos.

Mr. LAIRD. They are willing to take the amendments as far as continuing segregation as far as housing is concerned?

Mr. BOLAND. I think they will be happy to get the amendment as I propose it, both with the money and the provisos.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Are not those provisos contained in the rent supplement program approved by the Congress in the conference report we just considered a moment or two ago in the House?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. YATES. So that this continues the same sort of provisos contained in that bill?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, the justifications presented by the Housing and Urban Development Department clearly show this is a program for low-income groups. Congress, in its debates on this matter, has clearly stated that it should be restricted to this group.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to detail eligibility, income, and assets liability—also eligible sponsor organizations.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM—TENANTS ELIGIBLE FOR RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Before an applicant can qualify for admission to a rent supplement unit, he must show that his household is in one or more of the following statutory categories: has been or will be displaced by governmental action; contains a head or spouse 62 years of age or older; contains a head or spouse who is physically handicapped; now lives in substandard housing; occupies or did occupy living units destroyed or extensively damaged by natural disaster.

The statute further restricts availability of rent supplement payment benefits to families and individuals having low incomes. To assure that this requirement is met, the Secretary will set maximum limits for admission to rent supplement units in each locality. The limits being set will not exceed those which have been established for public housing projects in the same community. The rent supplement income limits for the 51 largest cities in the country and 20 smaller cities are presented in the Appendix. Combined gross family income of all members of a household before taxes or withholding will be used to determine eligibility for rent supplements. Appropriate adjustments will be made for temporary, seasonal, or nonrecurring income.

ASSETS LIMITATION

In addition to the requirement of a low income, an examination will be made of the assets of each tenant before he is approved for rent supplement. A household cannot have assets exceeding $2,000—or $5,000 in case of the elderly household. Ordinary furniture and the usual personal effects will not be counted for this purpose. The value of long-term assets such as real estate or an owned automobile will be included within the ceiling to the extent it exceeds any outstanding indebtedness against such assets.

ELIGIBLE TYPES OF SPONSOR ORGANIZATIONS AND FINANCING

Ownership of projects which are eligible to receive rent supplement payment benefits is restricted to private nonprofit organizations, limited-dividend mortgagors, or cooperative housing corporations.

Projects eligible for rent supplement payments, whether for rehabilitation or new construction, must be approved by FHA for mortgage insurance under section 221(d)(3) at the market interest rate—currently 5¼ percent plus one-half of 1 percent mortgage insurance premium—except for a limited number of projects which may be insured or financed under the experimental program as discussed later. Mortgage financing for these projects would be obtained from private lenders.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I took this time so that I might have an opportunity to direct a question to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins], the chairman of the subcommittee, concerning this part of the budget having to do with urban mass transportation activities of the Department of HUD. It is not to ask him a question about the funding, but about his understanding of how this program works concerning the providing of grants to communities for the taking over of private transportation companies, such as bus companies, and to have them run by the city. I am speaking of something that has just been brought to my attention from my own home town of Yakima, Wash., where our city applied some months ago for a grant from HUD. A city election on this plan is being held on May 24 but the grant must be approved first. Plans for this grant with the HUD office were going along very well until just this week. The city council members, the lawyers, and the mayor were informed they had not met the criteria of the mass transit bill because they were not offering the employees of the present private company the same terms they now work under in a union contract. Those terms they now work under, which they negotiated with the private company some years ago, include compulsory arbitration, collective bargaining, and a closed shop.

Yet, under the laws of the State of Washington it is very clearly spelled out that no city employee can come under such type of contract. Now, is it the gentleman's understanding that this is the way the program can be applied in a State? Where it is very clear that the State law forbids city employees to live under the same requirements that a privately negotiated contract provides between a union and a private business and where such contract has been negotiated, must all their cities be denied these HUD funds?

In other words, does this require a criterion whereby they must break State law before they can apply for or be granted such public transportation assistance?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Does the gentlewoman know if they have a transit authority in the city or is it a private corporation?

Mrs. MAY. No, they do not. It is just a private business that owns the bus company, and they want to go out of business. Therefore, this is the only public transportation agency available to the people of the city, and the city has agreed to take it over.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Is a private concern taking it over, or is a city transit authority taking it over?

Mrs. MAY. The city will be taking it over. The employees of the bus company will become employees of the city.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. There are certain criteria to meet in order to receive the grant. Some $55 million is contained in this bill for additional mass transportation grants.

I can assure the gentlewoman from Washington that they will contact the transit authority or the local transportation agencies concerned.

Mrs. MAY. They have already done this, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. Employees of the private company have already been offered jobs, increased wages and fringe benefits. A national representative of the union—the Amalgamated Transit Union—told the HUD Department that they cannot OK this grant because the city cannot offer the employees the same terms of contract which they have with their present employer. But under Washington State law it is impossible for a city employee to obtain the benefits that are now contained in their private contract.

I just wondered if anyone can answer the question as to whether this is the way the program is supposed to work?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. It is certainly not intended that there should be unemployment as a result of these grants. They certainly will not try to force employees out of work. However, in any program there are certain tests that must be met, and HUD representatives certainly will look into the problems involved.

Mrs. MAY. The employees have all been offered a job with the city, and the local employees are represented as being in accord with the proposal. They wish to become employees of the city and to be offered all of the benefits as a result thereof. However, the Amalgamated Transit Union has told the office of HUD that they could not OK this grant unless the city is willing to give the employees now working for the private company the same kind of contract which they now have. Yet that is against State law. In other words, they say "You cannot have it until you are willing to break State law."

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We shall be very pleased to look into the matter, and try to help the gentlewoman from Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman such time as she may consume.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, as one member of the subcommittee I would like to say again that I disapprove of anyone—any organization, whether representing management, labor, or any other group in the United States, undertaking to dictate to the Department of HUD as to how this program should be administered.

I do not believe it was the intent of the Congress to permit outside dictation or direction. If I remain on the committee, I can assure the gentlewoman from Washington that I shall do what I can to see that this will not be permitted.

Mrs. MAY. I certainly appreciate the words of my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

I would like very much to say again that I cannot believe that this program would actually dictate that a community was not eligible for public transit aid because of existing State law regarding city employees.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] for yielding to me this time.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] a valued member of our committee.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriation bill which has been reported to the House of Representatives from our Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

At this time I would like to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] for the fine job he has done as chairman. Succeeding the late Albert Thomas, one of the truly great giants of the House of Representatives, is no small task and Mr. EVINS has done so and done so well. It has been a pleasure to work with him.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill as you know is in excess of $14 billion and deals with many of the bread and butter agencies of our Government which must carry on the everyday activities of Government—the regulatory agencies, the Federal Aviation Agency, the General Services Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the NASA support program, and many others.

The subcommittee has sought to save money wherever money could be saved, and still make certain that these agencies carry on their work and do an effective job.

There was much unanimity in the subcommittee. There was some disagreement in specific areas, but in general there was general agreement on the legislation.

Concerning the space program there was some cutting of the amounts of money requested. This concerns me because I think the space program budget is a very tight one and I am concerned about the cut our subcommittee made. I am sure NASA will need every dollar it can possibly get so that we can be assured of the great successes that we have had in the field of space exploration.

The controversial part of this budget, Mr. Chairman, of course, is the question of the rent supplement program under the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

I am happy to hear that our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is going to offer an amendment at the proper time to restore the $20 million of grant authority.

When we think back to the question of rent supplements, I wish we would give serious consideration as to what we are trying to do with it this afternoon. Let me say that I, myself, have not been wholeheartedly in support of the rent supplement program.

Last year when the question came before the House—and if you will recall, the House at that time denied funds to the rent supplement program—I was not in favor of seeing the rent supplement program approved in the manner in which the regulations had been written. As a result of the actions of the House, the Department of Housing revised the regulations and assured us that these funds would be used for low income people—for people who desperately needed some sort of assistance in order to pay their rent. This has been done. As you know, we then voted $12 million to initiate and to start this new program. We completed action on that supplemental bill just an hour ago in the adoption of the supplemental appropriation bill which contained the $12 million for the rent supplement program.

Mr. Chairman, as one who comes from an urban area, I plead with my colleagues to recognize the great, pressing, and increasing need which we in the urban areas have and will continue to have in increasing proportions each and every day. I plead with my colleagues to recognize and realize the great stresses and strains confronting people in our urban areas.

At the present time we have public housing authorities trying to resolve this problem. The situation of seeing generation after generation of people living in public housing with little hope of getting out of that type of housing and environment concerns us a great deal.

The concept of the rent supplement program is an attempt to start in a new direction—to try to eliminate this public housing type of living which we have had in our urban areas. For these reasons, my colleagues, I say that this is indeed worth trying and this is the argument which convinces me that we should give it a try.

You will notice that your subcommittee has not been lavish with the funds—we have not been lavish with the requests which have been made by the Department of Housing. We gave them $12 million in the supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1966. They asked for $35 million in this bill and our subcommittee recommended $20 million saying, "We want you to get this program off on a good start. We want to see what you can do with it—move slowly and surely. We do not want to see any waste. Then once the program has proved itself, then come back and we will enlarge the program and try to meet the great need which exists in this area."

That, in effect, is what our subcommittee did after much study and concern about this matter.

So I say that $20 million is a good start, in addition to the $12 million in the supplemental appropriation bill. I say that they will not be able to go wild. I say they will not be able, as some people have suggested, to include middle-income groups in the rent supplement program. I can assure you that I, for one—and I know the subcommitee—will watch this new program very carefully to see that it does not get off the track at any time.

Mr. YATES Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. One of the reasons ascribed to the defeat of the rent supplement program was a statement attributed to the Administrator looking to the possible use of the program in the future for middle-income housing. The fact is that that remark, even if it were uttered, is extraneous now, because all that the House has under consideration today is the application of the rent supplement program for people with incomes that qualify for low-income public housing. The question as to whether or not this program might at some future date be made applicable to middle-income housing is something that the Congress will have to meet at some time in the future. Is that correct?

Mr. GIAIMO. That is correct, and it is something over which the Congress will retain control, and we would have to change the legislation to allow the middle-income groups to come in.

In fairness to the Secretary of the Department of HUD, Mr. Weaver, when that statement was attributed to him, there was a letter by him published in the newspaper the next day which disclaimed responsibility for that statement. He did not intend to suggest that we would include middle-income groups.

Mr. YATES. But, at any rate, even if that statement were uttered, it would have no relevance to the bill before us today.

Mr. GIAIMO. Exactly. Even if it were so, it would have no relevance to the issue before us today. But my point is that we are watching this program. I think it is an attempt to get away from the public-housing type of concept which we have had now for 20 or more years, and I think it is worth an effort. It is worth a look. It is a modest program as programs go in Government today, and I think it is worthy of our support, because if this program is successful—and bear in mind that this is what what we call a private enterprise type of program, where private enterprise will engage in this activity and will construct and create these new rents and tenancies—if it works, it will be much more successful than our public housing program has been to date.

So, in conclusion, it is for this reason that I, a person who has been and still am somewhat doubtful about starting this new kind of program, am willing to give it a try. I say let us vote to restore the $20 million in the rent supplement program. Let us give this legislation a chance to show what it can do.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I would surely not dispute the judgment of the committee, or the committee chairman, in placing a higher priority on our military needs than on non-defense-related scientific exploration. I do, however, feel that to refer to Project Mohole as merely a project "to dig a hole" fails to tell anything like the entire story. I should be less concerned about this were it not for the very great advance that the Soviet Union has been making, and has been making for the last 5 years in the field of inner-earth exploration.

As long ago as 1961 the Soviet embarked upon a program rivaling anything we contemplated in Project Mohole.

Undertaken by the Soviet were a total of five inner-earth drillings, two of which have been started. In an offshore drilling comparable to Mohole, the Soviets have undertaken to go to a depth of 9 miles.

It is not the part of wisdom nor of economy, in my opinion, to drop entirely a program which promises to teach us so much about the planet on which we live, at the time when we enter the far reaches of outer space. I do hope that between this body and the Senate, the judgment will prevail that this is a program worth keeping; that we shall not turn our backs on an expenditure of some $24 million, which represents the outlay to date, and accompany it with an out-of-pocket loss of $8 million, which the termination at this point would entail.

Mr. Chairman, I know that others will be heard on this point, both in general debate and during the period of amendments on this bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which will be proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] to replace the rent supplement program.

The amendment which struck out the rent supplement program in the Appropriations Committee was a very bad amendment, in my judgment. It was an anticity amendment. It was a proslums amendment, an amendment that is totally oblivious to the problems of every city in this country.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 90]

Abernethy
Adair
Baring
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Chelf
Cleveland
Colmer
Craley
Diggs
Dowdy
Findley
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Grabowski
Griffin
Helstoski
Henderson
Hull
Kelly
King, Utah
Macdonald
Mailliard
Mathias
Michel
Monagan
Morgan
Morse
Moss
Murray
Pickle
Powell
Resnick
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Sullivan
Taylor
Toll
Tunney
Utt
Williams
Willis

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14921, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 382 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, immediately prior to the calling of the quorum, I had stated that I was rising in support of the amendment which will be offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] to restore the $20 million in rent supplements, which was stricken out of the appropriation bill on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that the motion in committee which struck out the rent supplement program was a very bad motion. It is an anticity motion. It is a proslums motion. It is a motion that is totally oblivious to the problems of every American city. It is a motion that is totally oblivious to the cost of housing in every American city. It assumes that housing is available for people of every economic level of American citizens and this is not true.

All they have to do is go out and try to buy it.

Mr. Chairman, one is reminded of the words of Anatole France, in his book "The Red Lily," when he writes:

> The gentlemen want a law which, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich and the poor alike from sleeping under bridges and from begging in the streets.

So, too, the gentlemen who oppose the rent supplement program advocate a similar law, a law which in its majestic equality permits the rich and the poor alike to live in decrepit hovels, to share their quarters with rats and other invaders of the slums, to grace their nostrils with the odors which come from broken-down plumbing and uncollected garbage. Majestic equality indeed.

Will nothing be done for the poor or for the elderly or for the disabled, or for the dispossessed? This is exactly what the rent supplement program was directed toward.

The housing laws which the Congress has passed since 1939 have in great measure ignored these classes of people. Federal housing programs have been generous in stimulating construction of homes in the suburbs and in building luxury apartment buildings in the cities. But the poor, the elderly, the disabled, the dispossessed have been restricted to public housing buildings, which have been at best woefully inadequate in number and institutionalized in practice.

Mr. Chairman, the interesting point about all this is that now the people who oppose the rent supplement program say that we have an alternative in the public housing programs. Yet, over the years they have been the ones who fought the public housing programs.

A question of ethics has been raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin. In committee, and in his letter which he circulated among Members of the House, he said that there was an ethical problem that was implicit in the passage of this program because an immoral bargain had been struck in another body during the first rent supplements request by a Senator and the administration.

Apart from what can only be described as naivete in expressing shock that such a thing as vote trading goes on occasionally in the Congress, is the entire program to be condemned for what the gentleman implies is the guilt of one Member of the Senate? The question is whether we approve of the rent supplements program, not whether we approve of the Senator's conduct.

We, who support the rent supplements program, Mr. Chairman, are glad to meet the gentleman on the issue of the morality of the program. What standard of morality do the opponents of this program propose which can justify the deprivation of assistance to the poor, to the sick, to the elderly, to the disabled, to the dispossessed? What group of people are in great need of help from the Congress of the United States?

Is the forgotten man of the city to remain forgotten?

Mr. Chairman, nothing can be more crystal clear than that the underprivileged are to be condemned to the same half-life existence which is their lot today if we fail to approve this program. Their hopes ride on our votes today.

This corrective measure is constructive. It will have enormous effect on all of the citizens of the community. This is not open to doubt.

It has been proven time and again, not only in Watts, but in other urban communities. It will be proven again if the root causes for the explosive situations are not treated.

The rent supplements program tends to deal in part with that condition. It will help. It will be understood. It will be appreciated.

Centuries ago John Donne wrote that "No man is an island." How true that is in our American cities. Few other problems have more serious impact on the economic well-being of our cities and the social well-being of all our citizens than the housing programs approved by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts be approved.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words about the ups and downs of the rent supplement program. I remember last year—and I remember it very vividly—when we Republicans were saying that the program was a trick, a trojan horse, and our Democratic colleagues were all saying that the program was a great program. They said that the program was a program to build low-income housing, and they still say that it is a program to build housing for low-income families.

I regret to say that the administration has made monkeys out of those of our colleagues who believed rent supplement propaganda. Secretary Weaver, by letting the cat out of the bag concerning the proposed expansion of the rent supplement program to include middle-income groups, has clearly shown that the social planners have no intention of limiting the rent supplement program as we in Congress intended. The social planners want a huge program through which the Federal Government can decide who lives where and for how much. The social planners are not interested in low-income housing for its own sake. They want to get control—I repeat—to get control of residential patterns. If rent supplements can be extended to middle-income groups, the social planners will get more scope for extending Federal power over national residential patterns. I say this because control follows money, and if the Federal Government starts—via rent supplements—to be able to control residential occupancy in the suburbs, then we are well on our way to socialized housing.

If the objective of the Housing and Urban Development Department was simply to provide low-income housing in the greatest quantity—and this is the need—the rent supplement program would never have been thought up. It is almost twice as expensive as public housing.

We know that because of the committee hearings. We learned through expert testimony that it is almost twice as expensive as public housing. These figures were presented to our housing subcommittee by Ira Robbins of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. Rent supplements cost more because of economic integration—it is expensive to put subsidized tenants in better quality apartments instead of low-cost housing.

In my opinion, this is being done to get increased Federal residential control over the suburbs and other areas where Federal housing policy has had little impact. Of course, this cannot be admitted but, it is a very real unspoken objective.

The real objectives of the administration have slipped out from time to time all during the debate on rent supplements during this session and the last session. From time to time, Secretary Weaver, in particular, has stated that he wanted a broadened—I repeat—he wanted a broadened rent supplement program, including middle-income groups, as a tool of economic integration. All this is in the record. Perhaps most of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle did not know about it. Perhaps they were fooled by the administration into thinking that rent supplements were intended to build housing for low-income groups.

The real thrust of the rent supplement program has always been apparent.

When President Johnson first spoke of the rent supplement program last year, he talked of it as a tool to "increase the supply of housing available to those of moderate income." Secretary Weaver told the Housing Subcommittee, of which I am proud to be a member, last year that the program is a "program for middle-income families." Indeed Secretary Weaver often went further.

He said that the program was no good for low-income families, and that no management groups would willingly take on the problems of low-income management. One time not too long ago in Pittsburgh he said that a builder—and I quote—would have to have a "heart of gold and head of lead" to try to build rent supplement housing for low-income groups.

One thing I have to say about Secretary Weaver, he is as honest as the rest of the administration is deceptive. He tells you what is on his mind and does not equivocate about it. He has told us from the beginning that rent supplements were something he aimed to use for middle-income groups. He told us that his real motivation was economic integration. Many of his books and speeches are full of references to bringing land use and residential patterns under Federal control. I regret that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have ignored all this, although I am glad to see that many of them are beginning to see the light of day today.

If we fund the rent supplement program today, we will be giving money to a program that will expand like a snowball rolling down a hill until it covers everything. Once it gets started, in its multibillion-dollar glory, we would not be able to stop it, and we would not be able to control it. The rent supplement statute is like administrative putty. It can take just about any shape Secretary Weaver wants. If he wants to raise income limits, he can do so several ways. For one thing, he can increase the variety of things included from income, so as to redefine what income really is. He might also raise, by Federal pressure and suggestion, local public housing income level ceilings. This would automatically raise rent supplement income level ceilings. If the Congress votes the appropriation for this program as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts, we will be cutting our own throat, because in another year or so it will be too late to stop the program.

I can give you an idea of the menace of the rent supplement by citing recent legislation offered in the Senate to expand the rent supplement program. The same bill was first offered here in the House by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN]. Mr. RYAN wants to expand the rent supplement program to include much more private housing than is presently included under the rent supplement program. He proposes, for example, including New York State's Mitchell-Lama middle-income housing projects. These already get a direct subsidy from New York City through tax abatement. They also have a record of graft and windfalls. The gentleman is proposing a double subsidy. My colleague in the other body, Senator JAVITS, has now embraced this proposal, which I think is extremely misguided. If the income level for rent supplement eligibility is raised, and if the type of housing eligible is broadened, the program will slowly but surely be extended to bring Federal power to bear on every neighborhood in America. That is not something I want to see. Nor is it something I believe the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle want to see. Unfortunately, however, that is what the friends of the rent supplement—starting in the White House and working down—want to see. The rent supplement is the chosen vehicle of socialized residential patterns. The rent supplement is the real horsepower of a coercive national open housing law. What is unconstitutional, perhaps, if offered as coercive legislation, is constitutional, although insidious, if done through subsidy. The rent supplement program is the affirmative muscle of an open-occupancy legislation. The Washington Post recently made this point in a lengthy article. But this is something the President has never talked about. It is something I believe we should discuss because when a piece of legislation is as far reaching as the rent supplement program, every aspect of it ought to be brought out in the open.

I suggest to this House that the rent supplement program is a program of coercion and Federal control. This cat has been let out of the bag by the statements of rent supplement supporters, who, in their enthusiasm, have bragged about the future they contemplate for the program. The future they contemplate for this program is not a future I care to contemplate for America. I urge this House to support the Appropriations Committee and oppose any amendment to restore an appropriation for the rent supplement program.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear that the committee cut out funds for some of the proposed buildings in the District of Columbia. But I wonder if the economy program with respect to buildings in the District of Columbia was started quite soon enough?

I am prompted to speculate, because of what happened last weekend when the Smithsonian Institution—the new building on which the taxpayers have spent millions of dollars—was converted into a place of exhibitionist dancing with $75 to $100 charged for admission tickets.

I could not believe my eyes last Sunday when I picked up the newspapers and saw pictures of the Reverend Moyers, White House Press Secretary, gyrating half way down on his knees, doing the watusi or the frug, or whatever you please to call it. Then there was a picture of the wife of a State Department official who was sent home to put on some clothing. She apparently appeared half naked; at least that is the story in the newspapers.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps somebody ought to be renovating some of the burlesque halls downtown for the mink coat set to perform in for I question the propriety of converting the Smithsonian Institution into a hall for exhibitionist dancing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee in the future in consideration of buildings for the District of Columbia will make inquiry as to whether the buildings they approve are going to be used for dance halls with admission tickets costing $75 to $100.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. There is no money in this bill for the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. GROSS. I compliment the gentleman and the committee for not putting money in the bill for other buildings. I assume it was this committee that at one time put up the money for the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. JONAS. This is not under the jurisdiction of the Independent Offices Subcommittee but the the Appropriations Committee does act on the funds.

Mr. GROSS. Then, you put up the money do you not?

Mr. JONAS. Not all the time. We cut out four buildings for the District of Columbia that were in the budget this year. The gentleman will find no funds in here for construction of buildings in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Why should the Smithsonian Institution, a tax supported agency, be turned into a dance hall for a fund raising effort by a private group?

Mr. JONAS. I cannot answer that question. I am not on the Board of Trustees.

Mr. GROSS. It may be that some of those who indulged in the laughter a moment ago would like to answer the question, for I do not know. Perhaps they can explain it to their taxpayers. I cannot explain it to those I represent.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I just wondered if the gentleman from Iowa had in his hand a picture of this alleged Mr. Moyer—or Reverend Moyer—to prove thereby that this gentleman was formerly with the White House. I believe he has been relieved or has resigned or is soon to make his departure in some way or another.

Maybe the picture will make clear and apparent to the gentleman from Iowa as to whether or not he is dancing one of these vague gyrations of the anatomical and abdominal art of gyrations, or, indeed, praying. I understand he is on his knees. Perhaps he is praying for the Smithsonian Institution and the gentleman from Iowa has misinterpreted it.

Mr. GROSS. No, he is not exactly on his knees. He is doing a bend, a watusi or a frug bend.

Mr. HALL. I am not familiar with these terms.

Mr. GROSS. The Reverend Moyers is another of the twinkle toes that inhabit the White House. They dance there until 3 o'clock in the morning. Apparently the precedent is set from on high.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. But I must say I am not privileged to be familiar with the art form that the gentleman from Iowa has been talking about, nor the place.

Mr. GROSS. Now I would like to call attention to some of the uses of the money that the committee appropriates for the National Science Foundation.

There is $480 million in this bill for the National Science Foundation. I use as my reference the report of a subcommittee on government operations of April 27, 1966, which investigated this business of billions of dollars being spent on research by the various agencies.

For instance, the National Science Foundation has granted $32,900 to the Museum of Natural History in Iceland to study the northern grouse.

I realize some of the examples set forth herein are not under the National Science Foundation, but let me give you another one—the National Institute of Health will spend $2,380 this year to finance an exploratory study into five aspects of life of the factory worker in Ghana.

Here is another. The National Science Foundation granted $27,600 to an American at the University of Nigeria for an archeological survey of the cultural development in the eastern region of Nigeria.

I wonder how urgently that is needed—at a time when we are trying to balance—at least some of us would like to see a balanced budget.

The National Institute of Mental Health paid an American psychiatrist at the University of Montreal $11,050 for writing a book on the history of psychiatry.

The National Science Foundation will pay a Canadian psychiatrist $48,700 to study the learning and memory processes "of the large bilingual Estonian population of Toronto."

This is on a par with the $32,000 that went to a foreign university not so long ago for a study of the intrapersonal, interpersonal relationship of a husband and wife.

The National Science Foundation awarded $13,500 to two U.S. citizens, resident at the University of Alberta, Canada, to make a mathematical analysis of raw data previously collected in east Africa, on the behavior of monkeys.

The Air Force is paying $33,500 to an investigator at the University of Birmingham, England, who has unique qualifications and capabilities to study how the human nervous system handles and processes information.

It will be very interesting, will it not, to get such a report from an Englishman. Apparently there is no American who can do this kind of thing.

Incidentally, there is alleged to be concern about the deficit in our international balance of payments—these contracts are a contribution to that deficit. Perhaps the President, who is alleged to be interested in the deficit in the international balance of payments ought to look at some of these research contracts. I think you could on this committee have done a better job than you did this year with respect to cutting funds for the National Science Foundation, and I think the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and his Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with health, education, and welfare can do a better job than he has done in the matter of research on the basis of information developed by the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

I hope that next year both committees will get busy, chop these appropriations down to size, and cut out some of this funny business.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. The gentleman has referred to dancing. I would be willing to wager the gentleman that if he went back to his own district in Waterloo, Iowa——

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is referring to the Third District of Iowa?

Mr. JOELSON. Wherever you are in Iowa, if you go to the country club, you will find your constituents doing the watusi, and if you go to the senior prom you will find the high school students there doing the frug. But I do not think they are going to hell in a wheelbarrow any more than I think Mr. Moyer is.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether they will go to hell, and if they do whether it will in a wheelbarrow, in Cadillacs, or in mink coats. I do not know.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely disappointed that the House Appropriations Committee deleted from the independent offices appropriation bill the $19,700,000 requested for continuation of work on the Mohole project by the National Science Foundation. Project Mohole represents man's first attempt to explore the earth's deep crust and mantle beneath the sea.

I think that it is safe to say that, in all the scientific endeavors embarked upon by the Federal Government, there have been few of brighter promise for the advancement of man's knowledge of his environment and of such universal acclaim by scientist and layman alike.

This project has drawn the international attention of engineers, scientists, and laymen. It has fired the imagination of the American people in much the same manner as our probing of space.

And this is as it should be. While we are spending billions of dollars to reach the moon, and while we are focusing our thoughts on the mysteries of space, it well behooves mankind to explore and try to understand this planet on which we were born and where, in the final analysis, we will continue to draw our sustenance.

I am deeply concerned about this budgetary omission. Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, has already testified as to the care that has gone into the delineation of the project and the drafting of its present budget.

A description of this highly complex project is contained in the hearings of this bill and I read from portions of the hearings on page 162, which will, I hope, convince you of its importance:

> Much has been inferred about the nature of the earth's crust and the underlying

> mantle by indirect methods, such as the use of seismic waves, but these scientific theories remain unproven and must be tested through actual experimentation and direct observation * * *. Drilling to the mantle is a difficult engineering feat * * *.
>
> By drilling through the crust and on into the earth's mantle as far as possible, scientists hope to obtain the following kinds of information:
>
> 1. A better age determination for the earth.
> 2. A determination of the age and origin of the ocean basins and their waters.
> 3. A better understanding of how the earth-moon system came into being.
> 4. An understanding of the distribution of the chemical elements in the earth, which, in turn, bears on the origin of the sun and perhaps the stars.
> 5. An understanding of the origin of continents and whether or not they are drifting about on the earth's surface.
> 6. Knowledge of the mantle's composition and the origin of magnetic and gravity anomalies that have been discovered beneath the sea.
> 7. A better understanding of the origin of life and the carbon cycle with which it is closely connected.
>
> The Mohole project is considered to be of very great importance by the community of geophysicists, geochemists, geologists, and other earth scientists. It has been endorsed by the National Academy of Sciences and by many other national scientific bodies.
>
> The project has also created great interest, internationally.

Dr. Haworth has reported how, before designing of the expensive and revolutionary equipment for the project was begun, advice was taken from the leading scientists in our Nation—all of whom felt the work should continue. This was followed by a review of the governmental scientists and agencies most knowledgeable in the field, with the same results. This review covered both budgetary and scientific considerations.

In the scientific field, this project has been given a very high priority. It already has drawn great interest from the oil industry, through its advancement of the deep drilling art. It has shown promise of side effects advantageous to our space effort.

Its prospects of opening, for the first time, the vast and little-known areas of the earth's deep crust and mantle hold hope of advancing our understanding of the origin of life itself, and this and the geoscientific features of the project have drawn the attention of an international symposium of scientists.

From the budgetary standpoint, halting or delaying this project at the present crucial stage is false economy in the truest sense of the word. Through fiscal 1965, $37,560,000 was actually allocated to the Mohole project. Including the $17.9 million programed for the current fiscal year, total spending or allocation is almost $55.5 million. This year's request would add $19.7 million to that total, a far cry from the $55.5 million that would be lost if the project is abandoned and a minor fraction of the billions upon billions with which we will seek to send a rocket to the moon.

And, as I have said, the project has, in its formative stage, already shown concrete results. Its advancement of the deep drilling art is being augmented continually by the results of continuing research. There is expected major research that will be of great value to the Navy's deep submergence program. Our space program itself is expected to be a major beneficiary of the work being done on Mohole. About 52 scientific, engineering, and popular papers already have been published as a result of the program. The scientific accomplishments already are impressive.

We are now at the final stages of the immense national effort that has gone into preparations for this great advance. The national interest has been engaged fully, and some of our finest minds and most inventive imaginations have been committed to its success.

Thus, closing out the project now would not only throw millions of dollars away—dollars that are just on the verge of becoming greatly productive—but it will mean the scrapping of years of dedicated thought and effort by our scientific and technical community.

We can ill afford such waste. We can afford it even less when we reckon it against the additional cost to our national prestige. For, in this day of turbulence in world affairs, of misunderstanding of American motives abroad, of criticism of our national attitudes by our neighbors in the world community, we have proudly held to the boast that peace and the advancement of man's welfare is our greatest concern in every endeavor.

How can we continue to do so when we make such an admission as we seem to proclaim by this action—that the costs of war come before even so great an endeavor as research into the basic stuff of life?

It is my earnest hope that this project will be allowed to continue to its conclusion, and that this great promise of advancement of man's knowledge will be realized. It is my hope also that the committee will reconsider its action, and allow the Mohole project the funds it needs to complete its work with no interruption, no waste of funds, and no abandonment of the work which has gone before.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the decision to delay the Mohole project is both untenable and unwise. The $19.7 million increment diverted from this vital research project at a time when Congress has already provided $55 million for the project over the past 4 years will, in effect, create an unnecessary waste of tax dollars.

The argument that this money is needed to meet military requirements in Vietnam does not ring true, in my opinion. There are many questionable Great Society programs such as the Appalachia and Job Corps plans that could be easily and rapidly trimmed, thereby providing the needed money to support our war effort.

Project Mohole is vital both to our space program and our national oceanographic research effort. As it is, the Russians are now engaged in a drilling program rivaling our Project Mohole. Rear Adm. Charles J. Palmer, U.S. Navy retired, and now with National Science Foundation, recently stated in San Diego that the Russians are drilling two deep boreholes into the earth's crust and three others are planned. The admiral stated:

> In reviewing the Soviet super-deep drilling program, one must conclude that Project Mohole is modest by comparison.

Obviously, the Russians' efforts are aimed at military, economic, and scientific objectives.

The committee estimates that the cancellation of the Mohole project will cost an additional $24.7 million, including $6 million in penalties for cancellation of three contracts. This hardly would warrant the transfer of the original $19.7 million to Vietnam requirements particularly in view of the ease with which the administration could cut back their "high society" program spending and come up with the auxiliary funds required for our military in Vietnam. In short, this would be like borrowing $19.7 million and paying straight interest charges of $24.7 million, not including repayment of the principal.

And another point, Mr. Chairman, is that, while the House Appropriations Subcommittee estimates that cancellation will cost about $24.7 million, an IBM tabulation of the Mohole project estimated termination costs, as of March 9 of this year, reveals that the total estimate expended and contract termination cost for this project—prime contractor and National Science Foundation—is $45,840,010. This latter figure has been checked with the home accounting office of the prime contractor, Brown & Root, Inc., and with the GAO auditors presently in residence there. This is too much money to be wasted, when $19.7 million can keep the project going at full speed for fiscal year 1967.

In summary, I urge my colleagues to look at the total picture involved here and to join in the effort to gain full restoration for the $19.7 million deleted from the appropriations bill for the Mohole project.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to serve notice that I am considering the raising of a point of order against the language on page 33, lines 17 through 22, which appropriates funds for the use of the Renegotiation Board. I shall make this point of order on the grounds that the Renegotiation Act expires June 30, 1966, and the Congress has not passed authorizing legislation.

It is my hope that when the Ways and Means Committee considers this legislation, I will be given the opportunity to testify in opposition to an extension, because I believe I can conclusively prove that this act has outlived its usefulness. It is contrary to Department of Defense policy as outlined in the Armed Services Procurement Regulations. It is costing the taxpayers $3 for every $1 that the Renegotiation Board allegedly recovers in the form of excess profits.

U.S. industry's total renegotiable profits as a percentage of renegotiable sales have declined drastically in the past 10 years. In the 1956 fiscal year, overall renegotiable profits were 6.3 percent of sales, and by fiscal year 1965, this had declined to a 3-percent profit before tax margin. This before-tax defense margin of 3 percent in fiscal year 1965 compares to a 9.7 percent margin for all U.S. industry for the same period, after excluding renegotiable sales and profits. These commercial margins were obtained from the Quarterly Financial Report for Manufacturing Corporations published by the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In fact, during the 4-year period 1962–65, there was a total of $1.32 billion of losses reported by defense contractors in filings with the Renegotiation Board. During this same period, companies reported profits of $5.32 billion or a net profit before tax for this period of $4 billion. Total excessive profits determinations by the Renegotiation Board during this same period totaled only $29 million before tax or only 0.724 percent of total renegotiable profits. This is a rather ridiculous recovery in terms of the costs incurred by industry and by the Government in arriving at this determination.

The net result of these declining margins on defense business appears to be a major deterrent for obtaining the best manufacturing capabilities to efficiently perform defense contracts. In fact, the Department of Defense, under ASPR 3-808.1, clearly recognized the importance of profit incentive by stating:

> Low average profit rates on defense contracts overall are detrimental to the public interest. Effective national defense in a free enterprise economy requires that the best industrial capabilities be attracted to defense contracts. These capabilities will be driven away from the defense market if defense contracts are characterized by low-profit opportunities.

This is certainly equally true when low profits remain after the application of the renegotiation process. I believe we still have the same basic conflict in policy between the current incentive programs of the Defense Department, and the objectives of the Renegotiation Board which, in my experience, are primarily concerned with profit margins rather than really considering the overall efficiency and contribution of a contractor in relation to his renegotiable profits.

In the past 4 fiscal years ending with 1965, during which time the Renegotiation Act has been extended twice by Congress, a very conservative estimate of the net cost or loss to the Government, and, therefore, the taxpayer, as a result of renegotiation, is $64.2 million, determined as follows:

[In millions]

Renegotiable sales (fiscal years 1962 through 1965)	$134.6
Estimated cost incurred by industry to prepare and process renegotiation filings (0.01 percent of above sales) [1]	134.6
Above cost paid for by the Government in form of reduced income taxes	67.3
Add amount charged to Government in form of increased prices to recover costs, net of income taxes paid (assumes average contractor had 25 percent defense volume)	16.8
Total	84.1
Add 4 years' operating expenses of the Renegotiation Board	9.5
Total costs before refunds	93.6
(Deduct) refund determinations net of tax	(29.4)
Net loss to Government as a result of renegotiation, 1962 to 1965	64.2

[1] Estimated by Machinery & Allied Products Institute.

In summary, overall defense profits have declined 50 percent in the past 10 years, to a current rate of only 3-percent profit before tax, which in itself is a clear indication that defense profits can under no circumstances be considered excessive. In fact, they are not consistent with the profit incentive program initiated several years ago by the Department of Defense.

Coupled with the low profit return now being experienced by defense contractors is the estimated high cost to industry incurred in meeting renegotiation requirements, which in the final analysis is paid for in large part by the Government in the form of reduced income tax receipts and higher prices paid for defense materiel. With renegotiation refunds, net of tax, averaging only $7.2 million during the past 4 years, it is quite obvious that renegotiation is a costly, ineffective process, both to industry and the Government. What is important is the net effect of the Government's — administration's — policy which continues to support an agency which has clearly outlived its usefulness, and at a substantial cost to both industry and the Government itself.

Before concluding, I would like to point out that Public Law 87-653, which requires that cost data be revealed to Government officials on all negotiated contracts, has had an additional 2 years of operation since the last extension of the renegotiation law. The administrative regulations which have been devised to implement Public Law 87-653 have made it possible for Government negotiators to drive an even harder bargain with defense contractors. The trend toward requiring the revelation of cost data in other than negotiated contracts has been steadily upward. Thus the need for renegotiation has diminished even further.

As I pointed out in 1964, Government contracting agencies are doing an increasingly better job. As you know, catalog items which are in competition are not subject to renegotiation. All other procurements on a negotiated or fixed-price basis are almost always subject to a redetermination clause written into the contract. These clauses prevent unrealistic and padded cost estimates, and insure the fact that profit to the contractor will be no more than reasonable. Since this is the current practice, why should we continue the expensive process of renegotiation?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee, I am very much concerned that the Members of the House do not have an opportunity to properly judge the purposes for which funds are provided in some of these appropriations bills.

For example, the bill we are considering, H.R. 14921, provides funds for 26 different Government boards and agencies, yet it was just introduced last Thursday and was not available from the printers until Friday. Those of us who were out of town on Friday did not get a chance to see H.R. 14921 until yesterday and I think you will agree that this leaves little time to study two volumes of hearings totaling 3,356 pages.

I am particularly concerned about the appropriations to the Federal Aviation Agency. While the bill provides almost $7 million for this Agency, the explanation as to how these funds are to be spent is contained in about 65 lines, and the report only has about 70 lines to tell us what we are giving FAA this money for.

As chairman of the subcommittee on transportation and aeronautics of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I do not believe sufficient consideration is given to requests made by the FAA involving construction at the two Washington airports.

For example, during the current fiscal year, the FAA spent $92,132 for a study of Washington National Airport by Operations Research, Inc. This study was not specifically authorized by the Congress. When I asked General McKee where the funds came from, he stated "funds were provided by the construction, Washington National Airport appropriations". Yet I do not recall any mention being made on the floor of the House last year to the effect that we were approving a $90,000 study at Washington National and I doubt that many of my colleagues knew they were voting for such an expenditure.

In addition, just last week the FAA signed a contract with Vincent Kling & Associates of Philadelphia, architects; Jackson & Moreland, of Boston, engineers; and James C. Buckley, Inc., of New York, transportation analysts to develop four alternate plans for modernizing Washington National Airport under a $297,000 contract. This is one more example of what I mean when I say this was not specifically authorized by the

Congress. This study is supposed to be ready for submission to Congress within 2 years. By that time we will have already spent almost $400,000, in 3 years, just to "study" Washington National Airport.

Therefore, I think it is very important that we know just exactly what is covered under the words "construction" and "improvements" as used in this bill.

I would like to remind my colleagues that I objected to the construction of Dulles International Airport more than 10 years ago when we were told that it would cost about $25 million. Since that time we have spent more than $115 million on Dulles. They still have more than $20 million left from previous appropriations and are still planning "construction."

Mr. Chairman, I think this is gross waste of the taxpayers' money. Anyone who has ever visited Dulles Airport knows that it is a morgue. It is not being used at anywhere near capacity and neither is nearby Friendship International Airport. I simply do not see how we can justify appropriating any more money for jet airports in the Washington area when we already have two within a radius of 30 miles.

When former Administrator of the FAA., Mr. Halaby, appeared before the Appropriations Committee last year, he stated that the cost of modernizing Washington National would be in the neighborhood of $50 to $60 million. But this is only a drop in the bucket. Before they are finished they will spend another $100 million on that airport and Dulles will lose what business it now has and so will Friendship Airport. They will use as a justification for such an expenditure the operations research report which envisions up to $150 million to moderize Washington National. But they will continue to hide this fact under the heading of "improvements" which are not explained in this bill and will not be explained in the future.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I will offer an amendment to the FAA portion of this bill to state "that no funds provided in this bill shall be used for any construction at Dulles or Washington National Airports which is not specifically authorized by the appropriate committee."

I do not think it is in the best interest of the taxpayers to permit the FAA to do what it pleases at these airports without the approval of Congress and without proper consideration by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over airport construction. At the present time, the FAA can carry over appropriations not used for the purposes authorized and when they get a nice nest egg they spend it for anything they please.

The FAA received an appropriation of $1.1 million for the current fiscal year for construction at Washington National. I foresee the same pattern developing here which developed when Dulles was authorized. The FAA goes before the Appropriations Committee and gets a million here, 5 million there, 10 million another place, and the first thing you know you have spent another $120 or $150 million for another jet airport for Washington and the taxpayers' investment in Dulles is just wasted.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to Washington National having small jets. I am opposed to the pattern which is emerging for constructing a whole new airport. When we created Dulles they said that Washington National was overcrowded and that we needed Dulles.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I assure the gentleman that there is no money in the bill for construction at Washington National Airport.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I understand that, but there is a carryover of $2½ million. I am fearful of the use to which that will be put. They can use that money as they please, and they will use the funds in this bill as they please.

As I said in my statement a while ago, the FAA has already contracted for two studies of Washington National Airport during the present fiscal year, totaling almost $400,000. This wasn't authorized in any appropriation bill either but the FAA diverted the funds authorized by the Congress for other purposes and used them for these unauthorized studies. The whole purpose of my amendment is to prevent such diversion of funds in the future.

We have Dulles on our hands now. Some of the flights should be diverted from Washington National to Dulles and to Friendship, instead of building up Washington National.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's position, but I wonder if his language is properly worded. Would the gentleman read the amendment he intends to offer again? I fear it will not do what the gentleman from Maryland wishes to have it do.

Mr. FRIEDEL. On page 11 of the bill line 9, strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and insert the following:

> That no funds provided in this bill shall be used for any construction at Dulles or Washington National Airports which is not specifically authorized by the appropriate committee.

Mr. JONAS. In response to the chairman, I believe the gentleman said he was worried about the use of carryover funds. They are not included in this bill.

Mr. FRIEDEL. They have $2½ million that has already been appropriated in previous bills. This bill provides that this money can be merged with the funds granted under the heading "Construction and development, additional Washington Airport."

Mr. JONAS. I should like to help the gentleman do what he wants to do, but I fear the amendment will not do it. The amendment would seek to limit funds in this bill, to stop them from being used for construction. There are no funds in the bill for construction. The funds the gentleman seeks to prevent them from using have previously been appropriated.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I understand that, but whether it says "Construction" or not, the point I am trying to make is that they now have $2,267,000 and they will use this for construction and the FAA will divert funds earmarked in this bill for other purposes and use them for construction at Washington National.

Mr. JONAS. I fear the gentleman's amendment will not reach that money.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I hope it will.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I was indeed very unhappy when I was apprised of the fact that the Subcommittee on Independent Offices had deleted any funds whatsoever for Project Mohole. You know, I have followed Project Mohole since its inception, beginning about 7 years ago.

We held hearings in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the Subcommittee on Oceanography. So I have been following this very closely. I guess I have assumed that since we were so well on the road, Project Mohole would be carried to its ultimate end. If you kill this project now, you are going to be throwing away about $35 to $40 million of the taxpayers' money. You are going to be throwing it out the window. It is true that the Director said that this had given him lots of headaches. I am sure it did. It is an unusual program. It is a real imaginative program.

It is true that there was lots of pulling back and forth as to who was going to control this program, but we are over the hump on that now. Just a little over a year ago they sat down, the National Science Foundation and the President's Scientific Advisory Board, and reviewed this to see whether or not they should go ahead.

The decision was that this was a top priority scientific program. All right. Since that decision was made they have let contracts. One of them is for the drilling platform. If you drop this program down, all of these programs have to be canceled out, and you know what it costs to cancel out programs, particularly in a Government contract. This is not a program that you can just drop down and pick up again in a few years where you left off. It just does not work that way.

Now, I have no quarrel with the committee, because the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee has always been fair on the programs, but I will say this: I do not think that the committee was given the full picture as to the import and importance of the program, as well as what it would cost to cancel out the program.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to say to the gentleman that I, too, am concerned about this, because we have gone into a study of this project at some length in the Subcommittee on Oceanography. Also they have had a scientific evaluation by the National Science Foundation of this whole program for about a year, a year ago. It was decided that we should continue it. Certainly if there is one area where we need to continue research, it is in the development of the seas and what is under the seas.

So I would hope, too, that consideration could be given to this rather than just stopping it now and wasting the amount of money placed in the project already.

Mr. CASEY. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, because he has been very active in the program. I also want to point out to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I feel we who have been active in the program were remiss in not telling you more about this before it came up, as to its importance. Also I think if you get an updated estimate of what it is going to cost to cancel out this program, I know the gentleman is very mindful of how the taxpayer's dollar is spent and does not want any waste. This is one program where if you do cut it down, you will throw the money out the window and not get anything for it to speak of. This is a program that is high priority which works with the NASA agency. The Navy is vitally interested in it, because you have a joint committee on NASA and the Navy and the National Science Foundation and the National Geological Survey.

This is of top priority, not only with reference to our own country but with reference to the international scientific community.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CABELL. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to suport the statements and the very fine presentation which has been made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY], with reference to the continuation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, this certainly would represent a case of false economy at this time after the momentum has been built up in the development of this scientific project, to delay it and then seek to pick up the pieces at a later date.

We are seeking knowledge of the world and of the earth. This knowledge is invaluable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I just want to say this to the Members of the Committee: I sincerely hope that the other body will approve the continuation of this program and by that time that this Committee will have the opportunity to do what it should have done to begin with, to justify the continuance of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I shall sincerely appreciate the committee, if it has the opportunity later on, giving this program favorable consideration.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, 7 years ago, in June of 1959, the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held a hearing on Project Mohole, the imaginative scientific proposal of a group of distinguished earth scientists to drill a hole through the crust of the earth into the earth's mantle. The committee at that time was impressed with the great potential involved in carrying out this project which was expected to uncover a great deal of otherwise unattainable information about the history of the ocean and the earth—both biological and physical.

We followed the progress of the proposal in other hearings in later years. Its possibilities finally brought to it a high degree of support in the Government, in industry, and the scientific community.

It has become trite, but nevertheless true, to compare the greater extent of our knowledge of outer space, the moon and the planets, than we have of our own planet, earth, and the three-fourths of its surface which is covered by the oceans.

I take it that the reasons for the elimination of the modest amount requested for the continuation of Project Mohole in fiscal 1967 has to do with the very real strains to which our economy is subjected as the result of our support of the war in southeast Asia.

But Mr. Chairman, the elimination of this important project many be penny-wise and pound-foolish. The program is well underway. Organizations have been developed, procedures and systems have been established, and many of the unknown problems in the preparatory phase have now been solved. As part of all this highly sophisticated and important portions of the necessary equipment have been designed and either fabricated or are in the process of fabrication. The unique drilling platform has been designed, model tested, plans and specifications prepared, and a contract awarded for its construction.

I am told that under the illusion of saving some $19.6 million out of this appropriation, some $35 to $40 million will be wasted in the process of terminating the project.

So I speak only to express the hope that this proposal, having come so far along the way toward its objective, will not now be abandoned—that some way can be found to retain what has already been accomplished, and keep the project going until its objective can be reached, even if it has to be done with some modification of the time schedule.

Finally, I must call attention to the fact that the United States as a participant in the International Upper Mantle project is actually participating only to the extent of the work being done on the Mohole project. On the other hand, the Russians are very actively holding up their end of the Upper Mantle program by extensively carrying out drilling projects on land in Soviet Russia. Not only are they doing this as a part of an international program, but obviously and clearly for their own benefit as well.

I regret that a relatively small amount of money in this appropriation should jeopardize our effort to dispel the ignorance which we have of our own earthly environment while multibillions of dollars are being spent to obtain the same kind of information concerning the moon and other heavenly bodies.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that some word should be mentioned about our priorities here today.

We have in this bill $5 billion for NASA. The last time I looked at it, a billion equaled 1,000 million. So we have $5,000 million for NASA proposed in this bill and it has not even been talked about here, not a word about it.

However, Mr. Chairman, we are taking $30 million out of the bill for a rent supplement program. The rent supplement program holds out great promise for the American people, and I support it.

We are taking out $1½ million for nursing homes for aged veterans. Yet there is no motion on any side to cut the NASA appropriation at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the procedure in the past on the Republican side has been a 5 percent cut across the board. I have objected to this approach in the past because it is too diffuse. But here the Republicans have an opportunity to cut out $250 million for NASA anc I do not hear any talk about this being done.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. One reason for that is that this is not $5 billion. It is pretty close to it. It is $4,950 million.

We cut $62 million out of this budget. That is $225 million less than NASA had last year.

Mr. JOELSON. How much was authorized by the House?

Mr. JONAS. Well, it is under what was authorized.

Mr. JOELSON. Very little.

Mr. JONAS. Well, as I recall, the authorization was $4,986 million and we reduced it to $4,950 million. It is a cut under the budget of $62 million.

Mr. JOELSON. I believe that is incorrect.

Mr. JONAS. So it does represent a cut. We are not rubberstamping anything, and I believe the cuts can be justified.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, it is with extreme regret that I, too, note that the Committee on Appropriations has deleted $19.7 million from the Mohole project of the National Science Foundation.

Project Mohole is aimed at extending our knowledge of this planet by obtaining and studying samples of the earth's crust down to and including the unexplored mantle. The project would also enable us to determine the distribution of the chemical elements within the deep crust and upper mantle. It would provide us with added knowledge of the mantle and its heat resources, knowledge which would be invaluable in earthquake prediction. It would advance the national program in oceanography by making it possible for us to explore the deep sea floor and to assay its economics. Mohole would do all this and more.

In the rocks of the earth, according to Mr. Gordon Lill, Mohole project's director, we may well find the answers to the Nation's effort to find out what is on the moon. He points out that it is not only timely but urgently necessary that we know enough about the interior of the earth to enable us to interpret effectively the returns expected from the Nation's planetary and lunar programs.

This interrelationship between Project Mohole and the space program is tersely but effectively presented by Dr. George P. Woollard, director of the Hawaii Institute of Geophysics, when he says:

> Mohole is vital to the space program. Unless we know what we've got here at the base of things at home, how are we going to know what new discoveries we have made when we reach the planets?

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of practical economics, I submit the Mohole project has reached the point of no return. To terminate the project at this juncture would mean that Federal funds in an estimated total amount of $35 to $40 million will have been expended without the attainment of the original objectives. To defer the further funding of the project to some future date would result in the dispersion of highly skilled technicians, the rusting of equipment already prepared, and the expenditure of additional millions of dollars and the lapse of valuable time to revive the program and to bring it to the stage of progress that it has reached today.

The deletion of funds for the Mohole project is a mistake. It is a decision which is likely to lower our national prestige in the field of scientific development, for it is a well-known fact that the Soviet Union and Canada both are conducting deep drilling programs. It is a decision which will frustrate worldwide interest which has been shown in our Mohole project.

Mr. Chairman, I had fully intended to offer an amendment to restore the deleted amount of $19.7 million requested by the National Science Foundation for the Mohole project, but I will not do so, for the reason that I am informed that the Senate is disposed to take such action. I rise at this time to bring this matter to the attention of the House so that when the Senate does restore the deleted funds this body will see fit to agree with the Senate.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Mrs. Thomas].

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the need for construction of a Lunar Sample Receiving Laboratory by NASA is quite apparent and I urge all my colleagues to support its funding in fiscal 1967.

Furthermore, the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, according to all the experts, is the logical and natural place for this Lunar Receiving Laboratory.

They have satisfied the members of the committee that their recommendation is based on solid and thorough economic and operational analysis of independent surveys, not only by NASA, but by the Public Health Service and the Army Biological Laboratories.

Who can argue with the experts? Their studies showed that the Manned Spacecraft Center has an operational scientific and engineering advantage over any other candidate facility. The returned spacecraft, astronauts, and lunar sample material will be located in close proximity to the Apollo scientific, engineering, and medical teams at the Manned Spacecraft Center during the critical immediate postflight period. If the lunar laboratory were to be placed at some location other than the spacecraft center, travel to this facility by spacecraft center personnel to provide essential administrative and technical support would add considerably to the costs. Clinical examinations, debriefings, engineering debriefings, data retrieval and processing, laboratory analysis, public affairs activities support, and other vital work requires a hand-in-glove coordination between the two. Who would build a house with the pantry at the opposite end from the kitchen?

Locating the Lunar Receiving Laboratory away from the Manned Spacecraft Center would necessitate the installation of at least five hardlines for voice communications between the laboratory and the center—another added cost. And for what purpose? These voice links would be required for coordinating mission operations in all areas affecting the returned spacecraft and lunar sample material. This requirement, and other long-range communications, travel, and dual administrative and supporting staff requirements can be eliminated only by placing the lunar laboratory at the spacecraft center.

We all support the space program, and recognize how vital it is to the entire country. Therefore, with everyone aware of the need for economy at this time, does it not make sense to use our already established facilities to the fullest extent—the maximum—whenever possible? I think it does.

I want, finally, to applaud our NASA people on their excellent judgment. They continually put forth tremendous effort, under pressure conditions at times, to accomplish their monumental task. We need their continued dedication to this program and they deserve our wholehearted and enthusiastic support.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, when the rent subsidy program was considered in the House, I expressed my opposition in these terms:

> We face strong and growing inflationary pressures in the economy. I have expressed my concern about inflation several times in the Record, and I believe it is inopportune to pass the rent subsidy measure at this time.

Price indexes are still going up. Inflationary pressures are still strong in the economy. The Congress has seen fit to pass spending measures even above the President's own budget requests.

My position on the rent subsidy issue remains consistent.

I continue to oppose its passage.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, there are many meritorious items included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act before us today, which I recognize the need for as in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Conference Report before us earlier today. The independent offices appropriation contained such worthy items as the funding for the continuance of operation and expenses by certain bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices which I fully support and recognize the need. Again, as in the second supplemental appropriations bill, if these items were presented in a separate bill, there would be no hesitancy on my part in supporting them. However, the inclusion of rent subsidies under the Housing and Urban Development Agency appropriation precludes my voting in support of this measure and subsequent vote against final passage.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I have expressed my opposition to the rent-subsidy program contained in this act on other occasions. The most recent statement I made may be found on page 7097 of the Congressional Record of March 29, during the debate on the second supplemental appropriation bill.

At that time, the program was approved narrowly in the House, which voted funds to carry it until June 30, the end of the current fiscal year. The bill went to the Senate where the rent-subsidy program was adopted by the margin of only one vote obtained from a Senator who openly admitted that his vote was won by the administration's promise to spend public funds on a certain project in his State, funds it was not planning to spend prior to the time of the vote in the Senate.

In addition to other objections surrounding the rent-subsidy program, this apparent purchase of a vote through the expenditure of public funds raises a serious ethical question about the manner in which this measure has been handled.

With this narrow victory under its belt, the administration returns with this bill seeking funds to operate this program for the whole year beginning July 1, 1966. To me, this program remains as objectionable as ever.

PROGRAM NOT FOR POOR

The main objective of the rent-subsidy program is not to help the poor but to help selected middle-income families. The chief beneficiaries, as I see it, would be landlords and bankers whose rents and loans would, in effect, be underwritten by the Government. In April 1965, speaking to the Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, Housing Secretary Weaver is reported in the press as having said that a builder would have to have "a heart of gold and a head of lead" to try to apply rent subsidy to low-income people.

While I approve efforts to provide better housing for our people, I cannot vote to tax citizens of New Hampshire for the purpose of paying rent subsidies to other citizens, many of whom are better off than many New Hampshire residents.

Nor do I believe that subsidized rents would provide a socially sound solution to the problems of inadequate housing—certainly not housing for the poor. They would instead amount to an acceptance of the proposition that there is no solution except to create a permanent class of persons subsidized by the rest of the population. At the least, this is a highly experimental program, certain to be immensely expensive, and ought not to be undertaken at this time when war and welfare spending have already driven the national budget deep into the red.

Our purpose here in Congress should be to trim expenses that can be deferred. Our battle should be against inflation, which does more damage to the poor than any Federal handouts can compensate for.

We should not seek new ways to spend, which this rent-subsidy program would be. The people do not want this program according to all the polls that I have seen. All the polls I have seen, including one I took myself in my own district last year, after my first vote against the proposal, registered heavy opposition to this plan. I am certain the feeling is just as strong against it now.

I urge the House to defeat this rent-subsidy proposal.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support, particularly of that section of H.R. 14921, that provides $3,707,000 for construction of a Federal office building at Oak Ridge, Tenn. For a long number of years requests have been made for the construction of such a facility, however, for some reason the requests were declined.

The Oak Ridge facility was constructed during World War II and its place in history is well known by all of you. Oak Ridge, however, is just as important today as it was during World War I or II. The Federal employees at Oak Ridge have been housed since the beginning in old barrack-type buildings which are run down and obsolete.

I have discussed this request with many of you individually and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote for its approval today.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time and I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; purchase of one aircraft (for replacement only); hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $11,600,000.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time while this section is being read to point up what I believe is, in its practical effect a misuse of subsidies paid to the air carriers. While the incident I shall relate is strictly a local situation, it is of national significance.

In San Jose, Calif., we have a very fine municipal airport which is served by one subsidized carrier. Under this bill that carrier, Pacific Air Lines will receive in excess of $3½ million in subsidies. Pacific Air Lines has a monopoly of San Jose business, and most of its traffic and profit is generated in San Jose. I would say if all the other places it serves were as profitable, Pacific Air Lines would show a profit—but apparently they are not.

Pacific Southwest Airways, an intrastate carrier which does not get a single dime of Federal subsidy, is anxious to serve the city of San Jose, and has made arrangements to do so. But Pacific Air Lines, using part of its revenue which will include the $3.5 million it will get from this bill, is engaging in an expensive legal action to stop Pacific Southwest Airways from giving added service to the citizens of San Jose.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is an absolute misuse of a Federal subsidy program. It is perpetuating a monopoly that is not in the public interest, and it is squeezing down competition which is in the public interest.

Pacific Air Lines gives the most inadequate service that one can imagine. In fact, we jokingly refer to "PAL," the initials designating the line, as meaning "Positively Always Late." They give you coach service and charge you first-class rates for it. They do not serve meals at mealtime and if they are on time it is considered a miracle.

We people in the Santa Clara Valley, the second fastest-growing area in this Nation, feel that it is time competition is allowed to come to San Jose, and we feel that it would be good for Pacific Air Lines. Perhaps by improving service to meet competition a few more people would start riding Pacific rather than journeying 40 miles to San Francisco in order to connect with a good carrier.

The reason I am taking this time today is to point up that I believe this is a misuse of carrier subsidies, and I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if, in the interest of seeing that this money is properly administered in the public interest, if he would take a look into this problem in San Jose.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. What the gentleman has referred to seems to be an issue concerning interstate and intrastate carriers, and it is a matter for the CAB. However, we would be pleased to look into it and see if we can help the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure the gentleman from California would not want the record to show that we were passing legislation which would authorize these subsidies. All we do is look at the estimate given us by the CAB, and we have to put up the money because under the law the carriers that get the subsidies are entitled to them. But perhaps we can indirectly be of some help to the gentleman by reporting what he has said to the CAB. I am sure, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, we will be glad to do what we can.

But this is one item over which we have very little, if any, control.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman for making that point. Certainly there is no intention on my part to say that the money is being improperly appropriated. I am merely saying that one of the recipients of these Federal subsidies is acting improperly. They are impeding competition. They are not giving the service that they should give, and I want it publicly known. I sincerely hope your committee will interest themselves in the subject. I am glad the gentleman stated what he did.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. I am in complete sympathy with the remarks of my friend from California, because I have known poor air service between Cleveland and Washington that was not subsidized. I would merely like to point out that the subsidies this year have been decreased by $17.6 million. The appropriation for 1966 was $81,170,000 and the bill before you today contains $63,500,000, a reduction of $17,670,000.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 1:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

"For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the Washington National Airport, including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for police use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $3,731,500."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRIEDEL

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRIEDEL: On page 11, line 9, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and insert the following:

"That no funds provided in this bill shall be used for any construction at Dulles or Washington National Airports which is not specifically authorized by the appropriate committee."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, in explaining the purpose of this amendment, the FAA goes before the Appropriations Committee. It bypasses the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and they make a case for construction of pipelines, hangars, and other things that are vitally necessary. But somehow or other they always find ways and means of having money left over. They came up with one study estimated to cost $75,000. Then we found out the study cost $92,000.

I asked General McKee, head of FAA, where Congress authorized that they could use the $75,000. He said "Our budget is flexible. We saved some money."

I said, "Now it is $92,000. Where did you get the other $22,000?" He said, "The same way I got the $75,000."

Now he has awarded a contract to develop four alternate plans for modernizing Washington National Airport at a cost of $297,000. I do not know where in any bill the Congress authorized or appropriated the $297,000 for an award of this contract.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that we cannot accept the amendment of the gentleman, as much as we like him. However, we do expect FAA to submit its plans to the committee. The amendment of the gentleman goes to limiting any construction at both Dulles and Washington National Airports. It would stop even the most minor construction. They could not patch a piece of concrete, or perform any other necessary maintenance.

There is no money in this bill for major construction at either airport and I assure the gentleman, when the study is completed we will thoroughly go into the plans and proposals if they have any future recommendations. There is no fund in this bill for construction, I again assure the gentleman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I understand that. But there is a plan afoot, and I can feel it in the air, to spend anywhere from $1 million to $150 million for Washington National Airport. They have started the same pattern as when they built Dulles. They are already talking about needing $50 or $60 million for construction at National Airport. Prior to last year they have consistently said "Washington is overcrowded. We need Dulles." They have Dulles. Now they will try to spend all this money on Washington National, and you might as well put Dulles in mothballs, because nobody will want to go to Dulles if they can get all the jets they want at Washington National.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is interested in air safety. He would not mind getting a study on the subject, would he?

I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment, because we cannot accept it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the amendment provided the gentleman will call in the FAA and ask them specifically about this diversion of funds for projects not authorized by Congress.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we will be glad to look into the matter and try to help the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the recent colloquy about National Airport, there is construction in progress and everyone who has visited there in the last several months can see it. There will be more in the future. I think it should be emphasized that none of this is being done with Federal funds. It is all being paid for by the airlines. United and Eastern are spending $5 million for new counter space, and new ramp areas.

I understand that several other major airlines in the country plan to spend several million dollars more in the future, at no cost to the taxpayers. As has been stated, and I wish to again emphasize, there is no construction money in this FAA budget for construction at Washington National.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT LABORATORY

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including advances of funds without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), $280,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAC GREGOR

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACGREGOR: On page 12, strike out lines 4 through 10 and renumber the remaining lines accordingly.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It is responsive to at least the spirit of the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

My amendment would save $280 million in the next fiscal year. It would knock out the total funds allocated for the civil supersonic aircraft development.

The bill as it now reads would provide an appropriation of $280 million of taxpayers' money for the development of the supersonic transport during the year beginning July 1, 1966.

Mr. Chairman, I do not presume to be a professional or a technical expert in this field. I am, however, concerned, as many Members are concerned, with the problem of saving some money where we can, of establishing priorities, of postponing certain spending items when postponements might reasonably be made.

I am further impressed by the fact that the principal push for this huge expenditure for SST development comes from those who use the argument that the French-British combine will develop the Concorde, a 1,400-mile-per-hour aircraft which purportedly will enjoy great commercial success in the early 1970's, if not before. It is claimed that it will be absolutely essential, for America to regain its No. 1 position in the aircraft world, to have a 2,000-mile-per-hour supersonic transport which will far exceed the performance capabilities of the British-French Concorde.

I am not at all persuaded that there is any credible evidence that the Concorde is going to be successful. I am not at all sure there are any difinitive studies which indicate the average trans-Atlantic, trans-Pacific or transcontinental traveler will be interested in traveling at this rate of speed, compared to traveling at the present time at speeds of approximately 600 miles per hour. Indeed, long distance flights at present speeds have been proved to cause both physical and mental disabilities of a temporary nature.

We have been stampeded to some extent by those who have a special interest in this lavish outlay of public funds, which we can ill afford to spend at this time. This is more than a quarter billion dollars for a project which at best rests upon a speculation—a speculation that the British-French Concorde is going to be commercially successful, and a guess that we have to spend this amount of taxpayers' money now in order to bring about a superior plane some time in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that if Members are seriously interested in making spending cuts, in establishing priorities, in postponing expenditures where postponements can be made, in helping to control inflation by blunting the push of an ever greater spiral of Federal Government spending, this amendment ought to have the unanimous support of every one in this Chamber.

I see the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], is in the House. I appreciate that this $280 million expenditure is not in the NASA budget, but it lies in an analogous field.

I thank you, and I urge that the amendment be approved.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In the budget for the FAA we made cuts in every area except the supersonic transport. We should not go up the hill and down the hill on this matter. We have contracts at the present time for research on a supersonic aircraft—and the program should be funded. We must not violate our contracts. We need to go forward. The funds should be provided and the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Can the distinguished gentleman tell me approximately how much of the $280 million is necessitated, in the gentleman's opinion, by on-going contracts and how much of i. is new money for new contracts or new programs or new developments?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. At the preset time we are in phase 2-C of research and development, an 18-month design competition contract, and then we will move into the third phase of the program which is prototype construction.

We have two engine manufacturers, Pratt-Whitney and General Electric, and we have two airframe manufacturers, Boeing and Lockheed. These contracts have been entered into, and we are moving into the third phase. After this research has been completed, the prototype design will be selected, two prototype aircraft will be constructed, and the aircraft will be tested for 100 hours. At that time we can consider whether or not we shall move into private financing to build the plane. Contracts have already been let to the four contractors. We are about in the third phase of this research program.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. While I do not have an answer to my question, I would like to ask another question. Is it not true that a private group approached some of the members of your committee or of another committee of the Congress with a proposal to finance privately the continued development of the supersonic transport?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes. We heard a group interested in setting up a corporation with bonds similar to the satellite corporation to move into private financing after the research program has been completed.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I will say to the gentleman I have a bill pending before the House now to do exactly what the gentleman is saying; that is, the supersonic transport should be built by private funds. This bill is pending now before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. I hope it will be heard and passed, because it provides for the private financing of this plane. The first prototype will probably be built under the direction of what the committee of the gentleman has done, but when you get into production, it should be done by private financing and it can be done under the bond system that we have in that bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. When the research program is completed and a prototype is developed, that is the time to consider whether or not future financing should be under private arrangement, but currently we are engaged in research with private contractors and we must provide the funds for those contracts.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. How much money have we already put into the supersonic transport? It is in excess of $200 million, is it not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We have appropriated about $231 million to date. This is the third and final stage leading to the selection of one supersonic transport.

Mr. MacGREGOR. So what is proposed in this bill that I would like to knock out, added to what has already been appropriated, would be half a billion dollars on the supersonic transport.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The Congress made this decision to go forward with the supersonic aircraft—we are attempting to fund it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California

Mr. MILLER. I would like to answer the gentleman by saying the only time we have reversed the gold flow in recent times is when we were selling jet planes to Europe and around the world. We are again recapturing the market here. If we lose this market, it will reflect itself in our buying foreign planes. Already American companies have placed firm orders for the Concorde. I do not share the gentleman's view at all that the Concorde will not be built. They are already building this. Just at the present time we are beginning to reverse that trend with some newer planes we are bringing in. I think it is highly essential that we go forward with this. May I point out to the gentleman one plane we are now building is being shown in 17 foreign countries and the take will be over a billion and a quarter dollars.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we have a vote on the matter and that this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For advance planning, design, and construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, $75 million, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 30, after line 11, insert a new paragraph.

"None of the funds provided in this act shall be used for the construction of a lunar sample laboratory."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, last week when the Committee on Science and Astronautics brought its authorization bill to the House floor, there was included $9 million or approximately $9 million for the construction of a laboratory for the analysis of some 80 pounds of lunar dust that some say will be brought back to the earth someday somehow.

When on yesterday, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy brought its authorization bill to the floor of the House, and during the course of debate, some of us asked why the atomic Energy Commission and its numerous research and laboratory facilities could not be used for this analysis.

I would like to read to you from the Record of yesterday, after the question was posed. The gentleman form California [Mr. Holifield], chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, replied as follows:

> We have the finest laboratories that there are in the world for the analysis of materials. We have had to have them because we have given hundreds of millions of dollars for the radiation of material of different kinds. I would assume that the quantity of material that might be obtained on the moon and returned to our laboratories would be small, and I do not believe it would tax the facilities of our scientists to analyze that material. I will be glad to look into the matter and consider any information that Mr. Finger, the manager of the space projects, will bring to us.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer], the ranking minority member of the same committee said:

> I would say also to the gentleman that at the present time the AEC laboratories, because of their capability and excellence, are being used by various other departments and agencies of the Government to carry on necessary research. As the gentleman explained the moon materials program, I am certain there would be no difficulty in it being handled by the AEC, subject, of course, to further checks so that we could reassure the gentleman with certainty.

Now I say to Members of the House that here is a good opportunity to save approximately $9 million. I say to you, on the basis of the statements of the chairman and the ranking member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that the facilities are already available for an analysis of moon dust—if we ever get any moon dust.

I hope the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will see fit to accept the amendment and thus save the taxpayers an outlay of $9 million.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa is a very valued Member of this House and we all appreciate him. But one thing we have learned about my friend—no matter how much we do, one can never fully satisfy the gentleman's desire for more and more cuts in appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, this construction budget was $101.5 million and we cut it to $75 million. We made a $26.5 million reduction and yet my friend from Iowa wants to go even further and set certain priorities on the facilities for NASA that are most important for the space program.

The committee was somewhat impressed, I might add, with the same arguments that the gentleman from Iowa made, in other testimony before our committee but we should not determine here which facility has the highest priority for construction.

We think that NASA should determine that itself.

As I have pointed out, we have made a substantial cut—a $26.5 million reduction. We have said to NASA—You decide which one of these facilities is the most important to advance our space program and which has the highest priority.

But we did not pinpoint any specific facility to be cut out.

We are in sympathy with what the gentleman says, but we think a $26.5 million cut is enough in facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman seems to think I am hard to satisfy. If the gentleman would just accept this amendment, he would find out how easy I am to satisfy.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Apparently, a $26.5 million cut is not enough to satisfy the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The point is, why not cut it another $9 million if the facility is not needed?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We have already made cuts. We have made reductions. The national space team knows where their facilities are needed throughout the country and where they are needed most.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman would find the taxpayers of this country would very quickly approve a saving of $9 million that was not necessary.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. It is entirely possible that NASA might use the reduction which we have made for the facilities to which the gentleman has directed his amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am glad the gentleman made the last statement, because as I interpret the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, it does not cut out $9 million. It would be just a limitation and would eliminate the possibility that part of the money left in the bill might be used for this facility. But it would not be a cut in addition to the $26 million cut that the committee has already made in the bill.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am not in sympathy with the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa. The fact is that he has quoted from yesterday's RECORD the statements of two of the Members that the Atomic Energy Commission could in fact analyze the dust. That is not a sufficient answer to the question as to whether or not we should or should not have this lunar laboratory. The fact is that a proper committee has looked into the use of the Atomic Energy Commission's laboratory and has said that in order to protect this earth from contamination—not just the 80 pounds of dust, but on the possibility of the astronauts themselves contaminating the earth or being contaminated—this laboratory, if built at an Atomic Energy installation, would still cost in the vicinity of some $11 million, and therefore could not in any way handle and replace the need for this laboratory.

The laboratory is needed. It has been supported by a committee which has analyzed installations throughout the country. The Public Health Service is insisting that this be done, and it must be done at this time so that it can keep pace with the whole space program.

The fact is that this would be a limitation. There have been sufficient cuts. There should not be restrictions on the activity of the Space Agency to perform its duty and to keep to its schedule, and I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1897), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); maintenance and operation of one aircraft; purchase of flight services for research support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guards services; $479,999,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act: *Provided further,* That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers may be credited to this appropriation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join some of the other Members who have become concerned and alarmed at the action of cutting out the so-called Mohole project. This is an important scientific investigation. None of us can tell definitely what its benefits will be, but it is in the field of science. For some 8 years now we have been studying the possibilities of this program and its desirability, and the necessity for it has been accepted.

To curtail this project at this time would be not to go up the hill and down the hill, but to toss about $35 million away.

Someday the project will be completed. I can understand the feelings of some who do not have an appreciation for science. Perhaps the same argument could have been made 100 years ago about appropriating money for the land-grant colleges. Thank God that the argument did not then prevail, and we did establish these great institutions of science.

This program has been gone into very thoroughly. It is necessary. It finds itself in the position of being an orphan among the several agencies of Government. This has been the shortcoming of the oceanography program. Historically, oceanography has been divided among seven departments of Government. It has been hard to draw them together and to get the interest of a legislative committee behind any part of oceanography. There is no legislative committee directly to which the people who are engaged in the National Science Foundation in the field of oceanography can go. The Mohole project is in that category.

Had it been in the Committee on Science and Astronautics, we would have been in here fighting for it. It has no champion. But it is important. It is a part of earth sciences, and the earth sciences are a neglected field of science, and only now are we beginning to understand and take cognizance of them and what they amount to.

I have no criticism of the subcommittee. I think the Appropriations Committee has ruled as it has seen fit. But I am hopeful that if the Senate does replace some of this money, they will look favorably upon accepting such a compromise in conference.

I want to help make the record on behalf of the Mohole project in this House.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I understand the feeling of the distinguished gentleman on this. However, the gentleman implied we did not have a full appreciation for science or the full facts and information on this matter. We are very interested in science and scientific progress.

The bill contains about a half-billion dollars for the National Science Foundation. About $220 million is being spent for oceanographic research governmentwide. The original cost for the Mohole project was about $46 or $47 million. Then it went to $65 million, then $85 million. It will cost a half billion dollars over the next 20 to 30 years before it is completed.

A lot of letters have come in from people across the country saying they congratulate us for this decision to deny further funds for Mohole. In the opinion of many competent observers, this project is a giant boondoggle.

Mr. Chairman, I received a letter dated May 7, 1965, from Houston, Tex., which I believe will be of interest. It states:

> Congratulations on your decision not to grant additional funds for the Mohole project. In the opinion of many petroleum industry observers, this project is a gigantic boondoggle.

You will recall that, at the outset, several scientist types got together and formulated this project which was to cost a mere $2 million. Then the estimate went up to $5 million, $38 million, and now I understand it is going to cost at least $100 million before any hole is drilled. This means the project is going to cost hundreds of millions before it is completed.

Aside from the Madison Avenue appeal of drilling into the earth's mantle, many of us feel that far more information of scientific value can be obtained by drilling a large number of core holes in many locations throughout the world. The JOIDES program conducted by Scripps and a privately financed program under Dr. Maurice Ewing of Lamont, are going to accomplish this worthwhile objective at far less cost.

In summary, if the Nation is interested in reducing domestic expenditures to partially offset costs of the Vietnam war, I can think of no better place to start than Project Mohole.

This comment is from a very knowledgeable person in the area where the Project Mohole is headquartered.

There is also another very similar oceanographic survey sponsored by the National Science Foundation in this budget for $1.3 million, and we appropriated $5.4 million last year. This is the oceanographic sediment coring program, another Mohole project.

The second ocean drilling project is well underway. I think we are overly funded in Mohole drilling at this time, and we can save this $20 million now and a half billion dollars by terminating the contract.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California has been a longtime friend of oceanography—and I know that it is not easy for him to invite attention to the problems that face oceanographers—and, in particular, those who are interested in Operation Mohole. It is indeed unfortunate that the responsibility for the oceanography program is splintered as much, or even more than, he has described it.

We do have, however, a subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine which is devoted entirely to oceanography. They have, from time to time, made valiant efforts to bring to the Congress legislation which would furnish cohesiveness and direction to this vital ocean science. At this very moment, there are House and Senate versions of oceanography bills which are being discussed by conferees of the House and Senate.

I am hopeful that during this session, the differences between the branches can be resolved and that there will be an executive agency in the Federal Government which can help us as a Nation to develop the resources of the ocean. We have a head start in many areas. The Russians are also interested in projects similar to our Operation Mohole. Perhaps, when the executive branch is organized to attack the problems of oceanography on a comprehensive basis, we will be able to continue our exploration of the earth's crust.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $2,477,000.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not require 5 minutes. I know the House wants to move along.

I announced earlier that it would be my intention to offer a point of order against the language in this section, but I have been informed that the appropriation is to be used for wages and salaries of members of the Renegotiation Board and not for a continuation of activities of the Board beyond the expiration date of the present act. Therefore, since the point of order would apparently not prevail, naturally I will not make it.

I merely wish to restate my position. This law has outlived its usefulness. We are appropriating money today to administer a law which will have no substantive effect after June 30 of this year unless Congress moves to reextend it. We are spending additional money in added renegotiation costs which wind up in the cost of a product which the Defense Department buys, and results in losses in income taxes. Actually, we are losing an average of $15 million a year by the action of the Renegotiation Board. If given the opportunity, I shall appear before the Ways and Means Committee to attempt to influence that committee not to reextend the law.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be made against the remainder of the bill?

The Chair hears none.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: on page 46, after line 22, insert:

"RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

"For rent supplement payments authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased by $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOLAND was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered restores the $20 million that was recommended for the rent supplement program by the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations. This amount was stricken from the bill by the full Appropriations Committee last Thursday. To accept the action of the Appropriations Committee would deal this bold, new concept a disastrous, if not a fatal, blow. It would, in a real sense, reverse the action this House took this afternoon in passing the supplemental appropriations bill which finally assured that this program had finally gotten off the ground. The $12 million provided in that bill for fiscal year 1966 was $18 million below the request sought by the Housing and Urban Development Department. The $12 million will provide for no more than 20,000 units. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has received from churches, fraternal, labor organizations, nonprofit, limited-dividend, and cooperative groups and sponsors, letters of interest and intent to participate in the program to the extent of more than 100,000 housing units spread into every State of the Nation.

The amendment that I have offered will provide $20 million of contract authority for fiscal year 1967. The request from the Department was for $35 million. The number of units that can be provided for by the $20 million will be about 34,000 units.

Mr. Chairman, everyone in this chamber is familiar with this program. I do not know of any other proposal that has been so thoroughly aired by congressional debate and floor action—by committee hearings and reports. All of the arguments, pro and con, have been exhausted. They have been documented by all to read and digest—loud and clear—so loud and clear that even he who runs can read.

This program has been maligned. It has been misunderstood. And still it has been hardy enough to survive.

By supporting this amendment, we will be confirming our earlier judgments that private enterprise belongs in the low-income housing field.

Mr. Chairman, I believe deeply in this program. The experience that this Nation has had with public housing, noble though it has been, emphatically shows that it is not enough.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices for 12 years. During that period, I have come to know a little something about public housing. It has, and is providing decent living conditions for low-income groups. But it has, and it will produce problems, and it has been costly. During my dozen years of service on this committee, subsidy to public housing has run to nearly $2 billion.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we have a program that will complement public housing. In housing for low-income families, this could, indeed, be the wave of the future. It is a program of private housing, built by private industry for nonprofit, limited-dividend, or cooperative sponsors for low-income families. In the long run, it will be less costly than public housing. And it will enable families who needs the help most, to get out of ghettos—to abandon substandard housing—and give them an opportunity to raise their families in decent, wholesome surroundings.

Income and asset limitations have been established which assures that only those in the low-income groups will benefit by the rent supplement program. They have been detailed in the Record and need no elaboration now.

Support for this challenging effort has come from all segments of our society—real estate boards, builders, bankers, businessmen, the clergy of all denominations, and from people who have given a lifetime in working among the poor and disadvantaged people of our country.

Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt about this program. There can be no refutation of precisely the class of people who will benefit under this program.

This is a program for the poor.

It is, in the final analysis, a simple, straightforward question that we are answering here today.

Will we help the poor get the housing they need and cannot pay for on their own?

Will we let them share in the American dream, or will we let them struggle through their own nightmares?

Unless we appropriate funds, adequate funds to make the rent supplemental program workable, the entire concept of a decent home for every American becomes a shallow promise.

We abandon these people to their fate—a life of poverty spent in substandard housing.

We have appropriated $12 million for an inauspicious launching of this program. It desperately needs to be carried forward, with adequate funding in fiscal year 1967. The need has been detailed and documented, to get this program underway, to let the private sector of the economy breech the dollar curtain that has barred the poor from sharing the rewards bestowed upon us.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has already spoken on this matter. Together, the House and Senate have considered it six times. It has been a long, hard climb to the place the supporters of this program now occupy.

Do not let a handful of members of the Appropriations Committee sabotage the struggle—the successful struggle that has brought us to this moment. Those who voted to kill this program in the full Appropriations Committee have never, and never will, support this.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is making a great speech. I want to congratulate him. This is the fourth time in less than a year that this matter has been before the House. At least 500,000 poor people are waiting to see what the Congress is going to do. I commend the gentleman on what he is trying to do through private enterprise. This is for poor people, and the Secretary of HUD has said repeatedly, over and over again—he said it recently in a letter to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins]—that he has made no statement to indicate anything to the contrary. I commend the gentleman, and I hope that the House will follow his leadership.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland], has made a powerful, moving, and emotional appeal for the adoption of his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts is a very, very able, effective advocate. He is a close personal friend of mine. I know of no Member of the House for whom I have a higher regard. The gentleman and I have slight differences of opinion, however, with respect to this project. I mean no offense when I oppose the amendment that the gentleman has offered.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I am asking the Committee to support the action of the Committee on Appropriations. We had a rollcall vote on this matter last week and a majority of the members of that committee voted to eliminate the $20 million, the funds proposed for this program.

Mr. Chairman, the Republicans do not control that committee. The division is 34 Democrats to 16 Republicans. So I say to the Members of the Committee that there are no politics involved here. The differences are fundamental and philosophical, and differences of that nature, rather than political.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will permit me to finish and if I have any time left, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman. However, I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts said that to defeat his amendment would be to reverse the action taken by the House of Representatives earlier this afternoon. With all due respect for the gentleman, I must say that is not quite accurate. There was nothing pending before the House this afternoon dealing with rent subsidies. That item was not even in conference. It was not dealt with in the conference report. It was not considered in the conference. It could not be considered in the conference.

So, Mr. Chairman, by no stretch of the imagination, could it fairly be argued that to defeat the amendment now would be to reverse the position taken by the Committee earlier today.

Also, Mr. Chairman, it was argued, and has been argued since this program was first proposed, that this is a free-enterprise approach to the housing problem. It is said that private builders will build the houses, and that is true, but private builders built the public housing units. There is no more private enterprise in building a rent-subsidy unit than is involved in building a public-housing unit.

Mr. Chairman, the only private enterprise involved is in the management, because you cannot have a completely private-enterprise proposition when the Federal Government is subsidizing the rent and when it is because of the subsidy that the project is built.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is very little private enterprise involved in this business.

Also, it has been argued that this is a very small amendment, one which only involves $20 million.

But I would ask you to recall, if you vote for this amendment you are voting for an $800 million proposition instead of a $20 million one. Because whatever contracts are entered into involving the $20 million will run for 40 years.

So we are not dealing here with a small sum of money. We are dealing with folding money.

But aside from the money involved and the philosophical arguments that might be made against taxing John Smith to help pay the house rent of his next door neighbor—and arguments can be made that that is not fair and is not in the American tradition. But aside from that, I can submit another reason why this amendment should be defeated.

Last year Secretary McNamara froze money appropriated by this Congress to build 8,500 housing units—family housing units—for our servicemen. Now the ink was hardly dry on that freeze order, when the President sent up a budget asking for $35 million in addition to the requested $30 million previously requested to subsidize the rent of civilians.

Now if we can afford to postpone housing for the families of our servicemen in addition to sending them off to war, I think we can afford to hold up on this civilian rent subsidy proposition.

I think that is reason enough, Mr. Chairman, if there were no other reasons, for this amendment to be defeated today.

The **CHAIRMAN.** For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] rise?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of seeing whether we can arrive at some agreement on the time. Many of our colleagues have plane reservations and the hour is getting late and, of course, the discussion on this matter could be quite extended. But there is some urgency as to time, and it would be a matter of accommodation to our colleagues if we could come to an agreement on limiting the time.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, we would like 15 or 20 minutes on this side. We have a number of colleagues who desire to speak and we would like, I would say, 20 minutes on this side.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman agree to 10 minutes on each side—20 minutes altogether?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I would object to that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. We have at least one Member who wants to speak who was the author of the amendment in the full committee, and he would like 5 minutes plus some additional time if possible. There are several other Members who would be satisfied with 2 or 3 minutes apiece, including myself. But I would say a total of 20 minutes on this side would be satisfactory.

That is with the understanding, Mr. Chairman, as I gather from the gentleman that the 40 minutes would be divided equally.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. With 20 minutes on each side.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I would ask the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] if he will put the unanimous-consent request so as to have 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could not the gentleman do this so that we may divide up the time as we see fit?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of clarification, would it be in order for the gentleman from Tennessee to ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be confined to 20 minutes on each side, the 20 minutes on this side to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] and the 20 minutes on the Republican side by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas]?

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished majority leader for the suggestion and now make the unanimous-consent request accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support reinstatement of the 1967 fiscal year appropriation for the rent supplement program.

Some 8 million American families live in substandard housing today. Many of them cannot afford decent housing. Half of them are elderly or handicapped.

By failing to fund the rent supplement program we would deprive the very Americans who need help most in acquiring decent low-cost housing. Such action would be shortsighted and damaging.

Last year, when the rent supplement program was being debated, there was some question as to whether its benefits would actually accrue to low-income families in genuine need of better housing. The provisions drawn in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and the precise regulations set forth by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement the act, are assurances that low-income families will indeed benefit from rent supplement housing.

Again, in recent weeks, as we debated the fiscal 1966 supplemental appropriation for this program, important revisions in these regulations were made clear. These revisions involved such areas as income limits for eligibility, net assets, and reporting of income to insure gradual reduction of payments.

The regulations drawn for this program, in brief, contain many safeguards to assure that rent supplements will only go to those low-income families eligible for, and in need of, decent housing within their income capacity.

Mr. Chairman, the requirements affecting sponsorship of rent supplement projects are also important and worth noting.

Sponsorship is limited to nonprofit groups, limited-dividend corporations, and cooperatives. Under this approach, private initiative is invited to participate in the effort to solve the housing problems of the poor and elderly, but these restrictions discourage from the very beginning the expectation that large profits might result from such participation.

The program fosters private ownership, but the type of ownership and its methods of operation are limited by law. Rent supplement projects will be subject to cost certification and all mortgagors will be strictly regulated as to rent or other charges, sales, and rate of return by the FHA Commissioner. They will be regularly audited to assure proper handling and disbursement of income from the project. In addition, sponsors will be carefully screened to make sure that they have the qualifications and capabilities to develop and operate successfully housing projects for low-income people.

The rent supplement program will also utilize private construction but the profits of private builders will be strictly controlled by the establishment of mortgage limits and maximum rents low enough to permit only projects of modest design.

In addition, prevailing wages must be paid during construction, and the actual construction costs of the completed project must be disclosed and certified prior to the final endorsement of the mortgage note.

The requirement to maintain mortgage limits and maximum rents at a low level, precludes the possibility of windfall profits from land speculation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a most crucial distinction, and one not commonly made by the opponents of this appropriation here today. We are not talking about a $20 million impact on the budget for fiscal year 1967 when we talk of an appropriation for contract authority. In fact, the budgetary impact of this appropriation is more in the nature of $2 million in actual payments to rent supplement recipients.

Now let us focus carefully on this $2 million for the poor and the elderly. Is this inflation? Is this the social conscience of those who oppose this modest program?

Let us not be fooled by their false economies. Let us not be led astray by those who hold aloft the tattered banner of inflation while trampling on the dignity of the old, the underprivileged, and the poor.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment to restore the funds for a practicable and workable rent supplements program.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I support the distinguished majority of the Appropriations Committee in their assessment of the appropriation deserved by the rent supplement program. They arrived at the exact figure that this program deserves—and that is zero. I would like to compliment them for their wisdom. I would like to compliment them for their courage in withholding funds from this type of program. I think many Members of this House are beginning to realize that the rent supplement program cannot be trusted. This has been true all along.

The administration has made monkeys out of some of the people who listened to the propaganda with regard to this program. For example, despite the fact that the President and the Secretary of this Department, Mr. Weaver, both originally bragged that the rent supplement program was aimed at middle-income housing and economic integration, many of the Members on the other side of the aisle did not believe us when we said so. They chose to kid themselves that the rent supplement program was designed to provide the maximum housing for low-income people.

I think the gentlemen are beginning to realize that the rent supplement program is designed to do no such thing. Rather, it is aimed at securing a maximum of Federal control over American residential patterns. Secretary Weaver has never made any secret of his desire to see the Federal Government gain control of neighborhood residential patterns.

When President Johnson first spoke of the rent supplement program last year he talked of it as a tool to "increase the supply of housing available to those of moderate income." Secretary Weaver told the Housing Subcommittee last year that the program is a "program for middle-income families." Indeed, Secretary Weaver often went further.

He said that the program was no good for low-income families, and that no management groups would willingly take on the problems of low-income management. One time in Pittsburgh he said that a builder—and I quote—would have to have a "heart of gold and head of lead" to try to build rent-supplement housing for low-income groups.

The rent supplement program is the key to Federal power over neighborhood residential patterns. Housing for low-income groups is a very secondary consideration. I believe Secretary Weaver finally broke the last straw on this when he reiterated last week his desire to extend rent supplements to middle-income groups. He has said this before. He has always had it in mind. He is the only one in the administration that has been honest with the Congress.

The higher the income group that can be subsidized, the more types of housing the Federal power can be extended to. The social planners want to enlarge the rent supplement program in two ways. First, they want to expand it to include middle-income groups. These people can be used as advance agents of Federal power in the better suburban neighborhoods which the Federal Government wants to crack. Second, the social planners want to expand the program to include a much greater variety of private housing than the 221(d)(3) housing the program is presently limited to.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] has proposed a bill, similar, I believe, to one introduced in the Senate by Senator JAVITS, which would expand the program to include many other varieties of Government-aided or insured housing. This would be an instrument of coercion. Neighborhoods could be dealt with as the Federal Government might see fit once the economic leverage of rent supplements had been gained over a sprinkling of key buildings and developments. Some of you might say that the social planners downtown do not have this in mind. I can say from personal knowledge that they do. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, in this year's proposed housing act amendments, has proposed a rent certificate change which would make that program into a rent supplement program for other kinds of private housing. They never give up.

The social planner cannot wait to start playing with American residential neighborhoods. This program—and the rent certificate program if they can warp it—are the programs chosen. Money, in the form of rent subsidies, is to be the advance agent of control. The rent supplement statute is administrative putty. They can do pretty much what they want with it downtown.

What they want to do is this—they want to use the subsidy program as the muscle of a national "open occupancy" housing law. They want control of residential patterns. Open coercive legislation may be unconstitutional, but it is never unconstitutional to buy power. Subsidized housing is controlled housing, make no mistake about it.

One thing the administration cannot tolerate is the proviso that would keep the rent supplement program out of the suburbs. It is a trick to get the program past a suspicious Congress. If the program ever gets on its feet, the proviso will be scrapped. It has to be. This whole program is aimed at the suburbs and other areas which would exercise the local veto.

I hope this House will listen to the Appropriations Committee. They know the program must be killed now because it cannot be trusted and this may be the last chance to kill it.

I hope that this distinguished body will refrain from trading their consciences for igloos on this vote. This is a vote on America's future. I urge the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, what point is there in appropriating billions of dollars for antipoverty programs and for anticrime programs when the people we are seeking to aid under those programs are compelled to live in slums that are breeders of crime?

Thousands of people have come to me in my own congressional district and asked me to help them get into low-cost housing developments. But there just are not enough low-cost housing developments.

This business of Federal control is a lot of poppycock. The New York City Housing Authority and the city of New York determine who can live in public housing. The New York City Housing Authority—and I speak for New York City because that is the only area I am aware of, or at least knowledgeable about—will control this program, just the same as the public housing authorities will control it in the various other cities.

We are only trying to help the underprivileged, the poor, and we ask for assistance. If the Members consider this Federal control, they are wrong, but I implore every one to do what he can for those who cannot obtain housing today under our laws.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to briefly comment on the statement made by the gentleman who just had the floor, when he said this is going to require the renovation or the rehabilitation of existing housing.

This bill has nothing to do with that. This is for new construction. As was stated by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], this does not relate to the existing housing. The rent certificate program introduced by him and passed by this House is today operating in this area. It is in existence. It will operate to help the very people whom the gentleman is interested in.

There is no provision in this bill which will have a similar effect.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, like most other Members of this House, every few days I receive pitiful letters from people who cannot pay the economic rent for decent housing and who cannot get into public housing facilities in the area in which I live—Miami.

I cannot believe that certain Members of this House, if they really believe in helping people who need help to live in decent standard housing, have justification for their severe opposition to this proposal. Surely it cannot be on the ground that we do not believe in a housing subsidy, for on page 47 of the bill there is an item for the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, in the amount of $250 million.

In the next paragraph there is $18.8 million for administrative expenses of public housing programs.

This amendment helps people who are especially needy to live in fair housing through private enterprise where the property used and the income derived are taxable.

I hope that the amendment will be adopted, so that we can help many people in America who need help the most to live in housing which meets a minimum standard of decent American living.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment which would reinstate money for the rent subsidy program.

The rent subsidy program now before us would partly subsidize the rents of low-income families in privately built and privately owned nonprofit housing. Going by certain guidelines and income-asset limitations, the family would be required to pay 25 percent of its income for rent, and the Government would pay the rest. I believe a brief review of the legislative history of this proposal is in order. Things are never what they seem and this is a perfect example.

The President first proposed this program in his omnibus housing message of March 2, 1965, and it was immediately recognized as the most radical legislative proposal he had made to date, one with the Great Society brand burned deeply into it. In June 1965, the House approved it by only 6 votes, 208 to 202. Then, in October, by a vote of 185 to 162, the House rejected the appropriations to start the program at that time.

Early this year the President asked for money for the rest of fiscal year 1966; that is, until June 30, 1966. Again, the proposal barely got through the House by a vote of 198 to 190, even though the request was for only $12 million.

Then, in the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the funds were eliminated again. In what a national magazine described as "some arduous logrolling" the $12 million was restored by a vote of 46 to 45 in the Senate—a 1-vote margin of victory for the administration. This one vote, however, was admittedly purchased by the administration's sudden interest in and approval of a $10 million housing project for Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians living in Alaska near the Arctic Circle. The Member of the other body whose vote provided the margin confessed that "I am not proud of myself. It is not the kind of thing I normally do, but I could not seem to get the White House interested in my project." The White House would still be ignoring it if the rent subsidy program had not gotten into such trouble in the Senate.

Then, last week, by a vote of 25 to 21, the House Committee on Appropriations eliminated the funds once more, but here we are again resisting the administration attempt to again force the approval of money for this rent supplement.

I spoke in opposition to this measure when it first came up in 1965 and I believe since that time additional aspects have arisen that make opposition mandatory and rejection an absolute necessity.

The point has already been made that there is an ethical cloud over this matter. The winning Senate vote was purchased by blatant use of public funds. Who, or what, is on the auction block this time? What other proposal, normally fated to die unseen and unloved in some committee pigeonhole, is suddenly going to receive lavish, loving care from the White House in order to insure a margin of victory for this rent subsidy plan?

When this was first proposed, in 1965, many of us feared and openly stated that this was only a beginning and it would be no time at all until the Government sought to expand it to the middle-income bracket. The end result of this, of course, would be more and more expansion until there would be completely federalized—more accurately socialized—housing for the United States. This would in turn be followed by complete deterioration of our housing standards; it has happened in every other country where the Government became landlord for the nation and it would happen here.

The fears of expansion have proven to be well founded. As early as March 1965, Robert C. Weaver, then head of the Federal Housing Administration and now Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, told a House subcommittee that he favored the rent subsidy program as a "program for middle income families." The same position was taken by Mr. Weaver several times this year in the Senate committee testimony. Just a few days ago, there were newspaper reports to the effect that Mr. Weaver had stated, on a radio program, that:

> The administration would ask Congress to make the same kind of rent assistance available to families whose income is too high for public housing but who are too poor to afford adequate private accommodations. Congress will probably be asked to extend rent supplements to lower middle income families.

In a letter to the Washington, D.C., Post of May 3, 1966, Mr. Weaver denied this and put the text of the question and the reply from the transcript of the broadcast into his letter:

> Question. In the years ahead, do you plan to come back and ask for rent supplements for lower middle-income people?
>
> Answer. This is rather difficult to answer. I think that the first thing that would happen will be to try it out and see how successful it is, and I think it will be quite successful with the low-income segment of the market. Obviously, if this is true, then there is a very, very strong possibility and probability that it would be extended.

In his letter, Mr. Weaver went on to say, by way of disclaimer, that:

> This prediction of what Congress might wish to do some time in the future certainly should not be interpreted as meaning that I intend to make such a proposal.

How else is it to be interpreted? He is already on record as giving approval to the idea of expanding the program. We all know how, in way of justification of long-range spending schemes mounting in the billions, that what is first advanced as a "stopgap, emergency measure" has a way of becoming "vital to the American way of life," if I may use some favorite terms of the Washington bureaucracy.

As Humpty Dumpty said in "Alice in Wonderland," "When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less." The words setting up the rent subsidy will be used by the administration in exactly the same fashion and we can be certain that when it comes to cost, the words will mean more—not less.

If this program gets underway, there will be a constant pressure to expand its coverage, to increase its appropriations and lower its requirements for eligibility to participate. In editorial comment, the Indianapolis Star of May 8, 1966, said:

> It might be added that old-fashioned machine politics will be lurking in the background if not stalking bodily in the foreground. For the fellows who pay the rent, like the ones who used to bring around food baskets, get Pop out of jail or put Uncle Louis on the city payroll, will be paid back in due time with votes.

The American people are asking why the cost of Government is rising at such an unbelievable rate. In a recent public opinion poll I took, 93 percent were opposed to the rent subsidy programs; only 6 percent approved, and just 1 percent had no opinion. Rising Government expenses endanger out national economy and feed inflation; this in turn threatens the financial security of every citizen, especially the elderly and retired who live on the fixed incomes.

Three times now the Congress has refused to go along with the administration's request for this program. There is certainly no "consensus" of approval, either in the Congress or in the country. Opposition is based on the knowledge that the ultimate cost of this program would run into billions and only the very naive believe otherwise. This program would soon move into the middle-income group and could include even a majority of the American homes.

The time to stop is now, for it is late, but still not too late, to return to sane fiscal policies in Government. We should not consent to this rent subsidy proposal, for it is foreign to American concepts, will kill the incentive of the American family to improve its living standards by its own efforts, would kill the incentive for homeownership, would make renters wards of the Government, sets up a system of economic integration of housing through Government subsidy, and is the way of the socialistic state. We have an opportunity, by our vote of disapproval today, to stop this program before it becomes too late.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN to the amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On line 5, strike out the colon and insert a period. Strike out the remaining language of the amendment starting with "*Provided further*" and ending with "program".

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, when the supplemental appropriation bill was before the committee on March 29 I offered a similar amendment to strike out the local veto. The purpose of my amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is today the same, to eliminate from the amendment before the committee the local veto.

The effect of this limitation, which would prohibit the use of rent supplement funds for projects which do not have local official approval will be to block and prevent the movement of low-income families from our central cities into the suburbs.

I believe that one of the purposes of the rent supplement program and the public housing program is not only to house people but also to eliminate the ghetto conditions existing in our cities, and to make it possible for people to obtain decent housing in other areas and in other neighborhoods. Local officials can be expected to exercise this veto to preserve the economic and racial character of the suburbs if the urgent problems of the ghettos in our major cities are to be solved, then people must be encouraged to find housing outside of the ghetto.

I urge that this amendment to the amendment be adopted.

As to the merits of the principal amendment, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] for his very persuasive argument and very cogent reasoning in support of the rent supplement program.

Mr. Chairman, for the sake of this country's poor and for the sake of this country's cities, we must support the rent supplement program.

Earlier this year in asking the Congress for $30 million for the rent supplement program, President Johnson characterized rent subsidies as the "most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city."

Now the Appropriations Committee has proposed that we discard this instrument altogether.

Rent supplements would make it possible to expand the number of housing units available for low-income families.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has received expressions of interest from potential sponsors to build more than 100,000 units of new housing. The 1967 budget request of $35 million would have covered reservation of contract authority for 50,000 rent supplement housing units. The estimate is based on the assumption that the average annual rent supplement per unit will be $600 or a monthly rate of $50 per unit.

While the proposed amendment for $20 million is not enough, it would at least make it possible to construct about 34,000 units.

At a time when our nationwide housing needs are soaring at an alarming rate, it is unconscionable to scuttle what could be one of the most farseeing and progressive housing programs drafted in the last 30 years.

Indeed, my own view is that the $35 million proposed in the budget was only a fraction of what this country should be spending under this vital program.

In its report on page 2 the committee said that it had cut funds where it "is practical." Mr. Chairman, it is not practical to deny decent housing to millions of Americans. Nor is it desirable; nor is it just.

In his message on the cities last year, President Johnson noted that more than 4 million Americans live in intolerable housing conditions, without plumbing, without electricity, without sanitation.

This country should be constructing more than 200,000 new low-rent units a year. Unless the Boland amendment is adopted, we will not even begin to make a dent on that huge need. We will condemn millions of Americans to unfit homes.

Officials in the Department of Housing and Urban Development testified recently before the House Housing Subcommittee that there are some 500,000 families on waiting lists for public housing throughout the country. In New York City alone, more than 125,000 are on the waiting list.

According to a recent survey in New York City, 500,000 families, or 20 percent of the city's households, were ill housed. Some 400,000 of these families are in the low-income category.

Yet even under the proposed $20 million program, only about 3,400 units would be built in New York City.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us today should not be whether to appropriate any money. It should be how much money to appropriate. It should be how long the country will continue to make a piecemeal attack on its most critical problems.

I would have preferred to have the chance to support a request for the full $35 million appropriation. And ideally, I would have liked to have had the chance this afternoon to vote for a truly large-scale appropriation of funds of a magnitude which would finally make it possible for this country to make it possible for all Americans to live in good homes.

On May 7 the New York Times published an important editorial which advocated restoration of the funds for rent supplements. I include it at this point in the RECORD.

NEW REVERSE FOR RENT SUBSIDIES

By its irresponsible dithering over the rent subsidy program the bipartisan majority in control of the House Appropriations Committee is bringing the whole legislative process into disrepute.

President Johnson had requested $38 million to carry this modest program forward in the fiscal year beginning July 1. An Appropriations Subcommittee cut this request nearly in half, and then the full committee voted 25 to 21 to delete it altogether. An effort will now be made to restore the funds on the House floor.

The rent subsidy program would help low-income people to find better housing; the subsidy would only apply after the family had paid one-quarter of its total income toward the rent. No private landlords would be involved; only housing owned and operated by nonprofit groups would qualify for these subsidy payments. Since Congress authorized the program last year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been swamped with applications from private foundations seeking to participate. The need and the interest obviously exist.

Yet, before the program even gets off the ground, the Appropriations Committee is trying to shoot it down. The committee is arrogating to itself the power of a review board, abolishing programs authorized by majorities of both Houses. It is time for the House to rebuke this assumption of power.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], whether he will support the Boland amendment if his amendment does not prevail.

Mr. RYAN. If the gentleman from Michigan is referring to the Bow amendment for a 5-percent across-the-board cut, I will certainly oppose it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I was talking to the Boland amendment. I am talking to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. RYAN. Certainly.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, if your amendment does not prevail, you will still support the Boland amendment?

Mr. RYAN. Of course. It is important to fund this very vital program and get it started.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is important to fund it even though your amendment is defeated?

Mr. RYAN. I am opposed to any veto on the part of any local official that would prevent the movement of people to the suburbs.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the Boland amendment provides for that veto.

Mr. RYAN. I am opposed to the veto. I hope that the distinguished minority leader will support both amendments I challenge the Republicans to support both amendments because they are both in the interest of the American people.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, let me say that although ostensibly and superficially it appears we are only voting on whether to restore $22 million to the committee bill, in reality every one of us knows the end result of this 40-year program would be a minimum of $6 billion or $8 billion. A possibility and the real likelihood is that we would end up with a $20 billion commitment over the total span of years.

In the supplemental there was $12 million to get this program going. I do not think we should have initiated it at this time, but it is now funded. I think it would be wise and well if we let that program get going and see how it works before we embark upon a new or second segment that could cost anywhere from $6 billion to $20 billion over the next 40 years.

It seems to me also in discussing the problem today we ought to take a look at what has happened to our fiscal picture in the Federal Government since January 1, 1966. I am informed that our first quarter spending on an adjusted basis by the Federal Government is $36.8 billion, up 22 percent or 6.7 percent over a year ago. When you combine the fact that this is the initiation of a new program and when you combine our serious fiscal picture, I think this program should be defeated or at least deferred now in this bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to oppose the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Throughout the entire housing program the workable program concept is written into the law. This requirement is also in the law we have recently adopted providing initial funding for rent supplements. This amendment should be defeated. This is a provision to enlist local participation and to have local community support for this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment to include a modest amount of money in this bill to provide vitally needed housing for our lowest income families. The issue before us is very simple—whether or not we will provide the small but essential margin of aid for the 4½ million elderly families whose incomes are so low they cannot afford decent housing. For the 3 million poverty-stricken families now living in slums and for the thousands of low income families being displaced by highways, urban renewal and other public construction. That is exactly what the rent supplement program is designed to do and it will do it by unleashing the energy and imagination of private enterprise.

There is no need to go through the mechanics of the rent supplement program again. Every detail of the program has been gone over and explained over the past year. The Congress has approved this program not once but twice and the question today is whether or not we will make it a reality to the additional thousands of families who sorely need good housing.

This aid is needed not only by underprivileged families who are now living and trying to raise children in slum conditions but it is important to all of us in this country. The strength and prosperity of America depends on the success with which we meet pressing social problems and there can be no dispute that bad housing is one of the most fundamental.

It is hard to understand the roadblocks that have been thrown in the path of this program. It enjoys the widest support of any of our housing programs outside of Congress and it deserves the same kind of support here on the floor.

The record shows that it is wholeheartedly endorsed by mayors, labor organizations, civic groups interested in housing, church organizations, the National Association of Home Builders and the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

I was particularly pleased by the action taken last fall by the real estate boards. This important group had initially opposed the rent supplement program but after it was authorized in last year's housing act, they took a fresh look at the program and their position and came to the conclusion that it deserved their support and they have given their support without reservation. It is a tribute to the stature of NAREB that they were willing to review a stand they had taken and openly reverse course when they reached the conclusion that it was in the best interest of our country to do so. I hope those Members of the House who have opposed rent supplements will undertake the same soul searching because I believe that if they do, they will arrive at the same result and now vote in support of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I plead with my colleagues to keep in mind a picture of the elderly family which hopes to live out its years in decent housing but cannot do so without the aid which the rent supplement program will provide. I want them to keep in mind the feeling of hopelessness and despair that darkens the life of the family in the rat-infested slum. I want them to keep in mind the fear and uncertainty that go with a family's displacement from its familiar neighborhood. If they will do this, I am sure that the rent supplement money will be approved by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York. I want to tell the gentleman I will be glad to yield to him, but he has never yielded to me.

Mr. YATES. Nor to anyone.

Mr. FINO. My time has always been very limited.

However, I wish to ask the gentleman one simple question: Are these funds coming from the Federal Government?

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman asked me, are these funds coming from the Federal Government. Now, this is a very good question. I say to the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle that these funds will start these programs, but those who live in these projects will pay their own way. This is private enterprise. It will be privately controlled. It will be privately owned. There will be no subsidy money, as the gentleman has advocated in the public housing projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, there was a time that conservatives in the Congress were willing, and in fact, they were eager, to listen to one of the great Republican leaders, the late Senator Taft. They listened to him because he had a good mind, and a good heart, too, this was especially true in the field of housing.

Mr. Chairman, may I recall the words of the late Senator Taft at this time? They are very appropriate.

There are many conservatives who think this program is a liberal program. I do not believe anyone would say that the late Senator Taft was a liberal. Yet this is what he said about the problem of subsidizing this sort of program when he spoke to the Senate in 1949. He said this:

> The general theory of subsidizing low-income groups is not a new theory in Anglo-Saxon political life or Anglo-Saxon economic life. The general theory that the Government has a duty to assist the lowest-income groups has been accepted in England for centuries; it is accepted today. It is accepted in every State of the Union, and it does not involve any departure in principle from that which we have pursued during the 150 years of the life of the Republic. We have tried different methods of accomplishing the result. We have had poorhouses. We have county homes in nearly every county of the United States to look after those who cannot take care of themselves. Every city in the country provides free hospitals and free medical care. Every city and every township recognizes the obligation to provide food-relief and to provide clothing relief for those who have no other means of obtaining the absolute necessities of life. I think all of us acknowledge the duty of the community to take care of those who are unable to take care of themselves. That duty has been taught by every community chest in the United States. The American people are a charitable and humane people, and they do not want to see hardship and poverty in the midst of plenty.

Be conservative if you want to be conservative. But be conservative with a heart as well as your head. Be conservative with a conscience. This bill should provide housing for those who cannot afford to pay for housing as well as for those who can afford to pay for housing. It will provide subsidies for those who want to build homes in the suburbs. It provides subsidies for those who want to live in the high rise apartments in the cities. The amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be our only opportunity to provide subsidies for those who want to get out of the slums and who want to live with hope and pride in a decent neighborhood. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I suppose I should properly identify myself as the author of the striking amendment in the full committee. And I suppose that thereby I place myself in the category earlier described by the gentleman who just preceded me as being a rather naive country boy participating in a plot against the city dwellers.

I must disabuse him by relating that I live in a city and I represent here a substantial portion of one of the largest cities in this country. So I speak not because of who I might be for or who I might be against in terms of where they live. I cannot accept all these emotional pleas that we have heard here today on behalf of the poor. Because this program from its birth until today has been a program which has in concept been not for the poor but for those in the middle income brackets. Many of the advantages that we have heard talked about under this program this afternoon are advantages that can be achieved only if this is, as it was conceived to be, a middle income housing program.

Just 2 months before this House first authorized this rent subsidy program, the man in charge of its administration, in some very picturesque language which the gentleman from New York quoted earlier, made it plain that in his point of view, this program could not succeed as a low-income program. Then, you recall in June of that year, this House inserted some limitations as to the income that people could have if they were to participate, consistent with the limitations of public housing eligibility. But by September the Administrator of the program had issued regulations that were inconsistent with the expressed will of the House of Representatives and in October the House of Representatives rose up in rightful pride and struck down the funds.

Then you will recall after a few weeks had passed, some new regulations were issued and the House of Representatives by a very close vote in March approved the original contract authorization.

Here we have a program that was conceived for one purpose and then compromised legislatively to an entirely different kind of program, but still administered by a man who has never lost sight of the fact that this can only work as a middle-income housing program.

I may be naive, as the gentleman from Illinois indicated earlier this afternoon, but I am not so naive as not to know this afternoon that the man who promulgated those inconsistent regulations in September can promulgate inconsistent regulations when another few weeks have gone by and all of us are home campaigning and forgetting what he is doing downtown.

I am not so naive as to believe that with that authority he will not exercise it consistent with his conception of this program.

As men and women who sit in this House with pride, we have an obligation as a matter of self-respect to repudiate the tactics which have been used in an attempt to get this appropriation through this body. We saw what happened; we read what happened; we shamed at what happened over in the other body and, as I said, I may be naive, but I do not ever want to become so sophisticated that I do not feel a blush of shame when a man will vote one way in a committee, reverse himself on the floor of the legislative body, and then boast about the amount of public funds that he took out of the public treasury in order to convince him that he should change that vote.

I do not ever want to become so sophisticated, and I hope that, with pride in this House, we will never condone that kind of conduct.

Aside, then, from the fact that we are dealing with a program now before us that is inconsistent with his conception, aside from the ethical cloud that hangs over us, I think we might refer to the comments of the gentleman from Connecticut here earlier today, who suggested that, yes, he had misgivings about the public housing program. He had his misgivings about this program. But he wanted to give this program an opportunity as an alternative to public housing, because it was based upon free enterprise.

I suggest that this program has already been given its chance. It was given its chance in the $12 million included in the supplemental bill in the conference report that was agreed to earlier today. I suggest that if this is to be an experimental alternative, there is not much that can be done with the $20 million involved in this particular bill as an experiment that cannot be done with the $12 million in the conference report agreed to by the House earlier today.

There are many reasons why this House should reject the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, including economic grounds, ethical grounds, and grounds of already having in existence an experimental program that we ought to judge before we rush into what is, in fact, a multi-billion-dollar program. On all of those grounds the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts should be voted down.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, in closing the debate against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts a few moments ago, gave a variety of reasons for opposing the amendment. One was what he called ethical grounds—this consisted of some vague reference to some press statement about something that allegedly happened in the other body.

It certainly should have no influence or impact upon those of us who must exercise our independent judgment in this coequal body of the Congress.

Second, he talked about some vague plot about extending this program to groups not now included.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable JOSEPH L. EVINS, signed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, dated May 7, 1966, in which he states categorically—

> In response to your inquiry, I appreciate the opportunity to set the record straight concerning the rent supplement program.
>
> Erroneous reports to the contrary, that program is designed and intended to assist only those in the low income group. To this end, income limits are established for each participating community. In no case will these income limits be above those for the federally aided low-rent public housing program in that community. In addition, the allowable asset limitation has been set below those applied in public housing.
>
> Thus your understanding is correct that the rent supplement program is designed to assist the poor in raising their standard of living to a level befiting human dignity.
>
> This program will not be expanded to embrace people in any other income bracket. Specifically, I have no intention of making any proposals to expand the rent supplement program to include any higher income group.
>
> I hope this will fully answer your inquiries and will set to rest any misunderstanding which may exist.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ROBERT C. WEAVER.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. BOGGS. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have before me Public Law 117, 89th Congress, which deals with this subject. This act contains two specific limitations, the reading of which makes it impossible for me to understand how it can be seriously argued that this program is for middle-income families.

The act contains two limitations:

First, the limitations prescribed in section 22 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 for occupancy in public housing dwellings.

Second, those eligible must fall in one of the following categories: replaced by governmental action, 62 years of age or older, physically handicapped, occupying sub-standard housing, or an occupant or former occupant of a dwelling which is situated in an area determined by the Small Business Administration to have been affected by a natural disaster.

This means that they must be poor, and in addition they must also fall within one of the other limiting categories.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the majority leader has quoted from the law, which is specific. The only way it can be changed is by this Congress, not by any directive or any regulations. As everybody knows, Congress must review this program, as every other program, every year.

There was also a third objection. It was referred to as the economy. There was some reference made to what this program may cost over a period of 20 years, I believe it was, or 40 years. The figure that was given was $20 billion, by the distinguished majority leader.

The gross national product of this country today is three-quarters of a trillion dollars. McGraw-Hill, a most conservative group, made a survey in depth a few months ago. They estimated our gross national product in 15 years will be a trillion and a half dollars. That is, $1.5 trillion. So, if $20 million is spent out of that sum of money in 40 years it represents an infinitesimal part of our economy.

This is indeed a program designed to help the poor. Let me give some figures that have just been compiled in my own city of New Orleans. The gentleman from New York talked about his city of New York. I will talk about New Orleans, a city in the South.

It is estimated today that one-fourth of the houses are unfit for use: 23,000 have no hot water; 18,000 have no toilets; 20,000 people are trying to get into public housing units.

The net effect is that there is a tremendous demand for the slum dwellings, and the poor are caught in every direction. They cannot get into the public housing, and they must pay exorbitant rates for slum dwellings, which are in tremendous demand.

This is the only hope for the poor people, that is, the program we have before us today. Call it an emotional appeal, if you will, but it is a fair and a sensible and a logical and a free-enterprise approach to a problem that desperately cries for solution throughout this Nation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been debated thoroughly time and time again. It has been passed upon by the legislative committee, and twice previously by the Appropriations Committee.

Our committee was impressed by the testimony that 100,000 units are needed in 50 States. We did not fund the entire amount, but only $20 million in contract authority, with only $2 million in payments.

This is a program which is needed.

Mr. Chairman, we hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BOLAND and Mr. JONAS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 164, noes 157.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: On page 38, beginning in line 19, strike out "$2,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000".

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot conceive why the committee, in view of the great need which we are going to have for additional homes by reason of the medicare legislation, would want to strike out this comparatively small item.

Mr. Chairman, I have received telegrams today from three major veterans' organizations urging the restoration of these cuts.

The first telegram is from Mr. Harold E. Stringer, director, National Legislative Commission of the American Legion, and reads as follows:

> WASHINGTON, D.C.,
> *May 9, 1966.*
>
> Hon. CHARLES S. JOELSON:
>
> In House Report No. 1477 accompanying H.R. 14921 (the 1967 independent offices appropriation bill) the Appropriations Committee recommended $2½ million for grants for construction of State nursing home facilities. This is a reduction of $1½ million below the amount requested by the administration. This reduction will jeopardize construction of facilities for furnishing nursing home care in Wisconsin, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. It will seriously hamper the construction program where planning has already

commenced in the States of California, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington.

The American Legion urges your support in restoring this budget item to $4 million, the amount requested by the administration, so that our disabled veterans may receive the care and treatment intended by the Congress under Public Law 88-450.

HAROLD E. STRINGER,
Director, National Legislative Commission, American Legion.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I have a telegram from the head of the VFW, Mr. Andy Borg, who states as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 9, 1966.

Hon. CHARLES S. JOELSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars deeply disturbed over cut in matching funds for nursing care facilities in State homes proposed in independent offices appropriation bill for your consideration and vote Tuesday, May 10. Requests on hand from six States: Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, are in excess of amount recommended in committee bill.

Nine other States: California, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington, are in the planning stage and have applications pending for State matching grants. If amount requested by VA not approved, it will seriously cripple nursing care program. It could well postpone indefinitely the plans of the nine States which are going forward to provide these vitally needed facilities for invalid veterans.

Understand that appropriate amendment will be offered to correct this situation and your support and vote to reject the $1½ million committee cut and approve the $4 million amount requested by the VA will be deeply appreciated by the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

ANDY BORG,
Commander in Chief, VFW.

Last, I have a telegram from the head of the Disabled American Veterans organization, Mr. Charles L. Hubert, in which he states:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 9, 1966.

Hon. CHARLES JOELSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

An amendment will be offered to the independent officers appropriations bill H.R. 14921 to restore the full $4 million requested by the Veterans' Administration for matching funds to aid States in construction of nursing homes. Formal applications for funds have been made by the States of Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, requiring the $4 million requested. Failure to grant this amount will result in at least 1 year's construction delay. Additionally, applications for funds made by California, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington would be delayed indefinitely. Disabled American veterans urge your support of the amendment to restore requested funds.

CHARLES L. HUBERT,
National Director of Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Chairman, this $4 million program is necessary if we are to assist States in construction, because the various States have already committed matching funds and if the Veterans' Administration is not prepared, through the lack of appropriations, to assist them within a short period of time, the State funds may be withdrawn for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, based upon a review of this matter, the respective States are now spending 58 cents for each dollar that the Federal Government puts up.

I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is very much in favor of this appropriation as is the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] who is one of the sponsors of this legislation which passed the House unanimously. I would urge you to put this money back. It is only $1,500,000 but it means a lot of nursing home care for a lot of aged veterans. We have had enough emotions here. I think that statement speaks for itself.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVERETT. Is it not true that the Federal Government gets more for the money by cooperating with these State homes than if the Federal Government had to care for them themselves?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes, it is a good bargain for the Government and it is giving good service to the veterans.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], which would increase by $1.5 million the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for construction and expansion of nursing home facilities.

This amendment is of importance to those who are planning expansion of the Soldiers' Home at Marshalltown, Iowa. The total cost of this project is estimated at $1,014,000, of which $426,000 would come from Veterans' Administration funds.

If the appropriation for VA nursing home facilities is not increased, the expansion plans at Marshalltown will be in jeopardy. In my view, an additional $1.5 million is needed, and I urge adoption of the amendment before the House.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. In August 1964, Public Law 88-450 was approved. This law authorized a comprehensive and much-needed program of nursing care for the Nation's aging veterans. One provision of this legislation offered an incentive for States to participate in the program by authorizing a 5-year matching fund program. Under this program, the Federal Government was authorized to pay up to 50 percent of the cost of building nursing care facilities for veterans in nursing homes operated by State governments. The legislation authorized $5 million during each of the 5 years.

No funds were appropriated during the 1965 fiscal year. During fiscal year 1966, the first year in which funds for this project were appropriated, the budget request was reduced to $2½ million. If the committee action on the appropriation bill currently before the House is permitted to stand, we will again be voting to reduce by half the annual amount authorized by Public Law 88-450. In short, this means that the funding of the original authorization will have been reduced by a total of $10 million to date. Stated in another manner, we will appropriate only one-third of the funds which were authorized less than 2 years ago for the construction of State veterans' nursing homes.

Six States are awaiting approval by the Veterans' Administration of nursing home construction projects totaling $9,604,000. The Veterans' Administration share of these projects would total $4,429,000. These States are Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin. If the action of the Appropriations Committee is permitted to stand and the Veterans' Administration is not prepared because of lack of funds to assist them within a relatively short period, then State funds appropriated for these projects may be withdrawn for other urgent purposes. An additional nine States have expressed an interest in participating in this program, but have not yet filed a formal application for Federal funds. These States are California, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington. Plans in these States will, of course, be postponed indefinitely if the action of the Appropriations Committee is permitted to stand.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will restore the appropriation to the $4 million requested by the Veterans' Administration. If we are to alleviate the critical shortage of nursing care beds for veterans and if we are to encourage State governments to assist in solving this problem, then it is essential that the gentleman's amendment prevail. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we appropriated $2,500,000 for nursing home care last year. We gave the Veterans' Administration $2,500,000 for nursing home care for next year—the same amount as last year.

VA officials testified before our committee that expenditures this year will be $500,000, and $2 million will be unexpended.

We asked Mr. Driver, the VA Administrator, "How much do you have in the way of concrete plans for nursing homes?" The answer was, "$2.3 million"—$2.3 million is what he said they needed and we gave him $2.5 million. So we gave him more than he asked for. We certainly want the program fully funded.

Gentlemen, this is all very amusing to me. The largest item in this bill is for the Veterans' Administration. We are providing $6 billion for veterans programs. Our committee thought that we had given them everything they wanted. Now, they find one item that we reduced $1.5 million where we need a microscope to find it. But if it is needed and essential we want them to have it. Mr. Chairman, we have given the VA practically all they wanted. We have provided for more than they said they had plans for in committing funds for the nursing home care program.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee—did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that you appropriated $250 million for nursing care?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We appropriated $2½ million for this purpose last year and we gave the VA $2½ million for 1967—the same amount. They have a carryover of $2 million in unexpended funds this year. According to the Administrator's own testimony, he wanted $2.3 million and we gave him $2.5 million. If the Administrator needs more money for this purpose, we will certainly try to provide him with what is needed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed—the gentleman, of course, realizes he is talking on my time and the gentleman can talk on his own time.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thought the gentleman asked for information.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I asked the gentleman if he said $250 million was appropriated, which I think the gentleman said that he had.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. If you do not give them every cent they want, they send telegrams to all the Members. I want to provide the necessary and essential funds for all our veterans programs, but I do not think this is needed at this time.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think the great majority of the Members of the House of Representatives will agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been moderate in our approach to the problems of the veterans. For many years we had a hospital program and we had a program to take care of men who were not ill.

In 1964 after hearings for months by a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] we passed a very moderate nursing care bill. In this program we provided that each year beginning in 1965 the administration would have $5 million each year for grants to States, providing that the Federal Government did not pay more than 50 percent.

This January the Director of the Budget and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs came to my office and talked about how desperately they were trying to take care of the Vietnam situation and were trying to cut the budget. They asked to take $1 million off this $5 million that we had authorized for nursing homes, which money goes to the 50 States. I told them I would not oppose a $1 million reduction. I was told that the Veterans' Administration would ask for $4 million from the Committee on Appropriations.

Now I am told by the Veterans' Administration that as a result of this cut of $1,500,000 they are committed to $2,500,000 in Augusta, Ga.; in Grand Island, Nebr.; Vineland, N.J.; Bennington, Vt.; and Keene, N.H.

I am told further that they are in the stage of completing agreements in Indianapolis, Ind.; Marshalltown, Iowa; Dodge City, Kans.; Menlo Park, N.J.; and in Massachusetts and Wisconsin.

This totals $4,429,000.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to be moderate in our approaches to veteran affairs. I hope that the amendment will be adopted, and the $1.5 million will be put back in the bill.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state that we are approaching a very serious crisis as far as nursing-home beds and hospital beds in the United States are concerned with the coming of medicare on July 1. There are many things in the budget upon which we could economize, but when we get into the field of nursing-home beds and hospital beds, I think on July 1 when we see what happens with the number of people who are going to require these beds because of the new medicare legislation—I did not happen to vote for that legislation, but it is passed and it is the law of the land at this time—we are going to have serious trouble with hospital beds and nursing-home beds starting on July 1. I supported the veterans nursing home legislation. Most of the money appropriated in this bill and by this amendment is to go to King Veterans Home in Waupaca, Wis.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is unbelievable to me that this House will vote to supplement rents for people who are well but they will not vote—and this is the best bargain that the Federal Government will ever get so far as nursing-home care is concerned—to help disabled veterans in a nursing home.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I wish to join with the gentleman in support of the amendment. The money in fact is badly needed by the Veterans' Administration, and I hope that this body in its wisdom will allow these additional funds.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I include at this point, analysis and justifications which will help to understand the problem:

JUSTIFICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NURSING CARE FACILITIES—STATE SOLDIERS' HOME

1. Under the provisions of title 38, U.S.C. 5031–5037, the following States have submitted or are planning to submit formal applications in the near future.

(a) Tentative approval has been given to the following States for construction grants:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Number of beds	Amount of VA participation	Total estimated cost
Georgia, Augusta	192	$918	$2,029
Nebraska, Grand Island	100	607	1,892
New Jersey, Vineland	100	523	1,492
Vermont, Bennington	22	99	203
Contingency, 10 percent		210	
Wisconsin, King	200	[1] 143	268
Total	614	2,500	5,884

[1] To be increased by $954,000 upon receipt of fiscal year 1967 appropriation.

(b) Preliminary drawing conferences have been held with the following States, and formal applications are under review for those marked with an asterisk.

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Number of beds [1]	Amount of VA participation	Total estimated cost
Indiana, Indianapolis	168	$357	$850
*Iowa, Marshalltown	120	426	1,014
*Kansas, Dodge City	80	336	800
*New Jersey, Menlo Park	100	588	1,400
Massachusetts, Holyoke	100	1,365	3,250
*Wisconsin, King	200	954	2,290
Contingency, 10 percent		403	
Total	768	4,429	9,604

[1] Based on 42 percent (estimated) participation.

2. The following nine States have expressed an interest in securing financial assistance:

California: 170 beds—$500,000 (remodel).

Illinois: One building under construction.

Michigan: 260 beds—State appropriated $500,000.

Minnesota: 100 beds. Total estimated cost, $1,200,000.

Montana: Designs are in preparation.

New Hampshire: 40-bed unit in 1967.

Pennsylvania: No firm determination but planning.

Rhode Island: 60-bed unit—$1 million.

Washington, Retail: 60-bed unit—$500,000 in planning stage.

3. The $4 million in VA congressional budget submission for fiscal year 1967 is necessary if we are to assist States in construction of nursing care facilities as provided in Public Law 88–450. Officials of States that have submitted applications in anticipation of this amount have influenced States legislatures to appropriate funds for such projects, and if VA is not prepared due to lack of congressional appropriation to assist them within a relatively short period, then State funds may be withdrawn for other urgent purposes.

4. Based on our review of the first five project applications, the State is spending 58 cents for each dollar of the total estimated project cost with VA support of 42 cents. (Public Law 88–450 provides not to exceed 50 percent matching basis by VA.)

5. Public Law 88–450 provides for nursing care in three types of facilities, i.e., VA, community and State homes. Since the implementation of these programs, over 1 million days of nursing care have been furnished to veterans. State home facilities have provided about 265,000 days, or 27 percent, representing a goodly portion of total load.

6. In addition, we know that some States have withheld conversion of existing domiciliary and hospital space to approved nursing care beds on which Federal aid payment is at the $3.50 per diem rate instead of $2.50 until after construction projects are approved by VA. Thus, State homes will furnish a larger share of the total load in the future.

7. Public Law 88–450, August 19, 1964, authorized $25 million for grants for the construction of State nursing homes, $5 million each year beginning in fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1969. Of this authorization $7.5 million will lapse through fiscal year 1966. The House committee action will mean that the funding of the original authorization will have been reduced by a total of $10 million. In addition, Public Law 89–311, October 31, 1965, raised the potential magnitude of the program by increasing the number of beds eligible for grant funds from ½ bed per thousand veterans to 1½ beds per thousand veterans. It also removed the 10 percent limitation available for any one State. The committee action reducing funds

is inconsistent with the recent action of Congress in raising the scope of this program.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the 5 minutes allotted, but I am concerned about the need in this country for beds in hospitals and nursing-home beds.

I believe that we are going to face a serious crisis, as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out, come July 1, when great numbers of older people come into the hospitals. The crisis will be serious then, but it will be more serious on January 1, 1967, when the nursing-home provisions of the medicare bill go into effect.

Some time ago I, myself, introduced a bill. I believe it is the only bill in this body which would increase the Hill-Burton funds for nursing-home construction. I am sure that some very serious embarrassments will arise starting on July 1 with the hospital care and starting January 1 with the domiciliary care when older people reach our institutions and find that they do not have the facilities. I believe that there will be some scandals and some outcries about it.

Furthermore, it may injure the chances of some of us in the coming elections.

So, ladies and gentlemen, Members of this body, I will support any measure that provides additional nursing-home beds within reason, irrespective of whether it is for veterans or others, and even though this particular provision provides this for veterans. In my opinion, it will back off into the other area.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we do not think this money will be needed, but if Members think that it will be needed, we will certainly accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] for his initiative in offering this amendment to provide $1½ million for nursing homes for this Nation's veterans. The amendment is sound, the amount involved certainly is modest enough, and the need for additional nursing homes is a very pressing one indeed. In my congressional district, which includes western Westchester County and Putnam County, N.Y., there is a real shortage of nursing homes and the medicare program will make this shortage even more acute. I am very pleased to support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I will not take the entire 5 minutes, but my concern here is with the indirect costs of research grants. This committee last yeear modified the general provisions of this bill to require that part of the cost of research grants be met by the sponsoring institutions.

I do know the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], has spent considerable time on this, as has the Chairman, of the HEW subcommittee [Mr. Fogarty]. I would like to get his position with respect to the Bureau of the Budget's interpretation on research grants and indirect costs.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, for many years we carried a 20-percent limitation on the indirect costs. We added a new section 203 last year in the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and also for independent offices and the Defense Department appropriation bills. It was intended at that time that not more than 5 percent of the cost would be borne by the sponsoring institutions, as far as these grants were concerned.

It has come to our attention—and we discussed this the other day on the HEW bill—that the Bureau of the Budget is not interpreting this provision on a uniform basis with all of the institutions in the United States. I think it was the intent of the Congress that all institutions—the small private colleges, the large universities—all would be treated in a similar manner under a Bureau of the Budget directive that was to be issued. But this has not been done.

It certainly was the intent that the institutions make a small contribution, that it be less than 5 percent, and that it would be applied uniformly throughout the United States.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I agree with him. As far as I am concerned, as a member of this committee, I would hope that the suggestions offered by the Bureau of the Budget would be considered, and that this would be applied to all institutions regardless of size and amounts.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in the past we have offered on this side of the aisle a motion to recommit, which provided for a 5-percent reduction in the expenditure estimate—as set forth in the budget document which was sent to the House by the U.S. President in January.

This motion would not apply to this bill in view of the fact that the reductions by the committee would be 5 percent, as far as the expenditure level is concerned. So a 5-percent reduction in the expenditure level as set forth in the budget document would be in fact an increase in the amount of money available for expenditure on the part of the administration as compared with the Appropriations Committee report. This is the first appropriation bill this year that meets this test.

I think that this should be pointed out, because the Appropriations Committee has made substantial reductions in this bill, and a motion to set a figure certain as far as expenditure levels is concerned is out of order. The only motion that is in order is a motion directed at the expenditure figure in the budget document itself. Such a motion would not be applicable in this case because of the reductions approved by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, according to the committee report, the subcommittee and the full committee have made a reduction of $305.8 million below the budget estimates for new obligation authority.

In addition, as shown on page 2 of the committee report, the committee has made reductions of $373 million below the current obligation authority for this fiscal year.

I also wish to commend the subcommittee and the full committee for the fact that in 63 instances for fiscal year 1967 the appropriation recommendations are below the budget estimates, and in 30 instances the committee has recommended obligation authority below the fiscal year 1966 estimates.

So on the basis of the subcommittee recommendation and the concurrence of the full committee it seems to me it would be inadvisable—and, furthermore, inappropriate—to offer an expenditure limitation which in effect might well increase rather than reduce expenditures.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, since we shall have an opportunity to vote on the rent subsidy amendment which was adopted in the Committee of the Whole House, that cannot be included in a motion to recommit. Everyone will have an opportunity to go on record on that particular amendment by a separate vote which I intend to request at the proper time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this year's Independent Offices appropriation bill is marked by a constructive congressional policy and support for civil defense. I call attention to the following language which appears on page 16 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the bill:

> The Nation continues to be concerned with civil defense. The funding for this program over the years has been substantial. In 1963 the appropriation was $128 million; in 1964, $111,569,000; in 1965, $105,200,000; and for 1966 it is $106,780,000. For 1967 the budget recommends $133,400,000. The committee has approved $101,100,000. This includes $66,100,000 for operation and maintenance and $35 million for research, shelter survey and marking.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In recent years the entire concept of civil defense has changed vastly. The program now seems to be on a sounder footing and the present Director is providing able leadership. Testimony before the committee developed that tangible results are being achieved with the marking of 143 million shelter spaces; 70,800 facilities stocked with supplies for 65 million people for 8 days; 56,800 radiological monitoring stations in

> serviceable operation with trained monitors; a warning system which goes to over 1,000 points throughout the Nation; 2,000 emergency operating centers; and an emergency broadcasting system composed of 2,000 stations across the country, of which 540 have emergency power. The Public Health Service maintains a $200 million stockpile of medical supplies distributed across the Nation, including 200-bed portable disaster hospitals at 2,500 locations. There are 4,000 communities in the 50 States which have organized civil defense programs that cover about 80 percent of our population. There are over 30 separate agencies of the Federal Government engaging in some form of civil defense or defense mobilization function. From this concise summary, it is apparent that the program has come a long way and the base exists on which to continue to build in the future. The amounts recommended for fiscal year 1967 strengthen and expand the Nation's civil defense capability by continuing the general level of funding of recent years.

This statement established a clearer purpose for the civil defense appropriations to be made by Congress than in any recent years. It points out clearly that the results which have been obtained by current programs are substantial in numbers and tangible, but that they are still only a base upon which to build. In order to make sense to a reasonable citizenry and to all our State and local governments, the program must develop a civil defense system that can accommodate all the population, with additional capacity to allow for people in transit. Civil defense shelter cannot be rationed or divided up at the last moment—there must be enough available protection for everyone. This program should be enlarged so as to provide a reasonable level of fallout protection for the entire population. The committee reporting this bill is accepting and emphasizing the fact that it can and will be extended to provide spaces for all the people. I believe this marks a point where the Congress can agree with the planners and developers of the system that the program is sound and constructive.

I have been greatly interested in civil defense for the past 10 years. We have held hearings in both the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. During the past decade we have come a long way. For a long time, we have been overawed by the complexity and numbers of problems raised by civil defense programs.

Great numbers of human beings have had to be considered and provided for. The fullest range of human needs, for space, air, food, sanitation, tools, and many other needs, have had to be considered. Extremely complex variables and interrelationships of damage to, or survival of, resources have been studied. High costs and necessary appropriations for, many kinds of civil defense programs, spread over many possible time periods, have been examined. No choices have been easy. Always, our judgment has been tempered by the knowledge that there was only so much we could do, that if nuclear weapons were used, there would be death and destruction on a vast scale no matter what we did. But we have always known that we could not postpone such preparations indefinitely, we could not choose to do nothing rather than to try to provide some protection for those who would survive and require it if all our efforts for peace should fail.

For years we had only backyard fallout shelters that no one had even counted, and a scattering of shelter space designated or built in a variety of ways. Now, there is in existence an identified fallout shelter system, and, as the committee notes, 70,800 facilities for 65 million people are stocked with food so that if those spaces had to be used, they could be used. This system should be pressed to completion in an orderly and businesslike way, to provide facilities for 200 million people.

This fallout shelter system will not save everyone in the event of an attack on this country; since the beginning of the nuclear age, that has not been possible. But, if enlarged and completed, it can give most of our population a chance to survive the fallout from nuclear weapons. In the past decade, but mainly since that anxious wait during the 1962 missile crisis, we have come to understand the true dimensions of civil defense needs. It has now come to be accepted that many of the risks we may face from war in the future will require civil defense as a component of our defense posture. If we are compelled to proceed to the step of anti-ballistic-missile defenses, civil defense shelter programs will become an even greater component of our defenses.

For these reasons, I am in agreement with and support the views of the Appropriations Committee with regard to civil defense, and I am pleased to see the program making substantial progress. I would personally hope that the final appropriations for civil defense for 1967 will include additional funds to provide for an experimental program to subsidize shelter design in new buildings to the limit of 1 percent of construction costs. However, at this time I want to compliment the committee and support the well-stated conclusions and recommendations in its report.

The Office of Civil Defense has every right to be proud of what it has achieved in spite of many difficulties and I applaud the wisdom of the committee in recognizing its accomplishments and the base that is now provided to limit damage resulting from a nuclear attack.

There exists a great misunderstanding of the cost of both the present civil defense program and that of a broader program which would provide shelter for every man, woman, and child in these United States. A great many ridiculous exaggerations have been circulated by those who are misinformed or misled.

The present civil defense program, initiated in 1962, will cost a total of $1.5 billion projected to 1971—spread over a period of 10 years. Seven hundred million dollars have been invested already, with excellent results to date. This program is expected to provide over 200 million shelter spaces and will save 30 million American lives in the event of heavy attack against cities as well as against military targets.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that not one of my colleagues would be adverse to spending $50 to save a life—nor, I am sure, will they object to an investment of $1.5 billion to save 30 million lives. The Secretary of Defense reported that an additional 20 million lives could be saved at the cost of an additional $1.9 billion.

General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently stated:

> I regard a full fallout shelter program as being coequal, if not preeminent, in relation to the whole damage-limiting program * * * all of our studies show that a fallout shelter program would be more effective in terms of lives saved than any other program we could buy.

The committee's action is encouraging to all of us who believe as General Wheeler does:

> That a fallout shelter program would be more effective in terms of lives saved than any other program we can buy.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Boland amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on the other amendment? If not, the question is on the other amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 46, after line 22, insert:
>
> "RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM
>
> "For rent supplement payments authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased by $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation

or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(e) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 188, answered "present" 4, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—192

Adams
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Boling
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Ford, William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan

Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.

O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—188

Abbitt
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore

Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock

Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain

Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha

Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Herlong
Hicks
Hosmer
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
McVicker
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff

Pool
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Greigg
Olson, Minn.
Rogers, Tex.
Smith, Iowa

NOT VOTING—48

Abernethy
Adair
Baring
Brademas
Burleson
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Chelf
Colmer
Diggs
Dowdy
Findley
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen

Grabowski
Griffin
Helstoski
Henderson
Hull
Hutchinson
Kelly
King, Utah
McCarthy
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Monagan
Morgan

Morse
Moss
Murray
Pickle
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Staggers
Sullivan
Toll
Tunney
Utt
Williams
Willis

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fraser for, with Mr. Olson of Minnesota against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Greigg against.

Mr. Brademas for, with Mr. Smith of Iowa against.

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. McCarthy against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Rosenthal for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Grabowski for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Helstoski for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr Monagan for, with Mr. Carter against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Findley against.

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Rumsfeld against.

Mr. Pickle for, with Mr. Utt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Willis.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. If she had been present she would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the bill we are considering today contains an appropriation to the General Services Administration of $14,259,000 for construction of a Federal office building at Fort Snelling, Minn.

There is no question as to the need for this building and no argument about its proper inclusion in the budget for fiscal 1967. Some 2,000 people will soon be working in the offices at Fort Snelling, just beyond the southern city limits of Minneapolis.

Tenatively, the GSA has plans for the following Federal agencies to be housed in the building: the regional office of the Veterans' Administration; the 14th Army Corps; the regional office of the Post Office Department; the Fish and Wildlife Service; the Air Force Contract Management offices; the Army Veterinary Food Inspection offices; the 113th Intelligence Group; the regional office of the Civil Service Commission; the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior; and GSA building operations.

The Fort Snelling State Park Association deserves special commendation at this point. In determining a suitable site for this building several obstacles were encountered. Finally, when a site was agreed upon we found that there were no Federal funds to acquire the land; in addition a State law prevented the State of Minnesota from giving it away. The Park Association, on its own initiative, raised $12,000 to buy the tract and donate it to the Federal Government. The alternate site will allow for further development of the Fort Snelling State Park on adjacent land, thus providing a magnificent setting for this new Federal office building.

While I cannot vote for this omnibus appropriation bill because of its inclusion of funds for the rent subsidy program and civil supersonic aircraft development, the Fort Snelling building construction project is justified and necessary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 297, nays 82, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—297

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—82

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bennett
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Chamberlain
Clancy
Cooley
Corbett
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Ichord
Jones, N.C.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Morton
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Poage
Pool
Quie
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Scott
Selden
Skubitz
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whitener
Whitten
Wilson, Bob

NOT VOTING—53

Abernethy
Adair
Baring
Betts
Brademas
Burleson
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Chelf
Colmer
Diggs
Dowdy
Erlenborn
Findley
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Grabowski
Griffin
Helstoski
Henderson
Hull
Hutchinson
Kelly
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
McCarthy
McCulloch
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Monagan
Morgan
Morse
Moss
Murray
Pickle
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Staggers
Sullivan
Toll
Tunney
Utt
Williams
Willis
Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. McCarthy against.
Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Williams against.
Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Abernethy against.
Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Henderson against.
Mr. Pickle for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Carter.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Casey with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Murray.

Mr McCLORY and Mr. COLLIER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

A BILL TO PROTECT FISHERIES

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to establish fishing zones and to extend U.S. jurisdiction to waters beyond the 3-mile territorial sea.

This bill would provide for a congressional declaration that the fishing zones of the United States will be extended to the edge of the Continental Shelf, or 12 miles, whichever extends further. In other words, to protect coastal fishing resources beyond the present 3-mile limit, the United States would exercise the same fishing rights in respect to fisheries, to the 200-meter depth contour as its seaward boundary, except that at no point shall such line be less than 9 nautical miles beyond the present 3-mile limit.

Mr. Speaker, under the International Convention on the Continental Shelf adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea at Geneva in 1958, a coastal state exercises sovereign rights to where the depth of the sea is 200 meters or deeper, where exploration of natural resources is possible. Such natural resources, under this Convention, are limited to minerals and other nonliving resources, together with living organisms that are in constant physical contact with the seabed, such as crabs and shellfish.

In other words, free-swimming fish are not included under the existing Convention.

My bill would provide for a zone somewhat along the lines of Canada's 12-mile fishing zone, except that under my bill the fishing zone would extend the outer boundary to include the Continental Shelf, which is generally defined as 200 meters in depth, or, in other words, 655 feet. As such, this bill would adequately provide protection on our west coast off Oregon and Washington from the present encroachment of the Soviet trawler fleet, where the Russians are fishing 25 or 30 miles off the coast, but where the Continental Shelf is only about 40 fathoms or 240 feet deep.

Incidentally, the Soviets are one of several nations favoring a 12-mile limit and it is of interest that Japanese trawlers operating in the Japan Sea about 18 miles off the coast of Siberia were ordered by a Soviet patrol vessel in March of 1966, to leave the area. Similar incidents have occurred there before.

In order to assure that my legislation would not conflict with the jurisdiction of any foreign country, such as Mexico, I have included a provision whereby the President could set a boundary in substitution if he determined that part of the fishing zone boundary should be changed.

The bill further authorizes the State Department, in consultation with the Department of the Interior, to consult with foreign nations to ascertain the extent, manner, and annual average catch of their fishing boats in any of the affected area.

Under my bill, rights to fish in the fishing zone would be allowed to any foreign nation whose fishermen had established historic fishing rights within such zones during the 10 calendar years preceding the enactment of this law.

The provisions of this measure would conform to a considerable degree to existing uniform practice under international convention as to fishing, but in no way would traditional laws or regulations covering navigation be changed.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has procrastinated too long. By prompt action we have much to gain.

"ISSUES AND ANSWERS"—VIETNAM

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish that every American had been watching ABC's "Issues and Answers" on Sunday, May 8. Secretary of State Dean Rusk did a masterful job in response to interrogation by news correspondents Bob Clark and John Scali.

For those of my colleagues who did not hear this outstanding radio-television program, I submit a transcript of last Sunday's broadcast:

ISSUES AND ANSWERS; SUNDAY, MAY 8, 1966; GUEST, THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, INTERVIEWED BY BOB CLARK, ABC NEWS CORRESPONDENT, AND JOHN SCALI, ABC STATE DEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENT

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Secretary, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

Secretary RUSK. Thank you very much, John, I am glad to be here.

Mr. SCALI. Premier Ky may have stirred up another political crisis in Saigon yesterday by saying that he expects to remain in power at least another year despite the plans for the free elections which are aimed at naming a civilian successor government.

Are you at all alarmed or disturbed by this reported stand?

Secretary RUSK. Well, in the first place, John, Prime Minister Ky didn't say according to the transcript of his press conference that I have in front of me, that he is going to stay in office another year. He did make reference to the elections for a national assembly to be conducted in 1967. He didn't say what time in 1967. I think what happened there was that—we had another instance that you and I are familiar with where reporters grabbed somebody on the fly and they pressed them with questions and kept boring in until they get something that they think makes news.

As I look at the transcript, Prime Minister Ky was very cautious and very moderate in his comments to a large number of questions.

For example, when he was asked whether some of the Buddhists were neutralists, he said this is not the right time to talk about the venerables.

Well, I have been given that kind of question many times myself. He was asked whether the labor unions were infiltrated by the Vietcong. He said there are many labor unions in South Vietnam and the majority of them are not Communists. Of course, there is some infiltration.

He was asked whether there would be further political difficulties between now and the elections. He said he didn't know. He was also asked about the so-called baby Turks, the young officers who might be creating some problems, and he called them micro-Turks and he said, of course, these men who are out on the frontlines fighting are distressed by some of the troubles that have occurred there and so when a soldier is upset and angry who knows what their reaction is going to be?

He was asked whether he felt an elected government would be more efficient than his government. He says, "As a man who promotes democracy and elections, of course, I say Yes." As to whether he would resign as soon as the constituent assembly will be elected, he said no, their mission is to draft a constitution.

So they kept boring in and he did say—they asked him if he was going to run for the constituency and he said "No, that is not my job. I am the Prime Minister. I shouldn't be a member of the constituent assembly."

Whether he would run for election to the national assembly next year, he said, "I don't know."

Well, that is what most American politicians say before they have announced whether they are a candidate or not.

When you look at the schedule, the time factors here, there is now in session in Saigon a committee of some 35 people who are drafting an election law under which there would be elections for a constituent assembly. Now, those elections, as Prime Minister Ky said yesterday or the day before, would occur about September 15. When those elections occur and a constituent assembly convenes, that assembly will draft a constitution.

Now, that constitution will determine the basis on which elections for a National Assembly in the government would be held.

Now, there is the drafting process and then there is a period which precedes an election of that sort. So I don't anticipate that Prime Minister Ky is going to try to stand in the way of the constitutional and the electoral process which he himself and his fellow generals initiated last January 15, well before the Honolulu Conference.

Mr. SCALI. You see then, Mr. Secretary, no sign that Premier Ky, by whatever he has said, has interposed any new roadblock which will delay the process of a return to civilian government?

Secretary RUSK. No, I don't see that because what they have agreed to is that there would be elections for a Constituent Assembly. That Constituent Assembly would draft a constitution.

Now, what happens with respect to the government and the elections following that will be determined in the course—by the South Vietnamese themselves in the course of further discussions to be held.

I think this is a case where a particular remark was interpreted for more than it meant.

For example, on that particular question I understand that the reporters pressed him on the point and asked him if it was his understanding that his government would stay in power for another year. Well, he didn't say another year, but he said, "Until the National Assembly in 1967." This was a prediction as to when that National Assembly would come into being. But, as you and I know, sometimes a man's answer is taken to incorporate a question and I think it would have been helpful had we had in front of us the full transcript of the press conference. It would have shown that this was not a major change in this situation.

Mr. CLARK. I would take it then that you don't see any cause for concern at all that delays of some sort could provoke more trouble from the Buddhists?

Secretary RUSK. I think there are differences of view in South Vietnam among the different groups as to how this process should proceed. Many of them feel that the present government should stay in office until it can transfer its power to a freely elected government under a new constitution.

Now, there are some elements, and I don't believe these are a majority, who feel that somehow the present government ought to leave for some other arrangement before that occurs. But these are things the South Vietnamese can work out among themselves and these are matters that are still to be discussed.

You see, one thing the people sometimes overlook is that the initiative for moving toward a constitution and toward elections came from Prime Minister Ky and the directorate of the generals in January of this year, not through any stimulations or pressure from the United States, but for reasons of their own.

Now, they repeated this in Honolulu and President Johnson joined in saying that we thought this was a good idea. But it was the generals who said, "Let's move to a constitutional system here." They did that in January.

Now, I think that—and as Prime Minister Ky said in his press conference yesterday, an elected government could be more efficient than the present government. So I think we ought not to get too excited about these things and let the South Vietnamese work them out.

Mr. CLARK. Do you see any merit in the proposal made by Senator RIBICOFF this week that the United Nations take over supervision of the election by sending observers to the scene?

Secretary RUSK. Well, there are several points about that. First, President Johnson has urged on every possible occasion that the United Nations take more and full responsibility in the Vietnam situation. We have done that in speeches to the Assembly; we have talked about it in the committees of the Assembly; we have taken the matter to the Security Council, but you saw Secretary General U Thant's comment on this particular proposal.

He said it was not realistic, or commonsense indicated it couldn't go forward.

What I think is the situation is that Hanoi and Peiping have bitterly rejected any intrusion of the United Nations into the Vietnam problem, and in the last discussions in the Security Council the Soviet Union strongly resisted any United Nations role in Vietnam on the grounds that the Geneva machinery was the appropriate machinery to use in this situation.

Well, Ambassador Goldberg immediately said, "Well, if that is true, let's use the Geneva machinery" but the Soviets were not prepared to go down that trail.

Now, many members of the United Nations feel—we may not agree with them, but nevertheless they feel—that because of the attitude of Hanoi and Peiping that the injection by the United Nations of itself into this situation would make the possibility of settlement more difficult.

Now, they feel that sincerely and genuinely.

As I say, we don't necessarily agree with it because it is their feeling.

There is another element here too that we have to take into account. There was a British suggestion in the last day or two that the International Control Commission somehow supervise these elections for the Constituent Assembly. This created a very sharp reaction among all elements in South Vietnam—on the grounds that the South Vietnamese know all about how to run an election. They are living in a goldfish bowl. There are 25 diplomatic missions there who can look at the elections. There are hundreds of foreign newsmen there, many of them skeptical, who are going to look at these elections.

The South Vietnamese have had considerable experience over time in elections. Historically the villages in South Vietnam have elected their own leaders and they in turn have elected their provincial leaders. This was true during the period of French colonialism.

Last May they had municipal and provincial elections. Seventy percent of the registered voters voted. About 65 percent of the eligible voters had been registered. These are figures that compare favorably with our own. So that the South Vietnamese, a proud, sensitive people, feel they need not be subjected to some sort of tutelage. The whole world can look to see whether these elections are free. So, given the reluctance of the United Nations on the one side to inject itself into South Vietnam, and the reluctance of Hanoi and Peiping to let anybody have free elections, and the reluctance of the South Vietnamese to be put in a position of tutelage, it doesn't appear that this particular suggestion can go forward. But I emphasize that as far as we are concerned, we would be delighted to see the United Nations take whatever role it can and is willing to take to bring the South Vietnamese problem to a peaceful settlement.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Secretary, Historian Arthur Schlesinger said today that President Johnson is too gullible in taking the State Department's advice on the Ky government. He says the State Department has been wrong in the past and the President shouldn't take this advice. What do you have to say about this?

Secretary RUSK. Very little. Mr. Schlesinger is not an expert on Asia. He took a very small role in Asian questions when he was in Government. I worked on Asia for 25 years and I don't think I am going to get into a discussion with Mr. Schlesinger on Asia.

Mr. SCALI. Well, what about the gullibility factor?

Secretary RUSK. No, the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense with the full backing of men who have spent their lives working on Asia, look at these matters with great depth, with great comprehension and try to make the best judgments that we can about the alternatives and what we ought to do in connection with particular situations.

Mr. SCALI. I don't wish to belabor this, Mr. Secretary, but Mr. Schlesinger also said that you personally have an erroneous interpretation of the Vietcong in that you seem to judge it as speaking for a coordinated Communist effort. Do you have such a misinterpretation?

Secretary RUSK. It is not a misinterpretation. We have facts. We know that the Vietcong is speaking for Hanoi. The National Liberation Front was organized by Hanoi to seize South Vietnam. We know that their instructions come daily from Hanoi to the south. I am not talking about misinterpretation, I am talking about facts.

Mr. CLARK. Another of the strong critics of our policies in Vietnam and in Asia, Senator FULBRIGHT, has taken another tack recently as you know. In a series of lectures he has claimed to see signs that the American Government is falling victim to an arrogance of power. Do you see any such signs?

Secretary RUSK. Well, I have read those lectures. Senator FULBRIGHT has not been quite specific in just what it is he charges us with in this regard. One always has to be careful about the abuse of power. Lord Acton once said that power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

But I think it is a matter of the greatest historical importance that the almost unbelievable power of the United States since 1945 has not corrupted the American people. That power has been used to support the simple and decent purposes of the American people in world affairs.

Now let's look at the record since 1945 onward. We demobilized almost totally after World War II, to a point where in 1946 we did not have a single division ready for combat or a single air group ready for combat. We tried to eliminate nuclear weapons from the arsenals of the world by giving them up for ourselves under the Baruch proposals. We reduced our defense budgets to something like $10 billion in 1947. We took the leadership in insisting upon a peaceful reconciliation with our enemies, Germany and Japan. We spent over a hundred billion dollars not only binding up the wounds of war, but trying to help other countries get on with their economic and social development. We put some $14 billion in food assistance to other countries.

When crises have come up, upon occasion we have to act with firmness, but we have also acted with great prudence. We flew an airlift into West Berlin to help those people survive while we explored the possibilities of peaceful settlement rather than engaging our troops in combat.

In Korea we took enormous casualties to try to defend the ability of the South Koreans to live at peace without unleasing the Pandora's box of nuclear war. When the Cuban missile crisis came up, President Kennedy took extraordinary effort, as John Scali knows, to leave the door open to a peaceful settlement of that great crisis. We waited 4 years, through increased infiltration from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, before we struck at North Vietnam.

Now there may have been mistakes along this period, but they are not mistakes of arrogance. The United States has committed itself to trying to build a decent world order. Why? Because the tens of millions of casualties in World War II and the prospect of hundreds of millions of casualties in world war III make it a compelling necessity that we organize a peace, that we not leave these things just to hopes for peace, or we not leave them to the ideas of the 1930's that if you are not too rude to the aggressor, maybe he will be satisfied and leave you alone.

We have got to organize a peace. That is what the United States has been all about in this postwar period. And we don't go around looking for business in these matters. There have been dozens and dozens of crises in which we have not taken part. We are not the gendarmes of the universe. But it has been necessary upon occasion for us to move to defend the possibility of an organized peace, particularly where we have specific commitments through alliances.

Now this is not arrogance. The attitude of the American people in this postwar period has not been one of arrogance despite the unbelievable character of the power which is available. But this power must not be used by ourselves, the Russians, or others, because the survival of the human race depends upon it.

These problems should be approached on one's knees. These problems make pygmies of us all and unless we approach them with humility we will never solve them.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Secretary, Senator FULBRIGHT in criticizing the administration's policy toward Vietnam said, among other things lately, that the influx of several hundred thousand American troops into Vietnam has turned South Vietnam into an American brothel. Do you know of any such problem?

Secretary RUSK. Well I don't want to engage here today with Senator FULBRIGHT in a personal discussion. We will have full opportunity tomorrow to take up any of these questions that he wishes to pursue. I must say I was disturbed by the characterization of a city of two and a half million people, a proud and sensitive people, as an American brothel. It just isn't true, as a matter of fact.

We all know that the world's oldest profession is present in every big city throughout the world and the world's oldest profession is supported by men and has been since the beginning of time, whether in uniform or in civilian clothes. But what also disturbs me is that this reflects unfairly and inaccurately upon what our men are doing out there. The overwhelming majority of our men are fighting, standing guard, patrolling, carrying rice to people who are hungry, running aid stations for those who are sick, teaching classes, building schools, and doing the things that are necessary to help the South Vietnamese people get on with the job.

Now the characterization of a city of two and a half million people as a brothel, and the implication that this is preoccupying the attention of our soldiers out there I think is not very helpful under present circumstances.

Mr. CLARK. Do you feel in making remarks like this that Senator FULBRIGHT is giving aid and comfort to the enemy?

Secretary RUSK. No, no. No, no; I would not say that at all.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, that was Barry Goldwater's phrase——

Secretary RUSK. No, no. Well, I don't want to inject myself—it would be presumptuous of me, perhaps even arrogant of me, to inject myself into the discourse between Senator FULBRIGHT and former Senator Goldwater but, no; I don't attribute that kind of motivation at all.

Mr. CLARK. You don't share at all the Goldwater sentiment that Senator FULBRIGHT should resign?

Secretary RUSK. No, I don't. This is beside the point as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Scali. Mr. Secretary, Senator Robert Kennedy contends that the policy of no sanctuary for Communist planes which might attack from bases in Red China, that this policy amounts to a very dangerous escalation that would cause real trouble.

Do you see grave risks in this policy?

Secretary Rusk. Well, any decisions on that subject would be, of course, made by the President in the light of all the circumstances at the time. I think that we would not be building a peace if we should somehow establish the principle in international law that nations can conduct military operations against their neighbors and be themselves safe under a sanctuary of some sort. This would greatly distort the possibilities of organizing a decent peace. But the source of a danger, if that issue should arise, would be from those who would inject themselves into a conflict which we are trying to settle.

Once again, and I have said this at least what, a hundred times, John? I would be in Geneva tomorrow afternoon if there was anybody there to talk with me about peace in southeast Asia. For 5 years we have gone to the ends of the earth to talk about peace in southeast Asia.

We went to the Laos Conference in Geneva. We accepted the Soviet nominee as the Prime Minister of Laos. We accepted the idea—produced by the Laotians themselves—that they should have a coalition government. We signed that agreement. So did Peiping and so did Hanoi. But from the very day of the signature, Hanoi refused to withdraw its troops from Laos, refused to cease sending its troops through Laos into South Vietnam.

Now, the question is, who is interested in peace, and who is insisting upon taking over somebody else by force?

Now, a lot of these things ought to be sorted out on the basis of those very simple things. It isn't necessary to confuse these with a great deal of speculation and all sorts of philosophy and all sorts of ambiguity and murkiness. At the heart of the matter is, how are we going to organize peace and who is prepared to join in doing that, and who is determined to gobble up their neighbors by force?

Mr. Scali. Do you see any sign that the North Vietnamese or perhaps the Chinese Communists have softened their stand against negotiations lately?

Secretary Rusk. I have seen nothing on that in recent months. So far as we can tell, their attitude remains what it was toward the end of the 37-day bombing pause, that the National Liberation Front must be accepted as the sole spokesman for the South Vietnamese, that we must accept Hanoi's four points and we must get our troops out of South Vietnam.

Mr. Clark. Mr. Secretary, two Democratic Senators, Senator Ted Kennedy and Senator McGovern, of South Dakota, this past week proposed that a panel of distinguished Americans be named to reappraise our whole China policy.

Does that idea appeal to you?

Secretary Rusk. Well, this is an intriguing idea, but we have in the executive branch, have had for a long time, more than a year, a very competent group that has been making an intensive study of these matters. They have been in touch with many experts outside; they have visited universities and they have searched the literature for possible new ideas.

As you know, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Zablocki subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee have made a study in considerable depth of these matters.

Now, actually the President and I have discussed it recent weeks the desirability of systematizing outside advice in the general areas of the world, based largely on the organization of our Geographic Bureau in the Department of State; Africa, Western Europe, Latin America, the Far East, that sort of thing.

So I think it is very likely that we shall do this somewhat more systematically than we have done before.

We have very distinguished consultants whom we call on all the time so I think there is no great issue on this matter.

Mr. Scali. Mr. Secretary, do you see any sign that, as Senator McGovern suggested, the United States stop campaigning at the United Nations against Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations?

Secretary Rusk. Well, when all that comes up to the heart of the matter on this question, what do you do about Formosa? In our bilateral relations with Peiping, they make it clear there is nothing to discuss unless we are prepared to surrender Formosa.

Now, the United Nations runs into the same thing. It will, the United Nations, reject or expel the Republic of China on Formosa. It has a population equal to more than half of the members of the U.N.; it was a charter member of the U.N. Peiping has made it very clear, not only that the Republic of China must be expelled, but that the U.N. must apologize and reorganize and do all sorts of other things.

Mr. Clark. Mr. Secretary, I am sorry to have to cut this off, but our time is up. Thank you for being our guest on "Issues and Answers."

Secretary Rusk. Thank you very much.

MEMBERS TO HEAR GALBRAITH

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Wednesday, May 11, at 3 p.m., will be held another in a series of meetings open to the Members of the House to discuss our foreign aid program. Four Republican and four Democratic members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have joined in sponsoring these meetings in the belief that the aid program is of interest to the entire House.

Tomorrow, the guest speaker will be John Kenneth Galbraith, noted Harvard economist and former U.S. Ambassador of India. The subject will be "Foreign Aid: Some Recent Lessons." It should prove to be an interesting and stimulating session.

The meeting will be held in the Speaker's dining room at 3 o'clock to enable us to be near the floor if a rollcall should occur. I hope that my colleagues here in the House will join us to hear our distinguished guest.

A FRESH LOOK AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, at a recent regional foreign policy conference at Atlanta, Ga., Mr. Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, delivered an address entitled, "A Fresh Look at the United Nations." The substance of Secretary Sisco's remarks is, I am certain, of great interest to all members concerned about the future of the United Nations and our role in that organization.

For this reason I wish to insert Mr. Sisco's address in the Congressional Record.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my commendation for the fine job which Secretary Sisco has been doing since he was appointed to his present office last year.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have had ample opportunity to meet with Mr. Sisco, to discuss his views, and to review the actions which he has initiated on behalf of more effective U.S. participation in the many international organizations to which we belong. I must say that in all of our contacts Mr. Sisco has been very frank and helpful to the subcommittee.

In addition, the review of the budgetary procedures of the various international organizations, undertaken within the Department of State under Mr. Sisco's supervision, can have serious and constructive implications for the future of our participation in their activities.

As I have already said, I believe that Secretary Sisco is doing an outstanding job for our Government and country, and I certainly wish him well in his endeavors.

Mr. Sisco's address follows:

A Fresh Look at the U.N.

(Address by the Honorable Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, before the Regional Foreign Policy Conference, Dinkler Plaza Hotel, Atlanta, Ga., Saturday, April 2, 1966)

It is a privilege to be here in Atlanta. The aim of these regional foreign policy conferences is an excellent one, embodying a basic democratic idea—a direct discussion of public policy between interested citizens and those charged with formulating it.

A generation or two ago most of the major problems of government could be understood by almost every citizen. Today, even many well-informed people do not feel fully competent to judge many public issues. Too many persons simply shy away from their consideration altogether. Let the expert, the man with specialized knowledge, decide them. Yet these decisions, the complex no less than the simple, determine the future of our Nation.

The need for an informed, educated citizenry is therefore greater than ever. And as the issues grow more intricate, our obligation to explain and discuss them becomes correspondingly more important.

The institution I want to talk with you about today—the United Nations—is as complex as any around—as complex, in fact, as the 117 widely varied nations comprising it.

We Americans are pragmatic in our approach to most institutions. We pride ourselves on our flexibility and lack of dogmatism. Yet for some reason our view of the United Nations has often been somewhat simplistic. We have tended to forget that the United Nations must inevitably reflect the great diversity of views, interests and goals of the members represented in the world body. We sometimes forget when we do not always get our way that the United States is not the only country developing the scenario in world affairs today. We have at times asked too much of the U.N., and on other occasions have expected too little.

Polls show that the American people strongly support the U.N.: 80 percent believe the U.N. important and want the U.S. Government to use it more. Of course, the U.N. is an important instrument of foreign policy, one way among others for advancing our causes and for cooperating with other countries in the myriad tasks of political conciliation, social progress, economic development, and technical cooperation.

But we must avoid extravagant expectations about the U.N. Those who start out by seeing the U.N. as a panacea for all our ills often end in disillusionment. And they sometimes go to the opposite extreme of pessimism—regarding the U.N. merely as a decorative feature on the international landscape. For example, a distinguished correspondent, concerned over some irresponsible actions by some members of the General Assembly, recently advised his readers that "the only way to preserve the organization so that in some distant future it may play the role for which it was created is to spare it as much as possible." A few weeks later, another distinguished correspondent for a great U.S. newspaper entitled an article, "The U.N. Tries Hard, But."

Now, I have been engaged in wrestling with the sometimes exhilarating and sometimes frustrating problems that have faced us in the U.N. for the past 15 years. I try not to overexaggerate but—to quote a friend of mine—I try not to underexaggerate either. I believe the beginning of wisdom lies in being neither a pessimist nor an optimist—but in being a possibilist. I am a possibilist.

In fact, I would venture to say that all practitioners of foreign policy must be possibilists—for politics—whether in our own legislature or in an international forum—is the art of the possible.

How does a possibilist approach foreign policy problems, and more specifically how does he operate in the U.N.?

First, he keeps in mind the real options that are open to him. He is problem-oriented and does not grasp for utopian solutions.

In the words of Winston Churchill: "Do not let spacious plans for a new world divert your energies from saving what is left of the old."

He knows, in the words of President Franklin Roosevelt, that the structure of world peace "cannot be a peace of large nations or of small nations, [but] * * * a peace which rests on the cooperative efforts of the whole world."

He knows he must deal with factional disputes in Cyprus and disorder in the Congo and the effect of the price of cocoa on Ghana's future—not about some amorphous scheme for world order.

He knows that when weighing the question of Red China's admission to the U.N. or recognition that not only is our view relevant but also the adversaries' continued insistence that the Republic of China be eliminated or cast aside.

He is concerned with how to recruit observers for Kashmir, as well as how to achieve a more fundamental and lasting political solution.

Second, he adapts to changing circumstances. One of the cliches about practitioners of foreign policy is that we are unaware that the world is changing. We are either asleep like Rip Van Winkle or are romantically playing the old familiar tunes from our boyhood. I assure you that if you sat at my desk in Washington for 1 day you would soon be disabused of this cliche. In dealing with U.N. affairs we are constantly aware that we cannot escape the dramatic changes of the 20 years since the charter was signed, and especially the changes in the composition and pressures in the U.N. during the decade of the sixties. It is a commonplace that change is taking place at a revolutionary and ever-accelerating pace. The tough assignment is to know how to design and adapt machinery to provide for peaceful change while preserving the underlying values—justice, economic and social advancement, human rights—for which the U.N. was created and to which our foreign policy is devoted.

Third, a possibilist does not start out with extravagant expectations. He is not disillusioned when he encounters setbacks. He seeks limited goals. He is patient. He keeps probing for possibilities. The history of our efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem illustrates this dramatically.

The task of the United Nations has been encumbered almost from the start by great-power conflicts. Its efforts to promote social progress have been hampered by discord and strife. It has been called upon to keep peace where there has been no peace in the hearts of men. It has been buffeted by the winds of racism and nationalism as the peoples of colonial lands have moved to rule themselves in freedom and to assert their right to speak, and vote, as equals in the forum of the nations.

But through it all the U.N. has survived and continues to serve the cause of peace. That the United Nations has come this far is a tribute to the vision of those who drew the founding plans, a testimonial to the resiliency and relevance of the charter itself. The measure of the importance which President Johnson attaches to the U.N. is demonstrated by the fact that for the first time in our history, a Supreme Court Justice was asked to leave the Bench to lead us in the U.N. forum. Justice Arthur Goldberg has done this brilliantly.

CHANGE IN THE U.N. ITSELF

One question being asked is where is the U.N. going? This issue concerns us not only because of the present financial and constitutional difficulties the U.N. faces. In deeper perspective, we are grappling with the question of how to make sure that the U.N. structure keeps up with the times. For in the words of Lord Halifax at the concluding session of the San Francisco conference: "We cannot claim that our work is perfect or that we have created an unbreakable guarantee of peace. For ours is no enchanted palace to 'spring into sight at once' by magic touch or hidden power. But we have, I am convinced, forged an instrument by which, if men are serious in wanting peace and are ready to make sacrifices for it, they may find means to win it."

Changes in the world are inevitably reflected in changes in the U.N. To be sure, the U.N. must be representative of the new membership, as it tried to do by enlarging the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

The U.N. is based on the one-nation, one-vote principle. Of the present 117 members, nearly half did not exist as independent states when the U.N. was formed. Of the 67 new members to enter the organization since 1945, 34 are African states, most small and with limited resources. A significant shift in relative voting strength to small members has occurred in most important U.N. organs.

If the U.N. is to be vital and viable, it must reflect not only the "sovereign equality" of states but the realities of power and responsibility as they exist in the real world today. For if it does not do so, the U.N. will speak but no one will listen, and its findings will lose their value.

The 20th General Assembly witnessed several examples of excesses by the majority, in some cases overriding the charter provision for a two-thirds vote on an important question on issues affecting peace and security. As Ambassador Goldberg stated at the close of the 20th Assembly: Where action is taken by the assembly in derogation of the charter requirement for a two-thirds vote on important questions "that action is a complete nullity. It is null and void." The discrepancies between voting power and real power will not be solved by formal abandonment of the one-nation, one-vote system. The charter on this subject is unlikely to be changed, and an agreement on a formula for weighting votes is unlikely. Rather, informal influence, mutual adjustment procedures, composition of subgroups, and the weight of political and financial contributions should help redress the balance. Above all, patience and understanding will be required, particularly by the advanced countries with greater experience in international affairs. It is our hope that all members will see that in the long run orderly procedures will serve their interests and help move all of us toward a more stable world order in which the rule of law prevails.

A HARD LOOK AT U.N. PROGRAMS AND BUDGETS

We have also been taking a hard look at programs and budgets throughout the entire U.N. system. We supported the establishment of a General Assembly Committee to review budgetary problems in the U.N. system. The United States has been the main supporter of these programs in the past, and we can expect to do our full share in the future. We have supported U.N. programs because they help the developing countries to help themselves, because they sometimes avoid some of the political difficulties which are involved in bilateral aid, they help share the burden, and they provide a worldwide pool of technical help which is not available to any single country. But our support cannot and must not be taken for granted.

We realize the needs are great, and the developing countries understandably want to better their lot today—not in the distant future.

But we are convinced that more of the needs can be met by assuring that the U.N. and its family of agencies are operating at maximum efficiency, that sound and systematic budgetary procedures are followed, that program priorities are clearly established, marginal and duplicative activities eliminated, that undue increases in staff are avoided, and that reasonable and not excessive budget target levels are established.

We are working hard to this end. As President Johnson stated in a memorandum of March 15 to the Secretary of State directing him to undertake certain measures to improve our participation in international organizations: "No nation has been a greater supporter of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international organizations than the United States. * * * The United States shall continue to meet its fair share of the financial requirements of these organizations. If we are to be a constructive influence in helping to strengthen the international agencies so that they can meet essential new needs, we must apply to them the same rigorous standards of program performance and budget review that we do to our own Federal programs." Ambassador Goldberg and I have just returned from Geneva where we met with the other major contributors to the U.N. in an effort to give reality to this directive.

PEACEKEEPING

We consider U.N. peacekeeping an important security option in U.S. foreign policy. The U.N. has undertaken some dozen peacekeeping operations—all of which have served the national interests of the United States and the cause of peace. We would like to see the U.N. capacity to keep the peace strengthened. A U.N. committee of 33 is examining various facets of this problem—including whether new arrangements are needed regarding authorization of peacekeeping and their management, and how these should be financed in the most equitable and reliable manner.

However, as long as there are fundamental differences between the U.S.S.R. and the United States about the role of the U.N. in the peacekeeping field, it will be difficult to make real progress toward a more reliable system of financing or authorizing future peacekeeping operations.

The Soviets still want to subject all future peacekeeping operations to their total veto. We favor the Security Council playing the primary role provided in the charter. But subjecting peacekeeping operations entirely to the Soviet veto is a prescription for future total paralysis.

For our part, we will support desirable future peacekeeping operations. We recognize that where a major power has fundamental objections, those who favor a particular peacekeeping operation may have to carry a heavier financial burden. We recognize that the unwillingness of the General Assembly to apply the loss of vote sanction against those who refused to pay their peacekeeping assessments has weakened the principle of collective financing. But we will continue our efforts to preserve this concept wherever possible. We favor the broadest possible sharing of the burden by those who support U.N. peacekeeping.

A system based essentially on a voluntary means of financing is not as reliable as we would like. But this need not be fatal if the preponderant majority of like-minded states who support a peacekeeping operation band together and make reasonable contributions.

This ad hoc improvised system is working today. Blue-bereted U.N. soldiers or observers are helping to keep the peace in Cyprus, in Kashmir, in the Middle East—and you and I as a result—can sleep more restfully tonight. This is the U.N. at its best.

Let me close with this thought.

The key to successful U.S. policy in the U.N. arena, as in other arenas of our foreign policy, lies in joining with other nations in common institutions. We are coming to see that the capacity to act through the U.N. and to fulfill the purposes of the charter means building the joint executive machinery for that end.

Yet in the last analysis, Macaulay was right: "It is the spirit we are of, not the machinery we employ, which binds us to others."

It is the spirit and vision of the charter to which we must be dedicated if we are to carry out what President Johnson called the "assignment of the century"—the pursuit of peace.

A great American poet said that America is promises. We are dedicated in our domestic society to narrowing the gap between promise and performance in American life. This is now equally true for the societies beyond our shores. The Charter of the U.N. is promises, too. It is the promise of collective measures for peace; it is the promise of constant search for friendly relations among nations based on respect for equal rights and self-determination; it is the promise of international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, and cultural character; and it is the promise of encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

It is no longer our national community alone, but a whole generation of mankind for whom these promises must be kept.

They must be kept if we are to preserve this planet—this fragile spaceship we share—from the ever-brooding threat of annihilation.

They must be kept if our kind of world, the world of free choice, of diversity, and of the truths in the Declaration of Independence are to have a chance to prosper.

Let us stretch the possibilities in the charter. The U.N. can achieve the vision in the charter, but only with our help. The U.N. needs American commitment and participation and leadership if it is to fulfill the great promises of the charter.

FIRE SAFETY AT SEA—THE STRONG U.S. POSITION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the more we seek for means of assuring maximum safety of lives at sea, the more I become convinced that the necessary means can only be reached through mutual agreements on high fire safety standards by all of the maritime nations.

The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am Chairman, has been studying the practices and procedures of the U.S. Coast Guard in the examination of foreign-flag passenger vessels. While it is too early for me to voice any recommendations which result from that study, it is clear that passenger ships which sail under foreign flags are not subject to the rigid safety standards which apply to U.S. ships.

The crux of greater safety lies in raising international standards through international agreements; all other means that are available short of entirely stopping the international carriage of passengers, are peripheral. I have so advised Admiral Roland, who is Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard and chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Maritime Safety Committee of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, which is presently meeting in London on matters of ship safety.

The imposition of the higher standards which the United States is seeking at the Conference would be to the lasting advantage, not only of the United States, but to each and every nation that is involved. To do less would be shortsighted and a refusal to learn from the lessons of the recent horrible disasters at sea. Any lesser stopgaps would present continuing dangers to passengers at sea.

The position of the United States at the Maritime Safety Committee Conference is to seek changes in the 1960 Safety of Life at Sea Convention, looking toward the general adoption of U.S. standards. I have urged Admiral Roland to the fullest exertion of his knowledge and skill in seeking to bring about such general improved safety standards.

That the United States views the need for such improved standards as of the highest urgency and importance is indicated by the fact that it has taken what the London Times describes as the "unusual" step of sending U.S. Ambassador Averell Harriman to the Conference to urge the American position.

The U.S. position is not being received with open arms by all nations. It was only a little over 3 years ago that 125 lives were lost on the SS *Lakonia* which sailed from England; nevertheless, Great Britain has voiced strong opposition to the U.S. position, on the ground that the record of passenger ships over the years and around the world has been one of extraordinary safety; and that, as stated in a London Times editorial on May 5, 1966, there is no such thing as an incombustible ship any more than there is an unsinkable ship; and Britain's well-run ships, well-trained crews, sprinklers, automatic alarms, and the growing use of fire-resistant materials provide adequate safety measures.

At the same time the editorial inveighs against the use in other people's trade of old ships, possibly inadequately supervised by the countries whose flag they fly. The editorial suggests that unless international experts can find a means for relieving that situation the countries which provide the passengers on those ships "will have every reason to legislate against them, however unfortunate a precedent that would create."

Because these views are expressed by a nation of ancient maritime heritage, whose thoughts will be well received by others, I submit the article and the editorial, to which I have referred, for the RECORD. The article, taken from the London Times of May 4, 1966, reads as follows:

UNITED STATES WANTS STRICTER FIRE RULES AT SEA—STRONG BRITISH OPPOSITION TO PROPOSALS

American pressure for major changes in the fire prevention rules for passenger liners was firmly resisted by Britain at the opening session of a conference of the Maritime Safety Committee of the Intergovernmental Consultative Committee in London yesterday.

The United States, shaken by recent fires on two cruise liners, the *Yarmouth Castle* and *Viking Princess,* with American passengers on board, had taken the unusual step of sending Mr. Averell Harriman, U.S. Ambassador at large, to the conference to emphasize America's "serious concern and the requirement for adequate action."

America is pressing for compulsory adoption on all new passenger ships of its own system of fire prevention, which depends on the use of incombustible materials. In the case of existing ships, the United States wants to see compulsory compliance with one of the three present fire prevention methods, including the alarm and water sprinkler system generally in use on British ships.

International conventions specify only that ships built before these systems became mandatory in 1952 should be brought up to standard "as far as practicable and possible." It is for the government whose flag the ship flies to decide.

Mr. Harriman said that while the United States did not want unilateral action, "my statement would not be complete if I did not tell you that there is strong sentiment in the United States, and legislation has been proposed to the U.S. Congress, to control the safety standards of cruise vessels unilaterally under our laws. Congress feels, and rightly so, a responsibility for the safety of our citizens embarking on ships at our ports."

The disasters of the *Lakonia, Yarmouth Castle,* and *Viking Princess* make clear that something must be done, Mr. Harriman declared. Major and serious action was called for. "We have proposed certain amendments to the convention. We enter this meeting with open minds as to the technical details, but not as to our objectives. There have always been risks in sailing the seas, and there always will be some risk, but we cannot accept complacently the risks we do not have to accept, nor can we fail to act to meet those risks we can see or avoid or minimize.

INITIATIVE WELCOMED

"I am here to emphasize to you the serious political aspects of the problem, and to appeal through you to your governments and to those governmental agencies responsible for the political decisions involved in our taking adequate action."

The British delegation, in its opening statement, said Britain fully shared the serious concern of the United States for the safety of passenger ships and welcomed the American initiative for a Maritime Safety Committee investigation. The rules of the 1960 Convention ought to be reviewed.

But the British Government was not convinced that the specific measures proposed by the United States would make the best contribution to the protection of passenger ships against fire. They were not convinced that method 1 of the 1960 Convention (the American system) should become mandatory on all new ships, and also found it difficult to accept in their present form the American proposals for improving existing ships.

The editorial from the London Times of May 5, 1966, reads as follows:

IN PERIL ON THE SEA

Americans have rightly been aroused by two recent fires in cruise ships operating out of U.S. ports: the *Yarmouth Castle* last November with the loss of 90 lives; and the *Viking Princess* in April, fortunately with no direct casualties. In Britain where the loss of 125 lives on the Greek-owned *Lakonia* in the Atlantic three Christmases ago is still tragically fresh in memory, there will be a special sympathy and a shared determination with the United States to stop a recurrence.

The matter has to be kept in perspective. There is a peculiar horror about disasters at sea which, on the rare occasions when they do happen, tend to obscure the quite extraordinary record of safety held by passenger liners, year in and year out, across the face of the globe. The loss of passengers' lives by fire on British lines, by far the world's biggest carriers, are so rare that it is not easy to discover when one last occurred, if an exception is made of the pilgrim carrier *Dara*, blown up, it is thought, by a fanatic in the Persian Gulf 5 years ago. In most ships the precision with which boat drill is carried out is reassuring. The crews have an air of competence.

This being so, there must be reservations toward American pressure at this week's conference in London of the Maritime Safety Committee for radical changes in ship safety rules tending toward the general adoption of the American incombustible ship system. There is, of course, no such thing as an incombustible ship, any more than an unsinkable ship. The record suggests that Britain is sufficiently on the right lines not to be pushed off them in a panic: well-run ships, well-trained crews, sprinklers, automatic alarms, and the growing use of fire-resisting materials.

There is, however, a particular misgiving, and Britain should raise it at this conference: the use in other people's trades of old ships possibly inadequately supervised by the country whose flag they fly. Unless these international experts can find a formula to allay fears on this score, the countries which provide the passengers on those ships will have every reason to legislate against them, however unfortunate a precedent that would create.

THE DETERIORATION OF CASTRO

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of the danger of the spread of Castroism to other countries in Latin America. Obviously, this is and remains a threat. On the other hand, it was encouraging to hear the Honorable Lincoln Gordon, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs tell the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 5, that in the hemisphere "the Communists show little, if any, gain from their efforts. Public and official awareness of the danger has increased as Communist designs become more evident."

An article in the Miami Herald, dated April 15, 1966, by Don Bohning, describes the Communists' lack of influence in Mexico's State of Yucatan, a peninsula on Communist Cuba's doorstep:

MERIDA, MEXICO—Castro-communism gets a cool reception here in Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula, at Cuba's western doorstep.

"Castro is recognized for the farce that he is with his total dependence upon Moscow," says one knowledgeable resident. "There is little sympathy for him in the Yucatan."

A handful of homegrown Communists, some with Cuban training and working in collaboration with the Cuban consul here, do what they can to proselytize among students and campesinos and stir up anti-U.S. sentiment.

The most fertile field is the campesino, a man long neglected. Even here, while some Communist influence is noted, no serious inroads appear to have been made.

There has been little apparent Communist success with the 4,000 to 5,000 university students of the Yucatan.

A so-called Cuban cultural center, the Jose Marti Institute, devotes much of its attention to the students.

At one time it offered English classes among its activities. They have since been dropped and now the institute is devoted exclusively to recreational and propaganda type functions.

Czech and Russian produced propaganda films on Cuba are frequently shown, chess and oratory contests scheduled and festivals arranged in observance of such occasions as Marti's birthday.

A well-financed operation, the center attempts to recruit promising students for trips to Cuba. A limited few respond.

An indication, perhaps of the Yucatecan apathy toward communism came during a recent visit to Merida by Victor Lombardo Toledano, Mexico's aging top Communist.

A student group sponsored a Saturday night appearance at the university theater, in the heart of the city.

It attracted less than 200 people, about half students and the remainder either party members or curious residents. The response to Lombardo before and during his appearance was correct but obviously cool.

Hernan Morales, Yucatan's federal delegate to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, is generally considered the most prominent of the area's leftists.

He is friendly with the Cuban consul. Morales frequently makes speeches, anti-United States in tone, on matters that have no bearing on the Yucatan area, such as the salinity problem of the Colorado River, of the Chamizal territory, at the Mexican-Texas border.

Morales at one time was director of state public education. He was removed as the result of an anti-Communist student strike. He is bitterly opposed by Yucatan State Gov. Luis Torres.

There is no regular printed Communist mouthpiece in the Yucatan—daily, weekly, or monthly.

On the contrary, Yucatan's newspapers are stanchly anti-Communist.

One, the respected and independent Diario de Yucatan, refused to accept an advertisement from the Cuban consul announcing an oratorical contest at the Cuban cultural center.

He was told the paper would do business with him when the Cuban Government returned confiscated newspapers in Cuba to their rightful owners.

Diario de Yucatan also has editorially opposed Mexico's continued diplomatic relations with Cuba and supported U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic.

The 70-year-old paper undoubtedly has done much to shape current attitudes of the Yucatecans.

There is little anti-U.S. sentiment evident in the Yucatan. What there is shows signs of decline.

Several years ago, the U.S. consulate here was regularly painted with anti-U.S. slogans. None have appeared in the last 2 to 3 years.

And a recent leftist sponsored "Solidarity Week With Vietnam" demonstration opposing U.S. policies there, attracted less than 50 participants.

Coupled with the apparent apathy toward Castro and communism in the Yucatan, Cuba treads carefully in Mexico.

The Cubans are anxious to avoid any problems with Mexico, the only Latin American country still maintaining diplomatic relations with them.

Mr. Speaker, the debilitation of Castro's Communist government is well documented. We must continue to hasten the day when the last Communist in Cuba has been thrown out of power and when Cuba can once more live in peace and freedom, with all the rest of her neighbors in the Organization of American States.

THE 89TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF MODERN RUMANIA

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 89th anniversary of the independence of modern Rumania. Rumania was an independent country for 70 years until, in 1947, its legitimate monarch, King Michael, was forced from the throne by the illicit Communist takeover.

Rumanians in the free world who observe their enslaved nation's national holiday each year with great devotion are also diligently working in cooperation with representatives of other captive nations toward their common goal of restoring freedom to their native lands. It is a tragedy that the Rumanian people who suffer under Communist tyranny are prevented from celebrating their holiday, but their Soviet-imposed government seeks to obliterate all such traditional observances of Rumania's great past.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to observe the increased interest throughout the United States in the cause of the captive peoples of communism and the fact that their legitimate aspirations for independence for their homelands constitutes a major weakness in the Soviet imperialist empire. Self-determination of peoples is a cornerstone of our foreign policy which must be maintained until all the nations enslaved by Communist tyranny achieve their independence.

The illegitimate Rumanian government flaunts the will of the Rumanian people and is not a freely elected administration. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must do more than merely commemorate this and other national holidays of the captive nations. We must take positive action. One practical step we can take is to increase the hours of Rumanian language productiveness on the facilities of the Voice of America so that the people of Rumania might have more exposure to the truth.

We should also recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the Communist government of Rumania is receiving unusual attention from our misguided State Department these days. The self-defeating policy of accommodating the dictatorships of Eastern Europe will not bring freedom to the people of Rumania, but will, unfortunately, help the Communists keep them in bondage.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEROIC STRUGGLE OF THE SERBIAN MILITARY FORCES OF GEN. DRAZA MIHAILOVICH

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the 25th anniversary of the commencement of the heroic struggle of the Serbian military forces of Gen. Draza Mihailovich, who was the first guerrilla leader in Europe, which was then under Nazi conquest. General Mihailovich has been called the Robin Hood of Serbia and the Balkan Eagle and was wartime leader and supreme commander of the Yugoslav Army during World War II.

General Mihailovich was, indeed, a heroic martyr, for after having made a significant contribution to the delayed German military operations and the final victory of American forces in World War II, he was tragically abandoned by the Western democracies.

It certainly is a tragedy that the free world and particularly the United States has not learned a lesson from the case of General Mihailovich, who was our stanchest ally during the war period. If anyone should doubt the historic role of General Mihailovich, let him ponder the statement of Adolf Hitler:

> Having in view the danger contained in Mihailovich's movement, I have already, in anticipation of all eventualities, issued orders for the destruction of all his supporters on the territory occupied by my troops. The liquidation of Mihailovich's movement at the present time will no longer be an easy matter because of the forces he has at his disposal (Feb. 16, 1943).

However, General Mihailovich's movement was not destroyed by Hitler or by Mussolini, who also gave such orders. He continued to fight the Nazis without aid from the Western powers. Winston Churchill said:

> We were not able to send any aid or supplies except for a few droppings from airplanes.

The general and his forces kept up their fight and aided our military plans against the Nazi occupiers. Many hundreds of American airmen were saved by General Mihailovich when their planes were brought down by German artillery. Disregarding the losses of his forces and German retaliation against the civilian population, General Mihailovich and his forces made it possible for these airmen to return safely to our country.

The Western World should certainly be ashamed of its silence when the Communists of Yugoslavia persecuted, tried, sentenced, and murdered General Mihailovich for the crime of being a devoted friend of the West and an enemy of the Communists. The last head of our liaison mission in the general's headquarters, Col. Robert H. McDowell, said during testimony on the matter that:

> The real crime of which General Mihailovich is accused is that, in the minds of 80 percent of the Yugoslav population, he became and remains the symbol of the simple, sturdy Yugoslav peasant resistance to tyranny, foreign and domestic.

General Mihailovich, however, by remaining alive, would have made it impossible for a Communist government to survive. His inspiration to the people would have driven Tito and his Communist supporters out. That is why the Communists murdered him.

The Western World's naive leaders permitted this frightening crime to be perpetrated against this legendary hero and against his country. One of the greatest errors of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations was their betrayal of General Mihailovich and their support of Tito and his Communist apparatus.

As we now observe the 25th anniversary of the heroic struggle of General Mihailovich against the Nazi forces, we must recognize that the free world has an obligation to the memory of General Mihailovich to develop policies that will restore legitimate freedom to his people.

The people of Yugoslavia suffer under a tyrannical Communist regime. Contrary to the official line of our State Department, the Tito government is not independent of the international Communist conspiracy. The memory of General Mihailovich remains a rallying point for the silent people within Yugoslavia and the Americans who have found freedom in our land and who are descendants of the various peoples of Yugoslavia.

We receive constant reports of the steady economic deterioration in Yugoslavia and the lack of freedom under which the people suffer. I must point out to my colleagues that the people of Yugoslavia do have in the person of His Majesty King Peter II a legal and proper symbol of free government they hope to one day reestablish in their country.

In this year of the 25th anniversary of the heroic struggle which General Mihailovich waged for 4 years, it would be most practical if the U.S. public would insist that the administration and its State Department make a complete reappraisal of our foreign policy, especially as it applies to the unfortunate support and subsidy being given the Tito government. The peoples of Yugoslavia deserve their self-determination and throughout their history have fought for religious and political freedom. I am confident that those freedoms they hold so dear will ultimately be restored.

ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the unfortunate situations we on the Education and Labor Committee have faced in legislating the antipoverty program has been a lack of adequate and accurate information. Because of this the program has unfortunately suffered.

The committee and Congress must accept the responsibility for the chaos that reigns in the administrative halls of the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is our duty as overseers of the program to diligently seek out the problems in the program and find solutions through legislative amendment. We have not done the job well.

Each year since 1964, when the act was conceived, I have protested that the committee has not demanded and received the full facts in hearings and task force investigations.

It is doubly unfortunate that what information was elicited from Government witnesses before the committee, including the Director of OEO, has been less than candid. The only basis for intelligent discussion and reasonable amendment of any legislation is accurate information.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing in the Lynchburg News pointing out the unbelievable discrepancy between Youth Corps statistics cited by the Secretary of Labor and the Director of OEO. Very frankly, we on the minority side of the committee are still in the dark as to which, if either of the statements is correct.

This body will soon be charged with passing on the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1966. We will be undertaking that task with not only an inadequate supply of information but with the knowledge that the information we have cannot be relied upon as being accurate.

It is my sincere hope that the Members of this body will weigh carefully the presentations here on the floor when amendments to the act are considered.

I want to particularly commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], who have worked so diligently under most difficult conditions investigating the weaknesses and strengths of the various programs. I know their comments on the legislation will be most helpful to a thorough study of the amendments.

WHERE THE FAULT LIES

A U.S. House of Representatives committee is now holding hearings on the conduct of the so-called poverty war. Corruption, mismanagement, favoritism, patronage, and just plain inefficiency has managed the program to the point where its successes are the exception and its failures the rule.

Called as a witness for the program last week was Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, who is in charge of the overall poverty war.

During his testimony, which made the program appear to be—and how he would hate this expression—"lily white," Shriver made this statement:

"Since last summer fewer than 50 ineligibles have been discovered in the Neighborhood Youth Corps."

That's what the man said.

The next day, Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz contradicted Shriver by stating that at least 5,000—5,000—enrollees in the Neighborhood Youth Corps have been found ineligible and dropped since last summer. In Chicago alone, 1,700 were dropped since January 1.

"Fewer than 50" ineligibles had been found, said Mr. Shriver. More than "5,000" said Mr. Wirtz. Now that's quite a contradiction, any way one looks at it. It would appear they were not talking about the same thing—but they were. Mr. Shriver's statement is simply incredible. It flies in the face of hundreds of reports of persons expelled from Youth Corps camps. We doubt that Mr. Wirtz was being completely frank, either. So the figure may be much higher than 5,000.

What said the OEO about the contradiction? Oh, said the OEO, those cases Wirtz was talking about were really "welfare" cases, only slightly above the poverty level.

Not so, replied Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL, Republican, of New York. Mr. GOODELL said he made a spot check of the records of Youth Corps enrollees in Chicago and found many from families earning from $5,000 to $11,000 a year. This is poverty?

The Youth Corps was established, ostensibly, to help poor youngsters who are school dropouts or likely dropouts, Mr. GOODELL noted. However, Chicago Youth Corps officials have admitted that no means test is given applicants, so there is no way of knowing whether they are eligible on the basis of poverty.

Furthermore, Mr. GOODELL said, the director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Mr. Jack Howard, has admitted that there were about 2,000 ineligible enrollees in the New York City program and 1,000 in Los Angeles.

After listening to the statements of Messrs. Shriver, Wirtz, and Howard, can the House committee doubt where the fault lies? It lies at the top. Obviously these men either don't know what's going on, or are running the program to suit themselves and to blazes with the law. Mr. Shriver, it is equally obvious, isn't up to the job. If he was, it would be run in a smooth, no-nonsense manner, which would be to the advantage of those the program was intended to help—the poverty-stricken. As it is, funds intended to help the poor are being spent on camp contracts, frivolous trimmings, and huge salaries for poverty war officials. The entire program is one of the biggest boondoggles ever conceived by a political party as a sop to a bloc of voters and to the party faithful who are getting rich from it.

* * * * *

Congressman GOODELL, and Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, whose exposés of corruption in the poverty war resulted in the House hearings, have promised other disclosures of mismanagement and worse in the program.

Meanwhile, they maintain that their "crusade" would correct the faults in the present program and put 50,000 youngsters into productive jobs through a new "Industry Youth Corps."

They call their program, significantly, an "opportunity crusade"—not a war on poverty. There's quite a difference: the war is a welfare program, a handout. The "opportunity crusade" helps the poor to help themselves. One is the Socialist, welfare way of taking from those who work and giving to those who don't, for one reason or another. The other is the American, free-enterprise way of providing jobs for people so they can support themselves.

EXEMPTION OF FIRST $3,000 OF INCOME

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have undertaken a thorough study of the problems of our retired senior citizens. As I had anticipated, the study has revealed that one of the very real problems is the serious effect of rising costs and inflation on persons who have to rely on a fixed income. In Kansas, for example, we have over 240,300 citizens age 65 and above, and 144,473 living on social security income.

I have therefore introduced a bill in Congress—H.R. 13398—which would exempt the first $3,000 of retirement income from Federal tax. This proposal, the Retirement Adjustment Act of 1966, would be a big step toward equalizing the burden.

The response to my bill has been positive and enthusiastic. However, tax equalization is but one of the problems we must pinpoint and solve. It is time for positive action to develop a comprehensive, well conceived program to meet the needs of our older citizens.

The latest issue of Taproots, the official publication of the Kansas State Department of Social Welfare, contains an article which outlines in brief their plans to stimulate interest in our aging citizens. This is a most worthwhile endeavor and I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues.

MAY IS BEING DESIGNATED AS SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

The theme for this year's observance of May as Senior Citizens Month will be "A New Day for the Older American," focusing on new opportunities and benefits for older citizens made possible by recent legislation. Two basic concepts underscore this year's theme—"Adding Life to Added Years" and "Age in Action."

It is planned that the Governor will proclaim May as Senior Citizens Month in Kansas.

The Division of Services for the Aging, State Department of Social Welfare, will encourage county councils on aging, organized groups of volunteers, county welfare departments, and other related agencies and organizations to plan special events during this month which will stimulate interest in our older citizens.

Posters, fact sheets, guide booklets for Senior Citizens Month and other useful material will be made available to local organizations to assist in publicizing this month.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is beginning to appear that hope is waning for early and effective reform of the international monetary system. While the deputies of the Group of 10 have made some progress in reconciling opposing points of view, little sense of urgency reportedly exists among a number of the principal nations involved in the discussions.

The failure of the United States to solve its balance-of-payments problem and the prospect of an even larger deficit this year is the principal reason for pessimism about the outlook for reform. As the Economist of London recently commented:

> These indications of a larger American deficit have given a heaven-sent handle to some conservative European officials who have been dubious about any monetary reforms from the start.

Not only has the administration failed to solve the deficit, but it has contributed to a weakening of the world monetary system through the imposition of controls on the movements of capital and bank lending abroad. A further stiffening of these controls is likely in the face of the larger deficit expected this year.

As might be expected in light of our own example, other countries are moving more and more to controls for balance-of-payments reasons. The Economist also stated:

> In fact, if not in form, the West is imposing on itself a gigantic unwritten exchange control, an undoing of the currency convertibility which was once such a source of pride.

The trend toward creeping controls and the continuing instability in the international monetary system may seem unrelated to economic progress and job opportunities here at home. But that is precisely what is at stake. A proliferation of controls in a world marked by recurrent currency crises could set the stage for a free world depression reminiscent of the decade of the 1930's.

Admittedly a catastrophe of these proportions is not imminent. The world can probably muddle through for some time before the day of judgment. But just as the conditions for catastrophe take years to develop, so, too, will it require time to build a more stable world economic order.

We began this work after World War II with the development of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the freeing of trade and payments and the creation of institutions for economic cooperation, such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. But we can no longer say that we are moving toward our goal. Quite the reverse is true.

The continued weakness of the British pound, the chronic U.S. balance-of-payments deficits and resurgent nationalism in Western Europe have eroded away many of the gains made since the end of World War II. Aside from the growth of controls and the painfully slow and uncertain progress toward monetary reform, there is other evidence. The examples of our failure must also include the deadlock in the Kennedy round of trade negotiations, the inability of development assistance to close the still-widening gap between the rich and poor nations and the failure of the OECD to live up to its promise as a means of reconciling divergent and sometimes destructive economic policies followed by various free world nations.

What is so appalling is that to my knowledge no major public official in the free world is clearly and consistently resisting the trend and warning of the dangers ahead. True, our own Government has taken some initiative on monetary reform, and it deserves credit for that action. But monetary reform is only a part—a fairly small part—of the overall task of strengthening the free world economic community. Creating new reserve assets may stave off a monetary crisis, but it does little to eliminate the conditions of crisis themselves. Basically what is needed is a better functioning world payments mechanism.

The creation of such a mechanism is a fourfold task which government leaders everywhere shrink from beginning. It involves, first, some adjustment of the 20-year-old system of exchange rates set up at Bretton Woods; second, an alleviation of the burden borne by the key currency countries, which is at the root of current instability; third, a reevaluation of the role of gold in the system; and, fourth, a strengthening of the institutional means for economic cooperation in the free world.

I do not pretend that these are simple matters. Nor can I suggest how they should be resolved. But I do believe that recognizing them as fundamental areas of concern is essential to free world economic stability and progress. With few exceptions, international monetary talks have been carried on as though any serious discussion of these subjects would itself trigger a financial crisis.

The only thing we can be reasonably sure of is that failure to grapple with these matters now will create conditions requiring solutions hastily formulated in the face of monetary collapse. I, myself, would rather not wait that long. Nor do I believe that the people of the United States and other countries who would suffer most from such a collapse would allow their leaders to wait any longer if they understood what is at stake.

The mantle of leadership falls largely on the United States. Regrettably, this administration has for all practical purposes abdicated its leadership role in its search for expedient solutions to the balance-of-payments problem. The administration must take a more responsible, broader view of the needs of the free world economic community. It is time that it began to press with greater imagination and vigor for fundamental reforms which alone can assure the future stability and prosperous growth of the free world community. The job will not be accomplished easily or quickly, but now is the time to begin.

I include an article from the Economist of April 23, 1966, in the RECORD at the point, along with excerpts from a report on free world economic cooperation which Representative HENRY S. REUSS and I prepared following our return from talks with financial leaders in Western Europe last fall:

[From the Economist, Apr. 23, 1966]

A NEW PLAN FOR GOLD

(If South Africa were really so unwise as to embargo its main export commodity, the world could conceivably be pushed nearer the new monetary order it should adopt anyway. Here is a suggested contingency plan: to meet not only that threat, but the much bigger conceivable threat that rich countries of the world may be muddling themselves into a major international financial crisis.)

When the responsible men of power lower their sights to ground level, it is time for outsiders to raise theirs to the sky. Under the timetable proposed by the Americans last summer—and agreed, however reluctantly, by all the other rich countries—this week's monetary meeting in Washington ought to have been drawing up heads of agreement on a specific contingency plan for adding to international reserves. It was unhappily clear even before the meeting started that it would do no such thing.

Early in the year, the Americans had set out a hearteningly liberal proposal. This was designed to maintain the growth in total world liquidity at its recent average of $2 billion a year; through the creation of a new monetary unit or new automatic drawing rights on the International Monetary Fund, to the extent that ordinary reserve increases through new gold and dollar balances fell short of the $2 billion. But it was soon clear that this sober American plan, and a similar one produced by the staff of the IMF, were on the far leftwing in the present negotiating forum of rich countries known as the Group of 10. In this, General de Gaulle has again intervened to instruct the French delegates to play the hard line. The indications from Washington that America's payments deficit is likely to widen in 1966 are seized on with glee.

The relevance of this to the Paris Club exercise is dubious; the present monetary study is, after all, designed to cover the world's needs from at the earliest 1968, when America will presumably no longer be burning up dollars in Vietnam. Unfortunately, however, these indications of a larger American deficit have given a heaven-sent handle to some conservative European officials who have been dubious about any monetary reforms from the start. The notion of contingency planning is itself now being opposed as dangerously inflationary by the French and the Swiss. The Belgians, too, are unconvinced of the need to do anything soon. Interestingly, the usually more restrictive Dutch are no longer counted among the now all-French-speaking hard liners. As one Frenchman explained with delightful frankness, "the Dutch are indeed on the conservative side, but their minds are far too clear to go along with our position." This week's tussle at the Washington meeting has therefore been for unexciting stakes indeed: to go on working for a contingency plan at all would now be considered a victory for the military positivists.

Moving around among world financial officials today, one is struck by an extraordinary difference of perspective and of atmosphere. Everything depends on which side of what is in the end the same financial problem the particular officials or committees are concerned with. The overworked financial officials of the Group of 10, now well into their third year of doubling up their domestic responsibilities with the task of constructing a new international monetary system in their spare time, mostly see the reemergence of the American deficit as delaying the day when increased international liquidity will be needed. Their financial colleagues in the committees of the United Nations Trade and Development Board, which is concerned with the problems of the poorer countries, see it as precisely the opposite. These committees are now considering the scheme for some form of compensation to developing countries whose development plans have been disrupted through an unforeseeable fall in their export proceeds. This plan, based on the original British-Swedish proposal, has been carefully reviewed by officials of the World Bank to avoid overgenerous and automatic compensation. All that is lacking is the money; in the present financial atmosphere, that money is not going to be forthcoming.

An increased American deficit will certainly make America less willing to extend its foreign aid. It may also lead to a further stiffening of controls on America's capital outflow. This will bring no tears to the eyes of those European officials—now more often German than French—who are still concerned by the extent of America's penetration of their domestic industry. But it will certainly add to the tightness of European money markets; and it will make it still more difficult for middle-range countries such as Ireland, or the World Bank itself, to raise money on the international capital market at all. And the screw may be given another turn from the British side before long, if Mr. Callaghan sees no alternative to controls on capital outflows to the rest of the sterling area. Few people in Europe would be surprised by such controls; fewer still by the imposition by Britain of import quotas before the summer is out.

Financial officials ought surely to be much more worried than they seem to be by these creeping controls. Within official circles, one still hears talk of preserving the free use of the pound and the dollar as international currencies. But corporate treasurers are talking a different language, of external dollars, of investment currency premiums, and of effectively frozen American balances. In fact, if not in form, the West is imposing on itself a gigantic unwritten exchange control, an undoing of the currency convertibility which was once such a source of pride. Scarcely a week goes by without some reference in company reports to the difficulty or impossibility of transferring funds, not from India to Peru, but out of America or out of Britain.

These growing restrictions on world capital movements and on world trade, and the still more serious financial constraints on world aid, are essentially a sign that, after 8 years of continuous American deficit and after two decades of recurrent sterling crises, the world is still no nearer a viable system of international payments adjustment. It is becoming increasingly clear that a satisfactory form of adjustment may be attained only with the help of more flexible exchange rates. This is widely recognized, not only by a clear and substantial majority of academic economists; but also, in private and occasionally in public too, by a wide spectrum of financial officials and central bankers. These include many continental officials who are distinctly cautious about expanding international liquidity, but who recognize the undesirability of demanding that countries adjust their external payments by unnecessary unemployment or unnecessary inflation.

The need for increased exchange flexibility has been recognized for at least a decade. The great trouble in its implementation is that the countries that need such flexibility most, the United States and Britain, have always been inhibited from implementing it by the disturbance it would cause to the role of sterling and the dollar as reserve currencies. In America's case there is the additional complication that America's commitment to buy and sell gold at $35 an ounce provides the one link between all world currencies and gold. Any convincing reform would therefore probably have to tackle all three hot potatoes at once: the exchange rates along with the reserve currencies and the gold mechanism. A reform of this scale is far beyond the range of present official discussions. Yet it would be foolish to regard it as totally academic. While the strains on world currencies remain unresolved, the danger of a break in the whole system, and particularly in the gold price, can never be ruled out. So here, in briefest outline, is our own suggestion for a contingency plan.

1. Exchange rates should be made more flexible, but on a smooth continuing basis. Far better than a simple widening of official margins round existing parities—which could produce movements in unwanted directions under the influence of large speculative movements—would be adoption of the sliding parity. This would allow very small changes, of at most say 2 percent a year or one-sixth of 1 percent a month or one twenty-sixth of 1 percent a week. Anticipations of these movements could then be offset by changes in interest rates of the same magnitude; even if everybody thought that, under this system, sterling would be likely to be devalued by a full 2 percent as against most European countries in the year ahead, there would still be no incentive to move funds from London to Zurich if annual interest rates in London were kept 2 percent higher than those in Zurich. Countries might then give very substantial commitments to avoid larger changes in parities altogether. The result would be to combine a large degree of certainty over exchange rates with significant scope for long-term movement—10 percent over 5 years.

2. The best way of dealing with the reserve currency problem under this system would then be for America and Britain to hive off their reserve currency function into the IMF, along with a partial transfer of America's gold conversion commitment. America and Britain should offer, and the IMF should agree to allow, official holders of dollars and sterling to transfer their balances into deposits at the IMF—call them Keynes' Bancor. Such transfers would not be compulsory, qua Triffin, but entirely voluntary. Bancor balances would be guaranteed in their future value, in the special form described in 4 below.

3. When, say, Australia transferred sterling balances into the IMF in this way, its accruing IMF deposits would give it a right to demand other currencies from the Fund; and this would create liquidity problems for the IMF itself. Ultimately, these should be largely bypassed by the use of the Bancor itself for international settlements. But, in the interim, the IMF could reasonably ask America and Britain to start the ball rolling by establishing Bancor deposits of their own by buying these deposits for gold. Both countries could be asked to sell sufficient gold to the IMF to bring the ratio of gold in their total reserves down to the average gold ratio prevailing in the Group of 10 as a whole—a proposal that has been made officially in the past. This would involve a swap of around $4 billion of American gold; Britain's gold ratio, in its present largely borrowed reserves, is already down to the Group of 10's average. These gold transfers would be a reasonable quid pro quo from the Anglo-Saxons. In exchange, the IMF, and the creditor countries underlying it, would agree to hold the "old" dollar and sterling balances converted into the Fund in an open ended way. That is, there would be no fixed and rigid schedule of repayment. Instead, America and Britain would agree to pay them off gradually with part of their future payments surpluses.

4. The IMF could then take over America's present function to buy gold at $35 an ounce—and it could sell to the extent that the buyer had already deposited gold with it. But the clue to the whole operation would be that the price of gold would be fixed at its future dollar value, while the value of Bancor deposits would be secured at their present dollar value. In this way, America could depreciate the dollar through the use of the sliding parity by a maximum of 2 percent a year. It and any other country that reduced the value of its currency in relation to Bancor (i.e., the dollar at its present parity) would have an obligation to pay in additional home currency to the IMF to make good the deficiency. (In the case of an up valuation, the country would be entitled to reclaim its own currency from the IMF to make good the higher Bancor value of its currency.) If and when there was a marginal dollar devaluation of this kind, central banks that still held reserves in dollars would suffer an equivalent depreciation of their value, in relation to nondevalued currencies.

But the distinctive feature of this plan is that they would also suffer a corresponding depreciation of their own gold holdings, since the IMF would down-value the buying price of gold in terms of Bancor in the same ratio as it down-valued its buying price of dollars in terms of Bancor. The way to maintain the value of one's reserves in relation to Bancor, and to any currencies that had not depreciated along with the dollar, would be to get into Bancor in the first place. This would provide a positive incentive to all countries to hold Bancor; which would remove at one stroke the present speculative incentive to hold gold, without at the same time unrealistically depriving gold of all monetary value. Bookkeeping adjustments to offset the reduced value of gold in IMF assets could be arranged with a little ingenuity.

5. Aside from, and in addition to, such occasional adjustments prompted by marginal changes in Bancor parities, the IMF could adjust Bancor deposits in relation to current liquidity needs, as envisaged in the present plans of its own staff, and of the American Government.

6. Two steps could be taken to minimize fears about an undue transfer of powers and control to an international organization. First the gold transferred to the IMF could be kept physically in the vaults of the central bank concerned; the central bank could even record this in its annual report to reassure nervous citizens. This would provide some reinsurance for the undoing of the whole arrangement in the case of war or some other unforeseeable contingency. The initial gold deposits would always be covered fully by IMF gold holdings; and these deposits—but not newly created "credit" deposits—could always be reconvertible into gold, on the original terms. Secondly, management control could be delegated to a "governors' committee," as suggested by Mr. Robert Roosa last year for the management of his proposed scheme; this would put effective control into the hands of a small group of countries representing the main financial powers.

Standing back from immediate technical and diplomatic preoccupations, three major reforms are needed in the world payments structure: a little controlled flexibility in exchange rates; some unburdensome unwinding of the reserve currency role of the dollar and the pound; and some transfer of the gold-currency link from the shoulders of America alone onto a more international basis. Nobody who proffers any world currency plan at this moment, least of all one as apparently unorthodox as this one, can expect to see it adopted by this autumn's conference of the International Monetary Fund. This is a contingency plan for one of two future occasions—when the financial powers have a change of heart, which one can almost rule out; or when the financial powers face a major crisis, which one can never rule out.

One of the few monetary issues that unites not only the Anglo-Saxons, but the Germans, the Dutch, and the Italians as well, is their determination to avoid being forced by private and official leverage into an increased price of gold. A firm gold policy, backed by willingness to adopt an international scheme of this kind, could be carried by the unity of the Federal Reserve, the Bank of England, and the German Bundesbank, with most other leading central banks in natural alliance. In one possible last resort—namely when a threatening financial crisis has driven most countries to see the need for a large-scale reform, but France alone was obdurate—a plan of this sort could help force France's hand. Significantly, despite all the shouting and golden genuflections from Paris the Bank of France has throughout resisted suggestions that the franc itself should be convertible into gold—i.e., that the Bank of France buy and sell gold at a fixed price. France has a long position in gold, which it can put to advantage only through the folly or the inaction of its partners. The price of gold is and can be fixed at a stroke of a pen, in Washington, in London, and in Frankfurt. The use, or even the threatened use, of that price-fixing power could quickly turn the tables in the politics of world money.

Excerpts From Off Dead Center: Some Proposals To Strengthen Free World Economic Cooperation

(By Representative Henry S. Reuss and Representative Robert F. Ellsworth)

I. INTRODUCTION

The passage of the Trade Expansion Act in 1962 represented a bold American initiative looking toward a new era of expanding trade and economic cohesiveness among the nations of the free world. Today the exuberant hope for building a grand design of unity has been chilled by a gradual resurgence of economic and political nationalism. The free world community now stands at a crossroads. It may move forward to a more open international economy—with all free nations enjoying the fruits of closer economic ties—or it could move backward to a world marked by narrow and destructive economic nationalism.

We are already witnessing what could be the first signs of economic disintegration in the free world:

1. The successful conclusion of the Kennedy round of trade negotiations is threatened by the deadlock in the European Economic Community arising from a dispute over the fundamental nature of that organization.

2. The outlook for early and adequate reform of the international monetary system is uncertain because of differing views of the problem and objectives among the key financial powers.

3. A growing underbrush of restrictions and controls on international payments—largely reflecting the lack of a well-functioning balance of payments adjustment mechanism—is leading to the economic fragmentation of the free world.

4. An inadequate level of development aid threatens intensified political instability and a continuation of unacceptably low rates of economic growth in the developing lands.

5. Weaknesses in the institutional structure for economic cooperation among the nations of the free world poses a serious obstacle to the development of closer economic integration.

A failure on the part of American and European leadership to come to grips with these problems would do more than undermine the economic strength of the free world. It would also weaken the military and diplomatic posture of the Western Alliance and the ability of the West to offer positive leadership by example and adequate material assistance to the less-developed countries of the world.

With these problems in mind, we traveled through Western Europe between October 31, 1965, and November 12, 1965, for the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee. We spoke with officials of the European Economic Community, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, national governments, American officials abroad, and private bankers, businessmen, and journalists. Altogether we talked with over 60 individuals during our trip. Our purpose was to sound out their views on these problems and to explore possible new initiatives that the United States might take to check the drift toward disintegration of the Atlantic Community. This report represents a synthesis of our findings and recommendations.

* * * * *

C. THE NEED FOR A WELL-FUNCTIONING BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS ADJUSTMENT MECHANISM

Findings

While much attention has been focused on the adequacy of international liquidity and its future growth, the functioning of the balance-of-payments adjustment mechanism has received considerably less attention than its importance merits. In a world of convertible currencies, fixed exchange rates, and expanding international trade and payments, improved means of adjusting internal economies to one another must be found. The alternative might well be chronic deficits, a shortage of liquidity to finance them, escalating controls on trade and payments, and growing instability leading to a breakdown of the system.

An adequate and growing supply of international liquidity is needed to permit gradual balance-of-payments adjustment, but liquidity cannot substitute for adjustment. The balance-of-payments adjustment process must be strengthened by finding means of minimizing the conflict that sometimes exists between the attainment of national economic goals and the requirements of reasonable external balance.

The key to eliminating persistent imbalances without violating important national objectives is close and continuing coordination of domestic policies to keep price levels in harmony and national income at the full employment level. Nations should set their own economic policies but according to guidelines which they have all agreed are appropriate and with provisions for full review and confrontation. The result would be "parallel but national policymaking," which recognizes that sovereign states in an integrated international economy are unable to pursue effectively national economic objectives except through concerted action.

The possibilities for coordination of national economic policies are now being tested within the Common Market. The degree of economic integration already achieved within the Common Market has made the adjustment of policies more necessary as well as easier to achieve than in the larger Atlantic Community. The nations of the European Economic Community have come to realize that with growing interdependence they must move together on economic policy. Largely as a result of growing trade, inflationary and deflationary impulses are passed more freely from country to country within the Common Market than between the other members of the OECD. Although the Common Market still has a long way to go in coordinating economic policies, considerable progress has been made in developing within the individual countries the same policy instruments and a common understanding of how to use them. As an example, the Monetary Committee of the EEC has prepared a systematic description of the instruments of monetary policy in the member states, of the ways in which they are applied and of their efficacy. On the whole, the instruments of monetary policy appear to be more comparable now than in the early days of the Common Market.

In a decision dated April 15, 1965, the Council of Ministers of the EEC provided a striking example of trying to bring budgetary policies under one formula although in a decentralized fashion. In its decision, the Council called on the member states to give stability of prices and costs priority over all other economic policy objectives.

The recommendation specified the means to be employed and, in particular, said that the expansion of public expenditures should not exceed 5 percent a year. For the first time, a decision was made establishing a scale of priorities and ground rules backed up by specific figures. This decision has had a major impact on domestic policymaking within the individual countries.

Within the larger Atlantic Community, the real problem is how to bring the surplus countries into discussions of the adjustment problem. While a common understanding of responsibilities and objectives is already emerging in the EEC, it has hardly begun to appear in the OECD. However, there are some hopeful signs. The industrial nations are beginning to recognize their common responsibility for analysis of the adjustment process under conditions of convertibilty. The Group of Ten, for example, has assigned the task of studying the adjustment process to Working Party Three of the OECD, which will report next spring. Hopefully, the report will point out the possibilities for defining the measures and responsibilities that both deficit and surplus countries should be expected to undertake in support of a smoothly functioning system. At the same time, the Group of Ten has also established what has been termed "multilateral surveillance" over the ways by which deficits are financed and surpluses are used. International surveillance of domestic economic performance is here to stay but needs to be formalized further.

Recommendations

1. The United States should press within the OECD for the establishment of appropriate codes of good behavior by deficit and surplus countries to speed the adjustment process and the development of closer coordination of domestic economic policies among the major industrialized nations.

A better functioning balance-of-payments adjustment mechanism would help nations avoid the conflict that now often arises between the objectives of internal growth and external equilibrium. Balance-of-payments problems should not pose an obstacle to the achievement of domestic goals of full employment, rapid economic growth, and price stability. Nor should balance-of-payments considerations interfere with overriding foreign policy objectives, including aid and defense commitments.

On the other hand, while these domestic goals are paramount, they are not absolute. When required, policy should be able to shift to meet the requirements of external balance. In many cases, these shifts in policy will serve the ends of both domestic and external policy. In other cases, the requirements for external balance will conflict with domestic goals. In these cases, however, the effect on domestic goals can be minimized if liquidity is adequate to permit gradual restoration of balance-of-payments equilibrium and if all countries, deficit and surplus alike, are pursuing coordinated policies for the restoration of equilibrium in the system.

The development of "regularized criteria to speed adjustment" will not only permit adjustment with a minimum of damage to domestic objectives, but it will also help avoid controls and restrictions that narrow the freedom to trade, travel, and invest. Controls and restrictions impair individual freedom and efficiency in the use of resources, and their avoidance also should be considered an important goal of national policy.

2. The most urgent adjustment need is for guidelines establishing the appropriate mix of domestic fiscal and monetary policies for both surplus and deficit countries under varying economic circumstances.

The development of fiscal and monetary guidelines would provide more explicit understanding of the "rules of the game" regarding the adjustment obligations of surplus and deficit countries. In the past, actions taken within European surplus countries in the face of domestic inflation often have involved increases in interest rates. This has widened the gap in rates between the United States and Europe and led to increased capital outflows from the United States. Instead of raising rates, the Europeans should have held them firm or even lowered them while American rates drifted upward in response to strong economic expansion. Domestic inflation in Europe should then have been dampened down by the use of a more restrictive fiscal policy.

By adopting flexible fiscal policies countries should be able to correct external imbalances without reducing domestic output or inflating the price level. Ideally, interest rates should be partially responsive to a country's external position. The domestic effects of rates determined in this light should be offset by changes in fiscal policy.

It is obvious that difficulties stand in the way of such an approach. One is simply the political distaste for raising taxes. Another is the institutional inflexibility that makes rapid changes in fiscal policy difficult to accomplish. All countries should be encouraged to make changes in internal institutions which would facilitate the use of more flexible fiscal policies.

Considerably more analytical discussion also is needed on the domestic and international repercussions of changes in monetary policy. To date the dialog has been superficial and dogmatic. The Europeans repeatedly have insisted that U.S. rates should rise and the United States—with equal insistence—has maintained that rates could not rise without choking off the move toward full employment. It may very well be true, as the Europeans claim, that higher rates in the United States would not dampen investment. What the Europeans usually do not take into account is the effect of higher rates on small business, homebuilding, local school construction, and other activities that are interest sensitive. European governments often provide interest rate subsidies for these activities, which shelter them from the depressing effects of general rate increases.

Generally the United States does not provide direct subsidies. If monetary policy is going to be more and more determined in the light of our external position, the question of whether or not we should provide such subsidies deserves careful consideration.

3. The United States should press for progress in other areas where the coordination of domestic economic policies to promote external adjustment would prove feasible.

Areas where appropriate codes of national behavior could be developed include:

(a) Principles and priorities governing the appropriate use of restrictions on capital movements for balance-of-payments reasons should be formulated. While undesirable in principle, controls on capital movements may be necessary until countries make further progress toward international cooperation to promote adjustment. In the absence of a smoothly functioning adjustment mechanism, controls on capital are to be preferred to controls on current account. Some progress has been made in this area by the code of liberalization of capital movements negotiated by the OECD. However, all countries must work to avoid the growth of an underbrush of capital controls that work to the detriment of other nations. Standards should be developed, for example, to assure that when controls are necessary they leave scope for market forces or restrict short-term funds in search of higher interest rather than funds used to finance trade or direct investment abroad.

(b) The use of an income policy, principally by deficit countries, to maintain noninflationary wage and price behavior should be explored.

(c) The greater use of commercial policy (lowering trade barriers in surplus countries, for example) as a means of correcting deficits should be open to discussion. The extent to which GATT rules inhibit the use of this weapon should be considered.

(d) Guidelines should be developed on the appropriate use of domestic policies to stimulate exports and import-competing industries.

* * * * *

E. STRENGTHENING THE FREE WORLD'S INSTITUTIONAL MEANS FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Findings

While the free world has moved a long way from the "beggar thy neighbor" policies of the 1930's, the destructive forces of economic nationalism are by no means dead. Even during the highly prosperous period since the end of World War II, nations have not infrequently adopted policies which have inflicted hardship on other countries. What could we expect to happen should the free world again slip into depression? Experience would indicate that the fragile tradition of cooperation just beginning to emerge would crack as nations tried to protect their own interests.

A tradition of economic cooperation in the common interest of the entire free world can be built only over a number of years. The ideal period to develop this tradition is during prosperity and economic well-being. Regretfully, the free world is missing the opportunity that exists today to forge the institutions and procedures which alone offer hope of averting a repetition of the disastrous experience of the thirties.

The success of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) in assisting the recovery of war-torn Europe was an impressive demonstration of the benefits of coordinated economic policies. With the tasks of recovery completed, quantitative restrictions largely removed, and a high degree of convertibility of currencies restored, the challenges to economy policy changed. It became increasingly evident in the late 1950's that the economic policies of any one country had an unavoidable impact on the economies of other countries and that new machinery was required to deal with this growing interdependence.

To meet this need the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development was created on September 30, 1961, as the successor to the OEEC. The members of the OECD now include the United States, Canada, Japan, France, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Italy, Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Portugal, Austria, Switzerland, Ireland, Iceland, Greece, Turkey, and Spain. Yugoslavia and Finland participate as observers. If Australia and New Zealand were added, the OECD would generally comprise all the advanced countries of the free world.

The aims of the new Organization were to achieve a high level of sustainable economic growth and employment in member countries while maintaining financial stability, contribute to economic expansion in the developing countries, and help expand world trade on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis. The breadth of the OECD's interests thus include national economic policy, foreign aid, trade and payments problems, scientific affairs, progress and expansion of industry and energy sources, manpower and social affairs, and agriculture.

The broad membership of the OECD, the wide scope of its activities, and its continuing character make it the logical organization in which to develop the tradition of close coordination of economic policies which will be required if the free world is to realize its full potential. This promise has yet to be fulfilled.

The OECD today lacks the prestige, independence, and power to initiate policies and common solutions to cope with the free world's problems of trade, aid, payments, and economic growth. An organization of national governments operating under the unanimity rule, it lacks a genuine executive agency, such as the Commission of the EEC, as well as a legislative or consultative assembly. The Council of the OECD, the decisionmaking body of the Organization, has only infrequent meetings on the ministerial level.

The studies made by Organization and its annual review of national economic policies and prospects have had a useful influence in developing the habits of economic cooperation and consultation. But, much more needs to be done if the OCED is to fill its proper role as initiator of common policies for a stronger and more secure free world community.

Recommendations

1. The OECD should establish an executive commission independent of national governments and having the power to initiate proposals, make recommendations, and issue reports to the Organization as a whole.

A high-level commission with the power and duty to make proposals for the Organization as a whole, as opposed to proposals from national governments, has worked well for the three European communities. We believe a similar device should be adopted by the OECD, though with the Six's supranational characteristics.

The recommendations of a distinguished commission of, perhaps, five "wise men" would strengthen the ability of the Organization to make decisions in the common interest. The commission, which would be selected by the Council for long terms and from nationals of the member states, would serve as an important spur to needed action. Its proposals and recommendations would strengthen the Council in taking action which goes beyond the diluted solutions acceptable to the Organization's most intransigent member. Such a commission could be readily created by joint agreement among the OECD members, and we urge this action upon them.

2. The OECD should establish a parliamentary assembly composed of legislators drawn from and selected by the national legislative bodies.

Sentiment for establishing an OECD parliamentary assembly has been widespread in Europe for some time. The Secretary General of the OECD, Thorkil Kristensen, endorsed such a plan over 3 years ago. However, the American attitude has not been as receptive, largely because of concern over the proliferation of international parliamentary bodies.

While this objection has some merit, we feel that it could be overcome. The most practical solution would be to link the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe to the OECD and then tie in the OECD members not now represented. This would permit the elimination of the Consultative Assembly as now constituted and at least two other existing interparliamentary bodies. The Consultative Assembly itself has made this recommendation three times in the past 5 years.

Such an Assembly would be empowered to debate everything within the competence of the OECD. It could make recommendations to the Council and the Commission and issue studies and reports of its own. The chief value would be educational. By introducing public debate into the OECD's deliberations, the Assembly would help to educate the public of the member countries in the purposes and actions of the OECD. The members would also have a useful influence on the members of their own national legislative bodies by encouraging them to regard international problems in terms of their effects on all member countries.

These advantages would be particularly great for the United States. The representatives of other governments who participate in OECD meetings are almost all members of their legislatures. Our delegates are not. However, programs which the OECD may develop are likely to require approval by the Congress.

3. The Council of the OECD should be elevated to ministerial rank.

Although the Council of the OECD occasionally meets at ministerial level, most meetings are at the level of permanent representatives. Since the Council is the supreme decision-making body of the organization, it would carry more weight with the national governments if it were composed of national representatives of the highest rank. While the unanimity rule would still exist, the elevation of the Council would amount to a tacit agreement by the member states they would coordinate their foreign economic policies primarily through the OECD. In the interests of coordinating national economic policies in the common good, we believe such a development would represent a major step forward in invigorating the OECD.

SET THE TIRE SAFETY RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues within the current controversy over automobile safety is based on the allegation that tire failure accounted for 10 percent of all highway fatalities in 1964. This figure is attributed to a National Safety Council report. Statistic dramatists have translated this supposed fact into 4,000 highway deaths in 1964 caused by faulty tires. Other spectacular conclusions may have been drawn to paint a dim portrait of careless tiremaking.

The National Safety Council, through its director of statistics, H. Gene Miller, when asked to verify the statement, that "tire failure accounted for 10 percent of all highway fatalities in 1964," has stated:

> We do not have any facts which support such a statement, and to my knowledge no such statement has ever been released intentionally or unintentionally. Facts on "tire" accidents for the Nation simply are not available.

Mr. Miller attributes the probable source of this data to information reported on national turnpike fatalities which do not cover accidents on all the Nation's streets and highways. Let us inquire as to the basis of the turnpike data.

The Rubber Manufacturers Association found that this 10-percent turnpike fatality figure caused by faulty tires was based on a study of a total of 20 accidents which took place on 19 different turnpikes in 1964. It seems that two-thirds of the tire failures were old tires, most of which were bald. This leaves a possible one-third or as few as 20 accidents where new tires were listed as the cause of accidents resulting in a highway fatality. The Ohio Turnpike Commission, which reports the probable cause of fatal accidents on its throughway states:

> Most of the failures of new tires were sidewall failures, indicating the possible previous hard contact with curbs or other objects.

Mr. Speaker, my point is simply that the tire manufacturers of this country are being condemned for negligence by some persons on the basis of false statistics. I am disturbed about this misrepresentation because the good name of the tire industry is being subjected to such unfounded criticism. Two important tire manufacturers, the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co. of Findlay and the Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co. of Mansfield, have their home offices and production plants in my district. The record should be set straight, Mr. Speaker, for there are thousands of fine Americans conscientiously engaged in providing tires of all types for a world market and their integrity has been unfairly challenged. If and when the proposed Tire Safety Act of 1966 comes before the House for consideration, I urge my colleagues to examine with great care claims that our tire manufacturers are not living up to the highest standards of quality and safety.

A FREE WORLD OPPORTUNITY

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, May 8, 1966, carried an exclusive report on prisoners of war in the Soviet Union entitled, "250,000 Still in Red Slave Camps." The article written by Clyde Farnsworth, middle Europe correspondent for the Tribune, describes the efforts of the Polish Division of Radio Free Europe—RFE—over the years to bring pressure to bear on both the Polish and Soviet regimes to return to their homeland the thousands of Poles exiled to the Soviet Union during and after World War II.

Radio Free Europe's campaign started in 1955 when questionnaires were sent to approximately 4,000 German prisoners of war who were returned to Germany from the U.S.S.R. when Chancellor Adenauer told the Soviets that normal relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany were impossible until German prisoners of war were returned home, another example, incidentally, of the results of a tough and forthright stand against the tyranny of communism's leaders.

Radio Free Europe received from the prisoners of war the names of prisoners from countries all over the world who were still languishing in Soviet camps. Radio Free Europe then initiated broadcasts into Poland, giving the names of Poles still being held in the Soviet Union. Letters received from behind the Iron Curtain by the radio station indicated that the broadcasts were effective, and about 4 months later the first of the Polish prisoners of war began arriving home. By the end of 1955, 6,429 had been repatriated. In 1956 the figure increased to 30,786, and in 1957 to 93,872.

Although the Polish Government stated in 1959 that the repatriation was complete, the Polish Divison of Radio Free Europe "didn't believe that even a majority of their countrymen had been released from Soviet detention."

In February of this year, more than 20 years after the end of World War II, after years of gathering further information, Radio Free Europe again went on the air to force the return of additional Poles from the U.S.S.R. To date, 40 broadcasts have been made without any recognition from the Polish Government.

According to the data assembled by Radio Free Europe, also included among the inmates of the Soviet camps are Czechs, Hungarians, Germans, Russians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Finns, Jews, Bulgarians, Rumanians, and Kalmuks.

Here for the free world to see is another illustration of how tenacious action in a moral cause paid off. Over 125,000 human beings were released from Communist slave camps by the efforts of one organization. Imagine the effect of a relentless chorus of free world governments demanding the return to their homelands of those still divested of their human rights.

The vehicle is available to investigate the charges of Radio Free Europe as to additional thousands of captives in Soviet camps. This, of course, is the United Nations, which, as late as last Saturday, May 7, was used by the President in proposing a treaty for the peaceful exploration of the moon and other celestial bodies. Surely, the alleged capitivity of an estimated 250,000 human bodies takes priority in the scale of human values and warrants a fair and comprehensive investigation by an appropriate U.N. committee. Here is an unique opportunity for the United States to show moral leadership within the world body, using fair and peaceful means to right a grievous wrong. The burden of moral responsibility demands no less.

To this end, I am drawing up legislation requesting the President to direct Ambassador Goldberg to propose an investigation before the appropriate U.N. committee of the charges made by Radio Free Europe. This would constitute a first step in the eventual consideration by the U.N. of self-determination for the captive nations, which a number of us in Congress have proposed in legislation over the last several years.

If the free nations of the world expect divine assistance in their efforts to retain their liberty, then dedication to basic moral tenets and respect for human rights must be exercised. Second, our self-preservation in the cold war compels us to turn to our advantage every abuse of the Communist world. The Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in its report in 1963 on the Captive European Nations urged determined and forthright action in these words:

> The committee believes that we can achieve diplomatic and strategic gains in the cold war if we pursue our objectives with vigor and determination. The Soviets push every advantage, and exploit every weakness of the free world. We should push every advantage, and exploit every weakness of the Communist bloc. In this respect, while the captive nations add some strength to the Soviet Union, it must be remembered that they are captive nations, seeking to regain their freedom at the earliest opportunity. As such they constitute large areas of vulnerability for the Soviet Union. We must always remember that our support for the legitimate objectives of liberty and self-determination for these friendly peoples may exploit a woefully weak spot in the Soviet system.

With this in mind, I insert the article, "250,000 Still in Red Slave Camps," in the RECORD at this point, along with the listing of the 56 forced labor camps which accompany the article. As stated in the illustration accompanying the article, although the total of prisoners shown in the 56 camps is 157,000, Radio Free Europe's estimate runs to a total of 250,000. Where a particular camp is unnamed, the approximate location as shown on the accompanying map has been inserted:

EXCLUSIVE: A REPORT ON POW'S IN THE U.S.S.R.: 250,000 STILL IN RED SLAVE CAMPS—POLES, TERM OVER, KEPT ON TO LABOR

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

VIENNA.—There is reason to suppose that a quarter million Poles and other foreign nationals are still slaving in Soviet work camps, more than 20 years after the end of World War II.

This number and the names of some prisoners, along with the location of their camps, have been revealed by the Polish Division of Radio Free Europe, which has collected the information over a period of years.

Today, while the Polish Communist regime is trying to attract Polish exiles in the West back to their homeland, Radio Free Europe is telling the Polish people again about the fate of thousands of their countrymen in the Soviet Union.

GRIM STORY OF COLD WAR

Behind this campaign and the shocking estimate of the number of lives involved lies an involved but grimly fascinating story of the cold war.

The last time news of large-scale Soviet detention of Polish nationals came to attention was in 1955, when Radio Free Europe broadcast a series of programs about Soviet prison camps based on information supplied by returned German prisoners of war.

The release of the Germans had been prompted by the then Federal Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, who told the Soviet Government that there could be no normalization of relations between Bonn and Moscow until all Germans had been returned from Soviet prisoner of war camps.

EX-PRISONERS AID CAUSE

When the Soviets responded, and German prisoners began to return early in 1955, Radio Free Europe officials compiled a list of the returnees that eventually included almost 4,000 names. To these men a questionnaire was sent, appealing for the names, descriptions, and other pertinent details about fellow prisoners from other countries who were still being detained.

The purpose of the Radio Free Europe appeal—to effect the release of the other prisoners of war—was completely spelled out. And the response was considered remarkable. More than 90 percent of the former German prisoners filled out the questionnaires, and some took the trouble to visit Radio Free Europe headquarters in Munich to provide a firsthand description of their prison life.

DETAILS ARE LEARNED

From them Radio Free Europe gathered the names of prisoners from countries all over the world. Included were details about the prisoners' homes, their marital status, professions, the ages of their children, and so on.

These descriptions enabled Radio Free Europe to set up files on approximately 10,000 prisoners whose existence had been known by scarcely anyone but their Soviet jailers for a decade or more.

The names of those from Western countries were passed on to the governments concerned, usually through their embassies in German or through the International Red Cross.

The first Radio Free Europe broadcast campaign to release Polish prisoners was opened July 31, 1955.

DEMAND BY RADIO

Radio Free Europe's Polish language station director, Jan Nowak, told Polish listeners at that time:

"Germans, Austrians, and Italians—former soldiers of conquered enemy forces—are returning to their homes, while Poles remain in the depths of Russia because no one remembers them any longer or demands their return.

"We demand the return to the homeland of Poles in Soviet prisons and labor camps—Poles who are suffering and dying 10 years after the end of the war because they committed only one crime: They fought for independence."

For more than 7 months Radio Free Europe periodically broadcast the names of Poles and the prison camps where they were last known to have lived. The names were read at dictation speed so that listeners could write them down, along with any variations in spelling that might have occurred.

HELD IN SILENCE

According to the freed Germans, the Polish prisoner of wars had not been allowed to write their families or communicate in any way to the outside world. As a result, many were presumed dead because they had been missing for so long. In many cases, the Radio Free Europe broadcasts gave the first indication that individual prisoners were indeed still alive.

The names and descriptions of the prisoners went out over the air in brief messages such as these:

"Walenty Kucharski, 30 years old, born in Sosnowiec; lieutenant in the Polish Army; deported to Vorkuta after the war; mine No. 29."

"Stefan Szymanski, 26 years old, from Lwow; arrested as a 16-year-old boy toward the end of 1945; has remained in camp No. 36 in the region of Vorkuta."

Response to the broadcasts was such that there could be no doubt they were making an impact. Letters were received from behind the Iron Curtain asking the station to repeat particular programs so certain names could be verified.

But few of the writers mentioned the names of those in whom they were interested for fear that the letters might be intercepted and the prisoners face a worse fate.

BROADCASTS ANNOY REDS

Ignored initially by the Polish Government, the broadcasts caused considerable embarrassment to local Communist officials who were questioned by residents about the validity of the charges. Until that time the party line had always been that the Soviet Union held no more Polish prisoners of war.

Poles took advantage of the presence of a great number of Russian soldiers, observers, and advisers to ask the same questions of them. In an attempt to halt the growing uneasiness, the Polish Government finally broke its 3-month silence to comment on the Radio Free Europe pronouncements.

On October 31, 1955, Radio Warsaw referred to "a certain number of repatriates from Russia" and noted a few weeks later that "Poles have been returning from the U.S.S.R. for several months now." It added, "We are certain that the number of returnees will increase in the near future."

MORE AND MORE REPATRIATED

The hope was given foundation by the rising number of prisoners being freed. Before the end of 1955, a total of 6,429 Poles were repatriated. The next year the figure jumped to 30,786, and in 1957, to a record 93,872.

Still in 1958—13 years after the war ended—85,865 Poles were returned from Soviet detention, and in 1959, 28,400 more.

The Polish Red Cross claimed that all except 15 percent of the 245,000 repatriated Poles were actually residents of the territory annexed by the Soviet Union after the war. They said that only about 36,000 were actually deportees.

Even so, the imprisonment of 36,000 nationals of a "fraternal" Communist country would seem to require a lot of explaining so many years after friendly relations had been established between them.

MANY QUIT PARADISE

And the fact that so many of the beneficiaries of Russia's postwar expansion had chosen to leave the Soviet paradise could hardly be comforting to communism's internationalist ideologists.

Observing the return of a group of prisoners from Russia in 1959, a Warsaw journalist said:

"Looking at them, I could not restrain my own tears. And from the crowd of onlookers came anti-Soviet shouts and curses again and again. 'Take those poor devils to Comrade Wieslaw [Wladyslaw Gomulka]. Let him see what the Soviets have done with these people.'"

What they had done was to make the prisoners repay their jailers by working as miners, lumbermen, roadbuilders, and farmers. In short, the Polish prisoners provided a cheap source of labor to the Communist "liberators" of Eastern Europe.

One of the first acknowledgments of the extent of Polish detention in Russia appeared on October 25, 1956, during the time of the Hungarian revolution. The paper Tygodnik Zachodni admitted that there had been official silence in Poland about the "hundreds of thousands of Poles in Russia" and that this had given an excellent opportunity to "foreign radio stations" to conduct "an anti-Polish and anti-Soviet propaganda campaign."

PAPER GIVES ADVICE

It was time to speed up the repatriation of Poles from Russia, the paper added, suggesting that "a settlement of this humanitarian problem is in the interest of Polish-Soviet friendship and will also silence the 'Free Europe' broadcasts."

By mid-1959 the Polish Government was assuring everyone that "repatriation from the Soviet Union is complete." But Nowak and his fellow Polish exiles didn't believe that even a majority of their countrymen had been released from Soviet detention. They continued to search for further information.

Within a year they were convinced that additional thousands of Poles were still working in Soviet labor camps. And last February they decided that enough material had been gathered to open a new campaign to force the release of the remaining Polish prisoners.

A 45-minute special program on February 14 referred to the station's 1955–56 efforts and told of the new freedom drive that was being started. Typical Radio Free Europe programs described the various camps where Poles and other prisoners could be located.

"In the far north of the Soviet Union, near Lumbovka and its environs on the Kola peninsula in the Murmansk Oblast, Poles may be found among the 8,500 prisoners still held in three labor camps," the broadcast said.

STILL HELD CAPTIVE

"Some of the Poles are serving prison terms for alleged political offenses committed during and immediately after the war. Those who have served out their sentences still work under compulsion and are forbidden to leave the area."

"Among the prisoners held in Gandala," a later broadcast said, "there are Germans, Hungarians, and Poles, although the number and nationality of all the inmates are uncertain. They are employed in lumbering, in coal mining, and in the construction of rocket launching pads and sites, highways, railroads, hostels, and hotels."

WARSAW NOW SILENT

Although Radio Free Europe has made more than 40 broadcasts since February about the continued detention of Poles, the Warsaw government has again failed to comment on the matter. In view of the long delay in responding to the 1955–56 campaign, however, Radio Free Europe's Polish staff is not discouraged.

The station is still receiving information and further responses from Polish listeners giving details about imprisoned relatives and camps. And, at the start of the third decade of the postwar era, there is still hope for foreigners imprisoned in the Soviet Union.

LISTING OF 56 SOVIET FORCED LABOR CAMPS

1. Lumbovka: Mother camp.

2 and 3. Lumbovka subcamps, Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Germans, Russians—8,000 altogether, including women and children; mining of precious metals, construction of airfields, roads.

4. Another subcamp, liquidated because of epidemic.

LOCATED ON KOLA PENINSULA

5. Saborovo: Poles, Russians, a few Germans—total 5,000; mining of precious metals, building construction, road repairs.

6. Wykhodnoy: Poles, Latvians—around 3,000, including women; repairs to airfields, camp services.

7. Noska: In uninhabited area; little known about it.

LOCATED IN NOVAYA ZEMLYA AREA

8, 9, 10, 11. Viermyensk Vorkuta, Izma, Shchugor, Ukhta: Poles, Germans—altogether 6,000; construction of railroads, oil well drilling; terrible conditions, high mortality.

12. Berezniki: Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Germans—total unknown; heavy industry, manufacture of machinery.

13. Sukhobezvodnoye: Poles, Russians, a majority of Germans, a small number of Hungarians—total 2,000; heavy and chemical industries; forest clearing.

14. UFA: Poles from here transferred in 1958, fate unknown; Hungarians, Ukrainians, Russians, a few Alsatians remain—total 5,000; iron ore mines.

15, 16, 17. Camps in Kirghizian steppes. Hungarians, Germans, Kalmuks, Russians—3,000 altogether; drilling of oil wells, railroad track maintenance.

18, 19, 20. Lemborskaya I, Lemborskaya II, Lemborskaya III: Poles, Hungarians, Germans, a small group of Finns—3,000 in each camp, including women and children; construction of factories, airfields, railroads, highways; oil well drilling, canal construction.

21. Ugor Kaukaski: Poles, Czechs, Jews—total 4,000; quarries, airfields.

22. Navyersk: Camp for the military. Nationalities unknown; 5,000 prisoners; quarrying, road construction, oil well drilling.

23. Tbilisi (Tiflis): Poles, Hungarians, Germans, Kalmuks, Russians—altogether 2,500, including women. Electric powerplant, airfields.

24. Voronyezh: Poles, Germans, many Turks; coal mining.

25. Dudina: Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Rumanians, Germans, including women—total 1,500; factories, road construction.

26. Kaluga: Poles, Baltic people, Russians—total 1,000; road construction, canal maintenance.

27. Yaroslavl: Not many Poles, mostly Hungarians, Germans—altogether 2,800; metallurgical factories, canal construction.

28. Kadluga: Camp for Soviet officers; lumbering.

29. Kamenets Podolsk: Poles, Hungarians, Ukrainians—altogether 1,500; construction of airfields, highways.

30. Pervomaysk: Small group of Poles, plus Hungarians, Russians—total 3,000 in 1960; factories, cement plants.

31. Krivoy Rog: Poles, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Germans, including women—altogether 2,400; cellulose factory, road construction.

32. Tobolsk: Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, including women; altogether 20 camps with 500 prisoners each; construction of railroads, highways; drilling of tunnels.

33. Enurmino: Estonians, Finns, Russians—altogether, 6,000; various occupations, including construction of tunnels, airports.

34. Kurgam: Poles, Estonians, Russians—altogether 5,000; road construction.

35. Uka: Poles, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Germans, Russians, mostly women—altogether 6,000; drilling of mountain tunnels, railroad construction.

36. Ivashka: Nationality and occupations same as Uka; about 10,000 prisoners.

37, 38, 39, 40. Existence and location confirmed but no more details available; many prisoners sent here never return; official explanation is that, after serving sentences, they decide to settle there for good. [Located on Kamchatka Peninsula.]

41, 42. Darya I and IV: Subcamps; some Poles but mostly Germans, Kirghizians, Russians—altogether 14,500; tunnel, air field construction.

43. Kara-Kum: Camp for the military; also some Hungarians, Germans; prisoners dig canals.

44. Karabash: Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians—altogether 3,500; factories, road construction.

45, 46. Alma-Ata, Tiyupa: No other details.

47, 48, 49. Subcamps. Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, many Ukrainians—altogether 16,000; cutting down forests; airport, factory, railroad, highway construction. [Subcamps Nos. 47 and 48 located in Lake Baykal area. Subcamp No. 49 located in Amur River area.]

50. Ulan-Ude: Only Russians since 1958—total 3,500; mining of precious metals, forest clearing, railroad track maintenance.

51, 52, 53, 54, 55. Bogoshi, 52 name unknown, Komsomolsk, Gandala, Wangar: Five camps under joint administration; no details concerning nationalities and number but reportedly many Germans, Hungarians, lesser number of Poles; coal mining, coke factory, electric powerplants, railroads, highways, home building, rocket launching site construction. [Subcamp No. 52 located in Amur River area.]

56. Voloshtchovka: Poles, Russians, Germans, and subcamp of 5,000 Bulgarians—altogether 18,000; coal mines, heavy and chemical industries, forest clearance, building of roads and airports.

STATUS OF NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would clarify the status of National Guard technicians as employees of the U.S. Government.

There are some 35,000 National Guard technicians across the country who receive a Federal paycheck but are neither Federal nor State employees for the purpose of participation in retirement plans, life insurance, and health benefits.

As full-time civilian employees, technicians perform vital duties such as aircraft maintenance, flight training, administration, and supply functions which are necessary to the success of our military operations. They must be prepared to stay with their unit if it is mobilized. For this reason, National Guard membership is required as a condition of technician employment and, as a result, these positions cannot be part of the Federal civil service although technicians are paid by the Federal Government.

One-third of the technicians are covered by State retirement systems. However, the remaining two-thirds have no retirement, life insurance, or health benefits coverage except that provided by social security—which in many cases is not as complete as it might be because of the retirement age required by National Guard membership.

The bill I am introducing today would give technicians status as full employees of the U.S. Government, conferring on them the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act. Technicians presently covered by a State retirement system may elect to retain that coverage in lieu of the Civil Service Retirement Act. All satisfactory service as a technician prior to the effective date of this bill shall be included in the determination of length of service for the purposes of calculating the rights and benefits of employees of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this legislation has the full support and approval of the Department of Defense. I hope that prompt hearings will be scheduled so that the long overdue clarification of status and well-deserved recognition may be given to National Guard technicians who have been essential to our military operations since 1948.

FREE RENT FOR THE POOR?

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WALKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said before this body and before the other body regarding the President's plan to offer subsidies to so-called poor people for rent. This plan, to me, only represents another attempt by the so-called Great Society to usurp every bit of individual initiative from the American people, making them increasingly more dependent upon the bureaucrats.

Many would lead us to believe that this program if enacted would be merely a trial. This is not the case as I see it. The American taxpayer was told that Operation Headstart, the Job Corps, and many other programs designed supposedly to help the poor were also test programs. Yet, every one of these plans have remained in operation, at exorbitant costs to the taxpayer, even though many of the administrators admit failure of the programs to accomplish the original goals.

I am of the strong opinion that this measure will only serve to further the inflationary trend of our economy. The proposal does not take into proper consideration that there is a wide difference in rental structures across the country. What may rent for $80 per month in one section of the country may cost twice that much to rent in another part. The mere fact that the Government has such a program will cause property owners to increase their rental rates. When this happens, the next step will undoubtedly be a promotion of a method of Federal rent controls by the administration.

Already, the administration is asking the American taxpayer to cut unnecessary spending in order to curb inflation.

It certainly appears to me that if we are to restrict individual spending, this body must first set the example by cutting nonessential spending by the Government.

I am certainly considerate of the needs of the poor across this Nation, but I do not believe that we should establish a precedent of paying a man's rent.

There have been many examples presented by my colleagues which point up the problems that this measure will present. I would urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this appropriation.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE NATIONAL HOLIDAY OF THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE, MAY 10

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate all Rumanians with a love of freedom in their hearts as they join in celebrating their 10th of May national holiday.

It is regrettable that the marking of this anniversary is suppressed in Rumania. But it is obvious to me that Rumanians and Americans of Rumanian descent will always swell with pride on May 10.

History has attached singular significance to the date, May 10, for Rumanians.

It was on May 10, 1866, that Prince Charles, of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen founded the Rumanian dynasty. It was on May 10, 1877, that the principality of Rumania in alliance with Russia defeated the Turks and cut her bonds with the Ottoman Empire. It was on May 10, 1881, that Charles I was crowned King of Rumania and the nation entered upon an era of prosperity that lasted for six decades.

My good wishes and those of all Americans go to those Rumanians who yearn for the day when they can throw off the yoke of Communist oppression.

It is surely a good omen that Rumanians who are captives in their homeland still celebrate the 10th of May holiday in their hearts although forced by their rulers to raise their flags on the Soviet anniversary of May 9.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT—NEW VERSION OF OLD SHELL GAME

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the important, if not vital, functions of a legislative committee and the Congress is to debate the issues, expose the advantages and disadvantages of each bill, and to subject legislation to the spotlight of public opinion.

When bills are railroaded through the Legislative Committee, the Rules Committee, and the House you can bet the bill is bad and will not stand up to the light of day, the analysis of committee study or exposure of the news media.

Only Columnist James J. Kilpatrick has taken the trouble or time to ask why all the pressure and rush on the Participation Sales Act of 1966, H.R. 14544.

His column in today's Evening Star tells part of the story about this bill that should be known by every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States.

This bill is fraudulent—to every taxpayer. The way this bill was handled, from the beginning, degrades and demeans the committee system of Congress, the Rules Committee—if they report this bill out tomorrow—and the Congress itself.

I suggest that we withhold action on this bill until we have had a proper committee hearing and until one or two more reporters read the bill and report their findings and observations to the American public. At least one veterans' association was pressured or hoodwinked into supporting the bill before they had even seen the bill. Congress and the U.S. public will resent being hoodwinked. This bill will come back to haunt those who acquiesce to its passage without considering the consequences.

Under unanimous consent I insert the column of Mr. Kilpatrick who has keenly analyzed this bill:

New Version of Old Shell Game Is Charged

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The slickest skin game of the old county fairs, at least in the gullible South, was the skin game known as the old shell game. It flourished for years, until some educated cops came along. They put the thimbleriggers on the run and the shell game all but disappeared.

Last week it came back to town. You will find it, if you look fast enough, in H.R. 14544, which came shooting out of the House Banking and Currency Committee like a little green pea under three walnut shells. This is President Johnson's sensational gimmick for turning $4.2 billion in Federal assets into $4.2 billion in Federal liabilities, all without adding a penny to the Federal deficit. Or liabilities into assets. It is all the same thing. Come one, come all, and try your skill. The hand in truth is quicker than the eye.

Johnson sketched the general outlines of his Sales Participation Act of 1966 back in January, but it wasn't until Wednesday, April 20, that the bill turned up in the House. Then presto. On Thursday, April 21, with the ink still wet on the printed bill, Representative Wright Patman, Democrat, of Texas, scheduled 3 hours of hearings. Only administration witnesses were called. By a party line vote of 22 to 3, with 8 disgusted Republicans not voting, the bill came bombing out. A classic committee report followed on April 25. And last week the White House was proceeding in terrorem to get the bill whipped through the Rules Committee for an immediate vote on the floor.

The situation has its funny aspects, which is doubtless part of the game.

On the surface, this is a financing scheme by which the Government would "sell off some assets." But the trick is that no assets would really be sold off.

The committee's majority report declares, deadpan, that the plan would "carry forward the objective of substituting private for public credit in funding the loan programs" of various Federal agencies. But by its own terms, the bill provides for continued Federal subsidies to make the private creditors secure.

The sponsors of this legislation are shouting from the housetops that this "participation" plan is truly nothing new—that it is in fact an old plan, devised by President Eisenhower in 1959. But when Eisenhower undertook to sell off some Federal loans, he sold them off in straightforward transactions. Johnson's dazzling runaround is something else entirely.

Under terms of this legislation, the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, would sell certificates of participation in "pools of assets" to be provided from the outstanding loans of various Federal agencies. Up to $4.2 billion in such certificates could be sold, provided the market would absorb them, and why shouldn't the market absorb them? These handsome instruments would cost the taxpayers a rate of 5.4 or 5.5 percent, at least half a point higher than the rate on regular Treasury borrowings.

As the outraged Republicans point out in their minority report, this 0.5 percent represents an expense of $5 million a year on each $1 billion of participations sold. If the entire authority were exercised, the cost to the people would approximate $21 million a year. Over an average maturity of 10 years, these higher outlays for interest would amount to something in excess of $200 million.

Yet the cost of this scheme is the least of the objections to it. The purpose of this legislation is not to promote private credit. The purpose is to conceal a $4.2 billion deficit by entering the certificate sales as a "negative expenditure." Where has the deficit gone? It lies under the third shell on the left. If this maneuver works for 1967, we may never set eyes on a deficit again, for Federal agencies have $33 billion in such assets to slide in Fannie Mae's direction.

By the same token, as the Republicans remark, the Federal debt limit can be subjected to hocus-pocus dominocus. Now, you see it, now you don't. If the proceeds of these participations are applied on paper to debt reduction, the Government's total debt will not have been reduced in fact. The debt will simply have been transferred to the debt of FNMA, which is outside the statutory limit. In the course of this vanishing act, Government credit would be used, if indirectly, to effect a reduction in the Federal debt. This isn't done with dollars; it's done with mirrors.

There were signs last week that the administration's razzle-dazzle might prove to be self-defeating. Missouri's influential Representative Richard Bolling, a key man on House Rules, was balking hard. He describes the scheme flatly as "deceptive." Without a lot of sober persuasion, he won't be won around.

The administration's top persuaders have been summoned to the battle. With the President's prestige at stake, they may win in the end, but their problem is that Members of the House and Senate stand a cut above the rubes of the county midway.

SUPPRESS JET AIRCRAFT NOISE

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WYDLER**. Mr. Speaker, to those who suffer the agonies of jet aircraft noise, there is no matter more important that calls for Federal action.

In the fight against jet aircraft noise, action speaks louder than words.

A few days ago in Congress, I fought to get action for the people who suffer in "Jet Alley."

I tried to amend the NASA authorization bill to set aside—not add, just set aside—$20 million for a crash development program to reduce jet noise. It was one-half of 1 percent of the $4 billion plus made available for the flights to the Moon, to Venus, to Mars, and for other activities taking place millions of miles in space. The administration fought and defeated this proposal on the grounds the funds could not be spared.

The administration opposition, after so much recent lip service to the cause of jet noise reduction, is hard to understand. It will be harder for those living in "Jet Alley" to forget.

My proposal was a sound one based on years of experience in Washington. I am a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee which oversees the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. My subcommittee supervises the aeronautics office. In questioning the Director of that office during hearings, he testified that with $20 million his program could move from pure research work into engineering and development. He indicated that the preliminary studies had been made and he needed a go ahead. Subsequent private conversations confirmed this fact.

My fight has stirred some activity and wrung some concessions from administration spokesmen but the public should not be fooled into considering administration talk a substitute for action.

In fairness, I must report that the entire congressional delegation from Queens and all of Suffolk, in bipartisan unity, supported the amendment. I was disappointed that my Nassau County colleagues did not support me although the problem in their districts is as bad as in mine. They said we should wait for further hearings, wait for further reports, wait for someone else to act.

Congressional hearings have been held in the past. Scores of bills have been pending for years. Commissions have come and gone. Studies have been made and filed. Every excuse for lack of action was repeated during debate, including the cry "We need every penny for space" and "Let someone else do it."

It is clear to me that NASA is the logical agency to do this work. Further hearings on this are a waste of precious time. The head of the Federal Aviation Agency refers to NASA as a primary source of information on research.

I have filed bills. I have studied the problem. I have even held hearings on the problem in my district.

I am convinced that the necessary ingredient is action now. The funds I fought for would have started the development of a prototype quiet jet this summer.

The defeat of my proposal delays definite action for at least another year.

In the fight against jet noise, there is no substitute for action. How long must the suffering people wait? How long, indeed?

CIVIL WAR ANECDOTES

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I have addressed the House regarding the Grand Army of the Republic and the Civil War. It has been my hope that these remarks might serve as some reminder of our obligation to our veterans who have fought not just the Civil War battles but in every conflict from the Revolution to Vietnam. I also would hope that we would never grow so calloused or apathetic that we would forget our wonderful heritage and our debt to those who forged our way of life for us.

The Civil War touched the lives of virtually every family in the 1860's and I conclude this series with additional anecdotes and fittingly, I believe, some sidelights on the role of the wartime President, Abraham Lincoln.

One significant event at the close of the Civil War paled into insignificance because it was overshadowed by a traumatic incident of far greater national importance. The Federal army was in a process of recovering prisoners of war when in April of 1865 the *Sultana* was ordered from Cairo to Vicksburg to transport these men home. Lee surrendered at Appomattox on April 9 but hostilities continued in some sectors until April 26 when Gen. Joseph E. Johnston surrendered to Gen. William T. Sherman, at Greensboro, N.C. On April 23, the *Sultana* left Vicksburg with 2,300 passengers including civilians, released prisoners, mules, and 100 hogsheads of sugar for ballast.

A typical sidewheel packet, the *Sultana* had a legal load of 376. Considerations of this type were shunted aside, however, as 1,866 Federal soldiers and 35 officers who had recently been freed from Cahaba, Ala., and the infamous Georgia prisons of Macon and Andersonville were anxious to get home. The boat exploded on April 27 and some 1,500 persons lost their lives. Two Wooster men, Phillip Horn and Otto Bardon, were among the survivors.

Three Wayne County companies were in the 102d Regiment which had fought and lost at Clarksville, Tenn. Many of these men, who had been prisoners, were on board and lost their lives. Bardon gave a vivid account of the disaster. Typical of many Civil War incidents, historians still argue about the cause. Common suspicions favored the theory that some Confederate sympathizer placed dynamite in the coal bunker. The Nation was in a state of mourning for the martyred President who had been assassinated less than 2 weeks prior to this tragedy and the *Sultana* disaster received little attention.

Typical of the many contested historical accounts of the Civil War battles is the famous or infamous—depending on how you look at it—raid of General Morgan into Guernsey County. Russell Booth, Jr., Cambridge attorney, has established a reputation as one of the county's Civil War authorities. He has an interesting collection of slides which he uses in his many speeches delivered on Civil War history. He has discounted the theory of many, including the Ohio Historical Society, that Morgan's raiders went from Old Washington to Hendrysburg and back to Antrim. He believes it is more logical to assume that the main Morgan force never went into Belmont County but proceeded out what is now Route 22 through Harrison County into Columbiana County.

A monument stands at West Point near East Liverpool, where Morgan was captured on July 26, 1863. Morgan was lodged in the Ohio Penitentiary and many interesting stories center around this famous prisoner. There is hardly a single locality which does not have some type of good-natured controversy about specifics of a Civil War campaign or incident.

Elinor Taylor, columnist for the Wooster Daily Record, has pointed out that the statue standing on the public square was made by Alcock & Donald, Wooster granite firm in the post-Civil War era. It was made entirely of Richmond granite and carved by Capt. Forbes Alcock who took nearly 1½ years on his product. It stands 22 feet high and weighs nearly 30 tons.

One of the legendary Wayne County figures who towered as a giant in that era was Aquilla Wiley, a colonel with the 41st Regiment, OVI. He enlisted in April 1861, and lost a leg in the war. He won fame and praise for his leadership in the fierce battle which raged on a small ridge between Chattanooga and Mission Ridge. He was personally commended by Generals Grant and Thomas. Born in Mechanicsburg, Pa., he moved with his parents to Reedsburg in 1852 and was admitted to the bar in 1857. He became a general in 1863 and was one of Wayne County's leading citizens, a real log cabin product.

Russell Booth is a member of Cambridge's famous city band which has been in existence for more than 120 years. He recalls one performance which the boys would rather forget about. Three Confederate soldiers are buried in the cemetery at Old Washington. A monument was erected in the middle forties to their memory, a very fitting gesture. The Cambridge City band was to render a few selections at the dedication. Mr. Booth, a band member, recalls vividly the last minute instructions that the band would make its entrance to the tune of "Dixie." Safe enough, most thought, even though they had no sheet music. An embarrassing moment, however, when some musicians started playing the familiar melody and others started playing the introduction.

Mr. Booth recalls:

> It was pretty terrible, and it took us quite a while to get back in unison.

Every band is allowed at least one bad song but the spirit was certainly right.

The Civil War actually marked a turning point in military strategy. Possibly under some false notion of vanity, it had always been considered to be shameful to take cover. The war was marked by disastrous charges in the open field with hand-to-hand fighting. Painting after painting of the Civil War era depicts picturesque but grotesque battles in which men were locked in battle with opposing lines but a few hundred feet apart. Thousands died as a result of this type of warfare. The men and the officers soon learned. At the end of the war, during the long siege of Petersburg and Richmond, earthworks had become so extensive that the fighting had settled down to a stalemate foreshadowing that of the World War I trenches and no-man's land. David C. Pecht of Wooster was an enlistee in the 16th Ohio on November 14, 1861. He kept a diary which recorded such a disastrous charge. He wrote:

> DECEMBER 29, 1862.—Our brigade was ordered to charge the enemy's works—16th Ohio to support the 54th Indiana but they failed and we took the advance. Got within 50 yards of the works. They opened out with grape and canister from left, right, and front of our regiment killing, wounding, and capturing 400. Captain killed of Company I, second lieutenant and 21 privates captured, 4 of whom were seriously wounded, since died.

The 107th Regiment, the patriotic German outfit, was formed at Cleveland with one full company from Wooster. Their first encounter was at Chancellorsville where more than 200 were killed. They moved on to Gettysburg where more than 425 of the remaining 550 men were killed, wounded, or captured. Many companies were virtually wiped out. It was a brutal war with a great deal of foolish maneuvering which sacrificed many lives.

Wayne countians were torn between their duty to obey the law and their conscience which told them slavery was wrong. The fugitive slave law, passed in 1850, made it a crime to harbor a runaway slave. The Quakers, Wesleyan Methodists, and Abolitionists were chief among the "lawbreakers" who operated the underground railroad. E. H. Hauenstein, former editor of the Daily Record, did a great deal of research on Wayne County's role in the railroad. Ohio's geographical location made it the main artery in the system which channeled Negroes out of the South into safety. There were four stations near Shreve, among which was the farm now owned by M. C. Ebright, former county commissioner. One of the chief agents in aiding the slaves was Dr. W. S. Battles. His farm, northeast of Millbrook, was one of the chief stations. One active station was within the city on Pittsburgh Avenue at the home of Eugene Pardee, a well-known lawyer.

From Wooster the route led north through the vicinity of Golden Corners. There, on what was known as the David Armstrong Farm, a man named James Rose persisted in openly aiding the slaves who had reached this point in their travels. He is said to have transported Negroes in his uncovered wagon during daylight hours as he took them to Lodi where they were deposited at Burr's Tavern for further transportation.

One of the stories which has come down through the years involves the Snure family in Salt Creek Township. The underground railway came north to Wayne County from Millersburg. One day, slave hunters appeared at Snure's front door. Faced with a written demand to permit search, he invited them in, telling them it was the hour for family worship. He read the entire 119th Psalm, longest in the bible, and then concluded with a lengthy and sonorous prayer. In the meantime, one of the members of the family had spirited the slaves to a new hiding place. Wayne countians were hotly divided on this issue.

No President ever maintained such a close relation with his soldiers as did Abraham Lincoln. The Army was far from a professional one, at that time, without the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Pentagon, and the multibillion-dollar defense-military complex which now is a familiar pattern in the United States. He even advocated that soldiers bring their grievances to him. He spent a great deal of time at the front and often mused that this was the one place where office-seekers and politicians failed to follow him. The 1864 presidential vote indicated he had the overwhelming support of his soldiers. While carrying the North by only 200,000 votes, he carried the Union armies by a 4-to-1 margin. The soldier vote probably kept Abe Lincoln in the Presidency.

He well recalled the first time he met Gen. William T. Sherman, then a colonel commanding the well-organized New York 69th. He addressed the troops and gave his usual speech that he was the Commander in Chief and intended that all men would get a fair break, and so forth. As soon as he had said this, an officer pushed his way forward and explained that on that very morning Colonel Sherman had caught him leaving for New York without permission, and had threatened him by saying he would shoot him if he persisted in going. Pale and angry, he related this incident to the President with the troops looking on and Colonel Sherman at his side. Lincoln looked at him, then at the dour Sherman who said nothing. "Threatened to shoot you?" Lincoln asked.

"Yes, sir, he threatened to shoot me," the officer replied. Lincoln leaned over awkwardly and said in a loud, exaggerated stage whisper:

> Well, if I were you, and he threatened to shoot, I would not trust him for I believe he would do it.

The troops exploded in laughter and the humiliated officer sneaked away.

On one occasion, Lincoln wrote:

> I personally wish Jacob R. Freese, of New Jersey, to be appointed a colonel of a colored regiment—and this regardless of whether he can tell the exact shade of Julius Caesar's hair.

Lincoln felt a great compassion for the American volunteer soldier who was not a military man at heart. He won their hearts and they knew that a genuine request would get compassionate consideration. He helped those soldiers who were stranded, mustered out soldiers who were having trouble getting pay, lovers who needed to get married to legalize a birth and young men who were sentenced to death for desertion or sleeping on watch. He was responsible for many personal pardons. In the case of a homesick teenager, miserable in the strangeness and terror of his first days in the Army—first days which often were met with battle, not the training camp which the modern enlistee sees—he wrote:

> I don't see that shooting him will do him any good.

In the case of another death sentence he wrote to Secretary Stanton:

> There is a mistake somewhere in this case. Will the Secretary of the Army correct it, or else explain to me wherein the hitch is?

There was no question that the war took a turn for the worse and discipline became a problem after the initial thrust had worn off. Men were summarily tried and shot for sleeping on sentry duty or for being AWOL. Some described the war as an "unbroken funeral procession." In 1864, the Union army lost 55,000 men in the Wilderness campaign alone. Many desertions followed. It was probably in that spirit that Lincoln defended the cavalier treatment accorded Clement Vallandigham. He was tried and sentenced to imprisonment for deliberate propaganda against the Nation, a rather nebulous charge. Vallandigham had been urging an immediate armistice and the seeking of an international conference—a little like the peace bloc in our current Vietnam war, it would seem. Interestingly enough, it was in Mount Vernon that Vallandigham made his inflammatory remarks which led to General Burnside's orders for his arrest at Dayton on the following day.

To the criticism he received on his handling of this matter, Lincoln replied that the ex-Congressman was not arrested for using his right of free speech but because by hampering enlistments and encouraging Union soldiers not to fight, he was striking at the life of the Nation. He stated:

> Must I shoot a simple-minded soldier boy who deserts, while I must not touch a hair of a wily agitator who induces him to desert? This is nonetheless injurious when effected by getting a father, or brother, or friend into a public meeting and there working upon his feelings, till he is persuaded to write the soldier boy that he is fighting in a bad cause, for a wicked administration of a contemptible government, too weak to arrest and punish him if he should desert. I think that in such a case to silence the agitator and save the boy is not only constitutional but withal a great mercy.

Not exactly what the American Civil Liberties Union would applaud but as pointed out before, this was a decade of strange paradoxes. Lincoln was the balance wheel in this critical era and we can thank divine providence for his patience, wisdom and understanding. It is hard to contemplate what would have happened during this time had we not been blessed with a man of the caliber of Abraham Lincoln.

The final and tragic side of Lincoln's relations with his soldiers is evidenced by the many letters of sympathy which he personally penned to mothers, wives, and survivors. Framed in a hall at Oxford University is one of his famous letters which, Mr. Speaker, seems to me to be an appropriate reminder on which to bring these remarks to a close. The following letter would seem to sum up the hard struggle of the Civil War as no one else ever could:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, November 21, 1864.

To Mrs. BIXBY,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which would attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Yours very sincerely and respectfully,
A. LINCOLN.

The altar of freedom still requires the sacrifice of an alert and dedicated citizenry, the military might which is found in our Armed Forces and the relentless struggle of those who would keep aglow the light of liberty. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that in recalling the heroic contribution of our forefathers we can gain the needed will to be ever worthy of their sacrifices for us.

MEMORIAL FROM THE ALL NATIONS LOCAL UNION NO. 1200, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting to the House a memorial from the All Nations Local Union No. 1200, United Steelworkers of America, by its president, Al Lebbano of Canton, Ohio, who complains that this memorial was sent in November to the following officials and has not yet been acknowledged:

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, Washington, D.C.; Walter B. Lewis, Director, Federal Programs Division, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.; and Mr. George Holland, Director of Compliance, EEOC, Washington, D.C.

The memorial reads as follows:

I, the undersigned president of local union No. 1200, United Steelworkers of America, do hereby charge the President of these United States in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in that he violated the civil rights of all steelworkers by his intervention into the steel negotiations, of which consummation came in September 6, 1965.

This "arm-bending" pressure tactics resulted in the steelworkers getting far less than what we would have received had we been free to bargain in the tradition of the "Yankee trader."

Every steelworker in the United States, and Canada, along with every other citizen while cognizant of the fighting in Vietnam, and of, inflationary problems, finds it hard to believe that these are bona fide reasons for intervention as every other industry realized a far greater settlement package than the steelworker. Our rights in the areas of incentives, civil rights within plants and local unions, and safety conditions within plants and other working conditions, have been denied by the hurried-up procedure of nonthinking or selfish thinking, of Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of these United States.

Therefore, I seek redress, through every Federal civil rights agency, for answers as to how to compensate our incentive workers, who daily have, and are, losing much money; for a law enacted by Congress restricting Presidential intervention into free, democratic bargainings, for a full-scale investigation by the Labor Department into unsafe conditions wrought by obsolete plants and equipment supposedly corrected by tax rebates to correct this situation.

THE NEED FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE CIA

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which will provide for a special committee to study the operations, activities, and expenditures of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I am concerned about the blanket of secrecy which keeps the operations and expenditures of the Central Intelligence Agency not only from the general public, but from their duly authorized representatives in Congress. I recognize the need for security, and my resolution therefore provides that the hearings of the special committee be conducted in private. However, in a democracy, there is no excuse for distrusting representatives of the people or denying them access to basic information.

My resolution authorizes and directs the Speaker of the House to appoint a special bipartisan committee of seven House Members. It provides that among the members shall be at least two members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and two members of the House Appropriations Committee.

There is no reason why the total amount of money spent annually by the CIA should be unknown to Members of Congress. I would suppose that in the House of Representatives there are no more than 5 to 10 members who know how much money that agency is spending each year. More important, we do not know how effective the organization is nor even what it is doing. Because of the vital impact of the CIA on the international scheme, the fullest possible congressional scrutiny is in the public interest.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, 90 years ago, on May 10, 1877, the people of Rumania declared their independence. For centuries, Rumanians had lived under the yoke of the Ottoman Turks, who had dominated the life of the Rumanian communities and had exacted tributes, imposed rulers and carried out reprisals when local uprisings occurred. But in the 18th and 19th centuries, Turkish power began to wane. A reawakened national consciousness, the intervention of foreign powers, and the weakening of the hold of the Turkish administration in the Balkans and Eastern Europe all contributed to the achievement of the Rumanian goal of independence in 1877.

The newfound independence of the Rumanian nation was precarious, however. To the north and the east lay a powerful and expansionist neighbor. The designs of the rulers of Imperial Russia were no mystery to the Rumanians. Several times prior to independence, the Russians had seized on the excuse of protecting the Rumanians in order to occupy and to exploit Rumanian territory. In 1877, as the Rumanians declared their independence, they joined with the Russians to achieve a substantial victory over the Turks. But the Russians seized and held southern Bessarabia, and this seizure was ratified by the Treaty of Berlin of 1878.

The Rumanians regained Bessarabia following World War I, but the territorial ambitions of the czars were taken up and expanded by the new Communist rulers of Russia. Following the signing of the Soviet-Nazi pact of 1939, the Soviet Union seized Bessarabia and northern Bukovina. As World War II drew to a close, all of Rumania was invaded, and Soviet armies and commissars stayed long enough to insure the installation of a regime that would maintain Rumania within the Soviet orbit.

Today, Communists still rule in Rumania. But there is doubt whether the country remains an integral and submissive part of the vast Soviet empire. And this should not be a matter of wonderment. For Rumania, throughout its history has always had close ties with the West. Indeed, Rumania was first settled by Roman legions during the first century A.D. Throughout the centuries, the language and culture of these Westerners have influenced Rumanian life. And today, the Rumanian language is still in some respects closer to Latin than is Italian.

Thus we should not be surprised that Rumanian leaders are asserting some measure of independence vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, that they are seeking to build a modern industrial nation that is not enmeshed in regional economic plans drawn up in the Soviet Union, and that they are gradually expanding economic and cultural ties with the nations of Western Europe and the United States. Looking at these developments, it becomes quite obvious that the historical consciousness of a people and its traditions could not be wiped out by even one of the cruelest of postwar tyrannies manipulated from the Kremlin.

The Rumanian people have not yet regained their independence. But the first steps on a long road have been taken. On this 10th of May, an anniversary held dear by Rumanians everywhere, I would like to affirm that it is my hope that other steps on the road to independence can and will follow.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, May 10 commemorates the original independence of the Rumanian nation. Rumania's Communist regime has sought to make the Rumanian people forget May 10 and celebrate only the day when the Soviets defeated the Nazis. But the Rumanian people cannot and have not forgotten their great history.

For May 10 marks the anniversary of three great events. In 1866 the Rumanian people acquired the right to elect as their sovereign a member of a Western royal family. On May 10, 1877, the Rumanian nation proclaimed its total independence from its former Turkish rulers. And on May 10, 1888, Charles I was crowned the first king of Rumania.

After 1877 Rumania enjoyed several decades of independence. But today 20 million Rumanians live under a Communist system. May 10 cannot be openly celebrated. The Rumanian people will have to remember their national holiday quietly, in their hearts.

We in the United States can join the Rumanian people in remembering this day. Americans of Rumanian descent have contributed richly to our American heritage. On this occasion I should like to join with the thousands of Americans who are of Rumanian ancestry in expressing a fervent hope that Rumania will again live under freedom.

FEDERAL AID TO AIRPORTS

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues again to the vast significance and necessity of the Federal aid to airports program. This program has been a great assistance to interstate commerce, recreation, and in the many sparsely settled areas of our Nation are in the actual development of the area. We are the most mobile people in the world. A great deal of this mobility is due to the airport facilities which have been built and improved under this program in the past. Our future mobility is dependent largely upon the continuation of this type of program. The State of Montana and its widely scattered communities are extremely anxious to continue upon this program. I wish to enter into the record at this point a resolution passed by the Montana Airport Management Association at their annual meeting in Billings, Mont. This resolution was communicated to me by Mr. Robert S. Michael, executive secretary of the Montana Airport Management Association. It will demonstrate the forcefulness and degree of interest which these citizens show in airport development.

A RESOLUTION BY THE MONTANA AIRPORT MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

Whereas the continuous operation and development of public airports at all cities and communities across the Nation, and certainly including those in Montana, is of vital interest to all citizens; and

Whereas the costs of providing airport facilities and such improvements as are required to keep pace with the changing demands of aviation technology are expensive and sometimes a serious drain on the taxpayers ability; and

Whereas the Federal Government through the Federal Aviation Agency in realization of this fact has authorized grants-in-aid to various communities for the further development of their airports; and

Whereas in a combined effort, the American Association of Airport Executives, the Airport Operators Council, and the National Association of State Aviation Officials have compiled and made public a report indicating the intentions of many communities across the Nation to make, over the next 4 years, substantial capital investments in their airports and their announced shortage of a significant percentage of the funds needed to provide these improvements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Montana Airport Management Association at its annual meeting of April 15, 1966. That each member of Montana's congressional delegation be advised of the Nation's airports' needs, and those of Montana in particular, and that these individuals be requested to give wholehearted support to the passage of S. 3096 and H.R. 13665 for extending the Federal aid to airport program for an additional 3 years, beginning with fiscal year 1968, at a minimum annual level of $75 million; be it further

Resolved, That these same members are requested to take whatever steps there are available to impress the current administration with the severe consequences and gravity of withholding $21 million for grants-in-aid to airports previously appropriated for fiscal 1967 by the proper legislative process.

EAST GLACIER AIRPORT

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to again call to the attention of this body that there is pending before House and Senate committees, bills which would authorize further funds for the construction of airports in close proximity to national parks. These bills have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the FAA, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Defense. Not only would these airports add greatly to the recreational potential of the areas involved, but they would extend and add to the safety of civilian aviation and generally promote interstate commerce. I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point the following item from the minutes of the Montana State Fish and Game Department as they were forwarded to me by Mr. Frank H. Dunkle, State fish and game director. This expresses the support of the State of Montana, Department of Fish and Game, for the proposed East Glacier Airport, which is one of the many airports to benefit from this assistance.

MONTANA STATE FISH AND GAME COMMISSION,
APRIL 19, 1966

Proposed Glacier Airport. Mr. Tom Judge, Helena, the sales and advertising manager for Glacier Park, Inc., advised the commission of pending Federal legislation to provide funds for airports at East Glacier and Jackson Hole. Mr. Judge brought forth the following information: Glacier National Park is one of the world's outstanding scenic attractions. It was visited last year by 847,104 people from every State in the Union and many foreign countries. Because of its location in the northernmost region of the United States, it is inconvenient for many people to visit this famous national park. An airport near Glacier would permit thousands of people to visit the park from all parts of the United States. The airport, completed near Yellowstone Park last year, attracted 20,000 people in the first 3 months of operation, which is nothing compared to the traffic this airport will receive when the general public becomes aware of the advantages a park airport provides for tourists and vacationers, and many of the visitors to Yellowstone Park would also visit Glacier National Park. This air facility will also increase tourist trade at Yellowstone National Park. This airport will provide for emergency operations and administrative needs of the National Park Service and the Forest Service.

Mr. Judge requested the commission's support of the Montana installation.

Motion, Mr. Staves: "I move to endorse legislation authorizing and appropriating funds for construction of a modern air facility near Glacier National Park, and that the director so notify the Montana congressional delegation, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Department of Interior." Seconded by Mr. Waintz.

Carried.

FORD FOUNDATION SUPPORTS AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION PROGRAMS

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an event of considerable significance to those of us in Government took place here in Washington recently. But for some reason, the event occurred without much notice.

I refer to the announcement that the Ford Foundation had granted nearly $3 million to the American Political Science Association to operate four public service programs, during the next 5 years.

Activities to be financed under the grants are a State legislative service program for newly-elected State legislators, a public affairs reporting awards program for journalists, the congressional fellowship program and State and local internship programs.

These programs are very worthwhile, and they deserve the support of those of us in Congress as well as others who are interested in Government. The American Political Science Association and the Ford Foundation are to be commended for making these programs possible.

Many Members of Congress are familiar with one of these four programs in particular—the congressional fellowship program. We have had congressional fellows working in our offices, and we can testify regarding the contribution the program makes both to the congressional fellows and to the Members of Congress in whose offices they work.

Mr. Speaker, so that all of our colleagues will have an opportunity to learn more about the four public service programs, I ask unanimous consent that the press release announcing the grants to the American Political Science Association be printed as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

FORD FOUNDATION ANNOUNCES NEARLY $3 MILLION IN GRANTS FOR FOUR AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION PROGRAMS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Ford Foundation today announced nearly $3 million in grants to the American Political Science Association for operation of public service programs over the next 5 years.

The individual grants and activities which they will support are: $690,000 for orientation of newly elected State legislators under a State legislative service program; $750,000 for a public affairs reporting awards program, including seminars and fellowships for political journalists; $775,000 for continuation of the congressional fellowship program, which brings political scientists and journalists to Washington, D.C., for study of and work with Congress; and, $770,000 for State and local internship programs organized and conducted by university departments of political science.

Legislative service programs will be developed in about five States each year. Designed to introduce incoming members to the workings of their legislature, each program will include a series of seminars and the preparation of a handbook on legislative practices, organization and traditions. The association cosponsored similar programs for newly elected members of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1963 and 1965.

The grant for reporting awards provides for continuation and expansion of a program which has been operated by the association since 1956. Its purpose is to encourage and reward excellence in public affairs reporting at the State and local level. About 60 such awards will be made each year. Winners will be selected on the basis of regional competitions and will attend 1-week seminars on State and local government.

Additionally, the grant provides for establishment of a new fellowship program for newsmen. On the basis of a national competition, the association each year will award 12 fellowships for 6 months to one year of study in colleges and universities of the successful candidates' choice. Generally these awards will be made to reporters of public affairs who wish to develop new techniques for gathering and reporting the news or who wish to improve their knowledge in a particular field.

Sponsored by the association since 1953, the congressional fellowship program brings about 16 journalists and political scientists to Washington each year for 9 months of firsthand observation of Congress. Congressional fellows are chosen in a national competition and serve as aids to Senators and Representatives or work on the staffs of congressional committees.

The purpose of this fellowship experience is to improve teaching, research and reporting on Congress and the legislative process. Participants attend educational seminars conducted by the association throughout the period they are serving in congressional offices.

The State and local internship program is designed to establish internship as a permanent feature of graduate-level instruction in political science. Individual university departments of political science will submit proposals for operation of internship programs to the association, which will provide funds and technical assistance to support them. Under this program, the internships may be in State legislatures, with administrators at the State, city, and county levels, or in State and local party organizations.

The American Political Science Association is the major professional organization in the United States devoted to the study and development of the art and science of government. Supported by about 14,000 individual and institutional members and by grants from a growing number of private foundations, the association carries on impartial research projects, conducts educational programs for political scientists, journalists, and public officials and generally brings together theory and practice in the broad fields of government, politics, and public policy.

Membership in the association, founded 63 years ago, is made up chiefly of political scientists who are teaching in the Nation's colleges and universities. Also included among members are lawyers, businessmen, journalists, Federal, State, and local government officials and Members of Congress.

The association's headquarters is in the Political Science Building, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

INTERAMA—A DREAM COME TRUE

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 Dr. Irving E. Muskat, chairman of the Inter-American Center Authority, addressed the Inter-American Bar Association here in Washington.

At that time, I was on my way to El Salvador, Central America, for rest and discussions with that Government during the Easter recess. I believe my trip was helpful to Interama.

Dr. Muskat has proven he is truly a remarkable man and has done much to further Interama and make it what it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I incorporate in the body the introductory remarks of my administrative assistant, Mr. James F. Southerland, and Dr. Muskat's speech before that association for my colleagues consideration:

REMARKS OF JAMES F. SOUTHERLAND, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER, IN INTRODUCING DR. IRVING E. MUSKAT AT A LUNCHEON OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, APRIL 12, 1966

Congressman PEPPER deeply regrets that he couldn't be with you today.

I think you all know of his interest in the Inter-American Bar and its affairs. However, as your president has pointed out, he is on his way to El Salvador for a few days of rest.

A Congressman has really two choices to get away from the telephone. He either gets out of the country or gets defeated. We're very happy that the Congressman for the first time in 30 years, does not have opposition either in the primary or the general election, so he can afford to take this time for a rest.

He wanted me to express to you his deep appreciation for you giving this opportunity to the chairman of the Inter-American Authority to speak. This is a project in the Congressman's district—maybe it had something to do with the fact that he is unopposed, that it has finally been approved. But he began working on it some 25 years ago. When he introduced the first legislation for Federal participation in this project, he was in the Senate and then he was representing the whole State rather than the district in which it's in.

The project has had a lot of people interested in it over the years. But to put together the package which was necessary to make this project go, required the man who is your speaker today. He came to this country as a child in the early part of the century. They tell me he doesn't know what his birth date really was. But he picked Christmas Day as his birthday—which I think is symbolic. He picked a very good day and all through his work with Interama—I think through his whole career—he has demanded quality as he did when he chose his birthday.

This is one of the things that has made this project go: the insistence your speaker has had on making this a quality, meaningful project. And I think when he speaks to you, you'll understand just how valid his interest has been in this area.

He grew up in the Midwest. He got his degree in chemistry when he was 19. He received his Ph. D. from the University of Chicago at 22. He did some teaching; he did a great deal of research; he became very successful in devising new plastics, including those for holding together glass fibers, which made possible fiberglass boats. He formed two companies along the way—very successfully.

He decided to retire and concentrate on research in 1953. He went to Miami and 6 years later he was appointed as a member of the Inter-American Authority. In the meantime he had persuaded the banks in the area that they could finance a bond issue that was necessary to help develop Miami Airport—which is, I think, again significant of the man that as a newcomer to the community he showed some of the oldest business heads of the community how they could do a job to help their community. This, I think, led to his appointment to the Inter-American Authority and to his appointment later as chairman. He's brought this project along and it's a great privilege to introduce him so he can tell you about it—Dr. Muskat.

STATEMENT BY DR. IRVING E. MUSKAT, CHAIRMAN, INTER-AMERICAN CENTER AUTHORITY, BEFORE THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 12, 1966

I am deeply honored to have this opportunity to address this assemblage of members of the Inter-American Bar Association.

I am especially appreciative, because I am mindful of the fact that by your membership in this organization, you have specialized knowledge of inter-American affairs and will grasp the significance of a program which will build a unique bridge of understanding and friendship to improve our relations and strengthen our ties with the American Republics. Because of your inter-American orientation as an organization, and as informed individuals, you can make an important contribution to this project.

I also want to take the opportunity to acknowledge on behalf of the Inter-American Center Authority, our sincere appreciation to Representative Claude Pepper for arranging the invitation to address this distinguished gathering. Representative Pepper has been in the vanguard for many years in his helpful leadership in creating the project I will discuss today.

As chairman of the Inter-American Center Authority, an agency of the State of Florida, my associates on the authority and I are responsible for establishing the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center—better known as Interama—in Miami, gateway of the Americas.

Interama will be the world's first permanent international living exposition. Its theme is "The American Way of Life—Progress With Freedom." Interama will proclaim what the Americas have achieved without the sacrifice of civil liberties and individual freedom—within the framework of democratic institutions. Through dynamic exhibits, events and live performances that are constantly revised and updated, Interama will bring together, under freedom the governments and industries of the Americas in a spirit of good will and understanding and provide a continuous exchange of cultures, ideas and people.

The spirit and substance of Interama's goals will parallel and support the economic and social goals of the Alliance for Progress. Many fine accomplishments have been achieved since the Alliance program was inaugurated 5 years ago, but major and complex tasks still lie ahead.

Interama will provide a common meeting ground for the Americas where people and ideas will meet and products and goods will be exchanged—to help speed the goals of the Alliance. The charter for the Alliance recommended that the American republics "spread among the peoples of America, knowledge of each other and of the solutions they are finding to their problems." Interama will help to achieve that objective.

The inter-American cultural and trade center has been supported by the U.S. Congress. It has also received the support of three presidents, including President Lyndon B. Johnson, the Organization of American States, the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, and the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production—representing industry in Latin America and U.S. industry with major interests in Latin America. Vice President Hubert Humphrey refers to Interama as "a partnership between Government and industry," which will "bring in hundreds of millions of dollars of private investment and capital and provide a great international center for culture and trade."

Interma owns 1,700 acres of land, valued, after development, at $54 million. 680 acres have already been cleared and filled for the construction of buildings and the development of roads, parks, canals, lagoons and parking areas. The remaining undeveloped acreage will be utilized for future expansion.

A $21 million bond issue, underwritten by Goodbody and Company, has been validated. Eight million dollars have already been issued and the remaining $13 million will be drawn in the near future.

The Florida State Road Board has pledged the design and construction of all access and interior roads. Plans for installing—at no capital outlay to Interama—electric power, telephone, water supply and sewerage systems—have been completed.

When Interama becomes a reality on July 4, 1968, it will represent a capital asset valued at approximately $500 million—as well as an investment of the best creative talents of the Americas. It will represent a partnership in progress between the people and Governments of Latin America, the people and Government of the United States, and the major industrial firms, cultural and private organization of the United States and Latin America.

Although the Inter-American Center Authority is an agency of the State of Florida, let me emphasize that Interama is not a local or State project. It is an international project, which will serve the United States and the Latin American Nations.

In keeping with the project's concept and its high purpose, we have based all our activities toward the achievement of "excellence" in every phase of our work.

Upon completion, Interama will be one of the most significant enterprises conceived—in the unremitting effort to create stronger links of trade and friendship between the Americas. Interama will make possible new and better communication through exchanges of economic, technical, educational, and cultural talents. The project will also create thousands of jobs during its construction period for both Latin American and U.S. citizens and tens of thousands of new jobs when it becomes operational.

Governments, industries, and cultures of all of the nations of the Americas will be brought together at Interama. Interama's plans call for four principal, separate, yet interrelated areas: An international area, which will be the meeting place for the nations; an industrial area, which will be the meeting place for the industries of the Western Hemisphere; a cultural area, which will be the cultural center of the Americas with facilities to present the fullest range of the performing arts; and a sports and leisure area, which will be the meeting place to provide spectator and participants sports, and leisure activities for the entire family. A 1,000-foot tower of freedom with sightseeing levels and restaurant facilities will be the physical theme symbol of Interama. In addition, there will be a multistoried trade mart which will provide special facilities to expand hemisphere markets.

Recognizing the importance and vitality of Interama's concept and principles in helping to build a better hemisphere, President Johnson supported Interama in obtaining a loan from the Federal Government to design and construct buildings and facilities for the Latin American nations and the U.S. Government to house their exhibits.

In keeping with its determination to maintain its high standards of excellence, the authority has commissioned six world-renowned architects to design the buildings and facilities which will house the exhibits of the Latin American nations and the Federal Government. They are: Edward Durell Stone, Louis I. Kahn, Jose Luis Sert, Harry Weese, Marcel Breuer, and Paul Rudolph.

Interama's planning has been designed to encourage meaningful participation on the part of the Latin American nations.

In the international area each Latin American government will establish itself in a national hospitality house, which will be a showcase of exhibits expressing the history, culture, accomplishments, and aspirations of each country. Each nation will have a resident commissioner who will represent his government and supervise his country's facilities and exhibits. Exhibits will be of the highest quality so as to command attention and communicate effectively. The respective governments will be encouraged to constantly revise and up-grade their exhibits to reflect new achievements.

Each participating nation will also have student dormitory facilities. Each government will utilize the services of their university students to operate and maintain the buildings and exhibits.

These students will spend most of their time serving as guides and explaining their country's exhibits. A portion of their time would be spent attending an American university, or traveling through the United States, and learning about our customs and our way of life. At the end of a year they would be replaced by a new group of students—thus affording a great opportunity to inform the future leaders of Latin America about the American way of life. This is one of the methods Interama has developed to speed the process of exchanging knowledge and understanding between the people of Latin America and the United States.

In addition to a national hospitality house and student dormitories, each nation will have available exhibits areas and facilities for audiovisual presentations.

Special facilities will also be available for the use of all of the participating nations. There will be a special 360° projection theater-in-the-round, which will offer movie projection of films concerning the attractions of the countries. This facility will also be used for theatrical performances.

A parliamentary meeting center will be available for students, governments and resident international organizations. It will be equipped for simultaneous translation and transmission to the conference participants and the audience.

A large ceremonial plaza is included in the facilities. which will be used for outdoor events such as pageants, fiestas, parades and other ceremonial activities.

An audiovisual library will be constructed in the Pavilion of the United States. This library, using the latest techniques of automation will offer the visitor a wide choice of topics and comprehensive information about major events.

Our plans also call for an international bazaar which will provide space for each participating nation for the display and sale of their attractive and useful products from Latin America.

A club of the Americas will provide housing and serve as a hospitality center for visiting dignitaries, performers, and students.

We are proposing to the Latin American nations that a national Interama committee be established in each country—consisting of each nation's best creative talent—to determine the type of exhibits they consider most appropriate for their nation. The committee would include educators, architects, builders, and businessmen. Each nation would be responsible for designing and building its own exhibit, and for its operation and maintenance.

The authority also requested the U.S. Government to participate in Interama. An authorization bill has been passed by the Congress and was signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson. The bill authorized participation with a $7.5 million exhibit for the Pavilion of the United States and $2 million to operate and maintain the Pavilion and exhibit for a period of 2 years. On April 1, 1966, the President issued a formal Presidential proclamation inviting foreign governments to participate in Interama.

Programing of events will be the key to the success of Interama. These events will cover the entire gamut of human activity—ranging from domestic and foreign trade meetings, seminars, conventions, musical events, theatrical performances, sporting events, industrial conferences, and governmental meetings.

Many of these activities will take place in Interama's cultural area, which will provide special types of audience facilities to supplement programs originating from exhibitors in the international and industrial areas.

Drama, ballet, opera and all the performing arts will be presented in Interama's cultural area. A number of theaters are planned for this area, as well as an amphitheater and an arena. Major exhibitions—ranging from the ancient Inca, Aztec, and Toltec civilizations to contemporary painting and scultpure—will be shown in a museum.

The American business community has been increasingly supporting the arts, and has contributed liberally toward the construction of cultural facilities and the promotion of events. The authority will encourage industry to participate in building cultural facilities and sponsoring programs at Interama.

Sports and leisure activities have become a hallmark of life in democratic countries. Interama will be the meeting place to provide the facilities for the Pan American games or a summer Olympics. It will also have playing facilities for professional or high school students. Here the products and activities of the leisure industry will be demonstrated including boating, water sports, golf and simulated winter sports. For the children, this area will offer a world that brings to life their storybook heroes and legends—a world in which they can actually participate—a world of make believe come true. Here, youngsters—of all ages—can pack up their dreams and travel through a living pageant of our colorful past, or join the science "explorers" of tomorrow.

Interama will also be an important forum for private enterprise to generate better understanding of its vital role in the development of the Americas and in support of U.S. foreign policy. It will enable private enterprise to illustrate its participation in the hemisphere's economic and cultural life. Business and industry will have the opportunity to demonstrate its contributions to the welfare of a free society—which will be indelibly impressed on 15 million visitors annually, after Interama becomes an operating reality.

In the industrial area major industries will construct buildings to house exhibits to portray the way of life of the Americas. They will tell the story of today's tremendous array of scientific and productive know-how that stems from the meeting of men's minds—and men meeting to do business. These exhibits will show how the free competitive enterprise system has stimulated the great industrial accomplishments in transportation; communications; the advances in medical science and public health techniques; the development of our natural resources and international trade. It will be a showcase of a free society at work.

Interama offers a great opportunity for the United States and the Latin American nations. At Interama we can demonstrate how our free enterprise system and our people—working together with the American Republics, can stimulate on a scale of the greatest magnitude—the trade and cultural programs—which will build a better hemisphere for all of us. Our representatives are now contacting and inviting the major companies, institutions and organizations to participate in Interama.

In closing, I would like to offer these suggestions. First, that the Inter-American Bar Association seriously consider the establishment of a permanent headquarters at Interama. From the standpoint of geographical location, compatible interests, and the special and versatile facilities offered, Interama is a logical choice as the home of the Inter-American Bar Association. Second, if you represent major companies or know leaders in industry, I hope you can carry our message to the heads of those companies to urge their participation in Interama.

PULITZER PRIZE GOES TO DON WRIGHT, MIAMI NEWS NEWSPAPERMAN

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Pulitzer Prize awards were announced. One of these awards went to the evening newspaper in my home city of Miami, the Miami News. Don Wright won the Pulitzer award for his work as a political cartoonist. This Pulitzer Prize which was awarded to the Miami News is the fourth such award given to this outstanding newspaper—no other newspaper in the South holds this distinguished record for this award.

The Miami News previously had won the top journalistic award in 1939 for its exposure of the Miami "Termite Administration"; in 1959 for uncovering miserable conditions under which migrants live at Immokalee; and in 1963 for revealing the Russian missile buildup in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have incorporated in the body of the Record an article from the Miami News regarding Don Wright's award and giving some of the background about this fine young man. Also, I would like to add the editorial which appeared in the Miami News the same day regarding this Pulitzer.

Mr. Speaker, only last week did another Miami reporter, Miss Rose Allegato, of the Miami Herald, receive the award as one of this country's outstanding women of Italian descent. She is now joined by one of her colleagues, Jean Wardlow, who won an award for a series she wrote on automobile accidents. Miss Wardlow is the recipient of the annual Editorial Award of the National Foundation of Highway Safety in New Haven, Conn. I would also like to have incorporated this brief article about her award from the Miami Herald:

[From the Miami News]

Don Wright Took Just 4 Years To Win Pulitzer

(By Haines Colbert, reporter of the Miami News)

Don Wright made it to the top as an editorial cartoonist in less than 4 years, but he'd been working toward it since a fellow second-grader drew a picture of an automobile.

"I think all kids draw pictures of cars and warplanes and stuff," Wright said yesterday after he'd been awarded the Pulitzer Prize. "The only difference is that most of them outgrow it and I didn't."

The prize carries with it a $1,000 cash award.

Wright, 32, started doing editorial cartoons in his spare time while he was picture editor of the Miami News in 1961. He went into it full time a few months later, and the best way to stir him up is to tell him that it must be nice to earn a living by drawing one picture a day.

If he doesn't dream about it, Wright starts working on the day's cartoon when he gets up at about 7 a.m.

"I start groping for an idea while I'm having coffee, shaving, and getting dressed," he said. "I think about it while I'm driving to work and while I'm going over the mail and the newspapers.

"I'm in pretty good shape if an idea hits me by noon. That means I can finish the drawing by 6 or 7 p.m.

"If I don't have the idea by lunchtime, things start getting complicated. Then I'm not only trying to think of something to draw, but it has to be simple enough so the drawing won't take all night."

Wright's drawings infuriate some readers, delight others, and get the emotions of still others pretty well mixed up.

"A lot of readers complain that the cartoons are unfair and they're absolutely right," he said. "A cartoon has to be unfair because it's one sided.

"An editorial writer can present both sides of an argument and qualify what he says. The cartoonist can't do that. He strips an idea to the simplest form and uses it to hit the reader in the eye—whammo.

"The cartoonist is fair only in that he takes a swipe at anybody who seems to deserve it. Quite a few people have criticized me for being too liberal, but the liberals got all over me when I did a cartoon on the necessity for stopping communism short of California which won an award from the Freedom Foundation."

Wright was born in Los Angeles January 23, 1934, but was brought to Miami as a child by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles C. Wright.

He graduated from Miami Edison High School in 1952 and went to work as a copy boy for the News. Wright was a photographer for 6 years, with 2 years out for Army service, and then became picture editor.

"I was always drawing, though," he said. "When the kid drew the automobile on the blackboard in grade school, I got him to show me how, and I never quit fooling around with it.

"My wife (the former Rita Blondin) was the one who finally got me into fulltime drawing. She kept after me until I did a couple of political cartoons and showed them to the editor, Bill Baggs.

"I've looked at some of them recently, and I don't know how they ever got in the paper. They were terrible, but I think my style has improved. The drawings are simpler now, and they get the idea across better."

One of the first of Wright's cartoons to win national attention was drawn when Wally Butts, University of Georgia football coach, won a libel suit from the Saturday Evening Post.

Wright drew a bust of Benjamin Franklin, founder of the Post, being knocked over by a football. The cartoon was reprinted in Time magazine and a number of other publications.

Other Wright drawings have been reproduced nationally since, and a collection of his work is on permanent display at the University of Syracuse.

Last year, he won the national award for the best cartoon used in the Catholic press.

The Wrights—Don, his wife and a 165-pound great dane named Baron—live at 11725 Southwest 88th Avenue.

[From the Miami News]

Pulitzer Prize for Don Wright

We have long thought the cartoons of Don Wright are the best to appear on any editorial page in the country.

Certainly, he is the best of the younger cartoonists, and has been so recognized by the number of publications which have regularly reprinted his cartoons since they began appearing here in 1962.

It is a source of great pride to his colleagues at the Miami News therefore that Wright yesterday was awarded journalism's highest honor, a Pulitzer Prize.

It is significant that Wright's prize came not for any single cartoon, but for the exceptional quality of all of his work. The News is proud of him.

[From the Miami Herald]

HERALD WRITER WINS AWARD FOR SERIES

Herald Writer Jean Wardlow has received the annual Editorial Award of the National Foundation for Highway Safety in New Haven, Conn.

The award, a $100 U.S. savings bond, was given to Mrs. Wardlow for her series on mystery crashes that ran in the Herald last fall.

It was announced Monday by William H. Veale, president of the national group.

In her series, Mrs. Wardlow re-created some of the mystery crashes—one-car accidents that were never explained because the driver of the car was killed.

What happened to these drivers, she asked. "Did they fall asleep? Did they imagine an object in the road? What made them swerve, roll over, or speed headlong into a canal?"

In Dade County, 54 fatal one-car crashes in 1964 took 66 lives.

"The figures are laced with alcohol," she wrote.

FREEDOM FOR SOUTH VIETNAM STARTS IN SAIGON

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the United States is involved in the Vietnamese conflict because we believe that people should be free to choose the form of government they want.

The United States has made a commitment to the people of South Vietnam to see that they get that choice.

Reports from Saigon over the weekend are disquieting evidence that Premier Ky may not fully appreciate a basic tenet of democracy—that he governs only at the sufferance of the people.

The United States is in Vietnam not to support Ky but to back up the Vietnamese people in their struggle for the simple fight to be free from oppression.

This freedom of choice includes freedom from the terror and violence inflicted upon the Vietnamese by the Vietcong and it also means the freedom to chart their own course of action as the struggle goes on.

I believe that instead of offering explanations for Ky's procrastinations on holding elections and his acceptance of their results, Secretary Rusk should put Mr. Ky on notice that the United States will throw its full weight behind free elections in South Vietnam at the earliest practical date.

Premier Ky has made intemperate statements in the past.

It is now time for our Government to make it abundantly clear to the entire world that we will not stand idly by while one form of despotism is substituted for another.

Political freedom for South Vietnam starts in Saigon.

A NEW PROGRAM OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE THROUGH COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which will authorize the Department of State through the Agency for International Development to encourage and assist colleges and universities in the establishing, strengthening, and maintaining programs of foreign development and for their provision of research, education, training, advisory and technical assistance, directly or in cooperation with foreign universities and in connection with programs of assistance to developing nations.

This proposed act is a product of a series of penetrating studies on the problem of university involvement in the field of the foreign development program. University presidents, foundation officers, AID officials and educators have been examining, for several years, the role of the university in foreign relations. American universities obviously must have a major part in this national effort and they do. Our centers of higher education have demonstrated a willingness to confront the problems of our time and for the most part, they have recognized that no challenge is greater or more meaningful than that of assisting to remove the barriers to the development of the emerging nations.

The goal of this legislation is to provide a new basis for college and university involvement in the technical assistance area. This bill is based upon the time-proven 79-year-old Hatch Act of 1887 under which the agricultural experiment stations of the land-grant colleges were given annual grants by the Federal Government for agricultural research projects. As in the case of the Hatch Act, the universities would have a regular, continuing responsibility in providing technical assistance to underdeveloped nations. AID would be the administering agency for the Federal Government. The universities would be able to plan ahead, to assume greater responsibility, bring together more competent staff for the job and integrate this foreign work more smoothly into their other activities.

In operation today is the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 that was inspired by the principles of the Hatch Act. In this very successful Government-sponsored, university-operated research program, colleges and universities in each of our 50 States and in Puerto Rico are engaged in various water research programs and projects.

Our centers of higher education possess a unique combination of resources for development work. The universities contain resources of knowledge that are essential to the Nation and must be effectively employed in its behalf, both in domestic and foreign programs. Colleges contain specialized knowledge that, at times, is not immediately available within our governmental agencies. AID, for example, has recognized this tremendous reservoir of talent by calling upon the universities for research and other types of technical services for foreign aid programs.

But, the task of institution building for international service cannot be readily financed by any mechanism the universities now have before them. University budgets cannot afford to participate in such programs. According to a University of Wisconsin report:

> Each time a university organizes for an overseas venture it must assemble personnel, equip them with language skills and other special local knowledge, acquire library materials and other necessary data, and set up an administrative structure to handle recruiting, budgets, finance, travel, shipping, clearance and customs, medical problems, and the host of other matters incident to overseas programs.

The report goes on to say:

> When the project ends, there is no choice but to wastefully dismantle this structure or engage in a frantic effort to keep it in operation beyond its planned term and find other jobs to justify its continued existence.

With particular respect to the involvement by State universities in foreign programs, while we would all agree that they represent an indispensable reservoir of skills and goals, their ability to mobilize fully for those goals will depend on the willingness of the Federal Government, rather than that of the State, to build the institutional strength that will be required. State legislatures cannot justify commitments for such projects. It is always difficult to convince a State legislature that is faced with numerous tax issues to appropriate funds for the use of overseas development programs. AID, at present, cannot assure the future of such institutional facilities because of the short-term nature of its contracts. Private foundations have only limited resources and cannot support sustained long-term commitments.

The United States is committed to participation in foreign development. As a statement by Indiana University declares:

> The world is in an inexorable state of change. It is in the national interest of the United States to participate in the transformation of the underdeveloped countries so that the results are better for us, rather than worse. The unacceptable alternative is to allow others to determine the future conditions of the world in which we will have to defend our national interests.

But, the facilities to retain qualified people whose skills and competences had been developed in previous international assistance programs of the universities are not being maintained under existing support provisions to a level needed to meet our foreign policy objectives. Because most of the current programs are short-term commitments, it is difficult to obtain enough competent personnel. It is always difficult to convince people to enlist in a program with limited duration and no assurance of future work. The importance of the long-term contract is, that it will give the universities the assurance that their programs will not be ended just when they have built up staff and resources to do effective work.

We have learned from past experience that the technology of the Western World cannot be transferred to less developed nations without extensive adaptive research and training programs. The success of education in the United States can be attributed to the ability to bridge the gap between the laboratory and the field. Much of the effectiveness of, for example, applied science in agriculture has accrued because professors have had well-established roots in their local environments. This is also true whether we consider research or teaching. While the principles of science are the same everywhere, their application, however, differs with the environment. That is to say, it is one thing to enroll foreign students in courses in American universities, but it is quite another to train each student appropriately for useful careers in their home countries. Applying the relevance of an education obtained in the United States to the realities of the environment in the developing countries is, however, another story.

While large numbers of American professors have gone overseas on temporary leave to work on the problems of development in the poorer countries, they have done so only rarely as projections of their university. Upon their return, nearly all of these professors have felt impelled to lay aside and even to forget their foreign experience and to concentrate upon teaching and research at home in order to recoup "time lost."

Success in these overseas projects requires that adaptive research and training programs be carried on over a period of several years, and staffed by a team of experts. Experience has generally demonstrated that single experts have accomplished little in attempting to introduce a new technology in a foreign country. If our overseas development projects are to be successful, it is essential that there must be long-term contracts between AID and our universities, who will be supplying most of the personnel.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner, when president of the Carnegie Corp., authored a report entitled "AID and the Universities." Dr. Gardner maintained that AID, if it wanted to work effectively with the universities, would have to embark on a program of partnership and discontinue the present contractual relationship of the normal buyer-seller context. Secretary Gardner concluded that if AID wanted to use the universities more extensively, it must contribute to the enlargement of the strength of the universities to participate in this kind of international assistance, which means enlarging their capacity for research, enlarging their capacity for training and advancing and improving the competence and quality of their staffs. Prof. Raymond J. Penn, former director of the University of Wisconsin's Land Tenure Center, has stated:

> It is almost impossible for a university to carry on an international program with temporary contract funds and funds from Wisconsin taxpayers alone. Our big need is for some kind of a reasonably secure longer run source of funding so that it is possible to maintain a reservoir of trained personnel, to continue to publish the results of their research, and to make their services available to those who determine policy.

There is a great need for fruitful collaboration between AID and the universities, and this relationship must be based primarily upon long-term goals. Among the numerous and varied programs administered by AID, there are some which may properly be thought of as having short-term goals. But most technical assistance activities are not. Institution building is a slow process. Many tasks of technical assistance, particularly those carried out by the universities, are not only impaired but rendered meaningless by a shortened time perspective.

Senator Robert Kennedy yesterday spoke of the great contributions the universities of the United States can make to Latin American education, agriculture and public administration. The Senator, however, pointed out that undercover and military agencies have a great preponderance of foreign research appropriations and warned that the effectiveness of the universities will be seriously undermined if they have to rely upon contracts with such agencies. Senator Kennedy called upon the Department of State and AID to seek major increases in their research budgets, with corresponding reductions in such budgets for the military and the intelligence agencies.

Our universities are ready to demonstrate their willingness and competence in the international development field. With increased funds and long-term contracts that my bill provides for, the universities and AID, working together, can contribute substantially to the development of the economies of the emerging nations.

SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK—A RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Mize], and I recently attended the seventh annual meeting of the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank as members of the U.S. delegation.

The financial operations of the Bank began only 5 years ago. Its record of achievement during that period is substantial. The significance of the Bank's achievements can be seen in the decrease of economic and political instability in Latin America over those 5 years.

The accomplishments of the Bank are a testament to the vision and efforts of our Latin American neighbors. They should also be a source of pride to us as the legislative architects of our country's participation in this great experiment. Similarly, they are a tribute to all the people of the United States, without whose generosity and compassion none of the Bank's significant projects could have been accomplished. While the Bank's job is scarcely done, we may look back with gratification at its achievements.

The United States was most ably represented at this meeting of the Bank's Board of Governors by the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury and U.S. Governor on the Board of the Bank. Under unanimous consent, I insert his informative and constructive statement of April 27, 1966, to the Board of Governors in the Record at this point, and commend it to my colleagues for their careful consideration. In the near future, I shall report further to the House concerning the activities of the Inter-American Development Bank, and I believe that the Secretary's speech lays an important foundation for that report.

The statement follows:

Remarks by the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, and U.S. Governor on the Board of the Inter-American Development Bank, at the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Bank's Board of Governors, Wednesday, April 27, 1966, at Mexico City

It is a pleasure indeed to participate in a meeting in this great and beautiful capital city of Mexico. As a representative of the United States, I am particularly happy at this opportunity to visit our close and good neighbor. The bonds between us were demonstrated eloquently during the recent visit of President Johnson to dedicate a statute of Abraham Lincoln as a gift of the people of the United States to the people of Mexico. The visit was a deeply moving reaffirmation of the mutual feelings of respect and friendship which unites our two peoples.

It is particularly fitting for the Governors of the Bank to meet in Mexico, which long ago adopted under its revolution, and in many ways has illuminated, the principles of social and economic progress espoused in both the Charter of Punta del Este and in the charter of the Bank. I am sure I speak for the other Governors as well as for myself in paying special tribute to the extraordinary accomplishments of this great country in promoting economic development and social justice. May I also express my delegation's gratitude for the splendid arrangements provided by our Mexican hosts for the conduct of this meeting.

In contrast with other Governors present who have attended several of the Bank's meetings, I am here as a novice. I am able, however, to point to some previous association with the Bank in my earlier tenure as Under Secretary of the Treasury as well as during the past year in which I have served as Secretary of the Treasury and U.S. Governor of the Bank. I was honored to be present, for example, on the occasion of the signature in 1961 of the Social Progress Trust Fund Agreement by the late President Kennedy and by your own President Herrera.

I regard this meeting as a welcome opportunity to listen and to learn from my fellow Governors, as well as from the distinguished President of the Bank.

Before beginning my own remarks, however, I am greatly pleased and honored to convey a message to this distinguished assemblage from the President of the United States. I quote:

"Ten days ago it was my privilege to share the beauty and hospitality of this gracious city.

"On that occasion I urged that all of us in this hemisphere work together to open up new paths and breathe new energy into our efforts to give the Alliance for Progress increased momentum.

"As we carry forward our truly revolutionary cause, four areas of major endeavors must be—

"Higher agricultural production to feed our growing populations and to meet our expanding industrial requirements;

"Better education to open the door to intellectual fulfillment for all our people and to equip them with the skills of modern technology;

"Improved health facilities to protect our populations against the ravages of disease and to insure that they achieve maximum accomplishment in work and leisure; and

"Wider economic integration to achieve a more rational utilization of Latin American resources and thereby to accelerate economic growth and social progress.

"It is a great source of personal satisfaction to me that under my administration, the U.S. Congress has authorized the provision of $750 million for the Bank's expanded fund for special operations. The Bank, under Dr. Herrera's distinguished leadership, is making a strong contribution to the success of the Alliance for Progress. By emphasizing in your new program the four areas which I have described, you are placing the Bank in the forefront of a new, dynamic effort. I commend you for your vision and initiative."

Mr. Chairman, the Bank has recently marked two significant anniversaries. The first of October of last year marked the fifth anniversary of the date on which the Bank officially began operations and in February of this year, the Bank completed 5 years from the date of approval of its first loan. This is an appropriate time, therefore, for the Governors to review the record of the Bank's operations during the first 5 years of its existence, and to examine its role as it has evolved and should evolve in the future. Moreover, we have just passed the fifth anniversary of the launching of the Alliance for Progress which has been marked by an assessment of the problems and accomplishments of this initial period, as well as by the new initiatives launched by the Inter-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro. This would appear to offer a good opportunity, on my part, to review the role of the United States in relation to the Bank and to the development efforts of the Latin American countries.

The annual report of the Bank and the excellent presentation by the President of the Bank have illuminated the record in a manner that leaves little need for further review. It is an impressive first 5 years: loan commitments totaling $1.5 billion to help finance total investments of over $4 billion, and disbursements of approximately $600 million. It can be estimated that the Bank's disbursements have resulted in completed investments on the order of $1.5 billion—or an average annual rate of about $300 million. This is a remarkable achievement for an entirely new institution to have accomplished in so brief a period.

The Bank's operations, moreover, have been proceeding recently at an accelerating pace, and are assuming increasingly greater significance in the total flow of external funds to Latin America. During the 5-year period, the total fresh commitment of external funds for long-term loans and grants by the United States and multilateral development agencies aggregated $7.5 billion. Approximately $1.4 billion of these commitments were made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development Group, and $4.6 billion represented various bilateral assistance programs of the United States. The $1.5 billion of the Bank's commitments, including U.S. assistance through the Social Progress Trust Fund, represented about 20 percent of the aggregate 5-year total.

An outstanding feature of the record during its first 5 years of operation is the Bank's proven ability to raise funds in private capital markets. As we all know, it is no mean task for a relatively new and unseasoned institution—regardless of the backing provided by its member governments—to meet the standards, and to generate the confidence required, to place its debentures at reasonable cost and on long term. As of the end of 1965, the Bank had successfully placed $285 million of its long-term bonds. Issues in the U.S. market totaled $225 million, while issues in the European markets were a disproportionately—and disappointingly—small $60 million. Despite persistent and energetic efforts, the Bank has experienced directly one of the crucial problems of the moment—the lack of an adequate long-term capital market in Europe.

It is with considerable satisfaction that we have learned that the Bank—since the period covered by the annual report—has been able to place its bonds to the extent of an additional $89 million, in markets entirely outside the United States, in two operations of considerable significance. A $24 million long-term issue was placed in Italy this year, bringing the contribution of that country alone in this form of $48 million, or $12 million more than the long-term capital which the Bank has been able to raise in all the other European markets combined. The positive attitude displayed by the Italian authorities and investment community toward the Bank is indeed gratifying and should be welcomed by all its members. The Bank placed $65 million just this month in short-term issues, of which $57 million was subscribed by the Latin American members themselves through their central banks. The Latin American members of the Bank were already in the position of creditors as well as borrowers from the Bank, having initially subscribed to the paid-in capital in gold and dollars, as well as their own currencies, and to the callable capital in which they assumed a contingent liability of the Bank. This further tangible support of the Bank by its borrowing members not only provides new eloquent testimony of the confidence with which the Bank is viewed by its members, but further strengthens the reciprocal creditor/debtor relationship between the Bank and its members. At the same time, the multilateral nature of the Bank has been further underscored, giving all members an equal interest in assuring that the resources which they have together contributed are utilized in the most effective manner possible. This generous response to the Bank's needs has opened the way to new forms of cooperation between the Bank and its members which I am confident will be strengthened and made ever more fruitful in the years ahead.

Clearly, the Bank has grown substantially in its first 5 years, by all quantitative tests, and has become a very substantial source of financing for Latin America's social and economic development. But there has been qualitative growth as well, reflected in the Bank's present stature as a prime and respected source of technical advice and assistance to its members, and in its proven ability to provide leadership and to speak with authority in the affairs of the hemisphere. The great prestige of the Bank is reflected in commonly employed references to the Bank as "the Latin American bank par excellence," the "bank of the Alliance" and the "bank of integration."

The Bank antedated the Act of Bogotá as well as the establishment of the Alliance for Progress and the Charter of Punta Del Este. But as these historic programs were promulgated, the Bank was quick to take up its proper role within them. Even as it was on the point of beginning its operations, the Bank assumed the new responsibility of administering the Social Progress Trust Fund—which gave expression to broader areas of direct concern to the Bank than has been traditional in the development lending concept. In discharging its responsibilities as trustee, the Bank has developed and expanded the practice of looking beyond the immediate impact of individual projects toward the intimately related but broader questions of institutional change and social reform, and individual country efforts to further social progress as an indispensable prerequisite to effective utilization of loans for specific projects.

The experience of the first years led logically to the conclusion that the purely social and the purely economic areas of activity were in reality so closely linked as to be inseparable. Pursuing further the principles recognized in the Act of Bogotá—that economic development rests ultimately on social justice—the Governors of the Bank wisely decided in Panama 2 years ago to expand the Fund for special operations and to merge into its operations those activities previously conducted by the Social Progress Trust Fund as a separate entity for purely social objectives.

Simultaneously, the Bank moved toward programing all of its activities—in individual countries and in the region—in relation to the comprehensive policy objectives of the Alliance for Progress and the progress of self-help efforts in its member countries needed to attain them. With the establishment of the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—CIP—an effective inter-American organ came into being for the continuing review of country programs and the role which all the external lending agencies, the Bank included, could play in strengthening these programs. Participation in the work of the CIP, as benefits the principal financial instruments of the inter-American system, affords the Bank an opportunity for making its voice heard in the week-to-week review and implementation of multilateral policy, as well as in the various annual ministerial meetings at which the Bank is represented.

The Bank has played an active and leading role—under the inspired leadership of President Herrera—in constantly emphasizing and stimulating forward movement in the process of economic integration in Latin America. The Bank has already initiated two significant programs directly affecting the process of integration. The export credit facility is important as a catalyst to stimulate the growth of trade and direct cooperative relationships between individual members of the Bank in jointly furthering development. And the establishment last year of the Bank's Institute for Latin American Integration will assist in providing the necessary training and research, to explore in depth the problems of integration, and to support the efforts which are being made by governments toward the objective of a free trade area.

Indicative of the fact that the Bank's growth has not stopped, and will not, is the new initiative on economic integration which is before us for action at this meeting. I refer to the proposed establishment of a fund within the Bank to finance feasibility studies of multinational projects. My Government wholeheartedly supports the proposed resolution on this fund and will be prepared to reinforce the Bank's resources by providing supplementary loans for large-scale feasibility studies when preliminary investigation under the Bank's auspices indicates their desirability.

We have before us as well at this meeting a proposed resolution calling for a study of the Bank's future need for an increase in resources. I am pleased to indicate the full support of my Government to this proposed resolution. The Bank's ability to exercise leadership in the shaping of Latin America's future is obviously dependent on the continued availability of adequate and appropriate resources. I shall look forward with interest to the results of the study by the Board of Executive Directors—which I am sure will once again display the high standards of competence we have come to rely on.

In consideration for the Bank's future need for resources, and in determining our response to this need, all of us need to give fresh thought to the Bank's operations and policies, of their future direction, and of the Bank's future role in the continuing movement toward the objectives of the Alliance for Progress. I should like to touch briefly upon one or two questions which appear to me to commend themselves for special attention.

I believe we need to give greater attention to the sectoral needs—in addition to global needs—for Latin American development. Foremost among these, I would urge special thought to the problems of agriculture and food, and the further intensive promotion of the economic integration movement. The Bank's annual report indicates that in the first 5 years of its operation the Bank's cumulative lending in the field of agriculture was 21 percent of the total. Does this figure reflect the proper distribution of emphasis which we would place on our operation during the next 5 years? Are we doing enough, for example, to meet the critical problem of mobilizing and developing human resources to the critical task before us? I can appreciate from my own experience the problems which the governments of Latin America must face in finding a sufficient number of properly qualified and dedicated public servants in such key fields as taxation and public finance, and I wonder whether the Bank, in cooperation with other international and national lending agencies, could not plan to make a more intensive contribution toward the solution of this type of problem. Agriculture development and food production are assuming increasingly critical importance in the world today. With Latin America's vast resources of fertile and productive land, could the Bank do more to assist in developing Latin America's food production so that its needs for proper nutrition are more promptly and fully met? In addition to purely national efforts in this area, there are aspects of the food problem which would appear particularly fruitful to approach by means of multinational efforts—to open up new areas in the hemisphere, and to develop an industrial base to service agriculture by the production of fertilizer and pesticides, and modern tools and equipment.

As we ponder over the Bank's future direction and its needs for resources, I believe that it will become apparent that increasing emphasis must be placed on self-help efforts. The needs of individual countries, and the needs of the region, for external resources to finance high-priority productive projects are apt to expand as the momentum of economic and social advance accelerates. It becomes increasingly necessary for all the members of the Bank to maximize the mobilization of their own domestic resources, and to devote them to the most productive purposes. Continued progress on tax and fiscal reforms will be necessary, as well as rigorous efforts to eliminate nonproductive expenditures in favor of sound, social, and economic investments. I know the very real efforts now underway toward this end. Just before leaving Washington, I was fortunate in meeting with a number of directors general of taxation from Latin American Governments who have been working with our Internal Revenue Service, and I had the opportunity of learning firsthand of the progress being made in the face of very difficult problems and obstacles.

The Bank has at its disposal scarce and increasingly expensive resources in the form of foreign exchange which are of especial value since—unlike domestic resources—they may be used to purchase abroad additional goods and services of a directly productive nature.

To the extent that demands are placed upon the Bank to finance directly or indirectly unproductive or low-priority expenditures the entire region suffers by the failure to reap the benefits potentially available from the Bank's resources.

The financing of local costs with loans in foreign exchange can serve, and has served, a critical function in mobilizing resources for development—particularly social development. I believe we must ask ourselves, however—both in view of the limitations on local cost financing in the Bank's charter and in view of the Bank's limited resources—how far the Bank should go in providing such financing. With continued progress in rationalizing tax structures, improving tax administration, and the restructuring of public expenditures to eliminate elements of waste and nonproductive expenditures, it should be possible for the members themselves to finance an increasing share of the local currency requirements of projects—with benefits accruing to all the members of the Bank from the enhanced availability of bank resources for high priority external uses and from a structure of external debt accumulation by individual countries consistent with the growth necessary to service such debt.

It is clear that there will be a great and continuing need to emphasize discipline both on the part of the Bank in forming its future operations, and of all its members, in the interests of our common objectives spelled out in the charter of the Alliance for Progress. Insofar as my own Government is concerned, the first 5 years of the Bank's operations have coincided with a period in which the United States has been particularly subject to discipline and restraint in its balance of payments. Although we have made considerable progress toward the solution of our balance-of-payments problem, the time has not yet come when we can afford to relax, and I cannot yet say when that point may be reached. In addition to the uncertainties inherent in the situation, we are facing particularly in the current year the imponderables of developments in Vietnam and their effects upon our balance of payments—both directly and indirectly through their impact on our domestic economy.

The balancing of our external payments is an objective which two U.S. Presidents have affirmed to be a matter of the highest national priority. We must and we will bring to an end the succession of deficits which we have incurred in recent years. Yet with all the restraints which this objective necessarily imposes upon up, we have insisted on pursuing this goal in a responsible manner—

Responsible toward our economy, whose continued vigor and growth lies at the very heart of the long-range solution of the balance-of-payments problem;

Responsible toward the peoples of Latin America and the rest of the developing world: the well-being of the developing nations relies to a great extent upon the maintenance of an expanding economy in the United States and other industrial nations, and the well-being of the developing nations, in turn, is vital to the economic and political interests of the free world industrial nations;

Responsible to foreign governments and central banks, and countless other banks, business firms, and individuals, who have maintained confidence in the dollar, and with whom we will not break faith by adopting any facile but irresponsible solution to our payments problem.

Although we have approached the solution of our payments problem in a responsible way, we remain concerned nonetheless over the potential problems which may emerge under conditions—which would be unique in the post-World War II period—where the United States no longer provides by its deficits the international liquidity needs of the rest of the free world. It is for this reason that we have been concerned to prepare the way now, in advance of any potential crisis detrimental to us all, for a reform of the international monetary system.

As the Governors are aware, discussions are now underway with a view to assuring adequate and timely future reserve growth. I wish to welcome the understanding and interest which Latin American nations have displayed in connection with this matter.

As I indicated in my address to the Governors of the International Monetary Fund last fall, all nations have a legitimate and vital interest in the reform of the international monetary system, and we have proposed arrangements to assure that their views will be heard at appropriate stages in the discussion of this reform.

We have not been deterred by our balance-of-payments problem from the responsibility of continuing our support of development efforts throughout the world through the continuation of our extensive foreign assistance program. In the case of social and economic developments in Latin America, the figures cited earlier demonstrate our continuing involvement.

There is not, and there will not be, any weakening of our resolve to provide adequate and appropriate assistance designed to achieve our mutual objectives under the Alliance for Progress.

As I have suggested should be done in relation to the future of the Bank, the United States is also engaged in a continuing reassessment, in consultation with aid recipients, of the aims and methods of its bilateral assistance programs. We have recently resolved to give greater attention to the critical bottlenecks to development in the areas of food production, education, and health. We continue to be concerned with the structure of the debt burden being accumulated by the developing nations, and we intend to press other capital-exporting nations to expand their assistance on terms consistent with reasonable expectations of the ability to service debt.

As the Governors are aware, the United States has made efforts in recent years to provide assistance in the form of transfers or real resources rather than merely financial resources. This practice of so-called aid-tying toward this end is an indispensable condition of United States assistance programs in our present balance-of-payments circumstances. We share completely the view that in the ideal world, foreign aid should not be so conditioned. In the rest of the world, however, we find that the distribution of assistance funds by individual donor countries bears no relationship to the presence of payments deficits or surpluses—that is, to the ability to finance transfers of financial resources. We find, indeed, a combination of relatively short-term finance, high-interest charges, and tied procurement in the case of some industrial nations clearly able to provide assistance on more liberal terms. I ask the Governors to understand that under these conditions the United States has no option, in continuing its own foreign assistance program, but to take whatever steps are needed, in cooperation with aid recipient countries to insure that our aid takes the form of a flow of additional real resources from the United States.

The program of responsible restraint on which the United States has embarked as a part of the measures to eliminate our payments deficit has included, in addition to an interest equalization tax imposed on foreign access to the U.S. capital market, a voluntary program whereby banks, other financial institutions, and corporations have limited their investment of funds abroad. In all of these programs, special care has been taken to exempt the developing nations, or (as in the case of the foreign bank credit program) to make clear and to emphasize the high-priority nature of a continued and adequate flow of private funds to meet the needs of the developing nations. We have also continued various official programs—through AID and the Export-Import Bank—to insure loans and investments made by our citizens in Latin America and other developing nations.

We have been guided to a large extent in these actions by the provisions of the Alliance for Progress Charter which stress the need to encourage and stimulate the flow of private investment funds into Latin America. The benefits to be derived from such flows go far beyond the merely financial; and are a vital force in the process of economic development.

For such financial investments are accompanied by the introduction of modern plant and technical processes, training of local manpower—both skilled labor and executive and managerial personnel—with an infusion of modern business methods and attitudes.

In a sense, such investments can bridge a century within a matter of years. Latin America has an unique opportunity at this time to take advantage of the unrestricted potential, and the available guarantees, for U.S. private investment. But exemptions and guarantees by the United States will not of themselves increase the private investment flow into Latin America. Such inducements are of no avail unless potential investors are convinced that they are welcome, that there are reasonably good prospects for economic and political stability and progress, and that the conditions under which they undertake to invest are not in constant jeopardy of being overturned to their detriment. Foreign investors will also respond to the creation of favorable conditions for their entry via the continued lowering of trade barriers and enlargement of free trade areas, and the development of policies which will lessen restraints on the repatriation of reasonable profits.

I believe there has developed in recent years a growing awareness among potential U.S. investors—and this is true to a particularly high degree of the great multi-national corporations—that it is incumbent upon them to maintain appropriate standards of conduct, including a sense of community and national responsibility in the host country, and to take account of the traditional and legitimate aspirations of the developing nations to participate in shaping their own economic advancement.

My Government believes that the maintenance of conditions favorable for both domestic and foreign private investment is an indispensable feature of sound and constructive economic development. Public funds and initiative alone, foreign and domestic, cannot successfully accomplish this task. My Government is convinced of this proposition, because we have seen time and again the unfortunate results of a contrary policy which destroys confidence in the private sector. We view the inducement of foreign private investments as a particularly critical measure of self-help, without which the purposes of external public assistance are thwarted and impossible to attain.

My Government has welcomed various initiatives which would help to clear the air of misunderstandings which have existed in these matters and would provide a suitable framework within which we could all get on with the common task before us. We have for some time—from the early days of the Marshall plan in Europe—maintained a network of bilateral investment guarantee agreements. At the recent Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting, the U.S. delegation commended to the study of Latin American governments a multilateral instrument which would establish uniform procedures whereby individual participating governments guarantee the investments of their nationals in other participating nations. Such an instrument could be of special interest and value to several of the Latin American countries which are beginning to develop, or can look forward to the eventual development, of a flow of private investment into other countries while themselves continuing to receive private investment flows from abroad. There is now underway in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development a study which could point the way to multilateral coverage of risks arising from investment guarantees. Finally, I believe that the Latin American governments could make a useful contribution by reconsidering their position on the IBRD-sponsored multilateral Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes. Thirty-six nations have now signed this Convention. A decision by Latin American nations to accede to the Convention could only have a highly beneficial impact on the investment climate in the entire region.

We have been fortunate in the past few years to witness interesting initiatives on the part of private investors themselves to develop new forms of partnership and cooperation with developing nations. The Bank has just approved a loan to the Atlantic Development for Latin America which is a unique initiative in bringing together a pool of private capital, provided by leading industrial and financial concerns of the United States, Europe, Canada, and Japan, who are ADELA's shareholders, to promote private investments in association with Latin American capital. I should also like to mention another recent move of great promise in increasing exchanges and understanding between businessmen in my country and Latin America—the reorganization on a broadened and stronger basis of the Inter-American Council for Commerce and Production. It is new directions such as these which will pave the way toward understanding and coordination, rather than conflict, between national interests and multinational business, with great dividends for freedom and a healthy economic development of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, both the Bank and the Alliance for Progress have completed their first 5 years. Many problems dormant for centuries have been attacked. Difficulties—old and new—have been encountered in the struggle for progress and they have not yet been overcome. But a good beginning has been made—enough to give us a sound basis for greater confidence in our ability to make large strides ahead in the next 5-year period before us. In the Alliance for Progress, the recent meeting of the IA–ECOSOC provided a new and useful action program and concluded that sufficient general progress had been attained to warrant greater selectivity and concentration on the key problem areas remaining for solution. The Act of Rio de Janeiro has set forth the principles which are soon to be reflected in a basic revision of the treaty of the Organization of American States. The Bank should now proceed to chart its own course for the future.

Although our attention in conducting the business of the Bank is usually couched in other terms, it is important, Mr. Chairman, that we not lose sight of the basic human objectives which animate us and the Alliance for Progress. They are the betterment of the lives of our peoples, by the elimination of poverty, malnutrition, disease, and ignorance. We seek to accomplish these objectives through a process of accelerated economic development, accompanied by social reforms and greater social justice, and all within a framework of respect for human dignity and the rights of the individuals, in a climate of freedom of expression and initiative. It is a mighty and challenging task which we have set for ourselves, but I have no doubt that in the end we shall together prevail.

THE 10TH OF MAY: RUMANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the national holiday of the Rumanian people. Three great events of its history are celebrated at that date.

On May 10, 1866, Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, a scion of the southern and Catholic branch of the Prussian Royal family, was proclaimed in Bucharest Prince of Rumania, and thus founded the Rumanian dynasty. It was the successful outcome of the nation's long struggle to acquire the right of electing as its sovereign a member of one of the Western nonneighboring reigning families in order to put an end to the strifes and rivalries among native candidates to the throne. This ardent wish, though officially expressed as far back as 1857 by the Moldavian and Wallachian Assemblies—known as the Ad Hoc Divans—convened as a result of the Paris Treaty of 1856, was nevertheless opposed by the Russian and Austrian empires, equally disquieted by the growth in power and prestige of the young bordering nation they both secretly hoped to absorb someday. It was thanks to the unrelenting efforts made and wise steps taken by Rumanian patriots, and also to the constant diplomatic assistance of Napoleon III, Emperor of the French, to whom Prince Charles was related through the Beauharnais and Murat families, that all political obstacles were gradually removed and that what was to be the prosperous and glorious reign of Charles I could be inaugurated on May 10, 1866.

Eleven years later, on May 10, 1877, during the turmoil of the Russo-Turkish war, the Principality of Rumania, until then nominally a vassal of the Sultan, proclaimed her independence by severing the old and outdated bonds that linked her with the Ottoman Empire. This independence had to be fought out on the battlefields south of the Danube, where the young Rumanian army, as an ally of

Russia, played a noteworthy part in the defeat of the Turkish forces. The Congress of Berlin of 1878 confirmed Rumania's independence and conferred Europe's official recognition, a bright page in the country's dreary history though marred unfortunately by the loss of Bessarabia, cynically wrenched by Czar Alexander II and his government from the ally who helped them obtain victory over the Turks.

Another 4 years elapsed after the Rumanian people had proclaimed their independence and a further step was taken as they decided to raise their country to the rank of a kingdom. On May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned, by the will of his people, King of Rumania. A prosperous era, which lasted over six decades, opened on that day for the nation. Its appex was attained when national unity in the historic boundaries was reached after World War I. The socially progressive country had now become a factor of peace and equilibrium in the southeast of Europe.

During all those years and up to the present time, Rumanians have cherished and revered the 10th of May as their national holiday, the anniversary of happy and glorious events in their history, in which achievements of monarchy and people were interwoven. It remains the symbol of their permanency and perseverance through woes and hardships to reach the ultimate end of freedom and well-being.

The ruthless foreign rule which now oppressed the Rumanian nation had not been able to uproot the people's attachment to the traditional celebration of the 10th of May. In order to try and alter at least its significance, official celebrations were shifted from the 10th to the 9th of May, anniversary of the Soviet victory. But, though flags are now hoisted on May 9, Rumanians in their captive homeland celebrate nonetheless in their hearts the following day, awaiting with faith and courage the dawn of new times, when freedom shall be restored to them.

THE U.S. PATENT SYSTEM IN TRANSITION

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday and Friday, May 5 and 6, 1966, the Federal Bar Association and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, in cooperation with the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., held a briefing conference on "The U.S. Patent System in Transition."

A panel discussion on Friday morning had as its theme, "Recognition of a Bidder's Patent Position in the Award of a Government Contract." Remarks by those on the panel centered on the rights a patent holder may have in the procurement of patented items by the Government, the effect of 28 U.S.C. 1498—which allows the patent holder whose rights have been infringed the recourse of suing the Federal Government in the U.S. Court of Claims to recover reasonable compensation—on these rights, and an analysis of recent legislative developments in this area.

I introduced H.R. 10022 on July 22, 1965, as the reasonable legislative solution to a complex problem which has plagued Federal agencies for years. The question is, How do we preserve the integrity of a U.S. patent and guarantee its rights and privileges when, in making purchases and awarding contracts for the Federal Government, we invite infringement of that very patent?

It is important to note here that the provisions of 28 U.S.C. 1498 remain unchanged by my bill. However, the procuring statutes which, under certain conditions, permit direct negotiations by the agency head would be further amended to authorize the negotiation of purchases and contracts, by the Federal Government, for property and services in a situation where it is likely that a valid claim against the United States for patent infringement will otherwise be made.

H.R. 10022 would provide a needed flexible authority to solve procurement problems when the possibility of patent infringement is present. Simply stated, the bill would allow the agency head, at his discretion, the latitude of negotiating with a patent holder or his licensee whenever he determines that patent infringement would be likely to result from a proposed procurement and that exercise of this authority to negotiate would be in the public interest, taking into consideration all the factors bearing on the procurement. The authority afforded by H.R. 10022 would not make negotiation mandatory; the agency head would simply be given the opportunity to recognize private patent rights in appropriate cases.

Following its introduction, H.R. 10022 has received widespread support from some Government agencies, private law firms, industry, patent law associations, and trade associations. My purpose in making these remarks is to express appreciation to the Federal Bar Association and the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., for the opportunity of presenting "The Concept of H.R. 10022" to the distinguished men and women representing a broad cross section of American industry and Government agencies who attended this conference.

I believe, in addition to the above statement, the enactment of H.R. 10022 will encourage corporations who do not now submit proposals or bids on Government hardware contracts and research and development programs to participate. This would give the Federal Government a broader base of selection in its procurement activities and it would, in my opinion, also result in a better price for some items in the future. I think the substance and principle of H.R. 10022 is entirely in keeping with the free enterprise system that has made this Nation the greatest industrial power in the world.

RUMANIA

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is the traditional national holiday of the Rumanian people. It marks the day in 1877 when Rumania declared her independence from Ottoman rule. In 1877 by the Treaty of Berlin, Rumania's independence was recognized, and her dreams for centuries of gaining national independence were finally a reality.

However, Rumania quickly discovered that independence alone did not bring immediate solutions to the staggering economic and social difficulties. The government led the way in combating poverty and other ills, and by 1918 outstanding gains had been made in improving the conditions of the country and its people. Following World War I in which she assisted the Allies, Rumania made even greater economic progress with many new industries and foreign capital invested in the country.

Tragically, during the early part of World War II, a Fascist-oriented faction gained control of the government, and took Rumania into the war on the side of Nazi Germany. That regime was overthrown in 1944, but in 1945 a Communist-led coalition government was installed. Russia, which had overrun Rumania while pursuing the Germans, was determined to include Rumania among its other Eastern European booty. In 1947 she supported the establishment of the Rumanian Peoples Republic and thenceforth freedom in Rumania was a thing of the past.

But this is not the end of the story for Rumania. True, Soviet Russia still exercises major influence throughout the country, but there have recently been signs that changes are taking place in Rumania. We would not expect a complete collapse of the Communist position overnight but it is apparent that Rumanian national spirit is increasing and we can hope that it will be only a matter of time before the Rumanian people will once again be masters of their own houses. I am proud to extend best wishes to the people of Rumania and urge them to continue their vigil for liberty and justice.

OLANA—HISTORIC LANDMARK OF THE HUDSON VALLEY

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, it is my very good fortune that within my district—in Columbia County, New York State—there is located one of the most remarkable private estates in the entire country. Its name is Olana, and it was designed, built, and furnished by the celebrated 19th-century American artist, Frederic Edwin Church, a man who has been called the "Michelangelo of landscape art."

Olana is considerably more than just a home or an estate. It is a treasure house of art, books, design, and artifacts of the Middle East, most notably Persia.

Today, this historic landmark of the Hudson Valley is in danger of destruction. As the home of a brilliant artist, Olana would need no further reason for preservation. But its irreplaceable qualities as an architectural and artistic phenomenon would make its destruction nothing less than criminal.

The desperate circumstances in which Olana finds itself came to my attention shortly after I came to Washington early last year. In order to attract attention to its situation, and to enlist support for its preservation, I invited his Excellency Mahmoud Foroughi, who was then the Iranian Ambassador, to visit Olana. He agreed to come and both of us, together with art experts, spent an entire day inspecting the building and its treasures. The Ambassador was deeply impressed with Olana and agreed that every effort should be made to preserve it.

This week the splendor of this magnificent, unique estate has been shown to the American people in the pages of Life magazine—issue of May 13, 1966. In a lavishly illustrated, 16-page feature story, Life magazine puts Olana on display for all to see—its architecture, its artistic furnishings, the paintings of Frederic E. Church, and a history of both the artist and the home he created.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a tragic loss if Olana is not saved and preserved. So far, $160,000 has been raised for this purpose. But another $310,000 must be raised before June 30. As the poet said:

> Ask not for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee.

The loss of Olana would be a loss for every citizen of our nation. Therefore, I appeal to the entire nation to take note of this cultural monument and participate in the effort to preserve it.

We are indebted to the editors of Life magazine for this superbly illustrated, sensitive, and understanding presentation of the Olana story, and I am happy to take this opportunity to reprint it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A century-old refuge of art and splendor: Must the mansion be destroyed?

"About an hour this side of Albany is the center of the world—I own it." These proud words were written by the most celebrated painter in America a century ago, Frederic Edwin Church, the Michelangelo of landscape art. His center of the world was a towered villa which he built on a hill above the Hudson River 125 miles from New York. Church called it Olana, a name probably derived from the Arabic, meaning "our place on high." Over the course of 30 years he turned it into an exotic realm of art, a crossroads of cultures where East and West met in harmony with land, light and sky. There he painted the landscapes that won him fame; there great men of the day—Cyrus Field, Mark Twain, the painter Martin J. Heads—joined him in strolls on serpentine paths and conversations in airy loggias and opulent halls.

Since Church's death in 1900, his home has remained intact, its rooms still aglow with oriental treasures, tropical butterflies and sunlight warmed by amber windows. But today Olana is in imminent danger of destruction. In 1964 the artist's heirs decided to dispose of the 327 acres of land, the mansion and its entire contents, including several hundred paintings and drawings by Church himself. Alarmed at this news, Prof. David Huntington, a Church expert and enthusiast, rounded up a distinguished committee to preserve Olana as a museum and park. They have raised $160,000 toward purchase of the property, but they must obtain $310,000 more before June 30 when their option expires. Only the interest and contributions of many Americans can save this unique and splendid domain of an artist's fancy.

As an inveterate traveler, Frederic Church was able to satisfy his artist's craving for new scenes and his collector's appetite for works of art. His greatest passion was for things Persian—though he never made it to those distant parts. But he traveled extensively in Syria and Palestine, where he absorbed Persian modes of architecture and Islamic culture. When he returned home in 1896 he immediately began to design a house in a style he described as "Persian, adapted to the Occident."

The front door, shaped like a Persian arch, has a welcoming motto inscribed in Arabic on the glass. Doors and walls are stenciled with Islamic patterns. Floors are carpeted with rugs from Syria, Turkey and Persia. In the hallway that leads to the second floor, 18th-century Persian brass candlesticks keep easy company with Chinese tables. Japanese cranes, made of bronze in the 18th century, stand guard by Turkish draperies.

A brass Buddha gleams from a niche and Turkish armor is silhouetted against a leaded window of amber glass. In harmony with this oriental richness, a trayful of Tiffany glass returns the luster of the sun.

The Eastern sumptuousness of Church's villa was a result of his success as a painter of Western wonders. A single picture catapulted him in 1857 into the front rank of American artists—a panoramic view of Niagara Falls. When this 7½-foot-long painting was put on display, crowds hailed it as "the finest oil picture ever painted on this side of the Atlantic." "Niagara" went on a recordbreaking, moneymaking tour of the country, then traveled to Europe. Throughout the following decade Church continued to astound the public with his awesome views of nature—such as "Rainy Season in the Tropics"—all of which exhibited his dazzling skill in capturing evanescent effects of atmosphere and immensity of scale. Not until he visited the Near East did Church begin to portray the wonders wrought by man. One of these, a rock-hewn tomb at Petra, may be seen in a painting that still hangs in the parlor of Olana next to a sketch for "Niagara" and over a fireplace whose marble was specially chosen to complement the tones of Petra.

From the day he moved into Olana in 1872, Church never ceased to analyze and enhance its visual effects. The house was for him a life-sized canvas whose forms and colors had to be composed into a stimulating harmony. Aided by his studies of Persian art, as well as his Victorian instinct for clutter, Church developed a flair for playing off diverse designs and furnishings. A scalloped Persian table with its book of old Persian miniatures, stands on an Oriental carpet like a flower in a gaily planted bed.

A 16th century French tapestry hangs above an ornamental balustrade carved by Lockwood de Forest, a cousin of Mrs. Church who had spent 2 years in India studying the native designs and techniques of wood carving. When he returned home he set to work embellishing the Church mansion.

A master of spectacular effects of light in his own paintings, Church put light to dramatic use in his home. He contrasted cool light falling through clear glass with the golden hues diffused by amber glass. These in turn were caught up and flashed back by mirrors hung in shadowy corners. Near the central hall Church arranged a complex vision of reflections and refractions. In the mirror at the left, a bronze bust of a girl, made by his friend Erastus Dow Palmer, can be seen warmed by the moving sun. On the right an early 19th century reproduction of a Pompeiian painting is mirrored above the amber glass of the main entrance.

On all sides at Olana, orderly patterns of man's making alternate with the irregular harmonies of nature. The balcony projecting from Church's studio, carved and columned in East Indian style, and an adjacent balcony look out across the landscape that Church and his Hudson River colleagues made famous in paint. The house itself is a mosaic of multicolored tiles, bricks and stones. Rhythmic designs of tiles frame the bell pull that hangs at the mosquelike entrance. And a porch floor sets up a geometric dialog with a family of Indian boxes.

Church's eye for the beautiful roamed everywhere. He delighted in the civilized grace of a Japanese lacquered tea set. The jumbled hues of his garden offered friendly intimacy, a contrast to the virginal landscapes he viewed from his house or recorded in paintings like "Twilight in the Wilderness" whose flaming sky proclaims the painter's audacity as well as his century's taste for nature's portentous melodramas. And in the gallery leading to his studio, Church savored the treasures he culled through decades dedicated to making Olana a work of art.

A FINANCIER'S SON WHO DREAMED UP A VILLA OUT OF HIS OWN HEAD

Olana came into being when Frederic Church was on the crest of his success as a painter. He purchased much of the Catskill property in 1860, 3 years after his triumphant unveiling of "Niagara" and shortly before he married. He and his bride moved into a newly built cottage on the grounds, but this was only a way station to grandeur. To design a mansion to crown the hilltop, Church hired the fashionable architect Richard Morris Hunt.

Hunt worked up designs for a French-style chateau but when Church returned from his travels in the Near East, he scrapped Hunt's plans and took on a new architect. Church, however, assumed the role of designer. "I can say, as the good woman did about her mock turtle soup, 'I made it out of my own head,'" he remarked proudly, and hundreds of architectural drawings at Olana bear him out. He put his mind and eye to everything, from the thickness of walls to the conveniences of the service area, from designs for banisters to the slate patterns on the roof for which he produced more than a dozen drawings. He pored over books on Islamic art and chose patterns to be reproduced on tiles or in stenciled designs for the walls, doors and spandrels.

He commissioned a missionary in Beirut to buy him rugs and the French consul in Teheran to send him tiles for his bedroom fireplace. And in a whimsical mood, he adorned his tower with ceramic teapots.

Church's artistic bent seemed foreign to his family. His father was a well-to-do Connecticut businessman who tried his luck in all sorts of businesses—a papermill, bonnet making, real estate—and was successful in all of them. The elder Church took a dim view of his son's inclination toward art. Only after the most celebrated American landscape painter, Thomas Cole, accepted the young man as his sole pupil did his father agree to finance him for 2 years. But when Frederic established his own studio in New York, his father wrote him, "I have no money to spare on this unprofitable business."

This rejection did not discourage Church, for at the age of 20 he was already living comfortably on the sale of his work. As his success increased, Frederic's father became more sanguine about his son's business. He offered him assistance in the way of capital and eventually left him a sizable fortune.

Church's mother, however, was concerned with the perils of her son's career: "When with pencil you imitate the work of [God's] hand, let your heart praise the giver, but let not the pleasures of the world, the vanities, fill your mind and you lose the pearl of great price."

Certainly the beauties of the world were forever present in Church's mind, for he spent many months of each year roaming and painting nature's splendors from Maine to Virginia. In 1853, with his friend Cyrus Field (who later laid the first transatlantic cable), he headed south to explore the heroic landscapes of South America. This trip—and subsequent ones to Peru, Jamaica, Mexico, and the Arctic—inspired a fabulous series of panoramas which left spectators gasping. By the thousands they lined up to see paintings like "The Heart of the Andes," which became the rage of 1859. Visitors equipped themselves with binoculars to study, over the heads of the crowds, the meticulously painted birds and flowers.

Washington Irving called the painting "glorious," Mark Twain labeled it "a miracle," and a poet paeaned:

"But never any sight of new-found land
Shall equal this, where we entranced stand
With dewey eyes and overflowing heart
Gazing from the exalted hill of art."

After lengthy tours, "The Heart of the Andes" was sold to a private collector for $10,000, then the highest price ever paid for a landscape in the United States. In 1876 Church's "Niagara" surpassed the "Andes," bringing $12,500 at an auction in which a Winslow Homer sold for $1,800 and a Corot barely fetched $1,000.

This was the high-water mark for Church. The national enthusiasm for cosmical landscapes of the New World was on the wane. It had largely sprung from an almost religious belief that America was the favored continent, predestined to revitalize human history, and Church's paintings had provided visible confirmation of that belief. But the Civil War shattered this optimism. The change in the Nation's outlook, coupled with expanding foreign contacts, contributed to a shift in taste so that by the 1880's Church was out of fashion and on his way to being forgotten. The artist himself, who at his prime, worked virtually nonstop 10 hours a day, was increasingly impeded from painting by attacks of inflammatory rheumatism.

Dejection over his eclipse, as well as the hard realization that he was out of step with the times, must have been a major factor in the decline in his production. On the one hand he denounced "the new garish displays" of art; on the other, he wished that "science would take a holiday for 10 years so I could catch up."

In consolation, Church devoted himself more and more to the embellishment of Olana. In 1884 he wrote a friend: "I have made about 1¾ miles of road this season, opening entirely new and beautiful views—I can make more and better landscapes in this way than by tampering with canvas and paint in the studio." He flooded 15 acres of land to make an artificial lake and planted exotic tropical flowers and Mexican corn. He added a studio wing which he designed in an ingenious merger of Moorish, East Indian and American ferryboat styles.

In the salons and dining room of his house he hung his own paintings—some of which he had bought back—along with works by his contemporaries and a smattering of old masters. And in books, boxes and portfolios he carefully laid away the exotic butterflies and tropical leaves he had collected on his travels and used for models in his paintings.

All of these are among the innumerable pleasures of Olana, which after Church's death was kept by his children much as he had left it. Today some of the treasures—a group of Church's own paintings and drawings—are temporarily on leave from Olana. They have joined an impressive exhibition of his work which was recently inaugurated at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington and is now on a tour of the United States.

This show, the first retrospective of his art to be held since 1900, enables Americans to savor a kind of cinerama of yesteryear, the virtuoso painting of a native master whose combination of precise detail and grandiose scale goes far to accomplish his aim: to lead nature's "beauty forth for the world's wonderment."

RUMANIAN NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, the national holiday of the Rumanian people is celebrated. One hundred years ago on this day, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania and the Rumanian dynasty was founded. Eleven years later, in 1877, the principality of Rumania severed her links with the Ottoman Empire and proclaimed her independence and on May 10, just 15 years after the founding of the Rumanian dynasty, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, May 10 is a most significant day for the Rumanian people and for the world, because mankind has been greatly enriched by the many contributions made to it by this great nation. A nation, which we are sad to say, now stands beneath the dark shadow of communism.

Twenty-one years have passed since the independence of this spirited nation has been disrupted by the forces of communism, but this passage of two decades has not destroyed the will of the Rumanian people to assert their sense of national pride and national independence. It still remains to pierce the shadow of communism with the bright light of hope and historic strength.

This spirit of nationalism is particularly significant when we view how it has managed to break the monolithic Soviet bloc into many factions of communism, some of which are opposed to each other. And the spirited light of nationalism shines brightest in Rumania. Someday, I expect this spirit to overcome the darkness of communism and once again clearly place before the world the splendor of an independent Rumania.

ISRAEL'S AMBASSADOR AND ISRAEL'S GOALS

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with you and my colleagues the eloquent address of the Honorable Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel to the United States, at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee National Policy Conference luncheon, held at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 25, 1966, the day on which Israel celebrated the 18th anniversary of her independence.

The Ambassador's remarks follow:

Thank you very much Rabbi Bernstein, Chairman Morgan, distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and ladies and gentlemen, this is a very moving moment for me to stand here before you on the day in which my country celebrates the 18th anniversary of its independence. It is an occasion that makes me think back on that Friday afternoon, 18 years ago, when Mr. Ben-Gurion, the first Prime Minister of Israel, read the declaration of our country's independence before the meeting of the provisional Council of States.

Many of us in the country at that time were not able to participate in that occasion ourselves. Many of us, like myself, were in the beleaguered city of Jerusalem—cut off from the rest of the country. We couldn't even listen to the proclamation on the radio, because the electricity was cut off. But the news reached us, and within a few moments of that news reaching us, we heard that the United States of America had recognized our country's independent existence. I would like to take this opportunity of expressing to you all the undying appreciation of the people of Israel for that fact, and for the relations of friendship and cooperation that have ensued throughout this period of the past 18 years, and which I am sure will unfold still further in the years ahead.

And secondly, I'd like to express our appreciation of the support and encouragement we received in those days of trial 18 years ago from the great Jewish communities of your country, and from Jewish communities throughout the world. That was particularly important to us because we who were in Israel on that day and whose total number was about 650,000 people proclaimed our independence and sought to defend it against aggression because we believed that we were struggling not for ourselves alone, but for the future of the entire Jewish people and its culture and way of life. We felt that we had been designated by the Jewish people to create an instrument that would serve its needs and its aspirations.

During these last 18 years, we in Israel have set ourselves four major purposes. We are by no means at the end of those roads. But we feel that we are well along the way toward the realization of those aspirations.

Our first purpose was to develop peaceful international relations between our country and all countries throughout the world, especially in our own area, and to play to the fullest extent as a small country our role in the United Nations to help bring about an ordered and a peaceful international society.

Our second goal was to keep the doors of our country open at all times, for all Jews desirous and needing to come and settle in our midst; in search of freedom as individuals and freedom to live as Jews in accordance with their own conscience.

Our third goal was to develop fully all the economic capacities of our small and undeveloped territory for the benefit of our citizens and to create a democratic society which would regard the individual human being as the master of the society whose freedom the State is designed to enhance.

And our fourth objective was to create the conditions in Israel which would ensure the continuous creative expression of the Jewish civilization in a climate of freedom.

As we take stock today, 18 years later, of the distance we have traveled toward the attainment of these goals, we can, I think, permit ourselves the feeling that we have made some advance, although it is quite clear to us that there are still many problems ahead of us for the future.

We are full members of the United Nations, and we enjoy diplomatic, trade, and cultural relations with over 90 countries throughout the world. Increasingly in our world, technological and developmental cooperation is playing a growing role in the relations between states. That is an area of international relationship and concern which was pioneered by your own country after the end of World War II. I am persuaded that the historian of this postwar era will recall the revolutionary character and significance of this great contribution of the United States of America toward the fashioning of a new and ordered humanity.

I think that in recent years we have seen the emergence of a group of countries, whose number is beginning to grow year by year, who, while they still need help in certain aspects of their economic development, are increasingly in a position to make positive contributions on their own side in this process of international cooperation toward human development. To a very large extent, the positive content and character of Israel's international relations today relates to this area of international technical and development cooperation.

In pursuance of its goal of peace with its neighbors, Israel negotiated and signed armistice agreements with the United Arab Republic (or Egypt, as it then was), the Lebanon, Jordan and Syria, 17 years ago. These agreements require the signatory parties to proceed from armistice to peace. Israel continues to be ready for this transition.

While this desire has not so far found reciprocation, one important development has occurred. The extremist Arab viewpoint, which has been articulated consistently and with particular intensity in recent years, is that the future of the Middle East will be without Israel. It is clear today that this is an unrealistic goal, and that increasing numbers of Arabs are realizing that it cannot be attained, and that the future of the Middle East lies in the direction of Arab-Israel coexistence and accommodation.

We in Israel have not yet attained the goal of peace with our neighbors. But we derive considerable encouragement from the consideration of the fact that we have, by and large, during these last 18 years, succeeded in the goal of preventing a deterioration in our position and the explosion of war. And as we look toward our future, we feel quite confident in the continuous attainment of that negative but indispensable goal—indispensable toward breaking the road of the Middle East open toward progress in the direction of peace.

We face many problems and many dangers in this area, in spite of our continuous policy—and it is the policy of Israel at the present time—never to be the first country to introduce any new type of weaponry in the Middle East, we are faced by escalation on the Arab side. And as long as that escalation continues, we in Israel will continue to accord the highest priority to the maintenance of an effective deterrent strength. We are confident in our capacity to do so, just as we are certain that in existing circumstances this is the way to avoid war. This is the way, therefore, to create the conditions in which a peacemaking process can develop.

In pursuance of our open door policy toward Jewish immigration during the past 18 years, Israel has received close to 1,400,000 Jewish immigrants—half of them from Europe and half from the Arab lands. It has demonstrated that effective economic development policies could provide ample room in Israel for those who have come, and for many more.

At the end of its first 18 years Israel has a population of two and a half million. But in the southern half of Israel, that 60 percent of our small territory that stretches from Beersheba to the Red Sea, there is still only a population of 100,000 people. The development programs of Israel in the years ahead will concentrate on this virtually unpopulated area, where the bulk of our natural resources, such as they are, are to be found.

During this first period, the Constitution and institutions of self-government in Israel have taken shape. Despite pressing and burdensome problems of defense, population growth, and economic development, Israel has maintained a stability of democratic government elected by the people and responsible to it.

In the cultural area, the developments in Israel have proceeded a long way to providing the Jewish people with a center of learning, scholarship, and cultural creation which is beginning to make up for the appalling loss of the great centers of Jewish life in central and eastern Europe, destroyed during the Nazi period.

This, as I see it, is the background to the next phase in Israel's history which will continue to be directed toward these four central purposes. While it continues to be faced by danger, Israel will look to its defensive capacity, confident that it can continue to succeed in deterring aggression. The hearts and minds of the people and youth of Israel will continuously be open to the vision of peace between the Arab States and Israel for their mutual advantage.

There are still Jews in search of freedom, as individuals and as Jews, who will seek the road to Israel, and Israel will continue to be ready to receive them.

In the national policies projected for the near future, the greatest emphasis is being placed on educational growth as an indispensable means of welding the diverse elements of our population into a unified society with truly equal opportunity for all.

And in our continuous efforts for economic growth, we plan to put increased emphasis on individual excellence in terms of human skills and of scientific and technological capacity.

And finally, the spiritual and cultural ties between Israel and the Jewish communities throughout the world will, I believe, be cemented as Jewish cultural creation in Israel proceeds to flourish upon the sure foundations which have already been laid.

This has not been an easy road along which we have been traveling in the last 18 years. The road ahead of us will not be easy—but I think it will be easier. We shall face many problems, and perhaps even danger, in the years that lie ahead. But we can move forward with confidence, sustained by this record of 18 years of re-creating a people and re-creating a land. We can move forward in the conviction that we seek for ourselves only what people everywhere in the world are seeking for themselves—the right to develop our own personality as a people in an ordered and peaceful international society; the right to be left alone—in peace—while respecting the peace of our neighbors; the readiness for international cooperation on all levels, and above all, the chance to enlarge the freedom of our citizens by our own labors and determination.

As we view our future in the great perspective of world history, I would like to sound a note of optimism—not only for my own country, but for the world in which we live as a whole. There is justifiable and natural and understandable pessimism that wells up within us at times as we look around us at the world scene, with its conflicts, its uncertainty, and the absence of peace. But I believe that all of us can derive courage and hope from knowing that in these troubled and revolutionary times that started immediately after World War II was over, mankind has found within itself the capacity to avoid a global explosion. It hasn't solved all the problems. It hasn't broken open all the roads to real and effective peace. It still faces many challenges and many dangers. But this central achievement has been ours—that the world has been protected and insulated from a new global conflict.

It is against that kind of perspective that we in Israel look around us on our immediate scene in the Middle East of which we are a part. We've been able to build without peace—but we've been able to build. We've been able to avoid the onslaught of war and aggression—to keep on deterring it—to keep on giving ourselves the capacity to carry on building our country and our people. And we believe that the fate of our area is the same as the fate of the whole world—to carry on building, even without peace, as long as this is our fate. But to carry on building with the conviction that it lies within the capacity of our generation to break down the walls of mistrust and to replace them by bonds of neighborly cooperation, which are the hallmarks of real peace.

Thank you very much.

FIRST PRESENTATION OF JOHN C. HAUSCHILDT AWARD

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it had been my hope to be present today at the first John C. Hauschildt Award at the Hyde Park High School in Chicago, but this was a legislative day with an important measure up for a vote and my congressional duty required that I remain in Washington.

To Dr. Donald J. Blyth, principal of the Hyde Park High School, 6220 Stony Island Avenue, Chicago, I sent the following telegram:

> May I join you in tribute to Lt. John Hauschildt, hero patriot, the first alumnus of Hyde Park High School to give his life in Vietnam. Our sympathy to John's parents whose sacrifice is infinite. Today we all join in determination that the life of Lieutenant Hauschildt shall remain a hallowed tradition in a great school whose position through the years has been one of leadership.
>
> Barratt O'Hara,
>
> *Member of Congress, Second District of Illinois.*

John C. Hauschildt was the first young man from the Second Congressional District to enter the Air Force Academy in Colorado. He was graduated with the class of 1962 and we were photographed together on his visit to Washington. That photograph hangs on the wall of my office in the Rayburn Building. Lieutenant Hauschildt was killed at Vietnam last October. His memory will be honored during the years by the annual presentation of the John C. Hauschildt Award at the Hyde Park High School.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the March 1966 issue of the Airman:

[From the Airman, March 1966]

SABREMEN OVER AN KHE

(By Hap Harris)

They stun the Vietcong with bombs and high explosives. They fly in all kinds of weather, respond quickly, dodge jagged mountains and skim treetops to smash the invaders.

"Let's go down to meet the 'Yugoslavian Air Force.' We've got some time before briefing and takeoff," said Lt. Col. Harold Comstock, commander of the 481st Tactical Fighter Squadron.

"The Yugoslavian Air Force? At Tan Son Nhut Air Base, Vietnam? They're pulling my leg—both legs, in fact," I thought.

We walked down the concrete ramp toward the squadron revetments, heat waves shimmering in front of us. A bewildering array of aircraft circled overhead, roared down the runway or whined to a halt in parking areas. "Huey" helicopters in drab Army brown, sleek F–100 Super Sabres, huge commercial Boeing 707 jets, tiny O–1E Bird Dogs with their grasshopperlike whip antennas, sputtering A–1E dive bombers, their huge propellers clawing the humid air, all make a kaleidoscopic sight on one of the world's busiest airfields.

"I know what you're thinking," said Colonel Comstock, "'On top of all this sound and fury they're giving me the Yugoslavian bit.' But it's true. Here's our man to prove it."

We walked up to A2C Zlatko Sintic, an F–100 maintenance crew chief who was busy working on the engine of his aircraft and did not hear us approach. Introductions followed. Here indeed was a Yugoslavian of bygone days—for now he looked to an American future. I learned that while Airman Sintic's father, Royal Yugoslavian Air Force Gen. Zlatko Sintic, fought with the Americans against Nazi Germany, young Sintic and his mother remained in war-torn Yugoslavia.

"It was a hard life, but we dreamed of my father's return. In 1945 Communist authorities offered him a choice—remain in the air force or reenter civilian life. The Communists made the offer because they needed trained air force men. But as is usual with the Communists, they doublecrossed my father and his men.

"He returned home, and he and his unit were jailed. A few men were shot every day—my father was among the first to go," Airman Sintic said angrily. Later, life turned for the better. His mother married an American and now the family lives in California.

Our sense of time momentarily forgotten, we were pulled back to the present when Colonel Comstock said, "We're getting near flying time. Let's go back to squadron headquarters." As we crossed the squadron ramp, the colonel noted that Airman Sintic believes so strongly in the fight against communism here, or anywhere, that he works like a fanatic on his F–100. It's in top shape, and up to early September 1965, it had flown 119 combat missions, about 30 more than any other plane. That's dedication. "But don't get me wrong," the colonel added. "That goes for all the men in the squadron. They work long hours 7 days a week under difficult conditions. I wouldn't trade any of them for a year's salary."

At the squadron ready room flight leader Capt. Thales A. Derrick—a 2,500-hour, 84-combat-mission pilot—greeted us. He introduced members of the flight: Maj. Reginald H. Shepherd, a visiting official observer and senior pilot from the 354th Tactical Fighter Wing at Myrtle Beach AFB, S.C.; Lt. John C. Hauschildt, Air Force Academy, class of 1962, a former enlisted radio technician with 84 Vietnam combat missions; Lt. Gary D. Lape of the 524th Tactical Fighter Squadron, an Oregon State University general science graduate with 84 combat missions; and Lt. Clyde L. Newton of the 522d Tactical Fighter Squadron, a 1,500-hour pilot with a degree in chemical engineering from Washington State University.

The briefing began. Our target for the F–100 mission: a Vietcong-infested area about 40 miles from Pleiku and some 227 land miles northeast of Tan Son Nhut Airbase.

Altitude of the target was 2,000 feet. It was located in a valley, alongside a river. Mountains nearby rose 1,500 feet above the valley floor. It would be tricky. We were to "work" the valley floor with bombs and 20-millimeter cannon fire.

Newton was the pilot of our tandem two-seated F–100F. The other four aircraft were F–100D's. Our call sign was Light 85. Captain Derrick outlined procedures for us if we were hit. "Your primary emergency field is Pleiku, 45 miles due west of the target area. If necessary, head east, strike out over the water 5 miles; go over Que Nhon port, where our ships are. Punch out at 3,000 feet or more. Watch out for other aircraft going in or out of cloud cover. Our forward air controller is Baron 25 in an O–1E."

COUNTLESS PERILS AHEAD

We walked out to our plane and were met by A1c. Harold "Gene" Yeager, a musically inclined Pennsylvanian with some showtime on local radio back home. Aided by Yeager and A1c. Olen E. Moyer, another crew chief, Lieutenant Newton and I were strapped into our cockpits. I went through a review of emergency procedures with Airman Moyer.

Meanwhile Lieutenant Newton was kidding Airman Yeager about his guitar-playing days on a stateside radio station. "Only crew chief I know on this base who comes complete with a $300 guitar and a country and western beat," the lieutenant quipped.

Garbed in our inflatable G-suits, helmets, oxygen masks, parachutes, and seated on our emergency survival kits, Clyde Newton and I were sweating profusely in the bright sun. Strapped tightly to our armed ejection seats, he started the engine at the prebriefed time of 1300 hours. The five planes then marshaled on the parallel taxiway and moved finally into takeoff position on runway 25. Due to the heavy gross weights of the planes, our flight took off as singles rather than in formation.

At 300 knots indicated airspeed, we zoomed over nearby Saigon on the narrow and winding Donai River, assembled west of the city which was shimmering white in the midday heat, and began the climb to cruise altitude through a sky thick with thunderstorms. With radar assistance from the ground, our flight edged around the turbulent clouds and continued to the target area over the rocky bastions of the Annamite chain of mountains.

En route, Captain Derrick contacted three radar sites for flight-following information. The final radar site located near our target area was contacted for up-to-the-minute weather at target and the position of the FAC (forward air controller).

"Peacock control, this is Light 81, a flight of 5 F–100's with bombs and 20 millimeters, mission number 98058."

"Roger, Light 81 flight. This is Peacock control. Be advised we have a divert for you. Suggest you proceed out to the coast to avoid thunderstorms and contact your forward air controller, Baron 25, as you leave Qui Nhon. Your target will be on 070 radial some 40 nautical miles off the Pleiku TACAN."

On the intercom Clyde gave me some comforting news. "This diversion puts our flight at the near maximum range for our ordnance configuration without air refueling, but there's really nothing to worry about."

Approaching the target area, we roared over mountainous terrain, thickly covered with trees and tangled jungle growth. Ragged, saw-toothed spines of the mountains seemed to tear at the clouds, as if they were lying in wait for an unwary flyer.

"Not only VC's, but tigers, panthers, snakes, buffaloes, and wild oxen are down there, too," said Lieutenant Newton.

FIVE CENTURIES AND BOMBS

Our fighters whipped through the edges of more thunderstorms and began a gradual descent through a hole in the undercast. A radio channel change was made to get on the FAC's radio frequency.

"Baron 25, this is Light 81. How do you read?"

Baron 25 replied, "Reading you fine 81 flight, go ahead." Captain Derrick answered, "Roger, Baron 25, 81 is a flight of five centuries with antipersonnel-antimateriel bombs and rockets. We are approaching the rendezvous point on an 070 degree radial."

Baron 25 came back with, "Understand 81. Do you have the river, the one that comes in from the coast, in sight? There is some smoke from a previous strike about 2 miles south of the river, inland about 15 miles." Captain Derrick responded, "Roger, Baron 25. We have the river and the smoke from the other strike in sight. What is your position?" The FAC answered, "Baron 25 is just north of the river and northeast of the burning area. I'll put a marking smoke rocket on your target which is on the north side of the river. Rolling in to mark now."

From our seats in the sky we watched the smoke rocket streak earthward from the tiny single-engine plane and explode. A dense cloud of white smoke rose through the foliage over the Vietcong buildings. Captain Derrick called, "Tally Ho, 25. We have you and the mark."

"81 flight. Acknowledge that you have the FAC and the target in sight." "Two, three, four, five," replied four different voices on the radio, acknowledging.

"Baron 25, this is 81. Are there any friendlies in the area?" "81 from 25, negative on the friendlies. I'd like you to take out as many structures as possible located in those trees within 200 meters east and west of my smoke mark."

"Roger 25," said Derrick. "We'll do our best. 83, 84, and 85, set up for east to west passes. 81 and 82, come in west to east. Let's vary the headings."

Lieutenant Newton and I were in 85. We prepared to go in after the other four planes had made their first bomb run. We were attacking close to An Khe in Kontum Province near a branch of the Song Ba River. Newton handled his powerful Super Sabre jet as if it were part of him, an extension of his arms and legs. We twisted, we turned, we roared over hills and banked sharply while our G-suits acted to counter gravity's pull.

A THREE-RING CIRCUS

"Got that camera ready?" he asked over the intercom. "Yeah," I replied, and mumbled something about how tough it was to keep my cameras aimed at our small "flying circus." With our flight attacking the Vietcong area from different directions, the action was almost as difficult to follow as a three-ring circus.

Newton's head bobbed from side to side in the cockpit. He was constantly checking the flight's position during their death-dealing bomb and strafing runs.

Captain Derrick and his men talked back and forth; coordinating, advising each other, checking for Vietcong ground fire, aiding each other in the high tension of attack. Yet each pilot was his own master, flew his own ship, as Clyde Newton flew his.

The Vietcong assembly area near us was ablaze from the bombs and 20-millimeter cannon fire of our planes. Red flames soared above the green palms and lush grasses. We were going in—closer to the ground. I glanced at the speed indicator. I thought it read 300 knots.

Our plane was vibrating. The cockpit was stifling. I was sweating profusely, yet my mouth was dry. Would 50-caliber ammo from the ground slam into the thin skin of our bird and knock us from the sky? We would soon know.

The foliage seemed a blur. Rice fields went by like telephone poles on a fast railroad run. Billowing smoke rose hundreds of feet in the air. Our cannons stuttered—for seconds that seemed like minutes. The slugs were hitting their mark. Huts burst into flame. Smoke enveloped us. The Vietcong entrenched position was dying.

The hammering of our cannons stopped. With a chest-racking pullup, we were off the target and orbiting while the rest of the flight poured it on the enemy encampment. From our aerial vantage point, the exploding cannon fire flashed briefly like white gems on a green cloth.

Brief bursts of radio talk hit my earphones. The pilots were working together. Calmly and deliberately, they helped each other, covered each other, watched for ground fire, and talked with the nearby Air Force FAC.

TWICE OVER ROUGHLY

Twice more in G-pulling swoops we dived to the deck. Palm tops seemed to reach for us, small hut roofs loomed large as airplane hangars, pounding cannons, tongues of fire were everywhere in the Vietcong assembly area. Then we were up, up in the blue where the beauty of the clouds and the mountains slowed my pounding pulse.

Number 83 had reached "bingo fuel" (just enough fuel remaining to take him back to home base) first, and he and 84 were directed to leave the target. 81 and 82 completed their last strafing attack, joined our plane and departed the flaming Vietcong position.

Baron 25 called in the bomb damage assessment to Captain Derrick, "81, you have 18 structures destroyed and 11 damaged. Good shooting."

"Understand 25," Derrick answered, "this is 81. Thanks. We're leaving for home." With our fuel gages going down, our climb out was made through the storms, and some heavy rain was encountered. Much of the return from target was flown in weather at 21,000 feet. Our two flight elements recovered separately at Tan Son Nhut using formation GCA approaches.

The hot, humid, crowded, and bustling field never looked so wonderful. We cranked open our cockpit canopy as we taxied and were signaled into a revetment. We took off our helmets and oxygen masks amid smiles and thumbs-up signals from ground crewmen. Clyde Newton and I were dripping with sweat.

Glancing toward Captain Derrick's plane, and others nearby, I started laughing. Newton turned in his seat with a quizzical look. I pointed to the name painted on the nose, "The Mormon Meteor," then to the others. They had such names as "The Back Forty," "My Little Margie," "Mr. Magoo," "Hot Stuff," and the popular, all-encompassing U.S. Air Force-Vietnam phrase, "Why Not?"

"Didn't see them before, eh?" said Newton as he joined me in laughter. We both stretched and slumped in our seats for a moment. We were home.

Editor's Note: With regret we report that Lieutenant Hauschildt was killed on another mission to the same area a few weeks later. He was strafing at low level when his aircraft apparently was hit by Vietcong groundfire, crashed, and burned.

RUMANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kluczynski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Rumanian nation is observing May the 10th as their national holiday. One hundred years ago, on May 10, in 1866, Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern, was proclaimed in Bucharest the Prince of Rumania, and this founded the Rumanian dynasty. It was the successful outcome of the nation's long struggle to acquire the right to elect as its sovereign a member of one of the western reigning families, in order to put an end to the strife and rivalry among native candidates to the throne.

Eleven years later, on May 10, 1877, during the turmoil of the Russo-Turkish war, the Principality of Rumania, until then nominally a vassal of the Sultan, proclaimed her independence by severing the old and outdated ties that linked her with the Ottoman Empire. This independence had to be fought out on the battlefields south of the Danube where the young Rumanian army, as an ally of Russia, played a noteworthy part in the defeat of the Turkish forces. The Congress of Berlin of 1878 confirmed Rumania's independence and conferred Europe's official recognition, a bright page in the country's history, marred only by the loss of Bessarabia, cynically wrenched away by Russia from the ally who had helped them win victory over the Turks.

Four years later the Rumanian people had proclaimed their independence and a further step was taken as they decided to raise their country to the rank of a kingdom. On May 10, 1881 Charles I was crowned by the will of his people, King of Rumania. A prosperous era which lasted over six decades opened on that day for the nation.

During all those years and up to the present time Rumanians have cherished and revered the 10th of May as their national holiday. The ruthless foreign rule which now oppresses the Rumanian nation has not been able to uproot the attachment of the people to their traditional independence celebration. The official celebrations, in an attempt to alter their significance, have been shifted from May 10 to May 9, the anniversary of the Soviet victory, but even though the flags are now hoisted on May 9, one day too soon, Rumanians in their captive homeland still celebrate in their hearts the following day, awaiting with faith and courage the dawn of new times when freedom shall be restored to them.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 10 years since the Congress began for the second time in our history to take an active role in the movement for equality for all Americans. During the period since passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Congress has approved far-reaching legislation dealing with racial discrimination in voting, public accommodations, employment, public education and facilities, and the use of Federal funds. Today we begin consideration of new civil rights legislation in the areas of jury selection, housing, and racial violence.

The parallels to an earlier time in our history are striking indeed. Between 1865 and 1875, earlier Congresses enacted a succession of civil rights laws designed to guarantee the rights of citizenship to the newly emancipated slaves. Those Congresses, too, passed laws against discrimination in voting, places of public accommodation, and in other areas. Yet that first effort to secure equality for all Americans ended in failure.

One of the most significant reasons for our tragic relapse into a racial caste system in 1875 was the failure to enact, enforce, and uphold effective criminal legislation to secure the newly granted rights from violence. Much of the Reconstruction criminal legislation was loosely drafted in general terms and the courts invalidated or severely limited the scope of those statutes shortly after their enactment. In addition, in many areas the administration of justice was corrupted by racial discrimination in juries and lack of a will to enforce Federal rights. The result was that the paper rights created by the Congress never became a living reality.

We can avoid the mistakes of the past by the prompt enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. This bill contains clear, specific, and appropriately severe criminal sanctions against violence and intimidation of persons who seek to exercise Federal rights. And the Supreme Court has recently said that some of the old hampering restrictions on Federal criminal power would not be applied to new legislation. Moreover, the bill would deal effectively with all varieties of invidious discrimination in the selection of jurors. We can be sure, too, that the executive department will pursue a policy of vigorous enforcement. History need not repeat itself if we learn from its teaching.

WILL ROGERS, JR., SPEAKS AT OPENING OF FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES MUSEUM

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1966, the new Five Civilized Tribes Museum at Muskogee was dedicated, and Will Rogers, Jr., the son of America's beloved humorist, and a distinguished former Member of the Congress, was principal speaker.

A bright sun shone for the historic occasion, and leaders of the Five Civilized Tribes joined many of Oklahoma's most illustrious citizens in attending the dedication.

Chief W. E. Dode McIntosh, of the Creek Nation, was presiding officer. Remarks were made by Chief W. W. Keeler of the Cherokees, Governor Overton James of the Chickasaws, Chairman John Brown of the Seminoles, and Dr. B. Frank Belvin, president of the Five Civilized Tribes Inter-Tribal Council, represented the Choctaws.

Among the distinguished guests to inspect the beautiful museum, following the dedication ceremonies, was Oklahoma's Governor, Henry Bellmon.

From all over Oklahoma, Indians came to stand beside their Sycamore brothers, and to celebrate the giant step taken at Muskogee, to preserve at the historic Union Agency Building some of the great art and culture of the Five Civilized Tribes.

A long-time champion of the American Indian and of programs to advance his cause and assure justice for his tribes, Will Rogers, Jr., was an ideal choice as principal speaker for the dedication ceremony. His speech is being made part of the Record, because of its significance and the truth which it states so eloquently:

ADDRESS OF WILL ROGERS, JR., MUSKOGEE, OKLA., APRIL 16, 1966

Governor Bellmon, Congressman Edmondson, Chief McIntosh, chiefs of the Five Civilized Tribes, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of Indian ancestry, and those of you who came over from Europe, it is a great honor to be asked to participate in this dedication and opening of the Five Civilized Tribes Museum.

My father said, "'Civilized'—that meant there was no oil on our reservation." He also said, "The Cherokees may have had the brains, but the Osages got the money."

Of course, his most famous remark was, "I am not one of those Americans whose ancestors came over on the *Mayflower*, but we met the boat when it landed." Now that has been widely quoted, but people almost always leave out what he said after that—"and it was the biggest mistake we ever made when we ever let you land."

Incidentally, it may be of interest that this remark of his was actually first made in a speech in Boston before the Daughters of the Descendants of the *Mayflower*. You can imagine the effect that had on those proud and stately Boston matrons.

But we are here today to smoke the pipe of peace with our white brothers, and I can't think of a more appropriate place.

Oklahoma has more tribes and certainly contains more people of Indian ancestry than any other State in the Union. Therefore it is not surprising that the two greatest repositories of American Indian art and artifacts should be in Oklahoma. The Gilcrease Museum in Tulsa contains the finest collection in the world of paintings of the American Indian and the American westward movement. The Philbrook Museum, also in Tulsa, has the finest collection in the world of paintings by American Indians.

In their special fields, these two institutions outrank the Metropolitan in New York, the National Art Gallery and the Smithsonian in Washington.

Oklahoma, I sometimes think, is a little timid in promoting its cultural assets. Were the Gilcrease or the Philbrook Museums in New York or California, you would see them being publicized all over the place.

We are still a young country. We are just beginning to appreciate our past. And we are just beginning to appreciate how rapidly things of the past disappear.

The late Tom Gilcrease picked up for a song, things which today are worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. Nothing—stocks, bonds, land, diamonds or gold—has increased as rapidly in value over the last 30 years as have the better items of Western Americana.

This Five Civilized Tribes Museum is just at the beginning. As time goes on you will be acquiring rarer and rarer pieces—and as time goes on, those which you have will become more and more valuable, important and irreplaceable.

As has been said so often, the Indians of the New World were not a single nation, not even a related unit. Like Europe, they were a group of nations. But on this continent the different "nations" were far more numerous, several thousands, in fact. Most of them were totally different from each other, in language, culture and customs.

Each Indian group thinks its history is the most important. The Sioux in North Dakota point with great pride to their military exploits and "Custer's Last Stand." The Apaches in Arizona brag up Geronimo.

But in the long and colorful parade of Indian history, the story of the Indian removal—the story of the five so-called "civilized tribes," the story of their eviction from their ancestral homelands in the east, their travel across the Trail of Tears to new lands in the West, a territory now called Oklahoma—that story, I feel, is one of the most impressive and important of all of the Indian stories.

The removal of these people was—I think it should be faced—a blot on American history. But that blot has, to some extent, been erased by the success with which the new arrivals made a new home for themselves in their new territory.

How the Choctaws, Creeks, Chickashaws, Cherokees, and Seminoles established "nations" with capitals and schools and laws and churches is a story more inspiring for the future of our country than the Trail of Tears was dispiriting.

Every good Hollywood script should have a story of struggle and conflict, a story with a very low point when all seems lost, and then a final winning out to success (and in television you have the final winning out to success and then the closing commercial).

The story of the Five Civilized Tribes is in that Hollywood category. From a very low point after the Trail of Tears, they are today among the most advanced Indian groups in the Nation. Today, members of the Five Civilized Tribes participate in and furnish leadership to the life of our country more than does any other Indian group.

It is appropriate that the story of the Five Civilized Tribes be told and most appropriate that it be told here in Muskogee, the center of the Indian Agency, and in this historic building which used to house the Indian Agency.

This museum is important for several reasons. It was made possible entirely by people of this community. There were no Federal funds, no State funds. It is the finest possible example of community effort.

And, from what I have seen, all the physical labor was done by the women. They did the hammering, the nailing, the painting, the arranging. All the men did was talk about it and perhaps contribute some money.

This, then, is a local museum telling a local story, preserving in this place the heritage of a very colorful past. The work you have done here is appreciated by people all over the country. As an example, I have this morning received a telegram from Robert Bennett, the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs, as follows:

"The restoration of the historic Union Agency building as a museum is a fitting tribute to the role the five tribes have played in the shaping of the State of Oklahoma and, indeed, of the entire Nation. My congratulations to you, and all the groups and individuals who joined together to create the Five Tribes Museum. I am looking forward to close working relationships with the five tribes and all Indian groups, and with the local communities as well, for the social and economic advancement of Indian citizens.

ROBERT L. BENNETT,
Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs."

This museum is going to be appreciated more by future generations than it is today. As time goes on you are going to have your low points and your high points, your disappointments, wrangles and troubles. At times it will seem as though no one in the community appreciates what you are doing.

But as the years roll on, as this young country becomes a middle-aged country and perhaps, hundreds of years from now, even an old country—this small regional museum will, I hope, inspire and enrich classroom after classroom of Oklahoma children, giving them and their elders a better picture of their own past, helping them become better citizens. You people of Muskogee have started well. To you, all success.

MUSKOGEE'S NEW MUSEUM IS DEDICATED BY DR. BELVIN OF THE CHOCTAWS

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Muskogee were the proud hosts to Indians from many distant places on April 16, 1966, when the old Agency building was dedicated as a new museum honoring the Five Civilized Tribes.

The honor of formally dedicating the museum was given to an outstanding Choctaw, Dr. B. Frank Belvin, who has served as president of the Five Civilized Tribes Inter-Tribal Council, and is the brother of the principal chief of the Choctaw tribe, the Honorable Henry J. W. Belvin.

The restoration of the old Agency building as a site for the Five Civilized Tribes Museum has been a labor of love for many Oklahomans.

The roster of the board of directors for the new museum is in many respects a distinguished one, including some of our State's leading citizens in many walks of life.

Dr. Pat Fite, Sr., one of Oklahoma's great surgeons, is president of the board.

John T. Griffin, leading Oklahoma industrialist, is vice president.

Other members of the board of directors include: Mrs. Marie L. Wadley, secretary; Enos Vann, treasurer; Miss Marcell McDaniel, assistant secretary; W. W. Keeler, principal chief of the Cherokees; Overton James, governor of the Chickasaws; Harry J. W. Belvin, principal chief of the Choctaws; W. E. McIntosh, principal chief of the Creeks; John Brown, chairman of the general council of the Seminoles; Mrs. Don Bankston; Mrs. A. Chapman Bartleson; Mrs. Frances Rosser Brown; Mrs. Elizabeth Cohenour; James A. Egan; Mrs. S. L. Ferguson; the Reverend Canon F. Fulkerson; Harry W. Gibson, Jr.; Virgil N. Harrington; Hayes Holliday; Arthur C. Johnson; J. E. Johnston; Miss Margaret LaHay; William W. Leak; E. B. Maytubby; Earl Boyd Pierce; Larry F. Rooney, Jr.; Mrs. George W. Seibold, Jr.; Clarence M. Smith; John Lewis Stone; Mrs. Thomas D. Tarpley; Andrew C. Wilcoxen, Jr.; J. Dudley Wilkinson.

Important roles in connection with the museum also were taken by the Associate Directors, Miss Alice Marriott and Miss Carol Rachlin; by the hostess, Mrs. Spencer Denton; by the architect, John A. Reid of Reid and Associates; by the contractor, Billy Buckmaster; and by the building superintendent, Dakota Davis.

Mayor Jim Egan of Muskogee proclaimed April 16, 1966, as Museum Day in Muskogee, and all citizens in the community were called upon to join in honoring the Five Civilized Tribes and their contribution to Oklahoma's heritage.

The remarks of Dr. B. Frank Belvin, in dedicating the museum were a memorable contribution to the ceremonies of April 16.

The text of Dr. Belvin's remarks follows:

Address of Dr. B. Frank Belvin at the Dedication of Five Civilized Tribes Museum, Muskogee, Okla., April 16, 1966

We are assembled today on historic ground, and at a building whose walls have heard the tale of Five Nations. We are here to dedicate this historic building on Agency Hill as a museum to the honor of the Five Civilized Tribes.

It is altogether fitting that this building become the repository of pictures, documents, and other historic articles that help to tell the story of our people. For through these doors passed the great and the near great, and in these rooms were charted many plans designed to aid the young nations as they wrought out their temporal destiny in their new land.

The dedication of the museum is the fulfillment of a long cherished dream of a multitude. Plans for it were conceived in the hearts of patriots, and its progress was nurtured by tireless and benevolent friends. For the Five Tribes this is an honor and a recognition that is long overdue. For indeed, they have made a contribution to the history of this Nation far greater than most people realize.

But even so, the names of the Five Civilized Tribes are unfamiliar or even unknown to many people. Perhaps it is because, with few exceptions, they have been peaceable people. The Choctaws, for instance, boasted that until the Civil War they, as a tribe, had never spilled a white man's blood. But when they did things, they went "all out." The war with the Seminoles over removal was the most costly in both men and money that the United States ever had with an Indian tribe. And during the Civil War, when brother lifted up sword against brother, most of the braves of the Five Tribes fought with the South. When the Southern generals were brought to their knees, some of the Indians remained in the field fighting against overwhelming odds until they were finally called in from battle.

Before the coming of the white man to these shores, in a general way the Five Civilized Tribes laid claim to the southeast portion of what is now the United States, from the Mississippi River eastward to the sea. With the increasing number of white settlers, these land holdings dwindled.

Some time after the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, and under mounting pressure of white settlers, a plan was begun by the United States to settle the Indians in Indian Territory west of the Mississippi River. The great removal of the Five Tribes was effected between 1828 and 1845. The removals were under the direction of the War Department, which had poorly planned and poorly provided for such a tremendous undertaking. Thus, cruelty, hunger, disease, and death plagued them every step of the way. The Cherokees lost an average of four a mile in the journey from North Carolina to Tahlequah, while the Choctaws could have buried one every 1,300 feet from Mississippi to their new land. The Chickasaws and Creeks fared little better. And some of the Seminoles were marched in chains to the west. Observers of the day reported that some of the Seminoles marched silently and unflinchingly, while blood trickled from the wounds made and kept raw by their shackles. The removals have thus been rightly called the Trail of Tears.

At the end of these journeys the Five Tribes established their new nations. And in the face of hardship and heartache, they prospered under their own government for about 75 years. But once again, the settlers caught up with them. So in 1907 these governments were disbanded, tribal holdings divided, and Indian Territory became the State of Oklahoma. With it, the Five Tribes became citizens of the State and of the United States.

But we do not bemoan the past—rather we look forward with hope to the future. And from the faith and fortitude of our forefathers, we will draw lessons and strength, which, coupled with the grace of God, will enable us to attain a greater destiny.

Briefly, the purpose of the Five Civilized Tribes Museum is to preserve for posterity the traditions, and rightful records of our people. It will hold art, books, crafts, documents, letters, newspapers, pamphlets, and other data that help to tell the history of the Five Tribes. It is intended that this museum will display the story of the Five Tribes so well that even one who never heard of them can pass through these halls and within an hour have a general knowledge of them and their part in the history of America.

Therefore, in the words of that unexcelled and beloved historian, Grant Foreman, we dedicate this museum, "To those pioneer Indians, whose courage and fortitude, perserverance, and achievements sustained them through travail and disaster and earned for them the name of the Five Civilized Tribes, and so laid the foundation for the State of Oklahoma."

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the independence of Rumania, it might be well to reflect what independence means to us. We may openly profess our belief in God, the dignity of the individual, the sanctity of home and family, and respect for parents. We are guaranteed freedom of expression, freedom of the press, freedom of choice and place of work, and an equitable share in the fruits of our labor. We are guaranteed freedom from the fear the gendarmes may awaken us in the darkness and stillness of the night and take us or our loved ones or neighbors away to an unknown fate which is usually death, or slavery in a slave labor camp.

Fortunately we are able to celebrate openly an occasion such as this and to express our feeling on the natural rights of men and nations. This occasion will never be forgotten by the Rumanian people even though in these days they are forced to commemorate Rumanian independence under an enforced silence brought about by the alien occupier.

History teaches us that all those who have tried to put themselves above God's eternal design are defeated by the means they use to attain their evil objectives. History teaches us also that no people with any spirit or love of their native land can long endure absolute tyranny, and that at some point the tremendous pressures which are built up by this enforced silence not only in Rumania, but throughout the entire slave empire, will burst forth with such a violence as to completely destroy the alien occupier. We do not know when this will likely happen, but we are certain that it shall happen, and when it does we must be prepared to come to the support of the freedom loving patriots of Rumania.

We must find the means, the courage, and the determination to create a new world order based upon the rights of all nations, large and small, to national sovereignty within the framework of a world community dedicated to peace and prosperity for all people. When we have accomplished that goal, Rumania and all the other enslaved nations will be restored to a place of dignity which is demanded by every tenent of moral law.

TIME FOR FEDERAL ATTACK ON ALCOHOLISM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Hagan] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as you know there is increasing interest in the 89th Congress to establish a sound and substantial attack at the Federal level on alcoholism. I am proud to have been the first Member of this Congress to initiate specific legislation concerning alcoholism when I introduced H.R. 781 on January 4, 1965. Now, 43 Members of both Houses of Congress have sponsored such legislation. In his recent health and education message to Congress the President called for our consideration of a substantial Federal involvement in this pressing domestic problem. Alcoholism is ranked by Government health officials as being among the top four major health problems of this Nation. Much has been said in these

Chambers and on the floor of the Senate to validate this fact. But I submit to you that this disease is much more than a health problem. It is a problem which greatly compounds many other problems of society, such as poverty, welfare, crime, juvenile delinquency, family discord. Our tremendous industrial output—great as it is—is significantly hampered by alcoholism among those employed in industry.

The State governments have long been concerned about the far-reaching effects of alcoholism. My own State of Georgia is among 42 which have seen the need to establish comprehensive programs for alcoholism control at the State level. Many of these programs have been in existence 20 years or more. Whereas much has been accomplished by these fine State programs and whereas much has been learned about alcoholism, the illness apparently continues on the increase. But the State governments have, for the most part, reached their financial limits in expanding their alcoholism programs. It is time that the Federal Government accept its responsibility in this area by providing a substantial program of aid to the States in this crucial problem area. The estimated 5 million alcoholics in our Nation directly and seriously affect the lives of at least 20 million other citizens—the families and close relatives of the alcoholic. Mr. Speaker, this is more than 10 percent of our total population. Any problem of this magnitude, without question, seriously affects the lives of all of us.

This major illness is now widely accepted as an illness throughout our social structure.

Many chronic alcoholic court cases are pending over the Nation. Two have only recently been decided in favor of the appellants. The first of these was the case of Joe B. Driver who appealed a conviction and jail sentence for public drunkenness in North Carolina. Mr. Driver has been arrested more than 200 times over many years on the same charge. In a unanimous opinion, the Fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals held that Mr. Driver could not be stamped a criminal because of his unpretending illness.

In a similar case brought before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, DeWitt Easter was likewise exonerated of criminal action by all eight judges sitting en banc.

The opinion in the Driver case has already been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I would like, Mr. Speaker, for the opinions in the Easter case to be included also.

There is now pending in the U.S. Supreme Court a petition for certiorari in the case of Budd against the State of California. If this case, too, is decided in favor of the appellant it will, of course, be a nationwide ruling that persons may no longer be jailed and marked as criminals because of their symptoms of alcoholism.

Considering that more than half of all police arrests in many of our urban communities are alcohol related, we must conclude that a sizable portion of them will be affected by these court decisions.

That the public recognizes alcoholism as a menacing problem is reflected in a recent survey by the noted pollster, Louis Harris. This survey revealed that one in five persons interviewed indicated that problem drinking was evident in someone closely related to them. If Mr. Harris' sample is typical of the U.S. population, projection of his findings reveal that close to 40 million people are seriously and directly affected by the residual effects of alcoholism. This is almost twice the number as is conservatively estimated by health authorities.

I should like to include this Harris survey as an extension of my remarks. It appeared in the May 2 edition of the Washington Post.

In view of the recent developments related to alcoholism—the court decisions, the President's comments in his health and education message and the astonishing interest on the part of the public from all sections of this great Nation—I called on several national organizations having primary interest in the field of alcoholism to review my original bill, H.R. 781, and to make recommendations for a revised bill. The resulting updated bill, H.R. 13724, was introduced on March 16. In the opinion of these national organizations, this bill represents a very feasible approach to the problems of alcoholism and would establish the kind of comprehensive program needed at the Federal level. In view of the tremendous problems of alcoholism the bill is very conservative and, in my opinion, represents the minimal effort necessary at the Federal level.

This is an urgent matter deserving of immediate attention by Congress. We have waited far too long to take constructive action on this most pressing problem. We are already behind the State governments by 20 years. We cannot afford to wait any longer. I urge that immediate action be taken on the several bills now pending.

The matters referred to follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 2, 1966]

THE HARRIS SURVEY: ONE IN EVERY FIVE REVEALS DRINKING PROBLEMS

(By Louis Harris)

One in every five adults in the United States says someone close to him drinks too much alcohol upon occasion. And 1 in every 14 adults says this person shows the effects of drinking "almost all the time."

These problem drinkers are identified by the public, for the most part, as members of their immediate families and half of them are fathers or husbands. Quite clearly, according to the answers from a carefully drawn cross section of the adult public, men have a more serious problem with alcohol than women.

The chief reasons cited as the causes for alcoholism are family problems, an inherent craving for alcohol, an emotional need to drink, personal insecurity tracing back to childhood, and a desire to escape the realities of life. It is apparent that the roots of alcoholism are considered by the public to be essentially psychological.

When asked how the effects of drinking show in the individuals they know, those we interviewed spoke of persons passing out, marked belligerency, sharp personality changes, violence, self-injury, and abdication of family and job responsibilities.

To determine the incidence of the drinking problem, people were asked:

"Do you have anyone close to you who drinks too much or not?" and "What is the relation of that person to you?"

Incidence of drinking problem

[Total Nation]

	Percent
No one with drinking problem	80
Someone close with drinking problem	20
Father	6
Husband	4
Son	2
Wife	1
Mother	1
Other	6

Alcoholism tends to affect all segments of society with as many in low-income groups as high, as many among the better educated as among the poorly educated, as many rural residents as suburbanites reporting the problem.

People were also asked:

"How often does this person show the effects of too much drinking?"

The results:

How often show effect

	Percent
Almost all the time	38
Now and then	32
Only once in a while	26
Almost never	4

How these effects of drinking manifest themselves brought forth a flood of rather poignant word pictures. The cross section was asked:

"How do the effects of drinking show in the individual?"

Effects of excessive drinking

	Percent
Drinks until passes out	18
Becomes belligerent	13
Personality changes	12
Loud and noisy	10
Bloodshot eyes	9
Irresponsible	7
Can't hold a job	7
Not alert, uncoordinated	6
Slurred, slow speech	6
Manic depressive	5
Irrational	4
Can't communicate	3
Violent	3
Nervousness	3
Deprives family	3
Becomes paranoid	3
Injures self	3
Happy, relaxed	3

A majority of the public—54 percent—believes there is a cure for alcoholism, but that it lies within the individual himself.

Nature of cure

	Percent
Must want to help self	41
Find God	12
Psychiatry	10
Alcoholics Anonymous	9
Better family life	8
Medical help	8
More work, less leisure	7
Love from others	5

DEWITT EASTER, APPELLANT *v.* DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, APPELLEE

(U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 19365, appeal from the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, decided Mar. 31, 1966)

Messrs. Peter Barton Hutt and Michael S. Horne, with whom Messrs. Monroe H. Freedman, James V. Siena, National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union and Frank S. Ketcham, Washington Area Council on Alcholism were on the brief, for appellant.

Mr. Ted D. Kuemmerling, Assistant Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia, with whom Messrs. Milton D. Korman, Acting Corporation Counsel, and Hubert B. Pair, Assistant Corporation Counsel, were on the brief, for appellee.

Before Bazelon, Chief Judge, and Fahy, Danaher, Burger, Wright, McGowan, Tamm, and Leventhal, Circuit Judges, sitting en banc.

Fahy, Circuit Judge, with whom Bazelon, Chief Judge, and Wright and Leventhal, Circuit Judges join and with whom McGowan, Circuit Judge, joins in the result and in parts I and III of the opinion: In the Court of General Sessions for the District of Columbia, at a trial by a judge without a jury, appellant DeWitt Easter was found guilty of having been "drunk and intoxicated" on a stated date in a street in Washington, in violation of our Code provision reading:

"No person shall * * * be drunk or intoxicated in any street, alley, park, or parking;"

District of Columbia Code, section 25–128(a).[1] He was given a suspended sentence of 90 days imprisonment. That he was drunk or intoxicated at the time and place stated was proved and was uncontested. His defense was that he was a chronic alcoholic.

The judge did not rule that the evidence fell short of establishing that appellant was a chronic alcoholic. The judge ruled that the evidence to that effect was not pertinent; that is, that chronic alcoholism was not a defense to a charge of intoxication in a public place.

The District of Columbia Court of Appeals affirmed the conviction. *Easter* v. *District of Columbia*, 209 A. 2d 625. We allowed an appeal to this court. Sitting en banc we heard and now decide the case.

I

Our decision is that chronic alcoholism is a defense to a charge of public intoxication and, therefore, is not a crime in violation of section 25–128(a) of our code, supra n. 1. We think this follows, in the first place, from the act of Congress of August 4, 1947, entitled "Rehabilitation of Alcoholics," 61 Stat. 744, c. 472 now embodied in our code as sections 24–501, et seq.[2]

In aid of its purposes, one of which is "to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical, psychiatric, and other scientific treatment of chronic alcoholics" the act provides, "the courts of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to take judicial notice of the fact that a chronic alcoholic is a sick person and in need of proper medical, institutional, advisory, and rehabilitative treatment, and the court is authorized to direct that he receive appropriate medical, psychiatric, or other treatment as provided under the terms of this chapter."[3]—District of Columbia Code, section 24–501 (1961 ed.).

A "chronic alcoholic" is defined in the act:

"The term 'chronic alcoholic' means any person who chronically and habitually uses alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost the power of self-control with respect to the use of such beverages, or while under the influence of alcohol endangers the public morals, health, safety, or welfare."—District of Columbia Code, section 24–502 (1961 ed.).

We are concerend in this case only with the part of the above definition which refers to loss of the power of self-control with respect to the use of alcoholic beverages.

The above statutory provisions, considered in the full context of the act of which they are a part,[4] preclude attaching criminality in this jurisdiction to intoxication in public of a chronic alcoholic. An essential element of criminal responsibility is the ability to avoid the conduct specified in the definition of the crime. Action within the definition is not enough. To be guilty of the crime a person must engage responsibly in the action. Thus, an insane person who does the act is not guilty of the crime. The law, in such a case based on morals, absolves him of criminal responsibility. So, too, in case of an infant. In case of a chronic alcoholic Congress has dealt with his condition so that in this jurisdiction he too cannot be held to be guilty of the crime of being intoxicated because, as the act recognizes, he has lost the power of self-control in the use of intoxicating beverages. In his case as essential element of criminality, where personal conduct is involved, is lacking. This element is referred to in the law as the criminal mind. See *Carter* v. *United States* 102 U.S. App. D.C. 227, 235, 252 F. 2d 608, 616, where the subject is well discussed. It is there stated in terms of the common-law axiom, "Actus non facit reum, nisi mens sit rea." Coke, Third Institute *6, *107.

The act of 1947 does not state that a chronic alcoholic is suffering from a mental disease which causes the loss of control; the defense is not in terms of insanity. The condition is defined as a "sickness," and Congress did not find it necessary to specify whether it is mental, physical or a combination of both. Whatever its etiological intricacies it is deemed a sickness which is accompanied with loss of power to control the use of alcoholic beverages. The congressional judgment is supported not only by the evidence in this case adduced in the Court of General Sessions but by the record of the hearings on the act of 1947,[5] the entire legislative history of the act, and by an additional abundance of authorities, some of which are enumerated in appendix B to this opinion. As Congressman Miller, of Nebraska, stated on the floor of the House during the debate on the act:

"Jail is not the answer to their trouble. We think they are sick people and need scientific and technical attention of psychiatrists and medical personnel."—93 Congressional Record 3357 (1947).[6]

It is suggested that the public nature of the intoxication adds a factor which precludes the defense—that if suffering from the sickness is not a crime, manifesting it in a public place is. But, nothing whatever indicates that Congress intended to limit the scope of the act to persons sick in privacy. It is clear the act was primarily concerned with persons found in public places. The provisions which contemplated their institutional care, instead of the jail, show indubitably that the noncriminal approach of Congress applied to the chronic alcoholic floundering in a public place. The lack of power of self-control referred to cannot be limited to absolution of criminality for drinking or being drunk in a nonpublic place. No statute in the District of Columbia makes such an act or circumstance criminal. The very nature of the sickness goes where its victim goes.

It should be clear from the above that chronic alcoholism resulting in public intoxication cannot be held to be criminal on the theory that before the sickness became chronic there was at some earlier period a voluntary act or series of acts which led to the chronic condition. A sick person is a person who, at one time, may have been and, therefore, is unable to control his use of alcoholic beverages and is not to be considered voluntarily intoxicated. We desire to make clear, however, that we are not absolving the voluntarily intoxicated person of criminal responsibility for crime in general under applicable law. See *Harris* v. *United States*, 8 App. D.C. 20.

We find no basis for judicial repudiation of the act of 1947. The fact that in the intervening years the facilities contemplated by the act have not been made available does not detract from the legal effect of those provisions of the act which define the nature of the sickness. One who has committed no crime cannot be validly sentenced as a criminal because of a lack of rehabilitative and caretaking facilities.

In event of a determination of chronic alcoholism under the procedures of District of Columbia Code, section 24–504 commitment for treatment is not mandatory. In the judge's discretion the accused may be released. But he may not be punished.

---

[1] District of Columbia Code sec. 25–128 (1961 ed.): "(a) No person shall in the District of Columbia drink any alcoholic beverage in any street, alley, park, or parking; * * * No such person shall be drunk or intoxicated in any street, alley, park, or parking."

[2] The full flavor of the enlightened treatment of the subject by Congress, demonstrating its intention that the chronic alcoholic be subjected to civil processes when found intoxicated in public, rather than convicted as a criminal, can be gathered only by perusal in full of the Act of 1947.

[3] Sec. 24–509 provides: "Certification of adequate facilities: No chronic alcoholic shall be committed to a clinic, agency, hospital, or institution under the terms of this chapter until the District Commissioners shall certify to the municipal court for the District of Columbia the extent to which proper and adequate treatment facilities and personnel have been provided to carry out the purposes of this chapter."

It is not shown that the Commissioners have made this certification; but we are concerned with those provisions of the Act which bear upon the legal question before us. Their effect upon that question cannot be avoided because the facilities contemplated by other provisions of the act may not be available.

But the statute goes on to extend that category to include one who "while under the influence of alcohol endangers the public morals, health, safety, or welfare."

I am confident that Congress in its obvious purpose of seeking means for accomplishing the possible rehabilitation of the unfortunate victims of alcoholism had no thought whatever of addressing itself to some revised standards for determining criminal responsibility as to yet other crimes than public drunkenness. I wish to note my complete understanding that we are not now doing so. All too often this court has been confronted with circumstances of crime where intoxication has been urged as a ground of exculpation. See e.g., *Bishop* v. *United States*, 71 App. D.C. 132, 135–136, 107 F. 2d 297, 301–302 (1939); *Heideman* v. *United States*, 104 U.S. App. D.C. 128 259 F. 2d 943 (1958), cert. denied, 359 U.S. 959. (1959).

Obviously the application of any rule of law will depend upon the circumstances of a particular case. In the instant situation this appellant meets the definition of a chronic alcoholic because, by reason of his habitual use of alcoholic beverages, he "has lost the power of self-control with respect to the use of such beverages."

[4] "The purpose of this chapter is * * * to substitute for jail sentences for drunkenness medical and other scientific methods of treatment which will benefit the individual involved and more fully protect the public." District of Columbia Code, sec. 24–501 (1961 ed.).

[5] Portions of the hearings are set forth in appendix A to this opinion.

[6] Our reliance upon the act of 1947, and the independent support for its conclusion that the chronic alcoholic lacks the criminal mind and, therefore, is not guilty of a crime in being intoxicated in a public place, is a separate basis for our decision independent of reliance upon the eighth amendment, hereinafter discussed.

II

Our decision would be the same were we without the guidance furnished by the act of 1947. One who is a chronic alcoholic cannot have the mens rea necessary to be held responsible criminally for being drunk in public. This is so for the same reason which led Congress to that enactment; namely, that a chronic alcoholic is in fact a sick person who has lost control over his use of alcoholic beverages. This is demonstrated by the hearings on the act of 1947, by the evidence taken in the present case, and by the wealth of material available and appropriate to be considered by the court. See appendixes A and B.

The same basic problem now before us was recently before the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in *Driver* v. *Hinnant*, — F. 2d —.[7] This was a habeas corpus proceeding attacking in the Federal courts a conviction of Driver of public intoxication by the courts of North Carolina. Under a State statute it was a misdemeanor to be found "drunk or intoxicated on the public highway, or at any public place or meeting." Even without benefit of such a statute as our act of 1947, the court sustained the defense of chronic alcoholism. The court said in part:

"As defined by the National Council on Alcoholism, he [a chronic alcoholic] is a 'person who is powerless to stop drinking and whose drinking seriously alters his normal living pattern.'[8] The American Medical Association defines 'alcoholics' as 'those excessive drinkers whose dependence on alcohol has attained such a degree that it shows a noticeable disturbance or interference with their bodily or mental health, their interpersonal relations, and their satisfactory social and economic functioning.'[9] The World Health Organization recognizes alcoholism 'as a chronic illness that manifests itself as a disorder of behavior.'[10] It is known that alcohol can be addicting,[11] and it is the addict—the involuntary drinker—on whom our decision is now made.[12] Hence we exclude the merely excessive—steady or spree—voluntary drinker.

"This addiction—chronic alcoholism—is now almost universally accepted medically as a disease.[13] The symptoms, as already noted, may appear as 'disorder of behavior.' Obviously, this includes appearances in public, as here, unwilled and ungovernable by the victim. When that is the conduct for which he is criminally accused, there can be no judgment of criminal conviction passed upon him. To do so would affront the eighth amendment, as cruel and unusual punishment in branding him a criminal, irrespective of consequent detention or fine.[14]

"Although his misdoing objectively comprises the physical elements of a crime, nevertheless no crime has been perpetrated because the conduct was neither actuated by an evil intent nor accompanied with a consciousness of wrongdoing, indispensable ingredients of a crime. *Morissette* v. *United States*, 342 U.S. 246, 250–52 (1952). Nor can his misbehavior be penalized as a transgression of a police regulation—malum prohibitum—necessitating no intent to do what it punishes. The alcoholic's presence in public is not his act, for he did not will it. It may be likened to the movements of an imbecile or a person in a delirium of a fever. None of them by attendance in the forbidden place defy the forbiddance.

* * * * *

"Of course, the alcohol-diseased may by law be kept out of public sight. Equally true, the North Carolina statute does not punish them solely for drunkenness, but rather for its public demonstration. But many of the diseased have no homes or friends, family or means to keep them indoors. Driver examples this pitiable predicament, for he is apparently without money or restraining care."

Footnote 3 of Judge Bryan's opinion calls attention to reliance by the District Court in the Driver case upon the definition of a chronic alcoholic contained in the act of 1947.

Judge Bryan also stated for the Court that *Robinson* v. *California*, 370 U.S. 660, "sustains, if not commands, the view we take." In Robinson the Supreme Court held invalid as cruel and unusual punishment prohibited by the 8th and 14th amendments a California statute which made drug addiction a crime. The Court said such addiction was a status involuntarily assumed, and therefore to punish it as a crime violated the constitutional provisions. Since, as we have seen, public intoxication of a chronic alcoholic is not a crime, to convict one of it as though it were would also be cruel and unusual punishment. The fact that in our case the sentence of 90 days was suspended, whereas in Robinson there was imprisonment, is immaterial on the question of cruel and unusual punishment; it is the fact of criminal conviction that is critical: "In the light of contemporary human knowledge, a law which made a criminal offense of such a disease [mental illness, leprosy, or venereal disease] would doubtless be universally thought to be an infliction of cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the 8th and 14th amendments"[15] (370 U.S. at 666).

In Driver Judge Bryan stated it is "cruel and unusual punishment in branding him a criminal, irrespective of consequent detention or fine."

We hold, therefore, by reason of the act of 1947, for the independent reasons which underlay the theory of that act, and on the precedential authority of Driver,[16] with support also from Sweeney, n. 9 supra, that the public intoxication of a chronic alcoholic lacks the essential element of criminality; and to convict such a person of that crime would also offend the eighth amendment.

We close this discussion with the observation that confinement, e.g., for inquiry or treatment, lies within the means available for dealing, constitutionally, with a menace to society. This appears from passages in *Robinson* v. *California, supra*, 370 U.S. at 664–665; *Driver* v. *Hinnant, supra*. We are not called upon to speculate as to the range and nature of permissible detention which could be authorized by Congress beyond that contemplated in the act of 1947.

III

It follows that the evidence of chronic alcoholism adduced in this case was pertinent. It established the defense.

Expert medical and psychiatric evidence, not sought to be rebutted, proved that appellant was a chronic alcoholic who had lost self-control over his use of alcoholic beverages. His condition, with its usual physical manifestations, was arrayed fully before the trial judge and need not be repeated here in detail. Since 1937 appellant has been arrested for intoxication or associated conduct 70 times, 12 times in 1963 alone. On innumerable occasions he has been intoxicated but not arrested. The condition had progressed for many years, definitely since the 1930's, resulting in a broken home life, recurrent hospitalization, and loss of steady employment.

Reversed, with direction to remand to the court of general sessions for dismissal of the information.

APPENDIX A

Excerpts of testimony from hearings on H.R. 496 before Subcommittee on Health, Education, Recreation of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, 80th Congress, 1st session (1947).

"Chronic alcoholism is a disease. It is one which requires treatment and attention just as the narcotic habit demands treatment."—Congressman Miller, of Nebraska.

"This is not a measure to approach the moral aspects of drinking, nor is this an opinion as to the drinking of alcoholic beverages, but we are approaching the problem from a disease such as cancer, tuberculosis, or like diseases which also have an economic influence on the lives of our people."—Congressman Hébert, of Louisiana.

---

[7] Opinion by Circuit Judge Bryan, concurred in by Circuit Judge Bell and District Judge Maxwell.

[8] Public Health Service Publication, No. 730, "Alcoholism," prepared by the National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Education, and Welfare (1965).

[9] See footnote 8.

[10] See footnote 8. Chief Judge Butler noted below, 243 F. Supp. 95, 97, and followed the definition of Congress appearing in the District of Columbia Code, sec. 24–502, that a chronic alcoholic is "any person who chronically and habitually uses alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost the power of self-control with respect to the use of such beverages."

[11] See footnote 8.

[12] See Justice Clark dissenting in *Robinson* v. *California*, 370 U.S. 660, 684 (1962).

[13] Of the myriad authorities these citations will suffice: 2 Cecil and Loeb, A Textbook of Medicine, at 1625 (10th ed. 1959); Manfred S. Guttmacher and Henry Weihofen, "Psychiatry and the Law," at 318–322 (1952 ed.); Jellinek, "The Disease Concept of Alcoholism," at 41–44 (1960).

[14] See concurring opinion of Justice Douglas in *Robinson* v. *California*, supra, 370 U.S. 660, 676.

[15] We are referred to cases decided by this court in which narcotic addiction has been discussed in the majority and concurring opinions. These opinions bear upon rights of a narcotic addict in defending charges of having violated the narcotic laws. *Hutcherson* v. *United States*, 120 U.S. App. D.C. 274, 345 F. 2d 964; *Castle* v. *United States*, 120 U.S. App. D.C. 398, 347 F. 2d 492; *Heard* v. *United States*, — U.S. App. D.C. —, 348 F. 2d 34. Several of the opinions discuss the implications of *Robinson* as possibly barring punishment of such an addict charged with violating certain provisions of the narcotic laws, and, also, the relation of narcotic addiction to mental disease as a defense due to the addict's lack of responsibility for the conduct involved. Whatever impact if any our present decision has upon these problems in a narcotic case must be left for such a case. In this case, as we have said, the defense of chronic alcoholism to a charge of public intoxication is not rested upon mental disease as relieving of criminal responsibility, but upon the absence of responsibility, but upon the absence of responsibility incident to the nature of this particular sickness as set forth by Congress and as shown also by the learning upon which Congress relied. It is rested in addition upon the reasoning of the Fourth Circuit and the studies of the problem in relation to criminal responsibility referred to there.

[16] And see *Sweeney* v. *United States*, 353 F. 2d 10 (7th Cir.), where, also relying upon *Robinson*, it is held that a probation condition that the probationer "refrain from the use of alcoholic beverages in any form, and * * * support his children to the best of his ability * * * would be unreasonable as impossible if psychiatric or other expert testimony was to establish that petitioner's alcoholism has destroyed his power of volition and prevented his compliance with the condition." 353 F. 2d at 11. (Footnote omitted.)

"On a certain day last week, in which we had in our institution [the District of Columbia penal institution] 9 inmates; that is, people committed for intoxication, 5 percent had been committed 100 times or over before; 64 percent of these people in our institution had served time 10 times or more; only 1 of the 559 had been there only once, and so on. * * * In other words, the drink problem in terms of those who get arrested and convicted is primarily a problem of recidivism."—Donald Clemmer, Director, Department of Corrections, District of Columbia.

"Our hearts and minds particularly go out to those individuals. We know they are derelicts, many of them, partically hopelessly involved in this alcoholic confusion.

* * * * *

"We are hopeful a bill of this character will no doubt in the case of many men do a great deal of good. I would say if we got 5 percent out of these alcoholic cases restored to normal health and good citizenship, it will have been well worth the effort put forth in this Congress, I am sure. It is perfectly obvious that it will reduce our work, be for the interest to the individual, it being for his protection."—Inspector Walter H. Thomas, acting major and superintendent, Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.

"Through my experience I have been educated as it were to the point that your committee has arrived at, that alcoholism is a disease and that it is not criminal behavior, and that progress in meeting the situation cannot be made, in my mind, unless we break down in its entirety the concept that the alcoholic is a criminal."—Judge Fay Bentley, juvenile court, District of Columbia.

And see the testimony before the subcommittee of Dr. Robert F. Felix, Chief, Mental Hygiene Division, U.S. Public Health Service, Capt. Rhoda Milliken, Head of Women's Division, Metropolitan Police Force, District of Columbia, and others.

APPENDIX B

Report of the board of trustees of the AMA, 162 Journal of the American Medical Association 749 (1956).

"Among the numerous personality disorders encountered in the general population, it has long been recognized that a vast number of such disorders are characterized by outstanding sign of excessive use of alcohol. All excessive users of alcohol are not diagnosed as alcoholics, but all alcoholics are excessive users. When, in addition to this excessive use, there are certain signs and symptoms of behavioral, personality, and physical disorder or of their development, the syndrome of alcoholism is achieved. The intoxication and some of the other possible complications manifested in this syndrome often make treatment difficult. However, alcoholism must be regarded as within the purview of medical practice" (p. 750).

Trotter, "An Essay: Medical, Philosophical, and Chemical, on Drunkenness (2, ed. 1894).

"The habit of drunkenness is a disease of the mind" (p. 179).

But others think that it is physical and must be slowly dropped since it has become a "part of our nature" (p. 181).

Committee on Prisons, Probation and Parole in the District of Columbia, report (1957).

"Alcoholism is a serious problem in the District of Columbia." (p. 83)

"Repeaters accounted for 9,288 or 68 percent, of the total number of arrests. Police records reveal, moreover, that the average person arrested for intoxication during the test period had a record of 12 prior arrests for the same offense." (p. 93)

"More than 90 percent of the 16,267 persons committed to the District jail for intoxication during fiscal 1956 had served prior prison terms for the same offense. Many who were discharged from the workhouse on Monday, reappeared for another term before the week was up. The committee believes that anything more futile than this process of getting drunk, being arrested, receiving 10-, 15-, or 30-day sentences, going to the jail and to the workhouse, serving time, going out and getting drunk again, can scarcely be imagined. The rate of recidivism, moreover, is the best evidence that existing procedures are failing to rehabilitate the alcoholic." (p. 102)

"The committee cannot emphasize too strongly that not all persons committed for intoxication are chronic alcoholics. Many are relatively youthful offenders who were simply intoxicated at the time of arrest; a somewhat larger group are 'problem drinkers', bordering on chronic alcoholism—but who have families, job prospects, and a desire to 'get back home and back to work'; finally, the great majority of the approximately 14,000 intoxicants committed each year to the workhouse are chronic skid-row alcoholics.

"Most of the intoxicants in the first two groups should be handled, in any future program, in such a manner as to avoid incarceration.

"However, the vast majority of offenders are chronic skid-row alcoholics, who are primarily 'custody cases.' A great number are sick, infirm, and mental cases." (p. 103)

Haggard and Jellinek, "Alcohol Explored" (1942).

"It is necessary to recognize that the confirmed inebriate is a person requiring medical attention, and society must face the issue of treating him as an irresponsible individual until he can be rehabilitated.* * * It is clear that courts require the aid of medical agencies in diagnosing and classifying the types of inebriates who come to their attention, thus enabling them to dispose of each case in the appropriate manner." (p. 273)

MacCormack, "Correctional Views on Alcohol, Alcoholism, and Crime," Alcohol, Alcoholism, and Crime Conference 61 (Chatham, Mass., 1962).

"My professional and personal interest in the alcoholic and in alcoholism began during the 6 years, 1934 to 1940, when I was commissioner of corrections in New York City.

"I am not sure whether I was more impressed by the inhumanly of our methods of dealing with the alcoholic or by the futility of the process" (p. 61).

"In spite of the significant increase in the understanding of alcoholism which has taken place in the past 25 years, however, alcoholics for the most part are still dealt with in the legal and penal setting rather than by methods which are appropriate for persons-presenting a sociomedical problem" (p. 63).

"It would be a step in advance if laws and local ordinances throughout the country were changed so that they could be committed under health or welfare laws rather than under penal statutes" (p. 64).

Murtagh, "The Derelicts of Skid Row," 209 Atlantic Monthly No. 3, 77 (1962). (Chief magistrate to the city of New York, 1950–60.)

"Incarceration never cured a derelict, never did and never will. The problem of the skid-row derelict is basically social, medical, and spiritual in nature. Whether the derelict is a true alcoholic or merely a problem drinker, he usually has a much more deep-seated pathology, an emotional disturbance, if you will, that is an enigma to all of the disciplines. The penal approach to his problem is at best but a feeble attempt" (p. 80).

National Institute of Mental Health, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Alcoholism," Public Health Service publication, No. 730 (revised 1963).

"Only within the last two decades has alcoholism come to be accepted as a medical problem" (p. 9).

"The term 'alcoholism' is not easy to define. It is generally used to cover a whole range of individual and social problems connected with the use of alcoholic beverages. People whose drinking causes them to become enmeshed in these problems are called 'alcoholics.'

"The World Health Organization describes alcoholism as '* * * a chronic illness that manifests itself as a disorder of behavior. It is characterized by the repeated use of alcoholic beverages to an extent that exceed customary dietary use or compliance with social customs of the community and that interferes with the drinker's health or his economic or social functioning.'

"The National Council on Alcoholism defines an alcoholic as a 'person who is powerless to stop drinking and whose drinking seriously alters his normal living pattern.'

"It has been shown that alcohol can be physically addicting. The drinker may develop a tolerance to alcohol so that the same amount produces progressively less effect, and he craves larger and larger amounts. Eventually he must keep on drinking in order to avoid the severe and painful symptoms that result from abrupt withdrawal of alcohol. These symptoms include weakness, severe tremors, fever, and in some cases, convulsions and delirium tremens.

"Alcoholism occurs when people continue to drink heavily in spite of the painful and injurious consequences they suffer" (pp. 2–3).

Goff, "Correction and the Alcoholic," The Court and the Chronic Inebriate: Conference Proceedings 21 (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 1965).

"The dilemma of handling cases of alcoholism involving chronic public intoxication, appears to be deeply routed [sic] in an underlying philosophy of justice which looks at chronic public intoxication as controllable by traditional correctional means. It is fed by the implied and sometimes expressed belief that the disease can be 'punished away.' Until there is greater recognition both intellectually and emotionally of alcoholism as a disease, the 'exercise in futility' of punitive measures to cope with the chronic police court offender will continue.

"What we propose would use repeated offenses of public intoxication as an indication, not of the need of the individual for increased penalties, but of the need of the individual for nonpunitive State handling. Legislative procedure should permit the commitment of selected alcoholics on a civil, not criminal basis, to specialized facilities and programs under the jurisdiction of medical and welfare authorities, for an intermediate period not exceeding 1 year" (p. 24).

Hall, "Drunkenness as a Criminal Offense," 1 Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol 751 (1941).

"The trend of legislation is to treat habitual drunkenness as a disease of mind and body, analogous to insanity, and to put in motion the power of the State, as the guardian of all its citizens, to save the habitual drunkard, his family, and society from the consequences of his habit. It is not a penal but a paternal statute. This statute is limited to persons who have lost the power or will to control their appetite for intoxicating liquors, and have a fixed habit of drunkenness, who are in need of care and treatment, and to those it would be dangerous to leave at large."[1] (P. 758.)

"Excepting where serious personal injury is involved, there is no great obstacle to elimination of punitive methods where others are reasonably indicated." (P. 763.)

Alexander, "Jail Administration," 237–40 (1957).

"The alcoholic is the most common type of prisoner found in American jails. Usually he is committed for drunkenness, drunken driving, vagrancy, or as a public nuisance.

---

[1] *Leavitt* v. *City of Morris* 117 N.W. 393 (Minnesota, 1908).

"But the jail is not the answer to the problem of the alcoholic, despite the fact that it has had to deal with drunks from time immemorial and will continue to deal with them for some foreseeable years ahead. The unending series of fines which must be lain out in jail and short jail sentences repeated endlessly month in and month out, year in and year out, bear not the slightest semblance of an intelligent approach to the treatment and solution of the alcoholic's problem." (P. 237.)

Roche Laboratories, "Aspects of Alcoholism" (1963).

"[Alcoholism is] a condition which belongs in the realm of public health, but excludes the occasional excessive drinker whose disorderly conduct or automobile accident makes him more the concern of the civic authorities than of health personnel" (p. 9).

Pittman and Gordon, "Revolving Door, A Study of the Chronic Police Case Inebriate" (1958).

"The newer concept of alcoholism as a social, mental, and physical illness is in gross conflict with punishment and confinement for the habitual public inebriate" (p. 141).

"The results of our investigation negate completely the assumption that incarceration acts as a deterrent to the chronic public inebriate" (p. 139).

Note, "Legislation for the Treatment of Alcoholics," 2 Stan. L. Rev. 515 (1950).

"What is alcoholism? Authorities stress the fact that it is a health problem and not a penal one. It is a resultant of two factors: the individual's original psychological maladjustment, and the depressant effect of alcohol which creates of itself new maladjustments. The alcoholic feels he cannot successfully adjust to his environment without alcohol, but actually he cannot adjust successfully so long as he uses alcohol. The problem, then, is not solely alcohol but the individual and the manner in which he uses it. When an alcoholic shows pronounced mental and physical degeneration, he is termed 'chronic'" (footnotes omitted (pp. 515–15)).

"At the local level, the so-called revolving door treatment is prevalent. * * * The revolving door treatment is denounced as 'ineffective, expensive, and undesirable.' It has no advocates or defenders' (footnotes omitted (p. 523)).

Hall, "Intoxication and Criminal Responsibility," 57 Harv. L. Rev. 1045 (1944).

"The disparity between judicial and available knowledge is indicated by the need to point out that one of the commonest of expert agreements is that 'alcoholic addiction' (dipsomania) is a disease" (p. 1073).

The Correctional Association of New York and the International Association of Chiefs of Police, "Alcohol and Alcoholism, a Police Handbook."

"Alcoholism is a disease. The definition of a disease is: 'a disturbance in function or structure of any organ or part of the body, possessing certain recognizable symptoms.' Alcoholism fits this perfectly. The victim drinks repeatedly to drunkenness—despite the fact that it injures him physically or mentally, or endangers his earning capacity, or adversely affects his (or her) social and family life.

* * * * *

"The cause of the disease are [sic] not yet known, but it seems to be a combination of many physical and mental factors." (P. 14.)

Celebrezze, opening remarks, HEW National Conference on Alcoholism (1963).

"Alcoholism ranks as our fourth major health problem, following closely after cancer, heart disease, and mental illness." (P. iii.)

McGowan, Circuit Judge: "I concur in the result reached by Judge Fahy, and in parts I and III of his opinion. My reasons for doing so are stated hereinafter.

'It was not argued to us on this appeal that we invalidate in the District of Columbia Code provision against public intoxication on its face or as applied to any and all people found drunk in public places. What we were urged to do was to say that henceforth in this jurisdiction one charged with public drunkenness may assert chronic alcoholism as a defense and introduce evidence in support of that defense. This is what I consider we are doing in this case; and I agree that a remand is unnecessary only because the evidence of chronic alcoholism as to this appellant is clear.

"We may, in my view, summon this defense into being because we have both the authority and the duty to shape the criminal jurisprudence of the District of Columbia in accordance with civilized notions of justice. We are not like the 10 other Federal courts of appeals, whose authority over State criminal law derives only from the commands of the Constitution. In particular, we are not in the position of the Fourth Circuit when, in *Driver* v. *Hinnant*, — F. 2d — (1966), it decided that the eighth amendment barred the conviction and imprisonment of a chronic alcoholic under a North Carolina statute directed at public drunkenness.

"Our authority in this regard exists in any event, absent only an affirmative and valid legislative proscription of what we propose to do. Far from there being in effect such a veto by Congress in this instance, our duty to do as we do here is, if not compelled, at least strongly indicated and emphasized by the act of August 4, 1947. In that statute Congress exhibited an extraordinarily sensitive awareness of the problems of acute alcoholism and enacted a singularly enlightened—and noncriminal—approach to be followed in this jurisdiction. Had Congress acted to implement this statute with the necessary appropriations and facilities, this appeal would presumably never have reached us. The substantive statute remains on the books. Only the implementation is missing.

"The urgent need of that implementation is accentuated by what we do today. The community will not tolerate uncontrolled drunkenness in public places, and will insist that the police act to remove it as before. The power of the police in this respect is, in my view, unaffected by today's ruling.[2] But it does underscore the necessity of coming to grips with the ultimate disposition of the chronic alcoholics among those so removed. Congress has already done so in the 1947 act. All it needs to do now is to put some flesh on those bones."

Danaher, circuit judge, with whom Burger and Tamm,, circuit judges, join, concurring in the result: "I join Judge McGowan in concluding that 'a remand is unnecessary only because the evidence of chronic alcoholism as to this appellant is clear.' I share his view that we have here been asked to say that henceforth 'one charged with public drunkenness may assert chronic alcoholism as a defense and introduce evidence in support of that defense.'

"My real problem stems from the alternative clause in District of Columbia Code section 24–502 (1961). Its definition of a 'chronic alcoholic' as one 'who chronically and habitually uses alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost the power of self-control with respect to the use of such beverages,' is clear enough. As here applied, so far, so good."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Michel (at the request of Gerald R. Ford), from May 10 through May 21, 1966, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the 19th World Health Assembly, Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. Roncalio, for 5 days, May 16 through May 20, on account of official business.

Mr. Howard (at the request of Mr. Patten), from May 12 to May 17, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Conable), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. Conable), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Feighan, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Messrs. Bow, Laird, and Mahon (at the request of Mr. Mahon) to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular material on the conference report.

Mr. Cunningham.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Conable) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Griffin in two instances.

Mr. Bell.

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Stanton.

Mr. Reinecke.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McVicker) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Brown of California.

---

[2] The Fourth Circuit has said in *Driver:*

"We do not annul the North Carolina statute. It is well within the State's power and right to deter and punish public drunkenness, especially to secure others against its annoyances and intrusions. *Robinson* v. *California*, supra, 370 U.S. 600, 664. To this end any areas may be taken into custody for inquiry or prosecution. But the Constitution intercedes when on arraignment the accused's helplessness comes to light. Then it is that no criminal conviction may follow.

"And the brief submitted to us for appellant characterized as 'an unwarranted misrepresentation' the prosecution's claim that acceptance of his argument 'would paralyze the efforts of the metropolitan police to keep drunks off the public streets.' The rationale of this characterization was said to be that the 'defense [of chronic alcoholism] could neither be raised, nor resolved, until trial. That a defendant may be able to establish an absolute defense to the charge for which he is tried does not impair the validity of his arrest and prosecution.'"

Mr. TODD.
Mr. TUCK.
Mr. STEPHENS.
Mr. WRIGHT.
Mr. GRABOWSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 11, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2390. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2391. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law establishing the revolving fund for expert assistance loans to Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2392. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2393. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to relieve postmasters and other employees for certain losses resulting from improper, or incorrect, payments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 848. Resolution waiving points of order against H.R. 14921, a bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1498). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 197. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce technical services; with amendments (Rept. No. 1499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3177. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7728. A bill to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals; without amendment (Rept. No. 1501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7850. A bill to amend section 1822(a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9961. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran receiving pension under this chapter disappears, the Administrator may pay the pension otherwise payable to the dependent wife and children; with amendments (Rept. No. 1503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11934. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any veteran entitled to additional compensation by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance shall be furnished prescription drugs by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 12664. A bill to retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon Veterans Hospital; with amendments (Rept. No. 1505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 13012. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 13187. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate certain requirements for the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska or Hawaii; with amendments (Rept. No. 1507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 14347. A bill to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 14909. A bill to provide for the designation of certain Veterans' Administration facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 12904. A bill to provide that the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall consist of three appointive members, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 13277. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands; with amendments (Rept. No. 1511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CRALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 13298. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HERLONG: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 483. A bill to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11980. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate two obsolete German weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany; without amendment (Rept. No. 1518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1336. A bill for the relief of Rene Hugo Heimann; without amendment (Rept. No. 1514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1407. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Russo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3078. A bill for the relief of Lourdes S. (Delotavo) Matzke; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3233. A bill for the relief of Emanuel G. Topakas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 14950. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide that a State having an approved plan for medical assistance thereunder may provide supplementary medical insurance benefits under part B of title XVIII of such act for aged individuals covered by its plan without being required to provide comparable benefits for other individuals covered by such plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 14951. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 14952. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 14953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that all transportation furnished to members of the Armed Forces traveling in uniform on official leave, furlough, or pass shall be exempt from the tax on transportation of persons by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 14954. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to increase the funds available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for its secondary market operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14955. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to increase the funds available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for its secondary market operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 14956. A bill to amend section 416 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 14957. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14958. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 14959. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice in title 10 of the United States Code to require that persons accused or suspected of an offense must be apprised of their right to legal counsel before being interrogated or requested to make a statement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 14960. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make it clear that the existing authority under that act to waive the requirement excluding specified classes of aliens from admission into the United States may be exercised with respect to certain additional mentally retarded persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 14961. A bill to establish fishing zones of the United States beyond its territorial seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 14962. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14963. A bill to amend titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in school health and physical education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 14964. A bill to grant an additional tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H.R. 14965. A bill to permit all patients currently using the drug krebiozen to purchase same in Illinois for use in any State until a clinical test on cancer patients is completed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 14966. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a railroad a credit against the Federal income tax (instead of a deduction) for State and local real property taxes on its rights-of-way; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 14968. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that veterans must have served 90 or more days in order to make themselves or their survivors eligible for pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14969. A bill to permit public schoolteachers (and other public school employees) who do not have coverage pursuant to State agreement under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to elect coverage under such system as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 14970. A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of communities and rural areas of Alaska to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the provision of technical services and the making of grants and loans for comprehensive planning for, and aid in the provision of, public services, public facilities, and housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14971. A bill to provide against discrimination in housing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14972. A bill to protect against violence and intimidation in the exercise of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 14973. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 14974. A bill to provide for the best care, welfare, and safeguards against suffering for certain animals used for scientific purposes without impeding necessary research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 14975. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to make it applicable to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and to permittees and licensees of such Commissions; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 14976. A bill to prohibit the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Army, or any other Federal agency from charging use fees; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. Con. Res. 639. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of part II of House Document No. 402; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Con. Res. 640. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free-world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 641. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free-world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H. Con. Res. 642. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free-world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H. Con. Res. 643. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free-world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H. Con. Res. 644. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free-world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALKER of Mississippi:

H. Con. Res. 645. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free-world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Res. 849. Resolution providing for a special committee to study the operations, activities and expenditures of the Central Intelligence Agency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H. Res. 850. Resolution designating the third Sunday of June as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 14977. A bill for the relief of Maria Balluardo Frasca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14978. A bill for the relief of Lucia Musillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 14979. A bill for the relief of Antonio Parisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 14980. A bill for the relief of Miss Maggie Ting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 14981. A bill for the relief of Yoo Young Hui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14982. A bill for the relief of Yasuyo Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 14983. A bill for the relief of Maria Felicia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 14984. A bill for the relief of Renato Camacho Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 14985. A bill for the relief of Judith Plasencia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 14986. A bill for the relief of John Rask (Hanna Rizk); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 14987. A bill for the relief of Kevin Mandel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 14988. A bill for the relief of Antonino Mangiameli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14989. A bill for the relief of Jody Lou Krishun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 14990. A bill for the relief of Herman Adams, doing business as the Adams Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 14991. A bill for the relief of Ali Saban Zejneloski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

388. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the preservation of the Grand Canyon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today the Rumanian people all around the world celebrate their national holiday. The Rumanian organizations throughout the United States, including my own city of Cleveland, will gather to commemorate this occasion and rededicate their efforts to secure true freedom for their captive homeland.

On May 10, 1877, after approximately four centuries of Ottoman domination, the Rumanians proclaimed independence. This was recognized officially by the reigning powers of Europe a year later at the Congress of Berlin. Nearly 70 years of prosperity followed. Then came World War II and subsequent Soviet armed intervention. The Soviets installed a puppet regime in March of 1945 and have remained in control ever since. Individual freedoms were abolished and private property has been systematically confiscated by the State.

Nevertheless, the yearning for freedom cannot be extinguished, and in the course of the past year significant developments have been noted. During the 20th U.N. General Assembly Rumania voted independently from the Soviet bloc. Some time ago the Rumanian Central Committee proclaimed that Rumanians need be loyal to no other center of world communism than Bucharest, and this declaration has not been challenged. The spirit of nationalism is growing and is reflected in economic advances and cultural liberalization.

In spite of the attempts of the Soviets to change the anniversary date to May 9th, Rumanians have resisted the revision of their tradition and continue to celebrate May 10th privately, lest they invite fierce retribution from the Communist powers.

Today we pay tribute to the Rumanians for their courage and strong spirit as we join in remembering this day of freedom from the Turks and look forward to the time when May 10 will be commemorated also as a day of freedom from the Communist oppressors.

Rumanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, we commemorate the anniversary of Rumanian independence. After centuries of oppressive domination by the Ottoman Empire, the people of Rumania had at long last achieved their much-desired freedom and national independence.

The Rumanian people today are a people living in a state of national oppression. Since 1945, they have known nothing else but the tyranny of communism. At the end of World War II, the Rumanian people had hoped that they would be able to share with all freemen in the fruits of victory, a victory which many had hoped had brought mankind to a new era of peace.

But they were mistaken in their expectations of the future. The hopes of all freemen were soon crushed as we observed with profound concern the destruction of freedom throughout all Eastern Europe by a new world tyranny, communism. One after another, all the states of Eastern Europe had fallen victim to the military power and coercive ideology of the Soviet Union. Their freedom was destroyed and all the hopes of man for a better future were dissolved.

In recent years we have observed profound changes taking place in the Communist world, changes that have affected Rumania. Forces of diffusion of power have been at work, eating away the once total power the Soviet held over the East European states. Within the vortex of these political changes, Rumania has been able to wrench herself to a degree from the Soviet hold. And in the last 2 years we have witnessed a gradual gravitation of the country toward the West.

These are hopeful changes, and on this anniversary of Rumanian independence let us all express a common wish that the forces of Rumanian unity with the West will increase and that in the course of time the Rumanian people will enjoy the national independence that they so richly deserve.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, May 10 stands as a symbol of proud history, for its marks the 89th anniversary of Rumanian independence.

We are proud of the many contributions which the American citizens of Rumanian extraction have made to this country and it is with pride that we note the courage of the Rumanian people, as reflected in their history.

It is unfortunate that this holiday cannot be celebrated within the boundaries of Rumania, whose history is so steeped in love of freedom. However, despite the hardships which history has dealt Rumania, the people there have not lost their love of liberty or their desire for national independence.

Those of us who cherish the privileges and responsibilities of freedom share the hopes and confidence of these people for the future independence of their country. Today we join with Rumanians who are captive in their homeland, in hoping for the dawn of a new time when freedom will return to their country.

Los Angeles Music Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr BELL. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of the 20th anniversary celebration of the Los Angeles Music Festival provides appropriate opportunity for paying well-deserved tribute both to the festival and to its outstanding music director, Mr. Franz Waxman.

One of the finest examples of the cultural and artistic excellence found in southern California, and a major contributing factor to the growth of the arts there, has been the Los Angeles Music Festival, sponsored by the Los Angeles Orchestral Society and the committee on fine arts productions at the University of California, Los Angeles. For 20 years the festival has enriched the lives of many thousands of people privileged to attend its performances. It has brought to the public music of extraordinarily high quality and imagination. The finest in contemporary music has here been presented and subsequently achieved prominence.

The years of the festival have brought to the podium such distinguished conductors as Robert Craft, Eugene Ormandy, Walter Piston, Igor Stravinsky, Roger Wagner, William Walton, and, of course, Franz Waxman. Performing for the enjoyment of music lovers has been an impressive and wide-ranging array of soloists including Adele Addison, Dave Brubeck, Oscar Levant, Andre Previn, and Rudolf Serkin. Four world premieres, eleven American premieres, and forty-eight west coast premieres have taken place here. Included among them have been outstanding modern works by Igor Stravinsky, Ralph Vaughan Williams, Franz Waxman, Arnold Schoenberg, William Walton, Arthur Honegger, Gustav Mahler, Leonard Bernstein, Serge Prokofieff, Carl Orff, Dimitri Shostakovich, Hector Berlioz, Walter Piston, and Benjamin Britten.

The quality of the superb orchestral pieces selected for 1966 presentation are symbolic and a tribute in themselves to 20 years of excellence. This year, with a program ranging from Stravinsky's "Persephone" through Gershwin's "Rhapsody in Blue" to "The Song of Terezin" by Franz Waxman, the opportunity to hear music outstanding both in its conception and its performance will once again be afforded to those privileged to attend.

Just as the cultural significance of Los Angeles is greatly indebted to its musical festival, so is the festival indebted to its distinguished, able, and extraordinarily talented founder, mentor and music director, composer and conductor Franz Waxman. Through his selfless and inspired efforts, the festival has attained international prominence.

Mr. Waxman's personal fame also is worldwide, and justly so. International recognition was first accorded Mr. Waxman over 20 years ago, when Jascha Heifetz played Waxman's fantasy composition on themes from "Carmen." Then, in 2 consecutive years, Mr. Waxman was awarded an Oscar for outstanding film musical compositions. His place in musical history was assured by his composition, the oratorio, "Joshua," one of the most resplendent of orchestral and choral works; it has been accorded the same level of greatness as the oratorios of Stravinsky and Honneger.

Although a Los Angeles artist, Waxman's efforts have by no means been limited to Los Angeles. He has conducted orchestras throughout the world.

It was the desire to promote cultural excellence such as this throughout the Nation that prompted passage of the National Arts and Humanities Foundation.

No sooner will the 20th anniversary celebration be over than Los Angeles and the world will eagerly await the 21st season, and the 22d, and the rich rewards brought by fine music year after year.

Jefferson Belongs to the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the able Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, the Honorable JOHN O. MARSH, made a very interesting speech on April 16 at a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Charlottesville, Va., the community in which the great American, Thomas Jefferson, resided for many years and where he is buried.

The speech draws an accurate and stirring picture of Jefferson. It is so filled with history and with so much solid and sound doctrine that it has particular meaning in these days when we are fighting to preserve the principles upheld by this early American patriot. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman MARSH's remarks on the occasion above referred to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are as follows:

> Representing Mr. Jefferson's country in the U.S. Congress, I have selected as my subject "Mr. Jefferson's District," because, actually, this congressional district is Mr. Jefferson's country.
>
> Thomas Jefferson was born in this season of the year. In fact, the anniversary of his birth is just 3 days past. Traditionally, springtime in Virginia is one of the most beautiful seasons of the year, and the beauty of Jefferson's country is legendary. He was born on what was then the frontier—a sparse, unsettled, primitive, and sometimes savage land. A child of the frontier, he remained a pioneer in spirit. Jefferson's country was not just Albemarle, but western Virginia. It was the rushing Rivanna, and the tumbling Rapidan; the gracefully bending James and winding Shenandoah.
>
> It was Monticello and Shadwell—the rolling foothills of the Blue Ridge and the climbing ridges of the Allegheny. There were the green fields of the valley of Virginia and the woods and forests of Tuckahoe. It was, and still is, the land of mountain laurel and budding dogwood.
>
> It was western Virginia, where some of the counties were named for the land and nature's wonders, others for the age or taken from the fabric of his past, some for the people who were part and parcel of his time.
>
> Bath, Highland, Shenandoah, Rockbridge, Rappahannock, and Fluvanna have poetry in their names.
>
> Albemarle, Culpeper, Orange, Augusta, Rockingham, and Frederick were ties to the Crown.
>
> Clarke, Warren, Greene, Page, and Madison were men who marched across the pages of American history and shaped their times.
>
> It gave to Washington's army Daniel Morgan's "Long Rifles" and Albemarle's "Monticello Guards."
>
> This country is Virginia's—the Old Dominion's—Seventh District—it is yours, not just mine.
>
> This country left its stamp on Jefferson—on his personality—on his character. It opened the unlimited horizons of his mind. And he left his stamp on this country—and, I believe, its people.
>
> If we claim his name, we must declare his principles. He admonished us to love our country and to serve it. He defined the right of man and bade us to respect them.
>
> He believed in an ordered universe, and that man was a moral creature, who, through his unique power of reason, could chart his destiny—capable of self-government, if he could discipline himself under freedom to accept responsibility.
>
> He respected the rule of the majority, provided there was protected the right of dissent. Allowing for occasional human frailty, which he recognized in himself, he nonetheless practiced what he preached.
>
> Scholars tell us that if we were to assign a quantitative value of 1 day to man's total span of life on this planet from the aeons of time, that the period from the 1650's to the 1960's would be slightly less than 1 minute. Yet it would be a magnificent moment—the age of reason, renaissance and revolution.
>
> Jefferson in his letters, speaking of Monticello, refers to a phenomenon that rarely occurs on land, but frequently occurs at sea. It occurs at Monticello. He describes it as "looming." Looming, in reference to optics and vision, causes objects at a great distance to appear quite large. This happens at Monticello as you look into the distance, and perhaps it was one of the reasons he loved it so.
>
> When we look at Jefferson from the 20th century in an historical sense, this same phenomenon occurs, and in this brief moment of human history to which I have referred, he looms very large.
>
> As this country produced the spirit of this man, so today the people of this country must capture that spirit. Perhaps he would have defined it as the spirit of public service in the affairs of government.
>
> Although Jefferson is an historical figure, nevertheless, he is a man that belongs to the ages. I am confident that he would be

very much at home in Virginia today, and I suspect that he would find the forces of change that sweep the world today not unlike those of the age in which he lived. He was never frightened by change, which was evidenced in his remarks:

"I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened; as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

In this, we see how close akin in spirit he was to Lincoln, who in 1863 would say: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

Jefferson was a man of the people, and he was never impressed by positions of power or public office, because he had a humility based on the recognition that he had held high office by the will and choice of many people.

Wayland, in one of his histories on the valley mentions the community of Tenth Legion on Highway 11 between New Market and Harrisonburg.

According to Wayland, at some point in Jefferson's career, in referring to his support from the voters of western Virginia who shared his fierce frontier independence, he would refer to the area as the Tenth Legion of Democracy, hence the origin of the name of this community.

Although he disliked politics as such, evidenced by his remarks in one of his letters to Martha Jefferson Randolph, when he said: "Politics is such a torment, I would advise everyone I love not to mix with it," yet he recognized that in a free society politics is the means whereby you translate citizen action into government. Therefore, if you have good politics, you will have good government.

I think it was during the treaty negotiations following World War I that a French statesman remarked that "war is much too important to be left to the generals." And I submit to you that the state of the body of politic is much too important to be left to the politicians.

If he were here tonight, I think Jefferson would be impressed by the party that bears his name. Yet, I believe that he would reserve his tributes and accolades, not for the head table, but for those who are in the audience who really make representative government work.

Those of us who stand for public office are beneficiaries of the work of many people. Candidates receive the headlines on election day, but credit belongs to those unsung, unnoticed heroes that perform the backbreaking tasks night and day before election day. Such are those who are here tonight. Men and women who not only will give of their time, but of their estate. These are the party's great.

To those of us in Virginia's Democratic Party and who fly under Mr. Jefferson's colors and wrap ourselves in the mantle of his name, I sometimes wonder if we realize the significance of what we say or the consequences of the obligations that we thereby accept.

We must remember that politics is public service, and there are individuals here who have distinguished themselves in the field of politics and public service. Only as we accept our individual responsibilities in State and local governments shall we protect the freedoms that we enjoy.

Everyone is quick to point to and condemn the Federal Government. However, it is a magnificent system. Although Jefferson respected it, he was not over-awed by it. Generally speaking, where the Federal system has not worked, or where it has encroached on the rights of citizens and the responsibilities of States, it has done so because of the failure of individual citizens to participate in their Government and to accept their individual responsibilities. Your presence here indicates that you accept these responsibilities. Many of the pressing and urgent human needs brought about as a result of the changing times in which we live can best be met at the State and local levels of government, but it is going to require work and sacrifice.

Those of us who seek public office, as well as those who now hold office, are not modern medicine men or a 20th century edition of the witchdoctor. We are not answer men that once you put us into office can be expected to solve all the problems that confront our people. These problems frequently defy solution at the county seat, at the State capitol and in Washington, because their solution in a free society ultimately is to be found by individual citizens acceptng individual responsibilities. The unwarranted encroachment of federalism can best be stopped by individuals at the State and local level.

What do I see as the duty of the Jefferson party? I would like to sum it up in a list of party principles to which I think the Jefferson party might subscribe. Foremost, we must get people involved and participating. They must participate in the party of their choice in order that we can have effective representative government. I feel this party and the people who participate in it should be guided by the following:

First, America in these times in all offices of leadership needs men who are dedicated to the common good—I repeat the word dedicated. I believe the criteria is summed up in the words of Holland:

"God give us men.
A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands.
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie."

Two, politics is a form of public service and shall only be as good as you make it by being a part of it. If you will not be a part of it, then you cannot complain about the type of government that you receive or that you get.

Three, public offices are positions of public trust, and we should think principally in terms of performance of duty in these offices.

Four, the political party exists as a means or as a vehicle to express the public will and produce effective representative government and are not an end in themselves. Therefore, we should place less emphasis on party patronage and more on public service.

Five, that the achievement of effective government be sought, rather than the pursuit of power.

Six, political party membership should be inclusive rather than exclusive. With a rapidly increasing population, we must provide the growing number of young people with ways and means to participate in the political process by inviting them into the political structure.

Seven, the election of any person to any office, in an individual sense, is not important, but rather, an expression of an informed public will in the selection of an individual is the important thing.

Lastly, what should be the criteria for membership in Jefferson's party? I submit to you that the test should be the test of reason. Could not the party adopt for determination of its membership the charge that Jefferson would give to the prospective teachers at the University of Virginia, in these words: "This institution will be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind. For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is free to combat it."

If we adopt the test of reason, then it also seems to me that this should be the criteria by which we determine the votes of those elected to public office. Therefore, in the Congress, I submit to you that my votes and the votes of the Virginia delegation should be judged on this basis, and that measures should not be supported for the sake of support, nor opposed for the sole purpose of opposition and, I might add, neither should they be judged by the fact that the issue may originate on the opposite side of the aisle or from some place further down Pennsylvania Avenue.

In conclusion, the ultimate goal of Jefferson's party must be the protection of individual freedom. At a time when we see it being crushed behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, I believe this man from Monticello would find common cause with those Americans who seek to preserve it in the Mekong Delta and along the ridges of the Ammanite Mountains in Vietnam.

To Jefferson, the extension and preservation of individual freedom was his greatest cause. If we would be his heirs, then this must be our legacy.

The 1791 Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marked 175 years since a notable day in the political history of the Polish nation—the day when the Poles freely adopted their great Constitution of 1791. This document still represents for millions of Polish people their finest expression of great aspirations for a better national life.

The Constitution of 1791 was an example of a national act of self-regeneration and development. It was thus not only a case of a progressive step toward a responsible, representative, and effective government for the Poland of that time; it has stood for later oppressed generations as a symbol of their great political achievements of the past.

This year's celebration was of special significance because 1966 also marks the 1,000th anniversary of the birth of the Polish nation.

Although years of tyranny have settled upon Poland at the hands of conquering neighbors, the Polish people have never lost their spirit of independence.

Although Poland today is not free, her people have hope. The Constitution of 1791 is an act of hopeful men which it is proper to recall in asserting our wishes that Poland will soon again be free.

Southeast Water Laboratory Dedicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 6, I was given the privilege of introducing in Athens, Ga., our senior Senator, the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, on the occasion of the dedication of the new Southeast Water Laboratory, a part of our fight to meet an ever increasing National and State problem on water pollution.

The Southeast Water Laboratory was authorized in 1961 under the impetus of the concern of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for study of the health hazard of polluted water.

This brandnew facility has 50,000 square feet of space; has a central structure of two stories with one-story wings on the north and south sides and is of cast-stone facing. It is located in a 12-acre research park across the Oconee River on property donated by the University of Georgia. It is near the Poultry Research Laboratory and the site for the authorized $9 million food utilization research building soon to be commenced. In round figures, the Southeast Water Laboratory will cost $2,500,000 to build and $1½ million to fully equip.

John R. Thoman, Director of the Laboratory, arranged an impressive program with Federal Water Pollution Control Administration Commissioner James M. Quigley presiding and Congressman JAMES MACKAY of Georgia's Fourth District also attending.

The address of Senator RUSSELL at this important event was the main feature and I set it out in full for the permanent RECORD of Congress:

REMARKS OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL AT THE DEDICATION OF THE SOUTHEAST WATER LABORATORY OF THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION AT ATHENS, GA., FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1966

This is an occasion rich in significance and promise for the university community, for Georgia and for the entire southeastern region of the United States.

With the dedication of this ultramodern research facility, we are adding a powerful new weapon to the gathering assault now being mounted on many fronts against the growing blight of water pollution.

But the dedication of this laboratory has even broader meaning for our State and section. For it signifies another major milestone in our efforts to establish in the South a scientific and research base that will enable our region to share fully in the challenges and opportunities of this technological age.

We welcome this laboratory to Georgia and to the university. We know it will make a valuable and vital contribution toward further establishing Athens as a regional and a national center of excellence in education, science, and research.

Throughout our history, the rivers of America have played an influential part in the development of a great nation. They have served generations of our countrymen as arteries of commerce and travel. They have provided water for our growing population and for the unquenchable thirst of our rising industrial complex.

But beyond these considerations, most of us have a sentimental attachment for our rivers. We have immortalized them in song, story, and poetry. They are as much a part of our lives as they are of our land.

SICK RIVERS

It is, therefore, with sadness as well as alarm that we must face the harsh reality that our once pristine rivers are afflicted by the sickness of pollution. Indeed, some of our most fabled and historic rivers and lakes are so poisoned by agricultural, industrial and human waste that they have become virtual cesspools. They are uninhabitable for aquatic life, unusable by manufacturing plants, and unsafe for human consumption or exposure.

The experts tell us that six times as much sewage is being dumped into the Nation's rivers and streams today as at the turn of the century. The problem is further aggravated by the fact that a fourth of this sewage is raw—and another third has been only partially treated.

Our cities and towns—with the help of the States and Federal Government—have made a valiant effort to provide adequate sewage facilities to keep pace with their burgeoning populations. Here in Georgia, for example, 111 local government agencies have received Federal assistance for construction and improvement of sewage facilities.

But despite this commendable progress, there are more than 5,000 communities in the United States encompassing more than 33 million people that have inadequate or nonexistent waste treatment systems. The cost to meet these immediate needs has been estimated officially at almost $2 billion. A well-qualified industrial source estimates that another $30 billion will be needed to meet sewage facility needs over the next two decades. This sounds like—and is—a staggering sum. Yet it is about what we are now spending over a 2-year period for the Vietnam war—and with little to show for it except the killing and wounding of some of our finest young men.

THREE HUNDRED NEW PEOPLE AN HOUR

The one certain thing we can say about water pollution is that it becomes more acute and complex with each passing day as we become more urbanized and industrialized. The individual consumption of water has quadrupled since the end of the last century and will almost double the present rate by the end of this one. At the same time, the population surge races ahead at a spiraling pace. Every day the sun rises on 7,200 additional Americans—300 every hour.

It is expected that by 1980—and that is only 14 years away—the demand for water in this country will exceed the available supply by 85 billion gallons a day. By the year 2000, the demand will exceed the supply by the incredible quantity of 350 billion gallons per day.

This does not mean the country as a whole faces the devastating prospect of a permanent water shortage. But it does mean that to meet our anticipated needs in coming years we must use the same water over and over again. This gives critical urgency to the battle to clean up our water supplies and to keep them clean. This is why I consider water pollution to be the most pressing domestic problem facing the Nation today.

The problem of contaminated water has spared no section of the country. Every major river system is afflicted with some degree of pollution.

Fortunately, the situation in the Southeast as yet is not as severe as in some other parts of the country, notably the heavily industrialized Northeast and North Central. I suspect, however, that our good fortune has been due not so much to our good efforts as to the abundance of good water with which nature has endowed our section.

Indeed, the plentiful supply of clean water is one of the prime resources of the South and a key reason why ours is the land of the future.

WATER A VITAL KEY TO INDUSTRY

Any industrialist will tell you that the availability of water is a central factor in the location of most modern manufacturing activities. It follows that the industrial growth of any area will be controlled to a large degree by the quantity and the quality of its water.

Consider these random statistics:

It takes 770 gallons of water to refine a barrel of petroleum, and we Americans consume some 2 billion barrels in a single year.

It takes 50,000 gallons of water to make a ton of paper, and we are producing 35 million tons of paper and paperboard annually.

It takes 25,000 gallons of water to process a ton of steel, and industry is turning out 130 million tons each year.

It takes more water to manufacture a square yard of nylon than it does to grow and to process the same amount of cotton.

In the face of such awesome demands for water by modern industry, it is significant to note that the South has a third greater supply of streamflow water than does the Northeast and North-Central areas. Yet we are now using only about 15 percent of our available supply for both industrial and municipal purposes.

The vast potential for almost unlimited industrial expansion in the South must be evident even to our most hard-bitten critics. But there is a crucial condition to this bright prospect. The condition is that we prudently protect and husband the great God-given resource of clean water with which our section has been blessed.

The Southeast is not without its problem areas. The comprehensive report by the Southeastern River Basins Study Commission in 1963 showed that only two-thirds of the municipalities in the area had waste treatment facilities and that half of these were inadequate. The Commission also found that only about one-third of the industrial plants in the Southeast basins having independent waste disposal systems provided any treatment of their refuse.

PROBLEMS FACING SOUTHERN CITIES

Some of the major urban centers of the Southeast—among them Atlanta, Birmingham, and Miami—are feeling the effects of pollution of their water supplies. The Chattahoochee below Atlanta has been rejected by some prospective industries because of the poor water quality. Certain of our coastal recreational and commercial shell fish areas have been closed at times because of pollution.

These are but some of the mounting but soluble water problems of our region which this Laboratory must attack. Here the knowledge of modern science and the marvels of modern technology will be enlisted in the cause of cleansing our waters and keeping them safe from contamination.

The outstanding team of 150 scientists, engineers and technicians that will be assembled in Athens will have at its disposal the latest and most sophisticated equipment yet to be perfected in this relatively new field of water research.

The Laboratory will focus its efforts mainly in basic research in water quality, in rendering technical assistance in specific pollution problems to Federal, State, and local agencies and to industry, and in training water engineers and technicians in new methods of evaluating and combating pollution.

The research projects of the Laboratory will probe problems that will have national as well as regional significance. Its researchers will attempt to determine what actually is taking place in the streams and lakes of the Southeast and to develop new tools for predicting potential pollution problems before they arise.

With the Laboratory's two environmental chambers, scientists will be able to simulate nature under controlled conditions to find out what happens to water when it is exposed to different pollutants and varying conditions. From the knowledge thus gained preventive and remedial measures can be developed.

These chambers will be among the largest to be found anywhere in the world—and certainly the largest available for pollution research. They and other equipment and instruments will provide this Laboratory with the finest analytical tools known to science.

The problem of water pollution cannot be solved by research alone. This will require a continuing and coordinated effort by government at every level, by industry and by interested groups and individuals. But research can give us the knowledge to understand the problem more fully and suggest and devise new methods and approaches for solving it.

COOPERATION WITH UNIVERSITIES

This Laboratory will, of course, work closely with the University of Georgia and other educational institutions in the Southeast in fields of mutual interest and effort. Its location here on the university campus will facilitate the exchange use of facilities and more importantly, the exchange of knowledge and ideas. I am confident great mutual benefit will result.

We have been fortunate in recent years in bringing to Athens and to Georgia a number of important research activities of the Federal Government. The Southeast Water Laboratory is one of five federally operated research facilities to be located in the Athens area. I take immense pride in each and every one of these laboratories and I shall overlook no opportunity to win new ones.

I am sure I speak the sentiments of Dr. Aderhold and others present when I express concern that the South is not receiving its rightful and fair share of research grants and contracts that Federal agencies award to institutions of higher learning.

The indisputable fact is that the great bulk of Federal research money for institutions—funds that are vital to the support of graduate education and research excellence—is being funneled to a handful of schools in a few annointed areas of the country.

According to the latest figures I have seen, 10 of the Nation's largest and most celebrated colleges receive one-third of all Federal research funds dispended to educational institutions. All 10 of these schools are located in three general areas of the country—in the Northeast, in an area fanning out from Chicago, and in California.

The Southeast is one of the areas most flagrantly shortchanged in the sharing of the Federal research pie. Although the seven States comprising this region have 10 percent of the Nation's college enrollment, their colleges receive only about 7 percent of the Federal research dollars going to academic institutions. Our proportionate share would shrink a great deal more if it were not for the extensive research activities of the Department of Agriculture in our section.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SOUTH

I noted with disappointment but little surprise that the discriminatory practice of favoring the areas having heavily funded institutions will likely be observed again in the location of the proposed proton accelerator. A site selection group composed of members of the National Academy of Sciences has narrowed the site possibilities now down to six—all but one of which are located in the three favored areas of the country I identified earlier.

Needless to add, the South was eliminated from consideration even though 34 prospective Southern sites were acknowledged by the Atomic Energy Commission to meet the basic criteria for the location of the accelerator. The selection group did not trouble itself to visit a single one of these prospective sites.

It is the declared policy of the U.S. Government that Federal grants and contracts for university research should be more broadly distributed throughout the country. This not only is eminently fair to all sections, but is in the sound national interest.

In the case of the Department of Defense, we are attempting through legislation to reverse the undue concentration of research in a few schools and to broaden the base of the military's university research program. The defense authorization bill passed by the Senate last week includes $18 million to be used expressly to enable more universities throughout the country to participate in research projects sponsored by the Department.

I think it is high time that all Federal agencies began living up to the policy of the Government and stopped playing favorites with a few academic bellcows. For my part, I intend to do everything within my power to see that Georgia and southern colleges participate on an equal footing with other sections in Federal research activities.

The South has come a long way since the grim days of defeat and devastation that followed Appomattox. Our people have overcome many hardships and obstacles in the last century. But we have now entered the sunlight of a new day.

My illustrious and distant kinsman, the late Adlai Stevenson, once remarked that under the settlement of the Civil War the North permitted the South to keep its charm, its mockingbirds, and its beaten biscuits and retained only the money and the power for itself.

We have not yet recovered as much of the money and the power as we would like, and neither are they distributed exactly as we might like. But we have endured, and we have progressed.

Today, with the dedication of this fine facility, we are tasting another fruit of our progress. We are proud to have the laboratory on this campus, and we look forward to the contribution it will make to the accelerating advancement of Georgia and our sister States of the Southeast.

To Commissioner Quigley, I extend my best wishes as the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration prepares to embark on a new and productive era in the war on pollution.

To John Thoman and his distinguished staff of the laboratory, I offer my commendation for past achievements, and my hope and my support for the demanding course ahead.

The fight for clean water will not be won in 1 day, in 1 year, or even 1 decade. But by working together in unity of purpose and in determination of spirit it can and it must be won. This is the legacy we must leave to generations of Americans who are yet to walk the face of this magnificent land.

National Secretaries Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, in the rush of business in which all Members of Congress find themselves each day, it is very fitting that we should take a few moments to pay tribute to those many unsung heroes of the Hill, our secretaries. Where would we be without them? They make our job much easier. They prepare good letters from our scrambled dictation; they tell us where to go, and when to be there; they answer questions for us and for our constituents; they handle our casework; they know where everything is filed. They bring us our coffee in the morning; they greet our visitors—and make that first good impression. And sometimes they have to run interference for us, when things get tight.

Mr. Speaker, my secretaries, Mrs. Elisabeth Seeley, Mrs. Mary Lingle, Miss Nancy Newcomer, and Mrs. Joan McKay, are a great asset to my office. In keeping with the spirit of National Secretaries Week, just a week ago, let us extend our heartiest appreciation to our secretaries for a job well done.

Rumanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, in a world of multiple sorrows, one of the most onerous and sad is the deprival of human freedom. This is true whether on the individual or the national scale. Thus, when we can see the glimmer of the flame of future liberty for an oppressed people, it is always a moment for pleasurable contemplation of the continual striving and occasional success of the ordinary people for their freedom.

On the 10th of May we are being given such an opportunity. This day will mark the 89th anniversary of the declaration of Rumania's independence. On that day in 1877 the nation of Rumania emerged from centuries of bondage to a foreign empire, guided by a despotic regime, and adhering to a creed alien to the Christian heritage of Rumania. At that time, over eight decades ago, the striving for national self-determination and freedom had succeeded against terrible odds.

The intervening years have presented a mixed picture of domestic reform and progress and danger from rapacious larger neighbors. The upshot of the tragedy of recent history has been the well known imposition by 1947 of a puppet Communist regime upon the defenseless Rumanian people. This copy of Russian totalitarianism is still in power today.

However, tyranny cannot forever suppress human progress. The local Communist dictators have recently been showing unmistaken and ever increasing signs of paying attention to Rumanian national aspirations.

There has been a drive to escape from the confines of the economic control of Russia. Rumania has served notice that she will not continue to be the granary of the bloc but will develop all her potential for the good of her own people. Furthermore, the contacts with the West have been increasing, thereby restoring some of Rumania's traditional affiliation with the Latin branch of Western civilization.

Mr. Speaker, freedom has not yet returned to the citizens of Rumania. Nor is she yet fully independent. But, there are many encouraging signs. Thus on this anniversary of her independence it is fitting that we stop to note that the march of liberty seems to be again underway in Rumania, although it still has a long way to go. I wish to personally extend to the long-suffering Rumanian people my deep sympathy for their plight and my hope that in the not too-distant future full national liberty will be restored to them.

Food From Agricultural Waste Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the world today faces no problem more profound than the population explosion and the growing food shortages in much of the world.

At the beginning of the Christian era, there were only about 250 million people in the whole world. In another 10 years, there will be that many right here in the United States—on only 7 percent of the world's land surface. It took the human race 3,000 years to develop a population of 3 billion people. We are doubling that figure in less than 30 years.

How are these gigantic numbers of people to be fed? With hunger rampant in many sections of the world even today, the situation is bound to worsen unless new ways can be found to increase sharply the earth's food production. In addition to increasing the quantity of food, we must find new sources of high-protein and high-energy foods. Protein deficiency is responsible for widespread malnutrition and death.

Recently, I have been talking about these problems with a friend and constituent, Mr. Art W. Stegner, an export consultant in Fort Worth, Tex. I would like to share with my colleagues a technique Mr. Stegner suggests for transforming agriculture byproducts which are now largely wasted into usable food.

This has particular application in some of the underdeveloped countries where a need exists to provide both agricultural self-sufficiency and industrialization based upon development of existing resources.

These wasted products include such things as residue from sugarcane production, the heads and other generally unusable parts of fish and shrimp, the trimmings and tops from pineapples, and surplus lush grasses that cannot be consumed during the wet season.

In most cases, people cannot or would not eat those things. They can and will, however, eat beef and poultry, and drink milk. The waste products I have mentioned can be converted into cattle, poultry, and dairy feeds. The nutritive value of these feeds can be improved, if needed, by adding protein supplements.

Grasses already are being fed to cattle during a comparatively short period of each year, usually when tender and succulent. However, they do tend to spoil rapidly in moist climates, if not consumed or properly handled reasonably soon.

After grasses have spoiled, the cattle sometimes go hungry. Mr. Stegner has told me of one instance in a Central American country in which it was reported that more than 13,000 cattle starved during a 6-month dry season because there was no feed for them.

Is there not some way to preserve usable waste products for later use? Yes; there are three methods—freezing, pickling or making ensilage, and dehydration.

Freezing of these waste products in most cases is not really economical. Some products run 80 percent moisture, and the cost of freezing often is prohibitive. Similarly, the making of ensilage leaves much to be desired. This bulky high-moisture product must be fed or consumed near the point of storage because of the transportation costs.

Dehydration, then, appears, to be the most practical way of preserving these roughage-type waste products. When dehydrated they can be stored almost indefinitely in any type of climate with only a minimum type of facilities. They can also be moved from place to place with less handling and space.

Because of the suitability of the dehydration process for converting to animal food the products that otherwise might be wasted, Mr. Stegner has devoted considerable study to the process. His analyses and experience indicate that the dehydration process holds considerable promise for increasing the world's supply of food by utilizing these waste materials as livestock feed.

The dehydration process simply involves the removal of water from a food. This, of course, reduces its weight and volume. The rapid expansion of the dehydration process came about during World War II when the transportation of foodstuffs was at a premium. Every GI remembers eating powdered eggs and dehydrated potatoes and carrots. These foods were considered essential at that time to provide our troops with a better balanced diet. Other products like powdered milk have been around for a long time. As you know the dehydration of milk makes it possible to store surplus milk in usable form for future use.

Of course, new techniques in the dehydration process will need to be developed for each country and community in order to best handle the various types and combinations of waste materials available. We already possess much of the technical know-how, and technical assistance can be made available to help develop both short and long range programs. Other considerations such as labor, storage, transportation, availability of fuel, distribution and marketing of product would also enter into the location of such plants.

Mr. Stegner realizes, of course, that the dehydration of waste products is not the single, overall answer to the growing peril of world famine, but he believes it should be given proper consideration in the development of any program to help feed a hungry world. For that reason, I wanted to share with my colleagues this report on his efforts.

Planned Parenthood—World Population National Conference on Family Planning: Partners for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 6, Secretary Freeman addressed a luncheon of the Planned Parenthood—World Population National Conference on Family Planning: Partners for Progress, on the occasion of the celebration of their 50th anniversary.

The Secretary conveyed his message in his usual forceful, forthright, and cogent tone. It dealt ably with the subject of the delicate balance between world population and world food supply. It described the collision course on which we find ourselves. I commend it to my colleagues, and have permission that it may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, BEFORE THE PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 6, 1966

Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure this group does not have to be told that the population explosion may push the world to the precipice of crisis within our time.

Some how, some way, mankind must find the means to keep food production apace with human reproduction.

I am here today to tell you what I believe must be done.

Our world must prepare to feed a billion more people who will be added to the population over the next 15 years. Between now and the end of this century, the number of people presently on earth will double.

These figures are awesome. But even more awesome is the fact that fully four-fifths of this total will be added to the developing countries least able to feed themselves.

We are all familiar with the phrase: "Two-thirds of the world's people go to bed hungry every night of the year."

This is true. But the full dimensions of that truth are even more distressing.

There is more to hunger than an empty stomach. Nutritional hunger can be just as debilitating, and, in time, just as fatal.

In the developing nations some 171 million children under 6 years of age, and some 98 million between 6 and 14, suffer seriously from malnutrition.

Millions die because malnutrition has sapped their resistance to childhood diseases. Millions who survive are permanently handicapped.

Progress in education and in the national economies are seriously retarded by the degree of malnutrition that prevails in so many parts of the world.

Against this dark background, mankind faces its greatest challenge.

Already the spectre of food shortages, chronic hunger, malnutrition and imminent starvation threaten the lives in many in South America, in Africa, and in Asia.

And this threat is a threat to the building of free societies around the world and, ultimately, to our own national security.

What real security could we have in a world gone mad with hunger?

What is the answer? Two things must be done.

The population trend must be altered downward and the food production trend must be altered upward.

An all-out simultaneous effort must be launched to achieve both objectives. It cannot be done by birth control alone. We must pursue a combination of realistic programs to brake the population acceleration and to accelerate food production. Hope lies only in this combination of efforts.

As the Secretary of Agriculture, today I would like to concentrate my observations on the food side of the population-food coin.

Long before American newspapers and magazines publicized growing world food needs in black headlines with even blacker forecasts, your Department of Agriculture was seriously concerned.

For more than 10 years, the Department has been involved in helping to meet the food needs of some 70 countries under the Food for Peace program. The $15 billion we have spent in providing food and fiber to developing nations have done more than any other program in history to avert hunger, malnutrition, and famine.

Much of what we have sent abroad has been in the form of bulk products, principally food grains, but we have not overlooked the high protein foods so important to the growth and development of children.

Under this Food for Peace program, we have shared with the less fortunate some truly staggering amounts of dairy products: 6 billion 117 million pounds of nonfat dry milk; 290 million pounds of evaporated and condensed milk; 23 million pounds of dry whole milk; 715 million pounds of cheese; and 342 million pounds of butter oil.

And we expect to make available this year nearly half a billion pounds of nonfat dry milk for overseas programs.

These dairy products have been used mainly in school lunches and child feeding programs. For millions of children, they have provided that extra spark of nutrition that means better bodies, better minds, and better citizens.

We must remember, too, that the developing nations will have a longtime need for our dairy products, for increasing dairy production is a luxury those nations will not be able to afford until their food grain production increases and their general economies are strengthened. Most of their resources must be initially used to boost grain production, the diet base in those nations.

And there are small, higher income segments in the societies of most developing nations which want and can afford to buy dairy products.

This means, in turn, that our low-cost dairy manufacturing States, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, will have a continuing opportunity to meet that demand for their products.

A word should be said, too, about the technological improvements being developed for dairy product shipment and use overseas. A spray dry butter has been developed, for instance, and a dry milk which can be easily converted to fluid milk in a can of water in some far-off jungle is being perfected.

An enriching process for dry milk is meeting with much success, and our Foreign Agricultural Service, in cooperation with U.S. commercial interests, has stimulated sample shipments of concentrated whole milk overseas.

We are also providing some oilseed meal products on a trial basis in a number of foreign countries. We are working with private industry to advise and assist them in developing foods with high protein content for commercial sale abroad. And we have proposals before the Congress which will, if enacted into law, make possible the use of still more high protein foods. Some very exciting things are taking place in our protein enrichment development program.

During my 5 years as Secretary of Agriculture, my major concern has been to insure that the unparalleled productivity of our American farms be used not only to provide a fair reward to the American farmer and abundant supplies to the American consumer but also to alleviate hunger and want in the less fortunate countries of the world.

The productive genius of the American farmer has more than met our domestic needs, and for the past decade or more has provided that critical balance in food supplies overseas which meant the difference between survival and death for millions of people.

Our farmers have given us a diet of variety, abundance, and nutrition unmatched in history and at lower and lower net costs to us.

An hour's take-home pay today buys more food than it did 6 years ago and double the food it bought 30 years ago.

Americans spend a smaller percentage of their incomes for food than any other people on earth.

Farm prices today are lower than they were in 1952 yet some unthinking people blame the farmer for creating the threat of inflation.

The truth is that the American farmer has subsidized the consumer for had his prices gone up in proportion to the increase in virtually all other wholesale prices, full-blown inflation could be upon us now.

But I digress. The point at hand is American agricultural production in relation to the threat of world famine.

The challenge to produce for the hungry of the world has given American agriculture new stature, new dignity, new importance. The magnificent response by our farmers has provided the United States with an instrument for world peace of enormous potential, yet once again, some Americans fail to appreciate it.

Basking in our abundance, we are inclined to overlook the fact that millions of people in many other lands depend for their very existence on the fitful whims of weather and harvest or on American beneficence.

The ignominious failure of the Communist world to feed itself has not gone unnoticed by the uncommited nations nor has our abundance and our willingness to share that abundance with others.

In recent months we have seen how one poor crop year has threatened the vast nation of India with famine, and we have seen how only a massive food commitment by our Nation has averted widespread tragedy.

The food aid we are giving India is big, very big indeed.

Today we are shipping aid wheat to India at a faster rate than we did to all countries during the reconstruction period after World War II.

This year we expect to ship about 300 million bushels of wheat. This is about one and a half times the crop of our biggest wheat State, Kansas, and if made into bread it would make about 100 loaves for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

The importance of dairy products in the aid to India program was emphasized by the President in his aid message late in March, for he called for more shipments of nonfat dry milk to that troubled nation.

Under the food-for-peace program, we have shipped well over 100 million pounds of dairy products to India in the past decade. These products, nonfat dry milk, dry whole milk, evaporated milk and cheese, have been of great nutritional importance to the Indians, particularly to the children in the big cities where poverty discourages balanced diets and malnutrition is a continuing threat. Substantial additional shipments are in prospect for this year.

The new breadbasket of the world is North America—the United States and Canada. This new breadbasket exports more than 60 million tons of grain a year, with the United States providing three-quarters of that total.

We could increase that volume to more than 100 million tons a year, and the day may soon come when we must, if the immediate threat of global famine is to be met.

But direct food aid to the less fortunate countries is not nearly enough. Even with all-out production and more massive food donation programs, we can only postpone world hunger for a few years.

Disaster can be averted in only one way—by greatly accelerating the expansion of food production with the hungry nations themselves.

The hungry nations are faced with a tremendous task in increasing their agricultural productivity. Those most densely populated will have to do it the hard way by increasing yields per acre, for they are already cultivating most of their available land.

Serious roadblocks stand in the way of agricultural progress in these countries.

Some lack sufficient government stability for the establishment of effective policies.

Most lack incentives adequate to make it worth the while of the farmers to make all-out efforts to produce more.

Low rates of literacy, lack of know-how, and the absence of programs to help farmers to use new and better farming methods are serious.

Essential production inputs like fertilizers, improved seeds, modern equipment are scarce and the developing countries lack the foreign exchange to buy them.

All of these handicaps exist against the background of lack of roads, marketing facilities, farmers' cooperatives, and sources of credit.

Yet with all these handicaps, some hungry nations are increasing their agricultural productivity at a rate higher even than that ever achieved by the agriculturally advanced countries like the United States.

A recent USDA study of the changes in agriculture in 26 developing nations showed that between 1948 and 1963, 12 of these countries has compounded rates of increase in crop output of more than 4 percent per year.

These rates surpassed those ever achieved by the new economically advanced nations during comparable periods of time. The success of these 12 nations encourages confidence that underdeveloped countries can increase their per capita production of food and fiber.

I believe the task of these nations to raise their agricultural productivity is possible. Clearly it is a task which cannot—must not—be delayed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The United States can and definitely will provide technical and capital assistance to help those countries which undertake effective programs to increase their own ability to provide food for their people. Unless our assistance to them is directed toward that goal, few battles in the war on hunger can be won—and the war itself will be lost.

I mentioned before the 12 countries which achieved such phenomenal increases in agricultural production. The 12 differ widely in climate, literacy rates, land resources, culture, and governmental systems. But they had one factor in common—a national determination to carry out self-help policies to improve their food production.

Self-help is the key to victory over hunger.

This concept is the foundation for the food for freedom program currently before the Congress. It expands food shipments to countries where food needs are growing and self-help efforts are underway. It increases our commitment to lend capital and technical assistance. It eliminates the surplus concept in food aid by encouraging domestic production of those commodities which can be used constructively in fighting world hunger.

It fosters the continued expansion of markets for American agricultural commodities by helping to increase the purchasing power among the hundreds of million of consumers in developing countries.

And it encourages private industry, in cooperation with the Government, to produce and distribute foods to combat malnutrition.

The new food for freedom program can truly be an instrument through which millions of lives that are now threatened by famine under present trends can be saved.

But this will result only if it proves effective in changing those trends by stimulating, encouraging, and—if necessary—insisting on effective self-help measures.

Self-help is also the key to population control. The same factor common to the 12 developing countries—that national determination to carry out self-help agricultural policies—is the key to closing the gap between the urgent need for voluntary family planning services and the meager realities of actual birth control programs in developing areas of the world.

I want to close by sharing with you my own observation of the course of this new war against hunger—my own view of the potential outcome of the frightening race between population and food supply.

I make this observation in the light of another explosion that has taken place in our generation—one that can hold far greater meaning, and that certainly holds far greater hope than the population explosion.

I refer to the explosion of knowledge that characterizes our times.

Science and technology have progressed so far that it is now theoretically possible to produce enough for abundance for all.

But science and technology have likewise progressed so fast in the physical and material fields that our knowledge about the social, economic, and political relationships necessary to realize that abundance has not caught up.

The race is not so much one between population and food supply, but a race between what could be done and what will be done.

What could be done has already been determined by scientific and technological progress not only in food production but in birth control methods.

I ask you, and you can very well ask me, what will be done?

President Johnson has already made a firm commitment of what will be done.

He proposed this year in his international education and health message to Congress that the United States stand full square behind methods to fit population growth to food supply.

President Johnson proposed programs which would "expand research in human reproduction and population dynamics; enlarge the training of American and foreign specialists in the population field; and assist family planning programs in nations which request such help."

And, as I've already outlined for you, the President has staked out a comparable field of action to assure that expanding food supplies in the developing nations will accompany a downward adjustment in population thus hastening the day when the people of those nations have enough to feed themselves and are no longer dependent on us.

So we see that the fight against hunger will be waged on two fronts—that of population control and increasing food production.

President Johnson in his war against hunger message to Congress summed up the critical relationship between the two fronts in these words:

"A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine."

And so it is.

Military Might Alone Cannot Win in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, because of the continued crisis in Vietnam, and because the situation has only worsened during the past 6 months, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress a special report which I sent to the newspapers on December 2, 1965, during the adjournment period. I believe that the course of events since that time only serve to emphasize the correctness of my position at that time—which has not changed.

The material follows:

MILITARY MIGHT ALONE CANNOT WIN IN VIETNAM

Because of the growing concern of the American people about the fighting in Vietnam, I would like to make clear my own position as a citizen, and a Member of Congress, on this vital matter.

First, let me stress how important this problem is. A great and growing number of American young men, your sons and mine, are fighting and dying in Vietnam. There will be close to 200,000 there by January 1, 1966. In another year that number will probably be doubled. If the Chinese enter the fighting, as they did in Korea, then 500,000 to a million American soldiers will be involved in Vietnam. If we carry on a land war against China there is no limit to the number of men we will need to send.

There is a chance, small now but growing every day, that this may become a nuclear war and that Russia will become involved. If this happens, then every citizen of this country—young and old—faces possible death in a nuclear finale to human progress.

At the present level of the fighting, we are spending close to $10 billion a year on Vietnam—wiping out the tax cuts passed by this administration and making highly improbable the continuation of domestic efforts to improve the quality of life for the citizens of this country. At this spending level, a year from now we could face major tax increases, rationing of scarce commodities and major Government controls on production.

Every citizen should be deeply concerned about this. Every citizen should seek the best information available from his Government, and from every other source, on why we are engaged in Vietnam and what our goals are there. This is your war—your Government has ordered your sons to fight it. You will pay for it with your money and, possibly, your life.

I have made many speeches about Vietnam. My purpose has been not to force my view on anyone but to present the facts as I have observed them, to suggest courses of action that I think are reasonable, to encourage every person I can to think the problems through for himself and then to speak and act on his convictions. As long as this country is a democracy, this is the proper way for every citizen to exercise his rights.

Now, what are my own views on this problem? I accept and support the basic objectives set forth by the President—that we intend to resist and defeat any military solution by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong), and that we are willing to unconditionally negotiate a solution to the conflict at the conference table. I do not advocate a unilateral withdrawal of American troops or a surrender of South Vietnam to North Vietnam by negotiation or in any other way.

I strongly support the President's announced willingness to accept the principles of the Geneva Conference of 1954 as a basis for a negotiated settlement. I strongly support his expressed desire to have the South Vietnamese people decide for themselves, through free elections, the form of government they wish and the policies which that government will follow in its relation with its neighbors.

I believe that if every American citizen understood what the Geneva agreements provided, and why they were not carried out, and was willing to support the President's efforts to comply with the spirit of these agreements, the problems in Vietnam could be swiftly solved.

As we have become more deeply involved militarily in Vietnam, I have sought to resist the emotional pressures which inevitably develop—pressures which stifle dissent, which reject the facts that do not conform to the popular views, which prevent us from seeing how we got to where we are, and what we need to do to achieve our real goals. I cannot act in any other way. For 25 years I have been deeply concerned about how to create the conditions for peace and freedom in the world. The sacrifice of American lives, and the even greater suffering and sacrifice of the Vietnamese people, is an ever-present tragedy to me. I must, therefore, exert every power I have to help prevent an unthinking drift by this country into a course which does not strengthen America and does not expand freedom, but only threatens, catastrophe. This has been my fear about Vietnam, and this is why I have spoken out as I have.

While I accept and support the basic objectives set forth by the President for our future course in Vietnam, I do not completely accept the official view as to the nature of this war. Nor do I agree with all of the steps being taken to achieve the basic objectives. Let me explain some of these differences briefly.

The official view of this war is that it is an invasion from the north—that is, from the Communist state of North Vietnam—to overthrow a democratic country (South Vietnam) friendly to the United States and institute a Communist rule from Hanoi. This view is only partially correct. It neglects the fact that most Vietnamese, north and south, see themselves as one people temporarily divided against their will. It neglects the fact that the South Vietnamese Government has been an extremely oppressive, totalitarian dictatorship throughout its existence and has never been freely elected or enjoyed wide popular support.

The official view also neglects the fact that the vast majority of the enemy we are fighting (probably 80 percent) are native South Vietnamese whose motive, as they understand it, is not to expand communism but to secure freedom for South Vietnam. These Vietnamese see the United States as a foreign aggressor (as they did the French before us), and the Saigon government as merely a creature of the United States—completely financed by the United States and unable to stand alone.

Another official view of this war is that it is really aimed at stopping Chinese communism from further expansion. This again is only partially true. North Vietnamese communism is strongly nationalistic and only partly under Chinese influence. It is also under Russian influence, and it seeks to maintain a role independent of both where possible, as well as balancing between them when necessary. Vietnamese for 2,000 years have fought the Chinese, and it is doubtful if any conceivable pressure could make them willingly accept Chinese domination. In South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front not only would resist Chinese Communist control, but does not wish control by North Vietnam or immediate reunification of the two parts of Vietnam. It seeks, instead, a cooperative relationship and possible reunification after 10 or 15 years.

A frequently voiced official view of our role in Vietnam is that we are there to assist and advise the South Vietnam Government—first, in defending itself against aggression and subversion, and, then, to institute democratic reforms, and win the support of the peasants who comprise the vast majority of the population. I have pointed out that we have been working at this for the past 12 years—even since we helped establish the Government in 1954—and in this effort we have failed dismally. The Government has accepted our money—in fact, could not exist for 1 day without it—but has not accepted our suggestions for reforms and has never been able to inspire any substantial support for itself.

As a consequence, we now have been forced to forget what we said so emphatically only a year or so ago—that this is a Vietnamese war, and one which must be fought and won by the Vietnamese. Today, it is basically an American war against one part of the Vietnamese people, with another part—the Saigon government—playing an unconvincing role as our supporter and sponsor.

It is because of the weakness of the Saigon government—its lack of popular support among the peasants—that I have voiced the opinion that all of our sacrifices in Vietnam may have been in vain. The only way that our country can lose this war—or any war—is to end up supporting a government the people do not want and will not accept. To sacrifice our soldiers and the Vietnamese people—and to bring the world to the brink of thermonuclear war—only to end up with this sad situation is, indeed, the height of tragedy.

Because of my reservations as to the complete accuracy of the official views of the war, I differ with the military recommendations on how to achieve our goals. I place far greater emphasis on the recommendations for strengthening the structure of democracy in Vietnam. I would allow, not forbid, the expression of political views and the development of political parties in Vietnam. I would do far more than has been done in helping the peasants improve their economic level. I would use the minimum amount of military force in Vietnam consistent with maintaining our forces there and resisting the takeover by the Vietcong. I would favor reducing or stopping the heavy bombing, rather than extending it. In addition, I would make far greater efforts to bring an end to the fighting, through a negotiated peace, in accordance with terms that would guarantee South Vietnam what it has never had—a government elected by and responsible to its own citizens. Once that has been achieved, I would leave Vietnam to determine its own future, with whatever economic and technical assistance we see fit to give.

This is a very brief summary of my views and of some of the points I have made in dozens of speeches. I have expressed these views because I have a deep concern for the welfare of our country and for the peace of the world. If my own political life must be jeopardized, so be it.

Fino Introduces Railroad Tax Break Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to indirectly subsidize American railroads to enable them to furnish better passenger service and to compete against federally subsidized trucks, buses, and airplanes. My bill would do this by allowing railroads a tax credit instead of a deduction from income only for local real property taxes paid on rights-of-way owned and maintained by the railroads.

The indirect subsidy to the railroads under my bill would be significant as one-fifth of the railroad revenue dollar is spent on rights-of-way. Much of this is spent paying local taxes. Under my bill, the entire local real property tax bill of a railroad which represents tax on rights-of-way could be subtracted from the actual tax bill the railroad owed the Federal Government. Presently, the local taxes are just deductions, which—at present corporate tax rates—result in only half the tax writeoff the proposed credit would give.

In 1966, the Federal Government will spend $5.8 billion for construction, operation, and maintenance of highway, waterway, and air transport facilities. State and local governments will provide another $11.2 billion.

Compared with these sums, two modes of transportation are collecting peanuts—the railroads and the mass transit companies and agencies. I want to see things equalized as much as possible.

The big burden the railroads carry is a lack of Federal subsidy while their competitors receive heavy Federal subsidies. The biggest subsidy going to competitors of the railroads is the indirect subsidy involved in Federal construction of rights-of-way. Buses, trucks, and airplanes use subsidized and socialized rights-of-way. They have no upkeep and local property tax expenses. Railroads do. One-fifth of a typical railroad revenue dollar is eaten up by rights-of-way expenses. My bill, in effect, would provide that the Federal Government would subsidize railroad rights-of-way just as it does the rights-of-way of buses, trucks, and airplanes.

I think my bill embodies a simple yet straightforward means of subsidizing railroad rights-of-way. My bill would give railroads a big tax break for part of their rights-of-way expenses—that part represented by local real property tax costs.

I think this measure I am proposing represents nothing more than a fair shake for the railroads. To me, this tax break concept is the answer to the search for a sensible means of indirectly subsidizing our Nation's vital but hard-pressed railroads.

I am particularly concerned with the railroads in the eastern part of the Nation because they are in the most financial difficulty. As these railroads pay a particularly high ratio of tax dollars per mile of right-of-way, they should benefit the most.

Tribute to Joseph E. Talbot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that the Congress of the United States express its deepest sympathy to the family of Joseph Edward Talbot who died of cancer on Saturday.

Many of you will remember Mr. Talbot as a dedicated and highly effective colleague who served as a U.S. Representative from Connecticut during the 77th, 78th, and 79th Congresses. More recently, Mr. Talbot was a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission, where his knowledge of law and talent for leadership made their mark during the past 13 years.

Mr. Talbot embarked on his long and remarkable career in public service following graduation from Yale Law School in 1925. A Republican, he was a judge of the Borough Court of Naugatuck, Conn.; State representative from Naugatuck; State treasurer; and workmen's compensation commissioner in the Fifth District of Connecticut.

It is indeed with great sadness that we confront the loss of an old friend and dedicated American.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Dr. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.—John 15: 5.

We thank Thee, our Father, for Thy spirit which follows us all our days, for Thy love which will not let us go, and for the strength of Thy presence which never lets us down. Help us to open wide the door of our hearts that we may receive Thy spirit, welcome Thy love, claim the strength of Thy presence and thus be made ready for the experiences and responsibilities of this day.

By Thy grace may we put goodness before evil, truth before falsehood, high principle before low prejudice, the rights of the weak before the wrongs of the strong, and may we put Thee above all else, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14732. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11439. An act to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

BELLS OF AMERICA RINGING FOR FREEDOM

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the American Legion on its program "Bells of America Ringing for Freedom" which is conducted in each department to celebrate the date this country became an independent nation.

At 2 p.m., eastern daylight time, on July 4, 1966, the Liberty Bell will lead the ringing of bells throughout this land to remind America of its freedom and liberty. We will celebrate the 190th birthday of the United States this July.

I would like to encourage all Americans to participate in this patriotic event.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 93]

Abernethy
Adair
Ashley
Baring
Blatnik
Bolton
Brademas
Brock
Burleson
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Conyers
Corman
Daddario
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan, Oreg.
Ellsworth
Findley
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hull
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Kee
Kelly
King, Utah
Kupferman
McEwen
McMillan
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Michel
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nix
Pickle
Pool
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Shriver
Sullivan
Sweeney
Toll
Tupper
Utt
White, Idaho
Whitten
Williams
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RUMANIA AGAIN WILL BE FREE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our beloved country has been enriched by the presence among us of many men and women who came from the proud land of Rumania and their children and their children's children in whose veins courses Rumanian blood. All Americans join with them in celebration of the national holiday of Rumania and in the prayers that soon Rumania will reign again as a free and sovereign nation.

It was a hundred years yesterday that Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania. This marked the founding of the Rumanian dynasty. In 1877 the principality severed her links with the Ottoman Empire and on May 10, just 15 years after the founding of the dynasty, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania.

For 21 years now Rumania has lived unhappily in the midnight darkness of Soviet captivity. On this anniversary we renew our pledge of eternal friendship. Mr. Speaker, we will stand by until the light of day has returned and once again freedom rings in the proud land of Rumania.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT MAY ELIMINATE TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND COLLEGE FACILITY SECURITIES

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966, H.R. 14544, is being rushed and railroaded through the Banking and Currency Committee, Rules Committee, and the Congress because it is a bad bill and cannot withstand deliberation, debate, or exposure.

The bill was hastily concocted to hide the growing Federal deficit, the increasing national debt, and the accelerating administration expenditures.

Not only will the taxpayer pay dearly to permit the administration to conceal growing deficits, debts and spending, but other important consequences are likely to follow.

Today, certain securities held by the Community Facilities Administration, and other Federal agencies which lend to local governments and colleges, are tax exempt. This tax-exempt policy was designed to encourage this very necessary investment in local government and education.

The proposed FNMA participation sales would permit the pooling of tax-exempt securities with taxable securities.

The FNMA participation certificate would bear taxable interest even though some of the underlying pooled securities are tax exempt.

This may be unconstitutional. This may be the first step on the part of the Treasury Department and the Johnson-Humphrey administration to eliminate tax exemption on certain local and educational investments.

The proposal to substitute a Federal guarantee for the tax-exempt status of State and local government bonds may be another threat to tax immunity. The increased costs inherent in this proposal may seriously hamper the ability of local governments and colleges to meet the increasing demands placed upon them to provide public facilities.

If your communities or colleges have borrowed from the Community Facilities Administration, I suggest you obtain better answers than I have been able to obtain about this participation sales proposal or it might come back to haunt you.

This is only one of dozens of unanswered questions about H.R. 14544.

BANKRUPTCY THREATENS INDEPENDENT TRAVEL AGENTS—UNFAIR COMPETITION FROM BANKS THE CAUSE, CHARGES TRAVEL ASSOCIATION OFFICIAL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the ever-accelerating trend of large commercial banks elbowing their way into many nonbanking business activities continues.

Not only is it against the law, both State and Federal, for banks to engage in nonbanking activities, but this unfair competition threatens the very existence of many small, independent businessmen. Our commercial banks have much captive business—everyone must come to them because of their monopoly on checking accounts. Furthermore, the vast financial resources of these banks means that money is no problem in barging into new fields.

At the present time, one does not have to look hard or long to see banks engaging in insurance, personal property leasing, securities, accountancy, electronic data processing, mortgage servicing, travel services, tax services, credit cards, and so on. In several instances of these nonbanking activities, lawsuits have been filed, and rightly so, to prevent unfair and illegal bank competition, but just because an injured person has a legal remedy does not excuse a bank or bank supervisor for their actions.

With unanimous consent, I will insert at this point in the Record a recent letter I received from the President of the Association of Travel Agents, Mr. Othmar G. Grueninger, of Indianapolis, Ind., as well as my reply to him:

Association of Retail Travel Agents,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 27, 1966.
Mr. Wright Patman,
Chairman, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Patman: For your information we are enclosing two sample tour brochures, a joined effort of four of the local national banks which are merchandised not only through the travel department of each bank but are also displayed in their lobbies and in those of the multiple corresponding State banks.

The buying power of four national banks are becoming too much competition for the little agents as an example shown here in Indianapolis alone. On account of the overwhelming concentration of position in the travel field, that is to say, direct mailing lists, service of their research departments, influence of their loan departments, which theoretically enables them to loans subject to doing business with the banks travel department.

ARTA feels that the time has come that steps be taken to restrict banks from driving all travel agents to the brink of bankruptcy.

We'd appreciate if you can give this matter your close attention. Hoping to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,
Othmar G. Grueninger,
President, ARTA.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1966.
Mr. Othmar G. Grueninger,
President, Association of Retail Travel Agents, Indianapolis, Ind.

Dear Mr. Grueninger: Thank you very much for your letter of April 27.

For some time now I have been very much concerned over the unfair competition by national banks in the travel business. I am convinced that not only is this development harmful both for the independent travel industry and the general public, but it is also illegal under the national banking laws. Our Banking and Currency Committee publicized this very question last spring.

I am very much disturbed about your comment that many independent travel agencies are going out of business because of the aggressive and unfair competition by banks. I am hopeful that the committee will be able to schedule hearings on this problem before the expiration of the present session of Congress.

With kindest regards and best wishes,
Sincerely,
Wright Patman, *Chairman.*

MILITARY MEDICAL BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 822 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 822

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14088) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] and, pending that, myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, those who listened to the reading of the resolution know that this is a 1-hour open rule dealing with improved health benefits for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents. Frankly, I know of no controversy on the rule nor on the bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, House Resolution 822 will provide a 1-hour open rule for the consideration of H.R. 14088, to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill are to improve hospital care at military facilities for uniformed personnel; initiate a program of outpatient care from civilian sources for dependents of active duty members of the uniformed services; to provide a program of care in civilian facilities for retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents; and to provide a program of care for mentally retarded and physically handicapped children of active duty members of the uniformed services.

The number of retired military personnel and their dependents has increased rapidly in recent years to the extent that it is no longer feasible to provide all the care they are entitled to in military facilities. As in the case of dependents of military personnel on active duty, it is no longer fair to provide free treatment only at military medical facilities. This requirement puts a premium on a person's geographical location. All who are qualified should be able to receive treatment in the opinion of the committee.

The bill will improve and expand the medical benefits available to military personnel and their dependents by eliminating specific categories of treatments provided and substituting authority to provide benefits up to the highest option of the Government-wide plan covering civilian employees under the Health Benefits Act.

Outpatient care will be made available from civilian sources with the dependent paying 20 percent of the charges. Levels of benefits available are the same as the highest option of civilian employees. It is estimated that approximately 1.65 million dependents will be covered by the provision.

Handicapped children will be provided care and treatment in State or private, nonprofit institutions, or as outpatients. The Department of Defense will consult with the States to arrange for relaxation of State requirements for admittance of such military children. Military personnel would waive their tax immunity, and in effect, be treated as citizens of the State. Military personnel would be required to share in the cost of treatment, ranging from $25 to $250 per month depending on their grade, in no event to exceed 25 percent of the monthly costs.

The estimated costs of the bill are: for fiscal 1968, $216.2 million; 1969, $235.4 million; 1970, $259.4 million; 1971, $281.6 million; and 1972, $307.9 million.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense supports the bill, as does the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, there is no minority report. I know of no objection to the rule, and I know of no objection to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. However, I do not have any requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14088) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14088, with Mr. Multer in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services has unanimously reported H.R. 14088, a bill which will, if enacted into law, provide vitally needed improvements in the health benefits program available to the families of our uniformed personnel.

Its enactment will, among other things, provide a tremendous contribution to the enhancement of the morale of our military families at a time when their men are serving in mortal combat in Vietnam.

We can do no less than assure these men that their families back home will have guaranteed to them first-class medical care at a very minimum of cost.

This bill has received tremendous support not only from the members of military families but also from other sectors of our community. The objectives of the bill have been endorsed by the medical and hospital communities, as well as the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget.

I feel certain that with this general agreement on the necessity for an improved health benefits program for our uniformed services personnel that the House will give this measure its wholehearted and unanimous approval.

Rather than go into lengthy detail on the bill, the need for which is explained in the committee's report, I would like to briefly summarize its major provisions and then answer any questions you may have.

ACTIVE DUTY DEPENDENTS

For dependents of active duty men the bill provides an improved level of inhospital care and for the first time provides outpatient care from civilian sources. The Dependents Medical Care Act of 1956 provided an outstanding program of care in civilian hospitals for military dependents but the level of care has been frozen at the 1956 level while programs elsewhere in our society have made great advances. The bill would give the Department of Defense authority to increase the level of care for military dependents up to the level of the highest option of the Government-wide plan covering the larger number of civilian employees under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act. The bill provides that in no case shall the level of benefits be less than that provided civilian employees as of July 1, 1966.

Outpatient care is often the primary medical service required by military families. This is most frequently the case with men ordered to Vietnam when wives and children go home to live with the folks in locations not near military facilities. The bill would allow outpatient care from civilian sources with dependents paying 20 percent of the charges of such care, including cost of supplies and services in connection therewith.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

The bill would authorize Government financial support for the care of mentally retarded and physically handicapped children of military personnel. There are approximately 100,000 such children. Parents of these children at present have enormous difficulty in obtaining adequate care because of State residency requirements and because of high costs. The bill provides that the charge to the individual serviceman for care of a handicapped child shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the care. The bill also provides the serviceman could be charged from $25 for the lowest rank up to $250 a month for the top commissioned officers, but in no case shall the charge to the individual serviceman for care of his child in a public institution be more than he would have been required to pay if he were not a member of the uniformed services.

The Department of Defense had recommended that States be forced to waive their residency requirements under the threat of losing Federal grants. The committee felt that holding such a club over the States was neither desirable nor necessary. The committee contemplates that the Department of Defense can consult with appropriate representatives of the several States and arrange for the States to admit the children of service personnel concurrently with the service personnel waiving their State tax immunity under the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act.

RETIRED PERSONNEL

Hearings in 1964 by a subcommittee under our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. L. Mendel Rivers], established beyond peradventure of doubt that the Government had a moral obligation to provide medical care to retired military personnel and their dependents. This is something that has been promised to military men repeatedly in recruitment and retention literature and that has been traditionally granted. It was determined that this care could no longer be provided in military hospitals because of the growth of the retired population and because it would be unfair to deny care to those who did not live close to military facilities. The bill would expand the Dependents Medical Care Act to cover these retired personnel and their dependents, providing in-hospital and outpatient care from civilian sources at the same cost as is charged dependents of active duty personnel. The in-hospital charge is $25 or $1.75 a day whichever is greater. The outpatient charge is 20 percent of the cost. At age 65 these retirees and their dependents would be transferred from the Dependents Medical Care Act to the social security medical care for the aged program. It should be noted that they would be eligible for the social security program in any case since military personnel have been under social security since 1957. These retirees and their dependents would continue to be eligible for care in military facilities throughout the period of retirement.

The bill provides for programing of beds for retirees in military facilities with a minimum of 5 percent of retiree beds programed in all new hospitals and a maximum of 20 percent. It is the understanding of the committee that the number of beds would approach 20 percent when it is considered desirable in teaching hospitals.

The bill provides that care under the program would be provided for so-called title 3 retirees—that is, reservists who have 20 years, satisfactory Federal years, and start drawing Reserve retired pay at age 60. At present such retirees are allowed care in military facilities only if they have 8 years of active duty. The committee could find no rationale for the 8-year limitation and thus extended coverage under the new program to all Reserve retirees.

COSTS

The cost of the bill for its first year, would be $216 million. This will rise to $307 million a year by 1971. Changes made by the committee will increase the cost of the bill by approximately $21 million in its first year of operation, over the cost of the proposals recommended by the Department of Defense. These changes are the uniform charge for all retirees, dependents of retirees, and active duty dependents for care from civilian sources. The Department of

Defense had recommended a charge of 25 percent for both in-hospital and outpatient care for retirees and their dependents. The committee changed this to a uniform rate because it did not feel that the percentage charge would meet the Government's obligation to retirees and their dependents. This change adds $19.8 million to the cost of the bill in its first year of operation.

The inclusion of title 3 retirees under the bill will add $1.1 million to the cost of the bill in its first year of operation.

These cost figures which are found on page 26 of the committee's report do not reflect the savings that will accrue as a result of the committee's changes requiring the programing of beds for retirees in military hospitals. The best estimates of the Department of Defense available to the committee indicated the savings by programing of retiree beds will amount to $7.6 million by fiscal year 1972. These savings come about because care in military hospitals is markedly less costly than care in civilian facilities.

The members of the Armed Services Committee unanimously and enthusiastically endorse the Military Medical Benefits Act. We feel that it is an outstanding program of deserved care for our military families that will bring them up to the level of care provided other citizens in our society and that as such it will make a substantial contribution toward improving the morale and career retention rates of our uniformed services.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services provides that the provisions of this act will become effective on July 1, 1967. However, subsequent to the reporting of this legislation the Committee on Armed Services acted upon a proposed pay increase for uniformed service personnel. In arriving at the amount of the increase in military compensation that was necessary to provide military personnel with an adjustment in pay generally comparable to their Federal civilian contemporaries, the committee included a portion of the value of these proposed medicare and related benefits. Therefore, the committee directed that I request the House to approve an amendment to this bill which would strike the present effective date indicated in the bill and substitute therefor a new effective date of July 1, 1966.

This action will thus parallel the action previously approved by this body when it acted upon the Federal civilian pay increase and provided that it would become effective July 1, 1966. The Department of Defense has advised the Committee on Armed Services that it would have no objection to this change.

CONCLUSION

This, in brief form, summarizes the provisions of this bill as recommended by the Committee on Armed Services. It has received enthusiastic support from both sides of the aisle on our committee; I am sure that this bipartisan support will also be reflected in the action taken by this body today.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14088. I consider this bill one of the most important pieces of personnel benefits legislation that our committee has ever brought before the House. Because of my long association with the military, I know that nothing is of more vital concern to the military man than the provision of adequate medical care for his family. This is of particular concern to the military man because the nature of his deep commitment to his career frequently requires him to be separated from his family, and this is especially true today for those men serving in combat in Vietnam. They must be assured that their wives and children are receiving adequate care at home.

As the Surgeon General of the Army, Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, made crystal clear to our committee, the dependents of men in combat frequently go home to live with the parents of the wife or the parents of the serviceman. Quite often their folks live in areas where there are no military medical facilities; and even though civilian hospitals are available when hospitalization is required, there is no provision under present law for outpatient care from civilian sources.

Paradoxically, this is the care most frequently required by the family of the combat man wherever there are young children. General Heaton told us of a case where there was no serious illness, but the usual childhood diseases and upper respiratory infections had run up such doctors' bills, that the young mother had to take a job as a waitress to meet the expense.

The Dependent Medical Care Act of 1956 is one of the proud achievements of our committee. It was landmark legislation and at the time was one of the most forward-looking pieces of legislation passed by the Congress. The program has remained static since that time, however, while medical care programs in other segments of our society have made great advancements.

The present legislation will fill several gaping holes in the fabric of military medical care. With this passage, we will be able to proudly say, we provide our military families, in whom we require such a total and unique obligation, a program of medical care second to none.

The bill will allow the level of care in the civilian hospitals to keep pace with benefit improvements in other segments of the society by tying the maximum level of care to that provided Federal-civilian employees. The bill will provide outpatient care for dependents from civilian sources for the first time with the dependent paying only 20 percent of the cost.

The bill will fill a gap and fulfill a promise by providing a program of full care to the military retirees and their dependents. The bill does this by blanketing them under the Dependent Medical Care Act. The charge for those who receive in-hospital and outpatient care from civilian sources would be exactly the same as that of active duty dependents.

The bill provides that at age 65 they would transfer to the social security medical care program for civilian hospital care. Keep in mind that most servicemen would normally be eligible for this program in any case, since military men have been under social security since 1957.

The committee put what is, in effect, a savings clause in the bill to prevent any falling off of benefits on transfer to the social security program. The committee wanted to insure that there would be no sudden loss in benefits at a time in life when the retiree is least able to pay.

The retiree and his dependents would continue to be eligible for care in military facilities at any time during their retirement years even after passing the age of 65. The committee added language to the bill requiring the programing of beds for retirees in future military hospitals. A minimum of 5 percent and a maximum of 20 percent of new beds would be reserved for retirees under the bill. It is contemplated that the total would only go as high as 20 percent in cases where the hospital is a teaching facility. The bill provides for the first time relief for service parents in meeting the high cost of care for severely handicapped children. The Government would pay 75 percent of the cost of such care under this legislation.

I want to particularly mention an important feature that the committee added to the bill regarding reservists. I have in mind the citizen-soldiers, who complete 20 or more years of satisfactory participation in Reserve activities, and who at age 60 begin to draw a modest retired pay. These are the so-called title III retirees. The present law allows them to receive medical care in military facilities only if they have 8 or more years of active duty service. Mr. Chairman, I looked long and hard, but I could find no reason to justify this 8-year limitation. Just why it was enacted in the first place, I do not know. I suppose it was like the man who rode the horse into the police station; he could not remember later why he did it, but it seemed like a heck of a good idea at the time. The committee has eliminated this unrealistic 8-year period. This provision will add but a modest $1.1 million to the cost of the bill in the first fiscal year. I hope, in some small way, this will help boost the morale of the dedicated reservists, who have been so buffeted about by the flip-flop decisions of the Department of Defense on Reserve organization.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members of the House to support this legislation. I do not know how, in good conscience, we can do less for the men in uniform, who are now bearing the brunt of mortal combat.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14088. The bill has been well explained by Congressman HÉBERT. The need for legislation such as this is obvious. The legislation is supported by the Department of Defense and to the best of my knowledge is opposed by no one. I believe a review of changes which our committee made in the bill as recommended by the Department of Defense will be helpful.

The Department had recommended that retirees and their dependents, when brought under the Dependent Medical Care Act, pay 25 percent of all charges. The committee modified this to make the charge uniform for retirees and their dependents with the 20 percent charged for active duty dependents. The committee could find no justification for the higher charge to retirees. This change adds an estimated $20 million a year to the bill in its first year of operation. It is important to note that Department of Defense witnesses indicated that the Department would support this change. It is important because this one change accounts for almost all of the increased cost of the committee's bill over the departmental recommendations.

Defense had recommended leaving entirely in the hands of the Department the determination of how many beds would be programed for retirees in new military hospitals. The committee put in a minimum of 5 percent and a maximum of 20 percent. The committee has had sad experiences in the past with the Department failing to carry out the intent of Congress. It should be noted that the increased programing of retired beds in military hospitals is a savings because military hospital costs are significantly lower than the cost in civilian facilities. According to the best estimate available to the committee, the annual savings by this provision will amount to over $7 million by fiscal year 1972.

In accepting the Defense recommendation that retirees at age 65 transfer to the social security medical care program, the committee added a savings clause to assure there would be no diminution of benefits. This was done because in the hearings we had conflicting testimony between the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as to whether benefits would be lost by the transfer.

The defense proposal would have required withholding Federal grants from States which refuse to waive residency requirements for handicapped children of military personnel. The subcommittee eliminated this language as it felt the matter could be handled better administratively. The committee feels an arrangement can be made whereby States waive residency requirements and military personnel waive tax exemption under the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act. The committee also amended the handicapped children section of the bill to assure military people would not pay more than normal State charges.

The committee accepted the Department's proposal to tie dependent medical care in the future to the high option of the most widely used plan under the Federal-Civilian Employees Health Benefits Act. The committee, however, to prevent a reduction of benefits in the future, provided a floor on benefits equal to that under the Federal employee program as of July 1, 1966.

Mr. Chairman, that briefly summarizes the committee's perfecting amendments. I think they are reasonable and fully justified. I think it makes the bill an outstanding piece of legislation and I hope all my colleagues will support it.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of these amendments.

First, I am particularly interested in that portion which will provide better out-service care to dependents of the active duty uniformed personnel.

There have been many occasions arising wherein the mother of several dependents, with the husband overseas, has had to travel an undue distance in order to receive prescription service—for corrective measures for vision—or be it for drugs or other things. This is expensive and often requires hiring a car, and/or babysitters.

This will take care of this according to the original intent of the true medicare bill. This is the true medicare bill before the name was purloined for the general hospital care of the elderly or the aging, over 65 under the social security tax. It has worked beautifully, and has well demonstrated—with the Army as the action agency for the Department of Defense—the complete cooperation of organized medicine and ancillary agencies of health with Government services.

Second, I am of course, Mr. Chairman, vitally interested in that portion that guarantees the departmental care on a space-available basis, and under the new civilian medicare for the aged, now the law of the land, which goes into effect July 1, 1966—and other portions properly implemented by January 1967—for retirees and their dependents.

This is a bill for equity and justice in the best known medical care, such as the people of America demand based on both moral and legal obligations, for those who have served our country so long and honorably. It is a benefit that a grateful Nation gives to its people who have served with devotion and dedication in times of war and in times of peace in the armed services.

The third portion of the bill pertains to the care of medically handicapped dependents of those now on active duty in the uniformed services. It is really as important as the others, but I personally have had more experience in the previously discussed fields.

I predict that passage of this bill, will enhance the type of care we are giving to our deserving people, and that they will be happier with it. It will not be an additional drain either on the facilities of the armed services for hospital care or on the taxpayers. It is timely and appropriate. I hope it passes unanimously.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. This bill greatly improves medical care coverage for our military families in three general areas. It expands coverage for active duty dependents and provides them with outpatient care from civilian sources. It institutes, for the first time, a program of aid to families with handicapped children. And it provides a solution to the problem of adequate medical care for retired military personnel and their families.

It is to the latter provision that I would particularly like to speak today, though I feel all sections of the bill are necessary and important. I am particularly gratified by the retired section of the bill both because it meets an unusually critical need and because it is a problem to which I have given special attention over the last several years. In fact, the program recommended by the committee is essentially the same as a bill I first introduced over 3 years ago. That is, it extends the Dependent Medical Care Act to retired personnel and their dependents. Mr. Chairman, medical care for our retired personnel has been established by custom and statute since the mid-19th century. This is something that has always been promised to our retirees and their families. It is something that has always been provided.

Today, however, the rapid increase in the number of retirees—which is a byproduct of our maintaining a large ready force in the cold war—has made it clear that the promised medical care cannot continue to be given in military facilities. The Department of Defense has indicated that by 1970 there will be 25 military retirees for every 100 persons on active duty. By 1977, retirees will equal 40 percent of the total number of active duty personnel. These retirees together with their dependents cannot all be cared for at military facilities.

As an illustration of this, in my own district there are more than 42,000 retired personnel and their dependents. There is a brandnew Navy hospital under construction at Jacksonville which will have 400 beds. But even this new hospital cannot care for all of the active duty personnel in the area and the retired population too. It is clear that to carry out our promise to the military retired man we must program more beds in military hospitals and we must provide some of the care in civilian hospitals. Both of these would be done under the present bill.

The extended study that our committee has given to this problem has made clear beyond all question that we have a moral obligation to provide care to retirees and their families. Our men were consistently promised such care by recruiters and by the retention literature given them by the military departments. In the record of the 1964 hearings on hospital policy, directed by our very distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS, there is reproduced page after page of recruiting and retention documents which assured those men who made military service a career that they and their families would be cared for in retirement.

Mr. Chairman, there should be nothing more sacred to us than keeping the promises our Government makes to its individual fighting men.

In an effort to begin remedial action, I introduced early in the 88th Congress—in May 1963—H.R. 178. I reintroduced the bill in this Congress as H.R. 279.

This bill is essentially what the committee has reported to the House today—the blanketing of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependent Medical Care Act. I also introduced on April 9, 1964, H.R. 10763. This embodied an alternate program, proposed by the Fleet Reserve Association, to provide care for retirees and their families. It gave more emphasis to care in military facilities. I reintroduced that bill in the present Congress as H.R. 1525. In introducing these proposals, I wanted to get as many helpful items as I could before the committee so it could consider all possible angles for a solution to the problem. I think the FRA proposal served a very useful purpose in bringing increased discussion of the problem and helping to gain increased attention at the national level. And the present legislation carries out one key point of the FRA proposal: that the retiree and his family would know beyond question that he has an assured right to care. The committee has stipulated that the Department of Defense shall provide care, not just that it may provide care.

The committee, in reporting H.R. 14088, has strengthened the bill by requiring a minimum of 5 percent of bed space in new and replacement military hospitals for retirees and their dependents. The committee has also provided that at age 65 retirees would transfer to the social security medical care for the aged system. However, the committee has made sure that these over-65 retirees will continue to be eligible for care in military hospitals and it provided a savings clause so they would not suffer any loss of benefits.

In summary, the bill fully meets our moral obligation and fully carries out our promises to the retired man. This is an important day for all retired military personnel and their families. I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14088.

This bill has been adequately explained by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the legislation, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert], and other members of that fine subcommittee. There is one section of the bill, however, that I would like to give particular attention to because I think it is important that the legislative record and the legislative intent be clear on this point.

This is the section which provides that retirees covered under the bill will transfer at age 65 to the social security program of medical care for the aged.

The subcommittee accepted this provision because most service personnel are already eligible for social security medical care. This is true because military personnel have been under social security since 1957. The subcommittee felt that it would not make sense to have two separate programs going at the same time for military citizens of the same age group.

It should be understood that these military people continue to be eligible for care at uniformed service facilities after age 65. The social security program will be used to administer the care when they are cared for in civilian facilities.

The committee received conflicting testimony on whether or not there would be a falling off of benefits when the retiree transferred from the Medical Care Act to the social security program. There are some services available from social security that are not available under the dependent medical care program. The most notable of these for example is the provision for nursing care. This is a particularly valuable service to older patients. On the other hand, the dependent medical care program provides more extensive care in some areas. For example, the social security program provides up to 90 days hospitalization for each illness; the dependent medical care program provides 365 days.

To assure that there would be no loss of benefits at a time in life when the retirees are increasingly aware of medical needs, the committee put a savings clause in the bill. It provides that after exhausting benefits under the social security program, the retiree or his dependent could continue to get care that would have been available if he had been under the Dependent Medical Care Act.

I think it is very important to recognize that exhausting the care under the social security program includes using the supplemental benefits of that program. In other words it is not contemplated that the savings clause would be used to relieve the retiree of having to pay the extra $3 a month for himself and $3 a month for his wife. The extra $3 monthly charge at age 65 is not considered unfair to the retiree since at that time the retiree, with a few rare exceptions, commences to receive increased income in the form of monthly social security payments. The $3 charge would be deducted from his social security check. The retiree receives this social security payment in addition to his regular military retired pay.

In summary, the program provides a fair program of full coverage to the retiree which can be easily administered. It deserves the support of the House.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14088.

I had the burden and privilege for some 8 years in the Louisiana Legislature of working on the problem of providing adequate care for mentally retarded children. It is difficult for those who have not come face to face with the problem to appreciate the agony and heartache faced by parents, who have to care for such a child. The problem has been made especially acute for members of the armed services because in the past, the residency requirements have frequently prevented them from obtaining care for their children in public institutions. These public institutions are quite frequently the only institutions that military personnel can begin to afford.

For those of you who want some understanding of this problem, even when faced by one of the more successful members of our society, I commend to your attention a letter that appears on page 5969 of our subcommittee hearings on the present legislation. The letter is from Vice Adm. Mahlon S. Tisdale, U.S. Navy, retired. The letter, addressed to our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, L. Mendel Rivers, details the burdens and the cost faced by Admiral Tisdale in caring for his spastic son over a 44-year period. Admiral Tisdale said:

> I smile when I hear the father of a normal child complaining about the high cost of a 4-year college course for his child. The father of a handicapped child cannot plan for a fixed term, such as 4 years. Additionally—and importantly—he must strive to provide financially for his child after his own death.

Admiral Tisdale's tale is heartrending. But as he points out, he was a lieutenant commander, or of higher rank, during all of the period that his son lived. Think of the burden of such care and such cost on an enlisted man living on the modest pay we provide our enlisted personnel?

From 1947, when Admiral Tisdale retired, until 1963 when the boy died at age 44, the son was cared for in a cerebral palsy hospital in California—Hillside House in Santa Barbara—one of the best such institutions in the country. The cost for Admiral Tisdale was $325 per month for basic tuition. Clothing, doctors' bills, haircuts, and other incidentals were extra expense. This gives you some idea of the financial burden on a parent of a retarded and seriously handicapped child.

I do not believe that a country as rich and powerful as ours, a country that gives away billions every year in foreign aid, should have even one family face a hopeless financial debt because they were so unfortunate as to have a handicapped child. And I do not thing we can ever callously allow such burdens to rest on the families of servicemen, whose pay is particularly low and who have difficulty establishing residence in a single State because of the frequency of movement required by their military duty.

This bill would begin to right a tragic situation by having the Government pay 75 percent of the cost of the care for handicapped children of service personnel. That care includes the following: diagnosis; inpatient, outpatient, and home treatment; training, rehabilitation, and special education; institutional care in public, private nonprofit, and State institutions; and transportation incident to such care. The committee's intention is that care would be facilitated in State institutions by having the State waive residency requirements and having the serviceman waive exemption from State taxation normally granted him under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. The committee feels that the Department of Defense can make such arrangements by contacting appropriate State officials. As originally submitted by the administration, the bill would have, in effect, held a club over the States threatening a denial of Federal grants if waiver of the residency requirements were not forthcoming. The subcommittee felt that such Federal interference in the affairs of States were neither desirable or necessary.

Under the bill, the serviceman would first seek care in State institutions for his handicapped child. The bill carefully provides that the serviceman will not in any case pay more than the charge that would be required if he were not a member of the uniformed services. If it is necessary to seek care in nonpublic institutions or if the care is more expensive than most State institutions, the bill provides that a serviceman in the lowest enlisted grade may be requred to pay the first $25 of the monthly cost for such care. Members in the highest commissioned grade may similarly be required to pay as much as $250 a month. The precise range of costs is left to regulations to be drawn up by the Secretary of Defense in cooperation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It should be understood, Mr. Chairman, it is not the intention of the committee that the children of service personnel receive preferential treatment in State facilities. The intention is that they will be treated on an equal basis with State residents.

Finally, let me make it clear that the committee does not pretend that this bill is the whole answer. The problem, nationwide, in the care of the handicapped and particularly in the care of the mentally retarded, is the need for adequate facilities. There is a shortage of facilities right now and as long as that shortage continues, military interests and civilian alike will suffer. I am happy to tell the House, however, that according to the past testimony received in our hearings, a really dramatic start has been made on a program to provide adequate facilities for the first time.

Representatives of the Public Health Service under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare testified that the Federal Government is beginning to commit substantial sums of money in matching grants to the States for such facilities. They testified also that the States are responding magnificently in providing sufficient appropriations of their own to be eligible for such grants. Over $300 million is being spent by Health, Education, and Welfare this year in grants to the States for various programs to aid in the care of the mentally retarded. Mr. Chairman, I think we can look for a much better future national record in the care of the mentally retarded and physically handicapped children; and I think that the present bill would be an important and necessary part of that record. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the legislation.

I have confined my remarks to this portion of the bill because of my special interest in this field. But I want it clearly understood for the record that my wholehearted support is also behind the other portions of the bill that improve the medical care of active duty personnel and carry out the Government's pledge to provide full medical care to our military retirees and their dependents. I urge the Members of the House to make the vote on this bill unanimous.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman].

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have just a point of inquiry to the manager of the bill. If the gentleman will recall, yesterday in connection with the bill H.R. 14921, the 1967 independent offices appropriation bill, we added $1.5 million for nursing homes in the States for retired veterans. I wonder how that jibes with the bill we have before us today? Is there any difference in the amount involved here because of the fact that we added $1.5 million?

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, there is no inconsistency at all. This is an entirely different program. This is relating to retired military people and their dependents. It has no connection with any veterans' organization.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Leggett].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. I believe this is direly needed. In view of the confusion which has arisen in the last several years with respect to the obligation of this Congress to our retired military people with respect to health benefits, I believe this legislation clears the air to a reasonable extent.

Certainly it is critically needed because of the current drain on our stateside military hospital facilities. The alternative provisions for civilian care which are provided by this legislation are critically necessary.

At this time I ask the gentleman from Louisiana, the manager of the bill, with respect to the transition coverage for retired people from this legislation to social security legislation, is it the gentleman's understanding that all military personnel who are retired, who reach the age of 62 years or 65 years, are then automatically covered by the social security medicare legislation?

Mr. HÉBERT. They would be under the law, as the social security provisions of the law provide. They apply to everybody at age 65. However, at age 65 he must pay the $3, the same as everybody else, if he wants to obtain the full benefits of the civilian health care program. However, he continues to remain eligible for care at uniformed services medical facilities after reaching age 65 whether or not he participates under the social security program.

Mr. LEGGETT. The effect of it will not be to downgrade the coverage after age 65 by transition to the medicare social security benefits?

Mr. HÉBERT. Quite the contrary. The whole purpose of the bill is to upgrade and not downgrade the benefits given to the man in uniform. That is why we specifically added language to that effect.

Mr. LEGGETT. With respect to another matter, I believe coverage of the handicapped who are born to members of military services is extremely good legislation. Provisions like this might well be applied to civilians who are covered under the Social Security Act, who might also have totally disabled children through no fault of their own, for which children we currently make no provision of any benefits.

The Department of Defense, by this legislation, is assuming its responsibility to its military members who have these totally disabled children. It is extremely good legislation and in the public interest.

With respect to recoupment of the Department of Defense for the care provided under this legislation, as I understand, a flexible schedule is provided for the recompensation benefits. I ask the gentleman from Louisiana if that is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation. There is a flexibility of payments ranging from a minimum of $25 a month to $250 a month. This is graded on the rank of the individual affected.

For instance, an enlisted man who has a retarded child would not pay more than $25 a month and, under certain circumstances, even this could be waived by the Department.

The four-star general would pay no more than $250 a month. It is graded on a scale of the individual and his compensation in an area now where there is no provision at all to help these people.

Mr. LEGGETT. As I understand it, there is a limitation that the intent of the legislation is that 75 percent of the cost shall be borne by the Department of Defense, with a maximum to be recouped from the individual of from $25 to $250, depending upon the scale.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman has stated it satisfactorily and correctly.

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 14088 and as far as I know so does everyone.

H.R. 14088 combines three pieces of legislation supported by the Department of Defense. With certain changes, all of which I feel are fully justified, the legislation before the House today is that proposed by the Department of Defense. All of the witnesses before our committee supported the legislation. I know of no organization or group which does not acknowledge that the Government has a special obligation to assure adequate medical care to the military man and his family. This is especially true at this time when men are being called up and sent into combat.

The leadership of these combat units is largely provided by career personnel whose morale and performance have been outstanding. The vast majority of these career men in our Armed Forces today are married and it is the needs of their families which prompt this legislation.

H.R. 14088 will improve the level of care for military dependents who need hospitalization and, equally important, will provide a mechanism for future expansion as medical benefits are increased in other programs in our society.

Mr. Chairman, it is very apparent to those of us privileged to serve in this House, from our correspondence, that there is nothing that causes as much anxiety and concern to the military man as the problem of adequate medical care for his family. It is very clear that an improvement in the medical care benefits of military families will result in higher morale of our Armed Forces which will translate itself into increased retention of our highly trained career personnel.

This bill is necessary and desirable if we are to meet our obligations to the serviceman and his family. It is equally necessary and desirable from the standpoint of sound personnel administration. I hope it will have the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER].

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, shortly after I became a Member of this body I was notified that the Public Health Service Hospital in the city of Memphis, Tenn., was to be closed.

In 1936 I became a member of the armed services, as a member of the class of 1936 at the Naval Academy.

These two events have put me in a position to be acutely aware of the problems of the retirees and of their dependents.

When the Public Health Service Hospital was closed in Memphis this threw hundreds and hundreds of retirees and their dependents into a position where they had virtually no medical care readily available to them; this despite glowing promises and recruitment posters of decades ago, and in part because of the cruel application of the "space available" policy in military and veterans hospitals.

This is a great inequity which we are today curing, and I am very proud of the committee for reporting this bill.

As a Member of this House I have, of course, become aware of the needs of dependents of our men serving overseas. Not a week goes by that I do not receive at least one letter from some wife of a man on active duty who is living far away from any military installation and who is in critical need of medical care for herself and children. Here again this bill fills a great need. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation and urge all of my colleagues similarly to support it.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill with real enthusiasm. But before telling you why, I should like to say something about the mechanics which brought it before us today.

This is a classic example of the legislative process at work in an ideal sense. This bill is what legislation ought to be; it is the creature of Congress as the constitutional policymaking branch of the Government; it is the product of extensive and thoughtful deliberation; it is an example of real and honest cooperation between Congress and the executive branch.

Back in 1962 the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], who is managing this bill on the floor of the House today, planted the first seed of the legislation which we will pass here today. It was the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] who asked some questions in an Armed Services Committee hearing in 1962 that had to do with the old naval hospital fund under which naval personnel were charged so much a month so that hospitals could be provided for them. As a result of those questions asked by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] at this hearing, a series of newspaper articles was later printed about the general subject of medical care for retirees and dependents. This prompted the Fleet Reserve Association, which had always been interested in this subject, to accelerate their efforts in behalf of medicare for retirees and dependents. The association made proposals to the Department of Defense, which were considered and which contributed to the Rivers subcommittee hearings in 1964. It was those hearings which showed the real need for the legislation which we will pass today and which prompted the Department of Defense to start working on it.

Administrative action followed. An administration policy was developed and an administration bill presented. Finally this was climaxed in the excellent hearings conducted by our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] just a few weeks ago. And today we have a splendid bill which, as has been stated here earlier today, all of us can conscientiously support. So we have gone the complete cycle. It started with Congressman HÉBERT in 1962 who triggered a chain of events which produced this very worthwhile piece of legislation which he is managing today.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] for the significant part he has played in producing this excellent bill.

In recent years a lot of people have been trying to save money at the expense of the military retiree. Every time we cut retirement benefits, we wind up having to improve reenlistment pay and other active duty benefits to keep up retention rates.

The reason for this is simple. Retirement benefits are the most important career incentives for military men. If you do not believe that, just imagine the chaos that would result in the enlisted retention situation if you cut out 20-year retirement.

Medical care in retirement is second only to retired pay in importance to the career military man. Over the last several years, the Department of Defense has discontinued programing beds for retirees in military facilities. This, plus the growth of the retired population, has threatened the cutting off of medical care for retirees and their dependents.

In the 88th Congress, I introduced a bill to assure medical care for retirees and their dependents along the lines of a program proposed by the Fleet Reserve Association. The bill was designed frankly to be a catalyst, to get some action on this problem before it reached hopeless proportions. Action, we got. Hearings were held in 1964, chaired by our distinguished leader, the gentleman from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS, and those hearings proved what some of us had been saying all along: that medical care for retirees is a traditional benefit that has been provided for over hundreds of years and that has been repeatedly promised as an inducement for making the service a career.

The question before the Hébert subcommittee this year was how to carry out the moral obligation to retirees that had been confirmed by the Rivers hearings of 1964. The Hébert subcommittee, by modifying and improving the program proposed by the Department of Defense, has done an outstanding job, and it deserves the gratitude of all military retirees. It has drawn up a program which will assure medical care to retirees and their dependents at a very minimum of cost by allowing such care to be given in civilian hospitals under the Dependent Medical Care Act. At age 65 retirees would switch to the social security program, but the committee has assured that there would be no falling off of benefits. At all times the retirees and their dependents continue to be eligible for care in military facilities. To assure that some military facilities are available, the committee has provided the programing of at least 5 percent of beds for retirees in all new military hospitals. It should be recognized that this not only provides a desired benefit for the retiree himself, but helps to insure a rounded professional program for military doctors and makes additional hospital beds available for possible mobilization needs.

In summary, the bill carries out fully the Government's moral obligation to the military retiree and his family. This is what is important. The paramount concern is not the method of providing care or of financing the program, but simply the principle involved—that the Government keeps its word. The moral obligation of the Government is to keep its word to any individual military man is far more important than the amount of dollars involved.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Fleet Reserve Association deserves a great deal of credit for its efforts in bringing this problem to national attention and can take a great deal of pride in the part it has played in getting legislation advanced. I would like to particularly recommend one sentence from a booklet the FRA published on this problem:

> What the serviceman, active and retired, wants is not just to get a benefit, but to be assured that he will continue to get it.

One of the great advantages of the program provided in the present legislation is that it is a permanent, stable program. The retiree can be assured that he will continue to get medical care throughout his retirement.

In addition to providing for retirees, the present legislation also includes programs to meet simple basic needs of military personnel that are in line with benefits being provided to citizens throughout our society. These are outpatient care for dependents regardless of location, an expanding level of in-hospital care, and aid in caring for handicapped children. These are necessary and worthwhile programs and I support them wholeheartedly.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] yielding to me. Also, I want to associate myself with his remarks.

The need for this legislation is overwhelming. Anyone familiar with the problems of military personnel and their families must agree to vigorously support this bill. It is for this reason that I rise today to add my voice to the committee member's presentation.

Putting it bluntly, the military personnel and their families have been overlooked too long. The benefits for medical care have not kept pace with their civilian counterparts. We have made improvements in the salary structure to develop some semblance of comparability but the medical provisions have been totally inadequate. As many of the committee members with whom I have talked know—I have related rather forthrightly my personal gripes as to the inadequacy of their benefits, particularly for dependents of active duty members of our armed services. The lack of facilities, the lack of choice and flexibility in seeking medical attention have left these people with a feeling of neglect—this is no way to treat people whose husbands and fathers are on call around the clock to meet the demands associated with our national and international security commitments.

During this past year, I visited and held one of my regular meetings with a very responsible servicemen's organization, the Sergeant's Association at Hamilton Air Force Base. This group represents an exceptionally well qualified unit of noncommissioned officers. They are not the type of johnny-come-latelys that are inclined to complain at the drop of a hat.

During our visit, they brought to my attention many of the problems they were having with what would be categorized as inadequate medical facilities and programs for their families. Impressed as I was, I returned to Washington with the feeling that something must be done.

As we vote today in support of this bill, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee for adhering to our requests. While I believe there is still room for improvement, I am equally pleased to see that this oversight is on its way toward recognition and correction. I sincerely urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague from California [Mr. Gubser] for championing the cause of adequate medical care for dependents of active and retired military personnel and retired military personnel themselves.

I concur with his remarks, and am pleased to support the Military Medical Benefits Act, which is before the House today. This bill will greatly improve medical services available to our retired military ranks, their dependents, and families of active duty servicemen.

ACTIVE DUTY BENEFITS

The Dependents Medical Care Act of 1956 established a medical program for military families in civilian hospitals. This act represented a new concept in the provision of such care. Because it was a new program, its benefits were somewhat limited. This new bill will expand benefits to include all types of care and services provided under the highest option of the Government-wide health plan selected by the largest number of civilian employees of the Federal Government. In addition, certain medical services will be provided which are not available under the civilian programs. Examples are: Physical examinations, immunizations, care of the newborn, emergency dental care, and dental care outside the United States.

Inpatient care at civilian hospitals will cost only $25 per admission, or $1.75 per day, whichever is the higher. Outpatient care will cost the dependent only 20 percent of the actual hospital charge.

RETIRED PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Of especial interest to many retired military personnel now living in California's 12th Congressional District are the generous features of this bill. Retired military personnel and their dependents will now be covered by the Dependents Medical Care Act. This will make the same level of hospital care available to them that is available to dependents of active servicemen. Civilian hospital care and outpatient care will become available on the same cost basis.

Another important feature of the bill requires the Department of Defense to provide hospital space in all new hospital construction and replacement hospitals for retired personnel and their dependents. No less than 5 percent nor more that 20 percent of the planned bed space shall be constructed for them. The exact percentage will be determined by the amount of civilian medical facilities within 1 hour's traveltime from the military facility, and the requests for care made by retired personnel during the fiscal year just prior to the programing of the construction.

MEDICAL BENEFITS DIRECTLY RELATED TO MORALE AND ENLISTMENT RATES

I am pleased to urge enactment of this measure today. Its effects will be far reaching. The excellent fringe benefits, such as housing, medical care and retirement plans, offered by the military services used to serve as inducements for able men to enlist in a career dedicated to their country. Men were also assured that as retired personnel their benefits would keep pace with those of their active counterparts. Now, private enterprise and other governmental positions offer similar, if not greater benefits. This bill will restore a better balance of benefits. It will boost morale of our men in Vietnam because they will know that the best medical care can be given their dependents who are here at home at nominal cost. It should help reenlistment rates. It will provide a welcome improvement in benefits for retired personnel and their dependents.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill wholeheartedly and am confident my colleagues will pass this measure overwhelmingly.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I think it is a very timely piece of legislation and humanitarian as well. A number of health problems with regard to dependents of servicemen have come to the attention of my office in the past few months. This gap in our service was particularly noticeable. Certainly the committee is to be commended for this fine corrective piece of legislation.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Dyal].

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislative proposal—the Military Medical Benefits Act of 1966. I compliment the chairman and members of the Committee on Armed Services for their dedicated and expeditious consideration of this needed legislation which will improve the level of medical care for our active duty members of the uniformed services and their dependents and provide medical care to retired military personnel and their dependents to which I feel the Federal Government is morally obligated.

I am confident the action we are taking here this afternoon will show our continued faith in our servicemen, assure our military retirees and their dependents we are aware of implied moral obligations, and promote a better understanding for young men wishing to join our uniformed services.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson].

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the bill.

The provisions of this legislation affecting active duty personnel will help those who need it most and who are least able to pay—the young families, the families of enlisted men and junior officers. In my district, we are very much aware of the problems of getting adequate medical care, particularly outpatient care, for dependents of men who are at sea and away from their homes for long periods.

The provision of the bill aiding parents with handicapped children is long overdue. Surely no country as wealthy as this, no country able to give away billions annually in foreign aid, should allow families to get in hopeless and tragic financial situations simply because they are the parents of handicapped children.

I am especially proud of the committee's work in meeting the pledge this Government has made to provide care in retirement for the military man and his family. In 1956 our committee brought the dependent medical care bill to the floor. In our report on that bill 10 years ago, we said the following:

> The Committee on Armed Services recognizes the fact that retired personnel of the armed services have traditionally been considered a part of the uniformed services. To exclude them from consideration for coverage in civilian facilities might well reduce the increased reenlistment rate and improved morale which the proposed legislation seeks to bring about.

The committee, at that time, provided a discretionary authority for the Secretary of Defense to negotiate for a type of program similar to that provided active duty dependents. Such a provision passed the House, but was knocked out in the Senate. If it had been enacted into law, many of the problems of recent years could have been avoided and the morale of our military people would be better than it is now.

What we are proposing in the present legislation is not a great new departure, but is only what this committee and this House approved 10 long years ago.

Mr. Chairman, it has been established beyond all doubt that we have an obligation to provide medical care to the retired military community. The retired military man himself prefers his care in military facilities and our committee found that it is considerably cheaper to provide the care in military facilities. For example, the average cost per day for care from civilian sources under the dependents medical care program in fiscal year 1966 was roughly $63. The average cost per day for retired members and their dependents in military hospitals in the same fiscal year was roughly $30—less than one-half as much. The committee provides in the bill that at least 5 percent of beds programed in new military hospitals shall be for retirees and their dependents. This is desired by the patient, it is desired by the doctor, it is more economical, and it provides an additional reserve of beds for emergencies.

The committee determined, however, that it would be simply unrealistic to try to provide all such care in military facilities. The retired population has grown and is growing at such a rate that it would not be feasible to handle all care in military hospitals. We were able to accommodate just about all the inpatient and outpatient workload last year. But Defense estimates that by 1970 military hospitals will be able to meet only two-thirds of the outpatient workload and only one-half of the inpatient workload So even those retirees living near military facilities could not be guaranteed care. In addition, as the retired population grows, more and more retirees are settling in areas where there are no military hospitals.

The only answer is a system of care in civilian facilities and it would be foolish to start an entirely new program when there is a sound program in operation. Therefore, the committee did what it first recommended 10 years ago and blanketed all retirees and their dependents under the Dependent Medical Care Act. I think this fully meets our obligation to military retirees. It is a program we know can be soundly administered. And it is a program we can afford. I urge all my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to commend the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and all of its members, for the service that they have rendered to our service people in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House.

This legislation provides a substantial fringe benefit to active duty personnel and their families and retirees and their families. It also covers the dependents of those who die in active service. In all, it is a great improvement of fringe benefits for some 7 million Americans.

No benefit which now exists is taken away from dependents or from retirees and their dependents. But several important benefits are added to assure that military families get the care they have been led to expect for one reason or another which we have been unable to provide. Active duty dependents get an improved level inpatient care and get outpatient care from civilian sources. At the present time we have the inequitable situation of some dependents getting outpatient care because they live near military facilities and some having to pay for their own care because they do not live near military facilities. As the committee report points out, we cannot provide medical care on the basis of geographical good fortune.

Retirees will continue to be eligible for care in military facilities on a space available basis. There will be more space available because the bill provides a minimum of 5 percent of beds for retirees in all new hospitals. But the rapid growth of the retired population makes it evident that the present system can not continue to work. The bill, therefore, to assure continued care for retirees provides that they can get care in civilian facilities under the dependent medical care program. It also provides that they can get outpatient care from civilian sources on the same basis as active duty dependents.

The bill provides a new program of financial aid to families who have to care for mentally retarded and seriously physically handicapped children. This provision is in line with the increased national awareness of the needs for such children.

All the costs that will be borne by military families under the various provisions of this legislation are minimal. The important consideration is that care will be available whenever and wherever required.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced in my own mind that the bill will make an extraordinarily valuable contribution to the morale and welfare of our Armed Forces.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana and his colleagues for this legislation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14088.

Our Armed Forces are presently engaged in a war in South Vietnam. Regardless of how one feels about the policy issues involved, all of us have the deepest concern for the welfare of our servicemen in that conflict and all of us share a pride in the quality of their sacrifices. There is no more fitting way that we could confirm for them our appreciation of their commitment than by giving them assurance at this hour that their dependents at home are being taken care of.

For the most part the men who are facing the test of fire in Vietnam are young men, company level officers and enlisted personnel. Many of these men are married and have young families. Their children require regular medical attention usually outpatient care—that is, care they can receive at a doctor's office. There is presently in the law no provision for such outpatient care except at a military hospital. Yet quite frequently and quite understandably the serviceman's family goes home to live with the wife's parents or the serviceman's parents and the man is assigned to Vietnam. Naturally, the parents often live in areas where there are no military facilities. The serviceman's family, therefore, is faced with paying their own doctor bills. So we are in a situation where the serviceman's family who deserves care the most is least likely to receive it.

The present legislation would correct this situation. It will allow outpatient care from civilian sources regardless of where the family is located. It will allow the Government to pay the major share of doctor bills for service wives in your district and mine, regardless of how few we may have of military installations.

It should also be recognized that we are facing a situation today where frequently the outpatient facilities of military hospitals are terribly overcrowded and adequate service cannot be provided. The present legislation would allow a portion of the workload to transfer to civilian sources.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, out of especial consideration for the welfare of families of men fighting and dying in Vietnam and others, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, this legislation addresses itself to a number of basic medical care problems faced by military families. I am sure all Members of Congress agree that we have a special obligation to aid these military families in meeting their medical care needs because their way of life, with frequent separations from the man of the family, tends to accentuate medical care problems.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that has characterized the Congress as much as any other over the last several years is a special awareness of the medical needs of all our citizens. The Government now spends annually something on the order of $7 billion for all its hospital and medical undertakings, including medical research.

The present bill will cost $216 million in its first year and this cost will rise by fiscal year 1972 to $308 million. While this is a great deal of money, I think we should not lose sight of the fact that it involves a great many people. It will have substantially improved the medical care benefits for something over 6 million Americans. This includes 3.8 million dependents of active duty men, slightly over 600,000 retirees, and about 1,800,000 dependents of retirees.

The 3 million men on active duty will, of course, be assured by the bill that their dependents are adequately taken care of. Thus, a total of some 9 million Americans are affected by this legislation.

In the program for retired personnel and their dependents, the committee sought to carry out a clearly established moral obligation on the part of the Government. I believe we have done this in the most equitable and feasible manner. The associations that represent retired personnel indicated during our hearings that they believed this program would meet the Government's moral obligation to the retired population.

In providing financial aid for those in the unfortunate position of caring for retarded or physically handicapped children, the committee, of necessity, has left a great deal of discretion to the Department. When experience is gained in running the program, additional changes may be required. But I am satisfied that we have made a good start. The bill originally recommended by the administration would have held a club over the States to force cooperation in providing residential care for handicapped children. The committee did not feel this was necessary and I certainly strongly oppose any such arbitrary use of assumed Federal power. I am satisfied that suitable arrangements can be worked out between the Department of Defense and representatives of the States to provide equitable treatment for military children and equitable sharing of State taxation liabilities by the affected parents.

The portion of the bill affecting the dependents of active duty men would assure outpatient care from both civilian and military sources as well as an expanded level of in-hospital care. For the most part this outpatient care is a kind of medical benefit most needed by young military families and the program should have a very salutary effect on our reenlistment rates.

I hope all of my colleagues will support the legislation.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, in closing the debate, I must recognize the very fine, complimentary things that have been said on the floor today in connection with this legislation and which have also reflected upon me as an individual.

However, I cannot accept these accolades solely for myself personally. I am always cognizant of the fact that the subcommittee over which I have the privilege of presiding is composed of a group of dedicated men who have given me full and complete cooperation at all times.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a genuine honor and privilege to have been able to chair this subcommittee and to bring so many important pieces of legislation to the floor and to have them adopted and endorsed by this House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], the ranking Member, has always been unfailing in his cooperation. There has never been one tinge of politics. There is no right or left side of the aisle. It is one body.

Mr. Chairman, certainly I would be remiss if I failed at this particular time to pay tribute to them and the work they have done on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot cease these remarks or conclude them without paying particular tribute to an individual who has been an inspiration to the Committee on Armed Services, my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS, who came to this House with me more than 25 years ago, on the same day, and who has been an unfailing friend, an ally, ever since that day. It is because of his leadership as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that the subcommittees, not only the one that I have the privilege of chairing, but all subcommittees have been able to act in the manner in which they have conducted themselves so independently and so vigorously during this session of Congress, and at every turn bringing into full view their concept and responsibility that we have in discharging the law as written into the Constitution, that the Congress is charged with the responsibility of raising, maintaining armies and making regulations therefor.

In this particular field of legislation, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina has been one of the most vocal and active participants. Two sections of the bill that we have before us today are the direct results of his efforts. He is the author of that portion of the bill related to both retired personnel and their dependents and the dependents of our active duty personnel.

The section of the bill having to do with retarded children is a provision that I initiated. I want at this time to pay tribute to a fellow member of my staff, William Billiter who did all the ground work and the staff work on getting this piece of legislation together. It was in tribute to our distinguished chairman that I reintroduced the bill adopted by the committee in his name.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we have learned in my committee that for the career military man nothing causes as much concern as having adequate medical care for his family. Nothing causes more letters to my committee. And nothing has a greater impact on career retention.

Knowing this, we have given a great deal of attention to medical care problems in my committee. I myself was chairman of a subcommittee which in 1964 surveyed all facets of hospital construction policy in the Armed Forces. We found that defense planning had come up short in a number of areas. We found that defense planning had made inadequate provisions for the care of the retired men and their families. We found that the Defense Department had not properly weighed the valuable mobilization reserve that would be provided by the programing of beds for retirees.

This legislation brought before the House today would answer the needs we uncovered in our 1964 hearings. It would also solve some other vital medical care needs that have come to the attention of our committee since those 1964 hearings.

H.R. 14088 is an omnibus bill. It covers a broad range of medical care problems for military families. It improves the level of in-hospital care for the dependents of active duty servicemen. It assures outpatient care for military dependents no matter where they are located by providing such care from civilian sources. It marks a great humanitarian advancement by providing financial support for those families who have to care for their mentally retarded or physically handicapped child. And it provides a complete equitable program of care for retired personnel and their dependents.

In all, the bill provides our military personnel with one of the most complete and outstanding programs of medical care found anywhere in our society. It is landmark legislation. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and the members of his distinguished subcommittee, who drafted this bill, can take a singular pride in their achievement. They have earned the gratitude of military families everywhere.

This is no little bill for a special few. It affects more than 7 million Americans. For these 7 million Americans, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and the members of the subcommittee have performed a great service.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has made great efforts in the recent past to bring military personnel up to a position of equality with civil servants in the matter of pay. We have done this to spite some strenuous opposition. We have done some things may people told us we could not do. But we have established the rule that military pay will not fall behind civil service pay again. Now, in this bill, we are making sure that the medical care available to dependents of military personnel shall be equal to the medical care provided civilian Government employees.

The Dependent Medical Care Act, when passed in 1956 by our committee, was a great legislative advance. But we made one mistake in that bill. We made the same mistake that Hammurabi made when he drafted his code. We made it static. We wrote into the law the kind of care that could be provided so that it prevented an increase in the level of care as advancements in medical care coverage were made elsewhere in our society. The present bill brings the level of care up to the level provided under the most widely used program of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act. But even more important is that the bill ties the level of care to that program in the future. This means that as care is expanded for civilian Government employees it can also be improved for military families.

The families that need the benefits of this legislation the most are the young families of the men who are now fighting and dying in Vietnam. We will not say to them that their families will have to be uncertain about having proper medical care while they are meeting the enemies of freedom on a faraway battlefield. I know the Congress will say to them that the medical needs of their families will be taken care of. I know the Congress will say it by voting for this bill.

This bill fills another great need in providing care for military retirees and their dependents. Our hearings in 1964 proved beyond peradventure of doubt that we have an obligation to retirees. And the plan recommended to us this year by the Defense Department is actually the same thing our committee wanted to put in the Dependents Medical Care Act in 1956. It would expand that act to cover retirees.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great bill that is greatly needed and that will greatly improve retention in the Armed Forces.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14088

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 1071, 1072, 1073, and 1084 are each amended by striking out "1085" wherever it appears (in catchline or text) and by inserting in place thereof "1087".

(2) Section 1074(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired or retainer pay, or equivalent pay may, upon request, be given medical and dental care in any facility of any uniformed service, subject to the availability of space and facilities and the capabilities of the medical and dental staff. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, with the agreement of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, provide care to persons covered by this subsection in facilities operated by the Administrator and determined by him to be available for this purpose on a reimbursable basis at rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget."

(3) Section 1076(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a dependent of a member or former member who is, or was at the time of his death, entitled to retired or retainer pay, or equivalent pay, may, upon request, be given the medical and dental care prescribed by section 1077 of this title in facilities of the uniformed services, subject to the availability of space and facilities and the capabilities of the medical and dental staff."

(4) Section 1077 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1077. Health benefits for dependents; auauthorized care in facilities of uniformed services

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), health benefits provided under section 1076 of this title may not exceed those provided under the high option of the Government-wide plan covering the larger number of civilian employees contracted for by the Civil Service Commission under section 3003 of title 5, nor may they be less than those provided under that plan on July 1, 1966.

"(b) The following types of health benefits may also be provided under section 1076 of this title:

"(1) Physical examinations.

"(2) Immunizations.

"(3) Care of the newborn.

"(4) Routine dental care may be provided outside the United States, and in remote areas inside the United States where adequate civilian facilities are unavailable. Emergency dental care, but not including permanent restorative work or dental prosthesis, and dental care as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment, may be provided worldwide."

(5) Section 1078(a) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "Such charges shall be adjusted periodically to take into account adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services."

(6) Section 1079 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To assure that medical care is available for spouses and children of members of the uniformed services who are on active duty for a period of more than thirty days, the Secretary of Defense, after consulting with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall contract, under the authority of this section, for medical care for those persons under such insurance, medical service, or health plans as he considers appropriate. Health benefits provided under these plans may not exceed those provided under the high option of the Government-wide plan covering the larger number of civilian employees contracted for by the Civil Service Commission under section 3003 of title 5, nor may they be less than those provided under that plan on July 1, 1966.

"(b) Plans covered by subsection (a) shall include provisions for payment by the patient of the following amounts:

"(1) $25 for each admission to a hospital, or the charge prescribed under section 1078 (a) of this title multiplied by the number of days of hospitalization, whichever amount is the greater.

"(2) 20 per centum of the charges for outpatient care, including supplies and services provided in connection with that care.

"(c) The methods for making payment under subsection (b) shall be prescribed under joint regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(d) Under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the case of a child, as defined in section 1072(2)(E) of this title, who is moderately or severely retarded mentally or who has a serious physical handicap, the plans covered by subsection (a) shall, with respect to such retardation or handicap, include the following:

"(1) Diagnosis.

"(2) Inpatient, outpatient, and home treatment.

"(3) Training, rehabilitation, and special education necessitated by the child's mental or physical handicap.

"(4) Institutional care in private nonprofit, public and State institutions and facilities and, when appropriate, transportation to and from such institutions and facilities.

"(e) As their share of the cost of any benefits provided under subsection (d), members in the lowest enlisted pay grade may be required to pay the first $25 incurred each month and members in the highest commissioned pay grade may similarly be required to pay as much as $250 per month. The amounts to be similarly paid by members in all other pay grades shall be determined under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The amounts so prescribed shall ordinarily not be less than $25 or more than $250, however, in no event shall the amount paid by the member each month be more than the payment he would be required to pay to a public institution if he were not a member of the uniformed services. A member who has more than one child incurring expenses in a given month under a plan covered by subsection (d) shall not be required to pay an amount greater than he would be required to pay if he had but one such child. The monthly payments prescribed for members under this section shall not exceed $25 per centum of the combined payment made by the Federal Government and the individual member for the care provided a child covered under this section.

"(f) To qualify for the benefits provided by subsection (d), members shall be required to use public facilities to the extent they are available and adequate as determined under joint regulations of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

(7) The following new sections are added after section 1085:

"§ 1086. Contracts for health benefits for certain members, former members, and their dependents

"(a) To assure that health benefits are available for the persons covered by subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense, after consulting with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall contract under the authority of this section for health benefits for those persons under the same insurance, medical service, or health plans he contracts for under section 1079(a) of this title.

"(b) The following persons are eligible for health benefits under this section:

"(1) Those covered by sections 1074(b) and 1076(b) of this title, except those covered by section 1072(2)(F) of this title.

"(2) A dependent of a member of a uniformed service who died while on active duty for a period of more than 30 days, except a dependent covered by section 1072(2)(F) of this title.

However, a person who is entitled to hospital insurance benefits under title I of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (79 Stat. 286) is not eligible for health benefits under this section, except for those benefits provided by this section which are not otherwise payable under the hospital and supplementary medical insurance programs authorized by Seventy-ninth Statutes at Large, page 286.

"(c) No benefits shall be payable under any plan covered by this section in the case of a person enrolled in any other insurance, medical service, or health plan provided by law or through employment, except for benefits not payable under the other plan.

"(d) A person covered by this section may elect to receive benefits either in (1) Government facilities, under the conditions prescribed in sections 1074 and 1076–1078 of this title, or (2) the facilities provided under a plan contracted for under this section. However, under joint regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the right to make this election may be limited for those patrons residing in an area where adequate facilities of the uniformed services are available.

"§ 1087. Programing facilities for certain members, former members, and their dependents in construction projects of the uniformed services

"(a) Facilities for inpatient and outpatient care for persons covered by sections 1074(b) and 1076(b) of this title shall be programed in uniformed services construction projects in amounts to be determined by the Secretary concerned. In making such determinations he shall consider the teaching and training requirements of the staff of the facility being programed and the availability of inpatient and outpatient care in civilian communities within one hour's travel time of such facility.

"(b) Bed space programed under the authority of this section shall not be less than 5 per centum of the bed space otherwise programed for the facility, except that under special circumstances, as determined by the Secretary concerned, the maximum per centum shall be 20.

"(c) Except as provided in subsection (b), the amount of inpatient and outpatient space programed under this section shall not be less than the amount required by a facility to provide care for the persons covered by this section who had, during the fiscal year immediately preceding the programed action, requested such care at the facility."

(8) Section 1082 is amended by inserting "and 1086" immediately after "1081" and by amending the catchline to read as follows:

"§ 1082. Contracts for health care: advisory committees".

(9) The analysis is amended by striking out the following items:

"1071. Purpose of sections 1071–1085 of this title."

* * * * *

"1073. Administration of sections 1071–1085 of this title."

* * * * *

"1077. Medical and dental care for dependents: specific inclusions and exclusions."

"1082. Contracts for medical care for spouses and children: advisory committees."

and inserting the following item:

"1071. Purpose of sections 1071–1086 of this title."

* * * * *

"1073. Administration of sections 1071–1086 of this title."

* * * * *

"1077. Health benefits for dependents: authorized care in facilities of uniformed services."

"1082. Contracts for health care: advisory committees."

* * * * *

"1086. Contracts for health care for certain members, former members, and their dependents."

* * * * *

"1087. Programing facilities for certain members, former members, and their dependents in construction projects of the uniformed services."

SEC. 2. This Act becomes effective July 1, 1967.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 11, after the comma, insert the following language: "other than a child covered by section 1086(b) of this title,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HÉBERT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HÉBERT: On page 10, line 11, strike "July 1, 1967" and substitute therefore "July 1, 1966".

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MULTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14088) to amend chapter 55, of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 822, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 358, nays 0, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS 358

Abbitt
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.

Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—74

Abernethy
Andrews, Glenn
Baring
Barrett
Boland
Brademas
Brock
Burleson
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Conyers
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Diggs
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Findley
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gray
Griffin
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Hutchinson
Jennings
Kee
Kelly
King, Utah
Kirwan
Leggett
McDade
McEwen
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Michel
Monagan
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nix
Pickle
Pool
Quillen
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Shriver
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tupper
Utt
White, Idaho
Whitten
Williams
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Shriver.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Carter.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Boland.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Fraser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall just concluded on the bill H.R. 14088 to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes, reported from the Committee on Armed Services, I was unavoidably detained along with the distinguished member of my committee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HICKS], on a very important conference, and we missed the rollcall. Had we been present, we would have voted for the bill, as the entire membership of the House did, without one dissenting vote. We could not make the rollcall because we had a commitment from which we could not be excused.

TRIBUTE TO LADY BADEN-POWELL

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the United States has had the pleasure of some very important visitors from England in the past months. One who made a wonderful impression on us and who gained our deepest admiration and affection is Lady Baden-Powell, the lady who has served over 50 years in the Girl Guide movement.

People throughout the world owe this great lady a tremendous debt of respect and thanks for she has given her life to the furthering of good will among nations.

Lady Baden-Powell is the widow of the founder of scouting for boys and guiding for girls, and has spent more than 50 years of her life in furthering the movement as a force for international understanding and good will.

As world chief guide of the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts, she is the official leader of almost 6 million members of Guide and Girl Scout organizations in 68 countries of the free world. Though differing in uniforms and customs, each national organization adheres to the fundamental Scout promise of duty to God, to country, and to the service of mankind. Lady Baden-Powell also serves as honorary vice president of the International Boy Scouts.

The former Olave Soames was introduced to Scouting and to Lord Baden-Powell in 1912 aboard the liner *Arcadian* enroute to the United States from England.

Olave Soames and Lord Baden-Powell were married in St. Peter's Church, Parkstone, Dorset, England, on October 30, 1912. She is the mother of three children and has nine grandchildren.

After her marriage, Lady Baden-Powell traveled extensively with her husband on behalf of Scouting. During World War I, she took an active role in Scouting when she became a district commissioner. Later she served as chief commissioner for Great Britain and finally as the first chief guide. In 1917 she started the work which is still her major interest—the worldwide development of Guiding and Scouting, and in 1930 was acclaimed as world chief guide at the world conference held at Foxlease, England.

After several years in Kenya, Africa, where her husband died in 1941, Lady Baden-Powell returned to England and resumed her role as first lady of Guiding and Scouting. She took up residence at Hampton Court Palace where King George VI, in gratitude for her husband's service to his country, offered her a grace-and-favor apartment. She has continued her worldwide travels on behalf of the movement ever since. In 1959 she was welcomed by 14 of the Girl Guide Associations in Latin America. She has made frequent visits to Our Cabaña, the world association center in Cuernavaca, Mexico. Following her present visit she will again go to Our Cabaña to meet with young leaders from 12 countries who are carrying out a service program in a nearby village.

For her continued devotion to Girl Guides and Girl Scouts, Lady Baden-Powell has been honored by several nations. In 1932, she was named Dame of the Grand Cross, Order of the British Empire. She also holds the decorations of the White Rose of Finland, the Order of Merit of Poland, the Order of the Grand Ducal Crown of Oak of Luxembourg, the Order of the Phoenix of Greece, of Bernard O'Higgins of Chile, the Order of the Sun of Peru, and of Vasco de Balboa of Panama, the Order of the Cedars of Lebanon, and of the Sacred Treasure of Japan.

CALL FOR ACTION AND VIGILANCE: TO COMBAT COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent testimony the Honorable Lincoln Gordon, Assistant Secretary and U.S.

Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, Department of State told the Committee on Foreign Affairs that public and official awareness in all Latin American countries of the dangers of communism has increased as their designs become more evident. He was optimistic in his views of the future. This does not mean that we can relax our vigilance by one little whit. The committee heard other testimony that the tricontinent conference held in Havana this past January demonstrated that Soviet-backed Communists continue to press their efforts to subvert Latin America.

Of pertinence, therefore, is a statement of the Truth About Cuba Committee, Inc., whose president is the distinguished Luis V. Manrara. I am submitting it in full for the RECORD to point out to the American public that now is not the time to let down our guard.

Mr. Manrara's statement, conference background material, and highlights of statements pertinent thereto follow:

A STATEMENT BY THE TRUTH ABOUT CUBA COMMITTEE, INC., LUIS V. MANRARA, PRESIDENT

The tricontinental conference held in Havana in January 1966 is an open and blatant declaration of war of the Communist international conspiracy against the United States of America. If anybody entertained a doubt as to what were the intentions and the goal of the Communist conspiracy, the tricontinental conference must have completely dispelled them.

At the tricontinental conference it has been declared, without mincing any words or pulling any punches, that the wars of liberation and the Communist overt and covert attacks in every continent are carried out with one and only one purpose, to destroy the United States of America.

During the last 5 years we have been constantly warning our American friends of the danger of communism and how important the occupation of Cuba was to the Communist conspiracy for their goal of conquering the United States of America.

After the tricontinental conference we cannot speak any longer about threats or perils. A state of open and declared war exists, and only an immediate mobilization, both in the psychological and the armed fields, can save the United States of America and the free world from the Communist juggernaut.

BACKGROUND TO THE TRANSCONTINENTAL CONFERENCE, HAVANA, CUBA

The tricontinental conference held in Havana, Cuba, January 3-16, 1966, is the climax of a careful master plan started several years ago which crystallized at the Bandung (Indonesia) Conference, held on April 18, 1955.

"The feeling of solidarity among the people of three continents started with the Bandung Conference * * *" declared in Havana on November 29, 1965, Yusuf as-Sibai, a member of the R.A.U. delegation, Secretary General of the International Preparatory Committee of the First International Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (later elected Secretary General of the TCC).

Source: Havana CMQ radio, our monitoring service.

To prepare the Bandung Conference a five-nations committee was formed including: Burma, India, Indonesia, Pakistan and Ceylon, sponsored by Red China. Representatives from 29 countries were present at the Bandung Conference: Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gold Coast, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Nepal, North Vietnam, Pakistan, Philippines, Red China, Saudi Arabia, Syria, South Vietnam, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, and Yemen. (Listed in alphabetical order.)

The resolutions adopted at the Bandung Conference were:

1. Unity among the colored people of the world.
2. Fight Yankee imperialism.
3. Acknowledgment of equality between big and small countries.
4. Help the people of colonial countries to obtain their liberation.
5. Create the solidarity movements of the countries of Africa and Asia.

Five conferences were held after the Bandung Conference which gradually gathered momentum and finally produced the tricontinental conference. The fantastic increase in the number of countries represented—29, at Bandung to 82, at Havana—is a sure sign of the speed with which communism is spreading.

FIRST CONFERENCE

The solidarity movement of the countries of Africa and Asia held its first conference in Cairo, in December 1957, adopting a resolution to create collateral organizations to back and promote social, political and economic movements in both continents.

SECOND CONFERENCE

The second conference was held in Conakri, Guinea, on April 2, 1960, and amongst the resolutions adopted were the creation of the Pan-African Syndical Federation and the Afro-Asian newspapermen organization.

THIRD CONFERENCE

The third conference took place in Noshi, Tanganyika, in February 1963, with 250 delegates representing 54 countries attending. The final resolution adopted in this conference offered financial and military backing to all liberation movements and called upon the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to unite and to intensify their fighting spirit, offering full support to "Prime Minister Castro's five points in his fight against Yankee imperialism" (announced by Fidel Castro during the October 1962 "missile crisis"). At the proposal of the Communist Cuban delegates invited to this conference, a resolution was adopted calling for another conference to be held in Havana, in order to create the Afro-Asian-Latin American bloc.

FOURTH CONFERENCE

The fourth conference was held in Accra, Ghana, in May 1965. This conference ratified the resolutions adopted at the third conference and resolved to call a special meeting to be held in Cairo, in September 1965, to organize the Havana conference.

FIFTH (SPECIAL) CONFERENCE

The fifth (special) conference, held in Cairo, in September 1965, drew up the agenda for the tricontinental conference, to be held in Havana "* * as a stronghold to combat North American imperialism." This agenda contained the following points:

1. To fight Imperialism, Colonialism, and Neo-Colonialism. [U.S.A.—Ed.]
2. Discussion of relevant problems in relation to the fight against Imperialists [U.S.A.—Ed.] in the three continents.
3. Anti-Imperialist [anti-U.S.A.—Ed.] solidarity of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the economic, social, and cultural fields.
4. Coordination and unification of the efforts of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America in their common fight for national liberation and reconstruction.

This agenda was signed by Mahdi Ben Barka, from Morocco, chairman of the International Preparatory Committee of the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, (later murdered in France and substituted by Capt. Osmani Cienfuegos, from Cuba) and Yusuf as-Sibai, from Egypt, as Secretary General.

Thus was carefully built up the tricontinental conference held in Havana January 3-16, 1966.

Source: Pekin Informa and China Reconstruye, from Communist China. Nuestros Tiempos and Cultura y Vida, from Moscow; and, Daily Bulletin of Prensa Latina, from Havana.

Publisher's note: The stage was set and the Communist cadres ready to implement their painstakingly prepared plans for the decisive blow against the United States.

U.S.S.R. AND RED CHINA JOIN FORCES FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE

The U.S.S.R. approach: "Hitherto no regular links exist between the Afro-Asian solidarity movement, which has now been in existence for some years, and Latin America. * * * As far as we in the Soviet Union are concerned, everything will be done to make the Havana meeting a significant contribution to solidarity and unity of the Anti-Imperialist [U.S.A.—Ed.] forces."

Source: "Tricontinental Conference," by D. Volsky, published in Moscow's weekly New Times, December 27, 1965.

"Moscow has in the past few weeks considerably stepped-up its wooing of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America. * * * According to the party organ Soviet Tadzhikistany, the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with the Nations of Africa and Asia met on November 11, 1965, under the chairmanship of Mirza Tursun Zada. * * * The meeting was summoned in conection with the forthcoming Solidarity Congress of Peoples of three continents, scheduled to take place in Havana from January 3-10, 1966 (extended until January 16). * * * Detailed plans for the Soviet delegation at the Congress are now in the process of being worked out. The Soviet propaganda machinery is already running at full throttle. * * * One must admit that to some extent this large-scale propaganda campaign has borne fruits. Some delegates from African and Asian countries, invited by the Communists to visit Tashkent (U.S.S.R-Uzbeck, Asia), permitted themselves to be tricked by such propaganda."

Source: International Press Service tp December 20, 1965.

The Red China approach: "In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples who make up the overwhelming majority of the world's population. * * * Guerrilla warfare is the only way to expand our force in the course of war, deplete and weaken the enemy, gradually change the balance of forces between the enemy and ourselves, switch from guerrilla to mobile warfare, and, finally defeat the enemy."

Source: Article written by Lin Piao, Minister of National Defense of Communist China, entitled "Long Live the Victory of the People's War," quoted from Washington Report, November 8, 1965.

"Communist China support of revolutionary war in underdeveloped countries was a strategy directed at the eventual encirclement of the United States and Western Europe."

Source: Lin Piao's article, People's Daily, Pekin, as reported by Seymour Topping, New York Times correspondent in Hong Kong, September 4, 1965.

Publisher's note.—Soviet Russia and Communist China, the supposedly bitter enemies according to many gullible, sympathetic and/or fellow-traveler Western correspondents, work hand in hand against the common enemy: Imperialist U.S.A.

THE TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE—ITS TRANSCENDENTAL REVELATIONS

The tricontinental conference was officially opened in Havana at 9 p.m. on January 3, 1966. The setting was staged at the Ambassador's Room of the Havana-Hilton Hotel (owned by the Gastronomic Union Pension Fund expropriated without compensation by the Communist regime) rebaptized "Havana Libre." As a security measure the Hotel was closed to the public from December 28, 1965, to January 16, 1966.

Source: Our radio monitoring service.

On January 7, the Havana Communist radio announced that the attendance at the conference was:

Delegates	483
Observers	70
Guests	81
Newsmen	119
Total	753

In a meeting held by the delegation's presidents it was agreed to give the presidency of the conference to Cuba, represented by Raúl Roa García, Minister of Foreign Relations, and appoint Yusuf as-Sibai, from R.A.U., Secretary General. Three vice-presidencies were created, one from each continent:

America-Venezuela, represented by Pedro Medina Silva, commander in chief of the National Liberation Front (FALN).

Africa-Ghana, represented by John Tareaga.

Asia-Vietnam, represented by Ngu Yen-Van Tien.

Source: Our radio monitoring service.

The opening speech was made by Cuba's President Osvaldo Dorticós, from which we excerpt:

"In a peoples conference such as this, a basic truth is obvious: the definite and total overcome of underdevelopment can only be obtained through the fight against Imperialism [U.S.A.—Ed.] and its final and total defeat.

"At the inauguration of this conference we can proclaim the proliferation of the liberation movements and that, in the midst of difficulties, of difficult battles against the powerful enemy, some nations have undertaken the fight * * * other nations have obtained victory * * * and many nations are preparing to fight.

"In Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the fight against Imperialism [U.S.A.—Ed.] and for the liberation of the people is a fight to death.

"It is the responsibility of the vanguard of the people in those countries (which cannot win power by legal or pacific means) to create the subjective conditions for it (armed revolution) * * * wherever these do not exist.

"It is the right and the duty of the people to respond to the Imperialists' [U.S.A.—Ed.] violence with armed revolutionary violence.

"Cuba is a small country. We are just a little more than 7 million inhabitants. At the beginning of this conference we want to reiterate before you once more—and make it absolutely clear—that with whatever means at our disposal and the unfailing fighting energy of our people, as Fidel Castro has expressed: 'Any revolutionary movement, in any part of the world, may count on Cuba's decided and unconditional support.'

"It is important to find now the common forms of expression and actions against the Imperialist [U.S.A.—Ed.] enemy."

Source: Our radio monitoring service.

HIGHLIGHTS FROM MESSAGES SENT TO THE TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE

From the Soviet Union: "The Soviets salute your conference with the firm conviction that it will further the unity of the great masses that in the three continents have declared themselves against Imperialism [U.S.A.—Ed.] strengthening their militant friendship with the peoples of the socialist countries and the international workers movement. * * * The common action of the Anti-Imperialist [anti-U.S.A.—Ed.] forces is extremely important in the present international situation." Signed: Breznev and Kosygin.

From Red China: "Pekin, January 1, 1966. Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In the name of the peoples and the Government of China, we send you hearty greetings and wish that the conference make a positive contribution to the strengthening of revolutionary solidarity of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, promote the fight against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, headed by the U.S.A. [sic]. Signed by Chou-En-lai, Prime Minister of the Popular Republic of China.

Source: Our radio monitoring service.

Publisher's note.—Observe the almost identical language used by the supposedly "archenemies"—Soviet Russia, the "good" Communists, and Red China, the "bad" Communists.

HIGHLIGHTS FROM STATEMENTS MADE BY DELEGATES ATTENDING THE TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE

Sharaf Rashidovich Rashidov, alternate member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.S.R., delegate from the Soviet Union. Havana, UPI, January 7, 1966.

"The Soviet Union is backing liberation movements in Venezuela, Guatemala, Peru, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and British, French and Dutch Guianas." Furthermore, reports UPI, "the Russian delegate asked the delegates of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to form a united front against the common enemy, International Imperialism headed by the U.S.A. [sic].

The Cuban radio (monitored in Miami) quoted the U.S.S.R. Delegate Rashidov, as follows: "The Delegate from U.S.S.R. emphasized the support given by the Soviet Union to wars of liberation, pointing out that they back the creation of an organization of continental solidarity. Every year, between 3 and 10 of January, he said, the whole world should declare Solidarity Week with the Anti-Imperialist [anti-U.S.A.—Ed.] forces in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. * * * Furthermore, he stated (according to the Cuban radio) that the Soviet Union gives, and will continue to give, all kinds of help to the Vietnamese people, including the most modern weapons. We are doing our best so that planes, rockets, artillery, munition and other means reach their hands as soon as possible. That all people who fight against the Imperialist [U.S.A.—Ed.] can be sure that the U.S.S.R. will always give them aid."

Publisher's note.—Notice how "mellow," "friendly," and "peace-loving" has turned the Soviet Union.

Indonesia's delegate declared on January 6: "Against the Imperialist [U.S.A.—Ed.] there are only two alternatives: To finish it up or be finished up by it."

Ghana's delegate said January 6, 1966: "Solidarity is the weapon of victory, she will open the tomb for the Imperialist [U.S.A.—Ed.]."

The Venezuelan delegate declared on January 7, 1966: "The looting carried out by North-American Imperialists [sic] in my country can only be remedied by stopping them by means of force being used now by the Venezuelan people." And added this ominous threat: "No North American ship will be safe in Venezuela's harbors as long as there is a blockade of Cuba."

The delegate from Guatemala declared on January 6: "The people cannot wait for the common enemy (U.S.A. Ed.) to tumble down, we have to fight together, and the example set by Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba stimulate the fight of the Guatemalan people."

Perú's delegate, García Urrutia, declared on January 3: "The conference should condemn, without any doubt, the imperialist (U.S.A. Ed.), denounce it and give the military support that the maximum solidarity requires. * * * Perú is already ripe for the revolutionary process, all it needs now is the subjective element."

Robert F. Williams (American Communist Negro fugitive who lives in Cuba since 1962 and attended the conference as one of the visitors) said in Havana on January 6: "This is a conference of the greatest importance that unites under one common cause the representatives of all the nations in the common fight against imperialist (U.S.A. Ed.) and against its attacks such as are being carried out in Vietnam."

Source: Our radio monitoring service.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE CONFERENCE

A total of 32 resolutions were adopted, all promoting, helping, and assisting the liberation movements in the three continents and spurring the fight against U.S. imperialism.

The three most important ones were:

1. Creation of a tricontinental (permanent) organization under the name of "Solidarity Organization of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America."
2. Creation of an executive secretariat, composed of 12 countries, 4 from each continent.
3. Creation of a committee to help and assist the national liberation movements.

In a private meeting the Latin American delegates resolved to create a permanent organization, headquartered in Havana, under the name of "Organización Latino Americana" (Latin American Organization) to give full aid and support to subversive movements in America and to promote them wherever they do not exist.

Source: Daily Bulletin of Prensa Latina, Havana.

Publisher's note.—This confirms our conviction that the only cause of communism is the Communists, not poverty or any other hoax invented by the Communists. It is high time the free world—particularly United States of America—realize what makes communism tick so that our efforts to combat it be directed at the real enemy and not at faked enemies.

EXCERPTS FROM FIDEL CASTRO'S CLOSING SPEECH

"Never before has there been such a large meeting. Because here have been represented the peoples of three continents, the revolutionary movements of the peoples of three continents, who have a common antiimperialistic position. Movements that represent the struggle of the peoples of different philosophical ideas, of different religious beliefs, but who have one thing in common, that which unites the peoples of the three continents and of all the world, the struggle against imperialism, the struggle against colonialism and neocolonialism, the struggle against racism, and all those phenomenons that are the modern expression of what we should call imperialism the center or axis of which and its main support is: Yankee Imperialism [sic].

"In spite of the circumstances (shortage of time and the large number of delegates) a document (has been drawn) that, without any doubt, is the deepest, the most extensive and the most radical ever approved in a conference such as this one.

"It is the first time that the representatives of the Latin American people participated jointly with the people of Asia and Africa. Naturally, in the case of Latin America, the majority or almost all the representatives were those of the movements that are fighting, or will fight, for their peoples' liberation.

It is only our people (Cuba) who, in this instance, represent the one and only nation totally liberated from Yankee Imperialism [sic] and is organized as a revolutionary power.

"We believe that this conference undoubtedly holds a place in the history of the peoples fight for liberation and in the history of the revolutionary movement. We also believe that the solidarity ties that have been established amongst all the revolutionary movements in the world that carry the fight against Imperialism [U.S.A.—Ed.], and the organizations that have been created will unquestionably play a major role in the support, solidarity, and increase of the revolutionary movement.

"In spite of the millitary and technical power of the Imperialists [U.S.A.—Ed.], the united force of the revolutionary nations will unquestionably be far more powerful—Imperialism [U.S.A.—Ed.] will inevitably be defeated.

"We are a small country, very close to the coasts of the Imperialist Metropolis [U.S.A.—Ed.] Our weapons are defensive weapons but our men, our revolutionary militants, wholeheartedly willing to fight against the Imperialists [U.S.A.—Ed.] in any part of the world. * * * But the world is big and the Imperialists [U.S.A.—Ed.] are everywhere; and for the Cuban revolutionaries, the battlefield against the Imperialists [U.S.A.—Ed.] reaches all over the world. That is the reason we say and proclaim, that the revolutionary movements in any corner of the world can count on the Cuban combatants. The revolutionary nations have the right to aid, even with their physical presence, those who fight against Yankee Imperialism [sic]. And if each one helps according to its own means, the Yankee Imperialists [sic] will be defeated.

"In Santo Domingo, Latin America will face in the years to come, one of the most splendid fights. Santo Domingo, a small country, occupied by tens of thousands of Yankee soldiers, faces a long and hard struggle. The Dominican nation should not be the only one struggling against Yankee Imperialism [sic]. This struggle has already been unleased in Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and Guatemala. In Latin American there should not be one, two, or three nations fighting by themselves against the Imperialists [U.S.A.—Ed.]. The strength of the Imperialists [U.S.A.—Ed.] in this continent, the nearness of its metropolitan territory, and the zealousness with which they will try to defend its domination over this part of the world, demands in this continent, more than anywhere else, a common strategy and a common amd simultaneous struggle. We do believe that in this continent, in all or almost all the countries, the struggle will assume the most violent forms."

VALERIY TARSIS—NOTED RUSSIAN AUTHOR ADDRESSES NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I had the pleasure of attending a National Press Club luncheon at which the noted Russian author, Valeriy Tarsis, gave a most memorable speech.

Mr. Tarsis has written some of the most interesting, creative, and stimulating fiction that has come out of his native Russia since the revolution of 1917. His principal works which have been published in England, "Bluebottle" and "Ward 7," reflect those literary qualities which for so long characterized the works of a land once synonymous with the names of giants like Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy.

The Soviet Government recently bestowed a most unusual accolade on Mr. Tarsis. That accolade reflects both the nobility of the author and the fear which grips the heart of communism when it is faced with the passionate strength of only one individual who believes in and is willing to fight for freedom.

Faced with the choice of allowing a courageous and able author to continue his attacks on the Soviet regime or of imprisoning him and betraying their own tyranny, the Soviet leaders chose a way out of their dilemma. They permitted Tarsis to go on a trip to England and once there, they stripped him of his Soviet citizenship.

Thus they thought they could once and for all remove what for them is the cancer of freedom.

In his speech yesterday, Tarsis vehemently attacked the Soviet system, but he did much more. His conviction, intensity, and humor caught those present in the grip of that emotion which gave rise to our Nation—a love of freedom. That emotion, as Mr. Tarsis so well conveyed, is rooted in a rational understanding of the human soul and society itself—in the idea of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the National Press Club and its able and distinguished president, Windsor P. Booth, for inviting Mr. Tarsis to address the club. Yesterday's speech was but another example of the reason why the Press Club's continuing series of speeches has assumed such a vital role in the political and cultural life of Washington. Those who address the Press Club know that they have an unparalleled opportunity to partake in the dialog that is at the heart of democracy. They can approach the National Press Club's rostrum knowing this because over the years the club's presidents and officers have chosen, and today, under President Booth, continue to choose a variety of speakers from all walks of life who have a meaningful and memorable contribution to make to that dialog.

Mr. Tarsis' speech and President Booth's introductory remarks follow:

Introductory Remarks of Windsor P. Booth, President of the National Press Club

Valeriy Y. Tarsis was born in Kiev in 1906. His father was a storekeeper in Kiev who hid arms for the revolutionaries in 1905 and vanished under Stalin in the 1940's.

Valeriy went to school in Kiev and to the University of Rostov-on-Don. He specialized in Western languages and literature, worked in a publishing house until 1937, wrote a book on modern Western writers and some short stories that were published in "Novy Mir." He has translated over 30 books into Russian. He was twice severely wounded at Stalingrad. He married the niece of an air force general who was shot by Stalin in 1937.

As an old member of the Union of Writers and a resident of Moscow for more than 30 years, he has known most of the Soviet writers of his time. His antiregime attitude developed during the 1930's and since 1939 he has been writing fiction which he was unable to publish in Russia.

Despairing of being heard in his own country without foreign help, in 1960 he broke with the party and the Union of Soviet Writers and sent a manuscript abroad through foreign publishers he had met by chance. His book "The Bluebottle" appeared in England in 1962 and since then it has been published all over.

Shortly before his book came out, Mr. Tarsis, who had made no secret of having smuggled his manuscript out of the country, was put in a lunatic asylum in Moscow. In February 1963 his case was taken up by the Western press as well as privately by prominent Soviet writers, and soon afterward he was released.

He came out of the asylum with his spirit unbroken and more tham ever he determined to help Russians by exposing their government. He immediately wrote "Ward 7," the story of his experience at the asylum and those of other political prisoners he met there. It was in fiction form, but scarcely disguised.

He was particularly anxious to have "Ward 7" published because, although the Soviet Government claims that there are no political prisoners in the Soviet Union, the practice of putting troublesome citizens into insane asylums seems to have become fairly widespread. The term of detention is indefinite.

Early in 1966, in an astonishing lapse, the Soviet Government granted Mr. Tarsis permission to travel to London, but shortly after his departure from Moscow he was stripped of his Soviet citizenship. He is making his first visit to the United States and we are delighted to have him at the National Press Club.

Stairway to Disappointment

(Address by Valeriy Tarsis at the National Press Club luncheon, Washington, D.C., May 10, 1966)

It probably will interest you to know who I am. I must admit that this question intrigues me, too. For several months now I have traveled all over the world, making risky, headspinning journeys through the width and breadth of time and space. In these perigrinations in many mirrors I saw vivid reflections of my soul and I am bewildered.

The soul of a Russian poet is broad and impulsive. It is given to meditation and fantasy. It thrives in the air of freedom and simply cannot exist without it. The poet's soul is unable to lie, nor can it be creative without truth and justice. It is in such atmosphere that I craved to live.

It is only in the West, and especially in America, that I realized with great sadness and horror that I have not been living before, just existing. I was suffocating in a cell without light or air. Now my only consolation and justification before God's judgment and my own conscience is that I did not side with evil. I refused to submit to the dictates of a ruthless government. I did not betray my ideals.

I grew up in a world that has been brutally deceived by cheats and oppressors. They duped and enslaved the people in the name of freedom and the brotherhood of men. Dazed and daunted the people were made to follow their treacherous shepherds to nowhere. Like a lost herd, blinded by foul weather, one-third of the world population is driven by them today onto a slippery, dangerous path along the very brink of a precipice. I saw and understood the threat, and I felt that I had to shout a warning to mankind.

For this the Soviet Government labeled me a traitor, a criminal, and, finally, proclaimed me insane. Then it stripped me of my citizenship.

My life was not an easy one. I was not born with a silver spoon in my mouth. When I think of my early childhood, I smell the stench of paraffin oil and onions. I grew up in a petrol warehouse belonging to the Nobel brothers, and a thin onion soup was the main daily meal at our table. Yet, even then I was full of dreams and illusions, and I did not even suspect at that time that there could exist a stairway to disenchantment.

Although my father was a humble storekeeper, he, too, was a romantic dreamer. He traveled far into the kingdom of illusions. Unfortunately, his dreams led him away from God into the embrace of revolution. Yet, this long-awaited revolution brought him only misery, a broken heart, and, finally, death behind the barbed wire of a concentration camp. It is then that I began my descent down the stairway to disappointment.

Just before the outbreak of World War II, I considered writing an extensive literary chronicle of Stalin's period. It was at this point that the process of my rebirth became final. When I looked around and saw the cruelty, beastiality, corruption and lies which—like a cobweb—enveloped Russia ever tighter and tighter, I felt I could no longer follow the path of the kow-towing, servile Soviet writers. I felt a physical urge to face them all as an uncomprising foe.

I knew I had to tell the truth about those terrible years, when millions of the best people were suffering in jails and concentration camps; when even children stopped smiling; when it seemed that the sun itself will never shine over Russia again. The urge to describe all this became obsessive, irresistible. I knew this was my duty under God.

Almost a quarter of a century had passed. A quarter of a century that paled the horrors of the Inquisition. To think only that during the bloody purges of 1937 more people died in 1 month, than throughout the whole 250 years of the Inquisition. A monstrous machine of mass extermination was developed in the Soviet Union. Life turned into hell.

Then came the war. At its very beginning people in Russia imagined that the Germans wished to fight only against communism, and many Russians met them with bread and salt as liberators. But the Nazis came to conquer the Russian land. When the people realized this, the whole nation rose on its hind legs and chased the invaders back to Berlin. I spent the war as a war correspondent. I talked with hundreds of soldiers and officers. And they all told me the same thing: They did not fight for Stalin and communism. They fought for Russia, only for her.

Since the war the people's discontent with the Communist system grew ever stronger and stronger. In the recent years this resistance expressed itself in mass riots, strikes, and demonstrations: as in the riots of Novocherkassk, Tbilisi, on the Donbass; as in the strikes which flared up in Odessa, Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities; as in the demonstrations of youth last April and December; as in the circulation of anti-Communist writings and clandestine magazines.

A semiclandestine organization of young poets, writers, and artists known as SMOG works successfully in Russia today. The word SMOG is composed of the initial letters of Russian words: Smelost' (courage), Molodost' (youth), Obraz (image), and Glubina (depth). SMOG is the vanguard of an immense number of nonconformists and breakers of the Communist rules. The young people no longer want to tolerate the Communist tyranny and the fetters of Socialist realism, which is neither Socialist nor realist. It is merely a collection of cliches for the literary sycophants of the regime to follow.

The Russian people are no longer taken in by these falsifications. The people are now squaring their shoulders in battle. They are becoming ever more determined to shake off the shackles of a half century of slavery. Like a Phoenix rising from the ashes a free Russian literature is slowly being born. It is not by accident, therefore, that the first literary underground in post-Stalin Russia was named Phoenix.

For 20-odd years I wrote and kept my works in a trunk under lock, as did many of my friends, hoping that Stalin would die. At last that precious hour came. Khrushchev replaced Stalin. The personality cult of the Georgian tyrant was replaced by the personality cult of the Ukrainian boor. I realized that one could no longer hope for a change. I reached a decision and sent my manuscripts abroad. Since then I was able to experience on my own skin the workings of the Soviet "democracy."

One day the telephone rang in my apartment. At the other end of the line was the Secretary of the Party Committee of the Union of Soviet Writers, Sytin. This oily-voiced, old hypocrite muttered: "Valeriy Yakovlevich, we have decided to help you. Come around Monday, at noon, to the party committee and we shall talk about everything."

I arrived promptly at the appointed hour. Sytin came out somewhat dazed to meet me in the lobby. He stuttered and stammered. "You know, these comrades want to talk to you. They also want to help you."

"Which comrades?" I asked.

"Well, you know they are from the Committee of State Security."

I looked at him with open disgust, while the thought flashed through my mind, "So it has finally come to this. I am in the claws of the KGB. This is some help."

At that moment two men came out of the office. One was tall and somewhat bald; the other—a small man with a protruding paunch—was Mikhail Ivanovich Bardin, who all those years worked on my case.

I was showered with accusations. I was supposed to be guilty of all deadly sins, and was threatened with being shot. At that time none of my books had as yet been published abroad. Suddenly Bardin barked out to me: "Your position is very grave. Should one of your books appear in the West, we shall arrest you and you'll be tried with utmost severity."

The tall bald one began to shout at me. But I was totally resigned. I was prepared to die, if need be.

"You may shoot me," I said. "But what will you shoot? This stale hunk of human flesh—my body? But how about my soul, and my books? These you can never reach. They are abroad, and very soon they will appear in many languages. So shoot me, if you will, any time."

The meeting, obviously, did not work out the way they wanted. Half an hour later I walked out from the Palace of the Soviet Writers. I knew the die was cast.

My friends in the West tried to persuade me to have the "Bluebottle" published under a pen name. I flatly refused. I knew that in the battle of ideas one must fight with an open visor. Moreover, it was important for me to show that not all Soviet writers are servile cowards, that there still is gunpowder in the powder flasks of the Russians.

Soon after the appearance of the "Bluebottle" in London, I was arrested and shoved into a lunatic asylum. In my "Ward 7" I described my experiences there. I can only add that my stay in the Kaschenko Mental Hospital is for me one of the most treasured pages of my biography. There, as in a mirror, I saw all Russia—my great and ill-fated motherland, upon whom the Communist villains have thrust an iron straightjacket.

When under pressure from the West I was released from the mental institution, the first thing I did was to break with the party and the writers' union. But to leave the party at one's own choice is not an easy thing. For nearly a year I was summoned to different party departments for "negotiations." Finally, a character, named Zaytsev, brought me a document from the regional committee which said that I was expelled from the party for behavior unworthy of a Communist. Again lies, again hypocrisy. The party simply could not admit that anybody could of his free will part with this "illustrious" organization.

Then the Soviet "democrats" began to starve me. I was unable to get any job. My family and I were doomed to die of hunger. Had I not been receiving aid from the West, I would have simply starved to death.

Meanwhile, events developed quite differently from what the Soviet authorities would have liked. When I came out from the mental hospital there was only a handful of young defiant literati. But when I left Russia there were hundreds of them. And thousands all over the country listened to them, applauded them, and followed them.

Russia is breeding the bards of revolution. I am happy that I, together with my friends, were the first swallows of an approaching spring. A meeting I had not long ago with one of my friends from ward 7 must surely be a prelude to something significant.

One day my doorbell rang. I opened the door. A tall young man stood in the dark corridor. His answer to my questioning glance was a wide smile, as if sun rays had lighted his face. He threw his arms around my neck. We talked of the days spent together in ward 7. We talked of our friends and, of course, of the future of Russia. Then during a pause my friend said in his slightly muffled voice:

"Much of what you have said, there in the ward, has reached our ears. I have not come with empty hands. Many young people in my town share our ideas, and many of them are ready to fight."

Perhaps, I will best express the feelings which animate the young generations in Russia today, if I stop here to quote four lines from a verse written by one of my young SMOGist friends. He, too, was locked up in a mental institution. He, too, was persecuted and proclaimed insane.

"We had scarcely opened our mouths,
Coughing quietly into our handkerchiefs:
We have used up and ruined half of Russia
Let us now bury the Bolsheviks!"

And now to conclude I wish to say this: It is thanks to the reaction of world opinion, to the men and women of the press, to the insistence of famous people—academicians, Nobel Prize winners, prominent writers and philosophers, such as Lord Bertram Russell, Arthur Miller, and many, many others that I owe my escape from the claws of Communist hangmen. For the sake of my brave colleagues Sinyavsky and Daniel; for the sake of the young saplings of Russia's literature, the writers and poets of SMOG; for the sake of all the Russian people; protest, protest, protest. Do not give in. Insist, demand.

The strong voice of protest is a great force. It will bring closer the victory of freedom-loving men over the enslaving cohorts of communism.

God will help us.

PROGRESS IN SAFETY

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the apparent success of the U.S. delegation to the Conference of the Maritime Safety Committee of the International Consultative Organization—IMCO—in having the safety committee recommend stiffer fire prevention regulations for passenger ships operating in international traffic.

The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, has been conducting studies of the practices and procedures of the U.S. Coast Guard in the examination of foreign passenger vessels. The foreign passenger ships which sail from the United States, with American passengers, are examined by the Coast Guard.

However, the fire safety requirements of these foreign-flag ships are prescribed by a 60-nation convention, to which the United States is a party. The standards of the Convention and of other nations which are parties to it, generally are not nearly as exacting as those which the United States imposes on its passenger ships.

The absence of stringent requirements in the Safety of Life at Sea Convention for removal of many fire hazards may be said to have accounted for the burning of the SS *Yarmouth Castle* last fall, with the loss of 90 American lives.

The United States has long sought to improve the safety standards requirements of the Safety of Life at Sea Conventions. The *Yarmouth Castle* disaster, followed by the burning of the SS *Viking Princess*, gave added impetus to its efforts, and reportedly, the efforts are meeting with considerable initial success.

The Washington Post and the New York Times of this morning indicate that the Maritime Safety Committee—IMCO—in London yesterday recommended such tightening of international fire safety maritime regulations that, if adopted, some of the older ships considered dangerous fire hazards may be forced out of service, and all others will be brought up to higher standards of safety.

The Maritime Safety Committee's recommendations would require that decks of passenger vessels be made of incombustible material, and much of the bulkheading would have to be of fireproof materials. Greater firefighting equipment and fire escape regulations would be imposed. The full and exact text of the recommendations will be submitted to the governments involved through diplomatic channels.

The recommendations are to be submitted for consideration by a special assembly of IMCO, expected to be held in London in December of this year. The recommendations themselves probably could not be ratified and put into effect before 1968.

The Congress and the American public, and particularly the potential passengers on cruise ships owe a debt of gratitude to President Johnson, for his leadership in calling for the taking of measures to assure safety of American passengers on the high seas. I believe also that that gratitude should extend to those who so ably presented America's position to the Maritime Safety Committee. The State Department, and particularly Ambassador Averell Harriman, and the Coast Guard, under the able and distinguished Commandant E. J. Roland, should particularly be singled out for commendation.

The New York Times article to which I referred follows:

STIFF FIRE RULES ON SHIPS PROPOSED—INTERNATIONAL UNIT REQUESTS STEEL DECKS ON VESSELS

(By Joseph Lelyveld)

LONDON, May 10.—Responding to pressure from the United States, an international committee recommended today a stiffening of maritime fire-prevention regulations that would put potential *Yarmouth Castles* out of business.

It was the burning of the 30-year-old cruise ship of that name in the Bahamas last November, with the loss of 90 lives, that produced the American determination to obtain a change in the rules.

The ship was owned by a Canadian, who used U.S. ports and carried American passengers, but, because it was registered in Panama, the Coast Guard was powerless to make it correct obvious safety hazards. That was because the Safety of Life at Sea Convention, last revised in 1960, permitted the registering nations to exempt ships built before 1948 from its more severe requirements.

DROPPING ESCAPE CLAUSE

If the changes advanced today by the 14-nation Maritime Safety Committee are ratified that escape clause will be dropped. The group is one of the arms of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, a United Nations Agency to which 60 nations belong.

The regulation that would probably do the most to put ships of the *Yarmouth Castle's* age—it was built in 1927—out of operation is the requirement that their decks be made of an incombustible material. The *Yarmouth Castle* had wooden decks. Maritime experts said rebuilding would not make economic sense for a ship of her age.

Other proposed regulations concern the positioning of fireproof bulkheads dividing the ship vertically into zones, the enclosure of stairways, the location of fire doors, and the maintenance of ventilation and alarm systems. All of these have been standard in international maritime law for years, but mandatory only for ships built after 1948.

In addition, the committee, which met here for a week, recommended that fire pumps be maintained with water pressure instantly available outside the engine rooms.

FIRE IN ENGINE ROOM

This suggestion grew out of a study of the fire on a Norwegian cruise liner, the *Viking Princess*, which burned in the Caribbean last month. Because that vessel's engine room was its only source of water pressure, firefighting equipment was rendered useless when the blaze started there.

The American eagerness for a revision of the convention was intensified by bills now before Congress that would require unilateral action by the United States to enforce its own rigorous safety code on all cruise ships sailing from American ports, whatever their registration.

To underscore its concern, the United States sent a strong delegation to the Conference. It was led by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Adm. Edwin J. Roland, and the opening presentation was made by W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador at Large.

The draft amendments to the safety convention will be presented to a special assembly of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, which will probably be held here in December. But the proposed regulations would not become effective before 1968, at the earliest.

Consequently, the committee made a strong recommendation that member nations act to enforce the proposals immediately, without waiting for the completion of the long ratification procedure.

The Washington Post article for May 11, 1966, follows:

SHIP LINES STUDY FIRE SAFETY PLAN

(By Karl E. Meyer)

LONDON, May 10.—Britain's Cunard Steamship Co., the world's biggest passenger line, was among shipping firms giving intense study tonight to new fire safety recommendations that could involve costly structural changes as a condition of access to American ports.

The recommendations were offered by the 12-member Maritime Safety Committee of the International Maritime Consultative Organization which concluded a weeklong meeting here today.

The committee met following rising concern over maritime safety stemming from sea disasters in the past few years. A measure of American concern in revising safety standards was the appearance here of roving Ambassador Averell Harriman as committee deliberations began.

In unanimously adopted recommendations, the committee urged a reduction of combustible materials in older ships as well as more firefighting equipment and escape routes.

These recommendations for tightening the 1960 Maritime Safety Convention will go before a meeting of the 45-member IMCO in London next December.

The American Government's concern over maritime safety derives from the sea disaster last November involving the *Yarmouth Castle*, in which 90 persons were dead or missing, and the *Laconia* disaster in December 1963, in which the toll was 125 persons.

The *Laconia* was under the Greek flag and sailing in the Atlantic and the *Yarmouth Castle* was under the Panamanian flag in the Caribbean. A third tragedy involved a Norwegian vessel, the *Viking Princess*, in which two persons died of heart attacks during a ship fire.

Cunard ships, including the stately *Queen Elizabeth* and *Queen Mary*, have wooden decks and cabin fittings. A spokesman for Cunard lines said that in 125 years there had not been a single fatal accident due to fire.

Cunard ships have a sprinkler system that is highly rated as a fire safety precaution. A spokesman for the line said the anxiously awaited committee recommendations would be given immediate scrutiny by Cunard to see what changes might be needed in the line's fleet.

HALT AMERICAN FINANCIAL AID TO CUBA AND OTHER COMMUNIST NATIONS THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of growing concern to the American people to learn that tax funds paid by our citizens are being diverted through our funding of the United Nations into projects which not only aid Communist countries, but even go so far as to provide funds to be used for the training of

Communist youths in electronics, radar, and military communications.

The United Nations under the United Nations development program has proposed that the United Nations Special Fund spend more than $2 million in Cuba for the specific purpose of expanding the facilities for training engineers and architects at the University of Havana, which will include training in electronics, radar, and military communications.

Unless action is taken to prevent it, some 1,240,000 of American taxpayer dollars will be expended in this program. It has been reported by reliable sources that the technical branch of the University of Havana is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel. Students who will receive training at the university to become specialists in radar, electronics, and related fields must, according to reports, either be members of the Communist Party or in the Cuban army.

This is a serious situation when our young men are being sent to Vietnam to face the Communist enemy in combat, while American tax dollars are to be spent in a training program in Cuba which may train missile operators and others who may one day use the skills and knowledge they have acquired in some future action directed against the United States.

It is for this reason I have introduced today a bill to provide that the United States shall make no payments or contributions to the United Nations for furnishing assistance to Communist countries. In addition to Cuba, Communist and Communist-dominated nations coming under the provision of the bill would include the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Red China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Tibet, and Yugoslavia.

It does not make sense to fight a war in Vietnam to combat communism abroad, to see daily mounting casualty lists, and to constantly combat Communist subversion within our own Nation, and at the same time, through the United Nations, contribute American tax dollars for the use of the Communist enemy abroad.

It is time the United States takes firm, positive, and effective action to halt American financial aid to Communist and Communist-dominated countries through the United Nations, and the bill I have introduced is a step in this direction.

I earnestly request the serious consideration of the Members of the Congress to this proposed legislation.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT LOBBYING

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I question the actions of officials of the Post Office Department in lobbying for H.R. 14904, a bill to revise parcel post rates and increase the size and rate of parcels that could be carried through the postal system. May I point out the prohibition against officials of the executive branch lobbying with appropriated money and that the Post Office Department is encouraging its postmasters and employee groups throughout the country to pressure Congress for the passage of this bill.

I also question whether Postmaster General O'Brien is aware of this illegal and possibly criminal offense by members of the Post Office Department, since as a relatively new official, he is not as yet in complete control of his Department. The bill to which I refer was slipped through the House Post Office Postal Rates Subcommittee last week and is scheduled to be rushed through the full House Post Office Committee tomorrow, Thursday, May 12.

I am calling this to the attention of the Members and am also alerting Postmaster General O'Brien to the very embarrassing possibilities in this case. Postmaster General O'Brien has a well-deserved reputation for personal integrity and certainly he would not deliberately instigate this very questionable procedure which the Post Office Department seems to be following.

May I quote the law which expressly forbids that money appropriated by Congress "be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress."

Mr. Speaker, the volume of inspired mail on the subject and the outbreak of properly timed press interviews by postmasters across the country are an index of Post Office Department action.

Therefore, this parcel post bill itself has become a secondary issue to the reputation of Postmaster General O'Brien. He may well be the victim of overzealous and illegal activity on the part of his subordinates.

It is my intention in presenting this matter before the House to alert the Members and the Postmaster General to the diabolical nature of this illicit Post Office Department lobbying so that we can spare our great Postmaster General from the embarrassing and disturbing consequences that might follow.

I include a copy of my letter to Mr. O'Brien:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1966.

Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Larry: It is my grave concern that you may well be the victim of overzealous and illegal activity on the part of your subordinates, and this letter is intended to alert you to this possibility.

As you know, there is a prohibition against officials of the executive branch lobbying with appropriated money.

What you are undoubtedly unaware of is that postmasters and postal employees throughout the country are clearly involved in a concerted lobbying effort in support of H.R. 14904.

In my opinion, this parcel post bill therefore becomes secondary to the need to protect your personal reputation. You have a well-deserved reputation for personal integrity, and certainly you would not deliberately instigate this very questionable procedure which your subordinates in the Post Office Department seem to be following.

Trusting that you are relishing the great challenges which are yours and that you are retaining your good humor under the great pressures of your office, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,
Edward J. Derwinski,
Member of Congress.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FOWLER EXPLAINS ADMINISTRATION'S EXPENDITURE CONTROL POLICY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent speech by the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, has come to my attention. With all the clamor raised on the minority side of the aisle on budget management and budget cutting, I suggest that they read Secretary Fowler's careful description of the Federal expenditure control policy.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, the spectacular success of our 6 years of economic boom. This could not have been accomplished without the active cooperation and stimulation of the Federal Government. Speaking before the Appleton, Wis., Chamber of Commerce on April 21, 1966, Secretary Fowler outlines the importance that budget control and analysis play as an adjunct to our fiscal policy. Excluding the Vietnam costs, President Johnson has held the administrative budget to less than $1 billion over the amount originally estimated for the fiscal year in which he assumed office. Careful determination of priorities and goals, the use of up-to-date cost-benefit analysis, and the constant and close analysis of individual programs and activities are the tools for the administration's expenditure control policy.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Secretary Fowler's excellent remarks, to the readers of the Record, as follows:

Remarks by the Honorable Henry H. Fowler

Both as Under Secretary of the Treasury and now as Secretary I have tried to make it a practice, in dealing with the great economic issues that have come before the Nation, to do all I can to avoid the paths of narrow partisanship and, instead, to help open new and broader avenues for bipartisan cooperation in achieving national economic objectives on which there is general agreement.

So I feel that by being here tonight in Appleton, where I have been told one can stand on the main street corner for weeks and never catch sight of a Democrat, I am carrying on the good work.

Indeed, it has been my pleasure and privilege during my years at Treasury to work very closely with distinguished Wisconsin representatives in Washington—men of different political persuasions who have played large roles in shaping the important national economic and financial legislation enacted in recent years—Congressman JOHN BYRNES, who is the ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, who is a member of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress as well as of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and Congressman HENRY REUSS, who is a member of the Joint Economic Committee and the House Banking and Currency Committee.

I know that this informed audience is thoroughly familiar with this economic and financial legislation of the past 5 years—as well as with the policies of which they were so integral a part and with the unparalleled economic progress to which they gave so great an impetus.

But engrossed as we all are with the imperative present need to avoid the danger of economic excess, we may sometimes tend to forget how deeply we were mired, 5 years ago, in economic doldrums and how difficult was the task that lay ahead.

The decade of the sixties—the "soaring sixties" some had predicted—had scarcely begun when we fell into our fourth postwar recession. We looked back upon the decade of the fifties and saw little to fire our hopes for the future. To look back, in fact, was only to become painfully aware that each of the three prior recessions had been followed by shorter and weaker recoveries, and that the previous recession had produced what still remains the largest peacetime budget deficit in our history. Unemployment was intolerably high—6.9 percent in February 1961, the recession trough. Business investment had for years failed to maintain anything like adequate levels of growth, and remained far less than we needed to generate more vigorous economic growth—industrial plant and equipment, in February 1961, was operating at only 78 percent of capacity, compared to the optimum rate of 92 percent desired by most businessmen.

The question before us was how best to revive our economy and restore its capacity for strong and sustainable growth. We had essentially two choices: whether to increase Government expenditures or to reduce taxes—whether to rely, in other words, upon the renewed energies of the private sector or upon expanded Government activity.

We chose, as you know, to reduce taxes and to restrain the growth of Federal expenditures, for we were firmly convinced that the private economy simply could not do its job unless it were sufficiently freed from the burden of excessively high wartime tax rates—rates originally applied to restrain the strong inflationary pressures that accompanied wars and national emergencies.

Through the investment credit of 1962, the depreciation reforms of 1962 and 1965, the Revenue Act of 1964—and to some extent through the excise tax reductions of last year—we moved to diminish the burden of wartime tax rates upon the private economy and thus to furnish it with renewed opportunity and fresh incentives to help meet our basic economic needs.

The results are familiar to us all: our real gross national product has risen without interruption and at an average annual rate of 5 percent since 1961. Our rapid rise in new industrial capacity has been matched by a sharp reduction in idle capacity. Our unemployment rate has fallen below 4 percent. Productivity has grown significantly—and profits, incomes and wages have risen substantially.

But I come here today not to recite the brilliant economic success story of the past 5 years—you know that story as well as I, for you like all Americans have been reading it over and over again in the glowing annual reports of our companies and corporations, in the fuller pay envelopes of our wage earners, in the higher standard of living enjoyed by nearly all Americans.

I come to discuss a far less familiar, if extremely important, accomplishment of the past 5 years—the quiet but crucial revolution that has occurred in Federal expenditure control policy.

There has been intensive public discussion of the part that tax policy can play in stimulating or restraining economic activity. Indeed, I think it impossible to overestimate how far the tax discussion and tax action of these past years has advanced our ability to forge a flexible and effective economic policy.

But in our intense concern with tax policy, we have tended to give very little emphasis to another aspect of fiscal policy which has also emerged during these years—I refer to expenditure control policy.

Of course, the utilization of increased Government expenditures as a means of dealing with a recession or a lagging economy has been one of the most discussed aspects of economic policies over the years since the great depression. I will plow over that old ground here, although it still has important relevance to the future.

The new and more novel aspect of expenditure policy which deserves increasing examination is public expenditure control as an adjunct of fiscal policy. In at least two important and identifiable ways, which I will discuss in the course of this talk, the control of public expenditures can play an important role in stimulating economic growth without inflation or in restraining excessively exuberant growth when inflation threatens.

And I will also, of course, discuss the always important and basic objective of utilizing improved and more effective methods of public expenditure control to give the taxpayer a 100 cents value on every tax dollar expended and to assure that the public needs being served by that tax dollar are those which deserve the highest priority and result in the greatest benefits. In this sense, expenditure control is a continuing and primary responsibility of Government.

Both from the increasing recognition of the importance of assuring stable and sustainable growth in the economy with reasonable price stability and from the increasing effort to assure that waste and inefficiency are curbed and that out of all of the competing public needs for the tax dollar the most deserving are served—from these realizations of recent years has emerged what I have termed a quiet revolution in the processes of expenditure control.

That revolution had its roots in the decision to generate strong and steady economic growth by reducing Federal taxes rather than raising Federal expenditures. Indeed, tax reduction implied expenditure restraint, since it meant an initial and temporary lag in the growth of Federal revenues.

I do not mean to suggest that the policy of coupling Federal tax reduction with Federal expenditure restraint was the creature of only one branch of Government, or of only one party—or that it emerged in full, formal regalia in early 1961. For the notion of a program of expenditure restraint as an important and explicit part of a program of tax reduction was something that grew over time—and in the development of which members of both parties in the Congress played a significant role. And no one made a more persistent and effective contribution to that development than your own Congressman, JOHN BYRNES, in his position as ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

As this audience undoubtedly remembers, the early 1960's were scarcely propitious years for initiating a program of expenditure control: there was, for one thing, the urgent national need to raise our entire level of defense preparedness; there was, as well, the prospect of sizable increases in expenditures for expanding and accelerating our space program; and there was, inevitably, the rising cost of financing our national debt.

Over the first few years, therefore, we could not seek overall reductions in these areas of the budget, but we could—and the record reveals that we did—cut back on the rate of growth in all other expenditures of our budget.

In the fiscal 1961–64 period, for example, Federal expenditures other than those for defense, space, and interest on the national debt rose by some $4.3 billion, or by under 18 percent—while over the previous 3-year period, fiscal 1958–61, under an administration that prided itself on fiscal prudence, expenditures in these same areas grew by almost $4.9 billion, or by over 25 percent.

At the same time, we moved ahead with the first phase of our overall program of tax reduction—taking two significent steps to spur new and more productive business investment without entailing any large loss of Federal revenues. These were the Revenue Act of 1962, whose key provision was the 7-percent investment tax credit, and the administrative liberalization of depreciation.

It was during the weeks and months of effort that went into shaping the Revenue Act of 1962—a joint effort exerted by both the administration and the Congress—that the notion of coupling any massive program of tax reduction with a rigorous program of expenditure restraint began to come into clearer and clearer focus. Indeed, I well remember the sometimes lengthy colloquies on this subject between myself and other members of the administration and Members of Congress of both parties—including Chairman MILLS, Congressman BYRNES, and Congressman CURTIS of Missouri—during discussions on the Revenue Act of 1962.

Thus, in proposing the tax program which found final form in the Revenue Act of 1964, President Kennedy pledged—and I quote—that: "As the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the tax revenue thereby generated will be applied toward a reduction in the Federal deficit."

In all of my advocacy of that tax reduction measure, I too tried to make clear that the policy proposed was a two-pronged one—tax reduction and expenditure control.

For example, in my first public statement on the measure in February 1963 I said:

"The program has two main elements: First, a substantial net reduction in Federal taxes; and second, as the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy expands in response, the allocation of a substantial part of the resulting revenue increases toward eliminating the transitional deficit."

The Congress endorsed that policy when it declared, in section I of the Revenue Act of 1964, that: "It is the sense of Congress that the tax reduction provided by this act through stimulation of the economy, will, after a brief transitional period, raise (rather than lower) revenues and that such revenue increases should first be used to eliminate the deficits in the administrative budgets and then to reduce the public debt. To further the objective of obtaining balanced budgets in the near future, Congress by this action, recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending."

And President Johnson has more than redeemed that pledge by personally spearheading the most persistent and productive expenditure control effort ever witnessed in Washington.

And the results are remarkable. Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1964, when President Johnson assumed the responsibilities of the Presidency, were originally estimated at $98.8 billion. The expenditure target for fiscal 1966, the third year of his service was fixed in January of last year at $99.7 billion—less than $1 billion higher than the original estimate for fiscal 1964.

Then last July, events in Vietnam changed the picture—requiring additional expenditures of some $4.7 billion. Other increases also occurred—increases, both unforeseen and unavoidable, which totaled at net $2 billion. These included $740 million of military pay raises and an additional $288 million increase in veterans pensions voted by Congress in excess of Presidential recommendations; a $500 million increase in interest charges on the debt and two further increases of $500 million each as a result of payments required by law under the space and agricultural programs. All of these increases—which President Johnson could neither anticipate nor effectively control—more than wiped out economies realized by both administration and congressional action since the original budget estimate for fiscal 1966. And in doing so they obscured one of President Johnson's truly extraordinary accomplishments—the fact that, excluding these increases, President Johnson in nearly 3 years in office had held the total increase in administrative budget expenditures to less than $1 billion over the amount originally estimated for the fiscal year in which he assumed office.

Compare this with the average increase in the budget of $3 billion per year over the previous 10 years. View it in the context of the report issued in January of 1961 by President Eisenhower's last Director of the Budget, Mr. Maurice Stans, which pictured the outlook for Federal expenditures over the next decade. That report concluded that rising population and income, and the resulting normal growth in the Federal workload, would tend to raise nondefense expenditures in the Federal budget by $2 to $2½ billion a year throughout this decade. Look at what President Johnson has done against this background, and we begin to realize how really remarkable his accomplishment is.

Joined with rising Federal revenues from rising economic activity, the President's program of rigorous expenditure control has allowed us to meet urgent national needs while at the same time reducing the Federal deficit.

The record is clear: the 1964 budget submitted 3 years ago forecast a deficit of $11.9 billion premised, in part, on major tax reduction. This figure was reduced to an actual fiscal 1964 deficit of $8.2 billion.

Last year's budget contained an estimated deficit for fiscal 1965 of $6.3 billion. This was trimmed down to $3.4 billion.

The budget submitted in January of 1965 projected a $5.3 billion deficit for fiscal 1966. As of June 30, this estimate had been cut to $4.2 billion largely because revenues produced by the vigorous response of our economy to the tax cut exceeded our original estimate. Had it not been for the $4.6 billion of additional defense expenditures resulting from Vietnam in fiscal 1966, the higher revenues flowing from our burgeoning economy would either have eliminated or cut much further that estimated deficit for the current fiscal year.

Had it not, in fact, been for the increases projected for Vietnam expenditures in fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967 since the 1966 budget was originally submitted last January, we could have used the fiscal dividends furnished by this continued expansion to balance the budget in fiscal 1967 and still have had room for some increases in civilian expenditures, or for additional tax reduction, or for some reduction of the national debt.

As a result of all these policies which have proven so productive, we now have the economic strength and the fiscal resources—and the firm confidence these accomplishments more than justify—to carry on the fight for freedom in South Vietnam without abandoning our efforts at home. This was the real significance of the President's announcement—in his state of the Union message—that the enactment of all his recommendations will entail a deficit in the administrative budget for fiscal 1967 of only $1.8 billion—the smallest in 7 years—and will give us a surplus of $500 million in the cash budget.

And this accomplishment is made all the more extraordinary by the fact that fiscal 1967 expenditures include an increase in the special costs of Vietnam of $10.4 billion over the fiscal 1965 level—a $5.8 billion increase in fiscal 1967 on top of an increase of $4.6 billion in fiscal 1966.

Indeed, if you exclude the Vietnam program increase in both expenditures and revenues for fiscal 1967, the budget would show a rather tidy surplus of some $3 to $4 billion.

There could be no better testimony to the unrelenting rigor of President Johnson's efforts to control Federal expenditures than his success in obtaining results like these in the face of such severe difficulties. The success of any such campaign—as most of you in the audience know from your own business experience—depends upon insistent, intensive leadership—leadership that will allow for no letup and that will accept nothing less than maximum efficiency and maximum economy—leadership that requires constant and continual accounting from every responsible official on every program and every activity under his supervision That is the kind of leadership under his supervision. That is the kind of leadership that President Johnson continues to exert—the kind of leadership that has instilled in every Federal employee at every level of responsibility an acute cost-consciousness, and that engages his best efforts to seek out new ways to do the job better at less cost.

But the revolution in expenditure control which I have been describing involves more than the creation, under Presidential leadership, of a climate of cost-consciousness throughout the Federal Government. It involves the development, over the past few years, and the establishment, for the first time, on a governmentwide basis of a whole new system of procedures, standards and techniques to furnish the kind of precise and pertinent data required for exercising intelligent control over Federal expenditures.

I will not now attempt to describe this system in any detail—for the details are complicated and it would take too long. But I would like simply to cite some of its more salient features.

Under this system, for example, every Federal bureau, every Federal agency, every Federal department must furnish a detailed breakdown of all its activities and programs and expenditures for each of these—in terms of priorities, and reflecting the most up-to-date methods of cost-benefit analysis—which is simply a technical phrase that means making sure we're getting the most out of the taxpayer's dollar. What all this means, is that the President and the Budget Bureau in preparing the budget—and reviewing its operation throughout the year can decide to expand or curtail expenditures from authorized appropriations, or to request Congress to allow expanded or curtailed appropriations, not in terms of some arbitrary decision, but on the basis of a rational analysis of program priorities and program performance. It means that the President and the Budget Bureau have constantly at their fingertips the kind of information they need to exercise a greater measure of continual control over any proposed expansions in the levels of the budget. It means also that they have the same kind of information concerning lower priority programs that could be eliminated or reduced. It means that the entire budgetary process becomes far more than an exercise in numbers as it reaches into the realities behind those numbers—as it involves a constant and close analysis, in detail, of individual programs and activities in terms of their objectives and their costs.

It means, in short, that expenditure control becomes something more than an ad hoc, random exercise—something more than the imposition of arbitrary restrictions from without. Today, instead, expenditure control has become a built-in, ongoing, part of the entire operation of the Federal Government—continually at work as not merely a negative but a positive and creative factor in the continual effort to get the most out of every Federal dollar spent in terms both of effectiveness and efficiency and in terms of meeting our most urgent national needs. And today, far more than ever before, we are able to save where we can in order to spend where we must—for today, far more than ever before, we are able to identify and isolate those areas where we can most profitably save as well as those areas to which we can most profitably allocate our expenditures.

We see the results of this system in the budget for fiscal 1967—a budget in which, by a process of selective increases and decreases, the President was able to hold down the total increase in all budget expenditures other than the increase in special Vietnam costs to only $600 million. This net increase of $600 million includes both some substantial increases and some substantial decreases. It includes increases of $3.2 for Great Society programs, $800 million for higher interest charges on the public debt, and $1.3 billion for unavoidable commitments such as construction already in progress. It includes decreases of $1.6 billion in defense outlays unrelated to Vietnam, $1.5 billion in savings through pruning lower priority programs, through management improvements and through the nonrecurrence of certain costs, and $1.6 billion resulting from increased sales of mortgages and other financial assets and from the further substitution of private for public credit.

Thus, to talk about expenditure control solely in terms of expenditure totals is to tell only half the story—for we receive the greatest benefits from the President's insistent emphasis on cost reduction and program evaluation in the urgent new programs it enables us to afford through savings on those of lesser urgency and through greater productivity in existing programs.

I can personally testify to the effectiveness of this new system—and to the intensity of President Johnson's insistence upon expenditure control—by citing some of the more recent developments in my own Department.

Last July, with the shadows lengthening over Vietnam, the President called two meetings in which he personally developed with me and other members of his Cabinet and the budgetary officers of each agency his intention to restrict low priority expenditures and eliminate low priority programs.

On September 30 we submitted to the Bureau of the Budget our departmental estimates for expenditures in the fiscal year 1966. Shortly thereafter we received a Presidential request to hold expenditures to the absolute minimum and a Bureau of the Budget directive fixing an employment ceiling as of June 30, 1966.

As a result we identified $102.5 million of prospective reductions for the remaining portion of the 1966 fiscal year. This represented a reduction of almost 7 percent in our estimates in September and was the figure included in the President's 1966 budget expenditures when the 1967 budget was presented in January.

On March 15 of this year the President asked for a further review as the end of this fiscal year neared to make sure that there was no slippage. This review indicated that we would achieve only $90 million of our $102.5 million reduction target.

In late March another meeting of bureau heads resulted in the identification of additional reductions of $13.7 million, bringing the total $1.2 million under the President's January estimates for fiscal 1966 and $103.7 million below the Department's September estimates.

I should add that our departmental operating budget for fiscal 1967 was fixed by the President at a figure which represented an increase of less than 4 percent, most of which represented the financing of activities transferred from the Navy to the Coast Guard and built-in pay increases. Expenditures will be held even by economies in certain bureaus despite workload increases requiring increases in Internal Revenue, the mint, and the Coast Guard totaling approximately $46 million.

I do not, by all of this, mean to suggest that we have arrived at some infallible or automatic means of expenditure control. I mean only that we have entered upon whole new pathways to more effective, intelligent expenditure control. We have not eliminated—and will never eliminate—the necessity for hard decision on the part of the administration, the Congress, and the American people—all of whom must participate in varying ways and degrees in any program of expenditure control.

We will still have to face the fact, for example, that there is no such thing as an unpopular Federal program. Any program that exists does so because somewhere, sometime, the Congress and the Executive thought it worth instituting—and during its existence it has inevitably created its own often vocal and influential, if often small, constituency.

Last summer, the eminent chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman George Mahon, made an excellent statement before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress on the general problem of expenditure control. He was kind enough to send me a copy of that statement, and I took the liberty of sending him a few comments. I said in part, and I quote:

"One of the most obvious facts of political life is that the special interests are concentrated and strong while the general interest tends to be diffused and weak. I do not mean to imply that there is anything evil or sinister in special interests. It is only natural for those who benefit from particular Federal expenditures to employ all possible political pressures to preserve them. We must therefore rely upon both the President and the Congress to protect the general interest even though this is exceedingly difficult.

"Despite the tremendous efforts of the President to hold down expenditures, I think it is generally agreed that he has done his best to recommend sufficient funds to carry out the broad range of valuable Government programs. Nevertheless as you pointed out Congress increased these recommended expenditure authorizations by over $5 billion. The money will undoubtedly go for popular purposes, but we obviously need some method of holding down the overall Federal spending level, especially when our defense requirements are growing as they are.

"In the final analysis, however, we cannot escape the fact that popular and even desirable programs must be given very careful scrutiny. Certainly the poverty, education, and health programs are essential, but the President's budget recommendations, made in the light of how effectively those expenditures can be made, should not be exceeded. Military bases, veterans hospitals, and other Government installations which are no longer vital should be phased out. Public works which do not meet the Bureau of the Budget's rigorous tests of economic feasibility and national need should be postponed.

"In these respects, I do not wish to imply that Congress should not put its own stamp on the President's recommendations. The legislative branch has its responsibilities to review Executive recommendations with a fine tooth comb. In doing so, however, we need to keep the national fiscal requirements before us, so that additions can be offset by subtractions.

"I recognize that it is easier to turn on the faucet than it is to turn it off. Nevertheless, if we are to maintain an adequate national defense while yet protecting the integrity of the dollar from inflation, it is imperative that we as a Nation develop the fiscal flexibility necessary not only to stimulate the economy when appropriate but also avoid excessive stimulation when this policy is called for."

Witness, as a current case in point, the angry opposition in some quarters to some of the reductions the President has proposed in existing programs. Take, for example, the proposed reductions in the school lunch programs, in the special milk program, in operating grants to federally impacted school districts, and in grants to land-grant colleges. Each of these reductions represents a genuine effort to reduce assistance to those whose need is less urgent in order to afford increased assistance to those whose need is greatest. And each of these reductions was proposed in the light of large increases in expenditures at all education levels—expenditures particularly aimed at helping those most in need of help. Yet even in this context, these proposed reductions—and others—have met with some stern opposition.

So the task of Federal expenditure control continues to be a most difficult one—one that will continue to require diligent and dedicated effort on the part of both the President and the Congress—but one that in the years ahead, as we continue to perfect our techniques of continual program and expenditure analysis and evaluation, will become more and more susceptible to informed and intelligent accomplishment.

Already, as I have said, we are beginning to reap the benefits of that quiet revolution in expenditure control that has been taking place over the past few years. For today, when the need for restraint is so great, we are better able to exercise restraint without resorting to arbitrary expedients than we were some years ago. And today, as well, the task of expenditure control is far less staggering than it otherwise might be if we had not already achieved such excellent results from our efforts of recent years.

Perhaps the best way to sum up those results is to point to the diminishing ratio over recent years between the growth in Federal expenditures and the growth of our overall economy. Excluding special Vietnam costs, expenditures in the administrative budget fell from 14.9 percent of our total national output in fiscal 1965 to 14.5 percent in the current fiscal year. In fiscal 1967, it will drop even further to 13.7 percent, the lowest figure since fiscal 1948—some 18 years ago. Even including Vietnam costs, the ratio between Federal expenditures and our national output rises only slightly from 14.9 percent in fiscal 1965 to 15.2 percent for both fiscal 1966 and 1967—thus remaining well below previous levels. Compare these figures with the fact that throughout the late fifties—under an administration which, as I mentioned earlier, prided itself on fiscal frugality—expenditures in the administrative budget never fell below 16 percent of our national output and reached as high as 17.1 percent of that output in 1959.

The efforts, therefore, of recent years—and particularly under the leadership of President Johnson—have resulted in a real breakthrough in both the techniques and the practice of Federal expenditure control, a breakthrough that will mean greater and growing flexibility in Federal budgetary decisionmaking in the years ahead, and a breakthrough that stands us in good stead now when the need for responsible restraint is especially urgent.

We have, as I said earlier, far yet to go before we can confidently claim to have mastered the incredible intricacies and entanglements of the expenditure process. But, under President Johnson's leadership, we have already come far. We see the evidence, as I have pointed out, in our recent budgets. We see it also in a further dimension—in the broader context of the role that expenditure policy can play as an instrument of overall economic policy. In President Johnson's effort toward restraint in the fiscal 1967 budget—particularly in reducing requests for new obligational authority some $4.1 billion below the level of fiscal 1966—in his efforts in the current fiscal year to hold down expenditures in the non-Vietnam sector of the budget, and more broadly in his efforts to secure the voluntary cooperation of State and local government and of private businessmen in postponing marginal capital expenditures—in these efforts we see a really major attempt to employ expenditure policy as a countercyclical weapon.

We have done much in recent years to improve that weapon. We have much more to do in the years ahead.

W. B. MURPHY, PRESIDENT OF THE CAMPBELL SOUP CO., URGES CLOSER COOPERATION AND UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an astute observer of the business-Government relationship spoke recently to a group of businessmen on the importance of better understanding and relationship with the Federal Government. W. B. Murphy, president of Campbell Soup Co. and Chairman of the President's Business Advisory Council, addressed the Federal Business Association luncheon in Philadelphia recently and had much good advice based on many years of experience in business and government.

Campbell Soup Co. last year opened a new plant in a predominantly rural area of my district, testifying to the fact that industry is vital too for the survival of our rural countryside. I am proud of the fact that I visited the new plant and inspected the Campbell operations.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the Members' attention Mr. Murphy's informative remarks.

Remarks of W. B. Murphy, President, Campbell Soup Co., at the Federal Business Association Luncheon Meeting, April 19, 1966

If this talk has to have a title, the title might be "How This Businessman Would Hope His Government Would Look Upon Business and Businessmen" and "How This Businessman Views Government and Government People."

This may be the longest title for a short talk thus far in 1966.

I was asked if I would like the press to be here today. The answer was that by not having the press present, I could talk more as though a few of us were sitting down together and less formally, and I could even make a few slips of the tongue.

Many businessmen have had direct experience in Government by serving in Government posts.

I did this from January 1942 until the spring of 1945, and now am serving as a member of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber.

From personal experience I can say one's view of business is quite different depending upon whether he is in or out of business, or conversely, in or out of Government. Business seems more important when one is in business—conversely, Government seems to have the edge when one is in Government.

Actually it isn't one or the other—Government and business, and the academic world as well, must be a team—our problems are too vital for there to be anything but a high degree of understanding and mutuality.

When I use the word "business," I'm encompassing the team of capital, labor and management.

First. How does a businessman look on his Government?

I do not think most men in business feel too comfortable with Government people—they should but they don't.

Chief reasons—

Government by its very nature in many cases must have a policing posture, and this doesn't encourage the best fraternal chubby-kindly atmosphere. Of course, that can't be avoided.

The dealings between business and Government are sometimes at arm's length—by letter, by telegram, by press release, or by other means—when they should be direct—person to person.

On occasion there have been some pretty rugged attacks on business. There's nothing wrong with these attacks when they're fully thought out and justified, but sometimes they're of the "shoot from the hip" type.

It has been my experience that the vast majority of Government people—especially those in the career jobs—are dedicated and skilled. By the same token most businessmen are patriotic and proud of their country. Nevertheless most people in business believe there is a small hard core of people—a few in Government, some in the academic world, and even a few in business—who are dedicated to remaking the American system to provide for a far higher degree of centralized control. There are those who want czars to regulate industry. There are those who want the utilities to be taken over by the Government—to curb the powers of States, counties, and cities and concentrate that power in one place. There are those who want to dictate how packages are to be designed, how pension funds are to be invested, how automobiles are to be built, and on and on.

I'm not talking here about laws that spell out specific rules and regulations. I'm talking about laws and bureau decrees that give discretionary power to a central Government figure—a kind of economic czar of some segment of industry.

You'd think the difficulties of Soviet Russia in centralized government control would be enough of a lesson, but I guess some people never learn.

"The American Revolution was fought, primarily, not for political reasons but for the right to grow, manufacture, buy, and sell things without interference from the British Crown. The goal was economic freedom and, when attained, the results were almost miraculous."

Businessmen, in the main, do not fear enforcement of laws. Laws should be obeyed, and when not obeyed, the disobeyers ought to be apprehended and punished.

The real fear is the enactment of laws that "burn the barn down to kill a few rats," or that "rip the ship apart to fix a few leaks."

Business knows that while the public sector represents only 15 percent to 20 percent of the gross national product, it wields an influence far greater than that.

For example, our balance-of-payments deficit is only $1.5 to $2 billion—far less than 1 percent of the gross national product—but it exerts an enormous effect on U.S. business in the world trade and to an important degree on domestic trade.

Another example, taxation measures can help or hurt the entire economy depending upon their nature and their timing. On those two factors, incidentally, I'm certain that no one is more conscious of the potential effects than our President, our Vice President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Federal Reserve Chief—all of whom are knowledgeable and sophisticated in their appreciation of economics and the realities.

Businessmen have a dread of attacks or blasts that are premature and prejudicial. Such attacks can be quite harmful to a business since the answer never seems to get the attention that the attack gets. When these attacks are by competitors or by most any other element of our society, they can be challenged and met, but how to cope with Government attacks is not so easy since legal recourses are not available. And might I also say that I have heard some unfair biased attacks on our Government by those in private life. Why oh why can't we realize that we're all in the same boat?

Businessmen worry about how Government people regard them.

Do Government people know there are those that do their best to be pristine, those who are semipristine, and the few that are the opposite?

The man in successful commerce works hard, he is proud of his achievements and he doesn't want to be downrated. He doesn't want to be painted with a brush that ought to paint only the blackguards black.

Anyone who is trying to do his job well tends to wince or cringe whenever he reads of a business cheat or an inept action or stupid statement by a business leader.

Business is sometimes talked about as though it were somewhat monolithic or uniform, but it is far from that. Business has mostly good actors but some medium and a few bad actors—we run the whole gamut from fairly pure to almost impure. In any group meeting of businessmen, opinions run from A to Z. The lack of uniform thinking is remarkably uniform.

This is the reason that when there is a slashing attack on business generally or on an industry in toto, it usually is unfair to the high majority.

Now before I talk about how I would hope Government would look on business, I want to give a few recent examples to show that businessmen can and do exhibit a remarkable patriotism when their President tells them the chips are down and an emergency must be met—balance of payments; guidelines; and, at present, only essential capital expenditures—the practice of frugality.

How we would like Government people to look on business—recognize, believe, and preach the fact that the private enterprise system is the motive power that drives the economy forward. Business accounts for over 80 percent of the gross national product.

Just think of it: the United States has 6 percent of world population, 7 percent of the area, 28 percent of the world's national income, 55 percent of the motor vehicles, 50 percent of the phones, and, 35 percent of electric energy.

Business has been responsible for—a majority of technical advances, virtually all consumer product advances, and much of the scientific advances of this country in nonmilitary areas and for some of it in the military segment.

In my opinion, our American adherence to one private enterprise system under our form of government, accounts for this remarkable achievement.

It is most vital that action by the legislative and executive branches of the Government continue to aid the thrust of private enterprise.

I'm certain our President, Vice President, and a very high proportion of Government people believe this.

Now what do we need—after what is really a pretty frank outline of my views on the relationships of business and Government?

We need better two-way communication. There is a question of whether very many of our Senators or Congressmen have much knowledge about the actual workings of the private enterprise system. A high proportion of them are lawyers. For example, to my knowledge only one Senator and one Congressman have ever been in a Campbell plant. In each case, it was only 1 of the 18 or 20 plants that we operate. By the same token, I don't think our people have taken the time to visit with our Senators and Congressmen. I think we need a lot more visiting back and forth to help this two-way communication.

We need a better understanding of our separate opinions, goals and functions. Communication by letter, communication by press releases, or communication by speeches is a pretty poor way to get to know the other fellow. There is no substitute for personal get-togethers and for the exchange of views that comes about by personal meetings.

There is need for unswerving faith and a universal belief in the private enterprise method for operating our economic machinery.

Much of the shakiness on the part of the businessman comes about through the fear that we are drifting more and more in the socialistic direction.

We need adherence to the law by business (we have it in the main but not always).

We need a government that is objective, economical and guided by principles (again we have it in the main but not always).

Why there must be full cooperation and understanding between government and business and for that matter, between all facets of our society.

The world is erupting into a consciousness of the great economic gains possible by means of the economic system practiced by the leaders of the free world. In the United States, the leader of those leaders, we have the job of assisting a good part of the world to lift themselves to higher living standards.

This is going to take a tremendous lot of work by business, Government and our schools. The underdeveloped countries must lift themselves up but in many cases they need our technical assistance. We ought to give it to them when asked.

This assistance to the underdeveloped parts of the world can best be carried on by a cooperative effort of our Government, our schools and our businesses working with their counterparts in other lands.

The development of the poorer countries will not come through some centralized government control of the Communist type but through the multifarious efforts of a vast number of native private individuals and native private enterprises aided and abetted by the native governments and by the technical assistance of the schools, governments and businesses of the countries that are able and willing to lend a hand.

I happen to think that this very practical approach is going to be used and that this country of ours has a magnificent future.

MRS. HENRY EPSTEIN, A SPIRITED POLITICAL ACTIVIST AND CIVIC LEADER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, when Mrs. Henry Epstein died on April 29, New York lost a spirited political activist and civic leader.

Ethel Steuer Epstein was equally famous as the labor secretary to the late Mayor Fiorello La Guardia and a founder of the New York Studio School.

Observing her emotional defense of New York labor, one colleague was moved to remark:

> My dear Mrs. Epstein, you have the greatest capacity for indignation I have ever encountered.

But she was equally moved by a fine piece of music. "A perfectly turned phrase or a beautiful piece of music can bring tears to my eyes," she once said.

Mrs. Epstein, whose husband, the late State Supreme Court Justice Henry Epstein, father and brother were all active and prominent Democrats, was an influential and independent political personality in her own right. Throughout her career she made a monumental contribution to the cause of good government and liberal politics. Her voice and pen were always available to advance the highest ideals of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, Ethel Epstein will be missed by all New Yorkers. I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of her family, her two sons, Alan S. Emory and Eric S. Emory, and her daughter, Mrs. Arthur Naitove.

The New York Times obituary of April 29, 1966, follows:

MRS. EPSTEIN DIES; LA GUARDIA AID—LABOR SECRETARY WAS 66; DAUGHTER OF MAX STEUER

Mrs. Ethel Steuer Epstein, widow of State Supreme Court Justice Henry Epstein and a daughter of the late Max D. Steuer, the noted lawyer, died Wednesday of a heart attack in her apartment at 880 Fifth Avenue. She was 66 years old.

Mrs. Epstein had not been ill but had been devoting much time as head of the tax committee of the Women's City Club, for which she recently delivered a tax report and recommendation to Mayor Lindsay. She had also been occupied with duties connected with the New York Studio School, of which she was a founder.

Mrs. Epstein was perhaps best known as labor secretary to the late Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia for several years until 1942.

Her connection with the La Guardia administration almost terminated before it began. She had been recommended to the mayor as an assistant to the executive director of the department of welfare. "The mayor didn't want that," Mrs. Epstein explained. "You see, he and my father were political enemies and the mayor thought it might not be wise to appoint me for that reason, but he did."

She rapidly assumed more duties until finally she became a liaison officer between the mayor and the city's department of labor and then head of that department. In that capacity she often went to Washington, where her outbursts in defense of New York labor caused one observer to remark, "My dear Mrs. Epstein, you have the greatest capacity for indignation I have ever encountered."

EMOTIONAL PERSONALITY

She was as quickly moved to tears as to anger. "A perfectly turned phrase or a beautiful piece of music can bring tears to my eyes. I practically have a pail next to me," she once said.

As labor relations secretary to Mayor La Guardia, Mrs. Epstein was in the thick of many major labor disputes. She helped to mediate the citywide bus strike of March 1941. A year before, she had been active in settling the coal deliverers' strike, which reached serious proportions when many dwellings were without heat for several days in January.

Mrs. Epstein's departure from her city post on the eve of the 1942 election came about with publicly expressed bitterness on both her part and that of Mayor La Guardia. She said that she had been dismissed only a short time after having received a salary raise. Mayor La Guardia would say only that he insisted on political loyalty within his administration.

Mrs. Epstein was as much an individualist in her political affiliations as in her civic activities. Although her father, husband and brother were active and influential Democrats in New York politics, Mrs. Epstein was first a Socialist and then a member of the American Labor Party. Upon leaving the labor department office she became chairman of Americans for Democratic Action.

As for her widespread civic activities, she explained them by saying, "Anybody with the tremendous breaks I've had has certain responsibilities to others."

SERVED WAR LABOR BOARD

Mrs. Epstein was a public member of the War Labor Board, New York City district, in World War II. She was active in 1949 as one of an advisory group for the establishment of a child guidance center to combat delinquency in the West Harlem-Manhattanville area.

An enthusiastic collector of art, she was a member of the board of the Washington Gallery of Modern Art.

Mrs. Epstein was a tireless writer of letters to newspaper editors, her subjects ranging from taxes on church real estate to helpful hints for good employer-servant relations. After a series of conferences with her own servants, she agreed to reduce their work hours and regulate their days off. She described the negotiations step by step in a letter to an editor.

Mrs. Epstein, who was born here, was graduated from Goucher College in Baltimore, of which she was a trustee. She later trained as a psychiatric social worker at the New York School of Social Work. In 1938 she entered the city's employ in the Department of Welfare.

She leaves two sons, Alan S. Emory of Falls Church, Va., and Eric S. Emory of Scarsdale, N.Y.; her mother, Mrs. Bertha Popkin Steuer; a brother, State Supreme Court Justice Aron Steuer; a sister, Mrs. Alfred M. Lindau, and 11 grandchildren.

The funeral service will be private. The time and place of a memorial service will be announced.

BEWARE GREENE'S NOT SO JOLLY GIANT

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, those who are familiar with the background of the fall of Nationalist China in 1949 remember all too well the important part played by the well-coordinated propaganda machine in the United States which sold the American public the idea that the Chinese Reds were agrarian reformers.

Beginning in 1938 with the first edition of "Red Star Over China," by Edgar Snow, books and favorable book reviews espoused the cause of the Red Chinese and castigated Chiang Kai-shek. From that time until the fall of China, the American people were bombarded with works by pro-Communist oriental experts who had a virtual monopoly on the book reviewing in the most influential publications. These authors reviewed each others books favorably, while at the same time severely criticizing books not favorable to the Red Chinese cause.

A degree of responsibility certainly can be attributed to these propagandists for the fall of China in 1949 with its consequent slaughter of millions of Chinese people plus the loss of thousands of American soldiers' lives in Korea in the early 1950's, the rape of Tibet in 1959, and our present confrontation with a Red Chinese regime which has just set off its third atomic bomb.

Now, for the second time, a major propaganda effort is in full swing to again sell the American people on the merits of the Red Chinese. This time the product is the admission of Red China to the United Nations and diplomatic recognition by the United States.

The Washington Report of the American Security Council for April 4, 1966, details one such effort by Felix Greene, an apologist for Red China since 1957. The author of a book on China, and equipped with a film on that country, Greene is traveling throughout the United States, seeking to sell his product to the uninformed.

As forewarned is forearmed, I include the article, "Red China, Greene's 'China'," in the RECORD at this point:

RED CHINA, GREENE'S "CHINA"

(By De Witt Copp)

A recent Gallup poll indicated that if the American people had their say, they would vote down the admission of Red China into the United Nations by an overwhelming 3 to 1 majority. This is so despite the fact that for over a year a concentrated campaign has been going on throughout the United States not only to bring about a reversal of present policy by our Government, but also to convince the American public that we should seek to establish diplomatic relations with Peking. Some of the key proponents of this theory have recently stated their views before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. However, it is through lectures, books and films that the main thrust of the campaign is being directed.

One who is in the forefront of this campaign is Mr. Felix Greene, a British citizen with permanent residence status in the United States. For nearly a decade, Mr. Greene has been waxing diligently in Mao Tse-tung's behalf. His most recent visual effort is a 65-minute color film entitled

"China," which is presently being shown in theaters across the country. Its distributors hope to make it available for school showing in the not-too-distant future.

Many people who have seen the picture consider Felix Greene's "China" a stunning piece of Communist propaganda, the most effective yet to reach the West, yet it has succeeded in captivating viewers who are not pro-Communist and it has actually reversed the thinking of some who were previously opposed to accepting Red China.

In the film's prolog, Mr. Greene explains that his assignment was "to get as much film as possible which would show the day-to-day life of the Chinese people. We tend today to see other people too exclusively in terms of their politics and too little of them as fellow human beings."

Despite his protestations to the contrary, Mr. Greene's interest in his fellow human beings is definitely political, as an examination of the film and of the man responsible for it will quickly establish.

Greene first visited Red China in 1957, following which he produced a literary effort on the subject that was dutifully plugged in the October 1959 issue of Political Affairs, the theoretical journal of the Communist Party U.S.A.

It appears that from 1957 onward, Mr. Greene became an indefatigable champion of the People's Republic of China. He took to the boards as a lecturer and self-styled correspondent and in 1960 returned to Red China. This time he went at the invitation of the Peking government with book contract in pocket and camera in hand. He remained 4 months, in the course of which he interviewed Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. The latter interview was filmed and, when he returned, it was seen on television here and abroad.

The real fruit of Mr. Greene's trip, however, was his book, "Awakened China—The Country America Doesn't Know," published in the fall of 1961 by Doubleday. The book sold well, receiving reviews that followed set political lines. The Communist newspaper the Worker opened its review with the following appraisal: "A rare combination of excellent reporting—objective, yet human—a fine appreciation of the human miracle being wrought in the building of socialism in China is the remarkable service rendered by Felix Greene to readers of his 'Awakened China.'" Similar glowing comments were repeated throughout the Communist and pro-Communist press, even in a broadcast over Moscow radio.

Other publications were not so kind. The Los Angeles Herald-Examiner nailed "Awakened China" as "a blatant piece of propaganda which in no manner reflects facts of strife and hunger * * * and is an apology for Communist China."

In his new capacity as author and journalist Greene hit the lecture trail again not only to sell his book, but also to sell his compassionate theme: "Let's not be beastly to the Red Chinese." The essence of his apologia, dispensed from Hawaii to New York, is best summed up in his own oft-repeated words: "I know something, too, of the suffering and bloodshed that has accompanied the birth of this new China. But all this seemed trivial in the light of the accomplishments I could see around me wherever I went."

As Mr. Greene had not been in China between 1947 and 1957, one cannot help but ask how he knew of the suffering and bloodshed of which he spoke. To a man who describes himself as an "independent liberal not associated with any political movement," is it possible that genocide estimated to be in the neighborhood of 20 million persons might be a trivial matter? Is the wretched record of human misery that has been the lot of the Chinese people since 1949 also a trivial matter?

In September 1963, Felix Greene made his third pilgrimage to Communist China. This time he returned with 100,000 feet of 16-millimeter film, notes for a new book on the same theme (published in 1964), and another interview with Chou En-lai slated for sale to television networks here and in England.

Most recently, Greene's name has been in the news for his participation in anti-Vietnam lectures, radio broadcasts, and demonstrations, and as a self-appointed peace emissary to Hanoi. In his last connection, he was again in Red China.

Having examined the producer and his activities, let us now study the film itself.

As the title for the film is registered on the screen, credit is given to the Official China Film Corp. of Peking for its cooperation in the making of "China." Translated, this simply means that nothing Felix Greene photographed nor one step of the 15,000 miles he tells us he traveled in the course of production, was accomplished without the express permission and control of the Peking government. Nothing in Red China moves without such permission.

In his prolog, Mr. Greene explains that he went to China for British television and that the company that retained him asked him to avoid the political side of life. This opening statement by Greene is reflective of the lack of veracity and objectivity in the film's entire narration which he wrote. Mr. Greene did not go to Red China to make this motion picture for British television or for the company that later bought his TV material. Greene made the film independently with Peking's OK.

Film Producer Greene did not have a permit from the U.S. Treasury to buy film footage from the Red Chinese. Yet, he admits to having spent $1,500 in purchasing some film news clips from the Peking government for the purpose of adding historical perspective. This was done in violation of U.S. law. Nevertheless, the Treasury Department, on the recommendation of the State Department, gave Greene the necessary license to release the film. An official at Treasury told us they considered Greene "a responsible news gatherer" and they did not wish to become embroiled in a censorship controversy. They also chose to ignore the fact that he should have been required to register as an agent of Red China.

To the westerner who has any knowledge of or admiration for the Chinese people, this film is an illustration—no matter how politically motivated—that 15 years of communism has not broken the Chinese spirit or changed its enduring or artistic qualities. Although Mr. Greene seems unwilling to admit it, these qualities were not born with Mao Tse-tung. They have been in being for over 4,000 years, they have withstood and outlived many tyrannies, but none so alien to the Chinese character as the present one.

Variety in its review of "China" pointed out: "Although he [Greene] says he traveled over most of China, most of the film deals with two cities—Shanghai and Peking—both with heavy political overtones. The few rural or village shots could have been immediately outside either city."

In viewing these scenes of Peking and Shanghai, this reporter was reminded of some of the cities in which he has spent time, all on Taiwan. The similarity was not just in clean streets, new buildings, broad thoroughfares, but in the fact that they were Chinese cities. One essential difference between the people in the cities of Taiwan and those on the mainland had nothing to do with material progress but rather with freedom of action and freedom of opportunity. It is a difference wider and deeper than the 100 miles of water that separates Taiwan from the mainland.

Watching the rhythmic beauty of the film's Shanghai dancing troupe, I recalled the exact same Chinese pageantry and beauty observed in Taipei. The Communists did not invent the dance. Nor did they invent architecture and engineering, although the film makes much of a Peking theater which seats 10,000. It reminded this reporter of a theater seating 3,000 in which he watched a cast of 100 perform a brightly costumed historical drama. This theater was located inside a mountain on the island of Quemoy.

In the film, we visit a so-called typical commune, which means in any other language but Mr. Greene's a state-owned-and-controlled piece of land. This reporter has visited farms the length and breadth of the Republic of China [Taiwan] not owned by the state, not owned by landlords, but by the farmers themselves. There is a difference.

At the end of the film's prolog, Greene admits that others might leave Red China with a different set of impressions. Refugees this reporter has interviewed from the Matsus to Macao certainly prove the accuracy of this statement. Jules Roy, the noted French author, summed up his impressions following a long tour of mainland China thusly: "Having come to China in an ectasy of love and admiration, I left bitter and frightened." As Variety put it: "Greene * * * has tried to minimize political aspects of the film without losing the evident dramatic impact of the industrial growth of China * * *. He has been unsuccessful in both attempts."

Anyone who chooses to see and wishes to judge the validity of "China" should bear the aforementioned points in mind—and one other. Mr. Greene, for all his admiration for the Red Chinese, first attempted to sell his original film footage to our State Department for intelligence purposes. Whether they were expert film critics or just recognized a propaganda gambit, the Department wisely refused.

Under the stimulus of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, the film was brought back for reruns in three Washington theaters. If we are ever tempted to think that Americans are too wise to be taken in by pure propaganda let us be reminded of Felix Greene and "China."

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have occasions in this House in which Members pay tribute to the spirit of freedom living still in the countries of Eastern Europe. One of these nations is Rumania and we have special reason to join in acknowledgment of a special anniversary in Rumanian history.

The 10th of May, for various historic reasons, is accepted by Rumanians as their day of independence. The day will not be celebrated, however, in the Rumanian homeland. All such celebrations have been suppressed.

So it falls upon the exiles abroad, the descendants of Rumanian ancestry living abroad, the defenders of freedom generally, to make sure that the day does not pass unnoticed and ignored.

We can share, in this House, in the celebration of the 10th of May as Rumania's Day of Independence.

The cause of freedom and national self-determination is our cause wherever it may be centered. We are nationalists ourselves, we are Americans, but we know that freedom is indivisible.

The Rumanian people have been part of western society since the days of the Romans. Their language is related, as ours is, to the Latin and the affiliated Romance tongues. Their innate sense of identity with the Western World is as deep rooted as ours.

So we must pay our respects to a brave people living temporarily under an Iron Curtain government. In this manner we honor not only the Rumanians but do our duty to ourselves.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED TO TOMORROW

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order that I have for today for 30 minutes be transferred to tomorrow, May 12.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RECOVERY, INC.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Recovery, Inc., was founded in 1937, by the late Dr. Abraham A Low, of Chicago, Ill., for the purpose of enabling recovered mental patients and nervous patients to prevent relapses and chronicity by a system of self-help aftercare. Recovery is now serving a very vital and valuable need in the realm of mental health. The particular type of help involved is that of making available the Recovery type of self-help aftercare to all those who have need of it. It has as its purpose the prevention of relapses and chronicity, supplementary to that which a psychiatrist or a physician provides for a patient.

Recovery had its origin in Chicago, Ill.; today it has grown to the point where there are approximately 10,000 persons attending Recovery meetings in 548 groups, in 34 States of the United States. The organization is presently incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois, as a voluntary nonprofit corporation. However, because of the national scope and the extent of the work of Recovery in achieving better mental health, this bill is being introduced to supply a vital need to the organization in order that it may extend its beneficial assistance to an even greater extent than has heretofore been possible. The approval of a congressional charter would facilitate the carrying out of Recovery's work and assist considerably in the fulfillment of its objectives.

At the time of the incorporation of the Recovery program in Illinois, in the year 1941, the range of activities of the organization was confined to the State of Illinois, and therefore, the desirability or need for broader corporate protection did not actually present itself. Since the year 1941, however, Recovery has expanded considerably—into many other States of the Union and into Canada. At the present time, the program is operating actively in 34 States of the United States. In 10 of these States, Recovery has had to qualify individually, under the voluntary nonprofit charter provisions of the statutes. While Recovery thus has corporate protection in the larger States of the United States, that is, in those parts of the country where there are congregated a large bulk of the Recovery groups, nevertheless, at the present time, there are 38 States left in which the organization does not have corporate protection. Individual registration or qualification to do business in each of the States in which it is functioning and wants to expand is a very difficult task involving a vast amount of work and the expenditure of large sums of money that could be better put to the use of expanding the Recovery program itself.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill being introduced at this time is to enable Recovery to become a truly national project, by the recognition that will be given its work by the passage of this bill.

It is important for all of us to remember that Recovery is a voluntary association of former patients who have banded together for the purpose of improving their own health, and expanding the services of the self-help program to others who need it. A more worthy project for national charter consideration could not be thought of, in my opinion, and I am sure that anyone who has taken the time, or wishes to take the time to investigate the organization and what it is doing in the field of improving our national mental health, will certainly agree. It is for these reasons that I urge the passage of the bill and ask that it be considered promptly.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader what the schedule is for the remainder of this week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my able friend yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the distinguished minority leader has asked this question because there is some change in the program.

The sales participation bill will not be brought up tomorrow as originally planned. It will be brought up early next week.

The only remaining bill on the program for this week is the bill S. 1098, to alleviate the national freight car shortage, and it is planned to call it up and consider that bill tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the May 10, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee a policy statement regarding H.R. 14544, the Participation Sales Act of 1966, was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this statement.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966, H.R. 14544

With this bill, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has reached a new level of fiscal irresponsibility. In rapid succession we have witnessed 5 straight years of Federal budget deficits that have averaged $6.2 billion, the dwindling of our gold supply from $18 billion in 1960 to less than $14 billion, a balance of payments deficit that has averaged $3 billion a year, a rise in the budget from $81.5 billion in 1961 to an estimated $112.8 billion in 1967, the removal of silver from our coins, and a reduction in the gold that backstops our currency.

Now, under the provisions of H.R. 14544, the Johnson-Humphrey administration will be given the authority to establish a whole new system of backdoor, deficit financing. Under this system, all manner of grandiose Great Society programs can be funded by simply refinancing the billions of dollars in financial assets that the Federal Government presently owns and not one cent of this spending will be reflected in the budget.

Under the proposed Participation Sales Act, the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) will sell participations in a pool of Government-held financial assets or loans, which could total $33.1 billion. Unfortunately, the participation "sale" is a fiction. The purchaser does not acquire title to the pooled asset. All he acquires is the right to have his investment repaid with interest at the rate stated in the participation certificate. Moreover, the money acquired through these "sales" will be paid directly to the pooling agency and used to offset expenditures that normally appear in the budget.

The administrative budget for fiscal year 1967, after making several doubtful estimates of revenue, contemplates a budget deficit of only $1.8 billion. However, if the $4.2 billion of participation sales authorized by this bill are not made, the budget deficit will be $6 billion. It is interesting to note that, using the participations device, the administration could have projected a budget surplus rather than a deficit. But it chose not to do this. Apparently, it feared that such flagrant sleight-of-hand bookkeeping at this stage of the game would alert the American public to its fiscal chicanery. In the event this bill is enacted into law, there certainly is reason to believe that this type of financial gymnastics will be resorted to in the future. Thus, the day of the publicly acknowledged deficit may be a thing of the past.

The largest and most rapidly growing Federal loan program is that of the Agency for International Development (AID). It is estimated that at the close of fiscal year 1967 the outstanding volume of direct loans made in foreign countries by this Agency will be $12 billion. In its new role, FNMA could sell participations in a pool of such loans, even though in some instances AID loans bear interest as low as three-quarters of 1 percent per year. Obviously, these AID loans would be unsalable unless FNMA guaranteed the payment of principal and a reasonable rate of interest on the participations sold. AID holdings of foreign aid loans are expanding at a rate of $1.5 billion per year. Under the present system, this money is appropriated by Congress and charged against the administrative budget. If this bill is enacted, the only charge against the administrative budget would be the appropriation to make up the deficiency between the income received on the loans and the interest cost of the participations sold. Thus, instead of the real cost to the taxpayers—$1.5 billion—being charged against the budget, the charge, thanks to the provisions of this bill, would be as low as $45 million per year.

The refinancing that is required under H.R. 14544 will cost the American taxpayers an additional $5 million a year on each $1 billion of the participations sold. Thus, in the event $4.2 billion of participations are sold, there will be a cost to the taxpayer of $21 million per year. If the average maturity for participations is 10 years, the taxpayer will be gouged over $200 million in unnecessary expenses.

At the present time, the home mortgage market is in a state of turmoil and confusion. Home construction is at a dangerously low level. If the FNMA participation sales are authorized, the FHA and GI mortgages, and other home mortgages as well, will become less and less attractive to investors. In order to meet competition and obtain home mortgage financing, higher home mortgage financing costs will have to be imposed. As a result, the prospective home builders or buyers will be forced to carry an additional financial burden.

To date, FNMA has sold four issues of participations. Each time they have been sold to the same four big Wall Street investment houses. Transactions under this arrangement have totaled over $1.6 billion, and over $5 million of commissions have been paid. Under this bill, this clubby and financially advantageous arrangement could not only continue but could become even more lucrative. Certainly, at a minimum, the statute should require that these participations be sold on a competitive bid basis.

It has been claimed that the participations sale proposal contained in H.R. 14544 is an extension of the program inaugurated by the Eisenhower administration. In support of this contention, there is cited the FNMA swap in fiscal year 1960 of $311 million of low interest mortgages for $316 million of nonmarketable Treasury investment bonds owned by the public. The facts, however, reflect that these two programs are totally dissimilar, and the Eisenhower program cannot be used as justification for the Johnson-Humphrey scheme. The Eisenhower program was a straightforward financial transaction. The mortgages were sold on a competitive bid basis, paid for by bonds held by investors. Actual title to the mortgages passed to the purchasers and proceeds were carried in the budget as a budget receipt. The bonds acquired by FNMA were surrendered to Treasury for cancellation. Thereupon, Treasury reduced FNMA indebtedness to it by a like amount. Thus, contrary to the proposed scheme, there was no budget runaround in the Eisenhower program.

As incredible as it may seem, this bill was not available to committee members until one-half hour before the hearings began. Thereafter, only 2 hours of hearings were held and the Republican members of the committee were denied the right or opportunity to call any witnesses. Moreover, not one witness from the unions, farming, business, or banking was called. At the conclusion of these totally inadequate hearings, the committee was ordered into immediate executive session and in less than 30 minutes, the bill was ordered reported.

Legislative action of this type goes far beyond even that which has become the standard rubberstamp procedure for this 89th Congress. This bill would permit the Johnson-Humphrey administration to conceal huge budgetary deficits. It would invite a spending spree that would delight the emperors of old. It can only lead to financial disaster. H.R. 14544 must be defeated.

IS FAMINE THE ONLY ANSWER?

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 2, Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, made an address before the National Press Club outlining the work of the Planned Parenthood-World Population organization. His address follows:

IS FAMINE THE ONLY ANSWER?

(By William H. Draper, Jr., national chairman)

Members of the National Press Club, I have just spent 6 weeks in Europe and Africa trying to determine whether the world's rapidly growing population is in fact outdistancing the world's supply of food, and whether hunger and starvation actually lie ahead for the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

INTERNATIONAL PLANNED PARENTHOOD

First I took a look at the population side of the equation. I was in London for a week visiting the headquarters of the International Planned Parenthood Federation. Family planning organizations in 40 countries make up its membership, including as one member the Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

Sir Colville Deverell, its able secretary general, reports that women everywhere, of all races and creeds, desperately want help to avoid unwanted pregnancies. He believes that when voluntary birth control facilities become available throughout the world, and when governments give adequate support, the population problem will be well on the way to solution. To meet that objective, the federation has doubled its budget this year and hopefully will double it again next year.

At the end of World War II, the world's population was growing at the rate of 1 percent a year, higher than ever before in the world's history. Now, only 20 years later, the annual rate has more than doubled to over 2 percent, thanks largely to the export of American medical miracles such as antibiotics and DDT powder to the entire world.

But this 2-percent world rate is far from uniform. Western Europe averages three-fourths of 1 percent, and has no serious population growth problem. Japan cut its population growth rate in half in 10 years and is now only nine-tenths of 1 percent. Russia and the United States average under 1½ percent, whereas Africa's population is growing over 2 percent, Asia averages 2½ percent, and Latin America's rate is nearly 3 percent.

Broadly speaking, the industrialized countries average about 1 percent a year growth. The rest of the world averages 2½ percent and includes more than 2 of the 3 billion people on earth today. These people in the developing countries are adding nearly 60 million of the 70 million new mouths that have to be fed each year.

"A LOSING BATTLE" FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

Then to check the world's food production, I flew to Rome and visited FAO—the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which has "the official mission of increasing food production in the developing countries."

FAO has made three world food surveys and knows the facts about the production, distribution, and consumption of food throughout the world. Under Dr. B. R. Sen, its dynamic Director General who started the worldwide freedom-from-hunger campaign in 1960, it has a staff of some 3,000 at its headquarters in Rome and many more overseas. It is now preparing the first world food plan to assess the world's food surpluses and deficits, country by country, and to make specific recommendations for improvement.

FAO reports that per capita food production increased for 12 years after World War II in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. For the last 8 years, however, per capita production has been steadily slipping downward, and is simply not keeping pace with population growth. Dr. Sen speaks of "the losing battle against hunger and malnutrition in Latin America and the Far East." That is a polite way of saying that starvation may be unavoidable.

Dr. Sen has concluded that "the prospect seems dark indeed unless there is a combined worldwide effort to raise agricultural productivity in the developing countries along with determined measures to control population growth." He had the courage to ask the International Eucharistic Congress in Bombay, "Can we any more turn our faces away from the concept of family planning when the alternative is starvation and death?"

THE WHOLE WORLD IS WAITING FOR THE ANSWER

The fact is that most suitable land is already under cultivation, and that the developing countries cannot expect to increase their yield per acre fast enough to keep up with their population growth. How can a country like Brazil, for instance, possibly expect to support and feed a 3½-percent addition to its population each year when its own yield per acre of corn and wheat has actually declined during the last quarter century? Even Europe, which has increased its yield per acre by 2 percent a year would have a food problem today if its population were rising 2½ percent or 3 percent a year.

FAO's agricultural experience of the last 20 years, and particularly during the last 5 years, shows conclusively that under present conditions, without capital, without markets, without fertilizer, without modern technology, and even more important, without literate farm populations, the developing countries cannot hope or expect to increase food production much more than 1 percent a year. Unless the countries with two-thirds of the world's population substantially reduce their rate of population growth, they face certain starvation.

DROUGHT MENACES AFRICA'S FOOD SUPPLY

So I went on to Africa. In Cairo I was immediately informed that a serious wheat shortage was only beginning to be relieved now that American food-for-peace shipments of wheat have been resumed. Egypt's President Nasser has officially recognized the need for stabilizing his country's population growth by family planning, and a broad program is now getting started under the personal direction of the Prime Minister.

What finally convinced Nasser were the simple facts concerning the Aswan Dam. One of the great engineering projects of modern times, it will store the waters of the Nile nearly a thousand miles from Cairo to make possible the cultivation of 1 million additional acres of formerly arid soil, equal to one-fifth of Egypt's arable land. The project should be completed in 1970, but during the 10-year construction period, Egypt's population will have increased by one-quarter. Therefore, the tremendously increased food production made possible by the great Aswan Dam will not put any more food in the average Egyptian's mouth.

In Nairobi, the capital of Kenya, the first words I heard on the news broadcast startled me—the Voice of Kenya was asking for contributions to a national fund to alleviate the famine conditions throughout the country. A severe drought last year had ruined much of the corn crop. Delays in food imports aggravated the hunger and distress for many months. Only recently have large U.S. shipments of "food for peace" corn improved the situation.

So famine already stalks in Africa.

The medical director of Nairobi told me that birth control facilities were already available in most of the city's hospitals thanks to the Family Planning Association of Kenya, and that the Government of Kenya encourages this program. He hoped that the Government would soon undertake or help to finance a vigorously national program, so that the rest of the country could have similar facilities.

QUEEN OF BIRTH CONTROL

In Rhodesia the National Family Planning Association has been operating for the past 9 years, supporting almost singlehandedly by a devoted woman, Mrs. Stilhaus. She has contributed her time 7 days a week, her home for an office, her telephone, and even her car to travel to all parts of Rhodesia. She has been able to include family planning in 25 health centers in her own country, and has started 5 clinics in the neighboring country of Zambia. Her husband manufactures nitrogen fertilizer, so her friends say the king of fertilizer is married to the queen of birth control. She told me the family planning work with the white Europeans was self-supporting, but that she needed much more outside financial help to meet the needs of the Bantus or Africans, who outnumber whites in Rhodesia 16 to 1.

The drought that brought famine to Kenya also affected Rhodesia and its neighbors. In Zambia and Bechuanaland record numbers are on food relief. In Rhodesia the rains were so late that the crops are poor, but 2 weeks more of drought would have meant real disaster—a complete crop failure, and serious food shortages.

In general, the food situation in Africa is precarious, partly because of drought, which is increasingly common, and partly because of the primitive state of agriculture which cannot keep pace with the high and still rising population growth rates. There is general interest and support for family planning services, but except in Egypt, little government sponsorship.

SIX HUNDRED MILLION LATIN AMERICANS IN A.D. 2000?

Last year I visited Latin America several times. Most governments there now realize that the rapid population growth—an average of 3 percent for all of Latin America, and the highest rate for any area in the world—is their greatest obstacle to economic and social development. It even threatens—as Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, the former President of Colombia, has openly said "the very survival of their present-day civilization." But the governments have hesitated to take official action largely because of Catholic opposition. Even this opposition is now diminishing because of the rising rate of illegal abortion, and because of the poverty and misery so obviously resulting from the hordes of children who cannot be properly educated, clothed, or fed.

Latin America as a whole is growing less food per capita than before World War II—and the situation is deteriorating year by year. Without the huge and increasing food shipments from this country, famine would be rampant today in many parts of South America. At present growth rates, Latin America's 200 million will triple to 600 million by the year 2000—only 35 years off—and a century later Latin America alone would contain over 10 billion people—3 times the present population of the entire world. Impossible, of course. But what is going to slow down the present 3-percent rate, commonsense or starvation? Is famine the only answer?

You all know the situation in Asia, where China is spending $400 million a year—40 percent of her annual foreign exchange earnings—to buy grain, and where India is facing its most acute food crisis in modern times.

In 1964, India had the best grain crop in history—88 million tons—but still she needed 6 million tons of our wheat as foreign aid last year. Then the 1965 monsoon brought very little rain. The grain crop last November was 12 million tons short, and there are 12 million more Indians to feed than a year ago. President Johnson is increasing our grain shipments to the very limit, and the Pope has made worldwide appeals for help. But India is in serious trouble.

The Indian Government knows this and is opening a determined drive to produce more food. It also plans to spend over $200 million on birth control in the next 5 years.

I would sum up the world problem as follows: Every year 1 billion people in the industrialized countries are increasing their population 1 percent and their food 2 percent. Every year the 2 billion people in the developing countries are increasing their population 2½ percent and their food less than 1 percent.

As a whole, the world is increasing its population 2 percent and its food 1 percent. This means that the world is falling behind 1 percent a year—or, to put it another way, food production is falling behind minimum needs by 30 million people more each year. This is why disaster for the human race lies just ahead.

What can be done? What should be done? And who should do it?

Shipping our "food for peace" wheat and corn and rice is no solution. Even if we were willing to pay the cost, we cannot take on the feeding of 30 million more people each year.

The developing countries must solve their own population and food problems. Otherwise nature will take over and starvation will restore the balance between births and deaths.

But we and many others can help them understand that only massive birth control and higher food yields per acre can ever feed them adequately.

THREE MEN CAN ACT

There are today three men who together have it in their power to bring about a satisfactory world solution, Pope Paul VI, President Johnson, and U.N. Secretary U Thant.

The first of these is the Pope in Rome. He has realized the danger of the present population dilemma to the world as a whole and to his half billion Catholic communicants, more than half in Latin America and other developing countries. His special commission on birth control is meeting now in Rome. He has urged it to speed up its work and come quickly to a conclusion. Pope Paul's moral influence is so great with non-Catholics and Catholics alike, that a redefinition of the church's position would have tremendous impact throughout the entire world. It would hasten greatly the day when all men could join at the banquet of life, and, no longer hungry, give greater thought to their moral and mental development.

Another man with great influence is our President, who has already taken the lead in recognizing that all lands including our own must deal with the multiplying problems of their multiplying populations. He said in January, "The hungry world cannot be fed until and unless the growth in its resources and the growth in its population come into balance."

In 1962, I went to Brazil on a mission for President Kennedy, to study the acute economic and political problems brought on by President Goulart's regime. At that time, the danger of a Communist takeover in Brazil was very real. When I came back and reported to President Kennedy, I also told him about the serious population problem in northeast Brazil, where 25 million people in nine states had average incomes of about $100 a year and where economic resources were growing about 1 percent a year and population was growing 3½ percent. After discussing this hopeless situation, and the world population problem as well, the President suddenly asked me "Why doesn't the Ford Foundation make the population problem its top priority?" Later, he asked that same question of its chairman, and last year the Ford Foundation report, and its huge grants as well, concentrated on population as never before.

So, to paraphrase President Kennedy's words I suggest, quite respectfully, and fully realizing the many other serious problems our Government faces each day, that President Johnson make the stabilization of world population one of his administration's top priorities.

FANFARE AND DRAMATICS FOR THE POPULATION CRISIS

Suppose, first, President Johnson and Secretary Rusk ask every one of our ambassadors all over the world to discuss the world population problem seriously with the head of every other government, as they recently were asked to explain our aims in South Vietnam, and with the same fanfare and dramatics.

Suppose, second, they suggest that all countries with a population problem try to reduce their rate of growth annually, by one-tenth of 1 percent as the United States has done for the last 5 years. The result could be a drop in a decade of nearly 1 percent for the entire world.

And suppose, third, that in the same conversation, our ambassadors stress the world's food deficit and suggest that every country, developed and underdeveloped alike, should aim to accelerate its present rate of increase in food production by at least one-tenth of 1 percent a year.

And suppose, fourth, that each ambassador offer our technical assistance, and for the poorer countries our financial assistance as well, to help them solve both problems.

This I believe is a practical and possible program. If our Government would propose it, I believe that the governments of the world generally would back it.

The time has come for a great worldwide crusade by all the governments and by all the people.

If the rate of increase for food goes up one-tenth of 1 percent a year, and for population goes down one-tenth of 1 percent a year, then food and population would be brought back into balance in only 5 years' time. In 10 years the present 1-to-2 ratio would have been reversed—food production would be increasing 2 percent and population growing only 1 percent. Not only would starvation be averted, but in 25 years most of the world's nutrition problems would be solved.

Perhaps I am too optimistic. Perhaps it would take longer. But only in that direction—more food, less people—is there hope for the developing countries, and for the human race.

The third individual who has it in his power to promote a satisfactory solution is U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations. For the first time last year the United Nations sent a technical mission on birth control to India—under Sir Colville Deverell who heads International Planned Parenthood. For the first time last year the United Nations offered to extend technical help in this field to their member nations.

So the way is now cleared for a major effort by this great world body to deal with the world's greatest problem. If unsolved, hunger could become the greatest threat to world peace. Hungry men will fight. Hungry nations will make war.

NEED FOR U.N. POPULATION AGENCY

The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization already exists under Dr. Sen. What is needed is a great sister organization as part of the United Nations family to deal exclusively with the world population problem, just as WHO deals with the world health problem.

So I respectfully suggest to U Thant, and I would hope our Government would back some such proposal, that his Population Commission, so far dealing only with the statistics of world population, become an action arm of the United Nations be greatly expanded, and be authorized to draw up a world population program and to offer all possible assistance to carry it out. It should work in close cooperation with FAO, and with all member governments. It should set specific goals and strive to help the nations of the world achieve them in stated periods of time. That is my fifth and most important recommendation.

The Swedish Government has already urged the United Nations to deal more actively with this problem. Every government with a serious population problem could be expected to cooperate. Multilateral aid and multilateral advice on a problem as delicate as this one would probably be much more readily accepted than bilateral aid and bilateral advice, no matter how well intentioned.

In conclusion I can do no better than to quote Dr. Sen's words to the Population Commission of the United Nations:

"The next 35 years will be a most critical period in man's history. Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we will face disaster of unprecedented magnitude. I myself feel optimistic that mankind will not stand aloof from the drama of life and death that is unfolding before our eyes but will come forward to achieve that miracle of organized will which seems so distant today. This indeed must happen if freedom and dignity are to survive."

No, I would add, famine is not the only answer. Because I too believe that man can rise to meet this challenge, as he has so many times throughout history. But the worldwide crusade must begin soon, or it will be too late for millions of human beings now alive.

SENATOR JORDAN WARNS OF DRIFT TOWARD GOVERNMENT BY INFORMAL CONTROLS

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Senator Len B. Jordan, of Idaho, who serves with me on the Joint Economic Committee, recently issued a timely warning against the drift toward the use of Government's vast powers to influence private economic decisionmaking on an informal or voluntary basis. His remarks on the new and ominous dimensions of Federal economic power appear in the January–March issue of the General Electric Forum.

Senator Jordan makes a persuasive case against the administration's policy of putting the burden on the private sector for preventing an inflation which is largely the result of administration policies to stimulate the economy. He recommends that instead of simply exhorting the private sector to act responsibly Government should impose guidelines on itself for the responsible use of its fiscal and monetary policies.

Not only will the increased reliance by the administration on a network of voluntary controls over private behavior not work but, as Senator Jordan points out, it will weaken the real sources of growth in our economy while eroding economic freedom.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the article referred to in the Record at this point:

No one any longer denies that government has a constructive role to play in influencing the Nation's economy. The Employment Act of 1946 established the obligation of Government to promote conditions leading to a rate of growth that provides full employment without inflation.

Even without the use of its regulatory authority or its discretionary weapons of fiscal and monetary policy, Government would have a powerful impact on the economy. Federal purchases of goods and services alone remove about 10 percent of the annual production of goods and services from the marketplace. On the revenue side, both the level and structure of Federal taxes profoundly influence private economic decisionmaking.

It is obvious that even in these normal and accepted activities, government cannot operate in a vacuum. It must always formulate its policies in such a way as to avoid an adverse impact on the domestic economy and where possible provide a countercyclical force that will blunt inflationary expansions and deflationary contractions in economic activity.

NEW GOVERNMENT ROLE

My concern is not with the accepted uses of fiscal and monetary policies or of regulatory authority. What bothers me is the new dimension which the economic activity of the Federal Government is now taking. Both the scope and nature of the Government's involvement in the Nation's economy have changed significantly in the past 5 years. Not only does the Government play a larger role; it also operates more directly on the general level of economic activity as well as on selected areas of private economic decisionmaking. To a large extent these activities are carried on without the sanction of law.

TOWARD MORE GOVERNMENT POWER

Consider for a moment what has been happening in recent years. We have been witnessing a gradual drift toward a system in which Government uses its vast powers, often only selectively, to influence private economic decisionmaking in conformity with the Government's wishes. Business and labor have been exhorted repeatedly to follow responsible policies. Exhortation has been accompanied by the subtle threat that noncooperation would call forth more direct and disagreeable controls.

The first step toward Government's new role was the enunciation of wage-price guidelines in 1962. In the same year, the Government moved against the steel industry, forcing it to rescind a price increase, and in the process shaking business confidence to the extent that the stock market plummeted and economic activity leveled off for the rest of the year.

Meanwhile, intervention in major collective bargaining situations had become commonplace. In the circle of Presidential power and prestige, Government began virtually to dictate settlements to the parties in dispute.

Banks also came under Government pressure. In 1964, the Government forced banks outside New York City to rescind a proposed increase in the prime rate on business loans. The most recent manifestation of the new economic policy occurred when the Government dipped into its aluminum and copper stockpiles to prevent what it considered inflationary price increases in those commodities.

International investment and lending has also been subjected to economic "voluntarism." Guidelines have been established for bank loans and direct investment abroad, in effect creating partial exchange control over the dollar. Announced just a year ago, these guidelines have already been tightened up, with more stringent controls promised for the future if the present program does not work.

"GUIDELINES" FOR GOVERNMENT?

What seems to be absent in all of this is an awareness of the Government's own contribution to creating economic problems, whether inflationary excesses or heavy capital outflows. Instead of just exhorting the private sector to act responsibly, the Government should establish guidelines for responsible behavior in framing its own fiscal and monetary policies. Certainly appeals to the private sector would be more convincing and better received if Government were more willing to share the burden by readily adjusting its own policies to changing economic conditions.

In the short run, voluntarism and other ad hoc policies fail to solve the problems at which they are directed. The reason is simple. They deal only with symptoms, not basic causes. When these policies fail to work, Government's answer is new controls and restrictions. Witness what has already happened in the area of regulation of foreign lending and investment by U.S. businesses and banks.

ENGINE OF ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Also in the short run, these policies could kill our present expansion. Business confidence is the engine of our economic progress. Uncertainty about the widening role of Government involvement in private decisionmaking could very well shake that confidence and lead to a slackening off of investment, just as the steel episode did in 1962.

Over the longer run I believe that we are running even more serious risks in following policies of ad hoc economic interventionism. The result is likely to be a gradual, almost imperceptible weakening of our market system through the invalidation of price as an indication of the size of the demand for goods and services and of the costs incurred in producing them.

CURRENT CONGRESSIONAL FOCUS

Events of the past few months are beginning to focus attention on the implications of certain Government actions. The debate and discussion which I think the country needs on the direction in which we have been moving is likely to occur in the current session of Congress.

We are becoming more aware of the problems and conflicts of priorities involved in an economy at virtually full employment, which is experiencing new demands on its output because of the war in Vietnam and a host of new domestic spending programs.

I think it is becoming clear that exhortation and voluntarism cannot work when basic inflationary forces are at work in the economy. The policies of ad hoc interventionism appeared to work for awhile only because the economy still had a margin of slack in its labor force and plant capacity. With that inflationary buffer disappearing the futility and longrun danger of such policies are now being exposed.

Where should we go from here? There are some who will say that if voluntary controls will not work, then there should be compulsory wage and price controls. We will hear voices raised to claim that reduction in spending on domestic programs is impossible, that tax increases are politically unpalatable, that further tightening of money is inequitable and that, therefore, nothing remains but direct controls.

Without doubt, the administration and the Congress will be faced with difficult policy choices in the coming months. But unless the demands of the Vietnam war mount beyond anything now foreseen, it would be inadvisable to resort to direct controls. Conditions now indicate, however, that we should rely on other weapons in our economic arsenal.

OTHER ECONOMIC WEAPONS

The recent action by the Federal Reserve Board in raising the discount rate is one step in the direction of restraint. There will be little dissent to the view that our current situation also requires a high degree of discipline in Federal spending. Spending priorities should be established to insure adequate support for our efforts in Vietnam and to reexamine or postpone low-priority programs, if necessary, to relieve inflationary pressures and maintain fiscal integrity.

Finally, as part of the debate on fiscal and monetary policies that will occur in the coming months, we must examine closely the wisdom of resorting to ad hoc interventionism under any economic conditions. For my part, I feel that where Government action to influence the economy is required, we do better to rely on the tried and proven general policy instruments. Not only is their impact greater, but they are less discriminatory and do less violence to the forces of growth and change in the economy. The policy of ad hoc interventionism weakens the real sources of growth in our economy, which lie in the private sector. It also diminishes economic freedom.

MISUSE OF FARM POLICY TO MANIPULATE PRICES

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have risen many times in recent months to protest the manner in which the Secretary of Agriculture has consistently victimized the farmer with his price manipulations.

Today in the May 11 issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation report which is released monthly by the Department, there is yet another example of the misuse of farm policy to manipulate prices.

For the past several months, the livestock farmers have enjoyed the first profitable returns on their labor in many years. Meat prices have at last reached a level commensurate with the return that should be expected from any industry, and prices are some 10 percent above the prices received by livestock farmers 15 years ago.

The Department of Agriculture in its frenzied attempt to please the consumer instead of the farmer, has not been idle as meat prices rose to the current fair level. It has been busy encouraging large increases in meat production by holding down the price of corn and other feed grains.

Today's issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation reports, under the heading "Substantial Rise in Hog Slaughter Next Fall; Prices Lower," proudly indicated that—

> The hog-corn price ratio (farm price basis) was 3.9 in January, 23.7 in February, and 21.4 in March. These were the highest monthly ratios of record.

In other words, the Department is confident that by "bribing" livestock farmers with low feed grain costs, it can bring down the price of meat, both to the farmer and to the consumer. This will no doubt bring huzzahs from the harried housewives who have seen so many prices rise in recent months, but it will serve to increase the instability that now exists in the entire agricultural economy.

This is a patent example of the administration's backward fight against inflation. Still refusing to cut back at the real source of inflation—Federal deficit spending—the administration now seeks to bring down an agricultural price that has taken 15 years to regain its 1950 level. This move will have no effect on any other retail items that are straining the housewive's purse strings, but will add yet another chapter to the sad spectacle of farm failures that have swept the Nation since 1960.

KREMLIN CURTAILS CHURCH ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on April 7 I introduced House Resolution 817 to create a Select Committee on Human Rights and Peaceful World Order. At that time I pointed out several highly reliable studies by congressional committees and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress which fully document and expose the continued religious and racial discrimination in Soviet Russia and other countries under Soviet domination.

It is foolish for us to think that the Soviet Union has undergone any sort of basic policy change in regard to allowing her own citizens to enjoy the freedom of worship which is so highly treasured in the free world. Yet today we find several prominent and not-so-prominent leaders in our State Department and elsewhere who contend that we should do everything within our power to cooperate with the Soviet Union on many different fronts. The present emphasis on increased trade with Russia and her satellite nations is the prime example of this campaign.

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced House Resolution 817, I stressed the fact that such a select House committee would serve as an invaluable aid in our Nation's quest for a true world peace through the international observance and respect for the human rights bestowed by an all just God on all men. Yet we find ourselves today trying to live in so-called peaceful coexistence with a country which pays only lipservice to so many of the freedoms which we in America are so often apt to take for granted. It would be a strange form of coexistence in which we would find ourselves with the Soviet Empire should this campaign succeed.

One observation appearing in the introduction to part 1 of "The Church and State Under Communism—the U.S.S.R.," a series of reports prepared by the Law Library of the Library of Congress for the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, is especially pertinent:

> It is appropriate that the first study should deal with the status of religion in the Soviet Union because the structure established by the Soviet regime has set the pattern, with minor variations, for the many Communist regimes since established in various parts of the world.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the May 7 edition of the Christian Science Monitor dealing with state control of religious activities within the Soviet Union. The article explains the clear hypocrisy which is the order of the day when it comes to the Soviet Government's complete dominance over her citizens' religious activities.

As recently as March of this year the Soviet Union added higher penalty clauses to that section of her criminal code dealing with certain religious infractions. The article points out that—

> Other prescriptions added to the code severely punish the teaching of religion to minors or the refusal to work on certain days for religious reasons.

I am sure that my colleagues will find this article to be most illuminating in regard to the continued efforts of the Soviet Union to stifle the freedoms of her own citizens. In this light, it would be mere folly to expect any true peace and order in a world of coexistence unless we obtain such an order at the cost and sacrifice of valued freedoms. With this in mind, I offer the article, "Kremlin Curtails Church Activities," for inclusion in the RECORD.

FIRST HIT: KREMLIN CURTAILS CHURCH ACTIVITIES

(By Paul Wohl)

First to feel the Kremlin's return to a former political line were the religious communities.

Ten days before the opening of the 23d Party Congress, the Russian Soviet Republic issued a decree sharply curtailing traditional church activities and church finances.

There can be no more collections inside or outside the churches, says this decree. No "written" matter of any kind—tracts, letters, religious information or other documents relating to the cult—are allowed to be distributed.

The forming of groups of believers, religious processions, and other religious manifestations, which might "disturb" the public order, are strictly forbidden.

Hidden away in the legislative bulletin of the Russian Supreme Soviet, this decree became known only on the eve of the Orthodox Easter. Its purpose obviously was to hit the believers and their clergy where it hurt most.

Easter always has been a time of processions for orthodox believers: solemn processions of the clergy leading their congregation around the church building "in search of the body of Christ" and informal processions of groups of believers headed for home with burning candles and greeting each other with the words "Christ is risen," to which other believers answer: "In truth, he is risen."

PROCESSION ATTACKED BY MOB

In Moscow, Patriarch Alexius, head of the Orthodox Church, was allowed to lead an Eastern procession of many thousands of believers around the cathedral.

But the Communist youth organization had mobilized a larger crowd, which shouted curses and spat at the believers, who had to be protected from the masses by mounted police and volunteer militia.

Believers who tried to walk home with their candles alight were mobbed, and their candles blown out or thrown to the ground.

In most provincial cities, no processions at all could be held.

The Russian Republic's decree, dated March 18, probably will be enacted by other republics. It gives a new twist to the section of the penal code dealing with the church.

Hitherto any violation of the prescriptions of this section was punished with 6 months in a labor camp for reeducation and with a fine of 50 rubles ($55 at the official rate, but more than half the monthly money earnings of an industrial worker). Now a new clause has been added, punishing recidivists with 3 years in jail.

Other prescriptions added to the code severely punish the teaching of religion to minors or the refusal to work on certain days for religious reasons.

RELIGIOUS INFLUENCE GROWING

The decree marks the end of a recently opened dialog between church and state; it also marks a turning point in the internal tug-of-war between Communist Party reformers and hard liners. For the time being the party conservatives have won out.

That religious prejudices had become a serious matter for the party could be seen from the many references to survivals of the past at the Republican Party congresses and Russian provincial conferences, which preceded the Soviet party congress. At some of these gatherings, the growing influence of religion was openly admitted.

In veiled form, the significance of religiously inspired spirituality has begun to find expression in Soviet literature. Only a few months ago a young poet in a small prose book referred to a famous 12th century ikon of the "Mother of God" as the deepest expression of the Russian spiritual idea.

The book was published in fewer than 10,000 copies, but the astonishing thing was that it could be published at all.

On December 15, two priests of the Moscow diocese, Fathers Echlimann and Yakunin, sent Soviet President Nikolai V. Podgorny, a juridical memorandum about the closing of thousands of churches and houses of prayer and other restrictive measures during the last 3 years of the Khrushchev era of subjectivism and voluntarism. These measures had been taken in violation of the law, claimed the authors of the memorandum, quoting pertinent articles of the constitution and of the code.

CHURCH COUNCIL SOUGHT

One of the measures the two priests contested was an administrative order that the baptism of children had to be registered in the internal passport, which all Soviets over 16 must carry. Yet the basic law on the separation of church and state rules that "no official documents are allowed to contain a reference to a person's religion."

Orders forbidding priests to perform religious ceremonies in homes or in cemeteries and barring children from going to church also were shown to violate the law.

Another memorandum, supported by several bishops, was addressed to the patriarch, protesting against the tacit support of antireligious propaganda by servile church authorities. This second memorandum demanded the calling of a national church council for the renewal of the church.

Both documents became known in Moscow and offered further evidence of the growing strength of religious thought.

The response of the party was ambivalent. One group admitted that religion was a cultural phenomenon which would continue for a long time and could not be fought with primitive arguments.

This view was expressed at the Byelorussian party congress by the new alternate member of the Politburo Piotr Masherov. President Podgorny also seems to lean in this direction.

According to this group, the right policy for the party would be to give deeper meaning and solemnity to civic ceremonies (a suggestion already made by Leon Trotsky more than 40 years ago) and to engage a high level dialog with religion.

The other group, led by second party secretary Mikhail A. Suslov, favors restrictive measures. The Soviet decree of March 18, shows that at present the latter tendency prevails.

RENT SUBSIDY PROGRAM

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives in its wisdom on May 10 provided funds for fiscal 1967 for the important rent subsidy program. In closing debate on the issue, I cited figures that point up the need for adequate housing in my own area of New Orleans. I obtained these figures from an excellent article written for the Clarion-Herald, the newspaper published for the archdiocese of New Orleans. The article was written by the Reverend Eugene P. McManus, S.S.J., who is one of the archdiocesan leaders in a new housing program in my area.

Father McManus has written a perceptive explanation of the new rent subsidy program, showing by using New Orleans figures, how the program is desperately needed and how it will work.

I believe it bears reading by all:

RENT SUBSIDY PLAN IS ANSWER TO NEED

(By Rev. Eugene P. McManus, S.S.J.)

Although New Orleans is a quaint city with a warmth that charms visitors and residents alike, an alarming number of its citizens are forced to live in conditions of grim hardship. The housing situation in New Orleans approaches the dimensions of a local disaster. Even before Hurricane Betsy, one-fourth of the dwelling units in our city were dilapidated and clearly unfit to use in raising a family. A total of 23,500 of these homes had no hot water, and 18,000 had no private flush toilets.

A national housing expert, Howard W. Hallman, studied New Orleans early this year. In a report to the mayor, he summarized his findings in a statement which is supported by comparative statistics. "I have not seen so much bad housing in any other American city I have visited."

The present upward surge in the economy seems unable to alleviate the housing situation. Fourteen percent of our white families and 51 percent of our Negro families have incomes below the $3,000 poverty level. Moreover, the scarcity of usable land has inflated the real estate market so that most housing now under construction is priced beyond the purchasing power of 80 percent of our people.

The poor cannot escape. They are unable to afford new housing, and they are forced to compete at inflated prices for slum housing. Nor is there any hope for those who are factually, if not technically poor, those who stand in the twilight zone between public housing income limits on the one hand and the price of decent housing in the private market on the other.

At present the waiting list for public housing projects has already reached 20,000 and it is still growing. Even if all the poor could be housed in public housing projects, social experts believe that these projects do not really solve the problem of poverty.

Although our present Congress will appropriate $280 million for the alleviation of poverty through public housing, it is fairly well agreed by many experts that projects do in practice tend to perpetuate the poverty class. Like slums, they concentrate in one neighborhood a high density of low fulfillment.

Since a low income is a necessary requirement for admittance, we should not be surprised to find a high concentration of low education, minimal skills, and low horizons of hope. Many are welfare cases, many have been impoverished by sickness, and many, feeling they have been shortchanged by society, have understandably antisocial attitudes. Children who are born into such a world find it hard to escape.

We are then faced with a dilemma. On the private housing market, the high cost of land makes it impossible for a private builder to provide housing for the poor even on an equitable basis. Moreover, the housing needs of the poor are frequently exploited in high rents for overcrowded substandard dwellings.

On the other hand, attempts at providing housing for the poor in public housing projects have thus far produced many negative effects, creating pockets of poverty, low education, low ambition, high crime, and sickness. Worst of all, these attempts at housing the poor seem to be perpetuating the very conditions they were designed to alleviate.

Is there an answer to this dilemma? Many people, in public housing, in church work, and in social work, have hopes that the new Rent Subsidy Act of 1966 will provide the answer.

Like the public housing program, it does recognize the obligation of society, both from moral conviction and from enlightened self-interest, to provide a remedy for the housing problems of the poor. But the Rent Subsidy Act seeks to avoid the negative effects of public housing. President Johnson called this program "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city."

This program makes it possible for private enterprise to provide housing for low income families. To be eligible for rent subsidy, the family or individual must have an income equivalent to that required for admission to public housing and in addition must qualify as one of the following:

1. Has had or will have his present housing replaced by Government action.
2. Is 62 years of age or older.
3. Is physically handicapped.
4. Now lives in substandard housing.
5. Occupies or did occupy living units destroyed or extensively damaged by natural disaster.

The housing into which such persons can be moved can be any type of residential structure: single houses, row houses, or multifamily dwelling units. The housing can be new or rehabilitated. These houses need not be herded into projects, but can be interspersed throughout the city.

The sponsors of such buildings can be private, nonprofit organizations such as church groups, limited dividend mortgagors or cooperative housing corporations.

Part of the units in a rent supplement project can be occupied by tenants who would like quality housing at a fair price but do not qualify for rent subsidy. Such tenants would pay the full market rent.

Those tenants who do qualify for rent subsidy would be required to pay 25 percent of their income for rent. The difference between this and the full market rent for that dwelling would be subsidized by the Federal Government. As the income of the tenant improved, the amount of his subsidy would decrease, but he would not be required to leave when his income reached a level at which subsidy ceased.

The law also provides that tenants who have hope for a future increase in salary may pay rent with an option to purchase the home. Such a tenant will pay 25 percent of his income for rent, just as other tenants. When he has sufficient resources and qualifies for homeownership by FHA standards, he may take over ownership of the unit.

The Rent Subsidy Act thus provides advantages not available in public housing:

1. Management by private enterprise.
2. Absorption of the poor into the social mainstream.
3. Fair priced housing for those beyond the limits of public housing who are now unable to buy or rent decent accommodations in an inflated slum market.
4. Dispersion of the hopeless and normless from highly compressed pockets of poverty where antisocial attitudes are created and dangerously reinforced.
5. A chance for upward mobility by permitting a salary increase without loss of decent housing.
6. An opportunity for the poor to make an economic breakthrough in private home ownership.

No doubt some people will be alarmed by outright rent supplements and consider them another manifestation of galloping socialism. Such persons should recognize that the Federal Government has been indirectly subsidizing rent for many years through public housing projects. It has spent millions (280 million this year) on a program that has many negative results.

BILL TO PROVIDE A FEDERAL TAX CREDIT FOR STATE INCOME TAX PAYMENTS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, Representative ULLMAN and I are introducing bills today which hold promise of strengthening the revenue position of the States by removing obstacles to more effective State use of the personal income tax. This objective can be realized if Congress will give Federal income taxpayers a more generous writeoff for their State income tax payments through a tax credit.

There are three good reasons why the Congress should help to strengthen State income taxes.

The first is the overriding fiscal problem of the States, their need for additional revenue and especially for a tax source that responds more than proportionately to economic growth. The personal income tax has a greater capability for producing an accelerating amount of revenue in response to rising economic activity than any other tax now in use. It is estimated that without any change in tax rates, State individual income tax collections automatically increase about 16 percent for every 10 percent increase in gross national product. The principal State and local revenue producers—general retail sales and property taxes—increase only in proportion to GNP. But States now derive little benefit from the growth potential of the income tax because they use it so ineffectively that only 15 percent of their revenue comes from it.

The greater elasticity of the personal income tax takes on critical importance because State and local expenditure since World War II have been growing at the rate of about 8 percent per year; in contrast, the annual gross national product growth rate has averaged about 5 percent.

Second, the personal income tax provides the most effective way for exempting the disadvantaged members in American society—the poor—from some of the growing burden of State and local taxes. This fact takes on increasing significance as national policy objectives encompassed in the antipoverty program gain dominance, as the significance of the State and local sector in total Government operations increases, and as the weight of national payroll taxes to finance social security programs grows heavier.

Third, a greater reliance on the personal income tax would contribute to improving the fairness of State and local taxation also by permitting a larger share of the tax burden to be adjusted to the size of the family through an exemption system—a criterion typically disregarded by the property tax and violated by the sales tax. The unique ability of the income tax to treat individuals and households with equal income equally grows in importance as the margin between people's incomes and their consumer expenditures widens and as family homesteads become less and less indicative of taxpaying ability.

Despite the impressive case that can be made for greater State use of the personal income tax, one-third of the States, including some of the most industrialized high-income sections of the country, do not tax personal incomes at all and another third tax them at relatively low effective rates. In contrast, the National Government obtains over $50 billion, more than half of its tax revenue, from this source. Of the American people's annual tax payments on their personal incomes, 93 percent is to the Federal Government, only 7 percent to States, and local governments.

In its report, "Federal-State Coordination of Personal Income Taxes" the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations concluded that heavy Federal use of the personal income tax, especially since 1940, stands out as the single most important deterrent to its expanded use by the States. It has enabled the opponents of State income taxation to win the day with the argument that the Federal Government has effectively preempted this tax; and forced State and local governments to place primary reliance on the regressive and less elastic consumption and property taxes. It is significant to note that not a single State adopted a personal income tax between 1937 and 1960, when 12 States adopted general sales taxes. Although three new State income taxes have been added since 1960, approximately 95 percent of the nearly $4 billion currently collected from this source goes to those jurisdictions that enacted it prior to 1938—over a quarter of a century ago. In contrast, only 68 percent of general sales tax revenue is collected by States that adopted this tax before 1938.

Thus, the Advisory Commission reasoned that by providing Federal income taxpayers a more liberal writeoff of their State and local income tax payments, it should be possible to neutralize or offset the deterrent effect which heavy Federal use of this revenue source has had on the State personal income tax movement. A more liberal writeoff of State income tax payments will recognize the fiscal facts of life—that the National Government makes very intensive use of the income tax but taxes consumer expenditures only lightly and property not at all—thus deterring State taxation of personal income.

Specifically, the proposed legislation would facilitate greater State use of the personal income tax by amending the Internal Revenue Code to give Federal income taxpayers an option to either, first, continue itemizing their income tax payments to State and local governments, or second, claim 40 percent of such payments as a credit against their Federal income tax liability. The credit would be in addition to the standard deduction.

Clearly, a Federal credit for State income taxes would involve a continuing revenue cost to the U.S. Treasury, its amount depending upon its terms and upon the response of State legislatures. The range of probable costs can be estimated, however, within reasonably narrow limits and, in my judgment, would be well justified in the national interest.

Since the Federal Government already sustains a heavy revenue loss under the present deductibility system—every dollar of income tax collected by the States results in about a 24-cent reduction in Federal income tax liability—the initial cost of an optional credit plan would be less than is generally presumed. It is estimated that in terms of revenue foregone by the U.S. Treasury the cost of the present system of itemizing State income tax payments will reach about $1.1 billion by fiscal year 1967. The comparable revenue cost of an optional 40 percent credit for the same year would be about $1.8 billion. Thus, the additional 1967 cost attributable to the credit would be approximately $700 million.

On the assumption that a partial credit for State income tax payments will encourage most States to make more intensive use of this tax, the Federal loss will be more than offset by State revenue gain. Thus, for every additional income tax dollar collected by the States, the Federal loss in terms of revenue foregone would be approximately 40 cents. This would be a high rate of return for Federal revenue foregone and therefore an efficient investment in our federal system of government.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the proposed Federal credit for State and local income tax payments will serve four national policy objectives. First, greater State use of the personal income tax will exempt the most disadvantaged members in American society—the poor—from some of the growing burden of regressive State and local taxes.

This fact takes on increasing importance as the administration's objectives encompassed in the antipoverty program are given increased emphasis. Second, States in particular will be placed in a better financial position to underwrite their share of the Great Society costs. Third, more widespread use of income taxes will reduce interstate tax differentials and help mute tax competition among the States. And, lastly, by strengthening the fiscal capability of the States, a Federal tax credit will bolster the federal system of government.

For these reasons, we commend our bills to the favorable consideration of my colleagues.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO COLLECT THE PERSONAL INCOME TAXES OF A STATE REQUESTING SUCH ASSISTANCE

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon, Representative ULLMAN, and I are introducing bills to enable the Internal Revenue Service to help a State collect its personal income tax if mutually satisfactory arrangements can be worked out.

The Members of this House have no doubt been at a loss for a meaningful answer when asked by constituents why is it necessary to file both a Federal and a State income tax return—why can't something be worked out so that a single return can satisfy both Federal and State needs?

This question takes on increasing significance because there are now 20 to 25 million families and individuals paying both Federal and State income taxes.

The question is timely, too, because growing revenue pressures are forcing the nonincome tax States to consider seriously the adoption of this revenue instrument. In order to minimize taxpayer resistance to the adoption of a personal income tax, State legislators are receptive to proposals designed to hold taxpayer inconvenience to the irreducible minimum. State income tax laws enacted since World War II have all closely followed the Federal pattern. Moreover, a State contemplating the enactment of a personal income tax is not encumbered by tax collection machinery and the consequent vested interest in a dual collection system.

Our bills would authorize the Internal Revenue Service to respond constructively to a State request for collection help. The type of assistance could range from the minimal kind—using the Federal system for withholding of income at the source to a complete collection service including arithmetic verification of the taxpayer's return and even audit by the Internal Revenue Service.

Because of the political ramifications and administrative problems involved in Federal collection of State income taxes, any experimentation in this field would of necessity have to be on an optional basis. State political leaders would have to weigh the benefits to be derived—greater taxpayer convenience, administrative simplification, improved compliance—against the loss of States' control over their collection system. By the same token, the Internal Revenue Service would want to retain its freedom to prescribe the conditions necessary to enable it to undertake such an activity without handicap to its own job.

It is our expectation that experience with one or two cases would provide a basis for testing the practicality of the recommended joint collection system for Federal and State personal income taxes—a proposal recently made by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its report "Federal-State Coordination of Personal Income Taxes." Only in this way can we ever establish whether this dream of the tax coordinators and taxpayers can become a practical reality.

For these reasons, we commend our bills to the favorable consideration of my colleagues.

CIGARETTE TAXES

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, most of our States today are wrestling with problems of the increased cost of government and are constantly seeking new ways to increase State revenues and broaden tax bases. In a number of States, taxes on cigarettes provide a substantial source of income. However, it has become clear recently that widespread smuggling operations are making significant inroads into this source of tax revenue.

In 1949, Congress passed the Jenkins Act which established some restrictions on shipping cigarettes into cigarette-taxing States, but it left loopholes through which today's cigarette smugglers are managing to cheat States out of millions of dollars in tax money without violating Federal law. Maryland's State comptroller has estimated that Maryland may be losing a half a million dollars a year in this manner.

Today I am introducing legislation which will provide assistance to the States in collecting cigarette taxes by closing these loopholes in the Jenkins Act, thereby enabling the Department of Justice to prosecute the cigarette "bootleggers" in many instances where they are not now authorized to do so.

Very simply, the legislation which I am introducing today will make it unlawful for an individual to transport more than 2,000 cigarettes, the equivalent of 10 cartons, through or into a State unless he has in his possession invoices, bills of sale, or delivery tickets showing the name and address of the original seller, of the current owner, and of the person to whom the cigarettes will be delivered.

My bill differs slightly from legislation dealing with this problem which has been introduced by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] and others.

First, it establishes the minimum number of cigarettes to which the legislation would apply at 2,000 rather than at 5,000—or 25 cartons. It seemed to me that a 25-carton minimum was rather too permissive and might well have left the smugglers a new way to evade the law.

And second, it includes language providing concurrent jurisdiction so that the Federal laws do not supersede State laws regulating the interstate transportation of cigarettes.

SOUTH VIETNAM ELECTIONS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Secretary Dean Rusk has reinforced this Nation's determination to abide by the principle of self-determination with respect to the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam, despite the ambiguous reported statements of Prime Minister Ky which his own colleagues found necessary to censor.

After the optimistic declarations of the Honolulu Conference in February about the intentions of the South Vietnamese Government to implement reforms and free elections as early as possible, we have witnessed accelerated plans to prepare for those elections this fall after the people of Vietnam took to the streets themselves to demand a democratic form of government.

Skeptics are pointing out that the Vietnamese have never experienced free elections, and therefore cannot be trusted to make a rapid transition to popular government.

If we are ever to know the true will of these people, we must do everything we can to insure that the elections are held and that the results will be uncontestable, regardless of the outcome.

Those who agitate for these elections ask only for a hand in the destiny of their country, and since that is the professed reason for our presence in Vietnam, I believe that we must now insure that the voices of all interests will be heard in the conduct of that country's affairs.

With Secretary Rusk's assurances that we will indeed honor our commitment to self-determination for South Vietnam, it now becomes incumbent upon us not to leave open the possibility of later charges that the elections were not in fact free.

Excessive caution in this matter is further dictated by Premier Ky's reported statement that if the elections do not have results desirable to the present regime, then the Directorate will fight. This must be regarded as a real danger sign and steps must be taken now to insure the absolute validity of these elections. The closest surveillance is absolutely basic.

But, I think it wholly unrealistic for us to place ourselves in the untenable position of being the sole third-party monitor of these elections. Although our foreign policy leaders insist that we will abide by the wishes of the people of South Vietnam regardless of the outcome, there looms of course the qualification that the election be truly free and expressive of the will of the people of that wartorn nation. It is, therefore, in my opinion, unwise for us to assume by ourselves this responsibility as the judge and jury of weighing the quality of these elections.

I therefore join the distinguished Senator from Connecticut in urging that the President most seriously consider the proposal that either the United Nations or the International Control Commission be called in to maintain a field surveillance of these elections, and thereby relieve this country of the untenable task of being the guarantor of the outcome. If our commitment truly is to freedom in southeast Asia, then we have a solemn obligation to implement the conditions for that freedom. We owe the world, the Vietnamese people, and ourselves no less.

SOME NOTES ON THE GREAT EMANCIPATOR

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to bring to the attention of this distinguished body an outstanding accomplishment of or work by one of my constituents. Today, I am particularly pleased to present, for our colleagues' consideration, an article written by one of my constituents and good friends—Rabbi Martin M. Weitz. This article, which appeared in the American Examiner, is based on an address which Rabbi Weitz delivered before a convocation at Lincoln University.

Although Abraham Lincoln's tragic death occurred more than a century ago, his impact on the world has not diminished. The ideals and values which Lincoln expounded are still with us today. As Dr. Weitz so correctly states:

> Lincoln's soul is not at rest. His spirit walks through the land.

Rabbi Weitz makes us aware of this as he dwells on some of the little-known or forgotten aspects of Lincoln's life and personality.

Dr. Weitz is the author of five books and has served as rabbi to congregations in Wisconsin, Iowa, Arkansas, New Jersey, and New York. At present, he is the director of religious affairs for the Jewish board of guardians at the Hawthorne, N.Y., Cedar Knolls, and Linden Hill Schools.

It is with great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD, Rabbi Weitz' moving article "A Century of the Lincoln Saga":

A CENTURY OF THE LINCOLN SAGA

(By Dr. Martin M. Weitz)

Abraham Lincoln is magic for millions across the "lost horizon." He disarmed more enemies by his death than his generals won in disputed battle. That was the strange alchemy that bound his country and made him one of the world's elect, simple-hearted, strong-minded symbol of America—free from geography and genealogy. His life is as a fond refrain for all of us, except when we rephrase our memories and rebuild our images that people the past. Abraham Lincoln was born in 1809, in Kentucky, to Nancy Hanks and Tom Lincoln. The family moved in 1817 to Indiana, where it built a new log house in which his mother, Nancy Hanks, died at the age of 35, and where his stepmother indeed became a mother for the rest of his life. But the frontier beckoned on, and in 1830, with four oxcarts heavily laden with provision, many books, including the Bible, yet enfolded with a loving heart, the family moved on to Illinois.

History may be lost, stolen, or forged, but the biography of a great man is ever the spiritual autobiography of a great era. To gain perspective on the significance of the Lincoln saga we might recall that the Bible comprises a rollcall of approximately 926,000 words, that all of Shakespeare's works muster a total vocabulary of over 975,000 words, while the Sandburg saga alone, on Lincoln, claims over 1,026,000 words. This gives us a dimension of how one life may affect all lives, even though it is not quite a century and a half in the fullness and fruition of an incomplete life he shared with fellow man.

COLLECTION OPENED ON JULY 26, 1926

Greatest of all modern barometers on the Lincoln life and legend, is a microfilm collection with 20,000 documents in 194 volumes that as permitted for research and revelation by Robert Todd Lincoln, to be opened for the public 21 years after his death. This surviving son of Abraham Lincoln died July 26, 1926, and 1 minute after midnight, the entire collection was opened from the past for the present and the future. This collection was presented by Lincoln's son to the Library of Congress in 1925.

At that time this great treasury of Lincolniana had experts in all fields of this subject study its contents, and explain them to the world. Dr. Luther Evans, then Librarian for Congress, Randall Monoghan, State historian for Illinois, Paul Engle, of the Chicago Historical Society, as well as Carl Sandburg, were among the 200 visitors present who were scholars of the "Lincoln Life and Legend."

Disclosures were manifold, and it is important for us to know them, for it helps us appreciate even more the difficulties and the complexities from which Lincoln emerged, unsullied even in death, as well as life * * * From this collection and other related materials, we learn that throughout the Civil War, Lincoln was plagued with over 80 death threats and attempts at assassination. We discover that the war was hampered and tampered with by complaint about the drunkenness of Gen. U. S. Grant, and that Lincoln even had a special pigeonhole in his desk for these many complaints, that "petticoat politics" of the wives of the generals was really a roadblock for the war effort, that the petty conflicts between the Army and Navy in the form of certain memos found their way to Lincoln's desk under another pigeonhole entitled "Mars Versus Neptune." We learn also that many were refused promotions—often bluntly—by Lincoln, in specific instances and that the scramble for political patronage was incessant and exhausting.

WERE ROBERT'S LETTERS "LIFTED"?

This collection reveals also that there was the threat of a duel with a James Shields in 1842, in Alton, Ill., and that thereafter Lincoln and Shields became fast friends when the slight misunderstanding was clarified. The collection includes letters about the half-sister of Lincoln's wife, who lived at the White House, whose husband was a Confederate general but who often got a pass to go to Kentucky to claim property even though she refused to take an oath of loyalty to the Union. This collection informs us of military strategy proposed by Lincoln but rejected by McClelland. There are no letters, we find, of Robert Lincoln to his father (for they may have been "lifted" from the collection previously). Some of these items may have been available for the 10-volume history of Lincoln in 1890 by Nicolay and Hay, but access to the series was refused to Beveridge, especially when it seemed he asked unnecessary questions regarding the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Mysteries are still unsolved for approximately 11 letters from Robert D. Owen, 20 from William C. Bryant, 44 from Horace Greeley, 11 from a Roman Catholic archbishop, and an Anglican bishop are still missing, because these letters are known to have been a part of the collection decades ago. Perhaps someone in the family wanted such letters burned, a policy often resorted to by statesmen or members of their families, as was accomplished a century ago by Judah P. Benjamin of the Confederacy, before he left for England, or more recently in our times, former Vice President Garner from Texas.

This collection helps us understand that there were possibly five events, each an accident, which helped escalate into a ladder to the Presidency itself. First was an invitation to Abraham Lincoln to present an address in New York City for which he was offered a fee of $200 during the fall of 1859. We learn from the collection that Lincoln earned approximately $3,000 a year, that he was below the stature of Seward and Chase at that time, but that a great response was accorded him when 1,500 people came to Cooper Union in New York City and paid 25 cents per person to hear him.

Second "incident" seems to be the failure of a certain young man at Harvard, named Robert Todd Lincoln. The trip to New York City was in a way an event to cheer up his son on his failure at Harvard, as well as to seek his admission to Exeter School. This also permitted Lincoln to accept a few more invitations for speaking engagements en route to and from Boston.

Third "event" was a drama by a politician named Ogleby in Decatur, Ill., who brought the State Republican Convention to Decatur, and who, with John Hanks, dramatized Lincoln as the "railsplitter." Fourth, was the failure of a printer to keep his promise for tally sheets by 9 p.m., and thus permitted the convention to adjourn to 10 a.m. the next morning and—fifth "event"—provided a midnight political transformation in all of the hotels with delegates so that the drive for Seward gave way to Lincoln, and about midnight, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio delegates shifted to the Lincoln column * * * and changed the history of man.

LINCOLN'S TRIBUTE TO JOHNNY KUNGAPOD

We learn from this collection that Abraham Lincoln had major consideration throughout his life for all peoples who were part of life. We know the indignation that seared his heart when he beheld an auction-block in human fish in New Orleans, when black flesh was bartered and sold by seemingly respectable and honorable people in the full light of day. We know that he had a tender concern not only for the Negro, but for the Indian, for when a chieftain departed this life, it was Lincoln's sad mission of mercy to speak his sentiments for all. These words are ascribed to Abraham Lincoln in tribute to the departed Indian chief:

"Here lies poor Johnny Kungapod.
Have mercy on him gracious God,
As he would do if he were God
And you were only Johnny Kungapod."

This collection and other series reveal Lincoln's sagacity and humanity for other minorities. We know of his withdrawal of infamous "Orders No. 11" which referred to Jew of Kentucky in most uncomplimentary terminology by General Grant, and that he even appointed a Jew named Guttmann as American consul in Switzerland to emphasize American respect for all identities at a time when Swiss cantons practiced official anti-Semitism.

THREEFOLD BENEDICTION

Warren Wheelock, in 1915, whittled out masterpieces in wood of Abraham Lincoln. They were miniatures in size, but of spiritual stature beyond any dimension. One was the Intellectual Lincoln: another the Meditative Lincoln; and a third of the Tragic Lincoln; and we were to survey his saga in terms of the collection which affords new insight and provides new outlook, we should summarize and simplify his life pattern as a threefold benediction.

First of these, in honor of the 100th anniversary of the Emanicipation Proclamation. The Lincoln that lived in the America of the 1860's was indeed a counselor at law. He entered the Illinois bar, March 1, 1837. He practiced in Illinois 23 years, and extended that legal practice beyond 4 years in the White House. His early confreres were Stuart and Herndon. We know his legal practice through thousands of documents that have come to light throughout the century from libraries by the score, offices by the hundreds, and homes by the thousands. Throughout this correspondence, we sense half the presence of Abraham Lincoln, and the many appealing qualities which reveal countless clients of all kinds, many types, and involving a variety of laws.

His approach as a trial lawyer, from these and similar records, was calm, logical, and intelligent. His practice brought him to every corner of Illinois, its people, and their problems. Throughout this legal life he revealed a power of great intellect, infinite tolerance, and a most gentle and generous heart.

From all these assorted records which I discussed here last week it is obvious that Abraham Lincoln's preparation was thorough and compact, that he did get books and study them carefully, whether Blackstone's "Commentaries," Greenleaf's "Evidence," or Story's "Equality." He did interpret these and other basic legal works for the pioneer conditions he found, with pains for first principles and allowable changes for progress as applicable in cases in court. He also steeped himself in a thorough knowledge of each case, and would have no use for notes or even books when in action, in order to be completely free of the burden of uncertainty and to know fully and freely even all possible avenues to an opponent. Yet, he would always be fair to that opponent, and would preface his own case with a statement, in all fairness, of the other side prior to presentation of his own case, organized in compact simplicity.

He had a thorough knowledge of law, the lives of his people, and this served as a thread in the fabric into which he wove his homely imagery, scholarly citation, and dependence on impeccable honesty. Witness the Terney case, which involved a swindle by a pension agent, and for which he received no fee, once when he made clear his stance: "Gentlemen," he began, "I depended on this witness to clear my client. I now ask that no attention be paid his testimony. Let his words be stricken out. If my case fails I do not wish to win it by a falsehood." His frankness, followed by a magnificent summary of the merits of the case, brought a verdict of acquittal.

Second great facet of Lincoln in our commemorative profile is "Lincoln—the Storyteller." Many are the witnesses from all sources who relate this facet of the Lincoln saga with greatest affection and profoundest admiration. There is the ride with Swett, who recalls the childhood stories, the conversations with Judds, who remembers porch-talk and through it how Lincoln seemed as a man devoted to the far things, a man for the days to come * * * how he glowed with the suns beyond our sun, and who generated belief that with men all things are possible.

GALLANT NAIVETE

Even incidents at home portray him with nonchalant yet gallant naivete, as when his wife told him: "You are a very bright man," after he had come in from the rain and deposited his coat on her just starched gowns which she placed on the bannister. When poor Abe asked, "What have I done now?" she answered promptly, "Your wet coat is on my starched gowns." Then her and our Abe in simplicity said, "Don't be cross, dear. First I will hang up my coat, and then I will even hang your gowns over it."

One incident tells how a boy knocked off Lincoln's large hat, which incidentally served as his office, and scattered all the papers around the area. After these papers fell, Lincoln patiently picked all of them up, and without a further word, the boys clambered all over him, for they knew his arms would embrace them all.

A sharper incident is from Debates with Douglas, when Lincoln said of him, but with the naivete of human nature: "He has tens of thousands of blind followers, and it is my business to make them see."

Typically, his humor, even in hotels in his tours to the different courts of the area, enabled him to enlarge has gastronomic horizon without too much worry for health. When first served ice cream, he remarked: "Say, waiter, I do not want to slander this hotel, but it appears that this pudding has frozen." Another time in a different setting, he simply said to the waiter: "If this be tea, please give me coffee: if this be coffee, please give me tea."

The day's mail, especially during the Presidency, would call him "buffoon," "monster," "idiot," and other likely and unlikely epithets, but among the hundreds he was accorded, he liked best—for they provided him with a hearty laugh or two—the "accusations" of "Deformed Sir" and "Ugly Cub." He even liked Joe Miller's jests, for only a Lincoln could like them even though they were so "corny." Part of his storytelling that gave him visage and image for the ages is his world-weary remark after he was defeated for the Senate by Douglas "How do you feel" a confidante asked. His simple, sad and yet generous response: "Too badly to laugh, too big to cry * * *." This word of wisdom was quoted by Adlai Stevenson a la Lincoln in Springfield, Ill., when he was defeated by Eisenhower.

THIRD DIMENSION

Third dimension of the Lincoln Saga was "Lincoln—the Man Alone * * *." Living witnesses beheld him thus in his spiritual splendor on days they saw him. A Stuart said: "I saw Lincoln sitting around alone in a corner of the bar, remote, wrapped in abstraction and gloom. He seemed to be pursuing some painful subject and his sad face would assume, at times, the deeper phases of grief * * *." Hearken to a Whitney: "He had no system or method. He preserved a memo by throwing it in his hat. All was anarchy outside his mind but within it all was symmetry. His mind was his workshop * * *." Listen to a Birch: "His chair was against the wall for hours while his feet were drawn up and knees and chair were level. His hat tipped to shield his face. His eyes were sad with no merriment. His hands were clasped. No one could break this spell with speech, for it was a barrier none could enter * * *." Listen to a conductor on an Alton train: "Lincoln was such good company but we could not make him out. I would often see a dreadful loneliness—he was thinking alone. He never frightened you, but something about him made us plain folks feel as a child does to his father."

Many comments from these and other sources, from Sandburg and other Lincoln artists, would try to define him as he walked with a long, easy stride, with a sober face, deepened with soft melancholy, while his eyes seemed to say: "I shall never be glad again." All of the artists, of words or in stone, portray him as a tall, gaunt personality, with a peculiar slouch, an easy saunter, so bony, so sad, as a strange friend and friendly stranger, for everybody knew him and yet nobody knew him, for he was indeed the "Laughing Lincoln" and yet the great, sad man.

FROM THE WELL OF HIS BEING

Perhaps every experience from the well of his being come up filtered through darkness into light. They included early loneliness when he would often spend a week at home in the wilderness, or chop wood even at 1 a.m. in the moonlight. They embrace possibly the story of a duel, and the death of a man he tried to forget. They include the memorable rollcall or seemingly endless failures to opponents, as for the Senate, Vice-Presidency, or even as a surveyor in Illinois, as well as unfortunate inventions as a windmill, an unhappy lecture series in Milwaukee, a frustrating love for and death of Anne Rutledge, and, too, unhappy marriage to Mary Todd, unfortunate and untimely death of two of his beloved sons, one in Springfield and the other in Washington. They enfolded, too, a strange premonition of his own death.

But beyond such tidal experience with tragedy, were expressions of life and laughter. These reflected the love of trees in winter in the basic anatomy of nature, the love of laughter even at and by himself, the love of poetry that welled up from depths of grief yet breathed desperation in the width of words and depth of thought that echoed defeated winds in fugitive monotone * * * and the love of solitude when the light grew in his grey eyes, and the fire of emotion filled his facial features * * * as if his very soul came fresh from the Creator.

All of these helped build the Lincoln saga, foremost in which is the Emancipation Proclamation. We honor this day and this year in this very institution, which honors all of us by the Lincoln name. As President Marvin Wachman, of this great university, in his first assembly address in this very chapel, explained, the Emancipation Proclamation was written in the summer of 1862, read by Lincoln to his Cabinet on July 22, announced on September 22, 1862 and made memorable for history January 1, 1863, after a victory or two had been assured, and after the cause of freedom for slaves in areas of rebellion and union for all the States were synonymous. This proclamation indeed made Lincoln the "Great Emancipator" and added that not only to his stature, but in the spirit of man at large, another dimension to the others that make the Lincoln life glow in legend.

WORDS IN HOMAGE

We too, as you, have our secret and sacred wreath of words in homage—in the eloquence of silence—when we first beheld the marble significance of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C. We as you think our thoughts and share our tribute * * * with these very words penned early in the thirties, when we first viewed this great memorial:

Marble pillars give an inviting sense of majesty and stone supports lend a tone of simplicity. All is a graduated effect toward the statue of Lincoln. He is vast, huge, magnificent, also simple and sad. His hair is a toss even as the Union was, his eyes are welled with pain, but fixed, subdued, mild, pleading emotion. His beard is barely trimmed. There is a wart on his right cheek and his mouth is parted with the hint of a smile. His wrinkles are gentle and soft as the Illinois hillocks and vales. His rough-hewn grandeur suggests the American prairies, the pink-tinted sunrise over unplowed fields and the red-flecked horizon, over areas ripe for harvest. His simple speeches engraved on marble walls still may be heard—with a mood of silence. If we could only keep him a great soul, unspoilt by promoters of national heroes; if we can cherish him, but as a great man, not as marble god.

As we observe the 100 years of the Emancipation Proclamation, we observe Lincoln as he lived a century ago. "* * * They say that Lincoln's soul is not at rest. His spirit walks through the land, through the quiet countryside and the crowded cities, through the thick forests and the green fields. His heart is burdened with many fears. Why is Lincoln's soul so perturbed?

"The things he sees will not give him rest. The voices he hears disturb his peaceful sleep. He cannot forget the people he loved, in whom he believed. His spirit seeks out those who remember him. Through the length and the width of the country, through the mines, the factories and the offices, through the schools, the sanctuaries, and the homes, his restless spirit moves. He meets the people, the common, ordinary people, sons and daughters of the soil, the factory and the city. They stop him as he walks by and speak to him—even now."

He is the sad, sweet song of America—the chimes of cathedral—continent—the melody of freedom and of faith in man. The slow, somber strains of a Gettysburg Address and of the Emancipation Proclamation, not unheard, but as yet unheeded.

As the poet, Markham, sought and caught his spirit in the hovering spirit of Mother Nature itself.

"She bent the strenuous heavens and came down
To make a way to meet the mortal need.
She took the tried clay of the common road
—Clay warm yet with the genial heart of earth,
Dashed through it all a strain of prophecy;
Then mixed a laughter with the serious stuff.
It was a stuff to wear for centuries,
A man that matched the mountains, and compelled
The stars to look our way and honor us."

MR. J. IRWIN MILLER NAMED CHAIRMAN OF COMMISSION TO MEET SHORTAGE OF HEALTH PERSONNEL

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, 1966, President Johnson announced the creation of the National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower to plan ways of meeting this country's growing shortage of professional health personnel.

I was especially pleased to note that the President named J. Irwin Miller of Columbus, Ind., to serve as Chairman of this group of 15 distinguished citizen advisers.

In Mr. Miller, the President has chosen a man of great ability—a man who accepts the challenge of public service with a determination to fulfill whatever task he is asked to do. Mr. Miller has demonstrated his worth to his community, his country, and his church many, many times.

He is the chairman of the Cummins Engine Co., Inc., in Columbus, and through that firm's Cummins Foundation has instigated a remarkable architectural renaissance in his hometown. Mr. Miller has been described, in fact, by a national newspaper as a de Medici of the Midwest.

His business positions also include directorships of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Equitable Life Assurance Society, the Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., and Purity Stores, Inc., San Francisco.

Mr. Miller is no stranger in Washington. He is a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development; a former member of the Commission on Money and Credit and Chairman of the Special Committee on U.S. Trade with East European Countries and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Miller served as president of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States, the only layman ever to do so.

He is a trustee of the Ford Foundation, a fellow of the Yale Corp., and the list goes on.

Suffice it to say that we in Indiana have been aware for some time of the great contributions of this unassuming leader. I am gratified that the President is asking this man to bring his ability to bear on this important aspect of the Nation's health problem.

I congratulate Mr. Miller.

LIGHT THE ROADS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, traffic safety is receiving national attention today, the probability of legislation this year is virtually assured. Every newspaper and magazine is carrying articles about the subject almost every day. The public we are pledged to serve is aroused and the States are taking action to promote various aspects of traffic safety. My own State legislature in Kentucky recently passed a bill calling for a periodic vehicle safety inspection program, with inspections to be made once a year at State-appointed privately owned stations. This new law will become effective on January 1, 1968.

But as I have stated several times in this Chamber, a vitally important aspect of safety has been virtually ignored—proper illumination of the streets and highways.

I was gratified last week to see President Johnson call for a "redoubled" fight against crime in a directive to Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach for an accelerated priority program against organized crime. I would like to reiterate that lighting up our streets and highways has been proven to have a two-part benefit. It not only would significantly decrease fatal and injury producing traffic accidents; it would also serve to reduce the crime rate. In 1952, the town of Gary, Ind., began installing mercury vapor lights, especially in the dimly lit areas. At the end of 2 years, when there was a population increase of 27 percent in Gary, the rate of criminal assaults plunged 75 percent and that of armed robbery went down 65 percent. In a 111-block area of New York City mercury vapor lamps were installed and crimes of personal violence were cut in half and juvenile crime was reduced by a third. Similar results have been found in cities all over America.

Last Friday the Washington Post printed an editorial entitled, "Let There Be Light," which stressed the importance of installing lights in the city's playgrounds so that they would not have to be shut down after dark. There is no doubt about the need in the city for an organized summer recreational program for youngsters. And as the editorial concludes, "the need for playgrounds does not end at sunset." My simple proposition is that neither does the need for automobile transportation, which also requires illumination after sunset.

Today I am introducing a simple bill—but one that I hope will reap large benefits. It has but one provision—that Federal-aid funds for the construction of highways may not be apportioned to any State unless the roads built with such funds after January 1, 1967, include lighting which meets standards set by the Secretary of Commerce. Such lighting would be designed to reduce traffic accidents, and deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting therefrom. This bill is not intended to penalize; it is intended to produce constructive results which our citizens are entitled to expect.

Mr. Speaker, I have already publicly stated my intention to retire from the Congress at the end of this session. I will not be here at a later date to encourage the enactment of this bill. It is my fervent hope that we can get some action now, and that I can see the culmination of an effort I began 20 years ago in my own city of Louisville. Not only would I personally be rewarded at the termination of my service in the Congress if this bill is enacted, but also I respectfully ask my colleagues to consider the enormous advantages and protection it would provide for all the cities and communities in America.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 14994

A bill to amend section 109 of title 23 of the United States Code to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds on highways not to be properly lighted

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 109 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) No funds shall be approved for expenditure on any Federal-aid highway, or highway subject to any provision of chapter 2 of this title unless that portion of the highway with respect to which such expenditure is to be made will be properly lighted in accordance with standards determined by the Secretary as adequate to provide safe illumination for night driving. Such standards shall be designed to reduce traffic accidents at night, and deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting therefrom, on highways."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to all Federal aid highway funds apportioned on or after January 1, 1967.

MR. JEFFERSON'S DISTRICT

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1966, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, JOHN O. MARSH, JR., delivered the Jefferson-Jackson Day address at Charlottesville, Va.

His remarks are so timely and well-constructed I am sure they will be of interest and value to all who, as I do, revere and admire Mr. Jefferson.

I include them in the RECORD at this point:

MR. JEFFERSON'S DISTRICT

Representing Mr. Jefferson's country in the U.S. Congress, I have selected as my subject "Mr. Jefferson's District," because, actually, this congressional district is Mr. Jefferson's country.

Thomas Jefferson was born in this season of the year. In fact, the anniversary of his birth is just 3 days past. Traditionally, springtime in Virginia is one of the most beautiful seasons of the year, and the beauty of Jefferson's country is legendary. He was born on what was then the frontier—a sparse, unsettled, primitive, and sometimes savage land. A child of the frontier, he remained a pioneer in spirit. Jefferson's country was not just Albemarle, but western Virginia. It was the rushing Rivanna, and the tumbling Rapidan; the gracefully bending James and winding Shenandoah.

It was Monticello and Shadwell—the rolling foothills of the Blue Ridge and the climbing ridges of the Allegheny. There were the green fields of the Valley of Virginia and the woods and forests of Tuckahoe. It was, and still is, the land of mountain laurel and budding dogwood.

It was western Virginia, where some of the counties were named for the land and nature's wonders, others for the age or taken from the fabric of his past, some for the people who were part and parcel of his time.

Bath, Highland, Shenandoah, Rockbridge, Rappahannock, and Fluvanna have poetry in their names.

Albemarle, Culpeper, Orange, Augusta, Rockingham, and Frederick were ties to the crown.

Clarke, Warren, Greene, Page, and Madison were men who marched across the pages of American history and shaped their times.

It gave to Washington's Army Daniel Morgan's "Long Rifles" and Albemarle's "Monticello Guards."

This country is Virginia's—the old Dominion's—Seventh District—it is yours, not just mine.

This country left its stamp on Jefferson—on his personality—on his character. It opened the unlimited horizons of his mind. And he left his stamp on this country—and, I believe, its people.

If we claim his name, we must declare his principles. He admonished us to love our country and to serve it. He defined the right of man and bade us to respect them.

He believed in an ordered universe, and that man was a moral creature, who, through his unique power of reason, could chart his destiny—capable of self-government, if he could discipline himself under freedom to accept responsibility.

He respected the rule of the majority, provided there was protected the right of dissent. Allowing for occasional human frailty, which he recognized in himself, he nonetheless practiced what he preached.

Scholars tell us that if we were to assign a quantitative value of 1 day to man's total span of life on this planet from the eons of time, that that period from the 1650's to the 1960's would be slightly less than 1 minute. Yet it would be a magnificent moment—the age of reason, renaissance, and revolution.

Jefferson in his letters, speaking of Monticello, refers to a phenomenon that rarely occurs on land, but frequently occurs at sea. It occurs at Monticello. He describes it as "looming." "Looming," in reference to optics and vision, causes objects at a great distance to appear quite large. This happens at Monticello as you look into the distance, and perhaps it was one of the reasons he loved it so.

When we look at Jefferson from the 20th century in a historical sense, this same phenomenon occurs, and in this brief moment of human history to which I have referred, he looms very large.

As this country produced the spirit of this man, so today the people of this country must capture that spirit. Perhaps he would have defined it as the spirit of public service in the affairs of government.

Although Jefferson is a historical figure, nevertheless, he is a man that belongs to the ages. I am confident that he would be very much at home in Virginia today, and I suspect that he would find the forces of change that sweep the world today not unlike those of the age in which he lived. He was never frightened by change, which was evidenced in his remarks:

"I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened; as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

In this, we see how close akin in spirit he was to Lincoln, who in 1863 would say:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

Jefferson was a man of the people, and he was never impressed by positions of power or public office, because he had a humility based on the recognition that he had held high office by the will and choice of many people.

Wayland, in one of his histories on the Valley mentions the community of Tenth Legion on Highway 11 between New Market and Harrisonburg.

According to Wayland, at some point in Jefferson's career, in referring to his support from the voters of western Virginia who shared his fierce frontier independence, he would refer to the area as the 10th legion of democracy, hence the origin of the name of this community.

Although he disliked politics as such, evidenced by his remarks in one of his letters to Martha Jefferson Randolph, when he said: "Politics is such a torment, I would advise everyone I love not to mix with it," yet he recognized that in a free society politics is the means whereby you translate citizen action into government. Therefore, if you have good politics, you will have good government.

I think it was during the treaty negotiations following World War I that a French statesman remarked that "war is much too important to be left to the generals." And I submit to you that the state of the body of politics is much too important to be left to the politicians.

If he were here tonight, I think Jefferson would be impressed by the party that bears his name. Yet, I believe that he would reserve his tributes and accolades, not for the head table, but for those who are in the audience who really make representative government work.

Those of us who stand for public office are beneficiaries of the work of many people. Candidates receive the headlines on election day, but credit belongs to those unsung, unnoticed heroes that perform the backbreaking tasks night and day before election day. Such are those who are here tonight. Men and women who not only will give of their time, but of their estate. These are the party's great.

To those of us in Virginia's Democratic Party and who fly under Mr. Jefferson's colors and wrap ourselves in the mantle of his name, I sometimes wonder if we realize the significance of what we say or the consequences of the obligations that we thereby accept.

We must remember that politics is public service, and there are individuals here who have distinguished themselves in the field of politics and public service. Only as we accept our individual responsibilities in State and local governments shall we protect the freedoms that we enjoy.

Everyone is quick to point to and condemn the Federal Government. However, it is a magnificent system. Although Jefferson respected it, he was not overawed by it. Generally speaking, where the federal system has not worked, or where it has encroached on the rights of citizens and the responsibilities of States, it has done so because of the failure of individual citizens to participate in their Government and to accept their individual responsibilities. Your presence here indicates that you accept these responsibilities. Many of the pressing and urgent human needs brought about as a result of the changing times in which we live can best be met at the State and local levels of government, but it is going to require work and sacrifice.

Those of us who seek public office, as well as those who now hold office, are not modern medicine men or a 20th century edition of the witch doctor. We are not answer men that once you put us into office can be expected to solve all the problems that confront our people. These problems frequently defy solution at the county seat, at the State capitol and in Washington, because their solution in a free society ultimately is to be found by individual citizens accepting individual responsibilities. The unwarranted encroachment of federalism can best be stopped by individuals at the State and local level.

What do I see as the duty of the Jefferson Party? I would like to sum it up in a list of party principles to which I think the Jefferson Party might subscribe. Foremost, we must get people involved and participating. They must participate in the party of their choice in order that we can have effective representative government. I feel this party and the people who participate in it should be guided by the following:

First, America in these times in all offices of leadership needs men who are dedicated to the common good—I repeat the word "dedicated." I believe the criteria is summed up in the words of Holland:

"God give us men. A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands. Men whom the lust of office does not kill; men whom the spoils of office cannot buy; men who possess opinions and a will; men who have honor; men who will not lie."

Second, politics is a form of public service and shall only be as good as you make it by being a part of it. If you will not be a part of it, then you cannot complain about the type of government that you receive or that you get.

Third, public offices are positions of public trust, and we should think principally in terms of performance of duty in these offices.

Fourth, the political party exists as a means or as a vehicle to express the public will and produce effective representative government and are not an end in themselves. Therefore, we should place less emphasis on party patronage and more on public service.

Fifth, that the achievement of effective government be sought, rather than the pursuit of power.

Sixth, political party membership should be inclusive rather than exclusive. With a rapidly increasing population, we must provide the growing number of young people with ways and means to participate in the political process by inviting them into the political structure.

Seventh, the election of any person to any office, in an individual sense, is not important, but rather an expression of an informed public in the selection of an individual is the important thing.

Last, what should be the criteria for membership in Jefferson's party? I submit to you that the test should be the test of reason. Could not the party adopt for determination of its membership the charge that Jefferson would give to the prospective teachers at the University of Virginia, in these words: "This institution will be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind. For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is free to combat it."

If we adopt the test of reason, then it also seems to me that this should be the criteria by which we determine the votes of those elected to public office. Therefore, in the Congress, I submit to you that my votes and the votes of the Virginia delegation should be judged on this basis, and that measures should not be supported for the sake of support, nor opposed for the sole purpose of opposition and, I might add, neither should they be judged by the fact that the issue may originate on the opposite side of the aisle or from some place further down Pennsylvania Avenue.

In conclusion, the ultimate goal of Jefferson's party must be the protection of individual freedom. At a time when we see it being crushed behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, I believe this man from Monticello would find common cause with those Americans who seek to preserve it in the Mekong Delta and along the ridges of the Ammanite Mountains in Vietnam.

To Jefferson, the extension and preservation of individual freedom was his greatest cause. If we would be his heirs, then this must be our legacy.

DENIS N. COTTINEAU: THE LAFAYETTE OF JOHN PAUL JONES

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on March 3, 1966, entitled "Salute to John Paul Jones," I quoted a moving article by Kathleen Hargrave Frantz and Harry Warner Frantz about one of the greatest heroes in the history of our Navy.

The story of the victory on September 23, 1779, of the *Bon Homme Richard* under the command of Jones over the British frigate *Serapis* off Scarborough Head, England, won undying fame for the brave naval officer. His immortal reply to the query of the commander of the *Serapis* as to whether Jones had struck the flag of the *Richard* was: "I have not yet begun to fight!"

Less known is the part played in that battle by Capt. Denis N. Cottineau, commanding officer of the *Pallas*, one of the vessels in Jones' squadron. His valiant efforts during the naval battle contributed greatly to the American victory.

Captain Cottineau for a time lived in my own State of Pennsylvania and his son, Honore Cottineau, who was born there, followed his father's steps by becoming a midshipman in the Navy. But his life was cut short in a duel with a friend whom he was seeking to help out of coventry, a form of ostracism then practiced in the Navy.

The elder Cottineau, because of ill health, moved to Georgia in 1808 and died there the same year. In 1957, the Georgia Historical Commission placed a marble marker over his grave inscribed as follows:

CAPT. DENIS N. COTTINEAU—1745–1808

This grave links Savannah with one of history's greatest naval dramas—the epic fight in 1779 between the *Bon Homme Richard* and *Serapis* in which John Paul Jones immortalized himself. Denis Nicolas Cottineau de Kerloquen received a commission in the Continental Navy during the American Revolution. Commanding the slow sailing *Pallas* during the famous naval engagement of September 23, 1779, Captain Cottineau, by skillful seamanship, forced H.M.S. *Countess of Scarborough* to strike her colors. He was subsequently wounded in a duel with another officer, Pierre Landais, against whom Commodore Jones made serious charges after the battle.

Cottineau later settled in the French West Indies. During the slave insurrection in San Domingo, he fled to Pennsylvania where he joined several fellow French refugees in establishing a colony. Suffering from a lingering illness, he came to Savannah early in 1808. Captain Cottineau died here on November 20 of that year, at the residence of the Abbe Carles. Cottineau's widow was the sister of the Marquis de Montalet who once owned the Hermitage Plantation near Savannah.

In 1928 Ambassador Paul Claudel of France knelt in homage here at the grave of the gallant Frenchman who helped establish the prestige of the infant American Navy.

GEORGIA HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

A moving article by Frank Rossiter, of the Savannah Morning News tells some of the story of this early French naval hero, who was to John Paul Jones what Lafayette was to Washington and died in Savannah; and of his son, Honore Cottineau, whose remains lie in an unknown grave in Havana, Cuba.

The indicated article by Mr. Rossiter and a related news story follows:

[From the Savannah Morning News magazine, Dec. 2, 1962]

NAVAL HERO DIED IN SAVANNAH

(By Frank Rossiter)

One hundred and fifty-four years ago last Thursday, life slipped away from a gallant, retired French naval officer in a little house on West Broughton Street.

This officer was Capt. Denis Cottineau, who links Savannah with America's greatest naval victory.

But for him 29 years earlier, the brightest chapter in our naval history might never have been written, and John Paul Jones would probably have gone down with the *Bon Homme Richard*.

Savannah newspapers carried nothing of his death. According to Historian Thomas

Gamble only this succinct entry in mortuary records at city hall chronicled the event:

"Denis Nichs. Cottineau, 63 years, native of France. Gentleman. From consumption. Died November 28, 1808. Buried November 30. Was afflicted and was buried from the house of the Roman Catholic priest, Mr. Carles, on Broughton Street."

The Reverend Antoine Carles, former Canon of Guernsey, was a cousin of Mrs. Cottineau, the former Mlle. Lucie Mocquet de Montalet. She was a sister of the Marquis Jean Bernard Mocquet de Montalet, later of Sapelo Island and Savannah, and of William Polycarp Montalet, the early owner of the Hermitage Plantation, now the site of the great Union Big-Camp plant.

In the early 1790's we find Captain Cottineau living as a coffee planter with his family in Santo Domingo; his earlier exploits in helping establish the prestige of the infant American Navy all but forgotten.

With the rebellion of the blacks under Toussaint l'Ouverture, the Cottineaus fled to Pennsylvania and became a part of the colony at Axilium on the Susquehanna. Captain Cottineau ran a mercantile business in Philadelphia, but the condition of his health prompted the family to move to Savannah in January 1808. Abbe Carles had come here in 1803 as the second permanent pastor of the Church of St. John the Baptist, Montgomery and State Streets.

It is difficult to understand the lack of recognition for the passing of a man who was truly a naval LaFayette. His body was scarred by a wound received in a duel that was the direct outgrowth of the famed battle between the *Bon Homme Richard* and the *Serapis*. That wound hastened the death of the Frenchman. Another duel a decade or so later was to strike down a son—a duel that carries a touch of sadness to the hearts of all Savannahians even to the present day.

After a requiem mass in the little frame church around the corner, Captain Cottineau was buried in a shaded area of the historic graveyard at what is now Abercorn and McDonough Streets.

This family group provides us with one of the most touching chapters of Savannah history. But for the research and writings of men like the late Thomas Gamble, Msgr. Joseph D. Mitchell, Mrs. Marmaduke Floyd, and Walter C. Hartridge, the story of the Cottineaus and the other French emigres may have been consigned to oblivion.

Let us relive that story now:

Captain Cottineau sailed with John Paul Jones in his most famous cruise from L'Orient in August 1779. Jones' flagship was the almost rotten East Indiaman, *Bon Homme Richard*, with an armament of 42 guns, some of which burst at the first discharge in the engagement. Cottineau was in command of the slow-sailing *Pallas*, a former merchant ship with 32 guns. Also in the squadron were the *Alliance*, Capt. Pierre Landais, described as the best ship in the American Navy, also with 32 guns, and the smaller *Vengeance*. A cutter and two privateers which accompanied them soon deserted and the *Vengeance* played no part in the final battle.

Landais, a fit subject for a psychiatrist's couch, was destined to be a greater enemy than the British.

More than a month passed on this cruise. Then came the day of days, the meeting, when evening's dusk was coming on, with the fleet of Baltic merchantmen escorted by the *Serapis* and the *Countess of Scarborough*. The *Serapis* was new, strongly constructed, carrying 50 of the best guns of English make, a crew of 320 English sailors of the finest type, and was commanded by Pearson, one of the most skillful of the English captains. Her companion vessel was smaller but powerful.

Historian Gamble relates the thrilling account of the great naval fight off Flamborough Head, on the eastern coast of England, in this manner:

"The *Bon Homme Richard* was literally shot to pieces, sinking under the feet of what was left of her crew, her guns mainly silenced, the English prisoners from captured vessels escaping on deck were forced to man the pumps, the dead and dying were counted by the scores, the upper deck was ready to collapse, the entire vessel a mere shattered hulk at the mercy of the wind and wave—but above and beyond all stood out the coolness and unshaken determination of Jones. His matchless maneuvers finally locked the two vessels together.

"Then came the desperate attempts from each vessel to board, the almost cessation of fighting to partially quell the flames that promised to destroy both vessels, the final rally of the *Bon Homme Richard's* forces, with Jones cheering them on as they fought the British hand to hand—and then the unexpected, the sudden advent of the *Alliance* and the firing of her broadsides into the *Bon Homme Richard*. It was only the superhuman valor of Jones that resisted the urgings to strike his colors. Then came the final surrender of the *Serapis*, Captain Pearson hauling down his flag."

And while the *Serapis* and *Bon Homme Richard* fought out their duel of the sea, where was Cottineau, this man who now lies buried beneath the sod of downtown Savannah?

Unlike Landais, he had stood true to his promise, "I will stand by you in any event," he had told Jones.

Engaging the *Countess of Scarborough*, after an hour's hard fighting, he had captured the smaller of the British vessels, and stood ready to go to the aid of Jones when Landais came up with the *Alliance* and sailed around the *Pallas* and her prize. When called by Cottineau to take charge of the prize and permit him to help the *Bon Homme Richard*, Landais withdrew and a few minutes later had dastardly poured his shot into the American vessel.

Fortunate it was that Cottineau was not of the lower caliber of Landais. The additional guns of the *Countess of Scarborough*, if left to herself, would have consigned the *Bon Homme Richard* and her valiant commander and crew to an ocean grave.

Later Cottineau was praised by Jones and by Ben Franklin, the latter representing the United States in France, for his great part in the engagement. The French Government decorated Cottineau with the Cross of St. Louis.

Cottineau openly supported John Paul Jones in his accusations against Landais. For this Landais challenged Cottineau to a duel with swords in the use of which the former *Alliance* commander was an expert. The duel was fought on an island in the Texel and Cottineau was dangerously wounded in the right side.

Landais also challenged Jones, an expert with pistols. Jones accepted and specified that pistols be used, but Landais withdrew claiming that the French code duello did not recognize that weapon.

Twenty-nine years later we find a saddened family group, thousands of miles away from the scene of that naval engagement, gathered around an open grave in Savannah. "Let not the hand of Thy judgment be heavy upon him, O Lord," says the French padre as he sprinkles the grave with holy water. The grave is covered and all withdraw. But that is not the end of the Cottineau story in Savannah.

City council deeded Abbe Carles a section of the trust lot on the eastern side of Elbert Square, Montgomery and Hull streets, as a site for his rectory. There the priest and his cousin conducted a school where the sons and daughters of prominent Savannahians "were instructed in French and good manners."

And what of the Cottineau sons?

Achilles died in Savannah at the age of 22, in the year 1812 and was buried alongside his father.

Denis Louis Cottineau studied for the priesthood at St. Mary's in Baltimore and went on to France to be ordained. Thus the late Captain Cottineau and Mrs. Cottineau became the first Savannah family to give a son to the church. Father Cottineau died in 1830 after spending several years as a missionary priest in India. He wrote in English an historical sketch of Goa, the Portuguese enclave, only recently seized by Nehru.

Honore, who was born in Pennsylvania in 1794, followed in his father's footsteps and became a U.S. naval officer.

In 1819, Cottineau was a midshipman on the U.S. corvette *John Adams*, a vessel built by subscriptions from the city of Charleston. Aboard the ship on the West Indies cruise was another Savannah boy, Midshipman Pierson, whom he had known in Savannah.

Pierson committed some offense that put him in coventry, a form of ostracization by fellow officers. No officer in the service considered him a gentleman and he was treated with the coldest courtesy so far as official life of the vessel went. Only in the strict line of duty was his presence even acknowledged.

Cottineau was struck by the plight of his fellow Savannahian. The only way to break coventry was for some officer to treat the erring Pierson as a gentleman. Cottineau suggested that his friend might challenge one of the officers to a duel. "They wouldn't accept," he replied.

"Then challenge me," said Cottineau, "and I will accept."

They went ashore in Havana to fight a duel that held as its purpose Cottineau's desire to help a friend. Cottineau was killed in the very first volley and lies buried in an unknown grave in Havana.

The man who killed young Cottineau in the duel found his way back to Savannah and spent years of remorse. One writer, who saw him years later at the bar in the old Pulaski House described him as a "supernumerary in life."

When the Bourbons returned to the throne, Abbe Carles went back to France and became vicar general of the diocese of Bordeaux. Madam Cottineau returned to her native land about 1830 and resumed her position in court circles of that time.

Shortly after celebrating Mass in the cathedral at Bordeaux on Easter Sunday, 1824, Abbe Carles was fatally stricken. When the news of his death reached Savannah the little bell at the Church of St. John the Baptist was tolled, and later a Requiem Mass for the former rector was attended by scores of his former parishioners.

A Savannahian visiting in Bordeaux after World War II reported seeing a memorial tablet to Abbe Carles in the cathedral there.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, Jan. 1, 1958]

MARKER WILL BE ERECTED ON REVOLUTIONARY HERO'S GRAVE

A marker to the memory of Capt. Denis Cottineau de Kerloguen will be erected by the Georgia Historical Commission in Colonial Cemetery.

Alex Lawrence, member of the commission, said a marker erected in 1929 on the grave is difficult to see and that one of the uniform, standing markers of the commission will more clearly designate the site.

The marker will be unveiled in ceremonies Friday at 11 a.m.

Walter C. Hartridge, president of the Georgia Historical Society, will be the speaker and Msgr. T. J. McNamara will participate. Hartridge will tell of the significance of Captain Cottineau's valiant contribution to American independence in the Revolution, and the part the Cottineau family played in Savannah history of that period. He will particularly stress the Catholic history of the period.

Madame Cottineau was a relative of Father Karles, parish priest of Savannah and rector of St. John the Baptist Church, predecessor of the present cathedral. It was from the Cottineau family that the first priest from a Savannah family came. Denis Cottineau, Jr., was ordained to the priesthood and served a distinguished career as a missionary to India.

Denis Cottineau de Kerloguen was born in Nantesk, France, and died in Savannah November 29, 1808, at the age of 63 years. He fought in the war for American independence with John Paul Jones in the famous battle between the *Bon Homme Richard* and the *Serapis*, September 23, 1779, in which he commanded the *Pallas*, and rendered noble service to the American cause. He was praised by Benjamin Franklin and decorated with the Cross of St. Louis by the French Government. He was a member of the Society of the Cincinnati in the State of Georgia.

AID PROGRAMS LOOK MORE IMAGINATIVE THAN EVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a new appreciation and understanding of foreign aid. An example of this is a recent article in the Wilmington, Del., Morning News of May 6 by Associate Editor John G. Craig, Jr.

I include this excellent article by Mr. Craig, as well as the column by Joseph Alsop of May 11 which is a capsule of the past history of restraint on the part of the people of the United States and their Government in the use of American power. While others speak disparagingly of the spiritual and political responsibility of our country, and its record of mature and thoughtful direction of our foreign policy in this century, Mr. Alsop clearly defines the history as I am quite sure it will be written for all time.

[From the Wilmington, Del., Morning News, May 6, 1966]

AID PROGRAMS LOOK MORE IMAGINATIVE THAN EVER

(By John G. Craig, Jr.)

Ask an American what's wrong with American foreign policy and chances are he'll tell you his native land has been giving too much money for too long to too many of the wrong people around the world.

When it comes to international affairs, U.S. aid programs have about the same image that welfare payments do on the domestic scene. They are a Federal handout that is neither controlled nor helpful; aid is what one puts down a rathole.

While there have undoubtedly been many instances of ineffective expenditure of dollars abroad, it is a gross oversimplification to write off U.S. aid as a waste. After one talks with those officials in Washington who are most responsible for the aid programs, one is impressed with just how sophisticated U.S. aid programs have become. Mistakes there have been, but most of them were in the past when the United States was still learning what it meant to be an international power. The problem now is getting enough money to do the minimum necessary, not how to stop Agency for International Development officials from suffocating the developing world in money.

For example, one of the aid myths is that the United States gives away a lot of it. This is not so. Not only does the United States lend more than it gives, but the amount in either case is not that large. Forgetting Vietnam where military and economic aid are so entangled with the Defense Department budget, one finds that the United States is asking for about $3½ billion for aid, or about 3 percent of the Federal budget for 1966–67. That is a large amount of money, but it does not represent a great deal in terms of national sacrifice. The British, French, and Japanese, to name three nations, all spend a higher percentage of their gross national product for aid than does the United States; Japan spends 1 percent of its gross national product on aid, the United States spend four-tenths of 1 percent, or less than half the Japanese amount.

Another common criticism of U.S. aid is that it is poorly managed. That comes from two groups of critics, those who think aid is bad in any form, and those who think aid is fine but the way the United States gives it is bad. The second group, which is generally the more responsible, if not the more vocal, could be said to be represented by the Senator, J. W. FULBRIGHT. In the Senator's view it is wrong for the United States to give any money to any nation itself; it should contribute to international lending institutions and let them distribute of the credits.

Senator FULBRIGHT suggests that there is little use by the United States of the international lending agency. But, as Government officials in Washington point out, the United States is using agencies like the United Nations, the World Bank, African Development Bank, and the Asian Bank just as often as it can, and would use them more if they could meet the two conditions the United States places on their use: They must demonstrate that their management has the capacity to effectively handle the increased load that availability of more U.S. aid money implies, and they must be able to attract proportionate captial from other countries, so that the U.S. contribution doesn't dominate the agency's work. Some international lending agencies are comparatively new to the business and so far have been able to attract only a limited amount of managerial talent and international financial support.

Government officials are also emphatic in denying the Fulbright contention that AID programs are administered in such a way as to force U.S. policy to go in certain directions. The Senator, for example, suggests that the United States is involved in Vietnam today because it has to protect its financial investment in a series of South Vietnamese politicians from President Diem to Premier Ky. The administration counters this contention with a flat-footed denial. "Aid is the servant, not the master of U.S. policy," one official said. "We can stop it any time."

There is also the question of aid and the balance-of-payments problem. If the United States would just stop spending aid money, the problem of deficits would go away. In this regard, it is pertinent to point out that 80 percent of all U.S. aid money is now spent in the United States. And it is also worth noting that some U.S. industries, steel and rail machinery are examples, depend on aid programs for a significant amount of business. AID accounts for about 5 percent of total U.S. exports, but some industries count on U.S. aid programs for up to 33 percent of their export business.

Finally, there is the question raised by India's Mrs. Gandhi, who said her country does not want more aid, it wants a larger share of world trade. What she was suggesting is something that has been heard from a number of the underdeveloped countries: They want preferential markets for their goods in the developing world.

The administration replies sympathetically, but argues against preferences, because it says it is too easy to become dependent on them, and when a nation receives them it is too easy for that nation to ignore inefficiencies in its domestic economy. The administration takes the position that a developing country's domestic economic policies are the most important factor in its development. If they are sound, then trade will follow. Aid comes third, but it is merely a tool, a tool to help found that sound domestic economic policy and to help promote trade.

It is for this reason that the administration is now pressing for Congress to separate military and economic aid, to grant the Agency for International Development a 5-year authorization for specific aid programs, and to give its support to the use of international lending agencies. Aid is no longer a dollar handout; it is a sophisticated economic science. And one is convinced, after listening to Government officials for 2 days, that some of the most interesting and effective international work the Nation is doing is in the area of helping others to help themselves.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1966]

THE AMERICAN FORGETTORY

(By Joseph Alsop)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—The dreary airport waiting room like all the others on the west coast nowadays, is crowded with young Americans in uniform. They look hard and fit and carefree. Most of them are on their way to serve in the war in Vietnam in one duty or another.

It brings back the old days, when their uncles or even perhaps their fathers, suddenly called back to service after the first son was born, were going off to the Korean war. Our Army now is vastly tougher, vastly more professional than the half-trained occupation army that had to take the first shock in the Korean war. But otherwise the atmosphere is much the same.

But although the atmosphere in this airport waiting room recalls 1950, the same cannot be said of the atmosphere of present-day Washington, where everyone solemnly discusses Senator FULBRIGHT's pseudo-erudite pronouncements on the "arrogance of power." There has been a strange change, not least in Senator FULBRIGHT himself.

Only think of the record of the last 20 years of American achievement. The postwar drama opened in deadly earnest with a remote crisis in Azerbaijan, where the Soviets were most reluctant to withdraw their troops. Then came Greek-Turkish aid and the American role in the Greek civil war.

One wonders whether those who talked about that war in almost the exact terms they now use about Vietnam, are still convinced we should have made no effort to help the Greeks save themselves from the Communists!

The Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the birth of NATO, all followed in swift succession. But in 1949 President Truman attempted a Hardingesque return to "normalcy"; and the Truman-Louis Johnson disarmament program invited the aggression in Korea.

Being a very brave man, Mr. Truman met the challenge without flinching, and so we rounded that corner, albeit at great cost.

The Eisenhower years then saw the Lebanon landing, the stern, brief test of wills in the Formosa Strait, and the abrupt renewal of the Soviet threat to Berlin.

Out of the renewed threat, in turn, grew the central episodes of President Kennedy's great service.

At Vienna, in 1961, the young President heard a direct ultimatum from Nikita Khrushchev, who swore he would take Berlin by force before another year had passed. Mr. Kennedy replied bleakly that if Khrushchev meant what he said, it looked like being a pretty cold winter. And he went home to call up the Reserves—whereupon it turned out that Khrushchev did not quite mean what he said.

Nonetheless, Khrushchev still meant to get Berlin if he could. So the secret effort began to turn the American position, by placing Soviet missiles in Cuba. And when this was discovered, the result was the brief, terrible, breathless confrontation, big with a genuine danger of thermonuclear war, which ended so well that every world relationship was profoundly and fortunately altered.

Looking back on this long, proud American record, surveying the airport waiting room, remembering Senator Fulbright on the same topic, one cannot help but wonder what the devil has come over us.

Do the Senator and his admirers think, for instance, that President Kennedy succumbed to the "arrogance of power" when he knowingly risked a thermonuclear exchange to meet the Cuban challenge? And if not, where is the "arrogance" in President Johnson's doing in Vietnam approximately the same thing that President Truman did in Korea?

These are worrisome questions, indeed, for they suggest we may be in for another round or spasm of the American forgettory. A man or nation with a good forgettory is able to forget, ignore, overlook, or otherwise purge his mind of all displeasing facts and uncomfortable past experiences. The last great spasm of the American forgettory was in the 1930's.

The worst of that time was not the partylining foolishness of a small minority. The worst of that time, rather, was the loss of any sense of world-political reality by almost the whole American intellectual community.

In the midthirties, for instance, with Adolf Hitler ruling Germany already, almost the whole intellectual community held that opposition to the Nye Neutrality Act was a proof of wicked war-loving views. And only 4 years later, all the same people were more accurately bellowing that opposition to repeal of the same Neutrality Act was a proof of love of Hitler.

Must we now go through the same experience again? God help not! For where the follies of the older, weaker America were no great danger, another spasm of forgettory in the new, giant power America will surely have consequences too awful to contemplate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Findley (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through May 16, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the NATO Parliamentarian Conference.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for May 11, 12, and 13, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Pucinski, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Ashbrook, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Pucinski, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. Talcott (at the request of Mr. Conable), for 30 minutes, on May 12; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Grider), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Smith of Iowa (at the request of Mr. Grider), for 60 minutes, on May 12; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Conable) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Fino.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Grider) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gilligan.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 14012. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 12, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2394. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a resolution of the National Assembly of the Kingdom of Laos, regarding the violation of the neutrality of Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2395. A letter from the national commander, Civil Air Patrol, transmitting the Annual Report of the Civil Air Patrol for calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79–476; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2396. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Alaska Highway study report, pursuant to the provisions of 76 Stat. 1149; to the Committee on Public Works.

2397. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreements with Communist countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11777. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11775. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 851. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 13712, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1521). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 852. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14544, a bill to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating finanical assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1522). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 14992. A bill to provide for the payment of debt service construction charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 14993. A bill to provide that the United States shall make no payments or contributions to the United Nations for furnishing assistance to Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 14994. A bill to amend section 109 of title 23 of the United States Code to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds on highways not to be properly lighted; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude real property (other than the taxpayer's residence) from capital gains tax treatment, to limit the deduction for real estate taxes paid on unimproved land, and to eliminate the deductions for real estate taxes and depreciation on multifamily housing which is not maintained in a safe and sanitary condition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 14996. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 14997. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to enter into mutually acceptable agreements with States and possessions of the United States for Federal collection of State or possession income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14998. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals to claim a credit against Federal income tax for 40 percent of their State and local income taxes, in lieu of deducting such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 14999. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 15000. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15001. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide adequate notice and opportunity for the Secretary of the Interior and State fish and wildlife agencies to conduct studies on the effects of projects licensed by Federal agencies on fish and wildlife resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 15002. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to increase the funds available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for its secondary market operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15003. A bill to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15004. A bill to amend the Copyright Act by repealing the jukebox exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 15005. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 15006. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to permit the payment of dependency and indemnity to certain married children of deceased veterans who are attending educational institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15007. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a gradual increase up to 27½ percent in the depletion allowance for coal and uranium produced from deposits in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 15008. A bill to amend the act of October 10, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes," so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 15009. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to enter into mutually acceptable agreements with States and possessions of the United States for Federal collection of State or possession income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals to claim a credit against Federal income tax for 40 percent of their State and local income taxes, in lieu of deducting such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 15011. A bill to establish fishing zones of the United States beyond its territorial seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 15012. A bill to incorporate Recovery, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H. Con. Res. 646. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Con. Res. 647. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Con. Res. 648. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 15013. A bill for the relief of Maximo T. Bleza, Sr., and Nelia V. Bleza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 15014. A bill for the relief of Henry P. Leonhardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 15015. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Crescensia Virtudes Escobido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 15016. A bill for the relief of Despina and Christina Hatzisavvas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

389. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of San Jose, Calif., relative to the rights of agricultural workers to organize for collective bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

390. Also, petition of city of Youngstown, Ohio, relative to the 30 years of service in the Congress of Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of the 19th District, Ohio; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tribute to Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in commemoration of Rumanian Independence Day. On May 10, 1877, the Rumanians gladly proclaimed their independence from the Turks and prepared for an era of progress and freedom. In 1878, Rumanian sovereignty was recognized in the Treaty of Berlin.

Today, however, we experience both happiness and sorrow when we look back upon the history of Rumania—happiness for the years when Rumanians stood proudly in the ranks of free peoples, and sorrow for the fate which befell the beautiful land after World War II. For the past two decades Rumania has suffered under the hideous shadow of the Russian hammer and sickle, a symbol of slavery and oppression.

During the years following the war the Soviet Union engulfed Rumania and established the hated Communist rule in the little land. The servitude to Russia has been a terrible one. In 1945, for example, Stalin established SovRom joint stock companies, which exploited almost every facet of the Rumanian economy, denuding the forests, siphoning off the valuable oil and gas, and plundering the mining, transport, and shipbuilding industries. Not until the mid-1950's were the Rumanians at last able to buy off the last SovRoms.

Russian rule meant an era of terrible oppression for most of the 18 million Rumanians, characterized by concentration camps, unceasing propaganda, collectivization of farms, isolation from the West, poor wages, miserable clothes, food shortages, Government control of the arts, and the ever-present militia and secret police.

In the past few years, however, certain signs indicate that Rumania is drawing away somewhat from the Soviet Union. Trade with the West is increasing. Six years ago, half of Rumania's trade was with the Soviet Union. Today the figure has dropped to 40 percent. Overall trade with the Communist countries dropped from 70 percent of the total in 1960 to 62 percent in 1965, and is still decreasing. Rumania has insisted upon a separate economic future quite apart from the rigid plan for her set up by Moscow, which would have permanently relegated Rumania to the status of a vegetable garden and a source of oil.

Rumania has capitalized upon the Sino-Soviet split to gain flexibility in her foreign policy. Initially she declined to line up with Moscow against Peking. In 1963 Rumanian representatives in the United Nations refused to follow the Russian line on several occasions. That same year saw exchange of high-level officials with Western governments and a rapid upsurge of cultural exchanges with the West.

Compulsory study of the Russian language has been abolished. Western films and music have largely replaced Soviet output. Gone are many of the Russian spellings of the names of streets, movie theaters, political magazines, and cultural institutions.

Although the signs are hopeful, we must never be deluded into thinking that Rumania is free. She is still governed by Communists, and her people are deprived of individual freedom. Yet Rumanians continue to long for the day when their dreams of freedom will become reality. On this, their independence day, the people of the free world pay tribute to the courage of Rumanians and send warmest greetings and best wishes to them. Congratulations to a great people.

Fino Introduces Legislaton To Help Homebuyers and Tenants by Curbing Land Speculators and Slumlords

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an antislumlord and antiland speculator tax bill designed to aid the Nation's housing crisis by undercutting the profitability of slums and land speculation.

Succinctly, the provisions of my bill are as follows: Land speculation would be curbed by ending the capital gains treatment given to profits realized on unimproved land—most improved land is not now eligible for capital gains treatment as regards profits realized on the sale thereof. Taxpayers would face a ceiling on tax deductions for real property taxes paid on unimproved land. Slumlords would be denied deductions for real property taxes paid on buildings certified as "unsafe" by local housing authorities and slumlords would be additionally denied depreciation on buildings so certified.

Recently, I read several articles, in labor and architectural journals, about the effect that our tax laws were having on land costs and slum preservation. I decided to do something about this shocking state of affairs, and today I am introducing legislation to end certain abuses.

Capital gains taxation of undeveloped land sales profits is one key abuse. It works this way. Provided an owner does nothing to develop his property, he will pay very slight taxes on the profit he makes when he sells that property. He pays at capital gains rates, which are well below the rate at which the average prosperous taxpayer is taxed on his income. This makes it very profitable for speculators to hold land and sell it when demand has soared. This increases the pressure on land around our cities, forcing up land prices. This in turn forces up the cost of housing. What this means is simple—the home-buying public is paying, through increased housing costs, for the profits of a few land speculators. If we make profits on the sale of undeveloped land taxable at the same—noncapital gains but rather ordinary income—rate that other income is taxable at, we will take the profit out of land speculation, ease the pressure on land prices and reduce costs that will otherwise confront future home buyers.

As a corollary to the above, my bill proposes a ceiling on Federal income tax deductions for local property taxes paid on unimproved land. This would have a minimal impact on the "little fellow" who owns a plot of land somewhere, however, because under my bill, local taxes paid on unimproved land would be nondeductible only in excess of $200.

I believe that the two parts of my bill thus far described would diminish the profits of land speculation to the point where this profit potential would cease to exert its present upward influence on land costs and costs confronting the homebuyer. I think that my legislation would be a boon to the construction industry and to homebuyers, however much it might be regretted by speculators.

My bill would also strike at the heart of slumlord's profits. It would do this by two provisions, one denying slumlords Federal income tax deductions for local real property taxes paid on properties certified unsafe by local housing authorities, and the other denying depreciation deductions to taxpayers in connection with properties so certified by local authorities. If slums no longer qualify for Federal income tax deductions for local real estate taxes or so-called depreciation, they become less valuable as investments. The same deterioration that slumlords like because it reduces their assessable value locally will push them past a line that will deny them more than they will save by their avarice. That is the objective of my bill.

As far as I am concerned, this is a much needed bill. It will do a lot for our Nation's housing supply. It will open up new land to private homebuilders in our suburbs and outlying areas, and it will reduce land pressures of future years. At the same time, it should contribute to a revitalization of our downtown cities by striking at the heart of the slum preservation mechanism. Under the tough provisions of my bill, I would think that slumlords would either shape up or get out of business.

This bill is a bill that strikes at metropolitan housing shortcomings through rough treatment of society's troublemakers rather than the pampering of selective poor as embodied in the rent supplement philosophy. The bill does not spend money to disperse Federal control over a metropolitan area. If anything, the tax changes I propose would bring in money to fund additional housing programs, and no aspect of my bill in any way pulls power into the hands of the Federal Government and out of the hands of the States.

My bill probably treads on some vested interests. One of the vested interests it treads on is the idea that the answer to every problem confronting our Nation is a slapdash dose of Federal money poured in to pave the way for Federal control.

My bill would hurt slumlords and speculators. It would help tenants, homebuyers, and taxpayers. It costs no money and it does nothing for the bureaucracy. I urge its passage.

Village of Newtown, Ohio, Has New Civic League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years there seems to be a new awakening among the citizens of my district to the possibilities for new civic enterprises. Citizen groups are becoming more aware of the problems of their areas and are working to solve them.

In the village of Newtown, Ohio, located in the eastern portion of Hamilton County, one such new civic enterprise is being undertaken. On April 25, 1966, Mayor John Rabe called together a nonpartisan group of leading citizens to discuss the formation of a Newtown civic group. He indicated to them that Newtown is one of the few villages in Ohio which does not have a single strong civic organization pushing for the good of the village.

Mayor Rabe noted that projected studies of population for the area in and around Newtown show that in 1990 there will be over 830,000 people living in an area where 430,000 now live. He said that the village is in the very heart of the Little Miami Conservancy District watershed which contains large tracts of land for industrialization and residential development.

Because much of this land is flooded often, the Corps of Engineers has made studies and recommended action to contain the flow of the Little Miami River. When this is done, the currently empty farmlands will fill rapidly, and it will be necessary that this growth be directed in such a way that maximum benefit can be obtained, and that the current population of Newtown not be pushed aside and ignored.

Mayor Rabe said that industry in the Newtown area could stabilize the tax rate, give many in the area employment closer to home, and increase the tax duplicate to provide better government services.

At the meeting, the mayor urged that leadership of this new group be taken by interested persons in the community, so that the latent vitality he knew existed in the village could emerge. Immediately a steering committee was formed, which contained over a dozen interested persons from all walks of life. It is probable that the group will activate the old Greater Newtown Civic League, Inc., as the means for organization.

Mr. Speaker, Newtown is the fourth oldest community in Ohio, and next year will celebrate its 175th anniversary. Originally one of the outstations ringing the core city of Losantiville, now Cincinnati, during pioneer days, Newtown has a distinguished history. I suggest that the community is having a rebirth of a sense of accomplishment. It should be noted also that although the present Congress by its action has aided communities like Newtown to solve its problems using tools that the National Government alone can provide, it is not the National Government which has caused the impetus to organization.

In Newtown, as in every other community which is experiencing similar problems, it is the local citizens and the locally elected officials upon whom the opportunity and responsibility rest. They alone provide the spirit. They alone can organize. They alone provide the initiative for self-help. We at the national level can help, and will.

SENATE

Thursday, May 12, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. Frank Carlson, a Senator from the State of Kansas.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, we bless Thee for the life that Thou hast given us. Breathe even through these leaders' lives the breath of hope and peace.

We thank Thee for the Nation of which we are a part. Lead through the life of this Nation to ways of solution and rebuilding of fallen foundations of understanding and principle in man's humanity to man.

We beseech Thee to hasten the day when sin's fierce wars shall cease. Help us to build a new and better world in which goodness, honesty, truth, justice, peace, and good will shall prevail. Grant that we may use the rich gifts of our lives, not for selfish living, but as an opportunity to serve. In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Frank Carlson, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARLSON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 10, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 10, 1966,

The Secretary of the Senate on May 11, 1966, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 14012. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 10, 1966,

The following reports of committees were submitted on May 11, 1966:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 179. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons (Rept. No. 1155).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor (Rept. No. 1156).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 11487. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1157).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 10, 1966,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on May 11, 1966, reported favorably Executive A, 89th Congress, 2d session, the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2) thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 10, 1966:

S. 518. An act for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia; and

S. 1924. An act to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit referees from acting as trustees or receivers in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act.

On May 11, 1966:

S. 943. An act for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka; and

S. 1804. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee, the Subcommittee on

Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Robert Emmett Quinn, of Rhode Island, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals.

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Francis M. Wheat, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission;

H. Ralph Taylor, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

Don Hummel, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

By Mr. McINTYRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and sixty-one postmaster nominations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for reappointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Maj. Gen. Glen R. Birchard for special assignment and promotion to the grade of lieutenant general in the Air Force; Gen. Dean C. Strother, U.S. Air Force, to be retired in the grade of general; and Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves for special assignment and promotion to the grade of general in the Air Force. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for reappointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Maj. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Gen. Dean C. Strother (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list, in the grade of general; and

Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 1,120 appointments and promotions in the Navy in the grade of commander and below, and 1,125 appointments in the Marine Corps in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Charles S. Abbot, and sundry other midshipmen (Naval Academy), for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Andrew A. Blanchard, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates, for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Charles A. Alcon, and sundry other graduates from the Navy enlisted scientific education program, for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Pierre E. Biron, and sundry other Naval Reserve officers, for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Robert H. Nicholson and sundry other officers, for permanent promotion in the Navy;

Thomas E. Albright, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps officers, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Bernard F. Halloran, and sundry other Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps officers, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Vance Baker, and sundry other U.S. Naval Academy graduates, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps; and

Dean R. Aggers, and sundry other persons, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read nominations in the Coast Guard, placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO INEQUITIES IN ACTIVE DUTY PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO DEFERMENT OF 1966 CONSTRUCTION CHARGE PAYMENT DUE THE UNITED STATES FROM OKANOGAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting pursuant to law, on determinations relating to deferment of 1966 construction charge payment due the United States from the Okanogan Irrigation District, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF LAW ESTABLISHING THE REVOLVING FUND FOR EXPERT ASSISTANCE LOANS TO INDIAN TRIBES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law establishing the revolving fund for expert assistance loans to Indian tribes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
State House, Boston, May 6, 1966.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES IN FAVOR OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ALCOHOLISM CENTER IN BOSTON

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson in his message to the Congress of the United States on the health needs of the Nation called for the creation of a $20 million Federal Center for research into the cause, prevention, control and treatment of alcoholism; and

Whereas Alcoholism is the major cause of mental illness in Massachusetts and the primary cause of fifty per cent of our highway death toll; and

Whereas The educational and medical resources available in the Boston area to work in conjunction with Federal authorities is unequaled anywhere in the entire country; and

Whereas The religious community in Boston and throughout Massachusetts has achieved an outstanding degree of unity of thought and action in aiding alcoholics and their families to cope with the problems of alcoholism; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary for the establishment of the United States Public Health Service Alcoholism Center in Boston; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, April 21, 1966.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 14 RELATIVE TO EXPERIMENTAL FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE PLANTS

"WHEREAS The development of a means for low cost production of fish protein concentrate would mean that more than a thousand million human beings, who now suffer the misery of chronic malnutrition, would have an opportunity for a better diet; and

"WHEREAS Protein deficiency diseases are the largest single source of infant mortality in the world today; and

"WHEREAS The ocean resources off California contain vast numbers of fish, other than anchovies, such as the Pacific hake, which could be used for such a program without endangering either their population or the other fish resources of the state; and

"WHEREAS Proper development of a fishery for such purpose could greatly aid the commercial fisheries of this state and be a substantial addition to the state's economic prosperity; and

"WHEREAS The Conservation and Wildlife Committee of the California Assembly has considered this matter on numerous occasions and attempted to further the development of a program to provide such a concentrate; and

"WHEREAS California has increased its expenditures in this area, including an appropriation in the budget for this year of $92,000 from the state's General Fund for research; and

"WHEREAS Legislation has been introduced in Congress which would authorize the expenditure of $5 million for the construction of up to five experimental fish protein concentrate plants in the United States; and

"WHEREAS The earliest possible construction of such plants is essential to the development of an acceptable fish protein concentrate which can so immeasurably aid in relieving the suffering of so many persons in the world: now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation at the earliest possible time to authorize construction of experimental fish protein concentrate plants; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 9 RELATIVE TO REMOVAL OF RESTRICTION ON TITLE TO MORRO BAY ROCK

"Whereas to preserve Morro Rock as an historical site, natural landmark and public park, the Congress of the United States, prior to 1935, was requested to authorize the conveyance of said rock to the State of California; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, by an act approved May 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 311), authorized the Secretary of Commerce to convey Morro Rock to the State of California for public park purposes; and

"Whereas the United States did so convey Morro Rock to the State of California for public park purposes by deed dated August 17, 1935 (covering approximately 30.00 acres), excecuted pursuant to said act, and by deed dated September 15, 1960 (covering 0.69 acre), executed pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and

"Whereas the deed dated August 17, 1935 reserved to the United States of America the right to resume ownership, possession, and control, for government purposes, of any of the property so conveyed, at any time and without the consent of the State of California; and

"Whereas the right so reserved impairs the use and management of Morro Rock by the State of California for public park purposes, and its preservation as an historical site; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to authorize the removal of the restriction on the title to Morro Rock without monetary consideration based upon its character as an historical site and public park, qualifying it for transfer at no cost; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 10 RELATIVE TO THE EAST SIDE DIVISION OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

"WHEREAS Congressman B. R. SISK has introduced H.R. 14030, Congressman HARLAN HAGEN has introduced H.R. 14031, and Congressman JOHN MOSS has introduced H.R. 14202 in the Congress of the United States to authorize the East Side Division of the Central Valley Project; and

"WHEREAS The east side division will provide a much needed supplemental water supply to portions of Kern, Tulare, Kings, Fresno, Madera, Merced, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties; and

"WHEREAS There is presently a serious overdraft of the ground water resources of this service area which has resulted in an immediate need for supplemental water; and

"WHEREAS There are some 5,000,000 acres of land within the east side division, of which a considerable portion will require a substantial supplemental water supply; and

"WHEREAS Forty-five percent of California's agricultural production, valued at nearly two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000), is produced in the San Joaquin Valley, and

"WHEREAS Several San Joaquin Valley counties are among the Nation's leading producers of agricultural commodities; and

"WHEREAS The initial planned development will provide 1,500,000 acre-feet annually of supplemental water, primarily for agricultural use at a price the farmer can afford; and

"WHEREAS In addition to irrigation benefits, substantial flood control, recreation, fish and wildlife, and water quality control benefits will also accrue as a result of this project and

"WHEREAS The initial supply will be made available through the operation of existing facilities of the Central Valley Project supplemented by unappropriated flows from the American Stanislaus, and Sacramento Rivers; and

"WHEREAS The proposed project will have a dramatic economic and social impact upon the affected area by increasing agricultural production and farm income in addition to providing thousands of new jobs and otherwise benefiting the area: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California supports H.R. 14030, H.R. 14031, H.R. 14202, and similar legislation to authorize the East Side Division of the Central Valley Project and urges the Congress to enact such legislation at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the United States Commissioner of Reclamation, to the Regional Director of Region 2 of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12, RELATIVE TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

"WHEREAS Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 federal funds are available to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies, including school districts, for the education of children of low-income families; and

"WHEREAS Although under such act a state is allocated the total amount of federal funds which all the local educational agencies in the state are eligible to receive, the maximum amount each local educational agency may receive is limited; and

"Whereas If an eligible local educational agency determines that other local educational agencies within the state are in greater need of such federal funds and does not apply for its share thereof, the state cannot reallocate those federal funds to another needy eligible local educational agency within the state beyond the permissible maximum for that local educational agency; and

"Whereas There are many local educational agencies in this state who are in need of funds beyond the maximum permitted under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to permit the state to approve grants to school districts of federal funds allocated to the state under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 beyond the present maximums permitted under that act for individual school districts for the education of children of low-income families, where the school district is in need of such additional funds and the funds are made available by the failure of other eligible school districts to apply therefor so that the more needy school districts within the state could obtain additional funds; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and to the United States Commissioner of Education."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 11 Relative to Commending Wishard A. Brown, and Jack Craemer

"Whereas Wishard A. Brown has been a resident of Marin County since boyhood, graduating from San Rafael High School prior to attending College of Marin and the University of Oregon; and

"Whereas He served with distinction in the United States Army during World War II and was on the personal staffs of General Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., and General Joseph W. Stillwell; and

"Whereas He joined the staff of the Independent-Journal after his release from the armed forces in 1946; and

"Whereas He has been extremely active in civic affairs and has served as president of the San Rafael Chamber of Commerce and as a member of the Marin Safety Council, the Boy Scouts of America Marin Council, the National Board of the Junior Chamber of Commerce and many other boards; and

"Whereas He was honored by the Marin County Real Estate Board in 1955 as Marin County's outstanding citizen; and

"Whereas He is expected to continue the fine record of community service associated with the Brown family during the long tenure of his father, the late Roy A. Brown, as publisher of the San Rafael Independent-Journal; and

"Whereas He was named publisher of the Independent-Journal and president of California Newspapers, Inc., on March 23, 1966, the 105th anniversary of the founding of the Independent-Journal; and

"Whereas Jack Craemer joined the staff of the Independent-Journal in 1947 after working on the Turlock Daily Journal; and

"Whereas He graduated from Stanford University and worked for a time for the Holtville Tribune in Imperial County prior to entering the United States Army in which branch of the armed forces he served for five years, being discharged as a major of artillery; and

"Whereas He is immediate past president of the highly prestigious California Newspaper Publishers Association and past northern California vice chairman of Sigma Delta Chi Professional Journalism Society and serves the County of Marin on many boards and commissions; and

"Whereas He was named copublisher and editor of the Independent-Journal on March 23, 1966; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California (the Assembly thereof concurring), That the Members of the Legislature take pride in commending Wishard A. Brown and Jack Craemer for their outstanding records of achievement, and congratulate them on the occasion of their being named publisher and copublisher, respectively, of the San Rafael Independent-Journal; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to Wishard A. Brown and Jack Craemer."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 136. An act to amend sections 1, 17a, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1159); and

H.R. 3438. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy (Rept. No. 1158).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 3339. A bill for the relief of Peony Park, Inc., and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 3340. A bill for the relief of Garabed Eknoyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3341. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to restrict further the use of customers' funds by commodity futures commission merchants, to authorize further the regulation of records of contracts markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Cannon, and Mr. Dominick):

S. 3342. A bill to require authorizations of appropriations for the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. Bartlett):

S. 3343. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Case, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Randolph):

S. 3344. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3345. A bill for the relief of Vittorina Micol Squires; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3346. A bill for the relief of Camile Najib Rabah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3347. A bill to make certain expenditures of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, eligible as a local grant-in-aid for the purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BASS:

S. 3348. A bill to establish the Department of Education; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bass when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 3349. A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code concerning bias or prejudice of a judge of the court of the United States;

S. 3350. A bill to amend section 401 of title 18 of the United States Code dealing with the power of the courts of the United States to punish for contempts of its authority;

S. 3351. A bill to amend section 1651 of title 28 of the United States Code governing the issuance of writs by the courts of the United States; and

S. 3352. A bill to amend section 1292 of title 28 of the United States Code governing appellate jurisdiction of courts of appeals from interlocutory decisions of the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the 1st day of June in 1966 as "Quality Control Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

SUPERVISION OF ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN VIETNAM

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted a resolution (S. Res. 258) relative to supervision of elections to be held in Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Ribicoff, which appears under a separate heading.)

ANNUAL AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require annual authorizations of appropriations for the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce.

The Committee on Commerce has held long and elaborate hearings on the subject of weather modification. Research in weather modification is essentially indistinguishable, in many respects from research in the atmospheric sciences generally. The Environmental Science Services Administration, which includes the Weather Bureau is deeply involved in this area.

Much concern and interest has been expressed to the Committee on Commerce about the operations of ESSA. It therefore seems useful that the Committee on Commerce be given the opportunity to review ESSA's operations on an annual basis and to examine their proposed budget. In this way, closer attention can be given to this expanding, dynamic agency which plays such a significant role in our daily lives.

I am pleased to have as cosponsors Senator CANNON and Senator DOMINICK who have shown great interest in this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3342) to require authorizations of appropriations for the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. DOMINICK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A BILL TO AID HOMESTEADERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries which has been submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior with a recommendation for enactment. The bill would permit the Bureau of Land Management to sell lands in the public domain on which entries are made in good faith but the entrymen are prevented from full compliance with legal requirements for property improvement and thus are required to give up the land. The entrymen on homesteads, small tracts, trade and manufacturing sites, home sites, and other settlement or use and occupancy claims in Alaska would be given a preference right to purchase the land by meeting the high bid when it is offered at public auction by the Interior Department. In a case where the entryman becomes the purchaser of the land in question his purchase price would be reduced by any value added by him or his predecessors in interest.

If a purchaser other than the entryman acquires the land in a case where the original settler cannot or does not meet the price set at auction, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to compensate the entryman from the purchase price for the value of improvements added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest where such value is included in the appraised price.

In the case of removable improvements, an entryman who does not purchase the land in question he may, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, remove or sell to the purchaser those improvements which he or his predecessors in interest made; which can be removed without substantial injury to the land, and were not included in the appraised price.

The legislation which the Department has proposed and which I now introduce appears to provide a solution to the extremely difficult problems repeatedly presented by cases of individuals who, in good faith, enter upon the public domain for the purpose of establishing a home, but then find themselves unable to comply with the myriad rules and regulations of the Department of the Interior and are, thus, forced to give up their effort. This is a problem which has concerned me greatly ever since I came into the Senate 7 years ago and has been the subject of constant efforts on my part on behalf of Alaska's homesteaders.

As the Interior Department has recognized, it is highly desirable that legislation be enacted to protect the interest of settlers on the public domain who, through no fault of their own, are unable to obtain title to their land.

Individuals who attempt to acquire land by meeting requirements of the homestead or desert land laws, the Small Tract Act and other public land laws, must expend considerable sums of money and great physical efforts in making improvements which are unfortunately only too often met with failure because they cannot meet all the standards required by the Department of the Interior.

More entries are made in the State of Alaska on the public domain than any other State; therefore, the people of Alaska have a special interest in this legislation. Of course, more land is found in the public domain in Alaska than in any other State. Indeed, the latest estimate of the Bureau of Land Management—Public Land Statistics 1964—states that the Federal Government owns 100.004 percent of the land area of the State. It is explained that the acreage in excess of 100 percent is reported as a result of survey errors; however, it is certain that the Federal Government owns considerably more than 90 percent of Alaska.

For many Alaskans the only way of acquiring land on which to establish a home is by application under one of the public land laws and heroic efforts to meet the rules, regulations, policies, whims and fancies of the officials of the Bureau of Land Management. The number of homestead entries in Alaska was larger, by far, than in any other State as reported by the Bureau of Land Management in its 1964 statistics. Of 432 homestead entries patented in all the States in the Union in 1964, 405 of these were in Alaska. Among 1,429 small tract patents issued in 1964, 376 were in Alaska, with only the State of California showing a larger number of these entries completed. The entries completed and for which patent is issued are, however, a very small number of all those for which application is made. Unfortunately, it is the repeated experience of Alaskans that their best efforts are unavailing in their attempt to overcome the many obstacles placed in their way to final success.

Being well aware of the heartbreak and suffering caused by failure to complete requirements for patent on a homestead, I am pleased to introduce legislation which would give some relief by establishing in an entryman a preference right to buy land on which an effort has been made to complete requirements for patent. I believe the provision that would, in any case, provide compensation for improvements made on the land by an unsuccessful entryman is extremely useful.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the communication from the Secretary of the Interior recommending its enactment be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

It is my hope the bill will be acted speedily and favorably and that it lie on the desk for 1 week to permit the cosponsorship of other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3343) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3343

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of this Act—

(a) The word "entry" means or includes (1) a right to acquire title to public lands upon compliance with improvement requirements which may include, but are not limited to, irrigation and cultivation of the lands; (2) an application erroneously allowed embracing withdrawn lands; (3) any uncancelled allowed application even though not in good standing; or (4) any claim to withdrawn land in Alaska based upon settlement, use or occupancy, and purportedly initiated under the public land laws.

(b) The word "entryman" includes, in addition to its usual meaning, qualified assignees where the public land law under which the entry was made authorizes the leasing or assignment thereof.

(c) The term "value added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest" means the increase in market value of the land due to work performed, or improvements made, by such entryman or his predecessors in interest.

(d) The term "good faith" means honest intent and does not necessarily relate to the degree of compliance with statutory or regulatory requirements. With respect to withdrawn land, the term "good faith" also means the exercise of diligent inquiry and efforts leading to a reasonable inference that the land was open and available for appropriation under the particular public law invoked.

(e) The word "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Where the Secretary determines with reference to any pending entry made under the public land laws, other than the mining laws, whether made before or after the effective date of this Act, that—

(a) the entryman has in good faith made an attempt to comply with the law;

(b) there is no reasonable prospect that such entryman will be able to comply with the law to the extent necessary to earn title to the entered land;

(c) the land is proper for disposition under this Act, considering such factors as, but not limited to, Federal program requirements, sound land use and conservation principles, and effective management of the public lands; and

(d) in the case of withdrawn land, there has been demonstrated by substantial, positive, and compelling evidence that diligent inquiry was made by the claimant showing that the land in the entry was open and available for appropriation under the particular public land law invoked;

the Secretary is authorized to sell at public auction all or part of the land included in the entry for not less than its current fair market value. No land shall be offered for sale until after termination of the entry and after reasonable public notice. The entryman shall have a preference right to purchase the land by meeting the high bid within ten days after the date of the auction, or such further period as the Secretary may allow.

SEC. 3. (a) The determination of fair market value shall be made by the Secretary through appraisal which shall not include improvements which can be removed without substantial damage to the land; if the improvements cannot be so removed their value shall be separately appraised and added to the appraised value of the land.

(b) If the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the Secretary shall grant him a reduction in the purchase price for the value, as determined by the Secretary as of the date of the bidding, added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest if such value was included in the appraised price of the land.

(c) If a party other than the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the Secretary shall compensate the entryman from the purchase price for the value, as determined by the Secretary as of the date of the bidding, added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest if such value was included in the appraised price of the land. The determinations by the Secretary under this subsection and subsection (b) shall be final and not subject to review.

(d) If a party other than the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the entryman, with the consent of the Secretary, may remove or sell to the party acquiring the land the improvements which (1) were made by the entryman or his predecessors in interest; (2) can be removed without substantial injury to the land; and (3) were not included in the appraised price of the land.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act to the contrary, the Secretary, prior to the issuance of patent, may vacate any sale held pursuant to this Act if he finds that the land, or any portion thereof, included in the sale is needed for Federal program requirements.

SEC. 5. (a) Where the land has been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency, or of a State, county, municipality, water district, or other local subdivision or agency, the Secretary may dispose of such land only with the consent of the head of the governmental unit concerned and under such terms and conditions as such head may deem necessary.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall apply to land in any national forest, national wildlife refuge, wildlife range, game range, wildlife management area, waterfowl production area, or area reserved for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife which are threatened with extinction, or to any Indian land or land set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including land over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Secretary by Executive order for the use of Indians, or to any land administered by the Secretary under the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 6. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of (a) any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed by the Secretary of the Interior to be valuable or prospectively valuable as of the date of issuance of patent: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, and for lands in the States of Louisiana and New Mexico sulphur also; and (b) the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law.

SEC. 7. At least ninety days prior to the sale of any land under this Act, the Secretary shall notify the head of the governing body of the political subdivision or other instrumentality of the State having jurisdiction over comprehensive planning and zoning in the area within which the land is located or, in the absence of such political subdivision or instrumentality, the Governor of the State, in order to afford the appropriate body a reasonable opportunity to take such action as may be necessary to assure that the conveyance of the land, and the provisions thereof, will be consonant with local planning and development needs. If no such action is taken, no disposal of the land shall be made under this Act unless the Secretary determines that such disposal is reasonably consonant with State and local land use and development needs.

The letter presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The Public Land Law Review Commission will undoubtedly consider the issues involved in this proposal. Ideally, the subject could await Commission's deliberations. However, it is remedial in nature, designed to assist persons who appear to be receiving harsh treatment from their Government. As such, we think the Congress would want to consider enacting the proposal so that equity may be served over the next 3 or more years. If necessary, we would have no objection to making the legislation temporary as was done in the case of Public Laws 88–607 and 88–608 in 1964.

The objective of the bill is to mitigate the hardship encountered by public land claimants. The bill would provide an equitable approach in certain situations where the existing relief laws would not be applicable. For example, from time to time situations arise where entrymen under the homestead or desert land laws, lessees under the Small Tract Act, and other persons in good faith expend considerable sums of money in making improvements on public lands, but for one reason or another fail to qualify for patent under the law.

The Desert Land Act, as amended, 26 Stat. 1096 (1891), 43 U.S.C. sec. 321 (1958), casts the problem into sharp focus. Some desert land entrymen, after expending thousands of dollars in efforts to reclaim the land and "prove up," fail to do so after exhausing all relief provisions (i.e. act of March 4, 1915, 38 Stat. 1161, 43 U.S.C. sec. 337 (1958) and the act of March 4, 1929, 45 Stat. 1548, 43 U.S.C. sec. 339 (1958)) of existing law. We have no way of protecting their investment in the land. We think that such protection should be afforded to them consonant with the public interest.

Under existing public land practices, an entryman who has placed valuable improvements on his entry, upon its termination, is permitted to remove those improvements. Where a person has placed improvements on public lands and the lands are disposed of to another party, the Department has taken steps to assure that the person acquiring the land will reimburse the owner of the improvements for the reasonable value thereof which are left on the land and which are of value to the person acquiring the land. See *Lee Kisner et al.*, A–27189 (November 7, 1955); *Keith Specking et al.* v. *Charles S. Carter et al.*, A–26190 (July 24, 1951); *Maynard R. Stutzman*, A–25844 (May 17, 1950).

However, an entryman whose entry fails and who has expended money in disking, harrowing, etc., thus improving the land, is without recourse. Our proposal would afford relief to him and to others who have expended funds on entries in vain efforts to acquire title thereto.

Some of the problems which this bill is designed to meet stem from archaic laws, addressed to an essentially agrarian economy. The Public Land Law Review Commission will undoubtedly consider the suitability of these laws, and the need for continuing them or modifying them. Regardless of the recommendations offered by the Commission, however, some entries arising under these laws will be in effect for a number of years. We therefore believe that the enactment of the proposed legislation need not be deferred until the Commission study has been completed. The bill will serve an immediate and useful purpose, and it will not prejudice the work of the Commission.

Our bill is not an amendment of the equitable adjudication provisions, Rev. Stat. §§ 2450–2451, 2455–6–7 (1875), as amended, 43 U.S.C. §§ 1161–1164 (1958), but rather takes up where equitable adjudication ends. Equitable adjudication governs public land cases "* * * where the law has been substantially complied with, and the error or informality [e.g., the late filing of annual proof] arose from ignorance, accident, or mistake which is satisfactorily explained * * *", Rev. Stat. § 2457 (1875), as amended, 43 U.S.C. 1164 (1958). The bill is applicable where there has not been substantial compliance with the law, albeit good faith is present. This bill differs from equitable adjudication in that equitable adjudication requires substantial compliance with the law and permits the conveyance of land without regard to its fair market value. However, such substantial compliance is not necessary under the bill, but the fair market value of the land must be paid to the United States. Therefore, the bill is not a duplication of equitable adjudication, but may afford a vehicle for relief where patent cannot issue under the equitable adjudication laws or under any other statute.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell at public auction any or all of the land in a terminated entry, made other than under the United States mining laws, where he finds that (1) the entryman has made a bona fide effort to meet the requirements of the law to earn patent; (2) there is no reasonable prospect that he will be able to do so; and (3) the land is proper for disposal under the bill, considering such factors as, but not limited to, Federal program requirements, sound land use and conservation principles, and effective management of the public lands. Such sale could be held only after adequate public notice of the sale.

If the former entryman becomes the purchaser, he would be entitled to buy the land at his bid price less any value added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest. The entryman would have a preference right to buy the land by meeting the high bid. Any patent issued under the bill would reserve to the United States those minerals which are leasable under the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, 74 Stat. 781 (1960), and supplemented, 30 U.S.C. §§ 181–287 (Supp. V, 1964), for which the Secretary deemed the land to be valuable or prospectively valuable on the date of the issuance of the patent.

The bill would (1) embrace entries, inadvertently allowed on withdrawn lands; (2) apply to trade and manufacturing sites, homesites and other settlement or use and occupancy claims in Alaska, and to asserted claims under such laws, but made on withdrawn lands; (3) apply to entries which are not in good standing by reason of failure to meet statutory requirements, e.g., the filing of annual proofs in desert land cases. The term "good faith" as employed in the proposed bill is not intended to be equated with the degree of compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements. No withdrawn lands would be disposed of without the consent of the governmental agency for which the land is withdrawn and subject to such terms and conditions as that agency might deem appropriate. However, no lands in national parks, national monuments, national wildlife refuges and other areas dedicated to fish and wildlife purposes, national forests, and no Indian lands would be subject to disposal under the bill.

The provisions in the bill would not require the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land, but rather would permit him to do so in appropriate circumstances. We believe that the bill would obviate consideration of individual bills, e.g., S. 394, 88th Congress, culminating in the Act of May 17, 1963 (Private Law 88–4), H.R. 2291, 88th Congress, culminating in the Act of April 26, 1963 (Private Law 88–2), and H.R. 5302, 88th Congress, culminating in the Act of August 13, 1964 (Private Law 88–281).

We believe that the appraisal of the land should not encompass any improvements which can be removed without injury to the land, whether or not such improvements under the general rules of real property would be regarded as a part of the realty.

If the improvements are not so removable, their value would be separately included in the appraisal of the land. If the entryman acquired the land pursuant to the sale, he would be afforded a deduction in the purchase price for any improvements made by him or his predecessors in interest to the extent that the value of such improvements was an element in the appraised value. If another person acquired the land, the entryman would be compensated out of the purchase price by the Government for nonremovable improvements to the extent of the appraised value of the improvements. Furthermore, where a person other than the entryman acquired the land pursuant to the sale, the entryman, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, could remove the removable improvements or sell them to the person acquiring the land. The consent of the Secretary to such actions is deemed necessary to assure that (1) substantial injury to the land would not occur as a result of the removal of any improvements, and (2) the person acquiring the land would not be put in a position of paying both the Government and the entryman for the improvements.

In brief, where the entryman acquired the land pursuant to the sale, he would not be required to pay for the value added to the land resulting from improvements by him or his predecessors in interest. If the land is sold to anyone else, the entryman would be compensated for such improvements either by the Government or the purchaser of the land.

Our proposal requires the Secretary, 90 days before making a sale, to notify the head of the governing body of the political subdivision or other instrumentality of the State having jurisdiction over comprehensive planning and zoning in the area within which the land is located, or in the absence of any such instrumentality, the Governor of the State, in order to afford the appropriate body an opportunity to take appropriate land planning or zoning action to meet local planning and development needs. If no such action is taken, no conveyance of the land is to be made unless the Secretary determines that the conveyance and the provisions of the conveyance, will be reasonably consonant with local land use and development needs.

This provision is similar to section 2 of Public Law 88–608, 78 Stat. 988, an Act "To provide temporary authority for the sale of certain public lands."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

ELIGIBILITY AS A LOCAL GRANT-IN-AID OF CERTAIN EXPENDITURES OF THE CITY OF CINCINNATI, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on April 28, 1966, I received a letter from the city of Cincinnati requesting that I introduce legislation to achieve the objectives set forth in the letter.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill in behalf of the city of Cincinnati, as requested.

I request unanimous consent that the full contents of the letter referred to above be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3347) to make certain expenditures of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, eligible as a local grant-in-aid for the purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter presented by Mr. LAUSCHE is as follows:

CITY OF CINCINNATI,
OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 28, 1966.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: In 1962, the voters of the City of Cincinnati approved a ten million dollar bond referendum for the construction of a Convention Center for the City. This Convention Center is now under construction on ground made available through the Queensgate III Urban Renewal project (Ohio R–82).

The Convention Center is strategically located in the downtown area, adjacent to the Central Business District Urban Renewal project (Ohio R–55) now in execution. The benefits derived from this Convention Center will be of great value to the revitalization of the City's Core area. If the construction costs of this facility of nearly ten million dollars could be applied as a Non-Cash Grant-In-Aid Urban Renewal credit, it would allow the City to move more quickly into the implementation of many other needed City projects.

A weekly Washington report on housing entitled, "Housing Affairs Letter" dated April 22, 1966, indicates that the subcommittee Chairman SPARKMAN has introduced four bills to credit the Huntsville Civic Arts Center, the Birmingham Civic Center, the Mobile Cultural and Convention Center and the University of Alabama Medical Center Expansion Efforts as Non-Cash Grant-In-Aid. Another bill would credit New Haven's proposed Coliseum-Convention Center.

It would be most helpful to the Urban Renewal projects of this City if you could see fit to introduce such legislation for Cincinnati's Convention Center. Including the cost of this structure as a Non-Cash Grant-In-Aid would enable us to proceed with other needed and worthwhile projects aimed at improving other blighted areas of the City.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

W. C. WICHMAN,
City Manager.

A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would create a U.S. Department of Education to be headed by a Secretary of Education with Cabinet level status. This measure would transfer from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other agencies which have jurisdiction over programs of education all the agencies, functions, and programs involving education to this new Department and consolidate them under one authority.

Mr. President, the problems in the field of education are so enormous they are difficult to conceive. A few examples illustrate this. For instance, since World War II—a scant 20-year period of time—the number of colleges and universities has increased by 250 percent, from 866 to approximately 2,300. About 10 percent of these 2,300 institutions of higher learning have not met the minimum standards for accredition. In 1955 there were approximately 2.7 million students in the fall enrollment of our accredited colleges. By 1964 this number reached almost 5 million, and it is estimated by 1970 it will have reached 7 million. The rate of increase during the last 4 years has been approximately 8 percent. In addition, the cost of attending public institutions has increased over 30 percent between 1955 and 1965 and another 20 percent increase is estimated by 1970. The cost increase for attending private institutions is even greater. Our education experts estimate a cost spiral amounting to a 50-percent increase in tuition over the next decade.

In addition, there is also the problem of the increased demand for financial assistance. Under our existing loan programs, 600 thousand students have borrowed approximately $450 million. However, this is far from sufficient and far too many potential students have been left out. For instance in 1960, 1.1 million high school graduates were not attending college. Forty-two percent of these listed financial problems as the reason for not enrolling in colleges and universities. Twenty-two percent of the students that did attend dropped out at the end of the first year and of this group 28 percent listed lack of money as the chief reason for such dropouts. In June of last year, the largest senior high school class in the history of our country graduated. The September freshman class was estimated at approximately 1.4 million students. However, many promising young people were not able to attend. Of the top 50 percent of high school graduates, 37.9 percent of the boys and 57.9 percent of the girls from families with less than $3,000 annual income did not enroll in college.

It is interesting to note that two-thirds of the families whose heads of the household had less than 9 years schooling live in poverty; that 20 percent of the young people between ages 18 and 24 with less than 9 years of school were unemployed; that keeping a family on relief cost a minimum of $2,500 a year; and that keeping a young person in a detention home cost $1,800 a year, and a person in prison $3,500 a year. This is contrasted with the average cost of $450 a year for keeping a child in secondary school. This is not to say that this latter amount is sufficient, but the fact remains that at the present time it is the average.

Against this background of problems—and because of the efforts of the Federal Government to alleviate these problems—our involvement in the field of education has undergone one of the most rapid expansion programs of any area of government. For instance, the staff of the Office of Education increased during the fiscal year 1966 by 646 people. Appropriations for fiscal year 1965 increased over 200 percent to $1.5 billion. In fiscal year 1966 it again increased over 200 percent to $3.3 billion. This increase reflects both the stepped up activity in existing programs and in the inauguration of several new ones.

The Office of Education at the present time has one of the largest organizations in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. On January 1, 1966, it had 2,202 employees in four major bureaus with 21 divisions or offices, 9 other major offices, a contracts and construction service, and a national center for educational statistics, not to mention its regional offices. For this reason I feel that it is imperative that we reorganize the Office of Education and the various other offices which deal with educational programs into a new and separate department. When the increasing complexity of educational programs is viewed, and when the broader scope of these programs is considered, the urgent need to consolidate them in order to coordinate more closely all national educational efforts becomes very apparent.

At the present time, with the many different agencies which handle the educational problems, it is almost necessary that an institution of higher education, with respect to even the local boards of secondary education, employ a staff assistant specialized in contacting the Federal Government and its various agencies which handle these problems in order to be assured that full advantage is being taken of the opportunities afforded now for education at the national level.

I believe that, with the increased necessity for educational assistance at the national level, this new department should be created in the very near future. We know that, even though this is the first year in which we have entered the field of secondary education, the demands will become even greater in the next few years and that secondary education will receive an increased amount of assistance from both the Federal and the State level of government. Certainly if any political unit or any entity of government in the Nation has a responsibility in the field of education; whether it be the higher educational level or secondary level, the Federal Government has a responsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 10 days for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 3348) to establish the Department of Education, introduced by Mr. BASS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF QUALITY CONTROL DAY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which will authorize the President to proclaim the first day in June as Quality Control Day. This date coincides with the 20th anniversary of the American Society for Quality Control.

Quality control, with its associated discipline and reliability engineering, assures the public that the products it uses are safe, sound, and durable. The society, which started with 1,000 members in 1946, now number 20,000.

The quality control man in the factory is often referred to as the customer's voice in the plant. Proof of industry's forthright intent to provide good service to the consumer is the inclusion of a quality control program in the plant.

The establishment of a Quality Control Day will reaffirm Government's committment to the protection of the American consumer.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 159) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the first day of June in 1966 as "Quality Control Day," introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 150

Whereas the quality of American civilization is dependent, in large measure, on continuing improvement in the quality of goods and services; and

Whereas the survival and success of the free world depends to a great degree on the quality and reliability of its products and services in open competition on the international market; and

Whereas quality control unites the interests of consumers and producers alike in the joint pursuit of excellence; and

Whereas there is great need to draw wider public attention to the contributions made by quality control and reliability of scientists and engineers throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the first day of June in 1966 as "Quality Control Day" and inviting the Governors of the several States and mayors of the local governments of the United States to issue similar proclamations.

THE NEED FOR THE U.N. IN SOUTH VIETNAM'S ELECTIONS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, last week, I called for United Nations supervision of the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam. At that time I said:

> We must request that a special session of the United Nations General Assembly be called.
>
> We should introduce in that special session a resolution requesting that United Nations observers be assigned to the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam.
>
> And we should lend the full prestige of the United States to this effort, in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I emphasized that elections would be held within areas of South Vietnam which could reasonably be secured against violence and intimidation, and where U.N. observers could gain access to assure impartiality.

It is my belief—and the belief of many others—that the elections scheduled in South Vietnam must be held. At present the United States has committed over 250,000 men and substantial resources to the struggle in Vietnam. Our Nation is helping the South Vietnamese to fight the enemy in the jungle. We are helping to bring social and economic progress to the villages. Yet, the period of recent political turmoil and bickering in South Vietnam has shown that neither an effective military effort, nor successful economic and social development efforts—the so-called "pacification" program—is possible without the direction and support of a strong and stable central government. Also, if we are ever to have fruitful negotiations, they must rest on the same solid base. In fact, no effective or permanent solution to the problems of Vietnam is possible without political stability. Political stability, in turn, can best be based on institutions that are responsive to the needs and desires of the people—institutions that can accommodate the conflicts between divergent groups within the society in Vietnam.

Last month the Buddhists demanded elections. Premier Ky promised to comply with their demands. Thus, the South Vietnamese Government has committed itself to the elective process for developing political institutions. Elections must take place. And most important, they must be honest and free.

Let us face the issue squarely when we discuss the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam. The complexity of problems—the intricacy of the web that must be disentangled in setting up the electoral machinery required for a fair election—cannot be underestimated. The difficulties to be met are immense. South Vietnam—a country at war—is torn by violence and terror. South Vietnam is inexperienced in the ways of the elective process. And South Vietnam is a country where contending political and religious groups have had ample time, and ample reason, to accumulate a vast catalog of grievances against each other—grievances that have not been dissipated in the give and take of a political arena. Thus, if the elections are to succeed, it will take patience and understanding—perseverance and will—on the part of every political and religious group concerned.

One point seems clear. If the Ky government supervises elections, the results will be contested—and may well be rejected—by the other elements of the Vietnam power struggle. Buddhist-supervised elections, as Tri Quang has proposed, would be equally unacceptable to the military, the Catholics, and other groups. Pollwatchers supported by the United States alone would also be unsatisfactory.

The need for objective outside supervision of the forthcoming elections is clear. The kind of supervision required can come only from an international presence.

On many occasions I have stated my belief that every elected official, and every concerned individual citizen should analyze the issues and make every effort to contribute constructively as we search collectively for a solution to the situation in Vietnam. This is our right. This is also our obligation. It is recognized by the President of the United States who has said time and again that he welcomes suggestions and ideas concerning Vietnam.

Following my speech last Thursday, the Department of State was asked by the press to comment on my suggestion for U.N. supervision of the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam. The Department gave the following reply:

> We have seen Senator Ribicoff's suggestion. As far as the United States is concerned, we have urged on many occasions that the United Nations find a way to contribute constructively to a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem. Specifically, Ambassador Goldberg has recently reaffirmed at the U.N. our interest in a United Nations role in supervising elections designed to implement the Geneva Accords. Regrettably, the Soviet Union, Hanoi and Peking have frequently opposed any United Nations participation in the solution of the Vietnam problem. This opposition has apparently led the Secretary General and many members to conclude that there is no effective role for the United Nations to play in the present circumstances. However, we are glad that Senator Ribicoff has added his voice to those who believe the U.N. can play a constructive role in Vietnam.

In my approach to the complex problems of Vietnam, I have tried to be constructive. My proposal for U.N.-supervised elections is concrete. Yet, the Department's comments on my proposal are indecisive and misleading. Let me discuss State Department's statement point by point.

I do not doubt for a moment that the United States has urged the U.N. to find a way to contribute constructively to a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem. In my speech last Thursday I described the President's search for peace through diplomacy—his peace offensive which reached into the Security Council of the United Nations, as well as to some 115 countries. I fully support and encourage the breadth and intensity of his efforts.

Yet, when the Department of State says that Ambassador Goldberg has reaffirmed this country's interest "in a United Nations role in supervising elections designed to implement the Geneva accords," I am admittedly puzzled and dismayed. For the elections referred to by the State Department are those in point 7 of the final declaration of the Geneva Conference. They are not the elections promised by the Ky government. They bear no relation to my proposal. Thus the elections the Department refers to are the elections that were supposed to be held in July 1956, in both North and South Vietnam, with the object of unifying the country. At the concluding plenary session of the Geneva Conference, on July 21, 1954, Walter Bedell Smith, on behalf of the U.S. Government, explained the purpose of the elections set out in the final declaration:

> In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted freely.

Mr. President, the elections that I hope to see supervised by U.N. observers—the elections I discussed on the floor of the Senate—are not "elections designed to implement the Geneva accords"—though conceivably they might have some bearing on a future settlement negotiated according to the Geneva agreements. I am talking about the forthcoming elections demands by the Buddhists, agreed to by the Ky government and expected by the entire world. Their purpose is to choose the members of an assembly that will write a constitution for the Republic of South Vietnam. I think my statement was clear. The Department of State has not only sidestepped completely the critical issue involved in my proposal—the question of U.N. supervision of the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam—but the State Department has once again muddied the waters of discussion.

In its statement, the Department further states that the Soviet Union, Hanoi, and Peking have frequently opposed participation by the United Nations in the solution of the Vietnam situation. This comment also begs the issue. Two of the three countries named—Communist China and North Vietnam—are not members of the United Nations, nor do they control any significant number of votes in the U.N. Therefore, the Department's next point—that opposition by these countries "has apparently led the Secretary General and many members to conclude that there is no effective role for the United Nations to play in the present circumstances"—simply does not follow from the earlier premise.

Mr. President, if the Department of State believes my proposal has no merit, let it say so. If the Department wants or needs time to consider this suggestion, let the comment be made that the proposal is under study. But let us avoid the meaningless statement—the misleading phrase. The issues involved in Vietnam require that we say what we mean as clearly as we can.

And let us be clear about the elections in South Vietnam. They are vital. I believe that their failure would be a significant setback for the future of South Vietnam, the United States, and the cause of peace. And I believe that if those elections are to be free and honest, an international presence in South Vietnam is essential. So let our Government do everything in its power to obtain U.N. supervision. Let us commit our Nation to the success of the elections. The stakes have seldom been higher.

Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution urging the President to request the United Nations to send observers to the coming elections in South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the Record.

The resolution (S. Res. 258) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolution

Whereas the Republic of South Vietnam is actively engaged in making preparations for elections to choose a constituent assembly in a constructive effort to bring about a more representative government, and

Whereas the United States is dedicated to the principle, in the conduct of its foreign affairs, that peoples everywhere have the right to determine their own destinies through free participation in elected governments; and

Whereas the success of the promised elections in South Vietnam will depend on the assurance that they will be free, fair, and open; and

Whereas the United States has committed its resources and the lives of its men to the cause of freedom for the South Vietnamese people; and

Whereas an objective and international presence would make a significant contribution to assuring that the promised elections in South Vietnam are free, fair, and open, and thus help substantially in bringing about political stability and the establishment of effective political institutions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should encourage the Government of South Vietnam to seek United Nations observers for its forthcoming elections; and

That the President should call upon the United Nations to assign United Nations observers to the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Mr. Joseph Kraft has written a perceptive series of articles in recent weeks concerning the prospects for the coming elections in South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to have his articles, together with editorials from the New York Times, Hartford Times, Hartford Courant, Middletown Press, and New Britain Herald, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1966]

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK: VIETNAMESE CRISIS—I

(By Joseph Kraft)

SAIGON.—The most recent Vietnamese crisis brought to the surface all the complex social and political currents that the war and its drum-beaters tend to suppress. Indeed, precisely because these elements have been eclipsed in the past, their sudden outcropping now tends to catch Americans by surprise and to fill them with alarm and confusion.

But while the denouement remains in doubt, the outbreak and development of the crisis followed a logical course. They are subject to analysis, and I will offer an analysis in subsequent columns dealing with the two chief forces at work—the Buddhists and the Catholics.

First, however, I must try to describe the mosaic of Vietnamese policies. For it is a subject in which interplay is everything—a case of minority politics, a matter of action, reaction and counteraction by tiny groups. Indeed, in its basic elements, its geography, its history, its beliefs, South Vietnam is a divided country—"a huddling together," as Hazlitt once said of Shakespeare tragedy, "of fierce extremes."

Geographically, the basic division in South Vietnam is between the Center and the South. The Center, once known as Annam, is the coastal plain stretching from the 17th Parallel down the outskirts of Saigon. It happens to include—in Da Nang, Ankhe, Camranh Bay and Nhatrang—the main American air and sea bases. It is a region of tiny parcels of relatively poor land, much subject to salination by repeated incursions of the sea. Though the population is only 3 million and though fish are plentiful, Central Vietnam cannot support itself.

The South, or Cochin China as the French called it, includes Saigon and the delta of the Mekong River and its many mouths. The delta region is one of the great rice-producing areas of the world and Saigon its entrepot. Though the combined population amounts to perhaps 8 million people, in normal times, the South produces a large export surplus.

Historic difference tended to follow geographic lines. Central Vietnam has been the heartland of the country, the site of the imperial court, a center of Buddhist studies, and the historic seat of strong resistance both to Chinese pressure from the north and to French pressure from the south. Its elite is a traditionalist elite, looking back with nostalgia to the days of complete freedom from foreign presences and thus highly nationalistic, even xenophobic—especially in its attitude toward other regions of Vietnam that have accommodated more easily to foreign presences.

The South was a frontier province for the Center, settled late and, as usual with frontier provinces, in rather large holdings. The French invasion of the last century found easy pickings in the South, notably with the large landholders. The native elite that emerged from the process tended to be relatively well off economically, civilized in the French manner and totally divorced from the uneducated peasant masses.

Not surprisingly, differences in belief are in harmony with the geographical and historical divisions. The harsh, traditionalist xenophobia of the Center has found its purest expression in the Buddhist revival led by the famous Bonze Tri-Quang. A similar Catholic attitude was reflected in the family of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem, although more recently the Catholics of the Center have everted to the more self-effacing role of a heavily outnumbered minority. Before World War II, some of the same xenophobic spirit was channeled into two parties—the Dai Viet, or Greater Vietnam Party, and the Vietnamese Kuomintang, or Nationalist Party—which still have strength in the Center.

In the South, leadership in the cities tended to fall into the hands of the French-educated local notables. The colonialist atmosphere dissolved native Catholicism, and even more Buddhism, to the point of decay. Among the peasantry they developed several revivalist groups—notably the Hoa Hao and Cao Dai sects. The mixture was further thickened after the Geneva conference of 1954, when hundreds of thousands of Catholic refugees and some leading Nationalist politicians fled from Communist North Vietnam and settled, mainly around Saigon.

All of these forces have been jockeying for position ever since then. While the war has tended to submerge their activities, they have made themselves felt in every change of regime, beginning with the overthrow of the Diem government in 1963. Now the political forces are out in the open. The important question over the next few months is whether they will yield chaos and a running down of the war effort or a kind of consensus that could lead to an organized settlement.

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1966]

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK: THE VIETNAMESE CRISIS—II

(By Joseph Kraft)

SAIGON.—What do the Buddhists really want?

That question is at all times being put by Americans to the militant Buddhist leader, Thich Tri Quang. A skillful politician, far above average in the capacity to develop calculated ambiguities, Tri Quang keeps returning dusty answers.

It thus becomes possible to see him either as a Communist tool or as the potential savior of his country. And therefore the questioning game continues—ad nauseam and ad infinitum.

A more pertinent question, it seems to me, is to ask who the militant Buddhists are. The answer is that they are a tiny minority with respect to size, locale, and viewpoint.

Apart from Thich Tri Quang, a gifted leader in my view, the Buddhist militants include only a few hundred veterans of protest demonstrations. They are mainly drawn from the center of the country and notably from the children of good families, often of royal blood, who attended the University of Hue.

Their viewpoint is the viewpoint of narrow, xenophobic traditionalism, which, as I have indicated, is common to the educated elite of the central region of South Vietnam.

It happened that this tiny group played a dramatic role in the anti-Catholic protests that ended in the fall of the regime of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem. That (largely accidental) bit of history has combined with self-consciousness of their small numbers to define what I would call the minimum, and destructive goal of the militant Buddhists.

The minimum Buddhist goal is to prevent power from passing into the hands of any leaders who might try to reverse the events of 1963—who might, to be more specific, crush the militant Buddhists as an act of revenge for what happened to President Diem. That minimum goal has largely governed the actions of the military Buddhist leadership since 1963.

Thus when Gen. Nguyen Khanh seemed about to take dictatorial powers after the Tonkin Gulf incident of August 1964, the Buddhists went into the streets to force Khanh to rescind his declaration of one-man rule. Similarly, in May 1965, when Premier Tran Van Houng, a leading personality from the South, moved into a position to crack down, the Buddhists again went into the streets and forced his regime from power.

More recently, the specter of Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky's using his Honolulu meeting with President Johnson to gather supreme power set in motion the latest set of Buddhist-inspired troubles. And, if the Buddhists are now prepared to settle for free elections, it is again within the perspective of their minimum objectives.

For free elections, apart from demonstrating for all the world to see that the Catholics really are a minority, would wipe the slate clean. They would be a new beginning. They would serve to normalize the political situation, to ratify the events of 1963, to prevent the purge of revenge that the Buddhists most fear.

If avoiding a purge is the minimum, destructive goal, however, the Buddhists also have a larger and more positive aim—an aim that has been broadening in the course of time. The constructive goal, as I see it, is to become the nucleus for a popular majority in South Vietnam that might, in time, serve as a means of bringing an honorable peace to this country, and perhaps, even, to all of Buddhist southeast Asia.

To this end, the tiny knot of militant Buddhist leaders has developed a gamut of techniques for reaching the rest of the population. By emphasizing dislike of Saigon and the central government, they have won over most of the army and civil service of central Vietnam. Cryptic talk of peace appeals to the war-weariness that, at times at least, afflicts almost everybody in the country. A slight dash of anti-Americanism, by confronting the rich foreigner with the poor native, does duty for the one thing the Buddhists lack most of all—a social program with appeal to the poor.

My feeling is that the Buddhists hope to combine these tactics with elections to some kind of assembly to organize a popular national majority. Once the majority is in place, they believe, I think, that they could talk to the other side and arrange a peace that would be neither victory nor defeat for either party.

For the moment, however, the Buddhists are searching for allies to form the majority. Mindful of their own tiny size, they do not seek to dominate a national assembly. My information is that Tri Quang would like to see an assembly made up of one-third Buddhists, one-third Catholics, and one-third other groups.

Already the Buddhists are working to form alliances that could lead to the majority they seek. To establish a footing in the South, they have put out lines to leading southern personalities, notably former Gen. Tran Van Don, the president of the alumni association of southern high schools comprising most of the upper middle class of Saigon and the delta.

But the big hope for the Buddhists, the key to building a majority, is that they can work with the Catholics. I will be examining that possibility in the next column in this series.

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1966]

Insight and Outlook: The Vietnamese Crisis—III

(By Joseph Kraft)

Saigon.—Mention the Catholics of South Vietnam and most Americans think of people who are first, fervently anti-Communist, and only next Vietnamese. But that is not even a half-truth.

To be sure, about half of the 1½ million Catholics in South Vietnam are refugees who fled their native villages when the Communists took over North Vietnam in 1954. Most of these refugees are settled around Saigon in small, often armed, villages dominated by the local parish.

Thus cut adrift from their old moorings and isolated in present surroundings, the refugees represent a potent mass, easy to stir against any regime suspected of being willing to negotiate with the other side—the more so, since the fall of their great patron, the late President Ngo Dinh Diem. They are, in the words of one high official in the American Embassy, "like medieval fanatics." They have tended to form the popular backbone of the recent military regimes, and to be the death weapon against more moderate regimes.

But the other half of the Catholic population—the Catholics native to the southern and central regions of this country—are by no means fanatic, or even edgy. They are used to coexisting as a minority with a large Buddhist majority. Through the archbishop of Saigon, Nguyen Van Binh, they have felt the influence of the updating that has recently come to dominate attitudes in the Vatican. To some extent, Archbishop Binh has been able to take in tow the chief refugee leader, the Reverend Hoang Quynh.

The institution for this takeover by the more moderate Catholics of South Vietnam has been the liaison office of the archbishopric of Saigon. Over the last year the office has been issuing a series of communiques on political subjects.

For example, in its fourth communique put out in November of last year, the liaison office made an obvious effort to have all Catholics work to cooperate with the Buddhists. The communique said: "The office calls upon the faithful to pay very careful attention when speaking or writing on matters related to other religions, strictly avoiding any actions which might be harmful to friendly relations."

In its fifth communique, issued on January 7 of this year, the liaison office lined up with the Buddhists in supporting a compromise negotiated end to the war.

Most recently, the more moderate Catholics seem to have been working with the Buddhists against the military government of Air Marshall Nguyen Cao Ky. The most recent communique of the liaison committee, issued on April 6 said: "The most pressing problem * * * is the present political vacuum * * *. The political situation in South Vietnam is still a cold emptiness. The authorities are still unable to lay a legal foundation for the country, and they still lack the support of the people."

In short, the Catholics native to South Vietnam led by the highest authority in the local hierarchy are not far distant from the position of the militant Buddhists under bonze Thich (venerable) Tri Quang. The possibility of an alliance exists.

If such an alliance could be struck, elections could yield a coalition majority dominated by the militant Buddhists of the Center and the moderate Catholics of the South.

A government based on that majority could transform the situation here. It would at long last command the loyalties and faith of the most dynamic political forces in the country, and it could enlist these forces in support of the war effort. It could finally activate the pacification campaign which is now more than ever necessary as a supplement to American military successes.

To be sure, the Ky government, the old political parties and the undisciplined fanatics among the Catholic refugees are now at work trying to break up the prospective working alliance between Buddhist militants and moderate Catholics. These forces have produced recent anti-Buddhist demonstrations in Quang Ngai, in Dalat and in Saigon. They have inspired repeated statements emphasizing the dangers of elections.

Indeed, the election campaign is already shaping up as a struggle between the government, on the one hand, and the Buddhists on the other, for the support of the Catholics and the local notables of Saigon and the delta region. As a matter of fact, the winning combination will probably be a coalition of the present government, the Catholic refugees and the old-fashioned notables of the South. In that case, it seems to me that the essentially political struggle in South Vietnam will have been lost.

But it also seems to me that there is a dim chance of promoting the alliance between Catholic moderates and militant Buddhists from which so much could flow. That chance depends to a large extent on what the United States does, or does not do, in the period leading up to the elections and to that subject I will devote the concluding column in this series.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1966]

Insight and Outlook: The Vietnamese Crisis—IV

(By Joseph Kraft)

Saigon.—Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge's return to the United States is happily timed. For the central theme of his consultations will have to be the coming elections in Vietnam. And on that score Washington has a huge contribution to make to American thinking here in Saigon.

Without outside help, indeed, the American mission here is almost incompetent to frame a broad approach to the elections. For one thing, the mission is preoccupied with the day-to-day not so say minute-to-minute, business of supporting the war effort.

The emphasis is on moving goods and people, arranging appointments, making telephone calls and other tedious administrative tasks. That emphasis leaves little, if any, scope for thinking big. In consequence, the American mission here has yet to develop a coherent program for dealing with the elections and their predictable problems.

Precisely because the mission is so much geared to doing business, it tends to favor people in power who can get the job done. That is how such diverse figures as the late President Ngo Dinh Diem, former Premier Nguyen Khanh, and, now, Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky all acquired virtually unconditional American support.

By the same token, the focus on getting things done puts a discount on uncertainty. But a free election is uncertainty writ large—a leap in the dark. It is thus precisely the kind of thing the American mission in Saigon does not like to think about.

Already the unease of the mission here in the presence of an election prospect has yielded two exceedingly damaging impressions.

And in large measure, Washington's work during the consultations with Ambassador Lodge should develop a means for dissipating these bad impressions.

First, there is, rightly or wrongly, a widespread impression among both Americans and Vietnamese in Saigon that the United States is opposed to free elections. This feeling at this time is exceedingly dangerous. For insofar as they believe that the United States has misgivings about elections, by so much the Vietnamese military leaders in office will be tempted to stage a coup or phony coup designed to head off the elections.

There is also a widespread impression that if the United States does accept elections, it is only in order to provide a fig-leaf of legitimacy to the present military regime. This impression is reinforced by rumors of covert American efforts to set up some political notable from Saigon or the delta region as a front for the present military leaders. It is further reinforced by rumors of American efforts to line up a majority of refugee Catholics, nationalist parties, and members of the Hoa Hao and Cao Dai religious sects to support the government against the Buddhist militants under Bonze Tich Tri Quang.

The mere prevalence of these rumors, whether they are true or not, works against the American interest. For the rumors lend color to the suspicion that the United States is not in favor of a free choice in South Vietnam, that, instead, the United States only wants a regime that will continue to sponsor the war.

Even if the schemes attributed to the Americans here could be brought off, they could not yield lasting results. For the present government plus a politicalized front would fence out not only the Buddhists but the whole central region of South Vietnam. And the center, which has been the source of the present trouble, would react by making even more trouble.

The true American interest, in fact, lies in the one thing the American mission here finds it most difficult to contemplate. It lies in making a leap in the dark—in fostering a process that will give free play to local political forces. And the starting point for that process can be the coming elections.

But that means unrigged elections.

It means elections which hold out the possibility of a passage of power to a new government based on an alliance of the moderate Catholics of the South and the militant Buddhists of the Center.

It means elections from which there could at least develop a meaningful political opposition.

The consultations with Ambassador Lodge can be a success only if they advance the prospect for honest elections, only if they make clear beyond any doubt the American commitment of free choice in South Vietnam.

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1966]

Elections in Vietnam

Premier Ky's announced intention of holding office for another year, despite the promise of elections this fall, reduces his chances of doing so. His own Government has felt obliged to censor this latest evidence of political ineptitude out of the Saigon press in an effort to avoid new Buddhist demonstrations. And the Buddhist leaders, who fortunately are reacting with restraint, are undoubtedly right in their judgment that the elections will determine the outcome, not Marshal Ky.

Whether the Constituent Assembly elected in the fall limits itself to the task of drafting a constitution—as the military junta desires—or pronounces itself a legislative assembly, its existence is bound to alter the political context. The Ky government will be unable to ignore the views of a popularly elected body if the elections are fair and the Assembly is generally accepted as representative.

The real issues are whether the elections will be held on schedule and whether they can be organized in a fashion that produces a popularly accepted result. Ambassador Lodge's vaguely expressed reservations about the elections unfortunately have provided encouragement to those elements in South Vietnam which wear a Buddhist victory and want the voting postponed—through a military coup, if necessary. If the elections are called off or rigged, the damage in world opinion would be exceeded only by the destructive effect on political cohesion in Saigon itself.

Mr. Lodge's visit to Washington this week provides an opportunity for the Administration to remove any doubts about where the United States stands. An unequivocal statement is needed, but it ought to go beyond mere words. The most useful contribution would be a decision to seek international observation—and, preferably, supervision—of the entire electoral process from the current drafting of an electoral law through the campaign and the actual balloting.

Senator RIBICOFF has proposed that President Johnson invite the United Nations to take on this task through a special session of the General Assembly. This suggestion deserves thorough discussion with Secretary General Thant and other U.N. members.

Some form of international supervision could help assure that the election results will not be contested. More important, it would set a valuable precedent for the broader elections, including the Communists, that ultimately will be needed to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam conflict.

[From the Hartford Times, May 9, 1966]

TRAVESTY OR VALIDITY?

Premier Ky's expectation that he will retain power into 1967 and his evident hesitancy to commit himself to abide by the outcome of the proposed election may bring disorderly Vietnamese protests. The results hoped of the election may have been compromised.

But if the plans for it are pursued and the exercise of the popular will is to have any substantial meaning—or even an opportunity to be meaningful—more thought and preparation must be given to the election machinery.

For it would be witless to rely on the outcome of an election as a solution of South Vietnam's governmental problems when that election still has only the slightest prospect of being organized.

Senator RIBICOFF's call for U.N. supervision of the election process summons sense to a hectic situation.

This is true because the prospective elections are not to be conducted under such auspices of order as govern some similar event in Connecticut. The Vietnam balloting must take place in a nation torn, terrorized and shattered by a vicious guerrilla war, a nation lacking experience with campaigning or national election procedure.

In view of those conditions, Senator RIBICOFF in a major policy speech has asked that President Johnson personally lend the full prestige of the United States to a request that the UN assign observers for the Viet Nam voting.

The intention is to insure by the international presence, insofar as is possible, the validity of the election process and its outcome.

In response to Senator RIBICOFF's initiative, doubt has been expressed that the UN can arrange to assist. Certainly the arrangement would be difficult to make.

Yet, without such disinterested supervision, it is hard to imagine the holding of an election, much less to have confidence in its result. Without safeguards, the most extreme pressures would be employed in an attempt to make sure that this was anything except a free and open decision. The inclusiveness of the election is another point.

For example, as the Senator notes, only 20 per cent of South Viet Nam's 16 million people live in urban centers where, presumably the government alone might offer personal safety to those who went to the polls.

The masterful and perceptive analysis of the Viet Nam problem offered by Senator RIBICOFF in his speech lends weight to his plea that at this decisive time, the best possible expression of the will of the people of Viet Nam be obtained.

Senator RIBICOFF supports President Johnson, but he is convinced of "the powerlessness of sheer power" to effect a settlement in Viet Nam.

He asserts that our military, diplomatic and socio-economic assistance programs there are all drained down by local political instability arising from government that lacks consent as expressed by the people.

It seems to us, as it does to Senator RIBICOFF, that the proposed election offers opportunity to certify Vietnamese opinion and thereby solve some of the vast uncertainty and instability that surround the United States relation with South Viet Nam.

[From the Hartford Courant]

TENSE PROSPECTS

South Vietnam, Premier Ky's weekend assertion that he intends to stay in power at least another year brought a swift reaction both in Saigon and Washington. In Saigon, the physical evidence of the reaction was the prompt prohibition of any domestic publication of the statement, dramatized by the blank spaces in the first pages of the newspapers.

In Washington, the news brought Secretary Rusk to the TV screen on Sunday to insist that the news stories in the American press Sunday morning were misinterpretations of what Premier Ky had actually said. On Monday, he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that, while the text of the statement he had was incomplete, it had been misinterpreted to mean that the General would not step down after a civilian government was established.

What the incident did establish was evidence of the tenseness in both Saigon and Washington over the political prospects in South Vietnam. And it lends point to Senator RIBICOFF's suggestion, repeated in Hartford Sunday, that the State Department seriously consider his suggestion that it call on the General Assembly of the United Nations to lend a hand in supervising the elections there next fall.

[From the Middletown (Conn.) Press, May 7, 1966]

THE U.N. AND VIET NAM

Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's call for United Nations supervision of the forthcoming elections in Viet Nam is an inspired suggestion. It would give currency to the validity of the elections, it would involve the prestige of the U.N. in the outcome, and it would tend to stabilize the date on which the elections would be held.

As Connecticut's junior Senator put it:

"The elections must be held. But let us face reality. Under the supervision of the Ky government, the results would be challenged and rejected by the other elements of the Viet Nam power struggle. Elections supervised by the Buddhists—as Tri Quang has proposed—would be equally unacceptable to the military, the Catholics and other groups. Pollwatchers supported by the United States alone would also be unsatisfactory. The tides of colonialism have long since receded, leaving a residue of strong suspicion of Western man.

"There is a clear need for objective outside supervision of the forthcoming election. That kind of supervision and that kind of objectivity can come only from an international presence.

"There is no magic method that will assure the international presence needed—we must work, and work hard toward that goal.

"First, we must request that a special session of the United Nations General Assembly be called.

"Second, we should introduce in that special session a resolution requesting that United Nations observers be assigned to the forthcoming elections in South Viet Nam.

"Third—and most important—we should lend the full prestige of the United States to this effort. I can think of no better way to present the case to the U.N. than in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson—who has demonstrated time and again his unswerving devotion to the cause of peace.

"The elections should be held within areas which can reasonably be secured against violence and intimidation, and where the U.N. observers can gain access to assure impartiality.

"We must work toward the establishment of a strong—stable—and independent government in South Viet Nam. Let us at least recognize that the elections offer the chance to begin."

In his speech, Senator RIBICOFF also pointed out that the pacification program now stands on a tenuous base because the peasant is not really assured that he plays a role in his government. We could commit a million men in Viet Nam, he said, stamp out the Viet Cong, and still lose the war. All this is quite true, and anything that the United States can bring about to insure the credibility of the elections, both within Viet Nam and without, will contribute to a shortening of the war.

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald, May 7, 1966]

VIET NAM ELECTION FORMULA

Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF has fired off his second major Senate floor speech in 3 months on the subject of Viet Nam, and this message, like his first, deserves a careful hearing.

The Senator carefully traces the parallel military and political efforts to sustain South Vietnamese independence, and casts his lot with the political program as being most likely to produce the desired goal of achieving a Vietnamese society capable of governing itself and maintaining a semblance of control of the countryside.

He said, "Let me clearly state my belief: No solution to the problems of Viet Nam is possible without political stability—which must in turn be based on institutions which can accommodate the conflicts between divergent groups within the society of Viet Nam. Such institutions have developed in the West over the course of the centuries. South Viet Nam faces the incredible task of compressing the political experience of generations into several months."

To that end, RIBICOFF advocates United Nations presence during the elections; and that the elections be held only in those parts of Viet Nam where there is "reasonable" assurance that balloting can be conducted without Viet Cong interference. To emphasize the importance of such U.N. supervision, RIBICOFF proposes that President Johnson personally should go to the U.N. and appeal for its involvement in the elections.

In effect, RIBICOFF has consolidated a major idea that is being discussed in Washington, and has put it into proper focus. The two major variants to the U.N. supervision theme which were suggested by RIBICOFF—the President's appeal and the limiting of voting to "safe" areas—both make consummate good sense.

If the U.N. 115-member nation General Assembly cannot fulfill this obligation, then its value in this strife-torn world will have become so diminished as to be worthless.

WEATHER MODIFICATION PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 564

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 2916. I previously introduced S. 2916 as a vehicle to promote discussion and as a background for the extensive hearings by the Committee on Commerce.

Those hearings have been completed. The Library of Congress has prepared a special report on the subject of weather modification which I have presented to the Senate. The Committee on Commerce, thus far, has developed extensive knowledge on the subject.

S. 2916 has served its purpose. Reflecting what our hearings have revealed and what the Library of Congress prepared, I now offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

I am pleased to have as cosponsors Senators CANNON and DOMINICK who have shown great interest in this subject, and conducted the committee hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 564) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Weather Modification Act of 1966'.

"TITLE I—DECLARATION OF POLICY AND DEFINITIONS

"Declaration of policy

"SEC. 101. (a) The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to develop, encourage, and maintain a comprehensive and coordinated program in weather modification in order to contribute to:

"(1) the protection of life and property,

"(2) the maintenance of adequate water resources for the United States, and

"(3) the enhancement of commerce, transportation, agriculture, natural resources, health, and security in the United States.

"(b) In order to achieve the objectives of this Act, the weather modification activities of the United States shall be conducted with full consideration of:

"(1) the development of the necessary scientific basis in a strong and balanced program in the atmospheric sciences;

"(2) the mutual dependence of weather modification, weather forecasting, climatology, and other aspects of atmospheric sciences and meteorological services;

"(3) the effective utilization of all applicable scientific and engineering resources of the Nation, including those in industrial, academic, and other public and private organizations, in all regions of the United States;

"(4) the close cooperation of all agencies and organizations concerned in order to avoid waste or unnecessary duplication of effort, facilities, or equipment;

"(5) the effective utilization of scientific and technical knowledge, instrumentation, equipment, and techniques in all scientific and engineering disciplines applicable to weather modification;

"(6) the advancement of education and training in the atmospheric sciences and meteorology; and

"(7) the cooperation of the United States with other nations and international organizations, whenever such cooperation is in the national interest, in order to facilitate the exchange of scientific and technical information and the peaceful and beneficial application of weather modification.

"(c) It is the policy of the Congress that whenever the President deems any transfer of a function of any department or agency of the United States to any other Federal agency having responsibilities under this Act is necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, he shall accomplish such transfer under the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

"Definitions

"SEC. 102. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term "weather modification" includes any artificially produced changes in the composition, behavior, or dynamics of the atmosphere.

"(b) The term 'research' means an activity leading to increased scientific knowledge and understanding of weather modification, and includes related basic research in the atmospheric sciences.

"(c) The term 'development' means the conception, design, and first creation of experimental or prototype devices or systems, and the testing thereof, for weather modification, including the assembly of separate components thereof, but does not include the construction of such devices or systems through repetitive duplication to fixed specifications designed for operational application.

"(d) The term 'operational activities' means the construction and the use of devices and systems for weather modification designed to achieve a result of social, economic, commercial, biological, medical or military significance.

"(e) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Commerce.

"TITLE II—WEATHER MODIFICATION

"Functions of Federal agencies

"SEC. 201. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act—

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) carry out a research and development program in the field of weather modification, including a specific program designed to control or modify tornadoes, hurricanes, and other severe storms.

"(2) furnish technical assistance and information in the field of weather modification to any other Federal agency requesting such assistance or information; and

"(3) conduct such other activities in the field of weather modification as are delegated to him by the President.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to carry out a research and development program in weather modification in the field of water resources in the United States;

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to carry out a research and development program in such aspects of weather modification as relate to the control of lightning and hail, and to the protection of vegetation from the effects of other weather phenomena;

"(d) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to carry out a research and development program in such aspects of weather modification as relate to the control of air pollution and other similar deleterious effects of urbanization upon the composition of the atmosphere; and

"(e) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized to—

"(1) carry out a research and development program for the effective and beneficial dispersal of fog and cloud cover interfering with airports or air transportation in the United States; and

"(2) conduct operational activities for such fog or cloud cover dispersal.

"Administrative powers

"SEC. 202. In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, the head of any Federal agency charged with responsibilities under section 201 is authorized to—

"(1) adopt, amend and repeal regulations governing the exercise of his duties under this Act;

"(2) acquire by purchase, license, lease, donation, or otherwise such inventions, patents, patent applications, licenses, real property and interests therein as he deems necessary;

"(3) accept as a gift, money, material, or services and notwithstanding any other provision of law, use of any such gift, if the donor so specifies, may be restricted or limited to certain projects or areas;

"(4) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions, including the making of grants, as may be necessary to carry out his duties under section 201 and on such terms as he may deem appropriate; and

"(5) use, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of other Federal agencies with or without reimbursement, and on a similar basis to cooperate with other public and private agencies and instrumentalities in the use of services, equipment, and facilities, and each department and agency of the Federal Government shall cooperate fully in making its services, equipment, personnel, and facilities available to an agency charged with responsibilities under section 201 and, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, each department or agency is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to loan to such agency, without reimbursement, property, equipment, and facilities required for the performance of its duties under this Act.

"Hearings; documentary evidence

"SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary, or any employee of the Department of Commerce designated by him, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places and take such testimony as he deems advisable. The Secretary or any employee of such Department designated by him may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Secretary or such employee.

"(b)(1) The Secretary may obtain by subpena or otherwise such information in the form of testimony, books, records, or other writings, may require the keeping of and furnishing such reports and records, and may make such inspections of the books, records, and other writings and premises or property of any person or persons as may be deemed necessary by him to carry out the provisions of this Act, but this authority shall not be exercised if adequate and authoritative data are available from any Federal agency. In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person referred to in this subsection, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Secretary, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(2) The production of a person's books, records, or other documentary evidence shall not be required at any place other than the place where such person usually keeps them, if, prior to the return date specified in the regulations, subpena, or other document issued with respect thereto, such person furnishes the Secretary with a true copy of such books, records, or other documentary evidence (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy) or enters into a stipulation with the Secretary as to the information contained in such books, records, or other documentary evidence. Witnesses shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

"(3) Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by the above provisions of this subsection, or any regulation issued thereunder, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $500.

"Access to information

"SEC. 204. Information contained in any statement, report, record, other document furnished pursuant to section 203, and information developed by any agency in the performance of its functions under this Act shall be made available at all reasonable times for public inspection except (1) information authorized or required by statute to be withheld and (2) information classified in accordance with law to protect the national security. Nothing in this subsection shall authorize or require the publication, divulging, or disclosure of any information described in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, except that the Secretary may disclose information described in such section 1905, furnished pursuant to section 203, whenever he determines that the withholding thereof would be contrary to the purposes of this Act.

"Commercial operations

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, to issue regulations governing the weather modification research, development and operational activities of private business concerns, which conflict with or impede any activities conducted under this Act and to encourage compliance with such regulations by such business concerns.

"(b) The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other Federal agencies charged with responsibilities under section 201, and after consultation with representatives of such business concerns, shall conduct a thorough study of the need for the regulation of weather modification research, development and operational activities, and report to Congress not later than one year after the enactment of this Act recommendations for additional legislation concerning such regulation including enforcement of such regulation.

"TITLE III—FEDERAL COORDINATION AND PLANNING

"The President

"SEC. 301. In order to achieve the objectives of this Act, the President, through the Office of Science and Technology, is authorized to—

"(1) direct the planning and supervision of the weather modification program authorized by this Act;

"(2) establish the goals to be achieved by such program;

"(3) establish priorities and resolve conflicts between agencies engaged in such program so that the activities of one agency conducted under this Act will not conflict with or impede activities of any other agency conducted under this Act;

"(4) coordinate the activities of each agency engaged in such program in order to insure an effective and balanced effort and to avoid waste and duplication;

"(5) consult with the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and private scientific and educational organizations on scientific and technological developments and new opportunities for the beneficial application of weather modification; and

"(6) conduct a thorough study and investigation, in cooperation with all Federal agencies engaged in such program, of the need for new national facilities for weather modification research, including a consideration of the adaptability of existing Federal facilities, and report to the Congress not later than one year after the effective date of this Act such recommendations for such additional legislation as he deems advisable.

"International cooperation

"SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary is authorized to cooperate in any international activities relating to weather modification consistent with the provisions of this Act. The authority to cooperate in international weather modification activities shall be exercised only with the approval of the Secretary of State to assure that such authority is exercised in a manner consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States. Subject to the provisions of this section, if negotiation with foreign countries or agencies thereof becomes necessary, such negotiation shall be carried on by the Secretary of State.

"(b) The Secretary shall cooperate to the fullest practical extent with the Secretary of State in providing representation at all meetings and conferences relating to weather modification and climate control in which representatives of the United States and foreign countries participate. The Secretary of State shall designate the Secretary, or his designee, as a member of the United States delegation attending such meetings and conferences and also as a member of the negotiating team of any such delegation.

"Conduct of Federal operational activities

"SEC. 303. (a) Before any Federal agency conducts any weather modification research or development activity which is designed to affect the atmosphere more than 200 kilometers from the source of such activity, it shall obtain the prior approval of the Congress. Enacted into law.

"(b) Unless otherwise specifically authorized in this Act, before any Federal agency conducts weather modification operational activities, it shall obtain the prior approval of the Congress. Enacted into law.

"Investigations

"SEC. 304. (a) The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Attorney General, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation to determine under what circumstances the United States and private parties should be liable for damages attributable to weather modification activities, including indemnification of contractors and grantees of the United States engaged in such activities, and report to the Congress not later than one year after the enactment of this Act recommendations for additional legislation concerning such liability.

"(b) The Secretary in cooperation with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct a thorough study and investigation into the social and economic effects, both deliberate and inadvertent, of weather modification activities and report the results of such study to the Congress not later than two years after the enactment of this Act.

"(c) The Secretary in cooperation with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the biological and ecological effects of weather modification and report the results of such study to the Congress not later than two years after the enactment of this Act.

"TITLE IV—GENERAL

"Amendments to National Science Foundation Act of 1950

"SEC. 401. (a) Section 3(a)(2) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1862(a)(2)) is amended by adding 'atmospheric,' immediately after 'engineering.'

"(b) Section 3(a)(7) of such Act is amended by adding 'and' after the semicolon at the end thereof.

"(c) Section 3(a)(8) of such Act is amended striking out the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

"(d) Section 3(a)(9) and section 14 of such Act are repealed.

"Reports

"SEC. 402. The President, through the Office of Science and Technology, shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include (1) a comprehensive and detailed description of the activities and accomplishments of each Federal agency under the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year; (2) an evaluation of such activities and accomplishments in terms of obtaining the objectives of this Act; (3) an analysis of recommended expenditures for all weather modification activities authorized by this Act for the succeeding fiscal year; (4) a description of non-Federal weather modification activities; (5) a description of weather modification activities carried out by foreign countries; and (6) any recommendations for additional legislation which the President may consider necessary or desirable.

"Records and audit

"SEC. 403. (a) Each recipient of a contract grant or party with whom a cooperative agreement is entered into under this Act shall keep such records as the head of the appropriate Federal agency shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition of the funds received under the grant or cooperative agreement, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which the contract or grant was made or cooperative agreement entered into, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The head of each Federal agency charged with responsibilities under section 201 and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient of the grant or party to the cooperative agreement that are pertinent to the grant received or cooperative agreement entered into, under this Act.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 404. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for a weather modification program."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTION

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] be added as a cosponsor of the following bill, concurrent resolution, and resolution:

S. 3306. A bill to provide for establishing and maintaining reserve supplies of agricultural commodities for national security and other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities; and

S. Res. 256. Resolution relating to United States denunciation of the Warsaw Convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] be added as cosponsors at the next printing of Senate Resolution 256, the Warsaw Convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], be added as cosponsors of my bill S. 3303, amendments to world war GI bill, and that their names appear thereon at the next printing

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1966, the names of Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hill, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Sparkman were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3303) to authorize on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Yarborough (for himself and other Senators) on May 3, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON IMPROVEMENT OF JUDICIAL MACHINERY

Mr. TYDINGS. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, and for my distinguished colleague, Senator Ervin, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I announce that the joint hearing on S. 2855, scheduled for May 18, 1966, at 9:30 a.m., will be held in room 6226, New Senate Office Building, rather than in room 2228 as previously announced.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 14088. An act to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14921. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commission, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 14088. An act to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14921. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

WASHINGTON POST LAUDS EXCELLENT KENNEDY LATIN-AMERICAN SPEECH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday and Tuesday of this week, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] delivered one of the most significant Senate speeches of the year.

It was not only a major speech because of the national stature of the Senator from New York, but it was significant in the depth and obvious quality of the research and study that went into it.

There have been many press comments on the significance of the speech and its great portent for future American policy in Latin America.

One editorial comment on the Kennedy Latin-America speech came from the Washington Post in its lead editorial yesterday.

Mr. President, the first paragraph of that editorial reads:

> Senator Robert F. Kennedy has delivered in the form of a congressional speech what amounts to an encyclopedia on policy toward Latin America. His diagnosis is so good, his prescriptions so pertinent on matters ranging from land reform and education to private investment and relations with military regimes, that his remarks constitute a valuable one-piece guide to what ought to be this country's objectives. Happily, for the most part they are the objectives of the Johnson administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Diagnosis by Kennedy

Senator Robert F. Kennedy has delivered in the form of a congressional speech what amounts to an encyclopedia on policy toward Latin America. His diagnosis is so good, his prescriptions so pertinent on matters ranging from land reform and education to private investment and relations with military regimes, that his remarks constitute a valuable one-piece guide to what ought to be this country's objectives. Happily, for the most part they are the objectives of the Johnson administration, although performance has sometimes fallen short.

Whatever his occasional past aberrations, Mr. Kennedy has put his studies and travels to excellent use. His analysis of the real danger but exaggerated fear of communism in Latin America is especially astute. He also has courageously redeemed his unfortunate gaffe in Peru last fall by coming out foursquare for birth control assistance to countries that seek it. If there is a significant omission in his catalogue, it is in his failure to stress the responsibility of Latin American countries for self-help. No one can confer a better life on them. Orderly change is first of all a matter of facing hard political facts.

"Unproductive agriculture is probably the major factor in Latin American poverty," Mr. Kennedy correctly observes, citing the dramatic statistic that 90 percent of the land is controlled by only 10 percent of the landholders. Hence his great interest in land reform, credit and technical assistance. This is an area in which this country's vast knowledge can be of enormous help. Yet there are massive obstacles, one of which is the political reluctance of some governments to take on the oligarchy with such essential accompanying measures as tax reform.

Education is Mr. Kennedy's other passion; 50 percent of the people in Latin America are still illiterate. He does not minimize the difficulties with university students, many of whom are fanatically anti-Yankee. Such attitudes distract attention from real problems and cause instability. But Mr. Kennedy argues for understanding that motives often derive from nationalism and a demand for social justice. To counteract warped ideas of the United States he pleads for more effort to bring Latin American students here. He also has a useful suggestion for channelizing idealism with a multinational hemisphere peace corps.

Senator Kennedy wisely recognizes the important role of private investment and suggests a uniform code of behavior. At the same time he criticizes overzealous efforts to protect such investment, as when all aid to Peru was suspended because of a disagreement over oil properties. The most immediate need in governmental economic aid, he suggests, is in projects that help generate foreign exchange.

Likewise his appraisal of military regimes is balanced. Mr. Kennedy would make clear this country's support of free elections, and he would maintain contact with forces of reform whether or not they are represented in governments. In military regimes he would confine the identification of the United States to projects within the scope of the Alliance for Progress. But he also properly notes that "The Alliance for Progress was not meant to be—and could not be—a means for the United States to determine the government of every American nation."

There is a paradox here, which the Senator touches on in his remarks about Brazil (where he gives credit to the Castello Branco government while listing the dangers of extra-constitutionality). Although he does not say so, in situations where the ballot is restricted to persons who are literate and therefore come largely from the advantaged classes, it is conceivable that a conscientious military regime can be more representative than a bad government elected behind a facade of democratic institutions. In other words, dogmatism and total judgments must be avoided in the Hemisphere.

Unquestionably communism is a real threat in Latin America. But, says Mr. Kennedy, it is not merely a Soviet-and-Chinese-financed conspiracy; many who voice its slogans "seek a nonexistent shortcut to economic progress and social justice." Counter-insurgency training, particularly with civilian police, is part of the answer. But the allegiance of men "can be won only by positive programs of social justice; by land reforms; by schools; by honest administration; by roads and clinics and labor unions and even-handed justice, and a share for all men in the decisions that shape their lives. Counter-insurgency might best be described as social reform under pressure."

The best antidote for Communist appeals, in short, is confidence in orderly social change. This country cannot promote such change in Latin America merely by advocating it; but an adequate identification with the forces of change in practice is still the foremost need of American policy.

SCHOOL MILK BILL DESERVES SPEEDY SENATE ACTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I appeared before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices, of the Senate Agriculture Committee in support of my bill to make the special milk program for schoolchildren permanent and increase Federal funding for the program.

There is a tendency to downgrade the importance of securing early passage of this legislation because of recent House action providing $103 million for the program in fiscal 1967. Many strong program supporters are now inclined to say that the program is safe for yet another year, so why worry. The truth of the matter, however, is that failure to pass the school milk bill this year could very well have a disastrous impact on the program, as I pointed out in my testimony today.

The legislation authorizing the school milk program expires on June 30, 1967. Although this date is over a year away, tens of thousands of school administrators have been placed under a cloud of uncertainty by the administration's proposal to slash the school milk program by 80 percent. They do not know what is going to happen after June 30, 1967. We cannot expect these administrators to effectively promote this fine program until Congress lifts the cloud of uncertainty by acting on the school milk bill.

In addition, next year will see the beginning of a newly elected Congress. The housekeeping functions that consume so much time at the beginning of a new Congress could easily cause postponement of final passage of school milk legislation introduced next year until after the June 30 deadline.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that the bill to make the school milk program permanent will pass in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my remarks before the Holland subcommittee on "The Children's Special Milk Act."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHILDREN'S SPECIAL MILK ACT

(Statement by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE Before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices, Thursday, May 12, 1966)

Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to appear before your subcommittee today in support of The Children's Special Milk Act which would make the special milk program for schoolchildren permanent and set guidelines for the program's funding.

As you know so well, Mr. Chairman, the special milk program has been an unqualified success over the years. In 1966 the number of participating outlets will increase by nearly 1,000, while half pints of milk distributed under the program will climb by about 50 million. This impressive type of program growth has taken place annually since the program was initiated back in 1954.

The program itself fills a substantial child nutrition need. It helps provide children with milk in midmorning and midafternoon by authorizing the Federal Government to share the cost of this milk with the child. At the present time the Federal reimbursement amounts to approximately 3 cents per half pint. The child usually pays the remaining 2 to 4 cents, although in cases of demonstrated need the local school district will pay the additional cost, thus providing the milk to the child free.

I believe the facts will show that this program is essential to the health of our Nation's schoolchildren. Although it supplements in most instances the school lunch program it enables children attending schools, daycamps, Headstart nurseries and other institutions to receive vital supplementary nourishment. This is especially important to the child who may come to school without a decent breakfast or who may be going home to a meager dinner. The sustenance given by nature's perfect food is particularly helpful to children who have to travel long distances to their classes.

The school milk program has played an important part in relieving the Federal Government of the expense of purchasing and storing surplus milk. Milk not purchased for use in this program simply has to be purchased and stored at Federal expense under our dairy price support program. However, the school milk program is now generally regarded by school administrators and parents alike as first and foremost a child nutrition aid and only secondarily as a means of holding down dairy surpluses.

The administration has proposed an 80 percent cutback in the school milk program. It would redirect the program to the needy and those children attending schools without a lunch program. The number of children participating in the program would drop from approximately 18 million to 3 million as a result.

The passage of such a proposal could kill the school milk program. It would mean that only 1 million needy children would receive milk under the program. Yet almost 5 million school-age children come from families with incomes of under $2,000 a year according to statistics published by the Office of Education. Apparently the remaining 4 million children would either have to pay the full cost of the milk, receive a full subsidy from local school districts whose finances are already badly pinched, or stop taking milk breaks. I predict that the majority will follow the last-mentioned course.

Furthermore the administration's proposal would require children qualifying as needy to pass a means test. This is disputed by the Department of Agriculture, but I have with me today a number of forms used by local school districts to qualify children for free school lunches. Obviously these same forms would be used under the proposed redirection of the school milk program. I will gladly submit these forms, which cover communities with populations from a few hundred to hundreds of thousands for the subcommittee's records if it so desires.

My conversations with officials of the American School Food Service Association indicate that it would be impossible for the home room teacher or school nurse to choose those who were to receive the benefits of the school milk program without grave abuses developing. These are the very administrators who run the program. They certainly are in a better position than the Department of Agriculture to discuss the day-to-day problems of program operation on the local level.

These administrators say that many schools would simply abandon the school milk program rather than go through the complicated and discouraging task of discriminating between those who were to receive free milk under the program and those who were to receive no milk under the program.

The administration's proposal would mean that youngsters who did not pass an onerous means test would not receive milk under the program. It would bar the sons and daughters of many proud parents whose children need the benefits of the program, and could qualify to receive free milk, because these parents refuse to undergo a demeaning means test—refuse to have their children classified as needy. Many of these children simply could not afford to pay the extra dollar or two a month the withdrawal of Federal support would cost them.

Thus literally millions of children would stop taking nutritious milk breaks—the very children who need the milk most and can afford it least.

Study after study has indicated that as the price of milk drops, participation in the milk program increases. Some, such as an Illinois study made a few years ago, indicate that as the price of school milk goes up participation drops off substantially. Thus even in families with moderate incomes, there will be a substantial reduction in milk-breaks at school.

Take for example a family of six children whose breadwinner earns $6,000 a year. I cite this example because it is a real one—it springs from a constituent letter. This man works in Milwaukee. Because he is from a metropolitan area his expenses are greater than they would be in a small town. The added cost to this man, if the administration's proposal is passed, of providing milk breaks for his children would be equivalent to a pair of shoes per year per child. Yet he has to keep his children in shoes. He doesn't have to give them money for school milk. It's obvious that these children would no longer receive supplementary milk at school.

Passage of my bill which is being cosponsored by 67 of my Senate colleagues would eliminate the cloud of uncertainty that the administration's new proposal—the Child Nutrition Act of 1966—has placed over tens of thousands of school administrators. It would enable them to make their future plans with certainty in the knowledge that the school milk program as we know it today would continue.

The House of Representatives, fortunately, has dissipated the confusion to some extent by providing $103 million for the school milk program in the fiscal 1967 Department of Agricultural Appropriations bill. I'm sure the Senate will take similar action.

However additional legislation is needed. Although the legislation authorizing the school milk program does not expire until June 30, 1967, Congress must act this year to foreclose with any certainty the death of this vital activity. Next year may be too late. The housekeeping functions that consume so much time at the beginning of a new Congress could easily postpone final passage of school milk legislation introduced next year until after the June 30 deadline.

The time is now. The place is here. And the purpose is the enrichment of the diets and lives of millions of schoolchildren who have grown and prospered under the overwhelmingly popular school milk program.

A NEW LIFE FOR "KING" COTTON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in August of 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt wrote:

No nation has ever achieved permanent greatness unless this greatness was based on the well-being of the great farm class, the men who live on the soil; for it is upon their welfare, material and moral, that the welfare of the rest of the nation ultimately rests.

Agriculture continues to hold a key place in our society through its unique contributions to this Nation's greatness. The best example of this contribution to our greatness and our security lies in the most important cash crop in America—cotton.

From its first entry into the New England States, to the development of the great Cotton Belt, to its most recent expansion to the valleys of our Western States, "King" cotton became the source of income for more Americans than any other crop.

Today, cotton still affects the lives of more Americans than any other crop. It has been estimated that from 12 to 14 million persons in the United States depend directly on this crop for at least a part of their livelihood. On some 1,500,000 cotton-producing farms there are 10 million persons—approximately one-third of the farm population of the United States—who rely on cotton for a considerable part of their income. About 3 million or more persons derive their income from cotton textile and garment manufacturing. Cotton warehousing, ginning, distributing and marketing employ an estimated 500,000 persons. In addition to those directly dependent on cotton and the cotton industry, millions of persons throughout the United States are vitally affected by cotton. They include persons engaged in the manufacture, wholesaling, transportation, and retailing of commodities made by other industries and sold to those who produce, merchandise, transport, and manufacture cotton.

This tremendous growth and influence of cotton is reflected in my own State of California. Since the Second World War, there has been an increasing area dedicated to cotton production, principally in the southern San Joaquin Valley and the Imperial Valley. In the decade 1940 to 1950, the value of cotton produced in California increased 1,048.3 percent. By the end of the succeeding decade, cotton became and is today, with an annual crop valued at more than $300 million, the most important cash crop in California.

Cotton has played and continues to play an important role in our history, our economy, our security, and in our everyday lives. But "King" cotton no longer reigns alone in today's world of increased trade and fiber development. After 1951, cotton consumption in the United States has drastically declined. Exports of cotton cloth have diminished, imports of cotton goods from Japan, India, Pakistan, South Korea, Formosa, Egypt, and others have increased, costs of Government cotton programs are high and rising, there has been a rapid increase in carryover due to increased yields, and most of all, there has been an extensive competitive increase in other fibers, primarily manmade.

The biggest competitive gain in the domestic market has gone to the broad class of manmade fibers which go by the term "noncellulosics." This class includes nylon and the entire list of synthetic fibers which sell under such names as Dacron, Fortrel, Orlon, and Acrilan. These fibers now have a total U.S. market that equals nearly 7 million bales of cotton, and they have gained over 2 million bales of that in the last 2 years. These fibers are further backed up by $135 million worth of research compared with cotton's $26.5 million; and the $70 million a year they spend for promotion overwhelms cotton's $4 million. Lower cotton prices have been effective against rayon. But the noncellulosics, though costing better than 80 cents a pound as compared to cotton's 24 cents a pound, threaten all the markets served by cotton as a result of new yarns, new fabrics, new finishes, and greater promotion.

We seek a policy which will effectively assist cotton in meeting its competition—programs to improve farm operations, control insects and diseases, develop improved cotton varieties, and establish effective controls and price supports. The ultimate objective of these Federal programs is to adjust supply to demand in the interest of benefiting producers and all others concerned with the production and handling of cotton as well as improve the general economy of the country.

For this objective to be fulfilled, there must be a demand for cotton; there must be an increased market that will eventually reduce or eliminate the need for limiting marketings and supporting the price of cotton. But the demand is lessening each day as reflected by the increased losses on growing cotton surpluses. The U.S. Department of Agriculture states:

> Realized losses incurred by Commodity Credit Corporation on upland cotton price support and related programs and expenditures under direct payment programs have totaled $3,006 million during the past 10 years—ranging from $62 million in 1956 to $601 million in 1965. In addition, losses on loan and owned inventories as of June 30, 1965, were estimated at $541 million. These losses and expenditures do not include administrative costs or costs incurred in operation of the Public Law 480 programs that have accounted for substantial volumes of cotton exports. In spite of these expenditures, the carryover of cotton has mounted steadily since 1961, reaching a near record high of 14 million bales in 1965, and a projection of about 16 million bales in 1966.

These surpluses and losses can be directly related to the overwhelming competition from manmade fibers such as rayon and the noncellulosics. Again, according to the Department of Agriculture:

> From 1930 to 1960, cotton's share of the total U.S. fiber market dropped from 85 percent to 65 percent. Since 1960, cotton's share has declined at a much greater rate, dropping to 53 percent in 1965. In contrast, the manmade fibers' share of the U.S. fiber market increased from 3.9 percent in 1930 to 29 percent in 1960, to 41 percent in 1964, and to 42.5 percent in 1965.

It has been estimated that U.S. producers of noncellulosic fibers will spend over $200 million for developing and promoting these products—a figure seven times greater than the combined public and private outlays for development and promotion of cotton in 1965.

Cotton, therefore, is facing its greatest challenge in its long history, for the success of every governmental program, every regulation, every legislative effort in the past as well as the future is dependent on increased quality, research, advertising, and promotion.

To meet this challenge, H.R. 12322 has been introduced. It provides enabling legislation for a program of advertising, trade promotion, research and development to promote the sale and use of domestic cotton, with direct costs to be financed by producer assessments. This effort is to be accomplished through "cotton research and promotion orders" to be issued by the Secretary of Agriculture after notice and hearing and following approval by two-thirds of cotton producers participating in a referendum. The orders would allow for one or more of four permissive provisions: First, for advertising and sales promotion projects, second, for research and development projects, third, for handler reporting and recordkeeping, and fourth, for incidental terms and conditions needed to effectuate other provisions of the order. Participation in this program is completely voluntary on the part of the individual growers. Not only must there be approval by the farmers in a referendum for the program to become effective, but even during its operation any farmer may request not to participate and receive a complete refund of his money.

This is legislation which does not seek large amounts of Federal money or dominant Federal control. It seeks but the assistance of the Federal Government in helping the farmer help himself; in helping cotton become a strong competitor again. There is no question but that the cotton industry has the know-how to develop its abilities in research and promotion and turn its markets upward. But it needs concentrated finances similar to those of the large synthetic producers in order to enter effectively the modern world of fiber competition. The farmers, the producers, the cotton organizations are confident that they can get the money, but they need a uniform organization and system to eliminate haggling among various processors and handlers and establish an effective competitive mechanism. H.R. 12322 attempts to do this. It attempts in its own way to repay cotton for what it has given America in the past by giving it a new competitive life in the America of tomorrow. I urge the Senate to support this bill dedicated to helping the farmer and preserving an industry that means so much to so many Americans.

NEW VERSION OF OLD SHELL GAME IS CHARGED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star of May 10, 1966, there appears an article by James J. Kilpatrick, entitled "New Version of Old Shell Game Is Charged." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Version of Old Shell Game Is Charged

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The slickest skin game of the old county fairs, at least in the gullible South, was the skin game known as the old shell game. It flourished for years, until some educated cops came along. They put the thimbleriggers on the run and the shell game all but disappeared.

Last week it came back to town. You will find it, if you look fast enough, in H.R. 14544, which came shooting out of the House Banking and Currency Committee like a little green pea under three walnut shells. This is President Johnson's sensational gimmick for turning $4.2 billion in Federal assets into $4.2 billion in Federal liabilities, all without adding a penny to the Federal deficit. Or liabilities into assets. It is all the same thing. Come one, come all, and try your skill. The hand in truth is quicker than the eye.

Johnson sketched the general outlines of his "Sales Participation Act of 1966" back in January, but it wasn't until Wednesday, April 20, that the bill turned up in the House. Then presto. On Thursday April 21, with the ink still wet on the printed bill, Representative Wright Patman, Democrat, of Texas, scheduled 3 hours of hearings. Only administration witnesses were called. By a party-line vote of 22–3, with 8 disgusted Republicans not voting, the bill came bombing out. A classic committee report followed on April 25. And last week the White House was proceeding in terrorem to get the bill whipped through the Rules Committee for an immediate vote on the floor.

The situation had its funny aspects, which is doubtless part of the game.

On the surface, this is a financing scheme by which the government would "sell off some assets." But the trick is that no assets would really be sold off.

The committee's majority report declares, deadpan, that the plan would "carry forward the objective of substituting private for public credit in funding the loan programs" of various federal agencies. But by its own terms, the bill provides for continued federal subsidies to make the private creditors secure.

The sponsors of this legislation are shouting from the housetops that this "participation" plan is truly nothing new—that it is in fact an old plan, devised by President Eisenhower in 1959. But when Eisenhower undertook to sell off some federal loans, he sold them off in straightforward transactions. Johnson's dazzling runaround is something else entirely.

Under terms of this legislation, the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, would sell certificates of participation in "pools of assets" to be provided from the outstanding loans of various federal agencies. Up to $4.2 billion in such certificates could be sold, provided the market would absorb them, and why shouldn't the market absorb them? These handsome instruments would cost the taxpayers a rate of 5.4 or 5.5 percent, at least half a point higher than the rate on regular Treasury borrowings.

As the outraged Republicans point out in their minority report, this 0.5 percent represents an expense of $5 million a year on each $1 billion of participations sold. If the entire authority were exercised, the cost to the people would approximate $21 million a year. Over an average maturity of 10 years, these higher outlays for interest would amount to something in excess of $200 million.

Yet the cost of this scheme is the least of the objections to it. The purpose of this legislation is not to promote private credit. The purpose is to conceal a $4.2 billion deficit by entering the certificate sales as a "negative expenditure." Where has the deficit gone? It lies under the third shell on the left. If this maneuver works for 1967, we may never set eyes on a deficit again, for federal agencies have $33 billion in such assets to slide in Fannie May's direction.

By the same token, as the Republicans remark, the federal debt limit can be subjected to hocus-pocus-dominocus. Now you see it, now you don't. If the proceeds of these participations are applied on paper to debt reduction, the government's total debt will not have been reduced in fact. The debt will simply have been transferred to the debt of FNMA, which is outside the statutory limit. In the course of this vanishing act, government credit would be used, if indirectly, to effect a reduction in the federal debt. This isn't done with dollars; it's done with mirrors.

There were signs last week that the administration's razzle-dazzle might prove to be self-defeating. Missouri's influential Rep. Richard Bolling, a key man on House Rules, was balking hard. He describes the scheme flatly as "deceptive." Without a lot of sober persuasion, he won't be won around.

The administration's top persuaders have been summoned to the battle. With the President's prestige at stake, they may win in the end, but their problem is that members of the House and Senate stand a cut above the rubes of the county midway.

FHA PROCEDURES IN CERTAIN PROJECTS QUESTIONED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Federal Housing Administration has called the director and the chief underwriter from each of the respective offices throughout the country into Washington for a conference this week. This conference, beginning last Tuesday, will extend through May 12.

During the past few weeks I have had correspondence with Commissioner Brownstein asking questions concerning both the procedures followed and the status of certain projects.

The replies which I have received and the information furnished do not coincide with the facts of the cases as they are outlined in the official records of the agency, and I am most respectfully suggesting to Commissioner Brownstein that while these directors are in town he ask them to reexamine the replies furnished in response to my recent questions and to advise him promptly of the omissions.

For example, in certain instances the manner in which the land was overappraised has been ignored. A damaging report concerning the administration of the Houston, Tex., office has been completely ignored, and this report alone contains enough information to have justified the dismissal of the Houston director months ago.

I recognize that Commissioner Brownstein signs these replies after the data has been assembled by his subordinates and ofttimes the director of the office may be reluctant to tell the whole story, but this is no excuse. He should hold them responsible.

These partial replies that I get only further arouse my concern.

Again I most respectfully suggest that Commissioner Brownstein take advantage of this most convenient opportunity to discuss these incomplete reports with the directors while they are in Washington.

PILOTAGE SERVICES ON THE GREAT LAKES AND ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on May 1, 1961, a coordinated United States-Canada system of pilotage on the Great Lakes was inaugurated under joint administration of the Secretary of Commerce and the Canadian Minister of Transport.

Pilotage services to ocean vessels traversing the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes began at that time with 104 United States and Canadian registered pilots, operating under joint regulations which I understand are unique. In the intervening 5 years this number of pilots has grown steadily to a total pilot force today of 148 pilots.

In the initial year the pilot force, half composed of U.S. citizens and half those of Canada, carried out duties throughout the Great Lakes on more than 9,000 assignments. Last year the number of assignments approached 14,000. This large increase in services rendered is ample evidence of the growth of trade. It is also recognition of the need and value of pilotage services.

We cannot praise too highly these American and Canadian pilots who have contributed so much in professional skills—in the highest tradition—to the furtherance of the foreign trade of the Great Lakes under the administration of the Great Lakes Pilotage Administration. The outstanding safety of navigation record during these past 5 years is clearly attributable to the high standards of qualification set by the Great Lakes Pilotage Administration for appointment of the U.S. registered pilots. It can be said that no ocean vessel with a U.S. registered pilot on board has in all these years sustained major damage nor has any person suffered serious injury or loss of life.

The pilotage facilities, equipment and communications systems which barely existed in May 1961 now can be counted among the best. The pilot stations, pilot boats, radio stations and equipment are valued in the hundreds of thousands of dollars which the pilots as independent contractors own or operate through their independent voluntary pilot associations. The adequacy and efficiency of these facilities can also be attributed to the high standards set by the Great Lakes pilotage regulations and the good business practices applied by the Great Lakes Pilotage Administration in the regulation of these facilities.

As with any new endeavor this system of internationally regulated pilotage has had many problems requiring solutions unique without precedent. There are difficult problems yet unsolved and unquestionably there will be many more in the future. However, the mutual recognition by the United States and Canada of the common need to encourage foreign trade on the Great Lakes and the longstanding friendly relations between us have greatly facilitated this task of providing for the safety of navigation on the Great Lakes.

INFLATION: ITS CAUSES, AND PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on May 10, the senior Senator from Virginia and chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, spoke to a group of bankers in Minneapolis regarding legislation of interest to the financial community. Among the topics discussed, was inflation, its causes, and prospects for the future.

There are many indications that in the first quarter of this year, expansion was at a too rapid rate—one which cannot be sustained. Prices have been rising at a significantly faster pace than we have experienced over the past few years. Despite the rise in interest rates, and price increases, consumers have increased their purchases in the past quarter by over $11 billion compared with an average increase of $7 billion to $8 billion per quarter over the last few years.

I think that Senator ROBERTSON's remarks are timely. They make a valuable contribution to the present discussion of what actions should be taken to keep our economy on an even keel. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT BANKING LEGISLATION AND BANKING PROBLEMS

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, before the American Bankers Association's Sixth Annual National Mortgage Conference, Minneapolis, Minn., May 10, 1966.)

In Washington today two related conflicts are receiving major attention. One concerns the military activities that have been going on in Vietnam and seem likely to continue for an indefinite period. The other is concerned with the economic fight that is being waged domestically against the forces of inflation. The latter struggle could be won more easily than the first, or it could be lost by failure to adopt the right instruments or to be adequately aggressive.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Compared with these major conflicts and problems, the legislative program concerning banking seems to lack glamour. Yet some of the proposals being considered can have important long-run considerations for financial institutions. Of particular concern to bankers are proposals for changes in governmental supervisory powers over financial institutions. These include suggested revisions in laws governing bank holding companies to close some gaps in existing laws and Administration proposals to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations.

The Administration proposals have met some opposition as being undue extensions of Federal power over financial institutions and will probably be amended along the lines advocated by the American Bankers Association.

Already passed by both Houses of the Congress, after considerable controversy, and approved by the President, is an Act to amend previous legislation relating to bank mergers. This law establishes new standards for both the banking agencies and the courts to follow in approving or disapproving bank mergers. These new standards prohibit the approval of a merger that would result in a monopoly. In addition, a merger which would have substantial anticompetitive effects could not be approved unless its anticompetitive effects are "clearly outweighed in the public interest" by the effects of the merger on the convenience and needs of the community to be served. That is less restrictive than Section 7 of the Clayton Act.

ANTI-INFLATIONARY MEASURES

Perhaps the most important problem facing banking, as well as the whole country and the world, today is the fight against inflation. This problem has not called for any new legislation in the field of banking, from the Administration although a House Member is sponsoring standby consumer-credit controls.

There seems to be a popular view that inflation could be prevented by legislating or otherwise fixing ceilings on prices. Price increases are considered to be the causes of inflation. It is even said by some that increases in interest rates have inflationary consequences. Actually these are evidences or manifestations of inflation, not basic causes. Price fixing by fiat would merely attempt to suppress inflation without removing its underlying causes.

Causes of inflation are basically monetary. There can be no inflation without an expansion—past, present, or in the immediate future—of the supply of money greater than the supply of goods and services available for purchase. In our monetary system, increases in the money supply result almost wholly from expansion in bank credit. The banking system, therefore, has a pivotal role in bringing about or in curbing inflation—particularly the latter.

This does not mean that banks alone can bring about inflation. Nor does it mean that inflation cannot be stopped by other measures than restraint on bank credit. Banks cannot create credit expansion unless there are strong demands for credit. To cause inflation, moreover, these demands must exceed the volume of savings by the public.

Some expansion in credit and in money is desirable and necessary to supply businesses and individuals with cash balances they need and want to hold. Inflation occurs when monetary expansion greatly exceeds production—i.e., when people have more money than they want to hold and then spend the excess in amounts that exceed the goods and services available.

Inflation is generally associated with increased governmental borrowing, although it can occur as a result of private credit expansion. On the basis of current indications and estimates, the Federal Government and its agencies will probably need to increase borrowings in this calendar year by about $9 billion, which is more than in any postwar year and over three times as much as in 1965.

These estimates include not only direct borrowing by the Treasury but also borrowing and sales of assets or participations by various governmental financial agencies contemplated in the budget estimates. A bill to authorize the sale of participation certificates has passed the Senate.

Inflationary effects may also arise from increased private borrowing, particularly if it accompanies expansion in the public debt. Private borrowing needs in the aggregate will probably be in record volume in 1966, but the increase in net private borrowings would be less inflationary if smaller than in 1965. Although bank loans have been expanding at a very rapid rate during the past 3 years, private credit demands still appear to be much larger than the amount of credit that can be made available to meet these demands. This is especially true with savings & loan associations.

It will be difficult to find savings in amounts adequate to meet the record credit demands in prospect. There will, therefore, continue to be heavy demands for bank credit. Although further bank credit increases in moderate amounts are desirable and may be anticipated, to endeavor to meet all borrowing demands by the easy process of bank credit expansion, based on additional reserves supplied by the Federal Reserve, would mean an inflationary expansion in the supply of money.

Easy monetary policies of this nature would no doubt further stimulate inflationary price increases. A continued price rise or its prospect would not only result in further expanding domestic credit demands but would cause deterioration in the competitive position of the United States in world markets for goods and services and for money. The consequence would be a worsening of our balance-of-payments position and a loss of gold that would diminish our monetary reserves. In that event, credit restraints would not only be desirable but would be unavoidable.

THE NERVOUS STOCK MARKET

Another manifestation of inflationary sentiment is seen in the behavior of the stock market. Common stock prices have continued to rise, with occasional interruptions, for over 15 years, and trading activity has recently increased sharply. The rise in stock prices has reflected in large part the desire of investors to put their savings to use in a manner that will enable them to share in the profits resulting from our actual and anticipated economic growth. It is an expression of confidence in our future. To some extent, however, the buying of corporate shares has represented the search for a "hedge against inflation," and to some degree it has been speculative. Because of this speculative aspect, the market is susceptible to severe reactions, like that just occurring.

Increases in stock prices have outrun the growth in corporate earnings and the growth in dividends. Rates of return on common stocks at current prices and dividends have declined to relatively low levels—averaging around 3 percent for high-grade stocks. In the meantime, interest rates have risen, so that average yields on high-grade corporate bonds are now close to 5 percent and yields on U.S. Government bonds are above 4½ percent.

To validate these relationships and justify purchases of stocks instead of bonds at current prices, corporate earnings and corporate dividends would have to increase even more rapidly than they have in recent years.

To some extent the increases in stock market commitments have been based on credit. Yet, because of the high margins now required on borrowing to hold stocks (70 percent), the volume of stock market credit, relative to the total value of stocks outstanding, to the total volume of all credit, and to national income, is not at all comparable to similar relationships prevailing in 1929. For these as well as for other reasons a sharp decline in stock prices at this time should not be expected to have the cumulative and far-reaching consequences of the 1929–30 debacle.

It may well be that the latest decline in stock prices should not be considered as a precursor of disasters expected to ensue, but rather represents, as did other declines in recent years, a readjustment to the realities of the current situation.

CONCLUSION

As an essential ingredient of this equation let us remember an old maxim: "Man proposes but God disposes." Politicians with the endorsement of prominent business leaders planned a program of rapid economic expansion. For 10 years that expansion has been underway and with minor inflation. Two years ago, the politicians were so pleased with their handiwork that they decided to accelerate the business expansion with vast new spending schemes. But, just as our financial institutions began to creak and groan under the unprecedented credit demand to finance a broad scope of domestic projects, the politicians suddenly woke up to the fact that an additional billion dollars per month would be needed to finance the war in Southeast Asia. That is where God enters the picture.

Proud of the fact that at the end of World War II we were the greatest military power in the world, and proud of our economic wealth which enabled us to give and loan to foreign nations far more than $100 billion since the end of that war, we made commitments to Western Europe and Southeast Asia to answer their call to defend them against Communist aggression. The temple of peace that we sought to erect in the United Nations, in NATO, and in SEATO was never dedicated to the victory of moral force. Suddenly, the businessmen and those who invest in business enterprises realize that we have become overextended.

We have neither the cash nor the credit to finance both the Great Society and a war against communism in any and every area of the world in which the Communists choose to attack. So, we find the head of one of our biggest automobile companies, Henry Ford, II, a previous champion of domestic expansion, calling attention to violence, riots, urban crime, juvenile vandalism and wildcat strikes, undermining, as he said "everything that stands for order and responsibility and tradition." That note of pessimism and lack of faith in our manifest destiny was accompanied by a General Motors announcement of reduced production. As a result, on May 5th listed values on the New York Stock Exchange experienced the sharpest drop since the bleak, black day of the assassination of President Kennedy, and on May 9th the Dow-Jones average fell another 16 points.

Our banks were as sound on May 5 as they were on May 4. There had been no reduction in employment nor curtailment in private spending. Yet, there was a new and potent factor in the equation—the psychological factor of pessimism. Like the old Arab Sheik of the desert, Job, we had been relying on our strong right arm, and all of a sudden we questioned its ability to save us.

The true answer, of course, was given this nation by a great political philosopher, President Woodrow Wilson, when broken in both body and spirit by the materialism evidenced by the American people in 1920, he said in his last message to the nation he loved: "The sum of the whole matter is this: If our civilization is to survive materially, it must be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming imbued with the spirit of Christ and made free and happy by the practices that spring from that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

ADDRESS TO 1966 COAL CONVENTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was privileged to speak at the welcoming luncheon of the 1966 Coal Convention of the American Mining Congress on May 9, in Pittsburgh, Pa.

Because of the important role which coal plays in our national economy, and its integral part in the economic development of my own State of West Virginia, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to provide remarks on the coal industry's share in our future economy.

I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD BEFORE THE 1966 COAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS, PITTSBURGH, PA., MAY 9, 1966

Members and Guests of the American Mining Congress, Allen Overton and his staff are to be congratulated on the excellent program for this convention. I wish I could attend every session. Unfortunately, I must return to Washington this afternoon.

Appropriations Committee work alone is enough to hold a Committee Member at his desk until late at night . . . every night. With inflationary pressures gnawing at the vitals of economic balance, every federal expenditure must be scrutinized with maximum care.

Our commitment to the enigma that is Viet Nam requires enormous expenditures, for frugality must sometimes be sacrificed when American lives are at stake. Degrees of waste will always be attendant to the waging of war, inasmuch as we cannot chance the tragedy of undersupply that might deprive our men of necessary equipment or support. For this reason, if I am to be guilty of a miscalculation in the expenditure of funds for the armed forces, my error will not be on the side of parsimony where men on the front lines are concerned.

But to attempt to explain away the disparity between federal income and federal outgo as attributable wholly to our military effort would be less than honest. I am convinced that there is entirely too much extravagance in our bulging bureaucracy. Only by curbing it can we hope to check inflation and its vicious debilitation of our economy, for runaway inflation can impoverish families faster than the war on poverty could rehabilitate them even if conducted with utmost efficiency. Inflation, furthermore, is an exceptionally cruel cumbrance to those who expect to sustain themselves in the twilight of their lives on savings, pensions, and other fixed incomes.

Yes, the national budget requires a watchful eye, and membership on the Appropriations Committee is a sacred trust that calls for full attention. As chairman of the District of Columbia subcommittee, I have had an opportunity to inject a semblance of economy into an area where waste had long been rampant—the welfare program. While my efforts in this direction have elicited painful outcries from certain quarters, response from citizens who object to chiseling at taxpayer expense has been most gratifying. The average American is generous to a fault, but he will not tolerate policies that nurture indolence and perfidy.

My Committee activity has also brought me into close association with law enforcement officials. Under prevailing attitudes, theirs is a difficult lot. With riots becoming a commonplace in the city streets and on the college campus, it is incumbent upon all dedicated citizens to take an active interest in the problem. To start at the beginning, there must be a return to the philosophy that the child needs proper parental supervision if he is to become a responsible member of society as he grows into maturity. It is ludicrous to attempt to excuse riots in Newport and Fort Lauderdale as a normal outlet for vacationing college students; it is equally absurd to exonerate disorder in Los Angeles or Washington on the theory that products of poverty and frustration are understandably given to rebellion.

America must get back into proper perspective on this matter of law and order, and I feel that this responsibility supercedes any other domestic problem existing today.

Lest there be some feeling among you that there was a misunderstanding about my topic for today, I assure you that Mr. Overton's invitation in no way suggested a sermon on the social responsibilities of our time. But I believe that the problem is so serious as to merit much more attention than it has been getting in the proper areas. Certainly it cannot be dismissed in the manner of this Gilbert and Sullivan recipe:

> "Life's a pudding full of plums;
> Care's a canker that benumbs,
> Wherefore waste our elocution
> On impossible solution?
> Life's a pleasant institution,
> Let us take it as it comes."

No, Gentlemen, we cannot afford to be complaisant about these matters any more than we could go unconcerned about problems primarily affecting the coal industry. Certainly without diligent work on the part of such groups as the Mining Congress, my State and this State of Pennsylvania could hardly expect to share proportionately in the growing economy ahead.

But before surveying that road into the future, I should like to recall a Spring day in 1961 when a group of government officials visited West Virginia. On the assumption that coal might benefit if the new Administration's Secretary of the Interior were to visit a mining region, I invited Stewart Udall to a mine tour even before he was officially confirmed for the job. Steve Dunn made the necessary arrangements, and the trip was on. My fellow West Virginian, Mr. Overton, did not accompany us because he was still serving on the Tariff Commission at the time.

It seemed reasonable enough to have the Secretary and his party familiarize themselves with an industry in which they are so involved. There was also the hope that we might enjoy a residual benefit: after experiencing the dilapidated economic status of our mining communities, Mr. Udall might just become sympathetic enough to go back to Washington and set up tighter controls on the Number 6 oil shipped into this country.

In the final calculations, we not only failed to make much headway in this respect, but we almost lost a very important coal man in the process. Our tour called for a stop at the Gary preparation plant, and today's presiding officer promised to meet us there. He did, too, but a heavy overcast made flying conditions difficult and his airplane tipped over on landing at the airport. Mr. Core, it is mighty good to have you with us today.

No, despite our persistent appeals, a cutback in residual oil imports did not materialize. Shipments continued in ever-increasing volume. Early this year the mandatory control program was, to all intents and purposes, placed aside in willful disregard of our appeals for more reasonable restrictions.

For West Virginia, the Government's attitude on alien oil's arrogation of our domestic markets is particularly bitter. By far the greatest percentage of the coal displaced by the products of foreign refineries would come from the mines of our State, and be transported by our railroads. Secretary of the Interior Udall has given assurance that he will not permit importers to interpret the new order as an open invitation for further invasion of coal's current markets, yet he cannot very well police all the tanker traffic that moves into our Eastern seaboard. For this reason I hope that coal dealers will keep vigilant surveillance over the competitive situation, and I invite you to inform my office if there is any violation of the intent expressed by the Secretary.

While foreign oil has surged into coal's markets in progressively greater volume, another competitor has found coal a formidable rival. Natural gas, which five years ago had 27 per cent to coal's 65 per cent of the electric utility market, has finally begun to lose some ground, dropping to 25 per cent while coal went to 66 per cent in 1965.

Additional hydroelectric capacity has gone on the line, but it has been primarily in the West and may be considered inconsequential from the standpoint of total generation of electricity in this country.

Meanwhile, however, the atom looms as a definite competitive threat to coal, not from existing plants but from those in the planning stages. At present the capacity of atomic plants actually producing power is less than 2 million kilowatts, but the future offers a much more alarming picture. Last year atomic plants with a total capacity of 5 million kilowatts were ordered, and already this year contracts have been signed for facilities amounting to 3 million kilowatts in total capacity.

Coal has still other problems—including the air pollution and water pollution issues—yet the industry emerged from the depths of a 403-million-ton output in 1961 to reach 510 million tons last year. And we expect that figure to be exceeded in 1966.

Coal has come back because you men who produce it and your allied industries refuse to be beaten in the competitive market. Although the average price of bituminous coal at the mine had already been shaved from $4.99 a ton to $4.58 a ton between 1948 and 1961, you continued to invest in modern equipment and modern methods that drove your price still lower in the face of inflationary winds affecting almost every other commodity. Last year's average price at the mine was $4.45 per ton.

The unit train is to me one of the brightest chapters in railroad history. It has reduced the cost of delivering coal through drastic savings in freight costs, without which extensive losses to other forms of fuel would unquestionably have taken place. In 1961 it was in the planning stage; today the unit train delivers 50 per cent of all the coal moving to electric utilities.

To feed the growing energy appetite of other nations of the world, the United States bituminous coal industry last year exported 50 million tons as compared with 35 million tons in 1961. I was happy to have been able to assist in obtaining an appropriation for the deepening of channels at Norfolk, where ships much larger than we envisioned just 5 years ago will soon be standing in to receive the product of our mines, leaving behind dollars urgently needed to improve our balance of payments position.

We have come a long way since 1961. But there is no stopping here. We cannot forever expect to drive production and delivery costs down. We may already have reached the bottom from a cost standpoint. There must be a new approach to keeping coal competitive so that it will be able at least to maintain its ratio of the increasing energy market. Research would seem the logical answer.

In 1961 the Office of Coal Research was established under a law enacted the previous year. The father of that legislation, Congressman JOHN SAYLOR, is scheduled to address you tomorrow. I supported the original bill when I was in the House, and then was able to vote for the final measure in the Senate. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, I am in the extremely fortunate position of being able to support—and initiate where necessary—the funds needed to carry on activities of the Office of Coal Research.

Mr. fellow West Virginian, George Fumich, has performed admirably as Director of OCR. It is my pleasure to work closely with him.

Mr. Overton has asked that I review briefly some of the principal OCR projects, but I shall make no attempt to go into technical details on any of them.

The Office of Coal Research was five years of age last month. During its short but dramatic history, it has let contracts for some 40 projects involving about $26 million in federal appropriations. In insisting that all of these projects have great promise, I do not exaggerate. For—believe me—each has been scrutinized carefully not only by Mr. Fumich's staff experts but also by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House.

From a tonnage standpoint, OCR's liquid fuels and gasification projects offer greatest potential. I am sure that most members of this audience are familiar with Project Gasoline, which, it is hoped will lead to the establishment of a commercial industry for the production of high-octane gasoline from coal. Project Gasoline bench-scale experimentations far exceed the most optimistic estimates, and a pilot plant is presently under construction at Cresap, West Virginia. It is expected to go into operation later this year.

There are other coal-to-liquid projects being conducted under OCR auspices, but I shall not enumerate them here. We are confident that one or more will lead to the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry, initially competitive with petroleum products in areas where large reserves of coal are available. Later, as petroleum supplies dwindle, our markets will be extended. Meanwhile the substitute for petroleum would be ready to assume a vital role in the Nation's defense posture in the event of another world conflict.

OCR has also contracted for research on several projects aimed at producing a substitute for natural gas from coal. One of these is taking place within a few miles of this meeting hall—at Monroeville. Bituminous Coal Research is developing a gasifier which preliminary studies indicate has a good potential for producing competitively priced pipeline gas from coal. I have visited the laboratory at Monroeville, and I was impressed with the variety of scientific studies that are taking place there. I note that BCR's president, Mr. Garvey, will address tomorrow's session here.

In letting its contracts, OCR also has an eye on the removal of sulphur and ash from coal and on various improvements in the field of combustion. With air pollution control laws being tightened at all levels of government, particularly in the large cities, progress in sulphur and ash removal is mandatory.

Another local project which has considerable merit is the Westinghouse Electric Corporation's contract with OCR for the development of a coal-energized fuel cell. It would not only improve efficiency in electric power generation, but also reduce air pollution and eliminate the requirement for large quantities of cooling water.

Tomorrow OCR will sign a contract for a project beyond the dreams of Jules Verne—or perhaps I should say of Thomas Edison. The Gourdine laboratories in New Jersey have, through basic research efforts, demonstrated the possibility of producing electricity in large volume without the use of steam or the conventional turbine and generator. Mr. Fumich is so impressed with the potential that he asked me to obtain from our Appropriations Subcommittee permission to shift current fiscal year funds rather than wait until July to get started on the project. The National Coal Association also urged my support of such a reprograming of funds and I was instrumental in helping to bring this about. I am so impressed that I suggested to Mr. Overton that he ask Dr. Gourdine to come to Pittsburgh to attend this convention and thus be available to any of you who may wish to discuss the project.

While each OCR project holds exciting hopes for coal's future, I assure you that I do not intend to talk to you about all of them. I should like to mention, however, one of the few that can be understood without a scientific education. Fly ash has always been a problem in the combustion of coal. In former years it was discharged into the atmosphere and then collected on your windowsills. Along came the electrostatic precipitator and other devices to capture fly ash before it leaves the stack. But now that we have it, what do we do with it? * * * deposit it in unsightly piles or drop it into the water? For some time it has been known that it could be used as a mixture for concrete, but the volume used in this way has been entirely too limited. Probably only about 5 per cent of the 20 million tons of fly ash each year is ever put to use. It is my hope that the current developments will permit a sharp increase in this percentage.

Through the Office of Coal Research, the University of West Virginia is conducting a study of a new type of brick and other construction materials made largely from fly ash. Meanwhile I am looking into the possibility of expanding the use of fly ash in the construction of highways under the Appalachian Regional Development Act and in other government sponsored programs. Such application would not only help relieve the disposal problem but would also have the effect of reducing the cost of burning coal in large central station power plants.

By references to my own State, I may have implied that we on the Appropriations Committee and at the Office of Coal Research have been concerned exclusively with the coal industry of this area. Let me assure you that what is being done with these federal funds will serve to revitalize the industry in other parts of the country, just as it will react to the benefit of coal operators and coal miners here in the east. The University of Utah, for example, is studying the processing characteristics of Western coals under an OCR contract. There is also a study of potential markets for Western coal and lignite sponsored by OCR. And the CO_2 acceptor process is a pipeline gas project centered on the use of Northwest lignite as a raw material.

The coal industry of the West, particularly in the Four Corners area, is already entering an era of infinite promise. Through the use of unit trains and long distance transmission lines, Los Angeles and other coastal cities will be served with electricity generated with coal that lies beneath the soil of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado. In a few short years the vast lignite fields of Montana will supply generating stations that feed power into lines now served exclusively by hydroelectric stations.

Back in the East, our own mine-mouth plants in West Virginia and Pennsylvania are being readied to serve the megalopolis of the Eastern seaboard.

The coal industry has accomplished miracles in the past. I congratulate those operators who had the confidence to invest in progress at a time when pessimism should seemingly have been the order of the day. I congratulate you gentlemen who have applied your engineering and scientific skills to the development of this great industry. Through your genius and the versatility of mine workers who quickly adapted to mechanization's magic techniques, we have left the other mining nations of the world far behind in comparative productivity capabilities. We shall never stop improving where improvement is possible.

There is no question but that the coal industry is primed to do its part in meeting the unprecedented energy demands of the future. With synthetic oil and gas from coal assured a promising role in the projection, some of the problems that divided our fuels industries in the past will tend to bring them closer together in the future. Where inequities persist, however, the people of our mining states must stand as one to demand relief from undue competitive hardship.

Our coal industry is moving forward, and the impetus must be maintained if we are to enjoy the economic benefits that have been so long in coming. There is no doubt about the confidence, determination, and intention of management and production personnel. And I hope that there is no doubt in your minds that you have in Washington some deeply interested and highly steadfast supporters pledged to do everything possible to keep clear the path of coal industry progress.

TRADE BRIDGES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I believe Senators will be interested in a New York editorial commenting on President Johnson's announcement that he wants to liberalize trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

The Times states:

> An expansion of mutually advantageous trade between the United States and the Soviet block countries cannot help but strengthen the forces on both sides that press for reciprocally beneficial cooperation rather than discord.

I am sure others will want to see this editorial so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE BRIDGES TO THE EAST

President Johnson's announcement that he will send Congress legislation aimed at liberalizing trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union is a welcome implementation of his long-expressed interest in building more bridges to the Communist world. Much of the delay in moving toward extended relations has undoubtedly been linked to the fears of adverse domestic political reaction because of the strain of the war in Vietnam. Yet the dangers created by that conflict actually make it more rather than less important that the United States extend such a hand of friendship to the more reasonable Communist states.

An expansion of mutually advantageous trade between the United States and the Soviet bloc countries cannot help but strengthen the forces on both sides that press for reciprocally beneficial cooperation rather than discord. Substantially to increase that commerce will require at least three basic measures: Ending the discriminatory tariff barriers that now hinder sales of Soviet and most Eastern European goods here; removal of the legal obstacles to extension of normal commercial credits to those countries, and revision of United States strategic export controls to put them on a par with the more liberal—and more sensible—regulations in effect in Western Europe and Japan.

The President has now begun the process of making the needed changes, but he will need effective and vigorous support in Congress to make his proposals law at this session. If Congress fails to act positively, the result can only be more cynicism and disillusionment about the United States in the countries involved.

THE POLISH MILLENNIUM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on May 3 millions of Americans of Polish descent joined with many others around the world to commemorate the Polish millennium. A number of Senators have already commented on the significance of this occasion and on the important contributions which Poland has made to science, religion, literature, and other aspects of our civilization, and the Senate has passed Senate Resolution 255 saluting Americans of Polish descent. It is indeed appropriate that we pause to consider the achievements of this great people, and I am pleased to be associated with this commemoration.

Throughout its long and illustrious history—from 966, when it become a Christian nation, to the present—Poland has been the scene of major world events. Despite partitions, wars, and the scars of foreign domination, Poland has been a cultural inspiration. One need only mention Chopin, Paderewski, Hofmann, Rubinstein, and Madame Curie to understand the size of our debt to this nation.

In our own country, Mr. President, individuals of Polish descent have contributed substantially to our cultural and spiritual life. It is only fitting that this devoted loyal group be recognized on this 1,000th anniversary.

TORNADO ALLEY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, there is a corridor which runs from the Gulf of Mexico, up through the center of our Nation which climatological experts have dubbed "Tornado Alley." The "alley" cuts through the States of Oklahoma and Kansas, and its southernmost origin in in my own State of Texas.

More tornadoes are reported in these three States, on an area-by-area basis, than in any other part of the Nation. The residents of these States are in the midst of the tornado season at the present time. This "season" begins in April and extends until June, with the greatest violent weather activity in May.

During the past 50 years, 1,991 tornadoes have touched ground in my State alone, causing 879 deaths, thousands of injuries, and countless property damage.

Each year in the United States, an average of 240 tornadoes strike, killing, during the average year, 204 persons.

On May 11, 1953, 114 persons died in a single tornado which struck Waco, Tex.

As I am sure my fellow Senators are aware, Mr. President, virtually all sections of my State were affected by heavy rain storms, violent weather, and flooding in April and in this month. Hardest hit were areas and communities along the Trinity River from Fort Worth to the Gulf of Mexico. Flooding in the Dallas area was responsible for 19 deaths, and millions of dollars were lost in property damage.

But, as was pointed out by the Army Corps of Engineers, the greatest story was the flood that did not happen. The corps' flood control and reservoir projects, such as the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir, the Lavon Reservoir, and the Grapevine and the Benbrook Reservoirs, saved the city of Dallas and surrounding communities—indeed communities down to the gulf—from an estimated $51 million in damages.

Mr. Kent Biffle, of the Dallas Morning News, assessed this "flood that did not happen" in a most interesting and, I believe, most important article which appeared on May 8. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Biffle makes a thorough assessment of the value of the various flood control projects which saved Dallas and other cities along the Trinity River from additional disaster and costly destruction. The corps planners have done their jobs well.

At the same time, Mr. President—and this is the crux of my remarks today—additional actions can be taken to safeguard and warn communities of the imminent danger of flooding, hail, lightning storms, hurricanes, and tornadoes.

The Department of Commerce has proposed the establishment of a national natural disaster warning system, which, it seems to me, would be of inestimable value in saving human lives and safeguarding against property damage. The Department's proposal would establish an integrated natural hazards detections system, utilizing existing facilities, and would, also with the help of existing facilities, expand its communications network for dissemination of violent weather information and upgrade its capabilities for immediate alert to all sections of the Nation.

I have had a chance to study the Department's proposals for the nationwide natural disaster warning system, and I am in complete accord with the objectives of this program. It is my hope that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses will include funds for the system—called Nadwarn—in their final appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce.

With such a system in effect, our Nation would make valuable headway in reducing the number of deaths attributable to natural disasters; estimated at between 500 and 600 yearly. It would assist in halting the economic losses to our country, estimated at between $11 billion and $15 billion annually, caused by tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, seismic sea waves, blizzards, forest fires, earthquakes, severe local storms, and other adverse weather conditions.

I urge Senators to study the Nadwarn plan and give it their support. It would benefit every citizen in our Nation, since there is no State in the country which has not been visited by some sort of natural disaster in its history or which is not subject to future tragedy of this kind.

EXHIBIT 1

DALLAS SPARED FROM GREATER FLOODS—LEVEES, FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIRS HELD BACK MOST OF WATER

(By Kent Biffle)

Recent flooding in Dallas was blamed for 19 deaths, damage to more than 270 homes and property damage counted in the millions of dollars.

But even greater than the flooding between April 23 and May 4 was the flood that didn't happen.

To grasp the extent of what might have happened it is helpful to look at what was going on upstream from Dallas.

During the peak of the rainfall, water was pouring into Garza-Little Elm Reservoir at a rate of 90,000 cubic feet a second. That's "a second." And each cubic foot of it contained 7½ gallons.

At Lavon Reservoir, water was cascading in at a rate of 50,000 cubic feet a second. Other flood control lakes were experiencing similar inflows.

Lavon, Garza-Little Elm, Grapevine and Benbrook reservoirs held back water that would have kicked the Trinity at least 10 feet higher than its 39.7-foot crest in Dallas. (Flood stage on the Trinity is considered to be 30 feet.)

A U.S. Army Corps of Engineers spokesman said Saturday that during the flood period, 1,239,000 acre-feet of water fell into the upper Trinity basin. But—thanks to the flood control lakes—only 376,000 acre-feet of water went down the Trinity during the wettest period.

If some old-timers saw a Trinity that didn't compare in volume with the great floods of the past, it was only because of the amount of water arrested by the reservoirs.

The 1,239,000 acre-feet of 1966 compares with the greatest floods of record. Floods of 1957 and 1908 were each boiled up by about 1,300,000 acre-feet of runoff in the upper basin.

Existing flood control measures on the Trinity—including both the Fort Worth and Dallas floodways plus the lakes—were credited by the Corps of Engineers with preventing about $51 million in losses all along the river's route to the Gulf Coast.

Despite flood control measures, losses in the neighborhood of $14,500,000 were experienced throughout the Trinity basin.

Congressman EARLE CABELL's contention last week that completion of the Trinity River Improvement Program (a $900 million program that includes a barge channel as well as flood control projects) would have averted much of the loss, was verified by the Corps of Engineers.

A corps spokesman said that about $12 million of the $14,500,000 in losses could have been prevented if the big program were completed.

Lavon may have been typical of effects of the flood control measures taken during the stormy period. While peak inflow was 50,000 feet per second, the maximum outflow was held to 6,000 cubic feet per second.

In Dallas, scores of homes were flooded when White Rock Creek waters combined at the creek's mouth with waters from the swollen Trinity to flood Roosevelt Heights and Bexar Street areas.

This confluence of White Rock and the Trinity is included in the Trinity River Improvement Program. Engineers have recommended that the White Rock channel be moved from the west side of Roosevelt Heights to the east side. There it would be restrained by existing high ground on the east side of the new channel and by levees that would be built on the west side.

On White Rock Creek, in the Samuell Boulevard area, the City of Dallas is preparing to advertise for bids on about $365,000 worth of channel work and straightening that would protect roughly a mile of property along the creek between Samuell and the Texas & Pacific Railroad tracks.

Dallas City Manager Elgin Crull said the city will advertise for bids within a few weeks on this and another project—an estimated $130,000 worth of work aimed at relieving a White Rock bottleneck in the Winsted-Garland Road area.

These projects would be coordinated into a proposed $15 million program that would carry flood control on White Rock Creek all the way north to the Collin County line.

The construction cost is based on $10 million in anticipated work on upper White Rock Creek and $5 million on lower portions of the stream. It would not affect, however, the Trinity River Improvement Program proposals for the area of the creek near its meeting with the Trinity.

Work on White Rock Creek included in the program would install reinforced concrete channels such as were built along Five Mile Creek to prevent flooding. Portions of the creek would not be lined, however. They would be deepened and, in crooked spots, straightened. Where practical, Crull said, an open-space approach to the problem would be used.

In these areas, the city would buy the property adjacent to the stream and permit floods to spread harmlessly over vacant property in wet seasons.

There are advantages to the open-space approach in certain areas, said Crull. The taxpayer not only gets flood protection in the purchase of open space but park area as well.

While flooded a few days each year, the areas would be useful during the rest of the year as park area, he explained.

Another possible advantage to the open-space idea is participation by the federal government in the purchase of land for this purpose. The $15 million figure doesn't include the cost of right-of-way for open-space purposes.

A group of city officials will soon depart for Washington where, with the help of Congressman CABELL, they will meet with officials of four of five agencies that might offer assistance to Dallas, both in recovering from the flood and in preventing a recurrence.

Public Works Director H. H. Stirman, Parks Director L. B. Houston, and Assistant City Manager W. S. McDonald are expected to make the trip.

"We're going to take the problem to Washington and let the federal officials analyze it," said Crull.

The Corps of Engineers made early estimates that Dallas had received about $2,500,000 damage. The city, according to Crull, suffered something less than $750,000 in damage to streets and city-owned property.

"The city's primary responsibility in these situations is to protect the movement of traffic," he said. "Bridges, roads, and culverts must be constructed so that traffic will continue to move under all but the most severe circumstances."

A number of aging culverts and bridges in North Dallas would hopefully be rebuilt so that they would not slow the flow of runoff water, he indicated.

"The principle is this," said Crull. "Water will flow more slowly through a rough concrete pipe than through a smooth, glass-lined pipe. At any point where we can streamline the flow of water, the less water we'll have backing up."

Crull admitted, however, that there were certain aspects of the spring floods in Dallas that the city is almost powerless to guard against.

He quoted U.S. Geological Survey records on rainfall in Dallas during the early morning of April 28.

At Northaven Road at St. Michaels, starting at 12:45 a.m., a total of 5.8 inches of rain fell in 85 minutes.

At Walnut Hill Lane and Inwood Road, starting at 12:50 a.m., a total of 4.8 inches of rain fell in 85 minutes.

At Northwest Highway and Hillcrest, starting at 12:40 a.m., a total of 4 inches fell in 75 minutes.

At Webbs Chapel and Lombardy, starting at 12:40 a.m., a total of 4.65 inches fell in 80 minutes.

In Richardson, at Belt Line Road, 1 mile west of Central Expressway, starting at 12:35 a.m., a total of 5.1 inches fell in 90 minutes.

While other areas of the city escaped the sudden cloudburst, all across the North Side rain funneled out of the sky with an intensity that no drainage system could anticipate.

The result was flash floods that knocked out roads and inundated some of the most luxurious homes in the Nation.

Some of Dallas' wealthiest citizens joined the impoverished people of Roosevelt Heights as flood victims.

Water barged into the homes of Troy Post, Clint Murchison, Jr., and Jerome Crossman. One North Dallas man suffered $50,000 damage to his home. Another family this week reportedly discarded a carpet that had cost $100 a yard.

Paul Jacobsen, assistant executive director of the Dallas Chapter of the American Red Cross, said 40 businesses were damaged by high water.

At the Small Business Administration where flooded merchants were offered long-term, 3 percent Government loans, one businessman who lost a large inventory was inquiring about a loan of more than $100,000.

Jacobsen said that in addition to the more than 270 homes that were flooded, 350 families evacuated their homes and then returned when the water failed to reach them.

Crull noted that the disaster, while severe to those involved, touched only a fraction of 1 percent of Dallas' 150,000 homes and 40,000 businesses.

And at the end of last week, long after water had receded from homes, Crull was still getting calls from Eastern radio newsmen who wanted to know how much of Dallas remained under water.

"They don't understand about flash floods," he said.

Lee Halford, a field engineer for the Dallas County Flood Control District, said there were "eight or nine" earth slides on the Trinity levee during the rainstorms.

"Some of them were very minor," he said. "And none of them critically damaged the levee." The floodway through Dallas was never taxed, said Halford. Damage to the levee will be repaired this summer, he said.

The 12-mile-long system of levees on each side of the Trinity is equipped with seven pump stations that move runoff water from behind the levees into the channel of the Trinity. All seven were in use during the siege of rain, said Halford.

The swollen river did not look menacing as it rolled through Dallas because of the flood control activities upstream by the Corps of Engineers.

By the end of the week you could walk through Roosevelt Heights without getting your shoes muddy. Belongings of the victims were still littered in yards—furniture, old clothes, pieces of toys.

The smell of a receding flood and the smell of poverty were thick in Roosevelt Heights.

"At least our lives were spared," said a Negro woman, chipping dried mud off a piece of furniture. "But that was all that was spared for us," she sighed.

Many other Dallas residents were spared a great deal, however. They were spared by 12 miles of levees and flood control reservoirs upstream.

They were spared by that greater flood—the one that didn't happen.

CLOSING OF ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH, NEW HAVEN, CONN., AND DEATH OF TERRI ALTIERI

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently, Charles T. McQueeney, managing editor of the New Haven Register, has written two exceptionally fine pieces on the passing of two well-known and beloved institutions in that city.

One, on April 2, was devoted to the closing down of St. Patrick's Church at Grand Avenue and Wallace Streets in New Haven.

This particular parish enjoyed a long, illustrious, and constructive history in

New Haven and the surrounding area. As Mr. McQueeney concludes in his moving article:

> So, St. Pat's may be passing from the New Haven scene but it will never pass from memory. It has been too noble an institution for too long to permit that.

The second article, which appeared on April 9, was a tribute to Terri Altieri, for many years the able and dedicated staff photographer of the New Haven Register.

I was very saddened to learn of his death earlier this month. I remember Terri Altieri well; many are the times that I was the subject of one of his photos.

I ask unanimous consent to have both of these articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Haven Register, Apr. 2, 1966]

ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH

The passing of St. Patrick's Church at Grand Avenue and Wallace Street not only marks the end of an era but more importantly strikes a note of sadness in the hearts of those who were once members of the parish and those whose ancestors could make the same boast. And the use of the word boast is not in the spirit of bragging or overemphasizing, for St. Patrick's once played a very important role in the life of New Haven—the influence of its long-ago pastors as well as its communicants having tremendous impact on the city which at the time was struggling to make its mark in world affairs. And in its early days, its influence was apparent beyond the city, as far away as Branford, Guilford and Clinton. At that time, there was no Catholic church in any of those communities and members of the faith were forced to drive by horse-drawn carriage or walk the distance to attend mass on Sundays and holy days. That was at a time way back around the 1850's, the 1860's, and 1870's; when the Reverend Matthew Hart was the shepherd of the small but devout flock. From all accounts, he was a saintly man and it was he, as the first pastor, who was responsible for giving St. Patrick's a strong foundation. He took over not too long after his ordination and served for 25 years, until his unexpected death in July 1876. At the time, he was only 51 years old, but he was the oldest Catholic clergyman—in the point of service—in the city. We have a letter, written in 1876, which mentions his death. It was written by James Collins to his son Patrick, who was in Westfield, Mass., at the time. Patrick later returned to New Haven and for years ran his own tea business here. The letter writer is the great-grandfather of Larry Collins, of West Hartford, coauthor of "Is Paris Burning?" An excerpt follows:

"Now you will be sorry to hear of the death of Father Hart. He went in the boat to New York of a Wednesday night to St. Vincent Hospital and was found dead of a Sunday morning about 9 o'clock so the dispatch came before last mass. Father Lynch and another priest went to New York and returned with the body by boat of a Monday night at 8 o'clock. There was no less than 6,000 in the street and about the hall when he came. For two nights his body was in the hall in an icebox and on Wednesday morning the casket arrived and he was placed in it. At 5 o'clock everyone had to leave work to go and see him. He looked the same as ever. There were two masses said. The body was brought from the hall about 10 o'clock up to St. Mary's Church where there was a mass said. There were nearly one hundred priests and a great deal of the most respectable men of the city in attendance. There was a considerable crowd of other people as well. After the mass the body was brought back from St. Mary's and buried at the foot of the small steeple facing Grand Street. That is the steeple next to his house. Some went to the mayor and asked leave to have his remains there so he felt sorry for him and said to have him in any part of the property they fancied. So they began to dig the grave, and while they were digging it Father Hughes came from Hartford and said he should be buried in the cemetery. So the men said they had leave from the mayor and that would be the place for his remains, so he gave the contest up. Now, the grave is about 12 feet long, facing Grand Street, about 12 feet wide, and about 10 feet deep. A large flagstone was placed at the bottom of the grave and a brick wall built around it to about four feet high. The coffin was laid on the flagstone at the bottom and a similar flagstone was placed atop the brick wall covering the casket. Then they covered the top flagstone with the earth that was dug up. The remainder was carted away. It is not certain whether a monument will be built there as yet. Father Lynch was placed in charge of the parish for awhile and no one can say who will be named the parish priest. * * *"

Long after Father Hart's death we were born while our good parents were members of St. Patrick's parish. We were baptized in the historic edifice and our early memories of it go back to childhood and Sunday attendance at mass there. It was quite a chore for mom to get her brood of five ready, but for her it was a pleasant task and off we went each Sunday to mass feeling quite rich holding our "penny for the basket." Then it was back in the afternoon for catechism class in the little wooden school at the rear of the church under the direction of the Sisters of Mercy. That was in the era when the Reverend John Russell was pastor. He served the longest pastorate in the history of the Hartford Diocese, being stationed at St. Patrick's for 55 years. He was a tremendous person and around his distinct personality flourished the high traditions of the parish. There were few boys born in the parish who at christening were not given the middle name of Russell in his honor. He was a colorful figure and commanded great respect about the city. It was he who prevailed upon the city fathers of that time to add the good nuns of the parish school to the city teaching staff. It was probably the only such setup in the entire country. The convent was up on Franklin Street, at State, and the nuns were transported to and from school first in horse-drawn vehicles and later in a big motorbus. Outstanding among the sisters was one named Sister Celestine. And there are many women in New Haven today, one-time members of the old parish, whose middle name is Celestine in honor of that wonderful soul. We also recall the Reverend David Hutchinson and the Reverend Joseph Casey as outstanding curates there. Also, a Professor Lynch, the organist who was really a master of the keyboard. There is a recollection of some of the soloists, outstanding among them Margaret Hogan and a Mrs. Tobin. Fond thoughts also remain of the well-attended masses there when the old balcony on either side of the church was filled as was the main floor section. Then, shortly after World War I, things began to change down Grand Avenue way, the Irish families and some of the Italians, too, began to move away and little by little, the parish dwindled. In recent years redevelopment delivered the last blow and there was only a handful left in the parish and the shadows of death became more apparent. Last Sunday, the last masses were celebrated there and the one at 11 o'clock drew an attendance reminiscent of the old days. For the first time in many years, the balcony was used and held an overflow congregation. Many, who themselves had been a part of old St. Pat's and those whose parents once worshipped there, returned. The grand old church had come into its own once again and for the last time. And we have a feeling that Father Hart, Father Russell, Sister Celestine, and all of the good priests and nuns who labored there were watching and no doubt joyously recalling their days at Grand and Wallace. We think, too, that they joined with many in the congregation in shedding a tear as the once mighty organ concluded the services with "Danny Boy." So, St. Pat's may be passing from the New Haven scene but it will never pass from memory. It has been too noble an institution for too long to permit that.

[From the New Haven Register, Apr. 9, 1966]

TERRI ALTIERI

To those of us on The Register who had the happy experience of working with him, the death this week of Terri Altieri, a staff photographer for many years, brought genuine sorrow. Terri whose name really was Theodore, was with the paper for more than 40 years both as a part-time and full-time employee. For a long span he was a familiar figure at any place a good news story was breaking. His contributions of top grade photos won him wide recognition long before Art Dietle and his Mystery Photo came on the scene. Some years back, in addition to his being a member of The Register staff, Terri was also a "stringer" for the old International News Photo setup and as a result, many of his photos were given world wide exposure. Friend of long standing, our own fond memories of Terri go back to our first days with The Register. At that time, he used to dash about on assignments astride a motorcycle with sidecar attached. He was a colorful figure, bedecked in puttees, leather gloves up to his elbows, goggles, a leather cap worn at a jaunty angle and other apparel that was part of the well dressed motorcyclist's wardrobe of the era. A daring soul, Terri paid little heed to speed regulations or other rules of the road and the reporters who rode in the sidecar beside him often came back with harrowing tales, sometimes more exciting than the story they were sent out to cover.

Stories about Terri are legend. We recall asking him how come he came by the name of Terri in view of the fact that most people named Theodore were known as Teddy. He replied that it was because he liked the knickname of a great hero of his early life in this country, Terri Roosevelt. His embarking on a career in photography came about because of a misunderstanding. Upon arrival in this country from Italy as a youth, Terri joined his brother Wally in the barber business downtown. While serving his apprenticeship, he was entrusted one day with the job of shaving one of Wally's best customers, Big Dave Fitzgerald. A little nervous, Terri had an unsteady hand and in one of his swipes down the side of Dave's face, Terri knicked his ear and the blood began to flow very freely. Dave got excited and began to give Wally a good going over for letting an inexperienced hand work on him. He concluded by telling Wally that "the best thing for this guy to be doing would be working with a pick." Dave, of course, was referring to a job with the pick and shovel. Terri, however, not being too familiar with our tongue thought he meant pictures so a few weeks later he gave Wally his notice and told him he was enrolling in a camera school in Rochester. It didn't take Terri long to master the camera and in a comparatively short time he was back in New Haven to set himself in business. His first studio was in the old Poli Building on Church Street. On occasion we visited with him there and enjoyed each instance. For, in addition to his photographic equipment, he had the greatest collection of gadgets that we have ever seen. If ever Rube Goldberg needed ideas for his famous cartoons, Terri's studio would have been the place to find them. While working out of the Poli Building he struck up a warm friendship with the late theater magnate, Sylvester Z. Poli. Mr. Poli enjoyed Terri's company very much and was a frequent passenger in the sidecar on Terri's motorcycle. Mr. Poli was a great pool player and he and Terri often squared off at a green felt-covered table. Friend Terri would say: "I leta him wins to makea him happy."

During the football season, it was our assignment over a long stretch to accompany Terri to the Yale Bowl to keep a record of the action that he and his "Big Bertha" snapped. Our point of vantage was atop the press stand and in rain, snow, freezing weather and—once in a while favorable conditions—Terri never failed to come up with a variety of good shots. Before they resorted to taking movies of the games, the Yale coaches grabbed up as many as possible of Terri's photos to illustrate plays to the squad. We saved his life one day, pulling him from the harbor waters at Lighthouse Point after he had plunged in when the pier collapsed. It was a cross-harbor swim and Terri had stationed himself at the end of the pier to get a good shot of the first swimmers touching the finish mark. Others had the same idea and it wasn't too long before Terri had quite a crowd with him. The combined weight was far too great for the creaking old structure and as it broke up everyone—including Terri—was plunged into the water. We were on a nearby barge and reached down to grab Terri. We gave a helping hand to others as well and fortunately no one drowned or was injured. Terri lost his camera in the plunge and it was like losing his right arm. But he was completely crushed a while later when he walked into the news room, clothing still dripping water, and got a blast from the city editor of the day for not having any pictures. We'll never forget the look on Terri's face as he bemoaned: "Howsa you likea dat. "I'ma nearly drown and he wansa pic!" But, alas, Terri is no longer in our midst. He has gone to join a long line of former Register staffers who like himself helped to make this the great newspaper that it is today. Soon he'll be with them on the staff of the paper Up There, "The Heavenly Star." And it won't be long before he comes dashing into the newsroom with a wet print and exclaiming: "Heya boss, 1 minutes please, I gotta nice shot for Pagea 1."

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we are all aware of the remarkable progress our Navy has made in developing nuclear-powered submarines, thanks to the genius of Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover.

A few days ago, I received a letter from Admiral Rickover, which reveals him also as an accomplished writer. The purpose of his letter was to tell me about the first sea trials of the Polaris nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *George Washington Carver*, which was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.

But, the admiral went on to review the life of George Washington Carver, and in so doing, produced a fascinating account of how that distinguished Negro raised himself up from slavery to become an outstanding scientist in the fields of botany and agriculture. The narrative is such an interesting one that I believe it is worthy of much wider distribution. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Rickover's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S.S. "GEORGE WASHINGTON
CARVER" (SSBN-656),
At Sea, North Atlantic, May 8, 1966.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 37th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *George Washington Carver* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va. We also have in operation 22 attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of 59.

This ship is named for George W. Carver, a botanist and chemurgist renowned in the annals of American scientific agriculture. The child of slaves, he did not know the day of his birth. Even the year is not certain, but he thought it was 1860. Where he was born, however, is not in doubt. In 1943, shortly after he died at Tuskegee Institute, Ala., both houses of Congress passed, without a dissenting vote, a bill authorizing erection of a national monument at his birthplace in Diamond Grove, Mo. In fourscore years, George W. Carver had come a long way and accomplished a great deal.

None of it had come easy. His start in life was most inauspicious. A sickly infant, orphaned before he was a year old, it seemed unlikely he would survive. He lost his father in an accident and was soon after kidnaped, together with his mother and sister, by marauding nightriders. Those were lawless times. Stealing slaves for sale to plantations in the Deep South was not uncommon. But George Carver was such a puny baby that the kidnapers had no use for him, and so his master was able to get him released in return for a racehorse valued at $300. Of mother and sister nothing was ever heard.

Hard as it was to be a slave child without kith or kin, by great good fortune his master Moses Carver (from whom he took his surname) was not a typical planter but a plain farmer, one of the so-called Black Republican abolitionist Germans, or lop-eared Dutch, as they were contemptuously called, who had migrated to Missouri in the 1830's. He was opposed to slavery, but he and his wife were childless and middle-aged; they needed help and servants were not to be had. So Moses bought a slave girl from a neighbor for $700. After she had been abducted, he took it upon himself to raise her small son. Slavery ended when the boy was 4 years old but he remained with the Carvers and was treated much as any other farm boy. There was a lot of work to be done and George was expected to do his share. He was an especially apt pupil in all the domestic chores around the house and showed early that he had a way with growing things. People called him "plant doctor" for he could cure any ailing plant; he seemed to know instinctively what it needed in order to grow.

The boy was born with a keen mind, fantastically clever hands and so great a thirst for knowledge that no obstacle could bar him from obtaining an education. Of rebuffs he suffered many, but he was also often given a helping hand. The free school nearby was barred to him, whereupon Mrs. Carver gave him an old blue-back Speller and with her help he taught himself to read and write. Thereafter he was hardly ever without a book in his hand. He would prop it up while he washed and ironed, these being some of the chores that earned him a living while he gradually accumulated school credits.

At 10 he decided he must find a school and so he left the Carvers, all his possessions in a small bundle over his shoulder. Thus began an Odyssey that was to take him in short stages northward geographically and upward educationally. At several critical times during his 30-year quest for an education, luck or his pleasing personality, or perhaps a combination of both, brought him into contact with warm-hearted childless couples who gave him the concern and care usually found only in one's own family. With a few he stayed but he was never a burden. He earned his keep for he was a prodigious worker, determined never to accept charity.

George Carver literally inched himself up the educational ladder, working his way not just through college but through grade and high school as well, working all the time to support himself. He was 20 before he got to high school, 25 when he graduated. Highland University accepted his credentials but when he presented himself, he was told Negroes were not admitted. He was 30 when he finally entered Simpson College in Iowa. A year later, he entered Iowa State University, graduating with a bachelor of science degree in 1894. Invited to become a member of the staff in charge of systematic botany, the bacteriological laboratories and the greenhouse, he continued his studies and received a master of science degree in 1896. That year, he was invited by Booker T. Washington to organize and direct a new agriculture department at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. There he remained the rest of his life.

From earliest childhood, Carver had the habit of rising at 4 and walking about the countryside for an hour or two. Soil, plants, and trees interested him intensely; he wanted to know how they were put together, what made them fruitful. Nature was both a consolation and a challenge. In Tuskegee, he found the land exhausted from one-crop cotton culture, robbed of its mineral content, eroded from lack of plant cover, treeless and sun parched. The campus was bare earth, dusty in dry weather, a sea of mud when it rained. He went about looking for ways to restore the overworked earth and found it in green manure and the growing of nitrogen-producing legumes—pod bearers such as vetch, peas, clover, peanuts—plants which enriched the soil. Crop rotation which European peasants had practiced for a thousand years had to be relearned by Southern tenant farmers who knew no other crop but cotton. Carver went among them preaching diversification. He urged them to grow peanuts and sweetpotatoes; those who heeded his advice rode out the disastrous invasion of the bollweevil.

On the experimental farm he developed at Tuskegee, he evolved a cross between the short-stalk and the tall-stalk cotton known as Carver's Hybrid, besides three other new strains. With green manuring, he grew enormous potatoes, cabbages, onions, watermelons, and cantaloupes. He instituted a visiting day each month for neighboring farmers to show what could be grown with scientific methods. They were most impressed with his new cotton strain which carried 275 huge bolls on a single bush, and yielded nearly a bale and a quarter per acre, in contrast to the usual one-third of a bale most tenant farmers produced.

To bring the message of scientific agriculture to those who could not come to Tuskegee, Carver loaded a wagon with tools, boxes, jars, and packages of seed and set out every Friday evening after class to give demonstrations to meetings of farmers. In 1906, with money donated by Morris K. Jesup, a member of the Slater Foundation, he designed the so-called Jesup Wagon which served as a movable farmers school and was adopted in other countries.

Carver's skill as soil scientist and plant breeder was to him but a means to help raise the standards of the Southern farmer, not just in productivity, but in his whole way of life. It was obvious to Carver that the prevalent diet of pork, meal and molasses lacked the vitamins and minerals necessary for good health and stamina. So he urged farmers to grow more vegetable and fruits, showed them that many common weeds, properly cooked, were edible and nutritious, taught their women how to prepare them. His own boyhood had been spent on a multipurpose farm where everything the family needed was grown and processed, only sugar and coffee being bought. He called this living at home and preached it throughout the land. By avoiding store purchases, a little could be saved each week and eventually a piece of land bought. This, he said, was the way out of poverty. Tenant farmers lived in drab cabins. Noticing the beautifully colored clay in which Alabama abounded, Carver developed a simple method for making color wash and demonstrated how much even the shabbiest cottage could be improved by a paint that cost not a penny.

Carver is best known as a pioneer "chemurgist"—a word, coined by Dr. William J. Hale in 1934, which means chemistry at work. In his book "Pioneers of Plenty," Christy Borth called Carver "the first and greatest chemurgist." Carver made paper from Southern pine "at least a quarter of a century before Dr. Charles H. Herty tackled the problem," and synthetic marble from wood shavings "years before a rocklike plastic made from wood waste became a chemurgic promise." He saw promise in the peanut when it was still a lowly weed growing along fences and tolerated by farmers only because their children liked its taste. From the peanut and the sweet potato, Carver developed more than a hundred different products, including plastics, lubricants, dyes, medicines, ink, wood stains, face creams, tapioca and molasses. He developed these in his laboratory at Tuskegee which he had put together out of odds and ends salvaged from scrap heaps.

When he first arrived to take up his post, he discovered there was no money to equip a laboratory. In the course of his life, necessity had made him a genius at making do out of nothing. He and his students made the rounds of the rubbish heaps on campus and in town. They collected bottles, cut their necks off evenly and turned them into beakers. A thick, chipped teacup became a mortar, a piece of pipe the pestle. An old ink bottle with a wick made of string stuck through a cork became a Bunsen burner. Pieces of tin were punched and became sifters. Reeds served as tubes to transfer liquids. Carver had brought with him the one indispensable and costly thing not to be found on scrap heaps: a microscope. It was a parting gift from colleagues at Iowa State.

The products of his laboratory made his name known and brought him tempting offers of positions in industry, and checks for advice that had been sought from him. He politely declined the positions and returned the checks. He had no interest whatsoever in money and could not be bothered with the problem of marketing his inventions. His head was too full of ideas for new products. Advice, he thought, should always be free. He hoped it would reflect favorably on people's attitude toward his race, if he helped others with their problems. His own needs were minimal. Indeed, out of a salary of $1,500 a year at Tuskegee, he saved $33,000 which he donated to the Carver Foundation for creative research in chemistry.

Many people from all over the world sought out this shy and retiring man, wanting to talk to him and to observe his work. Edison, Henry Ford, Theodore Roosevelt, and other important men became his friends. Honors and honorary degrees came his way. One was the Roosevelt Medal for distinguished service in the field of science (1939). He was introduced to the dinner guests in Theodore Roosevelt's New York home with these words which are a summing up: "I have the honor to present not a man only, but a life, transfused with passion for the enlarging and enriching of the living of his fellowman."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

THE ROAD AHEAD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the National Society of the DAR recently heard an outstanding address by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, entitled, "The Road Ahead." Since this is such an outstanding account of our heritage and such an excellent program for our future, I ask unanimous consent that the speech by Lieutenant General Trudeau made before the annual defense luncheon in Washington, D.C., on April 18, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD AHEAD

(Remarks by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, USA (ret.), president, Gulf Research & Development Co., Annual Defense Luncheon, Daughters of the American Revolution, International Inn, Washington, D.C., April 18, 1966)

Mrs. Sullivan, Mrs. Griswold, Members of the D.A.R., Distinguished guests, Fellow Americans, I am greatly honored to address this distinguished group, the Daughters of the American Revolution.

This historic date in 1775 is a landmark to your association, I am sure. The lantern in the tower burned brightly as Paul Revere mounted his horse and took the road to Lexington to warn the people of Boston that the enemy was on its way. The subsequent skirmishes from Lexington to Concord, from Concord back to Lexington to Charleston—"the Battle of Lexington"—took many lives that next day, but the casualties would have been greater without his warning. Freedom, neither then nor now, can be secured or maintained without struggle.

These are days that try all men's souls and some men's nerves. However, where the soul is serene in forthrightly facing our problems, the nerves are calm, too, but the doves seem irritated and nervous. While there is no fox in the chicken coop yet, there appear to be some chickens in their aviary.

One hundred and ninety-one years after Paul Revere's journey, our road is heavily beset with the enemy, both hidden and out in the open. Our road leads either to freedom—or to oblivion. Some travelers (and their fellow travelers) are blind or indifferent to the signposts along the way. There are still too many, who, if faced with Paul Revere's mission today, would say, "Why me? Why should I ride all night? Other people have horses. Let them do it."

Others, like Paul Revere, are deeply concerned with the course we are taking and are trying to warn of the dangers around us.

Today, I want to touch on some of our problems as I see them down the road ahead. I know you share the concern of so many of us about our receding stature in this distraught and chaotic world. For twenty years, I have heard that time will solve our problems, but time is not on our side unless we use it more wisely and courageously. Too often I have heard that "He who fights and runs away, lives to fight another day," but this is a sad philosophy and gets more difficult and less likely as time goes on. There most certainly comes a day when that statement can no longer be true. As someone said, "When spirits are low and principles ignored, people don't give a damn if their own ox is gored." Some seem to have reached that point, but the majority have decided the time has come to take a firm stand.

I believe we are witnessing a struggle today on the national scene between the proponents of principle versus expediency. This is not to question the sincerity of some who, I believe, are badly misguided.

The contest doesn't break out clearly along either religious, racial or party lines; but it is here. It involves the interpretation of the Constitution and Bill of Rights in the moral climate that prevails today, and scratches the very touch-stones of our Republic. It involves a challenge to accepted foreign policy by a few but powerful voices.

I believe the challenge to law and order in this world by both the proponents of anarchy and chaos and the advocates of compromise and surrender must be met firmly and without surcease.

I believe the attempt to avoid the road to World Communism by taking the detour through Socialism will only make the trip to oblivion a little longer and must be reversed.

I believe the restoration of individual pride by upgrading our code of morals and ethics and by fostering greater freedom of enterprise, better and more responsible state and local governments and more severe punishment for criminal actions within just laws is essential if any sense of personal responsibility for government is to persist.

I believe the restoration of national pride by rejuvenating the Monroe Doctrine and pursuing a positive foreign policy (including the use of force where necessary) to repulse the advance of World Communism and world chaos is likewise essential if America is to remain the bulwark as well as the symbol of freedom and dignity of men and nations throughout this world.

These things I believe.

America still marches in the forefront of history, though precariously at times. We stand at the opening of a new and promising era—the most powerful nation in all the world; a nation recognized as blessed beyond measure, with the most enlightened form of government in the world. Yet, at the same time, and this has been historically true of other mighty states which have preceded us, we find ourselves challenged to defend—or even to assert—our rights at a score of vital points along a widespread defensive periphery (even in our front yard), and hesitant to stand fast for principle and right. We seem to still wallow in the doldrums of the decade following the Korean War when victory meant compromise and compromise meant appeasement or accommodation or convergence, as they call it now. Despite bold words in some high places, this remains the temper of a few of our policy makers today.

Do you know that the so-called "wars of liberation" are entirely in consonance with the Communist policy of "peaceful coexistence"? If time permitted, I could quote you chapter and verse on this. Do you know that Marx defined peace as a condition that could only exist in a classless state? Consequently anarchy, chaos, subversion, and "wars of liberation" are all justifiable means of achieving their goal. Anyone who endorses "peaceful co-existence" is either unaware of what the Kremlin policy is or is parroting the party line.

Let's quit coddling the Communists. There is no country in the Free World where they are not fomenting revolution and subversion and chaos and disorder. Despite this, there are those who would tell us not to be overly disturbed about such explosive developments because the tenets and goals of Communism are changing. This is untrue and highly dangerous.

We must indeed beware of the machinations emanating from the Pugwash conferences, the Fabian Socialists and the One Worlders. They, rather than the card-carrying Communists, constitute the major internal threat to our Republic today. I see nothing on the world scene today that would permit the relinquishment of one iota of our sovereignty or the reduction of a balanced military superiority by one jot or tittle. We should be just as assiduous in guarding our power as we are in avoiding belligerency. We must explain, again and again, that the possession of power is not synonymous with the use of force but that aggression will be dealt with firmly.

Our goal must still be to reduce or eliminate Communist imperialism as a threat to world peace by all means short of war. Some of our policies in this regard are hard to understand as we provide aid and comfort to our self-declared enemy. We even relieve internal pressures on the Russians and Chinese by feeding their people and expediting the buildup of their industrial base to compete with ours at a time when they are involved in military operations against us.

We see our Government defied by young men, indoctrinated by Communist propaganda, mutilating their draft cards and demonstrating against an established foreign policy which affects our very life's blood. Can you believe that the demonstrations against our involvement in Viet Nam, which appeared on our college campuses and around the world on the same day, were not organized and directed from some central headquarters? Where was it? In Cuba? The demonstrators, for the most part, are beatle-haired, misguided misfits looking for an outlet for their energies.

While they are a minority, our task today is to get Communism out of our schools and to get Americanism back into them. Our traditional type of education has always sought to develop the mind and to build character, to encourage self-reliance and engender a competitive spirit that brings out the best efforts of which each is capable. The so-called progressive system submerges the individual in the group, disregards character and faith in God, and eliminates competition as a spur to initiative. If democracy is only to be the triumph of such mediocrity, God help us.

You must be aghast at the widespread efforts to declare that "God is dead."

You needn't be. The scientific atheist is more dangerous to our society than the Russian Communists or our own Fabian Socialists.

This effort to destroy the remaining shreds of ethics and morals on which our Christian civilization and the culture and progress of the modern world were built, is the most insidious challenge of our times. To claim that this universe has no Creator but developed from the hydrogen atom leaves at least one very important and fundamental question unanswered. Who created hydrogen?

Let us bow our heads in humility and shame before a Creator on whose mercy, even more than his justice, all life on this planet depends.

As General MacArthur—God bless him—said, "There is no substitute for victory." The law of life is one of struggle. All the world knows this, but in this favored segment of the world we, as a people, seem to be forgetful. With three billion people unlike even in their fingerprints, the dawn of a Utopia full of milk and honey is still only a social scientist's dream. Struggle is a cross mankind is destined to bear as long as the world exists. It will never be made of foam rubber, nor will the psychiatrist's couch ever replace it. We don't need any more tranquilizers to help us ignore our problems, but we do need a moral adrenalin to stimulate us to solve them courageously. The erosion of the moral integrity of Western man is too prevalent to ignore. It pervades our atmosphere like a poisonous fog. No kind of air pollution is as dangerous as this one. We are being numbed by mounting violations of our ethical, as well as our criminal, codes in official, adult and adolescent life. Our sense of individual pride and responsibility is fading in the expanding grasp of a welfare state

After twenty years of so-called containment, there is hardly a section of the Free World's frontier that is not overtly or covertly being eroded or penetrated today. Only the torch left in Castro's hands could have lighted the fires in Panama and Guantanamo that smoulder throughout Latin America. Only our dilatory tactics in Korea fourteen years ago permitted Red China to challenge us in Southeast Asia as she does today. Unchallengeable power and determination to stop further erosion and preserve ourselves and western civilization is the priceless ingredient to any successful solution. Any weakening of our present relative nuclear deterrent or conventional military power in the face of this challenge could be devastating. Neither magic "black-boxes" nor the Ouija board of disarmament can give the solution to this struggle.

Today, change is more rapid and meaningful than in any period during the past five hundred years, at least. This situation is typified by not only the dramatic fading of the boundaries of empires, but by the ever-increasing rate of obsolescence of both commercial products and military weapons and even by ventures beyond the long-standing frontier of the atmosphere.

The explosion of science and technology has opened doors never dreamed of a few years ago. In the nuclear field as well as in space, all of us, both friend and foe are still infants. For one thing, we have no way of determining how much we don't know. More important to our security, we don't know how much our potential enemies do know, or how long it will be before—or even if—they know more than we know today. I am concerned that their 1962 tests may have provided them knowledge that seriously degrades our deterrent power today. With our vision limited to a second-strike missile system, we may be as wrong as France was in depending on their Maginot line. The blind ban on high altitude nuclear testing and on the development and testing of nuclear devices in space for deterrence and defense may have been disastrous to our nation's security as the failure to guard our freedom with continuing vigilance and courage along our far-flung earth-bound defense perimeter.

People talk—but only talk—about our nuclear defenses against enemy missiles and satellites. What nuclear defenses? We have none. We are naked. We have even offered the Russians an agreement never to build any. The Nike system—imperfect though it may be—is our best hope today but it is not in production. Had the same criteria of perfection before production been applied to our other major weapons systems or space ventures over the last decade—we would have nothing today—not even early warning. The growth potential of this basic system to defeat missiles and even satellites is our best hope for an effective nuclear defense tomorrow. Today we are the world's greatest nuclear nudist colony.

Recently, the Soviet displayed some new anti-missile missiles. They continue to make remarkable advances in space. If they are concentrating their current resources on the production and deployment of such a system, building an assault base in Cuba and placing supermegaton warheads on near-earth, orbiting, maneuverable satellites, we are facing the greatest threat that has evolved to date. I hope we have a strategy equal to the threat. We must strive to maintain an adequate deterrent and build a defensive capability of suitable magnitude. We must push new weapons systems and counter measures.

Military procurement must be greatly expanded. I do not intend to discuss shortages publicly but even an optimist would know there are areas where no surplus or reserves exist. Troopwise, our strategic reserve is already depleted and we are assuming risks no military commander would countenance. The demands in Southeast Asia must not blind us to the dangers in our own front yard or on a second front anywhere.

From a standpoint of cost-effectiveness, Newsweek mentions a United States cost of $375,000 per Viet Cong casualty. This is startling as we certainly aren't fighting a war of attrition. Are we using the right weapons systems? The right strategy? How about sealing off Haiphong by blocking or blockading the harbor since at least 75 percent of enemy supplies arrive by sea in both Communist and "friendly" ships? The principal logistic support comes from Russia, not China, of course. Such is peaceful co-existence, but we still ship them wheat and industrial plants.

Likewise, one of our leading columnists says we "lost the war in North Korea." That is not true. We didn't lose it. We could have won it. Instead, we let the Chinese "off the hook" and are now paying for it in Viet Nam, thirteen years later.

I rise to defend General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. His assurance that China would not intervene in Korea was based on his justified confidence that he could smother them in Manchuria if they did. He didn't know his hands were to be tied by making it a sanctuary, nor would he ever have thought that perhaps the Chinese knew this when he didn't. Now the Bay of Tonkin is their sanctuary as our Navy watches the ships go by.

Today is a time when our country faces the gravest crisis in its history. In Cuba, Southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America—or you name it—the fires are burning beneath the thin veneer of civilization and order we enjoy. It seems to me that unless leading citizens like you—in business—with the utmost seriousness and dedication—engage more actively in urging our Government to face the challenging problems before us, America and the whole Free World can suffer the most dire consequence. We still have a Congress that must listen. Communism, Socialism and the One World proponents of health, wealth and happiness-for-all fear a fully-awakened America and their No. 1 effort is to lull us to sleep.

It is the anomaly of our times that while Cecil Rhodes failed to found an African empire, the country named for him is fighting for its freedom while some of the dynasty enriched by his scholarships here are trying to give our sovereignty away.

We must also beware of domestic policies that destroy individual, local and State identities and initiative by overcentralization of government. Brainwashing is not confined to enemy prison camps. When the distinction between patriots and traitors grows dim in the public mind, as it seems to do today, the doctrine of Marx and the techniques of Pavlov have made their imprint. Maybe Johnny can't read but I am sure you can, and the handwriting is on the wall and in the papers.

The keys to our survival are still faith—not fear; firmness—not fuzziness; courage—not complacency; patriotism—not patronage; and sacrifice—not selfishness. The clarion call to be bold, decisive, creative, and morally strong is as clear as it was to our forefathers through the long painful decades when they stood alone and fought for liberty and progress. We, in our time, will be stronger and better when we weave back more brilliantly into our own fabric of thought and heart the epic days and deeds of our forebears and of our immortal great. As someone said one hundred years ago when we pushed the frontiers of Freedom out to the Pacific and built this great country, "The cowards never started and the weak never arrived." I hope history will write a favorable verdict of us, but what we need are more strong men with convictions throughout this nation if we are going to arrive at the dawn of the coming century intact.

Remember, at the age of only one hundred ninety years, our country is the oldest and proudest symbol of liberty in the world. Forty years after our Revolution we had ejected the British a second time. Then President Monroe told everybody else, including the Russians, to keep out of the Western Hemisphere. They did.

Another forty years, and our own sad conflict ended, we had to tell the French to get out of Mexico. They did.

Another forty years and we ejected the Spanish from Cuba, and told the Germans in no uncertain terms to stay out of Venezuela. They did.

Then on twenty-year cycles, we fought two World Wars to insure our freedom and hemispheric solidarity. We did.

Now, after another twenty years, our Cuban front yard is a playground for the "dead-end kids" and termites are in the woodwork from Passamaquoddy to Panama and Patagonia. I, for one, deplore this low state of American affairs.

The threat from Cuba today exceeds the one that existed in 1962, in my opinion. The overt withdrawal by Khrushchev then, has permitted the covert installation of major offensive and defensive installations since then, according to many on-site observations and reports that cannot be disregarded but have not been denied by our Government. I cannot believe our intelligence is so poor that these claims cannot be checked. What is at San Andrés? A major underground control center? A major missile installation? Are the Soviet submarine pens at Nipe Bay completed? What is going on at the Margot Mines? Are we blind to the threat of a major Communist headquarters now operating in Cuba to create chaos and anarchy throughout our hemisphere?

Let us remember, among the interesting words of Rudyard Kipling, the following, perhaps prophetic verse:

"Fenced by your careful fathers, ringed by your leaden seas,
Long did ye wake in quiet and long lie down at ease;
Given to strong delusion, wholly believing a lie,
Ye saw that the land lay fenceless, and yet let the months go by . . .
But ye say, 'It will mar our comfort.'
Ye say, ' 'Twill 'minish our trade.'
Do ye wait for the spattered shrapnel ere ye learn how a gun is laid . . .
For the low, red glare to southward when the raided coast-towns burn?
(Light ye shall have on that lesson, but little time to learn)."

It is fitting, as we contemplate our serious domestic and international problems and gaze at the critical months ahead, that we appraise again our humble beginning and shore up our nobility of purpose if we are to gauge successfully the rough course down the road ahead. While I regret all the unhappiness in this world, I refuse to be brainwashed by those who seek to instill in us a feeling of guilt by association for every maladjusted and unhappy person who exists or every unfortunate incident that occurs. Let us build up pride by association instead—pride to be countrymen of leaders like Washington and Lincoln, Tom Marshall and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Teddy Roosevelt and Douglas MacArthur, Longfellow and Will Durant, Victor Herbert and Gershwin, Edison and Henry Ford and a host of others, big and little, who lived (and a million who died) to give us the United States of America we know today.

With due regard and regret for both our past failures and our yet incomplete victories, we need apologize to no one for the causes we have advanced so greatly for the benefit of mankind. We must not lose our pride in accomplishment nor our loyalty to the ideals that made us great. The protection, the prosperity, and the progress of our country demand our fullest dedication, struggle and efforts if we are to achieve these goals.

This struggle will yet be won by the superior spirit, determination and tenacity of the victor. I hope it will be our side. If not, God knows we will deserve our fate. Greater devotion to the true spirit of America and continued expansion of the phenomenal moral and industrial power of the United States of America would be among the most reassuring signs that this country and the Free World, under God, will not fail. On this day that so symbolizes the beginning of our struggle for freedom, with the security of our country still challenged from without and threatened from within, let us pause to remember with calmness and good judgment that the nation we love will only remain the land of the free as long as it continues to be the home of the brave—and that means every dedicated American.

Thank you very much.

DR. VAN DER KROEF'S ANALYSIS OF VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, our perspective with regard to the nature of the war in Vietnam is often one-sided. We are correct in understanding this war as an attempt by world communism to expand its influence and control through the tactic of movements of "national liberation." This is what Communist leaders have repeatedly told us about Vietnam, and these are the stakes we have properly understood to be involved in that country.

Yet there are two distinct revolutions occurring in Vietnam, both of which are essential if the Communists are to achieve their stated goal. One is to remove American influence from southeast Asia and destroy the established governments in that region. The other is to transform these states into Communist dictatorships, just as China and North Vietnam have been transformed into such tyrannies.

Justus M. van der Kroef, chairman of the department of political science at the University of Bridgeport and senior fellow at the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University, has clarified these dual aims in a recent article in "Vietnam Perspectives."

He points out that—

> This dual aim of the war in the South * * * is for Democratic Republic of Vietnam leaders not simply relevant to Vietnam alone, but is generally characteristic of all "anti-imperialist" or "national liberation" struggles now going on in the world. Le Duan, chairman of the Lao Dong Party and one of the DRV's top theoreticians, addressing a central committee session of his party in December 1963, said that the national struggle against imperialism evident in the modern world could not be separated from the class struggle within the nations concerned; and that the wars to win national independence in Asia, Latin America, and Africa were "originally linked" to the fight for genuine "democracy" waged against domestic "feudal" and other "reactionary forces, agents of imperialism."

Many critics in this country have repeatedly stated that in their view the war in Vietnam is essentially a civil war, and the National Liberation Front is an indigenous movement seeking to achieve real national independence.

Professor van der Kroef rejects this view, and concludes by stating that—

> Seen from Hanoi, the Vietnam war aims not simply at driving American forces out, or at establishing some kind of "truly independent" government in Saigon, as one sometimes hears. DRV war aims go far beyond this and encompass, according to the pronouncements of its own leaders, a phased social and economic revolution in the South, in tandem with the North and directed toward the creation of a Communist state.

All who urge an American withdrawal should understand that were this to be done, all freedom and hope of future freedom in South Vietnam would die. A Communist tyranny would descend upon that country, free speech would end, and the slaughter of all those who dared to resist would ensue.

Since I feel that Dr. van der Kroef's analysis is so important for all of us to understand and ponder, I wish to share it with my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to insert it into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, Dr. van der Kroef's analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR SEEN FROM HANOI

(By Justus M. van der Kroef)

(NOTE.—Professor Justus M. van der Kroef is Chairman of the Department of Political Fellow at the Research Institute on Communist Affairs, Columbia University.)

In recent months, various published statements by the leaders of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV) and of its creature and ally, the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam (commonly known as the National Liberation Front, or NLF), have outlined a comprehensive and interlocking set of Communist objectives in the Vietnam war. These go much beyond the mere withdrawal of United States forces from South Vietnam, the cessation of attacks on the North, or even American recognition of the NLF as the sole bargaining representative of the South Vietnamese people. Seen from Hanoi, the Vietnam war has far-reaching domestic and international implications that must be taken into account in whatever settlement is eventually reached in the area. This article attempts an analysis of Hanoi's view of the Vietnam war as projected in Communist doctrinal terms by leaders of the DRV.

II

To begin with, the official United States position that North Vietnam is committing aggression against South Vietnam, that North and South are two separate states, and that the war in Vietnam is therefore not a "civil war," finds needless to say no acceptance in Hanoi. An exchange between the NLF Central Committee and the Vietnam Fatherland Front (the predecessor of the NLF and now little more than a paper organization) on war aims, published in March 1965, affirms the essential indivisibility of the county and the war. "Vietnam is one, the Vietnamese people are one. North and South Vietnam are of the same family . . . the heart cannot but suffer when the hand is cut. That the people in North Vietnam should be resolved to fulfill their duty towards their kith-and-kin in South Vietnam fully conforms to sentiment and reason." To this NLF pronouncement, the Vietnam Fatherland Front quickly responded that "Vietnam is a single territory from Lang Son to Point Ca Mau," and noted that the defense of "our Fatherland" is the sacred duty "of our 30 million-odd people," that is, of the combined populations of North and South.[1]

For Hanoi the paramountcy of national unity in turn requires reciprocal military assistance as between North and South. In September 1965 Nguyen Van Vinh, chairman of the DRV State Committee for Reunification, declared that "if the defense of the North is the bounden duty of our Southern compatriots, in return the support given to the South is the sacred duty of our Northern people. Vietnam is one, the Vietnamese people is one." The NLF statement of March 1965 also included among its objectives the duty not only "to liberate South Vietnam," but also to "defend the North" with a view to the reunification of the fatherland."[2]

But the emphasis on the oneness of Vietnam and on the requirement of mutual military assistance does not mean that, from Hanoi's point of view, the nature of the struggle is exactly the same in North and South. In the North there already exists a Communist "people's democratic government," while in the South there does not. This creates significant tactical differences which DRV spokesmen, along with their appeals to unity, have stressed over and over again. Necessarily, it also influences Hanoi's view of the war. Various signed or unsigned articles in Hoc Tap, the theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the Lao Dong (Workers) Party, the Communist Party of the DRV, have explored the implications of the "two aspects of the gigantic struggle put up by all our people," that is, "The Socialist construction carried out in the North" as opposed to "the revolutionary struggle waged by our compatriots in the South."[3] This difference is not simply a semantic exercise, but goes to the root of Communist theory and hence of DRV views as to the nature of the war, and the appropriate strategy and tactics for prosecuting it. Although on the one hand the struggles in North and South are considered to be "mutually complementary and must be closely coordinated," on the other hand the North is seen as having already overcome certain difficulties on the road toward Communist development while the South has not. Therefore "the building of the North itself cannot replace the resolution of the inherent social contradictions of South Viet Nam."[4]

As early as September 1960, the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party declared that "the revolution for the liberation of the South" involves a "solution of the two basic contradictions" existing in the South: first, the contradiction between the people of the South and the "aggressive imperialists, above all the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen;" and secondly, the contradiction between the people of the South, "especially the peasants" and "the feudal landlord class."[5] This means that the war from the DRV point of view must be prosecuted not only in purely military terms in order to defeat the United States and its South Vietnamese "henchmen," but also in terms of certain socio-economic reforms. Among these one of the most important is the land tenure question, which, in customary Communist jargon, stands for a whole range of problems typical of a country still presumably in a socially backward agrarian stage. The disparities between North and South, and the double aspect of the struggle in the South, have remained standard dichotomies in DRV and NLF pronouncements. At a recent scientific symposium in Peking, for example, Professor Nguyen Van Hieu, Central Committee member of the NLF, described South Vietnam as "a backward agricultural region subject to imperialist domination and at the same time semi-feudal in character. The national liberation struggle in South Vietnam is therefore closely linked with the struggle for the liberation of the peasants."[6]

North and South thus are considered to represent different levels of political and economic development, as generally indicated by Communist revolutionary theory today. According to such theory, for example, the "national democratic" revolution precedes the socialist revolution; the former is waged against "imperialism" and "feudalism," the latter against those class obstacles (at home and abroad) which may still resist the complete socialist transformation of state and society.[7] The national democratic revolution ends, according to Communist theory, with the complete dominance of the local Communist Party. As one Lao Dong Central Committee member put it during the Third Congress of the Party. "The North, completely liberated, has achieved the peoples national democratic revolution and is entering the period of transition to socialism. But the South is still under the yoke of the imperialists and feudalists," and hence the "people's revolutionary task" lies in promoting the "socialist revolution in the North, and at the same time the national peoples democratic revolution in the South."[8]

It may seem superfluous to emphasize the implications of this DRV position. But in some Western quarters the operations of the Viet Cong or the NLF are occasionally viewed as if they are somehow divested of any ideological character, except for a vaguely described "nationalistic" or "anti-colonial" commitment. The fact is that for Hanoi and its Southern ancillaries, the purpose of the war is not just a matter of winning a military victory in a broadly nationalist cause. It is also a question of bringing about the complete transformation of South Vietnamese society and economy, a transformation predicated on the Communist concept of a successful "national democratic" revolution led by the Communist Party, and exemplified by the experience of the North.

This dual aim of the war in the South, it may also be noted, is for DRV leaders not simply relevant to Vietnam alone, but is generally characteristic of all "anti-imperialist" or "national liberation" struggles now going on in the world. Le Duan, chairman of the Lao Dong Party and one of the DRV's top theoreticians, addressing a Central Committee session of his Party in December 1963, said that the national struggle against imperialism evident in the modern world could not be separated from the class struggle within the nations concerned; and that the wars to win national independence in Asia, Africa, and Latin America were "originally linked" to the fight for genuine "democracy" waged against domestic "feudal" and other "reactionary forces, agents of imperialism."[9] It is not, moreover, a question of postponing the desired transformation of society until independence has been won. On the contrary, the "national liberation" struggle must go hand in hand with the establishment of a "democracy" free from "feudal" landlords and other bourgeois and imperialist elements. In this connection, an interview of General Vo Nguyen Giap, the victor of Dien Bien Phu and the present DRV defense minister, which was published in a recent retrospective volume on the Dien Bien Phu campaign, is instructive. Giap notes that although, as the war against the French went on, the techniques and equipment of his forces improved, the truly decisive element in bringing final victory, including the surmounting of technical difficulties, was "the political factor. Our army fought for just political objectives." And what, Giap was asked, did this political factor consist of? The national consciousness and spirit, the general replied, and went on to explain;[10]

"Our revolution is in the first place a national revolution. It is also a democratic revolution. Our Party launched the agrarian reform while the war was raging. Our soldiers were mostly poor peasants. During their political studies each of them recalled how he had been exploited, oppressed by the feudal landlords * * * Our men at the front received many letters from their wives, their parents, informing them of the agrarian reform then in full swing, describing their joy and enthusiasm of the seething peasant masses. Our Party ceaselessly inculcated in our troops a double consciousness: national and class consciousness."

How effective the "agrarian reform" actually was, and what degree of enthusiasm it may or may not have aroused in Giap's forces, we can pass over here; in any case, from Hanoi's point of view they are not debatable. The point, again, is that the DRV avowedly is not simply fighting a war for national independence, but simultaneously a struggle for the elimination of "feudalism" and the bourgeois henchmen of "imperialism" in South Vietnam. The "double consciousness" to which Giap refers, and with which Hanoi seeks to inculcate its fighters, is but a reflection of this whole double purpose of warfare. DRV reports, meanwhile, continue to be fulsome in their praise of the revolutionary social and economic changes now being wrought in "the liberated zones in South Vietnam" (that is, the areas under NLF or Viet Cong control), noting the "bold program of land reform," education and public health services, and the new spirit being fostered by "art ensembles" and "song and dance troupes" in "every zone, province, district or village," and so on.[11]

---

[1] March 22, 1965, statement of the Central Committee of the NLF, and March 27, 1965, reply by the Central Committee of the Vietnam Fatherland Front, in Vietnam Courier (Hanoi), no. 23, April 3, 1965, pp. 5–6. In his interview with the British correspondent Felix Greene on November 24, 1965, Ho Chi Minh reportedly ridiculed the notion that North Vietnam had been committing aggression against South Vietnam, declaring that "Vietnam is one" and the "the Vietnamese people are one, children of the same fatherland." The New York Times, December, 19, 1965.

[2] Nguyen Van Vinh, "How Should the Most Correct Solution to the Vietnam Problem be Understood?", Vietnam Courier, no. 36, September 23, 1965, p. 4, and March 22, 1965, NLF statement in Vietnam Courier, no. 23, April 3, 1965, p. 6.

[3] On The Problem of War and Peace (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), p. 93. The citation is to an article in the January 1964 issue of Hoc Tap, which together with three other Hoc Tap articles has been reprinted in this volume.

[4] Nguyen Chi Tanh (a Lao Dong Politiburo member), Who Will Win in South Vietnam? (Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1963), p. 9. Originally published in the July 1963 issue of Hoc Tap.

[5] Third National Congress of the Vietnam Workers Party. Documents (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, n.d.), vol. 1, p. 5.

[6] Nguyen Van Hieu, "Special War"—An Outgrowth of Neo-Colonialism (Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965), p. 15.

[7] On the phase of "national democracy" in Communist revolutionary theory, see J. M. van der Kroef, "On National Democracy-Evolution of a Concept," Survey, April 1963, pp. 134–145, and "The Communist Concept of 'National Democracy,'" Studies on the Soviet Union, vol. 4 (1964), pp. 39–63.

[8] Third National Congress of the Vietnam Workers Party. Documents, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 243.

[9] Le Duan, On Some Present International Problems (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), pp. 154–155.

[10] Contribution to the History of Dien Bien Phu," Vietnamese Studies (Xunhasaba, Hanoi, 1965), no. 3, p. 20.

III

The conceptual link between "national liberation" and social reform in the context of an "anti-imperialist" war cannot be separated from the theoretical acceptance of the role of violence currently voiced by DRV leaders. This is not the place to appraise the influence of the Sino-Soviet split on Hanoi, or the impact of Peking's presumably more militant approach in world affairs. But it would appear from their published statements that DRV spokesmen are wholly committed to the proposition that violence is the indispensible midwife of revolutionary change. "Ruin and mourning," an already cited Hoc Tap article asserts, "is caused by capitalism, not by us. We do not tell the people to remain with folded arms looking helplessly at these ruins," but rather "we tell them to rise up" and, if necessary, "to wage revolutionary wars against capitalism for our own salvation." Of course, in the process of such resistance "ruin and mourning" will be inevitable. But only by making such sacrifices can capitalism be eradicated.[12] DRV military and political leaders have generally echoed this line. According to them, the Lao Dong Party has always had a thorough grasp of the Marxist-Leninist concept of revolutionary violence and, indeed, has consistently favored the use of violence to overthrow reactionary and counterrevolutionary elements, thus "enforcing" the dictatorship of the proletariat. This tactic has been, and still is, particularly necessary in Vietnam. The Vietnamese Communist movement arose in a colonial and "semi-feudal" society whose rules drowned the masses' struggle in blood; and very early it was realized that in order to achieve their self-liberation the people would have to follow the path of armed struggle. Yet Vietnam is not a unique case in this respect. The "national liberation" struggle in other parts of Asia, and in Africa and Latin America, has been developing against a background very similar to Vietnam. Today "the U.S. imperialists" face millions of people in the world who have risen against them; and like the people of South Vietnam, the peoples of many countries realize that the "imperialist aggressors" can only be dealt with by means of popular violence.[13]

Within the context of Hanoi's dual war aims, this acceptance of the tactics of revolutionary violence also applies to the social and economic transformation sought by the DRV in South Vietnam itself. Just as revolutionary violence is necessary to eliminate the military resistance of the "imperialists" and their "feudal" and bourgeois henchmen, so violence may also be necessary to destroy their social and economic resistance as well. Again, "ruin and mourning" may accompany this process of destruction, but this is unavoidable if, as the above mentioned Hoc Tap statement indicated, the people are to "be spared forever of the ruins and mournings caused by capitalism."

IV

The theory that violence is inescapable in the realization of revolutionary objectives at home is inseparably linked with the DRV concept of the international significance of the Vietnam war, a linkage that may now perhaps be briefly examined. At the outset, it is necessary to stress the open acknowledgment by DRV leaders of their theoretical debt to Maoism. Such ideas as the use of the peasantry as the "main force" of the revolution led by the proletariat, the reliance on rural base areas and the encirclement of cities by villages, the building of a broad "anti-feudal" national front, and the concept of protracted struggle, have all been specifically acknowledged by no less a figure than Le Duan as being of Chinese origin. "Chinese revolutionary tactics are at present exemplary tactics for many Communists in Asia, Africa, and Latin America." By means of the "creative" application of Chinese tactics, Le Duan goes on, the Vietnamese Communists have been able to guide their revolutionary cause to victory.[14]

Not least because of the alleged similarities in social and economic conditions among the underdeveloped countries struggling against American "imperialism," and the general applicability of them of Chinese revolutionary tactics, DRV leaders have emphasized the close identification of the Vietnam war with "the World Peoples' Front against U.S. imperialism." [15] In a recent memorandum castigating Washington's offer to hold unconditional discussions on the Vietnam war, Hanoi noted that the Vietnamese people were not making sacrifices simply for their own cause but "also for the freedom and independence of other peoples, and for world peace." [16] Indeed, the NLF avowedly conceives one of its main tasks to be to "internationalise" its struggle, that is, to make the people of South Vietnam fully aware that their national liberation struggle is part of the "common struggle" throughout the world against imperialism and in favor of "democracy, peace, and social progress." It is no small measure because of this international emphasis that NLF leaders also declare their movement to be the "genuine representative and champion of the South Vietnamese people's present basic interests and aspirations." [17]

Today, however, DRV spokesmen no longer think of the Vietnam war simply as a single salient in the "world people's" struggle against American imperialism, but rather as the principal testing ground of that struggle, and hence as a prime example for the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movement throughout the world. Hanoi's claims in this respect are loudly supported by the Chinese Communists. Peking's defense minister, Lin Piao, in a widely noted address on China's victory over the Japanese in World War II, published early in September 1965, declared that the "struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. aggression and for national salvation is now the focus of the struggle of the people of the world against U.S. aggression." [18] But more than a year before, General Giap had already struck a similar note. The "war for liberation" in South Vietnam, he said, was setting an example for other national liberation movements in the way in which a weak and small nation, by means of stubborn struggle, could be victorious over the American "imperialists" and their "special war" (counterguerrilla) strategy. The failure of the American "special war" effort in South Vietnam, Giap declared, "would mean that this war can be defeated anywhere in the world." [19]

It is difficult to assess the importance of this interpretation of the international significance of the Vietnam war. But there seems to be little doubt that it adds a dimension to Hanoi's war aims, and that this aspect of the struggle is not always taken fully into account by outside observers. To be sure, even for the DRV leaders themselves, Hanoi's self-proclaimed role as the vanguard of a world struggle against United States imperialism doubtless has considerable value simply as propaganda. Even so, one cannot altogether depreciate in this way the kind of statement made by Premier Pham Van Dong to the DRV National Assembly in mid-1964:[20]

"Recently when the Song and Dance Ensemble of the Republic of Guinea visited our country, the head of the Ensemble made a very significant statement: 'The successful Vietnamese revolution against colonialism has given us the determination to persistently carry out revolution in Guinea and Africa. The struggle of the Vietnamese people in the South is also our struggle, and the successes of that struggle are not only those of the Vietnamese people but also those of the Asian-African bloc and of the whole of mankind'.

"We can hear such heartfelt words in every part of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

More than a year later Pham was still elaborating on the theme when he noted the "deep and broad sympathy and support from the peoples of the world" which the Vietnam "patriotic" struggle was now receiving, including support from various groups in the United States. The movement "for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam is closely coordinated with the struggle for democracy and peace and the struggle against racial discrimination," he said, and added that "This movement is developing." [21]

There is one part of the world, however, to which the Hanoi government, by virtue of its geographic location, apparently believes that its concept of the international significance of the war particularly applies. "We must see the situation in the Indochinese peninsula against the background of the general situation in Southeast Asia," Pham Van Dong has emphasized; [22] and, indeed, Southeast Asia has been a focus of DRV policy for a long time. The reasons are not hard to find. Throughout the region there has been a notable upsurge in Communist guerrilla and united front activity as the war in Vietnam itself has begun to intensify. In Laos, the Communist Pathet Lao virtually control the eastern half of the country, and afford important geographic cover for DRV infiltration into South Vietnam. In Northeast Thailand, a new, Peking-backed "Thailand Patriotic Front" has launched a "national liberation" style guerrilla campaign; while in the southern part of the country, along the Thai-Malay border, there have been new attacks by remnants of the (largely

---

[11] Vietnam Courier, no. 34, August 26, 1965, p. 8.

[12] "On the Problem of War and Peace, op cit., p. 89.

[13] Major General Van Tien Dung (chief of staff, Vietnam People's Army), "On the Building of Our Revolutionary Armed Forces," Vietnam Courier, no. 16, December 17, 1964, p. 4; and Pham Van Dong (DRV prime minister), Vietnam Courier, no. 24, April 15, 1965, p. 5.

[14] Le Duan, Some Questions Concerning the International Tasks of Our Party (Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1964), p. 13. Originally delivered before the Ninth Plenum of the Third Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party and published in the February 1964 issue of Hoc Tap.

[15] See, for example, the report of Pham Van Dong to the DRV National Assembly, April 1965, in Against U.S. Aggression. Main Documents of the National Assembly of the D.R.V. 3rd Legislature—2nd Session (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), p. 73.

[16] Vietnam Courier, special issue, September 23, 1965, p. 2.

[17] Ibid., no. 29, June 17, 1965, p. 7.

[18] Lin Piao, Long Live the Victory of People's War! (Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965), p. 66.

[19] Vo Nguyen Giap, "The South Vietnam People Will Win (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1965), p. 70.

[20] Some Documents of the National Assembly of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, 3rd Legislature—1st Session, June-July 1964 (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), p. 73.

[21] Vietnam Courier, no. 35, September 9, 1965, p. 5.

[22] Pham Van Dong, "Vietnam Ten Years After Geneva," Vietnamese Studies (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), no. 1, p. 55.

Chinese Communist) guerrilla force that formerly operated in the Malayan jungles during the so-called "Emergency" of 1948–1960. In Sarawak, Communist guerrillas (also ethnically Chinese) have been engaged in a terrorist campaign against outlying settlements and police posts for some time. And in Luzon, in the Philippines, the Communist insurgency of the Huks has flared up again.

This is not the place to analyze the various causes behind all these manifestations of Communist violence in Southeast Asia, except to note the specific and strong expressions of support for them emanating from Hanoi. Thus the Pathet Lao have been assured of Hanoi's "militant solidarity," the new Thai "independence movement" has been described as "particularly welcome," and the new upsurge in the Philippines has been "hailed" as an indication that U.S. "imperialism" will be "defeated part by part and finally will meet complete failure." [22] While there has been no evidence of direct DRV participation in these developments, Hanoi's interest is clear. It is also obvious that a DRV victory in South Vietnam would give much encouragement to Communist elements involved in these scattered Southeast Asian insurgencies.

V

Thus, seen from Hanoi, the Vietnam war aims not simply at driving American forces out, or at establishing some kind of "truly independent" government in Saigon, as one sometimes hears. DRV war aims go far beyond this and encompass, according to the pronouncements of its own leaders, a phased social and economic revolution in the South, in tandem with the North and directed toward the creation of a Communist state. This revolutionary process specifically acknowledges the use of violence as central and indispensable to ultimate victory. Hanoi's war aims also include development of military and other tactics which will be applicable to Communist insurgency movements in other parts of the world. "If we can do it," Hanoi seems to be saying, "so can you." Herein lies the true significance of the Vietnam war.

INVESTIGATING THE INVESTIGATOR

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a funny thing happened to a Boston, Mass., State senator on his way to investigate the use of wiretapping. His own phones were "bugged," both at his office and at his home.

State Senator Mario Umana is chairman of a special legislative commission on electronic eavesdropping. Apparently the "bug" was discovered when the senator's administrative assistant—carrying on a conversation from his office—suddenly realized that he was also listening in on the senator who was having a personal phone conversation from his own home. Some so-called wiretap "experts" are of the belief that since the crossover occurred between different telephone exchanges, phone conversations from both the home and the office were being led into a wiretapping "plant" where the conversations were intercepted.

Mr. President, must it be that every time we pick up our daily newspaper, another wiretap episode is reported? The situation in Boston is most tragic—especially since Senator Umana is attempting to investigate the use of these electronic eavesdropping devices.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a report of this case from an article in the May 5, 1966, edition of the Boston Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, May 5, 1966]

Senate Head of Wiretap Probe Discovers His Phones Bugged

(By Ronald Kessler)

The State House and home telephones of a state senator investigating wiretapping are being tapped.

The charge, made by State Sen. Mario Umana, was confirmed by the top law enforcement expert on wiretapping in the state and by a high official of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D.C.

Sen. Umana told The Herald he was making a call from his home telephone in East Boston to another telephone in East Boston April 15. At the same time his administrative assistant was talking on the senator's State House telephone to a person in West Newton.

The administrative assistant, Ernest Ratto, Jr., heard Sen. Umana talking on the same line. Ratto gave the receiver to another person in the office, Sanford A. Kowal, a lawyer, and he too heard Umana's voice.

According to the two wiretapping experts contacted by The Herald, the fact that the crossover occurred between different telephone exchanges means conversations over both the senator's State House and home telephones were being led into a wiretapping "plant" where the conversations were intercepted. The wiretap was apparently a sloppy job.

A high-ranking wiretap expert in a state law enforcement agency said, "There is no doubt in the world that his phones are being tapped." The expert said he did not want his name used because it would impair his effectiveness.

In addition, Charles Cowan, FCC chief of the Domestic Service and Facilities Division of the Common Carriers Bureau, said from his Washington office, "I don't see how the incident could have happened unless the phones were being tapped."

Senator Umana is chairman of a special legislative commission on electronic eavesdropping.

The bizarre story came to light Wednesday as other developments unfolded.

A telephone company repairman in a Boston suburb said he personally found "about 30" wiretapping devices attached to lines in the suburb in the past year.

He said the devices were of all types—transmitters, direct connectors, and recording devices attached to lines in homes.

The devices and their services are easily obtained.

Meanwhile, a reporter posing as a prospective client called three detective agencies prominently advertised in the classified telephone directory and asked if they would perform wiretapping for him in a divorce case.

TWO ARE WILLING

Two of the three agencies indicated they would.

One said, "Let's put it this way, it's supposed to be illegal, but come in and talk to us about it and we'll see what can be done."

A check with state and Boston police disclosed the telephone company does not report wiretaps found by telephone company employes, despite the fact that wiretapping is prohibited by state law.

The company did report two instances of wiretapping to the Federal Bureau of Investigation last year.

The information comes from J. I. Hanley, FBI special agent in charge of the New England bureau; Capt. William F. Powers, state police director of public relations, and Department Superintendent William Bradley of the Boston police.

The telephone company has maintained that wiretapping is not widespread. J. M. Gepson, vice president and chief counsel of New England Telephone and Telegraph Co., said in an interview published in the Herald April 22, that only three cases of wiretapping have been uncovered in New England in the past two years.

NO PRECAUTIONS

He also said, in response to questions, that no precautions are taken to prevent tapping of telephone lines used by the governor, attorney general, state police, or other state agencies and officials; that terminal boxes are not locked; routine tests to detect wiretaps are not made; no special code is used when repairmen request information to locate a subscriber's line; and it is "possible" for anyone who knows the proper telephone number to obtain such information.

Telephone lines to some law enforcement agencies in New York City are enclosed in pressurized cables so that a tap can be located immediately.

Gepsen was asked where the thousands of wiretapping devices being manufactured and advertised in mail order catalogues are going. He replied, "I don't really know. Probably some of it is used in messy divorce cases and by industry to get trade secrets."

He asserted stricter laws are not needed to cope with wiretapping.

Sen. Umana (D-East Boston) said he was told six months ago by a friend who is a telephone company employee that his lines seemed to be tapped.

He made a complaint to a telephone company lobbyist, but he did not report the April 15 incident because, "It wouldn't do any good. You're not going to get the phone company to tell you your line is being tapped. The prevalent attitude in the Legislature is that legislators' lines are being tapped. You just go on that assumption, because there's nothing you can do."

Umana, a Harvard Law School graduate, has served two terms in the House and six terms in the Senate. He was assistant district attorney of Middlesex County and has a law practice in East Boston.

TELL OF CALL

The Herald interviewed the four parties to the telephone conversation, as well as the fifth person who was asked to listen in.

Here is their story:

At about 10 a.m., April 15, Sen. Umana called from his home telephone (LO 7–3199) at 82 St. Andrew Rd., East Boston, to his brother Guy's telephone (LO 7–9884) at 92 Brooks St., East Boston.

At about the same time a constituent of Senator Umana, Luigi Vuzzi of 39 Orleans Street, East Boston, was calling from his place of employment, the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority in West Newton (969–8751), to Senator Umana's State House line (727–2564). The senator's other three lines were not in use.

As Umana's administrative assistant, Ratto, was talking to Cuzzi, both men heard Senator Umana's voice clearly but not as distinctly as in a normal telephone connection.

Ratto summoned Kowal, counsel to the commission investigating wiretapping, and he also heard Umana. He could not speak to him. When Umana finished his conversation, Ratto and Kowal called him and told him what had happened. Umana confirmed he had just been talking on the telephone.

WILL CALL AGAIN

Umana said Tuesday he intends to request the telephone company and private detec-

---

[22] Vietnam Courier, no. 17, January 7, 1965, p. 8; no. 37, October 7, 1965, p. 7.

> tive agencies to appear before future hearings of the wiretapping commission. The commission has subpena power.
>
> At the legislative group's first hearing April 14, a New York manufacturer of wiretapping devices demonstrated the range of devices being produced.
>
> Umana believes the manufacture and use of such devices should be strictly regulated.
>
> Manufacture of these devices is legal under present statutes.
>
> However, wiretapping is prohibited by the Federal Communications Act of 1934. Penalty is up to a $10,000 fine or a year in jail, or both.
>
> According to Gepson, no prosecution has ever been initiated in New England under this law.
>
> Wisetapping is prohibited by State law, but it contains a loophole which permits snooping by "corporations subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Utilities of the commonwealth or to the jursidiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or to employees engaged in the conduct of its business."
>
> WIDE SANCTION
>
> Wiretapping is therefore sanctioned, according to legal experts, for stock brokerage firms, gas, electric, water, telephone, telegraph, railway, bus, trolley, and trucking companies—all under the "jurisdiction" of the State DPU.
>
> In addition, tapping is permitted for all corporations whose trucks or products cross State lines, thereby under the "jurisdiction" of the ICC. Included are department stores, manufacturing and food product firms, and newspapers.
>
> Penalty for infraction of the law is $1,000 or two years in jail or both.
>
> The first prosecution under this law was completed last week. Earl E. Jaycox, 41, of 212 Davis Street, Springfield, a former telephone company employee, pleaded guilty to four counts of wiretapping.
>
> Jaycox was given a six-month suspended sentence and a year's probation.

RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, starting in Chicago on May 4 and continuing during forthcoming weeks, the Interstate Commerce Commission is holding hearings and receiving testimony on which it will base an extremely important decision. This will be a decision that will have widespread and long-lasting effects on the Nation's heartland—the great Midwest between the Great Lakes and the Continental Divide and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. The State of South Dakota, by virtue of its location and an economy highly dependent on the preservation of a healthy railroad transportation system, has much at stake in the Commission's decision.

Now before the Commission is a positive and constructive proposal of the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. designed to create a strong competitive regional system which would bolster the economy of the Midwest. North Western seeks to merge with the Rock Island Railroad, another basically midwestern carrier. Both lines have been historically marginal in character with more than two-thirds of the North Western and one-third of the Rock Island overlapping in five Midwestern States: Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and South Dakota. Obviously, the opportunities are numerous for the two roads to improve service to the public through elimination of duplicating facilities, increasing car supply through pooling of equipment and other efficiencies stemming from soundly conceived coordination.

By eliminating duplicate facilities which abound in these areas, the combined railroads could function more efficiently, give far better service, and provide more coordinated schedules in keeping with the requirements of modern industry. It is significant that a combination of the two roads could only result in improvement rather than an impairment of needed transportation services.

North Western serves South Dakota with almost 1,500 miles of line. South Dakota, therefore, is deeply concerned and strongly encourages any steps that will result in improving the rail service which will have a major impact on the future of the State's economy, just as it has contributed to the growth of the State in the past.

I am convinced that a North Western-Rock Island combination can only result in what is essential for the Middle West; namely, the development of healthy regional rail systems oriented to the needs of thousands of communities throughout America's heartland of which South Dakota is a part. Such regional systems as the proposed North Western-Rock Island combination would unquestionably strengthen South Dakota's economy, broaden its opportunities to market its products, and also add to its capacity to consume products from other regions.

DESTRUCTION BY STRIP-MINING OPERATIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, strip mining without adequate regulation continues to ravish the Nation's beauty and natural resources. After mining, the broken and poisoned land is often left to nurture poverty, despair, and ugliness. The profits of strip mining are large, and, comparatively, the cost of rehabilitating much of this land is minimal. About 1,750,000 acres have been damaged or destroyed by surface mining for all minerals. To satisfy the country's growing need for electricity, more and more acres will be stripped for cheap coal to fuel the many thermoelectric plants. The Federal Government has too long shirked its responsibility to guide the coal industry in applying responsible mining practices.

Recently, an article published in the New York Times magazine of March 13 came to my attention. It vividly demonstrates the need for Federal regulation of strip and surface mining operations. The article, written by Mr. Harry M. Caudill, is entitled "Paradise Is Stripped" and describes the appalling waste that surrounds a town in a once beautiful Kentucky valley.

RESOURCE DESTRUCTION BY STRIP MINING

Evidence of resource destruction by strip mining has been accumulating for many years. Mr. Caudill's article indicates than an "enlightened industry" has done very little to alleviate the situation.

In many areas, the law condones and encourages destruction of the land and real and personal property of those who occupy the surface to get at the minerals below. People are deprived of the sanctity of their homes and their means of earning a living. Let me quote two paragraphs from Mr. Caudill's article describing conditions in eastern Kentucky:

> With this license to wreck, many operators have proceeded with complete abandon. They have rolled rocks through some homes and have pushed others off their foundations. Many have been demolished by avalanches from the spoil banks. In Knott County, a one-armed miner came home from a retraining program conducted as a part of the war on poverty to find his house and all its contents buried beneath a mammoth landslide.
>
> When a group of mountaineers calling themselves The Appalachian Group to Save The Land and People visited Governor Edward T. Breathitt of Kentucky last June, an 80-year-old woman told him that she had stood on the front porch of her little home and watched the bulldozers invade her family cemetery. She said, "I though my heart would break when the coffins of my children came out of the ground and went over the hill." This situation prompted one mountaineer to comment that the coal industry digs up the dead and buries the living.

The human anguish caused by these inhumane practices is outrageous.

Mr. Caudill's description of conditions around Paradise, Muhlenberg County, Ky., depicts the typical result of strip or surface mining on a community. Last year Muhlenberg County produced 17.6 million tons of coal—more than any other county in America. The cost has been staggering. He writes:

> Paradise is isolated and shrunken, huddled in an appalling waste. Thousands of acres of earth are piled high into ghastly ridges, sometimes black with coal, sometimes brown with sulphur. The streams that wind through this dead landscape are devoid of life.

This is not an isolated picture. It is repeated almost endlessly. Without rehabilitation, the future productivity of these lands is uncertain.

After the strip-mining profit taking is complete, companies move out, leaving desolation and poverty in their wake. Off-site damage also results from strip mining. Silt and sulphuric acid poison streams and destroy famlands far downstream from the mining operation. Fish and aquatic life die; timber and crops are destroyed; the natural beauty of valleys is scarred; and residents become impoverished.

REHABILITATION IS FEASIBLE

Many European countries are doing a great deal to rehabilitate strip or surface mined land. Mr. Caudill reports that in England, for example, the overburden is carefully saved and then replaced when mining is complete. He writes that costs average about $1 per ton of coal mined. This is clearly within financial reach of the coal industry and coal users.

Now is the time to start strip and surface mine rehabilitation in earnest. Several States do require strip mine rehabilitation. Those that have effective statutes and adequate enforcement are to be commended. The problem is that many State laws are weak or are not sufficiently flexible to insure good results.

These States are also unlikely to improve inadequate laws for many reasons.

HIGH PROFITS IN STRIP MINING

Much has been written about the high profits to be gained in strip mining the rich coal fields of the Appalachians. Reports are that more than 1.3 billion tons of coal have been mined in Appalachia alone in the past 3 years with a value of nearly $6 billion. Since 1954, when coal production was at a post-depression low, company incomes have been rising at a fantastic rate—nearly 30 percent in a little over a decade. The land companies that own this mineral wealth, and lease it to strip miners, show enormous profits. They are the highest in American industry. Mr. Caudill reports that one company retains as net profit 61 percent of its income and paid out 45 percent of its gross income as dividends. In contrast, General Motors cleared 10 percent of receipts and paid 5 percent in dividends during the same year.

The principal reason for the rising use of coal is the vast growth in demand for electricity. Cheap, strip-mined coal is, economically, the best fuel for generating it and will remain so for the foreseeable future. Atom-powered plants are seen to supply only 20 percent of the needed electricity in the year 2000 even by the most optimistic estimates.

Huge coal-burning electric plants dot the Appalachians and other eastern coalfields. They consume enormous quantities of coal supplied from strip mines. As demands for electricity continue to increase, these plants and attendant surface mines are expected to grow in numbers in the East and spread to the extensive Dakota lignite fields.

Mr. President, last October, I introduced a bill, S. 2688, to provide for the regulation of present and future strip mining, for the conservation and reclamation of surface and strip-mined areas.

The bill would create a Mined Lands Conservation Administration in the Department of the Interior. The Secretary of Interior could establish strip-mining regulations and require operators to post bonds and obtain strip-mining licenses. The fee for the annual license and the amount of bond would be set by the Secretary. Penalties are provided for operators who strip mine without the permit or do not conform to established regulations.

There is clear need for the legislation provided by this bill. Because of the urgency of this problem I am asking the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to schedule hearings on the bill.

Mr. Caudill's article vividly describes the seriousness of the situation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Paradise Is Stripped

(By Harry M. Caudill)

Descendants of the people who settled in the shallow valley of the Green River founded a small hamlet called Paradise, Ky. It was well-named, for the countryside was green and pleasant and the stream teemed with fish. Game abounded and a man could live an unworried life, the tedium broken by an occasional visit to the county seat to listen to trials and swap yarns with friends from other parts of Muhlenberg County.

But times have changed. There is still a dot called Paradise on the map of Kentucky but last year Muhlenberg produced 17.6 million tons of coal—more than any other county in America—and the production record was achieved at a staggering cost. Paradise is isolated and shrunken, huddled in an appalling waste. Thousands of acres of earth are piled high into ghastly ridges, sometimes black with coal, sometimes brown with sulphur. The streams that wind through this dead landscape are devoid of life.

Here in western Kentucky, part of America's Eastern Interior coal field, the mineral lies near the surface, and the region has fallen prey to strip mining on an immense scale. Strip mining is as easy as it is ruthless. It simply tears the earth apart stratum by stratum in order to rip out the minerals. Conventional tunnel and pillar mining leaves the surface relatively undisturbed, but stripping totally disrupts the land and its ecology.

In a typical Appalachian operation the development may proceed in two or more seams of coal at different levels in a mountain. The uppermost seam may be laid bare by the violent expedient of blasting away the entire overlying crest—a process known to the industry as "casting the overburden." Lower down, the seam is exposed or "faced" by bulldozing and dynamiting the timber and soil away from the coal. The uprooted trees, loose dirt and shattered stone are pushed down the slope. The coal is loosened by light explosive charges, scooped up with power shovels and loaded onto giant trucks for hauling to the nearest railroad loading docks.

Where the terrain is level or gently rolling, the bulldozers and power shovels scrape away the dirt to expose the rock layer roofing the coal. The stone is then shattered with dynamite and lifted by immense shovels or draglines onto the spoil heaps, accumulations that sometimes rise almost sheer to a height of 200 feet. Several acres of the fuel may be bared in this manner before smaller shovels begin loading it onto the trucks.

One gigantic shovel owned by the Peabody Coal Company is as tall as a 17-story building and has become a major tourist attraction. Thousands of people drive out of their way to watch it devastate the American land.

A traveler comes in along the new Kentucky Turnpike from The Bluegrass, where the lawns and fields are manicured and the miles of wooden fences gleam with fresh white paint. There the influence of the early German immigrants lives on, and in the counties around Lexington it is easy to conclude that the nation's heritage in its land is being safely guarded.

The turnpike carries the traveler through a line of lovely low hills into the west Kentucky plain. The land thins as it flattens. Muhlenberg County was never high-quality farm land, but it was adequate, and with constructive farm practices and enlightened forestry it had a substantial and permanent potential. By no stretch of the imagination did it warrant the destruction to which it has been subjected.

Aggravating the shock that accompanies one's visit to Paradise is the realization that this is TVA country and TVA is the nation's bench mark in land conservation. Two billion dollars have gone into TVA projects and a vast amount of favorable propaganda has accompanied its every venture. Millions of Americans assume that the TVA territory is in good hands.

At Paradise, T.V.A. assumes tangible form in an enormous coal-burning electric power plant, built at a cost of $183 million. It consumes 12,000 tons of coal daily. Modern, automated, gigantic, the plant towers above a desolation created by its insatiable appetite for fuel. Just beyond the steel fences which surround it the desert begins. Within sight of the plant Peabody's machines rip the tortured earth while gargantuan trucks rush the coal to the voracious "cyclone" furnaces.

T.V.A. has two faces. One is composed of the green hills around Knoxville, enriched with cheap Government fertilizer and green with pines planted with Government subsidies. It sparkles with T.V.A. lakes and hums with profits from a multitude of new industries attracted by a pleasant climate, abundant water, flood control and dirt-cheap electricity. But T.V.A.'s other face is less pleasing to contemplate. The agency generates much more electricity from coal than from its hydro-electric dams and fuel-buying policies have long been the subject of bittter controversy. By insisting on rock-bottom coal prices for its growing string of huge steam plants it has stimulated strip mining enormously.

T.V.A. is the nation's biggest coal consumer and its purchasing policies have set the pace for the market elsewhere. Despite a general inflation, coal prices have remained stationary for 15 years. Squeezed by rising costs of machines and labor, countless underground pits have been forced to close. Strip mines have been able to hold the price line and meet T.V.A.'s bid requirements. Therein lies the tragedy of Paradise. And therein lies similar tragedy for hundreds of other communities elsewhere in America—and, ultimately, enduring tragedy for all Americans.

A few years ago, oil and gas interests confidently assumed that theirs were the modern fuels. Coal was "old-fashioned." In burning, it left a residue of ashes, soot and grit. The industry was archaic—fragmented into hundreds of small companies, undercapitalized and plagued with labor troubles. Obviously the future belonged to other fuels.

But coal has staged an amazing comeback. The demand for electricity has grown enormously—and for most of America coal is the best fuel for generating it. The most optimistic proponents of atomic power estimate that nuclear generating plants will be able to meet no more than 20 percent of the nation's electric needs by the end of the century.

From a postdepression low in 1954, coal production had climbed 5 percent by 1960. Then the market zoomed another 5 per cent in 1961 and nearly as much in 1962. In 1963, the gain was 6.5 per cent and in 1964 it was more than 7 per cent. Economists now predict that by 1970 the coal industry will be producing at 100 per cent of present capacity.

According to the United States Bureau of Mines, more than 1.3 billion tons of coal, valued at about $6-billion, have been mined in Appalachia alone in the past three years. This year production is expected to reach 500 million tons. New pits are being opened, and most of the new production will come from "surface mining"—a euphemism dreamed up by the industry's public-relations firm.

The Appalachian coal field extends through Pennsylvania, West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, western Virginia, eastern Tennessee and northern Alabama. This mountain range is one of the richest resource areas in the continent—rich with coal, oil, natural gas, sandstone, limestone, low-grade iron ore, water, timber-growing potential and marvelous scenery. The hunters and wilderness scouts who first penetrated the gaps never beheld a land more enchantingly beautiful than the wooded Appalachian hills and hollows on a misty morning.

With wise management of its resources, Appalachia could have been the richest part of America today. Instead, it has become synonymous with poverty of land and people. But Appalachian destitution did not occur by accident. It is the result of nearly a century of remorseless exploitation.

The timber stands were bought up by Eastern lumber companies, and the forests were cut down, sawed up, and shipped away in a barbarous manner which totally disregarded the capacity of the land to regenerate the stands. Few healthy seed trees were spared, and today the woods consist mainly of low-grade stock which the lumbermen have culled many times.

But the disastrous exploitation of timber never equaled that which characterized the coal interests. Traditionally, America's industrial muscle has rested on Appalachian coal seams, and mining has garnered huge fortunes for Philadelphia, Boston, Detroit, Cincinnati, New York, and Chicago.

From the beginning, coal companies displayed a reckless contempt for the earth. Near their tipples they piled up tremendous culm heaps which they never troubled to vegetate. They poured—and continue to pour—immeasurable quantities of mine wastes into streams. Hundreds of them permitted the inhabitants of their towns to use waterways as dumping grounds for garbage and trash.

Their investment in schools and other local facilities was held to an absolute minimum. All proposals to impose severance taxes on minerals for support of local facilities and services were beaten. As successive generations of extractors prospered, they withdrew from the region, taking their money with them and leaving new accumulations of ugliness and poverty behind.

The coal industry's lack of responsibility has culminated in today's strip mining. A flight along the Appalachian crest from Pennsylvania to Alabama reveals the awesome scope of the depredations. For hundreds of miles one passes over lands churned into darkening death.

In Pennsylvania alone, 250,000 acres have been left as bleak and barren as the Sahara. As the hills steepen to the southward, contour strip mining begins. In West Virginia and in eastern Kentucky, whole valleys have been wrecked. Gigantic cuts are made at the face of the coal seam, the "highwalls" sometimes rising 90 feet straight up. The broken timber, shattered rock and dirt are shoved over the steep slopes, to be carried by the rains into streams and onto farm lands.

In Ohio, 202,000 acres in a half-dozen counties have been churned by the machines. Ohio's Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, a stanch friend of business, has repeatedly denounced the strippers who are ruining so much of his state. So complete is the devastation that in some areas once-valuable farmlands can now be bought for as little as 25 cents per acre.

In Wise County, Virginia, the coal lies near the hilltops and many mountains have been decapitated—turned into flat-topped mesas. In eastern Tennessee, where the seams are thin and the mountains a bit less steep, the damage subsides somewhat. Nonetheless, the hills which T.V.A. was established to save lie scarred as if by a monstrous whip.

In the Eastern Interior coal field the creeping ruin has spread across western Kentucky and far into Indiana and Illinois. Seventy-five thousand acres in Indiana have been ravaged. In Illinois, 105,000 acres embracing some of the world's best cornland have been turned upside down.

And the ravages of strip mining are spreading to other coal fields farther west. In North Dakota, the Truax-Traer Coal Company is strip-mining three million tons of lignite coal annually for the giant new power plant of the Basin Electric Power Cooperative. Using an ingenious device called the "launch-hammer mining wheel," the operation is incredibly swift and efficient. With the growing demand for electricity on the West Coast and the spread of extra-high-voltage transmission lines to carry the product from generator to consumer, the vast lignite fields in the Dakotas are likely to be wrecked on a gigantic scale in the next two or three decades.

In addition, there is talk of cooking Colorado shales for their petroleum. If this occurs, the shales will be recovered by strip mining, and the beautiful hills of Colorado will face the extinction that now threatens so much of the Appalachian range.

What kind of corporations commit this murder of the landscape? One might suppose them to be obscure entities whose managers have not yet learned that in the 20th century it is good business to preserve that which cannot be replaced.

Not so. Many of the great strippers are subsidiaries of well-known American corporations—Bethlehem Steel, Republic Steel, Inland Steel, Interlake Steel, Weirton Steel, Youngstown Steel and Tube and United States Steel. Their advertisements proclaim an enlightened concern for the perpetuation of the American way of life, but in Appalachian valleys they ruthlessly kill the land on which future generations of Americans must depend. The most brutal example of corporate irresponsibility lies on the Poor Fork of the Cumberland River in Harlan County, Kentucky, where the United States Coal and Coke Company has shattered the Big Black Mountain for more than 20 miles, reducing much of this noble terrain feature to a rubble heap.

The coal companies' profits are fantastic. Pittsburgh-Consolidation Coal Corporation earned $19,420,000 in 1955 and $44,470,000 in 1964. The profits of Glen Alden Corporation rose from $40,000 a decade ago to $6,000,000 a year ago. Peabody Coal enjoyed a profit increase in the same decade from $9,430,000 to $30,470,000. Ayrshire Collieries increased its net income from $2,520,000 to $5,790,000. The profits of Pittston Coal Company zoomed from $2,190,000 to $13,720,000 in the same decade.

The land companies that own the mineral wealth and lease it to strip miners show the most profitable balance sheets in American industry. In 1964, the Virginia Coal and Iron Corporation retained as net profits 61 per cent of its income and paid out 45 per cent of its gross income as dividends. This record was equaled by another huge land company, the Kentucky River Coal Corporation. By contrast, in the same year, General Motors cleared a dime out of each dollar received and paid out a nickel in dividends.

And what of the people whose communities are shredded for cheap coal? Obviously, ruined lands must be abandoned, and the strip-mined counties all have shown sharp population declines. A million people have moved out of Appalachia in the past 10 years, and the Eastern Interior field has fared little better. As subterranean mining declined, thousands of families passed onto the public assistance rolls. Today, welfare, not mining, provides most of the money spent by families in the nation's coal fields.

In Appalachia, exploitation has reduced a once-proud and even violent people to the most passive and trampled-upon part of the American population. Passivity has reached its ultimate depths in eastern Kentucky, where whole communities have been impoverished and debased with scarcely a protest. There, coal companies often own the minerals underlying the lands of farmers and the state's highest court has ruled that the companies have the right to destroy the land in order to get out the minerals.

With this license to wreck, many operators have proceeded with complete abandon. They have rolled rocks through some homes and have pushed others off their foundations. Many have been demolished by avalanches from the spoil banks. In Knott County, a one-armed coal miner came home from a retraining program conducted as a part of the war on poverty to find his house and all its contents buried beneath a mammoth landside.

When a group of mountaineers calling themselves The Appalachian Group To Save the Land and People visited Gov. Edward T. Breathitt of Kentucky last June, an 80-year-old woman told him that she had stood on the front porch of her little home and watched the bulldozers invade her family cemetery. She said: "I thought my heart would break when the coffins of my children come out of the ground and went over the hill." This situation prompted one mountaineer to comment that the coal industry digs up the dead and buries the living.

But even in the Kentucky Mountains, suffering and patience have their limits. In the Clear Creek community, women copied the tactics of civil-rights demonstrators and stopped the strippers by lying down in front of their bulldozers. They were promptly hauled off to jail, but the machines are still stalled by recalcitrant mountaineers determined to save their lands from ruin—and themselves from total impoverishment.

America is not alone in its craving for coal or in facing the problems growing out of strip mining. In Europe, postwar reconstruction has seen a Socialist Government in Great Britain and a Communist Government in Czechoslovakia authorize the demolition of whole towns to get at the coal beneath them. In England, strip miners have gone to a depth of 700 feet—500 feet deeper than anything yet attempted in America.

But European national coal boards have demonstrated that complete reclamation of strip-mined sites is possible. In England, for example, the topsoil is carefully scraped off and saved in separate heaps. Next, the subsoil is pushed aside and similarly isolated. So is the rock above the coal. At the end of the operation, the rock goes back into the pit first; then the subsoil is pushed in; finally, the topsoil is restored to its original site. The restored land is compacted as it is replaced. After it is contoured, it is fertilized and treated with limestone. It then undergoes an intensive five-year agricultural restoration treatment. Most of the land is returned to agriculture; the rest is planted in timber. Total cost averages about $1 a ton of coal recovered. These achievements demonstrate that "total reclamation" on the right terrain is within easy reach of American industry.

In 1875, California outlawed hydraulic gold mining, on the ground that it silted streams and caused the flooding of valuable farm lands. This type of mining was comparatively harmless when compared with coal stripping, but it is unlikely that any of the states will face up so squarely to our modern problems. In the coal states, legislatures are composed in the main of little men who yield easily to blandishments and enticements, and the coal industry is rich and ruthless.

For years, Pennsylvania had the strictest reclamation law. It required operators to obtain stripping permits and to post bonds to assure reclamation of the land in accordance with a state-approved plan. But when the stripped land is very steep, a bond guarantees only the impossible—a situation comparable to authorizing rape on assurance that the rapist will afterward restore his victim's virginity.

Early this year, conservationists all over America watched with admiration the efforts of Kentucky's young Governor Breathitt to tighten his state's reclamation law. The act, as amended, authorizes the Kentucky enforcement agency to require strippers in mountainous eastern Kentucky to drag part of the soil off the spoil banks and use it to cover the perpendicular highwalls, reducing them to a slope not exceeding 45 degrees. In western Kentucky, the mined land must be shaped so that it can be traversed by farm machinery. All disturbed lands must be seeded to a prescribed vegetative cover or, in the mountains, planted with approximately 800 seedling trees for each acre.

To these modest and reasonable requirements the coal industry responded with outraged bellows. Scores of lobbyists descended on the State House. Huge funds were collected from operators and their suppliers for the avowed purpose of defeating the bill. Governor Breathitt spoke out against improper pressures upon legislators and the bill passed by a comfortable margin—the severest public setback ever suffered by any segment of the coal industry in Kentucky.

While Breathitt remains Governor, strict enforcement is to be expected, but his administration is likely to be exceptional. The state has had a reclamation statute since 1954, but it has been generally ignored, and it is to be feared that future state administrations will emulate this leniency.

Elsewhere in Appalachia, Virginia, Tennessee and Alabama have never bothered even to enact reclamation statutes. In the Eastern Interior field, only Illinois has any sort of reclamation law. In the Western field, such legislation has never been seriously considered.

If governmental power is to save the American land, it must be Federal power backed by a strong national will and conscience. The American population is growing rapidly; estimates of the United States Bureau of the Census indicate a population of 300 million by the year 2000. The nation's land base cannot grow by a single inch, but it can be effectively diminished by industrial processes which include not only strip mining for coal but quarrying, borrow pits, opencast iron mining and similar operations. Under any enlightened philosophy, the present occupants of the land hold it in trust for future generations and are under a positive obligation to pass it on in a tolerable state.

The blight of strip mining does not stop at the edge of the spoil banks. When freshly exposed, the soil is hot with sulphuric acid: for years nothing can grow on it. In the meantime, the sulphur and mud wash into streams, killing aquatic life and piling up in horrible weed-grown banks. The long-range cost of dredging the Mississippi and its tributaries of this coal-flecked debris will be astronomical—a burden all Federal taxpayers will share.

In my opinion, the Great Society should enunciate a clear-cut policy relative to extractive industry and its distorted practices of social accounting. Based on need and historical experience, strip mining should be permitted in those areas where terrain and weather permit complete reclamation—that is, in flat or gently rolling country. In West Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and most of Pennsylvania, coal can be extracted cheaply and efficiently by this method, and the same machines which rip the earth can heal the scars. Following British practice, the land can be restored to its original condition and perhaps, even improved. If funds are made available for the purpose, and if the State and Federal Governments make certain it occurs, intensive treatment with fertilizers, limestone and leguminous plants and trees can restore the land to beauty and usefulness. Such costs should be borne by industry as part of the price of coal.

At the same time, it should be recognized that in most of Appalachia the land is simply too steep, too rough, too rugged, and the rainfall is too heavy, to permit restoration. When a hill is decapitated or flayed, the topsoil vanishes first. There is no feasible way to separate the rock, subsoil and topsoil and then to restore them to the pits in their natural order. In such terrain, and with the precipitation, freezing and thawing natural to the region, to strip mine is to destroy. Unless technological advances make possible a complete reclamation of mountainous land, national policy should outlaw strip mining in such terrain.

The technology of subterranean mining has made fabulous strides in the last two decades. Continuous mining machines, roof-bolting devices, battery-powered coal cars, improved ventilating techniques and strict enforcement of the Federal mine safety code have not only made the miner's life easier and safer but increased his productivity more than twofold. Coal from tunneled mines must sell for a little more per ton than that from strip mines, but the difference is a small price to pay for the preservation of the land.

The third feature of the national policy should provide an effective program for the reclamation of "orphan banks"—old strip mines worked out and abandoned long ago. Congress should appropriate funds for the purchase of these lands, and they should be smoothed and revegetated. When so restored, they could be sold, and the proceeds applied in payment of the Government's investment.

The same policy should apply to lands pitted by taconite mining in northern Minnesota, and to other areas where industries extract minerals by open-cast mining. Such rules would require only that the generation which damages the land—and benefits thereby—would pay for restoration, instead of future generations which, in all probability, will have enough problems of their own making.

To date, in the mining of all minerals, 1.75 million acres have been destroyed or severely damaged by surface mining. Some 400,000 of these acres are officially classified by state agencies as "reclaimed land," though often there is not a blade of grass or a seedling tree to support the claim.

The hour is late and the agony of the land is intense. Most Americans have long assumed that the waste of resources was curbed and that victory over greed and wantonness was achieved in the days of Theodore Roosevelt. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Shocking as were the mass slaughters of the American bison and the passenger pigeon, they were no more grotesque than the present destruction.

As wealth multiplies, hordes of Americans will purchase country retreats and seek quiet areas for recreation and leisure. Someday, every acre will be needed for its food and fiber. Unless we act now our grandchildren may inherit vast man-made deserts, devoid of life, polluted with acids, hideous to the eye, baked by the sun and washed by the rains. If this is their heritage, they will curse us so long as the deserts remain to monumentalize our greed and folly.

Continued silence by the national Administration on this urgent issue is inconsistent with the dream of a Great Society. It is, in fact, inconsistent with simple patriotism and basic common sense, for unless the land lives the people must perish.

BASIC HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the St. Petersburg, Fla., Times believes that all Americans should be proud of what this Nation has done in the past 12 years to guarantee basic human rights to all its people.

Speaking of the latest administration proposals on civil rights, the newspaper states "the President's requests would plug the largest gap remaining in America's civil rights legislation."

It adds:

We hope the President's proposal wins the support of majorities of both the Democratic and Republican parties, as did the other great civil rights acts, and that Congress will enact the new law without delay.

This editorial comment will interest many, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Apr. 30, 1966]

MORE TO BE DONE

Every American should be proud to have lived during the last 12 years.

No nation has done more in that time to guarantee basic human rights to all its people.

We have accomplished a lot. The doctrine of "separate but equal" schools, which never existed, has been exposed and discarded. Slow but steady progress toward school desegregation has been made. Discrimination in other public facilities has all but ended. In public accommodations and employment practices, it has been outlawed. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 tore down the walls built in some Southern states around their voting booths.

We've come far. But there's more to be done because discrimination still divides our nation. That's the goal of the new laws requested of Congress Thursday by President Johnson.

The President asked for four advances:

A declaration of national policy from Congress against racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing.

Changes in federal criminal statutes to protect all citizens from violence in the exercise of their rights to vote, go to school, travel, serve on juries, etc.

Banishment of discrimination in selection of federal juries and encouragement to state courts to do the same.

Broader powers for the attorney general to prosecute school desegregation violations.

The fair housing proposal promises to be the most controversial of the requests. Southern lawmakers began shouting "unconstitutional" immediately. Their protests overlooked Congress's clear authority, plus existing law.

In 1866 Congress passed a law saying: "All citizens of the United States shall have the right in every state and territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property."

By passing another fair housing act 100 years later, Congress merely will be modernizing a statute already on the books.

If states enforced their own criminal laws, additional federal statutes would be unnecessary. The sad truth, especially in Alabama and Mississippi, is that prosecutions have not been brought in racial killings. We would much prefer that state and local officials perform in such a way that no prosecutions would ever be necessary under federal law. However, that has not been the case in the recent past. We look forward to the day when all states learn that the way to maintain a balanced federal system is to enforce state laws impartially, a fact as applicable to Florida as any other state.

President Johnson's proposals on jury discrimination drive that point home. He wants discrimination prohibited by law in federal and state courts. He wants detailed guidelines for federal juries. But for state courts, the general legislation will be supported only by authority for suits against jury discrimination.

Here again, the first responsibility remains with states.

Together, the President's requests would plug the largest gaps remaining in America's civil rights legislation.

We hope the President's proposal wins the support of majorities in both the Democratic and Republican parties, as did the other great civil rights acts, and that Congress will enact the new law without delay. Mr. Johnson pointedly called this a 1968 package.

COMMUNIST PLANS FOR GUERRILLA WARFARE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we have a tendency not uncommon in all men to believe that the bell tolls for others, but never for us. We sincerely lament the problems which other nations face, but in the deep recesses of our own minds we believe that this cannot happen here.

Thus, many thoughtful Americans have been prone to regard the recent Havana conference which called for the support and stimulation of "wars of national liberation" in the underdeveloped world as something of only indirect concern to themselves.

The fact is, however, that the guerrilla warfare which world communism is now planning for Asia, Latin America, and Africa, is being planned for New York, Los Angeles, and other areas in our country.

This point is made in telling and forceful manner by Phillip Abbott Luce, a one-time leader of the "new left" who was associated with the Progressive Labor Movement from April 1963 until January 1965. He and his wife, a former copy editor for Progressive Labor Party newspapers, broke with the organization because of its terror tactics and advocacy of violence.

Although many pressures and gross injustices caused much of the discontent which spilled over into violence in Harlem and in Los Angeles, there was also an effort by professional agitators to take advantage of these justifiable grievances. Concerning this, Abbott writes:

> Once the Harlem riots reached their peak the Progressive Labor leadership considered spreading the chaos to other parts of the city. The editor of Challenge, the Progressive Labor weekly newspaper, signed an editorial published during the riots which stated: "The vision of half a million or a million angry black men and women, supported by allies in the Puerto Rican and other working class communities, standing up to their oppressors, is haunting the ruling class. People have already begun to speak of guerrilla warfare and revolutionaries."

Mr. Luce also discussed the recent association of American leftist groups with the Havana Conference, pointing out that American protest groups have direct affiliation with and affinity to the group of Communist guerrilla organizations which met in Havana. He writes:

> Progressive Labor's latest contact with the world guerrilla movements came when it sent Rick Rhoades, in violation of passport regulations, to the Tri-Continental Conference in Havana in January. Rhoades, who previously had been sent to City College in New York by Progressive Labor to head up the May Second Movement there, shared the spotlight with Robert Williams as the only invited observers from the United States. Upon his return to New York, Rhoades reported on his various meetings with guerrilla leaders at two closed meetings of Progressive Labor. Rhoades also admitted having had conferences with the Viet Cong about plans to try to increase agitation in this country against the war in Vietnam and also made contacts with the Chinese about the possibility of a trip to that country by a group of young Americans.

I would like to share with my colleagues this important article which appears in the April 11 issue of Washington Report published by the American Security Council and, therefore, ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Report, Apr. 11, 1966]

COMMUNIST PLANS FOR GUERRILLA WARFARE IN THE U.S.

(Note.—Guest editor, Phillip Abbott Luce, one-time leader of the "New Left" was associated with the Progressive Labor Movement from April 1963 until January 1965. He and his wife, a former copy editor for PLP newspapers, broke with the organization because of its terror tactics and advocacy of violence. He has since cooperated with government agencies and has just completed a book for the David McKay Company entitled "The New Left.")

At this moment, while Communist forces throughout the world are engaged in attempts to overthrow a number of governments, here, in the United States, the Progressive Labor Party (PLP) and the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) are actively involved in the first-step operations of guerrilla warfare. Both of these groups are storing arms, training people in sabotage and terrorism and actively preparing a group of people to institute armed insurrection.

Progressive Labor, acting in its capacity as the American arm of the Chinese Communist International, has prepared a number of its members for any eventuality. During the summer of 1964 the PLP initiated a plan dividing various "trusted" members into secret groups of four and then preparing them to go "underground" if a police crackdown became imminent. The PLP members were not simply to change their names and alter their physical appearance but also were to use the weapons provided to aid and promote a guerrilla operation in those cities where Progressive Labor had any strength, such as in New York and San Francisco.

THE PLP'S ROLE IN THE 1964 HARLEM RIOTS

When Harlem erupted that same summer the Progressive Labor leader there, Bill Epton, used his previous training to instigate further rioting. He actually trained people in the techniques of preparing and using Molotov cocktails. Epton is presently out on bond, pending the appeal of the one-year prison sentence he received as a result of his role in the riots.

Once the Harlem riots reached their peak the Progressive Labor leadership considered spreading the chaos to other parts of the city. The editor of Challenge, the Progressive Labor weekly newspaper, signed an editorial published during the riots which stated: "The vision of half-a-million—or a million—angry black men and women, supported by allies in the Puerto Rican and other working class communities, standing up to their oppressors, is haunting the ruling class. People have already begun to speak of 'guerrilla warfare' and 'revolutionaries.' "

The only reason that Progressive Labor did not try to spread the riots to New York's Lower East Side was later explained to us at a secret meeting of the Progressive Labor National Committee. Alice Jerome, the head of Progressive Labor's club on the Lower East Side explained: "We felt that we could not carry an action through with any kind of success or value, other than a blood bath. * * * If the opportunity comes again—the big question is how to consolidate whatever gains are made."

GUERRILLA TRAINING "UNDERGROUND"

By December 1964 the Progressive Labor leadership had embarked on yet another "underground" program which was to include a trip abroad during which the members would receive further training in guerrilla techniques. Today this program is operative; a number of Progressive Labor people have already dropped from sight. Jake Rosen, a former member of the Communist Party, USA, a traveler to China (1958), and the man responsible for bringing a number of guns to New York from the South, is in charge of this "underground" project. (Rosen casually left a wife behind when he went into hiding nearly a year ago.)

Progressive Labor's latest contact with the world guerrilla movements came when it sent Rick Rhoades, in violation of passport regulations, to the Tri-Continental Conference in Havana in January. Rhoades, who previously had been sent to City College in New York by Progressive Labor to head up the May Second Movement there, shared the spotlight with Robert Williams as the only "invited observers" from the United States. Upon his return to New York Rhoades reported on his various meetings with guerrilla leaders at two closed meetings of Progressive Labor. Rhoades also admitted to having had conferences with the Viet Cong about plans to try to increase agitation in this country against the war in Vietnam and also made contacts with the Chinese about the possibility of a trip to that country by a group of young Americans. Such a trip would violate current State Department travel regulations.

RAM

The other organizatiion in the United States that is preparing to launch a guerrilla warfare operation is the Revolutionary Action Movement. Founded in Philadelphia in the winter of 1963, RAM is headed by Max Stanford and Robert Franklin Williams. RAM is active in the large city ghettos and has a hard-core membership of about 250 people. RAM closely follows Williams who is listed as its "Chairman-in-Exile" and as the "Premier of the African-American-Government-in-Exile." Williams acknowledged his role while speaking in Hanoi in November, 1964: "As a representative of the Revolutionary Action Movement, I am here to give support to the Vietnamese people in their struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression."

Nearly a year ago a group of RAM followers attempted to destroy a number of national shrines and had planned a bombing raid on the nation's capital before they were rounded up by the New York police. The three Americans involved in this bizarre plot were all members of the Black Liberation Front which was formed in Cuba during the summer of 1964. This Black Liberation Front was merely a "front" operation for RAM. Even the extreme leftwing has now admitted this fact. Robert Taber, one of the founders of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and still an apologist for Fidel Castro, documents this relationship in his book on guerrilla warfare, "The War of the Flea."

Max Standford has made it perfectly clear that RAM favors any means to wrest control of the government from "white" people. Writing in the Detroit, Mich., monthly, Correspondence, he relates that RAM was informed by "Afro-Americans who favored Robert F. Williams and the concept of organized violence." He stated that the philosophy of RAM was "revolutionary nationalism and just plain blackism."

One Detroit group which amalgamated with RAM is UHURU which means "freedom" in Swahili. The program of UHURU was described by one of its leaders, who also traveled to Cuba in 1964, as "Mau Mau Maoist. We are strong supporters of the Chinese. If you're in doubt of any position we have, look it up in Peking Review."

RAM AND THE RED CHINESE

Although the RAMers advocate strong support for the Chinese revolutionary philosophy they cannot be considered a part of the official Chinese Communist International. While Progressive Labor has a number of direct contacts (including financial ones) with the Chinese Communist government, the Revolutionary Action Movement is not considered by the Chinese as their American agent. RAM utilizes a philosophy that is a strange mixture of black nationalism, white hatred, misread Marxism and kamikaze radicalism. They idolize the Chinese because of the rhetoric they use and because the Chinese are a part of the "colored" world.

TERROR IN THE CITIES

RAM has been explicit in its outline of how it will take power in this country. Advocating a guerrilla war different in nature from that described in the writings of Mao and the Chinese, RAM envisions using the urban areas as the base of operations. The revolutionaries in RAM believe that the black ghetto areas of our major cities hold the key to a successful guerrilla war. They specifically propose that black people be organized into small guerrilla units which will use the night to spread terror through a city. According to the plans of RAM, terror will be the major weapon—terror which will, in turn, lead to a demoralization of the will of the government. Bombs will be placed in New York's Grand Central Station or other public places; key personalities will be assassinated; snipers will indiscriminately murder innocent citizens; theatres will be fired.

Max Stanford puts it this way in a recent issue of "Black America," RAM's official publication: "When war breaks out in the country, if the action is directed toward taking over institutions of power and 'complete annihilation of the racist capitalistic oligarchy' then the black revolution will be successful. * * * The revolution will 'strike by night and spare none.' Mass riots will occur in the day with the Afro-Americans blocking traffic, burning buildings, etc. Thousands of Afro-Americans will be in the street fighting: for they will know that this is it."

RAM'S GUERRILLA WAR: A RACIAL CIVIL WAR

This type of guerrilla warfare might be destructive in terms of men and money but it could not possibly succeed. One of the major ingredients of such guerrilla action is to confuse and isolate your opponent (in this case, the government) by keeping it from knowing the enemy. RAM, however, is proposing a racial civil war that would be a battle of black versus white. Under these conditions they would hope that the enemy would be misidentified and that some whites would react violently against the innocent Negro majority, thereby intensifying the struggle. Immediate terror tactics might be effectively utilized by the black revolutionaries but in the long run they would be involved in a kamikaze action.

Fortunately, it should be stressed that RAM has not made any significant inroads into the Negro community but rather, has been disavowed by most Negro leaders.

While neither RAM nor the Progressive Labor Party is in any position to topple the American government in the near future, the very fact that they are preparing for some type of insurrectional action places them well outside the pale of democratic politics. And while our security agencies can control both groups, it is important to note that the Communist plan of guerrilla wars includes the United States itself.

EVALUATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS OPERATIONS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Reporter Felton West, of the Houston Post has just completed a most thoughtful, piercing analysis and evaluation of Neighborhood Youth Corps operations.

Mr. West is a former Washington correspondent for the Post and his work is well known and widely appreciated here. In order that his observations may be available to other interested Senators and Federal officials, I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the series was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 24, 1966]

BOONS AND BOONDOGGLES: YOUTH CORPS LOADED WITH ABUSES, ERRORS

(By Felton West)

When the federal war on poverty was started on such a large scale and a crash basis in 1964, critics predicted there would be a lot of snafus and mistakes.

The operations of the new Neighborhood Youth Corps bear out the critics' predictions.

A lot, but not all, of the bugs have been worked out of the new program. It seems to be working fairly well now and to be generally accomplishing its purpose.

Its local projects have been boons to the communities where they have operated.

But as antipoverty projects, some of them could only have been considered boondoggles. Until this year, the Youth Corps' rolls contained a good number of enrollees for whom Congress never intended the program.

As a poverty-fighting effort the Youth Corps has been abused in many parts of the country by enrollment of middle and upper-income family youths.

Although worse abuse has been found in other states, the program has not been free of misuse in Texas.

One of the worst examples of the Youth Corps in action in Texas in its early days was in Pasadena, where the city ran a project last summer that, by almost any standard of poverty-fighting, was a boondoggle. Many enrollees were far above the so-called "poverty level."

In Morris County, in far Northeast Texas, there was a similar program.

At La Grange, a high percentage of the youths failed to meet federal family-income-based enrollment standards when they were finally spelled out in terms of a poverty program.

In several other Texas projects among 14 surveyed by the Houston Post, there had been instances of ineligibility.

As of March 14, there were 108 different Youth Corps projects operating in Texas with enrollments totaling 21,281. Since the first Texas projects were started in late 1964, about 28,000 Texas youths have served in the corps.

The program is gaining popularity fast. Applications that would employ about 30,000 more Texans are pending in federal offices.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy director of the five-state Youth Corps regional office at Dallas, said he had no statistics on how many ineligibles have been in the corps in Texas. He guessed that "5 to 10 percent, closer to 5 percent" of the Texas enrollees—perhaps as many as 1,500 youths—were declared ineligible and dismissed last fall when federal income standards were enforced.

Williams said he would not consider the record bad. A long time school administrator and retired superintendent of schools at Corpus Christi, Williams said that "we'd be due an 'A' if we had no more than 6 to 7 percent (ineligible)" because "that much error was not bad error when I taught school."

However, there were other enrollees in Texas projects last summer who would never have qualified under the income standards—including some middle-income-bracket-family members—but were never declared ineligible because their programs ended before the standards were applied.

No estimate of the number of these can be made, but in certain projects the percentage was high.

Flagrant abuses of the Youth Corps were found in Rhode Island last year by the probing Providence Journal-Bulletin. That newspaper found widespread enrollment of children from middle or high-income families; enrollment of some college students, for whom the Youth Corps was not meant; rejection of eligible youths because they had no job skills, which is supposed to be no handicap to NYC employment; employment of youths on jobs at church camps and parish houses, which is clearly forbidden by the Economic Opportunity Act; and full-time employment by Youth Corps projects with federal funds of city officials who had never left their city jobs.

The Reporter magazine recently quoted Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee responsible for the Youth Corps budget, as saying he believed that as many as three-fourths of the NYC projects in the nation might have contained abuses similar to those in Rhode Island. Not enough independent investigation of the Youth Corps nationwide has been made to show if this is true.

Other instances of abuse have been reported in Boston, Kansas City, Kan., Bellevue, Neb., Wilmington, Del., Carlinville, Ill., New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

Leonard Burchman, special assistant to Youth Corps Director Jack Howard in Washington, told the Post the corps has made no statistics on how many enrollees have been in the program who would not have met the new poverty-level income standards.

At a congressional hearing on March 9, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, questioned by Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, Republican, of New York, said "5,000, plus or minus, a fairly small plus or minus" enrollees had been dropped from the program because of the Youth Corps' insistence on the poverty standards.

Director Howard told the congressman, "I think the program now is, in fact, for the last three or four months, in almost substantial compliance."

However, Congressman GOODELL said in a House speech March 15 that 1,700 enrollees in Chicago alone had been dropped since January 1. He cited numerous instances of Chicago enrollees from families with incomes exceeding the federal standards, including two from families of four and five with incomes of more than $10,000.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which had as its purpose "to combat poverty," established the Youth Corps to provide "useful work experience" for unemployed youths 16 through 21 to enable them to continue or resume their education or, if not interested in further school, increase their employability. The law authorized the corps to employ such young people on publicly owned or operated facilities or projects, or on projects or nonreligious projects of private nonprofit organizations, that contribute to providing needed services not otherwise being provided or that contribute to conservation, development, or management of natural resources or recreational areas.

In-school program enrollees work an average of 10 hours a week, out-of-school (or dropout) program enrollees 24 or 30 hours a week. In almost all cases, upon steady insistence of the Labor Department, they are paid $1.25 an hour. Two hours a week of counseling is required for in-school enrollees and four hours for out-of-school enrollees—for which they are not paid—and enrollees in out-of-school programs may be required to attend basic education, remedial, or vocational training classes.

Although Congress debate on the Economic Opportunity Act was in terms of poverty programs, with much discussion of helping families with $3,000 or less annual income, the Labor Department failed to spell out standards definitely limiting the Youth Corps to children of poor families when it rushed the NYC into operation.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz' December 1964, NYC regulations did specify that enrollees should be from low-income families. But it was not until July 8, 1965, that the Labor Department set family-income levels for qualifying enrollees. Some Texas project sponsors said they did not receive these standards for many weeks after that and some did not apply them until November.

These rules set different incomes for different size families as "poverty levels" for eligibility. These ranged (for nonfarm families) from $1,540 for an unrelated individual to $2,240 for a family of three to $5,090 for a family of seven or more. A November 30 change lowered the standard for a family of seven to $4,685 but allowed addition of $550 for each additional member in larger families. Levels for farm families are 70 percent of those for nonfarm families.

These standards are rigid—too rigid, many have complained. But corps officials say they have limited funds and such standards are necessary to confine the program to the hard-core poor.

Before these were put into effect, though, a lot of Youth Corps money was ladled out to sponsors on a first-come, first-served basis and some sponsors planned and executed programs they, themselves did not consider poverty programs.

They interpreted the program as one to provide a job for just about any idle youngster. And the Labor Department let them get away with it.

Undoubtedly the youngsters they served benefitted from their Youth Corps service. But Congress would undoubtedly have been bugeyed at the cost of operating a federal program to keep every idle 16- to 22-year-old in America busy with a part-time job.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 25, 1966]

Boons and Boondoggles: Pasadena Youth Corps Program Breached Poverty-Level Rule

(By Felton West)

One of the worst fiascos in the history of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in Texas occurred in Pasadena last summer as the federal antipoverty program got underway on a crash basis.

The City of Pasadena-sponsored project for 80 boys and 10 girls received nothing but nice notices in the news media at the time.

On February 3, when a reporter went to City Controller Bill Baker's office to examine the project's records and determine what sort of youngsters had been employed, there began unfolding a story of how about $43,000 in federal funds was committed to what was largely a waste of money as an anti-poverty project.

After allowing the reporter to examine a boxful of records for more than two hours, Baker noticed he was devoting considerable attention to the personal files of Youth Corps enrollees. Then Baker stopped his search and he, City Attorney James Riggs and Mayor Clyde Doyal all declared it city policy to keep such records confidential.

The files contained city civil service applications and Youth Corps Form 16 enrollment papers.

"We don't have anything to hide," said Doyal, "but those applications are between the people and the city."

Unbeknown to the mayor at that time, the reporter had already seen about a third of the personal files and noted numerous indications that youths from middle-income families had been enrolled.

Later the mayor did supply the names and addresses of the corpsmen.

Checking with a small percentage of the 101 youths enrolled at one time or another, or with their parents, produced this information:

At least two enrollees were college students, although the Youth Corps held that college students were not eligible. A Youth Corps ruling on this apparently never filtered down to the Pasadena project staff, or the staff of at least one other Texas project where some college students were enrolled last summer.

A 17-year-old corpsman was the son of an engineer for Brown & Root, Inc.

A 16-year-old was the son of a homebuilding contractor.

Another 16-year-old was the son of the personnel and safety director of a big East End industry.

Another 17-year-old was the son of a City of Pasadena secretary and an operator for a big chemical company, both working. The mother was Mayor Doyal's secretary for about a month soon after he took office last May, but she said she pulled no strings to get her son in the Corps.

Parents or corpsmen in each of these cases, as in many other instances where family occupations were less impressive, said the family incomes were considerably above the family income standards established by Youth Corps Director Jack Howard in Washington on July 8 for determining eligibility of prospective corpsmen.

Many other Pasadena enrollees were children of chemical plant or refinery employees whose wages run in the neighborhood of $3 or more an hour, and these children could not have qualified under the July 8 standards.

In many cases the corpsmen's parents said their children's participation was not because of economic need. Most parents said they did not understand that the program was for helping only the poor. They thought their children had derived important benefits besides the pay and the project was worthwhile for them as well as poor children.

The Pasadena project was not started until July 20, 12 days after Howard established the poverty-level standards, but the new federal standards were never applied to it.

"We had no definite guidelines from the federal government as to who should be enrolled," Mayor Doyal said.

He said he never heard of the so-called $3,000 income "poverty level" until about September, and never heard of the graduated by size of family income standards of July 8 until a reporter told him about them in February.

"I doubt if many of the enrollees would have met the $3,000 income standard," Doyal said.

John Ray Harrison, director of the Youth Corps project, described the enrollees as "average middle-class kids" in most cases.

The project really had no standards for excluding anybody on the basis of economic status.

Doyal said the Texas Employment Commission at that time could not help with enrollee selection, as he understood it was supposed to; so before the federal grant was approved he appointed a four-member committee to screen the applicants.

This group spent 3 days interviewing about 200 applicants. Then it ranked them on a priority list of 90 and a priority list for alternates. They were to be employed in order of their priority numbers.

"We didn't understand the Youth Corps to be strictly a poor-folks program," said the Rev. Harry L. Johnson, chairman of the selection committee. "Our determination of who should be picked first was not strictly on the basis of poverty. We felt there could be kinds of poverty other than material poverty, that perhaps some needed jobs for spiritual or other reasons."

He said no applicant "who really needed work" was turned down, "but, frankly, I believe we didn't have the really poverty-stricken people sign up." He thinks Pasadena has a lot of needy people, but they were "not well represented in the number who signed up for this program."

The project was approved by the federal government and got started later than expected, after school had been out for weeks, and when the staff started calling applicants in order of priority, many already had jobs or were no longer interested.

So the sponsors filled the jobs by dipping way down into the alternate list.

Rev. Mr. Johnson said it was possible some hired from the alternate list "just wanted to support a car."

"If they went down the list far enough," he said, "it is possible a boy with a father and mother who made $20,000 a year could have been hired."

On questionnaires in some personal files the reporter saw, several enrollees said they planned to use their earnings to buy automobiles. One said he planned to buy hunting and fishing equipment.

On one automobile-aspiring enrollee's application form, a selection committeeman noted: "Family not in financial trouble but would make the city a good boy. I would like to hire him."

Harrison, a member of the Texas House of Representatives, is a former law partner of Mayor Doyal. Doyal said he hired Harrison as director, at $180 a week paid from Federal funds, because he could find nobody else appropriate for the job at that time. Harrison is a former youth counselor for the Pasadena police and schools. He resigned as Youth Corps director September 25, before the program ended.

Harrison "did us a favor" in taking the job, Doyal said.

How much of a favor was not fully apparent until after the Post reporter began checking into the project on February 3.

Baker said that about February 8, Harrison brought back the W–2 tax withholding form he had received from the city and asked that the city stop payment on the checks totaling $1,552.34 (after taxes) he had received back at the time of this Youth Corps service.

Harrison, now a candidate for the state Senate, later said he had never intended to cash the checks "because I didn't want to get myself in a political box."

It just so happened that he asked the city to stop payment on them in February, months after he received them, "because that was just when the W–2 forms came out, and I wasn't going to pay taxes on them," he said.

Harrison said the checks were "stale-dated," meaning not good if not cashed within a certain period of time, anyway. However, Baker said they were still payable until the city sent the bank a stop payment order February 11.

Harrison's accepting the salary from the city, while drawing his $400-a-month legislator's salary as he did, could have raised a constitutional issue. Certain attorney general opinions indicate he might not have been entitled to his legislative pay under such circumstances.

Although Harrison said he did not think taking both salaries would have been an "unconstitutional conflict," he agreed "it is a pretty close question."

His worthless Pasadena payroll checks now hang on his wall as souvenirs, he said.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy regional NYC director at Dallas, said he did not visit the Pasadena Project until near its end in November.

"I could see then that things were not in line with the way other projects operated," he said. He suggested some changes to make the project "a satisfactory ongoing, in-school program," he said, but the city chose not to do so.

So Pasadena has no more NYC. The one it had must have been needed worse in other places.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 26, 1966]

Boons and Boondoggles: Two Projects, Not for Poor

(By Felton West)

Two other projects, one in Morris County and one at La Grange, illustrate how the Neighborhood Youth Corps in Texas has served a lot of youths for whom Congress did not intend it.

If Pasadena's Neighborhood Youth Corps was not an antipoverty program, neither was Morris County's—and it was more than twice as big.

La Grange's Youth Corps was aimed at helping the poor, but it enrolled many who could not meet poverty-level standards when the Labor Department finally got around to specifying them. And it was cut to about one-third of its original size.

The Commissioners Court of Morris County, in the northeast corner of the state not far from Texarkana, got federal and state approval last July of an NYC project with a $127,630 federal grant to employ a maximum of 250 school dropouts and in-school youngsters on summer vacation.

Although it was planned as a 10-week project, only seven weeks were left in the summer when federal approval came through. And when school started in the fall, the Commissioners Court discontinued the program.

The project was overfunded—at its peak, it enrolled only 212 young people, 22 more than twice as many as Pasadena's project—and if the federal money was seeking out the poor, it was outrageously overfunded.

"We didn't have a poverty program," said Stringer Wommack, the project co-ordinator. "We didn't operate it as a poverty program. We took the position that if the young people were loafing, we'd put them to work and do a lot of good.

"The ones we enrolled needed to work, whether they were poor or not. It kept them off the streets at night after they had put in a hard day's work.

"We did more good with that program than with anything that's ever been done for the young people here."

Thus Wommack, an elementary school principal at Omaha, expressed the philosophy of the Youth Corps held by many project sponsors last summer, although it did not appear to be that of either the Labor Department or Congress about the corps' purpose even then.

Wommack said that under the guidelines Morris County received from the federal government, poverty-level income was not the only criterion for selection, and "if we thought a kid needed to work, we put him to work."

The present federal income standards for enrollees were actually established July 8—before the Morris County project got going on July 19—but did not get enforced until November in some cases, and never were applied in Morris County.

Asked whether the majority of the youngsters employed came from families whose incomes would have been within the July 8 federal standards, Wommack said that "we don't have a lot of people here who would meet those standards."

Asked if the majority could be considered poor, he said, "I'll say this—the majority of them were not hungry."

But "we didn't have a child working who didn't need to work," he added.

The Dallas News reported last August that young people from families with incomes well above the poverty level, including many children of employees at the Lone Star Steel Co. at Daingerfield and the Red River Arsenal near Texarkana, were enrolled; that the father of one boy was a supervisor at the steel plant; that families of some enrollees operated successful businesses in Morris County; and that some youths' families had more than $10,000 annual income.

Wommack told the Post the project probably had "one or two" enrollees from $10,000-plus-a-year families and said he knew of one whose father operated a business.

He said 30 to 40 of the 212 enrollees dropped out before school started to participate in the pre-school football practice.

A federal official checked into the program after the Dallas News story, Wommack said, but was "satisfied with the way we were running it" and called for no dismissals.

The Commissioners Court did not wish to continue the project after school started, however—partly because of administrative difficulties, partly because of the publicity, Wommack said.

The Omaha principal makes no apologies for the program and thinks the federal government "ruined the NYC" when it adopted the family-income standards. Many youngsters needs jobs for reasons other than poverty, he said.

"Of course, it takes a lot of money to run that kind of a program," he said, "And they don't have it now."

At La Grange, too, it was not difficult to qualify for Youth Corps employment last summer.

The La Grange Independent School District, which has a high school population of about 530 students this year, got government approval of a summer project for 300 youths financed by a $170,315 federal grant.

Three hundred and 28 students applied and 300 were chosen, Supt. of Schools C. A. Lemmons, the NYC director, said, after the student body was told the enrollees must be needy and the NYC would be a "real work, not play, program."

Only 186 enrolled after the summer and program became an in-school project.

On Nov. 10 Lemmons received a November 1 memorandum from the regional NYC director at Dallas saying the July 8 family-income standards, established by NYC Director Jack Howard in Washington just 2 days after Howard originally approved the La Grange project, must be "rigorously" enforced. The memo sent to all sponsors in the five-state Dallas region, ordered rescreening of enrollees and dismissal of ineligibles.

Lemmons rescreened immediately and 71 of the 186 enrollees were dropped. This reduction to 115 enrollees was further cut to 107 by voluntary dropouts by December 31. To make the project's funds stretch through the school year, the enrollment was frozen at that level.

When Lemmons furnished this information in February, he said only six eligible persons were on the waiting list to join the NYC.

Lemmons, who is now applying one of the tightest NYC income-determination tests in the state, said Federal eligibility standards were not clearly defined when his project was started.

Most of the summer enrollees were from low-income families and would have qualified under the present standards, or come reasonably close, he said. But he guessed that 50 to 60 would not.

About 30 of the summer enrollees were football players—about a dozen who played this school year, the rest who played last school year and graduated in June. Some of them would not have been eligible under the income standards.

They included the son of a pharmacist, the son of an attorney, and the son of a service station operator and oil and gasoline wholesaler.

But Edward Meyer, the NYC chief accountant, said the football players worked hard and were shown no favoritism in hiring.

Since the summer experience, Lemmons requires enrollees' parents or guardians to sign a notarized statement telling how much income they reported to the Internal Revenue Service the prior year.

Many families just bring their income tax returns or W–2 tax withholding forms in and show them, he said.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy director of the NYC regional office at Dallas, said the La Grange project was one of two or three in the state which appeared to have "too high a percentage of the young people enrolled." He declined to name the others to which he referred.

"As soon as we called the standards to their attention," he said, "they rescreened."

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 29, 1966]

Boons and Boondoggles: Few Dismissals Under Tougher Texas Rules

(By Felton West)

While many Neighborhood Youth Corps projects in Texas had rather loose admission standards last summer, many went beyond the fuzzy federal instructions and adopted standards of their own designed to confine the program fairly well to helping the poor.

So when the federal income standards were enforced last fall, only a few enrollees had to be discharged to comply, sponsors of these projects said.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy regional NYC director, said more than half of the State's projects had already established their own criteria that were somewhat close to the July 8 federal standards.

Williams cited one project whose criteria is much stricter than the federal standards. This project has, from inception, enrolled no applicants where the per capita family income was more than $300 a year, he said. And it has maintained full enrollment. Such a standard means an only child may not be admitted if his father and mother's income is more than $900 a year; the federal standard for a nonfarm family of three is $2,440.

The Neighborhood Centers Association of Houston and Harris County, which started an NYC project for 132 dropouts and 61 in-school students last June 1 with a federal grant of $192,700, regarded the NYC from the start as a program for the socio-economically disadvantaged.

In the absence of specific federal standards at the beginning, it used the Bureau of Social Security city workers' family income index figures on what was considered a minimally adequate family income and adjusted them to Houston. This produced income eligibility guidelines of, for example, $3,840 a year for a family of four, $2,880 for a family of three and $1,920 for a family of two—slightly higher for some size families, but not a great deal, than the later federal standards.

Instead of just interviewing all comers, the NCA, through its neighborhood workers, went actively seeking out young people in economically disadvantaged families who needed the NYC in the southeast Houston neighborhoods it serves.

When the enrollees were restudied on the basis of the July 8 federal standards, the NCA found it had only six or seven ineligibles, said Mrs. Pearl Heller, the project director.

Project Coordinator Milton Womack of the Harris County Department of Education's NYC program, said the county program has been operated from the start as one to help the poor. He estimated rescreening under the new federal standards last November found only "four to seven" ineligibles.

The program operates for 200 students in the Goose Creek, Crosby, Channelview, Galena Park, Northeast Houston, Klein, Cypress-Fairbanks and Alief Independent School District in Harris County.

After an incident that brought upsetting publicity right at the beginning last summer, the Galveston County Commissioners Court NYC programs have been conducted carefully as antipoverty projects.

Both a summer program for in-school students and a dropout program were started at Galveston last summer. When the summer program began a few weeks after the other, some students referred to the NYC by the Texas Employment Commission were put to work before they were well screened.

Their second day on the job, County Judge Peter J. La Valle said, he noticed some of the girls working in the courthouse were "pretty well-dressed and had fancy hairdos." The next day La Valle got a complaint from a prominent Galveston businessman that his daughter had been rejected by the NYC while some of her school friends, equally well off economically, had been accepted.

La Valle laid down his own criteria limiting it to children from families with less than $3,000 income except in special circumstances, such as very large families.

Herbert Schmidt, the Galveston projects' director, said the Galveston standards were "tougher" than the July 8 federal standards and no enrollees had to be dismissed when the latter came along.

Although applications have been made for new and bigger programs, the Galveston NYC has been reduced to 67 enrollees now.

The Texas City Independent School District, which has been operating an NYC for 56 students since last summer, adopted a rule at the start to confine it to enrollees with $3,000 or less income. Project Director C. T. Decker said he departed from that only in a few cases of children from large families; so rescreening on the basis of the federal standards eliminated only three or four enrollees.

Bastrop County's NYC Co-ordinator Harold Goerner estimated that 90 percent of the enrollees in his summer project for 200 would be qualified under the present standards. The program was operated with standards close to the federal ones and only "about four" were eliminated.

At Beaumont, Director A. P. Griffin of the Beaumont Independent School District NYC estimated 90 per cent or more of the enrollees in his program last summer would have qualified under present standards. The summer program, approved for 200, had an average enrollment of only 100.

THE BEAUMONT ISD project set a standard at the beginning of admitting enrollees from families with about $2,500 or less annual income, except under certain other circumstances.

This school year, when the project is approved for 300 students, Griffin said he has dismissed only three or four for income ineligibility. Because of the strict income guidelines and unavailability of more jobs in locations where students can reach them, he said, only about 220 were enrolled when he was interviewed recently.

The South Park Independent School District NYC at Beaumont deliberately included about 15 "top-notch kids"—good students and leaders, without regard to economic status—in its summer program at all times in rotating groups last year, Director Ray Asbury said. Probably none of these students would qualify under the present standards, Asbury said.

About 15 enrollees had to be dismissed when federal standards were later applied, he said, but 265 of the 318 enrolled as of Jan. 31 had been in the summer program and qualified under the new standards, he said.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 28, 1966]

BOONS AND BOONDOGGLES: YOUTH CORPS FILES SECRET

(By Felton West)

Secrecy already hampers independent investigation of projects in the new Neighborhood Youth Corps and it is going to get worse.

In its study of 14 Texas NYC projects, the Post sought access to personal files of enrollees in 11 projects. In four cases it was denied access on the ground the records were personal and confidential.

These files contain enrollee application forms devised by the sponsors of most projects, and in all cases contain the enrollment papers (NYC Form 16) on enrollees which are sent to the NYC in Washington. In some instances they contain other records.

The information these records contain is, most of it, to determine whether applicants meet the enrollment criteria laid down by the federal government. Though often not conclusive, the information in these files often gives an outsider trying to evaluate the eligibility of enrollees indications as to eligibility or ineligibility.

Without examining these files, an outsider must make a much more extensive investigation to determine whether a project is serving only the poor, or some middle or upper-income youths.

Access to both the sponsors' own enrollee applications and NYC Form 16s was denied at the City of Pasadena, the Neighborhood Centers Association in Houston, and Galveston County. At the Texas City schools NYC, the reporter was shown the NYC Form 16s but not the sponsor's own application forms.

In all other cases, access was given to both kinds of records without any suggestion they should be withheld.

But had the sponsors been well aware of national Youth Corps policy, probably all would have denied access to the records.

Not a single project official, even those who refused to produce, seemed aware of a provision in the standard Youth Corps contract between the Labor Department and a sponsor which says "the sponsor agrees to maintain the confidentiality of any information regarding applicants, enrollees or their immediate families which may be obtained through application forms, interviews, tests, reports from public agencies or counselors, or any other source."

If the officials were aware of it, not one cited it.

The Youth Corps is about to plug up this hole.

Leonard Burchman, a special assistant to NYC Director Jack Howard in Washington, said regional NYC directors were told "weeks ago" that such records should be kept confidential.

Apparently the word had never gotten down to sponsors, he said, but it will soon. An administrative notice about this will be sent soon to all regional directors, to be passed on to sponsors, he said.

The confidentiality of such records was not written by Congress into the Economic Opportunity Act, which established the Youth Corps. Burchman said it was a decision made by Howard.

While the NYC appears to be relying greatly on citizens and news media to bring irregularities to its attention—Burchman emphasized it is happy to have anybody bring instances of ineligibility or other irregularities to its attention and will investigate and take appropriate action—the corps is thus making it more difficult for outsiders to monitor the projects.

The federal officials do not appear to be monitoring projects closely themselves.

The NYC has auditors in Washington who have the duty of making in-depth audits of programs, including studying eligibility of enrollees—indeed, sponsors have been warned they are subject to audit exceptions and withholding of federal funds for ineligibles.

But Burchman said there have been more than 1,600 NYC agreements since the program was started—there were more than 650 projects in operation in February—and all of them cannot be evaluated and audited with the limited staff.

Both Burchman and Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy regional NYC director at Dallas, said they knew of no Texas projects which had received in-depth audits—even projects that had shut down.

Williams and other officials of the Dallas office and its outstations travel constantly visiting projects in Texas and elsewhere. Williams said each project is visited about once every 2 months.

But they do only spot-checking on enrollees' personal files and do not make in-depth examinations of the records. They mainly look at fiscal operations and see that proper records are kept, he said.

"I'm not going in and investigate to see whether a sponsor is committing fraud," Williams said, "because I don't think we have that kind of sponsors. I think sponsors are people of integrity."

Except upon special request, the Dallas regional office does not even receive copies of the NYC 16 forms, which contain all the information the federal government gets to show an enrollees' eligibility. These are sent to Washington.

* * * * *

As much as they gripe about "red tape," they complain more about confusion and lack of direction.

The federal supervision does not even go as far as suggesting to sponsors any uniform procedure for determining what a family's income is, although some sponsors say such a suggestion would be desirable.

Williams said the Youth Corps does not want to tell them how to go about this because it does not want to be criticized for "trying to control everything."

A certain amount of information on each enrollee to substantiate his eligibility is kept in each sponsor's files, but there is great variation in how much.

Some sponsors have only the federal Form 16 in their files to show what enrollees' families' incomes are. This form, which is signed by the students after being filed out in an interview, shows only income ranges, such as "below $1,000," from $2,000 to $3,000," or "above $5,000."

Most sponsors have devised original applications of their own which elicit considerably more information on family income—sometimes ones which are signed by parents as well as applicants. But some of these do not elicit all the information pertinent, such as income of working brothers and sisters in the household. Some applications do not even elicit parents' occupations.

Some sponsors merely take a student's work for the family income and rely on their knowledge of where a student lives and his father's occupation.

Some rely strongly on reports of school counselors as to the family financial status, without much paperwork and with little investigation.

Some interview parents as well as the youths. In the Harris County Department of Education's program, Co-ordinator Milton Womack said he tries to visit the home of each enrollee for a personal investigation as to the family situation.

Some sponsors do considerable checking with employers as to parents' income, but most do not.

At Beaumont, Director Ray Asbury of the South Park schools' NYC uses no form except NYC 16 for determining income. Asked if he and his staff ever check with employers as to whether income figures furnished are correct, he said he did not think they should "pry" like that.

"Some of these things are pretty personal, you know," he said.

The simplest test of income seems to be that applied by the La Grange schools. Parents of enrollees are required to furnish a notarized statement of the family's income tax return figure for the prior year. Parents bring a lot of income tax returns and W-2 withholding forms in and show them.

None of the projects studied yet uses an application form eliciting information on farm and real estate holdings. But Co-ordinator Dee Wheatley III, of the 11-county NYC project sponsored by Southwest Texas State College at San Marcos for 500 enrollees, plans to use such an application next summer.

With all the variations in procedure and record-keeping, it is difficult for an outsider to evaluate eligibility of projects' enrollees. But still the records help.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 29, 1966]

Boons and Boondoggles: Poverty Pockets Hunted

(By Felton West)

A good deal of the millions of dollars the Neighborhood Youth Corps has spent in the war on poverty so far has been spent in places which had relatively less poverty and needed it less than other places.

This is one of the major bugs not yet worked out of the new program.

Youth Corps officials have become aware of this and are groping for a solution. An ideal one they are not likely to find.

There is nothing written in to the Economic Opportunity Act which insures that the federal funds go where they are needed most.

Projects are developed by local sponsors and proposed to the Labor Department, which approves or disapproves them. The federal government funds these and has not attempted to encourage development of projects in particular areas except by making information about the program available.

Where leadership has been aggressive and alert to the possibilities of federal aid—and had no antipathy to it—projects have been developed and the federal funds obtained.

Where such leadership has not existed, or aversion to federal aid did, the federal funds have not been obtained, even if there was more poverty than in places where the funds did go.

The Houston public school system is one agency that has not applied, although one project official thinks that the system needs an NYC for at least 1,000 enrollees.

The federal funds so far have been spent considerably on a first-come, first-served basis and now, when they are getting harder to get as there is more demand, some projects with probably more merit than some operations, are having to wait to get started.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy director of the Dallas NYC region, said the NYC does not want to "take the initiative away from the states and communities."

But he has been conferring recently with state officials throughout the region to work as liaison between the NYC and the state governors, who have a veto over Youth Corps projects.

Williams is asking the state co-ordinators to advise the NYC where the "real pockets of poverty" exist and where projects are most needed. With such advice, he said, the NYC may look with more favor on some proposals than others in using its limited funds.

Walter Richter, the Texas co-ordinator, who heads Gov. John Connally's office of Economic Opportunity, predicted that a greater effort will be made this year to serve the areas of greatest need rather than just approve projects on a first-come, first-served basis.

"I think the governor's office and the Labor Department will screen applications better and I predict that a lot more quality will be built into future Youth Corps projects," he said.

Williams said some projects in the past have been overfunded. In some cases this was because sponsors overestimated the number of eligible applicants they would have; he estimated 15 to 20 percent of the sponsors of dropout programs so overestimated. In other cases summer projects were overfunded because their approval came so late last summer that much of the summer was gone. Approval came so late in some cases that the sponsors abandoned plans for the projects.

Overfunding some projects delays funding of others.

The Federal funds were committed to projects so fast for school year programs in the current (1966) federal fiscal year that there could hardly be a summer NYC program in the state except through "recapture" of funds not used during the school year. This is being accomplished partly by limiting all programs roughly to their Dec. 31 enrollment levels which in some cases are far below the originally approved levels.

Because the Johnson administration has trimmed domestic program appropriations requests to finance the Vietnamese war, the Youth Corps' appropriation for the 1967 fiscal year starting July 1 will be smaller than the $500 million it wanted. It is now seeking about $300 million in Congress—only $41 million more than the 1966 appropriation, although the demand for project funds is much greater.

Williams said that because of shortage of funds, this summer's program will have only about 120,000 enrollees nationally, compared to the present 300,000, and only about 9,800 enrollees in Texas in addition to the 4,164 in dropout programs now that will extend into the summer—compared with about 21,000 in the Texas program now.

Unless the appropriation outlook changes, Williams said, the total program for the nation in the 1966–67 school year will be only about 160,000 enrollees.

He said that in March there were applications pending either in his office or in Washington for projects that would employ about 30,000 Texas youths—about 2,000 more than had been in all the state's projects so far.

The way the program has made some NYC projects start-stop-go affairs. Sometimes programs lapse while awaiting approval of continuance.

La Grange's program was out of operation from September 11 until mid-October while awaiting orders to proceed. Texas City's NYC was closed down from March 3 until March 28, then had another 2-week gap in January and February because extensions did not come through in time.

Such lapses are upsetting for schoolchildren dependent upon the jobs to pay their school expenses or help support their families.

Williams said about 25 projects in Texas have been started but not continued when their agreements, covering certain periods of time, expired. But he said not a single project in the state has been stopped because of federal dissatisfaction with its operation.

Hanging over the program is the threat of virtual extinction unless Congress further changes the law as to its financing. As the law reads now, project sponsors will have to pay 50 percent of projects costs after June 30, 1967, instead of the 10 percent now (which is almost always paid in services and office space rather than cash).

In the opinion of some sponsors, that would almost wipe out the Youth Corps. Terrell Blodgett, director of the Texas OEO until last December, said he doubted many communities would have projects if 50–50 matching were required. However, he said Congress is likely to extend the period of 90–10 matching for several years. It has already extended it one year.

Slowness in communication has plagued the Youth Corps in its first year and project directors complain of redtape and confusion. Several interviewed have had difficulty getting advances of the Federal funds in time to meet their payrolls. Several complained of slowness in receiving paper forms from the Government, or not receiving them at all.

Initially, three Federal forms had to be filled out to enroll every corpsman. Later, all three were replaced by one.

One director said he once received three telegrams from the Dallas regional NYC office requesting the same bit of information. He sent it back in three telegrams, plus talking to the Dallas office by telephone.

How slow communications have been may best be illustrated by the speed with which the family-income standards for enrollees were distributed and enforced.

NYC Director Jack Howard established these last July 8, to be effective immediately. Some sponsors say they received them in August, some in September, some in October.

A memorandum from W. L. (Bill) Crawford, then NYC regional director at Dallas, urged all regional sponsors to "rigorously" enforce the new standards, rescreen their enrollees and discharge ineligibles. This was dated November 1. C. A. Lemmons, La Grange NYC director, said he received it November 10.

On November 30 the July 8 standards were revised as they pertained to enrollees from families of seven or more persons. It was good news to Mrs. Pearl Heller, director of the Neighborhood Centers Association NYC project here, because it would make a lot more youths from large families eligible. But she did not get the news until a Post reporter told her on February 5.

One of the Youth Corps' difficulties has been that sponsors—particularly cities and counties—prefer to enroll skilled persons to do their jobs and sometimes have given them preference over unskilled youths. Williams said this has concerned him, but he believes the problem is now almost overcome. The Youth Corps would prefer to help the unskilled and give them some skill.

Another problem has been getting sponsors to provide good counseling as well as work for the enrollees. Williams said counseling generally needs improvement. Texas has some excellent counseling programs, but some are poor, he said. Officials say, however, that counseling in Texas is generally better than in a lot of other states.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 30, 1966]

Boons and Boondoggles: Corps Hailed Despite Abuses

(By Felton West)

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has certainly had mistakes, abuses and difficulties in its little more than a year in operation. But it also had mobilized a vast army of admirers ready to vouch for its value.

While the corps has been criticized for having an admission policy that was too open-armed at first, that is not all.

"On the other hand," as Office of Economic Opportunity Director Sargent Shriver told a congressional committee recently, "we are getting lashed from the other direction that our eligibility requirements are too tough."

Potential sponsors are clamoring for federal funds to start new Youth Corps projects faster than the Youth Corps can get the funds from Congress.

Most present sponsors are enthusiastic about continuing their programs and many would like to enlarge them.

There is ample testimony from enrollees, their parents, corpsmen's work supervisors and project directors to the good the corps has done in helping young people stay in school, return after dropping out, or prepare themselves for jobs they cannot get without work experience.

No meaningful statistics are available on how many have been kept in or brought back to school, or helped to get jobs.

But in the opinion of project directors, the corps has helped many children stay in school by allowing them to contribute something to the support of their families without dropping out. It has allowed them to stay proudly, able to buy their lunches and supplies, pay their school fees, buy class rings and wear decent clothes just like their more fortunate schoolmates.

Some dropouts have returned to school in most school districts when it was possible to work in the Youth Corps.

For dropouts who do not want to return to school, the out-of-school NYC projects furnish up to 6 months of work experience and discipline to prepare them for steady work, some degree of marketable skill, work references, and even placement in other jobs. And some receive remedial English and mathematics or vocational training courses along with their NYC jobs.

For many dropouts, the NYC is meaning new hope for their futures.

Many students' school attendance and grades have improved after they became corpsmen.

Many have gone to college after finishing high school in the Youth Corps, or working in last summer's Youth Corps projects, and have told the sponsors the NYC made it possible.

Some dropouts are learning the savings habits by putting money in sponsors' credit unions.

Many who have quit Youth Corps projects have done so for as good or better jobs, or to enter the military services better prepared.

The greatest value for many enrollees may be simply learning what it is to work, to get there on time, to take and follow orders and to get along with bosses and fellow workers.

"Every teen ager needs an introduction to work," said Mrs. Pearl Heller, director of the Neighborhood Centers Association Youth Corps. "They're not born knowing."

Despite widespread enrollment last year of youths who would not be classified as poor, most enrollees have been from the lower economic stratum.

Most are from large families, many from families with eight to 10 children. Many family live in low-rent public housing units, many on only Social Security benefits, retirement pay, public welfare or aid to dependent children payments.

Many Youth Corps enrollees have needed help so badly that they falsified their ages a year to meet the minimum age of 16, only to be discovered and dismissed later.

Many are from broken homes, or children of widows or widowers, or deserted mothers.

Many are enrolled when their families have temporary financial crises because of deaths or illness, then leave when family income is re-established.

Some enrollees already have children of their own. Fifteen out of 160 enrolled in the Neighborhood Centers project recently did.

In most projects, the majority of enrollees comes from minority groups—Negro or Latin American, whichever is most prevalent in the area. Relatively greater poverty is found among them than among the population majority.

Racial discrimination is strongly forbidden in the Youth Corps and Deputy Regional Director R. L. Williams said he has never received a complaint of any in Texas.

In fact, directors of two NYC projects said the projects gave them a fringe benefit in helping prevent trouble when their schools were desegregated last fall.

At La Grange, Superintendent C. A. Lemmons said there was racial antagonism in the community last summer.

"After working the Negro and white kids side by side in the Youth Corps for 2 weeks in the hot July sun," he said, "we had our problem licked when we integrated schools in the fall. The NYC was worth all it cost and all the trouble we went through to start it just for this."

Youth Corps Director Ray Asbury said working whites and Negroes together on the same NYC teams in the South Park school district in Beaumont last summer helped smooth the path for desegregation there in the fall.

Cities, counties, school districts, the federal government, hospitals, colleges, social agencies, and other nonprofit agencies benefit from work the corpsmen do under adult supervision.

Many work as nursing aides, clerical aides in city and county and school district offices, custodians in public buildings, garbage collectors, park or street workmen, and library assistants.

In La Grange, for example, corpsmen last summer renovated a school building, refinished the elementary school furniture, built tennis courts, a miniature golf course, and other playground facilities, cleared brush, built fences, dug ditches, moved a sewer line, and did many other jobs to improve the community.

Corpsmen's work is not always of high quality—the Youth Corps urges sponsors not to give preference to skilled—but much of it is amazingly good.

"The end result is the kid as much as the work he has done," said Bastrop County NYC Coordinator Harold Goerner.

Terrell Blodgett, who headed the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity until last December, said he received few complaints about the Youth Corps. "By and large, I think the work done was worthwhile, the kids helped needed help and the whole thing worked in pretty good fashion."

A. L. Bankston, a long-time school administrator who directs Orange County's Youth Corps, said the Youth Corps is "a long-range program that won't set the world on fire overnight" but will alleviate poverty more than any other Federal antipoverty program in operation now.

"I don't minimize the importance of the others," he said, "but dollar-for-dollar, the Youth Corps will reach more people and get more results."

Sargent Shriver, director of the federal poverty war, said recently the Youth Corps has already provided 540,000 job opportunities for young Americans.

WASTEFUL EXPENDITURE IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a certain Thomas F. A. Plaut, of Stanford University, was allocated $1,100,000 by the Federal Government to make a study of the subject of alcoholism and its impact upon the people of the United States.

After the agency with which Mr. Thomas F. A. Plaut has his connections spent the $1,100,000, it came up with the sensational recommendation that the serving of alcoholic beverages at supervised teenage parties is a sound "way of preventing alcoholism."

After 5 years of study, Mr. Plaut, the researcher, recommends to parents of the U.S. teenagers that they should begin feeding their children with alcohol. He further, after 5 years of study, concludes that taboos against liquor advertising on television, radio, and otherwise should be eliminated.

He urges the adoption of future television commercials showing drinks being served in family gatherings with children present.

One does not have to be an addict or abstainant from alcoholism to condemn vigorously the recommendations made by the researcher, Mr. Thomas F. A. Plaut. He has made his sensational recommendation; also expended $1,100,000 granted to his agency for the research work which he conducted.

The wasteful and wrongful expenditure of $1,100,000 has been multiplied many times by the astounding and sensational recommendations made by this particular researcher.

VIETNAM WARRIORS CHEERED BY CHILDREN'S CRAYON DRAWINGS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, of the substantial amount of mail received daily, once in a while correspondence is received that is so important or tells such a moving story that a Senator is required to share the message with both his colleagues and the American public.

I received such a letter from Lt. Comdr. David W. Plank, a Californian serving as a member of the Chaplain Corps on the U.S.S. *Hancock*, an attack aircraft carrier operating in the waters of southeast Asia. Commander Plank's story is a most moving one. It tells the story of 24 boys and girls of the second grade of the Oakridge School, Sacramento, Calif., wanting to thank the Navy for "fighting for our classroom and country." To do this, the youngsters wrote a letter to the "U.S. Navy, care of Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Vietnam." For some reason the correspondence was forwarded to the U.S.S. *Hancock*. Enclosed with the youngsters' letters were 24 grease-crayon drawings. Perhaps the paintings of the youngsters from the point of view of an art critic did not rival the Mellon collection which rightfully attracted many to the Washington area recently, but the ship's exhibit featuring these 24 grease-crayon drawings, was probably appreciated more by our fighting men than those who had the good fortune to view the Mellon collection. Commander Plank tells us that the group that saw this exhibit was not the sort of crowd that you would see in the National Gallery, for these men are the fighting men of the U.S. Navy who are waging war against Communist aggression in southeast Asia. Perhaps, Mr. President, as Commander Plank concludes:

> A little child shall lead them.

The youngsters seem to see the significance of the Vietnamese conflict even better than some Members of the Congress or our so-called experts. Rather than continue, Mr. President, and I do not believe that I could begin to tell the story as movingly as Commander Plank, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I received from Commander Plank together with his story of the children's letters and art be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and story were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S.S. "HANCOCK" (CVA-19),
FPO San Francisco, April 19, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: I invite you, Sir, to read the enclosed short article which pertains to a group of California school children. It describes what happened when a small package of their letters and crayon drawings found their way to the aircraft carrier *Hancock*. Not only were the weary warriors of this Vietnam-engaged ship cheered and strengthened, but they were vividly reminded of our American purpose in the world.

The story is both heartwarming and of great significance, I believe. It is my hope that you will both enjoy it and in some way find it helpful in your much appreciated work on behalf of us citizens of California—my native state.

Very respectfully yours,
David W. Plank,
Lieutenant Commander, Chaplain Corps, U.S. Navy, Ship's Chaplain.

VIETNAM WARRIORS CHEERED BY CHILDREN'S CRAYON DRAWINGS

(By Lt. Comdr. David W. Plank, Chaplain Corps, U.S. Navy)

This is the story of a bundle of children's drawings that were addressed and mailed to "The U.S. Navy, Vietnam." What follows could have been repeated aboard many other ships and military installations. Hence this is not a story about the Seventh Fleet Alameda-based attack aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Hancock* (CVA–19); it is about 24 grease-crayon pictures painstakingly drawn by second-grade boys and girls in Oakridge School, Sacramento, Calif.

The story necessarily begins on April 6, 1966, the day a small ordinary-looking cylindrical package arrived in the Chaplains' Office aboard *Hancock*. At the time, she was busy operating in the tropical waters of the South China Sea, catapulting Vietnam-bound planes from her flight deck, one every 26 seconds. The package which Ship's Chaplain David W. Plank found was tattered and badly scarred from its long journey. For it had been seventy days enroute—28 January was the postmark it bore. In a child's scrawled handwriting it was addressed to, "The U.S. Navy, care of Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Vietnam." It had come from "Miss Burns Second Grade, Oakridge School, Sacramento, Calif."

The Chaplain opened the package. Out tumbled 24 grease-crayon drawings, and 19 oversized letters. The pictures bore scribbled titles such as "Our Janitor In The Hospital," "My House," "This Is Me, This Is You," and "Evelyn The Clown." The letters read in part, "Thank you for fighting for our classroom and country. I hope all of you don't die," "We have sawdust in our hair," "My mother went to the hospital. Do you have have a brother?" "I am praying for you. I am crying for you. Please come back."

From where had this forlorn package of pictures and letters come? Who sent it to *Hancock?* How did it happen to arrive on board? Where had it been for seventy days? No one seemed to know or care. The Chaplain's first impulse was to simply discard them all, then write a perfunctory letter of thanks to Miss Burns.

But then came a thought. Why not give these children's expressions of concern, encouragement, and appreciation an opportunity to be heard themselves by those for whom they were intended, men of the U.S. Navy fighting in Vietnam? Mount and display them, of course. They may not be artistic masterpieces—certainly they had no commercial value. But the message they held to tell could be priceless.

Two days later, the "Miss Burns' Second Grade Class Grease-crayon Drawing Exhibit" officially opened in *Hancock*'s Library when Capt. James C. Donaldson, Jr., the ship's Commanding Officer, cut with a Navy ceremonial sword the paper chain-ribbon which stretched from wall to wall in the Library "gallery." By posters and flyers, by notes on barbershop mirrors and by word of mouth; from bow to fantail, from boiler room to bridge, the word of the unusual art exhibit spread.

The men came first by ones and twos, and then by dozens. During the first week of the exhibit alone, 1,000 men, nearly one-third of *Hancock's* crew, crowded into the Library and browsed among the pictures. To add to the enjoyment, they participated in a contest to choose which they thought were the best pictures and letters. Officers and enlisted men came at lunch hour, before plane launches, after recoveries, during the coffee-break of an engine room watch; early in the morning, late at night. They toured the picture exhibit in green flight suits and red crash-crew jerseys; in sweaty T-shirts and mechanic's overalls: hardly what you would expect at an Art Exhibit. But *Hancock* is a fighting ship. And the men that make her so, work hard, hot, round-the-clock hours. These are the ways of war. The men look the part they play.

Thus during the heat of battle, the men of *"Fighting Hannah"* have been chosen-by-chance as "The U.S. Navy, Vietnam." They have paused and pondered twenty-four crayoned drawings; they have thoughtfully read the penciled letters. Though these be the creations of children's tiny hands in faraway Sacramento, Calif., they might have been the heart's handiwork of children anywhere. Weary naval warriors rested and listened to the pure voices of seven-year-old boys and girls from home telling them of their love and prayers, their concern and gratitude. To their duties the men of *Hancock* returned with quicker pace and lighter heart. The true spirit of America had somehow touched and lifted her distant fighting sons—through the fingers of little children.

Into the midst of war, twenty-four second-grade boys and girls have unwittingly stepped to remind us of our American purpose: to strive always to obtain and preserve for them, and all children, both those living and those of generations to come, justice and equality, peace and freedom, in Vietnam, or any oppressed place upon earth, in order to make certain that children everywhere can always draw what they please, and write whom they wish.

As was said centuries ago, "A little child shall lead them."

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, May 10 was a special holiday for all of our proud people of Rumanian origin. It commemorated the day on which Rumanians, who enjoy a freedom here not known presently in their native homeland, celebrated the achievement of Rumania's independence and the founding of its kingdom.

The joy of all Rumanians is dimmed by the unhappy fact that their Independence Day cannot be celebrated in the homeland. It is fitting that our friends can observe this national holiday here in the United States where every individual and group have the promise of freedom. The Rumanian National Committee planned a fitting observance of the anniversary at the Carnegie Endowment International Center in New York City.

Independence came to Rumania on May 10, 1877; but the peace that followed the victory was a hard and bitter one. The valiant nation struggled bravely through the two World Wars, losing vast numbers of its soldiers and citizens. A free and independent government has been withheld from the patient Rumanians for 19 years.

In continuing sympathy for the Rumanian people and their lack of complete freedom on their national holiday, we renew our hope that one day their wishes for full independence will be realized.

OMBUDSMAN FOR THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently the American Association of Medical Clinics, in an editorial in their monthly journal Group Practice, discussed the ombudsman system as it could help physicians in the "two major problems of the age: the time and effort required to cope with redtape and the related problem of apparently arbitrary actions or procedures emanating most notably from governmental administrative officers."

The association points out that the "need to do something is hardly debatable; the method of performing the needed functions, whether by an ombudsman system or some substitute method is not so clear."

We are in complete agreement with this statement. As I have informed my colleagues many times before, the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure intends to study all facets of the ombudsman concept as it could relate to the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the editorial entitled "Ombudsman for the United States." This appeared in the April 1966 issue of Group Practice.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMBUDSMAN FOR THE UNITED STATES?

Physicians are becoming increasingly involved in, and conscious of, two major problems of the age: the time and effort required to cope with red tape, particularly—but not exclusively—that concerned with government and its agencies at all levels; and the related problem of apparently arbitrary actions or procedures emanating most notably from governmental administrative officers or bureaus and less frequently from the legislative branches of government.

Some of the smaller democracies have recognized and attempted to deal with such problems in a manner which is now being explored in the United States and which has been discussed in articles and by a number of newspaper columnists. This is the ombudsman system apparently first established in Sweden in 1809 and now spread to Finland, Japan, Denmark, Norway, New Zealand, and under consideration in Great Britain.

A person given the Scandinavian name of "ombudaman" has been variously defined as a "gad fly to government," "a guardian of the people's rights against abuses and malfunctions by government, its programs and officials" and as a "cutter of red tape and righter of wrongs for citizens caught in the toils of bureaucracy." However defined, the man serving as an ombudsman (there may be more than one) has the job of representing the "little fellow" against unlawful, capricious, or other faults of his government or of government employees.

In Denmark, for example, there is only one ombudaman who is a judge of exceedingly high standing. He is independent of Parliament in the performance of his duties though the general principles governing his activities have been established by that body. It is his responsibility "to observe if persons under his jurisdiction pursue unlawful aims in their service, make arbitrary or unfair decisions, or are guilty of other faults of commission or omission. Should he become aware of defects or shortcomings in current laws or administrative provisions, he must bring them to the attention of Parliament and the minister concerned."

The ombudsman can deal with a wide variety of problems and only one (from Denmark) is mentioned here. This concerned the question of the extent to which an administrative agent had the requisite legal authority for a decision taken. The Parliamentary Commissioner (ombudsman) investigated a case where a Chief Constable had forbidden a taxi-cab owner to seek hire at a cab-stand for a month because of a dispute between the taxi-cab owner and some of his colleagues. It was found that the Chief Constable did not have the requisite legal authority for refusing the taxi owner the use of the cab stand and this ended with a compromise under which the Constable undertook to pay the cab owner damages for lost earnings.

The question is being taken seriously in the United States. The Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure under the Chairmanship of Senator LONG of Missouri has been holding hearings to explore the feasibility of a U.S. version of this office. A distinguished Swedish ombudsman was the lead-off witness in March.

The need to do something is hardly debatable; the method of performing the needed functions, whether by an ombudsman system or some substitute method is not so clear. Thus the risk of merely establishing another bureau with still more redtape is real in a nation as vast as this and would bring little improvement. Possibly, the solution would be to set up a small experimental quasi-governmental organization which could receive and investigate complaints from individual citizens and make rough determinations of their validity. Those thought to be legitimate could be channeled to governmental individuals or agencies involved, to appropriate Congressional Committees, or to the public press if it were necessary to marshal public opinion on an important issue. No doubt new problems would be created and its success would depend entirely on the integrity, intelligence, vigor—and powers—of the heads of such an organization. Indeed, it seems highly uncertain that the ombudsman system in any modification could be suitably established in a nation like the United States!

On the other problem of redtape, however, which is a frequent irritant to physicians as well as to other citizens, it might be possible to bring about improvements with relative simplicity and this might be worthy of exploration. The reduction in governmental redtape could be assigned to a small corps of government employees whose one and only function would be to suggest simplifications of operations, procedures—and governmental language. Cutting redtape in this matter would doubtless lower the cost of operating the government itself as well as lessen the irritation of the ordinary citizen. As someone remarked recently the Internal Revenue Service has been going to simplify its forms for the last twenty years; it will probably take some outside individual or agency to accomplish such a miracle.

ACTIVITIES OF YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in recent days American young people have been criticized for everything from overexuberant spring weekends in seaside resorts, to dishonesty in taking examinations, to lack of understanding of the American commitment in the world.

Most Americans have taken little stock in such criticism. They have tended to believe that this generation was not really represented by the minority of its members who participated in such activities. Each generation must face the close scrutiny and examination of the one which precedes it, and today's generation is no exception.

It is for this reason that I feel it so important to publicize the many constructive and worthwhile activities pursued by our young people—activities which demonstrate that, in many respects, our young people understand the stakes in today's world a lot better than many who are older and presume to be wiser.

While a vociferous minority has demonstrated in opposition to the national commitment in Vietnam, and an even smaller number have championed the cause of the Communist Vietcong, the overwhelming majority of American students and young people have seen quite clearly that if aggression is not defeated it will be endlessly repeated. They have also felt the need to make it clear that the few vociferous critics do not speak for them.

One example of this comes from Wolcott High School in the town of Wolcott in my own State of Connecticut.

In a letter which I received from Robert F. Carroll, a faculty member at the school, the project initiated by Wolcott students was described in these terms:

> The students in my Contemporary Issues classes organized project SAVE (Students Approve Vietnam Effort) as a direct result of President Johnson's plea to the American people throughout the country to shout and make their views heard on Vietnam * * *. These students mailed out 16,433 letters and five times as many petition sheets to every public high school in the country on March 8th * * *. I am pleased to announce that returns are just beginning to come in and as of today 500 schools have made returns with a total of over 100,000 signatures.

This effort gives notice that the vast body of public-spirited high school students want neither to criticize nor stand silent. They want to be heard, and to show the world that the critics do not speak for them, that this generation of American young people understands that freedom does not come easily, and that each generation must rededicate itself to its preservation.

It gives me great personal satisfaction to know that such a national movement of support for our troops in Vietnam originated in Connecticut, and I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the details of this effort.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point information concerning the campaign started at Wolcott High School.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOLCOTT HIGH SCHOOL,
Wolcott, Conn., March 29, 1966.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: We both know that Democracy is a difficult system because it places great responsibility on every individual to contribute his share and his talents to society so that it can function successfully.

Today's high school students have the capacity to understand the problems facing our great country and a sense of responsibility to tackle them. My students have taken the Vietnam problem and have decided that a minority who have protested by burning draft cards and marching on Washington have distorted the true feeling of the majority of American students and American people toward the policy of their government. They feel they have a responsibility to do something so that other nations do not get a false impression of how the majority of us feel.

The students in my Contemporary Issues classes organized project SAVE (Students Approve Vietnam Effort) as a direct result of President Johnson's plea to the American people throughout the country to "shout" and make their views heard on Vietnam. His remarks were carried on the front page of the New York Times which each one of my students subscribe to daily. These students mailed out 16,433 letters and five times as many petition sheets to every public high school in the country on March 8. These letters were addressed to the high school principal. We asked him to circulate the petition through the Social Studies department so that intelligent discussion might precede any signing by the students asked to participate.

I am pleased to announce that returns are just beginning to come in and as of today 500 schools have made returns with a total of over 100,000 signatures. We hope this is just the beginning. AP wire service carried the story twice throughout the country, many newspapers using it as front page copy. The story was also picked up by television and radio. I have a folder with over 300 letters to date from all over the country and a number from our boys in Vietnam who read about the Wolcott High project in the Stars & Stripes. Many religious and fraternal organizations have made plans to make awards to the students involved and one man from upstate New York suggested that someone submit the project for a Valley Forge award.

The students hope to deliver the results to President Johnson personally when the country-wide project is completed. I will keep you posted on the progress of project SAVE, Senator DODD. We all hope you can be of assistance in arranging a meeting with the President.

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT F. CARROLL,
Faculty Advisor to SAVE.

SAVE,
WOLCOTT HIGH SCHOOL,
Wolcott, Conn., February 22, 1966.

DEAR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL: It has always been a part of our great American heritage to speak up for causes we believe in. The Vietnam War is such a cause. It is so tragic in intensity and so overwhelming in importance that we, the senior class of Wolcott High School, have decided to organize our nation's schools to take a position in support of our American policy there.

Our campaign for signatures offers students all over America an opportunity to be heard and to rally to a cause which has as its sole purpose the guaranteed independence of South Vietnam. We don't want our government to settle for anything less. If the United States gives up on Vietnam, free Asia will give up on the United States and all Asia will be swallowed up by the communist menace.

Student demonstrators against our policy in Vietnam are in the minority. Many of them are not aware of the issues involved there. We need the help of your students to help ameliorate this false impression given Peking and Hanoi. Your cooperation in this campaign for signatures will not be forgotten by us here at Wolcott.

SAVE would appreciate your distributing several copies of the enclosed petitions to each classroom in your school to be signed by those students who support our position. This can all be done very easily and conveniently at the beginning of the school day. This can also be done through your Social Studies Department, if you find it more convenient than the method we suggested. Have the sheets returned to your office as soon as possible so that you can mail them back to our headquarters. Please address your envelope to read: SAVE, Wolcott High School, Wolcott, Conn., 06716. If there are private schools in your area, we would appreciate your notifying them of our endeavor and urging them to send in signatures of their students on facsimilies of the form we sent you.

The critical nature of the Vietnam War makes it all the more essential that we complete our projects as soon as possible so that we can notify Washington of our results. We know you will not refuse so urgent an appeal. This project has the endorsement of the Connecticut Association of Secondary School Principals.

Very sincerely yours,

Ronald Bertothy,
SAVE Chairman.
Mr. Robert F. Carroll,
Faculty Sponsor.

SAVE Students Approve Vietnam Effort

School..
City..
State..

We, the undersigned, wish to express our support of the United States policy in Vietnam. As we understand this policy we are in Vietnam at the request of the South Vietnamese government to help them stop communist intervention. We are not there to impose our system because every nation should have the right to choose the system of government that best fits its needs. We are in Vietnam to protect this right; the communists are there to destroy it. We are not there to impose American colonialism; we are there to oppose communist colonialism.

We are seriously disturbed by the small minority of students demonstrating against our policy in Vietnam and even advocating the tearing up of draft cards. Their tactics have led to highly exaggerated estimates of their numbers. Because these tactics may lead Peking and Hanoi to seriously underestimate American commitment we, the students of America, have decided to speak up.

[Signatures.]

Mail returns to: SAVE, Wolcott High School, Wolcott, Conn., 06716.

SAVE Petitions Highly Praised

(By Greg Chilson)

Wolcott.—"God help you, keep it up," the Army colonel wrote from Fort Worth, Texas.

The Marine in Da Nang wrote that he read about SAVE in the Pacific Stars and Stripes and "it is one of the things that can make any of us over here extremely proud of serving our country."

"You may be interested to know that the first signer is the daughter of a soldier in Viet Nam," wrote the principal of the high school in Holidaysburg, Pa.

These are some of the responses pouring into Robert Carroll's contemporary issues class at the high school here, which is trying to get millions of students to sign petitions backing U.S. efforts in Viet Nam.

SAVE is the name of the project, "Students Approve Viet Nam Efforts," and the class plans to take the signed petitions to President Johnson as a counter to the draft-card burnings and other protests about American efforts.

"They're coming in now," said Carroll. "We've got them back from 190 schools in 34 states and the District of Columbia. People are sending in newspaper articles and a lot of other things."

These other things included an editorial cartoon from the York, Pa., Tribune. It showed a student shouting "Support America's Viet Nam Efforts" through a megaphone bearing Wolcott High School's name.

There were clippings from across the country, newspapers in Alabama, Detroit, Oregon. From Oregon there was also an interesting letter.

"Congratulations to you and the senior class," said a woman from Forest Grove, Oreg. "It's kids like that who make this country worth fighting for. I have just clipped the article out of the evening paper to send on to my husband in Viet Nam. He has been there since 1963 and has become very disgusted with all the student demonstrations in this country. Although I campaigned for Senator Morse, I want you to know that he isn't speaking for the people of Oregon and we are very ashamed of him and Governor Hatfield."

From Detroit came a song written by a music publisher who said all royalties from it would be sent to the Wolcott class.

"Although the number of signatures are few," said a letter from Girard, Tex., public schools, "it represents 100 per cent of our high school students * * * We are a rural community and have very strong patriotic feelings toward our country." There were 40 names.

The principal of Cherokee High School in Canton, Ga., wrote that names of his students have already been turned in to President Johnson after a rally at Atlanta, and any additional petitions would be duplication but "we wish you every success."

The principal of the Houston, Minn., high school wrote that the school policy "does not permit distribution" of petitions but "the number of 'I'm behind the boys in Viet Nam' buttons I see on our students shows they are behind you wholeheartedly."

Signed petitions from Mackay, Idaho, were received one day and the next day came a letter from two girl students. "We were not available when your petitions were passed around. We would like to add our names to the list."

Patapsco Senior High School in Baltimore wrote that students made duplicates of the petition forms so every homeroom in the school could have one to sign. They even went a step further and elected one student as SAVE chairman for the school.

Ink smeared on one of the printed petitions, which were mailed to 17,500 high schools across the country, and the principal of the Stony Point High School in North Carolina wrote: "Would you be kind enough to send us a legible copy of your petitions. I feel that the Stony Point students will react favorably if they have materials they can read."

"This Midwest is radical against demonstrations, and boy did they let me know how they felt," wrote a social science teacher from Warsaw, Ill. "All but one student was willing to sign."

There were some opposing letters, too, Carroll noted. Most contended the students saw only one side of the Viet Nam picture. A Waterbury man said he'd like to obtain a speaker to tell the class the "other side" of the story. A Naugatuck writer sent a five-page letter of opposition. A principal in Hawthorne, N.Y., sent back the petitions saying the project "is not in the service of educating students."

A packet of religious tracts came from a woman in Millersville, Pa., urging the students to read them "for in so doing thou shalt SAVE both thyself and them that hear thee."

"Dear Nut" started another letter, criticizing Carroll and the class for its project.

Carroll said some 700 out of about 760 Wolcott High School students have signed petitions, but none have yet come in from other Connecticut schools. He said the class isn't discouraged because someone found out that schools are holding back the petitions to give all students a chance to sign them and others are duplicating the forms.

Many school officials from this and other states called or wrote Principal Nicholas D'Agostino, asking if the project had the school's official approval and adding that if so, they'd send in the petitions.

There were petitions back from Senator Morse's Oregon but none yet from Arkansas, which is represented by another critic of the Viet Nam policy, Senator J. William Fulbright.

ADDRESS BY HAROLD F. LINDER, PRESIDENT, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, TO BANKERS' ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on April 26, Mr. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington made an important speech at the annual meeting of the Bankers' Association for Foreign Trade at Boca Raton, Fla. I believe it to be of interest to the Senate and to the public to see this speech and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman, Export–Import Bank of Washington, at the Annual Meeting, Bankers' Association for Foreign Trade, Boca Raton, Fla., April 26, 1966

It is a great pleasure for me and my colleagues at the Export-Import Bank to be at your meeting, to see and talk with so many people whose interests and occupations closely parallel our own. I know of no organization whose members are more intimately concerned with the daily business of Eximbank than this one. And therefore I value this opportunity to share with you my thoughts on the proper relation of our bank to your member banks, to our exporters, to our nation, to our borrowers and their governments abroad, and to our foreign exporting competitors.

Let me say also that, on the advice of your President and Vice President, I am assuming that most of you already are familiar with our basic operations in long term loans for capital equipment and our emergency foreign trade loans. Thus I will confine myself to those activities of our business which concern you and us in our day-to-day relations.

As I look back over the past 5 years during which I have served the Export-Import Bank, I am reminded how much it has changed—how far the Bank has traveled toward a close partnership with the commercial banking community in bringing financial assistance to exporters. The first guarantee under our present commercial bank program was authorized on April 18, 1961, just about two and a half months after I appeared on the scene. We have since issued over $1,300 million of these and other commercial bank guarantees.

Before 1961, commercial banks had issued letters of credit under Eximbank direct loans; we had occasionally guaranteed an export credit extended by a commercial bank; we had experimented with a commercial bank participation program; and we had occasionally sold nonrecourse participations to commercial banks in the near maturities of our better loans.

But there was no continuing, large-scale involvement of commercial banks in the daily business of Eximbank such as we take for granted today—an involvement which extends beyond the bank guarantee program to the protection of your credits under assignments of the proceeds of Foreign Credit Insurance Association policies. In turn, commercial banks have purchased, with the right to sub-participate to others, more than $1,700 million of participations in our Eximbank Portfolio Funds.

This widening partnership has benefited both of us. It has enabled us to increase our commitments by more than a billion dollars, while simultaneously reducing very substantially our drawings from the Treasury. It has brought more banks into export financing—one of our genuine even though intangible profits. To the commercial banks, our guarantee and insurance programs have brought added security. More importantly, they have made possible new business which would not have been done without our cover. Our Portfolio Fund sales have provided you and your subparticipants with a sound investment at an attractive return.

I can assure you that whenever we are convinced that by enlarging this partnership we can serve better our mutual goals of faster and more adequate financial assistance for sound export transactions, which will increase export receipts, we shall do so—and promptly.

This leads me to what I really want to talk about today—not the past, but the future. What would most interest you, I believe, is the current thinking of Eximbank's management on some of those proposals for changing export financing practices and facilities which are actively debated today.

The topics most frequently raised in comments or articles on our activities are, broadly stated, these:

First, whether we are overly conservative in our interpretation of the "reasonable assurance of repayment" requirement of our statute;

Second, whether a so-called National Interest fund should be established in Eximbank to finance transactions which even on a liberal interpretation do not offer "reasonable assurance of repayment";

Third, whether we should establish some sort of rediscount facility for export paper;

Fourth, whether Eximbank should greatly broaden its guarantees to commercial banks and, correspondingly, cut back its own direct lending activities; and

Finally, whether our existing programs should be made more liberal, especially in respect of fees, coverage, discretionary authority, advance commitments, and the like.

Most fundamental is this question: Does Eximbank's view of when to say "yes" and when to say "no" in the marginal case best serve our present national needs? The answer depends on what those needs are. Is the overriding need today the promotion of exports, purely and simply—exports for their own sake—regardless of the risk of nonpayment, regardless of what may be the terms? Or is the need that of expanding existing markets and developing new ones wherever there is a reasonable prospect that our debtors will be able to meet their obligations?

As we bankers know, the present national need, and the need you and we both serve, is the promotion of export receipts, not just exports. In today's plethora of slogans, it is sometimes easy to forget that increasing our exports is a means to an end—not an end in itself.

The true significance of exports, whether to stimulate the domestic economy or to contribute to our balance of payments, lies not in the departure of goods or services from our shores. It lies in the payments we receive for the exports. True, if Eximbank makes the payment or issues its guarantee of payment to the exporter, the domestic economy will be stimulated—even if the foreign purchaser has to postpone, or even fails to meet his obligation. But you will be the first to recognize that domestic stimulation is not what our economy needs today. The need is for credits to our balance of payments. And our financing of exports helps the balance of payments only when the foreign purchaser discharges his debt by paying dollars to this country.

Thus the interests of our nation are best served by the promotion—not of exports for exports' sake—but of exports for which we can reasonably expect to receive payment as promptly as possible from the foreign purchaser.

I suggest that the proper role of the Bank is therefore to stimulate the domestic economy when this is appropriate, but without subsidy, and at all times—particularly today—to aid our balance of payments by increasing receipts from export sales.

These are among the most important of our guideposts—the standards against which Eximbank's performance should be judged. And we try conscientiously to operate at the outer limits of these guidelines.

I do not imply that those who say that Eximbank is overly conservative use another standard. Our differences frequently come down to nothing more than differing judgments as to how short-run and long-run interests can best be balanced. The manufacturer who argues that to protect our markets we must maintain the flow of exports to a country in severe balance-of-payments difficulties, or who seeks assistance in penetrating new but risky markets, can always claim to have in mind the long-run interests of both our economy and our balance of payments. Should he be sufficiently objective he may even recognize that repayment for his sales may be highly doubtful—but if this be so I suggest that he does not recognize nor give sufficient weight to the seriousness of our country's present payments problem.

Is there any yardstick against which to measure whether Eximbank is in fact too conservative in its case-by-case decisions? I fear not. This is a matter of judgment, and into that judgment go a substantial number of considerations—political, economic, financial—which some of our critics cannot be expected to weigh or possibly even consider. Yet a reasonably dispassionate look at the contentions of some of our friends and critics may be instructive.

The proposition most frequently cited is the generalized statement that the United States is losing export sales because Eximbank will not offer credit support as liberal as that made available by other governments.

If this is true to any significant extent, we at Eximbank have been hard put to find evidence to support it. Our conviction is that the export credit facilities offered by Eximbank and other U.S. Government agencies are superior to those of any other country. We at Eximbank try to make it clear that we will consider meeting any foreign government's support for its commercial exports. If we are failing to do so in any significant number of specific cases, we would like nothing better than to know of it.

When we are confronted with the generalization that we fail in this regard, we ask that cases be documented. And then we are often met with a strange reticence on the part of our exporting friends—and, yes, sometimes our banking friends as well. Please believe me, we want to know about that export sale which may be lost because our terms, our procedures, or our requirements are deemed deficient. The Bank cannot weigh and judge the complaints unless it has the relevant facts.

To obtain these facts, we have established a group within the Bank to hear and assess complaints. Harry Rowntree, our Executive Vice President, is in charge. I would consider it a personal favor if you would give him in writing now or in the future the details of any cases of which you have direct knowledge, where it is clear that an export was lost just because a competing foreign exporter had better financial support from his government.

As I have said on other occasions, we do not deny that U.S. exporters may from time to time lose sales which foreign exporters may win with their government's support, just as our exporters win some sales with our help.

In a competitive world no country, regardless of its credit facilities, can expect to get all of the business all of the time. For years the United States Government has sought to persuade other industrialized nations to assume a greater share of the aid burden to developing countries. As you know, practically all such aid is "tied"; that is, it is made available through the sale on long terms of goods and services originating in the lending country. This of course means that the United States cannot at the same time expect greater participation by other industrialized countries and not expect them to take a share of the business.

We also hear that Eximbank must be too conservative because it has earnings, pays dividends to the Treasury, and has accumulated a reserve of a billion dollars. It is of course an insufficient answer merely to quote our statute: "Net earnings of the Bank after reasonable provision for possible losses shall be used for payment of dividends on capital stock. The real issue is whether our present "provision for possible losses"—our accumulated reserves—has passed the reasonable level.

Again, this is a matter of judgment. As the Chairman of one of the Congressional Committees is fond of reminding me, we will never really know the adequacy of our reserves until the Bank is liquidated. But some figures may be helpful.

As of this time the Bank has total commitments of over $6½ billion—some $2,200 million in so-called C and D markets, the high-risk countries. At least seventy million dollars of our loans are in protracted default. There are others we could place in this category. In the last 5 years, we have had to refund $263 million of maturities to avoid further defaults.

For example: in one country we are owed $275 million. Last year $38 million of principal on this country's loans came due. Of this, we were paid $24 million. We refunded the difference, calling for repayment over the next 7 years.

In a second country we are owed $718 million. Last year $47 million of principal was due. We received $9 million and refunded $38 million.

In a third country there is owed to us $192 million. Last year $24 million of principal came due. We were paid $6 million and refunded $18 million.

Eximbank's share of the total official external debt of these countries is also significant. In the first country, over 15 percent, in the second over 33 percent, and in the third over 23 percent of the total official external debt is owed to the Export-Import Bank—not to the U.S. Government as a whole, but to Eximbank alone.

These are not figures which we can ignore. To add substantially to the debt burden of these three countries—or any country similarly situated—could well jeopardize that country's ability to service not only new debt but its existing foreign obligations to others as well as ourselves.

These few statistics, I think, clearly justify our present level of reserves—not a lower one. They represent less than 15 percent of our total commitments, and 37 percent of this exposure is in high-risk markets. As we expand our commitments—and we hope and expect to do so in the near future—we may need every dollar set aside for contingencies.

There is another general misapprehension which I think it appropriate at this time to endeavor to correct. It is that since other export credit insurers—especially the Export Credit Guarantees Department in Great Britain—guarantee a higher percentage of national exports than are assisted by Eximbank alone, then QED—Eximbank must be more conservative than they are.

It is true that our volume of loans, guarantees, and insurance constitutes a smaller percentage of total exports than is the case in some of the other industrialized countries. But the conclusion that we are more conservative, or even less apt, certainly does not follow. It fails to take account of many differences in the economies and trading patterns of the United States and the United Kingdom, using that country as illustrative. Let me cite a few of these differences:

A sizeable volume of U.S. exports are shipped under AID, Department of Agriculture, or Department of Defense financing arrangements, and therefore do not require Eximbank assistance. U.S. exports to the least developed countries, where the need for insurance coverage is greatest, are covered to a considerable extent by such arrangements.

Bulk commodities comprise an unusually large share of U.S. exports; consequently a disproportionately large share of U.S. merchandise sales are for cash or on such short terms as to require no insurance.

A major share of our exports go to Canada, all uninsured by us.

U.S. corporations are larger and more soundly financed. They are therefore better able to be self-insurers of their export credits than are their overseas competitors. Export insurance is widely used by British firms on sales to European and, I emphasize, even to U.S. customers.

Proposals coming to us either through you or via FCIA are quite appropriately selected against us. One of the three largest automobile manufacturers uses our facilities to a limited extent to cover his higher risk sales.

The other two do no business with us on automobile or truck sales. One of the four major tobacco companies insures a portion of its business. The other companies prefer to be self-insurers, and so it goes.

Finally, a very significant share of our exports are shipped by U.S. companies to their foreign subsidiaries and affiliates. These exports seldom require government assistance.

It ill behooves a banker to proclaim too widely his liberality with the funds entrusted to his care. Accepting this risk, I hope I may have corrected some misapprehensions as to Eximbank's leanings in the opposite direction.

Our answer to whether we are too conservative is related to our thinking on the second topic of current debate—the proposal for a so-called National Interest fund. It has been suggested that Eximbank, using appropriated funds, provide export financing on concessionary terms for transactions which, in our opinion, frequently will not offer reasonable assurance of repayment, even on a liberal construction of that criterion.

Our position has been, and continues to be, that creation of such a National Interest fund is not really needed. The U.S. Government—through the various agencies to which I made earlier reference and, of course, through the Export-Import Bank itself—already engages in far, far more National Interest export financing than any other government in the world. The figures which I have already quoted seem to me clearly to attest to Eximbank's willingness to take risks where in our judgment there are valid reasons for so doing.

We have a large exposure in Brazil. But we continue to do moderate lending there. We have had problems in Argentina. Yet during calendar 1965 we made new commitments of $65 million there. Our emergency foreign trade credits—to Canada for $400 million, to Brazil for $168 million, to Italy for $200 million, to the United Kingdom for $250 million, to name the major ones in recent years—as well as our credits made in conjunction with the Defense Department—all fall clearly in the National Interest area. And I point out they too had very great value to our business and banking communities as well as to our government. In sum, we are not convinced that additional facilities with different criteria are indicated.

The third topic of current debate is whether Eximbank should establish a rediscount facility for export paper. We see no legal impediment to such a step. In the past, we have believed that banks and exporters had sufficient funds to carry the paper which might be eligible for rediscount by us. We therefore saw no real need for the facility. The very opposite, in fact: Eximbank sought in a number of ways to use private funds to finance its own activities—through guarantee and insurance programs and our participation sales. To reverse this trend, and greatly add to the funds we may need is a step we cannot take without most careful consideration.

Nevertheless we recognize the change in circumstances—in particular, that bank liquidity is severely curtailed. We have therefore undertaken a thorough reexamination of several rediscount proposals. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is extending us its full cooperation in our study, and other interested agencies are giving the matter active consideration. We have made real progress in the past few weeks, indeed in the past few days, and shall be in touch with you again on this subject, I hope constructively, and within the next few weeks.

Now I would like to turn to a subject which has been raised by a few of your members—namely, should Eximbank turn over more of its long-term direct lending to commercial banks for financing under our guarantee? We have done a modest amount of longer term guarantees—what we in the Bank refer to as "financial guarantees." These have been done under our 100 percent cover and we have split the interest with the commercial bank, believing this more appropriate than to charge a separate fee for our guarantee. W have also sold to the commercial banks under our guarantee some specific large loans made by us, under a like split of interest arrangement.

Generally these have been related to sales of jet aircraft, diesel lomomotives, and smaller plants—equipment now calling for terms beyond the usual 5- to 7-year limit of our bank guarantee program. This financing traditionally has been brought directly to Eximbank by the potential borrower. Eximbank therefore sets the interest, at our prevailing rate for direct loans.

When we decided to lay off some of these credits to commercial banks, we extended our full guarantee. Consequently we concluded that the return to the commercial bank should not exceed a reasonable rate for our fully guaranteed paper by allowing the commercial bank, say, 4¾ percent out of a 5½ percent interest rate.

So long as yields on agency paper were around 4¾ percent banks were happy to receive a comparable yield on this type of guaranteed credit. Today's yields as we all know are well above this level. Hence, if we are to continue to place some of this business with commercial banks, or if they are to bring us more of their own longer-term business for our guarantee, we shall either have to raise our interest rate to all borrowers; raise our rate for those transactions such as airplanes where the usual financial guarantee is possible; or invent a new pattern which does not involve a split of interest.

At this time, we are quite reluctant to raise our interest rate. To increase the cost of exports in this manner will not benefit either exporters or our balance of payments. Nor do we feel that we can discriminate against aircraft, locomotives, or similar products by raising our rate only on those credits in order that this special category of loans may be done under a financial guarantee.

This leaves the third possibility: devising a new form of guarantee. This we now will do. In addition to continuing financial guarantees as in the past, when an appropriate division of interest can be agreed upon, we will offer an alternative to the commercial banks:

Where a commercial bank is prepared to make and carry a direct loan to the borrower abroad, as distinguished from buying the borrower's paper from the exporter, on terms acceptable to us, Eximbank is ready to issue a guarantee subject to these provisions:

It must have acceptable answers to any questions about the transaction, by which I mean that the borrower must supply us through his commercial bank or directly the information which we regard as necessary to justify our commitment.

The commercial bank must carry the early installments up to 30 percent for its own account; that is, without either a political or commercial risk guarantee from us or FCIA on those installments.

If these conditions are met, we will give an unconditional guarantee on all later installments, for which we will charge an appropriate fee. And in such cases we will not limit the amount of interest charged by the lending commercial bank. Indeed, we will guarantee payment of interest on the later installments up to 6 percent. We will not require a cash payment by the buyer or a participation by the suppliers.

I must emphasize, however, that what I have described will be one of three—not two—possible ways of handling a direct loan. We will issue our guarantee as just outlined; or we will issue a financial guarantee with a split of interest; or we will make a direct loan ourselves at our going rate of interest if the borrower wishes to approach us directly. Even if a commercial bank is already endeavoring to provide financing on the prospect of our guarantee, we cannot justify closing our doors to our traditional borrowers, or to other long-term borrowers, so long as our exporters find themselves faced with interest rate competition from abroad.

A few may say that we are being unmindful of that part of our statute which directs us to "supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital". But as Al Smith was wont to say, "Let's look at the record".

In the short-term field we operate only in conjunction with the FCIA.

In the medium-term field, all of our business now is channeled through either FCIA or commercial banks. These are the two areas of traditional interest to banks.

In the long-term field (where the size of the loan is usually so great as to limit those interested to only a relatively few of the largest commercial banks), the volume of Eximbank direct credits far exceeds the present appetite of the commercial banks; and the nature of most of these loans is neither to their taste nor within their traditional field of activity. And in respect of the relatively few loans which could conceivably be attractive to commercial banks or even investment bankers, we satisfy ourselves by questioning the borrower and by applying our own judgment as to whether private financing, unsupported by our guarantee, is feasible. If there be an issue, it then relates to those long term loans made directly by Eximbank which a commercial bank might be prepared to finance with an Eximbank guarantee.

I cannot concede that our Bank competes with a commercial bank when we make a long-term loan which a commercial bank would make if—but only if—we are prepared to accept a major portion of the risk. This is not what I conceive to be competition. Nevertheless as I said, we now have a device which will enable commercial banks to engage in this type of lending to private borrowers under a substantial guarantee from us. Thus the commercial bank will have the opportunity to initiate or preserve the relationship with a good foreign customer. The advantage from our point of view is that the commercial banking system will be providing the necessary funds.

But gentleman, I must, at the risk of being redundant and in all frankness, point out that there are cases, particularly when governments, quasi-governmental institutions, or even some very large "private" companies are involved, when none of these arrangements wil prove feasible—where it is essential that the borrower deal directly with the United States Government. Nor can the competitive position of our country's manufacturers be jeopardized by denying them our facilities at times when it is impossible, or at least not feasible, for the commercial banks to meet Eximbank's 5½ percent rate.

So I have endeavored to make it clear that in all areas—short, medium, and long term—we neither have nor intend to compete, but rather have in fact supplemented private capital.

I come now to my final topic—a series of decisions for liberalizing our existing insurance, guarantee, and direct lending programs. I would like to cover this by simply informing you of the essence of some 17 changes which our Board of Directors and, where necessary, the Foreign Credit Insurance Association have just authorized. Most of these changes have been under consideration for some time; others have been suggested or modified by our study of the "Report of the Action Committee on Export Financing of the National Export Expansion Council." This Report has not yet been made public but some of you are aware of it.

Rather than give you all the fine print, I shall merely outline these changes. The details will appear in the course of the next week or so.

One. I described earier one additional proposed method of guaranteeing longer-term credits made by commercial banks directly to foreign borrowers. It does not preclude the arrangements, when money markets permit, of a split of interest with the commercial bank and a 100 percent guarantee by Eximbank. And of course both of these are outside the scope of our regular medium-term bank guarantee program.

Two. We will reduce our guarantee and insurance charges for C and D markets—by about 15 percent in C markets and 25 percent in D markets.

Three. We will permit lower cash payments in most C markets.

Four. We will increase substantially the discretionary authority of the commercial banks and FCIA to commit Eximbank in medium-term cases.

Five. We will authorize the commercial banks and the FCIA to make minor amendments to transactions previously approved by Eximbank, without requiring them to obtain our approval before acting.

Six. We will give FCIA discretionary authority to issue political-risks-only policies in a large number of markets.

Seven. We will add foreign commercial banks to the list of acceptable guarantors on certain medium-term sales to public buyers. Traditionally, we have required a Central Bank or Ministry of Finance guarantee.

Eight. The Eximbank Loan Committee, which meets daily, will be authorized to act on cases where Eximbank's liability under the transaction does not exceed $400,000—double the present $200,000 figure.

Nine. Our senior officers will have added individual authority to make certain changes in previous Board or Loan Committee authorizations.

Ten. We will revise the guidelines which relate the size of an order to the length of term of the credit so as to permit longer terms for smaller orders. Our willingness to make exceptions to the guidelines in appropriate cases will be reemphasized.

Eleven. We will not require that balance sheets of the buyer be submitted in certain transactions where the guarantor and credit reports are satisfactory to us.

Twelve. In appropriate medium term cases we will permit the use of bills of exchange or drafts. Heretofore we have required promissory notes.

Thirteen. After the first half of the installments on certain guaranteed or insured credits of three years or more have been paid as due, we will extend our coverage, without additional charge, to 100 percent of loss.

Fourteen. Today we require that all sales covered by our guarantees and FCIA insurance be denominated in dollars. We will hereafter provide cover for short-term credit sales denominated in foreign currencies—but not to the extent of covering the exchange risk.

Fifteen. We will permit annual payments—rather than semiannual, quarterly, or monthly—when appropriate.

Sixteen. We are occasionally asked to commit ourselves in a specific case as to a particular market before the credit information is worked up. When we give such specific advance political risk commitments, they will hereafter be firm and noncancellable on that transaction for a 90-day period.

Seventeen. In appropriate cases we will guarantee a contractor's equipment in use overseas against loss due to expropriation, war, or inability to re-export.

These changes and those being considered are evidence of the flexibility of approach, the willingness to find new solutions to new problems, which I believe have characterized Eximbank throughout its many years of service to our nation.

I come back to the overriding requirement today: export receipts. I do not pretend, gentlemen, that any innovations announced today, or any we may announce tomorrow, will provide a panacea for our payments ills. Certainly those who believe that a general loosening of credit terms on our part will result in a flood of exports are at best naive. For one thing, they underestimate the willingness of our competitors to match more generous terms. Nor do they consider fully the dangers of an international credit race.

We at Eximbank are doing and will continue to do our conscientious best to assist exports and export receipts within the framework of our overall responsibilities. But it is only when our manufacturers make a sale abroad that either we or you can help with financing. We together, as dedicated believers in foreign trade, must spread the gospel to our industrial brethren. Only when their eyes are distracted from the increasingly enticing domestic market, when they exercise their abilities and further ingenuity in style, design, engineering, pricing, and above all salesmanship abroad in the pursuit of sound export sales, then and only then can we in the financial community make our vital contribution to resolving our nation's balance-of-payments problem.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN SUPPORT OF COMPREHENSIVE FAMILY-PLANNING PROGRAMS—S. 2993

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week the Reverend Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., professor of law at Georgetown University, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. Father Hanley appeared in support of S. 2993, which proposes a program of Federal financial assistance to public and private groups supporting family planning programs.

It is my feeling that the type program proposed in S. 2993 deserves widespread support. It is conceived in a manner which would make available family planning information to all who would wish to avail themselves of this information. Under the provisions of S. 2993 the Government would permit a free choice on the part of its citizens—a choice which would be both uncoerced and informed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Father Hanley's statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement Before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Joseph S. Clark, Chairman, on S. 2993, Presented by the Reverend Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., Professor of Law and Director of the Institute of Law, Human Rights, and Social Values, of Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am grateful for the opportunity to testify today concerning Senate Bill 2993, which is designed to provide federal financial assistance to public and private groups in support of comprehensive family planning programs.

The concern of this Congress for the civil rights of our citizens and for the religious convictions of each citizen has been manifested in the particular attention which has been given to Catholic sensibilities and interests in the area of family planning. Indeed, it would be a sad thing were it to be otherwise. And, in turn, I think it is no less important that individual Catholics should be prepared to address themselves to the broad problems of public policy.

As perhaps you may know, I have given some attention to legislative and political procedures which may serve to insure full freedom of conscience for all citizens while guaranteeing civil liberty to each and while permitting governmental action in areas of legitimate social interest. The preliminary results of this study were presented last August 24 before the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of Senator Gruening. Although that record is available to this Committee, I should perhaps emphasize a few items of that testimony at this time.

First, I will support a government program which, in its legitimate concern about education, health, and welfare in a rapidly expanding population, permits each citizen a fully free moral choice in matters of family planning and aids him in implementing choice.

Second, in making this statement, I speak for myself and not for my Church or its leaders. I have come to my conclusion with full respect for and adherence to Catholic doctrine and traditional Catholic teaching on the questions of morality in family planning. Still, there are other Catholics who express opposition, usually on what they consider to be sound political and social grounds. There is no definitive Catholic teaching which requires a specific position on this public-policy question.

Third, the conclusion carries certain implications: that the government will not express a preference for one acceptable medical procedure over another nor lend its authority to one moral position rather than another. The government must be neutral. But such neutrality can be present where the government permits a free choice on the part of its citizens, provided the choice is both uncoerced and informed.

Fourth, there are related areas, such as abortion and surgical sterilization, which present particular problems both in the moral and in the social spheres. I do not read the bill before this committee as encouraging, permitting, or supporting either procedure. Such procedures, in my judgment, introduce new dimensions in the problems of public policy, dimensions justifying opposition on both moral and social grounds.

If it will be of help to this Committee to study more fully the complex religious and social issues which are involved in reconciling principles of private morality with the needs of public interests in the area of family planning, I will leave with the Committee a speech on this question which I recently presented in Washington before a Catholic group. ("The Catholic and Population Policy," Apr. 22, 1966.)

The reconciliation of these principles and needs is, however, dependent upon the existence of a legitimate social interest, one which is properly a concern of government and not merely a matter of private interest for private groups. I believe that the United States has such an interest, both at home and abroad, both in terms of our own welfare and of the needs of others. I support the position presented by Senator TYDINGS that "it is a proper function of Government to provide family planning information and assistance to those, both at home and abroad, who explicitly request it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 89th Cong., 2d sess., p. 4276, Feb. 28, 1966.)

However, the limits of this function must be very carefully drawn. I personally believe that there has been a great deal of imprecision in defining "government interests" and that there has been a confusion over its description. Though some may think that this is merely a semantic difficulty, I believe that it may rather go to the heart of the matter of finding a political ground upon which differing moral convictions may agree.

The real reason which justifies government participation in and support of family-planning programs is the general welfare, in terms of education, housing, health, and other problems. This interest is dramatized abroad where there is need to prevent hunger and famine by bringing resources and population into balance. The problem is no less real at home, where the quality of life and the opportunities of our citizens are affected by the population growth. At least, available evidence seems to point this out, and I am willing to accept such evidence at this time.

But poverty as such is not a reason for government interest in family planning. This can perhaps be made clear by supposing for a moment that all of our other problems (of housing, education, opportunity, and so forth) were solved, that adequate support could be given to those whose income was otherwise inadequate. I would find it hard to say that the federal government should then propose to enter upon a field so delicate, so involved with religious and moral overtones, merely to assure that there be an equality of choice in this question among all the citizens. There are many areas in which economic differences are accepted and private action is preferable. This, I suggest, would be one.

I make this point at this time, however, because I think that the shift of emphasis to the poor, rather than to underlying social problems which affect all, serves to attract opposition and to make it difficult to find an acceptable common ground. If attention be given to the basic social problems, then the economically handicapped will still be well served. For, as a matter of concrete fact, many of these social problems weigh most heavily upon the economically disadvantaged. Yet, it is these factors which are the government's concern. Poverty is a reason for government action in some fields, but alone it is not a reason for establishing family planning. To make it so is to give grounds for fears that the program is one of social engineering which will give economic costs priority over human values, or reason to suspect that the program is really one which throws its weight behind particular methods or moral convictions.

Thus you will note that, while supporting Senator TYDINGS' conclusions, I do not fully accept the analysis of his reasons. He has suggested in his speech introducing this bill that "wealth cannot be the basis for determining man's rights, his responsibility as a parent, and his ability to make a decision reflecting the future of his family." I would add that this is true, if, and only if, decisions as to family size have clearly defined social consequences. That they do, we both agree. I think this, however, is a vital and necessary condition for government support.

I turn now to areas of mutual concern in the preservation of civil liberties and personal convictions.

There are two specific questions to which I would have the Congress direct its attention. First is our mutual concern in these programs to avoid coercion, both direct and indirect. To this end, we need guidelines carefully formulated. These will not always be easily arrived at. What to some will seem perfectly proper will to others seem to be coercive. This will often be due to the moral attitudes of the individuals concerned. Now I think that it must be borne in mind that it will be as difficult for the non-Catholic to shed some of his predispositions when approaching matters of public policy as it will be for the Catholic. Neutrality is not found in any one-sided surrender of interests. To avoid coercive overtones and to achieve the best kind of a program will require open and fair discussion.

To achieve this, it is clear that Catholic participation is required in the formulation of guidelines and in the administration of programs, and I am sure it will be forthcoming. Without it, I am very sure that interests which I think should be safeguarded may be overlooked. Thus I view it as a responsibility of individual Catholics, according to their convictions as to the political propriety of these programs, to cooperate in developing specific guidelines and procedures. At the same time, I would call upon governmental and private agencies to openly court such participation. I must confess that I am not so sure it will be sought as I am sure that it is available. There is an understandable tendency to avoid becoming embroiled in discussions which may slow down the immediate acceptance of a specific program, a feeling that so long as Catholics do not block the program it is better to "do it my own way." This, however, is to overlook the very fundamental civic values which are at stake; it is a failure to make best use of a democratic process.

The second question is one of mutual concern over the preservation of the public morality. By "public morality," I have reference to those standards of conduct which society has chosen to set for itself, standards which we hope embody the highest of ethical and spiritual ideals. Law is a matrix into which many of these ideals have been poured; law itself is part of public morality and helps to form public attitudes. Now, if it be the right of those in society to try to have it reflect fundamental values, then a coordinated effort may be expected to see that these values are not lost and that support be given to public attitudes which strengthen family life. Leaders of planned parenthood themselves realize the need of channeling the resources of religion so as to protect these fundamental values. They, too, realize that the availability of contraceptives is having a profound effect on society.

Thus, a sincere attempt should be made to coordinate family-planning programs with counselling. Such counselling should touch upon the social, economic, religious, medical, and personal issues which are involved. This, I insist, is a matter of common concern to all citizens and to all religious bodies. Only so can an informed choice be made and liberty truly protected. Only so can we make available for the family all the resources which are necessary for family planning in the full sense of the words. Only so can we avoid depersonalizing the program and, in my judgment, risking a collapse of the public morality.

The development of such a program will again be difficult. But I am sure that a program which is limited solely to medical advice and prescriptions will inevitably be coercive in its effects. For, if one is freely to choose, he must be fully informed as to the full nature of his choice.

Before turning to the specifics of a federal program, I would like to say a brief word about legal arguments which I have seen which purport to show that the action of the federal government in supporting family planning would be an unconstitutional abridgement of a right of privacy. Without detailing my argument or burdening this Committee with citations, I will offer my personal legal judgment that such arguments are invalid.

But now what of the central question before you? What of the specifics of a federal program? At this time, I would like to do something I failed to do last August. Before the Gruening Subcommittee, I limited my testimony to a cautious statement that there were no grounds of private morality which would demand that I oppose the bill. Upon reflection, and specifically upon consideration of S. 2993 before this Committee, I am prepared to offer my support of the Gruening recommendation.

I have for instance tried to collect data concerning the functioning of programs throughout the United States. It is difficult to do, and it has been next to impossible to evaluate the conduct of such programs in any meaningful way. Senate Bill 1676 provides for coordinating information and for reporting on programs. This is to be done through the establishment of the office of an assistant secretary for Health, Medical Services, and Population Problems in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I shall not detail his functions; I am sure they are well known to you. Of course, there are some who feel that the power which will reside in this office is too great and is too dangerous. On the other hand, I am fearful that, lacking such a coordinating power, there is even greater danger of private programs deviating from approved guidelines and a greater impossibility of exercising supervision and control.

Indeed, I will go further and suggest that there should also be a special subcommittee in Congress to which reports on domestic and international programs will be made and which will exercise supervisory control over the guidelines and programs. Especially as such programs grow and proliferate, it is the responsibility of the elected representatives of the people to see that the programs properly serve all the people. It will again be a difficult task, but I believe the matter is too important and delicate to be left to piecemeal implementation by government agencies, whether acting by themselves or in cooperation with private groups.

In similar fashion, I would express a strong preference for entrusting the initial programs to governmental medical services. Here I realize that there are problems of departmental organization and that this may overlook the existence of private and well-organized groups ready to begin operation. There are conflicting interests involved, but I would like to see at least some attention given to the possibility of greater utilization of government medical services. In this way, and especially in the formative periods, more prompt control and coordination is possible, along with better training of personnel for the future.

At last, I turn to the specific language of Senate bill 2993.

I am pleased that specific authorization is now being sought. The matter of population policy is too important to be left to the present procedures, which have seemed to some to be without Congressional authorization. Both at home and abroad, a clear and definitive policy must be set.

There is no doubt that authorization for studies and research carries with it an almost universal approbation. The dissemination of information and the distribution of supplies may also, for the reasons I have given, be a proper government function. I have indicated a preference for the programs being under more direct government control, rather than through private agencies. But I lack information as to the extent and capabilities of private and of government medical services. At this time, then, I do not give specific approval to a broad program of private services; I can only reserve my judgment as to which is the more advisable procedure.

I am in favor of the provision (section 2(b)) which assures that individuals will not be pressured into accepting services out of a fear they will be deprived of other welfare and medical services.

The bill provides (Section 3(c)) that the Secretary will not deny a grant on the ground that the applicant, under standards it prescribes, provides assistance to unmarried individuals.

On this point, I would like to offer specific testimony. The policy of offering contraceptive advice to the unmarried has been a perennial source of argument. It is an explosive question and one to which I can offer no definitive answer. But there are several grounds for supporting the proposal in the bill.

It is clearly true that the problem of illegitimacy creates moral, social, and legal problems. A child has a moral and a legal right to be born legitimate. I do not hesitate to affirm that premarital and extramarital intercourse is a moral evil. But it is also a moral evil to procreate a child in circumstances where he cannot be born into a family. Of course, morality requires a cessation of an illicit relationship. But where, contrary to this moral and social precept, one still engages in the relationship, can it be said there is an obligation to procreate? I suggest that there is an obligation to the contrary, and that the essential moral evil of these situations is the illicit relationship itself, not the contraceptive practice. Thus, to avoid the clear social evils of illegitimacy, I think it proper for the Government to permit the distribution of contraceptive advice.

Yet, there are those who sincerely feel that the distribution of information and supplies to the unmarried will encourage promiscuity and a breakdown of public morality. This, of course, is not the exclusive concern of any one group, social or religious. It is an objection to be weighed. I think that, if contraceptive advice is to be distributed to the unmarried, two things will be necessary. First, as I have earlier emphasized, adequate counselling and increased attention to family values will have to be encouraged, both in and out of the planning programs. Secondly, doctors and counsellors will have to be able to exercise discretion. There is a real difference involved in the indiscriminate prescription of contraceptive supplies and a prescription which is concerned with an individual who has already made a mature decision. Where that patient has already made a decision to enter upon a relationship, I do not see where the social harms are increased by permitting contraceptive counselling. But, the doctor and others should not neglect the responsibility which is implicit in the giving of all such information and advice: an obligation to see that the individual has had an opportunity to make a fully informed choice. There is for instance a difference between what the doctor may choose to do for a young girl who is just thinking of entering upon a liaison and what he might do for one who has consistently borne illegitimates.

Thus, while supporting this provision in principle, I am not in favor of allowing the guidelines to be set entirely by the applicant.

There are a few questions I have about the bill. First, in section 3(a), it is stated that grants will be given to applicants whose services are limited in scope. While this may prove helpful to Catholic interests in that they will be able to operate rhythm clinics, it will also create a problem in areas where no such clinic exists and where all the counselling is done by private clinics which do not offer rhythm instruction. This lack of full freedom of choice among methods in individual clinics poses problems for careful consideration. It may again indicate a reason for my preference to have the government services (federal and state) handle the initial programs.

Second, in proposing the bill, Senator TYDINGS explained that procedures will be established to assure that "no individual will be provided with any information, medical assistance, or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., p. 4277, Feb. 28, 1966.) The bill before me does not contain the word "information" in the relevant section (section 2(a)(1)). This leads to some problems. Do not the guidelines have to assure that, even in the presentation of information about the programs, there must be protection for individual beliefs? Where individuals state that information is objectionable, at this point, at least, should not the presentation cease? Will the way be left open for proselytizing? I would suggest the inclusion of the word "information" in section 2(a)(1) of the bill so as to accord with Senator TYDINGS' explanation on the floor of the Senate.

But even then a possible difficulty can arise. While we all agree that a clear statement that a program is inconsistent with one's belief should be enough, does not respect for the individual conscience begin even earlier? Suppose one is speaking to a patient who is not fully instructed in his or her own beliefs. Is there not some obligation to make referral so that the person can make an informed choice? Again, I come back to the importance of a program integrated with full family counselling and to the importance of congressional review of and responsibility for the guidelines.

In closing, I would like to express my thanks to this Committee for the invitation to appear here today. In spite of a growing consensus as to the importance of the population problem and as to the need of government programs, there are still unexplored areas of mutual concern about the protection of civil liberty and of freedom of conscience. These can be worked out, I am sure, in a discussion which is free, open, and honest. I am pleased to have had this opportunity to present my views on these most important matters.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram on April 17, describing how a Maine firm has responded to President Johnson's appeal to industry to hire and train the handicapped.

I am proud to call attention to the commendable efforts of Hillcrest Poultry Industries of Lewiston, Maine, in helping the handicapped to become productive citizens, capable of self-support.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Telegram, Apr. 17, 1966]

PINELAND WORK PROJECT ACHIEVES HIGH SUCCESS

(By Frank Sleeper)

LEWISTON.—Since February 14, several patients at Pineland Hospital and Training Center have been working at the Hillcrest Poultry Co. here.

Fifteen started training then and six more later joined them.

Their jobs are the result of cooperative venture between Pineland and Hillcrest.

For years, Pineland officials have been trying to find jobs in larger industry where the retarded could be trained. They wanted to show how many patients could be employed and productive citizens.

With the labor shortage, Hillcrest needed unskilled workers to do repetitious jobs. Last September, Hillcrest representatives visited Dr. Peter W. Bowman, Pineland superintendent.

That meeting resulted in employment of Pineland people at Hillcrest.

And now from William J. Mendelson, Hillcrest president, comes word that the project is going well. "One third of the trainees have improved to a degree allowing them to be placed on the main production line," he says.

"Soon we hope some of this group will attain top union wage scales. The others are still on the slower or training lines but we are fairly confident that they will get closer to the standard rate of production with a little more time and experience," he adds.

Of the first 21 trainees, only three weren't able to make a satisfactory adjustment to the work and have been phased into another program.

The Pineland patients are full-fledged members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers of America, AFL-CIO, the bargaining union for Hillcrest employes.

All the trainees' wages are placed in their own bank accounts in Pineland. Spending of the money is supervised by Pineland chaplains. When the patients are discharged, all their moneys are returned to them.

The Pineland institution has plans to expand the program to other Maine industries if enough capable people are found and agreements can be reached with prospective employers.

Here's the way the idea was worked out after Dr. Bowman was approached. He talked it over with Dr. Anthony Chiappone, Pineland director of training, and Thomas Pooler and Sherman Hill of the Pineland vocational work training program.

Then Pooler, Hill, and two Pineland social workers visited Hillcrest's plant here. They were shown the various types of jobs that were available as well as complete plans for the proposed training-employment program. And they determined how many of the jobs they felt the retarded could be trained to do successfully.

Pooler and Hill screened many of the Pineland patients to find those willing and able to work at the jobs.

After final approval by Dr. Bowman and Mendelson, Hillcrest and Pineland officials conferred with Stanley Wollaston, regional director of the U.S. Department of Labor's Wage-Hour, Public Contracts Division's Boston office, and got United States approval. This was needed since the patients would be employed under the laws relating to employment of handicapped workers.

It was agreed that starting wages for the trainees who range from 18 to 40 years old would be in line with their ability. Job performance evaluation reports were to be made as the training program progressed. As each trainee's work improved his wages would be increased accordingly.

Mendelson agreed to provide transport to and from Pineland, 18 miles from Lewiston.

Pineland provides each trainee with noon lunches. Each would be able to draw money from his own account at Pineland each week to take care of coffee breaks and other incidentals. Each works a five-day, 40-hour week.

Allen Glidden, a production and quality control supervisor at the plant, was assigned to train the group. A metal rack simulating a production line was built for the training.

The trainees were then placed beside regular production line workers for more practice and the social benefits of seeing and working with experienced people.

The first few weeks, Hill and Pooler spent most of the time in the plant, assisting also with minor transitional problems and helping everyone get accustomed to the new program.

Mendelson says he was very pleased with the encouraging attitude of his supervisors and production line employes when news of the program got around the plant.

"I think the cooperation and understanding of our own people, evident from the very start, has played an important role in the program's success," he declares.

"This is one of the most progressive steps we have ever been able to take in our long-range rehabilitation program at Pineland," Dr. Bowman says. "A great deal of credit should go to Hillcrest for providing us with the chance to prove what many of the mentally retarded are capable of."

The union is happy with the program, too. Says Rodney P. Warren, president of Amalgamated Meat Cutters Local 385:

"Officers and members of Local 385 wholeheartedly endorse and desire to cooperate in the program at Hillcrest Poultry Co. to restore Pineland patients to useful positions in society through training for gainful employment."

Glidden is greatly impressed by the whole program. Fellow workers such as Mrs. Phyllis Martin, Miss Ruth Drinkwater, Mrs. Ruth Field, Mrs. Barbara Poirier and Mrs. Florence Heaward exclaim about the excellent behavior of the Pineland people.

Mrs. Bertha Lamb, RN, Hillcrest plant nurse and a former member of the Pineland staff, says behavior of the Pinelanders is setting an example for their fellow workers. They don't expect undue treatment and mix well, she says.

Dr. Peter Clavola, U.S. Department of Agriculture head veterinarian at the plant, is also enthusiastic about the program.

Good Friday, April 8, Hillcrest employees noticed a simple, friendly, home-made card among the many messages on the cafeteria bulletin board.

It carried this Easter message: "To all Hillcrest employees—we hope you have a happy Easter Sunday and many more to come." It was signed, "The girls and boys at Pineland."

CONTRIBUTION OF THE JOB CORPS TO THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in attempting to evaluate the contribution of the Job Corps to the war on poverty, it is really necessary to listen to the young men and women who are enrolled in the program, and who are trying to find the way out of deprivation into the Great Society. Desmond Stone of the Gannett newspapers has written a series of articles on the Job Corps urban training centers at Fort Custer, Mich., and Breckinridge, Ky. Mr. Stone gives us a realistic appraisal of the problems and accomplishments of this program, much of it in the words of the corpsmen themselves.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Stone's series constitutes a particularly valuable contribution to informed discussion of the Job Corps, and I ask unanimous consent to have the series, as it appeared recently in the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the series was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Times-Union, Apr. 25, 1966]

A LEARNING EXPERIENCE AT A MICHIGAN CAMP

(By Desmond Stone)

JOB CORPS CHANCE AND CHALLENGE

NOTE.—In Washington and across the nation, the Job Corps is drawing political lightning and creating public controversy.

Critics condemn it as an expensive boondoggle project, a refuge for hoodlums.

Supporters see it as an important chance for poor youth, as society's only alternative to paying a much higher cost in welfare and police protection.

To find out what the urban Job Corps centers are like, a Times-Union reporter visited two of them—the Fort Custer center near Battle Creek, Michigan, and the Breckenridge center in northwest Kentucky.

Here is the first of his reports.

FORT CUSTER, MICH.—This big military reservation is the permanent home of what's claimed to be America's biggest deer herd, running 125 to the square mile.

It's also the temporary home of 1,500 Job Corps youth.

With some bitterness, the center staff speak of a telephone recording in nearby Battle Creek in which the Job Corps was condemned as the "Mob Corps" by a citizen "survival" group.

Most Battle Creek people don't go along with the fanatical few, but the city at the moment is off limits to all but a few corpsmen making authorized home visits.

Empty beds in several of the camps barracks are one of the consequences of a recent street disturbance in Battle Creek, about 10 miles from the reservation.

The troublemakers have been shipped home.

But there are many more occupied beds than empty ones, more corpsmen staying than quitting.

Take, for example, 18-year-old Norman A. (Tony) Prescott of 792 Jefferson Avenue, Rochester.

Prescott makes no bones about where he was headed before he joined the Job Corps.

He was running with a gang or a club and was slipping deeper into trouble.

He doesn't remember exactly how it all began. He had a perfect school attendance record, he says, until ninth grade at Edison Technical and Industrial High School.

Then in spite of his mother's warnings, he recalls, he started hanging around with the gang and forgetting about school. There came a day when Prescott was arrested, given a suspended sentence and placed on probation.

He got the message.

"I knew I had to start fresh, stay out of trouble, get a trade and go back to night school."

So Prescott joined the Job Corps.

That was 6 months ago. Today he's close to graduating as a trained operator of heavy equipment—bulldozers, front-end loaders and other machines.

He likes the power of the big machines, he likes the money he'll be able to make, and he likes the prospect of getting his life back on the tracks.

He intends to get his high school equivalency certificate at night school in Rochester.

"I wish I had finished high school when I had the chance," he says. "I miss it really. It's a hard world out there."

Prescott didn't take quickly to the Job Corps.

At first he was homesick. For the first few weeks, he didn't attend classes. "I wasn't ready. I didn't like school already. I wasn't ready for 'social understanding'."

But to get a job he had to graduate, and to graduate, he had to settle down.

Prescott has a cousin in camp, Willie B. Lyman, of 33 Concord Street, Rochester. Lyman has also had his troubles.

Now he's learning building maintenance and changing some of his outlooks.

"I used to have a bad attitude at home towards school and working. I got C's at school when I might have got A's.

Getting away from it all has helped them both. So, they say, has the interest shown by their teachers.

Both feel that Fort Custer is "pretty good as it is."

Prescott, who's been in camp longer and seen more changes, says conditions are better than before.

"Things are stricter today. You have to act more seriously to make it through. They know all the tricks now."

Camp administrators confirm that discipline has been tightened.

In the earlier, more permissive days, corpsmen got involved in incidents in outside communities that gave the corps a bad name.

Some of the conditions inside the camp still appear to leave something to be desired—glass from broken windows, thick around several of the barracks, for instance. But a day has been set aside for a cleanup by the corpsmen.

"Doctors who get their degrees on the basis of some beautiful theory," says one staff man, "don't want the camps to smack of anything military, like turning everyone out to pick up paper. But you've got to be realistic. You've got to have rules."

There are other staff members who feel the administration may be tempted, under the pressure of public opinion, to swing to the other extreme and give marching orders to youth who have not seriously offended, to call in the FBI for too little reason.

If Prescott is typical, the corpsmen respect firmer guidelines.

"Before," he says, "there was too much mischief."

Being neither a regular military establishment nor a regular school, the center has had to establish its own standards on the basis of daily experience.

And since it's not yet a year old, it's still learning.

There is, however, unusual commitment among the teaching staff.

One man, a former high school teacher, tore up, as he talked, an evaluation form asking him to list the extra things he had done in his job.

"There's only one requirement for this job," he said, "and that, simply, is that you be a decent teacher and a compassionate human being."

Prescott seems to have responded to this kind of feeling. He says he's liked what he's done, both vocationally and academically.

The real world of work has never been far away from him.

For example, the "social understanding" course on getting a job confronts the corpsman with such pertinent questions as:

"You have been working your tail off all afternoon while the fellow next to you has been goofing off all day. The foreman comes around and asks you to to a real dirty job that should be done by the lazy fellow. What do you do?"

The failures at Fort Custer can be seen in the empty beds and empty lockers of youth who have been unable to measure up.

The successes are in corpsmen like Prescott who know why they're there and who have decided to see it through.

[From the Times-Union, April 25, 1966]

THEY FIGHT A QUIET WAR

If he's in an urban Job Corps center, he walks among the ghosts of yesterday's soldiers—the men who once crowded the military camps in World War II and in the Korean conflict.

Like them, he's taken an oath and he wears a uniform. He must get up and go to bed at specified times and he must stay in the camp except during leave and on supervised tours.

He's in a war. Upon his training depends his survival. Upon his survival and success depends, to a degree, the health of society.

But it's a very different war, and a different survival.

No bugles summon the corpsman. No top sergeant tears him into strips. No one marches him anywhere.

His instructors rely more on persuasion than on barked-out orders.

The corpsman's weapon are his hands and his resolve.

His target is a place in a society in which he can have no place without a skill.

His goal is to become one of the "haves."

He may be anywhere from 16 to 21 years old. He gets a monthly living allowance of $30 (minus deductions), and a readjustment allowance of $50 for each month of satisfactory service.

He may send home $25 of his readjustment allowance and have it matched by the Job Corps.

He begins with many strikes against him.

He's usually a dropout from school, unable to hold a good job for lack of a skill. He comes out of poverty in the cities and in the hills. And he may have been in trouble with the law.

At first, he's one or all of many things—scared, hungry, homesick, truculent, noisy, rude, aggressive, dirty, long-haired and plain bewildered.

He's at least 200 miles from home, and he's out in open view, with nowhere to run to, nowhere to hide.

He's grown up too quick and tasted life too early.

But though old beyond his years in worldly things, he's a child emotionally and, like any child, easily frightened by what he doesn't understand.

His first few weeks are critical, for this is when he usually decides to stay or to go back.

He can leave at any time. If he can't shake off the past, if he gets into a fight or commits a theft, he may be asked to leave.

Or he may quit himself if he's come along for the ride, or if he misses home too much.

But if he realizes that this may be his last chance, he decides to stay.

For the first time perhaps, he is among people who are not trying to cheat him or kick him around, but to help him on his own terms.

And being trusted, he begins to show trust. Being respected, he begins to show respect.

He takes off his cap now when he sits down to eat. He doesn't leave as much litter around. He doesn't start swinging every time he's jostled. He doesn't grab at the food—he knows there's plenty.

What's more, he's learning a trade, automotive repair perhaps. And math, when it's expressed in terms of six pistons rather than six apples, begins to make some sense.

It's not easy. He's never stuck at one thing very long before.

And when he goes into town, his reputation, based on reports of riots here and there, often precedes him.

Unlike the soldier, the corpsman gets no cheers from the people. The girls don't hang on his arm. He has little money to spend.

He's the no-hoper, it's reputed, the dropout, the addict, the guy with the prison record, the hoodlum, the drunk.

And sometimes he is just such an incorrigible, someone both camp and community are better off without.

More often, he's a basically decent youngster doing his best against odds.

In a small town, there's often little for him to do, particularly where the color line lingers. And he can't get out from under the spotlight.

The local boys, if they want to drink or neck, can take off in their cars to some secluded parking spot.

The corpsman, who has to hoof it everywhere, sneaks a drink in an alley and gets caught. He also get marked as stupid.

But he's far from stupid—he's lived by his wits in the past.

His English may be poor, but he's smart and he's cunning, and he'd hoodwink his instructors if he could.

But his instructors care enough to take no nonsense.

And this in the end is often what stops the corpsman from throwing in the sponge. Someone believes in him.

If he sticks it out, he dares to believe a little in himself and in the opportunities he always figures were for others.

He starts to stand a bit straighter, his handshake is firmer, his hair not so long.

He isn't in the mainstream yet, but he's on his way.

[From the Times-Union, Apr. 26, 1966]

THEY'RE SKEPTICAL, HOSTILE AT FIRST

(By Desmond Stone)

BRECKENRIDGE CENTER, KY.—Gathered in a circle for an evening bull session with their counselors, the recruits are new and nervous.

Though they've only just arrived, they're already wanting to know about home leave.

"What if your sister's having a baby?" asks one youngster.

No, says a counselor, that wouldn't be a reason for leave.

"What if your girl friend's having a baby?"

"I'd stay here if I were you," retorts the counselor.

The snickers ease the tension a bit.

But skepticism and hostility can still be sensed.

There's some jeering when it's suggested that the corpsmen should treat all women as they would treat their sisters.

Answering a question about tackle football, one of the counselors says the game can get rough and that it probably shouldn't be played except under supervision.

"What would you sooner have us do?" demands a corpsman. "Play tackle football or beat someone's head in the barracks?"

Fear and ignorance are here too.

"What about those block tests they gave us?" asks another youngster. "Was it to see if we're crazy or something?"

No, he's assured, this is a test of hand dexterity.

In a way, the recruits, or some of them, are daring the counselors to prove that they're wrong in their distrust of people.

When, for example, it's suggested that they show some acceptance of youths who are feeling lost, one corpsman promptly says: "You've got to show us you want us before we can show them * * *."

But there are some hopeful signs too.

One nice-looking youth who seems too young to have been in trouble says it's good to mix with other races.

"When I went to jail, I couldn't get along with Mexicans. But I was thrown in with them, and I had to learn to get along if I wanted out."

It's clear, too, that one instructor in camp, Clark Johnson, has already made an impression on the new arrivals.

"I don't think he'd be the kind of person to tell us wrong," says one corpsman of Johnson.

Johnson is a Negro who's had 8 years of Army service and who seems to have the knack of getting through quickly to the new boys.

"First," he says, "I explain to them that none of them are losers. At 16 to 21, they're not old enough to be losers.

"I tell them also, that I don't regard them as dropouts, that some may have had good reasons for leaving school. This helps."

Johnson, something of a boxer himself in the past, says he will sometimes clear away the chairs and ask two boys who may be spoiling for a fight to put the gloves on.

Johnson has no illusions about the kind of material he's working with, about the need to be alert to anything the recruits may try.

Neither has George Todd, coordinator of vocational programs.

"They're all con men in a way," he says of the corpsmen. "We all have to become proficient in the world of con. After all, these youngsters made a living off the streets in many cases. What they lack is not smartness but a basic education."

This willingness to meet the corpsman at his own tricks, plus a compassion for him and an understanding of the things that have made him what he is, often works changes sometimes unexpectedly.

Seventeen-year-old Ken from Colorado tried the Job Corps once and quit. He was pumping gas back home one day when he found himself watching the mechanic, envying his job, his wages and his house.

He asked to return to camp then a car accident has put his leg in a cast and given him still more time to think, and was readmitted. Since "I take life a lot more seriously now," he says.

Other corpsmen have a serious purpose from the beginning.

Says one young man learning retailing: "I ran off from my step-parents and quite school, so that I had no skill. I joined the Job Corps so I wouldn't have to be a short-order cook all my life."

Says another corpsman in the landscaping school: "I had to leave school to help my family. I like it here and I know it's about the only chance I'll get."

For those who must change their attitudes to become employable, good food and good health are part of the prescription.

One staff man tells of the physical improvement in boys who once subsisted mainly on rice or potatos and who, in their first days in the cafeteria, might grab six oranges at a time.

The corpsman still eats well. One youngster at lunch may tackle a large plate of beef stew and Spanish rice, a salad, a slice of cake, three slices of bread, two glasses of milk and one glass of orange juice.

But he isn't tempted now to hide anything under his sweater.

He also seems to observe most of the signs put up by students in the cafeteria—"Job Corps Boys would rather Dress than Mess," "Would you kindly remove your hats," "Don't shout, you may be escorted out."

The question sometimes arises whether conformity to what might be called middle-class values isn't carried too far.

Arthur Meyers, head of job development and placement, says that the resident counselors (young themselves) are sometimes tempted to impose higher standards on the corpsmen than they set for themselves.

He cites the case of a young man who graduated recently in spite of a counselor's objection that he hadn't made his bed in a week and was thus setting a bad example.

"The point is," says Meyers, "that this young man was good at his trade. He can hold a job even if he is sloppy about making his bed."

On the question of change, James R. Fornear, the camp director, says he is constantly amazed at what can happen to a young man "if we make him aware of his ability to learn and to be proud.

"Some people wouldn't give you the powder to blow some of the corpsmen off the face of the earth. But see many of these young men when they leave here and even their walk is different."

[From the Times-Union, Apr. 27, 1966]

Education Takes a Fresh Approach

(By Desmond Stone)

Breckenridge Center.—Something of a revolution in education is going on in the Job Corps centers.

Many of the teachers have, in a sense, rebelled against the traditional system of public education. They feel it has failed too many youth, both by what it teaches and by the teaching itself.

The determination here is to find new ways of tying basic education much more closely to vocational skills, whether the trade is auto body repair, culinary arts, retail sales, or welding.

There's great flexibility and a noticeable crusading spirit among those who are driving for a new kind of education—one that has never been tried before in the U.S. on such a scale.

George Todd, coordinator of vocational programs, gives an example of the kind of flexible approach that's being tried.

The camp had two prime requirements in hiring a man to manage its auto parts store—someone who knew the trade and how to work well with youngsters.

The man chosen had owned his own store and had a large family of boys. But he hadn't taught a day in his life. He had none of the usual qualifications, and he was worried about his shortcomings.

So the camp put alongside him a retired Air Force man who had done a lot of teaching in aircraft mechanics.

It's turned out to be an effective alliance, says Todd.

"What's happening in Job Corps centers today," he says, "will affect education throughout the country.

"The square box school with the teacher out in front teaching to the group isn't adequate any more. Kids are being lost in the second and third grade."

Todd acknowledges that the public schools, over the years, have done an excellent job with most young people, particularly the middle class.

But in the atomic age, in a day when even a ditchdigger must be skilled enough to operate a power shovel, the old-established system he says, is not reaching enough students, with the result that 1½ million drop out each year.

Robert D. Collier, senior education supervisor, a former teacher with the Los Angeles city schools, points out that many of the corpsmen come from communities where the schools are overcrowded, the class loads too heavy, and good instructional materials not always available.

"These boys represent an element in the population in need of special and individual attention. In a normal public school setting, as in Los Angeles, with perhaps 44 in a class and five classes a day, the instructor can't give of himself.

"Remember, these boys are not all slow, retarded youngsters. Somewhere along the way they lost interest. We have to get them back."

But finding texts that relate basic education closely to skills (that will, for example, give a retail sales student a spelling assignment with words like "requisition" and "inventory") has proved impossible.

Breckenridge, as with other centers, has had to begin writing its own courses.

Something of what's being aimed at can be seen from the reading practice book written for service station specialist (the camp has a fully-equipped service station for training.)

A section on syllables, for example, asks how many syllables there are in the words "lubrication" and "carburetor."

An exercise for alphabet learning asks the student to arrange in alphabetical order such words as "universal joint," "king pins," "wheel bearing" and so on.

To encourage dictionary use, the student is posed with the situation where his girl friend asks him what a distributor is.

"Now that you are going to school, you can probably raise the hood of your car and point to it, but, chances are, she still won't know what it is. Have you ever tried to explain anything about a car to a woman? Open your dictionary and see if it can help you explain."

There is still much to be done in adapting education to the needs of the corpsmen.

One programmed learning machine, for example, uses, among other things, the story of Dick Whittington, the boy who rose to become "thrice Lord Mayor of London." It's a tale a long way removed from the world of the dropout.

But as fast as fresh materials can be devised, they are being used.

The main push for new educational concepts at Breckenridge has come so far from Southern Illinois University, the operating contractor for the first year.

On July 1, in line with the Office of Economic Opportunity policy to experiment as well with administration by industry, the main contract will be taken over by General Precision Equipment, Inc., with its Graflex division in Rochester carrying out the actual camp operation.

There's some evidence that industry, by reason of its organized structure, may be better equipped to run the camp.

Graflex's man on the spot, Chris L. Faegre, program specialist, and a former teacher himself, notes that the Job Corps purpose is "to make the whole man available for life in an industrial society," that employability implies "far more than the individual's skill."

Towards this end, the curriculum, he says, must, and does, stress self-understanding and such cross-occupational skills as the use of banking services, how to give and take directions.

There cannot, he emphasizes, be any question of grading the corpsmen. "They've been told they're bad and a failure so often that they're gun-shy. So we have to turn the thing around and let the man set the goal, let him get on the ladder at whatever step he can, let him train to the standard that he himself sets."

Teachers, he further points out, are traditionally authoritarian, so that a camp such as Breckenridge has to sift out those "who love to find what's wrong in a test paper," those who tend to be punitive and corrective.

One of the failures of the public school system, he adds, is that it doesn't give enough reminders of success to potential dropouts and doesn't put enough faith in them.

"Here we ask a man to take a test and to correct it himself as he goes along, so that he gets the feeling he's being trusted."

The emphasis, says Faegre, is on a hands-on approach to education.

"The attitude of public schools is that first you do all the book work and then you get your hands dirty. Here we say, 'take the tires off now and then we'll talk about tread wear.' "

[From the Times-Union, Apr. 28, 1966]

Uneasy Public Shows Hostility

(By Desmond Stone)

At the airport in Battle Creek, Mich., a few miles from Fort Custer Job Corps Center, a short, earnest, voluble Mexican-American proudly displays his official Job Corps blazer.

"But when I get back to New Mexico," he then says, "I'll have to take off the emblem (a shield with an arrow pointing up a ladder.) Many people don't like us."

This isn't an isolated feeling among job Corpsmen.

At the Breckenridge center in Kentucky, a young man from Pennsylvania puts on his dress uniform for a photograph and says:

"I'm proud of the uniform and I'm proud of the badge. Yet people don't seem to want us. When I ask for directions in town they turn away.

"This uniform represents the government. It may be the closest I'll get to service. But in town, I feel like I'm wearing stripes. Just because some animals cause trouble doesn't mean that the whole lot of us are bad."

The Job Corps emblem is part of the blazer. With the rest of their uniform, the corpsmen have the choice of sewing it on or leaving it off.

Watching the Breckenridge boys come off the leave buses in Evansville (a small Indiana city just over the state line), it's noticeable that most prefer not to wear their badge, though they can still be easily identified without it.

Public uneasiness about the corps has some unfortunate results.

With Battle Creek and Kalamazoo, Mich., both off limits at the moment for general leave, the Fort Custer corpsmen, and only a certain number at that, must now travel from 60 to 120 miles to Grand Rapids, Lansing, Ann Arbor, South Bend, or Flint.

"What's more," says one Fort Custer corpsmen, "with more of us confined to camp, we're getting sick of the sight of each other and fighting more than we would normally."

Both centers have had their disturbances, in and out of the camp.

How bad they were depends on whom you talk with. They're variously described as riots, near-riots, and scrimmages.

Both at Breckenridge and at Fort Custer, there seems no doubt that incidents have occurred which neither camp nor community can countenance. Even though they may have been magnified, as both centers feel, they were still undesirable incidents.

And camp administrators have acted accordingly.

At Fort Custer, for example, new recruits now get closer screening.

At Breckenridge, boys who are clearly incorrigible are shipped out more quickly.

What went wrong to cause these troubles?

Growing pains, the very newness of the Job Corps experiment, are blamed in some cases.

Staff members at Breckenridge are generally agreed that boys were pushed in too soon, before the camp was ready, before the vocational facilities were set up, so that there was too much idle time, too much frustration.

Numbers may have something to do with it.

Fort Custer had to learn the hard way that when you put together 1,500 boys out of poverty, some firm basic rules are indispensable.

Breckenridge now has only 800 boys, though 50 to 60 are coming in each week.

Fort Custer's experience seems to be that disciplinary problems rise with the number in camp.

There are other explanations of past difficulties.

The Breckenridge camp director feels that the camp was too concerned in the beginning with maintaining a high holding rate instead of letting the troublemakers go.

Some recruiting agents, too, he points out, have created frustration in some of the corpsmen by painting impossibly rosy pictures of camp life—even to private rooms and maid service.

Beyond these things, most of the nearby communities are too small to absorb so many corpsmen without some kind of upset.

Better community preparation might have avoided some of the troubles. The Breckenridge center at least has a reception center in Evansville where Corpsmen can come in off the streets, play games, and wait for the return buses.

It's also a place where camp security police and local police can coordinate their work, where the image of the policeman gets changed a bit when he takes time out to play table tennis with the corpsmen.

In the Michigan cities of Battle Creek and Kalamazoo, center and community are only just getting around to setting up such downtown centers.

In the perspective of what the Job Corps is trying to do with youth who might otherwise be on the streets, some disturbances were probably inevitable.

Public opinion, however, has been damaged, and the assumption made that all Job Corpsmen are alike.

"Too many people," says the Breckenridge director, "don't understand that only a small percentage of students have been involved in troublemaking."

Says John Anesi, chief supervisor of group life at Fort Custer: "The public has the idea that the corpsmen are either addicts from Harlem or moonshiners from Kentucky. This just isn't so."

The woman who directs the Mayor's Human Relations Commission in Evansville agrees that the Job Corps "isn't altogether accepted in town. * * * Last year's riot didn't help matters. * * * There's been a lot of publicity about the fact they're the so-called dropouts and dregs."

Sometimes the double standards are used to judge the corpsmen.

One Breckinridge instructor points out that college kids can come into town, tear it up, pay for the damage, and suffer no penalty. "But a Job Corpsman gets it in the neck."

The editor of the daily newspaper in Henderson, Kentucky, says some local people criticized him for reporting the facts when several local boys picked on some Corpsmen after a dance and precipitated a fight. "They figured I should have covered up for our youngsters, but I wasn't about to do that."

Says the Evansville civilian who directs the downtown Job Corps reception center: "We have more trouble with the elite youngsters of the community than with the Job Corpsmen, but the elite can get away in their cars and create their mischief out of the public eye."

Here and there voices are being raised on behalf of the corpsmen.

Thus a high school junior wrote recently in the Battle Creek Gazette:

"The corpsmen are human. They talk, walk, breathe, eat and work the same as we do, but too many people treat them like animals. If I were treated the way a lot of these guys have been, I wouldn't want anything to do with the people of Battle Creek or any other place. Why don't people get off their high horses and do something for the guys instead of being against them?"

Said the newspaper editorially:

"The attitude of the many area citizens has not been what may be called positive. There have been grumblings, some justified, about the conduct of some corpsmen. What the complainers seem never to admit is that Job Corpsmen can have the same aspirations as any other young men. All of us would do well to recognize that and quit condemning Job Corpsmen simply because they're Job Corpsmen."

[From the Times-Union, Apr. 29, 1966]

Taxpayers Irate Over High Costs

(By Desmond Stone)

Cost bugs many people who are critical of the Job Corps.

Says one Fort Custer corpsman: "The college kids give us the worst time. They're paying for their education and they don't see why we should get ours for free."

The taxpayer is also troubled in many cases.

"I work hard for what I make," says a Battle Creek man. "Why should I have to pay out money for kids who should be supporting themselves?"

The cost is high.

The Office of Economic Opportunity estimates that in the period when the camps are building up to their maximum capacity, it costs about $8,100 a year to keep a youngster in a Job Corps center.

When the camps are at capacity, the annual cost is expected to be reduced to $7,765 a year.

These are higher figures than OEO originally talked about, and they have drawn down some congressional fire on Sargent Shriver, the antipoverty director.

Is it worth the cost?

Critics say no, that the youngsters could find success in the world if they worked at it.

"It mightn't be worth the cost," says a Breckenridge staff member, "if there was some alternative. But the schools can't cope with these youngsters. We think we can. We also can offer them a change from the environment that keeps reinfecting them."

A Fort Custer teacher who commutes over 100 miles a day from Grand Rapids to work at something he believes in, puts it this way:

"If we let these youngsters stay out of school, all we do is perpetuate unemployment and social ills.

"So either we spend millions on welfare and extra police protection or we take some of this money and try to salvage a few, * * * Sure, there's chaos and confusion, but we do have a purpose and we do feel the program is working."

It's still too early for the Job Corps' final test of success—the graduation of the corpsmen and their entry into the labor market.

A few have already done it, of course.

Jerry Oettle, one of the Breckenridge staff responsible for student development services, speaks with pride of one transformation.

"This boy was drunk when he arrived. His hair was down to his shoulders. He tore up the drunk tank.

"We started a gym team and he turned out to be the best. All of a sudden, he wasn't drunk any more. * * * Today he has a page boy job with CBS in Chicago.

"This was a boy I'd like to have beaten the tar out of at first. But he made it."

As yet, however, not enough corpsmen have completed their training to make any firm conclusions valid.

A paramount need in the meantime is a respite from disturbances, a little time for the camps to consolidate themselves and for the public to look again at the Job Corps.

Congressional criticism will certainly be renewed if discipline doesn't prevail.

Further uproar will also have the effect of discouraging more white youngsters from joining up.

OEO keeps no figures on the racial makeup of the corpsmen, which tends to vary from camp to camp. At Breckenridge, for example, there appear to be more whites than Negroes. At Fort Custer, it appears the other way round.

There is, however, concern in OEO that the Job Corps shouldn't become too heavily Negro.

This could be the effect of further disturbances, for the Negro, more often than the white youngster, has nowhere to go back to and will stick where the white youngster will decide against the Job Corps.

Until such time as the Job Corps can be measured by the employment of its graduates, more contact between camps and communities could change public opinion for the better.

A tour reveals that the camps are far from the jungles they're sometimes imagined to be.

At Fort Custer, corpsmen can be seen laboring for an understanding of Social Security, taking part in the volunteer firefighting, learning how to use a voting machine.

In his recreation, the corpsman can be seen learning to play again, for his childhood has usually been short.

At Breckenridge, corpsmen handle the tender shoots of young tomato plants, turn pieces of leather into wallets in the hobby shop, sing "Christ Is All" in the church.

To see the student government at work is to realize that the students, or some of them a least, are addressing themselves to their responsibilities.

Both at Fort Custer and at Breckenridge students are going out in groups to talk to some of the high schools, telling them how important school is and at the same time trying to give them a better understanding of what the Job Corps is and isn't.

At Breckenridge, an Easter egg hunt was held at the camp for nearby community children.

The dormitories are also trying to raise money for some of the men in Viet Nam.

The Job Corps is something new in the land.

It may turn out to be impossibly costly, or impossibly idealistic.

The publisher of the weekly newspaper in Morganfield, Ky., a small community close by the Breckenridge center, says it's unrealistic to bring in kids with juvenile records and expect a conversion overnight.

He also feels that the small, unarmed security force at the center is inadequate for the job, that even some of the universities have armed security guards.

"Washington's concern, I understand, is that it doesn't want to make cop-haters out of these youngsters. But that's a poor theory in my opinion," he says.

Center officials point out that the Job Corps holds to the belief that man is fundamentally good and decent and trustworthy, if he's only given a chance.

"You give us 100 percent (in effort and trust)," they say to the corpsmen, "and we'll give you 200 percent back."

The centers are trying to hold a delicate balance. They want to give responsibility to the students to work out their own rules (for compulsion can only be carried so far with volunteers), and yet they have to maintain discipline for the good of the camp and the community.

Can the youngsters justify the faith that's put in them?

Can they return to their old environment with enough new values to survive?

Can the habits of 17 or 18 years be changed in one year?

Will employers give them jobs, and will the Corpsmen be able to hold them?

On all these points, the center staffs are unshakably optimistic.

The public, however, needs the evidence that only time can supply.

No one really knows how long the Job Corps may exist, for it's dependent on year-to-year funding.

But the hunch at Breckenridge and Fort Custer is that it'll be around as long as it's needed.

"And that," says one administrator, "may be 10 to 15 years. It may take that long for the public school system to adapt itself to the changes we're trying to make in education."

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1117, H.R. 14215, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the rule of germaneness, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SMALL TAX COURT FOR THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference, which I believe is a very important piece of legislation, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 10 days for further cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for 10 days as requested.

The bill (S. 3344) to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest that this is a very important bill. It would establish what we have termed—we sponsors—a Small Tax Court.

"April is the cruelest month," said the poet, and for millions of taxpayers, truer words were never spoken. April is the month when Uncle Sam bites and, for far too many Americans, his bite is worse than his bark.

The first 9 pages of the Internal Revenue Code define income; the remaining 1,100 pages spin the web of exceptions and preferences. The average taxpayer rarely gets beyond the 9 pages. Americans, more than any other people in the world pay their taxes. They make no speeches about it, but they pay their taxes. Many Americans pay more than their share of taxes.

For the fortunate few, April is just another month. The business tycoon has little to fear from the April 15 deadline, except to wring out of every conceivable deduction and exemption the last drop of tax-free income. If he squeezes too tightly, then his accountant and lawyer do battle for him with the Internal Revenue Service—if necessary, the courts—and most likely with success in negotiating a "reasonable settlement."

I am told that more than 85 percent of the cases brought before the Tax Court are settled by the IRS attorneys, rather than adjudicated by the Court. So successful are the lawyers and accountants that less than half of the total personal income in the United States is subjected to the Federal income tax.

But the little fellow finds himself pouring over the miserably complicated tax forms late into the night of April 15. In desperation, he drags himself off to the central post office—the one that stays open until midnight. He drops his return in the slot and goes home to wait.

Soon the intricate process of checking his return begins; first, in the Collection Division of the District Director's Office and, then, in the Audit Division. At any time within 3 years from the date the return was filed, the taxpayer may be summoned to account.

Clutching a bundle of odd receipts, canceled checks and a couple of penciled lists, the taxpayer plods timidly in to do battle with the tax agent. Bureaucrats make him nervous. He recalls vague stories about criminal tax prosecutions.

The agent is armed with a deadly weapon—the Tax Code—a document so complicated that Einstein confessed he had to seek the advice of a tax consultant in figuring out his own rate. "This is too difficult for a mathematician," said Einstein, "it takes a philosopher."

Even the former Internal Revenue Commissioner, Mortimer Caplin, conceded that "Our tax laws have become unbelievably complex; they are riddled with exceptions and preferences"—complexities with which the revenue agent can baffle the taxpayer and intimidate him.

The taxpayer's first, and usually last, impulse is to quit—throw in the towel, pay the deficiency no matter how unjust he believes it is, rather than face bureaucracy or bear the burdens of a court fight. He knows the odds are such that by the time he wins, if he wins, the tax savings will be devoured by attorneys and accountant fees.

My office receives many moving appeals of honest taxpayers as I am sure other Senators do. Good faith errors in judgment can many times become nightmares.

A widow woman from Bellingham, Wash., sold her home shortly after the death of her husband. She sought aid from the local Internal Revenue Service in computing her tax. Together with the revenue agent, she filled out her return and paid her tax. As it turned out, she paid $775 more than she should have paid, but, when she finally discovered the overpayment, the Service refused to rectify the mistake which its own agent had caused. After years of fruitless dispute, I introduced a private bill to restore the overpayment to her. To this just bill, the Treasury objected on two grounds: First, that the taxpayer had failed to discover the error until the statute had run and, second, that tax agents, while offering their services to assist taxpayers, could not be expected to understand all the complexities of the tax laws, so that the Treasury could assume no responsibility for its agents' errors.

Mr. President, if Einstein and the agents of the Internal Revenue Service cannot understand the Tax Code, then the ordinary taxpayers of the United States are entitled to a little help.

The legislation which Senator LONG of Missouri and I are introducing today could give them such help. We propose it on a modest scale to begin with. It would create for the very first time a "Small Tax Division" within the Tax Court of the United States. The bill would authorize the Tax Court to appoint 20 small tax commissioners—2 for each tax circuit. Any taxpayer who is assessed a deficiency less than $2,500 could go before a small tax commissioner for himself, without a lawyer or an accountant, and be assured that his case will get a fair and sympathetic hearing from a commissioner who is independent of the Internal Revenue bureaucracy. In fact, our bill provides that—

> No person who has served as an officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service shall be eligible for appointment as a commissioner until 5 years after he has ceased to be such an officer or employee.

Once a taxpayer makes his decision to go before the Commissioner, the Commissioner's decision will ordinarily be final. The Government may petition the Tax Court for review only if it pays the taxpayer's court costs and legal fees. The taxpayer, of course, retains the option which he now has of paying the deficiency and suing for a refund in the

Federal court or of petitioning the judges of the Tax Court for relief.

Mr. President, the more complex and impersonal Government gets, the more important it is that our citizens have just and speedy relief from its excesses.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a memorandum describing tax audit and deficiency procedures be printed at the close of my remarks, together with two very interesting letters which I received just this morning.

There being no objection, the bill, memorandum, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3344

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter C of chapter 76 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the Tax Court) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IV—SMALL TAX DIVISION

"Sec. 7476. Small Tax Division.
"Sec. 7477. Procedure; commissioners.
"Sec. 7478. Decisions of Small Tax Division.

"SEC. 7476. SMALL TAX DIVISION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby established, within the Tax Court, a Small Tax Division (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Division'). The chief judge of the Tax Court shall from time to time assign one or more judges of the Tax Court to the Division and shall designate a chief judge of the Division.

"(b) JURISDICTION.—

"(1) DEFICIENCIES.—Any taxpayer to whom is sent a notice of deficiency in respect of any tax imposed by this title may, if the amount of such deficiency (not including interest) does not exceed $2,500, file a petition with the Division for a redetermination of the deficiency. Any such petition shall be filed within the time prescribed by this title for filing a petition for the redetermination of a deficiency by the Tax Court. The Division shall have jurisdiction to determine the correct amount of the deficiency to the same extent as in the case of petitions filed with ciency (not including interest) in excess of the Tax Court, except that the Division shall not have jurisdiction to determine a defi- $2,500.

"(2) REFUNDS.—Any taxpayer who has filed a claim for refund of any tax imposed by this title with the Secretary or his delegate and whose claim has been disallowed (or disallowed in part) may, if the amount of such claim (not including interest) does not exceed $2,500, file a petition with the Division for the allowance of such claim (or for the part of the claim disallowed by the Secretary or his delegate). Any such claim shall be filed with the Division within the time prescribed by law for commencing a suit for recovery of such tax. The Division shall have jurisdiction to allow, in whole or in part, the amount of such claim, except that the Division shall not have jurisdiction to allow any refund of any tax (not including interest) in excess of $2,500.

"SEC. 7477. PROCEDURE; COMMISSIONERS.

"(a) RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE.—The proceedings of the Division shall be conducted in accordance with such rules of practice and procedure as the Tax Court may prescribe. The provisions of part II of this subchapter shall apply with respect to proceedings of the Division only to the extent provided in such rules. Nothing in such rules shall preclude a taxpayer from representing himself in proceedings before the Division.

"(b) COMMISSIONERS.—

"(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Tax Court is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, such number of commissioners, not exceeding 20, as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Division. Each such commissioner shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for commissioners of the Court of Claims, and shall be subject to removal by the Tax Court. No person who has served as an officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service shall be eligible for appointment as a commissioner until 5 years after he has ceased to be such an officer or employee.

"(3) DUTIES.—Under the supervision of the chief judge of the Division, the commissioners shall conduct all proceedings before the Division, and shall perform such other duties as the Tax Court may from time to time direct. The commissioner who conducts the proceedings on a petition filed with the Division shall render a decision thereon which shall be reviewed by a judge of the Division and which shall be final unless reversed or modified by the reviewing judge.

"SEC. 7478. DECISIONS OF SMALL TAX DIVISION.

"(a) FINALITY OF DECISIONS.—There shall be no review of, or appeal from, any decision of the Division.

"(b) TREATMENT AS DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OR HIS DELEGATE.—A final decision of the Division shall be treated as a final decision of the Secretary or his delegate for purposes of the provisions of this title and all other laws of the United States, including (but not limited to) the provisions relating to—

"(1) redetermination of deficiencies by the Tax Court,

"(2) suits for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally collected, and

"(3) suits for recovery of taxes erroneously refunded.

"(c) FURTHER PROCEEDINGS BY THE UNITED STATES.—In any case in which—

"(1) the Division has determined the amount of any deficiency to be less than the amount determined by the Secretary or his delegate, and

"(2) the Secretary or his delegate certifies to the Tax Court that the decision of the Division involves a substantial question relating to the validity or meaning of a provision of this title or of the regulations prescribed thereunder,

the Secretary or his delegate may file a petition with the Tax Court for a redetermination of such deficiency. The Tax Court shall have jurisdiction to redetermine the amount of such deficiency to the same extent and in the same manner as if such petition had been filed by the taxpayer. In any proceeding commenced by the Secretary or his delegate under this subsection and in any proceeding commenced in any court for recovery of any amount allowed as a refund by the Division, the United States shall be liable for all court costs and shall pay a reasonable fee to the person or persons representing the taxpayer in such proceeding."

(b) The table of parts for subchapter C of chapter 76 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"PART IV. SMALL TAX DIVISION."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the provisions of secion 7476(a), 7477 (a), and 7477(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by this Act) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The memorandum presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

MEMORANDUM: TAX AUDIT & DEFICIENCY COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The initial inspection of Federal tax returns is made in the Collection Division of the District Director's office. Here, the returns are checked for mathematical accuracy, as well as execution, form, and completeness. If a mathematical error is discovered which caused an understatement of tax, regardless of the amount, the District Director will send the taxpayer corrected computations and ask for full payment of the amount due. The amount of the understatement does not qualify as a deficiency which requires the formal statutory notice affording the taxpayer 90 days within which to petition the Tax Court of the United States to consider the matter. As a result, there is no right of appeal and no restrictions on the Government's right to collect at this stage.

If the mathematical error discovered results in an overpayment of tax of less than $100,000, the District Director is authorized to refund the excess. The District Director has no authority to refund overpayments in excess of $100,000; he will instead forward the return for action in Washington.

The function of examining all returns is performed by the Audit Division of the District Director's office. The preliminary checking of the returns for the purpose of selecting those which appear to require a more thorough examination is likewise concentrated in the Audit Division. Many of the audits that result are either "correspondence audits" carried on entirely by letter or "office audits" in which the taxpayer appears at a local district office with the records and information requested. The remaining audits are "field audits" in which the examining agent checks the taxpayer's books and records at his home or place of business. There is no way of predicting how soon—or long—after a return is filed it is likely to come up for audit. Generally speaking, the Government has 3 years from the time the return was filed within which to assess additional taxes.

If an agreement is reached with the agent during the course of the audit, the taxpayer signs a Form 870, "Waiver of Restrictions on Assessment and Collection of Deficiency in Tax and Acceptance of Proposed Overassessment." If agreement cannot be reached with the agent, there is available to the taxpayer a series of levels at which he can have his case reviewed. After audit, the taxpayer will then receive a brief notice advising him of his right to request an "informal conference" in the District Director's office with the group chief or conference coordinator, which conference usually ensues within 10 days following his receipt of the notice.

The agent who made the original audit is supposed to be present at the conference. If agreement can be reached at the informal conference level, a Form 870 is prepared and signed. If agreement cannot be reached, the Internal Revenue Service will mail to the taxpayer notice of a proposed deficiency assessment, to which proposal he then has 30 days to file a formal protest.

If the taxpayer files a protest, his case is transferred to the Appellate Division of the regional staff, which will afford him an independent review of the issue. The regional staff members are usually accountants and sometimes lawyers. If there exists a national office position contrary to the taxpayer's position, a regional appellate staff member would not be able to decide the case in favor of the taxpayer even if he thought the national office position incorrect.

If the regional appellate staff has decided against the taxpayer, or if the taxpayer has waived his right of review by the regional appellate staff and has not filed a Form 870, the Internal Revenue Service will issue a statutory notice of deficiency. Settlement conferences continue after cases have been docketed, with the Government generally represented by both the Appellate conferee and the attorney assigned to the case for trial purposes.

Unless the taxpayer files a petition with the Tax Court of the United States within 90 days after receiving a statutory notice, the asserted deficiency will be assessed, and the payment must be made upon notice and demand, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent from the date on which the return was due. Trial in the Tax Court is de novo.

If a taxpayer pays his tax with his return or in response to a proposed deficiency, he may file a refund claim. A refund claim is audited and reviewed within the Internal Revenue Service much as in the case of a deficiency. But assuming the claim is denied, recourse is not to the Tax Court but rather to the U.S. Court of Claims or to a U.S. District Court; trial is de novo in either case.

MORENCI, MICH.,
May 9, 1966.

U.S. Senators EDWARD V. LONG and WARREN G. MAGNUSON

GENTLEMEN: This is the first sensible suggestion to help the little taxpayer—Magnuson-Long bill to authorize appointment of 20 small tax commissioners to hear appeals against income tax deficiency assessments of less than $2,500.

In 1965 we were forced to pay $46.95 on our 1964 income tax return. We used 12 cents per mile for business mileage and the tax office in Jackson Mich., where they audited our records said only 10 cents was allowed for 1964. We later found out that the top in 1964 was 15 cents per mile, not 10 cents. But as you say, we threw in the towel—paid the $46.95.

We are small, small business—net of $3,000 per year on our business. I know of a lot of little taxpayers that were called in and did the same thing we did—pay and get it over with.

Yet, many millionaires pay less income tax than the little fellow. I'm not the only one fed up with hearing how little the big ones pay and then look at what we pay in income tax. Most little taxpayers will say "what's the use of writing to your Senators or Congressmen—the little guy will always be on the small end and do the most paying."

At least, I'm taking the time and effort to commend you two Senators for thinking about the little taxpayer. If there is anything I can do, write to other Senators, etc., I sure would be glad to take the time to do it. Here's hoping you get your bill passed before this year is ended. The whole tax bill needs overhauling to make it more simple, and with less deductions for the big income people to use. The little guy pays tax on Bank Savings Interest, but the big fellow gets a deduction on income received from stock investments. Is this equality?

Very truly yours,
ALICE SUTHERLAND.

WINSTON HIBBERT,
Brooklyn, N.Y., May 11, 1966.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have observed in the New York News that you have proposed to Congress the establishment of a "small tax division" in the U.S. Tax Court. I want you to know that I am all for it.

As a member of the Bar whose tax practice is mostly limited to serving the "little people," it has been my observation that all too frequently these people lose out in their encounter with the Internal Revenue Service simply because they have not the means to press their rights against the governmental colossus. The insistence that these people have records to prove their claims for each item of deduction they take on their tax return is all too stringent.

More often than not, these people actually spend the money they claim they spend which is a legitimate tax deduction. However, because they have no documentary proof, they are peremptorily denied the deduction and assessed extra tax which very often become a burden upon them over a long period.

Your proposal will open up to them an avenue of redress which at present is nonexistent to them. It should be borne in mind that the "little people," some of them, in fact most of them are illiterate and to expect them to have records of their expenses is inflicting upon them a requirement that is well nigh impossible for them to meet. Even I, an attorney, find it difficult to keep up with my personal record; what with medical bills, dental bills and so on, how often does one get a receipt from the doctor. In my experience, I find these people are fair and honest in compiling their tax returns. I believe they should be given the benefit of the doubt except in instances where it is palpable plain thay are perpetrating a fraud upon the government.

Press for action on your proposal. You are on the right tract Mr. Senator.

Very truly yours,
WINSTON HIBBERT.

THE TAX OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, there are those who say I have been unduly harsh on the poor Internal Revenue Service. We all know that it is the duty of every American citizen to pay his taxes. In fact, I am often reminded of the old saying that the only things certain are death and taxes.

Of course, I do not quarrel with those who say we have an obligation to pay our taxes. But to this, I add one proviso: we must only pay those taxes which are properly due and owing. Recently, I read where more than 3 million income tax returns—a little over 5 percent of the total filed in fiscal 1965—were subjected to audit or examination by agents of the IRS. Deficiencies were found in 51 percent of these cases; refunds were paid by the Government in 14 percent. No change was made in 35 percent of the cases.

The most striking figure, however, was that the average deficiency was just below $700, and the average refund just above $100. Now I thought about these averages, Mr. President, in light of some of the cases which were heard by the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. Often, a taxpayer must spend much valuable time, money, and effort compiling the necessary documents for presentation at the IRS conference. More often than not, a lawyer should be present to protect not only the constitutional rights of the taxpayer, but to explain the many and vast complexities in our tax laws.

But lawyers cost money, and since we are speaking of only a few hundred dollars, the net result is that in either case—whether a refund is owed or there is a deficiency—the taxpayer cannot afford to hire accountants or lawyers in the average tax case. One author, writing in the May 5, 1966, issue of the Reporter, suggests that taxpayers are thus subjected to a form of "legalized extortion."

Mr. President, I have been most interested in the concept of ombudsman, the man who fights city hall. The bill which Senator MAGNUSON and I have today introduced would create such an ombudsman, in the form of regional small tax commissioners. Taxpayers who have been assessed a deficiency less than $2,500, or who claim a refund of less than $2,500 may go to the small tax commissioner for relief.

There are two features in the bill which are most significant. First, the taxpayer need not be represented by a lawyer when he appears before the tax commissioner. It is expected that the small tax commissioner will give the taxpayer a fair and understanding hearing, and will guide the taxpayer through the many mazes of the complex tax laws. To assure this fair hearing, we have incorporated the second feature into the bill. No person who has served in the Internal Revenue Service shall be eligible for appointment as a commissioner until 5 years after he has left the service. Presumably, after the 5 years have elapsed, a former IRS agent will have mellowed in his zeal to collect the last tax dollar possibly due.

Mr. President, I have great hopes for this small tax commissioner if our bill is enacted. Our taxpayers need some form of ombudsman to fight the proverbial city hall, and perhaps the new commissioners will assume that role.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the record, an article which appeared in the Reporter, May 5, 1966, entitled "The Tax-Appeal Ordeal," written by William R. Frye.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAX-APPEAL ORDEAL

(By William R. Frye)

Pity the poor taxpayer. He assembles his records, studies the instructions, wrestles with the forms, pays his tax—and then sits back to await doomsday. Doomsday, for him, is the day Form 3R73 arrives with this message: "Your above-described tax return or document for the year indicated has been assigned to the above-named Agent for examination. Please communicate with the Agent."

The possibility of being audited is the third dimension of the income-tax nightmare. Substantiating that office at home, finding that Washington hotel bill, proving that lunch was a business entertainment—these could be more difficult than making out the return itself. They could even be impossible.

Some 66 million personal income-tax returns were filed in fiscal 1965; 3,092,000—1 in 20, or just over 5 percent—were examined, as the Internal Revenue Service puts it. Deficiencies, or taxes due, were found in 51 percent of the cases, producing $1,063 million in additional revenue; refunds were paid by the government 14 percent of the time, for a total of $47,052,000. No change was made in 35 percent of the returns. The average deficiency was just below $700; the average refund just above $100. Aside from gamblers and other special cases, only 1,216 of those who were examined (or .04 percent) were prosecuted for fraud.

How many of the more than 1.5 million taxpayers who were made to pay additional tax really had short-changed the government, accidentally or intentionally? How many ran afoul of an IRS overeager to maximize collections? The IRS feels sure it was practically always right (an understandable view) but many taxpayers are by no means sure.

I know how they feel. I have just been through the mill. Mine was one of the relatively rare cases—1 in 7—where the taxpayer is found to have overpaid his tax. The return had been prepared for me while I was abroad and contained several major errors in the government's favor. I was due for a refund.

It was, nevertheless, a miserable experience. Day after day after exhausting day was taken up in minutely detailed, repetitive nit-picking. Accountants whom I told about the case said that they had never known an audit to be so detailed and prolonged. At the end of each session, I was assigned to prepare further data for the next visit—a task requiring long days and longer nights, sometimes running into weeks. (Everything involved had happened three years before.) My professional life was intermittently disrupted for more than 7 months. The lost time was worth conservatively $4,000 to $5,000—and since I was self-employed, I had no way to cushion the loss. Moreover, legal and other fees ate up much of the refund.

The only comic relief was that each time I was ordered to dive deeper into the records, I came up with a new accounting error in the Government's favor, and hence a larger potential refund. This was not what the agent had in mind. "How am I going to justify my time?" he asked. Finally, as a consequence of another of his probes, I discovered a $1,500 reimbursement that had been reported both as income and as a credit against expense. Whether by coincidence or not, the roof promptly fell in.

My agent (or his supervisor) reopened the whole audit and disallowed deductions that previously had been fully substantiated. The law had not changed; the facts had not changed; nothing had, except that someone seemed to have decided that letting a taxpayer get back that much money would not look good at all on the report of such a prolonged audit.

I could appeal the ruling, first to a "conferee"—a higher official of the IRS—and then, if necessary, to a still higher one. I could even go to tax court. But in the process, the additional time lost and the new legal fees incurred could more than wipe out any tax recovered. It seemed I would have to take the licking; either way, I would lose. After considerable additional dispute, the agent reconsidered and an appeal became unnecessary. But in my bitterer moments, I felt my government had subjected me to a form of legalized extortion.

THE HIGH COST OF APPEALS

A spot check of accounting firms in the New York area suggests that thousands of taxpayers every year may have similar unpleasant experiences. Similar, that is, not in the denial of refunds that are due but in the levying of additional taxes which they consider unjustified but which they cannot recover economically through the normal appeal process. By comparison with the total number of returns filed, the number of these taxpayers may be small, but to the people concerned it is a serious matter.

Mr. S., a partner in a New York accounting firm that specializes in tax work (because of his continuing dealings with the IRS, he insisted on remaining anonymous), said he used to fight, on behalf of his clients, as many as fifty appeals at a time. But in virtually every case, once the appeal was over the client was so angry at the size of the accounting bill that, whatever the results of the appeal, Mr. S would lose the account. So he made it a firm rule never to handle appeals. He now negotiates with the IRS agent as stoutly as possible the first time around, and then proposes to the client that he accept the outcome, favorable or otherwise. If the taxpayer wants to appeal, some other firm must take the case. His relationship to the client is then finished, either way.

The effect of this policy is that in cases where Mr. S's advice is accepted, the government has been allowed virtually to dictate its terms to the taxpayer on the issues in dispute. If Mr. S is right, many if not most appeals are too expensive to be practical. Other accountants are not quite so sweeping; but they say that unless at least $1,500 to $2,000 in tax is involved, the taxpayer can scarcely expect to break even from an appeal to conference even if he wins. Unless he feels qualified to handle it on his own, he must pay an accountant $50 to $200 a day, not merely during the conference itself but throughout a period of preparation. And the taxpayer's own time is also a factor. Still higher appeals, beyond the conference stage, are not considered economical unless something in the neighborhood of $10,000 in taxes is involved. The IRS does not release figures on how many cases went to conference; but in 1965, 21,737 disputes (less than 1 percent of the total) were handled at the appellate level, the next stage, and only 5,448 (roughly one quarter of 1 percent) were disposed of by the tax courts. The money in question, however, was in the hundreds of millions.

The man who decides to do without costly help is, in effect, throwing himself on the mercy of the IRS. Mr. C, a partner in a Connecticut consulting firm, was on the road five days a week, year round, returning home only for weekends. He naturally had a large travel and entertainment deduction. When the return was selected for audit, he could not take time off to attend personally; his "billing rate" (the rate at which clients were charged for his services) was $250 a day, and he was fully booked. So he sent his wife to the tax auditor, armed with canceled checks and credit-card bills. The auditor contended there was no proof the travel was not personal, and disallowed the whole amount. The wife did not know how to protest persuasively. So the whole year's travel was lost.

This couple could have hired professional help, but did not. Many others cannot afford to. Few men making less than $15,000 a year care to pay $15 to $50 an hour for an accountant, let alone $25 to $100 an hour for a lawyer. A return showing a $4,000 income is not as likely to be examined as one showing $400,000, but it can happen. The test, the IRS says, is not the size of the income but whether there is anything unusual about the return, anything that causes raised eyebrows. If the ax falls, the little men have no choice but to fend for themselves.

Experiences vary. If the agent is conscientious and high-principled, as is sometimes the case, they get a fair deal. If he is casehardened, callous, or young and eager to impress his superiors, taxpayers may come off badly indeed. Discouragement, dismay, fear, and ignorance all may serve to keep them from making use of the appeals machinery.

Something obviously is amiss. The IRS insists that serious injustices are very isolated cases. Agents, it is said, operate under strict instructions to collect the tax due and only the tax due. Each year, just before the Ides of April, the Bureau engages in a national advertising campaign to convince the American people of its virtue. Nice, reasonable men say soothing and high-minded things on television and radio, encouraging people to pay up and assuring them that the IRS will deal with them as gently as possible.

Somewhere between theory and practice, however, the benevolent-father image breaks down. No doubt the complexity of the tax law is in part at fault; reasonable men can and do interpret the law in differing ways. No doubt many taxpayers who believe they have a grievance have in fact been fairly treated. But the absence of a readily available appeals system creates serious doubts.

Moreover, even if the government were right fifty times for every time it does an injustice, the 3,092,000 audits that took place in fiscal 1965 would have resulted in more than 60,000 injustices. And there may have been another half million taxpayers who came out of their experiences with the IRS believing themselves wronged, though in fact they were not. Some of them undoubtedly resolved to get the lost money back the next time they filed a return. The government thus had made dishonest taxpayers out of honest ones. Another protection of the appeals system—the easing of legitimate doubts—was therefore not fully operative.

THE AGENTS

To far too great an extent, taxpayers are forced to rely on the objectivity and competence of one man. Deny it as the IRS may, most agents find that there is a premium on getting tough with the taxpayer, on producing results for their superiors in terms of cash on the barrelhead. In private, they admit it is so. The old quota system, under which each agent had to extract a given amount in a given time, is now officially banned. But agents acknowledge that they believe their standing with their superiors and their prospects for promotion depend in part on the money they collect for the government. They must account strictly for their time, and if it is not spent productively, they fear it may be a black mark on their record. If they are inexperienced or insecure, they may be afraid to give the taxpayer the benefit of a reasonable doubt, lest they be set down as naive or even corrupt.

IRS employees are not highly paid. Salaries start at $5,181 for trainee technicians and go up to $11,715 for experienced field agents. Supervisors get $10,000 to $13,000. Opportunities being more lucrative in private accounting practice, the government cannot always get and keep high-quality personnel. Moreover, the man making $6,000 cannot always readily believe the expenses reported by the man making $60,000, because they are too far removed from his own experience. How could a man really spend $20 for lunch or $7,000 for a boat just to entertain customers? Such figures just don't make sense to him.

One accountant says that when he runs into this kind of incredulity, he asks that the item be put aside temporarily, and then, come lunchtime, takes the agent to a nearby hotel dining room. He buys him a martini, a lobster cocktail, and a steak. When the bill is presented, the accountant inquires and "discovers" what he knew in advance—that the hotel does not honor credit cards, that the meal must be paid for in cash. He hands over a $20 bill, and the agent sees there is little or no change. A lunch can cost $10 a person, he has learned, and it may not always be easy to obtain a written record of the expense. When the agent returns to the audit, he has had an education in business expenditures.

In addition to collecting revenue and deterring cheating, the audit system is supposed to have the function of boosting the morale of the honest taxpayer. He needs to be assured that he will not, relatively speaking, be penalized for his honesty. One of the gnawing resentments of April 15 is the feeling that Joe Twerp has been getting away with murder. The majority of taxpayers, though they wail, are willing to pay what they owe (or most of it) provided everybody else does, too. But that is the rub. Many taxpayers who have been audited are not persuaded that the law has been applied fairly to them. The IRS is the only branch of government in which the basic assumption of Anglo-American jurisprudence—that a man is innocent until proved guilty—does not fully apply. By law, a deduction is subject to disallowance until it is proved allowable.

To some extent, this attitude is understandable. Some taxpayers ask agents to believe pretty farfetched stories. A man who had canceled checks showing $90 in contributions to his church claimed he had also given $1,000 in cash. A man who kept receipted bills for entertainment expense down to $2 and $3 claimed he also spent $4,000 without getting receipts. It could be true, but the agent can be forgiven for being skeptical.

Sometimes the taxpayer's records may be accurate, but he is unable to prove it; or perhaps he does not have complete records and has had to estimate. This is no longer permissible in all cases. The old "Cohan rule" of reasonability—that an entertainment expense was allowable if it was reasonable under the circumstances—has been replaced by a requirement that every item over $25 must be substantiated by a receipted bill. These new travel and expenses regulations, which went into force on December 31, 1962, have not yet been tested in the courts, but they are being strictly applied.

The taxpayer may approach the audit in a difficult frame of mind. Some panic, and prepare for disaster. Others become belligerent and self-righteous, ready to take on the Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court as well as the IRS. Still others try desperately to pull political strings, an effort that is usually highly counterproductive.

When the examination occurs, it sometimes is almost anticlimactic. The taxpayer finds he is not being summoned to court for commission of a crime; he may arrange the appointment at a convenient time. He need not go to the IRS with his papers and other records stuffed into a suitcase or a trunk. If the data involved are voluminous, the agent is willing to come to him. The agent is authorized to take into account evidence of a taxpayer's good faith, and need not check every minute detail—though some do. He has instructions to be courteous and fair.

ROUGH SAILING

If the agent is indeed reasonable and the taxpayer well prepared, the audit can be over in a few hours—a day at most. If the return is complicated, the records incomplete, and/or the agent difficult, it can drag on and on. It is then that it becomes an affliction. If in addition to being difficult, the agent misapplies the law, then the taxpayer really needs a friend.

A man who used a 23-foot sailboat for entertaining business contacts deducted half the expenses on his return. He was audited, and the agent, a man in his twenties, expressed much concern about the deduction. He inquired in detail about personal use of the boat, and was shown records in a diary indicating that such use occurred less than half of the time. He asked for, and obtained, corroborative evidence that business discussions had taken place on board. He studied a record of who went sailing, and saw proof that the entertainment had led to production of income. Nevertheless, he disallowed the deduction.

Lots of people have boats on Long Island Sound, he said, and in most cases they are strictly for personal use. The taxpayer's boat must also have been largely personal. It was too expensive to have been bought primarily for business. Did the taxpayer's wife go along on the trips? She did? Then it obviously was personal. The taxpayer argued that the presence or absence of a business discussion was the test, not the presence or absence of a spouse. The agent pulled out a copy of the Internal Revenue Service regulations (a large volume) and quoted from regulation 1.274-2(e)(4)(b): "Any use of [an entertainment] facility (of a type described in this subdivision) during one calendar day shall be considered to constitute a 'day of business use' if the primary use of the facility on such day was ordinary and necessary within the meaning of section 162 or 212 and the regulations thereunder.

"For the purposes of this subdivision, a facility shall be deemed to have been primarily used for such purposes on any one calendar day if the facility was used for the conduct of a substantial and bona fide business discussion (as described in paragraph (d)(3)(i) of this section) notwithstanding that the facility may also have been used on the same day for personal or family use by the taxpayer or any member of the taxpayer's family not involving entertainment of others by, or under the authority of the taxpayer."

The agent repeatedly quoted the phrase "not involving the entertainment of others." Relating it to the earlier part of the paragraph, rather than the portion in which it occurred, he said it meant that if others were present at the time the business entertainment took place, the facility at that time was not being used for business purposes.

The fact that this interpretation was directly at variance with other regulations did not disturb him. No amount of argument could shake him from this extraordinary distortion of logic, of the law, and of the English language. It developed that the agent's personal philosophy was that all entertainment was a form of bribery; that business shoud be obtained strictly on its merits, so that the IRS really ought to disallow all entertainment expense.

It seemed that the taxpayer had no option but to bow or go to the prohibitive expense of an appeal. Then, when he was just about at the end of his tether, the agent suddenly reconsidered and allowed the expense.

THE OMBUDSMAN IDEA

The appeal procedure, spokesmen for the commissioner say, is really not very difficult or expensive. They claim that the district conference, the first step, is just an informal discussion, with a friendly, experienced official—the father image again—who does not represent either the government or the taxpayer but is seeking pure and objective justice. The taxpayer doesn't need professional advice, they contend; he is in good hands. All this, however, is somehow at variance with the experience of most taxpayers who go "to conference." They regard it as a highly formal, even quasi-judicial proceeding, requiring extensive preparation, including legal briefs and affidavits; and they have little inclination to accept at face value the conferee's detachment and objectivity. He is, after all, an employee of the IRS.

Recently there have been some proposals for the creation of tax review boards, consisting of one or more experienced, well-paid specialists, to protect taxpayers from questionable rulings by the IRS. There is a kind of precedent in the Ombudsman system in force in Scandinavian countries and in New Zealand. The Ombudsman, a widely respected individual of national stature, is appointed by Parliament to guard against infringement of established rights. Any individual or group may petition him for relief, and he has extensive power to provide it. He may be removed by Parliament but is otherwise wholly independent. In the United States, Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, have proposed a not dissimilar plan for "administrative counsel," an employee of Congress who would investigate and seek to correct citizens' grievances, whether against the IRS or any other branch of government, when asked to do so by a Senator or a Representative. The bill was referred to the Rules Committee in February, 1965, and little has been heard from it since.

More recently, Senators WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and EDWARD LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, have mapped out a plan for a nationwide system of small-claims tax commissioners, under the aegis of the tax courts, to whom citizens could bring disputes with the IRS without the expense and formality of court procedure. Two commissioners would be appointed for each of the eleven regions into which the IRS has divided the United States. People who could not afford to hire legal help would be entitled to go to the commissioner, just as they now can go to small-claims court with other kinds of legal disputes involving amounts up to a few hundred dollars.

Commissioners or boards of this type are urgently needed. They should exist primarily to protect taxpayers' rights. The IRS could be forbidden to appeal their decisions if the taxpayer, for his part, also agreed in advance to accept the decision as binding. What would result would be analogous to binding arbitration.

No doubt there would be snags to be ironed out in practice. Safeguards might be needed against frivolous use of the boards. A taxpayer who appealed to them against the decisions of an agent and had his obligations to the Government affirmed, or even increased, might have to assume the costs of the action—the costs, however, being scaled in proportion to his income, so that the poor could afford the risk as easily as the rich.

If the taxpayer's obligations were reduced by the board, the government ought to be assessed for costs, a procedure calculated to inhibit arbitrary and ill-founded IRS rulings in the first instance. With such revenue the boards could be largely self-supporting, and they would greatly ease the case load under which many tax courts are staggering. (At the end of fiscal 1965, 10,765 cases were pending, about a 2-year backlog.)

The possibility of a simple and inexpensive appeal from a tax audit would do much to restore public confidence. Taxpayers who lost would be more likely to swallow the judgment with good grace, less haunted by the suspicion of injustice, less determined to get their money back. The effect on the attitudes and behavior of agents might also be healthy. They would be under pressure to be right, as opposed to pressure to be tough. If they were proved wrong, the government would have to pay costs. To a far greater extent than at present, prestige and advancement within the IRS would logically derive from being infrequently overruled. The balance of bargaining power between taxpayer and agent during the initial audit would be restored.

What are involved are some of the textbook precepts of American democracy—that the government is a government of laws, not of men; that no citizen is ever at the mercy of an official; that if an official exceeds his authority, there must be effective remedies available. This is the way the tax system is supposed to operate today, but a sizable number of American taxpayers doubt it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the article by Mr. William R. Frye will indicate what we are talking about in this bill. I suppose I could have found literally hundreds of cases similar to the ones I suggested which took place in Bellingham. I know that if I went through my files accumulated over the years, there would be literally hundreds of such cases there. This is true of every Senator.

This proposed legislation provides an opportunity for the small taxpayer to be heard. I do not think it will deplete any money which might otherwise go into the Treasury. These amounts represent only a small part of the revenue receipts of the country. But the main thing is to relieve the harassing of the small taxpayer who does not know where to go or what to do.

He surely has a right because the American people are probably the most responsible people in the world in paying their just taxes. No other country has a record of tax collections as does the United States.

But we do want the taxes to be just and we do want to provide an opportunity for the little fellow to come in and set forth his case before someone who would be more appropriate than the agency which is trying to collect the tax.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for his excellent statement, and I join him in sponsoring this important piece of legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may be recognized for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, the Internal Revenue Service was created to collect taxes, and this it does and well.

Our tax laws and regulations are a maze through which only the tax lawyers, accountants, and the IRS can find their way. The ordinary citizen is lost. Yet this ordinary citizen files the vast bulk of the income tax returns the IRS receives each year.

In preparing his return, this citizen is often at the mercy of the IRS for advice, the same IRS responsible for collecting as much in the way of taxes that it can.

The total amount of tax this citizen will have to pay would usually be less than $1,500 or $2,000. If there is a dispute over how much is owed, it is usually not too large—a few hundred dollars at the most—sometimes only $25 or $50, but still a significant amount to the small taxpayer.

If there is a dispute and his return is audited, it is the IRS who decides what deductions and credits to allow. If the taxpayer decides to appeal the result of his audit, he again appeals to the IRS—this time to a regional commissioner.

If his appeal fails, he has the option of taking his case to the U.S. Tax Court, where he reaches the first impartial arbiter in the whole process.

But when $25 or $50 is at stake—or even $150, it does not pay to appeal an audit decision. Tax lawyers say that at least $200 has to be involved before the taxpayer can gain anything even if his appeal is successful. His cost for a lawyer and probably an accountant, will be too great. For the same reason, unless $1,500 or $2,000 is involved, it does not pay to take the case on to the tax court.

So, we are left with the average taxpayer at the mercy of the IRS, which, no matter how much it maintains that it does its work carefully, still has a vested interest in the outcome of each case.

The legislation introduced here today, as the Senator from Washington explained, would allow the small taxpayer to go before an impartial arbiter, at a much lower level. Besides allowing an impartial decision on these small cases, creation of this small Tax Division of the Tax Court would instill in the IRS the desire to win its argument before one of the new Commissioners. This would provide a much-needed check within the IRS.

Mr. President, it is high time we gave a break to the average taxpayer who can not afford to duel with the Internal Revenue Service.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for having introduced the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for his interesting suggestion.

I have one or two thoughts in regard to the suggestion of the Senator. There is great discussion in this Nation about a program that started in Sweden some years ago. It concerns what is known as the ombudsman, a man who deals with people who have small problems and difficulties, and obviates the necessity of their going into courts.

In my opinion, this proposal sounds like a tax ombudsman and it might have merit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is exactly what it is.

I do not have the figures with me. However, the deficiencies that Internal Revenue tries to collect, or for which they send a bill to the small taxpayer, are very small. Perhaps the Government is correct, but the taxpayer is honest and he says, "I want to go in and find out."

I suspect that the Commissioner may find error here and there. I do not believe it would hurt the Treasury at all.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for purposes of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, to strike out "$48,755,000" and insert "$48,970,000".

On page 2, line 14, after the word "roads", to strike out "$2,900,000" and insert "$3,062,000".

On page 6, line 1, after the word "shops", to strike out "$114,475,000" and insert "$115,061,300".

On page 6, line 19, after the word "contract", to strike out "$55,325,000" and insert "$56,848,000", and on page 7, line 10, after the word "Reclamation", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $918,000 shall be for assistance to the Tularosa, New Mexico, School District No. 4 for construction of junior high and high school facilities, and to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school."

On page 7, line 19, after "section 203", to strike out "$16,754,000" and insert "$16,889,000".

On page 9, line 14, after the name "Oregon", to insert "and", and in the same line, after the name "Washington", to strike out "and Wyoming,".

On page 10, line 14, after the word "for", to strike out "$3,910,000" and insert "$3,960,000".

On page 11, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$76,203,000" and insert "$65,703,000"; in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$17,971,500" and insert "$23,471,500", and at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$13,093,000" and insert "$18,093,000".

On page 15, line 17, after the word "activities", to strike out "$72,782,000" and insert "$80,932,000", and in line 18, after the word "which", to strike out "$12,350,000" and insert "$13,250,000".

On page 17, line 10, after the word "substitutes", to strike out "$31,540,000" and insert "$34,940,000".

On page 17, line 18, after the word "Act", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,300,000".

On page 18, line 2, after the numerals "1965", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$7,000,000".

On page 20, line 12, after the word "law", to strike out "$20,312,000" and insert "$21,076,000".

On page 22, after line 5, to insert:

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), $2,675,000, to remain available until expended.

On page 24, line 14, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "$37,164,000" and insert "$39,161,400".

On page 24, line 20, after the word "therein", to strike out "$5,130,000" and insert "$8,341,600".

On page 25, line 15, after the numerals "1965", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$500,000".

At the top of page 26, to insert:

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), $2,675,000, to remain available until expended.

On page 26, line 9, after the word "offices", to strike out "$1,549,000" and insert "$1,564,000".

On page 28, line 1, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$35,694,000" and insert "$36,171,600".

On page 28, line 19, after the word "rights", to strike out "$22,894,000" and insert "$23,494,000".

On page 31, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$4,650,000" and insert "$4,704,000".

On page 32, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$4,984,100" and insert "$5,051,700".

On page 35, line 2, after the word "lands", to strike out "$172,821,000" and insert "$174,521,000".

On page 35, line 16, after the word "law", to strike out "$34,955,000" and insert "$38,578,000".

On page 40, line 14, after the word "Act", to strike out "$73,250,000" and insert "$73,671,000".

On page 40, line 24, after "(42 U.S.C. 2004a)", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$13,928,000".

On page 43, line 15, after the word "expended", to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$9,000,000"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "sections 5 (c) and" and insert "section 5 (c); $2,000,000 for carrying out section 7 (c); and $2,000,000 for carrying out section"; and on page 44, line 5, after "1966" to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That no funds appropriated pursuant to this paragraph may be used for any grant or other payment which is to be used directly or indirectly for the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City."

On page 45, line 11, after the word "publications", to strike out "$22,523,000" and insert "$22,844,000".

On page 47, line 19, to strike out "$2,694,000" and insert "$2,718,000".

On page 48, line 2, to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$35,000".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the committee, as indicated on page 1 of the report, considered budget estimates in the amount of $1,340,260,500, including indefinite appropriations of receipts, for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior and for the related agencies listed on page 2 of the report. Excluded from this bill are the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The committee recommends definite appropriations of $1,329,755,000. This is $34,585,500 more than the House allowance; and is $10,505,500 less than the budget estimates. Included in the amount over the House allowance is $10,300,000 in a budget estimate sent directly to the Senate and not considered by the House. This request pertains to exploration for and development of technology for recovery of heavy metals.

The committee recommended the following major increases over the House allowances:

Bureau of Land Management, $377,000; Bureau of Indian Affairs, $2,244,300, which will provide a full educational construction program to get greater numbers of Indian children in more adequate schools; Geological Survey, $8,150,000 and Bureau of Mines, $2,700,000. All but $250,000 of the increases for the latter two agencies are for the heavy metals program.

The amount proposed for the land and water conservation fund is $110 million, as requested in the budget and as allowed by the House.

It is the committee's recommendation that the amount to be available for matching on an equal basis by the States should be held closely to the 60 percent set forth in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The report states on page 10:

> Because of the numerous purchases which have recently been authorized for Federal recreational facilities it appears desirable to the committee that the maximum amount possible be made available to accomplish these purchases. This is especially necessary, it is felt by the committee, in view of rapidly rising land prices.

Of the budget estimate, $10 million was proposed for the Redwood National Park in California. Legislation to establish this Park has been introduced only recently, and no action has yet been taken. The committee recommends increasing funds for the Park Service and Forest Service by $5 million each and would distribute these amounts to reinstate planned acquisitions from which they were taken in order to allow funds for the Redwood Park. This will make available the following increases, among other additions: $500,000 for Assateague Island National Seashore in the State of Maryland; $500,000 for Minute Man Historic Park; $2,339,500 for Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; $1 million for Fire Island National Seashore; and $250,000 for Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.

The committee also has recommended increases over the House allowance of $3,439,000 for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and $7,399,000 for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Almost half of the total increases for these two agencies is for initiating activity under the Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries and Conservation Act which became law last October 30, and which by its terms will terminate in 1970. It was for this reason that the Senate committee added these two items to the bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives.

The remainder of the additional funds are for predatory animal control and for advancement of the commercial and sport fishery activities of the United States.

For the National Park Service there is an increase of $1,077,600. For the Forest Service the committee proposes increases amounting to $5,323,000, of which over 68 percent is for research.

It is recommended that the Division of Indian Health be financed at a sum $1,349,000 greater than the amount provided by the House of Representatives. However, $748,000 of this increase is a restoration of the House disallowance of a portion of the budget estimate for construction of sanitation facilities.

The House of Representatives declined, without prejudice, to allow any of the budget request of the National Endowment for the Humanities; and stated its "understanding that it may be taken up at a later date by the Senate." This was done, and a complete hearing was held as to the items which had not been considered or allowed by the House of Representatives. The committee proposes an appropriation of $2 million.

It is the opinion of the committee that the changes which are recommended provide for activities helpful in the development of the resources of our country and will broaden the base of the Nation's economy.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

Mr. BIBLE. May I first yield to the Senator from South Dakota? He is the ranking member of the Republican Party on the Appropriations Interior Subcommittee. He has performed yeoman service and has been extremely helpful in molding and developing the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

I congratulate the acting chairman of the subcommittee for his presentation this morning and the thoroughness with which the bill has been considered. The hearings in connection with the proposed legislation consist of 2,200 pages. This little volume of 920 pages, which I hold in my hand, is just a digest of the various items that are included. Every item has been scrutinized carefully, and I am happy to report that the bill in its present form has the unanimous approval of the minority and the majority members of the committee. Also, it received the unanimous approval of the full committee.

I am happy to report that the total amount of the items involved is still $10,505,000 below the budget estimates for the coming fiscal year. We do not pretend that every department that had a meritorious project has received all the money it would like. That is impossible. But we do think that it is fair. I believe the committee has run a taut ship. It has scrutinized these items very carefully, and we believe that the passage of the proposed legislation in its present form will be beneficial to America.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. He has been extremely helpful in developing the bill in its present form. As the Senator knows, more than 170 amendments were considered in subcommittee, which indicates the wide range of interest that was expressed by the various people who appeared before the committee.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

I notice that the bill includes an item of $200,000 for the Fort Scott National Historic Site. I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and the members of the committee for retaining this item, which was placed in the bill in the House.

The Fort Scott National Historic Site is one of the truly historic sites in the State of Kansas. It was authorized as a park site in a prior session of Congress.

The National Park Service last year set aside $50,000 for preliminary studies and planning, and the additional fund will enable the program to begin.

I assure the Senator from Nevada that not only the communities surrounding the Fort Scott National Park Site, but also the State of Kansas, appreciate this action.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments of the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

This is an important historic site. I am familiar with the enabling legislation. I am delighted that the Senate has concurred with the House action. This will permit the program to go forward without delay.

I yield now to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the United States will be a better and stronger Nation because of the money that will be spent under the proposed appropriation.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota was correct when he stated that every item that appears in the bill was examined with diligence and with care, after adequate testimony was heard. As a member of the subcommittee, I can attest that this is also true with reference to the many proposed amendments. They were considered, and when it was in the public interest and whenever the budgetary situation would permit, the committee moved affirmatively.

On a more local basis, perhaps, I should like to record by view that the committee acted wisely in adding to the bill $100,000 so that a mental health team may be organized by the U.S. Public Health Service for the benefit of the native people of Alaska. The native people are the Aleuts, the Eskimos, and the Indians.

As I recall, this program was initiated in South Dakota, and it has worked very well, leading the executive department of the Government to suggest that it be extended to Alaska. The committee agreed with this.

I was made happy by the action of the committee in adding money in certain situations to the budget request for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. For example, there is a program of Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development, a legislative act that has a life of only 5 years. The legislation provides a Federal appropriation annually of $5 million, so that all States in which they do not now exist may attempt to develop commercial fisheries, and the program can be expanded in States that now have such a program.

The budget request was only $3,210,000. The House, in its wisdom, increased this to $4,710,000. The latter amount was agreed to by the Senate committee, and that is the amount now in the bill.

As the acting chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, has already noted, the committee added $2,675,000 to the budget of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for the Great Lakes Fishery and for the sports fisheries, anadromous fish.

This is in response to legislation of last year. The United States has slipped from the position of second in respect to fisheries to fifth place among the maritime nations of the world. It is behind Peru, Red China, Soviet Russia, and Japan. We do need additional assistance to build up our commercial fisheries.

In this connection I should like to note that the committee has incorporated in the bill the sum of $100,000 for an expanded investigation of the Pacific hake fishery program off the coasts of Washington and Oregon. Hake were discovered there in great numbers by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries very recently. This offers the United States a splendid opportunity, which it has not had until now, of moving out of its coastal waters and into the offshore fishery industry which is dominated now on the west coast by Japan and Soviet Russia.

It is hoped and believed that the hake and pollack, which are found in Alaska in great numbers, will provide the basis for the establishment in this country of plants to produce fish protein. If this is done, as it can be done, the United States will then move into a much higher position in the fishing industry.

The committee added funds for shrimp research in Alaskan waters. I express here the hope that part of those funds may be expended in the South where there is a vast potential source of shrimp. I have been told that enough shrimp may be found there to supply 25 percent of the U.S. domestic consumption which runs approximately 400 million pounds.

I extend my congratulations and thanks to the acting chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who cannot be with us today.

The committee has reported a splendid bill, a bill which ought to be passed without opposition.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alaska is a very important member of our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. His service has been invaluable. Particularly, in the field of anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation. The Senator from Alaska conducted most of the hearings on these two items, both for the commercial and the sports fisheries.

The committee did allow the funds, as I said earlier, because there was a time limit on the expenditures of the $25 million. We believed that a great need was evidenced and were very happy to allow this item.

I hope that the entire amount can be held in conference.

Mr President, on page 26, line 4 of the bill, the date of October 3, 1965, is a typographical error. It should be October 30, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that this change be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I rise to support strongly the recommendation of the Senate Appropriation Committee to provide an additional $250,000 to provide additional staffing at the Southern Hardwoods Laboratory located at Stoneville, Miss.

Although this Laboratory happens to be located in my State, it is a facility which has great regional importance. Research at this Laboratory is designed to provide improved forestry management and use of 70 million acres of commercial hardwoods throughout the South. The benefits derived from this research extend far beyond the boundaries of my own State—indeed it affects approximately 60 percent of the national hardwood production.

The additional funds provided in this bill will enable the professional staff at the Laboratory to be brought up to the level originally anticipated when this Laboratory was designed and constructed. These additional staff personnel will enable the research to be greatly accelerated in the many problems affecting southern hardwoods.

An example of the need to accelerate this research is indicated by the fact that disease causes an estimated $2 billion annual loss in southern hardwoods. Likewise, damage sustained from insects and wildlife is substantial. The small cost of accelerating research on these problems can be recovered manifold in just 1 year if substantial progress is made in eliminating some of these problems.

I repeat for emphasis, the scope of this Laboratory is regional and the work performed at the Laboratory affects the entire hardwood industry throughout the southern part of the United States. It is for these reasons that I strongly support this appropriation.

KENTUCKY TROUT HATCHERY FUNDS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President. I am pleased to note at page 20 of the report that the Committee on Appropriations has recommended among the increases over the budget estimate and the House allowances funds in the amount of $20,000 for the "determination of suitable site for a trout hatchery in Kentucky."

I appeared on March 16 before the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department's budget and testified in support of the inclusion of these funds and also submitted a detailed statement on behalf of the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife. I note that this is the first time that any funds for a trout hatchery in Kentucky have ever been recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee. This action by the committee demonstrates clearly that it is the committee's decision that the Department of the Interior proceed with the determination of a suitable site for a trout hatchery without further delay, and on behalf of the people of Kentucky, I am very happy that the committee reached this decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee in this connection be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. COOPER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

ESTABLISHMENT OF TROUT HATCHERY ON CUMBERLAND RIVER, KY.

Senator BARTLETT. Senator COOPER.

Senator COOPER. Thank you Senator BARTLETT, and the committee.

I have two requests that I will make of the committee. One is to provide planning funds for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Cumberland River in Kentucky, below Wolf Creek Dam which impounds Cumberland Reservoir. To give some background of the problem, let me say that the Governor of Kentucky, the commissioner of the department of fish and wildlife, the director of the division of fisheries, the membership of the League of Kentucky Sportsmen and the congressional delegation of Kentucky, have requested the

Department of the Interior to proceed with planning for this hatchery, and I have also requested funds from this committee. Last year I came before you and, while the committee did not provide funds for planning at that time, Senator HAYDEN in a colloquy on the floor told me that he would give the utmost consideration to this request and he felt the committee would do so.

KENTUCKY PAST TROUT STOCKING

Since 1948 Kentucky has been stocking trout in its streams from hatcheries in other States, primarily from a hatchery in Virginia and one in Tennessee. The first stockings were experimental in nature, but in 1952, a trout fishery was established below Wolf Creek Dam on the Cumberland River at a point near where it is proposed that a hatchery now be constructed. It has been very successful and, from the history of this experimental work, certain conclusions can be drawn.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE STATEMENT AND SURVEY

The department of fish and wildlife in the Kentucky State government has provided a statement which I will file. Its survey shows that at least 75 streams in Kentucky can support a trout fishery of which some 515 miles of streams are suitable for stocking trout. There are 30,000 acres in reservoirs which would be suitable for trout stocking.

KENTUCKY NAVIGABLE STREAMS

I might say here that while it is not generally known—unless Alaska has now taken the lead—Kentucky has more miles of navigable streams than any State in the Union.

Senator BARTLETT. This is the first time I find myself unable to claim Alaska is first, because I do not know.

Senator COOPER. You might have more miles of streams than we have but I suppose our claim is we have more miles of navigable streams. We are fourth nationally in the number of rivers that we have in our State.

DEPARTMENT AND BUREAU OPPOSITION AND DEARTH OF HATCHERIES IN SOUTH

I do not think there is any question that the qualities that are needed for a fish hatchery have been established in Kentucky. But I might say that I think the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has quibbled about this. However, they have said that during the next 5 years Kentucky could use about 91,500 pounds of trout annually which meets the 5-year estimate of the State of Kentucky.

The Department has suggested that trout could be furnished from Tennessee or Virginia, as in the past. But, to supply trout from Virginia for some of the streams would involve haulage up to 600 miles, the nearest point being 250 miles. Tennessee is somewhat closer, but I think any examination would show that Tennessee can use all of the trout that its hatchery produces.

The Department has also said that it will have to determine if there is a suitable site available. Yet the facts show that the Corps of Engineers has assured the State that it would make a site available. I am conscious of the problems of the Department of the Interior and its Division of Wildlife but I want to call the subcommittee's attention to the fact that if you examine the list of present trout hatcheries, you would find there are very few in the South. I notice in the report of the committee for last year that funds were made available for studies and for continued appropriations to a number of hatcheries in the North. Of course that may be because their streams are generally more suitable. But when there are streams in a Southern State which can support trout, and are appropriate for it, then an effort should be made to develop the potential in that area.

For 5 or 6 years or perhaps longer our Kentucky congressional delegation has been meeting with representatives of the Department of the Interior on this subject. I am not one who wants to place blame, but I must say in this instance I think the Department has dragged its feet and that it has not made the investigations or completed the studies it should have made. Even now the Department's answer is that it wants to continue to make further studies of streams and related factors which data is already available.

FUNDS REQUEST

Based on this long record, I earnestly ask that the committee take this matter in hand and if it cannot supply the $50,000 that the Department says it would need to make this study, then at least supply some funds—$20,000 or $25,000—so that the Department will actually make the study, report to this committee, and report to our State. It has not done it. And I ask that this be done.

Senator BARTLETT. $50,000 seems quite a little for a study, don't you think?

Senator COOPER. I think so, but as I say in our report—

Senator BARTLETT. That is what they want.

Senator COOPER. Yes; and if that is too much, I would say give them $25,000. Because of the data which have been accumulated by the State, and the data which they say they have accumulated themselves in the past years, I believe they can make this study and make a determination.

Senator BARTLETT. The committee will give it close consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the unanimous action of the Appropriations Committee in placing in the bill an unbudgeted item of $500,000 for the acquisition of land to help round out the Everglades National Park. I think I should state in the RECORD the reasons behind our action in this matter.

For the last 6 fiscal years prior to this year the Bureau of the Budget has seen fit to include in the budget items for this purpose ranging all the way from $450,000 some 6 years ago to $1,125,000 last year.

On every occasion the Senate committee has inserted these items in the bill. On every occasion, in the face of rather determined opposition in the conference, these items have been eliminated in conference.

I am informed that some of the earlier opposition in the House of Representatives to this particular item has diminished and that there is a good chance of the conferees approving the item. I asked the committee, therefore, to include only $500,000, as opposed to the $1,125,000 requested last year, which was placed in the Senate bill, and eliminated in conference.

The reasons for my placing this item before the committee, are these: The State of Florida long ago fulfilled its commitments in this regard. It deeded to the Federal Government something like 850,000 acres of land and water for the purpose of setting up the Everglades National Park. If that land were to be valued at only $10 an acre—and it is worth much more than that—that would be $8.5 million.

The State of Florida later made a cash grant of $2 million as its part toward the acquisition of inholdings. The Federal Government was expected to put up $2 million as authorized by Public Law 85–482, July 2, 1958. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has never been able to go ahead with its part of its contribution. It was for that reason that I requested the committee, acting upon the request of the Bureau of the Budget, after 6 straight years, to put in less than half of the requested item this year.

The reasons for my doing so are well set forth in a letter written by me to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, under date of May 10, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1966.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Everglades National Park, Florida, was established by the Act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816; 16 U.S.C., secs. 410, 410a–410c).

Public Law 85–482, July 2, 1958, established boundaries of the park, authorized the transfer of certain lands between the Federal Government and the State of Florida and authorized to be appropriated $2 million for acquisition of privately owned lands within the park.

Under Public Law 85–482 the Secretary of the Interior transferred to the State of Florida about 65,000 acres of federal land lying outside the revised boundaries in exchange for about 64,000 acres of State lands within the revised boundaries. These exchanges of lands were completed on February 25, 1959. In addition, some 1,290,091 acres of land have been donated by the State, local agencies and private donors some of which are acquired by a $2 million cash grant made by the State of Florida.

Since 1961 efforts have been made through budget requests for the necessary funds to purchase privately owned lands within the park boundaries (Hole in Donut), and other inholdings.

In fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1962 the budgets as submitted to the Congress contained $450,000 for this acquisition. The House denied the requests and the Senate, on both occasions, restored the monies only to lose them in Conference.

In fiscal year 1963 and fiscal year 1964 the budgets submitted to the Congress contained $500,000 for the acquisition. The House again denied the requests and the Senate again restored the funds only to again lose them in Conference.

In fiscal year 1965 there was no budget request for the regular appropriation. However, $452,000 was in the Supplemental bill to purchase the Iori property which contained some 4,420 acres within the park boundaries. This property was obtained by the Department of Agriculture through foreclosure of certain liens which the Department held through the Farmers Home Administration. The property was simply transferred from one Federal agency to another.

In fiscal year 1966 a budget request for $1,125,500 was submitted to the Congress, which included $125,500 for the acquisition of the Smallwood area, in which is located Indian mounds (shells) and an Indian camp, as well as funds for the Hole in Donut. None of these funds were appropriated though the Senate itself approved the request but later it was lost in Conference.

To date the only funds appropriated under the authority of Public Law 85–482 enacted in 1958 has been the $452,000 previously mentioned.

The State of Florida has evidenced good faith and performed its full obligation in the transfer of some 850,000 acres of land to the park and by expending some $2 million for the acquisition of some of the private lands transferred to the park. Therefore, it is only right that the Federal Government show good faith by the acquisition of the Hole in Donut and other inholdings in order that the park boundaries may be rounded out. It is past time that the commitment of $2 million for this purpose made by the Congress in 1958 be carried out.

I earnestly request favorable consideration of the inclusion of $500,000 in the Department of the Interior Appropriation bill to enable a long sought after effort—since 1960—to start acquisition of the lands in the park which are privately owned, to which acquisition the Federal Government is fully committed.

With kind regards, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while I think the matter is well set forth in this letter, I want this additional statement to appear in the RECORD at this point.

I have for several years been negotiating with a private foundation in an effort to secure its help in rounding out this park by acquiring sites of interest, as, for example, one which includes a rather sizable area of Indian mounds. Those mounds have been undisturbed. They are there as they have been for centuries.

I have run into the question repeatedly, "How can you ask us to provide this when the Federal Government is not doing its part?"

I think we are at the stage where if we can get the Federal Government to perform its part of the obligation, which it entered into many years ago, we can get substantial help from these particular private foundations, and in connection with the particular proposal which I have mentioned, I know others are interested in the park, who have negotiated with other private foundations, with the same result.

Is it not natural for people handling large sums of private funds which are available for such purposes to say, "We must see an interest in the Federal Government in carrying out its obligation before we can be active in this regard, in which we are interested"?

I have, therefore, set forth the reasons for the inclusion of the item of $500,000 for land acquisition for the Everglades National Park. I appreciate very much the action of the Appropriations Committee to that end, and the fact that the Senate is about to act on this matter without objection to this particular item.

I hope sincerely the conferees from the other body will be able to agree on this matter, and decide to approve the item, and thus show the interest of the Federal Government in fulfilling its obligation in this important matter.

BEREA, KY., FOREST RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President. The Senator from Nevada, who is handling the bill, may recall that I appeared before the Appropriations Committee requesting funds for planning the forest research building to be constructed at the Berea, Ky., Forest Research Center. My statement supporting this request appears on pages 1848 to 1854 of the hearings, together with letters from the Commissioner of Natural Resources, Mr. Matlick, and from President Hutchins.

Last year, the Senate included funds for this purpose, but they were not allowed by the House. For that reason, I came before the committee again this year to call attention to the needs to house strip mine restoration and other research which is going forward there. The House has now allowed funds in the amount of $40,000 for this purpose, and I am very glad that the Senate committee has also recommended that amount. If the Senate agrees to the committee recommendation, as I am sure it will, funds for planning the building at Berea will be assured.

The forest research and strip mine restoration work proceeding at the Berea Center, as it has been developed in recent years, is a credit to the leadership, initiative and perseverance of Mr. R. D. Lane. I ask unanimous consent that a letter by the Commissioner of Natural Resources of the State of Kentucky, Mr. J. O. Matlick, on his advancement to be director of the Northeastern Experiment Station with continued responsibility for the forest research program in Kentucky, be inserted in the RECORD.

I support the $9 million recommended by the Senate Committee for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, which I supported last year.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 30, 1966.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A few days ago, Mr. Edward P. Cliff, Chief, U.S. Forest Service wrote to me about the reorganization of the Forest Service in eastern United States. I was greatly pleased and gratified to learn from Mr. Cliff that Mr. R. D. Lane, formerly Director of the Central States Forest Experiment Station, is now Director at the Northeastern Experiment Station and will continue to have responsibility for the Forest Service research program in Kentucky.

Under Mr. Lane's very capable and imaginative leadership, we have made in Kentucky fine progress toward a forestry research program of state and national significance. Forest Service scientists located at Berea, Kentucky, have aggressively tackled several difficult and complex research problems of major importance to us. They have undertaken their work quietly, efficiently, and without fanfare. And they have sought our advice and counsel in selection of research problems, have coordinated their work with our programs, and have consistently given us full assistance whenever we have called upon them. Moreover, with Mr. Lane's guidance, they have cooperated with and assisted others, such as the University of Kentucky, in developing a coordinated, productive forestry research program for Kentucky.

Let me give you a few examples of the excellent contributions they have made:

1. With their assistance we have established a Wood Use Demonstration and Training Center that promises to assist materially in expanding wood-based industries as well as employment opportunities in the highlands of eastern Kentucky and thus strengthen the economy of this area. The facility is operated by the University of Kentucky and located at Quicksand.

2. My Department and the Forest Service joined forces to make a thorough inventory of our state's forests. This work, now completed, gives us the most intensive, detailed inventory ever made of our state's forest resources. We have had a flood of inquiries about timber supplies in Kentucky and I am confident that our inventory will lead to the establishment of several new wood-based industries in our state.

3. Our State Legislature just recently passed a most stringent surface mine restoration law. The research conducted by Forest Service scientists at Berea provided the basis for this new law and for regulations being developed under it. Research programs they have in progress, although quite small in relation to the total problems, will help both us and the Kentucky mining industry abide by the new laws as well as other States and the industry throughout the Appalachian coal field.

We hold in great esteem the Forest Service scientists at Berea, Kentucky, and their director, Mr. Lane. They are, in our opinion, a distinct credit to your Department and to the Forest Service.

J. O. MATLICK.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to take note of the fact that the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, which we are considering today, contains a provision of $9 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. This is a matter of special interest to me since I am chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities which last year handled the authorizing legislation for this program.

I am pleased to note that although the Senate bill still represents a cut of $4.9 or more than a third less than the budget request, it does provide $2 million more than the House bill allowed, with all of the increase going to the National Endowment for the Humanities. This is entirely appropriate since the House committee passed over the request for the humanities endowment without prejudice, in view of the fact that the endowment's program had not been fully formulated at the time the House committee considered the bill.

However, it seems to me the record should show that the Senate bill still reflects some very substantial cuts in the basic programs envisioned under the new National Foundation. The largest is a cut of $3 million in the amount requested for the Endowment on the Humanities. In addition, the basic grant program under the Arts Endowment has been cut $1 million; the State grant-in-aid program has been cut $750,000 and the administrative allowance has been cut $180,000.

It is unfortunate indeed that these worthy programs must be held back because of the budgetary constrictions resulting from the situation in Vietnam. While none of us would assert a civilian priority under these conditions, it does seem to me that our cultural well-being as a Nation should hold a high claim under normal circumstances, and one which has long remained neglected. I therefore hope that the amounts cut from the projected programs of the foundation will be restored as soon as possible, hopefully in supplemental appropriations next year.

In the meantime, I hope that the foundation will be able to manage resourcefully with the funds allotted to it, and that, in particular it will be able to make equitable distributions to the States on the basis of need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 14215) was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the presiding officer appointed Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Young of North Dakota, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada for another outstanding contribution as the floor manager of this important measure. It is rather routine to achieve success on measures supported by the articulate and able advocacy of the senior Nevada Senator, but it is unusual, indeed, in this Chamber to pass a bill of this dimension affecting so many interests and so many parts of the country, with the ease and expedition witnessed today. Such an achievement can be obtained only with the greatest of skill and ability.

I commend the senior Senator from Nevada and thank him on behalf of the country as a whole and particularly on behalf of the people of Montana.

Of course, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee as well as the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] and others are to be commended for their support. But, as always, a success of this magnitude is a tribute to the entire Senate.

RESERVOIR ADMISSION FEES CONTRARY TO EARLIER PROMISE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the last few years we have grown used to what is called the credibility gap with regard to foreign affairs and defense matters in the Johnson-Humphrey regime. Now I am afraid we are experiencing a complete lack of credibility when dealing with the domestic policies of this administration.

A situation has again developed which leads me to question the credibility of this administration. Before I go into that, however, I believe I should lay a little groundwork. Through my home State the mighty Missouri River flows. We have been able to tame, to a certain extent, the violent wanderings of this river when the spring thaw and the March and April rains used to produce enough moisture to force the river over its banks.

We did this through the Missouri River development program. In 1944 Congress passed legislation popularly called the Pick-Sloan plan. The purpose of this plan was fourfold: flood control, irrigation, production of hydroelectric power, and improvement of navigation on the lower Missouri.

These four purposes still remain as the main reasons for the existence of the dams and the reservoirs that channel that river. Certain other benefits have derived from these dams but they are secondary in nature and always will be. Among these secondary benefits are scenic beauty and recreation.

I mention this because recently the Corps of Engineers announced certain areas that would be included as "designated areas" for the year April 1, 1966, to March 31, 1967, at which admission fees would be charged. This requirement for designated areas flows from a series of legislation, Executive orders, and administrative regulations that began with the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965.

In this piece of legislation, the Congress, by amending some existing laws and initiating others, determined that it should be the will of the legislative branch that certain areas be open to assessment of admission and user fees. As I will substantiate later, the legislative history also makes it clear that certain other areas were not included in this program.

A key point in this legislation was the limitations and requirements written into the bill as to what areas could be considered applicable for the admission fee program. These requirements which must be concurrent were:

First. Areas at which either recreation user or entrance fees may be charged must be designated by the President and all such areas must be posted.

Second. Entrance and admission fees may be charged only where a Federal area is administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife purposes.

Third. The particular area for which entrance or admission fees can be charged must be administered by a Federal agency.

Fourth. The recreational facilities or services where such fees are charged must be provided at Federal expense.

In regard to this criteria, I would like to stress two things. First of all, they must be concurrent. Second, there is a requirement that the primary purpose be for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife reasons.

Following the enactment of this legislation into law, Public Law 88–578, the President, on March 2, 1965, issued Executive Order No. 11200, designed to implement the provisions of that law. It specifically set out the criteria to be followed in determining the designated areas for 1965. The criteria listed were, properly enough, the same criteria enumerated in the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. The Executive order also required all subordinate units of the executive branch, including the Department of the Interior, to annually review all areas under their respective jurisdictions to determine whether any additional areas should, in accordance with the designated criteria, be designated as areas for which entrance, admission, or other recreation user fees were to be collected in future years.

On January 30 of this year, Secretary of the Interior Udall announced the sale of a new permit called the Federal Recreation Area Entrance Permit. At the same time he issued regulations spelling out the Federal Recreation Area Entrance Permit charges authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. These regulations, as listed in the Federal Register of December 31, 1965, make no mention of any criteria for determining designated areas other than the fact that authority for these fees was derived from the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 and Executive Order No. 11200. In the news release that accompanied this announcement, however, the criteria originally listed in Public Law 88–587 were described as conditions which must be met in order for fees to be charged.

Mr. President, I have set out this history behind these designated areas because I wanted to show that the authority for them started with the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. To my knowledge, this legislation still controls.

It was with a great deal of surprise, then, that I learned that the Corps of Engineers had listed four reservoirs on the Missouri River in South Dakota as designated areas. These four reservoirs are Big Bend, Fort Randall, Lewis and Clark Lake, at Gavins Point, and Oahe.

I was surprised because I had previously been informed by Edward Crafts, Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of Interior and the man who oversees this admission fee program, that these Missouri River Reservoirs would not qualify for admission charges under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965.

In anticipation of the exact same problem we are confronted with today, in 1964, prior to the passage of Public Law 88–578, I attempted to elicit from Mr. Crafts an answer to whether or not passage of that bill would affect the Missouri River Reservoirs. At two different times he assured me that it would not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter which I received from Mr. Crafts, answering in detail questions along this line, which I directed to him in a letter dated February 13, 1964, and also a colloquy between Mr. Crafts and myself when he appeared before the subcommittee on appropriations for the Interior Department.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1964.

Hon. Karl E. Mundt,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mundt: We have received your letter of February 13, with further reference to the proposed land and water conservation fund.

At times, after acts of Congress have been passed, unforeseen questions have subsequently arisen, in connection with the administration of their provisions, as to the intention of the Congress with respect to a given situation. Fortunately, the interest of the Congress in the proposed land and water conservation fund is so great that a record is being made that should reduce this type of problem to the minimum.

Your recital of the provision in S. 859, as modified by the House Interior Committee in reporting H.R. 3846, is entirely correct. Concerning the question you raise—its probable effect regarding charges for recreation use of Missouri River reservoirs in South Dakota—it is necessary to consider the following limitations and requirements that have been incorporated in the bill:

1. Areas at which either recreation user or entrance fees, may be charged must be designated by the President, and all such areas must be posted.

2. Entrance and admission fees may be charged only where a Federal area is administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife purposes.

3. The particular area for which entrance or admission fees can be charged must be administered by a Federal agency.

4. The recreational facilities or services where such fees are charged must be provided at Federal expense.

These requirements, you will perceive, which presumably will remain in the bill, clearly limit the areas for which charges can be made as a source of revenue for the land and water conservation fund.

Moreover, it is clear also from these provisions of the bill as reported to the House that no Federal admission or entrance fee could be charged at Federal areas that are leased to a State or to other public or private agency for exclusive operation of the recreation resource, such as is the practice at many Federal water development projects.

The first question that arises, of course, is whether or not these particular reservoirs are administered "primarily" for recreational or other purposes, as enumerated in item 1 above. We believe this is not the case from our present knowledge of these reservoirs. The following quotation is taken from page 7 of a publication by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, entitled "Water Resources Development in South Dakota, 1963":

"COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

"The 1944 Flood Control Act approved the expansion of the general comprehensive plan for the control of floods and development of water resources in the Missouri River Basin. The basinwide plan, popularly known as the Pick-Sloan plan, was based upon two proposals, the first recommended by the Corps of Engineers in the summer of 1943, and the second by the Bureau of Reclamation in the spring of 1944. It is a multiple-purpose program designed primarily for four basic purposes: flood control, irrigation, production of hydroelectric power, and improvement of navigation on the lower Missouri. Other allied benefits to the people of the valley and to the Nation are improved municipal water supply and sanitation, soil erosion control, conservation of fish and wildlife, and public recreational advantages."

Accordingly, I am convinced that the Missouri River Reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers in South Dakota are not in fact administered primarily for recreation or other purposes that would qualify them for the making of entrance or admission charges to these areas as a whole.

As in the case of the national forests, there may be small developed areas on the Federal land bordering a reservoir where the Federal Government makes substantial expenditures for recreation purposes and for which it would be reasonable and logical to make nominal charges. This, of course, would not restrict general public use of the water area of the reservoirs without charge.

In connection with the foregoing, we note that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in House Report No. 900, on page 20, is very clear on this point: "The bill will not be applicable to areas where recreation is purely incidental to another major purpose of the area, to areas where neither Federal personnel nor Federal facilities are provided for the recreationist, or to areas which are turned over by a Federal agency to a local authority for administration."

I hope this will help to clarify some of the questions in your mind. As your secretary may have told you, I have called to ask for an appointment to see you, at which time I would like to discuss the fund bill, some of the other recent correspondence which you have sent to me, as well as certain activities of the Bureau which may be of particular interest to your State.

I appreciate very much your interest.

Sincerely yours,

Edward C. Crafts, *Director.*

Colloquy Between Mr. Crafts and Senator Mundt

Mr. Mundt. I want to ask you a couple of questions about that. What would you envision as the kind of establishment on the chain of Missouri River reservoirs out in the Midwest in connection with this program of charging user fees as admission, under the act? I have had a lot of questions about that, and I have had no answers to give.

HOUSE MODIFIED BILL

Mr. Crafts. Senator Mundt, under the terms of the bill, as reported by the House committee— and this, I think, is the draft of the bill that I should speak to, because the House committee substantially modified the bill from the way it was originally set up—under the terms of the bill as reported by the committee, the admission fees or entrance fees can be assessed only if certain conditions prevail.

FEE ASSESSMENT

I think they need to be listed and there are four of them.

Areas that are federally administered directly, not under lease to the State or private concessionaires. They need to be areas that are administered primarily for recreation. And this is a very key point, the word "primary." They need to be areas of which Federal facilities are provided at Federal expense, and the areas need to be posted.

Now, most of the reservoirs in the Missouri River, and I am speaking in general here—I think the same would apply to reservoirs on most of the rivers—are built either by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers.

Senator Mundt. May I interrupt. The Missouri River chain of projects were authorized under special legislation. Criteria that apply there might not apply to others, so maybe we had better stick to the Missouri River.

Mr. Crafts. As far as I know, with respect to the Missouri River, the purpose of the reservoirs was primarily not recreation.

Senator Mundt. That is correct.

EXCLUSION OF FEES

Mr. Crafts. Therefore, we have gone on record in this in response to similar questions from other Members of Congress that on the reservoirs which are not administered primarily for recreation, it would not be possible, under the terms of the House bill, to impose a general admission or entrance fee.

It would be possible to charge a specific user fee for launching facilities, for camping facilities, for this sort of thing, but not a general entrance or admission fee.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is clear, on the basis of Mr. Crafts' letter and his answers to my questions in committee that the Missouri River Reservoirs were never intended to be included in the designated areas for admission charges. I think it is also clear that the floor debate on this legislation—which can be found in the Congressional Record, volume 110, part 14, pages 19115–19117—points in this direction. At that time I made the same argument that is being made today; namely, that because the purpose of these reservoirs is not primarily for recreation, the reservoirs do not meet the requirements set forth for the levying of charges under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. This argument was not refuted on the floor by the managers of the bill. Therefore, legislative history of the act clearly supports my contention that these reserves should be exempt from the recently imposed visitors' fees.

Mr. President, the reason we hold congressional hearings and the reason we participate in floor debate is to attempt to obtain answers to questions about specific provisions in pending legislation. This is the way legislative history is established. Once we obtain these answers and rely upon them in making our final determination on the legislation we should be secure in the knowledge that these answers will remain the same after laws have been enacted.

In this respect I have written another letter to Mr. Crafts asking him to explain why he has assured me one thing and subsequently permitted just the opposite to be done. I ask that this letter dated May 10 be made a part of these remarks at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Edward C. Crafts,
Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation,
U.S. Department of Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Crafts: Recently the Corps of Engineers announced that pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, they were designating four reservoirs in South Dakota under their jurisdiction as "Designated Areas" at which admission fees are charged for entrance thereto. These four reservoirs are Big Bend, Fort Randall, Lewis and Clark Lake at Gavins Point, and Oahe.

As you know, this determination was to be made as a result of the aforementioned Act, Executive Order 11200, and regulations issued by your office through the Secretary of Interior.

The criteria for selecting such areas was included in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, now Public Law 88–578. These criteria included a provision that entrance and admission fees may be charged only where a Federal area is administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife purposes.

In view of this, I am at a loss, therefore, to understand why these four Missouri River Reservoirs were included in the list of "Designated Areas". These reservoirs were at the time of their construction and are still, serving the primary purpose of flood control, irrigation, production of hydroelectric power, and improvement of navigation on the lower Missouri. Recreational benefits are secondary in nature.

This point was made very clearly, I believe, at two different times preceding the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. In answer to a question of mine before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department you stated that it would not be possible to impose a general admission or entrance fee charge on the Missouri River reservoirs. Again under date of February 20, 1964, in answer to a letter from me regarding this question you said that because of the fact that these reservoirs are not in fact administered primarily for recreation or other purposes that would qualify them for the making of entrance or admission charges, the passage of the bill would not affect them.

I would appreciate it if you would explain why this action has been taken by the Corps of Engineers in the face of your earlier assurances to the contrary and what action you propose to take to rectify this in harmony with your earlier statement.

Hoping to hear from you shortly, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it could be that this is another example of bureaucracy in action, in which the right hand, the Interior Department, did not know what the left hand, the Corps of Engineers, was doing. But this is not an acceptable explanation, let alone an acceptable solution.

There are only two solutions. One is for Mr. Crafts to live up to his word and retract the listing of the Missouri River Reservoirs as designated areas for admission fees. If he does not, the only other alterative is to introduce legislation prohibiting the inclusion of these areas in the Federal recreation area entrance permit program. This I stand prepared to do.

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1119, Senate Joint Resolution 108.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S.J. Res. 108) to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments in line 4, after the word "deleting", to strike out "the phrase 'not to exceed $50,000 annually' " and insert "$50,000", and in line 5, after "section (b)", to insert "and substituting '$75,000' "; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1008), is hereby amended by deleting "$50,000" in section (b) and substituting "$75,000" and adding "(c) Such additional sums as may be needed annually for the payment of all necessary expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities thereof."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously.

The main purpose of the joint resolution is to increase the ceiling of U.S. contributions to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History—PAIGH. As approved by the committee, this increase is from $50,000 a year to $75,000 a year. The resolution also authorizes appropriations for the expenses of U.S. participation in Institute activities. This item, which is estimated at $3,000 a year, would provide for the expenses of an annual meeting of the members of the U.S. National Section of the Institute and for publication of the Section's reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 108) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the third Chinese nuclear explosion must be a matter of serious concern. The Albanian Premier is reported as saying at a banquet in Peking that the Chinese nuclear weapons will throw their enemy "into panic."

Obviously this is not true, as was demonstrated in the firm remarks of President Johnson and the leaders of other countries of Asia.

However, this action by the Chinese must cause concern, in part, as to the course of action that other nations in Asia will follow. Newspaper reports today reveal that pressure by high Indian officials to develop nuclear weapons has increased, and that there is great concern also in Japan.

More important, there must be great concern as to the course of the Communist Chinese themselves in their relations with their neighbors, and, as Prime Minister Pearson stated yesterday, as to the increased danger of miscalculation on their part, which could lead to a major war. Therefore, it seems to me all the more necessary to open wider discussions and negotiations with the Communist Chinese.

It was stated yesterday by Chou En-lai that the Chinese had offered a pact with the United States which would outlaw the use of nuclear weapons between our two countries. He went on to say that our rejection of that treaty made it imperative for them to resume the testing.

A spokesman for the State Department has revealed that the Department did in fact reject this overture from the Chinese, on the basis that it was not sincere, and they felt that there were no adequate safeguards.

Although our position seems well founded in fact and experience, I question whether this will be well understood in the rest of the world, unless we now take further open and affirmative steps to make clear our desire to reach effective agreements for control over nuclear weapons with the Communist Chinese.

As I have said before in speaking to the Senate, I think this is the most important issue facing not only the United States, but mankind; and I think that it is extremely vital that the United States furnish the kind of leadership and the kind of direction that is essential during this critical period of time.

This problem is compounded by the fact, as the State Department spokesman also revealed, that we have not yet invited Red China to the disarmament meetings in Geneva.

The events of the last 72 hours have demonstrated quite clearly the importance of our demonstrating our readiness to reach international agreement on the control and proliferation of nuclear weapons—and the necessity of our making an effort to bring the Chinese, in an open way—and I stress, in an open way—into any discussions and negotiations regarding this matter.

It is, therefore, even more imperative that we make clear to the Chinese and to the rest of the world our deep interest in exploring openly and candidly the control of nuclear weapons.

I emphasize, as I have before, that Communist China should in fact be invited to participate in the Geneva disarmament negotiations.

It seems to me also important to make clear that we are prepared to enter into direct high-level discussions for just this purpose anywhere in the world, discussions that would be quite clear about their purpose, and it would be quite clear what our position would be in connection with the Chinese Communists. I think that the revelations in just the last few days about negotiations or discussions that took place a year ago in Warsaw have given a propaganda advantage to the Chinese Communists, and seem to indicate to the rest of the world that they, in fact, were interested in disarmament and nuclear control, and that we were not as enthusiastic. Of course, that is not the fact, but I think that the great danger is that that is the kind of conclusion that the rest of the world might reach.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I shall yield in a moment.

Involved in these discussions must be an exploration with the Chinese of whether, as part of any agreement that might be reached, they would agree not to test in the atmosphere, as they inferred publicly they were willing to do. I have serious reservations as to whether in fact they would make such an agreement. But it is nevertheless important that their position as well as our own be clearly understood throughout the world.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from New York has again spoken out on this issue, as he did some months ago, because I quite agree with him that when we talk about the dangers of nuclear proliferation, particularly the proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia, we are discussing perhaps the most urgent single international problem of our time.

The time for us to act is fast running out. I think the Senator from New York will agree that if we cannot make some progress toward a nuclear proliferation agreement within the next 2 or 3 years, it will be too late. We will then have, not 5 nuclear powers, but 8, 10, 15, or 20 nuclear armed nations, with all the resulting dangers that such a situation would present to the peace of mankind—the dangers of a nuclear accident, of miscalculation, of misjudgment—any one of which might plunge the world into a nuclear catastrophe. So I am pleased that the Senator has spoken out again on this issue.

I ask the Senator from New York if he does not feel that while the Chinese have been reluctant to join in the nuclear test ban agreement, they may have a real interest, as a member of the nuclear club, in joining in some kind of nonproliferation agreement. Would there not be factors involved in a nonproliferation agreement that would interest them more now than entering into the limited nuclear test ban agreement?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think that without any question they would be interested in a nonproliferation agreement. Let me just say, on the first point that the Senator from South Dakota has made, I think it is supported by statements in the newspapers this morning by representatives of India that there will be renewed effort by certain leading Indian officials to make nuclear weapons, so that they can protect themselves against the Chinese.

So I am not certain that we have even 2 or 3 years, because this is going to have a snowball effect. If the Indians become convinced that there will not be any treaty, any arrangement whereby they can be protected, then they will feel that their only security rests in their making nuclear weapons. Japan will have the same feeling; the same feeling will exist, obviously, in the Middle East—just as France demonstrates a capacity to make nuclear weapons, and there will be similar interest in other European countries.

So I think, as the Senator has said, the time to move is immediately. The question whether we will have sufficient time, I think, is very grave.

Mr. McGOVERN. It seems to me that the nuclear explosion which took place this week, in addition to highlighting as the Senator has said, the need for a direct approach to China, also highlights the need for the United States and the Soviet Union to be accelerating their efforts to break the bottlenecks or the stalemate, that has been holding back progress in the Geneva arms control discussions.

I should think that both powers, the Soviet Union and the United States would now have a new interest in trying to find some way to break the logjam and arrive at a settlement—especially on nuclear proliferation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I know the Senator has spoken out in connection with this relationship with China. I should like to ask the Senator. It was revealed in the newspapers that Chou En-lai has stated the reason China had resumed testing, and the reason the bomb was tested in the atmosphere, was that the United States had refused to make an agreement with them regarding the first use of atomic weapons—that is, a mutual treaty between the Communist Chinese and the United States. In fact, State Department representatives said that this was a proposal made by Chinese. Would the Senator feel that the United States will be placed at a disadvantage throughout the rest of the world, because we refused to explore this proposal, and that others would think we are, in fact, responsible for the Chinese testing their bomb in the atmosphere?

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree with the implication in the Senator's question. I believe that we make a mistake in terms of our own position in the world when we reject initiatives from the other side. It may be that those initiatives are not in good faith, but we have nothing to lose, as I see it, in exploring them and testing their good faith. Sincerity is subject to proof. Certainly, when a nation which has been as difficult as China has been over the last few years makes an overture to the West to settle one of the outstanding issues of our day, we should be quick to seize upon it and explore all possibilities for progress.

That was the general thrust of some of the remarks I tried to make on the floor of the Senate last week with regard to our overall relationship with China. While Peking may continue to be difficult, and we may suffer some rebuffs and even insults in our relations with them, I believe that our policy should be pointed in the direction of drawing the Chinese into a more responsible position, of drawing them into a more normal relationship with the West rather than automatically rebuffing everything they suggest in the way of new relationships.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I commend the Senator from South Dakota for bringing out some of these facts.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me and I warmly endorse his constructive suggestions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again I want to commend the distinguished Senator from New York for advancing an idea which is both meritorious and worthwhile, as well as extremely timely.

I was surprised to read in the press of the proposal by Peking referred to by the Senator from New York which, at that time, the Government did not feel worthy of consideration. I can see their viewpoint based on the conditions that existed then.

But, as the Senator from New York has indicated, conditions have changed considerably. It appears, at times, that events do outpace our thinking in this changing world—that we do lag behind when we should be ahead.

I am delighted with the Senator's suggestion that Peking should be considered for membership in the disarmament meetings now being held in Geneva. To those who raise the idea that this would, in effect, mean recognition of Peking, I would point out that we have held meetings between Chinese consuls general and our Ambassadors over 125 times. They first began in Geneva, some 11 or 12 years ago, at the time of the Geneva agreements on Indochina. Those meetings between our representatives and theirs, are still being conducted in Warsaw. So, the idea that contact with the Chinese would mean recognition loses its force in view of these contacts with the Chinese by this Government, through our regularly diplomatically accredited representatives, on policies promoted by President Eisenhower and continued by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

The fact that a nuclear device of very high potency—the third one—has been exploded indicates that Peking is advancing a great deal more rapidly than many of our experts thought she would. And, in view of her progress to date, the timeliness and urgency of the Senator from New York's proposal cannot be emphasized too greatly.

Thus, I wish to commend the Senator from New York for showing once again his leadership in advancing an idea that should and, I believe, will be taken up seriously by all parties concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Montana.

SENATOR KENNEDY OF NEW YORK'S LATIN AMERICAN STATEMENT SHOULD BE REPRINTED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, May 9, and Tuesday, May 10, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] made the most informative statement on United States-Latin American policy that I have heard in the Senate in my 9 years of service. It is probably one of the best informed statements on Latin American policy ever made in the Senate. As one who lives in a State bordering Mexico, and as one who lived in El Paso, Tex., a border city with Mexico, for 3½ years, I have had an intense personal interest in Latin American relations.

I commend the Senator from New York for his fine statement.

Mr. President, this statement is quite lengthy and complete enough to be printed in book form. I am hopeful that the statement will be printed in book form, or in some other form more easily distributed and read than in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This would allow for widespread distribution of the Senator's statement, so that it may receive proper attention and study by the American people.

I am hopeful that that might be done.

TELEPHONE COMPANY CHARGES HIGHER DEPOSIT RATES FOR SERVICE FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL THAN FOR CIVILIANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have discovered a situation in which the telephone company practices in this country result in discrimination against servicemen, particularly those who have been transferred to Vietnam. Recently I received a letter from a constituent now stationed in Vietnam. His wife had been required to make a $50 deposit to obtain telephone service in the State of Texas, while a civilian employee applying at the same time had been required to deposit only $25.

The Department of the Army informed me that deposits required by the telephone company range from $25 to $150. The factors determining the amount of deposit required include, according to the Army:

> How long the applicant has been at his present job, whether or not the applicant is subject to frequent transfers, and whether or not by virtue of a family separation long distance telephone calls are likely to be made.

I am also informed that it is "normal" for members of the military to have to make higher deposits than others who have been in the community longer.

The large number of servicemen being sent to Vietnam or being transferred elsewhere because of the Vietnam situation makes this policy grossly unfair. When one takes into account the low pay received by servicemen, the telephone company's action makes it almost impossible for them to have the telephone service without severe financial hardship when members of these families ought, more than many others, to be able to communicate with one another. It is conceivable in the case of a private's pay that deposits within the range I have mentioned could equal or exceed his monthly salary.

Mr. President, as a result of this situation in which our servicemen and their dependents are being discriminated against, I have written a letter to Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., asking that he investigate telephone company policy concerning deposits required of servicemen and their dependents and that he consider suspending all but token deposits for them while they are defending their country, particularly through service in Vietnam or related to the Vietnam situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Mr. Kappel of May 11, 1966, a copy of the letter from the Department of the Army to me, and a copy of the letter sent me by the sergeant in Vietnam, dated April 12, 1966. I have deleted the location in Vietnam from which the letter was sent, as well as the name of the sergeant, for security reasons.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 11, 1966.

Mr. FREDERICK R. KAPPEL,
Chairman of the Board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KAPPEL: Investigation subsequent to a complaint from a constituent has produced the information that it is normal for members of the military to have to make higher deposits to obtain telephone service than for civilians. I understand that two factors are taken into account in determining the size of the deposit required: whether the individual is subject to frequent transfers and whether the family is separated, thus bringing about a likelihood of many long-distance telephone calls. I am enclosing the correspondence.

The obvious impact of the application of these factors is that the military man will almost invariably have to pay a higher deposit than will civilians—as the enclosed correspondence shows, a much higher deposit. In view of the number of servicemen being sent to Vietnam, or being transferred about because of the Vietnam situation, it seems grossly unfair that this policy exists.

I strongly urge a reexamination of telephone company policy concerning deposits, particularly for the military, and ask consideration of suspension of all but token deposits for them during this period when they are defending the rights and property of all of us in Vietnam.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: This letter is in behalf of Sergeant McAnally who wrote concerning the deposit his wife was asked to make when she applied for telephone service in Temple, Tex.

The business office of the telephone company in Temple was contacted and Sergeant McAnally should be assured that no discrimination was meant merely because he is in the service. The deposits required by the telephone company range from as low as $25.00 to as high as $150.00 and depend on many factors, including the applicant's prior record of payment for telephone service received in the United States, how long the applicant has been in his present job, whether or not the applicant is subject to frequent transfers, and whether or not by virtue of a family separation long-distance telephone calls are likely to be made. It is normal for salesman, transitory personnel, and members of the military to make higher deposits than personnel who have been in the community a long time or whose credit rating is well established.

I am further informed that such deposits are retained only for approximately one to two years and if by that time a good credit rating is established, the deposit with 6 percent interest is refunded.

The telephone company in Temple was very cooperative in answering our questions and I suggest that Mrs. McAnally visit the business office there if she has any further questions on this matter. I am sure they will help her in any way possible.

Your interest in Sergeant McAnally is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. L. BLACKWELL,
Colonel, GS Office,
Chief of Legislative Liaison.

APRIL 12, 1966.

SIR: I have been in the Army for 10 years and I am now stationed in Viet Nam. About a week and a half ago, my wife, who now resides in Temple, Texas, went with a civilian to get a telephone placed into her residence.

The telephone office wanted to charge her $50.00 deposit and the civilian $25.00. Now the point is, why do they charge twice as much deposit for a telephone than they do the civilian.

What is the military nowaday's, a bunch of suckers.

I would like a reply to my letter if possible.

Yours truly,

———— ————.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Texas for his interest in our military personnel. He has been most assiduous in looking after our servicemen and women, particularly those now serving abroad, and their families. He has spoken out for a great many servicemen and their families from my own State, and I know that they would wish me to express their appreciation to him, along with mine.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator for expressing these kind remarks to me. The Senator exemplifies leadership in so many fields in the Senate. I thank him for the support he gave me on the GI bill which will enable 3 million servicemen already discharged to enter school on June the 1st, if they apply and qualify.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

MARY McGRORY WRITES HOW VISTA VOLUNTEERS PROVE THEIR WORTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most imaginative innovations of the war on poverty is the VISTA program.

VISTA volunteers live under the conditions they are trying to remedy.

Their pay consists of a mere subsistence allowance and $40 per month when they conclude their service.

In the short period of their existence, they have made significant contributions to the lives of the people with whom they have been working.

I ask unanimous consent that a well written article published in the Washington, D.C., Star, written by Mary McGrory entitled "Life Among VISTA Folk" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE AMONG VISTA FOLK—NOT RICH AND FAT

(By Mary McGrory)

Charges that the government's antipoverty warriors are too rich and fat stop short of the

VISTA volunteers, so-called "Silent Service" of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

VISTA volunteers, the domestic counterparts of the Peace Corps, are as indifferently housed, clad and fed as the people they are helping.

The big difference between them and the handsomely paid professionals who run the controversial Community Action Program of the OEO is that they live under the conditions they are trying to remedy.

Some of the volunteers were poor to begin with; they will certainly never get rich out of the antipoverty program.

They receive a subsistence allowance scaled to the minimum cost of living in the area where they serve. In addition, a $50 stipend is put away for them each month of their year's service.

NUMBER ARE DROPOUTS

A number of them are high-school dropouts, who have high-school equivalency diplomas. In Harlem no one is more eloquent in persuading would-be dropouts to continue in school than the neighborhood boy who is now a VISTA worker.

Right now, 1,720 VISTAs are laboring cheerfully among the rural and city poor, the migrant workers, the Indians, the mentally ill or mentally retarded and the Job Corps. The worst complaint made against them so far is that there is not enough of them.

Three-quarters of them are between the ages of 18 and 25.

They do not have the glamour of Americans abroad that is one of the dividends of Peace Corps service. But like their brothers and sisters overseas they have succumbed to the widespread youthful mania to serve which has so startled and reassured their elders.

This admission that they would like to do something for somebody else is considered by sociologists a phenomenon of the 1960s, evoked and nurtured by President Kennedy.

PROVE WORTH

In the first year of their existence, the volunteers have proved that with a little training and good supervision, willing spirit can provide social service of the highest order.

One government psychiatrist, getting reports on the work of some 95 volunteers in eight mental health projects in eight States, says they could revolutionize the care of the mentally ill.

"They are providing in many cases the warm relationships that are so desperately needed by disturbed persons," he said.

They have also moved into the field of mental retardation, where their involvement and their round-the-clock availability are obtaining remarkable results.

Wrote a 20-year-old volunteer who works in a center for the mentally retarded in San Francisco.

"Maybe I'm not serving the world, but when I see a child who's been working at a puzzle for 4 months put the final piece in place, I know I've given him something. And he's giving me much more."

PLEAS FOR VOLUNTEERS

This setting of and contentment with small goals may be one of the reasons that the OEO receives daily pleas for more volunteers.

They work with what is available, and they do what is necessary, with no organization tables or plans or forms to fill out. They simply pitch in.

Two young girls, on a reservation where Indians of the Harvasupias tribe practically starved during the winter months, taught the Indians how to make use of the wild chicken and wild celery available in the area.

In a depressed area in Clay County, Ky., two girls put themselves to the task of providing a garbage dump.

In Florida, a 19-year-old taught a 40-year-old woman to read and a whole family to tell time.

Among the rural poor and migrant workers, the volunteers met with initial suspicion and even hostility.

But the fact that they lived in shacks like everybody else and asked for nothing but the chance to help won them a place in their communities.

Many of the volunteers spent Christmas with their "families."

Sargent Shriver, director of OEO hopes there will be at least twice as many of them by next year at this time.

REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate Calendar No. 1120, H.R. 11487, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill [H.R. 11487] to provide revenue for the District of Columbia and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the bill today, but it is the pending business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, one of the perplexing problems of many corporations doing business in several States has been the definition of their income with respect to paying State income taxes. This problem has become aggravated by the fact that there is no uniform definition of the factors for allocating income to the various States. Legislation has been introduced to clear up this difficulty by mandatory requirements which would force a State, desiring to adopt a State income tax on corporations, to use uniform factors.

In my State of Iowa, the only factor in allocating income to Iowa, is the percentage of sales made in Iowa to the total sales made in all States, resulting in the allocation made to Iowa for income tax purposes.

Under the pending legislation, Iowa would have no choice except to allocate a considerably larger portion of the income in the State for tax purposes, because it would have to use property and payroll as well.

It seems to me that the State legislatures should have something to say in this regard.

I have no objection, and I believe it is desirable to require them to use a uniform definition of factors. But I believe the States should be permitted to say how much of the income that would be allocated to them would be taxable. Otherwise the States will not be able to use relatively low income taxes as an incentive for industrial growth. My State is in that category.

There is a lead editorial on this subject in the Wall Street Journal of May 4, 1966, which points out the failure of the States to get together on a uniform definition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "State Bungling and Federal Force," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 4, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE BUNGLING AND FEDERAL FORCE

State governments now are deeply concerned because Congress is considering a measure to take away some of their taxing powers. The states have every reason to be bothered, but they certainly can't blame all their trouble on Washington's omnipresent eagerness to expand its authority.

As happened when many states for years failed to fairly reapportion their own legislatures, the Federal Government now is moving toward clearing up a mess the states created with regard to taxing interstate corporations. The states have bungled the job.

Sales and income taxes are imposed in a bewildering variety of ways; many activities are taxed by some states but not by others, so that it may be difficult if not impossible for a firm to determine what tax it owes where. The confusion has been compounded over the years as more and more corporations, modest-sized as well as large, have spread their operations into more areas of the nation.

If every company carefully complied with the income tax laws of all states, many would wind up paying tax on more than 100 percent of their income. The fact that this unjust outcome is generally avoided by the simple process of ignoring some of the laws, scarcely makes the states' "system" praiseworthy.

To give credit where some is due, the states in recent years have made a little progress toward more uniformity. By the end of last year, 11 legislatures had adopted a model statute, endorsed by the American Bar Association, providing rules for apportioning corporate income for state tax purposes. But 11 states is a far cry from 50, and thus it's not surprising to find impatience in Congress.

The product of the impatience is the proposed Interstate Taxation Act, which is based on the findings of a 4-year study by a special House subcommittee. The consequences of measure, if it's enacted, could be pretty drastic.

To begin with, it would forbid any state to tax the income of most corporations unless they had a business location in the state. State officials argue, and we think with some justice, that a company can reap large profits from a state without having anything or anyone permanently located there—by sending in salesmen, for example. Exempting such a company, state tax men contend, would be unfair to its competitors which are more firmly based in the state and pay taxes there.

In determining the portion of a company's income that's subject to tax in any state, moreover, the state could consider only the portion of the firm's property and payroll within its boundaries. This differs from the model law adopted by the 11 states, which apportions income not only on the basis of property and payroll but on the share of a firm's sales that are made within a given state.

To take a hypothetical example, suppose a company has its factory and most of its employees in Kentucky and yet makes most of its sales in neighboring Tennessee. Under the pending bill Kentucky could tax all or almost all of the company's income while Tennessee could touch little or none of it. Though the hypothesis is exaggerated, it seems clear that the formula could produce results that would be unfair to some states.

While concerned about such a possibility, what worries the states more is the heavy hand the Federal Government would have in their tax affairs. Tax disputes between states and companies would go to a new board in the Treasury Department. The Treasury also would run a "cooperative" Federal-state system for collecting sales taxes on interstate transactions. States which did not cooperate would have their right to collect the taxes sharply curtailed.

Whatever the shortcomings of the pending measure or the extent of Federal encroachment, however, nothing can justify the present confusion. Barring swift moves by the states toward more tax uniformity, which appear unlikely, the current bill or something like it may well wend its way into law.

In that event, there's sure to be angry talk of yet another diminution of the rights of states. It's tempting to forget a major reason those rights are shrinking: Too often the states neglect their own responsibilities.

PROBLEMS OF INFLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, worsening inflation is one of the most serious problems facing the people of the United States.

There are always a few who profit from inflation. Investments and speculation can reap substantial profits; and special capital gains tax treatment is afforded these profits.

But most people are hurt by inflation, and the tragic fact is that those hurt the most are the ones least able to afford it—our younger people, who are trying to pay for an education, purchase a home, maintain a young and growing family, and raise the capital needed to get into a business or farming; and the older people, whose earning power is ended or greatly diminished and who rely on fixed pensions, insurance, annuities, and savings for a livelihood.

The Employment Act of 1946 declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government "to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

Inflation does not promote purchasing power. It takes away purchasing power by increasing the cost of living and of other goods and services, which means that the purchasing power of the dollar goes down.

In 1939, our dollar had a purchasing power of 100 cents. By 1960 the purchasing power of the dollar had fallen to 46.9 cents. By 1965 it had fallen to 44 cents. As of March of this year, it was down to 43.2 cents. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the yearly decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, along with the budget deficit—or surplus—for each year.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Purchasing power of dollar in relation to budget deficits*

Calendar year	Purchasing power	Budget deficits
	Cents	*Millions*
1939	100.0	$3,967
1940	99.2	3,823
1941	94.4	11,762
1942	85.3	41,461
1943	80.3	55,691
1944	79.0	53,650
1945	77.2	43,595
1946	71.2	2,512
1947	62.2	(+2,434)
1948	[1] 57.8	(+5,241)
1949	[1] 58.3	3,592
1950	57.8	422
1951	53.5	3,358
1952	52.3	5,842
1953	51.9	9,157
1954	[1] 51.7	3,683
1955	[1] 51.9	2,771
1956	51.1	(+3,779)
1957	49.4	(+592)
1958	48.1	7,088
1959	47.7	7,040
1960	46.9	(+1,953)
1961	46.4	6,306
1962	45.9	7,199
1963	45.3	6,672
1964	44.7	8,248
1965	44.0	4,699
1966 (March)	43.2	

[1] Years in which fiscal years ended which were under budget control of a Republican Congress.

Mr. MILLER. It is noteworthy that of the drop of 56.8 cents in the purchasing power of the dollar, 52.9 cents occurred during those years when the Democrats were in control of the Congress for the budgeting which ended during those years; and only 3.9 cents occurred while Republicans had control. Also, in the only 2 years—1949 and 1955—in which the purchasing power of the dollar increased, Republicans were in control of the Congress for the budgeting which ended during those years.

It has been well said that the declaration of policy set forth in the Employment Act of 1946 means both full employment and maintenance of the purchasing power of the dollar; and that it is contrary to this policy to pursue courses which constitute a trade-off of one of these goals against the other.

One can easily find statements opposed to inflation. For example, the report of the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee in 1960 on "Employment, Growth, and Price Levels" makes this comment:

> The acceptance of continuing increases, even though quite modest, in the general level of prices may result in acceleration of the inflationary pressures and lead to economic instability. Inflation is unjust. This is true whether it creeps or gallops. It redistributes income and wealth according to the ability of people to protect themselves against its effects. Because of this it benefits the strong at the expense of the weak. The avoidance of inflation is an important goal of economic policy.

In his Economic Report to the Congress, presented in January of this year, President Johnson referred to inflation as "the most unjust and capricious form of taxation."

The trouble is that words are not matched by deeds. And the deeds required to do something about inflation are reductions in Federal Government spending to avoid running our Government billions of dollars deeper into debt, year after year. One may blame the President of the United States for his economic policies, but the people should understand that the real responsibility rests with the Congress; and that the foundation for inflation is laid when a majority of the Members of Congress vote to spend billions of dollars more than our Federal Government takes in, year after year. Such action permits an excessive increase in the quantity of money and bank credit—beyond our production of goods and services.

Purchasing power can be taken from the people by taxes or by inflation. In either case, the people end up with less purchasing power.

For the school year 1960–61, the average cost of education in public college was $1,400. It is $200 per year more now. For the school year 1960–61, the average cost of education in private colleges was $2,090. It is $400 per year more now.

A home costing $12,000 in 1960 cost $13,300 in 1965. Moreover, with the increase in interest rates which has accompanied the inflation, a person taking out a 20-year 80-percent mortgage loan will pay $1,700 more in interest, for a combined increased cost of $3,000 on the $12,000 home, over 1960.

The average cost for a family consisting of husband, wife, and two children was $6,200 in 1960. It was $433 more last year. And a family in this income bracket simply cannot afford such an increase.

Last year the Congress increased social security pensions by 7 percent. Even with this increase, the purchasing power of our pensioners was below what it was in 1954 and 1958, the last 2 years when pensions were increased, as the following table indicates which I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Showing increases in social security pensions legislated by Congress in order to enable pensioners to maintain their purchasing power in view of decline in value of the dollar*

(NOTE.—The example is a worker having a $3,000 annual income base, single at retirement and "fully covered." The 1940 year figure is for a worker retired under the 1935 act. Other figures are for a worker retired under successive acts for years indicated.)

Year	Annual pension	Purchasing power of dollar compared to 1939 dollar worth 100 cents	Real value of pension
		Cents	
1940	$499.20	99.2	$495.20
1950	870.00	57.8	502.86
1952	930.00	52.3	486.39
1954	1,062.00	51.7	549.05
1958	1,140.00	48.1	548.34
1965	1,220.00	44.0	537.00

Mr. MILLER. Of course, with the purchasing power of the dollar continuing to go down, the value of the pensions today is even less than it was in 1965. One can conclude that hundreds of millions of dollars in purchasing power has been taken away from our social security pensioners by the economic policies of those in control of the Democratic Party.

Perhaps the best way to drive home to the average person what inflation has been costing him is to use a sales tax equivalent. A sales tax operates the same as inflation, because it strikes at every man, woman, and child; and it is regressive in that it bears most heavily on the low income, large family groups. Just since the Democratic administration, with its controlled Congress, took over in 1961, there has been an average annual inflation in this country of over $10 billion. With the exception of the Federal income tax, inflation has taken more purchasing power away from our people than any other item. It has been the equivalent of a 3 to 5 percent sales tax on the citizens of most of our States. Worse yet, the problem has been growing more serious. Inflation amounted to $16 billion for 1965, with a sales tax equivalent of from 4 to 8 percent on the citizens of most of the States. Three years ago, 20 percent of our increased gross national product consisted of inflation. Last year one-third of our increased gross national product consisted of inflation.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two tables—one showing the average yearly loss of purchasing power due to inflation from 1961 through 1965 allocated among the various States, with the amount so allocated measured in sales tax equivalent; the other showing the same figures with respect to the inflation for 1965, along with explanatory notes.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III

State	Average yearly loss from inflation, 1961–65	Loss of purchasing power measured in sales tax equivalent
Alabama	$125,300,000	3.6 percent retail sales and use.
Alaska	16,200,000	5.7 percent retail sales.*
Arizona	70,400,000	2.5 percent general sales and use.
Arkansas	66,100,000	2.7 percent retail sales and use.
California	1,126,700,000	3.8 percent retail sales and use.
Colorado	100,900,000	3.3 percent retail sales and use.
Connecticut	181,900,000	5.8 percent retail sales and use.
Delaware	31,900,000	4.5 percent retail sales.*
Florida	266,100,000	3.5 percent retail sales and use.
Georgia	178,000,000	2.9 percent retail sales and use.
Hawaii	38,200,000	1.9 percent gross receipts and use.
Idaho	30,700,000	3.2 percent retail sales.*
Illinois	654,500,000	4.1 percent retail sales and use.
Indiana	261,700,000	2.2 percent retail sales and use.
Iowa	135,700,000	3.1 percent retail sales and use.
Kansas	113,900,000	3.3 percent retail sales and use.
Kentucky	123,000,000	3.4 percent retail sales and use.
Louisiana	138,000,000	2.6 percent retail sales and use.
Maine	42,200,000	4.1 percent retail sales and use.
Maryland	201,000,000	5.8 percent retail sales and use.
Massachusetts	306,300,000	4.1 percent retail sales.*
Michigan	468,600,000	3.5 percent retail sales and use.
Minnesota	176,800,000	3.9 percent retail sales.*
Mississippi	68,900,000	2.7 percent gross receipts and use.
Missouri	223,900,000	3.9 percent retail sales and use.
Montana	$32,200,000	3.3 percent retail sales.*
Nebraska	72,000,000	3.4 percent retail sales.*
Nevada	27,400,000	2.2 percent retail sales and use.
New Hampshire	32,600,000	3.7 percent retail sales.*
New Jersey	416,100,000	4.6 percent retail sales.*
New Mexico	43,400,000	2.2 percent gross receipts and use.
New York	1,110,000,000	4.6 percent retail sales.*
North Carolina	188,800,000	3.6 percent retail sales and use.
North Dakota	28,500,000	3.1 percent retail sales and use.
Ohio	546,600,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.
Oklahoma	105,200,000	3.2 percent retail sales and use.
Oregon	100,600,000	3.8 percent retail sales.*
Pennsylvania	595,500,000	5.9 percent selective sales and use.
Rhode Island	47,500,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.
South Carolina	88,500,000	3.1 percent retail sales and use.
South Dakota	27,400,000	3.0 percent retail sales and use.
Tennessee	145,200,000	Do.
Texas	468,900,000	4.6 percent retail sales and use.
Utah	43,900,000	2.7 percent retail sales and use.
Vermont	17,600,000	3.3 percent retail sales.*
Virginia	201,900,000	4.2 percent retail sales.*
Washington	162,200,000	2.1 percent retail sales and use.
West Virginia	68,900,000	1.3 percent retail sales and use.
Wisconsin	210,500,000	7.9 percent selective gross receipts, use.
Wyoming	16,000,000	2.5 percent retail sales and use.

*See explanatory notes.

TABLE IV

State	1965 loss from inflation	Loss of purchasing power measured in sales tax equivalent
Alabama	$195,468,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.
Alaska	25,272,000	8.9 percent retail sales.*
Arizona	109,824,000	3.9 percent general sales and use.
Arkansas	103,116,000	4.2 percent retail sales and use.
California	1,757,652,000	6 percent retail sales and use.
Colorado	157,404,000	5.2 percent retail sales and use.
Connecticut	283,764,000	9 percent retail sales and use.
Delaware	49,764,000	7 percent retail sales.*
Florida	415,116,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.
Georgia	277,680,000	4.5 percent retail sales and use.
Hawaii	59,592,000	2.9 percent gross receipts and use.
Idaho	47,892,000	5.1 percent retail sales.*
Illinois	1,021,020,000	6.4 percent retail sales and use.
Indiana	408,252,000	3.5 percent retail sales and use.
Iowa	211,692,000	4.8 percent retail sales and use.
Kansas	177,684,000	5.2 percent retail sales and use.
Kentucky	191,880,000	5.3 percent retail sales and use.
Louisiana	215,280,000	4.1 percent retail sales and use.
Maine	65,832,000	6.4 percent retail sales and use.
Maryland	313,560,000	9 percent retail sales and use.
Massachusetts	477,828,000	6.4 percent retail sales.*
Michigan	731,016,000	5.4 percent retail sales and use.
Minnesota	275,808,000	6.1 percent retail sales.*
Mississippi	107,484,000	4.2 percent gross receipts and use.
Missouri	349,284,000	6 percent retail sales and use.
Montana	$50,232,000	5.2 percent retail sales.*
Nebraska	112,320,000	5.4 percent retail sales.*
Nevada	42,744,000	3.4 percent retail sales and use.
New Hampshire	50,856,000	5.8 percent retail sales.*
New Jersey	649,116,000	7.2 percent retail sales.*
New Mexico	67,704,000	3.5 percent gross receipts and use.
New York	1,731,600,000	7.2 percent retail sales.*
North Carolina	294,528,000	5.6 percent retail sales and use.
North Dakota	44,460,000	4.7 percent retail sales and use.
Ohio	852,696,000	8.6 percent retail sales and use.
Oklahoma	164,112,000	5 percent retail sales and use.
Oregon	156,936,000	5.9 percent retail sales.*
Pennsylvania	928,980,000	9.1 percent selective sales and use.
Rhode Island	74,100,000	8.6 percent retail sales and use.
South Carolina	138,060,000	4.9 percent retail sales and use.
South Dakota	42,744,000	4.7 percent retail sales and use.
Tennessee	226,512,000	4.6 percent retail sales and use.
Texas	731,484,000	7.1 percent retail sales and use.
Utah	68,484,000	4.3 percent retail sales and use.
Vermont	27,456,000	5.1 percent retail sales.*
Virginia	314,964,000	6.6 percent retail sales.*
Washington	253,032,000	3.3 percent retail sales and use.
West Virginia	107,484,000	2 percent retail sales and use.
Wisconsin	328,380,000	12.3 percent gross receipts and use.
Wyoming	24,960,000	3.8 percent retail sales and use.

*See explanatory notes.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. AVERAGE YEARLY INFLATION, 1961–1965

This was obtained from the Joint Economic Committee publication, Economic Indicators. "Total Gross National Product in 1958 Prices" for 1960 was subtracted from "Total Gross National Product in 1958 Prices" for 1961. This remainder, in turn, was subtracted from the difference between "Total Gross National Product" for 1960 and "Total Gross National Product" for 1961. This remainder, $6.8 billion, represents inflation for the United States for the year 1961 expressed in dollar terms. Similar remainders on noninflated GNP growth statistics, that is GNP figures all measured in 1958 prices, were subtracted from GNP growth figures in current, inflated, dollars for the years 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965. The yearly dollar value of inflation thus calculated was: $6.8 billion for 1961, $7.5 billion for 1962, $8.9 billion for

1963, $11.9 billion for 1964, and $15.6 billion for 1965.

Thus the total amount of inflation expressed in dollars for the period 1961 to 1965 was $50.7 billion, an average of slightly over $10 billion per year. To assign each of the 50 States its appropriate share of this inflation, The Survey of Current Business, April 1966, was used. Page 10, Table 2, contains "Total Personal Income, by States and Regions, 1948–1965." Personal income for the United States for 1965 was divided into each State total which gave each State a percentage, in several cases of 3 significant figures, which represents State share of total National Personal Income. This State percentage, multiplied by average yearly inflation 1961–1965 expressed in dollars, appears beside that State in the column Average Yearly Inflation 1961–1965 in the attached chart.

The State percentages of National Personal Income are:

Rhode Island .475 percent, Connecticut 1.819 percent, New York 11.100 percent, New Jersey 4.161 percent, Pennsylvania 5.955 percent, Delaware .319 percent, Maryland 2.010 percent, District of Columbia .557 percent, Michigan 4.686 percent, Ohio 5.466 percent, Indiana 2.617 percent, Illinois 6.545 percent, Wisconsin 2.105 percent, Minnesota 1.768 percent, Iowa 1.357 percent, Missouri 2.239 percent, North Dakota .285 percent, South Dakota .274 percent, Nebraska .720 percent, Kansas 1.139 percent, Virginia 2.019 percent, West Virginia .689 percent, Kentucky 1.230 percent, Tennessee 1.452 percent, North Carolina 1.888 percent, South Carolina .885 percent, Georgia 1.780 percent, Florida 2.661 percent, Alabama 1.253 percent, Mississippi .689 percent, Louisiana 1.380 percent. Arkansas .661 percent, Oklahoma 1.052 percent, Texas 4.689 percent, New Mexico .434 percent, Arizona .704 percent, Montana .322 percent, Idaho .307 percent, Wyoming .160 percent, Colorado 1.009 percent, Utah .439 percent, Washington 1.622 percent, Oregon 1.006 percent, Nevada .274 percent, California 11.267 percent, Alaska .162 percent, Hawaii .382 percent, Maine .422 percent, New Hampshire .326 percent, Vermont .176 percent, Massachusetts 3.063 percent.

2. LOSS OF PURCHASING POWER MEASURED IN SALES TAX EQUIVALENT, 1961–1966

This was obtained, in cases where State sales and use taxes are in existence, from Facts and Figures on Government Finance, 13th Edition, Tax Foundation, Inc. Section V, pages 187 and 188 contain "State General Sales Tax Collections By State" and "State General Sales Tax Rates" respectively. Loss of purchasing power in sales tax equivalent since the Democratic Administration took office in 1961 was determined as follows: "State General Sales Tax Rate" multiplied by "Yearly Inflation Since 1961" was divided by "State General Sales Tax Collections for 1964" for each of the 50 States which had, as of September 1, 1964, a State General Sales Tax in existence.

For the 13 States which had no Sales, Selective Sales, Gross Receipts, or Use Taxes as of September 1, 1964, a generalization was made based on the information from "The Statistical Abstract for 1965." Pages 828 and 829 of "The Abstract" list sales for "Retail Trade Establishments and Sales By Kind of Business by States: 1963."

*Percentages for the 13 States having no sales taxes as of September 1, 1964, were based on assumption of a simple retail sales tax on lumber, building materials, hardware, farm equipment dealers; general merchandise group stores; food stores; automotive dealers; gasoline service stations; apparel accessory stores; furniture, home furnishings equipment stores; eating, drinking places; drug stores, proprietary stores; other retail stores; and nonstore retailers. Dividing average yearly inflation since 1961 for each State by retail sales for the 11 groups of retail trades utilized, gave the percentage tax rate which would be necessary, if imposed on retail sales, to raise the dollar amount of inflation incurred by that State since 1961 for each year.

3. LOSS OF PURCHASING POWER MEASURED IN SALES TAX EQUIVALENT FOR 1965

1965 inflation by State was determined, as above, by multiplying State share of total National Personal Income, by 1965 inflation for the United States expressed in dollars, $15.6 billion. Again, as above, sales tax equivalent was determined by multiplying State General Sales Tax Rate by State share of inflation for 1965 and dividing the product by State General Sales Tax Collections. Likewise, an assumption of a simple retail sales tax was made for States with no sales tax in existence as of September 1, 1964. 1965 inflation for each of those States was divided by retail sales within the 11 categories previously utilized to give a percentage tax rate which would be necessary, if imposed on retail sales, to raise the dollar amount of inflation incurred by that State during calendar year 1965.

4. ACCURACY

Unfortunately, a certain amount of internal error is possible due to the law of significant figures. Retail trade statistics vary from a high of 6 significant figures to a low of 4 significant figures, whereas personal income statistics vary from 5 significant figures to 3 significant figures. Since inflation for the United States, both 1961–1965 average and that of 1965 alone, are in excess of $10 billion—11 significant figures—these statistics are useful only as a general guide illustrating simply and easily the awesome scope of inflation, State by State, across the Nation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I hope that, in light of these figures obtained from Federal Government statistics, the voting public will understand that when administration spokesmen speak of "the danger of inflation," they ought to be speaking of "the danger of more serious inflation," and that we have been having inflation which, while not galloping in recent years, is deadly serious.

The people should know that, by its deeds, the consensus of the Democratic Party believes in having the Federal Government spend billions of dollars more than our revenue; and that, whether those in control of the Congress like it or not, this lays the foundation for inflation. I do not say there is a precise correlation between deficit spending and inflation; but the table showing the drop in the purchasing power of our dollar and the budget deficits clearly show there is a correlation. For example, during the last 5 years, while the Democratic Congress was running our country $31 billion deeper into debt, we had $51 billion of inflation.

Inflation will, assuredly, be an issue in the elections this year. It should be. And if the voters awaken to who is responsible for it, there will be an end to one-party rule in Washington. Our country will be better off for it. And millions of young people, who are not yet of voting age, will bless the voters for their good judgment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN BILLS, RECEIVE MESSAGES, AND FILE REPORTS

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate from today until noon on Monday next, the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills; the Secretary of the Senate to receive messages from the President and from the House of Representatives; and committees to file reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALIFORNIA ASPARAGUS LABOR CRISIS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on many occasions since I have been a Member of this distinguished body, I have taken the floor to call attention to the urgent need of our farmers—both in California and in many States throughout the Nation—to obtain qualified and willing harvest workers when needed to supplement their year-round supply.

Historically, we in California have had to call upon our good neighbors in Mexico to supply this supplemental harvest labor needs. Last year, as the result of Secretary of Labor Wirtz' insistence that farmers should be denied the use of emergency supplemental workers from Mexico, our farmers were forced to endure a costly and unsuccessful bureaucratic experiment.

This unnecessary harassment from the Secretary of Labor resulted in losses of crops in the field, higher production costs, and higher grocery prices for the housewives of our Nation. It also resulted in the realization by anyone who studied the facts thoroughly that there will always be occasions when the domestic force is insufficient to handle urgent peak harvest demands. When this situation arises, and farmers are desperately pleading for assistance to avoid crop losses, we can either ignore their request or permit them to save their livelihood. We have this decision today in California in the asparagus harvest.

Secretary Wirtz can either ignore or deny their request—or permit them the needed help in order to avoid further loss.

The stake is $6 million and 15,000 acres of white asparagus which must be harvested immediately. Every effort has been made by my farmers to recruit domestic labor. The asparagus farmers assured me they have put to work every available, qualified, and willing domestic worker they can find. The crisis is now acute—and they have asked for 2,500 workers immediately. Otherwise their crops and investment will be lost.

Last week, I solicited the personal assistance of President Johnson, pointing out that asparagus was one of the commodities which last year suffered the most serious losses. The resulting burden on our housewives is evident from the wholesale delivery prices of loose large California asparagus on the Chicago market. On April 28, 1964, pyramid crates were selling for $6. Last year this was up to $6.75, and this year, I regret to report, on April 26 the price was $9. The housewives of our Nation are feeling these higher food prices every day in the marketplace.

Mr. President, there is no question that asparagus growers have been paying wage rates which average far more than the $1.40 minimum imposed on California by Secretary Wirtz. Last November, Secretary Wirtz saw fit to allow the Florida citrus industry to use an average wage system instead of a guaranteed minimum system, and it seems to me only fair that our California growers be permitted a similar arrangement.

Mr. President, let me comment on the growers' continued and relentless—but unsuccessful—efforts at interstate recruiting. Their efforts this year have been just as unproductive as they were last year, and the cost just as high. When Mr. Glen Brockway, regional director of the Bureau of Employment Security, San Francisco, announced his decision last week turning down the asparagus growers' request for 2,500 supplemental workers, he leveled a number of charges at the growers. However, his main criticism, and apparently the main reason for the denial of this request, was that they had not engaged in interstate recruitment through the facilities of the Department of Labor. The facts simply do not agree with Mr. Brockway's contentions.

That they are reluctant to submit interstate clearance orders through the Department of Labor is very understandable in view of their past experience. The growers made clear in their telegram to the Secretary of Labor requesting supplemental labor, that they could not afford the expense of such recruitment and the high level of worker attrition which they experienced in 1965. These experiences were also summarized by Mr. Nat Scatena, president of the Stockton Growers Group, when he testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor on March 11 of this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have two telegrams by Mr. A. R. Duarte, manager of the San Joaquin Farm Production Association, discussing wages and the association's recruiting efforts included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
May 10, 1966.

Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

(Copy of message sent to Glenn Brockway, Regional Administrator, Bureau of Employment Security, San Francisco, Calif.)

In answer to your telegram, May 4, 1966. The asparagus industry put on a real effective recruitment program to obtain domestic workers in 1966. $85,000 has been spent in recruitment efforts to date for transportation and subsistence and recruitment costs intra-State and interstate Texas and Hawaii.

Workers recruited did not stay long enough on the job to recover transportation and subsistence advances. As per secretary's criteria $1.40 per hour paid to all asparagus cutters since harvest operation started and remained on hourly rate until qualified. To attract American asparagus cutters piece rates were greatly increased. Qualified cutters earning $18 to $48 per day more and better food furnished to attract and retain workers. Board charges had to be increased.

Two of our members have offered free transportation and refund on board deduction from April 24, if workers remain to end of asparagus season. Both members short of workers.

The intensive crash recruitment program being conducted Los Angeles, San Francisco and Oakland East Bay has produced 81 workers from May 2 through May 9 only 32 remain.

The Department of Employment Personnel claim no cooperation or assistance from welfare and poverty offices. We feel that we more than complied with the suggestion your letter of February 11, 1966 except for some increase in board charges and maybe an isolated case or two of improper transportation deductions. For first time in several years shortages now getting acute for all thinning operations long and short handle hoe work and also cherry harvest.

Any assistance that you can offer will be greatly appreciated.

A. R. DUARTE,
Manager, San Joaquin Farm Production Association.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
May 2, 1966.

Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Copy of following wire sent to Honorable Secretary of Labor Wirtz:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The San Joaquin farm production has been recruiting for 2 months intrastate and also recruited interstate Texas. Hundreds of workers recruited to date. Growers also have attempted their own recruitment. Not sufficient workers to harvest asparagus clearance order placed with State department of employment April 14, 1966 for 500 workers. On April 25 order increased to 1,500. Increasing order with department of employment today for an additional 1,000 total 2,500.

Four asparagus growers, directors and myself met with Director, department of employment Albert Tieburg, Friday, regarding certification for Mexican nationals. Director said he could not certify because we were not on your criteria. We stated that our job offer to the worker exceeded criteria of 1965 piece work rates were producing $2 to $3.50 per hour for inexperienced workers.

In addition to our recruitment efforts department employment claims to be using sound trucks, hand bill, TV and radio and newspaper advertisement. Results to date has produced 35 workers, 3 still working. Crash recruitment program now being conducted by department of employment in Oakland area. Don't expect many workers out of that area. Crash recruitment program Los Angeles area today resulted in 8 workers for asparagus.

Our clearance order with Department of Employment now includes criteria for all recruitment intra-state.

At asparagus growers meeting held Thursday night growers stated that they could comply with criteria for intrastate recruitment but due to poor retention of workers recruited interstate 1965 and at great expense would appreciate your waiver of interstate recruitment as part of criteria 1966.

Mexico has been contacted and states it could have workers ready in 15 days after certification received from your office.

We have done everything possible to recruit and retain workers, increased wages average $2 to $3.50 per hour, better housing, better food. Combined efforts of Department of Employment and Labor Department has not produced sufficient number of workers to complete our asparagus harvest.

We respectfully ask for your immediate consideration to our request.

With best personal regards.

A. R. DUARTE,
Manager, San Joaquin Farm Production Association.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the sad plight of asparagus growers was discussed fully by me last year. On September 13, 1965, I included in the RECORD during my remarks on the agricultural labor situation, an article from the September 1965 issue of the California Farm Bureau Monthly concerning asparagus losses. That article will be found beginning on page 23519, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 17. I also submitted for the RECORD on June 30, 1965, a report of the San Joaquin Farm Production Association detailing its recruitment efforts and results. Interested Members will find those facts beginning on page 15427, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 11.

What were the results of the policies of the Secretary of Labor on California's asparagus growers in 1965?

A report prepared for the California State Board of Agriculture and presented in Sacramento on January 24, 1966, provides a documented account of 1965's experiences. According to that report:

> Asparagus acreage available for harvest totalled 54,900 acres in 1965, compared with 65,400 acres in 1964 and an average of 67,480 acres for the period 1960–64.

The acreage reduction "was attributed to an abnormally high plow-out in late 1964 and during the 1965 harvest."

In the words of the report:

> It is not possible to determine precisely why growers plowed out the unusually large number of acres during 1964 and the 1965 harvest season. Generally, growers may plow out more than a normal number of acres when (1) the weather is poor, (2) market prices are low, or (3) labor is in short supply.
>
> Weather, markets, availability or harvest labor, and cost of production contribute to changes in volume produced. In 1965, the weather was good and the domestic and export market outlooks were excellent; harvest labor costs increased approximately 46 percent.

Comparing projected normal production of asparagus in 1965 with the actual production, the study shows the latter to be almost 41 million pounds below the projected normal production.

Gross income to asparagus growers in 1965 was $1.2 million above 1964, but $2 million below the 5-year average. However, data based on a sample of growers show grower's production and harvest costs rose 17 percent in 1965 over 1964. Harvest labor costs, excluding increased recruitment costs rose 46 percent. Thus, the effect of increased costs was to reduce growers' net income about $2.4 million below 1964 and $5.6 million below the 5-year average.

There were, of course, other results of the disastrous policies followed last year which are obviously being repeated in 1966.

The 1965 pack of asparagus—green and white—was just over 2 million cases, a drop of 35 percent from 1964. The pack of white asparagus declined 1.3 million cases. Processors spent $2.4 million less on labor and materials than if the volume of 1964 had been packed in 1965.

These are the results of the labor policies imposed on asparagus growers in 1965. Is it any wonder that growers are unwilling to enter into an interstate recruitment program which the Secretary's own California Farm Labor Panel called "a dismal failure"?

This year, asparagus growers have increased their rates of pay. Earnings are averaging above $2 per hour. Housing has been improved. Menus have been revised at an increase of only 25 cents per day in board charges.

Asparagus growers have engaged in interstate recruitment on their own. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record at this point the report of Mr. Nat Scatena on those activities.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Stockton Growers Group, Inc.,
Stockton, Calif., April 24, 1966.

Hon. George Murphy,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Murphy: I am offering for your information a copy of a report pertaining to our 1966 asparagus harvest to date. The report was prepared for Mr. Glenn E. Brockway, Regional Director, U.S. Department of Labor, B.E.S. Mr. Albert Tieburg, California Department of Employment, has also been furnished a copy.

Our delta asparagus industry is faced with essentially the same problem that confronted us at this time last year: A lack of workers willing to cut asparagus.

We have already found, as the report shows, that a substantial increase in wages, an exceptionally high yielding season and numerous concessions to the worker in the way of food, management, living conditions, and various ways of computing units that the worker himself can see and compute, is not enough to induce him to do the job. The growers, at this point, have no additional inducements to offer; no means of holding the worker in asparagus.

In 1965 we got some relief; enough to perform a salvage operation only. The Japanese Nationals allowed to work in asparagus were too few in number, their quality and quantity of work was poor and their habit of taking extended vacations is not compatible to asparagus cutting that must be performed every day. We also received a few Mexican Nationals; they were too few and too late to allow completion of a full harvest.

At this time growers can only hope that others in positions outside agriculture will be able to devise some method of relief.

Respectfully yours,
Stockton Growers Group, Inc.,
Nat R. Scatena, *President.*

Stockton Growers Group, Inc.,
Stockton, Calif., April 23, 1966.

Mr. Glenn E. Brockway,
Regional Administrator, U.S. Department of Labor, BES, Post Office Box 36017, San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Mr. Brockway: I thought you may be interested in some information concerning our 1966 asparagus harvest to date.

These statistics have been compiled for growers representing 3,600 acres of asparagus on which 2,600 acres are on peat soils. These peat soil growers must convert to white asparagus production. During the last few days attrition of workers from our camps and nonavailability of sufficient workers for our day haul and gate hire operations has become acute. It is going to become more difficult to hold these workers for cutting white asparagus as each day passes. Wages, as indicated in this report, is not the factor.

These growers have expended thousands of dollars and have, through combined recruiting efforts, canvassed Texas, Mexican Green Card workers from within Mexico, and every area within California where we thought workers may be available for cutting asparagus in the delta area. Positive recruitment is continuing but, because of attrition, will have to be halted soon for economic reasons.

An order was placed with the California Department of Employment on April 13 for 125 asparagus cutters. This order was sent to all State Farm Labor offices. To date one worker has been referred. He was hired and departed his employment on April 22.

New activities are commencing. We must assume, and past experience has shown, that more asparagus cutters are going to pursue these other activities.

If the industry is to accomplish any more than a salvage operation, as was done in 1965, something must be done immediately. We are certain that everything possible is being done to motivate a desirous worker and costs are mounting daily to this end. However, the harvest is not being accomplished. It is safe to assume that the white asparagus industry in the delta area is doomed. Perhaps at some later date, when machinery is available to replace man, the white asparagus grower can hope to regain markets that are being absorbed by growers in areas outside the United States.

The only growers that can partially complete their harvests, say to June 10, are those that have filipino workers. The filipino is no longer desirous of cutting white asparagus. Too, he is getting old and each year many disappear from the scene.

In summary this report reflects a picture of dire predicament. We know of other growers who are, and have been, in more serious trouble than the eleven growers reflected herein. They do not appear in this report simply because this organization has not been able to field the manpower to service them.

There are some exceptions as I stated above: the few growers who have sufficient numbers of the old standby filipino worker. However, these workers are not able to harvest all the green, nor an appreciable amount of the white asparagus. Are we to repeat 1965?

Respectfully yours,
Stockton Growers Group, Inc.,
Nat R. Scatena, *President.*

Stockton Growers Group, Inc.,
Stockton, Calif., April 22, 1966.

The 1966 Asparagus Harvest

(Note.—The attached analysis (pages 1 through 6) were compiled from the payroll and production records of Stockton Growers Group, Inc. Request their dissemination be limited to persons having a direct interest in the subject material.)

Eleven Growers are represented in these statistics. Soil conditions and physical locations are varied. Workers were housed in six different camps located in various parts of San Joaquin and Contra Costa Counties. Camps were serviced by more than one caterer. Attrition has been constant, without enough variance to attribute it to any single Grower, Camp or Ranch. (We naturally assume, however, that the predominance of peat soil is a continuing contributing factor to attrition in the asparagus industry.)

At the beginning of the asparagus cutting season (mid March) workers averaged $1.46 hourly earnings. On April 1 average hourly earnings for all crews was $2.35. On April 21 average hourly earnings for all crews was $2.71. Lowest earnings for any single crew on April 21 was $2.03 per hour. Highest earnings for any single crew on April 21 was $3.42 per hour. (These dates were selected in order to show earnings at the beginning of the season, at an advanced date in the season when beds could be expected to yield full production and the last date for which earnings have been calculated prior to preparation of this report.) It will be noted that attrition is as great, if not greater, during the higher earnings periods. This would tend to indicate that earnings, regardless of their amounts, will not detain the worker from his migratory habits.

Attrition shown herein is at a time of green asparagus harvest and cool, comparatively comfortable working conditions. With the heat of early summer and the harvest of white asparagus, which is a more difficult task, attrition can be expected to increase considerably. Day haul and Gate hire operations can be discounted from white asparagus harvest. In addition to uncomfortable working conditions, weeding, hoeing, thinning and fruit harvests will absorb all local labor available, and more.

THE 1966 ASPARAGUS HARVEST—WORKER RECRUITMENT AND UTILIZATION, APRIL 22, 1966

Chronology of Inter-state Recruitment conducted by Stockton Growers Group, Inc.:

March 18: 56 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of $47 each: 3 workers departed without working, 3 workers departed after working 1 day, 2 workers departed after working 2 days, 4 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 28 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 50 percent.

March 23: 44 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of $47 each: 4 workers departed after working 1 day, 4 workers departed after working 2 days, 5 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 15 workers are present and still working. Attrition has been 66 percent.

March 26: 38 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of $47 each: 5 workers refused employment and departed immediately, 20 workers departed after working 1 day, 2 workers departed after working 2 days, 1 worker departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 6 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 85 percent.

March 31: 38 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of $47 each: 11 workers departed during their first night's stay without working, 3 workers departed after working 1 day, 1 worker departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 11 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 72 percent.

Chronology of Inter-state Recruitment conducted by San Joaquin Farm Production Association for Growers Serviced by Stockton Growers Group, Inc:

April 16: 25 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of $48 each: 3 workers departed without working, 3 workers departed after working 1 day, 7 workers departed after working 2 days, 10 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 2 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 92 percent.

April 20: 32 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of $48 each: 1 worker departed without working, 7 workers departed after working 2 days. The remaining workers worked 2 days; in the morning of their third day's work they sat down, refused to work, demanding higher wages. Following an offer by the grower to pay either by piece work or by the hour, as the worker desired, 6 workers remained having selected and being granted piece work rates. The remaining 18 workers declared they would not cut asparagus at any price and departed. On April 23, 6 workers are still present; have worked 2 days. Attrition has been 82 percent.

Chronology of Intra-state Recruitment Conducted by Stockton Growers Group, Inc:

April 7: 15 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $40 each: 6 workers jumped from the bus and departed at the first boulevard stop en-route to camp. On April 22, 1 worker is still present and working. Attrition has been 94 percent.

April 12: 16 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $40 each: 1 worker departed without working, 6 workers departed after working 1 day, 1 worker departed after working 2 days, 1 worker departed after working 4 days, 4 workers departed after working 5 days. On April 22, 2 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 88 percent.

April 14: 26 workers and a Foreman who had supervised these workers in the Imperial Valley arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $40 each. These workers rested in camp on their day of arrival, having arrived in the early A.M. after an overnight ride. On the morning of April 15, Foreman and all workers had disappeared.

April 16: 19 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $40 each: 1 worker departed without working, 1 worker departed after working 1 day, 1 worker departed after working 2 days, 2 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 14 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 27 percent.

April 19: 19 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $40 each: 12 workers slept overnight and departed without working. On April 22, 7 workers are still present and have worked 3 days. Attrition has been 64 percent.

April 21: 16 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $40 each: 15 workers departed during the night after arrival without working. On April 23, 1 worker is still present and has worked 1 day. Attrition has been 94 percent.

Chronology of Intra-state Recruitment conducted by San Joaquin Farm Production Association for Growers serviced by Stockton Growers Group:

March 29: 16 workers arrived from San Diego, Calif., at a cost of $20 each: 5 workers departed after working 1 day, 8 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22 no workers remain. Attrition has been 100 percent.

April 1: 10 workers arrived from San Diego, Calif., at a cost of $20 each: 2 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 1 worker is still present and working. Attrition has been 90 percent.

April 2: 17 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $20 each: 3 workers departed after working 2 days, 2 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 5 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 71 percent.

April 13: 8 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $30 each: 7 workers departed after 2 days work. On April 22, 1 worker is still present and working. Attrition has been 88 percent.

April 18: 25 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $30 each: 7 workers departed without working, 1 worker departed after working 1 day. On April 22, 17 workers are still present and have worked 3 days. Attrition has been 32 percent in 3 days.

April 19: 4 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of $35 each: All 4 workers slept overnight and departed without working.

(Workers recruited by Stockton Growers Group were recruited only for Growers being serviced by Stockton Growers.)

(Workers recruited by San Joaquin Farm Production Association were recruited for Growers being serviced by Stockton Growers Group.)

Local Recruiting Conducted by Stockton Growers Group, Inc.: During the 1966 Asparagus Harvest Season to date 52 workers have been locally recruited for camp dormitory type living: 410 man-work-days have been realized from this group, for an average of 7 man-days per worker. On April 22nd, 6 of this group are still present and working. Attrition has been 89 percent.

Day Haul and Gate Hire Operations conducted by Stockton Growers Group, Inc.: During the current Asparagus Harvest Season to date, 3,093 man-days have been realized from this labor source. Seven hundred eighty-three workers have been hired, for an average of 4 man-work-days per worker.

(On the day of this report, an average day, day haul hiring was 153 workers short of the number required to complete the day's harvest.)

Recruitment and utilization summary, 1966 asparagus harvest season through April 22

	Inter-state recruited	Intra-state recruited	Aggregate
Number of workers recruited	233	191	424
Recruiting costs	$11,008	$6,430	$17,438
Number of man-work days realized	2,257	627	2,884
Average number of work days realized per worker recruited	9	3	6
Recruiting costs per man-work day realized	$4.87	$10.25	$6.04
Number of workers still present and working	68	49	117
Attrition rate (percent)	71	75	73

NOTE.—Although man-work days realized and costs are computed to date only, there is no reason to believe that, with continued recruiting, attrition will be less. In fact, as discussed elsewhere in this report, attrition is expected to rise. Considering this, the above reflects true utilization and costs.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Wirtz' refusal to permit the employment of this needed supplemental labor will mean, according to the manager of the California Asparagus Growers Association, that some 15,000 acres of asparagus worth $6 million are doomed unless 2,500 additional workers are found almost immediately.

With all the urgency at my command, I call on the Secretary to reconsider his decision and permit the supplemental labor so badly needed to be admitted to this country.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE IN THE CANADIAN AUTO AGREEMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the adjustment assistance provided in the automotive agreement and treaty entered into with the Canadian Government last year.

Last September this body passed legislation implementing the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement after considerable debate and a narrow defeat of the recommittal motion.

Let me review some of the major points of that debate:

First. A selling factor for the implementing legislation was that Prime Minister Lester Pearson and our President had already signed an agreement for duty free treatment of new automobiles and parts, and that, therefore, we in the Congress must pass this bill rather than embarrass the administration. Several Senators and Representatives felt that this should have been a treaty and should not have been handled in such high-handed fashion.

Second. The agreement required a waiver from the most-favored-nation clause of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, even though at the time we were pushing for multilateral rather than bilateral agreements.

Third. The agreement substantially lessened our favorable balance-of-payments situation with regard to Canada. At the same time, the Departments involved in negotiating the agreements—State, Commerce, and Treasury—were working out all types of voluntary and mandatory controls to keep the U.S. dollar sound.

Fourth. The agreement and the legislation legalized an illegal scheme by which the Canadians were rebating our tariffs in violation of the Tariff Act of 1930, which stipulated that countervailing duties were applicable.

Fifth. The agreement had all manner of assurances to Canadian industry—including the 60-percent content requirement but none for U.S. small parts manufacturers.

Sixth. The legislation contained preferential adjustment assistance treatment for only one industry, at a time when we desperately needed a major overhaul of all adjustment assistance criteria.

Seventh. The agreement required a series of letters of undertaking to assure the Canadians that U.S. companies would continue production and augment their investment in Canada. That in itself was embarrassing to our U.S. automotive companies. The letters were remarkably similar.

It was a bad law, Mr. President, and even those who voted for it thought there were many parts which were not good for our economy. Administration spokesmen said in essence, "Bear with us, believe us, in the long run we will all profit."

Such assurances do not erase the objectionable points of the agreement. Now we see just how a questionable law can be administered poorly and without regard for the letter of that law.

The administration, through the President's special 3-man committee, has determined that 200 workers, fired by the Ford Motor Co. from their jobs in Pennsauken, N.J., are to receive the very generous unemployment compensation benefits Congress authorized last year when we approved legislation implementing the United States-Canadian Automobile Agreement.

We can sympathize with these workers, and their families. We can sympathize also with unemployed workers elsewhere in this country who have lost—and are losing—their jobs because the automobile companies prefer to expand their Canadian operations to the detriment of U.S. labor. But sympathy should not motivate the administration of an act of Congress.

Many of us objected last year that the Canadian Automobile Agreement legislation was rushed through the Senate so fast that we could not know the full impact of what we were doing. I have enumerated some of the points called in question. By ruling that these 200 employees lost their jobs by virtue of the "operation of the agreement" the President's special 3-man committee has proven how right we were.

These workers packaged "knocked-down" vehicles and parts for export. That is all they did. They did not manufacture automotive products. In some instances the parts they packaged for export were not even made by Ford—they were made by subcontractors and sold to Ford for export. The Ford Motor Co. made a private decision that it would package these "knocked-downs" in Canada rather than in this country. This was a private decision, which created the unemployment and despair for 200 workers and their families.

It may be argued that the private decision was in no way related to the agreement. If that is the case, the decision to pay the adjustment assistance is wrong. On the other hand, if because those letters of undertaking were a part of the agreement, the Federal Government is forced to pay the tab on company decisions similar to this one, our fears at the time of the legislation are proven valid, and the Government is in effect subsidizing the manufacturers in their private decisions for their own benefit.

Let us look at this April 14 Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board ruling that these 200 employees lost their jobs by virtue of the "operation of the agreement."

The Board, composed of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, Chairman, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, and Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, was unable to determine that imports of automotive products had increased appreciably or that exports had decreased appreciably because of the agreement. The Tariff Commission's report to that committee has not been made public. Nevertheless, the decision was made that the loss of jobs was, in fact, a result of operation of the agreement. Although the Ford Motor Co. workers had applied for the aid, the company was as surprised as I was that this petition was granted.

The real facts concerning this case are being kept secret, or so it seems. They are not available. I believe that it would be in the national interest to make the facts known. If the operation of the agreement truly was the cause of their unemployment, there should be nothing to hide, because we were made to understand by the Secretary of Labor that there would be dislocation. Only the size and nature of such dislocation was open to speculation. But, if Ford's private decision was the cause, then Ford Motor Co., not the taxpayers of this Nation, should be made to pay for the adjustment assistance. If the agreement and those letters of undertaking can be so stretched "outside the letter of the law," perhaps we ought to take another look at the enabling legislation we allowed to pass earlier in this Congress, H.R. 9042.

This question of special adjustment assistance under the Canadian auto bill was of great concern to many Senators, including some of us on the Finance Committee. Last year, during our hearings on the implementing bill, Secretary of Labor Wirtz responded to an inquiry by Senator CARLSON as to the breadth of the adjustment assistance section, as follows:

> I think it is a fair point, Senator CARLSON, that what it is done here is to try to identify as many different situations as could conceivably cause dislocation to a firm or to a group of workers, and to open that door very wide and then to make provisions for a procedure which will be sure to separate out the cases of propriety from impropriety.

At another point in the hearings, on the same day, the Secretary of Labor informed us:

> Under the statute or the bill as proposed there is a most orderly procedure, a carefully drawn procedure, in fact a conservative procedure, for the fullest possible reasonable advice to the President of the United States in making that determination.
>
> I think the bill adequately protects every interest which is involved, and does not result in the conferring of what would, by the implication of your question—

Senator GORE's—

> be undue discretionary authority.

From this advice we received at the hearing, a reasonable interpretation of the adjustment assistance feature of the bill would be that it was drawn so as to extend adjustment assistance in every conceivable case under which workers engaged in producing automotive products might lose their jobs. Having thus been drafted in the broadest terms imaginable, the provisions in question should not now be loosely interpreted in a manner which would increase the Federal deficit by extending Federal benefits to workers who lose their jobs solely by virtue of a private business decision.

Now, Mr. President, let me demonstrate why it is extremely questionable whether these workers are eligible for adjustment assistance under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. Section 302(a) of this act provides that a petition for a determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance may be filed with the President by a group of workers in a firm which produces an "automotive product." An "automotive product" is defined in the act to mean a motor vehicle or a fabricated component to be used as original equipment in the manufacture of motor vehicles. It does not include replacement parts.

After this petition is filed, the act requires the President to determine whether—and at this point I am quoting the statute—"production in the United States of the automotive product concerned produced by the firm or an appropriate subdivision thereof" has decreased appreciably. This statute, as I read it, makes it clear that the unemployed workers must have been engaged in the production of some specific "automotive product" if the Federal benefit is to be available.

But this group of workers in Pennsauken, N.J., was not engaged in producing any product. They performed a mere stevedoring operation. They packaged "knocked down" autos and parts for export. They did nothing more. And some of the parts, as I have stated, might not have been produced by Ford at all.

They did not lose their jobs because of any increase in imports. They were not unemployed because of any decrease in exports from the United States to Canada as the act by its specific terms contemplates. Their unemployment was not predicated upon any reduction in production in the United States of automotive products. The primary cause of their unemployment was, so the President's committee says, "by operation of the agreement."

But what does "operation of the agreement" mean? The statute defines this term to include governmental or private actions in the United States or Canada directly related to the conclusion or implementation of the agreement. The agreement refers only to a limited form of free trade in automotive products between the United States and Canada. This limited free trade is accorded only with respect to, one, vehicles imported into Canada by a manufacturer of automobiles, and two, parts and accessories imported into Canada for use as original equipment in vehicles to be produced in Canada.

Suppose the vehicles or parts involved are imported into Canada for the sole purpose of packaging them for export—and this is what the New Jersey workers alleged in their petition for adjustment assistance. Are they accorded free entry under the Canadian agreement? I think not. The "operation of the agreement" has nothing to do with it—unless, as I stated previously, the agreement is so loose that the private agreements between the U.S. automotive companies and the Canadian Government carry a lot more weight than the State Department admitted during the hearings.

Suppose then that the vehicles or parts involved are produced in Canada for export to a third country, replacing former U.S. exports. Is this an operation of the agreement sufficient to qualify these workers for Federal benefits? I think not. Nowhere is it suggested that U.S. exports to a third country might be decreased by virtue of the agreement. To the contrary, we were told in terms certain that increased Canadian production under the agreement was going to go toward satisfying the market for automobiles in Canada. But now we find that the Adjustment Assistance Board will allow Ford to cut its U.S. exports and expand its Canadian exports while changing the bill for adjustment assistance for its laid-off workers to the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, Congress made a serious mistake when it approved implementation of the United States-Canadian Automobile Agreement. The administration is now making a more serious mistake in passing out potentially vast Federal benefits to workers who have lost their jobs because the Ford Motor Co. prefers to package its unassembled parts and components in Canada rather than in the United States. The evidence, sketchy as it is, indicates that the United States-Canadian Automobile Agreement had little or nothing to do with the unfortunate plight of these workers. If full disclosure and closer examination of the facts in this case shows that the agreement is not at fault, then providing adjustment assistance to these workers is contrary to the terms of the statute and violates the intent of the Congress.

There will be other petitions for adjustment assistance under the Canadian automobile legislation. Indeed, the Tariff Commission announced on April 20, that it was investigating a petition by a group of unemployed workers from the Fisher Body Plant at Grand Rapids, Mich. These workers laid off by General Motors, like those fired by Ford in New Jersey, allege that their jobs were lost, not by increase in imports or decrease in exports but by a company decision to move the work of that plant to Canada. They allege this is an "operation of the agreement."

I do not propose to prejudge the cause of the Michigan firings but I do point out that this phrase "operation of the agreement" is not a loose term which can be stretched at administrators' whim or fancy to pass out Federal benefits as they or the auto companies choose. To the contrary, it is a term carefully defined in the law to cover situations—and again I quote from the statute—"directly related to the conclusion or implementation of the agreement." It is a term which must be construed in the framework of the whole bill. It is a term which must be interpreted in the light of congressional intent. The congressional intent, as developed in our hearings and in the proceedings on the floor, was that this liberally phrased statute should not be loosely interpreted but should be conservatively construed. The actions of the President's special committee belie this construction and as I have already shown is contrary both to the statute and to the intent of Congress.

Now, Mr. President, before concluding my remarks let me express my deep sympathy to the unfortunate American families whose husbands and fathers have been mercilessly sacrificed to the end that Canadian labor and Canadian industry might prosper. Had the Senate exercised the caution many of us urged, these Americans would be working today. Unemployment compensation would not be needed. Legal questions regarding eligibility such as I have discussed today would not have been raised.

I am not unmindful of the need for generous unemployment benefits for our workers thrown out of jobs by reason of imports. Indeed, for years I have urged that the Trade Expansion Act be amended to relax the test of eligibility for these benefits. Last year the administration finally agreed with my objective and I am hopeful we can now join forces to get a law which will make these benefits available when unemployment is triggered by our trade policies. It can be done by law. It should be done by law. It should not be done haphazardly by whim, caprice, or exercise of undue discretion. I fear that has happened in the New Jersey case. I fear that by granting this petition, the Adjustment Assistance Board points up just how badly a poor law can be administered. I call upon them to make all the facts known and to tell us just how loosely we can expect the letter of this law to be interpreted in the future and to what extent private decision can be charged to the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a number of documents pertinent to adjustment assistance under the Canadian auto bill and to the operation of the agreement. These are:

First. Petition for eligibility for adjustment assistance filed with the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board for the workers fired from the Ford Motor Co., Delaware Valley Parts Depot, Pennsauken, N.J.

Second. Summary of final determination and notice of certification by the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board of their eligibility.

Third. Petition for eligibility for adjustment assistance filed with the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board for the workers fired from the Fisher Body Plant No. 2, General Motors Corp., Grand Rapids, Mich.

Fourth. Excerpt from the Wall Street Journal of April 14, 1966, showing Canadian exports of automotive products to the United States increased 90 percent in 1965 over 1964.

Fifth. Excerpt from the Canadian Financial Post of April 2, 1966, showing the tremendous stimulation given Canadian automotive products manufacturers by the agreement and their contemplated expansion of exports to the United States.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

First U.S. Workers Receive Adjustment Assistance Under International Trade Law

For the first time in U.S. history, a group of workers has been certified eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under the Nation's international trade laws.

Almost 200 employees of a Pennsauken, New Jersey automotive parts depot, who had lost their jobs when their export packing operation was transferred to Canada, may now apply for assistance under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965.

The Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board today made the determinations regarding workers at the Ford Motor Company's Delaware Valley Parts Depot in Pennsauken who have become jobless since November 19, 1965.

The Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board is composed of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz (Chairman), Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, and Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler.

The Board's action came after the United Automobile Workers International Union filed a petition for eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance on behalf of a group of workers employed at the depot.

The Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board found that the U.S.-Canadian Automotive Products Agreement, signed on January 16, 1965, was a primary factor in causing dislocation of workers at the New Jersey depot.

The Board determined that as a result of the operation of the agreement the Ford Co. transferred its export packing operation from Pennsauken to Tillsonburg, Canada.

The Board based its certification on a report from the U.S. Tariff Commission and advice from the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, Labor, and the Small Business Administration.

Certified workers who meet the required standards may receive trade readjustment allowances, counseling and training (including training allowances), and relocation assistance.

[From the Financial Post, Apr. 2, 1966]

Most Auto-Parts Makers Are Rubbing Hands in Glee at Huge Market Prospects—Shock-Absorber Company Will Quadruple Business in 1967, Zinc Diecasters Expect To Boost Exports to United States and Opportunities Beckon for Most

(By David Crane)

With orders flowing out from the automakers for 1967 models, most Canadian auto parts manufacturers are forecasting unlimited opportunity for anyone who will get out and sell.

And big chunks of the sales for this first full model year of the automotive pact will be in the United States.

Scores of new factories are under construction or in the planning stage.

One discordant note: the stampers and firms which make products the automakers themselves produce in the United States may be hit hard.

Not everyone will do as well as Van Der Hout Associates, Ltd., of Toronto which, through its subsidiary, Gabriel of Canada, Ltd., will quadruple its business in 1967, selling $10 million worth of shock absorbers, compared with $2.8 million in the 1966 model year.

"Close to 75 percent of production in the 1967 model year will go to the United States," President J. B. Van Der Hout told FP.

Nor will many do as badly as National Auto Radiator Manufacturing Co., a Windsor stamping company, which will lose 80 percent of its business in 1967—a loss of $3 million of orders. Its work force, once 370, is down to 200 and will soon drop to 160.

Most companies are somewhere in between, with many more gaining than losing sales.

One branch of the parts industry that is really scoring with the auto pact is the zinc diecasting business.

An official of National Hardware Specialties, Ltd., a subsidiary of Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co. of Canada, told FP:

"Orders for 1967 are up considerably. It's really quite an increase over last year's business, in fact close to three times.

"A good proportion of the increase comes from increased exports to the United States. As far as we are concerned, a good deal of this is due to the auto agreement."

In Oshawa, Coulter Manufacturing Co., a diecaster acquired by Noranda Mines Ltd. last year, has a $1 million expansion well under way which will make it one of the largest diecasting and electroplating plants in operation in Canada when finished in late 1966.

"A considerable portion of the 1967 model year orders are now in and there's a considerable increase in business with the U.S.," President A. Graham Coulter told FP.

"We shipped very little to the U.S. in 1966. In the 1967 model year 15 to 20 percent of our output will go to the U.S. At the same time, we don't seem to have lost any business in Canada."

In Bramalea, Ont., Hudson Bay Diecastings Ltd.'s $2.2 million zinc plant is now getting ready for production. The company, which is a subsidiary of Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., will start operating a one-shift run in mid-June.

"In the 1967 model year we will operate at one-third capacity with 75 percent of our production going to the U.S.," general manager G. F. Clarke said.

In iron castings, Galt Malleable Iron Ltd. and its new $2 million plant operated by Galt Brantford Malleable Iron Ltd. will ship about one third of output to the U.S. in 1967.

"Our new plant is geared for North American production," president H. C. MacKay said. "Although we had participated in the U.S. market before the pact, it has certainly helped.

"And we expect better sales to the U.S. with the new plant. The market is there, the orders can be had. It's just a matter of producing."

Here are more companies, which say the pact has been good for them:

S.K.D. Manufacturing Co., Amherstburg, Ont. President Gordon Knight said: "The 1967 model year is all booked up. It won't be our first year of shipping to the U.S., but shipments to the U.S. in the 1967 model year will total 30 percent of output compared with almost none two to three years ago and not much last year either."

The company will complete an $850,000 expansion in July, increasing capacity by 20 percent.

Philco Corp., a division of Ford Motor Co., will ship close to 200,000 auto radios to the U.S. from its Toronto plant in 1967. In 1966 model year its shipments are likely to be a little over half that amount.

Canadian Acme Screw & Gear Ltd., subsidiary of Levy Industries Ltd., has a sizable order from Ford U.S. for transmissions and differentials for the M151 jeep. Company says it "has other irons in the fire."

Kralinator Filters Ltd., Preston, Ont. President C. N. Fouse said, "It looks very bright for us. We just started shipping into the U.S. in late fall, 1965, and now we expect these orders to really accelerate. We expect the 1968 model year will really show the greatest increase—and we are now working on plans for a plant expansion that we will probably announce in two months."

Wallace Barnes Co., Hamilton, is now starting a $300,000 additional auto valve spring line and is looking at plans for new plant space.

President W. A. Campbell told FP: "We have started to ship to the U.S. and are now shipping 5 to 7 percent of our output there after starting our export program last year. The auto pact has worked out very well for our company. We realize it's a rough game but we're used to the disciplines of the automotive market and are able to match or better U.S. competition."

Dominion Rubber Co., Montreal, is now receiving the first of its 1967 model orders. While tires are not included under the pact, the company also manufactures interior trim and estimates that 40 percent of its trim production is now going into the U.S. "Certainly since the auto pact we have picked up an increase in shipments to the U.S.," company president E. A. Martin told FP. "We picked up more business in 1966 and our initial orders indicate that we can expect even more in 1967."

Eaton Automotive Canada Ltd., London, is obtaining an increase in orders. Next month its Wallaceburg plant goes into limited production and a new plant in Chatham goes into limited production in the third quarter.

Hayes Steel Products Ltd., Thorold. President G. B. Mitchell said: "Our orders show a fairly substantial increase for the 1967 model year."

By early December the company's auto frame plant will be finished. Production should start in spring of 1967. "We will produce 200,000 to 300,000 frames for the 1968 model year, with 75 percent of production headed for the U.S."

Ontario Steel Products Co., Toronto, expects exports to increase in 1967. Vice-president E. B. Cranston said: "We will probably export quite a bit. Right now we are exporting about 25 percent of our production to the U.S., whereas three years ago we really were just Canadian suppliers."

Kelsey Wheel Co., Windsor. President W. A. Harrison said: "The outlook is pretty good. We've got something in the making that, if it clicks, will really be something.

"Right now we have one good order we didn't have for 1966. And since the auto pact about 50 percent of our production goes to the U.S."

Kelsey may announce a new plant soon.

Bendix-Westinghouse Automotive Air Brake Co., Ohio, is expected to announce plans for a new plant in Ontario soon. It will produce heavy duty truck brake parts.

Borg-Warner Corp., a major automotive parts manufacturer in the U.S., recently formed a new company, Borg-Warner Canada Ltd. "to prepare for future growth." Present company operations in Canada include Long Manufacturing Co., Marbon Chemicals, Morse Chain of Canada Ltd.

Chrysler Canada Ltd. is also planning an expansion of its parts-making subsidiaries—altogether the company will spend $2.6 million to double the size of its trim plant at Ajax, Ont.

For the stampers, the auto pact is another story altogether. More vulnerable than many partsmakers, since they represent a duplication of a very expensive tooling operation already in existence in the U.S., some see their industry as the sacrifice in the auto agreement.

"The question for many of the stampers," Donald Wood, executive vice-president of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association (Canada), told FP, "is whether they will have enough work in 1967 to keep them going until they will see what they can get in 1968.

"1968 is the year of the major model change. This is where we will find out if the agreement will work. Will we tool up in Canada? This will have to be decided soon."

National Radiator, which is Canada's largest jobber stamping plant, is not a captive firm with all its orders tied to one company. Its business is almost equally divided among the Big Three auto makers—but the Big Three also own vast stamping operations of their own in the U.S. which can easily absorb the work National Radiator and other Canadian companies like it have been doing under tariff protection.

Two months ago the stampers appealed to Industry Minister C. N. Drury for help. He arranged a meeting with the presidents of the auto companies—and this seems to have at least opened up some contacts between Canadian stampers and U.S. auto company buyers.

The president of another Windsor stamping company, who says, his business will drop by a third in 1967, told FP that "when Karl Scott (president of Ford Motor Co. of Canada) phoned across the river to Detroit, it at least got us into company offices."

What the stampers are waiting to see now is whether they will get any orders after all these meetings—although most concede that it's too late to pick up 1967 business, though they have some hopes for 1968.

Thomas Eansor, president of Fabricated Steel Products (Windsor) Ltd. and chairman of the subcommittee of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association that looks after the stamping industry's problems, told FP:

"Some stampers are going to suffer, but it will be their own fault. When the government opened the doors a few weeks ago, half of them didn't take advantage of it.

"The meeting produced results for those who were interested. It's not going to be easy, but the stampers can get the business."

Even for Fabricated Steel Products, Eansor said, "It's a struggle. But we will survive.

"There was a possibility at one time, though, of not surviving since we could not quote on parts. But with the chance to quote we may get orders. And the job will become easier because we will be making 30 to 40 parts, instead of 250."

Not all the parts stampers share Eansor's optimism. One Toronto firm told FP: "The pact still isn't doing anything for us. Two or three months ago there was considerable scurrying around and a session with Drury. This led to a pickup in the tempo of enquiries from the auto industry—but no new orders."

Another Toronto stamper said: "We are satisfied with the orders we have, but there could be a problem since the auto makers are trying to eliminate duplicate toolings and stampers aren't getting the U.S. business."

In Windsor, Johnstel Metal Products Ltd. has closed down because of the combined effects of a lengthy strike and a loss in U.S. orders. FP understands there are several other companies that may close down if discussions over the 1968 outlook are not promising.

Elsewhere in the auto parts industry, some highly specialized companies fear that they, too, may close up as a result of U.S. competition.

Ingersoll Machine & Tool Co. General Manager J. D. Loveridge told FP the company is losing $2 million of business in 1967 on steering box orders. Orders from Chrysler Canada will be less than $500,000, compared with $2 million two years ago.

"I don't know where we will end up, but we will produce steering boxes in 1967 to fill orders from our other customers," Loveridge said.

To compensate for lost auto business, Ingersoll Machine has won a $2 million contract from Ford in the U.S. for machined rocket warheads, under the Canada-U.S. defense-sharing program.

One company which, in the past three years, has established a reputation for aggressiveness, may wind up its operations soon. Reason: it makes a product that all of the Big Three manufacture in their own plants in the U.S.

A bearing company told FP: "We should know this week where we stand." It believes its bearing sales will be hurt by imports from Japan for manufacture into transmissions assembled in Canada for the U.S.

Then there are companies like Auto Specialties Manufacturing Co., Windsor, which saw the U.S. potential even before the auto pact. "The auto pact hasn't had much effect on us," President R. M. Foote said. "We started exporting in 1959-1960 and have grown ever since. Today 35 to 40 percent of our business is going to the U.S.—but the pact hasn't brought us a single new customer."

MAJOR CONGRESSIONAL BATTLE MAY ERUPT OVER LABOR WHICH IS DISPLACED BY PARTS DEAL

WASHINGTON.—First major test of federal aid for displaced labor under the Canada-U.S. automobile trade agreement is under way.

The U.S. Tariff Commission is investigating layoffs at a New Jersey Ford Motor Co. plant. The United Auto Workers Union says workers are losing their jobs because Ford is transferring to Canada work that had been done at its Delaware Valley parts depot in Pennsauken, N.J. UAW says the Canada-U.S. agreement is the primary reason.

If the commission decides no aid should be given it could spark a major battle in Congress over the agreement.

Under the terms of the U.S. legislation, workers who are dislocated because of the Canada-U.S. deal can get special help from the federal government for retraining, resettlement or extra unemployment compensation. The language providing for this assistance is far more liberal than that in the overall U.S. trade law. It was made more liberal at the insistence of UAW leaders and it was only on this basis that UAW officials agreed to support the trade agreement.

About 100 workers could be affected at the Ford plant. If the commission finds they are losing their jobs because of the Canada-U.S. agreement, it will so advise a Cabinet-level committee which almost certainly would agree and provide the aid.

Until now, no such aid has ever been given by Washington. Several applications were made under the general U.S. trade law, but all were rejected, primarily because of the strictness of the provisions.

No public hearing is planned as yet by the Tariff Commission on this first major test of the new provisions, but a hearing can be held if requested by UAW. It likely will take several weeks before the commission submits its recommendations on adjustment assistance to the workers in the New Jersey plant.

The U.S. government anticipates there will be some awards this year to American auto workers thrown out of work because of the Canada-U.S. automobile deal—there is provision for such awards in the new U.S. budget.

ONTARIO ABSORBING DEAL'S MAIN IMPACT

The greatest impact of the Canada-U.S. auto pact is being felt in Ontario, where the bulk of the auto and auto parts manufacturing is carried out.

Looking ahead, Ontario Economics & Development Minister Stanley Randall gave this growth forecast for the next two years at the opening of Ford Motor Co. of Canada's $25 million truck plant at Oakville:

Create at least another 20,000-30,000 new jobs in the province.

Stimulate another several hundred million dollars of investment in plant and equipment.

Add at least 5 million sq. ft. of new factory space.

Bring in at least 20 new plants to Ontario—and lead to expansions in 20-30 others.

"Of all the Ontario companies expanding their plants last year, 75 were involved in, or with, the automotive industry. They added over 8,000 employees, over 3 million sq. ft. of new space, and spent over $100 million on capital equipment," Randall said.

And, he added, "of all the new manufacturing establishments that located in Ontario last year, 35 companies were affected by, or resulted from, the new automotive pact. These companies added 5,000 employees, built over 2 million sq. ft. of space and invested over $50 million."

[From the Financial Post (Canada) Apr. 2, 1966]

INVESTMENT OPTIMISM ABOUT AUTO-PARTS PACT

Optimism about the auto-parts industry is the predominant mood among investment analysts and manufacturers now that the Canada-U.S. auto pact is starting to pay off for many of the country's parts makers.

But as far as stock prices are concerned, the market is cautious, with many investors still maintaining a wait-and-see attitude.

For the auto-parts industry, this is the first full model year under the pact in which they have been able to take advantage of the conditions of freer trade between Canada and the U.S.

But if the waiting period has been nerve-wracking, it appears to have been worth it for many of the producers, with 1967 model year orders now rolling in:

A Toronto shock-absorber manufacturer will nearly quadruple his sales in the 1967 model year and export 75 percent of his output to the U.S.

A Dresden, Ont., zinc-die caster will nearly triple his sales and also register a sharp increase in exports to the U.S.

A Windsor wheel manufacturer may build a new plant if the orders he expects to sign in the near future materialize. He exports 50 percent of his production to the U.S.

But there is another side of the story, too.

Some companies, especially stampers, are getting mainly bad news. Canada's largest jobbing stamper, a Windsor company with more than 150 presses, says it will lose 80 percent of its business in 1967 and is already laying off men.

Other companies surveyed by FP say they just don't know whether they can wait out 1967 with the slim orders they have to see what they will get for the 1968 model year.

The 1968 model year is the crucial one for many companies. Major model changes are expected then, and this is when Canadian companies will discover whether they will get any of the tooling work.

It is also the deadline year for the automakers to achieve what amounts to about a $500-million increase in Canadian content.

One problem that has bothered many Canadian parts producers: getting to meet the parts buyers in the U.S. auto companies.

Major purchasing decisions lie largely with the head offices of the auto companies now—and this means a lot of selling has to be done in Detroit.

Canadian parts producers had complained of difficulties in getting through the doors of U.S. purchasing departments. But a meeting two months ago between Industry Minister C. M. Drury and the presidents of the auto companies seems to have cleared up this problem.

For the complete picture of what the 1967 orders mean for Canadian parts producers, see pp. 25, 41.

How auto parts firms have fared

	Recent price	Percent change since—		Earnings per share		Capital expenditures		Yield (percent)	Price-earnings ratio
		Year ago	1961 [1]	Latest fiscal year	1961	1966 [2]	1965		
Hayes Steel Products, Ltd	27¼	+68	[1] +627	$1.47	[1] $0.02	$2,000,000	$902,000	2.8	18.5
Ontario Steel Products Co	39	+8	+271	2.86	1.20	1,700,000	2,000,000	2.7	13.6
Kelsey Wheel Co	17¼	+11	----------	1.04	.33	4,500,000	6,900,000	2.9	16.5
Ingersoll Machine & Tool Co	9½	+12	+19	[3] 1.85	[3] .88	250,000	[3] 90,000	5.3	5.1
S.K.D. Manufacturing Co	8¾	+46	+94	1.13	.10	850,000	592,000	2.3	7.7
Van Der Hout Associates, Ltd	2.80	+124	----------	.06	----------	----------	----------	----------	35.0

[1] Allowing for stock splits.

[2] Estimated.

[3] Deficit.

WHY THEY'RE MOVING—AUTO PARTS FIRMS FORGE AHEAD, MARKET CAUTIOUS

(By Martin Sinclair)

Auto-parts manufacturers most likely to succeed in the new freer trade environment are those which have been expanding plant, streamlining equipment and have U.S. affiliations, industry observers say.

The major auto builders are currently handing down orders for the 1967 models. The bulk of the companies in which there is investor interest appear to have done well.

Apprehension has been expressed by some investment men about some of the smaller auto parts companies, especially those with a fairly extensive product range.

One analyst says: "The companies that didn't start ploughing earnings back into plant and equipment after the Bladen report came out 5 years ago are the ones to be wary of.

"Although optimism predominates, there are some investors who think it wiser to wait until after the shakedown period before making commitments in the group."

Stock prices sustain this view. They have been stronger during the past year, but have shown no inclination to break records. The optimism of a year ago now comes tinged with more caution.

Hayes Steel Products, Ltd., manufactures clutches, axles, universal joints, etc. It will spend about $2 million on capital projects in the current year.

A $16 million auto-frame plant is being built adjacent to the existing plant at Thorold, Ont., which will be in production next year.

Hayes, 55 percent-owned by Dana Corp., Toledo, expects to export the bulk of the frames. The parent has three frame plants and an auto research facility in Detroit.

Stock prices reflect the general belief that Hayes is in a strong position to take advantage of the Canada-United States agreement. A year ago a share could be bought for $16¼; the current price is $27¼. The 1965–66 high-low is $28½–$15⅛.

Ontario Steel Products Co. manufactures a wide range of products for the automotive industry. It is controlled in the United States by Rockwell-Standard Corp.

Investment interest in the company has been consistent for some time although there has not been the same appreciation in stock value. Prices have been in a see-saw mood since the beginning of the year, trending lower from a 1966 high of $41 in January to $39 recently. The 1965–66 high-low, $41 to $28.

The company spent about $2 million last year, part of which included the building and equipping of a coil spring factory near the new General Motors of Canada, Ltd., plant at Ste. Thérèse.

Outlook for Ontario Steel under the agreement is said to be favorable. About 25 percent of production is being exported now. Three years ago all production was consumed domestically.

Kelsey Wheel Co. has been a favorite with analysts for some time. It spent more than $6 million on capital projects in 1965. A new plant at Windsor was completed and further expansion of wheelmaking capacity is planned.

Net earnings for 6 months to February 28, 1966, were released this week. The results—$254,174 (23 cents per common share) compared with $472,332 (43 cents) in the same period of 1965—were poor.

However, the company warned some time ago that earnings for the period would be adversely affected by abnormal preproduction, startup and development costs on new equipment.

Kelsey is thought to be negotiating a deal that if successful could have major implications. About 50 percent of production is entering the United States at the moment.

Since the beginning of 1965 the high-low range has been $19¾–$10¾. A high of $19½ was reached in February this year. The price has weakened to $17¼ recently.

S.K.D. Manufacturing Co., Amherstburg, Ont., is one of the few companies in the industry that is not a U.S. subsidiary. Consequently no helping hand can be expected. The second point is that the company manufacturers stampings and these are not expected to be in such demand since the major automakers in the U.S. do much of their own stamping.

However, S.K.D. is showing no misgivings. The company will complete a $850,000 expansion in July which will provide a 20-percent increase in stamped steel capacity. Three new presses are to be added to existing plant. Shipments to the United States in the 1967 model year are expected to total 30 percent of capacity.

Prices have been a little weaker recently, moving down on low volume to $8¾ this week from a 1966 high of $10 last January. The 1965–66 high-low, $10–$5½.

Ingersoll Machine & Tool Co. suffered an immediate setback. Steering box cutbacks will mean a loss of $2 million. Although an order worth $2 million for machined rocket warheads has since been received, it cannot be considered a continuing order.

The company's A shares rarely trade and have been at $9½ since the beginning of the year. The 1965–66 high-low is $12–$8.

Van Der Hout Associates, Ltd., Toronto, is making the most dramatic forecast of all—sales quadrupled by 1967.

The Toronto company is a distributor of automotive and electronic products. Consolidated sales for fiscal year ended August 31, 1965, were $1.7 million; net profit was $62,870, equivalent to 8 cents per common share. The company has a 49-percent interest in Gabriel of Canada Ltd., manufacturer of shock absorbers.

The stock, at a current price of $2.80 sold at a 1966 high of $3.50 last February. The 1965–66 high-low is $1.10–$3.50.

Toronto Iron Works, Ltd., annual report will be released shortly. Shareholders will probably be told of some fairly extensive expansion plans at that time.

But it's doubtful if such a prospect is behind the strength in the A stock.

When Wimco Industries (Eastern) Ltd., which owned 30 percent of Toronto Iron common shares, made an offer of $50 per share for the remainder last December, the Class A nonvoting stock—valued pari passu with the common for the past 20 years—seemed almost to have been cast into limbo.

The A shares were selling at $24¾ last January. Since then there has been a steady appreciation. A high of $34½ was reached recently; midweek price was $34.

The common was delisted earlier this month and A is now the only public means of participating in the company.

There was some speculation that Wimco eventually would have to make an offer for the A shares.

[Form AAB-2 (1-66)—Form Approved: Budget Bureau No. 126 R-001]

AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BOARD—PETITION FOR DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY TO APPLY FOR ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BY GROUP OF WORKERS (UNDER THE AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965)

For Government use only.

Date filed____________________________

Petition No. 6001.

General instructions: Each petition shall contain such information as will assist the U.S. Tariff Commission in its investigations and the Board in making the determinations required under the Automotive Act, relating to (a) whether the product which is the basis for the petition is an automotive product within the meaning of the act, (b) whether there is dislocation of a significant number or proportion of the workers, or a threat thereof, and (c) the role of the operation of the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement in causing such dislocation or threat thereof.

The regulations of the Board apply to this form. Copies of the regulations are available at the local State employment security agency offices or may be obtained from the Board.

Return an original and three copies to: Chairman, Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board, in care of U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Section 1. All questions in this section must be answered. (For additional instructions see last page.)

1. Petitioner (name and address):

(a) Person filing: Ken Bannon, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, telephone 926-5391.

(b) If petition filed by a union give name and address of union: International Union, UAW, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, telephone 926-5216. Affected local is No. 918; President Thomas Quinn, 922 Hunt Road, Newton Square, Pa. EL. 6-3187.

(c) If petition is filed by a group of workers, other than a union, describe the group briefly and give the names and addresses of three members of the group________________

2. Employer (name and address): Ford Motor Company, Delaware Valley Parts Depot, Post Office Box 816, Pennsauken, N.J., Route No. 130.

3. Automotive product: Name or describe the automotive product—i.e. the motor vehicle or fabricated component to be used as original equipment in the manufacture of motor vehicles—forming the basis for the petition. If the product is a part or component and if known, give the manufacturer's part number and indicate the make of the vehicle in which it is used. Packing and shipping for export of knocked down Ford cars and trucks.

4. Dislocation. If there were or are scheduled concentrations of dislocation on specific dates, indicate dates, and number of workers affected. If actual data are not available, make estimates and indicate the basis of each estimate.

Type	Date dislocation began or is threatened	Number of workers affected in establishment		
		Producing named article		Workers in other subdivisions unemployed because of lack of work in the affected subdivision
		Unemployed	Underemployed or working short weeks	
Actual dislocation____	Dislocation will begin Jan. 28, 1966, and will be completed in February 1966.	Upon completion of dislocation 111 employees will be laid off from export operations.	____________	Although only the export operations are being discontinued, seniority is plantwide so that employees from all parts of the depot will be laid off. Approximately 20 employees will be laid off from operations other than export.

(b) If the dislocation noted in 4a involves a layoff, indicate the type of layoff: Permanent ☒; indefinite ☐; or definite ☐ for a duration of —— weeks.

5. Basis of petition: Describe fully the basis for your belief that the operation of the U.S.-Canadian Automotive Agreement has been a factor in causing, or threatening to cause, the dislocation. Include or attach all available evidence.

In a memorandum of November 19, 1965 (copy attached) the Company announced that it was discontinuing the export operations (packaging knocked down cars and trucks for export) at its Delaware Valley Parts Depot. At a meeting on December 6, 1965, in Detroit, Company representatives advised the Union that the export operations were being transferred to Ford of Canada, Ltd., from where they would be contracted out to a firm located in Tilsonburg, Ontario. The Company subsequently advised the Union that the knocked down cars and trucks will continue to be manufactured in the United States, but will be shipped to Tilsonburg for export packing and shipping. This arrangement was made economically advantageous by the Automotive Trade Act's elimination of the tariff which previously would have to have been paid on the parts going into Canada.

Section II. The information requested in this section will be helpful in processing the petition. If the answers are not known, write "Do not know" in the appropriate space.

6. Firm name and address: Name and address of principal office of firm: Ford Motor Company, the American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

7. Competing products: To the extent known, name or describe any other automotive products directly competitive with the product described in Question 3. Knocked down cars and trucks produced by other automobile manufacturers.

8. Employment: Enter the average number of employees in the establishment, or appropriate subdivision, for each year since 1963 and for the most recent 6 months. If the annual data do not cover a calendar year, indicate the period actually covered. If the estimates are used in place of actual data, indicate the basis for each estimate.

Products involved	Number of workers					
	Annual					Monthly (January 1966)[1]
	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	
All products		350	325			276
Named automotive product		308	283			234

[1] We do not have monthly figures for past 6 months.

NOTE.—If more detail is available indicating employment devoted to production of the automotive product as original equipment as compared with employment devoted to production of the same product for use other than as original equipment (including replacement) supply this data below or as an attachment. Except for the named Automotive Product (parts for export), some of the parts handled in the Delaware Valley Parts Depot are for replacement and some are for original equipment. The named Automotive Parts are all for use as original equipment.

Section III. This section must be filled in and the original signed.

9. Public hearing: Do you desire a public hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission as part of its factual investigation? Yes [ ], no [X].

I certify that I have read this petition, that to the best of my knowledge and belief the statements contained herein are correct and complete, and that I am authorized by and on behalf of the group of workers, to file and sign this petition.

KEN BANNON,
Board Member-at-Large and Director, National Ford Department, International Union, UAW.

JANUARY 27, 1966.

INTRA-COMPANY COMMUNICATION
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,
FORD DIVISION,
November 19, 1965.

To the Hourly Employes of the Delaware Valley Parts Depot.

After long and careful study the management of the Company has decided to discontinue its CKD packaging operations at the Delaware Valley Parts Depot. This will not affect the service stock functions at the Depot which will continue.

Unfortunately it will be necessary in connection with the CKD discontinuance to lay off a number of hourly employes at the Depot. No layoffs resulting from this partial discontinuance of operations will take place until sometime after the first of the year, however.

The Company will offer employment opportunities to affected hourly employees at other Ford Motor Company locations, and will be discussing such opportunities with your collective bargaining representatives. In addition, the application to eligible hourly employees of various Company benefit plans will be reviewed with you and your Union representatives at an early date.

The transitional period ending with the final discontinuance of the CKD operations will be difficult for Depot employes and management alike. I know that all of you will continue to provide the high degree of cooperation of which the Depot has been justly proud since its inception eight years ago.

R. W. LEMMER.

AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BOARD—SUMMARY OF FINAL DETERMINATIONS AND NOTICE OF CERTIFICATION—PETITION FOR ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BY CERTAIN WORKERS OF THE FORD MOTOR COMPANY, PENNSAUKEN, N.J.

DETERMINATIONS OF THE BOARD

On the basis of the information available to it, the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board determines pursuant to the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 that—

Dislocation of workers in the Delaware Valley Parts Depot of the Ford Motor Company has occurred or threatens to occur since, beginning November 19, 1965, a significant number or proportion of the workers have become or will become unemployed.

The operation of the United States-Canadian Automotive Products Agreement has been the primary factor in causing, or threatening to cause, such dislocation (Section 302, Act; Section 501.9, Board Regulations).

CERTIFICATION

The Board hereby certifies that the workers of the Delaware Valley Parts Depot at Pennsauken, N.J., who became, or who will become, unemployed or underemployed, on or after November 19, 1965, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

BACKGROUND

A petition for a determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance was filed with the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board on February 4, 1966, by the United Automobile Workers International Union, on behalf of Local 918, a group of workers of the Ford Motor Company at the Delaware Valley Parts Depot in Pennsauken, N.J. This petition was filed under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. The petition alleged, in effect, that the group of workers was threatened with unemployment as a result of a decision of the Ford Motor Company to transfer the packaging and shipping for export of knocked-down Ford cars and trucks from its Pennsauken Depot to Canada, and that the operation of the United States-Canadian automotive agreement was the primary factor threatening to cause such unemployment.

On February 8, 1966, the Automotive Assistance Committee of the Board requested the United States Tariff Commission to conduct an investigation with respect to the facts relating to this petition. On February 10, 1966, the Commission issued public notice of receipt of the request and institution of the investigation (31 F.R. 2741, February 15, 1966). The Commission did not order a public hearing in conjunction with the investigation; the petitioners did not request such a hearing, nor did any other interested party.

The Commission submitted its report on this investigation on March 30, 1966 (APTA-W-1). As stated by the Commission in its public announcement with respect to this report, virtually all of the information in the report consists of material received in confidence, and, therefore, the report would not be made public (31 F.R. 5337, April 2, 1966).

In addition to the information obtained from the Tariff Commission report, the Board also obtained advice from the Departments of the Treasury, Commerce, Labor, and the Small Business Administration under Section 302 (f) (1) of the Act.

No interested persons, nor any others, made written submissions to the Board or requested opportunity to present their views orally, subsequent to the date the Tariff Commission made its public announcement of the completion of the investigation and the submission of the report to the Board (Section 501.11, Board Regulations).

CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 the Board considered the following:

Automotive product

The workers must be in a firm which produces an automotive product as defined by the Act. The petitioners are or were employees of the Ford Motor Company, which produces such automotive products. The majority of the petitioners worked preparing certain "knocked-down" cars and trucks for export. "Knocked-down" vehicles (KD) consist of a group of original equipment parts comprising components for a motor vehicle and which are shipped together to another location for final assembly into a motor vehicle. Accordingly, the requirements of Sections 302 (a) (2) and 302 (1) (1) are satisfied.

Actual or threatened dislocation

Unemployment or underemployment, or threatened unemployment or underemployment, must affect a significant number or proportion of the workers of a firm or appropriate subdivision thereof. Significant number or proportion of workers means in most cases 5 percent of the workers or 50 workers in a firm (or appropriate subdivision thereof), whichever is less (Sections 302 (b) (1) and 302(1) (2) (B), Act; Section 501.2(i) (2), Board Regulations). On November 19, 1965 the Ford Motor Company announced that it had decided to discontinue the export packing activity at the Delaware Valley Parts Depot. As the Commission points out, export packaging, previously done at the Depot, would henceforth be performed in Canada. This transfer has resulted in the dislocation of a significant number and proportion of workers from the Depot. Between November 19, 1965, when the threat of dislocation occurred, and March 8, 1966, the number of hourly employees at the Delaware Valley Parts Depot declined by more than 50 percent and almost 200 workers.

The Tariff Commission report states that the majority of the petitioning group of workers had been employed by the Ford Motor Company at the Pennsauken Depot in the distinct activity of export packaging (KD) automotive components to be assembled into vehicles in various overseas locations. This Depot also had responsibility for supplying parts for some domestic Ford customers. The Board is of the opinion that "bumping" of employees among the activities of the Depot makes the entire Depot the appropriate subdivision of the Ford Motor Company for considering dislocation and certification. Accordingly, the requirements with respect to dislocation are met.

Role of the operation of the agreement

The Board was unable to determine whether the economic criteria specified in Section 302(b) of the Act were met. The Commission found it impractical, due to the multiplicity of products involved, to obtain data appropriate for such purpose within the time for this investigation. In this case, therefore, the Board considered whether the operation of the Agreement has nevertheless been the primary factor in causing or threatening to cause the dislocation (Section 302(d), Act). Primary factor means a factor which is greater in importance than any other single factor present in a given case, but which does not have to be greater than any combination of other factors (Section 501.2(j), Board Regulations).

The Act (Section 302(1) (4)) defines "operation of the Agreement" to include governmental or private actions in the United States or Canada directly related to the conclusion or implementation of the Agreement. This definition is intended to permit consideration of the economic effects of the arrangements concluded between the Canadian Government and automotive vehicle manufacturers in Canada.[1]

The Ford Motor Company of Canada entered into such an arrangement by a series of letters in January 1965.[2] One of the more important commitments is an undertaking by Ford to increase its expenditures for Canadian material, services, labor, and capital by Can. $74 million by the 1968 model year. The Board notes that the expenditures for operating the KD activity in Canada will constitute a significant portion of the Ford commitment. In addition, the transfer may provide the opportunity to Ford for some savings in operating costs.

The Board concludes that the opportunity to meet a significant portion of the commitment to the Government of Canada was the compelling circumstance in the Ford Company's final decision to transfer the export packing operation from the Delaware Valley Parts Depot in New Jersey to Canada. The Board, therefore, determines that the operation of the Agreement has been the primary factor in causing or threatening to cause the dislocation of workers at the Depot.

(Section 302, Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965, 79 Stat. 1018, E. O. 11254, 30 F.R. 13569, the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board Regulations, 48 CFR, Part 501; 31 F.R. 827; and Board Order No. 1, 31 F.R. 853.)

April 14, 1966.

[Form AAB-2 (1-66)—Form Approved: Budget Bureau No. 126 R-001]

Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board—Petition for Determination of Eligibility To Apply for Adjustment Assistance by Group of Workers (Under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965)

For Government use only.

Date filed-----------------------------------

Petition No. 6-002.

General instructions: Each petition shall contain such information as will assist the U.S. Tariff Commission in its investigations and the Board in making the determinations required under the Automotive Act, relating to (a) whether the product which is the basis for the petition is an automotive product within the meaning of the act, (b) whether there is this dislocation of a significant number or proportion of the workers, or a threat thereof, and (c) the role of the operation of the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement in causing such dislocation or threat thereof:

The regulations of the Board apply to this form. Copies of the regulations are available at the local State employment security agency offices or may be obtained from the Board.

Return an original and three copies to: Chairman, Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board, in care of U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Section I. All questions in this section must be answered. (For additional instructions see last page.)

1. Petitioner (name and address):

(a) Person filing: Leonard Woodcock, 8000 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich., Telephone 926-5301.

(b) If petition filed by a union give name and address of union: International Union, UAW (same address and telephone number as in (a)). The affected Local Union is No. 1231-215 Sheldon SE, Grand Rapids, Mich., President, Frank Mills, Telephones GL8-2919; GL8-9903.

(c) If petition is filed by a group of workers, other than a union, describe the group briefly and give the names and addresses of three members of the group-------

2. Employer (name and address): General Motors Corporation, Fisher Body Plant No. 2, 2060 Vorhees NW, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

3. Automotive product: Name or describe the automotive product—i.e. the motor vehicle or fabricated component to be used as original equipment in the manufacture of motor vehicles—forming the basis for the petition. If the product is a part of component and if known, give the manufacturer's part number and indicate the make of the vehicle in which it is used. Interior soft trim for Chevy II and Chevelle.

4. Dislocation: If there were or are scheduled concentrations of dislocation on specific dates, indicate dates, and number of workers affected. If actual data are not available, make estimates and indicate the basis of each estimate.

Type	Date dislocation began or is threatened	Number of workers affected in establishment		
		Producing named article		Workers in other subdivisions unemployed because of lack of work in the affected subdivision
		Unemployed	Underemployed or working short weeks	
Actual dislocation ---	August to December 1965.	770	--------------	330 (inspectors, checker-trim, material control, and maintenance).

(b) If the dislocation noted in 4a involves a layoff, indicate the type of layoff: Permanent ☐; indefinite ☒; or definite ☐ for a duration of ——— weeks.

5. Basis of petition: Describe fully the basis for your belief that the operation of the U.S.-Canadian Automotive Agreement has been a factor in causing, or threatening to cause, the dislocation. Include or attach all available evidence.

Prior to the coming into effect of the Agreement, GM supplied its assembly plants, American and Canadian, with interior soft trim for all Chevrolet models from the Fisher Body Plant No. 2 in Grand Rapids. Since the Agreement the production of interior soft trim for Chevy II and Chevelle models have been moved from Fisher Body Plant No. 2 to a new cut and sew plant in Windsor, Ontario. From the new Windsor plant GM now supplies all Chevy II and Chevelle interior soft trim formerly produced at Plant No. 2 to the American and Canadian plants that assemble these two lines of cars. This move was made because GM finds it cheaper to manufacture the soft trim in Canada, at the lower wage rates that prevail there, and ship it to assembly plants in the United States, now that it can cross the border duty free.

Section II. The information requested in this section will be helpful in processing the petition. If the answers are not known, write "Do Not Know" in the appropriate space.

6. Firm name and address: Name and address of principal office of firm: General Motors Corporation, General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.

7. Competing products: To the extent known, name or describe any other automotive products directly competitive with the product described in Question 3. Interior soft trim manufactured by the other automobile manufacturers.

8. Employment: Enter the average number of employees in the establishment, or appropriate subdivision, for each year since 1963 and for the most recent 6 months. If the annual data do not cover a calendar year, indicate the period actually covered. If the estimates are used in place of actual data, indicate the basis for each estimate.

Products involved	Number of workers (annual)				
	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
All products-------------	1,785	1,952	2,425	------	------
Named automotive product------------	892	976	1,212	------	------

Note.—If more detail is available indicating employment devoted to production of the automotive product as original equipment as compared with employment devoted to production of the same product for use other than as original equipment (including replacement) supply this data below or as an attachment. Some of the production of the Automotive Product noted above is for replacement, but we do not know how much.

Section III. This section must be filled in and the original signed.

9. Public hearing: Do you desire a public hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission as part of its factual investigation? Yes ☐. No ☒.

I certify that I have read this petition, that to the best of my knowledge and belief the statements contained herein are correct and complete, and that I am authorized by and on behalf of the group of workers to file and sign this petition.

Leonard Woodscock,
Vice President and Director,
General Motors Department.

April 12, 1966.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 14, 1966]

Montreal.—Canada's growth outpaces the U.S. rate as trade deals bear fruit.

Canada's gross national product expanded 6½ percent in real terms last year, compared with a 5½ percent U.S. gain. Capital spending climbs at a 20 percent annual rate, outstripping the robust 16 percent U.S. rise. A smaller percentage of Canadian than American workers are jobless and wages grow three times as fast. Canadian exports have risen 45 percent in 5 years; the U.S. gain was 35 percent.

Trade with both cold war camps promotes Canadian prosperity. Big wheat contracts with Red China, Russia, and East European nations promise prairie province farmers good times until at least 1968, barring crop failure. Canadian auto output runs 13 percent above last year, while U.S. production lags 6 percent, as more Canadian-built cars are shipped to the United States under last year's U.S.-Canadian automotive "free trade" deal. A 90 percent gain in automotive shipments to the United States in 1965 over 1964 helped make manufactured goods Canada's fastest growing export.

Although the United States has 10 times the population of Canada and nearly 15 times the GNP, it is only three to four times larger in foreign trade.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

---

[1] House Report No. 537 (Committee on Ways and Means), 89th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 9042, p. 26.

[2] Copies appear among other places in Appendix C of House Report No. 537.

Mr. **HART.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. **HART.** Mr. President, if no further business remains, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand adjourned until noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12, 1966:

Office of Economic Opportunity

Bertrand M. Harding, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

U.S. Marshal

Roland S. Mosher, of Arizona, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Postmasters

ALABAMA

James E. McGlamery, Elmore, Ala., in place of R. H. Reid, retired.

Relfe S. Pruett, Seale, Ala., in place of L. V. Burch, retired.

James L. Shurett, Shawmut, Ala., in place of L. D. Strother, retired.

ALASKA

Eldor R. Lee, Petersburg, Alaska, in place of R. F. Brennan, retired.

ARIZONA

Joe E. Babcock, Fort Huachuca, Ariz., in place of N. I. Freihage, retired.

Norman G. Massey, Lakeside, Ariz., in place of F. A. Johnson, retired.

E. J. Foutz, Teec Nos Pos, Ariz., in place of K. E. Bradshaw, resigned.

Arnold R. Elias, Tucson, Ariz., in place of H. B. Collins, retired.

ARKANSAS

Charles T. Bryan, Gurdon, Ark., in place of L. E. Pruitt, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Wilbur S. Gram, El Cerrito, Calif., in place of C. F. Malling, deceased.

J. Edmund Culver, King City, Calif., in place of R. J. Briggs, retired.

William J. Askew, Lower Lake, Calif., in place of E. L. Layton, retired.

Edward F. Harrington, San Luis Obispo, Calif., in place of W. C. O'Donnell, retired.

COLORADO

Harold D. Jackson, Rye, Colo., in place of J. G. Bell, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Richard J. Marks, Norwich, Conn., in place of W. P. Moran, retired.

FLORIDA

Ray A. Hilliard, Geneva, Fla., in place of J. L. Brown, retired.

GEORGIA

James B. Young, Clermont, Ga., in place of M. H. Reynolds, retired.

Thomas L. Exley, Springfield, Ga., in place of L. D. Morgan, deceased.

IDAHO

Joseph W. Ebberts, Challis, Idaho, in place of E. I. Clark, retired.

ILLINOIS

William L. Sinnett, Adair, Ill., in place of R. L. Douglass, retired.

Bernie J. Cassidy, Cabery, Ill., in place of R. M. Miller, retired.

James N. Carner, Carriers Mills, Ill., in place of Elbert McDonald, retired.

Richard E. Dixon, Monticello, Ill., in place of F. H. Pembroke, retired.

Marjorie E. Scott, Olympia Fields, Ill., in place of W. S. Stamper, retired.

INDIANA

Jack E. Sprague, Angola, Ind., in place of R. L. Ridenour, retired.

Ruth M. Sutton, Hemlock, Ind., in place of H. S. Duncan, retired.

John E. Lansinger, Knightstown, Ind., in place of R. R. Morgan, retired.

Donald H. Owens, Mexico, Ind., in place of B. W. Postill, retired.

Harold D. Bowman, Roann, Ind., in place of R. B. Flinn, retired.

Charles H. Martindale, Solsberry, Ind., in place of D. F. McGuire, resigned.

IOWA

Raymond F. Weber, Fairbank, Iowa, in place of J. F. Rechkemmer, deceased.

William J. Dohrer, Rudd, Iowa, in place of L. F. Clay, deceased.

Lars C. Larson, Woden, Iowa, in place of P. L. Smith, transferred.

KANSAS

Francis J. O'Leary, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in place of W. J. Lyons, Jr., retired.

Morris T. Bowker, Ogden, Kans., in place of K. A. Blasing, retired.

Robert Shove, Onaga, Kans., in place of L. C. Irwin, retired.

Marie E. Vickers, Pratt, Kans., in place of H. R. Brickel, retired.

KENTUCKY

Clarence F. Jones, Grand River, Ky., in place of N. B. Jones, retired.

Robert O. Lanier, Kevil, Ky., in place of M. E. Johnson, retired.

LOUISIANA

Robert O. McClung, Homer, La., in place of V. M. Robert, retired.

MAINE

Delbert H. Spinney, Eliot, Maine, in place of C. G. Davis, deceased.

Claude A. Cyr, Fort Kent, Maine, in place of E. G. Labbee, retired.

MARYLAND

C. Alvin Sanger, Cordova, Md., in place of P. M. Roe, deceased.

William C. Norris, Jr., Forest Hill, Md., in place of W. S. Nagle, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Dorthy L. Connolly, Dunstable, Mass., in place of E. L. Naylor, deceased.

Philip E. Sullivan, East Pepperell, Mass., in place of I. S. Leary, retired.

Robert Connell, Forge Village, Mass., in place of J. M. Connell, retired.

P. Joseph Murphy, Hudson, Mass., in place of M. L. Hunt, retired.

Antone L. Silva, New Bedford, Mass., in place of J. J. Gobell, deceased.

Martin T. Ready, Winchendon, Mass., in place of J. J. Hunt, Jr., retired.

MICHIGAN

Frank P. Luta, Bridgeport, Mich., in place of K. E. Warner, retired.

Robert P. Fritz, Gaylord, Mich., in place of H. J. Lynch, retired.

Laverne F. Cole, Grant, Mich., in place of E. M. Grilley, retired.

Elmer A. Ellis, L'Anse, Mich., in place of J. B. Harrington, retired.

MINNESOTA

Frank E. Biniek, Bowlus, Minn., in place of T. S. Barton, retired.

Joseph E. Frankovich, Chisholm, Minn., in place of J. W. Kangas, retired.

Richard E. Reiland, Rollingstone, Minn., in place of L. J. Reiland, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Hugh J. McGraw, Yazoo City, Miss., in place of J. C. Lamkin, retired.

MISSOURI

Harold R. Warren, Climax Springs, Mo., in place of O. L. Warren, retired.

NEBRASKA

Leonard H. Pelo, Johnstown, Nebr., in place of R. C. Olson, retired.

Cecil G. Hutt, Lexington, Nebr., in place of G. W. Lincoln, retired.

Mildred M. Green, McCool Junction, Nebr., in place of L. L. Valentine, retired.

Opal K. Reese, Pleasanton, Nebr., in place of B. A. Reese, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

George S. Downer, Hampton, N.H., in place of S. A. Towle, retired.

Wallace A. Putnam, New Ipswich, N.H., in place of G. G. Helsberg, retired.

Raymond B. Brooks, Ossipee, N.H., in place of N. E. Vittum, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Rachel B. Hill, Cape May Point, N.J., in place of R. N. Gerew, retired.

Howard F. Haas, Cherry Hill, N.J. Office established May 21, 1965.

NEW MEXICO

John H. Phillips, Truth or Consequences, N. Mex., in place of J. D. Tafoya, retired.

NEW YORK

Blake F. Winter, Cicero, N.Y., in place of D. G. Mooney, resigned.

Harold T. Zwick, Crompond, N.Y., in place of M. A. Davis, deceased.

Kerlin R. Farwell, Cuba, N.Y., in place of G. L. Dye, retired.

Shirley A. Marshall, Hemlock, N.Y., in place of D. D. Smith, resigned.

Leo J. Soricelli, Peekskill, N.Y., in place of James Boylan, retired.

Edward S. Nowicki, Warsaw, N.Y., in place of T. J. Reilly, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Iva E. Hampton, Coinjock, N.C., in place of P. T. Woodard, retired.

W. Marvin Worrell, Jr., Como, N.C., in place of M. B. Railey, retired.

Nancy C. Blue, Jackson Springs, N.C., in place of L. A. Carter, retired.

Joe D. Thompson, Mooresville, N.C., in place of B. A. Houston, retired.

Thomas W. Galloway, Rosman, N.C., in place of W. J. Moore, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Donald R. Holler, Drayton, N. Dak., in place of V. H. Carlson, retired.

Vesta M. Schultz, Glen Ullin, N. Dak., in place of F. V. Hermes, retired.

OHIO

John D. Woosley, Camden, Ohio, in place of H. Q. Overholser, retired.

Lillian H. Harbaugh, Clinton, Ohio, in place of H. G. Casenhiser, retired.

Herman A. Clarke, Crown City, Ohio, in place of Julia Garlic, retired.

William E. Smith, Deshler, Ohio, in place of J. W. Watson, deceased.

Francis E. Szollosi, Toledo, Ohio, in place of J. M. Tertel, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Herman D. Jones, Burlington, Okla., in place of P. M. Alder, retired.

Homer H. Wyssmann, Fairmont, Okla., in place of D. E. Harris, transferred.

J. Freeman Parker, Ochelata, Okla., in place of E. M. Morrison, retired.

Billy R. Robertson, Sand Springs, Okla., in place of J. H. Bryant, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

George W. Shuman, Elizabethtown, Pa., in place of B. L. Ream, retired.

Joseph J. Drake, Hawley, Pa., in place of R. J. Drake, deceased.

Ubaldo V. Pambianco, Peckville, Pa., in place of Benjamin Shaute, retired.

Jennie S. Workman, Six Mile Run, Pa., in place of M. W. Workman, deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Luis I. Lugo-Mercado, San Antonio, P.R., in place of Angel Vargas, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Alvia Sanders, Clearwater, S.C., in place of W. H. Faddis, retired.

John W. McDill, Due West, S.C., in place of R. E. Young, retired.

Eddie L. Moore, Rembert, S.C., in place of L. R. McLeod, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Signe K. Loseth, Roslyn, S. Dak., in place of H. M. Baukol, retired.

TENNESSEE

Lucile M. Rowland, Del Rio, Tenn., in place of R. L. Ford, retired.

TEXAS

William M. Johnson, Jr., Alta Loma, Tex., in place of J. C. Rush, retired.

Jack G. Hunt, Kosse, Tex., in place of B. O. Jones, transferred.

Billie M. Wight, Somerville, Tex., in place of C. V. Welch, retired.

UTAH

Marjorie A. Predovich, Dragerton, Utah, in place of A. E. Scow, retired.

VERMONT

Donald R. Devarney, Milton, Vt., in place of I. M. Barrett, retired.

Doris C. Kendall, Reading, Vt., in place of E. B. Wilkins, retired.

VIRGINIA

Ralph P. Hawkins, Tazewell, Va., in place of H. L. Buston, Jr., retired.

WASHINGTON

Betty J. Hages, Easton, Wash., in place of Ruby Grandstaff, retired.

Charles H. Nash, Friday Harbor, Wash., in place of W. A. Arend, retired.

John C. Hafstad, Oakesdale, Wash., in place of L. A. Winn, deceased.

Melvin W. Schauerman, Odessa, Wash., in place of H. F. Ottestad, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Etta M. Aulabaugh, Hancock, W. Va., in place of E. P. Clark, retired.

WISCONSIN

Joseph C. Forgie, Oconto, Wis., in place of W. L. Chesley, resigned.

WYOMING

Edward D. Storrs, Alcova, Wyo., in place of W. C. Cardwell, retired.

In the Air Force

The following Air Force officers for appointment as permanent professors, U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333 (b), title 10, United States Code:

Alfred F. Hurley, FR27818.
Jesse C. Gatlin, Jr., FR16914.
Anthony J. Mione, FR18482.

The following cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Ahern, John Joseph, Jr.
Ainsworth, James Sterling IV
Albertson, Fred Woodward, Jr.
Allen, Jerrold Park.
Allen, John Joseph.
Almand, Larry Madison.
Amels, Bernard John
Anderson, Parker John
Andrade, Martin Glen
Andrews, Franklin Joe
Andrews, Victor Charles
Anthony, Ron Alan
Apgar, Robert Colin
Arnold, Colin Boone
Ashton, William Bradford
Aykroyd, Geoffrey Barr
Bagley, Larry Carl
Bailey, Edward Par, Jr.
Baker, Carl Laverne
Barnard, Milton Carlton III
Bauer, John Evans
Beatty, Jerry Lee
Becker, Gerald Ernst
Bennett, Martin Patrick
Berkley, Howard Dutcher III
Berls, George Otto
Bernstein, Alfred Michael, Jr.
Berry, William Geary, Jr.
Bethurem, Richard C.
Bevacqua, Michael Edmond
Bielo, Edward Julius
Bingham, Price Tompkins
Blaess, Edward Meredith
Blair, Michael Irwin
Blake, Ronald Lee
Blitt, William J.
Blumberg, Andrey Imants
Boatright, Ronald Lee
Boehringer, Kenneth Fred
Boney, James Stokes
Boone, Robert Kenneth
Borowski, Richard Alan
Botts, Mason Saunders
Bove, Anthony Joseph, Jr.
Bowen, William Garland
Bowers, Robert Joseph
Boyd, Stanley Eugene
Bracy, Ronald Layne
Bradley, Paul Fisher
Brandon, Thomas Scott
Brooks, Ronald Scott
Brost, Robert Nathaniel
Brown, Timothy Dean
Bruce, Philip Warren
Brunner, Gary Edward
Buck, Walter Herbert
Bulkeley, Michael Clare
Burroughs, Paul Norman
Bush, John Robert
Callahan, Jerry Bairn
Cannon, George Edward, Jr.
Capicik, Paul Joseph
Carlson, Kent Richard
Carlson, Randal David
Carr, Thomas Eames II
Carroll, Joel Allen III
Carson, James Matthew
Casper, John Howard
Cecil, Daniel Byron
Charles, Michael
Cheeseman, Alan Browne
Christian, Charles Britton, Jr.
Clements, Manen Osco
Cloar, Robert Ross
Closson, Luke Eldridge, Jr.
Cogley, Jesse William III
Connors, Michael John
Conrad, John Cosley, Jr.
Conver, Stephen Kay
Cook, Ivy Dewey, Jr.
Cook, Richard Paul
Cook, Wendell L.
Craigie, Donald Field
Cree, Richard Wiley, Jr.
Crist, Kenneth Roy
Crist, Neil Barry
Cross, Stephen Dennis
Crotteau, David Arthur
Culpepper, Donnie Dale
D'Benedetto, Carl A.
Daack, Martin Thomas
Dakins, James Michael
Daniels, Henry Spencer
Darrell, Wesley Kenneth
Daskevich, Joseph Ronald
Davis, Joseph Ronald
DeMatte, Eugene Mario
Denny, Gerald Ryan II
Detwiler, Ross Craig
DiBello, Edward George
Dibb, Phillip Allen
Dixon, Cornelius Warren III
Dopler, Bruce Allan
Doyle, Thomas Hankins
Dozier, James Kenneth, Jr.
Dudley, Lynton Charles
Dunham, Robert Lanson, Jr.
Dunn, Ben Garvin
Dunne, William Edward
Dunshee, Robert Burdette
Dyer, John Curtis
Earley, William Hugh
Eddy, Lucian Bruce, Jr.
Egge, Arthur Geoffrey
Eglinton, Gary Scott
Eisler, Steven Lee
Elliott, Dale Stanley
Estrada, Carlos Alberto, Jr.
Estus, Robert Carlisle, Jr.
Eubank, William Emanuel III
Evans, Robert Michael, Jr.
Faix, Joseph Lee
Fal, John William
Fales, David Patrick
Fegan, James Robert
Figueroa, Edmund Lyle
Finan, George Keith II
Finch, Louis Charles
Fink, Dennis Edwin
Foley, Robert Edward
Fornal, Andrew Robert
Fowler, Raymond Dale
Fritzsch, Ralph Burry
Fuller, Charles Thomas
Funkhouser, Kenneth V.
Gaffney, Michael Woodward
Galas, David John
Galer, Robert Tipton
Gardner, Phillip Duane
Gardner, Richard Ernest
Garland, James Edward, Jr.
Gault, Richard Stanley
Gideon, Francis Clare, Jr.
Godfrey, William Randall
Golas, Michael Terry
Golbitz, William Charles
Gommel, Hugh Eugene, Jr.
Gooden, Tobe Dean
Gough, Jamie III
Gourley, Laurent Lee
Govett, William Roger
Grabe, Ronald John
Graham, John David
Gravelle, Robert Michael
Grozier, John Lyman
Gubser, Burlyn Ross, Jr.
Guckert, Thomas Grover
Guenther, Thomas George
Guido, Richard Lawrence
Guido, Robert Vincent
Gundy, Ronald Lee
Hacker, Kenneth John
Hallenbeck, Don Michael
Hamernick, James Leonard
Hamm, William James
Harold, Francis Bernard
Harris, James Durley
Hatchett, Ronald Lester
Hauge, Robert Steven
Hausam, Donald Leroy
Heenan, Michael Edward
Heitman, William Harry
Heitz, Daniel Lee
Hernandez, James Frank
Hess, Frederick William, Jr.
Hess, James Lawrence
Hetrick, Robert Charles
Higgins, Clark Worthen, Jr.
Higgins, Terry Bruce
Higham, James Lowry
Hilker, Richard Peter
Hnat, James Gabriel
Hoffman, Gary Carr
Hogan, William Walter, Jr.
Hogle, Guy Otis, Jr.
Hoh, Robert Henry
Hohwiesner, William Henry
Hollinger, William Boykin, Jr.

Holmes, Douglas Irving, Jr.
Hoogerland, David Lee
Houghtaling, Michael Allen
Housel, Herschel Charles
Howard, William Harrison Furlong
Howard, William James Robert
Hudspeth, William Edmond
Hurst, Joseph Charles
Icke, Harold James
Iversen, Judd Casey
Jaeger, Jan Bruce
Jahnke, Robert Ernst
Jamrosy, Thomas Edward
Janco, Robert Lewis
Janecky, John Franklin
Jarvis, Jefferson James
Jarvis, Joe Howard
Jayne, Edward Randolph II
Johnson, Gary Michael
Johnson, Howard Conwell, Jr.
Johnson, P. W., Jr.
Johnston, Peter Anthony
Jones, William Hoke
Kasparian, A. Frank
Keeley, David Michael
Kehoe, Nicholas Bernard III
Keiser, Thomas Wesley
Kelley, Wayne, Jr.
Kelly, Michael Kenneth
Kennedy, Charles Arthur
Kennedy, Michael Prentiss
Kincaid, Thomas Edward
King, Walter Raymond
Koen, Lyle Dorsey
Koliner, Charles Michael
Kontrick, Alvin Andrew
Kopf, Christopher Robert
Koster, Charles Richard
Kramer, Earl Bain
Krug, Kurt Maurice
Kunz, John Walter
Kuzmiak, George
Lacy, Louis
Lantz, Paul L.
Lanzilotta, Nicholas Mark
Larson, Daniel Francis
Lauger, Larry Michael
Law, James Edward
Le Van, Jay Edwin, Jr.
Ledbetter, Lamar Edward, Jr.
Lee, Richard William
Leek, Warren John
Leib, Thomas Lee, Jr.
Leippe, David Lee
Lewis, James Franklin, Jr.
Leydorf, William Francis, Jr.
Lichtenwalter, Homer Otis III
Lindberg, Eric Kent
Liona, Walter Joseph
Loeffler, Murray William, Jr.
Lord, Kenneth Charles
Lowe, Buford Lee III
Lundholm, Larry Alden
Lupini, Robert Glenn
Lyle, William Franklin, Jr.
Macherione, Daniel
Maier, Dennis Allan
Maiorca, John Patrick
Manning, Henry William
Marcrander, David Bryce
Marcucci, Michael Guido
Markham, Thomas Orr
Maron, John Michael
Marshall, John Calhoun
Martin, Michael
Maybee, John Dallas
McBride, Gerald Bruce
McBroome, John Joseph
McClannan, Herbert
McClure, Alan Robert
McConn, Richard Dean
McCord, Marland Irwin, Jr.
McCormick, Larry Don
McCormick, William James
McDougall, Fritz Joseph
McElvain, Kevin Lawrence
McFalls, John Olin III
McGarrity, Raymond Hilton
McLean, Daniel Paul
McMahon, Joseph Patrick, Jr.
McNamara, Robert Andrew, Jr.
Meadows, James Edgar
Mestemaker, Robert Joseph II
Meyer, Alfred Michael
Michels, William Lee
Milberg, Raymond Fredrick
Monogan, Stephen Jay
Moncrief, Rehn Matthew
Moon, Jesse Morris III
Moore, Lewis Ten Eyck
Morey, Ronald Leonard
Morgan, Howard William, Jr.
Morelli, Peter Edward
Morrison, Russell Cowan, Jr.
Mosley, Ronald Arthur, Jr.
Mossbrook, David William
Mravak, Thomas Anthony
Mrozek, Jerry Lee
Mueh, Hans Juergen
Mullen, James Harry
Munch, Thomas Christopher
Murphy, James Mannion
Myers, Wayne Arthur
Nader, Alfred Harris, Jr.
Nangle, James Thomas
Narsavage, Joseph Martin, Jr.
Nash, Peter Robert
Nenninger, William Paul
Newton, James Allen, Jr.
Nichols, James Richard
Nielsen, Reese Robert
O'Brien, Patrick William
O'Connor, Lawrence Joseph
O'Donnell, Terrence
O'Leary, Patrick Francis
Oakes, David
Oliver, Richard James
Ollila, John Lyle
Olschner, Clarence Edmond, III
Orlowski, Joseph Michael
Ostrozny, Norbert Joseph
Paine, George Francis
Palmer, Gary Thomas
Parmentier, Michael Anthony
Parsons, James Henry
Parsons, Rick N.
Patrick, Daniel Kaye
Patterson, James, III
Perry, Glenn Myers, II
Peshut, Samuel
Petersen, Edward Alfred, III
Potter, Gary Cleveland
Powell, John Micheal
Price, Dorsey Dean
Prigge, Roger Allen
Purinton, Richard Anthony
Quiros, Evan James
Radtke, Danny Lee
Rankin, William Benford
Rathje, Norman Franklin
Reavey, William Anthony, III
Redman, Charles Edgar
Reed, Albert Thomas
Reston, Russell Turrefiel
Rhame, Robert Lynn
Rhynard, Wayne Edgar, Jr.
Rich, Claude Addison, Jr.
Richardson, Albee McLam
Richardson, Mercer Burk
Rickard, Damon Woodrow, Jr.
Riley, William James
Roberts, James Emry
Roberts, James Nelson
Rockefeller, Gary Russell
Rodrigues, Gary Ernest
Roman, Robert John
Rose, Charles Millard, Jr.
Ross, Donald Hamilton
Ross, Joseph Shaw
Rottiers, Robert Bernard
Rudner, Myron Alfred
Ryan, William John, III
Salat, Frank Emil
Salsbury, Leonard Donald
Sanders, Milton Richard
Sanderson, John Nathaniel
Sanford, John Joseph
Sarff, Charles Michael
Saunders, Walter Stanley
Schillereff, Ronald Leroy
Schmidle, George J., Jr.
Schmidt, Terry Allen
Schmiesing, Dale Cletus
Schock, Daniel Roland, III
Schrecker, Walter Norris
Scott, Roger Duncan
Scribner, Charles Reverdan
Seibel, Michael Wayne
Selecman, Thomas Henry, Jr.
Setterquist, Francis Leslie
Sharer, Bruce Warren
Shepard, William Kent
Shepler, Thomas Roberts
Sheridan, Paul Richard
Shirley, Graham Edward
Shultis, Donald Charles, Jr.
Sidwell, Larry Wayne
Simmons, Mark Owen
Simmons, Michael Wayne
Simpson, James Michael
Skagen, James Henry
Skora, Wayne Philip
Smith, Harvey Morris
Smith, Lee Thomas
Sollenberger, Stephen Shockey
Sowa, John Mathew
Spencer, Paul Cash
Spitz, George Ross
Steele, John Richard
Stein, Paul Eugene
Steward, Donald Emmet
Stierle, James Edwin
Stirrat, Thomas Merrill
Stith, John Andrew
Strong, Frederick Webster, III
Strzemieczny, Alan Lee
Stuart, Bryan James
Stuart, William Oswald, III
Sugg, Joseph Philip
Sullivan, Edwin Paulson
Suro, George Arthur
Sutherland, Mont Edward
Sutherland, Robert Blair
Svoboda, Joseph Gary
Swanson, John Gregg
Swartz, Steven Lee
Talcott, Ronald Taylor
Tanner, Morris Adams, Jr.
Taylor, Michael Leon
Teetz, Connie Otto
Thames, James Dennis
Thompson, Donald Yates
Thompson, James Donald
Thompson, Richard Gloster, Jr.
Thompson, Tommy Gordon
Tilley, James William II
Toney, Virgil Jackson, Jr.
Tooley, Edward Stephen
Toro, Bruce Robert
Towne, Geoffrey Wainwright
Traudt, Larry William
Turpen, Louis Alan
Tway, Duane Converse, Jr.
Urner, Ronald Mark
Van Duyn, John Edgar, Jr.
Van Valin, Gary Alan
Vaughan, Donald Reid
Veach, Charles Lacy
Vincent, Halton Ramsey
Viotti, Paul Richard
Vogel, Carl Joseph
Volin, David Ross
Voll, Richard Allen
Wacker, William Leslie
Walker, Donald Robert
Wallace, William Carl, Jr.
Walsh, John Anthony, Jr.
Ward, James Matthew
Watson, Charles Dennis
Watson, Richard Bruce
Webster, James Charles
Weed, Harold Vincent, Jr.
Weihe, Tyson Eugene
Weinman, Arnold Lee
Wetzel, Kenneth Richard
Wheeler, Michael Orvan
White, William Roy, Jr.
Wilkinson, Charles Davis
Willett, David Anthony
Wise, Sidney Jay
Withycombe, Frederick Keith
Witton, Richard Thomas, Jr.
Womack, Carl Lavan

Woody, James Robert
Work, Terrell William
Wormington, John Robert
Wright, John Robert, Jr.
Wroblewski, Robert Anthony
Zambelli, Anthony Carmen
Zent, Llewellyn II
Zomnir, Paul Andrew

The following cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Bashant, Ronald Wayne
Coonan, Daniel Joseph, III
Dodd, Daniel Ayler
Drury, Deane Charles
Engelman, Frederick Charles, Jr.
Fairchild, Frederic Peter
Foster, Henry Sessam, Jr.
Gibson, James Wesley
Glassford, James Churchill
Guerrero, Willard Charles
Lewandowski, William Joseph
Payne, William Ashley
Ramsay, Robert Benjamin
Seith, William Frederick G., Jr.
Stone, William McCarthy
Wiser, Gordon James
Wynne, Michael Walter

The following midshipmen, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Daly, Michael Jon
Hale, Russell Dean II
Smith, Michael Danny
Williford, James Vance
Wood, Kenneth Cecil, Jr.

In the Army

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Ganns, Ralph R., O20184.

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Gustafson, Pauline A. C., N2148.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3292, and 3294:

To be major

McGlade, Joseph G. (MSC), O67843.

To be first lieutenant

Beinhacker, Neal D. (MSC), O91516.

To be major, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Malone, Albert C., Jr. (AIS), O63275.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Lasseter, Earle F. (Armor), O69536.
Reinert, John E. (OrdC), O83775.
Russell, George G., Jr. (AGC), O78486.
Weisler, Julian E., II (Inf.), O87432.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Bell, Randall W. (MSC), O87021.
MacDonald, Bruce S. (Arty), O72132.
Noga, Gerald W. (CE), O87290.
Price, Herman L. (AGC), O82887.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Bagley, Philip J., III (Arty), O99541.
Balady, Salim J. (Inf.), O98349.
Bartee, William F., Jr. (OrdC), O97400.
Brown, Gerald M. (OrdC), O98350.
Cady, Donald F. (Arty), O98054.
Carroll, Bartlett J., Jr. (Arty), O98063.
Cook, Alan W. (Arty), O98051.
Ecclestone, John S., II (QmC), O97539.
Eckhardt, William G. (Inf.), O97836.
Franklin, William W. (QmC), O99555.
Franks, Mitchell D. (Inf.), O97504.
Freck, William B. (QmC), O97541.
Graham, Thomas A., III (CE), O97655.
Green, Fred K. (MPC), O97558.
Herkenhoff, Walter E. (TC), O99466.
Ippolito, Peter J. (Inf.), O98151.
Kessel, Mark (Arty), O98164.
Laney, John T., III (OrdC), OF100854.
Maher, Thomas R. (SigC), OF105578.
Naughton, John F. (CE), O98469.
Sessums, Robert B. (Inf), O98431.
Steinberg, Barry P. (SigC), O99592.
Thalken, Thomas B. (QMC), OF101191.
Thomas, Michael T. (TC), O98308.
Torres, Juan H. (Inf), OF102021.
Wager, Joseph S. (AGC), OF102660.
Watz, James H. (AGC), O99597.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Arends, Robert C. (MSC), O96561.
McAllister, Hugh A., Jr. (MSC), O92061.
Starke, William R. (MSC), O95704.
Whitmore, Paul V. (MSC), O96545.
Zimmerly, James G., O96557.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be lieutenant colonel

Shaddy, Mershan G., O1822638.

To be majors

Case, Onore E., O962490.
Fish, Roy E., O1876473.
Hanchett, William A., O2211591.
Hodges, Harry A., O2263710.
Hood, William P., O980555.
Killen, Frederick S., O975056.
Lawrence, Norman R., O1889925.
Lewis, William E., O1885601.
Michels, Daniel L., O1925951.
Mundy, Frederic L., O1882597.
Paige, Emmett, Jr., O1885808.
Primis, Nick J., O1889764.
Randolph, John P., O1893823.
Rogers, Ernest P., O1885476.
Selby, Norman D., O1925562.
Thompson, Jack H., O1120675.
Wakefield, Jack E., O1925579.

To be captains

Allen, Sydna B., Jr., O5304544.
Barron, James B., O4051270.
Bellamy, Bruce M., O4041344.
Boren, Charles M., O4049582.
Borum, William D., O4026606.
Brem, Homer L., Jr., O4024645.
Brien, John H., O4045163.
Brook, Howard F., Jr., O5308098.
Brown, James H., Jr., O5405393.
Burbules, John G., O4031092.
Butler, Joe C., O4009796.
Cotrupi, Francis J., O5000702.
Daniels, Jiles P., O4024587.
Davis, Ronnie C., O5400421.
Davis, Thomas J., O5305348.
Doyle, Noel J., Jr., O5002197.
Duerson, Virgil D., O5205808.
Dunfield, Edward P., O4063681.
Durham, James A., O4084860.
Eddie, Robert G., O4004884.
Erkelens, Henri F., O4052682.
Ferguson, Norman N., O5307073.
Fraser, Robert D., O5700189.
Garcia, Rafael G., O5401929.
Gonzales, Ralph V., O4006922.
Hoagland, David O., O4033594.
Humphries, George D., O4009949.
Isenberg, William C., O5206099.
Jeo, Herbert, O4013858.
Johnson, Richard D., O5507168.
Kendrick, Floyd R., O4048810.
Kilgore, James A., O4010851.
Landry, Stephen D., O4074403.
Livingston, Allen C., O4028900.
Lopez, Manuel, O5405384.
Lumpkins, William J., Jr., O988090.
Madden, Charles D., O5000428.
Matassarin, Leon C., O5507404.
Munson, Harvard R., O5301785.
Naclerio, Nicholas J., O4037578.
Ondarza, Fred, Jr., O4026141.
Pack, Tommy R., O5304492.
Pawlik, Stephen R., O4031000.
Pelham, Wendall L., O4006858.
Perkins, Albert R., Jr., O4034349.
Quedens, Bernard B., O4009577.
Reese, Kenneth D., O4047521.
Rodriguez-Fernandez, Jose G., O4029578.
Runnion, John E., O4009783.
Schnoor, Jack E., O4010034.
Sevilla, Exequiel R., Jr., O4048748.
Sharp, Richard H., O5307141.
Siner, Wallace K., O5405390.
Singer, Warren H., O2096953.
Smith, Blair E., O4006331.
Steinhilper, Edgar M., O4043004.
Straeb, Robert G., O5506115.
Tademy, Dudley L., O5400517.
Van Wert, John F., Jr., O4031124.
Vogel, Glenn A., O5207112.
Wilkinson, Ralph C., O5303123.
Yoxtheimer, Donald D., O4021249.

To be first lieutenants

Austin, Samuel F., O5303478.
Ballantyne, Nathaniel B., O5314921.
Barringer, Ronald W. L., O5405649.
Berhens, Robert W., O5211540.
Benson, Frederick W., O5214954.
Bertocci, David I., O5212335.
Black, Richard A., O5009715.
Bradley, Larry E., O5313732.
Brantner, Carter H., O5517469.
Brown, Raymond A., O2292936.
Brunson, Jackie L., O5316208.
Buczek, Henry F., O5314404.
Chesney, Ralph M., O5011067.
Coll, Thomas J., O5010445.
Cone, Billy J., O5410934.
Coonelly, Thomas F., Jr., O5314234.
Czerw, Theodore J., O5010127.
Cunningham, Richard W., O5406050.
Dean, Edwin B., O5213198.
Dillard, Leonard A., Jr., O5313773.
Doff, Lawrence D., O5311198.
Donovan, Timothy H., Jr., O5012242.
Doyle, Edward J., O5217940.
Edge, James G., O5002198.
Fallin, James E., O5213539.
Fincher, Jerry W., O5405710.
Fisher, David M., Jr., O5405914.
Foscue, Stanley M., O5313047.
Gaddis, Joseph T., O5530219.
Geisewite, Charles W., O5512673.
Gilmour, Adam S., O5310185.
Gleisner, James W., O5515604.
Goolsby, James R., O5404026.
Grossman, Robert F., O5010213.
Hammond, William R., O5501517.
Hansen, Michael H., O5412584.
Henderson, Donnie W., O5413136.
Higdon, Thomas E., O5315493.
Hobson, Alan D., O5515857.
Holland, Kenneth J., O5009606.
Huntsberry, Henry C., O5218875.
Innis, Joseph F., O5704262.
Jenkins, Oscar L., O5214198.
Jinks, James H., Jr., O5405478.
Johnson, Paul H., O5702659.
Karjala, Lawrence, O5405784.
Kelleher, Edward P., Jr., O5007927.
Kiger, David C., O5216062.
King, Donald H., O5314965.
Klausner, John T., Jr., O5707064.
Krawczyk, Joseph E., O5013701.
Lord, Fred E., O5014439.
Loveless, Kenneth D., O5411857.
Mann, Marion E., Jr., O2309917.
Marsh, Caryl G., O5214777.
Martin, James H., O5515251.
Mauk, George R., O5215579.
McAleer, Michael E., O5405825.
McDonald, Ted A., O5313287.
Morrell, Robert H., O5125286.
Murphy, Richard E., O5004936.

Nealon, Edgar L., O5315253.
Neitzke, Robert A., O5511714.
Nichols, Willard L., O5306551.
O'Brien, James J., O5009635.
Oliver, Ralph H., Jr., O5309997.
Overby, Glen A., O5413033.
Partin, Tommy M., O5409725.
Pate, Reuben M., O5409880.
Pattison, William C., O5009739.
Phillips, David M., O5516447.
Polk, Robert H., O5313465.
Quickmire, Carl R., O5405728.
Regelski, Joseph R., O5008793.
Rosbeck, Richard A., O5010424.
Schechtel, Lawrence P., O5705122.
Seely, John B., O2316595.
Seligman, Norman L., O5311528.
Sheetz, Michael L., O5514062.
Sheffield, Roger V., O5304264.
Silverman, Joel I., O5014073.
Singsank, James J., O5510994.
Smith, William A., O2313447.
Stewart, Peter, O5007015.
Swift, William D., O5316532.
Tassi, Gordon R., O5705126.
Turley, James M., O5514124.
Turner, Vance L., O5406238.
Vamvakias, Nicholas P., O2307040.
Wambsganss, Richard E., O5310958.
Winton, George C., Jr., O2313170.
Wolfgram, Richard E., O5516278.
Young, Luther D., III, O5410975.
Zielenski, Peter T., O2303975.

To be second lieutenants

Anderson, Martin S., O5709762.
Barnhart, Robert N., O5406640.
Bartholomew, Mark A., O5850133.
Barton, Jay W., O5419313.
Bender, Michael J., O5223330.
Brazee, Frederick E., O5223095.
Brazelton, John E., O5323247.
Bryson, Thomas E., O5534367.
Clare, Joseph F., Jr.
Costich, Kenneth J., II, O5533172.
Devine, William S., O5020514.
Donohue, Jeremiah F., O5406877.
Draper, Jerry Y., O5320146.
Drexler, Arthur J., Jr., O5221303.
Floca, Samuel W., Jr., O5419100.
Frame, Bruce C., O5225082.
Graves, Lawrence D., O5708311.
Gray, Robert W., Jr., O5406964.
Greenberg, Harold S., O5416158.
Hauck, John R., O5324788.
Hill, Roylance W., O5406461.
Hogan, Charles J., Jr., O5533436.
Hussong, William A., Jr., O5321797.
Jermyn, Bobby R., O5406896.
Judge, John R., O5318925.
Keating, Charles F., O5418972.
Koppler, Doit L., O5324952.
Lavezzi, George B., O5323642.
Manuel, Robert J., O5406678.
Martinez, Jose, O5324966.
McKeen, Robert W., O5321682.
McMinn, Robert K., O5416278.
Metherall, Paul E., O5322690.
Moore, John, O5322141.
Moss, Jackson C., III, O5415830.
Moyer, Richard D., O5227093.
Nowakowski, Richard C., O5227398.
Paris, Howard S., O2296015.
Rerecich, John A., O5017833.
Ricci, William L., O5320543.
Rowe, Michael A., O5018832.
Simpkins, Dale L., O5406314.
Smith, Cecil C., O5406369.
Sowell, Norman E., O5710514.
Stilwell, Richard G., Jr., O5225031.
Taylor, Kenneth A., O5418767.
Williford, Sherman H., O5322037.
Woods, Leroy, O5221978.
Zehnder, Joseph L., Jr., O5016200.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Anderson, Jack R., O1533480.
Svjagintsev, Jueri J., O4056020.

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Gronley, Jo Anne K., M2290109.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Aragones, Blanca A., N804029.
Boyersmith, Evelyn L., N901967.
Kelley, Joan M., N5003443.

To be captains, Chaplain

Gasquet, Mark C., O5403330.
Hopkins, Paul D., O2309435.
Peterman, James A., O2298149.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Balserak, Robert J., O5213645.
Braman, Denison B., O5223746.
Brown, George O., O5525028.
Carter, Richard L., O5525126.
Carter, Willard H., O2312623.
Edington, Ernest M., Jr., O5315927.
Hammer, Henry S., O2312652.
Kay, Michael M., O5223753.
Larson, Wayne J., O5501793.
McDonald, Frederick L., II, O5519170.
Merten, Robert L., O5525810.
Moyer, John H., O5213991.
O'Connor, Randolph P., Jr., O5306271.
Perez, Bienvenido, O4028506.
Roth, Neal A., O5216781.
Trawick, Jack S., O5408726.
Vitori, Robert A., O5223711.
Woody, Ronald D., O2312611.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Chalekian, Suran J., O5511760.
Tracy, Curtis L., O2299522.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Antony, Joseph G., O2313128.
Boatright, Charles F., O2313127.
Breza, George M., O5212075.
Cardell, Jose E., O5022190.
De La Perriere, Armand A., O2313053.
Eberhard, Edward J., O87096.
Everett, Elwood D., O5417527.
Garfield, Herbert I., O5319759.
Gernon, William H., O5525698.
Greene, Francis T., O5306009.
Gum, Ronald A., O5408340.
Guyton, William F., O5319756.
Hart, Clarence R., O5525679.
Haskell, Richard D., O2305769.
Houston, John B., O5227675.
Humbert, Paul V., Jr., O2313045.
Johnson, Lawrence F., O5208419.
Kaplan, Jerrold M., O2313094.
Lafontant, Robert R., O2309865.
Lefton, Theodore E., O5227832.
Magen, Walter H., O2313085.
Nelson, Donald E., O5227878.
Newstead, Robert R., O2309554.
Paulius, Charles D., III, O5525758.
Porzio, Raymond J., O5002071.
Reed, Robert L., O5022099.
Roycroft, David W., O5022018.
Sawhill, David L., O5227732.
Schweers, Carl A., Jr., O5525476.
Shock, John P., Jr., O87375.
Siegal, David L., O5500962.
Skinner, William E., O5709096.
Souffront-Velez, Wilfredo, O5826202.
Stabler, Carey V., O5304041.
Stansell, William J., O4041213.
Strum, Donald H., O2313077.
Sudderth, Jerry F., O5417537.
Taber, David O., O2313209.
Ten Eyck, James R., O5525860.
Tomlinson, Jerry A., O2305357.
Turner, Lewis M., Jr., O5700410.
Walker, Olyn M., O5308156.
Zients, Alan B., O5022059.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Green, Grant E., O4071955.
Heraly, Elroy P., O4023238.
Korte, Thomas H., O2298236.

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Ebertz, Peter E., O5013277.
Manus, Allan G., O2309449.
McSweeney, Richard D., O2309128.

To be first lieutenants, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Laubscher, Sonya R., M2300837.
Putnam, Joicey M., M2300814.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Abbott, Edith J., N5411462.
Foster, Imogene, N5407356.
Krisov, Althea E., N5411435.
Wise, Mary J., N2309938.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Malouf, Carl E., O5706696.
Sherwood, John T., Jr., O2314298.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Branch, Leslie B., O5315722.
Chamberlain, Terry J., O2321193.
Coville, Frederick V., O2320722.
Craig, David E., O2316803.
Culton, John W., O5711564.
Frostad, Alvin L., O2320778.
Garrettson, James A., O5215574.
Grannemann, Harry N., O5513341.
Gunther, John S., O5008543.
Harner, Stephen G., O2316830.
Harvey, John E., O2316829.
Haskins, Ronal C., O5311957.
Holton, Don B., O5412637.
Kichler, Jack, O2320755.
Kief, John J., O2320754.
King, John W., O5411894.
Malone, Edward M., Jr., O2316818.
Maraist, David V., O2320783.
Saposnikoff, John B., O2320774.
Shaw, James W., Jr., O2320741.
Smith, Davis S., O2320773.
Von Ruden, Dale A., O2320790.
Whitcomb, Michael E., O2316746.
Ziegler, Herman F., O2320732.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Amos, Oscar D., O5410660.
Bambery, Thomas W., O5514559.
Bell, Sterling W., O5405541.
Rose, Walter C., O2311709.
Sorbera, Salvatore, O5703731.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Strimple, Earl O., O2317087.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Murphy, Joanne, L5302045.

To be second lientenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Tomlan, Jolene K., M2317302.

To be second lientenants, Army Nurse Corps

Coulter, Sharon E., N5411553.
Herrington, Joyce, N2316081.
Wicki, Carol A., N2319695.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Durand, William B., O2316291.
Smith, David D., O5532147.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Brajkovich, Catherine A., L2317402.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Aaron, Moses E., O5328643.
Achuff, Peter L.
Acton, James E.
Adams, Brian R.
Alston, Virnal J.
Amstutz, Richard E.
Anderson, James W.
Anderson, Quinton D., Jr.
Applehans, Robert B., Jr.
Archer, Chris H.
Asiello, Robert M.
Asimakopoulos, Peter L.
Ayers, William M., Jr.
Bacon, David R.
Baker, Richard D., Jr.
Banks, Albert F., Jr.
Barich, Jerald J.
Barnes, Richard H., Jr.
Barnhill, Jerry R.
Barry, William A., III

Baxter, Larry J.
Beach, Lawrence A.
Beckroge, John H., Jr.
Bengtson, Richard L.
Benoit, James A.
Benton, William E.
Bergson, Henry P.
Bergson, Paul C.
Bernard, Joseph P.
Berry, Earl T.
Bertelsen, Mark A.
Bishop, Jerry D.
Blackshire, Benny W.
Blaine, Jerome M., Jr., O5235020
Boad, Roy E.
Boaldin, Bobbie R.
Bogue, Ronald A.
Boles, Edward A.
Borgatti, Edward M.
Bowdoin, William R., Jr.
Bower, Count L., Jr.
Boysen, Stuart W., III
Bridgewater, Irvin L., III
Brittingham, Michael L.
Brockway, Bruce E.
Brooks, Kenneth N.
Broome, Wallace S.
Brown, Bobby G.
Brown, David J.
Brown, Michael J.
Brown, Phillips L.
Brown, Robert J.
Brumfield, Wetzel D.
Buchwald, Clarence R., Jr.
Buckingham, Patrick W.
Burchill, Richard P.
Burghart, Frank G., III
Burk, William H., Jr., O5718533
Burnor, Paul J., Jr.
Bush, James G.
Cahill, John M.
Cain, Paul F.
Calhoun, Ernest L.
Cameron, Tom O.
Canup, Claude R., Jr.
Caputo, Carlo B.
Carr, Thomas D., III
Carver, William G.
Carvill, Richard A.
Casalese, Joseph S.
Casey, Francis W.
Caughron, Raymond D.
Chaffin, Charles M.
Chartier, Everette E.
Cheatham, James H., Jr.
Chimenti, Ronald C.
Clark, Thomas E.
Clarke, Robert A. A.
Clendenin, Joseph A.
Cleveland, David A.
Cochrane, Daniel P.
Cole, Daniel J., Jr.
Coleman, Bruce S., Jr.
Combs, Robert H.
Comer, Edward L.
Conderman, John D.
Cooper, William E., Jr.
Coradini, William J.
Corbin, James E.
Cornwell, Michael C.
Coughlin, John F.
Cowan, James A.
Coyne, Patrick I.
Crawford, Dereld G.
Cretella, Joseph, Jr.
Crittsinger, Clifford A.
Cunningham, John M.
Dalfonzo, Joseph A.
Darden, Mercer G.
Darnell, Ronald H.
David, Benjamin K.
Davis, Glenn R.
Davis, James H.
Davis, William M.
Deines, John M.
Delo, Lew E.
Deming, Michael D.
Dempsey, Daniel J.
Denison, Gordon R.
Denniston, LeRoy W.
Deters, Robert H., Jr.
Doby, Neal S.
Dockery, Patrick H.
Donah, Paul A.
Dort, Dean R., II
Dowgielewicz, John P.
Drake, Stephen M.
Droke, Willard B.
Dunbar, James D., Jr.
Duncan, William M.
Easton, James N., O5713629
Ebert, Steven R.
Edmunds, Bobby A.
Edmundson, Daniel C.
Elder, Robin L.
Ellis, Charles F.
Ellis, John D.
Eltrich, Martin C., Jr.
Emens, John A.
Epps, Jones N., Jr.
Ericksen, Scott R.
Estes, John R.
Fanning, Steven E.
Farrally-Plourde, Yana D.
Farrell, Michael V.
Farris, Karl
Farris, Robert J.
Fee, Warren M.
Felch, John E., Jr.
Felts, Thomas G.
Fergusson, Robert C. L.
Ferraro, Jerrold S.
Fifer, Peter J.
Fink, Steven E.
Fisher, James F.
Fitzgerald, Arnold E., Jr.
Franke, Stephen H.
Franz, Richard L.
Frazar, Gautier B.
Freas, Richard F.
Fredericks, Michael F.
Freeman, Dennis C. B. Jr.
Freeman, Elrie A.
Fronzaglia, Stanley N.
Frye, Robert F., III
Fuehrer, John C.
Galbraith, Milton A., Jr.
Gandy, Charles V., Jr.
Garcia, Dennis P.
Gardner, Roy
Garma, George
Gaudette, John J., Jr.
Gilbertson, Michael E.
Gilmour, Joseph E., Jr.
Giordono, Matthew J.
Gipe, George W.
Girardi, Ralph R.
Glass, John D.
Glenn, Richard J.
Gold, William A.
Golightly, Douglas V.
Gorang, Thomas D.
Gordon, Richard R.
Gorton, Ashton E.
Goss, Robert I.
Graf, Rudolph L.
Graham, Raymond F.
Grandel, Ronald D.
Gray, Kenneth D.
Green, Robert A.
Greene, Joseph T., Jr.
Greenwood, Robert M.
Griffin, Edwin N.
Griffin, James C., Jr.
Griffin, James G.
Grimsley, Lee E.
Groat, Gary L.
Grosch, David L.
Guarneri, Domenick
Guidry, Richard C.
Guy, Earl P., III
Haeme, Raymond A.
Hagstrom, Carl C. G.
Hall, Anthony W., Jr.
Hall, Jack L.
Hall, Roger W.
Hammon, John B., O5713496
Hampton, Marvin E., Jr.
Harada, Michael A.
Harley, George E.
Harmon, Larry G.
Harr, Gerry A.
Harris, James M.
Harris, William R.
Hartman, David A.
Hauck, David G.
Hauser, John R., Jr.
Head, Allan B.
Henderson, Aubrey E.
Henry, Sam S., Jr.
Hensley, Allan L.
Hepler, John F., III
Herion, George C.
Hermoyian, Edward J.
Herndon, Robert L.
Hetherington, Carl E.
Hetzner, Werner, Jr.
Heuwinkel, Richard J.
Higgins, James O.
Hill, Carl D., O5536947
Hill, Howard W.
Ho, Kenneth O. P.
Hoffman, Richard W.
Holder, Leonard D., Jr.
Hollandsworth, James G., Jr.
Hoodenpyle, James C.
Hoover, Thomas L.
Horstmann, Richard A.
House, Jonathan W.
Howard, Frederick M.
Howe, Robert L.
Howlett, John P.
Hoza, Philip J.
Huckabay, Warren T.
Hudgings, James G.
Hugus, David K., O5536683
Humphrey, Richard S.
Hunt, Daniel D.
Ingalls, Allan S., Jr.
Isom, Dennis R.
Jackson, James H.
Jacobs, Jack H.
Jacobsen, Gary A.
James. Richard J. O5536860
James, Wayne E., Jr.
Jarvis, Michael J.
Jeansonne, Paul D.
Jefferis, James L.
Jenkins, James D.
Jochem, Donald C.
Johnson, Arnold R., Jr.
Johnson, Dale H.
Johnson, Jeffrey P.
Johnson, Spencer C.
Johnston, Charles A.
Jolly, Michael S.
Jones, Allan R.
Jones, David H.
Jones, Gary A.
Jones, Hugh J. M., III
Jones, Richard P.
Jones, Robert E.
Joseph, John K.
Jue, Jin K.
Kale, William H.
Kazenski, Robert W.
Kearns, Ronald F.
Keenan, Edward J., Jr.
Kelley, Edward L.
Kelly, John P.
Kelly, Needham N., Jr.
Kemble, Raymond E.
Kennett, Michael B.
Kenyon, Norbert L.
Kerr, John A.
King, Eugene C.
King, Kerrith H.
King, Ladd M.
King, Robert D.
Kingham, Thomas B.
Kirchoffner, Donald P.
Kirkpatrick, Raymond L., Jr.
Klaver, Robert P.
Klock, John H., O5233737.
Konigsmark, Henry III
Korkalo, Roy E.
Kothen, Richard B.
Kramer, Peter M.
Kromer, Robert A.
Kropp, Richard E.
Krueger, Gerald P.
Kudra, Ronald N.
Kuehn, Robert J.
Kwock, Johnson C. S.
Labasan, Joseph F.
Lahr, Charles D.
Lain, William K.
Lang, Robert E.
Lauderdale, Charles W., III
Laws, Jerry L.
Leach, William G.
Lee, John C.
Leekley, Edward H.
Lefevre, Boyd H., II
Liggett, Lawrence G.
Livingston, Charles H.
Loop, Curtis A.
Lovett, Henry B.
Lowe, Ronald L.
Lucas, Steven W.
Lurix, Richard A.
Lynch, Richard J., III
MacLachlan, James G.
Mahon, Thomas J., Jr.
Maini, Paul B.
March, Charles E.
Marrapese, Richard L.
Martin, Russell M.
Massey, Albert P., III
Massey, Ronald E.
Mathias, Anthony E.
Matlosz, Henry S., Jr.
Mattes, David J.
Matthess, William D.
Matthews, Robert J.
Maxwell, Calvin W.
May, William J., O5713561
Maybee, Richard G.
McArdle, John C., Jr.
McBride, Ellis A., Jr.
McCall, George E.
McCalla, John H.
McConkey, Robert B.
McGough, Gerard E.
McGregor, Peter J.
McKenzie, Myron K.
McNeil, Dennis J., O5536419
McRae, Ralph D., Jr.
McWilliams, Brian M.
Meacham, Christopher L.
Meath, Donald G.
Meikle, James G.
Melton, James C.
Mendonca, Thomas G.
Merritt, Weldon L.
Mesarch, Victor P.
Midtun, Leroy L.
Miller, Edward A., Jr.
Mills, Gregory F.
Mills, Michael R.
Minnich, Tim I.
Minton, Marcus D.
Mirra, Ronald T.
Monk, Robert W., IV
Monroe, Eric G.
Montgomery, James M., O5421526
Moody, James L.
Moore, Robert S., Jr.
Moore, William F.
Mordue, Norman A., O5024062
Morris, Robert E.
Morrison, Richard E.
Morsch, Ronald L.
Mostella, Kenneth E.
Moster, Stephen A.
Mountain, Keith E.
Moushegian, Richard H.
Mueller, Mark A.
Mulford, Ralph K., III
Mullins, Daniel L.
Munsey, Robert O.
Murphy, James M.
Myers, David R.
Neumann, Hans J.
Nevares, Henry, Jr.
Nottingham, Donald R
Novakovic, William E., Jr.
Novotney, Laurence C.
Officer, Alvin D.
Ogles, Thomas M., Jr.
Ogley, Gary A.
Ohl, William C., II
Olney, Roger P.
O'Meara, John M.
O'Neil, Thomas J.
O'Reilly, Patrick A.
Orth, Walter H., Jr.
Osterhout, Michael L.
Overturf, Arthur G.
Owen, David W.
Palmer, John A.
Paraska, Harry J.
Pardew, James W., Jr.
Parrish, David J.
Parsons, William X.
Paulus, Jeffrey A.
Payne, Brown W.
Payne, Laurance J.
Penrose, Clifford E., II
Peters, Garry C., O5713564
Pezzano, Frank J., Jr.
Pfeifle, William G.
Pfrimmer, Robert J.
Phillips, Phil G., Jr.
Picquet, Philip G. O5713565
Pierce, David W.
Pilcher, David W.
Pilkington, Edgar L.
Pitman, James M.
Plavan, John C.
Pleasnick, Walter E.
Plumlee, Gordon K., O5421427
Prisk, Gary R.
Probart, Lewis D.
Pujals, Jaime
Quintin, Paul E., Jr.
Radinger, William, Jr.
Rauscher, Raymond C.
Rawson, James P.
Reft, Chester S.
Reichle, Paul T.
Reid, Gerald E., Jr.
Renalds, Juette O., III
Ressler, John T.
Rhome, Robert C.
Rickert, Wayne F.
Riedy, John M.
Ritchhart, Peter J.
Rittinger, John P., Jr.
Rivera, Ruben
Riviello, Robert N.
Robinson, Bruce D.
Robinson, Randal M.
Rogers, Jack A., Jr.
Rogers, Jerry T.
Rogers, Robert E.
Romines, Ronald F.
Ronay, James C.
Roper, James R.
Rose, Howard E.
Rothlisberger, Daniel L.
Roudebush, Robert A.
Rush, Michael C.
Russell, Donald R.
Saliny, Dennis E.
Sallenback, Murray D. O5713493
Salvatore, Ronald A.
Sanderlin, Allen P.
Sanders, Edward B.
Sands, Charles F.
Satterwhite, Neil E.
Saunders, Mark B.
Sawyer, Kenneth R., O5713628
Schaeffer, Gerard F.
Schafer, John R., II
Schailey, Glen H.
Schmidt, Richard W. O5536909
Schmitt, Joseph A.
Schneikert, Harold W., Jr.
Schopp, Steven M.
Schultz, Warren S.
Schwartz, James F.
Scott, Lowell K.
Sevene, Robert
Severino, Angelo A.
Sharp, Marvin W.
Shelton, William R.
Shepard, Ronald W.
Shriner, Robert M.
Sither, Charles R.
Skelley, Richard B.
Skoglund, Emil E., Jr.
Skripka, Frederick J.
Slater, Howard F., Jr.
Slater, Terry J.
Smith, Edgar A. P., Jr.
Smith, Eugene D.
Smith, James H.
Smith, Otis H., Jr.
Smith, Raymond M.
Smith, Richard C., III
Smith, William D.
Smith, William G., III
Soares, John F.
Somers, Richard E.
Sovie, Donald E.
Sparks, Earl C., III
Sparks, Gene D.
Stamoulis, Angelo A.
Stanfield, Morton D.
Stankovich, Peter
Stark, Michael E.
Stark, William W.
Stauffacher, Thomas J.
Steelman, Robert C., Jr.
Stein, Alfred G.
Steiner, Charles R., Jr.
Steman, Earl C.
Stempski, Frank
Stevenson, Donald J.
Stevenson, Harry C.
Stewart, Charles L.
Stewart, Clyde F.
Stewart, James B.
Stewart, Larry N.
Stock, Clifford J.
Stock, Michael L.
Strassburg, Thomas M.
Strawn, Marvin I.
Striegler, Thomas L.
Stuart, Kenneth K.
Stuart, Richard J.
Sugden, Barry K., Jr., O5230414
Sullivan, Lee J.
Swayze, Gerald C.
Swenson, Swante A., II

Szymanski, James G.
Tanner, Richard B.
Tarpley, Thomas J., Jr.
Taylor, Robert H.
Tees, Hans
Teverbaugh, John R.
Thacker, Wallace P.
Tharp, Thomas R.
Theroux, Thomas R.
Thomas, Bernard P.
Thomas, Michael A.
Thompson, James E.
Thompson, John A., Jr.
Thompson, John L., Jr.
Thompson, Joseph A.
Timboe, Arthur R.
Todd, James M.
Toledo, Richard B. V., Jr.
Tomik, John P.
Toohey, James P.
Tracy, Stephen A.
Tyson, Tony
Unkefer, John W.
Valenti, Philip A.
Valentine, William R.
Valle, Laurence F. M.
VandenBurg, Mercer O.
Van Wert, Ronald K.
Vaughan, Ronald B.
Vavrek, George M.
Vilsack, Harry L.
Virusky, Edmund J., Jr.
Vivolo, Anthony R.
Waddle, Harry I., Jr.
Wade, Michael R.
Wagner, Anthony L.
Walden, Charles C.
Waldera, David A.
Walker, Jerry W.
Walker, Stanley L.
Wallace, Charles E.
Walley, Bryan J.
Walsh, James D., Jr.
Walsh, Richard
Walthers, Alan E., O5536532
Warga, Russell M.
Wark, Richard W.
Washburn, Dennis A.
Watson, Don R.
Webster, Daniel B.
Webster, George K.
Weinstein, Leonard H.
Weis, Gerhard W., O5536441
Weller, Rexford E.
West, Oliver I., Jr.
Westling, Jerry M.
Wheat, Pryor L. B.
Wheeler, William L., Jr.
White, Jerry D.
White, Jonathan W.
White, Leslie M.
White, Richard J. J.
White, Robert G.
Wiggins, Theron L.
Wilcox, Duane W., O5234029
Williams, James W., Jr.
Williams, Jerald A.
Williams, Robert H.
Williams, Robert J., Jr.
Wilson, Douglas N., III
Wilson, Gerald R., Jr.
Wilson, John W., Jr.
Wilson, Thomas W.
Winterling, Grayson F.
Wright, Nelson B., Jr.
Wright, Walter G. B.
Yamaoka, Curtis A.
Yates, Clyde P.
Yukimura, Paul K.
Zanca, Peter A.
Zimmer, Lewis P.
Zimmer, Thomas E.
Zimmerman, Charles W.
Zuckor, Jesse F.
Zurcher, Thomas D.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the Dental Corps, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code. sections 2106, 3283, 3284, and 3294:

Arroyo, Francisco, O5826301.
Caruth, Lawrence G., O5214618.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

Anderson, Wolfgang R., O5713023.
Burch, John T., Jr., O5225886.
Buhrman, Richard W., O5317955.
Carlotti, Stephen J., O5016446.
Cowan, Walter G., Jr.
Deal, John N., O5323267.
Dittmer, Charles W., Jr., O5416744.
Flippo, Dean D., O5223450.
Fowler, Charles N., Jr., O5323268.
Gill, Vernon S., O5220741.
Helmers, John H., O5226560.
Higgins, James E., O5016458.
Howe, Kenneth A., Jr., O5226562.
Kramer, Kenneth B., O5531737.
McNulty, Anthony J., O5016171.
Moore, William C., O5323274.
Ruff, Rex R., O5323278.
Seamans, Richard C., O5016307.
Sills, Kenneth F., O5414946.
Smith, William B., III, O5530845.
Stumpf, James J., O5530708.
Torgerson, Kenneth A., O5016477.
Toro, Frank, O5016852.
Traylor, Jerry C., O5220709.
Vaughn, James C., Jr., O5323339.
Zanoni, Ronald A., O5016199.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Anderson, Robert M., Jr.
Aurbach, Frederick E.
Baylor, Ross G.
Bell, Michael M.
Berliner, Daniel S.
Broadnax, Gary B.
Burnley, David G.
Caraway, William C., Jr.
Champion, Charles H., Jr.
Cornett, Jesse R.
Costigan, William D., Jr.
Dickey, James R.
Fields, Richard S.
Grant, Columbus, Jr.
Hardman, James R.
Head, Harold D.
Hilt, Martin J.
Johnson, Thomas F.
Kaisershot, Gordon E.
Langhorne, Webster L.
Lavind, Johnny L.
Lewis, Chester
Meyer, Dennis E.
Nikolich, Francis M.
Ramsey, Jack B., Jr.
Rector, Clyde W.
Rice, Louis H.
Slayton, Jack R.
Stripling, Verlon
Talman, William T., Jr.
Taylor, Marshall C.
Thompson, Jerry F.
Valdés, Victor M.
Wainwright, David B.
Washington, Curtis L.
Williams, James N.
Winstead, Glenn C.
Young, Eddie L.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1966, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10 United States Code, sections 3284 and 4353:

Agnew, Eugene W., Jr.
Albrecht, Warren H. R., Jr.
Albright, Robert H.
Alexander, George M.
Almojuela, Thomas N.
Amatulli, Richard P.
Anderson, Dale R.
Anderson, David M., III
Anderson, Edward G., III
Andrews, Edward L.
Andrise, Daniel B.
Arnone, Robert N.
Arrants, William M.
Arthur, David W.
Ashbaugh, Brian W.
Atkinson, Eugene D.
Audibert, Reginald L.
Auer, Bruce P.
Backlin, Charles R.
Backlin, James P.
Bailey, Mark B.
Baily, Charles M.
Baker, Robert M.
Barksdale, Rhesa H.
Barnes, Fred W.
Barry, William F.
Bartek, Ronald J.
Bartholomew, Samuel W., Jr.
Basham, William D., Jr.
Beasley, Thomas W.
Behan, William E., Jr.
Behnke, Douglas J.
Benham, Philip O., Jr.
Bergman, William K.
Berkman, David S., Jr.
Berry, Steven D.
Bertolino, Fred G.
Biamon, Niels P.
Bishop, William E.
Blackwell, Stephen C.
Blades, Jon W. III
Bludau, Colin E.
Blumenfeld, Charles H., Jr.
Bohuslar, John W.
Bonifas, Arthur G.
Booth, William D.
Borek, Theodore B.
Bowen, Ronald D.
Boyd, John H. III
Braun, Peter E.
Brennan, Michael W.
Brinker, Walter E., Jr.
Britain, David W., III
Britton, James C.
Brodka, Stanley A.
Brown, David C.
Brown, Donald F.
Brown, Michael H.
Brown, Michael J.
Brown, Steven N.
Bruegger, Robert D.
Brunnhoeffer, Gilbert C. F.
Bryan, Lawrence D., III
Bubriski, Joseph A.
Buch, Kenneth D.
Buczacki, John B.
Buetti, Anthony J., III
Burger, John E.
Caldwell, Ronald G.
Calek, Joseph R.
Callahan, Francis R.
Campbell, Donald, III
Campbell, Elmer
Campbell, Michael T.
Canavan, Gene R.
Canning, William R.
Carber, John B.
Carhart, Thomas M., III
Carlson, Kenneth G.
Carlson, Kenneth R.
Carpenter, Ronald B.
Carrow, John C.
Case, Robert E.
Casillo, Vincent L.
Catlin, Robert W., Jr.
Cattron, Edward P.
Cavolick, Joseph D.
Cecere, Peter M.
Cecil, Gerald T.
Champi, Samuel F., Jr.
Chatfield, Richard A.
Chitty, Charles B.
Christie, John G.
Clainos, Deme M.
Clark, Richard N.
Clark, Wesley K.
Coates, Charles F., Jr.
Coats, Robert C., Jr.
Coggins, Gary M.
Cole, Bryan R.
Collmeyer, Michael K.
Connell, James P.
Cook, Shannon C.
Cooney, Norman R.
Correia, William H., Jr.
Cosentino, Frank C.
Cox, George T.
Cox, Ronald E.
Crabtree, Jack D., Jr.
Crants, Doctor R., Jr.
Crawford, Danny L.
Cresci, Robert J.
Crocker, David R., Jr.
Crocker, George A.
Crooks, Daniel R.
Crowell, David V.
Cruikshank, Ralph H., Jr.
Culhane, Floyd C., Jr.
Cullem, James M.
Culpepper, Allen R.
Cunningham, James W.
Daly, Timothy E.
Darby, Richard W., Jr.
Davis, Thomas B., III
DeBolt, Barry M.
Dean, Alvin B., III
de Jonckheere, Terrell M.
Delp, Larry E.
Denney, Robert G.
Deponai, John M., III
DiFiore, Matthew F.
Dickens, James A.
Dickey, David L.
Dixon, Gerald E.
Dobise, John J., Jr.
Dock, William E.
Donahey, Thomas M.
Donnell, Peter F.
Donnithorne, Larry R.
Donovan, John C.
Doogan, James P., Jr.
Doty, Richard D.
Doyle, James T.
Drewes, Carl E., Jr.
Driscoll, Eugene J.
Droubay, Juel G.
Dubia, John A.
Dunavan, Robert C.
Dunn, Carroll H., Jr.
Durbin, Terrence E.
Dusel, Thomas B.
Dutkiewicz, Henry E.
Dyer, Gaines S.
Eason, Thomas W.
Eberle, John C.
Eckert, John H.
Edwards, Jerome G.
Eichenberger, David G.
Eisenberg, Stephen A. J.
Eklund, Richard A.
Ekstrom, Paul J.
Ely, Cameron A.
Ernst, Frederick G.
Ewart, Thomas W.
Faber, Morris R.
Fantelli, Paul F.
Farewell, Thomas E.
Farrell, Henry R.
Faust, Edmond L., III
Fazen, Robert P.
Fellenz, Michael P.
Fera, John A.
Ferguson, William E.
Fields, Timothy G.
Figgins, Charles E.
Fish, Kenneth W.
Fisher, Herbert W.
Fix, Donald J.
Flynn, Billy W.
Ford, John A., Jr.
Ford, John K.
Foret, Kenneth A.
Fox, Jerry G.
Frazier, Billy W.
Fretwell, Norman E.
Fry, Michael D.
Fuller, Michael B.
Fullerton, LeRoy R., Jr.
Gagnon, Robert L.
Galligan, Francis B., Jr.
Gang, William G.
Gardner, James R.
Garrett, Thom P.
Gartenberg, Joel M.
Gatesy, John T.
Gaynor, Kevin C.
Geiger, John W.
Gibson, Emmitt E.
Gillenwater, Paul G.
Gimian, Allan D.
Glassen, Richard L.
Gleason, James C.
Gorski, Richard V.
Grabow, Thomas W.
Grandison, Wilfred G
Grant, Arthur V., Jr.
Grant, Russell P., Jr.
Grice, Kenneth R.
Grisafe, Michael F., Jr.
Groves, George H.
Grugle, Roger A.
Guerriero, Robert A.
Gunderson, Norman E. Jr.
Hackett, James K.
Haines, David I.
Hall, Gordon L.
Hallums, James D.
Hammond, Robert M., Jr.
Hanaberry, John A.
Hanau, Steven L.
Haneke, William G.
Hansen, Laurence N.
Hargett, Charles W., Jr.
Harnden, Glen M.
Harper, Richard T.
Harper, Walter G.
Harris, Boyd M.
Harris, Charles T.
Harrison, Matthew C., Jr.
Hart, Noble E., Jr.
Hartley, Shird B.
Hartline, Franklin Y.
Harvey, William T.
Hathaway, Edward N., II
Hayes, James M.
Hayes, John R., Jr.
Hayes, Thomas F., III
Hayes, Thomas J., IV
Helkie, William L.
Hicks, Robert R., Jr.
Higgins, Michael C.
Higgins, Michael J.
Hill, Emery F.
Hill, Theodore P.
Hiller, Charles B.
Hines, Charles A. W.
Hinkle, Lawrence R.
Hixon, William F., II
Hlista, Richard J.
Hock, Frank M., Jr.
Hoffman, Charles F.
Hoffman, John G.
Hood, Richard E., Jr.
Horst, Kelso W.
Hoskins, John T.
Howell, Richard V., Jr.
Hoyman, William W.
Hughes, William F.
Hunt, Lynn J.
Hunt, William C.
Hunter, Marion M.
Hustead, Michael W.
Huston, Robert E.
Huyck, Jere I.
Isenhour, John P.
Israelson, Gary L.
Jackson, Gary D.
James, Lewis H.
Jeffrey, Timothy B.
Jenkins, James E.

Jenkins, John M.
Jenna, Russell W., Jr.
Johnson, Charles F., Jr.
Johnson, Edgar C., Jr.
Johnson, Warren A.
Jones, Richard L.
Judd, Donald R.
Kakel, William W.
Kane, Edward P.
Keating, Patrick H.
Keener, Randall J.
Kehres, John K.
Keith, Chester E., Jr.
Kelley, David J.
Kelley, Kevin C.
Kelsey, John S.
Keravouri, Jouni
Kesmodel, Robert H.
Kievit, Donald J., Jr.
Kimbrell, Gordon T., Jr.
Kimel, Michael H.
Kinane, Thomas J.
Kirk, Howard C., III
Kirtley, William M., Jr.
Kline, Richard D.
Kobes, Frank J., IV
Kone, Wilson V.
Kopecky, Kenneth W.
Kozak, John B., Jr.
Kriebel, James
Kronberg, Peter M.
Kushkowski, John
LaRoche, John J., Jr.
Laipple, Douglas K.
Langendorf, Henry S.
Lantz, Peter J.
Larson, Richard C.
Lawrence, Gerald R.
Lawson, Douglas B., Jr.
LeCuyer, Jack A.
Leach, Lanse M.
Lee, James H., Jr.
Lester, John H.
Ligon, Peyton F., III
Lincoln, Arthur F., Jr.
Linder, David L.
Lindler, Curtiss M.
Lindseth, Alfred A., Jr.
Lingle, Ted R.
Liss, Melvin O.
Loftheim, Dennis D.
Loftheim, Jon W.
Loftin, Joseph R., Jr.
Lowry, Robert D.
Loysen, Garry J.
Luecke, Robert W.
Magee, Darryl D.
Manlove, Richard W.
Markey, Keith L.
Marshall, John W.
Martin, David F.
Marvin, Ronald E.
Mazzarella, Anthony R
McCallum, James S.
McCullough, Theodore V., Jr.
McDonnell, John J., III
McFarren, Freddy E.
McGoogan, Franklin A., Jr.
McGuire, John S.
McKay, Michael V.
McKearn, Chaunchy F.
McKibbin, Hugh R., Jr.
McKinney, William R.
McKnight, John T., Jr.
McLaughlin, Thomas R., Jr.
McNaughton, Thomas J.
Meccia, Robert M.
Medlock, Randall B.
Meier, Ronald P.
Mentell, Robert A.
Meszar, Frank, 3d
Meurer, Frederick E.
Mewhinney, Michael C.
Michener, Robert F.
Miller, Herbert G., Jr.
Miller, Thomas R.
Mlakar, Paul F.
Moffett, Donald L.
Moll, Jeremiah C.
Moore, Charles L.
Moore, Donald R., Jr.
Morgan, Kermit M.
Morrison, James L.
Morrow, Boyce C., Jr.
Morton, Berry E., II
Mosley, Arthur C., Jr.
Mulligan, Arthur G.
Murphy, Donald T.
Murray, Richard N., Jr.
Musiol, Joseph J.
Nason, Alan B.
Nelson, Phillip A.
Nemec, Henry A.
Nesmith, Vardell E., Jr.
Newell, William J., III
Newhouse, Nelson H.
Nibbelink, James C.
Nichols, Rex A.
Niskanen, Martin K.
Noble, Wright E., Jr.
Norris, Jack K., II
Norton, George E., III
O'Connell, Courtenay P.
O'Connor, William G.
Ogle, James T.
Ohotnicky, Stephen T.
Oi, John
Olkoski, Jan W.
Ophus, James B.
Oshel, Michael E.
Otto, William S.
Pailes, Jan V.
Pappas, John G.
Parker, Arthur M., III
Parker, Earle L., Jr.
Parker, James D.
Peake, James B.
Pearce, David C., III
Peery, George G., III
Pelletier, Donald L.
Penning, Michael N.
Perey, Lynn J.
Perkins, Dennis L.
Petersberger, John J., II
Phillips, John H.
Pickens, William E., Jr.
Pier, William S.
Piskun, Walter S.
Pleasant, Justin K.
Poage, Wayne L.
Pontuck, Howard S.
Poole, William M.
Potter, Mark W.
Pratt, Frank G., Jr.
Prem, Donald J.
Proctor, James H., Jr.
Rantala, John W., Jr.
Ray, James D., Jr.
Redmond, John, III
Rees, Raymond F.
Reilly, Bernard J., Jr.
Rennagel, William C.
Renneker, Dewey J., Jr.
Rhymers, Kurt L.
Rice, John M.
Riley, Philip D.
Rinehart, Stephen C.
Rizzo, Samuel A.
Robbins, Robert D.
Roggenkamp, Paul H.
Root, Paul M.
Rose, Donald E., Jr.
Roseborough, Morgan G., Jr.
Roshong, Bryon E.
Ruderman, Gill H.
Rybicki, Frank A., Jr.
Sahan, Bohdan A.
Salander, James M.
Salt, Terrence C.
Salz, Louis
Sandell, George N.
Sands, Gerald A.
Satter, Robert A.
Scales, Robert H., Jr.
Schap, Frank J., Jr.
Schofield, David M.
Schremp, Bruce H.
Schroeder, Kenneth P.
Schroeder, Thomas M.
Schulcz, Arthur A.
Scoggin, Donald H.
Scott, Troy C.
Scureman, Mark A.
Seger, Robert E.
Seibel, David E.
Seigle, Robert N.
Seith, William F.
Selsor, James L.
Sendak, Theodore T.
Sepeta, Raymond G.
Shepherd, Arthur R.
Sherrard, Roger D.
Shurtleff, Jeffrey C.
Silliman, Michael B.
Simon, Henry F.
Sims, Billy D.
Sims, Douglas A.
Singer, Stephen L.
Sirutis, Alfred J., Jr.
Skowronski, Walter E.
Smith, Abney A., Jr.
Smith, Daniel M.
Smith, Gerald G.
Smith, Jeffrey H.
Smith, John W.
Smith, Lawrence M.
Snell, Robert M.
Snyder, Karl S.
Sonstelie, Richard R.
Sparling, Frederick W., Jr.
St. John, Richard L.
Stalker, William H., II
Steel, Jon L.
Steenlage, John R., Jr.
Stenstrom, Ronald L.
Stepp, James M.
Stevens, Bryan R.
Stewart, Gary M.
Stowers, Charles T., Jr.
Strapac, John J.
Strickland, Walter M.
Striegel, Richard R.
Strokin, Victor J.
Stull, Terry G.
Suhay, James W., Jr.
Sullivan, William K.
Sustersic, Louis R.
Swain, Richard M., II
Swain, Thomas E.
Swanson, Francis L., III
Swift, Richard J., Jr.
Tarpley, Richard W.
Tarrant, James R., III
Tews, William E.
Thoden, Richard W.
Thomas, John R.
Thomas, William E.
Thompson, Richard W.
Thompson, Robert M.
Thompson, Roger G., Jr.
Thornblom, Douglas S.
Tillson, John C. F., IV
Timm, Timothy G.
Traubel, William E.
Tumas, Marc L.
Turbish, James W.
Turner, Robert H.
Ulrich, Frederick R., Jr.
Unger, James T.
Utter, George B., III
Van Prooyen, Jan A.
Van Sickle, James E.
Vivian, James S.
Wagner, Thomas E.
Waldo, Daniel W.
Wall, John W.
Wallace, William H.
Waylonis, Kenneth A.
Welch, Joseph L.
Wheeler, John P., III
Wheeler, Leigh F., Jr.
Whelihan, William P., Jr.
Whicher, James A.
White, James L.
Wight, William J.
Williams, Chares J., Jr.
Williams, Marion G., Jr.
Williams, Robert B.
Williams, Stephen A.
Wilson, Bruce M.
Wilson, David R.
Wilson, Lynnford S., Jr.
Wilson, Torrence M.
Winger, John H.
Wise, Harry E.
Wiser, Gordon J.
Wolak, Richard J.
Woltz, Kenneth A.
Wood, Piers M.
Woodward, Richard D.
Wright, Adrian R.
Wright, Cooper L.
Wright, Edgar, III
Wrightson, Samuel H., Jr.
Wysocki, Robert E.
Youngquist, David E.
Zehren, John V.
Zierdt, John G., Jr.
Zurla, Thomas F.

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1966, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284 and 3287:

Akers, Frank H., Jr.
Anderson, Ben L., Jr.
Bryan, Peter K.
Giles, Tommy H., III
Hall, James D.
Johnstone, Robert C., Jr.

The following-named cadet, graduating class of 1966, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284 and 3287:

Hathorn, Fred C.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 12, 1966:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning Roderick M. White, to be commander, and ending Cassius Lisk, to be lieutenant (jg.) which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 5, 1966.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Dr. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock.—Matthew 7: 24.

O God, our Father, who in the midst of the shifting sands of trying times stands steadfast and sure, make Thyself real to us we pray. We are weary of the littleness of little people and would escape from the limitations of their listless living. We are concerned about the state of our world and the direction in which our country seems to be going. We look about us and at times we are discouraged. Help us, we pray Thee, to look up and to keep on looking up that our eyes may be on Thee, our faith in Thee and from Thy hand we may take strength and courage for every day.

Steady us, our Father, steady us as we in spirit bow before the altar of Thy Presence that our faith may be renewed, our hope strengthened and our courage confirmed. In our hospitality to the highest may there come hope for this day and the days to come: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which would create a Committee of Grievances in the House.

The committee would be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, four from the majority party and three from the minority party. The Speaker would designate one of the committee as chairman.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of any complaint concerning the conduct of a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. The committee would be required to report to the House of Representatives the results of such an investigation.

The committee may, from time to time, make such recommendations as it deems appropriate with respect to ethical standards, conduct, and practices of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. The committee is authorized to request any Member of the House to make a full and complete report to the committee of his personal income and investments.

Mr. Speaker, such a grievance committee authorized in the legislation I am introducing would be similar to the grievance committees of the various bar associations of the country. The grievance committees of our bar associations work well and serve an ethical and good moral purpose.

The House of Representatives must itself provide for the discipline of its own membership. We must protect the image of Congress as a great people's institution. We must so conduct the public business and our personal affairs in such a way as to hold the esteem and confidence of the people of this country and indeed that of the entire world.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H.R. 13313, to amend the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MOUNTAIN BROOK SCHOOL DISTRICT, BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, foremost among the recalcitrant southern school districts one may find listed today in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is the school district of Mountain Brook in Jefferson County, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, it so happens that the city of Mountain Brook has no Negro citizens. There are no Negro children of school age within the bounds of its school district.

It so happens also that the city of Mountain Brook desires not to receive and does not receive any Federal aid for its school system.

But the city of Mountain Brook has failed to file the form of compliance and, therefore, the city allegedly stands in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

At a formal hearing which was held May 9, 1966, the matter was turned over to a hearing examiner. While no formal announced ruling has been made, it is expected that the ruling will be that Mountain Brook has not complied with the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, not because the district has discriminated against anyone anywhere, or because it is unlawfully receiving Federal aid, but because it has failed to file the form. This school district will therefore be subject to the withholding of Federal funds, which it is not receiving anyway, and does not desire. It will also, apparently, continue to be officially treated as an example of southern recalcitrance and discriminatory practice. Let America's cities, therefore, be forewarned. With or without any practice of discrimination, or even any Negro population, and with or without any desire for Federal funds, woe be unto the southern city which fails to file the form.

DEAN RUSK SHOULD RESIGN AS SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the press this morning carried the story that the Secretary of State addressed a letter to the Congress requesting authority to ease trade restrictions with Iron Curtain nations.

Mr. Speaker, no copy of that letter has been made available to the Members of Congress, but from the report I read, it is my firm belief that the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, should resign.

Any man who advocates, as the story indicated Rusk has done, granting most-favored-nation treatment to those Communist nations who are furnishing supplies and weapons to our enemy in Vietnam, should not be directing the foreign policy of this Nation.

If it is the policy of this Nation to help Communist countries improve their economic posture by extending to them trade concessions, thereby enabling them to better supply our enemies with weapons, then this Nation has no right to ask our boys to die fighting Communists in Vietnam, or elsewhere, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, the President is critical of the critics of his policies in Vietnam, claiming that any criticism of the administration's handling of the Vietnam crisis is affecting the morale of our Armed Forces there. Surely, the morale of our troops will now reach a new low, with this announcement by the administration.

Why any administration would insist on enhancing the economy of a Communist nation that is supplying weapons to be used in crippling and killing American boys is beyond my comprehension, and a Secretary of State who advocates such a policy, if in fact he did, has no business directing the foreign policy of this Nation.

ATTACKS UPON SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK ARE DISGRACEFUL AND IRRESPONSIBLE

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the attack upon Secretary of State Dean Rusk made in this Chamber today is one of the great tragedies of our time.

Mr. Speaker, no American has stood up more forcefully against communism than Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Today he is, in many instances, standing alone against attacks from both sides for his forceful stand against communism in Vietnam.

He is trying to rally the country to understand that to yield to the Communists in Vietnam today would be an open invitation to greater Communist aggression. I say for anyone to stand before the Congress and suggest that Dean Rusk is somehow trying to help the Communists in any way is to torture the truth and make a stranger of the facts.

We Americans, all of us, should offer a prayer of thanksgiving that destiny has given us a man like Dean Rusk for Secretary of State at this moment when the whole survival of freedom is at stake. We have never had a Secretary of State who has stood so forcefully against communism as Dean Rusk and generations of Americans for years to come will call him the great architect of freedom's survival when the present battle is over and the world—yes, the entire world—again is free. I am proud, as an American, that Dean Rusk is my Secretary of State.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Dean Rusk for 35 years. I have known him as a student, I have known him as a citizen, I have known him as an officer in the Army of the United States, and I have known him as Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, I can testify after this long association and close observation that I have never known a man who is stronger, wiser, or more patriotic or sincerely devoted to this country or to the things in which the people of this country believe.

The statement made by the gentleman from Ohio indicating that the distinguished Secretary of State might make any move which would be injurious to the welfare of American troops in Vietnam is most unfortunate. Even to raise the question whether the Secretary might be prompted by such motives is unfair. The entire life and service of Dean Rusk belies the slightest suspicion of his motives. He is a great patriot and a great American. I commend him on his distinguished service and on his steadfastness amid the criticism which he must endure daily from both the radical right and the radical left.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the House that Secretary Dean Rusk is one of the greatest Secretaries of State in the history of our country. The heritage of his family is deep in the soil of America.

In my own congressional district, at Clemson University, the old stone church there was built by one of his forebears. Thomas Jefferson Rusk another illustrious ancestor of Rusk signed the Texas Declaration of Independence, succeeded Sam Houston at the Battle of San Jacinto, and served later in the U.S. Senate. Our present Secretary of State graduated from one of the finest Presbyterian colleges in this country, Davidson College in North Carolina with honors. He served, and I want to repeat what our distinguished majority leader said, he served in southeast Asia during World War II with honor and distinction. He rose to the rank of colonel on the staff of Gen. "Vinegar Joe" Stillwell. I think he knows as much about southeast Asia as any American. He is standing guard on the ramparts of freedom for his country throughout the world. Secretary Rusk needs the united support of the people of our Nation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 95]

Abernethy
Ashbrook
Baring
Bingham
Brademas
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Chelf
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Dow
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Fisher
Fogarty
Fraser
Griffin
Halleck
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Helstoski
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kelly
King, Utah
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
Mailliard
Mathias
Michel
Miller
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse
Moss
Murray
Nix
Olsen, Mont.
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Race
Rodino
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Scott
Shriver
Stafford
Sullivan
Todd
Toll
Tupper
Vivian
Watkins
Watson
White, Idaho
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

"OFFAL IS AWFUL"

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which I hope will be a helpful adjunct to the Highway Beautification Act. It would require that new automobiles be equipped with suitable facilities for the disposal of litter. The public consciousness for highway beautification is slowly being aroused, and frequent reminders that "every litter bit hurts" are beginning to have their effect. Beautification committees are springing up across the country; quite often under the aegis of a community chamber of commerce. Many States, in recent years, have raised their fines and jail terms for the chronic litterbug. State patrols and local police are keeping an increasingly watchful eye out for those thoughtless drivers and passengers who cast their litter about the land.

The millions of dollars that this country spends each year to remove litter and rubbish from our highways and byways demands our attention. It is estimated that it costs each man, woman, and child in the United States more than $26 a year to clean up litter strewn along streets and highways and in public parks.

I believe that, by making a permanent litter receptacle available to automobile drivers and passengers, the irresponsible urge to toss debris out the window will be sharply reduced. The only winners in this competition between personal whim and public esthetics will be the taxpayers. I hope the Congress will favorably consider my bill and promptly enact it into law.

NATIONAL FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 830) providing for consideration of S. 1098, a bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 830

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1098) to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson] and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 830 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of S. 1098, a bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes.

Over the years the shippers of this Nation from time to time have faced shortages of certain types of cars available for meeting their needs. To meet these shortages in past years there was enacted into law provisions dealing with car service and the distribution of car supply authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to supplement and at times to override the various directives through which the railroad themselves undertake to ameliorate these conditions in their own cooperative car service rules.

Traditionally these shortages arose during the harvest season, but since World War II they have become chronic. They are not limited to the fall harvest season—although that continues to be a critical period—nor to the particular types of cars involved in the movement of agricultural products. They can occur in any month of the year with respect to any type of freight car.

The purpose of S. 1098 is to secure alleviation of the recurring national shortages of railroad freight cars.

This purpose is to be accomplished by authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission in its setting of the rates of compensation to be paid for the use of any type of freight car to include such elements as in the Commission's judgment will provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners, contribute to sound car service practices—including efficient utilization and distribution of cars—and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 830, in order that S. 1098 may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us makes in order under an open rule this bill which is very aptly entitled "The National Freight Car Shortage Bill."

I do not suppose there is a Member of this body who at one time or another during his service in this House has not heard from some constituent or from some shipper relative to the problems that are dealt with in this bill.

I was frankly amazed to learn during the time the hearings were held on this bill before the Committee on Rules that freight car ownership in this country today is actually less than it was at the end of World War II.

Further, we were informed that what was once a situation that could be described as one of peaks and valleys with respect to the shortage of freight cars, now is a situation of almost continuous or chronic shortage. The situation is so bad that some of our friends on the west coast, those who operate lumber mills and plywood mills have literally been obliged to cut down their operations because of the lack of cars or the shortage of cars to move their products from the mills. So I think that this bill is a wholly desirable effort to try to deal with this situation.

One point that does deserve emphasis, I think—and this was pointed out by the committee in its report—is that the record of the hearings on this bill do not indicate that the solution that is going to be attempted here is necessarily going to be the ultimate solution. There is no real guarantee or assurance that adding this incentive element to the per diem payment that can be assessed against a line by the Interstate Commerce Commission will solve the shortage of boxcars in this country. Other steps will undoubtedly be needed.

But insofar as it will help to alleviate this critical and serious shortage of freight cars, particularly in a time of national emergency, a time when we are being obliged to move great quantities of freight by rail, this bill is one that I think is a step in the right direction. So I join my colleagues from California in urging the adoption of this rule and the favorable consideration of the bill that it makes in order.

The purpose of the bill as previously pointed out is to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission additional ratemaking authority which is to be used to encourage railroads to acquire and maintain a supply of freight cars adequate to meet the needs of commerce and national defense.

Years ago, the ICC made one approach to the problem and attempted to invoke a penalty per diem procedure. It set up rates to be paid by one railroad to another whose freight cars were on the paying railroad's line. This was over and above what might be considered to be the outright recompense to the owner for the cost of owning the car and including an amount high enough to penalize the railroad using the car on its line instead of returning it to its owner. This section was voided by the courts as an action beyond the authority held by the ICC.

More recently the ICC has favored the inclusion of an incentive element in the per diem cost presently used which would induce railroads to own their own freight cars. This is the step taken by this legislation.

ICC's ratemaking authority will be increased by a grant of discretionary power to include an incentive element in the per diem now charged railroads using other railroads' freight cars. The aim is to encourage such users to acquire their own cars. This authority will become effective on September 1, 1966. Between the enactment date and September 1, the ICC will further study the problem to determine how large an incentive element is needed.

The ICC will be empowered to go beyond the basis of ownership expense in computing compensation; consideration may be given as to whether such compensation should be increased by an incentive element, and if so, how much. The power is discretionary, none need to be added. No such incentive element can be added to the per diem costs of any type of freight car if the ICC finds the type to be in adequate supply.

There are no minority views. The opposition to the bill is coming because of a fight between the railroads themselves as to the benefits of the bill. Generally western systems support the bill and eastern ones oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge adoption of the rule and express the earnest hope that this bill will be passed so that we can move in the direction of solving this critical problem of a shortage of freight cars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes of this time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and likewise in support of the legislation that will be made to order. To point up the importance of this legislation, I came across a little item which spelled out the situation more clearly than perhaps any speech that I might make could do. This is an excerpt from the quarterly report of the Weyerhaeuser Co. In reporting to their stockholders with regard to the boxcar shortage, they had this to say, and I shall read in the RECORD only a few sentences from that quarterly report:

> The nationally publicized boxcar shortage has had its effect on company manufacturing operations and shipping schedules. Our wood products shipments are currently about 1,000 railroad cars behind schedule, and trucks, barges and ships are being employed wherever feasible to ease this problem. Without these expedients, we would be an additional 800 cars behind. Only 75 percent of our car requirements are being supplied by the railroads, and this is a serious condition that shows only limited signs of improvement at this time.

Mr. Speaker, many mills and other types of businesses in the Far West have suffered as a result of the shortage of boxcars. Many of these are small businesses, of course, and not large like the Weyerhaeuser Co., which has its own steamship line. So I do hope that the Members of the House will listen to the arguments in favor of this legislation and, if they can do so, support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Illinois have any further requests for time?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, being a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have been interested in this problem for a long time. There is a tremendous shortage of boxcars. The way it is now, as may have been pointed out, a railroad owning a boxcar sends that boxcar to another part of the country, and the railroad that receives the car can keep it as long as it wishes at a very low rate per day of rental. That means that it is profitable for them to do this rather than build their own cars.

So this has caused a serious shortage. It is damaging to the economy. I think we are all aware of the fact that we need a dynamic economy, and the shortage is damaging because we just do not have the cars to move the various products, particularly grain in the Midwest, where the shortage has caused farmers to pile the grain on the main square, we might say.

Many Members have seen pictures of that in the paper. I hope the rule will be adopted—I am sure it will—and that the bill will pass, because this has a very great effect upon the economy of this country.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1098) to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1098, with Mr. HULL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, S. 1098, is designed to deal with some of the problems of the railroads. On occasion, this House has been asked to consider legislation which might be considered to be critical of railroad policy or practice. This should not blind us to the fact that railroads are absolutely essential to the continued existence of this Nation. The railroads built the Nation, in a very real sense. They held it together. No foreseeable development in other forms of transportation can make the Nation independent of the rails. Other forms are complementary, if you will; but they are not substitutes. The operations of everyday life are tied by customary usage to the rails; in a crisis, such as a war or a natural calamity, they carry the big load. I make the point strongly because a healthy and progressive rail system must be maintained in the public interest. We must not permit it to deteriorate from lack of serious constructive consideration. We have the best system on earth; it is our duty to keep it such. To the extent that Federal legislation can promote the interests of the railroads, we should do our best to devise good legislation. I urge you to put your best thought and judgment into the bill before us.

The purpose of this bill, S. 1098, is to secure some alleviation of the recurring national shortages of railroad freight cars. This is to be accomplished by giving the Interstate Commerce Commission expanded authority in the setting of railroad per diem rates. This per diem is the amount which an owning railroad charges another railroad for the daily use of the owning railroad's freight car.

At the present time the Commission has authority to set such rates at the cost of ownership of the car, namely, the maintenance and depreciation expenses of the car and a fair return of its value. This bill would enable the Commission to add an extra amount of incentive where the Commission finds any type of freight car is in short supply in the hope that this incentive would encourage people to buy such type of freight car.

This bill does not attempt to deal with the current freight car shortage which I shall describe later. It is a bill which its sponsors hope in the long run will result in an increase of the freight car fleet.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

We have had recurring shortages of cars continually since the end of World War II. Traditionally these shortages arose during the harvest seasons but since the last war they have become chronic. They are not limited to the fall harvest season—although that continues to be a critical period—nor to the particular types of cars involved in the movement of agricultural products. They can occur in any month of the year with respect to any type of freight car.

There have been all sorts of conflicting statements made as to the reasons for the shortages as to whether they arise from lack of adequate ownership, or from improper distribution of the existing car fleet, or from overdetention by the shippers in unloading, or from the prevailing 5-day as against the 6-day week, or from the movement of grain by the Commodity Credit Corporation, or from the change in the use of boxcars to the use of hopper cars in the movement of grain, or from the change to wide-door boxcars for use in transportation of lumber, or from the increased use of flatcars with containers and motor trucks, or from the change in industry practice in consignment, diversion, and otherwise, or from the problems of origination versus termination of loads on any given railroad, or a mass of other reasons.

There are some who argue that the trouble simply is a lack of enough cars and point to a declining number of cars owned by the railroads in the past 29 years. On the other hand, the railroads contend that a simple recital of numbers is not the full story for the cars which have been placed in service are much larger and the revenue ton miles which have been generated by each loaded car have increased by nearly 50 percent in the last 12 years and by 25 percent in the last 5 years alone.

It is true that to some degree this is a statistical increase merely reflecting the decline in the number of cars loaded with LCL freight and the dropping of local way freight service by the railroads, but, nevertheless, it is true that there have been much heavier loadings per car. In absolute terms the railroads in 1965 hauled over 695 billion ton-miles which is a higher figure than any since the war.

While there may be some argument over the overall railroad carrying capacity despite the decreasing number of individual cars, nevertheless, there has been a material change in the type of equipment owned by the railroads with a much greater concentration of buying in recent years of special purpose cars rather than general purpose cars as boxcars. These are cars like the rack cars for automobiles, the long flat cars carrying motor trucks and trailers and containers, and the covered hopper cars which now are used to move a substantial quantity of the total grain traffic. The increase in these special purpose cars which are not as susceptible for use in a return movement can be measured by the fact that in spite of all our utilization today of higher-tensile lower weight materials in car construction, the tare weight hauled per ton of revenue weight has not decreased in 40 years. It is also reflected in the fact that whereas we formerly hauled only two empty cars for every four loaded cars, we are now hauling 2 empty cars for every three loaded cars.

To some degree, accordingly, the users of the all-purpose boxcars have been faced with problems owing to the declining number of these cars, but it should be pointed out that the very utilization of covered hopper cars for the movement in grain and of flat cars for the movement of trucks and containers has decreased the demand for these general purpose cars.

All I am saying is that it is difficult to determine whether the current shortages are the result of adequate ownership or change in type of car owned or the many other reasons which I have just mentioned that have been advanced, but regardless of the causes we know that there have been these shortages.

There is no need here to present evidence of these shortages, for every Member of this body in the past 20 years at some time or other has had brought to his attention the discouraging situation facing the shippers in his area regarding an adequate supply of freight cars.

Something must be done to meet the needs of the shippers and of the public and of the country. We cannot go on as we have these many years.

At the close of the war the Commission attempted to institute a "penalty" per diem, that is to set a rate high enough to make it so expensive that a carrier would not wish to hold a foreign car and would return it to its owner. In a decision in 1947, however, the court held that the Commission did not have the power to set a rate on this basis under the statute and was limited to a rate representing adequate compensation for ownership expense.

The Commission did not appeal this decision, and off and on over the years since has sponsored legislation to increase its per diem authority. This legislation generally met with opposition by many railroads.

About a dozen years ago several western railroads sponsored legislation which would give the Commission authority to take into account the value of use of the car; that is, what they lost in terms of revenue by not having their own cars on their own line of railroad when they wanted to use them. This proposal several times was heard by the Senate committee or by our committee, and I believe once or twice was reported by the Senate committee.

Last year the Commission again renewed its proposal in language somewhat similar to that which had been supported by these western railroads; that is, the Commission was to take into account not only the ownership expense but also the value of use, and might include an element for encouraging the acquisition of a car. This bill was subject to hearings by committees in both bodies. It was generally supported by the western railroads and generally opposed by the eastern railroads.

You will appreciate, I am sure, by and large, the western carriers originate more traffic than they terminate, whereas the reverse is true as to the eastern railroads. As a result of this fact, it is likely that many western railroad cars, especially boxcars, will wind up on eastern railroads.

Many of these western railroads argue that they have sufficient boxcars if only the eastern railroads would return these cars to their owners and that the eastern railroads are not making their fair contribution to the national fleet. The argument of many eastern roads is that they have more cars on their lines than they need to protect their shippers and are compelled by the car service rules to load back west to the owning railroads the western cars before they load their own eastern cars, so there is no reason for them to buy the additional equipment, and that it is the duty of the western or originating railroads to own enough cars to protect their shippers. These western railroads in turn counter that they receive so little from the eastern railroads for the use of their cars that there is no inducement to increase ownership.

The resolution of just what is the number and type of cars which each railroad should own is not easy. This bill is an attempt to increase the amount paid for the use of a car so that there will be an incentive to own more cars.

The bill passed the Senate substantially amended from the form in which it was introduced, the amendment consisting chiefly of a provision that the Commission had the discretion of determining whether these eastern or "terminating" railroads would have to comply with the provisions covering an "incentive" per diem.

Our committee gave the measure very thorough consideration and arrived at the conclusion that the hearings on this bill, as had been true of the hearings on previous bills, were not conclusive as to whether the incentive per diem would be successful in achieving the goal which we are seeking; namely, the alleviation of these chronic freight car shortages.

The committee felt, however, that inasmuch as some railroads believed, and the Interstate Commerce Commission believed, that the additional authority contained in this bill might help and inasmuch as the railroads who consistently had opposed the bill were able to offer no alternatives, the legislation should be reported in the form amended by the committee.

The committee, in reporting the bill last fall, recommended that the Commission's authority in this field be not completely effective until September 1 of this year. This delay was incorporated so that one final period should be allowed so that the railroads, if they could and if they would, might work out their own problems.

Of course, this is exactly where the responsibility rests. It is the duty of the carriers to see that they have equipment to provide the service that they so earnestly wish to offer to the public.

Since the Cabinet report of 1955, and more specifically during the last 4 or 5 years, the railroads have urged legislation which would let them to better meet competition from other forms of transportation, and to permit them to regain some of the traffic they have lost to the motor and water carriers. In 1958, legislation was passed which changed somewhat the rule of ratemaking where competition was involved between carriers of different modes of transportation subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. Two years ago this committee reported out, after extensive hearings following transportation messages from both Presidents Johnson and Kennedy, a bill which would to some degree meet the railroad argument that there be less regulation of minimum rates on grain and agricultural commodities so as to equalize their opportunity to compete for the traffic being handled by other modes of transportation.

In view of this argument advanced by the railroads during these years that they be freed from regulation of their minimum rates so that they might compete for traffic against the other modes of transportation, it is anomalous to find that the railroads have not been and are not even today in a position to meet the demands for equipment which already are placed upon them. This has been especially true as to boxcars which are involved in grain movement. During all these recent shortages, the railroads continue to file lower rates on grain in order to take traffic from competing motor and water carriers, and the Commission continues to allow such lower competitive rates to go into effect.

The Chairman of the Commission has informed me that in his opinion the Commission in connection with a rate filed for the purpose of meeting the competition of a different mode of transportation cannot take into consideration the ability of the carrier filing the tariff to supply the equipment necessary to move the commodity covered by the tariff in the light of the carrier's ability to meet the transportation demand already existing upon it.

The railroads have not been able to work out a common position or an alternative to the legislation here proposed. At the start of this session, I asked the Association of American Railroads what it had done and had to propose for working out the problems in this field of the adequacy of freight car supply. I received no suggestion from it, and, accordingly, I requested that a rule be granted in order that this bill might be brought up before the House for its consideration.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amendment to the Senate bill sharpens up the authority given to, and the standards to be employed by, the Commission in determining these per diem charges.

The amendment first restates in clear language what the courts have held to be the limitations of the law as it is now written. The Commission in establishing the compensation to be paid under the terms of any contract or arrangement for the use of a type freight car shall compute this compensation on the basis of arrangements of ownership expense involved in owning and maintaining such type of freight car, including a fair return on value.

It should be noted here in passing that these contracts and arrangements among carriers have recently been on a sliding scale depending upon the age and value of the car and currently extend from $2.16 a day for a car valued under $1,000 to $3.58 a day for a car valued between $5,000 and $10,000, and a maximum of $12.18 for a certain special purpose car. This is a change from the average method that the railroads formerly used which method had resulted in a charge of $2.88 a day immediately before the sliding scale method was adopted 2 years ago.

Second, the amendment gives the Commission the discretionary power to increase this compensation by an incentive element to encourage the acquisition of an adequate supply of freight cars but it gives such power only by type of freight car, and the Commission is not allowed to make any incentive element applicable to any type of freight car, the supply of which the Commission finds to be adequate.

It should be noted here that while most of this discussion has been upon the amount paid by one carrier to another, the bill is not limited solely to car ownership by railroads, but includes also rentals paid by railroads to shippers for the use of shipper-owned cars. The Commission may increase such rentals above a compensatory basis by an incentive element to encourage the acquisition of types of cars found to be nationally in short supply.

In the third place, the committee amendment provides that the Commission would be empowered in its discretion to exempt from the incentive element provisions any group of carriers where the Commission finds such exemption to be in the national interest. This provision enables the Commission to make exemptions from paying an incentive element by class of carrier, and permits the Commission to consider the several factors specifically authorized in the Senate bill.

The committee amendment strikes the provision in the Senate bill which would have allowed the Commission to consider the element of value of use of the freight car, as the committee was not at all in sympathy with this proposal nor believed that it was workable.

Determination of the value of use of the car, namely, what the owning road might have received in terms of revenue from the car had it had the car on its own line instead of being on a foreign carrier is so conjectural and questionable as to be impracticable and essentially is an approach to the problem through penalties rather than through incentive.

THE CURRENT FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE

I should like to comment briefly on the present freight car shortage. Our committee has given much attention to it and what could and should be done under existing law to meet today's situation. This is a completely separate matter from the matters involved in this bill. The immediate shortage must be met by proper handling and distribution of the available supply of cars.

The committee report on the bill last October in addition to calling upon railroads to try to work out their own problems on these per diem charges also called upon those involved to consider other avenues of meeting the present day shortages, specifically the car service rules, problems of detention, of loading and unloading, and the like.

Last January I similarly attempted to develop what was being done to pursue these avenues which might give concrete results.

At the end of January, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued Car Service Order No. 973 which, with 21 supplements extending to the 10th of February, required 15 eastern and southern railroads weekly to supply 10 western railroads with 5,075 empty, plain narrow-door, under-44-foot boxcars, for the purpose of meeting demands for grain and lumber loadings. Our committee met with the Interstate Commerce Commission in an extended session to consider this order, other orders, and the problem generally. It has been evident that the acuteness of boxcar supply the past few months has been accentuated by movements of grain especially for export at a rate of 50 percent above that which prevailed the first 4 months of last year.

The Commission in March followed up this general boxcar order with additional car service orders designed to help two specific northwestern railroads, to restrict the free time to be allowed at ports and to increase detention charges, to expedite unloading of boxcars and covered hopper cars at ports, and to reinforce the basic railroad association car service rules.

It is commendable that the Commission finally moved in this area of car service to improve the availability of the existing car fleet.

It is not yet clear that all has been done which might be done nor how effective some of the measures which have been promulgated actually may have been or are, nor the statutory basis on which some of the actions are taken. The committee will continue to watch this situation.

The committee's concern and continuing deep interest in car distribution is, however, a completely separate matter from that of the long range solution proposed to be achieved by this bill. For the reasons I have stated, I urge its passage.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, since September of last year, I would guess that a very substantial number of the total membership of 435 in this House of Representatives have talked to some member of this Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce about this particular problem of a shortage of railroad cars in his district.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this has not always been true, up until about 5 years ago. There were shortages at certain times of the year, but there was in the economy what we call peaks and valleys. In short, if I could not get corn and soybeans, hauled in my district, out in October, November, and December, I could always look for the valley in January, February, and March. In other words, I could count upon the trains and the railroads to get that grain out at that time.

Mr. Chairman, this was true with reference to almost every single seasonal crop and almost every seasonal industry. Lumber, for example, has been mentioned as one of the industries involved here.

Today, Mr. Chairman, this shortage is uniform. For every one of the 365 days of the year we are, relatively, 10,000 boxcars short. I believe one can see that if we are running level short everyday, someone is not going to get his goods hauled out of his district. This, in my opinion, is most obvious.

Mr. Chairman, in this legislation we have come forward with a bill this year which has been recommended to us by the Interstate Commerce Commission, after a great deal of thought which has been given to this problem. That thought has extended over a 2- or 3-year period of time. They have come before us on at least two occasions prior to last September to ask us for legislation which would make it possible for them to increase the number of boxcars and service cars available to serve this country.

Mr. Chairman, over my objections this committee put the Interstate Commerce Commission off. That was a big mistake, which was made largely because the railroad industry itself was seriously divided over whether or not this legislation was needed and, then, there were certain groups and certain railroads that wanted themselves exempt from the legislation so that they did not have to have any part of it and did not have to accept any provisions and did not have to make any payments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to say that in view of that hindsight something ought not to be done today.

In an effort to put this in a nutshell, let me point out where we have been going in the railroad industry during the past 16 years.

Mr. Chairman, right after World War II, in 1950, we had 1,935,000 cars. Six years later, in 1956, we had 1,775,000 cars on the railroads.

As of January 1, 1965, which is almost 18 months ago, we had only 1,550,000 cars on the railroads.

Mr. Chairman, this meant that within a period of 15 years there were almost 25 percent fewer railroad cars on the railroads than there were 15 years before.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the meantime what had happened to the economy of this country? I am informed by the Department of Commerce that the economy of this country has multiplied or increased approximately 42 percent in that 15-year period of time.

Here we are today trying to haul 42 percent more goods in this economy than we hauled 16 years ago with 25 percent fewer cars.

Now, my colleagues, this is the crux of the situation. I think these figures are evident to you—that something has to be done about this problem. This is why this committee has brought this bill to you as the best that we can make out of a very difficult situation.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has given this all the thought that is possible. They are experts in the field. They were questioned by every single member of our committee who was present and I can say, at one time or another every member of our committee was there to ask questions. Some of them were making suggestions—you ought to do some other things—you ought to allocate cars—maybe they were not making the most efficient use of the cars they had. All of these questions were raised and the ICC came back and said, "We have told you the last three times that we appeared before you that we do not see any way out of this except our solution to increase the number of cars. We have done everything we can under special orders to get full 100-percent utilization of all the cars already on the railroad tracks."

Now we have to make this decision as to what we are going to do today.

The Senate in 1965 passed out a bill. It is not the same bill that your committee brings to you today and we are not going to quarrel with what the other body did on this matter. We, I think, today can work out our differences on this when we go to conference.

If some of you will look at the bill, S. 1098, that was the Senate bill that we considered. We added a committee amendment and rewrote a good part of that into what is the House version—you will see that we made some really important changes. The Senate passed that bill last year and we passed our version of S. 1098 on October 20, 1965.

When our former colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Harris, was chairman of the committee, we talked about this, after the bill was brought up. We felt if we got this bill out, we were going to give the railroads a chance—and they said they wanted a last shot at it to see if they could work out their differences and come up with something that would be a solution to this problem without perhaps having to pass legislation or having to force the situation.

The railroads have been at it since October 20, 1965, and nothing concrete has been arrived at. The action of the Interstate Commerce Commission is the best testimony of the fact that there has not been anything accomplished.

Now I think there is one further thing we ought to know. You will note that the date of our bill provides that it shall be effective on September 1, 1966. If we pass this bill and get to a conference with the other body in the next couple of weeks and finally get this matter worked out and it goes down to the White House and is signed, it means the industry will still have until September 1, 1966, to see if they can come up with some kind of agreement, outside this legislation, with which they can go before the Interstate Commerce Commission and perhaps settle this in their own way. However, they would still be bound by the law and if they do not have anything by September 1, 1966, a ruling or directive of the Interstate Commerce Commission will be forthcoming.

This is where we are today.

Now some of you are probably wondering, Have we ever been faced with this problem before? I quote from page 250 of the hearings before this committee in October of last year. A statement of the Western Forest Industries Association of Portland, Oreg., contained a short piece of doggerel and this is the way it goes. This was written in 1915:

> He would look way off t'ward the sunkist South,
> And his face was filled with sorrow,
> And the only thing that he would say,
> Was "They promised me some tomorrow."
>
> A stranger passing by one day,
> Inquired of a native son;
> "Who is that man who sits over there,
> With the antique vision gun?"
>
> "My friend," the native answered,
> As he wiped away the tears,
> "You shouldn't speak of him that way,
> For he's been there 50 years.
>
> "Why that man's story to us here,
> Is as common as the stars,
> "He's a western Oregon lumberman,
> Looking for S.P. cars."

So some 50 years ago railroads were faced with this proposition. Here we are today.

The Commission's proposal primarily is to grant an incentive to encourage an increased production of railroad cars. They will say that they have the present right to fix per diem rates. They do not, however, have the right to add incentive rates. This has been through the courts and it has been so determined. For this reason the Commission now believes that the only solution is to obtain authority to grant economic incentives to railroads which will get us more railroad cars.

The old theory of bare-bones-plus-interest rentals has not successfully produced the cars that we need.

If I were the owner of a railroad and did not choose to manufacture or buy new cars, I think I might like to do that, if I were president of the railroad. For what reason? Well, for $3.50 a day some of these boxcars can be rented. Would any railroad which can use these cars for a $1,000 profit have any incentive to produce a $18,000 to $25,000 boxcar? I think it is evident from the very economics of it that some additional incentive must be granted, and the Commission must have some authority to do this, which up to this time has been denied by the courts.

Now let us find out by whom this is supported. Is this supported by the great, broad public interests or not? Well, it is supported in a letter which Members will find in the committee report at page 10. You will find that it is supported by the Department of Agriculture in a long letter from Secretary Freeman pointing out that the proposal is in the public interest and ought to be undertaken now. It is supported in a letter written by the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce supporting the bill. The Defense Department earnestly supports the bill. The Office of Emergency Planning supports the bill. The Bureau of the Budget supports the bill.

May I say that all of the farm organizations that I know anything about support the bill. I do not know of a single shipping organization that appeared before our committee in opposition to the bill, and I believe they are all for the bill.

Now, may I say, there is a very small number who did appear in opposition to the bill. They are quite small; not very big. I think in fairness I ought to tell you who they were. They were the New York Central; the Pennsylvania Railroad, the New Haven, Boston & Maine Railroad; the Southern Pacific Co.; and the American Short Line Railroad Association. Nearly all of those companies sent representatives to see some member of the committee seeking some amendment whereby their economic situation could be exempted under the bill. So all of them had a personal interest in being opposed to the bill and desired amendments to fit their particular situations.

So I think I may say to my colleagues that this is a bill which would not only be in the public interest but is also a bill which is badly needed, not only by the Interstate Commerce Commission as a means of regulating this important problem, but it is needed by the economy of this country.

In closing, as I said to the Rules Committee—and I am not divulging any secret—that there was only one vote in opposition to bringing the bill before the House—if we do not solve this problem today by a favorable vote on this bill, I will guarantee you that you will be back here on January 1 with either this bill or a much more stringent bill than the one that you are asked to vote on today. This problem will not get better. It is going to get worse.

Let us take 1965 as an example. There were 52,000 cars which left the railroads of this country by wearing out or for some reason or other. There were 32,000 cars purchased. This gives you some picture of how fast down the hill we are going in a negative way, and how far behind the times we are getting in this whole field of transportation, unless we come up with this legislation.

To a large extent the committee has relied upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. Since the Commission is expert in this field and is subject to the legislative jurisdiction of this committee, we have relied upon them for the best advice we could get.

May I say that it has been with reluctance that we have this legislation, and only as a last resort. But now it is needed and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation today.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the passage of S. 1098. I am one of a score or more Members who introduced legislation similar in content to S. 1098. When the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee completed hearings last year, it saw fit to report out an amended version of the bill which had been approved by the Senate. I am sure that most of us agree that the provisions of this amended version are desirable in that the Interstate Commerce Commission would be given discretionary power to establish incentive per diem rates. This power is important if we are to get to the nub of the problem. Those of use who have lived with these annual shortages know that the per diem charges have to be high enough to create an incentive for buying and owning boxcars.

As has been pointed out many times, when the per diem charge is low, as it is now, it is cheaper to rent a car than it is to buy or build one. But with realistic per diem charges, any railroad using another line's car would save money by returning the car as quickly as possible. The same business economics dictate that by putting a profit into car ownership, the profit motive will insure the construction of more freight cars. Through proper rates, you provide the incentives for the construction of additional freight cars. Prospective freight car buyers will then have the assurance that per diem charges will be sufficiently high to make car ownership a profitable and desirable form of investment.

Mr. Chairman, legislation of this type has been a long time getting this far. Hearings have been held in previous Congresses, but getting the legislation to the floor of the House for a vote is a victory in itself. While the Congress has been wrestling with the problem, we have been going from one bad year to another as far as having enough freight cars is concerned.

We are right in the middle of another shortage. Latest figures indicate that during the week of May 1, we had a shortage of some 9,246 cars per day. This figure has been as high as 13,000 cars per day for 2 or 3 weeks in February and March. It will probably go that high or higher again. Within the next 30 days the winter wheat harvest will start in the Southwest. Add this demand to the already huge demand caused by increased shipment of CCC stocks and defense needs and you have a shortage of staggering proportions.

This legislation may not be the entire answer, but most everyone agrees "it is a step in the right direction." Any new rates fixed under this bill would not become effective until September 1, 1966. It will take a while for the new rates to have the desired effect in the construction of more cars and in keeping them from piling up on terminal lines, but at least, we are facing the problem and through the adoption of this bill, we may get over the hump so that next year's shortage would not be one that was worse than the year before.

In the April 24 edition of the Washington Post, staff writer Paul G. Edwards covered many aspects of the problem. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include Mr. Edward's article at this point in the RECORD:

ACTION URGED TO PREVENT FALL CRISIS AS SHORTAGE OF FREIGHT CARS MOUNTS

(By Paul G. Edwards)

A National freight car shortage is causing more concern now than at any other time in recent years.

During the past few weeks Congressmen from the farming States of the Midwest to the lumber producing Northwest have been calling for vigorous action on the part of the railroads, the Interstate Commerce Commission and Congress itself to find a long range solution to the problem and to take immediate steps to prevent major shipping tieups during the coming wheat harvest season.

The pre-harvest period usually is one of relatively light demand on the freight car fleet, but several factors have created an unusual strain on the car supply this year:

All sectors of U.S. industry are pushing their practical production capacities during this boom period and consequently the demand on all forms of freight transportation is high.

Increased grain shipments abroad have made unusual demands on the boxcar fleet.

The recent four-day strike against eight major railroads, while brief, deferred hundreds of thousands of carloading which, since there is a shortage of cars under normal conditions, cannot readily be made up now that the strike has passed.

Not only the causes, but even the dimensions of the freight car shortage are matters of dispute.

The Association of American Railroads, which speaks for the industry on car supply, grants that there is a shortage but has not published figures on it for five years because it feels that the railroads have become the whipping boy for general transportation shortages.

"Other modes of transportation do not publish figures on shortages of truck trailers or river barges," said an AAR spokesman, "so why should we furnish car supply figures?"

The AAR recently reported, however, that the National fleet of 1.8 million freight cars of all description now has about the same carrying capacity—107 million tons—as it did 10 years ago.

A substantial increase in the size of cars has compensated for a 10 percent decline in the number of units since 1956. Last year the 89,000 cars retired had an average capacity of 54 tons. New cars purchased barely exceeded this number, but had an average capacity of 78 tons.

These figures are for all types of freight cars, and though there is a growing need for almost every kind, the cries from the West are for general purpose boxcars. In this category number of units has declined 19 percent in the past 10 years and carrying capacity 13 percent.

Last month, ICC Chairman John Bush referred to the shortage as being about 13,000 boxcars a day. This figure has become the popular estimate. It is reached by comparing the average number of daily carloadings, a figure that is disclosed by railroads, with loading requests by shippers—a figure less easily obtained and less reliable.

"The trouble with this approach," the AAR spokesman said, "is that a shipper with facilities to load a couple of boxcars a day may have a backlog of orders that could fill a dozen boxcars and the difference is reported as a car shortage."

Everyone affected by the boxcar shortage does agree, it is not so much a problem of lack of total capacity as it is of getting the right kind of cars to the right place at the right time.

Boxcars belonging to one railroad fall into the hands of another through interline shipments. Receiving roads are allowed to retain the cars at a daily rental rate varying from about $2 to about $12, depending on the value of the car.

Boxcars naturally tend to collect in heavily populated areas and near seaports. Especially during peak freight periods, railroads in these areas frequently prefer to pay the rental rates rather than return boxcars to roads in the farm and timber areas of the country.

The ICC attempts to regulate the supply by issuing orders requiring certain railroads to return the cars of another over specified routes and in specified daily quantities.

Once, last month for the Great Northern and Northern Pacific Railroads, the ICC issued an "exclusion order" requiring all railroads to return all boxcars of those lines immediately.

"We realize this is not a real solution to the problem," Bush said at the time the exclusion order was issued. "All of our car service orders merely amount to an effort to distribute a shortage fairly, but this will not end the shortage itself."

The shortage in the Northwest was dramatized by curtailment of operations at some lumber mills that could not get boxcars for shipping. The economy of many small towns in the Northwest is built around a single mill, and it did not take long for the complaints of businessmen to take the form of speeches by Senators.

Thirty Senators signed a letter to Bush demanding action.

In the Midwest, such Congressmen as Senator **James B. Pearson**, Republican, of Kansas, are under constant pressure from wheat shippers to seek a government solution to the shortage.

Small country grain elevators filled with the hard red wheat now in need for shipment to India under the Food for Peace program are presently making heavy demands for boxcars.

A Food for Peace official said that it currently takes about 45 days from the time of the order to deliver a boxcar of Kansas wheat at a Gulf port for shipment to India. This, he said, is about twice the normal time.

Food for Peace wheat deliveries at U.S. seaports were at record levels during the first quarter of this year—160 million bushels in January, 166 million in February and 202 million last month. There is no indication the demand will ease, but recent reopening of the St. Lawrence Seaway is expected to help shipments from the upper Midwest.

The demand for general purpose boxcars and covered hopper cars will continue high, however. About 80 percent of all lumber is shipped in boxcars and both boxcars and covered hopper cars—with twice the boxcar capacity—are used for wheat.

There is little chance that the actual number of cars built will increase dramatically. Car manufacturers report substantial backlogs of orders and complain of a shortage of skilled machinists needed to build them.

Nevertheless, Congress is currently considering several bills aimed at increasing the supply. One was passed by the Senate last year and is awaiting House Rules Committee action.

All would give the ICC broader authority for regulating the boxcar supply, including a method for fixing rental rates that would encourage railroads to build more cars.

A bill recently introduced in the Senate would also double the investment tax credit for new freight cars to 14 per cent.

If the Johnson Administration has its way, the freight car supply problem will be shifted from the ICC to the proposed Department of Transportation. In that case, the authority contained in the bills now before Congress, if they become law, will simply transfer to the new department.

About the only bright spot in the boxcar shortage is the consolation it offers those concerned about inflation. No one in the Administration will make a firm estimate of the drag on the gross national product caused by the shortage, but a rough guess is obvious from certain government reports.

It has been estimated by the Commerce Department that a complete shutdown of railroads by strike would cut the GNP 13 percent after 30 days. The weekly boxcar shortage of 65,000 cars is about 10 per cent of weekly carloadings, so a reduction of 1 percent of the GNP, about one-tenth of the effect of a total shutdown, might be assumed.

If some economist finds this $7 billion slowdown consoling, the lumber men and grain farmers of the Midwest and Northwest—and their Congressmen—do not.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to my colleague from Washington, **Brock Adams.**

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, as the newest member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the committee's very important action in moving toward relieving the national freight car shortage. This shortage is critical now and is becoming worse. It is the result of two principal factors: first, inadequate car ownership; and second, failure to use existing equipment efficiently.

This is a bill in the national interest which, in simple terms, will give the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to include in the rental rates for the use of freight cars an incentive to induce the railroads to acquire and own freight cars so as to make sufficient freight cars available for the shippers in our communities throughout the United States.

It should be emphasized that this is not a penalty bill, nor should we be misled by arguments that this is a struggle between the so-called originating roads and terminating roads.

As reported in the Railroad Fact Book, the number of railroad freight cars at the close of 1963 was down to 1,512,000 cars. At the end of 1964 the total number of cars had slipped to 1,488,000. By April of 1966 the figure was 1,480,000. This was true even though the railroads placed over 68,000 new cars in service in 1965, double the 1962 total. The reason for this decline is that the retirement rate on older cars is higher than the new car replacement, plus the fact that new types of cars being demanded by shippers is making obsolete many of the older cars even though they may not have completely deteriorated. For example, in 1965 approximately 68,000 cars were built but 76,000 were retired.

The critical shortage of freight cars—which is becoming worse by the moment—is shown by the statistics set forth in the report of the committee on page 5 which reports on studies made in 1950 that indicated 1,935,500 freight cars would be required by 1956 to meet the anticipated needs of shippers. These studies did not even contemplate the tremendous expansion that has taken place in the transportation business of the United States since 1956. In spite of these recognized requirements the number of freight cars as of April 1966 had fallen to 1,480,000 cars, a record low.

This shortage recently became terribly aggravated by certain railroads not even being able to use their own cars. For example, Chairman John W. Bush of the Interstate Commerce Commission reported in March of 1966 that the percentage of plain boxcars on line—which is the ratio of cars owned by the railroad plus whatever cars from other lines the railroad had on its line, compared to the total number of boxcars the railroad actually owns—for the Great Northern Railroad was at 54.1 percent and the Northern Pacific at 59.5 percent. In simple terms, this meant that the Great Northern Railroad could only obtain approximately one-half of the cars it had built and placed on its railroad for use by the shippers and communities it serves. The cars owned by these railroads were being held by other lines either in use or awaiting use. For example, the New Haven Railroad had on its line 258.7 percent of its ownership—figures supplied by ICC at the request of the Senate Commerce Committee in March 1966.

How can this be done? Under the present "5A" agreement, a railroad holding another railroad's cars pays only $2.16 a day as rental for that car if the car is valued below $1,000, or a maximum of $12.88 per day for cars worth more than $35,000. Now these rates may seem inadequate, but prior to January 1, 1964, the railroad holding the cars only paid $2.88 per day per car regardless of the car's value. Even more difficult is the fact that this was done by a "5A" agreement among the railroads and certain lines have refused to pay even this rate and are still paying $2.00 per day—Senate Commerce hearings, April 7, 1965, page 22. Obviously it has been cheaper for many railroads to simply take the new cars produced by other railroads and hold them on their lines and pay a minimal rental rather than produce new cars. The same has been true with regard to shippers holding cars and being required to only pay minimal demurrage rates. For example, it was not until March 31, 1966, that Car Service No. 979 was issued by the ICC which raised the demurrage rate from $5 per day to $10 per day per car for the first 4 chargeable days.

The bill we are presently considering deals directly with this problem by authorizing the ICC to "give consideration to the national level of ownership" and "to other factors affecting the adequacy of the national freight car supply" in determining the daily rental for freight cars. This legislative grant of authority to the ICC is necessary because the ICC has taken the position that it cannot impose rental charges to stimulate the production of freight cars and the rapid return of cars. The ICC has construed the case of *Palmer* v. *U.S.*, 73 F. Supp. 63 (1947), to hold that the Commission does not have authority to impose per diem charges that would spur the production and better utilization of freight cars.

The bill presently before us would amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize the Commission to establish per diem charges which would not only include a fair return on value and provide reasonable compensation to the owner, but would also contribute to better car exchange practices and encourage the construction of an adequate national supply of freight cars.

The present effects of the national freight car shortage are being felt most disastrously at present in sections of the Midwest and far West because of the draining of cars from lines such as the Great Northern and Northern Pacific. It will later be felt in every other section of the country. For example, the Port of Seattle reports that in January of 1966 approximately 12 million bushels of grain requiring 7,000 railroads cars was ready to move to West Coast Tidewater elevators but only 20 percent of this number of freight cars were available. In March of this year I received a telegram from the president of the Western Lumber Marketing Association reporting on lumber mills being closed throughout Oregon, Washington, and Montana. This has already resulted in shortages in lumber in other parts of the United States causing a rise in prices and a slow down in construction. The movement of grain to India has also been critically affected.

This condition which has been acute in the West will spread to all other sections of the Nation as the shortage of freight cars continues to grow and the seasonal demands of that section occur.

We must stop the decreasing trend in production of freight cars. The decline of nearly 300,000 cars since 1945 is a staggering blow to the Nation. These 300,000 lost cars if placed end to end would make a solid train from Washington, D.C., to the west coast. The present cars being constructed are larger and more efficient so the high number of 2,500,000 cars in 1926 will probably not be needed immediately, but in order to meet the needs of our expanding economy, large numbers of cars must be built. The Yearbook on Railroad Facts reports 76,000 cars were retired in 1965. The replacement rate was only 68,400. This does not contemplate any expansion. Yet, the plywood industry alone reports that it will require 50 percent more cars in 1970 than it required in 1965.

This bill is a first step in producing more freight cars by making it more attractive for railroads to buy and own their own cars. It will also encourage more expeditious movement of cars.

It may be that additional steps will be required such as the encouragement of speciality shippers to buy and own their own cars. This could perhaps be done by providing incentives through rapid tax write-offs on this equipment. Also we might consider providing these shippers with protection so their present allocations will not be reduced as they provide cars and see that car ownership will receive sufficient rental payments to justify this investment. However, these are possible steps for the future and let us at least enact this bill today and take a step forward which has been recommended annually by the ICC since 1955.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for permitting me to share his time.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that a shortage of freight cars exists. Nor is there any doubt that the shortage is growing more serious every week. Nor is there any question that the effects of this shortage are extremely serious throughout most of the West. I know that the effect on the economy of the congressional district which I am privileged to represent is critical indeed.

Forest products are a mainstay of the economy in my hometown of Tacoma, Wash., and indeed throughout the Northwest. Lumber, plywood, chipboard, fiberboard, paper products—these are among our major products. They are physically bulky. They require considerable space for shipping, and for storage. They may be considered semiperishable, in that if they are stored outdoors for a considerable length of time the weather affects their value adversely. So when a mill has produced a certain amount of its product and that product cannot be shipped to market but must be stored, storage capacity is exhausted. With no products moving to market, collections fall off and the companies, particularly the smaller ones, find themselves under a financial strain.

So the mills close down one by one. Millworkers are laid off, and so are the lumberjacks in the woods and the truck drivers and all the other people who depend on the mills for their incomes, directly or indirectly. The effects are drastic on a town or an area which depends almost totally on a mill, and there are many such in the Northwest.

And, as has been mentioned by my colleagues, agricultural crops are affected most seriously, particularly during the harvest season which will be starting again soon.

It is our good fortune in the West, Mr. Speaker, to have great resources on our lands. That good fortune has its price, however, in that such resources and products are more bulky than the manufactured goods which are the main products of other sections of the country. This means that we ship out more bulk than we ship in for our own consumption. I believe the ratio is approximately three railroad cars of our products going out for every one that we get back loaded with goods coming into the area for our own use. This is what leads to the freight car shortage in our area.

The situation became so critical during this past winter that the Interstate Commerce Commission took the unprecedented step of issuing an order requiring railroads in the East to return freight cars to several western roads, at the insistence of my State's senior Senator, the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, and several other Members of Congress including myself.

The root of this unfortunate situation that has developed over the years is the freight car rental system. A carload of plywood, say, is shipped to New York City. It moves on a western rail line to perhaps Minneapolis, where it is transferred to another railroad. Since it is impractical to unload the cargo and reload it onto the eastern line's freight car, the roads agree to let it stay in the original car and the eastern road pays a rental fee for the use of the car. The rental fee is so unrealistically low, Mr. Chairman, that it makes it cheaper to rent freight cars than to own them. So when a freight car wears out, it just is not replaced. This is what has happened through the years, so that the total number of freight cars has declined steadily. It now is at such a low figure that something must be done.

We must have more freight cars. Either the railroads must build them, or the Government will have to step in with some kind of subsidy. This has been suggested, and I hope it remains merely a suggestion and never becomes a necessity. We have enough subsidies eating away our tax dollars now, without adding more.

Not only does the freight car shortage affect the economy of the country, and therefore our basic strength, but if it continues to get progressively worse at the rate it has worsened over the past many years, it inevitably will have an adverse effect on our defense effort. Obviously this cannot be permitted to happen.

The bill which is before us for decision today is part of the answer, Mr. Chairman. It is not the total answer, admittedly. As one of the sponsors of this legislation, I am aware that it will not solve the problem. But it will permit the executive branch to change the freight car rental rate so that it will no longer be cheaper to rent cars than to own them. It will make economically attractive the replacement of wornout cars with new cars. To any claims by the railroads that such action is not necessary, that they will handle the situation and solve the problem themselves, I would reply that they have had all these years to solve the problem and have failed to do so.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that this country can afford not to have this legislation.

My thanks to the gentleman again for yielding to me.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman and join in his remarks in support of this bill.

I strongly recommend passage of S. 1098, a bill that can help us alleviate the national freight car shortage. While the legislation before us today is not as strong as many would have desired, it will aid in removing a most hazardous obstacle in the flow of interstate commerce.

S. 1098 is one answer to a very serious question: How can we increase the flow of goods when we lack the necessary freight cars to put these goods into the stream of commerce?

In the United States today there is a daily shortage of 13,000 plain boxcars. In 1926, our total ownership of railroad freight cars stood at 2,427,026. In 1966, our total ownership has dwindled to less than 1,450,000. At the same time, the surge of our economy is creating a greater demand for freight cars. The plywood industry is a key example. They have estimated that consumer demands will require an additional 10,000 boxcars each year for the next decade. Critical shortages of cars plague many industries and all sections of the United States.

S. 1098 will permit the Interstate Commerce Commission to set "incentive" rental rates on freight cars for which there is a critical need. The present rate structure encourages the carriers to hold cars for long periods of time and to refrain from building new cars. Stimulating the rapid circulation of cars is not the real answer. I agree with ICC Chairman John Bush when he stated recently that:

> There is no such thing as equitable distribution in this period of severe car shortage.

Simply put, everyone needs more cars.

In the Pacific Northwest, there is a severe lack of wide-door boxcars. Plywood, for example, is manufactured in large sheets and can be loaded economically only if it is fork lifted into cars with 8-foot doors. Utilization of cars with 6-foot doors is a very expensive process, for the total loading-unloading expense can run as high as $215 over the normal automatic loading cost.

The shortage of boxcars in the Northwest has become so critical that many mills have had to shut down or lay off employees. Warehouses are bulging with produce, especially forest products. The plywood industry is 50 to 100 cars short each day of the number they need to get their merchandise to markets in the East and other parts of the United States. The demand for plywood is increasing; 90 percent of it is usually shipped by rail; and the supply of cars is steadily diminishing.

It is clear that the present per diem rates only encourage hoarding of freight cars and depress profits of our leading industries. Better circulation of cars will not alone solve this crisis. The Interstate Commerce Commission should have the authority to prescribe incentive rates for badly needed cars. I strongly urge the House to approve S. 1098.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time partly to clear up the record, and to add to it.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer], told part of the reason why this bill is before us at this late date.

In the 1st session of the 89th Congress, near the end, the committee reported the bill, but reported it with the understanding that the bill would not come to the floor and that the chairman would not ask for a rule in the first session. During the adjournment, we hoped, the railroads would get together and agree on a per diem rate, as they did before, because the per diem rate which is in vogue now was the result of an agreement among the railroads and ordered by the ICC.

The last week of the session the then chairman of our committee came to me and said that he understood this bill was agreeable to the Senate; the railroads were releasing their objections and he was going to ask unanimous consent for this bill to be called up on Friday for passage. I said, "Well, if you have an agreement with all of them, why, that is all right." Our chairman announced on the floor that he was going to call the bill up for consideration on the unanimous consent calendar for Friday. The next day I received reports from some railroads that they were not in agreement with the bill. I then went to the chairman and told him that if he called it up, I would have to object to the consideration because it was not in conformity with the terms on which we had voted the bill out. He respected my position and the bill was not called up. At the beginning of this session I went to our chairman and asked that he apply to our Committee on Rules for a rule, because in the interim the railroads had not gotten together and no action had been taken. That is the reason why the bill is coming to us at this time. The bill came out of committee without any negative votes. There may be some members of the committee who were not present when the bill was considered who are not in agreement with the bill, but there were no record votes against the bill when it came out.

I want to be honest with the House and say that I doubt very much if this bill will accomplish what we think it will. I doubt very much if the bill is going to cause very many boxcars to be built. I would be pleasantly surprised if it does, but I doubt that it will. I doubt if the mere raising of the per diem rent is going to produce any more boxcars, but it is worth trying. It is about the only means we have of trying to cure the deficiency. The record shows that we have today a deficiency of approximately 15,000 boxcars to meet the demands of the freight shippers as of today. Some of the roads have ordered a substantial number of new cars to be built this year. Other roads have not. This bill is one which I will vote for and which I am hopeful will produce something. If not, we will have to use another method which is probably more stringent than this bill, because boxcars must be built. There are a number of railroads that have in their ownership enough boxcars to meet the demands of the shippers on their line, but they have been unable to get those boxcars returned to their line to meet the demands of their shippers.

Therefore, we hope that the per diem increase may accomplish this purpose. I commend the bill to the House and hope it is passed. I hope with this action that some new boxcars will be built.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Redlin].

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and its distinguished chairman, Mr. Staggers, for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor of the House. I urge the House to support S. 1098 as amended.

The flexibility provided for compensation rates to be paid for the use of freight cars by this bill can help a great deal with the boxcar problem in our Nation. This provision would help assure a more adequate supply of freight cars to meet the needs of all commerce and particularly the movement of grain. This provision should help to encourage a better distribution of freight cars over all the Nation related to the needs of various areas, and particularly to the needs of grain-producing areas such as North Dakota at times of harvest and other times of heavy movement of grain.

This distribution problem was best illustrated by the fact that a major road operating in my State had cars on lines equal to only 54.1 percent of its own ownership just a short time ago this spring.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, one of the major problems of agriculture in recent years has been the shortage of railroad freight cars. This has seriously affected virtually all segments of agriculture. Small farmers in my district have been badly hurt by the constant, serious shortage of boxcars.

The ominous aspect of these freight car shortages is that they are getting worse, and at a time when our food-for-export programs are increasing in importance.

As you all know, the costly and disruptive effects of freight car shortages are not confined to agriculture, or to any particular area of the Nation. I am sure each Member of Congress has constituents who have felt the sting of this problem.

We now have an opportunity to enact a piece of legislation, S. 1098, that will take an all-important step toward the eventual alleviation of car shortages. Because of economic self-interest, the railroads themselves have not been able to agree upon a solution to the problem.

There has been an intensive effort to cloud the underlying reasons for these car shortages, but the basic cause is one of simple economics.

There are contributing factors, such as the lack of an efficient method of keeping track of and distributing freight cars on a national basis; and because freight cars too often wait long periods of time at ports or elevators for unloading and eventual return to service. These factors, do indeed, contribute to the severity of the national freight car shortage.

But the basic, underlying cause is simply that car ownership is not sufficiently profitable for many railroads. Like all businesses, railroads have only a certain amount of money to invest each year. Understandably, they invest their money where it will bring the highest return. For many years—perhaps 25, at least—car ownership has not been a sufficiently profitable investment to warrant large outlays by these roads. The daily rental rate each railroad pays for the use of another's cars is established by a sort of gentleman's agreement on the part of all the railroads of the country, who negotiate the rentals through their trade organization, the Association of American Railroads. There is a sharp difference of opinion between railroads as to what the level of car rentals should be.

This difference of opinion is not a result of geography, as some persons would have you believe. Rather, it depends upon whether a railroad unloads more cars on its rails each day than it needs to meet loading requirements, or whether it needs more cars for loading than have just been unloaded. Those railroads who receive more cars than they need want to keep the rental rate as low as possible. Railroads who receive fewer cars than they need for loading want the rate high enough to encourage faster return of cars to their owners, and to provide an incentive for railroads to own enough cars. This is the situation in a nutshell.

Unfortunately, there is no way a railroad can keep all its cars on its own lines. If such were the case—if cars were unloaded at each junction point and the shipments transferred to cars owned by the railroad which would then continue the haul—no doubt we would find every railroad of the country owning enough cars to accommodate all the business that came its way. But transferring loading at junctions is impractical and costly.

Railroad cars are designed for interchangeability: their parts are standardized, as is the gage of the rails over which they roll. A car loaded on the Pacific coast may travel a dozen railroads on its trip to the east coast. This flexibility is one of the great strengths of American railroading.

But this very strength produces a loophole for certain railroads to economize on their own car ownership, and often on their car maintenance, at the expense of other railroads. Through their voting strength in the Association of American Railroads, these roads have been able to keep the rental rate at an unduly low level. As a result, the investment emphasis of many railroads has been placed on other than freight car equipment. And the national freight car fleet has steadily and alarmingly decreased.

Because freight car ownership has suffered a sharp decline, many industries have also suffered. Car shortages used to be confined only to box cars in certain parts of the country at grain harvest seasons. Such is no longer the case. Today, shortages of almost any type of railroad freight car can occur in almost any part of the country at almost any time of the year. The selfish and shortsighted policy of the car-terminating railroads is coming home to roost. It has done grave injury not only to agriculture, lumbering, and many other industries, but it has been exceedingly costly to the railroads themselves. Millions of dollars of freight revenue have been lost because cars were not available. Often the car-short industries had to find alternate, higher-cost forms of transportation, and these higher costs eventually were passed along to the consumer.

There is little evidence, however, that the car-terminating railroads responsible for the increasing severity of freight car shortages are about to abandon their campaign to keep car rental rates low. The public interest is seemingly overlooked. One of the propaganda efforts is that although the number of cars in the national fleet has admittedly declined, the larger capacities of the new cars, coupled with their allegedly greater utility, has produced no net decline in total transportation capabilities. This is sheer fantasy, and illustrative of the extent to which these roads will go in an attempt to cling to their advantage realized from too-low car rentals.

I do not claim that passage of S. 1098 will prove a cure-all. It will not. But it is absolutely essential to a long-range solution of the freight car problem. It is axiomatic in our American economy that if something becomes profitable, it soon ceases to be scarce. There is no reason to think this philosophy will experience a first-time failure if applied to railroad freight cars.

S. 1098 will designate the Interstate Commerce Commission a tribunal—which we trust will be impartial—between the low-rental and high-rental camps of the railroad industry which historically have been unable to agree on car rental rates. Such inability to resolve issues, with resulting need to seek arbitration by the Interstate Commerce Commission, is not unknown in the railroad industry. It is, in fact, more the rule than the exception.

The terminating lines should no longer be permitted to successfully continue their program of delaying and stalling this legislation. Their requests for "further study" have been granted too many times, to the great disadvantage of millions of Americans. Now is the time to bring commonsense to the problem of freight car supply. Without passage of legislation to alleviate the boxcar shortage, I confidently predict we will soon be considering a very costly method of Government acquisition of freight cars. I would vote for such a solution with great reluctance, for it would presage governmental involvement in railroading that should give railroad management pause.

I have been asking for legislation such as the House is considering today for several years, and I would far prefer this method of dealing with the problem than by a massive Government ownership program which may well result if we fail to act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that the national boxcar shortage continues unabated in relationship to the growing population and the increasing needs for shipping grains, foods, and other products. It is recognized that some of the railroads have made commendable progress in modernizing and implementing their fleets of cars, but the shortage continues and is now a year-round problem in many areas of the Nation. Unfortunately, the construction of new boxcars is not keeping up with the retirement of old cars, especially in the plain boxcar category, which carries most of the grains and other farm commodities being shipped across the country and into ports for shipment to the food-hungry nations of the world. In other words, our war on hunger, both at home and abroad, is threatened by the boxcar shortage.

While some progress has been made in providing specialized freight cars, the Interstate Commerce Commission informs me that the number of plain boxcars on hand, the work-horses of the car fleet, dropped by almost 30 percent during the past 10 years. We had 190,550 less plain box cars on January 1 of this year than we had on January 1 of 1956.

It was almost 2 years ago when the ICC attempted to alleviate boxcar shortages by responding to my suggestions to reduce the free time during which a boxcar could sit at a port. It was a step in the right direction and recognized the need for moving critically needed cars at the earliest possible moment. I also noted at that time that reducing the free time only affected part of the problem, that the storage charges imposed were so low in many cases that many rail lines were encouraged to hold these cars for additional days. It seemed that charges for using cars owned by other rail lines were so low that the cars were not only being used for storage at ports but some rail lines were actually discouraged from adding to their own fleet of cars.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has been most sympathetic to this problem, and I believe welcomes the passage of the bill before us today, S. 1098, which will provide the ICC with additional authority with which to further regulate certain rates with the purpose of insuring the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply. I believe this bill will provide an effective tool for the ICC. It is not an immediate and total solution to the boxcar problem, but it is needed in the effort to reverse the trend that has seen the boxcar supply dwindle to a dangerous level.

We in the Midwest perhaps feel the boxcar shortage to as great an extent as any section of the country. Our greatest difficulty still comes during the harvest season, but we experience shortages all of the other months of the year as well. I believe the ICC has made an honest effort to move boxcars into areas of greatest need, such as early this spring when we in the Midwest desperately needed to move our stored grains out of the path of onrushing flood waters. The cars were provided, but as the ICC pointed out at the time, it was a case of moving cars from one critical shortage area to another area of even more critical shortage.

Legislation to correct this problem must do two things: stimulate construction of more new boxcars and speed up the return of present cars to the lines that need them. I believe this bill is a positive step toward accomplishment of both of these objectives.

Mr. Chairman, the growing shortage of boxcars is causing serious financial damage to many industries across the Nation. Over the long term, this shortage threatens to hamstring our ability to meet the needs of our exploding population and threatens the execution of our commitments to other nations of the world. Today we have an opportunity to act in a positive manner toward solving this problem. I respectfully urge favorable consideration of S. 1098, to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. I want to commend the committee and its chairman for bringing this very important legislation to the floor of the House. The problems created by the national boxcar shortage are particularly acute in the Pacific Northwest, where major shipments of lumber, grain, and other commodities are frequently delayed and scheduled shipments disrupted.

For many years the shortage has affected the region during the grain shipping season, but in recent years it has shifted from a seasonal problem to one of the constant concern by all shippers of bulk commodities.

This chronic shortage can only be solved by improved utilization of existing rolling stock and by bringing new equipment into service at a faster rate than has been accomplished in past years. I believe the enactment of S. 1098 is a positive step toward the achievement of those goals.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of the Members of the House for this legislation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful both individually and on behalf of my constituents to the committee, its past chairman, Mr. Harris, and to its present chairman, Mr. STAGGERS, for bringing this bill to the floor.

I cannot urge too strongly approval of S. 1098 by this House.

For too many years the shippers in the State of Oregon—and elsewhere—have struggled to fulfill orders under the most trying conditions of a chronic boxcar shortage.

Seven weeks ago, I stood here and said the situation was assuming the "proportions of national shame." I still believe this to be true.

There have been all sorts of conflicting statements over the years as to the causes for the shortage. Regardless, the point is that something must be done and done now.

This bill is designed to encourage railroads to acquire their own fleets of cars instead of freeloading on the cars of another railroad. The bill does this by authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to give due consideration to a variety of factors in fixing compensation to be paid by one railroad, for example one in the East, for the use of any type of freight car owned by another railroad, for example, one in the West.

The bill takes the handcuffs off the ICC which a Federal district court put on nearly 20 years ago when it ruled in the Palmer case that the specific power of the ICC to fix compensation for daily rental is not coextensive with the power to regulate the use of freight cars.

The shortage—one mainly of supply, but also one of distribution—becomes more aggravated by the year. From a condition of occasional shortage—such as occurs at harvest time—the condition has become a chronic one—occurring in any month, in any year and with respect to any type of freight car. Special orders to relieve specific shortages simply distributed the shortage and moved it from place to place in an uneconomic fashion.

Let us look at the record—Charles Webb of the ICC testified last fall that the carrying capacity of freight cars on class 1 railroads decreased from a total of 91 million tons to 87 million tons between January 1956 and January 1966. In step with this, the number of cars decreased during the same 10-year period from 1,774,614 cars to 1,550,447 cars—a "record low" the report of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee calls it.

In February of this year, Oregon shippers reported to me that Southern Pacific Railroad was able to furnish only 55 percent of car requirements. About the same time, the Southwest Oregon Shippers' Traffic Association wrote me that customer mills were loading at less than half of normal loadings—approximately 48 percent. Shortages translate themselves into plant shutdowns, with hardship to employer and employee alike, and added storage costs.

The economics of the situation show that the earning value of freight cars generally exceeds per diem charges now running from a little over $2 a day to slightly more than $12 a day, depending on the category of car. It is quite apparent, then, that if a railroad can manage to handle its business using cars belonging to other railroads it is encouraged to do so by the per diem system now in force. Also, such a railroad is led to the practice of scrapping its own wornout boxcars but not ordering replacements.

In a time of a rapidly expanding economy, which means an increasing volume of goods and services, it is senseless to tolerate a declining supply of freight cars. Production—without adequate means of transportation—becomes thereby crippled. The losses to individual shippers—and to the national economy in the aggregate—become substantial.

This bill has broad support from involved Government agencies. The ICC is on record with the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as stating that enactment of the bill would "overcome the effect of the decision in the Palmer case and would be of substantial assistance to the Commission in its efforts to alleviate the crippling economic effects of freight car shortages." The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, has said the bill "is a step in the right direction." The office of general counsel of the Commerce Department has endorsed the bill on the grounds there is a need "to provide a more equitable apportionment of railroad car costs." The Department of the Army last fall expressed the view that the Department of Defense is "vitally interested in there being an adequate railroad freight car supply in the United States." And the Office of Emergency Planning, lodged in the Executive office of the President, said the bill will legitimately arm the ICC with authority to "consider freight car supply as a factor in its determination of rental rates."

Now, this bill is not the complete answer to the shortage in the sense that overnight its passage—will immediately put cars on sidings. It will not. Even with its intended effect, it will take several years before substantial numbers of new cars will be constructed and "on the line."

There is also a related aspect. We do not have available current information on commodity shipping practices and on-rail car location, movement or availability forecasts. In late March of this year, I was told that rail car data being used at that time was actually data known as of February 1, several weeks earlier. It does not seem possible that a sophisticated transportation system in the world's major industrial nation can operate effectively with such dated data.

Therefore, I urge, along with passage of this bill, that the Federal Government undertake a comprehensive study of our surface commodity transportation systems—to include the possibility of using computer systems to keep track of current rail car locations and destinations.

The squeeze on circulation of boxcars will not get better even under a crash program of construction for perhaps 2 years. Thus, we should hesitate no longer, we should pass this legislation.

Those who would argue, as the railroads have sometimes done, that they want no additional regulation of any kind and who therefore have in the past opposed this bill, I would suggest to them that if they think this represents government regulation, they should wait until the demands of the shippers—the shippers in my own area many of whom are top free enterprise people—they should wait until the demands of those people who continue to be plagued by the shortage of cars reach such a crescendo that it will result in the passage of much more restrictive legislation than this.

Mr. Chairman, I again thank the committee and urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to the previous speakers, I have listened in vain for someone to speak for the terminal railroads on the east coast.

I believe that unless some answer is found to the questions as to the impact of this legislation on the eastern roads, we may have to ask that certain amendments be added to the bill at the appropriate time. In preparation for that possibility I should like to ask the chairman if there is any way in which we can guarantee that the penalties or the incentives that would be assessed would in fact result in additional freight cars, or if they would not in effect help the richer roads become richer and the poorer roads to become poorer?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is not the intention.

Mr. KEITH. I realize that is not the intention of the bill. I am in sympathy with the intentions of the bill. But I am concerned that the penalties or the incentives that will be collected may not actually be used for the purpose for which we hope they will be.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. KEITH. I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say to the gentleman that this will not be put into practice until there have been full hearings before the Commission and all sides have had an opportunity to argue and present their facts on the question. I am certain that if there is discrimination, we will see it. The committee will keep watch over the situation. This will be done only after each side has had an opportunity.

Mr. KEITH. The Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. KEITH. Could we not specify in the legislation that the incentive fees that are collected should go for that purpose?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I will certainly yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. The total amount of the incentive payments envisioned would be a relatively small amount, perhaps in the millions. While the amount is not small, we actually need billions of dollars to supply the cars that are needed in this country. We would not wish anyone to think the investment required is limited to the amount of incentive per diem. The provision to which the gentleman refers is only an incentive.

As you know since you are a member of the committee, the committee in its wisdom tried to do the very best it could under the circumstances after the railroads failed to do their job. I thought it was their job to meet this problem. The chairmen corresponded with them for months in an effort to get them to do something or to come up with some kind of suggestion, which we really did not get. As I said, this will not be put into effect until after complete hearings have been held before the Commission showing the need, and certain groups can be exempted if, in the wisdom of the Commission, such exemptions are needed in the public interest.

Mr. KEITH. Would there be any appeal to the courts from the ruling of the Commission?

Mr. STAGGERS. Certainly.

Mr. KEITH. Would the gentleman answer one additional question. Is there by chance a constitutional question involved in that we are taking property without due process?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. KEITH. I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. No constitutional question that I know of is involved, except that there are conflicting opinions between railroads. This legislation is an attempt to resolve some of that conflict and to bring some order out of the chaos that now exists.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, apropos of the answer of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. It was my understanding just from the brief hearings in the Rules Committee on this question that the deficiency created by the previous decision rendered by the courts that the Interstate Commerce Commission did not have authority to fix rates and to take these issues into account will be supplied by this legislation. It will be constitutional because there will be statutory authority for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois if he has any other requests for time. I have only one more request on this side.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the House is today, at long last, considering S. 1098, an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act designed to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply.

This bill is essentially identical to H.R. 8950, the bill I introduced on June 10, 1965, to relieve this problem. Hearings were held last year and since that time the already critical freight car supply became virtually intolerable. This legislation is the most important step toward solving one of the most frustrating and irritating problems North Dakota farmers and grain shippers have had to face over the years.

My colleague from Massachusetts just raised the point whether this bill was in conflict with the Constitution. I hardly think so, and I think the chairman will bear out the fact that this bill merely gives an individual railroad a right to charge an equitable rental rate for the equipment which it does in fact own and has in fact invested its own funds in. It certainly is a long step in the right direction.

The shortage of railroad cars necessary to carry the annual harvest to market centers has become more severe every year. Line grain storage points are filled to overflow soon after harvest begins, and farmers have annually faced the disappointing task of dumping their harvest on the ground. Losses result and losses are multiplied simply because sufficient cars are not available to allow shippers to take advantage of market prices.

The seriousness of this situation is best demonstrated by events in my home State since harvest started last fall. A particularly wet fall delayed field work and additional grain was destroyed because sufficient storage space was not available. Grain drying facilities were also plugged because the car shortage prevented orderly transportation of the harvest.

Later in the fall, when the situation was still critical, the Department of Agriculture reacted by compounding the problem. They placed all Government-owned wheat on the market, depressing the market price which many farmers had not yet been able to take advantage of and put further demands on the already critically short supply of railroad cars.

The problem was not localized in North Dakota nor was it just in farm areas. I understand that the great lumber industry of the Northwest was severely crippled, and men were laid off work because of the lack of rail transportation. And the problem goes into the field of national defense, also. Many of the weapons for the struggle in Vietnam must be shipped over these Northern lines, and the shortage of cars adds to the confusion and difficulty of making sure that the supplies our men need in Vietnam arrive in time. Then, too, the Administration has recently embarked on an expanded food-for-peace program. The need for our grain is urgent and immediate if millions of people are to be saved from starvation in India. We have been told of steamers waiting to be loaded in west coast ports, but no grain available. At the same time, grain that had been sold as long ago as last December for delivery to these ports was still, in March, located in elevators and warehouses in the Midwest, unable to be moved to the coast for shipment.

The Interstate Commerce Commission took action, finally, in March by issuing an exclusion order for the two larger railroad lines serving North Dakota and the Northwestern States. This exclusion order is merely a temporary policing action, necessary because this type of legislation is not in effect. Their investigation revealed that the problem did not occur because these lines failed to own freight cars in sufficient numbers to adequately serve the area, but because per diem rates have been and are so low as to discourage new car building and to encourage railroads in some areas to rent cars of others rather than to buy their own. Because it has been cheaper to rent cars than to build them, the number of freight cars in the country has declined by about 200,000 in the last 10 years.

Daily fees currently charged by railroads range from $2.16 a day for an old car worth $1,000 or less up to $12.18 a day for a $35,000 auto-rack car. Actually, you can rent a $15,000 boxcar for less than half the rental that Hertz would charge you for a $3,500 Chevrolet. By comparing these low fees to the rental charge made by automobile leasing agencies, members can get an indication of how important it is that this amendment be passed.

At the time the Interstate Commerce Commission issued its exclusion order, it was determined that the Great Northern Railroad had only 52.4 percent of its cars on its own lines, and the Northern Pacific had only 60.6 percent.

This exclusion order is serving its purpose and at the present time, I am told, sufficient cars are now available and the problem is being relieved. Too late, of course, to take advantage of the improved grain markets already depressed by Government wheat sales—but in time to clear up available storage for the 1966 harvest.

The exclusion order will be in effect only until May 28 and after that time I have no fear of predicting the car shortage problem will return unless Congress takes appropriate action today.

As I stated at the outset of my remarks, this problem is not new and proposed solutions have received careful consideration over the years. The solution proposed in my bill, H.R. 8950 and in S. 1098 has also received careful consideration and has earned the recommendation of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. In view of these facts and the needs of our Nation, I urgently request support for this measure, which is of such immediate necessity.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in expressing my appreciation to the chairman and members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for bringing this bill to the floor today.

The forest products industry, nationwide, moves the great bulk of its production to market by rail. In recent years, this has become increasingly complicated because of a recurring crisis in boxcar supply that is slowly choking off the more remote plants and reaching closer and closer to major marketing centers.

In 1963, when we experienced the worst boxcar crisis in history, there was a nationwide shortage of 17,000 boxcars per day—every day for weeks. In other words, the shortage was 17,000 the first day, 24,000 the second, and 51,000 the third, and so on.

Things again were tight in 1964, and the Interstate Commerce Commission predicted more problems in 1965—the prediction was borne out—and the situation is no better today.

The reason we have a boxcar shortage is a simple one—there just are not enough boxcars to meet the demands of the shippers. Car supply is at its lowest point since 1900, and, in a period of unprecedented national growth, the supply of boxcars is declining every year.

ICC has been issuing service orders at a rapid rate in an effort to alleviate the problem. But the fact is, these orders can often be effective in meeting a peculiar situation, but they are not designed to solve the overall car shortages.

Why does the lumber industry continue to depend on the railroads for transportation when they are continually faced with problems of inadequate supply of the types of equipment suited to their needs? The answer is that up to now, no other form of transportation is capable of handling the volume at costs as low as railroads provide. Further, some products such as plywood must be shipped under cover to protect them from the elements.

The western lines, shipping lumber from west coast forests, have found that they simply cannot afford to maintain the entire boxcar supply, especially when eastern lines hoard western-owned cars. Anytime an unusual demand is put on car supply—a dock strike, a grain harvest, and so forth—the West finds itself literally crying in the wilderness.

The only solution to this problem we are talking about—the critical shortage of boxcars—is obvious: An increase in the number of available freight cars, especially the workhorse of the fleet, the boxcar. The legislation introduced in the Senate—S. 1098—and in the House—H.R. 7165—and supported by the ICC is designed to do just that: Increase the national supply of boxcars by providing incentive for their construction. These identical bills, sponsored by legislative experts on transportation, have as their purpose "to insure the adequacy of the national freight car supply." The incentive provided in the bill is that, with increased per diem costs for handling boxcars, some railroads may find it better to build additional cars for their own use.

I would also endorse an amendment which would provide a second incentive. This amendment would exempt from per diem costs, any railroad which has provided enough boxcars to meet its own needs in general commerce and the needs of national defense. I think this amendment would improve the bill, and that, somewhere in the course of action, it will be accepted.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, every harvest season for many years the Midwest has suffered financial loss and untold frustration because of the shortage of freight cars needed to transport grain and other crops. The story has been told too often to need repeating. Attempts to correct the situation through industry channels and through the Interstate Commerce Commission have been equally unproductive. There is no absolute certainty about the proper solution, but many people have contended during this period that the amount to be paid for using a freight car owned by another railroad is the key to a practical solution. Frankly, I cannot be sure.

There seems to be logic in the contention that high per diem rates would tend to speed up the turn-around of cars and would at the same time create the incentive to obtain and maintain larger fleets. The railroad industry itself has been hopelessly split in its opinion. Some roads contend that substantially higher rates than now exist would ruin them entirely. Perhaps so.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was set up to handle the detailed matters of railroad regulation. It is perfectly willing to take the responsibility in the matter of per diem. It is, however, hampered by a court decision which restricts its jurisdiction to deciding what per diem will give a compensatory return on investment and it is denied the power to go the next step and decide what rates of per diem might offer incentive to car ownership. The bill before us today merely lifts that restriction and makes it possible for the Interstate Commerce Commission to take that next step. By delaying the effective date to September 1966, it also offers the opportunity for the various elements of the railroad industry to try again to reach agreement.

We are saying to the Commission here, "Go ahead and use your knowledge and experience with railroad matters and work out a just and workable arrangement." At the same time, the bill does allow for exceptions in the case of groups of roads which cannot meet the general requirement without jeopardizing the overall national interest. The bill also makes what seems to me an unnecessary and obvious limitation upon the authority given to the Commission when it states specifically that incentive rates cannot be used for types of cars which are found to be in adequate supply. I am sure that most of us would have correctly assumed that such a limitation would be observed, but apparently some interested parties felt the necessity to see it in black and white.

I certainly hope that with this new authority given to the Commission and with the obvious invitation to the industry to make one more try at internal agreement we can look forward to a greatly improved freight car situation in the Midwest as soon as next fall.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to add my congratulations to the committee. I think the manner in which they approached the question deserves specific commendation; that is, to let the railroads under some threat of a bill come up with a necessary remedy to solve the problem which the chairman states is really basically the railroad's problem.

I, for one, not only representing a very large grain-producing area, but also representing a State that has a tremendous lumber industry, received a telegram from one of the sawmill operators, saying he was going to have to close down. He did in fact close down his operation, throwing many people out of work, because they could not get the freight cars to move out the material that had been produced in their mill.

It is interesting, too, that with all that has been said about expanding Government programs, such as food for peace, and the President's recent request for a large amount of grain to be shipped to India, the shipments have been stopped because there were not enough cars in which to move the grain from the point of production to the coast for shipment.

I am sure, as I said to the members of the Rules Committee in testifying on behalf of the rule for this bill, this will not solve the problem. It is, however, a step in the right direction.

I would say to some of the railroads involved—and particularly to those finding it difficult to build cars, that it does not make much sense to me that in February of 1966 a New England railroad was able to control 197 percent of the ownership of cars they actually owned, while at the same time others who have built boxcars and put them on line were not able to control much over 50 percent of their ownership.

I agree with a former speaker in the well of the House. If some feel this bill is bad, I would caution that one of the most disastrous things which could happen would be for the transportation industry, particularly as it relates to railroads, to find itself in a situation where shippers bitterly complain about not being able to move their goods and ask the Congress of the United States to nationalize the railroads. That has been suggested many times before.

All that is needed is for the group that has the responsibility of providing a good rail system to live up to the responsibility. If this does not happen, then we will find the Congress stepping in to do whatever is necessary to alleviate the problem.

I believe the committee has done an outstanding job in bringing the legislation before us. I believe it has set down the pattern of what we must do so far as the country is concerned in looking to the future.

If something is not done, if the problem continues to exist, I fear things will happen which none of us and none of the individuals involved would like to see happen.

It is time we asked the railroad industry, who have provided a great transportation system for this country to continue to do so and to meet their responsibility by anticipating the need and prepare for future expansion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised and disturbed at the great contrast between the support the western railroads can mobilize to help them out on their freight car situation, and the complete lack of interest this Congress has shown in helping out our eastern commuter railroads.

I would like to say that I think this Congress should be more concerned with commuters than with boxcars. I am sure that Congress feels it is more important to carry people than wheat or pigs.

Earlier this year, I cosponsored a "commuter service" bill to bring Federal aid to bear on the operating deficits of eastern commuter lines, but unfortunately, pigs and wheat count for more than commuters.

Recently, I introduced further legislation to give railroads a tax break on the money they spend on rights-of-way. I would give them a tax credit instead of tax deductions for the money they spend on local real estate taxes on their rights-of-way. This seems only fair to me. The airlines and trucking concerns get whopping Federal subsidies by virtue of Federal airport and highway programs. The railroads get very little. The eastern commuter lines—the neediest railroads—are not getting a fair shake from the Federal Government. Now that we have showed so much concern about freightcars today, I hope we will take an interest in commuters in the very near future.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the critical shortage of railroad boxcars is a national disgrace. There are not enough freight cars in the United States today to supply demand. Despite shortages every year since World War II, total freight car ownership has dropped at a rate of 3 percent a year.

As has been pointed out by previous speakers, there is a good reason why this has happened. It is simply less expensive to railroads to rent boxcars than to build them. The incentive for most railroads to build new boxcars is marginal. Because a new boxcar can be taken over by another railroad whether or not the owner wants to rent it, and because the shortage of cars has become more and more critical, our national economic expansion is being strangled.

S. 1098, Mr. Chairman, will help correct this situation. Once enacted, this legislation hopefully will increase the supply of freight cars. The bill will give the Interstate Commerce Commission clear authority to set incentive car-rental rates wherever there is a clear need to encourage car ownership. The bill has my complete support and backing.

The legislation before us today, Mr. Chairman, has the support of the Interstate Commerce Commission; the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense; the Office of Emergency Planning; and the Bureau of the Budget. It also has the support of 24 railroads owning 40 percent of the Nation's freight cars. It has the support of the lumber and plywood industries and a large number of other interests dependent upon the common boxcar for transporting their products.

For the record, Interstate Commerce Commission Chairman John W. Bush, on March 17 of this year, made a public statement regarding the railroad boxcar shortage. His statement was in preamble to the ICC decision to take certain administrative actions to attempt to alleviate this emergency situation and assist in bringing about a distribution of the total number of cars available over the total area and the total economy of our country. Certain car service orders were issued. These are temporary measures designed to help alleviate the critical situation, but only for a short period of time.

Here is what Chairman Bush had to say about the overall problem:

> There is no question but what the shortage of plain railroad boxcars has created a very serious emergency situation in transportation. In past years there have been peak and valley periods in the demand for boxcars. The greatest shortage period was usually reached at grain harvesting time.
>
> This peak and valley situation no longer exists. Although we would now normally be in what we have termed a valley period of demand, the exact opposite situation prevails. There is currently a daily shortage of close to 13,000 plain boxcars, which would have been near the maximum daily shortage of peak periods in previous years.
>
> The critical situation is brought about by a combination of such conditions as the high level of our business economy, large grain harvest, the Food for Peace program, etc. I see no easing of the situation because the normal spring up-turn in business is practically upon us and so is spring planting time for this year's grain crop.

Previous speakers have detailed the serious regional problems occasioned by the boxcar shortage—in shipping of lumber, grains, sugarbeets, fruits, and so forth. But I would only add that passage of S. 1098 should not be considered a regional bill because it is not. It is a bill designed to help solve a national problem. It is for the good of the Nation. It should have the unanimous support of the House of Representatives such as it had the unanimous support of the Senate.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Wyatt].

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I have battled long and hard for this legislation and recently offered testimony before the Rules Committee on behalf of myself and Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, in strong support of it.

This shortage is something we have lived with since World War II. Heretofore it has largely been on a seasonal basis. It is presently a chronic problem and exists on a year-round basis.

The genesis of the problem we face today is the rapid disappearance of boxcars coupled with the substantial increase in our commerce.

While it is true that large sums of money are being spent by railroads for new cars at the present time, these new cars are largely for specialty items and have virtually no effect upon the cars which are in short supply. These cars in short supply are rapidly becoming useless because of age and deterioration and are disappearing each year now by the thousands.

The plain fact of the matter is that there is presently no incentive for the average railroad to build new cars which will cost in the neighborhood of $25,000 when a railroad may in effect rent them on the basis of approximately $3.58 a day or less.

The bill before the Congress is a step in the right direction. It will not certainly solve the problem and aggressive action must be taken to find a long-range solution to the problem or there will be a complete breakdown of important commerce between our States with disastrous effect upon the economy, certainly, of the Northwest and Oregon in particular.

I urge the prompt passage of this legislation to give the Interstate Commerce Commission discretionary authority to assist in providing incentive for the construction of new boxcars.

There is no hope that the railroads voluntarily will reach a resolution of this problem on their own initiative because of the plain economics of the situation which are so unfavorable.

In our present situation the western railroads are in effect subsidizing the eastern railroads and this bill will permit discretionary authority to help alleviate this situation.

While no full solution of our problem will be achieved, we will be taking affirmative action which will offer some help. We then must devote ourselves to efforts to finally and satisfactorily solve this most desperate situation.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYATT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which will go a long way toward assisting in the solution of the freight car shortage.

The box car situation is serious and has been for a number of years. It is imperative that relief be granted not only so far as the farmer, but to the lumber industry, the mining industry and every segment of the Middle West.

I cannot urge you too strongly to support this legislation for the good of the entire middle west.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYATT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, in the debate on the rule I have already expressed my support for this legislation, but the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Wyatt], in expressing his appreciation to the committee, reminded me that I had failed to do so. Therefore, I take this opportunity to join with him in thanking the committee for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to encourage support of S. 1098. While it is generally conceded that this measure may not solve all the problems with reference to boxcar shortages, it certainly will be of some assistance. Any legislation which will help relieve the chronic shortage problem should be enacted without delay.

The inadequate supply of freight cars places a heavy burden not only on shipment and exports of agricultural commodities, but on domestic commerce generally. It is agreed that the primary cause of this problem is inadequate ownership of rail cars. This bill will give the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority to establish per diem charges to encourage increases in ownership of cars. It does appear to be a step in the right direction and, therefore, in my opinion, the bill should be enacted forthwith.

In the Midwest, we are approaching another harvest season, and already there are rumblings about boxcar shortages. Over the years, there has been an inadequate supply during the harvest season, however, now the problem continues throughout the year. This shortage causes hardship to the farmer, to the elevator operator, to the railroad involved, to the Government, and ultimately to the consumer. In my district, for example, some elevator operators who received loading orders from the Commodity Credit Corporation last fall and winter have had their warehouses removed from the approved list and their licenses to store CCC grains suspended for failure to ship the grain within the 90-day requirement set by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. I am satisfied that in most cases removal from the approved list was because of circumstances beyond the control of the operator involved as it is impossible for him to ship the grain when cars are not available. The 90-day requirement should be extended, in my opinion, until such time as an adequate supply of boxcars is available.

In view of reports that the national supply of boxcars is declining sharply each year, it is imperative some type incentive must be offered the railroads to buy additional cars, and to insure an equitable distribution of them. As has been pointed out in hearings on the pending bill, measures taken in the past by the Interstate Commerce Commission to make the greatest possible use of the existing supply through equitable distribution, and maximum utilization have been helpful, but are becoming less effective as the supply of freight cars continues to decline.

There is great urgency with respect to the passage of this legislation, and while it offers little hope of immediate relief, it will authorize the Commission to prescribe per diem charges which would first, produce a profit for the carrier owner; second, provide incentive for car ownership; third, contribute to sound car service practices; fourth, recognize the value of freight car use; and fifth, encourage acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to the needs of commerce and national defense.

Again, I would say, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a step in the right direction, and this proposed legislation deserves our support.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer] have very persuasively and adequately pointed out the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my support for favorable consideration of S. 1098.

Mr. Chairman, when the boxcar shortage reaches crisis proportions, it creates a great problem in the State of Oregon. Such a shortage often means that the mills close down. When workdays are lost, it means that the economy of Main Street in every town and city is adversely affected.

In these days of increased national output in almost every field, it seems almost incredible that there has been a net loss in the national railroad car supply of 136,281 since 1956. The number of plain boxcars is continuing to drop at the rate of about 2,000 a month.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer], earlier quoted some poetry—which appeared in one of the Portland newspapers 50 years ago, which pointed out the shortage of boxcars at that time. I regret it has taken a half century, but I am delighted that this legislation has been brought to the House—legislation designed to alleviate this boxcar shortage, which has been a reoccuring catastrophe for these many years.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not have to wait another 50 years to have an adequate number of boxcars with which to take care of the lumber of the State of Oregon, and the other products produced there and in other areas.

No pretense is being made that increasing per diem costs would be an immediate panacea to the continuing critical national shortage—but it is an important step. Paying only $3.58 a day rental for a boxcar is not going to inspire any railroad to invest thousands of dollars to construct or acquire one. And the real problem is that this Nation desperately needs more boxcars—but better distribution of existing rolling stock will provide temporary relief.

I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this boxcar shortage is not something new. When I came to the Congress in 1951 we had had a boxcar shortage for grain shipments for many years out in the panhandle of Texas and that great area where they grow wheat and grain sorghum as well as other areas of the country.

I have watched grain lay on the ground and rot and spoil because there were no cars.

When I first became a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1955 this was a very serious issue and it has become more serious each year because the shortage that was formerly confined to grain shipments and to the harvest of agricultural products has spread to other commodities and to other areas.

As the gentlewoman from Oregon pointed out and as other speakers have pointed out, sawmills have had to be closed simply because they could not get cars.

Just recently the Commodity Credit Corporation has been issuing loading orders and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] brought this point out. They say: You send this grain to the shipping points so it can be shipped to India to help relieve starvation over there.

These people want to ship the grain. They have no desire not to ship it but they cannot get the cars. The Commodity Credit Corporation says, "If you do not ship within a certain time we are going to take you off the approved CCC list and you are not an approved warehouse any more and your license is canceled."

Here is a situation where a fellow has no control over what happens to him and yet he is denied the right to make a living to store commodity credit grain, simply because there are not enough cars available.

They have used cattle cars. They have used slatted cattle cars and put plywood inside of the cars in order to haul wheat. They have done eveything they could to get the grain out. They have taken flat cars and they have covered those cars with plastic coverings.

Now these are all the problems and what this Congress needs to do and must do is to find some solution.

During the years we have had hearings on this type of legislation, we have had all kinds of solutions offered. I was amazed at some of the people who are engaged in free enterprise activity coming before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and actually recommending that the Government of the United States buy up boxcars and lend them to the railroads. Others wanted to set up a pool under Government control and put all of the boxcars into that pool and send these boxcars out to the railroads to take care of these shortages. Some wanted the CCC to own boxcars to haul CCC owned agricultural products. Some wanted to nationalize the railroads.

Now we on the committee have weighed all of these different solutions that have been offered and we have come up with what I think is the best possible bill that we can come up with in order to maintain and retain the free enterprise system and permit the railroads to have an opportunity to solve this problem.

The problem must be solved. The American people are most patient but they are not interested in excuses. They want action and they need something to be done to help their economy whether it be in lumber areas of the Northwest or the wheat fields of the Southwest or anyplace else where you have a shortage of boxcars. Something must be done and I think this bill is an excellent beginning in the effort to solve this problem.

Certainly it is not an answer to every problem, but it is a beginning and I think it is a great step forward to try to get this problem solved in the future.

I would hope that an effort will not be made to burden this legislation down with a bunch of amendments because when you go back and look at what the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has gone through in trying to come up with some kind of solution that would be acceptable across-the-board and make it possible for these railroads to try to solve their own problem, I think you would agree with me that what we ought to do is to pass this bill in the form in which it was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and then let us go to conference with the other body and let us work this matter out so that we can get to moving on toward solving these problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to lend my support to S. 1098, as amended, as legislation necessary if the critical shortage of railroad freight cars and the crippling economic effects that result from these shortages are to be alleviated.

Mr. Chairman, the shortage of railroad freight cars has become almost commonplace on the American transportation scene since World War II. This shortage has come about for two principal reasons: First, because of the failure of some carriers to utilize their existing fleet effectively; and second, because under the current allowable scale of per diem charges for the use of freight cars, some carriers have found it cheaper to pay a per diem or rental charges than to own cars. Both of these factors have resulted in a lack of sufficient economic incentive on the part of carriers to provide their fair share of an adequate car supply.

The remedy proposed today will restore this incentive. If the committee amendment is enacted, the Interstate Commerce Commission will be empowered to establish charges above the bare cost of ownership and at a level that would make the advantages of owning equipment more attractive, as well as encourage the utilization of the existing fleet of freight cars in a more effective manner.

Mr. Chairman, past efforts of the Interstate Commerce Commission to alleviate the national shortage of freight cars have proved inadequate. Although the Commission has for years issued numerous car service orders and has stepped up demurrage charges in attempts to assure equitable distribution and maximum utilization of freight cars, these orders at best can provide a solution only to the immediate utilization of cars presently in service, and ignore the obvious fact that the number of freight cars in existence today is inadequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

Illustrative of the problems incurred by this shortage is the situation in my home State of Oklahoma. In the 1965 harvest season, in excess of 20 million bushels of wheat was left on the ground in Oklahoma, due to the fact that sufficient rail transportation was unavailable. The 1966 wheat harvest is due to begin in Oklahoma within the next few weeks, and the railroads have informed Oklahoma wheat producers that there will be a boxcar shortage in the State again this year.

Mr. Chairman, the shortage of railroad freight cars is not a new problem. It has existed for over 20 years. The time is long overdue when something must be done to meet the needs of shippers and of the public and of the country. I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this legislation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr SCHISLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the bill now before us to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national freight car supply and agree with the committee's judgment that action must be taken to alleviate the shortage of railroad freight cars.

I am hopeful that the present shortage will be alleviated by granting the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to establish a per diem rate for boxcar rentals at such levels as to result in an economic incentive for railroads to acquire an adequate fleet of boxcars to meet the needs of the public in normal times and to assure a reasonable supply in times of emergency.

Illinois, like most other States, has traditionally been plagued by shortages of railroad freight cars. This shortage has worked a great detriment to our farmers. Today's farming methods hold up incoming shipments of fertilizer and spring planting is delayed. In the fall, the boxcar shortage becomes even more evident. I know of many instances when our farmers in Illinois have been caught at harvest time unable to deliver their grain to market and stranded without adequate storage space.

Shortages have occurred frequently at other times and in areas other than rural areas in Illinois, all having a detrimental effect on our State's economy. Passage of S. 1098 would be a step forward in solving this persistent problem which is affecting so many of our States throughout the Nation.

I feel we have a responsibility to pass this legislation today and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the bill so that passage will be assured.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish today to join my colleagues in support of Senate bill 1098, proposed by my own colleague in the other body, the distinguished and capable chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, who has worked so long and hard on this problem.

I also wish to commend and thank the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, **Harley Staggers**, for his understanding of this tremendous transportation problem which is before us today and for his courtesy.

This is one of the most vital pieces of legislation, as far as the transportation and trade in my district and my State is concerned, which will be before us this year. I have had more letters supporting this measure than any for many years.

On April 2, 1965, I received a telegram from the president of the ILWU Local 21, Port of Longview, requesting "all possible assistance to obtain badly needed railroad cars." This request I forwarded to the Interstate Commerce Commission who replied by letter of April 6, with the following statement:

> The ownership of plain boxcars as of January 1, 1962, was 609,487. As of January 1, 1965, the ownership was 508,713, a loss of 100,774 plain boxcars. Currently the boxcar shortage is critical in all areas of the country. The latest reported average daily shortage is 5,392 cars.
>
> There are many factors which have aggravated the current car situation. The floods of December 1964 and January 1965 along the west coast caused much damage both to industry and the railroads. It will take many more months before all of the right-of-way damage can be repaired. The unusual circumstances of having a lengthy work stoppage at the Atlantic and the gulf ports, which immobilized thousands of cars, plus severe weather conditions, which disrupted train operations as well as switching operations in many terminals, played a major role in the present situation. It is believed that the traffic pattern has been so disrupted that it will take some time to return to normal.
>
> There is a backlog of grain to be moved not only for export but from country to terminal elevators. For the next sixty days the carriers will be hard pressed to furnish the desired railroad equipment to move this backlog of grain. The winter wheat harvest begins in Texas shortly after the middle of May, and the demands for cars will continue to grow. The lumber interests in the Pacific Northwest have been complaining bitterly about insufficient boxcars to meet their requirements.

I have extensive additional correspondence from my district. The Washington Public Ports Association says in a letter of March 21 of this year:

> We strongly endorse S. B. 1098 and hope that it will be approved to provide a long-range solution to the boxcar shortage problem.

The National Forest Products Association is strongly supporting S. 1098, and the Utilities and Transportation Commission of the State of Washington has repeatedly urged passage of this bill. Farm implement distributors have recommended the passage of this bill.

Since my district is a shipper of wheat and a shipper of lumber and because it is a district that does not depend upon defense contracts, but upon the economy of its own natural resources and commerce, I am urging on behalf of its continued economic well-being that Senate bill 1098 be passed today.

And again, I wish to express my deepest appreciation to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for his assistance.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, this body is today dealing with a situation which has been termed a national crisis. The freight car bill was passed by the other body of this Congress without opposition if I recall correctly, on June the 30th of last year. Until that time, this crisis had been building up for many years. Certain railroads found they had too few cars to meet the demand of their customers. Investigations showed that too few new cars were being produced each year. We were also informed that car usage was very inefficient. Some railroads took what steps they could; some modernized and increased their efficiency. Others, altogether too many others, tried to ignore the building crisis. These railroads were continually receiving cars from other lines—they found it very easy and cheap to use the cars owned by other lines while paying a ridiculously low per diem rate on very expensive boxcars. Railroads, such as the Northern Pacific, Great Northern, and Milwaukee which run through Montana, were continually losing more cars than they could afford to build. The industry itself was so divided that it was unable to deal with the situation through its own organization. Some roads were profiting so greatly from the status quo and others were losing so heavily that the entire industry was hamstrung. The Nation was losing 20,000 boxcars per year.

So the Congress has begun to take action. In the beginning it was to save the industry—or rather to save those parts of the industry which were unable to rectify the situation alone. Of course, complaints were heard from various shipping customers that something must be done quickly or a great shortage would occur which would have national implications. These farsighted people drew our attention to the obvious fact that the industry was unable to act and that it will continue to be unable to act until some economic stimulation is given it to return these borrowed cars, to begin an expanded boxcar construction program, and to continue full speed with its modernization program.

Well, the words of these wise people did not sink in. Some continued to state that the industry should solve its own problems. Others maintained that the Interstate Commerce Commission had the power to deal with the shortage. Both groups were quickly proven wrong.

Last winter this came to a head. First, we heard from the lumber people; in quick succession we heard from ranchers and farmers. The chorus grew. I received telegrams and letters from paper companies, merchants, bankers, automobile and farm equipment dealers, mining interests, exporters, and ocean shippers; all manner of commercial interests were losing money and sales. Crops began to build up in the warehouses. Deliveries could not be made, contracts were in danger of being canceled. All because of this boxcar shortage which we today have the opportunity to alleviate.

The ICC than slowly began to act. They issued boxcar orders and directives. They warned the industry that violators would be prosecuted. And yet, that all-important economic stimulus was lacking—no change was made in the per diem rates. The ICC questioned whether it had this power; another reason we must pass this bill today.

The crisis continued. On March 14 I was informed that the St. Regis Lumber Co. in the northwest part of my State would be forced to shut down because of the complete absence of any railroad boxcars. This company's supply, along with the supplies of the many other shippers in this area, had been dwindling, with seasonal fluctuations, for several years. This shutdown, just 2 months ago, threw 1,386 men out of work. I was quickly notified that other small plants were in the same position. The situation had become intolerable. When men are thrown out of work like this, each and every one of us here in this Congress knows that somehow we have failed, somehow we have not pressed our point hard enough, somehow we have not impressed this stubborn industry or the tardy regulatory agency with the seriousness of the crisis. Unemployment is the one fact of life that will permit no excuses. In my mind, the crisis had become a national disaster.

Finally the ICC moved. Looking fearfully over its shoulder at the powerful Eastern railroads, the Commission issued special orders to have cars delivered to this area where unemployment was rearing its ugly head. But this affected only the lumber concerns in one section of the crisis area, and the shortage continued to grow, particularly in the wheat areas. On March 15 and 16, one of the best prepared pieces of lobbying, and I use that term in its finest connotation, was conducted by a small delegation from the Northwest States representing every segment of the grain industry. Several Members of both Houses of this Congress called in the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission to hear these petitioners. The Commission met and issued an exclusion order, temporarily solving the shortrun crisis.

Today this body has the opportunity to take the first step toward solving the longrun difficulty. If we do not take this step, this shortage could easily become a seasonal disaster. Just like the monsoons in the Far East, each year we will have to brace ourselves for the loss of income and the unemployment which will most certainly occur. I must emphasize that this is only the first step. The danger that faces us is so great and so obvious that a Member of the other House, who is well known for his opposition to Federal intervention in any sphere of private industry, suggested that the Government might have to run the industry itself if the railroads did not fix their own wagon and do so quickly. Today we are being gentle with the industry. We are taking a small step by giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to raise the per diem rates. I hope that they are not hesitant in using this carrot to induce the railroads to return boxcars to the owners. If this solution is found to be too weak or unworkable, other stronger action will be proposed.

The Commission realizes the seriousness of this boxcar shortage. I believe they will use the tool which we can give them if we pass this bill today. The implications for national defense and economic health are too overriding for this body to ignore any longer. The point of the moment is that we must act, and we must act today.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I support passage of S. 1098 which provides an opportunity to alleviate a serious and chronic national freight car shortage.

The purpose of this legislation is to grant the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to prescribe per diem charges for the use of railroad freight cars on a basis that will encourage railroads having a deficit in car ownership to acquire and maintain their proportional share of freight cars required to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

This bill will give the ICC authorization to fix car rental rates so as to encourage the prompt return of freight cars and encourage the purchase of new cars so our national car fleet can meet the demands of the economy.

In a few weeks the wheat harvest will begin in Texas; it will move into Oklahoma; and shortly, thereafter, into my State of Kansas. Now we have no water transportation in Kansas and so we must rely on railroads and trucks to move the grain. Almost without exception every country elevator is located upon a railroad right-of-way.

A few days ago I discussed with ICC car service staff members the present freight car situation even before harvest begins. It is clear that this shortage no longer is confined to the harvest months. It is a national problem. There has not been a day this year that a shortage of cars has not been reported. It has been as high as 13,000 cars short a day. As of a week ago, the ICC reports indicated that we were 9,200 cars short daily. Another report will be released on Friday, May 13.

We are going to enter the harvest period this year with a shortage which can only grow worse. Farmers and elevator operators are concerned that grain will have to go on the ground.

It is likely that we will see the soybean and corn harvest begin in September and October and the wheat still will not have been completely moved.

The Commodity Credit Corporation continues to issue relocation orders for shipment of grain under the food-for-peace program to port areas.

For many years we have seen efforts to resolve this serious problem on a voluntary basis. I know that many Members of Congress, including myself, have worked closely with the railroads, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other interested organizations in the hope that the problems could be resolved. It is apparent, however, that a legislative remedy is necessary.

This bill, S. 1098, will help alleviate this recurring national shortage of railroad freight cars. It also presents a further opportunity for the railroads to work out this problem on their own.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "In fixing the compensation to be paid for the use of freight cars, the Commission shall give consideration to the level of freight car ownership and to other factors affecting the adequacy of the national freight car supply and shall, on the basis of such consideration, determine whether compensation should be computed on the basis of elements of ownership expense involved in owning and maintaining freight cars, including a fair return on value (which return shall be fixed at such level as in the Commission's judgment will encourage the acquisition and maintenance of an adequate freight car fleet), or should be computed on the basis of elements reflecting the value of use of freight cars, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as in the Commission's judgment will provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense. In the consideration of any element included in determinations pursuant to this paragraph as an incentive to car acquisition and maintenance the Commission is empowered to make such element, or any part thereof, inapplicable: (1) to carriers determined by the Commission as owning an adequate number of freight cars to meet their responsibilities to the needs of commerce and the national defense; (2) to carriers which terminate a substantially higher percentage of interline traffic than they originate; (3) to types of freight cars the supply of which the Commission finds to be adequate; and (4) to such other cases or circumstances as the Commission finds to be in the public interest."

Mr. STAGGERS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be printed in the Record and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In fixing such compensation to be paid for the use of any type of freight car, the Commission shall give consideration to the national level of ownership of such type of freight car and to other factors affecting the adequacy of the national freight car supply, and shall, on the basis of such consideration, determine whether compensation should be computed solely on the basis of elements of ownership expense involved in owning and maintaining such type of freight car, including a fair return on value, or whether such compensation should be increased by such incentive element or elements of compensation as in the Commission's judgment will provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners, contribute to sound car service practices (including efficient utilization and distribution of cars), and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense. The Commission shall not make any incentive element applicable to any type of freight car the supply of which the Commission finds to be adequate and may exempt from the compensation to be paid by any group of carriers such incentive element or elements if the Commission finds it to be in the national interest."

Sec. 2. Any compensation fixed pursuant to the amendment made to the Interstate Commerce Act by the first section of this Act shall not take effect before September 1, 1966.

Mr. YOUNGER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the Record and be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KORNEGAY

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 96]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Baring
Bingham
Bolton
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Chelf
Clevenger
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Dow
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Flood
Fogarty
Fraser
Griffin
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Howard

Hutchinson
Jacobs
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kelly
King, Utah
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McVicker
Mailliard
Mathias
Michel
Mink
Minshall
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murray
Nix
Olsen, Mont.
Poage
Powell
Pucinski
Quillen
Race
Resnick
Rodino
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Scheuer
Scott
Senner
Shriver
Stafford
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Toll
Tupper
Vivian
Watkins
Watson
White, Idaho
Whitten
Williams
Willis

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, S. 1098, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 339 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KORNEGAY

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KORNEGAY: Amend by adding after the words "to be paid by" in line 24, page 3, the words "and payable to", so that the last sentence of section 1 of the reported bill will read as follows:

"The Commission shall not make any incentive element applicable to any type of freight car the supply of which the Commission finds to be adequate and may exempt from the compensation to be paid by and payable to any group of carriers such incentive element or elements if the Commission finds it to be in the national interest."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to say with reference to my amendment that it was not brought up nor was it discussed, nor was it considered during the committee's deliberation on this bill.

It was only after the bill was reported out of the committee that this question came to the attention of several Members of the House.

I offer this amendment so as to remove an inequity which is plain on the face of the bill and which could work a substantial injustice upon the railroads in my section of the country and perhaps elsewhere.

The last sentence of section 1 of the committee version, unless amended, will permit a great discrimination.

Addition of the words "and payable to" after the words "to be paid by" in the last sentence of section 1 of S. 1098, as amended by the House committee, would have the effect of making per diem reciprocal, so that railroad A, for example, would have to pay railroad B at the same rate as railroad B pays railroad A. Without this addition, the Commission could use the per diem rate as a means of taking money from one road and giving it to another, even where both roads had the same number of cars and used each other's cars to the same extent.

This could happen unintentionally. For example, the Commission could establish a per diem rate that included an incentive element, and then exempt eastern roads from the incentive element. A western road that seldom used eastern cars would be in about the same position—relatively to eastern roads—as if there were no incentive element, but a southern road that had an even interchange of cars with an eastern road would find that instead of the per diem payments and receipts balancing, there would be a net payment in favor of the eastern road. Considering the number of cars involved, a nonreciprocal element of only a dollar or two per car could easily cost southern roads millions of dollars per year.

I propose simply that if the Commission should exempt a carrier or a group of carriers from the obligation to pay the incentive element or elements, such exempted carrier or group of carriers also will not be entitled to receive payment of the incentive element or elements set by the Commission. My amendment will take care of this and will prevent an injustice which otherwise will result.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], for his fairness, understanding, and the cooperation of the entire committee, because we have been working on this type of bill for about 5 or 6 years. Personally, I do not believe that we will correct the problem by legislation. However, I think the Kornegay amendment is very much needed. It is a very fair and simple amendment.

For example, if railroad A is exempted under this bill, and they have 10 freight cars belonging to railroad B they do not have to pay one penny for holding these cars for an excessive length of time.

But if railroad B has 10 cars belonging to railroad A, they have to pay the holding charge. In other words, A will collect under this bill, but they do not have to pay. That is how simple this amendment is. It is to make it clear and simple, that if a railroad is not obligated to pay the charges provided in this bill, then they cannot collect any such charges from any other railroad.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain it again?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, if railroad A has 10 cars belonging to railroad B, and railroad A is exempt under this bill, it does not have to pay one penny to railroad B. On the other hand, if railroad B has 10 cars on railroad A, it has to pay railroad A, although it cannot collect from that railroad.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Chairman, in fact, does not this amendment simply state, or make it possible, that all railroads will be treated fairly and equitably as far as the per diem is concerned?

It goes further, I would say, with the amendment to this bill. It would keep the ICC from showing preference to one railroad over another under certain financial difficulties they may have.

I associate myself with the gentleman, and I will vote for the Kornegay amendment.

Mr. FRIEDEL. It is a very good amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

At this time I read part of a letter which I have from the Interstate Commerce Commission in reply to this very question:

This is in response to your request for the Commission's views on the effect of a suggested amendment to S. 1098, an act "to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply."

The letter then gives the amendment, as given by our colleague from North Carolina on the floor today. This is the reply from the Commission:

In our judgment, the proposed amendment might well tend to defeat the purpose of the bill: to encourage the production of more freight cars and to improve car utilization. Under the measure reported by your Committee, the Commission would be authorized to exempt from the compensation to be paid by any group of carriers the incentive element if the Commission finds such exemption to be in the national interest. The amendment, however, appears to provide that any group of carriers so exempted by the Commission from paying an incentive element would also be precluded from receiving an incentive element. In effect, therefore, every exempted carrier would be completely removed from the purview of S. 1098.

Until we have had an opportunity to hold hearings under S. 1098, the Commission will not be in a position to determine whether a carrier made exempt from paying the incentive element should also be precluded from receiving it. Valid reasons may warrant a carrier being made exempt from paying an incentive element and yet remain entitled to receive an incentive element for its own cars. This may be because of the carrier's contribution to the freight car fleet, the type carrier involved, or other considerations which may be developed during the hearings.

We also observe that the incentive element is intended not only to encourage carriers owning an inadequate supply of cars to build more cars, but also to provide those carriers owning an adequate supply a sufficient return to encourage them to continue to build more cars. Under the suggested proposed amendment, however, it would appear that a carrier exempted from paying the incentive element because it has an adequate supply of cars, would also be precluded from receiving the incentive element necessary to encourage it to contribute to the freight car supply.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. TUCKER,
Acting Chairman, Committee on Legislation.

I think this is a sufficient answer to the amendment. It would certainly subvert the intent of this bill. I hope the committee will vote it down.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, some people came to talk to me about this amendment last Monday. They interpreted the amendmend for me. I was rather inclined to agree at that time that there was merit in the amendment, but I have been trying since then to get what I consider to be an impartial appraisal of the amendment, as to how far it would go and what it would do. Both the minority staff and the majority staff with whom I have consulted admit they are unable to tell exactly what the amendment would do to the bill.

In view of the fact that the committee did not consider the amendment and did not have an opportunity to go into this in great detail, in spite of my feelings on Monday I am quite reluctant. I must reluctantly oppose the amendment, but I feel I have no other alternative at this time, knowing no more than I am able to find out as to the legal effect of the amendment and what it will do.

For that reason I have to state I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I have not heard any statement made with relation to those freight cars which are hired, rather than owned, by particular railroads. There are several companies in the business of renting these cars. What happens in those instances? All I have heard about, as I said a moment ago, are the various railroads which own freight cars.

Can some one enlighten me with respect to that statement?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will make my statement, and perhaps the chairman of the committee will wish to answer the question.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out that in the long, long hearings we have had on this bill the proposed amendment today to my knowledge has not been discussed. It may be a good one, yet I must frankly say I would not feel I would know what I was doing in voting on the amendment.

If the amendment has so much merit, I fail to understand why it should have not been considered in the committee, with more discussion at an earlier time. I feel it is a mistake to bring the amendment to the floor at this point. I have not been thoroughly advised of it.

I am now told that some people have been around to talk to some other people. I do not know who they are. I do not know what the explanation has been. I believe I should know.

I believe our committee should have reviewed it, if the amendment merits attention at this time.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I believe the committee, in this bill, has attempted to give to the ICC a period of time to study this proposal. Incidentally, the bill will not go into effect until September 1, 1966. The bill will give both the Commission and the railroads a period of time to work on these problems.

It may well be that there is some merit to the amendment. At the present time, and certainly on the floor at this late hour, we cannot begin to determine the effects.

For example, it has been mentioned that railroad A and railroad B exchange cars. If railroad C and railroad D also exchange cars, and all the cars are going back and forth through the systems, and we begin to exempt one group and tie the hands of the ICC as to dealing with the total problem, there could be large pools of cars completely tied up so far as the ICC regulation is concerned.

As the gentleman from New York mentioned, in terms of the cars owned by other than railroads, this would "crank in" another factor.

The result, Mr. Chairman, is that this could become a great deterrent to the whole purpose of the bill, which is to provide an incentive for the various railroads to construct cars. This is not a case of simply having another exemption but one where one exemption would automatically partially exempt a second railroad.

I might ask, what would happen, if the second road were exempted to its relationship with a third road?

I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I invite the attention of my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY]. I should like to ask him a question about his amendment.

Before I do so, I must say with all due respect to the Interstate Commerce Commission that the arguments outlined in the letter read by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia do not impress me for this reason: I think that the legislation as it now is, without the Kornegay amendment, is self-defeating if the objective is to induce railroads to buy more freight cars. I am asking my colleague to check me on this to see if I correctly interpret his amendment and understand it. Of course, if I do, I am for it. If I have misunderstood his amendment, then I will back off from supporting it. However, as I understand the amendment, it would provide that if a railroad is granted an exemption from paying this surcharge—granted that exemption by the Interstate Commerce Commission and therefore is permitted to hold cars of another railroad company at length and merely pay the regular rental—it cannot then collect surcharges on its own cars that another railroad is retaining.

Mr. KORNEGAY. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. JONAS. And your amendment would merely say that a railroad A, B, C, X, Y, or Z, or whatever letter you want to give it, cannot have it both ways.

Mr. KORNEGAY. That is exactly right.

Mr. JONAS. If it wants to collect the surcharge on its own cars, then it would have to pay the surcharge on cars it holds. What could be more fair that that? As the gentleman from North Carolina said in his opening remarks, if you leave it the way the committee bill is, there will be an incentive to railroad X, which does not own many cars, to use other railroads' cars and pay the daily rate without buying cars itself. Therefore, you will not reach the very problem that this bill seeks to attack, which is to encourage railroad companies to buy cars.

Mr. KORNEGAY. That is exactly right. It appears to me to be a large loophole in the bill.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I would like to ask my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], a question. There has been a great deal of dust thrown around about railroad C, but as I understand your amendment, it merely says if one group of carriers is given the right to collect the incentive element, then that group of carriers must pay the same amount if they are withholding freight cars. I do not see where this group C our friend from Washington mentioned comes into the picture.

Mr. KORNEGAY. No. I do not see that, either.

Mr. WHITENER. And there is this other speck of dust, if the gentlemen will yield further, about privately owned cars owned by companies who are in the car rental business. This would not enter into the picture, because that type of ownership of cars does not bring the individual or the group which owns them into the term "group of carriers." So you are dealing here between groups of carriers, one group with another group, and not between privately owned or noncarrier owned cars. You are merely trying to bring about a situation of equity which would encourage rather than discourage railroads to build freight cars and not to do what the Interstate Commerce Commission said would happen in the letter to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. KORNEGAY. That is right.

Mr. WHITENER. Thank you.

Mr. JONAS. I wish to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for clearing up what I think was a misunderstanding about what your amendment would do. In view of the explanation, I frankly cannot see why anybody would oppose the amendment, because, as you correctly characterize it, it is a "fairness" amendment and simply provides one railroad or group of railroads cannot have it both ways. If it collects the incentive payment for use of its own cars by another road, it ought to pay a similar charge for cars it uses belonging to another road.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in the Senate version of this bill, it provides on page 2, at line 15:

> In the consideration of any element included in determinations pursuant to this paragraph as an incentive to car acquisition and maintenance the Commission is empowered to make such element, or any part thereof, inapplicable: (1) to carriers determined by

> the Commission as owning an adequate number of freight cars to meet their responsibilities to the needs of commerce and the national defense; (2) to carriers which terminate a substantially higher percentage of interline traffic than they originate; (3) to types of freight cars the supply of which the Commission finds to be adequate; and (4) to such other cases or circumstances as the Commission finds to be in the public interest."

Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that the Senate bill comes closer to accomplishing the objectives of the gentleman from North Carolina than those provisions contained in the House bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to either have the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay], or the chairman of the full committee speak of the differences between the two bills in this respect.

Would the chairman outline the effectiveness of the House version as contrasted with the version of the other body in attacking the problem to which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay], has spoken?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not quite understand the gentleman's question. If the gentleman will repeat the question, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. KEITH. The Senate version makes it appropriate to take into consideration the objectives sought by the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay], as I understand it. If the Kornegay amendment is defeated and if the interests of other railroads, particularly those terminating on the east coast—they are the ones who stand to lose most heavily in this respect—I would hope that when we go to conference the conferees on the part of the House would be ready to accept, perhaps, the Senate version.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I might say to my colleague that he knows that if this bill passes the House and goes to conference, the chairman will be accompanied by the ranking member and other members on that side of the aisle as well as on this side of the aisle. I am only one member. We shall try to work out these problems in conference. However, I could not assure the gentleman or promise him in any way what will take place in that conference. I shall always try to carry out the wishes and the intent of this House as long as I am the chairman of this committee, when we go to conference.

Mr. KEITH. I understand that, Mr. Chairman. I want to congratulate you upon bringing this bill to the floor of the House in an attempt to solve this problem. But it does appear to me that we should be acquainted with the differences in philosophy as between the Senate and the House versions, and I would like to have the gentleman's comment on that.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I might say that all this does to the House version is just sharpens up the objectives and aims as to what the legislation is intended to accomplish and brings it into focus a little bit more. It does give to the ICC the opportunity, after hearings, to exempt certain railroads. This is intended for railroads in the gentleman's area, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. KEITH. The Senate version, it would appear to me, is preferable to the east coast railroads.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say to the gentleman that this was considered in the committee and it was the will of the committee that our amendments be adopted. The legislation came out of the committee with the support of the full committee. I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I believe the will of the committee was worked. Certainly, when we go to conference, that will be a different story.

Mr. KEITH. I hope there will not be more of the same, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I think the gentleman has brought up an important point in connection with going to conference. I just want to impress upon the House this fact—if my amendment is not carried by the House, it cannot be considered in the conference. If it is adopted here, of course, it can be and will be considered by the conference. If as some say, it is not a good amendment, then it can be eliminated there. But unless it does carry here, we have no hope of further consideration of it. I think this is a good amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in not to exceed 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, my very able and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, just referred to the fact that the eastern railroads might lose by this legislation—or at least that was the implication that I got. I think that implication was very unfortunate. Earlier this afternoon during the consideration of the rule, I pointed out that one company alone had indicated they were short 1,000 cars and that they had diverted their products to the extent of 800 carloads to trucks or steamship lines and other means of transportation in order to try to alleviate the situation. Railroads should have had this business.

The fact is that the western railroads and the eastern railroads and all transportation by railroads will benefit greatly by this bill because we will get more cars and there will be more carloads of products shipped from coast to coast so that the eastern and western railroads alike will benefit by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Olson].

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the bill as reported by the committee. I believe it might be helpful to restate the purpose of this bill. That purpose, of course, is to relieve boxcar shortages by returning these cars to the railroads who own them and cannot afford to build new cars because the rate of payment they receive for cars out on other lines is so small that it does not reimburse them for their investment.

I think we should also bear in mind that this is sort of voluntary legislation. If the Interstate Commerce Commission should determine it needs to increase the rate that other roads must pay for cars that do not belong to them and if the roads holding those cars do not like the rates, they may simply choose to return the freight cars and build their own. Or else they may come to the conclusion that they can continue to rent cars that they do not own because it is more advantageous to do so.

I think this is a very simple objective that we are seeking today and it is simple justice that we seek. Certainly, I cannot see how we can make a determination other than to reward a man—or a railroad in this instance—properly for an investment in property.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my asking for additional time was to enable me to point out to the House that, in my view, the Senate bill is preferable to the House version.

My view is that it is only equitable to protect the railroads that qualify under the exceptions provided in the Senate version.

The Senate version states that it, the penalty, will be inapplicable first, to carriers determined by the Commission as owning an adequate number of freight cars to meet their responsibilities to the needs of commerce and the national defense; second, to carriers which terminate a substantially higher percentage of interline traffic than they originate; third, to types of freight cars the supply of which the Commission finds to be adequate; and fourth, to such other cases or circumstances as the Commission finds to be in the public interest.

I think that those provisions are in the public interest, and I hope that in the final analysis the bill will reflect more clearly the Senate philosophy than that of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate so much the interest that the committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] has given to this very critical problem of an adequate supply of boxcars in this country. This is one of the great problems confronting industry in our area in recent days. I am told by the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission that the same is true throughout the Nation.

It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] is merely an amendment to bring about equity in the treatment of railroads in the handling of the payment of charges for the use of freight cars. Certainly the Commission should be required by law to see that a railroad necessarily or unnecessarily keeping a car of another line for an undue length of time has to pay to that line on the same basis that the line which owned the car woud have to pay to the other line in the event of its withholding the car from use. It is mere equity and fair play, and I certainly hope that the amendment of my friend will be approved by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY]. I feel somewhat as does the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. I have serious doubts that this legislation will accomplish the purpose for which it is designed. But if this bill is going to pass, it seems to me that the amendment offered by Mr. KORNEGAY is a fair amendment. It is an equitable one.

It is hard for me to appreciate the fact that one could be exempt from paying, and yet have the privilege of charging others.

At this point I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] for any further comments he wishes to make.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman a great deal for yielding the balance of his time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to reiterate that the only purpose of my amendment, and the only reason I offered it, was to try to correct what appears to me to be an oversight in this bill. We had short hearings on the bill. The entire section was voted on, as I recall, unanimously in the committee. It was only after the bill got out of the committee that it really got a great deal of public attention, and that folks who are probably more expert in this type of thing than we on the committee are could look at it, judge it, and see what is really needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I emphasize again I think it is very unwise to make such a technical change in a very complex bill on the floor in this type of debate.

As to what this can do, for example, this could prevent use of the exemption entirely. The ICC might wish to exempt the one line because of its particular financial problems, which is what the gentleman has mentioned. Yet, there is another line that has a great deal of exchange with the first road, that the ICC does not feel should have an exemption. By hooking these together, there is a daisy chain effect and nothing would be done. This amendment can reach into many areas where it may not be wanted or may not be in the national interest.

For example, there may be a particular line receiving from an exempt line, but, because of its particular shipping requirements it has to ship into a nonexempt line. It might be caught in a nutcracker operation, where it would not be able to collect from an exempt line, and yet be in an operation where it would have to pay surcharges on cars it is using.

I think these things can be examined in further hearings, and this committee can produce what the effects of this will be in terms of car interchanges and competing and conforming lines and lines that would be hooked together. Then we could consider it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have had this matter explained to me before today. It has been explained by those who are proponents of this amendment, exactly as the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] have explained it to me.

In talking with my staff, I do not receive that result. I do not get the same interpretations. I am not saying anyone is not telling the truth about this, but as a lawyer I have read this amendment through and I have a great deal of difficulty in coming to a conclusion as to exactly what these words do mean.

The staff on both the majority and minority have come to the same conclusion: They cannot tell what the effect of this is going to be.

It seems to me to be extremely dangerous to take an amendment and bring it here unless we know positively at this time what the effect of this amendment is going to be. It is only for this reason that I object to the amendment. I hope it will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I say to the good gentleman from Illinois that all my amendment does is add "and payable to," so that the bill on line 24, page 3, says simply that the Commission "may exempt from the compensation to be paid by," and there I insert the words "and payable to," which merely makes it a two-way street.

It says that if they are going to receive exemptions from having to pay, the exemption should extend to receiving also.

Also I point out to the membership that there is the all-powerful phrase at the conclusion of this section which says, "if the Commission finds it to be in the national interest," conferring upon the Commission broad discretion and broad authority.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the membership will support this amendment, so that it can be preserved and considered by the conference. If it is not a good amendment, and if it does not do what I say it does, then we can get rid of it in conference. Otherwise this golden opportunity will be lost forever.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] to close debate.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The author of the amendment is a valuable and conscientious member of our committee, and I am sure he offered the amendment in good faith.

However, to me this is just another indication of what has been going on—not through the gentleman—for 40 years, among the railroads; of their inability to reach some understanding.

I communicated with the railroads time after time, urging them to reach a solution but the railroads themselves will not get together. Congress, therefore, must do it.

The committee has studied this problem. We have gone over it for many years. The committee has had great deliberations. We have had bills since 1947 and hearings on them. We were not able to bring it to the floor because of the railroad disunity.

The Senate has passed two similar bills, but we could not get them passed on this side.

The time has come now for Congress to accept its responsibility. Like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] said, our staff does not know the complete implications of the amendment, and the ICC says it is not a thing to be put into the bill.

I believe the amendment should be turned down and that we should pass the bill, to get started. If it does not work properly, the committee can always keep sight of it and see what is going on and try to correct anything that is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, S. 1098 has long had my strong support and I rise today to join my colleagues in urging overwhelming approval of this bill. I hope the President will sign it into law right away.

S. 1098 will stimulate boxcar construction and availability but the car shortage is so severe and has persisted for so long, that many of us think additional stimulation will be needed to bring prompt and effective relief.

It is time for congressional action which would provide a realistic and lasting solution to the unnecessary, needless shortage of boxcars.

The investment tax credit has existed for only a few years but it has demonstrated that it is a very effective spur and incentive to the construction of new freight cars. Even so, the problem has reached emergency proportions.

I have been in touch with interested people all over the United States to seek their views on legislation which would provide further investment tax credit for this purpose. The response has been positive and enthusiastic.

My proposal—which is now being drafted—would enlarge upon the present tried and proven program of investment tax credit and reduction of income tax liability. Under existing law the 7-percent investment credit for tax purposes is limited to $25,000, plus 25 percent of total tax liability over that amount. Unused credit can be carried back for 3 years and carried forward 5 years. My proposal would increase the limitation on the investment credit to 50 percent of tax liability, and permit a 7-year carry forward of the unused investment credit on multipurpose boxcars.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to create an atmosphere which would encourage those who are willing to help themselves. My bill will be designed to just that.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KORNEGAY) there were—ayes 36, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 1098) to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 830, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 306, nays 27, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—306

Abbitt
Adair
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gibbons
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Huot
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pirnie
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Philbin
Pike
Poff
St Germain
St. Onge
Shipley
Watts
Wolff
Wydler

NAYS—27

Bates
Boland
Burke
Carey
Daddario
Donohue
Dorn
Gallagher
Giaimo
Grabowski
Grover
Irwin
Keith
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Martin, Mass.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger

NOT VOTING—100

Abernethy
Addabbo
Ashbrook
Baring
Barrett
Bingham
Brademas
Burleson
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Dow
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Flood
Fogarty
Fraser
Gettys
Gilbert
Griffin
Halleck
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Mo.
Kelly
King, Utah
Leggett
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Michel
Mink
Minshall
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
Olsen, Mont.
Poage
Quillen
Race
Resnick
Rodino
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Schisler
Scott
Shriver
Stafford
Sullivan
Taylor
Todd
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Vigorito
Vivian
Watkins
White, Idaho
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Moss with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Corbett.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Toll with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. McVicker with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Vivian with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Race with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Harvey.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. Hanna with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Todd with Mr. White of Idaho.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Craley.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. BOLAND and Mr. CAREY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO LEND EQUIPMENT AND PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION AND SERVICES TO BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA IN CONNECTION WITH 12TH WORLD JAMBOREE AND CONFERENCE OF BOY SCOUTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12270) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the Twelfth World Jamboree and Conference of Boy Scouts to be held in the United States of America in 1967, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12270

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, for the use and accommodation of the approximately twenty-five thousand Scouts, Scouters and officials who are to attend the World Jamboree, Boy Scouts, to be held at Farragut State Park, Idaho, and five hundred Scouters who are to attend the World Conference of Scout Associations in Seattle, Washington, following the Jamboree, in July and August 1967, such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful, to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide, without expense to the United States Government, transportation from the United States military commands overseas, and return, on surface and other transportation facilities of the armed services for (1) those Boy Scouts, Scouters, and officials certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, at the jamboree referred to in the first section of this Act; (2) those Boy Scouts and leaders of other nations who are certified by the Boy Scouts of America as being official representatives to the world jamboree and world conference; and (3) the equipment and property of such Boy Scouts, Scouters, and officials and the property loaned to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to this Act; to the extent that such transportation will not interfere with the requirements of military operations.

(b) Before furnishing any transportation under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall take from the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, a good and sufficient bond for the reimbursement to the United States by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, of the actual costs of transportation furnished under this section.

SEC. 3. Amounts paid to the United States to reimburse it for expenses incurred under the first section and for the actual cost of transportation furnished under section 2 shall be credited to the current applicable appropriations or funds to which such expenses and costs were charged and shall be available for the same purposes as such appropriations or funds.

SEC. 4. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, no fee shall be collected for the application for a visa by or the issuance of a visa to any Boy Scout, Scouter, or official who is certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing a Scout association from another nation at the jamboree and world conference referred to in the first section of this Act. Further, the import and export of documents and paraphernalia needed by conference and jamboree delegates and representatives at said world conference and world jamboree will be guaranteed free entry and departure regardless of nationality.

SEC. 5. Each department of the Federal Government is hereby authorized under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary thereof to assist the Boy Scouts of America in the carrying out and the fulfillment of the plans for the encampment and conference referred to in sections 1, 2, and 4 of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 7, delete the word "who" and insert "whose associations."

On page 4, line 6, delete the word "who" and insert "whose associations."

On page 4, line 7, delete the words "a Scout association from."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the Twelfth Boy Scouts World Jamboree and Twenty-first Boy Scouts World Conference to be held in the United States of America in 1967, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12270 and make the following statement as a Scout and Scouter of 46 years continuous service:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the 12th Boy Scouts World Jamboree and 21st Boy Scouts World Conference to be held in the United States in 1967.

AMENDMENTS

The amendments made by the committee would provide that in the case of foreign representatives the certification required of the Boy Scouts of America would be of Scout associations rather than of individuals. The title was amended to more clearly describe the functions to be supported.

FISCAL DATA

The bill provides the Boy Scouts of America are to pay the cost of delivery and return of equipment and replacement and repair as necessary and are to pay the cost of transportation furnished. There will be some nonreimbursable services and some administrative costs which will be nominal and which can be absorbed within the operating budgets of the military installations concerned.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense interposes no objection to passage of the legislation.

COMMITTEE POSITION

The Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, unanimously approved H.R. 12270 and recommends its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge passage.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 12270.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 16

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the rest of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, Mr. Speaker, we have finished the legislative business for this week. The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There are nine suspensions as follows:

S. 693, Foreign Agents Registration Act Amendments;

H.R. 12676, temporary suspension of duty on certain forms of copper;

H.R. 14347, to liberalize dependency and indemnity compensation payments to parents and children of veterans;

H.R. 13313, concerning admission fees at Corps of Engineers reservoirs;

H.R. 7402, providing for the establishment of the Chamizal Treaty National Memorial, El Paso, Tex.;

H.R. 11775, providing for the popular election of the Governor of Guam;

H.R. 11777, providing for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 13277, providing for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands; and

H.R. 13298, authorizing the Legislature of Guam to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts.

We also have on Monday, H.R. 14544, Participation Sales Act of 1966, with an open rule and 4 hours of debate. We hope to adopt the rule and finish general debate on that bill on Monday, possibly.

Tuesday and the balance of the week: Tuesday is Private Calendar Day. H.R. 14544, Participation Sales Act of 1966, to conclude consideration.

H.R. 13712, minimum wage bill. Open rule with 4 hours of debate.

This, of course, is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

I advise Members that we expect to be very busy on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. We hope to dispose of the business before a number of Members will make an annual trip to New York City on Thursday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader answer this question: You hope to conclude the general debate on Monday on the Participation Sales Act, but you would go no further than the general debate at any cost on Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes. That is right. If we finish general debate, we will be very pleased. In no event would we begin the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule on Monday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, we are going to finish the minimum wage bill on Wednesday before we adjourn.

Mr. ALBERT. May I further advise Members of the House—and I have discussed this with the distinguished minority leader—depending on how we are getting along, we might very well like to come in early on Tuesday and/or Wednesday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I can assure the gentleman from Oklahoma that we will cooperate as much as we possibly can in trying to get this scheduled business done by Wednesday night of next week.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the gentleman's cooperation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. As I understand it, then, you expect to have a vote on the Participation Sales Act on Tuesday of next week, a record vote.

Mr. ALBERT. We hope to have a vote on it by Tuesday, and we hope to get started on the minimum wage bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Then we can advise our membership that there is a real possibility of a vote on Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes. Probability, I would say. Yes.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Tuesday is the Pennsylvania primary day. I think it would be most unfortunate if we started early on Tuesday and had to vote early, because while I have already voted in Pennsylvania by absentee ballot and it does not bother me at all, there may be a number of our delegation who will want to get back in time to vote.

If a vote is held at 10 or 11 o'clock, or something like that, then they would be prevented from being recorded.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would not think there would be any vote at 10 or 11 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. KUNKEL. The gentleman from Oklahoma said that you were going to try to come in early.

Mr. ALBERT. We might, depending upon how we are getting along. However, we would not come in early if we were near to a vote the first thing on Tuesday on the Participation Sales Act, because under the arrangement which we have already discussed with the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, we have told him that we would not consider the bill under the 5-minute rule on Monday.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my only thought in bringing this up was to protect the Pennsylvania Members who are going back to vote in the election.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate that, and of course we want to cooperate insofar as we can.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] has just advised me that for those Members who are not going to New York City, the Canadian Inter-Parliamentary Meeting will be held in Washington on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of next week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE FARMER IS NOT GUILTY

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, everyone wants to contribute to the effort to control inflation. No doubt about it, the increase in the cost of living operates as a new burden upon the consumer.

But there has been far too much talk lately that it is the farmers' prices that cause inflation. Nothing could be further from the truth. Such a charge is absolutely false. There may have been an increase in a few commodities but the parity ratio is at only 82 percent. The average income of persons on farms is less than two-thirds of the people of nonfarm population. We should remember the fact that farmers constitute only 7 percent of the population. Yet—make special note of this—they receive only 2.9 percent of the Nation's income.

Then how in the world, under such circumstances could farm prices be inflationary? The real truth of the matter is that until such time as the goal of complete parity is reached, farmers are entitled to some justified price increases. To make it even more emphatic, so long as farmers are faced with their own increased production costs, farm price advances are necessary just for the farmer to stand still.

It is difficult to see how any person committed to good logic and clear thinking could oppose increased farm income, if they reflect for just a few seconds on the terrible consequences of low farmer income.

Parity is a realistic, obtainable, and necessary objective. I get so tired of those who would try to array or deploy the consumer against the farmer. In the long run parity will benefit consumers just as well as farmers, because it will insure an adequate supply of food and stabilize food prices.

The shortsightedness of some recent comment originating with the Council of Economic Advisers underscores the tragedy of any effort to reduce parity. Everyone in rural America will suffer from a lack of adequate farm income. Of course, the farmer suffers first, but then the merchants and the professional people and everyone in communities situated in agricultural areas that depends upon farm income.

Those of us who represent rural areas sometimes wonder whether our rural citizens have been included as a part of the Great Society. Finding little or no consideration for themselves as farmers, many are leaving the countryside to try to improve themselves. I think the time has come for Members of Congress to say that if our Nation can afford to implement some of the new programs, including the poverty program which we passed in the last session of the Congress, then we can afford to maintain budgets adequate for the programs needed to raise the income of farm families to levels comparable to families in urban areas.

Those of us in the Congress, whether we represent a rural area, a suburban area, or an urban area, should soundly reject the philosophy apparently advanced by the Bureau of the Budget and seemingly supported by the Council of Economic Advisers which will continue to drive farmers into the cities to compete for jobs that, in many cases, may not be there because of a lack of training or skills. To cut back funds for farm commodity programs, including conservation, research, and the school lunch and milk programs, is not only without justification, but such proposals are so shortsighted they should not be confused with true economy obtained by reduction of expenditures for nonessentials. To shortchange such vitally needed programs is only false or fallacious economy.

Farmers and all the friends of farmers, including Representatives and Senators in the Congress, should resent the recent effort to freeze or roll back farm prices, which were already below parity. Farmers are still getting paid 15 or 20 percent less than equitable prices. Let us be fair; let us be equitable. The farmer is getting only 82 percent of parity on the average of his production. With such a figure as a solid foundation of fact it is little wonder that there is resentment against the present effort to blame our inflationary trend upon the farmer.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching a historic era in the annals of U.S. relations with Europe.

The President has sent to Congress his long-awaited message and proposed legislation on trade with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

It was my privilege to visit several countries in Eastern Europe in the past year and I can testify that the great majority of the peoples of these countries want above all else the opportunity to live in peace, and to achieve a better life for themselves and their families.

As their knowledge of life in the West has increased over the past decade because of a multiplication of contacts, these peoples have put pressure on their regimes to better the lot of the average man.

Until recently, the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe have fed their people chiefly with promises. The great sacrifices extracted from the population were to be temporary, the governments told them, but were necessary to insure the inevitable success of the Stalinist economic model.

Today we need only read the press or listen to the radio reports from East European countries to learn that one by one they are being forced to face up to the failures of their system.

As a result, changes are occurring within their economies.

There is a shift toward more incentives, an emphasis on salability and a greater ability of consumers to be choosy about the quality of the goods they are asked to buy.

While these trends do not indicate that Eastern Europe is about to adopt free enterprise "capitalism," they do portend that economic power—once held by central authorities—is being decentralized.

This has implications for the political climate in Eastern Europe.

No basic change has yet taken place in the Communist systems of government in Eastern Europe. The same people are still in the saddle.

Their ties with Moscow continue strong for obvious reasons, among them the instinct for self-preservation.

Eastern Europe is still under the domination of communism—but a communism which is changing, adapting and in a sense, becoming somewhat "humanized."

These were the trends which I noted last July in my visits to Poland and Czechoslovakia. In my report to the House of Representatives upon my return I said:

> The time appears to be ripe for "building bridges" in Eastern Europe.

The bill which the President now asks us to consider is the framework for these bridges.

Mr. Speaker, the countries of Eastern Europe are small. Their economies cannot support simultaneous production of armaments and consumer goods both on an increasing scale.

Last year, for example, the Rumanians reduced compulsory military service from 24 to 16 months and also are believed to have reduced the size of their army from 240,000 to 200,000 men—apparently without prior consultation with Moscow.

The reason behind these military reductions, the Rumanians have said, is the high cost of army maintenance and the fact that 2-years' service kept young men from productive jobs and studies at a time when they were needed in the expanding economy of the nation.

It seems logical, therefore, to encourage such trends.

It behooves us to let the people of Eastern Europe know that we are offering to open this door to a better life for all of them, through more trade in peaceful goods with the United States.

Their rulers then can see that their self-interest and that of their people lies down the path of peaceful trade and economic development, rather than support for futile, expensive attempts to extend Communist rule in Europe by force.

If given this choice, I have no doubt that the people of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe would choose peaceful interchange between East and West.

Under current conditions the pressures of the people on the regimes can be a significant factor in determining government policies. And those policies are going to help shape the future of Europe—and perhaps the world.

That is why President Johnson's message is so important. It is my hope that the Congress will give early and favorable consideration to the East-West Trade Act.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FROM THE CANADIAN-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I sincerely appreciate being invited to the 9th Meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

However, I regret very much that I will be unable to participate as a Delegate. We are having a celebration in Buffalo, New York, at that time in connection with the Polish Millennium, and I am the main speaker at a banquet in honor of my Pastor.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely yours,
T. J. DULSKI.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as a member of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE], to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE PRESIDENCY OF TOGO VISITS U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and the pleasure of announcing to the House that the Honorable Dr. Carlos de Medeiros, Secretary General of the Presidency of Togo, is visiting our Capitol in Washington. Dr. de Medeiros is second in his country only to President Grunitzky and is one of the outstanding physicians in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, we extend to him and to the great President of his country, and to all the people of Togo, our congratulations on 6 years of prosperity and progress since Togo became an independent and sovereign Republic and our best wishes for a future of brilliant accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks an article by the brilliant writer and musician, Philippa Schuyler, that was given me during the delightful visit with the distinguished Secretary General of the Presidency of Togo and with Miss Schuyler, the author of four books on Africa, in my office this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE TOGO SUCCESS STORY

(By Philippa Schuyler)

The Republic of Togo, which has just celebrated the sixth anniversary of its 1960 independence, is a stable West Virginia-sized country in West Africa. Untouched by the recent African coups and crises, it has remained an oasis of democratic individual liberty and free enterprise.

The leadership of President Nicholas Grunitzky, a devout Roman Catholic in his fifties, exemplifies the harmonious racial relations which make Togo outstanding on the African scene.

President Grunitzky, a rugged handsome man with a keen intellectual awareness of international issues, has shown poise and wisdom in handling the delicate relationship with Ghana, while maintaining an intelligent position in world affairs. Togo keeps diplomatic relations with Nationalist China. Throughout the period when its neighbors, Dahomey and Ghana, had Red Chinese Embassies, Togo had, and has a Nationalist Chinese Embassy in its capital, Lomé.

Togo has excellent relations with other African countries, and particularly close ties of friendship with the Ivory Coast and Madagascar. It is a unique laboratory of racial harmony, without friction between the varied tribal groups and the people of mixed ancestry. All the leading political parties are represented in the government.

There are 1,650,000 people in Togo. The main ethnic groups are Ewe, Mina, Kabrai, as well as about 15 smaller tribes. These are of West African Negroid and Sudanic origin. There was also considerable mixture between early Brazilian and Portuguese traders and these Africans, producing families like the de Medeiros and the Olympio groups. Certain other old families of Togo, with British names, such as Lawson, Johnson and Bruce, were descended from freed ex-slaves who were settled on the Togo coast, somewhat as in Sierra Leone.

Togo was a German colony from 1884 till World War I, when it was occupied by French and British troops. Following the war it became a League of Nations Mandate. The area now known as the Republic of Togo, was administered by France as a Mandate and later as a United Nations Trust Territory. British Togo, also a Mandate and Trust Territory, was joined with the Gold Coast in 1957 to form independent Ghana.

The largest organized religion in Togo is the Roman Catholic Church, numbering over 300,000 devout adherents. Various Protestant, animist and Islamic groups also exist. The firm religious Faith of Togo receives inspiring guidance from Archbishop Dosseh and the multi-racial priesthood. About 40% of Togo's budget is spent on education, which is largely carried on by the Catholic school system. Higher education includes several Colleges and the newly-opened Benin University, a branch of the one in Dahomey.

Togo has an exceptionally good climate for foreign investment. A new port is being constructed to facilitate shipping, and mining production is increasing by 20% yearly. Coffee and cocoa, produced on small independent farms in the hands of private ownership, are of the highest grade, and are Togo's chief crops. Copra, palm oil, manioc flour, cotton and peanuts are also grown. The immense surface mines at Hahotoe produce a million tons of phosphate yearly, working with the finest German equipment. Geologists estimate the reserves in the deposit at 50,000,000 tons. There are graphite, lead and gold deposits in the interior of Togo. The Bangéli region, nearly 300 miles inland has a 50 million ton deposit of hematite, and there are huge deposits of chromite in the Mount Ahito area. Various factories are under construction.

To date, much of the foreign investment in Togo has come from France and West Germany. Yet Togo offers magnificent investment possibilities for Americans. The country is completely pro-West. There is no Communist infiltration whatsoever. The climate is mildly tropical, like that of Puerto Rico. Foreign firms making large investments are granted exemption from customs duties and import taxes on equipment needed for the establishment of their plants and on certain raw materials consumed in their operations. Generally speaking, any commercial or industrial company establishing itself in Togo does not pay license or profit taxes during the first five years of its existence. And any already established company that reinvests half its profits, benefits from large proportional tax exemptions.

Besides the protection and tax advantages granted to Government-endorsed and approved industries, the Togo Government gives other assistance to foreign companies wishing to establish enterprises. It helps to make land sites available and to facilitate the installment of electricity and other facilities. Togo signed an investment guarantee with the United States in 1962.

Besides being a favorable location for new industries, Togo has a delightful atmosphere for the tourist. The luxury hotel Le Benin, the excellent beaches, the animal reserves in the north, the spectacular tribal dancing, the Museum of Lomé, and the Castle of Palimé, are among the principal tourist attractions. Togo's capital, Lomé, a city of 100,000 people, is a charming and serene metropolis where many people speak English and German, as well as the chief languages of French, Ewe and Mina.

Thus, the Republic of Togo has many assets. Here, racial tolerance, free enterprise, intellectual development, religious fervency, and political stability, combine to make this democratic country a model among modern African states.

THE 31ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the rural electrification program celebrated its 31st birthday. During those years, the Rural Electrification Administration and its locally owned and controlled rural electric co-op borrowers have written a proud record of achievement in the face of tremendous handicaps which many people believed to be insurmountable when the program was launched in 1935.

At that time, central station electricity in rural areas—when it could be obtained—was definitely in the luxury category. Today, thanks to REA and the rural electric cooperatives, it is taken for granted as a vital and necessary tool for better farming and better living in rural America.

I can think of no other Federal program which has done more to close the gap between rural and urban living and working conditions than rural electrification. Today's rural youths enjoy as a matter of course the same benefits which electricity brings that have accrued to their city-raised counterparts since the late 1800's. This is as it should be. It was one of the reasons why the pioneers in the rural electrification movement worked so long and hard to assure its success. They had the very natural and laudatory desire to provide for their children a better way of life than they had.

I do not wish to burden my distinguished colleagues in the House with the reams of statistics which chart the progress and achievements of the rural electrification program. However, I would like to point out that when REA was created in 1935, only 6.4 percent of the farms in my home State of Missouri had central station electricity. Today, 98.6 percent are electrified.

Missouri's 47 rural electric cooperatives are currently providing dependable electric service to 274,191 farm and other rural consumers. This amazing record has been achieved despite the fact that the rural electric distribution systems serve an average of only 3.1 consumers and realize only $388 in annual revenue per mile of line. By way of comparison, the class A and B utilities in Missouri have a density of 35 consumers and average annual revenues of $8,396 per mile of line.

The dramatic impact which rural electrification has had over the past 31 years is illustrated by the fact that kerosene lamps—once the hated symbol of the second-class citizenship endured by our farmers and rural residents—are now being sold as collectors' items by antique dealers. I might add that most of the kerosene lamps on the market today have been wired for electricity.

Throughout the years, the rural electrification program has been blessed with dedicated and competent REA administrators who have combined the vision and the practicality necessary to translate what was once considered a visionary idea into a sound and workable program. They have not been afraid to meet the challenges which come with our ever-changing times.

Our present REA Administrator, Norman Clapp, has done—and is continuing to do—an exceptionally fine job of administering the rural electric and rural telephone loan programs. His stewardship of the rural electrification program has come at a time when the entire electric utility industry has been undergoing revolutionary technological advances in the fields of generation, transmission, and distribution of electricity.

Administrator Clapp has been conscientious and eminently successful in his efforts to help the rural electric cooperatives move forward with the other segments of the U.S. electric utility industry. He has accomplished this within the framework of the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and the directives regarding generation and transmission loans set forth in recent House and Senate reports on agricultural appropriations bills.

Despite the fact that these directives have opened the door to hostile power companies to challenge the legality of REA loans in the courts, I feel that the record in this area is a tribute to Administrator Clapp's careful and judicious review of REA loan applications. Since he was appointed REA Administrator, early in 1961, he has approved 60 loans to power-type cooperatives for generation and transmission facilities. Of this total of 60 loans, only 10 loans affecting 6 REA borrowers have met with a legal challenge.

In addition, approximately 350 loans for generation or transmission facilities have been made to distribution type borrowers during this period. Only one of these 350 loans has been challenged, and that case was dismissed by the Supreme Court of Texas by agreement of the parties involved.

To date, the validity and legality of those few of Administrator Clapp's generation and transmission loans which have been challenged have been upheld by the courts, which speaks highly of his judgment in approving these loans.

I was very disturbed to learn that the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee has discussed—and presumably is considering—the addition of new and more restrictive directives for the REA Administrator to follow when considering generation and transmission loan applications. As I understand it, these proposals could require the REA Administrator to solicit wholesale power offers from all the investor-owned power companies in a region when considering a loan application from an existing generation and transmission cooperative for necessary expansion of its facilities to meet the increasing power needs of its member rural electric systems.

No useful purpose would be served by such a restrictive requirement. Indeed, it would disrupt the mutually beneficial power supply arrangements and interconnections which have been painstakingly negotiated and established over the years between generation and transmission cooperatives and private power companies in the area.

In Missouri, such a requirement would jeopardize our present sensible and beneficial power supply situation, where the rural electric cooperatives are engaged in fully coordinated operations with the investor-owned companies and are conducting joint planning with them for the power facilities which will be needed in the years ahead. Today, nearly every rural electric distribution cooperative in Missouri is served economically with wholesale power from a generation and transmission, of which the distribution co-op is a member. Each generation and transmission cooperative in our State is interconnected, not only with other generation and transmissions, but with the investor-owned electric companies as well.

The interconnected pool which exists among the companies and the cooperatives accrues to the benefit not only of the rural electric consumers, but to the consumers of the power companies as well. The benefits of shared reserve capacity, of economy exchanges based on load diversity, and of bigger generating units that produce electricity more cheaply, have achieved for all Missouri citizens the lowest cost power which today's technology permits.

This happy situation did not always exist in Missouri. Prior to 1955 landmark decision in the case of Kansas City Power & Light Co. against McKay, the investor-owned companies and the rural electrics were engaged in a long and bitter fight in which philosophical differences rather than sound business considerations of economics and engineering were the dominant factor. The court decision in the Kansas City case affirmed the right of the REA Administrator to make loans under the Rural Electrification Act and held that an investor-owned electric company had no standing in court to challenge a loan made by the REA Administrator. From then on, the investor-owned companies in my State and the rural electric cooperatives have been working together for their mutual benefits and the benefit of all electric consumers.

What we have in Missouri—and I believe the same situation exists in a number of other States today—is a highly satisfactory power supply relationship. A key factor is the strong, effective co-op generation and transmission system. Our Missouri cooperatives are able to approach the bargaining table with other power suppliers in a position of strength. The decisions made there are based on economics and engineering considerations, not on differences of philosophy nor the weakness of any of the bargaining power suppliers.

We in Missouri have been pleased with the way in which Administrator Clapp and his predecessors have administered the Rural Electrification Act, including the making of generation and transmission loans. Our cooperatives and power companies are relying upon REA continuing its lending procedures along the lines of past experience. In fact, there is a plan underway for one of our generation and transmission cooperatives to finance through an REA loan a large mine-mouth generating plant in the center of the State. This plant will eliminate a power deficiency which currently exists in central Missouri, and it will benefit all Missourians who receive electricity through the existing pool.

Today, as in the past, there is a need to husband the resources of the Federal Government, and that need extends to the prudent use of REA loan funds consistent with carrying out the objectives of the rural electrification program in the public interest. I believe the REA Administrator should assure that reasonable alternatives have been carefully considered before a generation and transmission loan is made, and the facility to be financed with a generation and transmission loan will, in fact, result in the lowest cost power. However, it seems to me neither practical nor appropriate for existing power arrangements to be disrupted by a requirement that power supply arrangements be sought in lieu of REA-financed facilities when those alternative approaches would conflict with or alter desirable and reasonable arrangements and contractual agreements already in being.

I understand the need for a careful examination of the practical alternatives to new generation and transmission facilities for which loans are sought by a new generation and transmission. There is also, I believe, a need for careful examination of proposals for REA loans for power facilities which would supplant facilities already in use or which would materially alter an existing power supply arrangement.

However, no good purpose would be served—and great damage could be done—by insistence by the Congress or the REA that existing power supply arrangements be altered or disrupted through changes in power supply relationships which have been patiently developed over a period of years. I would hate to see a resumption or initiation of predatory wars among power suppliers which would inevitably result in higher rates to consumers and a weakening of the rural electrification program.

Regional power planning such as that practiced by all power suppliers in Missouri has been praised by the Federal Power Commission in its recent National Power Survey as the type of arrangement which will insure maximum utilization of participating electric systems and result in lower rates for all consumers. It is in the national interest that the Congress foster rather than hinder this type of cooperation among all types of power suppliers—public, investor-owned and cooperative.

As rural electrification celebrates its 31st birthday, we would do well to reflect upon the many socio-economic benefits it has brought directly to our rural areas and indirectly to the Nation as a whole. The rural electric cooperatives—both distribution and generation and transmission—are an important and integral part of our electrical supply system. Without them, much of rural America would again become the dark land of pre-REA days. None of us want to see that happen. As guardians of the public trust, we have the responsibility of opposing proposals which have the potential for stopping or diminishing the flow of low-cost electricity to our farmers and other rural residents.

GUIDE FOR INFLATION WATCHERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, in a recent address to the 54th annual meeting of the chamber of commerce here in Washington, addressed some very important remarks concerning the subject of inflation. I recommend Chairman Ackley's remarks to the Members on the other side of the aisle who do not seem to be able to determine what is inflation and what is deflation.

There is a clear definition of inflation and a very lucid analysis of the causes of inflation in Mr. Ackley's speech. An attempt to define inflation must consider to what degree we are having too much demand for goods and services or, in other words, how much of a price rise can be termed inflation. I believe that Mr. Ackley carefully analyzed this point. He has told the American public that the Federal Reserve Board has contributed to the rise in prices by making credit more expensive and more difficult for businessmen and consumers to obtain. The conclusion of the Chairman's remarks contain an outline of what American business can do to stop the threatened dangers of inflation:

REMARKS BY GARDNER ACKLEY, CHAIRMAN, COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, ON "THE BUSINESSMAN'S ROLE IN FIGHTING INFLATION," 54TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 2, 1966

Fifteen minutes is a very short time for as big and complicated a subject as inflation. So I'll get right down to business, and try to say a few words about each of four questions:

1. What causes inflation?
2. How much inflation are we having?
3. What is the Government doing?
4. What can business do?

WHAT CAUSES INFLATION?

The classic cause of inflation is too much demand for goods and services: A collective attempt on the part of consumers, businesses, and governments—Federal, State, and local—to buy more goods than the economy is capable of producing when all resources are fully in use. If this condition exists, the only remedy is to reduce demand: by scaling down public expenditures, or by restraining private expenditures, most notably by higher taxes or tighter credit. Our productive capabilities can and do grow; but they cannot increase quickly once all resources are in use.

But how much the economy can produce with full use of its resources is not a completely unambiguous concept. The supplies of available resources are never fully balanced with the structure of demand for products and services. In particular, the supply of labor of various kinds and in various places never exactly balances the demand for labor. Moreover, people are always entering and leaving the labor force, and changing jobs voluntarily. So full employment of labor resources does not mean a zero unemployment rate.

In 1961, the Council set as an "interim target" a 4 percent unemployment rate—as a level that could safely be achieved by measures of demand expansion alone. At that time the Council noted that effective measures to improve the training and mobility of the labor force might safely permit a lower target. It also noted that the degree of inflationary pressures that would be associated with any given unemployment rate depends as well on the extent of internal balance—among economic sectors, industries, and regions—since pockets of intense demand will pull prices up more than pockets of excess supply will push them down.

If, when the over-all unemployment rate reaches 4 percent, it is still 8 percent for large categories of the labor force and 1 percent for others, the inflationary strain will be much greater than if the dispersion around the average is considerably narrower. Likewise, if a 4 percent unemployment rate finds a number of strategic industries operating at well over 100 percent of the capacity of their plant and equipment, while others are at 80 percent, a 4 percent-rate will be far more inflationary than if all industries are operating close to 90 percent.

In fact, we approached and reached a 4% unemployment rate in January of this year with an exceptionally good balance both as among categories of labor, and as among industries and regions. This is mostly, I am sure, because our expansion was prolonged and steady rather than coming in a sudden burst. There was time—and adequate incentive—for industries to tailor their investment to the growth of their demand. As a result, there have been large additions to capacity in just the industries where demand has grown most rapidly. There was time for the labor force to be reallocated—and particularly for the new entrants to allocate themselves—to the regions and industries and firms whose need for labor was expanding most rapidly. And, most important, we began in 1961 to develop, for the first time in our history, an active manpower policy, including significant programs of training and retraining, designed to aid in the preparation and allocation of our labor force.

But the fact that we could reach our 4% interim target without serious strain does not tell us how far below it we can now safely go. Nor does it tell us how fast we can safely penetrate into this territory, unexplored in a dozen years.

It is obvious that the lower the over-all unemployment rate falls, the more frequent will be the instances in which employers in particular industries or regions will experience difficulties in recruiting adequate supplies of particular kinds of labor. On the other hand, we know that there is a large additional supply of workers—more than 1½ million—coming into the labor force this year. And in March, there were still 3 million unemployed, of whom 61% were males, 75% adults, and 86% had held previous full-time jobs. The social gains to be achieved by employing the next ½ million of them will be incalculable. The increment will include a considerable number of Negroes and other relatively disadvantaged groups, whose unemployment rates are still disturbingly high.

But the farther we push down the unemployment rate in the effort to employ more of our labor, the more will be the strains on the supply of particular goods, and the greater the pressure on wage rates for particular kinds of labor. Thus prices tend to edge up as we approach full use of our resources, even before the maximum feasible level of output is reached.

But there is another source of inflation, that can operate even when resources are less than fully used. It arises from the desire and the ability of managements and workers—especially when times are relatively good—to try to increase their shares of the income pie beyond the total pie that's available to be divided. If wages and fringe benefits are generally pushed up faster than labor productivity increases, the labor cost of producing the average unit of output will rise. Unless profits are to be pinched, prices will be pushed up. But equally, if managements try to expand their margins over costs, even when costs are stable, that, too will raise prices. When both try to do it at once then we can have a wage-price spiral, even if the over-all pressure on our productive resources is not excessive.

To the extent that this is the cause of inflation, we can reduce total demand enough so that widespread unemployment and idle capacity create so much competition that the ability of labor and management to push up wages and prices is held in check. Or, we can somehow persuade them to behave more responsibly.

HOW MUCH INFLATION ARE WE HAVING?

For five years, until about the middle of 1965, our price level was more stable than ever before in our history, especially considering that it was a period of steadily rising prosperity. Then, last year, the record was broken. In the last 12 months, wholesale prices are up 4 percent; consumer prices, 2¾ percent.

As everyone knows, the biggest part of the recent increase has been in farm and food prices, due largely to a temporary maladjustment between demand and supply in the farm economy, especially for pork. Now food supply is once again catching up with demand. Farm prices began to turn down in February, and they have edged down a bit more in March and April. Consumer food prices were still rising in March—reflecting the lag from farm to processor to retail store. But retail food prices have stabilized in April, and declines in important food items should be seen during the rest of this year.

This merely confirms what we have been saying for months—that the rise in farm and food prices was largely a temporary affair. All along we have been as much worried about prices for items other than farm products and foods. Wholesale prices for industrial products, after 6 years of absolute stability, have begun to edge upward during the past year. In the last 6 months, they have risen at an annual rate of 2½ percent. Many industrial product prices still decline. But increases are becoming more numerous and decreases fewer.

So far, there has been no serious upward cost push from the side of wages. And we expect no dangerous general wage push during the remainder of 1966. But if consumer prices—and industrial profits—should continue to rise at the recent rate, we would have to expect larger wage increases in 1967, and the dreary price-wage spiral could begin to turn.

WHAT IS GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY?

Government's primary responsibility is to pursue fiscal and monetary policies that will keep total demand for goods and services high enough to promote full use of our productive resources, but not so high as to put excessive pressure on our resources.

The tax cuts of 1962, 1964, and 1965 were designed to raise total demand toward a level that would more fully use our resources. The policy succeeded. The unemployment rate was brought down from more than 7% in early 1961—and from an average of 6% for the 6 years 1958–63—to 3¾% in February and March this year. The use of manufacturing capacity was raised from an average of 78% in early 1961 to 91% at the end of 1965, compared with an average preferred rate of 93%. With the high recent and current rate of investment adding steadily to capacity, the average utilization rate is unlikely to rise much further this year. But the unemployment rate is likely to continue to decline.

With the approach to full use of labor and capital, Government fiscal and monetary policies have now shifted from stimulating demand to restraining it. The Federal Reserve has made credit harder to get and more expensive. The rise of Federal spending other than for Vietnam was held to $0.6 billion in the fiscal 1967 budget, and taxes were modestly increased.

Whether the restraints imposed up to now will be enough remains to be seen. The President has made clear that if Federal expenditures rise significantly beyond his budget—either because of Congressional action or because more is needed for Vietnam—or if private demand rises too fast, he will not hesitate to ask for further fiscal restraint.

The Federal Government is also trying to help break particular supply bottlenecks, by a whole series of measures: release of excess materials from industrial or farm stockpiles, alterations of the pattern of Federal purchases, expediting acquisition of critical equipment or the supply of boxcars, and an intensification of training and other manpower programs.

The President has also requested the cooperation of industry in postponing desirable but not immediately necessary plant and equipment investment, in order to reduce pressures on the machinery and construction industries. He has made the same requests to his own department and agency heads, and to the mayors and governors. The response has been most gratifying.

He has also called repeatedly for moderate and responsible wage and price policies. This brings me to the final question:

WHAT CAN BUSINESS DO?

Business can postpone unnecessary investments.

It can improve its recruiting and utilization of labor, by relaxing unnecessarily rigid or irrelevant hiring standards, by expanded training and retraining efforts, by holding on to workers who would normally retire or bringing back the recently retired, by breaking down jobs or redesigning processes in ways which economize on scare skills, and in many other ways.

It can refrain from scrambling to build up inventories of the few materials in scarce supply.

It can resist pressures for excessive wage increases.

Most of all, it can and must exercise responsible moderation in its pricing policies.

Over the past 5 years we have seen the most sustained growth of profits in any period of our industrial history.

The Government has welcomed and stimulated this growth of profits, and hopes and expects that it can continue. During the time we were moving toward full use of our productive capacity, the rise in profits was the result of spreading overhead, of greater efficiency, of wisely chosen and well-timed investment, of managerial and organizational improvements, and of massive reduction of taxes—including the investment credit, the depreciation reforms, and the reduction of corporate rates.

The growth of profits during most of this period of rising utilization of capacity was not at the expense either of labor or the consumer—though the fact that it could be achieved with stable prices reflected the moderation of labor settlements.

But now that profits after taxes in the fourth quarter of 1965 were up 88% over their level in early 1961, and were providing the highest sustained rate of return on owners' equity in our modern history, it is time to ask whether a further rise in the share of profits in the national income is in the interest either of the health of the Nation's economy or in the interest of business itself.

The Wall Street Journal last week published a tabulation showing profits up 12% in the first quarter over a year earlier. This substantially exceeds the rise in employee compensation over that period. It has been accompanied by a disturbing tendency for industrial prices to climb. In most cases the particular products whose prices have increased have sustained some cost increase. But the earnings figures make it clear that, on the average, the margin over costs has been advancing. Either prices have been raised more than costs, or prices have not been reduced where costs have fallen.

In March, the weekly spendable income of the average manufacturing worker with 3 dependents—measured in constant prices—was no higher than a year earlier, although he was working somewhat longer hours. Does anyone imagine that labor will continue to show moderation in its wage demands when prices and profit margins are continually rising?

Let me remind you of the consequences. Higher labor costs are a one-way street. A higher cost-price structure can torpedo all our efforts to continue our encouraging progress toward balance of payments equilibrium. It can engender a speculative boom that will bring on a bust. To avoid these outcomes, Government would face the need to clamp down on over-all demand, to move back toward the conditions of slack that depressed production and incomes—and especially profits—in the late '50's and early '60's.

And so I ask you—every one of you—to stop, look, and listen. Is that price increase you are considering really necessary? Are there not some prices that, in the long run, competition is going to force down and that you can cut now? Are you doing your part to assure the continuance of the healthy, expanding prosperity that has brought such great rewards to us all over the past 5 years? Are your policies strengthening the ability of the Nation to sustain freedom around the world?

Are you doing your part to fight inflation?

FORMER FORD FOUNDATION OFFICIAL PRAISES FOUNDATION INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article appearing in the Houston Chronicle by former official of the Ford Foundation, Robert M. Hutchins, has been brought to my attention. In this article, the former foundation official praises the efforts of the Select Committee on Small Business in revealing many of the highly questionable activities which many tax-free foundations had been practicing.

Too often in the past our investigation has been criticized as an attempt to subvert the good work that these private agencies have been doing. Granted the tax-free foundations have contributed many good results, but there have been too many violations of their privileged status. I am pleased to see our efforts given the recognition in the public media.

The article follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, May 1, 1966]

Foundation Probes Overdue, Ex-Official of One Says

(By Robert M. Hutchins)

Once I achieved, briefly, the ambition of every right-thinking man, I became associated with a very large sum of money. I refer to the Ford Foundation.

My experience during that period and my observation before and since convince me that a thorough examination of the foundations in American life is overdue.

No such examination has yet been made. The two formal congressional investigations staged in the 1950's were absurd on their face. They aimed to show that the foundations were subversive. The effort was to portray Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie, their heirs and assigns, conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Or, if the owners and nominal managers of these great fortunes were not knaves, they must have been fools, for they had allowed the foundations, it was said, to get into hands of officers and employees who were surreptitiously supporting subversion.

The "credibility gap" here was so wide that the congressional investigators aroused more laughter than alarm.

Congressman Wright Patman has lately been on a line of inquiry that must be taken seriously. He has been doing noble work in trying to find out whether the foundations are really foundations. He has been asking to what extent they are tax dodges, vehicles of financial manipulations, public relations devices and instruments of private aggrandizement rather than public service.

He has been concentrating on the donor's use of foundation money for his personal advantage. This is important, but it is only a small part of the problem.

In "Iolanthe," Gilbert and Sullivan's Lord Chancellor sings:

> "In my court I sit all day
> Giving agreeable girls away."

If you substitute millions for girls you get the popular picture of the foundation executive.

But it is not as idyllic as all that. The foundation officer knows very well that the money he is giving away would have gone to the Government if it had not gone into the foundation. If the Ford Foundation had not been established, the Government would have collected millions in taxes and spent them, presumably, in the public interest.

By setting up the foundation, the Ford family retained control of the Ford Motor Co. The public does not care who owns the company; it should care about whether it gets as much public service from the foundation as it would have from the taxes.

The Government is going into field after field formerly occupied by private philanthropy. The last big development is Federal financing of the fine arts. And I have not heard any serious suggestion that governmental subsidy is less efficient or discriminating than foundation grants.

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENTS OF 1966 ON THE ECONOMY OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, next week we will be considering the passage of H.R. 13712, the minimum wage amendments of 1966. Throughout my public life I have fought for higher wages for the workingman. But now, as the only Representative in Congress of the 2.9 million people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, I must express to the Members here assembled grave doubts and fears, shared by me and by the Government and people of Puerto Rico, concerning the disastrous effect that the proposed bill threatens to the island's economy. Exhaustive studies into the impact of the bill on Puerto Rico's economic structure, have shown that despite its beneficial aims, the bill, as presently drafted, will seriously, senselessly, and without recourse injure Puerto Rican businesses and employees, and will strike the Operation Bootstrap economic development program a severe blow.

I want to emphasize that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is in complete agreement with the underlying purposes of the proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. We favor raising wages on the U.S. mainland and in Puerto Rico, as fast as economic conditions will permit. The Commonwealth's wage policy is clearly and succinctly expressed in the following language from its own Minimum Wage Act:

> As rapidly as possible eliminate substandard working conditions in industries; promote living, health, and safety standards for workers; step-up the development of agriculture, industry and business in Puerto Rico; eliminate unfair competition and achieve the highest possible wage compatible with such development without substantially curtailing employment or impairing the opportunities to obtain the highest wages.

The act further states that it is the steadfast policy of the Commonwealth "to maintain the necessary flexibility in the fixing of minimum wages so as to insure for the workers the highest wage that the economic conditions of the industry will permit."

The economic gains by Puerto Rico, whether measured over the past 5, 10, 15, or 25 years, have been spectacular by any standards. Ever since 1941, the people of Puerto Rico have been energetically engaged in a massive effort to foster economic growth. In these efforts, we have been generally successful, much to our pride and that of the United States as a whole. The people of the world are interested in what we have been doing and accomplishing. Thousands have come to the Commonwealth under the exchange programs to examine, at first hand, this dramatic example of sustained progress within the framework of the democratic institutions that we mutually champion. The realization of this progress could not have been possible without the enlightened understanding of the U.S. Congress and of the several U.S. administrations.

Today, however, the Puerto Rican people are becoming increasingly conscious of certain harsh realities—

That their per capita income, at $900, is still but three-fifths that of Mississippi, the lowest per capita income State;

That two out of every five Puerto Rican families are still below the threshold income of $2,000 established by the Government of Puerto Rico in 1952—a level which is a thousand dollars below the minimum family income level established under the Federal antipoverty program;

That 11 percent of our labor force is unemployed, nearly three times the national average, and an additional 24 percent is underemployed with less than 35 hours of work per week;

And that the Commonwealth's industrialization program, which has been the essential dynamo behind the economic growth during the past 15 years, is currently facing a number of challenges which pose threats not only to the island's future potential development, but also to the achievements registered to date.

One of the most serious threats to our industrialization effort—the main object of which has been the creation of sufficient jobs for our people—is the legislation currently under your consideration, which would remove the historical, flexible approach to setting minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico.

We have found through experience that inflexible extension of the Federal minimum wage statute to Puerto Rico simply does not work, and we bear in mind that the law is intended to help the workingman, not hurt him. Congress has long recognized that Puerto Rico's development would be stunted by imposing upon it the identical minimum wages of the U.S. economy, the most highly industrialized in the world. Conversely, our workers would be harmed by holding minimum wages at the level of the least developed industries. Rather, it is essential to set minimum wages to meet the realities of the situation, individually for each industry, based on economic studies, at the level which each industry is individually capable of paying. Such has been the policy of both the Congress and the Commonwealth.

Since 1940, the minimum wages in Puerto Rico have been set through a flexible system of industrial committees, named by the U.S. Secretary of Labor, in which labor, management, and the public have been represented. These committees, after careful economic study and full, public hearings, recommend the highest minimum wage which each industry is capable of absorbing. This is the policy which the bill now before you would revoke.

It must be obvious to anyone, who may take more than a superficial glance, that the proposed legislation would cause a serious disruption to Puerto Rico's economic development. It would force upon an economy still in the process of developing a wage policy prevalent in and appropriate to a fully developed economy. It would reverse the sensible, practicable policy of a flexible, workable system adopted by Congress and the Commonwealth. Those who would be most seriously affected by this change would be the workers of Puerto Rico, themselves. A wage increase which destroys jobs is no increase at all. It would amount to an assault against the very foundation of the workers welfare: against their jobs. And it would be felt at the dinner table.

Former Governor Muños-Marín stated several years ago:

> Unemployment has a lower salary than the lowest of salaries.

He further observed at that time in stating our Government's philosophy with regard to wages in Puerto Rico:

> The goal of this government is not to include cheap labor as an incentive. This government does not believe that paradoxically richness should be based on hunger. Richness, which is derived from hunger, is enjoyed only by those who acquire it. Hunger salaries should not be held out as an incentive to Puerto Rico's industrialization. It should also be noted that fixing salaries in an industry on a higher scale than its production works, unwittingly in actually cutting all salaries in that industry.

This statement is significant in light of the often misunderstood or misinterpreted efforts of Puerto Rico to advance its economic well-being through attracting industrial investment from beyond its shores, principally from the U.S. mainland. In industrializing, Puerto Rico's policy is to create brand-new industrial activity and to build on that base. Throughout the years, Puerto Rico's spokesmen have made it clear that Puerto Rico neither seeks nor will shelter runaway industries from any State. We seek only a modest share of the annual expansion of U.S. industrial capital.

But in this effort we will not deprive our workers of their labor's just rewards, nor could we ever trade on the misery of our people in order to gain a position of competitive leverage.

Testimony reflected in the record of the recent San Juan hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, demonstrated that automatic three-stage, nonreviewable, proposed escalation of wage rates in Puerto Rico would reduce the industrial base in Puerto Rico, from which future expansion must essentially stem, to one-half the present number of firms, 55 percent of the present number of employees, and three-fifths the present number of different kinds of industry. Some 35,000 of 78,000 hard-won jobs currently provided by Operation Bootstrap manufacturing plants would, at best, hang precariously in the balance and, at worst, totally disappear. The testimony also demonstrated that the effect upon the sugar industry—the island's historical pillar of economic activity—would be similarly disastrous.

It was also shown that the 1961 amendments actually resulted in curtailment of employment in Puerto Rico, even in those industries which successfully filed appeals, as provided for in those amendments, a provision which the bill currently before you would delete. This loss of jobs, it was noted, was far from marginal, in the Puerto Rican context, and represented a loss which, at this stage of our development, we could ill afford, and which the workers could not afford at all. In sum, the entire automatic procedure, even though accompanied, as in 1961, by an appeals procedure, must be energetically rejected as inadequate protection for the delicately balanced wage situation which we continue to face in Puerto Rico, and as bad medicine for the Puerto Rican economy.

The question logically arises as to whether the proposed treatment is desirable in order to assure equitable treatment vis-a-vis the mainland industrial community. Puerto Rico wage levels have risen rapidly during the past decade, as a result of the aggressive wage policy experienced by the island's economy. During this period, manufacturing wages in Puerto Rico rose at an annual rate of 7.4 percent, vis-a-vis a national average of 3 percent over the same period. Since October 1956, manufacturing wages in Puerto Rico have risen by 60 cents, or 91 percent, vis-a-vis a 62-cent rise during the same period in U.S. wage levels. Comparisons with an earlier base period are not valid in light of the fact that in 1950, and even more so in 1939, when the fair labor standards statute was first enacted, Puerto Rico was not even a developing economy, but was rather an unstirred, unawakened economy, with its economic base largely in a fairly rudimentary agriculture and in handicrafts.

In October 1960, average hourly earnings in Puerto Rican manufacturing workers were 42.2 percent of those in the United States—already a considerable advance from the 1956 ratio of 32.7 percent. By October 1965, the Puerto Rican level had further increased to 47.7 percent of the United States. Considering the radically different capital structures of United States and Puerto Rican manufacturing industry, this represents a remarkably rapid approach toward the mainland level. It means, in effect, that over the past decade, Puerto Rican manufacturing wages have risen 3 times as fast as those in the United States, in the process of a catching up which can never completely occur because of inherent differences in the two economies and their resources. During this same period, however, the Puerto Rican labor force—swelled as a result of sharply reduced migration to the mainland and an influx of non-Puerto Ricans—rose by 20 percent, from 643,000 to 769,000. Total employment opportunities also rose rather impressively, from 558,000 to 680,000, but not enough to absorb all of the increase in the labor force, much less make a dent in the island's chronically high unemployment rate. In the past 4 years, the average number of unemployed has risen by 19 percent.

There are currently some 180,000 workers in Puerto Rico covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Some 57 percent of them are at the statutory minimum of $1.25; all but 12 percent are at or above $1. But there are some 22,000 workers whose wage rates are currently pegged at less than $1; some 4,200 at less than 80 cents. However, it should be emphasized that all of these rates have been reviewed at least twice, and in most cases, as many as four times, since the 1961 amendments by tripartite industry committees, which have exhaustively examined the conditions of each separate classification within the several industries. Thus, it may be safely concluded that these industries are currently paying the highest wage that they are in an economic position to pay without curtailing their operations or closing their doors. Any measure that would overlook this fact, would perpetrate a severe injustice on the Puerto Rican working classes even as it pursued a highly commendable goal of seeking to raise their working levels.

The bill also provides for the extension of coverage by the Fair Labor Standards Act to certain employees not now covered by the statute. For those employees that would be brought within the coverage of the act for the first time, the proposed amendments provide that minimum wage rates are to be set by special industry committees. These provisions would extend coverage in Puerto Rico to around 154,000 additional workers, or 62.4 percent of the total number of workers in local industries now effectively covered by the Commonwealth Act.

The Commonwealth government has had a well-organized and effective minimum wage program for many years. Puerto Rico enacted its first minimum wage legislation in April 1941 and substantially revised it in 1956 by the Minimum Wage Act which now prevails.

Under this act, coverage has been extended to its fullest; only government employees, domestic workers, professional, executive and administrative employees remain outside the reach of the act. All wage and salaried employees are covered, including agriculture, retail and wholesale trades, services and manufacturing. Even workers employed by labor unions, and religious and charitable institutions fall under the protection of the minimum wage provisions of the act. Thus, the act permits the setting of minimum wage rates for all economic activities in the island. Coverage of the local law is so extensive that approximately 380,000 workers—three-fourths of all wage and salaried employees on the island—are currently covered by minimum wage orders established under the act. Minimum rates apply to all workers covered by the act, including those workers which the bill currently under your consideration would now bring under the umbrella of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In addition, 22 wage decrees, issued under the authority granted to the Minimum Wage Board of Puerto Rico by the 1941 act—no longer in existence—provide important marginal benefits such as vacations, sick leave, and guaranteed weekly earnings to more than 84,000 workers in various activities including retail and wholesale trade and services.

Our local laws further provide that in intrastate activities workers are entitled to double-time compensation for hours in excess of 8 per day and 48 per week; while workers in interstate activities are entitled on the other hand, to receive time-and-a-half for all hours in excess of 48 per week.

The rates of all industries with a minimum below $1.25 an hour are reviewed at least once every 2 years by specially appointed tripartite committees representing labor, industry, and the public, and the highest rates are set in accordance with the economic condition, or capacity to pay, of each individual industry. As a result, during the past decade each industry's wages have been reviewed at least four times. From July 1956 to January 1966, a total of 112 minimum wage orders have been issued by the Commonwealth minimum wage board covering approximately 380,000 workers which have had the effect of increasing by $56 million the annual wages of covered workers.

As a result of local revisions, wages in Puerto Rico have steadily increased. As of November 1965, an hourly minimum wage of $1.25 had been set in 98 industry classifications employing around 24,000 workers, and minimum wages per hour ranging from $1 to $1.24 had been set in 174 classifications employing around 39,000 workers. There were only 17 industry classifications with a minimum wage below 50 cents. These were mostly in agriculture.

Thus, it is clear that in Puerto Rico—unlike many of the States which either do not have or do not actively enforce local minimum wage legislation—the workers who would be brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act by the extended coverage proposed in the bill have been and are now adequately protected by the Minimum Wage Act of Puerto Rico. In addition, most of the enterprises which would be brought within the coverage of the Federal Act by the proposed amendments—enterprises with annual gross sales between $250,000 and $1 million, as well as certain service enterprises previously exempted from the act, are small, locally owned, and essentially local in operation. Neither the employees nor the employers have the financial resources or, in many instances, the skills required to represent adequately their interests before the Federal quasi-judicial wage proceedings, requiring formal prehearing statements, fluency in English, and judicial review only in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. As a matter of practical availability, the wage review forum under the Minimum Wage Act of Puerto Rico is more adequate for equitable resolution of minimum wage controversies in the industries which would be covered by the bill.

These manifold adverse effects on employment and business in Puerto Rico are not creatures of my imagination. They are the sound predictions of the men entrusted with the Government of Puerto Rico, men intimately acquainted with the economic structure of their country. They are also the teachings of the history of the Federal minimum wage in Puerto Rico.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said that "a page of history is worth a volume of logic" and that "the life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience." Let us heed the wisdom of these words, for the proposed minimum wage bill does not. It turns its back on the history of Puerto Rico's experience with the Federal minimum wage which has demonstrated, since 1938, the futility of superimposing the wage policies of a large, integrated, highly industrialized mainland economy upon a relatively isolated, underdeveloped adjunct of that economy.

The original Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 established a basic minimum wage of 25 cents, with provision for its upward revision to 30 cents after 1 year, and 40 cents automatically 6 years thereafter or as much earlier as proved feasible on an industry-by-industry basis.

Congress initially provided that the act would apply fully in Puerto Rico, and the 25 cents per hour minimum wage that became effective for the States was also made applicable to Puerto Rico.

When the bill was passed, average earnings in U.S. manufacturing were 63 cents an hour and only about 300,000 workers out of a total labor force of 54 million received pay increases as a result of the establishment of the original 25 cents minimum wage. However, in 1938 Congress was probably unaware that it was imposing on Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands a minimum wage which was perhaps double the average wage in the various industries to which it was expected to apply. In effect this was not a lifting of the lowest, but a pushing vastly higher of the highest. The relevant impact was not on inequities in the distribution of income, but on the survival of industries and of jobs.

Thus, in Puerto Rico, the consequences of the initial application of the Fair Labor Standards Act were very great and, in some respects, catastrophic. Average factory earnings were perhaps one-fifth the U.S. average and about one-half the newly established Federal minimum. Whereas in the United States the new law reached the peripheral, marginal worker, in Puerto Rico the total wage structure was revolutionized.

As a result, an amendment (S. 2682) to the act was enacted by Congress in June and signed by the President on June 26, 1940. It authorized the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to appoint industry committees to recommend minimum wages for employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce. Such committees were to investigate economic and competitive conditions and recommend in the various industries the highest minimum wage, not in excess of the statutory rate, which would not result in substantial curtailment of employment. The amendment provided further that industry committees might recommend rates below the statutory minimum, but they were enjoined from recommending rates which would give any industry in the islands a competitive advantage over any industry in the continental United States. In the absence of a specific wage order for an industry, the statutory minimum would apply. Industry committees were to be representative of management, labor, and the public, and to be composed of residents of the continent as well as residents of the island—see "Wage Order Program for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa," issued January 1959 by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Thus, in 1940, Congress established a flexible system for industry-by-industry minimum wage determinations in Puerto Rico.

The first industry committee, appointed in the same year, made wage recommendations ranging from 12.5 cents to 25 cents per hour. By the end of 1947, three more industry committees were appointed which resulted in the achievement of the 40-cent minimum in a number of industries, although a large number of other industries were deemed unable to pay the 40-cent minimum.

The 1949 amendments to the act, effective January 25, 1950, raised the basic minimum rate to 75 cents, but continued the special provisions for Puerto Rico and left undisturbed the wage rates under the existing wage orders. Immediately thereafter, a congressional investigation led to the recommendation that greater progress could have been made toward the 40-cent minimum under the law before 1949, and recommended the more frequent review of wage orders—at least every 2 years—by the industry committees. In consequence, by 1955 the statutory goal of 75 cents was reached in a number of important industries in Puerto Rico.

The 1955 amendments to the Federal act, effective March 1, 1956, raised the basic statutory minimum to $1 an hour. They also made it mandatory for the Secretary of Labor to convene the industry committees once each year to review each of the minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico, and eliminated the Secretary's right to review and disapprove committee wage rate recommendations.

The 1958 amendments to the Federal act provided that, as of July 1, 1958, the annual review be changed to a biennial review. From this point until the 1961 amendments, there was considerable concentration upon review of Puerto Rico wage rates, which had not reached $1. By the close of fiscal 1961, more than 94 percent of the minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico were increased by an amount equal to or in excess of the 33⅓-percent increase in the statutory minimum; 68 percent of the minimum wage rates were increased 50 percent or more and 19 percent were increased 100 percent or more. About four-fifths were increased by at least 25 cents per hour, the quantitative amount of the statutory increase from 75 cents to $1.

The 1961 amendments to the Federal act increased the basic minimum wage for employees historically covered by the act to $1.25, with $1.15 to be reached by September 3, 1961, and $1.25 to be reached 2 years thereafter—a somewhat different phasing was instituted for the employees that were being covered by the act for the first time as a result of the 1961 amendments. In its applicability to Puerto Rico, as affected by the wage order procedure superseding the general statutory requirements, it was provided that all rates in Puerto Rico were to be increased by 15 percent by November 3, 1961, or 1 year from the effective date of the most recent wage order, whichever was later, and by another 10 percent above the preamendment rates 2 years after the effective date of the 15-percent increase. The 1961 amendments also contained provisions for application—by a stipulated type of employer action—to the Secretary of Labor for appointment of a review committee to recommend minimum rates in lieu of the foregoing rates for Puerto Rico. The Secretary could appoint such a review committee only if he found that the application of the foregoing rates would substantially curtail employment in the industry concerned. Hardship complaints were received from 11 industries—of a total of 30 in existence at that time—for 10 of which review committees were established. This led to increases ranging from 1 percent to the full 15 percent, with about 60 percent of the employees affected being in groups whose rates were raised 8 to 11 percent. The 1961 amendments also provided for biennial review of all wage rates below the statutory minimum—but not short of 1 year after a review committee recommended rates to be paid in lieu of the automatic increases.

During fiscal 1963, all industries which had not reached the $1.15 minimum were reviewed, and increases in rates ranged up to 10 cents an hour, but with no increases in some cases. For 13 classifications, the committees recommended rates equal to or higher than those which would have resulted from application of the second step automatic increase. As of June 1963, fewer than 5 percent of those covered prior to the 1961 amendments were below 50 cents, and two-thirds were at $1 or over. With an overall range from 28 cents to $1.15, slightly more than one-third were at the statutory minimum of $1.15.

The 1961 amendments also extended coverage to large enterprises in retail service, local transit, construction, and gasoline service. The prescription here, aside from some specific exceptions, was for a minimum wage of $1 unless a lower rate was set by the industry committee. In consequence of hearings, minimum wage rates ranged from 57.5 cents to $1, with about half of those affected in the 80- to 90-cent range. In consequence of further reviews, 6 out of 10 of the newly covered workers were at $1 as of June 1963, and 3 out of 10 were at 85 to 90 cents.

The wage increases under the 1961 amendments, however, were not achieved without cost. In a sense the workingman had won a Pyrrhic victory, for those higher wage rates produced a significant curtailment of employment. The automatic percentage increase system of

1961, together with the expanded coverage, caused a loss of jobs which seriously disrupted Puerto Rico's economic growth.

The minimum wage law of 1966, as reported by the committee, ignores this past experience. Despite the effect of the automatic wage increase technique on employment in Puerto Rico and despite the proved success of the special industry committee system, the automatic wage increase is once again upon us. And the adverse impact on Puerto Rico's economy will be even greater than it was in 1961, since the bill eliminates the appeal procedure which enabled almost 30 percent of the covered industries to survive.

In conclusion, careful study of both the present and the past teaches us that we must not cast aside the realities of today in our pursuit of the goals of tomorrow. We cannot blindly assume that a society and economy greatly different from that of the United States can absorb without difficulty the impact of automatic higher wages and the broadened base of minimum wage coverage.

It is my position, and that of the Government and people of Puerto Rico, that the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended up to and including 1961, be maintained as regards Puerto Rico, that is, that there be no further extension of the act's coverage to enterprises operating on the island; that no across-the-board wage increases be imposed on industries in Puerto Rico; and that the system of minimum wage determination through special industry committees be maintained as the only workable means of adjusting minimum wage levels in Puerto Rico.

The motivation of the framers and supporters of this legislation is to combat poverty and suffering. Let me assure my good friends on this subcommittee, that Puerto Ricans are not strangers to these ills. We have been to grips with poverty for a full generation, and we shall continue the fight to overcome it, to expand social justice, and to preserve democracy for all of our citizens.

But we must sympathetically understand one another's problems, for the misunderstanding of one will be the responsibility of all.

We have been building in our island a society which stands out as an oasis of democracy in a troubled and restless Caribbean. Within it, our workingman will continue to share in the just rewards of production, so that he may have, together with his family, ever-increasing betterment in the standards of living, and ever-higher wages and security. We will accomplish this, and with your help, understanding, and cooperation, we will eventually wipe out unemployment, underemployment, and poverty.

THE VALUE OF THE WAR ON POVERTY PROGRAM IN CINCINNATI, OHIO

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a chorus of criticism of the war on poverty rings throughout the Nation with detailed accounts of alleged failures, unwarranted costliness, and ineptitude. These representations convey a wholly distorted picture of what in fact the war on poverty is trying to accomplish and how those objectives are being achieved. Seldom have I seen in a newspaper or magazine, heard on radio, or seen on a television screen anything which points up accomplishments and successes in programs carried out by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Recently I received a letter from the Rev. Edward Jones in Cincinnati outlining the broad voluntary support for, and involvement in, the effort to combat the causes of poverty in our district.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the scope and nature of this voluntary activity and the high value placed upon it by the Honorable Theodore M. Berry, director of the community action program. This is one more reason why the war on poverty in Cincinnati is rated one of the best in the country:

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
March 17, 1966.

Representative JOHN J. GILLIGAN,
442 Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GILLIGAN: Due to your sincere interest in the progress and achievement of the people of Ohio, it is my grateful task to bring to your attention some of the aid our Community, namely, Steele Subdivision located in West College Hill, has received in its war on poverty.

In the drive to elevate our community we have received invaluable assistance and encouragement from the Sisters of Mercy, McAuley High School, St. Richards Parish, St. Margaret Mary Parish and St. Xavier High School. These neighbors were the first to volunteer professional aid when the community of West College Hill, Ohio, was funded for an Anti-poverty project in July 1965.

It was last September when a group of students under the leadership of Peter Cassady and Ron Reibenberger, felt that they wanted to get all St. Xavier High School students socially involved with the Poverty Program. The call for volunteers was made and out of 1240 students, 300 students responded and are at present working in classrooms, hospitals, and orphanages. They are doing a job which was long overdue.

Through the vigorous efforts of Sister Mary Fransicia and others, our community has enjoyed its first six week enrichment program in the summer 1965. This project offered courses in typing, remedial reading, creative arts, sewing, and tutoring to both students and adults. This proved to be a truly rewarding program. Many students have gained new confidence in themselves and many more are enjoying better grades in school. At present we are also presenting an effective and satisfying pre-school course. We are also offering continuing educational courses in our Adult Night School classes. The evening classes are taught by the Sisters of Mercy, teachers from St. Xavier High School and members of St. Margaret Mary Parish.

Our friends have also offered us invaluable information and the resources necessary for the purchasing of the equipment needed at the school.

I feel that congratulations are in order for all those who have contributed to this program—Very Rev. Thomas P. Murray, S.J., President of St. Xavier High School; Rev. John J. Beckman, S.J., Principal; Mr. John R. MacNamara, S.J., Moderator of the program, and all the students of St. Xavier High School who have contributed time and effort to this worthwhile undertaking. A special thank you to Sr. Mary Emily, Principal of McAuley High School for allowing the Sisters to give so much time to our program. Also to the McAuley students who are involved in the Saturday tutoring program.

Mr. Gilligan, these are just the highlights of their contributions to us. I cannot begin to tell you in this letter all the additional benefits that this entire community has enjoyed because of the intense interest shown by these people.

Sincerely,

REV. EDWARD JONES,
Coordinator, West College Hill Civic Association.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. GILLIGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILLIGAN: Thank you very much for calling my attention to the excellent letter you received from the Reverend Edward Jones, Coordinator of the West College Hill Civic Association, Cincinnati, Ohio. I certainly appreciate your interest in sharing Reverend Jones' comments with me.

As Director of the Community Action Program, I am delighted to commend the outstanding work being done by the dedicated educators and students mentioned in Reverend Jones' letter who have helped to improve conditions in the Steele Subdivision of the West College Hill area. They can truly be called "front line soldiers" in the War on Poverty, for without the active participation of committed individuals like these, community action would be just a meaningless expression.

Reverend Jones and his associates in West College Hill are also deserving of high praise for their hard work on behalf of the needy residents of their community. I am sure they will continue and increase their efforts.

Please advise the Sisters of Mercy and all those at McAuley High School, St. Xavier High School, St. Richard's Church and St. Margaret Mary Church of my admiration for their accomplishments in the Steele Subdivision. Those of us at national headquarters are very grateful for their contribution.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

THEODORE M. BERRY,
Director, Community Action Program.

REPORT ON THE FUTURE OF OUR STRATEGIC BOMBER FORCE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include pertinent material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I take this minute as a prelude to the remarks which are to follow.

On April 25, 1966, Secretary of Defense McNamara called a theatrical press conference in the Pentagon and, surrounded by people of his own choosing, on his own staff, he proceeded to excoriate the subcommittee of which I happen to be the chairman, the Subcommittee No. 2 on Armed Services, and charged that committee with "shocking distortion."

This afternoon at 1 o'clock, in the Armed Services Committee room in the Rayburn Building, I will hold a press conference, to which I have invited all the members of my subcommittee. I have received the assurance of my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], that they will be there.

This press conference will be held in order to present to the Nation the facts of the case and to give to the people of this country the documentary proof that the position which the committee took, was stated accurately on the basis of the facts. This will allow the American people to judge who distorted what facts and how much and for what reason.

I again repeat, Secretary McNamara, at his press conference attacked the credibility of a report issued by my subcommittee on the future of our strategic bomber force. The Secretary alleged that the report gave "a shockingly distorted picture of the true situation." He carefully attempted to leave the impression that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were part of the "we" who, as he said, today "still cannot see a clear need for a new strategic bomber."

Since the Secretary of Defense challenged the credibility of my subcommittee's report and attempted to utilize the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a follow-on bomber as illustrative of the "distortions" in our report, I challenged the Secretary to resolve this issue by releasing to the American public the present position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the need for a follow-on bomber.

That challenge was issued by me on April 26—the day after Secretary McNamara's press conference. Today, more than 2 weeks later, the Secretary of Defense has failed to accept this challenge and has not released the present recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which unequivocally reflect "a clear need for a new strategic bomber," and thereby flatly agree with the subcommittee and its report.

The refusal of the Secretary of Defense to release this information to the American people speaks for itself. However, I had assumed that this information would nevertheless be available to the American people at the time the printed hearings were released by the Committee on Armed Services on the fiscal year 1967 weapons procurement bill. This information was officially received in testimony on April 5, 1966.

I was, therefore, amazed to discover that this testimony, relative to the present position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the need for a follow-on bomber, was deleted from the committee transcript for "security reasons" by the Department of Defense. Since nothing in this testimony appeared to be in any way secret or in violation of our national security interests, I addressed a letter, on May 6, 1966, to the Secretary of Defense challenging this security action.

Late on May 9, 1966, I received a reply signed by General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Unfortunately, the letter from General Wheeler is also classified "confidential" and, therefore, I am precluded from making it available to the public in its entirety. However, I do not think it a violation of security to quote the following passage from that letter:

> I can not say that release of this advice (of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) pertaining to next year's budget, or release of selected extracts of that testimony you propose to release in its entirety, would be in violation of the national security interests of the United States. I do think such release would establish an unfortunate precedent.

Since the national security interests of the United States will not be affected by the release of this information, its release is in the public interest, and in view of the importance of this issue as it affects not only a possible follow-on strategic bomber but the very credibility of the Congress, I am today releasing an extract of this April 5, 1966, testimony as received by the full Committee on Armed Services.

I direct your attention to a statement made by the Secretary of Defense on a nationally televised press conference on April 25 at which time he said:

> The Report of the House Armed Services Committee on this subject of manned bombers gives, I think, a shockingly distorted picture of the true situation. The suggestion that major decisions on the manned bomber program were made against the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is without any foundation, whatsoever.

And now I direct your attention to the statement made by Gen. John P. McConnell, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, to the full Committee on Armed Services on April 5, 1966, and which was part of the deletion made by the Department of Defense in an obvious attempt to keep from the American people information they were entitled to have in the interest of national defense:

> The JCS are agreed that a missile/manned bomber mix is required for the foreseeable future. The operational life of the B-52 Gs and Hs cannot be assured beyond fiscal year 1975. The FB-111 as presently conceived, is not capable of covering the more distant targets in the USSR and communist China. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that concept formulation for a follow-on manned bomber should be completed at the earliest possible time.

The clear need for a new strategic bomber is further emphasized by the willingness of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to recommend, as testified to the committee on April 5, 1966—which I point out was a full 3 weeks before the Secretary's press conference—"full-scale follow-on bomber development in order to protect the offensive striking power of the United States by preserving an option for an initial operating capability in fiscal year 1974."

The Joint Chiefs did indicate they would prefer to review the results of a contract definition phase before actually committing themselves on full-scale development of any one particular strategic aircraft. But they feel so strongly about the clear need for some kind of follow-on manned bomber that they have recommended full-scale development of the AMSA to assure both initiation of contract definition and ultimate availability of a new strategic manned bomber. They have been forced into this position by the inflexibility of the Secretary of Defense and his opposition to entering the contract definition phase of the AMSA.

In summary, the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree completely with the position of the subcommittee. They support the concept of a follow-on manned bomber and they recommend at this time that the initiation of the contract definition phase of the AMSA go forward.

The whole picture here presented is, indeed, shocking, but clearly not because of any distortion of the facts by the subcommittee.

Attached hereto is my letter to the Secretary of Defense and the actual colloquy during the committee hearing as documentary evidence of the accuracy of the foregoing. That language which appears in brackets was physically cut out of the committee transcript by the Department of Defense:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
The Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Committee on Armed Services received testimony on April 5, 1966, from departmental witnesses relative to the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the need for a follow-on bomber. Regrettably, the Department of Defense, in sanitizing this testimony for public release, has seen fit to delete from the transcript such pertinent testimony as actually reflects the current position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft. Copies of the specific testimony to which I refer, both in unclassified and classified form, are attached for your information.

As you know, my Subcommittee recommended initiation of the contract definition phase of AMSA in fiscal year 1967. The full Committee on Armed Services concurred in this recommendation and, therefore, added to the fiscal year 1967 departmental procurement bill additional authorization for this purpose.

Since the current views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on this important subject constitute essential background information upon which the members of the House of Representatives must make a decision in reference to this Committee action, and since there appears to be no genuine security consideration which precludes the publication of this testimony, it is my intention to recommend that this deleted testimony be made available for publication.

In the event you believe such action would violate the national security interests of the United States, I would appreciate your specific views on this question not later than the close of business Monday, the 9th of May, 1966.

Sincerely,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 2.

Enclosures.

[Committee Print]

Mr. Bates. I won't take very long, because Mr. Hébert touched on one of the questions I wanted to get into, and that was the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Air Force with respect to AMSA.

Now, as far as the Air Force is concerned they wanted full funding for the program to move ahead. What was the recommendation of the Air Force, per se?

The Chairman. Contract definition?

General McConnell. Contract definition phase.

Mr. Bates. Is that as far as they wanted to go?

General McConnell. That is as far as the Air Force asked to go when this budget was made up; yes, sir.

Mr. Bates. So the Air Force wanted just the contract or project definition; is that correct? The reason I asked, somebody gave——

General McConnell. Since this budget was made up, Mr. Bates, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have made another statement with respect to the AMSA. [It was not the same statement that General Wheeler gave before the subcommittee, because we had not completed the 1968 to 1975 JSOP.]

[The position that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have taken in the new JSOP, which has just been published and submitted to the Secretary of Defense is that they support full-scale development.]

Mr. Bates. Mr. Hébert wants you to repeat that, General, if you please.

Mr. Hébert. The point about [development,] General, that last sentence.

Mr. Bates. [Full-scale development.]

General McConnell. Let me read to you what the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said in the 1968–75 Joint Strategic Objectives Plan, [which is not what they said before the fiscal year 1967 budget was made up.] General Wheeler quoted what the position of the JCS was at the time that the budget was made up, and when he testified before your subcommittee.

Since then there has been the publication of the new JSOP, Joint Strategic Objectives Plan.

The Chairman. What was that date?

Mr. Hébert. What was that date, General?

General McConnell. That was just about the middle of last month.

The Chairman. Is this what you are reading?

General McConnell. I would like to put in the record.

The Chairman. This is what you are reading?

General McConnell. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Go ahead and read it.

General McConnell. [It says the JCS are agreed that a missile/manned bomber mix is required for the foreseeable future. The operational life of the B–52 G's and H's cannot be assured beyond fiscal year 1975. The FB–111, as presently conceived, is not capable of covering the more distant targets in the U.S.S.R. and Communist China. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that concept formulation for a follow-on manned bomber should be completed at the earliest possible time.] And parenthetically, that is what the Secretary was talking about when he said we would hope by July to come up with the concept formulation.

I will go ahead and finish this, if I may.

Mr. Hébert. That is what I want to get.

General McConnell. [Subject to satisfactory completion thereof; that is, completion of concept formulation, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommend that succeeding stages be conducted on timing consistent with an I.O.C. of fiscal 1974. Although the JCS recognize uncertainties associated with a commitment now, to full-scale follow-on bomber development, the prohibition contained in Secretary of Defense memorandum of the 3d of September 1965, subject: Program Change Proposal of 5–038. Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft, forecloses the conduct of a contract definition phase without a decision to proceed with full-scale development.]

That is because of the Secretary of Defense's interpretation of contract definition. The Secretary of Defense says that if you go to contract definition phase, then he is conditionally committed to full-scale development.

[As a consequence, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have no alternative to recommending full-scale follow-on bomber development in order to protect the offensive striking power of the United States by preserving an option for an I.O.C. in fiscal year 1974. However, they would prefer to review the results of a contract definition phase before recommending full-scale weapons system development.]

Mr. Hébert. I couldn't have testified better for the subcommittee's report, General; I will let it rest there.

One last observation: Following his theatrical press conference on April 25 the magazine Newsweek quoted an unidentified official in the Pentagon as saying:

> My money is on McNamara who took on Senators Fulbright and Morse last week and overwhelmed them. He floored Hébert this week.

In the presentation of the facts I would suggest that Newsweek seek out this unidentified Pentagon official who was so important as to be quoted and suggest to him that he take the blinders off his eyes and look again. Instead of Hébert being floored by McNamara he will find that lying prostrate on the floor knocked out cold by the facts is the Secretary of Defense.

DID YOU HEAR THAT?—STUPID

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Overseas Press Club of America has just published a magazine entitled: "Dateline 1966 Covering War."

I certainly want to congratulate Publisher Arthur G. Milton and Jess Gorkin, editor of Parade Magazine, whose efforts are largely responsible for this publication.

Although the entire book deserves to be read by every Member of this House, I would like to call particular attention to the article by Mr. Morley Safer of CBS News, entitled: "Television Covers the War."

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that just 3 pages before the Safer article is another one under exactly the same title, written by Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. The two points of view are so contradictory I am certain the identical titles are not merely coincidence.

On page 30 of the publication, Vermont Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal makes this penetrating comment:

> A journalist owes nothing to those who govern his country. He owes everything to his country.

I believe this is a most fitting creed for the journalists who serve in Vietnam today, and the need for such a creed is nowhere better illustrated than in Morley Safer's reporting of a meeting with correspondents in Saigon by Sylvester.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if Mr. Safer's reporting of this meeting is accurate—and based on my own experience I have no doubt that it is—then, Mr. Sylvester should either resign, or be fired.

Can the American people, or this Congress, in any way excuse or condone an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, who says:

> Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that?—Stupid.

I will quote no further, Mr. Speaker, believing that this statement, in itself, will draw attention to the article which follows:

Television Covers the War

(By Morley Safer)

There has been no war quite like it. Never have so many words been churned out, never has so much 16-mm film been exposed. And never has the reporting of a story been so much a part of the story itself.

This has been true whether you are reporting television's first war, as I have been, or for one of the print media. Washington has been critical of American newsmen in Saigon almost continuously since 1961. That criticism has manifested itself in a number of ways—from the cancellation of newspaper subscriptions to orders to put certain correspondents on ice to downright threat.

As my friend and colleague Peter Kalischer puts it, "The brass wants you to get on the team."

To the brass, getting on the team means simply giving the United States government line in little more than handout form. It means accepting what you are told without question. At times it means turning your back on facts.

I know of few reporters in Vietnam who have "gotten on the team."

The fact is, the American people are getting an accurate picture of the war in spite of attempts by various officials—mostly in Washington—to present the facts in a different way. That is why certain correspondents have been vilified, privately and publicly.

By late winter of 1964-1965 the war was clearly becoming an American war. And with it came an American responsibility for providing and reporting facts. American officials thus were able to deal directly with reporters. The formality of "checking it out with the Vietnamese" ceased to be relevant.

In Washington the burden of responsibility for giving, controlling and managing the war news from Vietnam fell to—and remains with—one man: Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

By early summer of 1965 the first set of ground rules had been laid down for reporting battles and casualties. There was no censorship, but a very loose kind of honor system that put the responsibility for not breaking security on the shoulders of correspondents. The rules were vague and were therefore continually broken.

For military and civilian officials in Vietnam there was another set of rules—rather another honor system that was not so much laid down as implied. A policy of total candor was to be adhered to. "Total candor" is a phrase used by Barry Zorthian, minister-counselor at the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. Zorthian is what Time calls "the information czar" in Vietnam.

If Zorthian does not have the admiration of all the newsmen in Saigon, he at least has the respect of most of them. It would not be naive to say that the feeling is mutual, even when background briefings are held at the tops of our voices.

The breaking of the vague ground rules was something that annoyed everyone. Correspondents were rocketed by their editors, and the military in Vietnam felt that Allied lives were being endangered. So in midsummer, when Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara came to Saigon and brought Sylvester with him, we all looked forward to the formulation of a clear-cut policy. Sylvester was to meet the press in an informal session to discuss mutual problems. The meeting was to take the vagueness out of the ground rules.

I know that Zorthian looked forward to this confrontation. He had been concerned for a number of reasons about what he described as the credibility of the United States being questioned. In this he echoed former Ambassador Maxwell Taylor. Zorthian had, on Ambassador Taylor's instructions, assembled four correspondents to meet the ambassador in private and take soundings on the whole question of American credibility. I was one of the four, and what was discussed then remains privileged. The ambassador showed a great deal of sympathy and said questions would be put to people in high places. Unfortunately before the week was out he announced his resignation.

The Sylvester meeting, on the other hand, was surely one of the most disheartening meetings between reporters and a news manager ever held.

It was a sticky July evening. Zorthian had made the usual Thursday callout to what is known as the inner circle in American correspondents in Saigon. The time was fixed for 9 p.m. just after everyone had finished filing.

I was with Murray Fromson, CBS Southeast Asia correspondent. As we returned from our nightly broadcast to New York we looked forward to the cool drinks that are always available at Zorthian's villa.

Inside it was cool. The chairs had been arranged around a lower settee where Zorthian usually holds court.

Zorthian opened by saying that this was not to be the usual briefing "for information," but a bull session. "Let's face it, you fellows have some problems covering this war," he said. "I want Arthur to hear what they are. Maybe we can get something done."

Zorthian was less relaxed than usual. He was anxious for Sylvester to get an idea of the mood of the news corps. There had been some annoying moments in previous weeks that had directly involved Sylvester's own office. In the first B-52 raids, Pentagon releases were in direct contradiction to what had actually happened on the ground in Vietnam.

Also, those of us involved in broadcasting were anxious to discuss the increasing problems of communication. There was general opening banter, which Sylvester quickly brushed aside. He seemed anxious to take a stand—to say something that would jar us. He did:

"I can't understand how you fellows can write what you do while American boys are dying out here," he began. Then he went on to the effect that American correspondents had a patriotic duty to disseminate only information that made the United States look good.

A network television correspondent said, "Surely, Arthur, you don't expect the American press to be the handmaidens of government."

"That's exactly what I expect," came the reply.

An agency man raised the problem that had preoccupied Ambassador Taylor and Barry Zorthian—about the credibility of American officials. Responded the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs:

"Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that?—stupid."

One of the most respected of all the newsmen in Vietnam—a veteran of World War II, the Indochina War and Korea—suggested that Sylvester was being deliberately provocative. Sylvester replied:

"Look, I don't even have to talk to you people. I know how to deal with you through your editors and publishers back in the States."

At this point, the Hon. Arthur Sylvester put his thumbs in his ears, bulged his eyes, stuck out his tongue and wiggled his fingers.

A correspondent for one of the New York papers began a question. He never got beyond the first few words. Sylvester interrupted:

"Aw, come on. What does someone in New York care about the war in Vietnam?"

We got down to immediate practical matters—the problems of communication, access to military planes, getting out to battles.

"Do you guys want to be spoon-fed? Why don't you get out and cover the war?"

It was a jarring and insulting remark. Most of the people in that room had spent as much time on actual operations as most GI's.

Two television correspondents walked out, saying they had had enough. A few minutes later, two more correspondents left. The discussion went on. It got worse—more offensive. Only a few stayed—mainly out of regard for Zorthian.

The relationship between reporters and PIO's in Saigon, on the other hand, has been a good, healthy one. The relationship in the field is better, and in dealing with the men who fight the war it is very good indeed.

The PIO's in Saigon have been as devoted to their jobs as any officer or enlisted man in the field. And in many ways they have it a whole lot tougher. They are hog-tied by impossible ground rules. Certain items may be released by them, others only by Sylvester himself. Pity the career man who forgets it.

The implied threat of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs—"I know how to deal with you through your editors"—gives some indication of the way the Pentagon tries to exert pressure. Among my colleagues in Vietnam I know of no one who has been asked by an editor to "ease off" or to follow any kind of official line. I do know of attempts by certain American officials in Washington to vilify certain correspondents, among them this one.

It's no secret that the former president of CBS News, Fred W. Friendly, was informed that I was married to an Asian and therefore presumably had some kind of bias in favor of Asians and therefore presumably was not 100 percent American in my thinking. The fact that I'm not married at all makes the whole thing even more ludicrous.

The pressure can take less subtle forms: "Unless you get Safer out of there he's liable to end up with a bullet in his back."

This is television's first war. It is only in the past few years that the medium has become portable enough to go out on military operations. And this has raised some serious problems—problems, incidentally, which every network correspondent and cameraman in Vietnam is acutely aware of.

The camera can describe in excruciating, harrowing detail what war is all about. The cry of pain, the shattered face—it's all there on film, and out it goes into millions of American homes during the dinner hour. It is true that on its own every piece of war film takes on a certain antiwar character, simply because it does not glamorize or romanticize. In battle men do not die with a clean shot through the heart; they are blown to pieces. Television tells it that way.

It also tells what happens to civilians who are caught in the middle of battle. It tells what happens to soldiers under the stress of the unreal conditions in which they live. American soldiers are not always 100 percent sterling characters, just as American policy is not always exactly what is right for the world or for Vietnam's smallest hamlet.

The unfavorable has always been reported along with the favorable—but television tells it with greater impact. When the U.S. blunders, television leaves little doubt.

So when a government official, either in Saigon or Washington, denies what television plainly reports and then attempts to give verisimilitude to his denial by damning the reporter—at best that is pure humbug.

The war in Vietnam has become almost entirely an American responsibility. And responsible American officials must accept it. For the most part they have. But there have been glaring examples of miscalculation and a few examples of downright lying. The miscalculations have been reported, the lies have been found out. And it is that kind of honest reporting that in the end measures the rightness of our cause in Vietnam or anywhere else.

REVOLT AGAINST FREEMAN

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper article.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, we apparently no longer have a Secretary of Agriculture. We should have suspected as much when the 1966 Agriculture Yearbook was entitled "Consumers All." The farmers of America realize that they are a minority, comprising only 7 percent of the population. But they still are entitled to representation in our Government. It is now evident that the Department of Agriculture is headed by the Secretary for Consumers Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Washington Post of May 12, 1966, entitled "Revolt Against Freeman":

REVOLT AGAINST FREEMAN

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The political revolt against Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman got so overheated last week that he called a secret breakfast meeting in his office with eight Democratic Senators.

Whether it was the Secretary's ham and eggs, or his promises to do better next time, the Senators left the breakfast table momentarily mollified. But they are far from happy.

What angered the Democrats, all of them Westerners and four of them up for reelection next fall, is the fact that under the persistent prodding of President Johnson, Freeman has been making statements that seem to blame the farmer for the rising cost of living.

For example, on April 1, the Secretary said in a speech that he was "pleased" that hog prices had fallen from their peak. The effect of those words in the farm belt was dynamite. They put Freeman in the position of advocating a decline in farm income.

But more than words causes Freeman's trouble. Under orders from the President, he has released wheat and feed corn from Government storage for sale at less than market prices, an action that had the immediate effect of depressing the price of farmer-sold wheat and corn. This infuriated wheat and corn growers.

Then the Commerce Department slapped a ban on the export of rawhide, ostensibly to keep the price of shoes from going up. The farmer did not like being blamed for the high price of shoes.

The Commerce Department also opened the door to imports of cheddar cheese from Canada, which, coming on the heels of Mr. Johnson's cutback in the school milk program, enraged the dairymen.

Accordingly, the eight Democratic farm-bloc Senators complained to Freeman that his excellent reputation was falling to the level of Ezra Taft Benson's in the Eisenhower Administration—the most hated Secretary of Agriculture in this century. One of the eight, Sen. LEE METCALF of Montana, told Freeman that his re-election next fall hinges on the Administration's changing its image in the farm belt.

METCALF told Freeman that his slender 4,000-vote margin in 1960 was a direct result of his breakthrough among normally Republican wheat growers. Today, he said, he would not come close to getting that vote.

The Democratic Senators warned Freeman that if he did not explain the political facts of life in the farm belt to President Johnson, they would make a trip to the White House themselves and do it.

They told him he must get the President's permission to make political war on the Budget Bureau, the Council of Economic Advisers and other arms of the Administration that are blaming inflation on the farmers. They warned Freeman against any more presidential suggestions that housewives buy the "cheaper cuts" of meat, not the choice cuts, in order to help the campaign against inflation.

Finally, they told Freeman that although he personally was not the cause of all the growing resentment against the Administration, he was getting the blame and had better speak up for the farmers' point of view or face demands for his resignation. The breakfast meeting was the roughest and frankest Freeman has had in his five years as Secretary.

The fact is that Freeman is caught in a classic cross-haul. To appease the labor unions and the important voting blocs in the big cities, the Administration has singled out the farmer as the biggest culprit in the rise of the cost of living. Good citizen Freeman, playing like a member of the team, has been willing to go along with the President at the sacrifice of his own constituency, the farmers.

But no longer. As a direct result of last week's lecture he persuaded the President to expand the wheat acreage allotment by 7.7 million acres for 1967. Freeman is now out to show that he still loves the farmer.

There is just one trouble: farm-bloc Democrats are fearful it may be too late.

NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE BACK-DOOR AID RECEIVED BY VIETCONG FROM CAMBODIA

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last week, on Wednesday, May 4, and Thursday, May 5, I sought to bring to the attention of my colleagues the nature and extent of the back-door aid that the Vietcong derives from Cambodia and, directly or indirectly, from free world ships sailing up the Mekong River through South Vietnam to the Cambodian port of Phnompenh. That the fallacy of Cambodian neutrality is becoming a critical problem is confirmed by a report appearing in this week's issue—May 16, 1966—of U.S. News & World Report which states in part:

> The U.S. has firm evidence that three regiments of North Vietnamese regulars are now based inside Cambodia, in addition to thousands of Viet Cong guerrillas and main-line forces. All are at base camps that serve as springboards into South Vietnam.

This aid is now an open secret. We can no longer officially pretend that it does not exist. The time is overdue for the administration to urge the Government of South Vietnam to close this back door of supply for the Vietcong. I say the Mekong River should be closed to Cambodian-bound traffic both as a direct means to cut the flow of contraband to the Vietcong and as a weapon of economic pressure to encourage Cambodia to adhere to its alleged policy of neutrality. I include the article entitled "As War Spreads Into 'Neutral' Cambodia" at this point in the RECORD:

AS WAR SPREADS INTO "NEUTRAL" CAMBODIA

SAIGON.—War in South Vietnam has now spilled over into neighboring Cambodia—openly and officially.

On May 3, the U.S. high command disclosed that American artillerymen, in a battle three days earlier, fired into Cambodia to silence Viet Cong guns.

"Hot pursuit" orders: This was the first official report of such an attack, although some months ago U.S. officers were given authorization to fire onto Cambodian soil in the heat of battle or even undertake "hot pursuit" of Red troops using it as a sanctuary.

Another official disclosure—this one about the semisecret air war over Laos—also was made on May 3. The Defense Department announced that 11 U.S. airmen have been killed and "less than 20" are missing as a result of two years of operations against the Ho Chi Minh Trail leading from North Vietnam.

The big question was: Will war now keep spreading in these two small nearby countries?

The answer on Laos seemed set—a firm no. President Johnson earlier this year ruled out any ground action against Red routes in Laos, largely out of respect for friendly Laotian rulers. Cambodia is another story. Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the country's royal dictator, has broken diplomatic relations with the U.S. and advertises himself as a close friend of Red China.

The U.S. has firm evidence that three regiments of North Vietnamese regulars are now based inside Cambodia, in addition to thousands of Viet Cong guerrillas and main-line forces. All are at base camps that serve as springboards into South Vietnam.

How supplies move: The Reds are said to be supplied frequently by Cambodian merchants or, in the case of rice, directly by the Cambodian Government. A Cambodian supply route, called the "Sihanouk Road" by Americans, has been developed to ship supplies from Cambodia into South Vietnam.

Yet, top military men in Saigon report that the official American position is that there will be no large-scale drive against the Cambodian sanctuary.

When attacked from the Cambodian side, U.S. commanders have authority to call for air strikes or artillery against the enemy to ensure the security of U.S. troops. But retaliation on the ground rarely exceeds pushing more than 250 yards into Cambodia, for fear of being drawn into ambush in the heavily jungled mountain regions.

The official U.S. view in Saigon is that, although Cambodia is giving aid to the Communists; it is not in America's interest to push any farther into Cambodia—thus forcing Prince Sihanouk into openly helping Hanoi and widening the war.

LEASING OR OPERATION OF INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL FACILITIES BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES SHOULD BE BROUGHT UNDER THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there ojection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to bring under the Federal income tax profits derived by local governmental authorities or agencies from the leasing or operation of industrial or commercial facilities when the facilities are leased or operated for profitmaking purposes as distinguished from governmental purposes.

In general, the Federal income tax has not been imposed upon the profits made by State or local governmental units, or by any so-called authority or agency of those units. This has been true because heretofore, so far as I am aware, the facilities which these units operate have been confined to those which local government authorities believe should be constructed, owned, or operated by public bodies and which would not be adequately provided or operated by private industry. The public interest in government rather than private operation has justified the exemption from Federal income tax.

Recently, however, we have begun to witness attempts by local quasi-governmental units to take advantage of their Federal income tax exemption to construct and operate facilities which go far beyond any reasonable public need and convenience and which are already fully and adequately provided by private industry.

I refer particularly to the plans announced by the Port of New York Authority to construct and operate a World Trade Center in Lower Manhattan in New York City. The World Trade Center in New York is a most commendable project, but the Port of New York Authority has announced that it will be built to include twin 110-story towers that would be the largest office structures in the world, containing more than 10 million square feet of space. These structures, I am informed, would contain at least 4 million square feet of office space for private occupancy that is totally unnecessary to the operation of a World Trade Center. Office space for private occupancy is fully and adequately provided by private industry in New York City.

The purpose of this extra 4 million square feet of office space, I understand, is to provide profits for the Port of New York Authority to use in connection with other projects it carries on or contemplates. It is apparently intended that the authority will voluntarily pay amounts to the city of New York to equal real estate taxes on the value of this additional space, which would not be the case in New York if this extra space were considered an appropriate governmental facility or operation.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why a local authority should not pay Federal income taxes on its profitmaking ventures which compete directly with facilities properly and adequately maintained by private industry and for which governmental construction or operation is unnecessary. Unless the misuse of the Federal income tax exemption is stopped, there will be no limit to the extent to which local authorities or agencies engage in profitmaking ventures in unfair competition with heavily taxed private industry. The bill which I have today introduced would eliminate this improper advantage and produce the appropriate revenue for the Federal Government.

I should like to stress that my bill would in no way curb public officials or their constituents in deciding what local governments should do for their communities, if it is determined that a government project would help fill true community needs. But projects conducted only to make profits for government do not deserve exemption. To permit this will do harm to the Federal tax structure, to private industry and in the long run, I believe, to local governmental revenues as well.

HORTON BILL EASES DISABILITY REQUIREMENT FOR VETERAN POST-EXCHANGE PRIVILEGES

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last fall I received a letter from a constituent seeking my assistance, which has led me to introduce a bill designed to met his problem and others in similar circumstances.

This person is a World War I veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 60 percent. He asked if I could assist him in obtaining a certification from the Veterans' Administration that would allow him to purchase articles at a post exchange.

I was informed by the VA that military regulations do provide that purchasing privileges at PX's, and at commissary stores as well, may be extended to veterans, but only if they are totally disabled from service-connected causes or if they are hospitalized by the VA. The bill I have introduced would allow a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 50 percent or more to obtain purchasing privileges at military PX's and commissaries including naval ships' services.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a great deal to ask in the name of these veterans. It would have no significant impact upon either the retail economy or the post-exchange stores.

The military regulations governing the purchasing privileges of totally disabled or hospitalized veterans have been liberalized significantly over the years. At one time the veteran could exercise the privilege. A change was made to allow him to appoint someone else, usually his wife, to exercise the privilege for him. This change made good sense in view of the limitations on the ability of these veterans to actually get to a PX or commissary. The regulations were also amended last November by eliminating a requirement that a totally disabled veteran must also be receiving medical treatment from the VA in order to obtain the purchasing privileges. I look on my bill as another worthwhile liberalization to the rules governing these privileges, no more drastic than the changes that have been made in the past.

I would also like to take this opportunity to cite the importance, generally, of the post exchange and commissaries on our military installations. There has ben considerable talk of closing some or all of these facilities, and I wish to state my opposition to this trend. It is well known that PX privileges add materially to the real income and purchasing power of active duty personnel, retired servicemen and disabled veterans. There is no group to whom this Nation owes more gratitude, and certainly, there should be no "economizing" on the services we have promised to these military families.

It is my hope that the introduction of this measure will be looked upon not only as a liberalization of disability requirements for PX privileges, but as a general vote in favor of honoring and expanding our commitments to these men and their families.

ADULT EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we in this Chamber may take rightful pride in legislation we have approved in recent years to assist our Nation's education programs. Federal legislation to date, however, in support of adult education has been restricted to the elementary level. I believe the time has now come for us to enact legislation to assist those who have an inadequate education and are, therefore, denied equal employment opportunities.

For this reason I am today introducing the Adult Education Act of 1966 which would allow adults to meet the accepted standards of formal education which they have missed. It would offer other adults the opportunity to participate in "supplemental adult education" regardless of the levels they have attained through formal education. "Supplemental adult education" is defined as "a program of instruction and services for adults designed to enable them to over come English language limitations, to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training and more profitable attainment, or to become more productive and responsible citizens through citizenship training, parent education, and consumer education."

A look at some statistics reveals the extent to which the lack of higher education by many of our citizens is closely intertwined with unemployment, job instability, and myriad other problems. Between 1953 and 1963, jobs filled by high school graduates rose 30 percent, while jobs for those with only elementary education decreased by 25 percent. A 1963 report of the Office of Education shows that persons 18 years and older who have not completed high school make up 46 percent of the labor force, but a disproportionate 64 percent of the unemployed. At the same time, 93 percent of professional and technical workers have at least graduated from high school and 27 percent have college educations. The unemployment rate in this field is an unbelievably low 1.7 percent.

It is encouraging to note the growing extent of adult education through public school systems. However, as the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower noted in a report it issued in April 1964:

> Of 15,200 school systems studied by the Office of Education, only 4,840 reported any type of adult education programs. Only 160, or 3.3 percent, offered any instruction whatsoever in adult basic education. Of 23 million educationally deprived adults, only 47,500 were being taught basic literacy skills and only 1.1 percent of the limited number of adult education courses offered such training.

The purpose of my bill is to help develop and improve what should be a great national effort to provide through our public schools an educational supplement for all persons over the age of 18 years.

The National Education Association has issued a statement which indicates that their policies are in agreement with the purpose of this legislation. They would approve of any proposal which would provide for the training of teachers and granting appropriate stipends and allowances to teachers engaged in adult education. We must realize how important it is to adequately train teachers to work with adults and respect their specific problems. By including the teacher training program within the measures of the adult education bill, it is hoped that quality teaching will emerge.

I strongly urge my fellow Congressmen to support this important legislation. The programs provided by this bill will broaden the exciting vistas of adult, vocational and technical education, and do much to enrich the Nation and the lives of the citizens it serves.

HATCH ACT ENFORCEMENT, IMPROVEMENT NEEDED

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal on Friday, May 6, reported:

> Democrats' dinner next week will be a fund-raising disappointment. The Congressional sponsors figure to sell no more than 6,000 tickets at $100 each, down from 8,000 last year. Freshman House Democrats shy away, expecting little of the proceeds. But 1,000 upper-level bureaucrats have kicked in.

Mr. Speaker, this report seems to indicate the politicians are tapering off in their efforts to tap Federal workers in illegal ways for campaign contributions. Perhaps our long struggle to see that the Hatch and Corrupt Practices Acts are enforced has proved helpful.

But I cannot help wondering how many of the 1,000 upper-level bureaucrats who bought $100 dinner tickets did so because of heavy arm-twisting pressure from higher-ups in the Federal Government.

I think this news article verifies the fact we must continue to press hard for enforcement of the Hatch and Corrupt Practices Acts. As the chairman of the Republican Task Force on the Federal Civil Service Merit System, I would again urge my colleagues to act on the task force legislation introduced last week designed to put a stop to illegal campaign solicitations of Federal workers by drawing nearly 370,000 high-level Federal officials under the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

BUYING POWER OF FACTORY PRODUCTION WORKERS DECLINES IN THE PAST YEAR

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's factory workers may well wonder what the Johnson administration is talking about in its constant references to our record-shattering prosperity. Over the past year the buying power—technically the "real" spendable earnings—of factory production workers has actually declined.

The drop was small but highly significant in a growing economy in which new record highs are reached almost as a matter of course. However, the reason for the decline is not hard to find. While the administration has been propagandizing about the benefits it has bestowed on the average man through tax cuts, prices have been rising sharply and social security taxes have been increased. Balancing off tax reduction against the results of other administration policies, the factory worker has been the loser.

From March 1965 to March 1966, the gross average weekly earnings of factory production workers increased by $4.51. After deducting social security and Federal income taxes, however, the increase comes to $2.30 for a single worker and $2.46 for a worker with three dependents. But adjusted for changes in the consumer price index, the single worker lost 12 cents in purchasing power over the year, while the worker with three dependents lost 17 cents.

Two things should also be noted about these figures. Not all of the increased earnings result from higher wages. Part reflects the increase of 0.3 hour in average weekly hours worked over the year. In other words, the worker is not only receiving less buying power for his labor, but he is also working longer. Finally if State and local tax increases were taken into consideration, the reduction in "real" spendable earnings would be even more than indicated.

I include a Department of Labor press release of April 21, 1966, reporting these figures in the RECORD at this point:

NET SPENDABLE EARNINGS, MARCH 1966

Net spendable earnings—or "after-tax pay"—represent the factory worker's average weekly pay after deduction of social security and Federal income taxes. "Real" spendable earnings represent the buying power of the worker's net spendable earnings after adjustment for changes in the Consumer Price Index. These calculations are made for two representative types of workers—a worker without dependents and a worker with 3 dependents. The gross average weekly earnings for all factory production workers are used in the calculations.

Net spendable earnings (gross earnings less Federal income taxes and social security deductions) of factory production workers continued to move upward in March, the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. The February-to-March increase was due to a rise in the average workweek and a one-cent advance in hourly earnings. Average hourly earnings were at a record level of $2.68 in March.

Workers with three dependents averaged $98.55 and single workers $90.72. Paychecks for both increased by about 75 cents over the month. Compared with March 1965, spendable earnings had risen by $2.30 for the single worker and $2.46 for the worker with three dependents. The over-the-year advance was the result of a 0.3 hour increase in average weekly hours and a 9-cent rise in average hourly earnings.

The rise in consumer prices held the increase in "real" net spendable weekly earnings (or purchasing power) to about 35 cents over the month. Because of increases in both consumer prices and social security taxes, real spendable earnings were down slightly from a year ago.

Weekly earnings of factory production workers, March 1966

Month and year	Gross average weekly earnings	Spendable earnings,[1] worker with—		Real spendable earnings,[2] worker with—			
				No dependents		3 dependents	
		No dependents	3 dependents	1957–59 dollars	Index (1957–59=100)	1957–59 dollars	Index (1957–59=100)
March 1966 [3]	$111.22	$90.72	$98.55	$81.00	117.6	$87.99	115.3
February 1966 [3]	110.27	90.00	97.80	80.65	117.1	87.63	114.8
January 1966	110.00	89.79	97.58	80.89	117.5	87.91	115.2
March 1965	106.71	88.42	96.09	81.12	117.8	88.16	115.5
1957–59 average	84.17	68.87	76.30	68.87	100.0	76.30	100.0

[1] Spendable earnings are calculated by deducting social security and Federal income taxes applicable to 2 representative groups of workers from the gross average weekly earnings of all factory production workers. For further details see the technical note on calculation and uses of the net spendable earnings series, which is available on request.

[2] Real spendable earnings express the buying power of the factory worker's spendable earnings in dollars of 1957–59 prices. The index of these earnings shows the comparison with the 1957–59 base period as 100.

[3] Preliminary.

NOTE.—Data for previous periods may be found in BLS Bulletin No. 1312–3, Employment and Earnings Statistics for the United States, 1909–65, available for $4.25 from the U.S. Government Printing Office or from regional offices of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

NEW TAXPAYMENT PLAN TO ALTER BUDGET PICTURE FOR FISCAL 1966 AND 1967

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at the end of June the administration will claim another of its budget miracles as the 1966 budget deficit falls considerably below the $6.4 billion projected several months ago.

One important reason for the apparent improvement in the 1966 deficit will be a new plan announced by the Treasury on April 28 to require more frequent payment of income taxes withheld by employers. From now on larger employers will be required to make such payments twice a month rather than once a month.

The budget effect of the plan is that administrative budget receipts in fiscal year 1966 will be increased by approximately $1 billion. Fiscal 1967 revenues will be decreased by the same amount. The improvement in 1966, therefore, is offset by an equal deterioration of the 1967 picture. The projected deficit of $1.8 billion for fiscal 1967 automatically becomes $2.8 billion.

So that Members of Congress and the press will be able to better evaluate the 1966 budget results, I include the Treasury press release announcing the new plan in the Record at this point:

More Frequent Payment of Income Taxes Withheld by Employers Slated To Take Effect in Mid-June

The Treasury Department announced today that it expects to put into effect in June a new system to reduce the time lag on the payment of income taxes withheld by employers. The new system also would cover social security taxes withheld by employers, and matching amounts paid by employers.

About 75,000 larger employers would be required to deposit payments of such taxes twice a month—rather than once a month—either at designated commercial banks or federal reserve banks. The semi-monthly payments under the new system would be due within three banking days after the 15th and the last day of each month, covering taxes withheld on regular weekly, biweekly, or semi-monthly payrolls up to and including the 15th day or last day of each month.

The new payments plan would apply to any employer with $4,000 or more per month of the total of such taxes, that is—the income and social security taxes withheld from employees as well as the employer's portion of the social security tax.

Any employer could comply with the new regulations by depositing an estimated amount of the taxes due. If this estimated amount is within 90 percent of the actual amount, there would be no penalties.

The new regulations would not change existing regulations for any employer with less than $4,000 per month in such taxes.

However, the Treasury intends to give further study to the question of whether the more rapid payments plan might appropriately be extended to employers other than the 75,000 larger employers who will be affected by the proposed regulations. Currently, about 4.5 million employers withhold income taxes from employees, and of these, approximately 1.5 million make monthly deposits covering such taxes, while the other 3 million pay such taxes once every three months—by the close of the month following the end of each quarter.

The increased frequency of these employer deposits covering both the withheld income taxes and social security taxes is part of the effort of the Treasury Department and Internal Revenue Service to improve the efficiency of tax collection, and to put tax payments on a more current basis. The Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, signed by President Johnson on March 15, 1966, initiated a new graduated income tax withholding system for income taxes, to take effect on May 1, 1966, and made other changes in the tax law to put both individuals and corporations on a more current payments basis.

The new plan is expected to save the Federal government between $50 million and $75 million per year in interest costs on the public debt.

The new system would not increase the tax liability of any taxpayer—either the employee whose wages or salary are subject to withholding at the source or the employer who withholds such taxes and turns them over to the Federal government.

As a result of the change-over to the new system, administrative budget receipts in fiscal year 1966 would be increased by approximately $1 billion on a one-shot basis. If the new payments plan were to be extended to all employers who now are subject to deposit requirements—those with $100 or more per month or withheld income taxes and social security taxes—approximately 1.5 million employers would be affected and the effects on the federal budget, would be an additional half billion dollars.

Proposed regulations covering the new system for the payment of these taxes will be published in the Federal Register on Friday, April 29, 1966, with a notice that those interested will have 15 days to submit comments on the new rules.

For illustrative purposes, here is how the proposed regulations would work:

A larger employer, with $4,000 or more per month in withheld income taxes and social security taxes, would deposit in mid-June 1966 the taxes covering the month of May, which would be his last payment under current rules. He also would deposit, within three banking days after the 15th of June 1966 another tax payment covering income taxes withheld on regular weekly, biweekly or semi-monthly payrolls in the first half of June—up to and including the 15th of the month. In the case of the one-shot doubling up in mid-June, the employer could make both his last deposit under the existing rules and his first semi-monthly deposit under the new rules by June 20th.

By July 6th—three banking days after the close of June—the larger employer would make a further deposit of taxes withheld from the wages and salaries of employees during the second half of June, and thereafter would continue to make such payments on a semi-monthly basis.

All employers would continue to file just one quarterly tax return covering such taxes.

The employer with $100 per month or more in withheld taxes (and social security taxes) would continue, as under present regulations, to deposit tax payments once a month—on the 15th of the month following the close of each month during most of the year, and by the end of the following month at the close of each calendar quarter.

The small employer—who has less than $100 of such taxes per month—who now withholds such taxes and pays them quarterly with his tax return by the close of the month following each calendar quarter—that is, by January 31, by April 30, by July 31, and by October 31—would continue to do so.

FEDERALIZED NATO

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ellsworth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of the resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation, I was interested to see an editorial dealing with it in the Chicago Sunday Tribune on May 1, and a followup comment by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative Paul Findley, which the Tribune published on May 11. Here are the texts:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune, May 1, 1966]

Illusions Die Hard

The editor remarked in mock dismay, "It looks like we are being surrounded." His observation was prompted by a roster of Republican politicians who have come out as sponsors of a resolution looking toward making over the North Atlantic Treaty organization into a federal union.

The sponsor of the resolution is Representative Paul Findley, an Illinois Republican, who usually makes pretty good sense. Joining him as sponsors are four other Illinois Republicans: John B. Anderson, Edward J. Derwinski, Robert H. Michel, and Donald Rumsfeld.

But hang onto your hats. Listed as other sponsors are Barry Goldwater, former Vice President Richard Nixon, and less surprisingly, Gov. George Romney, of Michigan, and Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania.

The March issue of "Freedom and Union," the organ of the Atlantic union movement, can't refrain from gloating a bit that five of the 11 Republican House sponsors of the bill "are from Illinois, long dominated by The Chicago Tribune." We shall try to bear up under the imputed hardship.

The "Union Now" cause is practically a one-man crusade by a nice fellow named Clarence Streit, with whom we are on friendly terms. He has been plugging away at it for the best part of three decades and won't admit discouragement. According to Clarence, Atlantic union is a sure cure for whatever ails man or beast. It would, he says, solve the current NATO crisis, end the war in Viet Nam, stave off a depression caused by the collapse of the international monetary system, and end the threat of a nuclear war.

We have never questioned Mr. Streit's motives, but we do question his prescription. We also question the judgment of the various Republicans who are seeing things thru his own rose-tinted glasses.

All of these people know that the time is hardly opportune to expand NATO into a federal union when President de Gaulle of France is in the process of knocking the props out from under NATO. His precise objection to the NATO structure is that it forces France into "subordination described as integration."

Gen. de Gaulle doesn't want to get the United States into Europe; he wants to get it out. He starts by telling us to get our troops and military instalations [and the NATO headquarters] out of France, and he withdraws French forces from an integrated NATO command under an American supreme commander. His vision of a Europe united from the Atlantic to the Urals, under French leadership, allows no place for the United States.

As for our other NATO allies, these are precisely the nations which will give us no military support against the war of communist conquest in Viet Nam, but, to the contrary, trade with and supply the communist enemy. They will not support us in a trade embargo of communist Cuba, but support the faltering economy of the dictator Castro. They build steel plants for Red China, which is venomously hostile to the United States. They agitate for its admission into the United Nations.

Team up in a trans-Atlantic government with this lineup, tax the American citizen to pay everybody's bills and underwrite their currency? It is a pipedream, and thrust aside as such even by the state department in its refusal to support the internationalists—Goldwater, by all that's holy; Nixon, Findley, Rumsfeld, Derwinski, Anderson, and Michel. Crazy, man, as the beats say.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 11, 1966]

Federalizing NATO

Washington, May 6.—Your May 1 editorial "Illusions Die Hard" was a brilliant example of lighthearted writing which I enjoyed immensely, despite its obvious thrust against H.J. Res. 769, which I am sponsoring in Congress.

Editorials on foreign policy are usually so gloomy that a "fun piece" is doubly welcome.

One of these days I hope you will give this proposal serious attention. When you do I am confident that you will find it practical, completely in tune with our structural constitutional principles, and well worth thorough exploration. It would authorize a delegation of eminent United States citizens to meet with similar groups from other NATO nations, aimed at agreement on a declaration that the eventual goal is to transform the alliance into a federal union government, a tentative timetable for the transition, and the free institutions needed to reach the goal in time to prevent another war or depression. This proposal has been advocated for years by a number of respected statesmen.

Of course it commits no one and is purely exploratory.

If an agreement could be reached and the NATO alliance transformed into a federal union government, it might—as your editorial suggests—fall short of curing all the ills of "man and beast." However, former President Eisenhower once told me it would solve "almost all of our problems" in international affairs.

Actually the proposal is much more conservative than one advocated in 1943–44 in your editorial columns in which you suggested that Britain, Australia, Canada "and those other parts of the empire that have achieved self-government" become states in the United States union. That of course would mean bringing all the citizens of those countries under the United States social security system, thus expanding the present federal bureaucracy.

My suggestion is a new level of government whose authority would be very carefully limited to military, foreign policy, monetary, interstate trade, and postal affairs. National governments would continue with their own individual approach to other problems.

Although more modest than THE TRIBUNE'S statehood proposal, it is admittedly far reaching. Unhappily, so are today's problems.

PAUL FINDLEY,
Member of Congress,
20th District, Illinois.

RESULTS OF THE MIZE INSTANT POLL ON NATIONAL ISSUES

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the results of the questionnaire which I have circulated in the Second District of Kansas have been tabulated and I wish to bring the tabulations to the attention of my colleagues.

I called this the Mize instant poll because I visited most of the counties of the Second District during the Easter recess and handed out the questionnaire personally in every community I visited. In a great many instances, the questions on the opinion poll were answered on the spot and I was able to take them away with me. I also left additional copies in each community and mailed copies to those I did not visit personally, so the questionnaire did get good coverage in the district.

The response has been higher than average, I feel, because of the personal distribution and the fact that I could also collect a good many of the completed questionnaires before I left each community. I am pleased that so many of my constituents participated and I am confident that this cross section of opinion accurately reflects the position that a majority of the voters in the district take on each of these issues.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully request that the results of the Mize instant poll appear in the RECORD at this point. The summary follows:

THE MIZE INSTANT POLL ON NATIONAL ISSUES

[Results in percent]

1. Should Congress submit to the people a Constitutional Amendment that would permit one House of State Legislatures to be apportioned on a basis other than population?

Yes	58
No	34
No opinion	8

2. Do you favor a four-year term for Congressmen?

Yes	55
No	42
No opinion	3

3. Do you think the benefits of the poverty program outweigh the reported costs and abuses?

Yes	15
No	80
No opinion	5

4. Should the minimum wage be raised from its present $1.25 per hour level?

Yes	38
No	58
No opinion	4

4(a). If yes, to what level? (Not all of those who thought the minimum wage should be increased indicated a specific rate. Of those who did, these are the preferences.)

For $1.40	48
For $1.60	33
For $1.75	19

(b). Should farm, hotel and restaurant workers receive a minimum wage guarantee?

Yes	51
No	41
No opinion	8

5. Do you favor setting aside a small percentage of revenue each year to reduce the national debt?

Yes	88
No	9
No opinion	3

6. Do you think incomes are increasing in proportion to the rising cost of living?

Yes	29
No	66
No opinion	5

7. Do you favor or oppose the following courses of action which the U.S. might take in Viet Nam?

(a) Withdraw?

Yes	32
No	68

(b) Take whatever military action is necessary to achieve decisive victory?

Yes	87
No	13

(c) Keep up our present military effort in hopes of a negotiated peace?

Yes	52
No	48

(It should be noted that many of the respondents answered more than one part of the question. Many who voted against withdrawal also voted for one of the other proposals. By far, the greatest number of those answering this question responded to section "b".)

8. Do you favor more strict Federal regulation in the sale and ownership of firearms?

Yes	47
No	50
No opinion	3

9. Do you favor increasing Federal control of the Unemployment Compensation program, increasing the duration of the benefits and the amount of payments as well as employer contributions?

Yes	10
No	87
No opinion	3

MINORITY ECONOMIC COUNCIL IS ESSENTIAL TO BETTER FUNCTIONING OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, economists and consultants who have served under Democratic administrations agree that whichever party is the minority in Congress needs a Council of Economic Advisers to help promote sounder scholarship in the economic field.

This need has been recognized by my Republican colleagues, TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, and BILL WIDNALL, of New Jersey, who have introduced a bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to create a Minority Economic Council. Convinced of the need for such a group of advisers to the Minority, I am introducing today a similar bill. In the words of an editorial in the San Diego Union of March 12:

> Constructive opposition such as the "little" council of economic advisers could bring might sharpen administration thinking by presenting another side of the issues, have the stature and weight to focus public pressure, to correct mistaken thinking, and speak with studied authority.

The bill I am introducing would amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for a Minority Economic Council funded by Congress but directly responsible to the congressional representatives of whichever party does not control the White House.

Debate on economic issues is today not extensive enough or thorough enough. Administration economic policy lacks an institution to challenge the concentration of economic brainpower in the executive branch. Thus, while the executive has at its command vast internal resources and a strong attraction for private advisers, the minority party in Congress by comparison has no such resources, nor innate attraction. This is a problem of the preponderance of executive branch knowledge, combined with power, over the minority, and essentially this problem is an institutional one. No mechanism in our society can now focus dissent on economic issues.

The Minority Economic Council which the bill I am introducing would establish would help correct this situation. I urge thoughtful students who seek to build a stronger and better American economic system, both Republican and Democrat, to support this constructive proposal and help implement it in Congress. The Minority Economic Council is a logical extension of the Employment Act of 1946. It would benefit both parties during the period in which they happen to be in the minority in Congress, and is thus essentially a bipartisan proposal.

Economic matters are of increasing concern to all Members of Congress just as they are to all Americans. The ever-increasing cost of living and the danger of serious inflation concern taxpayers and their families. A Minority Economic Council could help the minority throw its weight behind sound economic decisionmaking.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 15041

A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for a Minority Economic Council.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created a Minority Economic Council. The Minority Economic Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the Minority Economic Council Board hereinafter referred to as "the Board" and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, to formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment, production, and purchasing power under free competitive enterprise, and to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of this policy. The Board shall designate one of the members of the Minority Economic Council as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman, who shall act as Chairman in the absence of the Chairman. The members of the Minority Economic Council shall be appointed within five days of the first day of the first session of each Congress, and shall serve for the remainder of such Congress. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each member of the Minority Economic Council shall be paid annual compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Board.

"(b) The Minority Economic Council is authorized to employ, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this section, without regard to the civil-service laws, and is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this section.

"(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Minority Economic Council—

"(1) to assist and advise the Board on national economic policy;

"(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic developments and economic trends, both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information in the light of the economic policy it believes to be in the national interest for the purpose of determining whether such developments and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of such policy, and to compile and submit to the Board studies relating to such developments and trends;

"(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the economic policy it believes to be in the national interest for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing, and the extent to which they are not contributing, to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the Board with respect thereto;

"(4) to develop and recommend to the Board national economic policies to foster and promote free competitive enterprise, to avoid economic fluctuations or to diminish the effects thereof, and to maintain employment, production, and purchasing power;

"(5) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of Federal economic policy and legislation as the Board may request.

"(d) The Minority Economic Council shall make an annual report to the Board in December of each year.

"(e) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this section—

"(1) the Minority Economic Council may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

"(2) the Minority Economic Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

"(f) To enable the Minority Economic Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

"(g) As used in this section the term 'Minority Council Board' means—

"(1) in the case where at the beginning of a Congress a majority of the Members of both Houses are of a political party other than that of the President, a board of directors consisting of the following: (A) the majority leader of each House, (B) the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, (C) the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, (D) the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and (E) the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

"(2) in the case where at the beginning of a Congress a majority of the Members of both Houses are of the same political party as that of the President, a board of directors consisting of the following: (A) the minority leader of each House, (B) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, (C) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, (D) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and (E) the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee.

"(3) in the case where at the beginning of a Congress a majority of the Members of one House are of the same political party as that of the President and a majority of the Members of the other House are of a political party other than that of the President, a board of directors consisting of the following members: (A) from that House the majority of whose Members are of a political party other than that of the President, the majority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, as the case may be, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and (B) from that House a majority of whose Members are of the same political party as that of the President, the minority leader, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, as the case may be, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and (C) the ranking majority member of the Joint Economic Committee from the House the majority of whose Members are not of the same party as that of the President, and the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee from the House a majority of whose Members are of the same political party as that of the President."

COTTON MILL MARGINS KEEP CLIMBING

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the debate of the so-called one-price cotton bills last year and the year before I warned that these programs would likely lead to a bonanza for textile mills with little or no advantage to American consumers or to wage earners.

Since then wage earners in some of the textile mills have received modest increases, but consumers clearly have not benefited. Quite the contrary. Unfinished cloth prices have climbed almost without interruption each month or so since August 1964 when the one-price cotton program went into effect. The price for the average of 20 constructions unfinished cloth prices as reported by the Department of Agriculture—CS-223 April 1966—on August 1964 was 60.83 cents. The latest figure for March 1966 is 64.88, an increase of over 6 percent. During this same period raw cotton prices declined from 27.64 cents per pound to 26.30. Just prior to the enactment of the program the cost for raw cotton to mills was 35.60.

Data from the Department of Agriculture makes it obvious that the mill profit columns are the principal beneficiaries of the one-price cotton programs. Prior to the effective date of the first program in 1964 the margins were averaging about 26 cents per pound. Since that date mill margins have climbed almost each month without interruption and the latest report was 38.58 cents for March 1966.

To summarize, average mill selling prices are up, the cost of raw cotton is down, and the gross profit margin for mills is up sharply.

Government inventories of cotton are at an alltime peak. The cost of the program to taxpayers approaches $1 billion a year.

In view of the mill profit margin trends, I do not see how the Congress can possibly defend the legislation recently passed by this body which would place on farmers the full cost of a checkoff assessment.

A far more hopeful approach would be to cut cotton farmers loose from the legislative thicket rather than make the thicket even deeper.

Following is a table from "Cotton Situation," published by Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture—CS–223—April 1966:

[Cents per pound]

	Average for 20 constructions		
	Unfinished cloth prices	Raw cotton prices	Mill margins
1963—January	60.55	35.45	25.10
February	60.47	35.66	24.81
March	60.49	35.95	24.54
April	60.26	36.08	24.18
May	60.00	36.16	23.84
June	60.11	35.86	24.25
July	60.28	35.57	24.71
August	60.56	35.33	25.23
September	60.85	35.19	25.66
October	61.25	35.11	26.14
November	62.01	35.27	26.74
December	62.34	35.37	26.97
1964—January	62.32	35.47	26.85
February	62.37	35.55	26.82
March	62.37	35.58	26.79
April	61.82	35.63	[1] 26.19
May	61.29	35.67	[1] 25.62
June	60.62	35.76	[1] 24.86
July	60.69	35.60	[1] 25.09
August	60.83	27.64	33.19
September	60.96	26.82	34.14
October	61.33	26.80	34.53
November	61.60	26.98	34.62
December	62.52	27.30	35.22
1965—January	63.13	27.30	35.83
February	63.28	27.26	36.02
March	63.42	27.26	36.16
April	63.89	27.40	36.49
May	64.65	27.35	37.30
June	64.85	27.36	37.49
July	65.30	27.33	37.97
August	65.43	27.12	38.31
September	65.30	26.73	38.57
October	65.23	26.61	38.62
November	65.15	26.57	38.58
December	65.11	26.34	38.77
1966—January	65.08	26.30	38.78
February	65.04	26.27	38.77
March	64.88	26.30	38.58

[1] Does not include the 6.5 cents per pound cotton equalization payment made to domestic cotton users on all bales opened beginning 12:01 a.m., Apr. 11, 1964. USDA made no adjustment for these payments prior to August 1964. Commencing August 1965, the domestic payment was 5.75 cents per pound.

Source: "Cotton Situation," Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, CS–223, April 1966.

MILITARY MEDICAL BENEFITS ACT

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14088, the Military Medical Benefits Act. This legislation is needed to assist the veterans of our Armed Forces, to whom this country is deeply obligated. It was impossible for me to be here yesterday. Had I been here, I certainly would have joined all of my colleagues in voting for this legislation.

CLEVELAND EXPLAINS OPPOSITION TO SHIFT IN WATER POLLUTION AGENCY

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, last Tuesday, reorganization plan No. 2 went into effect. As a result, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has been shifted from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior.

Prior to the effective date of this plan, I introduced the only resolution of disapproval, House Resolution 827, and held the option of making a privileged motion to bring the plan to the floor for debate. I decided not to do so, however, and take this opportunity to explain my decision.

My reasons for introducing the resolution of disapproval were explained, in part, on April 28 and may be found on page 9283 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I speak as one dedicated to the cause of full development of our water resources, in particular the campaign against water pollution. That is why I introduced House Resolution 827. I want to make it clear that I have the highest regard for the Department of the Interior and for Secretary Udall. Under his leadership, which is imaginative and energetic, the Department has made significant contributions to the preservation and improvement of our natural resources.

His department has done a superb job in connection with its recreational responsibilities in New Hampshire.

The State of New Hampshire has also established an outstanding record. New Hampshire pays 40 percent of the cost of pollution control facilities—the highest rate in the Nation. We offer tax abatement for such facilities when constructed by private funds. Almost 70 percent of our streams and rivers have been classified and all of our more than 1,000 lakes and ponds, with only a few minor exceptions, are pollution free.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

On Wednesday, May 4, the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee held a public hearing on my resolution. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] presided and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] attended.

I was given every opportunity to present my views in full. A summary of my objections to the reorganization plan follows:

First. The reorganization takes the Water Pollution Control Agency out of the hands of HEW, the Department charged with protection of the public health, to the Interior Department, the agency concerned with development of natural resources, thus shifting the emphasis of the program—an error, in my opinion.

Second. The reorganization is premature, being the third major shakeup in the Water Pollution Agency in 5 years.

Third. The reorganization is, in effect, a reversal by Executive fiat of the carefully studied, administration-endorsed, and unanimously approved Water Quality Act of 1965, which has been in effect only about 4 months. Such docility on the part of Congress makes one wonder why we bother having a Congress.

Fourth. The effect of the transfer to Interior is resulting in severe disruptions among the commissioned officers of the Public Health Service who are assigned to the Water Pollution Control Agency. The administration estimates that half of these vital personnel will leave the anti-water-pollution campaign. I believe that this number, which may actually be higher than the estimates, would not have been so great had the agency been left in HEW. I believe these defections will result in serious delays in getting the program underway.

I presented these views to the subcommittee in as much detail as I could, given the short amount of time I had in which to prepare myself. The gentlemen of the subcommittee were most courteous, fair and thorough. I filed the resolution because all of these reorganization plans should be scrutinized carefully and that the administration should be made to justify them fully.

While I am not fully satisfied that Reorganization Plan No. 2 has been justified, I was satisfied that there was not sufficient support for my opposition either in the Congress or from outside to justify my taking the issue to the floor. Following the hearing, the subcommittee voted to report my resolution adversely and this decision was endorsed the following day by the full committee.

My own views are unchanged and I fear this third reorganization in 5 years will seriously delay and possibly damage the efforts to clear up our lakes and rivers. Time alone will tell.

COLUMNIST KILPATRICK EXPOSES "OLD SHELL GAME" CONCEALED IN PRESIDENT'S SALES PARTICIPATION PROPOSAL—H.R. 14544

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, this House is about to consider one of the slickest, wheeler-dealer schemes ever presented to the Congress by any administration, including this one. It is called the Sales Participation Act. If it is approved, it will put the operations of the Federal budget on the level of the old carnival "shell game."

The whole story is spelled out clearly by Columnist James J. Kilpatrick in the Washington Evening Star of May 10. He concludes with the statement that Members of the House and Senate "stand a cut above the rubes of the county midway." If this bill wins the approval of Congress that statement will be open to serious question.

Under unanimous consent, I offer the Kilpatrick column at this point in the RECORD. I urge all Members to read it as well as the excellent minority views contained in House Report, No. 1448, which accompanies this very dangerous bill.

[From the Washington Star, May 10, 1966]

NEW VERSION OF OLD SHELL GAME IS CHARGED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The slickest skin game of the old county fairs, at least in the gullible South, was the skin game known as the old shell game. It flourished for years, until some educated cops came along. They put the thimbleriggers on the run and the shell game all but disappeared.

Last week it came back to town. You will find it, if you look fast enough, in H.R. 14544, which came shooting out of the House Banking and Currency Committee like a little green pea under three walnut shells. This is President Johnson's sensational gimmick for turning $4.2 billion in federal assets into $4.2 billion in federal liabilities, all without adding a penny to the federal deficit. Or liabilities into assets. It is all the same thing. Come one, come all, and try your skill! The hand in truth is quicker than the eye.

Johnson sketched the general outlines of his "Sales Participation Act of 1966" back in January, but it wasn't until Wednesday, April 20, that the bill turned up in the House. Then presto! On Thursday April 21, with the ink still wet on the printed bill, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, scheduled 3 hours of hearings. Only administration witnesses were called. By a party-line vote of 22-3, with eight disgusted Republicans not voting, the bill came bombing out. A classic committee report followed on April 25. And last week the White House was proceeding in terrorem to get the bill whipped through the Rules Committee for an immediate vote on the floor.

The situation has its funny aspects, which is doubtless part of the game.

On the surface, this is a financing scheme by which the government would "sell off some assets." But the trick is that no assets would really be sold off.

The committee's majority report declares, deadpan, that the plan would "carry forward the objective of substituting private for public credit in funding the loan programs" of various federal agencies. But by its own terms, the bill provides for continued federal subsidies to make the private creditors secure.

The sponsors of this legislation are shouting from the housetops that this "participation" plan is truly nothing new—that it is in fact an old plan, devised by President Eisenhower in 1959. But when Eisenhower undertook to sell off some Federal loans, he sold them off in straightforward transactions. Johnson's dazzling runaround is something else entirely.

Under terms of this legislation, the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, would sell certificates of participation in "pools of assets" to be provided from the outstanding loans of various Federal agencies. Up to $4.2 billion in such certificates could be sold, provided the market would absorb them, and why shouldn't the market absorb them? These handsome instruments would cost the taxpayers a rate of 5.4 or 5.5 percent, at least half a point higher than the rate on regular Treasury borrowings.

As the outraged Republicans point out in their minority report, this .5 percent represents an expense of $5 million a year on each $1 billion of participations sold. If the entire authority were exercised, the cost to the people would approximate $21 million a year. Over an average maturity of 10 years, these higher outlays for interest would amount to something in excess of $200 million.

Yet the cost of this scheme is the least of the objections to it. The purpose of this legislation is not to promote private credit. The purpose is to conceal a $4.2 billion deficit by entering the certificate sales as a "negative expenditure." Where has the deficit gone? It lies under the third shell on the left. If this maneuver works for 1967, we may never set eyes on a deficit again, for federal agencies have $33 billion in such assets to slide in Fannie May's direction.

By the same token, as the Republicans remark, the federal debt limit can be subjected to hocus-pocus-dominocus. Now you see it, now you don't. If the proceeds of these participations are applied on paper to debt reduction, the government's total debt will not have been reduced in fact. The debt will simply have been transferred to the debt of FNMA, which is outside the statutory limit. In the course of this vanishing act, government credit would be used, if indirectly, to effect a reduction in the federal debt. This isn't done with dollars; it's done with mirrors.

There were signs last week that the administration's razzle-dazzle might prove to be self-defeating Missouri's influential Representative RICHARD BOLLING, a key man on House Rules, was balking hard. He describes the scheme flatly as "deceptive." Without a lot of sober persuasion, he won't be won around.

The administration's top persuaders have been summoned to the battle. With the President's prestige at stake, they may win in the end, but their problem is that members of the House and Senate stand a cut above the rubes of the county midway.

COMMUNIST CONTROL ACT OF 1954

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WALKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to implement section 2 of the Communist Control Act of 1954, which stresses the danger to our national security by subversive organizations and declares that the Communist Party should be outlawed.

Since the time of the passage of the Communist Control Act, our Nation has been fully appraised of the dangers that the Communist Party of America and its front organizations pose to our way of life. It is surprising to me that in the 12 years that this law has been on the books, this body has not seen fit to pass the necessary legislation to enforce this section of the act.

Lenin, one of the fathers of the Communist movement once said:

> What does it matter if three-fourths of the world perishes if the remaining quarter is Communist?

This expresses to the letter the motives of the Communist Party—complete world control—this by no means excludes the Western Hemisphere or the United States.

Already the Communists have taken over the island of Cuba. This was not done with outside force, but by internal revolution. The revolution was not a spontaneous one, but a deliberate, planned maneuver strictly in accord with Communist doctrine.

The original overthrow of the Cuban Government was not publicized as a Communist backed movement, but innocent patriots were convinced that their revolt was a just one.

The Communist Party in the United States is not publicly known to be a large organization. But the Congress, the executive branch, and the judicial branch of our Government have been continuously appraised of the growth of the Communist movement through various front organizations. The following is a statement by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation made in October of 1962 concerning the current Communist threat:

THE CURRENT COMMUNIST THREAT

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

The investigation of internal threats to American freedoms is one of the major responsibilities of the FBI. This task was assigned on September 6, 1939, along with the duty of correlating all information relating to internal security and disseminating it to appropriate Federal agencies.

Fulfilling the investigative responsibility has become increasingly difficult. The international Communist conspiracy, an avowed enemy of the democratic system of government, is constantly assaulting this Nation with its spies, its propaganda, and its domestic adherents. Identifying its operations and penetrating and disrupting them are the main counterintelligence objectives of the FBI. Collecting intelligence data and evidence of Federal law violations also is a demanding task. Pertinent information is promptly reported to proper authorities.

The FBI's counterintelligence responsibilities do not extend to foreign lands. But, since the principal subversive threat to this Nation—communism—is international in scope, much of the information collected and disseminated by the FBI affects the formation of both domestic and foreign policy.

THE THREAT FROM ABROAD

The number of official representatives of Communist bloc nations assigned in the United States varies from time to time, but at any given moment there are several hundred of them. In their official capacity, these representatives serve in diplomatic establishments, United Nations delegations, and various missions to this country. Many of them, however, are engaged in some type of intelligence activity, much of which is outside the scope of their recognized official duties.

A former Soviet intelligence officer has estimated that from 70 to 80 percent of the Russian officials stationed in the United States have an intelligence assignment. This may range from a careful review of hundreds of daily newspapers and other publications to the acquisition through any means of technical information on military and industrial equipment and installations, either classified or unclassified. Penetration of various Government agencies as well as anti-Communist organizations also is a major goal of Communist bloc officials.

Never in the history of the world has espionage been emphasized as it is today by the

Communist nations. In addition to the use of official representatives for intelligence purposes, Communist bloc powers are training professional undercover spies—men like Rudolf Ivanovich Abel—to carry on clandestine operations. Likewise, Communist officials are constantly seeking contacts with Americans, contacts they can exploit.

Propaganda is another field which occupies much of the Communist officials' time. In the 1962 fiscal year, for example, 193 speeches were scheduled by representatives of Communist bloc nations. While they have actively sought speaking engagements in this country, they have ignored any suggestions that similar opportunities be offered to American representatives in Communist countries.

During the 1962 fiscal year, seven Communist bloc officials—four Soviets and one each from Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria—were declared persona non grata, ordered to leave the United States or denied readmission to this country. In each instance, the action was based on information developed by the FBI and supplied to the Department of State.

Also during the year there were two American citizens convicted as a result of espionage investigations. Dr. Robert Soblen, now deceased, was sentenced to life imprisonment following conviction on charges, of conspiracy to commit espionage. Irvin C. Scarbeck, who had served as second secretary of the U.S. Embassy in Poland, was convicted of having communicated classified information to a foreign government. He was sentenced 30 years in prison. An appeal of his conviction was pending at the close of the fiscal year.

THE THREAT FROM WITHIN

Probably more Americans saw and heard a self-avowed member of the Communist Party, USA, in fiscal year 1962 than in the preceding 10 years. Unquestionably, the party unleashed one of the most intensive propaganda campaigns in its history.

Cause of the sudden torrent of Communist lies was the Supreme Court's ruling in June 1961, upholding the decision of the Subversive Activities Control Board to the effect that the Communist Party, USA, is directed and controlled by the Soviet Union. The party was ordered to register its members, account for its finances, and identify its propaganda in accordance with the Internal Security Act of 1950.

With typical arrogance and disrespect for constitutional law, party leaders voiced defiance. They loudly proclaimed the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Supreme Court were instruments through which all Americans would be cheated out of their basic rights. Self-righteously, they claimed to be defenders of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Tons of printed propaganda were distributed throughout the Nation; new front groups were organized; and Communist leaders began issuing public statements, appearing on radio and television programs, and making speeches. The central theme of the aggressive campaign was the fraudulent claim that the Communist Party, USA, was bearing the brunt of the assault on American rights.

Most successful of all its efforts was its speaking campaign, especially before college groups. From late October 1961, through May 1962, leaders of the Communist Party, USA, made 48 speeches before groups of college students all across the Nation. Approximately 43,000 persons heard these talks.

Encouraged by the early success of college appearances, the party established a lecture and information bureau and early in 1962 sent a letter to college newspaper editors offering speakers on communism. Near the end of the 1962 fiscal year, the party already was lining up speeches for the coming academic year.

The prime objective of all the public activity on the part of the Communist leaders was to create a new image for the party—an image which connotes respectability, legitimacy as a liberal political faction, and freedom from foreign dictates. Their denial of subservience to the Soviet Union, however, was clearly branded as ridiculous by the fact that several party officials were delegates to the 22d Congress of the Communist Party, Soviet Union, in October 1961. Heading the delegation was Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, national chairman of the Communist Party, USA, who, in a speech before the congress brazenly predicted the United States would be in the Communist orbit by 1980.

LEGAL ACTION

Behind the facade of public activity, the Communist Party, USA, remained a sinister evil constantly striving to advance the cause of communism. While the leaders raised a great public clamor and attracted the spotlight to themselves, lesser officials and rank-and-file members drew further into their shell of anonymity. Secret orders went out to tighten the structure and security of the party all along the line. Titles were dropped, committees dissolved, the size of meetings drastically cut. Added emphasis was placed on protecting party records. These actions clearly revealed the party, as its leaders had proclaimed, intended to defy the order to register.

The order for the party to register with the Attorney General became final on October 20, 1961. The deadline of November 20, 1961, passed without compliance, and the obligation then fell upon certain designated party officials. The second deadline of November 30, 1961, passed, and each member of the party then became obligated to register himself by December 20, 1961. No registration was filed.

A Federal grand jury in Washington, D.C., on December 1, 1961, returned a 12-count indictment charging the Communist Party, USA, with willfully and unlawfully failing to register. A motion to dismiss the indictment was filed.

Individual six-count indictments against Gus Hall, general secretary of the party, and Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., national secretary, were returned on March 15, 1962. Motions to dismiss these indictments were pending at the end of the 1962 fiscal year.

The Attorney General on May 31, 1962, petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board to order 10 members of the national committee, Communist Party, USA, to register as party members. These individuals will be afforded a hearing before the Board to determine if their registration should be ordered.

The first case under section 504 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, which forbids an individual to hold certain positions in labor organizations if he has been a member of the Communist Party within 5 years, was tried in fiscal year 1962. This resulted in the conviction of Artie Brown in U.S. district court at San Francisco, Calif., on April 5, 1962. Brown, who had been active in the Communist movement for many years, allegedly was elected to an office in local 10 of the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union to test the law. He was sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment on May 4, 1962. He appealed the conviction and was released on $5,000 bail.

The International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers on May 4, 1962, was declared a "Communist infiltrated" union by the Subversive Activities Control Board under provisions of the Communist Control Act of 1954. The union has petitioned the Board to determine that it is no longer infiltrated.

COMMUNIST FRONTS

Most of the established Communist front groups as well as many of the new ones created in fiscal year 1962 were used extensively in the massive propaganda campaign against the enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Shortly after the Supreme Court's June 1961 decision, upholding the constitutionality of the registration provision of the act, the Communist Party formed a national group and a number of local organizations in various sections of the United States. The names of these organizations were designed to perpetuate the sham that the party was protecting constitutional liberties and the Bill of Rights.

The one and only function of these groups was to protect the party by generating public support. Their methods were those which have been used by Communist fronts for many years—distributing leaflets, holding rallies, organizing and encouraging protest communications to Government officials, and circulating petitions. Naturally, each group constantly engaged in efforts to raise funds.

Early in 1962 another national organization was formed to spearhead the defense of party leaders facing legal action. While the name of this group varies from that of the one created earlier to protect the party, the functions, funds, and personnel of each are interchangeable and their goals are the same—the advancement of the cause of communism.

Of course, the Communists have not deserted their usual front activities. They continue to operate organizations which promote programs relating to peace, disarmament, nuclear testing, youth, racial and nationality groups, labor unions, and other matters. Likewise, party members have intensified their efforts to infiltrate various legitimate organizations. They are especially anxious to control, influence, or undermine the affairs of labor unions; peace movements; and minority, youth, veterans', women's, cultural, educational, civil rights, and similar groups.

THE CUBAN PROBLEM

Thousands of refugees, fleeing the Communist regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba, have been entering the United States. There are approximately 100,000 Cuban refugees in the Miami, Fla., area alone. The FBI must remain constantly alert to the possibility that Castro spies may gain admittance to the United States under the guise of being refugees.

There is, of course, a great deal of intrigue involved in dealings among various Cuban factions. Even the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, one of the principal outlets for pro-Castro propaganda in this country, has become mired in a battle for control between the Communist Party, USA, and the Socialist Workers Party, a splinter Communist organization.

Prensa Latina (the Cuban news service) and its chief correspondent, Francisco V. Portela, were indicted by a Federal grand jury on December 8, 1961, for failure to register under the terms of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. A registration statement was filed with the Department of Justice on April 16, 1962. On April 18, 1962, Prensa Latina entered a plea of nolo contendere and was fined $2,000. Charges against Portela were dismissed.

Since 1962, the Communists in America have enjoyed substantial victories in their efforts to spread subversion in our country.

As an article in U.S. News & World Report on November 29, 1965, will indicate, because of recent Supreme Court decisions in favor of the Communist, they have announced plans to run their members for public offices. Such action demonstrates just how flagrant and open the Communists have become with their subversion.

The article follows:

HOW MUCH FREEDOM NOW FOR U.S. REDS?

The U.S. Supreme Court, in one decision after another, has made it harder and harder for the Federal Government to prosecute Communists.

Now the Court's latest ruling is seen as leaving the Reds almost a clear legal field.

Members of the Communist Party of the U.S. cannot be forced to register with the Federal Government as required by provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950—often known as the McCarran Act.

The Supreme Court, in an 8-to-0 decision, ruled that this provision of the law is unconstitutional because it requires a Communist to incriminate himself in violation of the Fifth Amendment. Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., writing the unanimous opinion of the participating Justices, noted that the registration requirement could open the way for prosecution "in an area permeated with criminal statutes."

The decision gave encouragement to Communists. Gus Hall, a national leader of the Communist Party, said in a news conference after the November 15 decision:

"Wherever it's possible we're going to run Communists for public office. This is something we've always wanted to do and couldn't."

The Communist leader added that the party now would consider calling a public national convention, issue a basic program and take steps for more active participation in the 1966 elections.

Over the years, the federal courts have made it virtually impossible to enforce the Subversive Activities Control Act and other anti-Communist laws.

In its previous term, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional a provision of the law that allowed the State Department to deny passports to Communists. The Court also threw out proceedings against two suspected Communist-front organizations on the grounds that the record against them was too stale.

In 1963, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia threw out a $120,000 fine that had been levied against the Communist Party for failure to register. The court held that the Government had to prove there was someone willing to register the party without forfeiting his protection under the Fifth Amendment.

REGISTRATIONS: NONE

Since 1950, when the McCarran Act was enacted, the Justice Department has brought actions against the Communist Party itself, against 22 alleged front organizations, and against 44 individuals. No one has registered.

Last month, the Government tried to prosecute a shipyard worker in Seattle under a provision of the law that barred a Communist from working in a defense industry. A federal district court threw out the indictment as not stating a criminal offense.

The Justice Department also tried to invoke a provision of the law that "Communist-infiltrated" groups also had to register. It proceeded against the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. A federal district court quashed this action by holding that the evidence was too stale.

"RISKS OF INCRIMINATION"

Justice Brennan, in his opinion, appeared to make the Act unenforceable when he said: "The risks of incrimination which the petitioners take in registering are obvious. * * * Such an admission of membership may be used to prosecute the registrant under the membership clause of the Smith Act * * * or under * * * the Subverse Activities Control Act * * * to mention only two federal criminal statutes."

Justice Tom C. Clark, in a concurring opinion, pointed out that when he was Attorney General in 1948 he warned the Senate Judiciary Committee, which was then drafting the McCarran Act, that the proposed law might be held "to compel self-incrimination."

The Justice Department concluded at that time, Justice Clark wrote, that "there would not be any voluntary registrations under the measure. Should a Communist organization fail to register, the burden to proceed would shift to the Attorney General * * * to prove that the organization is required to register."

This forecast has been proved correct, and the Supreme Court appears now to have all but killed the Subversive Activities Control Act.

Decisions of the Supreme Court also have weakened enforcement of the Smith Act, which makes it unlawful to belong to any organization or group that advocates overthrowing the U.S. Government by force and violence.

There have been convictions under the Smith Act, but the Supreme Court puts a heavy burden on the Federal Government in obtaining them.

WHAT GOVERNMENT MUST PROVE

The Court holds that the Government must prove not only that a defendant is a member of the Communist Party but, at the same time, that he knows the aims of the party are to overthrow the Government and that he himself intended to carry out those aims.

Lawyers say that these restrictions give Communists what amounts to a clear field.

In my opinion it is hypocrisy to send our boys into battle against the North Vietnamese while our Government tolerates the subversive activities promoted by the Communists here at home. Even more insulting is the fact that on June 7, 1965, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in the case of Archie Brown against the United States which held that a Communist can be the head of a labor union.

FBI Director Hoover, in a statement concerning the Communist Party line, said:

> The Communist Party, U.S.A., confident of its ability to survive and grow, is expressing its conviction that history is on its side, as the world is marching irresistibly toward socialism after clearly rejecting capitalism because of its failure to eliminate poverty, oppression, and insecurity. All attacks on communism are condemned as "undemocratic," and the party views the growth of rightwing organizations as evidence of a trend toward fascism in the United States. The "unjust" distribution of wealth in this country is cited as the explanation for what the party claims is practically a complete moral and ethical breakdown which has developed into a major national catastrophe.

Again, in a speech delivered in Washington, D.C., on October 19, 1965, Director Hoover stated:

> The communists profess to be a legitimate political organization. This is not so. Actually, the Party constitutes a foreign outpost on America's shores. Its members—knowingly, deliberately and willingly—are active tools of the Soviet Union.
>
> Witness, for example, the programs which occupy the primary attention of Communist Party members in this country: withdrawal of American support from South Vietnam; noninterference with communist terrorists in Santo Domingo; appeasement in all dealings with members of the Marxist world.
>
> The communists speak of peace, but peace at an exorbitant and heart-rending price—submission to communist domination. From 50 years of dealings with the Stalins, the Khrushchevs, the Brezhnevs, the Castros, the Mao Tse-tungs, this bitter lesson has been learned by the freedom-loving peoples of the world.
>
> Yet, in country after country, there still remain the legions of uninformed, misinformed and politically naive who are the noncommunist dupes and fellow travelers whom the communists rely upon to carry forward their programs for world domination.
>
> We find these dupes in shocking abundance here in our own United States where Gus Hall, the Moscow-trained General Secretary of the Communist Party, USA boasted to newsmen last fall that there are approximately 100,000 Americans within the Party's influence. About 10 per cent of them, he said, are dues-paying members. The remainder he described as close sympathizers.
>
> These sympathizers include growing numbers of young people—because the major target of communist propaganda and exploitation in the United States today is the Nation's youth.
>
> Standing in the forefront of the communist campaign to confuse the minds, distort the thinking and win the support of our young people is the DuBois Clubs of America—an illegitimate spawn conceived by the Communist Party and nurtured by a trusted band of youthful adherents to the cause of world Marxism.
>
> Leaders of the DuBois Clubs of America were prominent among the communists who attended a special youth leadership school sponsored by the Party last June to prepare for a stepped-up campaign of recruitment and agitation among youth. Already, this fall, there are signs that these training sessions have begun to bear fruit—in the form of defiant protests against law and authority.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the "defiant protest against law and authority" about which Mr. Hoover spoke is apparent in the works of various other Communist-front organizations actively working in our Nation today.

I, therefore, feel that legislation to outlaw the Communist Party and such front organizations is vitally needed.

POVERTY AND DISCRIMINATION IN THE SOUTHWEST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, more than 8 million persons are living in poverty, with family incomes of less than $3,000 per year, in the 5 Southwestern States. That is, although the total population of the States of the Southwest makes up only about one-sixth of the population of the Nation, a full one-fourth of the Nation's poor live in these same five States. They live in an enormous belt of poverty beginning in east Texas, sweeping down through south Texas and the Rio Grande Valley, and stretching west into New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and southern California. This vast region has been called a thousand miles of poverty. In terms of human suffering and waste it is a million miles of misery.

Of the 29.3 million persons living in the Southwest as of the 1960 census, 79 percent are erroneously and euphemistically referred to as "Anglos" in Texas and the other States. I say erroneously because the term is used in such a manner that King Alfred, King of the Angles, his followers and successors of Wessex and London, those stalwarts who successfully repelled the invasions of England from the mainland of Europe in the 9th century would cringe, wince, and turn over in their graves to hear their ethnic designation used with such abandon. Nevertheless, for the sake of avoiding further diversions in this discussion, let us agree to refer to the dominant, non-Negro, non-Mexican, non-Spanish, non-Indian, nonoriental group as "Anglos." At any rate, they make up 79 percent of the people of the Southwest. The remaining 21 percent, according to the 1960 census, consists of persons with Spanish surnames, Negroes, Indians, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos. Toward each of these ethnic minorities the dominant group has, at one time or another in the past, demonstrated practically all of the forms of racial discrimination and violence known to man, from the whip and the insult and police dog to the gun and the concentration camp. Today, patterns of discrimination are modified—generally more subtle—but present.

My purpose here is to discuss at some length the twin problems of poverty and discrimination in the Southwest. But I wish to state at the outset that although the two are intimately related, poverty and oppression know no ethnic boundaries. For while the natural resources of the region have served to enrich and benefit some; while oil and gas, cattle and aerospace industries create wealth and employ tens of thousands; while great cities have been built, in many ways the Southwest remains an economically underdeveloped area left behind. A good example are the men and women of Mexican origin who have built the roads, constructed the skyscrapers, and have hewn the cedar and drawn the bolls of the white-spotted fields of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, and California. The failure of this area to develop its economic potential in a full and balanced manner is keeping millions of Americans in a state of poverty and de facto serfdom.

These deprived Americans are white, black, brown, yellow, and red. There are 4 million Americans of Mexican descent in the Southwest. An inordinate degree of poverty is found in this group, the largest single ethnic minority in the Southwest. I will discuss their problems in Texas in some detail. But not all persons of Mexican descent are poor. Many are professionals, doctors, lawyers, architects, elected officials. Some are quite wealthy. And not all remember their roots or the less unfortunate. There are more than 2 million Negroes living in the 5 Southwestern States, and about 200,000 Indians, in addition to the smaller number of Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos. In these groups, too, poverty is pervasive, but not all inclusive. There are in addition tens of thousands of poor "Anglos" in the Southwest and it would be both inaccurate and inequitable to ignore their plight.

As for discrimination, it, too, does not flow in only one direction, as the "Okies" and other white sharecroppers found out when they sought greater opportunities by going west in the 1930's. Persons of Mexican descent and the nonwhites have suffered most from discrimination. But they are not blameless, neither in their attitudes toward the "Anglos" nor toward each other.

And what is worse: There are those who would capitalize on present inequities by creating even greater ones; there are those who seek to divide, who would incite one group against another. And there are those who would set themselves up as political brokers to bargain and negotiate uncollectively in the name of the ethnic group they happen to have been born into.

You have all seen how the political broker operates and promotes himself. He first acquires a reputation as a spokesman for a particular group by talking—not by acting or contributing or helping to solve—but by talking of the needs of "his" group. Soon he is recognized as a "leader," and is asked to join in meetings with local politicos and officials. But the trouble with his leadership is that typically his demands in behalf of the downtrodden group turn out to be demands for jobs or political appointments. Who needs a job, the "Anglo" official might ask. Why, I do, says the "leader." So the leader and his friends get a handful of jobs, and the politicos have quieted some unpleasant noise about bad housing, poor schools and unemployment. This has been the technique used in Texas for many years.

The capital of the political broker is the poverty and misfortune of others. But his authority is questionable, if not illegitimate, his methods are morally bankrupt, and he sells the people out.

I repudiate the dividers, the political brokers, the prophets of hate and envy. Their way leads to political cannibalism by which would-be leaders devour each other and their followers.

I speak today against the evil of discrimination, whether it be anti-Negro, or anti-Mexican, or anti-Indian, or anti-Chinese. I speak against those "Anglos" who have used their dominant status and the myth of racial superiority as a "mask for privilege." I speak against those Negroes who have allowed such things as anti-Semitism and bitterness toward persons of Mexican descent to distort their thinking. And I speak against those persons who have become jealous and resentful of the gains made by Negroes: These misguided souls do not realize that the gains made by Negroes in the cause of civil rights are won for all of us.

I speak also against the widespread poverty in the Southwest and the conditions that perpetuate it. Later I will outline the kind of regional approach to these problems which I believe is necessary if we are to make real, lasting gains for all the people.

But it must be recognized that these problems are complex. They must be attacked, if they are to be solved, in the open and regionally, not in smoke-filled rooms where big shots decide who gets the few good jobs.

The 1963 staff report to the Civil Rights Commission on the public schools in Texas pointed out in the preface that—

> The pattern of civil rights in the Texas public schools in mid-1963 is far from consistent and varies to such an extent from section to section and from community to community that a thorough understanding of this complex problem in the State would require an examination of many of its cities and towns.

The problems of poverty in Texas, much less the entire Southwest, are no less complex. Because most of what I know is confined to Texas, and because the least of what is generally known concerns persons of Mexican descent, I will emphasize this aspect in my speech.

PERSONS OF SPANISH SURNAME IN THE SOUTHWEST

Let me begin this part of the discussion by pointing out that persons of Spanish or Mexican descent are legally classified as Caucasian. That is, they are included in the census tabulations with other whites. The main effect of this classification, for our purposes, is that statistics for nonwhites, such as unemployment rates and income, do not apply to this group. Since the figures for persons of Mexican decent are averaged in with the figures for whites, these figures do not accurately portray the picture for this ethnic minority group. The 1960 census, however, included a volume for "white persons of Spanish surname." The most meaningful data that has been yet compiled for the group we are talking about is contained in this volume. But two things should be kept in mind about these figures. First, many persons whose families came from Mexico were originally descended from European groups other than Spanish. These persons, who have the same cultural heritage as others who came from Mexico do not have Spanish surnames. For other reasons, including intermarriage, many persons who are of Mexican or Spanish or Latin American descent do not have Spanish surnames. The census data misses these people altogether. Second, the 1960 census data is now 6 years old; in many ways it is obsolete. The basic configuration of poverty, unemployment, education, and other factors has not substantially changed for this group, in my opinion. But doubtlessly specific situations and conditions, particularly relating to metropolitan areas, have changed.

This brings up the issue, which has been discussed at length in Congress but not satisfactorily resolved, of the middecennial census. As is aptly stated in the report of hard-core unemployment and poverty in Los Angeles, prepared for the Area Redevelopment Administration in 1965:

> In an age of advanced computer technology and new data-processing techniques, it is almost incredible that the 10-year lag is retained.

I would add only one thing to that accurate observation. It is not "almost" incredible. It is incredible, and the failure to update our data gathering facilities through the census greatly handicaps our ability to properly evaluate our conditions and to take action where action is needed.

Another complicating factor concerns the heterogeneous makeup of this ethnic group, as I have already indicated. Many of the people we are discussing are immigrants or descended from immigrants from Mexico. Many of these persons, in turn, are descended from Spain and other European countries. Some are directly descended from the Spanish conquistadors. There are large numbers of these descendants in New Mexico. Some are descended from the Aztecs and other ancient Mexican civilizations. Some are descended from Indian tribes who lived in Mexico.

In fact, immigration generally has not yet been fully appreciated or understood in this country. Total immigration from Mexico from 1820, when records began to be kept, to 1964, was 1,326,370. In the decade 1950 to 1960 alone, 300,000 persons came to live in the United States from Mexico. In addition, there has been a substantial number of immigrants from other Latin American countries, especially in recent years. Most of these people reside in California.

To digress for a moment from the subject of poverty and discrimination, I want to repeat what I have stated before in speeches delivered in this House: The full story of the Mexican immigrant, and the Mexican who lived in the Southwest long before there was a United States and long before there was a Texas, has never been compiled, much less told. The great numbers alone cannot fairly indicate the contributions that these people have made to the Southwest and the Nation. It would take a team of sociologists, historians, economists, and others to gather the record of the achievements and the significance of the Mexican immigrant and his offspring to the American experience. But anyone who has traveled or lived in the Southwest can grasp some idea of the meaning of the waves of immigrants who have come across the Mexican border.

A third factor that needs to be kept in mind involves the designation of the ethnic group. Should we say Latins, Mexicans, Mexicanos, Latinos, Mexican-Americans, Latin-Americans, Spanish-Americans, persons of Mexican descent, or what? Personally, I oppose the concept of the hyphenated American. Carried to its extreme every one of us would be considered an Irish-American, Italian-American, German-American, Polish-American, Chinese-American, Lebanese-American, English-American, French-American, Swaziland-American, and so on. The nationality or nationalities of our ancestors have nothing to do with the fact that we are all presently Americans, in my opinion.

The people of the Southwest themselves have not agreed as to what they want to be called, although I think there is some agreement on what they do not want to be called. In Texas, "Latin" seems to be most acceptable. In New Mexico, "hispanic" or "Spanish" is preferred.

Since there is no agreement on terms, for this discussion I will use the phrase persons with Spanish surname, or persons of Mexican descent, or persons of Spanish descent, interchangeably. But the confusion here illustrates a very important fact; the problem is complex, more complex than is generally known. I may not be getting through to those whose thoughts run along the lines of stereotypes and whose solutions tend to be of the pigeonhole variety. So long as this mental dwarfism prevails, the problems of the Southwest are doomed to be handled as clumsily and ineffectively in the future as they have been in the past.

THE LARGEST ETHNIC MINORITY IN THE SOUTHWEST

I have already indicated some of the statistics as to percentages of the groups that make up the population of the five States of the Southwest. Of the 29.3 million persons in the 5 States, 3.4 million have Spanish surnames, according to the 1960 census. Today, an estimated 4 million persons have Spanish surnames. This is the largest ethnic minority in the Southwest. The figure, by the way, for 1950, was 2.2 million. In addition, in 1960, there were 2.2 million Negroes, 189,000 Indians. And smaller numbers of persons of oriental descent.

The percentages for the five States are "Anglos" 79 percent, persons of Spanish surnames 12 percent, Negroes 7 percent, and all other nonwhite persons 2 percent.

Another fact about the data is this, in the United States in 1960 there were 20.4 million nonwhites. Negroes comprised 92 percent of this group, 18.8 million. The predominance of the Negro in the minority groups outside the Southwest has tended to obscure the facts and figures for these five States.

UNEMPLOYMENT

In 1960 the national rate of unemployment was 5.1 percent. For "Anglos" in the five Southwest States the rate was 4.5 percent. How do these figures compare with the unemployment rates of the minority groups? For persons of Spanish surname, unemployment was 8.3 percent in 1960. For Negroes it was 9.7 percent. For the Indian it was an astronomical 18.4 percent. The rates of unemployment in the Southwest were very similar in 1965 to the rates for 1960. Last year, unemployment for persons of Spanish surnames was 8.4 percent, slightly higher than the rate for 1960.

In other words, the unemployment figures for persons with Spanish surnames and for the other two major minority groups in the Southwest are disproportionately high. They are much higher than the national rate and they are much higher than the rate for "Anglos" in the Southwest.

The unemployment figures are, of course, deeply significant. They represent more than just numbers of persons without jobs. They represent in addition heads of families without a livelihood. They represent families without money coming in to try to obtain food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities. They represent substantial hunger, hardship, and deprivation. They represent despair and hopelessness.

Yet, the unemployment figures themselves are only one-eighth of the iceberg that shows on the surface. The real significance of unemployment figures go much deeper than the statistics alone. For it is well known by many experts that rate of unemployment is an inadequate indicator of poverty and regional distress.

Especially in urban areas, underemployment, rather than unemployment, is the more critical problem. Workers with low skills get low pay. Their income might be slightly higher than the poverty level of $3,000 per year, but still beneath subsistence or at the level of subsistence. Many workers may be going in and out of jobs, finding employment for only part of the year. The Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training recognized these facts and stated them succinctly in its publication, Family Breadwinners—Their Special Training Needs. That publication states:

> The full economic implications of unemployment for breadwinners have long been masked in recent years by their relatively low unemployment rate. * * * The low unemployment rate for those workers obscures serious problems of underemployment and underutilization which occur when in order to meet pressing family responsibilities, they are forced to take jobs at levels and skills which do not fully utilize their training and experience.

The problem of underemployment and underutilization of manpower is aggravated in the Southwest and particularly in Texas because of the presence of large numbers of migrant farmworkers. The migrant farmworker is the most underemployed worker in America. Tens of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of migrant farmworkers live in the Southwest. They seek work all the time. But farmwork is seasonal and there are only certain times of the year when jobs are available. Perhaps this fact together with the high rate of underemployment in the Southwest might explain why some of us in Congress, the majority I am happy to say, opposed the Public Law 78 bracero program which was finally terminated. Under this program hundreds of thousands of foreign workers were brought in the United States each year to do the identical work that domestic migrant farmworkers were seeking. Of course the braceros displaced American workers and contributed to their problem. It was indeed wise that we ended this program. Beyond underemployment there are even deeper reasons to be concerned over unemployment. For unemployment and underemployment statistics are just symptoms of the root causes of the problem of why men cannot find jobs. What are these root causes? This is the sickness that experts must prove and that governments must solve if we are to wipe out poverty in the Southwest.

EDUCATION

What are some of the other symptoms of poverty and underdevelopment in the Southwest? The education figures are as disturbing as the unemployment rates for the minority groups in these five

States. For the American of Mexican descent in terms of number of years completed in school ranks as low as, or below, any other ethnic group in this region, and substantially below the dominant group.

The person of Mexican descent has completed 9 years of schooling in California, Colorado, and New Mexico, 8 years in Arizona, and less than 7 years in Texas. These figures and their relation to the ability of the group to find adequate employment speak for themselves. Later I will have something to say about segregation in the public schools of Texas.

HOUSING

The need for adequate, standard housing for the low-income group in the Southwest is as critical as the figures I have just recited indicate. Of course, families who earn less than $3,000 and many families who earn more than $3,000 live in wretched conditions. Not only do they live in slum housing, they live under slum conditions. Substandard shelter, substandard sewerage and sometimes no sewage facilities, unpaved dusty streets, maybe no electricity.

We are familiar with the photographs of stark poverty in the South and Southwest. These photographs often depict the unpainted, rickety shacks that the poor are condemned to live in. The shacks themselves are all too familiar in the Southwest. In Texas they may be found in every town and city. Even on the outskirts of the relatively affluent urban centers you will find shacktowns with hundreds and thousands of these hovels.

These shacktowns constitute the Southwestern version of the slum. In the North and in the East slums are associated with crowded, dilapidated tenements in the central cities. Perhaps that indicates a little more craftiness on the part of the affluent in the Southwest. You do not see slums as much when they are on the fringes of town as when they are in the center. Be that as it may, the shacktowns are the physical counterparts of the human neglect in this region. How have we allowed such misery to spring up around us?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from Colorado who, I might say at this point, has also distinguished himself, in my book, by his awareness of the problem, and all that he has done in his power to help solve it.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Congressman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect.

I did not know much about the gentleman until I came here to Congress. Yet when I came here I came with the knowledge that there was a great reputation in my district, the Third District of Colorado, for what he has done. He has been kind enough to visit my State and to meet with my people, both of Spanish name and Anglo name, and I hope he will be able to come back again on occasion in the future.

I have been following the comments of the Congressman from Texas with great interest and I agree with him wholeheartedly, particularly because I have a large Spanish-surname population in the territory of my district of Colorado, a population which I would say in the last 5 or 10 years has begun to awaken politically.

I welcome that awakening. I think it is long overdue. It used to be in the old days—I do not know whether it was done in Texas, but it was done in Colorado—that if we wanted the Spanish-surname citizens to vote, the votes were bought—or bought with whisky.

Those days, thank God, are gone. The Spanish surnamed Americans in the Third District of Colorado know what the vote is. They intend to make use of it. This is good. I believe not only the district but also the Nation should feel their talent and the weight of their political thought.

I am encouraged because I see similar signs in my district to those which have been mentioned in the State of Texas.

I remember that after World War II a Spanish surnamed veteran attempted to go into a local theater. He was sold a ticket, but he was required to go into the balcony. The Anglos of the community at that time informed the owner of the theater that either his practice would cease or his theater would be boycotted. That practice did cease.

They then began to move into better jobs. In fact, at this time I believe we have an unusual number of Spanish surnamed Americans who are leaders in the union of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., Local 2102 of the Steel Workers. They are leaders in the Steel Workers Union in the Triplex Corp. There are Spanish surnamed people at the Pueblo Army Depot, who hold positions of great responsibility, who have worked there 15 years or more.

We have more Spanish surnamed businessmen than ever before. We have teachers with Spanish surnames. We have lawyers and doctors.

This move has been going on in Texas, and it has been going on also in Colorado.

I am delighted to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Congressman from Texas. He has been most kind to me in the past in helping me, an Anglo, to understand more and more about discrimination. For this I am forever grateful, for I feel it is true that unless one is in a group of those who have been discriminated against it is impossible to know exactly what discrimination is. I intend to keep on learning. I intend to keep my interest high.

I hope I will be able to walk alongside Congressman GONZALEZ and I hope to have a reputation such as his.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

As I have told the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER], we Irishmen have got to stick together.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DYAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the comments of the gentleman from Texas are long overdue, and I compliment him for his careful analysis.

Mr. Speaker, our great region, the southwest portion of the United States, as my colleague from Texas has pointed out, contains 4 million Americans of Mexican descent and other Spanish-speaking people who may well be considered "forgotten Americans." The rest of our Nation has a record of ignoring the special problems of Spanish-speaking Americans in as much as they live, for the most part, far away from the eastern and midwestern population centers where most Americans reside. Our own region, I regret to say, has often neglected the special problems of Mexican-Americans. Yet this brave people does not stop to ask what their country is doing for them, they ask what they can do for their country. You will see Spanish surnames on every casualty list from Vietnam. Mexican-Americans, as I pointed out on Cinco de Mayo last week, always win more than their statistical "share" of military medals, including, on many occasions, the Medal of Honor.

In San Bernardino County, Calif., our Mexican-American population is very largely bilingual, and participates actively in community life. However, we still have pockets of poverty—and prejudice.

A number of years ago a women who felt the Mexican-American situation keenly, a Mrs. Tuck, of Redlands, wrote a book "Not With a Fist." This book, as much as any other I know, dramatized the problem of these people. She was a voice crying in the wilderness, since for years thereafter, only a limited number read the book or attempted to do anything about the situation she so graphically portrayed. The years have gone past and regardless of restrictions which were put on these people, "not with a fist," as Mrs. Tuck indicated, but rather by the harsh actions of an uninterested majority determined to force upon them a substandard form of life and through unwritten collusion to prevent them from taking their proper place in modern society, they have still made progress. Mexican-Americans are now prominent leaders in my area in business, industries, and public life. The group that has succeeded in that area are a minor percentage of the mass of these people, however, who need to become involved in production and education in order that they will become taxpayers and not tax eaters.

I commend the gentleman from Texas, Congressman GONZALEZ, for his leadership in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress. I am certain that his discussion of this important subject will do much to prevent the regrettable walkouts which have occurred recently, and will cause Mexican-American people to join the Congress and departments of Government in making endeavors to explore all means to bring them to the good rewards of our modern life.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman from California. I think maybe Ruth Tuck's book was a lot better known than people realize in Texas. In the 1940's it was an inspiration to many of us.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. It is certainly a privilege to associate myself with the very perceptive analysis that the Congressman from Texas has made. I have come to know and to understand and to appreciate very fully over the years the contribution that our Spanish-American neighbors and friends in southeast Iowa have made in our region. As you correctly pointed out, their forefathers came many years ago to help in the development of some of the great railroads at Fort Madison and Davenport. I think perhaps the most telling and the most important aspect of their congenial and totally American response to the environment there has been the fact that in our own era they have not only achieved a great deal in their communities for themselves but have been in the forefront of those who have extended their help to their fellow citizens in the efforts we have made in the last year or so in developing what has become known as the Migrant Workers Council to help their fellow citizens who come into our region from the Southwest every year. For this reason it is a great privilege to be associated with you today. You can be sure that I intend to help you in everyway we can to reach full realization of these goals you have outlined.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I would like to advise my colleagues that he will be honored by the national association known as the LULAC–League of United Latin American Citizens—later next month.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I certainly will yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Texas for having set aside this time to discuss the problems of poverty and discrimination of large minority groups living in the southwest part of the United States. I commend him for his knowledge on the subject and for his conclusions.

My home State of California has a Spanish-speaking population of approximately 1,750,000 people. This is a population that is larger than the entire population of the State of New Mexico. There are approximately 1 million Negroes in that State. May I say that there is no conflict between the Mexican-American and the Negro community in California for, although there may be a difference of opinion, the Mexican-American community applauds the progress made by the Negro and joins wholeheartedly in supporting him to acquire future gains. In cooperation we are fighting poverty and discrimination in order to build up our respective communities, but, Mr. Speaker, the Mexican-American in California is very much concerned. We are concerned about the apparent neglect on the part of this administration fully to recognize our problems, abilities, and desires actively to participate in the Great Society. Because of this concern 150 representatives of all Spanish-speaking organizations in the United States came to Washington in June 1965 to be briefed by Cabinet members, bureau and department heads. Every speaker for the administration admitted on questioning that they did not have Spanish-speaking personnel in their employ and that the vast resource of Spanish-speaking talent had not been utilized by our Government. They promised to do better. An administration spokesman said that the Mexican-American—and I am quoting now:

> The Mexican American, the second largest minority group in the United States, is the most neglected, the least sponsored, and the most orphaned major minority group in the country.

The President in answer to a question at a recent press conference said:

> I am going to give the Mexican American all the attention that I can. I haven't given them enough. I want to give them more.

Mr. Speaker, up to this moment, very little, if anything, has been done.

Mr. Speaker, the Mexican-American community, with an overwhelming Democratic Party registration, looks to the President for the way out of their forgotten status.

At a recent conference in Albuquerque, N. Mex., sponsored by the Federal Government—the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission—Mexican-Americans from California and from other States of the Union walked out in protest. They protested the fact that the Commission conference designed to discuss the problems of the Spanish-speaking people, had neglected to include a Spanish-speaking people who had firsthand knowledge of the problems of this group in their planning session.

They protested, also, the fact that the Commission as now constituted does not have a commissioner of Mexican-American extraction and, consequently, the Commission has no one who can adequately present, with understanding knowledge, the viewpoint of this forgotten group.

Mr. Speaker, not to have appointed a Mexican-American Commissioner may have been an oversight, but it is an oversight that in my opinion hurts the feelings of every American of Mexican-Spanish descent in the United States.

One Commissioner told me that complaints from Mexican-Americans to the Commission because of job discrimination are very few. This is true, but it is true due to the fact that in the past complaints that were made were just made without any results.

Mr. Speaker, a subject of great concern is the discussion, of course, of the forthcoming White House Conference on Civil Rights. The civil rights bill was passed for all Americans. Yet the civil rights of Americans of Mexican descent will not be discussed; in fact, we are not being invited to attend. I was told as much by a White House spokesman.

Mr. Speaker, a protest march on Washington may be inevitable.

The Mexican-American in California, Mr. Speaker, is tired of neglect. He is tired of being overlooked, and deeply hurt that he being relegated to a status of an unprivileged minority in the middle of the Great Society, designed to bring equality and opportunity to all Americans.

The protest that I presented to President Kennedy in the early part of 1963 on behalf of all Mexican-American organizations in the State of California, has since been presented to the present administration. It is being heard throughout California. It was heard in Albuquerque and it will be heard again here in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, the Mexican-American as you have already heard, has served the United States of America with great distinction during time of war, having received more than their share of Congressional Medals. During the Korean war, with a high percentage of American soldiers with Spanish surnames, not one defected to the Communist enemy.

Mr. Speaker, the Mexican-American is today dying in Vietnam. We also want to live in dignity in the United States. We want to serve our country wherever we can, in Latin America where our knowledge, our fluency of the Spanish language, and our feeling for the people, the Spanish-speaking people in the United States can be used on all levels, including the Embassy of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, most of all we want to serve the Great Society. We not only want to take part in solving our own problems, in serving on boards and commissions and in the Cabinet of the United States, if you please, but also in making the true principles of democracy a living reality to all Americans, without regard to race, color, or creed.

Mr. Speaker, the Mexican-American in the State of California has made a great deal of progress—there is no doubt about that. I concur with the report that the gentleman from Texas has made, but I too am concerned that this progress has not been enough. The Spanish-speaking community of my State is now crying aloud for recognition.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] symbolizes the tremendous strides that have been made. For years the gentleman was the first and only member of this particular group on the City Council of Los Angeles. That was at a time when that fact was an inspiration to everybody throughout the Southwest.

I might say by way of reference to the gentleman's well put remarks as to the obvious need for action that not only the President but members of the President's administrative staff are quite aware of the lag. The present indications, according to information that I have received, reveal a full and determined intention to place the grave and serious problems of this particular group on a coequal status with the problems of any other group in the United States.

I am sure that action will be taken.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. STALBAUM). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] in focusing attention on this problem.

I include the following newspaper article related to this subject:

Last fall, the education committee of the Latin American Research and Service Agency Inc. (LARASA) called a conference to discuss problems of the Spanish-surnamed citizen.

So, what's new about that? Haven't there always been conferences, panel discussions and seminars to seek answers to the plight of Denver's largest minority group?

Sure, but "this is the first time we have taken the initiative to call a meeting to talk about ourselves," according to Bernard Valdez, 54, Denver manager of welfare.

GIVEN HANDLE

"The majority community has always been concerned," Valdez says, "but they never had a handle before."

Providing that handle, according to Valdez, are organizations like LARASA and "a corps of leadership which is able to communicate between the Spanish-surnamed and majority communities."

Valdez, who is president of LARASA, regards the formation of that group a year ago as a milestone in the community's efforts to better the plight of its 70,000 citizens with Spanish names.

LARASA is primarily a counseling service, providing guidance in such fields as jobs, housing, welfare and legal matters.

"We hope to catch them before they sign something and get into financial problems," he said of the legal counseling section.

Also vital, in Valdez' view, is the intercommunication between the Spanish-surnamed and Anglo leaderships.

TEND TO FORGET

He acknowledged that some Spanish-surnamed leaders, who make it out of the poverty class into the middle class, tend to forget about their people in the lower strata.

But, he said the leaders who know what it's like in the low socio-economic class now "can talk to both sides and help to open doors for others."

Valdez is one of those Spanish-surnamed leaders who can talk to the "other side." But he is in constant contact with the less fortunate through his welfare and LARASA posts and membership on the board of Denver's War on Poverty Inc. (DWOP).

He sees some encouraging signs in welfare statistics which are beginning to show a "slowdown" in the shift of Spanish-named people from a rural to urban environment.

"Most of the people now coming to us for help," he said, "have lived in Denver five years or more. This gives us time to catch our breath."

TO SUBURBS

There is still considerable mobility from the center of the city to the suburbs, Valdez said, "but this is a natural progression of a better economic situation."

Valdez also noted, and school people agree, that "a growing number of youngsters are staying in school. This is a sign of real progress."

Valdez said 90 percent of the Spanish-surnamed people in Colorado have New Mexico or Colorado backgrounds and only 10 percent come from Mexico.

From a rural-folk background with "a long tradition of no education system," Valdez said the Spanish-surnamed people have moved into a community where education plays a major part.

Motivation programs in Denver high schools, now partly funded by DWOP and the Denver Public Schools, are helping to solve the dropout problem, Valdez said.

He said high school youngsters are briefed on their background and culture—"told who they are and why"—and are filled in on the competitive American society.

RETAIN THINGS

Many things in the Spanish culture—food, language, religion—can be retained, Valdez said, "but we have to learn to compete."

The emphasis on education is beginning to show results, Valdez said, with a "slow but pretty steady trickle of graduates who are going into education" as a profession.

He pointed out that the Latin American Education Foundation (LAEF), which had to comb the city for potential college students when it started 17 years ago, had more than 100 scholarship applicants last year.

Valdez also sees "exciting things happening" in the war on poverty programs, particularly the Neighborhood Youth Corps, work training experience under the welfare department, and Head Start projects for preschool children.

Formerly with the Denver Housing Authority, Valdez said he has seen people he knew from public housing projects who are now involved in the welfare work training program.

"They don't seem like the same people," he said. "They are being given a chance to help themselves."

"Complete assimilation into the American structure" should be the goal of the Spanish-surnamed community of Denver, in the view of State Sen. Roger Cisneros (D-Denver).

And, the young (42) Denver lawyer emphasizes, "it is our responsibility" to adapt to the competitive way of life.

"It is incumbent on the Spanish-American to learn to operate under the rules imposed by the majority," Cisneros says. "There are certain things that we have to do differently."

One of the Spanish-surnamed leaders who has assimilated with the Anglo world, Cisneros said there must be understanding between the two groups.

SOME CRITICIZED

He criticized many Spanish-named people for only talking about understanding on a 1-way basis.

"They want to be understood without trying to understand," he said.

"The Spanish-American has to learn to think on a broader scale," Cisneros said.

He declared that, too often the Spanish-surnamed person thinks only in terms of what will benefit himself rather than what will help the entire deprived group.

Legislators like himself often face criticism, Cisneros said, for not doing enough for the Spanish-surnamed citizen.

"But," he said, "you don't legislate for a specific group. You legislate for the whole community."

Cisneros cited labor legislation as an example of the type of legislative activity that benefits the community as a whole and its Spanish-surnamed section.

The Spanish-surnamed people need to get active in politics, Cisneros said, working within the party structure from the precinct level on up.

ADVICE OFFERED

He had some advice for candidates, though, particularly those who must run at large in Denver rather than from districts.

It doesn't do much good for a candidate to spend all his time with Spanish-surnamed groups which represent only 9 or 10 percent of the total vote, Cisneros said.

"You must go out after the other 41 percent," he declared.

Cisneros is one of those who has assimilated. He lives in an area that is predominantly Anglo, attends a Protestant church rather than the traditional Catholic, and his children are being raised in a community "where being Spanish doesn't mean as much as it used to."

In fact, says Cisneros, it's quite a change from a generation ago. He said his parents did not speak English, but his children know no Spanish except what they learn in school.

His children have learned the value of education, Cisneros said, and have placed less value on ancestry.

Mr. **UDALL**. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have touched on an aspect of Mexican-American poverty that I believe cannot be emphasized enough. And that is the tendency of nearly everyone except the people involved to ignore it.

Why is this? Why do Americans who recognize human needs in Appalachia or in the Negro ghettoes of our big cities have so little knowledge of the poverty that is such a perpetual characteristic of Mexican-Americans living in the Border States of the Southwest? I think the answer is that, even to Anglos living in Texas or Arizona or California, the Mexican-American is seen as different from other citizens. His poverty is not seen so much as poverty as quaintness.

You see, most Americans have a fondness for Mexico and Mexicans, and this carries over to Americans of Mexican descent. We love their language, their tacos and enchiladas, their traditional joy of living. Those of us who live in the Southwest are proud of the blending of our two cultures. And I suppose that, secretly or unthinkingly, we want our Mexican-American neighbors to continue to charm us with their old-country ways.

Now, admittedly, this is a very different sort of discrimination than has been practiced against that largest of minority groups, the Negroes. You can say a lot of things about the traditional relationships between whites and Negroes in the South—and surely there has been affection between the two races, particularly in years past—but you cannot say that a principal cause of the Negroes' poverty was a desire to preserve the Negroes' culture. Yet I think this is a factor of great importance with reference to the poverty of Mexican-Americans. And, I might say, it is a factor not only among Anglos but among some Mexican-Americans as well.

So I see the problem of Mexican-American poverty as partly one of recognition. It is there, all right. Now let us look at it.

I recall talking some years ago to a businessman who was listing some of Arizona's assets from the standpoint of industrial development. He talked of the weather and of our excellent community facilities and of our steady population growth. And then he came to what he regarded as Arizona's greatest asset—our Mexican labor force. He said that our large pool of Mexican-American workers constituted a major selling point to industry because these workers are faithful, they work hard, and they never stir up trouble.

What he did not say, but what I quickly caught, was that these workers also required less pay than other workers. Like the eminently amenable schmoos in "Li'l Abner," they existed, not for themselves, but to serve others.

Here lies part of the problem. Little has been done to provide greater economic opportunities for Mexican-Americans because it is convenient to keep them in their present, usually menial occupations.

Now, there are those who will point out, correctly, that Mexican-Americans are not without opportunities to advance. The transition from one side of the tracks to the other has been much easier for Mexican-Americans than it has been for Negroes in this country. In fact, the startling truth is that, once the economic transition has been made, many Mexican-Americans seem to lose their Mexican identity altogether. But the few examples of such a move into improved circumstances only conceal the multitude of problems making that transition almost impossible for other Mexican-Americans.

I am pleased that my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has taken the initiative in airing some of these problems today because I feel that the economic plight of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest is a national problem, just as we recognize a national obligation to help the people of Appalachia and advance the economic opportunities of this Nation's Negro population. I supported the Appalachia program, and I believe the steps we are taking to carve out a place in our political and economic life for the Negro are long overdue. But I believe we are neglecting the Mexican-American at the same time.

Now, I would not suggest that because a racial, ethnic, or national group is definable in our population necessarily means we must set out to accord the group special treatment. Not at all. I believe every citizen should be treated like every other citizen. But some problems happen to take shape because of ethnic structure, and we are dealing with some of these problems in the Mexican-American communities of the Southwest. Among these are language, a tradition of undereducation, and an overly strong ethnic identification.

I spoke of the businessman who described Mexican-Americans as Arizona's greatest asset. I agree with much of what he said. The Mexican-Americans I know are fine citizens, hard-working citizens. They are people of intense loyalties and, if one is your friend, he will be your friend, come what may. Perhaps it is wrong to generalize in this way, but I am speaking of a class of people I know quite well. I am aware, of course, that not all persons of Mexican ancestry meet this description. But I repeat that the Mexican-Americans I know in Arizona are fine people, exceptional people. And they are an asset to Arizona. What I do not like is that their worth should be rated in inverse proportion to the wages they demand.

I believe the Government can and should help people to help themselves. On this principle I have supported programs of foreign assistance, and I am pleased to see how some of these programs have stimulated expansion of agriculture, development of industry, and so forth. Similarly, I support manpower retraining and other activities which will help workers learn the skills they need to become fully self-sustaining members of society. And I believe Government can and should help the Mexican-Americans of the Southwest to overcome the obstacles which are preventing them from enjoying the benefits of our most affluent society.

In short, I believe the Mexican-Americans of the States along the Mexican border constitute an underdeveloped asset which can make our Nation richer and stronger and more prosperous, once fully developed. I believe these people have such potential that it is a crime to ignore it. Yet we are ignoring it.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent series of articles on the Mexican-American is appearing currently in the new Arizona magazine, Reveille. Written by Dr. John R. Martinez, assistant professor of history at Arizona State University, Tempe, these articles have attracted wide attention. In the April issue Dr. Martinez reviewed some recent history which should be of interest to my colleagues concerned with these problems we are discussing today.

Without objection, I shall insert this article by Dr. Martinez at this point in the RECORD:

PARADOXES OF EQUALITY

(By John R. Martinez)

(Last month, Dr. Martinez described the distinctive nature of the Mexican-American indigenous to the area, his increase by natural reproduction and his increase by migrant workers from Mexico; the effect of shifts in American and Mexican economies; and the lack of a real need to be assimilated by taking on the colorations of the Anglo culture which soon became dominant.)

From the period just before the Civil War on to the present time, hard headed Yankee ingenuity has managed to find or to create for itself a soft-bottomed labor market. At various times the Negro, the Chinese, the Irish, the Poles, and others have been introduced under the available labor force. That most of these people were eager to migrate does not alter the basic fact that in each instance the incoming group found itself working at the bottom of the economic structure. In each instance, by working for lower wages, the incoming group displaced a part of the available labor force and caused some economic disruption, much to the satisfaction of the exploiting business houses. Fortunately, the economic disruptions were of short duration because the rapidly expanding national economy soon caught up with and absorbed the flabby labor markets.

In the Southwest and in Arizona a situation existed unlike anything the expanding country had encountered. The native labor force largely obviated the need for an Anglo labor force to move in with the Yankee economy. What Anglo labor force did come in found itself caught between the business interests and the very low cost native labor force. Ill-feelings and ethnic conflicts aside, the developing economic structure in Arizona was a most unusual one.

Both the Mexican-American and the Anglo migrant were sources of cheap field labor; and, both were discriminated against. The depression of the 1930's intensified the problems; yet, poverty and discrimination were experienced only as unfortunate things to be endured as a matter of course. The Mexican-American felt the injustice of the condition, but did not feel compelled to try to change anything.

WAR, EXPEDIENCY, AND TURNING POINT

World War II altered the Arizona Mexican-American's situation drastically. Mexican-American volunteers and draftees left huge gaps in the labor force. Many of those who remained were absorbed by the war materials industries. Mexican nationals began to come, but in insufficient numbers. Predictably, Yankee ingenuity came to the rescue.

Justified by the emergency, Washington and Mexico City worked out what came to be known as the "bracero program." In the peak wartime year, 1944, 62,170 field hands entered the country. The number predictably decreased with the end of the war and in 1947 only 19,632 workers were imported.

To the surprise of the Anglo Southwest, however, many of the returning Mexican-American veterans and war industries workers did not willingly return to the fields. The veteran had fought well, had experienced Anglo living, has seen much of the world, had made equal wages under equal working conditions. When the Southwestern farmer offered the same old three dollars a day to the returning veteran he was ignored. The citrus grower and the tomato farmer who offered only sporadic employment managed to get only the least able worker. The others wanted more in education, more in housing, more in job advancement and in pay. The GI Bill was helping with the education and the housing and was promising more in position and pay.

Bellows of outrage from powerful growers and their organizations reverberated through the legislative chambers of Washington. Washington responded by passing Public Law 78, a law which permitted Mexican field hands to enter the country under private contract to perform unskilled work—stoop labor.

Each year thereafter growers found it profitable to increase the number of laborers brought in under contract. By 1956, the United States was importing 445,197 braceros to work in the fields. Not only was the labor cheap, it was flexible. When the job was finished the force could be sent home or moved on to another area.

Meanwhile, impoverished resident Mexican-Americans, Negroes, Indians, and Anglos sat on the sidelines. They were unable to work at the wages paid if they were to exist above poverty levels.

Another threat came with the legal entrant who came in under the quotaless immigration policy. These were the commuters, who made out papers for entry, obtained permission to live in the United States, and then proceeded to enjoy the best of the two nations—U.S. wages and Mexican prices.

The scope of the flow is perhaps best indicated by the number of legal border crossings. In 1961, for example, 103,670,026 legal Mexican crossings were registered, including the braceros, those with temporary work visas, and those who commuted daily to the border areas.[1]

An illegal flood of entrants also developed as the number admitted under contract increased. These were the "wetbacks" whom American labor smugglers sometimes brought in. Farmers were more than willing to hire Mexicans whose pay they did not have to guarantee, whose housing they did not have to maintain, whose illegality made them even more exploitable. (P.L. 78 had set minimum standards which farmers often thought accessive.)

---

[1] Julian Samora, "The Spanish Speaking People in the United States," a pilot study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, summary prepared by Eleanor Rubin, p. 17.

Complaints to Congress caused the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service to become more active. The USIANS can exert many pressures. It can deport after hearings and appeals and court judgments. And, it can recommend to an alien that he leave. The numbers of actions which fell into the latter category are surprising.[2]

Period	Mexicans deported	Required to leave
1940-44	17,078	40,191
1945-49	70,505	785,326
1950-54	63,515	3,841,562
1955-59	25,113	237,093

The national expulsion policy, for that is what it became, did not improve the status of the Mexican-American. Many illegitimate expulsions accompanied the exporting of illegal wetbacks. Many southwesterns today regard "Operation Wetback" in much the same light as the general population does the horror of the Japanese Internment Program during World War II.

The most obvious effect, then, of the Bracero Program was to keep wages low by means of a glutted labor market. However, a not so obvious effect, and perhaps an ultimately more harmful effect, was to reinforce the Anglo's view of the Mexican-American as an humble field worker and to reinforce the Mexican-American's view of himself as a member of an ethnic group other than the dominant Anglo one.

In the first instance, everywhere the Anglo looked he saw Mexican nationals in the fields and being moved from farm to farm. Every time the Anglo read in the local newspapers of Spanish-speaking people he read of nationals. When he thought of the brown people, he increasingly thought of Mexican nationals.

In the latter instance, with only the contacts with ethnic ways which normally would have occurred and with an increasing number of contacts with Anglo ethnic ways which resulted from wartime shifts, the Mexican-American predictably would have become assimilated into the dominant Anglo community much more readily. However, the constant renewal of contacts with the "old world" through the incoming braceros and other legal and illegal Mexican entrants constantly reinforced folkways and patterns. Those elements which the Anglo found "different" were perpetuated.

PARADOX OF EQUALITY

In another area, too, and in a less tangible way, the rug was soon pulled from under the post-war Mexican-American.

Separateness, on whatever basis, makes for unity within the separated group. The Mexican-American had been separated from the Anglo communities in several ways. He tended to live apart in "barrios." He usually found his schools populated largely and even totally by other Mexican-Americans. He found that less money was spent on those schools. He found he was excluded from jury duty. In many communities he was excluded from parks, from motion picture theaters, from swimming pools, and from other public places. Certain neighborhoods excluded him no matter how acceptable he may have been culturally and professionally. In some towns of the Southwest the Mexican-American did not patronize certain barber shops or stores. There were no "Keep Out" signs, but instead of a civil greeting for the Mexican-American customer, the shopkeeper "made one a bad face," as the saying had it.

The separateness that resulted often led to a drawing together within the Spanish-speaking communities. Ethnic pride was high after World War II. Anglos had not yet flooded into the Southwest. Many traces of the Mexican heritage were to be seen everywhere. Solidarity was growing. It took a variety of forms in Arizona and in Texas and California (each of the latter had almost forty percent of the Spanish surnamed population), but the solidarity and the desire for and equal place in the sun was apparent. In short, Mexican-Americans were becoming a force.

Potentially, this drawing together could have led to block voting and a variety of other activist pressures upon the Anglo communities. The post-war years saw take shape such ethnic oriented organizations as the G. I. Forum, Political Action for Spanish Speaking Organizations, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the Catholic War Veterans and, later, the Mexican-American Political Association and the Federation of Mexican-American Organizations. However, at no time could any of these groups muster the necessary unity to achieve the drive of either the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People or the Japanese American Citizens League. Paradoxically, there did not seem to be enough "separateness."

EFFECTS OF LEGAL DECISIONS

Several legal decisions, most often in school cases, through the years in various places undermined whatever tendency there might have been to unite on the basis of color, or race, or ethnic considerations. Two decisions involving jury service were of particular importance.

In Texas prior to 1954, the practice of excluding Spanish-speaking persons from juries led to charges of unequal justice in prejudiced courts. The courts of Texas had held uniformly that the prohibition against the systematic exclusion of a racial group from jury service did not "include and apply to members of different nationalities. Mexicans or Latin-Americans are not of a race different than white."[3]

The clever wording of this decision made it possible to continue to exclude Mexican-Americans from jury service.

By a landmark decision in that year the Supreme Court of the United States extended the jury exclusion rule to Spanish-speaking peoples. The Court held that the protection of the 14th Amendment in this regard is not limited to classes of "white" and "Negro" but includes any class against which distinctions are made in the community and which make up a substantial portion of the population.[4]

The decision, along with those involving the schools, was met with delight on the part of the Mexican-American. The word spread like wildfire. Discrimination was now illegal: justice in the courts and equality in education. Separate schools could now be closed. Spanish-speaking Americans could sit in the lower part of the movie houses. Believing that they were now officially "white," many Mexican-Americans began to act like white (while they stood a bit straighter, they started looking down on Negroes and Indians). In too many cases, they no longer vigorously fought to correct ethnic injustices.

These court decisions took much of the fury out of the growing drives for equality. At the time when the Negro, under the impact of the civil rights decisions of the fifties, was beginning to flex his street muscles, the Mexican-American was sitting down to bask in his equality. And, if anyone doubted his equality, he would reach back and pull out a driver's license marked "white" to prove it.

The equality was illusory. The cases meant little to the Anglo-in-the-street: he still too often regarded the Mexican-American as different and therefore inferior. To the Mexican-American, the decisions seemed to be an excuse to stop fighting. The rug, now, had really been pulled out.

FEW HOPEFUL SIGNS

Latterly, the Mexican-American has preferred to use the "white man's" political approach to attempt to solve remaining problems. There are perhaps ten political ethnic organizations for the Mexican-American for every one social service organization. Political appointments were sought and better jobs through political pressure. They sought better schools by attempting to influence school board elections. Only in rare instances (LULAC is one) did Mexican-Americans establish programs similar to those of the National Urban League, the NAACP, B'nai B'rith, or the American Friends.

The generally quiescent position of the Mexican-American and the resultant lack of power had been contrasted sharply by the aggressiveness of the Negro. Kennedy's election (perhaps 90 percent of Mexican-Americans voted for both Kennedy and Johnson) was rapidly followed by the appointment of several Negroes to important posts. The Mexican-American was left looking on. The poverty programs seem more because of and for the Negro than any other group. Much "foundation money" goes to Negro colleges and universities. (There are 27 Negro schools in the United States. There is none which might train Mexican-American leadership as the Negro schools have done. A foundation executive at a Los Angeles meeting would not consider the possibility of putting money into such an institution.)

The editors of "Carta Editorial," an influential newsletter published in Los Angeles, account for the contrast: "If the Negro community has leaped ahead of the Mexican-American community in utilizing the Economic Opportunity Act, it must be because that community has moved faster, with more decision, and has exerted more united pressure. A great deal of the Mexican-American programming and efforts to obtain projects and representation has been carried out through small cliques, exclusive of one another, and in many cases uncoordinated and at variance with each other."[5]

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend my very able colleague, Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ, of Texas, for taking this floor time today and for speaking cogently and accurately to the problem of discrimination and poverty in the Southwest. He has spoken of the interrelationship of social forces which constantly reinforce one another to deepen the general demoralization and frustration of the minority group.

Only recently have we been shown that the problem of civil rights and equal opportunity is not one for the South alone. Perhaps only the tragic and violent incidents in major urban areas of the North—Los Angeles, New

---

[2] Leo Greber et al., "Mexican-American Study Project," Advanced Report 2, Graduate School of Business Administration, U.C.L.A., 1966.

[3] *Rogers* v. *State,* 236 S.W. 2d 141, 143 (Tex. Crim. App. 1951). *Accord Salazar* v. *State,* 193 S.W. 2d 211 (Tex. Crim. App. 1946); *Sanchez* v. *State,* 181 S.W. 2d 87 (Tex. Crim. App. 1944). *Contra, Juarez* v. *State,* 277 S.W. 1091 (Tex. Crim App. 1925) jury exclusion of Roman Catholics).

[4] *Hernandez* v. *Texas,* 347 U.S. 475 (1954).

[5] August 10, 1965, p. 2.

York, Rochester—could shock public officials into realization of the tacit, subtle, but very real discrimination that exists in the Northern and Western States. In the Southwest, the plight of the Negro is shared by other ethnic groups—the Chinese, the Japanese, the Filipinos, the American Indians, the Mexican-Americans. Poverty is much of the problem, but it is intensified and maintained for additional reasons—discrimination toward the minority culture.

The situation becomes graphic when specific and so I would like to concentrate my remarks particularly on my own congressional district, the Ninth District of California, containing more residents of Mexican-American descent than any other congressional district in northern California. In Santa Clara County, for example, the median number of years completed in school by the total population is 12.2, by Negroes 12, and by Mexican-Americans 8.3. The same is true for median income: the figure for the total population is $7,417, for Negroes $6,280, and for Mexican-Americans $5,931.

In my district, the Mexican-American population lives primarily in two census tracts. In one tract the average education is 7.3 years and in the other 6 years. The average family income is $4,840 in one and $5,548 in the other. Unemployment is high: 11 percent in one tract and 7.9 percent in another. I need not say to you that this is an intolerable situation—this is quite evident.

In large part the situation of minorities in California is traceable to the agriculture economy and its needs. Californians have long looked to minorities as a source of mass labor on the farms—beginning with the Chinese, Japanese, and now primarily the Filipinos and the Mexicans. The agricultural laborers of this Nation have for decades lived on the fringes of American life. They have largely been ignored in the social movements which stimulated legislative protection and benefits for most Americans. This, coupled with their minority status, has meant these persons have not shared in the benefits of a growing America and have not been accorded the rights due them.

In employment, housing, income, education, the Mexican-American does not fare as well as the American of nonminority status. A concerted and coordinated attack in all these fields is of paramount need. Especially serious is the impact of socioeconomic status and cultural distinctions on the education of youngsters and to this problem I would like to speak more particularly.

The very high dropout rate for high school students of Spanish surname is evidence that changes need to be made and special programs instituted in education. The Mexican-American child, by the time he reaches high school, faces such difficulty that the seemingly easy answer is to drop out of school. Language is a tremendous barrier—it means a slower start in school and that the child will gradually fall further and further behind. The second hindrance is his family's social and economic level. His parents, who may have only a fourth-grade education themselves, would naturally have difficulty helping and motivating the child. And finally, the minority status contributes to the dropout rate because of discrimination and insults, especially in high school where the enrollment is larger and more likely mixed and the fear that education will not do them any good anyway.

We cannot speak to this situation without mentioning the cultural differences which exist between persons of Mexican descent and the rest of the community. The continuous migration of persons from Mexico has meant a strong maintenance of Mexican culture in California. Unfortunately, the white majority is too often not receptive and unthinkingly critical. I would suggest instead that for the benefit of both a special effort is required if we are going to correct the statistics of poverty cited above. We are just beginning to realize that our public schools are efficient only for middle and upper income level students and that our Negro kids need a "headstart" if they are going to be able to have a meaningful experience in school. Neither can Mexican-American children survive in a school which takes no cognizance of their special needs.

We are making a slow beginning through such efforts as the Economic Opportunity Act. I want to take this opportunity to stress that we will not succeed if we ignore large segments of our population—including the minorities of the Southwest. I would also stress that this effort must be a cooperative one, that no right is truly guaranteed until it is enjoyed by all. I again thank Congressman GONZALEZ for reserving this time to discuss poverty and discrimination in the Southwest.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ]. He has eloquently voiced his distress about the intimate and enduring relationship between poverty and discrimination in the Southwest, about the regional scope of these problems, and about the fact that minority groups of many ethnic backgrounds are caught in this two-pronged nightmare.

The civil rights revolution has awakened the national conscience to the plight of our Negro citizens. Our colleague has pointed out that we must not overlook the difficulties that beset other groups as well—such as persons of Mexican descent, Indians, Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos—that we must fight to see that all people are helped to secure their rights and to receive what they deserve.

This is especially poignant and understandable to me as a Congressman from New York City. New York has a population of diverse ethnic backgrounds. All minorities—Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other Spanish-speaking people, Chinese and other oriental people—face the twin problems of poverty and discrimination.

Statistics pertaining to Negro income, employment, and education are often cited. And they tell the story of centuries of exploitation and denial.

For a minute let us also look at statistics pertaining to the Puerto Rican community.

For example, in New York City among Puerto Ricans the median family income was only $3,811 in 1960. The 1960 census showed an unemployment rate of 9.9 per 100 for Puerto Rican men and 10.6 for Puerto Rican women. The median school years completed by Puerto Ricans was only 7.6. At that time 53 percent of Puerto Rican adults had not completed the eighth grade, while another 17 percent had not gone beyond it.

Some progress has been made since 1960. In 1965, for example, I cosponsored the amendment to the Voting Rights Act which provided that Spanish-speaking citizens could vote if they had completed a sixth-grade education in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, the problems remain massive for all deprived groups. In New York we have had for some time a fair employment practices law, a State commission against discrimination, and a New York City fair housing law. This is not generally the case throughout the Southwest.

Even with increasing civil rights and poverty legislation, we have not even begun to scratch the surface in enforcement or carrying out of programs. Discrimination still remains a barrier for minority groups trying to fight their way out of poverty into a decent life. And, in true circular fashion, poverty unchecked still helps to keep people segregated out of the mainstream of society and easily marked for discrimination.

To meet these twin evils, we must press for a minimum wage of $2, for massive programs to eradicate slums and supplement rents where needed, for an economy that provides full employment and adequately compensates idled workers when it cannot do so, for full educational opportunity for all, for full legal services and comprehensive medical care for all who need them without regard to ability to pay.

In short, we must make sure that no one finds the barriers of discrimination preventing his full access to the rights, benefits, and privileges of democracy. Without this achievement the war against poverty will be lost before it is fairly begun.

The social sickness of the urban ghetto and the social sickness of the Southwest as described by our colleague must be attacked on a full scale.

I am delighted to join my colleague in this special order, for he has made a major contribution to a better understanding of the depth of poverty in America. We must not rest until it is totally eliminated.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in calling to the attention of the Members of this body the often neglected situation of poverty and discrimination experienced by persons of Mexican-American descent in the Southwestern States.

My own congressional district, in Los Angeles County, includes the largest percentage of Spanish surname residents in the State of California—nearly 30 percent, or about 120,000 persons. This includes the unincorporated portion of East Los Angeles and the Lincoln Heights and Echo Park areas of the city of Los Angeles.

One of the most discouraging aspects of the Los Angeles problem is the fact that the economic situation is worsening rather than getting better.

A recent special census survey of the South and East Los Angeles areas taken by the Bureau of the Census shows some interesting statistics and comparisons between 1960 and 1965 census figures and between the Negro and the Mexican-American communities of Los Angeles.

The special census resulted from a request made by the Office of Economic Opportunity following last summer's disturbance in Watts. In general, it shows a lowering of average living conditions and a higher concentration of both Negroes and Mexican-Americans in the respective areas.

Since a great part of the Mexican-American neighborhoods in East Los Angeles are in the 29th Congressional District, which I represent, I have been studying these figures closely. Three geographical areas were delineated in East Los Angeles by the census takers, identified as Boyle Heights, City Terrace and East Los Angeles. Roughly, Boyle Heights includes all of the territory on the east side that is within the boundaries of the city of Los Angeles—on the west side of Indiana Street and bounded by 25th Street and Valley Boulevard on the south and north—and as far west as Alameda Street. City Terrace area is bounded by the Alhambra and Monterey Park city limits on the north and east, by the Los Angeles city limits on the west, and roughly, to Brooklyn Avenue on the south. The balance of the unincorporated area, reaching approximately to the Santa Ana Freeway on the south and to Monterey Park and Montebello city limits on the north and east, is denoted as East Los Angeles in the survey.

INCOME IS LOWER

It is disappointing to note that the median income for this entire area dropped over the 1960 to 1965 period—adjusted for price changes—by about $400—from $5,513 to $5,106. This is approximately the same percentage ratio of the drop in median income in South Los Angeles, although it runs about $400 higher per year in the Mexican-American community than in the Negro community.

The incidence of poverty on the East Side was almost as high as South Los Angeles, however—23.6 percent as opposed to 26.8 percent. This is about 2 percent higher than in 1960. Poverty figures ran higher in Boyle Heights—26.3 percent—than in the other two areas, but an unusually high proportion of young families—with family heads under 25 years old—are living below the poverty level in City Terrace—47.4 percent. This compares with an overall average in the Mexican-American communities of 32.1 percent for this age group and is a jump of 19 percent from the 1960 figure of 28.4 percent.

UNEMPLOYMENT DROP IS DISAPPOINTING

Unemployment is down about 1 percent—from about 8 to 7 percent over the 5-year period on the East Side, as compared with a drop from about 11 to 10 percent in the Negro area. This is not a really promising figure, however, when there was a drop from 12 to 6 percent in the unemployment figure for nonwhite males nationwide.

Housing conditions have worsened on the East Side during the past 5 years, as well, with the number of deteriorating units increasing from 20 to 28 percent. City Terrace appears to be in the worst shape, with the number of deteriorating units increasing from 27 to 38 percent. At the same time, real estate values have increased—along with the general trend in Los Angeles County—and rents have jumped from an average of $63 per month in 1960 to $75 in 1965. Paradoxically, City Terrace shows the highest average rent, going from $66 in 1960 to $79 in 1965.

HEAVIER CONCENTRATIONS

The overall population trend in the Mexican-American community has moved toward higher concentration—just as in the Negro areas—although the total population on the East Side has dropped. While the number of persons in the area went from 193,000 to a little over 178,000 in the 5-year period, there was an increase of more than 7,000 persons with Spanish surnames. The proportion of Spanish surnames increased from 66.1 percent to 75.6 percent.

An increase of persons who have recently moved into the East Los Angeles area from outside the United States is also evident, with 6.6 percent now indicating residence in another country 5 years ago as opposed to 5.5 percent in this category 5 years ago.

Another aspect of discrimination which the Mexican-American shares with the Negro is reflected in the Selective Service System. During the debate on the recent Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1966, on March 29, 1966, I stated:

> Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and those persons generally in the less affluent sector of our society, bear a heavier burden than most, simply because they do not qualify for or cannot afford the methods of obtaining deferment status—primarily, attendance at an institution of higher learning.
>
> I recently discovered another problem that is the result of our failure to update procedures and, whether or not it actually results in discriminatory selection procedures, it certainly could have such implications and is a matter that should be corrected.
>
> The problem involves the fact that in the areas in Los Angeles County where we have an extremely heavy concentration of Mexican-American citizens, there are three Selective Service Boards operating, and only one member from these Boards is of Mexican-American descent. In fact, in all of Los Angeles County, with more than 600,000 Mexican-American citizens, there seems to be only this one draft board member from this ethnic background.
>
> I hasten to add that I have contacted the Selective Service System concerning this situation and have received full cooperation and courtesy. It appears that we will be able to bring about corrective action in the near future. But, this leads me to wonder what the situation is in other parts of the nation.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] for the great service he is rendering the people of his State as well as the citizens of the entire United States in bringing attention to this problem.

Los Angeles is awakening to the needs of its Mexican-American barrios and to the problems of the community in general. This awakening is being brought about not by Federal programs or by scholarly studies, but by a group of leaders from the community, itself, who have astutely recognized that now is the time for the activity from within the community which will stimulate general awareness of the problem and, hopefully, will also stimulate some answers.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point a number of pertinent articles which have recently appeared in the local newspapers which serve to illustrate both the problems in Los Angeles and the awareness of the community leaders who will play a great part in the future of these Americans of Mexican descent:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 24, 1966]

MEXICAN-AMERICAN FRUSTRATION TOLD—SPEAKER SAYS LATINS FEEL THEY ARE NEGLECTED IN POVERTY WAR

(By Richard Bergholz)

There's a growing sense of frustration among Mexican-Americans that they aren't getting their fair share of help and attention from antipoverty officials, a racial conference was told here Saturday.

But there were differing views on whether this frustration would lead to race riots.

Juan Acevedo, a social worker and representative of the Council of Mexican-American Affairs, said at the conference of the recently organized Political Unity for Mexican-Americans (PUMA):

"There is a feeling that if it takes a Watts riot for the Negroes to get some attention and all this help from the war on poverty, then maybe that's what the Mexican-American should consider."

But George Sotelo, a Pasadena mechanical engineer who presided over the PUMA general sessions, said he thinks violence is unlikely, that better Mexican-American organization for political action offers better hope for achieving better conditions.

PROBLEMS DISCUSSED

Representatives from many Mexican-American political and civic organizations attended the PUMA sessions at the Alexandria and participated in day-long panel meetings on a variety of governmental and political problems.

Objective: to seek a better consensus on political and governmental needs of Mexican-Americans and to develop a kind of yardstick against which to measure candidates for public office.

Sotelo said the new organization, which has statewide interests, will not endorse candidates.

Many delegates zeroed in on the war on poverty as an example of government assistance going primarily to Negroes, while Mexican-Americans are ignored.

Richard Tafoya, pre-vocational supervisor for the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency (EYOA), the local operating head of the war on poverty program, said "if the squeaky wheel gets the grease, then we're going to have to squeak a lot more to get some help."

Mexican-Americans generally are "dissatisfied with antipoverty administration both here and in Washington," Tafoya said in reporting the findings of a PUMA "war on poverty" panel.

Tafoya said this dissatisfaction centers on:

1—An inadequate participation of the poor in the program.

2—A belief that more Mexican-Americans should be represented on the program's policy-making level and that Sargent Shriver, director of the program, should name a Mexican-American assistant.

3—A need for presenting information on the programs in simpler languages and, where necessary, in Spanish.

Mexican-Americans also are demanding to know, he said, how many of their racial group are benefiting from poverty programs and how many are serving on local or county poverty boards or in staff jobs.

Several Negroes sat in on a panel session on intergroup relations presided over by educator Ralph Poblano.

Mexican-Americans and Negroes have a similar hunger for better education, better housing, jobs and better treatment by law enforcement officers, Poblano said.

But Mexican-Americans differ from Negroes in their language, their religion and their psychological reaction to their heritage, he said.

Poblano submitted a report on education which charged that the Mexican-American level of achievement in school lags four years behind the Anglo-American and two years behind the Negro.

Delegates adopted a statement condemning the state educational system because "state curricula fails to meet the needs of the Mexican-American student."

Another statement adopted asserted that "every politician should commit himself to the principle that the poor should be in control of poverty programs."

Delegates generally agreed that more will be accomplished if efforts to achieve improved conditions are based on a multiracial basis than on a go-it-alone approach.

Oscar Fernandez headed a panel discussion on problems relating to the election of Mexican-Americans to public office, and Dr. Manuel Guerra led a panel discussion on education.

[From the Parkside Journal (Los Angeles), Mar. 17, 1966]

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOUNDATION LISTS 6 POINTS FOR MEXICAN-AMERICANS

A six-point program to stimulate better employment opportunities for Mexican-Americans was released Friday by the Equal Opportunity Foundation.

The program points were shaped from recommendations by the 1,000 professional and community people who attended the EOF-Sponsored Mexican-American Employment and Education Conference in Los Angeles last month.

"The newcomer is the individual who is most frequently the victim of prejudice and exploitation," according to Dionicio Morales, executive director of the EOF.

"He brings a triple handicap into our community: he has limited education—generally including little or no understanding of the English language; he has no marketable skill; and his skin is dark.

"Our society is still very color-conscious," Morales stated, "and in places where a fair-complected Mexican-American may be accepted, a darker-skinned one will be turned away."

Morales added that while the power structure generally denies the existence of "color-consciousness," Mexican-American community persons attending the EOF conference were very much aware of it.

To reach this individual, and to provide all Mexican-Americans with a fair, competitive employment opportunity, the following recommendations were made:

1. That offices be set up in urban "port-of-entry" areas to assist the rural immigrant in discovering his educational and employment rights and opportunities, and to aid him in overcoming prejudice in seeking employment.

2. That industry make better use of community and Spanish-language newspapers and other media in its campaign to provide "equal employment opportunity" to all minorities.

3. That government agencies make themselves more readily available to the poverty-area Mexican-American whose culture and language make it virtually impossible for him to communicate his experiences of prejudice to agencies which supposedly are set up to seek these out.

4. That persons with extra talents, such as being bilingual, be rewarded for these by their employers—both in government and industry—provided their job utilizes these special talents.

5. That citizenship as an employment requisite be re-evaluated in jobs and industries where there is no danger to national security involved.

6. That special programs be initiated to assist the dark-skinned Mexican-American under the under-skilled new arrival.

"It's evident that our system is not only failing to meet the challenge of providing equal employment opportunity to the Mexican-American," Morales concluded. "But it's becoming increasingly clear that society refuses to recognize what the problems are."

[From the Los Angeles Times]

RACE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT REDUCED—BUT UCLA ECONOMIST FINDS MORE SUBTLE FACTORS, SUCH AS LACK OF SKILLS, GROWING

Discrimination in employment of Negroes and Mexican-Americans here on the sole basis of race or national origin is diminishing.

But it is increasing on the basis of more subtle factors such as lack of education and skills, age and personal characteristics associated with race.

This report was given Thursday to the state Fair Employment Practices Commission by Dr. Paul Bullock, assistant research economist in the UCLA Institute of Industrial Relations.

BETTER EXCUSES

Telling the results of an institute survey in 1964 on the employment experiences of Negroes in South Los Angeles and Mexican-Americans in East Los Angeles, Dr. Bullock said:

"We are entering a new era where discrimination is hard to pin down as attributable solely to race or national origin.

"Employers, labor unions and hiring agencies are finding superficially better excuses for not hiring or promoting members of these racial minorities.

"These excuses include lack of education, and lack of skills, together with such personal characteristics as not fitting into the accepted norms on dress, style of haircut, police arrest records, speech and behavior."

Present antipoverty legislation is not producing the solutions to help Mexican-Americans and Negroes overcome this type of employment discrimination, Dr. Bullock said.

Dr. Bullock said the survey showed that recent migrants to the Los Angeles area are better employed than many Negroes and Mexican-Americans who have been here 10 years or more.

Dr. Bullock recommended retraining programs be oriented more toward allowing Negroes and Mexican-Americans to make social readjustments and obtain integration experience which would fit them for normal employment.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 8, 1966]

REVOLT IN THE BARRIOS—SOCIAL FERMENT STIRS MEXICAN-AMERICANS

(By Jack Jones, Times staff writer)

"You can't describe Mexican-Americans," shouted an angry 14-year-old boy from East Los Angeles. "We don't want to talk about our ancestors and all that. What's the chicano today? That's what counts!"

Others broke in:

"We're Mexicans."

"We're Mexican-Americans."

"That's what we want to be treated like—Americans."

"I'm an American. I live in the United States."

These were some of the 200 teenagers attending a three-day Mexican-American Youth Leadership Conference under the trees beyond Malibu in April. Their explosion of self-appraisal startled adult counselors.

EMOTIONS TAKE OVER

It was the first time since the County Relations Commission-sponsored meeting began four years ago that a half dozen "leaders" did not take over while the rest waited in bored silence for lunch.

The unexpected, emotional and often-heated search for identification by these few of 800,000 persons in the county who defy neat categorization and are sometimes described feebly as "the Spanish surname population" was a tiny outcropping of a proud new revolt.

The youngster who protested, "Chicanos (slang for 'Mexicans') don't give a damn. They could do good things, but he's always getting rowdy and everything," was put down instantly by a 16-year-old Lincoln Heights girl:

"Mexican-American means bicultural and bilingual * * * a little more than other Americans."

HOPEFUL SIGNS NOTED

Whether the apparent shattering of a long-prevalent sense of frustration and inferiority—produced by the predominantly Anglo society's view of Mexicans as lemon pickers and railroad laborers—is actually the beginning of a dramatic change, the fact remains that there are other signs.

Aghast that the problems of Negroes are receiving the lion's part of public and federal attention—even though Mexican-Americans share most of the difficulties and are even worse off educationally—an angry collection of activists in their early 30s has suddenly appeared.

It was these "young Pancho Villas" from Southern California who triggered the walkout of 50 Mexican-Americans from a federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission conference in Albuquerque on March 28, to protest the "hollow promises" and "lip service" of the government and the commission which has no Mexican-American members.

Excitement has swept virtually all Mexican-American organizations throughout the Southwest, who regard the Albuquerque walkouts as a second "El Grito," the 1810 shout by Fra. Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla in the village of Dolores to launch the rebellion against the Spanish.

The walkout, wrote two national columnists, "turned out to be the opening day for a political revolt by the Mexican-American community."

Although that demonstration of mass disenchantment with "being talked to but ignored" prompted President Johnson to promise full attention to their problems of discrimination in housing, jobs and education, the Mexican-Americans are still waiting for him to meet with them personally.

DEMONSTRATIONS URGED

On April 28, at a Statler Hilton banquet honoring the Albuquerque delegation (who wore tiny huaraches as proud symbols of their walkout) speaker after speaker from Mexican-American organizations called for demonstrations, picketings and more walkouts to prove they have had enough talk.

"Bastante" they said. Enough.

"That walkout," said a Los Angeles Mexican-American, "was the first time there has been cohesive, antisocial action on the part of successful, 'accepted' Mexican-Americans from all over the Southwest, and it was these young guys from California who showed 'em how."

Not the least of the manifestations of the rising revolt has been the fight by Cesar Chavez, National Farm Workers Assn. head, on behalf of the Mexican-American grape workers in Delano.

CAPITAL MARCH VIEWED

The Chavez-led march on Sacramento has brought talk of a similar march on Washington to take the problems of the Nation's 5 million Mexican-Americans "to Johnson's doorstep."

At the Statler dinner, where nearly a dozen organizations were represented, Bert Corona, state vice president of the Mexican-American Political Assn., suggested a day of protest in which children would be kept home from school and "we would refuse to speak English—at least, those of us who can still speak Spanish."

His shout, "Viva la causa (cause), viva la raza (race) y viva la unidad (unity)," brought the crowd up with a roar.

Few—if any—in the so-called Mexican-American community seriously expect that the extreme fragmentation will suddenly vanish, leaving 800,000 persons with identical viewpoints and goals.

Marcos de Leon, 50, long active in the drive to make Anglo educators admit the desirability of bicultural teaching, said:

"We are at all points of the spectrum in the process of assimilation—from the immigrant who came across the border yesterday to the old California families. The problems vary tremendously."

EFFORT DRAWS SNEERS

His point—that Latins of diverse backgrounds cannot be expected to agree—is illustrated by the fact that while he called the suddenly active young products of World War II, the Korean war and GI Bill educations "functional citizens attempting to motivate some change by utilizing both cultures," another old hand in the Mexican-American community said:

"These kids can't really communicate with the 76 percent who are unskilled. They use terms like 'process of acculturation' while Pacoima and other barrios (neighborhoods or, more loosely, ghettos) have slum houses. Some of them don't speak enough Spanish to have rapport with the people who have problems."

And a one-time East Side gang members now in youth work sneered, "All these new organizations are self-serving, just like the old one. Every guy is looking out for himself."

But, said William Gutierrez, a County Human Relations Commission consultant, American community now is beginning to articulate concerning the solutions of its own problems.

"It may sound haphazard, but the community is becoming much more concerned than ever before. The spokesmen now have groups behind them and the concern is starting to jell.

The young Mexican-American returned from war aware that there is "more to America than just the barrios," said Gutierrez. "And being a soldier gave him a sense of pride—to feel almost as any other American feels.

"TRANSITION SEEN

"What you're viewing here is a momentum of transition * * * the beginning of real leadership."

The concern—the rising sound of revolt—has come with an abrupt realization by the Mexican-American (or Latin-American, or Spanish-surnames) community that as the general affluence grows, there is deepening trouble in the heart of the barrio.

People of Mexican descent—those who have been able to take advantage of a lessening in discrimination—are moving up the social ladder, joining the exodus of the suburbs and in many cases becoming Anglicized.

They leave behind, in the barrios, an increasingly troubled mix of older residents who resist change, totally unassimilated immigrants from Mexico and a constantly growing number of unskilled workers driven by automatic harvesters from the rural fields of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California.

WEALTH DECLINES

On March 8, the U.S. Department of Commerce reported a special census had shown that the economic status of the Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles—like that of the Negroes—has deteriorated during the last five years in sharp contrast to Anglos.

That survey, conducted among the heavily Spanish-surname laden areas of Boyle Heights, City Terrace and East Los Angeles, found the median family income had dropped (while other incomes had risen) and that housing in the region had deteriorated.

Dr. Andrew F. Brimmer, assistant secretary for economic affairs, conceded that the decline in East Side areas—like that in predominantly Negro tracts—may be the result of a steady evacuation by residents benefiting enough from the general economy rise to afford other neighborhoods.

This view was shared by Dr. Leo Grebler, director of the Ford Foundation-financed Mexican-American Study Project at UCLA:

"I would say things are worse only in the compacted areas. The fact that many have moved out in itself means a certain advancement."

He added: "Where many other ethnic groups in the United States have been able to absorb and solve their problems, the Mexican-Americans here are constantly getting new immigrants and new problems."

(The UCLA project staff, which the Mexican-American Political Assn. has accused of being too distant from the grassroots to really understand the problems, said in one report that the term "Mexican-American" is used as a generic term to include people of Mexican, Spanish or mixed Indian descent.

SEE BETTER TERM

(It added "a note of regret that we have been unable so far to devise a short, descriptive and immediately, intelligible term that avoids the obnoxious hyphenation.")

It was World War II which brought the lessening of discrimination (at least for the lighter-complexioned), which opened up more jobs and allowed many in the old East Side barrios to move out—notably eastward to new tracts around El Monte, Pico Rivera, La Puente and Norwalk.

Other "colonias" are scattered throughout the county, in the Pacoima-San Fernando area, San Pedro-Wilmington and West Los Angeles-Venice.

SOME BLEND IN

Thousands of persons have simply melted into the general population. Many—especially several years ago—yielded to the temptation to Anglicize their names in the face of continuing Anglo pressures.

Today, as the advancing East Side freeways continue to displace people to the suburbs, while sons and daughters move out, the older Mexican-Americans hang on to the neighborhoods they have known for years, sharing them with the newcomers and living in dread of any urban renewal plans they feel will take their homes from them.

Because the old folks cling comfortaby to a culture their departing children do not necessarily cherish and because of the heavy influx of immigrants, more Spanish can be heard in the center of the barrio than 20 years ago, said Arturo Almanza, another County Human Relations Commission consultant.

Almanza lives two blocks from where he was born near Brooklyn and Eastern Avenues. He said:

"People in my neighborhood have lived there since I can remember, although their children have moved elsewhere. We still speak Spanish and a lot of this is because there is no more fear of our own identity. It's not quite as important to us to be something else as it was before World War II."

SIGNS IN SPANISH

East Los Angeles looks in many respects as it did when the county's Mexican-Americans were largely concentrated there.

Small frame houses fronted by cactus and picket fences still clutter slopes and gullies. Microscopic corner grocery stores give the impression of having been there since the 1910–1916 period when thousands of Mexicans fled here from the chaotic revolutions south of the border.

Along such "main drags" as E. 1st St., E. 3rd, Brooklyn Ave. and Whittier Blvd., signs read "Boticas" (drug store), "Tortillaria" and "Panaderilla (bakery).

On walls and bridge abutments, fresh scrawls—"White Fence," "Flats" or "Maravilla"—are evidence that some youngsters still feel the need to identify with the same juvenile gang image that was the only refuge for their fathers in a world that belonged to the gringo.

But the changes are there, too.

NEW BANK BUILDING

Recently remodeled stores brighten stretches of the boulevards. On Atlantic Blvd., big new shopping centers compete for trade with the tiny neighborhood businesses. A bright, modernistic "Mexicatessen" typifies the up-to-date appearance of many of the old taco houses.

At 3626 E. 1st St., the Mexican-American-operated Pan American National Bank of East Los Angeles has just moved into a gleaming, Aztec-decor $250,000 building boasting giant Jose Meza mosaics and a sign: "Se habla Espanol."

And the youngsters look different. Gone, for the most part, is the old "chicano uniform"—khaki trousers and loose shirt. Boys at Roosevelt and Garfield High Schools wear pressed slacks and neat sport shirts—hardly identifiable as anything but 1966 students anywhere.

Few of their girl friends favor the extremely short skirts and flamboyant hairdos of several years back.

There are less claims, say many residents of the area, to Spanish heritage by those more closely related to Montezuma than to Fernando Cortez.

PRIDE OF ORIGIN

"There is more pride," said an East Los Angeles woman, "in our Mexican origin—or in being an American who happens to have Mexican ancestors."

Much discussion of "la raza" continues to echo with differentiation between the "cholo" (laboring class immigrant) and the "pocho" (born in the United States), but a long-time activist in the Mexican-American community said:

"The young guys who grew up since World War II, who don't have the bitterness of the zoot-suit days and before, are emphasizing the desirability of biculture so much that the kids are starting to reflect pride and reach out for dignity."

NOTED IN REPORT

Beneath the surface, high unemployment, low incomes, menial jobs and substandard housing remain—as the special census report stated—"a way of life" in much of the barrios, despite (and partly because of) the ability of new generations to move out and be assimilated.

It was noted in last year's report on "Hard-Core Unemployment and Poverty in Los Angeles" by UCLA's Institute of Industrial Relations:

". . . in 1781 a tired and demoralized band of 22 adults and their families settled near a river in the southern part of California and founded El Pueblo de Nuestra Senora La Reina de Los Angeles de Porciuncula."

With poverty and unemployment characterizing much of the present-day region where that group landed, said the report, it "exhibits the demoralization which plagued the initial settlers."

It is this demoralization which the growing revolt among concerned Mexican-American organizations is designed to overthrow.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 9, 1966]

REVOLT IN THE BARRIOS—MEXICAN-AMERICANS SEEK UNIFIED LEADERSHIP

(By Jack Jones)

"I was a very bitter kid," recalled Anthony Rios, 51, local president of the Community Service Organization, sitting in his little East Los Angeles office and talking about the days he picked lemons as a boy in Ventura County.

"I complained about the mistreatment of the migrants and this straw boss told me, 'Son, don't you realize you come from captured people?'

"It was the first time I realized what the Anglos thought of me. When I came to Los Angeles to work in a foundry, I watched the telephone poles go by and I swore I'd hang an Anglo from every one of those poles."

Then he added, "But since then I've learned, working with the unions and all, that not everybody is like that. And, too, I've learned the techniques. I've mellowed."

If hatred has faded among older Mexican-Americans—some of whose ancestors were here before the first Anglo showed up to seize the land—there is a rising generation of men who remember little or no bitterness at all.

These young men, many of them teachers and referring to themselves as "a corps of Pancho Villa's to lead the Mexican-American out of his inferior role in California education," are learning the "techniques" also.

They feel, with apparent justification, that they are largely responsible for the sudden welding together of previously splintered groups in a mass effort to demand federal attention to the problems of the barrios (neighborhoods).

DR. MONTES LISTED

They include Dr. Miguel Montes, 32, first Mexican-American member of the State Board of Education; Daniel Fernandez, 33, president of the Council of Mexican-American Affairs; Ray E. Gonzalez, 33, of the CMAA's education and employment committees; Philip Montez, 35, director of the Foundation for Mexican-American Studies; Arturo Palacios, 32, secretary of the Assn. of Mexican-American Educators, and many more.

"Many young men of the rising middle and upper classes,'" says the City School District manual on Mexican-Americans, "have centered their interests and efforts on the Council of Mexican-American Affairs, or CMAA.

"Relatively new (as are most of the groups), the CMAA has attracted members who are effective and influential in the broader community. Despite several major setbacks and reorganizations, this group may yet attain a position of leadership among ethnic organizations.

"Its original purpose was to unite and thus make more effective the large number of relatively small, fragmented Mexican-American organizations under a legislative or governing group made up of representatives from each of the major organizations.

"Such a group might then speak in a united voice for the Mexican-Americans as do organizations for other ethnic groups, e.g., the NAACP and several Jewish organizations."

Limited funds and internal personality conflicts, says the manual, caused CMAA to fall short of its original goal, but it has been reorganized with more limited aims and "focusing on the young professionals who . . . feel that their special training and skills should be used to improve conditions in the Mexican-American community."

Ralph Guzman, the son of one-time migrant farm workers and now assistant director of UCLA's Mexican-American Study Project, returned here last year after two years out of the country and found himself struck by the youthful look of those striving to lead.

"There were a lot of young people at meetings," he said. "I was amazed by their youth and affluence. I hadn't expected that kind of change in two years."

"TALKING POLITICS"

With many of "the old firebrands" moving out of the barrios, he observed, "many of the young people coming up have bypassed the old militant phase. You hear a different language being spoken . . . less anger.

"They're talking politics now. They want to participate. They want more Mexican-Americans elected."

But the "different language" somehow helped produce the militancy that prompted the Mexican-American walkout on a federal conference at Albuquerque that brought on the subsequent call for marches and demonstrations to focus national attention on the problems of the barrio.

That development almost seemed an answer to Guzman's complaint, when he came back, that "despite a lot of talk about new organizations, the old mass efforts of the 1950s (when the Community Service Organization mounted heavy Mexican-American voter registration drives) were missing."

"The poor," said Guzman, "have very little with which to bargain. They have to organize."

He noted that very few of the country's estimated 800,000 Mexican-Americans (or Latin-Americans) are really prosperous. Some of the exceptions he named: food manufacturer Armando Torres, landowner-banker Dr. Francisco Bravo and Dr. Reynaldo Carreon, city police commissioner.

The Mexican-American community, he stressed, has no institution comparable to the Negro-owned Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co. There is only one Mexican-American bank (Pan American National, where Dr. Bravo is on the board) and one savings and loan association—Eastland, which also involves some Japanese-Americans.

But he said he is "excited" by the emergence of the new young activists: "They all seem to reflect a kind of conscience, a great new interest in the Mexican-American community, different from what was found years ago."

If, indeed, the individualism characteristic of the Mexican culture has caused the constant proliferation of organizations that tend to spring up by the dozens and die, one of the so-called "young Pancho Villas," Philip Montez, is convinced that changes are occurring.

Like CSO, which began as a move to elect Edward Roybal to the City Council in the 1940s, the Foundation for Mexican-American studies which Montez directs grew out of a youthful movement which sought, unsuccessfully, to get Ralph Poblano elected to the City Board of Education.

Why is there change?

"The reason is that there are educated Mexican-Americans today that were not here before," said Montez. "A generation ago, educated Mexicans simply became Anglos.

TRAGIC THINGS

"There have been some tragic things. A lot of these old-timers who were making it changed their names. Now they're suddenly running back, feeling free to be themselves. It's been a painful transition for them."

The worldwide attitude of revolution and the civil rights movement in the United States, he said, has stirred the Mexican-American to do something about his own group.

"He has come out of this background and is now in a changing world, finding that he has some social and professional responsibilities. The Mexican-American is now becoming more aware of himself as a Mexican-American. There's something in knowing who are you."

He said he feels "the Mexican-American is learning to use pressure techniques" in politics and elsewhere. "I will venture to say that they will start listening to us."

But he conceded that the Mexican-American has not involved himself as much as the Negro in the war on poverty ("as far as he can see it's for somebody else") or in the civil rights drive.

"I would be embarrassed to file a discrimination complaint," he confessed. "It's this great thing called pride. I'm proud to be a Mexican."

Another of the young men, CMAA president Daniel Fernandez, denied the accusation by some of his elders that he and his colleagues do not communicate with the impoverished, uneducated Mexican-American.

"We are working at the grass roots level," he protested. "We have a Head Start program. We are working with 900 families right in the community. Maybe we're not down there personally, but we have programs down in the middle of it."

SOCIAL TERMS

Fernandez, an aerospace research engineer conceded that he and his group used "social science terms," but argued. "We have to take advantage of the processes where you get ahead. I think we're making some progress."

In the future, he said "we're going to have to be more active, more aggressive and more professional. There definitely will be a big change."

Whether the young men can bring off their dream of "unidad" in the Mexican-American community, the Negro community is stronger because it has such groups as the Urban League and the NAACP "where the Negro can polarize and find a voice," said a gray-haired Mexican-American who has spent years studying the subject.

The Mexican-American community, said Dr. Ernesto Galarza, author and current former program analyst for the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency, "is kept in a fluid state because of the constant immigration. A relatively small number of young men represent the middle class, the stabilized element."

FAMILIES DISPERSE

"They've dispersed. They don't live in any one place. The middle-class Mexican-American can move wherever he wants."

But, despite Galarza's conviction that there is no lack of young leadership talent because "larger numbers of young Mexican-Americans have made it professionally . . . know their way around in the Anglo culture," the departure of "leader types" from the barrios, he said, have allowed private and governmental agencies to fill leadership roles.

"There are solid communities," said Galarza, "like Pico Rivera, where they have not organized themselves. They only wait around for the periodic candidate to say, 'I'm your leader. Vote for me.' "

One of the most divisive influences on the Mexican-American community, feels Galarza, "is the politics of the Anglo."

Because there are now so many Mexican-American voters, "they have become a prime target for the politicians. Periodically the politicians reach into the Mexican-American community for 'leaders.' The Democrats run off with some, the Republicans run off with some and you have these periodic schisms with very little relationship to the actual problems of the community as a whole."

OLD FIREBRAND

One of the old firebrands, 63-year-old Eduardo Quevedo, state president of the Mexican-American Political Assn., said of the new, young faces:

"I welcome them. We have done our little share. It's up to them now. I'm proud of them. They are doing a tremendous job. They are coming up with better qualifications than the old leadership and it seems to me they have a better rapport—a better sense of unity * * *"

Bristle-haired Quevedo, who came here 40 years ago from New Mexico, where politics has always had a Mexican flavor, credits the youngsters with "projecting into our minds the advantage of working with other groups."

TOO MANY CHIEFS

Formation of the Mexican-American Unity Council, he implied, was the result of a growing realization—prompted by the younger men—that "in the past we had too many chiefs and not enough Indians."

The council will "have communication" with groups which have not always traveled in the same direction—the American G.I. Forum, the League of United Latin-American Citizens (both national) and the CSO and MAPA (both statewide).

It drew on support from these groups recently to bring about a $400,000 Labor Department grant to put unskilled Mexican-Americans in touch with job training and placement.

"Now," beamed Quevedo, "we are beginning to see the results of working with unity."

On the political front, said Quevedo, MAPA now has 44 active chapters throughout the state. "That wasn't true three years ago. It implies we are developing a following in the political arena."

(Another manifestation of the constant effort of Mexican-American politicians to pull all their forces together may be seen in the recent formation of Political Unity for Mexican-Americans.

(PUMA, which held its first statewide conference April 23, at the Alexandria Hotel, was formed with representation from MAPA, CSO, LULAC and the Assn. of Mexican-American Educators.

ENDORSEMENT PEDDLERS

Where Quevedo sees political action as the main hope for the Mexican-American in his various predicaments, the one time "bitter kid," Rios, snorted:

"We have become endorsement peddlers, political prostitutes, leaning on somebody for a little something . . . ."

One of his favorite jokes involves two Mexican-Americans who 20 years ago went to the Sacramento Valley to pick lettuce, but who today, better dressed, head for Sacramento to seek political appointments.

Rios, who has been with CSO from its inception as a movement to elect Roybal to the City Council and through its metamorphosis as a voter-registration force into today's concept of self-improvement through community action, said:

"I'm not against anyone getting involved in politics, but I think they ought to lift themselves up to higher dignity."

(It should be noted that subsequently, Judge Alfredo Hernandez, national president of LULAC, told the banquet honoring the 50 Mexican-Americans who walked out of the federal equal employment conference in Albuquerque that all 50 have agreed they will accept no further federal appointments short of a Mexican-American on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.)

Wearing a "huelga" (strike) button in sympathy for the organizing struggle of Mexican-American agricultural workers, the mustachioed Rios sat in the East Los Angeles Neighborhood Adult Participation Project outpost where he is director and commented:

"I do not notice any trend among the so-called 'leaders' toward self-help for the Mexican-American community."

CSO, the oldest such organization here and the only one with a history of mass effort, may have lost much of its force because of "competition from all these other groups," but Rios feels that, with 600 local members, it is now a more stable community action group.

Where in the past it had a highly fluid membership, CSO now is placing emphasis on such programs as its 18-month-old credit union (300 members with $14,000 in assets), its newly qualified statewide death benefits society and a proposed buyers club (which will train 120 counselors to instruct 6,000 persons on how to manage their money and to buy in groups).

CSO is being aided here with anti-poverty funds.

"You will find that a lot of people playing politics are only calling attention to themselves," observed Rios. "They are 'titeres' (puppets). The real strength of the people will come from community action programs."

Whether or not the traditional fractionalization will continue despite all the efforts to pull together, one of the "young Pancho Villas," Ray E. Gonzalez, 33, of the CMAA's education and employment committee, said:

"They often accuse us of being divided. But you find this is in Anglo terms. We are much more together than you realize, because we have language in common.

"Anglos are much more fractionalized than we are. There's something about it when we start speaking Spanish together . . ."

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, May 9, 1966]

L.A.'s Mexican Colony Looks Ahead—A Million Lives in Ferment

(By Al Bine)

There is "great dissatisfaction" among the almost one-million people of Mexican-American bloodlines in the metropolitan area, many of whom are confined to so-called "poverty pockets" within Los Angeles.

Although the old image of the stereotyped, rural romantic has faded and the Mexican-American today is as urbanized, sophisticated and industrious as the rest of the homogeneous population, nonetheless, he still is very much a member of a "minority."

These people include, unfortunately, large numbers of low-income families and individuals with relatively low educational attainments, working in low-grade occupations and living in substandard housing.

Essentially, the Mexican-American, affluent and indigent alike, is suspicious, is depressed, is hostile, is frustrated and is notably cognizant that, in the present society, is it not noticeably easier to do good than evil.

"There is much latent hostility, frustration and anxiety among our people here and elsewhere throughout the state.

"We are the most politically fragmented minority of all ethnic people."

That was the claim today from Ralph Poblano of Monterey Park. He is an articulate educator. He is an acknowledged leader, too, too, of a recently organized "grass-root" politically "activist" movement.

A self-styled "maverick," Poblano, 38, has conspired—as the outgrowth of dissatisfaction with what he calls the "conservative status quo"—to form a consensual discussion group, "Political Unity for Mexican-Americans."

PUMA, he said, wants action, not just talk.

Painfully aware that his people continue to suffer discrimination ("It's subtle; far more dangerous, too, than when it was out in the open"), Poblano warns that his fellow colonists:

"What is it we must do . . . to merit attention, particularly from 'The Establishment'?"

He said the crux of the problem is easy to identify.

"We simply have no voice.

"We must align, organize and strike . . . through political action . . . or must we protest violently and riot in the streets?

"These are our dimensions: on one side are the activists, who both feel and understand that the most direct route is through political action.

"On the other side is the man-in-the-street, who also keenly feels the same but does not necessarily know what to do."

Two other PUMA spokesmen, who believe ethnic tension has established a beachhead in the Mexican-American community, have contrasting viewpoints.

A veteran social worker, Juan Acevedo of Montebello, was militant.

"If we can't get what we want from 'Whites'—if we can't get what we want by joining the Negro movement—we must strike out on our own.

"If the Mexican-American doesn't speak out, we're going to continue to suffer in relation to the Negro.

"We are opposed to riots. No one suggests this, but when you're forced against the wall, you've got to strike back.

"There is a feeling that, if it takes a Watts riot for the Negroes to get some attention and all this help from the War on Poverty, then maybe that's what we should consider."

George R. Sotelo of Pasadena, an operating engineer ("I operate a bulldozer") shares the frustration of Poblano and Acevedo but differs sharply, in that he thinks violence is unlikely.

"We can achieve more without militant force; we have friends in the 'white' community."

Sotelo doubts whether the impact created by the Watts riots will benefit the Negro over the long run.

"Present steps only suffocate the issue. The poverty commission reports the war, the (John) McCone awareness of civic reponsibility * * * it will not be sustained. Within 6 months or a year, they (the Negro) won't get anything.

"Power (the government) will lose interest and start to retrench," Sotelo opined. "When the local taxpayer has to decide whether he'll foot the bill * * * power and the public is not going to vote for people who riot!"

Acevedo, in rebuttal, added that "it's not going to be that simple or easy."

Another advocate of Acevedo's adamant concern is handsome Richard Tafoya, pre-educational supervisor for the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency.

"If the squeaky wheel gets the grease," he asserted, "then we're going to have to squeak a lot more to get some help.

"We're not anti-Negro" he continued, "but they'll respect us if we become vocal. We're got to get off the dime."

Mexican-Americans, Tafoya declared, generally are "dissatisfied with anti-poverty administration both here and in Washington." He said this dissatisfaction focuses on:

"Inadequate participation of the poor; more Mexican-American representation on the policy-making level; additional information in plain language and, where necessary, in Spanish."

The resentment in the Mexican-American community is more than youthful rebelliousness; it is cynical.

"I'm frustrated, sure," said Mark Encinãs, a pressman for the Western Tag and Printing Co. "The Negro seems to have so many areas of outlet; they speak English only.

"We have so little going for us in communications.

"I feel like striking out at our so-called leaders for doing nothing. They hold meetings but they don't let the man-in-the-street know what's going on."

The pattern of answers The Herald-Examiner obtained while preparing this report displayed bitterness, but no outright revolt.

What developed, however, except for some isolated views, appeared even worse—lack of interest, unwillingness to talk "on the record," much distaste for the Negro, and even more apathy.

"What good does it do to complain? We're going to be ignored anyway, in the long run," said a young boy from Roosevelt High School.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 8, 1966]

East Side Economical Status Falls Sharply—Mexican-Americans Fail To Share in U.S. Affluence, Commerce Department Reports

The economic status of Los Angeles' Mexican-Americans—specifically in the Boyle Heights, City Terrace and East Los Angeles areas—has deteriorated sharply in five years, said the U.S. Department of Commerce in March.

Like the ghetto-bound Negro, an upward swing in the general affluence has meant for the Mexican-American in the barrio only lower incomes, poorer housing and a relative status quo in employment.

EXPLANATION GIVEN

The special survey found that median annual family income in the three named areas dropped from $5,513 in the year 1959 to $5,106 (adjusted for price changes) in 1965.

An explanation is that many of those able to improve their financial status have moved away, leaving the unskilled and jobless behind to be surveyed.

The incidence of poverty (a family making less than $4,000 a year) was found in the East Side areas to be almost as high as that in the Negro area of South Los Angeles—23.6% against 26.8%.

While unemployment of males nationwide has dropped to an all-time low, on the East Side it has scarcely changed—dropping from 9% to 8%.

Department of Commerce census takers estimated that housing in the region has deteriorated noticeably; that the dilapidation rate increased from 5% to 7% and that the proportion of houses deteriorating rose from 20% to 28%.

The County Human Relations Commission has reported, "It has been pointed out that the greatest concentration of poor housing in Los Angeles County is found in and around East Los Angeles, which is the hub of the Spanish-surname community. There is considerable overcrowding."

Despite this, home values are on the rise—up from an average of $11,800 in 1959 to $16,400—because of the proximity to downtown Los Angeles.

The 1960 census showed that Spanish-speaking people rent more than Anglos, get less for their money.

In all five Southwestern States, according to a city school district manual, "the Spanish-speaking have a higher percentage of unemployment than do Anglos and nonwhites—with the exception of the Indians of New Mexico and Arizona. Their occupational status is lower * * * with very few in high-status occupations."

EDUCATION LACKING

Educationally—primarily because of language and cultural differences—the Mexican-American suffers perhaps more than in any other field, having been unable to close the scholastic achievement level gap between himself and all other groups.

In Los Angeles County, the median number of school years completed among the Spanish surname population is nine—compared to 11.1 for Negroes and 12.2 for Anglos.

All of these difficulties defy quick solution in view of the Human Relations Commission's observation that the barrios—although losing in total population—are becoming more and more areas of concentrated segregation.

Although U.S. policy "is clearly moving in the direction of stricter controls on the movement of Mexican nationals into this country," concluded UCLA Mexican-American Study Project researchers, an estimated 44,000 Mexicans a year have arrived since 1960—many of them heading straight for the barrios.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, which cannot even guess the number of illegal immigrants, noted in its 1964 report that Mexicans accounted for 59 percent of the deportable aliens found in the 1963-64 period (38,866 Mexicans in 1963 and 43,789 in 1964).

The service said that principal contributing factors to the increase in 1964 of Mexican nationals here illegally "were the expected termination of the bracero program and the far-reaching effects of a continued severe drought in Mexico, accompanied by a marked deterioration of the ranch economy there."

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Henry Gonzalez, in expressing our grave concern over the poverty and discrimination which blight the lives of millions of our fellow citizens.

During the past decade the Congress has been engaged in a historic effort to give full meaning to the constitutional rights of all Americans and to the spirit of equal opportunity which is an essential part of our free society. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, who helped to write the Civil Rights Acts, I know that the struggle has been a gruelling one. We have had to contend with corrupt traditions of prejudice which for too long have stained the fabric of our Nation. We have come to realize that the poverty and deprivation arising from centuries of mistreatment and neglect will not vanish with one touch of the legislative wand.

What has been achieved, and what will be achieved, has been the product of unity among the forces pressing for equal opportunity. George Orwell's biting satire of totalitarianism contained the famous phrase, "We are all equal—except some are more equal than others." Equality of opportunity exists for all Americans or its exists for none.

If the United States is to attain our egalitarian goals, then the Congress must be active and forceful. The expression of solidarity which we have witnessed on the floor of the House today is an encouraging sign that the Congress will meet its responsibility.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the subject of my special order and include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ONE POSSIBLE CAUSE FOR STOCK MARKET FLUCTUATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are many people concerned in this country about what is happening to the stock market—and quite properly so.

I should like to discuss today this phenomenon in the present gyrations in the stock market. I should like to remind the House that in May of 1962—May 1, 1962, to be exact—I gave a speech here in the well of the House in which I attempted at that time to explain or at least to provide some clue as to why the stock market was going down 4 years ago in exactly and precisely at the same time that it is this year.

It is rather significant that every year since then during the month of May and the latter part of April and sometimes in June, we have seen these wild fluctuations in the behavior of the stock market. In 1962, I said and I predicted that there would be the springtime gyrations because of a bill that was passed in this Congress in the spring of 1962 dealing with pension funds.

Many of you will recall that the Congress in 1958 passed a health and welfare pension fund disclosure bill. But it was a compromise bill and very ineffective. It did not really give the country any idea of where these pension funds were being invested or how.

So in 1962 the Congress adopted several significant amendments which required that the managers of the pension funds must in a sworn statement provide the Department of Reports of the Department of Labor a disclosure of how the funds are invested.

That bill came out of my subcommittee. At the time my subcommittee was considering this bill, I said that if this bill were enacted there would be gyrations in the stock market.

We are talking about 285,000 separate health and welfare pension funds in America totaling almost $90 billion.

Ninety-four percent of these health and welfare pension funds are management-administered, and only 6 percent of the funds are administered jointly by management and labor.

I suggested then, and I am suggesting again today, that what we are seeing happening in the stock market today is that many of those responsible for the management of these funds are flushing out their portfolios and substituting investments in speculative stocks with more conservative and conventional investments, so that when they submit their annual reports to the Department of Labor on the disposition of these pension funds, their portfolios will indeed have a conservative character.

There is nothing wrong with investing in speculative stocks or blue-chip stocks the funds of the pension fund. There is nothing improper and nothing illegal, but certainly those of us who have had any experience at all with these funds will quickly recognize that for a manager of such a fund to report to the Labor Department in a sworn statement an excessive amount of investments in speculative stocks would certainly not reflect well on the manager.

So 40 percent of all of these reports must be made during the month of May. These reports are spread out throughout the whole year, but it just so happens that the largest single batch of reports are made during the month of May. So, Mr. Speaker, I submit that if the American people will understand what is happening and why it is happening, perhaps we will not have great losses due to panic selling.

In 1962, I said that after this flushout the stocks would rise again. There is every reason to believe that the stocks will rise again this time as they have in every ensuing year since 1962.

But in order to stop these annual gyrations, I have asked my committee counsel to prepare an amendment to the Health and Welfare Disclosure Act which would require managers of these funds to state in their annual sworn reports what stocks they have bought throughout the whole year. The law now requires only that you reflect the nature of your investment at the time of filing.

It seems to me that by requiring a greater degree of reporting of this huge amount of money that certainly has a serious impact upon this country's economy, we shall be able not only to provide a greater degree of protection for these health and welfare funds, but, indeed, we will be able to contribute toward stabilizing the market.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this will be the last year. We have done this in 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. I am hoping that with the adoption of the amendment which I am suggesting, perhaps we will take the speculators out of the health-and-welfare-pension-fund business. Certainly those funds deserve to be invested in a more conservative way, and the people who invest in the stock market should not be exposed to these gyrations.

This is not to say that every single manager of a health and welfare fund is playing the stock market. On the contrary, our studies have shown that most managers of health and welfare funds are doing an extremely responsible job, and I say that for the most part these funds are in good hands. But it does not take much, when you are dealing with $80 to $90 billion and 285,000 separate health and welfare funds.

Ten percent of those funds being invested in speculative stocks would make an appreciable dent, upward or downward, in the gyration of the stock market. Certainly at this point, when all economic indicators continue pointing upward, when we are now confidently predicting that we are going to hit $735 billion of gross national product in 1967, and certainly in an era when economists, both conservative and liberal, are confidently predicting that the gross national product of America is going to exceed $1 trillion early in 1970, there is no reason for these gyrations in the stock market.

There are those who attribute these gyrations to the small decline in automobile orders. It is my judgment that it takes something bigger than that to affect the stock market. I submit to this House that it is the upcoming report on the disbursement of health and welfare pension funds during the month of May that has caused many of these managers to pull out of the stock market and to buy more conventional investments.

I can assure you that as soon as the ink is dry on their sworn report to the Labor Department, those people will be right back in the stock market, and you are going to see the stock market going up again.

RESCUE THE MIGRANT CHILDREN

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, next to imprisonment, the nomadic life of a migrant farmworker is the most cruel existence in our society—especially for the children. The innocent school-aged children suffer most.

The children's deprivations are, among others, lack of security and a normal home. They lead a disruptive life, without roots, which often results in permanent emotional, social, and educational scars, and malformities. They do not "drop out" because they are never "included in." They cause problems for themselves and for society.

Until you have lived with a migrant family, or have lived in a community through which the migrant family must swarm, you cannot appreciate the cruelties imposed upon them by this nomadic way of life.

Conversely, migrant families seriously disrupt a community. They cause enormous policing problems. They increase extraordinarily relief and welfare requirements. They disrupt schools—preventing both local and migrant children from achieving a proper education.

A family needs a permanent home; a migrant never has one. A child needs an education; a migrant child seldom obtains one.

The migrant life is cruel in many respects; it is a scourge of education; it damages the individual and society; it disrupts every phase of community life.

We in Congress should not encourage or perpetuate this nomadic way of life. However, present Federal policies strongly encourage and promote family migrancy for farmworkers. Congress itself terminated the bracero program—thereby purposefully forcing upon our domestic farmworkers, and their innocent children, a nomadic, decivilizing way of life.

THE FORGOTTEN MIGRANT

While many programs have been enacted for the poor, the uneducated, the disadvantaged, and the underemployed, nothing has been enacted to alleviate the misery of the migrant families, the misfortune of the migrant children, or the burdens of the communities through which the migrant farmworkers must wander.

Housing for migrant families is the most difficult to finance and maintain. College dormitory housing for kids who can afford higher education is not lacking, but basic housing for impoverished migrant children is practically nonexistent.

Federal aid for education to almost every educational segment of our society has been proposed—preschool to university, public schools and private schools, day schools and night schools, for bright students and dull students, for mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed students, for blind and deaf students—but practically nothing for migrant farm children.

The educational needs of the migrant children are the greatest, yet they have been most neglected. Migrant children are the most illiterate group in America, yet they receive the least Federal attention or assistance.

IMPROVE MIGRANT EDUCATION

If child migrancy cannot be terminated, it should be improved. The helpless children should be our first concern. Next to their protection, the education of our children should be our foremost mission.

Because of this child migrancy, the enrollment of some schools will increase by as much as 50 percent—some by more—for a few weeks or months during the planting or harvest seasons.

Can you imagine what the school systems in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, or Los Angeles would do if their student enrollment increased over the weekend by as much as even 25 percent? They would for all practical purposes close down. Yet the large city schools should be far better able to cope with enrollment fluctuations than small schools. Can you imagine what kind of education the children would receive? The confusion and overloading, the teacher, classroom, and equipment shortages would be disastrous.

Most classes in rural California are already exceeding the prescribed optimums—even before the children of farm workers begin their migration. Even if school districts could provide classrooms and desks, they would be greatly overcrowded and the quality of education would be sorely degraded. Overcrowded facilities, large classes and double sessions prevent both the transient and the regular students from achieving an adequate education.

Funds for educational purposes are diverted to immediate physical needs and, regrettably, teachers' salaries must be reduced. Competent teachers move to districts where the classroom load is less.

An even sadder fact is that migrant children are often undereducated, far behind their age level and unable to compete with the permanent students. The migrant child becomes frustrated, then troublesome. He disturbs the regular education program or "drops out." He does not learn and prevents other students from learning.

Another tragic fact is that many of the migrant children often speak little English—certainly not enough to enable them to progress satisfactorily in a regular school. These students need extra help in language.

Many migrant students are culturally deprived, asocial, or semiliterate. These pathetic children require a very special extracurricular program under school supervision and direction.

The migrant children invariably need special compensatory education—which is the most difficult to provide. An educational program for the migrant—even with ample facilities—is a most expensive and ambitious undertaking.

LOCAL EDUCATION OFFERS BEST ANSWER

The local schools have the ability, experience, concern and willingness to provide superior educations for their students whether they be transient—of only a few weeks duration—or permanent—but they do not have the finances or the necessary resources.

Recently a few hastily concocted schemes for migrant student education have been proposed. Most of them are frantic and impractical. Portable classrooms, mobile facilities, scattered temporary school grounds, and itinerant teachers—proposed by some who have never seen a migrant student—will not work.

Good teachers do not want to migrate either. Movable schools and facilities are limited in function and enormously more expensive to acquire, move and maintain than permanent, normal school facilities. Today such segregation of the migrants would be socially unacceptable if given even a second thought.

More pertinently, all migrants who follow the crops do not follow the same routes. Migrant workers do not travel in groups, stay together, or remain at the same places for long. Keeping a mobile school in the epicenter of the migrant farmworker stream would be as difficult as collecting spilled quicksilver with a fork.

Migrant children need the best education possible; they need to be included in a conventional school and a normal society. A second-rate education by itinerant teachers along the migrant trail should be rejected.

RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS LACK TAX BASE

Agricultural, rural areas—without industry or a substantial property tax base—cannot finance this difficult, expensive compensatory education for migrants from other States.

School districts in the main current of the migrant agricultural labor stream need help desperately. Without outside assistance, both transient and permanent schoolchildren will suffer the scars and the mental crippling of an inadequate education.

Local governments do not have the funds or tax resources. The property tax is not an appropriate tax for any educational purpose. It is especially not appropriate for nomadic students from other school districts. Financial assistance should come from the Federal Government.

Migrant education is interstate in character. Students often attend school in five or six different States—and often several schools within one State. Inadequate education for migrant children is a national problem.

A poorly taught or uneducated child from any State will be a poor citizen and often a public charge in every State in which he resides. Every State has a stake in making certain that the migrant student becomes an adequately trained and educated adult citizen of the State where he finally resides.

Present Federal aid-to-education funds or programs are of little help to migrants, or schools who teach migrants, because these funds and programs are generally aimed at special projects categories. The migrants' primary need is a good basic general normal education.

Local school districts with large inundations of migrant families are usually not able to obtain adequate State funds because the migrant child does not stay long enough in one school district to qualify under the "average daily attendance" requirements. The migrants are not just a problem of the local school district, or an individual State—but of the whole Nation.

The local communities are faced with other expensive problems caused by the migrant families. When the braceros did the farmwork during the temporary peak harvest seasons—there were no police, welfare, or education problems. When the harvest was completed, the single men went home to their families. During the harvest they worked.

Now farmers without braceros must import entire families, usually large families. Federal agencies encourage the families and children to follow, nomadlike, their low-skilled parents as they seek employment from one harvest to the next.

These rural agricultural communities are now faced with at least double expenditures for extra policing, jail facilities, alcoholic care centers, medical clinics, and health services, public housing, welfare and relief costs. Education is only one of the extra burdens heaped upon the agricultural communities which must accommodate the migrants.

MIGRANT IMPACTION

There is considerable similarity between the educational problems of a rural agricultural community "impacted" by children of migrant farmworkers and the problems of a city or school district which is "impacted" by children of Federal employees stationed at nearby military bases. The agricultural community suffers much more because the influx of students varies much more, the student turnover is much greater, and the general caliber of the students is woefully inferior.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 14947, which will amend title I of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of migrant agricultural workers.

The philosophy of Public Law 874 is utilized. The same procedures are employed. The early implementation of the act would be simple; the administrative experience with Public Law 874 would be beneficial.

The Federal funds would be paid directly to the local school districts. As under Public Law 874, the Federal contribution would be related to local current school expenditures for operation and administration, but not for buildings or land. The Federal Government would contribute a prescribed amount for each student who resides in two or more States during the school year, prorated according to the percentage of school days spent in the school district.

As I have outlined, the nature of the compensatory education required, above normal instruction, for migrants is extraordinarily costly. Therefore, a Federal contribution of 150 percent of the local school expenditure is fully justified and is proposed in my bill. The costs of educating migrant children are variously estimated—but no estimates are less than 200 percent of the costs for educating resident students.

Congress has long neglected the poorest of our poor, the most illiterate of our educationally deprived, the most frustrated of our culturally disadvantaged—the migrant family.

With all our professed concern for the health and welfare of our youth, Congress has neglected the most pathetic of our youth—the migrant child.

With all our professed concern for education and schools, the administration and the Congress have neglected the schools with the most difficult and expensive problems and the least resources—the rural schools in the migrant farm labor stream.

The most essential need of a migrant child—his education—is being sorely neglected. He is being crippled and scarred. He is being left defenseless to cope with both society and his employment needs.

I urge passage of my bill H.R. 14947 to provide Federal aid for school districts who must bear the burden of educating the migrant child for the benefit of the whole Nation and all of society. Suggestions for improvement of the bill, or other better ideas for improving the educational opportunities of the migrant child, are earnestly solicited and will be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I insert several newspaper articles pertinent to this subject of education for migrant children:

[From the Salinas Californian, May 5, 1966]

EDUCATION TAKING BRUNT OF CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS' REVOLT

(EDITORS NOTE.—Fifteen years ago a local school bond issue was almost certain of passage by voters. Today, its chances are little better than 50 percent. The following dispatch explores the reasons behind the change.)

(By Reeve Hennion)

SAN FRANCISCO.—There's a taxpayers' revolt brewing in California and education is taking the brunt of the attack.

The issue is rising property taxes, and the battleground is local school bond and operating tax elections.

Throughout the state—in such cities as Glendale, Bakersfield, Tulare and Los Gatos and in Contra Costa County—voters have recently turned thumbs down on proposals for school construction and operating cost increases, both paid from property taxes.

Recently, voters in Albany (Alameda County) and Santa Paula (Ventura County) refused to raise their taxes to provide more money for education.

And these districts are not alone. The California Teachers Association reports that since July 1 of last year, only 55 per cent of school finance elections have been approved, in contrast with an average of 70-80 per cent in the 1950s.

In Los Angeles County alone during a six-week period in February and March, 14 out of 22 school fund-raising elections were defeated.

OPPOSITION INCREASES

"There's no question that a growing opposition exists, and that it has been accentuated in recent years," said Dr. Max Rafferty, state superintendent of public instruction.

The local property owner is being pushed backward and backward to the edge of a cliff—and he's not going to go any farther."

In Glendale voters turned down a tax increase last month and the results for the school district will be crippling. Next school year 93 out of about 1,000 teachers will be dropped, class sizes will be increased and high school students will attend only five instead of six periods a day. For most students, this will eliminate their "elective" course, such as music, art or vocational training.

"I can't attribute the election failure to anything other than growing opposition to growing taxation," said Dr. James H. Williams, Glendale's superintendent of schools. "The pressure on the property taxpayer is constantly becoming greater and has to be reversed."

It is generally agreed that the revolt has come to a head for two reasons.

STATE HELP DROPS

First, the percentage of education financing paid by the state has dropped in recent years, putting a greater burden on local districts.

"For the last 15 years the state of California has been gradually withdrawing from the function of physically supporting education," Rafferty told UPI. "In 1950 the tandem partnership which existed (between state and local governments) was about 50-50. Today the state pays about 40 per cent."

Robert Brown, executive vice president of the California Taxpayers Association, agrees that the state must increase its aid to education.

"We have a basic reform coming that has to be carried out . . . if we are going to give any assistance to the property taxpayer."

Bills now pending in the legistature are a measure that would put a $260 million bond issue for school construction before state voters in June, and a proposal to increase the state sales tax one per cent to provide an additional $325 million for education.

The second reason for the high failure rate of school finance measures is explained by Assemblyman Charles B. Garrigus, chairman of the Assembly Education Committee:

"People often are not familiar with the real need that exists for bond money and so express their rebellion against increasing property taxes by voting against bonds."

NEGATIVE TENDENCY

As property taxes continue to increase, the tendency to vote against all the tax-increasing measures grows, and more issues are defeated.

"This is the one area where the local taxpayer has an opportunity to express himself, and he does it in 'no' terms today," said Brown. "We don't like to see all these elections go down the drain; many times those districts that are in greatest need lose the elections."

Garrigus has pending in the legislature a constitutional amendment which would lower the current two-thirds majority needed for passage of a school bond measure to 60 per cent. This, supporters suggest, will overcome some of the power that an opposing minority of total voters is able to wield over the majority.

"This would absolutely help to solve the problems," said Garrigus. "About 86 per cent of the bond proposals which failed in the last five years were approved in the 60 per cent to 66⅔ per cent range."

Rafferty agrees: "It isn't logical to require only a simple majority for state bond issues and require local school districts to get two-thirds."

But both feel that merely lowering the majority requirement will not solve the problem forever. Rather, they see changes in financing education by the state as the best means to relieve the burden on local districts.

Until this happens, however, the opposition to increasing tax rates will continue, with the loss of money to school districts which need it to meet ever-growing student enrollments and a resulting cutback in the quality of education.

[From the Salinas Californian, May 5, 1966]

SOLEDAD UNION SCHOOL FACES BIG PROBLEMS

(By Eric Brazil)

SOLEDAD.—When the problems were passed out, Soledad Union Elementary School District got more than its share.

Many of the really pressing problems of public education—growth and classroom construction, financing, teacher recruitment, functionally non-English speaking students, etc.—seem to be focused with special intensity in Soledad.

As the 1965–66 academic term draws to a close, district Supt. Wendell Broom says "we'll make it this year, all right. It's next fall I'm worried about."

Soledad Union Elementary School District has the fourth lowest assessed wealth per student ($8,701), third lowest cost of education per student ($337.66) and the second highest tax rate ($1.92) among Monterey County's elementary school districts.

It is officially "impoverished."

UP BY 232 STUDENTS

Present enrollment in the district, which maintains a kindergarten-through-eighth grade program in two schools, Soledad and San Vicente, is 1,364 students. That is an increase of 232 over the enrollment at this time last year.

Rated capacity of the two district schools is 1,306 students. Broom anticipates an enrollment of about 1,450 next fall.

Pre-enrollment for kindergarten in the district Monday and Tuesday netted 124 students. Just 92 youngsters pre-enrolled during the same two days in 1965.

The Soledad electorate recently defeated a bond issue to build a third district school, 250 "yes" to 199 "no". The bond issue, passage of which would not have raised the district's tax rate, ran into heavy opposition in the south end of town and fell short of the required two-thirds majority "yes" vote.

District trustees have not yet decided when to call another bond election. But, the pressures of growth being what they are, the board will probably be obliged to make a move in that direction soon.

CLASS SIZE HIGH

Average class size in the district's primary grades is 32 students. If the average climbs one student higher, the district may be penalized financially by the state.

Average class size in grades 4–8 is 33 to 35 students.

Obviously, something rather drastic is going to have to be done if the district is to stuff all the children it's supposed to educate into the classrooms next year. (It has no vacant classrooms now.) Redeployment of seventh and eighth graders into large classes for some subjects is one possibility. Broom says, leasing of portable classrooms is another. And, of course, double sessions is a third.

The Board of Trustees hasn't formally decided yet what it's going to do.

But it has already made one painful economy move by ruling out teacher salary increases for 1966–67. That doesn't help the districts' competitive position in the field of teacher recruitment one bit. And a rural, rather isolated school district doesn't have a very enviable competitive position under the best of circumstances.

Soledad Union Elementary School District has, like other districts in the Salinas Valley, been hit by an influx of children from migrant farm worker families.

About 142 of the students new to the district this year are from migrant families. The other 90 are just part of the district's normal growth. Broom doesn't blame the influx of migrants for all the problems the district has had this year and faces in an aggravated form, next year.

LANGUAGE PROBLEM

The district has a severe problem with functionally non-English speaking students. Broom estimates that 20 percent of the children in the primary grades and 10 percent in grades 4–8 don't speak English. Many of the migrant children fall in this category.

English as a second language is one of the district's major programs.

The district got some help through a $32,000 allocation under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act this year. It used the money for a communication skills-language arts center and the specialized personnel to staff it, along with 12 teacher aides.

Next year, Broom says, the district's ESEA allocation will be used strictly to beef up the English as a second language program.

Soledad had a promising "head start" project for preschool children going last summer. But its application for a year-around project, made late last fall, is still hung up somewhere in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

SUMMER SCHOOL

Because the district has been beset with so many educational problems of late, the Board of Trustees has decided to conduct a summer school program for the first time. It is patterned after the Salinas City School District program, which has been a conspicuous success.

Pre-enrollment for the remedial and enrichment program has already hit 400 students.

Broom a curriculum specialist, has "built" a special reading course, which includes mythology, American prose and folklore, with special texts, for the summer program.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ATTITUDE TOWARD FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the subject matter involved in my special order, following my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said in the past few weeks concerning the Johnson administration's attitude toward farmers but so much of what has been said has been directed at a few statements and actions that I think it is important that the whole situation be put into perspective. I do have some criticism to make of some of the actions and statements that have been made but we should also view them as a part of an overall agricultural situation.

No one can doubt that the overall accomplishments of the past few years for those engaged in farming and agribusiness have been very great. The administrations of both President Johnson and President Kennedy, when viewed on an overall basis, have accomplished a great deal more than anyone would have thought possible in 1960. At the time Secretary Freeman became Secretary of Agriculture in 1961, the general attitude among both farm and city dwellers was that nothing can be done to make agriculture prosperous. Many people were saying that those engaged in agriculture in all countries of the world have always been relegated to the lower income levels in the economy and that it cannot be any different in the United States. Secretary Benson had made many speeches, mostly to nonfarm audiences, saying that the Government should not even try to help farmers secure their fair share of the national income. A large share of the newspapers of this country were applauding him as being a brave man for making what they thought were true statements but we now know that he was guilty of gross ineptitude and the events of the past 6 years have shown that something can be done to help farmers obtain their fair share of the national income. Secretary Benson had performed the worst possible public relations job hurting the farmers of the United States and had created great misunderstandings in the minds of city people concerning farm problems. In contrast, for 6 solid years, Secretary Freeman made speech after speech that improved the understanding of farm problems and were favorable to farmers' public relations. He then made one statement on last March 31 which was subject to more than one interpretation and for the past 5 weeks the critics have chosen to ignore the hundreds of statements made during that previous 6 years, but quote a newspaper account of his statement of March 31, 1966.

Recently Secretary Freeman was interviewed by farm editors of radio stations: WCCO in Minneapolis, WGN of Chicago, WSN of Nashville, and WHO of Des Moines, Iowa. A summary of his interview which includes a statement relative to that March 31 press conference is as follows:

Asked why food is mentioned most frequently in talk about inflation or higher cost of living, Secretary Freeman said:

"The worst culprits in using the farmer as a whipping boy in complaining about the cost of living are some of the big city newspapers. Every time I go to some of these big cities and hold a press conference, particularly in the East, I hear people claiming to represent the consumer criticizing the farmer. These big newspapers, and some people who want to be in public office and think they can get votes that way, are trying to hang on the farmer's back the label that he has been responsible for inflationary pressures.

"That simply is not true," Mr. Freeman said. "With farm prices 12 percent lower than they were in 1952, everybody ought to be saying thank you to the farmer instead of criticizing him. If farm prices had gone up as much as other things have gone up, the housewife would be spending many, many more billions of dollars."

Secretary Freeman said that the big increases in food prices have taken place "between the time the product leaves the farm and the time it gets to the consumer."

He said for every dollar spent on food in the United States, the farmer gets only 39 cents, and that the additional 61 cents is added to the product enroute to the retail buyer.

In the ensuing discussion, it was pointed out that housewives tend to mistakenly blame the farmer for the entire cost of the food they buy at the marketplace. It was also pointed out that Americans today spend only 18.4 percent of their income for food, the lowest percentage spent by any other people, and that this percentage has dropped from 25.6 percent in 1947, to 21.6 percent in 1955, to 18.4 percent today.

Secretary Freeman was questioned about recent reports which indicated he was "pleased" with lower farm prices.

"I could never say I was pleased about lower farm prices," he said. "I think I would swallow my tongue if I even tried to say that. What started that rumor was this:

"At a press conference March 31, I made some projections of certain farm prices. In the course of this, I commented that I was pleased that some of the very high peaks in prices were moderating at what seemed to be reasonable levels. I said this because very high price peaks brought about by unusual circumstances are always followed by overproduction and a sharp break in prices.

"I said we hoped to avoid this in the future, because booms and busts in prices are good for neither the farmer nor the consumer.

"The fact that the word 'pleased' was used," he said, "apparently led some, intentionally or otherwise, to immediately expand these remarks to cover farm prices, period. That just simply is not true."

Reporting on farm income, the Secretary said that net farm income will be up about $3.5 billion in 1966 over what it was in 1960, "and I feel very proud of that." He said that net farm income is up about 55 percent per farm.

On questions about why the Department of Defense reduced pork purchases, the Secretary said:

The Defense Department "tries to be like a prudent housewife and to buy intelligently and effectively." When the Defense action was taken, hogs were selling at 122 percent of parity. Now that they are selling at 97 percent of parity, the Secretary has asked Defense to step up pork buying and has "reason to believe they will act favorable."

Secretary Freeman recalled that both Agriculture and Defense Departments spent many millions of dollars buying beef "in 1964 when cattle prices fell to catastrophic lows."

On the government corn sales controversy, the Secretary declared: "So long as the market price of corn is 10 to 20 cents above the loan rate . . . the accusation that you're dumping and driving down the farmer's prices really isn't very meaningful."

Asked about dairy support prices, the Secretary responded:

"Not very long ago I increased the dairy support price to about $3.50. The market price at $3.73 a hundredweight is the highest it has been since 1952. On the other hand, this does not mean the average dairy producer in the Class II dairy areas is getting a very big return for his very, very hard work.

"There is no simple answer to this question," Mr. Freeman said. "It may well be that we should increase that dairy support price more. I have been giving that some very serious thought. By the same token, the $3.50 figure we settled on here several weeks ago was the product of much consultation . . . and it represented the majority opinion of the dairy industry itself when it appraised the market conditions and realistically looked at what the situation was."

Questioned about the recent increase in cheese imports, Mr. Freeman replied:

"In this case the increase was in response to the request of the dairy industry itself. I had many phone calls from Minnesota and from Wisconsin from buttermakers who were having a difficult time getting milk because the shortage had boosted prices to a higher level than they had been for a long time. They requested that we do something to dull the edge of the cheese prices a little bit so they could get some milk. Cheese prices were higher than they had been since 1947.

"The net result," he said, "was a very minor import relaxing action, involving less than a tenth of one percent of annual consumption. And the cheddar involved was Canadian cheddar, which sells about 10 to 15 cents a pound on the market more than our cheddar. As such, the experts in the dairy industry felt it was not competitive."

The Secretary pointed out that while Canada imports some $400 million worth of agricultural commodities from the United States each year, we buy less than $200 million worth from Canada.

"To buy a very small amount of cheddar cheese, which was symbolic to Canada, and a part of our bargaining to allow us to sell more, made good sense when the dairy industry itself felt this would be useful in restoring better price relationships. I can assure you the Secretary of Agriculture isn't trying to move down the dairy farmers' products—quite the contrary."

Asked about the concern of some soybean growers that soybeans "may soon wind up as a surplus," Secretary Freeman commented:

"I think that the soybean farmer need have little concern that we are going to get into a surplus condition. There is no one who wants to avoid surpluses more than the Secretary. By the same token, I am deeply concerned always that we have an adequate supply."

That March 31 press conference was one of several statements and actions made in the past months, which combined, did not produce a good image for the administration. I believe the reporting out of context of what the Secretary said on March 31 would have been ignored had it not been for some other actions and statements.

One of the actions that had occurred was to establish export controls on hides. Since I am on the subcommittee that recommends appropriations for export control office, I was one of the first to know of the intent to adopt such an order and was the first critic of such an action in the Congress. I am still strongly critical of that order. I do not think it was justified for all the reasons I have previously set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I think it should be abolished.

I also think the Department of Agriculture sold more corn during the first 3 months of this year than should have been sold under the supply and demand situation. In previous years the amount of corn sold was approximately equal to the difference between production and anticipated or needed utilization. Under the feed grains program we have in the average year produced less than was needed and thereby provided a market for some of that corn which was accumulated under the ridiculous 1959 and 1960 Benson no-feed-grains program. It was that huge accumulation that gave the Commodity Credit Corporation the corn that could be sold. I think that they did use fairly good discretion from 1961 until 1966 but I think they used poor judgment in the timing and amount of sales made this year.

In my humble opinion both the action concerning hides and the action concerning corn sales was the result of pressures built up within the Administration by the Council of Economic Advisers, none of which is an agricultural economist. Statements made by the Chairman of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, seem to substantiate this. He has been making some ill-advised statements about a subject matter upon which he is thoroughly unqualified to speak and as late as 2 weeks ago was still bragging to some supermarket executives to the effect that people influenced by his advice had helped to hold down farm prices. Prior to that, he had spoken of the excess corn sales as something desirable to hold down corn prices and as if these sales would have some immediate direct effect upon food prices. Anyone even remotely acquainted with the agricultural field would know that the price of hogs and beef is determined by the supply of hogs and beef rather than by the price of corn. The supply of hogs and beef is mostly determined by the supply of corn but that is a delayed action of 6 months to a year. Anyway, the price of corn is so cheap in comparison to the price of hogs and beef and the feed grains farmer has been receiving such a small part of the beef and pork dollar, that reducing the price of corn by 10 cents per bushel would not be involved in the alleged inflation problem.

There was also a big political public relations to-do by some Republicans about the Defense Department substituting some increased purchases of sausage, beef, and poultry for some of the bacon and pork chop purchases. For several years the Defense Department has been periodically following the same practice that housewives do in looking for favorable prices and supplies and substituting one kind of meat product for another in accordance with the availability of the product. I was one of those that was most critical when the Defense Department in the late 1950's thoroughly ignored the low price of hogs and big supply of pork when determining the kinds of various meats to purchase. I think they should constantly review this and give consideration to the price and supply situation. Although statements concerning these actions were politically inspired and thoroughly ignored, the fact that other meat products were to be substituted for the reduction in bacon and pork chop purchases, much of the misunderstanding that many people had must also rest upon both the poor quality of newspaper reporting concerning this matter and the poor quality of explanations given by both the Defense and Agriculture Departments.

The Des Moines Register recently carried an excellently written editorial which includes references to the overall problems involved and so that others might have an opportunity to be exposed to the facts expressed in this editorial with which I mostly agree, I would like to read it to you. It is as follows:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, May 6, 1966]

THE FARMER'S PUBLIC RELATIONS

From the uproar by farm leaders about the Defense Department reducing its purchases of pork and butter for the troops you would think some great issue of agricultural policy was involved. Also, a city dweller might conclude that the commercial farmer was in desperate shape.

Farm leaders have been accusing Agriculture Secretary Freeman and the Johnson Administration of "blaming the farmer for inflation", trying to fight inflation at the expense of the farmer and so on. Such charges are absurd. Nothing has been done to bring down the general level of farm product prices or to lower farm income.

The facts are that commercial agriculture is enjoying a boom in net income. Net farm income rose from $11.7 billion in 1960 to $14.1 billion in 1965 and is currently forecast by the Department of Agriculture at $15.1 billion for 1966. Here are the estimated cash receipts for major commodity groups, with projections for 1966:

[In billions of dollars]

	1960	*1965*	*1966*
Cattle	7.6	8.8	10.0
Hogs	2.9	3.7	4.1
Broilers	1.1	1.3	1.4
Eggs	1.7	1.7	1.8
Dairy products	4.7	5.1	5.4
All crops	15.8	19.6	20.2

The changes in buying of food for the military services are a small factor in the total demand for farm products. The reduction in buying of pork, for example, undoubtedly would be offset by an increase in buying beef and other meats. When pork is relatively high, why not change the proportions? This makes more pork available for civilians and tends to lower pork prices. But the total demand for meat is unaffected.

There is nothing sacred about the quotas of different kinds of foods bought by the armed forces. A wise buying policy should consider availability of supplies and relative prices.

However, the Administration seems to be buckling under to the political noise from farm leaders, and Secretary Freeman says he will try to reverse the pork buying policy.

The shortsightedness of farm leaders in this dispute, especially the spokesmen for the hog and butter interests, appalls us. Both pork and butter have been losing in consumer preference to competitive products. Beef and margarine have been gaining steadily. Now the hog and dairy people are insisting that in a time of high prices for their products the government continue to buy the same quantities for the armed forces.

This of course would drive still more consumers to beef and margarine. The dairy and hog spokesmen are putting their attention on the 3 million troops instead of the 192 million civilian customers.

Farm leaders who complain about misunderstanding in the cities are failing to recognize a good opportunity to keep quiet. When food prices are high and farm income is favorable is a poor time to be howling about government food-buying policy.

Incidentally, no U.S. troops are being fed foreign food. Some foreign meat is being procured for commissaries and officers' clubs, and this is being obtained by barter arrangements, that is, by trading corn and wheat for it.

So that the whole matter can be put into better perspective, I want to cite some facts and statistics relative to changes in agriculture.

First. Net farm income in 1965 was $14.1 billion or 20.5 percent more than in 1960.

Second. Per capita income from all sources per person on farms increased from $1,108 in 1960 to $1,510 in 1965. That is a total of 66 percent or 15 percent per year.

Third. Net income per farm increased 40 percent from $2,956 in 1960 to about $4,150 in 1965 and that is by far the biggest increase ever for a 6-year period. In the previous 6 years, it had increased only $450.

Fourth. Prices of commodities changed, as follows, between March of 1960 and March of 1966:

	1960	*1966*
Beef steers & heifers (cwt)	$24.10	$26.20
Hogs (cwt)	15.00	24.00
Corn (bu.)	1.00	1.12
Soybeans (bu.)	1.99	2.71
Milk (cwt)	3.21	3.73

In spite of these changes, consumers gave only 18.2 percent of their earnings for more food in 1965 compared to 20 percent in 1960.

Fifth. Farm production per man hour increased in 1965 and was 30 percent more than it was in 1960. This could not happen without sufficient additional capital derived both from savings and backup credit.

Sixth. Agricultural exports for dollars increased from $3.3 billion in 1960 to $4.8 billion in 1965 for an increase of 45 percent.

Seventh. Gross farm income increased from $37.9 billion in 1960 to $44.4 billion in 1965. Production expenses increased from $26.2 billion in 1960 to $30.3 billion in 1965. Thus, gross income increased $6.5 billion while costs were increasing $4.1 billion making income increase 60 percent faster than expenses.

In spite of all the progress that has been made, farmers still enjoy only about 70 percent of the return on their time and investment that is enjoyed by the average in the nonagricultural industries. We need to continue to work for more improvements.

In spite of the great improvement in understanding of the farm problems by the nonfarm segments of our population, there are still too many misunderstandings. Too many farm organization statements constitute bad public relations for farmers when read by city folks and for farm information we still depend upon news media most of which have such a small number of farm subscribers that we really cannot expect them to employ reporters who have the necessary background to enable them to report farm facts as vividly as they report baseball games, crimes, the stock market, and the economic events which city people are more interested in. More improvement in farm public relations is needed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that anyone who looks at the full record will see that the administrations of both President Kennedy and President Johnson have secured great overall accomplishments for the American farmers. Surely no one can doubt that President Johnson's heart is in the right place. I am glad that I was one of those that has strongly supported the feed grains program and most of the actions taken to bring about the overall accomplishments of the past 5 years, but I do also think that some improvements can be made and I offer the following additional suggestions for the consideration of all concerned.

First. Especially since the tremendous responsibility the President has for the conduct of our international affairs takes so much time that he cannot devote as much time as he undoubtedly would like to agricultural affairs, there should be an agricultural economist at the White House level and preferably a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. This would give greater assurance that the immediate family upon which the President must depend for economic policy advice would include someone who would be able to correct such erroneous assumptions as have been made by Gardner Ackley.

Second. I believe the President should appoint an agricultural advisory panel at the White House level. I notice that there are advisory panels on labor, industry, and for various other economic and social groups, but for some reason a White House agricultural advisory panel has not been appointed. I am not fully convinced that we need all of these White House panels but, as long as they have all of the other kinds reporting to the President, I am afraid the advice to the President may become overweighed against agriculture and somewhat distorted unless an agricultural panel has the same opportunity to offer advice.

Third. I hope that the administration will reverse the export control order on hides as it previously reversed the export control order on walnut logs to which I had strenuously objected and that it will be made clear to those in the administrative departments that export control orders shall not be used for the purpose of instituting price controls upon products which have not even reached a parity price level with other products.

Fourth. A realistic look should be taken toward a program of establishing a reserve of soybeans in such a way that farmers will not be contributing the reserve without compensation. All knowledgeable estimates concerning 1966 by the industry indicate a shortage will occur and the prices on the futures market prove their conviction that this is the case. We need to avoid a shortage but also need to establish a reserve in such a way that producing the additional soybeans for the reserve will not depress soybean prices below the level that will assure a reasonable return to the farmer. To the extent that additional soybeans could be produced within this framework additional farm income would result. Last year U.S. farmers produced 135 million bushels more of soybeans than were produced in the previous year and soybeans sold for approximately the same price per bushel. This resulted in an additional $300 million in income from soybeans. Since we supply 95 percent of the soybeans that are shipped between countries and since 40 percent of all of our soybeans are sent overseas, we are the world's storekeeper of soybeans; and, since farmers do have the idle land, the capital, and the labor available to make sure that all the beans are available that foreign purchasers will buy at a reasonable price, we should have them available. Raising and marketing them would increase farm income. Unless some action is taken relative to this matter, it is a farce to talk about using soybean products in a food-for-freedom program and establishing a soybean reserve.

Fifth. It would be helpful if the President would put a muzzle on speeches being made and articles being written by confidential advisers at the White House level. The kind of statements that Gardner Ackley has made and the kind of magazine articles that Kermit Gordon wrote can offset the good public relations jobs being performed by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. Many people who read these statements had no way of knowing that these confidential advisers are ill informed on agricultural matters and too many assume that they are espousing administrative policy in this field.

Sixth. A high priority in budgeting is needed for the new sewer and water resources bill that will give rural communities the greatest opportunity they have ever had to continue as a local trading and service center for the surrounding farm area. Without a sewer system and a water system, many people who were thoroughly happy and satisfied in small towns 30 years ago will not stay and work in these small towns. With a sewer system and water system, a large number of commuters will also prefer to live there even if they have to drive 10 or 20 minutes by superhighway to the job. These trading and service centers, including a local bank, an elevator, a grocery store, and a local garage, are necessary for a vibrant and efficient agriculture.

Seventh. Some segments of agriculture are receiving far greater attention than other segments when measured by the importance both as to the volume of goods produced and the number of people involved. A study needs to be made quickly and the results used in determining the emphasis to be placed upon various programs.

Eighth. Establishment of a very carefully considered inventory of actions and policies that could be enacted to the extent and when the Federal budget warrants it to help those engaged in agriculture attain an income commensurate with those with similar responsibilities and rendering similar service in other industries. Some of these ideas may come from the agricultural advisory panel, above referred to, and others from agricultural research stations. While admittedly most of the ideas developed may not be used, we need to have a better perspective as to what kind of action should have the highest priority.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that most of the recent critics of the administration on agriculture have been those who have consistently opposed almost every action which improved farm income in the past 6 years. If agriculture had moved forward as fast as they wanted it to, farmers would still be plowing with one mule.

I shall continue to be one of those who offers constructive criticism and promotes new ideas, but I challenge other critics to also suggest some specific actions which they think will help the farm industry attain its fair share of the national income. I hope those who have recently tried to appoint themselves as friends of the farmer by criticism alone will now come forward with specific suggestions and will not continue to meet challenges for suggestions with a deafening silence.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the comments made by the very distinguished gentleman in the well, a man whom I feel is one of the most knowledgeable men in this great body in the total area of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman in the well, my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], for setting forth a very positive statement on agriculture. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the comments we have just heard come from one of the most knowledgeable men in this great body in the total field of agriculture. I speak with authority when I state the high degree of respect and esteem in which he is held in his home State. All know the great contribution he made in the enactment of the feed grains programs. I certainly want to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, there should be in the Congress, and in the Nation as a whole, continuing concern for the well-being of our farm families. They have made this a nation of food-and-fiber abundance. They have made it possible for the United States to lead in the fight against hunger throughout the world and to use food as an instrument for the achievement of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I find it a real honor to represent one of the greatest agricultural districts in this Nation. On several occasions, I have brought to the attention of city audiences in my district and in several urban centers throughout the Nation the significant contributions that our farmers have, and are, making to our total economic structure. I would like to incorporate some of those statements with a few additional thoughts today.

Foremost among any observations on agriculture must be, I think, that U.S. agriculture is the greatest manmade miracle of history. Much of the history of civilization rests on man's search for enough to eat. That being true, the achievement of abundant agricultural production becomes the greatest accomplishment in the history of man. We have even surpassed this level of productivity in America today. In fact, for the first time in recorded history, science and technology have progressed so far that we can envision the day when no one on earth need suffer for want of the nutritional necessities of life.

Unfortunately, the productive capacity of our domestic agriculture is not always viewed in such light on the home front. Too often it is thought of in terms of problems rather than successes. The ability to produce more than we are able to consume, sell, or share is a new dimension in human experience. It is understandably difficult to comprehend. However, if we only look at the obvious alternative to abundance, comprehension becomes easier.

Any time we feel discouraged over our agricultural problems we need only to remember that there is hardly a nation in the world that would not gladly exchange its "farm problem" for ours. The average American family eats better than ever before. In the underdeveloped nations, most of the day's work is required simply to obtain enough food to survive.

The unrivaled productive efficiency of American agriculture is not a mere happenstance. Essentially the world's most productive and most efficient agriculture is a monumental tribute to the hard work, the ingenuity, and the ability of American farmers.

Ours is an agriculture based on the family farm unit, a family size unit in which the operator and his family own and operate an agricultural business. It is a system which benefits this land of ours through more than the obvious benefits of productivity—through its social and moral values.

As simple and uncomplicated as it is, the family farm system is the one consistent measure of success or failure among the nations of the world. Among the developed nations, the family farm is always present in a successful agriculture. It is always absent where agriculture has failed. Science, technology, education, and capital are all essential to the achievement of agricultural abundance; but only when teamed with family farm ownership, operation, and management has the result been an outpouring of food and fiber such as we enjoy in the United States.

Aside from the immediate benefits of an abundance of food and fiber, agriculture is a pillar of the American economy in other respects. It is widely known—but apparently too little appreciated in some circles—that agriculture plays an important role in maintaining general economic stability in the nonfarm economy.

Most of us have heard the expression, "Depressions are farm led and farm fed." The House Committee on Appropriations, in 1958, offered this observation:

> A review of economic history of the United States will show that every economic recession in this country has started on the farms. Every recession has been preceded by a period of reduced income to the agricultural segment of our economy which generates new wealth, it is inevitable that a prolonged depression in agriculture will eventually reflect itself in more aggravated economic distress throughout the rest of the economy.

Despite sharp declines in the agricultural population, farming remains the largest U.S. industry. It employs 12 times as many people as work in the steel industry and 9 times as many as in the automobile industry. Forty percent of all the jobs in the United States are agriculturally related.

The farmer is a consumer as well as a producer, and other economic groups are affected by declines in farm purchasing power. The farmer spends $26 billion each year for fuel, fertilizer, and other goods and services required to produce crops and livestock. He spends at least another $15 billion annually for the same things that city people buy—food, clothing, drugs, furniture, and appliances.

In the face of a steady decline in number of farms and farmworkers, farmers' total expenditures have constantly increased. While gross farm income has but little more than tripled over the past 40 years, farm production expenses have more than quadrupled.

I could go on indefinitely citing facts to emphasize the importance of agriculture to the American economy: As an essential prime producer and creator of employment and as a consumer of everything from candy bars to motor trucks. Clearly it is in the deepest interest of all Americans that our agriculture continue to be not only progressive but prosperous as well.

We know, however, that prosperity in agriculture has lagged. In the face of the tremendous contributions of agriculture to the national economy, the American farmer has failed to share commensurately in the prosperity his labors have made possible. At a time when economic growth and increased productivity are regarded as major national goals, the segment of our economy that has increased its productivity the most, that contributes so much to the national—and world—welfare, receives the least reward in terms of income.

A major result of all the research, mechanization, and increased efficiency of American agriculture has been that fewer and fewer farmers are needed to produce all that is required to meet our total agricultural needs. In competition with each other, farmers provide food and fiber—one farmer now supplies 31 people—to the Nation but at prices which return to him a proportionately small share of national income. The American farmer, even considering income from all sources, still averages only about 60 percent of the income of his city counterpart.

A substantial number of our fellow citizens have attempted to place the blame for this income lag upon Federal farm programs.

The facts, however, fail to substantiate such claims. It is true that Federal farm programs of the past have generally fallen short of solving all the problems they were designed to solve: but, despite recognized shortcomings, most of us acknowledge the necessity of continued Government programs for agriculture and agricultural commodities.

It is perhaps ironic that the success of farm programs is usually measured by claims of misfortunes they have prevented, but numerous independent and reliable studies have indicated rather conclusively that these programs have held farm prices and incomes at substantially higher levels than would have otherwise been the case in the absence of such programs.

The most recent of these studies, made by Dr. Walter W. Wilcox of the Library of Congress, points out that net farm income, which averaged $12.6 billion in 1964 and for the two previous years, would have probably averaged about $6 billion a year in the absence of price support and acreage diversion programs. Dr. Wilcox further states that estimates for this year indicate that with a continuation of existing programs realized net farm income may continue near recent levels, but in the absence of the programs it would be expected to drop to $6 billion.

Speaking in a specific vein, realized net farm income in 1965 totaled $14.1 billion—$2.4 billion, or 20.5 percent, more than in 1960. Encouraging to say the least is that farm income this year will climb at least $1 billion more—to the highest level in history, except for the postwar years of 1947 and 1948. Net income per farm, which averaged $2,956 in 1960, rose to nearly $4,200 last year and is expected to reach $4,600 this year. This represents an increase of about 55 percent in 6 years. I think that it is significant to note the following table drawing a comparison of prices of important commodities for March of 1960 and March of 1966:

	1960	*1966*
Beef steers & heifers (cwt)	$24.10	$26.20
Hogs (cwt)	15.00	24.00
Corn (bu.)	1.00	1.12
Soybeans (bu.)	1.99	2.71
Milk (cwt)	3.21	3.73

I do not mean to infer that criticism of Government agricultural programs is entirely without justification. Certainly most of us recognize that programs need to be periodically reappraised and updated in response to changing conditions. But the necessity for continued strong Government programs for agriculture cannot be questioned by responsible and knowledgeable people. Sound farm programs benefit the entire Nation, consumers and farmers alike.

Most of our farm programs date back to the early 1930's. It is worthy of mention that the skills of our farmers and the productivity of our farms have made their greatest gains during this same period—since the early thirties. In 1930 the number of persons supplied per farmworker was about 10, today it stands at 31. These years were also marked with rapid strides by the entire American economy. Such progress does not occur in an atmosphere where individual freedoms are prohibited or where economic balance is lacking.

A productive agriculture protected and reinforced by strong Government farm programs is clearly fundamental to any growing and prosperous nation. Those who advocate abolition of Government farm programs would not only deny farmers the protection extended to most of the other principal segments of the economy but they would take away an extremely large market for other industry as well as hitting all consumers squarely in the pocketbook through rising food prices.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the right of any individual to criticize the Secretary of Agriculture or any other public official. However, I am not impressed with how

Mr. Freeman is quoted, or misquoted, interpreted, or misinterpreted in the press. I may not always agree with him, but I know he will not purposely sell the farm families of this Nation short. All we need do is recall the disastrous decline in farm income under former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. Regardless of criticism leveled—I am interested in fact. The fact is that we have a 4-year farm program and that farm income will be up another $1 billion this year.

To be sure, we have our agricultural problems in this country but let us all be thankful that they are largely problems of abundance instead of problems of scarcity.

In view of the great significance of American agriculture to the national economy, we can ill afford to endanger our enviable position as builders of the world's most efficient and most productive agriculture. The American agricultural system has proved its worth by the test of time.

I for one firmly believe that it is not beyond the capability and ingenuity of the American people to turn the productivity of American agriculture into a complete asset—as it is already viewed by the majority of the world's people. Efforts in this behalf will be richly rewarded and in consequence American agriculture will be sustained as a major force in a strong and prosperous America.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I want to say that I have been very grateful, both in the preparation of these remarks and in various conversations that I have had and the total body of thought that has gone into this entire subject matter, to my colleagues from Iowa who are on the floor and all of my colleagues from Iowa.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the dean of our Iowa delegation, the honorable NEAL SMITH. I wish to commend him for the clear and succinct manner in which he has analyzed the frictions that have developed recently in connection with this agricultural industry.

I appreciate the opportunity to share with my colleague in upholding the hand of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. Since the Secretary sits in one of the hottest seats in the executive branch of Government, I am certain he is accustomed to the scorching flames of criticism.

Certainly it is unfortunate that the Secretary's words on farm prices were misinterpreted. But that is one of the problems of relying on the mass news media, and its need to sensationalize, for our information.

The record of performance by the Department of Agriculture during the last 5 years clearly indicates its aim for a profitable agricultural industry free from the boom-and-bust cycle that has in the past been so typical of this industry.

This cannot be denied. The record shows a gain in net income ranging from $11.7 billion in 1960 to a rate of over $15 billion in 1966. Average farm prices in April 1966 are 9 percent over those of 1965. Certainly one intercepted pass in a season does not relegate a star quarterback to athletic oblivion, nor a championship team to the cellar in its league.

The recent editorial in the Wallaces Farmer clearly bares to full view the baloney that opponents of this administration have been tossing around.

Inflation Stories True and False

Farm State Republicans have had real good hunting since the administration's unwise blasts at food prices. Without doubt they have some real issues in some areas. But some of the political attacks show more heat than light.

While consumers are critical of recent food prices, we feel the President erred in opening an attack on inflationary food prices. The reason is obvious—food is still a real bargain.

The restriction placed on cattle hide exports by the Department of Commerce—to hold down shoe prices—was ridiculous. With 25 or 30 cents worth of hide in a pair of shoes, even a doubling of hide prices would have little direct effect on shoe prices.

We feel that some of the other attacks on administration anti-inflation actions are less valid, however. Here are some of the most publicized ones.

The 50-percent cut in military buying of bacon. Bacon prices soared to abnormal levels last winter, even considering the good hog prices. In view of this, we feel it was a logical move for the military to reduce bacon purchases temporarily. Eggs, sausage, ham, and beef are all good alternate sources of the protein supplied by bacon.

Why shouldn't our military procurement people shift purchases among comparable food items from U.S. farms in response to current supplies and prices? This is the way you'd operate your own business.

Military buying of margarine instead of butter. A lot of tears have been shed because our boys in Vietnam are being fed some margarine. We suspect this is the least of the worries of the boys on the firing line.

L.B.J.'s suggestion to buy the cheaper cuts of meat. Will this undermine our livestock economy? The producers' own promotion agency, the National Live Stock and Meat Board, has spent a lot of money showing housewives how to prepare and serve the cheaper cuts. The limited demand for the cheaper cuts is a real drag on beef prices, especially during boom times such as now. L.B.J. probably helped livestock prices with this comment.

CCC corn sales to beat down prices. More than 344 million bushels of corn was marketed by CCC since October 1. These sales pushed down prices in February and March, and it's very possible they were timed to encourage signup in the feed grain program.

Regardless, corn prices have been good. Considering our record crop, the feed-the-world excitement of last winter probably pushed up prices more than supplies and potential markets justified. Average monthly prices in Iowa hit a peak of $1.07 in January. By mid-March they were only 4 cents lower—$1.03.

The key point is, however, that we can't operate a successful feed grain program if corn is permitted to only flow into—never out of—CCC bins.

We still have 15 to 20 million tons of feed grains in excess of desirable reserve levels. Isn't it wise management for CCC to move out some corn during periods of brisk demand, especially when dry corn is badly needed to fill export orders?

CCC sales shaved a few cents off corn prices this year. But prices are probably at least 15 cents above where they'd be if we didn't have the feed grain program taking 32 to 36 million acres out of production each year. We can't have our cake and eat it, too.

This reasoned view of the farm situation helps all of us to more adequately understand the long-range program of the administration. Certainly there have been mistakes made, but the continual growth of farm income from $11.7 billion in 1960 to the projected $15 billion for this year belies the carping criticism that Secretary Freeman and the administration are out to destroy the farmer. A little over a week ago it was reported in the Wall Street Journal that net farm income has finally returned to the same level that it was in 1952. It has taken over 4 years to recover from 8 years of Republican mismanagement.

Secretary Freeman is being castigated for an unfortunate remark, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26 clearly shows that it was the Republican votes that attempted to cripple the agricultural appropriations bill as they voted against funds for soil conservation, REA, FHA, and other programs vital to the farm economy.

It is time the farmer, the businessman, the worker, and the consumer come to know who their real friends are.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend my distinguished colleague from the Fifth District of Iowa for this most appropriate, and I believe timely, analysis of the status of agriculture in our total economy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the recommendations which have been made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], in particular, deserve a great deal of attention, because unlike himself, as a more recent Member of Congress, I feel that we have made a determined effort in the 89th Congress to bring to rural America many of the benefits which for many years have been limited in programs to urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity for increasing funds for the rural water and sewer systems was so obvious to all of us because of the overwhelming number of requests that we have received from our own community for the services. And I might at this point say that the development of a sound basis for rural America will inhibit and eventually prevent what has been an exodus for many decades to urban centers from the farm. We are really striving in this Congress to provide opportunities for young people in rural America to make a career on the farms which their fathers and grandfathers have developed for them.

This is our goal.

The gentleman's emphasis upon the detrimental policies of Secretary Benson, I think, are quite appropriate. I think the gentleman's statement today and those of my colleagues from Iowa who are here today certainly underscore the fact that we, as Members of this Congress, would certainly never stand for any Cabinet officer who would turn his back on rural America.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to my colleague from our neighboring State of Wisconsin. The gentleman is one of the three leading milk experts in the Congress. I assume that the gentleman is going to make reference to the milk and dairy products industry. The gentleman very ably represents that industry here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman on his very fine remarks and thank him for yielding to me.

I might point out that the gentleman is correct—I do intend to comment on the dairy phases of the farm picture very briefly.

I first want to commend the gentleman from Iowa, particularly for taking this time today to call this entire matter of the movement of prices and the general upward tendencies in the farm pricing picture and the price patterns in the last 6 years to the attention of the Congress and particularly pointing out the contrast of what has occurred in this 6-year period with that which had developed during the prior 8 years under Secretary Benson.

During the course of the gentleman's remarks, he mentioned that the price of dairy products has increased since 1960 from $3.21 a hundred to $3.73 a hundred, if I am quoting the gentleman correctly.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. STALBAUM. That is an increase of 16 percent. Like the gentleman from Iowa, I, too, find considerable rumblings at this time in my district among the farm people. I think it is high time they are again reminded that there has been a general upward movement in the prices they are receiving and that much of this can be credited to the agricultural policies that have been followed during these past few years.

I was called out of the Chamber during a portion of the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa and I wonder if the gentleman made any reference to the reduction of the total commodities in storage?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No, not to any extent; I think the gentleman is wise in pointing that out because, after all, in 1961, these huge commodities that had accumulated were hanging over people's heads and definitely had a depressing effect upon the market—not only the grain market but all the livestock products—milk and everything else, to which grain can be converted.

Mr. STALBAUM. The gentleman has very ably pointed out the point I wish to make and the reason for bringing it into this colloquy at this point.

Along with the other pricing factors we have seen, the present administration, however, should be given credit and great credit, for in an orderly manner reducing these stocks without disrupting farm prices substantially. Thus getting them away from having them hang, as he pointed out, as a sword over the head of the prices of farm commodities.

In the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa, he has made several suggestions as to what should be done. I feel as the gentleman from Iowa feels that those who have been critical should come forward also with suggestions. While I have been moderately critical of some of the things that have occurred in the past few weeks, I too would like to offer some suggestions particularly as to the dairy field.

First, I would like to suggest that the Secretary indicate there will likely be no further increase in the import quotas of cheese. This is sort of the other side of the coin to the matter of hide exports where the hide people want to keep the figure up. Those who represent the dairy industry want to keep import quotas down.

Actually, the amount of cheese brought in, it should be pointed out, amounted to about one-tenth of 1 percent of the cheddar cheese consumption in America. Yet, there developed from this a certain feeling among farmers that this was an open-end affair and that in time the price of dairy products was to go up and that the more import quotas would be raised, more cheese would be imported.

I feel the Secretary should speak out on this point and indicate to the dairy farmers there is no more likelihood of more of an increase in cheese import quotas.

I have recommended to the Secretary in a letter which I sent him on April 20 that we have committed this country, by act of Congress, to providing 125 million pounds of dried milk to India in our special assistance, and that, if they are going to fill this commitment this year, they should be considering doing it now during the spring flush season in dairy production.

Some evidence of how they intend to fulfill this commitment would be encouraging to the dairy farmers throughout all of America, and particularly the manufactured-milk area of the Midwest, including Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Then I do believe, in line with the statements the Secretary made when price support announcements were made on March 31, that if these did not prove adequate to get the desired reversal of the downward production trend, that he would consider further increases in the price support level from the $3.50 level he established.

Yesterday the production figures were made known on dairy products and we find that for April there was a drop of about 4 percent from last year. Interestingly, the drop was not as great as it was in March. It was not as great as we had seen in February. So there may be some slight indication that the trend is slowly reversing itself.

But I do want to point out that this April downward production figure is the 13th consecutive month in which dairy production is below the corresponding month for the preceding year. During the 4 months the figures have been rather alarming, reaching over 5 percent in December, and holding there in January and February, at 4.6 percent in March, and now in April at about 4 percent.

I do believe that the Secretary should seriously consider further increases in dairy price supports to reverse this downward trend, a suggestion which he indicated he was willing to follow at the time the original price supports were announced just prior to April 1.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Iowa for letting me make these observations on the dairy picture, which is as critical in my area as corn and hogs are in central Iowa, and hope that as a result of this colloquy we can point out to the American consumer, and also to others, the role that the American farmers play and the desirability of getting greater equity for them in our whole American economic system.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am glad to yield to my colleague from my neighboring district who, along with other midwesterners who are participating in this special order today and in this colloquy on the floor, have helped so much in getting the new 4-year farm program passed. I think there is no doubt about it—without these midwesterners here this year, this 4-year farm program probably would not have passed, and instead of people worrying about some remarks someone made today, they would be worrying about what will happen when this farm program expires. So I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I wish not only to commend the gentleman in the well but also to associate myself with his remarks. I particularly appreciate the constructive suggestions he has made, and I hope that the administration will pay close attention to what he has outlined. I think this is the type of criticism we ought to have—something which the administration can profit from—rather than the negative type of criticism that we hear daily, both in the press, and some of it, unfortunately, here on this floor.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has suggested that we need some further improvements, and I might point out at this point that before too long this House will be considering the food-for-freedom program. There are those who think that we should discriminate against the American farmer in this bill by making it more difficult in our foreign assistance programs to sell agricultural products than it is to sell any other type of product. I am amazed to find that such thinking exists here in Congress, but some of it, unfortunately, exists even apparently in the farm areas.

I am sure that the farmers of this country would find it difficult to understand that we would sell iron, fertilizer, and even birth control pills to the people in "Gambu," for example, on softer terms than we would sell them wheat, or rice, or corn oil, or soybean oil, or dry milk, or, for that matter, any other agricultural commodities I can possibly think of.

I am hopeful that those who, in this election year, want to do so much for the American farmer, and so dearly love him in an election year, are going to be here on the floor when the food-for-freedom bill comes out. If the bill should come out discriminating against the American farmer in this particular regard, I hope they will stand up at that time and be counted.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations, which were very pertinent, because, of course, it is these kinds of things which are usually obscured, and usually do not come to the attention of the public, and which are so important as far as the pocketbook is concerned. They do not get as much attention as some remark that somebody happens to make at a press conference.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, we have just been privileged to hear an informed, well-reasoned, and extremely perceptive analysis of the current agricultural situation from our colleague, Neal Smith. Because of his deep concern for the problems of the American farmer, his recognized knowledge in the area, and his constructive approach to the formulation of agricultural policy, he speaks with authority and has assumed an important role of leadership in the Congress.

Most importantly, as clearly shown today, he possesses the unquestioned ability to place the matter of agricultural policy in proper perspective, and assess its vital role in maintaining the overall strength and viability of our economy.

In the past 5½ years we have been the proud witness to real progress in strengthening the farm economy. Promising increases have occurred in net farm income—the prices of individual commodities nearly across the board, productive ability, and the dollar income from the sale of products abroad.

However, it is no time to stand on the achievements of the past, or still worse, to single out well-deserved and long overdue farm advances as a causal factor of inflationary pressures in our expansive and complex economy.

The policies initiated in 1960 have been instrumental in raising the level of farm income substantially, while actually reducing the percentage of disposable income Americans must spend to be the best fed nation in the world.

However, in recent months I have had occasion to express serious differences with administrative decisions on important policy matters, and I have strongly urged that action be taken to further raise the price support level for milk; to reverse the ill-advised restrictive export control order on livestock hides; to avoid threatened cutbacks in the successful school lunch and special school milk programs; and to give greater attention to important programs to assist in the construction of badly needed sewage and water systems in rural areas.

In conclusion, I wish to join my colleague, Neal Smith, in urging that consideration be given to the selection of informed agricultural specialists at the top levels of personal presidential advisers. By guaranteeing this stronger voice in economic policymaking, we will hopefully realize the full promise of American agriculture in the years ahead.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental question on agricultural policy concerns whether Congress and the administration accept price support and supply management as a means of stabilizing agriculture and protecting farm income.

It is a matter of record that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman last year appeared before the House Agriculture Committee, on which I serve, in strong advocacy of that philosophy and that policy which form the underpinning for the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. That act, authorizing a 4-year program and stating the principle that farmers are entitled to 100 percent of parity, has been widely accepted by the farmers in my State of North Dakota.

Although the new 4-year program has not taken effect yet, the farmers in my State have once again illustrated their affirmative attitude toward price support and supply management by leading the Nation in the percentage of eligible farms signed up for participation in both the wheat and feed grain programs for 1966.

Yesterday, Arthur Gronhovd, chairman of the North Dakota Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, advised me that 93 percent of the wheat farms in North Dakota are enrolled in the wheat program, representing 94.9 percent of the wheat allotment in the State. Eighty-two percent of the eligible farms are signed up for the feed grain program, representing 87 percent of the State's feed grain base.

I am proud that this marks the third year in a row that North Dakota has led in the wheat signup. In 1964, the signup was 92.3 percent of the eligible farms and in 1965, more than 94 percent.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that this Congress will soon pass a food for peace and freedom bill to launch a new attack on world hunger, with production planned for this purpose, rather than the present approach of using primarily the surplus that spills over.

The 15-percent increase in wheat acres, announced last week by the President, is related to this new approach and is a welcome turning of the corner in production opportunities. We should be ready to use export certificates, adjusted support rates, and to make full use of a market unencumbered by undue pressures from reserve stocks, so as to reinforce fair income potential for farmers who raise the food for the food for peace and freedom program.

A restrained and careful policy on disposition of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks can help to improve farm income. I continue to believe that there should be a 115-percent release price for CCC stocks and am happy that the House Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve, has taken a first step in this direction by providing in the food for peace and freedom legislation for a 115-percent release price when stocks fall below a level related to total requirements.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the food for peace and freedom program offers new opportunities for American agriculture. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the farmers of our Nation are still striving to catch up with the prosperity pace of all other segments of our economy—this, in spite of their amazing ability to furnish food for the American people at an average 18 percent of income, lower than any other nation. We must exert every effort to protect the income of producers who perform this service for our own people and who are now being called upon to furnish more and more food for hungry people abroad.

The majority leaders of this House—the Honorable Carl Albert and the Honorable Hale Boggs—have given great leadership to the cause of protecting farm income and improving rural living.

Mr. Boggs, during a recent visit to my State, assured the people of North Dakota that he would work hard to retain adequate budgets for programs of concern to farmers and rural businessmen. Mr. Boggs specifically mentioned the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural telephone program, soil conservation, the agricultural conservation program, the school lunch and special milk programs, agricultural research, and extension service.

The majority whip fulfilled his pledge. In the case of REA and ACP, the budget items were strengthened over the opposition of the minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that this Congress will write a record that will strengthen farm income and improve rural America.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have pointed out that farm income has improved during the past 5 years and that the prospects for 1966 are good, but I think we can all agree that in spite of the improvement farm prices are not as high as they should be. I am sure all the Members of this House are well aware of the fact that farm prices generally are about 80 percent of parity, and I am hopeful that further increases in farm income can be brought about in the next few years.

One of the most important accomplishments of the 89th Congress in my judgment was the passage of the 4-year omnibus farm bill. Everyone agrees that some type of a farm program is needed and most Midwestern farmers agree that the feed grains program has been successful. I recognize that not everyone is satisfied with every aspect of the feed grains program, but it has been successful in improving farm income and in reducing the huge surplus of corn and other feed grains.

The 85 million tons of feed grains in CCC bins had a depressing effect on the market and, since these stocks have been reduced, corn prices have improved. The feed grains program has improved the income of farmers in the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa to the tune of $20 to $25 million each year it was in operation. A poll published by the Wallaces Farmer early in 1965 indicated that 74 percent of Iowa farmers favored the feed grains program while only 12 percent were listed as being opposed.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, it seemed to me that we needed a 4-year program in order that farmers could plan ahead knowing not only that there would be a feed grains program in operation but also knowing what the program would be. As many will recall, the administration originally asked for a 2-year extension of the feed grains program, but a majority of us on the committee were convinced that a 4-year program was needed, and I am pleased that the administration came around to our way of thinking.

Not only did Congress pass in 1965 a 4-year farm bill but it passed the House of Representatives on the crucial vote by a margin of 49 votes. In previous years it had only been passing by a very few votes, and I think the large vote by which the 4-year farm bill passed last year clearly indicates that the present Congress recognizes the important role of agriculture.

As I mentioned earlier, Congress will soon be considering the food-for-freedom legislation. The efficiency and productivity of the American farmer has been the marvel of the world. Our farm population is now only about 7 percent of our total population, and this 7 percent has in the past been able to produce more than we can sell, consume, or give away. Food is still the best buy of all in the marketplace and only 19 percent of each disposable dollar goes for food. It is no wonder that the efficiency of the American farmer has come to the attention of the rest of the world.

We are now exporting over $6 billion in farm products which means that we have a favorable balance from agricultural products alone of more than $2 billion. In short, our American farmers are contributing substantially to the solution of our balance-of-payments problem. At the present time, two-thirds of the world's population live in food-deficit countries. The food-for-freedom bill will, when enacted, strengthen our foreign policy. I recognize that we cannot begin to feed all the people in the world, and, in addition, there are other problems over which we have little control, such as docking facilities in other countries, rat-proof storage, and an adequate transportation system within the recipient country itself. But it will be a beginning, and I am hopeful that within the next few years the food-for-freedom legislation will make a valuable contribution toward strengthening democratic governments, producing political stability, encouraging economic stability, and assisting national development. In short, the food produced by American farmers will continue to be used for the purpose of establishing peace, and it is one language that everyone can understand.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman NEAL SMITH, has suggested a number of improvements, and I heartily concur in the suggestions he has made. I do want to mention, however, that there is one other item which I am vitally concerned about, and I am sure that my colleagues here this afternoon are equally concerned about it.

It is the matter of vertical integration in the livestock feeding business. Recently the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains held hearings in Des Moines, Iowa, on my bill, H.R. 12115, which would prohibit packers and retail chainstores with more than $1 million in annual gross sales from feeding livestock. It would also prohibit any officer or director of such firms or any person who owns more than 5 percent of the stock in such firms from feeding livestock. It would also prohibit these firms from purchasing livestock for slaughter by means of feeding contracts with individual farmers.

The hearings were very helpful, and I feel the members of the subcommittee who were present learned a great deal about grassroots thinking on this subject in the Midwest. I am also hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that those who have been so critical of the Secretary of Agriculture and the President will demonstrate their real love for the family-sized farmer by introducing companion bills. Or if they have better ideas on how to solve this problem, I would be happy to cooperate with them as long as it will get the job done. After the Des Moines hearings are printed I intend to summarize them and mail them to a number of farmers in the Fourth Congressional District since I recognize that not everyone who was interested was able to attend the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I again want to commend my colleague, Congressman NEAL SMITH, for having obtained this special order which provides the opportunity to emphasize the importance of the American farmer. However, in the last analysis, we are all consumers, and I can think of very few things that are more important than an adequate supply of food. I hope the American people and this Congress will never fail to recognize just how important it is.

DISREGARD OF FARMERS' INTERESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, for some reason the powers that be have lost their sense of direction in the field of agriculture during the last few months. In February and March the President evidently ordered a number of actions to beat down farm prices and prevent the normal functioning of market forces. Farmers and ranchers were singled out as the villains in the inflationary spiral. The "Secretary against agriculture" was so elated over his part in these efforts that he announced with pleasure on March 31 that the USDA monthly price report showed some softness in farm prices. He has consistently ignored the ever-rising costs to farmers.

This heartless disregard of farmers' interests has caused many farmers, ranchers, and others, including Members of both Houses of Congress, to raise their voices in protest.

On April 29, 40 Members of this House sent a telegram to the President—the man—who now we know was the instigator of all of these actions against farmers—pointing out that the policy was totally discriminatory against and injurious to an important segment of our economy.

We are pleased to report that there now seems to be some change in attitudes. On May 9 each of the signers of the April 29 telegram received an answer from the "Secretary against agriculture" praising farmers and ranchers for their productive achievements. We all know that our farmers have made this record in spite of the attempts by the "'Secretary against agriculture" to restrain them.

We note that the answer we received studiously avoided the questions we raised in our telegram dated April 29 to the President but included a lot of political "poppycock" about how farm income has improved since 1960. Also it raised the extraneous issue of how certain Members voted on a selective list of supply-management proposals. We hold that farm income has increased not because of the farm programs initiated and operated by the Secretary against agriculture but in spite of his actions. Our votes, the record will show, were with farmers and not against them. I call your attention to the results of the wheat and turkey referendum a few years back. Further, I refer you to the statement in the RECORD made Tuesday of this week by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, to set the record straight I would like to include in the RECORD my statement of May 4, a copy of the wire sent to the President April 29 signed by 40 Members of the Congress, Secretary Freeman's response of May 9, and a wire addressed to the President today and signed by me and 48 of my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, we are not interested with polemics authored by the "Secretary against agriculture":

FARM PRICES

(Extension of remarks of Hon. JOE SKUBITZ, of Kansas, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, May 3, 1966)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days I have spoken of the concern that livestock producers and grain growers have registered with respect to actions of our Secretary against Agriculture and the President to depress farm prices. I pointed out that these actions were very unfair and discriminatory because it is apparent that a rise in farm prices was singled out as the chief cause of the inflationary spiral in the cost of living. Nothing could be further from the truth, and farmers everywhere are very resentful of this charge.

As I pointed out the other day, 40 Members of the House sent a telegram to the President detailing the actions and directives to various departments of Government to bring down farm prices. This complaint to the President was sent last Friday—it must have struck home because according to today's Washington Post, the Secretary against agriculture yesterday recommended to the Defense Department a resumption of purchases of ham and bacon and other pork products to feed the troops. It was only a couple of months ago that Mr. Freeman had requested the Defense Department to cut purchases of these products by 50 percent in order to bring down the price of hogs.

Also, our Secretary against agriculture insisted that farm prices are not inflationary—according to the Washington Post article. What a sudden reversal of position because in March he intimated that he took pleasure in announcing a decline in farm prices and that they would continue to decline during the months ahead.

Further evidence that our telegram to the President was on the mark is a report that on Saturday, the day after the telegram was sent, there was a high level meeting held by the Vice President, the Secretary against agriculture, the Under Secretary against agriculture, Mr. Schnittker, and others at the request of the President to consider what to do next. Now it seems apparent that our Secretary against agriculture has been told "Whoa, back up." I might add, "Be careful Mr. Secretary, your slip is showing."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of the wire which was sent to the President and a copy of the Washington Post article dated May 4, 1966, "Freeman Urges Pentagon To Reconsider Buying Cuts":

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Your recent actions directed at American farmers and ranchers taken through Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, Secretary of Commerce Connor, and Mr. Gardner Ackley have done and will do little to lower consumer food prices, but will insure financial hardship for many farm families.

Over the years attempts to bolster farm prices have led to large and costly farm programs. Now that farm prices have risen somewhat, you act to undermine the very thing we seek. The actions you have ordered taken:

1. Dumped huge quantities of Government-held stocks of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum at cut-rate prices in order to force compliance with the wheat and feed grain programs and to overexpand livestock productions.

2. Initiated an incentive program for soybeans in order to create a surplus and force down market prices.

3. Ordered an increase in the import quota for cheddar cheeses.

4. Ordered the Department of Defense to substitute margarine for butter and initiated a margarine purchase program for relief donations in place of butter.

5. Ordered the Department of Defense to cut the use of pork by one-half, and authorized the purchase of meat in foreign countries for our military establishments abroad.

6. Directed the Department of Commerce to limit the exports of cattle hides and skins.

7. Made large payments to cotton textile manufacturers to offset a part of the market price for cotton, but let them increase prices of textile goods.

These actions will directly lower prices to farmers, but will not result in significantly lower consumer prices. Depressing farm prices only worsens the farmer's already tight cost-price squeeze. No effective Government action is taken to curb the increasing cost of items farmers must buy to produce our food.

Mr. President, this policy is totally discriminatory against an important segment of our economy gravely injuring a $42 billion industry.

JOE SKUBITZ, ANCHER NELSEN, BOB DOLE, CATHERINE MAY, DURWARD G. HALL, H. R. GROSS, ALBERT QUIE, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, GEORGE HANSEN, E. ROSS ADAIR, CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., JAMES B. UTT, CHESTER MIZE, JOHN ASHBROOK.

GERALD FORD, LESLIE ARENDS, MELVIN R. LAIRD, JOHN BYRNES, E. A. CEDERBERG, GLENN CUNNINGHAM, RALPH HARVEY, GARNER E. SHRIVER, JOHN ANDERSON, MARK ANDREWS, DON CLAUSEN, GLENN R. DAVIS, ROGERS MORTON.

CHARLES HALLECK, FRANK BOW, PAGE BELCHER, ODIN LANGEN, DELBERT LATTA, BEN REIFEL, E. Y. BERRY, PAUL FINDLEY, LAURENCE BURTON, JAMES F. BATTIN, DAVE MARTIN, ROBERT ELLSWORTH, RICHARD ROUDEBUSH.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 9, 1966.

Hon. JOE SKUBITZ,
Washington, D.C.:

Your recent wire to the President offers an opportunity to look once again at the remarkably successful record of U.S. agriculture. I welcome the opportunity and thank you for it.

All Americans can be proud of our farmers and their awesome ability to overcome drought, hail, flood, wind, and other vagaries of nature and to produce the most abundant and nutritious supply of food in history.

Those in other countries—friend and foe alike—stand in awe, envy, and thankfulness too that our farmers are able to feed this Nation superbly and yet to produce enough in addition for hungry mouths all over the globe.

The American farmer, working with this administration and a majority of the Congress, has acted these past 5 years to develop farm programs that have brought about amazing results.

It is dramatic and exciting, when you look back at the dismal state of agriculture at the end of the 1950's, to compare today—1966—with 1960.

Gross farm income is up nearly $10 billion.

Net farm income is up nearly $3.5 billion.

Net income per farm is up more than 50 percent.

Per capita farm income is up 50 percent.

Major farm prices are up:

Beef steers and heifers up $2.10 per hundredweight since 1960.

Hogs up $9 since 1960.

Corn up 12 cents a bushel since 1960.

Soybeans up 72 cents a bushel since 1960.

Manufacturing milk up 52 cents per hundredweight since 1960.

Eggs up 9 cents a dozen since 1960.

Acreages of rice, soybeans, barley, and wheat are up. A 15-percent wheat acreage increase has been announced for 1967.

Loans to rural electric and telephone systems are up 26 percent.

Exports are up to the highest point in industry.

Loans to rural families and rural communities to improve their way of life are up from $300 million to $1 billion.

A few things are down. They are:

SURPLUSES

Taxpayer costs for storage and handling of surpluses.

The percentage of take-home pay needed to buy food.

And, the public standing of those who opposed the farmer, the Congress, and the administration in building this record of farming success.

This administration's unexampled record of success in agriculture is essentially the result of five major legislative acts since 1960. The 40 Members of Congress who signed the wire to the President had an opportunity to cast nearly 200 votes, in total, in support of these important bills for the farmer. However, with 200 chances to help the farmer, you voted "yes" only 27 times in all. A mere 13 percent of your votes for the farmer—87 percent against him.

That is not a record to write home about. Not if you have farmers in your home district.

Yet you said, in your message to the President, that the administration "acts to undermine the very thing we seek."

Obviously you don't seek the positive gains accomplished by the legislation you rejected—the higher farm income and higher farm prices, greater farm acreage, increased agricultural exports, and all the other benefits for the farmer.

What do you seek?

You complained about "dumping" stocks of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum. Certainly you know that we sold these grains to meet domestic and world needs. Storage costs were lessened, and farmers' prices remained well above support levels. This was not true before 1960.

You charged erroneously that we raised the support price for soybeans "in order to create a surplus and force down market prices." Certainly you know that our soybean stocks are down to a 3-week supply, and the price of soybeans has gone up 10 to 20 cents a bushel since the announcement.

What is it you seek? To build new surpluses of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum, and create artificial shortages of food for our people, and hold down exports?

Should incentives be denied for soybean production, thus creating a shortage and causing wild fluctuations in price—and profits for speculators? Is that what you seek?

American agriculture has experienced an unprecedented period of progress in the period 1961–66. The income gap between farmers and nonfarmers has narrowed by nearly 20 percent since 1960. Even so, farmers have a long way to go before achieving income parity.

And it is the continuing objective of this administration to keep agriculture on the rise.

Let me tell you what we seek.

We seek your support in this effort.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

MAY 12, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House
Washington, D.C.:

While you were absent from Washington, we received a 7 page telegram from Secretary Freeman purporting to be an answer to our telegram to you dated April 29, concerning specific actions taken or directed by you to lower farm prices in 1966.

We note with interest that Secretary Freeman studiously avoided the major points in our earlier telegram with his 7 pages of propaganda costing taxpayers an estimated $2,400. We note with interest that your reaction has been to announce steps to rescind one of your earlier ill-advised actions to force down farm prices. Your Secretary fails to discuss these actions by trying to divert attention with some highly selective comparisons of 1966 and 1960.

We agree that our farmers and ranchers have done an outstanding job of supplying the nation and the world with low cost food and fiber despite the handicaps imposed by your Secretary of Agriculture in his attempts to control their operations. Gross production and sales of farm products have increased to meet expanding demand; production of wheat and feed grains set a new record high in 1965, although the government has paid out increasing billions of dollars in an attempt to purchase a reduction in these crops. We note that CCC realized losses in fiscal 1965 totaled $5.2 billion compared with $3.3 billion in fiscal 1960. Thus we wonder how a slight decline in CCC storage and handling costs can be so important.

With respect to net farm income, we note that the estimated increase of $3.5 billion for 1966 is just equal to the expected total payment to farmers out of the Treasury. Also, we note that gross income, including government payments amounting to $2.5 billion, from the controlled crops in 1965, declined slightly while that from uncontrolled crops, livestock and products with no government payments increased by $2.5 billion; therefore, you can sense our concern when you direct actions to reduce farmers' prices of these products in 1966.

As for average per farm income, we note that about one-half of the reported increase since 1960 is due to a decline of 700,000 in the number of farms. We wonder how the farmers who have been forced off their land are enjoying the reported increase in income.

We are pleased that your Secretary admits that prices of livestock and a number of crops are up and we hope that he now will stop all actions to beat them down. He should recognize that market forces, which may be alien to him, are functioning and that attempts at governmental interference are dangerous. We believe there is no substitute for the profit incentive to farmers in the market system. It is noteworthy that an increase in foreign demand has been the major factor reducing surpluses of grains—not the costly attempts at supply management; on the other hand, the loss of foreign outlets for cotton has been the major factor in increasing the cotton surplus.

We cannot conceive of an increase in farmers' indebtedness, either to the government or otherwise, as being an improvement. We do note that the total farm debt has increased by 50 percent since 1960 and assume it is due to the ever-increasing costs of operations which reached an all-time record high in April 1966.

As for our voting record, we stand on our record in opposition to efforts to regiment and control our farmers and we believe that the results of the wheat and turkey referenda proved that ours have been votes with our farmers.

We note with approval that you have seen fit to order the Secretary of Defense to resume the purchases of pork for our troops. Your acceptance of the views expressed by many of us that wheat allotments should be increased will be beneficial to the farmers if properly programmed and administered. We hope that you will direct the agencies to improve further the lot of farmers and ranchers in the other areas we mentioned in our previous telegram by:

(1) Stopping the dumping of wheat and feed grains on the market at cutrate prices.

(2) Rescinding the order to increase the import quota on cheeses.

(3) Resuming the purchases of butter for the Air Force and Army and exercise the authority in the 1965 Act to purchase dairy products for relief donations.

(4) Stopping the purchases of meat abroad for the military establishments.

(5) Removing the export controls on hides and skins.

Gerald Ford, Les Arends, Odin Langen, Melvin R. Laird, John W. Byrnes, Charles Halleck, Frank T. Bow, Albert Quie, Ancher Nelsen, Robert Dole, Charles M. Teague, Joe Skubitz, Catherine May, John Anderson, Dave Martin, E. A. Cederberg, Laurence Burton, Durward Hall, Don Clausen, Chet Mize, George Hansen, E. Ross Adair, John Duncan, Glenn Andrews, Clark MacGregor, William H. Harsha, William L. Dickinson, Jackson E. Betts, Wm. N. McCulloch.

Ralph Harvey, Glenn Cunningham, Delbert Latta, Clarence Brown, Bob Ellsworth, Ben Reifel, James F. Battin, E. Y. Berry, H. R. Gross, Page Belcher, John Ashbrook, Paul Findley, Jack Edwards, Garner Shriver, James B. Utt, Glenn R. Davis, Rogers Morton, Richard Roudebush, Mark Andrews, W. E. Brock, Members of Congress.

(This telegram is paid for in cash by the above-mentioned signers, not at Government expense.)

DIVIDING THE PIE DURING THE BOOM

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Marquis Childs would indicate that while the American housewife is worrying about the increased costs of bread, meat, and milk, the American businessman has something else on his mind. The article by Mr. Childs speaks for itself:

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1966]

Dividing the Pie During the Boom

(By Marquis Childs)

As related by his loyal lieutenant Sherman Adams, President Eisenhower once asked his Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, if it were not possible for American businessmen to make some sacrifices in the interest of world peace. In his Firsthand Report, an account of the Eisenhower years, Adams reports the following:

" 'No,' Humphrey replied candidly. 'The American businessman believes in getting as much as he can while the getting is good.'

" 'Maybe that's the trouble with businessmen, George,' Eisenhower said seriously."

The Humphrey candor, reflecting his own capacity as a leading industrialist to get it while the getting was good, is recalled by the earnest plea of Chairman Gardner Ackley of the Council of Economic Advisers to the United States Chamber of Commerce. Recounting the record profits of the past year or more, Ackley asked the assembled businessmen to consider whether they were doing all they could to fight inflation. Does anyone, he asked, imagine that labor will continue to show moderation in its wage demands when prices and profits are continually rising?

The Ackley exhortation was received politely by the business community. But skeptics are saying that, in the immortal words of Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen, his homily will have all the impact of a snowflake falling on the broad bosom of the Potomac River.

Increasingly within the Administration, however, the issue of profits versus wages is a cause for concern. The AFL-CIO has blasted the Johnson hold-fast line with George Meany's declaration that organized labor is not tied to the Democratic Party. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and others participating in the session of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy are acutely aware that wages have not kept pace with prices and, therefore, the 3.2 percent guideline must be modified.

But how to modify it without opening the flood gates to new demands is the problem. Ackley referred to the Wall Street Journal's tabulation showing profits in the first three months of this year up 12 percent over the same period in 1965.

As the Journal's account indicated if steel and autos were omitted—because of special circumstances they did not share in the big upswing—the increase would be 18 instead of 12 percent. Broken down by separate industries, the gains are even more remarkable. Railroads showed an increase of 103.8 percent, building supplies 42.4, publishing companies 55.7, airlines 26.3, aircraft makers 25.1, tools and machinery 38.3.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council, meeting in Florida in February, released a report charging that over the past decade there has been a continual shift away from wage and salary earners "to other groups in the economy." As proof of this shortchange, the report said that while output per man-hour had been rising at the rate of 3.6 percent, the employee's compensation per hour had increased only 2.9 percent.

The showdown may come in the only big union-industry contract to be resolved this year. General Electric and Westinghouse, the giants in the industry, face new contract demands from unions more united than in the recent past. A strike in August when the present contract expires would dramatize labor's claims to a bigger share in the becoming economy. The Wall Street Journal's tabulation showed profits of electrical companies up 20.7 percent.

Taxes are another sore point with organized labor; and if the White House concludes that a tax increase is necessary, the form that increase takes can be a major issue in the fall elections. With the 7 percent investment credit and the change in the depreciation rate imposed under the Kennedy Administration, plus the reduction in corporate taxes from 52 to 48 percent in the Johnson tax bill, business has had a cut of $7 billion, labor economists say. A straight across-the-board tax cut, as advocated by Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, would draw cries of rage from the unions.

The AFL–CIO report cited the profits of General Motors—$2.1 billion after taxes in 1965, up 23 percent from 1964.

But what has been happening to GM, with production slowed and the resulting earthquake on the stock market, indicates the edge may be off the boom. Chairman Martin a year ago suggested parallels between 1929 and the collapse of that boom and 1965. If this is true, labor is saying, it means business got too much while the getting was good and the worker who has the buying power too little.

THE POLISH MILLENNIUM, 966–1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this year Poland is celebrating the 1,000th anniversary of its nationhood, as well as the 1,000th year as a Christian nation.

The survival of both is something of a miracle. During the first three centuries of its existence as a sovereign state, Poland was invaded by German princes from the west and the eastern Slavs and Mongol tribes from the east. Time after time foreign invaders galloped across the great plain, ravished the farms of the poor Polish peasants, and reduced the nation to near anarchy. Finally, in 1386 a Polish-Lithuanian federal union was created. The alliance of the two medieval powers effectively halted the invasions of their common enemies and by the middle of the 16th century, the unparalleled economic and cultural advances in Poland had produced what today's Polish historians have heralded as a "golden age."

Unfortunately, the flat topography of Poland still provided an open invitation to outside invaders. A new series of invasions by a variety of foreign foes gradually weakened the once proud power. By the end of the 18th century, Poland had been partitioned among the great powers of central Europe—Russia, Prussia, and Austria—three times. The last partition, which took place in 1795, led to what many thought was the final demise of Poland as a sovereign nation.

Although Poland remained divided among the three Central Powers until after World War I, the national spirit of the Polish people remained very much alive. Insurrections occurred against the czarist rule in 1830, and then 30 years later in 1863. Far from being integrated into the empires of their conquerors, the Poles grew more and more restive as the years passed.

The First World War and the collapse of the Central Powers once again opened the flood gates of Polish nationalism. Poland, along with the other smaller states of Eastern Europe, was once again granted her full independence and status as a sovereign nation under the terms of the postwar settlement. For 20 years Poland enjoyed her independence. Then, in 1938, her Eastern European neighbor, Czechoslovakia, was gobbled up by a new kind of expansionist empire, the growing war machine of Adolf Hitler's Germany. Poland was to be next. The Polish foreign minister was summoned and told that Hitler demanded Danzig. Poland, however, would not submit to the intimidation. On September 1, 1939, artillery shells fell on Danzig, and once again Poland was about to be partitioned by Russia and Germany. Now she was the victim of a new breed of empire builders, the totalitarian systems of communism and national socialism.

The First World War liberated a captive Polish nation; the Second World War resulted in the captivity of an independent Poland. Russian armies were the first to liberate the Poles from the Nazis. Almost immediately, the liberators became the new captors. Today the Polish nation remains united, but the Government is foreign to the people and hostile to their traditions.

The condition of Christianity in Poland also remains under the dark cloud of foreign oppression. Since the conversion of Duke Mieszko I in 966, Polish Christians have had to withstand the invasions of innumerable alien dogmas; however, none has been quite so oppressive as the pressure of the secular religion of its present masters, the rigid dogma of modern communism. The very practice of Christian worship, as the growing spirit of nationality, has become a symbol of the open defiance of Poland's Russian Communist masters.

The defiance of its foreign masters has not been without some success for the Poles. Today the flame of nationalism and the spirit of Christian reverence and brotherhood is beginning to glow more and more brightly in Poland, despite the harshest efforts of the Communist functionaries. Poland is not yet completely free again, and Christianity still suffers from the oppression of communism. Nevertheless, the millennium is proof that neither can ever be completely crushed in Poland. Those who know the spirit of national unity that exists in Poland, those who know the place of Christianity in the Polish spirit, know that someday Poland will again stand as a completely free and independent Christian nation.

For my part, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Polish people on their first 1,000 years as a Christian nation and wish them a happier future in their second millennium.

POVERTY IN TEXAS

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Herman P. Miller in his book "Rich Man Poor Man," concludes from a study of national statistical data that the following conditions accompany high rates of poverty: old age, broken homes, unemployment and unskilled employment, and nonwhite race. If we added persons of Mexican descent to this list we would have a pretty good idea of the factors involved in the Southwest and in Texas.

The figures according to the 1960 census are these: of the 9,626,000 families having incomes less than $3,000, 688,000 were living in Texas. In other words, while 21.4 percent of all American families were living in poverty, in Texas 28.8 percent of the families were living in poverty.

In his 1964 economic report, President Johnson contrasted the high standard of living which most Americans enjoy with the poverty under which millions suffer. The President said:

> We cannot and need not wait for the gradual growth of the economy to lift this forgotten fifth of our Nation above the poverty line. We know what must be done, and this Nation of Abundance can surely afford to do it.

The President talked about the forgotten fifth of the Nation living in poverty. But in Texas there are more than a forgotten fifth. There are a forgotten fourth. To repeat, 28.8 percent of the families in Texas are living in poverty.

The problems of poverty in Texas are both rural and urban. My own city of San Antonio suffers badly from this malady. San Antonio, a city of about 700,000 people, is located in Bexar County. The proportion of families earning less than $3,000 per year is 27.2 percent, slightly less than the statewide proportion but substantially more than the national proportion.

Yet, the rural areas are even worse off than the urban areas in Texas. While the figures for families living in poverty in cities in Texas are 426,000 or 23.8 percent, the figures for families living in poverty in the rural areas are 261,000 or 43.5 percent. Almost twice the incidence of poverty is found in the rural areas than is found in the urban areas.

The geographical distribution of poverty shows that it is most highly concentrated in the east Texas and south Texas areas. This should come as no surprise since the great majority of Negroes live in east Texas and the great majority of persons of Mexican descent live in south Texas. But if we were to take a map of the State and color each of the 254 counties in various shades of black or gray depending upon the proportion of families living in poverty a surprising thing would emerge. In 63, more than one-fourth, of the counties more than 50 percent of the families are living in poverty. In 89 of the counties, 25 percent of all Texas counties, more than 35 percent of the families are living in poverty. In 76 of the counties more than 20 percent of the families are living in poverty. In only 26 counties, 10 percent of the total Texas counties, do the families living in poverty constitute less than 20 percent of all families living in those counties.

That is to say, the map of Texas would look like a great almost all-encompassing mass of grays and blacks, with a few whites dotting the picture here and there, were we to color in the counties in accordance with the incidences of poverty. We talk of pockets of poverty in America. But in Texas there are only pools of prosperity in a vast sea of poverty.

The factors listed by Miller in "Rich Man Poor Man" hold true for Texas, with the addition I indicated, persons of Mexican descent. This indeed is the conclusion of William P. Kuvlesky and David E. Wright in their 1965 study, the most comprehensive study of poverty in Texas to date, "Poverty in Texas: The Distribution of Low Income Families." Kuvlesky and Wright say in their report:

> It can be generally observed that in counties which had high levels of poverty there were above average proportions of elderly, non-whites, and Spanish-speaking persons—often these counties were above the state average in 2, or even all 3 minority groups.

To illustrate further the concentration of poverty in the area in which San Antonio is located, south Texas, let me give these few additional statistics. In the 28 counties of south Texas there were 1,662,272 persons at the time of the 1960 census. About 616,000 of these people were living in poverty. More than 37 percent of the population of south Texas are living in poverty. And further, it was estimated by the census that 400,000 of south Texas have family incomes of less than $2,000. I want to repeat that fact because if those listening to this speech have not yet been moved they must have leaden hearts not to feel any impact from the knowledge that 400,000 persons in South Texas have family incomes of less than $2,000. This is the reason why when I voted for the Appalachia program last year I made a speech on the floor of this House urging my colleagues to look at south Texas where a comprehensive program of Federal assistance on a regional basis was needed as desperately as any other area of the Nation.

I will dwell a little longer on the poverty in Texas to mention an area in my district. It is a relatively small community called Villa Coronado. Part of it lies in the San Antonio city limits. Most of it lies outside the city but within the county. Several thousand persons live there, although no one knows the exact figure. In 1964 a survey of Villa Coronado was conducted by the National Council for the Spanish Speaking. More than 1,500 persons were visited by the study group. The figures that were gathered would rival any other similar sized community in the Nation, if not in the hemisphere, for the abject deep-rooted poverty revealed:

More than 39 percent of the persons living in Villa Coronado were found to be unemployed. The average income of those employed was $37.85. Twenty percent of the residents could not read or write in either Spanish or English.

Of the 275 homes visited, 157 had no bath facilities; 12 had no electricity; 46 had no running water; 1 had a hand pump; there were no sewage facilities; there was no garbage collection; there was no public transportation; there was no fire station; there was no drugstore; there were no medical facilities; there were no schools; and there were no recreational facilities.

The families are all of Mexican descent. Many of them if not most of them are migrant farm workers. In some of the homes as many as 22 persons were living in 3 rooms at the time of the study. Some of the families survived by selling junk. Many of the residents need medical care, especially the children.

Villa Coronado is an extreme case of an entire community living in poverty. But there are conditions equally grave throughout the Southwest. Last year there was a National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest. More than 2,000 persons attended the conference, held in Tucson, Ariz., included Vice President HUMPHREY and Sargent Shriver, both of whom gave speeches. The director of the Social Services Department of the Bexar County Hospital District, Mrs. Vera Burke, also spoke. Her speech has been called a grave indictment of medical and social welfare conditions in San Antonio and Texas.

She said that mothers getting aid to 4 dependent children who are under 16 years of age get only $115 per month from the aid to dependent children program. She attributed this subsistence level of support to the high incidence of hospitalized children suffering from malnutrition and diarrhea. She said that these illnesses are usually associated with underdeveloped countries.

At that conference the staff director for the Dallas County Department of Public Welfare also spoke. He said that the State of Texas has no general assistance program for the poor, and that as a State Texas ranks 34th in old-age assistance payments, an average of $70.24 per month; 45th in aid to the permanently and totally disabled, $57.24 per month; 42d in aid to the blind, $69.39 per month; and, 45th in aid to dependent children, $81.73 per month.

Another speaker pointed out that 300,000 people were living in poverty in the city of Houston. Another speaker, Marion Cline, assistant professor of education at Texas Western College in El Paso, said that 70 percent of the students of Mexican descent in El Paso drop out of school before high school graduation.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE SOUTHWEST

The discrimination against Negroes in the South and the de facto segregation of the North and the East is well known and has been well documented. In the Southwest we are richly endowed with both forms of irrational bigotry. But the case has not been so well documented and it is not so well known.

For example, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission has yet to make a comprehensive study or publish a report on discrimination in Texas or the Southwest. Two of its reports bear on the subject. One I have already referred to, the staff report on the public schools in Texas. Another, mentions Texas, the report on equal opportunity in farm programs in the South. But neither one deals with the person of Mexican descent. Both refer exclusively to the problems of Negroes.

Yet discrimination against the person of Mexican descent as well as against the Negro exists.

De facto segregation in the public schools and in residential communities is common in Texas. In a speech delivered in 1963 at the 25th annual convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society, Prof. Donald N. Barrett of the University of Notre Dame said that, "Mexican, Spanish-American, and others are considerably lower than Anglo and Negro in education, housing, occupation," and that there was "extensive discrimination against the Spanish speaking" in the United States. He said that the people in this group "pay more for less adequate housing than Anglo or non-white." These observations are not inconsistent with my own.

What is the extent of discrimination in the Southwest? Studies have just not been done. It would be extremely useful to have them.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at some length because the problems I have outlined are of deep concern to me. Any reasonable man with a soul who has seen these conditions must be moved to speak out or do something. All my life I have struggled against the forces of poverty and discrimination. It is fitting that this Congress take note of the problems of the Southwest. It would be more fitting if it took action.

The action that I believe needs to be taken must come in the form of a sustained, comprehensive attack on a regional basis. In many ways we are fortunate in the Southwest. Megalopolis has not yet engulfed us. We can still create a balanced economy with proper urban and rural components. But we need to act soon for the sake of millions of fellow Americans. I hope to speak further on this subject.

CONTIGUOUS FISHERIES ZONE

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1703, the Dutch jurist Bynkershoek suggested that the width of a nation's coastal belt should be determined by the range of a cannon shot. One hundred years later, as a result of tests done by the Navy, the U.S. coastal range was set at 3 miles because that was the shore cannon range. Beyond that range, jurisdiction ended. Thus the position established by Thomas Jefferson in 1793—that the 3-mile coastal range constituted the scope of the U.S. territorial waters—was upheld. And it has remained unaltered to this day.

For navigational purposes, the 2-mile coastal range marks the imaginary line separating international and inland rules of the road. For fishing purposes, the 3-mile coastal range marks the end of our jurisdiction over foreign fishermen who are exploiting our coastal waters of their fishing stocks.

Mr. Speaker, the status of our fishing industry is such that it demands extension of the 3-mile limit for purposes of conservation and to enhance the much needed development of our own fishing industry. Since 1957, the United States has dropped from second to fifth place among the nations in total world catch while Peru, increasing its output 140 times since 1948, now is the world's leader. In 1950, the United States accounted for 13 percent of the world's catch. In 1963, we accounted for less than 6 percent. And this sharp decrease in output, Mr. Speaker, has occurred in the midst of a rapidly growing worldwide demand for fish.

In 1962, about 33 million metric tons, live weight, of fish were caught for food use. By 1970, the demand may be between 40 and 45 million tons. In addition to this, large quantities of fish are caught for reduction purposes—e.g., to be used as feed for farm animals. This also has been growing at an extremely rapid rate. By 1970, the total world demand for fish for all purposes may be between 52 and 72 million tons.

In other words, while the world demand for fish has increased, we have failed to develop our fishing industry in accordance with this demand and have allowed the rapidly developing foreign fishing fleets to come within 3 miles of our coast to gather their catch, which in many cases, have in turn been sold back to us because we import approximately 50 percent of the edible fish consumed in the United States.

Why do we persist in maintaining a 3-mile limit? Is it because this is the limit traditionally held by the majority of nations and therefore we do not wish to disrupt what is commonly regarded as an internationally fixed limit?

Let us examine this view. At a conference called by the League of Nations in 1930, more countries favored the 3-mile limit than any other distance but a large number of other widths were claimed. However, at the 1958 Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea, only 23 of the 86 nations represented claimed a 3-mile territorial sea. Therefore, to invoke the majority principle in arguing for the retention of a 3-mile limit is impossible.

Mr. Speaker, there is no uniformity in the territorial sea nor fishing claims established by the various countries of the world. Let us look to our neighbors: Canada claims a 12-mile limit while Mexico claims a 9-mile limit. Scanning across the globe, we find that Albania has a 10-mile limit; Cambodia, 5 miles; Iceland, 4 miles; Korea, 20 miles, and Costa Rica has 200 miles. Many nations have territorial limitations and fishing zones—for example, South Africa maintains a 6-mile territorial sea and a 12-mile fishing zone.

Realizing the lack of uniformity, the United States during the 1958 Geneva Convention proposed a 6-mile territorial sea plus an adjoining 6-mile exclusive fishing belt plus access to nations with historic rights. This proposal or any other proposal for uniformity failed to meet the approval of the majority of the nations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in view of the lack of a uniform worldwide criteria, the growing number of nations who are extending their territorial waters and fishing zones, the growing world demand for fish, the growing infringement upon our territorial waters by foreign fishermen, and the diminishing status of the American fishing industry, I propose at this time to introduce a bill to establish a contiguous fisheries zone of 9 miles beyond the territorial sea, extending 3 miles from the coast of the United States.

It is anticipated that this legislation will serve to: first, protect our fishermen from foreign fishermen operating in our coastal waters; second, enhance our fishermen to extend their operations and further develop the fishing industry as a whole; and, third, enable us to exercise conservative measures in the highly productive but not inexhaustible coastal waters.

NORMAN HEGELUND CITED FOR HEROIC ACTION

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow a 13-year-old constituent of mine, Norman Hegelund of St. Clair Shores, Mich., will be among 12 youngsters who will receive gold lifesaver medals from the American Automobile Association. The presentations of the medals will be made by Vice President Humphrey in ceremonies here at the Capitol.

The 12 boys and girls, who are members of school safety patrols, are being honored for actions which resulted in preventing serious injuries to their schoolmates. The following is the citation for my constituent, Norman Hegelund, who attends Trinity Lutheran School in Mount Clemens, Mich.:

Medal Citation

Lyle Koch, age 6, had pushed his bicycle past the outstretched arms of Patrol Member Norman Hegelund and around a group of children waiting to cross the busy intersection of Farmcrest and Harper Avenue. When the youngster started to run across the street into the paths of two fast-moving cars, Norman immediately recognized the danger and acted instinctively and courageously. He ran into the roadway without thought of self, and pulled the boy and his bicycle back to safety.

Norman is the son of Mr. and Mrs. William Hegelund, 23617 Elmira Street, St. Clair Shores, Mich.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to extend my congratulations to my young constituent, as well as to the others who are being honored for their actions. Norman's parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Hegelund of St. Clair Shores, have reason to be very proud of their son as he receives his lifesaver medal.

For the information of Members of Congress, I am including as part of my remarks at this point in the Record information supplied by the American Automobile Association about the history of the school safety patrol and the lifesaver medal award. I also ask that a press release announcing tomorrow's presentations be printed as part of my remarks.

School Safety Patrol History

The School Safety Patrol movement has grown tremendously since its origin in the early 1920's. Today, it is a national institution—a vital force in the important work of protecting America's children from the hazards of modern traffic. More than 900,000 boy and girl Patrol Members in the United States daily help to protect millions of children enrolled in thousands of elementary schools. In cities and towns, in rural areas, and on school buses, the School Safety Patrol serves to remind school children of hazards of street and highway crossings on their way to and from school. This "nation on wheels" can well be proud of the work that these young citizens are doing.

Educators regard the Patrol movement as an excellent school activity, as well as a method to help develop a sense of responsibility, character, and positive usefulness for community living. Commendation for Patrol work is universal. It comes from parents, educators, police, and other outstanding public officials.

While it is obviously impossible to set any precise figures on the lifesaving results of School Safety Patrol work, it is certain that this movement has been partly responsible for the improvement of the traffic death rate of children 5 to 14 years of age. Since 1922, the traffic death rate for this group has continued to decrease to nearly one-half, while the death rate of other age groups has practically doubled.

LIFESAVER MEDAL

The American Automobile Association and affiliated Automobile Clubs inaugurated the AAA Gold Lifesaver Medal Award in 1949. Yearly, the President of the AAA appoints a Medal Award Board and authorizes the members to select Patrol Members whose traffic lifesaving acts have saved the life of persons in imminent vehicular traffic danger.

In the years of this honor award program, beginning in 1949, the brief summary following explains the considerations given by the Board: Recommendations submitted, 237; medal awarded, 125. Seventy-four cities in 25 states have been represented.

Presentation of the award is made annually by outstanding national leaders. It has been the good fortune of recipients to have been decorated for their valor by: the President of the United States, the Vice-President, Cabinet officers, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and top leaders of the United States Armed Forces.

Vice-President Humphrey To Present AAA Lifesaver Medals to Patrol Heroes

Washington, D.C., May 5.—Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey will present AAA Gold Lifesaver Medals on Friday, May 13, to twelve young School Safety Patrol heroes who have actually saved lives of schoolmates in traffic incidents, according to the American Automobile Association.

The presentation ceremony, which will be held at 10 a.m. in the U.S. Capitol, is the highlight of a festival week in Washington honoring the nation's more than 900,000 Safety Patrols.

Mr. Humphrey will also serve as the Honorary Grand Marshall of the 30th National School Safety Patrol Parade, which will be held on the following day, Saturday, May 14. Some 22,000 boys and girls from 22 states and the District of Colubmia will march down Constitution Avenue in the mammoth spectacle.

The week of May 8 through 14 has been designated as "National School Safety Patrol Week" in a joint resolution which has been passed by the Congress and now awaits President Johnson's signature.

Safety Patrol heroes who will receive AAA Gold Lifesaver Medals from Vice-President Humphrey are:

Debbie Sue Banion, 12, of Kansas City, Mo.; Robert Conley, 12, of Dearborn, Mich.; Thomas D. DiBlasi, 12, of Cambridge, Mass.; Johnnie Ewing, 13, of Niagara Falls, N.Y.; Brad William Farnsworth, 11, of Norfolk, Va.; Darrell Gorenflo, 11, of Marion, Ohio; Norman Hegelund, 13, of St. Clair Shores, Mich.; Amy L. LaFraniere, 11, of Cleveland, Ohio; Alfred LaPan, 11, of Bay City, Mich.; Sam Moschella, 13, of Brooklyn, N.Y.; Michael David Munns, 11, of North Little Rock, Ark.; and John P. Weaver, 11 of Manheim, Pa.

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE SALARIES OF POLICE AND FIREMEN OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join many of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to increase the salaries of the police and firemen of the Nation's Capital.

We cannot expect the Metropolitan Police Department to attract capable young men to their ranks when the beginning salary is less than that for beginning policemen in 65 other cities in the United States. If the District is to become a city whose streets are safe to walk at night we must provide a pay scale that is appealing and practical.

To increase the policeman's pay 3.6 percent retroactive as of October 1, 1965, and to again increase it 2.6 percent on July 1, 1966 is a step in the right direction. This 6.2-percent increase would enable the Metropolitan Police Department to compete with other areas in the recruiting of capable young men and provide a decent wage to competent professionals who risk their lives to protect our property and lives.

Certainly the same statement equally applies to Washington firemen. The job of a fire fighter must be filled by able men willing to risk their lives to save others.

There is an urgent need to increase the lower salary brackets if the programs for better law enforcement and fire protection are not to flounder for lack of recruits or from the loss of these new men after training.

Apprentice bricklayers are being paid at $2.50 per hour and bus drivers at $3.18. The beginning pay for a policeman is only $2.40. The beginning District policemen are paid after taxes, less than a hundred dollars a week, perhaps to sacrifice their lives.

It should therefore be obvious that both our firemen and policemen deserve the 6.2-percent pay increase proposed by H.R. 13874.

WATERSHED PROJECTS CURB TEXAS FLOODS

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, once again the Department of Agriculture's upstream small watershed program has proved its effectiveness in curbing damaging floods and reducing erosion.

Last month between April 17 and 28, extremely heavy rains hit a large area of Texas with intensities ranging from 8 inches near Dublin to more than 25 inches in the Marshall-Gladewater area. Extensive flood damage occurred on both agricultural and urban areas. Damages to roads, bridges and utilities were high.

The Texas State Highway Department reported Wednesday that floods at the end of April did nearly $1 million damage to highways alone. The damage to county roads throughout the State was much higher.

Significant is this fact: Where the upstream watershed projects were completed or well underway, only minor flooding occurred. All the 1,100 floodwater retarding dams completed in the State's small watershed projects held back some floodwater.

In the north central and northeast portions of Texas where flood damages were greatest, 821 dams were in operation. Water runoff was so great in this area that the emergency spillways on 130 dams were put to use with water running as high as 2 feet in some of them.

All these structures stored at least a 25-year frequency storm runoff and functioned as planned. The other floodwater retarding structures in this area were filled from 50 to 95 percent of capacity.

Never before has the upstream watershed protection and flood prevention program in Texas been tested so extensively and thoroughly and never before has the proof of adequacy been so evident.

For example, total rainfall ranged from 8 to 18.5 inches over the Chambers and Richland Creek watersheds where project measures are still under construction.

Flood detention measures on the Richland Creek project presently control runoff from about 15 percent of the watershed and measures installed on the Chambers Creek project control runoff from 22 percent of the watershed.

Despite this partial protection, the flood prevention measures applied through local soil and water conservation districts in these two project areas reduced flood and erosion damages by more than $1 million.

Conservation practices on the land made a major contribution to reduced land and sediment damages to downstream areas. Along White Rock and Pinoak Creek—tributary of Richland Creek—and Onion Creek—tributary of Chambers Creek—where land treatment, floodwater retarding dams, and stream channel improvements have been established, runoff from the rainstorm was confined to the channel. Untreated adjacent watersheds suffered tremendous flood damages.

Mr. Rip Boetler, Johnson County commissioner, reported that none of the bridges in his precinct located in areas protected by flood prevention measures were damaged while five bridges were lost in areas not protected.

In another watershed project area—Tehuacana Creek located east of Waco—where 13 of the 30 planned floodwater dams have been constructed, flood damages were reduced by more than $200,000.

In the Cow Bayou watershed, a completed pilot project, the upland conservation practices on 11 critical areas and the 29 floodwater dams kept the heavy rains under control and prevented all flood damage.

There is no doubt in my mind that the small watershed program—Public Law 566—is one of the most effective tools in resource conservation. Congress can well be proud of its continuous support of this significant approach to natural resource management.

NASSER'S RECKLESSNESS THREATENS WORLD PEACE

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in the tinderbox that is the Middle East, fiery words and reckless actions could ignite a world conflagration, threatening the lives of all of us. It is just such fiery words and reckless actions which have characterized the recent conduct of Egypt's dictator. Gamal Abdel Nasser has been threatening preventive war against the State of Israel, continuing military adventures in the state of Yemen, and threatening to seize parts of Saudi Arabia. This man must be stopped before he is responsible for the deaths of millions.

If this statement sounds alarmist to you, I ask you to consider the situation in which Nasser's paranoiac actions are taking place. Here's how the independent rightwing Arab newspaper Al Jarida of Beirut reported the comments of "a qualified military source" on Nasser's preventive war threat against Israel:

> How can Egypt launch its preventive war? It is known that the Israeli radar opposite Egyptian frontiers would be unable to detect Egyptian aircraft approaching at an altitude of 100 meters. The distance between the border and Demona station (where an atomic reactor is located in Israel) is only 120 kilometers which takes only three minutes to reach by a plane. Israeli planes need about five minutes to be in the air and five more to reach Demona. This leaves seven minutes for Egyptian aircraft to hit and run, without combat with Israeli aircraft.[1]

This chilling analysis goes on to spell out the possible use of commandoes to destroy underground installations, the use of supporting artillery from Jordan, and the subsequent intervention of the United States with the 6th Fleet, after the damage had been done. It suggests that the Soviet Union would be likely to intervene on the side of the Arabs, with the United States merely preserving Israel border lines but not helping Israel to take revenge. The analysis concludes:

> The U.S. may even force Israel to accept certain conditions in an attempt to solve the Palestine question permanently, such as the partition plan. In any case, Israel would be the loser.

I personally have no great faith in the ability of anyone to predict the course of a war in advance. Many military analysts gravely underestimated what the tiny new State of Israel could do when it was attacked from all sides 18 years ago on gaining its independence. I call this grim analysis to your attention because I think it does bring home two things which are undeniable. The present policies of the United States do leave Israel facing grave peril. And, as a result of that, there is grave danger of head-on conflict of the great powers in the Middle East, threatening not only that area but the entire world.

This is hardly the situation one would like to be able to report as another year of Israel independence gets underway, with all its promise of continuing phenomenal progress in so many fields. But I think all of us who admire the achievements Israel has made since those heroic days when Israel independence was first proclaimed and defended, still realize that Israel's national security, then as now, must be the prime concern.

What can we do to further that security today against the threats of Nasser and the thrusts of other hostile Arab neighbors?

As many of you know, at the beginning of this year, I introduced a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 146, in the House of Representatives. It expresses the sense of the Congress that it would be in the interest of peace if the United States entered into a mutual defense treaty with Israel. Surely one effective thing our country can do is to remove any shadow of doubt that may exist in the minds of Nasser and his allies of our firm resolve and inflexible determination to protect Israel and to punish any aggressor, immediately, directly, and thoroughly. I urge approval of this resolution and the negotiation of such a treaty.

---

[1] The Arab World, February 22, 1966, p. 5.

We must also seek to strengthen Israel's own defenses against any demoniacal plots which Nasser contemplates. I was proud to join a number of my colleagues in the House of Representatives earlier this year in writing to Secretary of State Rusk to urge greater efforts by our Government in this regard. We wrote the Secretary that the arms buildup of the Arab countries is a direct result of the policies of Nasser, who has promised that a war with Israel is inevitable. We stated our belief that it is imperative that the United States take effective measures to strengthen Israel's defenses in order to deter those who menace her security.

I shall also work during the present session of the Congress to tighten up the provisions of our food distribution programs overseas. There must be no possibility that Nasser may indirectly use food intended for the needy as a method of devoting more resources to the production of products which he can then barter with the Soviet Union in exchange for arms. If clear guarantees cannot be given, then we must end all such assistance.

And I believe our Government should also make it clear that further dangerously belligerent words and actions of Gamal Abdel Nasser will bring about increasingly strong sanctions from this country, including the presentation of charges before the United Nations.

It is my fervent hope that through such firmness on our part we can help to assure peace in the Middle East as Israel begins her 19th year of independence. I am confident that in so doing we will be making a further contribution to the peace of the world as well.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, today we concluded hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the subject of traffic safety.

We have learned much and as a result of the testimony of a variety of competent witnesses we should be able to shape legislation which can result in the reduction of losses of life and property on our Nation's streets and highways.

Chairman STAGGERS is to be commended for having held these hearings before the full committee because of the magnitude of the problem and the complexity of it. I wish that every Member of this House could have sat with the committee.

Some of the testimony was so provocative and informative that I intend to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the convenience and information of all of the Members of Congress and citizens throughout our Nation.

Today I present the testimony of Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, and now at the Center for Advanced Research at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

This testimony is thought provoking and gives an interesting analysis of why we have failed to come to grips with this lethal problem in other years.

This testimony makes clear our duty to take advantage of our present opportunity to take effective action to build a safer traffic environment throughout our country.

His testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN, PREPARED FOR THE TRAFFIC SAFETY HEARINGS, OF THE COMMITTEE OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 1966.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third occasion on which I have appeared before members of this committee to testify on the subject of traffic safety. On two earlier occasions I had the honor to testify before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, then under the direction of your distinguished former colleague, Hon. Kenneth Roberts of Alabama, to whom the nation owes a great debt for having begun the systematic enquiry into this subject almost a decade ago.

It was a quality of those previous hearings that each year a comparatively small group would assemble and make essentially the same points, but no one was listening. That period is past. The message has gotten through. That being the case, I would like to address myself not so much to the subject of the safety of American motor vehicles, as to the larger question of how are we to use this opportunity.

A series of converging events make it likely that the United States is, at long last, going to come to terms with a gigantic domestic problem that has attracted enormous attention but almost no interest: traffic safety. It is not at all clear how much will be made of the present opportunity. But much more is at stake than is generally perceived. To grasp this, it is necessary to have some ideas of the dimensions and the ramifications of the problem.

Automobile injuries and deaths began to cause concern before the First World War. In the 1920's, when the automobile became a standard family possession, it also created what is by now an endemic public health problem. The National Health Survey indicates some 4 or 5 million persons are injured each year, involving perhaps 100,000 permanent disabilities. Another 50,000 injuries are fatal. In Korea the Air Force found that automobile injuries were generally more serious and required longer hospitalization than battle casualties. One can be fairly certain the same is true in Viet Nam.

The economic costs are considerable, of course. A disproportionate number of the persons killed or permanently disabled represent an almost complete loss on a heavy investment: they are persons with twenty years of nurture behind them and presumedly forty years of productive work ahead. The cost estimates are surpassingly fuzzy, but something like 2 percent of the Gross National Product seems about right, if property damage accidents are included.

Little attention has been given to the indirect social costs of traffic accidents, although these are probably the more serious ones. American adults probably have more direct relationship to government through the management of the motor vehicle system than in any other way. There are some 90,000,000 persons who are licensed to drive. Nothing like that number pay taxes, vote, engage in "participatory democracy," or know that the mainland of China is controlled by Communists. A driver's license is close to a necessity of life for many, perhaps most Americans, and the power of government to grant or deny it, or to suspend or withdraw it, is, of course, considerable. Oddly enough, it does not seem to have led to a very great deal of corruption—perhaps because it is so near to indispensable. It may be that corruption arises in areas where something more like privileges are dispensed. On the other hand, because the traffic laws are not observed, the system has made lawbreakers of just about everyone, and has resulted in the arrest and trial of vast numbers of persons. I should not be surprised if, as a consequence of the management of the system, the incidence of police arrest in American society is the highest of any in history. I am not clear that it is good for a society for the persons in it to become accustomed to being arrested. (The darkest aspect of this development is that we no longer seem to think much of it. George Orwell, of course, kept insisting that oppression comes on little cat's feet, and that once it has happened it no longer seems like oppression.)

The most important impact of traffic law enforcement has been on the courts and the legal profession. It is probably true that the judicial and legal profession of the United States devotes almost one half of its time to the adjudication and adjustment of automobile matters, and earns perhaps a third of its fees that way. An editorial in the New York Times reports that "automobile negligence suits make up from 50 to 90 percent of the case loads of civil courts throughout the country." This appears to be true in the appellate divisions as well as in the lower tribunals. It inevitably has led to a startling backlog of cases in American courts.

In New York, for example, it takes over four years to get a jury trial convened. In measure that justice delayed is justice denied, it would seem there are clear implications of such delays for a society that wishes to be a just one. The advantages that the wealthy have over the poor in such a system are obvious. Whether or not this situation will bring about an eventual erosion of respect for the judicial process, is a related question.

Now these are a familiar assortment of sorrows: life is expensive; justice, elusive; death, inevitable. There is little to be said for or against them unless it can be seriously argued that, in this particular case, they are unnecessary—or at least meliorable. Not only can such an argument be made; increasingly, it is not even disputed. There is a considerable body of empirical evidence—of which the different accident experience of different road systems is the most striking—that automobile accidents can be reduced without substantially compromising the essential transportation system by which they are generated.

It should be noted on the other hand that there is not much evidence that the number of accidents can be substantially reduced by alerting the behavior of drivers while maintaining the present, near universal, driver population. It may be this can be done, but it has not been done. This leads to the basic strategy of crash injury protection: it is assumed that a great many automobile accidents will continue to occur. That being the case, probably the most efficient way to minimize the overall cost of accidents is to design the interior of the vehicles so that the injuries that follow the accidents are relatively mild. An attraction of this approach is that it could be put into effect by changing the behavior of a tiny population—the forty or fifty executives who run the automobile industry.

It would also seem obvious that the legal problems of ajudicating the consequences of traffic accidents could be considerably reduced. Most accidents are probably not worth ajudicating: a simple claims procedure as proposed by various judges, and most carefully by O'Connell and Keeton, would eliminate a large part of the case load (as would, of course, a reduction in accidents). More significantly, a careful enquiry might well reach the conclusion that in many cases it is simply not possible to establish by testimony and similar evidence just how an accident occurs, much less who is to blame. The system failed, and that is about all that is to be learned with finality. With the best will in the world on the part of persons testifying, it is probable that for many high speed accidents the essential events are beyond the threshold of perception of the persons involved. (Supposing murder trials were conducted on the basis of demanding to know of witnesses which way the bullet was travelling when the victim was hit.)

If the reduction of accidents and injuries—and of the social costs they give rise to—is possible, how is it that this has not been done? More to the point, why has it not been seriously attempted?

It is not that no one has noticed the problem. On the contrary, there are few public issues which have been so consistently the subject of comment by government officials, communications media, service organizations, and the like. There is every reason to suppose the public is highly sensitive to the subject, and that it can be a rewarding political issue. (In a recent survey by The Economist, British voters were asked to name what they thought was the single most important issue in the then forthcoming British general election, "Without any prompting," more named "road safety" than taxes.) Why then so few results?

I am persuaded there are at least three clusters of reasons that explain this failure.

FIRST, THE VENALITY OF THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

The object of the automobile industry is to make money, but also to make automobiles. For a long period, perhaps because of the influence of corporate managers who were also engineers and took great interest in design as well as styling questions, the industry was highly innovative, and in the view of persons who should know produced increasingly safe and well engineered vehicles. For the past quarter century, however, financial management seems to have been dominant, and the industry has become technologically moribund. The "failure" rate of vehicles has been allowed to settle down at a level which in any comparable field would be regarded as absurd and unacceptable. Thus in 1959, Haddon and I calculated that almost one out of every three automobiles manufactured in Detroit ends up with blood on it.

To a perhaps surprising degree, the profits of the industry are related to these accidents (although not of course to the injuries). Much attention has been paid to the concept of "planned obsolescence" (which itself may account for a fair number of vehicle failures) but almost no interest has been shown in the role of accident damage in creating a market for the products of the industry. There are anywhere from 15,000,000 to 40,000,000 accidents a year. While in the Department of Labor, I made some rough estimates that as much as 20 percent of the total production of the automobile industry is required to replace or repair damaged vehicles. (This estimate may be high, of course.)

I believe it can no longer be doubted that within the higher executive levels of the industry there has been a conviction that an excessive concern with safety is bad for business. Ford made a serious effort in 1956 to sell a safer car; this was accompanied by a bad sales experience that has apparently frightened off the entire industry ever since. Chrysler, at a time of management troubles, made some important statements on the subject, and has kept a highly competent man on as its safety engineer, but has not gone much beyond that. On balance, the impression anyone following the subject must have is that the sales managers have been consistently opposed to any systematic concern and have had their way.

This is the hardest possible case to prove, of course, but there is evidence. One of the few glimpses inside the industry came from testimony in the 1959 case of *Comstock* v. *General Motors Corporation*, heard in the Supreme Court of Michigan. Anyone concerned with the morality of American business organizations would have to be appalled by Comstock. The uncontested facts of the case are that the 1953 Buick Roadmaster had a defective power brake system (involving a ring sealer in the hydraulic brake master cylinder which allowed the brake fluid to escape from the cylinder.) Having manufactured this car, and having discovered that the brakes did not always work, the manfacturer's response was as follows, in the words of the Michigan Supreme Court:

"The matter was judged serious enough by General Motors to require the issuance of 2 separate kits for replacement of the defective parts.

"The agencies were instructed to make repairs on the power break system at General Motors' expense whenever 1953 Buicks came into the shops. These repairs were made without notice to the owners and even if there was no complaints about the brakes. No warning to owners of 1953 Buicks equipped with these power brakes was given either by General Motors, or by the agency which sold this Buick as far as this record reveals.

"Wentworth, the Lawless Buick agency service representative, testified on this point:

" 'Because I was not allowed a campaign to call these people or mail anything to them.

" 'The Court: They asked you to call them.

" 'A. They said to get these cars whenever you could get your hands on them. When a customer didn't come around I couldn't look up the thing. I thought it was Buick's responsibility. Most of the time on things like that owners were sent registered letters. I was not allowed to do that.

" 'The Court. Who said you couldn't send letters?

" 'A. The service department at Buick. It was a hush thing. They didn't want the public to know the brakes were bad and they were very alarmed.'

"Mr. Kraus, the general service manager of Buick, testified somewhat differently:

" 'Q. Mr. Kraus, did the Buick Motor Division ever contact the owners of these cars? A. No, sir.

" 'Q. Didn't advertise what the conditions were? A. No, sir.

" 'Q. I take it nothing was done at all by the Buick Motor Company or Buick Division of General Motors unless and until the parts were asked for and then they were given, if possible? A. The parts were ordered by the dealer and shipped to the dealer by us.

" 'Q. That is all the Buick Company did?

" 'A. Well, other than put out the technical information such as the bulletin you just read there.

" 'The Court. You didn't call them up and say, get all these cars in and have them repaired? A. No, sir.

" 'Q. Why not? A. Well, in the first place that is the obligation of the dealer, and in the second place we don't know who all the owners are or where they are.

" 'Q. Did they ever do anything to find out? A. We have no right to tell the dealer how to run his business. He is an independent business man.

" 'Q. But did you do anything to find out?

" 'A. No.' "

Just how general such conduct has been in the industry is an open question: but the attitude underlying it has been general and manifest. When the possibility first began to be raised that the impurities in automotive exhausts might cause cancer as well as smog, the response of the industry was one of utter unconcern and flat refusal to do what would have been easy and cheap to do (install blowby devices as standard equipment) until forced to do so by legislation.

There is a resistance to reasonableness in this field that is at once baffling and revealing. It was soon enough evident that the executives and engineers in the industry simply would not comprehend the idea of designing their machines so that the injuries that result from accidents would be minimized. This at least could be explained: these were one-subject-at-a-time men who would not accept the inevitability of accidents, or in any event were trying to design machines that would not have them as a result of mechanical failures. If the damned fools driving them wished to collide with one another, that was not the engineer's look out. But recent congressional hearings have produced evidence that the incidence of design failure known to the industry is much greater than anyone suspected. Meanwhile evidence of failure in the obsolescent stage is mounting. (Non whites have much higher fatality rates than whites, owing presumedly to being forced by economic pressures to drive older and hence more dangerous vehicles.)

But beyond the unwillingness to face up to the persistence of accidents, there is an obtuseness on the overall subjects of traffic safety, that is bewildering, coming as it does from men of unquestioned probity and manifest rationality in the management of their affairs in general.

On April 5, 1966, for example, Mr. John Bugas, Vice President of Ford, speaking for the industry before the Senate Commerce Committee, asking that the industry be given a chance to police itself, said "Whatever happened in the past, this industry is now wide-awake." They had, got, he said, the message. Yet 10 days later, on April 15, Mr. Henry Ford 2d made it just as clear that this was not so. In an otherwise candid and positive statement of intention to make cars even safer than they are, Mr. Ford went on to criticize Mr. Ralph Nader, one of the most forceful critics of the industry, in terms that do no one any good: "He can read statistics and he can look up a lot of facts that are in the public domain, but I don't think he knows anything about engineering safety into automobiles," said Mr. Ford, "I think that, if these critics who don't really know anything about safety will get out of our way, we can go ahead with our job—and we have a job to do. We have to make our cars safer." This in itself is an understandable enough attitude for a manufacturer, and would not merit comment save for the remarks that preceeded it. Pointing out that "The driver is the most important factor [in safety] because, if you drive safely, accidents won't happen." Mr. Ford noted that laws passed by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF when he was Governor "cut the deaths on Connecticut roads by about 50 percent" without any changes being made in automobiles.

If in truth there are laws which when enacted cut the number of highway deaths in half, it will surely be seen that this is an immensely important fact. And if the chairman of the Board of Ford Motor Company says it is a fact, we should have every reason to assume it is. What is then to be made of the discovery that it is not a fact? In the four years 1951–1954, the average number of highway deaths in Connecticut was 254 per year. In the four years of Governor RIBICOFF's term, that followed, the average was 286. In the years since the average has been 323. In the period since 1955 the number of accidents per year in Connecticut has more than doubled, the rate of accidents per hundred million vehicle miles has gone up 43 percent, and the rate of injuries up 29 percent.

It has been these frustrating, stubborn realities among others, that have led Senator RIBICOFF, for whom no praise could be too great in this area, to his present line of enquiry.

Mr. Ford's confusion is not an isolated event. It is the pattern of events. Moreover the message the critics of the industry have sought to deliver goes precisely to this point. If the companies will not respond fairly to information that is in the public domain, what can be the grounds for confidence that they are acting responsibly about information that until now has been entirely internal and private.

The practice of tire manufacturers, if not as extensively documented as those of the motor industry, are not more reassuring.

There is, of course, another major "industry" concerned with traffic safety, the insurance industry. With the exception of some mild experimentation carried out by Liberty Mutual and a few other groups, the insurance industry has done nothing about traffic safety of any consequence, so far as I am aware. I do not know why this is so, and have only the vaguest impressions. One impression is that the insurance industry has not wished to get into a public row with the automobile industry: a kind of class solidarity that forbids washing dirty corporate linen in public. A second impression is that the executives of the insurance industry are not innovative men and do not have the initiative to undertake any serious efforts to change a system that is working well enough from their limited vantage point. (This seems true of the industry as a whole. The automobile is a 19th century machine that has not been much changed for at least a generation now. General Motors does not seem to be a place where a genuinely creative engineer would want to spend much time—certainly not in the age of the Moon Shot. Part of the task of the management of public affairs in the modern world must be to take into account the fact that large segments of life will be in the hands of men of modest endowment.) A third possibility would be that, despite denials, the insurance industry does in fact profit from automobile insurance to an extent that is satisfactory to them. The issue is not clear, nor have the companies sought to make it so.

As with the harassment of the driver in the first era of traffic safety, it seems we are now entering a period of indicting the businessmen involved. The need to impose guilt in this field is obviously deep seated, and we may very well be over correcting. The more important question is why have the very large number of persons in business, industry, and the law who have made large profits out of automobiles been impervious to the pleas to be rational about automobile safety. Has it got to do with the nature of corporate organization, or is it simply a matter that our society is easily corrupted in areas where individuals are asked to assume a personal relation to a collective responsibility, a matter Reinhold Niebuhr has insisted we attend to. Or alternately, is this simply more evidence of the trivialization of American business: the fact that the central concerns of American society are no longer in the hands of free enterprise, and that free enterprise is no longer in the hands of men who expect to lead society.

SECOND, THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE AUTOMOBILE

It is surely clear that the largest reason we have not done anything to tame the automobile is that we have not much wanted to. That the automobile has a powerful symbolic, emotional role in American life is a proposition few would doubt. It is a central symbol of potency and power: the equivalent of the sword, or the horse, the spear of earlier ages. It is both a symbol of aggression, and a vehicle thereof. It is a sanctioned form of violence. In American society one can injure and kill another person with an automobile at virtually no risk of physical reprisal. It is also a prime agent of risk-taking in a society that still values risk-taking, but does not provide many outlets.

Anatol Rapoport has suggested that the most careful approach to accident prevention may in the end lead us nowhere if it turns out that "accidents are manifestations * * * of global cultural factors—that is, of social analogues of destructive drives."

For example, if we should find that in spite of clear determination of the marginal effectiveness of certain measures and the actual implementation of these measures with the resulting reduction of accident mortality and morbidity in one area, the over-all accident incidence of morbidity or mortality remains unaffected—i.e. if stopping up one would we only help to open another, as sometimes happens in superficial cures of conversion hysterias—then we will know that something more basic is wrong with us.

Whatever the truth of this kind of speculation, at very least it can be said that the attitude of the public is ambivalent on the question of traffic safety. Too much attention to safety must necessarily call attention to the dangers of driving, which is not agreeable. At the same time, the dangers of driving are agreeable, and are sought. By the almost total emphasis on the responsibility of drivers to drive safely, it becomes possible for the individual driver to assume he is safe when he wishes to be, and to have the satisfaction of taking risks when he desires that experience. In this context, the otherwise absurd business of counting the death toll over the holiday weekends assumes a certain cultural consistency: it is rather like keeping score on Russian roulette—those who have successfully avoided disaster are pleased to be reminded of it, those who have not are beyond all reminding.

THIRD, THE FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT

The power of the automobile industry and the ambivalence of the public have combined to prevent effective governmental action. We have opened for an arrangement which is, I suspect, not unusual in such circumstances: working at the problem in ways fairly certain not to succeed. One of the most effective ways in which a government cannot do something is to assign the task to the kinds of people who never get anything done.

Since the 1950's there has existed in Washington an organization known as the President's Committee for Traffic Safety, which uses the Presidential seal with abandon. I served as a departmental representative on the body for a year before learning that the executive director was neither chosen nor paid by the Federal government but rather by the industry. This man presided over the expenditure of public funds allocated to the Department of Commerce, and generally disported himself as the head traffic safety man in Government, although he was in fact a paid agent of the interests he ought at least to have been keeping an eye on. In 1963 I attended a meeting in the White House called by the Secretary to the Cabinet to consider whether the integrity of the Presidential seal was not being abused: it was, and it was so agreed; but what to do about it remained a puzzle.

Similarly, the public will have largely been paralyzed by the seeming incompatibility of safe driving and mass driving. In the course of the past half century we have designed our cities and generally arranged our lives so as to make the use of the automobile indispensable to most persons. This makes it politically impossible to withdraw the right to drive from anything but a small fraction of adults, and then for only short periods. Hence any strategy based upon punishment of the driver for inadequate performance must tend to fail. Even drinking drivers, who are unquestionable dangerous persons who by and large must be said to be responsible for their dangerous condition, will nonetheless by and large continue to drive: the social life of the American middle class now primarily takes the form of getting into an automobile, and driving to a place where alcohol is consumed—a friend's home, a tavern, or whatever. This is too deep a social pattern to be broken. Hence, at very least, massive ambiguity.

There is, however, another source of the failure of government: it is the striking absence of any of those conditions of self-generating reform which would enable government to take initiatives on its own—such conditions as money to carry out programs, social statistics and related data on which to base programs, and professional persons to devise them. To a surprising degree, none of these exist in the world of traffic safety.

The amount of money allocated to research in traffic safety has been miniscule. (The one exception—a major one—to this rule concerns highway construction. The nation has constructed a fabulously elaborate highway system designed with steadily improving safety features. In this instance, however, the interests of the industry and the public were harmonious with those of safety.) The automobile companies spend money designing their products so that they operate properly in traditional terms; but so far as is known, they do almost no research in crash injury prevention, nor do they seem to have done any work in the larger area of developing scientific data about the man-machine relationship in the highway complex. Recently a number of universities have begun to study the problem, but in general it is fair to estimate that at no one time over the past half century have there been as many as a dozen senior scientists working in this field.

It is not to be supposed that there has been a deliberate strategy on the part of the automobile industry behind all this, but the outcome could not have been more effective if there were. Because there has been so little money devoted to safety research, there are almost no facts. There being no facts, there is very little in the way of argument. Amateur efforts to produce crash-proof cars have, by and large, been more ludicrous than not.

Directly related to the absence of facts about safety design is the absence of facts about the whole subject. This is central. Despite the inundations of putative data about death rates and such like, there are in fact no standard national statistics about traffic safety. The United States government does not collect them.

The only moderately reliable statistic that exists is the number of persons killed. We have this information in consequence of the established practice of coroners of reporting the probable cause of death of bodies found on public highways. Combining death and taxes, the death-rate is obtained by a simple formula that derives total miles driven from gasoline taxes paid, and then divides miles by the number of cadavers. The results of this not very complex calculation is the death rate, a dependable but meaningless number, in the sense that it provides no guide to action of any sort—and, more seriously, is probably misleading. (One would think the number of persons who actually die in motor vehicle accidents responds more to advances in medical practice than anything else.)

It is hardly a complicated matter to conceive what basic national data ought to be collected: rates for deaths, injuries, and accidents; geographical and temporal distribution of such; types of vehicles involved; types of driver failure; types of vehicle failure; types of drivers involved; types of roadway and environmental failures. That would be a beginning. Most of the data could be gathered by standard sampling techniques.

To repeat: None of this data now exists, save the death rate. (A few states also gather injury and accident rates.) Thus. so far as is known, the automobile manufacturers do not keep any systematic records of the injuries that occur to automobile occupants when they are thrown against the vehicle's interior in the course of the accident. There are, of course, millions of such events each year, and it may be said that it would be a rare layman whose self composure would survive 15 minutes of color photographs of the results.

In 1963, testifying before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I dwelt at some length on this subject. In the course of my remarks I made the following statement:

"In an effort to keep with the problem [of traffic safety] for little more than a generation agencies of local, State, and Federal Governments have been compiling statistics about accidents, injuries, and deaths with a diligence and industry that seems to grow as the years go by.

"But that has been an almost wholly uncritical effort. As a result, it has been almost wholly useless. It is my impression, and it is the firm opinion of research workers for whom I have the greatest regard, that with perhaps one or two exceptions all the vast accumulation of data about automobile accidents over the past half century has contributed almost nothing to our understanding of the cause and prevention of accidents."

The hearing room in which I made this statement was filled with persons representing the major institutions concerned with traffic safety. I appeared, not as an interested amateur, but as a member of the subcabinet supporting a bill to establish a National Accident Prevention Center which had been introduced by the chairman of the subcommittee. This was a serious level of government. Thus the reaction to the statement is a good illustration of the atmosphere that has pervaded this subject. There was no reaction. So far as, I am aware, the statement never appeared in any of the myriad traffic safety publications. No one commented on it. No one attempted to refute it. No one attempted to do anything about it.

What is true of accidents statistics is similarly true of accident investigation: there are none. Save for an aborted experiment at the Harvard Medical School, there has been no effort over the past half century to unravel the etiology of actual automobile accidents in the way that is routine for airplane accidents. The concept of "grounding" a particular model of vehicle that appears to have safety problems does not exist with respect to automobiles.

A final aspect of the failure of government, and the crucial one, has come from the fact that, despite its long history, the problem of traffic safety has never yet associated itself with a professional group that would apply to it standards of evidence, evaluation and self-criticism that the solution of problems of this kind require.

Government regulation of the automobile began as a form of tax collection, upon which a layer of law enforcement was superimposed. In time the automobile helped create a new institution of law enforcement: the State Police. Probably because they are characteristically not corrupt, very little attention has been paid to them. However, they have been the dominant institution in traffic law enforcement (and, by a feed-back process, probably to traffic law enactment as well) and little notice has been given of what a very poor job they have made of it, despite their high standards of personal conduct.

The entire pattern of State Police management of the automobile complex is derived directly from the model of the prevention, detection, and punishment of—crime. From the cowboy hats, to the six gun, to the chase scene, the entire phenomenon is a paradigm of the imposition of Law on an unruly and rebellious population. This involves intense concentration on the guilt of individuals, as measured by conformance to statutes, and of the efficacy of punishment, either threatened or carried out, as a means of social regulation. There is not much evidence that this works. More to the point, the police have almost no tradition of controlled inquiry that would find out. Thus, in 1955 the Connecticut State Police began a crack-down on speeders that soon brought nationwide attention. In a curious way the efficacy of such an effort is somehow presumed. Yet by any measurable standards the Connecticut program has been a distinct failure. Yet it is clear that the Connecticut State Police do not, in any meaningful sense know this, and do not intend to find it out. Their response to the gentlest criticism is simply wholesome Hibernian apoplexy. (It happens there is a Bureau of Public Roads study which shows the rate of accidents decreases as speed increases between 35 and about 68 miles per hour. Most probably this is because both speed and accidents are functions of density. But it could be hoped that even the most dense Police Commissioner might wonder if there were not some relation between this study and results that seem to bear it out, even if on further reflection they might not.)

Similarly, there is no evidence that drivers who are arrested for speeding, or similar offenses, are in fact any different from other drivers, or that they act differently thereafter. Since most drivers, according to Bureau of Public Roads studies, exceed posted speed limits much of the time, it is likely that to be arrested for speeding is in the nature of a random event. Again it must be emphasized that such drivers may in fact be different—and worse, or whatever—but the management of traffic safety has largely been in the hands of institutions and groups that do not routinely ask such questions, much less tease out the answers.

The highway engineers, whose research I have cited, are the major and the most revealing exception. They are a profession: they have standards: they pursue them. When a bridge falls down, they try to find out why. When a new road is to be designed, they try to calculate how many cars will be using it and at what speeds, and design accordingly. By and large they have been predictably, sometimes brilliantly, successful.

By the mid 1950's it was becoming evident that this over-all situation could not persist. A matter of considerable public interest was in the hands of incompetents or worse. Some protest was inevitable, and it arose, in a natural course of events among a small group of professional persons—lawyers, doctors, engineers, and public officials. Articles began to appear. Intellectuals were doing their work.

Up to this point the automobile industry had options. There were two courses open. The industry could recognize that the automobile system was working badly from the point of view of safety and could have sought to organize a mixed public and private effort to introduce rational and effective measures, including much greater attention to automobile design, but by no means limited to that. This would have involved considerable shaking up of the corporate staffs, the establishment of flunky organizations such as the National Safety Council, and the creation of a federal automobile agency modelled on the FAA, which has presided over a highly creative relationship between the Federal government and the aviation industry. Alternatively, they could go the route of the railroads in the 19th Century which also sought to brazen out a safety problem, and ended up with a particularly dreary form of Federal statutory regulation. There was no third way.

The sequence of events is important. The medical doctors were the first on the scene. The enormous medical problem created by accident trauma led in a quite natural way to the question of whether these could not somehow be reduced. The American Medical Association and the American College of Surgeons set up committees on the subject. By this point, techniques of crash-injury protection (padded dash boards, seat belts, etc.), had become quite sophisticated in aviation. The orderly instinct, of the doctors was to transfer them to automobile design. In the 1950's the Public Health Service began making small grants with these possibilities in mind. Inevitably there arose a body of opinion, to which some information was attached, to the effect that the automobiles were not safe as they might be. This was the crucial moment for the industry; had they joined in this enquiry with a modicum of zeal, they would be a free enterprise to this day. Instead, they chose to resist.

Students of American business ought really to try to learn what decision-making processes went on at this point. The largest and most profitable industry in the world faced the relatively simple problem of responding to criticism couched in terms of public interest; and it could not do so. The industry gave almost no sign that it was aware of criticism: it was not so much a matter of responding badly, as not responding at all. Presumedly this has mostly to do with the nature of the organizations involved, and of the men who were running them. The physical isolation of Detroit is probably another significant factor. It is also true that the business schools and their various journals, which might have given some guidance, gave none (as far as I am aware). Some of these journals are notable for their interest in the Christian Responsibilities of the American Business Executve, but somehow the question of the responsibilities of the nation's largest industry for the safety of its products never came to mind. Nor, when others drew attention to the subject, did the business schools and journals comment.

In 1961, in a paper given at one of the very few meetings at which the manufacturers and their critics came together, I wrote: "It would not appear that the industry is particularly conscious of the fact, but the belief is well established among intellectually influential circles in the United States that the automotive manufacturers are essentially indifferent, and sometimes even opposed, to traffic safety measures. This is a scandalous position, but it is nontheless held, and before long it will begin to damage the manufacturers more than they may imagine." There was no response to this conciliatory gesture, any more than to the defiant ones. The industry became more and more a caricature of an overmuscled, under-brained organism heading for disaster.

Disaster came from an unlooked for source: the legal profession. Not from the Bar Association, or the Wall Street firms, or the great law schools, which are said to maintain a watching brief of sorts on such matters, but rather from the declassé claimants' attorneys, organized as the American Trial Lawyers Association. Out of a combination of self interest and genuine, hot indignation at the indifference of the manufacturers, this professional association decided the time had come to stop "Murder by Motor" by the direct and lethal process of suing the manufacturers in whose automobiles their clients are killed and injured in such wholesale numbers.

This process has begun, aided by judicial ruling concerning the nature of the automobile manufacturers warranty. Just as importantly, the reactions of the industry to criticism have steadily eroded the presumptions of good faith and diligence on its part: juries are more and more disposed to find the manufacturers guilty. A certain political edge has also appeared. The ATA is known as the "Democratic Bar Association:" its members are instinctual Democrats, much as the ABA members are Republicans. At recent meetings of the Trial Lawyers, elected and appointed officials have competed with one another in denouncing Detroit.

It may also be noted that the failure of the executive branch of the government has given an unusual opening to legislators, which by and large they have exploited. At the Federal level, for example, it has been men such as former Congressman Kenneth Roberts and Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF who have prodded the government into action. Somehow there were legislators who retained their freedom of action when all else was paralysis.

The industry has now announced that it will not only accept, but actually requests government regulation. This is a normal, predictable outcome. For its own protection the industry has to get itself regulated by the Federal government. What only a decade ago was unthinkable, has now become all but inevitable. The companies must get their products formally certified as safe in order to protect themselves from massive litigation. If everything continues to form, the next step will be for the industry to seek to dominate the government agency charged with regulating it, and so we begin another chapter of exposure leading to legislation imposing regulation that ends up more like collusion than anything else.

This process has, of course, begun. The Federal government now specifies safety features that must be incorporated in vehicles it purchases. The Administration proposes to extend this technique to all vehicles sold in interstate commerce. Federal tire safety specifications are on their way. State regulations of this or that feature of vehicle design are starting up again (there was an earlier period when such items as windshield wipers were ordained) and may be expected to multiply. A federal law controlling automobile exhausts was signed in October, 1965, and Federal standards will take effect in the fall of 1967.

Because of the failure of leadership in the automobile industry, the issue is coming more and more to be defined as one of regulating the conduct of that one industry. But this would deal at best with only part of the problem. From the outset, the principal question of traffic safety has been; what kind of problem is it? It is not fundamentally a problem of law breaking or of profit making, although it involves both those things. The closest one can come to an adequate conception is reflected in the statement of John F. Kennedy during the presidential campaign of 1960: "Traffic accidents constitute one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest, of the nation's public health problems." I wrote the statement, I rather doubt the President ever saw it; certainly nothing much was done about it in his administration. But the idea has gained increasing acceptance. Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, for one, clearly grasps the concept and cites his brother's statement.

The point is that traffic accidents are part of the general phenomenon of accidents, which have become the largest single cause of death between ages one and thirty-five for most of the industrial nations of the world. They are a particular aspect of our culture. Moreover, the social response to them has been characterized by a peculiar cultural lag. Just as classical forms of disease were in general treated by magic up until perhaps two centuries ago, accidents have until this moment been thought of as somehow "wild" occurrences which do not conform to the sequential chain of casual events that define the way things in general occur.

This happens not to be so. In a series of apercus that began hardly two decades ago, a tiny number of American and British researchers, primarily medical men, have unravelled the etiology of the accident to show that it is, in fact, fundamentally similar to disease—"to the initiation of infectious and other insults to the body, which have long been the concern of preventative medicine." This began with the perception that accidents do in fact fit the classic public health pattern of host-agent-environment. Perhaps the most important refinement came with the conception that the agent—e.g. the bacillus—was not all the various instruments by which one can get knocked on the head, but rather the abnormal energy exchange produced thereby. (In an instance of scientific serendipity, this occurred almost simultaneously to two men: William Haddon, Jr., and James J. Gibson working unawares within miles of one another in upstate New York.) As the forms of energy exchange can for practical purposes be reduced to five categories: mechanical, thermal, electrical, ionizing, and chemical, the conception of accidents as diseases suddenly emerges in a manageable form. Significantly, it was in puzzling over traffic safety that much of this theory was formulated.

The issue, then, is whether the national committee to the problem of traffic safety will occur at this level of understanding, or whether it will proceed in the honorable but outdated tradition of muckraking, exposure, legislation, and regulation by bureaucracy. Traffic safety is a problem for scientists, including social scientists. The object should be not merely to produce adequately designed vehicles, but to produce a traffic system that is as efficient as can be attained given competing values, and which as much as possible will put an end to the present idiocies of armed police arresting and often imprisoning hordes of citizens who are then hauled before courts incompetent to judge a problem that in any event is almost impossible to define in legal terms. Federal concern with automobile transportation, properly conceived, could in the end produce less bureaucracy, less harassment, less regulation, less intimidation, insult and coercion. That should be the national object, rather than simply the punishment of motor magnates. The Highway Safety Act of 1966, which President Johnson has sent to Congress, having announced it in his State of the Union Message, has this potential, but not as it is now drawn, nor as it is likely to be administered.

The nation's largest industry is about to come under Federal regulations. The reaction of the automobile industry has been to try to discredit the character of one of its most responsible critics. The nation's largest, or near to largest, public health problem is about to receive massive research support. The reaction of the Bureau of the Budget (or whoever made the decision) is to give the management of the problem to the Commerce Department, which presided over the development of the present crisis. The professors of business administration are silent. The regulatory economists are elsewhere engaged. The press is mostly interested in humbling of General Motors.

Somewhere in all this there must be persons who will try to sort out the public interest. The outcome will test the vitality of the American system. In the meantime, the failure of the business and government bureaucracies is a fact to be noted with little pleasure.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT

(By Daniel P. Moynihan)

At the outset of these hearings a week ago a representative of the automobile industry came forth and, to the surprise of no one who has followed this subject, offered not only to accept but in fact requested legislation "with the ultimate authority and duty residing in the Federal government to set vehicle safety performance standards."

This request was predictable and inevitable: one out of every three automobiles manufactured in Detroit ends up with blood on it. The victims of those accidents have begun to sue the corporation who manufactures those vehicles. The companies therefore, for their own protection, must get their products certified as safe by the Federal government. I call your attention to the word "duty" in Mr. Bugas' statement.

In any normal situation the Congress would have every reason to accept the good faith and plain dealing of the industry representatives. I submit, however, that this is not a normal situation. I have for ten years—from the time Congressman ROBERTS began hearings—been involved in this subject, and if that experience has any value I offer you my judgment that the industry cannot be depended upon.

Senator RIBICOFF for one has noted that the industry's proposal would require the Federal government to collaborate in intricate detail with the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission that has been established by the State governments. I offer you the testimony of Mr. Jeffry O'Connell and Mr. Arthur Myers in their book "Safety Last" that this commission is impotent, incompetent, and utterly dominated by the industry.

Recently Mr. Lynn Townsend, President of the Chrysler Corporation, explained this proposal. The companies, he declared, would "like to see (standards) set by the people who have been involved for many years with the industry."

I submit that this is precisely what must not happen. If it is allowed to happen we shall have lost this desperately important opportunity.

The landscape of American government is littered with the bones of agencies set up to curb the voracious appetite of private interests only to be devoured by them.

The only way we can escape this dreary and even squalid outcome will be to establish an entirely new organization, headed by and staffed by scientists, medical doctors and engineers who will hold themselves responsible to their own standards of professional integrity as well as to the public trust imposed on them. That there are such men, none can doubt.

I would like finally to state my belief that this would best be accomplished by the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency as proposed by Congressman MACKAY, and some 45 Members of Congress.

OUR SISTER DEMOCRACY—THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it was on May 14, 1948, upon the termination of the British mandate over Palestine, that the State of Israel was proclaimed as an independent nation.

As Americans, we all share gratification in observing that event because the

State of Israel has been a parliamentary democracy since its inception as a nation. There, in the strategically important Middle East, it stands as a bastion of freedom and as an object lesson that a democratic and parliamentary government is best. The entire free world has a friend and ally in that once ancient land that was reborn 18 years ago.

Israel's greatest force is spiritual. It has performed miracles. It has moved mountains. It has regenerated peoples and nations. It is almost unbelievable how a little nation, with all the odds against it, could have overcome most of its difficulties and won the respect and admiration of the free world.

To be sure, Israel is a very young nation—only 18 years old. During this very short time it has performed wonders which would have been considered impossible 18 years ago.

Israel's economic and cultural progress is due to three things: The pioneering spirit that inspired its immigrants who responded to the challenge of the then desolate area; the feeling of the people that they are partners in the enterprise of Israel's resurgence in its ancient homeland; and the power of modern science and technology.

The State of Israel is a peace-loving nation, which recognizes the folly and futility of war. Israel realizes that her destiny is bound up with that of humanity as a whole and that her safety depends on peace among all the nations. In her own country, she strives to exemplify that which is best in our own United States through the establishment of a society built on liberty, equality, tolerance, and democracy. She stands fast as a religious country, as America's friend, and as an implacable foe of Red communism that would try to destroy all religions.

The United States was the first country to extend diplomatic recognition to Israel. Our faith in her has been more than justified. In the midst of an area of hostile and fighting neighbors, she has been an example of stability, prosperity, and progress.

On the occasion of the 18th anniversary of the rebirth of the "land of the Bible," I know my colleagues in the Congress join me in wishing Israel a "happy birthday." May it continue to be a haven for the oppressed and persecuted from communistic and fascist nations and inspire other nations to become part of the free world. May that country continue to prosper and grow with the help of her allies.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support H.R. 14544. This legislation—the Participation Sales Act of 1966—is a tried and true method of financing. It will enable us to continue the necessary and needed direct financing programs of the Federal Government while at the same time increasing the participation of private funds and private enterprise in those programs which now do not need complete Federal direct financing.

This proposed legislation is based on the same principle as the Federal National Mortgage Association secondary mortgage operations.

Under this program, as we all know, when Fannie Mae buys mortgages, it provides lenders with cash to reinvest in other mortgages or in new construction. On the other hand, under Fannie Mae secondary mortgage operations, when private lenders have more money available than outlets they can buy existing mortgages from the Fannie Mae portfolio.

Of course, this whole Fannie Mae operation has been heralded as a great success in that it provides for flow of funds between lenders and borrowers and sellers and purchasers.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the Sales Participation Act of 1966 operates on this same principle. The programs to be included under this bill would enlist private financial resources in the participation pool or pools to be established for those programs such as the Small Business Administration which do have marketability. By passage of this legislation we will continue to live up to the principles of our American free enterprise capitalistic system.

I urge everyone to support this legislation for the reasons I have set forth here and those which my colleagues have and will make.

I include an article from a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal on FNMA secondary market operations.

FANNIE MAE'S FIRST PERIOD MORTGAGE BUYING SET HIGH, NEARLY DOUBLING PRIOR QUARTER'S

The Federal National Mortgage Association said it poured an unprecedented amount of money into the housing mortgage market in the first 3 months of this year.

The agency's report came amid growing indications that tightening mortgage credit has been causing dislocations in house prices besides continuing to press upward on mortgage interest rates.

Fannie Mae in this year's first quarter bought a record $797.8 million of Government-backed mortgages on the secondary, or resale, market, almost double the $405.4 million purchases of the last quarter of 1965, the previous high. The total for the latest period marked the sixth consecutive quarter in which mortgage purchases increased from the preceding three months.

J. Stanley Baughman, Fannie Mae president, said the continued rise in purchases "reflected the general scarcity of privately held funds available for mortgage financing." This tightening, he noted, has been caused by "large and expanding credit demands of business, Government, and consumers" generally. "As a result," he added, "private lending institutions in need of liquidity sold mortgages to FNMA in unprecedented volume."

When Fannie Mae buys mortgages, it provides lenders with fresh cash to reinvest in other mortgages or in new construction. Conversely, when private lenders have more money available than outlets, they can buy existing mortgages from Fannie Mae's portfolio.

SALES DWINDLED TO TRICKLE

Mortgage sales by Fannie Mae in the March quarter dwindled practically to a trickle, the agency announced in Washington. Sales in the period slumped to only six mortgages for $62,000, down from sales of 18 mortgages for $221,000 in the previous quarter. By contrast sales in the first quarter of 1965 totaled 1,719 mortgages amounting to $19,565,000.

This year's first quarter purchases of $797.8 million, comprising 61,739 separate Government-backed mortgages, were by far the largest for any quarter since Fannie Mae's secondary operations began in 1954. The March period's volume was more than eight times that of the first quarter of 1965, when 8,536 mortgages were bought for $94.7 million.

The extent to which tightening mortgage money conditions have been affecting housing prices was suggested by real estate brokers, appraisers and other specialists at a national mortgage banking conference yesterday in the New York Hilton Hotel. The real estate men predicted a rise of 5 to 10 percent in the price of new houses in coming months if current inflationary trends continue in the economy.

John R. White, vice president of James D. Landauer Associates, a New York real estate consultant, termed the expected increase "probably the most significant jump in residential home prices since 1960." He said annual price boosts in the past five years have averaged from 2.7 to 3.2 percent. The real estate specialists stressed that rising costs of labor and materials as well as credit conditions have been exerting increasingly strong upward pressure on home prices.

One of the housing men forecast that, paradoxically, prices of older existing houses will decline in some areas while those on new homes go up. He explained that as most home lenders channel scarce mortgage credit increasingly into newer housing, older units will tend to be in oversupply, depressing their sale prices.

A banker-economist told the mortgage banking conference that any substantial further tightening of Federal Reserve monetary policy could severely dislocate the mortgage money market. For this reason, he said he doubted that the Federal Reserve would bear down much more vigorously on bank credit.

Guy E. Noyes, senior vice president and economist of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York, noted that savings and loan associations and other thrift institutions specializing in mortgage credit already have been having difficulty in matching rising rates offered savers by commercial banks. He warned that any further sharp increase in the basic rate structure could "literally" price the mortgage credit specialists out of the market.

"The Federal Reserve is as well aware of this situation as anyone—perhaps better aware," Mr. Noyes declared. "While we may see some further 'snugging up' of monetary policy, drastic changes aren't a probability," he stated.

MORTGAGE DELINQUENCIES

In a related development, the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, sponsors of the mortgage conference, reported that residential mortgage delinquency rates declined in the quarter ended March 31 from year-end figures, but were still higher than in the first 1965 quarter.

At the end of March, 3.02 percent of all mortgages surveyed were delinquent 30 days of more, according to the trade group. This was down from 3.29 percent at December 31, but was up from 2.94 percent on March 31, 1965.

By type of loan, mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration had a 3.29 percent delinquency rate against 3.59 percent at the start of the year and 3.20 percent a year earlier, while delinquency on Veterans Administration-guaranteed mortgages declined to 3.31 percent on March 31 from 3.60 percent on December 31, but increased from 3.21 percent a year earlier.

"Conventional," or non-Government-backed mortgages, had a 1.72 percent delinquency rate at the end of the quarter, against 1.87 percent on December 31 and 1.71 percent a year earlier.

Fannie Mae Debenture Issue

(By a Wall Street Journal staff reporter)

Washington.—The Federal National Mortgage Association said it will offer next Tuesday $400 million of 5.45 percent debentures.

The Government-backed securities will be used to finance the agency's secondary market dealings in existing home mortgages. The price will be announced on the day the issue is to be sold by Fannie Mae's fiscal agent, John H. Claiborne, Jr., of New York, and a nationwide selling group. The 12½-month issue is to be dated May 23 and mature June 12, 1967.

Fannie Mae's most recent debenture sale, of $250 million of a 14-month maturity, was priced to yield a record 5.38 percent. The face interest rate on those securities was 5.30 percent.

Mortgage Purchases by FNMA up Sharply

The record purchases of $797,803,000 of mortgages during the first three months of 1966 by the Federal National Mortgage Association in its secondary market operations is chartered here in relation to FNMA's activity in this area since the program was started in 1954.

The agency purchases mortgages during periods of short money supplies—providing lenders with new funds for making mortgage loans—and sells mortgages during periods when the supply of privately held funds are plentiful.

Since the operations were established in 1954, the association has purchased 567,425 mortgages for $6,761,647,000 and has sold 199,570 mortgages amounting to $2,336,241,000.

In the first quarter of this year it purchased 61,739 mortgages for the record $797.8 million, and sold six mortgages for $62,000.

NATIONAL TRANSPORT NEEDS

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker—

The entire transportation picture is changing so rapidly that it has become essential to create a single agency of the Federal Government to keep track of what is going on and to channel Government spending and research into areas where they are most needed.

So editorialized the Lousiville, Ky., Courier-Journal recently on President Johnson's proposal for a Department of Transportation.

The Courier-Journal noted:

The suggestion is not new; John F. Kennedy and Dwight D. Eisenhower considered creating the same post. A whole new set of imperatives has arisen in the meantime which make the proposal more timely than ever.

I insert the Courier-Journal editorial in the Record:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Mar. 7, 1966]

New Directions and Methods for National Transport Needs

The entire transportation picture is changing so rapidly that it has become essential to create a single agency of the federal government to keep track of what is going on and to channel government spending and research into the areas where they are most needed.

To this end President Johnson has asked for a cabinet-level department consolidating the activities of 11 separate federal agencies. The suggestion is not a new one. Presidents John F. Kennedy and Dwight D. Eisenhower considered creating the same post. A whole new set of imperatives has arisen in the meantime which make the proposal more timely than ever.

The nation has at last become conscious of the need for a drive, coordinated at the federal level, for safer automobiles and tires. There have been calls for an end to the meaningless numbers game in reporting traffic fatalities and a start on a more scientific approach to the reasons so many of us drive ourselves to our deaths. There has been comment about the disparity in death rates between various modes of transportation and speculation about how this relates to the amount of money spent on safety research.

The President's message was responsive to this concern. He called for increased federal grants to state highway safety programs, construction of a national highway safety research and test center and authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to determine the need for additional safety standards for automobiles.

The whole question of priorities has also come in for a good deal of public attention lately. Is it fair to subsidize the automobile by putting up 90 percent of the cost of interstate highways while starving mass transit? Is it worth rebuilding the nation's merchant marine fleet at vast cost to the federal government? Would it make more sense, for example, to put the money into hydrofoil boats which could ply the inland waterways? The President has indicated that he means to stick with a 1974 deadline for a supersonic airliner, but it could be that a transportation czar would see more need for a subsonic jet bus which could carry 750 passengers at low rates and thus lure more travelers into the air.

The transportation problems of the eastern seaboard are forerunners of what cities like Louisville and Lexington may someday be faced with. Railroads, the single great unsubsidized portion of the American transportation system, must revive their commuter and short-haul passenger service if the travel needs of our populous areas are to be met. Once in or near a large city, mass transit must be added to the transportation mix if we are to avoid being choked to death by our own automobiles. At present, mass transit is the responsibility of the department of Housing and Urban Development. Ultimately, it should be transferred to the new department so that the President's goal of having all transportation functions coordinated "in a single coherent instrument of government" can be met.

POLICE WEEK

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Diggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, despite the explosive and tender nature of police-Negro community relations across the country, Detroit has been unique in avoiding incidents which have characterized communities similarly situated.

This is not to say, however, that tensions do not exist with potentials for trouble nor that the present record can continue unless those tensions are allayed through conscientious planning to create between police and the citizen community a climate of understanding, respect, cooperation, and assistance in maintaining law and order. Detroit's unique situation is due to the efforts of an alert leadership which recognizes the problems and dangers. While the Detroit Police Department has been wisely responsive in various ways to criticism and claims of the Negro community it is still wisely cognizant of the fact that its job is not done in building toward this kind of relationship. It is, therefore, to be commended and encouraged in its cooperative and good working relationship with the Michigan Civil Rights Commission.

Its Detroit Police Recruiting Office is also able to be commended and encouraged this "Police Week" for its efforts to initiate response to the concern of the community regarding discrimination in recruitment, selection, training, assignment to duty, and promotion. Spokesmen for the office cite an increase in Negro patrolmen for the year 1965 and a sincere concentration directed toward securing additional Negroes for service.

AMEND PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bandstra] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, on May 4 I introduced H.R. 14879, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act. The basic purpose of this legislation is to update a law which has served the Nation well.

The Packers and Stockyards Act was enacted in 1921—45 years ago. The act originally regulated the marketing of livestock at the large public markets and the activities of meat packers. In 1935, the act was broadened to cover poultry, handled or slaughtered in commerce. The act was further broadened in 1958 to cover the marketing of livestock at the smaller country markets and in transactions in commerce away from public markets.

Drastic changes have taken place in the marketing of livestock, poultry, and meat since the provisions of the act, presently in effect, were enacted. In 1921, packers bought most of their livestock at the few large terminal markets. Today, however, they buy about two-thirds of their livestock away from the large terminal markets at thousands of decentralized locations.

When the act was originally passed, large packers had a dominant market power position with respect to retailers. Today, however, large chainstores have greater bargaining power than the largest of the packers.

Vertical integration in the poultry industry was virtually unknown when the poultry provisions of the act were added in 1935. Today, however, about 95 percent of the broilers are produced under a vertically integrated operation—that is, the processor or other integrator owns the birds and they are produced by his employees or under his control through contractual arrangements.

Many farm leaders and others have recognized the necessity for updating the Packers and Stockyards Act to keep pace with the rapid changes which have occurred and which are occurring in the livestock, poultry, and meat industries.

The Packers and Stockyards Act is too vital to allow it to become antiquated. It affords protection to producers, industry groups, and consumers alike with respect to about $12 billion worth of livestock, $18 billion worth of meat, and $3 billion worth of poultry annually, or a total of about $33 billion worth of commodities.

Farmers derive approximately one-third of their cash income from the sale of livestock alone, and, therefore, it is vital that they be protected from unfair or monopolistic practices in the sale of their livestock.

H.R. 14879, which I have introduced, provides for a complete updating of the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act to make it a more effective instrument for protecting producers, industry groups, and consumers.

INJUNCTIONS

One of the major provisions of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to request the Attorney General of the United States to obtain a temporary restraining order or injunction to prevent irreparable damage. Such an injunction could be issued only by a Federal judge upon a showing made by a U.S. attorney that the restraining order or injunction is needed to prevent immediate irreparable damage. This authority could be used, for example, in case a person subject to the act failed to pay or was unable to pay for livestock, meat, or poultry, or failed to remit to the person entitled thereto the proceeds from the sale of such commodities sold on a commission basis. It could also be used if a person operated in violation of the act in a fraudulent manner which may endanger payment for commodities purchased by him or result in injury to persons with whom he engages in business.

The Secretary of Agriculture has no present authority to prevent irreparable damage in such cases. At present, the Secretary can file an administrative disciplinary action. This can result in the suspension of the registration of a commission agency or dealer, for a reasonable period of time, and in a cease and desist order requiring the person to stop engaging in the practice in the future. In the case of a packer, a cease and desist order is the only administrative action which can be taken.

Such administrative proceedings can, if vigorously contested, take 1 or more years to complete. An additional year, or more, can be consumed by an appeal to the Court of Appeals or to the Supreme Court of the United States. During all of these years of litigation the respondent is free to continue the practice which may be causing irreparable damage to countless numbers of persons.

A more speedy remedy is plainly required. Federal judges do not issue restraining orders or injunctions in the absence of strong evidence of irreparable damage. If such evidence is demonstrated, speedy action to prevent irreparable damage should be available.

REPARATIONS

H.R. 14879 would also modernize the reparation provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act. Under the reparation provisions, an injured party may file a claim with the Packers and Stockyards Division for money damages. After a hearing, the Secretary can order the payment of money damages to the injured party.

At present, reparation awards are issued against stockyard owners, livestock commission agencies and dealers—but not against packers. When the act was passed in 1921, producers sold very little livestock directly to packers. Now that packers buy a large part of their livestock directly from producers, packers should be subject to the reparation provisions of the act.

When reparation actions are filed with the Packers and Stockyards Division, they investigate the matter thoroughly. Their investigative file becomes a part of the record in the reparation proceeding. Without this impartial investigation by the Packers and Stockyards Division, a producer would have little chance of developing sufficient evidence to bring a court action against a packer.

If the reparation provisions are extended to apply to packers, this would mean that a packer could use the reparation procedure to his advantage if another packer failed to comply with the act with respect to a sale of meat. Even in the absence of reparation provisions applicable to packers, the Packers and Stockyards Division obtained about a million dollars last year in informal settlements involving primarily packers' transactions with other packers.

The proposed bill further strengthens the reparation provisions by requiring that a reparation award be paid. At present, about 90 percent of the amount of money involved in reparation awards is not paid. If an award is not paid, it is up to the complainant to sue the respondent in court.

The proposed bill would make the reparation provisions more meaningful. If the respondent ordered to pay damages does not pay the award or appeal to a court to have the award set aside, he is penalized. The penalty as to a registrant—that is, a commission agency or a dealer—is suspension of his registration until the award is paid. The penalty as to a packer—packers are not required by the act to be registered—is a $500 fine for each day he engages in business until the award is paid.

PACKER BONDING

The proposed bill authorizes the Secretary to require bonds of packers relating to their purchases of livestock. At present, commission agencies and dealers must file a bond—generally based on an average of 1 or 2 days' business—but packers are not required to file bonds.

In earlier years, most producers had bond protection on livestock sold to packers because most of the livestock passed through the hands of commission agencies or dealers, who were bonded. Now, however, with almost half of the livestock purchased by packers not subject to any bond protection, producers are entitled to the protection of a bond in direct sales to packers.

Recent statistics compiled from packer annual reports filed with the Packers and Stockyards Division show that about 10 percent of the meat slaughterers had current liabilities in excess of their current assets. About 15 percent of the meat slaughterers had less than $20,000 worth of net fixed assets, and about 9 percent of the meat slaughterers had less than $10,000 worth of net fixed assets.

During the years from 1958 through 1964, the Packers and Stockyards Division received information that 65 packers ceased operations owing $6.2 million for livestock.

The need for packer bonding has been recognized, and is required, by 13 States, 20 livestock organizations, and 3 stockyard companies.

The Packers and Stockyards Division has computed that the total annual cost of bonding for the packing industry would not exceed $150,000 if packers were bonded in the same manner as dealers, and at the same rates. Three-fourths of the packers would be required to file a bond not in excess of $20,000, costing about $100 each.

JURISDICTION

The proposed bill makes it clear that the Secretary's jurisdiction under the Packers and Stockyards Act applies to chain stores and other retailers of meat and poultry. At present, chainstores and other retailers are subject to the act if they manufacture or prepare meats or meat food products for sale or shipment in commerce—or if they slaughter livestock. The Secretary believes that many chainstores are subject to the act as packers, because they engage in such practices as breaking carcasses, corning, making sausage, or grinding meat. This jurisdiction is being contested, however, by some of the leading chainstores. The proposed bill would make it clear that the Secretary's jurisdiction includes chainstores and other retailers which market meats or poultry.

This would not change the present division of authority between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission as to retail transactions.

The Federal Trade Commission has primary responsibility for retail transactions involving meat or poultry products. This would continue under the proposed bill. However, the bill would make it clear that the Secretary has jurisdiction with respect to wholesale transactions involving the sale of meat from packers to retailers.

For example, if a chainstore not subject to the Secretary's jurisdiction forced packers to give discriminatory allowances as a condition of selling meat to the chainstore, the Secretary's only remedy would be to bring disciplinary actions against all of the packers who gave the discriminatory allowances. But the real culprit in this example is the chainstore. Under the proposed amendments, it would be clear that an action could be brought against the chainstore requiring it to cease and desist from forcing suppliers into giving discriminatory allowances.

The bill also makes it plain that integrated poultry operations are subject to the Secretary's jurisdiction. The Secretary has engaged in a widespread investigation of conditions in the broiler industry, particularly in the Southeastern States. Actions have been instituted against a number of poultry processors alleging unfair practice against poultry producers, but the Secretary's jurisdiction has been challenged in some proceedings. This bill makes it clear that the Secretary has jurisdiction with respect to such matters.

The bill further provides that the Secretary has jurisdiction over any transactions which burden or affect interstate commerce. This is necessary so that the Secretary can assume jurisdiction over any unfair practice which has a significant impact on the livestock, poultry, or meat industries even though the particular transaction occurs entirely within a State. Under today's fragmented but interrelated marketing system, jurisdictional questions will occupy an increasingly large percentage of the time and attention of the Packers and Stockyards Division and seriously hamper and delay resolution of important problems and conditions unless a broader, more practical approach to jurisdiction is adopted.

Moreover, the Packers and Stockyards Division works very closely with State officials to avoid duplication of effort. Formal memorandums of understanding involving the work of the Packers and Stockyards Division have been entered into with about half of the States. The first formal agreement was signed in December of 1963, and this program of Federal-State cooperation is expanding rapidly. Even in the absence of formal agreements, excellent working relations exist between the Packers and Stockyards Division and the State officials having similar responsibility under State laws.

The amendment extending the Secretary's jurisdiction to include transactions which "burden or affect" interstate commerce will be helpful to prevent unfair practices—occurring within the confines of a particular State—by persons who operate primarily across State lines, so that no one State can adequately regulate their activities.

MERGERS

The proposed bill clarifies the Secretary's authority to act in the case of mergers, the effect of which may be substantially to lessen competition. This Nation is going through a period, in many industries, where substanial numbers of mergers are decreasing competition. The regulatory bodies having antitrust responsibility have not been able to deal effectively with the tremendous numbers of mergers taking place. This bill would make it clear that the Secretary has authority with respect to those industries subject to his jurisdiction. The bill would not, however, interfere with the present authority of the Department of Justice to bring antimerger actions.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Numerous other proposed amendments are contained in H.R. 14879. These amendments are primarily clarifying in nature, or they are to update and modernize various provisions of the act to keep pace with the dynamic changes taking place in the livestock, poultry, and meat industries. All of the amendments are summarized in a brief statement which I will include in the RECORD.

I believe that the Congress owes it to the livestock and poultry producers to enact these amendments. The amendments will substantially assist them in marketing their production under fair and competitive conditions. The bill will also assist the many members of the livestock, poultry, and meat industries who are entitled to protection from the few who would seek to profit from unfair competitive practices. The bill will further give added protection to consumers. Unfair and monopolistic practices result, in the long run, in higher prices to consumers.

The summary of H.R. 14879, to which I referred earlier, follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

TITLE

The title of the Packers and Stockyards Act is amended to eliminate therefrom reference to dairy products and eggs, which were removed from the Act by the 1958 amendment, and to substitute meats and meat food products so that the title more accurately describes the subject matter of the Act.

SECTION 2

This section defines the terms "poultry" and "poultry products" which are not now defined, but are used throughout the Act. The language of these definitions closely parallels that used in the Act in defining the terms "livestock" and "meat food products."

SECTION 3

This section clarifies the commerce definition set out in section 2(b) of the Act to include any transaction which "burdens or affects" the current of commerce usual in the "livestock or meat packing or distributing industries or in the poultry or poultry slaughtering, processing, or distributing industries." The addition of meat "distributing" and "poultry or poultry slaughtering, processing, or distributing industries" brings the definition into conformity with the scope of the Act.

SECTION 4

This section sets forth the present administrative construction of the Act that it is an unfair practice for any person, without reasonable cause, to fail to make full payment for a commodity or to refuse to accept or fail to deliver a commodity in accordance with the applicable contract.

SECTION 5

This section clarifies and expands the definition of the term "packer" in section 201 of the Act by bringing clearly within the definition all persons operating in commerce in the poultry, as well as meat industries, including brokers, chainstores, distributors, wholesalers, and purveyors. The addition of the phrase "or otherwise acquiring" is intended to remove any possibility of doubt with respect to livestock or poultry or their products produced or acquired in any manner other than by purchase.

The word "processing" is added to "manufacturing or preparing" to correspond to the present administrative construction of the Act. The addition of the phrases "in any manner" after the words "manufacturing, processing or preparing" is to clarify that any activity involving the production of or the preparation of products for shipment or sale is included, such as trimming, freezing, or packaging. This bill preserves the status quo of the Federal Trade Commission's concurrent jurisdiction with the Department, the Department retaining primary jurisdiction at the wholesale level and the Commission retaining primary jurisdiction at the retail level.

SECTION 6

This section provides for the substitution of the phrase "this Act" for the phrase "this Title" so that cases involving violations by packers of any section of the Act will be handled under the procedure established in sections 203, 204, and 205 of the Act.

SECTION 7

This section expand the heading for Title III to include "Stockyards; Registration; and Reparation." This is more descriptive of the contents of Title III.

SECTION 8

This section eliminates the description of the information which should be supplied by an applicant for registration so that it is clear that the rules and regulations of the Secretary may prescribe any reasonable requirements as a condition for registration, such as the filing of a bond.

SECTION 9

This section makes it plain that the burden of proof with respect to the reasonableness of any rate, charge, regulation, or practice which a stockyard or market agency desires to place into effect is on the proponent thereof, including any initial tariff. It also provides for lengthening the period of time that the Department will have in which to properly analyze these requests. Section 306 as now written requires the Department to take action within 10 days or suspend the application for increases in rates or changes in rules affecting rates, and limits the extension of such suspensions to two 30-day periods, after which time the proposed rate or rule may be placed into effect by the petitioner. The change will improve the rate making procedure.

SECTION 10

This section clarifies the Act by making it clear that a stockyard owner has the right to manage and regulate the activities at his stockyard, provided he acts in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner.

SECTION 11

This section provides that reparation actions (under which money damages may be awarded to complainants) may be filed against all persons subject to the Act. It also broadens the reparation provisions to provide that reparations may be awarded for damages sustained in consequence of a violation of any section of the Act or of an order of the Secretary under the Act.

SECTION 12

This section extends the period of time within which to file a reparation complaint for money damages from 90 to 120 days. It provides that oral hearings need not be held if the damages claimed do not exceed $1,500. It also sets up a procedure for judicial review of reparation awards, provides for suspension of registration of those registrants who fail to either appeal the reparation award or pay the award, and provides for the assessment of a penalty against a defendant, not registered under the Act, who does not appeal or pay a reparation award, of $500 for each day that he engages in any business subject to the Act.

This proposal would correct one of the principal weaknesses of the present reparation procedure under the Act—the inability of the Department to require payment of reparation awards. The imposition of a penalty against defendants who fail to pay or appeal to a court is similar to the present procedure under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act.

This section makes it clear that if the Secretary conducts a hearing with respect to any issue, either on his own motion or upon a complaint, the Secretary can introduce relevant evidence either in favor of an issue or in opposition to the issue. Generally, a complaint is not issued unless the Secretary has reasonable grounds for believing that the party complained against has violated the Act in some respect. On occasion, however, the Secretary may believe that a person has acted legally, but that the issue is sufficiently questionable that a hearing should be held, with right of judicial review by any party aggrieved by the final decision in the case. In such circumstances, the Secretary should have the right to submit evidence in the administrative hearing in favor of the legality of the matter.

SECTION 13

This section confirms that the phrase "owner or operator" used in section 310(b) of the Act is intended to mean "stockyard owner or market agency." This is in accord with the settled administrative contruction of the present language.

SECTION 14

Section 311 of the Act was designed originally to eliminate any unreasonable advantages, prejudices, or preferences between livestock markets in intrastate commerce and interstate or foreign commerce. It was amended in 1958 to bring within the scope of the Act the intrastate practices of dealers for the same purpose. Its provisions are limited at this time to rates and practices of stockyard companies, market agencies, and dealers involving livestock.

This amendment brings within the scope of this section similar unreasonable advantages or preferences with respect to all products handled by all persons subject to this Act. It would, therefore, serve to prevent this type of preference or advantage, not only involving livestock, but also poultry, meats, meat food products, livestock products in unmanufactured form, and poultry products. It would permit the Department to assist States and persons subject to this Act in eliminating unfair and discriminatory methods of competition in intrastate commerce if interstate commerce is adversely affected.

SECTION 15

The language of section 312(b) permits issuance of cease-and-desist orders in instances in which a stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer "is violating" the provisions of the Act and the Secretary finds that such a violation "does or will exist." This language has been interpreted to include instances in which the firm has violated the Act. The amendment confirms the settled construction of the Act and makes it clear that a cease-and-desist order may be issued if a person "is violating or has violated" the provisions of section 312(a).

SECTION 16

This section amends section 312(a) to provide that any "officer, director, agent, or employee" of any stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer who fails to obey any order of the Secretary is subject to a civil penalty. The amendment also extends the penalty to violations of orders issued under proposed section 409 of the regulations (relating to suspensions).

SECTION 17

This section amends section 315 to correspond with section 314(a), to provide that in the event any "officer, director, agent, or employee" of a stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer fails to obey any order of the Secretary, the Attorney General may apply to the court for enforcement of such order.

SECTION 18

Section 316 of the Act is repealed since its provisions are no longer effective, having been superseded by the Hobbs Act.

SECTION 19

This section amends section 402 of the Act to clarify that the provisions of sections 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act create a Federal Trade Commission incorporated into the Packers and Stockyards Act to provide authority with respect to records, reports, subpenas, etc., are applicable to any person "as defined in the Act" as under the Federal Trade Commission Act and are not limited to persons "subject to the provisions of the Act."

SECTION 20

Section 402 of the Act, providing that when construing the Act, the act of an agent is also deemed to be the act of his principal, is extended to apply to orders of the Secretary. In addition, the section makes it clear that cease-and-desist orders may also be directed against any individual, named as a party to the proceeding, who, as "officer, director, agent, or employee" was responsible for the violation.

SECTION 21

This amendment is for the purpose of clarifying that the Secretary has the authority under section 407 to make such rules, regulations, and orders as may be necessary not only to carry out the specific provisions of this Act, but also to accomplish "the purposes" of the Act. This is similar to the language in other regulatory statutes.

SECTION 22

This section redesignates section 408 as 412 and adds three new sections.

Section 408 restates the authority given the Secretary in the Appropriation Act of July 12, 1943, to require reasonable bonds from market agencies and dealers, and clarifies that this authority applies to packers purchasing livestock in commerce. This amendment provides that such bonding authority extends only to secure the performance of obligations with respect to transactions involving livestock or poultry subject to the Act.

Section 409 restates, in slightly different language, the authority given to the Secretary in the Appropriation Act of July 12, 1943, to suspend the registration of any registrant who is insolvent or who has violated any of the provisions of the Act. It adds the authority to revoke a registration for a flagrant or repeated offense. This section also prohibits a registrant whose registration has been suspended for a period of 90 days or less from permitting any other person to carry on his business during that period of time.

Section 410 provides the Secretary with authority to request injunctions from the U.S. District Court in certain instances when it is believed that irreparable damage may result to producers or members of the industry if a practice is permitted to continue.

Section 411 adds a new section to the Act, clarifying the prohibition in the Act against mergers or combinations, the effect of which may be substantially to lessen competition. It also requires pre-merger notification by packers.

SECTION 23

This section repeals Title V of the Act, which provides for designating major live poultry markets, and for licensing and regulating the rates of persons operating at such markets. As the character of the poultry industry has changed, these markets no longer have the importance which they had in earlier years. Under the amended definition of "packer" in section 5 of this bill, persons operating in the live or processed poultry industries would be subject to the same regulatory provisions now applicable to meat packers and live poultry dealers and handlers.

SECTION 24

This section deletes the proviso in the Appropriation Act of July 12, 1943, authorizing the Secretary to require bonds and to suspend registrants as this authority is now contained in sections 408 and 409.

SECTION 25

This is a statement of intent designed to preserve the current provisions in the Act in the event any of the new provisions should be held invalid. This section also provides that pending proceedings shall be disposed of pursuant to the existing provisions of law.

CLEVELAND AFL–CIO CALLS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland AFL–CIO Federation has taken a clear and strong position in support of President Johnson's recommendations for consumer protection legislation. A resolution adopted by the federation on April 13, 1966, expresses the concerns and hopes of its 200,000 members.

The resolution points out that the use of sly and deceitful labels and containers costs the average American family an estimated several hundred, hard-earned dollars each year. To stamp out this widespread trickery perpetrated on the American consumer on a national basis requires Federal legislation. The time for Congress to act on this legislation to protect the American consumer is now—during this session of Congress.

The Federal Trade Commission has primary responsibility for retail transactions involving meat or poultry products. This would continue under the proposed bill. However, the bill would make it clear that the Secretary has jurisdiction with respect to wholesale transactions involving the sale of meat from packers to retailers.

For example, if a chainstore not subject to the Secretary's jurisdiction forced packers to give discriminatory allowances as a condition of selling meat to the chainstore, the Secretary's only remedy would be to bring disciplinary actions against all of the packers who gave the discriminatory allowances. But the real culprit in this example is the chainstore. Under the proposed amendments, it would be clear that an action could be brought against the chainstore requiring it to cease and desist from forcing suppliers into giving discriminatory allowances.

The bill also makes it plain that integrated poultry operations are subject to the Secretary's jurisdiction. The Secretary has engaged in a widespread investigation of conditions in the broiler industry, particularly in the Southeastern States. Actions have been instituted against a number of poultry processors alleging unfair practice against poultry producers, but the Secretary's jurisdiction has been challenged in some proceedings. This bill makes it clear that the Secretary has jurisdiction with respect to such matters.

The bill further provides that the Secretary has jurisdiction over any transactions which burden or affect interstate commerce. This is necessary so that the Secretary can assume jurisdiction over any unfair practice which has a significant impact on the livestock, poultry, or meat industries even though the particular transaction occurs entirely within a State. Under today's fragmented but interrelated marketing system, jurisdictional questions will occupy an increasingly large percentage of the time and attention of the Packers and Stockyards Division and seriously hamper and delay resolution of important problems and conditions unless a broader, more practical approach to jurisdiction is adopted.

Moreover, the Packers and Stockyards Division works very closely with State officials to avoid duplication of effort. Formal memorandums of understanding involving the work of the Packers and Stockyards Division have been entered into with about half of the States. The first formal agreement was signed in December of 1963, and this program of Federal-State cooperation is expanding rapidly. Even in the absence of formal agreements, excellent working relations exist between the Packers and Stockyards Division and the State officials having similar responsibility under State laws.

The amendment extending the Secretary's jurisdiction to include transactions which "burden or affect" interstate commerce will be helpful to prevent unfair practices—occurring within the confines of a particular State—by persons who operate primarily across State lines, so that no one State can adequately regulate their activities.

MERGERS

The proposed bill clarifies the Secretary's authority to act in the case of mergers, the effect of which may be substantially to lessen competition. This Nation is going through a period, in many industries, where substanial numbers of mergers are decreasing competition. The regulatory bodies having antitrust responsibility have not been able to deal effectively with the tremendous numbers of mergers taking place. This bill would make it clear that the Secretary has authority with respect to those industries subject to his jurisdiction. The bill would not, however, interfere with the present authority of the Department of Justice to bring antimerger actions.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Numerous other proposed amendments are contained in H.R. 14879. These amendments are primarily clarifying in nature, or they are to update and modernize various provisions of the act to keep pace with the dynamic changes taking place in the livestock, poultry, and meat industries. All of the amendments are summarized in a brief statement which I will include in the RECORD.

I believe that the Congress owes it to the livestock and poultry producers to enact these amendments. The amendments will substantially assist them in marketing their production under fair and competitive conditions. The bill will also assist the many members of the livestock, poultry, and meat industries who are entitled to protection from the few who would seek to profit from unfair competitive practices. The bill will further give added protection to consumers. Unfair and monopolistic practices result, in the long run, in higher prices to consumers.

The summary of H.R. 14879, to which I referred earlier, follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

TITLE

The title of the Packers and Stockyards Act is amended to eliminate therefrom reference to dairy products and eggs, which were removed from the Act by the 1958 amendment, and to substitute meats and meat food products so that the title more accurately describes the subject matter of the Act.

SECTION 2

This section defines the terms "poultry" and "poultry products" which are not now defined, but are used throughout the Act. The language of these definitions closely parallels that used in the Act in defining the terms "livestock" and "meat food products."

SECTION 3

This section clarifies the commerce definition set out in section 2(b) of the Act to include any transaction which "burdens or affects" the current of commerce usual in the "livestock or meat packing or distributing industries or in the poultry or poultry slaughtering, processing, or distributing industries." The addition of meat "distributing" and "poultry or poultry slaughtering, processing, or distributing industries" brings the definition into conformity with the scope of the Act.

SECTION 4

This section sets forth the present administrative construction of the Act that it is an unfair practice for any person, without reasonable cause, to fail to make full payment for a commodity or to refuse to accept or fail to deliver a commodity in accordance with the applicable contract.

SECTION 5

This section clarifies and expands the definition of the term "packer" in section 201 of the Act by bringing clearly within the definition all persons operating in commerce in the poultry, as well as meat industries, including brokers, chainstores, distributors, wholesalers, and purveyors. The addition of the phrase "or otherwise acquiring" is intended to remove any possibility of doubt with respect to livestock or poultry or their products produced or acquired in any manner other than by purchase.

The word "processing" is added to "manufacturing or preparing" to correspond to the present administrative construction of the Act. The addition of the phrases "in any manner" after the words "manufacturing, processing or preparing" is to clarify that any activity involving the production of or the preparation of products for shipment or sale is included, such as trimming, freezing, or packaging. This bill preserves the status quo of the Federal Trade Commission's concurrent jurisdiction with the Department, the Department retaining primary jurisdiction at the wholesale level and the Commission retaining primary jurisdiction at the retail level.

SECTION 6

This section provides for the substitution of the phrase "this Act" for the phrase "this Title" so that cases involving violations by packers of any section of the Act will be handled under the procedure established in sections 203, 204, and 205 of the Act.

SECTION 7

This section expand the heading for Title III to include "Stockyards; Registration; and Reparation." This is more descriptive of the contents of Title III.

SECTION 8

This section eliminates the description of the information which should be supplied by an applicant for registration so that it is clear that the rules and regulations of the Secretary may prescribe any reasonable requirements as a condition for registration, such as the filing of a bond.

SECTION 9

This section makes it plain that the burden of proof with respect to the reasonableness of any rate, charge, regulation, or practice which a stockyard or market agency desires to place into effect is on the proponent thereof, including any initial tariff. It also provides for lengthening the period of time that the Department will have in which to properly analyze these requests. Section 306 as now written requires the Department to take action within 10 days or suspend the application for increases in rates or changes in rules affecting rates, and limits the extension of such suspensions to two 30-day periods, after which time the proposed rate or rule may be placed into effect by the petitioner. The change will improve the rate making procedure.

SECTION 10

This section clarifies the Act by making it clear that a stockyard owner has the right to manage and regulate the activities at his stockyard, provided he acts in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner.

SECTION 11

This section provides that reparation actions (under which money damages may be awarded to complainants) may be filed against all persons subject to the Act. It also broadens the reparation provisions to provide that reparations may be awarded for damages sustained in consequence of a violation of any section of the Act or of an order of the Secretary under the Act.

SECTION 12

This section extends the period of time within which to file a reparation complaint for money damages from 90 to 120 days. It provides that oral hearings need not be held if the damages claimed do not exceed $1,500. It also sets up a procedure for judicial review of reparation awards, provides for suspension of registration of those registrants who fail to either appeal the reparation award or pay the award, and provides for the assessment of a penalty against a defendant, not registered under the Act, who does not appeal or pay a reparation award, of $500 for each day that he engages in any business subject to the Act.

This proposal would correct one of the principal weaknesses of the present reparation procedure under the Act—the inability of the Department to require payment of reparation awards. The imposition of a penalty against defendants who fail to pay or appeal to a court is similar to the present procedure under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act.

This section makes it clear that if the Secretary conducts a hearing with respect to any issue, either on his own motion or upon a complaint, the Secretary can introduce relevant evidence either in favor of an issue or in opposition to the issue. Generally, a complaint is not issued unless the Secretary has reasonable grounds for believing that the party complained against has violated the Act in some respect. On occasion, however, the Secretary may believe that a person has acted legally, but that the issue is sufficiently questionable that a hearing should be held, with right of judicial review by any party aggrieved by the final decision in the case. In such circumstances, the Secretary should have the right to submit evidence in the administrative hearing in favor of the legality of the matter.

SECTION 13

This section confirms that the phrase "owner or operator" used in section 310(b) of the Act is intended to mean "stockyard owner or market agency." This is in accord with the settled administrative contruction of the present language.

SECTION 14

Section 311 of the Act was designed originally to eliminate any unreasonable advantages, prejudices, or preferences between livestock markets in intrastate commerce and interstate or foreign commerce. It was amended in 1958 to bring within the scope of the Act the intrastate practices of dealers for the same purpose. Its provisions are limited at this time to rates and practices of stockyard companies, market agencies, and dealers involving livestock.

This amendment brings within the scope of this section similar unreasonable advantages or preferences with respect to all products handled by all persons subject to this Act. It would, therefore, serve to prevent this type of preference or advantage, not only involving livestock, but also poultry, meats, meat food products, livestock products in unmanufactured form, and poultry products. It would permit the Department to assist States and persons subject to this Act in eliminating unfair and discriminatory methods of competition in intrastate commerce if interstate commerce is adversely affected.

SECTION 15

The language of section 312(b) permits issuance of cease-and-desist orders in instances in which a stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer "is violating" the provisions of the Act and the Secretary finds that such a violation "does or will exist." This language has been interpreted to include instances in which the firm has violated the Act. The amendment confirms the settled construction of the Act and makes it clear that a cease-and-desist order may be issued if a person "is violating or has violated" the provisions of section 312(a).

SECTION 16

This section amends section 312(a) to provide that any "officer, director, agent, or employee" of any stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer who fails to obey any order of the Secretary is subject to a civil penalty. The amendment also extends the penalty to violations of orders issued under proposed section 409 of the regulations (relating to suspensions).

SECTION 17

This section amends section 315 to correspond with section 314(a), to provide that in the event any "officer, director, agent, or employee" of a stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer fails to obey any order of the Secretary, the Attorney General may apply to the court for enforcement of such order.

SECTION 18

Section 316 of the Act is repealed since its provisions are no longer effective, having been superseded by the Hobbs Act.

SECTION 19

This section amends section 402 of the Act to clarify that the provisions of sections 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act create a Federal Trade Commission incorporated into the Packers and Stockyards Act to provide authority with respect to records, reports, subpenas, etc., are applicable to any person "as defined in the Act" as under the Federal Trade Commission Act and are not limited to persons "subject to the provisions of the Act."

SECTION 20

Section 402 of the Act, providing that when construing the Act, the act of an agent is also deemed to be the act of his principal, is extended to apply to orders of the Secretary. In addition, the section makes it clear that cease-and-desist orders may also be directed against any individual, named as a party to the proceeding, who, as "officer, director, agent, or employee" was responsible for the violation.

SECTION 21

This amendment is for the purpose of clarifying that the Secretary has the authority under section 407 to make such rules, regulations, and orders as may be necessary not only to carry out the specific provisions of this Act, but also to accomplish "the purposes" of the Act. This is similar to the language in other regulatory statutes.

SECTION 22

This section redesignates section 408 as 412 and adds three new sections.

Section 408 restates the authority given the Secretary in the Appropriation Act of July 12, 1943, to require reasonable bonds from market agencies and dealers, and clarifies that this authority applies to packers purchasing livestock in commerce. This amendment provides that such bonding authority extends only to secure the performance of obligations with respect to transactions involving livestock or poultry subject to the Act.

Section 409 restates, in slightly different language, the authority given to the Secretary in the Appropriation Act of July 12, 1943, to suspend the registration of any registrant who is insolvent or who has violated any of the provisions of the Act. It adds the authority to revoke a registration for a flagrant or repeated offense. This section also prohibits a registrant whose registration has been suspended for a period of 90 days or less from permitting any other person to carry on his business during that period of time.

Section 410 provides the Secretary with authority to request injunctions from the U.S. District Court in certain instances when it is believed that irreparable damage may result to producers or members of the industry if a practice is permitted to continue.

Section 411 adds a new section to the Act, clarifying the prohibition in the Act against mergers or combinations, the effect of which may be substantially to lessen competition. It also requires pre-merger notification by packers.

SECTION 23

This section repeals Title V of the Act, which provides for designating major live poultry markets, and for licensing and regulating the rates of persons operating at such markets. As the character of the poultry industry has changed, these markets no longer have the importance which they had in earlier years. Under the amended definition of "packer" in section 5 of this bill, persons operating in the live or processed poultry industries would be subject to the same regulatory provisions now applicable to meat packers and live poultry dealers and handlers.

SECTION 24

This section deletes the proviso in the Appropriation Act of July 12, 1943, authorizing the Secretary to require bonds and to suspend registrants as this authority is now contained in sections 408 and 409.

SECTION 25

This is a statement of intent designed to preserve the current provisions in the Act in the event any of the new provisions should be held invalid. This section also provides that pending proceedings shall be disposed of pursuant to the existing provisions of law.

CLEVELAND AFL–CIO CALLS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland AFL–CIO Federation has taken a clear and strong position in support of President Johnson's recommendations for consumer protection legislation. A resolution adopted by the federation on April 13, 1966, expresses the concerns and hopes of its 200,000 members.

The resolution points out that the use of sly and deceitful labels and containers costs the average American family an estimated several hundred, hard-earned dollars each year. To stamp out this widespread trickery perpetrated on the American consumer on a national basis requires Federal legislation. The time for Congress to act on this legislation to protect the American consumer is now—during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the resolution on consumer protection adopted by the Cleveland AFL–CIO Federation of Labor:

RESOLUTION ON CONSUMER PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION

Whereas the modern shopper is lost in a sea of shelves loaded with boobytrapped packages sometimes labeled "large" for small size, "giant" for medium, and "family size" for large, containing varying fractional weights and measures;

Whereas this tricky and deceptive packaging sometimes makes it impossible for a housewife to determine the actual unit cost of some items she is purchasing;

Whereas sly and deceitful labels and containers are also used to lure men and even children into unwise purchases;

Whereas such trickery is estimated to cost the average American family several hundred hard-earned dollars every year;

Whereas the Federal Government is the only agency that can protect consumers from such fraud and deception;

Therefore be it resolved that this Cleveland AFL–CIO Federation of Labor go on record as strongly recommending that the Congress of the United States adopt the consumer protective legislation recommended by President Lyndon B. Johnson, which would require plain and accurate labeling of package contents and set standards of weights and measures;

And be it further resolved that our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress be advised, by copies of this resolution, of the views of this federation and its 200,000 members.

Adopted: Cleveland AFL–CIO Federation of Labor April 13, 1966.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Skubitz (at the request of Mr. Conable), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Feighan, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Mize (at the request of Mr. Conable), to include extraneous material following remarks made today in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Talcott to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material during his special order today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Conable) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Berry.

Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Don H. Clausen.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. Vanik.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 14732. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplementary stockpile;

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 14012. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 11781. A bill to improve and clarify certain laws of the Coast Guard; with amendments (Rept. No. 1523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALL: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12270. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the 12th World Jamboree and Conference of Boy Scouts to be held in the United States of America in 1967, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13366. A bill to authorize the disposal of aluminum from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13768. A bill to authorize the disposal of celestite from the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13769. A bill to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber (sisal) from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13769. A bill to authorize the disposal of crocidolite asbestos (harsh) from the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13772. A bill to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13773. A bill to authorize the disposal of opium from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 15017. A bill to require that new automobiles distributed in interstate commerce shall be equipped with suitable facilities for the disposal of litter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 15018. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 15019. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to monthly cash benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act, and individuals retired for disability under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 15020. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 15021. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide pensions for widows of certain retired members of the

Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 15022. A bill to provide grants to the States for the strengthening of adult educational programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 15023. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 15024. A bill to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to require the Administrator of General Services to acquire certain additional property in the District of Columbia for public purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 15025. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to permit veterans with service-connected disabilities rated 50 percent or more to make purchases at post exchanges and commissaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 15026. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to continue to exclude policemen and firemen from the insurance system, except where such system is made available as a supplement to police or fire department pension systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 15027. A bill to make certain reclamation project expenses nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 15028. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 15029. A bill to amend the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 15030. A bill to establish a contiguous fisheries zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 15031. A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 15032. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to increase the funds available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for its secondary market operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 15033. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 15034. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 15035. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an individual's entitlement to retirement benefits under that act or the Social Security Act while he or she is entitled to dependent's or survivor's benefits under the other such act shall not operate to prevent any increases in his or her benefits under the 1937 act which would otherwise result under the so-called social security minimum guarantee provision; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 15036. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 15037. A bill relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 15038. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 15039. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALKER of Mississippi:

H.R. 15040. A bill to implement the conclusion contained in section 2 of the Communist Control Act of 1954 that the Communist Party should be outlawed by prohibiting membership in the Communist Party and similar subversive organizations; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 15041. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for a Minority Economic Council; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 15042. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 15043. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to require uniformity of eligibility to receive certain surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.J. Res. 1140. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 649. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 650. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. Con. Res. 651. Concurrent resolution to request the President to proclaim August 13, 1966, as "National Wall of Shame Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.:

H. Con. Res. 652. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Con. Res. 653. Concurrent resolution relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H. Con. Res. 654. Concurrent resolution relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Res. 853. Resolution creating in the House of Representatives a committee on grievances to study complaints concerning the conduct of Members of the House of Representatives and to make investigations and appropriate recommendations thereon; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

474. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to pending minimum wage legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15044. A bill for the relief of Angelo Sedita, Filomena Vincenza Sedita, and Vincenza Sedita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 15045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sara Resnikoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 15046. A bill for the relief of Iraj Mahbod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 15047. A bill for the relief of Lila Everts Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15048. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Bizzarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 15049. A bill for the relief of Mr. Denbigh T. Hernandez and Mrs. Ruby M. Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 15050. A bill for the relief of Winston Hyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 15051. A bill for the relief of Antonio Tavares da Silva Praticante and his wife, Margarida Praticante; to the Committee on Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Time Is Now for Wyoming Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide coal and uranium with the same depletion allowance now granted to gas and oil.

This action is necessary because of the tremendous demands for power generated by our technological advances and population increases. It is also necessary because of the changing concept of energy production.

It is no longer adequate to merely react to today's problems. We must, as far as possible, anticipate future needs and act to meet them.

This anticipated need for more energy can be met by encouraging development of the tremendous coal reserves in this country and the uranium resources of our Western States.

My State of Wyoming has coal that represents one of the greatest supplies of hydrocarbons to be found in the North American Continent. The Department of Interior estimated in 1950 that Wyoming coal resources amounted to 121,553,850,000 tons. Wyoming has known or probable coal-bearing lands on 40,055 square miles, or approximately 41 percent of our State.

The uranium ore in Wyoming constitutes 36 percent of the known reserves in the United States. Our reserves are rich in quality, substantial in volume, and have shallow overburdens, permitting efficient and economical production. Truly, Wyoming is the energy capital of North America.

The problem therefore is not one of scarcity, but rather one of inactivity. From its wartime high of 9,836,000 tons in 1945, coal production in my State has declined, dropping to 1,629,000 tons in 1958. It has increased to more than 3 million tons in 1963, but this represents only a fraction of what could be done.

Our objective is to encourage development of this coal, and in this regard, the utilization of tax incentives has been a reliable catalyst to activity.

The oil and gas developers presently enjoy a 27½-percent depletion allowance, permitting them to deduct this percentage from their income without taxation.

Uranium presently has a 23-percent depletion allowance and coal lags behind with only a 10-percent allowance, although it can be a more costly means to obtain energy in comparison to gas and oil recovery.

Gas, oil, coal, and uranium are all forms of energy and should be treated equally with respect to tax incentives—for in the long range, they must compete as equals for the energy market.

My bill would graduate the depletion allowance for uranium to 27½ percent after December 31, 1967. It would raise the depletion allowance for coal by 2½ percent annually until it reaches the 27½-percent level after December 31, 1972.

This legislation serves as recognition of the fact that there is no longer a need for distinctions between various forms of energy. The fuels all serve one purpose ultimately, and in view of the fact that companies no longer restrict themselves to one fuel source, it is time for our tax laws to correspond to this new concept.

I am hopeful that the immediate effect of this legislation will be to encourage private industry to look once more upon the tremendous potential of coal, even as we recognize the possibilities of uranium. This attention will hopefully lead to activity in our idle coal fields and a resurgence of interest in this proven, plentiful resource. Because Wyoming ranks fourth in coal reserves and holds more than one-third of the Nation's uranium, I assure you this legislation can do much to bring Wyoming's energy potential to realization.

Joan Merriam Smith the Outstanding Aviatrix of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1964 at 12:12 e.d.t. a young courageous aviatrix wrote aviation history for the United States when she landed at Oakland, Calif. airport by her flight completion of the 1937 Amelia Earhart global Equator route and the longest single solo flight of 27,750 miles. This was the late Mrs. Joan Merriam Smith—born 1936, Oceanside, Long Island, N.Y., and later resided in Detroit, Miami, San Diego, and Long Beach, Calif.

Joan Merriam—her flying name—was awarded the highest aviation award, posthumously, the 1965 Harmon International Aviation Trophy by Vice President HUMPHREY on December 14, 1965.

The inscription read:

> Joan Merriam Smith—the world's outstanding aviatrix for 1964, in recognition of her piloting skill and courage in completing a 27,750 mile solo flight around the world, on a course which ran mostly near the Equator in a twin-engine light plane between the dates March 17, 1964 and May 12, 1964.

Vice President HUMPHREY has stated of Joan Merriam:

> All Americans and particularly American women can be justifiably proud of this courageous woman's accomplishments.

On this the second anniversary of this historic flight, I should like to remind the Members of the House of the introduced memorial resolutions—House Joint Resolution 461-5—pending before Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4 under Chairman BYRON ROGERS and request their interest and support in securing 1966 congressional approval. The resolutions were introduced by myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], and in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 114 by Senators SMATHERS and SMITH.

The resolution requests post office consideration of the issuance of an airmail stamp in honor of Joan Merriam's flight and a proposed theme of, "World Friendship via Aviation" would be appropriate for this stamp because of Joan Merriam's plane—thousands of new global friends wrote their names and greetings on her plane during her historic global flight.

As president of the Congressional Flying Club, I know of the interest of the several other flying Members of Congress in this resolution and should like to note the growing contributions of general aviation industry and pilots toward peace and world friendship, for example, in the fields of rescue, travel, business, racing, agriculture, missionary work, and lastly pioneering as was the flight of Joan Merriam.

The second request for a joint day of honor for May 12 of each year "Joan Merriam-Amelia Earhart Aviation Day" in honor of both aviatrixes and all women fliers of the United States is a deserved honor. Amelia Earhart was America's first and greatest aviatrix and the first president of Ninety-Nines—International Organization of Women Pilots—and served as the inspiration of Joan Merriam's life and flight. Mrs. Muriel Morrissey—sister of Miss Earhart—has written:

> Please advise all Congressional Members of my interest and approval of this memorial tribute for the late Joan Merriam. As Amelia's sister, I know that she would be most proud of Joan and her 1964 World Flight * * * I recall the reason that she stated for her flight, "My flight was made to complete a page in Aviation History for the United States."

History has now linked together the names of these two courageous pioneers and hopefully a joint Aviation Day would inspire all Americans in their life's work to pioneer and achieve and contribute to peace and world friendship in the air and space age—as did Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the attached statements that will further tell the Joan Merriam Smith story:

THE 1965 HARMON INTERNATIONAL AVIATION TROPHY—CLIFFORD B. HARMON TRUST

Awarded to Joan Merriam Smith, The World's Outstanding Aviatrix for 1964, In recognition of her piloting skill and courage in completing a 27,000-mile solo flight entirely around the world on a course which ran mostly near the Equator, in a twin-engine light plane, between the dates of March 17, 1964 and May 12, 1964.

Presented on December 14, 1965, Old State Building, Washington, D.C.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President of the United States of America.
EDWARD H. RYAN,
MARY V. BROSNAKAY,
ANSEL EDWARD TALBERT,
Trustees.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1965.

Miss PEG SCHRODER,
The Bronx,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR MISS SCHRODER: This will acknowledge your letter of August 12 and the material you sent me regarding the late Joan Merriam Smith.

In response to your request, I have checked with the Federal Aviation Agency. That agency informed me that it has no record of any safety violations incurred by Mrs. Smith. Her flight was officially recognized by that Agency, and one of its representatives met Mrs. Smith when she completed her around-the-world trip. It is my understanding that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency at that time, Mr. Najeeb Halaby, extended his personal congratulations to Mrs. Smith for her accomplishment.

With kind regards,
Sincerely yours,
MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, July 23, 1965.

Miss PEG SCHRODER,
Bronx, N.Y.

DEAR MISS SCHRODER: I have read with interest your letter concerning your efforts to obtain the Medal of Freedom for famous aviatrix, Joan Merriam Smith.

All Americans—and particularly American women—can be justifiably proud of this courageous woman's accomplishments. I shall see to it that the White House is informed of your interest in this matter.

Best wishes.
Sincerely,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

JOAN MERRIAM SMITH STAMP PROPOSED

Under the leadership of Peg Schroder, 3034 Grand Concourse, Bronx, N.Y., 10458, a campaign seeking issue of a U.S. air mail stamp honoring the late Joan Merriam Smith has gained considerable momentum during recent weeks.

Mrs. Smith, it will be remembered, made aviation history in 1964, when she retraced the late Amelia Earhart's 1937 Trans-Pacific route, establishing a number of records—including the longest single solo flight of 27,750 miles.

For this flight Mrs. Smith received the Harmon International Aviation trophy.

The trophy was awarded posthumously for the distinguished aviatrix and a flying friend, Trixie-Ann Schubert, lost their lives February 17, 1965, in a plane crash of uncertain cause near Los Angeles.

Mrs. Schroder, who heads the Citizens Committee for Recognition of Joan Merriam Smith, reports that Senators and Representatives have introduced a Joint Resolution in Congress authorizing and directing the Postmaster General to give due consideration to issue of an 8-cent air mail stamp in honor of Joan Merriam Smith. The resolution calls for issue of the stamp on May 12, the anniversary of her famous solo flight over the Amelia Earhart Route.

The Joint Resolution calls for designation of May 12 each year as Joan M. Smith-Amelia Earhart Aviation Day in honor of all the country's women fliers: Amelia Earhart who blazed the frontier of aviation for women and Joan Merriam Smith, who dreamed, lived and fulfilled the achievement of flying solo the uncompleted 1937 Amelia Earhart flight route around the Equator in 1964.

Joan Merriam Smith, the Joint Resolution points out, was the first person to fly solo around the world at the Equator, the first person to fily a twin-engine aircraft around the world, the first woman to receive the airline transport rating at the age of 23, the first woman to fly the Pacific east-west in a twin-engine plane and the first woman to fly solo from Africa to Australia, from Australia to Guam via New Guinea and from Wake to Midway.

The Committee for Recognition of Joan Merriam Smith is now seeking public support for its campaign to bring about the issue of a stamp honoring the aviatrix.

Speech of Senator Muskie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the attention of every Member of Congress has been directed to this year's celebration of the Polish millennium, the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity.

It is regrettable that plains for this year's celebration were marred by an unfortunate change in policy on the part of the Polish Government, precluding a proper interchange of faith.

On Saturday, May 7, at Cambridge Springs, Pa., Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, made a brilliant speech on the occasion of the Polish millennium entitled "This Is Our Heritage."

The speech is submitted as follows:

THIS IS OUR HERITAGE

President Parcinscki, Most Reverend Bishop Watson, Reverend Fathers, Reverend Sisters, Censor Dworakowski, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to be here at this time, at this place, and in such distinguished company.

With you, I have enjoyed this evening up to this point.

I have enjoyed the music of Chopin, the performance of Mr. Zugcic and Mr. Aaron, and the singing of the Millennium Singers. And the folk dancing of the Kujawiaki, Dr. Parcinski, has truly been a symbol of that excellence which is the objective of Alliance College.

Now it is my task to speak, and yours to listen. I hope that we finish at the same time.

We are here because, one thousand years ago, Poland entered upon the stage of world history—and embraced Christianity.

Ever since, she has had an impressive and meaningful influence upon western civilization.

An influence that has enriched the life of Western man.

An influence that has contributed to the development of Western political institutions and concepts.

An influence that has been exerted by Polish leaders who have been, at the same time, leaders in the Western World.

An influence that gives us reason, as Poles, on this millennium anniversary, to be proud of our heritage and what it has meant for mankind.

It is appropriate, therefore, that we should create occasions such as this to review that heritage, to take satisfaction from it, but more important, to draw meaning from it as we contemplate today's world and the unknown future.

There is much of glory in Poland's past—glory which was the product of the love of liberty, fierce independence, intense patriotism, and courage so characteristic of the Polish people.

And because of her geographic position, Poland has had ample opportunity to put these qualities to the test.

On two important occasions in a thousand years, Poland was the first line of defense against invading hordes from the east. She held her line proudly, and the eastern dreams of conquering Europe were dashed.

Every Pole remembers that in 1241 Prince Henryk Pobozny, at the cost of his life, forced the Mongol invaders to retreat to Asia in the battle of Legnica.

Every Pole remembers that, in 1683, Poland put an end to Turkish expansion in Europe, when the great Jan Sobieski went to the aid of Vienna, and, in a decisive battle, routed the Turks.

And no Pole will ever forget that, even under the burdens Poland has carried in this century, she has fought gallantly in the cause of freedom.

In 1920, Polish armies, led by Marshal Jozef Pilsudski, arrested the march of the bolsheviks on Germany, and the victory, known as the "miracle on the banks of the Vistula," was credited with saving Europe from communism.

In 1939, Poland was the first to feel the military heel of the Nazis at the start of World War II.

Outmatched at the start by Germany's motorized military machine, Poland was stung 17 days later by an attack on the east front by Russia.

Alone and isolated, unable to defend herself on her homeland, she refused to play a passive role in the war.

Without delay, the Polish Army, Navy and Air Force, 80,000 strong, regrouped in France, fought at the side of France, then with the British, and later on, in Norway, North Africa, Italy, Normandy, Belgium and the Netherlands. In the famous Battle of Britain in 1940, Polish airmen were responsible for 15 percent of the German air losses. Altogether, more than 300,000 Poles served with the Allied Forces during the war. Meanwhile, at home, Poland built one of the strongest underground networks in Nazi-occupied Europe.

This is a valiant record for a nation which was attacked and overrun by two nations almost before the rest of the world recognized that a global war had begun.

It is the record of a nation which, for a thousand years, has never rejected the burdens of freedom. And, despite the bitter disappointments of the postwar years, the spirit of freedom has never died. The Poznan uprising of 1956 was a vivid expression of that spirit. It still burns today among Poles, both in and out of Poland, and always will.

The same qualities which brought glory on the field of battle were the inspiration for achievement in the works of peace.

Poland's history sings of human and cultural progress.

Encouraged by centuries of reverence for individual freedom, the arts and sciences flourished.

Even a partial list is impressive:

Europe's first ministry of education resulting from the constitution of 1791;

Mikolaj Kopernik, one of Europe's outstanding scholars in the 16th century, and the father of modern astronomy; Ludwik Zamenhoff, the inventor of the language of esperanto; Madame Marie-Curie-Sklodowska, world-famous for the discovery of radium; in the field of literature, Wladyslaw

Reymont and Henryk Sienkiewicz, winners of Nobel prizes, Reymont for his novel "The Peasants," and Sienkiewicz for "Quo Vadis"; and the world renowned Jozef Conrad-Korzeniowski, author of "Lord Jim" and other novels.

In no field has the glory of Poland shone more brightly than in the field of music. Frederic Chopin is a gift to the ages. His brilliant compositions will delight the souls of men as long as music is heard. And in our times, the world has thrilled to the incomparable Paderewski, Rubinstein, Landowska, and Rodginski.

These glories are but the beginning of the Polish story.

Especially impressive have been Poland's contributions to the ideals and concepts of democracy.

In the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries, Poland was the largest and most civilized and powerful state in central and eastern Europe.

And the significant fact is that this achievement was built on a series of fundamental concepts of liberty:

—The "nemineh captiuabus" in 1425 which guaranteed personal liberty of the citizens.

—The "Statutes of Nieszawa" in 1454 which established a bicameral parliamentary system.

—The "nihil novi" in 1505 which made the crown powerless to legislate without consent of the two chambers.

Beginning in 1573, election of the Kings of Poland, and a new set of laws known as "pacta conventa" which gave citizens the right of withdraw allegiance to the King if he transgressed any law or broke any stipulation under which he was elected.

These and other concepts are striking examples of a nation's will to be free of tyranny.

It was the custom for nations seeking empires to subjugate weaker nations and to build autocratic central authority.

Not in Poland. Internally, she decentralized authority. Internationally, she sought to win the hearts of her member nations. She undertook to gain their loyalty, not by coercion, but by making them political and cultural partners.

The free union of Poland and Lithuania, concluded in 1413, is unique in the history of international relations. The treaty puts at the very basis of the union the Christian principle of love.

An attitude of tolerance and respect for local institutions, religion and language was taken by Poland toward her vassal states.

The immense dominions of the Polish crown were divided into 34 provinces, all of which enjoyed all the privileges and benefits of broadly conceived self-government.

Eventually, the degree of local independence contributed to the several partitions of Poland in the 18th century. However, she responded to the internal turmoil by writing the constitution of 1791, a remarkable document in its day. It balanced individual freedoms against the needs of the nation.

Class distinction was ended. Towns obtained administrative and judicial autonomy and parliamentary representation. Peasants were placed under the protection of law. Measures aimed at the abolition of serfdom were sanctioned.

What is there, then, in all this thousand years of history as a Christian nation which has particular pertinence to our day, to our times, and to our future?

Belief in God—yes—with a faith which relates God's will and God's justice and God's compassion to the destiny of Poles and Poland—as in that great national symbol—the Black Madonna.

And so Poles have believed in and fought for the dignity of man.

As they have believed in and fought for the independence of Poland.

And as they have believed in and fought for freedom from tyranny.

These beliefs have written our history, inspired our leaders and our people, shaped our institutions, produced our culture, our literature and our music. These beliefs are Poland—the Poland which the world knows and honors and respects, the Poland of history—the Poland which lives in the hearts and minds of all Poles.

This is the Poland which, in the Warsaw Conference of 1573, guaranteed free worship of any religion.

This is the Poland, whose non-Jewish Poles, hid 300,000 Jews from the searching German Nazis, notwithstanding the threat of the death penalty if caught.

This is the Poland whose Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the "father of American artillery," fought for American independence and then authorized the sale of the lands given him by a grateful America, the proceeds to be used to free and educate slaves.

This is the Poland whose Kasimir Pulaski, the "father of American cavalry," died in the same cause.

This is the Poland of which my father spoke to me, at his knee, for hours on end, out of the fullness of his heart.

Increasingly, as the years passed by and my comprehension grew, he drove home his lesson. What he had lost by leaving Poland had been more than offset by what he gained—for himself and for me. Here, if a man had ability, he could apply it in a manner of his own choosing. Here, if a man had an opinion, he could express it without fear of reprisal. Here, if a man disagreed with governmental policy, he could say so, and, more than that, he could do something about it by casting his ballot at the polls. Here, a man was completely free to reap the fruits of his own integrity, intellectual and physical capacity, his own work. There were no heights toward which he could not strive. It mattered not what his national background, his religious or political beliefs, his economic status in life might be.

These beliefs were my father's life. He held them confidently through periods when he felt the lash of prejudice directed against those of foreign birth and of his creed. On the evening of my inaugural day as Governor of Maine, he turned to me and said, very simply, "Now I can die happy." A few months later the final chapter of his life was written. I am sure that, in the closing moments, he must have thought of the strange and wonderful destiny which had so astonishingly vindicated the beliefs which had uprooted his life.

In 1789, Benjamin Franklin described the America which was my father's life, and his Polish heritage when he wrote:

"God grant, that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man, may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface, and say, 'This is my country.'" This is our heritage—and our unfinished task—here and around the globe.

Everyone in America is a member of a minority group. It may be economic, social, political, religious, racial, regional, or based upon national origin. It may not be such today as to set us apart in any unpleasant way. But it could tomorrow.

The character of our minority status may vary in its impact today upon our effective enjoyment of dignity, equality, security, and opportunity. It may not today constitute a disability in any of these respects. But it could tomorrow.

Our particular minority group may be joined today with others in a common cause or common prejudice or a common indifference with majority status. The accompanying power to affect the rights and privilege of minority groups not a part of the coalition is subject to abuse resulting from indifference, callousness, or deliberate intent.

Today, as a member of the current majority, the possibility, or even the actuality, of such abuse may be of no concern to us. But it could be, if our particular minority group becomes the object of tomorrow's prejudice or indifference.

To those who say—and there are such—that certain national and ethnic groups are better and more desirable as Americans than other, let us ask: "Who is to make the selection, and at what point in history, and is the selection subject to revision as the majority coalition changes?"

To those who say that there are superior and inferior citizens, depending wholly upon race, national origin, religion, or color, let us ask, "Who is to make the selection and how can you be sure what your status will be when the majority coalition takes shape?"

I am not suggesting that the case for civil liberties should be based upon fear of each other.

I am saying simply this. Our differences have made our country great. They have done so because, increasingly, creative ability, intellectual capacity, and high moral and spiritual principles, wherever found, have been allowed to seek their highest attainable level.

I am also saying this. Our differences can destroy us; and the instruments for such destruction are prejudice, fear, indifference, hatred and retaliation.

Is it better for us and our country that we seek reasons to like and trust each other? Or is it better that we seek reasons to fear each other?

In the 1860's, the Maine Legislature concerned itself with the problem of inducing settlements in the unpeopled townships of the State. An agent was sent to Sweden, with instructions to make vigorous efforts to establish a Swedish colony in Maine. Within 10 weeks he had brought to Maine 21 men, 11 women and 18 children—including a pastor, farmers, a civil engineer, a blacksmith, two carpenters, a basket maker, a baker, a tailor and a shoemaker. They carved a home out of the wilderness of northern Maine.

New immigrants followed. Within five years the population had increased to 600 who had built a prosperous community of 130 houses, barns, two steam sawmills, one water power sawmill and the incidental business establishments. At the end of five years, 133 men applied for citizenship.

A Member of the Swedish Parliament wrote to the Governor of Maine as follows: "May the young colony of 'New Sweden' grow and flourish, not only in material strength, but even in developing their moral and intellectual faculties. And may the new population thus add to your State and to your great Republic a good and healthy element of moral power from the Old World, and becoming imbued with the spirit of your free institutions, reflect that spirit on their native land.

"What we have lost in the old fatherland will then not have been lost to humanity: On the contrary, the trees have only been transplanted on a fresher soil, where they will thrive better, and give richer and more abundant fruits. God bless the harvest. God bless your land."

And we are the new Poland—with a similar mission.

Civil liberty is the sunshine without which the crop will suffer. The enemy of civil liberty is prejudice. The cause of prejudice is fear—fear of the unknown, fear that there is no real basis for mutual trust and confidence, fear that those discriminated against may abuse power and authority if given the chance.

If such fears are well-founded, there is no real basis for democratic institutions. All the evidence from our national history and experience indicates that they are not well-founded. The growth of our free institutions—their effectiveness and strength—has been in direct proportion to the expansion of civil liberties and their enjoyment by greater numbers of our people of more diverse and varied backgrounds, talents, and experiences. This has been our harvest and it has been fruitful.

The cause of civil liberties, then, is not simply that of do-gooders, or of neighbors interfering without justification in the affairs of neighbors. It is the cause of all those who are concerned that our national climate be a healthy one.

Let those who support this cause, however, avoid self-righteousness. Let us not refuse to give the trust and confidence which we ask. Faith begets faith if buttressed by an accumulation of reassuring experiences.

We have made legislative progress in this field in recent years. Some believe we have moved too fast; others that we have not moved fast enough. Without resolving that difference of opinion, I think it fair to say that we have moved ahead, that the movement has achieved constructive results, and that it gives promise of more progress.

And we should take pride as Poles, that, as we contribute to that progress, we will be enhancing an ancient Polish heritage—a heritage that was nobly expressed in 1413 in the treaty of union between Poland and Lithuania:

"May this deed be remembered forever. It is known to all that he will not attain salvation who is not sustained by the mystery of love which—radiates goodness, reconciles those in discord, unites those who quarrel, dissipates hatred, puts an end to anger, furnishes to all the food of peace, brings together the scattered, lifts up the fallen, makes rough way smooth, turns wrong into right, aids virtues, injures no one, delights in all things: he, who take refuge in its arms will find safety, and thenceforth even though insulted, will have no fear."

"Through love, laws are established, kingdoms are ruled, cities are set in order, and the welfare of the state is brought to its highest."

This is the creed of a Christian nation.

We believe it because it is right.

We believe it because we are God's children.

We know that, only when all God's children are warmed by its beneficient glow, can we hope to achieve justice, and order, and peace on earth.

H.R. 12117

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am again urging that H.R. 12117, a bill providing for a commission to stop the spread of noxious, obscene, and smut material, be given immediate hearings and be immediately passed.

This loathsome profession has become a multibillion-dollar business and is one which must be stringently controlled.

This is an interstate business and only the Federal Government can control it. I hope, Mr. Speaker, action can be taken immediately.

Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. For the 6th consecutive year, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members the results of the congressional questionnaire conducted in Michigan's Eighth District. Before listing the results, I would like to mention that the questionnaire was mailed to some 120,000 homes throughout the district. In addition, most of the 26 weekly and daily newspapers in the district's five counties ran the questionnaire ballot as a public service, which resulted in greater participation. Over 11,000 returns have been received. The results were based on the tabulation of 8,428 completed by a private business firm, Control Data Corp.

A news release issued on the poll is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Wider use of American air and sea power in the Vietnam war was the most popular view expressed by Michigan Eighth District voters in Congressman JIM HARVEY's annual Congressional Questionnaire.

In announcing results of the questionnaire, Congressman HARVEY emphasized that the majority of the returns had been received before the recent riots by the Buddhists in South Vietnam cast some doubts whether the Ky government would be able to continue to represent the people there.

HARVEY said that some 8,428 questionnaire returns were tabulated by the Control Data Corp. "A few returns are still coming in, weeks after the mailing of some 120,000 to every postal patron in the five counties," HARVEY said. "These results also include hundreds of ballots which were printed in most of the District's weekly and daily newspapers. I would guess that our final total will be about 11,000."

In the four-part question on the Vietnam crisis, Eighth District voters emphatically turned down a withdrawal of United States forces or even a holding operation by U.S. forces aimed at making secure the areas now controlled by the South Vietnamese government.

Of those voting, 68.7 percent opposed a withdrawal of U.S. forces, as against 10.4 percent favoring it. On the holding action, 54.5 percent were against such strategy, with 15.6 percent voting for it.

On the increase of American air and sea power, 52.3 percent were recorded for it, and 19.8 percent against it. A clear majority also called for an increase in U.S. ground troops, 50.7 percent as against 26.4 percent.

The closest vote in the 12-question ballot centered on the question for an increase in the present $1.25 per hour Federal minimum wage. Led by the nearly 2,000 hourly employees who participated in the questionnaire, the increase was narrowly voted down, 51.7 percent to 43.6 percent. Hourly employees were the only ones of the eight occupation groups which favored it, 57.7 percent to 38.8 percent. All others—salaried employee, businessman, professional, farmer, housewife, retired and the general "other" classification turned it down.

Another surprising result was the top-heavy defeat on the question of the right-to-work law. In asking of Section 14-b of the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed, nullifying State right-to-work laws, 69.6 percent were against repeal. Only 19.7 percent favored repeal.

More interesting perhaps was the fact that 57.6 percent of the hourly employees were against repeal, while 30.8 percent wanted the law discarded. The question has been included for the last 2 years on Mr. Harvey's questionnaire and both times has been turned down by all occupations.

Other results were rather decisive. Eighth District residents remain opposed to possible future dealings with the communist world. They reject expansion of trade with communist-block nations, 66.3 percent to 26.2 percent, and again do not favor admission of Red China to the United Nations, 63.2 percent to 29.6 percent.

One of the most lopsided votes was against the Administration's efforts to all but eliminate the existing school milk program, since restored by Congressional action. The vote was 73.1 percent to 19.3 percent against curtailment of the popular program.

Voters turned down the War on Poverty program, 52.8 percent to 38 percent, with many expressing dissatisfaction with its operations.

The biggest margin was shown on the question of restraint in domestic spending in order to fight inflation. Some 74.5 percent favored such action, with 19.4 percent against it.

Enactment of compulsory Federal standards for the manufacturing of vehicles, tires and accessories to further highway safety was favored, 61.7 percent to 32.1 percent.

The complete results are as follows: Do you favor—

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No answer
1. If a satisfactory settlement in Vietnam cannot be secured by negotiation in the foreseeable future:			
a. Withdrawal of U.S. forces even though this means a Communist take-over of South Vietnam?	10.4	68.7	20.7
b. Increase in U.S. ground troops to whatever size is needed to clear most of South Vietnam from communist control?	50.7	28.4	20.7
c. No increase in U.S. ground forces but wider use of American air and sea power?	57.3	19.8	27.8
d. A holding operation by U.S. forces aimed at making secure the areas now controlled by the South Vietnamese government but not winning back parts of South Vietnam controlled by the communists?	15.6	54.5	29.8
2. Expansion of trade with communist-bloc nations?	26.2	66.3	7.5
3. Admission of Red China to the United Nations?	29.6	63.2	7.3
4. Repeal of Section 14–b of the Taft-Hartley Act, nullifying state right-to-work laws?	19.7	69.6	10.7
5. Administration's proposed 80% curtailment of the school milk program?	19.3	73.1	7.5
6. An increase in the present $1.25 per hour Federal minimum wage?	43.6	51.7	4.6
7. The War on Poverty program?	38.0	52.8	9.2
8. Restraint in domestic spending in order to fight inflation?	74.5	19.4	6.2
9. The enactment of compulsory Federal standards for the manufacturing of vehicles tires and accessories to further highway safety?	61.7	32.1	5.2

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John W. Pressly, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Sacramento, Calif., offered the following prayer:

God of our lives, Thou who art our highest thought and our noblest aspiration, we ask that Thou will free us from a stubborn trust in ourselves. Enable us to trust in Thy guiding providence. May the mists of doubt be dispelled in the light of a vigorous and confident faith.

Here today in this distinguished Chamber of national deliberation, where history has been made, where tradition bespeaks integrity, freedom, and justice for all men, help these Representatives of the people that they may not merely represent their constituents, important as this is in our system of government, but that they may truly seek the welfare and security of all and be true to their own ideals, integrity, and faith in Thee.

Bless each legislator in his unselfish commitment and grant to each one so committed the full measure of personal satisfaction in their individual and public life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 12, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14215. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14215) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D.C., May 11, 1966.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the duty to inform you that I have transmitted to the Honorable George Romney, Governor of Michigan, my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Ninth District of Michigan, effective at the close of business, May 10, 1966.

I leave the House of Representatives to assume the office of U.S. Senator from Michigan.

With kind personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D.C., May 11, 1966.
Hon. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Governor of Michigan,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROMNEY: I hereby resign my office as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Ninth District of Michigan, effective at the close of business, May 10, 1966.

With kind personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. **DENTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DENTON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. MARSH, MAHON, REIFEL, MCDADE, and BOW.

KY STATEMENT FRAUGHT WITH INHERENT DANGERS

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 mintue and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Speaker, last week I warned of the dangers in the leadership of South Vietnam by Premier Ky. I was alarmed by statements which cast doubt about whether free elections in that country could ever be held while Ky remains in power.

Yesterday my fears were realized as Ky took over Da Nang by force.

Through tactics similar to those employed by the Vietcong, Ky accomplished by force that which he was unable to accomplish by the democratic process.

The people of South Vietnam rely upon the United States to guarantee their freedom from attacks from both within and without. Premier Ky has abused our protective assistance and is indeed coming to exemplify that which we are fighting against in Vietnam—a dictatorship of force.

With Ky's seizure of Da Nang, an overt act of violence, how can we hope for free elections?

I have supported Ky's government in the past, not the man nor his intemperate acts, but a caretaker government which I hoped would provide some stability during the emergency brought about by Communist aggression. But Ky's action endangers the faith of the entire free world in the rightness of our cause in Vietnam.

I call upon the ruling junta in Saigon to remove Premier Ky from power.

The United States is paying an increasingly steep price in the lives of our young men that the South Vietnamese people might have a chance to live in freedom.

It is intolerable that our Government continues to support a man who more and more is coming to represent what we are fighting against—rule by force in defiance of the will of the people.

THE MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. **MORRIS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a proposed amendment to the minimum wage bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MORRIS**. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow and Wednesday the House will be considering H.R. 13712, the bill to raise the minimum wage. I support th's bill and intend to vote in favor of it. I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

I am concerned, however, not with the level at which the minimum will be set, but with the speed with which we proceed to that level. I think we would do the cause of full employment and decent living standards a great disservice if we move to the $1.60 level too rapidly. I intend, therefore, to offer an amendment which will bring the $1.60 minimum wage into effect at a more reasonable time.

For the information of the House, I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of my amendment. I intend to make a more complete statement later when the debate actually begins:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 13712, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. MORRIS

Page 46, beginning in line 24, strike out "during the first year" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "during the first three years".

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, during the period of May 15 to 22 local churches throughout the United States are observing Soil Stewardship Week. This annual observance is sponsored by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts and the 3,000 local soil and water conservation districts which blanket the Nation.

The subject of this year's observance is "Crisis in the Countryside." Ministers of all faiths are carrying vital messages to their followers to further God's purpose.

I salute the thousands of clergy of all faiths who use this observance to remind us that soil stewardship is everyone's responsibility. It is a responsibility of people who live in the towns and cities as well as those who work the land.

The President of the United States has recognized Soil Stewardship Week with a special statement issued from the White House. President Johnson stated:

> It is our responsibility to make certain that our stewardship of the soil ensures progress and prosperity for the generations of the future.

Under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD the full text of President Johnson's statement:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 2, 1966.

It is appropriate that we set aside a Soil Stewardship Week each year to rededicate our commitment to the preservation of our precious natural heritage.

This observance reminds all responsible Americans of our duty to protect our threatened land and water resources, to restore those which have been ill-used, and to develop their rich potential for the benefit of all of our people.

Much of the future of the country lies in the wise and proper use of its rural lands. It is our responsibility to make certain that our stewardship of the soil ensures progress and prosperity for the generations of the future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TIME FOR LESS EMOTIONAL LOOK AT AUTO SAFETY

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the stock market closed last week in a tailspin and amid reports of a decline in automobile sales and production widely attributed to the impact upon the public of the congressional investigation of car safety.

This disturbing chain of events, underscoring again the bellwether position of the automobile industry in our economy, while not a cause for panic, is certainly a cause for concern. At a time when the economy is experiencing high employment and prosperity, it is incredible that right here under the Capitol dome we can talk ourselves into a decline such as this merely by the sensational play given a few people who have been acting like safety had just been discovered.

While I feel very strongly that every purchaser should have a safe automobile, I do not believe that even the most vehement critic intended that concern over safety should trigger a setback throughout the entire economy. But whatever the intentions, it is obviously time that we start to look at the problem a lot less emotionally and a lot more realistically.

The problem of safety on our highways is hardly a new one. People have been working on it for years. If anyone doubts this they should talk with the automobile workers themselves to see just how much safety is stressed within the plants. I know from personal experience the pride that our craftsmen take in what they are making.

Certainly cars can have more safety features, but it is a fact, recognized by the tests given for operators' licenses, that it is the driver's attitude that is the first cause of the overwhelming majority of accidents. It matters little what part of the automobile the driver or his victim comes into contact with as far as the real cause of the accident is concerned. It is a cruel deception to lead the American people to believe that Congress can guarantee auto safety simply by legislating.

Before we go about trying to write any such Federal legislation, especially in an election year, I believe, we should heed the suggestion of Governor Romney, of Michigan, and first take a long hard look to see what could be realistically achieved through the existing State and local agencies which have the experience and facilities to get closer to this problem.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER.** This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AUTHORIZING ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO CONTRACT WITH MEDICAL SCHOOLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 197) to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce technical services.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 197

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4116. Contracts for scarce technical services.

"The Chief Medical Director may enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics to provide scarce technical services at Veterans' Administration facilities (including, but not limited to, services of radiologists, pathologists, and psychiatrists)."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 73 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4116. Contracts for scarce technical services."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "§ 4116." and insert in lieu thereof "§ 4117.".

On page 1, line 7, strike out "Chief Medical Director" and insert "Administrator" and strike out "technical" and insert "medical specialist".

On page 1, line 9, strike out "technical" and insert "medical specialist".

On page 2, after line 4, strike out "4116" and insert in lieu thereof "4117" and strike out "technical" and insert "medical specialist".

On page 2, beginning on line 5 insert the following:

"SEC. 2. That section 610 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(c) While any veteran is receiving hospital care in any Veterans' Administration facility, the Administrator may, within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities, furnish medical services to correct or treat any nonservice-connected disability of such veteran, in addition to treatment incident to the disability for which he is hospitalized, if the veteran is willing, and the Administrator determines that the furnishing of such medical services (1) would be in the interest of the veteran, (2) would not prolong the hospitalization of such veteran, and (3) would not interfere with the furnishing of medical services to other veterans under authority other than this subsection.' "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, section 1 of the bill, as reported, would give the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs specific authority to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce medical specialist services, thus defining in more specific terms what is inherent in section 213 of title 38.

The Administrator believes that "specific authority to contract in this area would be a statutory recognition of the Veterans' Administration-medical school relationships, and would serve a useful purpose in enhancing these relationships." Section 1 has been amended as suggested by the Veterans' Administration and its enactment would not lead to any additional cost.

Section 2 of the bill writes into law what has long been the practice of the Veterans' Administration in the treatment of patients in its hospitals. This practice has been described by a former Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration as treating the "whole man." By that description, it was intended to convey that it was the Veterans' Administration policy to make the patient completely well or as well as possible before his discharge. For example, a veteran is admitted for a stomach disorder. During the course of his hospitalization a dental examination reveals the need for the extraction of some teeth which are abscessed and are a real threat to the patient's health though not necessarily related to the disorder for which he was hospitalized. Under the current practice and as envisioned by this bill, not only would the stomach condition be corrected, but the veteran's teeth would receive the necessary attention and correction.

Since the bill merely states existing practice and would not require expansion of facilities, including staff, no additional expenditure is expected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce medical specialist services, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN WIDOWS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3177) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3177

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 412(b), title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In any case where the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation payable under this chapter to a widow who has children is less than the amount of pension which would be payable to (1) such widow, or (2) such children if the widow were not entitled, under chapter 15 of this title had the death occurred under circumstances authorizing payment of death pension, the Administrator shall pay dependency and indemnity compensation to such widow in an amount equal to such amount of pension."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill would authorize payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to a widow with children in an amount equal to any greater amount of death pension which would be payable to the children had the veteran's death occurred under circumstances authorizing payment of pension and if the widow were not entitled thereto.

Under the provisions of existing law (38 U.S.C. 412(b)), where the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to a widow with children is less than the amount of death pension which would be payable to her had the veteran's death occurred under circumstances authorizing payment of death pension, she may be paid dependency and indemnity compensation in an amount equal to the greater pension rate. If, however, the widow would be ineligible for pension by reason of excessive income or due to corpus of estate the greater payment based on such pension rate is not paid.

In certain such cases wherein a widow's income or corpus is excessive, this proposal would afford a new basis for payment of a greater amount of dependency and indemnity compensation. It could affect only cases of a widow with eight or more children. The regular dependency and indemnity compensation rate for a widow with eight children might be only $131 per month. Aggregate death pension payable to eight eligible children where there is no eligible widow is $143 per month. Under this bill a widow could receive such greater amount as dependency and indemnity compensation. H.R. 3177 is an equitable extension of the principle contained in existing law that service-connected death benefits for a widow should not be less generous than those payable for deaths not due to service.

The bill is recommended by the Veterans' Administration which has advised that its cost would be insignificant.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VA PARTICIPATION IN MEDICAL COMMUNITY PLANNING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7728) to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of this House Committee on Veterans' Affairs if he feels in anywise this might be a device or a foot-in-the-door technique for taking over of private hospitals or a subsidy of medical schools by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or the Medical Director thereof?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No sir, I certainly do not. This in our opinion is a way of giving the people of a community, be they veterans or nonveterans, better medical service by an exchange of medical equipment and services between the Veterans' Administration and community medical units.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a most worthy objective and certainly in view of the longtime functions of the Veterans' Administration medical facilities with the dean's committees and others, both for training and for better service to the community, as well as our veterans, I think this is quite well.

I would like to address one more question to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. Could this be a preamble or a buildup in any manner or means, in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas, for care of veterans under Public Law 88-97, the so-called care of the elderly under social security tax "medicare" type of bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, sir, I do not. I would say to the gentleman, our committee gave very careful consideration and study to the effect of the medicare program on the veterans' hospital program. As yet, we have not finished our study. This bill—H.R. 7728—does not involve Public Law 88-97.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this in the legislative record. The Committee on Armed Services is doing similar research insofar as retirees with or without physical disability based on service connection is concerned, who elect to accept their disability pay as retirees under tax-exempt basis and, of course, the privilege of veterans' care, also.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7728

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 5007. Specialized medical resources

"(a) To secure certain specialized medical resources which otherwise might not be feasibly available, or to effectively utilize certain other medical resources, the Administrator may, when he determines it to be in the best interest of the prevailing standards of the Veterans' Administration medical care program, make arrangements, by contract or other form of agreement, as set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) below, between Veterans' Administration hospitals and other public or private hospitals (or medical schools or other medical installations having hospital facilities) in the medical community:

"(1) for the exchange of use of specialized medical resources when such an agreement will obviate the need for a similar resource to be provided in a Veterans' Administration facility; or

"(2) for the mutual use, or exchange of use, of specialized medical resources in a Veterans' Administration facility, which have been justified on the basis of veterans' care, but which are not utilized to their maximum effective capacity.

The Administrator may determine the geographical limitations of a medical community as used in this section.

"(b) Arrangements entered into under this section shall provide for reciprocal reimbursement based on a charge which covers the full cost of services rendered, supplies used, and including normal depreciation and amortization costs of equipment. Any proceeds to the Government received therefrom shall be credited to the applicable Veterans' Administration medical appropriation.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'specialized medical resources' means medical resources (whether equipment, space, or personnel) which because of cost, limited availability, or unusual nature, are either unique in the medical community or are subject to maximum utilization only through mutual use.

"(d) Eligibility for hospital care and medical services furnished any veteran pursuant to this section shall be subject to the same terms as though provided in a Veterans' Administration facility, and provisions of this title applicable to persons receiving hospital care or medical services in a Veterans' Administration facility shall apply to veterans treated hereunder."

(b) Such chapter 81 is further amended by adding at the end of the table of sections relating to subchapter I the following:

"5007. Specialized medical resources."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this measure was officially requested by the Veterans' Administration in a formal submission to the Speaker on April 23, 1965.

The purpose of the proposal is to authorize the administration of the Veterans' Administration to enter into agreements for the exchange or use of specialized medical facilities by the Veterans' Administration hospitals and other public or private hospitals or medical school in a medical community where, in the judgment of the administration, such action is in the best interest of the medical and hospital program administered by the Veterans' Administration. Such authorization would provide for a charge which covers the full cost of services rendered or the supplies used. Any proceeds which accrue from such action would be credited to the applicable Veterans' Administration medical appropriation.

The measure is believed to be in the best interests of providing the best in medical care for the veterans of this country and also would provide for responsible action on the part of the Veterans' Administration in meeting the health needs of a community generally by cooperating with all phases of a community health program.

The Veterans' Administration states that the enactment of this proposed legislation would not result in any additional expenditure of public funds.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE PROVISIONS FOR TREBLE-DAMAGE ACTIONS TO DIRECT LOAN AND INSURED LOAN CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7850) to amend section 1833(a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this is meritorious legislation, but I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs what, if any penalty is imposed upon a veteran who willfully enters into a side deal in the matter of a real estate loan?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. None under this law, but of course that is fraud and he could be prosecuted just like anybody else.

Mr. GROSS. Would that not be true of the real estate concern or person dealing in the real estate involved? This bill seeks to penalize for a side deal. Could they not be likewise prosecuted for fraud?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. They can be prosecuted for fraud also. This bill would extend to direct loans the same provisions that now apply to our guaranteed loans.

Mr. GROSS. But ought not the veteran to be held more to account if he willfully enters into a side deal?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Under present law he would be.

Mr. GROSS. I am not a lawyer, but I am sure under general law dealing with fraud he would be subject to a prosecution. But I still do not understand why the veteran is not to be held as much to account in a side deal as those who are making the loan. Perhaps the veteran is properly held accountable. I do not know. That was my question.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The veteran is covered. The other person is covered. The damages would be for the veteran because the veteran is the one who would be paying for the house.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask some questions of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The bill is far-reaching, and would it put a pall over the real estate market and put one at his peril in dealing with veterans? So I should like to ask, first, What is the difference between an insured veterans loan and a guaranteed veterans loan?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, this bill would not put any pall over the real estate market. This is a provision we have on guaranteed loans, and which we have had ever since the program started. Direct loans are about one-tenth of it. There was not one objection from anyone in the real estate industry to this bill. I would certainly disagree with the gentleman that it would put a pall over the real estate business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. In answering the question, I believe the gentleman said that one-tenth of the loans are now covered. They are the insured loans. The purpose of the bill is to cover the remaining nine-tenths.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. One-tenth. Nine-tenths are already covered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Oh, nine-tenths are already covered?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. What is the difference between an insured loan and a guaranteed loan?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. An insured loan is guaranteed up to a certain amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Is there any difference between an insured loan and a guaranteed loan?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. A private lender makes a loan on a house. The Government guarantees a certain amount of that insured loan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. To a lending institution?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Or to an individual.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Is this a big problem with respect to a veteran in dealing with real estate brokers and lending institutions today?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Not particularly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Do you know how many suits have been brought all over the United States in which treble damages have been obtained?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Very few.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Do you know whether the Attorney General of the United States has ever instituted a suit or not in this connection?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, I do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. You say that right now we have a law. But is not the net effect of the law actually that anyone dealing with a veteran—for example, a banker making a loan to a veteran—does it not really in essence put the banker and the real estate broker at their peril in dealing with a veteran because of the possibility of being sued for treble damages?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, sir. I think if that were to happen, we would be getting more complaints. We have had none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. How could such a situation occur? After all, I handle quite a number of these loans myself. The insurance is provided by the Veterans' Administration only after appraisal by two to three competent appraisers, and the loan is never more than, I think it is, a 90-percent loan. The appraisal is, of course, an honest appraisal. Let us say it is $10,000 and the veteran is given a loan of $9,000. How could any fraud occur wherein the veteran would be harmed when he is clothed with this tremendously great appraisal service?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Surely if the Member has handled many of these cases, he would know better than the gentleman from Texas how one could be paid under the table, over the table, or on the side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Perhaps the veteran would be committing a fraud, but not the banker or the real estate broker.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It would have to be both.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. In this particular case who would have the right to bring the action?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The veteran.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. In other words, if the veteran participated in his own fraud, he could bring an action and get treble damages?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, or the district attorney could bring the charges, too.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. If the veteran files his suit for treble damages, I understand he would get the money.

Would the money go to him? Or would it go to the Veterans' Administration or to the bank that made the guarantee or insured the loan?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It goes to the man who has been paying the bill, the veteran.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Would it go to the veteran, even though he had participated in the fraud and paid this under-the-table money?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I do not know. I assume it would. If the gentleman will yield to his colleague from Tennessee, he knows more about it than I do.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it was brought out in the hearings that normally the veteran did not have knowledge. He signed whatever papers were necessary. This merely affords him some relief, when he is taken advantage of. That is really all the bill does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have yet another question. Does the gentleman know whether this protection today is thrown around people who buy homes and obtain mortgages through the Farmers Home Administration or through the other agencies of the Federal Government?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. So far as I know, it is not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. So this is just a peculiar protection which will be put around the veteran who buys a home?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Well, if the gentleman wants to call it peculiar, it is a protection which has been in the veterans program since the beginning for nine-tenths of the loans made. This is extending it to the other one-tenth who live in communities where there is no money, and this is made in direct loans. There is nothing peculiar. It is for the veteran's protection. There has been no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation. I thank the gentleman for the information that it applies to only one-tenth of the loans made and that it is presently the law covering nine-tenths of the loans. The gentleman has no record of any prosecutions, and I certainly withdraw my reservation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this measure was formally submitted to the Speaker on April 28, 1965.

Existing law—section 1822, title 38, United States Code—permits a veteran to institute action against any party who knowingly makes, effects, or participates in a sale of any property to a veteran in excess of the reasonable value as established by the Administrator where the property is guaranteed under the appropriate provisions of title 38. Damages are set at three times the amount of such excess consideration. The purpose of this bill is to extend the same protection to the veteran who obtains a direct or insured loan as is now provided to the veteran who has a guaranteed loan.

The committee amendment to the bill would assure its applicability to direct loans to veterans covered by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1966.

The measure is supported by the Veterans' Administration which advises that it would not result in any increased cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7850

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1822(a), title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "title," the following: "or made under section 1811 of this title, or insured under section 1815 of this title,".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be applicable only to cases in which the offense occurs after date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 5 insert "or 1818" after "1811".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF PENSION TO WIFE AND CHILDREN WHERE VETERAN HAS DISAPPEARED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9961) to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran receiving pension under this chapter disappears, the Administrator may pay the pension otherwise payable to the dependent wife and children.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9961

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter I of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 507. Disappearance

"Where a veteran receiving pension under subchapter II of this chapter disappears, the Administrator, in his discretion, may pay the pension otherwise payable to his wife and children. Payments made to a wife or child under the preceding sentence shall not exceed the amount to which each would be entitled if the veteran died of a non-service-connected disability."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, insert "(a)" after "That".

On page 1, line 7, after "under" insert "subchapter II of",

On page 2, line 2, after the word "children." insert, "In applying the provisions of this section, the Administrator may presume, without reports pursuant to section 506(a) of this title, that the status of the veteran at the time of disappearance, with respect to permanent and total disability, income, and net worth, continues unchanged."

On page 2, line 7, strike out "the preceding sentence" and insert in lieu thereof, "this section".

On page 2, line 11, insert "(b) The table of sections at the head of subchapter I of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '507. Disappearance.' "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes in the case of the disappearance of any veteran who is receiving a pension under Veterans' Administration law after 90 days, to grant to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs authority to pay the veteran's wife and children the pension otherwise payable to the veteran. Such payments could not exceed the amount to which the wife or children would be entitled if the veteran had died of a non-service-connected disability.

Under existing law when a veteran's whereabouts are unknown pension payments are discontinued until a valid current address is received. The resumption of payments are effective on the day following the date of last payment if entitlement is established.

The bill has been amended in the form suggested by the Veterans' Administration, and the amendments are technical in nature rather than substantive.

The Veterans' Administration advises that the cost would not be significant.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9961. This bill proposes in the case of disappearance of any veteran receiving pension to authorize the Veterans' Administration to pay to the veteran's wife and children the pension otherwise payable to the veteran. Payments could not exceed the amount to which the wife or child would be entitled if the veteran died of a non-service-connected disability.

Under existing law, when a veteran's whereabouts is unknown, pension payments are discontinued until a valid current address is received. This, of course, imposes a severe hardship on the veteran's dependents. Provisions similar to those sought in this bill already are contained in the law controlling the payment of disability compensation. It would appear that the need of the wife and children of a disappeared veteran who was receiving pension is no less deserving of assistance than the family of a disappeared veteran who was receiving compensation. The Veterans' Administration has estimated that the cost of this proposal would not be significant. I urge its approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran receiving pension under this chapter disappears, the Administrator may pay the pension otherwise payable to the wife and children."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DRUGS AND MEDICINE FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11934) to amend title 38 of the United States

Code to provide that any veteran entitled to additional compensation by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance shall be furnished prescription drugs by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I certainly shall not object—I simply want to bring out the point that there has been much correspondence favorable to this bill.

I rise in strong support of it, in spite of the additional minimal cost to the Government and the few who are involved.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Speaker, if there is not almost a paradox that we would have covered in like manner those with no service-connected disabilities under a law passed in the 88th Congress, and not have covered those who are in need of extra attendants, and nursing care, who are severely disabled, such as bilateral amputees and others?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge passage of this bill, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11934

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 361. Drugs and medicines

"The Administrator shall furnish to each veteran, who is entitled to receive additional compensation under this chapter by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance, such drugs and medicines as may be ordered on prescription of a duly licensed physician as specific therapy in the treatment of any illness or injury suffered by such veterans."

(b) That table of chapters of such chapter 11 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"361. Drugs and medicines."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: That section 612(h) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Administrator shall furnish to each veteran, who is receiving additional compensation or allowance under chapter 11 or increased pension as a veteran of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict under section 521(d) of this title, by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance, such drugs and medicines as may be ordered on prescription of a duly licensed physician as specific therapy in the treatment of any illness or injury suffered by such veteran."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is patterned after section 8 of Public Law 88-664 which authorized the furnishing of drugs and medicines to those veterans who are receiving the aid-and-attendance pension under the new non-service-connected pension program based on their condition of being so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person. This bill would amend that section by authorizing the same sort of treatment for service-connected veterans who are entitled to receive the regular aid-and-attendance service-connected increased compensation or allowance which is now a minimum of $400 a month for a wartime veteran and $320 for peacetime. Such veterans are eligible for drugs and medicines for their service-connected disabilities. This legislation would give them the same sort of eligibility for drugs and medicines even though the condition for which drugs and/or medicine is prescribed is non-service-connected in character.

The committee is advised that actual and estimated data indicate that the expenditures for drugs and medicines for pensioners under section 8 of Public Law 88-664—38 U.S.C. 612(h)—has been about $1,063,187 through April 30, 1966, of which $872,287 was for medication and $190,900 for administrative expense. Available statistics for the first 3 quarters—9 months—of fiscal 1966 show that approximately 337,294 prescriptions were filled during that period at an average cost of $2.41 each, including administrative cost. The average cost has been an increasing figure. As of December 31, 1965, approximately 17,515 veterans had received drugs and medicines under this program.

The bill has been amended in its technical aspects as suggested in the report of the Veterans' Administration which appears hereafter.

The Veterans' Administration favors this legislation and advises that as of June 20, 1965, there were 13,000 service-connected veterans who could be potentially eligible for these additional medical benefits. Assuming an average rate of two additional prescriptions per month at an average cost of $3 each, the cost of the bill for that group for the first year is estimated at $936,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain veterans receiving additional compensation by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance shall be furnished prescription drugs by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETROCEDING TO THE STATE OF COLORADO JURISDICTION OVER THE FORT LYON VETERANS HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12664) to retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon Veterans Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12664

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby retroceded to the State of Colorado the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired from such State by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyons Veterans Hospital, Las Animas, Colorado.

SEC. 2. This retrocession of jurisdiction shall take effect upon acceptance by the State of Colorado.

The following committee amendments:

On line 6, strike out "Lyons" and insert "Lyon".

On line 6, insert "reservation" after the word "Hospital".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, simply stated, the purpose of this bill is to facilitate the opportunity to vote of residents of the Fort Lyon, Colo., Veterans' Administration reservation by retroceding to Colorado exclusive jurisdiction over the reservation.

The Fort Lyon Veterans Hospital is located in Bent County, in Colorado, near the city of Las Animas. It is on a 618.2-acre Federal installation with approximately 1,150 persons of whom approximately 125 are resident employees of the Veterans' Administration. The United States has exclusive jurisdiction over the reservation, except for the service of civil and criminal processes.

The Department of Justice had advocated general legislation to take care of cases such as this. Places over which the United States has exclusive jurisdiction are not considered part of the State in which they are physically located. Only the States of California, West Virginia, Utah, and Nevada permit residents of such areas to qualify as voters. Since there is no general law on this subject, the Department of Justice and the Veterans' Administration have no objections to the enactment of this specific proposal.

There will be no additional expenditure of public funds as the result of enactment of this proposal.

The title was amended so as to read:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon Veterans Hospital reservation."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO BILOXI, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13012) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have for the RECORD, if possible, some estimate as to the present value of the land involved in the approximately 75 acres of land to be transferred.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am sorry, but we did not get that value. Whatever the value is, we got the same protection we have gotten for every other piece of property given back to a city for park purposes. I do not know the value.

Mr. PELLY. I should like to have the gentleman indicate, if he will, whether my understanding is correct that originally this land did not cost the Federal Government any money.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is correct. The city of Biloxi acquired the land.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13012

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall convey, without monetary consideration therefor, to the city of Biloxi, Mississippi, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of the real property of the Veterans' Administration Center, Biloxi, Mississippi, approximating seventy-five and eighty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, on condition that such real property shall be used for a public park or other public purpose. The exact legal description of such real property shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and in the event a survey is required the city of Biloxi shall bear the expense thereof.

SEC. 2. Any deed of conveyance made pursuant to this Act shall contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Biloxi, Miss., for public park purposes, without monetary consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States to a tract of land, 75.82 acres, the same being a portion of the reservation of the Veterans' Administration Center and which is excess to the needs of the agency.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the deed of conveyance shall provide such additional terms and conditions as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

In the early thirties, the city of Biloxi paid the acquisition cost of 709 acres of ground, a portion of which is now used for the Veterans' Administration Center. Since 1950 some 265 acres have been declared excess and transferred to the General Services Administration which subsequently transferred it to the Department of the Air Force for use by the adjoining Air Force base.

The Veterans' Administration interposes no objection to favorable action on this proposal.

There would be no additional expenditure of funds as the result of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NURSING CARE IN ALASKA AND HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13187) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate certain requirements for the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska or Hawaii.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to say that the chairman has worked out these bills very carefully, and there has been no opposition on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13187. This bill will eliminate an unintended inequity with respect to the furnishing of nursing care for veterans in the States of Hawaii and Alaska. When Public Law 88–450, the veterans' nursing care bill was enacted into law, it contained provisions authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to a public or private community nursing home any hospitalized veteran patient who had received maximum hospital benefits. The law authorized this type of nursing care for periods up to 6 months with the Administrator authorized to pay not more than one-third of the cost of care furnished by the Veterans' Administration in a general hospital.

There are no Veterans' Administration hospitals in Alaska or Hawaii. Eligible veterans in these States are generally hospitalized in facilities operated by other Federal agencies. Because Public Law 88–450 limits care in community nursing homes to those veteran patients who are in Veterans' Administration hospitals, veterans residing in the States of Hawaii and Alaska are inadvertently denied the benefits of this law.

H.R. 13187 would correct this situation by authorizing the Administrator to furnish nursing home care in Alaska and Hawaii by the transfer of veteran patients needing such care from any hospital in which hospital care has been furnished them by the Administrator. I urge that the bill be passed.

REMARKS ON H.R. 197

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 197. This bill has a twofold purpose. Section 1 of the bill will provide specific authority for the Veterans' Administration to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce medical specialist services. Existing law already provides general authority for this procedure by stating:

> The Administrator may for purposes of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, accept uncompensated services and enter into contracts or agreements with private or public agencies or persons, for such necessary services (including personal services) as he may deem practicable.

The Veterans' Administrator feels, however, that statutory recognition of the Veterans' Administration-medical school relationships would serve to enhance these relationships.

Section 2 of the bill again writes into law procedures that have long been pursued in the Veterans' Administration hospital system. This section merely authorizes the Veterans' Administration to furnish medical services to correct or treat any disability in addition to treatment of a disability for which he is hospitalized.

In a sense, this type of treatment can be termed "preventive maintenance." A practicable example of its application would be the case of a veteran admitted for treatment of an ulcer. Upon examination, it is determined that the veteran has abscessed teeth that are injurious to his health. H.R. 197 would permit the hospital, with the veterans' consent, to extract the teeth in addition to treating the ulcer. Since the bill merely provides statutory authority for existing practices, no additional cost will be involved. I urge its approval.

REMARKS ON H.R. 3177

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3177.

This measure will provide increased monthly service-connected survivor benefits for a limited number of widows with eight or more children.

Under existing law, when the monthly benefit payable to a widow with children for a service-connected death is less than the monthly pension payable to a widow with children for a non-service-connected death, the Veterans' Administration is required to pay a monthly service-connected death benefit equal to the amount of non-service-connected pension. This entitlement to the greater benefit is based on the assumption that the widow would meet the other criteria necessary to qualify for pension.

There are a limited number of widows with eight or more children who are in receipt of service-connected dependency and indemnity compensation payments which are less than the monthly payments payable to similarly circumstanced widows based on deaths unrelated to military service. The Veterans' Administration cannot pay the higher rate because either their income exceeds the statutory limit for entitlement to pension or the sizes of their estate serves as a bar.

H.R. 3177 would authorize the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation in an amount equal to the pension that would be payable to children where there is no eligible widow.

The minimum monthly payment under DIC is $131 monthly. Under the nonservice pension program, payments to eight children total $143 monthly. Therefore, the bill will affect only those widows with eight or more children. Mr. Speaker, this bill represents an equitable extension of the principle that service-connected benefits should not be less generous than non-service-connected benefits. I urge its approval.

REMARKS ON H.R. 7728

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7728. This proposal will authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into agreements with medical schools and public or private hospitals for the exchange or use of specialized medical facilities. Any such agreement, of course, would include provisions for reciprocal reimbursement based on a charge covering the full cost of services rendered or supplies used.

The dramatic advances of modern medicine in recent years, Mr. Speaker, have produced highly specialized and expensive equipment and procedures. The cost of the equipment and the shortage of specialized professional and technical personnel limits the availability of these resources.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, in authorizing the sharing or exchange of specialized medical facilities, will assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans and at the same time will provide maximum effective utilization of specialized medical equipment under the direct control of the Veterans' Administration during periods when their immediate needs do not require maximum usage.

Now, it is my understanding that concern has been expressed that this bill would authorize or permit the use of Veterans' Administration beds for the medical care of nonveteran patients in those areas where a shortage of beds in the private medical community exist. Let me assure you that it was not the intent of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in reporting this legislation to authorize medical care for nonveteran patients in Veterans' Administration facilities. The report of the committee which accompanied this bill very effectively points out that such a broad interpretation was in no way intended by the Veterans' Administration in recommending this legislation nor by our committee in reporting it and, therefore, would not be permissible.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that enactment of this legislation would result in no additional expenditure of public funds. In fact, I believe that legislation will result in some economic gain to the Government. I urge its approval.

REMARKS ON H.R. 7850

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7850. Under existing law, a veteran is permitted to institute a damage suit against any person who sells a home to a veteran for a price in excess of the reasonable value established by the Veterans' Administration where the loan is guaranteed under the appropriate provisions of title 38 of the United States Code. Damages are set at three times the amount of the excess charges. This provision of law, Mr. Speaker, protects the veteran against the possibility of being required to make a so-called side payment. Unfortunately, these provisions do not extend to those cases involving a direct loan or an insured loan. The Veterans' Administration advises us that there have been cases involving direct loans in recent years in which the veteran paid a consideration in excess of the reasonable value of the property without the knowledge of the Veterans' Administration at the time of loan closing. Because existing law failed to provide the same protection as is provided in guaranteed loans, the veteran had no effective remedy for recovery of the excess consideration.

H.R. 7850 will correct this situation by extending the same protection to the veteran who obtains a direct or uninsured loan as is now provided the veteran who obtains a guaranteed loan. There is no cost to the Federal Government attached to this program and I urge its approval.

REMARKS ON H.R. 11934

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11934. Public Law 88-664 authorized the furnishing of drugs and medicines to those veteran pensioners who are in receipt of the so-called aid and attendance allowance because of serious disabilities which render them so helpless as to require the assistance of another person. Public Law 88-664, Mr. Speaker, limited the furnishing of drugs and medicines to the non-service-connected group.

We have been advised by the Veterans' Administration that there are approximately 13,000 service-connected veterans who are so seriously disabled as to require the aid and attendance of another person who are not eligible for the furnishing of drugs and medicines except for care and treatment of their service-connected disabilities.

H.R. 11934 would extend this benefit to this deserving group of seriously disabled veterans. I urge its approval.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bills, as follows:

H.R. 13187

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 620 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any veteran who is furnished care by the Administrator in a hospital in Alaska, Hawaii, or the Philippines may be furnished nursing home care under the provisions of this section even if such hospital is not under the direct and exclusive jurisdiction of the Administrator.".

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out ", Hawaii," and insert "or Hawaii".

On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike "or the Philippines".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when Public Law 88-450 was enacted authorizing among other things the furnishing of nursing care in Veterans' Administration operated nursing homes and in community nursing homes, there was no provision made for the furnishing of such nursing care in the States of Alaska and Hawaii. There are no Veterans' Administration hospitals in these two States, but rather care is provided in hospitals operated by the armed services or other Federal hospitals on the basis of agreement with the Veterans' Administration and, in the case of service-connected veterans, hospital care may be provided by contract in community hospitals.

One of the basic provisions of Public Law 88-450 is that in order for an individual to be placed in a privately operated or community nursing home for temporary care at VA expense the patient must first have been in a Veterans' Administration hospital and reached a medical condition which warranted a transfer to a nursing home installation. This provision, in view of the absence of Veterans' Administration facilities in Alaska and Hawaii, prevented the furnishing of nursing care in these two States.

The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to permit the furnishing of nursing care in Alaska and Hawaii where such care is found to be warranted.

A special Subcommittee on Intermediate Care has recently conducted a review of the operation of Public Law 88-450 and during the course of these hearings the subject matter of this bill was discussed.

The Veterans' Administration, which favors the proposal, estimates that the annual cost of the bill, as amended, would be approximately $22,000.

Mrs. **MINK**. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs deserves the highest praise for its swift action to correct a longstanding inequity by reporting the bill under consideration, H.R. 13187, for action by the House.

This bill, which is similar to one I have introduced, would permit the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to furnish nursing home care on a temporary basis in Alaska and Hawaii by transfer of veteran patients needing such care from any hospital in which hospital care has been furnished by the Administrator.

Until now, veterans in these two States have been denied posthospital nursing home care because the law provided such care only for veterans hospitalized in VA hospitals. Neither Alaska nor Hawaii has such an institution.

This proposal has the support of the Veterans' Administration.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this measure.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAMING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14909) to provide for the designation of certain Veterans' Administration facilities.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I certainly support the laudable objectives of the first, second, and fourth sections of this bill.

I wonder if the committee chairman would offer an amendment to strike section 3 from this bill. I am sure there would be no objection to the passage of the remaining sections. I am sure the House would unanimously support an amended bill. There is no controversy with respect to sections 1, 2, and 4. As far as section 3 is concerned, I opposed that proposal when it was before us in the 88th Congress, and my views are the same as I expressed then.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I could not possibly offer such an amendment. The committee considered this very carefully. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Certainly the chairman could not offer an amendment such as that.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, if the chairman would do so, his action would be consistent with the action of the Veterans' Committee in the 88th Congress. Originally there were separate bills for each of these three veterans' hospitals. They were combined in one bill only after it was known there would be opposition to the bill which would name the hospital in Jackson for the late Congressman Rankin. If the bill is amended, we can expeditiously pass the sections to which there is no objection.

I refer to the hospitals to be named in honor of our former beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn; in honor of Edith Nourse Rogers; and now the cemetery in honor of our former colleague, Albert Thomas. I really hope that the chairman will consent to strike section 3, so that we can pass the other sections.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will call the next bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING THE REVISED ORGANIC ACT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS TO PROVIDE FOR THE REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13277) to amend the revised organic act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the legislature of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. The bill is listed for consideration later under a suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM IN ORDER TO AUTHORIZE THE LEGISLATURE THEREOF TO PROVIDE BY LAW FOR THE ELECTION OF ITS MEMBERS FROM ELECTION DISTRICTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13298) to amend the organic act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. It is a bill to be considered under suspension of the rules. I believe we should hear an explanation of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DONATION OF TWO OBSOLETE GERMAN WEAPONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11980) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate two obsolete German weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11980

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress asesmbled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to transfer to the Federal Republic of Germany, without compensation, one German gun, 21 cm K38, and one German tank, Pzkw III, with flamethrower, which are now the property of the United States in the custody of the Secretary of the Army. However, nothing contained in this Act shall authorize the expenditure of any funds of the United States to defray any cost of transportation or handling incident to such transfer.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 693) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, with two committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 693

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'foreign principal' includes—

"(1) a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party;

"(2) a person outside of the United States, unless it is established that such person is an individual and a citizen of and domiciled within the United States, or that such person is not an individual and is organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and has its principal place of business within the United States; and

"(3) a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of persons organized under the laws of or having its principal place of business in a foreign country."

(2) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, the term 'agent of a foreign principal' means—

"(1) any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, or servant, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal, and who directly or through any other person—

"(i) engages within the United States in political activities for or in the interests of such foreign principal;

"(ii) acts within the United States as a public relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee or political consultant for or in the interests of such foreign principal;

"(iii) within the United States solicits, collects, disburses, or dispenses contributions, loans, money, or other things of value for or in the interest of such foreign principal; or

"(iv) within the United States represents the interests of such foreign principal before any agency or official of the Government of the United States; and

"(2) any person who agrees, consents, assumes or purports to act as, or who is or holds himself out to be, whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, an agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause (1) of this subsection."

(3) Subsection (d) is amended by striking out "clause (1), (2), or (4) of".

(4) Subsection (g) is amended by inserting before the words "matter pertaining to" the words "public relations" and before the semicolon at the end thereof the words "of such principal".

(5) Such section is further amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of subsection (n) and adding the following new subsections:

"(o) The term 'political activities' means the dissemination of political propaganda and any other activity which the person engaging therein believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way influence any agency or official of the Government of the United States or any section of the public within the United States with reference to formulating, adopting, or changing the domestic or foreign policies of the United States or with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party;

"(p) The term 'political consultant' means any person who engages in informing or advising any other person with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States or the political or public interest, policies, or relations of a foreign country or of a foreign political party;

"(q) For the purpose of section 3(d) hereof, activities in furtherance of the bona fide commercial, industrial, or financial interests of a domestic person engaged in substantial commercial, industrial, or financial activities in the United States shall not be deemed to serve predominantly a foreign interest because such activities also benefit the interests of a foreign person engaged in bona fide trade or commerce which is owned or controlled by, or which owns or controls, such domestic person: *Provided,* That such foreign person is not, and such activities are not directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in substantial part by, a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party: *And provided further,* That the identity of such foreign person is disclosed to the agency or official of the United States with whom such activities are conducted."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the second, third, and fourth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Except as hereinafter provided, every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal shall, within 10 days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath on a form prescribed by the Attorney Gen-

eral. The obligation of an agent of a foreign principal to file a registration statement shall, after the tenth day of his becoming such agent, continue from day to day, and termination of such status shall not relieve such agent from his obligation to file a registration statement for the period during which he was an agent of a foreign principal."

(2) Subsection (a)(3) is amended by striking out the comma following the word "each" where it first appears, and the following: "unless, and to the extent, this requirement is waived in writing by the Attorney General"; and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of the subsection a comma and following: "or by any other foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (a)(4) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is a political activity".

(4) Subsection (a)(6) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is a political activity".

(5) Subsection (a)(7) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) The name, business, and residence addresses, and if an individual, the nationality, of any person other than a foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act or has agreed to act under such circumstances as require his registration hereunder; the extent to which each such person is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party or by any other foreign principal; and the nature and amount of contributions, income, money, or thing of value, if any, that the registrant has received during the preceding sixty days from each such person in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (6) of this subsection, either as compensation or for disbursement or otherwise, and the form and time of each such payment and from whom received;".

(6) Subsection (a)(8) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) A detailed statement of the money and other things of value spent or disposed of by the registrant during the preceding sixty days in furtherance of or in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder and which have been undertaken by him either as an agent of a foreign principal or for himself or any other person or in connection with any activities relating to his becoming an agent of such principal, and a detailed statement of any contributions of money or other things of value made by him during the preceding sixty days (other than contributions the making of which is prohibited under the terms of section 613 of title 18, United States Code) in connection with an election to any political office or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office;".

(7) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Attorney General may, by regulation, provide for the exemption—

"(1) from registration, or from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section, of any person who is listed as a partner, officer, director, or employee in the registration statement filed by an agent of a foreign principal under this Act, and

"(2) from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section of any agent of a foreign principal,

where by reason of the nature of the functions or activities of such person the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, determines that such registration, or the furnishing of such information, as the case may be, is not necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 3(d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only (1) in private and nonpolitical activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal; or (2) in other activities not serving predominantly a foreign interest; or (3) in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Act of November 4, 1939, as amended (54 Stat. 4), and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder;".

(b) Section 3 of such Act is further amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of subsection (f) and adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) Any person qualified to practice law, insofar as he engages or agrees to engage in the legal representation of a foreign principal before any court of law or any agency or official of the Government of the United States (other than a Member or committee of either House of Congress): *Provided*, That in representing the interests of such foreign principal before any such agency or official the fact of such representation and the identity of such foreign principal shall be disclosed to the agency or official concerned."

Sec. 4. Section 4 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; and by striking out the words "sent to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "file with the Attorney General two copies thereof".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" where they first appear the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; by inserting after the words "setting forth" the words "the relationship or connection between the person transmitting the political propaganda or causing it to be transmitted and such propaganda;"; and by striking out the words "each of his foreign principals" and inserting in lieu thereof "such foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out the words "sent to the Librarian of Congress" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "filed with the Attorney General".

(4) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the provisions of this Act to transmit, convey, or otherwise furnish to any agency or official of the Government (including a Member or committee of either House of Congress) for or in the interests of such foreign principal any political propaganda or to request from any such agency or official for or in the interests of such foreign principal any information or advice with respect to any matter pertaining to the political or public interests, policies or relations of a foreign country or of a political party or pertaining to the foreign or domestic policies of the United States unless the propaganda or the request is prefaced or accompanied by a true and accurate statement to the effect that such person is registered as an agent of such foreign principal under this Act.

"(f) Whenever any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act appears before any committee of Congress to testify for or in the interests of such foreign principal, he shall, at the time of such appearance, furnish the committee with a copy of his most recent registration statement filed with the Department of Justice as an agent of such foreign principal for inclusion in the records of the committee as part of his testimony."

Sec. 5. Section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting after "the provisions of this Act," where they first appear the words "in accordance with such business and accounting practices,".

Sec. 6. Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting the letter "(a)" after the section number and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The Attorney General shall, promptly upon receipt, transmit one copy of every registration statement filed hereunder and one copy of every amendment or supplement thereto, and one copy of every item of political propaganda filed hereunder, to the Secretary of State for such comment and use as the Secretary of State may determine to be appropriate from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this Act.

"(c) The Attorney General is authorized to furnish to departments and agencies in the executive branch and committees of the Congress such information obtained by him in the administration of this Act, including the names of registrants under this Act, copies of registration statements, or parts thereof, copies of political propaganda, or other documents or information filed under this Act, as may be appropriate in the light of the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 7. Section 8 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by adding before the period at the end of paragraph (2) a comma and the following: "except that in the case of a violation of subsection (b), (e), or (f) of section 4 or of subsection (g) or (h) of this section the punishment shall be a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both".

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) Whenever in the judgment of the Attorney General any person is engaged in or about to engage in any acts which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or regulations issued thereunder, or whenever any agent of a foreign principal fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, or otherwise is in violation of the Act, the Attorney General may make application to the appropriate United States district court for an order enjoining such acts or enjoining such person from continuing to act as an agent of such foreign principal, or for an order requiring compliance with any appropriate provision of the Act or regulation thereunder. The district court shall have jurisdiction and authority to issue a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order or such other order which it may deem proper. The proceedings shall be made a preferred cause and shall be expedited in every way.

"(g) If the Attorney General determines that a registration statement does not comply with the requirements of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, he shall so notify the registrant in writing, specifying in what respects the statement is deficient. It shall be unlawful for any person to act as an agent of a foreign principal at any time ten days or more after receipt of such notification without filing an amended registration statement in full compliance with the requirements of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act to be a party to any contract, agreement, or understanding, either expressed or implied, with such foreign principal pursuant to which the amount or payment of the compensation, fee, or other remuneration of such agent is contingent in whole or in part upon the success of any political activities carried on by such agent."

SEC. 8. (a) Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals

"Whoever, being an agent of a foreign principal, directly or through any other person, either for or on behalf of such foreign principal or otherwise in his capacity as agent of such foreign principal, knowingly makes any contribution of money or other thing of value, or promises expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, in connection with an election to any political office or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office; or

"Whoever knowingly solicits, accepts, or receives any such contribution from any such agent of a foreign principal or from such foreign principal—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both.

"As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'foreign principal' has the same meaning as when used in the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, except that such term does not include any person who is a citizen of the United States.

"(2) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' means any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, or servant, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal or of a person any substantial portion of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, or controlled by a foreign principal."

(b) Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principal

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government or in any agency of the United States, including the District of Columbia, is or acts as an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"Nothing in this section shall apply to the employment of any agent of a foreign principal as a special Government employee in any case in which the head of the employing agency certifies that such employment is required in the national interest. A copy of any certification under this paragraph shall be forwarded by the head of such agency to the Attorney General who shall cause the same to be filed with the registration statement and other documents filed by such agent, and made available for public inspection in accordance with section 6 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended."

(c) (1) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals."

(2) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals."

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect ninety days after the date of its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The measure before the House is designed to strengthen the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938. That act protects our national interests by requiring complete public disclosure by persons acting for or in the interest of foreign principals, when their activities are political in nature. Public disclosure permits the Government and the people to be informed as to the identities and activities of such persons and so be better able to appraise them and the purposes for which they act. The present legislation resulted from investigative hearings held by the other body, revealing practices requiring strengthening of the 1938 act. Companion bills were introduced in the House by Judiciary Committee Chairman CELLER in both the 88th and the present Congress and hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 3 on July 28 and August 2, 1965.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is chairman of Subcommittee No. 3. He being absent, I am undertaking to act as best I can in his behalf in reporting this bill to the House. I may say, in my opinion, this is a very worthy and meritorious measure which was considered carefully. Public hearings were held in July and August 1965 by the subcommittee. We had full cooperation of all the members of the subcommittee. Particularly I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON], as well as other members of the subcommittee for the fine work they did in working up this bill.

The principal provisions of S. 693 may be briefly stated:

First. New definitions are provided—aimed at better focusing the act on individuals attempting to influence Government policies through political activities and the requirements for disclosure of political activities and expenditures are made more strict.

Second. In contacting Congress or the Government on policy matters, registered foreign agents will be required to disclose their status as agents and identify their principal and in appearances before congressional committees, to file their registration statements.

Third. Contingent fee contracts between agents and foreign principals based on success in political activities of the agent are banned.

Fourth. Campaign contributions for or on behalf of a foreign principal who is not a citizen are prohibited.

Fifth. Officers and employees of the U.S. Government are prohibited from acting as foreign agents.

The legislation also contains two important procedural amendments:

First. An injunctive remedy is provided for the Attorney General in addition to the criminal sanctions already in the act, where compliance is considered inadequate.

Second. The Attorney General is given specific authority to exempt certain persons from registration, and to exempt registrants from being required to furnish information, not necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Finally, the proposed legislation deals with exemptions. The commercial exemption is broadened to exempt all private and nonpolitical activities with a genuine commercial purpose and other activities not serving predominantly a foreign purpose, even though they may be political in nature. The committee's amendment No. 1 clarifies this latter feature by expressly providing exemption from registration for legitimate representatives of U.S. concerns with foreign affiliates, provided the foreign affiliate is not—and the activities are not directed by—a foreign government or foreign political party and provided that the identity of the foreign affiliate is disclosed.

Although exempted from registration such representatives of internationally affiliated persons would still be agents of foreign principals and would be prohibited from making campaign contributions on behalf of their principals.

Committee amendment No. 2 clarifies the Senate bill's proposed exemption for attorneys. It makes them exempt insofar as they engage in legal representation, provided they disclose their principals.

Mr. Speaker, this important measure, with the amendments thereto, was recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary without a dissenting voice and I urge its enactment by the House.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the chief credit for bringing this measure to the floor belongs to my distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. TUCK]. I have been privileged to serve, with him and with the others he named, on this subcommittee during the past year, and it has indeed been a most pleasurable experience.

Mr. Speaker, simply stated, this act protects the United States from clandestine political activities that seek to benefit foreign interests. This protection is accomplished by removing the shield of secrecy that might otherwise conceal the true purposes of such activities. Public disclosure of a foreign agent's practices is essential forewarning. To forewarn is to forearm public officials and others so that they might properly assess and appraise the merits of such activities.

Although it is simple to state the purpose of the act and the amendments we recommend, it has been a most difficult task to draft language that fulfills this purpose without unnecessarily broadening the strictures of the law. We did not wish unnecessarily to burden persons with the requirements of registration and furnishing information when it would serve no useful purpose. While there is no disgrace in being registered as a "foreign agent," there is a stigma that should not be unnecessarily extended.

My able colleague from Virginia [Mr. Tuck] has told you the purport of our efforts and our unanimous recommendations. On pages 2 and 3 of the report there are listed the major provisions of the bill. However, it is difficult to appreciate these amendments without understanding the background of the bill.

Before I attempt to give my own brief explanation of the amendments added to S. 693 by the Judiciary Committee, let me assure my colleagues that the exemptions in this law will not serve as a device for evasion of the law by the unscrupulous representatives of foreign interests that provoked the Congress to amend the law in the first instance.

The complaints of several very able and respected witnesses focused the attention of our subcommittee on the original provisions of S. 693 exempting those persons who might otherwise be deemed foreign agents under the bill, but for the fact they were engaged in normal business activities or routine legal representation.

The commercial exemption was based upon the nonpolitical nature of the business activity or the fact that the activity did not primarily benefit any foreign interests. Lawyers were exempted when representing a foreign client in a formal proceeding in a court or administrative agency.

Although the subcommittee agreed with the exemptions of the bill, study and scrutiny of these exemptions revealed that they had technical and practical shortcomings. The subcommittee has amended the bill to correct these shortcomings.

I believe the fruits of our labor will assure American businessmen who are primarily involved in domestic businesses with incidental foreign connections that they will not be forced unnecessarily to register as foreign agents. Similarly, I believe that our amendments make it clear that American attorneys with a foreign client who has retained their legal skills to represent them in legal matters will not be unnecessarily required to register under the act.

The hearings on S. 693 also attracted other individuals who believed they should be exempted from the law. The committee deliberated on the arguments made by each such witness and S. 693, as amended, reflects our conclusions. Among these requests, I believe it important to mention briefly the request presented on behalf of our good neighbors, the Canadians.

At the hearings, the representatives of two Canadian provinces that maintain American offices devoted to tourist and industrial promotion requested that the committee exempt their activities; otherwise, they are within the coverage of the act.

Recognizing that the American people and Government cherish the goodwill and enduring friendship of our Canadian neighbors, the committee could not recommend an exemption for the Canadian promotional agents and deny a like exemption to representatives of other nations with which we also enjoy friendly relations.

I believe, however, that section 2(7) of the bill, creating a section 2(f) of the act, provides the solution. This provision empowers the Attorney General, by regulations, to exempt from registration and the furnishing of information if the information provided would serve no useful purpose under the act. The Attorney General is expected to use these new discretionary powers to avoid unnecessary harassment and to keep the burden of registration at a minimum. If he fails to do so, Congress may well take another look at the situation.

I join with my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee in recommending and urging the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, recalling the sage advice of the 17th century educator and philosopher, Fenelon, that "the more you say, the less people remember—the fewer the words, the greater the profit," I wish to make a few brief comments.

As the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck] have told you, the Foreign Agents Registration Act seeks to protect the interests of the United States by requiring public disclosure of the activities of those serving foreign interests within this country. The wisdom of this procedure has been undisputed since its enactment in 1938.

Today we propose amendments to the act to assure that its basic purpose is in accord with the time. As times have changed so have the nature and modus operandi of the foreign agent. Accordingly, the broad provisions of the present law have been retailored for today's needs.

This task has not been without its difficulties, and Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary is to be complimented on its excellent work. I must praise the work of the able lawyers that constitute that subcommittee and their diligence in studying this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the matters involved in S. 693 are nonpartisan. It is a technical bill that can only be appreciated after complete study. I believe the amendments added by the Judiciary Committee to S. 693 are prudent and justified. They reflect the committee's effort to protect our national interests without unduly jeopardizing the freedom of those members of the business and professional community whose activities incidentally concern them with foreign interests. These efforts are embodied in a statutory rearticulation of the intention of the other body in passing S. 693. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator Fulbright, said in discussing the bill that it was not intended to extend the act's coverage to normal commercial activities. Also that body has added an amendment exempting attorneys engaged in the usual practice of law from the strictures of the law.

I believe the two amendments added by the Committee on the Judiciary clarify the scope of these exemptions. An unclear law is a bad law, and I can assure you that the bill reported by our committee today has weathered the scrutiny of some of the Nation's foremost lawyers.

I stand with my colleagues of the Judiciary Committee to favorably report this bill to you and recommend its passage.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the one who is entitled to greatest credit for this legislation is our eminent Speaker John McCormack. He, many years ago, labored for the principle embodied in this bill and recognized the need for reform. I am happy, thus, at the outset of my remarks to give him full measure of praise for his wisdom and acumen in first suggesting this legislation.

This legislation was introduced by me in the 88th and the present Congress. Its enactment, now overdue, will be a vindication of the prescience of our Speaker.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 concentrated on agents engaged in propaganda activities on the eve of World War II. It has proved inadequate, however, to the various subtle forms of persuasion and missionary work on behalf of foreign principals to which we have been subjected in more recent years.

Apparently both the registered agents and those that are unregistered have, to a startling extent, engaged in highly questionable conduct. There have been disclosures of lobbying on behalf of Philippine sugar interests; of an American wire news agency hiring out its newsgathering facilities to public relations firms working for foreign governments; of a society gossip columnist disseminating propaganda for Trujillo, the deposed dictator of the Dominican Republic.

The proposed amendments to the Foreign Agent Registration Act should go far to closing the loopholes in existing law, improving enforcement, and discouraging the unethical practices of agents of foreign principals that were brought to light by the hearings conducted by the other body, under the expert guidance of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright].

Among the beneficial provisions of the measure are a tightening up of registration requirements, a prohibition of contingent fee arrangements, a prohibition against officers and employees of the United States being or acting as foreign agents, and a prohibition of political contributions by agents of foreign principals who are not U.S. citizens. Enforcement will be immeasurably assisted by a provision authorizing the Attorney General to seek injunctive relief in the courts.

As amended by our committee, the measure wisely exempts from registration legitimate representatives of U.S. concerns with foreign affiliates under limited conditions. The foreign affiliate must not be—and the activities must not be directed by—a foreign government or foreign political party, and the identity of the foreign affiliate must be disclosed. So, too, lawyers would be exempt insofar as they engage in legal representation of disclosed foreign principals. These requirements cannot be met by the sugar lobbyists and others whose conduct was exposed in course of the Senate investigation.

This is a wholly nonpartisan, and much needed, measure. It encountered no dissent in the committee and I urge its immediate enactment.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tenzer].

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and join with my colleague, the distinguished chairman of our Judiciary Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck] and my other colleagues on the subcommittee in urging its adoption by the House.

I want to call to the attention of my colleagues, that the various committee amendments to S. 693 remove the objections of distinguished lawyers, leading law firms, and leading bar associations, The subcommittee was privileged to hear the testimony of Mr. Arthur H. Dean, senior partner, of the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, who while supporting the objectives of the Senate bill, proposed amendments which sought to improve the legislation.

The subcommittee also heard the testimony of Mr. Robert Dechert—of Dechert, Price & Rhodes, Philadelphia, Pa., who appeared on behalf of the American Bar Association; Mr. Carlyle E. Maw of the law firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore, representing the association of the bar of the city of New York; Mr. John F. Sonnett, partner, Cahill, Gordon, Reindel & Ohl, New York City, representing the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Each of these gentlemen, in their representative capacity, supported the objectives of the bill, yet sought amendments to clarify definitions and improve the language of the exemptions, so as to exempt "any person qualified to practice law" from filing as a "foreign agent" under certain conditions and in limited circumstances.

The language of the Senate bill, section 3(g), reads as follows:

> (g) Any attorney whose activities are confined to openly representing, as an attorney of record, the interests of a disclosed foreign principal before any court or administrative agency of the United States, or of any State or political subdivision thereof.

The subcommittee amendment reads as follows:

> (g) Any person qualified to practice law, insofar as he engages or agrees to engage in the legal representation of a foreign principal before any court of law or any agency or official of the Government of the United States (other than a Member or committee of either House of Congress): *Provided*, That in representing the interests of such foreign principal before any such agency or official the fact of such representation and the identity of such foreign principal shall be disclosed to the agency or official concerned.

With this particular amendment, and the others already commented on by other of my colleagues, I urge adoption of the bill, as amended.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, indeed, as the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], has just told you, S. 693 makes many vitally needed improvements in the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

To cite only an example I mention section 7, paragraph 2(f) on page 13 of the bill, which is a provision giving the Attorney General authority to bring an injunctive action to test the application of the act, and to prevent attempts to avoid the application of the law. Under the existing law, the Attorney General is confronted with an all or nothing situation. He must either bring a suit for violation of the act or no suit. Under the injunctive provision in the bill, if the Department of Justice is aware of a potential violation, it will be empowered to prevent violation rather than the present all or nothing situation. I believe that the injunctive provisions are wise additions to the law.

Another example of the improvements made by S. 693 are the reduction of certain penalties to the status of misdemeanors for circumstances of misbehavior that are certainly not concomitant with what is believed to be a felonious action under our system of jurisprudence. The lesser violations are penalized by $5,000 or less than a year in jail while retaining the felony penalty of $10,000 or 5 years for primary violations of the act.

Thus, the failure of a foreign agent to identify material submitted to U.S. officials or governmental agencies; or the failure of a foreign agent to submit proper identification to a committee of Congress; or deficiencies in a registration statement; or a violation of the prohibition on contingency contracts; these are all treated as misdemeanors—not felonies.

I also urge my colleagues to support this measure and I recommend its passage.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I will support Governor Tuck's bill and want to associate myself with his remarks to the House. The fact that Governor Tuck is for this bill is recommendation enough for me that it pass, and that it pass overwhelmingly.

I commend Governor Tuck for holding the hearings and for guiding this bill through the subcommittee, the committee, and now through the House of Representatives. Governor Tuck's bill is designed to protect the interests of the people of the United States by requiring individuals acting in the interest of foreign nations to adhere to certain principles and regulations.

This great piece of legislation will apply to those foreign agents who are particularly engaged in political activities or activities which border on the political. This bill will require a public disclosure of their activities in order that the American people can be informed, and properly so, of the identity and activities of these agents or persons operating for foreign governments or foreign interests.

I wish to particularly commend Governor Tuck for that section of the bill which would prohibit foreign agents from making political contributions or engaging in political activities in behalf of candidates for public office in the United States.

This bill is designed to protect the interests of the United States. Again, I congratulate the illustrious, distinguished, and able Representative from Virginia, Governor Tuck, for this legislation and for the superb manner in which he is bringing this bill to a successful conclusion here on the floor today. Governor Tuck, you have my gratitude and that of the American people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 693, with amendments?

The question was taken.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 285, nays 0, not voting 146, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—285

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton

Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnum
Fascell
Fino
Flynt
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gibbons
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Love
McCulloch
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
Machen
Mackay
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Morton
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pickle
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—146

Andrews,
Glenn
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Blatnik
Boggs
Brock
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Cameron
Carter
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Donohue
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Farnsley
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Halpern
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Helstoski
Henderson
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kornegay
Kupferman
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mackie
Madden
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
May
Meeds
Michel
Mize
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Powell
Purcell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roybal
St. Onge
Scheuer
Scott
Shriver
Sickles
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tupper
Ullman
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.

So the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Burke with Mr. McClory.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Sickles with Mr. Cameron.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Resnick.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Irwin.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. Stalbaum with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Pepper.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Olsen of Montana.

Mr. McVicker with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. Mackie with Mr. Pike.

Mr. Long of Missouri with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Huot with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Bandstra.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Curtin.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Watson.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Moss of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. Rodino with Mrs. May.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Flood with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Macdonald with McEwen.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Shriver.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, S. 2950.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY OF CERTAIN FORMS OF COPPER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12676) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12676

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C., sec. 1202) is amended by—

(a) amending items 911.10, 911.11, and 911.12 to read as follows:

Item	Articles	Rates of duty			Effective period
		1-a	1-b	2	
"911.10	Copper waste and scrap	Free	No change.	No change.	On or before 6/30/68
911.11	Articles of copper	Free	No change.	No change.	On or before 6/30/68
911.12	Other	Free	Free	Free	On or before 6/30/67";

(b) deleting the effective period accompanying the descriptive material preceding items 911.10, 911.11, and 911.12; and

(c) inserting immediately following item 911.12 the following new items:

<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Item</th><th rowspan="2">Articles</th><th colspan="3">Rates of duty</th><th rowspan="2">Effective period</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">1</th><th>2</th></tr>
<tr><td>"911.13</td><td>Copper bearing ores and materials (provided for in items 602.30 or 603.50, part 1, schedule 6).</td><td colspan="2">Free of duty imposed on copper content under items 602.30 or 603.50.</td><td>No change</td><td>On or before 6/30/68 when headnote 5, part 1, schedule 6 is inapplicable.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td colspan="3">Rates of duty</td><td rowspan="2">Effective period</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>1-a</td><td>1-b</td><td>2</td></tr>
<tr><td>911.14</td><td>Cement copper and copper precipitates (provided for in item 612.02, part 2C, schedule 6).</td><td>Free</td><td>No change</td><td>No change</td><td>On or before 6/30/68.</td></tr>
<tr><td>911.15</td><td>Black copper, blister copper, anode copper (provided for in item 612.03, part 2C, schedule 6).</td><td>Free</td><td>No change</td><td>No change</td><td>On or 6/30/68.</td></tr>
<tr><td>911.16</td><td>Other unwrought copper (provided for in item 612.06, part 2C, schedule 6).</td><td>Free</td><td>No change</td><td>No change</td><td>On or before 6/30/68."</td></tr>
</table>

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after February 8, 1966.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 12676, with amendments, was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means without any expressed objection within the committee to the bill's being reported. It would provide for the temporary suspension of duty on copper raw materials and copper scrap for the period February 9, 1966, through June 30, 1968.

It will be observed that the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] introduced the bill initially. Several other Members of the House also introduced bills, including the distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] who has filed the report accompanying the bill, H.R. 12676.

Mr. Speaker, the import duty which would be temporarily suspended by this bill is 1.7 cents per pound of pure copper which may be commercially obtained from the imported article. The only exception is in the case of nickel silver waste and scrap where the rate that would be suspended is 1.7 cents per pound of the commercially recoverable copper plus 10 percent ad valorem.

Mr. Speaker, copper is a metal, as we know, that is extremely important to the defense needs as well as the nondefense needs of the Nation.

In midautumn of last year, it became increasingly apparent that the world demand for copper exceeded the world supply. This imbalance resulted not only from the tremendously enlarged needs in a number of industrialized countries, including the United States, but also from strikes and other problems that have adversely affected production and exports from source countries abroad.

The shortage in the supply of copper has been reflected in pressure on copper prices both at home and abroad. The U.S. producers price for refined copper, which until March 1964, had remained constant at 31 cents a pound for about 3 years, experienced three increases in the space of little more than 1 year, going from 31 to 32 to 34 cents and then to 36 cents per pound in May 1965. After consultations and conferences with representatives of the Federal Government, domestic producers have endeavored, on a voluntary basis, to maintain the 36-cent-per-pound producers price for domestic copper in the U.S. market. These producers have continued to maintain this price level to the present time.

Prices of copper outside the United States, however, have ranged in recent months from a minimum of 42 cents per pound to a maximum of about 90 cents per pound. The spot price of copper on the London Metal Exchange on May 3, for example, was about 70 cents per pound.

The situation had so progressed in seriousness and gravity by November 17, 1965, that the Secretary of Defense on that date felt compelled to recommend that action be taken which would be designed to maximize the supply of copper in this country; to provide for stabilization of the domestic market; and to maintain as much as possible a noninflationary price level for copper. In announcing this program the Secretary made the following statement:

> Our greatly increased defense efforts in Vietnam and recent international political disturbances threaten both to disrupt and to distort the market for copper despite the best efforts of our American copper industry to supply that market.
>
> This market disruption can lead to strong inflationary pressures, not only in copper essential to defense needs but also more generally throughout our economy. Such developments would seriously impair our defense efforts in Vietnam.

Among the specific measures recommended by the Secretary was a request that the Congress temporarily suspend import duties on copper raw materials and copper scrap, which as I have indicated are presently principally subject to a duty rate of 1.7 cents per pound.

The purpose of this particular recommendation, as announced by the Secretary, was to bring about a reduction by an amount equivalent to the duty, in the cost of foreign copper to domestic consumers, thereby contributing to the efforts to hold the price line in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no objection expressed from any source within the domestic copper production industry within the United States. Some of the people within the industry did not like one particular provision, section 2(b), of the bill as originally introduced. The committee amendment would strike that provision from the bill. But all those from whom we heard—and I think we heard from representatives of practically all interested segments of the industry—favored a temporary suspension in the duty on copper.

Mr. Speaker, we produce approximately 90 percent of our own domestic needs. We have to import approximately 10 percent of those needs. Historically that excess copper that we have needed has come to the United States from Canada, Peru, and Chile. Copper produced in other areas of the world has found its market primarily in other industrialized countries. Some of what is produced in Peru, in Canada, and Chile also finds its market outside the United States. But principally we have depended upon these three countries for that 10 percent of our copper that we have needed not only historically but in recent months.

To the extent that the duty on copper coming into the United States affects the price to the copper consumer, this relief in the duty would have the effect of reducing the cost to those who consume copper.

I call attention of the House to the fact that legislation for a temporary suspension of duties on copper is not new to this body. Similar legislation has been enacted for periods in the past when the available supply of copper was insufficient to meet demand and pressure on prices existed. The periods covered by such prior suspensions are April 30, 1947, to the close of June 30, 1950; and April 1, 1951, to the close of June 30, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, favorable reports on this legislation were received from all the interested Federal agencies, including the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, Labor, and Interior.

This is a measure which would merit the approval of all the membership of the House. I would urge its passage by the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Have we been drawing down on the defense stockpile?

Mr. MILLS. We have been. That is true. As I recall, there have been two orders, of 200,000 tons each, taken from the stockpile.

Mr. GROSS. What is the condition of the defense stockpile at the present time?

Mr. MILLS. It is my recollection, based on information from the public hearings, that we have—and I do not want to discuss this in too much detail—approximately 400,000 tons remaining.

Mr. GROSS. I note that the report mentions Zambia as being a source of supply of copper. It is my hope that no copper will be purchased from Zambia, in view of the statement only last week by the President of that so-called Government in which he said there must be a spilling of blood. I do not know whose blood he wants spilled in Africa. I would doubt very much that the President's blood would be spilled. I suppose he would spill the blood of Americans, if possible.

In view of this statement I would hope that not a pound of copper be purchased from Zambia as long as that Government takes the attitude it does that differences with other countries can only be settled by the spilling of blood. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, representing the great copper-producing State of Montana, I would ordinarily be opposed to any gratuitous reduction in the rate of duty on the importation of copper. Because of the special circumstances which presently exist, I nevertheless support this bill to suspend the duty for a period of 2 years to June 30, 1968. Unless unforeseen circumstances should develop, by the time that the suspension expires production will have been expanded and will exceed domestic consumption of copper.

It has been estimated that the U.S. copper requirements for the year 1966 will amount to approximately 2.2 million short tons. Domestic sources—including the release of 400,000 tons from the defense stockpile—will account for about 2 million tons. The balance of almost 200,000 tons must be imported in order to meet our needs.

There is a duty of 1.7 cents per pound on copper imported into the United States. On several occasions in the past, when domestic copper was in short supply, Congress has suspended the duty. The bill before you today would do this again. That is all.

The domestic producers support this bill because with the rise in price of copper, they are concerned that substitute materials will be found.

The domestic users support this bill because products which they manufacture must reflect the higher costs for raw materials. The duty is a part of these costs.

The world shortage of copper has precipitated an inflationary price rise which is of concern both to producers and users. The price abroad greatly exceeds the price of U.S.-produced copper. Under these conditions, the tariff serves no useful purpose.

I certainly would not claim that the suspension of the duty will, in itself, make any more copper available for import into the United States. The worldwide demand exceeds the available supply of copper. Since the prices paid abroad are substantially in excess of domestic producers' prices—a difference of 1.7 cents per pound will not be a significant factor. However, the suspension of the duty will serve to reduce slightly the cost—and the pressure on the prices—in the United States of all articles using copper.

Today, the user of copper pays several prices for his raw materials. He may get some at the domestic producer's price at 36 cents a pound. He may buy other copper from the scrap market at 50 or 60 cents per pound. He then may have to go into the New York market or the London market and buy foreign copper to complete his requirements. The price for that copper has ranged all over the lot, from 60 to 90 cents per pound. To the extent that the mix includes any copper imported from abroad, the user's cost will reflect the duty of 1.7 cents per pound unless we enact this bill. Since those costs are already inflated because of purchases made in the scrap market and abroad, anything that we can do to reduce that cost will be helpful.

Enactment of this legislation will not affect the planned expansion of copper production either in the United States or abroad. The free world copper industry can produce about 5 million tons per year. By the end of 1970, the industry is expected to reach a capacity of about 6.3 million tons per year. During this period U.S. domestic production alone will increase by about 400,000 tons. Copper production will more than meet all needs of the free world by the year 1970.

What we are doing in this bill has no relationship to the actions of our Government in its dealings with Chile in order to hold down the price of our imports of Chilean copper. It has nothing to do with the actions of our Government in releasing copper from the defense stockpile. For that reason, it has my support.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I think my friend from Montana would agree that there would be a lot less likelihood of us ever buying copper from any of the African sources, including Zambia, if this legislation passes.

Mr. BATTIN. I would completely agree, because this is an effort to bring into the domestic market of the United States copper that is necessary to meet the domestic demands.

I compliment the chairman for bringing it to the floor. It has certainly had long and adequate consideration in the committee.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 12676, which temporarily suspends the present duty on copper, will provide a much-needed measure of relief to the Nation's economy and defense efforts, and it will have a special impact on the massive copper-consuming industrial complex which is located in my congressional district. I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, and the members and staff of the Ways and Means Committee, for their valuable cooperation and assistance in bringing this bill before the House today.

Three months ago, when I introduced H.R. 12676, the worldwide shortage of copper was at an alltime high and all indications were that market strictures would continue to plague civilian and military consumers of this vital metal for at least the balance of this year. Today the shortage is even more acute and resulting price rise has raised serious threats of inflation in this country. To date we have taken virtually every conceivable step to guarantee an adequate supply of copper for our rising defense needs and to hold the price of this metal within noninflationary limits. Since 1964, when a serious supply-demand situation first became apparent, I have followed and participated in these efforts, and it is gratifying to note that real successes have been achieved in this area.

Through the gradual and controlled release of 520,000 tons of copper, including 200,000 tons to be released shortly, from our national stockpile and the timely imposition of revised military set-aside orders our expanding defense commitment has thus far been insulated from the effects of the worldwide shortage of this strategic material. Moreover, these measures, accompanied by revised export licensing provisions and export controls, and the New York Commodity Exchange's raised margin requirement for copper trading have managed to hold the U.S. primary producer price of this metal at 36 cents per pound while the primary producer price in most foreign markets has surged upward to 62 cents per pound, and the London Metal Exchange price has reached 98 cents per pound before leveling off at its present price of 72 cents per pound.

However, the pressures on copper prices have been growing steadily and most of our emergency relief measures have been exhausted. This bill, H.R. 12676, represents one of the few remaining steps the Government can take to ease the copper shortage. It will suspend the present 1.7-cent-per-pound duty on certain forms of copper from February 9, 1966, to June 30, 1966, and it will thereby complement the numerous relief measures that have preceded it in an effort to insure an adequate supply of copper and simultaneously stabilize its price.

In 1965, the United States produced about 90 percent of the 2 million tons of copper consumed by domestic industries, and the balance of approximately 200,000 tons was imported. While copper consumption is up in the first quarter of 1966 as a result of our rapidly expanding economy and our growing defense effort, it is doubtful that domestic production can be immediately increased to keep pace with this intensified demand. While Government efforts are being administered by the General Services Administration to encourage expanded copper production, this object will not be accomplished overnight, and in the meanwhile we will be forced to rely on imports to fill the gap. This bill will create a more favorable climate for U.S. imports by suspending the present 1.7 cents per pound tariff from February 1, 1966, to June 30, 1968, and it will help to ease the burden on copper-consuming industries during the interim period of domestic mine expansion.

Not the least important result of this bill will be the salutary effect on relations with copper-producing nations who have been unhappy about our duty.

I am convinced that the purposes of this bill are worthy and vitally needed at this time, and I urge the Members of this House to act favorably upon it today.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 12676.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12676.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the various veterans bills passed today.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

INCREASED DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR PARENTS AND CHILDREN OF VETERANS WHOSE DEATHS ARE SERVICE-CONNECTED

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14347) to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14347

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 415(b), title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b)(2), if there is only one parent, dependency and indemnity compensation shall be paid to him at a monthly rate equal to the amount under column II of the following table opposite his total income shown in column I:

"Column I		Column II
Total annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
------------	$800	$87
$800	1,100	$69
1,100	1,300	$52
1,300	1,500	$35
1,500	1,800	$18
1,800	------------	No amount payable"

"(2) If there is only one parent, and he has remarried and is living with his spouse, dependency and indemnity compensation shall be paid to him under either the table in subsection (b)(1) or the table in subsection (d), whichever is the greater. In such a case of remarriage the total combined annual income of the parent and his spouse shall be counted in determining the monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation under the appropriate table."

(b) The table in section 415(c), title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Column I		Column II
Total annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
------------	$800	$58
$800	1,100	$46
1,100	1,300	$35
1,300	1,500	$23
1,500	1,800	$12
1,800	------------	No amount payable"

(c) The table in section 415(d), title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Column I		Column II
Total combined annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
------------	$1,000	$58
$1,000	1,500	$46
1,500	2,000	$35
2,000	2,500	$23
2,500	3,000	$12
3,000	------------	No amount payable"

SEC. 2. Section 415(g)(1), title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding new paragraphs as follows:

"(F) payments under policies of servicemen's group life insurance, United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance, and payments of servicemen's indemnity;

"(G) 10 per centum of the amount of payments to an individual, under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs;

"(H) amounts equal to amounts paid by a parent of a deceased veteran for—

"(i) a deceased spouses's just debts,

"(ii) the expenses of the spouse's last illness to the extent such expenses are not reimbursed under chapter 51 of this title, and

"(iii) the expenses of the spouse's burial to the extent that such expenses are not reimbursed under chapter 23 or chapter 51 of this title;

"(I) proceeds of fire insurance policies;

"(J) amounts equal to amounts paid by a parent of a deceased veteran for—

"(i) the expenses of the veteran's last illness, and

"(ii) the expenses of his burial to the extent that such expenses are not reimbursed under chapter 23 of this title;

"(K) profit realized from the disposition of real or personal property other than in the course of a business;

"(L) payments received for discharge of jury duty or obligatory civic duties."

SEC. 3. Section 3012(b)(4), title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", except that when a change in income is due to an increase in payments under a public or private retirement plan or program the effective date of a reduction or discontinuance of payments under chapter 13 of this title shall be the last day of the calendar year in which the change occurred".

SEC. 4. Section 413, title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$77" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "$80";

(2) by striking out "$110" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "$115";

(3) by striking out "$143" in paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "$149"; and

(4) by striking out "$28" in paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "$29".

SEC. 5. Section 414, title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$28" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$29".

(2) by striking out "$77" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "80"; and

(3) by striking out "$39" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$41".

SEC. 6. (a) Except as otherwise provided herein, this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Section 2 of this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1967, but paragraph (G) of section 415(g)(1), title 38, United States Code, as added by such section 2, shall not apply to any parent receiving dependency and indemnity compensation of December 31, 1966, or subsequently determined entitled to that benefit for said day, until his contributions to the described plans or programs have been recouped.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill seeks to liberalize the provisions for payment, to parents and children, a dependency and indemnity compensation based on the service-connected death of a veteran. Since July 1, 1963, when Public Law 88-21 increased these rates, there has been an increase in the cost of living in excess of 4 percent. The first section of the bill as reported recognizes this increase by increasing the parent's rates by this approximate amount and at the same time liberalizes the income limitations to make them the same at the upper level as that applicable to those individuals who receive non-service-connected pensions. This section also protects the monthly rate of a sole remarried parent. Sections 4 and 5 of the bill provide cost-of-living increases for children who are receiving dependency and indemnity compensation.

The logic of this legislation is summed up very well in the statement of the representative of the American Legion when he appeared before the subcommittee on March 17 to testify in support of this and similar proposals:

> Of the older American, it has been said, a high degree of independence is almost as valuable as life itself. It is their standard of self-respect; it is a measure of their importance to others; and it is a source of strength for assisting those about them.
>
> To them, enjoyment of this independence rests, to a degree, on the part they play in the community—partly on the condition of their health and partly on the sufficiency of their income to provide adequate food, clothing, housing, medical care, and other essentials.
>
> With this foreground, we look to the reports and other data on the aging and the impoverished to learn of the extent to which the income of dependent parents need be supplemented to assure that they have an income adequate to defray the reasonable expenses of living in an environment typical of the American way of life and to learn the level of personal income beyond which these supplemental payments need be made.

At the same time the representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars stated his view, saying:

> In many cases we are talking about parents whose only son was shot down on the field of battle. That they are in almost destitute circumstances is obvious, and in grateful recognition of these facts the Congress has seen fit to provide these parents with some assistance during their hour of need.

Section 2 provides the same exclusions from the determination of income as are now applicable to the income limitations of non-service-connected pension.

Section 3 would delay the reduction or discontinuance of monthly payments to parents of dependency and indemnity compensation where the income exceeds stated levels by reason of an increase in benefits under a public or private retirement plan.

The bill, except for section 2, will be effective on the first day of the second calendar month following date of enactment. That section will be effective January 1, 1967.

The first year's cost of the bill is $5,198,000.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington. D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for a report on H.R. 14347, 89th Congress.

The bill would increase the rates and income limitations applicable to the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to certain parents of deceased veterans and would increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children. It would also liberalize the income exclusions relating to the computation of income for parents. Protection would be afforded the monthly rate of a sole surviving parent who remarries. Additionally, a delay would be provided in the reduction or discontinuance of monthly payments of dependency and indemnity compensation to parents where the income exceeds stated levels by reason of an increase in benefits under a public or private retirement plan.

Under chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, monthly dependency and indemnity compensation payments are made to certain children of veterans who die of a service-connected or compensable disability without respect to the financial need of the children. Payments to parents of such veterans, however, are provided on a sliding scale based upon annual income. The income limitations vary according to whether there are one or two parents, and in a case of two parents, whether they are living together or apart.

The first section and sections 4 and 5 of H.R. 14347 would increase the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for parents and children. These rates were last increased in 1963 based on the increase in cost of living to that date. The proposed liberalization of the rates would be generally commensurate with the increase in the cost of living since then and accordingly is favored.

The first section of the bill also deals with annual income limitations governing eligibility of parents for dependency and indemnity compensation. Currently, they range to maximums of $1,750 for an only parent and for each of two parents living apart, and $2,400 for two parents living together. The bill would modify the various levels, with maximums of $1,800 and $3,000, respectively. We do not believe the proposed increase in income limitations contained in this section is necessary at this time.

In determining the annual income of parents for purpose of dependency and indemnity compensation all income is not counted. A number of types of payments are specifically excluded under the provisions of 38 USC 415(g). It should be noted, however, that the exclusions governing countable income for the non-service-connected pension program (38 USC 503) are more liberal than those relating to the dependency and indemnity compensation program for parents. Section 2 of the bill would liberalize the income exclusions to make them comparable to those under the death pension program. It seems only fair and reasonable that the income exclusions for parents of a veteran whose death was service connected should not be less liberal than those which are applicable for payment of pension for a non-service-connected death.

Another feature of the bill relates to the effective date of a reduction or discontinuance of dependency and indemnity compensation. Increases in retirement benefits sometimes cause a reduction or discontinuance of dependency and indemnity compensation payments for parents. Under current law it is necessary to make these adjustments effective the last day of the month in which the income is so increased. Section 3 would delay any such reduction or discontinuance until the last day of the calendar year in which the change in income occurred. Since these parents have relied on their dependency and indemnity compensation benefits to help meet their day-to-day living expenses, it is believed the proposed provision for a period in which to readjust their living standard is desirable.

Under existing law a sole surviving parent who remarries may suffer a reduction in the monthly rate of his dependency and indemnity compensation even though his income remains static and the new spouse has none. This inequitable situation would be remedied by the proposed section 415(b)(2), of title 38, United States Code.

The bill would generally take effect the first day of the second calendar month after the date of its enactment. Section 2 of the bill, relating to income exclusions, would be effective January 1, 1967. Provision is made, however, for the proposed 10% of retirement income exclusion to be inapplicable to any parent receiving or entitled to receive dependency and indemnity compensation on, or for, December 31, 1966, until his contributions to the retirement program have been recouped.

It is estimated that enactment of H.R. 14347 would result in an additional cost of approximately $5.2 million the first year. The cost would increase gradually for each of the subsequent four years to approximately $6.1 million for the fifth year.

In summary, while we have expressed one reservation, we recommend favorable consideration of this bill.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,
CYRIL F. BRICHFIELD,
Deputy Administrator
(For W. J. DRIVER, *Administrator*).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14347. This bill will liberalize the dependency and indemnity compensation program for parents of veterans who die in service or as the result of service-connected disabilities.

In order to qualify for monthly payments under this program, the parents of a young man killed in combat in Vietnam must meet extremely stringent income limitations. Two parents living together, for example, must have a combined annual income of less than $2,400 to qualify for a monthly stipend of $11 each. If there is only one parent, that parent must have income of less than $1,750 annually to qualify for monthly payments of $17.

The increasing scope of our combat action in Vietnam with its accompanying casualties has vividly pointed up the inadequacies of existing law. Case after case has been brought to the attention of our committee in which a young unmarried veteran had been contributing to the support of his dependent parents. Upon his death in combat, the parents are denied dependency and indemnity compensation payments because their combined annual income is approximately $2,600. In the case of deaths since September 29, 1965, the date of enactment of the servicemen's group life insurance program, these parents receive the proceeds of the veteran's life insurance. Prior to that time, however, no veterans' benefits were available to these parents.

H.R. 14347, Mr. Speaker, will revise the structure of payments to dependent parents by increasing both the income limitations and the monthly payments. For example, the bill proposes to increase the $3,000. A modest increase in monthly $2,400 annual income limitation to rates of dependency and indemnity compensation are provided in recognition of an approximate 4-percent increase in the cost of living since these rates were last increased.

Section 2 of the bill, Mr. Speaker, provides generally the same exclusions in the determination of annual income as are now applicable to the income limitations controlling the receipt of non-service-connected pension. The law grants certain income exclusions to pensioners that have not been made available to dependent parents of the service connected deceased veteran. For example, the pension program provides that 10 percent of any retirement income, either public or private, may be excluded from the computation of income for pension purposes. H.R. 14347 will extend this same exclusion to the service-connected DIC program. It was the unanimous view of our committee that the formula for computing income should be consistent.

This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, which provides modest liberalizations in the benefit program for survivors of our war dead. It has always been the philosophy of the Congress to give the highest priority consideration to the service-connected veteran and his survivors. This bill carries out that noble purpose. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 14347.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHAMIZAL TREATY NATIONAL MEMORIAL, EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7402) to provide for the establishment of the Chamizal Treaty National Memorial in the city of El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and develop a memorial to be known as the Chamizal National Memorial at El Paso, Texas, on approximately fifty-five acres in the northeastern part of the portion of Cordova Island acquired by the United States under the Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the Solution of the Problem of the Chamizal, signed at Mexico City August 29, 1963 (TIAS–5515). The Chamizal National Memorial shall commemorate the harmonious settlement of the long-standing boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico concerning the Chamizal, an area of land situated to the north of the Rio Grande in the El Paso Ciudad Juarez region.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, defer the establishment of the Chamizal National Memorial until the city of El Paso or other governmental agencies of the State of Texas has submitted, and the Secretary has approved, a comprehensive plan for the development of the remaining lands acquired by the United States under the Chamizal Convention, August 29, 1963, upon their transfer to said city or other government agencies in the State of Texas under other provisions of law. Such comprehensive plan shall include a development plan and work schedule that is in the judgment of the Secretary compatible and coordinated with the development plan and schedule for the Chamizal National Memorial.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer, protect, and develop such memorial, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes," approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate and consult with the city and county of El Paso, Texas, Texas Western College, local historical and preservation societies, and other interested government agencies, associations and persons in the utilization and preservation of the Chamizal National Memorial.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $2,060,000 for the development of the Chamizal National Memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ], will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7402 by our colleague from Texas [Mr. WHITE].

This bill is designed to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to create and administer the 55-acre Chamizal National Memorial in El Paso, Tex. The purpose of the memorial is to commemorate the peaceful settlement of a century-old boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico. It will be located on some of the land that was directly involved in that settlement.

The story behind the origin of the dispute is a fairly simple one. Back in the 1850's or 1860's the Rio Grande, which was then—as it is now—the boundary between Mexico and the United States, made a substantial shift in its course in the vicinity of El Paso. Whether this shift occurred by gradual erosion or sudden avulsion, I do not know. In either case the acreage north of the Rio Grande after the shift was greater than it had been before, and the acreage south of the Rio Grande was smaller than it had been before. Let me recall to you, in this connection, the reverse English of Mark Twain's cogent observations about the Mississippi and its wanderings:

> The Mississippi is a just and equitable river; it never tumbles one man's farm overboard without building a new farm just like it for that man's neighbor. This keeps down hard feelings.

The question whether the new acres to the north belonged to the United States or to Mexico was a natural for every contentious person in the vicinity, and heaven alone knows how much effort, time, and money was spent by the lawyers and diplomats in Mexico City and Washington trying to prove the case for their country. It was probably more than the land was worth at any time until the very recent present.

This remained a sore point for, as I said, nearly 100 years. I shall not even attempt to detail the many efforts that were made to settle it. Suffice it to say that it was not until the 1960's that these efforts met with any success. It was only when President Kennedy and President Lopez Mateos put their heads together that it was settled.

The treaty of settlement was signed in 1963 by President Johnson after receiving the advice and consent of the Senate. It has been ratified by both parties. In addition, the Congress has already passed an act providing the machinery to implement the treaty. All that remains now is to decide what use shall be made of the 193 acres of land to which the United States acquires clear title as a result of the treaty.

Three projects have been proposed. Part of the land will be used by the city of El Paso and other State agencies for educational purposes. On another part of the 193 acres the proper Federal authorities will construct new port of entry facilities. The third proposal, and the only one that is before the House, is for the Chamizal National Memorial. This has the enthusiastic support not only of the Department of the Interior and the State Department but also of State and local officials and of interested local citizens.

Of the 55 acres involved in H.R. 7402 will be located a visitor center in which will be displayed the highlights of the story of our Mexican boundary and particularly of the Chamizal dispute and its settlement. There will also be a small auditorium and an outstanding monument overlooking the border with a reflecting pool between it and the visitor center. Parking space will be provided, of course, and there will be broad grassy areas on which visitors can relax and enjoy themselves. The estimated cost of this development is a little over $2 million.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE], is prepared to go into more detail, so I shall say no more than to urge that H.R. 7402 be given favorable consideration by the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member desiring to do so may be permitted to extend his remarks immediately following debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that this bill is before the House today and for two reasons.

In the first place, I do not understand why we should spend more than $2 million and a minimum of $173,000 a year in perpetuity in a situation of this kind. It seems to me we did very well by the Mexican Government in the Chamizal Treaty.

In the second place, the Government of Mexico has not up to this time given evidence that it is overly friendly to the United States of America.

It was Mexico that voted against us, as I remember it, with respect to the Cuban situation. Mexico voted against us, if I remember correctly, as a member of the OAS in the Dominican Republic situation. For a long period, Mexico maintained a form of transmission belt to Cuba. It provided a means by which many subversives made their way from the Central and South American countries to Cuba for guerrilla training and training as saboteurs and subversives. I have yet to note the Mexican Government demonstrating a real capacity for friendship to the United States. Moreover, in the present Vietnam crisis ships flying the Mexican flag are not permitted to transport American military supplies to Vietnam. I regret that this bill is here, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances that prevail and I shall vote against it.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7402 to establish the Chamizal Treaty National Monument in the city of El Paso, Tex.

This proposed memorial will commemorate the settlement of a longstanding international boundary dispute between Mexico and the United States involving 600 acres of land lying along the Rio Grande. In 1848, the Rio Grande was designated as the permament boundary between the United States and Mexico in this area by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Subsequently, the Rio Grande changed its course so that a tract of land known as the Chamizal fell on the northern bank of the river. A question then arose over sovereignty to this tract of land and has remained an issue between the two nations for over 100 years.

On January 14, 1964, the Chamizal Treaty became effective and provided for the permanent relocation of the river in this area and marked the center of the channel as the international boundary. In accordance with the treaty and river relocation, the United States will transfer to Mexico approximately 630 acres and the United States will acquire 193 acres from Mexico.

The U.S. Department of State will take jurisdiction of the 193 acres acquired by the United States under the treaty. A portion of the 193 acres will be developed for public purposes by the El Paso Independent School District and the city of El Paso. The U.S. customs and immigration facilities will be east of the proposed memorial site. The Chamizal Treaty National Memorial will occupy approximately 55 acres.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed national monument will include a suitable monument structure, a reflecting pool, a museum and information center to commemorate the spirit of international cooperation and accomplishment between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed Chamizal National Memorial will serve as a symbol of international good will and friendship. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are considering today, H.R. 7402, which I have sponsored to establish the Chamizal National Memorial in El Paso, Tex., is of great national importance and equally great international significance.

The Chamizal National Memorial will stand as a permanent symbol of the finest tradition of international relations—the peaceful settlement of disputes—and will commemorate the workable and friendly relations between the United States and our neighbor, Mexico.

Every American can be proud of the diplomatic tradition embodied in the convention between the United States of America and Mexico signed in August of 1963, which settled a longstanding boundary dispute between the two countries. Nearly 100 years of colorful border history has taken place on the Chamizal, a tract of land of some 630 acres, situated on the north side of the Rio Grande in the vicinity of El Paso, Tex.-Ciudad Juarez. Under the direction of our Presidents Kennedy and Johnson the dispute was resolved in the finest spirit of cooperation and friendship between our countries.

It is appropriate that this boundary history and this settlement be commemorated by the Chamizal National Memorial in El Paso. Under the convention 193.16 acres now under Mexican jurisdiction comprising the north half of land known as Cordova Island will be transferred to the United States. It is on 55 acres of this land that the proposed memorial would be established. El Paso is the focal point of much of the history of this entire international border.

It is also appropriate to commemorate international good will in El Paso, for El Pasoans have long been setting an example for all Americans in their friendly, cooperative relations with our neighbors.

The Chamizal settlement offers an unprecedented opportunity to beautify our international border in the spirit of international cooperation. The Mexican Government is presently developing in an attractive fashion their side of this Chamizal section. It is appropriate that the United States through this memorial develop our part of the Chamizal in an equally attractive fashion. This will make the entire Chamizal section a showplace for both countries, reminding the thousands of visitors every year of cooperation between nations. The city of El Paso will share in this development on an adjoining tract of land.

My legislation authorizes $2,060,000 for the Department of the Interior to construct a suitable monument, a museum-information center and attractive landscaping.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I urge the enactment of this legislation, for the Chamizal National Memorial will be a source of pride to every American. Every Mexican citizen, and, indeed, every citizen of the world that shares our desire for peace will find in the Chamizal National Memorial a symbol of the tradition we cherish in foreign relations—cooperation and good will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado, that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 7402 as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDE FOR POPULAR ELECTION OF GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11775 to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11775

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 386; 48 U.S.C. 1422), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The executive power of Guam shall be vested in an executive officer whose official title shall be the 'Governor of Guam'. The Governor of Guam, together with the Lieutenant Governor, shall be elected by a majority of the votes cast by the people who are qualified to vote for the members of the Legislature of Guam. The Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be chosen jointly, by the casting by each voter of a single vote applicable to both offices. If no candidates receive a majority of the votes cast in any election, on the fourteenth day thereafter a runoff election shall be held between the candidates for Governor and Lieutentant Governor receiving the highest and second highest number of votes cast. The first election for Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be held on November 8, 1966. Thereafter, beginning with the year 1968, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be elected every two years at the general election. The Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall hold office for a term of two years and until their successors are elected and qualified. The term of the elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall commence on the fifth day of January following the date of election.

"No person shall be eligible for election to the office of Governor or Lieutenant Governor unless he is able to read and write the English language, is and has been for five consecutive years immediately preceding the election a citizen of the United States and a bona fide resident of Guam and will be, at the time of taking office, at least thirty years of age. The Governor shall maintain his official residence in Guam during his incumbency.

"The Governor shall have general supervision and control of all the departments, bureaus, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the executive branch of the government of Guam. He may grant pardons and reprieves and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against local laws. He may veto any legislation as provided in this Act. He shall appoint, and may remove, all officers and employees of the executive branch of the government of Guam, except as otherwise provided in this or any other Act of Congress, or under the laws of Guam, and shall commission all officers that he may be authorized to appoint. He shall be responsible for the faithful execution of the laws of Guam and the laws of the United States applicable in Guam. Whenever it becomes necessary, in case of disaster, invasion, insurrection, or rebellion, or imminent danger thereof, or to prevent or suppress lawless violence, he may summon the posse comitatus or call out the militia or request assistance of the senior military or naval commander of the Armed Forces of the United States in Guam, which may be given at the discretion of such military commander if not disruptive of, or inconsistent with, his Federal responsibilities. He may, in case of rebellion or invasion, or imminent danger thereof, when the public safety requires it, proclaim the island, or any part thereof, under martial law. The members of the legislature shall meet forthwith on their own initiative and may, by a two-thirds vote, revoke such proclamation.

"The Governor shall make to the head of the department or agency designated by the President under section 3 of this Act an annual report of the transaction of the government of Guam for transmission to the Congress and such other reports at such other times as may be required by the Congress or under applicable Federal law. He shall have the power to issue executive orders and regulations not in conflict with any applicable law. He may recommend bills to the legislature and give expression to his views on any matter before that body.

"There is hereby established the office of Lieutenant Governor of Guam. The Lieutenant Governor shall have such executive powers and perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Governor or prescribed by this Act or under the laws of Guam."

Sec. 2. Section 7 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422a), is deleted and replaced by the following new provision, also designated section 7:

"Sec. 7. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Acting Governor of Guam shall be removable from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, high crimes and misdemeanors. Impeachment shall be by resolution adopted at an open session of the legislature held not less than fifteen days after introduction of the resolution. The vote on any such resolution shall be by the yeas and nays and the affirmative votes of at least three-quarters of the full membership of the legislature shall be requisite for its adoption. Notice of impeachment, which shall include the articles of impeachment, shall be filed by the speaker of the legislature with the clerk of the District Court of Guam who shall forthwith cause a true copy thereof to be served upon the person impeached. The judge of the district court shall notify the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit who shall assign three judges of said circuit to try the impeachment at such time and at such place in Guam as may be specified by said chief judge. Judgment by such court shall be final and not reviewable in any other court and in case of conviction shall extend no further than removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, profit, or trust under the government of Guam, but the party impeached, whether convicted or acquitted, shall be liable to prosecution and punishment according to law. No officer shall exercise his official duties from the time he has been impeached and notified thereof until he has been acquitted."

Sec. 3. Section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422b), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) In case of the temporary disability or temporary absence of the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor shall have the powers of the Governor.

(b) In case of a permanent vacancy in the office of Governor, arising by reason of the death, resignation, removal by impeachment, or permanent disability of the Governor, or the death, resignation, or permanent disability of a Governor-elect, or for any other reason, the Lieutenant Governor or Lieutenant Governor-elect shall become the Governor, to hold office for the unexpired term and until his successor shall have been duly elected and qualified at the next regular election for Governor.

"(c) In case of the temporary disability or temporary absence of the Lieutenant Governor, or during any period when the Lieutenant Governor is acting as Governor, the Speaker of the Guam Legislature shall act as Lieutenant Governor.

"(d) In case of a permanent vacancy in the Office of Lieutenant Governor, arising by reason of the death, resignation, removal by impeachment, or permanent disability of the Lieutenant Governor, or because the Lieutenant Governor or Lieutenant Governor-elect has succeeded to the office of Governor, the Governor shall appoint a new Lieutenant Governor, with the advice and consent of the legislature, to hold office for the unexpired term and until his successor shall have been duly elected and qualified at the next regular election for Lieutenant Governor.

"(e) In case of the temporary disability or temporary absence of both the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor, the powers of the Governor shall be exercised, as Acting Governor, by such person as the laws of Guam may prescribe. In case of a permanent vacancy in the offices of both the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, the office of Governor shall be filled for the unexpired term in the manner prescribed by the laws of Guam.

"(f) No additional compensation shall be paid to any person acting as Governor or Lieutenant Governor who does not also assume the office of Governor or Lieutenant Governor under the provisions of this Act."

Sec. 4. (a) The second and third sentences of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422c(a)) are deleted.

(b) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 9 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422c(b)) is deleted.

Sec. 5. Section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 389; 48 U.S.C. 1423i) is amended by deleting its fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth sentences and by substituting therefor the following: "If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of all the members of the legislature pass the bill, it shall be a law.".

Sec. 6. Section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 391; 48 U.S.C. 1421d), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 26. The salaries and travel allowances of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, the heads of the executive departments, other officers and employees of the government of Guam and the members of the legislature, shall be paid by the government of Guam at rates prescribed by the laws of Guam."

Sec. 7. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, section 5 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 385; 48 U.S.C. 1421b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (u):

"(u) The provisions of paragraph 1 of section 2 of article IV and section 1 of amendment XIV of the Constitution of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the unincorporated Territory of Guam as in the United States or in any State of the United States."

Sec. 8. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, chapter 15 of the General Military Law (70A Stat. 15, 16; 10 U.S.C. 331–334) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section 335:

"Sec. 335. For purposes of this chapter, 'State' includes the unincorporated Territory of Guam."

Sec. 9. Except as to provisions applicable to the election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, which provisions shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and unless otherwise expressly provided herein, this Act shall be effective January 5, 1967.

Sec. 10. This Act may be cited as the "Guam Elective Governor Act."

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **SKUBITZ**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11775 is the first of four bills being brought to the floor this afternoon to extend additional home rule to Guam and the Virgin Islands. In keeping with congressional policy, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recognizes that when the abilities of the people of our offshore flag areas are such as to permit them to assume more responsibilities of government, they will be granted.

Our committee members are convinced that the Guamanians and the Virgin Islanders through their wisdom and political maturity are now ready to relieve the President and the Secretary of the Interior of certain of the functions of government they have been handling for the territories. Personally, I know both the Guamanians and the Virgin Islanders well, I respect their judgment and have every reason to believe that the responsibilities being transferred to them by these four bills will be in safe hands.

The first bill, H.R. 11775, was introduced by Subcommittee Chairman O'Brien at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, the Guam Legislature, the Guam Governor, and hundreds of U.S. citizens of Guam. The bill provides for the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor to be elected on November 8, 1966, for a 2-year term. Today, under the Organic Act of 1950, the Governor and Government Secretary are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Since 1950 two of the six Governors have been Guamanians. There is no dearth of highly qualified candidates for either of the elective offices.

As shown on page 4 of our committee report this bill is one of many public laws which have transferred Federal responsibilities to the Guam Legislature. In each respect the Guamanians have shouldered the burdens with ease and facility. For the past 16 years, the Guam voters have elected on a two-party system their own legislators who have wisely voted their opinions on local issues. It is only logical that they should now wish to move forward one step further and elect their own Chief Executive. This will require an amendment to the Organic Act, an elimination of a transitional feature; the Presidential appointment to the Governor and elective Governor.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse H.R. 11775, and urge its acceptance.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member desiring to do so may extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN's record in this body has been one of friendliness and one of attention to the problems of our offshore areas. Of course, his knowledgeable and effective work has extended into many other fields of legislative endeavor, also. I think that no man deserves more credit for the forward movement that we have made in the fields of territorial matters during the last 15 years than does the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]. He has performed outstanding services for all of us. As his chairman for many years I shall sorely miss his presence at my side when he retires at the end of this Congress.

I now yield him such time as he may desire.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I shall address myself specifically here to H.R. 11775, but the remarks I make are broad enough to encompass the three remaining bills on the calendar.

Mr. Speaker, this is my 12th year as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, a group with geographical jurisdiction extending from the Virgin Islands to the South Pole, from the sparkling waters of the Caribbean to sun-drenched Guam, American Samoa, and the trust territories.

Mr. Speaker, many times during those years we have come to the well of the House for approval of legislation extending additional home rule to our offshore fellow citizens. The House has been most kind and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, the bills we bring to the floor of the House today are among the most significant we have offered, because they round out a record of which we and our country can be proud.

I hope the Members will indulge me for just a moment, if I look briefly to the past before dealing with the future. I ask this privilege for two reasons, the first of which is somewhat personal.

Mr. Speaker, I will retire from Congress at the end of this year, and this, perhaps, is the last major bill which I will have an opportunity to discuss from this place. But far more important than a personal swan song is the opportunity to answer some of the criticisms of our offshore relations which have been leveled at us in the United Nations by our enemies and by a few of our fair-weather friends.

I have mentioned my 12 years as chairman of this subcommittee. It has been a long time to serve on a subcommittee, but it has been an experience rich in challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress a little over 14 years ago, at a time when the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] ably backed by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] were winning congressional approval for the historical act which gave Commonwealth status to Puerto Rico, and the wise measures which gave organic acts to the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands.

What was the condition of our offshore areas less than a decade and a half ago? Let us see. Both Alaska and Hawaii were incorporated territories. Puerto Rico was struggling to change from an agrarian to an industrial complex.

The Virgin Islands were still in the grip of poverty, not far removed from the status which once earned them the unfortunate description of the "Poor House of the Caribbean."

Mr. Speaker, Guam was battle scarred and completely dependent upon a military economy.

The trust territory lacked proper help and educational facilities.

American Samoa had a poverty-strained economy, in the midst of a geographical paradise.

We had little reason for pride 15 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, as we contemplated our territorial responsibilities, this was the picture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in that decade and a half? Have we as the Congress a just reason for pride of accomplishment?

No longer is there an incorporated territory under the American flag. Alaska and Hawaii have become States, advancing their statehood complex to the very borders of Siberia and far out into the Pacific. My days ahead will be filled with memories of the debates and votes which achieved these spectacular advances.

The Virgin Islands have tossed the ignominious "Poorhouse" tag into the Caribbean and today are prosperous and represent a model of advancement for the world to see.

Mr. Speaker, battle-scarred Guam has emerged from the shadow of a purely military complex and is advancing steadily in prosperity. Like the Virgin Islands, Guam has pushed its educational system to a high level, to a point where it is now at the college level. Tourism is on the upgrade right now. A $5 million luxury hotel is being built on Guam.

American Samoa, under a brilliant administration has made giant strides and is literally a paradise. It, too, boasts a modern luxurious new hotel.

The trust territory has advanced steadily. Its educational system has improved and very soon will receive a solid shot in the arm through the presence of eager Peace Corps volunteers who will aid in its educational development and in the progress of its villages to bring them into the modern era.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues that we need not apologize here or in the United Nations. I suggest that the development of our offshore areas is without parallel in the annals of any other nation in history.

Let our critics ask the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Isands or Guam or American Samoa and, yes, the trust territories, if it is necessary to employ guns and tanks to keep them willingly at our side?

Forgive me, Mr. Speaker, for this general discussion. Forgive me, if you will, for pointing with pride in this my swan song.

Now as to the specifics of the bill before us.

It has been our purpose as the freest nation on earth to advance self-government at every opportunity.

Years ago we gave the Virgin Islands and Guam organic acts and the right to choose their own legislature.

Now we ask you, walk another step forward and give them authority to elect their own Governors.

Denial of that right in the face of advanced economies and high level of political maturity would be an admission of failure on our part. In effect, we would be saying, after 50 years of Americanism in the Virgin Islands and 68 years in Guam, we have not allowed the people to develop enough political judgment to elect their own chief executive.

Second, we would be saying that it requires more political maturity to elect a Governor than to elect a legislator. As a Member of Congress, I will never make that admission.

I hesitate to even mention loyalty lest anyone think that there is the slightest question of the loyalty of the Guamanians and the Virgin Islanders. Their pride in their American citizenship is deep and unshakable. Their love of the flag is inspiring. Their devotion to democratic ideals is unchallenged.

Permit me to tell you what happened during our hearings on the Guam legislation. We asked the speaker of the Guam legislature about possible subversion. He was puzzled for a moment, before he realized what we were talking about. Then he told us a story.

He said from time to time, visitors come to Guam. They say, "Are you not uneasy over the presence of these American bombers on Guamanian soil that fly to Vietnam?" Then he said, "Our answer is always the same—'Of course, not. They are our bombers.'"

I have expressed the wish to some of my colleagues that the speaker of the legislature of Guam 9,000 miles from Washington could be invited to speak on some of our college campuses that are very near Washington.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge this House of Representatives today to take pride in what we have done for the offshore areas in the last 15 years and to advance our reasons for pride another stride by saying to these loyal citizens, "Well done, thou good and faithful people."

If these bills are enacted, I will retire to the sidelines a happier man—taking with me a going-away present without price.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the majority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and with many others in paying tribute on this occasion to my colleague from New York [Mr. O'Brien]. He has today presented us with an eloquent statement in support of the two bills which will give to the people of Guam and the Virgin Islands at long last the right to elect their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor.

We are saddened that our esteemed colleague has announced that this will be his last term in the Congress, and we wish him all success and happiness in the future. I have no doubt that the bills before us today will be enacted into law and thus create a fitting capstone to the legislative career of this outstanding Congressman, who will always properly be known as the Father of Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

Others on this floor today have commented on the outstanding legislative record of our colleague from Albany, and there is nothing I can add to what they have said. But I would like to express to him my appreciation for his kindness and generosity to me as a new Member of the Congress. Leo O'Brien is in every sense of the word a true gentleman, and he will be sorely missed in the Congress.

The bills to be adopted today represent another step in the progress of Guam and the Virgin Islands toward full self-government. The people of these territories, as well as their elected legislatures, have demonstrated their political sagacity and maturity. They have long wanted the privilege of electing their own Governors, and they have earned it. I hope these bills will be adopted unanimously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] has consumed 11 minutes.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. REID of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Before the gentlewoman begins her statement before this body, I wish to take notice of the valuable work and very able talents of the gentlewoman from Illinois, who has given of her time and her efforts since she became a Member of Congress to this committee on which she serves, and of which I have the honor to be chairman. She has sacrificed time. She has gone into the trust territory, the island of Guam, and other places in the Pacific, including the islands of American Samoa. She has come to know the people in those far away places as well as any second-term Member could possibly know them. I wish to congratulate her and commend her for her wonderful work.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the feelings of my colleague, Leo O'Brien, at this time as he speaks of his "swan song" in this body.

I regret that he has voluntarily decided to retire from this House. His presence, ability, and spirit will be missed. I am happy to have worked with and been associated with the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien].

Leo, I say good luck to you in all your endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation providing for an elected Governor of Guam. H.R. 11775 also provides for the popular election of the Lieutenant Governor of Guam.

Mr. Speaker, since World War II the American citizens of Guamanian ancestry have launched the territory of Guam into an orbiting pace economically, politically and socially. The people of Guam have demonstrated their political maturity in many respects and have earned the privilege to select their own chief executive through the democratic process of free elections.

To say to the people of Guam that they may elect their own legislature and that they may legislate with respect to all local matters, that they may establish an independent judiciary, that they may levy taxes and appropriate moneys for the operation of the government, but that they must be satisfied with a federally appointed Governor is blatant inconsistency and one which it is our duty to correct.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has responded many times to the wishes of the people of Guam in their desire for more self-autonomy. The Congress has, since the passage of the Organic Act in 1950, furthered the participation of the people of Guam in their government and in the relationship of that government to the United States. The passage of H.R. 11775 will bring to an end the era of the federally appointed Governor and begin a new era of territorial development premised on giving to the territory of Guam a strong and significant new voice in mapping its own future.

I urge and support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at this time I rise to pay tribute to my colleague, Leo O'Brien. Leo O'Brien, in his wisdom, has decided that he will retire from this body. I reget his decision. I regret it, despite that fact that he comes from the opposition party and has held the distinction of being the chairman of the Territorial Subcommittee for many, many years. I would have liked to have had that position, but had to sit next to him as the ranking minority member of that committee.

But Leo O'Brien, in his work on the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has in every instance affecting the territories and insular possessions of the United States, risen above partisan politics and placed the interests of his country first. He was one of the first, when he came to Congress, to stand for the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as the 49th and 50th States of the Union.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] was one of those who fought valiantly to extend freedom and increase the rights of American citizens who live in our off-shore possessions and territories. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] has often said, that unless we begin to give them the opportunity to exercise the rights and privileges of a free government and allow participation in their own government rather than being directed from Washington, we could not expect them as American citizens to rise to their full capability. He has been one who has fought valiantly for American citizens rising to full citizenship wherever they may live.

To the gentleman from New York, I want to say that personally it has been a real pleasure to work with him. The bills that we have before us today are just another step in building a bigger and better America. The people who live in the 50 States, and the people who live in our territories are deeply indebted to the gentleman from New York. For many years to come, the freedom-seeking people of the world can look to the example set by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] and what he has tried to do for American citizens wherever they may be. Leo O'Brien has worked to keep the torch of freedom burning.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Rivers].

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I join in support of this bill with those distinguished people of our committee on both sides of the aisle who have spoken in the affirmative. I particularly subscribe to the eloquent speeches made by Mr. O'Brien and the one made by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Reid] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor]. I urge passage of this legislation which gives an additional factor of freedom to our fellow Americans on the island of Guam.

The remarks about Alaska are reminiscent of the days when we fought the battle for statehood, and when Hawaii was simultaneously fighting that battle. I speak for all Alaskans in expressing gratitude for the work done by Mr. O'Brien in his efforts to obtain Statehood for the territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

I cannot let this time go by without joining the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and other Members, including the able chairman of the committee, in this word of tribute to a man whom I have regarded for many years as one of the most outstanding Members of this House.

The gentleman from New York has carved out for himself an illustrious and singular career, particularly in the area of legislation dealing with offshore territories. He has, indeed, been outstanding in all his committee work and in his work in the House.

The gentleman from New York does not take the floor frequently, but when he does he commands attention. He is, by any standard, one of the most articulate, one of the most eloquent Members of the Congress. He speaks with conviction, he speaks with clarity, and he speaks with effectiveness. As a debater, he has few peers and no superiors.

The House is going to miss this distinguished and able Member of this body, this great American. He has served his district, his Nation, and humanity well. There is no finer, more deserving Member of this House.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this time go by without also mentioning the gentlewoman from Illinois, Charlotte Reid. Mrs. Reid, as the minority counterpart chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, has taken an active interest in our territories since she has been a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. She has taken a trip to the trust territory, which is as trying and as exasperating and as physically exhausting as a trip anywhere in this world. She has familiarized herself with the people who live in our offshore territories and possessions under our jurisdiction. She has made a remarkable contribution to the cause of American citizens who live in these areas.

I commend her today for stepping forward and handling the bills providing for an elected Governor another step in the advancement of freedom to these people.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York [Mr. Celler].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished gentleman from the State of New York, our Empire State. I have served with him all the period he has been in the House. I find him a very affable, kindly, well-disposed gentleman who has blazed new trails in his work in various committees. He has been an indefatigable worker and has shown rare wisdom, perspicacity, and prescience in all work at hand.

We shall certainly miss him. I wish him good fortune and good health in all his future undertakings.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall]. I know of no other two Members who can speak with such great certitude on the problems of interior and insular affairs. Over the years they have been giants in this or any other Congress in which I have served on matters pertaining to insular affairs.

When they point to the distinguished gentleman from New York as one of the great Members of this Congress or any Congress in this area, I am pleased to have them do so.

I have now sat with Leo O'Brien for some seven terms. I believe I can say I have never sat with a finer gentleman or one with more knowledge of the subject he was discussing on the floor than he has had.

I suppose this comes to him with particular grace, because I know of no one who has worked any harder to understand the problems of our offshore possessions. It is necessary to go there. As had been so well pointed out with reference to the distinguished lady who comes from Illinois, Members make these very hard and laborious trips to these areas to glean a knowledge which enables them to come back here to educate those with whom they serve. Leo O'Brien has done this. This is typical of him.

When he decided he would leave the Congress of the United States, I believe there was a general groundswell in his district that he return again to the 90th Congress. Typical of him, when he made the announcement he stayed around for a couple of days. They had a meeting of the leaders in Albany. A choice had to be made in that area, so he slipped away to the 50th State of this Union. He went there, where no one could find him. He was making sure his wish would be observed. I am sure that if he had remained in the area they would have convinced him that he ought to come back to serve in the 90th Congress. I wish that were true. I am sorry to see him go.

At the same time, I am delighted that my associations here with him have enabled me to know a wonderful American and a great statesman. I know this Congress will miss him. I know the Nation will miss him.

I wish for him and Mrs. O'Brien and his family the very best in the future.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are now considering under a suspension of the rules would provide for the popular election of a Governor and Lieutenant Governor in Guam.

Some people have expressed concern as to whether, if this right is given to the people of Guam, we might be chipping away at the foundation of the American system of government, and perhaps someday they would look away from the United States, so that we could no longer use Guam as a military base.

If there was any doubt in my mind that at any time such a proposition would ever be considered, I would be the first to be here opposing this bill. Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question was so ably stated by the Speaker of the Guam Legislature when asked whether or not the people of Guam resented the presence of our bombers, he said, "Why should we? They are our bombers." These people are proud Americans, and I am proud today to come before you and ask you to suspend the rules and give to these Americans another privilege of freedom, which is, the right to select and elect their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 11775.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Morton].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to bring before you today and recommend that you support this legislation which will give the people of Guam an opportunity to take another step forward in the exercise of the responsibility to govern themselves. This responsibility, I believe, is of the highest order for free men everywhere. I had the opportunity to visit Guam on several occasions. I have had the opportunity to address their legislative body and also to visit with the executive branch and agencies of their government. On every visit I have been progressively impressed by the political maturity, by the administrative keenness with which these people have pursued their responsibilities. I think it is of great importance to all who look at the Pacific in these troubled times to see here under the American Flag and in the spirit of the American Constitution a new step being taken toward political maturity. The Trust Territory of the Pacific, I hope, will become a shining example of what Americans can do in the exercise of a trusteeship. Further maturity in Guam and the right to elect their own Governor and the right to participate fully in their own government will also, I think, be a shining example to people on the islands of the Pacific what they can do when they are given an opportunity to do so.

The connection, both spiritual and political as well as economic and geographical between the islands of the trust territories and Guam and also of our own State of Hawaii brings home, I think, the importance of the great American development in this area. Some of us have advocated a State of the Pacific. I hope in this century this can be achieved. I do not feel there is anything immoral about the growth of America in a geographical sense. As those people who espouse the American ideal and the American dream are given the opportunity fully to partake of it and to become a member of our community of States, then I believe this opportunity should be presented to them.

Mr. Speaker, as part of this plan and as a further step in political maturity, I believe we are writing history today when we give the people of Guam the opportunity to elect their own Governor. I hope this step will lead to further steps and that we will see an American family in the Pacific community.

Mr. Speaker, before I relinquish my time I would like to add to what has already been said concerning my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien]. He and I served together on the Status Commission for Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland 2 additional minutes. I am doing so, with the understanding the gentleman will yield to me. I wish to give recognition at this time to his fine and effective service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the subcommittees thereof on which he serves. He is a most able, dedicated, and effective Member.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for those kind words.

I found on the Status Commission for Puerto Rico that the solid rock, the one person whose experience and knowledge of insular affairs and the history of insular affairs in the United States is our own colleague, Mr. O'BRIEN. I was very much impressed with his wisdom, his knowledge, and his background in this field. Though he may leave us physically here, I do not think he will ever leave us in spirit.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that his advice and his background of knowledge will be sought in the future by Congresses of tomorrow, and in the next decade, because here is a man who has had the experience and understands how to bring about the necessary interrelationship between island people and those of the continent.

Mr. Speaker, truly for me it has been a privilege to serve with the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as the introducer of H.R. 8322, a bill similar to the one now under consideration, I rise in support of H.R. 11775.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will provide for the long-delayed extension of a basic American right to a people who have been citizens of the United States for the last 16 years and who have been Americans in their hearts for more than half a century. Although denied any significant measure of self-government until passage of the Organic Act in 1950, the people of Guam not only suppressed their resentment over a seemingly unwarranted paternalism of the United States but also continually manifested, to their eternal credit, a deep and appealing pride in their allegiance to a country that returned them less than a full measure of enlightened interest.

After finally attaining limited statutory autonomy, the Guamanians demonstrated that patriotism was not their sole attribute. Their unicameral legislature, which under the Act of 1950 was no longer simply an advisory body, soon distinguished itself by the maturity of its deliberations and the excellence of its legislation. It quickly became evident that in terms of ability and devotion to the public weal the 21 members of the Guam legislature could stand comparison with their counterparts in the 50 States; that they reflected the worth, as well as an instinct for the American political process, that characterized their constituents.

As dedicated legislators and as enthusiastic voters, the people of Guam have continued to demonstrate an impressive aptitude for self-government, in addition to an enviable sense of civic and social responsibility. Their basic abilities and attitudes have now been sufficiently enhanced and refined by training and experience to merit the right basically inherent in all free and intelligent men to choose their own leaders—in the executive branch as well as in the legislative.

For these reasons, I unreservedly support H.R. 11775, which provides for the popular election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Guam. Jefferson's sage observation that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" was valid in 1776 and it is just as valid today. It cannot be disputed that that power of consent can never be fully exercised by the governed, unless it is vested with the right of election.

There was, perhaps, some degree of reason in not countenancing an elective executive before the Guamanians could prove an ability to legislate effectively for themselves; but surely any doubt in that regard has been completely dissipated.

It is significant that H.R. 11775 has the fervent support of the Guamanian people, the Guam Legislature, the President of the United States, the Department of the Interior, and the unanimous approval of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The measure under consideration was introduced last October 22, by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], who was the House floor manager for the bills that provided for the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii to statehood and who has been farsighted champion for the cause of the underprivileged American. Certainly, Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood stand as living monuments of this great American. The passage of this bill today will add to the innumerable accolades accorded him. H.R. 11775 not only provides for the popular election of the Governor, but also creates the office of Lieutenant Governor, with both officials to be chosen by the people qualified to vote for the members of the Legislature of Guam. Both would hold office for a term of 4 years, except that the candidates elected in 1966 would be restricted in tenure to 2 years.

Having visited Guam and knowing its people I know that they are prepared and qualified to accept the challenge posed by this bill.

Let us by positive action today, present fresh evidence to the world that we who proudly call ourselves Americans not only preach but practice democracy; that we will not deny the governed the right to choose their own Governor.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY], also an able member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 11775.

I wish to congratulate and commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the ranking minority member, for bringing this legislation to the floor.

But further and beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the citizens of Guam themselves on the ability and loyalty they have shown to our democracy and to the principles of our democracy. I am sure it is their efforts and their loyalty to our country that has brought this legislation to this point and to its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a delegate to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations, where the name of Guam often was heard in the utterances of delegates of foreign nations who were critical of the United States, and especially of our engagement in Vietnam and the use of Guam as a base for our bombing aircraft, I know that no legislation enacted by us this year will be of more importance in a very large international way than the good bill now before us.

Among the agenda items adopted by the United Nations on December 16, 1965, by a vote of 91 to 0, with 10 abstentions, was one that included Guam, the Virgin Islands and American Samoa among 27 areas that it listed as "Colonial Countries" for which the United Nations was pledged to secure the right of self-determination.

On December 7, 1965, in reply to an especially bitter attack on the United States by a delegate from an African country, who demanded that the United States set the people of Guam free and give them their independence, I told the General Assembly of the United Nations that Guam was as American as my native State of Michigan and my adopted State of Illinois, both of which had once been territories in training for statehood in the good democratic American way. I pointed out that with the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States we had run out of incorporated territories but their place had been taken by our unincorporated territories such as Guam and the Virgin Islands and they were as American through and through as the territories of Michigan and Illinois had been.

The heart of Guam is American to the core. The men, women, and children of Guam are intimate and respected members of the American family. No State legislature functions more efficiently than the legislature of Guam, the members of which are elected by popular vote of the people of Guam. The former speaker of the Guam Legislature, now the representative of Guam to the Congress of the United States, elected by the people of Guam, the Honorable Wam Pat, is high in the esteem of the members of this body as are other Guamanians who have contributed mightily with Americans from all other areas of our beloved country in a cooperative effort for the advancement of the American ideal.

With the enactment of this good measure the people of Guam will enjoy the fullest measure of self-government, the same full measure enjoyed by the people of Michigan, Illinois, and the other States that elect the members of their own legislatures and their own Governors and their own Lieutenant Governors. The enactment of this bill will put to rest forever the claim of our critics that Guam is a colonial possession.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expression of regret that our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], has decided to leave the stage of public affairs. The service that he has given in leading the way from two States of the American Union and opening the door of the future for Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa will never be forgotten. He has earned an enduring place in the history of our country. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, he is deep in the hearts of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11775, a bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam. These good Americans on their beautiful island home are best qualified to choose their own Governor. To allow this is consistent with the idea of democracy and it is consistent with the fundamental idea of government being responsible to those governed. Before I conclude I would like to pay my respects to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]. His bringing this measure to us is in keeping with his fine leadership for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. Those measures, along with the one before us today speak eloquently of the thoughtful and able leadership given his country by this fine Representative. We will surely miss him when he retires from this body.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for reporting out four bills which will add significantly to the local self-government rights and responsibilities of the people of Guam and the Virgin Islands.

Guam has been a territory since 1898 and was administered militarily by the United States until passage of the Organic Act of Guam in 1950, which allowed for the first civilian administration and elected legislature with statutory powers of local self-government.

In the 15 years that have elapsed since the Organic Act, the Guamanians have enacted local laws, levied taxes, and appropriated funds for their local needs without requiring Federal assistance. They have developed a strong two-party system, and have in many ways proved their capacity for self-government.

Both the Governor and the secretary of Guam are native Guamanians, and even though they are still appointed by the President, their functions have become mostly local, indicating that the people should have a say in who will hold these high offices.

The Guam Elective Governor Act, H.R. 11775, would provide for the popular election of a Governor and Lieutenant Governor every 2 years, beginning this year. The bill provides for an orderly succession in case of vacancy in either office, allows the salaries of these two top officials to be fixed by the Guam Legislature, and supplies local checks and balances, for example, impeachment proceedings.

It is my sincere belief that the people of Guam have shown themselves ready for this additional move toward local home rule, and I am convinced that H.R. 11775 is a step in the right direction.

A similar bill, H.R. 11777, will do the same for the Virgin Islands, which have been a U.S. Territory since their 1917 purchase from Denmark. The people of these islands have been electing their own legislators since annexation, they have voted their opinions on local matters, and they, too, have developed a two-party system. The Virgin Islands Legislature has enacted laws of local application, has levied taxes, and has appropriated funds sufficient for the ordinary needs of local government without resort to direct Federal appropriations.

Here, too, the governorship has shifted from a Federal function to almost exclusively a local office, and the Governor has become a part of the legislative process in the islands, with the authority to recommend and veto legislation. The Virgin Islands have proved ready for a progressive step toward broader self-government, and H.R. 11777 would accomplish this by providing for popular elections every 2 years for a Governor and Lieutenant Governor. This bill has all the features of the Guam Elective Governor Act, and I regard this legislation as a heartening sign of our commitment to local home rule for the Virgin Islands. Like the Guamanians, the Virgin Islanders are ready for increased self-government which will be responsive to local needs, and I applaud the committee for its recognition of the political maturity of the people of these two territories.

Two further bills, H.R. 13298 and H.R. 13277, direct the apportionment of legislative districts in Guam and the Virgin Islands in line with the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote principle. On Guam, only 10 of 19 voting districts are represented in the present legislature, and the present system makes it possible for as little as 51 percent of the voters to elect the whole legislature.

In the Virgin Islands, on the other hand, present law allows each voter to cast a ballot for only two of the six at-large candidates for the legislature. H.R. 13298 and H.R. 13277 will provide for more equitable election procedures in the two territories in accord with the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, so that the elected legislatures will more truly represent the total population.

Once again, I wish to congratulate the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs for reporting out this progressive legislation that broadens democratic participation in governmental affairs by the citizens of Guam and the Virgin Islands, and I commend highly the people of the two territories whose responsible actions in local affairs have merited them this recognition of their capacity for home rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 11775, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE POPULAR ELECTION OF THE GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11777) to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11777

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 9, subsection (d), of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 502; 48 U.S.C. 1575) is amended by deleting its sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth sentences and by substituting therefor the following: "If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of all the members of the legislature pass the bill, it shall be a law."

SEC. 2. Section 11 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 503; 48 U.S.C. 1591) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. The executive power of the Virgin Islands shall be vested in an executive officer whose official title shall be the 'Governor of the Virgin Islands'. The Governor of the Virgin Islands, together with the Lieutenant Governor, shall be elected by a majority of the votes cast by the people who are qualified to vote for the members of the legislature of the Virgin Islands. The Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be chosen jointly, by the casting by each voter of a single vote applicable to both offices. If no candidates receive a majority of the votes cast in any election, on the fourteenth day thereafter a runoff election shall be held between the candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor receiving the highest and second highest number of votes cast. The first election for Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be held on November 8, 1966. Thereafter, beginning with the year 1968, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be elected every two years at the general election. The Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall hold office for a term of two years and until their successors are elected and qualified. The term of the elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall commence on the fifth day of January following the date of election.

"No person shall be eligible for election to the office of Governor or Lieutenant Governor unless he is able to read and write the English language, is and has been for five consecutive years immediately preceding the election a citizen of the United States and a bona fide resident of the Virgin Islands and will be, at the time of taking office, at least thirty years of age. The Governor shall maintain his official residence in the Government House on Saint Thomas during his incumbency, which house together with land appurtenant thereto is hereby transferred to the government of the Virgin Islands. While in Saint Croix the Governor may reside in Government House on Saint Croix free of rent.

"The Governor shall have general supervision and control of all the departments, bureaus, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the executive branch of the government of the Virgin Islands. He may grant pardons and reprieves and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against local laws. He may veto any legislation as provided in this Act. He shall appoint, and may remove, all officers and employees of the executive branch of the government of the Virgin Islands, except as otherwise provided in this or any other Act of Congress, or under the laws of the Virgin Islands, and shall commission all officers that he may be authorized to appoint. He shall be responsible for the faithful execution of the laws of the Virgin Islands and the laws of the United States applicable in the Virgin Islands. Whenever it becomes necessary, in case of disaster, invasion, insurrection, or rebellion or imminent danger thereof, or to prevent or suppress lawless violence, he may summon the posse comitatus or call out the militia or request assistance of the senior military or naval commander of the Armed Forces of the United States in the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico, which may be given at the discretion of such military commander if not disruptive of, or inconsistent with, his Federal responsibilities. He may, in case of rebellion or invasion or imminent danger thereof, when the public safety requires it, proclaim the islands, or any parts thereof, under martial law. The members of the legislature shall meet forthwith on their own initiative and may, by a two-thirds vote, revoke such proclamation.

"The Governor shall make to the Secretary of the Interior under section 30 of this Act an annual report of the transactions of the government of the Virgin Islands for transmissions to the Congress and such other reports at such other times as may be required by the Congress or under applicable Federal law. He shall have the power to issue executive orders and regulations not in conflict with any applicable law. He may recommend bills to the legislature and give expression to his views on any matter before that body.

"There is hereby established the office of Lieutenant Governor of the Virgin Islands. The Lieutenant Governor shall have such executive powers and perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Governor or prescribed by this Act or under the laws of the Virgin Islands."

Sec. 3. Section 12 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 503; 48 U.S.C. 1593), is deleted and replaced by the following new provision, also designated section 12:

"Sec. 12. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Acting Governor of the Virgin Islands shall be removable from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, high crimes and misdemeanors. Impeachment shall be by resolution adopted at an open session of the legislature held not less than fifteen days after introduction of the resolution. The vote on any such resolution shall be by the yeas and nays and the affirmative votes of three-fourths of all the members of the legislature shall be requisite for its adoption. Notice of impeachment, which shall include the articles of impeachment, shall be filed by the duly elected presiding officer of the legislature with the clerk of the District Court of the Virgin Islands who shall forthwith cause a true copy thereof to be served upon the person impeached. The judge of the district court shall notify the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit who shall assign three judges of said circuit to try the impeachment at such time and at such place in the Virgin Islands as may be specified by said chief judge. Judgment by such court shall be final and not reviewable in any other court and, in case of conviction shall extend no further than removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, profit, or trust under the government of the Virgin Islands, but the party impeached, whether convicted or acquitted, shall be liable to prosecution and punishment according to law. No officer shall exercise his official duties from the time he has been impeached and notified thereof until he has been acquitted."

Sec. 4. Section 13 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (63 Stat. 497, 503; 48 U.S.C. 1594) is hereby repealed.

Sec. 5. (a) Section 14 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgins Islands (68 Stat. 497, 504; 48 U.S.C. 1595), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. (a) In case of the temporary disability or temporary absence of the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor shall have the powers of the Governor.

"(b) In case of a permanent vacancy in the office of Governor, arising by reason of the death, resignation, removal by impeachment or permanent disability of the Governor, or the death, resignation or permanent disability of a Governor-elect, or for any other reason, the Lieutenant Governor or Lieutenant Governor-elect shall become the Governor, to hold office for the unexpired term and until his succesor shall have been duly elected and qualified at the next regular election for Governor.

"(c) In case of the temporary disability or temporary absence of the Lieutenant Governor, or during any period when the Lieutenant Governor is acting as Governor, the President of the Legislature shall act as Lieutenant Governor.

"(d) In case of a permanent vacancy in the office of Lieutenant Governor, arising by reason of the death, resignation, removal by impeachment, or permanent disability of the Lieutenant Governor, or because the Lieutenant Governor or Lieutenant Governor-elect has succeeded to the office of Governor, the Governor shall appoint a new Lieutenant Governor, with the advice and consent of the legislature, to hold office for the unexpired term and until his successor shall have been duly elected and qualified at the next regular election for Lieutenant Governor.

"(e) In case of the temporary disability or temporary absence of both the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor, the powers of the Governor shall be exercised, as Acting Governor, by such person as the laws of the Virgin Islands may prescribe. In case of a permanent vacancy in the offices of both the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, the office of Governor shall be filled for the unexpired term in the manner prescribed by the laws of the Virgin Islands.

"(f) No additional compensation shall be paid to any person acting as Governor or Lieutenant Goveror who does not also assume the office of Governor or Lieutenant Governor under the provisions of this Act."

(b) Section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 504; 48 U.S.C. 1596), is repealed.

Sec. 6. Subsection (a) of section 16 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, as amended (68 Stat. 497, 504; 48 U.S.C. 1597(a)), is amended by deleting therefrom the last sentence.

Sec. 7. Section 20 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 505; 48 U.S.C. 1592, 1598, 1641), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 20. The salaries and travel allowances of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, the heads of the executive departments, other officers and employees of the government of the Virgin Islands and the members of the legislature, shall be paid by the government of the Virgin Islands at rates prescribed by the laws of the Virgin Islands."

Sec. 8. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, section 3 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497; 48 U.S.C. 1561), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The provisions of paragraph 1 of section 2 of article IV and section 1 of amendment XIV of the Constitution of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the unincorporated territory of the Virgin Islands as in the United States or in any State of the United States."

Sec. 9. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, chapter 15 of the General Military Law (70A Stat. 15, 16; 10 U.S.C. 331–334) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section 336:

"Sec. 336. For the purposes of this chapter, 'State' includes the Virgin Islands."

Sec. 10. Except as to provisions applicable to the election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, which provisions shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and unless otherwise expressly provided herein, this Act shall be effective January 5, 1967.

Sec. 11. This Act may be cited as the "Virgin Islands Elective Governor Act".

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Reid] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] and that any Member desiring to do so may have the same privilege.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien].

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to say I am grateful to the House for its approval of H.R. 11775, and I am grateful to my colleagues for their kind personal remarks.

I would simply add, Mr. Speaker, that the bill now under discussion, H.R. 11777, is identical with the bill just approved by the House except for the geographical application of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, like the bill the House just passed, this one, H.R. 11777, extends further autonomy to the other of the two organized territories of the United States and is a step toward fulfillment of the political aspirations of the 40,000 U.S. citizens residing in the Virgin Islands.

This forward step was logically planned. Some 12 years ago, during the consideration of the Revised Organic Act of July 12, 1954, members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs advised the Virgin Islanders that additional measures of self-government would be granted to them commensurate with their capacities and indication of mature judgment. At the suggestion of the committee, in 1963 the territorial legislature held a convention of elected delegates to draft proposed amendments to the organic act. Among those recommendations were the ones for an elective Governor and Lieutenant Governor. The present Governor, the Secretary of the Interior, and an overwhelming majority of the voters strongly endorse this bill.

Since the enactment of the 1954 act which inter alia created an 11-member unicameral legislature and provided a means of covering locally collected Federal income taxes into the territorial treasury, Congress has enacted several items of significant legislation, each extending home rule. Among these items are: Public Law 84-177, which, in recognition of the importance of the islands as a potential tourist area, created the Virgin Islands National Park on St. John; Public Law 85-224, which provided that criminal cases would be tried before a jury if demanded by the defendant or by the Government, and also permitted the issuance of revenue bonds for projects authorized by an act of the legislature if they will promote the public interest through economic development of the islands; Public Law 86-289 changed the convening date of the legislature, increased the per diem from $10 to $20 during the legislative session, and extended to the territorial attorney general some of the functions of the U.S. attorney; Public Law 88-183, which transferred certain submerged areas bordering on fast land to the territorial government, and Public Law 89-100 which provides for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the local rather than the Federal Government.

Subsequent to the enactment of the 1954 Organic Act, the Virgin Islands voters have elected legislators, organized a two-party system, and have identified, discussed, and voted their opinions on matters of local concern. The legislators, in turn, have debated the issues, and at times disagreed with the Washington-appointed Governor in the manner of free legislatures everywhere. They have enacted laws of local application, and have levied taxes and appropriated funds sufficient for the ordinary needs of the local government—without resort to direct Federal appropriations. During the past decade Virgin Islanders have accumulated sufficient political maturity and practice in the art of self-government to eliminate from the organic act what the committee members feel is a transitional feature, the federally appointed Governor and Lieutenant Governor. Members feel the Virgin Islands voters are ready, anxious, and capable to elect their executive officers.

Like one of his predecessors, the present Governor is a native Virgin Islander. There are several strong potential candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor. The voters will use good judgment in the selection of successors to the incumbent.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 11777 without hesitation. I urge its expeditious enactment.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the support of H.R. 11777, providing for the popular election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Virgin Islands.

Since the Virgin Islands became a U.S. territory in 1917, the governing function has been carried out by a naval commander-Governor or a federally appointed civilian Governor. Yet, within this framework, the people of the Virgin Islands have demonstrated their political maturity by organizing a party system and electing legislators who have debated and legislated on all issues of local concern, including the levying of taxes and appropriation of funds sufficient for the needs of the local government.

Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 11777 would be another step in furthering the participation of the people of the Virgin Islands in their government. The desire of the people of the Virgin Islands to select their own chief executive through the democratic process of free elections has been expressed repeatedly, publicly and officially through the Virgin Islands Constitutional Convention. The legislation has been the subject of extensive hearings conducted in all three Virgin Islands—St. Croix, St. Thomas, and St. John—by the Virgin Islands Constitutional Convention and has been overwhelmingly endorsed by the people of the Virgin Islands.

This legislation providing for the popular election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Virgin Islands is a meritorious step and a privilege which has been earned by the people of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I urge its passage.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. REID of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wish to compliment the gentlewoman from Illinois on her statement and the committee for its action, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee who is retiring from Congress, my good friend, the gentleman from New York, LEO O'BRIEN.

I am familiar with this problem in the Caribbean, as I was in the case of Guam, not only as a member of the Armed Services Committee, but because I have visited, met personally, and known some of the people in the Virgin Islands Assembly, with the regained vitality of these islands and their relatively new U.S. type and granted legislature. I strongly support this bill and recommend that it do pass.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. This is another step in giving to the people of the Virgin Islands a bigger voice in handling their own affairs. It is true that the American citizens who live in the Virgin Islands have not been citizens of this country as long as those of certain other areas under the American flag. But they are good and loyal citizens of this country and have earned the right to elect their own Governor.

This bill, together with the bill increasing the size of their legislature, will enable the people who live on the islands, known as the Virgin Islands of the United States, an opportunity to become an integral part of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules be suspended and that this bill be passed.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11777, a bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands. For many years I have been interested in providing maximum local self-government for the good Americans who live in the beautiful Virgin Islands. They are fine people in the best traditions of our country, fully qualified to fulfill the responsibilities that this law would impose upon them. It is my hope that before many years go by they may also find a way to participate in the election of the President of the United States, and of representation in the House and Senate of our national Congress. I have introduced legislation to accomplish these objectives and would welcome constructive suggestions as to methods of improving my proposals, or others which the people of the Virgin Islands may suggest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11777.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF LEGISLATURE OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13277) to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13277

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective January 1, 1967, section 5(b) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (48 U.S.C. 1571(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The legislature shall be composed of fifteen members to be known as senators. The apportionment of the legislature shall be as provided by the laws of the Virgin Islands: *Provided*, That such apportionment shall not deny to any person in the Virgin Islands the equal protection of the law: and *Provided further*, That every voter in any district election or at large election shall be permitted to vote for the whole number of persons to be elected in that district election or at large election as the case may be. Until the legislature shall provide otherwise, the apportionment of the legislature shall remain as it is upon the date of enactment of this section: *Provided, however*, That the second proviso of this section shall be effective upon enactment."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

The gentleman from Colorado will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentlewoman from Illinois will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has a two-fold purpose. It amends the Virgin Islands Organic Act to provide for the enlargement of the legislature from 11 to 15 members and it creates a different system of reapportionment.

The executive communication from the Secretary of the Interior recommended apportionment in a manner to be provided by the laws of the Virgin Islands but with certain provisos. In its amended form the bill increases the membership of the legislature from 11 to 15, effective on January 1, 1967, and provides that five members of the legislature shall be elected from the district of St. Croix, five from the district of St. Thomas, one from the district of St. John, and four from at large until the legislature decides otherwise.

The additional four seats in the legislature will help the members to perform their duties more effectively. The increase in population, tourism, and economic activity since the enactment of the Organic Act in 1954 has literally swamped the members of the legislature. The four additional legislators will ease the situation considerably. Although the population of the Virgin Islands is only some 40,000 it is divided among the three major islands and the legislature handles all local as well as territorial functions. Therefore, there is a tremendous amount of detailed work to be done. The expenses of the legislature are borne by the territorial government so no additional expenditure of Federal funds is involved.

The voters of the Virgin Islands have been building toward this legislation for a number of years. They have expressed concern over the existing provisions of the statute which permitted the election of two legislators from each, St. Thomas and St. Croix, one from St. John, and six from at large. Their chief concern was over their entitlement to vote for only two of the six candidates-at-large. This restriction they claimed prevented the development of strong party responsibility.

The Virgin Islands political parties are affiliated with the U.S. political parties. Only the Democratic is represented in the legislature but it is split into two factions on a 6-to-5 basis. Thus, for all practical purposes, issues are debated as warmly as if both major mainland parties were involved.

H.R. 13277, as amended, is a long step toward reapportionment in keeping with the U.S. Supreme Court decision on the one-man, one-vote principle. It goes further than a recent recommendation by the constitutional convention in the Virgin Islands in that it increases the number of legislators and provides for reapportionment. The constitutional convention recommended reapportionment but on the existing 11-member basis.

This bill, if enacted, will become effective on January 1, 1967, but after that date if the legislature wishes to do so it may reapportion its members as it sees fit, providing such reapportionment is not inconsistent with the laws of the United States which are applicable to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend enactment of H.R. 13277 in its amended form. I assure you it meets with the approval of a majority of the voters of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado has covered very clearly and fully the purposes of this bill.

It seems to me in view of the actions taken earlier today and in the past, in the extension of home rule, that we should by all means enable the legislature to reapportion its own districts.

Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure that we are conferring upon them an unmixed blessing. The problems that some of our legislatures on the mainland have had with reapportionment indicate it may very well be that our brethren in the Virgin Islands could find the courts doing the final job for them.

We do think we have made a practical approach to the problem of one-man, one-vote, without completely destroying the island identity in the Virgin Islands.

It is true that the island of St. John is much smaller in population than the two larger islands, but there is a feeling among all the people in the Virgin Islands that that small island should have a representative in the legislature. This is made easier by enlarging the membership of the legislature from 11 to 15.

That enlargement also will enable the legislature to deal with the various complex and sophisticated problems which have developed with their advancing economy.

There is at least 1,000 percent more work for the legislature now than there was in the days when the Virgin Islands lived largely on the gold of the mainland.

In this legislation we are doing what we have done so often in the past—granting additional home rule to people who have proved they can operate under it.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13277, providing for the enlargement and reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands.

This legislation recognizes the wishes of the people of the Virgin Islands as expressed by the recommendation of the Virgin Islands Constitutional Convention. It recognizes our territorial responsibilities to assist in the development of the Virgin Islands and extend the principles of meaningful self-government.

Experience under the Revised Organic Act of 1954 has shown the political maturity of the people of the Virgin Islands. Enlargement of the membership to 15 members will permit the legislature to more effectively discharge its responsibilities to the people of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 13277.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which deals with the legislature of the Virgin Islands, and the bill just passed, which deals with the election of a Governor in the Virgin Islands. The Virgin Islands by any yardstick which can be used to measure growth and progress have done an exceptional job under the administrations which have been appointed by the President.

I should like to give credit to the present Governor and the present legislature for the job they have done in recent times in improving the way of life in the Virgin Islands.

It might be asked, because of that: If it has been so good, why change it?

One of the questions which was raised frequently in the hearings before the subcommittee on this bill was the question of the quality of representation to be obtained under this bill and the question of the quality of the candidates for Governor, if the people were given the opportunity to elect their own Governor, a subject dealt with by legislation previously passed.

The answer which came back was always the same: That there was no question in the minds of those who were testifying, in both cases, that the type of people voted in to represent the people of the Virgin Islands would be of the highest order. I believe we left the hearings with that general impression, and it was partly due to this impression that we voted to report the bills to the committee and subsequently to the House.

The question of the size of the legislature of the Virgin Islands was one which concerned many of us. I for one believed that the former 11-man legislature was not big enough to handle not just the representative phase of the job but also the committee work and in exercising of normal legislative oversight over the program which they enacted.

The idea that 15 people would be a better number for the legislature seemed to take hold when it was suggested.

With the situation in the Caribbean as it is, a "tinder box," and with Cuba and all that it is, this new step in the exercise of self-government by an island people is certainly one which is excellent in the face of all the circumstances external to the Virgin Islands as well as all the circumstances which exist within that territory.

Therefore, I join with my colleagues and urge that the House accept this legislation as they have the legislation immediately preceding it. We are again enlarging the scope of freedom. We are providing a better framework for the exercise of the responsibility of self-government for American citizens who do not live here in the contiguous 48 States or in the States of Alaska or Hawaii.

I think this is a very fine move on the part of this Congress.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning I want to say I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and would like to associate myself with them. I am even wondering if maybe the legislative districts, in spite of the relatively small number of people, should not be expanded even further toward the end of geographical representation. However, while I rise in support of the bill, I primarily rise for a point of information based on the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where in his opening remarks he said there is only one party that functions here but there is "division" within that party. I submit that there is division within the majority party here in the United States to the point where sometimes you cannot recognize one from the other. Indeed, there is an alleged division within the minority party. Is the word "democratic" spelled with a capital D?

My question to you or to the chairman of the committee is this: Is there anything in this bill that would preclude the establishing, or origination of, or the development of a regular two-party system, whether it be Democrats and Republicans or Christian Socialists versus Constitutional Patriots, or some other party; whatever the label might be, under this system of government, inasmuch as it is a unicameral legislature?

Mr. MORTON. On the contrary, I would say to the gentleman, the very opposite is true. I believe the development of the districts in the Virgin Islands and the increase in the size of the legislature along with the opportunity to elect their own Governor will encourage the development of a two-party system. It is my firm belief that it takes elections and political activity to provide the basis for a political party's development and strength. I believe the districting of the Virgin Islands and the opportunity to elect more people to its legislature and to elect a governor will encourage it.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman does not mean the difference between the ADA'ers and the Dixiecrats, for example?

Mr. MORTON. No, I do not mean that at all. People naturally divide themselves into different political points of view. Any population will naturally do that. The only way they can do that is to have political activity. There must be the opportunity for debate. The basis of American politics is free debate, as we find here in the House so many times, among men of good will.

Mr. HALL. I agree with the gentleman. I happened to be there when they were having their territorial convention in December 1964. I was camped out on the Department of the Interior controlled seashore shoreline which encompasses the island of St. John. These people are divided, in my opinion, into what we refer to back here as conservatives and liberals. The conservatives are very concerned lest the Department of the Interior will take over the entire island as they have already taken over the seashores. I would hope certainly that they have, first, the right to form parties of their choice based on dialog and debate and even some good strong party might spill over there into the Virgin Islands from the continent if we give them more and more trusteeship.

Finally, second, I have another question I would like very much to raise, that is, the question of geographic distribution. If I understand it correctly, until such time as they redistrict themselves under the one-person, one-vote rule, they will just have one representative or one senator, I believe they call it, from the island of St. John, because it is by far the least in population. Is that correct?

Mr. MORTON. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that this is adequate in view of the additional at-large representatives and that they can also participate in it? I am sure the gentleman, based upon his visits, knows that at the present time, they only have one Senator.

Mr. MORTON. Yes, I know that they only have one Senator.

This question was raised in committee, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri. Personally, I was a little uncomfortable with this situation, but the door for reapportioning themselves is wide open. I believe that because we cannot solve it any other way, due to the population discrepancy, we have to solve it in a practical manner, as between St. John and the other islands.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman means the discrepancy that was made by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MORTON. No. I mean because St. John is so much smaller in population, it is very difficult to deal with 15 members of the legislature in any other way than the manner in which we have dealt with it in this bill. However, we left the door open so they can reapportion themselves. Personally, I do not like the at-large business very much. I would prefer that all of them some day be elected from specific districts. When this happens it well may be that the island of St. John would be entitled to more representation. But at the present time this is not the case.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, if this bill does pass, they will, if they should have an outstanding candidate, be able to have an additional senator from St. John, provided he is elected at large by the populace of the other two islands.

Mr. MORTON. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. They could furnish all of the at-large candidates, as a matter of fact, if they have the people with which to do it.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the committee upon bringing this bill to the floor for House debate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13277, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF GUAM LEGISLATURE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13298) to amend the Organic Act of Guam, and to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13298

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress, assembled, That section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1423), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) The legislative power and authority of Guam shall be vested in a legislature, consisting of a single house, to be designated the 'Legislature of Guam,' herein referred to as the legislature.

"(b) The legislature shall be composed of not to exceed twenty-one members elected at large, or elected from legislative districts, or elected in part at large and in part from legislative districts, as the laws of Guam may direct: *Provided,* That any districting and any apportionment pursuant to this authorization and provided for by the laws of Guam shall not deny to any person in Guam the equal protection of the laws: And provided further, That in any elections to the legislature, every elector shall be permitted to vote for the whole number of at-large candidates to be elected, and every elector residing in a legislative district shall be permitted to vote for the whole number of candidates to be elected within that district.

"(c) The laws of Guam shall not alter the manner in which members of the legislature are to be elected as provided in subsection (b) of this section more often than at ten-year intervals: *Provided,* That any districting and related apportionment pursuant to this section shall be based upon the then most recent Federal population census of Guam, and any such districting and apportionment shall be reexamined following each successive Federal population census of Guam and shall be modified, if necessary, to be consistent with that census.

"(d) General elections to the legislature shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, biennially in even-numbered years. The legislature in all respects shall be organized and shall sit according to the laws of Guam."

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after enactment of this bill, and subject to the conditions and requirements of section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam, as amended by section 1 hereof, the laws of Guam shall be amended to make provision for the manner of the election of members of the legislature. Until the laws of Guam shall make such provision, the legislature shall remain as it is upon the date of enactment of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the enactment of H.R. 13298, a bill which will permit the Guam Legislature to district the territory, and apportion itself according to its wishes but subject to the provision that neither the districting or apportionment shall deny to any person on the island the equal protection of the law.

When the organic act of 1950 was enacted, our committee felt that the 21-member unicameral legislature, elected at large, could adequately represent the small, compact—206 square miles—island with a population of some 35,000, excluding the military. Like other areas under the U.S. flag the civilian population has increased to 47,000 to which may be added at least another 20,000 to 25,000 military personnel. Sixteen years ago the 21 legislators elected at large represented rural and urban area fairly equally. Such is not the case today. Several rural areas have no representation at all, while the three urban communities are possibly overrepresented. There are 19 election districts for some 20,000 eligible voters of whom 16,200 voted in the most recent election. Only 10 of 19 districts are represented in the eighth, the incumbent legislature. This absence of representation is not peculiar to the eighth legislature. The present speaker advised the committee the average number of districts represented in the eighth legislative session stands at 11. Removing the election-at-large requirement of the present statute and permitting election by districts will allow the legislature to bring about a greater equality of representation, which is a hallmark of sound government. It will also encourage the voters of each district to concentrate on the capabilities of the district candidates rather than to have to weigh the merits of every candidate who presents himself.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that we completely rewrote H.R. 13298 in committee. We believe its provisions now give assurance that the principle of one man, one vote will be applicable inasmuch as every voter in every district shall be entitled to vote for the whole number of persons to be elected from the district at that election as well as all the candidates running at large, if there are any.

This is permissive legislation. Possibly the Guam Legislature and the Guam voters will decide against districting. I would be surprised if they did, but this bill places the responsibility in their hands. Two years ago Congress passed legislation permitting the Government of Guam to pay the expenses of its legislators. The time is now ripe to let the voters decide the manner in which the legislators shall be elected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], chairman of the subcommittee handling the legislation.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I shall address myself briefly to this bill. It is much simpler than the Virgin Islands bill that was just disposed of because here we are merely giving to the people of Guam an opportunity if they desire it to reapportion their legislative districts. All of their legislators are presently elected at large. Perhaps in a compact area such as Guam that is all right. But if they desire to move into districts as we have in the mainland, this bill will give that authority.

We have no island problem such as we have with the Virgin Islands, and I think we can approve this bill without any difficulty.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in supporting the passage of H.R. 13298, a bill to authorize the territorial legislature of Guam to provide by law for the election of some or all of its members by election districts.

Since World War II the people of Guam have experienced seemingly unlimited growth economically, politically and socially. I daresay that the Congress of the United States has helped foster the growth of Guam. The Congress has done so by legislative enactments which extended the principle of self-autonomy to the people of Guam. H.R. 13298, is a further extension of this principle.

The extension of this principle to the people of Guam as American citizens is in keeping with our responsibilities to promote the principle of self determination.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] such time as he may require.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth bill referred to the House of Representatives on the territories of our country.

Guam has made remarkable progress since we originally gave them the right to elect their own legislature. It is very evident that instead of being a burden as many territories are to other nations, Guam now is self-sufficient. They are proud American citizens. One of the rights of American citizens is to elect their own legislature. The people of Guam are very, very cognizant of this fact and the elections that have taken place on the island have been very spirited, indicating that they appreciate the opportunity to participate in their government.

With the House passage today of the bill permitting the people of Guam to elect their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor and with the bill we are now considering this will be a great step forward, not only for those who live in these territories, but, in my opinion, it will be a great step forward in the history of our country in that the Congress of the United States is cognizant of its citizens wherever they may be—and that when they show that they have measured up to the privileges of citizenship that this Congress will give them increased responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules be suspended and that this bill be passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY], sponsor of the legislation, and one who has dedicated his efforts to the people of these faraway islands.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is proud to bring this bill up for consideration this afternoon. It is one of four pieces of legislation which extend additional home rule to our unincorporated territories, Guam and the Virgin Islands. We have carefully studied the needs and desirability of recommending enactment of H.R. 13298. We are convinced that the American citizens on Guam are capable of performing the duties detailed by this bill.

Since the enactment of the Guam Organic Act of 1950, the 21 members of the unicameral legislature have been elected at large. Although the island is small in area there is a growing need for providing election districts so that the rural as well as urban communities will have representation in the territorial legislature. Presently only 10 of the 19 local voting districts have representation. From the first to the incumbent eighth legislature, the average number of local districts represented has been 11.

Based on testimony from the members of the legislature, the Governor, the Office of Territories on our visit to Guam last fall, our committee was convinced that permitting election by districts will allow the voters to enjoy a greater equality of representation than that presently found in the legislature. It will also encourage the voters from each district to analyze the merits of the few candidates from that district rather than learn about all candidates in the field.

I was on Guam twice last year. On each occasion I was told that the at-large election system made it possible for a slight shift in the attitude of the voters to change the entire makeup of the legislature.

To carry this weakness to its ultimate, under the present system 50½ percent of the voters could elect all 21 at-large members of the legislature, thereby denying direct representation to the other 49½ percent of the voters. Election by districts will reduce the likelihood of eliminating the minority party from representation in the legislature.

Guam has a two-party system with a 13-to-7 breakdown in the eighth legislature. There is one vacancy. This has not always been the case, however. In four of the legislatures the minority party has had no representation.

We all realize that this is not the democratic way. Under the provisions of H.R. 13298 the Guam Legislature may district the island and apportion itself as it believes proper but with a requirement that every person in Guam shall be guaranteed the equal protection of the laws. Each voter in each district shall be entitled to vote for the whole number of persons to be elected from the district at that election as well as the whole number of candidates to be elected at large—if there are any. Thus the bill gives further assurance of the "one man, one vote" principle.

Again this is but another indication of our confidence in the political maturity of the people of Guam, for it will extend to these people another opportunity in self-government.

I wish to express my gratitude to Chairman ASPINALL and to Mr. O'BRIEN for their kind cooperation, help, and understanding during the past 16 months.

I also extend my appreciation to my fellow colleague from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member, Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in accord with the principles set forth in H.R. 13298, as amended, and look forward to its expeditious enactment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13298.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF PARTICIPATIONS IN GOVERNMENT AGENCY LOAN POOLS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 852, and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 99]

Adair
Baring
Barrett
Blatnik
Boggs
Brock
Brooks
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Cameron
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Dow
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Farnsley
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Fogarty
Ford,
 Gerald R.
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Giaimo
Gilbert
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kornegay
Kupferman
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mackie
Madden
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
May
Meeds
Michel
Mize
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Nix
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Pike
Poage
Powell
Purcell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
St. Onge
Scheuer
Scott
Shriver
Sickles
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Ullman
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Williams
Willis
Wilson,
 Charles H.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 294 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SALE OF PARTICIPATIONS IN GOVERNMENT AGENCY LOAN POOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 852

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14544) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 14544, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3283) and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 14544 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 852 provides for consideration of H.R. 14544, a bill to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 4 hours of general debate. After passage of H.R. 14544, it shall be in order to take S. 3283 from the Speaker's table, strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the House-passed language.

H.R. 14544 permits the injection of private capital and private financing into certain of the direct Federal lending programs. This purpose is accomplished by permitting the agency affected to transfer obligations held by it to a pool or pools under the management of the Federal National Mortgage Association. Private investors would, under the provisions of the bill, be permitted to purchase shares in this pool.

The sale of such shares would be credited to the account of the agencies whose obligations make up the pool. In every instance where such a participation pool were to be established, authorization for the transfer of obligations would have to be contained in an appropriation act, thus providing Congress with continuous supervision and control over the gross amounts as well as the manner of such sales.

In many instances agencies having authority to make direct sales of their obligations, such as the Small Business Administration, and others having the authority to establish participation pools, such as the Veterans' Administration, are permitted on the sale of such loans or participations to relend such moneys without additional congressional approval. The Participation Sales Act of 1966 would, in effect, prevent this end run around the Appropriations Committee and thus subject such agency loan expenditures to congressional control.

The bill would in fact strengthen congressional control over direct lending programs. No longer will the perpetual motion, direct loan revolving funds be permitted to revolve without the intercession of congressional approval.

While it is true that the Nation has enjoyed unprecedented prosperity over the past few years, it is also true that the legitimate and competing needs for the public dollar cannot be uniformly satisfied through continued reliance on traditional techniques of public financing. It is essential that we tap the great financial resources of the private market if we are to attain the Great Society goals. H.R. 14544 will provide the substitution of private financing for certain direct loan programs and release public dollars to continue urgently needed public programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 852 in order that H.R. 14544 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 852 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 14544, sale of participations in Government agency loan pools. The resolution provides for 4 hours of general debate. It is an open rule. Points of order are not waived, although this was requested. There may be several places in the bill where a point of order can be raised on the basis of a standing committee making an appropriation which they are not allowed to do under the provisions of rule XXI, clause 4 of the rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, testimony before the Rules Committee indicated that there are different interpretations of language in the bill by different individuals. My interpretation is as follows:

The purpose of H.R. 14544, according to the majority report of the Banking and Currency Committee, is to provide an orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal lending agencies, and to continue to expand private credit participation in the funding of Government loan programs. This is to be achieved by authorizing such agencies as the Small Business Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Export-Import Bank, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies with loan programs, to pool their loans with the Federal National Mortgage Association, which will sell participation certificates, representing an interest in the guaranteed return on the pooled loans.

Federal agencies pooling their loans will receive funds from FNMA representing the face value of their pooled loans, deposited to their account in the Treasury. These funds are available to the lending agency to draw on in order to make further loans. Some agencies, because of the language of the law governing their operations, will be able to use this device to actually exceed their authorized ceiling by means of continually making loans, pooling them, and using the proceeds to make more loans.

In this context, let us consider the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967. It contemplates a deficit of $1.8 billion. To achieve this figure the administration must sell through the FNMA pool $4.2 billion of its financial assets. The proceeds are treated in the budget as "income," though in reality a liquidation of capital assets is what has occurred. If the sales were not made, the budget deficit would be $6 billion. Actually the administration could have wiped out the $1.8 billion deficit merely by planning to pool additional assets. H.R. 14544 is an authorization to destroy, by juggling and manipulating the bookkeeping, the validity of the Federal budget.

In the same fashion as the budget, the validity of the Federal debt limit may be prostituted. The Government will still owe the obligations pooled and represented by the certificates. However, FNMA certificates are outside the Federal debt limit. By using the unlimited authority of FNMA to draw upon the Treasury to finance its operations, significant portions of the Federal debt can be removed from the Federal debt, thus deceiving the people as to the true figures.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee held extensive hearings. They are printed and available; I recommend them to each Member. They are the only hearings available which are not pro forma. They are the only hearings on H.R. 14544 which actually seek to discover what the language of the bill will do.

The hearings clearly show the dangers of rushing legislation without careful consideration of the language. Prior hearings by a legislative committee on the general subject are no substitute for careful consideration of the exact language involved. Our record bears this fact out again and again; it shows that the legislative committee did not hold sufficient hearings to determine the actual meaning of the language in the bill. Repeatedly we received contradictory or vague answers; repeatedly the necessity of redrafting was pointed out. A number of amendments were discussed, and I understand some will be offered.

We Republicans are sometimes accused by our friends across the aisle of not caring for the people. Today we speak again for the people, for the farmer, the factory worker, the homeowner, for all those who use the private credit market in the normal course of their lives. We oppose the administration's efforts to embark on a financial gimmick which will have the effect of increasing the cost of credit for all Americans. A vote for this bill is a vote against the people, a vote for this bill is a vote for higher interest rates. A vote for this bill is a vote in favor of budgetary deception.

We heard considerable testimony as to the cost of raising Federal funds in this manner, as opposed to normal Treasury borrowing, which the Undersecretary of the Treasury states is done at an interest rate of 5 percent. Witnesses agreed that this was a more costly method of raising revenue; the only question was how much more. The Undersecretary testified concerning a recent FNMA offering at 5.33 percent. The most recent participation offering was sold at 5.5 percent, a full one-half of 1 percent above normal borrowing costs. The Undersecretary also testified that this bill will further tighten the money market; a tighter market will require a higher rate on these certificates. If the administration sells the projected $4.8 billion worth of certificates rather than raising the money through conventional means, it may cost the taxpayers between $15 and $20 million in additional interest charges.

It has been claimed that the participations sale proposal contained in H.R. 14544 is an extension of the program inaugurated by the Eisenhower administration. In support of this contention, there is cited the FNMA swap in fiscal year 1960 of $311 million of low-interest mortgages for $316 million of nonmarketable Treasury investment bonds owned by the public. The facts, however, reflect that these two programs are totally dissimilar, and the Eisenhower program cannot be used as justification for the Johnson-Humphrey scheme. The Eisenhower program was a straightforward financial transaction. The mortgages were sold on a competitive bid basis, paid for by bonds held by investors. Actual title to the mortgages passed to the purchasers and proceeds were carried in the budget as a budget receipt. The bonds acquired by FNMA were surrendered to Treasury for cancellation. Thereupon, Treasury reduced FNMA indebtedness to it by a like amount. Thus, contrary to the proposed scheme, there was no budget runaround in the Eisenhower program.

Against these facts, examine H.R. 14544. It is nothing more than a refinancing scheme which will make money available to operate Federal loan programs without reflecting the additional spending as a debit in the budget. It will, at the same time, appear to reduce Government spending, as loan programs are removed from individual agency lending programs in the budget and pooled in FNMA, whose operations are outside the budget and which has the right of an unlimited draw on the Treasury to make good any losses suffered. This is the biggest scheme to legalize backdoor spending ever brought before the Congress.

At the present time, the home mortgage market is in a state of turmoil and confusion. Home construction is at a dangerously low level. If the FNMA participation sales are authorized, the FHA and GI mortgages, and other home mortgages as well, will become less and less attractive to investors. In order to meet competition and obtain home mortgage financing, higher home mortgage financing costs will have to be imposed. As a result, the prospective home builders or buyers will be forced to carry an additional financial burden.

Many times during the 89th Congress, we have debated over the means of achieving a result sought by all Members, the improvement of our society. Today we will debate a bill which lends no assistance to that end, which does not advance the well-being of the American people. It will be costly to the people, both directly and by increasing governmental costs.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, H.R.14544 is a very bad bill, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that I oppose a rule. I sometimes think that Members have forgotten what a rule is. It is a resolution which makes a piece of legislation in order, in a sense beyond the regular rules of the House. It in effect is a resolution which provides for the special consideration of a particular piece of legislation. The last rule that I voted against I discovered that a good many of my colleagues did not understand what I was saying when I voted against the rule. I voted against the resolution which made in order the consideration of legislation providing for the Vice President's residence, and then I voted for the bill because I have been in favor of a residence for the Vice President for a very long time. I voted against the rule because I was not for the consideration of that particular piece of legislation at that particular time. That is exactly the way I feel about this particular bill that is before us today.

The participation sales was presented to the Congress as an idea in the President's economic message in January of this year, January 24, to be exact. On the 20th of April a bill was presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am not being critical of their procedure. They have a perfect right to function as they please. However, on the 21st of April that piece of legislation came out.

Now, I happen to believe that this is a very important, significant step. I think it is something that should be considered carefully and at length by the House of Representatives and the Congress, and with all due respect to the committee on which I serve, the Committee on Rules, as well as the Committee on Banking and Currency, I do not feel that it has had that kind of consideration. The people that purchase these participations or will purchase these participations were not heard before the committee. The mortgage bankers, the bankers generally, the insurance companies, none of them were heard. Administration witnesses were heard. No doubt the administration is thoroughly convinced of the wisdom of this legislation. I do not impugn their motives or their good faith, but I think that the easier solution to this, a nonpartisan—not a partisan—solution is to vote down this rule and let the Committee on Banking and Currency more carefully consider the matter.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendously important bill that we are about to consider this afternoon. I feel that many Members of this body were more than a little bit surprised when they listened to the President's budget message in January and learned that in spite of the old programs and new programs, that we are going to wind up 1967 with a deficit of only $1.8 billion.

Well, I believe now we realize, at least everyone in this Chamber realizes, just how this is going to be achieved. It is going to be achieved by selling off Government assets of better than $7.4 billion. However, as the record of hearings before the Committee on Rules will show it is in reality not a sale of Government assets at all; merely a refinancing through the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be quite as charitable as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], with reference to the cavalier treatment that this bill received in the Committee on Banking and Currency. The bill should have received more thorough consideration there. Instead that committee heard only two administration witnesses and concluded its hearings in less than a day without allowing any opposition witnesses to be heard.

It is my recollection that the entire record of hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee was only two-thirds the volume of the record on this bill compiled by the Rules Committee. I believe everyone will have to agree that we heard more witnesses before the Committee on Rules than were heard by the Committee on Banking and Currency. This is a highly unusual situation.

I feel that something has gone wrong, and we are witnessing a short circuiting of the legislative process in an effort to ramrod this bill through the House of Representatives.

You know there is something else that occurs to me this afternoon and that is this. The chief sponsor of this legislation, at least before the Committee on Rules, was the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. I have listened to him for the last 5 or 6 years excoriating the big bankers and excoriating those who charge high and extortionate rates of interest and yet I find to my complete and utter amazement that he has reversed his position to the point where he is advocating that the House of Representatives undertake to pass a bill that even the sponsors, even the Under Secretary of the Treasury, admitted before our Committee on Rules that, of course, it is going to cost the Federal Government more to borrow money to refinance these obligations through Fannie Mae than through Treasury borrowing of the usual kind.

You know it was not many months ago that the Nation mourned the passing of the last of the red hot mommas. I think it is time and I am beginning to think maybe we here must mourn the passing of the last of the red hot Populists. There is going to be a new Washington parlor game if this bill becomes law and that is going to be "Deficit, deficit, who's got the deficit" because nobody, literally nobody, is going to be able to tell where they have it hidden.

Maybe James Kilpatrick had it right when he explained just what the nature of the emergency was that brought this bill shooting out of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as he says, "Just like a little green pea under three walnut shells."

That is exactly the way I felt as I sat in the Committee on Rules for several days listening to the testimony on this bill. Because, as I say, this represents a very fundamental and basic decision. We should not be under any misapprehension as to what we are doing when we act on this bill.

This represents a very fundamental policy decision. We are to raise money that the Government so desperately needs today, but we are not going to borrow it, we are not going to raise taxes; instead we are going to try a new gimmick—we are going to try to sell off Government assets and hope somehow, someway, we can thereby raise the money we need and at the same time conceal from the American taxpayers just what the true extent of our indebtedness is.

Elliot Janeway, the financial writer, was commenting on this bill a few days ago in a New York newspaper. He made this very cogent comment on the bill before us today:

JOHNSON RESOURCEFUL IN TAX ALTERNATIVE

(By Elliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—Whatever President Johnson's critics may fault him for they can't deny that he is resourceful. Certainly, the gimmick he's relying on as an alternative to higher taxes is an artful one. It calls for the sale of Government assets to private investors.

What puts the authentic L.B.J. stamp on this maneuver is that it gets the President off the horns of the trilemma confronting him. Horn No. 1 is fiscal: the rising cost of the Vietnam war has run the Government out of money, and it needs more than even the boom is bringing in at current tax rates.

Horn No. 2 is political. The rising cost of living and of doing business has alerted consensus-taking politicians to the danger of adding the higher cost of Government to the burden of inflation-pinched taxpayers. All hands agree, for example, that Johnson's political losses from plumping for emergency war taxes would erase most of his winnings from civil rights and related victories. The political answer to the fiscal question comes through loud and clear: If the administration needs money for Vietnam, any way to raise it is smarter and safer than by emergency taxes.

BORROWING IS PROHIBITIVE

Horn No. 3 is prestigious: The rising cost of money has made borrowing prohibitive for everybody—including even the Government. To finance the war by borrowing would therefore be bad business, but it would also be bad public relations.

For Johnson has been building his image of prudent progressivism by pointing with pride to his modest budgetary deficits and by contrasting them with the Eisenhower and Kennedy deficits, which mushroomed into $12-billion failures of political finance. Neither the Eisenhower image nor the Kennedy image led the public to expect business management from either personality, and the temper of the times did not particularly require it.

But the public does expect Johnson to pass the pragmatic test and so does the emergency that had developed in Vietnam. A "Johnson deficit" in wartime of the proportions of the peak peacetime Eisenhower and Kennedy deficits would look bad, and it would be bad.

NEW TRIPLE PLAY

Hence L.B.J.'s shrewd new asset-selling triple play. It will get him off the hook fiscally by flooding the Treasury with a bigger cash windfall than a preliminary war tax would have brought in. It will get him off the hook politically by finding the money needed for Vietnam without taking it from the taxpayers. And it will get him off the hook prestigiously because the substitute he has hit for borrowing means that the deficit won't go up even though billions will be raised without raising taxes.

Admittedly, financial purists will object that cash raised by the selling of assets is not bona fide income which balances expenditures and really avoids deficits. But, in terms of the practicalities of political image merchandising, L.B.J. has pulled off another one of his miracles. He can continue to point with pride to his businesslike management, and the customers won't start complaining.

NOT TO JOHNSON

At least to him, for while the administration's new asset-selling device does get Johnson out of his immediate fiscal political and prestige trilemma, it does not get the economy out of the 1966 money squeeze. On the contrary, the administration's new money-raising deal will give the screws another turn—in fact, the cruelest turn yet.

In order to make room in the liquidity-parched private sector for the billions in Government paper the administration proposes to dump on the money market, a suitable incentive will have to be provided. This means that the rate of return on Government-backed investments will have to rise again—the column believes to above 6 percent and, quite possibly, to 6½ percent, an interest-rate level which Congress would never authorize the Government to pay on new issues. A 6- to 6½-percent rate on Government issues is a peril point rate for the entire economy, beginning with the already suspect stock market.

If we take this step, we are going to do it at the expense of raising interest rates in the country.

The last issue of Fannie Mae participation sold for 5½ percent. The interest rate on long-term Treasury bonds is 4.25

percent. So the little fellow will go on supporting his Government by purchasing the long-term bonds that will bring him 4¼ percent and some of the Wall Street investment bankers and the big institutional investors, some of the firms we heard about in our hearings before the Committee on Rules, that already have a very cozy arrangement with Fannie Mae—they will flock in and buy participations that will yield 5¾ percent.

So do not let anyone kid you, my friends. This bill is going to cost the Federal Government money. It is going to cost the taxpayers money when they subsidize the interest rates that are going to have to be paid. It is going to cost the consumers and it is going to cost the fellow who wants to go into the home mortgage market and find the money that he needs to buy a home. He is not going to find it. Why? Because why should a banker go out and buy an FHA or a GI mortgage or any kind of a home loan mortgage at 5½ percent and go to all the trouble and the expense and the risk of servicing that obligation?

If this bill is passed he will instead go to the Federal Government or FNMA and buy participations for 5¾ or 6 percent with no fuss, muss, or bother whatever.

I submit that this is a bad rule. The rule ought to be defeated. The bill ought to be defeated. We certainly found in the hearings we had before the Rules Committee that even the members of the legislative committee do not agree exactly on what this bill meant. In the middle of those hearings they agreed that certain amendments would be offered. But in the time that I have been a Member of this body, I have been told and reminded consistently that it is bad to write legislation of this nature on the floor of the House, and that is the reason why we customarily, I suppose, grant closed rules in the case of legislation coming out of the Ways and Means Committee.

I would suggest that it is bad legislative policy to try to rewrite this bill, faulty and defective as it is, on the floor of the House of Representatives today. I hope that the rule will be defeated.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time or a reason for defeating a rule, this is it.

Regardless of the merits—and there are not many—or any—good reasons for this bill now—we in Congress have some larger responsibilities, some more fundamental obligations.

The committee system—the backbone of our legislative process; an essential ingredient of our parliamentary procedure—is being flouted.

In a large complex society, representative government is only as good as the legislative committee.

The Banking and Currency Committee has been ruthlessly and arrogantly demeaned and circumvented. If you permit this to happen to the Banking and Currency Committee it can happen to any committee of Congress—and no committee would be any longer necessary.

Let me review briefly the chronology of this bill. The President sent up an executive communication—which is not important enough to be read in the House—and this was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The day before, our committee was sent notice of a hearing on a bill not yet introduced.

The following day our committee met, Mr. Speaker, faster than a committee could respond to a Presidential request for a declaration of war.

The President's message in the form of an executive communication to Congress on the subject was delivered to the House on the same day. Such Presidential communication is not important enough to be read in the House. No subcommittee hearing was scheduled. The full committee could not begin until 10:40 a.m.—the Housing Subcommittee had a previously scheduled hearing at the regular meeting time of 10 a.m.—and printed bills were not available at 10 o'clock.

Only two witnesses, both administration officials, were called. No member was permitted more than 5 minutes for interrogation. Many members were not allowed to complete their questioning.

The committee adjourned at 11:55 a.m. and resumed the hearing at about 2:15 p.m.

At about 3 o'clock, the same day, a majority of the committee voted to close the hearing, excuse the witnesses, dismiss the public and the press, meet in executive session and vote out the bill. Four simple amendments were accepted without debate and the bill was passed in about 5 minutes.

Our committee spent 2 hours and 22 minutes on the bill. No general bill has received less attention or consideration by our committee for a long time.

A bare quorum attended the meeting. The chairman took votes. He was prepared. He had proxies for all absent majority members. The ranking minority member had no valid proxies because he could have had no idea that such an important bill, or any bill, would ever be voted out with so little consideration.

Again the Banking and Currency Committee has degraded itself and demeaned the legislative process, and the Congress. The parliamentary system has been flagrantly abused. Our committee has disdained debate and deliberation. A majoritarian device has been arrogantly applied: "We have the votes, so why deliberate?" Few would believe a once-facetious cliche has been given brutal currency: "My mind has been made up for me, so don't confuse me with the facts." The committee had its orders, so why even listen to any other views.

Some committee members, who were voted in favor of the bill had not even read the bill. This makes a travesty of our committee rules and the quality of our legislative process.

A good bill can stand debate, deliberation, full inquiry. A bad bill cannot withstand the light of day, the scrutiny of interrogation, the crucible of debate, the spotlight of public opinion.

H.R. 14544 must be a very bad bill. It is being rammed through the committee and the Congress before even Members of Congress can understand it or evaluate the consequences. It must be forced through Congress before the taxpayer discovers the added costs. Enactment must be railroaded before the citizens realize that an enormous deficit is building because of the "guns and butter" spending extravagances of the administration. Enactment is urgent before the people of the United States discover that instead of a $1.8 billion deficit which the President promised, we really have a $6 billion, or more, deficit. The bill must be enacted hurriedly before the public discovers the budgetary legerdemain.

The Chairman likens this bill to emergency legislation during the great depression of 1933. The terrible consequences of extravagant Federal spending are obviously imminent. We all know this. The growing inflation is convincing evidence. But we should do the right things, forthrightly, openly, after thorough study, debate, and deliberation. Gimmicks and tricks, which only postpone proper and necessary action until after the election, should not be tolerated.

The merits of every bill are important. But Members of Congress have a larger responsibility than any particular bill. We have an obligation to preserve sound parliamentary procedure, the committee system, and the right of the public to know fully about bills which we consider. We are not discharging our obligation. Our committee, the Congress, and the administration which is pressuring our committee to behave in this unseemly manner, will suffer and regret this performance.

This committee is a crucible where legislation should be refined—Federal legislation affects every citizen of the United States and of the world—it should be as nearly perfect as possible. Legislation is not often perfected by amendments from the floor at the last minute. This bill was hastily conceived, loosely and poorly drafted—filled with contradictions and enormously broad, new authorities which were never questioned or discussed—certainly not explained, perfected or refined. The committee did not perform this function at all.

The legislative committee is the only practical agency for marshaling facts and obtaining expert opinion and professional advice. Only two Government witnesses were called—they testified only briefly—some members were prevented from questioning them. No private or industry witnesses were called. No participating agency heads were called. Not even the president of FNMA was called. Some witnesses who wanted to appear were not permitted to testify.

Some organizations were told to write letters in support of the bill when they had not even seen the bill. Some organizations heeled to the administration and wrote letters in support without any information or background.

Most experts in the financial industry are keeping mum on this bill—they know it is fraudulent.

The committee has neglected its fact-marshaling responsibility.

A committee of Congress should make certain that the press and the public know and understand the proposed legislation, its advantages, disadvantages, and consequences.

Some members of our committee voted to report this bill without even reading the title of the bill.

There are not three newspaper reporters who understood the bill—one reporter for a leading financial paper said:

> How can I report on these hearings. I don't even know what a "participation" is.

There is more confusion, less understanding, of this bill than any other proposed in the last two Congresses. Yet our committee spent less than 2½ hours on it.

We have let the Members of Congress down. Few Members can explain this bill to a constituent. The Rules Committee was thoroughly confused—they spent more time on this bill than the Banking and Currency Committee. The Under Secretary of the Treasury spent more time explaining this bill to the Rules Committee than to Banking and Currency Committee. More major amendments were proposed and agreed to in the Rules Committee—believe it or not—than in our committee. Did you ever hear of trying to amend a bill in Rules Committee? Well it happened several times with this bill.

Our committee did not do its work. It did not gather the facts, it did not seek expert advise, it did not debate or deliberate the bill, it did not help to inform or advise the public, press, or Members of Congress.

The chairman is not entirely at fault. He does not like this kind of a bill. This is a "high interest" bill. This is a "tight money" bill. This will raise the costs of housing especially. All of these things are contrary to everything our chairman has advocated for years.

Unless we study this bill more—unless we amend the bill—it will come back to haunt and embarrass everyone of us, including the chairman.

If you do not send this bill back to the committee—and permit the legislative committee to fully perform its function—you will be demeaning the committee system, degrading the Congress.

There are dozens of other reasons to defeat this rule—one example, only, and I will yield back my time—a point of order will be made. The ruling will either gut this bill or set a precedent which will get the appropriations power of Congress. You can avoid this dilemma only by defeating the rule.

No country or system can long tolerate an arrogance of power. A majority, no matter how great in numbers, will not survive if it cannot withstand the questions or ideas of the minority. Suppression of debate, ideas or the free expression of opinion—whether by brute force of arms, or by denial of the basic parliamentary functions—will inexorably undermine the majority, the Congress, and the Nation.

May I suggest that, in spite of your orders, you study thoroughly H.R.14544.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is the most confusing piece of legislation ever brought before this House. One of the reasons it is so confusing is that the proposal is self-contradictory. Another reason for the confusion is that our committee, the Banking and Currency Committee—and it is with some reluctance that I make this charge—simply has not done the job that it should have done in giving extensive and careful consideration to this legislation.

We spent less than 3 hours on this bill. We heard only two administration witnesses, with no notice to, or opportunity for, opposition witnesses to appear to testify on this bill. We held a very brief executive session, and adopted two amendments, one of which was in principle only, and without benefit of the text of the proposed amendment. When the text of one of these crucial amendments appeared as a committee amendment of this reported bill, many of us were astounded to note that the amendment apparently involved a more far-reaching policy change in the appropriation process. The hearings of our committee on this most important measure consisted of only 61 pages of testimony, and of the 61 pages the first 21 pages is material simply laid into the record by the administration witnesses.

Our committee's actual consideration of the legislation, therefore, involves only 40 pages of the printed record.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman remembers that we spent almost a month on a companion bill that covered every problem and every controversy that this bill has.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman knows full well that the subject of the bill to which he refers was only the SBA.

Mr. PATMAN. The SBA, but that bill involved the same question as in H.R. 14544. Frequently it was mentioned that the big bill would soon be up for consideration. We had 4 full days of hearings, and then we had consideration outside of the hearings. We had a 2-week Easter recess, and the staff, both Democratic and Republican members of the staff, worked during those 2 weeks on the bill. So, in effect, we had 4 weeks of consideration of this general proposal before our committee.

Mr. FINO. I hate to disagree with my distinguished chairman, but this was an entirely different bill. It required full consideration. It required the full testimony of witnesses, and we did have witnesses who wanted to appear, but we did not give them the opportunity or the time to appear.

Our committee's hearings were so scanty and confusing that an unusual thing has happened. The House Agriculture Committee, because some of its programs were involved, took it upon itself to hold a hearing on our Banking and Currency Committee bill. For this, the Agriculture Committee is to be commended, and complimented, and praised.

The House Rules Committee, when it was considering the legislation, adopted the rather unusual procedure of that committee, actually holding hearings on this legislative proposal. The gentleman from California has already indicated that they had to do the job that we were supposed to have done. Its hearings comprise 101 pages of printed record. The Rules Committee is to be especially commended for its hearing. As a matter of fact, the Rules Committee hearing exceeds both in time and in printed record, hearings held by either the House Banking and Currency Committee or the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

In the course of the Rules Committee hearing, as a result of probing the wide-open authority in the bill, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee agreed to offer amendments on the floor, to some extent circumscribing the wide-open authority of the bill which our committee had reported. To my mind, this is most unusual legislative procedure.

When the bill is read for amendment, numerous other amendments will have to be offered and adopted if the bill is to emerge as anything other than a legislative monstrosity. The House will simply have to do the job which our committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, did not do and should have done in the first instance. It will be a complicated and confusing procedure.

There is only one way to eliminate the complications and confusion, and that is to defeat the rule.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is another side to H.R. 14544, a meritorious side. This is not a new proposal. This bill would provide the same type of assets sales program which was utilized to good advantage by President Eisenhower's administration. It has received the support of the Bi-Partisan Committee on Money and Credit and the support of President Kennedy's Committee on Federal Credit programs. Thus, President Johnson is the third Chief Executive to support this concept in very recent years.

Instead of taking away congressional jurisdiction and control, as so many bills do, this one would expand congressional control to the pooling of assets for sale, and it would strengthen congressional appropriations control over Federal lending agencies and their financing.

It seems to me that is advantageous and desirable.

I am impressed by the fact that the bill will permit handling of sales by the Federal National Mortgage Association, an experienced, capable, and trustworthy agency. The FNMA will coordinate with Treasury's debt-management activities. The proposal will reduce interagency competition in the market. It will encourage the substitution of private credit for public credit in Federal lending programs. Certainly in those areas we would be taking important forward steps. There is much more to be said in favor of the bill than there is in opposition to it. I support it. I hope it will pass. I say, let us try it. If there are Government assets which can properly be disposed of, why should we not take advantage of that fact? Why should we not also take advantage of a desirable new procedure for doing so?

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I might not take this time if it were not for the fact that the President, in a public statement—in which he was encouraging the Congress to enact this legislation—did list me as an advocate of what this legislation would authorize him to do.

I want to state categorically that I am opposed to the fiscal gimmickry and the sleight of hand that this bill would permit.

I did discuss the matter at one time with the President, and in the presence of Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, and I suggested that I would support legislation to authorize—and I thought we should have legislation—the promoting and making easier the sale of assets held by the Government which were marketable. But I said at that time both to the Under Secretary and to the President that I could not support this program which, in my judgment, was pure gimmickry.

I wonder how many really know what they will be voting for if they vote for this legislation. I am not so sure, frankly, that the President knows what is involved, because constantly the statement is made that this is a sale of assets. This is not a sale at all. This bill would simply authorize another means by which the Government could go out and borrow money.

What will a person get, if he comes down and says, "here is $100,000, or $1,000, or $1 million; and I want some of these participation certificates?" What will he get?

I wish I had the time to cite the kind of certificate he would get. It is an I O U, a promise to pay, with a certain interest rate, to be paid on a certain date. It is simply a borrowing process. The Government will not sell anything but a promise to pay with interest.

In order to set it up as a new technique, it is said, "We will set aside these assets the Government has and put them in a pool." Fundamentally, the word of the Government that it will pay is just as good as having this so-called pool of assets as security. It is just a new device for borrowing money.

Why does the administration want this new device? They want it because of two restrictions we have in the law today with respect to Government borrowing.

First, the Congress establishes the borrowing limit, a debt ceiling limit. We are going to have hearings in the Ways and Means Committee next Monday and Tuesday on the question of a new ceiling for the debt limit. Whatever ceiling we may set may be meaningless if this bill is enacted. The borrowing this legislation will permit will be entirely separate from the debt controlled by the ceiling.

This Congress has also established an interest limit of 4¼ percent on borrowings of the Government for longer than 5 years. But on this new borrowing there will be no limit. On this there is no limit on the amount of interest Uncle Sam will pay.

So they can get around two things by this proposal. No. 1, they can exceed the debt ceiling. No. 2, they can exceed the interest ceiling.

Let me say quite frankly, I believe we should raise the 4¼ percent interest ceiling. I believe that it is unrealistic and will get us into trouble. But the way to do it is honestly and frankly. Come to the Congress and say, "We want the ceiling raised or we want the interest ceiling eliminated."

I would say to some of my Democrat friends, it was just a few years ago when we got into a problem on interest rates. That was under the Eisenhower administration. A request was made to raise the ceiling. Government was in a very serious position in trying to properly manage the debt within a 4¼-percent ceiling. But could we get the ceiling raised? No. The Democrat Congress refused.

Yet today you are apparently willing to vote an authorization to Uncle Sam to borrow with no statutory limitation on the interest rate, and it is acknowledged that the interest rate that will be paid to the buyers of these certificates—the inerest rate that will be paid will be in excess of the interest rate that the Treasury has to pay when it goes into the market in the normal borrowing process.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this rule should be defeated and so should the bill. It is pure fiscal gimmickering.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as we approach congressional action necessary to pass the participation sales bill into law, we face essentially a question of mechanics. Almost everyone agrees that we should sell substantial amounts of the direct loan assets held by the Government. There is no forceful argument in favor of immobilizing billions of dollars of the taxpayers money in a growing portfolio held by our lending agencies. There is no convincing justification for taxing current incomes and tying up the money for years in direct loans or for borrowing money essentially at short term to lend at longer terms when private financing is available to do the job.

What we face is a question not of whether we should sell these direct loan assets—but how. The Federal Government has been involved in a major and growing program of direct sales of assets since the mid-1950's. Substantial amounts of direct loans have been transferred from the Government's portfolio to the private market through this program. However, although this program has worked, it has not worked well enough.

For one thing, direct sales conducted by as many as half a dozen Federal agencies sometimes conflict with each other and with the Treasury's debt management operations. But the chief disadvantage of relying on direct sales is that the portfolio of direct loans held by the Government is still growing. A total of $25.1 billion was immobilized in the portfolio on June 30, 1961. Four years later, at the close of fiscal 1965, the figure had grown by $8 billion—to $33.1 billion. Even assuming completion of the sales contemplated in the latest Budget document, the estimated level for June 30 of this year is $33.3 billion.

The primary reason for this growth in the portfolio is that the market for individual loans under Federal credit programs is limited. Often this has the effect of driving up the price—expressed in the yield that the Government must guarantee to private investors in order to interest them in direct purchases. Beyond that, we have found that the market often simply does not exist for much of the loan paper we hold.

One example of the marketing problem is found in the recent experience of the Small Business Administration, which has been engaged in selling its loan paper directly. In most cases, individual small business loans are too small and too expensive to administer to be very marketable. We have found that many private lenders, whether individual or institutional, will simply not invest in them. This condition led to introduction of a bill last year—and now passed by the Senate—to authorize participation sales of loans held by the Small Business Administration.

In testifying before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in March of this year, Mr. Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after discussing the marketability of SBA direct loans and outlining the studies which had led to the bill, described the Small Business Administration's situation in the following words:

> In the meantime, SBA has urgent needs for funds. To help meet these needs, the 1967 budget for the SBA assumes that participation sales of $50 million will be made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Unless such sales can be made during the next 3 months, or unless funds can be provided otherwise, planned programs will have to be limited to about half the level called for in the President's budget.

Let me contrast the SBA experience with the experience of certain other agencies which have used the participation sales technique.

The Export-Import Bank has, since 1962, sold through participation sales about $1.7 billion of its loans which might not have been marketable at all otherwise. The Federal National Mortgage Association, under authority granted by the Housing Act of 1964 to serve as trustee in such transactions, has sold about $1.6 billion of participation certificates in pools of home mortgage loans made by the Federal Housing Administration and by the Veterans' Administration.

The contrast is clear. The purpose of the participation sales bill is to extend the use of the technique employed so successfully by Fannie Mae and by the Export-Import Bank to other Federal agencies operating credit programs in order to avoid the sort of situation which the Small Business Administration faced.

The participation sales technique is not new. Nor was it really new when the Export-Import Bank and Fannie Mae started using it. The process of pooling risks to convert loan instruments of limited marketability into more attractive investments with broad marketability is simply an application of the basic technique employed by most of our large financing institutions.

The participation sales technique is the best way available to us to broaden our program of asset sales, to mobilize the resources of the private market in support of our lending programs to the greatest extent feasible, and to reduce the portfolio of direct loans held by Government agencies.

This technique, as embodied in the participation sales bill, preserves all existing congressional controls over the lending programs and specifically extends congressional control to the pooling of assets for sale, through the appropriations process.

The legislation maintains effective limits on the lending operations of the administration while enabling the administration to do what is needed—to transfer more Government holdings into private hands.

The bill will have a beneficial effect on the private market because it will help to make the market stronger, more competitive, and better able to serve the economy's needs over the long term. This is the effect of employing a better technique to implement the principle we have espoused for many years, which is that public credit should supplement rather than substitute for private credit.

Participation sales are also best in the cost aspect. You will hear—and the administration has acknowledged—that participation certificates will sell for one-quarter to three-eighths of 1 percent more than Treasury securities. You may be told that this differential means they are an expensive way of selling assets. But to compare these certificates with Treasurys implies that further borrowing through the Treasury is an acceptable alternative to asset sales. That, I am sure, is not the case. We should compare the cost to the Government of selling participations with the cost of selling assets directly. Because of the limited market of much of the loan paper and the broad marketability of the participation certificates, the participation technique results in a lower cost to the Government.

But the best argument in favor of this legislation is that it has been proved sound by experience. The success of the Export-Import Bank and Fannie Mae in selling participations shows that the technique can be extended to other agencies. It shows that holdings of direct loans which have only limited marketability at best can be converted into assets which have broad market appeal and high salability. In short, the best argument for the bill is that we know the principle embodied in it works. That is why it has my support.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman has mentioned—I did not count the number of times—but I am sure everybody recognized the constant emphasis whereas that this was a sale. Frankly, I do not think if the Congress calls a dandelion a rose that that is going to be anything more than a dandelion.

Now I would like to have the gentleman tell me how he can have a sale where there is no title that passes where the Government in this instance still services the paper or the mortgage that it purportedly sold and where the Government still assumes the risks of whether that paper or that mortgage is good or not. But where is the element of a sale?

I think the gentleman is right that these agencies have used it, as I said was the situation—the agencies use it as a means of borrowing more money so that they can make more loans. That is what Fannie May has done and that is what is proposed to be done by small business. But that is not a fiscal operation nor a sale.

Mr. MILLS. My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, goes back to the point of the direct sale. As I said, direct sales of these assets have been going on since the middle of the 1950's. They are still going on. The point is that through direct sale of Government assets, we are not cutting down our portfolio to the extent that we should. Here is a device that we can use in supplementation of direct sale of Government assets to give broader salability and broader marketability to assets that we cannot so dispose of in direct sales. I take it that this is not in replacement of direct sales by any means, but would be used to supplement a continued effort to bring about all the direct sales possible. But where direct sales are impossible, are we going to ask the taxpayers to continue to let us immobilize, if you may, $33 billion, or even more, of their money in the future when there is a market in private hands, through private sources, to relieve that load? That money may be used by Government, but if it is not used by the Government, I fear—and I know that my friend from Wisconsin fears—that we may be back at the taxpayers asking them for another bite at their pocketbooks.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If the gentleman would only call it financing or call it refinancing, we might be able to debate this on a sound basis. But you call it a sale and it is not a sale and it cannot be.

Mr. MILLS. I have not misrepresented, my friend. This is a sale of certificates of interest.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. You have, too, because you are calling something a sale that is not a sale, and the gentleman is too good a lawyer to know that this is not a sale.

Mr. MILLS. My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, very well understands the term "participation sale," because he has seen the use of the same device by private lending institutions. It is now used. We know that.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is attempting to confuse the point. What we are doing here is not selling complete instruments or mortgages. We are selling a participation interest, an undivided interest. This is the traditional way of selling a part of a big mortgage or a big obligation, whether it be a bond or otherwise. You sell a participation interest. It is an undivided interest.

Mr. MILLS. And that is what I say our financial institutions have been doing over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas ended his remarks, I was on my feet wanting to ask him a question. He has made a statement about former sales of participations by the Export-Import Bank and states that what will take place under the bill is supposed to be exactly the same as what has taken place before. Let me read from the new prospectus for the Export-Import Bank advertising the sale of $500 million 5½ percent participation certificates that are now about to be sold to the public. The last line states:

> The proceeds of this issue will be used to retire existing debt of the Export-Import Bank.

That is a very important distinction, which the gentleman from Arkansas failed to recognize when he said that this is exactly similar. There is no subsidy at all in connection with the sale of those participations. They are guaranteeing that the amount received from interest and principal payments from the assets in which they are selling participations will be sufficient to cover necessary interest and principal on the participations, and no taxpayer subsidy will be required.

I should like to pose very seriously the following question to all Members of the House: Who can remember in the history of their own membership in this House that the following groups were together in opposition to a bill: the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, the National Grange, the National Home Builders Association, the two major savings and loan associations and the Mortgage Bankers Association? None of these organizations have had an opportunity to testify. This is really an outrageous situation. We are embarking upon a precedent-making program, something that has never been done before regardless of what has been said, a program the like of which we have never acted upon before, and which can mean a program that will bite into so many other programs that have been very, very beneficial for the growth of the United States.

I should like to read very briefly from the minority views, and I hope that every Member of the House will read these before voting:

These views are for those who may wonder why a committee of the House of Representatives must report to the House after 3 hours of public testimony a bill whose gestation period in the Bureau of the Budget was at least 3—perhaps as long as 6—months.

These views will try to express the views of those of our citizens and affected industries who were refused access to the witness table by a rigid, uncompromising majority.

These views are for those who defend the right of an accused to adequate defense counsel in court, but who refuse the right of a committee minority to bring forward its witnesses.

These views are for those who snicker at the shallow success of the legislative maxim which states, "When you've got a bad piece of merchandise, wrap it up before anyone can get a good look at it."

These views are for those who express concern over the rising threat of inflation, but would vote for a plan that could remove for all time the fiscal restraint that normally accompanies big budgetary deficits by concealing billions in increased Federal spending outside of the budget.

These views are for those who rant and rave at higher interest costs, yet willingly would raise billions by a far more costly route than Treasury borrowings.

These views are for future generations of Americans and for Members of future Congresses as a reminder of the ways of the "fabulous 89th," when the Congress ceased to be an independent branch of our Government.

These views especially are for those who refuse to read them, for the human mind that is closed to all elements of dissent is to be pitied.

I reiterate, it is just a shame that with major groups, respectable groups, well-known within our country, wanting to air their views and be questioned by Members of Congress, no opportunity was given for that questioning.

The bill was introduced in Congress on April 20. Hearings were called on April 21. There was no notice of any executive session on that day. The executive session was called immediately thereafter, and a vote was taken. I urge defeat of this bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is an urgently needed bill. I most earnestly recommend the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 120, not voting 127, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—184

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Callan
Carey
Casey
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fisher
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Holifield
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Landrum
Love
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
Machen
Mackay
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Race
Rees
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—120

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence, J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Erlenborn
Fino
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McEwen
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Younger

NOT VOTING—127

Baring
Barrett
Blatnik
Brock
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Cameron
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Colmer
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Giaimo
Gilbert
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Halpern
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kornegay
Kupferman
Leggett
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mackie
Madden
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
May
Meeds
Michel
Mize
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murray
Nix
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pike
Poage
Purcell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Scott
Shriver
Sickles
Stalbaum
Stratton
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tupper
Ullman
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Burleson with Mrs. May.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Dent with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Howard with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Watson.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Celler with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Watkins.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Mize.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Farnum.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Olsen of Montana.
Mr. Pike with Mr. McDowell.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Cameron.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Huot with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Purcell with Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Stalbaum with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Craley.
Mr. Willis with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Mackie with Mr. de la Garza.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF PARTICIPATIONS IN GOVERNMENT AGENCY LOAN POOLS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14544) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14544, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

THE PARTICIPATIONS SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14544 is good, sound, sensible legislation. It seeks to utilize and take the best elements of all methods of financing the needs of our American economy. We all know our American economy benefits immensely from the fruitful partnership between private and public initiative.

This is most evident in the varied Federal programs to assist and stimulate the flow of private credit into the various sectors of our country.

Mr. Chairman, we have approximately 100 agencies in our Federal Government which make loans or guarantee them. The object of this legislation is to bring more coordination into the field of Government securities sales—directly or through participations. We could go ahead as we are now, and not sell any of these securities or participations in the securities, and in a few years, or in a few decades, the Government of the United States will have more securities in its lock boxes in the Treasury than will be owned by all the commercial banks in the United States of America.

I do not believe that is the way the people of this country want our Government to operate. We do not want it to become a huge bureaucracy in the moneylending business, never feeding any of these securities back into the private sector, but keeping them solely within its grasp.

THE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE WAY

That is not the private enterprise way. The private enterprise way is that when the Government is compelled to go into the business of lending money, the Government should make it possible for the money which has been loaned and securities which have been obtained, to be sold back into the private sector, into the private market.

By this method and procedure we will not arrive at a time in this country when the Federal Government will have more securities in value than all the commercial banks in the United States. That could be possible under existing conditions if these assets of the Government remain frozen. If we were ever to reach that point, then an argument would be made that the commercial banks were serving no social purpose and that therefore the Government should take over the commercial banks.

Thus, in selling participations back to the private sector we are avoiding the possibility of a campaign ever being made in this country to nationalize the banks.

This effort under H.R. 14544 is in the direction of supporting private enterprise and in the direction of preventing a possibility that the banks would be nationalized because the Federal Government might have more of the banking business than the banks themselves.

THE EXPORT-IMPORT AMENDMENT OF 1945 PROVIDED FOR PARTICIPATION SALES

In 1945, during the administration of President Truman, we amended the Export-Import Bank Act. The object of that act, of course, was to help manufacturers and exporters generally to sell goods and merchandise produced in the United States of America to people in foreign countries. In order to do that we expected to extend them loans under reasonable terms and conditions. We provided in that act in 1945, that the Export-Import Bank would have the authority to sell such obligations, either directly or in participation pools, which they had obtained to the private sector, to the private market.

For 21 years that has been the law. It was passed both in the House and in the Senate by a voice vote. There was no objection to it. It has been on the books for 21 years, and the participation sales provision was used first in 1961.

Not only that, my friends, but during the administration of Mr. Eisenhower, the President asked for power to sell Government assets repeatedly—in four different messages to the Congress. During that period of time he asked for this power, but he did not get it, except in one instance. That was to refinance the building of post offices. That act was passed in 1954.

Why was it passed? Mr. Eisenhower thought it was not proper—and many people feel as he did about it—to charge up as current expenses capital expenditures for buildings all over the Nation. He felt we should charge only an amortization payment and the interest rates each year in the budget.

That was in effect for 2 years, but a Democratic Congress came in and the Democrats decided that the terms and conditions were very unreasonable and detrimental to the Government and the general welfare of the people, so it was never renewed. But it was put into effect for 2 years.

HOUSING ACTS OF 1964 AND 1965 APPROVED PARTICIPATION SALES

In 1964 a housing act came up and passed the House. When it passed the Senate a provision was added providing that some of the mortgages obtained by HHFA could be pooled and participation certificates, if you please, sold on those securities. That was in 1964.

HOUSING ACT OF 1964

The Housing Act of 1964, as it emerged from conference, contained a provision from the Senate-passed bill—title VII of the bill—amending the National Housing Act, section 302, permitting FNMA to sell participations in a pool of VA-guaranteed mortgages. This provision was not included in the House-passed version but was accepted in conference and on the House floor. The list attached indicates Republican Members who supported the conference report containing the sale of FNMA participation provision.

On this vote on August 19, 1964, 110 Republicans and 200 Democrats voted to adopt the conference report.

The list referred to follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT—HOUSING ACT OF 1964—HOUSE

REPUBLICANS VOTING FOR THE REPORT

Baldwin, Don H. Clausen, Gubser, Mailliard, Martin, Talcott,[1] Teague of California, Wilson of California, Bell, Hosmer, Lipscomb, Brotzman, Chenoweth, Sibal, Cramer, Gurney, Arends, McLoskey, Michel, Reid of Illinois, Springer, Collier, Rumsfield, Halleck,[1] Bromwell, Avery, Ellsworth, Shriver, Siler, Tupper, Mathias, Morton, Bates, Conte, Keith, Martin, Morse, Broomfield, Cederberg, Griffin, Knox, Meader, Langen, MacGregor,

---

[1] Members of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Nelson, Quie, Battin, Cunningham, Cleveland, Wyman, Auchincloss, Cahill, Dwyer,[1] Frelinghuysen, Glen, Osmers, Wallhauser, Widnall,[1] Barry, Goodell, Grover, Horton, King, Ostertag, Reid of New York, Riehlman, Robinson, Wharton, Wydler, Fino,[1] Halpern,[1] Lindsay, Broyhill of North Carolina, Jonas, Andrews of North Dakota, Ayres of Ohio, Betts, Bolton of Ohio, Bow, Clancy, Latta, Mosher, Rich, Schenck, Taft,[1] Curtin, Fulton of Pennsylvania, Johnson, Kunkel, McDade,[1] Milliken, Saylor, Schneebeli, Schweiker, Weaver, Berry, Reifel, Baker of Tennessee, Burton, Lloyd, Stafford, Broyhill, Horan, Pelly, Stinson, Westland, Moore of West Virginia, O'Konski, Thomson, and Van Pelt.

It discloses that 110 Republicans voted for it and only 41 against it. Two hundred Democrats voted for it and only 29 against it. That is exactly the same deal we have here today. What we are trying to do here today has been passed by both Houses of Congress at different times and has been supported by both Democratic and Republican Members voting for it. While it is true the 1964 act was not unanimously adopted it is significant that, among the Members who voted for it on the minority side, were members of the Banking and Currency Committee. Among those were Mr. Talcott, Mr. Halleck—he is not a member of our committee, but he was the former minority leader—Mrs. Dwyer, Mr. Widnall, Mr. Fino, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Bow of Ohio, Mr. Taft of Ohio, and Mr. McDade. They were among those members of the committee who at that time voted for this very principle. In 1965 it was repeated again in the Housing Act and with a like result.

HOUSING ACT, 1965

The 1965 Housing Act contained a Senate provision extending the sale of participations in a pool of VA and FHA mortgages by FNMA including sale of mortgages bearing a below market interest rate. FNMA would be appropriated funds to make up the amount of the differential—interest cost and administrative expenses—between outlay for the sale of participations at below the market rates and the receipts from the sale of the participations.

On July 27, 1965, the House approved the conference report by a vote of 251 to 168, with 26 Republicans and 225 Democrats voting for the report.

CONFERENCE VOTE—1965 HOUSING ACT—HOUSE

REPUBLICANS VOTING YEA

Bates, Cleveland, Dwyer,[1] Ellsworth, Fino,[1] Fulton of Pennsylvania, Halpern,[1] Horton, Keith, Kunkel, Lindsay, McDade, Mathias, Morse, Mosher, O'Konski, Quillen, Reid of New York, Schweiker, Stafford, Tupper, Watkins, Whalley, Widnall,[1] and Wydler.

So why all this fussing here? Both sides of the aisle have given it support in the past. It has always been considered good. Why is it not good now?

Now let me take up the objections of the Republicans and briefly go over them. I know both sides can probably be accused of being inconsistent on this. Sometimes when the Democrats proposed it, the Republicans opposed it. Sometimes when the Republicans proposed it, the Democrats opposed it. So I guess it is just in order to say that we reserve the right as Members of Congress in dealing with public issues to be consistently inconsistent on occasion. However, if you will always look at the true facts and evaluate the circumstances, any time you find a Member of Congress who looks as though he is inconsistent, you will find in most cases when you properly evaluate it he was justified, regardless of party, in voting that way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would just like to know how I voted so I will know whether I am consistent or inconsistent, if the gentleman will tell me, please.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me get to that a little bit later.

REFUTATION OF THE REPUBLICAN POSITION ON H.R. 14544

I have before me the Congressional Record of May 11, page 10322, under the title Participation Sales Act of 1966, a statement by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes]. He says:

> Mr. Speaker, at the May 10, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee a policy statement, regarding H.R. 14544, the Participation Sales Act of 1966, was adopted.

Mr. Rhodes is chairman of the policy committee. I would like to include here the remarks of Mr. Rhodes on that. Here is why he says the Republicans are against this. This is a statement by this Republican policy committee:

> In rapid succession we have witnessed 5 straight years of Federal budget deficits that have averaged $6.2 billion.

And so on.

Let us take up the first point first. Who objects to 5 straight years of prosperity? We have had 62 consecutive months of prosperity here in the United States of America. We have had the longest period of economic growth and prosperity that the United States has ever experienced and enjoyed in peacetime history. Does anybody want to say that was not a good thing? It was a good thing. Why should the Republicans come out and criticize it? If it had not been for the Eisenhower administration letting the Federal Reserve have what they call their independence so they could do what they want to do regardless of the wishes of the elected representatives or even of the President of the United States—if President Eisenhower had not done that and if we had kept interest rates as they were when Mr. Eisenhower came in and the Republican Party came in—then today our national debt would be substantially lower and we would have saved $60 billion in extra interest alone.

THE PARTICIPATION SALES BILL WOULD NOT BE NECESSARY IF THE LAST REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION HAD PROTECTED THE COUNTRY AGAINST RUNAWAY INTEREST RATES

When the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953, the interest charges on the national debt stood at $5.8 billion. With the Eisenhower administration working hand-in-glove with the Federal Reserve Board, interest rates skyrocketed and, as a result, we will be paying $12.750 billion in interest in the next fiscal year.

If the interest had been kept at the 1952 level of the Truman administration, we would be paying only $6.6 billion annually on the national debt instead of the $12.750 billion. In other words, we would have a budget surplus of $4 billion and there would be no need for the participation sales bill.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION, WORKING BEHIND THE SCENES WITH THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD, OPENED THE FLOODGATES TO HIGH INTEREST RATES

The policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration and the Federal Reserve Board during the 1950's are the real reasons that the participation certificates will be sold at yields above 5 percent.

For example—when the Truman administration left office in 1952, the computed annual interest rate on the public debt—that is all marketable issues—stood at about 2 percent. Eight years later, when the Eisenhower administration departed from Washington, this same interest rate had skyrocketed to 3½ percent.

THE REPUBLICANS, INCLUDING MANY ON THIS FLOOR TODAY, DID NOT RAISE A SINGLE VOICE OF PROTEST, WHEN THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION ADOPTED A RUN-AWAY, HIGH INTEREST RATE POLICY IN THE 1950'S

The Republican leadership watched while yields on long-term Government bonds rose from 2.68 percent in 1952 to 4.02 percent in 1960.

Where was the Republican concern when the Eisenhower administration, year after year, increased the cost of financing public expenditures?

FROM 1939 THROUGH 1951—THE YEARS OF THE ROOSEVELT AND TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION—THE YIELD ON LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT BONDS NEVER DID RISE ABOVE 2½ PERCENT

On the other hand, during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, yields on long-term Government securities were never below 2½ percent and were between 3 and 4 percent in 5 of the 8 years. When Eisenhower left office in 1960, the yield was 4.02 percent on long-term Government bonds.

HIGH INTEREST COSTS ADD TO NEED FOR PARTICIPATING SALES

High interest costs imposed by the Federal Reserve action of December 6, added $750 million to the fiscal 1967 budget. This is the added cost of financing the national debt. This additional $750 million, added by one directive of the Federal Reserve Board, brings the total annual interest cost on the national debt to almost $13 billion.

HIGH INTEREST RATES ARE CAUSED BY THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND NOT BY THE PARTICIPATION SALES BILL

The Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates 37½ percent in December, nearly 5 months before the President sent the participation sales bill to the Congress.

The Republicans lauded the Federal Reserve action of December 6 and approved of the higher interest rates.

The Republicans suddenly discoverd the interest rate issue on April 20—the date the participation sales bill was introduced.

---

[1] Members of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Chairman, these interest rates went up tremendously, tremendously. That is the cause of our problems with reference to deficits.

Mr. Chairman, had we had a capital budget like former President Eisenhower indicated, there would not have been a year within my memory—and I have been here a long time—that we would not have had a surplus instead of a deficit—that is, if we had had a capital budget and not charged all of our expenditures against current revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Republicans have a leg to stand on when they criticize our 62 months of great prosperity. Why do they want to change it? Why do they not help us continue it?

LIMITATION OF SALES TO $10.9 BILLION AND NOT $33 BILLION

Now, in this Republican statement, it says that under the provisions of this bill—

> The Johnson-Humphrey administration will be given authority to establish a whole system of backdoor deficit financing.

Mr. Chairman, that is not true. The American bankers thought the same thing. When we put the provision in the bill, which we expected to do all the time—to have the Committee on Appropriations pass on these matters, they could even pass upon the terms, the interest rates if they wanted to with reference to these participations—then the American Bankers Association sent a telegram which said in effect we are no longer—listen now; this is the American Bankers Association—we are no longer opposed to this bill, because there is no backdoor financing.

Therefore, the criticism and censure uttered by the Republican Policy Committee is absolutely unfounded and unjustified.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, let me say that under the proposed bill for participation sales, as originally introduced, FNMA could sell participations in a pool of Government-held financial assets or loans which could possibly have totaled $33 billion. However, this was never contemplated and is not the case at this moment. I refer the Members of the House to page 426 of the fiscal 1967 budget that clearly spell it out.

PRIVATE PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL CREDIT PROGRAMS

(For additional details, see Special Analysis E in separate volume, "Special Analyses of the United States Budget," 1967.)

Despite the number and variety of major Federal credit programs, they directly affect only a small fraction of the total volume of credit, both public and private. Of the estimated private debt of $853 billion outstanding on June 30, 1965, direct Government loans and guarantees of private loans to domestic private borrowers accounted for about 11%. Federal guarantees or insurance of private loans were responsible for most of the Federal assistance.

In recent years, and especially during the past year, emphasis has been placed upon obtaining private participation in public credit programs wherever consistent with achievement of the purposes of such programs. Numerous methods are being employed to make this policy effective, including: (a) limitation of direct lending to cases where borrowers cannot otherwise obtain the funds on reasonable terms; (b) liberalization in lending authority of private institutions; (c) expanded use of Government guarantees and insurance of private loans as an alternative to direct loans; and (d) increased sales of Government loans to private lenders.

Direct sales and participation sales of loans by Federal credit programs

[In millions of dollars]

Agency or program	1965 actual		1966 estimate		1967 estimate	
	Direct sales	Participation sales	Direct sales	Participation sales	Direct sales	Participation sales
Department of Agriculture: Farmers Home Administration	35		40		15	[1] 600
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education						[1] 100
Department of Housing and Urban Development:						
Federal National Mortgage Association	264	200	182	485	49	[2] 520
Federal Housing Administration	6		15		65	
Public housing program	4					
College housing loans	12		5		5	[1] 820
Public facility loans	11		5		5	[1] 80
Veterans Administration:						
Direct loan revolving fund	61	93	60	625	80	154
Loan guarantee revolving fund	266	7	260	200	290	106
Export-Import Bank of Washington	124	450	60	975	25	975
Small Business Administration	31		45	[1] 350		[1] 850
Total, by type of sale	814	750	672	2,635	534	4,205
Grand total	1,564		3,307		4,739	
Present programs	1,564		2,957		1,889	
Proposed legislation			350		2,850	

[1] Under proposed legislation.

[2] Includes $400,000,000 under proposed legislation.

Legislation is being proposed to authorize a Government-wide program for the sale of participations in outstanding direct loans. Under the expanded program, the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, will continue to administer the pools of loans set aside by the Veterans Administration and by its own special assistance and management and liquidating programs. It will also administer and sell certificates of participation in pools of loans set aside by the Farmers Home Administration, the Office of Education, the Small Business Administration, and the college housing and public facility loan programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The program authorized by this legislation will use many of the techniques successfully employed in earlier sales of participations by the Export-Import Bank and the Federal National Mortgage Association. In addition, new provisions will make it possible for the first time to include in the pools many loans which bear interest rates below current market levels. The agencies pooling such loans will be authorized to make supplementary payments to the trustee, which, together with the interest on the loans in the pools, will assure a level of return adequate to attract private investment.

Largely as a result of this proposed legislation, sales of financial assets are expected to increase from the $1.6 billion actually consummated in 1965 to $3.3 billion in 1966 and $54.7 billion in 1967. These figures exclude sales made as part of the usual process of guaranteeing or insuring loans, and sales from one Government agency to another, as well as regular amortization and prepayments of principal.

Of the total sales anticipated in 1967, $4,205 million will be accomplished through sales of participations and $534 million from direct sales of individual loans. The timing of sales and the specific assets to be sold are subject to variation depending upon market developments and shifts in the inventory of available assets.

However, nevertheless this technical question will be met and will be restricted by amendment.

Mr. Chairman, after we conferred with the Rules Committee and we told them we did not want all of this $33 billion authority in the bill, they said, "Well, get up an amendment to say that." We got up an amendment and it will be offered on the floor. This amendment will restrict these participations to $10.9 billion only. I do not believe many people object to that. We specify the agencies that may place their assets in the pool. Now, furthermore, the Republicans charge—and I am reading now from their policy statement—the following:

> If the $4.2 billion participation sales authorized by this bill are not made, the budget deficit will be $6 billion.

Are the Republicans saying, "Now, please, vote this bill down; we want the deficit just as high as we can get it; we want a $6 billion deficit; if you do not vote it down, the Democrats will get by with a deficit of $1.8 billion."

In other words, Mr. Chairman, they are saying, "Let us make it hard on our country." They do not intend it to be that way. I know that. But in effect they are implying and in effect they are saying, "Let us make it hard on our country by having the deficit just as big as we can; the bigger the deficit, the more it will help the Republican Party." They can say that, but that is not a very good thing to do. We should not have politics in things like this. They are absolutely wrong in clamoring for higher deficits, when that is unnecessary. It will hurt and not help our country. They are in a very bad position on that score.

Now, with reference to foreign loans, the policy statement refers to the Agency for International Development and to the $12 billion they have made in loans.

Of course, none of them are involved here—not one of them.

Most of those loans are made at a very low rate of interest. Some of them are made at three-fourths of 1 percent. Why? In order to help people in developing nations to have some hope for the future and something to work for and to have some reason not to engage in wars just because a dictator says they should have a war.

These loans were made to help assure a permanent and lasting peace and that is why we are making these loans at a very low and subsidized rate of interest.

There is not and never was any intention to put them in this participation pool at all.

ADDED COSTS ARE MINOR

Now then as to the costs under the bill, H.R. 14544—it will cost the American taxpayers an additional $5 million a year for each billion dollars sold. That is the same theory that Mr. Eisenhower had when he was having the post offices built. It is the same theory as the Export-Import Bank. It is the same theory that has applied to all such programs. There is no change here. We are doing exactly what has been done in the past.

Now the Republican policy statement goes on to say:

> To date Fannie Mae has sold four issues of participation. Each time they have been sold by the same four big Wall Street investment houses.

Well, what is so wrong about that. Personally, I think FNMA could sell these participations at public auction. They should be sold to the highest bidder. That would be what I would advocate. Is it so bad if it can't be done in a more efficient way to have some brokers do it?

Well, you ought to look at the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee. They use broker-dealers. They have 20 dealers around them. You can get on top of the Federal Reserve bank in New York and throw a stone and hit each one of these 20 dealers offices.

They are right there around the Federal Reserve bank in New York. They have dealt with them for 50 years—not just for 2 or 3 years. Is that so wrong? If it is, of course, you can compare that with the four dealers here.

Again, I say these participations should be sold under the best conditions possible so as to obtain the best deal for the Government and the people.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. I think I have heard that story somewhere before.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope you have.

Mr. WIDNALL. What I would like to know is why you think it is better to narrow it down to just four?

Mr. PATMAN. I am for public auction. I am for selling them—like Fannie Mae can sell and often does sell at the lowest possible rate.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Why have you not provided some safeguards in the bill that you have offered to the Congress?

Mr. PATMAN. We do not need it. We leave it to the discretion of the people who are handling it, and when they think it is better to sell them at auction, by negotiation or otherwise—as long as the Federal Government and American people get the best deal. It is entirely up to them and that is the way to leave it. We trust the administrators. That is what we think should be done in this case.

Now, let me raise another point with those against this legislation. I believe it was in 1959 under Mr. Eisenhower's administration when it was proposed to swap enough VA-guaranteed 4-percent mortgages for $311 million of low interest Treasury obligations that were coming due.

If the people holding this $311 million in Government bonds that were coming due had said, "No, we do not want anything—we want our money." Then the Treasury would have had to go into the market and borrowed $311 million. That would have increased the budget by that much. It would have increased our national debt by that much. It would have increased the expenses of the Government by that much—$311 million.

Now we are proposing this participation pooling of Government assets, and we are accused of using a gimmick. If it is, then let it be so called. It is in the public interest. This is the same type of gimmick—if that is the word the Republicans want to use—as that used during Mr. Eisenhower's administration when those VA mortgages were swapped for low interest rate Government securities.

That action by President Eisenhower reduced the national debt in exactly the same way that this bill will reduce the debt. When you vote for this Sales Participation Act of 1966 that we have before us today, you will be reducing the national debt. Certainly this is in the interest of our country.

Furthermore, the national debt does not include all debts—not by any means.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Where does it say that in the bill? Where in the bill does it say what you just said?

Mr. PATMAN. It is just a statement of fact. For example, we have $33 billion of Federal Reserve notes outstanding. They are not a part of the national debt, because they are not interest-bearing obligations of the Federal Government. If the gentleman from New Jersey owned a million dollars worth of Government bonds that came due today, and if he decided not to cash them tomorrow, they would not be carried as part of the national debt. The debt would be reduced by that amount because those bonds are no longer interest-bearing obligations of the Government.

It is only interest-bearing obligations of the Government that are carried in the national debt. That is the reason we do not have to put such a provision in the law. It has always been that way; there has been no change.

This bill is very reasonable. We have many precedents for it. The principle has been approved by Members on both sides of the aisle. Each party has used it to good advantage to help the public interest and the general welfare of all people. I think it should be passed and voted for by everyone. The Republicans should reevaluate their thinking on this measure.

THE QUESTION OF INTEREST RATES NOT GERMANE

The question of interest rates does not enter this debate. The question is whether it is right that we sell these securities through the participation pool back into the private sector. If it is, we must sell them at the rate of interest that will cause them to be purchased, whether that rate of interest is low or whether it is high. That question will depend upon the market at that particular time, a question over which the Congress does not have any control. We must make them acceptable to the market at the particular time at which they are sold. Therefore, the question of interest is not involved, except that we have to pay the going rate of interest at the time in order to sell them.

Is it not better to sell these obligations at an interest rate that is even a little higher than that which the Treasury would have to pay—about one-quarter to three-eighths higher in order to maintain our free enterprise economy?

H.R. 14544 SHOULD PASS UNANIMOUSLY

I suggest that the bill should be passed unanimously in the interest of the entire country, in the interest of the private enterprise system, the small business people of the country, the people who want and deserve decent housing, and the small communities that are clamoring for facilities loans for water and for sewers, the farmers and all groups in the United States. They are all involved in this bill.

You know you are going to vote for big cities. You know that. Why not vote for the little towns? If you vote against this bill, you vote against the little towns, you vote against the farmers, and you vote against the small businessmen.

A vote against the participation sales bill is a vote to strangle these programs: The Farmers Home Administration, college housing, Veterans' Administration loans, Small Business Administration loans, Export-Import Bank, soil and water loans, and all of the various housing programs.

A vote for the participation sales bill is a vote to provide adequate funds for these needed programs already voted by the Congress.

So I ask you Republicans to reevaluate your position on this measure and see if you do not want to vote "aye."

ANSWER TO REPUBLICAN CHARGES OF RAILROADING AND LACK OF HEARINGS

Mr. Chairman, throughout this debate we have heard charges by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the Sales Participation Act was rushed through the Banking and Currency Committee without adequate hearings and that Republican members of the committee were not given advance notice as to when the committee was planning to vote on the bill.

It has further been charged by our Republican friends that this legislation is of such importance that more hearings are needed. These charges cannot be substantiated.

To prove my point, I call attention to the hearings on H.R. 14544 before the Banking and Currency Committee. In my opening statement, I said:

> May I express the hope that we stay in session on this bill today and tomorrow, if necessary, until we get the bill passed on. The House will be in session at noon for a short time. I do not think it will be long, but I would like to have the Committee come back if we do not get back by noon, and it does not look too good that we will, we should come after the House has recessed in the afternoon and stay in session until we get the bill passed on this afternoon if we can. If not, meet tomorrow morning at 10 and stay until such time as is necessary. I am expressing that as a hope.

A short time later during the hearings, I made the statement:

> I want to express the hope that we resolve this thing before we conclude today.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that these remarks were made at the outset of our hearings. It is on the record and crystal clear that there was a strong possibility that a vote would be taken on the measure in the afternoon session following conclusion of testimony from the witnesses. Although the Republicans have charged that full hearings were not held on the bill, it must be noted that when the April 21 afternoon session of the committee was called to order for the continuation of H.R. 14544 testimony, only four Repulican members were present. And when the committee voted to report the measure, only three Republicans were present. I submit to this body that the Republicans did not consider this legislation important enough to attend the hearings on the matter and when a rollcall vote was taken, less than one-fourth of the Republican membership of the committee was on hand to vote for this important matter. I ask my Republican colleagues on the committee: If you feel that adequate hearings were not held on this legislation, why was your party not better represented during the sessions that were held on the bill?

I must point out that one of the loudest critics of this legislation, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], was among those missing during the afternoon testimony on H.R. 14544 and was not present when a vote was taken. At the outset of the hearings, Mr. BROCK complained that we had not scheduled enough witnesses for this legislation and indicated that he wanted to be fully informed on the matter before concluding hearings. If the gentleman was sincerely interested in learning exactly what this bill would accomplish, why did he not attend all of the hearing sessions on this legislation?

In addition to the hearings on H.R. 14544, as I have previously mentioned, the committee held four days of hearings on S. 2499, a bill which would allow the Small Business Administration to sell shares in a pool of loans. This legislation is almost identical to the bill before this body today. However, the Republicans once again showed their lack of concern over this legislation by establishing a poor attendance mark for the hearings. On April 1, only five Republicans were present for the hearings; and on April 4, only six Republicans were present. Once again I repeat, if the Republicans were so concerned over this legislation, why did they not attend the hearings and ask questions?

THE PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966 AND OUR NATIONAL GOALS AND NEEDS

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CAPITAL IN PARTNERSHIP

The home mortgage insurance and guaranty programs of the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration, the many programs of agricultural credit assistance, lending assistance rendered by the Small Business Administration, and more recently the credit aids enjoyed in the college housing program and the student loan program—all these bear witness to our success in using public and private assets to achieve common goals.

Very frequently in this effective partnership arrangement between private and public credit, we have started out with a program that is either wholly or relatively dependent upon Federal lending. Then in time, the program has evolved into a form in which the private sector gradually takes up more and more of the task of providing financing.

Over the years, however, we have devised different means to use the great resources of the private credit market to accomplish the very necessary and highly desirable social goals and purposes which we originally set out to accomplish through direct Government lending programs. When private capital takes up part or all of the burden of a lending program, then the resources of the Federal Government can be and are free to turn to other equally worthwhile purposes. Broadly speaking, this process has been operating ever since we turned to guaranteed and insured loans in place of some of the direct lending programs. We might single out, for example, home ownership, which is not only an individual American aspiration but one of our most widely accepted goals. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, we could ever have achieved our high degree of home ownership without using the resources of the private market under guaranty and insurance arrangements. This is true for at least three reasons:

First. The capital resources of the private market obviously are far greater than those of the Government; second, we could not have increased the Federal budget, and indeed, few if any of us would have wanted to increase the Federal budget to the degree required to provide the necessary funds through direct Government loans; and third, while Government assistance was required to get the necessary programs under way we needed the ingenuity of the private market in order to carry them out successfully.

Federal credit programs, working through the private market, help to make the market stronger, more competitive and better able to serve the economy's needs over the long run.

H.R. 14544 NOT A RADICAL DEPARTURE

I am sure we will hear charges made today that H.R. 14544, the so-called Participation Sales Act of 1966, is a new and radical departure from traditional methods. This, Mr. Chairman, is not substantiated by the facts. The policy of asset sales has been endorsed by previous administrations and by a number of private independent commissions and groups which deserve and receive the highest respect in our economy. Others will dwell on this point in greater detail.

THE BASIC PROBLEM

Basically, Mr. Chairman, this is the problem on hand at the moment. Outstanding loans made through Federal credit programs to domestic private borrowers accounted for about $125 billion out of a total of $835 billion of private debt outstanding as of mid-1965. Guarantees and insured private loans were responsible for more than $91 billion of the $125 billion. Only a little more than $33 billion was in direct loans.

But this $33 billion, which will be amended to reduce the amount to $10.9 billion, Mr. Chairman, and other necessary additional lending under existing Federal credit programs, represents budget expenditures which could be avoided if private capital could be mobilized to take the place of public credit as envisioned under H.R. 14544.

Yet, despite major efforts since 1950 to draw on private credit, the volume of direct Federal loans outstanding has continued to increase. It was $25.1 billion on June 30, 1961, and $33.1 billion on June 30, 1965.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, these loans have direct consequences on the Federal budget—and thus on the policies followed by any administration. Money for lending programs must be budgeted. This means that it must be matched by tax revenue or by additional debt—or it must take the place of some other program which must then be postponed or dropped.

Today we know that competition for available Federal budget dollars is extremely keen—particularly when the whole range of great unsatisfied needs of our society is considered.

The President's state of the Union message of last January has cataloged these needs and his budget has provided a program for meeting them.

It is only necessary to name a few areas—health and education, the elimination of rural and urban poverty, the rebuilding of blighted urban areas, water pollution, air pollution, transportation—to see that future national needs will continue to place pressures on future demands for capital. This future need, together with present programs, makes it essential that we act now to reduce the total amount of loans outstanding by substituting private for Federal credit wherever possible.

This legislation does not authorize any new programs whatsoever or any additional loan funds for existing programs. However, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is of vital concern in assuring local communities, educational institutions, business firms and individuals that loan programs already authorized by the Congress will be properly and adequately funded. Further, this legislation would provide assurances to many others— individuals, communities, and institutions—that future programs to alleviate their most severe problems would be financially feasible and properly funded.

This bill would enable those who do not have ready access for whatever reason to capital markets to benefit from the most efficient and economical financing techniques which are currently available to large and well-established borrowers. This bill would provide the kind of stability and continuity in program financing which is essential both to orderly and economic planning on the local and individual level and overall financial program planning on the Federal level.

Federal credit programs in such areas as education, agriculture, and small business would be empowered to utilize the same financing techniques that the Congress has previously made available for housing and other programs such as in the Department of Housing and Urban Development through the participation sales authority provided in the Housing Acts of 1964 and 1965.

Some of the most vital credit programs are on a direct loan basis rather than on a guaranteed or insured loan basis. This is due to the fact that such borrowers are either not well established and accomplished in the capital market, or remote from or strange to the source of financing funds, or it has been determined by the Congress and the American people that such programs by their very nature must qualify for a lower interest rate than would be feasible under either private financing or a Federal guaranteed loan program.

These reasons should not interfere with the availability of funds, within the limits prescribed by legislation, but such interference does exist. Needed programs are unjustly penalized by financial arrangements which require them to compete for scarce budget dollars with defense and other essential needs. Substituting private for public credit removes this unnecessary competition.

NECESSARY DIRECT LENDING WILL CONTINUE

For those who have fears that this legislation will spell the beginning of the end of direct Federal lending programs, let me say that with all respect I believe their fear is ungrounded. I do not believe that this administration nor any party in power would ever be in a position to contradict that there is no need for any direct Federal lending programs. Your committee stated in the report on H.R. 14544 as follows:

> Your committee wishes to retain, however, the principle that the allocation of credit for essentially private purposes should be a function of the private market. By the same token, this position does not mean to imply that existing or new social and/or economic programs requiring Federal Government sponsorship and/or direct financing should be curtailed or ceased.

Mr. Chairman, the Government's basic contribution in all of these Federal loan programs, guaranteed and direct, is essentially that of assuming a credit risk. When private rather than public credit is used, the guarantee is exactly the same—but the main essential difference is that Federal funds are not tied up where private loans can be used to do the job.

In order to avoid adding unnecessarily to the budget, and yet to provide sound financing for necessary programs, this bill calls for in effect the substitution of private credit for public credit wherever feasible. This in essence is what the participation sales under this legislation would accomplish. This bill, Mr. Chairman, is not substantive in nature but merely procedural.

THE SALES PARTICIPATION ACT AND INTEREST RATES

Argument has been raised concerning the increased costs in interest rates or yields which will have to be paid under the participation pool procedure as set forth in H.R. 14544 as compared to direct Federal financing. That argument, curiously enough, Mr. Chairman, has been voiced by those who traditionally object to most, if not all, Federal direct lending programs. Perhaps I am engaging in wishful thinking, but I welcome this change of heart, and trust that this support will be forthcoming when legislation is before this body for subsequent funding of existing direct lending programs, and new programs of this nature, when they are before this body.

No one can argue against the fact that the Federal Government can finance its needs at a lower cost than anyone else—either business or individuals. Let me quote from the majority report on H.R. 14544 on this subject:

> It has been pointed out on some occasions that the sale of Federal credit program financial assets, whether through participation certificates or other means, is more expensive than financing through the direct issue of Treasury obligations. This is true, although the cost difference has proved to be relatively minor. For example. FNMA participation certificates have been sold at rates roughly one-fourth of one percent above Treasury issues of comparable maturity; and it is entirely possible that the margin may diminish as the market gains experience with these high quality credits.
>
> Moreover, carried to its logical conclusion, this argument would have the Treasury financing directly all of the Federal insurance and guarantee programs, since it can obviously do this more cheaply than the private market. Other types of credit, now handled entirely in the private market, could also be financed more "cheaply" by the U.S. Treasury.

This argument, Mr. Chairman, reducto absurdum, would have the Federal Government, through the U.S. Treasury, financing all activities in our Nation—from business to individual to consumer loans. I do not believe anyone wants this to happen.

But there is another point which must be made on this subject. The minority report accompanying this bill makes much of the argument that H.R. 14544, by establishing participation pools, will end up costing the American people more money. I am sure that the minority party will continue to make much of this point as we debate the bill today. From a short range view, it cannot be denied that there is a small interest rate differential between these participations and direct Treasury financing. But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will take a long-range view and reject any short-sighted play on figures.

MINORITY KEEPS FACTS FROM PUBLIC

The minority party's argument about higher costs through participation sales tells only a small part of the story and keeps the true facts from the public. Viewing the legislation from a longer range, it is highly probable that the interest rate differential between participation sales and direct Treasury issues will soon become minimal, if not nonexistent. This will be true as the participations gain familiarity and acceptance in the money market. But, the minority ignores these facts.

However, I am happy at long last to see so many of my colleagues on the minority side exhibit concern about interest rates. Many times, I have stood on the floor of this Chamber seeking support for efforts to hold down interest rates. I have often sought support for legislation which would curb the excesses of the Federal Reserve Board and its never-ending drive to increase interest rates throughout the economy. Never do I remember my colleagues on the minority side rising in support of these efforts.

Now, the participation sales bill has somehow awakened the slumbering elephant. Yes, my Republican colleagues, I too would like to see these participation sales made at low interest rates. But, it is the Federal Reserve Board, and not this participation sales bill, that has pushed interest rates up to an all-time high.

Not 4 months ago, I stood here and exposed the action taken by the Federal Reserve Board in December 1965, when it raised interest rates by as much as 37½ percent. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that if this Congress had not allowed the Federal Reserve to take this action, the rate the Federal Government would have to pay for these participations could well be within the 4¼ percent statutory limit on long-term Treasury securities. However, many of my Republican colleagues supported the Federal Reserve action and said nothing about holding down interest rates.

HIGH INTEREST RATES UNBALANCE BUDGET

Listen to what the President had to say in his budget message for fiscal 1967:

> Apart from the special costs of operations in southeast Asia, increases in Federal expenditures for high priority Great Society programs and for unavoidable workload growth have been largely offset by reductions in lower priority programs, management improvements and other measures. As a consequence, total regular administrative budget expenditures—i.e., outside of special Vietnam costs—rise by only $0.6 billion between 1966 and 1967.

That statement, Mr. Chairman, is on page 9 of the budget for fiscal year 1967. Now, what do we find on page 140 of the budget? This statement is made:

> Interest payments on the public debt will rise substantially both for fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967.

The estimate of interest payments for 1966, Mr. Chairman, is $12 billion, and for 1967, $12,750 million. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if we were able to hold interest down to that level prior to the recent actions by the Federal Reserve Board, we would have affected the administrative budget not by an increase of $600 million between 1966 and 1967, but by a decrease of $150 million, comparing again 1966 and 1967.

I welcome the support for low interest rates by members of the minority party, and I trust that this position they are taking on this specific issue will carry forward to other issues regarding interest rates as they occur in the future.

I trust that my colleagues on the minority side have not seized on the issue of interest rates simply as a political gimmick to oppose the administration's participation sales bill.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

For the benefit of the Members of the House I include at this point in my remarks the amendments I propose to offer tomorrow on H.R. 14544:

Amendments to be offered by Mr. Patman to H.R. 14544 as reported:

Page 2, strike lines 6 through 15 and insert:

"(3) by striking out the words 'offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages in which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof' in the first sentence thereof and by inserting 'and other types of securities, including any instrument commonly known as a security, hereinafter in this subsection called "obligations," in which any department or agency of the United States listed in section 302(1) (2) of this Act,' ";

Page 3, strike lines 3 through 6 and insert:

"(2) Subject to the limitations provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, one or more trusts may be established as provided in this subsection by each of the following departments or agencies:

"(A) The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, but only with respect to operating loans, direct farm ownership loans, direct housing loans, and direct soil and water loans. Such trusts may not be established with respect to loans for housing for the elderly under sections 502 and 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, nor with respect to loans for nonfarm recreational development.

"(B) The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but only with respect to loans for construction of academic facilities.

"(C) The Department of Housing and Urban Development, except that such authority may not be used with respect to secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

"(D) The Veterans' Administration.

"(E) The Export-Import Bank.

"(F) The Small Business Administration. The head of each such department or agency, hereinafter in this"

Page 3, line 20, strike "may" both times it appears and insert "shall".

Page 9, line 25, insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 6.".

Page 10, insert immediately after line 3:

"(b) After June 30, 1966, no department or agency listed in section 302(c) (2) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act may sell any obligation held by it except as provided in section 302(c) of that Act, or as approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, except that this prohibition shall not apply to secondary market operations carried on by the Federal National Mortgage Association."

Page 11, immediately after line 16, add the following new section:

"Sec. 9. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized during the fiscal year 1966 to sell—

"(1) additional participations in the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust, and

"(2) participations in a trust to be established by the Small Business Administration, each without regard to the provisions of paragraphs (4) of section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act."

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I have now been in the House of Representatives for 17 years. I never thought I would live to see the day when the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency would stand on the floor of the House and advocate higher interest rates with no ceiling on the interest rates.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Why should the gentleman be concerned about our interest rates when his party—with some exceptions such as the gentleman from New Jersey—has always been for high interest rates? Your party is even referred to as the high interest party because you have such a good record of high interest.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have not yielded, but I have let Mr. Patman speak.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I do not think the party will be referred to in those terms after this bill passes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the distinguished chairman of our committee has referred to some things that have taken place in the past, I would like to read now an excerpt from the hearings in January 1959, on the Economic Report of the President. I refer to pages 417 and 418:

Representative Patman. Now, do you consider it a good thing to sell off assets of the Government for the purpose of balancing the budget? After all, this is selling an asset that the Government owns as if that could in any real sense balance the budget. Do you endorse that as a Government policy, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Anderson. Congressman Patman, the act which created the Federal National Mortgage Association provided that we should, to the maximum extent and as rapidly as possible, have private financing substituted for Treasury borrowings that would otherwise be required to carry mortgages.

Now, over the period of the FNMA history, they have sold, as I recall, about $1,600 million worth of these mortgages.

Representative Patman. But I am talking about selling $335 million to apply on the budget. It occurs to me that if you are going to endorse the policy of selling assets of the Government for the purpose of trying to balance the budget, it will possibly lead to the sale of such things as, for instance, Grand Canyon or Yellowstone National Park, or a few acres of the Capitol Grounds.

I don't think we should endorse or be misled by a policy of selling our assets as a device for "balancing" the budget.

Now, I have some questions about that, Mr. Secretary, which I shall not burden you with by reading, but I would like to get your answer to them for the record, if you please.

Pursuant to permission of Representative Patman to submit questions in writing to the Secretary this was done and questions and answers appear on pages 418 to 422 of the hearings.

The following is Question 7 submitted by Representative Patman and the answer provided by Secretary Anderson:

7. Q. How will the Treasury's accepting the bonds and their retirement be reflected in the budget accounts?

A. Acceptance of the bonds at par and retirement of the bonds will be reflected in the budget as a receipt item (credited against the expenditures of the agency), just as the purchase of the mortgages was reflected in the budget as an expenditure item.

Confusion is the hallmark of this bill. There is good reason for this. It was steamrollered through our committee with most inadequate hearings and most inadequate consideration in an extremely brief executive session. In the hearings we only had two administration witnesses. No opportunity was afforded organizations opposing the bill to testify. Nevertheless, in the interval since, substantial opposition has developed to the bill. Who is opposed to the bill?

One of the first organizations to go on record against the bill was the Mortgage Bankers Association of America. This Association's representative appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee after having been notified at 9:15 in the morning that he could appear before the committee that day. In his oral testimony, obviously because there was no time to prepare a formal statement on such short notice, the representative of the Mortgage Bankers made four points against the bill. These are:

1. It is more costly than direct Treasury financing.
2. It circumvents the legal prohibition against Treasury borrowing in excess of 4½ percent interest.
3. There is a loss or reduction at least of congressional control over programs.
4. It does not effectively stimulate private investment. It substitutes for it.

The testimony appears on pages 83 to 91 of the Senate hearings.

Another organization to early go on record against the bill was the National Farmers Union. Included in this organization's testimony, which appears on pages 66 to 83 of the Senate hearing, is a letter from the president of the Farmers Union dated April 21, 1966, to the President of the United States. Let me read this letter:

Farmers Union,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1966.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We are very much concerned about H.R. 14544 which would increase interest rates to farmers already overburdened by excessive interest charges. The Federal Government should lead the way toward decreasing interest rates, not increasing them.

We recognize that you are seeking to avoid a tax increase but feel that a small increase in the Federal deficit or an increase in taxes is preferable to adding one-half of a percent to interest charges which are at an all-time high.

All interest rates will be affected by this proposal to turn over all Government-sponsored programs to private moneylenders. Over the years the cumulative effect in H.R. 14544 will add millions of dollars to the amount consumers of credit will pay. It will result in increased costs for all consumers since interest charges must be added to the cost of doing business and in turn passed on to the consumer. It will result in decreased farm income since the farmer cannot pass on his costs to those who purchase food and fiber.

We respectfully urge that you seek other ways to solve your budgetary problem. We must regretfully oppose this inflationary interest proposal in every way possible.

Respectfully,

TONY T. DECHANT,
President.

As a followup to his testimony in opposition to the bill, the Director of Research for the National Farmers Union, under date of May 6, 1966, has directed a letter to some Members of Congress. I place this letter in the RECORD and Members will note that the Director of Research says of the bill:

> It will tighten money in the home mortgage market. This bill is not in the interest of farmers and others who depend on credit.

MAY 6, 1966.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Farmers Union, the National Grange and the AFL–CIO are opposed to the enactment of the proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966. H.R. 14544 will bring about an increase in interest rates. It will short circuit the local banker under the Farmers Home Administration Program and turn over farmers loan paper to the National Mortgage Association which deals primarily with Eastern bankers and institutional investors.

Where interest ceilings exist it will increase the cost to the taxpayer while lining the pockets of the big city bankers. It will cause an increase in money cost on all loans not covered by ceilings. It will increase pressure to do away with or raise interest ceilings. It will tighten money in the home mortgage market. This bill is not in the interest of farmers and others who depend on credit.

The Grange is opposed to the proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966 and was dismayed to learn that no opposition witnesses were permitted to present testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee despite a telephone call and letter requesting to be heard.

The AFL–CIO says, "To add something like $3 billion of Participation Certificates in this kind of market would add to the tightening of the money market and to the high and rising trend of interest rates. The higher level of interest rates would affect all borrowers—particularly small business, farmers and consumers, who are already saddled by high interest rates. The public-at-large, therefore, would be affected indirectly by the higher level of interest rates generally in the market. And, it would be affected directly by the increased cost to the government—the difference between the low interest rates the government receives on its loans and the high interest rates it pays on the certificates."

We urge you to use your influence to bring about the defeat of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ANGUS MCDONALD,
Director of Research.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashbrook
Baring
Barrett
Blatnik
Bolton
Brademas
Brock
Broomfield
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Cameron
Carter
Cederberg
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clevenger
Colmer
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Dickinson
Diggs
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gilbert
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Latta
Leggett
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mackie
Madden
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mize
Moore
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Nix
O'Brien
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Poage
Powell
Price
Purcell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Scott
Shriver
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stalbaum
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Ullman
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Yates

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair [Mr. KEOGH], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14544, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 260 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized.

Mr. WIDNALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At the time the quorum call was instituted, I was referring to a letter I inserted in the RECORD which had been received from the director of research of the Farmers Union.

An interesting point in this letter is that the director of research of the Farmers Union includes a quote from the AFL–CIO expressing opposition to the bill. It is true the president of the AFL–CIO has publicly stated that his organization has no position on the bill. However that may be, I simply do not believe that the director of research for the National Farmers Union would attempt to mislead the Congress by misquoting an AFL–CIO memorandum. It is clear to me whether that organization has or has not taken an official position, someone in the organization at least has violent opposition to the bill.

A somewhat similar situation exists with the American Bankers Association. On pages 23 and 24 of the Senate hearings is a letter under date of April 26, to the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. This letter, which I introduce in the RECORD, expresses very grave reservations about the bill and its probable adverse impact on capital markets.

THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., April 26, 1966.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: The American Bankers Association desires to take this opportunity to express its views on H.R. 14544, a bill to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an effective and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies and for other purposes, which we understand will shortly be under consideration by your committee.

Inasmuch as H.R. 14544 has been introduced to carry out a definitive policy decision of the administration, we are not expressing any comments on such policy decision. Nevertheless, we are concerned about certain aspects of the legislation as outlined below.

H.R. 14544 provides a mechanism for financing the Treasury through the issuance of securities by the Federal National Mortgage Association representing beneficial interests or participations in certain loans made by various agencies of the Government. The Government agencies responsible for administering the loan program which will be utilized as a basis for the issuance of participation securities will retain custody, control, and administration of the obligations securing the participation certificates. FNMA will promptly pay to the agencies whose obligations form basis for the issuance of participations the full net proceeds of any sale of such beneficial interests or participations to the extent they are based upon such obligations or collections. Such proceeds will be dealt with as otherwise provided by law for sales or repayment of such obligations. In most cases, this will make the proceeds available for new loans to the extent authorized under existing programs.

In my letter to you of February 28, 1966, with reference to S. 2499, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, we expressed our concern about certain implications of that bill which we believe also applies to H.R. 14544. We desire to restate such comments, in part, as follows:

(1) The type of transactions envisaged seems to us to be simply another type of deficit financing, rather than a genuine substitution of private for public credit, but at interest rates higher than is effected in the usual manner through sales of Treasury obligations. Although no serious objection could be made to this alternative type of financing of itself, the higher interest cost that is likely to be incurred should be of concern to both taxpayers and the Congress.

(2) Debt operations of the type authorized in H.R. 14544 bypass the public debt ceiling and the interest rate ceiling on new issues of Treasury securities with maturities beyond 5 years. Our purpose here is not to defend the arbitrary manner in which these limitations can impinge on budget spending and Treasury debt management. But we do believe strongly that the issue of our relaxation or elimination of these limitations should be confronted directly in the Con-

> gress and not bypassed through alternative methods of financing.
>
> In addition, we are concerned with the impact of the implementation of the program contemplated under H.R. 14544 and the demands it will place on the money and capital markets at a time when private demands for funds are active and strong. From the standpoint of timing, such a program could be better implemented at a time when the banking system and long-term investors are actively seeking earning assets because of a limited availability of such in the private sector. The proposed Government agency financing may very well have a considerable rate impact in the market. So long as economic conditions continue expansive and private demands for funds are heavy, the agency financing will exert upward pressure on interest rates. This pressure could be felt in the market for direct Treasury obligations and rate adjustments could take place in that sector. The sheer magnitude of the administration's program—$3.3 billion in this fiscal year and $4.7 billion next year—raises the question as to whether all of the Government agency funds can be raised in this time interval.
>
> The Government agencies that have been regular borrowers in the market for many years (such as Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal home loan banks, Federal land banks, FNMA, etc.) have increased their borrowing demands both in terms of magnitude and frequency of borrowing. This borrowing has already become more expensive in relation to direct Treasury obligations and the spread in rates has widened as a consequence. The rate spread could widen further as enlarged Government agency borrowing reaches the market, particularly if this increases the frequency of borrowing operations. On some recent occasions, it has appeared that the Government agencies were competing among themselves for funds and have had to pay a higher rate in the market because of this.
>
> Section 2(b) of H.R. 14544 amends section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act by giving FNMA authority to issue securities under the new program "notwithstanding any other provision of law." We believe it is essential that the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to issue securities as contemplated under H.R. 14544 be made subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in order that such transactions be handled with utmost care so as not to disturb market financial processes more than is absolutely necessary.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> CHARLES E. WALKER.

A couple of days later, a telegram came to the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee from the American Bankers Association. This is found on page 53 of the Senate hearing. It reads:

> Supplementing and clarifying my letter to you of April 26 the American Bankers Association believes that H.R. 14544 with proposed amendments offers adequate congressional safeguards for use of the authority, and we therefore interpose no objection to the passage of the bill.

It is interesting that both the AFL–CIO and the American Bankers Association, in part, contradict themselves in their positions on this bill. This strange behavior seems to suggest the question, "Was pressure applied?"

The legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in a letter dated May 13, 1966, records the position of his organization against this bill. The concluding paragraph states:

> We therefore believe that H.R. 14544 should be defeated or recommitted to permit comprehensive analysis of federal financing procedures by the appropriate committees of the Congress, at which time the views of private organizations and expert opinion in this area could be presented for consideration.

I place this letter in the RECORD:

> AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
> *Washington, D.C., May 13, 1966.*
>
> The Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
> *U.S. House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: This is to record the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation with respect to the Participation Sales Act, H.R. 14544.
>
> The increasing use of a variety of means to provide funds for the expenditures of the federal government is making it more and more difficult to understand the fiscal and budgetary status of the federal government. A major expansion in the type of financing proposed by H.R. 14544 would still further complicate efforts to understand the budgetary situation so far as the general public is concerned.
>
> It appears to us that the widespread use of "participation" certificates will involve a higher rate of interest on such obligations than the rate of interest on Treasury issues, and that this will ultimately be reflected in higher interest rates, either paid by taxpayers, or paid by the beneficiaries of the various programs financed with participation certificates, or both.
>
> The major effects of the bill seem to be that federal expenditures will appear to be less than they actually are, the deficit will appear to be less than it actually is, and the periodic review and control of the Congress with respect to the statutory debt limit will be eliminated.
>
> We do not pretend to understand the full implications of the procedures proposed in H.R. 14544. But they obviously represent a major departure, at least in terms of magnitude, from the financing practices of the federal government in the past. It does not seem to us that the long-run implications are adequately understood. We believe there is need for a comprehensive review by the appropriate committees of the Congress and by private agencies and organizations of the whole question of the manner in which federal loan programs are to be financed, before embarking on a major revision of such financing procedures.
>
> We therefore believe that H.R. 14544 should be defeated or recommitted to permit comprehensive analysis of federal financing procedures by the appropriate committees of the Congress, at which time the views of private organizations and expert opinion in this area could be presented for consideration.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JOHN C. LYNN,
> *Legislative Director.*
>
> P.S.—Similar letters have been sent to Congressmen MILLS, MAHON, LAIRD, ARENDS, FORD, BYRNES, BOW, POAGE, BELCHER, COOLEY, and BOLLING.

The president of the National Association of Home Builders is against this bill. In a letter under date of May 9, to me, the president of the National Association of Home Builders states:

> I believe this is the wrong time and wrong bill to carry out an otherwise worthy objective. As you know, the mortgage market currently is in a chaotic state.
>
> Approval of this bill will introduce an additional upsetting factor that will complicate and confuse further the overall situation.
>
> Such sales that would be permitted by the measure will compete for the rapidly dwindling available supply of long-term residential financing.

> NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
> HOME BUILDERS,
> *Washington, D.C., May 9, 1966.*
>
> The Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: On behalf of the National Association of Home Builders, I wish to make these comments concerning H.R. 14544, the proposed "Participation Sales Act of 1966", now before the Congress.
>
> This bill would permit the Federal National Mortgage Association as trustee to sell certificates of participation in pools of assets set aside by certain Government agencies. Asset sales in fiscal year 1967 are expected to include sales of participation in assets of the Farmers Home Administration, the Office of Education, the Community Facilities Administration in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Small Business Administration. As a result of the proposed participation sales, the volume of direct Federal loans outstanding would decline from $33.3 billion to $31.5 billion on June 30, 1967.
>
> The NAHB Board of Directors has not had an opportunity to take a formal position on H.R. 14544. As a general principle, we would favor the objective of the bill—to maximize the use of private credit to the greatest extent possible. The immediate realization of assets held by the Federal Government and which ordinarily become receipts over a period of years facilitates sound financing for worthwhile programs with a minimum of Federal participation.
>
> However, I believe this is the wrong time and wrong bill to carry out an otherwise worthy objective. As you know, the mortgage market currently is in a chaotic state.
>
> Approval of this bill will introduce an additional upsetting factor that will complicate and confuse further the overall situation.
>
> Such sales that would be permitted by the measure will compete for the rapidly dwindling available supply of long-term residential financing.
>
> FNMA experience indicates that participation certificates will, in all likelihood, bear interest rates higher than obligations of the United States having comparable maturities.
>
> Sales of such participations at a higher interest rate than direct Treasury borrowing could result, therefore, in a further short-term rise in short-term interest rates. This would only add to the distress of the present condition in the home mortgage market.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LARRY BLACKMON, *President.*

Americans for Democratic Action is another organization opposed to the bill. The organization has sent a fact sheet to some Members of Congress detailing their opposition to the bill. One of the 10 points of their opposition to the bill states in part:

> To add something like $3 billion of participation certificates in this kind of market would add to the tightening of the money market and to the high and rising trend of interest rates. The higher level of interest rates would affect all borrowers—particularly small business, farmers and consumers, who are already saddled by high interest rates.

I place the fact sheet of this organization in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of this House.

Arguments Against Participation Sales Act of 1966

1. The bill would permit the sale to the public of participation certificates—shares in loans by the federal government, such as Export-Import Bank, Farmers Home Administration, college housing and public facilities loans. Sales to the public of these participation certificates, backed by a pooling of government loan paper, would be through FNMA to financial underwriters, at the interest rates in the market. The federal government would continue to hold the assets—the loan paper. The public investor would buy the certificate—a share in the pool of assets. The federal government would continue to receive the interest payments (usually at low interest rates) on the loans. And the government would pay the interest (at the higher interest rates of the market place) on the participation certificates. The cost to the government would be the difference between the low-interest payments it would receive and the high-interest it would pay.

2. This technique is not new. Some individual government agencies have sold such participation certificates in the past few years, backed by the loan paper of the agency. This bill would: 1) expand this program to all forms of government loan paper, as far as can be seen, and 2) would permit the government to sell certificates in large blocks, backed by a pooling of the loan paper of different agencies.

3. The federal budget estimates is that $2.6 billion of participation certificates would be sold in fiscal 1966 and $4.2 billion in fiscal 1967. However, under existing legislation only a part of these quotas can be fulfilled. It is claimed that the full-scale expansion of this program is necessary to meet these quotas—to sell about $350 million of additional certificates before June 30, 1966 and about $2.9 billion of additional certificates in fiscal 1967, more than would be permitted under existing legislation. Actually, through full-scale expansion of the program, this bill would permit the sale of much greater amounts of participation certificates than indicated by these official estimates; the federal government holds about $33 billion of direct loans outstanding.

4. It is claimed that this technique substitutes private credit for public credit. This is a specious argument. There is no sale of government assets under this program. The federal government continues to hold and service the loan paper and to receive interest payments on those loans. All the government does is to raise additional money—which does not show up in the budget—by selling participation certificates (shares in the loans without a transfer of ownership); and the federal government pays the interest on these participation certificates.

5. This technique is a way of getting around the statutory 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term Treasury securities. Under existing legislation, the Treasury cannot float long-term securities at an interest rate above 4¼ percent. However, there is no interest rate ceiling on participation certificates and the government can sell these certificates at interest rates of 5 percent, 5½ percent, 6 percent or more.

6. Interest rates in the market are now very high—higher than in a generation or more. As a result, interest rates on these participation certificates are also very high. Not only is the money market now tight and interest rates very high, but the outlook in the next several months, at least, is for interest rates in the market to move up to even higher levels.

7. To add something like $3 billion of participation certificates in this kind of market would add to the tightening of the money market and to the high and rising trend of interest rates. The higher level of interest rates would affect all borrowers—particularly small business, farmers and consumers, who are already saddled by high interest rates. The public-at-large, therefore, would be affected indirectly by the higher level of interest rates generally in the market. And, it would be affected directly by the increased cost to the government—the difference between the low interest rates the government receives on its loans and the high interest rates its pays on the certificates.

8. Moreover, interest rates on participation certificates, in the coming months, could well move up from a high of 5½ percent in mid-March to a high of 6 percent or more in the coming months. Compare such interest rates on participation certificates—within a range of 5 to 5½ to 6 percent—with the statutory low interest rates on federal direct loans, under federal programs that are aimed at serving the national interest and meeting socially-desirable objectives. Interest rates on such programs are as low as 2 percent on REA loans and 3 percent on college housing loans. I think it is a fair assumption that, on the average, the statutory interest rate on government-guaranteed loans is something like 3 percent to 3½ percent—compared with interest rates on participation certificates at present and in the near future of about 5–5½–6 percent or, perhaps even more. At present, there is a spread of about 2 or 2½ points and this spread is rising.

9. Moreover, the 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term Treasury securities and the statutory low interest rates on direct loans are facing a growing threat. They are already threatened by the tight money and very high interest rates in the market at present. They are further and more directly threatened by the widening spread between the low statutory rates and the interest rates on participation certificates. The entire structure of low-interest rates on direct government loan programs is placed in jeopardy.

10. In addition, operation of the program would tend to tighten an already tight money market and push up interest rates which are already high—affecting all people and businesses that have to borrow money from the banks and other financial institutions.

The recurring theme throughout all of these organization positions in opposition to the bill is that sale of participation certificates in the volume contemplated by the bill will adversely affect an already extremely tight money market and drive interest rates higher.

In short, this is a high interest rate bill. Those who are for high interest rates should support it. Those who are against high interest rates should vote against the bill.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, what is in a name? I ask this because when the administration proposed the sale of participations bill they kept saying that we would be replacing public credit with private credit. Certainly this sounds like an admirable undertaking. But is that what is being done? And will the administration's bill achieve the goals of such an undertaking? The answer to these questions is emphatically "No."

First of all, there is no real "sale" under this bill. That is, the purchaser does not acquire possession of anything and likewise he does not have to assume any risk. The pooled assets are not sold, they are merely refinanced in a more costly way because Fannie Mae cannot borrow as cheaply as the U.S. Treasury. The participation sales bill accomplishes a "sale" by legislative definition only. Therefore, this bill does not substitute private for public credit. The U.S. Government still maintains ownership and assumes the risk of default.

When a harried husband who has overextended himself by buying on credit finds that his monthly payments take up the greater part of his monthly paycheck he is often tempted to "pool" his bills with another loan company and make a so-called one easy payment each month. Often he does not realize that his one easy payment will, of course, cost him more than the many he had before because the new loan company adds their interest charge on top of all the rest. Many of us feel that this is a cheap trick which loan companies play on unsuspecting citizens. However, we now find ourselves in a position where our own Government is playing the same cheap trick on its citizens. In H.R. 14544 the Government is saying we will sell some of our outstanding loans and with the money received we can cut down on the deficit for this year. Of course, what the administration fails to point out is that, like the harried husband, what we wind up with is a greater deficit for the future because we must add the high interest cost of selling the participations to the repayments.

The financing that will be permitted under this bill will cost the taxpayer an additional $5 million a year on each $1 billion of participations sold. Thus, in the event $4.2 billion of participations are sold, there will be a cost to the taxpayer of $21 million per year. If the average maturity for participations is 10 years, the taxpayer will have to pay $200 million in extra interest charges. Is this fiscal restraint? Is this sound fiscal responsibility? The answer to these questions, Mr. Chairman, would seem obvious.

The family who has fallen for the one easy payment deception then feels, for a while at any rate, free from debt. Restraint is thrown to the wind and they begin their time payment buying all over again. This, Mr. Chairman, is exactly the effect this bill has already had on the Congress of the United States. We have seen in the past few months bill after bill which has authorized and appropriated moneys in excess of the President's recommendations and budget requests. There is no doubt in my mind but that the Congress has felt free to appropriate greater amounts of money due to the fact that the estimated deficit is only $1.8 billion. How many of us have stopped to reflect that the deficit this year is actually $6 billion? Only by anticipating the sale of these participations has the administration been able to present such a relatively small deficit figure. If we knew that the real deficit was $6 billion instead of $1.8 billion, would we be so quick to vote in extra sums of money for a variety of new and untried Federal programs? I think not, Mr. Chairman, I think not. This legislation invites a spending spree, not only this year, but in the years to come.

The participation sales program is a device to fool the public on budget expenditures. It is a costly delusion.

Mr. Chairman, there is another area of delusion in this legislation. The Treasury Department, through Mr. Joseph Barr, said that the cost of refinancing these loans is relatively unimportant, since the main aim of the bill "is to get the Government out of the banking business."

Implicit in this argument is the assumption that as sales of participations continue, the Government's portfolio of direct loans will decline commensurately. However, this is subject to question.

Mr. Barr himself pointed out that direct loans eligible to be pooled, currently at $33 billion, would increase to $39 billion by the end of the year.

He further stated:

> It would not be hard for me to imagine that within 2 years the total will go over $50 billion, and within a decade, over $100 billion.

He emphasized that the Government would continue its multisided direct lending program and also that as new lending programs are conceived or invented, these loans also could be made eligible for later pooling.

To "get the Government out of the banking business," as the Treasury says this bill would do, it would necessarily be assumed that the rate of sales of participations each year would increase faster than would the rate of buildup in new direct loans.

This would presuppose, using Mr. Barr's own estimates, that loans eligible for pooling would increase by more than 50 percent within the next 2 years, $50 billion over $33 billion, an increase of $17 billion.

In short, Mr. Chairman, it would appear, assuming the Under Secretary's estimates are reasonably correct, the Government will be much more in the banking business than it is today, and rather than eliminating one form of banking business, it will have in fact two forms.

Today's—May 16—issue of the Weekly Bond Buyer has an article by John Gerrity on the Sales Participation Act that contains some excellent points. Because of its importance I shall read it in full.

Washington Perspective: Involving the Government Deeper in the Banking Business

(By John Gerrity)

Washington.—Though few members of the House and Senate are fully aware of what they are doing, Congress this week is expected to write an entirely new chapter in American public finance by approving the Administration's scheme to sell $8 billion of Government "assets" this fiscal year and next.

In giving its approval to the Sales Participation Act of 1966—the legislative title of the bill to permit the substitution of private for public credit—Congress will also unwittingly write out of existence a substantial portion of its control over public spending and the structure of the Federal budget.

On its face, the legislation appears to be harmless enough—even praiseworthy.

It provides for the pooling of direct Government loans to farmers, small businessmen, colleges or veterans, for example, with the Federal National Mortgage Association which, acting as trustee, will issue a new kind of Government paper called "participations" in the beneficial interest of such pools of loans.

These participations, to be sold directly in the capital markets by Fannie Mae, will carry the going market rate of interest—or in today's terms, something in the range of 5.5 per cent—and will mature in between six and 10 years, with the average maturity of each offering about seven years.

RETURNS TO TREASURY

Proceeds from the sales of these participations to private investors will be returned ultimately to the U.S. Treasury to be credited proportionately to the lending authorization of each of the individual agencies that shared in the pooling of the loans.

While the participations will not carry specifically the "full faith and credit" of the Government, they are in effect guaranteed Government securities, since the legislation gives the Association power to make "indefinite and unlimited" draws on the Treasury to ensure payment of principle and interest.

Because many of the loans that will become part of the future pools were made at below-market rates—some for as little as 3 per cent—the new law provides that Congress will appropriate whatever amounts are necessary to make up the rate differential of pooled loans and the market rate required to make the Fannie Mae participations attractive to investors.

Because the proceeds of participations sales would go into general Treasury funds, the budgetary impact is to reduce the size of the Federal deficit in both years, and for so long as the new sales program is continued.

In short, if the Administration were to fail to reach its target of $3.3 billion in sales in fiscal 1966 and $4.7 billion in 1967, the deficits would be $8.9 billion and $6.5 billion, rather than $5.6 billion and $1.8 billion, respectively, as currently anticipated.

Expressed another way, the sale of participations this year and next is expected to produce $8 billion, which the Administration would otherwise have to raise either by increased Treasury borrowings of a like amount, or by increasing taxes to produce the same amount.

Theoretically, the new law is merely an extension of a "sale of assets" program first launched by the Eisenhower Administration in 1960, and the bills approved in 1964 and last year permitting Fannie Mae to sell participations in Veterans Administration housing loans—so its backers claim.

MORE THAN EXTENSION

But analysis of the fine print of the new law, coupled with facts disclosed in testimony before the House Rules Committee clearly established that the new program is much more than a "mere extension" of earlier programs and that it differs substantially from anything attempted during the Eisenhower tenure.

In fiscal 1960, the Treasury authorized a Fannie Mae swap of $311 million of low-interest mortgages it held for $316 million of non-marketable Treasury bonds held by the public.

This was an actual sale of assets. The mortgages were sold on a competitive bid basis and paid for by bonds held by investors. Actual title to the mortgages passed to the purchasers. Proceeds of the deal were reflected in the budget as receipts.

The bonds acquired by Fannie Mae in the swap were surrendered to the Treasury for cancellation. After taking into account differing maturities, the non-marketability of the bonds acquired in the swap, the discount cost to the Treasury was estimated to be about $5 million.

But the new program, when labeled a "sale of assets" program, is a fiction. The buyers of participations do not acquire title to the assets pooled. Nor do they even acquire a pro rata interest in those pooled assets. All they acquire is the right to have investments in participations repaid, with interest at the rate stated on the participation certificate.

In short, this is a refinancing scheme, not a sale of assets plan. As a matter of fact, since many of the loans to be pooled may have maturities upward from 20 years and since the average maturity of participations is to be seven years, the identical loans can be repooled and repooled to back repeated offering of new participations.

That there is in fact no actual sale of assets is amply demonstrated in this brief exchange between Treasury Undersecretary Joseph Barr and Rep. Del Clawson, Republican, of California, during hearings before the House Rules Committee:

Mr. Clawson. Now I would like to know at this point about the ownership of this instrument and is there actually a passing of title to the private investor in the field?

Mr. Barr. Title does not pass to the private investor. The beneficial interest.

Mr. Clawson. What is the sale concept?

Mr. Barr. He is purchasing a beneficial interest in a pool of assets.

Mr. Clawson. Without passage of title?

Mr. Barr. That is correct.

Mr. Clawson. That is a beneficial interest in what, the FNMA or their power to borrow from the Treasury or what?

Mr. Barr. It is a beneficial interest in a group of assets. It might be college housing, might be mortgages, Small Business Administration loans. It is a pool of assets guaranteed by the agency and backed up by the appropriation of Congress.

Mr. Clawson. And backed up by the Treasury, of course, eventually, is it not?

Mr. Barr. Backed up in the ultimate by the Congress, sir. The Treasury is nothing but the authority of Congress.

Mr. Clawson. The investor would interpret that the Federal Government is backing this?

Mr. Barr. That is correct.

It is the Administration's belief, according to Mr. Barr, that the interest rate differential between the average rates of pooled loans and the rate to be given to participations will be between "one-fourth and three-eighths of 1 per cent"—and that the Government subsidy on all participation sales will be relatively slight.

This belief is subject to question. The House Banking and Currency Committee report on the bill (H.R. 14544) suggested that the spread may usually be a 0.5 per cent and frequently more. It notes that last February the Export-Import Bank sold $360 million in participations at a 5.5 per cent rate. Last March 16, Fannie Mae sold $41 million of participations at 5.5 per cent for intermediate maturities.

The Treasury does not contest the assertion that financing through the sale of participations will be more costly than direct Treasury borrowings. But it does challenge opponents' estimates as to how much more costly it will be.

In any case, the Treasury, through Mr. Barr, says the added cost is relatively unimportant, since the main aim of the bill "is to get the Government out of the banking business."

Implicit in this argument is the assumption that as sales of participations continue, the Government's portfolio of direct loans will decline commensurately. This, too, is subject to question.

Mr. Barr pointed out that direct loans eligible to be pooled, currently at $33 billion, would increase to $39 billion by the end of the year.

He further stated that "it would not be hard for me to imagine that within two years the total will go over $50 billion, and within a decade, over $100 billion."

He emphasized that the Government would continue its multi-sided direct lending program and also that as new lending programs are conceived or invented, these loans also could be made eligible for later pooling.

To "get the Government out of the banking business," therefore it would necessarily be assumed that the rate of sales of participations each year would increase faster than would the rate of build-up in new direct loans.

This would presuppose, using Mr. Barr's own estimates, that loans eligible for pooling would increase by more than 50 per cent within the next two years, $50 billion over $33 billion, an increase of $17 billion.

In short, it would appear, assuming the Undersecretary's estimates are reasonably correct, the Government will be much more in the banking business than it is today, and rather than eliminating one form of banking business, it will have in fact two forms.

It is also the Treasury's argument that neither the volume of sales of participations nor the costs to the Government to refinance previous loans "will ever get out of hand" since "Congress through the Appropriations Committee, will remain permanently in control of the program."

The legislation as it goes to the House floor today (it has already been passed by the Senate) spells out this Congressional control in this way. It provides that whenever Fannie Mae has prepared a package of loans against which to offer its participations, this package or pool must be approved by the Appropriations Committee.

This is correct—as far as it goes. Committee approval, however, will extend only to the physical structure of the pool. That is, to approval of the loans making up any given pool.

No committee of Congress is sufficiently prescient to guess accurately in advance what rate will have to be placed on the participation certificates so that they can be sold. Therefore, as the bill states, approval of the structure of the pool will carry with it automatic approval of whatever dollar amount may be required to make up the rate differential—even though Congress won't know what the amount will be.

A pool could be submitted to the committee as much as six months or a year before participations are actually sold against it. In the interval, between approval and actual sale of participation rates could rise by as much as a quarter or one-third of a point.

The additional cost would make no difference. The appropriation to finance the rate subsidy is automatic, and congress has no recourse or power of recall of its approval.

Mr. Barr conceded as much when he told the Rules Committee last week that the amount to be fixed "would have to be indefinite," although he supposed the committee could, if it chose, put some ceiling on the maximum rate to be paid on participations.

The legislation, however, contains no specific provision to support Mr. Barr's supposition.

When the White House first sent its plan for participations sales to Congress, it proposed that loans made under 100 different programs, including foreign aid loans, some of which are 40-year loans at ¾ per cent, could be eligible for pooling. It estimated that the total amount of direct loans that could be switched over to private investors, via the participations route, was $33.1 billion.

However, during Senate floor debate on the bill, when it was discovered that not only foreign aid but Commodity Credit Corporation loans to the British Government could be pooled, the Treasury hastily agreed to accept floor amendments stripping these types of loans from the eligibility list.

As the legislation stands today, here are the agencies, their loan programs and amounts that will be eligible—more than sufficient to meet the requirements of fiscal years 1966 and 1967:

	In millions of dollars
Agricultural Department, Farmers Home Administration	2,054
Office of Education, Academic Facilities Loans	66
Department of Housing and Urban Development	
FNMA	1,427
Federal Housing Administration	490
College Housing Loans	2,170
Public Facility Loans	206
Public Housing Loans	59
Housing for Elderly Loans	151
Urban Renewal Loans	214
Public Works Planning Advances	63
Veterans Adminisration, Direct and Vendee Loans	868
Small Business Administration	1,072
Export-Import Bank	2,091
Total	10,971

These totals, of course, are subject to upward changes. The Senate approved only the stated agencies and the specific programs, but it placed no ceiling on the dollar amount of any loan program now eligible.

CASE IN POINT

The Eximbank is a good case in point. Eligible for pooling now—but only now—are $2,097 million of Eximbank loans. Since the bank can lend up to its paid in capital of $1 billion, its surplus of $1 billion and its "draw on the Treasury" of $6 billion, it could make an additional $6 billion in export-import loans which, in turn, would become eligible for pooling.

There is considerable confusion remaining as to whether any given agency that has reduced its loan portfolio, say by $500 million, by transferring that amount of loans to a Fannie May pool, can increase its direct loans by the same amount—without any further authorization from Congress.

The question is—as agencies sell portions of their existing loan portfolios, can they turn around and lend to other borrowers whatever they realize from their proportionate sale of participations?

The answer is still vague. The best that the Senate was able to arrive at is that any agency's future lending plans will depend on its individual charter. Since ultimately 100 loan programs may be declared eligible for pooling, these varying charter provisions will only add to the bewilderment as to what can or cannot be done with the proceeds from the sale of participations.

NO MORE DEFICITS

But this much is certain. With passage of the Participations Sales Act, there never need be another Federal deficit in the administrative budget.

If, for example, President Johnson has chosen to send to Congress a balanced budget for fiscal 1967, rather than one calling for a deficit of $1.8 billion, all that he would have had to do would have been to add $1.8 billion to his proposed "sale of assets."

In brief, under this legislation any future President can tailor his deficit—or his surplus—to whatever the fashion of the times demands. Obligations incurred by Fannie Mae do not appear in the budget as additions to the overall Federal debt, since they are agency securities, not "full faith and credit" obligations of the Government.

Much of Congressional confusion over what may be done in budget rigging in the future doubtless stems from the speed with which the measure has been jammed through committees and floors of both houses.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee "deliberated" for two days—two hours one day, one hour the second, and then reported the bill out favorably.

DOES BETTER

The House Banking and Currency Committee did even better. The Committee convened a half hour after printed copies of the Administration's bills were handed to Committee members. It met for three hours, hearing only Mr. Barr and Budget Bureau Director Charles Schultze, and then voted the bill favorably. Only during the Rules Committee's hearings was any other than favorable testimony taken.

Still another element of confusion—especially for Democratic members of both houses—is a quotation that keeps cropping up. Made during Congressional debate over the sale of assets proposed by the Eisenhower Administration, it is:

". . . The purpose of this proposed bill is to achieve a balanced budget by selling off capital assets of the Federal Government. Such a balance would be fictitious and fiscally impossible. . . ."

Author of this quotation is the former Majority Leader of the Senate who, as President of the United States, is today chief sponsor of the current legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I believe that one of the sobering aspects of this legislation is to consider the alternative to what we propose to do. I believe that this has been fairly clearly delineated by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. If we believe in the support of the programs for which these loans have been used; that is, to help to foster a normal economy and to extend credit to those people who have, because of their situation, been denied credit, we either have to support the bill or face some harsh alternatives.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we would want to take the first alternative, which is to just stop these programs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those of us who want to go back and explain to the small businessmen, to the veterans, and to the homeowners, the college people and the farmers, why it is that we are not able to extend to them these programs, we may take that route. However, if we are going to carry on the program, then how are we going to do it? We could do this by raising taxes, but if we did this, we would have to freeze the programs for at least a year and take on the onus of raising the taxes. And, what would we do with the tax money? As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] indicated, we would freeze that tax money increasing the heavy portfolio of these loans. I do not believe we want to do that.

Or, Mr. Chairman, we could take the third route, which would be to go out and borrow the money on the full faith and credit of the United States. Borrow that money for what purpose? To freeze it into a building of this portfolio and then have the same impact on the same money market that we are talking about in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, let us make this clear. What are we talking about in this bill? Let us not be confused. This is an extension of an existing program. The thing that amazes me is this: If this program is so bad, why have we not heard about the $3.3 billion of sales under participations which have already gone on since 1962?

If it is so bad, why has there not been some reaction in these 3 years in which those $3.3 billion of participations have been sold in the market?

Under this bill what is proposed to be done is that we extend this program by bringing in five agencies, for a total of $2.8 billion of participations into a program that has already been tried and proven by those $3.3 billion of sales which have already been made.

Mr. Chairman, if we are just talking about an ongoing program, why this terrific amount of reaction?

Well I can see only several different answers to that. The first and obvious one, pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], it is true if we take the alternative to raising taxes or raising the money by the credit of the United States, this is a rather onerous job to be assumed by the party who has the responsibility of administration.

If on the other hand we utilize this device, we are going to be able to go into the same market, mind you, the same market we go in on credit and we will be able to go into this market and get money which will reduce the loan portfolio and allow good programs to proceed.

It seems to me that makes good sound sense.

What effect will this have on that market? I can see no effect whatsoever but a neutral effect. The question is, if you assume we are going to go ahead and fund these programs, who is going to get to the market? Is it going to be the Treasury with Treasury bills or is it going to be FNMA with the participations?

So you are going to the same money market for the same purpose of raising this money. The difference is—in the one instance we continue to build a portfolio and remain a permanent banker and in the other we reduce the portfolio and we follow the policy of bringing private credit in where public credit now stands.

It seems to me that is the purpose that the Government has been following for a long, long time and one that has been espoused by both sides of the aisle.

So it seems to me we should continue to do this.

Now it will be said by some that this is a gimmick or that it is gimmickry. Wherein lies the gimmickry? It seems to me pretty clear as a lawyer that we have something to sell. Take this instance—suppose you are a landlord and you have a lease on a large apartment house. Now have you ever heard of a device of assigning the rents and profits that you have under the lease? Do you give up the lease when you do that? No—because you have to keep the burdens of the lease to yourself. But when you separate the rights and the income out of that, it is a transferable commodity which can bring you money or it can be something which you provide as collateral to get cash.

Now we are here asking ourselves this basic question as we would ask ourselves as an individual. We have a need of funds. We have credit on the one hand and we have assets on the other. We ask ourselves the question. Shall we go to the money market with our asset and liquidate it and plow it into reuse? Or shall we go with our credit and build up further our asset portfolio. It is as simple as that.

This legislation suggests where we stand today. The intelligent thing is to reduce our assets.

From the time that this country began, we had only one budget. That budget gives you no credit for any assets that you have bought or acquired. It is carried on the books as a debt until an asset is liquidated and then it is income. But you get no credit so far as the net wealth of the United States is concerned. I challenge any of you to tell me what it is. Because we do not keep books that way. It seems to me what we have devised here is a sensible and a longtime known principle under the legal market conditions of commercial paper and various negotiable instruments, a manner in which we can raise money for our needs and make a choice—a sensible choice—to say, What shall we do—increase our debt or reduce our assets? You do it all the time, gentlemen, if you are in any kind of business yourself.

All we are doing is trying to say to the Government, Why do we not operate on the same basic principle? We have assets. Why should we increase the debt?

The way we keep our books on this income-expense method has clogged the budget with these asset holdings which increase the debt.

There is one aspect of this legislation that I would like to call attention to, especially to the Republican Members.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. In the statement that was signed by all the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1963, commencing with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] this statement is made—there was an issue of increasing the national debt. The minority members were arguing against it because we should instead sell off some of the assets and not have to increase the national debt.

The administration also can always reduce its borrowing requirements by additional sales of marketable Government assets. This provides the Treasury with another cushion.

For example, when the Secretary of the Treasury was before the committee on February 27, we suggested it was incumbent upon the administration to show good faith before coming to the Congress for an additional increase in borrowing authority.

We point out that the Government held about $30 billion in obligations, many of which were readily marketable. In fact, there was a very good market for many of these loans. Instead of making an offer of these loans to private lenders, the administration was then acting on the supposition that the Congress would automatically accede to a request for an increase in the borrowing authority. In other words, we were being blamed for voting against increasing the national debt because we did not do exactly what we propose to do today.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WELTNER. In view of the statement of the distinguished chairman of our committee citing previous urgings by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to sell these securities and hence derive funds for carrying on governmental purposes, I wonder if the gentleman in the well could comment on the charge that this is really not a sale. If one goes by the Blackstone principles of what might constitute a sale—and, as I recall that from law school days, you had to have some consideration; it could be a peppercorn, a horse, a hog, or a robe, I believe the old Blackstonian concept was—this would not be a sale.

But I ask the gentleman if the beneficial ownership of security documents is disposed of in a binding transaction that carries with it the effect of guarantee of the U.S. Government, is that not for all intents and purposes in modern day financial practices safe?

Mr. HANNA. In my opinion it is, and I think the gentleman makes a very salient point, because I believe we are already well versed in the difference between equitable ownership and legal ownership. I wish I had a card that said I had legal ownership in my automobile. I have equitable ownership, and because I had equitable ownership I was able to go to the sheriff and say that my car had been stolen. So I must have had some rights in it.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WELTNER. Would the gentleman agree that the best way to serve the people of this country in converting these assets into money which can be devoted to programs determined by the Congress would be the most efficient and productive way of disposing of them, even though it does not jibe with some Blackstonian concept of law?

Mr. HANNA. I hope we will not be ruled by the dead hand of Blackstone. I would rather hope that we would take on the fine flexible concepts that have been developed in the commercial world.

Mr. WELTNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman has in the course of the debate suggested that the proposal was a way to reduce and liquidate assets, if I am correct in refreshing my recollection. Will the gentleman point out to the House where in the bill it states that any of these assets will be liquidated or where it states that anything will be sold?

Mr. HANNA. If the gentleman follows the concept of the participation pool, he will find that there has been a division that is constantly being made in the business world between the burdens of a contract and the benefits of a contract. Once that division has been made—and it is often made—the benefits of the contract are transferred in trust to FNMA. It then creates a pool arrangement and a dollar volume, which has as its prime interest payments on loans. Those are the benefits of the contracts.

Then there is made a division of that interest in a certificate, which is then transferred as an equitable interest to a buyer, and whether you call it an assignment, a transfer, or a sale, the gentleman from Georgia is entirely correct. It is not what you call it; it is how effective it is. It transfers that beneficial interest to the person who holds that piece of paper, and it is just as true that if I assigned the certificate of my insurance company to the fellow who holds the mortgage on my house—you may not think I have transferred very much to him—but if my house burns down, I know who gets the money out of the insurance. That is something that is beneficial.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. First, I wish to say to the gentleman from California that he has not answered my question. I asked him where in the bill does it say that these assets will be liquidated or sold?

But what we are talking about is the sale of participation certificates, where ownership of these bonds, or the loans, will remain in the name of the U.S. Government; is that not correct?

Mr. HANNA. I have pointed out to the gentleman that the distinction is made as to the holding of legal title, with the burdens of the particular document we hold, which is a mortgage. There is a separation. The benefits are the payments, and the thing which is liquidated is the payment part of the contract. There has been a long-time distinction in the business world between the benefits and burdens.

I can assure the gentleman that these transfers have been going on for a long time. As a matter of fact, on the transfer of single loans or portion of single loans, there have been many instances, for instance, where the Farmers Home Administration has transferred, supposedly, the loan, but has withheld the responsibility of servicing the same loan sold.

I assure the gentleman, it is not a matter of semantics. We are taking equitable interests, assigning them, setting them up, transferring them. Call it anything, but it is a commercial transaction, dignified and accepted in the commercial market.

I would like to make another point, then, if I may. It seems to me we have raised the question here as to the impact of this transaction upon the market. There has been some suggestion that this will have a bad affect upon the mortgage market. I ask the gentleman to keep his eyes on this picture.

FNMA is the agency which will handle various participating certificates. FNMA is the public agency which is responsible for keeping some kind of balance in the mortgage market. Right now FNMA is in the mortgage market as a buyer, because money is short in the mortgage market.

At the same time, we have had successful sales of participation arrangements, and FNMA is the seller. Why is that? It is because the participation certificate goes to a different part of the money market than does the mortgages. It is precisely for this reason that we ought to have the flexibility of having both participation by certificate and the right to sell the full mortgages.

Mr. MILLS pointed this out very eloquently. I heartily endorse his statements, because what we have done here is to provide this instrument, which allows us to go into the money market, where there is money flow. The money which is now going into expansion of the industrial and commercial capabilities, where there is some inflation.

There is no inflation in the mortgage market right now. Quite the contrary. But these instruments do not go there. They go where the money is in too loose a supply. As a matter of fact, it will have a deflationary influence, if these sales are handled correctly.

I suggest we support the legislation.

This legislation is directed toward the goal of substituting private credit for public credit. A continuing objective of the Congress and the administrations of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson. In order to understand the thrust of this measure and the sense of that objective, we might find it helpful to look back at the underlying rationale for having Federal credit programs in the first place. Today there are approximately 100 different Federal programs where the Government assumes all or part of the credit risk. These Federal credit programs have successfully enabled sizable groups of our citizens to share in economic progress and these programs authorized by Congress have had a significant contribution to the vital task of community development, education, health, development of resources and other social goals. These programs have resulted in $100 billion in guarantees and $33 billion in loan assets.

There are many types of borrowers who, in the judgment of Congress, carry on activities which are of social and economic importance to our system who are unable to establish credit standings. Perhaps it is because of their inexperience, as in some new small business, or their remoteness from credit sources, such as on the farms. Sometimes it is because of the attitudes and behaviors of lenders as it was in the instance of the homeowner purchase situation some 30 years ago. In each of these cases, the Government has adopted programs to encourage intrusion into these areas of some of the credit resources of our great economy, and in taking that lead the Government also picked up a part of the load and became, in a sense, a mix of pioneer banker and subsidizer—one who went out and trusted the strength of these borrowers and their ability to meet, on their own, the obligations of debt.

Throughout, the basic purpose of the Federal loan program has not been to build up a large portfolio of financial assets. We did not want to take on the role as full-time banker, but to assume a sufficient portion of the risk to make loan funds available on satisfactory terms to those borrowers whose activities were looked upon with favor by the Congress.

It was part of the basic philosophy to supplement and encourage the private market to direct the great resources of this land into places where investment in the future seemed to be a wise idea. At no time did Government want to replace the private money banking system. To encourage worthwhile enterprises, in our public, semipublic and private sectors, the Federal Government has established sort of a stepladder of assistance, and at the bottom of this ladder are the outright grants which are provided in those instances where it is thought the improvement brought about would put the recipient in the posture of self-help.

The next step is the direct loan with low interest rate and long terms where the ability to service debt appears to be somewhat weaker than the average in our economic situation in general. The next step up the ladder is to give 100-percent guarantee. After that, it is the participation loan in which a portion of the risk is assumed by the Government and the bulk of the loan is assumed by a private party, and, finally, the outright shift of the lending program to the normal institutions of credit in our society.

In regards to the extension of credit, the picture at the present time indicates that we have about $33 billion worth of paper that has been generated by direct loans. In 1967, it is estimated that the five agencies involved in this legislation would have in their portfolio some $7,736 million worth of frozen assets. Out of that portfolio, the present legislation contemplates in the same period the sale of about $2.8 billion, leaving approximately $5 billion still in their portfolios.

For a long time the economic financial specialists have been saying and political leaders have been agreeing that it did not make sense for the American people to go out into the money market and obtain funds to be channeled into these obligation notes and supporting paper and be frozen for long periods of time involved in the maturity of most of this paper. It has an average maturity life of something from 9 to 15 years. In the growing demands for support in certain segments of our economic activities, the volume of these programs has been growing every year and unless there is some liquidity and some source of shift provided, it simply means that more and more Government money will be frozen in the assets of the loans and the benefits that have been found to flow from encouraging the private market to participate will have been gone and for these particular obligations, Uncle Sam becomes the permanent banker.

Let it be said that there have been unanimous voices heard on the sale of these assets but the preference of some appears to be for the sale of the total asset on the part of some persons. We will seek to demonstrate as we go along how, if one is committed to the principle of shifting private for public credit, and unless there is a desire for inefficiency and limited transfer, the participation program is greatly to be desired above the sale, straight sale, of selected loan assets.

The substantive policy we strongly maintain has been laid down a considerable time ago and has had general support. This bill speaks not of that substantive policy but of procedure to achieve that policy. This, gentlemen, must be understood.

Now, what of this procedure? This is where the Participation Sales Act of 1966 comes in. Because with the techniques, with the procedures that are made possible under this legislation, we would hope to be able to achieve a substantial reduction in a $33½ billion portfolio during the fiscal year of 1967. This would be accomplished by stepping up to 4.2 billion the sale of loan assets through the participation sales device back into the private sector. We would be utilizing a technique which is not new, but one tried, tested, and proved through the export-import bank participation pools starting in 1962, through the FNMA participation pools made up of three classifications of loans. These programs have sold substantially over $3 billion in a 3-year period. Let it be understood that these programs will go forward regardless of this legislation and there will be some 1 billion 900 million sold under those programs and this legislation would add to the growing program an additional participation volume of 2.8 which would bring us up to the 4.2 billion about which we speak.

The participation program, therefore, gentlemen, is a new rung in the ladder in which the Federal Government comes in to make an activity self-supporting, encourages it with direct loans, and then shifts the burden of the portfolio into the private sector freeing the Federal Government to continue to extend this help to the various sectors that have been selected by Congress and in a volume controlled by Congress without the burden of frozen assets that are generated as a result of going into the program. In other words, it minimizes the continuing involvement of the Federal Government in the financial and economic activities of the people within our country. Now let us examine into the question of why this particular procedure—why the participation pool? Here let us make some distinctions. If our friends of the minority who oppose this legislation are for the direct sale of loans, then their argument to you must be on substantially this basis. They prefer to see the Government sell the total loan. That is, the loan with its benefits and its burdens, a sale which is only possible on a selective basis inasmuch as these things are bound to be true—that if you sell the loans themselves, you immediately narrow the band of the market to a group of buyers who are familiar with the particular kind of activity to which the loans attach. This must be true because they have taken with the total sale where title passes to include the servicing and maintenance of the loan as well as the benefits of the payments on the loan accruing to them. In such a sale, there will be not only the consideration of making the yield on the face of the loan current to the market, but there will be in addition a discount which will be negotiated on the buyer's concern for the cost of the burdens he assumes as well as the inherent risk of payment on the loan. In such sales, it has been demonstrated that the market band is narrow, the interest rate is current and the burden of the discount is carried in addition to the supported interest which means that the Government pays both in front to support the interest yield and on the back end of the deal for the discount, so that the total recovery by the Government is thereby substantially reduced.

Experience has shown that these markets are not moving a volume of paper which is in keeping with the demands of these programs. Now let us examine the benefits of the participation program. In this program, as it is true in many other transfers known to our commerce and business world, the burdens of the loan obligation are separated from its benefits. This is as though you had a lease drawn up in which both the landlord and the tenant have certain burdens within the lease. The landlord has the benefit of the rents and profits recited in the lease. The landlord for many years has had the right and exercised the right of transferring and assigning those rents and profits to a person who leaves the landlord holding whatever burdens of the lease were originally his. And so in this program in the loan assets the agency which has made the loan retains the loan and its burdens, that is, the requirements of servicing the loan and foreclosing it, rehabilitating it as the case may dictate, whereas the rights to the principal and interest payments are separated, assigned in trust to FNMA which in a trust indenture sets it up as part of the pooling arrangements wherein it takes similar assignments from other agencies on other type loans and having generated thereby a pool of income. A legal transfer of these rights to the payments can be made by certificates which are undivided interest in those payments. The person buying the certificate, therefore, obtains a proportionate right to certain of the payments made to the pool and in his transfer he is guaranteed by FNMA that the payments will be made. In the trust indenture, FNMA in turn has been guaranteed by the agencies that the obligor will either pay into the pool or the agency will pay into the pool. Therefore, the buyer has a doublebarreled guarantee made in the first instance by FNMA and backed up in the second instance by that agency in contractual relationship in the indenture agreement.

Now it is clearly to be seen that such paper generated would have a far wider appeal for there is no need for the buyer to be concerned about the knowledge of the activity concerned in the loan. He will have no obligations concerning them. This paper does not recite that it is guaranteed by the U.S. Government, for that would carry an implication otherwise that would imply that the income was immune to State tax. But this in no way demeans nor changes the fact that it has a guarantee of payment of an agency of the U.S. Government behind it and this should be clearly in mind so that we do not get into a battle of semantics over the terminology of the guarantee. This device having been tested and tried by the export-import bank and by FNMA has encouraged debt management people of our Government to the point where they now propose through this bill to expand this newfound device in order to make more effective the policy of transferring from the Government to the private sector the financing of some of these programs for as the instruments or certificates are sold, the money comes into FNMA is channeled back to the agency and from there in payment of the outstanding obligations of the agency to the Treasury places the agency in a position to extend new loans on the basis of the renewed standing on the books of the Treasury without the necessity of the Treasury going forth into the same market getting new money to be placed in new loan assets to fill an already bulging portfolio at a rate that is quite substantial every year. I should like to point out an additional plus that is achieved by this new device, the certificate on the participation pool. This is a fully transferable instrument on its own, a negotiable instrument in the terminology of the law, and it provides a new fluidity in the money market itself in that once known these instruments will create their own secondary market and begin to flow as effective units of financial paper on their own. This is in the tradition of the Federal Government, gentlemen. We have constantly pursued this philosophical principle of creating vitality and velocity in our governmental and private sector financing. That is the reason that we have placed deposit insurance into operation. To take the money that was frozen in the hands of our public placed in tin cans and under mattresses and other dark and necromantic spots and put it into the institutions which could utilize it for the monetary demands of the day and give it an opportunity of utilization in two or three different directions almost simultaneously. And it is this tremendous velocity of our financial resources which has made the great progress that we have enjoyed possible. This move in creating this new instrument is in this same tradition.

Now let us look at how the shift from the private to the public sector occurs. You must constantly keep in your minds, gentlemen, that if we believe in the programs that the agencies are carrying out and the philosophical basis on which they rest, then we are committed to support them in the Congress. How do we express our support, by setting up appropriations for their programs and then placing the burden of funding these on the Treasury. How does the Treasury fund them? It goes to the money market with its Treasury bills, obtains the money on the Government's credit, places it in the hands of the agencies and they put it out in accordance with the loan programs dictated in the authorized legislation. This money then is converted into the loan portfolio for the agency according to the interest and length of term established in the program. Now, how will this program differ in terms of funding? The appropriations will be made in the same manner by Congress only in this program the appropriation will speak in terms of authorization for the pooling arrangement.

The amount to be pooled will be stated and the volume of activity of the agency will be gaged by that appropriation measure. Then the agency involved will go through the mechanics we have described in setting over the rights of income, principal, and interest, to FNMA for the pool. FNMA will then go out with the certificates of participation to the market which the Treasury would have gone to to obtain the same money so there is no difference, gentlemen, as to the impact on the market—it is the question of who is going to go to the market and with what. In the first instance the Treasury with a Treasury bill and in the second instance the FNMA with a participation certificate, so that the volume of activity in the marketplace is the same if the volume of support for the program is the same. The question can be raised as to the differential of price. Argument will go in this vein. If the credit of the United States obtains a better yield on the marketplace, then will the participation certificates?

The argument is true, experience has indicated that the difference in the interest paid by the Federal Government on its bill is from one-eighth to three-eighths spread below the interest that has to be placed on the participation certificates. However, what are we buying with this differential? First we are buying the concept that we should substitute, to the maximum extent reasonable, private credit for public credit. In other words, it is worth some spread in order to get the private sector to assume a larger portion of the load of these programs. Second, this is buying that particular policy at the best possible price, for we are paying it now if we sell the way we have been selling the direct full loan in the narrow market, the price of this shift is considerably higher because as I have indicated, we are selling the burdens as well as the benefits and the market is thereby narrowed and the price is therefore raised. We are buying another thing which is of extreme importance. We are buying FNMA's experience in serving to coordinate the various agency financing one with the other and with the Treasury's debt management operation as well. And such cooperation, believe me, gentlemen, is worth a price in and of itself because without such coordination then the Treasury, as well as all of the agencies, will be getting less than the best interest price for any of their offerings.

We are also buying with this differential the opportunity to place into our system a new negotiable instrument which as it proves its effectiveness will also lower the spread that we have experienced and, in my judgment, these will enjoy sometime in the future a competitive position so close to that of the Treasury bill that the distinction will be negligible. We will not know about this until we have given this program an opportunity to mature and to become understood and accepted. But those within the Government and those of us here in the House who have closely studied this matter have great faith that the prediction which I have voiced will indeed come true. As the Secretary of the Treasury said, in a recent speech:

> We expect to find that the cost difference between these credit programs will be narrow and if anything may tend to decline, particularly after both private investors and the Government have gained useful experience under the program.

Now let me speak to you on this matter of the budget and the claims that this somehow or other distorts Government action, allows back-door spending or charges of that nature. I should like to make it clear at the outset that I entertain a high degree of sympathy and understanding for the Republican posture which would prefer to see the Democrats suffering under the tortures of extending the debt ceiling and therefore are very unwilling to see even a reasonable program of this nature come along to, in any way directly or indirectly, soften that burden. But to those enlightened Republicans who see the interest of their Government first and the political consideration second and to those liberal Democrats who have been for a moment enchanted by the idea that perhaps this is some kind of a giveaway, let me make these points clear. The posture of the Government has to be seen in terms of the distinction between this kind of banking activity which is a capital-making activity and the general operational function of the Government and the budgets which relate thereto. If we had simply an operational situation, then the cash inflow-outgo budget on a yearly basis that we now enjoy would make some sense. But because we have only the one budget and because there is no distinction between the capital formation activities and the general operational activities of the Government, then the debt ceiling has to reflect the outflow for both programs. There is no question that in the carrying out of the banking functions, there are operational costs—as the cost of administration, there are the costs that flow from the support of interest rates, and the cost of discounts and the cost of utilizing any agencies in the sale of offerings made by the Government. All of these are operational costs and should be accepted in the operational cash flow budget. But the tremendous amounts on the principals involved should not be reflected in the general debt because there are loan assets behind these which should be equal to, superior, or almost equal to the amounts involved and this is what does not reflect in the budget. In the bill that is before you today, there will be a more honest, a more clear demonstration of the actual cost of these programs than is true under present circumstances. I say this because the administrative costs many times; the interest support costs, and others of those I enumerated will be lost in the general budget of the administration of the agencies involved and will only be untangled by these few of our Members who read the document recently devised by the Treasury to reveal this capital program; that is, the special analysis E that comes in with the budget. Furthermore, this legislation will relate—the sale of assets—carried out to the support for the volume of new activity that is authorized and appropriated by the Congress. The sales programs under this legislation will first have to find an expression of authorization in an appropriation bill and will, therefore, be under constant and close surveillance by the Congress, and this has not been true in the sale of full assets that have been experienced in the past. This legislation improves the effective role of Congress because it—First, brings the control of volume of loans closer to the appropriation method; and second, delineates and makes clear the actual costs related to the loan programs for which particular appropriation requests will have to be made.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman to yield because I want to respond to a comment made in the colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and the gentleman who just left the well.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas read from the minority views on a report coming out of the Ways and Means Committee, but I invite attention to the fact that those minority views were directed against the bill that sought to increase the debt limit.

We have quite a different situation here today. I will vote for this bill, if an amendment I propose to offer is adopted, and that is to provide that the funds generated by this program will be applied on the national debt. It is proposed in the bill to use capital assets to pay current operating expenses of the Federal Government.

When capital assets are disposed of, the proceeds ought to apply against the national debt.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Sales Participation Act of 1966. I believe that we need an equitable tax reform measure instead of a reshuffling of debts.

Economic trends indicate that there is an even more urgent need for a thorough tax reform now in May than was apparent earlier this year. I began my systematic appraisal of our tax structure in the fall of 1965. My first tax reform bill, H.R. 12993, which would lower the oil depletion allowance, was introduced before passage of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. As I stated on February 23, 1966, during debate on the tax legislation:

> One such recommendation that has long been overdue is the need to reduce the present oil depletion allowance which currently gives an unwarranted tax advantage to an advantageously situated small segment of our population. It is unfortunate that a progressive reduction in the oil depletion allowance has not been incorporated in the present bill. To meet this need, I have introduced legislation in the House which will reduce the oil depletion allowance from its present rate of 27½ to 20 percent in progressive steps over a 3 year period.
>
> I respectfully call to the attention of the Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee the fact that a sensible reduction in the oil depletion allowance will bring to the Nation substantial revenue without reimposing upon our working people in our factories and on our farms a heavier share of the tax load.
>
> Finally, I believe it is time we redistributed that load by eliminating the special tax privileges that currently exist. The place to start is the reduction of the oil depletion allowance. The time to start is now.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the need for action to lower the depletion allowance, I believe the time also has come to thoroughly reexamine the tax free status of revenues from advertising in magazines and other periodicals that are published by exempt organizations and that compete with taxpaying publications. On April 26, I pointed out to my colleagues in the Congressional Record, page 9004, that the tax free publications number about 700 and gross an estimated $100 million a year. At that time I requested the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to act on this matter which has been pending for 6 years.

Since the Internal Revenue Service has continued to drag its feet in the true bureaucratic fashion that often disregards the public interest, I want to urge my colleagues to join me in pushing for an end to this special privilege.

Today I would like to point out that I believe current economic developments and trends require elimination or modification of the 7-percent tax credit for business investment in new equipment. I believe the same argument used to justify approval of the 7-percent tax credit in 1962; namely, to stimulate outlays for new business equipment, is now clear justification for its modification.

The most important thing to note about my tax reform proposal is that it would be absolutely unnecessary to increase the personal tax rate for the purpose of providing revenue or to curb allegedly inflationary pressures. In short, I firmly believe this is the fairest way to meet international and national needs for revenue and yet recognize that the economic restraints that have been imposed on our agricultural producers, our factory workers, and small business owners, should be applied equitably to all other sectors of the economy.

This noteworthy goal of fairness in the distribution of tax burdens is just as important a reason for rejecting the pending Sales Participation Act as it is for adopting a thoroughgoing reform of our tax structure. Over the past months we have had repeated suggestions from the President, various Cabinet officers, and the Council of Economic Advisers, concerning "cooling any inflationary fires in our total economy." Adoption of the Sales Participation Act will not in any sense of the imagination cope with a real or imagined inflationary fire. Instead, it will further shift the burden onto the backs of those who must borrow money—particularly small borrowers.

Instead of putting the burden on the backs of small businessmen, workers, and farmers, let us take a good hard look at the huge profits announced recently by large corporations, and place a fair tax burden where it belongs, in addition to dampening this most potent source of inflationary tendencies. Thus, by rejecting the Sales Participation Act and initiating a thorough tax reform that has been overdue the last decade, we will achieve two noteworthy purposes.

First, dampening possible inflationary fires from their actual source, and second, guaranteeing to the American factory workers, small businessmen, and farmers, that the American tax system has achieved a degree of the fairness which it has been lacking over the past 10 years.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, at the May 10, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee a policy statement regarding H.R. 14544, Participation Sales Act of 1966, was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I include at this point in the Record the complete text of this statement:

> With this bill, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has reached a new level of fiscal irresponsibility. In rapid succession we have witnessed five straight years of Federal budget deficits that have averaged $6.2 billion, the dwindling of our gold supply from $18 billion in 1960 to less than $14 billion, a balance of payments deficit that has averaged $3 billion a year, a rise in the budget from $81.5 billion in 1961 to an estimated $112.8 billion in 1967, the removal of silver from our coins, and a reduction in the gold that backstops our currency.
>
> Now, under the provisions of H.R. 14544, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration will be given the authority to establish a whole new system of back-door, deficit financing. Under this system, all manner of grandiose Great Society programs can be funded by simply refinancing the billions of dollars in financial assets that the Federal Government presently owns and not one cent of this spending will be reflected in the budget.
>
> Under the proposed Participation Sales Act, the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) will sell participations in a pool of Government-held financial assets or loans, which could total $33.1 billion. Unfortunately, the participation "sale" is a fiction. The purchaser does not acquire title to the pooled asset. All he acquires is the right to have his investment repaid with interest at the rate stated in the participation certificate. Moreover, the money acquired through these "sales" will be paid directly to the pooling agency and used to offset expenditures that normally appear in the budget.
>
> The Administrative budget for fiscal year 1967, after making several doubtful estimates of revenue, contemplates a budget deficit of only $1.8 billion. However, if the $4.2 billion of participation sales authorized by this bill are not made, the budget deficit will be $6 billion. It is interesting to note that, using the participations device, the Administration could have projected a budget surplus rather than a deficit. But it chose not to do this. Apparently, it feared that such flagrant sleight-of-hand bookkeeping at this stage of the game would alert the American public to its fiscal chicanery. In the event this bill is enacted into law, there certainly is reason to believe that this type of financial gymnastics will be resorted to in the future. Thus, the day of the publicly-acknowledged deficit may be a thing of the past.
>
> The largest and most rapidly growing Federal loan program is that of the Agency for International Development (AID). It is estimated that at the close of fiscal year 1967 the outstanding volume of direct loans made in foreign countries by this Agency will be $12 billion. In its new role, FNMA could sell participations in a pool of such loans, even though in some instances AID loans bear interest as low as ¾ of 1 percent per year. Obviously, these AID loans would be unsalable unless FNMA guaranteed the payment of principal and a reasonable rate of interest on the participations sold. AID holdings of foreign aid loans are expanding at a rate of $1.5 billion per year. Under the present system, this money is appropriated by Congress and charged against the Administrative budget. If this bill is enacted, the only charge against the Administrative budget would be the appropriation to make up the deficiency between the income received on the loans and the interest cost of the participations sold. Thus, instead of the real cost to the taxpayers—$1.5 billion—being charged against the budget, the charge, thanks to the provisions of this bill, would be as low as $45 million per year.
>
> The refinancing that is required under H.R. 14544 will cost the American taxpayer an additional $5 million a year on each $1 billion of the participations sold. Thus, in the event $4.2 billion of participations are sold, there will be a cost to the taxpayer of $21 million per year. If the average maturity for participations is 10 years, the taxpayer will be gouged over $200 million in unnecessary expenses.
>
> At the present time, the home mortgage market is in a state of turmoil and confusion. Home construction is at a dangerously low level. If the FNMA participation sales are authorized, the FHA and GI mortgages, and other home mortgages as well, will become less and less attractive to investors. In order to meet competition and obtain home mortgage financing, higher home mortgage financing costs will have to be imposed. As a result, the prospective home builders or buyers will be forced to carry an additional financial burden.
>
> To date, FNMA has sold four issues of participations. Each time they have been sold to the same four big Wall Street investment houses. Transactions under this arrangement have totaled over $1.6 billion, and over $5 million of commissions have been paid. Under this bill, this clubby and financially advantageous arrangement could not only continue but could become even more lucrative. Certainly, at a minimum, the statute should require that these participations be sold on a competitive bid basis.
>
> It has been claimed that the participations sale proposal contained in H.R. 14544 is an extension of the program inaugurated by the Eisenhower administration. In support of this contention, there is cited the FNMA swap in fiscal year 1960 of $311 million of low interest mortgages for $316 million of nonmarketable Treasury investment bonds

owned by the public. The facts, however, reflect that these two programs are totally dissimilar, and the Eisenhower program cannot be used as justification for the Johnson-Humphrey scheme. The Eisenhower program was a straightforward financial transaction. The mortgages were sold on a competitive bid basis, paid for by bonds held by investors. Actual title to the mortgages passed to the purchasers and proceeds were carried in the budget as a budget receipt. The bonds acquired by FNMA were surrendered to Treasury for cancellation. Thereupon, Treasury reduced FNMA indebtedness to it by a like amount. Thus, contrary to the proposed scheme, there was no budget runaround in the Eisenhower program.

As incredible as it may seem, this bill was not available to Committee members until ½ hour before the hearings began. Thereafter, only 2 hours of hearings were held and the Republican members of the Committee were denied the right or opportunity to call any witnesses. Moreover, not one witness from the unions, farming, business, or banking was called. At the conclusion of these totally inadequate hearings, the Committee was ordered into immediate executive session and in less than 30 minutes, the bill was ordered reported.

Legislative action of this type goes far beyond even that which has become the standard rubberstamp procedure for this 89th Congress. This bill would permit the Johnson-Humphrey Administration to conceal huge budgetary deficits. It would invite a spending spree that would delight the emperors of old. It can only lead to financial disaster. H.R. 14544 must be defeated.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of H.R. 14544, the Sales Participation Act of 1966. H.R. 14544 might also be called the Small Business Revival Act of 1966, since passage of the measure will insure that the Small Business Administration will reopen its regular lending programs which have been closed since October of 1965, and hopefully this legislation will preclude the possibility of SBA closing its lending windows in the future.

The Sales Participation Act of 1966 will not only benefit the entire economy, but its impact on small business will be tremendous. Recently, the Small Business Administration, in an effort to secure much-needed funds, sold $110 million worth of small business investment company 20-year debentures. These are loans which the Small Business Administration has made to SBIC's throughout the country. These debentures were sold on an individual basis, and the market response was so poor that in order to obtain the much-needed funds, the agency finally had to sell the debentures for 5.75 percent, plus a quarter of a percent brokerage commission. When the dust had finally cleared, SBA had discounted the loan paper nearly $10 million, $10 million which could have gone to deserving small businesses.

However, if the agency had been blessed with passage of H.R. 14544, the loss incurred in the debenture sales would not have happened, since the agency could have pooled these loans and sold participating shares in the pool. It is estimated that this technique would have saved the agency nearly $5 million. This savings represents 500 $10,000 loans which could have been made to small business concerns.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time the Small Business Administration holds nearly $1.4 billion in loans to small businesses and disaster loans. It is particularly significant to note that of this total, nearly $282 million is in the form of disaster loans which carry 3 percent interest rate and run as long as 30 years. It is virtually impossible, due to the long maturities and low interest rate, for the Small Business Administration to sell disaster loans directly. This is one of the main reasons that the agency has had to curtail its lending functions in the past. Disaster loans were needed, but because of the large holdings of these loans, the agency had to borrow from funds earmarked for other programs.

However, under the Sales Participation Act, SBA will be able to pool disaster loans along with its regular business loans, which carry a 5.5 interest rate, and through an equitable mixed formula, establish a participation pool which will be readily marketable. In this way, the Small Business Administration should have adequate funds for all its lending programs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for passage of H.R. 14544.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress from the great State of Iowa, long one of the Nation's leading agricultural producing areas, I rise in support of the pending bill, called the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

I favor the basic objectives of this legislation, and I am confident that it will in no way jeopardize any of our existing Government lending programs involving our farm families.

Permit me to review briefly the progress of this legislation, which already already has passed the Senate—with some additional safeguards accepted by the administration.

As I understand it, when this bill was originally proposed, it would have authorized the pooling of loan paper—direct loans made in the past and outstanding at the present time—now held by many different Government agencies.

The authority in the original bill for this type of pooling operation was pretty broad.

But, Mr. Chairman, it would be both incorrect and unfair to say that the administration at any time ever suggested that such broad authority, once granted by Congress, would be used to sell participations in the outstanding direct loans made in the past under all the Government credit programs voted by Congress.

There have been—in my opinion—some false alarms about this.

So far as I can determine, no one speaking for the administration, for example, ever said REA loans would be pooled—with participations in such pooled assets being sold subsequently to private investors. No one ever suggested that foreign aid loans would be pooled.

From the very beginning, Mr. Chairman, we have been given the assurances that the Government is not going to rush pellmell into an extension of the sales participation technique to a huge number of direct Government lending programs. And, as this legislation has moved through Congress, it has changed somewhat. As I understand it, the other body modified its bill to provide that the participation sales approach should be extended only within specific limits. Further, there was a Senate amendment making it clear that certain lending activities of the Farmers Home Administration would be reserved from the asset pooling operations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that we in the House of Representatives, during floor consideration of the bill approved by the House Banking and Currency Committee, are in the process of adopting very similar, if not identical, limitations.

As for the basic idea behind this legislation, I support it. I do not favor building up, more and more, the volume of direct loans being held by the Government particularly when we can, through authorization legislation, cut new channels from the public credit to the private credit sector of our economy.

And, as Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler pointed out in a recent speech in North Carolina:

> We are well aware that in seeking to deepen and widen the channels between public and private credit markets that it would be pointless to attempt to press more on the market than it can readily absorb.

Even without the new safeguards we in Congress have put into this legislation, I personally feel, Mr. Chairman, that the bill in its original form would not have jeopardized any of our meritorious direct Government lending programs.

I will not go into the history of that, except to say that this legislation would not have created any new lending authority; it would not have removed control of any direct lending program from the hands of the agencies that now administer such programs; it would not have given private credit sources control over such direct lending activities.

In addition, the legislation provides for careful review of participation pooling operations by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

I support the bill. I intended to vote for it. And, Mr. Chairman, I urge other Members of this body to vote for it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will count.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Keogh, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14544) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking today in the Committee of the Whole may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter; and I further ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD today and of including extraneous matter on the bill, H.R. 14544.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FACT-REPORTING BAIL AGENCY IN COURTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a fact-reporting bail agency in the courts of the District of Columbia. I am introducing this bill at the request of the circuit judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals, who met in council on May 11, 1966.

This legislation has been thoroughly considered by the judges of the Circuit Court of Appeals and represents the thinking of many knowledgeable persons in the field of criminal jurisprudence.

It has as its basic purpose the establishment of a system whereby worthy defendants in criminal cases may have an orderly procedure available to them and to the courts for the determination of the preliminary question of bailability, amount of bail, and other relevant factors which are daily passed upon by the judges in the District of Columbia.

In addition, the fact-reporting entity will also make its services available upon request to the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals and to any Justice of the Supreme Court whenever bail pending appeal becomes an issue.

It is contemplated that the annual cost of this advanced and improved program of handling bail matters will not exceed $80,000 per year. It is further contemplated that this amount will be recouped manifold because of the advantages to the worthy accused whose family and community ties justify release under terms fixed by the courts. The need for placing the family on relief, the possibility of continued employment of the accused, not to mention the cost of detention, are factors which we feel will bring benefits greatly in excess of the cost of the program.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives has been interested in this problem for some time, and I am introducing the bill with his full concurrence in order that the Congress may have an opportunity to consider it and hear the testimony of interested parties. It is hoped that this will result in the enactment of legislation which will find unanimous support in both bodies of the Congress.

FEDERAL BANK SUPERVISION IN SHAMBLES—CAUSES HIGH INTEREST RATES AND UNFAIR COMPETITION FOR THRIFT INSTITUTIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, ridiculous and unnecessary as it is, the Nation's financial institutions, the largest as well as the smallest, are engaging in a wasteful and destructive rate war. This rate war has two causes. First and foremost is the Federal Reserve Board's extreme tight money policy which has led financial institutions into a wild scramble for deposits. This competition for new accounts plus tight money has led to sky-high interest rates and unsound banking practices. Instead of acting to cool off this dangerous and extremely inflationary development, the Federal Reserve Board's encouraging banks to issue $18 billion of negotiable certificates of deposit of doubtful legality has instead seriously aggravated the situation.

The situation is now so critical that your Banking and Currency Committee is taking up much valuable time to put an end to these unsound practices and this senseless rate war. Already home buyers, home builders, and the mortgage market have suffered extreme harm with interest rates on home loans at their highest in many years. The thrift industry—savings and loan institutions from all over the country—are literally flooding Members' offices with their mail because of massive savings withdrawals. But it is not just the thrift industry and housing that are suffering from this lax and inadequate bank supervision. The Treasury bill market has suffered drastically with interest rates there also the highest in many years and thus an added burden on the taxpayers.

We have just let the Federal Reserve System and the other Federal bank supervisory agencies have their way for much too long. They have proven themselves incapable of doing a decent job, claiming independence as they do from the rest of the Government. To restore some sanity to this deplorable and completely unjustifiable situation, it will be necessary that this freewheeling independence be curbed.

Indicative of the widespread concern and attention that this matter is getting, in addition to the hearings on my bill H.R. 14026, to outlaw negotiable certificates of deposit, is the following editorial from the May 12 Journal of Commerce entitled "Did the Fed Make a Mistake?"

[From the Journal of Commerce, May 12, 1966]

DID THE FED MAKE A MISTAKE?

The Reserve Board's announcement of a fresh inquiry, to be made at 6,200 member banks by questionnaire, as to what interest rates and other terms are being offered on time deposits, carries a connotation that either the Board made a mistake last December in raising the interest ceiling on time deposits other than passbook savings to 5½ from 4½ per cent, or that the nation's commercial banks have mistakenly taken the new ceiling as a license to pay too much.

Another connotation is that if a mistake was made the Board is contemplating what should be done to correct it. This in turn raises the interesting question of what in the world the Board can do without new legislation.

Certainly it is unfortunate that one sequel to the high rates paid by major banks for certificate of deposit money should result in a drain of upward of $1 billion from savings and loan associations and from mutual savings banks. This puts a big crimp in the mortgage market and is destructive to new housing and other building construction.

At the time the Board set the higher interest ceiling on time deposits the hope was officially expressed that banks would not go out and bid too recklessly for money. Obviously a large segment of the banking business, faced with a need for more money to lend at rates well above deposit interest rates, has done just that. The new inquiry will pinpoint who and where and how much. The Federal Reserve questionnaire to commercial member banks will be supplemented by a similar Federal Deposit Insurance survey of non-member banks. In effect this covers all banks.

Incidentally, a similar and perhaps more limited inquiry earlier this year produced results indicating that banks were moving slowly in paying higher rates. Since then, however, money rates have moved to further 40-year highs and pressure on banks for funds has increased.

The purposes of the rise in the interest ceiling on certain forms of time deposits last December were, of course, to stimulate banks to increase their lending capacity by gathering in an increased percentage of existing deposits rather than to resort to ever more Federal Reserve money to support a higher volume of demand deposits created by rising loans. It would be incongruous for the Reserve banks to restrict bank lending through the rise in the rediscount rate to 4½ from 4 per cent last December while at the same time pumping into the banking system ever more Federal Reserve money.

Had the discount rate been increased without a higher ceiling on time deposit rates banks might have been put into a liquidity squeeze through forced redemption of large amounts of certificates of deposit then already created. Maybe a 5½ per cent ceiling was too high. The Federal Reserve can reduce it, but to do so now would at once produce a real banking liquidity crisis.

There are ways in which the Board can correct a mistake, if it was made, but they seemingly require new legislation. One way would be to a $15,000 limit upon certificates of deposit on which rates up to 5½ per cent could be paid. A bill is pending to set such a limit, which would automatically end much of the withdrawals at savings banks and savings and loan associations.

The Board now does not have the power to set rates by volume of deposits, although it may and has distinguished between savings and other time deposits. By keeping the passbooks saving rate at 4 per cent it has encouraged big shifts out of commercial bank savings accounts.

Another way out would be to set higher required reserves on small denominations of certificates of deposit, which would discourage banks from issuing them and thereby raiding savings and loans and savings banks. But the Board apparently has no power to set different rates on various categories of time deposits; the same reserve rate must apply to all.

The new questionnaire to banks has a deadline of May 18, which means that the Board should have its revised facts on what happened as a result of its actions of last December by the end of this month. In the meantime it may get new legislative authority to correct the mixed up flow of time deposits if the Congress will act speedily. But Congress probably will not act until the Board gets the results it is seeking from its questionnaire and specifically asks Congress for more authority.

All this is just another indication of what happens when one sets controls, or ceilings, on anything and the ceilings become at least in part unworkable or are abused. What has recently been going on contains much potential dynamite for the mortgage market and therefore for homeowners, homebuyers and builders.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD HATCHING ANOTHER PHANTOM IN AN ATTEMPT TO DOMINATE BANKING INDUSTRY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, like the small child who does not want his mother to turn the light out in his bedroom because of bogie-men hiding in corners, the Federal Reserve Board is proving equally adept at fighting phantoms.

Since the Board's meetings are highly secret, no one can be certain exactly what goes on at these closed-shop sessions; but from recent actions of the Board, it would appear that this austere group, headed by "Don Quixote" William McChesney Martin, spends most of its time convincing each other that financial phantoms, windmills, ghosts, and even a few hobgoblins are flying about the economy.

MASTERS OF IMAGINATION

So it was on December 6, 1965, that the Board raised interest rates to fight an imaginery inflation. Not content with this action, the Board has concocted another fantasy. It is now trying to convince the public and Congress that it should have reserve requirement control over all insured banks because of an "accelerated withdrawal by member banks from the system in recent years."

From the annual report of the Federal Reserve Board and newspaper accounts of the report, it would appear that banks are withdrawing from the Federal Reserve System faster than a jackrabbit with ingrown toenails. But the figures on the number of banks that have withdrawn from the Federal Reserve System in the past 5 years clearly show that the Federal Reserve Board once again is seeing lions and tigers hiding in bedroom corners.

The following table shows that there is no large net decrease in number of Federal Reserve banks and, in fact, there has been a steady increase over the years in deposits of Federal Reserve member banks:

Year	Number of voluntary withdrawals	Number of new State member banks	Deposits of all FRS member banks
			Billions
1960	26	12	$193, 009, 604
1961	17	7	209, 615, 684
1962	26	9	219, 467, 644
1963	22	7	229, 376, 427
1964	19	8	253, 723, 748
1965	23	5	275, 516, 681
1966	11	4	(1)

[1] Annual figure not available.

It can easily be seen from this table that there has been no net loss to the Federal Reserve System in deposits which are subject to reserve requirements. And I see nothing in the bank membership withdrawal figures to suggest an accelerated rate, but rather the figures are fairly standard for the past 5 years and 1966 appears to be an average year.

The Federal Reserve Board blames the withdrawal from the System on the fact that these institutions do not wish to comply with the Board's reserve requirements. Perhaps they are right in this contention. Whatever the reason is for the withdrawal, there is no need for alarm. It is high time, however, that the Federal Reserve Board began to study facts and figures in its handling of the economy, rather than establishing regulations on the basis of phantoms that fly in the night.

THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT AND ITS EFFECT ON PUERTO RICO

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, it has been very gratifying for me and for the people and Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to have had the strong and constant support of newspapers in Puerto Rico, and here in Washington, D.C., in our efforts to amend H.R. 13712, the proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. Editorials on Puerto Rico's minimum wage crisis have appeared in the San Juan Star, El Imparcial, and El Mundo, in Puerto Rico, and the Evening Star and Washington Post, in the District of Columbia.

Despite the divergent political philosophies of these newspapers, they have joined in declaiming the treatment of Puerto Rico contemplated by H.R. 13712. They recognize that these minimum wage amendments, far from being an elixir that will magically eradicate poverty and unemployment in Puerto Rico, will be, in fact, a poison to "Operation Bootstrap," the Puerto Rican Government's economic recovery program.

Some of these newspapers are bitterly pessimistic about Puerto Rico's chances of convincing this Congress that H.R. 13712 deals in the worst possible way with the problem of low wages in Puerto Rico by failing to recognize the unique economic problems the Commonwealth now faces. They feel that Congress is unwilling to listen and to act. I ask my colleagues to demonstrate that this pessimism is unwarranted.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Record 10 of these editorials:

[Editorial from the San Juan Star, Aug. 19, 1965]

The Unmerry-Go-Round

The House Education and Labor Committee approved a bill yesterday that would increase the Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour to $1.75 in three annual steps to $1.40, $1.60, and $1.75 the third year and would extend coverage to an additional 7.2 million workers, including thousands in Puerto Rico.

Thus Puerto Rico, blanketed under the House committee version, seems to be facing another merry-go-round to prevent full application of the measure to the island's business and industry. Full application of the bill, if it becomes law, would cause serious harm to the island's economy.

In the past, Federal minimum wage legislation has contained special provisions for Puerto Rico in recognition of the difference in the local economy compared with that of the U.S. mainland. The industrialization program would be dealt a hard blow if all business and industry in interstate commerce here, which is virtually everything under the new bill, would be compelled to meet the fixed increases.

The existing Federal act as it applies here provides for special industry committees to study conditions in the various industry categories no oftener than every two years and to set minimum wage rates after public hearings. These committees can set any rate up to the mainland minimum of $1.25 an hour but they can order an intermediate rate when it is determined that an industry does not have the ability to pay the $1.25 rate.

The Commonwealth government's policy is to encourage all business and industry to raise wage rates as fast as possible, but it regards the fixed-wage increase for all business and industry as highly detrimental to the economic development of Puerto Rico.

Present minimum wages here have reached the mainland $1.25 rate in hundreds of cases. Some have exceeded that rate, but in all cases the increases were based on ability to pay them and remain in business. Any compulsory minimum that would apply to Puerto Rico, if this bill is approved by the House and Senate in its present form, would require some industries now paying 90 cents or $1 to go to $1.40 on July 1, 1966 with another 20 cents-an-hour increase the following year and still a third increase of 15 cents an hour the following year. Perhaps some could meet these mandatory increases but hundreds could not. For those who would lose their jobs there would come the sad realization that the lowest wage is no wage at all.

There would be little sense for industrialists to finance factories in Puerto Rico for the incentive of tax exemption if the prospects of profits did not exist. Without profits, tax exemption is an illusion.

The Commonwealth Government may have another survival operation on its hands in

Washington. In the past it has never failed to convince the leadership in both House and Senate that economic conditions in Puerto Rico are far below those on the mainland and the result has been the protective amendments that have made the island's continued economic growth possible.

This is an area with a chronic unemployment rate of 10 to 12 percent of the labor force. The per capita income is four times greater on the mainland than it is in Puerto Rico. It would be extremely harmful and discouraging to have the Congress at this stage of the island's development legislate it back into the poverty that has been partly erased through the massive self-help effort of the people themselves.

[Editorial from the San Juan Star, Aug. 24, 1965]

Minimum Wage Crisis

(By A. W. Maldonado)

Commonwealth status appears to be as difficult as it is good. It seems that every time one opens the newspapers, there is a new "crisis" in Puerto Rico related to our unique relation with the United States; the crisis today, which is very real, is over the minimum wage bill in Congress.

If the bill is passed as it now reads, setting for Puerto Rico the same $1.75 minimum wage in three annual increases as for the rest of the U.S., it will critically damage Puerto Rico's economic development program. Certainly it will be a major defeat for the Gov. Sanchez administration and, perhaps more important, for the future of Commonwealth status.

Government economists have been attempting to determine just how much unemployment the bill would create on the island, how many industries may close. But the real effect is an intangible; how many industries will not decide to come to Puerto Rico as a result of this bill? Everyone in the government knows that Operation Bootstrap's future operations will be seriously damaged, but no one can pinpoint the extent.

New capital investment comes to Puerto Rico simply because our industrial salesmen in the U.S. can convince investors that they can make a better profit in Puerto Rico than in Florida, Virginia or Oregon. Our salesmen offer basically two unique Puerto Rican conditions; freedom from federal and local taxation, and a wage differential. Eliminate the second and Bootstrap is denied one of its most powerful incentives.

This is exactly the difficulty of Commonwealth. The Puerto Rican government has to conduct a do-or-die battle in Congress to get Puerto Rico exempted from the blanket U.S. minimum wage regulations every time the law is changed. It is clearly a disagreeable task; we are open to the charge that Puerto Rico is against lifting the wage of Puerto Ricans to the level of the U.S., or even more serious, that Puerto Rico is deliberately keeping its workers poorly paid in order to snatch industrial investment away from other areas in the mainland.

At this precise moment, the battle against the minimum wage bill is particularly sticky. Is Puerto Rico "in" or "out?" How can Puerto Rico sit quietly while it receives up to $100 million in federal funds for public housing, medicare, anti-poverty, education, and then create such a fuss over a bill as basic to social justice as the minimum wage?

The temptation in Washington, I suppose, is to clear up this matter of just what is Puerto Rico, just how does it fit in the U.S. system. If the island is "in," then let it be in all the way—let it participate in the great social revolution taking place, the Great Society, which means the U.S. minimum wage just as it means Medicare. If its "out," then let it be just that—out.

I know that many in Puerto Rico feel this way. How long, they ask, will Puerto Rico be required to fight the same battles again and again? We have won in the past; but clearly there is no security in a system where a few powerful men in Congress (Adam Clayton Powell, for instance, Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee) can virtually cripple our entire economy. This feeling is one of the bases of the Commonwealth "culmination" plan; and what prompted the "Keyserling report" urging Congressmen to consider the need Puerto Rico has for "labor legislative autonomy."

No matter how you look at Commonwealth, it can leave you with a sense of deep dissatisfaction. On one hand, this minimum wage fight risks our Operation Bootstrap program and keeps our economic base up in the air. On the other hand, participation in President's Johnson's vast social reform programs gives up an uneasy feeling of getting too much in return for too little. Can Commonwealth survive? We are pulled towards opposite directions—towards more fiscal autonomy in the first case, and towards greater fiscal participation in the second.

The answer in the minimum wage problem is for Puerto Rico to be free of federal minimum wage legislation; the answer to the ironic problem of "getting too much" is for Puerto Rico to somehow share in the cost of the Great Society. Are we to go further "out" or further "in"? The argument has always been that Commonwealth will have to grow within its own genesis; but can it "grow" in opposite directions, or will it, by necessity, disintegrate?

But this is not a hopeless paradox; there is an answer. What we are experiencing today are not the difficulties of Commonwealth status, but the difficulties of Puerto Rico. Commonwealth is not the cause of this paradox; it is its victim.

The fundamental crisis in Puerto Rico today is not its political status; it is what it has always been, poverty. Only when Puerto Rican leaders forget this, do we suffer from our apparent contradictions. From a political status point of view, we simply cannot justify wanting the Great Society and not the minimum wage bill. But from the point of view of simply desiring to eliminate poverty, it is not only justified, but beautifully consistent.

Commonwealth is indeed twisting and turning. The answer may well be that Puerto Rico should move in both directions—towards greater autonomy and greater participation. And whether this is possible, I believe, will depend on how long our leaders remain determined to ride the difficult tiger of Puerto Rican poverty.

[Editorial from the San Juan Star, Aug. 25, 1965]

The Big Challenge

(By A. W. Maldonado)

The real crisis in Puerto Rico today is poverty. The battle the Commonwealth government is carrying on in Washington against the minimum wage bill as it now reads is decisive. The government will hold nothing back to get the bill changed. If necessary Gov. Sanchez will go to Washington to lead the campaign against the bill.

The more one looks at the effects of that bill on Puerto Rico's economical development program, the more dramatic the battle appears. Rafael Durand, head of Fomento, put it very simply: "If the bill is passed as it is now, it would be a disaster for Puerto Rico." Labor Secretary Alfredo Nazario described the consequences of the bill as "extremely serious."

La Fortaleza, Durand, Nazario and most other Commonwealth officials dealing with this are insisting, however, that it is still too early to panic. All insist that they are optimistic that the House bill will be amended in the U.S. Senate restoring to Puerto Rico the "flexible" method of determining minimum wages for each industry. As the bill now reads, Federal minimum wage increases are applied to Puerto Rico without possible adjustment to local conditions.

But let's take a close look at just what the problem is. We must begin with Puerto Rico's poverty; the island's per capita income is about a third of the mainland per capita. The solution is creation of employment by means of capital investment in island industry. Capital comes to Puerto Rico only if a profit can be made, and a profit is possible only if the product manufactured can be sold in sufficient quantities. Sales, in turn, depend on competition.

The wage levels in Puerto Rico go to the core of the problem. Puerto Rico, just as Japan, Germany or any other exporter, can sell its products only if it can produce them of comparable quality but cheaper. This is the key importance of what is called the "wage differential." Puerto Rico clearly would like its workers to make as much as U.S. workers. But the reality is that if they did, the wage differential would be eliminated, factories would close, unemployment would rise, poverty would increase.

A case is the island apparel industry, the single most important in Operation Bootstrap since it employs half of all the Fomento-created jobs. This industry is now operating on a very low profit margin; its minimum wage is $1.15 an hour. These factories came to Puerto Rico for two reasons—tax exemption and the lower wage scale here compared to the mainland. But local tax exemption is now expiring for many of these plants and the wage gap has been steadily closing.

In women's underwear, for instance, salaries went up in Puerto Rico by 134 per cent during 1952–57, in the U.S. by only 21 per cent. During 1957–64, salaries here climbed by 35 per cent, in the U.S. by 14 per cent. In men's clothing, 1957–64, salaries here went up 62 per cent, in the mainland by 18 per cent.

Now, if the minimum wage bill is passed as it is now, the Puerto Rican apparel industry would have to increase its wages by 40 per cent during the next three years—from $1.15 an hour up to $1.60. There is no doubt in the industry and in Fomento, that this would cause many of these plants to close down.

But taking a wider look at the Puerto Rican economy reveals an even more dramatic picture. Puerto Rico continues to have an annual unemployment crisis. Although unemployment went down to 75,000 in 1961, today it is up again between 80,000 to 90,000. That is, there are more people looking for jobs and unable to find them than those working in all the 1,100 Operation Bootstrap plants operating today.

Are we making progress? The answer is clear. During the 1950's, the island labor force actually went down an average of 8,000 a year (80,000 for the decade). But in the past five years, our labor force has been increasing by about 27,000 a year. These are record years for Fomento—but yet Fomento-plant employment is going up only by 8,000 a year. Total employment is increasing by about 15,000 a year. The answer is that Puerto Rico is steadily drifting backwards.

Expanding the scope of this problem even wider, the U.S. today is negotiating with foreign countries the possibility of lowering U.S. protective tariffs. This is not an immediate danger. But clearly if the price of Puerto Rico products go up and tariffs on foreign nation's products go down, Puerto Rico may simply find itself out of the competitive market completely.

It is evident, then, why government officials are giving this battle in Washington the highest possible priority. Unless flexible methods of determining minimum wages for Puerto Rican industries are restored, it is undeniable that Operation Bootstrap will be seriously crippled. But why the optimism that Puerto Rico will come out on top at the end? The answer is simple.

Puerto Rico today buys over $1.3 billion in U.S. goods. We are fifth in the world and climbing up to third place. The Commonwealth government is certain that there is a solid base of "mutual consent" on the fundamental issue—Puerto Rico's economy must not be destroyed.

[Editorial from the San Juan Star, Aug. 30, 1965]

PUERTO RICO IN MOTION

(By A. W. Maldonado)

In 1905, Albert Einstein removed the floor from beneath the feet of science, philosophy, and indirectly, religion. His "theory of relativity" held that even time and space are not absolute entities; they exist in a universe that is constantly moving. Physics, as the one solid ground where man could stand on, suddenly was not there.

No description or analysis of Puerto Rico today is accurate or meaningful unless it begins from the reality that Puerto Rico is in motion. No statistic tells us the truth about Puerto Rico unless it is based on the speed of Puerto Rico's movement.

This "motion" is the island's population growth. Just as space and time can be measured only on the basis of a universe in which everything is in motion, the population growth represents the Puerto Rican universe—everything takes place within it. Lets turn to some concrete examples.

There was a news story the other day in the local newspapers that the Economic Development Administration (Fomento) had the best year in its history. The statistics are dramatically impressive; employment in Fomento plants up by almost 10,000.

As everyone in Puerto Rico knows, from Gov. Sanchez on down, Fomento is the basic government program. Today we don't give Fomento as much publicity as in the 1950's, but still a record year for Fomento is considered a good omen for the island's entire economy.

But what is the reality? From July, 1964 to July, 1965 total employment (manufacturing, agriculture, construction services, etc.) went up from 651,000 to 687,000. This seems to be even more fantastic; an increase of 36,000 in one year. But is is not; the truth is that during this last year Puerto Rican employment moved backwards.

During that same period, the labor force in Puerto Rico (those employed and those looking for work) went up at a faster rate: from 738,000 in July, 1964 to 787,000 in July, 1965. The increase was 49,000. Thus unemployment, that was 87,000 that month in 1964, jumped to just over 99,000 last month. This is "relativity;" you are in a speeding train, but suddenly on the other track another train speeds by faster and you, in fact, fall behind.

This point must be emphasized. It isn't that Puerto Rico is making great progress but that is "not enough." It is that Puerto Rico is falling behind. Statistically, we know that more and more high school graduates are being turned away from the universities because there is no space for them; we know that government services are falling further and further behind the demand; we daily experience our communications, particularly roads, shrinking beneath us.

Economists in Fomento have decided that the only way to keep up with the population growth is by doubling the number of a new Fomento-promoted jobs during the next five years. Rafael Durand head of Fomento, insists that he is confident that he can do it. Gov. Sanchez is fully supporting the Fomento program. But two things should be made clear.

The challenge is no longer to substantially reduce unemployment, but to desperately attempt to double a program already going at full speed in order to prevent unemployment from zooming up. Secondly, it is becoming increasingly difficult for Fomento to simply match past performances. There are in the U.S. today 14,000 organizations trying to promote industries for their areas. We have seen Puerto Rico almost double tax-exemption in recent years attempting to get industry where it is most needed; out in the island.

The deep implication of Einstein's discovery is not that all is relative and therefore there is no truth, but that the truth itself lies in the endless motion of our universe. In this decade, Puerto Rico is moving five times as fast as in the 1950's. Our population growth today is just over 2.4 percent as compared to .5 percent during the last decade. We are running out of space; population density today is twice that of India and over three times that of China.

But more important, we may run out of time. Puerto Rico has a great number of people who are neither working nor looking for jobs. The labor participation ratio is very low; less than 50 percent. The economy of Puerto Rico is indeed running faster that ever; but if we open our eyes to a 1905 discovery, we will see that we are losing the race.

[Translation from an editorial in El Imparcial (San Juan), Sept. 11, 1965]

A MISERABLE VENGEANCE

Knowing by experience all the many unpleasant things which may be expected from the complex functioning of the United States Congress, the people of Puerto Rico must accept with great reservation the reiterated belief manifested by Mr. Alfredo Nazario, Secretary of Labor, that Congress will not take action, as of now, on the new Wage and Hour Bill.

Power feeds on power, and the President, who has achieved all that a President may aspire to, obviously would prefer to assure himself that he will be able to face the electorate in 1968 with a law extending the federal minimum wage to some seven million more workers.

Under normal circumstances, the President could well decide not to exert pressure in favor of the approval of this law before December of this year. It could be approved in 1966 or 1967.

But right now, such normal circumstances do not exist in the United States. The dramatic change in the course of domestic and foreign affairs may force a modification of the estimates, and no politician with his head on his shoulders—and Johnson is one of them—will skip doing what is advantageous and desirable at the moment when all the factors are favorable.

The President is on his best terms with Congress. But he is having a hard time with foreign politics. Because of the military commitments in Asia, more and more men and resources are tied up. You must make concessions to have a happy rear-guard. It, is quite possible, therefore, that the President may decide to have the law increasing the federal minimum wage approved this year instead of the following.

If the President does decide to exert pressure on Congress regarding this law, its approval would be certain this year. This is the danger which Puerto Rico is running at this moment. The Law establishes a new Federal minimum wage salary of $1.75 per hour and it creates step increases for the Island of 12, 16 and 12 per cent during a period of three consecutive years. This would govern all the industries in interstate commerce, that is, those which export their merchandise to the United States. The estimates indicate that the application of the federal statute would adversely affect at least one-third of the factories established in Puerto Rico and that it would create helpless unemployment for some 30,000 persons.

The last-minute allegations of Representatives POWELL and ROOSEVELT are so extremely ridiculous that it is not worthwhile to honor them with any comment. They harbor a miserable grudge against Puerto Rico, because its Government, its Press and its economic institutions, year after year, have vigorously protested in Congress against a legislation which destroys the industrial efforts and the programs of the Island to create better ways of life for the people.

It is very dangerous, nevertheless, this confidence of the Secretary of Labor. It is time already that we realize the unscrupulous machinations of the North American politicians and that we do whatever is needed to keep them in line in their perverse intentions. The Department of Labor, the Economic Development Administration and the Resident Commissioner should constantly be on guard in the Congress against this legislation. Before its approval, it is preferable, without waiting any further, to request Puerto Rican sovereignty over its own system of salaries.

[Editorial from the San Juan Star, January 1966]

There may be trouble ahead for Puerto Rico, however, in the President's promise to fight for a higher Federal minimum wage and expansion of coverage to millions of workers not now included in the minimum wage law. Puerto Rico is included in the Fair Labor Standards Act, which includes minimum wages, under a special provision which permits reviews by industry committees of hardship cases. It is ironic that all of the beneficial provisions of the Great Society program could be negated here by one mistake in the treatment of Puerto Rico under one wage law. If the Federal minimum wage were to apply here equally with the mainland, without special consideration for the peculiar conditions in the island and the difference between this and the U.S. economy, all the anti-poverty help wouldn't make a dent in the poverty that would be created let alone relieve what exists today.

Resident Commissioner Santiago Polanco Abreu said in Washington last week that he would ask the House subcommittee on labor to re-open hearings on the minimum wage bill to hear Puerto Rico's story. A subcommittee of the Senate held hearings here recently and compiled a strong record of warnings against extension to Puerto Rico of the minimum wage bill already approved by the full House Labor committee last year. This could be a make or break issue for the island this year, at a time when Puerto Rico needs more than ever before to increase the momentum of its economic growth rather than apply artificial and unrealistic brakes to its progress.

[Editorial translated from the Jan. 10 edition of El Mundo, San Juan, P.R.]

IT IS URGENT TO REACH CONGRESS

The Government of Puerto Rico has expressed clearly its opposition to the planned increase in minimum wages, in the form in which the United States Congress contemplates it at the present time, and it has stated that it would constitute a mortal blow to the efforts being made to give impulse and vitality to the island's economy.

Several Puerto Rican officials—among them Alfredo Nazario, Secretary of Labor—making a statement before the Senate Labor Subcommittee, pleaded for keeping the special industry committees, which up to the present time have had the right of regulating the minimum salary.

Such committee, which would disappear if the federal legislation under consideration is approved, have been up to now a relief for certain industries which cannot bear the pressure of the present salaries.

The Secretary of Labor expressed opposition also to the suggested formula of automatic increase, stating that the same would result in harm to the Puerto Rican economy. Up to now, the existing precarious balance, between what many industries can pay its workers and what they are actually paying them, has been kept, thanks to the complex series of factors, which vary in each situation. The salary increases have taken place, but they must be justified, so that they do not endanger the existence of industry, nor its capacity to generate employment.

The automatic increases proposed by Congress would not have the virtue of making the individual corrections needed by many of those industries, and the disappearance of the special committees would eliminate the last refuge for them.

The closing of those factories and the decrease in the number of jobs in many others, undoubtedly would be enough to hold and even turn back the economic revolution which has been taking place in Puerto Rico.

Ever since the United States Congress started to promote the revision in minimum wages, "El Mundo" has been pointing out the need for the government leaders to become aware of the irretrievable harm which might be done to the Puerto Rican economy.

In the recent public hearings, even the labor leaders, traditionally bound to defend every salary increase, were divided regarding the desirability of eliminating the special committees, which up to now have kept, in some cases, lower salaries from those stipulated by law.

Puerto Rico should bring up, with great urgency and by all the available means, its point of view before Congress regarding this case. The greatest number of authorized persons should raise their voices to warn clearly that one of the bases of our progress during the last twenty years cannot be eliminated in such a way, without endangering the stability of our whole economic structure.

[Editorial from the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1966]

PUERTO RICAN WAGES

Irreparable damage may be done to the developing economy of Puerto Rico if changes are not made in the minimum wage bill reported by the House Labor Committee. Unlike its predecessors, the present bill fails to take account of Puerto Rico's position on the ladder of economic development. It would over a two-year period raise the minimum wage on the island by 28 per cent, and the consequent increase in labor costs would surely reduce employment.

It has long been the policy of both the Federal Government and the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to eliminate the wage differentials between the islands and the mainland. But precipitous moves in that direction will be self-defeating. Here on the mainland, where the average hourly wage is far above $1.25, the proposed 28 per cent increase in the minimum—from $1.25 to $1.60 over a two-year period—will affect only 21 per cent of the employed workers and raise the total wage bill by a little more than 2 per cent. But in Puerto Rico a comparable advance in the minimum wage would affect 79 per cent of the employed and raise the total wage bill by 14 per cent. It has been estimated by the Commonwealth Economic Development Administration that 27,000 manufacturing jobs would be lost or endangered.

Under the current law review committees appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Labor are empowered to reduce mandatory minimum wage increases in Puerto Rican industries where they would result in substantial reductions of employment. But despite exceptions made by the committees, 60 per cent of Puerto Rican workers covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act are subject to the statutory $1.25 an hour minimum. And wages in the island's manufacturing industries have over the last decade increased by 100 per cent.

The review committee mechanism, which has worked so well in the past, should be incorporated into the pending bill. Puerto Rico's per capita income is 40 per cent below that of Mississippi and the rate of unemployment is 11 per cent. The sharp rise in labor costs that would result from the passage of the House Labor Committee bill will diminish employment opportunities and subject Puerto Rico's industries to insurmountable competition from other Caribbean areas. "Operation Bootstrap" will be succeeded by "Operation Backslide" if Congress fails to recognize the uniqueness of Puerto Rico.

[Editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 3, 1966]

SAN JUAN'S FLOWERS HIDE THORNY PROBLEMS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.—They tell a story here of the flamboyant tree. It is like marriage, say the Puerto Ricans, making a small joke. It begins with lovely flowers, but it winds up with ugly pods.

The visitor to San Juan is likely to find in the cycle of the flamboyant tree a vivid symbol of the contrasts that mark Puerto Rico today. The Commonwealth's economy is flowering in a hundred ways; but behind and beyond the flowers lie some fearful problems.

To the casual eye of the mainland visitor, San Juan is a tourist's dream. He drives from the bustling new international airport along postcard avenues, palmlined; the sky is a cobalt blue and the foam-fringed sea a turquoise green. On down the Avenida Ashford, resort hotels tower from the beach like wedding cakes, and swank little shops are a tray of petits-fours.

Over most of the Santurce district of downtown San Juan, the aura of wealth is as sweet as the breeze off the sea. Most of the great banks of the world have branches here. Leading U.S. corporations have left their trademarks all over town. By night, the elegant casinos are crowded with visitors who come not only from the United States but from much of Latin America as well. This is luxury—at $42 a night for a single room in the best hotels—and Puerto Rico loves it.

The city bubbles with proud statistics—three new plants a week; a 10 percent annual gain in the national product; a spectacular rise in per capita income. Everywhere one looks, a giant construction crane is bowing and dipping like some bony shore bird, concrete slabs in its beak. There is a Levittown, and a dozen other private subdivisions, all of them lifted from monotony by the Puerto Ricans' individual taste in Spanish grilles and ironwork screens.

Manufacturing booms—textiles, cigars, clothing. San Juan, one is told, is the "brassiere capital of the world," and they make a small joke of that, too. If the United States supports Puerto Rico, it is said, in return Puerto Rico supports the United States. In fact, it supports both hemispheres. There is mucho gusto here, a dynamic energy, a fierce zeal to keep the flamboyant blooming.

Yet there is anxiety also. The prodigious exertions of Operation Bootstrap have created problems almost as rapidly as they have solved them. In the midst of a wild inflation in land values, prices of private housing have soared. The classified ads of the San Juan Star list dozens of houses and condominium apartments from $23,000 to $68,000, but few at lower levels. Unhappily, little of this inflation has filtered back to construction workers. By mainland standards, wage rates are low. Unemployment last month reached 11.9 percent of the labor force, and the trend is upward.

Beyond the spacious boulevards, the teeming slums persist. Public housing projects have relieved the problem, but not always successfully. The typical Puerto Rican is an individualist to the core; he was not made for regimentation, or for community action either. Some of the older "urbanizaciones" are unspeakably dreary—three-story concrete slums, chainlinked—but new projects are considerably better.

The island's population problems pile up like cumulus clouds, grey-streaked with storms ahead. After a brief decline, emigration to the American mainland once again is increasing. In the first three months of this year, 21,500 departed the island, against 16,000 in the same period of 1965. In March alone, the net outflow approached 10,700 persons. Yet this emigration has not been nearly sufficient to offset a population increase pushed along by a birthrate of 31.8 per thousand. The island's population passed 2.7 million in January, and is gaining at 50,000 a year. Everyone talks about birth control, one is told, but in a predominantly Catholic society, no one does much about it.

The gratifying increases in per capita income ("We are now 60 percent of Mississippi!") cannot conceal a widespread poverty. Yet many of the leaders of San Juan, Liberals and Conservatives alike, are fighting desperately to defeat legislation now pending in Congress that would impose a 28 percent increase in minimum wages upon Puerto Rican employers. At this point in Puerto Rico's economic growth, especially if it were piled on top of a drastic change in capital gains taxation asked by Governor Sanchez, so large an increase in wages could have catastrophic results. The island's boom is not that solid.

Yet a visitor is likely to form a conclusion that Puerto Rico will solve these problems. Under the beloved Munoz, and now under Sanchez, the island has benefited from intelligent leadership. The industrial and intellectual communities are not wedded to doctrinaire solutions. And beyond the elegance of the new hotels and the honky-tonk of Old San Juan lie the massive granite walls of El Morro. Puerto Rico has made it these 400 years and more. Under the flag of Spain, it survived the guns of Drake; under its own flag—and ours—Puerto Rico will survive the 20th Century forces that now pound at its shores like the restless sea.

[Editorial from the San Juan Star, May 13, 1966]

LAST DITCH FIGHT

Resident Commissioner Santiago Polanco Abreu put in a full day in Washington yesterday in his last ditch fight against congressional approval of a minimum wage bill that would seriously harm Puerto Rico's economy. He visited the White House where he briefed Presidential aide Harry McPherson on the bill's provisions for Puerto Rico and on the impact they would have on the island's economic development if approved, spoke briefly on the floor of the House where he warned the bill would "seriously strike Operation Bootstrap," and held a press conference in which he outlined his program to fight the bill this week and next week when it will come to the floor for debate.

That was a busy day for a good cause. If the bill as presently drafted should be approved by Congress it would impose on industry and business here a 28 percent mandatory increase in Federal minimum wage rates over the next two years. Even more drastic is the harm it would do by extending coverage to agricultural workers.

Mr. Polanco told reporters that the bill is senseless in its application to Puerto Rico Not senseless was his reason: "The Puerto Rican economy is a developing one and this bill is geared to an already high economy in the United States. It would be a serious error to impose this bill on Puerto Rico."

The Congress will not commit that error, we hope, because there has been no time in the last two decades of economic progress here when prudence and moderation in the handling of this sensitive development program has been more necessary. We saw quite recently the ill of an ill-advised capital gains bill which, fortunately, was stricken down by public opinion. That hurdle, has been overcome and serious dislocation of the economy was averted.

Now the Federal minimum wage bill poses an even greater threat to a program designed to create jobs, not destroy them. Those industries that can pay better wages here should pay them, either voluntarily or by determination of the Federal or Commonwealth minimum wage boards or through collective bargaining. But the imposition of blanket percentage increases to all operations covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act would certainly destroy not only those firms that are unable to meet the increases but it would discourage many others from establishing job-creating factories on the island.

Mr. Polanco is doing a yeoman service that should have the blessings of every man and woman in Puerto Rico who hopes to find a job and those who want to retain the jobs they have.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the House last Thursday, I pointed out the grave consequences that H.R. 13712, the proposed Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966, will have on the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico's economy, if enacted without amendment by this Congress. I said then, and I say again now, that the bill fundamentally errs in attempting to impose the wage policies of the United States, the world's most affluent, most industrialized, most productive country, upon Puerto Rico, an emergent but still economically underdeveloped and isolated affiliate of the Great Society.

Our goals are identical—the betterment of the working conditions of our citizens. But the economic framework of our societies, which must necessarily be considered in determining the feasibility of our goals, are vastly different. From an economic point of view, we cannot blindly assume that what is right and good for the United States is necessarily right and good for Puerto Rico.

I showed last week that the teachings of the history of the Federal minimum wage in Puerto Rico counsel us to discard the automatic wage increase in Puerto Rico as a formula that has proved unworkable and greatly injurious to the Commonwealth's constant efforts to lower the level of unemployment on the Island. A flexible method of wage adjustment—in the form of committees which review each industry—is the only feasible means of paying José his deserved wage, without robbing Ramón of his job.

At this point, I would like to call your attention to a resolution passed, just last week, by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico and the report on this resolution of its Senate Committees on Labor, Agriculture, and Industry. These documents cogently explain and defend the position on H.R. 13712, which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, through its Resident Commissioner, has taken. This resolution also reflects the great anxiety and concern which H.R. 13712 has generated throughout the length and breadth of Puerto Rico—on the farms, in the stores, in the small factories as well as the large, in union halls—a fear, which the Puerto Ricans have made vocal through the voice of their legislative assembly, that H.R. 13712 will deprive them of their jobs, cost them their businesses, and stifle the economic growth of their island. The texts of the resolution and report read as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, CAPITOL, SAN JUAN, P.R.

We Néstor Rigual and Diego Román-Artiguez, Secretary of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, respectively, certify: That in sessions held by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, during the Second Regular Session of the Fifth Legislative Assembly (1966), the following concurrent resolution (H. Conc. R. 16) was approved:

"Concurrent resolution to express to the Congress of the United States the position of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to H.R. 13712 of the United States House of Representatives anent the provisions establishing irreversible automatic raises in the minimum wages of all industries of Puerto Rico now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the provisions that apply to Puerto Rico the extension of the coverage of said act, and to provide for the transmittal to that Legislative Body of this concurrent resolution;

"Whereas pending consideration by the House of Representatives of the United States is H.R. 13712 to amend the present Fair Labor Standards Act;

"Whereas said bill, as regards Puerto Rico, provides for industries now covered by Federal Minimum Wage Orders two consecutive automatic increases of 12% and 16%, effective April 1, 1967 and 1968, respectively, without providing an adequate revision procedure;

"Whereas the application to Puerto Rico of a system of automatic federal minimum wage increases of a uniform, inflexible and irreversible nature, not taking into consideration the existing differences in the economic situation of the different industries affected, threatens the stability of those of said affected industries that cannot pay them, and, consequently, the security of employment therein;

"Whereas the procedure of fixing in Puerto Rico minimum wage increases based on percentage parallel with minimum wage increases in the United States is not in consonance with the reality of the situation, for because of the difference between economic conditions in the United States and Puerto Rico, while the minimum wage in Puerto Rico, is, as a general rule, the prevalent wage, in the United States the minimum wage fixed by law is in fact much below the wages currently paid in industry;

"Whereas for the aforesaid reasons, a raise in the general level of minimum wages in Puerto Rico has a much greater and different effect than a raise in the minimum wage in the United States;

"Whereas the working mass of Puerto Rico increases rapidly on account of the growth of our population, which calls for an ever increasing number of jobs with the highest wages which the economic capacity of the industries of Puerto Rico can afford;

"Whereas an increase in the minimum wages in Puerto Rico in the form proposed in H.R. 13712, would adversely affect the industrialization program of Puerto Rico, thus preventing the creation of new sources of work to cope with the serious unemployment problem existing in Puerto Rico;

"Whereas same H.R. 13712 would extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to other industries of an essentially local character, and to agricultural activities, whose minimum wages are determined and subject to periodical revision under the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Act;

"Whereas the provisions of H.R. 1312, with respect to agriculture, while fundamentally taking into account the characteristics of agriculture in the United States, are not adaptable to the conditions of agriculture in Puerto Rico;

"Whereas the extension of the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to industries of a local character and to agriculture does not improve the procedure and would add nothing to the benefits already enjoyed by our laborers under the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Act, but on the contrary, would create complications and difficulties, specially in so far as the Island's agriculture is concerned, to the prejudice of both laborers and employers;

"Whereas under the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Act there is being envolved an effective minimum wage program applicable to such industries and to agriculture, under which, not only are minimum wages in industries and agriculture periodically revised every two years, but it is the policy of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, expressed in the Minimum Wage Act itself, to insure to the laborers the highest wage that the economic conditions of the industries will permit, through a flexible procedure for the fixing of minimum wages in each industry and in agriculture;

"Whereas it is the duty of this Legislative Assembly toward the people of Puerto Rico in general, and toward the laborers of Puerto Rico in particular, to bring to the attention of Congress the reasons for which the amendments proposed to the Fair Labor Standards Act as regards Puerto Rico should be considered unnecessary, unjustifiable and prejudicial: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

"(1) To express, as it is hereby expressed, to the House of Representatives and to the Senate of the United States:

"(a) That it favors that the statutory minimum wages provided by H.R. 13712 be applied in Puerto Rico as soon as circumstances will permit, but is opposed to the automatic, irreversible and uniform-percentage increases provided for Puerto Rico in said bill, that, is, without flexibility or review recourse;

"(b) That it is opposed to the application to Puerto Rico of the extension of the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act as contained in the said H.R. 13712.

"(2) To direct, as it is hereby directed, that this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted through the Puerto Rico Resident Commissioner to the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States."

In testimony whereof, we issue this certificate to which we set our hands and affix the seals of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico at the Capitol Building, San Juan, Puerto Rico, this tenth day of May one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six.

DIEGO ROMÁN-ARTIGUEZ,
Secretary, Senate of Puerto Rico.
NÉSTOR RIGUAL,
Secretary, House of Representatives.

REPORT ON CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16 OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PUERTO RICO BY THE SENATE COMMITTEES ON LABOR, AGRICULTURE, AND INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

GENERAL EXPLANATION

Introduction

In considering H.C.R. No. 16, your Committees carefully examined and studied each and everyone of the provisions of H.R. 13712, of the House of Representatives of the

United States, which motivates the consideration thereof, in order to determine the scope of said bill with regard to Puerto Rico. In the analysis and discussion of the said bill, these Committees received valuable assistance and cooperation from the Secretaries of Labor, Justice, and Agriculture of Puerto Rico; from the Chairman of the Minimum Wage Board of Puerto Rico; and also from the Economic Advisor of the Economic Development Administration.

In order to place in the proper perspective the scope and purpose of the Concurrent Resolution, there follows a brief account of the Fair Labor Standards Act in its philosophy and application to Puerto Rico; likewise, an explanation concerning the provisions of H.R. 13712 relative to Puerto Rico.

Fundamental Philosophy of the Fair Labor Standards Act in Its Application to Puerto Rico

The Fair Labor Standards Act of the United States, originally approved on June 25, 1938, included Puerto Rico in its provisions, as well as the States of the Union. The consequences of the application of the law in Puerto Rico, because of the differences between our economic situation and that of the states of the Union, were serious. Having knowledge of this, Congress adopted special provisions for Puerto Rico (54, Stat. 615). A perusal of the text of these provisions will be enough to notice that the application of the law in Puerto Rico had to be given, in a substantial manner, a purpose which was fundamentally different from that of its application in the United States. In the United States the law aimed primarily at creating a uniform base, a common denominator, on which the structure of the wage system in the United States was to be built; minimum wages, for each industry, would be dependent on the system of collective bargaining; agreements established between the industry, developed and organized, and labor unions, also developed and organized. There was no intent to establish, nor was it possible to establish, such uniform base in Puerto Rico. It was not possible to establish a common denominator which could afford a uniform base to collective bargaining. To some industries it would have been beyond their means; to others it would have been too low. Industrial Committees appointed by the Secretary of Labor would have to determine the minimum wage for each industry, and, as a criterion to follow in the fixing of minimum wages by the Industrial Committees, there was established the specific rule that the minimum wage should be in each case as high as the industry could afford to pay without causing unemployment; on the other hand, not so low that it might give undue advantage to any Puerto Rican industry in the United States market.

It was thus admitted that the raise of wages beyond certain limits might cause unemployment in Puerto Rico, and no changes were to be taken. Between the wage which might paralyze the industrial development of Puerto Rico and the wage which, without being too high, might allow for the establishment and the existence of the industries, the need for an adjustment was admitted, so that employment opportunities in Puerto Rico might not be curtailed. Congress acknowledged the great necessity of preserving existing jobs and of increasing, insofar as possible, employment opportunities in Puerto Rico, afflicted as it was, and still is, by serious unemployment.

On the other hand, by establishing that salaries to be paid in Puerto Rico, pursuant to the determinations of the Industrial Committees, were not to be as low as to give to the Puerto Rican industry a competitive advantage in the United States market, it legitimately protected the employment stability of the United States worker.

It is with these fundamental criteria that the law has since been applied to Puerto Rico. The remarkable industrial and economic development of Puerto Rico during the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act in the manner described above constitutes proof beyond doubt of the soundness of the determinations of Congress in its Law of June 26, 1940, already mentioned.

Modifications to the Fair Labor Standards Act in Its Application to Puerto Rico

The system of Industrial Committees thenceforth in force in Puerto Rico for implementing the Federal Minimum Wage Act has been the subject of successive amendments, in an attempt to perfect it in the course of the years. By virtue of such amendments the procedure for determining the wages is swifter and more expeditious than it originally was. Revisions occur at intervals of not more than two years.

An amendment in 1961 (Law No. 87-30 of May 5, 1961) altered the system for wage determination. Congress decreed an automatic increase of 15 and 10 per cent in the minimum wages theretofore paid in Puerto Rico under the determinations of the Industrial Committees.

The supporters of this deviation from the established procedure explained that automatic increases should be made in Puerto Rico in a proportion percentagewise, to the increases made by law to the uniform minimum wage in force in the United States. Representatives of Puerto Rico at that time reasonably argued that the proposition was based on a false premise. The legal minimum wage is not the prevalent wage in the United States; it is only the platform on which collective bargaining is mounted; the prevailing wages in the United States are generally higher, sometimes considerably so, than the minimum wages prescribed by law. Consequently, an increase in the legal minimum wage in the United States does not automatically bring about a uniform increase in the wages paid by the various industries. The minimum wage, even increased by law, generally remains below prevailing wages. Conversely, the automatic increase of the minimum wage in Puerto Rico means a raise of the prevailing wage, because there is, in Puerto Rico, very little difference, if any, between the latter and the legal minimum. It should be borne in mind that the Industrial Committees should, in the determination of wages, reach the maximum wage level which industries are able to attain, without causing unemployment.

In the contraposition of the proponents of the automatic increases on a percentage basis on the one hand, and the representatives of Puerto Rico who pointed out its unreasonableness on the other, a compromise was arrived at whereby, even though automatic increases were accepted for that year, review committees would be appointed in all cases where the affected industries were unable to pay the automatically increased wages, whose application might create unemployment. The Review Committees were authorized to reduce the increase provided by law wherever the inability of the industry to pay the same were established.

This system inverted the procedure so far followed. Instead of having the Industrial Committees determine the minimum rates which industries would have to pay, the Review Committees might, whenever industries should be unable to pay the minimum rates established by the law, consequently reduce the amount of the wages.

Experience since 1961

Five years have elapsed since then, and experience has shown how right were those who opposed the rigid automatic increases while favoring a flexible system. Practice has shown how necessary it was to maintain an individualized system for the determination of wages in Puerto Rico. Ten industries with a total of 30 classifications appealed from the first increase of 15 percent, and the committees on appeals recommended increases lower than 15 percent for 25 of these classifications. Eight industries having a total of 24 classifications appealed from the second 10 per cent raise. In this case the committees recommended raises lower than 10 per cent for 22 classifications. The industries so affected were affording employment to 28,000 workers.

In the light of these facts, it is difficult to understand why H.R. 13712, disregarding the data offered by experience, now proposes automatic increases on a uniform percentage basis, inflexible increases, with no possible correction in the event of economic inability to pay. If we are to judge the future by the past, as it is wise to do, in the face of the fact that the circumstances in 1966 are the same as in 1961, there does not seem to be any possible justification to cast aside the Review Committees. By so doing, as it would have been the case in 1961 if the Review Committees had not been created, H.R. 13712 threatens the existence of our industries; it threatens, consequently, the working opportunities of thousands of persons employed in the affected industries. In the face of these facts, which make the measure unnecessary, erroneous, unjustified and dangerous, the urgency of modifying its provisions is obvious, so that the principle of flexibility be preserved in the law, that it may be applied realistically, with due protection to United States workers by excluding undue competition on the part of the Puerto Rican industries, but also with due regard to the working opportunities in, and the economic development of, Puerto Rico.

Provisions That Extend the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act To Cover Industries Not Heretofore Subject to Said Act in Puerto Rico, Including Agriculture

By extending the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, minimum wages for industries heretofore not included in its provisions, would be determined through the Industrial Committees procedure. The agricultural industry is included.

As regards new industries, agriculture inclusive, the provisions of the bill to apply in the United States are directed to the circumstances of the United States economy. Although, by virtue of its federal form of government, the Union consists of 50 different political units, the truth is that the United States constitutes a geographical unit (with the only exception of Hawaii and Alaska) and, undoubtedly, an economic unit. This is the outcome of a long and well known historical development. Consequently, the concept of interstate commerce has been progressively changing in its significance and interpretation. The commercial and industrial activities do not evolve in separate state compartments. United States commerce develops throughout the entire United States geographical area. At present it is difficult to draw a line between what is interstate commerce and what is purely internal state commerce. The concept of interstate commerce has been in practice substituted for one of national internal commerce.

Although the economic development of all the geographical areas of the Union is not uniform, the differences between them are not extreme and it is possible to find, for the purpose of establishing a national minimum wage, a reasonable common denominator. It is only in a limited number of cases that minimum wages might be higher than the wages prevalent in a given industry or region.

Puerto Rico's case does not fit in this pattern. Neither does the degree of development of Puerto Rico, whose per capita income, in spite of the progress achieved during the last few years, continues to be about half the per capita income of the state of the Union having the lowest income; nor the geographical location of Puerto Rico, at a distance of not less than 1,000 miles from the eastern coast of the United States and depending for its manufacture on raw material transported from the continent; nor the lack of raw material for manufacturing purposes (except certain tropical agricultural products); nor its population density; nor its high percentage of unemployment, permit the application of the same criteria to regulate the intercoastal commerce of Puerto Rico with the United States, and much less to consider the local commerce of Puerto Rico, as if immersed within or wholly integrated into the U.S. national internal commerce.

Wholesale and retail trade in Puerto Rico does not have the same effect on the wholesale and retail trade in the United States, as the wholesale and retail trade of a state has on the wholesale and retail trade of contiguous or neighboring state. The construction industry in Puerto Rico does not and cannot have the same effect on the construction industry in a state of the Union, as that of a contiguous or neighboring state in the Continent. Laundries in Puerto Rico can not possibly compete with laundries in the states of the Union; laundries more than one thousand miles apart cannot influence each other from an economic point of view. Public transportation, restaurants, hotels, motels, hospitals and other related institutions, and gasoline service stations, are activities of an eminently local character in Puerto Rico and must operate within and in harmony with local economic conditions, in an insular area, not in accordance with continental economic conditions. The highest possible wage should be established for the sake of the workers, but the element of competition with the salaries of the workers of the continent does not exist. It should be borne in mind that one of the two criteria that must be followed in the application of the law in Puerto Rico under the formula of the Industrial Committees is that the wages in Puerto Rico should not be so low as to permit the industries of the Island to unduly compete on the market of the United States. Such criterion would be inapplicable in the local non-agricultural industries nor in the agriculture of Puerto Rico.

Had Puerto Rico been remiss to adopt laws for the protection of the wages of its workers, the provision of federal protection by federal law might be warranted. But Puerto Rico has an efficient Minimum Wage Act since 1941, and it is a fact that under this system wages in Puerto Rico have considerably increased in the course of the years. For instance: In the manufacturing industries, from 36 cents and hour in 1946, to \$1.26 in 1965; in hotels, from 36 cents an hour in 1950, to \$1.26 in 1965; in laundries, from 35 cents in 1950, to 77 in 1964; in restaurants, from 17 cents in 1944, to 77 in 1965; in wholesale commerce, from 59 cents in 1950, to \$1.34 in 1963; in hospitals, from 27 cents in 1950 to 88 cents in 1965; and in the construction industry, from 49 cents in 1950 to \$1.27 in 1964. As a result, the distribution of Puerto Rico's income has notably improved, the proportion for wages and salaries having increased from 56.5% in 1940, to 69.0% in 1965.

The Minimum Wage Act of Puerto Rico provides that in the determination of minimum wages the conditions of each industry must be taken into account. Minimum wages should be determined at the highest level the industry is able to bear. In this respect nothing new is proposed for Puerto Rico in H.R. 13712 by the extension of coverage to new industries and agriculture. However, instead of the Industrial Committees being entirely composed of residents of the community they serve, they would be largely composed of residents in the Continent, who cannot be supposed to have a greater or even an equal knowledge of local conditions as residents here might have. Another difference would be that instead of the industrial committees being appointed by the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Board, with permanent offices in Puerto Rico, they would be appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Labor.

It is difficult to understand how industrial committees thus composed can be more effective in the protection of the worker's wages and employment stability than the industrial committees formed under the Puerto Rican law. The economic conditions of a country visited for the first time cannot be easily understandable in a short period of days nor by those who have never lived in that community. The procedure to which employers and workers in Puerto Rico are used would be substituted for others with which they are not familiar. Any claim or complaint would have in each case to wait until the federally appointed committees are met and in operation in Puerto Rico, or else addressed to Washington. At present, employers and workers have continuous access to the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Committee, with its permanent office in Puerto Rico.

Although the teaching of English is compulsory in the schools of Puerto Rico and a considerable percentage of our population is knowledgeable in said language, Spanish is the community language of Puerto Rico for the same historical reasons that English is the community language of the United States. Proceedings before the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Board are conducted in Spanish. The employers and workers of Puerto Rico not proficient in the English language would meet difficulties which they do not have today in their relationship with an official organization in charge of matters of such importance to them as the fixing of minimum wages. This would especially apply in the case of agriculture; it would affect in a large measure our rural population.

With regard to agriculture it should be particularly pointed out how undesirable and unfruitful would be the application of the provisions of the bill. Our main agricultural commodity is sugar. The wages the cane sugar grower can pay must bear relation with the price at which Puerto Rican sugar is sold in the United States. The United States sugar market is controlled by a quota system. The price at which sugar is sold is not fixed through free competition. The Secretary of Agriculture of the United States has in his hands the mechanisms to control sugar prices in the continental market. Puerto Rico has no means whatsoever to influence the price at which sugar is sold. The wages that can be paid in Puerto Rico in sugar cane cultivation depend on the price of sugar in the United States market. It cannot be higher than what that price allows. On the other hand, to pay wages lower than what economic conditions would permit, would not mean in any wise a competitive advantage, in the market of the United States, for sugar produced in Puerto Rico. If Puerto Rico sold its sugar at a price lower than the prevailing price in the United States, it would not therefore sell more sugar, in unfair competition with sugar produced in the United States, since the quantity of sugar that Puerto Rico can sell is limited to a quota. The criteria that the industrial committees would have to follow in the determination of wages, according to law, would hence be inapplicable in the case of sugar cane.

Coffee is another of the farm products of Puerto Rico. Coffee produced in Puerto Rico is almost all locally consumed. Save in the State of Hawaii, no coffee is produced in the United States. There is no competition between Puerto Rican and Hawaiian coffee. Puerto Rico's coffee is sold on the United States market only in those years in which the crop exceeds local consumption. It does not compete there with coffee produced in the United States, but with coffee imported from foreign countries, duty free.

It is evident that the fixing of wages in Puerto Rico in these two items of our agriculture is a matter that must be governed by the local situation, or by circumstances, as in the case of sugar, which are already predetermined by Congressional law. The intervention of federally appointed industrial committees in the fixing of wages in sugar cane and coffee, taken care of as it is by local law, does not respond to any practical necessity.

In so far as the law is applicable to the tropical food crops of Puerto Rico, which in their largest part are locally consumed, it is obvious that the situation would still be the more preposterous.

The law includes all farmers who have employed during the preceding year 500 man-days in any quarter. A man-day, as defined in the bill, is any man working any part of the day. Excluded from the computation are only the immediate relatives of the farmer and whose workers who, besides meeting other requirements, have not performed farm tasks for a period of 13 weeks during the preceding year. This last exception has very little application in Puerto Rico, where we have a rural population of 55.8 percent of our inhabitants, a rural population whose livelihood is, almost exclusively, farming. It would seem quite odd to find a rural worker in Puerto Rico who is not customarily an agricultural laborer. Because of the complexity of computations, many difficulties would be encountered to determine which farmers would be subject to the law and which would not, particularly in the case of small farmers. This would bring about unnecessary anguish and worry, besides issues of a legal nature.

Finally, attention should be called to the fact that from the standpoint of sound government principles, the best law is the simplest law, the most easily understandable to the citizen; the best government is that which is closest to the citizen. The extension to local industry and, above all, to agriculture, of the Federal minimum wage law, a law of difficult interpretation and execution and with its application entrusted to offcials who, at least to a large extent, are not members of the community—instead of a law known for many years, implemented by officials conversant with the living conditions of the community, who are a part of that community, and who are to answer from day to day to the opinion of their fellow citizens—certainly is not in keeping with the governmental principles under which Puerto Rico lives.

Clearly, a provision of this nature would depart from, and would constitute a setback in, the trajectory heretofore followed in the development of the relationships between the Federal Government and the people of Puerto Rico.

HIRSHHORN ART COLLECTION

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, last week it was disclosed that our Government has almost reached an agreement whereby one of the great private art collections in the world could be secured for this city and our Nation. The collection belongs to Mr. Joseph H. Hirshhorn of New York.

Thursday afternoon I had a conference with people from the White House and the Smithsonian Institution about this. They assured me this collection is worth every effort on our part to obtain it. From what they told me—and from what I have read about it—I am greatly impressed.

Mr. Hirshhorn's collection contains more than 6,000 pieces of art—many of them by foremost painters and sculptors of the past hundred years. Moreover, it is said to include the largest private collection of American art in existence. In my judgment, it would be a splendid addition to the cultural treasures of the Nation's Capital.

But to bring it to Washington is going to require that we provide a museum for it. In fact, this is going to have to be done right now. The element of urgency is in the fact that many other museums in this country and elsewhere in the world have been attempting to obtain the collection. Mr. Hirshhorn has received a number of proposals. So there is a plan to ask the Congress for the necessary authorization and construction money to build a museum for the collection here. The Smithsonian Institution would administer it.

Now I know there have been many controversies here in the last few months over a number of programs. There are those of us who have argued that it would be wise to postpone some of these projects for at least a year or more. But as this matter of the Hirshhorn collection comes before us in committee, I do not see how that argument can apply. This is a now or never proposition.

If we are to secure this collection for our National Capital—and if we are to assure that it remains permanently in the United States—then action must be taken at once. Otherwise, it will be lost to us forever.

I hope and trust that this body will hold that thought in mind as this matter moves along, and will take kindly toward it.

HIGHJINKS AT THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include excerpts from letters.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, May 10, I expressed criticism of the use made of the Smithsonian Institution when it was converted into a place of exhibitionist dancing. I also made reference to the dancing gyrations of the Reverend Bill Moyers, to the attire of the wife of a State Department official, and to dances at the White House which last until 3 o'clock in the morning.

To those in the administration hierarchy and others in and out of Congress who might be inclined to scoff at criticism of the highjinks that have been taking place in Washington's little world of social make-believe, let me say that I have received scores of letters and telegrams, 99 percent of them denouncing this foolishness, especially while Americans are fighting and dying in a sanguinary war thousands of miles from home.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD brief excerpts from a number of the communications received on this subject:

"I would like to express my appreciation to you for speaking out about a deplorable situation in Washington, D.C." (California housewife.)

"I wholeheartedly agree with your stand against the mink coat set swinging watusi until early morning hours while our men are fighting and dying in Viet Nam." (Texas minister.)

"Here's one who agrees with your statement. Have heard dozens say the same thing." (Resident of Atlanta, Georgia.)

"What a spectacle for our morals when our boys are fighting in Viet Nam. No wonder teen agers act the way they do." (Michigan resident.)

"I just had to write to you and say 'Bravo' for your courage in calling attention to the 'mink coat set' in Washington. It is high time those White House watusi dancers realize there is a war going on." (Maryland housewife.)

"Parties until 3 a.m. at the White House are a direct insult to those families whose sons are serving in Viet Nam." (Resident of Philadelphia.)

"This is to commend you for your stand, and all of us in this family agree with you wholeheartedly." (Connecticut citizen.)

"I have never written to a congressman before, but after reading today's paper I felt I must. I am the mother of three small children and a Baptist. Thank you for standing up for what you believe in." (Kentucky housewife.)

"I strongly support your opposition to the shocking and inappropriate conduct of the LBJ 'Mink Coat Set.'" (A Texan.)

"They ought to be ashamed of themselves. I think of us as a nation in mourning, deep mourning, with our boys dying while they who sent them away to die, dance and have such merriment." (Resident of New York.)

"The purpose of this letter is just to let you know that some of us in the hinterlands do notice these things also and appreciate sincerely a person in your position putting our feelings into words and speaking up for all the country to hear." (Another Tired American.)

"May I congratulate you on your remarks regarding the Ball. One cannot but think of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." (Resident of Pennsylvania.)

"I have an 18-year-old son in the Army in Viet Nam and my husband is a career man in the Air Force, also serving overseas. I am very concerned with what seems to be going on in our Capital, by people in responsible positions." (Resident of Detroit.)

"Thank you for being a man representing the American people." (New Jersey resident.)

"I heard what you had to say in the papers. God bless you, Mr. GROSS." (Iowa resident.)

"Such actions are disgraceful with our boys dying in Viet Nam." (Delaware housewife.)

"I had the occasion to type a will for a career soldier who was home on a thirty-day emergency leave from Viet Nam which was extended to him when his wife suddenly died. When he came to the office I had a long conversation with him because I was very interested in Saigon. When he started to talk, his hands shook and he broke out in a cold sweat. I don't think I have ever had so much sympathy for anyone. President Johnson and his light hearted friends should be using their time and energy to help try to end the war and thereby helping young men like the one above referred to to live." (Florida secretary.)

"In our house live three lively children, one hamster, assorted fish, two salamanders, several neighborhood children at various times, and one husband (not necessarily listed in order of importance), so I have not too much time left over for writing letters to the proper government official or officials complaining of some breach of conduct. So I was very much encouraged (I might even go so far as to say thrilled) when I read last night of your remarkable speech on the House floor. I wanted to shout, 'All is not lost.'" (New Jersey housewife.)

"It makes me more than a little sick to know that these social butterflies are having such a great time while our boys are in Viet Nam. Now, I'm not an old prude, and I enjoy a good party as much as the next, but enough is enough. All that remains to be said is what an example." (Resident of Connecticut.)

"All this taking place with great merriment while loyal, patriotic American soldiers are giving their lives in Viet Nam. Mr. Congressman, many former Democrats—like myself—have joined the ranks of the Republican Party because of what is going on in this country of ours. (Resident of Virginia.)

"I am a firm believer in fun and relaxation, that it is necessary and is the due of everyone, but think those in Washington, and elsewhere, who are carrying fun to extremes, and at the cost of dignity and decency, are indeed making light of the problems facing our country and the world." (South Bend, Indiana, housewife.)

"I agree with you 100 percent. My opinion is let's get on with the job of winning the war and save our boys." By the way, I am a Democrat.' (Oregon resident.)

"In a regular business meeting of our church we voted unanimously to send you an expression of our appreciation for the courage that you have displayed in the rebuking of Mr. Bill Moyers and other present administration officials for their uncomplimentary public behavior." (Oklahoma Baptist minister.)

"On the same day we had casualties and deaths with the blood of our boys flowing in Viet Nam while they were celebrating with the cup and dance." (Maryland resident.)

"I am 70 years old and have never written a letter to a government official before. If a person wants to have a private party and make a fool of himself—that is his business—but when government officials reflect the standards of the U.S. Government I am afraid the Great Society is headed for the rocks." (Resident, New York State.)

"Thank you for speaking up about the 'Washington Blasts.' If we could only get a few more to speak up once in awhile maybe our state of affairs would change a little." (Iowa minister.)

"I think these 'affairs' are a shame and disgrace to our Nation; they are a terrible image and example to be set by our Nation's leaders." (Oklahoma judge.)

"We have no hope for the survival of our Nation, or the winning of the war unless these evils are corrected. Keep on and speak out." (Missouri minister.)

"Although I'm only 30 years old, I am old-fashioned enough to be shocked, too, at these orgies. They remind me of what I've read of the Roman Empire, and I shudder to remember that Rome fell." (Resident of New York.)

"I want to commend your vocal disapproval of these White House social activities—truly a disgrace to a nation with men dying on the world's battlefields. You have voiced the sentiments of many. We do thank you." (Minnesota minister.)

EARMARKED FUNDS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HELICOPTER SERVICE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last year the House removed an appropriation bill with funds earmarked for the development of helicopter service to three large cities in this country. I supported the measure to delete the funds because of an earlier understanding I felt the committee had reached on this subject.

The late and beloved chairman of the House Independent Offices Committee, Albert Thomas, strongly presented his reasons for deleting the funds and the House concurred with Mr. Thomas.

He made the point that only three cities had been singled out as recipients of the funds, and that it ought to be enlarged on a wider scale, or eliminated entirely until a more clear position could be reached.

I think, however, that the time has come now for Congress to give consideration to aiding the helicopter concept of air transportation.

In his message to Congress on transportation, President Johnson said:

> Transportation is not good enough when it provides sleek and efficient jet aircraft—and yet cannot move passengers to and from airports in the time it takes those aircraft to fly hundreds of miles.

In a similar vein Vice President HUMPHREY said:

> The establishment of helicopter service between city centers and outlying airports can do much to ease urban traffic congestion.

Helicopters, capable of vertical flight, have opened a new vista of air transportation. They offer a means of rapid access to city centers, avoiding the congestion and wasted time of surface travel.

The need for a coordinated air transportation system has long been recognized. Proper planning and administration should enable passengers and cargo to move from one carrier to another without significant delay. The major requirement is for improvement of service to travelers between close major metropolitan areas, city centers and outlying communities, particularly airports.

In spite of the financial problems that face helicopter carriers, they are making substantial contributions to the national air transportation system.

This is possible largely because of the important technical and development work that was carried out in prior years in collaboration with the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency, under a policy of Federal support.

However, there is good reason to submit that these carriers should not be compelled to carry out their present functions—as to the importance of which there is no disagreement among knowledgeable people—under the economic stress and limitations that have unfortunately been imposed on them, as opposed to other forms of air transportation.

For example, helicopter service connecting the centers of Washington and Baltimore with Dulles, Friendship, and National Airports would do much to eliminate the expensive delays that are now almost inevitable for the traveling public, as well as the airlines—both on the ground and in the air.

Such services would make better use of the large Government and industry investment already represented at Dulles. It would permit travelers to take full advantage of the fine facilities at Dulles. It would also enhance the central location of National.

Overflying surface congestion, helicopters save valuable time. They serve the needs of originating, terminating, and connecting passengers.

The problem of getting to and from city center centers to outlying areas—the most frustrating problem of the entire transportation system—should be eliminated.

The irony of the present air transportation system is that as jets decrease air time, surface time to and from airports grows more difficult and time consuming. Serious as the situation is now, it will become even more critical and more of an intolerable contradiction.

The helicopter concept is desperately needed in the North and East—and other large metropolitan areas. It certainly could be used in the Texas cities of Houston and San Antonio and the Fort Worth-Dallas area.

This is a growing and apparent need and I feel that Congress ought to face up to it now.

Efforts to resolve these difficulties must be undertaken on a larger and more expansive scale, as our national economy permits.

THE USE OF FORCE

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the authorization to use force granted by the United Nations to Great Britain in the present Rhodesia showdown is a cause for concern as evidenced by the following two editorials from two of this Nation's leading newspapers.

The distortion of the meaning of the threat to peace mandate contained in chapter VII of the United Nations Charter opens up a whole new area in which the internal affairs of individual nations can be dictated by the world body if conditions are not to the liking of a coterie of its members. One can well remember the warning of the late Dag Hammarskjold that the settlement of the Katanga affair was "an internal political problem to which the United Nations as an organization obviously cannot be a party." The United Nations did not heed the warning of Hammarskjold, and the ensuing chaos is now a matter of history.

If the United Nations is to have the confidence of fairminded men of all nations, its use of inconsistent and arbitrary policies must be eliminated.

Under unanimous consent, I include the two editorials from the Los Angeles Times and the Chicago Tribune in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune,
Apr. 12, 1966]

BRITAIN RESORTS TO FORCE

A last minute United Nations resolution has given the British government the authority—or more realistically the excuse—to do what it dared not do on its own. Acting under this resolution, a British frigate has intercepted and diverted the Greek tanker Manuela, which was headed for Portuguese Mozambique with a cargo of oil believed destined for Rhodesia in disregard of the embargo imposed by Britain.

It had become clear that without force, the Wilson government would probably be unable to carry out its promise to put down the white "rebellion" in Rhodesia; yet the British electorate is overwhelmingly opposed to the use of force. By waiting until after the election and then pushing the responsibility off on the U.N., at least on paper, Mr. Wilson is spared some of the pain of admitting failure.

The U.N. resolution was purposefully delayed, by a good many left-leaning Africans and others, including the president of the security council, Mr. Keita of Mali, in the apparent hope that the delay would make possible a much stronger resolution calling for the use of force against Rhodesia itself.

The chief backer of the resolution, aside from Britain, was the United States, of all countries. As early as 1776 the Continental Congress proclaimed the rights of neutrals on the high seas, in what is known as the Plan of 1776, and it was in large part to defend these rights that this country went to war in 1812 and again in 1917. Ambassador Goldberg admitted that it was "a hard decision" to back the resolution in the light of our own history, but said that conditions are different.

If conditions are different, it is only because the United Nations has assumed the role of rewriting international law—and rewriting it, ironically enough, so as to erode the protection to minorities and small groups which is the very basis of all law.

Thus freedom of the seas becomes a dead letter for those who are in the unfortunate minority in the United Nations. It remains the right of that self-seeking majority, indifferent to justice or principle, which would continue sending supplies to Castro's Cuba or to North Vietnam, and of our own officials who ignore the Russian trawlers which are steadily and irrevocably depleting the fishing waters just outside the three-mile limit of the United States.

The United States goes shopping for "threats to the peace" in a nation thousands of miles away from this country, allied with us in two world wars, and with which we have never exchanged a shot. It ignores the underground Russian missiles reported in Cuba by refugees, and turns the other cheek when Castro turns off the water supply to Guantanamo. In the kingdom of the blind, the one-eyed man is truly king.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Apr. 13, 1966]

RHODESIA: A DUBIOUS PRECEDENT

Actions often speak louder than words but, like words, actions too can mislead, distort or seem to imply more than they were intended to do. This certainly would appear to be the case in the current high seas drama featuring the U.N. Security Council, the British navy, and the oil tankers bound for Beira in Portuguese Mozambique.

The final destination for the oil carried by the tankers is Rhodesia, whose white-rule government last November unilaterally declared the colony independent from Britain. The oil is important, though more symbolically than economically, because Britain is trying to force the regime of Prime Minister Ian Smith to return to the fold. Economic sanctions have been Britain's chief weapon to this end for the last five months.

Up to now Britain has sought to handle the Rhodesian situation largely by herself. Trade has been cut off, assets frozen, credit suspended. The British government had realistically anticipated that it might be a full year before the economic squeeze on Rhodesia brought the desired results.

Britain's patience, however, has not been matched in black Africa, where emotionalism on the Rhodesia issue is intense.

President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania typified the sentiments of African spokesmen when he wrote recently that the continued existence of the Smith regime constitutes an advance "by the forces of racialism, fascism and . . . colonialism . . . a step backward in the drive for African freedom."

What the Africans want is quick military action against Rhodesia, to topple the white government and bring about rule by the country's 4 million blacks. They are prepared to fight to the last Englishman to achieve this end. And, Nyerere has written, if Britain won't do the job then the Africans will, presumably through Communist-supported guerrilla warfare.

Britain has no intention of using military force against Rhodesia. But, confronted with ever more shrill African demands for action, Britain apparently felt it had to move more vigorously in its policy of sanctions. This is why Prime Minister Wilson took the drastic step of going to the Security Council and internationalizing what so far had been essentially a British-Rhodesia affair.

Britain's recourse to the United Nations thus was prompted as much by a wish to circumvent the extremists as anything else. But the trouble is that in doing this Britain not only jeopardized its own control over the trend of events. It also may have been the unwitting instigator of a dangerous precedent.

The Security Council acted, in the oil tanker case, under Chapter VII of the Charter, which deals with threats to peace. But was there indeed any pressing threat to peace involved? Or was the Council resolution, asked by Britain and supported by the United States, chiefly a concession to expediency? And what future expediencies might result in similar Council action, prompted by the less responsible states, against the interests of other nations, great or small?

An irony in this disturbing business is that the Beira-bound tankers at issue really don't seem that important. Oil has, after all, been moving into Rhodesia overland from South Africa and Mozambique all through the embargo. Sealing Beira isn't going to stop this flow.

It isn't going to stop African demands for militant action against Rhodesia, either. In going to the Security Council Britain, at best, may have bought some more time for its pressures on Rhodesia to work. The price it paid, however, could turn out to be excessive.

FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the impact of H.R. 13712, the wage-hour bill, will have a highly adverse effect on retailers and their employees, for it can only increase prices and fan the already rampant inflation.

President Johnson, in his message to the 1st session of the 89th Congress in January 1965, proposed a broad program on labor legislation. Included in this program was a recommendation to Congress that the Federal minimum wages should be increased, and the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended in 1961, should be extended. In doing so, the President made no specific recommendation with respect to the amount of an increase in the minimum wage. He left that for Congress to determine, but he warned that Congress should consider carefully the effects of higher minimum wage rates on the income of those employed and also on costs and prices and on job opportunities—particularly for the flood of teenagers then entering our labor force. At the time that this proposal was made, our country was enjoying a healthy, prosperous, and a stable economy.

The condition of our economy now is quite different from what it was in January 1965. With the step-up of the military actions in Vietnam there exists currently a serious threat of run-away inflation. Wholesale prices have risen steadily as has the consumer price index. While the appeal at the present time to business and labor is self-control and conservatism in their price and wage policies, we are confronted with the possibility of increased taxation to curb the present inflationary trends and we have over our heads the possible necessity of Federal price and wage controls for all business. In view of these factors, I cannot see the logic, at this time, of increasing Federal minimum wages and the broad extension of coverage to other employers under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Such action would contribute further to the rapidly growing inflationary trends.

In my opinion the passage of the minimum wage bill, H.R. 13712, would be highly inflationary and greatly exceed the price-wage guidelines established by the administration. While H.R. 13712 proposes a less drastic increase in the minimum wage than that contained in H.R. 10518 reported out by the House Labor Committee in the last session of Congress, its effect on our economy would still be highly inflationary; would result in increases in prices to consumers, and would result in a reduction of employment. Its only justification for passage would be to fulfill the promise made to labor unions in the November 1965 elections.

My concern is particularly for the retail and service trades, which were brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act only by the 1961 amendments. Those retail enterprises with an annual sales volume of $1 million or more which were covered by the 1961 amendments have already experienced a 25-percent increase in the Federal minimum from September 1964 to September 1965.

To impose upon these retail enterprises another 15 cents per hour increase in February 1967 and an additional 20 cents per hour increase over that date in February 1968, would represent an overall increase of 28 percent over and above the present $1.25 per hour minimum wage. Such an increase is nearly 9 times the 3.2 ceiling which administration economists have urged as being necessary to check inflationary pressures.

In effect, if H.R. 13712 is enacted in its present form, presently covered retail enterprises would have been subjected to a 60-percent increase in their base or starting wage for marginal employees in approximately 3½ years. Such a drastic increase cannot be absorbed out of profits, but would have to be passed on in the form of higher prices to the consumer and in a reduction of employment.

H.R. 13712 proposes extension of coverage to retail and service enterprises doing $500,000 or more sales volume per year beginning February 1, 1967. This coverage would be lowered to include retail enterprises doing $250,000 or more beginning February 1, 1969.

The minimum wage for these newly covered establishments starting at $1 per hour would increase on an annual basis of 15 cents per hour per year until a $1.60 per hour minimum is reached in 5 years, representing a 60-percent increase on their base starting wages in a short period of time. This would place an undue and unwarranted requirement on these small enterprises. They could not absorb a 15-cent annual increase each year, and certainly not a 60-percent increase within 5 years. Again, they would have to pass this increase on to the consumer to the extent that they can. With the competition facing these small enterprises particularly from mass merchandisers, many would not be able to do this and would be forced to close their doors.

These increases both for the presently covered retail enterprises and those new ones to be covered under this bill represent more drastic escalation in minimum wage rates than was proposed by the 1961 amendments. As you all know, those retail enterprises covered for the first time by the 1961 amendments which established a minimum of $1 per hour were given 3 years to absorb the $1 minimum before the rate was stepped up to $1.15 per hour and in the following year to $1.25. So in my opinion, the minimum rates which would be imposed on retailing are unduly high, and escalator provisions are unduly brief, severe, and unrealistic.

EFFECT ON PRICES

As previously pointed out, wholesale prices have risen sharply. Many manufacturers and wholesalers subject to a $1.40 per hour minimum and $1.60 in 1968 will not be able to absorb this increase out of the present operating revenues. They will have to increase their prices to retailers who in turn would have to pass these prices on to the consumer at their regular currently established mark-on. In addition, the retailers themselves would have to drastically increase their own prices further in order to absorb the heavy additional payroll expense involved.

Information which has come to my attention from retailers, and particularly department stores and women's specialty stores, indicates that prices to the consumer would have to be increased by 5 to 10 percent, and in some instances more in order to absorb the added payroll expense which would be imposed.

This again, greatly exceeds the administration's price-wage objectives and would lower the purchasing value of the consumer's dollar.

In a competitive market such as retailing, many smaller stores in smaller communities would not be able to increase prices to the extent necessary and would be forced out of business.

I can conceive, for example, just taken out of the air, that in a business such as the greeting card business, the 5- and 10-cent card would disappear and be replaced with 20- or 25-cent cards as the minimum price which an individual would have to pay to express his well wishes to a relative or to a friend.

The charge for many services upon which the public relies has already risen sharply over the last 4 or 5 years. To impose a $1.40 minimum and then a $1.60 minimum would cause the charges for these services to be increased again. This would apply to haircuts, beauty salons, dry cleaning, laundries, and many other basic services.

IMPACT ON PAYROLL

The impact on payroll expenses for the retail and service trades resulting from the imposition of the proposed minimums contained in this bill would be drastic. It must be remembered here that it is not only the wages for the marginal employee, to bring them up to the new minimum is involved but all wages will be affected including those earning above the present minimum wage. It is impractical to raise the wage of a new, inexperienced or marginal worker by 15 or 35 cents per hour by 1965 without providing comparable wage increases to those earning above the minimum. Sound business requires the maintenance of established wage differentials based upon skill, experience, and productivity and this spills over to the first and second level of supervising employees.

Too often the proponents of Federal minimum wages talk and think solely in the terms of the marginal employee at the minimum rate, and pay little, if any, heed to the impact on the entire wage structure. Even the information collected annually by the Department of Labor does not fully or accurately reflect the full added payroll cost involved when the minimum wage is increased.

Studies made among retail department and specialty stores based upon fiscal 1964 payroll expense which have come to my attention indicate that to go to $1.50 per hour minimum would have involved a 4.8-percent increase in gross payroll and another 3.6 percent to maintain established wage differentials or a total increase of 8.4 percent. Under a $1.60 minimum a direct payroll increase to bring employees up to this minimum would approximate 7½ percent of present payroll. Added to this would be another 4.8-percent increase to maintain wage differentials or a total increase of 12.3 percent. Again these increases greatly exceed the 3.2-percent wage criteria of the administration to curb inflation.

I point out that these estimated increases do not include or measure the impact of compulsory cost increases such as workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance benefits, or the increase in both the salary base and tax rates of social security which the employer must bear. Neither do these increases include nor reflect the added expense which would be incurred in nonwage benefits so-called fringe benefits which have already increased rapidly in the retail and service trades. Again, to the extent that these direct and nondirect costs are increased, there will be further pressure for higher retail prices to the consumer and fewer man-hours of employment where reduction in employee staff is vital for survival.

EMPLOYMENT

I think it is self-evident that the imposition of higher Federal minimum wages and extension of coverage to smaller retailers at this time would result in a substantial reduction of employment. With only a few exceptions, retailers who have contacted me indicate that they would have to drastically reduce the number of their present employees and to place some of the remaining full-time employees on a short-hour workweek in order to absorb part of the additional payroll expense which would be incurred. Many of these stores have had to curtail full-time employees through attrition and other means and resort to the greater use of part-time employees to meet the $1.25 per hour minimum imposed as of September 3, 1965. Again, information which has come to my attention from those retailers who will be newly covered as of February 1, 1967, indicate that they would have to reduce their employee staff about 14 to 15 percent. A similar reduction of employment can be anticipated among smaller retailers who would come under the act on February 1, 1969.

For retail enterprises presently covered and doing from $1 million to $10 million annual volume, a reduction of staff of approximately 9 percent has been forecast. Even the large retail giants at a $1.60 per hour rate, would be forced to lay-off a substantial number of employees. Heretofore these large retail enterprises have been able to absorb the minimum wages imposed by the 1961 amendments by eliminating unessential jobs and through the greater utilization of short-hour or part-time employees plus casual or contingent employees called in on a daily basis as needed.

In a tight labor market, which we are currently experiencing in our economy, such a reduction in employment would not seem very important, and it could be assumed that employees affected could find jobs elsewhere. However, it is most important to remember that the employees who would lose their jobs would be the elderly and the older workers or the inexperienced or marginal employee whose skills and productivity would not justify a higher minimum hourly rate.

These are the very employees which the purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act is designed to protect. With their limited skills and low productivity, it would be extremely difficult for them to find other employment, in spite of the retraining programs which are being sponsored by the administration. These higher minimum wages would also close the employment door on the youthful members of our society who are already finding it difficult to obtain gainful work.

So, if H.R. 13712 is enacted as proposed, it will create the very situations which the President warned should be avoided; namely, undue increase in consumer prices and employee wages greatly exceeding the price-wage guidelines which the administration has established; job opportunities will be drastically curtailed particularly in those areas where there is the greatest need of assistance; and unemployment will rise for those individuals engaged in the distributive and service trades. Time does not permit me to mention other features of H.R. 13712 which I believe are inadvisable.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I think that the passage of H.R. 13712 as proposed would be highly inflationary at this time and is inadvisable and unwarranted. I believe it would force out of business many small retailers and service establishments. It would have a serious impact on store profits and thereby the ability of the retail industry to expand to meet the increasing shopping needs of a rapidly growing population. It would have a direct and adverse effect on the Government's tax revenues resulting from substantially lower profits and the liquidation of many small businesses. Considering the present state of our economy, I strongly urge that this is not the time to increase the Federal minimum wage or to extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1961.

CONSERVATION—DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR OPPOSES H.R. 13313

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13313, which was scheduled for action today but was removed from the suspension calendar, has attracted growing opposition among conservation groups and Members of Congress since its rapid passage through the Committee on Public Works.

The bill, by proposing to exempt the Corps of Engineers from having to collect admission fees to recreational sites on its projects, is a direct threat to the integrity of the land and water conservation fund on which the future development and acquisition of recreational sites depend.

It would be unfair to the seven other Federal land-managing agencies which must collect these modest charges.

It would set a dangerous precedent on which further exemptions could be sought and justified in the future.

The land and water conservation fund, still in its infancy, relies heavily on these fees as a source of revenue with which to pay for improved facilities to meet the growing public demand for outdoor recreation. Currently, 70 percent of the fund is allocated to help the hard-pressed States develop their own programs.

One of the best statements of opposition to this legislation appears in the form of a letter from Mr. Harry R. Anderson, Acting Secretary of the Interior, to the chairman of the Public Works Committee, which considered H.R. 13313.

I urge my colleagues to read it. The subject is still very much before us. The Rules Committee has scheduled a hearing on it Wednesday.

I also urge my colleagues to read the supplemental views, which I filed with the committee report on H.R. 13313, in which further information is set forth.

The text of the letter from the Interior Department follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
May 14, 1966.

Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 26 this Department submitted a report on H.R. 13313 and H.R. 13412, identical bills, "To amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes." We strongly recommend that the bill not be enacted.

Your Committee has now reported an amended version of H.R. 13313 which reads as follows:

"Sec. 315. No fee or charge shall be collected or received under authority of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 for entrance, admission, or access to the project area (including the waters), or for the use of minimum recreational facilities as determined by the Secretary of the Army, at such project area, of any project administered by the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers."

While your Committee has not requested the views of this Department on the revised bill, we wish to make our position known to you because the legislation is of major importance to this Department.

We strongly recommend against enactment of the bill as reported. The practical effect of this bill would be almost identical to that of the bill as introduced; namely, to prohibit the charging of Federal recreation fees under authority of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 at any project administered by the Corps of Engineers. Entrance and admission fees would be specifically prohibited. User fees could be charged only for facilities other than "minimum recreational facilities as determined by the Secretary of the Army." Since practically all of the recreational facilities at Corps of Engineers projects are classified as minimum, few, if any, user fees could be charged if this bill were enacted.

Thus, the five basic points made in our previous report would apply equally to the amended version. In that report we stated that the bill would substantially alter the following policies and principles established by the Congress:

1. The pay-as-you-go concept for carrying out a program aimed at meeting the increasing needs of our growing population for more and improved outdoor recreation areas and facilities.

2. User charges should be instituted by Federal agencies where appropriate.

3. The Congress intended the Corps of Engineers to be a full participant in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program along with other land managing agencies.

4. Recognition of recreation, and enhancement of fish and wildlife, as major purposes in multiple-purpose development of the Nation's water resources and allocation of costs to these purposes would be severely limited.

5. All Fund revenues are needed to help pay for new recreation areas recently authorized by Congress.

The reasoning behind each of these points is fully explained in the previous report.

In addition to reiterating these reasons for opposing this legislation, I should like to emphasize the following points:

First, we believe it would be illogical and unwise to apply criteria to the charging of fees at Corps reservoirs that are different from those applicable to Federal recreation areas and facilities administered by other agencies. The physical situation at Corps reservoirs is similar to that of National Forests with respect to the charging of fees under the authority of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. In both instances, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act prohibits the charging of entrance or admission fees to the project or the forest as a whole because the whole is not administered primarily for recreation. It does, however, permit the charging of such fees at specific areas within the project or forest where recreation facilities have been provided at Federal expense and are Federally administered. The system has proved feasible on the National Forest and would, in our judgment, be equally feasible on Corps of Engineers projects.

Secondly, the prohibition in the pending bill against any entrance or admission fee means that the annual Federal Recreation Entrance Permit would not be applicable at any Corps of Engineers project. This would reduce the number of sites where the annual permit is applicable by some 3,000, thus reducing substantially the income that can be expected from sale of this permit.

The precedent that would be established if this bill were enacted would be most unfortunate. If the Corps of Engineers projects are, for all practical purposes, removed from the fee category, it would then be argued that similar exemption should be granted to TVA and Bureau of Reclamation projects, then to National Forests and National Parks. Such exemptions would thus destroy completely the fee concept adopted by the Congress after extensive consideration less than two years ago.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it concurs in the views expressed in this report and that there is no objection to its presentation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

ADMINISTRATION ACTION NEEDED IN FACE OF COMMUNIST PLANS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 Communist Tricontinental Conference held in Havana last January made it crystal clear that the subversion of free nations in this hemisphere is and continues to be the goal of international communism.

To date, the administration has failed to come forward with any plan or program to thwart the Communists' announced efforts to step up their "wars of liberation" in Latin America. Indeed, the Great Society has distinguished itself by its total lack of any meaningful program to meet the problems of Communist aggression in Latin America.

The Task Force on Latin America of the Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives has proposed five concrete steps to meet the threat presented to the hemisphere by the Tricontinental Conference.

Following is the statement of the Republican Task Force on Latin America which I urgently recommend to the Members of this body:

ADMINISTRATION ACTION NEEDED IN FACE OF COMMUNIST PLANS IN LATIN AMERICA

The Co-chairmen of the House Republican Task Force on Latin America, Congressmen BRADFORD MORSE, Republican, of Massachusetts, and DONALD RUMSFELD, Republican, of Illinois, and the Chairman of the Task Force Subcommittee on Subversion, WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, today called on President Johnson for action against the subversive plans and goals of the organization established by the January Tri-Continental Conference held in Havana, Cuba. That Conference, attended by Communist delegations from 82 countries throughout the world, including Red China and the Soviet Union, joined in unanimous declarations calling for "armed battle" and "liberation wars" in a number of Central and South American countries.

Representatives MORSE, RUMSFELD, and CRAMER stated: "We urge the Administration to meet the threat of the new Communist subversive activities headquarters now established in Havana.

"We believe, with the Republican Coordinating Committee, that 'there is little evidence thus far, that the 1966 Communist Tri-Continental Conference held in Havana, last January, has sufficiently alerted the Administration to the continuing and growing danger of Communist "wars of national liberation" in the Western Hemisphere.'

"The Conference, which was sponsored by the Communist Afro-Asian Peoples Organization, included delegations from 80 nations in Latin America, Asia and Africa. These delegations included not only non-government delegates representing political parties and leftist groups, but government officials from some participating nations as well.

"According to the delegate from the Soviet Union, the purpose of the Conference was 'to promote in every conceivable way the unity of anti-imperialist forces of the three continents, so as to unfold on a still greater scale our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism, headed by the U.S. capitalists.'

"To achieve this goal the final declaration of the Havana Conference recommended direct support of armed guerrillas attempting to overthrow existing governments in Venezuela, Colombia, Peru and Guatemala. In addition, it recommended opposition to military governments in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia and other countries.

"The declarations of the Conference were accompanied by the establishment of a General Secretariat and the authorization of an action group from each Continent. It is significant that within four days of the conclusion of the Conference, the first continental group to be established was the Latin American Solidarity Organization. It is clear that the major thrust of the Tri-Continental Conference is to spearhead violence and subversion here in the Western Hemisphere. The magnitude of the threat becomes more dramatic when we realize that there may be as many as 43 training camps in Cuba capable of training as many as 10,000 guerrillas a year in the techniques of sabotage and subversion.

"The reaction of Latin American governments to the Tri-Continental Conference was immediate and sharp. The Brazilian Ambassador to the OAS said, 'Except for the placing of nuclear weapons in Cuba in October 1962, no event threatens more dangerously the territorial and political integrity of our continent.'

"The Government of Peru, one of the targets of communist subversion, called a special session of the Council of the Organization of American States and offered a resolution denouncing foreign support of subversive movements as a violation of the principle of non-intervention and a threat to the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 18–0 with two abstentions in an outstanding display of Western Hemisphere concern and solidarity.

"The United States representative on the OAS Council at the January 24 meeting joined with the other Latin American nations in denouncing the Havana declarations and in calling for continued efforts to eliminate the sources of social unrest through the strengthening of 'free, democratic, political, economic, and social systems.'

"We believe that the threat presented to the Hemisphere by the Tri-Continental Conference requires more specific action.

"We recommend:

"1. That the United States government call to the attention of people here and throughout the Hemisphere the magnitude of the danger of subversion to existing governments. We cannot forget our responsibilities to freedom here in our own Hemisphere, even when we are engaged in a struggle half-way around the world.

"2. That the Administration reiterate publicly and frequently the determination of the U.S. to help the nations of Latin America to strengthen the capacity of government to administer the vital development process and to broaden the base of popular participation in decision-making.

3. That the United States continue to press for changes in the OAS Charter that will strengthen the collective ability of the Hemisphere to resist subversion, such as the creation of a standing Inter-American Peace Force, added authority for the Secretary-General, and broadened jurisdiction for the Inter-American Peace Committee. The Task Force reiterates its call of November 12, 1965, for the establishment of an "OAS Security Committee with jurisdiction over threats to the peace and security of any OAS nation, from any source."

4. That the United States support the prompt establishment of an Inter-American Civil Service Academy as recommended by the Republican Task Force on Latin America last fall, to strengthen the ability of the governments in the Western Hemisphere to resist internal subversion. (It was not a coincidence that many of the delegations to the Havana Tri-Continental Conference were guerrilla fighters from Latin American countries, rather than the better known communist party bureaucrats).

5. That the Department of State review with great care the composition of the delegations to the Conference with a view to determining whether the subsequent actions of their governments constitute aggression. Such actions could involve a violation of section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act which prohibits U.S. assistance to nations which engage in aggressive actions against nations receiving our aid.

"Efficient and speedy cooperation with the other governments is a prime requisite to modernize agriculture, diversify production, attack illiteracy, and improve health conditions within our Hemisphere. These are areas where the Alliance for Progress has lagged. These are areas which must be improved if we are to eliminate the social unrest that is fertile ground for violence and subversion.

"We believe that this is the minimum program of action required by the United States Government in the face of this new assault on freedom and liberty in the Hemisphere of its greatest vitality.

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, it is fundamental that any attempt to amend the Constitution of the United States must be approached with great caution, for Americans do not take the basic blueprint of their freedom lightly. We make it a long, difficult, and time-consuming process, in order to insure that any constitutional change reflects not momentary impulse or hysteria, but the thoughtful expression of the will of the majority of the American people. Nevertheless, there are times when a constitutional amendment is required as a last resort in resolving basic differences over the form of our government.

I believe that we face such a situation today, notwithstanding action taken by the other body on April 20, 1966. The U.S. Supreme Court's decisions regarding the apportionment of State legislatures has raised just such a basic conflict over the form of our representative government. As Justice Frankfurter said in his dissenting opinion in Baker against Carr, the first of the historic apportionment rulings:

> In the last analysis, what lies at the core of this controversy is a difference of opinion as to the function of representative government.

AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION

In such a conflict, constitutional amendment becomes our only method of resolving a great national issue without rupturing the fabric of our constitutional system of checks and balances. The Supreme Court interprets our Constitution. There have been many times in our history, however, when the Court's interpretation of a provision of the Constitution has seemed, to the vast majority of Americans, so out of touch with the needs of the time that steps have been taken to overrule the Court's holding.

Bitter experience teaches us that extraconstitutional methods of supplying pressure to the Court are destructive of the very framework we seek to uphold. There have been occasions when Congress or the Executive has sought to bend the Court to their will. One strong-willed President told the Court that now that they had made their decision, it was up to them to try to enforce it. Another conceived of the ill-fated "Court packing" scheme. It is to the credit of our institutions and a keystone to the survival of our Republic that such methods have not prevailed.

There is only one way to insure that the Court shall continue its eminent role in our national life, and at the same time insure the people their right to ultimately determine how they shall be governed, and that way is open through the right granted in article V to amend the Constitution.

Recently, Justice William O. Douglas—whose alinement as a member of the so-called liberal wing of the Court is well known—summed up the respective roles of the Court and the people in determining how the Constitution shall be applied to changing conditions.

> Many Supreme Court decisions over the history of our country have caused a lot of discussion and disagreement among the people. We are dealing with clauses of the Constitution written in broad generalities that are applied to situations where people have differences of opinion. The Court has always since the very beginning since Marshall's time—1801—undertaken to sit in judgment on the constitutionality of Federal laws and state laws and state action of various kinds and we don't operate necessarily on the basis of consensus. We operate upon the basis of what is the meaning of the document. What is the history of it. What is the spirit of it, and what does it mean applied to the conditions, say, in the 1960's?

Justice Douglas is here telling us, of course, that the function of the Court is to interpret the Constitution in terms of the document itself and in terms of its history and to apply this interpretation to a given problem at a given time. He goes on:

> Sometimes the decisions of this Court are not approved in the long run and constitutional amendments are made. For example our court held that the graduated income tax was unconstitutional. And we got the 16th Amendment—we changed that. Our Court held that a state could lay a poll tax as a condition of voting, and that was changed with respect to Federal elections. Our Court held that a state could keep women from voting and that was changed by the 19th Amendment.
>
> This is part of the process. People can have such constitutions—such provisions—as they want. It's the duty of the Court to construe the Constitution as it exists to the best of their knowledge.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM

We all recognize that our Bill of Rights, the basic guarantee of our individual liberties, is comprised of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. We all cherish our constitutional system. And in urging the passage of this amendment, we are operating solely within the framework established by that system. This amendment does not in any way affect the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. It neither adds to nor reduces the power and scope of judicial review. It simply redresses, through a traditional means, the decision of the Court in a particular instance in which the American people are not content.

But this issue and the debate on it is historic not solely—or even primarily—

because we seek to amend the Constitution. It is such because of the nature of the issue to be resolved.

WHAT IS THE ISSUE

Now what is this issue? It involves the very basis of our system of Government.

It involves our right to vote.

It involves our claim to representative Government.

It involves our heritage as Americans, a heritage which says that as individuals under God we have an inalienable freedom to choose—to decide—to participate—with regard to the affairs of our Government.

The right of the people to do just these things has been challenged. And unless we in Congress act now, those who oppose the people's right to shape their political institutions will triumph.

The Supreme Court has ruled that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned solely on the basis of population. This ruling invalidates for the States the system of balanced representation so long practiced by them and by the U.S. Congress itself.

And what is this balanced system of representative Government? It is a system based on the rule of the majority, tempered by recognition and preservation of minority rights. We say that the will of the majority shall prevail, but only when that majority has heard the voice of the minority and has assured that the interests of the minority will be effectively represented. Has not this balance been the genius of American political success and governmental stability for nearly two centuries?

With the overthrow of this traditional balance, minority interests and rights will be ignored in the conduct of our States' affairs. As a practical matter, the control of State government will pass into the hands of the big city political bosses who can control or manipulate large blocks of urban votes.

MACHINE POLITICS

State legislatures controlled by this new form of machine politics could be indifferent or even hostile to all other segments of the community and State. As stated by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN on January 19, 1966:

> And so I say, down the road paved with distrust for the people, to the devil with the rights of minorities, lies a concentration of political power far more devastating than any against which our forefathers rebelled. At the end of this road lies concentrated power in the hands of a few self-serving manipulators to control the legislative and executive branches of our state and federal governments, to dictate the destiny of the American Republic—and voiceless voters.
>
> These would-be bosses today champion the "population only" clause. Why? Because behind its ring of fairness they see control of state legislatures falling into their hands. Yet these same "champions" already say the people can't be trusted whenever many of us in the Congress say, let the people decide.

THE SOLUTION

I believe that the only solution to this critical situation is the passage of the reapportionment amendment.

It is unfortunate that the opponents of the amendment have sought so bitterly to cloud it in confusion and distort its purposes, for it really is very simple. It would restore to the people the right to decide for themselves how their State legislatures are to be apportioned. Through an election, the people may select to apportion their legislatures on the basis of the Supreme Court's "population only" rule. Or they can decide to adhere to the traditional timetested system of balanced representation by allowing one legislative house to take into account factors other than population alone. The result is irrelevant. The essential thing is that the people will have their chance to choose.

Moreover, the amendment recognized the need to adapt to changing conditions and times by providing for referendums on apportionment every 10 years, following the U.S. census.

The reapportionment amendment, it must be emphasized, does not require any particular method of apportionment. It simply serves as a device by which the people themselves can determine how their State lawmaking bodies are to be constituted. Nor would the amendment, as opponents charge, place control of State legislatures in the hands of a small group that would not reflect or consider the interests of the people as a whole. In fact, it is the opponents of the reapportionment amendment who would turn control of State government over to special interests.

NO TIME FOR SLOGANS

The opponents of the reapportionment amendment march under the slogan "one man, one vote." This is the rankest hypocrisy, for it is they who are denying the people the right to vote on one of the most fundamental issues, the form of representative government in the United States. They say "trust the people," but their actions speak a good deal louder than their words. They do not trust the people to make this basic decision.

Today over 255,000 young Americans are fighting and dying in Vietnam in order to protect the independence and liberty of those unhappy people. It would be tragic if we lost at home through indifference and inertia what we are trying to win in southeast Asia with American blood. But this is just what can happen unless we act now.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The right to vote on the composition of our representative government cannot be compromised or denied. Congress has a duty to recognize this right and to protect it by approving the pending reapportionment amendment.

The issue is simple: Let the people decide. Let the people vote. This is the most important domestic issue of our time. The struggle to right the wrong will be long and difficult against unfavorable odds, but the issue must be resolved by and for the people.

IRVING MANESS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, PROCUREMENT AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, DISCUSSES A REVOLUTIONARY SBA PILOT PROGRAM

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Irving Maness, Deputy Administrator, Procurement and Management Assistance, Small Business Administration, recently told a group of Federal administrators and representatives of small-business concerns of a revolutionary experiment initiated by the Small Business Administration in the form of two pilot projects, in which the Small Business Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are participating. These projects are designed to develop an effective transfer of technological information resulting from Government-sponsored research and development to America's small-business community. We are all aware of the extreme difficulties involved in such transfer.

It is, therefore, most gratifying that the Small Business Administration, under the guidance of its able Deputy Administrator, Irving Maness, has taken the initiative to effectively benefit small business from the technical developments resulting from Federally sponsored research and development.

Since 1940, $125 billion has been spent for research and development by the Federal Government. A great bulk of knowledge has been accumulated as a result of this vast scientific and ingenious effort. Yet, this great storehouse of technological information has remained locked and has not been put to the commercial use it deserves and the Nation needs. Thanks to the initiative of Deputy Administrator, Irving Maness. The Small Business Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have jointly embarked upon a course of action which will effectively utilize at least part of the information acquired by these agencies by enabling a segment of our small-business community to derive commercial benefits therefrom.

During Mr. Maness' tenure in office the Small Business Administration has made substantial progress in the areas of small-business participation in Government procurement, management assistance, and, generally, in the governmental administration of aid and counsel to the small-business community.

As one who speaks effectively and from the heart for the small businessman, and has demonstrated his ability to translate the President's concern for the welfare of America's small-business community into positive action, Mr. Maness has taken a forward looking step which constitutes a path-breaking precedent in the national endeavor to open the Nation's storehouse of technical and scientific know-how to the small-business community. It can only be hoped that the example of the cooperative effort of the three agencies will be emulated by other Federal agencies, and transform the Small Business Administration's two pilot projects into a permanent and fruitful governmentwide program.

The Congress and the small-business community and, particularly, the beneficiaries of Mr. Maness' ingenious effort, owe a debt of gratitude to him for his leadership in insuring that small business will be able to keep up with America's accelerated growth, and maintain its competitive and entrepreneurial vigor.

Deputy Administrator Maness' speech follows:

Address by Mr. Irving Maness, Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration, Before the Small Business Briefing on Technology Transfer, Chicago, Ill., March 30, 1966

Mr. Moderator, Director Graves, distinguished Federal colleagues and representatives of small business concerns, it is indeed gratifying to see that so many business concerns are interested in the transfer of technological information. I can assure you that the President and the Congress are greatly concerned that the American business community be given every opportunity to share in the benefits of Government sponsored research and development. Written into the legislation governing each agency conducting research and development operations is some reference to their responsibility that nonclassified technological information be made available to the business community. The Small Business Administration's mandate from the Congress specifically directs that it assist small-business concerns to obtain the benefits of research and development performed under Government contracts or at Government expense.

That is why we are all here today, to explore together the problems involved in transferring highly technical research and development information to the shops, to the factories, to the assembly lines and to the laboratories of our small business community. Indeed, Congress believes that small business should be the principal beneficiary of technology resulting from federally-sponsored research and development.

When I reflect on the tremendous growth of our industry and the wonderful products that have come on the market during the past quarter century I am overwhelmed. Many of today's commonplaces were unknown, not even a dream, just a few years ago.

We live in a new World of lasers and masers, space ships and inter-continental missiles; of nuclear power and oceanography; of supersonic aircraft and air-cushioned sea-land vehicles; of television transmission from Mars and Venus. We have new sciences such as cybernetics and cryogenics and shop techniques which, while still new, are no longer novel, such as chemical milling, electron-beam welding, clean rooms, white rooms and zero defects. We are reducing unbelievably complex electronic systems and devices into unbelievably tiny capsules. We have and are developing more wonder drugs, and medical and surgical techniques that are measurably prolonging human life, thereby creating an entirely new set of socio-economic problems which will again tax our ingenuity to solve.

With all of these wonders and awesome achievements of science and industry we are still left with the problem I mentioned at the outset and that is—how do we accomplish the transfer of technological information? What is being done to solve the problem and by whom? In fact, we can well ask "what is the nature of the problem?." It is like the school boy who was taking a very tough examination. He became stuck on a question and sat chewing his pencil and staring into space. His teacher came along and said "what's the matter Johnny, having trouble with that question?" "Oh no, teacher" said Johnny—"the question doesn't give me any trouble, it's the answer that bothers me."

I have been talking about technological information, or to put it another way, about technical data resulting from scientific and engineering research and development.

Let us see if we can get a general idea of the scope of this ocean of technical knowledge. Since 1940, $125 billion has been spent on research and development by the Federal Government. This $125 billion went from a puny $74 million in 1940 to a whopping $15.4 billion for fiscal 1966. In fact, over half of that $125 billion has been spent during the last 5 years.

Three agencies account for 90% of the Federal research and development procurement dollar: the Department of Defense, The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and your co-host, the Atomic Energy Commission.

The great bulk of the knowledge accumulated as the result of this vast scientific and engineering effort belongs to you. I have heard and I cannot vouch for the accuracy of this item—I doubt that anyone can—that there is probably 16 million bits of technological information in the repositories of the Federal agencies. Whether this is overblown or underestimated we do know that there is an awful lot, and that we have merely scratched the surface in trying to break it out and put it to use.

The difficult task of organizing, classifying and storing this large volume of data has been going forward and great strides have been made in the techniques of data retrieval. During the question and answer period, representatives from some of these activities will be available to explain these processes. Represented here today are the Defense Documentation Center, a Department of Defense activity, the Clearinghouse for Scientific and Technical Information of the Department of Commerce and NASA's Technology Utilization Division, in addition to others taking part in the program.

However, this meeting today is aimed specifically at acquainting you with a joint experiment, or pilot project, in which SBA and the Atomic Energy Commission and Argonne National Laboratory are collaborating. We not only want to tell you about the pilot project, but to invite you to participate. In so doing we hope that each of you may acquire information that will be useful to your business now or at some future time.

I have spoken of the wonderful new fields of science and industry which have contributed in such a great degree to unprecedented levels of economic growth and our vast national wealth. The other day, the Bureau of Labor Statistics predicted that the 1966 Gross National Product would reach $735 billion—a record rate of increase of 8.9 percent. It would be $13 billion higher than the forecast of the President's Council of Economic Advisors and $60 billion greater than 1965's Gross National Product.

Despite this almost staggering indication of economic vitality and well-being and despite the fact that I am an incurable optimist, I must confess to an uneasy feeling that somewhere behind this glitter some unpleasant factors are casting their shadows. Frankly, I am wondering if small business is keeping up with this accelerated growth rate by maintaining its competitive, entrepreneurial vigor. Is the small business manufacturing community keeping pace with the innovations, techniques, new products and processes that have been and are being brought out in a seemingly endless stream?

We know of something of the problems of small business that makes this question pertinent. We know that the average small-business production concern quite often has a small management staff which doubles in brass, covering all operations from the front office to the shop. Sometimes it is one man driving himself to meet pay roll, collect accounts, sell his product, hire, fire, plan and manage production, in other words, being all things to all men. But whether it is one man or a dozen, if there is no opportunity to plan ahead to meet the changing demands of the marketplace, to keep pace with innovations which reduce costs, increase production or improve quality then that business is headed for trouble.

SBA believes that small-business utilization of technology available from Government sources is essential to maintaining a strong progressive economy at the small-business level. This belief is shared by the research and development generating agencies. Efforts to make this technology available in meaningful terms has had only limited success. Larger business concerns, and this includes some companies who are small business by classification, who are well staffed with engineers and scientists or other technically trained personnel, and who have a planned program for the development of new products and technical improvements can and do regularly search for technological data in these Government repositories. Furthermore, they are generally financially capable of supporting in-house research and development operations.

But the majority of small companies are not blessed with large technical staffs or financial resources. The data in storage are in the form of research reports, abstracts, references, technical briefs, etc. The language is technical in nature and requires considerable translation to become meaningful to less highly qualified technical people busy running a shop.

From this problem—really a problem in communication—has come the pilot project between, AEC, SBA and Argonne Laboratory, which is the basis of today's meeting. We also have a similar experimental project with NASA at three of their regional dissemination centers—the University of Indiana, University of Pittsburgh and Wayne State in Detroit. Through these efforts on a small scale we hope to develop techniques that will enable Government to distribute technological information on a broad scale to small business.

SBA's role in this endeavor is to provide a needed link in the chain of communications between the centers of data dissemination and small-business concerns. From the information you furnished us when you registered in our Facilities Inventory, we were able to select small companies who seem to be types that could be expected to benefit from an exploration of technological information.

We will help both AEC and NASA in identifying the problems that the small business companies are concerned with. We will try to help the companies understand the answers that are developed. Through our established assistance programs—financial, procurement, management—we will try to help them apply that information to their operations.

Gentlemen, I am convinced that among you here today are some who will derive an exciting new outlook on your business. The pilot projects I spoke of have shown that this is not idle speculation. Some of you may find you do not need technical assistance and that is fine. Some of you may find nothing of interest at this time. But all of you will know more about the tremendous pool of scientific and technological knowledge which is available to you, where to find it and how to obtain it, after this meeting.

Again, let me say what a pleasure it is to be here and thank you for coming.

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN HENRY BLAIR

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a very splendid statement made before the Hattiesburg, Miss., Kiwanis Club on May 10, 1966, by Mr. K. P. Walker, superintendent of Jackson, Miss., Public Schools, extolling the services of my longtime friend, Stephen Henry Blair. The statement of Mr. Walker is not only a tribute to Superintendent Blair, who is retiring after some 27 years as superintendent of public schools of Hattiesburg, but it is also a most interesting and accurate statement of the problems and duties confronting a superintendent of public schools everywhere.

I have known Stephen Blair for many years, and I am in full accord with the evaluation made by Mr. Walker of this dedicated schoolman. Because of its general interest I submit it for the Record.

Mr. Walker's remarks are as follows:

I. THE SUPERINTENDENCY

May I be so brash to say at the outset that I hope the time will never come when your public school superintendent will not be one of the most important people in this community. I say this because in my view this public officer should be at the focal point toward which community and individuals look for professional statesmanship to administer their public educational services that will contribute effectively toward fulfillment of a community's dreams for its best development and prominence, and toward realization of parental aspirations for their children.

If a superintendent of schools does his work well, then all is well; if he performs poorly, then all is ill because the resultant damage to the school system is nigh irreparable. We must remember, however, that the superintendent is not the policymaker for the school district he serves—he is the chief executive officer, employed by a school board whose duties and authority are legally prescribed.

The superintendent, then, is clearly a middleman as a quick rundown on his duties will show. He is properly accountable directly to his governing body of five trustees; he is responsible for directing and evaluating an instructional program, in content and scope, largely state determined; he is answerable for the performance of every school board employee; he is not sheltered from responsibility for every pupil's behavior and scholastic achievement; and he is duty-bound to account properly for all funds and for all properties of the school district.

Although he may be described as a man in the middle, his responsibilities place him in the forefront in many ways.

The superintendent must maintain a satisfactory school program, and beyond expected optimum academic achievement on the part of his charges, that includes producing superior bands and choral groups, winning athletic teams, and happy PTA's. He requires friendly cooperation of teachers and administrators.

Harmony between trustees and the superintendent must prevail even though there may be differences in philosophy and procedures at times. The people of his school district, actionists and reactionists, must be dealt with diplomatically and helpfully. Candor with the press is essential—weal or woe.

If his tenure is of some length, to no little extent, the educational and cultural level of his community can be measured by his effectiveness. This can be awesome to a timid schoolman. There are some who believe the tour of duty of a superintendent should be limited to about ten years. This would get the best from him and allow his successor to make amends for his errors of commission and omission. It takes courage to stay in the same post twenty-seven years to face your shortcomings and errors in judgment.

Truly the superintendent must be a paragon.

I offer this short job description for a superintendent because in a sense it represents a straightedge against which the citizens of Hattiesburg have been placing Steve Blair for nearly thirty years, and beside which he has consistently measured up admirably in every respect.

II. CRITICAL EVENTS

It is not necessary here to recount the many achievements of this capable school administrator whom you honor today. You are aware of these and appreciative of them. They are matters of record. For example, the latest reports on rankings of Mississippi's 150 school districts show that the Hattiesburg Public Schools ranked number one in the average salary of its teachers even though it was sixth in wealth per pupil. Instead, let us recall some of the critical events that have transpired since Mr. Blair entered upon his duties here as superintendent. These have been extraordinary challenges to his personal and professional resourcefulness.

Mr. Blair took his general administrative post with this school system after an outstanding sixteen-year role in your secondary schools as teacher, coach, and principal. His new obligation as superintendent of schools came just as this nation was struggling to its feet after the overpowering depression of the '30s. I lived in Forrest County during some of those trying years. I still marvel at the fortitude of many people in this county whose means of livelihood during that period were often scant and at times nil. Some of us may have forgotten or do not know that there were then no community service agencies to assist families in distress. There was no public welfare program. There was no unemployment compensation. Banks were shaken, foreclosures on homesteads were common, cut-over lands sold for taxes or reverted to the State, bankruptcy was vogue—yet the people wanted their children well educated so that they could be better prepared than were they to cope with another such economic upset, if one should recur. Hopefully they looked to their public schools for this insurance and supported them at no little personal sacrifice.

Then there was World War II and its many attendant problems for school administration. The school superintendent was a key figure in mobilizing school personnel to register men for military service, to help train manpower for national defense, to issue ration books for foods, gasoline, and tires, to salvage vital materials, to stimulate purchase of government bonds to finance the war effort, and to do all of this as a labor of love for country and community and at the same time to maintain a good school system.

As would be expected, a shortage of qualified teachers became pronounced during many of these years. Wages for teachers then as now left much to be desired. This made recruiting more difficult. College graduates who might have taught had to enter military service as conditions required. Some were lured to business and industry where pay was more attractive than was teaching. Morale of teachers who stayed in the classrooms was severely tested.

The birth rate jumped. There was a migration of families from rural to urban centers. Soon these two post-war phenomena called for more teachers, more classrooms, and for better services. School administrators were sorely pressed to meet the burgeoning needs for facilities, funds, and faculties during these years.

While grappling with one or more of these incessant threats to acceptable school service another presented itself—the Korean conflict.

And soon thereafter the spectre of desegregation appeared and then became a reality to management with its educational and emotionally-packed social problems which now permeate every aspect of school administration.

Meantime teachers were beginning to see that their profession was being downgraded because the "leavings" of college-trained manpower were about all that school boards had to draw on to staff their schools. With pardonable pride for their profession teachers sensed that if this nation maintained its world leadership position this condition had to be overcome, because good education is prerequisite to good citizenship. This prompted concerted action at this grassroots of the profession that has been widely felt throughout the nation.

Class loads, working conditions, and compensation became immediate priority concerns of local, state, and national professional education associations. Soon these organizations began to flex their muscles to influence public policy. At times their activities, although well meaning, proved nettlesome to some school boards and other public officials. The superintendent was caught in the middle. Often he was in a difficult position and was misunderstood as he tried to serve his board and at the same time speak for teachers as a professional leader should.

Finally the launching of Sputnik I by Russia threw a fear into the people of the United States that its public schools and colleges needed to improve the quality of their programs. What followed is well known to you.

This is a short recital of the more significant events of the past three decades that have demanded the best of school administrators in stamina, ingenuity, patience, tact, intelligence, and just plain hard work.

III. STEVE BLAIR

These disturbing events brought into clear relief the unusual versatility and managerial capability of Steve Blair. That he survived these arduous years is a testimonial to his hardy physique, to his emotional stability, and to his intuitive sense of timing and fair play. How fortunate Hattiesburg has been for nearly three decades cannot be fully appreciated by its people because they have not been without good school administration during these years.

Hattiesburg has warm affection and high regard for Steve. The many personal experiences of citizens of this city in which his strong but gentle hand and heart have been felt could be told a thousand times to his everlasting credit. This suggests something more. Steve and his beloved companion, Marguerite, have been exemplary parents rearing two handsome sons whose professional careers are bright and whose children are even brighter.

Maybe a new breed of school superintendents will be required for tomorrow's schools. Even so I have a strong conviction that although they may appear different, basically they will be endowed with gifts of leadership, foresight, intellect, acument, integrity, and the common sense of a Steve Blair.

IV. APPRECIATION

I want to thank you for inviting me to join you in eulogizing my longtime friend. Possibly you know that I grew up in Hattiesburg, attended Court Street Elementary School when Miss Grace Christian was principal, Hardy Street Elementary School where Miss Mattie Houston was principal, and was graduated from the high school on Main

Street when Burrow P. Brooks served as principal. It means a great deal to me for sentimental reason alone to be back home on this important day.

Thank you for the distinct privilege of publicly paying my respects to Steve Blair who has brought visionary reality to multifarious duties of the superintendency of the Hattiesburg Public Schools for the past twenty-seven years, who has been gentle but firm in his administration, and who has displayed courageous tenacity for school improvement and has made an enviable record of accomplishment—all of which has been to the benefit of the people of Hattiesburg who love and revere him for what he has modestly done as your superintendent of schools.

The words of a prophet of old seem somehow to sum up the life of this noble man: "He hath showed thee what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

POST COLUMNIST WRITES ON FORBIDDEN SUBJECT

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I was startled to read in the May 10 issue of the Washington Post a column written by Ruth Daniloff titled "The Chained Door, the Police Siren," in which the writer detailed in no uncertain terms the terror in which respectable people live here in the District of Columbia.

The Post is well known for its constant flow of biased editorials and prejudiced news stories designed to convince everyone that crime is not on the increase here, that the streets are perfectly safe, that any troubles that might by chance exist here are, after all, entirely the blame of the Congress and in particular, those red-necked Neanderthal southerners who sit on the House District Committee. If they would just give the culturally disadvantaged, the economically disassociated, and the ambitiously discombooberated all the money they want and so forth and so forth. You know their line of illogic as well as I, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, knowing the Socialist left policy of the Post, you can imagine my amazement to read a column, on the editorial page, mind you, that, for once, paints a realistic picture of what it is like to live in this Casbah on the Potomac.

It is such a rare happening that, like a whooping crane, it should be protected and saved for posterity to see and enjoy. I would like to insert this historical document in today's RECORD so that posterity will know there was one brief, shining moment known as "Truth at the Washington Post":

THE CHAINED DOOR, THE POLICE SIREN

(By Ruth Daniloff)

After four months of living in the United States, I have been enlisted into the ranks of the Nation's frightened women. In the past I have had no hesitation in traveling over Europe alone, but now nothing will induce me to go down to the basement laundry of our apartment building in Washington unescorted.

Crime is on the increase everywhere, but I cannot believe that it is in proportion to the fear which the American woman is now experiencing. I resent being turned into a "hysterical female," having to size up men as possible attackers, fearing to walk in the park alone or on the streets at night. Possibly "cowards die many times, the valiant never taste of death but once." One hesitates to draw an analogy between Julius Caesar's Rome and Mr. Johnson's Washington, unless it is that Washington, like Rome before, is neglecting domestic problems for commitments abroad.

Few cities in the world have so many trees or such attractive parks as the Capital of the United States. I was delighted to discover a small park at the back of our apartment building until I was told not to walk there alone. I now take my child for an uninspiring walk around the block and reflect on the use of parks which one cannot enjoy.

At the local playground, the latest rapes, attempted rapes, muggings and indecent exposures are compared. Some one leaves dirty notes in the laundry and when I advertised for a job in the newspaper I was besieged by obscene telephone calls. I have never lived before in an apartment with a security chain and am forever embarrassed and disconcerted at having to eye people through the peep hole before opening the door. It violates all principles of politeness.

The perpetual wail of police sirens, besides being an eerie reminder of wartime England, tends to dramatize yet another "happening" in Washington. Although one cannot help but be impressed by the speed at which American police cars navigate the traffic, one nevertheless wishes they were a little more discreet, but no doubt the criminals appreciate the trumpeted approach. I have heard of several incidents here where someone reported a suspicious character in the vicinity only to have the police arrive on the scene in full chorus.

Publicity and counter-measures such as the do's and don'ts of self-protection only tend to heighten the fear. While the newspapers' tally of daily rapes is apparently justified by even the more prestigious publications on the grounds that it keeps the police department on their toes, it nonetheless serves to remind nervous readers that even two-year-olds, centenarians and nuns are eligible.

We are encouraged to arm ourselves with "female protection" devices—aerosol sprays with such reassurring names as "Repel" and "Rebuff", ("Rebuff" is also sold to postmen who have trouble with dogs), shock rods, whistles, sirens and alarms. Could it just happen that you are taken by surprise and haven't time to position your artillery, then there is always the knee and the fingers. A 25-cent booklet sold at the local drug store entitled "Protecting Yourself and Your Family" advises on how to gouge out an attacker's eye with an index finger. "Don't remove your finger to jab again, instead keep twisting it." If you can get your knee in his groin at the same time, all the smarter, and remember to keep screaming.

The police tell us that the best protection, though difficult to come by these days because the army has drafted them to Vietnam, is a police dog. I can feel sympathy for the matron who insists on sleeping with a loaded gun under her pillow and who lobbies so successfully against any changes on the present rules on firearms.

Even behind the wheel of the huge invincible American automobile danger lurks. "Lock all doors. Roll up windows," advises my booklet. Always lock the car even when just going to the local supermarket. A man can be crouched in the back, hijack you, and do what he will with the groceries. Must future generations of women, of what is surely one of the most powerful countries in the world, approach life with index finger poised, knee bared and pocket book full of assorted weapons?

However, one small hope * * * It seems that even men are beginning to feel scared. Scared of being taken as molesters, that is. I recently met one man who protested that he couldn't walk through Glover Archbold Park to work because he was frightened of frightening women.

IMPERIAL VALLEY SUCCESS STORY

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great success stories of American agriculture has been the battle that farmers in the Imperial Valley of California have waged against silt and salt.

Since 1901 farmers have been building a rich farming region out of a barren desert, against great odds.

At first, silt was a severe problem because water flowed directly from the muddy Colorado River into irrigation systems. Expensive cleaning and dredging operations were necessary to keep water flowing through the canals and ditches.

After the Imperial Dam and a desilting control device were built on the Colorado River in 1938 silt became a minor problem. But the salt problem continued to worsen. The water-lain soils of the valley already contained accumulations of salts. More salt was deposited with each application of irrigation water which, in that region, carries varying amounts of salts.

For a time this was a losing battle because of the continued salt buildup in the soils.

But farmers in the valley would not give up. They continued to search for ways to keep the land productive. By 1940, when the Imperial Irrigation District called upon the Soil Conservation Service to study the drainage and salinity problems, some 50,000 acres had gone out of production. Later, when a workable solution was developed, the irrigation district constituted itself as a soil conservation district under a unique memorandum of agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This agreement has enabled farmers to bring a maximum amount of expert help to bear on this difficult land-use problem. Soil scientists, engineers, research workers, and soil conservationists of the SCS, the Agricultural Research Service, and other agencies, have helped develop irrigation and drainage methods that leach out and carry away dissolved salts that otherwise would ruin the land. In addition, they have worked out crop management and tillage practices that minimize the effect of salts. They have helped select salt-tolerant crops and devised special planting and bedding methods for them.

Once a week for the last 24 years the district has calculated the amounts of salt coming into and going out of the valley. Technicians do this by measuring the salinity of the Colorado River water entering the valley's irrigation network and that of the water draining from the valley into the Salton Sea via the New and Alamo Rivers.

Until 1949 more salt was entering the valley than was leaving. Since that year, more salt has been flushed from the soil than has been brought in through the irrigation water.

The payoff is a steadily improving salt balance. The salt content of the soil is decreasing gradually, rather than increasing as it did for many years. And the future of agriculture in the Imperial Valley is now bright—thanks to the tenacity of its farmers and the effectiveness of their partnership with our competent agricultural agencies.

However, the battle with salt is continuous and soil scientists report that to allow unfavorable salt balance for just 1 year would cause considerable damage to our farmland. It is reassuring to note that the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1967 urged the continuance of research to improve the tile drainage systems in southern California. I am hopeful that funds will be allocated from the Department of Agriculture's contingency fund to carry on research in this vital area.

THE QUESTION OF A TAX INCREASE

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schmidhauser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, during recent months American citizens have heard much discussion, pro and con, on the question of a tax increase to combat alleged inflationary tendencies in our Nation's economy and to produce increased revenues. Presumably there are merits to both sides in this current controversy, but I believe the most effective way to meet both of these objectives would be to thoroughly reform our Federal tax system. I have made several reform proposals. However, I believe the first priority should be a lowering of the 27½-percent tax giveaway known as the oil depletion allowance.

When our agriculture producers and our workers are being subjected to economic restraining measures, I firmly believe those many privileged interests—the oil companies being one of the most privileged of the many presently benefiting by our outmoded tax laws—should bear their fair share of this burden. The exact size of the tax giveaway enjoyed by the major oil companies was clearly revealed in the March 21, 1966, edition of the Gasoline Letter. I want to call these figures to the attention of my colleagues and urge them to join with me to eliminate privileges in our tax system.

The article is as follows:

Tax Figures Conceal Real U.S. Income Taxes

If you read the official oil company income tax figures it looks as if Standard Oil Co., (N.J.) is paying more than half a billion dollars a year in Federal income tax.

In reality the total U.S. income tax burden of the 22 top refiners was only $240 million in 1964, the latest year that figures are available in the Securities and Exchange Commission files.

Lumping foreign and U.S. taxes together has led to public statements by oil company foundations and Senators who support the big refiners that the oil companies pay as much tax as anyone else.

Page 29 of Texaco's annual report shows "provision for income taxes" for 1964 as $83.4 million.

But if you check with SEC you learn that $5.5 million went to Uncle Sam and $77.9 million went to foreign governments and some states.

Figures for 1963 and 1964 presented in our tax table on pages three and four, here compiled for the first time as far as we know, show that the 22 refiners paid 4% of their gross income as U.S. income tax while the rate for working people and small businessmen is about 20%.

The table also reveals for the first time that the 22 retained after U.S. and foreign taxes an average 74% of their gross profit. But some companies retained 100% or more.

The figures reveal that the oil companies paid almost a quarter million to the U.S., but over $1 billion to other governments. While 4% of their gross profit went to the U.S. Treasury, over 20% went to foreign governments and States.

The provisions allowing oil companies to pay so little are the 27.5% depletion allowance, intangible drilling costs provision, and being able to classify certain royalty payments on oil as income tax to a foreign government and thus subtract the royalties from their tax payment due the U.S. after calculating tax due.

But, Mr. Speaker, these striking figures are only part of the story of tax privileges. I believe all Americans should be fully informed of the estimated taxes not paid during the period 1955–65 by the 20 largest oil companies because of the depletion allowance, intangible drilling cost provisions, and the Internal Revenue Service ruling that royalties abroad may be deducted from the final tax liability as a tax credit. This estimated tax probably exceeds $6 billion.

This situation leads me to ask three questions.

First. Is this subsidy in line with the intent of Congress?

Second. Is this subsidy in harmony with our national goals?

Third. Is this subsidy in the same legal framework to which our system of democratic government is so closely related?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the consideration of my colleagues, an article which reveals more clearly how 1,900 firms beat the Federal tax problem—a problem with which the average American has just been faced and required to resolve:

IRS Reveals Depletion Effect—How 1900 Firms Beat Federal Tax Problem

The Internal Revenue Service, with its characteristic lack of humor released last week a detailed study of the depletion allowances and how they lower income taxes.

While many were racing to ready their returns for the Apr. 15 deadline, IRS gave details on the $2.5 billion subsidy Congress enacted allegedly to encourage exploration for minerals.

By far corporations account for the biggest chunk of the depletion boom, about 90%.

Integrated refining companies accounted for more than $1.6 billion of the depletion claimed, well over half the total.

BIG REFINERS GOT LARGE BITE

But of the $1.6 billion, $435 million was claimed by the 22 oil refining companies for production from foreign properties.

This tax subsidy is aimed at encouraging international corporations to find new sources of oil in the middle east and other areas where it can help the U.S. in time of emergency, while tending to unbalance our international payments.

One of the best features of depletion subsidies is that some firms can do away with paying income tax altogether.

The report shows that 1900 tax returns in 1960 had no taxable income at all.

But depletion only accounted for $880 million while depreciation cut the taxable income another $572 million for these firms.

APPLIED TO $10 BILLION

In the oil and gas industry alone depletion was applied to almost $10 billion in gross income from properties.

Here's the breakdown:

Number of returns	7,183

[In thousands of dollars]

Gross income from mineral properties	9,433,618
Deductions exclusive of depletion, total	4,326,810
Exploration	---------
Development	1,036,845
Dry hole deductions for oil and gas	140,851
Depreciation	179,644
Operating expense	2,603,232
Taxes	83,475
Overhead and other	282,763
Net income less loss before depletion	5,106,808
Percentage depletion at statutory rate	2,594,114
Allowable depletion, total	2,530,235
Percentage depletion	2,251,470
Cost depletion	278,765
Deductions on nonproducing properties	1,464,762

Curiously some of the depletion benefits were taken by wholesale and retail firms with producing properties.

Marketing firms with depletion, 618 of them, took $26.5 million in depletion on gross income from production of $161.9 million, but these figures include nonoil industry depletion statistics.

The word gets around in financial circles.

GETTING IN ON ACT

While the general public may not be aware of the effects of the depletion allowance, 392 manufacturing firms not in oil refining took advantage of oil and gas depletion in 1960 as did 475 nonpetroleum wholesale and retail firms.

Another 2,500 firms, in insurance, finance, and real estate dipped into the depletion cooky jar in the same year through oil property holdings.

One big distinction made in the report is between cost depletion and percentage or statutory depletion.

Cost depletion refers to the actual amount by which the value of property drops when minerals are removed.

U.S. income taxes of 22 largest oil refiners (1962, 1963, 1964) [1]

Rank in size	Year	Gross profit	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some States' tax	Percent	Income after tax	Percent of gross
Standard (N.J.)	1962	$1,271,903,000	$8,000,000	0.6	$423,000,000	33	$804,903,000	66
	1963	1,584,469,000	69,000,000	4.3	496,000,000	31	1,019,469,000	64
	1964	1,628,555,000	29,000,000	1.7	549,000,000	33	1,050,555,000	64
Texaco	1962	546,371,000	13,000,000	2.3	51,700,000	9	481,671,000	88
	1963	615,768,000	10,250,000	1.6	58,850,000	12	545,668,000	88
	1964	660,761,000	5,500,000	.8	77,900,000	11	577,361,000	87
Gulf	1962	488,351,000	19,389,000	3.9	128,871,000	26	340,091,000	70
	1963	540,065,000	30,870,000	5.7	137,842,000	25	371,353,000	68
	1964	607,343,000	52,443,000	8.6	159,781,000	26	395,118,000	65
Socony Mobil	1962	379,339,000	8,300,000	2.1	128,700,000	33	242,339,000	63
	1963	437,352,000	23,000,000	5.2	142,500,000	32	271,852,000	62
	1964	464,660,000	27,700,000	5.9	142,800,000	30	294,160,000	63
Standard (Calif.)	1962	348,181,000	5,800,000	1.6	28,600,000	8	313,781,000	90
	1963	356,568,000	2,900,000	.8	31,600,000	8	322,068,000	90
	1964	393,188,000	8,300,000	2.1	39,600,000	10	345,288,000	87
Shell	1962	173,555,000	7,200,000	4.1	8,680,000	5	157,675,000	91
	1963	211,575,000	19,100,000	9.0	12,623,000	5	179,852,000	85
	1964	213,575,000	2,800,000	1.3	12,585,000	5	198,190,000	92
Standard (Ind.)	1962	168,843,000	3,105,000	1.8	3,381,000	2	162,420,000	96
	1963	208,022,000	22,182,000	10.6	2,748,000	1	183,092,000	88
	1964	204,817,000	8,486,000	4.1	1,480,000	.7	194,851,000	95
Phillips	1962	158,320,000	48,000,000	30.3	3,365,000	2	106,955,000	67
	1963	160,954,000	52,000,000	26.2	3,491,000	2	105,463,000	65
	1964	152,197,000	32,229,000	22.2	4,950,000	3	115,018,000	74
Cities Service	1962	84,143,000	20,773,000	24.7	3,185,000	3	60,185,000	71
	1963	101,976,000	20,188,000	21.4	4,283,000	4	77,505,000	74
	1964	113,405,000	27,925,000	24.7	967,000	.8	84,513,000	74
Continental	1962	73,477,000	1,065,000	1.4	3,335,000	5	69,077,000	94
	1963	99,665,000	9,143,000	9.2	3,157,000	3	87,365,000	88
	1964	112,009,000	8,725,000	7.7	3,175,000	2	100,109,000	89
Sun	1962	66,395,000	[2] 200,000	0	13,400,000	20	53,195,000	80
	1963	79,976,000	1,300,000	1.9	17,460,000	22	61,216,000	77
	1964	88,577,000	2,400,000	2.7	17,670,000	20	68,507,000	77
Union	1962	59,421,000	8,000,000	13.5	5,500,000	9	45,921,000	77
	1963	73,028,000	13,100,000	17.7	6,000,000	8	53,928,000	74
	1964	87,564,000	13,300,000	15.2	7,200,000	8	67,064,000	77
Standard (Ohio)	1962	37,235,000	9,275,000	25.0	3,738,000	10	24,222,000	65
	1963	54,008,000	15,225,000	28.1	4,896,000	9	33,887,000	62
	1964	70,252,000	21,150,000	30.2	5,334,000	7	43,768,000	62
Sinclair	1962	57,936,000	0	0	10,586,000	18	47,350,000	83
	1963	71,036,000	1,200,000	0	9,532,000	13	62,704,000	88
	1964	66,444,000	[2] 3,119,000	0	10,531,000	15	58,736,000	88
Marathon	1962	35,894,000	[2] 2,200,000	0	205,000	.5	37,889,000	105
	1963	50,058,000	(3)	0	933,000	1.8	49,125,000	98
	1964	63,220,000	(3)	0	2,844,000	4.4	60,376,000	95
Atlantic	1962	61,110,000	0	0	14,844,000	24	46,266,000	75
	1963	56,747,000	0	0	12,734,000	22	44,013,000	78
	1964	61,081,000	0	0	14,005,000	22	47,076,000	77
Tidewater	1962	35,191,000	228,000	.6	2,387,000	6	32,576,000	93
	1963	42,795,000	[2] 63,000	0	3,384,000	8	39,474,000	92
	1964	40,508,000	377,000	13.7	4,426,000	11	35,705,000	
Ashland	1962	24,324,000	6,201,000	25.8	2,799,000	11	15,324,000	63
	1963	28,769,000	10,556,000	37.7	104,000	.3	18,109,000	64
	1964	36,385,000	9,672,000	26.8	2,977,000	8	23,735,000	65
Sunray	1962	41,203,000	3,850,000	9.3	1,152,000	2.8	36,201,000	88
	1963	49,727,000	6,533,000	13.3	1,328,000	2.7	41,866,000	85
	1964	29,357,000	[2] 7,115,000	0	1,290,000	3.6	35,182,000	100
Pure	1962	27,680,000	[2] 2,546,000	0	1,276,000	4	28,950,000	107
	1963	28,582,000	[2] 1,212,000	0	27,000	.01	29,767,000	106
	1964	32,282,000	600,000	.01	164,000	.5	31,518,000	98
Skelly	1962	22,674,000	1,260,000	5.7	250,000	1	21,164,000	96
	1963	27,479,000	3,025,000	7.7	275,000	4	24,179,000	89
	1964	26,601,000	785,000	1.2	275,000	2	25,551,000	98
Richfield	1962	36,615,000	6,000,000	16.6	0	0	30,615,000	83
	1963	29,767,000	1,300,000	4.4	773,000	2.6	27,894,000	94
	1964	26,255,000	[2] 629,000	0	5,429,000	20.8	21,455,000	82
Total	1962	4,198,161,000	164,500,000	4	838,891,000	20	3,194,770,000	76
	1963	4,908,386,000	246,660,000	5	950,540,000	19	3,649,849,000	74
	1964	5,179,036,000	240,529,000	4	1,064,383,000	20	3,873,836,000	74

[1] Compiled from records of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission by the staff of THE GASOLINE LETTER. WARNING—this table is part of the March 21, 1966 issue of THE GASOLINE LETTER and may not be reproduced by any means—including office copying equipment—without prior written permission of the publisher. Violation of copyright is a federal offense carrying penalties from $500 to $2500.

[2] Cr.

[3] Marathon is the only large oil company that has been able to conceal its domestic income taxes in the Securities and Exchange Commission files. We phoned Girard Jetton, Marathon's tax chief and asked the U.S. figure, but he said it's a secret. Since the firm probably doesn't want to keep secret the smallness of its foreign taxes, it's assumed the U.S. tax is small and all of Marathon's income taxes are listed here as foreign.

This real depletion reflects the declining value of a property related directly to the amount of oil produced.

TAKE HIGHEST FIGURE

But Congress decided to give oil and gas producers a 27.5-percent boon.

No matter what the real depletion is, producers can deduct 27.5 percent of their value of production up to 50 percent of the property's net income before depletion.

Look how it works out when applied to foreign producers and refiners:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Oil and gas producers	Oil refiners
Net income	473,750	1,370,331
Income subject to tax	437,078	969,613
Income tax	225,842	495,702
Gross income from mineral properties	1,321,362	5,419,552
Foreign	805,886	1,589,757
Domestic	515,476	3,829,795
Depletion, total	353,158	1,424,744
Percentage	343,577	1,351,554
Cost	9,581	73,190

[In thousands of dollars]

	Oil and gas producers	Oil refiners
Depletion, foreign	220,257	434,920
Percentage	215,974	416,849
Cost	4,283	18,071
Depletion, domestic	132,901	989,824
Percentage	127,603	934,705
Cost	5,298	55,119

The IRS was particularly careful in writing the report to avoid any judgments or opinions particularly after an oil producer group

made IRS remove the swimming pools, oil wells and bathing beauties from the depletion allowance section of their tax guide a few years ago.

Keeping in mind how sensitive the President is these days, the report is kept right to the hard facts.

Send 40 cents to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 and ask for Pub. 475 (2-66).

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE FIELD OF TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, President Howard Pyle, of the National Safety Council, testified before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce last week. This testimony is helpful and illuminating to anyone who genuinely desires to grasp the issues confronting Congress on this huge and complex subject.

The National Safety Council was chartered in 1913 and since then it has provided the only national leadership in the field of traffic safety.

I commend Governor Pyle and his associates for the quality of this testimony. It is straightforward, analytical, and affirmative in its approach to the enormously complex subject.

I commend the National Safety Council for refusing to get on the defensive in the face of recent criticism it has received and I congratulate it for giving strong support to congressional efforts to achieve a new and clearly defined role in the field of traffic safety for the Federal Government.

Perhaps better than any other group, the Council recognizes that the only hope for us to build a safer traffic environment will be through intelligent, creative Federal, State, local cooperation and through mobilizing and coordinating public and private efforts in the field of traffic safety.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF HOWARD PYLE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL, ON H.R. 13228, TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966 BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MAY 12, 1966

May I begin, rather than end, my statement with our conclusions on what has become the most controversial aspect of H.R. 13228, to wit: Federal safety standards for motor vehicles.

1. The National Safety Council has agreed with the basic approach of the Administration bill, H.R. 13228, namely that there is wisdom in a system of safety that provides for both

(a) voluntary industry high performance standards, and

(b) mandatory government minimum performance standards.

2. The Council is not satisfied with, and urges the Congress not to "settle" for, minimum Federal safety standards alone.

3. The Council must disagree with those who urge that the best way to obtain motor vehicle safety is through Federal minimum safety standards alone, because in our judgment such a position could result in Congressional action that would

(a) absolve the automotive industry of its inherent obligation to achieve voluntarily the highest practicable safety standards for its products, and to do this as rapidly as possible, and

(b) rely primarily on minimum Federal safety standards (which have a tendency to become a ceiling for safety rather than a floor).

4. The Council urges the Congress not to enact "half-loaf" safety legislation. The Council believes that reliance primarily on minimum Federal safety standards, to the detriment of voluntary industry high performance standards, is "half-loaf" safety.

5. Finally, the Council again advises the Congress that the high degree of traffic safety we all desire requires that Congress deal with the full range of safety measures affecting cars, drivers, and highways, which we have put before the Congress.

Now, may I tell you in some detail why we feel this way and how we believe H.R. 13228 can be strengthened to provide the maximum traffic safety for the American people?

INTRODUCTION

The President has quite properly said that traffic accidents are the second most serious problem facing the nation, second only to the war in Viet Nam.

It is simply disgraceful that, since 1961, we have lost four times as many American servicemen in motor vehicle accidents as our enemies have been able to kill in all the bitter fighting in Viet Nam.

U.S. motor vehicle accidents in 1965 killed 49,000 men, women and children. Injuries disabled 1,800,000 and an equal number suffered non-disabling injuries. Economic costs which can be tabulated aggregated $8,500,000,000.

These are tragic and costly facts, but little more so than the records of other years when too little, too late, in the way of corrective measures has cost us far too many killed, too many injured, and too many dollars needlessly wasted.

Prevention expenditures in scale with this economic burden are badly needed and fully justified, and the Federal government is long overdue in assuming its appropriate role.

Industry has shown noteworthy progress in the control of on-the-job accidents, but public agencies responsible for so much of what is needed to curb such killers as traffic accidents have not been so successful.

So, we are grateful for the awakening that now finds all levels of government, led by the President, distinguished Congressional leaders, Governors, Mayors, and others, showing a commendable and meaningful determination to be as responsible in traffic safety as government should be in all matters of such critical concern to the national welfare. We believe that the resultant stimulation of public discussion and informed focus on the complexities of traffic safety will produce measures to save many a motorist from death, injury and economic loss.
death, injury and economic loss.

Commenting now on H.R. 13228, may we that are basic to the NSC's position on traffic safety.

1. The American people can have just about as much traffic safety as they are willing to pay for—in terms of dollars and discipline. Traffic safety does not come cheaply.

2. No one panacea, or even a baker's dozen of panaceas, as such, will meet the safety needs of the American people. There must be a balanced, comprehensive and systematic program stressing all of traffic safety's essential aspects, including the vehicle, the driver and the road. There are no simple remedies.

3. Traffic safety requires even safer cars, but even the safest car will not bring traffic safety without ever safer drivers and safer roads.

4. No one has done enough in traffic safety. The Council has for years expressed dissatisfaction with the feebleness of the totality of the national effort to cope with highway accidents.

5. Traffic safety requires an effective operating partnership between industry, the public and government. No one of these groups alone can do the job. All of them together, each playing its full role within a comprehensive, balanced program, can reduce the present traffic safety toll by half, and save 25,000 lives each year. An increased Federal role does not mean that any of the other partners should be permitted to slough off their respective responsibilities for the highest possible voluntary level of effort which it is practicably capable of producing.

We understand that this Committee's jurisdiction is limited to Titles I and II of H.R. 13228, and that Title III of H.R. 13228 (the remainder of the President's proposals) falls within the purview of the Committee on Public Works. But the traffic safety problem is a unified one and cannot be solved without a unified and comprehensive approach. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, while I shall discuss Titles I and II of H.R. 13228, I should like to urge that you put these Titles into the context of the full range of Congressional and Executive action needed.

As an indication of our concept of such a comprehensive traffic safety program, we submit for the Committee's attention, the 18-point program we provided the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization on February 2, 1966. The key to this balanced program is in the Action Program for Highway Safety which was developed by national professional and official safety associations as a soundly conceived and available guide to the nature and scope of a comprehensive program.

The Action Program was ratified by the White House Conference on Highway Safety in 1946, as a master plan for highway safety. It has been updated twice since then, in 1949 and 1960, and two major sections were added since 1960. It has been approved by the President's Committee for Traffic Safety, the Governors Conference, the National League of Cities, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. The NSC is a strong supporter and advocate of the Action Program.

A great deal of time and many lives could be saved if the Action Program recommendations concerning all aspects of safety were used as a broadly agreed upon point of departure to consider how mutual objectives could be more rapidly attained.

TITLE I, H.R. 13228

Title I provides for a two-step process of achieving motor vehicle safety standards. *First*, it encourages development of non-Federal and voluntary motor vehicle safety standards. If such standards exist or come into timely effect, and they are adequate and effectively complied with, the Congressional objective would be met. *Second*, if, however, the non-Federal or voluntary standards are not adequate or not effectively complied with, then *minimum* Federal standards may be issued and shall be mandatory.

The fundamental issues

The fundamental safety issue is whether the maximum practicable degree of vehicle safety can best be attained by:

a. Both legal minimum regulations and strong encouragement and reliance on voluntary performance standards, or

b. Primary statutory reliance on legal minimum regulations.

The National Safety Council and the President's bill have recommended that the first of these alternatives be followed.

The National Safety Council continues to believe that the Federal government has a responsibility to assure that there are adequate legal minimum safety regulations, either at the state or Federal level. This has presented an administrative issue as to the best type of Federal action.

a. Should the Federal role be to aid and strengthen state action in establishing minimum legal standards for motor vehicles? or

b. Should the Federal role be to establish direct Federal minimum legal standards for motor vehicles?

From the beginning the National Safety Council has stated that either of these levels of administration could be effective, and the Council has presented recommendations as to how each of these courses can be made workable.

We have stated that the first of these two Federal roles was preferable because presumably it could be made to work promptly. The basic Federal and state machinery was already in place, i.e., the Roberts Act, the Beamer Resolution, and the Baldwin Amendment. However, we have not been encouraged by our interim experience with the existing mechanism and our assessment of the apparent disinclination of the Congress to strengthen it as we recommend. Since our concern is to get on with the safety job, we therefore turn to our first and only alternative recommendation, i.e., standby authority to establish Federal minimum legal standards coupled, as it is in the President's proposal, with strong built-in encouragement for voluntary industry high performance standards, but subject to strengthening amendments, some of which we previously proposed to the Senate, and which we will submit here today.

Necessity of voluntary, industry high performance standards

The National Safety Council was conceived 53 years ago on the premise that industry was responsible for accident prevention and had social and economic reasons for doing the best practicable job.

And, on the record, this principle of enlightened leadership has been the source of safety improvements both in employee and product safety in many industries. May I cite some examples:

1. The low occupational injury rates in this country are attributable to leading businesses which go far beyond legal regulations. In contrast, European businesses mostly comply with legal regulations and then stop. This European custom has produced higher injury rates.

2. The electrical equipment manufacturers voluntarily seek the seal of approval of the independent Underwriters Laboratories.

3. The farm equipment industry for 20 years has worked with organized agriculture to develop safety standards for its products and has voluntarily applied these standards for such aspects as: shielding power take off, lighting, functional controls, etc.

4. The petroleum industry has been a leader in developing and applying fire safety standards for the use of its products, and has subsequently supported legal regulations based on voluntary standards.

5. In the last few years, the Council and the Public Health Service have helped the power mower industry and architectural glass industry develop safety standards for their products, and the glass standard is now being worked into local building regulations as well as Federal housing regulations.

There are numerous other examples which are sufficient to show that our national progress in safety across the complex array of products we use has stemmed primarily from industry leadership. I am not saying that industry always shows leadership. For example, it took a Federal law to get child-safe refrigerator doors.

It is true that, in some categories of activities, the standards voluntarily developed by industry and public representatives through such groups as the American Standards Association and the National Fire Protection Association have later become the basis for state and local regulation in order to achieve universal application. However, in most such cases it must be emphasized that voluntary industry leadership on standards preceded the regulatory phase.

Now we face the need to assess the relative roles of industrial leadership versus regulatory prodding for the automobile manufacturing industry, and for the tire manufacturing industry as well.

The present question is: "Is the automobile industry as willing as it is able to provide design improvements on a voluntary basis?" In the recent past the industry has voluntarily provided better seat anchorages, better door locks, improved windshields, better door handles, and with a little encouragement, even a collapsible steering column. Will they now be willing to voluntarily add such things as more crashworthy instrument panels, freedom from dangerous ornaments, improved padding in interior, safer tires, etc., etc. We think they will, especially with the "encouragement" of what someone on our staff termed the "loaded gun in the corner" approach of the President's bill.

As a matter of fact, the auto industry itself provides us with examples of progressively higher voluntary standards providing the basis for regulatory action in two areas of present Federal legislation:

1. Seat Belts. The standard of the SAE was progressively raised because the individual company standards were largely more stringent than SAE at each stage of development. When Federal regulation moved to eliminate fly-by-night products, the regulation essentially was that of SAE, upgraded by industry action.

2. Brake Fluids. The manufacturers followed the SAE standard they had developed. When Federal regulation was needed, again to control fly-by-night operations, the SAE standard was at hand as a ready-made standard of reliability.

Our point is that voluntary industry high performance standards can yield safety more quickly than Federal minimum standards. The tire situation is a good example of what we mean. The hearings of the Federal Trade Commission and the Senate hearings on tire regulation have indicated the technical complexity of this subject and the need for additional research to develop adequate grading and standards. However, it does not require a technical background to realize that the "heavy duty" tires now offered by the manufacturers as optional equipment on new cars are needed by those who plan to use heavily loaded cars in long distance, high speed travel. Such tires should be made *standard equipment* on new cars for the simple reason that practically every modern car can be assumed to be used in family vacation travel requiring the "heavy duty" equipment. The present "original equipment" tires should be reserved as "light duty" options for those who are positive that their travel will be limited to light loads in essentially urban conditions. This safety improvement is as simple as a few automobile company presidents directing it without waiting for the necessarily more lengthy and involved process of establishing Federal minimum safety standards.

At this point of "the great debate" a goodly segment of the public, and perhaps of the Congress, is persuaded that greater auto safety can and must come from Federal minimum regulation of design. Such regulations can do some good, but will be so far short of our proper goals as to be a "half loaf," if that much, and in some respects a set back for safety.

The recent testimony of representatives of the automobile manufacturers, who now support minimum regulations, was perhaps more eloquent in what it had to say about high performance standards and the inhibiting effect of regulations than was their similar testimony at a time when they were opposing minimum regulations. For example, the industry representative said, "The mere pendency of a vehicle performance standard proceeding could retard the progress of research and development."

The President's concept of legislation very wisely put primary emphasis on voluntary action, in the hope that voluntary action would be so exemplary and outstanding as to never warrant Federal minimum standards. The President's proposal is one of the most imaginative and perceptive proposals in the history of regulation.

Now some members of Congress are joined by the auto industry itself in urging mandatory action by the Secretary of Commerce. If this view prevails there will be no premium or gain from vigorous industry action in the next two years; rather, the premium would come from low standards which would hold down the Federally-required minimum standards to a so-called "practicable" level.

There are those who seem ready to begin our journey on the tired road of legal regulation of details, settling for such safety as can be haggled out of conflicting views. Do we want to settle for a system which encourages least common denominator safety? This will undoubtedly give us more safety than we have now, but less safety than we deserve to have and could get from industry leadership combined with government supervision.

The Council continues to advocate the President's course because it gives the last clear chance to voluntary action and sets excellence as the standard to be sought. The regulatory route of minimum standards is slower than enlightened industry action (but of course is faster than no industry action). Regulation can only put a floor under performance; it usually does not produce high performance. Regulation can inhibit better methods, either by indirectly prohibiting them in regulation, or by killing the desire to excel.

We hope and trust that Congress will follow a course of wise pressure for the high goals of the Action Program coupled with a mandatory floor which writes into minimum regulations, the progressively higher standards which industrial leadership can attain.

The vehicle

I would now like to read certain provisions of the Action Program in order to make unmistakably clear that there was no disagreement in 1960, the automobile industry included, on the general nature and importance of the desired improvements in vehicle design. May I read from the Action Program.

"20. The automotive industry should continue its efforts to improve all elements of vehicle design having a bearing on safety. The relative importance of proposed vehicle changes should be assessed to insure that the items of greatest potential benefit are kept under attention. Greater effort is needed in—

"*a*. Developing more rugged and effective equipment for defrosting and cleaning windshields and rear windows under severe weather conditions.

"*b*. Standardizing the placement of instruments and controls, and advancing their functional design.

"*c*. Implementing basic safety-design concepts, particularly those related to restraining devices, dissipation of impact energy, and the lessening of structural deformation in the passenger compartment.

"*d*. Conducting collision research to establish criteria for structural design and to determine the effect of the forces involved on both restrained and unrestrained occupants.

"*e*. Evaluating the safety aspects of various types of automatic controls.

"*f*. Determining causes of commercial vehicle fires and means for alleviating these through vehicle design and operating procedures.

"21. Driver fatigue should be reduced and comfort improved by the functional design of passenger-car bodies and truck cabs to provide more adequate seating, by the reduction of truck-cab noise and vibration, and by the provision of more durable exhaust systems.

"22. Research on vehicle handling should be intensified with respect to—

"*a*. Provision of maximum maneuverability compatible with driver-reaction and vehicle-response times.

"*b*. Improving traction on low-friction surfaces.

"*c*. Reducing vehicle response to road and aerodynamic disturbances.

"23. Industry, highway-user groups, and the Government should intensify their research and development on brakes, to the end that—

"*a*. The performance of truck brakes may more nearly approach that of passenger car brakes.

"*b*. Practical antilocking devices of special benefit on slippery surfaces may be developed.

"*c*. Metering devices may be produced to keep braking forces proportional to the load carried on each axle, whether the vehicle is loaded or unloaded.

"*d*. In the event of partial brake failure on single unit vehicles, brakes may still operate on one axle.

"*e*. Adequate braking and retarding capacity may be available for the descent of long grades and for stopping from high speeds.

"24. Industry and public officials should cooperate in working out vehicle-performance requirements that will insure for commercial vehicles the proper relationship between design capacities of vehicle components and the gross loads as operated."

There are many other elaborations and details of these basic points in the original text of the Vehicle Engineering Section of the Action Program for Highway Safety, but the summary suffices to state an agreed upon view.

I do not rule out that in 1966 we could improve on this 1960 statement. But I do emphasize that a great deal of apparent difference of opinion could have been eliminated if this statement had been used as a point of departure a year ago.

Please note that these Action Program recommendations are directed largely to the automotive industry in connection with its obligation for the safety of the products which it sells to the public. The consensus grows that the auto industry failed to make a fully satisfactory record of progress in attaining goals mutually agreed upon in the 1960 revision of the Action Program.

The actual controversy is as to *how* these goals may be attained, rather than on their importance. The *how* is more important than the statistical evidence for this or that vehicle feature. Yet there has been much debate and controversy over the relative degree of "fault" of the automobile, the driver, the road, and other factors, in causing traffic accidents. Unfortunately, research data are meager and do not give answers to this natural question. Most accidents, and/or the injuries resulting, should be assumed to result from multiple contributing factors, including in most cases the automobile, the highway and the driver. However, present day methods of reporting accidents at the source are not sufficiently refined to be able to separate these various factors in mass statistics. Exhaustive research into accident causes is urgently necessary. For the Committee's information, *Appendix No. 1* discusses the relationship between statistics and the determination of causes of accidents, and *Appendix No. 2* the relationship of vehicle factors to accident and injury causations. Traffic safety requires safe cars, but safe cars alone will not yield traffic safety. We must have even safer cars than we now have—but we must also bear in mind that traffic safety also requires the measures covered in Title III of H.R. 13228, as well as other propositions stated in the Action Program for Highway Safety.

So far as motor vehicle design is concerned, the National Safety Council's policy was particularly well expressed on January 10, 1951, when Sidney J. Williams, then assistant to the President of the Council, said at the annual meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers:

"I have spoken of (auto) design chiefly because in any problem the engineering solution, if there is one, is always the best. It is the easiest, because machines are easier to understand than people—they are more tractable, they don't talk back. The engineering solution also is the cheapest because it is permanent, while education and enforcement must be kept up year after year."

Administration through the States

As stated earlier, the Council believes administration through the states is possible. But for reasons already indicated we now will confine our remarks to the alternative of Federal standards. However, in case any member of this Committee wants to examine the potentials and the problems inherent in the state route, we supply as an Exhibit a copy of our testimony on S. 3005 referring particularly to pages 3 to 8 inclusive.

Administration at the Federal level

As stated earlier, we have turned to our only alternative recommendation, standby authority to establish Federal minimum legal standards coupled, as it is in H.R. 13228, with strong built-in encouragement for voluntary industry high performance standards.

As we have already stated, we propose certain amendents to strengthen title I. In doing so we wish it to be clearly understood that we concur in the philosophy of H.R. 13228 as stated by the Secretary of Commerce before this committee, as follows:

"The authority to set pre-emptive national standards, . . . would be a standby authority to be exercised at the discretion of the Secretary under statutory criteria."

The National Safety Council proposes amendments to title I, H.R. 13228 as follows:

1. Advisory Board

The NSC recommends establishment of a Vehicle Safety Advisory Board composed of representatives of the automobile industry; the insurance industry, consumers; commercial vehicle users; Federal, State and local governments; voluntary safety organizations; the interested professions; university researchers; and the public at large. Board members should be appointed by the Secretary for fixed terms of office.

The Secretary should be required to consult the Board no less than 90 days prior to the issuance of any determination or order under Sec. 102(a) of H.R. 13228, and provide it with a copy of the proposed determination or order, to enable the Board to submit its views thereon. Such views shall be published in connection with the Secretary's determination or order.

An Advisory Board brings to a Federal program the strength and skills of a representative group of the most knowledgeable people outside the Federal structure, and provides the Federal administrator a two-way channel of communication. Such a Board can serve an especially useful purpose in this program which would be a new venture for the Federal government. It would expedite the program's effectiveness by providing a means for developing a consensus in connection with Federal standards, without changing the Federal government's ultimate authority to act.

2. Certification

The NSC recommends that for the period during which no applicable Federal motor vehicle standard is in effect under Sec. 102 because the Secretary has determined that another motor vehicle safety standard meets the criteria listed in Sec. 102 of H.R. 13228 (lines 1 to 11, page 4), that the certification procedure provided for in Sec. 7 of H.R. 12458 (Mackay) should be applicable.

This requirement would strengthen the Administration bill and still retain its basic structure wherein the Federal standards are designed as standby authority. Nor will this suggestion place any substantial additional burden on the Department since Sec. 102 (a)(4) of H.R. 13228 would presumably require continuous checks on "effective compliance with respect to any existing motor vehicle safety standards." Formal certification of such compliance, as proposed by Sec. 7 of Mr. Mackay's bill, is a very short step indeed.

3. Economic Impact

If Congress deems Federal standards should be authorized, the NSC believes that it should confirm the authority of the Secretary to consider economic impact as part of his judgment of practicability under Sec. 101(b) and Sec. 102(a). This is appropriate because measures which are clearly uneconomic can endanger public acceptance of the whole safety program.

4. Classification of Motor Vehicles

The NSC recommends that Congress should clarify the authority of the Secretary to classify vehicle types for the setting of standards, since Title I relates to *all* motor vehicles and not merely passenger vehicles. For example, if the GSA standards for passenger-carrying vehicles were applied to all motor vehicles of any kind, they would rule off the road sport roadsters and convertibles, some small cars and motorcycles. We doubt the American public is willing to give up these types of vehicles. Some standards for passenger cars will be inappropriate for trucks and buses, and vice-versa. Proper classification of vehicles and variable requirements is an accepted part of the Uniform Vehicle Code.

5. Annual Report

The NSC believes that the provisions of Sec. 11(a) of H.R. 12548 (MACKAY) requiring an annual report by the Secretary, is a vital instrumentality focusing national attention on traffic safety in a continuing fashion. Without this the Congress would be handicapped in its surveillance of the traffic accident problem. Our proposal would relate not only to Title I, but also to Titles II and III, so that the Congress would annually have a comprehensive review of all aspects of traffic safety, relating each Title to the others.

6. Higher State Standards

Section 102(b) of H.R. 13228 prevents any State or local government from establishing a standard on an item to which a Federal standard is applicable under the bill except "for the exclusive purpose of its own procurement." We believe this provision is unwise in denying States and local governments the right to establish such more rigorous requirements for all their citizens and not merely for the State and local governments' own use. Where a State faces an especially difficult problem to which a Federal standard is not responsive, or altogether responsive, the State should be authorized to act by providing higher standards. California's attempt to deal with automotive air pollution is a classic example of the need for authorizing States and localities to adopt standards more rigorous than those prescribed in the Federal standard.

7. Interim Action in Two Year Period

Section 102(a) prevents the Secretary from issuing any Federal standards prior to two years from enactment. There may be occasions when, upon special findings, the Secretary should be authorized to act earlier. For example, elimination of radiator and other ornaments which are hazardous to pedestrians. If an industry standard is not available, the Secretary should be authorized to act in six months or less if he is ready to do so.

TITLE II, H.R. 13228

This title authorizes Federal facilities to conduct research and testing. The Council endorses this proposal.

We desperately need more research information on traffic safety problems, and the research role is an especially fitting one for the Federal government.

The size of the effort as projected in Title II would appear to be in scale with the size of the problem. In fact, it appears to be the first time the Federal government has projected a research expenditure appropriate to the size of the accident problem. As we have repeatedly said before Congressional committees the amounts appropriated for Federal safety research should have the decimal point moved one or two places to the right.

Under the present form of Title II, it would appear wise to amend Section 202 to authorize the Secretary to use appropriated funds for the initial steps in site acquisition because decision on site or sites will be necessary parts of the final stages of planning.

Comprehensive Program

Having now addressed myself to Titles I and II of H.R. 13228, I return to my original point that it is necessary to assess them and place them in the context of a comprehensive, balanced program. For this purpose, I should like to make two major observations:

1. Title III of H.R. 13228

The NSC supports Title III of H.R. 13228 as being indispensable to a comprehensive and balanced program to cope with traffic accidents. However, we urge some amendments which will strengthen and improve Title III's effectiveness.

Yesterday we presented our views to these ends on H.R. 13290 (which is, except in one respect, identical with Title III of H.R. 13228) before the House Committee on Public Works. For this Committee's attention, I furnish a copy of that statement.

2. Additional 10-Point Program

The NSC recommends an additional 10-point program, each of which recommendations is explained more fully in *Appendix No. 3.*

(1) *Action Program for Highway Safety:* The Congress should by *Joint Resolution* adopt recommendations embodied in the *Action Program for Highway Safety* as an interim, non-exclusive guide to national policy

(2) *Congressional Review of National Policy*

(3) *Coordination among Federal Agencies*

(4) *Increased Federal Support for Accident Research*

(5) *Federal Accident Costs and Prevention Budgets*

(6) *Use of Seat Belts*

(7) *Federal Driver Improvement*

(8) *Federal Off-the-Job Safety*

(9) *Drinking Drivers*

(10) *Strengthening Voluntary Safety Organizations*

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me again say that the National Safety Council is gratified that traffic safety is now so high on the national action agenda. If Congress enacts an effective traffic safety bill—and we have indicated what the NSC believes such a bill would be—the nation will be taking an enormous step forward toward coping with highway accidents. With the President and Congress taking this initiative, and with industry, the American driving public, the voluntary safety community and the States and local governments each being thus activated to do their utmost as part of a comprehensive action program, the NSC believes we can save 25,000 lives a year.

ESCALATION AND ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam continues to be escalated to new levels by both sides.

In the last weeks new doubts have been cast on the possibility of holding early elections and on whether certain outcomes of these elections would, in fact, be honored.

Both of these developments, Mr. Speaker, disturb me greatly.

ESCALATION QUESTIONED

I strongly question the wisdom of escalating the war. I question whether such action will not lead to a larger and much more costly conflict, or to at least a new stalemate at a higher and more dangerous level. I question, too, whether it brings us any closer to the conference table and a verified cease-fire.

The United States is in Vietnam so that the people of that war-torn country may have an opportunity to determine their own future, free from the outside interference of those who would determine it for them. This purpose remains valid so long as we honor that choice, whatever it may be, and so long as we encourage, in every way we know how to, the day when free elections may be held.

But preceding degrees of escalation have not induced the other side to desist, and I fail to see how an even higher level of military effort can advance the day when any meaningful form of self-determination may be possible. I suspect it may make its achievement that much more difficult.

I also fail to see how any action that would delay popular elections can be condoned, or how any action which would jeopardize their result could be tolerated.

OUR POLICY ON ELECTIONS IN DOUBT

Yet, the respected columnist, Joseph Kraft, writing from Saigon, has confirmed what I felt on my own inspection trips to Vietnam, and that is:

> The American mission here has yet to develop a coherent program for dealing with the elections and their predictable problems.

He has noted that:

> Rightly or wrongly there is a widespread impression among both Americans and Vietnamese in Saigon that the United States is opposed to free elections.

He has gone on to report that:

> There is also a widespread impression that if the United States does accept elections it is only to provide a figleaf of legitimacy to the present military regime.

There can be little question, Mr. Speaker, that the majority, if not all, of the governments we have supported to date in Saigon have been supported for the simple expedients that they could function and that they were the most stable that could then be achieved.

COMMITMENT TO ELECTIONS URGED

The time is past, however, when these can be our standards. There is a ground swell in South Vietnam that is properly demanding a popularly elected government, and we should be encouraging and supporting its creation, if for no other reason than that it is consistent with our own national tradition.

What steps, then, can we properly take? What actions can we pursue which might hasten the time when negotiations may be held, peace restored, and elections made possible?

First, I believe it is absolutely essential that this country make clear, by word and deed, its irrevocable commitment to free elections. There must be no room or reason for anyone to challenge our sincerity.

Second, we should assist the government in power in Saigon to move as rapidly as possible toward the day when these elections can and will be held. We should plainly resist, with all of the appropriate tools at our command, any unnecessary or unreasonable delays in this process.

Third, we should insist, and insist now, that the results of free elections be respected. Our continued support should be conditioned on an acceptance of the voters' will. And this includes immediate withdrawal on our part, if we should be so asked by any government that comes to power.

NEW EFFORTS TO END THE WAR

At the same time, we must make new efforts to end a war which is destroying the resources and devastating the people of Vietnam. We must be unceasing in our endeavors to bring this conflict to the conference table and to achieve an effective cease-fire.

There are, of course, no ready or easy solutions to this task. But one or more of the following initiatives on our part might be considered as practical means of further opening the door to negotiations:

A call for a truce during the period of the South Vietnamese elections.

A further pause, however limited, in the bombing of North Vietnam, accompanied by aggressive diplomatic efforts to substitute discussions for further destruction.

A proposal for a mutual and supervised reduction of force levels, such as the verified withdrawal of equal numbers of North Vietnamese and American troops.

A call for a peace conference at a specified time and place, to be open to all parties, including the Vietcong.

A recommendation that the United Nations, or a strengthened International Control Commission, be called upon to supervise elections open to all the people, and to verify their results.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that no efforts on our part will induce the other side to discuss a peaceful settlement. But with the terrible loss of lives, with the danger of an even larger and more costly war, and the tremendous drain on otherwise needed resources which this war has caused, it is imperative that we make every reasonable attempt.

The cause of peace must be pursued with diligence, perseverance, and urgency.

It must be pursued with an awareness that the people of Vietnam have known little else than war for 2 dozen years.

And it must be pursued with the knowledge that we still have wars to complete at home against poverty, discrimination, and the other common enemies of man. In winning those wars we have no time to lose.

Mr. Speaker, these remarks were prepared before the seizure of Danang by the Ky government. If anything, I believe this action underscores the necessity of pressing forward firmly and without hesitation toward the day when free elections are held.

I believe it also means that we must be alert to the purposes for which our own military forces are used. It may even mean that we should withhold our given that no delay will be imposed in the election of a constituent assembly this military support until assurances are fall or in the orderly transition to a popularly based civilian government.

As the New York Times states so correctly this morning:

> The alternative to elections is chaos. Premier Ky must realize this. So must Washington. Whatever happens now, the final goal still has to be elections.

Mr. Speaker, I include this timely editorial from the New York Times and also the perceptive article by Joseph Kraft which I referred to earlier in my remarks, and which appeared in the Washington Post on May 11:

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1966]

THE DANANG COUP

The seizure of Danang by the Ky Government means a determination to fight it out with the dissident political elements of the Unified Buddhist Church. Unless the struggle is quickly stopped, this would mean an end to the hopes, expectations and promises of an election by Sept. 15 for a constituent assembly and later an elected government.

The gravity of the situation is obvious. Civil war is one possibility. The South Vietnamese struggle against the Vietcong is bound to be seriously hampered. Worst of all would be the embarrassing and perhaps critical position of the American forces in Vietnam and the handicap to the war they are waging.

Once again, Washington has been caught by surprise—even to the extent of Ambassador Lodge being in the United States instead of in Saigon. When Marshal Ky calmly announced a few days ago that he intended to keep his government in power for at least another year, Secretary Rusk declared that the Premier had been misunderstood and really did not mean what he seemed to be saying. He meant it all right, and this development becomes another in the long series of misunderstandings and miscalculations of the Vietnamese by the United States Government.

As always when a sudden and unexpected event of this sort explodes in Vietnam, it is necessary to let the storm blow over. When it does, every effort must be made to bring the electoral position back to where it was, if that is going to be possible.

The desirability and, indeed, necessity to hold elections that would permit a broad-based civilian government in South Vietnam is as clear as ever. Washington's orders to the American advisers in Saigon to urge a peaceful settlement can only be a stopgap move. The military may prove strong enough to prevent the militant Buddhists from creating a chaotic situation in Danang, Hue and Saigon. The damage is by no means beyond repair. In South Vietnam the pessimists as well as the optimists are often confounded.

But the coup emphasizes once again that it has never been possible to interpret Vietnamese events in terms of American ideas or Western logic. Premier Ky obviously feels strong enough to assert Saigon's authority over the virtually rebellious northern provinces. If, having done so, he then turns back to the concept of constitutional and legislative elections, the harm can be held to a minimum.

Once the situation has stabilized it is more important than ever that the election be demonstrably fair. The very nature of the American involvement in South Vietnam makes it impossible for the United States to operate with total detachment in this respect. As Senator RIBICOFF has suggested, the United Nations would be the best possible choice to exercise a supervisory function to guarantee the fairness of a vote in a country with no democratic tradition.

The alternative to elections is chaos. Premier Ky must realize this. So must Washington. Whatever happens now, the final goal still has to be elections.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1966]

THE VIETNAMESE CRISIS—IV

SAIGON.—Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge's return to the United States is happily timed. For the central theme of his consultations will have to be the coming elections in Vietnam. And on that score Washington has a huge contribution to make to American thinking here in Saigon.

Without outside help, indeed, the American mission here is almost incompetent to frame a broad approach to the elections. For one thing, the mission is preoccupied with the day-to-day, not to say minute-to-minute, business of supporting the war effort.

The emphasis is on moving goods and people, arranging appointments, making telephone calls and other tedious administrative tasks. That emphasis leaves little, if any, scope for thinking big. In consequence, the American mission here has yet to develop a coherent program for dealing with the elections and their predictable problems.

Precisely because the mission is so much geared to doing business, it tends to favor people in power who can get the job done. That is how such diverse figures as the late President Ngo Dinh Diem, former Premier Nguyen Khanh, and, now, Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky all acquired virtually unconditional American support.

By the same token, the focus on getting things done puts a discount on uncertainty. But a free election is uncertainty writ large—a leap in the dark. It is thus precisely the kind of thing the American mission in Saigon does not like to think about.

Already the unease of the mission here in the presence of an election prospect has yielded two exceedingly damaging impressions.

And in large measure, Washington's work during the consultations with Ambassador Lodge should develop a means for dissipating these bad impressions.

First, there is, rightly or wrongly, a widespread impression among both Americans and Vietnamese in Saigon that the United States is opposed to free elections. This feeling at this time is exceedingly dangerous. For insofar as they believe that the United States has misgivings about elections, by so much the Vietnamese military leaders in office will be tempted to stage a coup or phony coup designed to head off the elections.

There is also a widespread impression that if the United States does accept elections, it is only in order to provide a fig-leaf of legitimacy to the present military regime. This impression is reinforced by rumors of covert American efforts to set up some political notable from Saigon or the delta region as a front for the present military leaders. It is further reinforced by rumors of American efforts to line up a majority of refugee Catholics, nationalist parties and members of the Hao Hao and Cao Dai religious sects to support the government against the Buddhist militants under Bonze Tich Tri Quang.

The mere prevalence of these rumors, whether they are true or not, works against the American interest. For the rumors lend color to the suspicion that the United States is not in favor of a free choice in South Vietnam, that, instead, the United States only wants a regime that will continue to sponsor the war.

Even if the schemes attributed to the Americans here could be brought off, they could not yield lasting results. For the present government plus a politicalized front would fence out not only the Buddhists but the whole central region of South Vietnam. And the center, which has been the source of the present trouble, would react by making even more trouble.

The true American interest, in fact, lies in the one thing the American mission here finds it most difficult to contemplate. It lies in making a leap in the dark—in fostering a process that will give free play to local political forces. And the starting point for that process can be the coming elections.

But that means unrigged elections.

It means elections which hold out the possibility of a passage of power to a new government based on an alliance of the moderate Catholics of the South and the militant Buddhists of the Center.

It means elections from which there could at least develop a meaningful political opposition.

The consultations with Ambassador Lodge can be a success only if they advance the prospect for honest elections, only if they make clear beyond any doubt the American commitment to free choice in South Vietnam.

HEROIC ACTION BY AMY LA FRANIERE, MEMBER OF SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 13, 1966, Vice President HUBERT

H. Humphrey awarded the AAA Lifesaver Medal for heroic action to Amy La Franiere, of Cleveland, Ohio, a member of the school safety patrol.

The language of the citation accompanying the medal award is a great tribute to the personal courage of 11-year-old Amy La Franiere.

MEDAL CITATION

Amy L. La Franiere, age 11, Halle School, Cleveland, Ohio.

Patrol Member Amy L. La Franiere was on duty at the northwest corner of Wentworth and West 82nd Street. She noted a fast-moving car going north on 82nd Street—so fast, in fact, that the driver might not be able to stop at the stop sign. At that moment 5-year-old Enrico Clark ran into the street in the path of this car. Without thought of her own safety, Amy ran to the southeast corner of the intersection, grabbing Enrico on the way and carrying him onto the sidewalk. Witnesses said that Enrico would have been hit except for Amy's alertness, defiance of danger, and prompt action.

Mr. Speaker, I share the pride of my constitutents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank La Franiere, for this national recognition which has come to their daughter, Amy.

The presentation ceremony highlighted the festival week in Washington honoring the Nation's more than 900,000 safety patrols. These awards are distinctive in themselves, but what is more important is the fact that countless lives have been saved through this program. So important is the patrol to our schoolchildren that at this point I wish to insert a short résumé of the history of the safety patrol and the lifesaver medal.

SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL HISTORY

The school safety patrol movement has grown tremendously since its origin in the early 1920's. Today, it is a national institution—a vital force in the important work of protecting America's children from the hazards of modern traffic. More than 900,000 boy and girl patrol members in the United States daily help to protect millions of children enrolled in thousands of elementary schools. In cities and towns, in rural areas, and on schoolbuses, the school safety patrol serves to remind schoolchildren of hazards of street and highway crossings on their way to and from school. This "nation on wheels" can well be proud of the work that these young citizens are doing.

Educators regard the patrol movement as an excellent school activity, as well as a method to help develop a sense of responsibility, character, and positive usefulness for community living. Commendation for patrol work is universal. It comes from parents, educators, police, and other outstanding public officials.

While it is obviously impossible to set any precise figures on the lifesaving results of school safety patrol work, it is certain that this movement has been partly responsible for the improvement of the traffic death rate of children 5 to 14 years of age. Since 1922, the traffic death rate for this group has continued to decrease to nearly one-half, while the death rate of other age groups has practically doubled.

LIFESAVER MEDAL

The American Automobile Association and affiliated automobile clubs inaugurated the AAA Gold Lifesaver Medal Award in 1949. Yearly, the president of the AAA appoints a medal award board and authorizes the members to select patrol members whose traffic lifesaving acts have saved the life of persons in imminent vehicular traffic danger.

In the years of this honor award program, beginning in 1949, the brief summary following explains the considerations given by the board:

Recommendations submitted	237
Medal awarded	125

Seventy-four cities in twenty-five States have been represented.

Presentation of the award is made annually by outstanding national leaders. It has been the good fortune of recipients to have been decorated for their valor by the President of the United States, the Vice President, Cabinet officers, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and top leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces.

I extend my personal congratulations to Amy La Franiere along with those of the grateful family of the child she saved as well as those of her own family and schoolmates. Well done, Amy, and a girl with your devotion and talents is sure to be a success in life. The future is indeed bright for youngsters such as you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Giaimo (at the request of Mr. Albert) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. McGregor (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through May 27, on account of illness.

Mr. Mathias (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week.

Mr. Watson (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week, on account of illness in family.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson (at the request of Mr. Cohelan), from May 16 to June 10, on account of official business.

Mr. Stalbaum for May 16, on account of official business in district.

Mr. Downing (at the request of Mr. Garmatz), for an indefinite period, on account of official business. Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee assignment.

Mr. Reinecke (at the request of Mr. Garmatz), for an indefinite period, on account of official business. Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee assignment.

Mr. Reinecke (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Dole (at the request of Mr. Stanton), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The following (at the request of Mr. McGrath) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Morrison, for today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. Cohelan, for today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Feighan, for today, for 15 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Fino and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Stanton) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Pelly in two instances.

(The following (at the request of Mr. McGrath) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matters:)

Mr. Pool.

Mr. St. Onge.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. Celler.

Mr. Schmidhauser in two instances.

Mr. Kornegay.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14732. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 17, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2398. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Mountain Park project, Oklahoma, pursuant to the provisions of 53 Stat. 1187 (H. Doc. No. 438); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2399. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the recommendations of the Secretary of Commerce, together with the supporting staff study, on the manner in which and the extent to which the United States should participate in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–284; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2400. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a summary of the Federal Government's "National Atmospheric Sciences Program," for fiscal year 1967, prepared by the Federal Council for Science and Technology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2401. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report of the adoption of a resolution by the United Nations Security Council regarding petroleum shipments to Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2402. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

2403. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements during April 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2404. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of policyholders of the cash surrender value of the proceeds of a matured endowment policy of U.S. Government or national service life insurance to purchase annuities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2405. A letter from the director, legislative commission, American Legion, transmitting a statement of financial condition of the American Legion as of December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provision of Public Law 66-47; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1966, the following bill was reported on May 13, 1966:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 13313. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 16, 1966]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13650. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13651. A bill to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13652. A bill to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government; with amendments (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14182. A bill to provide for judgments for costs against the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2950. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 15052. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of sea-grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15053. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of exemplary rehabilitation certificates to certain individuals after considering their character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15054. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 15055. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 15056. A bill to authorize the grade of brigadier general in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 15057. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15058. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of Labor with respect to establishing a Federal program to attain "portability" of private pension credits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 15059. A bill to amend the law establishing the revolving fund for expert assistance loans to Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 15060. A bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries, and property damage which occur in such accidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 15061. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of sea-grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 15062. A bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries, and property damage which occur in such accidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15063. A bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15064. A bill to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER (by request):

H.R. 15065. A bill to establish a fact-reporting bail agency in courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 15066. A bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 15067. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area, in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 15068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on the profits derived by local governmental units from the leasing or operation of industrial or commercial facilities where such activity is unrelated to their governmental purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 15069. A bill to consent to the interstate compact defining the boundary between the States of Arizona and California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 15070. A bill to authorize project grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 15071. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 15072. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 15073. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for a pension of $75 per month for widows of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 15074. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 15075. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 15076. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia, to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.J. Res. 1141. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 1142. Joint resolution to establish the Commission for Reestablishing Constitutional Principles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

475. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to the enlargement of the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

476. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the protection and management of the national forests in California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

477. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to authorizing construction and operation of the Marysville Dam and Reservoir project; to the Committee on Public Works.

478. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to the consideration and approval of H.R. 13677; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 15077. A bill for the relief of Eli Eleonora Bianchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 15078. A bill for the relief of Electric Power Plants, Inc., of Cadiz, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 15079. A bill for the relief of Margareta Marianne Fox, Sharon Dianne Fox, David Norman Fox, Donald Wayne Fox, and Shirley Ann Fox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 15080. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Franchino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 15081. A bill for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 15082. A bill for the relief of Lorna Leonie Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 15083. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. Chester Haen, maiden name Desanka Rogic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 15084. A bill for the relief of Rev. Kyung Suh Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 15085. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of California at Riverside; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 15086. A bill for the relief of Eric Azariah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 15087. A bill for the relief of Foreston Coal Co., Inc., of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who didst raise up strong and good men to design and defend this Nation: grant unto Thy honored servants in this Chamber wisdom and courage sufficient to strengthen the moral defenses of our beloved country, and, together with other men of good will throughout all lands, by Thy grace to beat a thoroughfare for freedom across the world for the friendly traffic of all kinds and conditions of men and the generations yet to be; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Hart, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 12, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 12, 1966,

The Secretary of the Senate received on May 12, 1966, messages from the President of the United States, submitting nominations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States received on May 12, 1966, submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 12, 1966,

The Secretary of the Senate on May 12, received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 14732) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 12, 1966,

Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, on May 12, 1966, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 259), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 259

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, under rule VIII, I ask unanimous consent to waive the call of the calendar of measures that are not objected to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I advise the Senate that ROBERT P. GRIFFIN has been appointed by the Governor of Michigan as a Senator from the State of Michigan to represent that State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy thereof, caused by the death of the late Senator Pat McNamara, is filled by election as provided by law.

I send the certificate of appointment to the desk.

The certificate of appointment was read, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lansing.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Michigan, I, George Romney, Governor of said State, do hereby appoint ROBERT P. GRIFFIN a senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Patrick V. McNamara, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor George Romney, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, Michigan this 11th day of May in the year of Our Lord 1966.

GEORGE ROMNEY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Hon. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, escorted by Mr. HART, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President; and he subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that there be a recess of 3 minutes, for the purpose of greeting our new fellow Senator.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 12:12 p.m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CONVENTION ON THE SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, so long as a large number of Senators are in the Chamber, and after discussing the subject with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the acting minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering Executive A, 89th Congress, 2d session, the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive A (89th Cong., 2d sess.), the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, which was approved March 18, 1965, by the Executive Directors of the International Banks for Reconstruction and Development, and which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION ON THE SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES AND NATIONALS OF OTHER STATES

PREAMBLE

The Contracting States

Considering the need for international cooperation for economic development, and the role of private international investment therein;

Bearing in mind the possibility that from time to time disputes may arise in connection with such investment between Contracting States and nationals of other Contracting States;

Recognizing that while such disputes would usually be subject to national legal processes, international methods of settlement may be appropriate in certain cases;

Attaching particular importance to the availability of facilities for international conciliation or arbitration to which Contracting States and nationals of other Contracting States may submit such disputes if they so desire;

Desiring to establish such facilities under the auspices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;

Recognizing that mutual consent by the parties to submit such disputes to conciliation or to arbitration through such facilities constitutes a binding agreement which requires in particular that due consideration be given to any recommendation of conciliators, and that any arbitral award be complied with; and

Declaring that no Contracting State shall by the mere fact of its ratification, acceptance or approval of this Convention and without its consent be deemed to be under any obligation to submit any particular dispute to conciliation or arbitration,

Have agreed as follows:

CHAPTER I.—INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES

Section 1. Establishment and Organization

Article 1

(1) There is hereby established the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (hereinafter called the Centre).

(2) The purpose of the Centre shall be to provide facilities for conciliation and arbitration of investment disputes between Contracting States and nationals of other Contracting States in accordance with the provisions of this Convention.

Article 2

The seat of the Centre shall be at the principal office of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (hereinafter called the Bank). The seat may be moved to another place by decision of the Administrative Council adopted by a majority of two-thirds of its members.

Article 3

The Centre shall have an Administrative Council and a Secretariat and shall maintain a Panel of Conciliators and a Panel of Arbitrators.

Section 2. The Administrative Council

Article 4

(1) The Administrative Council shall be composed of one representative of each Contracting State. An alternate may act as representative in case of his principal's absence from a meeting or inability to act.

(2) In the absence of a contrary designation, each governor and alternate governor of the Bank appointed by a Contracting State shall be ex officio its representative and its alternate respectively.

Article 5

The President of the Bank shall be *ex officio* Chairman of the Administrative Council (hereinafter called the Chairman) but shall have no vote. During his absence or inability to act and during any vacancy in the office of President of the Bank, the person for the time being acting as President shall act as Chairman of the Administrative Council.

Article 6

(1) Without prejudice to the powers and functions vested in it by other provisions of this Convention, the Administrative Council shall

(a) adopt the administrative and financial regulations of the Centre;

(b) adopt the rules of procedure for the institution of conciliation and arbitration proceedings;

(c) adopt the rules of procedure for conciliation and arbitration proceedings (hereinafter called the Conciliation Rules and the Arbitration Rules);

(d) approve arrangements with the Bank for the use of the Bank's administrative facilities and services;

(e) determine the conditions of service of the Secretary-General and of any Deputy Secretary-General;

(f) adopt the annual budget of revenues and expenditures of the Centre;

(g) approve the annual report on the operation of the Centre.

The decisions referred to in sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (f) above shall be adopted by a majority of two-thirds of the members of the Administrative Council.

(2) The Administrative Council may appoint such committees as it considers necessary.

(3) The Administrative Council shall also exercise such other powers and perform such other functions as it shall determine to be necessary for the implementation of the provisions of this Convention.

Article 7

(1) The Administrative Council shall hold an annual meeting and such other meetings as may be determined by the Council, or convened by the Chairman, or convened by the Secretary-General at the request of not less than five members of the Council.

(2) Each member of the Administrative Council shall have one vote and, except as

otherwise herein provided all matters before the Council shall be decided by a majority of the votes cast.

(3) A quorum for any meeting of the Administrative Council shall be a majority of its members.

(4) The Administrative Council may establish, by a majority of two-thirds of its members, a procedure whereby the Chairman may seek a vote of the Council without convening a meeting of the Council. The vote shall be considered valid only if the majority of the members of the Council cast their votes within the time limit fixed by the said procedure.

Article 8

Members of the Administrative Council and the Chairman shall serve without remuneration from the Centre.

Section 3. The Secretariat

Article 9

The Secretariat shall consist of a Secretary-General, one or more Deputy Secretaries-General and staff.

Article 10

(1) The Secretary-General and any Deputy Secretary-General shall be elected by the Administrative Council by a majority of two-thirds of its members upon the nomination of the Chairman for a term of service not exceeding six years and shall be eligible for reelection. After consulting the members of the Administrative Council, the Chairman shall propose one or more candidates for each such office.

(2) The offices of Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General shall be incompatible with the exercise of any political function. Neither the Secretary-General nor any Deputy Secretary-General may hold any other employment or engage in any other occupation except with the approval of the Administrative Council.

(3) During the Secretary-General's absence or inability to act, and during any vacancy of the office of Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General shall act as Secretary-General. If there shall be more than one Deputy Secretary-General, the Administrative Council shall determine in advance the order in which they shall act as Secretary-General.

Article 11

The Secretary-General shall be the legal representative and the principal officer of the Centre and shall be responsible for its administration, including the appointment of staff, in accordance with the provisions of this Convention and the rules adopted by the Administrative Council. He shall perform the function of registrar and shall have the power to authenticate arbitral awards rendered pursuant to this Convention, and to certify copies thereof.

Section 4. The panels

Article 12

The Panel of Conciliators and the Panel of Arbitrators shall each consist of qualified persons, designated as hereinafter provided, who are willing to serve thereon.

Article 13

(1) Each Contracting State may designate to each Panel four persons who may but need not be its nationals.

(2) The Chairman may designate ten persons to each Panel. The persons so designated to a Panel shall each have a different nationality.

Article 14

(1) Persons designated to serve on the Panels shall be persons of high moral character and recognized competence in the fields of law, commerce, industry or finance, who may be relied upon to exercise independent judgment. Competence in the field of law shall be of particular importance in the case of persons on the Panel of Arbitrators.

(2) The Chairman, in designating persons to serve on the Panels, shall in addition pay due regard to the importance of assuring representation on the Panels of the principal legal systems of the world and of the main forms of economic activity.

Article 15

(1) Panel members shall serve for renewable periods of six years.

(2) In case of death or resignation of a member of a Panel, the authority which designated the member shall have the right to designate another person to serve for the remainder of that member's term.

(3) Panel members shall continue in office until their successors have been designated.

Article 16

(1) A person may serve on both Panels.

(2) If a person shall have been designated to serve on the same Panel by more than one Contracting State, or by one or more Contracting States and the Chairman, he shall be deemed to have been designated by the authority which first designated him or, if one such authority is the State of which he is a national, by that State.

(3) All designations shall be notified to the Secretary-General and shall take effect from the date on which the notification is received.

Section 5. Financing the Centre

Article 17

If the expenditure of the Centre cannot be met out of charges for the use of its facilities, or out of other receipts, the excess shall be borne by Contracting States which are members of the Bank in proportion to their respective subscriptions to the capital stock of the Bank, and by Contracting States which are not members of the Bank in accordance with rules adopted by the Administrative Council.

Section 6. Status, immunities and privileges

Article 18

The Centre shall have full international legal personality. The legal capacity of the Centre shall include the capacity

(a) to contract;

(b) to acquire and dispose of movable and immovable property;

(c) to institute legal proceedings.

Article 19

To enable the Centre to fulfill its functions, it shall enjoy in the territories of each Contracting State the immunities and privileges set forth in this Section.

Article 20

The Centre, its property and assets shall enjoy immunity from all legal process, except when the Centre waives this immunity.

Article 21

The Chairman, the members of the Administrative Council, persons acting as conciliators or arbitrators or members of a Committee appointed pursuant to paragraph (3) of Article 52, and the officers and employees of the Secretariat

(a) shall enjoy immunity from legal process with respect to acts performed by them in the exercise of their functions, except when the Centre waives this immunity;

(b) not being local nationals, shall enjoy the same immunities from immigration restrictions, alien registration requirements and national service obligations, the same facilities as regards exchange restrictions and the same treatment in respect of traveling facilities as are accorded by Contracting States to the representatives, officials, and employees of comparable rank of other Contracting States.

Article 22

The provisions of Article 21 shall apply to persons appearing in proceedings under this Convention as parties, agents, counsel, advocates, witnesses, or experts; provided, however, that sub-paragraphs (b) thereof shall apply only in connection with their travel to and from, and their stay at, the place where the proceedings are held.

Article 23

(1) The archives of the Centre shall be inviolable, wherever they may be.

(2) With regard to its official communications, the Centre shall be accorded by each Contracting State treatment not less favourable than that accorded to other international organizations.

Article 24

(1) The Centre, its assets, property and income, and its operations and transactions authorized by this Convention shall be exempt from all taxation and customs duties. The Centre shall also be exempt from liability for the collection or payment of any taxes or customs duties.

(2) Except in the case of local nationals, no tax shall be levied on or in respect of expense allowances paid by the Centre to the Chairman or members of the Administrative Council, or on or in respect of salaries, expense allowances or other emoluments paid by the Centre to officials or employees of the Secretariat.

(3) No tax shall be levied on or in respect of fees or expense allowances received by persons acting as conciliators, or arbitrators, or members of a Committee appointed pursuant to paragraph (3) of Article 52, in proceedings under this Convention, if the sole jurisdictional basis for such tax is the location of the Centre or the place where such proceedings are conducted or the place where such fees or allowances are paid.

CHAPTER II. JURISDICTION OF THE CENTRE

Article 25

(1) The jurisdiction of the Centre shall extend to any legal dispute arising directly out of an investment, between a Contracting State (or any constituent subdivision or agency of a Contracting State designated to the Centre by that State) and a national of another Contracting State, which the parties to the dispute consent in writing to submit to the Centre. When the parties have given their consent, no party may withdraw its consent unilaterally.

(2) "'National of another Contracting State" means:

(a) any natural person who had the nationality of a Contracting State other than the State party to the dispute on the date on which the parties consented to submit such dispute to conciliation or arbitration as well as on the date on which the request was registered pursuant to paragraph (3) of Article 28 or paragraph (3) of Article 36, but does not include any person who on either date also had the nationality of the Contracting State party to the dispute; and

(b) any juridical person which had the nationality of a Contracting State other than the State party to the dispute on the date on which the parties consented to submit such dispute to conciliation or arbitration and any juridical person which had the nationality of the Contracting State party to the dispute on that date and which, because of foreign control, the parties have agreed should be treated as a national of another Contracting State for the purposes of this Convention.

(3) Consent by a constituent's subdivision or agency of a Contracting State shall require the approval of that State unless that State notifies the Centre that no such approval is required.

(4) Any Contracting State may, at the time of ratification, acceptance or approval of this Convention or at any time thereafter, notify the Centre of the class or classes of disputes which it would or would not consider submitting to the jurisdiction of the

Centre. The Secretary-General shall forthwith transmit such notification to all Contracting States. Such notification shall not constitute the consent required by paragraph (1).

Article 26

Consent of the parties to arbitration under this Convention shall, unless otherwise stated, be deemed consent to such arbitration to the exclusion of any other remedy. A Contracting State may require the exhaustion of local administrative or judicial remedies as a condition of its consent to arbitration under this Convention.

Article 27

(1) No Contracting State shall give diplomatic protection, or bring an international claim, in respect of a dispute which one of its nationals and another Contracting State shall have consented to submit or shall have submitted to arbitration under this Convention, unless such other Contracting State shall have failed to abide by and comply with the award rendered in such dispute.

(2) Diplomatic protection, for the purposes of paragraph (1), shall not include informal diplomatic exchanges for the sole purpose of facilitating a settlement of the dispute.

CHAPTER III. CONCILIATION

Section 1. Request for conciliation

Article 28

(1) Any Contracting State or any national of a Contracting State wishing to institute conciliation proceedings shall address a request to that effect in writing to the Secretary-General who shall send a copy of the request to the other party.

(2) The request shall contain information concerning the issues in dispute, the identity of the parties and their consent to conciliation in accordance with the rules of procedure for the institution of conciliation and arbitration proceedings.

(3) The Secretary-General shall register the request unless he finds, on the basis of the information contained in the request, that the dispute is manifestly outside the jurisdiction of the Centre. He shall forthwith notify the parties of registration or refusal to register.

Section 2. Constitution of the Conciliation Commission

Article 29

(1) The Conciliation Commission (hereinafter called the Commission) shall be constituted as soon as possible after registration of a request pursuant to Article 28.

(2) (a) The Commission shall consist of a sole conciliator or any uneven number of conciliators appointed as the parties shall agree.

(b) Where the parties do not agree upon the number of conciliators and the method of their appointment, the Commission shall consist of three conciliators, one conciliator appointed by each party and the third, who shall be the president of the Commission, appointed by agreement of the parties.

Article 30

If the Commission shall not have been constituted within 90 days after notice of registration of the request has been dispatched by the Secretary-General in accordance with paragraph (3) of Article 28, or such other period as the parties may agree, the Chairman shall, at the request of either party and after consulting both parties as far as possible, appoint the conciliator or conciliators not yet appointed.

Article 31

(1) Conciliators may be appointed from outside the Panel of Conciliators, except in the case of appointments by the Chairman pursuant to Article 30.

(2) Conciliators appointed from outside the Panel of Conciliators shall possess the qualities stated in paragraph (1) of Article 14.

Section 3. Conciliation Proceedings

Article 32

(1) The Commission shall be the judge of its own competence.

(2) Any objection by a party to the dispute that that dispute is not within the jurisdiction of the Centre, or for other reasons is not within the competence of the Commission, shall be considered by the Commission which shall determine whether to deal with it as a preliminary question or to join it to the merits of the dispute.

Article 33

Any conciliation proceeding shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of this Section and, except as the parties otherwise agree, in accordance with the Conciliation Rules in effect on the date on which the parties consented to conciliation. If any question of procedure arises which is not covered by this Section or the Conciliation Rules or any rules agreed by the parties, the Commission shall decide the question.

Article 34

(1) It shall be the duty of the Commission to clarify the issues in dispute between the parties and to endeavour to bring about agreement between them upon mutually acceptable terms. To that end, the Commission may at any stage of the proceedings and from time to time recommend terms of settlement to the parties. The parties shall cooperate in good faith with the Commission in order to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, and shall give their most serious consideration to its recommendations.

(2) If the parties reach agreement, the Commission shall draw up a report noting the issues in dispute and recording that the parties have reached agreement. If, at any stage of the proceedings, it appears to the Commission that there is no likelihood of agreement between the parties, it shall close the proceedings and shall draw up a report noting the submission of the dispute and recording the failure of the parties to reach agreement. If one party fails to appear or participate in the proceedings, the Commission shall close the proceedings and shall draw up a report noting that party's failure to appear or participate.

Article 35

Except as the parties to the dispute shall otherwise agree, neither party to a conciliation proceeding shall be entitled in any other proceeding, whether before arbitrators or in a court of law or otherwise, to invoke or rely on any views expressed or statements or admissions or offers of settlement made by the other party in the conciliation proceedings, or the report or any recommendations made by the Commission.

CHAPTER IV. ARBITRATION

Section 1. Request for Arbitration

Article 36

(1) Any Contracting State or any national of a Contracting State wishing to institute arbitration proceedings shall address a request to that effect in writing to the Secretary-General who shall send a copy of the request to the other party.

(2) The request shall contain information concerning the issues in dispute, the identity of the parties and their consent to arbitration in accordance with the rules of procedure for the institution of conciliation and arbitration proceedings.

(3) The Secretary-General shall register the request unless he finds, on the basis of the information contained in the request, that the dispute is manifestly outside the jurisdiction of the Centre. He shall forthwith notify the parties of registration or refusal to register.

Section 2. Constitution of the Tribunal

Article 37

(1) The Arbitral Tribunal (hereinafter called the Tribunal) shall be constituted as soon as possible after registration of a request pursuant to Article 36.

(2) (a) The Tribunal shall consist of a sole arbitrator or any uneven number of arbitrators appointed as the parties shall agree.

(b) Where the parties do not agree upon the number of arbitrators and the method of their appointment, the Tribunal shall consist of three arbitrators, one arbitrator appointed by each party and the third, who shall be the president of the Tribunal, appointed by agreement of the parties.

Article 38

If the Tribunal shall not have been constituted within 90 days after notice of registration of the request has been dispatched by the Secretary-General in accordance with paragraph (3) of Article 36, or such other period as the parties may agree, the Chairman shall, at the request of either party and after consulting both parties as far as possible, appoint the arbitrator or arbitrators not yet appointed. Arbitrators appointed by the Chairman pursuant to this Article shall not be nationals of the Contracting State party to the dispute or of the Contracting State whose national is a party to the dispute.

Article 39

The majority of the arbitrators shall be nationals of States other than the Contracting State party to the dispute and the Contracting State whose national is a party to the dispute; provided, however, that the foregoing provisions of this Article shall not apply if the sole arbitrator or each individual member of the Tribunal has been appointed by agreement of the parties.

Article 40

(1) Arbitrators may be appointed from outside the Panel of Arbitrators, except in the case of appointments by the Chairman pursuant to Article 38.

(2) Arbitrators appointed from outside the Panel of Arbitrators shall possess the qualities stated in paragraph (1) of Article 14.

Section 3. Powers and functions of the tribunal

Article 41

(1) The Tribunal shall be the judge of its own competence.

(2) Any objection by a party to the dispute that that dispute is not within the jurisdiction of the Centre, or for other reasons is not within the competence of the Tribunal, shall be considered by the Tribunal which shall determine whether to deal with it as a preliminary question or to join it to the merits of the dispute.

Article 42

(1) The Tribunal shall decide a dispute in accordance with such rules of law as may by agreed by the parties. In the absence of such agreement, the Tribunal shall apply the law of the Contracting State party to the dispute (including its rules on the conflict of laws) and such rules of international law as may be applicable.

(2) The Tribunal may not bring in a finding of *non liquet* on the ground of silence or obscurity of the law.

(3) The provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not prejudice the power of the Tribunal to decide a dispute *ex aequo et bono* if the parties so agree.

Article 43

Except as the parties otherwise agree, the Tribunal may, if it deems it necessary at any stage of the proceedings,

(a) call upon the parties to produce documents or other evidence, and

(b) visit the scene connected with the dispute, and conduct such inquiries there as it may deem appropriate.

Article 44

Any arbitration proceeding shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of this Section and, except as the parties otherwise agree, in accordance with the Arbitration Rules in effect on the date on which the parties consented to arbitration. If any question of procedure arises which is not covered by this Section or the Arbitration Rules or any rules agreed by the parties, the Tribunal shall decide the question.

Article 45

(1) Failure of a party to appear or to present his case shall not be deemed an admission of the other party's assertions.

(2) If a party fails to appear or to present his case at any stage of the proceedings the other party may request the Tribunal to deal with the questions submitted to it and to render an award. Before rendering an award, the Tribunal shall notify, and grant a period of grace to, the party failing to appear or to present its case, unless it is satisfied that that party does not intend to do.

Article 46

Except as the parties otherwise agree, the Tribunal shall, if requested by a party, determine any incidental or additional claims or counter-claims arising directly out of the subject-matter of the dispute provided that they are within the scope of the consent of the parties and are otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Centre.

Article 47

Except as the parties otherwise agree, the Tribunal may, if it considers that the circumstances so require, recommend any provisional measures which should be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party.

Section 4. The Award

Article 48

(1) The Tribunal shall decide questions by a majority of the votes of all its members.

(2) The award of the Tribunal shall be in writing and shall be signed by the members of the Tribunal who voted for it.

(3) The award shall deal with every question submitted to the Tribunal, and shall state the reasons upon which it is based.

(4) Any member of the Tribunal may attach his individual opinion to the award, whether he dissents from the majority or not, or a statement of his dissent.

(5) The Centre shall not publish the award without the consent of the parties.

Article 49

(1) The Secretary-General shall promptly dispatch certified copies of the award to the parties. The award shall be deemed to have been rendered on the date on which the certified copies were dispatched.

(2) The Tribunal upon the request of a party made within 45 days after the date on which the award was rendered may after notice to the other party decide any question which it had omitted to decide in the award, and shall rectify any clerical, arithmetical or similar error in the award. Its decision shall become part of the award and shall be notified to the parties in the same manner as the award. The periods of time provided for under paragraph (2) of Article 51 and paragraph (2) of Article 52 shall run from the date on which the decision was rendered.

Section 5. Interpretation, revision and annulment of the award

Article 50

(1) If any dispute shall arise between the parties as to the meaning or scope of an award, either party may request interpretation of the award by an application in writing addressed to the Secretary-General.

(2) The request shall, if possible, be submitted to the Tribunal which rendered the award. If this shall not be possible, a new Tribunal shall be constituted in accordance with Section 2 of this Chapter. The Tribunal may, if it considers that the circumstances so require, stay enforcement of the award pending its decision.

Article 51

(1) Either party may request revision of the award by an application in writing addressed to the Secretary-General on the ground of discovery of some fact of such a nature as decisively to affect the award, provided that when the award was rendered that fact was unknown to the Tribunal and to the applicant and that the applicant's ignorance of that fact was not due to negligence.

(2) The application shall be made within 90 days after the discovery of such fact and in any event within three years after the date on which the award was rendered.

(3) The request shall, if possible, be submitted to the Tribunal which rendered the award. If this shall not be possible, a new Tribunal shall be constituted in accordance with Section 2 of this Chapter.

(4) The Tribunal may, if it considers that the circumstances so require, stay enforcement of the award pending its decision. If the applicant requests a stay of enforcement of the award in his application, enforcement shall be stayed provisionally until the Tribunal rules on such request.

Article 52

(1) Either party may request annulment of the award by an application in writing addressed to the Secretary-General on one or more of the following grounds:

(a) that the Tribunal was not properly constituted;

(b) that the Tribunal has manifestly exceeded its powers;

(c) that there was corruption on the part of a member of the Tribunal;

(d) that there has been a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure; or

(e) that the award has failed to state the reasons on which it is based.

(2) The application shall be made within 120 days after the date on which the award was rendered except that when annulment is requested on the ground of corruption such application shall be made within 120 days after discovery of the corruption and in any event within three years after the date on which the award was rendered.

(3) On receipt of the request the Chairman shall forthwith appoint from the Panel of Arbitrators an *ad hoc* Committee of three persons. None of the members of the Committee shall have been a member of the Tribunal which rendered the award shall be of the same nationality as any such member shall be a national of the State party to the dispute or of the State whose national is a party to the dispute shall have been designated to the Panel of Arbitrators by either of those States, or shall have acted as a conciliator in the same dispute. The Committee shall have the authority to annul the award or any part thereof on any of the grounds set forth in paragraph (1).

(4) The provisions of Articles 41–45, 48, 49, 53 and 54, and of Chapters VI and VII shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to proceedings before the Committee.

(5) The Committee may, if it considers that the circumstances so require, stay enforcement of the award pending its decision. If the applicant requests a stay of enforcement of the award in his application, enforcement shall be stayed provisionally until the Committee rules on such request.

(6) If the award is annulled the dispute shall, at the request of either party, be submitted to a new Tribunal constituted in accordance with Section 2 of this Chapter.

Section 6. Recognition and enforcement of the award

Article 53

(1) The award shall be binding on the parties and shall not be subject to any appeal or to any other remedy except those provided for in this Convention. Each party shall abide by and comply with the terms of the award except to the extent that enforcement shall have been stayed pursuant to the relevant provisions of this Convention.

(2) For the purposes of this Section, "award" shall include any decision interpreting, revising or annulling such award pursuant to Articles 50, 51 or 52.

Article 54

(1) Each Contracting State shall recognize an award rendered pursuant to this Convention as binding and enforce the pecuniary obligations imposed by that award within its territories as if it were a final judgment of a court in that State. A Contracting State with a federal constitution may enforce such an award in or through its federal courts and may provide that such courts shall treat the award as if it were a final judgment of the courts of a constituent state.

(2) A party seeking recognition or enforcement in the territories of a Contracting State shall furnish to a competent court or other authority which such State shall have designated for this purpose a copy of the award certified by the Secretary-General. Each Contracting State shall notify the Secretary-General of the designation of the competent court or other authority for this purpose and of any subsequent change in such designation.

(3) Execution of the award shall be governed by the laws concerning the execution of judgments in force in the State in whose territories such execution is sought.

Article 55

Nothing in Article 54 shall be construed as derogating from the law in force in any Contracting State relating to immunity of that State or of any foreign State from execution.

CHAPTER V. REPLACEMENT AND DISQUALIFICATION OF CONCILIATORS AND ARBITRATORS

Article 56

(1) After a Commission or a Tribunal has been constituted and proceedings have begun, its composition shall remain unchanged; provided, however, that if a conciliator or an arbitrator should die, become incapacitated, or resign, the resulting vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of Section 2 of Chapter III or Section 2 of Chapter IV.

(2) A member of a Commission or Tribunal shall continue to serve in that capacity notwithstanding that he shall have ceased to be a member of the Panel.

(3) If a conciliator or arbitrator appointed by a party shall have resigned without the consent of the Commission or Tribunal of which he was a member, the Chairman shall appoint a person from the appropriate Panel to fill the resulting vacancy.

Article 57

A party may propose to a Commission or Tribunal the disqualification of any of its members on account of any fact indicating a manifest lack of the qualities required by paragraph (1) of Article 14. A party to arbitration proceedings may, in addition, propose the disqualification of an arbitrator on the ground that he was ineligible for appointment to the Tribunal under Section 2 of Chapter IV.

Article 58

The decision on any proposal to disqualify a conciliator or arbitrator shall be taken by the other members of the Commission or Tribunal as the case may be, provided that where those members are equally divided, or in the case of a proposal to disqualify a sole conciliator or arbitrator, or a majority of the conciliators or arbitrators, the Chairman shall take that decision. If it is decided that the proposal is well-founded the conciliator or arbitrator to whom the decision relates shall be replaced in accordance with the provisions of Section 2 of Chapter III or Section 2 of Chapter IV.

CHAPTER VI. COST OF PROCEEDINGS

Article 59

The charges payable by the parties for the use of the facilities of the Centre shall be determined by the Secretary-General in accordance with the regulations adopted by the Administrative Council.

Article 60

(1) Each Commission and each Tribunal shall determine the fees and expenses of its members within limits established from time to time by the Administrative Council and after consultation with the Secretary-General.

(2) Nothing in paragraph (1) of this Article shall preclude the parties from agreeing in advance with the Commission or Tribunal concerned upon the fees and expenses of its members.

Article 61

(1) In the case of conciliation proceedings the fees and expenses of members of the Commission as well as the charges for the use of the facilities of the Centre, shall be borne equally by the parties. Each party shall bear any other expenses it incurs in connection with the proceedings.

(2) In the case of arbitration proceeding the Tribunal shall, except as the parties otherwise agree, assess the expenses incurred by the parties in connection with the proceedings, and shall decide how and by whom those expenses, the fees and expenses of the members of the Tribunal and the charges for the use of the facilities of the Centre shall be paid. Such decision shall form part of the award.

CHAPTER VII. PLACE OF PROCEEDINGS

Article 62

Conciliation and arbitration proceedings shall be held at the seat of the Centre except as hereinafter provided.

Article 63

Conciliation and arbitration proceedings may be held, if the parties so agree,

(a) at the seat of the Permanent Court of Arbitration or of any other appropriate institution, whether private or public, with which the Centre may make arrangements for that purpose; or

(b) at any other place approved by the Commission or Tribunal after consultation with the Secretary-General.

CHAPTER VII. DISPUTES BETWEEN CONTRACTING STATES

Article 64

Any dispute arising between Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to the International Court of Justice by the application of any party to such dispute, unless the States concerned agree to another method of settlement.

CHAPTER IX. AMENDMENT

Article 65

Any contracting State may propose amendment of this Convention. The text of a proposed amendment shall be communicated to the Secretary-General not less than 90 days prior to the meeting of the Administrative Council at which such amendment is to be considered and shall forthwith be transmitted by him to all the members of the Administrative Council.

Article 66

(1) If the Administrative Council shall so decide by a majority of two-thirds of its members, the proposed amendment shall be circulated to all Contracting States for ratification, acceptance or approval. Each amendment shall enter into force 30 days after dispatch by the depositary of this Convention of a notification to Contracting States that all Contracting States have ratified, accepted or approved the amendment.

(2) No amendment shall affect the rights and obligations under this Convention of any Contracting State or of any of its constituent subdivisions or agencies, or of any national of such State arising out of consent to the jurisdiction of the Centre given before the date of entry into force of the amendment.

CHAPTER X. FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 67

This Convention shall be open for signature on behalf of States members of the Bank. It shall also be open for signature on behalf of any other State which is a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice and which the Administrative Council, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, shall have invited to sign the Convention.

Article 68

(1) This Convention shall be subject to ratification, acceptance or approval by the signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures.

(2) This Convention shall enter into force 30 days after the date of deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval. It shall enter into force for each State which subsequently deposits its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval 30 days after the date of such deposit.

Article 69

Each Contracting State shall take such legislative or other measures as may be necessary for making the provisions of this Convention effective in its territories.

Article 70

This Convention shall apply to all territories for whose international relations a Contracting State is responsible, except those which are excluded by such State by written notice to the depositary of this Convention either at the time of ratification, acceptance or approval or subsequently.

Article 71

Any Contracting State may denounce this Convention by written notice to the depositary of this Convention. The denunciation shall take effect six months after receipt of such notice.

Article 72

Notice by a Contracting State pursuant to Articles 70 or 71 shall not affect the rights or obligations under this Convention of that State or of any of its constituent subdivisions or agencies or of any national of that State arising out of consent to the jurisdiction of the Centre given by one of them before such notice was received by the depositary.

Article 73

Instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of this Convention and of amendments thereto shall be deposited with the Bank which shall act as the depositary of this Convention. The depositary shall transmit certified copies of this Convention to States members of the Bank and to any other State invited to sign the Convention.

Article 74

The depositary shall register this Convention with the Secretariat of the United Nations in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations and the Regulations thereunder adopted by the General Assembly.

Article 75

The depositary shall notify all signatory States of the following:

(a) signatures in accordance with Article 67;

(b) deposits of instruments of ratification, acceptance and approval in accordance with Article 73;

(c) the date on which this Convention enters into force in accordance with Article 68;

(d) exclusions from territorial application pursuant to Article 70;

(e) the date on which any amendment of this Convention enters into force in accordance with Article 66; and

(f) denunciations in accordance with Article 71.

Done at Washington in the English, French and Spanish languages, all three texts being equally authentic, in a single copy which shall remain deposited in the archives of the International Bank for Reconstruction and, Development, which has indicated by its signature below its agreement to fulfil the function with which it is charged under this Convention.

For the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:

George D. Woods,
President.
A. Broches,
General Counsel.

March 18, 1965.
For Tunisia:
Rachid Driss.

May 5, 1965.
For United Kingdom:
Patrick Dean.

May 26, 1965.
For Jamaica:
Neville Ashenheim.

June 23, 1965.
For the Republic of Ivory Coast [translation]:
D. Agoussi.

Juin 30, 1965.
For Pakistan:
G. Ahmed.

July 6, 1965.
For Nigeria:
S. O. Adedo.

July 13, 1965.
For the Islamic Republic of Mauritania [translation]:
Ahmed Baba Ould Ahmed Miske.

July 30, 1965.
For the Republic of Niger [translation]:
Illa Salifou.

Août 23, 1965.
For the Central African Republic [translation]:
Michel Gallin-Douathe.

Août 26, 1965.
For United States:
Henry H. Fowler.

August 27, 1965.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the main purpose of this convention is to set up machinery for the settlement by conciliation or arbitration of investment disputes between private foreign investors and governments of countries where investments are made. This is accomplished by providing for the establishment of an International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes under the auspices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Panels of specially qualified persons would be maintained from which arbitrators and conciliators could be selected by parties wishing to use the Center.

Pursuant to the provisions of the convention, the jurisdiction of the Center extends to "any legal dispute arising directly out of an investment between a contracting state and a national of another contracting state." The decision to submit a dispute to conciliation or arbitration would be voluntary and would be based on a written agreement between the foreign investor and the contracting state. Once written consent to submit a dispute to the Center is given, however, it may not be withdrawn unilaterally by either party.

This Convention will enter into force 30 days after the deposit of the 20th instrument of ratification, acceptance, or approval. As of this date, 36 countries have signed the convention and 5 have deposited their instruments of ratification.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that the submission of investment disputes for settlement under this convention would be entirely voluntary. In no circumstances could any private U.S. investor or the U.S. Government be forced to submit a dispute to conciliation or arbitration in the absence of a written agreement consenting to do so.

I might add, no witness appeared in opposition to the convention, and the committee has not received any adverse communications with regard to it. Overall, I believe it will be beneficial to both capital importing and capital exporting countries. I hope, therefore, that the Senate will give its advice and consent to the resolution of ratification of the convention.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this convention is noncontroversial. It was reported by the committee unanimously.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report accompanying the legislation now being considered be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpts from the report are as follows:

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS

Article 25, which deals with the jurisdiction of the International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes, is probably the most important article of the convention. It provides that the jurisdiction of the Center extends to "any legal dispute arising directly out of an investment between a Contracting State and a national of another Contracting State." The word "investment" is not defined by the convention. Set forth below, however, are excerpts from a memorandum on this subject which was submitted by the Treasury Department at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations (see hearing reprinted as appendix to this report):

"It is entirely clear from this negotiating history that the term "investment" in article 25(1) of the convention does not exclude from its scope an investment simply because it is a short-term investment. It is also clear from the negotiating history that the term "investment" is to be broadly construed.

"For example, an "investment" within the meaning of the convention could include, though it would not be limited to, a loan by a private foreign investor of one country to the government of another country, or a transfer to a new or existing enterprise in a host country of loan or equity capital, industrial property rights or services. Such a transfer might be, but need not have been, made pursuant to an agreement between the investor and the host government to submit any future controversy to arbitration, although there would have to be such an agreement before a dispute could be submitted to arbitration under the convention."

As is pointed out above, the parties must consent in writing to submit their dispute to the Center. Once such consent is given, however, it may not be withdrawn unilaterally by either party. With regard to disputes arising between contracting states concerning the "interpretation or application" of the convention, article 64 provides that any such dispute, which is not settled by negotiation, "shall be referred to the International Court of Justice by the application of any party to such dispute, unless the States concerned agree to another method of settlement."

The convention provides for the establishment of an Administrative Council composed of one representative from each contracting state. The main functions of the Council are the election of the Secretary General (who is to be the legal representative and principal officer of the Center) and the adoption of administrative and financial regulations, including the budget of the Center. In this connection, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has agreed to provide the Center with office space and underwrite its basic overhead expenditure for a period of years to be determined after the Center is established. In addition, expenses of the Center will be met out of charges for the use of its facilities, or out of other receipts, and it is not anticipated that the United States will be required to make any financial contribution to the Center in the foreseeable future.

Articles 28–55 deal with conciliation and arbitration procedures. The function of a Conciliation Commission would be to clarify the issues in dispute and to recommend terms of settlement, but its recommendations would not be binding on the parties. On the other hand, an award rendered by an arbitral tribunal would be binding, and if one of the parties does not comply with the award, it would be enforcible in the courts of any contracting state. In this regard, it is understood that implementing legislation will be requested to provide that an arbitral award rendered pursuant to the convention shall be enforcible in the Federal courts of the United States.

Pursuant to the provisions of article 68, the convention will enter into force 30 days after the deposit of the 20th instrument of ratification, acceptance, or approval. Any contracting state may denounce the convention by giving 6 months' notice in writing (art. 71).

The convention is open for signature on behalf of countries which are members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or are parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice and which the Administrative Council, by a two-thirds vote of its members, shall have invited to sign the convention. At the time this report was filed, 36 countries had signed the convention and 5 had deposited their instruments of ratification.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes was submitted to the Senate on February 16, 1966. The Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on it on March 29, at which time Mr. Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Leonard C. Meeker, Legal Adviser, Department of State, testified in support of the convention. No witness appeared in opposition to the convention and the committee has not received any adverse communications with regard to it. The convention was considered in executive session on May 5, 1966, and ordered reported favorably to the Senate.

During the course of the committee's public hearing a question arose as to whether the convention might have any effect on U.S. securities laws. Accordingly, the committee requested an expression of views on this subject from the Securities and Exchange Commission. In a letter dated April 7, 1966, which is reproduced in the printed hearings appended to this report, Mr. Manuel F. Cohen, the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, replied that "The Commission believes * * * that the Federal securities laws would not be adversely affected or superseded by the convention."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

The principal purpose of this convention is to facilitate the settlement of investment disputes between private foreign investors and sovereign states where investments are made. It is also designed to improve the international investment climate and stimulate the flow of private investment capital to the less developed countries throughout the world. In the committee's view, this is a commendable objective and it is consistent with past congressional efforts to encourage increased participation by private enterprise in economic development abroad. In addition, it is reasonable to expect that a substantial body of new international law will be developed as a result of this convention. This, also, is a step in the right direction.

It should be emphasized that the submission of investment disputes for settlement under this convention would be entirely voluntary. In no circumstances could any private U.S. investor or the U.S. Government be forced to submit a dispute to conciliation or arbitration in the absence of a written agreement consenting to do so.

Overall, the committee believes that the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes will be beneficial to both capital importing and capital exporting countries. It recommends, therefore, that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the convention.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, speaking as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, it is my recollection that there was not the slightest opposition to this convention in the committee. The convention is based upon the voluntary decision of the potential litigants in any case.

In my judgment, this is another opportunity for us to add further foundation stones to the erection of an international organization with procedure for the settlement of disputes by the substitution of the rule of law. We all know that there is a great need in this country for the building of the precedents of international law.

It may be said by the lawyers in the Senate that because of their private nature, the disputes involved in this convention, will not have an effect on the building up of precedents in international law; but that would be a mistaken point of view.

If the private investors and businesses of the various foreign lands will agree to settle their disputes by way of arbitration through the presentation of a record of the evidence, much will be done to hasten the day when such procedure will become a common practice among disputants of different nationalities.

In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations at this moment, I take this opportunity to express the enthusiastic support of the committee for the convention.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I was present while this measure was being discussed by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The dangers which at first sight might appear to be existent—that is, to have a conciliation or arbitration board decide the rights of American nationals in disputes with a foreign country—do not in fact exist in this measure.

No one of U.S. nationalist identity is obligated to submit his claim to the arbitration or conciliation board. It is entirely voluntary for the U.S. national to determine whether or not he wants the board to conciliate or decide. If he does not so desire, he does not have to do so.

I subscribe to the proposal. I voted for it, and I wanted Senators to know my attitude toward it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Convention will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of resolution of ratification, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States which was approved on March 18, 1965, by the Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and which is open for signature at the Bank's headquarters in Washington. (Executive A, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the resolution of ratification, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 75 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—28

Aiken
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Harris
Hayden
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Moss
Neuberger
Pastore
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Simpson
Smathers
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the nomination of H. Ralph Taylor, of Connecticut, and Don Hummel, or Arizona, to be Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Department of Housing and Urban Development be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis M. Wheat, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Emmett Quinn, of Rhode Island, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk read the nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Navy and Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes during the morning hour.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I would like to ask to have 5 additional minutes to discuss a matter which I regard as of some importance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 or 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, recently there has been a spate of erroneous news articles and editorials relative to the relationship of the Senate Committee on Armed Services to the Central Intelligence Agency. Ordinarily, I do not like to discuss in the Senate the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency or its relationship with the Armed Services Committee. Discussion of the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency affects sources of information that are available to the CIA. In the very nature of things, these sources of information are very sensitive and easily disturbed. For that reason, I have not discussed this subject, despite the fact that some of our most eminent newspapers have made completely erroneous charges that were meant to mislead and deceive Members of Congress who are not familiar with the operations of the committees with regard to the Central Intelligence Agency.

There is a general rule, Mr. President, that the legislative oversight of any agency of Government is vested in the committee that reports the legislation that creates that Agency. Let me point out here and now that the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency were created by the National Security Act of 1947. That legislation was considered only by the Committee on Armed Services, insofar as the Senate is concerned.

Therefore, unless the committee of which I am chairman has been derelict in its duty, there is no justification whatever for any other committee "muscling in" on the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, insofar as it pertains to the Central Intelligence Agency.

As for the Appropriations Committee, a group appointed from the Department of Defense subcommittee has oversight over the Central Intelligence Agency. Every Member of the Senate, of course, knows that the appropriations for this Agency are not identified by line item for each activity. If that were done, it could destroy the usefulness of the Central Intelligence Agency and could have fatal results. Appropriations for CIA functions are included in other appropriations bills, without separate identification.

It happens that there was a duplication in the senior members of the Armed Services Committee and the senior members of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations. For example, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and I are members of both the Armed Services Committee and of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense. It is perhaps unusual, but as a matter of convenience for some of the members of the subcommittee, the subcommittee from Defense Appropriations and the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services have met jointly in our examinations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

At the express request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] I have presided over those two subcommittees for the past several years.

Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency occupies a very peculiar position in our scheme of things. A great many charges have been made over the years against the CIA. But regardless of the nature of the charges, the CIA is not in a position to answer them. It is compelled to stand mute. It matters not the nature of the charge; and heaven knows that enough charges have been heaped upon them over the past several years.

It has been charged repeatedly that the CIA makes foreign policy and that it takes over foreign policy. That is asserted as one of the grounds of justification for the demand that the Foreign Relations Committee be permitted to share supervision over the Agency. There simply is not a scintilla of truth in that charge, and not a single concrete case can be brought to the attention of the Senate in which the CIA has undertaken to fix or to make foreign policy. It cannot possibly do so, from the very nature of its structure. Under the Constitution, the President of the United States is responsible for the conduct of the Nation's foreign policy and he operates in this area through the Secretary of State.

The CIA functions under the National Security Council. That Council is composed of the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The CIA is not authorized to initiate any kind of activity anywhere in the world, unless such activity has been ordered by the National Security Council, which is the overseer within the executive branch for the Central Intelligence Agency.

As a result, the Secretary of State is privy to all that the Agency undertakes to do.

In addition, during the administration of the late lamented President John F. Kennedy, an Executive order was issued to all our Ambassadors stating that they had control of the activities of all Federal agencies within the country to which they were accredited. Accompanying the open text in the Federal Register went a private note to each Ambassador, stating that this order also relates to the CIA. Therefore, the Ambassador to each country has control over the operations of the CIA within that country, and he has a right to halt them or to direct them as he may see fit. So it is sheer poppycock to say that the CIA is making its own foreign policy.

Mr. President, these charges have gone so far that an editorial, which I have in my hand, published in the New York Times, refers to "Senator RUSSELL and his secret seven," and charges that the Senate subcommittee is selected with CIA screening from the Armed Services and Appropriations Committee.

There is not the slightest bit of substance to that charge. The CIA has no more to do with selecting the members of this subcommittee than the Armed Services Committee has to do with selecting the editorial staff of the New York Times—not a particle more. We have followed all the rules of seniority very rigidly in both the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and the Armed Services Committee in selecting those who would exercise this oversight.

Some of the press insists that the Agency has congressional immunity. This editorial is headed "Congressional Immunity." Mr. President, I am familiar with the extent of legislative oversight exercised by committee. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for more than 30 years, and I know something about the oversight performed by the Appropriations Committee.

The CIA undoubtedly spends more time with its legislative oversight committee than does any other Government agency of which I have any knowledge.

The subcommittees have frequent meetings, and we undertake to keep abreast, as best we can, with the operations of the CIA and with its budgetary matters. These subjects are handled before two subcommittees composed of four Democrats and three Republicans. The subcommittees meet jointly for the purposes of convenience.

Mr. President, I am exceedingly proud that there has never been a security leak of any of the testimony that has come before the subcommittees. Every Senator knows something about the efforts that are exerted to get Members of Congress to give information, particularly information that has been received in executive session.

Confidential information passes through some committees as if they were sieves. When some committees meet in executive session, from the time the door is opened the information is in the hands of the press. I am very proud of the fact that there has never been a harmful leak out of these subcommittees in all of the years since the creation of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the subcommittee of which the senior Senator from Georgia is now speaking has distinguished itself for the fact that there have not been any leaks. The Committee on Foreign Relations has also distinguished itself for the frequency of leaks that come out of their hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Ohio is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and I have read articles that were written as a result of information that came out of executive sessions of that committee that had to do with some of his actions. I can understand how he might feel about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that another very important matter over which the Committee on Armed Services has jurisdiction concerns the matter of confirmation of the nomination of the head of the Central Intelligence Agency?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct. However, that is handled before the entire Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is an Armed Services Committee jurisdiction.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct. We have legislative oversight and it has never been challenged, despite the fact that others wish to "horn in" on the committee. The legislative oversight is vested in the Armed Services Committee under the rules, and that cannot be controverted. It is as established as any action or tradition or operation of the Senate could possibly be, that the legislative oversight is vested in the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not also true that, in addition to having jurisdiction over the confirmation of the nomination of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Committee on Armed Services also has jurisdiction over the confirmation of the nomination of the Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and is regularly exercising that function?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct. That is within our domain.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought it well for the RECORD to show that the complete exercise of jurisdiction is shown to be in the Committee on Armed Services as a whole or in the Legislative Oversight Committee that was set up on an informal basis, as the Senator has discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Georgia is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I will not be able to yield to other Senators because of the limited time.

I think that one of the principal reasons why there is such a great clamor among some segments of the press to open the doors of this committee is the fact that we have been able to keep secret the matters that we have discussed and examined from time to time.

There is undoubtedly a segment of the press in this country that feels that it, and it alone, can properly direct the Government of the United States. That segment of the press has not been able to get any information from the subcommittees so that it might tell us exactly how to run the country. That segment actually does exercise a great deal more influence over the Government of the country than the average citizen suspects or recognizes. It has kept the pressures going to break into these subcommittees and to asperse their actions, when the critics have no knowledge whatever on which to predicate the charges that they make.

Mr. President, there is, of course, some connection between the operations of nearly every committee in the Senate. The Committee on Foreign Relations contends that the CIA has something to do with foreign policy. I could state with all the more assurance and justification that the actions of the Committee on Foreign Relations affect the work of the Committee on Armed Services. The size and composition of our Armed Forces are largely determined by our foreign relations. If that is a valid argument the Committee on Armed Services should have representation on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There is some degree of relationship between almost every committee of the Senate, and for that reason the Senate rules and practices vest oversight responsibility in the committees exercising legislative jurisdiction.

The resolution being considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations seeks not only to cover the CIA, but also to include the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which I would assume is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary under the rules that we have observed heretofore.

Mr. President, the subcommittees do not operate merely to satisfy the curiosity of Senators about what the Central Intelligence Agency might be doing all over the world. No subcommittee should be created to satisfy curiosity or to disseminate information on what the Central Intelligence Agency is doing.

Think for a moment of the effect this would have on the sources of information that have been opened up painstakingly over a period of years all over the world so that information may be furnished to the executive branch of our Government, to enable the Commander in Chief to know what military or diplomatic response to make to the manifold problems that continually arise all over the world.

As I mentioned earlier, even the fact that the subject is discussed on the floor of the Senate has a tendency to chill these sources of information. Some of these sources might be in the city of Washington. The very discussion of the subject might cause them to close up like a clam for fear that something might happen that would cause a leak that would identify them and cause them to lose their positions or, worse than that, to lose their lives.

Mr. President, the same thing is true with respect to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation over the years has gone to a tremendous amount of effort to open up sources of information—call it counterintelligence, if you will—concerning what our enemies are doing in this country in the area of gathering information. And our enemies do not have the difficulties that we have with leaks that come not only from Congress but also from the executive branch of the Government.

Information concerning most of what we are doing can be obtained from the magazines and the newspapers.

However, securing intelligence information is an entirely different problem for us. It is a matter of extreme difficulty. If we were to let word go abroad that a large group of Congressmen is going abroad on a matter dealing with the Central Intelligence Agency or the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it would close up many sources of information those agencies have and would nullify the very considerable sums of money that it has cost us to keep those agencies in operation.

As a member of the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and of the Appropriations Subcommittee that has this duty, I am not in a position to evaluate my own services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I can only say that I have worked earnestly and conscientiously, and I have had associated with me some of the finest Members of the Senate. I do not think that these subcommittees need to apologize to anyone for the efforts they have made to carry out the duties imposed upon them by the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I received unanimous consent, I believe, to proceed for 3 or 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For 5 additional minutes. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall finish well within that time.

Mr. President, I rise to support the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my very conscientious and thorough-going chairman of that committee, where we have served together over the past 20 years.

The CIA, we should remember, is an important effort in the security of our country. That is what it was established for. It is essential for the President to have the sort of information which it supplies, have it quietly, and have it from every source that he can get it, in order to make intelligent decisions.

The Senator from Georgia has emphasized that the CIA does not formulate policy. I cannot state that too strongly. It gathers the information on the basis of which the National Security Council does make policy.

The CIA is an outgrowth of the OSS of World War II. It was established in the Unification Act of 1947. I happen to know that because, in the end, I was the acting chairman of the conference committee that shaped that act.

Then in 1949, Congress passed a special act with relation to the CIA, to enable it to carry out its work effectively within our Constitution and our laws. Now, certainly the CIA has never had anything to do with who served on the subcommittee. As the chairman of the committee has so well said, membership has been entirely by seniority. I first served on the Armed Services Subcommittee along with the late Senator Bridges of New Hampshire.

Under the terms of the Reorganization Act, which reformed the Senate's committee structure, this CIA effort is a part of the Armed Services Committee responsibility. Certainly we do not wish to interfere with the Committee on Foreign Relations, and they do not necessarily wish to interfere with us. What we wish to do is to act in the best interests for the security of our country, and that is what I wish to emphasize in the few minutes I have.

As the Senator has said, the Ambassadors, by an order of the late President Kennedy which has since been continued, have the opportunity to supervise the work of the CIA. When I traveled abroad in 1957, I had the opportunity to have the CIA men in every city that we visited discuss their problems with me. I was much impressed by the quality of those men. In each instance, I discussed the questions with the Ambassador.

Something the Senator has not pointed out, and that I might add to this discussion, is that under President Eisenhower, first, there was established what he called an intelligence consulting group. That was headed by President James Killian of MIT. When he became ill and for physical reasons could not continue that work, Mr. Clark Clifford assumed the chairmanship of that group. It has been continued under President Kennedy and President Johnson.

President Kennedy, after the Bay of Pigs, called together this group and asked them to do four things: first, to look into our foreign operations and intelligence; second, to recommend changes; third, to be a continuing body to advise him; and fourth, to be familiar with the CIA and all its activities.

I know that that group is composed of very substantial citizens, in the fullest sense of that term. I inquired just this morning as to their personalities. We all know Mr. Clifford, the chairman. There are two leading scientists on the group: Dr. Baker and Dr. Land of the photographic organization.

The military is represented by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, for whom we all have a very high regard, and Admiral Sides. The State Department is represented by the very distinguished former Assistant Secretary and Ambassador, Robert Murphy. There is no man in whom I would have more confidence on this sort of question.

In addition, there are Gordon Gray, a former Assistant Secretary of the Army, Professor Langer of Harvard, who was in the OSS and has always had a special competence in intelligence activities, and Frank Pace, the former Budget Director and Secretary of the Army.

I emphasize this, because the group serves as a consulting committee directly responsible to the President of the United States. What we should wish to do in this body, as I see it, is to help the President, who must make decisions regarding our national security in all parts of the world today, in every possible way we can. We can help him best if we do it quietly, if we follow the activities of the CIA in every way that we believe is helpful, and give it sufficient funds to do its work.

As the chairman says, if we make public these matters in passing upon appropriations, if we publish the questions that we ask the chairman, then the CIA loses much of its value to the President of the United States.

Speaking personally, as a member of these subcommittees, I have had Mr. Allen Dulles come to my house, and I have gone to his house, in the evenings, so we could have a quiet discussion. I have done the same with Mr. McCone. Admiral Raborn has been in my house a number of times.

Last Friday afternoon, I spent a great part of the afternoon going through the CIA building and seeing with my own eyes how some of their activities were being conducted.

Under the leadership of our chairman, the Senator from Georgia, every member of that group has the opportunity to ask all the questions he wishes. The CIA gives us the subjects of concern around the world today, as it does the Foreign Relations Committee when they ask, and then we go into every question that we believe is of value for us to have knowledge of in order to discharge our legislative responsibilities.

Deliberately we publish no transcripts, as the Senator has said, because of the security questions involved. We have the very able chief of staff of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Darden, present with us at all meetings, and he keeps the continuity for us. But he takes no notes and we take no notes. Any notes that I take for the purpose of asking questions, I tear up when we leave.

That is the way we have conducted our work, and we have done it thoroughly—in my opinion as thoroughly as we can—and have kept it as quiet as we can. We have done so, as I have said before, in an effort to maintain the security of our country, and the ability of our President to function effectively. I do not care whether he is a Democrat or Republican, as the leader of our country, he must establish the policies.

This is not an instance of congressional interference with the President; it is congressional assistance to the President and his Security Council in building up the defense agencies and the defense of our country.

Mr. President, perhaps I am prejudiced, but I believe we have been trying to do our job; and I think and I hope that the supervision of the Armed Services Committee on security matters is left where it belongs, in that committee.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, is the Senate in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Senate is now in the morning hour.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think the subject matter here has been well covered by the Senators who have spoken, but merely for emphasis on some of the points they have made, I wish to say this:

First, if we are to have a general debate here now on the Senate floor, or in the committee rooms, either, on the CIA, I think it is comparable to the situation going on in Vietnam, where we are over there fighting their battles, or helping them fight, and they are carrying on another war among themselves to the rear.

I believe it is beyond the capacity of our form of government to have an effective CIA, if it is to be regarded as just an ordinary agency and to be treated as such. I further believe that with our present arrangement already outlined, with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as the chairman of this small committee, with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the other Members, excepting myself, we have the very finest plan that the Senate could have for handling a serious, delicate, highly sensitive, and highly important matter of the most complicated nature.

I am pleased that the Senator from Georgia has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate this morning. He has been the most discreet, the most careful, and the most discerning Member we have, I believe, in the handling of this highly important matter. There have been statements in the press and elsewhere talking about the committee membership being screened by the CIA. Such charges are ridiculous.

We know the Senator from Georgia has served us in many ways in an outstanding manner; but I have never seen him shine quite as brilliantly, or do any job in quite as fine a manner than he has done, year after year, in this highly significant assignment. We had better leave it alone.

He has had the deepest concern. He has given the most rigid attention and the closest scrutiny and screening to money activities and to all other phases of it.

I can tell the Senate that the money the CIA has obtained has to be justified, fully justified. This is always true when the Senator from Georgia is concerned. Whatever money is gotten from him is fully earned. He is not tight with his own personal funds, but he is tight with public funds money in the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee; and he knows what he is doing.

I wish to mention another matter. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is a man of few words but intense activity. I wish to mention him especially. Last year it fell my duty for a short time to be the acting chairman of this group. I have never had finer and more effective help than the help received from the Senator from North Dakota.

He works on these CIA matters year after year and makes a fine contribution thereto.

I trust and believe the Senate will leave this delicate and sensitive matter where it presently rests and not indulge in an extensive debate thereon; to do so would be to destroy the usefulness of the Agency that is doing a fine job.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I rise to support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with respect to the handling of CIA appropriations and reports.

This is a most difficult assignment, handled, as chairman of a special committee, by one of the most able Members of the Senate, who has been on the Committee on Appropriations for more than 30 years, and who has made an intense study of military affairs, as well as other problems related to our national security.

I also support the position of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] who was the former Secretary of the Air Force, who has concerned himself with problems of this nature for years. Also the chairman of the Committee on Defense Preparedness [Mr. STENNIS] and others in support of present handling of CIA matters.

I play a minor role in this committee but I do appreciate the comments of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

This is a difficult assignment and sometimes I wish I were not on it. One could speak more freely on some subjects if we were not on this committee because far too often people interpret what a Senator on this committee says as coming from the CIA, which is not the case. One has to be very careful what he says on almost any subject involving foreign affairs where the CIA might be involved.

A year ago last fall I took a trip around the world. Everywhere I traveled, every CIA agent was given instructions by Mr. McCone, then the head of the CIA, to give me a full report on CIA operations and to answer all questions. In all the countries I visited I met usually with the head of the CIA and the Ambassador together. I found close cooperation between the two in every country. The Ambassadors knew what the CIA was doing, and they operated under the instructions of the Ambassador.

I can see no need whatever for the Committe on Foreign Relations having some of its members on a special committee looking into the operation of the CIA. In fact, they could well establish a subcommittee of their standing committee to handle CIA matters alone.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A short time ago, when this matter first came up, after the introduction of the original McCarthy resolution calling for an investigation, we had Admiral Raborn in committee. He takes the position that he is not authorized under existing regulations or law to answer questions put to him by the Committee on Foreign Relations, other than very superficial ones. However, the original McCarthy resolution, Senate Resolution 210, is not what is currently under consideration in the Committee on Foreign Relations. All that the resolution now being considered would do—on which we intend to have a vote tomorrow—would be to formalize the committee as it is now constituted and to add to it three members from the Committee on Foreign Relations. This resolution does not call for an investigation. It is only to add three members to the present membership, thus giving three-committee representation. It is quite simple.

Statements have been made here indicating there might be a misunderstanding as to the nature of the resolution now under consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wanted to make that clear.

I believe the Foreign Relations Committee should be represented because under existing regulations, Admiral Raborn feels he is not authorized to answer questions put to him by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In addition, I believe that the growth of the CIA is such that it is not an anomalous situation for the Senate to have its Foreign Relations Committee represented.

All this resolution would do, if agreed to by the committee, is to have this issue submitted to the Senate, and the Senate could do what it pleased. There is nothing in this action to reflect on the senior Senator from Georgia. We all have the greatest respect and affection for him. That is quite irrelevant to what is considered here, and that is the foreign relations implications of the activities of the CIA.

It is revealing no secret that the CIA operation abroad is very great.

Foreign relations are not, of course, involved in many ways, as we were not involved when the original CIA was created. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that the CIA has operations which are more extensive than the State Department's. They have far larger budgets and far more personnel operating in these countries. There is no idea at all on my part, or on the part of any member of the Foreign Relations Committee, to reflect upon the Senator from Georgia or any member of the existing committee. This resolution is merely an assertion of what we believe to be one of the duties of the Foreign Relations Committee, to be aware of the developments and activities of our Government in respect to foreign relations. We are not asserting that the CIA makes foreign policy. We do assert that they greatly influence foreign policy. This is not new at all. There have been a great many times when resolutions have been introduced in this body—and I believe in the other body—seeking to create special, joint committees, or some other kind of committee to oversee CIA. This is not any new idea at all.

My thought is that it would be helpful to the CIA, and to the existing committee, if this matter in some way could be regularized by action of the Senate. The Senate has never taken any specific action creating the existing committee, nor has it ever taken any action whatever directly with regard to the CIA that I am aware of. We do not take any action on its budget, and so forth. Thus, I believe that it would clarify the situation and be beneficial to the CIA to regularize its relationship to the Senate. I do not believe it would cause all this harm.

I can see why everyone is suspicious, perhaps, of every other Member of the Senate when it comes to leaks. They are afraid someone else did it. But this resolution provides for only three new members. I believe that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee are responsible Members of the Senate.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. First, I should like to say I believe that the Foreign Relations Committee could have accomplished that purpose by establishing a subcommittee of its own to authorize and get all the information it wanted, but I believe——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How do they do that?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Let me answer the question. If the President of the United States would limit the CIA, as other agencies of the President are, as to the information they can divulge, I do not see that the Foreign Relations Committee would get any more information if they were part of our committee, or operating separately.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may respond, I asked the admiral some questions he would not answer to the Foreign Relations Committee. Then I asked: "Do you answer this kind of question to the advisory committee?" And he said, "Certainly." The advisory committee, I believe, has eight private citizens on it who are not officials of the Government in the same sense, I believe, that a Senator is. While I do not wish to puff up the importance of Senators too much, I do believe that as elected representatives they are as much entitled to information about this activity as are these private citizens who come from the business life of the Nation and also from the ranks of retired generals or semiretired generals.

Admiral Raborn said, in answering, that he would give the information to these people but not to the Foreign Relations Committee. He draws a clear distinction between the Foreign Relations Committee on the one hand and on the other the informal committee and the advisory committee. We went through all this before we offered the resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I believe it is of great importance to keep this committee small. In fact, personally, I would not serve on a committee of 15 members or more, or even——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is nine.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Or even nine members or more, because——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Because there is always the chance of leaks. The Senator from Georgia pointed out that this committee never has had a leak. I trust every Member of the Senate, but I would not want to serve on a sizable committee dealing with top-secret questions.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Arkansas referred to the informal committee. Let me say that these subcommittees are as formal as any in the Senate. When a committee is created, it is authorized to appoint subcommittees. That is exactly what we have done. There is nothing informal about this. These are formal subcommittees appointed under authority of the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me ask, has there been any precedent? Was there any other example of this kind that the Senator knows of which a subcommittee has jurisdiction or oversight over an agency which is larger than the State Department?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. If the Senator is referring to the number of employees, let me mention the Department of Agriculture. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has four times as many employees to supervise.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But this is, as I understand, a joint committee.

Mr. RUSSELL or Georgia. It is not any joint committee. We meet together merely for purposes of convenience, because the Senator from Massachusetts and I are members of both committees, as well as the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. To avoid having to meet once here, the same members go over the same subject, or practically the same subject, the next day.

For purposes of convenience, we have convened the two subcommittees together, but both are subcommittees duly appointed, as all other subcommittees of the Senate are appointed.

Mr. President, I submit that over four-fifths of the bills of this committee are sent to us to consider by the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I want to say one word about the budget. I understand that the Bureau of the Budget, which also supervises the CIA, considers the CIA budget to be one of the very best in Government because it details everything. The Bureau of the Budget knows more precisely how the CIA operates and spends its money than any other agency of the Government.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, to be sure that we understand the nature of this resolution—and I speak as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee who is also a member of the Armed Services Committee, as well as a member of the Subcommittee on the Central Intelligence Agency I read section 2 of said resolution:

> It shall be the duty of the committee on intelligence operations to keep itself fully and currently informed of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State and other agencies of the Government, including but not limited to the Federal Bureau of Investigation in so far as the activities of such agencies relate to foreign intelligence or counter intelligence.

Mr. President, it would seem obvious that a committee which operated in such a broad and diversified field would have to have a staff. But reasons for not having a staff have already been presented by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Nevertheless, section 5 states:

> The committee shall have power to employ and fix compensation of such officers, experts, and employees, as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the government.

Mr. President, I, too, was disturbed by an editorial on Sunday, May 8, in the New York Times, which stated:

> Senator RUSSELL and his "secret seven"—a Senate subcommittee selected, with CIA screening, from the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees—

Mr. President, everyone who knows anything about this committee knows that is a misstatement. There has never been any screening of this subcommittee. After 10 years of service on the Armed Services Committee I went to the chairman of that committee and asked him if I could join the CIA subcommittee. He explained why he had rigidly held to the seniority system, in the hope that as few people as possible would know the details of the various operations of the CIA, operations which affect the security and lives of the U.S. citizens; and also many people, in other countries. There is an article in the New York Times, of Friday, May 13, which gives in some detail what went on at a hearing the previous day in the Foreign Relations Committee.

It is not entirely accurate. It is my understanding executive hearings should be executive hearings, and if details of them are given the press, they should be given to all the press, not to any particular segment.

Mr. President, I have often heard the basic criticism of the Central Intelligence Agency; namely, that it is setting policy. Therefore, in November and December of last year, and January and April of this year, I visited a dozen countries and made it a point to ask two questions of our Ambassadors.

First, were they entirely satisfied with the functions of the Central Intelligence Agency?

Without exception of any kind whatever, all of them said they were so satisfied.

Second, I asked if at any time they had problems with respect to the Central Intelligence Agency setting policy; and they all assured me they did not have any such problems.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, 5 additional minutes are allotted to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. Did any Ambassador tell the Senator that the CIA was creating policy without his knowledge?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No Ambassador I talked to said the CIA was creating policy.

All said they were entirely satisfied with the operations of the CIA in the country in question.

In view of these colloquies and various dialogs, I am beginning to wonder whether some people think the United States can operate without any intelligence agency of any kind, unless it is an open agency; that it is not necessary or advisable, in a democratic system, to have such an agency as the CIA. I would hope, if anyone believes that is true, they would frankly so state, because I do not see how we can operate in this world in which we live today without an agency such as that headed by Admiral Raborn and formerly by John McCone and Allen Dulles.

I recently read the Penkovsky papers. He estimated that 80 percent of the people who represent the Soviet Union belonged either to the KBG, the political intelligence branch, or the GRU, the military unit.

It is interesting to note that Penkovsky tried to make contact with British businessmen for some time before he was successful, because he could not believe that anybody from the United States or Great Britain could be in Russia on a job and not be an intelligence agent of the United States or Great Britain.

Finally, I would pay my respects to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who satisfied me that this kind of intelligence information was so highly sensitive it should not be given to newspapers or anybody else except on the basis of right to know; and the committee should not have a staff.

In my years in the Senate I have never seen anyone who, when assigned a task, carried it out with greater diligence, character, and ability than the senior Senator from Georgia.

I would be the first to say I agree wholeheartedly with my distinguished friend the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that there was no intent of any kind on the part of any member of the Foreign Relations Committee to criticize Chairman RUSSELL, but I do think when people write that the committee of which he is chairman is only chosen after screening by the CIA—completely inaccurate—that at least is implied criticism.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question. I share wholeheartedly the tribute which the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] paid him, but I would like to pose a question, because I think it pertinent to this discusison on whether the Foreign Relations Committee should not have representation on the Senate's watchdog committee. If the CIA does not make foreign policy, it certainly helps make it decisively and irretrievably when we think of the lamentable episode of the Bay of Pigs, which it sponsored, organized, and financed. When there were grave doubts about its advisability in the White House, the CIA was defending and urging that operation, in which it had the vested interest of proving that it was right, in starting it, which was certainly a matter of foreign policy. The CIA did indeed have a profound effect on the foreign policy of the United States. As has been so carefully brought out in the historical accounts by Mr. Ted Sorenson and Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, both firsthand witnesses of how the decisions for this tragic misadventure were made, the CIA did make foreign policy in that case. The CIA certainly devised, promoted, and conducted the execution of the policies that resulted in that ghastly fiasco.

I wish the Senator from Georgia would comment on that matter.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Boiling down what the Senator has said, he says that the CIA sold the President a bill of goods that was defective; that the CIA had a plan that did not work and it convinced the President to go ahead with it.

The late President John F. Kennedy was a fine statesman, with the soul of a poet and the heart of a lion. He never backed away to escape responsibility. He took full responsibility for the complete fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. Preparations and plans for the invasion had started before President Kennedy took office. There had been a training program for Cuban refugees. Those people were getting impatient and there was a possibility of their being disbanded and the whole undertaking being abandoned. The President consulted with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I do not think the President was completely responsible. There was confusion about the views of the Joint Chiefs. There was a series of tragic errors.

The CIA made a mistake, in my opinion, in telling the President they thought this operation had a good chance of success. My own view of it—and I did not know about the timing of it, although I did know about the training—was that no 1,500 men who ever lived or fought could be put ashore under the situation that then existed in Cuba and expect to get a foothold there. But the Joint Chiefs interlaced their views with all kinds of suggestions about support by U.S. forces. There was a carrier just out of sight, off the shores of Cuba, over the horizon. I am not too sure whether our ships were to be used as support. But the operation was hopeless, because from the beginning it was based on mistakes by many of those involved, I think including everyone who was involved, except the Senator from Arkansas. He has complained about his not being privy to CIA activities. I did not know the timing of the Bay of Pigs operation but apparently the Senator from Arkansas was informed. He advised against it. I only wish I had been consulted, because I would have strongly advised against this kind of operation if I had been. That may have been one reason why I was not consulted. My position was well known. I knew about the plans, but I did not know about the timing of it. I did not think the operation had a chance of success, unless it had active support from the United States.

But the Senator cannot blame the CIA for all that was wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. GRUENING. I ask the Chair for 1 minute more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may have 1 additional minute.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The CIA could not move 1 foot and would not move 1 foot without the approval of the President of the United States and the National Security Council; and they, in turn, thought they were relying on the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There is some dispute about that.

Mr. GRUENING. My point is that they do in effect make foreign policy, through their persuasiveness and presumed inside knowledge. When they can persuade two Presidents—President Eisenhower, to start with in getting the expedition started and President Kennedy, who was instinctively opposed to it to approve it reluctantly—it seems to me that they did in effect make foreign policy.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not agree with the Senator at all. I do not think they made a mistake in trying to train some of the refugees, because no one could tell what was going on in Cuba. Those men might have been valuable.

Mr. GRUENING. Why did they not know what was going on in Cuba? That was their function. That was their responsibility. They led the President to believe that there would be a great uprising, and they misinformed the President.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is what the Senator says.

Mr. GRUENING. It is a fact, as reported by the competent historians who sat in on the whole business. How can it be disputed?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think that was a series of tragic errors on the part of everybody involved, and I do not think it is fair to place the entire responsibility——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alaska has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the matter or discuss all its merits. It would take a long time, and it has been discussed before. I wish to put in perspective the resolution the Foreign Relations Committee has under consideration. It calls only for the addition of three members to the existing informal committee. There is no requirement that there be any staff. The committee does not need to have a staff, if the committee does not wish one, and they do not have to go into all of the matters, of the FBI and others, that are within the authorization of their powers.

The way matters have developed, this agency seems to have engaged in far more activities than was anticipated when it was originally created.

Recently two affairs have been mentioned in the press. I am giving away no secret, because I read about them only in the press. One was the Carver article. It is unusual for a paid full-time employee of the CIA to write articles directly on foreign relations—not only on foreign relations, but also on our specific relations in Vietnam at the moment—without any identification that he is a Government employee. It seems to me to be quite beyond the ordinary anticipated activities of a member of this agency to write without identification for a distinguished domestic journal.

I do not believe the agency was created to influence surreptitiously, in a sense, the attitude and policies—the attitude, particularly—of the people of this country.

The other affair involved Michigan State University. These are two of the most recent matters that have been revealed.

I am interested because I think these are essentially nonmilitary matters, and they are intended to operate, and do operate in a different field, one that is essentially foreign policy.

The advice of three members of the Foreign Relations Committee could help to prevent the CIA from becoming involved in this kind of activity. The strictly military activities certainly are not matters of major concern to my committee; and I do not believe that my committee attempts or will attempt to inerfere with any of the military aspects.

However, I have asked the CIA questions—which I do not like to go into in the Senate—about other matters which concern me very much, as a matter of foreign policy.

This quibbling about words, as to whether the CIA influences or makes foreign policy, is a matter I do not know how to resolve. I believe that this agency, because of its enormous size and the money it has to spend, is a major influence in our foreign policy.

This is not said in derogation. On the contrary, I compliment the CIA, because in many countries its representatives stay longer and in many ways are better prepared—they are certainly better financed and have more influence—than our Ambassadors. I have been told this on a number of occasions. In other words, it is a highly efficient organization. My remarks are not meant to be a reflection upon them. But the fact is that they are often in positions because of continuity and experience to dominate policy in particular countries.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Will the Senator name any of those countries?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not like to do so in public, because it would immediately bring up names. It is for the same reason that the Senator from Georgia does not want to discuss these things in public.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have been told—and I think it is quite natural—the employees of CIA do not have the same relationship to Congress as employees of the State Department. I have never heard of anybody seeking to be sent abroad as the head of a CIA mission because he was a major contributor to a political campaign, and I doubt whether the Senator knows of one, either. In other words, the CIA employees are professionals. I was paying them a compliment, insofar as their efficiency goes. Nevertheless, it also means they are very influential in the reporting and the making—the final making—of foreign policy. I agree that foreign policy is made, in the technical sense, by the President; that is, he determines it more than anyone else—he and the National Security Council.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may have more time, I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I request 5 additional minutes, so that I may yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Arkansas is granted 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding, and I am sure it is the understanding of the Senator from Arkansas, that the Director of the CIA supplies intelligence information each day to the President and the heads of various departments. The information also is given to the State Department, the military departments, the Atomic Energy Commission, and any other agency that is concerned. So it is not the CIA alone that has this information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is the largest and most important of the intelligence agencies. I do not view this resolution as a radical action. I shall be content with whatever the Senate wishes to do. This is the most moderate proposal that has been made to Congress in recent years, and I thought it would help to dispose of this matter. The question did not originate with the resolution of the Senator from Minnesota. I recall that the present majority leader introduced a resolution providing for the creation of a much larger joint committee in this field, and other Senators have done the same. I considered this a modest proposal, one that would necessitate a minimum of participation by Senators outside those who are at present concerned.

No other committee of any consequence has as few as nine members. The Foreign Relations Committee has been enlarged to 19, over my protest, and that of a number of senior Senators. It started out with 13, was enlarged to 15 and then 17, and now has 19 members. I think the committee is too big. I certainly was not in favor of it. The enlargement was done, without my concurrence, during the regime of the present President of the United States. Anyway, it was done.

I grant that the more people who are included, no matter who they are, the more likely will there be leaks of information. In this instance we are only suggesting three additional members, to bring the total membership to nine. I would not say that this would result in a major, terrible, drastic, catastrophic change in the present situation. I thought it was a modest suggestion, one that might quiet the whole matter down and satisfy those who violently object, for example, to incidents like the Carver article or the MSU incident. I do not want to call the roll on others.

There have been other instances, and I do not want to dwell upon a mistake. Everybody makes mistakes. I want to keep to this point and to some of the other points that have been made. I do not understand why this proposal is taken so seriously and is considered a major uprooting of the established procedure. I do not believe that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee are any more prone to leak information than anyone else.

I do not consider as leaks some of the matters that have been referred to this morning as leaks.

For example, a complaint was made this morning in the committee about the votes in executive session.

During the tenures of Senators Connally and George as chairmen, when there were votes in executive session on specific bills, they tried not to divulge to the newspapers the results of the voting. But the reporters bedeviled everybody with the question, "How did you vote?" As a matter of convenience to the members, so far as the vote was concerned, my predecessors as chairman gave the information to the newspaper reporters. It was actually a convenience. This is one of the things that was called a leak this morning. It is not a leak. It is an old custom that information as to the votes be given when there is a specific vote, as was taken on the resolution which is under consideration by the committee as a whole. If a quorum is developed—I do not know whether it will be—the committee will vote on the proposal tomorrow morning.

Even then it is up to the Senate to do what it likes with the proposal. The committee sincerely believes that this proposal would contribute to the quieting of the quickening criticism of the Central Intelligence Agency. It might even contribute some suggestions as to how the agency might operate. That is all the proposal is. I think it is a very modest proposal. I am not fighting over it. If the Senate does not want to do this, it is all right with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at the time that I questioned whether I be a member of the committee some 4 or 5 years ago, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said I could go to the Central Intelligence Agency at any time and get any information desired. In that way it was limited to one person.

I feel sure that, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if the distinguished Senator from Arkansas wanted to get any information personally, he would be assured he could obtain that information.

I would not want the RECORD to reflect there is any information that the able Senator could not obtain. It is effort to control the number of people, perhaps, especially staff people, who have access to such highly sensitive information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is a matter of principle that the Committee on Foreign Relations is entitled to this information. I am not complaining about the matter personally. I related this in the committee meeting. I asked certain questions which I think are quite legitimate. The questions did not involve certain delicate matters such as the budget which he might not want to answer even to the committee.

I feel that the admiral is under great restrictions as to our committee, and he may be correct. It is a big committee. As everyone knows, it is too big a committee, but I cannot help that.

The proposal of the Senator from Minnesota is to have three Senators from Foreign Relations on a select committee. That would be very different from giving the whole committee security information on the CIA.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator feel any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations who wanted specific information on the basis of "right to know," would be denied that information?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know about that. I can only relate what actually happened. I do not know whether anyone has made such an effort.

I do not see that this is so important or that it involves so much. Our country is involved in so many different countries around the world that it is more than appropriate that the Committee on Foreign Relations have representation in this very unusual operation.

There is no denying that the CIA in numbers—and I might think in quality, although I do not know that except in a few instances about which I have been told—is larger than the State Department.

I do not know that we can say that the State Department makes policy. It merely advises the President, and it has more or less influence.

I do think that this great prominence of the Central Intelligence Agency in foreign policy probably grew up by pure chance when the Secretary of State and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency were brothers. That created a relationship that was rather unusual in our system. As a result of this relationship, there grew up the idea that perhaps the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency were more intimately associated with the making of foreign policy than the original creation of the Agency anticipated. That situation existed for the 7 or 8 years, or whatever period of time it was, that John Foster Dulles was Secretary of State.

I think this is a restricted proposal and I hope that the Senate will accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in view of the remarks that have been made by sundry Senators today, I feel that I should make some brief comment.

Both as a member of the House Appropriations Committee for 10 years and as a Senator, in my personal relations with the Central Intelligence Agency and its Directors have been good.

I have heard the chairman of the committee make inquiries of the Director in recent weeks, to which inquiries the Director did not answer. I have not personally made an inquiry of the CIA which has not been satisfied.

As chairman of the African Subcommittee during the critical situation in the Congo I was currently informed. I was in the Congo. I had close communication with the CIA agents and personnel there. I should like to say that the operation in the Congo was one of the successful undertakings of our Government in this decade. It saved the heart of Africa from a deliberate, attempted seizure by the Soviet Union. So, when I make the comments which I expect to make, I wish them to be understood in the light of my own close working relationship with the CIA on critical occasions and my very good and satisfactory relations with them.

I want to make another thing perfectly clear. I hold the senior Senator from Georgia in the highest esteem and affection. That question is not involved here at all.

The question really before the Senate, or the question that will soon be before the Senate, I hope, is whether the CIA and its program and its operations have sufficient implications on foreign policy to justify the Senate in placing three members of the Senate Foreign Relations committee on a select committee to exercise surveillance over the CIA.

In my view the case is overwhelmingly persuasive. Unquestionably the Appropriations Committee should have a member on the surveillance committee. I think that unquestionably the Armed Services Committee should have representation on that surveillance committee.

It would seem to me, as between the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services, that perhaps the Committee on Appropriations would have priority. But, as between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, I should be hardpressed to say to which committee the choice should be given, if a choice were to be made between those two committees.

I should be a little inclined to think, in view of the current and recent operations of the CIA, that priority should be given to the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, I think that all three of the committees that I have mentioned should be represented on the surveillance subcommittee. That is the reason that I propose to vote for the resolution.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia spoke of there being no necessity to satisfy the curiosity of Senators. I think that upon reflection he would think that there is a need to satisfy the inquiries and the concern of Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I did not say inquiries and concern.

Mr. GORE. The Senator said curiosity.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. I should think the Senator from Georgia would think, upon reflection, that there is a need to satisfy the curiosity of Senators on a matter affecting war or peace, on a matter affecting the relationship of the United States and that of other foreign countries.

I think Senators are entitled to have their curiosity satisfied under such circumstances. However, I have had very satisfactory experience with the CIA and with the present Director when I talked to him last at a committee hearing.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11487) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Senator does not need unanimous consent to proceed.

Mr. GORE. I shall not use very much time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, does the rule of germaneness apply?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule of germaneness does apply.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Correct. That was my intention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Now that the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, do we automatically bring to an end the morning hour, or are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business has been concluded at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. Then the Senator from Tennessee has the floor in his own right for whatever period of time he wishes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor in his own right. The Senator from Georgia has requested that the rule of germaneness be waived. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the rule of germaneness is waived.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I was about to say that the last time the Director of the CIA, Admiral Raborn, appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he personally came by and offered to come to my office to give me such additional information as I might wish about a question which I had expressed an interest. So in stating these views, I wish to make it explicitly clear that I do not take this position in criticism of the CIA—though in some instances I have not favored the undertaking of that agency—nor the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Georgia about the Bay of Pigs and the Joint Chiefs of Staff cause me to make some comments which I have withheld for a long while. The only time I recall when I have been personally pilloried on the floor of the Senate during my service here was during the period when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was investigating the Bay of Pigs affair; and after a certain revelation, which was within my knowledge before it was generally revealed, I expressed the view that the President needed the advice of a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff other than the Chairman at that time, General Lemnitzer. As sometimes happens, this expression of mine received wide circulation.

There was an immediately outcry on the floor of the Senate, by some of the generals of the Senate, that I was undermining the morale of the armed services. There was a spate of editorials from coast to coast. I was unable to defend myself with facts because the information which would have provided me a perfect defense was then classified information.

Since then, a great deal of history has been written by the people who were participants in that conference. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has himself made some statements on the floor today which prompt me to make this statement. He said that the Joint Chiefs implied that—I will not undertake to quote him exactly, but as I understood it—that they based their opinion on air support.

Mr. President, it happened that I was the first caller on the late President Kennedy on the morning after the Bay of Pigs invasion. I shall not undertake to describe the drama of that occasion. He was a very troubled man—very disturbed about some advice he had received.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has now related, at least in part, and as others have stated, the Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff certified to the President that the proposed Bay of Pigs invasion was a feasible military operation without air support. It was upon the basis of the knowledge of that fact that I made the statement that the President needed the advice of a wiser and abler Chief of Staff. So I make this statement now, long after the Bay of Pigs and long after the experience I endured on the floor of the Senate then, being unable at that time to defend myself by making a statement for the RECORD, when all that any Senator had to do was go downstairs and read the committee record, and I invited some of them to go and so read.

Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska says that the CIA made policy with respect to the Bay of Pigs operation. I could not exactly agree with that. I would not agree that the CIA made policy in this instance or that it made policy in the Congo. But there, as in the Congo, the CIA was a very important operative. An agency that executes policy and advises as to the feasibility of policy, an agency that gathers and evaluates intelligence, that advises upon the probable results of policy, describing conditions existing which, in the view of that Agency, justify a policy, is certainly a part of decisionmaking.

I think, if the Senator from Alaska will permit me, I would suggest that instead of the CIA making policy, it engages in an important decisionmaking function, the final policy determination being, of course, vested in the President of the United States.

But this advice, this execution of policy, this examination of the situation, this description of an existing situation, this gathering and evaluation of intelligence information, is such a vital part of decisionmaking, and in many instances has such important implications on foreign policy, that it seems to me overwhelmingly to justify the presence of members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this surveillance committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, with no intention to derogate members of the present subcommittee, or to criticize the CIA in any particular instance, I shall support the resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee, and I commend him for having made a most objective case in behalf of the resolution proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Certainly no one on that committee questions the ability, the integrity, or the dedication of the senior Senator from Georgia in his work in dealing with this Agency, nor the ability, integrity, or dedication of any of the members who have served on this very special committee. So far as I know, they have met all their responsibilities.

That is not the issue presented to the Senate. The issue is the basic one defined by the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], of whether or not the Senate believes that the Foreign Relations Committee, which is the instrument of the Senate charged with responsibility for advising the Senate on foreign policy questions, should have the same kind of information which is given to selected members of the Armed Services Committee.

As the Senator has said, we do not challenge the right; it is entirely proper that the members of that committee should be given information about the Central Intelligence Agency. We do not challenge the right of the Appropriations Committee to receive such information. But I am sure the Senator agrees with me that, if we are really to fulfill our constitutional responsibility delegated to us by the Senate in foreign relations matters, at least three members of our committee should receive the same treatment accorded three members of the Armed Services Committee and three members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GORE. I concur fully. The Senate, under the Constitution, has a limited sort of partnership with the President in the conduct of this Nation's relations with other countries through advice and consent to confirmation of appointees, ambassadors, Secretaries of State, to ratification of treaties, and in other ways.

This body has a quasi-partnership with the President in the conduct of international affairs. That responsibility has been partially delegated by the Senate to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It would seem to me that in consequence, therefore, the committee would be entitled to the privy sort of relationship with this operational agency, surely to the extent of any other committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. In effect, what we are asking is that the Senate pass judgment on this proposal. It may be that they feel they have a different responsibility and that the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are not to be trusted. If that is the case they should give thought to changing the membership of that committee so that it could carry out its responsibility.

But some Senators say, "We can trust six members of the Senate to deal with this matter, and we can trust six persons from the citizenry." We know the members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget have to be trusted with information on the CIA. And at least six members from the House of Representatives are trusted.

Here we have Senators who should be given this information. We have a CIA Director saying, "I can give this information to others, but not to you."

There was no offer to give the information if we went to the building on the other side of the river. He said that he thought it was clear that he did not have the right to give it to us.

What we propose to do is to make it clear that under the law the Director can give this kind of information to the members of our committee under the same conditions and terms that it is given to members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

One of the Senators cited the resolution in terms of staff and related activities.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee made the point that under the present arrangement there is a formal committee, a subcommittee of his committee. If that is the case, then he could use the authority he has in setting up a staff for his committee to carry on necessary activities.

If there are new procedures recommended by the Senate that are not now followed, those procedures could be followed by this proposed special committee which is in controversy here today.

Mr. GORE. I serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This committee handles information of the most secret and delicate nature. It has a very competent staff. Its meeting room is subject to scrutiny by the FBI before each meeting is held. I have never known of the divulgence of any secret from that committee. I know no reason why this cannot be duplicated.

How a Senator may vote on an issue is not a secret which involves the national security. The design of a bombsight, or the techniques involved in the development of a nuclear weapon might be a secret which the enemy would welcome. But I doubt if any foreign country is very much interested in how I vote on a motion in the Committee on Foreign Relations. My constituents are interested and perhaps they are entitled to know. At least the security of the country is not involved if they do know. My own security might be at some time.

This is a matter of one sort, but a secret that is important to the security of the country is another.

I know of no information that is ever divilged from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that involves the security of the country.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know that the interest of the Senator from Tennessee and myself and other Senators did not develop in consequence of a series of articles in magazines and newspapers, or publications and books dealing with the CIA.

That interest and concern goes back to the early fifties when the Hoover Commission reported and advised that there should be a committee to exercise continuous supervision of this kind.

At that time, it was not a question of passing judgment on any activities, but of proper procedures of the Government of the United States. That was when interest in this matter first developed. I have followed it since. This is true of most Senators who have continued that interest through the years. It is a concern for the proper function of Government, for the maintenance of proper relationships, and it is a desire to provide procedures by which the Senate, in this case through the Committee on Foreign Relations, can exercise its basic constitutional responsibility.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. Before closing, I wish——

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before closing?

Mr. GORE. I shall yield, but now I wish to advert to the question involving General Lemnitzer. I do not now wish to criticize General Lemnitzer.

As the Senator from Georgia said, many people made an error in the Bay of Pigs fiasco. I have made my share of errors.

I do wish to set the record straight at this late date. After it was divulged that General Lemnitzer had certified to President Kennedy that the proposed Bay of Pigs invasion without air cover was a feasible military operation, I thought that the President was entitled to have, and I felt there was a great need for him to have, advice from a different Chief of Staff.

Let the record show that President Kennedy thought so, too, as demonstrated by his subsequent action in bringing Gen. Maxwell Taylor back from retirement and making him Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I wish to complete the record on that point. I do not wish now to criticize anyone. I wish to say that I was unjustly criticized at the time because of the statement I made, which I think was 100 percent true then and it is 100 percent true now.

I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I have no quarrel with, in fact, I welcome the emendation which my friend from Tennessee made with regard to my statement that the CIA does make foreign policy.

Whether the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that the CIA influences foreign policy, or whether the modification proposed by the Senator from Tennessee which I think falls between those two statements is correct, the basic fact is that the CIA exerts enough influence on foreign policy in effect to make foreign policy. This was demonstrated in the Bay of Pigs, where they organized the invasion project and when its soundness was challenged in the White House before it was launched, felt they had to defend and stay with their original purpose, which would more than justify putting three members of the Foreign Relations Committee on the watchdog committee. That was the point I was making.

It is very clear that in the Bay of Pigs they, the CIA, were major factors in making policy and had created a situation which made it almost impossible for President Kennedy to back out. Thus, in effect, they did make foreign policy, although technically, as a matter of semantics, the decision was made by the President of the United States, just as it is said that the State Department does not make policy, that the President is the ultimate maker of foreign policy, but we do know, of course, that the State Department does make a great deal of foreign policy, just as the Pentagon is making a great deal of foreign policy.

Mr. GORE. Sometimes the Senate itself makes foreign policy by amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Sometimes I wish it would make it more often.

In this connection, it might be pointed out that the bad advice which has been given our Presidents may have been responsible for much of the difficulty in which we now find ourselves. It is clear that many of the decisions were made without adequate knowledge of the situation in southeast Asia, which suddenly took those who have been advising the President by surprise.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provision of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Pike, of New York, as a member of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, vice Mr. Dulski, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1098) to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Denton, Mr. Kirwan, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Marsh, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Reifel, Mr. McDade, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12270) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the 12th Boy Scouts World Jamboree and 21st Boy Scouts World Conference to be held in the United States of America in 1967, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12270) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the 12th Boy Scouts World Jamboree and the 21st Boy Scouts World Conference to be held in the United States of America in 1967, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Summary of Federal Government's "National Atmospheric Sciences Program"

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a summary of the Federal Government's

"National Atmospheric Sciences Program," for fiscal wear 1967 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Recommendations of Secretary of Commerce Relating to U.S. Participation in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the recommendations of the Secretary of Commerce, together with the supporting staff study, on the manner in which and the extent to which the United States should participate in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition, to be held at San Antonio, Tex. (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Visitors to that Academy, for the year 1966, together with recommendations for certain changes (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

East-West Trade Relations Act of 1966

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreements with communist countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Admission Into the United States of a Defector Alien

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order entered granting admission into the United States of Gustav Mertha (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on the Alaska Highway Study

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Alaska highway study (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

Authorization for Postmaster General to Relieve Postmasters and Other Employees for Certain Losses

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to relieve postmasters and other employees for certain losses resulting from improper, or incorrect payments (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"The Commonwealth
of Massachusetts,
"Office of the Secretary,
"*State House, Boston 02133, May 6, 1966.*

"Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States in Favor of the Establishment of the United States Public Health Service Alcoholism Center in Boston

"*Whereas,* President Lyndon B. Johnson in his message to the Congress of the United States on the health needs of the nation called for the creation of a $20,000,000 Federal Center for research into the cause, prevention, control and treatment of alcoholism; and

"*Whereas,* Alcoholism is the major cause of mental illness in Massachusetts and the primary cause of fifty per cent of our highway death toll; and

"*Whereas,* The educational and medical resources available in the Boston area to work in conjunction with Federal authorities in unequaled anywhere in the entire country; and

"*Whereas,* The religious community in Boston and throughout Massachusetts has achieved an outstanding degree of unity of thought and action in aiding alcoholics and their families to cope with the problems of alcoholism; therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary for the establishment of the United States Public Health Service Alcoholism Center in Boston; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonweath.

"House of Representatives, adopted, April 21, 1966.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk.*

"A true copy. Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Concurrent Resolution 16

"Resolution to express to the Congress of the United States the position of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to H.R. 13712 of the United States House of Representatives anent the provisions establishing irreversible automatic raises in the minimum wages of all industries of Puerto Rico now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the provisions that apply to Puerto Rico the extension of the coverage of said act, and to provide for the transmittal to that Legislative Body of this concurrent resolution

"Whereas: Pending consideration by the House of Representatives of the United States is H.R. 13712 to amend the present Fair Labor Standards Act;

"Whereas: Said bill, as regards Puerto Rico, provides for industries now covered by Federal Minimum Wage Orders two consecutive automatic increases of 12% and 16%, effective April 1, 1967 and 1968, respectively, without providing an adequate revision procedure;

"Whereas: The application to Puerto Rico of a system of automatic federal minimum wage increases of a uniform, inflexible and irreversible nature, not taking into consideration the existing differences in the economic situation of the different industries affected, threatens the stability of those of said affected industries that cannot pay them, and, consequently, the security of employment therein;

"Whereas: The procedure of fixing in Puerto Rico minimum wage increases based on percentages parallel with minimum wage increases in the United States is not in consonance with the reality of the situation, for because of the difference between economic conditions in the United States and in Puerto Rico, while the minimum wage in Puerto Rico is, as a general rule, the prevalent wage, in the United States the minimum wage fixed by law is in fact much below the wages currently paid in industry;

"Whereas: For the aforesaid reasons, a raise in the general level of minimum wages in Puerto Rico has a much greater and different effect than a raise in the minimum wage in the United States;

"Whereas: The working mass of Puerto Rico increases rapidly on account of the growth of our population, which calls for an even increasing number of jobs with the highest wages which the economy capacity of the industries of Puerto Rico can afford;

"Whereas: An increase in the minimum wages in Puerto Rico in the form proposed in H.R. 13712, would adversely affect the industrialization program of Puerto Rico, thus preventing the creation of new sources of work to cope with the serious unemployment problem existing in Puerto Rico;

"Whereas: Same H.R. 13712 would extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to other industries of an essentially local character, and to agricultural activities, whose minimum wages are determined and subject to periodical revision under the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Act;

"Whereas: The provisions of H.R. 13712, with respect to agriculture, while fundamentally taking into account the characteristics of agriculture in the United States, are not adaptable to the conditions of agriculture in Puerto Rico;

"Whereas: The extension of the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to industries of a local character and to agriculture does not improve the procedure and would add nothing to the benefits already enjoyed by your laborers under the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Act, but on the contrary, would create complications and difficulties, specially in so far as the Island's agriculture is concerned, to the prejudice of both laborers and employers;

"Whereas: Under the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Act there is being evolved an effective minimum wage program applicable to such industries and to agriculture, under which, not only are minimum wages in industries and agriculture periodically revised every two years, but it is the policy of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, expressed in the Minimum Wage Act itself, to insure to the laborers the highest wage that the economic conditions of the industries will permit, through a flexible procedure for the fixing of minimum wages in each industry and in agriculture;

"Whereas: It is the duty of this Legislative Assembly toward the people of Puerto Rico in general, and toward the laborers of Puerto Rico in particular, to bring to the attention of Congress the reason for which the amendments proposed to the Fair Labor Standards Act as regards Puerto Rico should be considered unnecessary, unjustifiable and prejudicial; therefore,

"*Be it Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:*

"(1) To express, as it is hereby expressed, to the House of Representatives and to the Senate of the United States:

"(a) That it favors that the statutory minimum wages provided by H.R. 13712 be applied in Puerto Rico as soon as circumstances will permit, but is opposed to the automatic, irreversible and uniform-percentage increases provided for Puerto Rico in said bill, that is, without flexibility or review recourse;

"(b) That it is opposed to the application to Puerto Rico of the extension of the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act as contained in the said H.R. 13712.

"(2) To direct, as it is hereby directed, that this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted through the Puerto Rico Resident Commissioner to the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States."

"REPORT ON CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 16 OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PUERTO RICO BY THE SENATE COMMITTEES ON LABOR, AGRICULTURE, AND INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

"GENERAL EXPLANATION

"Introduction

"In considering H.C.R. No. 16, your Committees carefully examined and studied each and everyone of the provisions of H.R. 13712, of the House of Representatives of the United States, which motivates the consideration thereof, in order to determine the scope of said bill with regard to Puerto Rico. In the analysis and discussion of the said bill, these Committees received valuable assistance and cooperation from the Secretaries of Labor, Justice, and Agriculture of Puerto Rico; from the Chairman of the Minimum Wage Board of Puerto Rico; and also from the Economic Advisor of the Economic Development Administration.

"In order to place in the proper perspective the scope and purpose of the Concurrent Resolution, there follows a brief account of the Fair Labor Standards Act in its philosophy and application to Puerto Rico; likewise, an explanation concerning the provisions of H.R. 13712 relative to Puerto Rico.

"Fundamental Philosophy of the Fair Labor Standards Act in its Application to Puerto Rico:

"The Fair Labor Standards Act of the United States, originally approved on June 25, 1938, included Puerto Rico in its provisions, as well as the States of the Union. The consequences of the application of the law in Puerto Rico, because of the differences between our economic situation and that of the States of the Union, were serious. Having knowledge of this, Congress adopted special provisions for Puerto Rico (54, Stat. 615). A perusal of the text of these provisions will be enough to notice that the application of the law in Puerto Rico had to be given, in a substantial manner, a purpose which was fundamentally different from that of its application in the United States. In the United States the law aimed primarily at creating a uniform base, a common denominator, on which the structure of the wage system in the United States was to be built; minimum wages, for each industry, would be dependent on the system of collective bargaining; agreements established between the industry, developed and organized, and labor unions, also developed and organized. There was no intention to establish, nor was it possible to establish, such a uniform base in Puerto Rico. It was not possible to establish a common denominator which could afford a uniform base to collective bargaining. To some industries it would have been beyond their means; to others it would have been too low. Industrial Committees appointed by the Secretary of Labor would have to determine the minimum wage for each industry, and, as a criterion to follow in the fixing of minimum wages by the Industrial Committees, there was established the specific rule that the minimum wage should be in each case as high as the industry could afford to pay without causing unemployment; on the other hand, not so low that it might give undue advantage to any Puerto Rican industry in the United States market.

"It was thus admitted that the raise of wages beyond certain limits might cause unemployment in Puerto Rico, and no changes were to be taken. Between the wage which might paralyze the industrial development of Puerto Rico and the wage which, without being too high, might allow for the establishment and the existence of the industries, the need for an adjustment was admitted, so that employment opportunities in Puerto Rico might not be curtailed. Congress acknowledged the great necessity of preserving existing jobs and of increasing, insofar as possible, employment opportunities in Puerto Rico, afflicted as it was, and still is, by serious unemployment.

"On the other hand, by establishing that salaries to be paid in Puerto Rico, pursuant to the determinations of the Industrial Committees, were not to be as low as to give to the Puerto Rican industry a competitive advantage in the United States market, it legitimately protected the employment stability of the United States worker.

"It is with these fundamental criteria that the law has since been applied to Puerto Rico. The remarkable industrial and economic development of Puerto Rico during the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act in the manner described above constitutes proof beyond doubt of the soundness of the determinations of Congress in its Law of June 26, 1940, already mentioned.

"Modifications to the Fair Labor Standards Act in its Application to Puerto Rico:

"The system of Industrial Committees thenceforth in force in Puerto Rico for implementing the Federal Minimum Wage Act has been the subject of successive amendments, in an attempt to perfect it in the course of the years. By virtue of such amendments the procedure for determining the wages is swifter and more expeditious than it originally was. Revisions occur at intervals of not more than two years.

"An amendment in 1961 (Law No. 87–30 of May 5, 1961) altered the system for wage determination. Congress decreed an automatic increase of 15 and 10 percent in the minimum wages theretofore paid in Puerto Rico under the determinations of the Industrial Committees.

"The supporters of this deviation from the established procedure explained that automatic increases should be made in Puerto Rico in a proportion percentagewise, to the increases made by law to the uniform minimum wage in force in the United States. Representatives of Puerto Rico at that time reasonably argued that the proposition was based on a false premise. The legal minimum wage is not the prevalant wage in the United States; it is only the platform on which collective bargaining is mounted; the prevailing wages in the United States are generally higher, sometimes considerably so, than the minimum wages prescribed by law. Consequently, an increase in the legal minimum wage in the United States does not automatically bring about a uniform increase in the wages paid by the various industries. The minimum wage, even increased by law, generally remains below prevailing wages. Conversely, the automatic increase of the minimum wage in Puerto Rico means a raise of the prevailing wage, because there is, in Puerto Rico, very little difference, if any, between the latter and the legal minimum. It should be borne in mind that the Industrial Committees should, in the determination of wages, reach the maximum wage level which industries are able to attain, without causing unemployment.

"In the contraposition of the proponents of the automatic increase on a percentage basis on the one hand, and the representatives of Puerto Rico who pointed out its unreasonableness on the other, a compromise was arrived at whereby, even though automatic increases were accepted for that year, review committees would be appointed in all cases where the affected industries were unable to pay the automatically increased wages, whose application might create unemployment. The Review Committees were authorized to reduce the increase provided by law wherever the inability of the industry to pay the same were established.

"This system inverted the procedure so far followed. Instead of having the Industrial Committees determine the minimum rates which industries would have to pay, the Review Committees might, whenever industries should be unable to pay the minimum rates established by the law, consequently reduce the amount of the wages.

"Experience since 1961:

"Five years have lapsed since then, and experience has shown how right were those who opposed the rigid automatic increases while favoring a flexible system. Practice has shown how necessary it was to maintain an individualized system for the determination of wages in Puerto Rico. Ten industries with a total of 30 classifications appealed from the first increase of 15 per cent, and the committees on appeals recommended increases lower than 15 per cent for 25 of these classifications. Eight industries having a total of 24 classifications appealed from the second 10 per cent raise. In this case the committees recommended raises lower than 10 per cent for 22 classifications. The industries so affected were affording employment to 28,000 workers.

"In the light of these facts, it is difficult to understand why H.R. 13712, disregarding the data offered by experience, now proposes, automatic increases on a uniform percentage basis, inflexible increases, with no possible correction in the event of economic inability to pay. If we are to judge the future by the past, as it is wise to do, in the face of the fact that the circumstances in 1966 are the same as in 1961, there does not seem to be any possible justification to cast aside the Review Committees. By so doing, as it would have been the case in 1961 if the Review Committees had not been created, H.R. 13712 threatens the existence of our industries; it threatens, consequently, the working opportunities of thousands of persons employed in the affected industries. In the face of these facts, which make the measure unnecessary, erroneous, unjustified and dangerous, the urgency of modifying its provisions is obvious, so that the principle of flexibility be preserved in the law, that it may be applied realistically, with due protection to United States workers by excluding undue competition on the part of the Puerto Rican industries, but also with due regard to the working opportunities in, and the economic development of, Puerto Rico.

"Provisions that Extend the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act to Cover Industries not Heretofore Subject to Said Act in Puerto Rico, Including Agriculture.

"By extending the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, minimum wages for industries heretofore not included in its provision, would be determined through the Industrial Committees procedure. The agricultural industry is included.

"As regards new industries, agriculture inclusive, the provisions of the bill to apply in the United States are directed to the circumstances of the United States economy. Although, by virtue of its federal form of government, the Union consists of 50 different political units, the truth is that the United States constitutes a geographical unit (with the only exception of Hawaii and Alaska) and, undoubtedly, an economic unit. This is the outcome of a long and well known historical development. Consequently, the concept of interstate commerce has been progressively changing in its significance and interpretation. The commercial and industrial activities do not evolve in separate state compartments. United States commerce develops throughout the entire United States geographical area. At present it is difficult to draw a line between what is interstate commerce and what is purely internal state commerce. The concept of interstate commerce has been in practice substituted for one of national internal commerce.

"Although the economic development of all the geographical areas of the Union is not uniform, the differences between them are not extreme and it is possible to find, for the purpose of establishing a national minimum wage, a reasonable common denominator. It is only in a limited number of cases that minimum wages might be higher than the wages prevalent in a given industry or region.

"Puerto Rico's case does not fit in this pattern. Neither does the degree of development of Puerto Rico, whose per capita income, in spite of the progress achieved during the last few years, continues to be about half the per capita income of the state of the Union having the lowest income; nor the geographical location of Puerto Rico, at a distance of not less than 1,000 miles from the eastern coast of the United States and depending for its manufacture on raw material transported from the continent; nor the lack of raw material for manufacturing purposes (except certain tropical agricultural products); nor its population density; nor its high percentage of unemployment, permit the application of the same criteria to regulate the intercoastal commerce of Puerto Rico with the United States, and much less to consider the local commerce of Puerto Rico, as if immersed within or wholly integrated into the U.S. national internal commerce.

"Wholesale and retail trade in Puerto Rico does not have the same effect on the wholesale and retail trade in the United States, as the wholesale and retail trade of a state has on the wholesale and retail trade of a contiguous or neighboring state. The construction industry in Puerto Rico does not and cannot have the same effect on the construction industry in a state of the Union, as that of a contiguous or neighboring state in the Continent. Laundries in Puerto Rico cannot possibly compete with laundries in the States of the Union; laundries more than one thousand miles apart cannot influence each other from an economic point of view. Public transportation, restaurants, hotels, motels, hospitals and other related institutions, and gasoline service stations, are activities of an eminently local character in Puerto Rico and must operate within and in harmony with local economic conditions, in an insular area, not in accordance with continental economic conditions. The highest possible wage should be established for the sake of the workers, but the element of competition with the salaries of the workers of the continent does not exist. It should be borne in mind that one of the two criteria that must be followed in the application of the law in Puerto Rico under the formula of the Industrial Committees is that the wages in Puerto Rico should not be so low as to permit the industries of the Island to unduly compete on the market of the United States. Such criterion would be inapplicable in the local non-agricultural industries nor in the agriculture of Puerto Rico.

"Had Puerto Rico been remiss to adopt laws for the protection of the wages of its workers, the provision of federal protection by federal law might be warranted. But Puerto Rico has an efficient Minimum Wage Act since 1941, and it is a fact that under this system wages in Puerto Rico have considerably increased in the course of the years. For instance: In the manufacturing industries, from 36 cents an hour in 1946, to $1.26 in 1965; in hotels, from 36 cents an hour in 1950, to $1.26 in 1965; in laundries, from 35 cents in 1950, to 77 in 1964; in restaurants, from 17 cents in 1944, to 77 in 1965; in wholesale commerce, from 59 cents in 1950, to $1.34 in 1963; in hospitals, from 27 cents in 1950 to 88 cents in 1965; and in the construction industry, from 49 cents in 1950 to $1.27 in 1964. As a result, the distribution of Puerto Rico's income has notably improved, the proportion for wages and salaries having increased from 56.5% in 1940, to 69.0% in 1965.

"The Minimum Wage Act of Puerto Rico provides that in the determination of minimum wages the conditions of each industry must be taken into account. Minimum wages should be determined at the highest level the industry is able to bear. In this respect nothing new is proposed for Puerto Rico in H.R. 13712 by the extension of coverage to new industries and agriculture. However, instead of the Industrial Committees being entirely composed of residents of the community they serve, they would be largely composed of residents in the Continent, who cannot be supposed to have a greater or even an equal knowledge of local conditions as residents here might have. Another difference would be that instead of the industrial committees being appointed by the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Board, with permanent offices in Puerto Rico, they would be appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Labor.

"It is difficult to understand how industrial committees thus composed can be more effective in the protection of the worker's wages and employment stability than the industrial committees formed under the Puerto Rican law. The economic conditions of a country visited for the first time cannot be easily understandable in a short period of days nor by those who have never lived in that community. The procedure to which employers and workers in Puerto Rico are used would be substituted for others with which they are not familiar. Any claim or complaint would have in each case to wait until the federally appointed committees are met and in operation in Puerto Rico, or else addressed to Washington. At present, employers and workers have continuous access to the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Committee, with its permanent office in Puerto Rico.

"Although the teaching of English is compulsory in the schools of Puerto Rico and a considerable percentage of our population is knowledgeable in said language, Spanish is the community language of Puerto Rico for the same historical reasons that English is the community language of the United States. Proceedings before the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Board are conducted in Spanish. The employers and workers of Puerto Rico not proficient in the English language would meet difficulties which they do not have today in their relationship with an official organization in charge of matters of such importance to them as the fixing of minimum wages. This would especially apply in the case of agriculture; it would affect in a large measure our rural population.

"With regard to agriculture it should be particularly pointed out how undesirable and unfruitful would be the application of the provisions of the bill. Our main agricultural commodity is sugar. The wages the cane sugar grower can pay must bear relation with the price at which Puerto Rican sugar is sold in the United States. The United States sugar market is controlled by a quota system. The price at which sugar is sold is not fixed through free competition. The Secretary of Agriculture of the United States has in his hands the mechanisms to control sugar prices in the continental market. Puerto Rico has no means whatsoever to influence the price at which sugar is sold. The wages that can be paid in Puerto Rico in sugar cane cultivation depend on the price of sugar on the United States market. It cannot be higher than what that price allows. On the other hand, to pay wages lower than what economic conditions would permit, would not mean in any wise a competitive advantage, in the market of the United States, for sugar produced in Puerto Rico. If Puerto Rico sold its sugar at a price lower than the prevailing price in the United States, it would not therefore sell more sugar, in unfair competition with sugar produced in the United States, since the quantity of sugar that Puerto Rico can sell is limited to a quota. The criteria that the industrial committees would have to follow in the determination of wages, according to law, would hence be inapplicable in the case of sugar cane.

"Coffee is another of the farm products of Puerto Rico. Coffee produced in Puerto Rico is almost all locally consumed. Save in the State of Hawaii, no coffee is produced in the United States. There is no competition between Puerto Rican and Hawaiian coffee. Puerto Rico's coffee is sold on the United States market only in those years in which the crop exceeds local consumption. It does not compete there with coffee produced in the United States, but with coffee imported from foreign countries, duty free.

"It is evident that the fixing of wages in Puerto Rico in these two items of our agriculture is a matter that must be governed by the local situation, or by circumstances, as in the case of sugar, which are already predetermined by Congressional law. The intervention of federally appointed industrial committees in the fixing of wages in sugar cane and coffee, taken care of as it is by local law, does not respond to any practical necessity.

"In so far as the law is applicable to the tropical food crops of Puerto Rico, which in their largest part are locally consumed, it is obvious that the situation would still be the more preposterous.

"The law includes all farmers who have employed during the preceding year 500 man-days in any quarter. A man-day, as defined in the bill, is any man working any part of the day. Excluded from the computation are only the immediate relatives of the farmer and those workers who, besides meeting other requirements, have not performed farm tasks for a period of 13 weeks during the preceding year. This last exception has very little application in Puerto Rico, where we have a rural population of 55.8 per cent of our inhabitants, a rural population whose livelihood is, almost exclusively, farming. It would seem quite odd to find a rural worker in Puerto Rico who is not customarily an agricultural laborer. Because of the complexity of computations, many difficulties would be encountered to determine which farmers would be subject to the law and which would not, particularly in the case of small farmers. This would bring about unnecessary anguish and worry, besides issues of a legal nature.

"Finally, attention should be called to the fact that from the standpoint of sound government principles, the best law is the simplest law, the most easily understandable to the citizen; the best government is that which is closest to the citizen. The extension to local industry and, above all, to agriculture, of the federal minimum wage law, a law of difficult interpretation and execution and with its application entrusted to officials who, at least to a large extent, are not members of the community—instead of a law known for many years, implemented by officials conversant with the living conditions of the community, who are a part of that community, and who are to answer from day to day to the opinion of their fellow citizens—certainly is not in keeping with the governmental principles under which Puerto Rico lives.

"Clearly, a provision of this nature would depart from, and would constitute a setback in, the trajectory heretofore followed in the development of the relationships between the Federal Government and the people of Puerto Rico."

A resolution adopted by the West Brooklyn Independent Democrats, of Brooklyn, N.Y., favoring the discontinuance of the bombing in North Vietnam, and to recognize the NLF as an independent negotiating body in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Board of Directors of the Order of Lafayette, in Washington, D.C., relating to the Freedom Academy, NATO, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 2463. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1160).

PRINTING OF STUDY ENTITLED "POLICY PLANNING FOR AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 260); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the study entitled "Policy Planning for Aeronautical Research and Development," prepared for the use of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences shall be printed with illustrations as a Senate document, and that there be printed four thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 3353. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the transfer of three paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany in trust for the Weimar Museum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 3354. A bill to amend the law establishing the revolving fund for expert assistance loans to Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3355. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel Ramon Calzadilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 3356. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3357. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to give the Civil Aeronautics Board certain additional authority to improve service; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 3358. A bill for the relief of Theodora Toya (Lambrini) Bezates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):

S. 3359. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; and

S. 3360. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 3361. A bill for the relief of Gyorgy Sebok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF STUDY ENTITLED "POLICY PLANNING FOR AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT"

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 260) to print a study entitled "Policy Planning for Aeronautical Research and Development," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. ANDERSON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE OTTAWA TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], a bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a description of the bill prepared by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and a document showing the distribution of the funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the description and document will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3359) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The description and document presented by Mr. MONRONEY are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted.

On February 11, 1965, the Indian Claims Commission issued an Amended Final Award granting the Ottawa Tribe $368,039.55, with interest at 4 percent per annum from March 22, 1934, on $30,603.94 of unaccounted trust land funds. The initial sum of $30,603.94 together with the interest thereon to March 22, 1934, has already been incorporated in the final award. The recovery represents additional payment for Ottawa lands in Kansas ceded under the treaties of June 24, 1862 (12 Stat. 1237), and February 23, 1867 (15 Stat. 513, 517), and for other items such as unaccounted treaty funds and expenses of a commission established to mediate a settlement between the United States and the Ottawa Tribe for unsold lands and assets arising from the sale of school lands. These funds were appropriated by the Act of April 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 81), and are on deposit in the United States Treasury drawing interest at 4 percent per annum.

At the time of first European contact the Ottawas were located on Manitoulin Island and along the shores of Georgian Bay in what is now southern Ontario. In the late 1640's, however, the Iroquois pushed them into the area around Green Bay, Wisconsin. Subsequently, segments of the tribe returned to their earlier home while others settled along the eastern shore of Lake Michigan, some moving as far west as southern Wisconsin and northeastern Illinois, and along the southern shore of Lake Erie into Ohio and parts of Pennsylvania. In 1831 three bands of Ottawas in Ohio, Blanchard's Fork, Oquanoxa's Village and Roche de Boeuf, ceded their lands to the United States and were granted a reservation in what is now the State of Kansas. They arrived there in 1836 but later, under pressure for the opening and sale of Indian lands, the Ottawas of Kansas, now also known at the Ottawas of Blanchard's Fork and Roche de Boeuf, concluded the 1862 and 1867 treaties whereby they sold their lands in Kansas and purchased a tract in what is now Oklahoma.

The Indian Claims Commission has stated that the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma comprises and represents those brands of Ottawa Indians parties to the above-mentioned treaties. Although Federal supervision over the Oklahoma Ottawas was terminated pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 963), to be effective three years later, the termination Act provided that nothing in it would affect claims previously filed against the United States. The Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma had been organized under the provisions of the Oklahoma Welfare Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), and its Constitution was approved by the Secretary of the Interior on October 10, 1938. A Final Roll, prepared pursuant to the 1956 Act and listing 630 individuals was published in the *Federal Register* on August 13, 1959.

The proposed bill provides for a per capita distribution of this award to those persons whose names appear on the Ottawa terminal roll, and their heirs and legatees, and gives the Secretary authority to develop procedures for the disposition of the shares of minors or persons under a legal disability. Since the relationship between the Ottawa Tribe and the United States has been terminated, the proposed bill does not provide for programming of the judgment funds.

As there are several claims pending before the Indian Claims Commission in which the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma might have an interest, the proposed bill provides that in the event the sums of money reserved by the Secretary to pay the distribution costs exceeds the amount actually necessary, such funds shall remain to the credit of the tribe to be disposed of at the discretion of the Secretary.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Ottawa (docket No. 303) judgment fund

[Balance as of October 19, 1965]

Net Award—14X7098 Awards of Indian Claims Commission, Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma	$406, 166. 19
Attorney's fees	40, 585. 24
Attorney's expenses (none to date)	----------
Interest as of June 30, 1965	----------
Interest and Accruals on Interest—14X7598 Awards of Indian Claims Commission	2, 087. 58
Balance as of October 19, 1965	367, 668. 53

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF CHICKASAW NATION OF INDIANS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the second bill which I wish to introduce, in behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], provides for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians, and for other purposes.

In connection therewith, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a description of the bill as prepared by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and a document showing the disposition of the funds in that case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the description and document will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3360) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The description and document presented by Mr. MONRONEY are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted.

Funds were appropriated by the Act of March 31, 1961 (75 Stat. 2400), to pay a judgment of $190,934.79 recovered by the Chickasaw Nation in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 269. The judgment was for inadequate consideration for one quarter interest in 266,435.13 acres of land in Oklahoma allotted to the Choctaw Freedmen by agreement of March 21, 1902 (32 Stat. 641), supplemental to the "Atoka" Agreement of April 23, 1897 (30 Stat. 495). These judgment funds are credited to the account of this group and draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum.

The Chickasaws were closely associated, territorially, historically, and culturally, with the Choctaws. At the time of the first European contact, the Chickasaws were living in what is now northwestern Mississippi, northwestern Alabama, and western Tennessee. They parted with these lands by treaties made in 1805, 1816, 1818, and 1832, but actual migration to their new home, in what is now Oklahoma, did not begin until 1837 and extended to 1847.

Since provision for a place of resettlement was overlooked in earlier treaties with the Chickasaws, it was necessary to enter into agreement with the Choctaws under which a portion of their land was used for the Chickasaw people. About one-fourth of the total land area set aside for the Choctaws was allocated for this purpose. As a consequence, the two tribes have been closely related and continue to share in unallotted tribal property and in money derived from the sale of tribal lands.

At the outbreak of the Civil War the Chickasaws signed a treaty with the Confederacy. As a result of this alliance, their former lands were subdivided and opened to settlement by other Indian tribes. Part of the land which they held jointly with the Choctaws was later allotted to the Choctaw Freedmen. This award arises out of a claim for inadequate compensation to the Chickasaw Indians in connection with these allotted lands.

The 1866 "reconstruction" treaty signed by the United States and the Chickasaws and Choctaws re-established the governments of both Indian nations. A new constitution was adopted by the Chickasaw Nation and tribal government under a Governor and council continued until the conclusion of the Dawes Agreements of the 1890's which were ratified by the Act of April 26, 1906. After that the Governor was allowed to continue in office during his lifetime but with the provision that the President could remove him for failure to perform his duties and would have the authority to appoint a successor in case of death or removal. The council was discontinued. The system of an appointed Governor has continued to the present time. The Dawes Agreements also provided for the allotment of the tribal lands in severalty.

The Chickasaw Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma is today located in those counties which until statehood were recognized as the territory of the "Chickasaw Nation." The Tribe should be regarded as the successor of the "Chickasaw Nation." The group has no written constitution and no formal organization, but still maintains a Governor. The Tribe maintains no business enterprises or activities. Tribal funds in the U.S. Treasury are allocated each year for expenses of the Governor.

A tribal roll, totaling 6,304, was completed and made final as of March 4, 1907.

The net amount of the judgment, plus accrued interest to September 30, 1965, is $200,802.75. The other funds of the Tribe on deposit in the U.S. Treasury (consisting almost entirely of the proceeds of lands and interest thereon) amount to $148,825.80, making a total of $349,628.55. This amount is too small to distribute per capita, considering administrative costs. It would amount to something less than $53 per share, and much less than that in the case of heirs.

The proposed bill therefore provides that the funds on deposit in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the Chickasaw Nation as beneficiaries of this award, and all other funds, including interest, on deposit in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the Chickasaw Nation, may be advanced or expended for any purpose authorized by the Governor of the Chickasaw Nation and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. A similar provision was contained in the Act of October 9, 1962 (76 Stat. 776), relating to the Cherokee judgment. Under that Act approximately $267,000 of the judgment reverted to the Tribe subject to expenditure for purposes authorized by the Principal Chief and approved by the Secretary. The Chickasaw Nation is considering ways to utilize a portion of these funds for tribal enterprises and other program activities.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosures.

Award of Indian Claims Commission, Chickasaw Nation, Docket 269

These funds are on deposit in the United States Treasury and draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum.

Net Award (14X7495, Awards of Indian Claims Commission, Chickasaw Nation)	$190, 934. 78
Less: Attorney fees	−19, 093. 47
Balance of judgment fund principal	171, 841. 31
Interest accrued as of September 30, 1965 (14X7995, Interest and accruals on interest, awards of Indian Claims Commission, Chickasaw Nation)	28, 961. 44
Total judgment fund, principal plus interest	200, 802. 75

BALANCES IN ALL OTHER ACCOUNTS ON DEPOSIT IN U.S. TREASURY TO CREDIT OF THE CHICKASAW NATION

Proceeds of Lands, etc., Five Civilized Tribes (Chickasaw) (14X7149)	$145, 901. 59
Interest (14X7649, Interest on Proceeds of Lands, etc., Five Civilized Tribes, Chickasaw)	2, 898. 21
Proceeds of Labor, Chickasaw Indians (unallotted lands) (14X7212)	26. 00
Interest (14X7712, Interest on Proceeds of Labor, Chickasaw Indians, unallotted lands)	----------
Total Balances of other accounts	148, 825. 80
Grand Total of all funds on deposit in U.S. Treasury to credit of the Chickasaw Nation	349, 628. 55

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 3107, a bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes, the name of Senator QUENTIN N. BURDICK of North Dakota be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of May 3, 1966:

S. 3302. A bill to amend the Act of October 10, 1949, entitled "An Act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes", so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes: Mr. CASE.

Authority of May 9, 1966:

S. 3325. A bill to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the

Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screwworm eradication in Mexico: Mr. Hayden and Mr. Murphy.

Authority of May 10, 1966:

S. 3332. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal facilities, and to otherwise assure humane care and treatment of laboratory animals: Mr. Allott, Mr. Holland, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Yarborough.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered, to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Excerpts from his remarks and excerpts from speech by Under Secretary of Commerce LeRoy Collins at Salute to Industry luncheon, Huntington, W. Va., May 14, 1966.

REPORT OF GAO ON AUTOMOBILE INSPECTION ACTIVITIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 2, 1966, I wrote a letter to the Honorable Frank H. Weitzel, Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, requesting that the General Accounting Office look into possible irregularities in the automobile inspection activities of the District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a copy of my letter to the Comptroller General on February 2, 1966.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

February 2, 1966.

Hon. Frank H. Weitzel,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Weitzel: I have received certain allegations relating to possible irregularities in the inspection activities of the Department of Motor Vehicles of the District of Columbia Government. The information I have received indicates that certain new and used car dealers in the District of Columbia may be obtaining motor vehicle inspection stickers and affixing them to cars sold without presenting the cars to the Department of Motor Vehicles inspection test stations for inspection.

I would appreciate your having members of your staff review the procedures for maintaining control over the receipt, storage, and issuance of motor vehicle inspection stickers for the purpose of ascertaining whether certain dealers may be delivering cars to their customers with vehicle inspection stickers affixed that have not been officially inspected. Inquiry should also be made as to whether the Department of Motor Vehicles may have improperly delegated to the dealers its inspection responsibilities.

In the event your investigation bears out these allegations, I would appreciate receiving a report describing the nature and extent of the deficiencies and irregularities in the Department's vehicle inspection activities, together with your suggestions for needed corrective action.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Comptroller General complied with my request. The General Accounting Office investigated the matter and on May 4, 1966, sent me a report of its investigation. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Reference is made to your letter of February 2, 1966, acknowledged by us on February 10, 1966, relating to possible irregularities in the inspection activities of the Department of Motor Vehicles of the District of Columbia Government.

In accordance with your request, we have reviewed the controls of the Department of Motor Vehicles over motor vehicle inspection stickers. On March 30, 1966, representatives of our Office informed Mr. Richard Judd, Staff Member, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, that our review did not sustain the allegation that certain new and used car dealers in the District of Columbia may be obtaining motor vehicle inspection stickers and affixing them to cars sold without presenting the cars to the Department of Motor Vehicles inspection stations for inspection. They informed Mr. Judd also that our review indicated the need for improved procedures to overcome certain weaknesses in the controls of the Department of Motor Vehicles over the motor vehicle inspection stickers. In accordance with the arrangement with Mr. Judd, we are transmitting herewith a copy of our letter bringing these weaknesses and the changes which we believe are necessary for the control to be effective to the attention of the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Sincerely yours,

Frank H. Weitzel,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

Enclosure.

U.S. General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1966.

Hon. Walter N. Tobriner,
President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Dear Mr. Tobriner: The General Accounting Office has reviewed the controls of the Department of Motor Vehicles, District of Columbia Government, over motor vehicle inspection stickers pursuant to a request of Senator Wayne Morse dated February 2, 1966.

We reviewed the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle laws and inspection regulations and the accountability records for regular motor vehicle inspection stickers. We did not review the records for motor vehicle inspection seals for vehicles without enclosed windshields or special inspection stickers for taxicabs.

Our review of the accountability records for the regular motor vehicle inspection stickers showed that they did not evidence a complete accounting for all stickers and that improved procedures are needed to overcome certain control weaknesses. However, on the basis of the procurement records showing the number of inspection stickers purchased for use during the period from April 1, 1965, to February 28, 1966; the daily inspection station reports showing the number of motor vehicles inspected and approved; a record of inspection stickers canceled and missing; and stickers reported as having been issued as samples, it appeared that practically all of the inspection stickers could be accounted for as summarized below.

Inspection stickers purchased (serially numbered from 1 to 197,000)	197,000
Inspection stickers:	
Required for vehicles inspected and approved	195,527
Issued as samples	27
Recorded as canceled	104
Recorded as missing	8
On hand at January 31, 1966	1,315
Total	196,981
Inspection stickers unaccounted for	19

The controls over motor vehicle inspection stickers and the procedural changes which we believe are necessary for the controls to be effective are discussed in the following sections of this report.

CONTROLS OVER MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTION STICKERS

The Department of Motor Vehicles inspects motor vehicles at two official inspection stations and at the yards of several commercial operators of large motor vehicle fleets. A serial numbered inspection sticker is affixed to the windshield of each motor vehicle that is inspected and approved and shows when the vehicle is required to be reinspected.

The chief motor vehicle inspector issues the inspection stickers, usually on a monthly basis, to the supervisors of the two inspection stations. The station supervisors issue the inspection stickers on a daily basis to the station lane inspectors. A daily inspection lane report is prepared showing the number of vehicles inspected and approved and the serial numbers of the stickers affixed to the vehicles. The daily lane reports, together with the unused stickers and an inspection record card for each vehicle inspected and approved, are transmitted to the station supervisors who summarize the daily lane reports into a daily station report which is forwarded to the chief motor vehicle inspector and provides the basis for statistical reporting on motor vehicle inspection activities.

The inspection record cards show certain information regarding the inspected vehicle, including the State of registration, the registration tag number, and the serial number of the inspection ticket affixed to the vehicle. The inspection record card is initiated by an inspector at the entrance of a vehicle to the inspection lane, and the card moves along the lane with the vehicle and at each inspection point is punched by the assigned inspector with a special punch to show whether or not the vehicle met the inspection standards. At the end of the inspection lane, an inspector affixes an inspection sticker to each approved vehicle and records the serial number of the sticker on the inspection record card. In the case of a vehicle that did not meet the inspection standards, a rejection sticker is affixed to the vehicle and the inspection record card is transmitted to the station supervisor for use when the vehicle is reinspected.

The inspection record cards for the motor vehicles inspected and approved at the two inspection stations are forwarded to the supervisor of the record section located at inspection station No. 2 for recording in the sticker control ledger, after which the cards are filed for reference and informational purposes. The sticker control ledger lists all inspection stickers procured for an inspection year by serial number and provides for recording opposite each sticker number the registration number of the inspected and approved motor vehicle to which the sticker was affixed.

The same controls are applicable for those motor vehicle inspections that are made at the yards of commercial operators of motor vehicle fleets.

PROCEDURAL CHANGES NECESSARY FOR CONTROLS OVER MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTION STICKERS TO BE EFFECTIVE

The inadequacy of the motor vehicle inspection sticker accountability reports and records to evidence accountability for all stickers may be attributable in part to the lack of written procedures providing for their maintenance. The need for written procedures for maintaining control over the inspection stickers is indicated by the fact that the lane inspectors' daily reports do not account for the stickers issued to the lane inspectors, by errors in many of the daily station reports, and by the incomplete manner in which the sticker control ledger was maintained.

For the lane inspectors' daily reports to adequately account for inspection stickers, we believe that the procedures should provide that each lane report show, in addition to the number of vehicles inspected and approved and the number of stickers used based on the serial numbers of the stickers affixed to the vehicles, the number and serial numbers of the stickers issued to the lane inspector and the serial numbers of the stickers on hand at the end of each day.

Our review of the daily station reports revealed 67 reports that showed a number of vehicles inspected and approved that differed from the number of inspection stickers used. To ensure that these reports clearly summarize the inspection activities, we believe that the procedures should require that the reports be checked to determine that the reported number of vehicles inspected and approved is in agreement with the number of inspection stickers used based on the serial numbers of the stickers that were affixed to the vehicles as shown on the reports and on the inspection record cards for inspected and approved vehicles.

Our review of the sticker control ledger showed that no record had been made in the ledger to show the use made of many of the inspection stickers. Our examination of the daily station reports and the inspection record cards showed that most of these stickers either had been affixed to inspected and approved motor vehicles that were registered in jurisdictions other than the District of Columbia or had been canceled.

For the sticker control ledger to evidence accountability for the motor vehicle inspection stickers, we believe that the procedures should require the daily recording of the State and registration tag number of each inspected and approved motor vehicle to which an inspection sticker was affixed, as shown by the related inspection record card, and of the inspection stickers issued as samples, canceled, or otherwise disposed of as shown by the daily station or other reports. Also, unaccounted for stickers should be investigated on a current basis.

We also believe that the procedures should require the chief motor vehicle inspector to maintain a record showing the serial numbers of inspection stickers (1) used as samples, (2) issued to each inspection station, (3) transferred between the two stations, and (4) withdrawn from the stations for use in inspections performed at the yards of commercial operators of large motor vehicle fleets. The maintenance of such a record would permit the placing of responsibility for stickers unaccounted for. We believe further that the procedures should provide for the retention of all mutilated, canceled, and expired unused inspection stickers and for the destruction of the stickers on a controllable basis such as that currently in effect for the destruction of expired unissued motor vehicle registration tags.

We discussed with the Director, Department of Motor Vehicles, the deficiencies in the control procedures for motor vehicle inspection stickers, the procedural changes essential for attaining improved control, and the desirability of adopting written procedures, specifying the manner in which the accountability reports and records are to be maintained. The Director agreed that some procedural changes are necessary to insure adequate accounting for the motor vehicle inspection stickers and that written procedures should be developed.

Copies of this letter are being sent to Senator WAYNE MORSE and to the Director, Department of Motor Vehicles.

We acknowledge the cooperation extended to our representatives during the review. We will appreciate being advised of the actions taken toward strengthening the control over the motor vehicle inspection stickers.

Sincerely yours,

L. K. GERHARDT,
Associate Director.

Mr. MORSE. I am very pleased, Mr. President, that the General Accounting Office report found the allegations made to me to be without substance. I am pleased that the investigation was conducted by the General Accounting Office because it should put rumors of possible irregularities in the inspection activities in the District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles to rest.

The General Accounting Office, in its report to me, recommend certain administrative changes which it believes are necessary for better control of automobile inspection stickers. I hope that the District of Columbia Commissioners and Mr. George A. England, Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles, will seriously consider the changes suggested by the General Accounting Office.

In conversations with representatives of the General Accounting Office, I am pleased to learn that Mr. George England cooperated in every respect with the investigators from the General Accounting Office. This is what I expected from Mr. England. I regret that at least one other head of an important District of Columbia department did not see fit to cooperate with an investigation of his department by the Metropolitan Police Department. I think George England has conducted himself properly in this instance. I congratulate Mr. England for the attitude he has taken on this entire matter.

I want to briefly state that another investigation into the theft of Department of Motor Vehicles drivers' records is currently underway in the Department of Motor Vehicles, as well as the altering of official Department of Motor Vehicle records. I have been kept informed of the progress of this investigation. I wish to plead with the District Commissioners to assign more personnel to this investigation so that it may be completed soon. The evidence which is being obtained is very disturbing because, apparently, some Department of Motor Vehicle employees are implicated in altering and selling drivers' records.

Another investigation is currently underway in the Department of Motor Vehicles concerning the removal of inspection stickers from automobiles. These inspection stickers are stolen and, in many cases, sold. I hope that some solution can be reached on this problem at an early date, and I am confident that this can be done.

Mr. President, I felt that I should bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time in order that the public will know the results of the investigation I requested the General Accounting Office to make earlier this year.

I shall discuss, within a short time, a police report I received on the misconduct of employees in the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

THE ARROGANCE OF DE GAULLE ON NATO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments to direct attention to the arrogance of President Charles de Gaulle of France as exemplified by his attitude and position with respect to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We have been on notice for sometime, as have all other members of the NATO Alliance, Canada, Iceland, Norway, Britain, Netherlands, Denmark, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, Italy, Portugal, Greece, and Turkey, that General de Gaulle has decreed that NATO headquarters and NATO forces must withdraw from France after being so located and established for more than 15 years. This sudden decision came without adequate explanation and it was only natural that member nations to this defense pact which states in plain language that "an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe and North America shall be considered an attack against all," reacted with amazement and resentment. These feelings subsequently developed into hard-core irritation when General de Gaulle set a timetable for NATO and its forces and installations to get out of France and to do so without any expense to France.

In recent days, General de Gaulle compounded the ill feelings he had previously created among NATO member nations by canceling unrestricted flights of military aircraft of the United States and those of other member nations over French territory and substituted therefor an arrangement whereby these aircraft must obtain month-to-month authority to conduct any type of missions over French airspace. No explanation was advanced by General de Gaulle for creating this awkward requirement for NATO aircraft which operate over his country on missions that basically are for the protection of his country and its people. It is difficult to comprehend the reasoning and objective of General de Gaulle in policing the flight of U.S. aircraft over French territory when they are there for the sole purpose of protecting that territory from attack.

The time seems appropriate to let General de Gaulle know that the sanctions he has imposed on the flight of U.S. military aircraft over French territory as a part of the overall NATO mission, could boomerang and have serious repercussions on the economy of the French Republic which General de Gaulle apparently believes he can revive to the standing of a major world power without the aid, comfort, and protection that NATO affords. It is nothing short of irrational for the United States to have to forgo free flight over French territory in fulfilling its obligations and commitments under the NATO alliance. General de Gaulle seems to forget that the United States has saved French territory twice in a generation, at a high cost in lives, and was not required in so doing to obtain monthly commutation tickets to operate its aircraft over French territory.

I strongly suggest that the appropriate officials of our Government consult with our NATO associates and seek their cooperation and support in keeping General de Gaulle from deterring NATO from performing its well-defined functions. I believe we have now arrived at the appropriate juncture to apply a few pressures on General de Gaulle to awaken him, if possible, to the folly of the course he is pursuing against friendly neighbors of the French people who are committed to save France again in the event of invasion or attack.

I am not an eye for an eye conformist, but unless General de Gaulle, as President of the French Republic, can be induced to function compatibly with the aims and purposes of NATO, instead of hindering them at every turn, I advocate that the U.S. Government, in consort with all member nations of NATO and all member nations of all other defense pacts to which we have committed our Government to resist unfriendly attacks, consider canceling and repudiating any and all rights or authorizations for Air France—the Government-owned worldwide airline of France—to operate into, out of, or over any of these conutries; and that the countries involved should also consider notifying the French Government that any air service they may currently be performing into, out of, or over France by a Government-owned or privately owned airline or airlines, is to be discontinued.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a digest from the May 16th issue of U.S. News & World Report of the various commitments the United States has made with 43 nations throughout the world.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW U.S. IS PLEDGED TO DEFEND 43 OTHER NATIONS AROUND THE WORLD

(NOTE.—In all, U.S. has raised a protective umbrella over these 43 different nations—in 9 seperate treaties—both north and south of the equator, completely around the earth. The question being raised: Is America, seemingly hard-pressed to keep a small war going in Vietnam, in a position to guarantee commitments in the rest of the world?)

In NATO—North Atlantic Treaty Organization—U.S. is allied with 14 other nations:

Canada, Iceland, Norway, Britain, Netherlands, Denmark, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, Italy, Portugal, France, Greece, Turkey.

The commitment: This treaty, blanketing an expanse from Canada to Western Europe and eastward to Turkey, pledges the U.S. to regard an attack on any member as an attack on itself.

In Rio Treaty—signed at Rio de Janeiro—U.S. is allied with 19 other nations:

Honduras, Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Panama, Venezuela, Ecuador, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay.

The commitment: In a part that covers every nation of Latin America except Cuba, the U.S. agrees, in the event of aggression against any member, to provide assistance on request.

In CENTO—Central Treaty Organization—U.S. is linked with 4 other nations:

Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, Britain.

The Commitment: This pact covers the Middle East and South Asia. U.S., while not directly a member, has pledged to co-operate in mutual defense.

In SEATO—Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—U.S. is allied with 7 other nations:

Britain, France, New Zealand, Australia, Thailand, Pakistan, Philippines.

The Commitment: This treaty covers Southeast Asia, pledges U.S. to "consult immediately" on measures for common defense in case of attack. U.S. has extended its commitment to include aid to South Vietnam under a special protocol signed in 1954.

In Anzus Treaty—U.S. is allied with 2 other nations.

Australia, New Zealand.

The commitment: In the Pacific region, the U.S. acknowledges that an attack against either of these countries will automatically involve America as well.

The individual pacts—U.S. is allied with 4 other nations:

Japan, South Korea, Nationalist China, Philippines.

The commitment: In the Far East, all along the Pacific periphery of Red China, U.S. has signed bilateral treaties pledging mutual assistance in case of an attack.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this compilation of the defense alliances we have in different parts of the world, all similar in purpose to NATO, graphically illustrates the impact that cancellation of landing and flying rights by all of them would have on Air France, which is reputed to be the largest commercial airline in the world.

Such a wholesale cancellation of operating rights would dismember the framework of the Air France system so as to leave its operations on a small local basis. However, the airlines of countries that canceled the rights of Air France would be disturbed only to the point where they would fly around France and its foreign possessions.

Such a wholesale cancellation of the right of Air France to travel over the lands of the members of NATO and other worldwide organizations with which we have defense pacts, would cause economic damage to France that she could not withstand. That economic damage, however, would not be as severe a blow to the good of the world as what De Gaulle is attempting to do by his declarations with respect to NATO.

To practically shut down the operations of Air France by the method of cancellation of its operating authority throughout the world, and the disastrous effect it would have on the economy of France, may be interpreted by some as harsh retaliation. But in the light of all of the bold shots General de Gaulle has leveled at NATO, and particularly against the United States, and his impending 10-day visit to Moscow starting June 20, it is vital that we let General de Gaulle know that he does not hold all of the good cards in the wrongful game that he has been promoting.

I appeal to all nations and all people who are interested in self-preservation to be wary of General de Gaulle and his strange motives, to say nothing of his unconscionable pursuit of alienating friends of France who have never failed to respond when the survival of France was at stake.

Mr. President, I have been a defender of De Gaulle. In my judgment, when France was in chaos, he brought it to fiscal stability and reestablished the strength of France. We collaborated with him and we are entitled to treatment different from the kind he is now according us. His views have changed. They are not sound. He should be informed that what he is doing may boomerang against the French economy.

Mr. GRUENING. I want to comment briefly on the statement of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the suggestion that in retaliation for France's carrying out its views of her defense needs, we cancel the certificates for Air France, a civil agency of transportation.

I cannot imagine considering doing anything so utterly foolish.

I think what President de Gaulle has done, while it may be irritating to some of our military and while perhaps it was considered as requesting a somewhat precipitate withdrawal, may serve the useful purpose of calling upon us to examine whether NATO may not well be obsolete, or perhaps obsolescent, and to make a careful review of the desire of France to do what she feels is necessary in her national interest.

Certainly, it is true that conditions no longer obtain today that existed at the time NATO was established, when there was imminent danger of Russia marching across Europe. That situation no longer exists.

It is also true that the other countries of Europe in NATO have fully recovered from the damage inflicted on them during World War II, and are in a much better position to defend themselves at this time than they were then, should such defense be necessary. In any event, the United States has effectively demonstrated its ability to airlift troops and could do it again if necessary.

So instead of constantly criticizing President de Gaulle for what he considers to be desirable programs in the interest of France, which is his primary concern and responsibility, perhaps we should be grateful for his opening up this whole question, and leading us into a more up-to-date realistic policy, and opening the way to lessening our heavy financial commitment abroad which should be borne by others if needed.

NASSER—RUSSIA'S CATS-PAW IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 2½ years ago, in reporting to the Senate Committee on Government Operations on a study I had made of U.S. foreign aid programs in selected countries in the Middle East and Africa, I pointed out how completely dependent President

Nasser had become on Russian arms. I stated then:

> Today, militarily, Egypt is completely dependent on Soviet bloc countries. Colonel Nasser has maneuvered himself into the position of being completely dependent on Communist Russia for a continued flow of arms and parts. Should that flow be cut off, Egypt is militarily unarmed.

Kosygin's visit there served to underscore the truth of the statement that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

In his column in the Washington Post on May 14, 1966, entitled "Confronting Nasser: Recent Events Points to One," columnist William S. White stated:

> President Nasser's eager thralldom to international communism has long been a fact of life. But it is now becoming so open, so notorious and so deliberately provocative tward the West as to threaten a new and perhaps a decisive political crisis in the Middle East.
>
> Nasser's close friendship with the Russians has just been underlined in conferences with Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union held simultaneously with disclosures that a "permanent mission" of the Communist Vietcong has been welcomed to Cairo. This cell is to become an infection center for the Vietcong—the assailants of South Vietnam—through all the Middle East and Africa to the South.

Mr. White's clear analysis of the situation in the Middle East should be carefully studied. It is no mere coincidence, in the light of events in southeast Asia, that Nasser is taking this moment to blackmail the United States. But the amazing thing is that the United States continues to enable Egypt, through our supplies of food under Public Law 480, to carry on its reckless militarism in Yemen, as well as to carry on other aggressive policies and acts in every way hostile to the purposes of the United States—a long list which the junior Senator from Alaska has long repeatedly cited on the floor of the Senate. Nasser has continued to do so with impunity for so long now that he must come to the conclusion that the United States will continue its policy of folly indefinitely.

It is well that Columnist William S. White points out at this time that Nasser is and has been Russia's cats-paw and is playing Russia's game in the Middle East. It is clear that our financial aid, which should have ceased long ago, should now be cut off.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by William S. White in the Washington Post for May 14, 1966, and the news stories on events in Cairo appearing in the New York Times for May 14 and May 16, 1966, be printed in the RECORD in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1966]

CONFRONTING NASSER: RECENT EVENTS POINT TO ONE

(By William S. White)

A slow gathering of events and omens suggests that an American showdown with the bad man of North Africa, Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt, may not much longer be deferred.

President Nasser's eager thralldom to international communism has long been a fact of life. But it is now becoming so open, so notorious and so deliberately provocative toward the West as to threaten a new and perhaps a decisive political crisis in the Middle East.

Nasser's close friendship with the Russians has just been underlined in conferences with Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union held simultaneously with disclosures that a "permanent mission" of the Communist Vietcong has been welcomed to Cairo. This cell is to become an infection center for the Vietcong—the assailants of South Vietnam—through all the Middle East and Africa to the South.

Again simultaneously, Nasser press organs threaten the United States that should it dare to discontinue economic aid to Egypt "an extremely grave situation" for us would open in the Middle East.

This is blackmail of an exceptionally insolent kind, even for Nasser, and it is difficult to see how the almost infinitely patient U.S. State Department can further avoid accepting his challenge.

The whole long effort of the United States has been to placate Nasser; not, of course, for his own sake but simply in the desperate hope of keeping some kind of peace, however tenuous, in the Middle East. The maintenance of what Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara calls "a delicate balance" has been the objective.

It has been an objective pursued through three American Administrations with matchless tolerance toward a man whose grandiose expansionist dreams have kept pro-Western Israel in constant fear and have subjected Yemen to much the sort of Nasser-inspired "war of liberation" that is now torturing the South Vietnamese in Asia.

Not the least of the indications that a time may be coming when action against Nasser will become absolutely unavoidable is the forthcoming visit to Washington of King Faisal of Saudi Arabia.

Faisal is expected here on June 21 and it may be assumed that among his purposes will be to discuss the state of his efforts to raise up an Islamic grouping to fight Nasser's increasingly overt attempts to range the whole of the Moslem world on the side of international communism.

King Faisal himself is an incontestably good Arab who is not anti-Nasser because Nasser alleges himself to be engaged upon social reform but rather because Nasser has become an undeniable accomplice of communism in the Middle East. The King is thus an important adversary. He could become an irresistible one if he is indeed to be able really to rally a big bloc of the Arabs against Nasser's attempt to sell out the ancient religious culture of Islam to the antireligious importation of Russian and Chinese communism.

It is impossible to know or effectively to guess on this side of the world how much of a counterforce Faisal can in fact be expected to raise up. The available bits and pieces, however, do indicate that Nasser himself knows that all is not going well with him.

His military campaign against Yemen has bogged down, before the memorably courageous resistence to his Communist-supplied tanks of barefoot Yemeni riflemen still loyal to their old tribal monarchy. His propaganda grows more shrill. And it may be that even his klieglit act of drawing closer to Moscow is itself an indication of fear and growing weakness.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, May 14, 1966]

CAIRO INTENSIFIES ANTI-U.S. ATTACKS—SPOKESMAN CALLS AMITY WITH WASHINGTON IMPOSSIBLE

(By Hedrick Smith)

CAIRO, May 13.—The United Arab Republic stepped up its press campaign against the United States today. It said that friendship with Washington was not possible because it "wants agents and not friends" in the underdeveloped world.

Mohammed Hassanein Heikal, President Gamal Abdel Nasser's chief unofficial spokesman, declared in his weekly column in the newspaper Al Ahram that Washington's use of "a policy of force and blind pressures" ruled out political and economic cooperation on an equal footing.

His and other attacks in the press followed charges in a speech last night by Premier Alexei N. Kosygin of the Soviet Union that Western aid to developing nations carried political strings while Communist assistance was unconditional and based on mutual respect.

After inspecting the High Dam at Aswan, which is being built with massive Soviet assistance, Mr. Kosygin chided the West for withdrawing its offers to help finance the project and cited this as an example of Western attempts at political pressure.

MORE TALKS WITH NASSER

Today the Soviet leader, here on an eight-day state visit, toured Soviet-aided land reclamation projects in Liberation Province and went to Alexandria for more political talks with President Nasser.

The new anti-American propaganda campaign began a few days before Premier Kosygin's arrival and sent Egyptian-American relations into a new tailspin.

It was the second time that Cairo had chosen to attack the United States vehemently while a prominent Soviet visitor was in Egypt. In December, 1964, in the presence of Alexander N. Shelepin, one of the Kremlin's inner circle, President Nasser told Washington to "drink seawater" because of irritations over American aid policies.

Western diplomats have been puzzled by the latest anti-American turn of Egyptian policy, which follows months of improving relations. Some analysts see it as an outburst of frustration caused by Mr. Nasser's sense of political isolation in the Arab world and Africa.

Other analysts speculated that Cairo had been deeply irritated by Washington's refusal for the time being to enter negotiations on the latest Egyptian request for more American aid. About a month ago the United Arab Republic asked for $150-million worth of surplus food for the year beginning July 1, after the present aid agreement expires.

In his most stridently anti-American editorial in months Mr. Heikal indicated that he was inclined, despite official denials, to believe a report that the United States did not intend to renew the aid.

Mr. Heikal also accused Washington of trying to set up King Faisal of Saudi Arabia, and before him former King Saud, as "Pope of Islam" and of trying to develop Saudi Arabia as a "counterpoise" to President Nasser's power in the Middle East.

"Outside the Western world the U.S.A. wants agents and not friends," Mr. Heikal declared in his column, "and even in the Western world, where the U.S.A. accepts friendship, it has not been able so far to take itself to the idea of friendship on an equal footing. The stands of General de Gaulle are considered a concrete proof."

Other press articles today ridiculed Washington's explanation of American arms sales in the Middle East and reiterated earlier accusations, denied by Tunisia, that the United States had secretly negotiated with President Habib Bourguiba for use of the Tunisian naval base at Bizerte.

START OF LATEST CAMPAIGN

Cairo's latest war of words with Washington was triggered by President Nasser's May Day speech in which the Egyptian leader threatened to invade Saudi Arabia if provoked. The Egyptian press later described the United States as instigator of Saudi "aggression" against Yemen.

Mr. Nasser also threatened to begin development of an atomic bomb because Israel was allegedly doing so, and in a welcoming speech for Premier Kosygin he condemned the United States for "horrifying aggression" in Vietnam.

This followed his defense of Chinese Communist policy in an interview with an Indian journalist and his comparison of American policy in Vietnam to the attack on Egypt in 1956 by Britain and France and Israel. Recently the Vietcong were allowed to expand their political representation here.

When press dispatches from Washington reported American irritation over such charges and suggested that the future of American aid to the United Arab Republic was teetering, Cairo responded with a warning that a cutoff in aid would lead to a "grave situation" in the Middle East.

Some Soviet officials have indicated private concern that Cairo might push Washington too far and provoke the ending of the aid program.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1966]

NASSER ATTACKS PRO-WEST ARABS—KOSYGIN VOWS HELP IN FIGHT AGAINST IMPERIALISM

(By Hedrick Smith)

CAIRO, May 15.—President Gamal Abdel Nasser threatened today to mount an armed struggle, if necessary, to defeat the "reactionary-imperialist alliance" facing Arab nationalism.

He received a prompt pledge of support for his "struggle against imperialism" from the visiting Soviet Premier, Alexei N. Kosygin.

The Egyptian President, speaking at a luncheon in Port Said in honor of the Soviet leader, couched his threat in general terms. But he appeared to be directing it against efforts by King Faisal of Saudi Arabia to rally the conservative leaders of the Middle East under the Islamic banner.

Both President Nasser's threat and Premier Kosygin's response arose as a result of their references to the "defeat of imperialism" during the British-French-Israeli attack on Egypt in 1956.

NASSER SEES NEW THREAT

"We know you form the vanguard of the alliance of reactionary forces against the independence of the Arab nation," President Nasser declared. "But the Arab nation, as it conquered imperialism in 1956, will once again conquer imperialism and reaction even if it has to resort to armed struggle."

President Nasser's threat drew the first moderately aggressive remarks from Mr. Kosygin during his six days in Egypt.

"We know you form the vanguard of the struggle against imperialism," the Soviet Premier told his host. "You can rest assured the Soviet people will always stand by your side."

Port Said was considered a likely site for such speeches,, having been a key battleground in 1956. The two leaders had gone there to lay wreaths at the memorial in Martyrs Square to Egyptian casualties of the attack.

President Nasser told Mr. Kosygin that the Egyptian people, especially the citizens of Port Said, would never forget Soviet support in 1956, "which encouraged us and all progressive forces resisting imperialism everywhere."

He was alluding to Moscow's threat of retaliation against London if the British and French did not call off their attack on Egypt. He made no mention of United States pressures on London and Paris to withdraw.

Earlier as the two leaders arrived at Port Said on President Nasser's yacht after an overnight voyage from Alexandria, they were greeted by a mile-long procession of fishing boats and tugs carrying flag-waving seamen and workers.

The Soviet Premier was reported to have shown interest in the operation of the Suez Canal and Port Said, and to have extended an offer to help the Egyptian shipbuilding program.

Mr. Kosygin was quoted by Egyptian sources as having told the director of the Suez Canal Authority, Mashour Ahmed Mashour, "If you want help in building ships, we are ready to cooperate with you."

The Soviet delegation had been expected by Western diplomats to discuss with the Egyptions a possible long-term arrangement for servicing of Soviet Navy vessels at Egyptian ports. Some Soviet warships have made calls at Egyptian ports in recent months, but it is believed that this was done on an individual basis and that the Russians would like to see it regularized.

After a four-hour visit in Port Said, the two leaders returned to Cairo by train.

WE SHOULD HAVE DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH OUTER MONGOLIA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it was reported in the Washington Post of May 10 that the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] in an interview with the Associated Press urged that the United States recognize the Communist Government of the Peoples Republic of Mongolia, commonly termed Outer Mongolia. I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the majority leader. Extending diplomatic recognition to Outer Mongolia would provide our Nation with a strategic outpost in one of the most vital, yet relatively unknown, areas of the world. Here indeed is an opportunity to establish another listening post in the heart of Communist Asia.

Outer Mongolia, a country of little more than one million people, is landlocked between the two greatest powers of the Communist world—Soviet Russia and Red China. It shares an 1,800-mile border with the Soviet Union in the north and a 2,500-mile border with China on the east, south, and west. To a great extent the people of Mongolia depend upon the capital, trade, and labor of these countries for recently initiated industrial development. However, it is generally conceded that Outer Mongolia is within the Russian sphere of influence and that its Nationalist Communist rulers have allied themselves with the Soviet Communist leaders in the power struggle between the Russians and Chinese.

In spite of its economic dependency, Outer Mongolia has developed a spirit of intense nationalism and pride in a rich history and tradition stretching back over centuries. At one time Mongolian armies under Genghis Khan controlled a vast empire reaching from Northern Siberia to Tibet and from the Pacific Ocean to the Caspian Sea. After Genghis Khan's death, Mongolian sovereignty gradually declined. Eventually the country was split into the two Mongolias of today—the nation of Outer Mongolia, and Inner Mongolia, which is now a Chinese province.

Outer Mongolia's economy is primarily agrarian. Indeed, this country enjoys the distinction of holding first place in the world in the number of domestic animals per capita. Moreover, it is a land rich in natural resources such as gold, copper, and other precious metals. Leaders of the nation of Outer Mongolia are eager to establish an industrial base for their country so that their nation may leap into the 20th century and end its reliance and dependence on Russian capital and Chinese labor. The United States and Outer Mongolia will both benefit from a diplomatic exchange and the establishment of formal channels of communication. We have few friends and fewer allies in that remote part of the world.

There are clear indications that the rulers of Outer Mongolia are desirous of establishing diplomatic relations with the United States. I agree with the distinguished majority leader that our recognition of that nation would help prevent its complete submergence into the Communist bloc, would contribute toward a relaxation of international tensions, and would give us a valuable listening post in that part of the world.

We Americans have nothing whatever to lose. We would have much to gain were we to offer diplomatic relations with the independent country of Outer Mongolia. It may be that the Mongolians have products about which we do not know. It may be there are furs and even minerals which American businessmen would like to import. Furthermore, undoubtedly there are products of American farms and factories which Mongolia needs and which we would like to sell for gold paid to us at world prices.

Far more important than trade would be the fact that Outer Mongolia, if we were to have an embassy in Ulan Bator, its capital, with an ambassador in charge and an office force, not only would provide a listening post for us but would be an open window for our country, enabling us to peer into the vast area of Communist China and the Soviet Union bordering on Outer Mongolia.

We need that open window. We need the listening post. Mongolia was admitted to United Nations membership in October 1961. There is no valid reason why we should not have diplomatic relations with the Peoples Republic of Mongolia.

AGRICULTURE—FRONT AND CENTER—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on May 13 the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville Freeman, delivered an address before the National Press

Club, at one of its regular luncheons. I was present at the luncheon, and I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Secretary.

He did a splendid job, not only in presenting his prepared remarks, but also in answering the many questions that were propounded to him by members of the National Press Club. I regret that I do not have the questions and answers to place in the Record.

I ask unanimous consent that his prepared statement entitled "Agriculture: Front and Center" be placed in the body of the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AGRICULTURE: FRONT AND CENTER

Today is Friday the thirteenth. It is now the thirteenth hour of the day, and we are together on the thirteenth floor of the National Press building.

Now, before you panic, let me assure you the building is sturdy, the economy is sound, the President is confident, and I am not superstitious.

I'm like the man who overheard his wife telling her friend: "My husband had good luck on his hunting trip. He came back alive."

In my last appearance at a Press Club luncheon, more than five years ago, I described the goals I would seek to achieve as Secretary of Agriculture. They were to reverse the then rapid buildup of agricultural surpluses, to reduce the cost of those surpluses, to increase the incomes of farmers, and to insure that our food abundance was made available to those who needed it.

Many people said then that I was setting out to do the impossible. Well, here I am again * * * and still alive. If the impossible has not been achieved, it has been a good hunting trip, to say the least.

It is a good time to take a look at what is happening today in agriculture * * * and to consider some of the challenges that confront our highly productive and creative American farmer in the second half of the decade of the '60s.

Five years ago the challenge was to find some way to live with what some people thought was a too-productive agriculture—to enjoy its benefits without being drowned by its excesses.

Five years ago the farmer too often was characterized as a mendicant who produced unwanted glut in exchange for public alms.

How times have changed in five years.

Today, the American farmer holds a key position—truly, Agriculture is Front and Center—in the U.S. economy * * * in the policies of our nation as a world leader * * * in the hearts, minds, and hopes of millions of people all over the world.

Today, the American farmer is being asked to undertake an entirely new dimension of effort abroad. A large measure of hope for peace in the world depends upon his ability to furnish food for restless, hungry people * * * to buy time while scientists and agricultural technicians of our own country and other advanced countries teach the less developed regions to produce more for their own needs.

Thus it is not surprising to find a condition of great flux in America agriculture today. Uncertainty and uneasiness are always present when great changes and new challenges are being approached for the first time.

And, on a less ethereal plane, we must recognize that confusion tends to be agitated rather than ameliorated in an election year.

My listeners may take their choice in assigning responsibility—either to confusion or partisanship—for some of the following assertions, which are distressingly current:

"The interests of the farmer are being subordinated."

"Agriculture is losing its influence."

"The Administration, for political reasons, has written the farmer off and is competing for consumer votes."

I have even heard it said that the Secretary of Agriculture has forsaken the farmer. Let me tell you * * * as a source close to the subject * * * that this is like saying Koufax and Drysdale will represent the Dodgers' management next year in wage negotiations.

These, obviously, are absurdities. But there is also a deep undercurrent that stems largely from a lack of understanding * * * from an information gap that produces the urban view of agriculture in America and the way the farmer sees the challenges which he knows await the productive capacity of the land he farms.

Consider how the farmer has seen and now sees himself presented to an urban America. For nearly a decade and a half, the city press, radio and television, and the national magazines generally held the farmer synonymous with "surplus and subsidy." The farmer long has accepted the cracks about "putting my flower box in the soil bank" from the well fed urban dweller.

But six months ago, when the city press awoke to find the surpluses nearly gone, the farmer found that he had become associated with a new term—"inflation." Now that he had licked the surplus problem and had gained slightly better prices and a good boost in income, many of the same people who once charged surplus and subsidy were now accusing the farmer of inflation.

The farmer can understand the housewife's concern over food prices. Many farm wives today buy their food in the supermarket just like the wife of the factory worker, and both wish that food would take less of the family budget.

But the farmer also is aware of some facts which the urban family is not often told. Facts which rip off the "easy" labels:

- Surplus.
- Subsidy.
- Inflation.

These are the facts:

Farm prices in 1965 were 14 percent below their level in 1952. This is true even with the improvement in prices since 1960. Farm prices—and farmers—have contributed to price stability. Farm prices are not inflationary. Instead of helping to boost the cost of living, they have held it down.

If farm prices of food products had increased since 1952 to the same extent as all other products, the housewives of America in 1965 would have spent over $7 billion more for food then they did. This means that American families have $7 billion more to spend on other things.

The cost of food, in terms of the average family income, is lower today than ever before. As a nation of consumers, we spend only a little more than 18 percent of our take-home pay for food—compared with about 20 percent only five years ago. Even with higher meat prices today, the average factory worker can buy more beefsteak today with an hour of labor than in 1960.

Net farm income this year will top $15 billion—the best year since 1947 and 1948. While this level represents a 44 percent increase in income per person on the farm (since 1960), it is sobering to realize that the average farmer this year will earn only two-thirds as much as the person off the farm.

Farmers, as a group, are the biggest consumers in the nation. They consume annually more than $30 billion in goods and services—fertilizer, machinery, gas, electricity, and/or items of production.

Agriculture contributes more than any other industry to the U.S. position as a leading export nation. Farmers account for a fourth of total U.S. exports, and in the past five years have increased the dollar volume of farm exports by more than half.

So this is a brief recapitulation of American agriculture as it is, and as the farmer knows it to be. But, unfortunately, it is not generally the picture of U.S. agriculture that the urban consumer has had framed for him up to now.

But, as a pulse-taker of some experience, I see strengthening evidence, almost daily now, that the city dweller is beginning to view the agricultural picture in a new light. Not only the city dweller, I might add, but governments all over the world—governments that include our own.

Policymakers in our government * * * dealing daily with Kennedy Round negotiations, with the Common Market, with international commodity agreements, with India, with Viet Nam, with a host of hungry countries and regions * * * have come to recognize that agriculture is not a relic of the past, dwindling in scope and importance, but a subject of vibrant concern even to the industrialized nations of Europe, just as it is the "gut" issue—literally—to the hungry peoples of the food-deficit regions of the world.

And I think that many of you newsmen have come to a new realization that world hunger and expanding populations and food production and economic development are intertwined and vital to national and international policy * * * and, yes, to the very existence of people and to peace among men * * * and thus an important story to tell.

Our domestic agriculture has an impressive story to tell, too. Five years ago, the American people wondered if mountainous surpluses of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, and other commodities could ever be mastered. Today, those surpluses have all but disappeared, and, looking into the future, we have had to ask for some production increases in order to maintain adequate reserves. To this end, already, we have taken recent actions that will result in larger production of wheat, soybeans, and dairy products.

Given generally favorable weather in the 1966 growing season, farm output promises to be at record levels. Farm prices are stronger today than at any time in the past six years. Moreover, we now have—with passage of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, which was the end product of five years of struggle—a major legislative tool for use in achieving balanced production and improved farm income.

Last week's announcement of a 15 percent increase in the 1967 wheat allotment was an example of the new flexibility and adaptiveness of our great agricultural production plant. With this adjustability, we are able to use land or to conserve land, as domestic and export requirements demand * * * and we can do it without accruing costly surpluses to burden the taxpayer and depress farm income.

As a result, the outlook for the American farmer—who in the past was ever the low man on the economic totem people—is the brightest within memory.

Concurrently, events around the world have made it increasingly and dramatically clear that agriculture, far from being relegated to an inferior status, stands front and center on the global stage.

To put it simply, the world is in a race against famine—the awesome grindstone of too many people against too little food—and the American farmer holds the key to whether there will be time enough to avoid disaster.

The American people often take agriculture for granted—and forget that they live in a world where most people are bound to an agrarian economy. Many of these people live and die knowing no other achievement than providing just enough food each day to sustain themselves until the next day begins.

But even this capacity to subsist is diminishing. For the past decade there has not been any large scale famine in the free world, but this condition has prevailed only because of the American farmer. His productivity, shared through the programs established by PL 480, has provided a safety valve to relieve the pressure of the food population grindstone.

In recent months, however, we have witnessed in India how close these stones of famine have pushed together. One poor crop year has threatened that nation with the grim reality of famine, and only a massive commitment by this country to supply grain has helped to avert a tragedy. It is a unique event, for never before has one nation committed so large a share of its food producing resources to the welfare of the people of another country.

Thus India demonstrates that we do not have much time, as history is measured.

This shift has been gradual, so gradual that the warnings have been largely ignored by a world preoccupied with man's race into space and the dread of a cold war turning hot.

But in looking back over the past 25 years, the changes are more visible. A generation ago, North America was only 1 of 6 food exporting regions. Latin America was the leading export region, exceeding the combined total of North America, Africa and Asia.

Today, however, North America and Oceania—Australia and New Zealand—are the only consistent exporting regions. Latin America, plagued by a runaway growth in population, is struggling to remain self-sufficient. Eastern Europe, which exported 5 million tons of grain a generation ago, now must import some 14 million tons each year. Asia and Africa both must import food to live.

North America—Canada and the U.S.—have emerged as the breadbasket of the world. The Russian people, with biting humor, once called Khrushchev the world's greatest farmer because he could plant wheat in Kazakstan and harvest it in Alberta and Kansas.

North America exports over 60 million tons of grain a year, with the U.S. supplying about three-fourths of the total. We could easily increase the volume to over 100 million tons—and the day may soon come when we must.

The implications of this shift in the flow of world food trade are both frightening and reassuring. If the power over food is the power over life and death, then food is an instrument of power as ultimate as the hydrogen bomb itself.

Thus, the productive capacity of the American farmer has given the American people an instrument for world peace of enormous potential. We do not yet fully appreciate this fact. However, these nations aware of the threat of hunger now recognize the Achilles' heel of communism is its incapacity to feed its people; and we are beginning to recognize food as a powerful instrument by which this country can demonstrate its dedication to works of peace and freedom.

This is the purpose and goal of the Food for Freedom program which President Johnson recommended this year to the Congress. With it, we will assist those countries seeking to develop an economy which will raise the standard of living of its people * * * by using our food supplies to avert starvation * * * and by providing technical aid and assistance to help them modernize their agriculture.

The President's strategy in the war on world hunger has three elements: We will use our food to buy time, we will help those countries where food is sent to modernize their agriculture and move along the road of economic development, and we will assist those coutnries to undertake more intensive programs in family planning. All three are essential to each other.

Let me emphasize that the tide we face is running swiftly. In the next 15 years the world must make room for another billion people, and fully three-fourths of them will be living in the regions already short of food.

I am confident that we can succeed, and I am grateful that the success of American agriculture enables us to make the effort rather than to sit helplessly in sorrow.

No nation before us has faced so massive a challenge, for at no other time in the history of civilization has any nation possessed the capacity, skill and forewarning to undertake a responsibility as great.

This is the new dimension of effort—the real challenge to abundance—which the American people must accept.

We have shown that abundance can be managed * * * that food and fiber can be provided in unparalleled volume at fair prices * * * and that the farmer can earn a decent income for his labor and skill.

But that is only the first step. It is no more than getting our house in order. The second step will prove more difficult, for it will require that we sustain the productivity and the economic health of our agriculture while we apply its power to the war on world hunger.

We have already begun to meet this challenge. Last week's wheat announcement by the President alerted both the farmer and the business and industrial complex which supports him to the job ahead.

The farmer now must lead this country in a lasting victory in the war on world hunger, and the danger I see is not that he lacks the capacity or skill * * * the danger is that an urban nation may find it more comfortable to look at agriculture in terms of easy cliches—"surplus, subsidy, inflation"—and fail to recognize the new dimension of effort that is required.

AIRLINE LIMITS OF LIABILITY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, since 1929 and up to the present time, the heirs of American citizens killed in aviation accidents on international routes could recover no more than $8,300. Moreover, if the airline involved could show that it was not at fault, the unfortunate family would not receive anything at all. This is a situation I discussed in the Senate almost a year and a half ago.

Because of tough bargaining over the last few months by the Department of State other agencies and the airlines there is now a radical change in this situation.

All major international airlines serving the United States now agree that they will pay damages up to $75,000 for each passenger killed or injured in an air crash. Moreover, they will no longer have the opportunity to try to show that a particular accident was not their fault. The governments concerned have supported their airlines in the $75,000 offer. The proposal means that an American citizen, injured in an air accident, would be able to recover a sum of up to $75,000 anywhere in the world against most international airlines. He would no longer have the onerous chore of proving that the airline was at fault, but would merely be required to prove the damages which he has suffered. This will greatly reduce costs of litigation. Such an arrangement represents a substantial improvement over the existing situation.

There has been a good deal of misunderstanding about the proposal which the airlines and the many foreign governments have made, and some of these misconceptions have found their way into our press. One misunderstanding is that the $75,000 represents an insurance figure, and that all passengers would be automatically insured for $75,000. As a result of this misunderstanding, the fear has been expressed that there would be more sabotage of planes. It should be made clear that the proposal does not call for $75,000 insurance. The $75,000 amount represents a maximum award which might be made after all due consideration of the damage which has been suffered. Furthermore, neither a saboteur nor his family would be entitled to collect a penny.

Other nations have come a long way to meet the point of view of the United States on aircraft liability limits. At the conference held in Montreal in February, and since then, they told the United States that they would be satisfied with liability limits far lower than those which we have proposed. In order to keep the United States in the international aviation community, they have, however, agreed virtually unanimously to the $75,000 arrangement.

The arrangement will go into effect Monday, May 16, if the United States elects prior to that time to remain in the Warsaw Convention. I believe that our election to do so is of benefit to our traveling public. It also clearly indicates that we have not abandoned our traditional stand in favor of international cooperation in resolution of problems.

PROPOSED CUTBACK IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM MIGHT MEAN NO FEDERAL MILK FOR NEEDY CHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some time ago I had an opportunity to discuss the administration's proposed Child Nutrition Act with the Department of Agriculture representatives appearing before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. As my colleagues know so well, this legislative proposal, if enacted, would mean an 80-percent cut in the special milk program for schoolchildren.

Two categories of children would be eligible for assistance under the cutback proposal. First the subsidized milk would go to children in schools without a lunch program. Second, free milk would go to the needy.

During the hearing I discussed the question of priorities under the new proposal with Mr. Howard Davis, Deputy Administrator for Consumer Food Program. I would like to read part of that discussion into the RECORD today:

> Senator PROXMIRE. Now, for these schools with no school lunch programs, the milk will not be free, but it will be made available on the basis of the Federal Government paying a certain proportion of the cost and the student paying the remainder, or the school district paying the remainder; is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Senator PROXMIRE. The second category is $11 million (for the needy). The $10 million (for schools without a lunch program) that I talked about is on the same basis as we have at the present time.

You think your figures are sufficiently accurate, your responses, I think, are helpful, but I am not sure they indicate complete confidence in your figures. Will $10 million do the job for sure? In other words supposing it is going to take $15 million or even $20 million to provide for schools (without a lunch program). This would mean nothing would be left over for the needy. Isn't that correct?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

In other words, the thrust of the testimony is that first priority under the Child Nutrition Act goes to children in schools without a lunch program. If the demand was great enough, the entire $21 million provided for school milk under the proposed act would go to these children. None would go to the needy. Yet it seems to me that the whole justification for the cutback proposal is that priority must be given to children who cannot afford to buy their own milk at school.

The Department of Agriculture, of course, feels it is highly unlikely that the entire $21 million would go to children in schools without a lunch program. Let us look at the figures. The Department estimates that $10 million can provide a school milk subsidy for 2 million children at schools without a lunch program of any kind. Yet the Department, itself, estimates that 9,277,000 children would attend such schools. Even assuming that half of these children were in rural areas without a readily accessible supply of fluid milk, we would still find more than 4½ million children who could qualify to receive first priority on milk under the Child Nutrition Act. These children would more than account for the $21 million the act would provide.

NEBRASKANS ARE CHALLENGED TO ACCENTUATE ARBOR DAY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the spring of each year, Nebraska observes Arbor Day at the home of its founder, J. Sterling Morton, in Nebraska City. For some years, following the example of the late Congressman J. Hyde Sweet, it has been my custom to call attention to this important holiday and salute those who are carrying on this fine tradition.

This past Sunday, May 15, was designated Arbor Day Sunday this year. Principal speaker at the ceremony was Mr. Frank W. Mueller, a former Nebraska City resident, who is now an executive of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce here in Washington.

Mr. Mueller gave his former townsmen a good-natured scolding for hiding their light under a bushel and asked the question:

> Could it be possible that other States are doing more to publicize Arbor Day than is the State that originated it?

He urged his listeners to go out into all parts of the country and accentuate Arbor Day.

It is, Mr. President, a holiday well worth accentuating.

Today, all but one of our 50 States recognizes Arbor Day with appropriate tree-planting ceremonies. While not a national holiday, it is a nationwide one.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of Mr. Mueller's challenging remarks, together with an article from the April 17 edition of the New York Times, headlined, "Arbor Day Proposes for the Future."

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCENTUATING ARBOR DAY

(Address by Frank W. Mueller, manager, State Chamber of Commerce Service Department, U.S. Chamber of Commerce)

There are so many celebrities here that I fear I'm going to miss acknowledging some of them, but I do want to pay homage to Queen Jean and the ruling monarch, King Charles of Ak-Sar-Ben.

I want to recognize Governor Morrison, Mayor Ransdell, Father Kelly (when I lived in Nebraska City, all the priests were called Bauer).

I want to extend a belated Happy Birthday wish to our Honoree, Otto Wirth,—and I want to greet Grove Porter. It was Grove Porter who, 26 years ago, persuaded me to move to Nebraska City, and, Grover, I want you to know that I am real pleased that you were so persuasive.

Oh, yes, I want to bring greetings to Joe Knoll's parents. Joe is a fine example of the young men of Nebraska, and especially Nebraska City—who come to work in the Nation's Capital. I know Joe's a good boy because he and my daughter graduated in the same class from Mrs. Bosworth's pre-kindergarten school when we lived over on Second Avenue.

In the years that I have been observing our Nation's Capitol Hill, I have always been elated over the fact that Nebraska has been represented so well in the Senate and in Congress. Just one example of how on-their-toes our people in Washington are—is the fact that Senator HRUSKA's office sent to me a fine story out of the Sunday, April 17th, New York Times, entitled "Arbor Day Proposes for the Future."

I wish there would be time for me to read the entire story. I tried to find out what prompted the author to write it, but have been unable to get the information.

An article of this kind is one that I would like to see appear in every major newspaper in America. This would be the ideal way of accentuating Arbor Day.

Arbor Day is truly a national expression of confidence in America. Few nationwide activities have added so much to the benefit and comfort of mankind, to soil and water conservation, to the beauty of the landscape, to the enjoyment of recreation, and to the food supply and protection of wild life—while at the same time, it is helping to fill the nation's wood box.

We forget that, at 22 years of age, Mr. Morton moved to this pioneer country of Nebraska—then an almost treeless area. Planting trees became almost his life's work, and he emphasized their importance in meeting wood requirements as well as in conserving soil and water.

I, for one, am proud when I walk through the Hall of Fame in our Nation's Capitol—to see that life-size statue of Julius Sterling Morton of Nebraska.

Few Otoe Countians realize that, although Arbor Day itself is of Nebraska origin—many foreign countries conduct similar tree-planting observances under appropriate titles.

Today, every State except Alaska recognizes Arbor Day through tree-planting observances tailored to its climatic requirements.

Yesterday, it took me just 4 hours and 57 minutes to fly from Washington to Omaha to be here to make this Arbor Day speech. Just imagine how much longer it took J. Sterling Morton to go from Nebraska City to Washington, D.C.—72 years ago when, as Secretary of Agriculture, he made the Arbor Day address there.

On that occasion—72 years ago—he said: "So every man, woman and child who plants trees shall be able to say on coming, as I have come, toward the evening of life, in all sincerity and truth: 'If you seek my monument, look around you.' "

I was pleased and honored when Chairman Mort Porter issued an invitation for me to come back to Nebraska City to make this speech. I'm pleased to be back home.

This is a beautiful day and one not readily given to scolding, but I feel that I should do just a little bit of scolding of you citizens of Nebraska City, you residents of Otoe County—and as far as that goes, all of you Nebraskans.

It was the New York Times article that gave me the courage to come here this beautiful Sunday to scold you.

I feel certain that during the past several winters, all of you have tuned in on your television sets to watch a program called "Bonanza".

Bonanza concerns the fictional Cartwright family and the Ponderosa Ranch near Virginia City, Nevada.

Actor Loren Green, of the series, says that at first they didn't like the Bonanza TV crowd around Virginia City, but, after thousands of tourists asked where the Cartwrights lived,—Virginia City decided to designate a certain ruin as being the old Cartwright House in Ponderosa.

If any of you have recently taken a trip from here to Hastings, Nebraska, you probably noticed some signs along the way that said, "Write a friend from Friend".

Here's a progressive little Nebraska town that is doing something with its name to encourage people to stop and linger a little while within its city limits.

If you've recently gone through central Kansas, you've probably seen signs encouraging you to stop and see the largest hand-dug well in the world at Greensburg.

What I'm trying to say is that all over this nation we find progressive cities doing everything they can to encourage tourists to visit their area. With Americans having more and more leisure time on their hands, it's only the smart business move on the part of any progressive community to encourage such visitations.

Do you residents of Nebraska City and Otoe County realize how many areas would be just overjoyed to have within their boundaries a beautiful spot like Arbor Lodge?

How proud are Nebraskans of the fact that a National Holiday originated in their very own State?

How proud are the residents of Nebraska City and Otoe County of the fact that this National Holiday not only originated in their home State of Nebraska—but that it originated in their home County—that the site of the origin of that National Holiday, Arbor Day, is marked by such a beautiful setting as Arbor Lodge.

Nebraska City—with its block house commemorating the beginning of Fort Kearney, with a log cabin which was used by John Brown, with a beautiful park given to this area by John Steinhart, with a beautiful city park like Riverview—and with a nearby Girl Scout Camp in memory of John Catron. How few Mid-Western cities of this size can claim such great distinction.

Yes, J. Sterling Morton did great honor to this fine State when he and his young bride came here from Michigan in 1855 to construct a four-room house.

In 1858, the foresighted Morton planted an orchard along with other trees and ornamental plantings. This very site, Arbor Lodge, represents one of the earliest attempts at home landscaping in Nebraska.

As President of the Washington Chapter of the Nebraska Alumni Society, I must mention the fact that it was J. Sterling Morton who spoke at the Dedicatory Ceremonies of the University in 1871, and there he was already speaking out on proper tillage of the land.

How many of you know that January 4, 1872, was the date that J. Sterling Morton, while at the Annual Meeting of the State Horticulture Society in Lincoln, brought forth his Arbor Day Resolution,—and then, on March 31, two years later, Governor Furness issued the First Arbor Day Proclamation.

President Grover Cleveland came here in 1905 to dedicate the memorial monument here at Arbor Lodge, and on it is an inspirational inscription from the writings of Morton which we should all remember:—

"Other holidays repose upon the past; Arbor Day proposes for the future."

The Omaha World-Herald of March 27 shocked many Nebraskans with a story titled "The Blank Spot"—in reporting a study made by the Cornhusker Motor Club and its affiliates in the American Automobile Association.

This raises the question:—Has the Chamber of Commerce or the Rotary Club, the City Council, or anyone ever invited Betty Malm of the Cornhusker Motor Club in Lincoln—to come visit Nebraska City and see what it really has to offer—or the people at the Omaha Automobile Club . . . or at the Kansas City Automobile Club?

Have such cities as Omaha, Lincoln, Beatrice, and Nebraska City banded together to bring to this City the travel editors from the Kansas City Star, the Denver Post, the Minneapolis Tribune, the Des Moines Register—to see that they find out about the fine attractions we have in this area,—so that they can write such stories as Mr. Sowder did in the New York Times?

How much real backing have the citizens of this County given to Virgil Pitstick, who is Chairman of the Arbor Day Committee of the Nebraska Centennial?

The planting of a tree from Arbor Lodge on the Capitol lawns of all fifty States is a wonderful idea.

Planting a tree on the State Capitol lawn next year with the Caravan coming to Nebraska City—is a fine plan.

Those of you who are members of civic clubs, of sportsmen's organizations, of women's clubs, Girl Scout leaders, Boy Scout leaders—what have you been doing personally to encourage your national organization to do more about Arbor Day?

I note that Sevrin Sorensen is a member of the Committee that planned this day, so I'm sure that The Future Farmers of America have been made well aware of this activity.

How much have you encouraged the Nebraska State Conservation Department to assist with Arbor Day exercises in other States?

Arbor Day makes many people tree-conscious at least once a year, but many more need to be brought into this picture.

Let me challenge the school systems of this County. Are you ahead of Red Wing, Minnesota?

Up in Red Wing, there's been an outstanding annual Arbor Day event since the early 1940's. Here the soil conservation district plantings near this City stabilize the soil and are also sources of forest products.

The farmers buy the small trees and organized groups of high school students voluntarily spend a half day planting these trees on the slopes too steep to farm.

Could it be possible that other States are doing more to publicize Arbor Day than is the State that originated it?

The National Association of Travel Organizations each year gives top Awards. An Award was given to the Georgia State Chamber of Commerce. I talked Mrs. Mozelle Christian, of the Georgia staff, out of one of these kits. I'm going to leave it with Mort Porter for use by his fine Committee.

Let's resolve right here and now that each and every one of us here who is—or ever has been—a Nebraska Citian—a resident of Otoe County—will make it his prime responsibility to see to it that every Nebraskan is made aware of Arbor Day,—and then encourage all Cornhuskers to go out into all parts of the country and "Accentuate Arbor Day."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1966]

Arbor Day Proposes for the Future

(By A. M. Sowder)

Visitors to Arbor Lodge State Park near Nebraska City, Nebr., will see inscribed on a monument to Julius Sterling Morton, United States Secretary of Agriculture from 1893 to 1897 and founder of Arbor Day, these words: ". . . Other Holidays Repose upon the Past; Arbor Day Proposes for the Future." The inscription, taken from Morton's writings is a reminder of the days each year when all America, and other countries as well, plant trees.

"Arbor Day, U.S.A." is truly a national expression of confidence in America. Few nation-wide activities have added so much to the benefit and comfort of mankind, to soil and water conservation, to the beauty of the landscape, to the enjoyment of recreation and to the food supply and protection of wildlife, while at the same time helping to fill the Nation's woodbox.

PIONEER PLANTER

Julius Sterling Morton was born in Adams, N.Y., on April 22, 1832, and received his education in Michigan. Thus he grew up in an environment of trees, and he appreciated them. At 22, Morton moved to the pioneer country of Nebraska, then an almost treeless area. He was employed as a journalist in Nebraska city and became a homesteader. He was later appointed a member of the State Board of Agriculture.

Planting trees became almost his life's work, and he emphasized their importance in meeting wood requirements as well as in conserving soil and water. In 1872, Morton's resolution that the citizens of Nebraska devote a special day (April 10) to the planting of trees was passed. He referred to it as Arbor Day (Tree Day). It is reported that more than a million trees were planted in Nebraska that first Arbor Day year. In 1885, the Nebraska State Legislature made the day a legal holiday and set aside April 22 for its continued annual observance. Nebraska has since become known as a great tree-planting state.

EARLY JOINERS

Kansas and Tennessee accepted the Arbor Day idea in 1875 and Minnesota in 1876. The American Forest Congress in 1833 passed a resolution recommending that Arbor Day be observed in schools throughout the country. That year Ohio proclaimed its first Arbor Day and the public schools of Cincinnati first observed the event. The National Education Association adopted a similar resolution tne next year.

From these beginnings, Arbor Day has become a definite part of the civic and educational program for American youngsters and adults. By instilling a love for trees, encouraging their planting and stressing the interrelationships of trees, soil, plants, water, forage, recreation and wildlife, we are helping to conserve much needed resources for future generations.

The Hall of Fame in the nation's Capitol displays a lifesize statue of "Julius Sterling Morton, Nebraska." On Nebraska's Arbor Day, April 22, 1932, the United States Government issued a two-cent commemorative postage stamp to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the holiday, and the centennial of the birth of its founder.

HISTORIC AREA

Morton's former Nebraska home is now Arbor Lodge State Park and serves as a museum of natural history. The surrounding grounds are an arboretum, containing about 140 species of trees and shrubs. And the millions of trees Americans plant annually on Arbor Days are living memorials to his early foresight.

In 1887, Arbor Day became an international movement when the education system in Ontario instituted it as a tree-and-flower-planting day. Canada's action was closely followed by Spain and soon the British Empire, France and Norway adopted it. One country reports a person uses the wood produced by 300 mature trees in a lifetime. This could serve as a tree-planting target for each American.

In Rome in 1951, a conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations recognized "the need of arousing mass consciousness of the esthetic, physical, and economic value of trees." It recommended a "World Festival of the Trees to be celebrated annually in each member country on a date suited to local conditions." Though Arbor Day itself is of American origin, many foreign countries conduct similar tree-planting observances under appropriate titles.

NATIONAL PROJECT

Today, every state except Alaska recognizes Arbor Day through tree-planting observances tailored to its climatic requirements. Generally, a state legislature sets aside a specific day, or the event is designated by governor's proclamation or by the state's department of education. Due to the great variation in climate throughout the country, a uniform date is not practicable. One-third of the states including New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut have selected the last Friday in April. Other dates are earlier, some later.

The southern states have fall or winter days. Hawaii observes a day in November. While not listed as a national legal holiday, Arbor Day is national in scope.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Usually, interested civic-minded citizens, service clubs, sportsmen's organizations, women's clubs, churches, and schools, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, 4–H clubs or Future Farmers, cooperating with county agents or state conservation or forestry departments, initiate and assist with Arbor Day exercises. Frequently, the observances touch off a week of general conservation activities. Thus Arbor Day helps plant the seed of natural resource conservation in the minds of millions. Its activities make many people tree-conscious at least once a year.

Tree-planting projects can take many forms. Trees may be planted for community, family, school and church forests, conservation plantings, beauty to the landscape, recreation areas, windbreaks and shelterbreaks, Christmas tree plantations, wildlife plantings, watershed protection or roadside and highway plantings. Other possibilities are trees dedicated to specific causes such as memorials. The memory of many of our presidents, statesmen, governors, war heroes, conservationists and others has thus been honored.

The planted school forests of Michigan and Wisconsin are proven enterprises. These provide income to the rural communities while helping to meet national wood requirements. The soil conservation district plantings near Red Wing, Minn., while stabilizing the soil are also sources of forest products. Here farmers buy the small trees and organized groups of high school students voluntarily spend a half-day hand-planting trees on slopes too steep to farm.

This has been an outstanding annual Arbor Day event since the early 1940's.

PLANNING THE ENVIRONMENT

The selection of trees to be planted is important. They should be in harmony with existing plans and laws, satisfy quarantine regulations and certainly be adapted to local climatic and soil conditions. State foresters, the United States Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, extension service and consulting foresters, county agents and local nurserymen are always glad to help out. They will provide guidance in planting the trees, supply tools, and arrange for the trees' subsequent maintenance.

ARTS FOR ALL: A RISING TIDE IN AMERICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when the arts and humanities bill passed the Senate last year, I stated that the act would offer encouragement to increased nongovernmental financing of activity in the arts and humanities.

Of course, it is too early to draw any conclusions on this point, but it appears that interest in the arts, away from the established centers like New York, is already on the upswing. Indeed, Howard Taubman, in the May 16 New York Times, states:

> The 1960's seem certain to become the decade in which the arts in this country achieved the broad, democratic base that the prophets had long talked about.

Mr. Taubman cites a project in my State, the Globe Theater in Odessa, a lovely reincarnation of the theater of Shakespeare's time. The people of Odessa are making extensive plans to put this facility to many creative uses.

This increased activity in the arts is a good example of how sound governmental support can motivate latent interest and initiate a reaction which, through the real interest of the people, results in developments of far greater magnitude than can be accounted for by the governmental support alone. This, I believe, will be increasingly true of the arts as time goes by. The work of the National Endowment for the Arts, I predict, will help create a new environment in which the arts in America will flourish.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Taubman's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1966]

ARTS FOR ALL: A RISING TIDE IN AMERICA

(By Howard Taubman)

The nineteen-sixties seem certain to become the decade in which the arts in this country achieved the broad, democratic base that the prophets had long talked about.

For the first time in American history there is a determined drive to make them available to people everywhere, regardless of income level, remoteness from metropolitan centers, their ages and previous exposure. For the first time huge amounts of Government money are being spent to bring children in the schools in direct contact with music, drama, dance, and the visual arts.

To this observer, who has visited large and small communities in the Northeast, the South, the Midwest and the Southwest in recent weeks, the artistic tide is rising and there is no telling how far and deep it will spread.

The forces that are bringing about this cultural revolution are many: civic pride, economics, affluence, greater educational opportunities, the new leisure, higher aspirations for the life of the mind and the spirit and the discovery by countless Americans of the exaltations and consolations to be found in a play or a poem, a symphony or a painting.

Consider the element of civic pride. A good many large cities and some small ones are eager to be in the swim and to have their own cultural institutions like New York's Lincoln Center and Los Angeles's Music Center. But some, like Atlanta, which is about to start building one, have really urgent need for such facilities to provide proper accommodation for their music and drama.

In Atlanta the most important business leaders, men like Robert Woodruff of Coca-Cola, and Richard C. Rich of Rich's Department Store, are in the vanguard of those pushing for a new arts center.

In Kansas City, where a plan to build a new theater and establish a repertory company has been hanging fire for months, a decisive meeting called by Mayor Ilus W. Davis took place last week. A businessman, William Deramus, president of Kansas City Southern Railways, made the first substantial offer of funds with a pledge of $75,000.

His friends describe Mr. Deramus as anything but "a culture type." Like other local businessmen, he wants the new theater to be downtown rather than on the campus of the University of Missouri in Kansas City. Merchants and bankers are eager to revive downtown Kansas City.

They are paying close heed to the contention of those backing a theater with a fine professional company that it will attract more visitors to the city than the Chiefs, the professional football team. They may well accede to the suggestion of Homer C. Wadsworth, president of the school board, that the downtown groups should raise half of the $4 million needed for the theater.

But to talk with business leaders in Georgia and Missouri, North Carolina and Texas, is to learn that these people are not latter-day, prosperous Babbitts who have simply latched on to Apollo and Dionysius as a good commercial thing. Even among men not deeply versed in the arts one finds a high regard for quality.

PURCELL AND KANSAS CITY

A desire for excellence is behind the pride that Winston-Salem, N.C., takes in the new North Carolina School of the Arts, which is giving serious professional training.

A desire for outstanding standards is behind the program of the Performing Arts Foundation of Kansas City, which last year did a handsome revival of Handel's "Julius Caesar" and this month will offer a tribute to Purcell, including a special ballet starring Dame Margot Fonteyn, the great British ballerina.

For three performances of "the Purcell parcel," which will include his opera, "Dido and Aeneas," and a new symphonic piece by Virgil Thomson, the Performing Arts Foundation is spending more than $150,000. The money has been raised by local subscription.

The aim is not only to produce a notable evening of music, dance, and theater but, in the words of Mrs. R. Crosby Kemper, Jr., whose husband is a banker, to show another image of Kansas City than the outworn one of a dull gateway to endless farming and grazing lands.

Residents of Kansas City point to the vigorous contemporary orientation of the outstanding Nelson Gallery as further proof of the brisk modernism in their town.

At a session of the Friends of Art, 460 men and women discussed paintings by Arshile Gorky, Jackson Pollock, and Robert Rauschenberg and voted by a sizable majority to purchase Gorky's "Housatonic," described without irony as "vaguely a landscape."

GLOBE THEATER, ODESSA, TEX.

The element of local pride in cultural achievement is strong in smaller communities. In Odessa, Tex., where a schoolteacher, Mrs. Marjorie Morris, and an architect, J. Ellsworth Powell, virtually foisted a lovely reincarnation of Shakespeare's Globe theater on the town, the citizens are girding themselves to make broad, creative use of the unexpected facility.

In St. Joseph, Mo., some days ago this itinerant observer attended the gala opening of a new municipal museum, the Albrecht Gallery. What was once a handsome residence on a four-acre site has been converted into an agreeable museum. The building was presented to the town by its private owners, and the local Art League raised more than $100,000 for renovations and for the start of museum activities.

Even more striking than the museum itself is the philosophy it has adopted. Realizing that it cannot expect with its limited means to find old masters as a basis for a permanent collection, it has opted for contemporary American art.

Its inaugural exhibition is devoted to the paintings and drawings of Wayne Thiebaud, a painter who is on the faculty of the Davis campus of the University of California. Mr. and Mrs. Thiebaud came from the West, and his dealers, Mr. and Mrs. Allan Stone, from New York to attend the opening festivities in St. Joseph.

BLACK-TIE AND CHAMPAGNE

The town turned the opening into a black-tie event. It held a gala dinner at the principal hotel. It served champagne to all comers at the Albrecht Gallery opening.

It was difficult to assess the reactions of the solid citizens of St. Joseph to Mr. Thiebaud's art, which has a strong leavening of pop influence and an unexpected conservatism and solidity of figure draftsmanship, especially in the drawings. There was obvious astonishment at the literalism of the purely pop examples and perhaps some puzzlement at the stark, white background affected by Mr. Thiebaud in his figure paintings.

The Albrecht Gallery decided to purchase a Thiebaud. With the advice of D. Craig Craven of the Nelson Gallery in Kansas City, who is giving part of his time to St. Joseph, the Albrecht Gallery will concentrate on further showings of new American work. Eventually it may have a distinctive contemporary collection.

The new mood in the country has produced a drive for the upgrading of orchestras. In Atlanta it is expected that within a year the salary scale will be doubled and the season will be lengthened. In Phoenix, Ariz., there is a 5-year plan for the improvement of the orchestra.

The Ford Foundation, with its munificent program to help orchestras across the country, has been partly responsible for fresh orchestral vigor in local communities. But this program could not have caught the imagination if the communities as a whole were not ready for a move forward.

YOUNG AUDIENCES, INC.

Orchestras as well as the theaters are seeking to widen their range of activities. Performances are arranged for children in the halls and auditoriums of performing companies and the companies are sending performing units into the schools.

In Kansas City the Lyric Theater, an opera company of modest financing but good taste, has arranged a specially attractive program that makes opera fresh and appealing to boys and girls. Young Audiences, Inc., which brings chamber music into the schools, is very active in this part of the country, thanks to considerable local backing.

In West Hartford, Conn., last week the school system arranged a festival of the arts in which nationally known composers, poets, dancers and actors came into the schools, illustrated their work and discussed it with the boys and girls in a week-long demonstration.

This festival was made possible by a grant from the Hartford Arts Foundation. Other exciting demonstrations of the living arts to youngsters in the schools are being arranged through grants from the Office of Education under Title III of the Federal Elementary and Secondary School Act.

The burgeoning state arts-council movement is responsible in many areas for the first appearance of professional performing ensembles. With help from the Missouri Arts Council both the St. Louis and Kansas City orchestras have been making tours into small towns.

HOSPITALITY IN BRANSON

Some weeks ago the St. Louis Symphony played in Branson, a town of about 2,500 in the Ozarks. It gave an afternoon concert for the school children and an evening concert for the adults. Both were filled, and more than 700 people were turned away in the evening.

The town not only liked the music but also took the musicians to its heart. When an orchestra on tour visits a metropolis, the conductor usually is feted, and the men drift off after the concert to have a beer on their own. In Branson the instrumentalists were invited into local homes and treated like honored visitors.

The colleges and universities are everywhere becoming centers of communal cultured activity. Just outside Phoenix on the Arizona State University campus stands one of Frank Lloyd Wright's last buildings, a concert hall and theater that has become the focal point for an expanded program in music and drama.

At the small Webster College in Webster Groves, just outside St. Louis, a new performing arts center was dedicated last week. In addition to being the college's base for an expanded fine-arts program, it will be the home for a new resident, professional acting company, which will serve St. Louis and Missouri.

Even with today's jet airplanes one can in a period of weeks only spot-check the country's cultural growth. But on the basis of what one has seen and heard in these first, tentative forays, one feels that the cultural pulse of the nation is beating strongly and likely to grow stronger.

There are dangers, of course, that new buildings will be mistaken for art, that new audiences will settle for less than high quality, that a vast democratic public will lead to a dilution of standards. But there are also breath-taking possibilities that high art, for centuries the preserve of a social and intellectual elite, will reach out and be understood by the millions.

DISGUISING THE DEBT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin of May 15, 1966, there appeared an enlightening editorial entitled "Disguising the Debt." This editorial points out the deceitful manner in which the Johnson administration is trying to camouflage the true deficit by selling Government assets and applying the proceeds to daily expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISGUISING THE DEBT

Democrats in Congress, under stern White House guidance, are rushing passage of a bill to greatly expand the sale of federal financial assets—such as college housing, small business and agricultural loans—from the government's $33 billion portfolio.

Last year, sales of such assets totaled about $1.5 billion and this year nearly $3 billion. The receipts are credited directly against expenditures in the budget. Were it not for the proposal to sell off $4.7 billion of these assets in the coming fiscal year, the budget would show a deficit of $6.5 billion instead of the modest $1.8 billion to which President Johnson pointed with such pride in his January message. Given the current low level of unemployment, high utilization of plant and the attendant inflationary pressures, any deficit at all would seem to fly in the face of sound economics, "old" or "new." A 1967 red ink figure of $6.5 billion should be unthinkable.

Yet in fact, that is the true deficit in the budget, for the device of selling off assets—or "participations" in such assets, as the Administration's scheme is called—merely amounts to borrowing outside the usual Treasury channels. And, in fact, it is more expensive than regular borrowing by anywhere from .25 to .375 percent, as the budget director himself admits.

The only reason the Administration gives for this roundabout, deceptive financing scheme is this (in the words of Treasury Under Secretary Joseph W. Barr): "We cannot justify immobilizing the dollars of the taxpayer by holding larger and larger amounts of loans when the private credit markets can and want to participate with us in our credit programs."

Of course they want to "participate!" A government-guaranteed loan paying as high as 5.5 percent is a fairly attractive investment. Just why the "taxpayer" is obligated to provide this opportunity for big investors will not be as obvious to many as it is to Mr. Barr.

But more to the point—which makes his statement quite meaningless—the asset sales program won't free any tax dollars whatever. If Congress blocked this side door borrowing, the Administration has given no hint that it would use tax receipts now committed to other programs or seek a tax boost. It would simply borrow the needed money through the front door.

The sale of these assets is nothing more than a way to disguise the true extent of new borrowing proposed in the 1967 budget. It is, as Representative Widnall of New Jersey has said, "a masterpiece of sneaky draftsmanship." And that probably explains why the House is ramming it through without taking a word of opposition testimony.

INCREASE IN POPULARITY OF COUNTRY MUSIC

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the tremendous growth in popularity of country music is one of the outstanding success stories of the last 20 years. I am proud to point out that Nashville, the capital of Tennessee, has been the birthplace and home for a large portion of the industry. Nashville has become the center of a recording, publishing, broadcasting, and personal-appearance network that is spreading around the world. To commemorate the rapidly growing country music industry, I have previously introduced Senate Joint Resolution 135, requesting the President to designate October as "National Country Music Month."

Also, I want to call my colleagues attention to an article in Newsweek on April 4, 1966. The article, entitled "The Gold Guitars," describes the "Nashville Sound" and many of the personalities that are playing major roles in presenting it to the Nation and world. Newsweek appropriately calls Nashville "Music City, U.S.A." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this interesting and informative article from Newsweek be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOLD GUITARS

The phenomenon called "Nashville Sound" yields about as easily to definition as relativity. Whatever it is, its jet-propelled sound waves have shattered the Tennessee capital's dignity as the "Athens of the South," a city of universities whose chief symbol is a concrete replica of the Parthenon.

Nashville has a new name: "Music City, U.S.A.", country-music capital of the world, and its real Parthenon is the Grand Ole Opry. What soothes the classical pride of Nashville, which generally regards country musicians as shoeless hillbillies, is the $60 million annual balm provided by the booming record industry, Nashville's largest.

Nashville, after New York, is now the second largest recording center in the world. Big pop stars such as Perry Como, Bob Dylan, and Connie Francis record there. Thriving are 1,200 professional musicians, 800 professional songwriters, 322 music publishers, 26 record companies, eleven talent agencies, four pressing plants and fifteen sound studios which make nearly one out of every two pop records in America.

Converted: Real estate is a land-office business all over Nashville, but nowhere more exuberantly than on Record Row, the four-block-long, two-block-wide vortex of the music industry. A buyer who paid $39,000 for a corner lot there last year refused $160,000 this year. The major record companies have spent millions. Along both sides of the street, converted houses announce: "Tree Publishing," "Quilla Records," "Sharecroppers Music," "Pittman Spears Talent," while a vacant lot proclaims: "Future Home of Pamper Music, Inc."

Last year country music raked in $70 million, or about 10 percent of the total sales of all records. About 25 percent of the major record companies' popular releases are country. The releases are broadcast by some 1,500 radio stations. Many of them, including such urban strongholds as Chicago's WJJD and Newark's WJRZ, devote themselves exclusively to country music. Radio Prague has requested, and a Singapore station will soon be broadcasting, a 55-minute weekly excerpt from Grand Ole Opry. Two weeks ago, ground was broken on Record Row for a million-dollar country-music Hall of Fame whose first immortals are Jimmie Rodgers, dead at 35 in 1933, Hank Williams, who died in 1953 when he was 29, and Roy Acuff, Tex Ritter, Ernest Tubb and the late Fred Rose.

Rural: Sooner or later, the fever of country music was bound to spread to epidemic proportions. "I think there must be a little country in everyone," says 47-year-old Stoney Cooper, who, with his wife, Wilma Lee, leads the Clinch Mountain Gang. Country music is a rich vein of folk music derived from the Anglo-Saxon traditions of the Appalachians and Southern flatlands, and infused with Negro blues and ragtime. The melodies are simple and tuneful, the rhythms easy on the feet, and the generally melancholy words are close to the hearth and the heart, direct, eloquent, honest. Such songs as Hank Williams'

"Cold, Cold Heart" are as rural and ingenuous as Blake's early poetry.

"This music comes from the working class," 31-year-old composer John D. Loudermilk told Newsweek's Joseph B. Cumming Jr. "When they sing about heartache it really means something. It's not for teen-agers. It's got soul." And he picked up his guitar and sang his autobiographical song, "Tobacco Road," evoking the scraggly patch of land where he was born, and how it was ugly but home. The song had soul. "If I feel out of touch," Loudermilk said, "I'll go down to the bus station and just sit and talk to some old wino a while."

What has made the Nashville Sound an all-American sound is the evolution of country music toward popular taste. The raw, nasal "hillbilly" sound, alien to urban ears, has gradually been discarded. Along the way every great country musician contributed to the change. The Carter family contributed their "ring-a-ling" rhythm on the flat-top guitar, Roy Acuff made the vocalist more prominent than the instruments, and the great guitarist Chet Atkins created new possibilities in the "take-off" (melody-carrying) guitar. In the '40s, Eddy Arnold ("Anytime") softened the nasal twang while his sideman, Roy Wiggins, developed the soft, trembling echo on his electric steel guitar. "There were no smooth singers before Eddy," Wiggins told NEWSWEEK's Hal Bruno. "I had to make that sweet crying sound to go with his voice."

Tormented: Hank Williams, the greatest name in country music, pioneered in his band the deep-popping electric bass that gave weight to rhythm. And in his "hungry hillbilly" style, he sang songs with a profound and inimitable expressiveness. Above all, he raised country songwriting to an art form, pouring out in the four years of his fame such songs as "Jambalaya," "Your Cheatin' Heart," "Hey, Good Lookin'," and his great religious song, "I Saw the Light." Williams lived his tormented music and died at 29 of a heart attack in his chauffeur-driven Cadillac.

But country music is changing, and Marty Robbins and Buck Owens are very nearly the last word. Robbins' smooth Broadway crooning is backed by the heavy ordnance of electric guitars, piano and drum. In spite of his famous written pledge swearing never to sing a "song that is not a country song," Owens, along with Leroy Van Dyke, is a leader in "rockabilly," a blend of country and rock 'n' roll calculated to "grab" teen-agers everywhere.

After all this mutating, there is still something that won't go away—the true, elusive Nashville Sound. Even Owen Bradley, head of Decca Records in Nashville, has trouble defining it. "I've been asked what the Nashville Sound is a thousand times," he says, "and I've given a thousand different answers. And I think I've been right every time. It's a song that's our kind of song and a bunch of musicians who can put it over."

The "bunch of musicians" are Nashville's famous sideman who can earn as much as $75,000 a year in the studios. They already use written scores, simply listen to the songs once or twice and then improvise expertly as if they had been playing together all their lives. A standard joke is about the sideman who, asked if he could read music, replied, "Yeah, but not enough to hurt my playin'." Thirty-year-old Lou Stringer, bass player with Wilma Lee and Stoney Cooper, says, "It's the sidemen who are the genius spark in this business. It all comes from the smooth steel, that bass bottom sound, the ring-a-ling rhythm and the take-off man who thinks with his fingers."

The one place to hear the Nashville Sound, or what is perhaps more accurate, the sounds of Nashville, is in the Grand Ole Opry. In the "Athens of the South," the 40-year-old Grand Ole Opry is the musical Atheneum, the hillbilly's Metropolitan country's Carnegie Hall. The Nashville Sound was born and cherished here and because of the Grand Ole Opry, Nashville is "Music City."

"When I was a kid," says tall Texan Ernest Tubb, "it was my life's ambition to be here." Robbins says, "The Opry is the most important thing to us," and Roy Acuff adds, "Without the Opry we wouldn't be anywhere today."

Visitors: The jamboree goes on every Saturday night for four and a half hours, broadcast by WSM to 31 states and Canada, to 10 million people, as well as live to the 4,000 that jam the Ryman Auditorium, and roar and stomp when the announcer cries, "Welcome to the Graaaand Ole Opry!" For those who can't get in, there is a two-and-a-half-hour show on Friday nights, also broadcast, and a 55-minute excerpt rebroadcast over 400 stations each week.

The typical Opry visitor has been there three or four times and has driven 1,000 miles round trip from Indiana or Ohio or Michigan. On hand recently were Homer Schoonover, 48, of Brimfield, Ohio, a mold assembler at the Goodyear Tire factory in Akron, along with his wife, Evelyn, his stepson, Don Wagner, 23, Don's wife, Rose, and their two daughters, 4-year-old Brenda and Rose Marie, 8 months. They had piled into the Schoonover car on Friday night and driven twelve hours to cover the 524 miles to Nashville. They drove all night afterward to be home by Sunday noon. This was Schoonover's 14th trip to the Opry in 20 years. He pointed to Don and said proudly, "Ernest Tubb took this boy for a walk when he was only 4 years old. And we even knew Hank Williams."

Victor Armes, a grocer, his wife, Christine, and their children, Rita, 15, and Andrew, 17, had come further—from England. Just for the Opry. They had saved their money for three years. Why? "Now it just does something to you," said Armes. He revealed that he planned to stay in Nashville and open up a grocery store there. "We just like the music and the people."

The Opry curtain rises on a stage overflowing with girls in print dresses and men wearing overalls, outrageous cowboy outfits and even tuxedos. Throughout the evening, performers, their families, friends, stagehands mill about the stage in joyful pandemonium during a chaos of music that ranges from the Bluegrass wizardry of Lester Flatt and Earl Scruggs to the clownish antics of banjoist Stringbean. The only decoration is an advertising backdrop that is lowered for such sponsors of the fifteen- or 30-minute segments as Luzianne Coffee, Stephen Work Clothes and Martha White Flour.

But country music at the Grand Ole Opry has changed. Not only are smoothies like Marty Robbins welcome, but the Opry has grudgingly given ground to newfangled electronic instruments, and even to a piano and a trap drum, which had been hidden on stage behind a screen for five years. "Roy Acuff and I said electric instruments would ruin the Opry," says comedienne Minnie Pearl, an Opry veteran of 26 years. "But it didn't." Stoney Cooper says, "I wouldn't have wanted a drum ten years ago but I think it's in order today." "But," adds his wife, Wilma Lee, "we want it to be a Salvation Army type drum."

But it is possible that in countenancing change, the Grand Ole Opry is dooming country music. Leroy Van Dyke, whose biggest hit is "Walk On By" by city slicker Burt Bacharach, has revolutionary ideas. In contrast to the informal chaos of the Ole Opry, he conducts a carefully planned show that is the hottest act on the country circuit. "After I was in the Opry a few years, I got a feeling that something was missing," he says. "I believe country music needs staging and choreography—pretty girls, musicians in tuxedos—and we've found that it works. I don't expect everyone to change, but artists should broaden the base of country music." Pretty young singer Marion Worth endorses Van Dyke. "Now the people in minks as well as overalls will come to see us. And country singer Margie Bowes goes to charm school now, to learn how to dress, walk, talk and put on make-up. "A country artist needs it just as much as any other artist," she says.

Living: The phenomenal success of country music, even at great cost to its integrity, generates the need for more success. "We never thought anyone could make so much money in this field," says June Carter. "Things have sure changed." Acuff says, "I only expected to make a living." Now he is as rich as Eddy Arnold, who develops real estate, owns cattle farms and is director of an insurance company.

Urbanized, traveled, up to their white collars in investment, today's affluent country minstrels sound a bit incongruous as they keen the sweet sad turnings of fate. "Country music can't stand still," says Acuff, as if folk music were Paris fashions. "We're not *trying* to change. It just happened when country music, rock, pop and folk got exposed to each other. Someday it may be one music."

And that may be the future of the Nashville Sound. It may be hard to define, but today one thing seems more common to it than the plinking of banjos, and that is the clinking of gold.

NEOSHO RIVER DAM AND RESERVOIR, COUNCIL GROVE, KANSAS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 15, Council Grove, Kans., did indeed have its big day.

On the afternoon of that sabbath a new dam and reservoir on the Neosho River was dedicated. Built at a cost of slightly less than $12 million the reservoir covers 3,000 acres and at conservation stage has an elevation of 1,270 feet. Mr. President, so many people have worked so long to provide flood control, recreation and future municipal water supply in this Kansas community. On the day of the dedication some of those who had worked so hard were no longer present. But others were there seeing a dream come true, and I think that this event was most accurately described in the editorial of the Topeka Capital Journal on Sunday May 15, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL GROVE HAS ITS BIG DAY

"I can hear it always—the call of the prairie. The passing of 60 winters has left me a vigorous man, although, my hair is as white as the January snowdrift in the draws, and the strenuous events of some of the years have put a tax on my strength . . .

"But this love of the prairie is a part of my being. All the comedy and tragedy of these 60 years have had them for a setting, and I can no more put them out of my life than a Scotchman can forget the heather, or the Swiss emigrant to the flat green lowland can forget the passes of the glacier-polished Alps.

"Geography is an element in every man's life. The prairies are in the red corpuscles of my blood. Up and down their rippling billows my memory runs. For always I see them—green and blossom-starred in the springtime; or drenched with the driving

summer deluge that made each draw a brimming torrent; or gold, purple and silver-rimmed in the glorious autum. I have seen them gray in the twilight, still and tenderly verdant at noonday, and cold and frost-wreathed under the white star beams. I have seen them yield up their rich yellow sheaves of grain . . ."—From the Preface of Margaret Hill McCarter's novel, "The Price of the Prairie."

It seems appropriate now to quote the above from Margaret Hill McCarter's book because her story was writen about Council Grove in Civil War Days. Today being Council Grove's big day, with dedication of the Council Grove Dam and Reservoir more than a century after the pioneer days depicted in the McCarter story, the town Mrs. McCarter called Springvale by the Neosho has come a long way.

Its new dam and reservoir on the Neosho River, built at a cost of slightly less than $12 million, is about the size of Pomona Lake. It covers 3,000 acres and at conservation stage has an elevation of 1,270 feet.

When residents of Council Grove and others in nearby areas of the Neosho watershed gather this afternoon for the formal dedication, they will be proud indeed of the completed project. They will be glad, too, that the dam north of the city means the rambunctious Neosho can no longer sweep over their property in floodtime, leaving destruction in its wake.

Council Grove has had reason in past years to fear such floods, in spite of a dike system that could hold back the swollen Neosho up to a point. But all too often the stream, after heavy rains, would push up and over the downtown bridge crossing the river.

Flood control, of course, is what inspired men years ago to dream of such a project for the Neosho Valley. The Council Grove Republican, edited by Don McNeal, in a special section this week told how a former mayor of Council Grove, the late W. L. Young, and Walker Leigh used a garage door for a raft in the 1929 flood to save the lives of a family marooned in a tree. Mayor Young later recalled that the woes of Council Grove in that flood caused him to ponder ways and means to control high water.

A powerful figure who fought for 34 years for flood protection on the Neosho was the late John Redmond, Burlington publisher for whom the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir north of Burlington is named. Mr. Redmond began the drive for flood protection in 1932.

Taming of the Neosho should be appreciated in many ways. Council Grove, while it has its own city lake for a water supply a mile and a half west of the big Federal reservoir, and Emporia, downstream, have an agreement with the Corps of Engineers for an added potential of 3 million gallons daily if they desire to exercise this option.

The recreation facilities of the Council Grove reservoir are a special dividend that will be enjoyed by thousands in the future. Beautiful tree-lined coves will beckon the fishermen, while other water sports will attract more visitors.

It would be hard to find a better setting for such a reservoir. And, of necessity, some familiar landmarks had to go when the construction began. There are many Kansans who enjoyed the hospitality of the late State Senator W. H. White, Jr., at his home just north of Council Grove.

High on a hilltop, the White residence offered a magnificent view, especially at sundown. Today, part of the big dam, 96 feet in height, has been built over the site of the White home.

Senator White, a banker and rancher, and the heirs of C. H. White, his brother, have made possible a gift of 78 acres for a Congregational Church camp to establish a memorial to parents of the White brothers, W. H. and Sarah White, Council Grove pioneers. The land is being used as the site of the White Memorial Camp, a mile north of the dam and overlooking the reservoir, and will be a year-around operation available to other faiths as well.

The shaded streets of Council Grove have long had their other attractions. Historical landmarks abound—Council Oak, Post Office Oak, Hays Tavern, Custer Elm, Last Chance Store, Hermit's Cave, Kaw Mission and Old Bell which called people to church, summoned children to school and warned of approaching floods, fires and Indian raids.

For the Indian was part and parcel of early-day Council Grove, as was the Santa Fe Trail which carried the wheels of commerce westward so that wagons with goods from the East could roll into the plaza of Old Santa Fe, there to be greeted by the shouts of natives: "Los Americanos! Los Carros! La entrada de la caravana!"

So there will be many a thought given to the past as Council Grove dedicates its new dam and reservoir today. And after Mayor Lester McClintock welcomes those attending, and Frank (Chief) Haucke, vice president of the Neosho-Cottonwood Flood Control Assn., introduces special guests, Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy will make the dedicatory address. General Cassidy is chief of engineers, Dept. of the Army, Washington, D.C. Present will be many Kansans prominent in public life.

As they witness all the various events at the reservoir today, we may stop to ponder that in the past century the Council Grove community has accomplished much and will accomplish more. Margaret Hill McCarter put it this way, near the close of "The Price of the Prairie":

"Slowly, through tribulation, and distress, and persecution, and famine, and nakedness, and peril, and sword; through fire and flood; through summer's drought and winter's blizzard; through loneliness, and fear, and heroism, and martyrdom too often at last, the brave-hearted, liberty-loving, indomitable people have come into their own, paying foot by foot, the price that won this prairie kingdom in the heart of the West."

SANDIA LABORATORY ALBUQUERQUE, PLAYED VITAL ROLE IN H-BOMB HUNT

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the unheralded but crucial part that the Sandia Laboratory in Albuquerque played in the successful search for the missing hydrogen bomb off the coast of Spain is described in an article in the May 13 issue of Time magazine.

The article tells of a truly remarkable technological feat, the plotting of the trajectory of the bomb as it fell from the B–52 after the midair collision, and the determination of the probable point at which it fell into the sea.

The bomb was finally recovered within 1,200 yards of the point selected by Sandia scientists as the most likely place to search.

I ask unanimous consent that Time's account of this feat be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPLIED SCIENCE—HOW THEY FOUND THE BOMB

The 2,200-man Navy task force that carried out the Great H-Bomb Hunt near the Spanish coastal town of Palomares more than earned its headlines. But the men who conducted an equally productive part of the search were an unheralded group of scientists and technicians in far-off New Mexico.

Soon after the January 17 collision between a nike-carrying B–52 and its KC–135 tanker over Spain, a desperate Defense Department turned for help to the Sandia Laboratory in Albuquerque, which conducts bomb-electronics research for the AEC. Sandia scientists promptly requested all available accident data from the task force. With other experts they pored over interviews with surviving B–52 crew members and witnesses on the ground; they studied Air Force wind-velocity records and the ballistic characteristics and impact points of the three recovered H-bombs. By feeding complex equations into computers, they projected trajectories backward from the impact points and established the precise location of the collision—the point from which the missing bomb began its descent.

SIMULATED BREAKUP

Sandia's next step, reports its house organ, Lab News, was to work out what had happened to the lost bomb. Had it broken apart in the air, or come down intact? Had it fallen freely to the land below, or been carried far out to sea on its parachute? To simulate a mid-air breakup, the scientists dropped bomb parts from a high-flying plane at White Sands Missile Range, then photographed the craters made by the parts as they hit the ground. The pictures were rushed to Palomares, where searchers looked in vain for similar patterns on Spanish soil.

Back at their computers, other scientists of Sandia determined that the radioactive contamination of Spanish soil had been caused entirely by the two recovered bombs that had broken apart on impact. Had another bomb shattered on land, the level of radioactivity would have been higher. Thus the scientists assumed that either the missing bomb had not broken apart on hitting land, or it had fallen into the sea. Further ballistics analysis and wind data enabled the Sandia computers eventually to plot the probable trajectory of the missing bomb and locate where it had hit the water. Their calculations tended to confirm the story of Spanish Fisherman Francisco Simo y Orts, who had reported to skeptical task-force officials that a "stout man" swinging from a parachute had hit the water only about 75 yards from his boat, five miles off Palomares.

PRECARIOUS PERCH

Late in February when the final information from Palomares had been processed by the computers, Sandia scientists traced a square on a Spanish coastal chart and said, "Tell *Alvin* (the deep-diving research submarine that eventually found the bomb) to look here." Three weeks later, when the little sub finally located the missing bomb—2,500 feet below the surface, still shrouded in its parachute and perched precariously on a 70 degree slope—it was 1,200 yards from the final coordinates calculated in a laboratory over 5,000 miles away.

RILEY H. ALLEN—A BUILDER OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in his long and notable newspaper career in Hawaii, Riley H. Allen devoted his life to building democracy in Hawaii. Combining his tireless energy and multiple talents, he pointed the way to many avenues of progress when the community needed direction. He fought and won the hard fight on many issues, none more brilliantly than his unflagging, all-out advocacy of Hawaiian statehood over many, many years.

Numerous honors were bestowed on Riley Allen when he was editor of the

Honolulu Star-Bulletin and many more honors have been conferred on him since his retirement in 1960.

The latest recognition was the selection of Riley Allen to receive the Liberty Bell Award of the Hawaii Bar Association on Law Day. On that occasion, the Star-Bulletin published a most fitting editorial tribute to him titled "A Builder of Democracy." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FONG. It is typical of Riley Allen that he gives credit to others for many of his achievements. On his 80th birthday, April 30, 1964, when it was my pleasure to pay tribute in this Chamber to the editor emeritus, he responded in a letter to me as follows:

> All I have ever done, as an editor and a citizen of the Territory and now the State of Hawaii, would have been useless except for the faith and support of such people as you. And all of us can take great pride in the constant development and progress of Hawaii—materially, politically and in the highest civic sense.
>
> A great many people have asked me, since we achieved statehood, whether statehood has really been advantageous to Hawaii. As you and many thousands of others know full well, achievement of statehood has been immensely beneficial—not only to Hawaii but I am sure to the entire United States and to the Pacific areas. Today Hawaii plays a more and more important role not only as a state but as a strategic position in mid-Pacific and, with such leadership as you have given, that role will continue and expand.

EXHIBIT 1

A BUILDER OF DEMOCRACY

The selection of Riley H. Allen to receive the lawyers' Liberty Bell award and the citation accompanying it confirm a widely held view in the community.

This is that the retired editor of the Star-Bulletin, long before the Supreme Court made civil rights a national issue in 1954, was building a foundation for democracy in Hawaii, with equal opportunity under the law as a paramount goal.

When he came to Hawaii as a young editor, he found a paternalistic, almost a feudal system, and a wide gap between the predominantly white managerial class and the predominantly nonwhite laboring class.

With clear foresight, he realized that equal opportunity could only result from equal educational opportunity. He fought for universal public education at a time when many questioned its wisdom, and disdained ridicule in supporting the fledgling College of Hawaii which grew into the highly respected University of Hawaii.

Realizing that a one- or two-crop economy tended to perpetuate the semi-feudal plantation system, he supported diversified agriculture and stimulated early efforts to attract visitors to Hawaii.

He encouraged young people to advance on their merits in many ways: through the home and school garden programs, through oratorical contests and spelling bees, through the Junior Chamber of Commerce which he helped to establish in Hawaii while he was president of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce.

He regarded the letters to the editor column as a "town meeting" for practical democratic expression.

Riley Allen realized, however, that the people of Hawaii would never approach their destiny until they enjoyed the total citizenship that comes only with Statehood. He endured many jibes in the long, uphill fight which was finally crowned with success in 1959. No man contributed more to that result, although he was the first to give credit to the many others who labored to reach the goal.

Without the universal education for which he fought, Statehood would not have been possible.

On a broader scale, he contributed to the liberalization of immigration and naturalization policies, and worked through such organizations as the Institute of Pacific Relations for a better understanding among leaders of the Pacific-Asian area.

Nor were all these battles waged from an ivory tower. He was in the thick of the fray as a leader in community organizations, an enthusiastic participant in grass-roots politics, and as an adviser to numerous civic groups.

Riley Allen loves people and has faith in them. He defended the loyalty of Hawaii's people in the trying days of World War II, and worked with quiet responsibility to replace military government with civilian control. He has always been optimistic in setting goals for Hawaii and its people, and they have not let him down.

The Liberty Bell award is one of many honors he has earned in the more than 60 years of his leadership and good citizenship in Hawaii. It is a tangible symbol of the ineffable admiration, respect and affection Hawaii's people hold for him.

The lawyers chose well when they decided to award their Liberty Bell to Riley Allen.

WAR ON POVERTY FOR THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the war on poverty as led and directed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, is bringing "inspiration and hope" to the American Indian. This is the collective judgment of leaders of 62 Indian tribes who recently met in Santa Fe, N. Mex., and who sent Sargent Shriver a telegram of strong support following his embarrassment by a few self-appointed representatives of the poor at the International Inn luncheon incident.

In sharp contrast to the professional rabble rousers, the Indian leaders expressed their "wholehearted support" for the war on poverty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a report of this significant development, which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on April 16, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANS PRAISE WAR ON POVERTY

SANTA FE, N.M.—Leaders of 62 Indian Tribes gathered here expressed shock yesterday at a demonstration in Washington against the federal antipoverty program.

In a telegram to Sargent Shriver, head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, they announced "wholehearted support" for the program.

They said "creative" efforts of the OEO had become "an inspiration and hope for the American Indian."

The Indians, the nation's poorest Americans, deplored heckling of Shriver Thursday by some of the urban poor attending a conference called by the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty.

As Shriver sought to report on progress of the program, he was drowned out by jeers that it "hasn't done anything for us."

The dissidents' demonstration brought the conference to an abrupt and premature end.

The Indians' telegram was signed by Wendell Chino, a Mescalero Apache who is president of the National Congress of American Indians and other officers of the organization.

The Tribes ended a three-day "emergency" conference here that was called on short notice when they received reports from Washington that a pending Bureau of Indian Affairs reorganization might imperil tribal control of OEO programs on reservations.

At the conference, the Indians repeatedly expressed their desire to be permitted more freedom to arrange and conduct self-improvement programs without "paternalistic" interference and control by the bureau.

For the last year or so many tribes have been doing just this with Head Start, job training and other programs financed by OEO. They feel the programs have brought measurable gains to the reservations.

"OEO has brought into Indian communities the vital principle that each tribe can plan and program most effectively for its own people without a middle bureaucracy," Chino told the final session of the Indian conference.

He added the tribes hoped to gain a stronger voice in Indian affairs through the appointment by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall of an advisory committee of elected tribal officials.

OPPOSITION TO INCREASED TRADE WITH COMMUNIST-BLOC NATIONS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, my mail convinces me that the overwhelming majority of our people are strongly opposed to the administration's policy of increased trade with the Communist-bloc nations. One letter which I have received from Miss Bess Stinson of Phoenix, eloquently expresses the disgust and frustration of the American public with this policy. Miss Stinson is one of our most outstanding women in the State participating in numerous civic activities.

I am proud to bring Miss Stinson's letter to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that her letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF ARIZONA,
Phoenix, Ariz., May 5, 1966.

HON. PAUL FANNIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FANNIN: Once again I implore you to work against and vote against the increased trade with the Communist bloc of nations. It is so abhorrent to me that I can hardly endure the thought of such official action by our Government.

What has happened to us? How can it be that our President can send more and more troops into battle and then urge increased trade with the enemy that works to destroy them.

How can it be that businessmen of our Nation can even consider the proposition. Like a rat smells cheese in a trap and rushes in to destruction—our people are seduced by the sweet prospect of profit and so walk into eventual destruction.

A few days ago I went to the airport to meet a friend. There I saw another friend—a mother with three handsome little boys—3, 5 and 7. Word had come that the father had been killed in Vietnam and they were on their way to his parents.

I was sick inside. These three boys would never know their father and the young mother faced the future with full responsibility. He was a college graduate and capable—but he gave his life. Our country asked him to make the sacrifice as it has done of hundreds of others.

And now we urge more trade with the enemy that the enemy may be strengthened. Why not force the Communist bloc countries to keep their resources at home for their own needs instead of making it easier for them to wage war?

It is an outrage to think we would even consider such a plan, and I hope the parents of the boys in Vietnam and elsewhere rise up in rebellion.

Sincerely,

Bess B. Stinson.

THE WARSAW CONVENTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Warsaw Convention of 1929 is probably the most widely adopted international law treaty in the history of the world. Since its adoption, it has benefited air travelers immensely and has facilitated uniformity of documentation which has been a major factor in the growth of international air transportation. It has been cited as an outstanding example of an international agreement facilitating trade and commerce and thus promoting world peace through rule of law.

I am pleased that our Government has reached an accord with the major airlines of the world avoiding the necessity of a U.S. withdrawal from the Convention. This is in keeping with U.S. leadership and dedication to the principles of international cooperation. In addition, this action expresses the continued support of the U.S. Government of the aims and objectives of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The only major issue in our continued adherence to the Warsaw Convention was the limitation of liability. The accord now reached removes the present limit of $8,300, which certainly by U.S. standards is unconscionably low, and increases this limitation to $75,000, a major step forward. Widows and surviving children of air disasters will be able to secure adequate and just recoveries at a time when their need for recovery is greatest.

The arrangement agreed to provides that there will be no limitation of liability if the victim or his survivors can prove that the accident happened as a consequence of the carrier's willful misconduct. This exception encourages sound safety practices and at the same time assures that in the rare case where a carrier clearly acts contrary to such practices, it will be liable without any limit.

It should be noted that the arrangement which the administration is proposing is only an interim system. It can be changed and will be changed when the nations of the world sit down soon and negotiate a new treaty. I have no doubt that the State Department will continue its efforts on behalf of the American traveling public. The State Department has already announced that their objective in such an international conference will be a limitation of no less than $100,000, with several other improvements in the basic treaty. When that revised treaty is brought before the Senate for ratification, there will be public hearings and all sides will be given the opportunity to state their views fully and on the record. Moreover, there will no doubt be public hearings and extensive consultations with representatives of interested public and private groups long before the State Department goes to that conference.

I have confidence that what the administration is doing now is in the best interests of the American public.

I would also like to introduce into the Record an editorial, together with an article, which appeared in Friday morning's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that they be included.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 13, 1966]

An Airline's Liability

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has shown a strange obliviousness to its chairman's complaints about American arrogance in advising the State Department to reject an arduously evolved agreement on international airline liability. Tough bargaining by the Department had led to a satisfactory compromise on claims procedure—until the Committee threatened to upset the arrangement. What makes the last-minute intervention worse is that it apparently was an uninformed response to pleas by plaintiff attorneys who would stand to lose some of their cushy fees. To his credit, Chairman Fulbright voted against the mischievous motion by Senator Gore.

Last November the United States denounced the 1929 Warsaw Convention, which provides a liability limit of only $8300, after foreign governments and airlines had rejected a new $100,000 limit asked by this country. These blunt tactics had produced sufficient agreement on an interim limit of $75,000 to warrant withdrawal of the denunciation before it becomes effective May 15.

For many reasons it is desirable to preserve the Warsaw Convention; otherwise there could be chaos on matters ranging from baggage to airline law. The State Department still aims at a new convention with a statutory liability of $100,000. Meanwhile, however, the interim agreement worked out by the International Air Transport Association will afford substantially greater protection to air travelers. What the $75,000 figure means is that airlines must accept absolute liability up to this amount (apart from any separate trip insurance the passenger may have bought) for provable damages in the event of death or injury. Unlimited damages may be recovered on proof of reckless conduct by the airline. A safeguarding clause specifically excludes payments that would be an invitation to sabotage.

Understandably there have been shrill protests from some foreign and certain domestic carriers. But initial resentment at the State Department's take-it-or-leave-it approach (after it declined a $500,000 substitute proposal) had modified as other governments faced reality. The Senate Committee action is certain to revive it.

Several recent crashes, notably that of a foreign plane over Japan in which much of the sales staff of an American firm was killed, have shown the pathetic inequity of the $8,300 value on human life set by present international law. It would be absurd to think that carriers which can find the millions to buy equipment for overseas air operations cannot afford through reinsurance to provide adequate protection for their passengers. If they can't, they should not be in the international travel business.

But the whole procedure is now endangered by the Senate Committee's ill-advised roadblock. We trust that in this situation the State Department and the Administration will stick to their position and disregard the gratuitous intervention.

[From the Washington Post, May 13, 1966]

Demands Foreign Unanimity—Senate Unit Endangers Airline Liability Revision

(By John P. MacKenzie)

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee threw a last-minute monkey wrench yesterday into State Department negotiations for a new international agreement on airline accident liability.

By a vote of 7 to 2 the Committee called on the State Department to go through with renunciation of the 1929 Warsaw Convention unless all international air carriers agreed to conditions laid down by the United States.

The vote was hailed by the American Trial Lawyers Association, a group of plaintiffs' attorneys, as a victory in its campaign against a new standard of absolute liability in international flights.

ADMINISTRATION UPSET

Administration officials, who were on the verge of declaring a diplomatic triumph of their own, scheduled a high-level meeting for today to determine the meaning of the Committee resolution and decide how to meet the Sunday deadline for the renunciation decision.

All but one major foreign airline and a few foreign governments have complied with the State Department requirement to raise liability limits from $8,300 to $75,000 and allow recovery for death or injury without proof of airline fault.

As a result, the Committee resolution, introduced by Senator Albert Gore, Democrat, of Tennessee, appeared the only major obstacle to a decision to remain in the convention under terms more favorable to American airline passengers.

MANN TESTIFIED

Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann told the Committee Wednesday that less-than-unanimous compliance would suffice to enforce the new liability rules because a minority of holdouts would be forced into line by competition. The Committee responded by calling for unanimous compliance.

There was confusion, and intense lobbying by the trial lawyers, over the meaning of the Gore resolution, which read:

"It is the sense of the Committee that the Department of State should not withdraw its notice of denunciation of the Warsaw convention unless all air carriers operating within the United States adhere to the proposed concord regarding liability of $75,000'.'

The resolution's literal words said nothing about the absolute liability provision in a concord reached by international carriers and the State Department at a recent meeting in Montreal. Five holdout airlines, which operate primarily domestically, complied with the literal wording.

GORE ELABORATES

Advised by the lawyers group that State was reading the resolution literally, Gore issued a statement saying the resolution was intended to cover absolute liability also. Gore added that supplemental and charter lines, not merely major trunklines, were embraced by the resolution.

Lee S. Kreindler, aviation chairman for the plaintiff lawyer group, then wired Mann saying it was "shocking" that Mann would read the resolution any other way.

The new liability rules would reduce the work of plaintiffs' attorneys in most cases to proof of actual damages. The lawyer group was joined on the absolute liability issue by the Air Line Pilots Association. ALPA called the rules "an invitation to sabotage," a claim the State Department denied.

Dissenters in the Committee vote were Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, ranking minority member, abstained.

LENNOX, S. DAK.—MODEL TOWN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, long ago, little David proved that size is not the most important ingredient for success. Out in South Dakota we have a thriving, progressive little city—Lennox, S. Dak.—where the people are again proving that same idea.

Lennox, S. Dak., has won a trophy three times in the National Cleanest Town Achievement Awards Contest. This award is given to the city or town which does the most to improve its physical appearance by clean up, paint up, and light up campaigns.

However, Lennox does not rest on past laurels. The citizens of that town are looking for new ways to keep alive the interest of the area in making Lennox a better place to live. They have just completed a kickoff campaign, held on May 2, and with it they have incorporated a Loyalty Day Program.

City officials throughout the Nation are on the lookout for good ideas to foster community spirit and pride. I suggest they take a page from the "idea book" in Lennox, S. Dak. The following newspaper report gives a working outline for anyone interested in civic improvement. I ask unanimous consent to insert the news story from the Lennox Independent, indicating the type of projects which were carried out successfully in the combined cleanup campaign and Loyalty Day activities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lennox (S. Dak.) Independent, Apr. 28, 1966]

OPEN HOUSE TO KICK OFF CLEAN-UP CAMPAIGN MONDAY—W.R.C. AND PETAL PALS IN CHARGE OF OPEN HOUSE ACTIVITIES; TO GIVE MANY PRIZES—TO SHOW FILM EVERY HOUR

Residents of Lennox and the surrounding area—young and old—this weekend will put on a sparkling display of good citizenship in contrast to Communist Russia's May Day display of war might on May 1.

While there'll be some preliminaries on Saturday, involving initial activities in the annual clean up—paint up—fix up—plant up—light up campaign, the local event will be the City of Lennox's sixth annual municipal open house on Monday, May 2, which promises to be an impressive combination of many features.

While the municipal open house is scheduled between 1 and 5 p.m. at the City Hall, it will be preceded by a short Loyalty Day ceremony at 12:45 in front of the City Hall. The Lennox high school band, under the direction of Tom George, will play the National Anthem, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag led by several Boy Scouts. Other band selections will follow.

The event will provide the official send-off here for the annual clean up—paint up—fix up—plant up—light up campaign, and it will also provide the local observance of Loyalty Day and Invest-In-America Week, all of which reflect on good citizenship.

Members of the Col. Ellsworth Chapter of the Woman's Relief Corps here will again serve as hostesses, distributing the various special materials and publications. They will also handle the visitor registrations and provide the refreshments during the four-hour event. Adding color and blending in well, special flower pens of assorted kinds and colors will be presented adult visitors as long as the supply lasts.

Special attractions will be provided by the Lennox Petal Pals Garden Club, including a special flower show and a hobby exhibit, as announced in recent weeks. A special film has also been obtained for the event, to be shown each hour on the hour, and a selection of plants or slips and plastic articles that also tie in with the clean up campaign will be offered for sale. Members of the W.R.C. will also have their traditional articles for sale.

Two Pfitzer evergreen shrubs and 50 packets of flower seeds are being furnished by Western Power & Gas Co. as door prizes. The first 25 persons to register at the open house at one o'clock will receive a packet of seeds, and again at 3 p.m. 25 packets will be given away. A drawing will be held at 5 p.m. for the two shrubs, those persons whose names are drawn need not be present to win.

Other valuable prizes have been provided by various Lennox business firms, to add to the rewards in attending, and the accent will be on clean up—paint up—fix up—plant up—light up activities, including garbage disposal items, and clean up, fix up implements.

Congratulatory messages have been received from Governor Nils Boe, the South Dakota legislative delegation in Washington, and from officials of various organizations and agencies. They appear elsewhere in today's Independent.

Special displays tieing in with the various observances will again be present for viewing at the City Hall, as will the Lennox entry and top trophy award which ranked among the 12 in the nation irrespective of population in the 1965 National Cleanest Town Achievement Award Contest.

DISPLAY FLAGS

Business firms and residents of Lennox are urged to display the United States Flag on their premises on Monday, May 2 as a symbol of their loyalty to country. May 2 has been designated as Loyalty Day and every American is encouraged to fly the colors.

BRINGING THE GREAT SOCIETY TO REALIZATION: FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS AND THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I was privileged last Friday to attend the signing of the Supplemental Appropriations Act containing the first funds for two of the most innovative of the Great Society programs—the National Teacher Corps and the rent supplement programs.

On this historic occasion, the President said:

> Today we can be proud that this is still the century of hope; that a great Nation is still meeting the challenge to provide enough for those who have little.

Mr. President, we should be thankful that we have a President with the vision and courage to commit the full power of the Presidency to fighting for programs which, because they are new and untried, aroused both opposition and indifference among some people here in the Congress.

Our President fought hard for these programs. He did so because he realizes that a new age demands new ideas.

If the Great Society is to be the vital, living, vibrant place which its architect envisions, then we shall need many future days filled with the triumph of new ideas. I believe we shall gain those days and that the occasion of May 13 will be repeated many times over in the years to come.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the President on signing the supplemental appropriations bill providing funds for the National Teacher Corps and the rent supplement program be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SIGNING OF AN ACT PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS AND THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM IN THE ROSE GARDEN, MAY 13, 1966

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Vice President, Secretary Gardner and Secretary Weaver, and Senator MANSFIELD, and members of the Senate and the House, and Friends: On January 20, 1937, Franklin D. Roosevelt mounted the steps of the Capitol for his Second Inaugural. That day, he reaffirmed for his people one true measure of our advancement as a nation:

"The test of our progress," he said, "is not whether we add to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little."

Franklin Roosevelt—and the men of Congress—won enduring honor because they made this century a century of hope: Hope for the dispossessed people of the earth—and hope for all of the poor and forgotten.

Today as we met here with the signing of this Act, we mark a new beginning, a beginning of two bold programs—the National Teacher Corps and the Rent Supplement Program.

It has been many months since Congress authorized both of these programs. But the appropriations needed to translate idea into reality were slow in coming.

Today, however, we mark the end of hope and struggle for these legislative programs. And today we can be proud that this is still the century of hope; that a great nation is still meeting the challenge to "provide enough for those who have little."

For the first time, Congress is enabling private enterprise to take a direct hand in meeting the housing needs of poor families. At an average cost of $600 per housing unit, we will help low-income families afford decent dwellings. Thus we are being not only compassionate, but cost-conscious. Our present cost-per-unit for public housing averages in excess of $1,000.

This program is modest, but it is flexible and imaginative—and it is necessary and it is experimental. It puts a new tool in the hands of those who are helping to build better housing for all Americans. While every man's house cannot be a castle, it need not be a hovel.

Among those who have little, there are also those who have little learning, and they have little opportunity for it.

For these, the schoolchildren of our city slums and our rural pockets, the National Teacher Corps will mean a great deal.

There are those who would have us wait before launching the Teacher Corps—wait until there are more funds; wait until things are settled in Vietnam; wait until education programs are on a firmer footing. Wait, just wait.

To them I must this morning reply: This is no time to wait. The men and women who have volunteered for service in the Teacher Corps have already waited long enough. The slum schools which urgently need our attention and need our assistance have waited long enough. The poor children of this Nation who desperately require attention now must not wait any longer for this help.

That is why I have instructed Secretary Gardner and Commissioner Howe to take steps immediately to launch the Teacher Corps, to recruit and to train the maximum number that this very small appropriation will allow. By next fall, those teachers will be on duty.

We will seek high quality and deep commitment among all those who serve. They must be like the young volunteer from Macon, Georgia, who wrote, "I don't particularly get pleasure out of being in the slums, but I want to do something about them. The Teacher Corps will prepare me to work in any area at any time, and it is the opportunity of a lifetime."

They must be like JoAnn Navorr and Frances Nichols and Alberto Huerta—three of the first Teacher Corps volunteers who you see here on the platform with me today. JoAnn, who comes from Los Angeles, is a returned Peace Corps volunteer and a qualified language instructor. Frances, a student at Berea College in Kentucky, helped organize the Appalachia volunteers and worked with the poor children in Kentucky for more than 2½ years. Alberto, who comes from Laredo, Texas, and is fluent in Spanish, wants to be a teacher of Mexican-American children.

There was a period when I was a teacher of Mexican-American children. It gave me the greatest satisfaction of my life.

We need more volunteers like these three. I don't know, Alberto, where you will go. You may not follow the route I did after I left those Mexican Americans. But you can't ever tell. They will do a lot for you while you are trying to help them.

The other night after Ray Scherer's television broadcast, one of MIKE MANSFIELD'S colleagues and one of my Senate friends, said to me, "Well, all my life I heard that any boy born in America had a chance to grow up and be President, and now I believe it."

So the hour is already late. Many June graduates considering the Teachers Corps have begun already, because it is late, to look elsewhere for the year ahead.

I appeal to them all over the Nation this morning to reconsider that decision. I call on them to think again about coming and helping us and helping those more unfortunate. No service at this time could be more valuable to your country.

I also call on the Congress to reconsider—to make available the funds that we need, and we desperately need, for a Teacher Corps in fiscal 1967. I hope that Congress, which has already done so much for so many, will do just a little more, and give the Teacher Corps a chance to help others.

I know from personal experience how bitter is the want and how great the need of poverty's prisoners. I know, too, what a decent house and what a decent education can really do to end that want and to help fill that need.

It was years ago that Justice Holmes told a reunion of his Harvard classmates that they were fortunate because, as he said, and I quote, "In our youth our hearts were touched with fire."

Today it is not enough to touch with fire the hearts of just the few in this country. We must take the light to all the dark places in this Nation, and here this morning, in your presence, with God as our witness, we make that start.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, few issues in global affairs have such widespread and important ramifications for the entire spectrum of problems and relationships existing among nations as does the question of nuclear proliferation. Science has proved that the atom can be made to yield vast riches for the human race. And plans have been put into execution for sharing nuclear technology among all nations. But how far mankind will ultimately benefit from these steps, Mr. President, will depend upon the degree to which progress is achieved in dispelling the ever-present specter of war, waged with new weapons capable of returning 20th century man to the Stone Age.

Mr. President, any nation with the necessary scientific, technical and economic resources can develop nuclear capacity. In 1945 the United States established its charter membership in the atomic club by the first controlled atomic explosion known to mankind. Now, just 20 years later, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, and Communist China have joined the club and a number of other nations are knocking on the door. India, Israel, Canada, Sweden, and Japan, along with Italy, West Germany and several other countries, according to various estimates, have developed an advanced nuclear technology which puts the bomb within reach. And the sad thing about the development of nuclear capacity by this ever-growing number of countries is the the fact that it is contagious. The mere possession of impressive military force does not per se guarantee that a nation will be successful in achieving its goals of statecraft. But certainly the neighbors of these new nuclear powers may feel threatened by this power and feel impelled, for reasons of their own national security, to also develop nuclear capability.

Mr. President, many owners of nuclear power means many with the opportunity to use it or threaten its use. It means that many will be threatened by them. It means there will be difficulty in knowing who has been responsible for particular actions if these ever happen. It probably means that measures of arms control will be more difficult to devise and negotiate, and it introduces uncertainties into international bargaining which might well be more than the human processes of diplomacy and the complexities of alliances could sustain.

As the destructive power of modern weapons has risen by almost geometric proportions since World War II, the postwar period has been characterized by interminable and highly technical meetings of negotiators from powerful countries; by carefully drafted and exceedingly complex disarmament proposals and counterproposals; by mounting pressure from public opinion around the world for renewing the search for a way out of the disarmament impasse; and, down to the early 1960's, by remarkably little genuine progress in resolving the issues which have blocked great power acceptance of an operable disarmament plant. We must do better than this.

Mr. President, the challenge of our time is not how many more warheads we can produce or stockpile but rather how we can prevent nuclear proliferation and how we can prevent its use. This is a problem which concerns every country—regardless of its political affiliation. Every nation must take an active part in preventing an eventual holocaust. This requires the utmost efforts of our combined wisdom, energy, and concern for the survival and progress of mankind. The future is, therefore, one of political choice, not of technical capacity.

Mr. President, the great objective of a nonproliferation system must undoubtedly be to gain control, on some international basis, over the production of fissile material. If in some way this can be achieved, there is a real prospect of stopping the spread. If it cannot, it is difficult to foresee anything but a steady increase in the number of nuclear powers. The truly difficult part of this problem is not to secure the signature of the existing nuclear powers to an agreement not to give nuclear arms or knowhow to other governments. None of them intends to do this anyway. What is more difficult is to induce nonnuclear powers to agree not to acquire these arms and to find a way of holding them to their undertaking. Any serious treaty would have to face this issue, especially as the principal danger of proliferation still lies some years ahead, when it is impossible to foresee which nonnuclear powers might be involved or what the pattern of great power relationships might be by that time.

The fact is that, much as the big nuclear powers might prefer to avoid proliferation, their fear of it is not strong enough to force them into so drastic a joint policy as would be needed forcibly to deter a determined and substantial power from making its own nuclear weapons. It is, rather, for that group of countries which have deliberately held back on the development of these weapons to force the pace in broad international arrangements as the price of their continued nonnuclear status.

Nevertheless, the nuclear powers who say they are concerned about proliferation can do a great deal to slow it. The major responsibility for initiative along this line still belongs to the United States, England and the Soviet Union. Ever since the United States developed nuclear capacity in 1945 it has been a policy of this country to work for the control of nuclear energy, for we realized early what vast destructive power lay in the unleashed use of the atom. In 1945 the United States, Canada and England proposed the immediate establishment of a United Nations commission to prepare recommendations aimed at utilizing nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes. More recently England has taken the dramatic initiative in cutting back its independent nuclear force.

Mr. President, it is now, not sometime in the vague tomorrow, that is the time for us to pursue the common objective of all countries to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. And we must work toward this end with the utmost energy and speed.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that the resolution by the Senator from Rhode Island is so terribly important and timely. It is not asking too much that the Members of the Senate, as representatives of the people of this Nation, make themselves be heard on this issue. We support the President in his attempts to find a solution to the problems of proliferation. But, at the same time, this resolution leaves open the opportunities for the Senate to carry out its distinct duties in deciding whether treaties or agreements that the President makes are satisfactory.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly endorse this resolution as an essential step in furthering the cause of world peace.

THE VISTA PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the excellent work that the Volunteers in Service to America, more commonly referred to as VISTA, are doing both in Rhode Island and in the Nation.

In my own State of Rhode Island there are currently four VISTA volunteers serving under the sponsorship of the Cooperative Extension Service of the University of Rhode Island. The Cooperative Extension Service, a recipient of both Federal and State funds, disseminates information and educates in the area of home economics, agriculture, and family and community living. The four VISTA volunteers are supplementing and assisting staff members in a self-help program concerned with children, young adults, with home makers and with elderly persons who live in the hard core areas of South Providence.

These dedicated VISTA volunteers work with especially poor families who are not reached by the existing welfare programs. They also work with youth in a variety of club activities, developing their educational needs and recreational programs. The work that these VISTA volunteers are doing in Rhode Island is to be highly commended, as is the entire VISTA effort throughout the country. The mission of VISTA is to attack poverty wherever it festers in America. No region is too remote, no slum too forbidding, no conditions too impossible to halt VISTA's efforts to help.

As Ben H. Bagdikian, in a recent article that appeared in the Saturday Evening Post said:

> Marked by the unparalleled prosperity of their fellow citizens, some 3 million people go without jobs. The Government speaks of improvement, but a dangerous number of Americans cannot keep up with the onrushing technology.

Those Americans who have been passed over by technology mainly live in our urban communities. But poverty also exists in rural America.

On February 4, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson said:

> Lack of a decent life is almost twice as prevalent in rural America as it is in urban America. * * * Rural America has almost three times the proportion of substandard houses found in urban states. A fourth of all farm homes are without running water. * * * Rural people lag almost two years behind urban residents in educational attainment. * * * Rural children receive one-third less medical attention than urban children. * * * Special measures must be taken by the States and the Federal agencies to reach rural people, particularly in remote areas.

Mr. President, this is where VISTA serves. The cities, in rural America, in Appalachia, migrant workers, American Indians—helping our mentally handicapped, serving the Job Corps.

Today, there are 1,900 Volunteers in Service to America at work on 252 projects in 43 States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands. Another 257 volunteers are presently going through their 6 weeks of training. These dedicated volunteers can be found in distant Alaskan villages where they arrive by bush plane. In fact, 30 VISTA volunteers fanned out of Anchorage by both plane and boat to man their war on poverty outposts, among Alaska's isolated Eskimo villages. These volunteers are the first of 200 who are needed to help the State's indigenous population of approximately 60,000 Eskimos, Indians and Aleuts, who rank as the poorest group of the entire Nation. Many of these families live on less than $1,000 a year. Half of the Aleuts have had less than 5 years of school and 9 out of every 10 families live in substandard conditions.

The volunteers arrive and work in the slums of New York, Chicago and Los Angeles and even in the eroded hollows of Appalachia. They make their homes in the hogans of Indian reservations and in the shacks of migrant farm laborers. They bring a glimmer of hope to the mentally ill and retarded and live side by side with the confused and homesick youngsters in the War on Poverty Job Corps centers.

President John F. Kennedy said:

> Mental retardation strikes without regard to class, creed or economic level. Each year sees an estimated 126,000 new cases. But it hits more often and harder at the underprivileged and the poor and most often of all and most severely in city tenements and rural slums where there are heavy concentrations of Americans with poor education and low income.

Until a decade ago, not a single State health department offered any special community services for the mentally retarded or their families. Now, 123 VISTA volunteers have chosen to devote their year in Service to America by helping the mentally ill and retarded, people whose problems have very often been swept under the rug.

The volunteers are at work in 11 mental health projects in 9 States; these include a program to aid retarded children in San Francisco; assisting mental patients in Boston State Hospital who are attempting to readjust to life outside the hospital; in a statewide program in West Virginia which has asked for 168 volunteers and thus far has received 42.

The Volunteers in Service to America are not a special breed of children. They simply have the common desire to help their fellow man, to help those caught in poverty's trap. The monetary rewards these volunteers receive are meager. They are given a small stipend of approximately $50 a month.

In greeting the first VISTA volunteers at the White House on December 12, 1964, President Johnson said:

> Your pay will be low, the conditions of your labor will be difficult, but you will have the satisfaction of leading a great national effort and you will have the ultimate reward which comes to those who serve their fellow man.

These words of President Johnson clearly state the mission of VISTA, a program which is unknown to most Americans and which has not received the great public relations push which so many of the other poverty programs have been given. VISTA has been embroiled in no city-State-Federal power plays. Its volunteers have quietly worked efficiently and well.

Mr. President, I think it is time VISTA programs under the direction of its great administrator, Glenn W. Ferguson, is finally given the public recognition that he deserves.

VISTA volunteers range in age from 18 to 85. They come from every State in the Nation and from every segment of American society. Some volunteers come to VISTA as young men and women, others are in their sixties and older. Some still have their careers before them while others have interrupted their work to serve. And there are those who are from the ranks of the retired. Thirty-nine percent of the VISTA volunteers are men, 61 percent are women. Married couples are encouraged to serve as volunteers. Although some assignments require special skills or advice from professionals, it is not necessary to have a skill in the sense of being an expert. The only essential ingredient for a VISTA volunteer to have is the desire to serve, the willingness to learn so that they may teach others, and an insight that provides that commodity most needed by the poverty stricken—hope.

Rhode Island alone is privileged to have 12 volunteers currently active in the VISTA program. They are: William A. Brooks, 59 East Orchard Avenue, Providence; Burton B. Bryan, Box 2, Adamsville; Armand W. Carriere, 1 Park Drive, Woonsocket; Julia W. Davis, 50 Arlington Street, Pawtucket; Domenic A. Annotti, 443 River Avenue, Providence; Diane M. Barrette, 26 Gilmore Street, Providence; Barbara J. Boudreau, 72 Ridge Road, Slatersville; Charles E. Capraro, 20 Wentworth Street, North Providence; Minnie M. Dadam, 130 Fair Street, Warwick; Robert J. Dilibero, 150 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Providence; Austin J. Duffy, 15 Grosvenor Avenue, Providence; Ave M. Murphy, 77 Arnold Avenue, Cranston.

Mr. President, I would like to tell the Senate about the work of just two of these fine people, Burton B. Bryan and Armand W. Carriere, who are doing work that is typical of the high caliber of the services VISTA is performing throughout the country.

Mr. Bryan, 22, of Adamsville, is a VISTA volunteer who acts as counselor, teacher and friend to underprivileged boys at the Tillamook Job Corps Camp, Tillamook, Oreg. This rural conservation center, located in the northwestern corner of Oregon, 10 miles from the Pacific Ocean, is designed to bring up the educational level of 16- to 21-year-old dropouts, and at the same time have them work on useful conservation projects on public lands. Burton Bryan assists in the camp's math class and teaches reading classes on his own. Many of the boys who come to Tillamook arrive with no reading ability. After a month or two they are able to read short stories and simple books. When they have also mastered fractions and decimals, they can go to an urban center and get more intensive vocational training. Mr. Bryan is a graduate of the University of Vermont with a degree in zoology. He plans to go to graduate school in preparation of a teaching career. Mr. Bryan works alongside another Rhode Islander, Bryan Corrigan, of Providence, R.I., a former Peace Corps instructor, who is an employee of Job Corps and who also assists in counseling the young men at Tillamook Job Corps Camp.

Armand Carriere, of Woonsocket, R.I., a 1965 graduate of the University of Rhode Island, is a community developer in rural Grant County, W. Va. Carriere who has been in Grant County since January, makes his home in a trailer in a Negro slum neighborhood called Town Hill. He describes the people as "first suspicious and then friendly" toward his efforts to pull them up from poverty to an acceptable level of subsistence. First and foremost, he recognized the need of a community sewer system for Town Hill. This community was passed over last year when the municipal government installed new sewers in nearby Petersburg. They need a playground during the school year, a circulating library and sidewalks. Thus far, Carriere has made great strides toward these ends. An organized community, Armand feels, is his most effective tool. Carriere has so far received donations from the nearby town of Petersburg for a library and has written to several publishing companies who appear to be sympathetic to his cause. He also discovered that the State Department of Libraries would loan books for the use of VISTA volunteers in library projects.

I mention only two volunteers but I believe that the work of these fine people is representative of the excellent service that this agency performs. This organization, which was first known as the Domestic Peace Corps, then as the National Peace Corps, is truly the silent service in the war on poverty. This combination of able leadership of Glenn Ferguson and a host of dedicated volunteers is quietly and effectively fighting this war and its evils by helping those who are most adversely affected by poverty to escape its terrible grip.

CRISIS IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, churches of all denominations throughout the United States are observing Soil Stewardship Week during the period May 15 to 22. This annual observance is sponsored by the Nation's 3,000 local soil and and water conservation districts.

The purpose of this observance is to help more Americans to become fully aware of the close relationship between the teachings of the Bible and the conservation, development, and proper use of soil, water, and related resources. Our soil is our strength. The water that sustains us demands constant vigilance.

"Crisis in the Countryside" is the theme of this year's observance. Abundance and affluence are terms descriptive of much of today's living in our country, but what of the future? We are plagued by this question, not so much because we mistrust God to provide for our needs, but because of the recurring realization that mankind through carelessness, and shortsightedness, may waste, destroy, pollute, or neglect his God-given bounty.

This point was aptly made by Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, in a statement he issued in connection with Soil Stewardship Week observances. He says there are two crises. One is the continued wastage of land through erosion and improper use. The other is the crisis of complacency about conservation.

I commend Mr. Williams on this fine statement. I ask unanimous consent to have his full statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRISIS IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

(A Soil Stewardship Week statement by D. A. Williams, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service)

Today, there is indeed a "crisis in the countryside"—or rather, two crises. One is the continued wastage of the land through erosion and improper use. The other is the result of man's partial success. This is the crisis of complacency about conservation.

Why this complacency? Perhaps it is because the need for increased conservation measures does not immediately strike the eye. The supermarkets are full—today. The dust may not be blowing—today. And so we concern ourselves with the big headlines—wars, space, missiles, murders.

These are serious matters indeed. But, we lose more of our land every year to silent erosion than we have ever lost, or shall ever lose, to a foreign foe. Where is the battle cry for this?

What happens to the eroding lands in Missouri and Montana affects us more directly than our landing on the moon. Where are the pleaders for this? And—no matter what weapons of the future we develop—the most modern army in the world still travels on its stomach, still depends on the bountiful earth we take for granted.

Do not misunderstand me. Our activities around the world, and out of it, are very necessary. But I will firmly believe to the end of my life that there is no work more important, now or for the future, than conserving and enriching our own land, the basis for our life, our living, our national wealth.

Yet, we lose each year, through erosion and other forms of preventable damage, about 500,000 acres of formerly productive land. The bulldozer and the builder take another one and one-third million acres of the best land every 365 days for highways, factories, housing and so on. Our rivers continue to flood and destroy homes and hopes. Our water supply runs short, becomes polluted, erodes the land. And, as much of our land disappears, our population and that of the world increases.

Yes, our supermarkets are still full. Our time has not run out. But, quite literally, the sins of our forefathers are being visited upon us. We cannot afford to be as wasteful in the future, if we desire our children's children to inherit an affluent America. We must plan more intensively, farm more wisely, care more urgently. And we must make sure the city man understands that what happens in rural America affects him immediately and profoundly.

We call our land "God's country," and it is. Let us clearly acknowledge it is our job to keep it that way. Farmers and ranchers, as the chief soil stewards, have the heaviest responsibility. They, of all people, know the conservation job is far from done. Thirty percent of our land is being properly treated. what about the 70 percent?

As we acknowledge Soil Stewardship Week, let us indeed thank God for this country, and for the thousands of dedicated people working to keep it rich and bountiful—especially the officials and cooperators of our 3,000 soil and water conservation districts. And then—let us get off our knees and go back to work.

TWO SIDES TO HIGHER MINIMUM WAGES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I submit herewith an editorial from the Iola Register by my friend Angelo Scott, former editor and publisher of this most worthwhile Kansas newspaper.

In this editorial Mr. Scott points out most forcefully that there are two sides to higher minimum wages.

Because of the clear and concise lines of argument drawn in this editorial, I think it would be of interest to my colleagues in the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO HELP TO POOR

(By Angelo Scott)

"Of all the laws on the statute books of this country, I believe the minimum wage law probably does Negroes the most harm," Milton Friedman, a Chicago university economist, said in a recent report.

"It does not attack the problem of poverty—but only creates more poverty. It does not protect marginal workers—but just reduces their chances of finding jobs.

"It does not increase purchasing power—but only distributes it more unequally. It hurts most of the people having the toughest time to begin with—Negroes, teen-agers, the unskilled, and people living in economically depressed regions of the country."

This statement is the unvarnished and uncomfortable truth, as little as we like to admit it.

It isn't all the truth. The rest of it is that minimum wage laws have over the years raised whole industries from sweat shop conditions to decent living standards. They have put an end to much exploitation of human labor.

But what Friedman says is still true: minimum wages are not an aid but a barrier to the employment of those who need help the most. And the higher it is pushed, the greater a barrier it will be.

If the present objective of $1.65 an hour is reached, how many employers like The Register, for instance, will be able to pay raw high school kids that kind of money for stuffing papers or helping in the mailing room?

How many employers can afford to pay uneducated, untrained laborers $66 for a 40-hour week while they are learning to do something besides bend their backs?

Mighty few—unless there is a sweep of inflation so severe that $1.65 begins to look like $1.25 again.

So there are these two sides to higher minimum wages. Some they help, some they hurt. But don't kid yourself as to who the gainers and losers are.

The tip-off is that all the pressure for higher minimum wages is from unions, the great bulk of whose members are already far above the proposed minimum levels.

Why? Because they seek the "bumping" effect. Higher minimums require higher wage steps all along the line in order to preserve reasonable differentials between the beginners and the journeymen, the learners and those with long experience.

Union journeymen are already the cream of the crop so far as wage scales are concerned. They are the ones most likely to benefit from higher minimum wages.

The War on Poverty will only be harder to fight.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS SITUATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, because the balance of payments in American dollars due to foreign nations is in such an adverse position to our interest, the President of the United States has repeatedly requested the private enterprise system of our country not to spend American dollars abroad.

It would seem that this request, if it were to apply to private enterprise, unquestionably should also have applied to Federal agencies constituting a part of the White House operation.

It is un-understandable and ironical to learn that in spite of the request made by the President of the United States, the Tennessee Valley Authority—the big U.S. Government-owned utility—recently announced that it awarded to foreign companies contracts totaling some $4½ million after the foreign concerns beat the U.S. corporate bidders in the competition. The bids of the successful awardees were substantially lower than the bids submitted by the U.S. private enterprisers.

Two lessons are to be learned from this particular experience. First—can it be expected that private enterprise will be able to carry out the request of the White House when agencies of the Government fail to do so; second—if the bids of the foreign competitors were widely below the bids of the U.S. concerns, it behooves us to recognize that inflation has taken hold and, therefore, labor unions and business should understand that unpardonable and indefensible harm is being done to the economy of our Nation by a trend that makes it impossible for American manufacturers to come within close distance in meeting the bids of our foreign competitors.

The efforts of labor leaders and business managers should be in the direction of placing ourselves in a competitive position with foreign competitors and then to support vigorously the principle of "buy American."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a letter received by me from H. Richard Roser dated May 2, 1966, and also a copy of an article carried several days ago in the Wall Street Journal under the heading: "Two TVA Contracts Go To Foreign Firms Trouncing U.S. Bidders."

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CUYAHOGA FALLS, OHIO,
May 2, 1966.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: The attached article taken from page 9 of the April 22, 1966 issue of the Wall Street Journal, has caused me, as well as others, to become thoroughly disgusted with the administration of TVA. Needless to say, I have seen evidence of foreign purchases made by government agencies; but to buy—even a postage stamp—from a country such as France, in light of its antagonistic foreign policy with regards to NATO in particular and the United States in general, is an insult to the American people who can still read the news. Even if such a purchase were to be written off the French war debt to the United States (which will not be the case), such a transaction is nauseous in light of this Nation's attitude toward other democratic nations of Western Europe and the Americas.

Does our Government's request to "buy American" apply only to private industry and individuals, or is this just another example of "feeding the hand that bites us?"

The time is long overdue that this tax free Government controlled utility, which is supported by all of the taxpayers in the country, be returned to its originally conceived purpose of flood-control with associated hydrogeneration.

Very truly yours,
H. RICHARD ROSER.

(Attachment.)

TWO TVA CONTRACTS GO TO FOREIGN FIRMS TROUNCING U.S. BIDDERS—AGENCY'S OUTLAYS ABROAD NOW TOP ALL FISCAL 1965 DESPITE JOHNSON PLEA FOR RESTRAINT

(By a Wall Street Journal Staff Reporter)

KNOXVILLE, TENN.—Despite repeated White House requests for reduced spending abroad to help ease Uncle Sam's balance-of-payments problems, at least one Federal agency is stepping up foreign purchases.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, big U.S. Government-owned utility, announced it awarded to two foreign companies contracts totaling some $4.5 million, after the foreign concerns beat U.S. corporate bidders by a wide margin. The new contracts, for high-voltage-power equipment, raised total foreign purchases by TVA so far in the current fiscal year ending June 3 to about $10 million, compared with about $7 million in all of 1965, a TVA spokesman said.

"It seems all the utilities are turning to these high-voltage lines at the same time," the TVA spokesman said. "And from the bidding it appears to be the case; all the American manufacturing companies must have their shops pretty full already."

TVA said it awarded the foreign contracts under provisions of the "Buy American Act," which allows Government agencies to buy foreign products if the low foreign bid is more than 6% below the low American bid or more than 12% below the domestic bid if the American firm operates in an area of labor surplus.

On one contract, English Electric Corp., Stafford, England, undercut the top American bidder, Westinghouse Electric Corp., by nearly 50%. English Electric offered to build four 500,000-volt power transformers, plus accessories, for $2,249,010. Two other foreign companies also beat the best of three American bids, $3,309,859, entered by Westinghouse.

On a contract for up to ten 500,000-volt power circuit breakers with spare parts, TVA made the award to Cogenel, Inc., Villeurbanne, France. Of the three bidders, two were foreign. The lowest bid was Cogenel's at $2,296,977; the highest was Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.'s at $3,022,000.

On another major contract, however, which drew General Electric Co., Allis-Chalmers and Cogenel as the only bidders, TVA awarded the contract to GE, whose bid was $315,000 each for up to nine 500,000-volt power circuit breakers, compared with $258,000 each bid by Cogenel, the lowest bidder.

"We made the award to GE after considering a number of factors, including an engineering evaluation," said a TVA spokesman. "Also contributing to our decision was adding 12% on to Cogenel's bid under the Buy American Act plus the fact we would have to pay to maintain a TVA inspector at the factory abroad for the purchase of anything this large."

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY TO ISSUE BONDS AND FINANCE ITS POWER PROGRAM

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, on January 26 of this year I introduced a bill (S. 2827) to remove the limitation on the authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds to finance its power program. Since the temporary limit of $750 million in bond authority will soon be reached, early consideration of S. 2827 is essential in order that TVA can develop adequate plans to meet rapidly growing needs.

On March 29, 1966, in Memphis, the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association passed a resolution which I wholeheartedly support. The resolution provides a concise statement of present circumstances and recommends a reasonable solution to a perplexing problem. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Congress in 1959 enacted legislation authorizing the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) to use revenue bond financing as an additional method of financing needed power facilities to serve its area; and

Whereas, revenue bond financing has been used in a highly successful manner by TVA, with its bonds receiving the highest rating in the private money market; and

Whereas, the temporary limit of $750 million in bond authority will soon be reached; and

Whereas, TVA has demonstrated clearly during this test of revenue bond financing that it has exercised this authority in a responsible manner, and that the actual limit on TVA's ability to issue bonds and notes is a demonstrated ability to pay the charges thereon from the revenues derived from the sale of the additional power provided through the use of the bond funds; and

Whereas, TVA is also limited by Congress as to the area in which it can market power, so that power expansion is within geographic limits carefully defined by Congress; and

Whereas, TVA must plan on a long-range continuing basis to meet the growing power needs of the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, on March 29, 1966, urges the Congress to place TVA revenue bond financing authority on a permanent, long-range basis, with the TVA Board of Directors made responsible for determining the amounts and timing of bond issues to meet the power needs of the area.

Passed by the membership of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association at its 20th Annual Meeting held in Memphis, Tennessee, on March 28, 1966.

(Copy of this resolution sent to the Tennessee Valley delegation in Congress.)

ASIANS CONSIDER UNITED STATES INEPT, NOT ARROGANT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled, "Asians Consider United States Inept, Not Arrogant," which was written by Stanley Karnow, and published in the Washington Post of May 16, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 16, 1966]

MOSCOW, PEKING, WASHINGTON SHARE ILLUSIONS—ASIANS CONSIDER U.S. INEPT, NOT ARROGANT

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG, May 15.—Viewed from Asia, Sen. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT'S description of American conduct abroad as the "arrogance of power" appears somewhat inappropriate.

If anything, much of United States policy and practice in the Far East seems more to resemble a kind of "illusion of power." And in their ways, Peking and Moscow may be sharing similar illusions.

It isn't that America is the earnest Boy Scout trying to help the old lady across the street against her will, as FULBRIGHT put it. The apparent problem is that America is far less adept at crossing the street than the old lady herself.

Thus a prime characteristic of U.S. efforts, where they have been applied energetically, has often been ineffectiveness rather than overbearance.

So it has begun to strike a good many observers out here that perhaps the most meaningful sort of U.S. policy, in this part of the world at least, may be as little policy as possible.

INDONESIA AN EXAMPLE

Indonesia is the most obvious case in point. In 1958, an occult branch of the American government exerted itself to undermine President Sukarno, and failed. In the years that followed, Indonesia gradually edged to the brink of a "peoples democracy." As recently as last summer, there were prominent Americans who advocated drastic means to prevent a prospective Communist takeover.

But coolness prevailed. When Ambassador Marshal Green went to Djakarta in August, his instructions were to do nothing, and he performed ably.

Without the slightest American interference, the abortive Communist putsch on Sept. 30 turned into an anti-Communist holocaust. Without a penny of operational CIA money spent, Sukarno has gradually lost his authority, and the new Indonesian leaders are slowly striving to rejoin the international community.

Geopoliticians far from the scene have argued that American determination in Vietnam inspired the Indonesian anti-Communists. Such thinking was not apparent in Indonesia itself, where students, Moslems and Army officers turned against the Communists for almost purely local reasons, using rather gruesome local techniques.

"You can do us a great favor," a youth leader in Bandung told an American reporter not long ago. "Please don't try to teach us how to fight communism. We have our own methods."

It can be pointed out, of course, that the Communists came within an ace of pulling off their coup. How they would have evolved had they succeeded is a matter of conjecture. Many Western experts believe that, over the long run, Indonesian nationalism would have outweighed Communist doctrine. Indeed, there are hints that Peking considered Indonesia's Communists to be potential "revisionists."

As events proved, however, the anti-Communists were stronger and the Communists far weaker than any outsider had anticipated.

Sukarno may have inadvertently done Washington a favor by restricting American activities in Indonesia.

SUBTLE SUBVERSION

A less visible and more subtle kind of subversion has been going on for years in Communist China, nibbling away at Mao Tse-Tung's dogmatic brand of communism.

From top to bottom, the Chinese regime is being perceptibly eroded by a widespread weariness with ideology and what must be termed, for lack of a better expression, the intangible human instinct for individual expression and improvement.

The force of this instinct was evident in 1956 when Mao's decision to "let a hundred flowers bloom" sparked an explosion of criticism against his regime. It was clear in the collapse of the "Great Leap Forward," and in the pervasive, every-man-for himself spirit of the lean years that followed. It is currently apparent in Peking's waves of attacks against "bourgeois" tendencies allegedly seeking to undermine the Communist Party.

One of the most significant statements to come out of China in a long time was made in Peking last week by a visiting Albanian dignitary, Hysni Kapo. Accurately parroting Mao's fears, Kapo warned that the main danger for a Communist state is not the external threat of "U.S. imperialist" aggression but internal "degeneration toward capitalism and revisionism."

THE NEW BOURGEOIS

Kapo deplored signs of this trend in "The rising bourgeois stratum * * * made up particularly of Party and state cadres and intellectuals who have degenerated into bourgeois elements."

None of this portends the imminent end of communism. But it suggests for the years ahead that the future Chinese leaders, lacking Mao's prestigious authority, may have to soften Peking's present fanaticism in order to accommodate the popular mood.

If such an evolution takes place, it would owe less to America's China policies than to dynamics within China itself—changes stemming, as De Gaulle might say, from "the nature of things."

CONJECTURE FASCINATING

What might have been in Vietnam had the United States avoided a commitment there is a fascinating subject for conjecture. If all Vietnam had become communist when the Indochina war ended in 1954, it is plausible that the Sinophobic Vietnamese would have long ago asserted their independence from China in much the same way that the Rumanians now hold the Soviet Union at arms' length.

Even at present, under the enormous pressures of war, the North Vietnamese have not become Chinese lackeys. Despite Peking's displeasure, Hanoi sent a high-level delegation to the Soviet Party Congress in Moscow last March.

In short, Vietnam's communists are largely managing their own show. And so are Vietnam's anti-Communists. The United States has poured manpower, money and materiel into South Vietnam to hold the military line. In the crucial sphere of politics, however, the Saigon government eludes U.S. control and often even American guidance. Not an American in Washington or Saigon can make Premier Nguyen Cao Ky keep his mouth shut.

It has been that way in Vietnam for years. The late President Ngo Dinh Diem, former premier Nguyen Khanh and several lesser luminaries regularly rejected American recommendations. If Ky is an American puppet, as his critics contend, he is a puppet who pulls his own strings.

In North as well as South Vietnam, therefore, future moves may be taken that disregard the aims of wishes of the United States, Russia and China. The potential of deals involving Buddhists, Communists, Catholics, generals, various sects and assorted politicians is an infinity of possibilities. Their ultimate outcome could be a "Vietnamese solution" that defies the easy comprehension of outsiders.

If such a solution evolves, it will not be because American power is arrogant, but because American power has been restrained, incomplete, confused. For all the Boy Scout's honest intentions, to use the Fulbright image, the little old lady may manage to cross the street in her own good time by her own devious native devices.

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1966]

THE DANANG COUP

The seizure of Danang by the Ky Government means a determination to fight it out with the dissident political elements of the Unified Buddhist Church. Unless the struggle is quickly stopped, this would mean an end to the hopes, expectations and promises of an election by September 15 for a constituent assembly and later an elected government.

The gravity of the situation is obvious. Civil war is one possibility. The South Vietnamese struggle against the Vietcong is bound to be seriously hampered. Worst of all would be the embarrassing and perhaps critical position of the American forces in Vietnam and the handicap to the war they are waging.

Once again, Washington has been caught by surprise—even to the extent of Ambassador Lodge being in the United States instead of in Saigon. When Marshal Ky calmly announced a few days ago that he intended to keep his government in power for at least another year, Secretary Rusk declared that the Premier had been misunderstood and really did not mean what he seemed to be saying. He meant it all right, and this development becomes another in the long series of misunderstandings and miscalculations of the Vietnamese by the United States Government.

As always when a sudden and unexpected event of this sort explodes in Vietnam, it is necessary to let the storm blow over. When it does, every effort must be made to bring the electoral position back to where it was, if that is going to be possible.

The desirability and, indeed, necessity to hold elections that would permit a broad-based civilian government in South Vietnam is as clear as ever. Washington's orders to the American advisers in Saigon to urge a peaceful settlement can only be a stopgap move. The military may prove strong enough to prevent the militant Buddhists from creating a chaotic situation in Danang, Hue and Saigon. The damage is by no means beyond repair. In South Vietnam the pessimists as well as the optimists are often confounded.

But the coup emphasizes once again that it has never been possible to interpret Vietnamese events in terms of American ideas or Western logic. Premier Ky obviously feels strong enough to assert Saigon's authority over the virtually rebellious northern provinces. If, having done so, he then turns back to the concept of constitutional and legislative elections, the harm can be held to a minimum.

Once the situation has stabilized it is more important than ever that the election be demonstrably fair. The very nature of the American involvement in South Vietnam makes it impossible for the United States to operate with total detachment in this respect. As Senator Ribicoff has suggested, the United Nations would be the best possible choice to exercise a supervisory function to guarantee the fairness of a vote in a country with no democratic tradition.

The alternative to elections is chaos. Premier Ky must realize this. So must Washington. Whatever happens now, the final goal still has to be elections.

TRIBUTE TO HON. HARVEY M. JOHNSEN, EIGHTH CIRCUIT, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was my privilege last week to participate in the Law Day program of the University of Nebraska College of Law and the Lincoln Bar Association.

The college was celebrating the 75th year of its founding and honoring one of Nebraska's preeminent jurists, the Honorable Harvey M. Johnsen, senior judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.

The salute to Judge Johnsen and his invaluable contributions to the administration of justice was made by another outstanding member of the Federal bench, the Honorable John W. Delehant, senior judge of the U.S. district court.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record the text of Judge Delehant's remarks, together with a report of the occasion from the Lincoln Evening Journal.

There being no objection, the address and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Testimonial Dinner in Honor of the Honorable Harvey M. Johnsen, the University of Nebraska College of Law and the Lincoln Bar Association, Friday, May 6, 1966

In a perfectly valid sense, an institution of learning, or a professional society or association, honors itself on an occasion, wherein it singles out for public recognition, a worthy recipient who, as the case may be, pursued his education under the tuition of the institution, or holds, or has held, membership in the society or association. For the signalized distinction achieved by the honoree is frequently, if not invariably, referable in substantial measure either to the quality of his education or to the stimulation issuing from the contacts of his association with his professional brethren. With due allowance for his own native capability and application and industry, few influences contribute to his success more effectively than his formal scholastic career, or the educative ministry of his more mature contacts with others also dedicated to his calling, or both of these in combination. I am aware of the contribution to success which is frequently attributed to what is roughly characterized as "luck." I do not utterly deny its occasional influence. Yet, I allow myself to believe that its frequency and potency are largely overemphasized and that, almost invariably, its beneficiary generates his own "luck."

May I, therefore, congratulate the College of Law of the University of Nebraska, and, through the Lincoln, Nebraska Bar Association, also the Nebraska State Bar Association, upon the deserved honor which is theirs because of their joint sponsorship of this ceremony, but, more especially, because of their sharing, each in its own way, in the making of the man, whom they are here and now so appropriately commending. In acclaiming him, we inevitably direct respectful attention to the excellence of their own ministry.

Nebraska proudly and correctly claims Harvey M. Johnsen as her own. He was born in Hastings, spent the greater part of his boyhood, including his common school years, in Fremont, and even while laboring beyond Nebraska's borders, has always resided in this state. He graduated from the University of Nebraska with the degree, Bachelor of Laws, in 1919, and with the degree, Bachelor of Arts, in 1921. In the University he achieved the first scholastic position in his class, and was the year's Ivy Day orator, and the recipient of membership in Phi Beta Kappa. In possible prevision of his career, and in the course of his residence in the University, he served during some three years as Secretary to the Honorable Andrew M. Morrissey, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Nebraska, who was recognized as a highly competent appellate judge and judicial administrator.

In 1951, the University of Nebraska conferred on Judge Johnsen the degree, Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa,* and in 1960, the Creighton University conferred on him the like degree.

He practiced his profession with acknowledged distinction in the city of Omaha until 1938. There he was associated, first as an employee, but chiefly, as a partner, in well known legal firms of high standing, including Johnsen, Gross & Crawford, of which, at the close of his active practice, he was the senior partner. Through four years of his practice in Omaha, he devoted a portion of his time and energies to instructional service as a member of the faculty of the School of Law of The Creighton University.

During the period of his practice of Law, Judge Johnsen participated actively in the work of the Nebraska State Bar Association, originally a voluntary organization, later and now an integrated entity. From 1928 to 1936, he was the secretary of the Association. And during its 1938 term, he served as its president. He has retained, and still possesses, his membership in the organization.

On January 3, 1939, he was appointed by the Honorable R. L. Cochran, Governor of Nebraska, as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Nebraska. He served with conspicuous competence in that office until his resignation on November 18, 1940. On the latter date, he qualified as a judge of the United States Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, pursuant to his nomination by the President of the United States, and the confirmation thereof by the United States Senate. He became the Chief Judge of that court on August 8, 1959, and continued to serve in that capacity until July 16, 1965, when, pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C., section 45, he terminated his service as Chief Judge of that court. Effective August 1, 1965, he retired from active status as a judge of the United States Court of Appeals, and became, and he now is, a senior judge of that court. In his status as a Senior Circuit Judge, which will persist so long during his remaining life as he shall elect, and subject also to the discretion of competent assigning authority within the judiciary, he will be available for the performance of judicial service within the federal courts, exclusive of the Supreme Court of the United States.

One aspect of the position of a chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for one of the several circuits is the fact that such Chief Judge, by statute, serves as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Briefly explained, and with no attempt at precise adequacy, the Judicial Conference of the United States consists of the Chief Justice of the United States, who is its presiding member, the chief judges of the several judicial circuits, the chief judge of the United States Court of Claims, the chief judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and a district judge from each judicial circuit, the latter selected in regular circuit conferences, by the circuit, and district judges of each such circuit, with appropriate provision, in emergencies, whereunder the Chief Justice may designate another judge to serve at a scheduled meeting in substitution for any chief circuit judge, or chief judge of either of the two special courts, or regularly selected district judge, who shall be unable to attend a particular Judicial Conference meeting. Thus constituted, the Judicial Conference of the United States meets and performs its duties at regular intervals.

The proper limitation of time this evening forbids the present explanation of the functions by law committed to the Judicial Conference of the United States. It must suffice to observe that they have broadly to do, among other things, with the promotion of the economical and efficient operation of the courts of the United States, not including the Supreme Court of the United States, through suggestions or orders calculated to promote economy and efficiency in the administration of justice in those courts; the consideration of, and making of recommendations touching, rules of practice, in such courts, and the consideration of, and making of recommendations concerning, proposed legislation by the Congress of the United States having an impact, certain or potential, upon the administration of justice in all of the federal courts. This admittedly important service imposes a heavy burden upon the members of the Judicial Conference. It likewise presents to them an obvious opportunity for the rendition of service contributing measurably to the improvement of the administration of justice in the courts of the federal judicial system. Judge Johnsen's valuable contribution to the service of the conference through his faithful attendance at its sessions, and participation in its deliberations, but especially through his service on many of its most vital committees, is familiarly known to us of the federal judiciary, and has placed us, and this nation, in his debt.

Obedient to what, from long and intimate acquaintance with him, I know would be his wish, even his command, if he were interrogated concerning the subject, I shall refrain altogether from an itemized or detailed recollection of his contribution as a jurist to our profession, to Nebraska, and to the United States. Much, though by no means all, of that contribution is disclosed in the literature of the law proper to these most recent twenty-seven years and longer, in the way of his many judicial opinions. Of those opinions, let it be said that they faithfully disclose the native intelligence of their author, his broad cultural and professional education for which, next after his own capacity and industry, he is indebted to his University; the maturity which he attained through his day-to-day practice of the law, and his abrasive contact with his brethren at the bar; his pursuit of justice both in the instant case, and in the broad pattern of the law; his determination to arrive, so far as has been humanly possible, at the correct result, in short, to achieve a just solution, unbothered by extraneous considerations; and throughout, a clarity and grace of expression adequate both to dissolve doubt respecting his judicial meaning, and to prompt its reader to an admiring envy of its writer's scholarship.

So far—even if so very little—respecting what by many may be thought to be the entire service of a jurist as a member of a court whose labors are performed largely—even if not entirely—in the area of review, his hearing of causes, his study of and conclusions upon them, and his formal announcement of those conclusions. That is, to be sure, the heart, the prime ingredient, of his official duty, the very objective of his office. But as I have undertaken to suggest, it is not his exclusive task. And of few judges is that more true than it has been of Judge Johnsen.

Allusion has already been made to the administrative authority which, in the federal judicial structure, is conferred upon the Chief Judge of each judicial circuit. By virtue of it he is, in practice, responsible for the orderly and effective functioning not alone of his own court, but, to a considerable degree, of the district courts within the circuit. And remember that the Eighth Judicial Circuit comprises the states of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota. In those seven states are located 10 separate federal judicial districts, each with its own complement of judges, and multiple sites for the holding of court, and all, save Nebraska, with district divisional structures.

Judge Johnsen arrived at his chief judgeship, with the fortification not only of his own service through some eighteen years as a judge of the Circuit Court, but also of his close observation of judicial administration by eminently competent judicial executives. I have already mentioned his youthful association with Chief Justice Morrissey. Beyound that, for several years in his own court, he had observed at close range the direction of that court and of the Eighth Circuit generally by Chief Judge Kimbrough Stone, a recognized master of judicial statesmanship. No lesson thus observable was lost on Judge Johnsen. His perceptive mind directed him to the proper solution of problems of whose potential existence his entire previous legal and judicial career made him aware. He was abundantly prepared for the chief judgeship, and he exercised its authority firmly but compassionately, prudently but unmistakably.

However, perhaps the most notably of all of tonight's reflections is this. Few jurists, equally with Judge Johnsen, have possessed the ability and the willingness, to envision and promote the administration of justice as such in its broadest sense. For justice, however varied its techniques or formulae of bestowal, is ultimately a single and sensitive entity. Its denial or perversion anywhere impairs, in varying degree, its esteem everywhere. While that may be accepted as at least remotely true on a world wide pattern, it has an especially persuasive significance when it is limited in its consideration to a single state or nation. Hence, in a concrete decision, in the formulation of a rule or rules of practice, even in the erection of usages or practices of an individual court, or in an important problem of judicial administration, it is in order to reflect, perhaps to determine, whether, and if so, in what manner and in what measure, the course to which a judge feels tentatively inclined, may enhance or impair the stability or esteem of ordered justice, especially near at hand, but, on occasion, even remotely. Admittedly, such a consideration should rarely, if ever, control the substantial resolution of specific litigation. But it is surely not too much to ask that a judge rationally satisfy himself that his decision in a particular case be not the "shaft at random sent" which "hits mark the archer never meant." Saying which, I observe that in his judicial career, whether strictly decisional, or administrative, or in the labors of conference committees, he is a rare judge whose course is as free from "aimlessness" as that of our present guest.

Finally, I venture to emphasize the fact that, in harmony with the federal statutes relating to the subject, Judge Johnsen has not, in any sense, withdrawn from judicial office. He has merely accepted the status of a Senior Circuit Judge. In that capacity, as I have already observed, he is, under the applicable national statute, available for assignment to judicial service, not alone in the Eighth Circuit, but anywhere in the United States. And, upon the basis of some nine years and more of personal experience in judicial seniority, I expect him through many years hereafter to receive, and to serve under, assignments to active duty requiring his presence from time to time, and subject to his own acceptance, in almost every circuit in the country.

So, your honor, in behalf of these, your friends, who know you so well, and love you so sincerely, I welcome you not to retirement from judicial service, but to the enjoyment of your Senior Circuit Judgeship, and of the labor and the fellowship which it will provide for you, whose encounters will vary only slightly, if at all, from those you have enjoyed in the performance of your strictly judicial duties during more than a quarter century.

[From the Lincoln Evening Journal, May 7, 1966]

Law College's Diamond Jubilee—Judge Johnsen Paid Special Honor

(By John Odgaard)

An estimated 400 attorneys, judges, students and faculty members attended the 75th anniversary Law Day celebration of the founding of the University of Nebraska Law College Friday evening.

The diamond anniversary banquet, cosponsored by the Law College and the Lincoln Bar Association this year, paid special honor to one of Nebraska's foremost legal figures.

U.S. Senator Roman Hruska and senior U.S. District Court Judge John W. Delehant were guest speakers in the ceremonies honoring the Honorable Harvey M. Johnsen, senior judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit.

Judge Johnsen, 70, was cited for his outstanding career and service in law. During his 46 years in the profession, the judge served as secretary to Nebraska Supreme Court Chief Justice Morrissey and was himself a justice of the State Supreme Court.

Judge Johnsen was the first president of the Bar Association in Nebraska, was a member of the American Judicature Society and American Law Institute, and prior to his appointment to the U.S. Court of Appeals in 1940, was in law practice in Omaha for 18 years.

CHIEF JUDGE

A native of Hastings and Fremont, Judge Johnsen was chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit for several years, before his recent retirement from that office.

In addition to the recognition paid Judge Johnsen, outstanding students of the College of Law were honored at the banquet.

Graduating seniors Donald F. Burt, Lincoln and Harvey S. Perlman, York, won the Thomas Stinson Allen Appellate competition award.

From the publication of the Nebraska Law Review, awards for best student articles went to Gailyn L. Larsen and Alan E. Peterson of Harlan, Iowa, and Lincoln, respectively.

Members of the 1965–66 National Moot Court team who placed fifth in the national competition were also honored.

Burt, Vernon F. Duncan, of Ashland, and Stephen M. Joynt of Lincoln presented their national award gavel to Prof. James A. Lake who presented it to the College of Law.

SPECIAL AWARDS

Three special awards were made to students for outstanding papers.

Lincolnite Robert C. Downs won the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation Award, and Stanley D. Cohen of Lincoln was winner of the Nathan Burkan Memorial award.

The National Grange competition award went to a native of Blair, senior law student Robert S. Lingo.

WAR ON POVERTY AMONG AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Office of Economic Opportunity has taken a giant step in the war on poverty among American Indians. The recently announced grant to the Office of Navajo Economic Opportunity for a legal services program is a truly significant antipoverty measure.

This project, which will be administered by the Navajo Legal Aid and Defender Society, will provide legal services for some 96,000 indigent Navajos who reside on the huge Navajo Reservation, including parts of Arizona, Utah, and New Mexico. The $872,851 grant will provide five legal services offices on the reservation and a legal and lay staff of 77 persons to serve the Navajo people. The project will include preventive legal education for the entire Navajo community, including the training of Navajo counselors to represent clients before Navajo tribal courts.

As an indication of what the war on poverty has come to mean to the Navajos, I call to the attention of the Senate the statement of Raymond Nakai, chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council, who attended the OEO press conference at which the grant was announced. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Nakai's statement printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Raymond Nakai

Today is an historic moment—a turning point—for my people the Navajo.

Among my people, innocent men have gone to jail.

Among my people, trusting sheepherders, unsuspecting housewives and hard-working laborers have been victimized by unscrupulous individuals.

Among my people, many have been at serious disadvantage in defending themselves against charges in alien courts under alien laws.

Injustice, indignity, helplessness—this is the law as the Navajo has known it by and large. These are the enemies which the program funded today by the Office of Economic Opportunity will help to defeat.

This program, which provides over $800,000 for legal services, will bring 18 attorneys to the Reservation and will encourage the growth of justice for all within our bounds.

From today forward, we begin to chart a new course for ourselves and for other Indian nations.

A course of growing economic independence and self-reliance.

A course which restores to the Indian his historic due which enables him to progress rapidly into the twentieth century through education and jobs and better housing and child care.

This program will provide the Navajo with the resources and grasp of the law that are necessary to hammer out a new charter for the Indian people in American Society.

To enable the Indian to shape his own destiny.

To enable the Indian to defend his own land against liquidation.

To define the rights and interests of all the Navajos.

To vest in the Indian people control over their schools, their jobs, services and their future.

To me personally, the significance of the Poverty Program rests on the principle of involvement of the poor themselves. This concept has been conspicuous by its absence in the past operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Now we find scattered points within the United States that aspire and struggle toward "maximum feasible participation of the residents of the area." I believe the Navajo and other Indian tribes are leading the way for the American people, showing them the correctness of the hypothesis but more importantly the positive effects of such involvement.

There are some who in an egalitarian zeal would liken the American Indian to the Negro—and the reservation to the ghetto. They would propel us into landlessness, into assimilation, into termination—all under the name of uncomprehending equality.

The Navajo is not the Negro. He is the Navajo.

The reservation is not the ghetto, it is our home—and our heritage.

And the challenge we face is how are opportunity and equality to be achieved consistent with the Navajo values, individual Navajo self-determination and Navajo preference. And how are these desires—the desires of the Navajo people to be translated into legal doctrine which outsiders—Congress, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and even other Americans can understand—even if they are not us and even if they do not fully comprehend our culture.

Everywhere now there can be seen signs of an awakening—a stirring on the reservation and in the councils of the white man—a stirring toward independence and self-determination. We have seen instances where America has acted to bring equality without comprehending the Indian. He has acted to do justice to the Indian without understanding that a forced choice between continued poverty and instant riches, quickly depleted, is no choice at all.

We do not want the new interest in the Indian, the new desire to make individual self-determination a reality turned into forced expulsion, rootlessness and landlessness. The removal of disabilities, the rejection of paternalism, the opening up of opportunity should not be perverted into some new form of genocide. The Indian's need—his past, his present and his future—must be respected in developing a policy that brings opportunity without cultural imperialism, without economic imperialism and without political imperialism to the reservation.

I would like to personally thank Mr. Shriver and members of the Office of Economic Opportunity for their dedicated efforts on behalf of the Indian people generally and the Navajo people specifically. Up to this time, no one in such a high Government position has taken the time or shown the personal interest in the problems of the Navajo people. Mr. Shriver was willing to visit the Navajo Reservation, eat our food, take part in our ceremonies, ride over our roads and talk to our people. He understands us and we are proud to call him our friend.

In conclusion I would like to say today's grant—the creation of a legal services program which recognizes the rights of Indians, which respects the Indian tribal court systems, which makes lawyers the employees of Navajos rather than their masters—is the first step in a new day—a new era of justice under law for Indians.

CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am heartened by the interest of the press in the principle of full public disclosure of financial interests for Members of Congress.

Strong support has been expressed throughout the country for a disclosure requirement along the lines I have proposed in S. 1877. My bill would apply both to Members of Congress—and candidates for Congress—and top congressional staff and to top officials of the executive branch. Each would be required to report annually his assets, liabilities, amounts and sources of income, gifts received, and financial transactions.

I ask unanimous consent that a group of editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Trentonian, Apr. 15, 1966]

ANOTHER BAKER CASE?

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, has demanded a public airing of charges against his colleague, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut. Anything less, he says, will lead to another "Bobby Baker Case"—with a bland official "whitewash," endless political recriminations and enduring public suspicion.

It is interesting that the charges against Senator DODD, like those against Mr. Baker, involve primarily certain alleged financial dealings. The reluctance of the Senate to probe deeply into any financial affairs of either its members or employes—a reluctance so markedly in contrast to its attitude toward Administration officials—is very well known.

There are exceptions, of course. Our own New Jersey Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE has long advocated that senators and other public officials put their private finances on the public record. This would put a stop to a lot of suspicions. It might also put a stop to a lot of other things—which seems to be the main reason why Senator CASE hasn't got very far.

[From the Elizabeth Daily Journal, May 4, 1966]

THE CASE FOR SEN. CASE'S BILL

If the august United States Senate is to avoid further dimming of the respect and confidence of the American people, now is the time it must turn on the searchlight of Senator CLIFFORD CASE's proposed public financial disclosure law.

The free-wheeling dealings of Bobby Baker while he was secretary to the Democratic majority stirred citizen indignation and reflected no credit upon the senators. The Senate's handling of the subsequent investigation of Baker's influence peddling did nothing to make amends for its laxity.

Again the Senate finds itself in the shadow of unfavorable publicity, this time as a result of allegations involving campaign funds for Senator DODD. Charges have been made that the Connecticut Democrat took $100,000 in political contributions for his personal use without paying income tax on it.

The reluctance with which the Senate ethics committee is conducting an investigation is made obvious by the comment of Senator McCARTHY, Minnesota Democrat, a member. The probers, he says, should not "allow ourselves to be moved to judge the conduct of a senator by standards which never have been defined."

Ethical standards never have been delineated because through the years Congresses presumptuously have rejected the idea that rules for official conduct were necessary. Thus it is true there are no precedents for judging Senator DODD's handling of campaign gifts.

Senator CASE's bill would require members of Congress and top congressional and executive department employes to make annual public reports of financial interests and sources of income, including gifts of more than nominal value. The New Jersey senator has been trying since 1958 to obtain passage of this legislation.

The measure would be of no assistance to the Senate ethics committee in its present dilemma. It would help, though, to avert future situations in which suspicion of impropriety in official conduct would give the public cause for dismay.

As Senator CASE suggests, the knowledge such financial reports were mandatory would have a salutary effect in serving as a signal to a lawmaker to "stop and think" about public judgment on the propriety of his conduct.

[From the Hackensack Record, Apr. 29, 1966]

HOW TO FORESTALL THE SCANDALMONGER

Now that the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct is writhing in perplexity over the far from sufficiently singular case of Senator DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, and the testimonial dinner money, it is to be noted that in each of the last four Congresses Senator CASE, Republican of New Jersey, has introduced bills to require regular periodic disclosures of the financial interests of members of Congress, members of their staff, and ranking officials in the executive department. The bills have been stoutly resisted; Senator DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, has objected, for instance, that disclosure would reduce Congressmen to second-class citizenship.

It is time Congressmen reconsider. Mandatory disclosure would compromise no honest man; it would spare honest men such vexation as is now visited on Mr. DODD. Mr. CASE explained why in a speech on the Senate floor the other day:

"The knowledge that such reports would have to be made would in itself have a salutary effect; it would serve as a stop and think signal. The fact that the reports would be available to the public would provide a means of enforcement which is even now the real sanction behind the ethical standards we espouse. The facts would be laid out to the public, and it would be left to the public to judge the propriety or impropriety of official conduct."

Mr. CASE and perhaps three dozen other members of Congress have submitted periodic disclosure statements voluntarily. He is satisfied that it is effective. "I believe the members will find it not only far less painful than they now fear but affirmatively helpful," he said.

It might even help a fellow get re-elected. This is more than can be said for sensational newspaper columns whose emergence is possible only because they tell stories a Senator might better have told himself.

[From the Newark Evening News, Apr. 29, 1966]

Of Testimonials

Senator John J. Williams, of Delaware, who sets a high value on ethical behavior in public life, has joined the critics of Senator Dodd, of Connecticut. Mr. Williams has accused the Internal Revenue Service of "quietly approaching" some members of the upper chamber with the suggestion that the present law "may be fuzzy" on the question of tax liability of funds derived from political "testimonials."

Mr. Williams saw the maneuvering as a "back stage plan" to get Senator Dodd off the hook, and the IRS has now ordered an investigation into the tax, if any, Mr. Dodd owes on an estimated $100,000 claimed to represent tax free gifts.

Unanswered to date is the broader question of senatorial ethics. New Jersey's Senator Case long has been urging legislation requiring that congressmen make full public disclosure of their income—including gifts. The Case bill merits new attention and action. It would not correct all the inequities that go with campaign funds, but it could help restore confidence in the Senate.

[From the Plainfield Courier-News, Mar. 21, 1966]

Conference on Ethics

An intercollegiate conference on ethics was held at Rutgers University last Saturday, and the discussion got into areas of conduct that have long concerned individual, corporate and public leaders. The question is basically how can those who occupy public office, whether at the federal, state or local level, be held to the same standards of fiduciary responsibility that are now imposed on persons occupying positions of private trust.

For the most part at local level, the operations of government can be watched closely; but there have been times, and still are in some localities, where grafting and favoritism within city halls and state houses is taken almost for granted. The fact that students are discussing the problem is a good sign.

The Bobby Baker case at federal level resulted in an executive order setting out in considerable detail the standards of conduct expected of federal employees and what they may or may not do by way of outside activities.

In the legislative branch, Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, has been one of those who has advocated the principle of full public disclosure applied to financial interests, campaign costs and contributions. The Senate has established a Committee on Standards and Conduct, and there is a growing number of congressmen who have voluntarily made public reports in varying detail of their income and financial situation. The trend is to increase the effectiveness of the disclosure principle, and meetings like the one at Rutgers help to keep it moving in the right direction.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 28, 1966]

A Shadow Falls Across the Senate

Grave charges of misconduct in office have been levelled against Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, by columnist Drew Pearson. Some of these accusations go far beyond alleged unethical practices, They involve charges that Dodd siphoned political campaign funds into his private bank account.

With obvious reluctance, the Senate's Permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, established in the wake of the Bobby Baker scandals, has undertaken a probe of these accusations.

Their problem, say Washington observers, is compounded by the fact that the committee as yet hasn't even drawn up a yardstick for measuring misconduct.

This strikes us as a weak alibi, in the Dodd case, for not pressing vigorously ahead with their investigation. If true, Pearson's charges against the senator go beyond any borderline aspects of unethical behavior. If false, they constitute a serious breach of journalistic conduct on the part of Pearson himself.

The six-man ethics committee, headed by Senator John C. Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, will do the Senate and the nation a vast disservice if it fails to arrive at a persuasive conclusion about Dodd's proper or improper use of his high office.

Newspapers throughout the country, including The Times, have reported the bulk of Pearson's charges. His sharp attack against Dodd is too widely known, and too detailed, for the ethics committee to sweep the matter under the rug of a closed hearing room.

The Bobby Baker case gives melancholy proof that the Senate has no stomach for policing itself. Aside from election frauds, it has acted to censure only two senators in the last 100 years.

Senator Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey, declares that a law requiring members of Congress and their aides to make full public disclosure of income, assets and liabilities, and other financial interests, is the only way to tackle the basic conflict-of-interest issue.

He is right. We think that full accounting of campaign contributions, and how such monies are spent, is equally vital.

Meanwhile, however, the Senate must resolve this present situation, promptly, cleanly, and without equivocation. Unless it does, a shameful shadow will fall across a great legislative institution, which no amount of pious doubletalk can drive away.

[From the Manville News, May 5, 1966]

The Conflicts Within Government

That ancient legislative bugaboo—conflict of interest—has risen again in Congress. This time the ethics of U.S. Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, are under the public's glare and the Senate's cloak of fraternalism. Senator Dodd has been accused of improper dealings with a former National Guard major general who, in the line of his work as a public relations man, is a registered agent of business interests in West Germany.

The Senate's Committee on Ethics has announced it will give Senator Dodd plenty of time to prepare his defense, and this could be the beginning of another congressional maneuver to play down the need for conflict-of-interest legislation that could provide more protection for the public interest than is now available.

A charge has been made against the senator, and he will have an opportunity to stipulate his side of the story for the record.

More important than Senator Dodd and his relations with Julius Klein of Chicago is the failure of the Congress and the legislatures of the States to stand up to this issue and write the kind of rules that the public—and the legislators, too—can understand. Not only should these law-making bodies set the rules—they also should set penalties for violations of their self-decreed codes of ethics. They should—but they don't.

An indication of how clubby our legislators on all levels of government can get about their own affairs—although they move quite rapidly to pry into the businesses of others—is seen in the almost fruitless fight that has been made for several years by U.S. Senator Clifford Case. New Jersey's senior senator has long been a spokesman for reform of the Congress, and in line with this desire he has sought to have the Senate demand by regulation that each of its members disclose each year his private holdings and the source of income other than that received from the U.S. Government.

The Case proposal would be but one step on the path to a firm code of ethics, but even to this suggestion the Upper House turns a deaf ear. Nevertheless, Senator Case and a few of his colleagues believe strongly enough in the need for disclosure that each year they voluntarily list their financial holdings for the Senate record and the public scrutiny.

We have declared on previous occasions that another way to keep legislators from indulging in activities that clash with their law-making positions is to pay them the kind of money their responsibilities warrant, an area in which the Federal Government and the States are failing. The $25,000 a year paid to congressmen and the $5,000 stipend that goes to New Jersey's State legislators are puny sums when compared to the cost of a single general election campaign.

The courage that is needed to correct the faults in our legislatures is not very evident. Perhaps the Senate hearings on the charges leveled against Senator Dodd may help awaken the Congress to its failures, but don't bet on it.

[From The Nation, Apr. 11, 1966]

Pearson's Hot Potato

Drew Pearson practices a difficult but necessary kind of journalism. He does not have the power of subpoena nor the right to cross-examine under oath. What he does have are a capable leg man—Jack Anderson—numerous contacts, a good news sense and courage. Sometimes he misses, but there is no denying the unique service he has performed in an age in which newsmen play it safe more often than not.

Now Pearson has flushed out something which on its face would appear to be a matter of major importance and which is not receiving anything like the attention it deserves. It involves the handling by Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, of campaign funds. What Pearson has had to report about the matter in his "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column is pertinent and revealing; he has named names, cited specific dates, stated precise amounts collected, and indicated the manner of disposition.

The whole affair is now in an inconclusive state that is fair neither to Senator Dodd nor to Pearson, and it will remain in that state until it is thoroughly investigated. Dodd may have a perfectly satisfactory explanation for the apparent discrepancies between campaign funds collected and actual campaign expenditures. But on its face, the material in the series calls for careful investigation. In actual fact, the Department of Justice has launched an investigation—but not of the charges. It is investigating Pearson and Anderson in response to Senator Dodd's complaint that the information used in the articles came from former employees in his Washington office. This seems an odd reaction to charges of such gravity.

But of more immediate moment is the reluctance, to date, of the Senate's Permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, better known as the Senate Ethics Committee, to undertake a thorough inquiry. The committee was set up with great fanfare by a conscience-troubled Senate in July, 1964, in the wake of the Bobby Baker scandal. At that time there were those who expressed doubt that the committee would ever investigate with the rigor that would be needed if a serious effort were made to police the Senate's ethics. Senator Clifford Case, a strong advocate of Senate reform, questioned the value of the Ethics Committee. "History," he said, "shows that legislatures do not police themselves. Apart from election frauds, only twice in the last 100 years has the United States Senate acted even to censure one of its own members for any cause." The last Senator to be censured was, of course, the late Joseph R. McCarthy.

As Senate committees go, the six-member Ethics Committee is a good one; the Democrats who serve on it are MIKE MONRONEY, EUGENE MCCARTHY and JOHN STENNIS; the Republicans are JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, WALLACE F. BENNETT and JAMES B. PEARSON. But this group has shown no enthusiasm for Drew Pearson's hot potato. If the committee approach does not work now, it is not likely to work in similar cases in the future—there will always be strong political pressures not to pry into the behavior of fellow members, Democrats or Republicans. If the committee ducks its responsibilities in this case, renewed demands will be raised for stringent conflict-of-interests legislation, or for legislation—like that proposed by Senator CASE—requiring members of Congress and their employees to make public disclosures of their income, their assets and liabilities and other financial interests.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Times, Mar. 14, 1966]

A CODE OF ETHICS FOR CONGRESS

Any requirements that members of Congress disclose their business connections would doubtless be a net gain. In the past, Congress has successfully resisted even the principle of reporting financial data that might expose conflicts of interests. Constituents have no way of knowing whether, when their senator's vote is cast, it reflects his concept of the public welfare or his estimate of where his own interests lie.

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican of New Jersey, seeks to change all this. He urged the Senate Standards and Conduct Committee the other day to recommend legislation requiring senators and their staffs to make public their assets, liabilities and income.

As the New Jersey Republican put it, "Surely there can be no doubt that the activities of Bobby Baker (the Senate's former majority secretary who is now under federal indictment) could not have gone so long undiscovered had a disclosure requirement been in effect for Senate employes."

He is so right. Yet when proposals are presented that would establish a stiff code of ethics for members of Congress and their employes, a good many senators move quietly but firmly to push the whole idea under the rug.

During the last session, for example, staff members of the Senate Rules Committee recommended that senators provide full disclosure of all outside interests and income—a requirement that already applies to executive-branch government employes. But the committee itself showed it favored only partial disclosure. It discussed legislation to exempt all congressional employes earning less than $10,000 a year and which have called for listing outside interests but not the extent of any investment or the amount of any earnings.

Yet even that mild measure drew strong opposition. Some members insisted that full disclosure would turn senators into "second-class citizens." That argument, of course, ignored the fact that members of Congress are the only government employes who have chosen to exempt themselves and their staffs from the provision forbidding officials from acting on issues in which they may have a financial interest. In the end, the Senate accomplished nothing at the last session except to turn the whole matter over to a new committee for study.

We commend Senator CASE for reminding his colleagues of some important unfinished business. It's past time for Congress to adopt a responsible code of ethics that will get rid of the double standard that now prevails. Congress, in short, ought to make it unmistakably clear that no dark corners will be tolerated in the goldfish bowl in which public officials are compelled to live.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 18, 1966]

SENATOR CASE'S SOUND FISCAL ADVICE

Supreme Court rulings have made it clear that the motivation behind the conduct of members of Congress is not open to executive and judicial inquiry.

That is as it should be. But it means that legislative bodies must police themselves. Unfortunately, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, has pointed out, "history shows that legislatures do not police themselves."

Two years ago a Senate rules committee staff report on the Bobby Baker case recommended compulsory disclosure of outside financial interests of senators and Senate employees. Although nothing came of the proposal, the Senate did create a special Select Committee on Standards and Conduct to police senatorial ethics.

After remaining unactivated for almost a year, this committee is now functioning, and Senator CASE has renewed the financial public disclosure recommendation.

The measure he urges would require regular public reports of income, assets, and liabilities, stock or commodity transactions and other outside financial interests of members of Congress and top congressional employees. Even if such a requirement is not imposed on the entire Congress, CASE believes it should at least cover the Senate.

Presidential appointees to top governmental posts have been subjected to searching financial scrutiny by the Senate. At times divestiture of monetary interests has been required. The Senate has the right and the duty to make such inquiries.

There would appear to be an equal right and duty on the part of the senators to make public their own financial interests. That they hesitate to do so raises some serious questions.

The Senate lost stature when it failed to act affirmatively on the earlier staff suggestion. Continued refusal can only serve to undermine confidence in that body.

The Bobby Baker case placed the Senate under a cloud from which it has not yet completely emerged.

The Times believes Senator CASE's proposal should be approved without delay. The Times believes, also, that the California Legislature would profit by enactment of a similar disclosure requirement.

[From the Elizabeth Journal, Mar. 3, 1966]

COURT GIVES ETHICS BOOST

The U.S. Supreme Court has given a strong intimation that Congress should do something about the ethics of its members. New Jersey's Senator CASE has been saying the same thing since 1958.

Senator CASE wants legislation requiring members and top employes of the Senate and the House to make annual public disclosures of their incomes public disclosures of their incomes and financial interests. If there had been such a law when Bobby Baker was secretary to the Senate Democratic majority, his influence peddling might have been prevented, averting a scandal which damaged the Senate in the eyes of the public.

The hint from the Supreme Court came in a unanimous decision holding that the Constitution's "speech or debate" clause bars any judicial inquiry into a congressman's official acts or the motives behind them. The ruling reversed the conviction of a former congressman on a charge of accepting a $500 payment for a speech in favor of savings and loan institutions.

In their opinion, though, the justices indicated they might uphold a law enacted by Congress to punish its members for bribe taking. This would be in line with the reforms for which Senator CASE has been crusading.

The court's suggestion certainly seems to strengthen the case for the senator's proposed legislation calling for full reports of income, assets and liabilities and any transactions in commodities and stocks.

Such a law would have the praiseworthy effect of making a senator or a representative think twice about accepting money, often under the guise of a campaign contribution, from individuals or organizations with a particular interest in legislation. The natural suspicion in such instances is that they are looking for preferential treatment.

Senator CASE, incidentally, recently made the annual public accounting on his own finances which he long has been doing. It's too bad his example is not a popular one.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Feb. 28, 1966]

CONGRESS SHOULD HAVE A CODE OF ETHICS

The Supreme Court, in a unanimous decision, has reaffirmed the constitutional guarantee that makes the official words and acts of members of Congress immune from outside prosecution. The pertinent part of the Constitution reads: "For any speech or debate in either house they (the members of Congress) shall not be questioned in any other place."

The case on which the Supreme Court ruled involved former Representative Thomas F. Johnson of Maryland. He had been prosecuted and convicted in the lower courts on a charge that he had accepted a bribe in 1960 to make a speech on the floor. But these lower court proceedings were improper, the Supreme Court now has ruled, because the Constitution specifically forbids any judicial inquiry into anything a member of the legislative branch says while acting in his official capacity.

There are valid reasons for this immunity. In the first place it gives the members of Congress a freedom to speak out without restriction that contributes to the openness of our open society. In the second place, it tends to safeguard the careful balance in our system which rests on a separation of executive, legislative and judicial powers.

The turn of affairs in this particular case, however, focuses attention again on an area in which Congress has been disgracefully negligent.

Each branch of Congress is the judge of its membership. Each branch has the authority and the duty to oversee the acts of its members, to set the standards of behavior, to reprimand them when a reprimand is in order, or to expel them if expulsion is called for.

Yet despite this authority and this duty, Congress over the years has always shied away from any effective implementation. It has been hesitant to draft a code of ethics for itself, reluctant to exercise its power of reprimand, and timorous about calling into question the questionable acts of its members. Only in the cases of the most flagrant misconduct or gross misbehavior has it found the courage to act at all, and it usually prefers to approach even these cases with a whitewash brush instead of a rod.

From time to time the congressional negligence has set off a stir and raised hopes that Congress, at last, might grapple boldly with its problem. One such instance occurred during the sordid Bobby Baker investigation a couple of years ago. But in this instance, as in all the previous ones, Congress managed to ride out the furor and settle back into its complacent attitude of indifference once the storm had blown out.

Not all of the members of Congress, by any means, are satisfied with this state of affairs. Many of them have been advocating ethical reforms for years.

One of the most promising proposals is a financial disclosure plan. Under this arrangement, the members of Congress would be required to disclose their financial holdings and their sources of income.

Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, who has been plumping for a disclosure act since 1958, says the recent Supreme Court decision should strengthen the case for his legislation. The measure he backs would require members of Congress to make public a full report on their income and resources, their assets and liabilities, and any transactions in commodities or stock.

Senator Case concedes that such a requirement would not automatically eliminate every opportunity for skulduggery. But, at least, he points out, "it would put the facts out on the table for the people to judge."

Several members of Congress feel so strongly about this matter that they have voluntarily disclosed their financial holdings in the Congressional Record. Included among these volunteers are Senator Stephen M. Young, Democrat, of Ohio; Senator Jacob Javits, Republican, of New York; Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; and Senator Hugh Scott, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

In a statement last year, Senator Javits deplored what he termed a double standard of ethics. "I feel it is completely incongruous," he said, "for Senate committees rigorously to question executive appointees on their financial affairs when those of us in Congress are not subject to similar requirements. We cannot continue to function on this double standard of ethics."

Congress certainly has been negligent in this area of ethics and blind or indifferent to the impression its negligence fosters. The recent Supreme Court decision is a useful reminder that should prod the members of Congress into some self-examination.

[From the Newark Evening News, Apr. 27, 1966]

State of Affairs: Dodd Case Boosts Disclosure Bill

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Washington.—There is nothing so mysterious as political reform. When it comes, it invariably comes unexpectedly and haphazardly.

Who could have guessed that the most profound abuse of American polity would suddenly be relieved by the Warren Supreme Court moving in (on reapportionment) where previous courts had feared to tread?

Or, to bring matters up to the minute, who could have imagined that the seemingly hopeless efforts of Senator Clifford Case, R-NJ., to raise the ethical standards of Congress would abruptly get fresh life from the boiling Dodd-Pearson confrontation?

Since 1958, Case has been urging legislation to require public reports of income (including gifts of more than nominal value), assets and liabilities, and stock or commodity transactions by Members of Congress and top legislative staff, as well as officers and employees of the executive branch. His bill, which four other senators have joined in sponsoring in the present Congress, would also apply to candidates for the House and Senate.

The reason Senator Case has turned to financial disclosure was not that he thought it was an ideal panacea but because he despaired of persuading Congress to do more.

In this country it has been largely left to legislatures to police themselves but, as Case has said, "history shows that they do not police themselves." Apart from a few raw election frauds, only twice in the last 100 years has the Senate acted even to censure one of its own members for any cause whatsoever.

The public disclosure principle would at least put the facts on the table for the people to judge.

Although Case's disclosure bill seemed utterly dead until columnist Drew Pearson began his expose of Sen. Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, Case's crusade was not wholly without effect. In the last few years an increasing number of congressmen, about 30, have voluntarily made public reports of their financial condition.

In addition, President Johnson last year issued an executive order requiring executive officers and employes to file financial reports with their superiors or with the Civil Service Commission.

Opponents of the disclosure requirement object that it is "too drastic," and argue that it would constitute an invasion of the privacy to which every citizen is entitled. But many citizens in private life are already subject to this requirement. The Securities and Exchange Commission, for example, requires corporate "insiders" to report regularly their transactions in the stock of their corporations.

LEGITIMATE INTEREST

No less than the stockholders of a private corporation, the public at large has a legitimate interest in the financial activities of those to whom they have entrusted the operation of their government. Case believes the adoption of a disclosure requirement at every level of government "would put new meaning into our traditional concept of public office as a public trust."

He couldn't have been more right. Most senators, even now, have grave doubts about the ability of Congress to police itself. However, to appease public opinion, the Senate did create the new Committee on Standards and Ethics, but then it simply appointed no members.

Finally, after more than a year of stalling, six highly regarded members, three from each party, were prevailed on to accept appointment. Today they are unhappy men, for their very first case involves the charges against Senator Dodd, including the accusation that he put $100,000 of campaign contributions into his personal pocket and failed to pay income tax on it.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington (D.C.), May 8, 1966]

The Case Bill: Answer to Ethics Problem

Now that Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, has brought a libel suit against columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson for their charges about his conduct in office, all the ramifications of this murky affair presumably will be brought to light. This is a good thing, because the ramifications of the Dodd case go deep into the fabric of our political ethics.

None of them, in our view, goes so deep and poses such difficult public issues as does the question raised about the use of funds collected in so-called "testimonial dinners" held in behalf of a legislator. Unfortunately, this is a question which the court case can hardly resolve.

It may turn out that Dodd's handling of such funds was quite proper. Perhaps they all went to cover legitimate political expenses. Perhaps they were used, with the knowledge and prior approval of the donors, for personal living expenses.

But the interesting and disturbing point that seems to have emerged in recent days is that, whether or not Tom Dodd is snow-white as regards the use of such collected funds, for many legislators this whole business is in a gray area which they are most reluctant to explore and define.

The Senate's Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has been preparing to explore it, as regards Mr. Dodd, with all the apparent enthusiasm of condemned men marching to the gallows. It has become abundantly clear that the gentleman from Connecticut is by no means alone in his hour of trial.

Apologists for Dodd have argued that, whatever he may in fact have done, there is nothing wrong with the practice of augmenting a legislator's private income with contributions from assorted personal and political well-wishers. It is, a member of the Senator's staff has said, so widespread a practice as to have become "a part of the American way of life."

Now the truth is that this practice—no matter how widespread—is completely indefensible as a matter of public policy. The accepted means of financing political campaigns by contributions from those with a vested interest in the outcome is questionable enough. But there can be no doubt at all as to the impropriety of lobbyist and favor-seekers putting money directly into the pocket of a friend in Congress.

Consider the moral fervor with which members of the legislative branch pounce upon the slightest scent of conflict of interest within the executive branch. Business leaders, accepting a presidential summons to duty at great personal sacrifice, are put on the congressional griddle and forced to divest themselves of holdings in any company that might conceivably do business with their agency. Sherman Adams, President Eisenhower's top administrative aide, was driven from the White House in disgrace for the folly of accepting gifts from questionable sources.

But the legislators tend to lose their moral zeal when it is their interest that is being conflicted.

It costs money, they say, to be a senator—more than the $30,000 salary and the approximately $170,000 annual allowance for office, travel, stationery and miscellaneous expenses can cover. So indeed it does—particularly for those senators who lack personal fortunes but who have convinced themselves that living at a certain level of grandeur is necessary for the dignity of the high office.

But several members of the Senate are appalled by the present practices, and a number of others deny that it is impossible for a senator to live within his earned income. There are some who insist that failing to keep up with the Kennedys is less degrading to the office than accepting handouts from lobbyists and others with obvious axes to grind. It is, in fact, impossible to pin down the exact number of senators and representatives who have profited personally from the testimonial dinner route. Those who have are reluctant to volunteer information. Those who have stood by silently with the knowledge that such affairs were taking place are, for the most part, equally shy about discussing the subject. But as one senator put it, "the number is considerably higher than I would like to think it is."

What can be done?

One suggestion calls for increasing the salaries of legislators to a point that they could "afford" to live without accepting handouts. If Congress considers itself underpaid, it should by all means vote itself a raise.

That would not, however, meet the problem of the legislator who still found it hard to make ends meet, even at the higher salary. Whatever might done on the salary front, there is another step Congress would have to take to put its house in order. It goes the name of Senate Bill 1877.

The bill, introduced in the last session of Congress by Senator Clifford Case, is now before the Rules Committee. It is predicated on the basic assumption that legislators themselves are reluctant to broadcast the fact that they are on any payroll other than the federal government's. It provides that members of the House and Senate must file annual statements of income with the Comptroller General—specifically including the monetary value of gifts and free services—and a detailed statement of net worth. Failure to file or willful inaccuracy would carry a penalty of a $2,000 fine, or five years in prison, or both. The statements would be maintained as public records.

Case contends that public knowledge of all sources of income would serve as an automatic "stop and think" signal for legislators who might be tempted to accept offers of personal financial aid. And he believes the measure would serve the additional function of relieving Congress of the burden of sitting in judgment on the financial adventures of its members. The verdict would be left to the fully informed voter.

Case frankly describes the reception accorded this bill most of his colleagues as "chilly." The general objection seems to be that a man's personal finances are nobody's business but his own, and that some perfectly innocent items might be liable to sinister coloration by a skillful and unscrupulous opponent. Another complaint is that the public, if apprised of all the facts about a senator's sources of income, might misunderstand.

Or could it be that some senators are worried the public might understand too well?

Whatever the individual motives behind these reactions to the disclosure bill, a second, closer look is in order. It could be the cleanest way out of a messy dilemma for Congress. It might just possibly serve the public interest as well.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Apr. 27, 1966]

Dodd Case Shows Need for Disclosure Law

Senator Case, Republican, of New Jersey, long-time sponsor of a congressonal disclosure bill, cites the case of Senator Dodd's "tax-free" gifts as demonstrating the need for a tough law requiring lawmakers to list their sources of income, including gifts.

The question before the Senate Standards and Conduct Committee, and eventually the Senate as a whole, is the purpose of nearly $200,000 raised at dinners and other events for the Democratic senator from Connecticut. Did the money go into Dodd's campaign coffers, as most of the givers had reason to assume, or into the senator's private purse? If the "tax-free" money was pocketed, then the public should have a clearer explanation and a report on how many other national lawmakers are doing the same thing.

STAFF AT CROSS PURPOSES

Dodd, under fire by columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, was with an ailing son in Florida last week. Members of his staff explained that the funds in question were not campaign contributions but private gifts. It is hard, they said, for the senator to make do on his regular income—$30,000 salary, plus lecture fees and money from his former law firm, use of a car furnished by a firm with government contracts, and so on. All senators also have, at federal expense, staff members, telephone and telegraph privileges, an office in their home states and six annual round trips back home. Dodd's "break-even point" staffers said, is $50,000 a year and they argued he is legally entitled to use financial gifts any way he chooses. Such "testimonal" gifts, they said, "enable a poor man to stay in office. They're part of the American way of life."

Dodd and his staff apparently had their wires crossed because the Connecticut senator returned last weekend, and stated he had never authorized anyone to offer the explanation that the money came from "gifts," not campaign contributions. He didn't deny or admit anything more.

WHAT IS TAX FREE?

The Internal Revenue Service, which usually concerns itself in such situations, explained last week that money from testimonial dinners is tax-free. It quoted a Supreme Court decision to the effect that if a donation is given from a "detached and disinterested generosity" and "out of affection, admiration, charity or like impulse," it is a gift according to law and not liable to taxation.

This may put Senator Dodd in the clear. But whenever money collected at affairs advertised as "campaign fund-raising" endeavors is diverted to personal use, the public ought to have a complete explanation. Moreover, the ethical questions are so serious that if a loophole exists in the law, it is an extremely bad law and ought to be changed.

Utah's Senator Bennett, vice chairman of the Senate Standards and Conduct Committee, expressed surprise about the report of dinners to raise money for a senator's personal expenses and said his standard of living in Washington did not require more than his $30,000 salary. It may be hoped Senator Bennett will push for full disclosure by Senator Dodd and for adoption of the Case bill requiring all members of Congress to report regularly on their financial affairs.

Behind the Headline—The Ethics Bill: Its Time Has Come

(By Senator Clifford P. Case)

(This article dealing with congressional ethics was written exclusively for The Call by Senator Clifford P. Case (Republican, of New Jersey)—Editor.)

"They laughed when I sat down at the piano * * *" an old-time advertisement began.

The reaction was somewhat akin when in 1957 I first introduced my bill to require top Government officials, including members of Congress and top staff to make regular public disclosure of their assets, liabilities, amounts and sources of income, gifts received, and financial transactions. But the atmosphere had changed considerably when, for the fifth time, I reintroduced, with four cosponsors, the bill in the present Congress. Sooner or later, I am convinced, the Senate will adopt a disclosure requirement.

It will do so because it is becoming apparent that the disclosure approach is the only really practicable and effective way to handle the problem of legislative ethics.

SELF-POLICING WON'T WORK

With a conspicuous lack of success, the Senate has tried other methods of self-discipline. In a hundred years, apart from election frauds, the Senate has only twice acted even to censure one of its own members for any cause. Currently the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, set up in the wake of the half-hearted Bobby Baker inquiry, is considering allegations of improper use of senatorial office. Whether it will also consider charges of personal use of funds collected for campaign purposes is uncertain at this writing.

No Senator envies the Committee its task; Senators do not enjoy sitting in judgment on a fellow member. Further, it is traditional that elected officials are accountable to their constituents rather than to their colleagues.

The right of the people to elect whom they will must not be impaired. And we rightly prize the independence of the legislators and legislatures, an independence which the Constitution specifically protects. Thus, recently, the Supreme Court reversed the conviction of a former Congressman because the conviction was based in part on a speech he had made in the House of Representatives. The Court pointed out that in providing that for any speech or debate in either House, they (Senators and Representatives) shall not be questioned in any other place, the Constitution has foreclosed from executive and judicial inquiry generally the motivation behind the conduct of a member.

THE AUTOMATIC ALARM

Clearly the monkey is on the legislative back to provide for itself some effective way of regulating the conduct of its members. And the way to get the monkey off our back is, I believe, to apply the disclosure principle.

Specifically I believe every member of Congress (and every candidate for election to Congress), top committee and personal staff, as well as top officers in the executive branch, should make an annual report, to be open to the press and public, covering the amounts and sources of all his income, including gifts of more than nominal value, his assets and liabilities, and his transactions in property of whatever kind. It would not matter whether it was taxable income or gifts; both would be included.

The advantage of disclosure is, first of all, its value as a deterrent to misconduct and conflict of interest. The fact of having to make a public report serves as an automatic stop and think signal.

THE OBVIOUS WEAKNESS

Disclosure has also the advantage of being self-enforcing in the sense that the facts are made available to the press and the public and the people can register their judgment at the polls.

As far as both individual members and the Senate as an institution are concerned, I know of no better protection of our reputation and standing. Having once filed a report, the members would soon, as I have, come to take the report as a part of the regular routine of office. And the confidence of the people in the integrity of the Senate as a whole would be greatly strengthened.

The executive branch has already partially recognized its value. A recent executive order requires all officers and employees in the executive branch to submit financial reports to their superiors or in some instances to the Civil Service Commission. But the order lacks a vital element. It does not make the reports open to public view.

TO RESTORE FAITH

Nor is it just the federal government that would benefit from a disclosure rule. At every level, State and local as well as federal, and in both legislative and executive branches, adoption of a disclosure requirement would put new meaning into our traditional concept of public office as a public trust.

DEPLETION OF COASTAL FISHERY RESOURCES BY FOREIGN FISHING FLEETS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have regularly and continuously expressed concern over the crisis this Nation faces in the depletion of our coastal fishery resources by foreign fishing fleets. Thus far, there has not been action of the kind needed to either banish the foreign fishing fleets or assist our own fishermen to participate in this resource harvest in sufficient volume.

Perhaps some of the lack of national response is found in the fact that the major justification for present action lies in the future value of the fishery resource to this country. It is difficult to appreciate hunger until you have been without food, and it is even more difficult to anticipate such an absence in a time of plenty.

There is another facet to the problem of foreign fishing off our shores, however, which is of much broader immediate concern; an area which can be as well understood by the American housewife as the American fisherman. I speak of national security; and in this era of rockets and missiles, there is no inland retreat.

Mr. President, there is a mounting concern over the threat to national security posed by the Soviet fishing fleets off our coasts—both in the Pacific and in the Atlantic. Citizens of the State of Washington are very concerned in this matter, and I am not unappreciative of their support in my longstanding effort to focus attention on our fisheries. By midmorning last Friday, my desk was piled with telegrams; there were over a thousand of them then, and many more have come since; they will literally run into the thousands. But, unlike previous expressions on behalf of fisheries, this one is not coming from the fishermen alone, it is coming from citizens; people in all walks of life.

Mr. President, I did not ask for these expressions of support for our fishery programs. But I have been passing on to the people in the Pacific Northwest the position on fisheries as expressed by the Department of State, and it is readily apparent that the citizenry of my home State is not satisfied with the Department's excuses for inaction.

The State Department position on this Soviet fishing question has already been printed in the Record in its entirety, but I would ask that you bear with me for the inclusion of a paragraph from a letter I received from Douglas MacArthur II, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, U.S. State Department, on April 27. The letter came in response to a telegram I had sent to the President and Secretary of State on April 18 urging immediate diplomatic meetings with the Russians and an immediately implementation of the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation.

It is this section, I believe, which prompted the host of messages which I have received in recent days:

> In the circumstances, the courses of action available to us under normal practice between nations are those based primarily on the requirements of conservation. It is our understanding, based on consultants with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Department of Interior, that there is insufficient scientific evidence at present to justify conclusions as to what, if any, the conservation requirements might be for the bottomfish stocks off our Pacific Coast.

Mr. President, the people of the State of Washington were not pleased or satisfied with the position of our Government as stated by Mr. MacArthur. I am certain that the citizens of Oregon and California and Alaska were equally unimpressed.

Many of the telegrams I have received are highly critical of the U.S. State Department. I ask unanimous consent that some of these messages be printed in the Record for a better understanding of the concern of the people of my State.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Was there scientific evidence prior to Pearl Harbor? Get rid of the Russian fleet.

Otto L. Johnson.

Gig Harbor, Wash.

Senator Warren Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Enact legislation to keep Russians from our shores. Miles of lonely coast make infiltration or worse possible.

Stanley Beach.

Bainbridge Island, Wash.

Senator Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Let not the fish Russia catches be us. Help.

Fluto.

Senator Warren Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

I have three children. I am afraid. Get the Russians off our coast.

Sandra Alm.

Mercer Island, Wash.

Senator Warren Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding Russian fleet off West Coast. State Department says don't worry. I am still worried.

Al Langseth.

Tacoma, Wash.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Russians fishing off coast destructive to conservation, menace to national security. Please rouse State Department.

H. B. Teichroew.

Seattle, Wash.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Protect our shores, homes and fish. Get Russians 200 miles off shore.

Mr. and Mrs. Cobert K. Blackstone.

Seattle, Wash.

Senator Warren Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Russian fleet like Trojan horse. Demand Congress adopt 200-mile coastal limit.

Jean M. Wuell.

Poulsbo, Wash.

Senator Warren Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

When the sun is up, let's not be in Russian nets; not you or me.

Ethel Wertz.

Seattle, Wash.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

One nation indivisible under the State Department. Save us Magnuson.

Mr. and Mrs. George Sommers.

Seattle, Wash.

Senator Warren Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Shocked and sickened regarding handling of Russian fishing fleet problem. Urge action be taken immediately.

Mrs. Laverne Foster.

Des Moines, Wash.

Senator Warren Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Investigate Soviet spy trawlers, and missile homing devices planted off our coasts.

Dan Higgins.

Seattle, Wash.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Thousand mile fishing limit would suit us fine, but at least 200 will do.

C. C. Leach.

Gig Harbor, Wash.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Concerned with presence Russian fleet. Equally concerned apparent apathy of State Department.

Richard Dunn.

Tacoma, Wash.

Senator Warren Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

A citizen and member of the Japanese American community is concerned of the Russian ships.

Mrs. Sam Goto.

Seattle, Wash.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Please help us keep American's last frontier from being Russia's first American conquest.

Mrs. William F. Wyatt.

Tacoma, Wash.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson,
Washington, D.C.:

Please introduce legislation to remove the Russians from our shores. Aid fishermen and America now.

Barbara Starbird.

Seattle, Wash.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, most of these citizens are not expressing concern at the loss of the fishing resource, but are concerned for their own safety.

In a recent issue of the Seattle Times, quotations were included from an article in the March 1966 issue of Navy magazine, a publication sent out by the Navy League, headquartered here in Washington, D.C. The article was authored by Raymond Schuessler who wrote of the discovery by the U.S. Navy of Soviet homing devices on the seabed of our Continental Shelf. These homing devices, according to Mr. Scheussler, would be of great use to Soviet submarines to direct missiles at 43 of the Nation's largest cities and at 80 percent of our industry.

Mr. President, I intend to get to the bottom of this. If these fears are well founded—if the Soviet Union trawlers have been placing these devices on our Continental Shelf seabed, thus threatening the security of our major cities and the overwhelming proportion of our basic industry—then such information must be in the hands of the Senate Commerce Committee if it is to properly consider legislation as to the breadth of our fishery zone. I am writing today to the Navy requesting witnesses for our hearings on S. 2218 on Wednesday or Thursday of this week. They may be heard in the public hearings or closed door sessions, depending upon the classification of their testimony.

In this question of affixing homing devices on our Continental Shelf, I find myself turning again to one of those four conventions adopted at the Law of the Sea Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1958. In the case of the Convention on the Continental Shelf, which seems to apply here, we do not have some of the handicaps which the State Department emphasizes in our discussions on fishery conservation. To begin with, the Continental Shelf Convention has been ratified by both nations concerned—the Soviet Union on November 22, 1960, and the United States on April 12, 1961.

That convention gives the coastal State the right to "construct and maintain or operate on the Continental Shelf installations and other devices necessary for its exploration and the exploitation of its natural resources." It seems quite clear that the installation of devices is an exclusive entitlement of the coastal State.

But even in the case of a coastal State device installation, due notice must be given under article 5, paragraph 5, so that even if the foreign state had the right to install devices, she would have to give notification of such, or if she were to argue that they were not now being used, she would still be in violation of the section.

Perhaps the Soviets might choose to claim they were conducting research. Here, under paragraph 8, same section, it is stated:

> The consent of the Coastal State shall be obtained in respect of any research concerning the Continental Shelf and undertaken there.

Consent must be obtained. Was it? Would the placing of homing devices be adjudged as research, sponsored by a qualified institution as required under this section? There are some very real questions which the Senate Committee on Commerce intends to find answers for as part of the proceeding on fishery jurisdiction legislation. If the Soviets are violating this world agreement, our Navy should move swiftly to correct the situation.

Mr. President, I would like to look for a moment now at the fishery aspects of this unfolding drama. The American fishermen, who are finding themselves in some cases virtually driven from the traditional fishing grounds by these huge Soviet trawlers and motherships, are coming to the Capital in good numbers this week to testify on S. 2218, the proposed legislation introduced by the senior Senator from the State of Alaska and me to provide for a 12-mile fishery zone for the United States.

Many of the fishermen will testify, I am certain, that 12 miles of fishery jurisdiction is inadequate to protect the major portion of our resources, and indeed, is obviously too narrow to give any security against the present encroachment of Oregon and Washington which has been well outside any 12-mile zone. These fishermen will be asking for 200 miles, and I expect that such a position will be held, not only by the trawlers of northern California, Oregon, and Washington, but from some Atlantic fishing ports as well, where the problem is one of long standing.

The Congress of American Fishermen—the organization which had its beginnings with the yet-unsolved problem of Japanese interception of American salmon on the high seas—unanimously on April 21 endorsed the position of 200 miles or the Continental Shelf, whichever is greater as their proposed fishery jurisdiction.

The meeting represented, I am told, the producing fishermen from Bristol Bay, Alaska, to northern California. Representation was not available from the southern California tuna fleet—a distant water segment of our fisheries complex—who I would expect to appear in opposition to any 200-mile limit, or other "unusual" jurisdiction, for in the past they have judged this not to be in their best interest.

Mr. President, the U.S. State Department has made it very clear to me that they are not going to move the United States unilaterally to a 200-mile zone on the basis of fisheries requirements or broad national interest in the resources. The statement from the Department, which I placed in the RECORD earlier, states this attitude clearly. The Department does not feel that they have the scientific evidence necessary to establish the conservation requirements of the resource. I expect the witnesses on S. 2218 to demonstrate to layman and scientist alike that the Soviet Union has not been practicing conservation on these resources adjacent to our coasts. It would be my prediction that the hearing record will show a path of ruthless resource exploitation and depletion in the wake of these huge fleets, and further will explain a part of the continuous southward migration of this fleet from Bering Sea to their present positions off Washington, Oregon, and California.

The loss of these resources alone is quite enough to prompt action by this Government, without even considering the question of their threat to security. As I have said so many times, we have a responsibility to look after these resources. The 1958 Geneva Convention clearly delegated a "special interest" in the conservation of the adjacent resources to the coastal state, and I would contend that in a world where two-thirds are now suffering from animal protein malnutrition, our failure to act in assuring a proper conservation regime for the coastal fishery resources is a dereliction of our responsibility to the world community.

Mr. President, there are economic facts involved here, too, and they are important; but there are hungry people throughout this world whose hope for tomorrow, next week, or perhaps in the year 2000 may very well be obliterated by the unrestricted exploitation of these Soviet vessels on our own Continental Shelf. And the State Department answers that we do not have the scientific evidence as to the conservation requirements of these stocks. If this is true, why is it true? Why have we not this information? Even the Soviets put their own observers aboard foreign vessels fishing off the Russian coast. The arrival of Soviet vessels off Washington shores is no surprise to me. I have been expecting them for a long time, and I have so stated this judgment many times.

I have great respect for our fishery scientists. Their work in the salmon resource of the North Pacific will go down in history as one of the greatest efforts in fishery research of all time. The lack of success in application of their learning is no fault of theirs, for Japan's stubborn reluctance to make the necessary adjustments in the North Pacific have been based on political considerations, not scientific questioning of our men's good work.

But despite the respect I have for our scientists, I cannot find reason for our present lack of scientific evidence as to the conservation requirements on groundfish stocks off our coasts. The Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas was adopted in Geneva in 1958—8 years ago. Have we been waiting for the 22d ratification—which just came a few months ago—to begin preparing ourselves for the advantages accorded a coastal state? Did we think when the Soviet Union entered the Bering Sea to help develop the world's largest flounder fishery that she would stop there? And then when her fleets found lower catch rates, and they entered the Gulf of Alaska, did we believe that she would now be satisfied? And then when she began sending exploratory vessels off my State, and off Oregon and California, did we suspect that they would not come? And when the Soviet Union announced back in February that she intended to take 300,000 centners of Pacific hake, did we classify this as an idle threat?

It is almost as if we have already classified our adjacent resources as expendable. Perhaps our scientists and national fishery leadership are planning that we seek our future off the shores of Kamchatka or in the Sea of Japan. There are some questions here, and the Senate Commerce Committee means to get the answers. Our goal is to inaugurate a positive, forward-looking fishery program for America which can restore this Nation to its rightful place in the world fisheries community.

Mr. President, I and my staff began work several months ago on a 5-year program for fisheries. I would hasten to assure that it is not patterned after those of the Soviet Union, but the plans are imaginative and the goals are well beyond the mere massive construction proposals. In the case of this, we have discovered that 5 years is not enough; our vision must go far beyond. We must be looking at the needs of this Nation and the world in the year 1985, and the year 2000. Many man-hours have already gone into this brave new approach, and much advice and counsel is being included from all of the American fishery coasts. And when that program is ready, I shall present it to this body.

But today, we must have action, a program of shorter application, but no less important.

Mr. President, I have 11 principles I would wish to present to you today. These principles are based on calm judgment of the facts and conditions as they are; not upon false hope and rash promise. Our present goals toward national security and fishery protection are clear ones, and our method of achievement must be no less clear. There are some "study areas"; there are some "committee approaches"; but the program is, for the most part, based on action. There is nothing unrealistic about these principles, though success will depend largely upon some changes of attitude and approach.

First. An immediate factfinding mission to determine the strategic and security implications, if any, of the current Soviet incursion in waters off our coasts. I expect to have some of these answers at our hearings this week, but there is need of exhaustive study, and the depth of inquiry is not intended to indicate delay. The examination must be immediate.

Second. That the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries immediately form an industry-Government committee to receive and analyze all reported foreign activities off our coasts. That such committee receive proper security clearance so that classified material can be made available for evaluation, and that consideration be given to geographical, harvest gear, and economic interest of its membership so that its scope may be broad. Such committee would report directly and regularly to the Bureau and to respective committees of the Congress. Formation of this group should begin now.

Third. That the U.S. State Department give serious considerations to a 200-mile fishery zone from the standpoint of national security and broad national economic interest. It is my judgment that they have been unwilling to give such consideration because of preconceived opinions that such a zone is unrealistic. I suggest that the fishermen who will be appearing are deadly serious and that the thousands who sent telegrams to me did not do so lightly. The State and Interior Departments should reexamine their positions in this same vein.

Fourth. That the conservation crisis which I believe now exists with the resources off the Pacific Coast not be clouded with the issue of jurisdiction, regardless of the important need for the latter. Though I am bitterly disappointed in the loss of 3 critical years, the State Department is now acting on the Senate resolution calling for a World Fisheries Conference, and I think this should proceed without interference. It is now scheduled, I am advised, for January 1968 under the sponsorship of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations with the United States as host. The agenda is to be primarily concerned with the development and implementation of the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation. There should be no further discussion as to the merits of this conference. Time is precious, and every moment should be spent in expediting its scheduled date.

Fifth. That the U.S. State Department immediately begin the necessary action for the calling of a third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, not only for consideration of the proper breadth of the territorial sea, but to consider amendment to existing conventions. It would be my hope that such a conference would study the possibility of a redefinition of the concept of the natural resources, including the living organisms, with the intent that the restrictive language which now requires the ability to "move except in constant physical contact with the seabed or subsoil" be expanded to include those resident groundfish stocks which are now the subject of great concern. Such free swimming species as tuna would then be exempted, which would not be the case in a direct, broad zone of exclusive fishery jurisdiction.

Sixth. That the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries give thorough study to suggestions that the United States place a fleet of fishing vessels off the Soviet coast in a similar manner to the present Soviet fleet off the American coast. Subsidy support for such vessel construction and operation, and a method of disposing of the produce should be considered so that there be no adverse effect on the present American fishing industry.

Seventh. That the U.S. Department of State immediately implement the 1958 Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, that our "special interest" as a coastal state may be brought into force, thus assuring some adherence to necessary conservation measures to protect our coastal fishery resources. Emphasis should be given to article 6(1), which states:

> A coastal state has a special interest in the maintenance of the productivity of the living resources in any area of the high seas adjacent to its territorial sea.

Eighth. That the Department of Defense provide the Senate Commerce Committee immediately with a full report as to the method and type of surveillance now in effect in regard to the foreign fishing fleets offshore. That such report include full justification of any classifications which might now be attached to such material in light of U.S. security requirements.

Ninth. That the Congress be urged to move rapidly on Senate Joint Resolution 29, which would "authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions." That the Federal fishery agency immediately present to the Senate Commerce Committee a report outlining the timing necessary to determine the extent of these resources and their conservation requirements.

Tenth. That the Congress proceed swiftly, following scheduled hearings this week, on S. 2720, so that product and process for the manufacture of marine protein concentrate be approved, thus providing a fishery product market of consequence for the increased harvest of our adjacent fishery resources.

Eleventh. That the Federal fishery agency reanalyze its 1968 budget items with a view toward developing accelerated programs in the area of fish harvesting and processing techniques. It is my judgment that, though we do have some clear "special interests" in conservation requirements as a coastal State, our long-range effort toward harvest participation in all adjacent sea areas must be increased substantially. It is my thought that the agency should give consideration to a separate, independent, emergency office, at a high level, for this purpose; and that it be headed and staffed by men whose efforts will not be confined simply to an improvement of existing gear and techniques.

Mr. President, I could go on for some time on this program, as I regard our fisheries as one of the most important crises facing the Nation today. I can well remember when my talks on fisheries dwelled solely on the needs of the fishermen. No longer is this the case, for today, the marine resources in America's adjacent sea are matters of clear national concern and their implication is worldwide.

Hunger is a terrible thing, Mr. President, and as the President of the United States has said so often, no world order can endure, no peace can be secure, in a society where one-third of the people have plenty, and two-thirds are in hunger and want. I believe that the world oceans hold the key to peace, and indeed, the future of mankind. In unfriendly hands, it can constitute a far greater danger than a superior arsenal of missiles, or the conquering of space.

If we awaken today to the urgency of this crisis, the future implications and importance of our fisheries, then I could say that the trawlers of the Soviet Union have done us a favor.

Mr. President, I am deeply concerned by this question and that concern should extend to each Member of this body. If the information that has been carried in the Seattle newspapers and on the radio and television stations, was made available in other cities of this Nation, every Member of the U.S. Senate would be the recipient of a flood of telegrams, for as I said earlier there is no inland retreat.

As one of my good citizens said:

> When the sun is up, let us not be in Russian nets; not you or me.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the beginning of the session today, in a conversation with the majority leader, I obtained clearance to proceed to make the speech on foreign policy that I am now about to make, but we did not anticipate at that time that we would have the rather extraordinary session, which was quite appropriate. That is the only reason why I shall speak at this time. The majority leader agreed, because I have a series of important meetings to attend, with which I am connected under another hat, relating to the threatened airline strike.

Before I make my speech, I wish to insert in the RECORD certain items which I had intended to insert during the morning hour.

DUERR REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on March 23 there was inserted on page

6616 of the Congressional Record, in the House of Representatives, what purported to be previously withheld material from a so-called Duerr report.

On May 16 the Forest Service supplied me with further comments which shows quite conclusively that this material does not add significantly to the material which I inserted in the Record January 17, 1966.

I do not know where or how this material was obtained from Forest Service files, but those who seek publication of isolated excerpts from initial drafts of research reports, prior to their review and subsequent final drafting, fail to serve the public interest and add confusion rather than understanding of the important conservation issues of allowable rates of cutting for public timber.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the letter of May 16 to me from the Chief of the Forest Service.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Forest Service,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: This is in further reply to your request for information regarding Congressman Wyatt's insertion in the Congressional Record for March 23 of information relating to the so-called "Duerr Report."

The excerpts from the Duerr Report which follow Mr. Wyatt's statement consist of:

1. A memorandum from Dr. Duerr dated August 19, 1960, transmitting an initial draft report which Dr. Duerr specifically described as an office report. In this transmittal, and also in his letter to Mr. Robert F. Smith of November 2, 1965, he stated that a certain amount of translating would be needed if the report were prepared for outside use.

2. Selected portions from the text of the initial 1960 draft which comprise about 20 pages out of a total of 191 pages in the initial draft. About two-thirds of the 20 pages of excerpts, moreover, were published in the printed report issued in 1963. The remaining one-third of these 20 pages consist of material which the authors either deleted or handled in some other way in the printed report based on technical review of the original manuscript. It is entirely normal procedure for any author of a research report or other document such as an important letter to make revisions in the initial draft prior to publication.

3. A copy of Appendix C of the initial 1960 draft dealing with future projections. Part of this material also appeared in the published report printed in 1963. The main part of this material dealing with a projection of an accelerated cut represents back-up material for the unpublished final chapter of the 1960 rough draft report. The material the Forest Service supplied to you and others, and which you inserted in the Record on January 17, 1966, consisted of this unpublished chapter. This final chapter and a portion of Appendix C were not published because the subject considered had not been completely analyzed.

A few illustrations may be given to illustrate the nature of the material that was deleted by the authors during review and revision of the initial draft, as follows:

Page 6616 of the Record of March 23, column 1, paragraphs 1–5: This material primarily represents an amplification of material appearing in the printed report. The influence of rate of interest was discussed on earlier pages of the printed report and the topic of the Federal Government as a conservative owner is specifically covered on page 24 of the printed report.

Page 6617 of the Record of March 23, column 3, last paragraph: Certain material on forest taxation was deleted by the authors presumably on the grounds that the subject of tax modifications was outside the objectives and scope of this study of timber trends. Tax reform is a complex and important subject that could not be handled by a relatively few paragraphs in this report.

Page 6619, column 3, paragraph 2: The brief comments relating to "evenflow" deal with an extremely important policy issue that involves such questions as community stability and longrun cutting and investment programs on public lands. These brief comments were deleted on the ground that a much more thorough study of alternative cutting and management policies would be needed to determine the costs and benefits of abandonment of the policy of evenflow and sustained yield.

We believe these examples will illustrate the nature of the material that was not formally published. Other unpublished excerpts essentially represent restatements, amplifications, or references to the accelerated cutting alternative that was analyzed in the original report but not included in the published document.

As indicated previously, we have published the material which our research workers believed ready for publication. Answers to the questions that are now being raised regarding sustained yield and allowable cut on the National Forests, for example, cannot be determined from unpublished excerpts of this 1960 rough draft report, but must depend rather upon thorough and up-to-date analyses of all the considerations involved.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. Greeley,
Associate Chief.

RUSSIAN FISHING TRAWLERS OFF THE PACIFIC COAST—III

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on two previous occasions recently, I discussed in the Senate the problem of Russian fishing activities off the coast of Oregon which have been causing grave problems for Oregon fishermen and which raise the issue of depletion of one of our valuable natural resources.

I have been in correspondence with both the State Department and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior with regard to this matter. On April 25 I inserted into the Record the reply which I received to my initial letter to the State Department and my reaction to that response. I have just received a reply to my second letter and since it goes much farther in clarifying the issues I raised, I ask unanimous consent that the State Department letter of May 9 be set forth in the Congressional Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of State,
Washington.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: I have received your letter of April 25, 1966 with further reference to the operations of Soviet trawlers off the Oregon coast.

I regret that my letter of April 19 on this subject apparently led to the inference that we would require to have at hand the results of a full-scale, long-term scientific investigation of the affected stocks of fish before we would be able to take any steps in the matter. What we intended to convey was that a review of the available data should be undertaken and estimates made on the basis of such a study. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has now done this. We are informed that the data available do not show the need for specific conservation measures now, and further research will be necessary to determine what, if any, conservation measures would be required. An approach to the USSR need not await the completion of this research, and in fact Soviet cooperation in such research would be most desirable.

Since an approach to the USSR at this time would have important implications for other major United States fisheries in the Northwest, we consider that we have an obligation to consult with our advisers from the fishing industry and from state governments and to obtain their views before taking such action. We are proceeding with these consultations.

You note that it has been suggested that Proclamation No. 2668 issued by President Truman on September 28, 1945 might serve as a basis for action in the present circumstances. That Proclamation envisages the establishment of fishery conservation zones in areas of the high seas contiguous to the coasts of the United States. It recognizes two different types of situations in which such zones may be established. In the first, where fishing activities have been or may be conducted by United States nationals alone, the United States may establish conservation zones in which fishing shall be subject to the regulation and control of the United States. In the second type of situation, "where such activities have been or shall hereafter be legitimately developed and maintained by nationals of the United States and nationals of other States, explicitly bounded conservation zones may be established under agreements between the United States and such other States; and all fishing activities in such zones shall be subject to regulation and control as provided in such agreements."

Developments since 1945 make it clear that the United States could not successfully maintain under international law a claim to the right by unilateral act to exclude foreign nationals from fishing on the high seas in areas off our coast. Thus, if the United States, in the first type of situation, were to establish a conservation zone and regulations for its own nationals, and if foreign nationals were subsequently to enter the fisheries affected, the situation would then become one in which the procedures of the second category would apply, that is to say, the boundaries of the zone and the regulations to be applied would be established by agreement with the other country or countries.

No conservation zones have been established specifically under the terms of the Truman Proclamation. However, we have in effect achieved its ends in a number of instances by negotiating regional conservation treaties or agreements with various countries, for example, the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, 1949, the Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, 1949, and the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, 1952.

The United States is also a Party to the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, which specifies in Article I that "All States have the right for their nationals to engage in fishing on the high seas, subject (a) to their treaty obligations, (b) to the interests and rights of coastal States as provided for in this Convention, and (c) to the provisions contained in the following articles concerning conservation of the living resources of the high seas. All States have the duty to adopt or to cooperate with other States in adopting, such measures for their respective nationals as may be necessary for the conservation of the living resources of the high seas." The United States ratified this Convention subject to the understanding that such ratification is not to be construed to impair the applicability of the principle of "abstention," which is incorporated in our North Pacific Treaty with Japan and Canada mentioned above. It may be of interest to note that the practical application of the special interests of the coastal State, recognized in the treaty, is predicated on scientific evidence of the need for and nature of conservation measures and on nondiscrimination against foreign fishermen.

With respect to jurisdiction over the continental shelf, both the United States and the Soviet Union are Parties to the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf. This Convention provides that the coastal State exercises over the continental shelf sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources. For the purposes of the Convention the natural resources of the shelf are defined as "the mineral and other non-living resources of the seabed and subsoil together with living organisms belonging to sedentary species, that is to say, organisms which at the harvestable stage either are immobile on or under the seabed or are unable to move except in constant physical contact with the seabed or subsoil." While it is a relatively new concept, the inclusion among resources of the shelf of living organisms which have a constant physical link with the seabed or subsoil has gained increasing acceptance in international practice to the point where it may be considered developing international law. This cannot be said of the living resources of the waters above the shelf and, in fact, the Convention specifies that the rights of the coastal State over the shelf do not affect the legal status of the superjacent waters as high seas.

The Department shares your concern that foreign fishing vessels shall not operate off our coast in a manner contrary to sound conservation policy, and we are proceeding with examination of the problem as rapidly as possible. You may be sure that Secretary Rusk is aware of this matter and of the factors we must take into account in considering it.

If you wish, we will be glad to send an officer to discuss this matter in detail with you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas MacArthur II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the State Department does not indicate that it is willing to begin immediate negotiations, I intend to urge the Department to undertake diplomatic negotiations with the Soviet Union as speedily as possible on the matter of conservation of this vital food resource, which is of concern not only to the people of Oregon and the United States, but of other parts of the world as well.

It is my understanding that the Soviet Government has been amenable to agreements concerning conservation of sea resources on several previous occasions and we should certainly do all we can to come to an understanding with them on the present problem.

An illuminating reply was also received from the Bureau of Commerical Fisheries of the Department of the Interior. I am pleased to make this information available to those interested in the conservation problem. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mr. Donald McKernan, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, be set forth in the Congressional Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is in answer to your letter of April 25 regarding the fishing activities of Russian trawlers off the coast of Oregon. We share your interest concerning fishing resources off our shores and the conservation of these resources.

Our information indicates the Soviet fleet is taking ocean perch and smaller quantities of other species. About 30 fishing vessels, including stern and side trawlers, are on the fishing grounds about 15 to 20 miles offshore. On April 27 four refrigerated fish transports, a tanker, and a research vessel were accompanying the trawlers. It is not easy to estimate the actual amount of fish being taken as we do not have direct contact with the Russians. Observations of the vessels while nets are being retrieved show that catches vary from negligible amounts to 60,000 pounds per haul. Total catch of the fleet may be as much as 1,000 to 2,000 tons per day. Similarly, we have no direct information as to how long they may remain on these fishing grounds. If catch rates are high, they could continue operations throughout the year.

A careful review of the evidence provided by long-standing Bureau research and exploratory fishing programs and by information which we have on the pattern of Soviet fishing indicates that there is a potential conservation problem. We do not, however, have data demonstrating the need for specific conservation regulations now. In our view, further research will be necessary to determine what, if any, conservation measures would be appropriate. Such research is time-consuming, and it is not possible now to say how much time would be involved. However, it is not necessary that this research be completed before making an approach to the USSR. Indeed, it would likely be impractical for the United States to do the research without Soviet cooperation and participation. In brief, from the point of view of the knowledge of the resource and of the Soviet fishery, an approach to the USSR need not await the collection of further data.

As the Department of State has suggested, an approach to the Soviet Government on this problem at this time would have substantial implications for other important U.S. commercial fisheries and for existing international arrangements with other governments. We are now consulting with the other segments of the fishing industry involved, as well as with State governments, and we expect to be in a position shortly to make recommendations regarding appropriate courses of action.

Regarding the Columbia River salmon resource, the Soviet fishing fleet now operating off Oregon does not appear to have the capability for taking such salmon commercially. It is composed of trawlers which catch bottom species. There is no indication of any intention to fish Columbia River salmon. The Soviets have not done so off Alaska although ample opportunity exists. In fact, the Soviets have consistently opposed high seas salmon fishing, holding, as we do, that such a practice makes it impossible to implement proper conservation measures. We are in a much better position with the salmon resources regarding information needed for conservation regulation since, unlike the ocean perch and other species the Russians may be taking, it has been exploited and under management for many years.

I trust this information will be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

Donald L. McKernan,
Director.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was encouraging to note that the threat to Columbia River salmon from Russian fishermen appears to be negligible, at least at this time.

I look forward with great interest to the recommendations which the Bureau plans to make in the near future regarding appropriate action to be taken in this matter.

THE VIETNAM CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record at this point an editorial from the Everett Herald, Saturday, May 7, 1966, "Two Years Ago."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Everett (Wash.) Herald, May 7, 1966]

Two Years Ago

Suppose a U.S. political leader running for re-election this year campaigned on the following platform:

1. American boys should not be sent to fight in Viet Nam because it is an Asian war.
2. U.S. planes should not bomb supply lines in North Viet Nam.
3. Bombing North Viet Nam is likely to involve this country in a major land war with Communist China.
4. The U.S. should confine itself to an advisory role and provide equipment to South Viet Nam.

Would the politician be elected? Or defeated? The New York Herald Tribune notes that this is the stand President Johnson took in the Presidential campaign of 1964—just two years ago.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Congressional Record at this point an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle, April 13, 1966, "The Viet Crisis We Now Face."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 13, 1966]

The Viet Crisis We Now Face

The Buddhist political crisis in South Vietnam has confused, disturbed and frustrated officials in Washington. Well it may, for the evidence of 1963 showed beyond question that the Buddhists held the ultimate strings of popular control over South Vietnam. They showed they could bring down the Ngo Dinh Diem, the Catholic dictator, and eliminate him, which was a relief to us. For at the time, the Buddhists were on our side, or, more accurately, we were on theirs.

The Ky government is clearly on the losing side of a political showdown. This threatens to compromise the reasons for the American presence in Vietnam. It is the President of the United States who, at Honolulu, embraced General Ky; and it is General Ky who is not long for power. If the bland Buddhist pressure in the city streets and villages continues to grow in the days ahead, it will undermine the Ky regime.

For the Johnson Administration, the American position in Vietnam is subject to the most disheartening speculations and ironical afterthoughts. The basis of our being there, it has been said like a litany, is the long-standing United States "commitment" to a succession of South Vietnamese governments to support their opposition to a Communist takeover.

However, so far as has been heard from Secretary Rusk or the President, we have no "commitment" to support the government in Saigon against a takeover by its own people.

Underneath all this turmoil, the GIs know that one of the messages which the demonstrators are giving out is that Americans are not welcome in their country. It is to the American forces that our keen sympathies go. As one said to Jack Foisie, "If they don't want us, what are we here for?"

THE PRESIDENT AND VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in recent days, President Johnson has sought to cover up the collapsing situation in Vietnam with increasingly blatant appeals to national honor for its own sake, not for the sake of practicality or likelihood of success or true national American interests.

The Nation heard him use the occasion of the Democratic fundraising dinner publicly to denounce and ridicule the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Vietnam and China. Why? Because it has been the Foreign Relations Committee hearings that have exposed to public view the bankruptcy of the Johnson foreign policy.

Those hearings have revealed the immorality, the uselessness, and the illegality of the slaughter in Vietnam, a slaughter perpetrated as much by the United States as by anyone.

The administration cannot withstand this public discussion of the war in Vietnam any more than it could withstand an analysis of its Dominican intervention by the Foreign Relations Committee chairman.

So it is necessary for the President to try to upstage the committee as he did by summoning General Ky to meet him in Honolulu, and then to denounce the hearings in their entirety.

I extend my tribute and support to the chairman of our committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, whose statesmanship in these matters has reduced to disrepute the foreign policies of the United States based on bombs and bayonets.

In the last week, the President has stopped talking about peace and negotiations altogether; he has had little to say about elections in Vietnam. He gives every evidence of total adherence to the advice of his military leaders who believe armed force is the best answer to everything and who are bent on war with China, in my opinion.

It is now up to the American people to demand that the war in Vietnam be stopped. They must demand that the administration stop killing American boys to keep General Ky in power. They must demand an end to a war that sees American soldiers go out to kill the Vietcong while the soldiers of South Vietnam fight each other. They must refuse to allow American forces to continue fighting a war to keep Ky and his flunkies in power against the wishes of a majority of people in Vietnam who are not even controlled by the Vietcong.

I hold in my hand today's Washington News, with the headline "Vietnam on Brink of New Civil War." I ask unanimous consent that the article connected with the headline be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President let us face it. We are escalating a war to keep a military junta in power that has no appreciation for the meaning of the word "freedom" and could not care less.

The present outbreak in Vietnam, demonstrating the further instability on the part of the puppet we have been supporting, calls upon the President of the United States to issue a request for a cease-fire now, to stop killing these American soldiers.

My President does not have the slightest moral right to send another American to his death in Vietnam, in the light of the civil war within the civil war in Vietnam.

That is why I have been heard to say—and I shall continue to say it from coast to coast—that the President must be stopped with ballots, for it is the only way left to stop his bullets. We have no right to be shooting those bullets in South Vietnam now, in view of the shocking record that has been made by the Ky regime and the previous military puppets that the United States has set up in South Vietnam, in open violation of the Geneva accords.

We must call a halt to the flow of American blood to defend General Ky so he can impose his own bloody rule upon the helpless people of the South.

Every day the war continues, more lives will be lost needlessly, for the rotten foundation of the South Vietnam Government becomes more precarious every day. General Ky and his fellow militarists do not want elections, and I predict he will arrange things so there will be none in which anyone can place any confidence.

It is still a criminal offense in Vietnam to be a "neutralist." Who is or is not a "neutralist" will naturally be decided by General Ky. The world has already heard that "Communists" and "neutralists" will be fought by the Ky government. As is customary in Vietnamese elections, North or South, the election, if it is held at all, will be controlled by the means of controlling the candidates allowed to run.

In fact, I have heard nothing in the discussion of these proposed elections that offers a prospect of their being meaningful. They can be a decoy, however, to American public opinion. They can mislead American public opinion into the false assumption that these elections mean something. These elections, for the most part, will be metropolitan elections in areas under the control of the Government.

Mr. President, I shall be proud to have the RECORD show that I was the first in the Senate to call for international supervision of these elections, as some months ago I called for international supervision of the elections in Guatemala, where a democratic administration was not in charge of the election machinery.

We can be sure that any elections in South Vietnam under this tyrant and corruptionist Ky will be featured by carefully screened candidates, just as all candidates were screened by Ngo Dinh Diem in the elections he conducted.

By the time only Government candidates are allowed to run for seats, what kind of "election" do you have? You have the same kind the Communists conduct, where only the candidates of the Communist Party are allowed to run for office and they then poll 98 or 99 percent of the vote.

That is what Americans are dying for in South Vietnam, and they are dying for nothing worthwhile. They are dying for nothing productive of freedom. They are dying for nothing more than the personal ambitions of a few local leaders of South Vietnam who do not have the confidence or backing of their own people.

Above all, they are not dying for any American interest in Vietnam, for the American interest lies in getting the fighting stopped, not in escalating it.

The American military has no means of stopping the fighting. Its only suggestions and recommendations are for expanding it and increasing it. That is why I share the fears of Arthur Schlesinger, when he fears that the President has lost control of American foreign policy. The control over American foreign policy has passed to the Pentagon, and the Pentagon is maneuvering this President and his country ever closer to war with China.

This morning the Foreign Relations Committee met for its first executive session in connection with the foreign aid bill. I served notice on the committee that I shall insist upon exercising all parliamentary rights, to assure that no action is taken by the committee on the foreign aid legislation without a quorum being present and without full and extensive discussion of the relationship of this bill to the Military Establishment and its plan for international intervention.

It is through the foreign aid bill that much of the disaster of American policy has been carried out. It is through the foreign aid measure that Secretary of Defense McNamara expects to carry out a goal of American policy, which he described before the committee last week as one of seeking "stability" throughout the less developed countries of the world. At Princeton, the President called it "forces of disorder" that must be opposed in Asia. Stability and order are something the Secretary of Defense wants military aid for, because where stability is not imposed directly by American force of arms, he hopes to see it imposed by arms given by us to local armies, under a military dictatorship or the direction of a military junta.

Not long ago a very highly respected Republican came over to my seat on the Senate floor. He asked me whether I thought President Johnson could control the Military Establishment of the United States. I asked him what he meant by that. He said he believed the Military Establishment was so in charge of the war in Vietnam that he questioned whether the President could carry out any Vietnam policy of which the military did not approve. It has long been my opinion that if the President wanted to find a political settlement of the war, he could not do it because the military now has such a vested interest in a direct confrontation with China that they will not allow our presence in Vietnam to be dissipated or eliminated for any reason. This is a fear I repeated to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, and which I said I thought had to be a part of our discussion and decision on the aid program.

Never has pursuit of freedom for South Vietnam been an object of American policy. Pursuit of containment of China and the possibility that war in Vietnam could lead to war with China has been the object of military policy in Vietnam.

As the Ky regime falls apart in Vietnam, the President is pressed into more and more blatant contortions of history to seek to maintain the image of American purity. His Princeton audience heard him say that American intervention in foreign countries was justified on the ground that "not one single country where America has helped mount a major effort to resist aggression, from France to Greece to Korea to Vietnam—not one single country where we have helped—today has a government servile to outside interests."

The President conveniently neglected to say that none of the countries where we have intervened is servile to anyone except the United States. The governments of Korea and Vietnam are today creatures of the American Treasury and the U.S. Defense Department. Without both, those governments would disappear. Their countries would not necessarily disappear, but their present governments would. Much the same is probably true of Greece, whose political adventures in Cyprus that have so debilitated her economy and politics are largely subsidized by Uncle Sam. Of the countries the President named, only France can lay claim to not being servile to any outside interest.

I regret hearing the President of the United States continually tell the American people such a simplified and glorified version of international events, a version always calculated to reassure us that everything we do and everything we touch abroad is gilded with selflessness and crowned with success. I am sorry to hear him misrepresent the effect of American interventions in the world, because he misleads the American people when he tries to tell them we no longer are the sole support of Korea or Vietnam or Greece or Turkey, or Taiwan, because we are. More often than not, where we have intervened, we have created another dependency for American taxpayers to support and American soldiers to defend, and dying in the defending.

That is the record of the postwar era. That is why we have troops stationed in hundreds of thousands outside our country, in numbers not matched by all the other countries of the world combined.

There is no other power on the face of the earth that maintains major military establishments and bases and forces outside of their jurisdiction, except for this little remnant of British support in Singapore and Gilbraltar; and the British are not going to be in Singapore indefinitely. They have already learned that no Western power can maintain a dominating foothold in Asia. We have not learned that lesson yet. And how many coffins have to come back from Asia bearing the bodies of American boys before our Government learns that sad lesson?

Mr. President, I shall be proud to have my descendants read that I have not cast a vote for this war, and, short of a declaration of war, I intend to cast no vote to support it, because this is an inexcusable, immoral, and unjustifiable war.

As I said to my friend, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who is sitting in the Senate Chamber, as I go through these airports—and I go through several every week—I see hundreds of American boys, 18, 19, 20, and 21 years of age, on their way to Vietnam, where they did not ask to go. On the basis of our present escalating of war, I think that 15 percent of them will never come back.

As I see these boys, I ask myself the question: "By what moral right are we doing this? What is the justification for this?" All the semantics of the President of the United States cannot change the sordid fact that we are without a scintilla of legal or moral right to kill these boys.

That is the reason why I say to the American people: "You are the only ones left to stop this. You have got to stop it with your ballots by defeating those who are supporting the war."

It does not make me happy to say so. However, this is the issue facing the American people, and this happens to be their constitutional right and prerogative. I repeat that we can stop the killing only with ballots now, unless the Congress at long last wants to assume its constitutional trust and proceed to impose on this Democratic administration the constitutional checks that the forefathers wrote into the organic law.

With the defeat of 50 or more Members of Congress in November, I want to say to the American people that we have a chance to stop the war. However, if the American people reelect to Congress or send to Congress men and women that will rubberstamp this President in carrying on this shocking war, in my judgment we will end up in a war with China and the American people will die by the hundreds of thousands, for it will be the beginning of world war III.

I have been heard to say so many times that in my judgment that is what the war-minded directors of the Pentagon building seek. I listened to a General Johnson speaking on television the other night in St. Louis. I was shocked to hear this general say in effect, that the probabilities are that we will be in this war for 10 to 12 years.

I want to say to the American people, "Stop them. Give some consideration to this Republican leader who came and talked to me the other day and asked me the question: 'WAYNE, do you think the President can control his military?' "

I say to the American people: "If you want to make certain that we can control the military before it is too late, use your ballots to stop this war and put this military in its place. That is the only protection that you have left, for, in my judgment, if you permit them to lead us into a war with China, we will be bogged down unilaterally. There will be no allies. You will look in vain for any major country that will come to our support in trying to conduct a war against China."

Mr. President, if we get involved in such a war we will deplete not only our manpower but also our resources, and we will have to maintain occupying forces in that part of the world for several decades.

This is the time for the American people to stop, look, listen, and check an administration that is leading them into an escalated war now, dropping bombs out of planes traveling 1,500 miles an hour, within 30 to 40 miles of the border of China.

We still do not know whether or not we have crossed the border. But I think it is inevitable that we will, if we continue this type of military operation. And when we start crossing that border, what makes anyone think that we will not be at war with China?

Is this a new device of the Pentagon for sinking a *Maine*? Is the new subversive tactic of the Pentagon to involve a violation of a border, so that then there will be those who will try to wave the American flag to tatters in a foolish justification of the war against China?

Mr. President, the people will have to have it out with this administration now. Congress has refused. The people will have to have it out with the administration at the ballot box.

But let me say I am very much concerned about what I hear as I go across the country, at the community level, when responsible middle-class Americans—businessmen, wives, farmers—come to me and tell me their stories of the fear that is being created at the grassroots of America, in community after community, when there are views of dissent and question raised about American foreign policy.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that in my judgment a propaganda job is being done by this administration, through its State Department and through its Defense Department, that must be stopped. For, as has been pointed out to me, where there is a forum, where there is a meeting of a community group, or a service club convention, or where various bodies of Americans coming together to discuss foreign policy, the brass shows up. The brass comes in, in the form of colonels and generals, to discuss foreign policy under the pretext of military policy at the grassroots of America.

Mr. President, can anyone think that is not having a psychological effect? Can anyone think that is not helping to cause a growing fear at the grassroots of America?

I say to my President this afternoon, there is an Executive order that ought to be issued forthwith, and that is that the Pentagon, with its uniforms, stay out of the field of foreign policy, as our Constitution dictates. I say to the Secretary of Defense, "You happen to have a solemn responsibility, as Secretary of Defense, to make clear to your military officers that they have no place, in this democracy, in seeking to determine public opinion in respect to foreign policy."

Let them take off their uniforms. Let them resign from the Military Establishment, and come back to civil status, if they wish to involve themselves in seeking to formulate American foreign policy.

I warn the American people from this desk this afternoon: "Watch your military. It is dangerous."

In fact, the senior Senator from Oregon—and I measure these words very carefully; I know their import—says to the American people, "I think the most dangerous force to the threat of peace in the world at this moment happens to be the American military."

It has happened in other countries in the past. And if we let this military continue to go as unchecked as President Johnson is letting it go, if we let this American military go unchecked as Secretary McNamara is letting it go, I say to the American people "Watch out for your freedom. For you can have a democracy semantically, but you can lose your freedom with a military establishment taking over the direction of American foreign policy."

Mr. President, we have the record of the postwar era. As I have said, that is why we have troops stationed by the hundreds of thousands outside our country, in numbers not matched by all the other countries of the world combined.

These policies are carried out in large part through the foreign aid program, and that is why I believe they need the extensive scrutiny of our committee before any decision is reached.

I refer the President to the great Woodrow Wilson, whom he honored last week in his Princeton address. His audience heard the President pay tribute to Wilson as an outstanding scholar who "knew that learning is essential to the leadership that our world so desperately yearns for and needs today."

But what a pity there was no reference in that speech to the conclusions that Wilson applied out of his scholarship to the workings of government; what a pity there was no reference on May 11 at Princeton to Wilson's address to Congress on April 2, 1917, wherein he said that it was neither right nor constitutionally permissable that he assume the responsibility of making the choice between peace and war, that being the duty of Congress.

It is the duty of the Congress to review programs that can lead to war, and that is a duty I shall insist the Foreign Relations Committee fulfill as long as I am a member of that committee. But because the great chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has been assuming that responsibility of leadership, he is held up to castigation by the President of the United States and to criticism by the warhawks of this country, who cannot answer the charges of the immorality and illegality of the war, but can resort to personal attack, in the hope that that may cause some to dismiss the views of the Senator from Arkansas.

In my judgment, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has performed a service to the American people that needed to be performed, by his leadership of the committee in conducting these public hearings. Oh, I know we have some on the committee that do not want any more of them. We even have some on the committee who believe they certainly should not be televised.

Why? Because they know that as the public gets a chance to see and hear, through the hearings that Senator FULBRIGHT has been conducting, it is producing a negative reaction to the President's policies.

If the Foreign Relations Committee ceases to carry out the great educational function that these hearings have performed, ceases to exercise its responsibilities of checking the administration in the field of foreign policy, it will have clearly failed in its responsibility to the American people. This administration, if it thinks it is right in its polcy, should welcome the presentation of the points of view that are being set out in the record of the Foreign Relations Committee.

So it is a duty of Congress to review programs that can lead to a war, too, and that is why I insist it be a continuing duty exercised by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

We cannot stop armies from marching. We cannot forestall the executive branch from ordering the Armed Forces into foreign lands, as for example, in the Dominican Republic. It surely must have made his Princeton audience squirm to hear President Johnson say, only a year after he poured tens of thousands of American troops into the Dominican Republic:

> Unlike nations in the past with vast power at their disposal, the United States of America has never sought to crush the autonomy of her neighbors.

We crushed it in the Dominican Republic. We first walked out on constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic. The Johnson administration recognized and added a military junta in the Dominican Republic that had crushed constitutionalism. Then we crushed the indigious effort to get rid of the junta. The people of the Dominican Republic have never had anything to say about their government since they elected Juan Bosch. Now we are crushing the autonomy of a population 8,000 miles away in Vietnam. But at the bottom of much of this use of armed force lies the foreign aid program with its military assistance, and Congress must maintain close surveillance over it.

I am not optimistic that even if he wanted to the President could make a political settlement in Vietnam. I feel that the military and even foreign policy agencies of our Government are so committed to a military solution in Vietnam that, in the President's word the other night at the political banquet, they will persevere in Vietnam without a local government, if necessary, or by imposing one on the people if possible. They will persevere until the north and south are devastated; they will persevere until we are involved irretrievably in a war with China.

I deeply regret that President Johnson is not interested in persevering with the United Nations. I regret that he is not interested in persevering with his peace offensive, that he is not seeking to persevere in obtaining a cease-fire and in obtaining the help of the U.N. in policing it; that he goes to Honolulu instead of the session of the United Nations to make a plea to them calling for a cease-fire order in Vietnam, with a pledge that we will cooperate in carrying it out if the members that are pledged by their signatures to the charter will likewise give assurance that they will join in enforcing such a cease-fire. I regret these things because we have reached the stage in Vietnam where American disengagement on almost any terms would be preferable to further sacrifice of American life for nothing.

Finally, on Saturday I took part in a foreign policy forum sponsored by Muhlenberg College in Allentown, Pa. Five local colleges joined in that forum, in which Senator STENNIS and I were the speakers and the discussion was moderated by Max Frankel of the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my statement my prepared remarks be printed in the RECORD followed by an article by Jean Lacouture from the May 12 New York Review of Books entitled: "Vietnam: The Turning Point," and various communications I have received on this subject.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 2, 3, and 4.)

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, I am having inserted in the RECORD the statement that I made at Allentown, Pa., on Saturday, because, interestingly enough, it will contain an answer to the point of view expressed by my good friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] in regard to our relationship with France, and also setting forth my views in regard to the NATO crisis.

I wonder how many Americans, if they were Frenchmen, would be voting to leave thousands and thousands of American troops on French soil, in view of the military record we are making elsewhere in the world.

Why are we so surprised that there is a growing concern and fear of American military power in France? We interpret SEATO, of which France is a member, entirely to suit ourselves and without regard to the views or interests of the other parties. How can France or other NATO members know whether we will use and interpret the North Atlantic Treaty the same way?

The trouble with us is we do not like to look at ourselves. The trouble with us is that we think our Narcissus image that we have painted for ourselves is accepted by millions of people elsewhere in the world. The trouble with Americans these days is that we do not recognize the fact that we are bitterly hated by millions of people in many places of the world, for they see all the difference between our verbal statements and our actions, and condemn us for a growing hypocrisy, of which we are guilty.

Mr. President, would that my conscience and my convictions did not dictate that I must warn the American people: "It is not too late for you to exercise the check that the Constitution gives you to stop this trend away from democracy in America and bring your Government back within the framework of constitutional power."

NEED FOR CIA COMMITTEE

All one need do to learn about the danger is to read the record made earlier this afternoon on the floor of the Senate in regard to the CIA. It is hard to believe that it would be seriously proposed in the Senate that a small group of senior citizens should have a monopolistic right to have access to information dealing with the operation of a police state institution that has been allowed to grow up in the body politic of this Republic, for the CIA is a police institution that has no place in democracy except under careful surveillance of our check-and-balance system.

As I listened to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] seek to justify the type relationship that exists between the CIA and the select few in this body who can have access to some information of the CIA, I knew that my case was proved.

By what right—and I speak respectfully of him—does the Senator from Massachusetts think the American people are protected because he has his meetings in various forums—and I think the record will show in his home and others—with McCone or Allen Dulles or Raborn? What kind of check is that on the CIA?

Of course, I have voted hundreds of millions of dollars for a spy system; but I have not voted for a spy system free from the check of the elected representatives of the American people and of Congress. In my judgment, the security of no country is such that it is necessary to engage in that kind of police-state system.

So I join with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and other Senators when I say that the CIA should be checked, and that the Committee on Foreign Relations should have the representation of a watchdog committee to check it.

Let me also say that I do not accept the major premise that the elected officials of the American people should not have an opportunity to be briefed in executive sessions of their committees in regard to what their checking committee has found.

To get the ugly reality out on the floor of the Senate—for I think it is here, and I think some of the facts this afternoon skirted on the edges of it—those who are on the "in" with the CIA do not want the Committee on Foreign Relations or representatives of that committee to have any checking voice in connection with the affairs of the CIA. My conclusion is that they run a pretty good chance that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations would not agree with many of the things that the CIA is doing in the field of foreign policy.

I yield to no one in my high regard for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], but I completely disagree with his position on the CIA. For the Senator from Georgia, when he says that the CIA really did not determine foreign policy in connection with the Bay of Pigs, is grossly mistaken. The fact that John Fitzgerald Kennedy later assumed full responsibility for that fiasco does not change the fact that the CIA misled him. CIA both formulated and executed a foreign policy at the Bay of Pigs and it continues doing so today. I conducted the executive session hearings in regard to the investigation of the CIA, and I say to the Senate this afternoon that I am perfectly satisfied it never would have occurred except for the CIA. The President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, never would have been misled except for the CIA. In fact, I hold the CIA more responsible than the Joint Chiefs of Staff, although they also misled the President.

The sad thing is that President Kennedy came to recognize it and told a considerable number of us so, but he made a great mistake when they sold him a bill of goods that he should not consult Congress.

Imagine what would have happened if John Fitzgerald Kennedy had come back to the Foreign Relations Committee and apprised it of the recommendations being made for the Bay of Pigs. Why, Mr. President, of one thing you can be certain, and that is that the overwhelming majority of the Foreign Relations Committee would have advised against it, as the chairman of the committee did when he was apprised of it at the eleventh hour, under a strict doctrine of privilege.

Of course, it is to the great historic credit of President Kennedy that he assumed the responsibility. But I have been heard to say before, and say now, irrespective of his statement about responsibility, that the wrongdoers were the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Bay of Pigs is one example to which I wish to invite the attention of the American people as supporting part of my fear of the growing power of the American military, including the CIA, in the formulation of American foreign policy.

Of course, CIA is a foreign policy agency. Whether it is supervised by the President and the State Department is not the issue here. The issue for us is whether the congressional check upon CIA should extend only to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, but not to the Foreign Relations Committee, when its activities in fact have as much to do with foreign affairs as with military affairs.

I know that John Fitzgerald Kennedy, prior to his death, expressed the view that he was also concerned about whether he was being sucked into—and that was his language—sucked into another Bay of Pigs in Vietnam. That is why he sent his Ambassador to India, Mr. Galbraith, to Vietnam to make a study and to report to him.

There is no doubt about the advice that the Ambassador gave, and that the Ambassador in his findings supported the position that I was taking at that time, the same position President Kennedy was taking before his death. I had expressed to him, before his death, my great concern for the course of action he was following in Vietnam because, as I said to the President, "What concerns me is the military advisers being only a step away from ground troops." Although the President said it was not his intention, nevertheless, it was perfectly obvious that that is what would happen unless the President stopped the course of action he was following.

No one knows what he would have done had he lived, but I am satisfied that the Galbraith report shook him. I am also satisfied that, had the President lived, we would not be escalating the war in Vietnam today. That war would have been either settled on honorable terms, or we would be out.

Thus, as I close my speech, this will be the first time I have ever said this, because it is the first time that I have come to this conclusion: If the United Nations continues to refuse to live up to its treaty obligations of enforcing the peace in South Vietnam, as it did in the Congo, as it is doing in the Gaza Strip, as it is doing in Cyprus, and as it did in the war between India and Pakistan, if my President continues to refuse to call upon an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to call for a cease-fire order, and pledge that they will support a cease-fire order—and we will cooperate with it—then let me say that my Government cannot possibly justify the continuing slaughter of young Americans in Vietnam in support of a corrupt military junta in Vietnam, a junta which today is beginning a civil war within a civil war and which the American people are entitled to have stopped. If the President refuses to follow these other procedures, then I believe the time will have come for us to say that unless these procedures are followed, we should get out and let South Vietnam determine its own policies.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I merely wish to say that I find myself in complete accord with the analysis which the distinguished Senator from Oregon has made about the situation in Vietnam. What is happening there today is what he and I have been saying for over 2 years now, that we have no business in Vietnam, that nothing whatever justifies our being there militarily, that the American people have been constantly misled and misinformed, and that they are being led down an ever-deepening pit to disaster.

No one has said these things more effectively, more frequently, and more courageously than the Senator from Oregon. It is my hope that the American people, when they get the facts which have been so long concealed from them, will rise in their wrath and mobilize public opinion to do something about it, and stop this utterly unjustified, illegal, and immoral war.

It is utterly inexcusable that we should be drafting American boys and sending them to be slaughtered in Vietnam, and to kill people against whom they have no grievance whatsoever, against whom we have no grievance as a nation, whose actions do not in any way jeopardize the security of the United States.

We, the United States, while charging aggression to others, are actually the aggressor. We are the nation that went halfway around the world to barge into a civil war between Vietnamese. We were the outsider. We were the intruder. We are the aggressor. And we violated solemn treaty commitments in the process.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Alaska. Let me make this closing comment about him. It has been more than 2 years that the Senator and I stood together in the Senate on this question, most of the time almost alone. This year we have been getting some support—not many votes yet, but it is encouraging—at least receiving public recognition from men who are expressing grave doubts as to the soundness of previous votes in the Senate. It may be that we will start getting some votes. I believe that we will have a better opportunity to get more votes for our position when the votes out in the hustings start to be counted next November. But, let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Alaska, that if we wish to use a figure of speech, what we really are trying to do is to support the stability of a bowl of jelly in Vietnam.

I want to say to Mr. McNamara that he cannot make a bowl of jelly very acceptable by the type of aid we are giving Vietnam because of the civil war within a civil war. Vietnam, because of the nature of its junta leaders, I think can best be described as a bowl of jelly; and I do not intend to remain silent while my Government mistakenly, as the Senator from Alaska has pointed out, continues to send men in the flower of their manhood, with all of life before them, from this country into South Vietnam, to be killed in a war in a country where we had no right to go in the first place and in which we cannot justify, on moral or legal grounds, continuing to stay. The American people must show that they want the President to stop, with their ballots, by defeating those who continue to vote to send American boys into Vietnam to support a bowl of jelly.

I want to thank the Senator from Alaska for his leadership, for he has been, as I have said previously, on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere, one of my teachers in the field of foreign policy.

I am willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with him as history judges the historic debate of the last few years in regard to this subject.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 16, 1966]

CIVIL STRIFE DEEPENS AFTER DA NANG SEIZURE: KY'S FORCES ALERTED FOR ATTACK FROM HUE

DA NANG, May 16 (UPI)—Forces loyal to Premier Nguyen Cao Ky which seized control of Da Nang yesterday with machine guns, tanks and fighter planes were alerted today for possible attack by antigovernment troops from Hue.

There was no immediate indication that troops of the First Vietnamese Division, commanded by Gen. Phan Xuan Nhuan, had started an advance from Hue toward Da Nang, 60 miles to the southwest.

At latest reports, a regiment of Gen. Nhuan's men was digging defensive positions on the outskirts of Hue.

An appeal issued in the names of Gen. Nhuan and Maj. Gen. Hoang Xuan Lam, commander of the Second Division, called on soldiers and civilians to "rise up and fight."

Buddhist leaders in Saigon, meanwhile, summoned antigovernment elements to a mass meeting tonight which could lead to a showdown with Premier Ky's government.

The Buddhists had declared earlier that Gen. Ky's attack in Da Nang had brought the nation to the brink of "unavoidable" civil war.

Militant Buddhist youth leader Thich Thien Minh called the mass rally to tell the people of the government's "betrayal." Buddhist youths urged monks to let them stage a torch-light parade thru the streets.

Combat police and a crack paratrooper battalion were standing by in case of trouble.

The mass rally could become the first official "call to arms" since Gen. Ky's troops seized control of Da Nang.

Chief of State Nguyen Van Thieu told the nation by radio last night that the government was forced to act in Da Nang because of communist subversion, continuing unrest and illegal movements in the northern provinces.

He called on the people to realize the danger and share with the government the task of restoring national solidarity.

U.S. officials refused to discuss any possible American involvement. There were indications, however,the Americans were told of Gen. Ky's plans in advance.

EXHIBIT 2

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, MUHLENBERG COLLEGE, ALLENTOWN, PA., MAY 14, 1966

The program of your Foreign Policy Forum is an indication of the response which I think is to be found in many parts of the country to the Vietnam and China hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It is sometimes said in disparagement of the teaching profession that "those who can, do, and those who can't, teach." Although the Senate is supposed to have a special responsibility in the field of foreign relations through its advice and consent to treaties, the great bulk of foreign policy matters are handled without benefit of treaty, and we have seen many evidences in recent weeks that Senatorial advice, without consent, is viewed by the Administration with scorn and outright resentment. So we in the Senate, and we on the Foreign Relations Committee, do not make foreign policy; we do not directly determine the course of our relations with other countries; and we have little to do with the making of what the Secretary of State calls "a foreign policy attitude," in a new phrase he has recently offered to our Committee.

It seems to me, therefore, that unless the role of the Senate in foreign policy is to be lost altogether, we must carry it out in another way from that contemplated by the Constitutional fathers. If we no longer "do," in foreign policy, we must perform the function of a good teacher, and that is to ask questions, to demand satisfactory answers, to point out past mistakes, to review critically, and to introduce new alternatives and options.

Such labors will never endear us to any President, to any State Department or National Security Council. They will not endear us to the public, either, until it comes to have a better understanding of the ways in which foreign policy formulation has changed and the necessity for the Senate to find a new means of performing its role in it.

With all due respect to the representatives of the news media here, I must say that the extreme orientation of the news media to the presidency—to any presidency—has given the United States a cult of presidential personality in the last 20 years that is scarcely exceeded in any communist country. No doubt this orientation is explained on the ground that the president and his executive agencies make the decisions and are the "doers" of so much federal activity, almost exclusively so in the area of foreign relations. But I am ever hopeful that led by the New York Times and the broadcast media, the public may soon come to a better understanding of why our constitutional system needs a new kind of activity on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee from what we have had in years past.

Yet the response to our public hearings this year convinces me that the public does understand that American foreign policy is in serious trouble.

PROBLEMS IN EUROPE

In Asia, we are fighting virtually alone in a war that our State Department says must be fought if confidence in us among our 42 treaty partners is to be maintained, while in Europe our strongest alliance is being dissolved on the ground—or at least one of the grounds—that the American involvement in Asia robs NATO of American interest and protection and the others must now go their own way.

It is commonplace for commentators to say today that the post-war era of Cold War blocs has ended, and the changing conditions of the world are causing the military alliance system of the 1940's and 1950's to break down into irrelevancy.

Yet there is every indication that our foreign policy, like so many military policies of history, is designed to cope with past problems more than with current or future ones. This, for example, has largely been the response of the American government to the withdrawal from NATO of French forces and the order by France that NATO forces withdraw from France. The American President appeals to NATO nations to remember the lesson of World War II, and maintain the unified military force that was developed first to fight Germany, and subsequently to forestall any Russian military move across Europe.

In the opinion of President DeGaulle of France, the necessity for the military force established under the treaty has been undermined by events. The text provided that it was a 20-year treaty, to be renewed or revised in 1969 upon the wishes of the members. It was not perpetual, in other words. We knew in 1949 that the conditions that made it desirable could change or disappear in 20 years.

France has concluded that they have, and that the essential task for Europe is no longer one of amalgamating American military forces into a defense against the Soviet

Union, but amalgamating the Soviet bloc into a peaceful coexistence and cooperation with western Europe. It is the French view that the massive American presence in NATO makes this European task more difficult.

The extent to which this Gaullist view may or may not be accurate, and the extent to which it poses excruciating problems for Germany have not been met by the United States. Instead, we have tried to pretend that it is only DeGaulle who is out of step and who fails to recognize the lessons of the past. We have assailed the breaking up of the unified NATO military force. But we have done it on the basis of its past success, rather than on the basis of whether it is wise or needed for the future and, indeed, whether its existence obstructs more desirable events than it prevents.

The American Department of Defense, and the American State Department have for 20 years grounded their defense policies upon the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We have counted on NATO countries, NATO territory, and NATO forces almost as part of our own. We have become accustomed to stationing some 300- to 400,000 troops in Europe as part of the NATO defensive force, and the vast and far-flung military bases across western Europe are counted upon almost as much as those on American soil.

Now, the whole fabric is threatened; the most basic assumptions and practices of the American military stance are on the verge of dissolution. There is every evidence that it is this threat to traditional military planning that is uppermost in the American objections to the Gaullist policy.

I say this because the American arguments against DeGaulle partake of military ossification more than of political realities in Europe. In 1952, Stalin offered Adenauer the reunification of Germany provided the whole country would be neutral. John Foster Dulles became Secretary of State in time to prevail upon Adenauer to reject the offer with the seductive counter-offer that if West Germany joined NATO, it could soon demand reunification on its own terms, including full German alliance with the West.. But the military strength of NATO, including that of a re-armed West Germany, never was able to reunify Germany short of war, and the hope and expectation of the Germans that it could has long since gone glimmering.

This central political objective in Europe has not been achieved, and there is a growing realization in Germany and throughout Europe that if Germany is ever to be united, and a major cause of East-West friction removed, it will have to come about through de-escalation of military confrontations and not through their escalation. This is one attraction of the Gaullist theory to many Europeans. It is an attraction that the American insistence upon continuation of the military organization of NATO has no means of countering. The perpetuation of the NATO force may well mean the final settlement of World War II on the basis of a dismembered Germany. If that is what we and western Europe want, that is what I think we will get.

The opportunities of improved trade and cultural relations with eastern Europe are another attraction of Gaullism. As the monolith of Communism breaks up in eastern Europe, the fear of military aggression from it recedes in western Europe. The issue that the United States does not face is whether the path to eased tensions and better relations is through "building bridges" rather than building armies.

The failure of the Secretary of Defense in his appeal to NATO ministers to join us in the war in Vietnam reflects a decided European attitude that to become involved in the war in Asia can only get in the way of improved relations within Europe. To Americans, preoccupation with Vietnam forces us to dredge up old battle cries about "Munich" and to warn Europe that if the so-called yellow peril is not stopped in Vietnam it will overrun not only the whole of Asia, Africa, Latin America and North America, but Europe, too.

This "yellow peril" argument of the Secretary of Defense was coolly received in Europe by our NATO friends. Whether or not they think it useful for the Americans to fight communism in Asia, they seem convinced that it is not their war and that they have more urgent and useful endeavors on their own continent.

The American appeal for continuing NATO without France as though nothing had happened, and waiting for De Gaulle to pass from the scene, implies that nothing has changed since 1949. At least it implies that we are seeking to perpetrate the solution of 1949 without inquiring whether the problem is the same.

As one who participated in the Senate debate and ratification of the treaty, I am increasingly of the opinion that this is an issue that our European partners must decide, and not an issue on which an American decision can or should be forced on them. If Germany, Britain, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, and the other treaty partners want to continue the treaty organization and pick up their share of the military and financial load being put down by France, then I think the United States should pick up its share, too.

But this can happen only if Europeans are themselves convinced that the military organization serves a more useful purpose than it frustrates. So far, I have not heard any convincing argument that it does. We have only depicted De Gaulle as going back to the pre-World War I system of alliances without unified forces, while we urge the system of only 20 years ago when a multi-national military force helped to conquer Germany.

Both sides accuse the other of being tied to the past, and both claim to be applying the lessons of history. But are any of these analogies valid, or do they serve only to relieve both of the burden of making a case?

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has written a new chapter in postwar history by opening to public discussion the previously closed subject of our China policy, and the war in Vietnam. Without necessarily dropping that subject, I am hopeful that the Committee can also open the subject of the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I hope we will hold open, public hearings on the future of NATO; if we do not, we are likely to continue to hear an American case based primarily upon the convenience of the Defense Department, and not one that considers the political objectives of the West and how they can be pursued most effectively.

U.S. POLICY IN ASIA

On March 8, the Foreign Relations Committee opened its China hearings in an effort to re-examine a major policy of 17 years' standing which is leading us even closer to World War III. As with the Vietnam hearings to which they were related, our proceedings were viewed with ill-concealed distaste among policy-makers who have hewn devotedly for 17 years to the China policy laid down in 1949 when the Secretary of State said we would wait for the dust to settle in China before deciding what to do about its new Communist regime.

A recent television broadcast on China by the American Broadcasting Company described accurately the attitudes of China's leaders toward the U.S. by showing that they had not changed since 1949. But if Mao Tsetung still thinks of America and China exactly as he did 17 years ago, the same must be said of Dean Rusk, who became Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East in 1950 and whose views of U.S.-Chinese relations remain in the same antiquated and dangerous rut along with Mao's.

The same program translated the slogan uttered by small school children to the effect that "if the American soldiers come to China, they will be buried in our soil." The commentary went on to describe this as evidence of China's "belligerence" toward the United States.

The recitation of recent Chinese history before our Committee, and the extent to which it has rebutted official doctrine that China is another Nazi Germany that must be surrounded with military power has provoked some familiar old charges of "appeasement" and "apologists for Chinese communism."

But what has been surprising is the extent to which this review has been accepted calmly by the American public. What our hearings did was to reflect not a fear and apprehension of China among the public, but the extent to which official policy clings to old myths and fears that no longer reflect public opinion.

The dust has settled in China. Her Communist regime is here to stay. While India has staggered in her effort to mobilize and organize her economy and depends upon hundreds of millions of dollars worth of gratuitous food from the U.S., China has managed to feed a much larger population by paying hard dollars for what she needs from the West. Most significant of all to the American public, in my opinion, has been China's development of a nuclear weapon.

However primitive it may be, and however impossible for her to deliver upon U.S. cities from the air, nonetheless Americans no less than the Soviet Union or China respect force and power. A country that commands nuclear power commands far more respect among the American public than one that does not, no matter what ideology guides it.

So since our hearings began, it has become respectable in Congress, among academicians, the press, and the public to point out that isolation is a bad thing for China because she is a nuclear power. So is the isolation of any nuclear power a bad thing for the United States, and it is on this basis that many of us believe American interests and security would be better served with Peking in the U. N. than outside it.

Diplomatic recognition is perhaps less urgent; but it is nonetheless unfortunate that those who seek to transfer our containment policy from Russia to China continue to overlook the diplomatic relations we had with Russia and the extent to which they enabled us to judge Russian purposes and reactions firsthand.

The body of "Kremlinologists" and such State Department Soviet experts as George Kennan, Charles Bohlen, and Llewellyn Thompson did not develop their body of knowledge and judgment about Russia purely from U–2 plane pictures, from questioning of refugees, from statistics published by the Communist government, and similar intelligence sources. They were in Russia; they knew and talked to Russian leaders at high and low levels; they lived in the country and saw the people and how they lived.

Sixty-eight years ago we had toward China what we called the policy of the Open Door. It sought to maintain for American commercial interests equal access to the Chinese empire with European imperial powers. It opposed exclusive rights extended to any one European power and demanded that the United States receive from China whatever extra-territorial or trade concessions any other nation received. The "Open Door" was looked upon by some as the best China could hope for, and it kept her from being colonized by one outside power. Yet it also meant that every western power could walk all over China together and not just one at a time.

Since 1949, we have sought the opposite. We have had a Closed Door policy toward

China. Under it we perpetuate the greatest myth of American foreign policy which holds that Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan is the government of China. Under our closed door policy we permit no trade, and we limit human travel to a tiny handful of public health specialists, selected journalists, and academicians, which China does not admit.

Under the Closed Door policy, we have sought to close her off to other countries as well. British recognition of Peking is belittled, French recognition was opposed by the United States, Japanese and German recognition is forestalled by immensely strong U.S. representations, and we do all we can to limit trade from western nations, most particularly Japan and West Germany.

Despite our diplomatic efforts, despite her recent failures in poor countries, and despite the constant exhortations by the Secretaries of State and Defense that China is a voracious monster, out to devour Asia today and tomorrow the world, most industrial nations are moving toward more normal relations with her. Japanese trade with China is small but growing, and recently moved ahead of the volume of her trade with the Soviet Union. The consortium of European firms headed by Germans to construct steel mills has apparently gone ahead despite protests by the State Department.

In fact, as China's commercial and technical relations with the Soviet Union have atrophied, her commercial and technical relations with the West have grown. Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Canada—most of our key allies—have sent trade missions to China. They have found that trade with mainland China is possible, practical, and can be quite profitable. In fact, NATO-associated nations accounted for $223 million worth of imports from Communist China in 1964 alone.

OPPORTUNITY TO OPEN THE CLOSED DOOR

I suggest that China is burgeoning economically, and technically, far beyond the limits of our capacity to contain her with military force alone. We are satisfied to say that China is isolated because of her own actions, but she is isolated because we have for 17 years done our best to keep her that way. The Chinese are quite right in pointing to the ring of American bases which confront her on three sides as a source of fear to her national security. And the testimony and speeches of our leading cabinet officials make clear that our dominant attitude toward China is that if she makes one false move, we will pulverize her with nuclear weapons.

Officialdom in Washington has brainwashed itself to the extent that Chinese airbases are called "sanctuaries," just as though they had no right to fly 30 miles across their border over North Vietnam, but we have every right to fly thousands of miles from our borders to bomb North Vietnam. The containment dogma that allowed the Soviet Union a rather ample ring of Soviet-dominated countries around her borders does not permit any such ring of Chinese-dominated countries around her borders, for if the Chinese do what we did in the Dominican Republic, that will be aggression.

We need something more than a simple change of policy in Washington. We need a change of official mind and attitude. We need to have a new Open Door policy toward China. It must take into account her status as a near-great power; her interest in protecting her borders just as Russia and the United States have done by assuring countries nearby that are not hostile if not downright friendly or communist; her legitimate claim to the seat assigned to China in the United Nations Charter.

We need to begin seeking trade at least in non-strategic goods.

We need to start talking to her and to other affected Asian countries about a settlement of the status of Taiwan, for we use Peking's ferocity about Taiwan as the excuse for our bad relations; but we have been quite content to let it go at that, and to keep the issue of Taiwan around for just this purpose.

We need to stop being satisfied with China's isolation. We need to mount a diplomatic offensive that will open the door of normalcy between China and the rest of the world.

We need to stop talking about sanctuaries and how easy it would be to bomb her nuclear bases and start talking about how China can be brought into the community of nations at all levels and in all fields.

We need a massive effort on the diplomatic and economic fronts to open the door to China once again, for ourselves and for all nations, not for exploitation but on the basis of full national equality. This should be our offensive.

China is the last of the emerging nations remaining outside the community of nations. It is not good for her, but I do not suggest these changes in American policy for her sake, but for our own.

I do not believe exclusive reliance upon military containment is a sound, reasonable, or productive policy for this country any longer. In my opinion, it stands to lead us to war far more certainly than to peaceful coexistence.

Within the foreseeable future, China will be a genuine nuclear power; by the end of the century, she will make up half of the world's population. I am interested in finding where our interests lie in the Pacific that can be defended without costing more than they are worth, and I am interested in achieving a condition that will enable us to live in peace with China. I do not believe this condition can be achieved without a diplomatic effort commensurate with our military effort. To that end, I believe we should initiate a calculated, sustained, and overt effort to rebuild normal relations between our two countries.

RELATIONS WITH UNDEVELOPED WORLD

Finally, I would like to discuss generally our policies toward Latin America and the rest of the poorer nations of the world. Much of what I shall say applies also to China and Southeast Asia, for they, too, must be counted among the poorer nations of the world.

One of the saddest statements I heard in our hearings this year was uttered only Wednesday by the Secretary of Defense. In discussing the $917 million military aid budget, Senator Pell asked him whether all the references the Secretary had made to what are called "civic action" programs by indigenous armies really exemplified an "eleemosynary intent."

The Secretary replied with what I think has become the epitome of American policy toward these countries on whom we heap military assistance:

"Well, I just think that instability is a danger to our peace and security, and that instability may come from communist or noncommunist causes. It isn't only communism that is causing revolution in the world today. I have the figures here; there have been 160 or 180 political disorders in the last several years, five or six years. And perhaps no more than half of those have been caused by communists, *but all of them are a danger to us*, because all of them disrupt the peace of the world, and when the peace of the world is disrupted, nations can very easily come into conflict one with another, and it is extremely difficult for the great powers to separate themselves from those conflicts."

"Instability" is what we fear and oppose in the undeveloped world, not privation nor injustice nor lack of opportunity, but instability. And whether communist inspired or not, the Secretary of Defense tells us that all disorders "are a danger to us," because they might involve the great powers. So as a great power, we have promptly involved ourselves in them, in an effort to preempt the political field for ourselves.

In many ways, the most tragic of these interventions has been in the Dominican Republic, about which Mr. Frankel probably knows as much as I do! In keeping with the view expressed by the Defense Secretary, the Administration found that a disorder which was not communist inspired at the outset was not controlled by the American embassy, either, and therefore it regarded it as a danger to American peace and security. So acting upon endless false representations from our embassy in Santo Domingo, the President ordered a virtual occupation of the Dominican Republic by American military forces, in total and complete violation of our treaties with the Dominican Republic and other nations of the hemisphere.

In my opinion, that intervention did more to help communism in Latin America than any other course we could have followed. It remains to be seen from the scheduled election June 1 whether we have brought stability to the Dominican Republic, even at the cost of many American and Dominican lives, or as in Vietnam, whether our intervention will merely widen and intensify the conflict it was intended to suppress.

In what I thought was a mild, restrained, and helpful address, the Chairman of our Committee, Senator Fulbright, sought to review the circumstances of that intervention and draw some conclusions from them that would help us avoid similar situations in the future.

Among his conclusions was this:

"The movement of the future in Latin America is social revolution. The question is whether it is to be communist or democratic revolution and the choice which the Latin Americans make will depend in part on how the United States uses its great influence. It should be very clear that the choice is not between social revolution and conservative oligarchy but whether by supporting reform, we bolster the popular non-communist left or whether, by supporting unpopular oligarchies, we drive the rising generation of educated and patriotic young Latin Americans to an embittered and hostile form of communism like that of Fidel Castro in Cuba. . . . I think that in the case of the Dominican Republic we did close our minds to the causes and to the essential legitimacy of revolution in a country in which democratic procedures had failed."

As one who was pleased to support the findings and conclusions of Senator Fulbright, I am dismayed to find that even this week, the State Department refuses to understand what is really going on in Latin America.

Thanks to the New York Times, I have read that State Department aides have apparently succeeded in censoring the views of a prominent American labor leader, who is part of our delegation to the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labor. I read in a May 11th dispatch from Caracas the following about my good friend, Joe Beirne of the Communications Workers:

"In the first version of his address—copies of which soon became scarce because they were destroyed by aides of the United States delegation—Mr. Beirne declared: 'When we speak of nonviolent change, the priority, if it should come to that, is on change, not on non-violence.'

"He also said, 'We believe in obtaining social reforms through lobbying and voting rather than by fighting, but if anyone were to take away our rights to lobby, to strike or to vote, you can be sure we would fight.'

"State Department aides here would say only that Mr. Beirne would not speak today and that the only speech they knew of was being 'translated.' But a copy of the new address showed considerable softening of Mr. Beirne's remarks."

Mr. Beirne is also quoted as telling newsmen: "I am sticking by my address and if you can't get a copy I'll show you mine in longhand."

The "translation" of Joe Beirne's speech was not into Spanish but into State Department language that will once again put stability and order ahead of change in order of importance.

That is where we are going wrong everywhere in the world. We are forgetting that the first message of America to mankind was not the Alliance For Progress, nor the Marshall Plan, nor NATO, nor the Four Freedoms, nor the Declaration of Independence. Our first message was the shot heard round the world from Lexington, and there are still some of us in the Senate who will never believe that shot was fired on behalf of stability, or even order. It was fired on behalf of change.

Yet from Latin America to Europe to Asia by way of the Middle East, we trust to military power to maintain stability with as little change as possible. Out of our immense wealth, we can sustain such a policy for a long time. But as we are finding in Vietnam, what military force can prevent it cannot always solve, and what it can start it cannot necessarily finish.

Our effort to bring peace and stability to Southeast Asia by armed force has only brought an ever-widening circle of war's disruption. Still the escalation goes on, but now we are hearing of "mutual escalation" rather than American escalation. The only prospect for the future in Vietnam is one of more troops sent, more installations in North Vietnam to be bombed, and more warnings to China that her planes will have no "sanctuary" if they interfere.

In closing I offer you something Carl Sandburg once wrote about the American Civil War. It surely has application far beyond that conflict, for he called it "Hammers Pounding":

"Grant had a sledgehammer pounding and pounding and Lee had a sledgehammer pounding and pounding
And the two hammers gnashed their ends against each other and broke holes and splintered and withered
And nobody knew how the war would end and everybody prayed God his hammer would last longer than the other hammer
Because the whole war hung on the big guess of who had the hardest hammer
And in the end one side won the war because it had a harder hammer than the other side.
Give us a hard enough hammer, a long enough hammer, and we will break any nation,
Crush any star you name or smash the sun and the moon into small flinders."

Today, the United States possesses the power to smash our world into small flinders. But do we possess the will, the capacity, the desire, the intellectual means to help the world cope with its shifting problems by peaceful means?

That is the test for this generation.

EXHIBIT 3

VIETNAM: THE TURNING POINT

(By Jean Lacouture)

"Here Is Your Enemy," by James Cameron. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 160 pages, $3.95.

On the screen an old peasant woman stands amidst devastated houses and fields; like 25 million men and women in both parts of her country she wears black silk pajamas. Her left sleeve hangs empty. The picture dissolves quickly and those who see her on the television film that James Cameron, an English newspaperman, has brought back from North Vietnam will forget her—unless they have also read his book, "Here Is Your Enemy." It is dedicated to the "old lady who lives in the village of Naah Ngang, in the Thanh Hoa province of North Vietnam which is unfortunately near a strategically important bridge."

The bridge as far as we know still stands [Cameron writes], but the old lady had her left arm blown off by one of the bombs that went astray. She was more fortunate than her daughter, who was killed. She said: "I suppose there is a reason for all this, but I do not understand what it is. I think I am too old now ever to find out."

Most Americans are not too old to understand and are living far enough from the bombed bridges to appraise soberly the Vietnam policy pursued in their name. Indeed they have more information available to them about the war than any other nation that has ever fought in a remote foreign land. Now, at a moment when the war seems to be reaching a turning point, James Cameron's book and film give us the first perceptive report we have had in years on the lives, reactions, ideas, and leaders of the enemy in the north.

Cameron was the first Western correspondent admitted to Hanoi since the beginning of the bombings. "Why I was selected out of a clamoring multitude of serious newspapermen is an enigma to me," he writes. "It could have been the fact that I had insisted on going, if I went, on my own terms, uncommitted and unsponsored." In any case, it was a fortunate choice. Cameron is not a neutral observer—he has been critical of both the Conservative and Labor positions on Vietnam—but he seems less susceptible to the passions and resentment we might have expected from a French or American reporter. An English liberal with long experience in Asia, he is able to distinguish between the totalitarian Communist apparatus which rules in North Vietnam and the authentic drive for national identity and independence which has made the Vietnamese revolution possible.

Much of Cameron's book will be familiar to those who read his dispatches in *The New York Times* and the *London Evening Standard* last September. What emerges most clearly from the second reading is his sense of the ordinary Vietnamese people he met during the winter of 1965 when American bombs were falling on the transport and communications systems throughout the country. Cameron is not a sentimentalist but he was enormously impressed by the remarkable courage and cheerfulnsss of the Vietnamese in the face of death. Indeed the most important contribution of his book is to show that the stoicism of the Vietnamese is one of the most important, and most neglected, factors in the debate over Vietnam—as important as the follies of French colonialism, or the calculations of Secretary Rusk. Western leaders have not understood that bombing operations that might produce panic and disruption in their own countries have had remarkable little effect on a people who resisted French "mopping up" operations for eight years and are led by an old man who has spent one third of his life in prison and another third shaking off the agents of various colonial police forces.

So far from terrorizing and disrupting the people [Cameron writes] the bombing seemed to me both stimulated and consolidated them. By the nature of the attacks so far, civilian casualties had not been very great, but they had been great enough to provide the government of the Vietnam republic with the most totally unchallengeable propaganda they could ever have dreamed of. A nation of peasants and manual workers who might have felt restive or dissatisfied under the stress of totalitarian conditions had been obliged to forget all their differences in the common sense of resistance and self-defense. From the moment the United States dropped its first bomb on the North of Vietnam, she welded the nation together unshakably . . . even in their own interests the U.S. planners failed to recognize the reality of a society like this. A bomb here, a bomb there; a family eliminated here or there; . . . these were troublesome, infuriating; they were not disabling. The destruction of a bridge or a road—in Western terms it could be disastrous. Here it was a nuisance.

One might add that since the resumption of the bombing the rate of North Vietnamese infiltration into the South has quadrupled; the number of American casualties has risen; Northern influence in the South has increased along with the prestige of the Communist cadres in the Vietcong. Moreover, the membership of the PRP, the Communist organization within the National Liberation Front, has tripled during the last year.

No doubt Cameron's book will be dismissed—as his articles were dismissed by *Time*—as a "conduit for North Vietnamese propaganda," naive in its uncritical presentation of talks with North Vietnamese leaders. But Cameron writes, "It seemed to me from the beginning that I of all people was most likely to be handled with circumspection and to receive in official conversations the most distilled official line." On the other hand, his observation of the effects of the war on the North Vietnamese are his own and they are important. Those who have served as a "conduit"—if not as a source—for official American propaganda justifying the bombings can learn from Cameron's report how badly this policy has failed.

The events of the past month make Cameron's book all the more pertinent. The bombings in the North have become even more severe, while the demonstrations in the South seem to have made a political solution more possible. At least some of the more fragile American myths have been exploded and the hard political questions that have been obscured by Washington's rhetoric are coming into the open. Can the war be justified as a "defense of free men against a foreign invasion" when thousands of people have been openly demanding an end to dictatorial government, not to mention the American presence itself? Do all the non-Communists really want a powerful American army to fight in Vietnam until the last Vietcong is killed or driven North? If not, what is the basis of the American commitment?

These questions can at last be raised largely because of the agitation of the Buddhists in their Northern stronghold of Hue and Danang as well as in Saigon. But the intentions of the Buddhists are not easily discerned, for they have been reluctant to announce their concrete political aims. Tri Quang and his followers have advocated "absolute peace" and "absolute nationalism," while shrewdly improvising ways to undermine the military dictatorship. If their views seem abstract or contradictory, this is a characteristics of Vietnamese political life. Nationalism and Communism have long been intermingled in the Vietnamese revolution; so have the desires of the South Vietnamese for reunification and their resentment of Northern domination. In much the same way it is extremely difficult to distinguish the religious principles of the Buddhists (and often the Catholics) in the South from their political activism.

But it should be made clear that the Buddhists are a relatively new force in South Vietnamese politics. They did not begin to make their influence felt until the early Sixties when the pagodas and monasteries became centers of resistance to the oppressive (and largely Catholic) Diem government. The recent demonstrations are the Buddhists' third political offensive. The first created the situation which led the army to bring down Diem in 1963; the second ended in the fall of Khanh in 1964. Their current campaign is a direct reaction to the mounting intensity of the war and the increasing numbers of civilian casualties all over the South. (According to the recent testimony of Representative ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, it is estimated that at least two civilians, and perhaps as many as six, are being killed for each Vietcong soldier.)

"This cannot go on!" is the Buddhist slogan. It is aimed not only at the war itself but at the recent national humiliation which is summed up by the word "Honolulu." For the Honolulu meeting exposed the nearly total failure of a great Western power to understand public opinion in a small country, where feelings of oppression and resentment have been smoldering for years. In organizing the conference Washington had hoped not only to strengthen Ky's position but to encourage him to be more flexible politically and to undertake social reforms. However so far as most Vietnamese were concerned, Washington had already shown unprecedented contempt for their country by imposing Premier Ky on them in the first place; to them, the meeting was no more than a summons from a foreign general to a cocky lieutenant—a glaring example of Saigon's "abject" dependence on Washington. The following week Tri Quang warned an American visitor that a wave of anti-American agitation was sure to follow; Obviously a considerable part of the population shared his feelings.

The crisis that broke out on March 10 may well have set a hopeful process in motion. It has shown Washington that the Vietnamese cannot be treated simply as pawns to be managed by native dictators, but that they are in fact a volatile and touchy people with a complex politics of their own. And in South Vietnam itself Washington has begun to act with more politicial acumen. Although General Ky was foolish enough to claim that Danang was in Communist hands, and the U.S. Airforce was available to help "liberate the city," no serious reprisal was allowed to take place; and William P. Bundy, the Assistant Secretary of State, was unusually calm in his appraisal of the situation. Futhermore William Komer, the new White House advisor on foreign affairs, met with Tri Quang in Hué soon after the crisis erupted. He listened to his complaints against the Ky government and then forwarded a letter from Tri Quang, to Mr. Johnson. In this letter the Buddhist leader requested that the United States support the convening of a Vietnamese national Congress that would settle peacefully the political and military future of Vietnam—would, in particular, decide whether U.S. forces should continue to be present in the country.

The promise of elections on August 15 seems to have pacified Tri Quang, at least for the moment, but we may be sure that the continuing presence of American troops will remain the central question of the future. Tri Quang and his colleagues will have more to say on this subject. Their elusive neutralism may turn out to be quite incompatible with any permanent foreign military presence.

Thus the basis of the American commitment in Vietnam has been thrown into doubt. Until now Washington's professed aim has been to allow the South Vietnamese to choose their future freely. The recent campaign of the Buddhists could finally make such a choice feasible, but it may also mean that the Vietnamese will eventually demand the removal of the American garrison. The question must be raised, however, whether some leaders in Washington are committed not to "self-determination" but to preserving South Vietnam as a military base for the containment of China. In a remarkable essay in the April *Commentary*, George Lichtheim suggests that the essential American motive is to maintain a strong American presence in Vietnam—particularly the enormous air base now being built at Cam Ranh—in preparation for the day when Communist China will possess a nuclear force. Furthermore, in his interview with a correspondent of *Le Monde* George Ball defined Washington's view of an acceptable Vietnamese neutrality as the absence of foreign alliances—but said nothing about foreign bases.

The hypothesis that certain American authorities are anxious to have a large permanent base in Vietnam may help to explain certain aspects of American behavior in the past; its intransigent opposition to direct dealings with the Vietcong, for example. However, the policy has not been publicly stated or defended and it remains unclear why the U.S. should need a base in South Vietnam at all, in view of its other strong installations in the area as well as the Seventh Fleet. But if such a policy were to be adopted, an espousal of neutralism by the Buddhists would make them, for American purposes, the allies of Chinese imperialism and they would soon be swept aside. Tri Quang could easily find himself in the same position as Juan Bosch did last year.

Obviously Washington is about to make vital decisions. The rainy season in the South will start in two months and this will sharply limit air operations and therefore the efficiency of General Westmoreland's troops. We may also expect that attempts will be made during the next two months to reconvene the Geneva conference—possibly as a result of General de Gaulle's visit to Moscow. When this happens, the international pressures on Washington to participate will be heavy. President Johnson would be well advised to undertake his own diplomatic efforts first.

In this situation Washington may reckon that it has two months to win the war. As General Ridgeway has recently written in *Look*, the war could be won if the full force of U.S. air and naval power were brought to bear on the enemy. But the price would be genocide: Much of Vietnam would be turned into a desert occupied by Marines, a result the General believes unworthy of American traditions and not justified by the threat of China. Meanwhile another experienced observer, J. K. Galbraith, has warned that the country is running an "intolerable risk" of provoking Chinese intervention as it launches heavier and heavier bombing attacks on the North.

At the same time certain hopeful, if little-publicized, diplomatic developments have taken place: Along with the recent negotiations with the Buddhists they may help to provide an alternative to genocide and further escalation. It seems clear, for example, that new and very discreet contacts have been made with the Vietcong. For over a year negotiations have been underway to obtain the release of Mr. Hertz, a U.S. official held prisoner by the Vietcong. First, Paris attempted to intervene with Hanoi on Mr. Hertz's behalf; then Senator ROBERT KENNEDY stepped in. Four months ago Hanoi let it be known that the National Liberation Front insisted on conducting its own negotiations concerning the prisoner. After some hesitation Washington made contact with the Vietcong and several meetings followed. So far as is known, a dialogue is now secretly taking place somewhere in the South between the U.S. government and the N.L.F. Apparently no results have been achieved so far, but at least a channel of communication has been established.

Official doctrine is also changing. While Vice President HUMPHREY denounced Vietcong "assassins" in Honolulu, Charles Bohlen and Averell Harriman hinted at a more flexible U.S. position: The Vietcong, they said, might back candidates in the next election and thus participate in a South Vietnamese government. And later, after Senator KENNEDY's statement on Vietnam, Bill Moyers stated that no groups could be denied participation in the public life of South Vietnam, provided its representatives had been duly elected. This "Moyers Compromise" would seem to be the last authoritative word on the subject. Neither Hanoi nor the NLF has as yet rejected Senator KENNEDY's suggestion that the Vietcong might participate in a coalition government (the first "goal of war" of the NLF), although Peking called it a "new imperialist maneuver." Whether or not this is of any significance remains to be seen.

Let us suppose that the American leadership finally rejects the course of escalation and decides to bring the war to an end. The logical objectives of such a policy would be: (a) to restore the moral prestige of the United States in Asia and in the world; (b) to allow the South Vietnamese to create their own independent state which can prepare a future merger with North Vietnam and co-exist with China; (c) to promote the development in South East Asia of a broad movement based on both neutralism and nationalism—a movement that would include the political tendencies of both India and Indonesia and would establish friendly relations with Japan.

Is it possible to suggest precisely what steps should be taken to implement such a policy? A peaceful settlement might be pursued in three stages. At first, every effort must be made to encourage the local forces in South Vietnam to come forward and take their place in the political life of the country. If democracy has any chance in Vietnam it will succeed only by the vigorous political activity of the groups that genuinely represent Vietnamese society—the Buddhists, Catholics, trade unions, students, army, Cao-Dai, and "Hoa-Hao" among others. These are the famous "chickens" that Mr. HUMPHREY wants to protect from the hungry "fox." But if they are bold enough to challenge a regime supported by the U.S. army there is good reason to believe they will be able to resist threats to their integrity in the future. Tri Quang may favor neutralism and negotiations, but he is not a man inclined to yield power to any competing group.

Recently there has been a tendency in the United States to make glib jokes about Vietnam's political "instability." But it remains to be seen whether people who have refused to support a series of despicable dictatorships openly backed by foreigners—the regimes of Bao Dai, Diem, Khanh, and Ky—have proven their instability or their desire for identity and freedom. Should the Vietnamese be called "irresponsible" and "ungovernable" because they reject the rule of an unknown jet pilot trained by the French at the height of the Algerian war?

We can now say that the first step toward a peaceful settlement of the war was taken this Spring, although many questions remain in doubt. Will elections be held on August 15 to form a National Congress? Will this assembly meet only to write a South Vietnamese constitution and decide on the form of a future civilian government? It is possible to arrange reasonably fair elections under present conditions? In any case, a Constitutional Convention might be able to work out procedures to form a more permanent congress made up of delegates representing all the significant groups in the South. Until the signing of a cease fire, a number of seats could be held open for the representatives of the NLF. Meanwhile the Congress would set up a caretaker government that would eventually deal with the NLF and prepare the way for its return to legitimate political life.

During the second phase the military leaders on both sides would meet to work out a cease fire: Representatives of the American and South Vietnamese armies would negotiate with leaders of the Vietcong and their Northern Allies. But this will be a harder task than the first because there is no evidence that the Vietcong have abandoned the theory that a long struggle will bring them total victory as the U.S. grows weary of the war. Indeed one of the great tragedies of the conflict is that both sides are so badly informed about the firmness of the other's intentions. Undoubtedly the hard-line Communists in the Vietcong want a long war. For one thing it brings them new recruits. Communist membership has grown from ten thousand since 1951 to almost a hundred thousand at the present time.

The principal effort of American policy must therefore be to provide political opportunities to those revolutionaries who have not become "professional warriors." Unlike the guerrilla fighters who *enjoy* the adventure and power of warfare, many of the Vietcong followers are exhausted. Senator KENNEDY's proposal is therefore sound, because it may strengthen the position of those revolutionaries who would like to convert a military into a political struggle. However while the Vietcong is a most efficient machine of war, its political and psychological skill may not match its fighting power. This is probably one reason why its chiefs prefer war.

The only chance of persuading the guerrillas in the South to accept a cease fire is to speak to them directly and not through Hanoi or at an international conference. They have not forgotten the 1954 Geneva conference when their interests were submerged in a deal among the great powers (and the less-than-great Vietminh). The Southern combat forces were sent off to the North while the country remained in "reactionary" hands.

Many of the same guerrillas have now returned to the "Maquis" in the South and have resumed fighting. It is true that they now depend on the North and the nations of the Communist bloc for much of their support; and any agreement with the guerrillas would eventually have to involve Hanoi as well as the great powers. But since the guerrilla chiefs are wary of being duped again by an international deal—and are enjoying the prestige of battle—they are quite capable of sabotaging an agreement made without their full consent. Therefore any efforts to make peace must start with them—if peace is the goal.

Once a cease-fire agreement is in prospect, the third stage—preparation for self-determination—should begin. The opposing forces must agree on the procedures for a nationwide referendum. It should be pointed out that, unlike the FLN in Algeria, the NLF leaders have unequivocally admitted that their movement cannot fully represent the South Vietnamese people. This has been made clear not only in public statements but in the allotment of public seats on the National Council to volunteers—who are not volunteering. Is it possible that the two incomplete assemblies—the National Congress and the NLF committee—might merge to form a fully representative parliament for South Vietnam?

No matter how it is organized, a referendum would reveal the full diversity of South Vietnamese society. It is entirely possible that the NLF will appear as a "major factor of the South Vietnamese political scene," as George Carver has recently written in *Foreign Affairs*. It is also quite likely that the Congress will reflect the various zones of influence in South Vietnam, with Buddhists predominating in the Hué and Danang areas, the Catholics around Saigon, Cai Dalists in the West, and Hoa-Hao in the South West. The Vietcong may be expected to predominate in the East (Zone D), the South, and the Quang Ngai area, which lies between the strongholds of the Buddhists in the North and the Catholics in the center of South Vietnam. In Vietnam, as in most countries, men have a stronger political appeal than ideas: The referendum might therefore be more effective if it were to choose a head of state rather than a cabinet government drawn from different factions or parties—but this would require the non-Communist groups to agree upon a common candidate, something that seems highly unlikely at the moment. The key to the political situation and to a workable balance of power among the forces in the South will be the possibility of cooperation between the Buddhists and the Catholics. The Vatican is now trying to bring this about with the help of the new liberal Catholic groups which center around Mgr. Binh and the Archbishop of Saigon, and are now providing a counterforce to the reactionary traditions of Vietnamese Catholicism.

It should be clear that no solution will be acceptable to Hanoi unless there are guarantees of close ties between the two Vietnams before the country can be reunited. It is far from clear how long reunification itself might take. Ho Chi Minh estimated that it might take ten years when I spoke to him in 1962, while in 1965 an NLF spokesman in Algiers thought fifteen years more likely. It could take a long time indeed.

Finally, it will remain for international negotiation to guarantee the results of the peace talks, perhaps making use of an enlarged version of the International Control Commission of 1956 (India, Poland, Canada) to supervise the referendum and protect Vietnamese neutrality. As a matter of fact, international negotiations among the Great Powers have secretly been taking place since 1964. It is rumored that Secretary General U Thant now plans to request a leave of absence from the United Nations in order to concentrate on the Vietnam question. This will put him in a better position to deal with the Asian Communists who distrust his organization but trust him personally. Something may also come of General de Gaulle's trip to Moscow, as well as new interventions by Pope Paul VI. Harold Wilson may at last choose to display his diplomatic talents by assuming his position as cochairman at a reconvened Geneva conference. He could then count on the assistance of Canada whose delegate at the International Control Commission has kept in close touch with Hanoi.

The next two months will be decisive. The United States can certainly hold South Vietnam and impose a military government simply by threat of force; it can retain a firm grip on its "enclaves" and bases without worrying about popular feelings. The Vietnamese have been subjected to treatment of this kind for many years. Even if this Spring's uprising has demolished some of the myths on which American intervention has been based, it cannot be expected to end power politics.

Washington has intervened in Vietnam four times: first, from 1950 to 1954 it supported France in her fight against Asian Communism; second, from 1954 to 1963 it supported Mr. Diem, "the defender of freedom"; third, from 1963 to 1965 it sent American troops to fight in the South; fourth, since 1965 it has extended the war to all of Vietnam. There is no reason why there should not be a fifth stage during which it holds on to the large base of Cam Ranh, in case there is to be a sixth stage—a great war against China.

We can only hope that it is not too late to attempt a different policy, one that would place reliance on the Vietnamese themselves—all the Vietnamese—to maintain their integrity in the face of whatever forces may threaten it.

EXHIBIT 4

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you completely in your convictions on foreign policy and wish you success in their implementation.

MR. and MRS. VICTOR LINDEN.

PACOIMA, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Your stand on Vietnam wonderful. Administration and public must hear it again, again, again.

MIKE MARGULIES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you for your speech today May 11 before the Senator Fulbright Committee.

MRS. HELEN LOMAN.

HADDONFIELD, N.J.
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with your courageous stand on Viet Nam. Urge continuance of valiant effort.

SALLY and DICK PRYOR.
SYLVIA and KEN NEWCOMB.
RUTH and JOE KRAUSE.

DEL MAR, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

A thousand thanks to you for your courageous onslaught upon ugliness in our precious land.

ELIZABETH D. NEWTON.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The following message sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson. "Please listen to Senator MORSE before it's too late for our country, our people, and the world."

MR. and MRS. W. J. LYTLE.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Democrat,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank God there are men like you.

DR. HARRY GORAN ALTAFFER.

PASEDENA, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand before Foreign Relations Committee live this a.m. Especially in regard to Americans get matter before U.N. and get U Thant out. Is this the way to defend the vested interests in war profits and bloodshed. How long before all of us will be silenced, since peace is not considered profitable.

A Sincere Citizen.

Newton, N.J.,
May 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your stand (Senate Caucus Room) yesterday. Johnson venture Vietnam far greater folly than Crimean War.

Fred Farr.

Oreland, Pa.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

You have made me angry because you never made your point crystal clear. Today you were clear erudite and I must say I agree with your point of view. President Johnson should go to the United Nations he should put us on record there to call the colors of the Nations of the World and then we should go to the brink. The tree of liberty needs blood shed for nourishment, sir, as said by Thomas Jefferson.

Howard W. Dyson.

West Orange, N.J.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud and salute you.

Mrs. Alex Portnoff.

Des Moines, Iowa,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please don't fail our Americans. Negotiate a just peace or bring our boys home now.

Mrs. Robert L. Stapes.

Youngstown, Ohio,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your tireless efforts for peace. Blessed are the peace makers.

Mrs. William Daggett.

Monsey, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree on a cease fire and enforcement in Vietnam through the efforts of the U.N.

Mrs. Mary Anne Levy.

Daytona Beach, Fla.,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

The magazine "Nation" year 1927, "the British Ambassador Turner and the American Ambassador MacMurray gave permission to the Chinese war lords to violate the sovereignty of the Russian Embassy at Peking China and 30 Chinese girl clerks were taken out and strangled." Louisville Courier Journal April 26, 1966, "are Lodge's fears of Vietnam vote his own or the President. At best his (Lodge's) remarks seem to be a prelude to a vote of no confidence in the election; at worst they could be a warning that we will not accept a vote that doesn't please us. If this is Mr. Lodge's view it is one thing. It is something else if it was relayed to him from Washington." Both the Vietnam and Korean wars were and are designed for the recapture of China for the American dollar patroits. Highest regards to you Senator Morse and Senator Fulbright.

George Edwin English.

White Plains, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your arguments re Vietnam are very convincing. I have so wired Johnson, McNamara, and Rusk.

Very truly yours,

Marion Glass.

Indianapolis, Ind.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue to ask questions and make decisions which will lead to peace.

Your admirer,

Frances P. Friedman.

Boston, Mass.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I think you are very right.

Jean Gustafson.

Van Nuys, Calif.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your views that we should get out of Vietnam, however, if we must fight our soldiers should have the best equipment possible. The reports of shortages are disgusting and unforgivable. As the mother of a newly enlisted marine I want to do anything I can to support your cause and please consider me as a volunteer.

Mrs. Marilane Perkins.

Milwaukee, Wis.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C:

Your vigorous and courageous defense of peace and morality is a highwater mark of American patriotism today. You have our support.

Mr. and Mrs. Alan Shaw.

Oakland, Calif.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

You are the greatest. What is the U.S. Senate for? The Constitution states you represent the people. Let's keep it that way. No 5-year aid. Make them ask for approval each year.

La Neil.

Beverly Hills, Calif.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept our thanks and amen for your courageous stand against the illegality of the dirty war in Vietnam.

Lester A. Davison.

Oxnard, Calif.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud comments to McNamara. Hope fellow colleagues see validity. U.N. still exists. Let's use it.

Three grateful mothers,

Karen Olson.
Kay Mikita.
Colleen Dalporto.

Parkridge Ill., *May 11, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Millions of Americans agree United Nations main function is to intervene and help in Vietnam. McNamara should be investigated, psychoanalyzed for saying decisively Russia and Red China will not merge and inferring we have unlimited military power. All efforts must be used immediately to end war or what good urban renewal etc., if we are conquered. Please give your last breath to terminate war along line suggested at this morning's hearing.

Mrs. Pfegen.

Berkeley, Calif., *May 11, 1966.*

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position in opposing our present policies in Vietnam. America needs your courage.

Mike Sobiloff.

Houston, Tex., *May 11, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,
Washington, D.C.:

Propose stand of immediate elections as requirement of continuation of military aid. This will give us an out either way.

E. H. Palmer.

Richmond, Va., *May 11, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Give 'em hell.

Dr. D. E. Wheless.

Holland, Mich., *May 11, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I agree, if the Vietnam issue was put to the voters today, Johnson would be clobbered worse than Goldwater and his war mongers were in 64.

D. M. Hatley.

Storrs, Conn., *May 10, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

U.S. action in Vietnam in contravention of UN charter articles 52 regional peaceful settlement of disputes and 53 section NE if such action is justified by SEATO. Articles 51 and 54 are violated by unilateral nature of intervention.

Adrea Helms.

Mendocino, Calif., *May 10, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand against Rusk. Please reopen televised Senate hearing on Vietnam.

Emmy Lou Packard.

Mendocino, Calif., *May 10, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand against Rusk. Please reopen televised Senate hearing on Vietnam.

Byron Randall.

Montclair, N.J.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your courageous efforts to bring about a just peace in Vietnam.

R. C. Cammerer.

Barrington, R.I.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please insist upon bringing out the legality of this war.

Mrs. Carlton H. Curry.

New York, N.Y.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo, we applaud your efforts to end the horrible war in Vietnam.

Eric and Naomi Foner.

Sierra Madre, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

A small element in the American ferment. Thank you for your representation hearings.

Mrs. Marion Beardsley.

Wilmington, Del.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations TV today. Following night letter sent to President Johnson: "Nazi war criminals were prosecution of American war criminals—decent people sickened by pictures in pamphlet called the unspeakable war. Now circulating inhuman burning by napalm. Now torture by nausea gas. Have wired Wayne Morse to start movement demanding immediate resignation of Johnson, Rusk, McNamara."

Crusaders for Peace,
K. A. Horner,
President.
Marie Hitchens,
Secretary.

Millbrae, Calif., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request open hearings with testimony by international law witnesses legality U.N. Vietnam position.

Martha Rozen.

Denver, Colo., *May 10, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo for your views in the Senate hearings today. Admire your courage keep up the good work.

William Hannah.

Seattle, Wash., *May 10, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept our congratulations for your continuing courageous opposition to the Vietnam war.

Dward Alice David.
Patrick Friel.

Jacksonville, Fla.,
May 9, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.:

Concerning today's Senate hearings, your courageous defense of our constitutional government advances the cause of freedom throughout the world, and is a further step toward a world of law for suffering humanity. All men everywhere stand in your debt. May God grant you victory and long life in this noblest of causes.

David B. Lord.

Worcester, Pa.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your proposed hearings on the legality of Vietnam war gratefully.

Walton and Nicolita Geiter.

Buffalo, N.Y.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your stand on Vietnam and respect both your rationalism and humanism.

Dr. and Mrs. James R. Robinson.

San Francisco, Calif.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Count us as two grateful citizens of the many in our land you speak to and for when you ask about questions in committee of our unhappy involvement in the Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. Robin Kindead.

San Francisco, Calif.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Thank you Senator for effort to get us out of Vietnam. How can we help?

Mr. and Mrs. Max Schiffman.

Winnetka, Ill.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Keep it up; we're all for you and so are many friends here.

James Zacharias Family.

New Hope, Pa.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Bravo, magnificent.

Mr. and Mrs. Francis L. Lovett.

Palo Alto, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. For God sake keep it up. You have the country behind you.

Felix Greene.

San Francisco, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand on U.S. foreign policy. Thank you.

Jay and Kelly Twigg.

Hayward, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: We wholeheartedly agree with you views and course of action.

Mr. and Mrs. L. Enriquea.

Redoak, Iowa,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

South Vietnam legally is separate nation? If not, then with which military dictatorship have we made treaties? Is interference in a civil war justification for threatening the safety of the world? I believe we are the aggressors in this inglorious conflict. The executive branch of our Government has proved it is incapable of wisdom in global strategies and power policies. Congress would be wise to challenge such leadership.

Respectfully.

Gretchen Gittins
Mrs. Bert Gittins.

San Francisco, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Our great admiration for your courageous stand regarding Vietnam. Please enlist more Senators to help end this senseless war.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Helen Sauer.

Chicago, Ill., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue as you have this morning in the questioning of the Secretary of State. Please continue to bring the truth to the people of the United States. Millions of our citizens support you completely. With our deepest thanks.

Alfred Lipsey.

New York, N.Y., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

That was a very good talk you made today before the committee and hope you get the Secretary of State to answer to your satisfaction.

H. K. Whitehead,
Seamans Unit P.O. No. 1.

Minneapolis, Minn., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Great praise for your stand on Vietnam. Deeply appreciate efforts. Bring truth to American people.

Mrs. W. A. Peek.

Cherry Hill, N.J., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your position taken at Senate Foreign Relations Committee meetings.

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Weiss.

Miami, Fla., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. We're all behind you.

Mrs. Roy T. Russell.

Great Neck, N.Y.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C:

Your courageous voice our bulwark against mass destruction. We humbly thank you.

Ruth Blumenthal.

Modesto, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

We are all back of you. Please keep with it.

Eleanor Haun.

Berkeley, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hail to a great American. God bless you Senator Morse. Wish you would be our

President. Very sincerely good American citizen.

Mark Peters and Manya Pickus.

New York, N.Y.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Our wholehearted support in your intelligent unequivocable questioning entire U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. Sidney Vogel.

Seattle, Wash., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our continued admiration and prayers for your courage and actions.

Mr. and Mrs. Alden H. Bowes.

Wheatridge, Colo., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Much support here your pursuit of facts on foreign aid and Vietnam. Glad someone supports own honest conviction.

Mrs. Ralph D. Barnhart.

Richmond, Va., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish to thank and support you for your statements and views made this morning on our country's legal obligations concerning our administration's actions in Vietnam. I, too, would like a clear, concise, undisputed decision defining our lawful rights in our Vietnam policy and whatever this decision, see the administration confine its activity to boundaries and restrictions of that law.

John H. Farmer.

Asbury Park, N.J., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Committee Meeting,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations your stirring, eloquent speech. God bless you. Fight to stop needless war and loss American lives. World War I veteran.

Mark Dorio.

Minneapolis, Minn., *May 9, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Cheer for your speech. May your wisdom prevail. Americans should not be killed for Ky.

Mrs. Walter Gardner.

Mars, Pa.,
May 9, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Don't give up. Many American citizens support you.

Mr. and Mrs. M. H. Hubbs.

Sacramento, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Armed Services Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Please ask Mr. Rusk what free people he is under the impression we are aiding in Vietnam.

Ray E. Debarra.

New York, N.Y.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo Senator Morse for factual intelligent position on Vietnam. My unequivocal support.

Mrs. Chalotte Shatz.

Detroit, Mich.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your speech on TV wonderful. Seems you alone understand the majority of American people and are speaking our thoughts for us. If there is anything we can do to help please let us know.

God bless you and keep up the good work.

Mrs. B. Morris.

Milwaukee, Wis.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Investigating Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on the stand you are taking on part of the American people being informed. Not misinformed. Our full support.

Mrs. Eleanor Schuster and Emma Barnes.

Walkersville, Md.,
May, 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you on your stand war in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Simms.

Harwichport, Mass.,
May, 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Hearing Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep at it, please. With you.

M. N. Parsons.

Janesville, Wis.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your outstanding speech of today keep up your strong assertion.

Mrs. Charlene Kliefoth.

Arlington, Va.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are wonderful. A concerned citizen. There must be something I can do to help.

Mary Jenkins.

Haverhill, Mass.,
May, 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for a man like you in our Government.

Mrs. G. Balukas.

Walled Lake, Mich.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Watching you this a.m. on TV. We're with you 100 percent and we're Republicans. This country needs more men like you.

Albert and Clara Krusac.

Richardson, Tex.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your John F. Kennedy view today, May 9. Keep up the good work.

Martina Langley.

Des Moines, Iowa,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

I'm a Republican. I think you're doing a good job. Listening to you now. Keep it up.

Donna McCuen.

Portland, Oreg.,
April 13, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Would this not be a propitious time to renew our attack on the administration's Vietnamese policy? It seems so obvious that the people there don't want our military forces there. Let us save lives and not worry about saving face.

Please, help as you have in the past to correct the horrible mistake of the present war.

Thank you.

Mrs. Ruth Roper.

Tillamook, Oreg.,
April 15, 1966.

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Could this be our opportunity to get out of Vietnam and save our apparent face. Remember opportunity strikes but once. Let us get out of Vietnam now.

Respectfully,

Boyd B. Hartman.

Milwaukie, Oreg.,
April 15, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building.

Dear Senator Morse: Thanks for your continuing courageous efforts to bring home to the administration the folly and the senseless tragedy of Vietnam. We need more like you in Washington.

Yours respectfully,

Floyd O. Harvey,
Father of Two Boys.

Eugene, Oreg.,
May 6, 1966.

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: I wish to congratulate you for your courage to stand up for what you think is right. Especially your stand on the Vietnam issue. I believe if this was left to a vote by the people whether or not, that all American troops be withdrawn from Vietnam it would go over by a big majority, as one very seldom talks to anyone, but who thinks the U.S. should withdraw all troops and should never of been sent there in the first place.

Yours very truly,

W. S. King.

April 25, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your Vietnam position. Urge continued vigorous pressure for intelligent humane Asian policy.

Robert C. Crokett.

Portland, Oreg.

Fossil, Oreg.,
April 28, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I am typing this letter to let you know of my dislike of our policy in Vietnam. I could, at the first of the Vietnamese war, see some point of our being over there. After all, the United States of America stands itself out as a worldly protector of the underdog. But as of this last month or so I see no reason for staying in Vietnam. The Vietnam conflict is going to accomplish the same thing the Korean conflict did and that is get a lot of our boys killed and wounded and that's all. We accomplished nothing in Korea and we will obtain the same thing in Vietnam.

As of lately I see less reason for being over there because the North Vietnamese want us out and the Buddhists and a lot of the people of South Vietnam want us out. So why in the name of God don't we get out of Vietnam and stop being aggressors. Because aggressors is just what we are.

Sincerely yours,

DON NICKELSEN.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,
April 14, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for the valiant stand you have taken to end this futile strife and the slaughter of our fine young men in Vietnam.

In the beginning of the war, I favored our efforts to support the Vietnamese people, but events have proven we are wrong in continuing this war.

There is no doubt in my mind that the United States should not be fighting to support the Vietnamese people when they do not want us there, they do not understand, deserve, nor appreciate our fine young men who are giving their lives to help them, when even the Vietnamese women kill our wounded soldiers.

This war is an outrage to thinking people. If there is fear of the spread of Chinese Communism, let us support the surrounding countries that welcome our support and efforts.

Most sincerely,

MRS. GLADYS L. CRAWFORD,
MRS. A. G. SIEBERTS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 13, 1966.

Hon. Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is a relief to know that we have a Senator from Oregon who really works for what he believes is right. My husband and I both agree wholeheartedly with you in regard to your views on Vietnam, as opposed to those of President Johnson.

I am expressing the views of many people who feel as I do in regard to Lyndon Johnson's unfair treatment of our boys and grandsons. It is a disgrace that the leader of our country would excuse his prospective son-in-law from military service and give him a plush job in Washington, D.C., and send our loved ones to fight in Vietnam. I should think that he would realize that this action belittles him in the eyes of many.

When will his eyes be opened to the fact that our boys are fighting for a country whose people do not want our help or our presence in their country?

Mothers and grandmothers represent a sizable vote in this country. This I assure you, will be felt at the next Presidential election.

Sincerely,

MILDRED O. SMITH.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 11, 1966.

To Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I think it is about time for this constituent to let you know that I am definitely in favor of your actions regarding our foreign aid and also our expressed opinion of our action in Vietnam.

I am sorry we haven't another 50 senators like you in the senate. I am speaking as a World War I veteran.

More power to you and I wish you every success.

Sincerely,

WM. P. CADY,

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
April 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your stand on Viet Nam. It is a wonderful thing that there are still some legislators who have the courage and independence of mind to speak out as their conscience bids.

Sincerely,

CHARLES J. PHILLIPS.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
April 19, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for helping to bring these Senate Hearings to the public. There are a lot of things I didn't know about that was brought to my attention.

Also I want to commend you on your stand on this war and sticking with it. My husband has fought 2 wars and has retired this year. I am glad he is retired.

Good luck and keep up the work.

Thank you,

MRS. ROBERT L. TEATER.

PRIMEVILLE, OREG.,
April 18, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your stand on Vietnam.

Sincerely,

MRS. PAUL MICKEL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an American citizen and an Oregonian, I am greatly concerned about the present situation in Vietnam.

After much consideration and study I am convinced that you are definitely right in your opinion and I fully support your views.

I hope that you and Senator FULBRIGHT will be able to persuade the President and his advisors that our foreign policy at this time is not what it should be.

Please encourage all Members of the Senate to oppose our position in Vietnam.

A concerned citizen with much displeasure in our American foreign policy.

Truly yours,

MRS. DELORES CROTTY.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an Oregonian and a concerned American I want you to know that I am actively supporting your opposition to the present policy in Vietnam.

I hope that you and Senator FULBRIGHT will be able to swing some of our Congressmen and the President against our position in much of our foreign policy.

I want you to know that I am proud of your stands and am grateful for a leader such as yourself.

Sincerely,

MADELINE DRAKE.

RAINIER, OREG.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
April 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have followed your stand regarding Vietnam with keen interest and sincere support. We feel, as do our friends, that it is most urgent for those who represent our State to speak out in no uncertain terms about this terrible debacle in which this Nation is now engaged. We concur that Asia is for the Asians.

It is the responsibility of our administration that was elected by the people to devote itself to the immense and critical problems in our own country first and foremost. We deplore its poor judgment and resent the high-handed manner of Secretary of Defense McNamara.

We commend you for stoutly supporting your convictions and we depend on you to continue to be the voice of those of us who have the same ideas.

Very truly,

BUFORD E. BOYD,
MARGARET A. BOYD.

MILWAUKIE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an interested and concerned Oregonian and American, I want you to know that I support your convictions against our stand in Vietnam.

I believe the time has come when we should look more constructively at our own foreign policy.

The efforts on behalf of yourself and Senator FULBRIGHT to stop the war have, in my opinion, been of the highest concern and concentration for world peace.

I wholeheartedly support your convictions and your stands.

Sincerely,

CECIL E. FITZELL.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
April 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR: Keep up the good work. I want you to know that you have my support in your stand as regards the war in Vietnam. Our presence there is obviously illegal in respect to international law and I believe that we must pull our troops out before any lasting peace can be effected there. You are one of the few people in our national government who have my respect and my vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN JEDDELOH.

BEAVERTON, OREG.,
April 20, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: "It requires a real man or woman to stand alone on a moral issue in the face of the crowd."—Eleanor Roosevelt.

Our family want to let you know that we admire your stand on the Vietnam issue.

It seems a sad commentary on the courage of the President to deplore the bombing of a church in Alabama, or the murder of persons sympathetic to those deprived of their civil rights, yet to condone, nay, to order the wholesale bombing of villages in southeastern Asia. They are people, and they suffer grief at the loss of loved ones just as you and I.

And, why the precision, and seeming almost delight, in counting the Vietcong dead while the euphemism, "American casualties light"?

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. MYERS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
March 15, 1966.

U.S. Senator MORSE.

HONORABLE SIR: I would like you to know that you have my utmost respect for your great effort and courage in trying to bring this useless war to an end. I am with you all the way. The great loss of our boys and the great expense their home folks are put to doesn't make sense to me. If you can run for President in 1968, you may count on my vote. I feel you are about the best American left there in Washington.

Most sincerely,

MRS. KATHRYN MAYBERRY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
March 5, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want you to know that we are very grateful for the stature of your leadership at all times and particularly in the Vietnam matter.

The copy of your Senate speech in January on the subject gave us information we are glad to have.

Sincerely yours,

Ruth Bruner.
W. E. Bruner.

March 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Congratulations, on the bold stand you're taking on what is right and not swayed by the large majority, on the Vietnam situation and others.

In the last issue of U.S. News & World Report of March 14, 1966, is a very good article, "What United States Can Expect From Allies in Vietnam," and in this article, it seems the whole world is against us. When the whole world is against us, how come so few people in our Government are so blinded by pride that they cannot use good judgment? Also, quote at top of page 32, "It's largely a U.S. show." But, to this I can add, showoff of our might and strength. How long?

Practically every person I talk to feels just as you do. Keep up the good work. I'm behind you.

Yours truly,

Henry Nuszbaum.

Portland, Oreg.

McMinnville, Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please keep up the good work, and get us out of Vietnam if possible. We are back of you 100 percent.

Yours sincerely,

James S. Green.

Eugene, Oreg.,
April 18, 1966.

Dear Senator: My wife and I back you 100 percent, re: Vietnam.

I would say 85 percent of the people agree with you on this issue.

Your next election will, I feel sure, give you your largest majority of your distinguished career.

Cordially,

Al Hoffman.

March 26, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for doing all you can to expose what we are doing in Vietnam and the Near East. I find it hard to live with the guilt feelings I have over our actions in the world and I worry for my 16 year old son. There must be something that we common, ordinary citizens could and should be doing to prevent escalation and to change our direction. But what?

Again, thanks for being our spokesman and may you continue to abound in health and energy.

Sincerely,

Mrs. George H. Allen.

Portland, Oreg.,
March 10, 1966.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I want to express my gratitude to you for your integrity and courage, in the face of great opposition and pressure, in leading the opposition to the foreign policy of President Johnson. As a voting citizen, I must share the responsibility of the conduct of our country. The shame I feel over what we are doing to the people of Vietnam is somewhat alleviated by being represented by a man who steadfastly upholds the constitution, our U.N. obligations, sanity, and human decency. I feel that President Johnson has betrayed the people, in that the people voted for him and repudiated Goldwater, in the belief that they were voting for a policy against war. At least Goldwater was frank. I resent the President's subversion of the constitution; his fatuous assumption that he can achieve a "consensus" by lies and misrepresentation; his phony peace offensive; and his hypocritical concern for the people of Vietnam.

I applaud your vote against the appropriation to continue and escalate the war. I am in favor of Senator Gruening's bill to prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam. I believe in negotiating with the N.L.F., the legitimate government of South Vietnam, and the force we are fighting. I believe that the only alternative to stopping this war by negotiation is more escalation, leading to a war with China, and probably the third world war.

Thank you for upholding legality, decency, and sanity. I believe the tide is turning, and I hope that by election time the vote will be overwhelming to endorse your views.

Sincerely yours,

Glenn M. Blevins.

Salem, Oreg.

March 26, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse, Senator,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to thank you for your efforts in behalf of the American people. Some friends of ours who were visiting in New York, when introduced to some VIP's in New York, were told, "You people should be proud to be Oregonians, you have the only Statesman in the Senate". There may be a couple of others but for the most part we feel as the people in New York expressed themselves.

We are proud of you, we feel terrible that you have to stand alone and take so much abuse from those politicians. Even people who may not agree with you always, admire you.

What Johnson doesn't seem to have caught on to is that we didn't elect him—we voted against Goldwater.

We are very disillusioned Americans—we sent our son to college seven years for a good education and so that he would be a good citizen—now the army has him.

God bless you Senator Morse as you stand alone for decency in government.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. D. G. Baird.

Portland, Oreg.

Ontario, Oreg.,
March 28, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
209 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have always admired your deep convictions and your ability to stick with them, whether I agreed with you at the moment or not.

In the Vietnam issue, at first I found myself more or less unconcerned, later concerned and wanting to fight quickly and get it over, but the more I have studied the issue I am wondering why we are involved in their dispute. Daily the news seems to back up your position that we are involved in a squabble in which if peace were to come quickly we couldn't put our finger on any particular group capable of calling themselves a stable government or having any control. In many ways it appears we are fighting a war simply to satisfy the rich Vietnamese mandarin who is doing all he can to goad us into continuing because of the rich profits he can derive therefrom. As for the ordinary little people I am convinced the majority do not want the present ruling class they have in charge of their country in power at all and will always continue to fight until they are rid of them.

Its a puzzle to me how a President of the United States can wage war, sacrificing our men and wealth due to his own personal whim, without giving constitutional authority to the Congress to debate and make this decision. This I feel is for the Congress to determine—not a power drunk group of adversaries forcing their will upon the people.

Perhaps as these pine boxes arrive from Vietnam carrying the remains of precious loved ones, they should carry the inscription stencilled thereon, "Compliments of Lyndon B. and Lady Bird Johnson and their fellow cohorts."

Just at this time it appears to me Lyndon Johnson and his friends are doing a magnificent job of building the Democratic party image into one of a monster with the blood and guts of little people spilling from its jowls, paunch full of corruption.

You'll be in the Senate long after this crowd of phonies are forgotten.

Sincerely,

Dwight L. Johnston.

Eugene, Oreg.,
April 20, 1966.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We want to assure you that the National Commander of the American Legion does not speak for all the members concerning the escalation of the Vietnam war. Members have been asked to write the President, Senator Fulbright and our State Senators to back the war effort. We have attended a number of different posts where this letter was read, many without comment. Comments after the meetings leads us to believe more letters will be written against the war than for it. We feel that even if we could be sure that this is a war against the Communists how sure can we be that we have won the peace even if we win the war, even if we destroy their country completely? We certainly can't expect them to love us for throwing our millions into their country to build it up again. Money can't pay for lives, theirs or ours.

We've already lost face all over the world so we can't lose any more by staying in. If we would put our own house in order and show the world how a real democracy can work we would have a good chance to win the peace.

Thanks again for representing us so ably. It is so easy to just nod and say we agree with you without telling you, so please excuse this belated letter on this subject. We are proud of you.

Sincerely,

Ira and Elsie Williams.

April 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Despite biased, onesided newspaper editorials condemning your views, you have many staunch supporters in Oregon and the Nation. It is gratifying to peace-loving citizens to see a Senator with your courage expressing his convictions, despite loud-mouthed opposition from those who prefer war and slaughter.

I, like thousands of others, cannot supply a satisfactory answer to the question, "Why are we in Vietnam?" The millions wasted on this illegal, useless and undeclared war could produce untold benefits if utilized instead on worthwhile domestic projects.

Keep up the good work—we're with you.

Best regards,

Don Nixon.

Lincoln City, Oreg.

Anna's Flower Shop,
Woodburn, Oreg., April 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We are very pleased with your stand on the war.

Oregon has a great statesman in you. The more we study the present administration, the more we realize you are right. We feel it is a privilege to live in Oregon, more so when we have a man in Congress that speaks his mind.

Sincerely yours,

Robert Awa Field.

Portland, Oreg.,
April 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have fought you on other issues, but on Vietnam, you have my 100 percent backing.

The administration gave us poor leadership when they stopped being advisers in Vietnam.

But the problem is getting us out of this mess. God speed in this endeavor.

Yours very truly,

Ron Symons.

Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Pacific Yearly Meeting,
Portland, Oreg., April 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: As Quakers we feel a real sense of frustration and despair over our government's present military involvement in Vietnam. We have continuing faith in the attitudes and outlooks of yourself and Representative Edith Green toward the problems in Vietnam. We are appalled at the reports of atrocities committed on both sides and by the saturation bombing committed by our forces in Vietnam.

We cannot understand the position of the Johnson administration which appears to advocate the liberation of people by taking their lives and ravaging their land. Believing that there is that of God in every man to which we must minister, we fervently urge the President to initiate negotiations for peace including all factions which are a party to the conflict and further urge an immediate cessation of bombing as a first step toward peace.

Sincerely yours,
Multnomah Friends Meeting,
Howard J. Richard,
Presiding Clerk.

May 9, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: May I take a few moments to comment on your continuing struggle in our foreign situation.

In my business in this small community of Vernonia I have yet to find anyone in agreement with the administration's policy in Vietnam.

I personally congratulate you for your honestly and determination and feel certain justice will prevail when the American people awaken to the perils of where this present situation will lead us.

This letter is of little help, I realize, but I will be most willing to help whenever possible.

Very truly yours,
Davies Chevrolet Co.,
James R. Davies,
Owner, Democrat Committeeman, Precinct No. 4, Vernonia, Oreg.

May 1, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I think you should know that the people of Oregon are behind your stand on Vietnam. I have written a letter to President Johnson pointing out that I disagree with his policies, in the hopes that this will show that not all Americans are supporting our policy in Vietnam.

It is possible that your stand is a form of political suicide. Be that as it may. I admire deeply a man who will stand up against overwhelming odds because he believes something to be wrong. When a person stakes his entire career and future on an unpopular point of view, to me he qualifies as a true hero.

Even if I disagreed with your stance about Vietnam. I would vote for and support you, now, because you have demonstrated beyond any doubt that you are a man of the highest form of integrity.

One hundred percent behind you (even if I am a Republican).

Joel C. Barber.

Eugene, Oreg.

Portland, Oreg.,
May 10, 1966.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I am so happy that you were right on the spot in asking that the committee hold a public inquiry into the legality of the American position in Vietnam.

Congratulations to you for continuing to be a persistent foe of American involvement in the Vietnamese struggle. I think you would be surprised at the friends you have.

Sincerely yours,

Roy A. Gage.

Rainier Manufacturing Co.,
Rainier, Oreg., May 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: Your appearance on TV last night wherein you made your dissenting opinions known to Secretary of State Dean Rusk regarding the Vietnam situation was most gratifying to us, and to everyone that saw you in action that we have spoken to.

It is very gratifying to know we have one representative from Oregon that has the courage of his convictions, and hope that you will soon "take on" Dean Rusk for allowing the continuation of the excessive amounts of our logs going to Japan to the detriment of existing Oregon industries.

Please be assured of our continued support in your efforts to convince the present administration that the American people are not a bunch of sheep to be bamboozled by fancy phrases, and as a last resort, raise taxes to cover misjudgments.

Kindest personal regards, and may you long represent us.

Respectfully yours,
Don V. Bellamy,
Vice President.

May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I've just finished viewing the last televised Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing. I've been very pleased that they have been televised whenever possible. They have been extremely helpful to myself and others in clarifying many situations which we found confusing. Most importantly, the purpose of the hearings has certainly become more understandable.

I am anxious that Defense Secretary Robert McNamara would not indicate which 3 nations are giving us considerable assistance in Vietnam. Why is this considered confidential information? I can't imagine why the American people should not know which nations are really willing to help us.

I agree with your stand on the Vietnam war. I cannot see that any commitment was made that should have resulted in such a tragedy. The United Nations should have been approached at the very onset. Without their approval and assistance we had no right to take it upon ourselves to handle that volatile situation, almost entirely alone. I only pray that we can get out of that horrible situation before it's too late.

I, and many others I know, also agree that military and other assistance to nations that constantly throw vile accusations and brickbats at the United States should be cut back altogether. The fact that Russia would then step in and fill the gap is certainly to be expected, I say—so what? They're doing it anyway but with things as they now stand, we are actually helping them arm our enemies! Let Russia have the added burden of supplying the additional military assistance to those nations we drop as a result of their open animosity. By continuing assistance, we're only two-faced and playing both ends against the middle in the eyes of the world; and I might add, in the eyes of our own countrymen. By dropping our aid, we move the responsibility to Russia's shoulders for an added expense to their budget; and in the meantime, we can devote this money to better use—I hope.

I'm sorry to say we were unable to attend the rally at Benson High School last Sunday, but my husband and I did attend a reception held Saturday night and met both Howard Morgan and Robert Vaughn. I was quite disappointed at not seeing you personally.

Thank you so much for your time.

Best regards from,
Mrs. Victoria (Ben L.) Russell.

Portland, Oreg.

Medford, Oreg.,
May 12, 1966.

Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Keep up the good work. I am behind you all the way. We wouldn't be in the mess we are in if we had more men like you working for us.

Sincerely yours,

Artha S. Metz.

Hood River, Oreg.,
March 6, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your stand on Vietnam.

I am utterly opposed to this war.

Sincerely yours,

Reta P. Hausen.

Hon. Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: This is the first time I have ever written to a public official but I just had to let you know, there is one family of Oregonians, who is for you 100%.

I thank heavens there is somebody back in Washington, who has the courage of his convictions and is not afraid to have them known.

You are, as far as we are concerned, a realist in the midst of this emotional upheaval concerning Viet Nam.

My husband and I, and my father-in-law believe you to be right.

Once more Senator, more power to you, good luck, and God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. Otto Kuhnhausen.

Portland, Oreg.

Lake Oswego, Oreg.,
March 6, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Senator Morse: There is no need to go into details as to why I support your position on the Viet Nam issue, but I do think it necessary that the thousands of us who agree with you let our voices be heard so that you will continue to raise your voice for us.

Sincerely,

Jack Radow.

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION, LOCAL 8,
Portland, Oreg., March 4, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Executive Board of Local #8, I.L.W.U., Portland Oregon wish to extend their whole hearted support in your effort to end the War in Viet Nam.

Your courageous effort is indeed worthy of the support of every American. By ending the war and settling the Viet Nam issue through the efforts of the United Nations, it will prevent the needless sacrifice of many thousand of American boys.

The billions spent on war can pay for help to improve the living standard of the underprivileged through a realistic foreign aid program.

We hope that you and your friends in the Senate will continue your fine effort in the cause of World Peace.

Very truly,

CARL H. ANDERSON,
Secretary, ILWU Local #8.

GRESHAM, OREG.,
March 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your Viet Nam policy 100 per cent. In fact more than 100 per cent for I feel we should get out of there entirely.

The time has long since past when one country, however powerful, can dictate to another country, however weak, the form of government the latter should have.

I admire your courage and urge you to maintain your position. Speak out, our country need you!

Sincerely yours,

E. G. LARSON.

ASTORIA, OREG.,
March 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: If only we had more men like you and Governor GRUENING in Washington. We could look hopefully into the future, so many of my friends who hear what you stand for do admire your courage—to stand up against the war hawks.

I wish you well and am for you and your policies 100 percent.

Yours truly,

MRS. J. D. WARILA.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator MORSE: The purpose of this letter is extremely simple. I want you to know that you are supported in your views on Vietnam—and I urge you to continue—and congratulate you on your courage.

JANET DUTHELM PECK.
MRS. WILLIAM PECK.

WALDPORT, OREG.,
March 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Salem, Oreg.:

For a long time, I have been going to drop you a line to tell you and let you know that I am behind you in your views about our involvement in Asia. I admire your courage and spunk to speak out for something you and I know to be only right and honest. It must not be an easy job. I just want you to know that you have my support all the way. My prayers for the innocent, best of luck to you.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MYRTLE BRADFORD.

MOORESTOWN, N.J., *May 14, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you again most sincerely for your great and determined work concerning this stupid, insane, and evil war in Vietnam.

We are with you and working to awaken more people to see and understand what an insane stupid course this administration is taking.

Most sincerely yours,

FRANK N. MORSE.

KENILWORTH, N.J.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been watching you on T.V. today on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

May I state that I just burst into applause after you stated your position regarding Vietnam to Secretary of Defense McNamara.

This is one person who admires your "idealism" immensely. I totally support your view that we indeed have an obligation to do all we can to negotiate peace in southeast Asia.

It is too bad that today we are so severely criticized when we uphold ideals and principles—therefore I just wanted you to know that I heartily agree with your views.

Sincerely yours,

MADELINE SAVULICH.

DOWNEY, CALIF.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your continued efforts as a "dove" are strongly commended! We plan to cast our votes for "doves" wherever possible.

What can be done to outlaw napalm? Of all the horrors of war, this seems one of the most horrible.

Keep up your efforts, and never doubt that you have strong support.

Sincerely yours,

NETTIE R. VAN RAAPHORST.
JOHN N. VAN RAAPHORST.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Thank you so much for your forthright and courageous stand against the illegal dirty war in which our country is engaged. Your voice is the voice of the conscience of our country.

There are many of us who are 100 percent behind you. Keep up the good work.

Respectfully,

MARGARET GINSBURG.

CHEHALIS, WASH.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have listened carefully—and I believe—understandingly—to your ideas as regards our bloody war in Vietnam. Every word you said made sense as I understand it. You know—as do I—if once we took profit from war—war would cease. What can we common citizens do?

Yours truly,

MRS. ROY LA DUE.

MADISON, WIS.,
May 13, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE MORSE: I am 100 percent in favor of your stand for a peaceful and moral solution to the crisis in southeast Asia as well as your hope that our country might return to a closer following of the principles of the Constitution. A stronger voice for Congress in determining foreign policy and more control over the CIA also seem to be very important aims.

Your talk here in Madison in February was inspiring. Especially impressive is your belief which you stated as something like, "The only truly practical course of action is one determined by strict application of principle. Expedience defeats the aims it seeks to further."

I hope that more and more Members of the Senate and House will join you in the bold stand you have taken. If I possessed the aptitudes to be a politican, I would hope to be one of your caliber.

For a better world,

CHARLES T. DEITZEL.

MAY 9, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: As I watched the Committee hearings on T.V. today I wished to thank you. Thank you for having them and for saying what I would say if I could speak to Dean Rusk or to the President. I truly admire your courage.

Sincerely,

KATHRYN INCROCCI.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.

PEORIA, ILL.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: I am writing to let you know that I support you on the stand you are taking about this terrible war in Viet Nam.

I was very pleased to watch you on TV on Monday when you backed Secretary Rusk down on the absence of a formal vote in SEATO.

You men who are opposing this war are doing a real service for this country and I for one want to thank you.

I believe, like you, that if we could just bring the Congress around to refusing to vote the money to support this immoral war then they would have to stop it.

In my opinion the best way to support our boys in Viet Nam is to bring them home.

I am almost ashamed any more to say I am American—I shudder to think what the rest of the thinking world thinks of us.

It as a shame that our country has reached such a low.

Thank you again, Senator MORSE, for what you have already done and please continue the good work.

I, too, love my country.

IRVINGTON, N.J.,
May 15, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in "your" corner re Viet Nam.

It is with regret that I am unable to attend the meeting tonight at Bloomfield College.

I recall that old, old saying "One on God's side is a majority." "We" have five in the Senate who speak out. Here's hoping that we can increase that "majority"—and some day, make it for real.

More power to your elbow—and uncommon sense.

Sincerely,

ELMER BRASHEAR.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
May 12, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous stand on Viet Nam— We are indeed living in perilous times and I agree with Senator Fulbright that we are following in the foot-steps of ancient Rome and only honest, courageous men, such as you and Senator Fulbright, can save us—

May God strengthen and protect you in your endeavors—

Sincerely

Miss Mary C. Callaway.

May 11, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you sincerely for your recent letter. I admire the things that you say concerning our being in Viet Nam.

I just wanted you to know that our only son will be going to Okinawa and both you and I know the destination from there. What can a mother *do*? How can the truth be told to his devoted little sister, only seven years old?

May God forgive those in Washington who are responsible for this entire mess. How can they sleep at night? And why is there not immediate action, instead of drawing the debate out for so long while our boys are dying or being maimed for the rest of their life?

A cease-fire must be instituted at once with no more killing. Please, please make those others see that.

Thank you very sincerely.

A very worried and heartbroken mother,

Mrs. Gene Gassman.

Pearl City, Ill.

Thank you again, Mr. Morse for your sincere concern, and may God Bless you for your efforts.

San Mateo, Calif.,
May 12, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: May I say your T.V. arguments really touched us?

You were great.

Truly yours,

Alice and Al Reynolds.

Vinton, Iowa,
May 14, 1966.

Dear Senator: This is the first time I have ever written a government official but I have been watching you on TV and only wish we had more men like you working for us.

I have lived beyond my three score and ten and have always been a republican but that party around here have only praise for you and the work you are doing.

I sometimes wonder if this is only rotten politics or the fullment of the scriptures. Please keep up the good work.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. Mary Floyd.

Monterey, Calif.,
May 10, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a line to tell you my gratitude for your courageous stands in the senate against the horrible genocide in Vietnam. I am very discouraged, disillusioned, and ashamed of this country's actions there.

Thank you for helping me believe there is some sanity remaining. When critical letters to the president get turned over to the F.B.I., when protesting students get reclassified, and our answer to increasing criticism at home and abroad is escalation of the slaughter it is easy to lose faith in the democratic process.

Thank you for helping me maintain my faith in America.

Respectfully,

B. L. Jones.

Upland, Calif.,
May, 11, 1966.

Senator Morse: I have adopted you as my Senator, even though I am a resident of the State of California. The purpose of this letter is another vote of confidence for the courage you are showing in trying to open the doors of truth, that have been closed by this administration.

The good Lord Himself is not on our side in this modern tragedy we are responsible for in Vietnam. We are not fighting the Vietcong. We are fighting the people of Vietnam itself. How else could they be so very successful at resisting great, big, powerful, Uncle Sam? Future history books will give credit to the great fight these people have put up against overwhelming odds.

Yes, let's save face in Vietnam. Not the face of our image, but the real faces of thousands of men and women who will die in the coming months. People who do not want to fight or die for any cause.

Let's get on the Lord's side—we all need Him badly. Let's get out, where we are not wanted.

Respectfully,

Wallace Smith.

Chicago, Ill.,
May 15, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thought you would be interested in reading my opinion about our undeclared war in South Vietnam and the Great Society.

Sincerely yours,

William Wagner.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 15, 1966]

ONE-MAN GOVERNMENT?

Chicago, May 11.—I fully agree with those Senators who charged President Johnson with mismanagement of our undeclared war in South Vietnam. In my opinion this has resulted from his failure to heed the suggestions of our outstanding and experienced military men.

Unfortunately, we elected a shrewd politician as President, and not a man of wide executive qualifications. The Great Society's major aim is to achieve one-man government and, in my opinion, it appears to be making great progress.

William Wagner.

Summit, N.J.,
May 16, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for sending "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam" which appeared in the Congressional Record for February 25.

You are a true representative of the people and the hope of America and the world. As a citizen I am proud of you as a Senator.

The first consideration of every concerned person should be the establishment of world government and the prevention of a nuclear war which would be a disastrous disgrace.

Thank you again for all your efforts toward a world of progress and peace.

Sincerely yours,

Arpard A. Fazakas.

New York, N.Y.

Dear Senator Morse: I must thank you so much and pray that you continue to fight against the frightening foreign policy currently practiced by that weird axis—White House, Pentagon, State Department.

We believe that the military expeditions under the guise of foreign aid is unconstitutional and that such decisions must never be left to them again. Perhaps only the people—by vote—should render such decisions. Washington's executive branch has followed a criminal course. Our political idiom imposes itself as much as communism—it does not have to.

The White House is endangering the civilization we created.

Regards,

Jay Eady.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
May 10, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I appreciate your efforts to end the war in Vietnam and wish you all success.

In connection with this it is fundamental that we end our present policies toward Asia and recognize that the Chinese are an important factor which must be considered in any Asian settlement.

Our present policy, if continued, will lead to nuclear war.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Ammens.

Chicago, Ill.,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am fully in accord with the views you expressed today on television as opposed to Secretary McNamara.

I thank God that we have a Senator who has the courage and convictions to stand up and voice his opinion.

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. Davidson.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to express my appreciation for the courageous and enlightened leadership you are giving to the American people.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Miriam Camp.

Southampton, Mass.,
May 12, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: With regard to your stand on the Vietnam situation, I have only a few things to say: You are being heard, you are right, and may God bless you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Joyce M. Carney.

May 12, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up the excellent work you are doing.

I have been watching you and Senator Fulbright with tremendous interest and appreciation. I trust you will continue until the forces for peace in this country become militant.

Sincerely,

Frances Ransom Lane.

New Albany, Ind., *May 13, 1966.*

Senator Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Thank you for expressing my views on Vietnam so eloquently.

Bringing the committee hearings to the public through television was a marvelous idea and who ever is responsible is certainly to be commended.

I understand that Mr. Raborn of the CIA is to be replaced. I would like to see Lieutenant General Gavin head that organization while I am not usually in favor of the military running anything but the military. I do not consider Lieutenant General Gavin just another military man. He appears to be a very intelligent, thoughtful man with a wonderful grasp of world affairs and the role of the United States in them.

If you feel this suggestion has merit perhaps you can give it some impetus.

Thank you for having the strength of your convictions and the courage to speak out.

It is very reassuring to me to know that we do have people like you in our Government.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Leo V. Corbett.

St. Louis, Mo.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We admire your honesty and courage in the recent statements you have made in the Foreign Relations Committee Hearings. We depend upon you and others of like thinking to continue to represent the American people, who voted against this impossible war, and have been hurt and disillusioned by the escalation.

Before it is too late—we *must* stop it. More and more, the people are aware, and as they become so, they are against this war.

With great Respect,

Ilse Shank.

Brilliant, Ohio,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: I just listened to the hearings on TV also the ones before that and think we should have more of the same. I agree with you and Senator Fulbright on everything you say and hope you will keep on showing the American people how wrong our government has been in this war and the foreign aid we have been so free with to nations who couldn't care less if we win or lose.

I am ashamed of our leaders who try to tell other nations how to run their countries when we have such a mess here at home.

You take heart and keep on fighting because you are right and there are more people for you than the rest of the Congress wants you to think.

I am a Democrat but I will never vote for one again till I am sure they are worth my vote.

The people I talk to here are all very upset over this war and are going to show it at the polls.

Thank you again for being a truly great American with courage and conviction.

Mrs. A. W. Haithaway.

I am not a parent, just a good American citizen.

P.S.—I also saw the film you referred to on educational TV and I cried when I thought of the position our country is taking to create such hate and destruction. And why can't the press and regular TV carry films such as these so more people can really see this? I will tell you, they are afraid to really inform the people, but people are smarter than they think and are learning more and more about the true facts which you are helping to bring out.

May 13, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: At a time when you are being attacked from many quarters because of your stand on our policy in southeast Asia, I am writing to say I support you in your constant questioning and criticism of our ill-formed foreign policy in Vietnam—a policy that is becoming increasingly dominated by military expediency rather than any consideration of human rights. Our President speaks much about human rights but his words sound hopelessly unrealistic in this present situation. I write this as a concerned and committed Catholic and also as a graduate student in social work at the University of Chicago, two areas in my life in which my commitment to others makes me regard our Nation's current self-seeking foreign policy with great dismay and profound regret and sorrow. I am praying daily for you and for all our leaders, most especially for our President, that God may help us see our way out of this mess.

A supporter,

Al Murdach,

Chicago, Ill.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Dear Senator Morse: Good for you, Morse. I hope you never die—God bless you and your conscience.

Else Firschein.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
May 14, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I hope you don't get disheartened by the recent attacks the President has made against you and your policy concerning the Vietnam war.

Believe me, the majority of the people think as you and as a mother I pray that you don't give up the fight.

The Vietnam war is stupid, senseless, and immoral.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara Hansen.

New Britain, Conn.,
May 13, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank God for men of your caliber.

The stand you have taken with regard to Vietnam shows you have the interest of our country and precious boys at heart.

Keep up the good work, and may your endeavors soon bear fruit.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. Albert) Charlotte B. Hoffmann.

Seattle, Wash.,
May 12, 1966.

Dear Sir: I am writing to express my gratitude and appreciation for your efforts with regards the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

1. I am a 24-year-old college senior, an ex-GI, hopefully a future doctor.

2. I am not a great respecter of many of the ideas which you have championed in the past. On the Vietnam issue, however, I believe that you have been most honest, forthright, and I sincerely say, "courageous."

3. I encourage you in your efforts to bring the truth to the American people.

4. Much of what you have publicly stated has been either poorly reported, or not reported at all in the local Seattle papers. Most importantly, anything that you have advocated as an alternative to present U.S. policy has not come through.

5. I suggest that you attempt in the future to more explicitly state, and singly put forth what you suggest the United States do about our involvement in southeast Asia. I mean that you should make your suggestions on occasions separate from your criticisms, since the papers seem to print the criticisms and not the alternatives.

6. Please continue in your efforts as I am in mine on a much smaller scale. I sincerely believe that the tide is turning, though I am most apprehensive that it may be too late.

Sincerely,

Andrew M. Fegan.

Glenbrook. Conn.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept my hand in support of your stand that we, the American people will show by our ballots that we violently oppose 'our' war in Vietnam.

I devoted my time to the entire Senate Foreign Relations proceedings over N.B.C. T.V. on Monday, May 9th and, to say the least, remembering our American heritage, felt discouraged and mortified at the ruthless attitude toward the tiny country of Vietnam ruled by a 'Hitler' oriented Premier Cao Ky whom we support! I know now that elections in this torn, demoralized land will be to no avail unless Cao Ky is removed from his stand of absolute power.

As you repeat, and I agree, that our boys are being slaughtered in this undeclared war with no end in sight—except in world conflagration, that we make moves to end it and follow the Geneva agreement of '54 which we honored.

Thank you for your unstinting efforts on behalf of humanity. May you be given good health and strength to keep reminding the administration their responsibility to the people of our land and the world.

These public hearings are a healthy and necessary service and we homemakers approve and listen!

Most respectfull yours,

Mrs. A. Epstein.

Rindge, N.H., *May 12, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Friend: This is just to express to you my appreciation for your words and your clear understanding of what is really the true situation in southeast Asia—and Vietnam in particular. It is so discouraging for some of us to see this mistake of 1954 compounded daily until we are deeply depressed—for surely if our (U.S.) "powers that be" do not soon see it is up to them to call an honest-to-goodness halt—before we can ever expect Hanoi to feel we are sincere about negotiations—we are sure it is getting too late fast.

Keep up talking.

Sincerely,

Helen L. Bliss.

Oakland, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: I just heard your remarks regarding the legality of our being in Vietnam. I want to congratulate you and thank you for having the courage to carry on the fight for sanity in this chaotic world.

As a Democrat, a voter, a taxpayer, and a mother, you have my wholehearted support.

My only regret is I don't live in your district—keep up the good work—we will support you all the way.

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. Eidinoff.

San Jose, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to say that I am one of the many Americans who admires you very much, and who supports your views regarding Vietnam (among other things).

It seems as if you are one of the few remaining bright lights of intellect and commonsense left burning in Washington, and I wish you the best of luck in your fight.

Respectfully,

Miss Carol Campbell.

Newton Centre, Mass.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Killing is killing, and it is a good idea to remind Secretary McNamara of the human consequences of his successful military operations, although it appears that he is not to be reached by anything but statistics.

Please do not let up your battering of U.S. policy in Vietnam. Unless some fundamental changes are made in the direction of peaceful settlement the outlook for the world is terrifying.

Sincerely,

Emily V. Wolf.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with your views on Vietnam. You deserve more support from the other Senators than you are getting. I intend writing to Senators JAVITS and KENNEDY on this subject.

Very truly yours,

MRS. L. CHERNICK.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: One hundred percent approval of your stand.

Keep it up. You are gaining more supporters every day, even though they may be reluctant to speak out.

Help me to continue to be proud to be an American.

MISS LILLIAN MEISTER.

EDMONDS, WASH.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note of appreciation and to thank you for just now speaking out on TV. I hope and pray your words will be heeded. God love you.

Sincerely,

MRS. GRANT E. RILEY.

ALDON, OHIO,
May 13, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I am glad you have the courage to question our being in Vietnam. I wish I could vote for you.

I think it is time for a change, we should have a new draft law, draft everybody and everything, for the duration of any war declared or not, pay all according to their rank and service, and I am sure we would be able to get a way to get out.

Yours truly,

MRS. A. BAILEY.

DARIEN, CONN.,
May 14, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: History's tragic error is our "charge of the Light Brigade," in Vietnam.

You are so right.

MARGARET KOSTENBADER and FAMILY,
ROBERT A. SHERWOOD.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your remarks today on television during the Senate investigation of the war in Vietnam, and I can't express too strongly my admiration for your position and for your course of action in general.

You are absolutely right: Our whole psychological orientation toward war, toward military power, and toward international political situations has got to be changed. I am a native of Arkansas, a resident of Illinois, and a voter; and you may count on my support in whatever way it can be expressed.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET DUGGAR.

SAN LEANDRO, CALIF.,
May 10, 1966.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I fully support the policy which you advocate for Vietnam. And for everyone who writes, I am sure there are thousands of others who are supporting you but never let you know.

Sincerely,

MRS. WILMA WEBB.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We congratulate you upon your courage and vigor in prosecuting your case against an unwanted war in Vietnam.

My wife and I want you to know how proud we are of you and your forthright stand against a most disastrous adventure.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM WANAMAKER, M.D.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just to reaffirm my complete support of your stand in regard to the war in Vietnam. This as well as your opposition to our interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

You are, in my opinion, one of the few who place the welfare of our country ahead of their own ambitions for reelection to office. You have my most sincere admiration.

Cordially,

HOWARD L. SEAVEY.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is most gratifying to hear your concise and bold remarks challenging policies we feel are not for the benefit of the United States or humanity in general. I'm sure that you stick your neck out often, and that you take grave political risks in so doing; but we want you to know that we are grateful for it.

Our Government is in an awkward and difficult position, and I'm sure there is no really easy way out; but your statement that our present course of action just is not working seems so obviously apparent that we wonder why there is not more opposition to it (Government policy—not your statement.) by other members of the Senate.

Please keep up the good work—and tell us what to do to help.

Very sincerely,

JERRY AND KAY MCSPADDEN.

TOPEKA, KANS.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue your unbiased analysis of the Vietnam problem. Knowledge of the history of southeast Asia makes our presence there illogical, the centuries of exploitation. These peoples thinking cannot be changed by force, or by money.

Sincerely,

LEO A. SMITH, M.D.

DOYON, N. DAK.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You would be surprised at how many Americans think like you do about the war in Vietnam. The trouble is we do not have the facts to back our thoughts and we do love our country.

Just from the facts we can glean from the news media, we were about 20 years too late in stopping the spread of communism in Asia. It is there and has been for a long time. Supposing we did bring North Vietnam to her knees, would that end the war? Wouldn't we have to go on killing and killing like the fast gun of the Old West? We are told that we want nothing in South Vietnam; that all we want is to stop the killing and intimidation. And we do this by killing and destruction. It just doesn't make sense.

Is it a trait handed down from our founders that we think we can stop a thing merely by killing the person who does it? Can't we learn that the way to stop a bad idea is to make a better one work? It makes one wonder if democracy and freedom can be attained without a loaded gun to back us up.

Thank God for people like you and Senator FULBRIGHT. You speak for those of us who want to be free to live a Christian type of life but do not want to have to carry a gun to do it. You are most courageous. A great many people would like to help you but we can't even find out why we are fighting a war in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. LORETTA EVANS.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations. I have been listening to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee TV program with great interest and congratulate you, dear sir, on speaking as I feel many, many of us would voice our opinion if given the opportunity.

This Vietnam situation is in such confusion and escalation it certainly has people scared as to where or how it may end. Two wrongs do not make a right and this escalation on both sides is only making things worse and the price of our best young men giving up their lives in such great numbers, in addition to dollars spent, is too high a price to pay and for what? I do not feel we are closer to peace—in fact, I think conditions are worse with the Chinese, etc. Also, we are creating a hate from most nations and—instead of a warm feeling, we are creating one of fear and antagonism.

This is my first letter ever to Washington as I feel there are so many problems to be settled by men much more brilliant than most of us American citizens but this is so serious that I am very grateful to you and your committee for trying to get a settlement of this very horrible, gruesome situation. I feel so badly seeing pictures of these very young boys—17, 18, 19, 20, dying and severely wounded—please it is very late and getting worse—if not too late already.

Thanks again, dear Senator MORSE.

Sincerely,

BERTHA GUCKENBERGER.

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
New Paltz, N.Y., May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I say once again that were it not for men like you, I should despair for the future of our country and for the integrity of our political institutions.

Your defense of the life of principle is nothing less than courageous, and you almost persuade me that politics can be an honorable profession.

My hope is that you prosper in health and success and that the cause for which you have labored so hard and so long will prevail in the end. I speak not only for myself but for all enlightened men, I hope, when I say that I am truly grateful that you are in a position to defend those of us who love truth, human decency, and the democratic way of life.

Senator you were positively Burkean in your denunciation of this unjust, illegal, and immoral war, which is corroding the moral fiber of our country.

Yours sincerely,

STANLEY C. RUSSELL,
Associate Professor.

Cornell University,
Ithaca, N.Y., May 13, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to inform you that you have my wholehearted support in your continuing efforts to bring sanity to our Viet Nam policy. My concern grows daily, and I fear that time is running short, as I see, in the wake of senseless death and destruction on both sides, our encroachments creep closer to Hanoi, Haiphong, and China.

Sincerely yours,

Charles K. Sinclair.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
March 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: It is impossible to express my gratitude for all that you are doing to draw the country's attention to the insanity of the war in Vietnam.

Please continue in your efforts to bring about a negotiated peace.

Again, my many thanks for your tireless efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Abbie Kiasne.

Oklahoma City, Okla.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I had only a few minutes' time to observe the Foreign Affairs hearing on Monday morning, especially that part dealing with Vietnam.

I certainly want to compliment you on your good efforts and hope you will continue to do everything you can to stop the murder of our fine young men in a war where we have no business being.

We can win nothing by continuing to fight.

We can lose nothing if we abandon our war efforts in Vietnam but we can save the lives of our good American boys.

Sincerely,

R. W. Robberson.

Ventura, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We have been listening to the Senate Foreign Relations hearings today on NBC. We certainly admire your stand and only wish there were more men like you in the Senate.

We are Republicans but Americans first.

Sincerely,

Laura and Arthur Endell.

Wichita Falls, Tex.,
May 9, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: We appreciate you and your statesmanship. Thanks for all your hard work.

Harl Mansur, Jr., M.D.

Flushing, N.Y.,
May 9, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept our thanks and gratitude for your courageous stand in questioning the morality and legality of our presence in southeast Asia. With tonight's announcement that 7,200 pounds of nausea-inducing gas has been released in an area in South Vietnam, how can we hold our heads up as members of the human race?

We're sorry we cannot show our appreciation by voting for you.

Very truly yours,

Marie Hausman.

Lancaster, Ohio,
May 9, 1966.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Dear Sir: I am always pleased to know America has such a brilliant man as yourself, in our Government.

The rank and file of people I talk to are opposed to our men fighting in Vietnam. They say Morse is a smart man. So don't think you stand alone. You have lots of friends.

Mrs. Glenn E. Lane.

Berkeley, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Dear Senator: Thank you for your television appearance today. I hope thousands saw you and will carefully consider your bold stand against sending our finest young men to be killed thousands of miles away from home in an action which is, as you state, entirely illegal according to the fundamental principles of this Nation.

Never before in our history of wars has there been so much opposition by so many of our people.

The voters of the Nation are against what the President is doing to disturb other nations by our superior attitude, and if President Johnson ever tries again for the White House he will fail by a large majority. If Stevenson could have been in the White House, we would not now be in this unfortunate situation before the world.

More power to you. I think I do not remember when you were ever wrong as a public official.

Sincerely,

Mrs. L. V. Tabler.

Berkeley, Calif.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: It makes my heart turn over to watch you courageously maintain your position with regard to our involvement in the Vietnamese war—always reasonable, never deflected by the barrage of doubletalk thrown at you. My faith in American statesmanship is restored when I watch you and Senator Fulbright at work in these hearings.

Yours sincerely,

Malvina Reynolds.

San Bernardino, Calif.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your remarks to Secretary McNamara and the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, especially your suggestion that the President should go to the U.N. and press for the full use of its help in a negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

You are not alone in your sentiments. I am sure there are many women like me who feel the tragic bitterness of this war. I was a Red Cross hospitals worker in American field hospitals in Europe in World War II, and saw considerable suffering there. Now I have a 12-year-old son and a 16-year-old daughter whose lives will be deeply affected by decisions made in your committee room. I think the televised hearings are good education for the public.

If you and your like-minded colleagues asked groups such as the social action section of the National Council of Churches, the League of Women Voters (who support the U.N. actively) and the American Association of University Women to urge the President to go to the United Nations as you suggested, he just might do it. Who knows?

God bless you for your courage and concern.

Mary A. Gaston.

Chicago, Ill.,
May 12, 1966.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Never fear, Senator, there are those of us in the American scene who not only appreciate your efforts in the current debate regarding the tragedy and debacle which is Vietnam, but also take every opportunity to at least make known our dissent concerning present U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Your good efforts on the national scene, along with those of your colleague Senator Fulbright, are of the utmost urgency as they are the key to returning sanity and good sense to the halls of our government.

Thank you and best wishes for gaining the support sanity and good judgment deserve.

Sincerely yours,

James A. Bateman.

Belle, W. Va.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to advise you that we are in full support of your stand on the Vietnam situation. You and Senator Fulbright seem to be standing alone against heavy odds, and we want you to know that the people that we have talked with stand ten to one in your favor.

Most people seem horrified at the administration's stand and fear escalation to an even greater degree. We are relying on men like you and Senator Fulbright to keep up the good work, for we and many, many others support you wholeheartedly.

Mr. and Mrs. D. B. Runyon.

Cleveland, Ohio,
May 10, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: "Yes," on your position on the war in Vietnam.

Downing N. Mann.

Belle, W. Va.,

Dear Senator Morse: This is to advise you that we are in full support of your stand on the Vietnam situation. You and Senator Fulbright seem to be standing alone against heavy odds, and we want you to know that the people that we have talked with stand ten to one in your favor. If only all our leaders were so wise and brave.

Keep up the good work, for we and many others support you wholeheartedly.

Mr. and Mrs. John R. Hoffman.

Linden, Mich.

Dear Sir: Thank you for your efforts in enlightening us (the American people) on the legal aspects of the Vietnam situation. Your discussion on TV today was very important. Again thanks.

Yours truly,

Ethel R. Wells.

Hillsdale, Mich.,
May 12, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: It is not often that I write a letter of this kind. But I am so grateful to you for expressing my very own feelings about this tragic mess in Vietnam, that I am eager to say, "Thanks, and God Bless You."

For if there is any real excuse for us being over there—inflicting all that suffering and destruction on a helpless people—to say nothing of our sinful sacrifice of our own youth—then I am yet to hear it.

And we—supposedly—a Christian nation.

Sincerely,

Edith W. Lackey.

Poughkeepsie, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to let you know of another American who supports your position as you stated it today at the hearings.

There are many who agree with your views and earnestly desire diminution rather than escalation.

Sincerely yours,
Anne S. Carrothers.

May 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: The courage you display in speaking the truth in the Senate hearings makes me proud that we have such a man as yourself in the Federal Government.

Our boys are being slaughtered because of the unwarranted intervention of our country in Vietnam's internal problems, and I thank God that you are raising your voice so that this terrible bloodbath will come to an end.

Those of us who stand up for the truth are being persecuted. I am a true American, an active Roman Catholic, and not in favor of communism at all; but I say that if these people want and vote in this kind of government we should allow them to have it, and stop killing these Vietnamese people. It is a crime that the cream of our young manhood is being maimed and killed in an Oriental war which was provoked by our intervention with a promise made to these people that they would have free elections in 1954.

Please keep up the fight for truth. God bless you. You are wonderful.

In gratitude,
June Degenhart.

Buffalo, N.Y.

San Francisco, Calif.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept my expression of appreciation for your courage in vigorously questioning our Government policy in Vietnam.

I definitely am in favor of preventing the growth of communism throughout the world, but it seems to me that our current actions in southeast Asia are further alienating the very people whom we wish to protect.

I have written to President Johnson advising him that as a member of the Democratic Party I will use my vote to protest the escalation of the Vietnam war by either voting for the Republican candidate or refraining from casting my ballot in the next election.

Please continue to use your influence to persuade our Government leaders to employ methods other than the slaughter of innocent peasants and the sacrifice of American servicemen in bringing self-determination to the people of Vietnam.

Respectfully,
Adrienne Thiele.

Red Bank, N.J.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Sir: I have been watching the Senate hearings on our foreign aid and why we are sending our beautiful young men into the Asian war.

It seems to me that you stand out as the real statesman—a true American—a sincere representative for your people and Americans all over this land. Congratulations.

Thank God we have at least one American who cares about the Constitution laid down by the Founding Fathers. Return to it.

The Congress doesn't seem to control affairs any more—what had happened?

No one questioned why the greatest general of the Korean war was fired. Why?

There are many questions the American people would like answered. Speak out.

Usurp the power that was taken away from you. Perhaps it's easier for most of our Congressmen this way.

They should get to work.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Mildred Brown.

P.S.—I was watching you, I clapped real loud, hurray Senator.

Sudbury, Mass.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I trust that your suggested session with international lawyers will be held. I fear that the testimony would overwhelmingly condemn our actions and thus they will never be held.

Thank you, thank you for representing my views

Mrs. C. Strand.

Alliance, Ohio,
May 11, 1966.

Dear Sir: We are behind you in your stand 100 percent. Keep up the good fight—you are in the right.

Sincerely,
Eleanor Fullmer
Mrs. Howard Fullmer.

P.S.—I am a citizen and a taxpayer.

Bellefontaine, Ohio,
May 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Character will out, high office brings the pressures that reveal it. Your stand is just and highly commendable.

A heartfelt thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,
Arthur E. Knack.

Jacksonville, Fla.,
May 12, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I wonder how many of the so-called hawks, put out on a scouting mission in Viet Cong territory, would turn out to be chickens.

Thank God for your independent thought and action. There is hope yet.

Yours very truly,
Norman Supove.

Alexandria, Va.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am writing to say that I am in full agreement with your sound, knowledgeable, and reasonable views on Vietnam. The more I listen and watch the public discussions of your committee on TV the more thankful I am that we have at least a few courageous, broadminded, honest, brilliant, eloquent men such as you left in our government. I am sure there must be many others in Congress who share your views which are so realistic, so understanding, so reasonable and so right, but for some reason or another they seem to lack the courage to speak up.

I would urge you to continue to do as you are now doing—hammer away again and again and yet again at your views until the American people become firmly convinced of the truth of the situation in Vietnam.

Thank you for standing up for the right and the truth against almost overwhelming odds, but please continue to preach the truth again and again and again. Also, be wary of any further bid for power by the administration by anymore such emergencies as the "Tonkin Gulf affair."

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Evelyn Reed.

May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: The ill wind of current colds which prevented me from going to work this week blew me the good of being at home this morning for the TV Senate hearings with our Secretary of Defense.

I cannot adequately express the gratitude I feel (along with so many other Americans) that in you we have a distinguished and articulate spokesman. You said all the things that are put up in our hearts and thoughts concerning the intolerable situation in Vietnam.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Miss Ella Zimmerman.

New York.

May 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: My husband and I want to congratulate you on your stand regarding the Vietnam war. We wholly agree with you in regard to halting the slaughter of American boys.

If our Government is supposed to be "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," why don't they ask us if we want to send our sons, brothers, and fathers to Viet Nam to be killed? Why are we not consulted first before we become involved in such a situation? After all, it is our sons who have to fight and be killed. This decision should be made by the people and not any government official. It doesn't seem fair that we have no recourse in this matter, none whatsoever, except to turn over our sons without a word.

We certainly would appreciate anything you can do to terminate this horrible situation.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Walter E. Kottas.

Buffalo, N.Y.

Milwaukee, Wis.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been watching with great interest the television coverage of the meetings of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I think the suggestion you made yesterday that our President insist that the United Nations take over and do something about the Vietnam situation. I think this is the best plan that has been offered and wish to tell you that there are many of us who believe you are one of the few clear-thinking people in Congress who is honest with the American people.

I am glad, too, that you said with so much feeling that it is not easy for you to be against the administration. I feel there are many people who have been told that you take a stand against the administration because you enjoy being controversial. I feel that John F. Kennedy would have been glad to include you in his "Profiles."

I am writing my Senators and Congressman asking that they get strongly behind you in insisting that the United Nations do something about this miserable war now.

All my good wishes go to you, Senator MORSE.

Sincerely,

MABEL E. LEARY.

THE MOUNT SINAI HOSPITAL,
New York, N.Y., May 11, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I write a short letter of praise to you and your colleagues for the fine job the Foreign Relations Committee is doing in providing the American people with detailed insight into the unfortunate conflict in Vietnam.

Examples of sincere and well-founded dissent are becoming harder to find in the present political scene. Therefore, I commend your motives and the sincere, direct manner of the presentation of information.

Sincerely.

ROBERT S. APRIL, M.D.,
Laboratories of Clinical Neurophysiology.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 11, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I address you with a great deal of regret—regret that I am not an Oregonian and therefore cannot support you by ballot. Nevertheless, I write to thank you for your persistent stand of incisive questioning and for your intelligent, brave critiques of our government's Viet-nam policies.

My appreciation and respect are yours not only for those policy changes you advocate. As importantly, I thank you for having thrust your doubts toward the public forum. By having done so, you have helped greatly to re-create an atmosphere in which honest statements of dissent, questioning, and disapproval are once more tolerated, if not yet welcomed with respect. As little as one or two years ago—sadly—my family felt constrained from discussing publicly such issues as our Viet-nam policy. You have done much to assure the public that anti-Viet-nam involvement does not equal anti-patriotism. Perhaps from the freer questioning you have helped foster, more enlightened and less rigid approaches to foreign situations may begin to emerge.

Respectfully,

JAMES LEVINSON.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
May 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for the stand you are taking in regard to Vietnam. I believe history will prove you right. I pray we will not get into an atomic war. So keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. G. A. HORACK.

AUSTIN, TEX.,
May 9, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have hardly written at all to any Congressmen. But I do so now to express my support of your position on Vietnam. If I may help to support your views let me know how.

Respectfully yours,

MEREDITH D. TURNER.

ESCANABA, MICH.,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On May 10, 1966, I wrote a letter to Senator J. WM. FULBRIGHT, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, thanking him for his efforts in promoting peace in the world and specifically his attempt to stop the useless slaughter in Viet Nam. As I mentioned to him, I am a long time student of political science and government, going back more than forty years. I want to thank you for your sincerity and efforts in promoting world peace. I have watched and listened to many of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, publicly televised in recent weeks. I specifically want to commend you on your effort at the public hearing, which was televised today, May 11, which I watched. Your extemporaneous comments to Secretary McNamara, trying to get necessary this whole Asian and world problem to the United Nations, are necessary for world peace, in my opinion and seemingly in yours, and probably in the opinion of the great majority of the people of United States and the world. It was the greatest unprepared speech for peace I have heard in a long time.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE ERDMAN.

MAY 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We watched you on live T.V. yesterday, and are behind you 100% in every thing you said.

It is too bad we don't have more wonderful men like you who speak out, and work for the good of the U.S.!

Best wishes for success.

Sincerely,

LEWIS AND EVELYN GRAY.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

FREEPORT, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been watching the Senate hearings on TV and felt I had to somehow let you know how very deeply I, and many many others, appreciate your stand. Yours is the sanest word put forth.

Please do not become discouraged. Your followers and supporters are legion.

Sincerely yours,

MARJORIE P. LUYCKX.

BRISTOLVILLE, OHIO,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In my opinion, there are very few men who have the courage and fortitude, as you have, to stand up for their convictions even though they may find themselves in the minority. Certainly these men are the foundation of a strong democracy, and I think these men should be commended.

Recently, you and your colleague, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, have probably been the most criticized Senators in the Senate, due, primarily, to your opinions regarding the Vietnam conflict. I share your deep concern in our involvement there. I certainly admire your questioning of the legality and actual basis of our concern there, and I, also, admire your great respect for the lives of American men fighting and dying in Vietnam.

I wanted to let you know that there are many Americans who are very proud to have a man of your stature in their Government, and I hope we will continue to have men in our Government like you, who will question and not just accept.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD COOPER.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God we have at least one man in our government who has the courage to speak out and hold to your convictions. I agree completely with your views on our situation in Vietnam. May God bless & keep you.

Most sincerely,

GERTRUDE WELTON.

MADISON, WIS.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your clear lucid arguments involving the legalities of our position in Viet Nam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Your sanity in a time of reckless abandon and temptation of fate and the steps leading to global war are much appreciated. We are in complete accord with your views on Viet Nam and are grateful to you for speaking out. Thank you also for your fine talk here in Madison in February.

Yours truly,

Mrs. HUGH ILTIS.

MAY 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Just a note to express our appreciation for your courageous statements in recent weeks.

We realize that certain forces seem to be leading us toward a military dictatorship. And we thank you for challenging those who would lead us down the road to the destruction of true Democracy.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. DANIEL DEATON.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this opportunity to express my full support for your position with respect to our military involvement in Vietnam. I greatly admire your courage and hope you will be successful in bringing about a change in administrative policy on this crucial matter.

Sincerely

ROBERT C. STEBBINS,
Professor of Zoology.

MONTEREY, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The opportunity to view the televised hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning prompts me to write this letter. You have earned the gratitude of every American citizen by your persistent and relentless questioning of the present administration's foreign policy. Your outspoken refusal to accept the fiction that our military action in Vietnam is in any way justified, and your reference to our violation of the United Nations Charter, give new hope to those of us who earnestly desire a sane and sensitive foreign policy for our nation.

Perhaps we may yet come to base our relations with other countries on an understanding of the genuine desires of the people of un-developed nations, rather than on a sterile and self-defeating anti-communism. Thank you for your continuing efforts in that direction.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. B. L. JONES.

MAY 9, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is an expression of admiration from a resident of California for your courageous and honest stand against the conflict in Viet Nam.

It was a most distressing experience to watch a television program from Viet Nam and listen to the pilot speaking of his bombing attack as if he were killing a few pests.

He said that he enjoyed using the napalm and strafing the human beings as they ran in search of safety. It was a horrifying experience to witness the torture and death of a prisoner, the evident terror of a young lad of fourteen or fifteen years of age, who was thought to be a member of the Viet Cong, as he was marched down the road and other parts of the film. Have we reared our boys to have no respect for life and no feeling for the pain inflicted upon other human beings?

Even if I were convinced that our involvement in Viet Nam were justified, I could not condone such bestiality. I have failed, thus far, to be convinced that this war in Viet Nam is our affair and I deplore our involvement.

Thank you for your forthright stand and sane approach to this distressing war.

With sincere admiration and gratefulness,

SIMON R. STEIN,

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am in full agreement with you in your stand on the Vietnam war. I don't see how Rusk, McNamara, etc., can utter the flimsy excuses which they do. All these bombings, right in Saigon show that we are not wanted there.

Yours truly,

JANET HARDING.

MAY 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I felt I must sit down and write to you and express my thanks for your stand against the horrible war my Government is involved in.

I realize the ridicule and harassments you are put to for your stand, as an ordinary citizen. I see a very small sample of this by simply stating that I am against our policy.

I am a young adult who has voted for only one President and has never written to any public official before, but after closely following you and Senator FULBRIGHT on television I felt compelled to write you and thank you for your courage. I am frightened to think that my husband and brothers may have to die for a war I feel is senseless and which I believe in time will be proven unnecessary.

Sir, to close, let me say I support you and am heartily grateful that there are men like you, however few in number, who rise above politics to raise their voice when they feel an issue is wrong. You belong in President Kennedy's "Profiles in Courage."

Sincerely,

MRS. JOANNE SARVER.

CUYAHOGA FALLS, OHIO.

MAY 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to add my small voice to the many who thank you for your rational and courageous position with regard to the immoral war being waged by the United States in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, we are still living in a time when to be rational demands courage.

For the good fight you are waging, I know you will be remembered when others, presently more influential, will either be forgotten or remembered with shame.

Please continue the good fight. My only regret regarding you, sir, is that as a resident of New Jersey, I am unable to vote for you in Oregon.

Very truly yours,

JACOB ELDMAN.

TOMS RIVER, N.J.

BELLEVILLE, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been viewing the foreign relation hearings and just want to let you know how much I admire your courage on the stand you are taking concerning the war in Vietnam, and the effort you are making in trying to get at the truth of the matter.

Too many of our young men are taken into the service as soon as they graduate from high school age 18 to 19 years many of whom have already been killed and are being killed every day according to the reports in the local newspapers, which is a very shocking thing to anybody's mind.

Thank you for the good work you are doing in the interest of our Government and peace. I thank God for men like you who have the wisdom and courage to fight for the right of the people and work toward peace and good will among the nations.

God bless you.

MRS. H. BECKMAN.

NARBERTH, PA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my thanks for your efforts to bring some sanity into the Vietnam situation. There are many of us on the sidelines who applaud you.

Respectfully,

FRANCES P. BRODIE
MRS. GEORGE R. BRODIE.

MAY 13, 1966.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have always had my general appreciation in your political career—and your stand on Vietnam has done nothing but magnify this. I sincerely hope that you can prevail among your colleagues and bring some sense to our country's actions.

Sincerely,

MARTHA KAY.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are absolutely right in your viewpoint on Vietnam. A misadventure by the United States of America. We interposed in a civil war, backgrounded by a religious strife, and corrupt political influences. The precedent we set there—could be duplicated in Indonesia, Colombia, Rhodesia, and Pakistan. The American people are sick and tired of warmongering and war. Keep strong, and solvent and charitable—but no more. Cut the foreign aid by 50 percent.

GEORGE T. MEYERS.

BETHESDA, MD.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot let another day go by without telling you how greatly I admire your stand, bravery, and integrity. Keep up the magnificent work.

Gratefully,

MARJORIE H. LASHER.

FREEPORT, N.Y.,
May 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As you can see I don't live in the State you represent. I am writing to you because I feel sure that you will ask and try to get an answer to the question I have on my mind.

Why are more Americans dying than Vietnamese? This week three times as many American boys died than Vietnamese.

Are these people going to sit down and let my son and other Americans fight and die for their freedom? I thought we went there to help them, not to do the whole job while they sit around and wait for a promised election.

Why can't the Americans sit and wait, too? Maybe that way the war would go away. I don't know how we can end it unless this country is ready to fight an all-out war.

I object to my son fighting and maybe dying while the Army of South Vietnam is on vacation. If they want to be free, let them fight; no fight, no freedom.

Bring our boys home so that they can enjoy the freedom their fathers and grandfathers fought for.

Respectfully,

ROSE C. STONE.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your presentation of your views on the conflict in southeast Asia at today's Foreign Affairs Committee hearings, was most impressive. At last we had a clear idea of the alternatives that could be followed. We appreciate your thoughtful comments and hope that you will keep up with your efforts and eloquence for the things that you and many other people think right, the smears and attacks on you notwithstanding.

Very truly yours,

Dr. and Mrs. WALTER STRICKS.

DOUSMAN, WIS.,
May 11, 1966.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The plan you expressed today while the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was questioning Mr. McNamara was the most hopeful plan I've heard. It had seemed to me that the U.N. is failing in its duty to work for peace and, since they've done nothing in response to President Johnson's request for help, I had decided that the U.N. was about dead. Could you not write out the plans you gave today at the meeting and send copies to whomever could do something about it? Just maybe the United States can be got "off the hook." I really believe that if the President demanded such action as you suggested we might get results.

Always I have this fear: Since so many countries for so long had urged us to get out of Vietnam and we paid them no attention. Maybe now those countries think we are getting what we deserve and no one will help us. I do hope we still have enough friends who will go to bat for us by following the U.N. plan you suggested. It seemed to hold hope in what has looked like a hopeless situation.

God bless you.

Sincerely,

MRS. EVA M. BARRY.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and myself have been very attentive in recent months to the hearings in Washington relative to the merits of the war in Vietnam.

We have taken notice of the fact that at all times you have put the welfare of the Nation and the people ahead of any political considerations even at the risk of splitting party unity.

We are convinced that you have acted at all times in accord with your conscience and that you are one of the few people in Washington with the courage to speak the truth.

We have a son of military age who has discharged his responsibility to the State and Nation by completing training in the National Guard and stands ready to defend his State and his country in any emergency, but we would feel frustrated indeed if he were called to fight in an Asian jungle for a cause he does not believe to exist.

In conclusion, we can only say that we think the billions of tax dollars that are being expended to prolong the war in Vietnam could be much better utilized to further the needs of our own people.

We are indeed grateful that there are still those in Washington who put the National interest ahead of other selfish considerations.

Very sincerely,

James H. Paist.
Ellen M. Paist.

Schenectady, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I should like to have my name added to the list of millions of Americans who applaud your efforts in the Vietnam dilemma. Out of every agonizing crisis in America's history, there have come great men, men of great vision. You, Senator Morse, are one of the great men to emerge in this crisis. May the good Lord continue to give you the courage to carry on your work.

Sincerely yours,

Ernest R. Blake, Jr.

May 12, 1966.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Sir: Since you said yesterday that it was hard to be in your position and misunderstood by many, I feel that I owe you a letter of support and appreciation for your courageous stand on Viet Nam.

Thanks for expressing my own views so eloquently; it was thrilling to watch you on T.V.

Congratulations on your passionate plea for peace through the United Nations; I hope and pray that your suggestions will be followed.

I trust that this note of approval will be encouraging to you, sir.

Respectfully,

Marguerite Pauley.

Boynton Beach, Fla.

May 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,

Dear Sir: I have been seeing the telecasting of the Senate hearing on the Viet Nam affair or war. I will say, this that I sure agree with you.

And I will only vote for the candidate that is for peace. You know the news programs show some of the fighting in Viet Nam but to see the old women and children routed by the American troops, 6 ft. boy and those little and women crying just makes me sick.

We our supposed to be Christians so let's act like one. We brag about killing 400 or 500 Viet Congs a day with bombing and gun fire these bombs must be killing a lot of women and children. We see them crying on television. I sure don't like it. To me it looks like a giant picking on a baby. For God sake there must be a better way to have peace without killing all the people in Viet Nam.

I agree with you, Mr. Morse, that they should have had elections in 1952 or 1954 as you say.

So Senator, keep on with your good work.

I am sure for you and I tell everybody that I talk to that I am for you would be surprised how many agree with you. So God bless you, Senator.

Edward G. Teal.

Santa Monica, Calif.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Since I am a resident of the state of Wisconsin I am sorry I shall be unable to support you directly with my vote, but you most certainly have my moral support. The only reason I have now to be proud to be a democrat is that you are a member of the party. *Please* keep up your good work. It is most refreshing to hear your comments on the Vietnam war.

Sincerely

Norman C. Russell.

Milwaukee, Wis.

Somerset, Mass.,
May 11, 1966.

Dear Sir: I agree with you that the President should go to the United Nations and ask assistance in this conflict. You are doing a good job, please keep it up.

Sincerely,

Mrs. John Russell.

Crystal Lake, Ill.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: My wife and I have been encouraged by your position on a number of national and international issues during your tenure in the Senate. Particularly, we now join in supporting you in your stand related to our activities in Vietnam.

We feel that your efforts have contributed enormously to grassroots participation in this discussion. It is our strong conviction that public participation is the key to a just solution of this problem. We find that the subject of Vietnam is no longer forbidden at lunch with associates or during dinner with friends.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chester and Betty Keeney.

Wheaton, Ill.,
May 12, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to tell you, as I have Senator Fulbright, how grateful I am, as an American citizen, to have the unprecedented privilege of participating in the Senate Foreign Relations hearings at this crucial time in our history.

I am writing you particularly, because I feel you have done such an outstanding service to the American people in fighting so hard and so intelligently to keep us from going over the brink.

Yesterday, on May 11, in your exchange with Secretary McNamara, there was a moment when it could be felt, by the viewers that you and he were stripped of all pretense and protocol, and he honestly had no defense against your passionate and lucid honesty and logic.

What really takes courage and patriotism is to think and study and agonize over our infinitely complex problems, and then have the intestinal fortitude to stand up against the establishment and fight for reason and light. God bless you.

Sincerely,

Revelle Dux.

Buffalo, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

My Dear Senator: I am writing you in appreciation of your work on the Foreign Investigation Committee. I can't tell you how much I agree with yours and Senator Fulbright's views on this matter. In fact, if either of you gentlemen were to run for President I should work endlessly for your victory.

I believe that either you or Senator Fulbright would have if you were the President today found a solution to this war. I don't believe that either of you would have gotten us into such a state of affairs. Judging by your convictions you are both solid American citizens who love America and the American people. With this sincere love you could never lead us into a dangerous situation.

So I shall pray that both you tremendous men can bring peace to our country. I have a son in the Army who I fear will never return to me if soon this war does not end. I have always worked, my husband and I always paid our taxes. We were honored to pay them because we're proud to be Americans.

I would even give my sons and my own life if anyone threatened our country. Yet I feel that for this war is my son's life necessary. Please end this war even if the people who want it and seem to benefit from it should be impeached. I admire you and Senator Fulbright. So with God's speed shall your mission be successful.

Always,

Mrs. Anna Aqualina.

Hollywood, Fla.,
May 11, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: May I thank you, even though I do not live in your State, for your magnificent stand against the war in Vietnam, and the policy of this administration in that area. I have listened to most of the broadcasts of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. I have found that your brilliant and courageous exposition of the issues at stake there represent my own views and feelings almost exactly. I am aghast at the danger of our present course, and have welcomed your repeated reference to legal concepts, which are so lacking in the justifications put forward by the members of this administration. Thank you once again.

Sincerely yours,

Josephine Barclay.

Orange, Tex.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I thoroughly endorse your views on the Vietnam war. Stop this war, as you say. We are not doing any good, only killing great numbers of our innocent young boys and men.

I have listened to all of the public TV Foreign Relations discussions and I appreciate them very much. The public is entitled to know what is going on. We pay taxes to help kill our boys. Why?

Senator, please keep expressing your candid views and know that a great many, I would say the great majority of people, endorse your views.

It seems to me the majority of these people we have tried to help detest us, as they are displaying every day, so what is the motive of our leaders to keep it going?

I am wondering how many of those Senators share your views as they do not express their views as candidly you do although I can see there are doubts in their minds as to the validity of our course in Vietnam.

I hope I am not out of place in expressing my views to you, as, of course, I am only a citizen and not cognizant of all the facts. I am so interested in your meetings that I just can't keep from expressing my views.

Thank you Senator for allowing us to see and listen to your discussions.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Birdie Ball.

Utica, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: We have been thoughtful listeners to the Senate hearings on television. Thank you for the energy and commitment that you have put into these investigations.

Today when you spoke out so explicitly I felt compelled to write to you. You have put your finger on our dilemma. When we as a nation proclaim that war is immoral, inhuman, contrary to our conviction on the dignity and worth of all men, then and only then will the world believe in the alternatives that will evolve in such a climate. Many people will need to change their thinking but it can happen because we are human beings with a human relationship to all people on this planet and it must happen if we are to survive.

Twenty-five years ago I lifted my hand in proud farewell to a husband off to war. Now it may soon be necessary for our sons to go. It will not be a proud occasion. My thinking has changed. This has in no way changed my loyalty or love of my country. Our sons were taught to respect the right of all, to turn the other cheek when necessary. They know there are better ways of resolving conflict because they have practiced them.

We as a nation can find better ways. The world will believe us when we erase our warlike image. True humility and agony for all is something not expressed in words but in actions. But first we must be and believe. Thank God that you and Senator FULBRIGHT are in Washington right now.

Sincerely yours,

WINFRED S. ROBERTS
Mrs. Wilbert T. Roberts.

MAY 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your active participation in the Foreign Relations Committee hearings is a real delight to me. We need more men like you to speak up and express their views. Too many Government officials worry too much about their own political and social gains and too few have the interest of the people at heart.

The hearings that are televised for the public are a wonderful example of America's right for freedom of speech and freedom to question our policies.

Keep up the good work; the people want the truth, and they want action.

Sincerely,

DARLENE SALL.

GREELEY, COLO.

DALLAS, TEX.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God we have a Senator MORSE in this beloved country of ours. "Stick to your guns," Senator MORSE. If we fail to have good, sensible, level headed men like you speaking up (I've got to knowing you through the Foreign Relations Committee hearings). I think we will be in grave danger. I know it's a lonely position. I feel almost as lonely here in this largely conservative town (though there are thousands of good people here who are prone toward creative, broad thinking).

My sincere thanks to you.

Sincerely,

MRS. OPAL LOVING CHRISTOPLE.

PENDLETON, IND., *May 12, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in accordance with your every comment on the situation we are in, and I honor you for every thing I heard you say on TV.

I have a son who served 51 months in World War II, now his 19 year old son, (our only grandson) leaves May 18 for Training. I thank God my son came home safely and my prayers are for our precious grandson. Our older son had four severe heart attacks last summer, Doctor has not dismissed him as yet, I thank God his life has been spared.

I pray they will call our boys back before things get worse.

If France and Russia, and smaller countries will not help us, why are we sacrificing our boys.

I wish everyone would write you a letter, telling what they think of it all.

Thanking you again for all you have said, I remain your sincere friend.

MRS. CHARLES E. COOPER.

KIRKWOOD, MO., *May 13, 1966.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my appreciation of the work the Foreign Policy Committee is doing in behalf of enlightening public opinion regarding the war in Asia.

You and the chairman of this committee stand 10 feet tall morally and judgmentwise in this insane venture in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

DAISY D. WINGFIELD.

ROCKPORT, MASS.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my heartiest congratulations on the way you have called the bluff on the administration's policies in South Vietnam during the recent Senate hearings. Your exposure of the bankruptcy of American foreign policy is a true service to your country.

As a recently elected Democrat (planning board) in a Republican town I feel I am one of a growing number of disillusioned Democrats.

Again sir; my congratulations, and please keep at it.

Sincerely,

ROGER MARTIN.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Today I heard you speak, while Senator McNamara was being interviewed. May I tell you that you spoke so well. If only the powers to be would listen. You are so right. We must end this war. And we must, as you suggest take this to the U.N. demand a vote on this.

Just as you worry about our becoming involved in a larger war, so do many of us Americans. Please Mr. MORSE keep up your good work. We, the people of this large country are grateful to you. And I firmly believe history will prove you right. I wish with all my heart we could wake up tomorrow morning, and learn that the Vietnam war was over. It must somehow be stopped, we are losing too many men, and if they persist it, we will lose many more.

Please do all in your power to convince our government that this is the wrong war at the wrong time. I believe most of America hopes we never never fight a war again.

Gratefully,

MRS. HALLWARD.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: God bless you, sir. I know that millions of mothers support your brilliant and courageous crusade for peace.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH GIBSON.

KIRKWOOD, MO.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You and Senators FULBRIGHT and GORE are to be commended on your stand with regard to our position in southeast Asia. The philosophies which you upheld in yesterday's televised session of the Senate caucus indicate a concern for for present actions both with regard to the historical context of U.S. policy and purpose and to the light in which the future will view the present decisions.

Your suggestion for the use of intervention by the United Nations offers a constructive and logical mode of action toward resolution of the Vietnam conflict. I hope it will be acted upon.

Sincerely,

MISS MARY P. MCCUE.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am at this moment listening to the televised account of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am in complete accord with what you and Senator FULBRIGHT are trying to do. I believe you are realistic men attempting to do a very difficult job.

Frankly, everyone (almost without exception) that I talk to about the war in Vietnam is against it.

Your idea of going before the United Nations—particularly, the Security Council—sound logical, sensible and certainly worth a try.

Remember many, many people are behind you. Don't lose heart.

Yours truly,

LOIS M. GARDNER.

P.S.—I am a housewife, middle-aged, mother of three.

FENTON, MO.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Have just finished watching your interview with McNamara. I want you to know there are thousands of people backing you. If there's anything the people can do to help, besides write letters, be sure and let us know.

We have sons, one in service. We've had friends that lost sons in Vietnam. It is all so useless for these young men to give their lives for what? It seems like there are people that think money can pay for these young lives. But they don't seem to have sons over there.

Keep the good work up. And I'm sure that most of us will have to be Republicans next election.

Mr. and MRS. ROBERT C. MCDOWELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We always delight in hearing your views on Vietnam. You somehow reestablish reason as a possible tool in ending this tragic war. We are sick of outright lies and admire your gumption for speaking out against them.

Yours for Peace,

CAROL DE'AK and WILLIAM DE'AK.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *May 12, 1966.*

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Since I am an admirer of you and your policies on our situation in Vietnam I think I can write you and get an honest answer. First, what law of our land gives authority to our Armed Forces to take one's son, who is a draftee, and send him to a combat zone which is an undeclared war in a foreign country?

He is my only son, and I think Vietnam is a civil war we have no business sticking our nose in.

Because someone made a promise there, some time ago is no sign they could not remember the Biblical saying "A wise man changes his mind, but a fool never does."

It seems our country is going more to a dictatorship, ruled by a very few and Congress has not much say, at least that is the way it looks now, or is the challenge too great—and politics gets in the eyes of too many of our chosen senators and representatives?

Sir, I'm writing you, because I believe you will give me a true answer to my questions which I doubt I could receive from my own representative.

Sincerely,

H. C. Ruhnke.

Massachusetts.

Dear Senator Morse: Stay with it. There are more Americans secretly behind you than one can count. They do not quite dare say so. What you say about "tyranny" and the "slaughter of our American boys" hits truth and maybe hurts in some spots!

Mrs. Luke Leonard.

Ghent, N.Y., *May 11, 1966*.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: As a long time Democrat I take my hat off to you and want you to know I appreciate your voice in this wilderness of deceit, lies, and confusion of today.

You spoke clearly, sincerely, and overwhelmingly with truth and I am sorry everyone in the country could not hear you. Do not be discouraged as I am one of the little people and so hear what little people think and feel and they are with you.

To one who carries the Holy Grail of Peace my best wishes for your health and success.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Dorothea Connacher.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HISTORY WARNS THAT PROSPERITY PRECEDES A STORM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the March 27 issue of the Cedar Rapids Gazette appears an article by the distinguished economist, J. A. Livingston, entitled "History Warns That Prosperity Precedes a Storm."

In view of the events which have occurred in the stock market subsequent to the publication of this article, which points up the accuracy of the statements which were made, I ask unanimous consent that the article be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Great Society and the Stock Market—History Warns That Prosperity Precedes a Storm

(By J. A. Livingston)

Surely, it is no accident that literature, history, and philosophy are laden with warnings against prosperity.

"Everything in the world may be endured," said Goethe, "except a succession of prosperous days." A proverb says, "Prosperity lets go the bridle." Tacitus asserted, "We are corrupted by prosperity," and Washington Irving counseled that in a "time of unexampled prosperity" businessmen should "prepare for the impending storm."

"Prosperity sows the seeds of its own destruction" has become a cliche. Why? Because prosperity fashions its own pathology: The prospects of ever-rising profits develop a Frankenstein dynamism toward over-expansion.

President Johnson is aware of the danger. In January 1965, he said in his economic message to Congress: "A time of prosperity with no recession in sight is the time to plan our defenses against future dips in business activity."

But he is caught up in his own propulsive commitments. The Vietnam war keeps enlarging. The Great Society program expands. The President competes for men, materials, machinery, and credit with the City of New York, the State of California, and such corporate giants as Ford, United States Steel, General Electric, in a congested marketplace. Result: Upward pressure on prices.

NOT EMBARRASSED

This doesn't embarrass the President. He is committed to full employment—to unemployment of 3.5 percent or less. The poor and underprivileged must find work. But job opportunities will open only if manufacturing and service industries need workers. Then, industry will be willing to provide on-the-job training.

So this is the Washington trade-off, the calculated risk: A little price inflation in exchange for big, broad social gains—for full employment.

In the algebra of nice, round assumptions, in inflation markup of $18-to-$23 billion on total output of $710 billion is a small price for social progress.

True, people who have savings accounts will have less real purchasing power stored away. True, also, persons who live on pensions or other fixed incomes will be somewhat less well off. However, if those who have little are lifted far, far up, while those who have enough lose only a little, the swap is justified. It's for the greatest good of the greatest number. But . . .

Anticipation—the velocity of the marketplace—is the algebraic unknown. Will the 2 percent-to-3 percent-a-year creep change into a gallop?

The labor leader who expects prices to rise, wants protection against increased living costs. That's why George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, rejects the President's 3.2 percent guideposts. He doesn't want workers shortchanged in advance.

EVERYONE JOINS

The businessman wants to increase prices so as to obtain adequate profit margins after paying higher wages and higher prices for raw materials. Everyone joins in the game of buying ahead to beat the price rise and/or possible shortages.

A plant bought today will be worth more tomorrow. Ditto a housing project or shopping center. Real estate developers pick up land—by option or down payment. Business men add to inventories. Corporate and other borrowers make loans ahead, fearing congestion in the money market. Fear of inflation lurks in every commitment, contract and purchase. It even pokes into the shopper's cart in the super market.

Price indexes do not measure the inflation fully. Firms drop discounts, discontinue services, scant quality or treat as extras what has been standard. Deliveries are often delayed, which adds to costs. Companies have to increase inventories against slower replacement of stock.

Investors prefer stocks—capital gains—to fixed income from bonds, in spite of the current large discrepancy in yields—3 percent against 5 percent.

Why not? The economy has been expanding at a 4 percent to 5 percent annual rate. A bumper crop of young men and women will be going to the altar this year, next and the year after—the legacy of the baby boom, just before and after the war. This will bolster demands of all kinds—for homes, for furniture, for pots, pans and appliances. Dynamic: He who buys something today will be richer tomorrow. In a seller's market, ownership is the first rule of profit.

The President has intervened in the marketplace to stay the process. He has rolled back prices of aluminum, copper, steel and cigarets. But, he hasn't stopped dozens of other prices from advancing—chemicals, plastics, TV tubes, gasoline, newsprint, copper tubing, aluminum light-poles, rubber tires.

HITS SYMPTOMS

The President is tilting with symptoms. The cause is overconsumption. The economy lacks room at the top. Though production rises, demand is rising even faster.

The father of the New Economics, John Maynard Keynes, dissected the process in his "General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money". Even before full employment is reached, he wrote, "money wages have to rise in response to an increasing effective demand" but the rise in wages will not be "fully in proportion to the rise in the price level." This is true today, despite cost-of-living clauses in wage contracts.

Keynes went on to describe the state we, in the United States, may be entering: "When a further increase in the quantity of effective demand produces no further increase in output * * * we have reached a condition which might be appropriately designated as one of true inflation."

In World War II, Congress moderated inflation with wage-price-and-profits controls. But that was an all-out war. This is only a 2 percent war. And controls would require a no-strike pledge. Labor is unlikely to give up its chief bargaining weapon—the right to strike—for Vietnam. It didn't during Korea.

So the President has these rather-not alternatives: To cut government spending or to ask Congress to increase taxes.

In either case, demand would be lowered. Fewer jobs would be created. And economic expectations would slip into a lower trajectory. The up-spiral would become a down-spiral. Negotiations for property would be halted, corporate blueprints for expansion shelved, inventory policies shifted downward.

CHANGE INEVITABLE

Sooner or later, such change is inevitable. The Vietnam war isn't endless. The escalation in requirements—for men and materials—will slow down. And peace, itself, will eventually come.

A wise professor, I. L. Sharfman, of Michigan, where Gardner Ackley got his Ph. D. in economics, told me again and again: "In times of prosperity, it is the function of the business analyst to point out the danger of excesses. And in times of depression, it is his responsibility to point out the bright spots. Thus he can temper over-exuberance at the top and despair at the bottom."

The United States today is in the boom phase—the capital-goods phase—of prosperity. President Johnson and Ackley hope that higher Social Security and other taxes will slow up demand and "tame down" expectations.

The President doesn't want to apply the brakes and chance a recession. This is understandable—particularly in an election year.

The President and his advisers hope to "slot" Great Society projects into the Vietnam gap. The backlog of social undermaintenance is unlimited—potholed and cramped streets and highways; crowded airports, polluted rivers and streams; contaminated air; shortage of educational facilities; slums; inadequate water supplies; congested hospitals; too much crime and too little police protection.

Ideally, prosperity would flatten out and forward into a plateau. But this happy hope is not promised by history, as noted in the second article.

Even if post-Vietnam projects are prepared in advance, revival won't be instant. It takes time for public expenditures to course through the economy, revive anticipatory purchases of inventories and reinitiate postponed corporate expenditures on plant and equipment. Capital-goods booms evaporate fast and reconstitute slowly.

Nor will Federal Reserve Board action be immediately useful. Easy credit and lower interest rates are only an invitation to borrow. The incentive comes from the prospect of profit.

URGENT TO PLAN

Further, the nation's balance of payments deficit does not allow full freedom of choice. If interest rates come down too fast, gold might flow out of the country. Indeed, a recession might cause loss of confidence in the dollar. So it is all the more urgent to "plan our defenses against future dips in business activity."

And fiscal activism will be possible then. The President undoubtedly will urge, and Congress undoubtedly will pass, a bill reducing taxes. This will lift the purchasing power of consumers, elevate the profit potential of corporations and renew confidence in common stocks as long-term investments.

We—all of us—need to layer prosperity at the top—to peel off projects not immediately necessary—whether plans to build steel or chemical plants, shopping centers, apartment houses, public works, or to buy homes. What isn't bought today will be deferred demand for tomorrow.

The decline so far in the stock market has been salubrious. It is a warning: All is not up, up and up.

The drop in the bond market, similarly, is salubrious. It has forced some states, some local governments and some corporations to review expansion plans.

Mortgage rates have risen. Home-building is falling. This may be salubrious, but it could be a signal . . .

Yet, the view from the top of prosperity is always upward. It takes periscopic vision to see a downturn.

The national mood is impatience, not moderation. The President nurses the Great Society. He drives toward full employment and Vietnam drives him on. Corporations, speculators and householders fear higher costs and shortages. So they buy now and order ahead.

Only a letdown in effective demand—to use Keynes' term—will suppress inflation. Prosperity is bruising itself against a ceiling of manpower and capacity. It is bloodied by the war in Vietnam. But it's still very much unbowed.

It is still progressing. It still possesses a propulsive dynamism. And that's its trouble.

And if, by pointing out this, these articles cool off some exuberance and level down expectations, they will have served their purpose. To temper a boom is to diminish the velocity, depth and duration of its aftermath.

THE VIETNAM WAR: A COST ACCOUNTING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the April issue of Fortune magazine appears a very knowledgeable article entitled, "The Vietnam War: A Cost Accounting."

There is much concern nowadays about the cost of the commitments we have in Vietnam. Various estimates have been made, running in excess of $15 billion a year.

This article points out that much more is involved than merely adding up items. Commitments against future appropriations must be taken into account, and when that is done the estimated costs run to over $23 billion a year.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VIETNAM WAR: A COST ACCOUNTING

(By William Bowen)

(NOTE.—The cost analysis for this article was carried out by a team consisting of, in addition to Mr. Bowen: Alan Greenspan, president of Townsend-Greenspan & Co., consultants; P. Bernard Nortman, independent economic consultant; Sanford S. Parker, chief of Fortune's economic staff; and research associate Karin Cocuzzi.)

The Vietnam war is peculiarly expensive, far more so than is generally thought. Costs are running above $13 billion a year, and are headed up. Fortune's figures suggest that we're in for bigger defense budgets—and new economic strains.

What happens in the U.S. economy over the next year or two, what happens to demand and production and prices and taxes, will to a large extent depend upon the cost of the Vietnam war. If anyone inside the Pentagon knows the current cost, he is not telling, nor, of course, is anyone there telling about costs associated with future operations. Accordingly, Fortune has undertaken on its own to figure out the cost—present and prospective—of the Vietnam war. It is already costing a lot more than almost anybody outside the Pentagon imagines.

At present, with about 235,000 U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam, the U.S. costs are running at a yearly rate of more than $13 billion. Costs, it should be observed at once, cannot be translated mechanically into expenditures; a drawdown on inventories involves a cost, but may not involve an expenditure for quite some time. Still, if the war continues at only the present rate through fiscal 1967 (the year beginning next July 1), the resulting Defense Department expenditures will probably exceed the $10 billion or so that the hefty 1967 defense budget officially allows for the Vietnam war.

But the war, it appears, will get bigger. U.S. Senators who know what Defense Department witnesses say in closed congressional hearings have predicted a U.S. buildup to 400,000 men, or more. General William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, has reportedly requested a buildup to 400,000 by the end of December. With that many U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam, the cost of the war would run to $21 billion a year—even more if bombing and tactical air support increases in proportion to the buildup on the ground. At any such level the Vietnam war would bring on economic strains beyond what most economists appear to foresee, and beyond what makers of public policy appear to be anticipating. The strains would surely add to the pressure for higher taxes.

In its Vietnam cost accounting, Fortune had considerable help from outside economists, but no access to classified data. The basic sources were public documents—federal budgets, Defense Department publications, transcripts of congressional hearings. Defense Department officials interviewed were persistently wary of discussing the costs of the war, although the department proved willing to provide some missing bits of factual information that would otherwise have been unobtainable. It turned out that some costs—of ammunition, for example—could be easily calculated from published Defense Department figures. But getting at some other costs required elaborate calculations, and still others could only be estimated. Estimates and assumptions were in all cases conservative. The results, set forth by category below, represent what is probably the first serious effort outside the Defense Department to analyze the costs of the war.

The purpose of the undertaking was not to make a case against (or for) the fiscal 1967 defense budget, but to provide a basis for looking beyond the budget and assessing the potential economic effects of the war. In wartime no defense budget can sensibly be viewed as a hard forecast of defense spending. Actual expenditures during the fiscal year will be determined by unfolding events that no budgeter can foresee months in advance. So far as the economy is concerned, then, what counts is not budget projections but Defense Department orders and expenditures.

The costs and expenditures resulting from a war do not match up in the short run. They rise and decline in different trajectories. In the early phases of any war, the Defense Department can hold down expenditures by drawing upon existing forces and supplies, just as a business firm can temporarily reduce cash outlays by letting inventories dwindle, or a family can cut next month's grocery bill by eating up the contents of the pantry. Later on in the war, expenditures catch up with costs. It must be kept in mind that "expenditures," as used here means *incremental* expenditures—those that would not be required if it were not for the war.

An idea of the movements of costs and expenditures and defense orders, and their changing economic effects, can be gathered from the following budgetary-economic scenario of a medium-sized war—i.e., a war not very different from the one in Vietnam.

A WAR IN FIVE ACTS

Act I: It looks like a small war, and it requires only smallish incremental expenditures. The forces sent overseas are members of the existing defense establishment, and the Defense Department would have had to pay, feed, and otherwise provide for them if they were doing peacetime duties in Georgia instead of fighting guerrillas in a tropical republic. The weapons, ammunition, and equipment come from existing stocks. The extra expenses (hostile-fire pay, transportation) can be temporarily absorbed in the immensity of the defense budget, and the Administration does not have to ask Congress for supplemental appropriations to finance the war. It is being financed, in effect, through "reduced readiness"—that is, the U.S. has fewer trained men and smaller stocks of war materiel to deploy or use in any other contingencies.

Act II: The struggle has expanded, and the armed forces need extra inflows of men and materiel to compensate for the unexpectedly large outflows to the war zone. The Pentagon places contracts for additional arms, ammunition, equipment; it expands draft calls and recruitment efforts. The Administration asks Congress for supplemental appropriations. War expenditures are still only moderate, but with defense orders increasing and inflationary expectations beginning to stir, the war is already having noticeable effects upon the economy.

Act III: The U.S. buildup in the war zone has continued. The Administration has asked Congress for large supplemental appropriations. Spending still lags behind costs, but it is rising fast—the recruits in training have to be paid, and so do the additional civilians hired. The war's economic effects, moreover, are expansionary out of all proportion to the actual increases in defense spending: the surge in defense orders has increased demand for skilled workers, materials, components, and credit in advance of deliveries and payments. To some extent, the Defense Department's materiel buildup is being temporarily financed by the funds that contractors and subcontractors borrow from banks against future payments from the U.S. Treasury.

Act IV: The U.S. military buildup in the war zone tops out. Defense production continues to rise, but the rate of rise is much less rapid than in Act III, and the expansionary economic force exerted by the war begins to wane. Deliveries of arms, ammunition, and equipment rolling into military depots more than match the chew-up of materiel in the war, and so some replenishment of inventories takes place. Men are moving out of training and into operating units faster than forces are being sent overseas, and so there is a net buildup of trained deployable military forces in the U.S. Expenditures catch up with costs.

Act V. The war ends. The drop-off in contract awards and the collapse of inflationary expectations reverberate throughout the economy. Far from falling steeply, expenditures continue to rise a bit before entering into a gradual decline: the incoming deliveries must be paid for, and the men brought into the armed forces must be provided for until they are mustered out. With deliveries no longer partly offset by wartime chew-up, inventories fill rapidly, and begin to overflow. During the period of readjustment, military manpower and military inventories exceed normal peacetime requirements. Expenditures for this excess readiness largely make up for the expenditures deferred through reduced readiness in the early phases of the war.

In January, 1965, the Vietnam war was still in Act I, and to all appearances nobody in the Administration expected an Act II. The President's budget message declared that, with the "gains already scheduled," U.S. military forces would "be adequate to their tasks for years to come." The new budget projected a *decrease* in defense spending in fiscal 1966, and a *decline* in total uniformed personnel. Major General D. L. Crow, then controller of the Air Force, subsequently testified at a congressional hearing that "the guidelines for the preparation of the budget as they pertain to Vietnam were actually a carry-forward of the guidelines that were used in the preparation of the 1965 budget, and they did not anticipate increased activity, per se, in Vietnam."

IT'S NOW ACT III

Not until last May was it entirely evident that Act II had begun, but there were intimations earlier. In January, 1965, after declining for four consecutive quarters, the Federal Reserve Board index of "defense equipment" production turned upward, beginning the precipitous climb. In February the U.S. began bombing targets in North Vietnam. In March the decline in Army uniformed personnel came to a halt, though the downtrend continued for a while in the other services. In April the U.S. buildup in Vietnam accelerated. In May the Administration asked for, and Congress quickly voted, a supplemental fiscal 1965 appropriation of $700 million. In June the decline in total uniformed military personnel turned into a steep rise.

The Vietnam war is now well along in Act III of the budgetary-economic scenario. Since that $700-million request in May, 1965, the Administration has asked for $14 billion in supplemental war appropriations. Soaring orders for ammunition and uniforms have contributed to shortages of copper and textiles for civilian use. So far, however, the costs of the war have been largely channeled into reduced readiness. The war reserve of "combat consumables" has been drawn down. New equipment and spare parts that otherwise would have gone to units elsewhere have been diverted to Vietnam—Iroquois helicopters, for example, that would have gone to the Seventh Army in Germany. Fixed-wing aircraft to replace losses in Vietnam have been ordered, but not yet fully delivered and paid for. The war has required only moderate incremental expenditures (that must be understood, however, to mean "moderate" as war expenditures go—a few billion dollars). But as deliveries roll in and the armed forces expand, expenditures will begin to catch up with the war's far from moderate costs.

In numbers of U.S. servicemen deployed, the Vietnam war is not as big as the Korean war at its peak. But costs per man run much higher than they did in the Korean war. The pay that servicemen get has gone up more than 40 percent since then. Some matériel costs have risen very steeply since Korea. The F-86D fighters in Korea cost about $340,000 each; the F-4C's in South Vietnam cost nearly six times as much. Ammunition use per combat soldier is very much higher than in the Korean war. The M-14 rifle fires up to 150 rounds per minute, and ten rounds per minute at a sustained rate. The M-16, carried by some Special Forces troops, can use up ammunition at a full-automatic rate of 750 rounds per minute. The M-79 grenade launcher fires grenades as if they were bullets.

The nature of the war contributes to making it peculiarly expensive for its size. Technologically sophisticated military forces, magnificently equipped to kill and destroy, are inefficiently employed against meager or elusive targets. In Korea, there were visible masses of enemy forces to shoot at, and the U.S. superiority in weapons could be exerted efficiently; in Vietnam the enemy hits and runs, moves under cover of darkness or foliage. With their abundant firepower, the superb U.S. fighting men in South Vietnam clobber the Vietcong in shooting encounters, but the U.S. forces run up huge costs—in troop supplies, fuel, helicopter maintenance—just trying to find some guerrillas that they can shoot at.

FIRING INTO A CONTINENT

There is an almost profligate disparity between the huge quantities of U.S. bullets and bombs poured from the air upon targets in Vietnam and the military and economic damage the bullets and bombs do, in the aggregate. In North Vietnam the U.S. has debarred itself from attacking economically valuable targets such as port facilities and manufacturing plants. From bases in Thailand, F-105's fly over North Vietnam and drop their mighty payloads on or near roads, rail lines, ferry facilities, bridges. The costs to the enemy of repairing the damage are picayune compared to the costs to the U.S. of doing the damage. In South Vietnam the guerrillas seldom present concentrated targets. Machine guns mounted on helicopters and on A-47's (elderly C-47's, modified and fitted with three guns) fire streams of bullets into expanses of jungle and brush that are believed to conceal Vietcong guerrillas. The thought of an A-47 firing up to 18,000 rounds per minute into treetops brings to mind that bizarre image in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, of the French warship off the African coast: "There wasn't even a shed there, and she was shelling the bush . . . firing into a continent."

B-52's, operating at a cost of more than $1,300 per hour per plane, fly a ten-hour round trip from Guam to South Vietnam to strike at an enemy that has no large installations or encampments visible from the air. The B-52's have been fitted with extra racks that increase their payloads to more than sixty 750-pound bombs, about $30,000 worth of bombs per plane. "The bomb tonnage that is resulting is literally unbelievable," said Secretary McNamara at a Senate hearing last January. Several weeks later, at a press conference, he said: "Our consumption in February . . . of air-delivered munitions alone in South Vietnam was two and a half times the average monthly rate in the three years of the Korean war." But much of that "literally unbelievable" bomb tonnage merely smashes trees and blasts craters in the earth.

Only a rich nation can afford to wage war at ratios so very adverse. But the U.S. *is* a rich nation. If there is a great disparity between the bomb power dropped and the economic value of the targets, there is also a great disparity between the wealth and power of the U.S. and of the enemy. The cost of the bombs is small in relation to the G.N.P. of the U.S., and the damage they do is sometimes substantial in relation to the G.N.P. of North Vietnam, or to the resources available to the Vietcong. But the costs of winning are going to be unpleasantly large.

The official position of the Defense Department is that it does not know what the costs of the war are, and that it does not even try to compute them. As a Pentagon official put it: "We have no intention of cost-accounting the war in Vietnam. Our business is to support the conflict there. Our business is not cost accounting. We have no estimates of costs. It's not practical to say the war has cost x dollars to date."

The Defense Department argues that the war costs are commingled with those of a military establishment that existed before the U.S. troop buildup in South Vietnam began. And that, of course, is true. Still, a meaningful total can be arrived at by analyzing and adding up the various war costs, regardless of whether they translate immediately into added expenditures. One way or another, we may assume, all costs will result in either added expenditures or reduced readiness, and in the reckoning of the costs it does not matter which, or when, or how.

Fortune's first objective was to arrive at an approximation of annual costs at the early-1966 level of 200,000 U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam. The results of that analysis can serve, in turn, as a basis for calculating costs at higher levels of buildup. In what follows, costs are divided into standard categories—military personnel, operation and maintenance, and procurement—that the Defense Department uses in its budgeting. To outsiders, the department's assignment of expenses to these categories sometimes seems at bit arbitrary. Some clothing is funded under personnel and some under operation and maintenance; ordinary repair parts are funded under O. and M., aircraft "spares" under procurement.

INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE THEATRE

Military personnel. As noted, the fiscal 1966 defense budget, submitted in January, 1965, projected a moderate *decline* in total uniformed military personnel ("active forces"), from about 2,663,000 at that time to 2,640,000 as of June 30, 1966. Actually, the decline proceeded so briskly that the total got down to 2,641,000 in May, 1965. Since then the Defense Department has announced plans to *increase* military personnel to 2,987,000 by next June 30, and to add on another 106,000 by June 30, 1967; by the latter date, the total would be 452,000 above the May, 1965, low point. In addition the department is expanding the civilian payroll by about 100,000 during fiscal 1966, and many of these civilians will take over work previously done by servicemen, freeing them for other duties.

It might appear that these figures could serve as a basis for calculating the personnel costs attributable to the Vietnam war. But it is impossible, without knowing the Defense Department's classified plans and assumptions, to relate the announced personnel increases to any particular force level in South Vietnam. And to have any meaning, statements about the cost of the Vietnam war must be related to specified force levels. Here we are trying to get the cost of the war at a particular level—200,000 U.S.

servicemen in South Vietnam. For this reckoning, the war personnel costs may be taken as the combined personnel costs of (1) the 200,000 men in Vietnam, (2) the peripheral supporting forces in Southeast Asia, and (3) the required backup forces. The Defense Department defines personnel costs as pay and allowances, subsistence (chow), personal clothing (the "clothing bag" issued to each recruit), plus certain other expenses. Average personnel costs in the armed forces run to $5,100 per man per year, but the men in South Vietnam get "hostile-fire pay" of $65 a month, and other war costs boost the average to about $6,200. So, 200,000 men at $6,200, or $1,240,000,000.

The peripheral supporting forces—mainly aboard Seventh Fleet ships and at bases in Thailand—numbered at least 50,000 last winter, when the U.S. force level in South Vietnam reached 200,000. That's 50,000 men at $6,200 a year, or $310 million.

Each thousand U.S. servicemen stationed overseas under non-war conditions have on the average about 600 other servicemen backing them up: trainees, transients, men serving in supply units or performing various auxiliary functions. But it takes far more than 600 men to back up a thousand men deployed in South Vietnam. Additional supply men are required to keep the huge quantities of arms, ammunition, equipment, and supplies moving into the theatre of war. The men serving there are rotated home after a one-year tour (a three-year tour is normal for U.S. forces in Western Europe), and additional trainees are needed to support the rotation. Extra backup men are needed, also, to make up for the erosion resulting from deaths, severe injuries, and tropical ailments. In the course of a month, large numbers of men spend some days or weeks in transit to or from South Vietnam. And additional men in training require additional men to train them. With all the additions, it works out that there is a ratio of one to one, or 1,000 to 1,000, between servicemen in the theatre of war and servicemen outside the theatre but assignable to the war as elements of cost.

For the 250,000 men in Vietnam and vicinity, then, there will be 250,000 others elsewhere. Since some of these are new recruits, the average personnel cost is taken to be only $4,700. That makes another $1,175,000,000, bringing total personnel costs to $2,275,000,000.

KEEPING THEM FLYING

Operation and maintenance. This category is even more capacious than its name suggests. It includes everything that does not fall into other categories—recruitment, training, medical care, repairs, operation of supply depots, transport of goods, and, in the official expression, "care of the dead." A great many of those additional civilians hired by the Defense Department in the last several months are working in O. and M.

In fiscal 1965, O. and M. for the entire armed forces averaged out to $4,630 per man. For 500,000 men that would come to $2,315,000,000. But the Vietnam war entails extraordinary O. and M. expenses. Planes there fly a lot more hours per month than they normally do, and the extra O. and M. involved in keeping them flying runs at a rate of more than $200 million a year. Extra repair and maintenance are required to keep vehicles moving and equipment working. An enormous logistic flow must be coped with—more than 700,000 tons a month. The shipping costs to Vietnam amount to $225 million at a yearly rate. Combat clothing gets ripped up in the bush, deteriorates rapidly in the moist tropical heat. And, of course, extra medical care per man is needed in a tropical war. When all the extra O. and M. costs involved are added together, the total, by a conservative reckoning, comes to $1 billion. That brings the over-all O. and M. costs *$3,315,000,000.*

Procurement, i.e., matériel costs. As reckoned here, these are taken to be the chew-up in the war zone rather than the additional procurement resulting from the war. Ammunition and aircraft losses together account for more than 75 percent of matériel costs, and for both categories the costs can be calculated with some statistical precision.

McNamara reported last January that U.S. ground forces in South Vietnam, including Army and Marine helicopter units, were "consuming ammunition at the rate of about $100 million per month," and that U.S. air forces were using up "air munitions" (mostly bombs) at a rate of about $110 million per month. That works out to a combined rate of $2.5 billion a year. At that time there were about 190,000 U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam, so for the calculation of costs at the 200,000-man level, the figure has to be adjusted upward a bit, to *$2,650,000,000.*

In testifying at congressional hearings, McNamara and other Defense Department witnesses furnished numerous bits of information about U.S. aircraft operations in the Vietnam war, including losses in 1965 and numbers of sorties over various periods (one flight by one plane counts as one sortie). Sorties per month increased dramatically during 1965, and despite low loss rates per 1,000 sorties, losses added up to large numbers over the course of the year: 275 fixed-wing aircraft lost as a result of "hostile action" alone, and 177 helicopters lost, 76 as a result of "hostile action," 101 in accidental crashes and other mishaps. Assuming continuation of 1965 ratios between sorties and losses, estimated annual attrition at a 200,000-man force level works out, in rounded figures, like this:

475 fixed-wing tactical planes @$1,800,000	$855,000,000
165 other fixed-wing planes (transport, observation) @$200,000	33,000,000
320 helicopters @$250,000	80,000,000
	$968,000,000

A figure for aircraft spares was arrived at by first calculating total flying costs of the aircraft operations (information on average flying costs per hour for various types of military aircraft is available). That came to $800 million a year. Spares represent, on average, 20 percent of flying costs, which comes to $160 million. With the addition of a minimal $25 million to allow for spares required to repair planes hit by enemy fire, the total for aircraft spares comes to $185 million.

Little information is available about matériel chew-up, apart from ammunition and aircraft. In the absence of direct evidence, however, Defense Department procurement orders provide a basis for rough estimates. It is assumed—and this is a bit of a leap—that the annual attrition of weapons, vehicles, and equipment is equivalent to one-third of the increase in procurement orders in those categories (as measured by the increase in prime contract awards from the second half of 1964 to the second half of 1965). From that procedure emerges a round figure of $600 million for attrition of hard goods other than aircraft, ammunition, and ships (in effect, ship losses are assumed to be zero). That brings total procurement to $4.4 billion.

The three categories together—military personnel, O. and M., procurement—add up to $10,440,000,000. That is the approximate annual cost of the U.S. operations in the Vietnam war at the 200,000-man level reached early this year. To that figure must be added support for South Vietnamese military forces. (For fiscal 1967, military assistance to South Vietnam will be included in the defense budget.) Counting supplemental requests, total military aid to South Vietnam comes to more than $1 billion in the current fiscal year. In the early 1960's military aid to South Vietnam ran to something like $100 million a year; the $900-million difference can be considered a Vietnam war cost. In addition, the U.S. pays $50 million to help support South Korean forces in South Vietnam.

Much of the $1.4 billion that Congress has appropriated in fiscal 1966 for military construction in Southeast Asia has to be counted as part of the Vietnam war cost. According to Secretary McNamara's testimony at a Senate hearing, all of the contemplated construction "is associated with the operations in South Vietnam." Some of the facilities may have military value to the U.S. after the war is over, but it seems reasonable to suppose that at least $1 billion of the planned construction would not have been undertaken had it not been for the war. If that is spread over two years, construction adds $500 million a year to the cost of the war.

That brings the grand total to $11.9 billion a year. This figure does not allow for an important deferred cost, depreciation of equipment. Since the Defense Department does not pay taxes or operate in terms of profit and loss, the business-accounting concept of depreciation is hard to apply, but the wearing out of equipment is a reality whether it is cost-accounted or not. This wear-out is a separate cost from the additional maintenance and repair required to keep planes and ground equipment operating in the Vietnam war. Tactical planes and Military Airlift Command planes involved in the war are flying 60 percent more hours per month than they normally do in peacetime, and even with extra maintenance their useful lives are being shortened. The consequences will show up in future defense budgets.

In addition, the war imposes substantial nonmilitary costs that are not included in the $11.9 billion (or in the other war-cost figures that follow). U.S. economic aid to South Vietnam, for example, leaped from $269 million in fiscal 1965 to $621 million in the current year.

MORE MEN FOR PATROL, SEARCH, PURSUIT, ATTACK

The $11.9 billion may be taken as the annual military cost of sustaining the war with 200,000 U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam—the level reached around February 1. Given that yardstick, it is a relatively simple matter to cost out the present level (about 235,000 in South Vietnam). It can be assumed that costs have increased since February in direct proportion to the buildup, except that construction costs and military aid to South Vietnam remain unchanged. So calculated, the current cost works out, at an annual rate, to $13.7 billion—the "more than $13 billion" mentioned at the beginning of this article.

Efforts to project costs at very much higher levels of buildup run into some uncertainties. Costs at the 400,000-man level—the level General Westmoreland is reportedly aiming for by the end of this year—would not be double those at 200,000. For one thing, the expansion of U.S. forces will itself tend to alter the character of the war. Indeed, it has already. The widening U.S. superiority in firepower forced the enemy to cut down on direct assaults by battalions and regiments and revert pretty much to guerrilla warfare. As the number of G.I.'s in South Vietnam increases, the forces needed to guard the coastal enclaves will not have to increase proportionately, so a larger percentage of the total combat-battalion strength will be available for patrol, search, pursuit, and attack operations. Some costs, as a result, will increase faster than the number of U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam—e.g., Fortune has assumed a 5 percent increase in the rates of ground and helicopter ammunition use per 100,000 men.

But in some respects costs would not nearly double as we built up to 400,000. The existing construction plans, for example, provide for port facilities, roads and installations beyond current requirements. Costs of supporting South Vietnamese forces would not double either—South Vietnam's military and paramilitary forces already number about 600,000 men, and an increase of even 50 percent could not be squeezed out of a total population of 16 million. (An increase to 670,000 has been announced, however, and some upgrading of the military equipment and supplies furnished by the U.S. will undoubtedly occur.) Bombing and tactical air support operations would probably not double either: lack of runways would prevent that large an expansion.

In Fortune's calculation it was assumed that the 100 percent increase in U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam, from 200,000 to 400,000, would be accompanied by these less than proportionate increases: 50 percent in bombing and tactical air-support operations; 10 percent a year in construction costs; 15 percent in military aid to South Vietnam.

On these exceedingly conservative assumptions, the costs at 400,000 come to the resounding total of $21 billion a year.

To calculate Vietnam war costs during fiscal 1967 it is necessary to make some assumptions about the pace of the buildup. Fortune assumed that U.S. forces in South Vietnam would increase to 250,000 men by this June 30, expand steadily to reach 400,000 as of December 31, and then remain at that level. On this basis the prospective Vietnam war costs during fiscal 1967 work out to $19.3 billion.

USED-UP OPTIONS

The $58.3 billion defense budget for fiscal 1967 includes, by official reckoning, $10.3 billion in expenditures resulting from the Vietnam war. With a buildup to 400,000 in fiscal 1967, war expenditures during the year would greatly exceed this figure, but would not necessarily boost total defense spending as much as $9 billion. For one thing, Secretary McNamara can cut somewhat further than he already has into programs not directly connected with the war.

But not very far; McNamara's options for deferring expenditures in fiscal 1967 have been pretty well used up. The 1967 defense budget shows a total of $1.5 billion in cutbacks in military construction, strategic-missile procurement, and other non-Vietnam programs. In view of McNamara's economizing in recent years, there cannot be much leeway left for deferrals. The Secretary himself said not long ago that in shaping the 1967 budget he had deferred "whatever can be safely deferred," which suggests that there is *no* leeway any more.

He has also largely used up the options for restraining expenditures by drawing down inventories and reducing trained forces outside the war theatre. McNamara has vigorously insisted that "we have a great reservoir of resources," and he is undoubtedly right about that, especially if "a great reservoir" is interpreted to include the potential capacity of the U.S. economy to produce military goods. But he has overstated his case by arguing, in effect, that the Vietnam war has not reduced readiness at all (". . . far from overextending ourselves, we have actually strengthened our military position"). Counting peripheral supporting forces, the U.S. now has about 300,000 men deployed in the Vietnam war theatre, and (in keeping with this one-to-one ratio) another 300,000 men are committed to beefing them up. That makes 600,000 men unavailable for other contingencies. Since the low point in May, 1965, U.S. military manpower has increased by approximately 400,000 (this figure allows for substitution of civilians for uniformed personnel), and a lot of those 400,000 are men still in training. It would be remarkable indeed if all this had somehow "strengthened our military position."

Nor is there much left to draw down in military inventories. As shown in the middle row of charts on page 121, Defense Department expenditures for procurement declined sharply in fiscal 1965—by $3.5 billion, in fact. This decline in procurement apparently contributed to the Army shortages (of repair parts, communication equipment, helicopters, and trucks, among other things) discovered early last year by investigators of the U.S. Senate's Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Mississippi's Senator JOHN STENNIS. Pentagon witnesses tried to explain that the "shortages" were mere routine gaps between reality and ideal tables of equipment. But at one point South Carolina's Senator STROM THURMOND pinned down two Pentagon generals in this exchange:

Senator THURMOND. You have not denied those shortages, have you, General Abrams?

General ABRAMS. No.

Senator THURMOND. And you have not, General.

General CHESAREK. No.

Senator THURMOND. You do admit the shortages?

General CHESAREK. Yes. sir.

The combination of rising Vietnam requirements and thin, declining inventories led last year to surges in military production and orders far beyond what can be inferred from the official estimates of expenditures attributable to the Vietnam war. In the second half of calendar 1965, Defense Department prime contract awards ran $3.3 billion ahead of the corresponding period of 1964—$6.6 billion at an annual rate. In contrast, the Defense Department estimates fiscal 1966 expenditures for the Vietnam war at only $4.6 billion. Anyone trying to catch an intimation of things to come might do well to keep an eye on orders, rather than expenditure estimates. Orders are for real: if you want the stuff delivered in time, you've got to order it in time. But expenditure estimates are not binding upon anybody.

TRYING TO AVOID THE PILE-UP AT THE END

Since they are not for real, budgetary expenditure estimates are an exceedingly unreliable guide to the future. A better guide can be found in requests for appropriations. For the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 combined, the Defense Department has estimated Vietnam war expenditures at $15 billion, but for the same two fiscal years the department has already requested approximately $23 billion in Vietnam war appropriations.

Big as they look, however, these requests for war appropriations will almost certainly be added to long before the end of fiscal 1967. That probability can be inferred from on-the-record statements by Secretary McNamara and other Defense Department witnesses at congressional hearings.

The Defense Department has based its requests for war appropriations not upon a forecast of what will actually happen in the Vietnam war, but upon what a Pentagon official calls "calculated requirements." In calculating the "requirements" for any procurement item, the department considered the lead time—how far ahead you have to order the item to have it when you need it. For complex or precisely tooled military hardware, lead times may run to a year or more, and for such items—particularly aircraft and aircraft spares—the department allowed fully for expected losses and use-up to the end of fiscal 1967. But for items with shorter lead times, requirements were calculated tightly, on the assumption that later on they could be revised and McNamara could ask for supplemental appropriations.

Supplemental appropriations have come to be viewed as natural in wartime. And McNamara's policy of asking for funds "at the last possible moments," as he puts it, has its merits. By following that policy he hopes to avoid "overbuying" and any pile-up of surplus matériel at the end of the war. (When the Korean war ended, the military establishment had billions of dollars worth of excess goods in stock or on order.) But the policy implies that the Defense Department will have to ask for more funds before the end of fiscal 1967 unless there is some unexpected abatement in the war.

Of necessity, the 1967 defense budget was constructed upon working assumptions about how big the war will get and how long it will last, and given all the uncertainties, these cannot be expected to coincide with the realities. In estimating expenditures and appropriations for fiscal 1967, the Defense Department assumed that U.S. "combat operations" in Vietnam will not continue beyond June 30, 1967. In keeping with that assumption, the 1967 budget does not provide funds for orders of aircraft or other military goods to replace combat losses after that date. Here again the assumption implies that the Defense Department will need supplemental appropriations in fiscal 1967 if the war continues at even the present rate.

McNamara has not said in public what U.S. force level in South Vietnam is allowed for in the 1967 budget, and the explanations he has offered at congressional hearings have been deleted by Pentagon censors. But at a Senate hearing in January, General John P. McConnell, the Air Force chief of staff, indicated that, for the Air Force at least, the appropriations requested so far allow for little or no expansion of the war beyond the 200,000-man level. Said McConnell in reply to a question concerning the adequacy of the funds requested: "We don't have any problem if the war continues at about the same rate as now, Mr. Chairman."

These budgeting assumptions expressed and implied by McNamara and other Pentagon witnesses lead to a strong inference: by next January, if the war continues unabated until then at even the present rate, the Defense Department will have to ask for supplemental appropriations for long-lead-time items required in fiscal 1968 and shorter-lead-time items required in the last months of fiscal 1967. Some months before next January, indeed, perhaps this summer, the department will have to begin ordering very-long-lead-time items in anticipation of fiscal 1968 combat losses.

MOUNTING ASTONISHMENT AT THE BAD NEWS

It follows that if the U.S. buildup in South Vietnam proceeds to a much higher level, the supplemental requests will run into many billions before the end of fiscal 1967. And since the military establishment will have to procure a lot of additional equipment and supplies and bring in a lot of additional men, defense expenditures will rise billions of dollars above the estimate submitted last January.

So the 1967 budget barely begins to suggest the level of Vietnam war spending that probably lies ahead. The budget is not misleading once its rather sophisticated underlying assumptions are understood; but the assumptions are not widely understood, and the Administration has not made much of an effort to see that they are. There is likely to be mounting astonishment this year and next as the bad news about the war's costs and the implied message about taxes and inflation sink in. It's a good bet that Americans will still consider the war worth winning. There is no reason for them not to know its cost.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11487) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1966".

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

Sec. 101. Clauses (4) and (5) of subsection (a) of section 23 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D.C. Code, supp. V, 1966, sec. 25–124), are each amended by striking out "$1.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1.75".

Sec. 102. Subsection (a) of section 40 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D.C. Code, 1961, sec. 25–138), is amended by striking out "$1.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3.50".

Sec. 103. The increase in tax upon spirits, alcohol, and beer as provided by sections 101 and 102 of this title shall be applicable to all such beverages in the possession on the effective date of this title of the holder of a retailer's license under said District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

Sec. 104. Within twenty days after the effective date of this title, every holder on said effective date of a retailer's license under said District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act shall file with the Commissioners a sworn statement on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioners showing the quantities of spirits, alcohol and beer held or possessed by such licensee or anyone for him as of the beginning of the day on which this title becomes effective, or as of the beginning of the following day if the effective day be a Sunday, and shall, within twenty days after the effective date of this title, pay to the Commissioners the difference between the amount of tax imposed by the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act prior to the effective date of this title and the amount of tax imposed by sections 101 and 102 of this title.

Sec. 105. Every holder of a retailer's license under said District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act shall keep and preserve for a period of twelve months after the effective date of this title, the inventories and other records made which form the basis for the information furnished on the sworn statement required to be filed under this title.

Sec. 106. Any violation of the provisions of this title shall constitute a violation under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto.

Sec. 107. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT, 1925

Sec. 201. Subsection (j) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (43 Stat. 1119), as amended (D.C. Code 1961, sec. 40–603(j)), is further amended by striking out the figure and words "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure and word "3 per centum".

Sec. 202. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX ACT

Sec. 301. Subsection (c) of section 127 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, as amended (D.C. Code, supp. V, 1966, sec. 47–2604(c)), is amended by striking out the figure "4" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "5".

Sec. 302. Paragraph (q) of section 128 of said Act, as amended (D.C. Code 1961, sec. 47–2605(q)), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 303. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIGARETTE TAX ACT

Sec. 401. Subsection (a) of section 603 of the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act (63 Stat. 136, ch. 146. title VI), as amended (D.C. Code 1961, sec. 47–2802(a)), is amended by striking out the figure and word "2 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure and word "5 cents".

Sec. 402. The increase in tax upon cigarettes as provided by section 401 of this title, shall be applicable to all packages of cigarettes bearing District of Columbia tax stamps, and to all stamps in the possession, on the effective date of this title, of the holder of a wholesaler's, retailer's, or vending machine operator's license under said District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act.

Sec. 403. Within twenty days after the effective date of this title every holder on said effective date of a wholesaler's, retailer's, or vending machine operator's license under said District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act shall file with the Commissioners a sworn statement on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioners, showing, as of the beginning of the day on which this title becomes effective, or as of the beginning of the following day, if the effective date be a Sunday, the number of each kind of stamps denoting payment of District of Columbia cigarette taxes, held or possessed by such licensee or by anyone for him, including stamps affixed to packages of cigarettes.

The licensee, within twenty days after the effective date of this title, shall pay to the Commissioners the difference between the amount of tax represented by such stamps at the time of purchase and the amount of tax imposed by the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act, as amended by section 401 of this title.

Sec. 404. Every holder of a wholesaler's, retailer's, or vending machine operator's license under said District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act shall keep and preserve for a period of twelve months after the effective date of this title, the inventories and other records made which form the basis for the information furnished on the sworn statement required to be filed under this title.

Sec. 405. Any violation of the provisions of this title shall constitute a violation under the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto.

Sec. 406. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—FEDERAL PAYMENT

Sec. 501. In recognition of the unique character of the District of Columbia as the Nation's Capital City, regular annual payments are hereby authorized to be appropriated from revenues of the United States to cover the proper Federal share of the expenses of the government of the District, and such annual payments, when appropriated, shall be paid into the general fund of the District. The annual payment authorized shall be an amount equal to 25 per centum of the sum of all tax revenues, including that portion of the motor vehicle registration fees but excluding fees from licenses and other charges, which the Commissioners estimate will be credited during each fiscal year to the general fund of the District of Columbia, including, by way of illustration and not as a limitation, revenues estimated to be derived from those categories of taxes (including penalties and interest thereon) of which the following are representative: Property taxes, both realty and personal tangible; sales and gross receipts taxes; income taxes—individual, corporation franchise, and unincorporated business franchise; the real estate deed recordation tax; inheritance and estate taxes; and so much of the motor vehicle registration fees as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia from time to time determine shall be credited to the general fund, as authorized by section 3(d) of title IV of the Act approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 673, 681) as amended (sec. 40–103(d), D.C. Code).

Sec. 502. The Commissioners shall annually compute the amount of the Federal payment authorized to be appropriated under this title, and the amount of such authorization so computed, as approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall be submitted to the Congress together with any request for the appropriation of such payment. Each such computation shall be determined on the basis of estimates of the tax revenues referred to in section 501 of this title which are expected to be credited to the general fund during the fiscal year for which the annual payment is being computed: *Provided*, That the amount so determined shall be subject to review after such fiscal year, and if the Federal payment appropriated on the basis of the amount so determined is in excess of the amount determined on the basis of revenues actually received and credited to the general fund, such excess shall be refunded to the United States by the District of Columbia.

Sec. 503. Article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 361), as amended (secs. 47–2501a and 47–2501b, D.C. Code), and title I of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1085; secs. 47–134, D.C. Code), are repealed.

Sec. 504. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Payment Authorization Act".

Sec. 505. This title shall take effect with respect to fiscal years beginning on and after July 1, 1966.

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION FOR LOANS FROM THE UNITED STATES TREASURY

Sec. 601. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act approved June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), as amended (sec. 9–220(b), D.C. Code), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To assist in financing the cost of constructing facilities required for activities financed by the general fund of the District, the Commissioners are hereby authorized to accept loans for the District from the United States Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to lend to the Commissioners, such sums as may hereafter be appropriated for such purpose: *Provided*, That no loan made pursuant to this subsection shall cause the amount required to service the aggregate indebtedness of the District payable from the general fund to exceed 6 per centum of the total of the following: (1) the sum of the tax revenues, including that portion of the motor vehicle registration fees but excluding fees from licenses and other charges, which the Commissioners estimate will be credited to the general fund during the fiscal year for which request for such loan is made, including, by way of illustration and not as a limitation, revenues estimated to be derived from those categories of taxes (including penalties and interest thereon) of which the following are representative: Property taxes, both realty and personal tangible; sales and gross receipts taxes; income taxes—individual, corporation franchise, and unincorporated business franchise; the real estate deed recordation tax; inheritance and estate taxes; and so much of the motor vehicle registration fees as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia from time to time determine is to be credited to the general fund, as authorized by section 3(d) of title IV of the Act approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 673, 681), as amended (sec. 40–103(d), D.C. Code); and (2) the annual payment authorized to be made from revenues of the United States to cover the Federal share of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year for which such request for a loan is made: *Provided further,* That any loan for use in any fiscal year must first be specifically requested of the Congress: *And provided further,* That such approval shall not be construed to alter or to eliminate the procedures for consultation, advice, and recommendation provided in the National Capital Planning Act of 1952. Such loans, when advanced, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the general fund of the District."

SEC. 602. Subsection (f) of the first section of the Act approved June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), as amended (sec. 9–220(f), D.C. Code, 1961), is repealed.

SEC. 603. This title shall take effect with respect to fiscal years beginning on and after July 1, 1966.

TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX ACT OF 1947

SEC. 701. Section 3 of title VI of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 331; D.C. Code, sec. 47–1567b(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. IMPOSITION AND RATES OF TAX.—There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year upon the taxable income of every resident a tax at the following rates:

"Two and one-half per centum on the first $2,000 of taxable income.

"Three per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Three and one-half per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Four per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Four and one-half per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Five per centum on the taxable income in excess of $10,000."

SEC. 702. The amendment made by section 701 of this title shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

TITLE VIII—AMENDMENTS TO THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX

SEC. 801. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for a tax on motor vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved April 23, 1924 (43 Stat. 106; D.C. Code, sec. 47–1901), as amended, is amended by striking "6" and inserting in lieu thereof "7".

SEC. 802. Section 14 of such Act approved April 23, 1924 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1912), as amended, is amended by striking out "6" and inserting in lieu thereof "7".

SEC. 803. The amendments made by section 801 and 802 of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

TITLE IX—ABATEMENT OF TAXES

SEC. 901. The Commissioners are authorized to abate the unpaid portion of the assessment of any tax, or any liability in respect thereof, other than taxes on real property, if the Commissioners determine under uniform rules prescribed by them that the administration and collection costs involved would not warrant collection of the amount due.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1001. Subsection (a) of section 402 of the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 110; D.C. Code, sec. 7–133 (a)) is amended by striking "$50,250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$85,250,000".

SEC. 1002. As used in this Act, unless the context requires otherwise, the word "commissioners" shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the Distirct of Columbia, or its designated agent.

SEC. 1003. Any word or term used in any title of this Act, unless the context requires otherwise, shall have the same meaning as that applicable to such word or term in the Act to which such title applies.

SEC. 1004. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 1005. The Commissioners are authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 1006. The Commissioners are authorized to enter into such agreements with the States of Maryland and Virginia and with political subdivisions of such States as may be necessary to develop a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process for the National Capital region for the purpose of complying with the requirements of section 134 of title 23, United States Code, except that no such agreement shall require the District of Columbia to pay more than its pro rata share of the costs of such planning process. In developing such transportation planning process the Commissioners shall consult and cooperate with the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council. For the purpose of this section, the term "National Capital region" shall have the same meaning as is given it in section 103 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 537; D.C. Code, sec. 1–1401).

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I shall make a brief explanation about the purposes of the bill and a statement as to its provisions.

The purpose of this bill is:

First. To provide through various tax measures additional revenue urgently needed for financing District government activities that are supported from the District of Columbia general fund, which includes the cost of police, fire protection, education, health, welfare, courts, trash and refuse disposal, and various other general government functions.

Second. To provide for the enactment of a method for computing the annual Federal payment authorization—not appropriation—for the District of Columbia.

Third. To provide for the enactment of a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia government.

Fourth. To increase the District of Columbia tax on motor vehicle fuels from 6 to 7 cents per gallon.

Fifth. To increase the highway fund borrowing authority for highway construction from $50,250,000 to $85,250,000, an increase of $35 million.

Sixth. To authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to abate the unpaid portion of any tax when, in their judgment, the amount of money involved would not warrant the cost of collection.

And seventh, to authorize the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to participate with Maryland and Virginia authorities in comprehensive planning for transportation facilities for the National Capital region.

The general fund of the District of Columbia government will be improved by some $13,200,000 annually by virtue of passage of titles I, II, III, IV, and VII.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have incorporated at this point in my remarks a summary of the tax revenues, so that a full explanation may be made of exactly what each title does.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of District of Columbia tax revenues under H.R. 11487, as amended

<table>
<tr><th>Tax increase proposal</th><th>Increased annual yield</th><th>Remarks</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title I. Alcohol and spirits tax</td><td>$1,300,000</td><td>Increases tax from $1.50 to $1.75 per gallon. Proposed tax will place District rate below the rate in 18 States and above the rate in 15 States.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Title I, sec. 102. Increase of tax rate on beer</td><td>1,200,000</td><td>Increases tax from $1.50 to $3.50 per barrel. The proposed increase would leave the District rate lower than the rate in ⅓ the States.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Title II. Motor vehicle excise tax</td><td>1,500,000</td><td>Increases the motor vehicle excise tax from 2 to 3 percent. The proposed tax is the same rate as that in Maryland and 17 other States, and less than that in 8 others.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Title III. Increases sales tax on rooms and lodgings furnished transients.</td><td>500,000</td><td>Increases from 4 to 5 percent on sales or charges for rooms and accommodations furnished transients.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Title III, sec. 302. Repeals exemption from sales tax on gross receipts from cigarette sales.</td><td>1,300,000</td><td>This tax subjects cigarette sales to the District's 3-percent sales tax. At the present time, 24 States impose a retail sales tax on cigarette sales.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Title IV. Cigarette tax increase</td><td>3,400,000</td><td>Increases the cigarette tax rate from 2 to 5 cents per package. At the proposed rate, the District would have a tax rate less than 39 States and identical to that of 3 others.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Title VII. Increases the rate of the individual income tax</td><td>4,000,000</td><td>The taxable income to which present rates will apply are changed as follows:
<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Tax rates</th><th colspan="2">Taxable income brackets</th></tr>
<tr><th>Present</th><th>Proposed</th></tr>
<tr><td>2½ percent</td><td>$5,000</td><td>$2,000</td></tr>
<tr><td>3 percent</td><td>5,000</td><td>2,000</td></tr>
<tr><td>3½ percent</td><td>5,000</td><td>2,000</td></tr>
<tr><td>4 percent</td><td>5,000</td><td>2,000</td></tr>
<tr><td>4½ percent</td><td>5,000</td><td>2,000</td></tr>
<tr><td>5 percent</td><td>25,000</td><td>[1] 10,000</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Total, general fund</td><td>13,200,000</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

[1] $10,000 and over.

Individual income tax rates and taxable income brackets as of Jan. 1, 1966 (District of Columbia and States)

District and bordering States	Personal exemptions			Rates (percent) and taxable income brackets	Federal tax deductible	With-holding
	Single	Married	Dependent			
District of Columbia	$1,000	$2,000	$500	1st $5,000—2.5. Next $5,000—3. Next $5,000—3.5. Next $5,000—4. Next $5,000—4.5. Over $25,000—5.	No	Yes.
Maryland	800	1,600	800	Earned income—3 Investment income over $500—5.	No	Yes.
Virginia	1,000	2,000	200	1st $3,000—2. Next $2,000—3. Over $5,000—5.	No	Yes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AREA TAX COMPARISONS

Changes proposed in District taxes by the Senate District of Columbia Committee compared with current District taxes and with taxes in the other jurisdictions of the Washington metropolitan area:

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE

District of Columbia

Current rate: $1.50 per gallon on spirits and alcohol.

Proposed rate: $1.75 per gallon on spirits and alcohol.

Maryland

Rates: $1.50 per gallon on spirits. $2.50 per gallon on alcohol.

Virginia

Rates: Spirits and alcohol sold by the alcoholic beverage control board to consumers is taxed at the rate of 10 percent of the price charged in addition to any markup charged by the board.

BEER TAX

District of Columbia

Current rate: $1.50 per barrel of 31 gallons.

Proposed rate: $3.50 per barrel of 31 gallons.

Maryland

Rate: 93 cents per barrel of 31 gallons.

Virginia

Rate: $6 per barrel of 31 gallons.

MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAILER EXCISE TAX

District of Columbia

Current tax: 2 percent of fair market value.

Proposed tax: 3 percent of fair market value.

Maryland

Rate: 3 percent of fair market value.

Virginia

Rate effective on Sept. 1, 1966. 2 percent of fair market value.

GENERAL SALES AND USE TAX—TRANSIENT ACCOMMODATIONS

District of Columbia

Current tax: 4 percent on transient accommodations.

Proposed tax: 5 percent on transient accommodations.

Maryland

Rate: 3 percent on transient accommodations.

Virginia: Rate effective on Sept. 1, 1966. 2 percent on transient accommodations.

CIGARETTES (SALES TAX)

District of Columbia

Current: No sales tax on cigarettes.

Proposed: 3 percent of retail sales price.

Maryland

Rate: 3 percent of retail sales price.

Virginia

Rate effective on Sept. 1, 1966. 2 percent of retail sales price.

CIGARETTE TAX (OTHER THAN SALES TAX)

District of Columbia

Current: 2 cents package of 20 cigarettes.

Proposed: 5 cents per package of 20 cigarettes.

Maryland

Rate: 6 cents per package of 20 cigarettes.

Virginia

Rate: 3 cents per package of 20 cigarettes (reduced to 2.5 cents per package of 20 cigarettes as of Sept. 1, 1966).

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the needs for additional revenue are many. Titles I, II, III, IV, and VII of the bill are revenue taxing provisions designed to increase the revenues of the general fund of the District of Columbia in fiscal year 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter.

The general fund for the District of Columbia represents approximately 88 percent of the District's total budget. This fund provides the financial support for functions relating to law enforcement, education, health, welfare, and the various other government functions that relate to the operation of the District government.

The present financing for this important general fund poses a critical problem for the District government as the budget requirements are rising more rapidly than available revenue. This is demonstrated by the fact that in fiscal 1967, it is estimated that local taxes and appropriation of the presently authorized Federal payment of $50 million, plus the normal use of existing loan authority, will provide only $346.7 million of the $371 million budgeted in the general fund for District expenses. Thus, it can be seen that additional revenue of $24.3 million is necessary to finance the 1967 general fund budget. H.R. 11487, as amended, would close this gap by providing increased local tax revenues of approximately $13 million. The remaining deficit would be met through funds appropriated from the increased Federal payment authorization contained in this amended bill.

Between the fiscal years 1960 and 1966, District government operating costs alone increased $107.8 million. Of this 6-year increase in operating expenses, personnel costs such as pay raises and other benefits accounted for 53.2 percent of the total increase. The remaining 46.8 percent of the increase represents expanded and new programs. Of this, public schools accounted for 13.4 percent; public safety, 10.2 percent; and health and welfare, 15 percent.

Proposed or now before Congress are pending salary increases for District policemen, firemen, teachers, and classified employees calling for an annual $9,444,246 expenditure with District policemen to receive $2,335,200; firemen, $1,001,400; teachers, $3,586,880; and classified employees, $2,520,766. Therefore, a major percentage of the $13 million revenues sought in the pending bill, is potentially allocated.

To combat the rising crime rate in the District and raise the quality of law enforcement, an increase of $6.7 million is needed for the District agencies concerned with public safety. In an effort to make more effective use of the recently enlarged police strength, police department plans for fiscal 1967 include establishing a planning and development unit to develop ways to improve police operations, adding civilian clerks to relieve policemen of clerical duties, continuing a tactical force, and installing a closed-circuit television network.

Additional funds are also needed to increase the number of trainees in the highly successful police cadet program and to finance a stepped-up recruitment program for police officers in the District. Efforts to bring the police force up to its authorized strength will require recruiting teams to canvass communities east of the Mississippi River, and to place advertisements in various media to seek out potential officers. This program is deemed highly important. For a number of years, the actual strength of the Metropolitan Police Department has never reached the full authorized strength. Since January 1966, the Department's authorized strength has been 3,100 men, while on May 2, 1966, the actual number of officers on duty totaled 2,885 men.

This is one of the problems that was presented to us in our consideration of the salary bills. I am sure that I speak for the Congress, and for the committee of which I am honored to be the chairman, when I say that we shall explore every method of bringing the police force up to that strength. This requires additional recruiting, and it may require additional salaries and similar inducements.

Significant increases in the school population and the over-65 age population in recent years have placed heavy demands on the District school system and its welfare and health programs. During the last 10 years, for example, the school-age population increased 15 percent and the over-65 age group rose 24 percent, while the working-age population decreased 4 percent.

It is estimated that by 1971 some 167,000 children will be enrolled in the public school system, which is an increase of 18 percent over the present enrollment of 142,000. Thus, in addition to eliminating part-time sessions and providing suitable physical facilities in the years ahead, it will be necessary to provide a considerable number of new teaching positions to maintain approved pupil-teacher ratio throughout the system.

The operating costs per year of public education in the District rose $28.6 million over the period 1959–65. Aside from general actions on personnel which accounted for $15.9 million of this increase, two other major factors led to higher costs for education. The first of these was the necessity to provide 1,035 additional teachers to educate 29,000 more pupils in 1965 than in 1959. The second was the city's effort, supported by the Congress, to achieve a relationship of pupils to teachers in regular classes of 30 to 1 in elementay schools and 25 to 1 in secondary schools. It is apparent that an additional increment in these costs for purposes of improving education will be needed for the years ahead.

It is estimated that the operation of the District school system will require an additional $6.9 million in fiscal 1967 for such items as special classroom teachers, an expanded professional staff, and maintenance of new buildings. These actions are necessary if progress toward the requirements of a modern school system is to be continued.

Other areas in which demand for service are rising include public health, welfare, and vocational rehabilitation. In fiscal 1967, these programs are expected to cost almost $9 million more. In order to meet the basic needs of the poor, the aged, and disabled, additional funds are needed to finance programs providing emergency assistance, broaden the assistance program of needy children of the unemployed in conjunction with job training and job placement for the parents of these children, and expand the mental health services.

Mr. President, there is a pressing need to replace and renew many District facilities, as well as to provide additional ones.

The capital outlay program planned for fiscal 1967 calls for an expenditure of $62 million. The critical shortage of classroom space has forced some 2,100 District children to accept part-time education. A $32.9 million school-construction program is planned in fiscal 1967 involving some 35 new replacement and enlargement projects. Other pending capital outlay projects for 1967 include work on a new central library; plans for three new swimming pools and construction of one; the addition of an industrial arts building for the Department of Corrections, a shop building for the Children's Center, and a school activities building at Junior Village; the acquisition of a site for a new health center; and a preliminary survey in connection with additional District buildings at the municipal center. An outlay of $8.5 million is also scheduled in the coming fiscal year as the District's second payment toward its share of the cost of the rapid transit system.

The District has taken maximum advantage of Federal grants-in-aid and other Federal financial assistance programs. They represent funds made available for specific purposes to all State and local governments but do not include the annual Federal payment made directly to the District of Columbia.

It is estimated that the District will receive about $118 million for its share of this Federal assistance during 1967. Federal assistance includes grants that have been in effect for many years such as highway aid, urban renewal, public assistance grants, and school lunch programs. In the last few years, the earlier grants have been augmented sharply by programs providing for impact aid for schools, the Education Act of 1965, the Economic Opportunity Act, medical assistance for the aged, maternal and infant care and many others.

These funds are an important source of additional financing for the District, but do not diminish in any way the basic responsibility for meeting the social and economic needs of the community from District resources.

Your District Committee has through the years consistently favored obtaining the major share of District revenues from local taxes and thus urges adoption of the proposed tax program as the first step toward meeting the District's revenue needs. It is also believed that a comprehensive solution of the District's revenue problem must include a change in the method of determining the annual Federal payment and the borrowing authority for the general fund as incorporated in this amended bill.

The proposed tax measures of H.R. 11487, as amended, on a full yearly basis are expected to provide increased revenue in the amount of $13.2 million.

Title VII of the bill, as illustrated in the chart previously inserted, into this RECORD, would increase District individual income taxes by reducing taxable income brackets from the present $5,000 to $2,000 to which existing rates ranging from 2½ to 5 percent would apply. This increase in individual income taxes would yield additional annual revenue of $4 million. A comparison of the District individual income tax with the income taxes of Maryland and Virginia shows that for most individuals and families the present $5,000 bracket system results in a substantially lighter income tax burden for District residents. In both Virginia and Maryland the maximum tax rate is applied at a lower level of taxable income. Under the proposed $2,000 bracket system, District income tax liability throughout the income scale will be more comparable to such liability in Maryland and Virginia. Tax liabilities on District residents will continue to be somewhat lower than those on Maryland residents for income levels up to $10,000, and lower than those on Virginia residents at most levels of income.

This proposed change would not increase the income tax of the typical family of four with an income of $5,000, which would remain at $38. The $7,500 and $10,000 income families would be increased by $8 and $25, respectively, but would still be taxed at a lower amount than in Maryland and Virginia. The $15,000 family would have its income tax increased by $90, and would move from third place in the area to about a midpoint between Maryland and Virginia. Exhibits on pages 63 and 64 of the printed committee hearings on proposed amendments to H.R. 11487 compare in detail with all of the States the present District income tax burden as well as that which would prevail upon enactment of the proposed increases.

The maximum amount of increase for any person would be $225 a year, which would apply to a person with a net taxable income of $27,000 or more, in general, to persons with a gross income of about $30,000 or more.

In proposing an increase in the transient room sales tax of 4 to 5 percent which will provide annual revenues in the amount of $500,000, the committee was of the view that every favorable consideration possible should be given to increasing substantially the annual appropriation to the Washington Convention Visitors' Bureau. This Bureau performs the important function of promoting tourism and convention business in the city of Washington, and for that reason adequate promotion funds should be made available to the Bureau in order that it can bring to the city such business activity as will continue to assist and to benefit the many fine hotels and other lodgings places in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. President, title V of the bill proposes to increase the annual Federal payment authorization for the general fund of the District government. This legislation would provide a method of establishing the annual Federal payment authorization for the District of Columbia. Under present law, the annual authorized Federal payment is a fixed amount, and since 1964, it has been set at $50 million annually.

Under this title, the method to be adopted would establish the level of the annual Federal payment authorization at 25 percent of the District local tax revenues including the revenues obtained through the motor vehicle registration.

The following tax revenues would be included in the base of the proposal for determining the Federal payment authorization: Income and franchise taxes, sales and gross receipts taxes, property taxes, inheritance and estate taxes, and deed recordation tax, general fund portion of motor vehicle registration revenue.

The implementation of this proposed method for establishing the authorized Federal payment envisions a steady growth in the authorized payment in proportion to revenue returns. This is illustrated by an estimated projection for the next 6 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have incorporated at this point in my remarks a summary of estimated Federal payment authorizations proposed by this title for the years ahead.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal payment summary

	Estimated local general fund tax and motor vehicle registration fees	Federal payment as 25 percent of estimated revenues (millions of dollars)
Fiscal year:		
1967	256.7	64.2
1968	270.3	67.6
1969	287.7	71.9
1970	305.8	76.5
1971	321.5	80.4
1972	337.7	84.4

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the Congress and the President have consistently recognized the unique responsibility of the Federal Government for the District of Columbia as the Federal City and the Congress has regularly provided payments to help defray the costs of operating the District.

Varying amounts of Federal support were provided to the District of Columbia over the years. During the first 89 years of the Capital City's existence, the Federal Government appropriated an average of approximately 40 percent of the cost of local government, though the amounts were not explicitly determined on any consistent basis. Beginning in 1879, the level of Federal participation was set at a flat 50 percent of total expenditures, an arrangement which was maintained for 42 years. Between 1921 and 1924 the Federal share was set at 40 percent of District expenditures. Since then, Congress has enacted lump-sum authorizations which have varied over the years.

On five occasions since World War II, Congress has increased the lump-sum Federal payment authorization raising it from a wartime level of $6 to $50 million. In each case, within a few years, the level established became inadequate as the needs of the District grew in response to changes in the District's population, greater demands for Government service, and a decline in the real value of the dollar. During this same period, taxes imposed on District residents also were increased substantially in response to needs. While increases in the Federal payment authorization have been made by Congress from time to time, its growth has been irregular and has had no consistent relationship to annual needs. Instead, what is needed is an equitable and systematic method of determining annually the relative amounts to be provided by District taxpayers and the Federal Government.

Your district committee believes strongly that a Federal payment authorization based on a percentage of local tax revenue would provide a constantly updated measure of what it feels is an equitable sum to supplement District revenues. This would enable the District to compute the Federal payment authorization at the time of its earliest budgetary planning and would make it possible for the District to assess its probable total resources from local sources and the Federal Government so that priorities could be established among competing needs. In this way the District will be able to evaluate and present its recommendations to the Congress regarding the level at which its programs should go forward in a reasonable and orderly fashion.

It should be pointed out that this proposal does not involve any kind of an automatic payment of Federal funds for District purposes. The District government would not be able to spend either local revenues or the Federal payment authorization that is not explicitly appropriated by Congress. The District budget would continue to be reviewed and justified each year before the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. Under this proposal, the Congress can be assured that the Federal payment authorization will increase only as revenues from local taxes increase. Except for the establishment of the property tax rates which has been delegated to the Commissioners, any changes in local taxes must be enacted by Congress.

Throughout much of the history of the District of Columbia, the Federal payment was based upon a percentage of the total appropriation. For several reasons, it is felt that relating the Federal payment to local revenues is more appropriate. In the first place, it would tend to avoid any criticism that the District might seek to spend more money in an effort to increase the Federal payment. Second, this method provides the District an incentive to keep local taxes at a realistic level since the authorized Federal payment would be tied directly to local tax effort in a ratio of 1 to 4.

In this title, the proposed method for establishing the authorized Federal payment differs from the Federal payment formula that was included in the home rule bill—S. 1118—and passed by the Senate on July 22, 1965. Under the formula provision that was included in S. 1118, the authorized Federal payment would have related the authorization to Federal property holdings, and Federal employment in the District. Also, S. 1118 provided for the computation of a permanent, indefinite Federal payment appropriation—not merely an authorization—to be paid to the District each year based on the computations under the formula without further legislative action by the Congress.

Mr. President, title VI of the bill would amend existing law so as to establish a new method for determining the maximum amount the District is authorized to borrow from the U.S. Treasury for general fund capital projects.

Under present law, the ceiling of the District's borrowing authority is set at a fixed amount of $225 million—$175 million for general fund loan authorization and $50 million for rapid transit loan.

Under the method proposed by this title, the total annual revenues from local District taxes and the annual Federal payment would serve as the basis for computing the annual borrowing authority for the District of Columbia general fund. The proposal would limit the amount of revenue the District would be authorized to use for long-term debt retirement annually to 6 percent of total estimated annual general fund revenues from local taxes, and the annual Federal payment for the year involved.

Certainly, the present lump sum debt limit ceiling has no relationship whatsoever to the city's ability to repay or the need for its capital construction items to be funded by such borrowing authority. The District's capital construction requirements are great. This proposed method of paying for such facilities as they are used over a period of years provides for fiscal responsibility that cannot be questioned because of its general nationwide practice.

It is expected that this method would provide for a steady growth in the borrowing authority that would be available to the District on a year-to-year basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in my remarks a summary illustrating estimated projections for borrowing authority totals for the next 6 years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Borrowing authority summary

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—					
	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Estimated local general fund tax and motor vehicle registration revenue	256.7	270.3	287.7	305.8	321.5	337.7
Plus estimated Federal payment	64.2	67.6	71.9	76.5	80.4	84.4
Total revenue base for loan computation	320.9	337.9	359.6	382.3	401.9	422.1
Annual debt service as 6 percent revenue base	19.3	20.3	21.6	22.9	24.1	25.3
Authorized outstanding indebtedness, based on 30-year, 4½-percent Treasury loans	314.4	330.7	351.8	373.0	392.6	412.1

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the proposed method for arriving at the authorized borrowing authority for the District, as provided in this bill, would eliminate the controversial features of computing the borrowing formula through an assessed valuation of all real and personal property in the District, including that owned and used by the Federal Government, as proposed in S. 1118, the home rule bill.

Annual revenues from all local sources unquestionably constitute the most reliable and realistic measure of the ability of a government to support long-term debt especially in the case of jurisdictions like the District of Columbia where property taxes are only one of a number of tax services. In the District property taxes constitute only about one-third of the local general fund tax base. The growth of nonproperty tax sources and the emergence of a number of other problems in connection with the use of assessed values, have caused the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and others to recommend that consideration be given to the use of annual revenues rather than assessed values as a measure of debt ceilings. Use of annual revenues also has the advantage of eliminating the problems caused by changes in the assessment level which makes these values subject to manipulation.

Such a change in the method of setting debt limits has been made in several other American jurisdictions. Puerto Rico, for example, adopted a constitutional amendment in 1961 which limited the maximum annual debt service of its Commonwealth Government to 15 percent of the average of the last 2 years' annual revenues. Connecticut also changed its statutory debt limits for local governments in 1963 and now uses multiples of average tax receipts of these governments as the basis for determining their debt ceilings. Two other States which use annual tax revenues for debt limitations are Tennessee and Mississippi. In Tennessee, additional bonds may be authorized by the legislature only if tax revenues collected during the preceding year were at least 1½ times the debt service on all outstanding bonds. Mississippi provides that bonded debt may not exceed 1½ times the highest annual tax receipts of the past 4 years.

Limiting the annual debt service of the District for general fund purposes to 6 percent of general fund revenues from local taxes and the Federal payment would permit the District at the current U.S. Treasury interest rate of 4½ percent on 30-year bonds to incur an outstanding indebtedness which is slightly less than the estimated revenues from local taxes and the Federal payment for the corresponding years as the borrowing authorization estimates shown above indicate. In comparison with prevailing local government borrowing practices generally in the United States, this is a conservative amount of indebtedness in relation to local revenues. A comparison of the outstanding indebtedness for general governmental purposes with revenues in the 21 largest cities in the United States in fiscal 1964, indicates that the ratio of revenue to debt in these cities ranged from a low of slightly less than 1 to 1 to a high of 1 to 4 with a median level of indebtedness that was twice the revenues for the same year.

Of the Nation's 21 largest cities, Washington, D.C., for fiscal year 1964, had the smallest outstanding indebtedness as compared to local revenues.

The objective of all debt limitation provisions is to limit the amount of debt a government may incur to an amount which it can safely repay and to restrict the authority of imprudent administrations. Most governments are unable to finance all their requirements on a current basis and use long-term borrowing to finance capital outlay projects of lasting benefit whose cost is heavy relative to the current financial resources of the community. Between 1952 and 1960, 63 percent of all local government capital outlay work was financed with loans. In many respects the use of long-term loans to finance projects which will serve residents of the community for many years in the future is more equitable than current payment since it places some of the financial burden of these projects on the future users of the facilities. Paying for such capital improvements entirely out of current revenues actually constitutes payment in advance in these cases.

The proposed change in the District's borrowing authority would relieve Congress of the need to periodically adjust the lump-sum authorization that inevitably becomes inadequate in a relatively short time, since this type of authorization does not reflect repayments or changes in the District's capacity to finance long-term debt. A flexible borrowing authorization is essential to putting financial planning for long-range public works programs on a sound basis in the District. The availability of early estimates of the level of borrowing authorization would permit the District to plan the timing of substantial capital outlay expenditures by providing a more accurate estimate of the city's ability to finance such projects.

Mr. President, title VIII of the bill increases the District of Columbia tax on motor vehicle fuels from 6 to 7 cents per gallon. This increase on an annual basis is expected to increase the highway fund by an estimated $2 million. The proposed fuel tax increase would make the District of Columbia tax equal to the motor vehicle fuel taxes presently in effect in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland. Also, 24 other States have a fuel tax established at 7 cents per gallon or higher.

Title X of the bill provides authority for increasing the present highway loan authority for the District government from the present ceiling of $50.25 to $85.25 million, a $35 million increase.

The proposed increase of $35 million in the highway borrowing authority and the proposed increase of 1 cent per gallon in the fuel tax are essential to meet the immediate financial requirements of the District's program of highway construction and maintenance. The proposed fuel tax increase is designed to amortize the $35 million highway fund borrowing authority in the years ahead, at the rate of $2 million per year for debt service.

The highways which these revenues will finance include the interstate program, of which the District government finances 10 percent and the Federal contribution amounts to 90 percent. The A–B–C highway system is a distributor type of program between the Interstate System and local roads with the District paying 50 percent and the Federal Government 50 percent. The third highway program is the local system in which the Federal Government does not participate.

Distribution of District of Columbia government funds required for the three-phase highway program during the period 1966 through 1971 is projected by the District Commissioners in a summary. I ask unanimous consent that this table be incorporated into the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed highway expenditures

[In millions of dollars]

Interstate System	35
A–B–C system	17
Local streets	17
Operating expenses (including maintenance and traffic police)	83
Repayment of loan and interest	21
Total	173

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, your District committee was informed by the District Commissioners that the estimated cost of the District highway program during the next 6 years is $501 million. As already indicated, the District's financing share of this highway program is $173 million. However, funds presently anticipated from District sources are $55 million short of meeting this expenditure requirement. Therefore, if the District government is to proceed in an orderly way with the freeway program, the increased borrowing authority and the increased fuel tax provided in this bill, which will finance the program until fiscal year 1970, must be approved by the Congress before the pending District of Columbia's appropriation bill is enacted.

Your District committee believes strongly that a balanced highway-rail transportation system is urgently needed in the District of Columbia, and any delay in implementing the interstate freeway network in the District will compound problems of the rapid movement of people.

One aspect of the District's interstate highway construction program that deeply disturbed the committee in its consideration of this general highway borrowing authority proposal was the indecisiveness over the last 3 years of the policy advisory committee to reach unequivocal conclusions about exactly what the scope of the Interstate Highway System should be to meet the needs of the Nation's Capital City.

It was your District Committee's unanimous conclusion that the policy advisory committee should take the following steps at the earliest time:

First. Formalize its procedures to permit hearings on the interstate program, review the various proposals and make conclusive decisions to permit their immediate implementation thereafter;

Second. That the District Highway Department follow the conclusions of the policy advisory committee in its construction program;

Third. That the policy advisory committee be a continuing body to serve as a force for decisive and majority consensus among its members.

For the best interests of the District of Columbia, it was your District Committee's judgment that the guidelines set out above will affirmatively encourage more expeditious decisions by the policy advisory committee membership including the District of Columbia Engineering Commissioner, Chairman; Director, National Park Service; Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Administrator, National Capital Transportation Agency; Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts; Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads; representative of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. President, I know that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who has just come into the Chamber, has shown a deep interest in this subject in the past. As a member of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, he will certainly have oversight of the various proposals that will come forward.

I hope—and I say this with all sincerity and candor—that some finality can be reached in the attempt to balance freeways and rail rapid transit. I believe this is the best means we have designed to date to do that.

Irrespective of what the final decisions may be about the scope of the Interstate freeway program within the District, your District Committee recognized the fact that, due to the steady 3- to 7-percent increase in vehicular traffic, each year and the lack of a completed basic freeway system, many of the District's local and residential streets are becoming major traffic carriers.

Certainly, such traffic conditions are one of the major causes of blighted and slum conditions both in the residential and commercial areas of the city. It must be borne in mind that the transportation program for the National Capital region has been planned and designed for many years as a continuous integrated system of highway and rapid rail transit facilities that will ultimately serve the entire Washington metropolitan area. Consequently, partial completion of the system will frustrate the objectives of an integrated system and only provide limited relief to the present intolerable traffic congestion on our local streets and along the arterials leading into the District from neighboring Maryland and Virginia.

Early completion of the total highway-rail rapid transit transportation system will enable District highway officials to institute appropriate control measures on local streets which now serve as major traffic arteries, in order to insure that the residential character of our neighborhoods can be restored and preserved.

Until the total highway-rail rapid transit transportation system is sufficiently completed to afford permanent relief, the invasion of the District's streets for parking and traffic will continue. District government traffic engineers, therefore, will continue to fight traffic congestion through increased use of one-way streets, reversible-flow streets, and other traffic engineering techniques. These are partially effective, but conflict with pedestrian use of street space, residential usage, and the operation of small businesses.

To permit completion on schedule of the freeway portion of the coordinated transportation plan of highways and and rapid rail transit facilities that has been developed, the District government must increase its highway fund revenue and loan authority without delay. The need for additional financial capability derives from the fact that the freeway system in the District of Columbia is a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and that existing Federal-aid highway legislation requires the completion of the Interstate System by October 1972. To meet this objective, funds must be obligated for completion of the system, and all work must be contracted not later than fiscal year 1970, according to testimony provided to your District Committee by the District Commissioners.

YOUR DISTRICT

Mr. President, the purpose of title IX of the bill is to authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to abate the unpaid portions of any tax, or any liability in respect thereto, other than taxes on real property, where administration and collection costs would not warrant collection of the amount due.

This title is patterned after section 6404 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and requires the Commissioners to establish uniform rules for the abatement of tax balances. It would permit the Commissioners to prescribe tolerances for processing tax returns so as to avoid preparation of numerous tax bills and the maintenance of accounts receivable records for minor amounts of tax which cost more to collect than the tax liability involved.

The Internal Revenue Service and several States, including New York and Maryland, provide explicitly in their income tax returns and instructions that an amount due of less than $1 need not be remitted, and that an overpayment in like amount will not be refunded unless the return is accompanied by an application requesting it.

A tabulation of the 1963 District of Columbia individual income tax returns disclosed that 2,567 returns had amounts due under $2 aggregating $1,958.03—an average of 76 cents each. It is estimated that with this abatement authority, using a tolerance of $2, the annual amount of taxes abated would be less than $3,000 for individual income taxes and $1,000 for all other taxes.

Section 1006 of title X authorizes the District Commissioners to enter into agreements with the States of Maryland and Virginia to develop a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process for the National Capital region for purposes of participation by the District in planning processes to comply with the provisions (sec. 134 of title 23, U.S.C.), relating to interstate planning on Federal-aid highway projects. The section authorizes appropriations to the District government for its pro rata share of the costs of such transportation planning process.

During the public hearings held on this section of the bill, the District of Columbia Commissioners stated that in their opinion title 23 of the United States Code provides adequate authority for the District to enter into agreements with the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, and to undertake the construction of Federal aid highway projects to be paid for partly from funds appropriated for the District of Columbia and partly from funds appropriated to the District. Moreover, in furtherance of this authority (title 23), the District Commissioners believed that it encompassed authority to enter into agreements with the States of Maryland and Virginia. Accordingly, the effect of this section will be to provide a restatement of existing authority.

Mr. President, I think this is a responsive bill. It is responsive to the needs for additional revenue in the Nation's Capital, which are urgently needed in many areas.

I am not going to say that this will be the last plea we make along this line. It may not be. Many demands are made on us and we have to have the revenue with which to face them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 18, after line 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 1007. (a) The first sentence of the first paragraph of section 20 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–121) is amended by striking out ', with the exception of beer and light wines,' and by striking out 'or beer or light wines to any persons under the age of eighteen years,'.

"(b) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 20 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–121) is amended by striking out ', with the exception of beer and light wines,' and by striking out ', or permit the consumption of beer and light wines by any person under the age of eighteen years'.

"(c) Section 25 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–125) is amended by striking out ', except beer and light wines, or any minor under the age of eighteen years to sell, give, furnish, or distribute beer and light wines'."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, radio and television stations WMAL during the week of August 29, 1965, in an editorial used these phrases:

> Washington is an oasis for teenage drinkers for miles around. Teenagers come in from the suburbs and as far away as Baltimore and Richmond to buy beer and wine.

The present District of Columbia alcoholic beverage laws seriously undermine the efforts of the neighboring State of Maryland and the neighboring Commonwealth of Virginia to protect their youth and to cut down on juvenile delinquency and to accord with what surely is the wish of the citizens of those States as expressed in their legislatures.

Washington is governed willy-nilly by Congress. It seems to me that the District of Columbia, through Congress, owes a responsibility not only to its neighboring States, but also to the country and to the parents in the communities affected.

The District of Columbia has the duty of doing something to protect its citizens from juvenile misbehavior and to prevent the exploitation of our youth by the tavern owners and saloonkeepers of the District.

This is not a situation in which it is customary to blame everything on the underprivileged or the poor, or to say that someone is being denied a simple pleasure because he lacks the income with which to enjoy a simple pleasure, or anything of that sort. These are middle-income miscreants about whom we are talking. These are the children of people with more or less average income who are bothered by the strictures of the laws of the two adjoining States. The youths are looking for a place in which to enjoy some "happenings" and a certain amount of rock and roll, accompanied by not merely a considerable amount of noise, but at times an unbearable amount of noise, amounting almost to riot or civil commotion.

These teenagers clog the streets with their automobiles, and the screeching of their horns and the near collisions—and sometimes actual collisions—keep the residents of various neighborhoods of the District upset.

The Citizens Association of Georgetown has protested this situation over and over again. The residents of other neighborhoods have also protested.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter from a citizen in another part of the District.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SCOTT. The parking problem has made it impossible for residents who live near these saloons to park their automobiles. The automobiles have blossomed and flourished in number like the green bay tree, while the youths drink, not green bay rum, but apparently some very green beer and wine.

Their conduct would shame their parents, I am sure, if the parents are not too permissive. Their behavior is a scandal to the jaybirds as well as to the residents of this area. Their use of obscenity, their participation in obscene acts on the highways, as witnessed by friends of mine in nearby areas, and the harvest on Sunday morning of beer cans and discarded objects of all kinds is considerable in the areas near these saloons.

Two or three of these saloons have been interdicted by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board and have appealed to the District court. They have lost there and are appealing now to the next higher court and are exploiting their appeal by signs such as the one saloon displays on the front of their establishment to boast in great orange and black letters, I believe, saying with a double entendre, "We are appealing." They hope thereby to draw in more of these young people to a sort of last roundup if the courts finally succeed in putting an end to this gleeful exploitation of youth by these money-mad merchants who have the ability to hire lawyers for the purpose of delay while they continue their own undesirable conduct in encouraging this sort of activity.

This is really a scandalous thing. My amendment, although not a cure-all, does address itself to the heart of the problem, and that is the influx into the District of Columbia of the crowds of teenagers from adjacent jurisdictions where it is wisely forbidden that they attend these palaces of pleasure and relaxation.

This is a common subject daily. It is topic A among the residents of various areas of Washington.

The residents ask one another: "What are we going to do about the teenagers on the move from these other States? What is to happen to our control of traffic?"

There are not enough policemen, as good as they are and as zealous as they are, to control the situation, especially as it exists in relation to illegal parking.

One police officer said to a friend of mine the other night: "I have already given out two books full of tickets on this street and they still come." The teenagers pay no attention to traffic tickets whatever, in spite of the laudatory efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon with relation to traffic violations. Presumably, it does not bother them or, if they pay their fines, they evidently think the pleasure is worth the money. The situation has reached the point at which I see no reason whatever that the District of Columbia should not have the same drinking age as the surrounding areas.

Up to now the attitude seems to have been, Let the people scream. Let Congress scream. Let the residents scream. Whatever rights they think they have we will see are duly subverted by the activities of the "legal eagles"—and I do not mean to reflect on the profession; I did not say "legal beagles," Mr. President—who are busily furthering a nuisance in a series of neighborhoods.

This has come to be pretty outrageous, and I serve notice here and now that if we cannot get action today—and I have had some discussion with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]—that we will pursue the question. I intend to pursue it until some action is taken, and until a rollcall vote, if necessary, is secured.

Mr. CASE Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for this action. We have had for many years, in New Jersey, a similar problem, because of the fact that the neighboring State of New York permits youngsters in the age bracket of 18 to 21 to buy drinks freely, whereas our minimum age is 21—and it seems to me that that makes pretty good sense. This unsupervised and unrestricted drinking of alcoholic beverages by teenagers, in public and in private, has resulted in a variety of harmful activities, including reckless and drunken driving, assaults upon persons and property, and other forms of delinquency.

The same thing applies in regard to the District's laxer regulation as compared to the regulations in effect in the neighboring States. Although I think it is a very grievous thing for New York to permit—even though presumably its citizens are allowing its legislature to continue to permit the situation to exist—the differing regulations to continue to apply, to the detriment of citizens of New Jersey and their children, it is much worse for us in Congress to permit a similar situation to exist here, because nobody is putting any pressure on us at all. The iniquity is the difference in the age; it excites the kids that something that is unlawful over there can be done lawfully over here. The Senator and I remember a similar situation in our time, because we are among the older Members of this body——

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator is correct. If I were the same age, I would be taking advantage of the same law. But that does not make it right.

Mr. CASE. We remember how attractive it was for youngsters to go abroad during prohibition and drink in the taverns of France, for instance. That was exciting only because it was unlawful at home. The situation cleared up very rapidly when prohibition was abandoned.

I happen to think 21 is a very reasonable minimum age for selling liquor to children. We should not put any pressure on the States of Maryland and Virginia to lower their age, but rather we in Congress should meet their very reasonable regulations by increasing the minimum age in the District of Columbia. There is no advantage at all to the District of Columbia in this unreasonable regulation, except perhaps for those few who wish to make some money from the situation.

I congratulate the "Senator from Virginia"—he was from Virginia as a boy, though he now represents the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I shall continue to support him to the hilt.

Mr. SCOTT. I was once a member of the Virginia bar, and am presently a member of the Pennsylvania bar, so I do not wish to seem, by my remarks, to condemn the legal profession. Perhaps my analogy was too close.

Mr. President, I am reminded of a situation which has some humorous aspects.

One night, while the uproar and madness was at its height in my own community, at about midnight—and they usually advert to peculiar noises and enormously vocal hails and farewells around 1 to 2 a.m. on weekdays and just after midnight on Saturdays—after midnight, on one of these occasions, the noise was really almost too much to bear, and I came to the door, and there I saw a group of about six of these young men engaging in rehearsals for future civil rights proceedings, I imagine. I said to them mildly, "Would you please cut that down to a roar?"

They were all in civilian clothes, but one of them said, "The trouble with you is that you are living in peace and comfort here, while we are in Vietnam, fighting to save you."

Well, I doubt very much if they were soldiers. If so, it is clear that they were not in Vietnam. I did say, "Such heroes as you we don't need." I also was a little affronted because, like most Members of the Senate, I suppose, we had seen some combat ourselves, both military and nonmilitary—as well as political.

But before I could say anything else, the car was propelled onward with a string of obscenities containing words which would be new even to such a master of the art as Henry Miller.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a letter from the Citizens Association of Georgetown, dated September 2, 1965, signed by Gerald G. Schulsinger, chairman of its committee on legislation and taxation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Citizens Association of Georgetown,
September 2, 1965.

Mr. Chester H. Smith,
Clerk, Senate District of Columbia Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Smith: I would be grateful if you would convey to the members of the Senate District Committee our support of S. 2480, a bill by Senator Scott to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age, and our hope that the Committee will be able to act on it during the current session.

I know you are aware of the critical problem we have on M Street in Georgetown, which threatens our survival as a residential community and which defeats the purposes of the Old Georgetown Act of 1950 and other salutary legislation with which the Senate District Committee has long and honorably been associated. While S. 2480 is not a cure-all, it addresses itself to the heart of the problem—the overwhelming number of carousing teen-agers from adjacent jurisdictions with higher drinking ages—and its enactment would contribute substantially to the restoration of the conditions intended by the Old Georgetown Act. Thus we urgently request prompt action on this bill, and, if hearings are held, we request the opportunity to testify, and to present the views of the Georgetown community.

Sincerely yours,
Gerald G. Schulsinger,
Chairman, Committee on Legislation and Taxation.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania was good enough to state to me the substance of the remarks he would make and the nature of his amendment before rising to address the Senate.

A bill was offered, I believe, on August 31, 1965, to change the age limit from 18 to 21 as the legal minimum for serving beer and light wine.

Mr. President, I am not at all convinced, without attempting to go into the merits of the matter at this time, that the Senator's proposal would be the solution to the problem to which he is directing his attention. It may be helpful; I do not know. I do not suppose we will be able to know until we have some hearings, until we hear both sides, the proponents and the opponents, and see what the ultimate effect of this particular proposed amendment, as embraced in the Senator's bill of last August, might be.

I think in fairness it should be said that in Virginia, they do sell beer to those who have reached the age of 18, as long as it is 3.2 beer. So there is another little difference there between Viriginia and the District of Columbia and Maryland.

These differences do arise. It is true that in New York and Louisiana they sell any kind of liquor to those 18 or over. Those are the only two States, I think, that have that low an age limit. I do not know what the proper age limit is, and I doubt if anybody really does know.

If youngsters do not get it legally, they will probably get it some other way. But that is a question that goes to the merits of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

This is new to this particular bill. This is a revenue bill, as the Senator from Pennsylvania well recognizes. I would hope that he would not press his amendment and try to tie it on to the revenue bill. I think we should have hearings on it, and I will tell the Senator now, as I told him earlier, that I will do my very level best to attempt to have some hearings at an early date, so that we can explore this problem.

We have had periodic complaints about some of the problems in the Georgetown area. Of course, I will say that when you become chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, you get periodic complaints about everything that crosses the span of human activities here. I do not think we can correct them all. We can try, and we will do our best to have an early hearing and see what this looks like. I express some personal doubts that the changing of the age limit will solve the problem to which the Senator from Pennsylvania alludes. But be that as it may, when we do hear witnesses, maybe they will give us some ideas as to how we can better deal with the problem.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I wish to register quite strong disagreement with the last suggestion, that this matter is of no consequence as an inducement to youngsters to come to the District and drink, who would not otherwise either come to the District or drink.

Mr. BIBLE. I do not know whether it is or is not. I have an open mind on the subject.

Mr. CASE. All anyone could ask the Senator to do is keep his mind open. I am confident that, with the fine mind the Senator has, if the matter is left open to consideration of the facts as adduced by responsible testimony, his conclusion in the end will be one that we can all be happy with.

Mr. BIBLE. We will be very happy to hear the witnesses for that very purpose.

Mr. SCOTT. I conclude by saying that I thank the Senator from Nevada, first of all, for his generosity in agreeing to hold hearings. I would like to feel that we can hold hearings in the next 5 or 6 weeks in order that we do not get too near the exit of Congress.

Mr. BIBLE. I will give the Senator that assurance, to the best of my ability. We have more rugged problems in the committee this year than at any time I can ever remember in my years of service in the Senate.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator lives in Georgetown, he has a rugged problem to add to it.

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator is adding to it now. We will do our best to have hearings sometime in the next 6 weeks.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate that. I assure the Senator that 13 Members of this body who live in or on the fringes of "Saloon Heaven," and who suffer from the madness of the streets in the wee hours, will all be given an opportunity to testify, as well as anyone else from the neighborhoods of the District who may suffer from the same affliction.

I may add that a good many Members of the other body are also able to testify. I can promise the Senator an interesting hearing when citizens associations appear there. I think we can well make the point by the best method used to show that conditions did not exist there until the impulse-like movement of the lemmings caught hold of youth and tempted them to do something which is legal here but illegal elsewhere. Such a movement could result in reversal of the trend if the law is changed to conform to the laws of the two adjoining States.

I suspect that this likewise will give the brewers—the industry affected—an opportunity to jump on me and a number or others who feel the way the Senator from New Jersey noted, but I do not believe there is any need for us to feel this pressure is one to which anyone should pay too much attention.

There is still enough time if these kids could only hold back a little; or if they would simply buy the beer and drink it in their homes with parental supervision. That would be much better than to inflict on the neighbors this awful torture and the immensity of their enthusiasm night after night.

Therefore, in view of the statement of the Senator from Nevada, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall undertake after the hearing, subject to what I expect to be heard in the testimony, to offer the amendment at some other time on some other bill. At that time I would expect to ask for a rollcall vote.

I thank the Senator.

Exhibit 1

Washington, D.C.,
September 1, 1964.

Dear Senator Scott: I read in the paper that you are introducing legislation to raise the age limit in the District of Columbia for drinking alcoholic beverages from 18 to 21. My father and I operate a bar in Southeast Washington right on the District line. Please be advised of our extreme sympathy for such legislation. I have written to congressman Machen and previously to Congressman Lankford from the 6th Maryland district requesting such relief legislation.

Teenagers have been a constant thorn in our sides since we opened 12 years ago. At one time we had every drinking teenager in Oxon Hill, Md. in our place until we voluntarily raised the age limit to 20 to keep this bad element out.

These young people travel in groups of four to six and sometimes more and because of their numbers can be very difficult to control. These groups are usually all male. When there are girls in the groups they are frequently under the 18 age limit and "sneak" drinks from their older boy friends when not closely watched. These youngsters lend each other identification cards showing they are old enough to drink, when actually not. When trouble arises, as it usually does, the bar owner is held responsible. The law requires that these people be over 18. It does not state how we are supposed to know. Apparently authentic identification is not accepted, if it is proved that these people are under age.

If these young people, who come from Maryland or Virginia, get into trouble, the law has no means to call either them, or their parents to account. They simply cross the state line after paying a fine and thats that.

I'm sure that sufficient scientific information can be found which shows that the percentage of those who become alcoholic later is considerably less among those who start drinking at 21 or later. The number of serious accidents directly or indirectly attributable to teen age drinkers is a serious factor not to mention other serious crimes incited by the spirit of strong drink. If the argument is given as it was to me by a city official that if we don't sell it to them, they will simply buy it illegally, "This way we can at least keep them under control in public places." Whose control? Mine? We may not be our brothers keeper, or the keeper of his children, but we can try and the place to try is not in the tavern.

I'm sure I'm not in the minority in this business along with my father. However, I know there are many who will count the loss of profit, by not having these sales, if teenagers are excluded from legal purchase. We are certainly not in this group. If I may be of help in any way in getting this bill passed, please call on me.

I am yours thankfully,

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania. This is a law that has been on our books for 33 years. We are trying to update it and determine what the present situation is.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], I am sure will be a very astute and responsible spokesman for the position he takes on this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute to commend the chairman upon this revenue bill. It was not an easy bill to handle in committee. It called for a considerable amount of give and take by way of ironing out differences within the committee as to whether it should be this amount or that amount. Once again, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] has demonstrated his great powers of leadership in bringing divergent views together in an acceptable compromise without anyone sacrificing any principle. I highly commend him for his handling of the bill. I shall support the bill, for I think it is a good one, in view of the problems that faced the chairman.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 11487) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia; to provide for increased Federal participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City; and to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] once again has led the successful presentation of legislation on the floor of this Chamber. Once again he has obtained Senate approval of a measure with efficiency and expedition of the highest order.

No amount of praise can better describe the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia than his own record of outstanding achievements. No greater tribute can be paid him than that found in his own record of consistent effectiveness. So again today his great talents met success readily when devoted to the handling of the District of Columbia revenue measure. We are grateful for another of his splendid achievements.

The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is to be commended for his outstanding cooperation in assuring swift and orderly Senate action on this measure. His unfailing generosity permitted its unimpeded disposition and we thank him.

To the Senate I am once again grateful for another important accomplishment achieved orderly and expeditiously.

NONPROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1113, Senate Resolution 179.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 179) pertaining to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERALLY SUPPORTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past 20 years there has emerged a large and vital Federal research and development program which has changed the everyday life of Americans, as well as other peoples of the world. The developments in science and technology have had a tremendous effect upon the industrial vitality of the country, and have brought the terminology of the scientist into common, everyday usage. These advances have also brought to the campus of the large research-oriented universites of the Nation an entirely new component—federally supported research and development, which profoundly influences day-to-day decisionmaking. Just a little over a generation ago, the scientist worked quietly in a basement or attic laboratory, and was left much to his own devices. Asking little in material support, he received little more than commendation upon the announcement of some new discovery.

Today, our Government is spending almost $16 billion per year on research and development programs. This is about one-seventh of the total budget. This is no small sum, when we consider that within the lifetime of some Members of this body the total Federal budget was not much larger than $16 billion. The Department of Defense research and development expenditures account for approximately one-half of the figure I mentioned above. A slightly smaller portion goes into our space efforts. A smaller, but significant portion, approximately $2 billion, is devoted to basic research, which is carried out to a large extent by our universities, and private and Government institutions. A small number of our educational institutions receive the major portion of the basic research dollar. Some 20 universities compete actively with each other for the bulk of these funds. The great number of colleges and universities of lesser prestige receive minimal support from Federal funds.

Though the competition is keen for the Federal "dollar," it is equally, or even more, competitive for the "brains" that are needed to make the "think factory" run. Competition is evident in almost all segments of American higher education facilities, and no school is truly free from the desire to feed on Federal research funds. For this reason, the long-sought-for plum is the Nobel Prize scientist. The latest indication is that the going price for this scientist is somewhere in the range of $45,000 per annum, plus a free hand in research, in addition to necessary buildings and facilities, and this all totaled may run into several millions of dollars. Even the large institution is not immune to having its research scholars lured away by such attractions as higher pay, better climate, bigger facilities, more stimulating colleagues, and so on. Our highly mobile society makes this shift from coast to coast, or from midlands to coast, a very easy process. Plain and simply, who among us is going to turn down a good deal, when it means a better home, better education for our children, and more of the material things in life? This "raiding" is done for the purpose of acquiring new talent in order to obtain larger Federal research grants.

With this background, let us move on and examine some of the problems that confront us. The Senate, recognizing the problems involved, has created a Subcommittee on Government Research of the Government Operations Committee. The subcommittee is chaired by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma, FRED R. HARRIS. I am the ranking minority member and other members of this subcommittee are Senator JOHN McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, Senator JOSEPH MONTOYA, of New Mexico, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, and Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, of Wyoming. We have been authorized by the Senate to make studies of the research and development programs financed by the Federal Government. One of the subcommittee's goals is to determine the need for the establishment of national policies regarding our whole research effort. The subcommittee has been charged with establishing guidelines for national policy, priorities, evaluating technical advances, better coordination of programs between departments and agencies, manpower policies, and arriving at a policymaking criteria for equitable distribution regarding Federal research and development contracts.

The program which the distinguished chairman and the staff of the subcommittee have outlined in consultation with members of the committee, is an ambitious one, and requires a diligent study of the complex Federal research and development program. Within the several agencies and departments of the Government which make use of research and development funds, there are at times conflicting interests. This was not the intention of any agency or department, but is due to inadequate coordination from without or from within.

NATIONAL POLICY AND GOALS

The search for a comprehensive, sciencewide national policy is often referred to as a "search in futility." Many would claim this country does not even have a science policy. I believe this is incorrect; we do have a policy, but one born of necessity, which requires action at a given moment, a composite of many interrelated directives and policies initiated over the years by departments, agencies, and members of both executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Our policy is dominated by the desires of many within and without the scientific community to improve our national and international image and prestige and is formulated by national defense needs, space commitments, and individuals strengths. The Subcommittee on Government Research is engaged in studies to determine and enunciate a more definitive, longer ranging policy than is now extant. The attainment of a directed and comprehensive national science policy is a desirable goal at this time, as we have arrived at a crossroads in our proliferating scientific endeavors, and it has become painfully obvious that we cannot continue to support all who demand support, but must be selective in the allocation of research funds.

PRIORITIES

The problem of priorities now confronts Congress. The Congress has, over the years, through the cooperation of its own informed membership, the executive branch, and respected scientists, maintained a space program that we believe is second to none. NASA now is on the threshold of placing a man on the moon within this decade. After this, what? This question concerns the leaders of this fine NASA organization, as well as its highly trained, scientific and technical staff. Where do we turn? Shall the space program continue on its present course, or shall it be broadened to better serve the everyday needs of the American people. This is a priority crossroads.

I think there are additional immediate problems which demand priority. Increasing air and water pollution require action now. The residents of urban industrial centers are feeling the impact of continued and unabated air pollution. Where it was once smugly referred to as being indigenous only to Los Angeles, we find now that air pollution, smog, has crept across the Sierra Nevada Mountain and the towering Rockies, to become a matter of concern in the urban areas of the eastern foothills of the majestic mountain system. Water pollution has been with us for many years, and recently the effects of this creeping paralysis have become a major concern to all segments and areas of our society.

I am reminded that the first major piece of legislation which I introduced as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives in 1939 was a measure designed to provide some measure of relief for the water pollution problem which then existed. We made some progress in that bill, but it was inadequate. The problem has been in existence a long time. So the water pollution problem is before us in a very real sense today.

Similarly, we are now becoming cognizant of the tremendous potential that weather modification can hold for the peoples of this country, as well as for the people of the world. Expansion of our research endeavors in this field is necessary for the general welfare of our Nation. We must support an expanded program of basic research and experimental technology in weather modification. And what are the necessities in the social sciences? Are they to remain unattended and unattainable for lack of funds? Perhaps social science research is not as spectacular as are the thrilling attainments that accompany a moon probe, but, nevertheless, they are worthy of further study.

Has the time come to direct our medical research effort toward mission-oriented—or preferred—goals? Applied research could bring about significant breakthroughs in the health sciences. How can we supply the facilities and funds for these advances without stifling the initiative of good research and interfering with creative research? The question of priority will be with us as long as man is of an inquiring nature.

Where do we look for guidance in determining priorities? At this point it would be advantageous, I believe, to examine the thoughts and recommendations of the excellent scientific and technical community, the knowledgeable Members of Congress and the executive branch, and interested and informed citizens.

TECHNOLOGY

It is necessary to couple basic and applied research with technology to better use the vast resources of basic information for the benefit of mankind. What is the proper split between R. & D.? At the present time, basic research receives about one-seventh of the total R. & D. allocation of the Federal Government. Is this a proper balance? Basic research has done its job so well it is ahead of attempts to apply this data to current human problems. Should input for application of technology be increased?

To cite an example of the benefits to mankind which can be derived from technology: Many people felt that the development, in the 1940's, of atomic and nuclear weapons was a curse from which no blessing would ever emanate. Yet, in the sixties, we find that technological advances have directed these powers to alleviate human suffering, increase industrial development, and possible engineering applications for the improvement of society. Perhaps our space efforts offer similar hope.

COORDINATION AND DUPLICATION

It is mandatory that we continue to work for a system whereby the Federal Government can achieve a maximum effort with a minimum of duplication. No agency or department consciously promotes duplication of research or development, yet some duplication is inevitable for the good of the unit concerned. Unnecessary and wasteful duplication must be eliminated, so that these funds and talents will be made available for urgent work on other problems. This can only be done by better communication and understanding of the mutual problems of the several agencies. Committees now exist seeking solutions to this problem, but Congress must act to help make these units an agent for accomplishing our goals.

MANPOWER

Manpower is referred to as another area of concern. At this time, several agencies are making manpower surveys. The National Science Foundation was specifically charged with determining scientific manpower in our country, and this they have done. And yet, what has become of this information? The crux of the problem is to use this scientific manpower survey in our basic planning for science, education, defense, space, health, and other areas. The assimilation and use of this information is invaluable in arriving at realistic science policies for this country.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

The last area to which I would like to direct attention is the very important area of distribution of research and development funds. The executive branch of the Government, the Congress of the United States, and the educational community have become increasingly concerned over the uneven distribution of R. & D. funds. Senate Resolutions 218 and 231 are directed in part to the study of and solution to this urgent problem. I shall ask permission to enter in the RECORD several tables of statistics showing the distribution pattern for 1964, State by State. It is interesting and distressing to note that more than half of all research and development expenditures from Federal sources were spent in four States during fiscal year 1964. One State receives more than the total of the lowest 43 States. It is not the intention of this Senator to suggest that funds be taken from the affluent and showered upon the undernourished. But I would here point out that some departments have worked out quite equitable systems of distribution of research and development funds. The Department of Agriculture is using a program of distribution that provides a climate in which all States can participate and share in the burdens and fruits of their joint labors. This has worked to the benefit of all, and it can hardly be said that the agricultural community of the Nation has shirked its responsibility in research. They have an enviable tradition of good, sound research programs, going back many years. Similarly, the Department of the Interior has worked out a plan in which all States participate in cooperative research programs. Thus, if some departments have a workable solution to this difficult problem, it would seem to me that others might try to accomplish similar distribution patterns.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Research—I may state that we are now engaged in a study in depth—I am taking a vital interest in these problems, and it is my belief that the staff of our subcommittee can, through thorough study, make recommendations which will help provide answers to the questions which have been raised in my mind, and which have been set before the Senate in this speech today.

I ask unanimous consent that a series of tables which have been prepared appear in the RECORD at this point of my remarks. I have labeled them numbers 1 through 10.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Research and development obligations for all performers, fiscal year 1964 (arranged in alphabetical order)

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	$314,069	2.2
Alaska	13,155	.1
Arizona	88,429	.6
Arkansas	5,030	(1)
California	4,953,121	34.6
Colorado	264,504	1.8
Connecticut	130,288	.9
Delaware	5,627	(1)
District of Columbia	478,425	3.3
Florida	489,628	3.4
Georgia	48,135	.3
Hawaii	7,358	.1
Idaho	31,334	.2
Illinois	208,632	1.5
Indiana	$103,117	0.7
Iowa	25,128	.2
Kansas	13,949	.1
Kentucky	11,936	.1
Louisiana	290,092	2.0
Maine	6,423	(1)
Maryland	748,178	5.2
Massachusetts	570,303	4.0
Michigan	163,827	1.1
Minnesota	72,474	.5
Mississippi	15,691	.1
Missouri	386,378	2.7
Montana	8,832	.1
Nebraska	5,463	(1)
Nevada	173,299	1.2
New Hampshire	22,306	.2
New Jersey	440,571	3.1
New Mexico	422,791	3.0
New York	1,133,240	7.9
North Carolina	27,389	.2
North Dakota	33,832	.2
Ohio	307,924	2.2
Oklahoma	19,753	.1
Oregon	19,834	.1
Pennsylvania	513,951	3.6
Rhode Island	27,120	.2
South Carolina	17,571	.1
South Dakota	12,133	.1
Tennessee	155,514	1.1
Texas	628,313	4.4
Utah	65,180	.5
Vermont	4,904	(1)
Virginia	210,399	1.5
Washington	262,565	1.8
West Virginia	8,935	.1
Wisconsin	69,983	.5
Wyoming	29,531	.2
Territories	7,418	.1
Abroad	3,739	(1)
Unallocated	237,883	1.7
Total	14,315,604	----------

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.

Research and development obligations for all performers, fiscal year 1964 (arranged in order of magnitude)

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Amount	Percent of total
California	$4,953,121	34.6
New York	1,133,240	7.9
Maryland	748,178	5.2
Texas	628,313	4.4
Massachusetts	570,303	4.0
Pennsylvania	513,951	3.6
Florida	489,628	3.4
District of Columbia	478,425	3.3
New Jersey	440,571	3.1
New Mexico	422,791	3.0
Missouri	386,378	2.7
Alabama	314,069	2.2
Ohio	307,924	2.2
Louisiana	290,092	2.0
Colorado	264,504	1.8
Washington	262,565	1.8
Virginia	210,399	1.5
Illinois	208,632	1.5
Nevada	173,299	1.2
Michigan	163,827	1.1
Tennessee	155,514	1.1
Connecticut	130,288	.9
Indiana	103,117	.7
Arizona	88,429	.6
Minnesota	72,474	.5
Wisconsin	69,983	.5
Utah	65,180	.5
Georgia	48,135	.3
North Dakota	33,832	.2
Idaho	31,334	.2
Wyoming	29,531	.2
North Carolina	27,389	.2
Rhode Island	27,120	.2
Iowa	25,128	.2
New Hampshire	22,306	.2
Oregon	19,834	.1
Oklahoma	19,753	.1
South Carolina	17,571	.1
Mississippi	15,691	.1
Kansas	13,949	.1
Alaska	13,155	.1
South Dakota	12,133	.1
Kentucky	11,936	.1
West Virginia	8,935	.1
Montana	8,832	.1
Territories	7,418	.1
Hawaii	$7,358	0.1
Maine	6,423	(1)
Delaware	5,627	(1)
Nebraska	5,463	(1)
Arkansas	5,030	(1)
Vermont	4,904	(1)
Abroad	3,739	(1)
Unallocated	237,883	1.7
Total	14,315,604	----------

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.

Research and development obligations, fiscal year 1964

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	$1,916	1.1
Alaska	1,075	.6
Arizona	2,712	1.6
Arkansas	1,348	.8
California	12,461	7.2
Colorado	2,392	1.4
Connecticut	712	.4
Delaware	365	.2
District of Columbia	16,267	9.4
Florida	3,873	2.2
Georgia	5,208	3.0
Hawaii	883	.5
Idaho	1,811	1.0
Illinois	7,181	4.1
Indiana	1,751	1.0
Iowa	5,523	3.2
Kansas	1,236	.7
Kentucky	1,962	1.1
Louisiana	8,108	4.7
Maine	758	.4
Maryland	24,604	14.2
Massachusetts	624	.4
Michigan	2,324	1.3
Minnesota	3,209	1.8
Mississippi	4,740	2.7
Missouri	1,801	1.0
Montana	1,773	1.0
Nebraska	1,477	.9
Nevada	503	.3
New Hampshire	691	.4
New Jersey	1,032	.6
New Mexico	1,185	.7
New York	5,985	3.4
North Carolina	3,442	2.0
North Dakota	1,740	1.0
Ohio	2,397	1.4
Oklahoma	1,592	.9
Oregon	2,920	1.7
Pennsylvania	6,177	3.6
Rhode Island	344	.2
South Carolina	2,050	1.2
South Dakota	1,413	.8
Tennessee	1,624	.9
Texas	5,011	2.9
Utah	1,626	.9
Vermont	588	.3
Virginia	1,463	.8
Washington	2,682	1.5
West Virginia	1,241	.7
Wisconsin	5,434	3.1
Wyoming	796	.5
Territories	1,775	1.0
Abroad	555	.3
Unallocated	1,367	.8
Total	173,729	----------

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

State	Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	$2,321	2.1
Alaska	2,892	2.7
Arizona	2,422	2.2
Arkansas	576	.5
California	6,822	6.3
Colorado	7,522	7.0
Connecticut	687	.6
Delaware	61	.1
District of Columbia	6,539	6.0
Florida	1,423	1.3
Georgia	1,141	1.1
Hawaii	2,165	2.0
Idaho	1,078	1.0
Illinois	598	.6
Indiana	258	.2
Iowa	335	.3

Research and development obligations, fiscal year 1964—Continued

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Amount	Percent of total
Kansas	$389	.4
Kentucky	1,057	1.0
Louisiana	589	.5
Maine	1,009	.9
Maryland	4,883	4.5
Massachusetts	3,026	2.8
Michigan	1,266	1.2
Minnesota	3,021	2.8
Mississippi	731	.7
Missouri	1,453	1.3
Montana	1,083	1.0
Nebraska	591	.5
Nevada	3,012	2.8
New Hampshire	168	.2
New Jersey	1,308	1.2
New Mexico	1,838	1.7
New York	2,463	2.3
North Carolina	1,712	1.6
North Dakota	845	.8
Ohio	1,100	1.0
Oklahoma	1,913	1.8
Oregon	3,442	3.2
Pennsylvania	12,773	11.8
Rhode Island	154	.1
South Carolina	185	.2
South Dakota	675	.6
Tennessee	1,205	1.1
Texas	3,290	3.0
Utah	2,352	2.2
Vermont	406	.4
Virginia	887	.8
Washington	5,852	5.4
West Virginia	2,429	2.2
Wisconsin	597	.6
Wyoming	2,169	2.0
Territories	285	.3
Abroad	000	.0
Unallocated	1,182	1.1
Total	108,180	

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

State	Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	17	(1)
Alaska	000	.0
Arizona	3	(1)
Arkansas	123	.2
California	939	1.8
Colorado	8,447	15.9
Connecticut	648	1.2
Delaware	000	.0
District of Columbia	30,607	57.5
Florida	1,825	3.4
Georgia	195	.4
Hawaii	139	.3
Idaho	000	.0
Illinois	475	.9
Indiana	50	.1
Iowa	39	.1
Kansas	3	(1)
Kentucky	30	.1
Louisiana	110	.2
Maine	000	.0
Maryland	2,523	4.7
Massachusetts	432	.8
Michigan	250	.5
Minnesota	138	.3
Mississippi	26	(1)
Missouri	76	.1
Montana	19	(1)
Nebraska	3	(1)
Nevada	2	(1)
New Hampshire	18	(1)
New Jersey	178	.3
New Mexico	000	.0
New York	2,354	4.4
North Carolina	162	.3
North Dakota	000	.0
Ohio	276	.5
Oklahoma	291	.5
Oregon	45	.1
Pennsylvania	576	1.1
Rhode Island	000	.0
South Carolina	000	.0
South Dakota	000	.0
Tennessee	000	.0
Texas	1,194	2.2
Utah	33	.1
Vermont	000	.0
Virginia	445	.8
Washington	166	.3
West Virginia	000	.0
Wisconsin	380	.7
Wyoming	8	(1)
Territories	000	.0
Abroad	000	.0
Unallocated	20	(1)
Total	53,265	

Research and development obligations, fiscal year 1964—Continued

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	$55,893	0.7
Alaska	4,964	.1
Arizona	66,874	.9
Arkansas	85	(1)
California	2,548,268	34.0
Colorado	218,914	2.9
Connecticut	71,096	.9
Delaware	3,858	.1
District of Columbia	204,361	2.7
Florida	273,039	3.6
Georgia	18,664	.2
Hawaii	1,370	(1)
Idaho	496	(1)
Illinois	71,013	.9
Indiana	79,363	1.1
Iowa	2,113	(1)
Kansas	4,871	.1
Kentucky	3,809	.1
Louisiana	1,775	(1)
Maine	2,078	(1)
Maryland	450,325	6.0
Massachusetts	406,278	5.4
Michigan	114,204	1.5
Minnesota	30,761	.4
Mississippi	7,163	.1
Missouri	49,317	.7
Montana	3,488	(1)
Nebraska	52	(1)
Nevada	571	(1)
New Hampshire	17,913	.2
New Jersey	317,993	4.2
New Mexico	175,539	2.3
New York	769,859	10.3
North Carolina	5,286	.1
North Dakota	30,558	.4
Ohio	163,802	2.2
Oklahoma	8,498	.1
Oregon	1,642	(1)
Pennsylvania	252,130	3.4
Rhode Island	21,623	.3
South Carolina	1,255	(1)
South Dakota	21,623	.3
Tennessee	7,982	.1
Texas	325,447	4.3
Utah	55,041	.7
Vermont	1,100	(1)
Virginia	110,019	1.5
Washington	205,485	2.7
West Virginia	626	(1)
Wisconsin	23,760	.3
Wyoming	26,210	.3
Territories	2,106	(1)
Abroad	1,320	(1)
Unallocated	223,463	3.0
Total	7,495,976	

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

State	Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	$7,481	1.0
Alaska	1,378	.2
Arizona	2,210	.3
Arkansas	1,950	.3
California	70,781	9.2
Colorado	7,155	.9
Connecticut	9,782	1.3
Delaware	597	.1
District of Columbia	30,506	4.0
Florida	10,248	1.3
Georgia	13,821	1.8
Hawaii	1,271	.2
Idaho	210	(1)
Illinois	33,406	4.3
Indiana	7,640	1.0
Iowa	5,539	.7
Kansas	4,294	.6
Kentucky	4,303	.6
Louisiana	9,209	1.2
Maine	1,930	.3
Maryland	130,828	17.0
Massachusetts	61,095	7.9
Michigan	22,979	3.0
Minnesota	17,358	2.3
Mississippi	2,389	.3
Missouri	13,105	1.7
Montana	2,160	.3
Nebraska	2,313	.3
Nevada	166	(1)
New Hampshire	1,741	.2
New Jersey	10,110	1.3
New Mexico	1,350	.2
New York	104,608	13.6
North Carolina	12,326	1.6
North Dakota	569	.1
Ohio	29,054	3.8
Oklahoma	4,836	.6
Oregon	8,515	1.1
Pennsylvania	$41,302	5.4
Rhode Island	2,868	.4
South Carolina	1,002	.1
South Dakota	530	.1
Tennessee	9,282	1.2
Texas	16,865	2.2
Utah	4,018	.5
Vermont	2,395	.3
Virginia	7,359	1.0
Washington	10,028	1.3
West Virginia	1,745	.2
Wisconsin	12,451	1.6
Wyoming	265	(1)
Territories	2,238	.3
Abroad	1,864	.2
Unallocated	6,070	.8
Total	769,496	

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

State	Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	$246,151	5.7
Alaska	2,070	(1)
Arizona	9,626	.2
Arkansas	464	(1)
California	2,045,171	47.4
Colorado	11,427	.3
Connecticut	12,343	.3
Delaware	394	(1)
District of Columbia	166,109	3.8
Florida	194,488	4.5
Georgia	7,874	.2
Hawaii	436	(1)
Idaho	313	(1)
Illinois	20,677	.5
Indiana	3,928	.1
Iowa	3,938	.1
Kansas	1,441	(1)
Kentucky	127	(1)
Louisiana	269-108	6.2
Maine	307	(1)
Maryland	124,655	2.9
Massachusetts	68,910	1.6
Michigan	13,161	.3
Minnesota	13,116	.3
Mississippi	454	(1)
Missouri	318,397	7.4
Montana	110	(1)
Nebraska	5	(1)
Nevada	2,655	.1
New Hampshire	901	(1)
New Jersey	91,252	2.1
New Mexico	11,763	.3
New York	125,972	2.9
North Carolina	1,130	(1)
North Dakota	000	0
Ohio	90,746	2.1
Oklahoma	1,614	(1)
Oregon	701	(1)
Pennsylvania	76,613	1.8
Rhode Island	397	(1)
South Carolina	118	(1)
South Dakota	823	(1)
Tennessee	7,475	.2
Texas	260,112	6.0
Utah	504	(1)
Vermont	75	(1)
Virginia	85,594	2.0
Washington	3,900	.1
West Virginia	264	(1)
Wisconsin	18,968	.4
Wyoming	000	.0
Territories	000	.0
Abroad	000	.0
Unallocated	000	.0
Total	4,316,777	

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

State	Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	$160	(1)
Alaska	68	(1)
Arizona	510	(1)
Arkansas	295	(1)
California	250,206	20.3
Colorado	1,423	.1
Connecticut	31,566	2.6
Delaware	94	(1)
District of Columbia	5,865	.5
Florida	2,071	.2
Georgia	595	(1)

Research and development obligations, fiscal year 1964—Continued

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Amount	Percent of total
Hawaii	$164	(1)
Idaho	27, 249	2.2
Illinois	65, 294	5.3
Indiana	6, 400	.5
Iowa	6, 686	.5
Kansas	518	(1)
Kentucky	129	(1)
Louisiana	179	(1)
Maine	270	(1)
Maryland	7, 632	.6
Massachusetts	14, 325	1.2
Michigan	4, 347	.4
Minnesota	2, 619	.2
Mississippi	58	(1)
Missouri	239	(1)
Montana	34	(1)
Nebraska	511	(1)
Nevada	166, 212	13.5
New Hampshire	91	(1)
New Jersey	14, 124	1.1
New Mexico	230, 712	18.7
New York	106, 496	8.6
North Carolina	1, 497	.1
North Dakota	26	(1)
Ohio	17, 054	1.4
Oklahoma	229	(1)
Oregon	1, 078	.1
Pennsylvania	116, 059	9.4
Rhode Island	540	(1)
South Carolina	12, 737	1.0
South Dakota	639	.1
Tennessee	82, 987	6.7
Texas	5, 117	.4
Utah	793	.1
Vermont	45	(1)
Virginia	3, 986	.3
Washington	31, 835	2.6
West Virginia	89	(1)
Wisconsin	5, 021	.4
Wyoming	000	.0
Territories	943	.1
Abroad	000	.0
Unallocated	5, 779	.5
Total	1, 233, 596	

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

State	Amount	Percent of total
Alabama	$130	0.1
Alaska	707	.4
Arizona	4, 072	2.5
Arkansas	189	.1
California	18, 473	11.2
Colorado	7, 224	4.4
Connecticut	3, 454	2.1
Delaware	248	.2
District of Columbia	18, 171	11.0
Florida	2, 661	1.6
Georgia	637	.4
Hawaii	930	.6
Idaho	177	.1
Illinois	9, 988	6.1
Indiana	3, 727	2.3
Iowa	955	.6
Kansas	1, 197	.7
Kentucky	519	.3
Louisiana	1, 014	.6
Maine	71	(1)
Maryland	2, 728	1.7
Massachusetts	15, 613	9.5
Michigan	5, 295	3.2
Minnesota	2, 252	1.4
Mississippi	130	.1
Missouri	1, 990	1.2
Montana	165	.1
Nebraska	511	.3
Nevada	178	.1
New Hampshire	783	.5
New Jersey	4, 574	2.8
New Mexico	404	.2
New York	15, 503	9.4
North Carolina	1, 834	1.1
North Dakota	94	.1
Ohio	3, 495	2.1
Oklahoma	780	.5
Oregon	1, 490	.9
Pennsylvania	8, 321	5.1
Rhode Island	1, 194	.7
South Carolina	224	.1
South Dakota	71	(1)
Tennessee	697	.4
Texas	11, 277	6.9
Utah	813	.5
Vermont	295	.2
Virginia	646	.4
Washington	2, 617	1.6
West Virginia	2, 541	1.5
Wisconsin	$3, 372	2.0
Wyoming	83	.1
Territories	71	(1)
Abroad	000	.0
Unallocated	000	.0
Total	164, 585	

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the tables include the documentation for some of the statements I have made during the course of my address. I think the first table will be especially interesting to Members of the Senate and Members of the other body because in that table we have arranged the States in the alphabetical order in which they are normally set out, so that any Member can quickly turn to his own State and see how it has participated in the $15 billion worth of research.

I also call special attention to table No. 2, because in that table we have rearranged the order in which the States usually appear. Instead of being shown in the usual alphabetical order, they are listed in the order of their participation in these highly desirable Government contracts.

This total will be especially interesting and pleasing to Members in the Senate and the House from the Golden State of California, because the table discloses that 34.6 percent of all the research and development contracts are given to institutions in the State of California.

Interestingly enough, the next highest State, as one would expect, is New York; but there is a great disparity between those two States, because for the State of New York there is only a total of 7.9 percent of all the moneys made available for distribution.

The rest of the table will speak for itself. Members of Congress can turn to table 1, which will show their State alphabetically, and then turn to table No. 2, which lists the States in the order in which the States receive the benefit of these contracts, so they can see where their States rank, if they rank at all, in the distribution of these highly important contracts.

I commend to Senators a study of the tables.

We seek guidance and counsel from other Senators who may have suggestions as to the best approach to this matter, in order to secure a greater degree of equity, and at the same time to enhance and expand the productivity of this great and valued research program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend the Senator for his remarks today. I agree with him. I commend him not only for what he has said today but also for his previous efforts in connection with this matter. I express my gratitude to him for being a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 231.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the resolution is before us. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska submitted it on March 2, 1966, and it has a number of cosponsors.

It is a brief resolution, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 231) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the National Science Foundation is requested to formulate and transmit to the Congress at the earliest practicable date its recommendations for such changes in—
>
> (1) the laws under which research and development funds are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by departments or agencies of the Government to institutions of higher learning for scientific or educational purposes; or
>
> (2) the administration of such laws;
>
> as may be necessary and desirable to provide for a more equitable distribution of such funds to all qualified institutions of higher learning to avoid the concentration of such activities in any geographical area and to insure a continuing reservoir of scientific and teaching skills and capacities throughout the several States.

Mr. MUNDT. We have discussed the resolution in executive deliberations of the subcommittee. Hearings are scheduled to be held in connection with it. We not only invite the Senator from Nebraska to come as a witness, but also encourage him, if he can, to provide other witnesses. No definite date has been set for the hearings, but the committee probably will be ready for public hearings either the latter part of this month or the first part of June.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator. That coincides with the information I have obtained in my direct contacts with the committee.

Is it not true that wherever great sums of Government research money are directed, a scientific complex will be built around the recipient university, sometimes a large one, sometimes a small one; but, at any rate, scientific endeavors will follow. Is that not true?

Mr. MUNDT. That is a very logical hypothesis.

If one examines in detail what has been happening in the State of California, which alone receives more than one-third of the total money available for these contracts, the demonstrable proof of the Senator's hypothesis is apparent. There is a tendency for the development around these universities and scientific communities of complexes which not only in turn tend to attract new contracts and new research, but also tend to attract the kind of industrial development which utilizes the findings of these scientists.

Mr. CURTIS. That was my next point: Is it not true that following that, the private industry of the country, which is going to adapt itself to future development, will locate in these areas or will have a strong pull toward them?

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me they would have an incentive in that direction.

Mr. CURTIS. Can it not be said, then, that a maldistribution of research funds throughout the United States can adversely affect future development of many portions of the country?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. As I said in my prepared remarks—and I add to them for the benefit of the Senator from Nebraska—a kind of magnetism is developed by which the best and most capable scientists of universities and colleges and institutions not located in the area which presently receives the bulk of these funds tend to be pulled away from their home campuses, so that they can become associated with one of the favorite institutions which is already out in front in this kind of operation. Scientists like to associate with other scientists. A man with scientific capacity and a great deal of energy, understandably, is likely to move from the State of Nebraska or the State of Pennsylvania or the State of Illinois or the State of Texas into an area where he is more likely to find adequate Federal funds and the necessary laboratory facilities with which to conduct his professional endeavors.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. It is difficult for a fine institution that is not sharing in this research program either to attract new talent or to hold that which it has.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall read briefly from three or four letters I have received concerning Senate Resolution 231. The general objective has met with widespread approval.

The head of one university in my State, referring to another matter and to this resolution, says:

> We believe both of these are vital to the growth and the development of Nebraska.

The head of another university in my State, referring to this proposal says:

> I agree with you that the colleges and universities in our State are well equipped to handle research projects and, in most cases, would be anxious to benefit from additional funds of this nature.

The head of another university writes, referring to the efforts to have these research grants and expenditures evenly distributed among the qualified institutions:

> This is excellent in every way. I am in hearty accord with what you are doing.

Now I shall read briefly from the letters of the heads of two small colleges—small in comparison with what we often consider large institutions.

One college president writes:

> I wish to commend you for the introduction of Senate Resolution 231. In my opinion, the law of diminishing return has been operating for some time in the channeling of immense sums of money to the large institutions on East and West Coasts. Many Midwestern institutions, including small ones, have much to offer and it is sensible that they be made recipients of a fair proportion of funds for scientific and educational purposes.

With the Senator's further indulgence, I shall read one more statement. This one is from the president of another fine but small institution. He writes:

> We sincerely appreciate your leadership in promoting better distribution of research and development funds. Assuredly this is vital to our promising Midwest area, and we have the resources and skills to be effective stewards of funds which might be allocated in our region.
>
> We in the smaller colleges are also keenly aware of the fact that the bulk of these funds go to larger institutions. This is proper, in view of the limitations of our smaller private schools, but we already know by experience that a number of small research projects are within our scope and can be conducted efficiently and economically. I know you share our interest and will be aware of this in your planning and proposals.

I should say that the distribution of these funds is not easy. It cannot be done arbitrarily or merely upon a geographical basis. It should be confined to qualified institutions. But the fact remains that the present method of distribution is bad, it is maldistribution, and is adversely affecting the future development of the country.

Whether the problem is solved under Senate Resolution 231 or otherwise, some method must be devised that will make it possible for qualified institutions, regardless of their locations, to participate in the program. Certainly a great endeavor like this, which costs a total of more than $15 billion a year, should not be localized. It should not be conducted for the benefit of only a few localities or States.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has demonstrated a great deal of very constructive initiative toward a solution of the problem and the presentation of the problem to the attention of the country. However, I do not believe that a single member of our subcommittee—which is charged with the responsibility of trying to find some suitable solutions to what is a very complex problem—believes for a minute that the distribution of these contracts should be let out on the basis of pork barreling, on the basis of quid pro quo, on the basis of population distribution, or on any other artificial formula of that kind.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator very much.

Mr. MUNDT. I have the complete conviction that the money should be made available where it can produce the maximum good for the minimum amount of expenditure.

Having said that, I am sure that many of the committee members feel—and I certainly feel, as I have gone into the matter—very definitely that there is a tremendous vacuum in the Federal Government in terms of having established and proper policies for the distribution of the funds. The institutions are confronted with a difficult situation.

When the money becomes available, I think they act somewhat impulsively. I know that they act without carefully developed guidelines. I am positive that they act without guidelines which are understood or even known by any Senator or Representative. I think that certainly the time has come when this has gotten to be a $16 billion infant. Policies should be developed, criteria should be crystallized, and devices for distribution should be publicized.

By so doing and by spending some of the money in areas in which it is not now being spent, the taxpayer will get far more for his dollar than he would get if we were to concentrate too much of the scientific activity within the confines of too small an area in a nation consisting of 50 States.

I am sure that each of the 50 States has some place located within it in which it has scientists, laboratories, and institutions of learning which can make a contribution to the overall welfare of the country provided a program has been developed for classifying the available talent and for surveying and inventorying what is available in State after State and in area after area. Then, we can develop criteria which will bring into focus these great potentialities before the contracts are let, rather than after the fact.

Mr. CURTIS. While I realize that it is very difficult, I am also aware that it is a real challenge for the Government. It is very easy for a weak administrator to award research contracts to a main university. That is the path of least resistance. It calls for a considerable undertaking to ascertain all of the places in the country that are qualified to participate in the program and to utilize them all in the way in which they can best serve. That is what must be done.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. That is a temptation which it is easy for any administrator to succumb to because if he sends the contract to a great main university which already has a dozen contracts which it is handling rather well, or perhaps exceptionally well, it is likely to relieve an administrator of any criticism from any source if he were to simply say: "Well, let's send them another contract."

The thing continues to feed on itself. That is the reason that one of the tasks the subcommittee proposes to undertake is the inventorying and disclosure of the available talents and facilities which are not now being used, primarily because, I presume, they have not been used in the past and their facilities and talents have not been called to the attention of the administrator.

The administrator, consequently and understandably, finds it easier to pile layer after layer of contracts in areas in which they have been successfully handled in the past. That fact does not prove that the contracts could not be successfully handled elsewhere.

So we want to insist on the establishment of some criteria which will assure the taxpayers generally that all of the facilities and talents of this great land are known to the people who make these contractural decisions. They will then have some criteria and some procedures of distribution which are not the closely kept secret of a few people on or off the public payroll, but which are written in black and white and available to citizens everywhere.

We believe that this kind of public business should be openly arrived at and that people should know why certain kinds of facilities are required and where they are located and what kind of things will go into the determination as to where the contract is to be let.

Nothing of a security nature is involved. It is simply a matter of trying to bring the country as a whole into an area of activity in which a great many States have found themselves almost entirely neglected and in which they have difficulty in bringing to the attention of the proper authorities the talents of the scientists and facilities which they have available.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. I visited one coastal university and found that a sizable portion of their entire budget was made up of grants from various Federal agencies.

I also found that the operation of those programs was cumbersome. They were receiving grants and contracts not from one or two Federal agencies, but from a long list of Federal agencies. There was overlapping and competition between Federal agencies in bidding for the top talent in that university which was very real overlapping and competition.

It can be said actually, without downgrading any of the universities receiving these grants, that the best job from the standpoint of results is not being done. Certainly, the most equitable expenditure of Government funds is not being attained.

Mr. MUNDT. To give the Senate a little better idea of the magnitude of the problem to which he has just alluded, may I say that I happen to serve on the Subcommittee on Appropriations which deals with the funding of some of the items involved in the contracts which have been let. We are constantly being entreated for more funds by presidents and deans of great American universities in which most of these contracts are now being handled. They tell us, and I presume rightfully, that the problems of administering this plethora of Government contracts have become so great that they want an increasingly large percentage of the administrative cost of the university to be paid by the Federal Government as part of these contractual funds.

We have had great difficulty in arriving at a proper percentage formula as to how much of the universities' administrative costs is a rightful and honest charge to be picked up by Uncle Sam because of the very attractive governmental research contracts which the institutions may have achieved.

The institutions have been asking for more contracts, and the more contracts they receive, the more they are concentrated in one area and the more they come to our appropriations subcommittee with vigor to ask for a bigger chunk of Government funds with which to administer the programs.

I am sure that a great many highly qualified institutions around the country have been overlooked entirely by whomever it is who places these contracts and allocates them. I am sure that these institutions would be perfectly willing to assume the administrative costs of running the school and would be willing to absorb the cost of the extra talent that comes there and the extra students that are attracted there. They would be perfectly willing to assume these costs out of their ordinary housekeeping funds for running a university, without coming back for a chunk of the contract money which is supposed to be used for research and saying, "We have to have a certain percentage or a growing percentage of these funds in order to administer programs of this magnitude."

Mr. CURTIS. It would certainly cut it down.

Mr. MUNDT. We would certainly equalize it. We would certainly tend to distribute the contracts more equitably. I believe we would get a better job done, because the administration would be more meticulous; it would be more careful; it would be concentrated on just a contract or two; and it would not be confronted with the situation which must exist in the larger universities, when they say, "In order to administer it properly, we have to have more and more Federal funds in order to meet that challenge."

Mr. CURTIS. That is because it is so concentrated, it takes an entire bureaucracy on the campus to run the various programs.

Mr. MUNDT. They make some very interesting presentations, and the more contracts they get, the more enthusiastic they become in seeking a bigger percentage of the funds intended for research to be diverted to them for administrative purposes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

UPSTREAM FLOOD CONTROL AND SOIL CONSERVATION IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, to be in on the ground floor of any great movement is cause for considerable satisfaction, and it carries with it a certain responsibility to assure its continued success.

I am proud to have participated in the early battles for Federal legislation to fight flood and drought in Oklahoma and elsewhere in the Nation. We are winning the battle with a fickle nature because we set up a sound soil and water conservation program under the Flood Control Act of 1944, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954—better known as Public Law 566, the Great Plains Conservation Program, and other congressional actions in support of a prosperous agricultural economy and a stable rural society.

For more than 20 years I have initiated and supported legislation designed to save the land and water resources of this Nation and build their potential for the benefit of the city man and the rural resident alike. I have done so because I believe it is no use talking about a sound and prosperous America in the years ahead if we do not make sure now that our basic natural resources—our soil and water—will be able to support a growing population, an expanding economy, and an enlarged commerce at home and abroad.

We have not yet licked the elements, in spite of all we have accomplished on the land. We have not yet made the most out of the land, or assured the clean water supplies we need in a given amount at a given place, when it is needed.

We are going to do this, but we are going to do it only by pushing hard those programs of soil and water conservation of proven benefit.

The Washita River Basin in Oklahoma provides an outstanding example of watershed protection and development. The Washita contains 64 separate watersheds, and stretches from the western border of Oklahoma in Roger Mills County to the southern border at Lake Texoma. The Washita embraces one of the pilot watershed projects established under the 1944 act. The Washita experience has demonstrated conclusively that effective flood control—which is basic to sound land use can be accomplished.

Sixty-six of Oklahoma's 77 counties are participating in upstream flood control. Under the Public Law 566 program in Oklahoma more than 50 watershed projects have been approved for planning and over 40 of these for operations. But there is a backlog of applications waiting to be serviced, and the projects underway must be completed as rapidly as possible. Delay in making this program as effective as we can means loss of protection against floods in hundreds of valleys throughout the country; loss of water storage as a hedge against drought; loss of opportunities to attract industry, to develop water-based recreational areas, and to provide for the growing needs of urban and rural America. I firmly support the House action removing the limitations imposed by the Bureau of the Budget on the number of watershed projects to be authorized for planning and for operations. And to make this action meaningful, I submit that the Senate should increase support of watershed works of improvement by $5 million, to the 1965 level of appropriation.

On Oklahoma farms and ranches today there are nearly a half million more cattle grazing the land than in 1960. This increase has come about through sound pasture management and enlarged pasture acreage. We increased proper use of native rangeland from 1 million acres in 1960 to over 6 million acres in 1965, and new tame pasture by approximately a million acres since 1960.

We have successfully converted cropland to pasture where this change indicated better use of the land. In this transition, the Great Plains conservation program has played a vital role. More than 2 million acres in Oklahoma are under contract through this program. About 71,000 acres of cropland will be converted to grass, and about 1,800,000 acres of rangeland will be improved.

This highly successful operation deserves the support of Congress. I propose an increase in support funds for the Great Plains conservation program of $2 million over the budget proposal and the House action to meet the backlog of work on the farms and ranches of a great and promising region of midcontinent America.

The sharp cut in soil survey funds proposed by the Budget Bureau, and only partially restored by the House, challenges the Senate to assure greater progress in this vital work on the millions of acres of rural and rural fringe lands not yet serviced. Soil testing and classification are vital to sound development—in the city as well as in the country. This scientific work should be accelerated—certainly not retarded—if the national interest is to be properly served. The Senate should, at the least, increase soil survey funds by $1,600,000 over the House figure, to the 1966 level of appropriation.

I propose further the following Senate action in support of the Soil Conservation Service budget for fiscal 1967:

Restore the $1,026,000 to assist with income-producing recreation on our farms and ranches which was deleted by the House.

Restore the $983,300 for acceleration of river basin surveys and investigations, cut by the House.

Restore the $227,000 for resource development and technical assistance cut by the House from the resource conservation and development item. The House action reduces the effectiveness of a highly promising cooperative program at a time when it should be given every opportunity to prove itself. The Cherokee Hills resource conservation and development project in Oklahoma, and the other 19 resource conservation and development projects throughout the Nation have outstanding potential. Let us give these projects the support they deserve.

There has grown up in this Nation a sound and beneficial relationship between the Federal Government and local land owners and operators in the rural areas, with the firm cooperation of the States. We have demonstrated in this greatest volunteer land and water conservation movement in the history of man the resourcefulness of our free enterprise society at its best. We have every reason to see to it that this relationship is strengthened, so that our lands and waterways may better serve America's needs.

Proud as the people of my State are of Oklahoma's national leadership in soil and water resource development, we are not satisfied merely with leadership in this vital endeavor. We seek, and I am confident Americans everywhere seek, the wisest and most beneficial use of the waters and land that we possess.

I dedicate myself to this task, and I call upon my distinguished colleagues representing our sister States to join in this dedication.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR TOURISTS AT THE CAPITOL SHOULD BE IMPROVED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we are once again witnessing the spring crush of visitors to our Capital. The number of visitors to Washington, D.C., increases year after year, and is now estimated at over 20 million annually. By 1980, this figure will top 35 million.

In the last few years our Capital has undergone some dramatic changes, making it a more beautiful and captivating center and host city for our visitors from all over the world. Our charming First Lady deserves much of the credit for launching the drive to beautify the city. Areas previously barren mud patches are now ringed with colorful azaleas, shrubs, and trees. Tourists can now stop at public information booths and kiosks for directions and information on historic points of interest. Future Americans who visit their Capital will owe much to Lady Bird Johnson's project to make Washington, D.C., a showplace of beauty.

Congress must also do its part to assure visitors to the Capitol Building adequate accommodations. During the peak tourist season the pressures on the physical facilities in the Capital complex are tremendous. Existing facilities cannot adequately accommodate the present number of visitors and will be woefully inadequate with increased traffic.

Mr. President, in light of these increasing needs, I propose that steps be taken to establish a light refreshment and comfort station area for summer visitors. This center could be located on the Capitol Grounds and be operative from April through September. It need not be an elaborate and expensive area but could consist of a few attractive temporary structures or possibly even gaily colored tents. These structures could be so placed that they would add to the festive and picturesque mood of the visitor but not detract from the historical beauty and tradition of the Capitol.

Mr. President, not enough is being done to accommodate the public visitors to the Capital. In addition to the limited facilities, Congress is not using an opportunity to increase public knowledge about Congress' role in the American system.

On April 5, 1966, I introduced Senate Resolution 247, authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make arrangements for preparing a film on the Senate. It is my belief that such a movie would explain the working of the Senate and its significance to our system of Government. I suggest to my colleagues in the Senate that the time has come to expand public knowledge about Congress, how it works, and its role in the Government as a whole.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 17, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Messages from the White House received during adjournment:

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12, 1966:

The Judiciary

John J. Hickey, of Wyoming, to be U.S. circuit judge, 10th circuit, vice John C. Pickett, retired.

Ozarks Regional Commission

William M. McCandless, of Oklahoma, to be Federal Cochairman of the Ozarks Regional Commission (new position).

Executive nominations received by the Senate, May 16, 1966:

In the Marine Corps

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. James M. Masters, Sr., U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

In the Army

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William Jonas Ely, O18974, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

In the Navy

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Francis J. Blouin, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

In the Air Force

The following officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

In the grade of lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Richard M. Montgomery, FR1025 (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. William O. Senter, FR 648 (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

In the grade of lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Marvin L. McNickle, FR1721, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Arthur C. Agan, Jr., FR1759, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Austin J. Russell, FR1980, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James W. Wilson, FR1711, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George S. Brown, FR4090, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Seth J. McKee, FR4279, Regular Air Force.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be majors

James W. Mangum, FV763273.
Laurence Maher, Jr., FV1911933.
John D. Ward, FV1910290.
William B. Owens, FV1911869.

To be second lieutenants, distinguished Officers Training School graduates

Paul E. Braden, FV3153716.
John K. Bray, FV3153660.
Paul D. Burtner, FV3153798.
Terry H. Campbell, FV3153827.
Kenneth E. Dean, FV3153894.
Ronald L. Deanhofer, FV3153862.
Arthur L. Dirkse, FV3153750.
Thomas Donnelly, FV3153739.
Hugh H. Forster, FV3153726.
John M. Gay, FV3153758.
Milton T. Gerock, Jr., FV3153700.
Richard W. Johnson, FV3153926.
Charles W. Magsig, FV3154274.

Joseph McDonald, FV3153846.
Alfred A. Parone, Jr., FV3153826.
Richard L. Purdon, FV3153749.
Michael G. Roehr, FV3153869.
Ronald Schultz, FV3153663.
Roger J. Vercruyse, FV3153816.
James E. Waller, Jr., FV3153719.

The following Air Force officers for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code:

To be lieutenant colonel

Hugh McFarland, FR7580.

To be major

James R. Cicarelli, FR15656.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with date of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be majors (Chaplain)

Conaboy, Conan J., FV2255923.
Lesch, Howard J., FV2234070.
Nelson, John F., FV1860232.
O'Brien, Joseph T., FV2250873.
Mooney, Robert M., FV2218441.

To be captains (Chaplain)

Hall, William S., FV3046071.
Sirles, James W., FV3088065.

To be first lieutenants (Chaplain)

Bluschke, Derrick W., FV3097399.
Bode, Harold, FV3061891
Busher, Peter J., FV3062289.
Carleton, Rhon V., FV3095858.
Cleary, William O., Jr., FV2062400.
Cowell, Donald M., FV3106941.
Davis, Edwin S., FV3060282.
Doughtie, Robert J., FV5205412.
Evans, Paul R., FV3062404.
Felker, Lester G., FV4073842.
Gallenbach, Thomas E., FV3062362.
Griffith, William H., FV3062357.
Hartsell, Franklin D., FV3062522.
Hensley, Billy D., FV3094402.
Kaiser, Roman F., FV3062403.
Lewin, Fred, FV3062024.
McGinty, Edward S., FV3062325.
Meeks, Alfred W., FV3062369.
Metcalf, Frank D., FV3062407.
Richard, Leon J., FV3062581.
Smeltzer, John P., FV3106119.
Thurman, James M., FV3062560.
Valen, David L., FV3093523.
Warren, William H., FV3062416.
Whalen, John R., FV3062426.
Wood, Richard D., FV3061979.

To be majors (Medical)

Baker, Robert N., FV3077246.
Battle, Earl P., FV3044197.
Beckman, Paul H., FV3125369.
Chang, Walter W. Y., FV3077268.
Kelley, Ira M., FV2100087.
Neal, William R., FV3043092.
Reddin, Patrick C., FV3044891.
Traynor, Joseph E., FV3044805.

To be captains (Medical)

Alexander, David G., FV3140215.
Allen, Benjamin R., Jr., FV3111743.
Anderson, Hal C., FC3114455.
Armer, John A., FV3126912.
Armstrong, Joseph R., FV3114534.
Baker, Edgar D., FV3114457.
Banta, Miguel B., Jr., FV3167323.
Bauer, Jimmie O., FV3140214.
Becchetti, John J., FV3114414.
Beckham, Mack E., FV3123026.
Belk, William F., FV3141230.
Benvenuti, Robert P., FV3074137.
Bidstrup, Richard J., FV3124964.
Biltz, John F., FV3141708.
Blacker, Gerry J., FV3111840.
Boerner, Robert M., FV3113948.
Boineau, Maxcy C., FV3124144.
Boivin, Robert J., FV3077248.
Booth, Donald J., FV3141042.
Breschi, Louis C., FV3114540.
Britton, John J., FV5305148.
Buckley, Clifford J., FV3142859.
Buckley, Richard E., FV3141379.
Burgos, Vazquez Francisco, L., FV3126911.
Callahan, William E., FV3127231.
Carraway, James H., FV3114384.
Cole, Ronald J., FV3127026.
Collins, Harry G., FV3124773.
Corpening, William S., Jr., FV3140539.
Danehower, Chester C., Jr., FV3114476.
Dittert, Henry M., Jr., FV3114536.
Donald, Robert L., FV3114538.
Dudley, Ainsworth G., FV3139963.
Ennis, John M., FV3111659.
Faries, James L., FV2227379.
Fascenelli, Fred W., FV2227983.
Fetkenhour, Carl L., FV3126955.
Fettus, George H., FV3123881.
Fleming, Bryan W., Jr., FV3126975.
Fontenelle, Larry J., FV3114456.
Freeman, John A., FV3124961.
Galindo, Osilio J., FV3004103.
Garner, Joseph F., FV3114610.
Gawecki, Frederick M., FV3126964.
George, Harold C., FV3037564.
Gilman, Robert T., FV3123831.
Gleason, Paul D., FV3142185.
Glickman, Kenneth I., FV3124443.
Gonzalez, Antonio C., FV3126913.
Gonzalez, Joe V., FV3004406.
Good, Glenn E., FV3126909.
Goss, Kelly E., FV3111788.
Grober, Ronald S., FV3140346.
Haaland, James A., FV3140138.
Haff, Roderick C., FV3141201.
Haney, James A., FV3114575.
Harada, William S., FV2230331.
Hermann, Lee K., FV3111549.
Hite, Donald B., FV3074460.
Hollander. Edward M., FV3140991.
Hudson, Edward V., FV3141973.
Jaegers, Kenneth R., FV3123794.
Johnson, Leonard W., Jr., FV3079060.
Johnson, Warren E., FV3140000.
Kienzle, George E., FV3114544.
Kim, James D. S., FV3123103.
Kimball, David A., FV3114543.
Kirkland, Charles P., FV3022545.
Kudzma, David J., FV3114576.
Kitching, Gilbert E., FV3045956.
Kyker, Paul G., Jr., FV3124638.
Labarre, Gary C., FV3143769.
Laborde, Cliffe C., Jr., FV3126752.
Lawrence, Leonard E., FV3140251.
Lawson, James G., FV3140900.
Lewis, Ronald G., FV3122990.
Lohr, David C., FV3141412.
Lopezcorrea, Raul H., FV3125346.
Madere, Sherman G., FV3114469.
Mahoney, Jerome J., FV3125999.
Maloney, Thomas R., FV3126845.
Mann, Thomas W., FV3142478.
Marsh, Wallace S., FV3142878.
Massey, Freddy M., FV3122920.
Maurer, Robert M., FV3114468.
Mazzaferri, Ernest L., FV3140576.
McCall, Victor E., FV3113938.
McCullough, Charles T., Jr., FV3124688.
McNeill, Donald L., FV3114459.
Moore, William B., FV3141596.
Moorehead, Myron E., FV3141431.
Morris, John R., FV3111579.
Mullican Charles N. FV3140917.
Murphy, Thomas E., FV3141982.
Nall, Joseph D., FV3111578.
Opitz, James C., FV3127060.
Palma, Joseph A., FV3114553.
Pamplin, Gary N., FV3140732.
Perkins, Paul H., FV3126896.
Petri, Edward J., FV3114551.
Poston, Alexander, FV3140610.
Prentice, James A., FV3142203.
Price, Terrill E., Jr., FV0462164.
Prohaska, Gary T., FV3126871.
Puma, Samuel C., FV3114466.
Reid, Donald A., FV3114430.
Rosen, Gerald M., FV3124432.
Saldana, Luis R., FV3123903.
Schultz, John L., FV3113951.
Severs, Ronald G., FV3002648.
Shaklan, Barry N., FV3111670.
Shelton, Leslie W., Jr., FV3112029.
Shultz, Gail N., FV3114550.
Simpson, Richard B., FV3126484.
Stover, William S., FV3124971.
Slarve, Richard N., FV3124809.
Smith, Darryl D., FV3142650.
Smith, James F., FV3141786.
Smith, Roger R., FV3141372.
Snell, John C., FV3142169.
Stewart, James E., FV3111568.
Stinebiser, James H., FV3111569.
Talbot, John M., FV3124970.
Taylor, Burt F., FV3141216.
Thurmond, Nicholas D., FV3126487.
Torphy, Daniel E., FV3066145.
Torres, Tomas M., FV3127072.
Tucker, Harry L., FV3114429.
Tucker, Joseph B., FV5315744.
Vandyke, John J., FV3114372,
Vause, David D., FV3126190.
Walsh, Ronald E., FV3141358.
Warkentin, John H., FV3126938.
Wasser, Arthur H., FV3114428.
Watson, Claren F., Jr., FV3111923.
Wenger, Bruce E., FV3084635.
White, John W., Jr., FV3111551.
Wilson, Joe B., FV3111660.
Wittke, Paul E., FV3140224.
Worrell, Aubrey M., Jr., FV3127075.
Wright, John, FV3114426.
Zavacki, John, FV3114374.

To be first lieutenants (Medical)

Abbott, Kenneth H., II, FV3166665.
Anderson, William E., FV3165895.
Andruczk, Robert C., FV3125874.
Ashby, Kenny, FV3125875.
Bauer, Raymond, FV3126199.
Berry, Frank W., Jr., FV3125877.
Bickham, Billy L., FV3125878.
Bishop, John E., FV3126010.
Brashears, Larry B., FV3125900.
Bryant, James L., II, FV3125880.
Burton, James R., FV3125879,
Carlton, Thomas K., Jr., FV3125637.
Chaney, Arthur W., Jr., FV3125902.
Chappell, Seaborn, M., FV3126278.
Chastain, George M., III, FV3141057.
Conklin, Thomas R., FV3141056.
Cook, James H., FV3125905.
Cox, Aris W., FV3164870.
Crowder, Wade A., FV3141452.
Davies, Chesley R., FV3126095.
Dear, Steven R., FV3165938.
Demos, George T., FV3140730.
Dunaway, Rodney P., FV3140647.
Erickson, Larry L., FV3167299.
Falbaum, Hartley L., FV3166444.
Fisher, William J., FV3125889.
Forkner, William A., FV3140645.
Frank, Sanders T., FV3166648.
Giese, Herbert A., Jr., FV3140643.
Gigax, John H., FV3167409.
Gillingham, Kent K., FV3125911.
Gilsdorf, Richard C., FV3126182.
Gladhart, Rodney D., FV3035280.
Graubert, Alan S., FV3125885.
Harger, Charles H., FV3166138.
Hargis, Robert J., FV3126047.
Harper, Douglas M., FV3143228.
Harsin, Harold S., FV3125884.
Hartman, James F., FV3165568.
Hasz, Richard D., FV3125883.
Hatch, Larry K., FV3125890.
Henrickson, Hilbert J., FV1934925.
Houk, Robert L., FV3125954.
Howshar, Edward G., FV3125891.
Hughes, Joseph E., FV3125892.
Hunter, David M., FV3125887.
Hutton, Robert D., FV3141635.
Hyman, Miles D., FV3165693.
Johnson, Randall E., FV3126250.
Johnson, Wayne A., FV3065394.
Kelly, Paul A., FV3165675.

Kirk, Clifford C., Jr., FV3166183.
Kramer, Edward F., FV2236303.
Lewis, Henery L., III, FV3125881.
Longnecker, Morton F., Jr., FV3085690.
Lucey, Donald T., FV3126012.
Maxey, Samuel A., FV3125895.
McFarlane, Claude L., FV3125894.
Messenger, John C., FV3165897.
Morgan, John L., FV3143378.
Mumby, Robert C., FV3002476.
Murphy, James E., FV3125896.
Natelson, Stephen E., FV3125955.
Neimanis, Andris, FV3139919.
Odom, David D., FV3165690.
Olsen, Armin B., FV3140656.
Parkins, Charles W., FV3126031.
Pascualybaralt, Jose F., FV3143137.
Phillips, Joe M., Jr., FV3140651.
Poe, Booker T., FV3143023.
Pohl, Donald R., FV3140655.
Pugh, William R., FV3126201.
Recker, Robert R., FV3125898.
Reed, James C., FV3143823.
Robinson, Charles C., FV3166524.
Robinson, James R., FV5403728.
Robinson, Thomas R., FV3125952.
Rodriquezcolon, Juan, FV3166602.
Rosenthal, David S., FV3126435.
Ruggeri, Robert W., FV3143483.
Sarnacki, Clifford T., FV3167179.
Shirley, James H., FV3126094.
Spurlin, Richard J., FV3125904.
Stadler, Frank, III, FV3126318.
Stevens, Joseph B., FV3165058.
Stieg, Richard L., FV3126011.
Strine, James A., FV3127001.
Sullivan, Clyde E., FV3125868.
Swaim, John F., FV3126046.
Swanson, Philip A., FV3164829.
Tate, Harry B., FV3125872.
Thebaut, Ben R., Jr., FV3142201.
Thompson, Cleveland, III, FV3166182.
Thompson, Francis C., Jr., FV3125871.
Thompson, Richard M., FV3125870.
Tobias, Thurman E., FV3126045.
Todd, David S., FV3126310.
Vondrell, John J., FV3126129.
Walker, Thomas F., FV3125985.
Watson, Alfred B., Jr., FV3165006.
Wells, David E., FV3140653.
Wood, Albert F., FV3126940.

To be captains (Dental)

Battock, Richard D., FV3110778.
Birdman, Murray J., FV3113510.
Blumenfeld, Walter L., FV3125568.
Brumfield, Frank W., FV3113450.
Buchen, Bayard A., FV3090647.
Buzenas, John A., FV3126711.
Crockett, Leonard D., FV3090836.
Davis, Fredric C., FV3113430.
Fliss, Sheldon D., FV3113843.
Forrest, William R., FV3125116.
Garcia, Reynaldo, FV3113662.
Green, Larry E., FV3114498.
Hartman, Garrett E., FV3125120.
Hazelbaker, Dale R., FV3125132.
Hersho, Robert M., FV3033204.
Hickey, James C., FV3113846.
Hubbuch, Behrle W., Jr., FV3140795.
Idema, William A., FV312646.
Jarvis, Raymond J., FV3125196.
Karnes, George D., FV3113438.
Keuper, Jack B., FV3125134.
Marchelya, Norman A., FV3125540.
Morse, Donald P., FV3090902.
Parttridg, John C., FV3125619.
Penn, Paul D., FV3113246.
Rice, David R., FV3125183.
Rosen, Ronald, FV3113569.
Salazar, Cervando, FV3123427.
Schaeffer, Max L., FV3089349.
Sebastian, Alexander J., Jr., FV3124653.
Setzler, Ralph C., Jr., FV3125137.
Sudinsky, Theodore R., FV3125492.
Sydlowski, Stanley E., FV3125467.
Taft, Jerry D., FV3113625.
Thompson, Michael W., FV3125740.
Tyler, Donald L., FV3123075.
Vanvooren, Claude P., FV3125503.
Wilensky, Alan J., FV3123533.
Wood, Douglas E., FV3111019.
Wymer, William E., FV3088712.

To be first lieutenants (Dental)

Aberth, George H., Jr., FV3140407.
Addis, James E., FV3140291.
Allen, Ronald L., FV3140394.
Ausich, Joseph E., FV3141173.
Bobo, Willis D., FV3140387.
Boese, Lee R., FV3140463.
Brunsvold, Michael A., FV3140969.
Burkes, Ernest, J., Jr., FV3140459.
Butts, Charles S., III, FV3140334.
Chipman, William R., FV3140592.
Coe, Sheldon, FV3140430.
Collins, Ernest F., FV3140458.
Cruser, Dwaine K., FV3140472.
Dohaney Martin, J., Jr., FV3140623.
Drake, Philip L., Jr., FV3141604.
Dukart, Rodney C., FV3140522.
Frost, Douglas Y., FV3140473.
Gecsek, Edward P., FV3140625.
Graham, Robert F., FV3140437.
Gullatt, Theodore J., FV3140381.
Halpern, Martin R., FV3140943.
Haroz, Carl T., FV3140523.
Hill, William J., FV3140823.
Holbrook, Thomas E., FV3140456.
Holgate, Robert S., FV3140763.
Jennette, William C., Jr., FV3140465.
Johnson, David J., FV3140466.
Kay, William D., FV3140438.
Keenan, Allen C., FV3140825.
Kirkatrick, Patrick A., FV3140246.
Kutz, Paul L., FV3140742.
Lawbaugh, Michael J., FV3140947.
Maust, Jay R., FV3140401.
McLeod, Gary L., FV3140565.
Moore, John N., Jr., FV3140316.
Morgan, Gary H., FV3141048.
Nero, Louis A., FV1340474.
Osborne, Harold W., FV3140269.
Osburn, Richard C., FV3140642.
Palace, Victor J., FV3140408.
Porter, Cleveland H., Jr., FV3140476.
Rocco, James J., FV3140202.
Roylance, Robert L., FV3140424.
Schiller, Lary J., FV3140467.
Scholes, Edwin, Jr., FV3140406.
Searl, Frank V., Jr., FV3140525.
Senia, Ennio, S. A., FV3037750.
Short, Ronald C., FV3140297.
Smith, Howard E., FV3017378.
Smith, Kenneth J., FV3140469.
Valenzano, Vito J., FV3140368.
Wilkinson, Raymond F., FV3140268.

To be captains (Nurse)

Baukus, Donna M., FV3078972.
Bennett, Leland R., FV3044613.
Boone, Reba, FV3089351.
Engle, Raye C., FV3045811.
Forster, Mary R., FV3089680.
Gordon, Charlotte J., FV3089659.
Kammerlocher, Mary T., FV5407046.
Kidder, Joanne, FV2243315.
Maine, Hugh C., FV3045798.
Schmidt, Ellen C., FV3089719.
Wetherby, Shirley M., FV2243542.

To be first lieutenants (Nurse)

Adams, Mary E., FV3090486.
Adkins. Leona F., FV3124389.
Albaugh, Beverly A., FV3126646.
Aufdenberg, Shirley J., FV3126600.
Beaugez, Annette M., FV3126230.
Berkheiser, Jean L., FV3125948.
Beuing Ursula I., FV3126844.
Brillhart, Rita A., FV3140184.
Caldwell, Sally A., FV3089732.
Cardinal, Virginia, FV3114486.
Cunningham, Patricia A., FV3125528.
Dellesky, Mary A. L., FV3125942.
Demeaux, Jeanne R., FV3091808.
Deogburn, Charlotte M., FV3091956.
Duff, Carol J., FV3125807.
Durrette, Elsie L., FV3126418.
Eliseo, Irene J., FV3126166.
Evoy, Mary E., FV3126642.
Falkenberg, Carol L., FV3126264.
Farrell, Barbara L., FV3126362.
Fenton, Patricia M., FV3126497.
Fetsch, Blanche, A., FV3046020.
Flythe, Susie A., FV3090050.
Fuller, Mary C., FV3078933.
Ganser, Carol A., FV3125993.
Gendron, Bernice M., FV3126605.
Guerricabeitia, Christina, FV3111133.
Guthridge, Evelyn V., FV3091545.
Haney, Mary S., FV3092077.
Hines, Bertha J., FV3126217.
Irish, William R., FV3125820.
Jenkins, Ella L., FV3127296.
Johnson, Judith A., FV3126713.
Jorgensen, Margaret J., FV3092901.
Kurt, Jerome C., FV3125762.
Kuzmich, Nancy, FV3125385.
Laudise, Margaret A., FV3140500.
McCabe, Patricia A., FV3125967.
Mead, Edward C., FV3126613.
Meggers, Adele L., FV3111361.
Menne, Kenneth E., FV3126210.
Miller, Peggy J., FV3140017.
Morris, Virginia B., FV3139949.
Munro, Jean A., FV3126298.
Nathan, John G., FV3126207.
Novak, John F., FV3126774.
Pavlich, Mary L., FV3092138.
Pearcy, David A., FV3125771.
Phillips, Georgia E., FV3112778.
Price, Carolyn M., FV3126492.
Priddy, Billy G., FV 3126554.
Privitera, Paul A., FV3126460.
Rieck, Gwendolyn A., FV3126592.
Sabol, Regina J., FV3091775.
Sam, Alice M., FV3092197.
Shulse, John R., FV3125355.
Steadman, Barbara J., FV3127104.
Stone, Alexis A., FV3126521.
Swearingen, James L., FV3140159.
Swope, William C., FV3126555.
Walls, Jeanette L., FV3127227.
Warren Judith N., FV3126775.
Wolford, Priscilla R., FV3126985.
Wood, Virginia M., FV3127292.
Young, Marva P., FV3091448.
Young, Willie E., FV3092564.
Zigarovich, Annette, FV3140598.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinarian

Brewer, George L., Jr., FV3143178.
Burch, Louis T., FV3140758.
Dalgard, Dan W., FV3142792.
Greybek, Adolphe D., FV3166490.
Kendrick, Jerry Z., FV3143100.
May, William O., Jr., FV3140755.
Townsend, Lee R., FV3140959.
Vandyke, Don, FV3165892.

To be captains, Medical Service

Batiste, Harold E., Jr., FV3077985.
Brown, Duane C., FV3077986.
Dodson, Burt, Jr., FV3075654.
Fudge, Forest W., FV3087790.
Jacquin, John H., FV2262091.
Johnson, Glenn E., FV3087690.
Katz, Stewart H., FV3078387.
O'Connor, Joseph J., FV3078875.
Parker, Robert W., FV3088593.
Redman, Ronald A., FV3087850.
Tamse, Jacob G., Jr., FV3078017.
Whittemore, Warren W., FV3078131.
Yeomans, Richard C., FV3078674.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service

Amesbury, John F., FV3091253.
Anastasiu, Elaine S., FV3110188.
Davis, Allen W., FV3166674.
Frient, Gerald J., FV3098196.
Genco, Louis V., FV3167366.
Habbinga, Richard H., FV3100331.
Hermann, Kenneth G., FV3112497.
Kollbaum, Dennis D., FV3167250.
Maisey, Terry M., FV3105105.
McCusker, Edward P., FV3091710.
Morton, James I., FV3091804.
O'Donnell, Daniel J., FV4065982.
Powell, George F., Jr., FV3091535.
Rieckhoff, Elmer C., FV3104844.
Taucher, Donald F., FV3167649.
Turner, Charles E., FV3111384.
Welsh, Kenneth W., FV3167070.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service

Birch, Shelton R., FV3154516.
Bomar, John B., Jr., FV3157370.
Cumuze, Antonio G., Jr., FV3168955.
Dobbs, Melvin B., FV3133360.
Giles, Jay J., FV3160276.
Kapsch, Robert J., FV3160208.
Parker, Frank M., III, FV3162995.
Rakowski, Robert F., FV3160440.
Riccardi, Richard M., FV3160315.
Ryan, Michael J., FV3159996.
Schiering, George D., FV3130399.
Stone, Kenneth M., FV3160543.
Thornell, Michael J., FV3157353.
Tremblay, Roland A., FV3160160.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Specialist

Clarkson, George W., FV3166629.
Drawdy, Joan, FV3125340.
Harthan, Karen E., FV3164096.

To be second lieutenant, Medical Specialist

Trittschuh, John C., FV3167943.

To be captains, Judge Advocate

Cain, John J., FV3025356.
Fuller, Joseph L., FV3117371.
Hamilton, Jerry J., FV3104301.
Hon, Daniel, FV3116152.
Palmer, Garrett W., FV3082377.
Persky, Arnold I., FV3055931.
Smith, Earl C., FV3032631.
Stephens, Larry G., FV2227802.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate

Adams, Franklin L., Jr., FV3109170.
Alexander, William W., Jr., FV3121990.
Bailey, Edward L., FV3139100.
Bexten, Richard C., FV3139101.
Brown, Ken M., FV3139105.
Browne, Richard C., FV3100968.
Bruner, James D., FV3139117.
Conner, Leslie L., Jr., FV3109520.
Cunningham, Arthur B., FV3100487.
English, James L., FV3139122.
Farfaglia, Theodore S., FV3105260.
Gauger, James E., FV3100588.
Hitt, William R., FV3139107.
Huffman, William G., FV3136514.
Hyland, Gerald W., FV3096817.
Kautt, Richard W., FV3154889.
Keller, Peter A., FV3139207.
Klein, Daryll E., FV3105943.
Lester, Stephen K., FV3139209.
Lewis, Paul K., Jr., FV3139110.
Loy, William A., FV3003912.
Lusk, Robert E., FV3139210.
Marvin, Charles R., FV3105591.
Mims, Roy L., FV3099721.
Montgomery, Robert F., FV3139213.
Murphy, Michael E., FV3139112.
Nagy, Robert A., FV3100592.
Ohlstein, Myron, FV3139113.
Olson, Theodore H., FV3121963.
Oxford, Hubert, III, FV3106463.
Pushkar, Raymond S. E., FV3139215.
Rengert, Kenneth R., FV3121953.
Salem, Albert M., Jr., FV310586.
Schulman, Sydney T., FV3095800.
Sebesta, Joe M., FV3139216.
Seeligson, Henry, FV3106547.
Stanton, James L., FV3100670.
Stout, James A., FV3139217.
Thomas, Forrest W., FV3139118.
Warner, Arthur W., Jr., FV3139099.
Williams, Conward E., FV3121969.
Woodley, Samuel S., Jr., FV3109186.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1966:

Department of Housing and Urban Development

H. Ralph Taylor, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Don Hummel, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Francis M. Wheat, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1971.

Small Business Administration

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Court of Military Appeals

Robert Emmett Quinn, of Rhode Island, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term of 15 years expiring May 1, 1981.

U.S. Air Force

To be generals

Gen. Dean C. Strother, FR591 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, FR1082 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, FR1623, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United State Code.

U.S. Army

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, to be Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 142.

Postmasters

ARKANSAS

Jack Whillock, Clinton.
Elizabeth K. Brannon, Colt.
John T. James, Cotton Plant.
Carroll W. Patrick, Decatur.
Denver H. Estes, Malvern.
Leo J. Eckart, Paris.

CALIFORNIA

Leonard J. Bednorz, Banning.
Jack W. Wilkins, Courtland.
June M. LeRoy, Dobbins.
David Hartshorn, Holtville.
Wilbur F. Hammond, Lomita.
Daniel J. Taylor, Modesto.
Harold J. Mahar, Orange.

COLORADO

Ruth M. Gurley, Englewood.
Lois E. Mall, Louisville.
Lloyd C. Catron, Sterling.

CONNECTICUT

John T. Smith, Brooklyn.

DELAWARE

Richard H. Quillen, Lincoln.

FLORIDA

George W. Kelley, Howey in the Hills.
Norton B. McNeal, Ocala.
Delmas E. Pittman, Oneco.
Dorothy L. Smith, Sumterville.

ILLINOIS

Donald S. Maciejewski, Calumet City.
Glenn A. Brown, Farmersville.
Forrest A. Holstrom, Geneseo.
Ernie A. Plotz, Grayslake.
John J. Drover, Jr., La Grange.
Mervin J. Hoffman, Lenzburg.
Grover J. Beaird, Norris.
Thomas H. Nolan, Oakland.
John C. Totten, Peoria.
John C. Wenger, Rock City.
Helen L. Brent, Stanford.
George R. Campbell, Tower Hill.

IOWA

John D. Kaster, Afton.
Harvey, W. Spurgeon, Keosauqua.
Charles A. Papach, McIntire.
Robert C. Dee, New Hampton.

KANSAS

Harold H. Derby, Dresden.
Edwin M. Whitmore, Fall River.
Lucille J. Lindh, Marquette.
Ray T. Amer, Pleasanton.
Richard A. Merz, Satanta.

KENTUCKY

Heskel W. Roaden, Corbin.
Carl W. Preston, Junction City.

LOUISIANA

Georgiana M. Authement, Cut Off.
Charles V. Giles, Hosston.
Alma L. Guillot, Norco.

MAINE

Arthur L. Reed, Brewer.
Theodore A. Johns, Carmel.
Carroll A. Nevells, Lee.

MARYLAND

George H. Buck, Havre de Grace.
Joseph A. V. Duchaine, Kensington.
C. Irving Pinder, Queenstown.
Franklin P. Coulbourne, Salisbury.
Harry O. Baker, Willards.

MICHIGAN

Daniel J. Fox, Decatur.
Luther S. Larkin, Drayton Plains.
Norman F. Knorr, East Detroit.
Monte C. Sauers, Lake Odessa.
Samuel L. Buck, Rapid City.

MINNESOTA

Eldon L. Rootes, Elk River.
James M. Hawkinson, Jr., Kandiyohi.

MISSOURI

Ralph W. Anderson, Holcomb.
Glenn K. Chaney, Humansville.
Blanche A. Goodan, Hurdland.
Raymond L. McDonald, New Haven.

NEBRASKA

S. Gertrude Neubauer, Brewster.
W. Wayne Thompson, Bruning.
Donald C. Lange, Gibbon.
Harold L. Bausch, Leigh.
Donald E. Warnke, Meadow Grove.
Wilma M. Novotny, Odell.
Merle S. Treadway, Rising City.
Mable M. Boggess, Salem.
Dean W. Spike, Silver Creek.
Ruth G. Reichstein, Trumbull.
Earl K. Trullinger, Waterloo.

NEW JERSEY

Philip J. Leary, Sr., Egg Harbor City.
Joseph C. Thomas, Englewood.
Mary E. Bernard, Kingston.
Alice E. Taylor, Malaga.
Robert F. Kelly, Palisades Park.
Francis W. Kasse, Ridgefield Park.
Vincent J. Sindone, River Edge.
Leonard F. Errico, Stockton.

NEW MEXICO

Cyril B. Tate, Moriarty.

NEW YORK

Neil G. Van Allen, Central Square.
Francis J. O'Gorman, Colton.
Andrew F. Papa, Fonda.
James H. Blaney, Franklinville.
Merel G. Hubbard, Gilboa.
Ralph E. Christoferson, Greenhurst.
Shirley M. Buchanan, Hagaman.
Conrad W. Sinning, Hawthorne.
Ralph G. Cascardo, Hicksville.
Helen S. Swotkewick, Jamesport.
Leonard S. Fischer, Monsey.
Edna C. McManus, Montrose.
Reeve D. Curtis, Mount Upton.
Carroll H. Belgard, Ogdensburg.
Andrew T. Pink, Pleasant Valley.
Anne Wolstencroft, Sayville.

NORTH CAROLINA

Allen T. Powell, Jr., Aboskie.
C. Odell Merrill, Beaufort.
James L. Perry, Carrboro.
Charles L. Marks, Chapel Hill.
Paul D. Gilmore, Julian.
Roger C. Royall, Roaring Gap.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marie E. Lockhart, Egeland.

OHIO

Mildred L. DeVault, Maynard.
Eldom E. Rychener, Pettisville.
Otto McClanahan, Springboro.
Joseph L. Dennison, Springfield.

OKLAHOMA

Jack E. Cochran, Wagoner.

PENNSYLVANIA

William G. Lutz, Sr., Barto.
Eleanor M. Bordner, Bethel.
Hugh J. Malloy, Carrolltown.
John F. Helm, Downingtown.
Mattis A. Pottiger, Harrisburg.
C. Jean Steinkirchner, Jennerstown.
John J. Mullally, Jermyn.
Ernest P. Zserai, Jonestown.
Howard L. Bredbenner, Mifflinville.
Herbert D. Snyder, New Bethlehem.
George W. Brehm, Newtown Square.
Albert L. Seals, Rices Landing.
John J. Buchinsky, Shenandoah.
William G. Cox, Thompsontown.
Lloyd L. Williams, Vintondale.
Robert H. Stoner, Washington.
Lyman A. Stambaugh, York.

PUERTO RICO

Benjamin Cole, Mayaguez.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sara L. Hendrix, Conestee.
Louise W. Sottile, Isle of Palms.
M. Alexander Foster, Roebuck.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Eugene C. Lauer, Howard.

TENNESSEE

Kermit S. Boals, Finley.
Jack F. Naifeh, Mason.
Nancy L. Shaw, Pleasant View.
Arthur E. Reynolds, Tennessee Ridge.

TEXAS

Travis W. Russell, Ackerly.
John O. McMahon, Bremond.
Jerrold N. Turner, Daingerfield.
Lura E. Seago, Gustine.
James L. Davis, Howe.
Jackie L. Reed, Manvel.
Tom M. Yarbro, Marathon.
Elsie Joyce Rowe, Moscow.
Atha E. Williamson, Olden.
Martin E. Parker, Round Rock.
Leona M. Page, Wink.

VIRGINIA

Eleanor W. Smith, Farnham.
Murray O. Cates, Lawrenceville.
Robert M. Dwyer, Remington.
Annie J. Lewis, Stony Creek.
Samuel B. Sheffield, Jr., Waverly.

WASHINGTON

Clifford K. Brock, Chehalis.
John H. D. Smith, Orondo.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles B. McDonald, Jane Lew.

WISCONSIN

Inez I. Goodell, Wheeler.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Charles S. Abbot, to be ensign in the Navy, and ending Roger D. Zorens, to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 5, 1966.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Resource Leaders Help Beyond the Farm in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, when the next population census is taken just 4 years from now, we expect to find that Connecticut will have one person for each acre in the State. The total number of acres in Connecticut is 3,135,360 and the population is estimated at 3 million.

Meeting land and water requirements for 3 million people and more in our State calls for intelligent consideration of the use of each tract of land. It calls for protection and improvement of the land in that use.

I am pleased that in Connecticut nearly 5,000 landowners are working together in 8 soil conservation districts to better their lands. The progress they have made in protecting and improving our private rural lands, with technical help of the USDA Soil Conservation Service, during the past two decades is commendable.

These districts have pointed the way to proper land use and treatment. They now are unselfishly helping bring the same know-how to the expanding rural-fringe areas where much of Connecticut's rapid development is taking place. Each district has revised its program to include broader community help, and signed a new working agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The districts have been of considerable assistance to the planning agencies and to the town conservation commissions in their work of guiding urban growth and meeting needs for open space and outdoor recreation areas. Soil survey information, furnished by Soil Conservation Service soil scientists, has been valuable in locating suitable areas for housing, industry recreation areas, new roads, schools, and other developments. As such, this information is vital as a basis for comprehensive town planning.

Through these soil conservation districts, technical advice is made available for solving erosion, siltation, drainage, and flooding problems in built-up areas. Many of the same conservation land treatment measures that are effective on farmlands also work or can be adapted for use on land developed for urban uses. And land must be protected no matter what its use.

Most of Connecticut's land is privately owned. If it is properly used and developed, it adds greatly to the scenic beauty, character, and economic potential of the State's communities. We do not want the other alternative.

I want to salute Connecticut's eight soil conservation districts and their cooperators and elected leaders for their vigorous efforts on behalf of all the citizens of the State. We have a brighter future in store because they are part of the resource improvement team.

National School Safety Patrol Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my fine colleagues in the House of Representatives in designating the second week of May at National School Safety Patrol Week.

Our school safety patrols perform a valuable service as auxiliary aids to our local police officials in improving traffic safety in the vicinity of the public schools. In volunteering for the school safety patrols, our children accept both a responsibility and a concern for the well-being of others. I believe these children should be commended for the fine contribution they have made to their schools and their communities through this volunteer service.

Let us all take time this week to offer our thanks and appreciation to the children serving on school safety patrols and afford them the acknowledgment they so well deserve.

New Speedup of Tax Collections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I realize that accelerated wars, one in Vietnam, and the Great Society one on the home front have increased the pressure to get more money, faster, into the Treasury.

The latest gimmick in this money grab is a new regulation of the Internal Revenue requiring two deposits a month instead of one by employers of the income tax they withheld from their employees pay and also of employer-employee social security taxes.

Under the present requirement employers must deposit these taxes by the

15th of the following month. Under the new regulation, as I understand, employers will make semimonthly deposits within 3 banking days after the 15th and last day of each month covering taxes collected up to and including the 15th or last day of the month.

I have long strongly objected to the fact that business firms are compelled to do so much accounting for the Government at such a heavy cost.

This new proposal will double this cost which is especially hard on a small business which has no electronic bookkeeping equipment.

However, where the real problem comes under the new plan is with firms with branches where all the payroll accounting is done at one office and where information as to withholding has to be forwarded from these other offices.

I can understand why an administration that wants to spend more money quicker would want a speedup of collections.

But these new regulations show a complete lack of consideration of corporation procedures and appreciation of office costs.

Mr. Speaker, this new regulation should be rescinded.

Fino Urges Federal "Portable Pension" Mechanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to study a Federal mechanism for "portable pensions" because I feel that in this day and age, there ought to be some way in which our workers can achieve job mobility without sacrificing accrued pension payments and rights.

The way in which present lack of pension interchangeability presently restricts the job mobility of American workers smacks of medieval feudalism when peasants were tied to the land. Lack of a credit mechanism to transfer pensions within an industry or within a group of companies—or ideally within a nationwide framework—contributes to overemployment in evermore redundant industries and to a lack of initiative on the part of those who have lost jobs but because of pension payments wait around for possible rehiring instead of moving on to new jobs. The lack of a viable national "portable pension" scheme is also a factor in keeping skilled labor from moving into booming new enterprises crucial to our expanding economy.

As far as I am concerned, a "portable pension" mechanism is vital to a 20th century industrial nation. I regret that the Johnson administration has given no leadership in coping with this problem. They are too busy trying to pull the wool over labor's eyes with respect to broken promises to bother with achievement.

My "portable pension" bill is part of a package I am introducing to help prove to labor that creative Republicanism and national labor can move together toward progress. My package also includes H.R. 14932, my bill to require the NLRB to order a union-busting employer who has defeated a union in an election only by unfair practices to bargain with that union as if it had won the election, and H.R. 14872, my bill to knock out the tax-free interest status of municipal bonds used by right-to-work States to attract runaway industries.

There is plenty of room within the Republican ideology for these badly needed measures, ignored by the Democrats, to aid and strengthen American labor.

Communist Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the administration announced it is seeking legislation to give it additional authority to negotiate commercial agreements with the U.S.S.R. and other nations of Eastern Europe.

This would be part of the effort to "build bridges" to the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe which it is claimed would benefit us through allowing them to sell more goods here and presumably open the gates wider for U.S. sales to Communist bloc countries.

I believe this is a highly inadvisable proposal which runs directly contrary to our national interest and security.

Something that is not always fully realized is that we are already selling significant amounts of technical data and equipment to Communist bloc nations and that these items are highly significant toward building up the economic and industrial potential of those countries.

At various times in the past I have brought to the attention of the House many instances of licenses issued authorizing shipments to the Communist bloc. One of these was my statement to the House which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last fall, September 2, 1965. It will be recalled that among the many items referred to were licenses to ship oil production and vital equipment and data to Rumania.

I know that many Members of Congress and large segments of the public who share my deep concern about shipments of such items as oil producing equipment to the Communist bloc will be interested in a letter I have just received setting forth the impressions of an American couple who recently witnessed the shipping to and unloading of oil production equipment in Rumania. The letter states:

> On January 27, 1966 we were aboard the *Aimess Lykes* at New Orleans, bound for the Mediterranean and Constanza, Rumania. At that port we loaded a complete crane (for oil field use apparently) with parts—one piece alone weighed 24,800 lbs.
>
> On February 26, 1966 at Constanza, Rummania this shipment was unloaded. A representative of the American shipper was on hand to check the arrival—even to the extent of photographing the equipment in the hold. Apparently this piece by piece check and pre-unloading photography was to prevent any complaint by Rumanian interests.
>
> On the dock adjacent where our ship was tied up was a city block completely covered by military vehicles, jeeps, armored cars, etc. labeled for "Haiphong Made in Bucharest, Rumania." We were shocked to find our country shipping industrial material to a country who was supplying the Vietcong with material to kill American boys.

I am sure that millions upon millions of Americans concur completely in those remarks. Why, indeed, should the United States sell data and equipment to the Communist bloc countries who are aiding Communist aggression in Vietnam?

There is little likelihood in my view that selling advanced equipment and data to the Reds can really reduce Communist zeal for world conquest or their deceit and duplicity in carrying out their goals.

Disclosures of the Week—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, certain new serious disclosures came to my attention last week, which I would think would invite public indignation and tend to cause people to lower their respect for the way the Johnson administration is conducting our affairs.

Case one: The Richmond Va., Newsleader reported that we are spending $25 billion a year for the war in Vietnam; the Communists, on the other hand, are only spending $1 billion. If this continues for 20 years, what will be the result on U.S. finances, considering the huge domestic spending? We better get in and win, or get out.

Case two: Typical of the policy which Secretary McNamara defends as economy was the case of a jeep found on a Far East Army base. It had 13,000 miles on its odometer. Army inspectors said it could be repaired for $4.47 but it was declared overage and disposed of.

Case three: The Federal payroll is listed at $35.3 billion next year, up $4.8 billion in the past 2 years.

Case four: The Neighborhood Youth Corps of the poverty program has thus far spent $287 million. And to date the Youth Corps has produced 1,061 "graduates," including those who entered the Armed Forces. The cost works out to

$270,909 per graduate. The most expensive school in the world.

Case five: In De Kalb, Ill., a suit has been filed to stop a kindergarten class from saying:

> We thank you for the flowers so sweet, we thank you for the food we eat, we thank you for the birds that sing, we thank you for everything.

Case six: The Baltimore Sun reports that a manual of Federal programs takes 332 pages to describe the 223 Federal assistance programs under which Maryland State and local agencies can tap the Federal till.

Case seven: Senator LAUSCHE told the Senate the other day that a certain Thomas F. A. Plant of Stanford University was allocated $1,100,000 by the Federal Government to make a study of the subject of alcoholism and its impact upon the people of the United States.

According to the Senator, after 5 years of study, Mr. Plant, the researcher, recommends to parents of teenagers that they should begin feeding their children alcohol. He concluded that taboos against liquor advertising on TV, radio, and otherwise should be eliminated. He wanted future television to show family drinking.

That was what the taxpayers money was used to recommend.

Hon. LeRoy Collins, Under Secretary of Commerce, Delivers Informative and Challenging Address at Salute to Industry in Huntington, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, culminating a Salute to Industry Week proclaimed by Mayor Robert E. Hinerman, the Huntington, W. Va., Downtown Improvement Group had Under Secretary of Commerce LeRoy Collins as guest speaker at its luncheon event last Saturday.

Having been a participant in the program for the event, I commend Under Secretary Collins' informative and challenging address, and I especially underline his expression of belief that—

> Local people have the ability to plan programs that will meet local needs and that there is need for only a minimum of such decision making in Washington. But I do think we should make the most productive use of our Federal system. It doesn't make sense for each town or even each state to struggle with problems in isolation, behind a spite fence of sovereignty, when those problems have common roots and common consequences, and often—though by no means universally—common solutions.

And I believe that the appropriate Federal role is to encourage such meaningful cooperation. Let me emphasize the word "encourage." By encouragement, I mean, very simply, building effective incentives into Federal programs that will stimulate and aid strong local effort. We have been doing much of this over the years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from my remarks and my introduction of Under Secretary of Commerce Collins, as well as from his enlightening and meaningful speech at the conclusion of Huntington's Salute to Industry Week.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH AT SALUTE TO INDUSTRY LUNCHEON, HUNTINGTON, W. VA., MAY 14, 1966

This noteworthy tribute to industry has been substantial. This is merited recognition of the significant accomplishments of labor and management in contributing to the continued social growth and economic development of Huntington and surrounding communities. I am confident that each of us will draw from these activities inspiration and motivation and most importantly a sincere appreciation of the dedicated industrial forces which are daily creating a better America.

In the spotlight during this Salute to Industry Week have been the 44,000 industrial employees in the Greater Huntington area and the products which they produce. Each unit and segment fits into this vital industrial complex.

We are aware of the varied products, the payrolls which mean buying power, the taxes for Government services and education, the contributions to organizations—charitable, civic, and religious, and the leadership to the community—all are a direct result of the industrial employment in our Huntington area.

But the most important realization to be derived is that an organization, a business, or an industry is only as progressive and productive as individuals make it.

A salute to industry is actually a tribute to each individual who is supporting the total efforts for achievement. We stress strongly the vital part the human element performs and will continue to contribute in our society. We recognize that this Nation and the world are in an era of unprecedented change with automation, computerization, and technological advances. And the role of the worker in such a dynamic society must change with the altering of our economic structures and institutions. We will still need the native ability, education, and experience of the individual citizen. Certainly, there will be requirements for a higher level of training and education of workers, but this will not lessen the importance of a person's contribution. On the contrary this will make it even more essential that each individual, with guidance and motivation, be responsive to the challenges and responsibilities of assigned tasks.

We commend past accomplishments of industry but this celebration also constitutes a dedication to a better tomorrow. Thomas Wolfe, one of America's literary greats, thought in terms of the promise of America and said:

"To every man his chance * * * to every man the right to live, to work to be himself, and to become whatever his manhood and vision can combine to make him. This, seeker, is the promise of America."

Indeed, we are a nation of seekers, and our aspirations and hopes are being realized in part by the vibrant and cooperative forces of labor and management.

We have not yet fulfilled the promise of which Thomas Wolfe wrote, but certainly we have made pronounced progress. In the forefront of these endeavors to build a better America is our guest speaker the Under Secretary of the Department of Commerce, LeRoy Collins. It is fitting that he be with us, since the activities and programs of the Department of Commerce are vital to the economic development of this Nation and to the labor-management atmosphere through which this development will be more effectively realized. Settlement of the recent Holland-Suco dispute here is a good example of labor-management cooperation.

But Secretary Collins does not merely represent a department of Government keenly interested in securing solid business and industrial bases for our communities, he is a dynamic leader with productive years of experience in public service dedicated toward this end.

From 1955 to 1960, he established a distinguished and progressive record as the Governor of the State of Florida. Officials involved in the administration of local government and programs may be assured that he knows your problems because he has experienced them. After his tenure as chief executive of Florida, Secretary Collins served as the President of the National Association of Broadcasters. He then returned to Government as the Director of the Community Relations Service of the Department of Commerce. In June of 1965, Secretary Collins was appointed to his present post.

Secretary Collins has been a policymaker in organizations dealing with public administration, education, and social development. Of particular interest to our audience today is his work as Chairman of the National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment, a position bearing directly on our efforts to revitalize communities in West Virginia and throughout the Nation.

LeRoy Collins is a compassionate man, yet a man of realism. His constructive contributions to business and government are a testimony to his commitment to good citizenship and cooperative effort.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LEROY COLLINS AT SALUTE TO INDUSTRY LUNCHEON, HUNTINGTON, W. VA., MAY 14, 1966

Through the efforts of this Downtown Improvement Group and other organizations, you are coming to grips with your essential needs here in Huntington; you are striving to do those things which will be of lasting advantage in the years that will stretch out ahead; you measure your work not merely in terms of how it will affect your own well being, but how you can serve new generations to come.

This is a beautiful land you occupy, though some of its lines are deep and demands harsh. It chose the people who have lived here—by trying their endurance and perseverance and ingenuity and by testing their faith. It chose them well, and they have served well—Huntington today is proud evidence of the strength of the American spirit and the spirit of American strength.

From 1962 through 1965, employment in the Huntington-Ashland labor area has risen from 80,000 to 87,800, an increase of almost 10 percent. That's 7,800 more people who are enjoying the satisfaction of gainful and productive jobs.

On the other hand, unemployment dropped more than 34 percent. In effect, that means that 3,300 people who had no way to contribute their talents and their efforts to Huntington and the Nation now have a way. And while unemployment fell the number of persons in the work force increased by 4,500. That is a splendid advancement in your economy in such a short time.

These are the kind of statistics that make you happy to read. For behind them, you can see thousands of happier, brighter homes, where children are no longer bewildered and worried because daddy is so cross most of the time and are thrilled because mama can get a piano—children who are not hungry any more.

That's what prosperity means to me. It cannot be defined or measured really by an artful arrangement of numbers—it must be cast in human terms. Prosperity is the opposite of poverty's pain. It is the release from want that frees a person's mind to relish the gift of life.

When I became governor of my state in 1955, we felt Florida was then on the threshold of a major general expansion. We were eager to stimulate and guide that growth in ways which would be most meaningful and which would promote long-range stability.

Up to then, Florida's economy primarily was supported by two strong legs—agriculture and tourism. While these afforded substantial income, our economic stability was a little precarious just as a two-leg stool would be.

So, we set out to build a strong third leg for our economy—industry.

We armed ourselves with a lot of very impressive statistics about low taxes, ample labor supply and new markets, but we also emphasized heavily the human side—our educational advantages, religious activity, health, good human relations, and sound law enforcement.

We quickly learned from business leaders all over the land that their officials and employees were interested in much more than the pay in a job. They were interested in the whole community in which they lived—the kind of people who lived there, the kind of leadership they encouraged, the kind of schools, hospitals and recreation they had, and the goals the community set for itself.

They were not looking for cheap labor but competent labor, with responsible leadership sharing an interest in the community.

My more intimate relationship with business as Under Secretary of Commerce has served to make me even more conscious of this truth.

It seems clear that you have recognized this also and obviously, as for us, it has been working to your advantage in countless ways.

Your new payrolls, improved public schools, rapidly advancing Marshall University, public parks, recreational programs and art galleries all attest that Huntington is importantly on the move with leadership that not only reflects the vision to see but the will and energy to act.

I firmly believe that local people have the ability to plan programs that will meet local needs and that there is need for only a minimum of such decision making in Washington. But I do think we should make the most productive use of our Federal system. It doesn't make sense for each town or even each state to struggle with their problems in isolation, behind a spite fence of sovereignty, when those problems have common roots and common consequences, and often—though by no means universally—common solutions.

I think we should put our heads together at the Federal, state and local level and share our resources, share our know-how. As President Johnson has stated, all of these problems, the burdens of progress, cannot be heaped upon what he called "the strained resources of local authority."

I believe that better cooperation between local government units on a multitude of local and regional problems is highly desirable. This cooperation can be between neighboring cities, between cities and their bedroom suburbs, between counties, as in connection with an economic development center, and between states in regional compacts.

And I believe that the appropriate Federal role is to encourage such meaningful local cooperation. Let me emphasize the word, "encourage." By encouragement I mean, very simply, building effective incentives into Federal programs that will stimulate and aid strong local effort.

We have been doing much of this over the years.

Think what this country would be like without the roads, bridges, airports, hospitals, schools, health programs, farm programs, research centers, and so on, which have been developed by joint Federal-local effort.

The new Economic Development Administration, established by Congress in 1965, and the Appalachian program which preceded it provide systems for grants and loans to help communities which have problems of high unemployment or low family income.

These programs are not for new court houses. They are designed to be generative.

The objective is to provide the conditions which will induce private industry to create new and permanent job opportunities.

These are not hand-out programs, but strictly a self-help opportunity by which the areas affected can better attack basic problems through their own initiative.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, once wrote: "I think it is required of a man that he should share the action and passion of his times at peril of being judged not to have lived."

In every lifetime, there are basic issues which give rise to the most significant events of that chapter of history—issues that are filled with passion and demand action.

Some people are rarely touched by them. They manage to turn their heads from the tumult and the heartaches of the nation and the world; and it was Justice Holmes' theory that when they do this, they turn away from life itself.

But today, in our ever more interdependent society, we simply cannot afford blindness to the problems about us. I think there are five areas of critical importance in which we must use more and more of our talent and other resources:

1. The making of equal opportunity a reality in America;

2. The elimination of the scourge of poverty;

3. The elimination of pollution in our natural environment;

4. The achievement of sustained national economic growth and avoiding cycles of boom and depression; and,

5. The development of a firm basis for world peace.

Generations before ours have known the critical nature of these needs, but we have neglected to apply the might and strength of our nation in effective programs to meet them.

The country long preferred to let them stew, hoping that somehow they would go away. But they haven't. Like most unmet problems they have grown ever larger. Without adequate action, the passion has become more inflamed.

In the area of race relations, we have felt the fury strike in countless ways and places.

In the area of poverty, rebellion has replaced the tired eyes of acquiescence.

In the area of our natural environment, the pollution of streams and the air, the ruthless, heedless exploitation of the land have left their stench and ugly scars to the extent that we sometimes cringe at the thought of lifting up our eyes unto the hills.

In the area of economic stability, we have avoided serious storms of late, but many of us here well remember the economic depressions that have struck in former years with such devastating damage, inducing hundreds of our people to take their own lives and reducing millions to the agony of want through no cause of their own making.

And in the matter of world peace, we continue to have very serious problems.

We aspire for a world in which freedom, democracy and self-determination are available to all nations. Yet today coercion through military coups and imposed solutions plays a very large role in a growing number of nations.

We have two Berlins, two Germanys, two Chinas, two Koreas, two Vietnams—two worlds, East and West—each with guns pointed at the other. This doesn't look like the kind of arrangement which can be permanent and we must become more deeply concerned about how it may be changed for the better.

We are in a war now in southeast Asia, and we cannot yet get an end to this in our sights, as hard as the President and those working with him are trying.

But nothing is beyond our capabilities. We have proved this time and again.

If America will face its needs with knowledge of their meaning and dimensions—with a unity in purpose for meeting them—with a will to work and sacrifice in such efforts—then we cannot fail.

We hear clearly today not just the call of a President, or of a party, but the call of people—Americans everywhere—people who are different in color, in religious loyalties, in national origin, in temperament and disposition, in regions people with beliefs of unlimited varieties—but people, who know they have a common destiny in one nation, indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all.

I need not remind you that this is a call of passion, a call to be answered by action in our time.

A Tribute to Secretaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege and pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the dedicated secretaries in observance of National Secretaries Week.

Today, I would like to pay tribute to those many loyal men and women who, in their dedicated careers as secretaries, give each of us in public life such capable and understanding guidance in our daily efforts to serve our constituents in the U.S. Congress.

I also would like to pay tribute to all of the secretaries in private business and in industry. I especially want to point with pride to the secretary on Capitol Hill, who plays such a vital role in serving our country and who is well trained and qualified to help keep the wheels of our economy running smoothly.

May I also take this opportunity to compliment and commend the work of the Official Reporters of Debate. This is such a demanding job, and a task that often requires a certain skill to take the dictation that is so rapidly spoken on the House floor, and when transcribed flows into such eloquent remarks.

My wholehearted thanks go out to my entire staff, who serve me faithfully in discharging my duties to the people of southeast Iowa.

Legislative Poll in Texas, Third Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE R. POOL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed a legislative poll in the new Third Congressional District in Dallas touching upon various matters of great importance before Congress this year. I have found this survey to be most informative and, in addition, I have been extremely impressed by the enthusiasm with which my constituents took part in this survey. Many wrote to me to express their appreciation for my seeking their views. It is obvious by the response that those participating approve of this type of poll.

In the course of this project, I mailed an approximate total of 180,000 questionnaires and received 12,314 replies, representing nearly 7 percent of the number mailed out. I believe this is considered normal in the direct mail industry.

I would like to further state my pleasure over the overwhelming response to question 7 on tax credit exemptions for parents of college students and question 8 on demonstrators since I have pending legislation in the 89th Congress on each subject.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert, at this point, a tabulation of my questionnaire responses:

[Answers in percent]

1. GI Bill of Rights. Do you feel Congress should enact some form of GI Bill of Rights to extend to Viet Nam servicemen the same benefits enacted for veterans of World War II and the war in Korea?

Yes	94
No	4
Undecided	2

2. Excise Tax. To help finance the Viet Nam war, do you feel Congress should reestablish the excise tax on automobiles and telephones this year which we eliminated during the 1st session of the 89th Congress?

Yes	42
No	50
Undecided	8

3. Withholding Rates. Do you favor changes in our present federal income tax withholding program to make withholding rates more closely correspond with actual tax rates?

Yes	66
No	22
Undecided	12

4. Four-year Term. Do you favor a Constitutional Amendment providing a four-year term for Members of the House of Representatives instead of the present two-year term which was designed to allow voters to closer "grass roots" relationship with their elected officials?

Yes	42
No	51
Undecided	7

5. Viet Nam Policy. Do you approve of the Administration's handling of our situation in Viet Nam?

Yes	51
No	35
Undecided	14

6. KKK Investigation. Do you feel the investigation of the Ku Klux Klan by the House Committee on UnAmerican Activities has served a good purpose?

Yes	57
No	28
Undecided	15

7. Tax Credit. In 1958, I publicly proposed an extra tax credit for parents of college students. Are you in favor of such a tax credit exemption as presently gaining bipartisan support in Congress?

Yes	73
No	19
Undecided	8

8. Demonstrators. Do you feel demonstrators who block U.S. troop trains, burn draft cards, send gifts and blood plasma to North Viet Nam should be fined and imprisoned when such acts would be considered treasonous if we were in a declared state of war.

Yes	86
No	7
Undecided	7

"Where Law Ends, Tyranny Begins"—Law Day Address of Senator Richard B. Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MASTON O'NEAL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Friday to attend the 18th annual Law Day observance at Mercer University. The occasion was highlighted by the dedication of the Langdale Law Library—named for a distinguished Georgian, Judge Harley Langdale.

I was impressed by the dignity of the occasion, the tribute to Judge Langdale and the academic caliber of students and faculty at Mercer University. Above all, I was inspired by the profound Law Day address delivered by Georgia's senior Senator, RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL.

Senator RUSSELL is one of the great men of our age. I would like to share his timely remarks with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

Today marks another landmark in the history of Mercer University.

The addition of the Langdale Law Library—named in fitting tribute to my good friend, Judge Harley Langdale—bears evidence of the determination to continue Mercer's tradition of excellence as a citadel of learning.

In the 133 years since this institution was founded at Penfield in Greene County, Mercer has furnished enlightenment and leadership to our State and Nation through the thousands of young men and women who have gone forth from this campus. Its graduates have distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and have brought great honor to themselves, their alma mater and to Georgia.

I particularly wish to commend President Harris for his leadership here. He carries forward an unbroken succession of illustrious educators who have guided Mercer's destinies and made it a source of intellectual and spiritual strength. His example in giving up the presidency of a much larger institution in order to devote his great energy and talent to Mercer is a tribute to his deep faith in the vital role of the smaller independent college in our plan of higher education.

It has always seemed appropriate to me that Mercer chose to name its law school in honor of a man of the stature and character of Walter F. George. It was my privilege to serve with Senator George for 25 years of the 34 he spent in the Senate, and I very early came to recognize him as a man of great wisdom, towering intellect and broad statesmanship. He knew no calling above that of love of country and love of God, and he demonstrated this countless times and in innumerable ways during his long and fruitful life on this earth.

George of Georgia, as he was respectfully known throughout the free world, was a gentleman to the manor born and a statesman of the highest rank. To me he was more. He was my friend. His memory will be cherished always, and his life's work will stand as an enduring monument to decency, dignity, and freedom.

No observance of law day would be complete without a reaffirmation and reiteration of a basic tenet of American democracy—that our's is a governmnt of laws and not a government of men.

The written law is the bulwark of our freedom. It is the means by which we define our rights and defend our individual liberties—liberties which our priceless heritage as Americans. For as the English statesman, William Pitt, observed: "Where land ends, tyranny begins."

The men who composed the Constitutional Convention in 1787 were wise far beyond their time. They had suffered and sacrificed in the cause of freedom and had felt the whiplash of tyranny. They knew from personal experience the eternal truth which history teaches—that no men, or group of men, can be entrusted with government of unlimited power or a government unrestrained by law.

The Founding Fathers, therefore, drew heavily on both their wisdom and their experience to fashion a system of government that provided permanent safeguards for the rights of the American people. They knew the truth of Thomas Hobb's words that "Freedom is political power divided into small fragments." Accordingly, they drafted a written constitution based on the doctrine of divided and defined powers.

They applied the doctrine in two ways. First they delegated to the Federal Government the powers necessary to discharge its functions as a Central Government, and they reserved to the States the power to conduct their internal affairs.

To this plan of dual government—the heart of the federal system—they added a double check on unbridled power by dividing the Central Government into three distinct and co-equal branches—the judiciary, the legislative and the executive. It is this concept of checks and balances that sets the American system apart from and above every other type government known to man.

Our system of government was never represented by its architects to be perfect, for it was an instrument of mortal man. But, in

Jefferson's words, the Constitution "unquestionably was the wisest ever to be presented to men."

Over the years—and particularly in the recent past—there has been an unmistakable assault on our constitutional system and on the doctrine of the separation of powers. This occurrence might be understandable if the Constitution could be classified as a vague document. But it is not vague. The limitations on power carefully delineated by the Founding Fathers are not obscure ambiguities, but precise statements of clarity.

The principal source of the assault on our Constitution is the present Supreme Court. In a long series of decisions reaching into many areas of our national life, the occupants of the Court have, in my view, clearly exceeded the power and authority granted the judiciary under the Constitution.

Indeed, the truth is that on many occasions in recent years, the Supreme Court has usurped and exercised the powers that clearly belong to the Congress and to the States. In the process, it has encroached upon the constitutional powers of Congress and struck down the actions of State legislative bodies in areas clearly reserved by the Constitution to the States.

I for one can only conclude that a majority of the present Court has ascribed to itself a knowledge and wisdom it deems superior to that of the Founding Fathers. These Justices have stopped interpreting the Constitution and have undertaken nothing less than to rewrite the Constitution.

I submit that the time is long overdue for the Court to return to its proper constitutional role. I do not believe it is too much to ask that the Court interpret the Constitution as it was written, and not as some of the Justices might wish it had been written.

George Washington might well have had the present Supreme Court in mind when he said in his farewell address that: "If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation."

The Supreme Court is not alone in its assault on the Constitution. The executive branch of the Government and even Congress have contributed in the past few years to the effort to centralize all power and authority in Washington at the expense of the State and local governments.

I recognize that we are living in an era of vast and sweeping change. I recognize, too, that the accelerating shift to an urban-oriented society is producing new and challenging problems for government at every level.

But I emphatically disagree with those who contend our Constitution is outmoded and that our system is incapable of meeting the changing needs of our people. It is an insult to the Framers of the Constitution, whom historians have called the most brilliant gathering of minds under one roof, to suggest that they were so shortsighted as to fail to anticipate future changes in our national life.

The truth is that our constitutional system is fully capable of coping with the changes and meeting the needs of 20th century America. What is required is not a fundamental change in the system, but a determination to apply the efforts and resources of Federal, State and oftimes local government to common problems in programs that recognize the legitimate rights and role of each. This is another way of saying that the urgent need is for more Federal cooperation with the States and local government, and less attempt at Federal domination.

There are numerous examples of successful programs that have thrived on the proven concept of Federal-State partnership. This is the basis for the Federal highway program, for the joint airport construction program, for the growing attack on water pollution, and for many health and welfare programs.

I believe a major reason for the success of these programs rests in the recognition that the States of this Union do have rights and responsibilities under our Federal system. It was, after all, the States that created the Federal Government and not the Federal Government that created the States.

The debate over the relationship between Federal, State and local governments is not likely to end in the near future. Indeed, it is likely to grow in intensity and, hopefully, in enlightenment in the future.

During the past 2 years, a new phrase—"creative federalism"—has crept into the lexicon of the great society. No one, including those who band it about, seem to know what it means, but there are indications that the President will expound on the theme in a forthcoming message to Congress.

I shall await with interest the official unveiling of the "creative federalism" concept. If it is to mean more emphasis in the future on programs that stress the partnership concept, then it will have my unstinting support.

I believe we have an excellent and up-to-date example of such an approach in the Appalachia program, wherein twelve States, the Federal Government, and local communities are uniting to attack the pressing economic problems that long have gripped much of the Appalachia region.

But if "creative federalism" is to be nothing more than a clever cover for further enhancing governmental giantism in Washington while continuing to downgrade the States and local units of government, I shall oppose it with all the vigor I possess. We have seen far too much of this approach already, notably in recent well-intentioned but misguided programs such as the so-called war on poverty.

Let me, in closing these brief remarks, say a word about the place of the lawyer in our government of laws.

Under our constitutional democracy, no citizen regardless of his station can be excused from the obligation to observe the laws regardless of what his personal feelings about them may be. We cannot pick and choose among the laws, obeying those we like and ignoring those we don't like.

Today, even this cardinal tenet is being flouted by some who enjoy the fruits of our free society. Some of those who take to the streets to demonstrate against actions or laws of their Government which they happen to disapprove claim the right to disobey laws they deem to be unjust.

But there is clearly no such right. If it existed, we would not have a government of laws. We would have an open invitation to anarchy.

Those of you who are lawyers and those who will become lawyers understand more clearly than most people that disrespect for the law and contempt for legally constituted authority simply cannot be squared with our concept of a government of laws. You know that if one man is allowed to violate one law with impunity on grounds that he deems the law to be unjust, there will surely be another man who will claim the right to violate another law with the same impunity. This can only lead in the end to the total destruction of the entire body of law upon which rests not only our freedom but our civilization.

Lawyers have traditionally contributed to the stability of our society. This was so even in Shakespeare's day. Henry VI contains a memorable passage about the plotting of Jack Cade and his fellow rebels against the realm in which Jack is haranguing his followers with lavish promises of money, food, drink and clothing. He is interrupted by his lieutenant-in-rebellion, Dick the butcher, who cries:

"The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers."

I have often thought that this in its way was a rather remarkable tribute to the practitioners of the law. Even in 15th century England, lawyers were considered to be the natural enemies of those bent on disorder and destruction.

Today, as in the past, the men of the legal profession stand as stalwart champions of government by law over government by men—no matter how well-intentioned the men might be. They know the truth of Daniel Webster's observation that good intentions are not a substitute for the rule of law. For as Webster said:

"Good intentions will always be pleaded for every assumption of authority. It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions. There are men of all ages who mean to govern well, but they mean to govern. They promise to be good masters, but they mean to be masters."

Institute for Retired Professionals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Record my remarks before the Institute for Retired Professionals of the New School for Social Research in New York, at their annual dinner on Friday, May 12, 1966. My remarks follow:

Thank you for the honor you are paying me. The annual award of the Institute for Retired Professionals is a particularly coveted prize, coming, as it does, from men and women whose distinguished pursuit of learning and the arts is matched only by their serene determination that their later years shall also be fruitful years of fulfillment.

Four years ago, speaking to the Congregation Ohav Sholom in New York, I had occasion to deplore what seemed to me to be a national neglect of the aged. I spoke of the increasing proportion of elderly people in our population and the relative absence of any "accent of age" in our social thinking and planning. I stressed the conditions adversely affecting older people, the discrimination they encounter in employment, the cruel impact of compulsory retirement merely because of age, often at the very height of productivity. I dwelled on the economic stringency of the elderly and their dependence on old age insurance. Finally, I deplored what I conceived to be the prevailing attitude toward people over 65, describing it as one of mere tolerance and condescension, calculated to make even the aged think ill of themselves—sapping their self-respect. Too often, they were thrust aside like broken tools.

I urged a reversal of our national negativism toward the elderly. I pleaded for a restoration of their prestige.

Although much of what I said in 1962 could still be said today, there is one marked exception. And that exception calls for an apology from me to you. I make it to you now. In my earnest advocacy of the right of older people to live rewarding lives, in my plea for consideration of their plight, I overlooked a central factor in the entire problem.

I overlooked the will and wisdom of the elderly themselves. Little did I know that at the very time at which I spoke—the spring of 1962—your Institute was being given life under the aegis of the New School for Social Research. The Institute came into being as a center for members of the professions who had retired and who wished to continue their education in their chosen intellectual and cultural pursuits. Wisely, the programming was made to include both study and volunteer work, affording the participants the opportunity both of receiving and of giving—a tried and tested formula for successful living.

Your Institute's growth has been phenomenal, opening its doors in 1962 to 185 members and now finding its membership trebled, with a substantial waiting list. The key to IRP's success appears to be twofold: First, the very nature of its membership, intellectual equals of similar age groups in varying professional backgrounds, meeting regularly for the purpose of self-development and the cultivation of a new life. Second, the pursuit of these objectives under their own leadership within the walls of an established educational institution.

Through your Institute you have realized the teaching that life and learning are a continuous process. Thus, what is called the tragedy of old age is seen as a time of rich fulfillment.

Look at the men and women of ripe age who have been marked by history—Galileo, Spenser, Verdi—who were creative in their ninetieth year. Or you can point to such men as Orlando, who at 91 was a member of the Italian Senate, professor at the University of Rome, head of a very successful law firm, and the last survivor of the prime ministers who concluded the Peace of Versailles. Or Churchill or Bernard Baruch and other aged but nevertheless young in mind and spirit. Some of these people I have personally met and I have been impressed with their vigor and interest in living and in life. The one common fact that characterizes all these men is that they never gave up their interest in living and never doubted their capacity for learning. This is a way of life that all can embrace.

At 77 I refuse to believe that in two, three, five years I shall suddenly forsake my interests and feel abandoned. My being in Congress has nothing to do with this. I have been in Congress since I was 36, and I find that the enthusiasm for new problems, the excitement of learning, the stimulation of plays, of opera and music, and reading, and love of family, continue with the years, and I know that because these are with me I shall never be old.

I like what Dr. Martin Gumpert, author of "You Are Younger Than You Think," said: "It now remains for us to transfer our medical experience, our scientific knowledge, into social attitudes. If we accept the older citizen as an asset to our community instead of a burden, if we restore his dignity and independence, if we listen to his judgment and experience, if we respect his rights and challenge his responsibilities, we may be on our way to fulfill mankind's most ardent hope: a mature society governed by wisdom."

Hundreds of bills are introduced in every session of Congress dealing with the many phases of aged and retirement living. The Older Americans Act of 1965 passed by Congress last year marked a major step forward in the Nation's recognition of the need for the full participation in our social and economic life of American older citizens.

The Act emphasized the importance of a strong, central concern for the interests of older people within the Federal Government by establishing an Administration on Aging as a separate and independent operating agency of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Also, the Older American Act places a premium on State and community action and responsibility, citizen interest, and developing opportunities and services for and with older people in their home communities.

The declaration of the 10 objectives in the Older Americans Act of 1965 affirms the Nation's concern for maintaining individual and family self-reliance and independence, for preserving self-respect, and for preventing dependency wherever possible.

"Self-reliance" and "independence"—these are the key words; for the responsibility for the aged does not rest solely on the Government; it is a responsibility within each home and for each individual. While the state can provide such machinery as low-cost housing, to enable old people to live away from the families, and municipalities can provide social centers, and states can provide institutions, and the nation can provide old-age monetary assistance, and employers can do away entirely with compulsory retirement and can employ more people in the older age brackets—all this will be incomplete unless and until the attitude of the people toward old people will change with the changing times and more importantly, unless and until the attitude of the old people will change toward themselves.

What is so superb about your Institute is that it marks a change of attitude that can only result, in Gumpert's words, in "a mature society governed by wisdom." Your leadership in this endeavor should and I believe it will, be widely followed. You know and I know that there is really no such thing as a "retired professional." We will never be really old as long as we maintain and nourish our ceaseless curiosity. It has been cogently pointed out that the only persons who escape the hardening of the arteries of the spirit are those who remain young, naive, innocent, while maturing physically and mentally. They are the people whose middle and late careers continue to reflect the sunrise.

And as a finale to these remarks, permit the following quotation from Longfellow:

"Ah, nothing is too late,
Till the tired heart shall cease to palpitate.
Cato learned Greek at eighty; Sophocles
Wrote his grand Oedipus, and Simonides
Bore off the prize of verse from his
compeers,
When each had numbered more than four-
score years.

"Chaucer, at Woodstock with the nightin-
gales,
At sixty wrote the Canterbury Tales;
Goethe at Weimar, toiling to the last,
Completed Faust when eighty years were
past.

"For age is opportunity no less
Than youth itself, though in another
dress,
And as the evening twilight fades away
The sky is filled with stars, invisible by day."

Results of Questionnaire to 10th District of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert the results of a questionnaire I sent to all the registered voters of the 10th District of Virginia a few weeks ago.

I was elated at the percentage of response in that 21,765 people replied out of approximately 100,000 families who received questionnaires. In addition, I received more than 3,000 letters giving additional comments on the questions.

Sending questionnaires is one of the many procedures I have used during the past 14 years to determine how the citizens of northern Virginia feel about the many problems with which our Nation is confronted. I believe sending out questionnaires on a cross-section of issues every 2 years helps our people to give additional thought themselves to these problems, and I know their response gives me a rather significant confirmation of their views on basic issues.

Question No. 1: Do you favor any further restriction in the sale or ownership of rifles, shotguns, and pistols:

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	14,294	68.0
No	6,716	32.0
No response	755	------
Total	21,010	------

Question No. 2: Do you favor repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits State rights to work laws?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	3,559	17.4
No	16,863	82.6
No response	1,343	------
Total	20,422	------

Question No. 3: Do you favor the President's action in Vietnam?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	14,126	70.3
No	5,974	29.7
No response	1,665	------
Total	20,100	------

Question No. 4: Do you favor a naval quarantine of North Vietnam?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	14,683	74.8
No	4,939	25.2
No response	2,143	------
Total	19,622	------

Question No. 5: Do you favor bombing of North Vietnam?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	15,461	78.3
No	4,274	21.7
No response	2,030	------
Total	19,735	------

Question No. 6: Do you favor a tax credit to help families with children in college to meet tuition costs?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	15,233	72.9
No	5,665	27.1
No response	867	------
Total	20,898	------

Question No. 7: Do you favor increase of unemployment compensation in both amounts and length of benefits?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	3,673	18.0
No	16,752	82.0
No response	1,340	------
Total	20,425	------

Question No. 8: Do you favor sale of wheat and other commodities to Russia and/or other Communist bloc nations?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	8, 916	43. 5
No	11, 595	56. 5
No response	1, 254	------
Total	20, 511	------

Question No. 9: Do you favor any State desiring to do so the right to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	10, 394	51. 5
No	9, 782	48. 5
No response	1, 589	------
Total	20, 176	------

Question No. 10: Do you favor increasing the terms of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	10, 929	52. 5
No	9, 890	47. 5
No response	946	------
Total	20, 819	------

Question No. 11: Do you favor a constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	16, 252	77. 5
No	4, 708	22. 5
No response	805	------
Total	20, 960	------

Question No. 12: Do you favor restoration of excise taxes and increased withholding taxes as recommended by the President?

	Number	*Percent*
Yes	7, 548	36. 8
No	12, 960	63. 2
No response	1, 257	------
Total	20, 508	------

Cards processed, 21,765.

Dedication of New Veterans' Hospital at Charleston, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a majestic new center of healing was dedicated May 13 at Charleston, S.C., for the care and treatment of our veterans.

The Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, ranking Democratic member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, delivered an eloquent address as the principal speaker. His remarks speak for themselves. Under unanimous consent, I am including the text of his address so that those of you who were not fortunate enough to be present at the ceremony may read and enjoy his remarks:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, CHARLESTON, S.C., MAY 13, 1966

Thank you, Chairman OLIN TEAGUE, for your very kind and warm introduction. I am grateful for our association together in the Congress and on our great Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Governor McNair, Majority Leader ALBERT, Mr. RIVERS, distinguished visitors, and friends. I know of no one I would rather have present me to an American audience than TIGER TEAGUE, a great combat soldier, a dedicated colleague, and friend.

OLIN TEAGUE has fought admirably for the veteran, his widow and orphan since he first came to the Congress in 1947. All of us can be grateful to Mr. TEAGUE not only for his leadership in the field of Veterans Affairs, but also in the fields of space and astronautics which will mean so much to the preservation of our country and freedom throughout the world.

Mr. TEAGUE, I welcome you and Mrs. Teague to South Carolina. You have our admiration and appreciation always.

It is always an honor and a pleasure to visit in the Congressional district of my distinguished and illustrious colleague, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS. Mr. RIVERS, we are grateful to you and proud of you. This entire nation, and indeed the free world, is stronger and more optimistic about the cause of freedom because of your chairmanship of the powerful Armed Services Committee. We are grateful for your leadership and we appreciate your hospitality and your kindnesses.

I particularly welcome the Majority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, a man whose leadership, courage, and statesmanship are inspirational to his colleagues. I welcome ihs lovely wife, a native South Carolinian and a very gracious and charming lady of whom all South Carolina and America can be proud.

I welcome to South Carolina and to the great City of Charleston this fine delegation of outstanding Members of the Congress of the United States. We are deeply grateful for your coming to Charleston with us for the dedication of this, one of the world's most modern and finest hospitals.

Somehow it seems more than fitting that this majestic new center of healing should be located in Charleston—a city that is known far and wide for its charm, its warmth, and its noble traditions. Charleston is famous for she-crab soup, that classic musical play "Porgy and Bess," for its lovely gardens, for historic Fort Sumter, and most of all, for its gracious people. This new hospital, with its ultramodern resources for healing, will complement the very spirit of Charleston.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of my colleagues in the Congress; I am proud of the Congress as an institution—one of the greatest institutions preserved over the years by the American people and by our fighting men. I have been associated over the years with many organizations and legislative bodies, but I have never known a more dedicated, courageous, and patriotic group of men and women than those with whom I serve in the Congress. I have every confidence in the distinguished committee chairmen and the individual members of Congress. I can assure you that they will keep that sacred covenant with the American people and uphold the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress has a long and illustrious history. May I remind you that the Continental Congress created these United States. It selected George Washington as Commander in Chief. It was the Continental Congress which conducted the Revolutionary War and the functions of Government before there was a Constitution and before there were any agencies of the United States Government. The Continental Congress created the Army of the United States—the Navy and the Marine Corps. The First Article in the Constitution and the first words following the Preamble deal with the creation of a Congress with a House and a Senate.

I want to welcome the Honorable and Mrs. William J. Driver to South Carolina. As administrator of Veterans Affairs, Bill Driver is recognized by the President and the Congress for his tremendous talent and great ability. He is considered one of the finest and most outstanding public servants in this Nation.

The Veterans Administration, under his leadership, is one of the most efficiently operating agencies in the government. It is one of the largest agencies, with over 170,000 employees and an annual expenditure of approximately 6.5 billion dollars.

The Veterans' Administration has a single aim—to serve those who have so faithfully served their country. The VA takes many roads to that single goal. One of the broadest paths is exemplified by this hospital we dedicate here today, one of the most modern hospitals in all of the United States, indeed, in all the world. Medical care for the veteran is a prime effort of the VA, and in that field it is doing a magnificent job.

The VA has many other important functions. It is the agency that administers such veterans benefits as pensions and compensation for the fighting men wounded in wars, aid to the orphans and widows of those who gave their lives, and one of the finest programs ever passed by a Congress of these United States—the GI education program.

That education program, helping veterans get a better education and better jobs, has proved to be one which has not only been good for fighting men, but also a great financial boon to our country. It was a superb investment by our Government.

Since World War II, this country has spent $19 billion in education benefits, paid to over 10 million veterans. That's a lot of money, and big investment. But look at the return on that investment.

The GIs who took advantage of this education under the GI bills have already returned to the Federal Government, in increased income taxes alone, more than three times the total cost of that program, and the investment will keep paying off for years and years to come. That repayment to the public Treasury is in addition to the greater contributions these educated veterans have made to the economy of the country, and to her enlightened citizenship. These contributions are immeasurable, for they can also be considered in terms of better environment and education for the veteran's children.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you don't find many educated veterans parading around with those Peaceniks * * * Our veterans are solid citizens who know what it's like to face an enemy in a foreign land * * * to defend freedom * * * and they don't want their children to have to do it in this country.

These better-trained and better-educated veterans average 30 per cent greater income than the country's nonveteran population. And that bigger income is directly attributable to better education.

The success of previous GI bills is a lesson that hasn't been lost on your Congress. It has passed a new GI Bill, providing assistance to the veterans of the Viet Nam conflict and other crises since 1955.

That new GI Bill is going to mean a better education for thousands and thousands of younger veterans. We expect over half a million to go to colleges and universities and other schools throughout the United States to improve their earning in the first year of the program.

South Carolina veterans, and Georgia veterans—veterans in every state—will get a better education. Already, more than 143,000 World War II and Korean conflict veterans from South Carolina have gone to college or received training under GI bills, making them better professionals and better technicians and better farmers and better businessmen.

In South Carolina alone, there are now 47,000 post-Korean conflict veterans eligible for benefits. Almost 7,000 of those eligible are expected to enroll in colleges and universities in South Carolina, and they will receive cash benefits of almost $6 million dollars the first year. Both the number of South Carolina veterans in schools and total payment will increase every year for four or five years.

In the next five years, South Carolina veterans will be paid over $30 million in direct educational benefits under this new GI Bill.

Let's look for a minute at the economic advantages of veterans benefits in South Carolina. At this hospital alone, when it is fully staffed and operational in a few months, there will be 558 employees and a payroll of $5 million annually. That's a pretty good economic shot to any community, and it doesn't include the several millions to be spent in purchase of supplies and services, nor the hundreds of jobs provided during the construction of this $13 million magnificent buildings.

Add to that, the VA Hospital at Columbia which has almost 750 employees and an annual payroll of $6,600,000 and the VA Regional Office at Columbia that employs 220 persons and has a payroll of $1,800,000.

All together, the direct payroll to those working for the Veterans Administration in South Carolina will run almost $13.5 million, providing a good livelihood for more than 1,550 families.

That's just the beginning. The Veterans Administration last year expended more than $74 million in South Carolina, including the figures cited on existing payrolls. So this year, with the big new Charleston Hospital, it will be considerably bigger. That $74 million figure of last year includes the amounts I've already given you, plus $8.5 million in compensation and pensions, over $8.5 million in insurance payments, and $650,000 in direct loans.

There is another benefit that hasn't cost the taxpayers a great amount of money but which has been another great stimulus to South Carolina's construction industry and general economy—the GI loan program for homes and business. These are loans made by private banks and savings and loan companies, but guaranteed by the Veterans Administration. Altogether, in South Carolina, 45,800 such loans have been guaranteed, totaling $371 million, up to this year. With the new GI Bill in effect, there has been a new rush for GI loans and almost 700 are expected to be made in this first year.

The Veterans Administration is big business in South Carolina, and these benefits to veterans are benefits which veterans have earned from a grateful nation. That's the reason that the new GI Bill was passed unanimously by both Houses of this Congress.

Overseeing all these millions and billions in expenditures in South Carolina and other States is a very efficient agency, the Veterans Administration. This agency has been a leader in adopting modern management techniques and has saved the Government literally millions of dollars. Just one example: The VA was employing 17,000 clerks and accountants and other people in keeping track of insurance and in making insurance payments, just five years ago. Today, only 3,000 people do the same job, and do it better because of a data system and modern methods. In this field, other government agencies are copying the VA because of its efficiency. The Postmaster General, in a speech the other day, pointed out how efficiently the VA had been operating and said he wanted to adopt some of the practices. I commend the Honorable Larry O'brien who, I predict, will rank with Benjamin Franklin and Jim Farley as one of the greatest Postmaster Generals in the history of our Country.

There's still another area of operation in the Veterans Administration that few people hear about and that is their research in medicine.

You have heard of the pacemaker, a little electronic device which is implanted in a patient's body to send signals to keep weak hearts beating. It has meant life itself to literally thousands of Americans. That, my friends, is one of the accomplishments of medical research in VA.

There are many others, and the benefits of the results of this research has spread throughout all of medicine, all over the world. This research has been accomplished by the VA, and in affiliation with the nation's leading medical schools. Another item is the immediate post-surgery prosthesis of attachment of artificial limbs right in the operating room. The VA is the country's leader in this research, advancing techniques and methods. The work promises to be the greatest single advancement in prosthesis since the French Revolution, when man made the first real efforts to rehabilitate those who lost limbs.

You have heard about the advances in treatment of tuberculosis, the great achievements which have moved the tuberculosis patient from a lingering lifetime in an asylum back to the mainstream of a useful life. VA research played a leading role in making this possible. The VA, as late as 1955, operated 21 TB hospitals, and treated 17,000 patients. Now, it operates two—for 6,000 patients, many of whom stay only short periods. All the rest of those hospitals have been converted into general or neuropsychiatric hospitals to offer treatment to additional veterans who need care.

The VA has also been a leader in research in heart operations and coronary artery surgery. You know of Dr. Michael E. DeBakery, the famed Houston heart surgeon. The VA researchers, working in collaboration with that great surgeon, did much of the early work in developing replacement parts for diseased blood vessels. This work has resulted in the savings of thousands of lives due to techniques developed to remove and replace damaged sections of blood vessels.

Much of the research on the artificial kidney, another advance which saves lives, was done by Dr. Bedding Scribner, a pioneer in the field—when Dr. Scribner was a VA physician.

Organ transplants, still another medical advance with great promise, has been pioneered by a VA team in Denver.

Laser surgery, cryosurgery (a technique of using extreme cold in the operating room), the use of psychotropic drugs in mental disorders, stroke research, group therapy for older patients and the use of drugs taken internally for control of diabetes—are projects that VA researchers have been engaged in.

The VA has also been a leader in use of computers and new machines in diagnosis and analysis. It operates, for instance, a computer adapted to modern techniques which has made analysis and diagnosis of heart disease far more accurate. I could go on and on.

The Veterans Administration hospitals are not just treatment centers.

Their own doctors and psychiatrists, in collaborations with the world's leading medical scientists at medical schools with which VA is affiliated, have been leaders in dozens of fields of medical advancement.

The affiliation with medical schools is another wonderful thing, for both the VA and the medical schools. Right here, in Charleston, the Veterans Administration hospital is fully affiliated with the South Carolina Medical College, located just a few block away. That great college with a dedicated President and faculty is one of the finest and one of the proudest medical institutions in the United States, with a tradition that has made our Medical College of South Carolina known everywhere.

The contributions of the South Carolina Medical College to medicine in this country are too numerous to recount here, but now, with this wonderful new facility and this affiliation, we can all expect our great medical college to reach new heights in research, in education, and in medical achievements. It will mean better medicine for veterans, and better medicine for South Carolina. It will mean research that will seek the way for relief of human suffering and the savings of more and more lives.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the fairest judges of the quality of treatment in veterans hospitals are the veterans themselves. I know, because as a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, I think we hear every complaint any veteran has ever made about hospital care.

What do the veterans themselves, those who use the 125,000 beds in 165 VA hospitals, think about their hospitals? I'll tell you what they think. They think they're superb. Our Committee—the Veterans Affairs Committee—recently sent out thousands of questionnaires to veterans in all general VA hospitals, asking them what they thought of the doctors, the nurses, their care, the hospitals—everything about the hospital operation. The response was overwhelmingly favorable. Over 95 per cent of those who replied said they thought their care and treatment was good, and some of the comments reflected their feeling.

Said one South Carolina veteran at the Columbia Hospital, and I quote:

"I have had to be in this hospital several times in the past two years. I would like to say that I feel that I have had the best care and the best possible doctors. I cannot say enough about the good medical and personal attention I have received."

And another: "I have had the best care and best possible doctors."

Lest you think they were all high in praise, one had this to say: "The coffee was cold." Now there's a veteran who remembers his GI days. But that was about the worst they had to say about our hospitals. Bill Driver's people are doing a magnificent job.

Abraham Lincoln, speaking at Gettysburg, said, "We cannot dedicate, we cannot hallow this ground." My Friends, in the truest sense, those of us gathered here today cannot really dedicate this building. It has already been dedicated by those who fought on a thousand battlefields, and by those who gave their lives that men shall be free.

The men who dedicated this splendid building were the men who were "over there" during World War I—the men at St. Mihiel, Chateau Thierry, and the Meuse-Argonne who wrote an indelible chapter in the annals of military history.

This building has been dedicated by those men in the Ardennes, North Africa, Italy, and Normandy Beach who destroyed the fascist "isms" that would enslave mankind.

It has been dedicated by those who on the land, on the sea, under the sea, and in the air defeated the raving Hitler, Tojo, and the dictator Mussolini who referred to the American Congress "as a bunch of parliamentary charlatans."

This hospital has been dedicated by the flower of our manhood who fought in a far-away distant land—Korea where they were truly tested in that "fiery crucible of combat."

This building is being dedicated today in South Vietnam, Santo Domingo, at the Berlin Wall and in those areas throughout the world where freedom is being challenged by the bigotry, hatred, greed and intolerance.

This building has been dedicated by our professional soldiers in four world wars and, yes, by those civilian soldiers called from the farm, the factory, and the corner drugstore to stand guard on the ramparts of freedom to hurl back the tide of dictatorship, atheism and communist aggression. We can dedicate this building today to our men fighting in South Vietnam to prevent the spread of war, men fighting to prevent World War III, men fighting to prevent bombs and the tide of war from coming to the shores of this country, men fighting to protect our civilian population. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, men fighting in South Vietnam to protect western Europe and General DeGaulle's France from encirclement, conquest, and enslavement. Vietnam and Southeast Asia is truly the road to Paris and the road to the conquest of western civilization and the enslavement of free peoples.

This hospital is dedicated, in gratitude, to those who were maimed and injured in the cause of freedom, and who suffer from disease. It is dedicated to the veterans of our country and it is a manifestation of the deep gratitude of the American people.

The 50th Anniversary of Pomona Products Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, 1966 marks the 50th anniversary of the Pomona Products Co. of Griffin, Ga., famous for pioneering the cultivation packing and marketing pimientos in America. Pimiento growing and processing is of considerable importance to southern agriculture.

The story of pimientos in Georgia, and probably in America, begins in 1911, when a young man, George Riegel, saw a can of Spanish pimientos on a grocery shelf in Griffin. He and his brother and father were commercial vegetable growers on a farm near Griffin and together they had worked on improving the quality of vegetable crops, particularly peppers. Through the American consul in Spain the Riegels secured 6 ounces of pimiento seed and in 1912 grew enough plants to set out 1½ acres of pimiento plants on the Riegel farm. From this planting a single plant was selected which bore fruit so perfect in shape, size, and color that it was given the name "Perfection." Subsequent plantings were made from the seeds of this plant.

Attempts to sell pimientos on the fresh market met with no success because of the extreme toughness of the pimiento skins. George Riegel recalled that his interest in pimientos had stemmed from the canned Spanish product, so he decided to attempt canning himself. Skins were removed by immersing the pimientos in a lye solution. After cleaning they were canned with salt and vinegar.

The use of lye proved so tedious that the help of the Spanish consul was again sought, and he reported that the skins in Spain were removed by roasting the pimientos for several minutes in a hot oven and wiping off the charred skins with clean cloths.

The roasting operation proved far more satisfactory, and by 1913 Mark Riegel perfected a mechanical roaster. It consisted of a coke-burning tunnel of fire brick, through which the cored pimientos passed, each placed over a steel spike fastened to an endless chain. The charred skins were then removed by sprinkler washers and brushes, with the final cleaning done by hand.

Finding the new roaster satisfactory, the Riegels continued their research on canning pimientos in a small shed on a farm near Pomona, Ga., a few miles from Griffin. During the summer of 1914 they put up a small pack of pimientos in this little plant, and the H. V. Kell Wholesale Grocery Co. of Griffin marketed the entire pack.

Frank Patterson, who was associated with the H. V. Kell Wholesale Grocery Co. in Griffin, became interested in the new pimiento cannery after his success in selling the first canned pimientos. He offered to provide financing for two additional roasters and a plant, to be built on his farm. Plans were made, and Mark Riegel, Frank and Bob Patterson, and Frank Cook, Sr., built and equipped the Pomona Products Co. This plant was an extremely large food processing facility according to the standards of that day and probably the largest in Georgia. It was located 3 miles west of Pomona and about 6 miles north of Griffin.

Pimientos were first canned in the new plant in 1916 and sold under the Sunshine brand name. The total crop that year came from 75 acres, all located in Spalding County, of which Griffin is the county seat. Frank Patterson served as president of the young organization. By 1918 the plant was processing the pimiento crop from 100 acres in the area.

It was in 1920 that Pomona Products Co. began to assume the character and the personality that have made it an outstanding member of the American food industry. In that year Walter L. Graefe purchased a controlling interest in the business and became president of the pioneering company. He served as president until 1955, when he became chairman of the board and was succeeded in the presidency by W. Ennis Parker.

Walter L. Graefe was a native of Maryland and attended school at Western Maryland College and Johns Hopkins University. After serving as first lieutenant in the Army during World War I, he was discharged on March 4, 1919, at Camp Gordon near Atlanta. Liking Georgia, he looked for a business connection in that area. One night at a party a prominent Atlanta business man suggested to Graefe that the young Pomona operation near Griffin might offer an opportunity. Mr. Graefe visited the company and was offered a job which he accepted.

During 1920 he decided that the business offered a substantial future, so he purchased control of the business and became its president. His first major action was to move the plant to Griffin where gas was available to provide fuel for the huge roasting ovens which charred the skins so that they could be removed from the pimientos.

In spite of the problems faced by a new company processing a new product, Pomona Products Co. grew and prospered. There were bleak years—when all the pimientos on contract could not be processed because of lack of labor and facilities, but they still had to be paid for. There were years when the pimiento crop was too short to produce a profitable pack. But the bad years were outnumbered by the good years and pimiento volume climbed steadily. Pomona's success led to the entry of other canners into the Pimiento field and over the years as many as eighteen or twenty firms were in the business at one time. Growing of pimientos by farmers, once limited entirely to Georgia, now extends into several adjoining States and California.

Pimiento growing added a new crop to Georgia and southern agriculture. It provided millions of dollars for farmers and off-farm workers, but perhaps its greatest economic contribution was the growth it sparked for food processing in Georgia and other Southern States. Plants built and expanded to process pimientos found themselves with sufficient facilities to handle many other products, thus providing further employment for southern workers and additional income for the areas in which they were located.

During the period of peak production Pomona employs more than 1,000 workers. About 20 different fruits and vegetables are processed and canned. All of these are distributed and sold in the Southeastern States and some carry the Sunshine label throughout the United States and parts of Canada.

The past 50 years have been full years for Pomona Products Co. A new American-grown food was introduced to the Nation, the complexities of processing it and packing it were solved. Its growth in acceptance and sales over the years has been consistent. The future is not ours to foretell, but Pomona will always seek new products and constantly research methods to improve them—to the benefit of the American food industry and America's grocers.

Mr. W. Ennis Parker, of Griffin, Ga., is now president of Pomona Products Co., and is currently serving as president of the National Canners Association.

Congressman Basil L. Whitener Addresses Democratic County Convention at Gastonia, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER, made the principal address at the Gaston County, N.C., Democratic convention in Gastonia, N.C., on May 14, 1966.

His speech ably describes the work of the Democratic Party and the great principles upon which the party is founded. I believe my colleagues will find it most interesting, and under leave previously granted I insert the speech in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AT GASTON COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, GASTON COUNTY COURTHOUSE, GASTONIA, N.C., SATURDAY, MAY 14, 1966

It is a high honor and a great privilege for me here this afternoon to address this convention of Gaston County Democrats. I always find it a great pleasure to speak to Democrats, regardless of where they are. It gives me special pleasure, however, to speak to so many Democrats with whom I have worked through the years for great Democratic victories.

We meet this afternoon at a very critical period in the history of our Nation and of the world. We gather at a time when the need for dynamic leadership is mandatory if our way of life and that of the free world is to survive.

The Democratic Party had its origin in the philosophy of men who believed in the dignity of man and in his right to share in his government and to enjoy the fruits of his labor. The principles of our party were first enunciated by Thomas Jefferson. Later Andrew Jackson, a great North Carolinian, carried forward Jefferson's ideals of democracy.

Jefferson believed that in the people resided the source of all authority and power in our land. This principle forms the very basis of our government. It has enabled our country to become the leader among the nations of the world and to be the guardian of freedom in all ages.

The Democratic Party has produced great leaders in the past, whose broad vision and vigorous efforts have helped us to realize the hope of our forefathers who expressed in the Preamble to our Constitution the desire "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

More than any other political organization in our history the Democratic Party has adopted programs to bring to the American people the great blessings expressed in the Preamble to our Constitution.

The Democratic record at all levels of government has for the past 150 years been one of sound and progressive government and educational, economic, and social progress.

One of the things that has made our party great is that we have not been afraid to have differences of opinion within the party as to political, economic, and social programs. We have been tolerant of the views of every American.

We were the first party to realize that, in a great nation embracing many nationalities, races, and religions, it is impossible for all of our people to think and act alike. Our party has been made strong by accommodating within its philosophy the hopes, the ambitions, and the ideals of all Americans.

Our party is the party of the farmer, the businessman, the worker, the youth, and our aged. It is the party which envelops the thinking of the liberal, the conservatism, and the middle-of-the-roader. Out of this amalgamation of thought our party has developed principles and procedures which have given to the American people programs that have resulted more nearly in a consensus as to the approach to issues.

As a result of this combined thought we can and do move forward on a sound, middle ground, giving recognition to time-honored principles and ideals which afford a meeting place for all who are interested in the progress of our nation. There is room in our party for all sincere, honest elements who have a fervent desire to observe the principles on which our nation is founded and to bring about progress without a violation of those principles.

As one who takes pride in the great accomplishments of our party, I feel that we often overlook the real strength of our party when we place too much emphasis on the accomplishments made at the national level.

The basic strength of our party has been the people, as Thomas Jefferson so ably enunciated. The Democratic Party has always had a strong foundation at the township, county, and state level. It has been the sound and progressive government which our party has given to the people at these levels that has enabled it to sustain the confidence of the American people and to be rewarded with national leadership.

The record of the Democratic Party in North Carolina is an outstanding example of the sound and progressive government which our party has given to the American people.

During the past 65 years North Carolina has had Democratic governors. Their administrations have been characterized by a greater development of our resources; more jobs for our people; a vastly improved system of elementary, secondary, and higher education; and an expanded network of fine highways and improved harbor facilities.

Under Democratic leadership at the state and county level North Carolina has moved into the forefront of the Southern States and has taken her place as one of the most progressive states in the Union. In the last 25 years the Democratic record has been exceptionally noteworthy.

The late great Democratic Governor Gregg Cherry of Gaston County will be remembered for his work in improving the mental institutions of our state.

Our people will long remember the record of Kerr Scott in behalf of better roads in North Carolina. Although his administration was cut short by his untimely death, Governor William B. Umstead will be remembered for his steady hand at the helm of government at a time of social and economic change in our state.

Governor Hodges gave new direction to our state's program of industrial development. Governor Sanford carried forward our great traditions of providing improved educational opportunities for our young people.

Today we have a Governor whose efforts to create new jobs in North Carolina through industrial development and to improve educational standards are bringing praise to our state from all areas of the country. Governor Moore is a great Democratic leader.

At the national level our party has a record without equal in the history of the nation. For the 35 years since 1930 Democratic leadership has brought a fuller measure of economic opportunities to our people than was accomplished during all the other years of our history.

Laws have been enacted to protect the bank deposits and other savings of our people, to strengthen our farm economy, to bring electricity to the rural areas of our nation, to provide loans to get the wheels of industry humming, to establish a minimum wage for our people, to provide expanded educational opportunities, to set up social security for the wage-earner and his dependents, and countless other laws of far-reaching significance to the future of our nation.

Today we have the highest level of employment of any nation in the world; 73 million Americans are employed. As a result our people have better housing, better health facilities, and are receiving better educational opportunities than any other people. In every phase of our activity our nation is experiencing unbounded progress.

New businesses are being incorporated at the rate of 197,000 every year. Common stock prices, earnings, and yields are at a high level, and the profits of corporations after taxes have grown more than 80%. Since 1961 the average factory worker's wage has increased 20%, and the income of the farmer has also increased nearly 20%.

The Democratic Party leadership has not only been concerned with providing the American people with the highest standard of living in the world. Our party has consistently stood for strong national defense and opposition to all forms of tyranny from abroad. It was under Democratic leadership that the nation crushed Nazism in World War II and repelled communist aggression in the Korean War.

Most Americans strongly support the efforts our government is making today to halt the spread of communism in Southeast Asia, Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and in Latin America.

Under the direction of Democratic Presidents the United States has become the leader in nuclear research and in the exploration of outer space. We have come to the forefront in this area which is so vital to the survival of our nation and that of the free world.

We can be proud of the great record of our party.

In our desire to improve the economic and social conditions of our country we should not overlook the fact, however, that we must keep our nation on a sound economic basis.

We should support the principle of fiscal responsibility. It is only through the application of sound economic principles that we can provide for our continued prosperity and national security.

We should vigorously oppose the efforts of all of those who would undermine the resistance of our nation to communist aggression. We should strongly support our young men who are fighting in Viet Nam and who are serving in other parts of the world in the cause of freedom.

The operation of the United States Government is the largest business in the world. Every American is a stockholder in his government.

Our people should be encouraged to take a more active interest in our local, state, and national governments. You and I should encourage everyone to register and to vote. An informed citizenship exercising its right to franchise is the most effective bulwark against the critics of our way of life.

In two weeks our party will have its primary in North Carolina. Democrats will be nominated for the General Election next fall. The nominees of our party will deserve our support. In the traditional Democratic way we should forget the personal differences that we might have during the primary contests and unite behind our candidates selected in the primaries.

The continuance of good government that we have in Gaston County, throughout North Carolina, and at the national level depends upon the degree of support that we give our Democratic candidates this fall.

In conclusion, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those here this afternoon for the generous support which they have given me through the years in my efforts to be of service to our people in the Congress of the United States.

It has been said that: "Nothing is more honorable than a grateful heart."

My heart is grateful this afternoon for your warm personal friendship and for the privilege which you have given me to serve you in the Congress of the United States.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Carl B. Harris, pastor, St. Albans Episcopal Church, Annandale, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God, we ask that You not let us restrict You to a narrow ghetto labeled "religion," but lead us to worship You in the fullness of life as the Lord of politics, economics, and the arts.

Give us light to seek true morality, not in narrow legalisms, but in sacrifice and open responsibility. Show us how to express our lives in very specific, concrete service to other men. Teach us how to say what we have to say, clearly, simply, and openly.

We remember specifically at this time our astronauts Thomas Stafford and Eugene Cernan. We ask for their safe return as we do for our men in Vietnam. Let these prayers remind us of our frequent separation from You and our need to enter again into Your life through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 16, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON DISASTER RELIEF—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 439)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit herewith a report of activity under authority of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, and required by section 8 of such law.

Funds which have been appropriated to accomplish the Federal assistance determined eligible under this authority are specifically appropriated to the President for purposes of disaster relief.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 17, 1966.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uganda, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 693) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3177. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation in certain cases;

H.R. 7402. An act to provide for the establishment of the Chamizal Treaty National Memorial in the city of El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes;

H.R. 7850. An act to amend section 1822(a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases;

H.R. 9961. An act to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran receiving pension under this chapter disappears, the Administrator may pay the pension otherwise payable to the wife and children;

H.R. 11775. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11934. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain veterans receiving additional compensation by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance shall be furnished prescription drugs by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

H.R. 11980. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate two obsolete German weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany;

H.R. 12676. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty;

H.R. 13012. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H.R. 13187. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate certain requirements for the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska or Hawaii;

H.R. 13298. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts; and

H.R. 14347. An act to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3177. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation in certain cases; and

H.R. 7850. An act to amend section 1822(a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 9961. An act to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran receiving pension under this chapter disappears, the Administrator may pay the pension otherwise payable to the wife and children;

H.R. 12676. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty; and

H.R. 14347. An act to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 7402. An act to provide for the establishment of the Chamizal Treaty National Memorial in the city of El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes;

H.R. 11775. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13298. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11934. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain veterans receiving additional compensation by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance shall be furnished prescription drugs by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

H.R. 13012. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Mississippi; and

H.R. 13187. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate certain requirements for the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska or Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 11980. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate two obsolete German weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the following committee and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary; and the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MONTOYA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 3031. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a National Visitor

Center, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1161); and, pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 17, 1966, the bill was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Public Works:

Donald Opie McBride, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

William Howard Shaw, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce;

Capt. Chester I. Steele, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion the grade of rear admiral; and

Capt. Leon G. Telsey, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the grade of rear admiral.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3362. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as equitably to provide for the disposition of certain accrued benefit amounts due an individual at the time he dies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 3363. A bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreements with Communist countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 3364. A bill to authorize the establishment of a National Nuclear Museum; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONTOYA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3365. A bill to extend the period during which the funds may be appropriated pursuant to the act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), for the conservation of migratory waterfowl, and for other purposes; and

S. 3366. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3367. A bill to make certain expenditures by the city of Richmond, Va., in connection with the proposed coliseum in downtown Richmond, eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 3368. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 3369. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3370. A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3371. A bill for the relief of Col. Bruce H. Vail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3372. A bill to amend Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to designate the period beginning June 13, 1966, and ending June 19, 1966, as "Gas Industry Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S.J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF DOCUMENT "HISTORY OF THE SENATE SEALS"

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 261); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to prepare a revised edition of the document entitled "History of the Senate Seals" (Senate Document Numbered 164, Eighty-second Congress), which revised edition shall be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I have submitted a resolution for a second edition of "Senate Seals." It is a little pamphlet that has been drafted by Mr. Emery Frazier. The first edition is about exhausted. The resolution has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope the committee will give to it its thoughtful consideration, because since the first edition of "Senate Seals," there has been no similar pamphlet on the history of the seals of the U.S. Senate.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. KUCHEL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 262) assigning the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] to committee service, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KUCHEL, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT FILED BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. SMATHERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 263); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging six thousand two hundred additional copies of a Senate report, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, entitled "The War on Poverty as It Affects Older Americans".

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreements with Communist countries, and for other purposes, popularly known as the East-West trade bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3363) to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreements with Communist countries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln was greatly troubled by his inability to build bridges of friendship and understanding between North and South.

"I once knew a good, sound churchman, whom we'll call Brown," Lincoln was quoted, "who was on a committee to erect a bridge over a dangerous and rapid river. Architect after architect failed, and at last Brown said he had a friend named Jones who had built several bridges and could build this. 'Let's have him in,' said the committee. In came Jones. 'Can you build this bridge, sir?' 'Yes,' replied Jones, 'I could build a bridge to the infernal regions, if necessary.' The sober committee were horrified, but when Jones retired Brown thought it fair to defend his friend. 'I know Jones so well,' said he, "and he is so honest a man and so good an architect that, if he states soberly and positively that he can build a bridge to Hades—why, I believe it. But I have my doubts about the abutments on the infernal side.' "So," Lincoln added, "when politicians said they could harmonize the Northern and Southern wings of the democracy, I believed them. But I had my doubts about the abutments on the Southern side."

So today we have our doubts about the "abutments" in Communist Eastern Europe. But we also have a President with the courage and the determination to build bridges of trade and understanding if it is possible to build them on a sound foundation.

Probably no piece of legislation in this Congress has less of a constituency, yet few bills can ever hope to rival this one in its potential for contributing to the peace and stability of the world in what is left of the 20th century.

But we cannot begin to realize the wisdom and propriety of the legislation until we see the Communist world as it exists today in actuality, not as it took shape in our fears of 10 or 20 or 30 years ago. Let us make no mistake about it: The Communist bloc will not crumble if we choose to withhold our trade. At $280 million, our total trade with the Warsaw Pact countries in 1965 was an insignificant fraction of the total free world trade of about $11 billion. There is little likelihood that trade with the bloc will ever reach proportions of strategic significance either to us or the Communists.

I recently received a complaint from a Washington citizen that we had sold quantities of "inedible tallow" to the Communists. She was concerned because the tallow could be used to produce glycerine—an ingredient of many explosives. But the simple fact of the matter is that a country capable of developing a hydrogen bomb and vast missile power—and a country which produces and exports great quantities of oil—from which glycerin is easily and economically extracted—does not need U.S. tallow to maintain its military might, any more than we need Soviet platinum to maintain our stockpile of strategic metals.

The President believes, and I share his belief, that a broad and continuing exchange of nonstrategic goods and technology between East and West raises the stake of the individual Eastern European countries in stable East-West relations and inevitably acts as a damper upon the appetite of the bloc for aggressive adventures.

Though peaceful and stable international relations are our primary goal, we cannot be unmindful of the vital role which exports can play in restoring our balance of payments. There is an enormous appetite for American goods and technology in Eastern Europe—an appetite limited only by the ability of some of the still underdeveloped economies to generate sufficient hard currency.

Again, by opening up sources of supply independent of the Soviet Union, increased East-West trade necessarily reduces the economic dependence of the smaller Eastern European countries upon the Soviet Union.

Expanded East-West trade also leads to greater contact and understanding of both Western peoples and the products of Western institutions. Because we are convinced that our economic and political institutions are best designed to satisfy the universal rising tide of expectations, we expect these contacts to stimulate the increasing economic liberalization of the internal economies of Eastern Europe.

There is ample evidence that we are not whistling in the dark. Each day brings to light new cracks and crevices in the Iron Curtain. Poland joins and lives up to the requirements of the Paris Convention for the protection of industrial property and applies for membership in GATT. Rumania criticizes the Soviet Union for interfering in the internal affairs of her neighbors—such as Rumania—and praises the United States for its liberal trade policies. Hungary withdraws its rigid bureaucratic planning from major exporting enterprises—replaces the "plan" with profit incentives—and gives the managers freedom to try their wings in a competitive market economy—at least for exports. Bulgaria—for long years standing with her back to the West—displays a new eagerness to increase trade and contact with the West.

The countries of Eastern Europe come seeking the tourist dollar: "Fly to Moscow" reads an ad in the New York Times, "and paint the town Red." An American soft drink bottling plant springs up on the Black Sea, and rock 'n' roll blares forth from state-controlled radio stations.

The largest Moscow department store succumbs to what I was about to describe as the Western "vice" of charge accounts. I believe that is an inappropriate word; I should say "Western practice" of charge accounts. If the Russians are succumbing to capitalism, they are succumbing to capitalism in the American way. The people's appetite for consumer goods grows and feeds on itself. Motorcycles and leather jackets—rather than Communist Party membership cards—become the status symbols among the young. We may be witnessing what some observers have called creeping capitalism.

And, ironically, there is probably no area in the world today where American commercial and economic prestige is as high as among the peoples of Eastern Europe.

What the President seeks in this legislation is not concessions to the Communists but tools with which to shape mutually advantageous trade relations. We have tied the President's hands and frustrated the development of a flexible policy in an area in which the President must be able to act flexibly if we are to forge a successful policy. With the authority contained in this bill, the President will be able to develop conditions for trade with each of the Communist countries on a country-by-country basis—responsive to the inevitable flux in Government policies and international relations. As Secretary Rusk indicates, this legislation would "strengthen, not weaken the President's authority to deal with the Communists."

The act in its principal substantive provision would authorize the President to use most-favored-nation tariff treatment as a bargaining point in negotiating commercial agreements with individual Communist countries. The importance of flexible authority to grant or withhold most-favored-nation status is well illustrated by a look at our recent trade relations with Rumania.

In June 1964 the United States reached a series of "understandings" with Rumania. The Rumanians have lived up to their side of those "understandings." Pursuant to the "understandings," Rumania has guaranteed the protection of patents and other industrial property; the Rumanians have entered into satisfactory arrangements with us for the settlement of financial claims. They have extended hospitality and freedom of movement to the American trade mission and to businessmen generally. They have expanded trade and tourist facilities, facilitated the exchange of trade exhibits and the publication of trade promotion materials and have upgraded our diplomatic presence in Rumania from a legation to a full-fledged embassy.

By August 1964 Rumania had granted amnesty to virtually all of her political prisoners—an estimated 11,000. She had put an end to jamming of Voice of America broadcasts and had begun limited sales of Western newspapers. At the time of the "understandings," the U.S. delegation took note of the concern of the Rumanian delegation at the maintenance of the discriminating tariff wall. That wall still stands.

Today the duty on Rumanian caviar remains 30 percent higher than Iranian; the tariff on Rumanian cheese is 7 cents a pound—for its competitors, 5 cents a pound. On Rumanian glassware—both plateglass for industrial use, and tableware—the tariff is 60 percent while other countries bear only a 15- to 50-percent tariff.

"We are between the anvil and the hammer," says the Rumanians. "If we lower our prices sufficiently to overcome the tariff barrier, then we are accused of dumping."

Undoubtedly, the inability of the President to grant the most-favored-nation treatment to Rumania has greatly impaired the effectiveness of our efforts to assist Rumania in steering the independent course which she seeks for herself.

The Senate Commerce Committee has long maintained a deep interest in the development of mutually advantageous East-West trade relationships. Last fall the committee was represented by staff counsel who served as a consultant to the U.S. trade mission to Poland and Rumania—the first such mission sponsored by the U.S. Government—and at the invitation of the Department of Commerce, the committee will again be represented in October as the United States sends its first trade mission to Hungary and Bulgaria.

Mr. President, in his letter of transmittal, Secretary Rusk predicted that expanded East-West trade would produce a "growing understanding of the skills, opportunities, and earnings of free labor in the United States." The U.S. trade mission to Poland and Rumania last fall reported several instances which dramatize the growth of such understanding.

Mr. James O. Ellison, of San Francisco, for example, was the trade mission's machine tool expert.

I am told that no one who witnessed his electrifying tours through Rumanian and Polish factories could doubt the wisdom of promoting commercial contacts between American businessmen and their Communist counterparts. From the moment he crossed the threshold of a plant, it became evident that this man embodied that quality—American know-how—which the Europeans most covet. The Rumanian expression for know-how is know-how. Quietly, politely, not unlike a patient teacher, Jim Ellison would thread his way through each factory, pausing to acknowledge and praise that which was sound, but seeing with a comprehending eye and identifying those gaps which were the product of technological isolation.

At the Red Star truck plant in Brashov, Rumania, the technical director sought his advice on the possibility of licensing American technology to solve a persistent production problem. The plant had begun producing a high-speed engine which wore out its camshaft in 4 to 5 months. Ellison paused for a moment and then replied that they did not really need a license—the problem could be simply solved by redesigning the camshaft with double, rather than single lobes, so that it need revolve only half as fast.

In the Nova Huta Works, near Krakow, Poland, the mission watched an American rolling mill smoothly and effortlessly turning out galvanized steel, while nearby a new piece of Russian equipment had broken down. I could give many other examples such as these.

In neither country could one tell where admiration for the American and his machines ended and where admiration for the economic and political system which produced them began.

I think it is high time that we take a step forward on this road toward better world understanding. As I have stated on so many occasions, legitimate trade, nonstrategic trade, is a tool for peace.

Mr. President, the Senate should know that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] would be here this afternoon were he not confined to the Bethesda Naval Hospital with a slight touch of the flu. He has prepared a statement on the bill which he has asked me to make for him.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD READ BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill which is reported to have been already consigned to the legislative junkheap. And, indeed, that may prove to be the case. At this point, certainly, there is far more reason than not to concur in the bleak journalistic forecasts of the future of the so-called East-West trade relations bill.

That is a most unfortunate situation especially since the measure has been requested by the President and asked for by the Secretary of State in letters to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House.

I do not suppose that in the great equations of peace and war a few million dollars of trade with Bulgaria or Rumania looks like a very urgent or major matter. In the rising flames of the Vietnamese conflict, it appears almost incongruous to put forth a legislative effort which has as its purpose the enlargement of commerce with some countries in Eastern Europe.

Nevertheless, the leadership is going to introduce this East-West trade relations bill. It will be introduced now because the President and the Secretary of State have asked for it. It will be introduced now because the majority leader welcomes an initiative along lines which he has believed desirable for many years. The measure will be introduced now because even the act of doing so or failing to do so does have some relevance to the great equations of peace and war. It will be introduced now, not in spite of the Vietnamese war, but, if anything, because of it.

Finally, Mr. President, the leadership will introduce this measure because it is an entirely proper vehicle for a hard legislative look at the incongruities and anachronisms which have long characterized the policies of the United States toward Eastern Europe. These barnacles on American commerce not only plague businessmen, they also hamper the diplomacy of the President and the Secretary of State in seeking to develop useful and peaceful relations with various nations in that region.

Whatever their original justification, certain of the conditions which we ourselves imposed on our commerce years ago and with which this act, in effect, is designed to deal have become self-defeating, often meaningless, and very costly to individual Americans and to the Nation as a whole. The measures were largely an expression of the fear, hostility, disgust, or whatever with which the United States greeted the appearance of certain systems of government and economics in Eastern Europe. They were in the nature, too, of reprisals for hostile acts against us. And they were, finally, vaguely designed to defend the West against communism from the East.

I think, by this time, it is clear that while many factors may be involved in determining the future of communism in Eastern Europe, the trade policies of the United States are at or near the bottom of the list in terms of significance. I would point out in this connection that, for many years, we have had no trade to speak of with certain of the Eastern European countries but, at last report, they still had Communist governments. And the truth is that over the years we have had trade with Yugoslavia and Poland and even aid but, at last report, they, too, still had Communist governments.

Let us, therefore, if we are going into a consideration of this bill, go in with our eyes open. Let us not tilt with windmills. If past trade policies have had little significance for the future of communism in Eastern Europe one way or the other, it may be said that this bill does not have much significance either, one way or the other. I doubt that it will strike very much terror or very much joy in the hearts of the Communist purists of Eastern Europe.

The basic question in this bill, in short, is not what it will do to communism in Eastern Europe. The basic question is what this bill will do for the United States.

The bill has no automatic and direct effect on trade between Eastern Europe and the United States. Rather, the bill deals with the relationship of the President and the Congress in delineating the patterns of that trade. It gives the President substantially the same kind of control over U.S. commerce with the entire region of Eastern Europe that he now has by law over trade with Yugoslavia and Poland.

The bill says to the President, in effect, if opportunities present themselves to enlarge the trading relationship in peaceful goods with various Eastern European countries, go ahead and explore them. If the occasion arrives to promote better and more stable relations by adjustments in peaceful trade with these nations do not hesitate to take advantage of the occasion. In short, this act would authorize the President to use his judgment in setting certain rules and approaches for the conduct of trade with Eastern Europe. The passage of this act would make clear that the President is trusted by the Congress to act in this connection in the best interests of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, Congress has not hesitated to place an immense trust in the Presidency in matters involving war. It has done so in connection with Vietnam. And, indeed, in the matter of nuclear war we have, literally, entrusted the whole fate of the Nation and the world to the Presidency.

Yet, it is obvious that we tremble with mistrust, now, as an elephant before a mouse, when it is a question of entrusting to the Presidency certain very limited and highly circumscribed tools which may be useful to him in advancing the commercial interests of the United States. We tremble with mistrust at the possibility of a President, on his own, making a small contribution to the building of peaceful economic relations with a major area of the globe. And may I say, Mr. President, that that trembling in itself can have a far more adverse significance for the interests of the United States in the world than this bill could ever have, even in the wildest imagining of its misapplication by a President. How incongruous, indeed, is it to stand dauntless and courageous in support of the President in the war in Vietnam while suffering the pangs of terror, revulsion or suspicion at the prospect of the President seeking to promote a little more peaceful commercial relations with Bulgaria or Rumania or some such nation.

The irony, Mr. President, is that the cost of this reaction, the cost of this failure to face up to the implications of this proposed act falls heavily, not on others, but on citizens of this Nation.

If we refuse even to consider action on this measure in this session, we are putting off coming to grips with the incongruities and anachronisms of our present trade policies respecting Eastern Europe for that much longer. And these are damaging, not to Eastern Europe, but to the economy of the United States of America.

Here are some of the more flagrant indications of the distortions which result from these policies.

Does the Senate know that there is a basic list of strategic goods which allied countries join with us in more or less excluding from normal trade channels to Eastern Europe? Beyond this limited listing, however, anything goes and devil take the hindmost, who, in this instance, is guaranteed by our own trade policies to be the American trader. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Netherlands or Sweden do about the same amount of business with the Communist countries as does the United States. It is not surprising either that the total exports of Western Europe and Japan to the Communist countries amounted to $3.8 billion in 1965, while the total of U.S. exports to these countries added up to the grand total of $140 million.

Does the Senate know that our present restrictive trade policies do not deny Eastern Europe access to very many of the products of the ingenuity of modern industry? They tend, rather, to turn Eastern Europeans to Western European and Japanese sources rather than to the United States for these items. And let us not delude ourselves; they find them. Even insofar as choice and exclusive American nonstrategic products may be concerned, which we choose not to ship to Eastern Europe, these may not necessarily be denied to Eastern Europe. At the end of my remarks, Mr. President, I shall insert an article from the Wall Street Journal which appeared in the May 10 issue and which shows in detail, Mr. President, how time and again American firms operate through Western European branches or other corporate arrangements in order to sell such products in Eastern Europe.

I do not blame the American businessmen. They are compelled to this course by the intense competition and the demands of modern world-scale business. Many are prepared to sell and ship from the United States directly to Eastern Europe, but for a variety of reasons are unable to do so. In short, Mr. President, the policies and attitudes on trade with Eastern Europe have now become a stimulus for American business to export investments and jobs to Western Europe and elsewhere.

The stigma for this state of affairs, I repeat, does not attach to business. It attaches to the Congress and the executive branch for the reluctance or inertia in facing up to the facts of a changed commercial world, especially in Europe. In this connection, I need not dwell at length on the Firestone fiasco of last year. You know the sorry circumstances which compelled that company to cancel an arrangement which it had made in good faith with the Rumanian Government. The Firestone Co. had encouragement and approval from the executive branch in its proposal to supply the technical resources for the construction of a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania. But in the end, the Firestone Co. was victimized for its efforts by a scurrilous private boycott which was set in motion here at home, according to some reports, with the encouragement of one of Firestone's competitors.

While on the subject of Rumania, I would point out, further, that the United States is obviously not that country's principal capitalist trading partner. But does the Senate know which country has the largest volume of trade with Communist Rumania after the Soviet Union? Poland? Eastern Germany? Outer Mongolia? China, or some other Communist state? No, Mr. President, Rumania's second largest trade is now with Western Germany. Nevertheless, we still cling to the practice of sharp restriction on trade with Rumania—and, even worse, shift the trade signals uncertainly, as in the Firestone affair.

The Senate, Mr. President, has heard of the recent arrangement whereby Fiat of Italy contracted to build an entire automobile assembly plant in Russia and of the West German agreement to undertake to erect a whole steel complex in Communist China. These are only striking examples in the long list of spectacular trade arrangements whereby Western Europe and Japan are moving into expanding and advantageous economic relations with the nations of the Communist bloc.

I could go on, Mr. President, citing illustration after illustration in a similar vein. All serve merely to underscore the anomalies which arise from a vastly altered trading situation in Europe coupled with a substantially unaltered pattern of trade policies and attitudes on the part of the United States. The anomalies clearly affect in a most adverse fashion the commercial interests of American citizens.

But, in the end, Mr. President, we will not act or fail to act on this bill merely for the commercial advantages which may be involved. And that is as it should be. In the end, the larger international equations cannot be ignored, even in a minor bill of this kind. And in the larger equations, the fundamental factor, today, is Vietnam.

I said at the outset, Mr. President, that in my judgment, the tragedy of Vietnam is not a factor which argues against this measure but rather one which, if anything argues for it. I say that notwithstanding the fact that the nations which would be most constructively affected by this measure are sharply antagonistic to our policies in Vietnam. But they are not alone in that attitude. It would be an irresponsible self-immolation of this nation's commerce to require approval of Vietnamese policy as a basis for mutually advantageous commercial relations with nations elsewhere. And it is akin to that immolation to reject better commercial relations with nations where they can be but have not yet been established because those nations disapprove of these policies.

Far more important, however, than the limited increase in trade it promises to bring, is the great significance which attaches to this measure as a clear-cut act of peace in the midst of the blurred and bloody act of the Vietnamese war. It is a tangible affirmation of American words of peace which will rise above the cannonades of that conflict. It says, as no words can say, that peace and not war is what the United States wants. It says that the Congress of the United States trusts the President to pursue the one even as it upholds his hand in the other.

It is in that vein that I introduce the East-West Trade Relations Act at this time. I endorse fully the purpose of this bill and will support its enactment.

I say in all frankness, however, that the hope of action is dim, and I have no desire to stimulate false hopes. My purpose, today, is to bring the matter into the open. The questions which this bill raises should be faced. They ought not to be swept under a rug of indifference. They ought not to be obscured by the Vietnamese conflict.

It is my personal judgment that if we examine these questions, whether in the minute details of commercial value to individual American citizens and companies or in the vast context of the search for world peace, this proposed trade act has a part to play which serves the interests of the United States. I am persuaded, moreover, that the sooner this act is permitted to play that part, the better it will be for this Nation and the world.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some documents and statements in connection with this subject to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Imports from Sino-Soviet bloc, January to December

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

	S. Union		China		Poland		Czechoslovakia		Rumania		Bulgaria		Hungary		E. Germany		Total	
	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964
G. Britain	331.7	252.8	82.9	68.9	135.3	134.7	48.6	47.3	31.3	24.9	15.1	12.0	19.0	20.4	33.5	28.8	697.4	589.8
W. Germany	275.3	234.3	72.7	51.8	108.9	90.7	84.1	72.0	72.4	61.3	41.3	30.3	71.9	61.8	314.4	259.3	1,041.0	861.5
Japan	240.2	226.7	224.7	157.7	1.9	2.1	7.0	6.0	19.0	11.9	6.1	5.8	0.4	0.6	1.2	3.3	500.5	414.1
France	146.8	142.5	43.8	31.1	31.2	31.1	26.8	23.0	29.0	29.4	7.3	8.1	15.9	11.8	15.9	14.3	316.7	291.3
Italy	181.1	147.8	38.2	23.8	61.1	53.2	35.9	36.4	61.1	55.4	30.7	19.9	51.3	42.8	14.2	14.8	473.6	394.1
Belgium	46.3	50.1	14.2	13.7	13.7	13.4	20.9	15.1	3.6	7.0	2.5	2.5	7.8	7.6	26.3	23.0	135.3	132.4
Netherlands	52.7	35.8	25.4	20.2	15.1	13.7	27.9	26.6	5.6	4.5	3.6	2.5	12.6	12.3	32.6	30.5	175.5	146.1
Finland	229.3	245.5	5.9	6.4	31.3	30.0	10.9	10.1	3.9	2.8	1.7	1.4	5.0	7.8	15.1	15.1	303.1	319.1
Norway	28.2	25.8	4.7	3.4	10.6	11.5	11.4	12.9	1.1	1.4	1.4	0.8	3.6	5.0	11.7	9.8	72.7	70.6
Sweden	72.5	70.0	15.1	12.3	38.5	33.3	22.0	20.4	7.3	3.6	2.8	1.7	12.6	10.9	25.1	20.7	195.9	172.9
Denmark	33.5	26.0	6.4	7.5	31.5	31.6	14.2	12.3	0.8	0.6	0.8	0.6	6.7	6.7	25.1	21.0	119.0	106.3
Austria	53.0	52.6	5.0	3.4	45.8	40.3	38.2	27.4	20.7	19.6	11.7	8.1	31.5	27.4	26.5	22.1	232.4	200.9
Switzerland	12.0	8.1	12.6	7.6	13.1	10.4	19.5	13.7	5.6	9.0	2.2	0.8	20.0	19.9	7.5	6.2	92.5	75.7
	1,702.6	1,518.0	551.6	407.8	538.0	496.0	367.4	323.2	261.4	231.4	127.2	94.5	258.3	235.0	549.1	468.9	4,351.1	3,774.8

Exports to Sino-Soviet bloc, January to December

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

	S. Union		China		Poland		Czechoslovakia		Rumania		Bulgaria		Hungary		E. Germany		Total	
	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964
G. Britain	126.9	106.4	69.5	49.6	68.1	66.9	35.7	35.3	26.8	23.0	10.6	7.8	21.2	24.1	22.6	14.0	381.4	327.1
W. Germany	146.3	193.6	79.0	25.4	91.5	78.4	100.6	82.9	115.6	82.7	55.2	39.0	76.8	74.0	296.6	289.8	961.6	865.8
Japan	168.6	181.8	245.0	152.7	5.4	2.4	8.7	2.8	15.2	19.2	10.9	7.5	2.3	4.0	1.1	0.1	457.2	370.5
France	72.5	64.7	60.5	50.1	35.7	40.0	35.7	16.2	44.1	43.4	23.7	21.3	20.9	24.6	69.5	26.6	362.6	286.9
Italy	89.6	91.3	56.4	16.8	49.4	31.4	41.6	36.4	46.6	41.4	32.6	27.7	37.1	31.9	16.2	11.8	369.5	288.7
Belgium	22.9	14.8	17.0	7.6	14.0	14.3	22.9	17.0	6.1	6.4	4.7	3.9	10.9	12.3	12.0	8.7	110.5	85.1
Netherlands	29.3	15.1	19.0	5.9	12.8	10.4	15.4	10.6	42.	5.0	11.7	3.9	10.9	13.7	19.8	15.7	113.1	80.3
Finland	224.9	115.7	80.9	64.0	33.2	25.5	8.1	5.9	3.3	2.8	1.9	7.8	7.5	8.4	12.0	12.6	371.8	225.0
Norway	18.4	17.1	5.3	5.9	12.6	10.4	10.0	9.5	1.7	0.8	4.7	1.1	5.6	3.9	10.0	16.0	68.3	64.7
Sweden	50.5	87.6	13.7	14.0	30.9	22.4	18.9	14.0	7.3	7.0	5.9	2.0	9.5	10.6	32.4	26.3	169.1	183.9
Denmark	30.7	35.0	1.9	1.1	17.0	11.2	10.9	7.0	2.0	2.0	2.8	1.7	6.7	4.2	22.6	18.5	94.6	80.7
Austria	57.5	48.2	1.7	0.6	32.1	23.8	37.4	29.1	22.0	23.8	25.4	18.2	42.7	43.7	28.5	19.6	247.3	217.0
Switzerland	15.1	10.1	18.1	10.4	14.5	9.5	18.7	16.0	8.1	9.8	6.9	3.4	11.2	10.4	8.4	5.3	101.0	74.9
	1,053.2	1,031.4	668.0	346.5	417.2	346.6	364.6	282.8	303.0	267.3	197.0	145.3	263.3	265.8	541.7	465.7	3,808.0	3,150.7

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1966]

BONN HELPS SALE OF STEEL FACTORY TO CHINESE REDS—BACKS $87.5 MILLION CREDIT FOR DEAL BY 5-NATION GROUP—U.S. TOLD OF PLAN

(By Philip Shabecoff)

BONN, March 17.—The West German Government has approved a $87.5-million guarantee of credit to finance the construction of a big steel plant in Communist China by a European consortium headed by Demag A.G., a Ruhr steel and machinery company.

The steel complex will consist of hot and cold rolling mills as well as steel rail and tube production facilities. The cost of the steel works will be about $150-million.

Observers here describe the projected steel complex as the biggest single industrial plant delivery ever made to Red China from the West.

Other German companies participating in the consortium are: Schlömann A.G., Siemens A.G., Linde's Eismaschinen A.G. and Otto Wolff. According to reports here, French, British, Italian and Swiss companies also will take part in the venture.

TERM SET AT FIVE YEARS

The German share in the project will be about $86-million.

The West German Government approved the principle of extending credit guarantees to Communist China some months ago. Bonn stipulated, however, that the guarantees should be for five years or less. The credit guarantee will have a duration of five years.

Before their ideological break, the Soviet Union was giving China assistance in building up its industrial facilities, including steel-producing equipment.

[West Germany informed the United States of the proposed sale several weeks ago and no attempt was made to discourage the transaction.]

Bonn has already approved credit guarantees totaling $15-million for a chemical plant and a small cold steel rolling mill in China. In all its other dealings with West German industry, China has paid in cash.

SHARING CONDITION NOTED

One of the conditions of Bonn's extension of the credit guarantee was that companies from other Western nations take part in the transaction with China.

West German industry has recently been seeking to intensify its trade with the Chinese. Industry observers here note that economic conditions in China have improved considerably. In addition, China has the reputation of paying promptly and in full in dealings with West German industry.

Last year, West Germany's exports to China totaled $79-million. Imports from China were $72.5-million.

There is no formal trade pact between Bonn and Peking, although private delegations of West German businessmen have visited China. West Germany has no diplomatic ties with Communist China.

U.S. INFORMED BY BONN

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, March 17.—The United States was informed several weeks ago by West Germany of the proposed sale of a steel mill to Communist China that had led to the attempt to discourage the transaction.

When approached by West Germany, the United States took the position that it could not approve or disapprove or encourage or discourage the sale. The Administration pointed out the political-military problems presented by Communist China that had led the United States to adopt a policy of economic boycott on all trade with Peking.

The United States felt it was powerless to stop the sale, if not by the German-led consortium then by some other group as long as there was not a common front on the question of trade with Peking. But the American attitude also reflected a gradual modification in Administration policy toward trade with China.

SOME TRADE CONDONED

The Administration holds to the position that there must be a change in China's international conduct before normal trade relations can be permitted.

During the Eisenhower Administration, British-American relations reached a low point over Britain's plan to trade with Peking.

From a policy of opposing all trade, the Administration has come around to the position of condoning some trade, and some experts in the State Department urge that the United States should encourage such trade in line with a policy of "containment but not isolation."

The Administration would prefer that some nations, such as Britain and Japan, not conduct as much trade as they are with China. But it has tended to go along with Japan in drawing a distinction between political and economic relations.

Unable to stop all trade, the United States has fallen back on the position that the trade should not include strategic items and should not result in a competitive credit war among the trading nations.

The strategic restrictions are set by the Economic Policy Coordinating Committee, known as Cocom, which is composed of most Western European nations and Japan. The committee issues lists of items that are not to be sold to Soviet-bloc nations and Communist China. Over the years the list has been modified so that it now applies primarily to goods that have a direct strategic or military value.

The credit guidelines are established by the Berne Union, an association of 23 credit-insurance organizations in 18 nations that was set up in 1934. Its standards on credit terms are designed to forestall a credit war among nations.

The State Department made it clear that the steel mill transaction complied with the guidelines laid down by both Cocom and the Berne Union. The type of steel mill involved is not on the strategic list.

A department spokesman said the United States took the position that the decision whether to sell the steel mill was "one for the German Government to make on its own."

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1964]

BRITISH CLOSE DEAL WITH SOVIET FOR $140 MILLION FIBER PLANT

MOSCOW, May 16 (Reuters).—Probably the biggest trade deal in British-Soviet history—a contract to build a synthetic fiber complex worth £50 million ($140 million)—was announced here today.

Paul Chambers, chairman of the Imperial Chemical Industries, said the contract would be between the Soviet Government and a British consortium, Polyspinners, Ltd.

Mr. Chambers, whose company plays a leading role in the consortium, said that the contract would be signed within two weeks and that all details had been settled.

The synthetic fiber complex will produce British-patented Terylene. Mr. Chambers said he expected the complex to be built and in full operation in two years.

ANOTHER DEAL PENDING

He also said he was negotiating with the Soviet Government on another deal of "quite outstanding importance" worth "very large sums of money."

The Terylene plant represents the major part of a deal totaling about £100 million ($280 million) agreed upon in principle with the Russians earlier this year.

The second part of the project—the sale of fertilizer equipment—will take more time, Mr. Chambers said.

He said he had proposed to Soviet leaders the building of other plants in the Soviet Union. He refused to disclose the products involved, but said the proposed deal was "very important."

The company's Terylene process has already been sold to Japan, West Germany, Italy, France and other countries.

Mr. Chambers said he had found the "Greatest cordiality and the desire to reach agreement" in his talks in Moscow.

The British Government's export credit guarantees department will underwrite bank credits up to 12 to 15 years to help the Soviet Union pay for the Terylene plant, he said.

I.C.I. engineers will supervise the erection of the plant and the company will train Russian specialists at its factories in Britain. The exact location of the complex was still being discussed.

The Terylene contract has been under negotiation for about a year.

Mr. Chambers said I.C.I. and the Russians would also consider ways of pooling latest research, as in developing products from the laboratory stage to full commercial production.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1964]

LONG-TERM PACT IS HAILED IN MOSCOW

(By Theodore Shabad)

MOSCOW, Sept. 12.—Soviet news media were gleeful this week at the news that the biggest single contract in British-Soviet trade history had been signed in London for the British to supply a polyester fiber plant costing £30 million ($84 million).

The major part of the Soviet satisfaction was caused by the British Government's readiness to insure a 15-year credit for 80 per cent of the contract value.

With unconcealed glee, Izvestia, the Government newspaper, reported that a United States Department spokesman had publicly criticized the British, not only for selling the plant but for granting a long-term credit in contravention of the Berne agreement of North-Atlantic nations limiting credits to Communist countries to five years.

The British fiber-plant deal was only the latest and most publicized of a continuing series of Soviet-Western trade agreements in which the five-year credit limit is being increasingly breached.

The Japanese Government decided recently to approve eight-year credit terms for 80 per cent of the contract value of a $10 million urea plant sale to the Soviet Union by the Tokyo engineering division of the Mitsui industrial group.

Under a compromise formula, financing for five of the eight years is to be provided by the semiofficial Export-Import Bank of Japan and the remaining three years by Japanese commercial banks.

This formula is expected to serve as a precedent for other large contracts under negotiation between Soviet trade agencies and Japanese concerns.

However, there are indications that the eight-year credit limit now tolerated by the Japanese Government despite United States pressure for adherence to the Berne accord may be inadequate in the face of longer-term British concessions.

A recent case in point was Japan's loss of a Soviet order to a British-Dutch group. Two Japanese concerns, Ube Industries, Ltd., and the Nissho Trading Company, had been conducting negotiations for the sale of two 50,000-ton plants for the manufacture of caprolactum, raw material for nylon.

However, the Soviet negotiating agency, Tekhmashimport, awarded the contract to a British-Dutch engineering group, reported to include Simon Carves of Britain and Dutch State Mines, which is to supply technology.

TERMS A FACTOR

It is presumed that the award of the contract to the British-Dutch group was related not only to the price differential but also to prospects for longer credit terms than the eight-year limit now set for Japanese sales. The British-Dutch group's bid was about $25 million compared with the Japanese bid of $30 million.

Although most large Soviet import deals are in the industrial field, notably fibers, fertilizers, weed killers and other chemicals, a change of policy may be in the offing in consumer goods imports.

In the past, Soviet imports of consumer goods were not only limited in general but largely restricted in assortment to clothing and shoes.

Recently two Japanese electronics concerns, Toshiba and Sony, reported the first sale of transistor radios to the Soviet Union. The sale, amounting to 2,200 sets, is believed to be the first large import deal for consumer durables.

Vacationers in the Soviet Union's southern resorts last summer reported an increasing popularity for small portable radios blaring forth jazz and dance music broadcast by Soviet radio stations under a growing leniency toward foreign music.

Outside of the industrial-equipment and consumer fields, recent Soviet purchases cover a vast range from office equipment to camera shutters. Last July, a British concern, Rank Herox, Ltd., put on a show of its copying machines at Moscow's Polytechnical Museum. The concern had previously sold the Soviet Union office equipment worth nearly $3 million and its officials said they were looking forward to additional orders of about $700,000 as a result of the exhibition.

Persistent Soviet seeking for advanced Western technology paid off recently in an agreement with a Japanese concern for the sale to the Soviet Union of production facilities and manufacturing technique for a sophisticated electric-eye camera shutter.

The contract was signed by the Copal Koki Company of Japan with two Soviet agencies, Mashpriborintorg and Lisentsintorg, is reported valued at $400,000. It is believed to be the first deal for the export of Japanese camera technology to the Soviet Union.

A flurry of contracts resulted from a two-week exhibition of construction and road-making machinery that closed here earlier this week. As of Tuesday, the Soviet Union was reported by fair officials to have bought $14 million worth of machinery and have sold half of that amount to foreign buyers.

$90,000 WORTH SOLD

The Joy Manufacturing Company of Pittsburgh, the only American exhibitor at the show, was reported by Tass, the Soviet press agency, to be negotiating an eighth contract with the Soviet Union.

Joy exhibited compressors and drilling machinery at the fair, and sold them for $90,000. A Joy official said the Soviet buyer might order 50 more such units in the future.

The last Joy deal, concluded with the Russians in July, was for $5.5 million.

Despite the absence of a long-term trade agreement, the Soviet Union has been doing business with West German concerns, notably Krupp. Earlier this year the Soviet Union placed a third order for polyester fiber equipment with Krupp for the expansion of a plant built and equipped by the West German concern at Kursk, south of Moscow. The latest order, for $4 million, brings the total value of the contract to about $14 million.

West German concerns, still limited by a five-year limit of deferred payment terms for sales to the Soviet Union, are reported complaining that their conditions are uncompetitive compared with the longer credit terms offered by Britain.

Even French and Italian concerns are reported to have offered long-term financing of more than five years though without their governments official guarantees.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Mar. 10, 1965]

MORE SOVIET DEALS SIGHTED BY UK FIRM

LONDON, March 9.—The Commonwealth's largest industrial complex, Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd. (ICI) today said it hopes for bigger deals with Communist China and the Soviet bloc. China has agreed to a comprehensive exhibition of ICI products in Tientsin in October.

ICI's shipments to China in 1964 were worth more than £1 million ($2.80 million), the company's annual report said today this was only a small fraction of ICI's overseas business but was substantially higher than in 1963. It added "conditions are favorable for greater trade with China. The company is making considerable efforts to take advantage of the improved situation."

1964 AGREEMENT

In 1964 ICI signed an agreement together with the British engineering group of Simon Carves Ltd. to build a polythene plant in China.

ICI said that its sales to Russia and Eastern European countries were maintained at £10 million ($28 million) which was slightly higher than in 1963.

It said that ICI has signed a number of contracts with Eastern bloc customers over the past five years for chemical plants based on its processes.

The report added "substantial sums are receivable by the company under these contracts which have also provided valuable export business for British plant contractors. In addition, the growth of industrialization in these countries should provide increasing opportunities for trade."

HEAVY INCREASE

ICI said that last year's record results were partly due to the heavy increase in capital invested in the business in recent years.

The average cost of fixed capital equipment per employe in 1964 was £6,521 ($18,258).

Total group funds invested at the end of 1964 were £966 million ($2.704 billion). Construction spending in Britain alone last year cost more than £70 million ($196 million) and this year it promises to be much greater.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 12, 1964]

HUNGARY TO PURCHASE $24 MILLION OF GOODS FROM CANADA IN 3 YEARS—IT WILL BUY 9,250,000 BUSHELS OF WHEAT, FEED BARLEY; THEY ADOPT FAVORED-NATION TARIFF CLAUSE

(By a Wall Street Journal Staff Reporter)

OTTAWA.—Canada and Hungary concluded a three-year trade agreement under which Hungary will buy wheat and other goods valued at $24 million from Canada, Trade Minister Mitchell Sharp announced in the House of Commons.

Hungarian wheat purchases over the three years will total 9,250,000 bushels, he said, but Hungary may take half that amount in feed barley rather than wheat. Hungary traditionally has been an exporter of wheat.

The two countries also agreed to exchange most-favored-nation tariff treatment. Under such treatment, either country would have to give to the other nation any tariff concession granted to a third party.

The trade agreement also provides that each country may open trade offices in the other country.

Aside from wheat or barley, Hungary will be free to choose the Canadian goods it wants to complete its commitment.

External Affairs Minister Paul Martin announced a further agreement with Hungary for an exchange of diplomatic missions to negotiate an early settlement of outstanding financial claims between the two countries.

Further negotiations will be held at a later date on property claims, Mr. Martin said. These include debts prior to World War II, war damage, and property that has been nationalized or expropriated since World War II by Hungary. The claims also cover Hungarian claims on blocked or vested Hungarian assets in Canada.

The Canadian government will invite nationals to submit claims against Hungary.

Another agreement will loosen travel restrictions in Hungary for Canadians and allow consideration for emigration from Hungary of relatives of Canadian nationals there.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 26, 1966]

BIG SUITCASE—SOVIETS, ITALIANS SIGN TRADE PACT

(By Walter Lucas, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

ROME.—The new economic agreement just signed between the Soviet Union and Italy is the first of its kind, according to the Soviet Government newspaper Izvestia.

Details of the pact have not been disclosed, but it is "a large suitcase that can hold a great deal," said one Italian negotiator.

The agreement is apparently the most positive outcome of the three-day official visit here concluded Sunday by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko.

The accord generally provides for "active technical and scientific cooperation that will encourage individual contracts between Italian operators and Soviet organisms aimed at industrial progress."

Italy already has similar agreements with other Iron Curtain countries as Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, and Romania.

INTERDEPENDENCE SEEN

It now appears that the technicians who run Soviet affairs realize that European economies can be interdependent, however different their political systems may be.

As the respected Turin newspaper La Stampa writes, "This interdependence is a form of coexistence inspired by vital necessity rather than by fear.

One gets the impression that the political side of Mr. Gromyko's talks with Italian officials were useful. He apparently made no attempt to weaken Italy's attachment to NATO.

Mr. Gromyko made a public statement that "we respect the viewpoint of the other side. We take into account the existing situtation in Europe and the world. We do not wish to give any embarrassment to Italy in her relations with other countries.

"But dialogue can be useful without losing sight of realities of international equilibrium."

The economic agreement apparently means that the Russians have decided to turn to the West for help in carrying out their new five-year plan. They are buying machines and plants from the West as well as technology.

Already Japan has been associated with the industrial expansion of Siberia. The French are helping with color television. British are engaged in building a natural-gas pipeline from Iran into the Soviet Union.

ECONOMIES COMPLEMENTARY

Italians now are awaiting the signing of a contract that will give the giant Fiat automobile firm a large part in development of the Soviet automobile industry under the new five-year plan. Alexander Tarazov, minister for Automobile Industry, and team experts now are in Turin and it is thought that they are almost ready to sign.

If this deal goes through it would be the first major step in implementing the new economic agreement.

There are reasons why Italy is the first Western nation to sign this type of agreement with Moscow. As one Soviet negotiator is reported to have said, "Italians are more forthcoming than most other people. In that they are like Americans."

Be that as it may there are more compelling reason. Italian and Soviet economies are to some degree complementary. Italy lacks raw materials the Soviets can provide.

Italy has industrial products, skills and know-how that Moscow wants.

Moreover the present balance of trade between the two countries is $90 million against the Italians, which is another reason why leaders here want to increase trade.

This agreement is seen here as more than as economic affairs. It is felt that it will have indirect bearing on East-West political relationships, since its action can modify problems which now seem insoluble.

From what can be learned of Mr. Gromyko's discussions with Foreign Minister Amintore Fanfani, Premier Aldo Moro, and President Saragat, it was shown that Italy is as much concerned as the Soviets with possibility of rebirth of German "revanchism." Italians pointed out that French President de Gaulle's break with NATO is only stimulating this.

If Moscow encourages General de Gaulle in his anti-NATO stance they would only be indirectly helping to build up German nationalism, Italian leaders reportedly said.

The impression was gained here that the Soviets want the status quo in Europe so as to prevent any threat from Germany.

Meanwhile, Associated Press quoted Vatican sources as saying that Pope Paul VI is expected to receive Mr. Gromyko in private audience this Wednesday, after the Soviet diplomat returns Romewards from a tourist visit to Florence and Naples.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 24, 1965]

TRADE PIERCES IRON CURTAIN—BONN'S DRIVE TO EAST SCORES

(By Harry B. Ellis, Staff Correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

BONN.—West Germany's trade offensive east of the Iron Curtain continues to chalk up new gains.

Results achieved in 1964 and so far this year reinforce the position of the German Federal Republic as the West's No. 1 trader with Communist lands.

Last year West Germany not only sold more, but bought more, from every Communist country than was the case in 1963.

Figures through April of this year indicate that the gains are bing held and in some cases increased.

CREDITS CONCLUDED

Bonn's trade across the Iron Curtain now is aided by the government's willingness to grant credits up to eight years to Communist customers.

This lengthening of credit terms was designed to put West German businessmen on an equal footing with their rivals in Britain, France, and other Western nations.

Since March of this year deals involving eight-year credits have been concluded with Romania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. Bonn and Moscow are negotiating the extension of similar West German credits to the Soviet Union.

Bonn pays special attention to Romania, which in May hosted a $10-million West German industrial show in Bucharest.

DIPLOMATIC TIES

In 1964 West German bought $61 million worth of goods from Romania and sold $82 million worth in return. The comparable 1963 figures had been $56 million of imports from Romania and $73 million worth of German exports.

Even before the trade fair opened in Bucharest, this year's trade between Romania and West Germany was running substantially higher than in 1964.

The reason is partly political. Already Bonn officials are talking of the possibility of opening diplomatic relations with Romania.

This would be the first Communist country, other than the Soviet Union, with which Bonn would exchange ambassadors.

POLITICAL BARRIERS

Diplomatic relations with Romania would be the next step in a campaign to strengthen West German influence behind the Iron Curtain.

The atmosphere between Bonn and Bucharest is friendly. The same is not true between West Germany and Czechoslovakia. Yet trade between them grows.

For political reasons Czechoslovakia and the Federal Republic have failed to conclude a formal trade agreement. Nor has a West German trade mission been allowed to open in Prague.

Nonetheless trade between the two countries in 1964 was considerably above that of the year before.

The same was true with Poland, though Bonn and Warsaw continue to joust about the final frontier between Poland and a united Germany.

"INTERZONAL" TRADE

The Soviet Union remains by all odds West Germany's largest trading partner behind the Iron Curtain, except for the (East) German Democratic Republic (DDR).

Bonn regards commerce with East Germany as "interzonal" trade, separate from "foreign" trade conducted with other Communist lands.

Trade between Moscow and Bonn continued to rise in 1964, despite the absence of a new trade agreement to replace one which expired at the end of 1963.

The West German Government looks upon trade as a floor on which to build cultural and possibly diplomatic relations with Communist nations.

The trade is valuable in itself. But it also may smooth the way for Bonn to outflank East Germany in the Communist world.

TRADE PINPOINTED

BONN.—In 1964 the (West) German Federal Republic traded with Communist nations as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Imports from	German exports to
Albania	0. 1	0. 9
Bulgaria	30. 0	39. 0
Communist China	52. 0	25. 0
Cuba	0. 8	11. 7
Czechoslovakia	72. 0	83. 0
Hungary	62. 0	74. 0
Poland	91. 0	80. 0
Romania	61. 0	82. 0
U.S.S.R.	234. 0	194. 0

West German trade with Communist nations totaled about 4 percent of Bonn's world trade.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 10, 1966]

BACK-DOOR TRADE: U.S. FIRMS DEAL MORE WITH RED BLOC VIA FOREIGN UNITS

(By J. Russell Boner)

LEIPZIG, EAST GERMANY.—American companies are selling more to Communist countries than anyone would ever guess from the trade figures.

They are accomplishing this through the back door, via subsidiaries in Europe. Thus, sales and profits from dealing with Eastern European nations are buried in the consolidated corporate reports of U.S. companies and are reflected in export figures from European nations, rather than in U.S. trade totals. Moreover, these sales may obtain fresh impetus from a bill proposed by President Johnson last week to liberalize trade with East European nations.

Examples abound of heavy selling to Eastern Europe by U.S. subsidiaries abroad.

Victor C. Squitieri, Jr., manager of Honeywell, Inc.'s commercial controls division for continental Europe, says, "Of the commercial equipment we sell (in East Germany) about 60% is made in West Germany and counts as German exports." Only 40%

shows up in U.S. trade figures. International Business Machines Corp. reports that its sales to the Communist bloc come almost entirely from its Western European plants.

No one knows exactly how much U.S. trade is carried on through overseas subsidiaries. But talks with companies doing business behind the Iron Curtain indicate commerce of this type is rising faster than direct U.S. trade. Direct trade itself is moving up briskly. Last year U.S. imports from Red nations rose some 40% from 1964, to $141.5 million. U.S. industrial exports to Red nations rose, too, Government officials estimate, though the overall export figure slipped to $222.6 million from $339.2 million in 1964, because massive grain shipments of 1964 weren't repeated last year. Based on these figures, America's trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc accounts for only 3% of all East-West trade.

All the evidence indicates these statistics don't even begin to show the volume of U.S. trade with Red nations. Italy's Fiat, for instance, has just negotiated with the Russians to build an auto plant in the Soviet Union with a capacity of more than 2,000 units daily. The cost would be in excess of $800 million. Fiat officials say that U.S. companies may be asked to bid on more than $50 million worth of equipment for the plant. But the shipments to Russia would be through Fiat, and all sales would be lumped into Italy's exports to the Soviet Union.

U.S. EXHIBITORS OVERLOOKED

The U.S. trading role has been taken over by overseas subsidiaries to such an extent that some Communists apparently aren't aware they're dealing with American companies. The East Germans, eager to indicate American de facto recognition of their regime, claimed that 68 American firms were represented at the recent Leipzig fair. The number was heavily bolstered by the inclusion of over 30 U.S. publishers represented in two small booths by Dutch and Swiss exhibitors. Yet, astonishingly, in their listings the East Germans failed to identify as American more than 20 publicly held U.S. companies, including subsidiaries and ventures of such giants as Ford Motor Co. and H. J. Heinz (both counted as British), Honeywell (West German) and General Electric (French with Machines Bull).

The Communists aren't the only ones overlooking the American role in sales behind the Iron Curtain. "Britain Wins Moscow Order for Landing Aid System" reads a London Times headline. The story deals with a $280,000-plus Russian order for an instrument landing system to be installed by Standard Cables & Telephones, Ltd., at Moscow's Sheremetyevo Airport. Nowhere does the story mention that SCT is a British subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., New York.

Even U.S. banks apparently are establishing "back door" branches to help U.S. corporate customers abroad conduct trade with Communist nations. They are homing in on Vienna, a key financial center in East-West trade. Last November Bank of America opened an office in the Austrian capital, and Chase Manhattan Bank is currently negotiating to acquire an Austrian bank there.

There are many reasons American companies are selling the products of their European subsidiaries behind the Iron Curtain. Some are matters of simple economics: Lower transportation costs or easier adaptability. Others are of political origin, involving tariffs and clearances.

Caterpillar Tractor Co., for instance, has a perfectly straight-forward reason for preferring to sell Eastern Europe customers its D4 tractors made in France. "It costs $600 to ship a D4 from Grenoble," says Stephen G. Weckel, Caterpillar's Eastern European representative. The freight bill to ship one behind the Iron Curtain from Peoria, Ill. the company's U.S. headquarters, is over $1,200.

IBM equipment made in Europe is simpler to sell to the Reds because both East and West Europe are on a 50-cycle electrical system. Equipment sold in the U.S. is designed to operate on 60 cycles.

In many cases the sale of products made entirely in Europe can mean avoiding bothersome clearance procedures through the U.S. Commerce Department. In the final quarter last year, the department rejected export licenses for $1.8 million in goods, or 4% of the total applications for shipments behind the Iron Curtain. Not all the products for which licenses were required appear to be strategic goods. For instance, official clearance was required for $4 million worth of cotton seeds shipped to Albania.

Even where shipments are approved, the licensing procedure can pose a psychological barrier to trade. Mr. Weckel reports that last September Caterpillar concluded a deal to sell some $250,000 worth of big crawler tractors and wheel-loaders to Czechoslovakia, but did not get a go-ahead from the U.S. Government until last month. Mr. Weckel contends that the Communist representatives are "very unhappy about having to sign forms" pledging not to use the equipment for strategic purposes. And "it's embarrassing to the customer once they have done it to have to wait six months to a year for U.S. Government approval," he adds.

Communist lands often balk at direct trade with the U.S. because of the difficulties they encounter in selling goods to America.

"Exchanges must be made on a reciprocal basis," argues Vasile Eustatiade, a representative of Rumania's Masinexport. "We have to achieve a balance between imports and exports."

COMPLAINTS OF DISCRIMINATION

But this is difficult to accomplish. Gerhard Beir, East Germany's deputy minister of foreign and inter-German trade, says his country is stymied in selling to the U.S. because of "discriminatory treatment of our products." These include, he says, such things as high tariff barriers, the barring of East German businessmen from the U.S. and a requirement that U.S. importers stamp "Made in the Soviet-Occupied Zone" on East German products, including even Christmas tree ornaments.

The high tariff complaint is voiced by most Eastern bloc nations. Only Poland enjoys most favored nation treatment in dealings with the U.S. (So does Yugoslavia, but that country is considered a Western nation by the U.S. Government in its trading statistics.)

President Johnson has asked Congress to empower him to extend the most favored nation treatment to Red nations at his discretion. Under present law, these nations must hurdle the 1930 Smoot-Hawley tariff to sell in the U.S. The average Smoot-Hawley rate on durable products is about 45% of their value, against a comparable rate of 12.2% for nations covered under the 1962 Trade Expansion Act.

Many U.S. companies have begun working through Western European agents or representatives who can use or convert bartered Eastern European goods into hard currency in their own lands. This money, in turn, can be switched easily into dollars.

Gunter Diederichs, a representative of Franz Kragh, Bremen, West Germany, says his firm sells U.S. flue-cured tobacco to the East Germans, receiving goods in exchange. In turn Kragh sells these goods in Western Europe and pays the tobacco growers in dollars.

Gordon S. Planner, director of Dominions Export Co., Ltd., London, handles Red bloc trade for a growing list of British-based U.S.-owned companies. Last year Dominions sold the Communists about 200 British Ford tractors and Ford-powered tractors.

Dominions actually sells more Communist-produced goods, such as fertilizer, furniture, toys and chemicals, in Britain than it does Western goods to the Reds. Because of this favorable flow of foreign exchange through Dominions, Mr. Planner says, the Communists are receptive to hard currency deals for products his company represents. As the Dominions experience indicates, it's much easier to sell Communist goods in Britain than in the U.S.; in fact, Britain has a trade deficit in its dealings with the European Communists.

The back door approach doesn't by any means suggest that American businessmen are being sneaky. Right now there's more pressure than ever before for a lowering of barriers to East-West trade. This year, for the first time, the U.S. State Department dropped opposition to U.S. exhibits at the March fair held here in Leipzig and rated as the most important trade fair in the Communist world.

A CHANGE OF ATTITUDE

The frank and open attitude in discussing trade relations with newsmen displayed by representatives of American firms and products here indicates a vast change from recent corporate misgivings about East-West trade. A year ago Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. dropped plans to give Rumania technical information to build a synthetic rubber plant. Sen. FULBRIGHT (D., Ark.) charged then that the cancellation was due to pressure from U.S. right-wing groups and to attempts by Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. to exploit the deal with the Communists for competitive purposes.

In fact, the increasing commercial contacts with Eastern Europe are viewed by many as beneficial to U.S. political aims. "Trade negotiations and trade relations can provide us with useful opportunities to influence attitudes in these countries in directions favorable to our national interest," argues a report to the President of the Special Committee on U.S. Trade with Eastern European Countries and the Soviet Union. This blue-ribbon group was headed by J. Irwin Miller, chairman of Cummins Engine Co. of Columbus, Ind.

Despite President Johnson's plea for liberalization of East-West trade, it's unlikely that the suggested measure will be enacted in this session of Congress. Even though the climate for liberalization may be better than it has been, this is not the sort of legislation anticipated in a Congressional election year.

Many Americans still strongly oppose trade with the Red bloc, contending that it only serves to strengthen communism to America's detriment. The prolonged Vietnam conflict, plus indignation over a plan by Western European companies to sell $150 million worth of steel finishing mills and other equipment to Red China, could strengthen the opposition to freer trade.

Thus it appears that for the present, at least, the main American approach to the Communist bloc will continue to be through the back door.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has come before Congress recently. It proposes to have really a new look, in a substantive way, at what this trade means.

Trade is something that the peoples of Communist countries, can understand perhaps better than they can understand anything else.

The hands of the President have been tied in extending most-favored-nation treatment to European Communist countries. I personally believe that he has been unable to do what needs to be done—and I shall outline that in a moment—without the assistance of this legislation.

When Congress has had a chance to furnish the President with such authority, it has turned the proposal down and tied the hands of the President even tighter. This has been very unwise for American policy.

I have been in the Soviet Union on a mission for one of the congressional committees. We looked into the question of East-West trade. It was immediately apparent to us that our friends and allies were selling hundreds of millions of dollars worth of goods to the Soviet Union. These goods consisted of nonstrategic items. We were not making these sales because we could not make the proper trade with them. The Russians would say to us: "There is no use in your engaging in this minuet. France, Germany, and Britain are selling to us."

I think that West Germany sells approximately $1 billion worth of goods a year to the Communist bloc. And the terms on which they sell these goods—notwithstanding the Berne Agreement, which limits Western credit terms to 5 years—are now from 5 to 10 years, and sometimes longer.

There is great competition for this business. We do not begrudge our allies these sales. It makes for a very poor picture and posture on the part of the United States to have this illusory policy which prohibits trade for all practical purposes, as the senior Senator from Washington has stated, while all of our allies are selling freely to a Russian shopping list.

It is necessary that we trade with the central European bloc for the good of the free world, especially at a time when we hope, by virtue of our sacrifices in Vietnam and elsewhere, that the Russians may reverse their priority and stop trying to dominate the Communist world by competing with China in an effort to subvert South Vietnam.

We should not, however, have trade with the central European bloc except on a reciprocal basis. This bill would prvoide for that reciprocity.

In order to do that effectively, one of the top priorities of the Nation is to harmonize our policy with the policy of the NATO allies.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, with France now dropping out of the NATO alliance, there is little chance of accomplishing such trade without some assistance. I have recently come back from service as a rapporteur of the NATO Conference. Things can be done now in Europe which could not be done before. One of the most important things is to have harmonious relations between East and West trade with our allies, Germany, Great Britain, the low countries, Italy, and our other allies. All of these allies sell infinitely more goods than we do to Central Europe.

Without this bill, we cannot do that, because with it we can do things we cannot otherwise do or agree to. We cannot deal with dumping, we cannot deal with patents, we cannot deal with offices in which sales can be made, we cannot deal with arbitration of commercial disagreements, and a dozen other things.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say that the things I have mentioned flag this as one of the most important bills before us. I have asked the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] if I could join as a sponsor of this bill.

Second, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a code of fair practices which were first developed by the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference when I was its Chairman, which will show exactly what this bill can and should accomplish, both in stimulating trade and, what is even more important, in making for greater unity between NATO countries and the United States and its allies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CODE OF FAIR PRACTICES IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

1. Facilitating access to markets: Each government shall permit the entry into and residence and travel within its territory of bona fide foreign commercial representatives and salesmen, for the purpose of the normal conduct of their business, including, inter alia:

(a) Opportunity to procure suitable facilities such as office space, warehouse space, space for the public display of merchandise, and facilitation for the post-sales maintenance and servicing of their products;

(b) Access to importing and exporting interests, banks, insurance companies, publicity and advertising media, and postal and other communications facilities;

(c) Freedom to bring in advertising material and samples, and to disseminate the same within the national territory;

(d) Freedom to bring in or employ locally interpreters, translators, secretaries, accountants, technical experts, and legal counsel.

2. Publication of laws, regulations, and statistics: Each government shall publish promptly all laws, regulations, judicial decisions and administrative decisions affecting foreign trade, and adequately detailed statistics regarding foreign trade, in such a manner as to enable governments and traders to become acquainted with them.

3. Patent and copyright protection: Each country shall observe equitable standards of patent and copyright protection, and shall maintain procedures so that foreign nationals are able in practice to obtain adequate, prompt, and effective compensation for the use of their industrial and intellectual property.

4. Rules on state trading: In a country which maintains any state enterprise with exclusive or special privileges regarding purchases or sales (other than purchases purely for governmental use) such enterprises shall make any purchases and sales involving imports or exports solely in accordance with commercial considerations, such as price, quality, availability, marketability, transportation costs, and other conditions, and foreign enterprises shall be afforded adequate opportunity to compete on an equal basis in state purchases and sales abroad. Such state enterprises shall not claim sovereign immunity with respect to their commercial operations.

5. Switching of procurement: Each government shall insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises shall not arbitrarily change sources of imports for purely political reasons in such a manner as to disrupt the normal marketing arrangements of supplying countries.

6. Reexportation: Each government shall insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises do not reexport a commodity imported from another country at a price lower than that at which it was originally exported, and do not make reexports contrary to the laws and regulations of the country of origin.

7. Dumping and market disruption: Each government shall establish or maintain procedures to insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises do not introduce products into the commerce of another country at such prices, in such quantities, or at such a rate as to cause or threaten serious injury to an established industry in the latter country.

8. Settlement of commercial disputes: Each government shall facilitate the use of arbitration in the settlement of disputes that arise in the course of international commerce. To that end, each government shall avoid taking any action to prevent the inclusion in agreements of provisions for settlement of such disputes in third countries or for the appointment of arbitrators who are nationals of third countries.

9. Consultation: Each government shall accord sympathetic consideration to, and shall afford adequate opportunity for, consultation regarding such representations as may be made by another government with respect to any matter affecting the operation of this code.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], not only for introducing the bill, but for making the fine statement he has made. I think an essential supplement to that statement, which is not mentioned in it, but is very important, is that this will form the basis by which we can, at long last, have a common policy with our allies of the Atlantic community with respect to East-West trade; and that common bond is just as important as is this bill, giving the necessary power to the President of the United States.

Mr. **McGOVERN**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **JAVITS**. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. **McGOVERN**. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the splendid statements by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has long been an advocate of greater East-West trade. I agree enthusiastically with what they have said. I think the President's message and his request on East-West trade represents the most constructive initiative for better international relations that has come to Congress this year.

In a sense, the Senator from New York has said we have been cutting off our noses to spite our faces by denying ourselves access to the very promising market in Eastern Europe. I hope that we cannot only give heed to the President's request with greater flexibility and more commonsense in this area, but that we can also make progress in the months ahead, toward resolving the stalemate that has made it difficult for us to carry on wheat sales to the Soviet Union.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR MUSEUM SHOULD BE BUILT IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, for myself and my senior colleague from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to establish a National Nuclear Museum in the State of New Mexico.

Such a museum has been discussed on an informal basis for a number of years, both within the Government and by leading citizens of my State who wish to recognize the primary role that New Mexico has played in the development of atomic energy.

It was in the Los Alamos Laboratory in the mountains northwest of Santa Fe that the cream of the scientific community of the United States and free Europe congregated to design and develop the first atomic bombs during World War II.

It was at the Trinity Site in the desert northwest of Alamogordo that the first atomic bomb was exploded on July 16, 1945.

It was at Los Alamos that the first thermonuclear bomb was developed.

And in the years since, Los Alamos, Albuquerque, and other scientific centers in New Mexico, have led the way in the immensely hopeful change in emphasis from strictly military application to the peaceful uses of the atom. This work that is going on today will, in the long run, be my State's most important contribution to accomplishments of the atomic age.

The discovery that man could use atomic energy, first for war and now for peace, has changed the history and politics of this earth in a more fundamental way than any event in the past. It is time that this great technology, with its unprecedented implications for good and evil, be displayed and explained to the public in its own museum.

The bill I am introducing to accomplish this purpose has due regard for the national security. It specifies that materials selected for display shall be "subject to such limitations as the Commission in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, determines are necessary in the interest of the national security."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3364) to authorize the establishment of a National Nuclear Museum, introduced by Mr. Montoya (for himself and Mr. Anderson), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3364

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized and directed to provide for the establishment and maintenance, at a suitable site in the State of New Mexico, of a National Nuclear Museum for the advancement of public knowledge with respect to matters pertaining to the uses and development of nuclear energy. The Commission is authorized to acquire the site for such museum by purchase, gift, condemnation, or otherwise, and to make all necessary improvements thereto. Items displayed in such museum shall be selected to reflect their historical interest and educational value, subject to such limitations as the Commission in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, determines are necessary in the interests of the national security.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

ACQUISITION OF WET LANDS FOR THE CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the acquisition of wet lands for the conservation of migratory waterfowl.

This proposed legislation, requested by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, proposes to extend the present 7-year program of wetland acquisition, which expires at the end of fiscal year 1968. The proposed bill amends existing law by extending the program for an additional 8 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3365) to extend the period during which the funds may be appropriated pursuant to the act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), for the conservation of migratory waterfowl, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3365

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), is amended by deleting "seven-year period" and inserting therein "fifteen-year period".

Sec. 2. Section 3 of the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1977, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 per centum of the moneys accruing annually thereafter to such fund. In the event the full amount authorized by this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the fifteen-year period established by this Act, repayment shall begin with the next full fiscal year."

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1966.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To extend the period during which the funds may be appropriated pursuant to the act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), for the conservation of migratory waterfowl, and for other purposes."

We recommend that this draft bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

In 1961, Congress enacted the "Wetlands Loan Act" (75 Stat. 813), which authorized an appropriation of up to $105 million over a 7-year period beginning in fiscal year 1962 for an accelerated land acquisition program for the benefit of the Nation's migratory waterfowl. In our comments on the legislation (see H. Rept. No. 1184, 87th Cong.), we said:

"It is significant to note that there were originally in the 48 contiguous States some 127 million acres of wetlands; however, by 1955 this total acreage was reduced to approximately 74 million acres. Of this amount only 22.5 million are now of significant value for migratory waterfowl use. Each year this acreage shrinks considerably. Time is running out in the race to preserve our migratory waterfowl. These factors are reducing the natural habitat available to our migratory waterfowl and are creating an urgent need for well-considered counter measures. The only solution, we believe, is an expansion in the Federal land acquisition program for the benefit of our migratory waterfowl resource. Unless appropriate action is taken soon, very serious losses to this resource will result."

Preliminary work was necessary in the first fiscal year, namely fiscal year 1962, to assure success of the accelerated land acquisition program. Funds were first appropriated for fiscal year 1963. Seven million dollars were appropriated that year. During fiscal years 1964 and 1965, the program was delayed due to local opposition in some of the key States to Federal land acquisitions with their resultant adverse impact on county revenues. In 1965, Congress amended the antiquated Refuge Revenue Sharing Act of 1935, and this provided a more equitable formula for the distribution of revenues beginning in fiscal year 1966 from the National Wildlife Refuge System to the local counties. It is expected that this new revenue formula will lessen the impact of the Department's acquisition program for waterfowl on the counties, and permit the Department to carry out this program at a better pace with available funds.

When the "Wetlands Loan Act" was considered by the Congress, we estimated that approximately 2.5 million acres could be acquired in fee and easement during the seven fiscal years following enactment, using approximately $35 million in estimated "duck stamp" receipts during this period, and $105 million to be appropriated under this Act. Since the beginning of this accelerated program in fiscal year 1963, approximately 523,000 acres have been acquired in fee and easement up to June 30, 1965, at the cost of about $41 million. This latter figure includes $25 million appropriated during fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965 under the "Wetlands Loan Act" and about $16 million in "duck stamp" receipts. There remain to be acquired under this accelerated program, 2 million of the 2.5 million acres which we estimated could be acquired in the 7-year period. Unfortunately, the program will terminate at the end of fiscal year 1968 unless provision is made to extend it. Obviously we cannot acquire the remaining 2 million acres by the end of fiscal year 1968. Additional time is needed. Through this fiscal year there has actually been appropriated $32.5 million of the $105 million authorized. At the present rate of appropriations, we believe an additional eight years will be needed to complete the program. Our proposed bill provides for this extension.

The House Appropriations Committee, in its report (H. Rept. No. 205, 89th Cong.), recommended an appropriation of $7.5 million for fiscal year 1966 for this program. In addition, the report stated "the Committee expects that the Bureau [of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife] will continue the policy of more widespread acquisition by easement instead of purchase in fee and reduce the cost of the program."

We recognize, of course, that land costs—especially wetland costs—are gradually increasing. We agree that to some extent the cost of this program could and should be reduced through the continued use of easement acquisitions. We wish to emphasize, however, that easements, if they are to serve a useful purpose, must be acquired in conjunction with, and not independently of, fee acquisitions. The whole program is based on the need for a balance of fee and easement acquisitions. We estimate this balance to be about one fee acre for each two easement acres. Generally, the types of land being acquired under the program in fee simple are the more permanent wetlands. Undue emphasis on the easement aspects of the program would materially reduce the effectiveness of the program. Thus, while we will continue our policy to acquire lands by easement, we do not want to lose sight of the need for fee acquisitions to accomplish the program objectives. The 1961 Act now provides that the funds advanced will be repaid ultimately out of "duck stamp" revenues beginning in fiscal year 1969. Our proposed bill changes the repayment date to fiscal year 1977.

In addition, our proposal repeals the provision in the "Wetlands Loan Act" which prohibits the Secretary from acquiring lands in a State with funds from the Migratory Bird Conservation Act until the Governor or an appropriate State agency approves of the acquisition. The primary reason for the "veto" provision in the 1961 Act was the problem of decreased tax revenues in local counties due to Federal acquisitions. This loss will be substantially reduced by the new revenue sharing formula. The Migratory Bird Conservation Act requires State legislative consent to acquisitions. For these reasons, we believe that this additional consent provision is unnecessary.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY A. CAIN,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ARMING OF EMPLOYEES OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with the letter from the Administrator, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3366) to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3366

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 313 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, (49 U.S.C. 1354) is amended by renumbering present subsection (e) as subsection (f) and adding a new subsection (e) to read as follows:

"ARMING EMPLOYEES

"(e) The Administrator is authorized to purchase and to permit employees of the Agency and persons performing services under contract with the Agency to bear arms and ammunition as necessary for the protection of public property under his jurisdiction, custody, or control, or the execution of responsibilities vested in him by law."

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft bill "To authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of our legislative program for 1966 and its enactment by the Congress is recommended. The bill would authorize the Administrator to purchase and furnish firearms to employees of the Agency and persons performing services under contract with the Agency as necessary for the protection of public property under his jurisdiction, custody or control, or the execution of responsibilities vested in him by law.

It is the opinion of this Agency, and one shared by other agencies, that the head of an agency of the Federal Government has implied authority to arm his employees for the protection of Federal property. (See S. Report 1858 and H. Report 2087 accompanying H.R. 11700, 85th Congress.) Accordingly, at those facilities for which we must provide service, and for which the normal protective services of the General Services Administration are not available, the Agency has provided arms to the guards. In one instance, the arming of the guards has been preceded by securing from local jurisdictions their designation as "special policemen." This has been done as a precautionary measure to prevent any conflict with local authorities. However, such a designation cannot always be obtained, and because of the potential hazards involved in the carrying of firearms, we believe it prudent to obtain express legislative authority. This would place beyond dispute the legal status of our employees in the event of an accident.

The bill also provides that the Administrator is authorized to arm contract employees. Sometimes it is a more economical practice to contract with a private guard service than to use Agency employees as guards, and express authority to arm the contract guards is as desirable as in the case of the regular Agency employee.

In addition to the normal peacetime requirements for property protection, the October 1962 international crisis demonstrated some of the very urgent protection problems which this Agency will face in a national emergency when all of its resources must be directed to maintaining an air defense and air strike capability. The continuity of service of the hundreds of air navigation facilities and other installations which this Agency operates then becomes a matter of critical importance. To assure protection of these facilities, we anticipate arming a limited number of employees at each installation during an emergency. The legislation which we propose would also eliminate any doubt as to the authority of those employees to bear arms.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS TO PURCHASE U.S. OBLIGATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE TREASURY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, a bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3368) to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, May 3, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for two years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury."

The proposed legislation would extend for two additional years, from June 30, 1966 to June 30, 1968, the present temporary authority under which the Federal Reserve banks may purchase public debt obligations directly from the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time. The present direct purchase authority was originally provided in 1942 and has been extended since then on a temporary basis. The latest extension, enacted in 1964, will expire on June 30 of this year.

The importance of the direct purchase authority rests not in the amount or frequency of its use, but rather in its availability in time of emergency. Although the purchase authority has not been used for over eight years, its mere existence permits the Treasury to operate with a smaller cash balance than could otherwise be prudently justified. Moreover, in the event of major national emergency, such as a nuclear attack on the United States, the availability of the authority would help to assure the provision of essential Government services.

There is enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative type showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed legislation.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposal has been sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Henry H. Fowler.

AUTHORITY FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO MAKE SPECIAL STUDIES, TO PROVIDE SERVICES, AND TO ENGAGE IN JOINT PROJECTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Secretary of Commerce requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose of the bill may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement of purpose will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3370) to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1966.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are enclosed herewith four copies of a draft bill "To authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes;" and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

John T. Conner,
Secretary of Commerce.

Enclosures.

Statement of Purpose and Need for Legislation To Authorize the Department of Commerce To Make Special Studies, To Provide Services and To Engage in Joint Projects, and for Other Purposes

This legislation would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake upon request special studies of matters falling within the province of the Department of Commerce, to prepare from records of the Department special tabulations and reports, and to furnish transcripts or copies of Department records, upon payment of the cost of such work. Funds received would be deposited in a special account and used to pay the costs of performing the requested work. A proviso in Section 3 preserves present legal authority to deposit such funds directly into existing working capital funds. In the case of non-profit organizations, research organizations, or government agencies, the Secretary would be authorized to perform services or undertake joint projects with costs to be shared as determined by the Secretary.

The Department of Commerce now has authority under a number of different statutes to perform such services with respect to certain areas of the Department's work. These statutes are conflicting or overlapping and vary as to the extent to which payment may be required for the services and the use of the funds received in payment for such services. The proposed legislation would repeal a number of these statutes and substitute for them the general uniform authority described above.

The first paragraph of Section 1 of the proposed legislation combines the language of several existing statutory authorities and also includes a reference to the statute authorizing the activities of the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information. Thus, the first paragraph authorizes the continuance of existing activities with the assistance of reimbursement authority. Joint projects and performance of services under the second paragraph of Section 1 will be limited in availability to non-profit or research organizations or government agencies, and in applicability to matters of material interest to the Department and the cooperating group.

The services and projects which would be performed under this proposed legislation with the assistance of reimbursement authority cover a wide range of Department activities. Among the more significant are:

(1) Making available to the public a large amount of unpublished data of the Office of Business Economics. Special compilations of this data could be made in the form most usable by the requesting agency. At present such data in special forms can be compiled only with difficulty because of the restraint imposed by limitations upon the use of appropriated funds. In addition, joint analytical studies of the raw data undertaken in cooperation with non-profit research organizations would greatly enhance the knowledge available on the workings of our economy.

(2) Promotion of tourism. The authority to engage in joint projects with non-profit organizations would be most helpful to our efforts in this field since it would facilitate joint preparation with non-profit organizations and State and local governments of travel promotion materials and films and in conducting cooperative research programs.

(3) Making available copies of records, charts and other services of the Environmental Science Services Administration on a reimbursable basis. The authority to conduct joint operations and research with government agencies would be particularly valuable in the development of improved geodetic and meteorological information systems.

(4) Provision of direct service to friendly countries and their institutions with respect to standard reference materials, samples of highly characterized materials sold by the National Bureau of Standards for such scientific uses as checking chemical analyses, temperature, color, viscosity, heat of combustion and various basic properties of materials. Special measurement services could be provided to other nations to assist in the correlation of our national measurements system with that of other nations.

The following laws or portions of laws would be repealed by the proposed legislation:

The proviso in the appropriation act of 1919 which refers to moneys received by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and provides for coverage of charges into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts (40 Stat. 1256). Although the law appears to have been impliedly repealed by the Act of May 27, 1935, it should be removed from the books.

The Act of May 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 292; 15 U.S.C. 189a, 192, 192a) which authorizes the Department to make special studies and prepare statistical compilations and to deposit the moneys received in a special account. However, the provisions relating to use of funds to employ persons who are neither officers nor employees of the United States are no longer pertinent under Civil Service laws and regulations.

The proviso in the appropriation act of May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1335; 15 U.S.C. 189) which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to charge for lists of foreign buyers and other services and to deposit the moneys collected into miscellaneous receipts.

The Act of December 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 1067; 5 U.S.C. 606) which authorizes the Secretary to establish schedules of reasonable fees or charges for services or publications, except services performed for or publications furnished to the Federal Government, State Governments and the District of Columbia. The Act further provides that moneys collected shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts.

Those provisions of the Act establishing a clearinghouse for technical information (64 Stat. 823; 15 U.S.C. 1153) which authorize the Secretary to establish fees or charges for services performed or for documents or publications furnished under the Act, and the proviso in the Act of October 22, 1951 (65 Stat. 586; 15 U.S.C. 1153a) authorizing use of such funds to reimburse the applicable appropriation. Replacing the above provisions with the reimbursement provisions of this legislation will enable the Department to recover more of the costs of clearinghouse services. Present authority to recover costs has been interpreted restrictively by the Comptroller General (34 Comp. Gen. 58).

The draft legislation would permit the Department to make more widely available the valuable data, statistics and other material collected by it without additional appropriations. Similarly the authority to conduct joint projects on a cost-sharing basis would enable us to expand our basic knowledge in important fields with less appropriations than would otherwise be required.

The Department of Commerce therefore urges early enactment of the proposed draft legislation.

AMENDMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. METCALF. On behalf of myself and the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Mansfield] I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill, and I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the majority leader, that I may introduce the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3372) to amend the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, introduced by Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

GAS INDUSTRY WEEK

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to designate the period beginning June 13, 1966 and ending June 19, 1966 as "Gas Industry Week."

This year the gas industry is celebrating its 150th anniversary. It was on June 13, 1816 that the first gas company in the United States was founded in Baltimore, Md. The gas industry is now the sixth largest industry in the United States, serving 36.6 million customers in all 50 States. The industry has an investment in plant totaling $29 billion and gives employment to over 200,000 of our citizens.

This resolution requests the President to issue a proclamation recognizing this anniversary celebration which marks an extremely important milestone in the development of a great American industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 160) to designate the period beginning June 13, 1966, and ending June 19, 1966, as "Gas Industry Week," introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ANNUAL FATHER'S DAY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in June each year as Father's Day.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the turbulent nature of the world today requires that now, more than ever before, the American home should be the center of strength and stability in which our people can develop to the fullest their physical, emotional, intellectual, and moral capacities; and

Whereas the service rendered to the United States by the American Father is a constant source of intellectual and moral strength which helps to perpetuate the highest values of our civilization and our Nation; and

Whereas men of the highest principle are devoting their time and energies to providing guidance and counsel in homes where there are fatherless children, and where the constructive influence and example of a father would otherwise be absent; and

Whereas the genuine regard, appreciation, and love which fathers earn each day should be publicly and especially commemorated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third Sunday in June of each year is hereby designated as "Father's Day." The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the appropriate Government officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, inviting the governments of the States and communities and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies, and urging our people to offer public and private expressions on such day to the abiding love and gratitude which they bear for their fathers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 161) to designate the third Sunday in June each year as Father's Day, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. The resolution has been cleared by the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 262) was considered and agreed to.

BRINGING JUNIOR COLLEGES AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES WITHIN THE ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL TRAINING ACT

AMENDMENT NO. 565

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, amendments to S. 3102, the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act. This amendment is to include junior colleges and community colleges within the covearge of the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 565) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. As we know, there is a vast shortage of personnel in fields related to health. Not only do we have a shortage of doctors, but the supporting medical personnel needed to make the work of the doctors more effective are unavailable in adequate numbers. Estimates I have received indicate a need of at least 50,000 more graduates a year than at present in medical technology and related fields, to fill positions in these skills. There are only about 20,000 graduates in these fields from baccalaureate programs per year at the present and about 10,000 students enrolled in junior college programs training allied health technicians.

The number of technical specialties in the field of medicine has grown rapidly with developments in science and with the increasing division of labor. We now have medical occupations we had not heard about a few years ago. While we used to rely on a single doctor perhaps assisted by a single nurse for many medical procedures, including some operations, we now find that over 100 medical specialists, nurses, and technicians are needed in preparation for and performance of an operation on a baby for congenital heart defect. Where we once had only the doctor, or the doctor and a nurse, we now have the doctor-nurse plus, with the help far outnumbering the doctors, just as support troops now outnumber those in frontline battle operations.

All this is reason for programs to increase training opportunities in occupations relating to medicine, such as medical technology, to improve the quality and training of those preparing our allied health professions personnel, and to increase the size of student loan programs in these areas. All this is included within the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act. However, the benefits of this act as presently written are intended only for those programs at colleges or universities leading to the baccalaureate degree or its equivalent. These institutions will be able to obtain improvement grants of $500 per student and $5,000 per curriculum. This does not go far enough.

The bill now excludes from its coverage programs offered in junior colleges and community colleges, where only 2-year programs are involved. An increasing number of junior colleges are offering substantial programs in health fields, leading to the preparation of medical technologists. The students who graduate from these programs are fully qualified to take many jobs in the allied health professions, thus assisting in relieving the shortage of trained personnel that we have all seen. About 10,000 students are presently enrolled in allied health professions programs in junior colleges in the United States. Examples of junior college programs in the allied health professions fields include those at Chicago City Junior College and Cerritos College, California, to prepare technicians in the field of manufacturing and fitting of artificial limbs and other aids for the handicapped; at Los Angeles City College and Erie County Technical Institute, Buffalo, N.Y., in optical technology; and at St. Mary's Junior College, Minneapolis, Minn.—in the present Presiding Officer's own State—where no fewer than seven different programs are offered in allied health professions fields.

To exclude junior colleges from the coverage of this act is to work discrimination against the many students—a rapidly increasing number—who attend our junior colleges rather than 4-year institutions of higher education. To finance programs at 4-year schools but not at 2-year schools is to tell the junior college student that he is a second-class citizen. We must remember that the junior and community colleges are a vital part of our system of higher education in this country. They provide education for late bloomers, for those who cannot afford to attend school away from home, and for the many who do not wish more than a 2-year program to prepare them to take useful places in society. Not to fund programs in the junior colleges also creates a hardship for the many students who attend junior colleges and then transfer to a 4-year school to finish their undergraduate work. Under the bill as presently written, the first 2 years of their training in medical technology programs will not be improved through the substantial grants under this bill, which provides that the first 2 years of training could be subsidized only in a senior college; the third and fourth years of their program would not be enhanced, unless the student who started at a junior college transferred to a senior college to finish his studies.

That is rank discrimination, Mr. President; and if junior college programs suffer as a result, one can see the 4-year school becoming reluctant to admit the product of the 2-year school unless he takes additional course work. This should not be allowed to happen, because the growing method of taking care of the great influx of students to educational institutions in America is to build more junior or community colleges. We have 4 million college students in America today, double the number of 10 years ago. Ten years from now, we will have 8 million.

All educators virtually agree that the way to take care of this great coming flood of students is to increase junior college education.

We are told that some money is available for training health service technicians under the Vocational Education Act. However, most of this money is used at the secondary—high school—rather than postsecondary—college—level. For example, in Texas, where 175,000 secondary students are in such programs supported by Vocational Education Act funds, only 64,000 postsecondary students are in such programs. And the percentage of postsecondary students in Texas is higher than in most States.

Most postsecondary students in the health fields under the Vocational Education Act, some 42,000 in fiscal year 1964, are enrolled in practical nursing courses, and many of that number are part time—leaving very few full-time students in the allied health professions being supported by Vocational Education Act money. Even when support for these programs is available from this source, the financial level is well below the $500 per student provided in the present bill—perhaps as low as $70 to $88 per student.

My proposed amendments are basic. They bring junior colleges within the bill's coverage. A definition of 2-year programs is provided for clarification. And, finally, a provision concerning the accreditation of junior colleges—through regional accrediting agencies—is provided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendments printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 15, line 16, strike out "college or" and insert "college, junior college, or" and insert "college, junior college, or".

On page 15, line 19, after "higher degree" insert "(or, if such department, division, or other administrative unit is in a junior college, leading to an associate or equivalent degree)".

On page 16, line 1, strike out "college or" and insert "college, junior college, or".

On page 16, line 8, strike out "and" and insert "or which is in a junior college which is accredited by the regional accrediting agency of the region in which it is located or which has been certified by such agency to be making reasonable progress toward meeting the requirements for accreditation by such agency,".

On page 16, line 10, strike out "college or" and insert "college, junior college, or".

On page 16, immediately after the comma on line 16, insert "and".

On page 16, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

"(F) which, if in a junior college, provides a program which (i) is of not less than two years duration and (ii) is acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree or is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician on a semiprofessional level in the allied health professions,".

On page 17, line 6, strike out "a baccalaureate" and insert "an associate or equivalent degree, a baccalaureate".

DIVIDED HIGHWAYS ARE ESSENTIAL FOR SAFETY ON INTERSTATE SYSTEM—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

AMENDMENT NO. 566

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 3155, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, which will eliminate a serious flaw in the present standards of the Interstate System.

Unless Congress acts to change the present law, about 1,200 miles—3 percent—of the interstate will be built as dangerous two-lane highway. That may come as a surprise to some Members of this body, but the present design standards will impose such highways on 16 States from Maine and Vermont to Oregon, Texas, and New Mexico.

Separation of traffic is the single most important reason that divided highways are safer than conventional highways, and I think it is a serious mistake to spend millions of dollars on portions of the interstate which lack this essential safety feature.

The amendment I am offering today will require that the interstate in all cases provide for at least four lanes of traffic.

Commissioner Rex Whitton of the Bureau of Public Roads testified before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works last week that four-laning of the entire interstate is desirable. The American Association of State Highway Officials has been on record in favor of this requirement since 1963.

The Subcommittee on Public Roads is holding further hearings on S. 3155 on Wednesday and Thursday of this week, and again next week. I ask all Senators who wish to join me in support of this measure to advise the committee so that their views may be considered during the hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 566) was referred to the Committee on Public Works

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, RESOLUTION, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] be added as cosponsors to amendment No. 565 to the Allied Professions Act, S. 3102.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] be added as cosponsors of my bill, S. 3306, to provide for establishing and maintaining reserve supplies of agricultural commodities for national security and other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the resolution (S. Res. 179) relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 3183, to impose penalties for the illegal importation of dangerous drugs, and Senate Joint Resolution 154, to establish a Joint United States-Mexican Commission on Narcotics, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, to express the sense of Congress that the United Nations provide for the self-determination of the Baltic States, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 88

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be added to the sponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 88 dealing with parity prices for farm products. I ask that his name be included in any future printing of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce, in connection with the resolution to which I have just referred, that hearings thereon have been scheduled for early in June by the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Production, Marketing, and Prices.

The resolution to which I have referred would forbid any Federal agency from taking action to freeze or to roll back any farm price that is below parity.

The Senator from Florida has authorized me to make this announcement, and I wish to reassure farmers who are concerned about it that the hide export order, the dairy import action and other steps taken recently to freeze below-parity farm prices will be fully examined in these hearings, and any interested group will be given an opportunity to testify.

Farmers and farm groups who wish to be heard should contact the Senate Committee on Agriculture at their earliest convenience. While no specific date has been set, it will probably be within the first week of June.

I wish to take this opportunity, Mr. President, to express my appreciation to the Senator from Florida for his prompt authorization of the hearings, and also to express my appreciation to each of the 42 Senators who have joined me as cosponsors of this resolution, which would prohibit efforts to depress subparity farm prices.

I also appreciate the support of a number of Senators who do not ordinarily make it a practice to cosponsor measures, but who have given me firm assurances that they will support this resolution on the floor of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on April 19, I submitted Amendment No. 546, to S. 3046, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966. This amendment would assure the continued participation by junior colleges in the impacted-aid program. I ask unanimous consent that the name of my distinguished senior colleague, Mr. Kuchel, be added as a cosponsor on this amendment at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of April 25, 1966:

S. 3273. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

Authority of May 10, 1966:

S. 3328. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the disposal of certain medical materials and supplies whenever the remaining storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies is too short to justify their retention, and for other purposes: Mr. Clark, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Mondale.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS RELATING TO THE FEDERAL ROLE TO THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations will initiate its inquiry into the Federal role for the handicapped on May 24 and 25, 1966, in room 3302, New Senate Office Building. Hearings each day will commence at 10 a.m.

Mr. President, the Federal Government aids the Nation's handicapped in many ways—grants to States, direct assistance, research and technical advice. Our concern about the mentally ill, who comprise the largest single handicapped group, is receiving special attention currently, including research on prevention and cure of mental illness.

One result of such research has been the development of the drug LSD. Recent disturbing reports regarding the misuse of this drug convince me of the need to closely scrutinize the role of government in its development—government at the Federal, State, and local level. We will seek answers to questions relating to the development of this drug, the role of public and private agencies, the extent of its misuse and what the recognized experts in the field would recommend.

Mr. President, at least three Federal agencies—the Food and Drug Administration, the Public Health Service, and the Veterans' Administration—have been involved in the research, regulation, development and medical use of LSD. The efficiency and economy of their activities, the extent to which they coordinate their activities, and an examination of the proper Federal role in this field will be the subject of the hearing. Representatives of the Federal agencies involved and leading experts on the subject of LSD will be heard.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were order to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Statement by Representative Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia, at the ninth annual dinner of the Air Freight Forwarders Association, April 29, 1966, New York, N.Y.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Address by Representative Seymour Halpern entitled "U.S. Police in the Middle East," delivered at the American Jewish Congress Biennial Convention on April 29, 1966.

DEDICATION OF THE COUNCIL GROVE DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Sunday it was my privilege to attend the dedicatory ceremonies for the Council Grove Dam and Reservoir, located on the Grand—Neosho—River near Council Grove, Kans. Many National and State leaders were in attendance.

Mr. George A. Fox, president of the Neosho-Cottonwood Flood Control Association presided and the dedicatory address was delivered by Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army.

Kanopolis Reservoir, built 18 years ago, was the first of such reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Army Engineers in Kansas. Council Grove is the eighth such project completed in our State. Presently five more such projects are under construction under an authorized statewide reservoir program, which totals well over one-half billion dollars and is about 60 percent complete.

Kansans can well be proud of the fine progress that is being made in our State in the control of water runoff for beneficial uses. We can also be proud of the fact that during recent years water conservation programs in our State have been carried on at a much higher rate than the national average. The future growth and development of Kansas will be largely determined by the amount of water we can impound for the use of our citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by General Cassidy at the dedicatory ceremonies be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chief of Engineers Dedicates Council Grove Dam and Reservoir

(Remarks by Lieutenant General William F. Cassidy, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, at the dedication, Council Grove Dam, Council Grove, Kans., May 15, 1966)

Governor Avery, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great privilege to participate in these ceremonies of dedication for another fine reservoir project in the State of Kansas. Council Grove is one of eight such projects which the Corps of Engineers has completed in the

Sunflower State during the past 18 years. All of these reservoirs, which so many Kansans have worked so hard to bring into being, are proving to be important stimulants to the growth and prosperity of the State. They are affording millions of people substantial protection from the devastation of floods, and rewarding opportunities for the enjoyment of a better life. With five more projects now being built, the authorized statewide reservoir program, which totals well over half a billion dollars, is already more than 60 percent complete or under construction.

Two of the four reservoir projects in the program for the control of your Grand-Neosho basin—this and John Redmond—have been finished, and we expect to have Marion on the Cottonwood completed by December of 1967. The fourth—Cedar Point—is now in the preconstruction planning phase. So the long dreams of the people of this basin are well along toward fulfillment.

Council Grove is already returning a handsome dividend on the investment which has been made in it. As you know from painful experience, this valley through the years has been subjected to extensive flood damages—over $19 million in 1951 alone, when 236,000 acres were inundated. In that flood, the city of Council Grove suffered damages of nearly ¾ of a million dollars. Now this dam stands guard over the city and many miles of good valley below it. By itself, it protects 34,000 acres of fertile agricultural lands, valued, with improvements, at over $163 million. Although there has been no extraordinary rainfall since Council Grove began impounding water about 18 months ago, it is so far credited with preventing damages of $200,000, which is close to the annual average expected during its lifetime. When the fourth reservoir system has been completed, serious flooding will be substantially reduced throughout the basin. Annual flood control benefits will be almost $3½ million.

Storage of flood flows in reservoir projects such as this is the key function in water resources development. It provides the primary answer both to problems caused by too much water and those caused by too little. Water impounded in flood time so that it will not destroy life and property is available later for whatever beneficial uses we wish to make of it.

More than 24,000 acre-feet of the capacity of Council Grove reservoir is earmarked for the conservation of water to meet future municipal and industrial needs of Council Grove and Emporia. The controlled release of water will also be an important factor in maintaining acceptable water quality—reducing the concentration of residual pollutants discharged into the river from various sources.

One of the basic objectives of our nationwide water resources development program is to help meet the increasing demand for healthful outdoor recreational opportunities, which are becoming more and more important to the wellbeing of the American people in this complex age. Council Grove, like the other reservoirs which have been built in Kansas, contributes substantially to meeting this need. An investment of almost half a million dollars has been made in recreational improvements. Visitors here find good access roads, boat launching ramps, camping and picnic grounds and other conveniences. Up to December of last year, 180,000 people had visited the project. We estimate that annual attendance at this new scenic lake will reach half a million in 1967, which will represent a very handsome extra economic dividend for nearby communities.

In addition to affording primary protection to life and property, and other tangible benefits, flood control facilities such as this are major stimulators and aids to beautification. Floods create blight and ugliness on the American scene. When there is nothing better to look forward to than another flood, the incentive to invest in the improvement and beautification of property is diminished or lost entirely. Effective flood control changes all that, because people are able to build and beautify for the future with confidence that their work will not be in vain.

Kansas is one of the leaders in our nationwide effort to develop and put to beneficial use our precious and limited water resources. During recent years the water conservation program here has been booming at a rate considerably higher than the national average, which is a great tribute to the foresight and energy of your State's leadership. Over the last decade, annual expenditures by the Corps of Engineers throughout the country have doubled. Comparative expenditures in Kansas were more than fivefold greater in 1965 than they were ten years ago. And, of course, these expenditures relate to only a part of your state-wide development program.

Although so much has been accomplished, much more remains to be done throughout the State. For one thing, 11 of your 24 active authorized reservoir projects remain to be started, although we are now engaged in preconstruction planning on five of them. The timely completion of this program will be of immense value to all the people of the State.

I foresee that the Kansas Water Plan, adopted last year, will be an increasingly important factor in the coordinated, orderly, and full development of the State's water resources at all levels of effort during years to come. Kansas is fortunate to have such a far-reaching and comprehensive blueprint for action.

I want particularly to compliment on this occasion all of the public-spirited citizens whose cooperative effort and faith in the future have carried forward the vital program for the development of the Grand-Neosho basin. Among others have been the members and leaders, past and present, of the prime-moving Neosho-Cottonwood Flood Control Association; the members of your Congressional delegation, who have so effectively supported Council Grove and the other elements of the basin system, and your former Congressman and present chief executive, Governor Avery.

Special tribute is due to the people—and I am sure many of them are present today—who gave up much that was dear to them—homes, farms, and businesses—to make this conservation project possible. Your sacrifice was not a small one, and your reward lies in the knowledge that your contribution will benefit a great number of people for many, many years to come. All of those who will enjoy a fuller life because of Council Grove Reservoir owe you a debt of lasting gratitude.

I offer my congratulations to the primary contractor—the Cook Construction Company of Hattiesburg, Mississippi—on a fine job brought to timely completion. Compliments are also due the Corps' area engineer here, Frank J. Bosche; and our resident engineer, Richard N. Palmer, for their effective supervision and coordination during the construction period.

Council Grove Dam and Resorvoir is another monument to the true American spirit of public endeavor to serve the greatest good of the greatest number of our people. I now dedicate it to the achievement of that high purpose during the years to come.

NDEA SHOULD NOT BE SHORTCHANGED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in 1958 Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act. One of its major provisions was direct financial assistance to college students under which a student may borrow up to $5,000 during his entire college career or an annual maximum of $1,000. Loans are granted on the basis of ability and need.

Students who lacked financial resources, but possessed good academic potential, could borrow money from the Federal Government and pay it back at low interest rates over a reasonable period of time.

The National Defense Education Act was a boon to many youngsters from poor families who desired a college education but could not afford one. Now, with the Vietnam conflict costing billions of taxpayers' dollars, the administration has decided to place the responsibility for these loans on the private credit market. Given the limited amount of money that private institutions have to loan out, it is a very real possibility that students from well-to-do families will be preferred over youngsters from families lacking financial resources.

Estimates reveal that more than 17,000 college students in Ohio alone will require financial assistance to continue their education. It is disheartening that many of these students may not be able to receive needed assistance simply because they come from poor families or because other applicants have a better credit rating.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the administration request to slash appropriations for the National Defense Education Act will be denied and that the Congress will appropriate the necessary funds to continue this beneficent program.

I consider that administration officials are 100 percent wrong in deciding against direct funding of the National Defense Education Act loan program for college students. I am hopeful that Congress will overrule this unwise decision so that sons and daughters from families lacking financial resources will not meet discrimination in seeking out higher education and the advantages that go along with it.

THE LEGALITY OF THE UNITED STATES POSITION IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in the current issue of the American Bar Association Journal an article appears which should be read by all Members of the Senate. It is written by Eberhard P. Deutsch, of New Orleans, an outstanding member of the bar whom I have admired for many years.

Mr. Deutsch has written this article in connection with his role as chairman of the ABA Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations. It was in that same capacity in February of this year that he presented to the house of delegates the resolution affirming the legality of the United States role in Vietnam. That body approved the resolution and it has appeared earlier in the RECORD, but I should like to have it appear again, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed immediately at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. In his article entitled "The Legality of the U.S. Position in Vietnam," Mr. Deutsch presents the reasoning which lay behind the conclusions represented by the February resolution. Although the text of the article has no official standing so far as the ABA is concerned, it bears this notation by the editors:

> Reviewing the history of developments in and concerning the Southeast Asia area since 1954, Mr. Deutsch demonstrates the soundness of the position taken by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association last February—that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty.

Mr. President, I shall not attempt to summarize the supporting evidence which the article presents. Mr. Deutsch has done a masterful job of marshaling the arguments and his conclusions are completely irrefutable. Any effort of mine to recapitulate or paraphrase the text could not do justice to the presentation of the author. I hope Senators will take the time to read every word of it. I ask unanimous consent that the complete text appear in the RECORD immediately following the text of the ABA resolution referred to above.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

Whereas in recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, it has been stated that international lawyers are agreed that the U.S. position in Vietnam is illegal and in violation of the charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas articles 51 and 52 of the charter sanction steps for self-defense and collective and regional security arrangements such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to which the United States is a party; and

Whereas in the course of these hearings, it has been suggested that an expression on this subject by the American Bar Association would be appropriate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Bar Association, That the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the charter of the United Nations and the Southwest Asia Treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution immediately to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate.

EXHIBIT 2

THE LEGALITY OF THE UNITED STATES POSITION IN VIETNAM

("Reviewing the history of developments in and concerning the Southeast Asia area since 1954, Mr. Deutsch demonstrates the soundness of the postion taken by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association last February—that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty." The Committee of which Mr. Deutsch is chairman was one of the sponsors of the resolution the House adopted.)

(By Eberhard P. Deutsch, chairman of the American Bar Association Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations)

By the Geneva accords of 1954, the commanders in chief of the French Union Forces in Indochina, on the one hand, and of the People's Army of Vietnam, on the other, established the 17th parallel as the military demarcation line between North and South Vietnam, with a demilitarized zone on each side of the line. They stipulated that the armed forces of each party were to respect the demilitarized zone and the territory of the other zone, and that neither zone was to be used "for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy."[1] The accords additionally provided for the creation of an International Commission, composed of India (chairman), Poland and Canada, to supervise the agreements.[2]

In 1962 the International Commission reported, with approval, findings of its Legal Committee to the effect that "there is evidence to show that arms, armed and unarmed personnel, munitions and other supplies have been sent from the Zone in the North to the Zone in the South with the objective of supporting, organizing and carrying out hostile activities, including armed attacks, directed against the Armed Forces and Administration of the Zone in the South", and that the People's Army of Vietnam "has allowed the Zone in the North to be used for inciting, encouraging and supporting hostile activities in the Zone in the South, aimed at the overthrow of the Administration in the South".[3]

The evidence further demonstrates that the aggression by North Vietnam against South Vietnam (the Republic of Vietnam) had been going on unabashedly since the signing of the Geneva Accords and that North Vietnam had consistently violated those accords from their inception. An official State Department report recites:

"While negotiating an end to the Indochina War at Geneva in 1954, the Communists were making plans to take over all former French territory in Southeast Asia. When Vietnam was partitioned, thousands of carefully selected party members were ordered to remain in place in the South and keep their secret apparatus intact to help promote Hanoi's cause. Arms and ammunition were stored away for future use."[4]

It is important to bear in mind that neither the Republic of (South) Vietnam nor the United States is a party to the Geneva Accords, and that while the United States participated in the discussions leading up to the accords, it did not sign the final declaration. However, during the last plenary session of the Geneva Conference on July 21, 1954, Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, head of the United States delegation, said in an official statement that his Government "would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security".[5]

On September 8, 1954, just a few weeks after the Geneva Accords were executed, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense (SEATO) Treaty was signed. Parties to it were the United States, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines. The United States Senate ratified the treaty on February 1, 1955, by a vote of 82 to 1.[6] It took effect on February 19, 1955.[7]

Paragraph 1 of Article IV of the SEATO Treaty provides that each party thereto "recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area[8] against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes".[9] By a protocol to the treaty executed on the same day, the parties "unanimously designate[d] for the purposes of Article IV . . . the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam".[10]

The SEATO Treaty was made by the parties in a reiteration of "their faith in the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations",[11] nothing in which, according to Article 52 thereof, "precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action . . .". Article 53 of the charter provides that "no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council . . .". These two articles are at the head of Chapter VIII.

The preceding chapter (VII) deals with "Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression". The first twelve articles (39 to 50, inclusive) of that chapter prescribe the measures to be taken by the Security Council to meet "any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression". By the last article (51) of that chapter, it is stipulated expressly that "nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security".

It was clearly with these provisions of Articles 51 and 52 of the Charter of the United Nations in mind that, in Article IV of the SEATO Treaty, each party thereto agreed that it would "act to meet the common danger" in the event of "aggression by means of armed attack [anywhere] in the treaty area" (Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific). "Enforcement action" is clearly action to enforce decisions of the Security Council under Articles 39 to 50 of Chapter VII of the charter. Equally clearly, "enforcement action" does not include measures of "individual or collective self-defense". So that when Article 53 of the charter provides that "no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements . . . without the authorization of the Security Council", it does not refer to such measures of "self-defense" as are contemplated under the SEATO Treaty, particularly in light of the explicit recital of Article 51 of the charter that "nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense".

---

[1] Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam, IC/42/Rev. 2, July 20, 1954 (the first of the Geneva Accords. The others, not immediately relevant, dealt with Laos and Cambodia respectively), Art. 19.

[2] *Id.*, Chap. VI, Arts. 29, 34 *et seq.*

[3] *Special Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet Nam*, Saigon, June 2, 1962, para. 9; reprinted in *Hearings Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. 2793*, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 736 (1966), hereinafter cited as *Hearings*. The Polish delegation dissented.

[4] *Aggression from the North*, 52 DEP'T STATE BULL. 404, 424 (1965).

[5] 31 DEP'T STATE BULL. 162–163 (1954).

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 106.

[7] 6 U.S.T. & O.I.A. 81, T.I.A.S. No. 3170. The treaty is reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1049, and and in STAFF OF SENATE COMM. ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, 89th CONG., 2D SESS., BACKGROUND INFORMATION RELATING TO SOUTHEAST ASIA AND VIETNAM 70–74 (Comm. Print 1966).

[8] Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific, Article VIII.

[9] Execution of the treaty by the United States was "with the understanding that its recognition of the effect of aggression and armed attack and its agreement with reference thereto in Article IV, paragraph 1 apply only to communist aggression . . .". *Supra* note 7, signatory clause.

[10] The protocol is annexed to the treaty.

[11] Prefatory clause.

DECLARATION STATES PURPOSE OF AGREEMENT

The "Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference", issued on July 21, 1954 the same day on which the Geneva Accords were signed, states:

"The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Viet Nam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." [12]

It was by no means contemplated, however, that there was to be no ultimate partition of Vietnam. On the contrary, the very next article (7) of the final declaration provided expressly that the political problems of "independence, unity and territorial integrity" were to be determined by free elections, internationally supervised. That article reads "that, so far as Viet Nam is concerned, the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot . . . under the supervision of an international commission . . . ".[13]

It will be recalled that by the protocol to the SEATO Treaty, South Vietnam ("the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Viet Nam") was promised protection as such under the treaty. Reference has since been made to South Viet Nam as a "protocol state".[14]

In addition to the reference in the contemporaneous protocol to the SEATO Treaty to "the State of Viet Nam", the Republic of (South) Vietnam "has been recognized as a separate international entity by approximately sixty governments around the world. It has been admitted as a member of several of the specialized agencies of the United Nations. In 1957, the General Assembly voted to recommend South Viet Nam for membership in the United Nations, and its admission was frustrated only by the veto of the Soviet Union in the Security Council." [15]

The right of self-defense under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations is expressed to be unimpaired "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations", and it has been asserted by opponents of United States policy in Vietnam that this amounts to explicit denial of such a right in the event of attacks against nonmembers of the United Nations. A thesis that members of the United Nations are not permitted to participate in collective self-defense to repel aggression, on the ground that the aggrieved nation is not a member of the United Nations, can hardly be supported on its face, in reason, logic or law.[16] Would proponents of this doctrine suggest that members of the United Nations would have no right to assist Switzerland in self-defense against a foreign invader?

But the right to self-defense has always existed independently of the charter,[17] and that right is recognized expressly in Article 51. It is quite obvious that the charter merely confirms, as to members of the United Nations, the innate right of self-defense appertaining to both members and nonmembers. Article 51 expressly retains, unimpaired, the "inherent" right of both individuals and collective self-defense, thus implicitly recognizing the independent existence of the right of members to come to the aid of nonmembers in collective self-defense against aggression, or attack "to maintain international peace and security"—the very first purpose of the United Nations itself, as stated in the charter.[18]

On August 7, 1964, the Congress adopted, by a vote of 88 to 2 in the Senate and 416 to 0 in the House,[19] the Joint Southeast Asia Resolution, in which the preambular clauses recite that "naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace": "these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression" against the South Vietnamese "and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom".

The resolution then states "that the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression"; that "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia"; and that "consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." [20]

In an address delivered at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, on April 4, 1959, President Eisenhower declared that his administration had reached "the inescapable conclusion that our own national interests demand some help from us in sustaining in Viet Nam the morale . . . and the military strength necessary to its continued existence in freedom".[21] In a letter of December 14, 1961, to the President of the Republic of Vietnam, President Kennedy, recalling that the Communist regime of North Vietnam had "violated the provisions of the Geneva Accords . . . to which they bound themselves in 1954" and that "at that time, the United States, although not a party to the Accords, declared that it 'would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security' ", assured him that "in accordance with that declaration, and in response to your request, we are prepared to help the Republic of Viet Nam . . . to preserve its independence".[22]

In President Johnson's message of August 5, 1964, to Congress, reporting the Communist attacks on United States' naval vessels in the international waters of the Gulf of Tonkin, he said:

". . . The North Vietnamese regime has constantly sought to take over South Vietnam and Laos. This Communist regime has violated the Geneva accords for Vietnam. It has systematically conducted a campaign of subversion, which includes the direction, training, and supply of personnel and arms for the conduct of guerrilla warfare in South Vietnamese territory. . . . Our military and economic assistance to South Vietnam and Laos in particular has the purpose of helping these countries to repel aggression and strengthen their independence. The threat to the free nations of southeast Asia has long been clear." [23]

The Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam questions whether President Johnson's deployment of United States forces to Vietnam can "be squared with our Constitution . . . for, contrary to widely held assumptions, the power to make and conduct foreign policy is not vested exclusively in the President, but is divided between him and Congress. . . ." [24] In his message of August 5, 1964, to the Congress, President Johnson went on to say unequivocally that "as President of the United States I have concluded that I should now ask the Congress on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom." And the President forthrightly requested that Congress adopt "a resolution expressing the support of the Congress for all necessary action to protect our armed forces . . . and to defend freedom and preserve peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the obligations of the United States under the Southeast Asia Treaty."

Two days later, on August 7, in response to this message from the President, Congress adopted the resolution quoted above, and on August 10 the President signed it as Public Law 88-408.[25]

Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which provides that "nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense", requires that "measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council . . .". That the Southeast

---

[12] IC/43/Rev. 2, July 21, 1954; reprinted in Background Information, *supra* note 7, page 66.

[13] Because of the North Vietnamese aggression against South Vietnam, the contemplated elections were never held: "A nationwide election in these circumstances would have been a travesty." Memorandum, *The Legality of United States Participation in the Defense of Viet Nam,* Department of State, Office of the Legal Adviser, March 4, 1966, page 33.

[14] See, for example, *Hearings* 463–465 and Joint Southeast Asia Resolution, 78 Stat. 384, approved August 10, 1964.

[15] Memorandum, *supra* note 13, page 12. See also *Vietnamese-United States Relations,* a joint statement issued at Washington by the President of the United States and the President of Viet Nam, May 11, 1957, White House Press Release. 36 Dep't State Bull. 851–852 (1957).

[16] The principle that members of the United Nations are legally entitled to participate in collective self-defense of nonmembers is sustained by leading authorities on international law. Bowett, Self-Defense in International Law 193–195 (1958); Kelsen, The Law of the United Nations 793 (1950).

[17] Oppenheim, International Law, 297 *et seq.* (8th (Lauterpacht) ed. 1955); Jessup. A Modern Law of Nations 163 *et seq.* (1948).

[18] See footnote 16, *supra.*

[19] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, pp. 18470–18471, 18555.

[20] 78 Stat. 384, approved August 10, 1964.

[21] 40 Dep't State Bull. 579–581 (1959).

[22] 46 Dep't State Bull. 13–14 (1962).

[23] 51 Dep't State Bull. 261–263 (1964).

[24] *Hearings,* Appendix 704–705.

[25] *Supra* note 20.

Asia Collective Defense Treaty was made under and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Article 51, is evidenced by the provision of paragraph 1 of Article IV of the treaty (by which each party agreed to participate in defending acts of aggression in the treaty area), that "measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations".

On August 5, 1964, Adlai E. Stevenson, United States Representative to the United Nations and the Security Council, advised the council formally of two "deliberate armed attacks" by North Vietnamese torpedo boats against a naval unit of the United States on the high seas. He declared that "these wanton acts of violence and destruction" were simply part of "the sabotage of the international machinery established to keep the peace by the Geneva agreements—and the deliberate, systematic and flagrant violations of those agreements by two regimes which signed them and which by all tenets of decency, law and civilized practice are bound by their provisions", all of which, he said, "fit into the larger pattern of what has been going on in Southeast Asia for the past decade and a half".

Ambassador Stevenson assured the Security Council that "we are in Southeast Asia to help our friends preserve their own opportunity to be free of imported terror [and] alien assassination, managed by the North Viet-Nam Communists based in Hanoi and backed by the Chinese Communists from Peiping". He affirmed solemnly "that the deployments of additional U.S. forces to Southeast Asia are designed solely to deter further aggression".[26]

On Ferbuary 7, 1965, Ambassador Stevenson, by a letter to the President of the Security Council, informed that body of "attacks by the Viet Cong, which operates under the military orders of North Vietnamese authorities in Hanoi". He said the attacks were part of an over-all plan "to make war against the legitimate government of South Viet-Nam" in "violation of international law and the Geneva Accords of 1954". He stated also that, as required by paragraph 2 of article IV of the Southeast Asia Treaty, the United States and Vietnamese Governments had consulted immediately and had agreed that it had become "necessary to take prompt defensive action" to resist "this continuing aggression". He reported further that the "counter measures . . . are a justified measure of self-defense" and that he was "reporting the measures which we have taken in accordance with our public commitment to assist the Republic of Viet-Nam against aggression from the North".[27]

Of particular interest at this point is the reiterated assertion by the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam, phrased variously throughout its submission, that "only the Security Council . . . is authorized to determine the existence of any . . . act of aggression and . . . the measures to be taken to maintain or restore international peace".[28] To the statements quoted above, which were made by Ambassador Stevenson in his letter of February 7, 1965, he added significantly: "We deeply regret that the Hanoi regime, in its statement of August 8, 1964, which was circulated in Security Council Document S-5888, explicitly denied the right of the Security Council to examine this problem."[29]

Less than three weeks later, in another letter to the President of the Security Council, Ambassador Stevenson transmitted to that body an extensive State Department report entitled *Aggression from the North: The Record of North Viet-Nam's Campaign To Conquer South Viet-Nam*, the facts recited in which, Ambassador Stevenson submitted, "make it unmistakably clear that the character of that conflict is an aggressive war of conquest waged against a neighbor—and make nonsense of the cynical allegation that this is simply an indigenous insurrection".[30]

Innumerable other reports, both formal and informal, were made to the Security Council by the representatives of the United States at the United Nations; and there was even one by President Johnson on July 28, 1965, bespeaking the continued efforts of Secretary General U Thant to find a solution of the Vietnamese problem through the United Nations. In the last of these reports available as this article is written—two letters of January 31, 1966, from Ambassador Goldberg to the President of the Security Council—it is requested "that an urgent meeting of the Council be called promptly to consider the situation in Viet Nam". A draft resolution, calling "for immediate discussions without preconditions . . . among the appropriate interested governments . . . looking toward the application of the Geneva accords . . . and the establishment of a durable peace in Southeast Asia", was transmitted with the second of these letters for consideration by the council.[31]

"We are firmly convinced", said Ambassador Goldberg, "that in light of its obligations under the Charter to maintain international peace and security . . . the Council should address itself urgently and positively to this situation and exert its most vigorous endeavors and its immense prestige to finding a prompt solution to it."[32] Despite all prior, and this formal, urgent submission of the Vietnamese problem to the Security Council, it has never taken any action of any kind looking toward the restoration of international peace and security to Southeast Asia. Neither has the council expressed the slightest criticism of any action taken by the United States in the SEATO area.[33]

In its memorandum in opposition to the policy of the United States, the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam asserts that "the conduct of the United States Government in Viet Nam appears plainly to violate the terms of the Geneva Accords".[34] While the United States is not a party to the accords, it did by contemporaneous unilateral declaration agree, in effect, to respect them. But, as demonstrated above, the Geneva Accords since their inception have been violated continuously by the Hanoi regime. It is an accepted principle of international law that a material breach of a treaty by one of the parties thereto dissolves the obligations of the other parties, at least to the extent of withholding compliance until the defaulting party purges its breach.[35]

It has been suggested that because the power to declare war is vested by the Constitution in the Congress alone, the deployment of United States forces to Vietnam by the President, without a formal Congressional declaration of war, violates the constitutional fiat. When the phrasing of this clause of the Constitution was being considered at the convention in 1787, its original form, vesting in Congress the power to "make" war, was changed to give it the power to "declare" war, "leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks"—"he should be able to repel and not to commence war" and "to 'conduct' it which was an Executive function".[36]

The President is, under Section 2 of Article II of the Constitution, the "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States". Throughout the history of the

---

[26] 51 Dep't State Bull. 272–274 *passim* (1964).

[27] 52 Dep't State Bull. 240–241 *passim* (1965).

[28] *Hearings*, Appendix 695.

[29] In a letter of July 30, 1965, from Arthur J. Goldberg, who succeeded Ambassador Stevenson as our Representative to the United Nations and the Security Council, to the President of the Security Council, he repeated, in substance, this statement. Ambassador Goldberg said: "It is especially unfortunate that the regime in Hanoi . . . has denied the competence of the United Nations to concern itself with this dispute in any manner, and has even refused to participate in the discussions in the Council." United States Mission to the United Nations, Press Release 4610, July 30, 1965.

[30] 52 Dep't State Bull. 403, 419 (1965). It is interesting to compare this statement by Ambassador Stevenson with the assertion of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam that "Ho Chi Minh can compare his position in demanding union of Vietnam with that of Lincoln, when Britain and France were threatening to intervene to assure the independence of the Confederacy". *Hearings,* Appendix 692.

[31] United States Mission to the United Nations Press Releases 4798 and 4799, January 31, 1966.

[32] *Id.*, No. 4798.

[33] Memorandum, *supra* note 13, page 20. On February 2, 1966, the Security Council did put the Vietnam question on its agenda at the request of the United States. The vote was nine in favor (Argentina, China, Japan, Jordan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay); two against (Bulgaria and the Soviet Union); four abstentions (France, Mali, Nigeria and Uganda).

Ambassadors Fedorenko of the Soviet Union and Tarabanov of Bulgaria stated that their governments "supported the position of" North Vietnam "that the question be settled within the Geneva Accords", and the former added that the United States "was trying to throttle the struggle of the people of South Viet-Nam for freedom and independence". Ambassador Seydoux of France insisted that the United Nations "was not the proper framework for achieving a peaceful solution".

No further action has been taken by the Security Council, but by a letter of February 26, 1966, the president of the council advised its members that the differences of opinion among them as to the problem of Vietnam had "given rise to a general feeling that it would be inopportune for the Council to hold further debate at this time", but "that the Council, having decided on February 2 to place on its agenda the item contained in the letter of January 31 from the Permanent Representative of the United States, remained seized of the problem of Viet-Nam." UN Monthly Chronicle, March, 1966, pages 3–10 *passim*.

[34] *Hearings*, Appendix 702.

[35] 2 Oppenheim, *op. cit. supra* note 17, at 136, 137. See draft Article 42 of the Law of Treaties by the International Law Commission in the report of its fifteenth session, May 6 to July 12, 1963. U. N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 18th Sess., Supp. No. 9, (A/5509).

[36] 2 Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention 318–319.

United States, he has been deemed to have authority to deploy the country's military forces to trouble spots around the world, frequently in combat. The Department of State has a record of some 125 such instances.[37]

In the last analysis, however, the exercise of the President's power as Commander in Chief in deploying forces of the United States to Southeast Asia for the defense of the Republic of Vietnam has had the repeated sanction of the Senate, as well as of the Congress as a whole, so that, although the situation now seems unquestionably to constitute war in its technical sense, a former Congressional verbal declaration of war as such could not conceivably be essential to clothe the President's conduct with constitutional validity. This Congressional sanction has been evidenced by overwhelming majorities in the Senate's approval of the SEATO Treaty, in the adoption of the Joint Congressional Southeast Asia resolution of August 10, 1964, and in the passage of the appropriations necessary to carry on the defensive actions undertaken by the Executive.

First, as to the treaty. In it (paragraph 1, Article IV) each of the parties "recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against" any of them or against the "free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Viet-nam" (protocol) "would endanger its own peace and safety".

The "treaty area", under Article VIII, includes "the general area of the Southwest Pacific not . . . north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude". The United States has historically owned tremendously important and valuable strategic territorial interests in that area. Aside from its trusteeship over the Mariana (except Guam), Marshall and Caroline Islands, the United States owns Guam, Wake and the Samoan group. And yet the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam has asserted that "SEATO is not a regional agency within the letter or spirit of the UN Charter", because "Articles 51 and 53 . . . envisaged regional systems which historically and geographically developed into a regional community—not contemplating a regional system which fused . . . Southeast Asia with a country of the North American Continent"—"separated by oceans and thousands of miles from South East Asia".[38]

In the cited paragraph of the treaty, the United States agreed that in the event of aggression in the treaty area it would "act to meet the common danger". In recommending ratification of the treaty to the Senate, its Foreign Relations Committee reported that "the committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that the acceptance of these obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests."[39] The Senate ratified the treaty on February 1, 1955, by a vote of 82 to 1.[40]

In light of all of the foregoing, it seems difficult to find anything in the nature of an adequate foundation for the *ipse dixit* of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam that "the 'Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty'—connecting the United States with Southeast Asia, architectured by Secretary of State Dulles, is a legalistic artificial formulation to circumvent the fundamental limitations placed by the United Nations Charter on unilateral actions by individual members".[41]

Undoubtedly the clearest and most unequivocal Congressional sanction of the President's deployment of United States forces for the defense of South Vietnam is contained in the Joint Southeast Asia resolution of August 10, 1964, reciting expressly "that the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression", and that the United States is "prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom".[42]

The Lawyers' Committee on American Policy Towards Viet Nam quotes a passage from an article in the *Washington Daily News* of June 4, 1965, by Richard Starnes, read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska, which states that the joint resoultion was "passed in the fever of indignation that followed" the Gulf of Tonkin attacks, and then, again as their own *ipse dixit*, assert that "there is no evidence that Congress thought or understood that it was declaring war".[43]

This statement is simply incorrect. When the President sent his message to Congress on August 5, 1964, recommending passage of "a resolution expressing the support of Congress for all necessary action to protect our Armed Forces and to assist nations covered by the SEATO Treaty", he stated explicitly that he "should now ask the Congress on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom".[44]

In the course of a colloquy on the floor of the Senate on August 6, 1964, between Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee which recommended passage of the resolution,[45] the following discussion (excerpts) took place:

Senator COOPER. Are we now [by this resolution] giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Viet-nam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think that is correct.

Senator COOPER. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead us into war, we would give that authority by this resolution?

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is the way I would interpret it.[46]

Senator MORSE himself called the resolution "a predated declaration of war",[47] which would, somewhat enigmatically, give "to the President what I honestly and sincerely believe is an unconstitutional power * * * to make war without a declaration of war".[48] The enigma in this puzzling concept seems to arise from the rather simple and logical hypothesis that the function of a legislative "declaration of war" is to authorize the executive "to make war". Since, by Senator MORSE's own statement, the resolution authorizes the President "to make war", it surely has the same legal effect as a Congressional "declaration of war" *in haec verba* would have had.[49]

Actually, while two or three members of the Senate expressed doubt as to whether the resolution was intended to go as far as it did, there was no real question about it. Senator MORSE himself made extended speeches against it, repeatedly warning his colleagues as to its dire import, in such words as that it "does go beyond the inherent authority of the President to act in the self-defense of our country and does vest in him authority to proceed to carry out a campaign that amounts in fact to the waging of war".[50]

In the course of a recent debate on the floor of the Senate on a bill for an appropriation in support of the military forces in Vietnam, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL of Georgia, Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said:

"I knew that the joint resolution conferred a vast grant of power upon the President. It is written in terms that are not capable of misinterpretation, and about which it is difficult to become confused. * * * The language could not have been drawn more clearly. Personally, I would be ashamed to say that I did not realize what I was voting for when I voted for that joint resolution. It is only one page in length. It is clear. It is explicit. It contains a very great grant of power."[51]

During the hearings on that appropriation bill before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 18, 1966, Senator MORSE asked Secretary of State Rusk whether he thought that the vote on the Southeast Asia Resolution "would have been the same if my colleagues in the Senate had contemplated that it might lead to 200,000 or 400,000 or 600,000 American troops in South Viet Nam?" The Secretary replied: "I doubt very much that the vote would be substantially different."

In response to that, Senator MORSE commented that there would be "a chance next week to find out. * * * I intend to offer [a rescission resolution] as an amendment to the pending business in the Senate."[52] On March 1 Senator MORSE offered his amendment to the military appropriation bill, to provide that the "'Joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia' * * * is hereby repealed."[53]

To avoid any question as to the effect and meaning of a vote on his amendment, Senator MORSE himself declared that it "would be a vote to make clear to the President that those who vote for the amendment disapprove of the continuation of the exercise of the power he has been exercising under the Tonkin Bay resolution."[54]

Senator RUSSELL said "that the defeat of the proposal of the Senator from Oregon by the Members of the Senate * * * will leave the original joint resolution * * * unimpaired, in full strength and vigor, and with Congress, except for two Members of the Senate who voted against the 1964 resolution, solemnly and solidly behind the President in the steps that he has taken in southeast Asia."[55]

---

[37] See *State Department Position Paper* prepared for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, November 19, 1965, BACKGROUND INFORMATION, *supra* note 7, at 254.

[38] *Hearings*, Appendix 693.

[39] S. REP., 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 15 (1955). Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, as a member of the committee, concurred in this report.

[40] *Supra* note 6. The negative vote was that of Senator William Langer of North Dakota. Senator MORSE voted for ratification of the treaty on the floor of the Senate where he stated, after ratification of the treaty, that "there is no doubt in my mind that the treaty is in conformity with the United Nations Charter". CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 1, p. 1060.

[41] *Hearings*, Appendix 693.

[42] *Supra* note 20.

[43] *Hearings*, Appendix 710.

[44] 51 DEP'T STATE BULL. 261–263 (1964).

[45] S. REP., 88th Cong., 2d Sess. (1964).

[46] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18409.

[47] *Id.* at 18427.

[48] *Id.* at 18443.

[49] "When I use a word", Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean,—neither more nor less." CARROLL, THROUGH THE LOOKING-GLASS.

[50] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18443.

[51] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4370.

[52] *Hearings* 591.

[53] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4370.

[54] *Id.* at 4395.

After full debate, Senator MANSFIELD of Montana, the majority leader, moved to table Senator MORSE's amendment, and the motion was carried, 92 to 5.[56] After some further discussion, Senator RUSSELL moved for passage of the appropriation bill, and his motion carried by a vote of 93 to 2.[57]

One of the best means available to the Congress for the control of executive action is through the power of the purse—the ultimate necessity of Congressional action for appropriations to provide funds to carry out executive functions. As stated by Senator MORSE during the hearings on the military appropriation bill, "a vote on this pending piece of business in the Senate really is a vote as to whether or not we are going to continue to support this program, because the only check, one of the best checks we have, is to say we are not going to finance it."[58] As stated, the bill was passed in the Senate by vote of 93 to 2. The vote in the House was 393 to 4.[59]

The legal authority of the President of the United States to conduct the present war, for "the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia," which, as the Congress declared in its 1964 resolution, "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace," is surely sustained amply by the composite impact of that resolution, the terms of the SEATO Treaty ratified by the Senate and the appropriations made by the Congress to support the military actions in the treaty area.

That the memorandum of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam is grounded on an emotional attitude opposed to United States policy, rather than on law, is not only demonstrated by a look at the facts, but is emphasized by the memorandum's concluding paragraph:

"Should we not, twenty years after President Roosevelt's hopeful dream—twenty years after the advent of the nuclear age with the awesome potentiality of incineration of our planet and the annihilation of our civilization and the culture of millennia—Should we not 'spell the end of the system of unilateral action . . . that has been tried for centuries—and has always failed'?"[60]

Contrasted with the tone and substance of that memorandum is the temperate statement of thirty-one professors of international law from leading law schools throughout the United States, which recites simply that they "wish to affirm that the presence of US forces in South Vietnam at the request of the Government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of US forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression."[61]

Contrasted also with the tone and temper of the memorandum of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam is the simple resolution adopted unanimously on February 21, 1966, by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association on the joint recommendation of its Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations and its Section of International and Comparative Law.[62] The resolution is supported by a brief report, which concludes "that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the South-East Asia Treaty".[63]

These conclusions as to the legality of the presence of the United States forces in Vietnam under the Constitution of the States, as a question of domestic law, are those of the author. They were not included in the opinion of the thirty-one professors of international law or in the resolution of the American Bar Association.

THE STATUS OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in the New York Times for May 2, one of its staff writers, Neil Sheehan, outlines the evidence we have concerning the status of the so-called National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, and he brings up to date the chronicle of events by which this phony organization has been promoted. As in other presentations on this subject, the Times article reveals clearly that the NLF is nothing more than an instrument of Hanoi—and perhaps not even a tool which its masters trust to any great extent.

One of the most important questions for any pretended national political organization is whether it controls and directs the armed forces with which it is associated. It is clear that the NLF does not control the Vietcong forces; that task is handled by a group called the Central Office for South Vietnam, which is the Communist headquarters for the south and reports directly to the politburo of the Communist Party in Hanoi.

The NLF is the supposedly political and administrative arm of Hanoi, but, even in these activities, it is subject to the direction of the same people who direct the Central Office for South Vietnam, or COSVIN, as it is called. This is done through the key memberships which the COSVIN holds in the committees of the NLF. Thus, Mr. Sheehan says:

> The front's committees appear to be appended to the party committees at various levels and, although the party members act in the name of the front, they receive their orders through party channels. In much the same manner, the Communist Party controls the governmental machinery in the North, by making certain that party members hold the important positions at all levels.
>
> There is no evidence that the front's presidium and central committee exercise any independent direction over the front's mass organizations and local committees.

There is no question, Mr. President, that all of the efforts being made in South Vietnam to subvert its people and destroy its government at all levels are directly under the strict supervision of the Communist Party at Hanoi. It is merely a matter of its choice as to the means and channels for exercising that control and direction. This subject is important, of course, because of the many statements often made by those who oppose the President's actions in Vietnam that what is going on in South Vietnam is some type of spontaneous local revolution against the generals at Saigon. This article, and others which appear occasionally in responsible publications, such as the recent article in Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Faceless Vietcong," make it clear how completely false such statements are.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 2, 1966]

HANOI'S TROOP INFILTRATION SAID TO TROUBLE VIETCONG

(By Neil Sheehan)

SAIGON, May 1.—The increasing infiltration of North Vietnamese into South Vietnam, which United States military officials say has amounted to more than 20,000 troops since Jan. 1, is reported to have started some difficulties for the Vietcong.

The extent of these difficulties is not known. They do not yet appear to have affected the discipline of the Vietcong fighting units or political and administrative apparatus in South Vietnam.

Intelligence reports indicate, however, that the indigenous southerners. who form the bulk of the approximately 210,000 guerrillas, are beginning to complain that the northerners treat them condescendingly and receive favored treatment.

The infiltration of such large numbers of North Vietnamese has raised once more questions concerning the status of the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front, the political organization of the Vietcong.

While the front publicly acknowledges an alliance with the Government of North Vietnam, it says it is a separate movement that exercises independent control over the guerrilla units and the Vietcong political and administrative apparatus.

The front also acknowledges that Communists exercise a leading role in its activities, but says it has important non-Communist leaders as well.

Informed Vietnamese and Western analysts here do not accept these assertions. While they agree that there are considerable numbers of non-Communists in the front, they believe that the front is an organization created by the Vietnamese Communist party and is ultimately controlled by the party politburo in Hanoi.

Analysts offer no incontrovertible proof to support their belief. In Vietnam, little of importance is obvious and neat; legalistic documentation to support any given position cannot usually be found.

Instead, analysts base their case on evidence provided by captured Communist documents, the interrogation of prisoners and the public pronouncements of Hanoi and the Liberation Front.

---

[55] *Id.* at 4370.

[56] *Id.* at 4404.

[57] *Id.* at 4411. Only Senators MORSE and GRUENING voted against the appropriation. It was announced that five senators, necessarily absent, would each have voted "yea"; so that a full vote would have been 98 to 2. *Id.* at 4410.

[58] *Hearings* 593. On May 4, 1965, President Johnson had requested "the Congress to appropriate, at the earliest possible moment, an additional $700 million to meet mounting military requirements in Vietnam". He explained, in his message to the Congress, that "this is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Each is saying that the Congress and the President stand united before the world in joint determination that the independence of South Vietnam shall be preserved and Communist attack will not succeed." H.R. Doc. No. 157, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965). The appropriation bill (79 Stat. 109) was passed in the Senate, 88 to 3, and in the House, 408 to 7. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 7, pp. 9540, 9771.

[59] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 4474–4475 (1966).

[60] *Hearings,* Appendix 713.

[61] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 1408–1409 (1966).

[62] 52 A.B.A.J. 392 (1966).

[63] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 5062–5063 (1966).

First of all there are the historical circumstances connected with the creation of the front.

When the Hanoi radio announced in January, 1961, that a South Vietnamese National Liberation Front was founded on Dec. 20, 1960, the guerrilla war in the South had been under way for four years.

The guerrillas grew from small assassination squads in 1957 to armed bands ranging the countryside. They were challenging the South Vietnamese armed forces and were beginning to threaten the existence of the Saigon Government. It is thus evident that, although the front now claims to lead the Vietcong, it did not initiate the war in the South.

HANOI ROLE INDICATED

The available evidence strongly indicates that the war was actually initiated on orders from Hanoi after the regime of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem refused in 1956, with United States support, to hold the Vietnam-wide elections that were to decide the circumstances for a reunification of the country.

These elections were provided for in the 1954 Geneva agreements that ended the French Indochina war and divided Vietnam into two zones—the Communist North and the non-Communist South.

Hanoi had hoped, by one means or another, to win these elections and thus to extend its rule. When this peaceful avenue was closed to it, Hanoi resorted to renewed guerrilla warfare.

The instrument for the renewal of guerrilla warfare was the clandestine organization that had been deliberately left behind when the bulk of the Communist-led Vietminh troops, who fought the French and were the predecessors of the Vietcong, were withdrawn to the North in 1954.

The existence of such a clandestine Communist party organization in the South has been documented in this regard, analysts also point out a fact often little understood in the West, that there is only one Communist party in Vietnam and that its organizational tentacles extend throughout both the North and the South. At no time since the mid-nineteen-forties, when the struggle against the Japanese and then the French began, has the politburo of the party lost control over its branch in the South.

The men who led the developing guerrilla units in 1957 and 1958 were the men who had directed the Vietminh campaign in the South against the French. South Vietnamese villagers still often refer to the Vietcong as Vietminh. The name Vietcong, which means Vietnamese Communist, was applied to the guerrillas by the Diem regime in an attempt to remove the nationalistic connotations of the guerrilla movement against the French.

By 1960, the evidence indicates, Hanoi decided that some instrument was necessary to lend an aura of legitimacy and to disguise Communist control over the guerrilla warfare its cadres had fostered in the South.

The occasion for the announcement of this decision was the third national congress of the Vietnamese Communist party in Hanoi in September, 1960. Le Duan, the party secretary general, called for the formation of a South Vietnamese National Liberation Front.

On Sept. 10, the congress introduced a resolution stating that "to insure the complete success of the revolutionary struggle in South Vietnam, our people there must strive to establish a united bloc of workers, peasants and soldiers and to bring into being a broad national front, directed against the United States-Diem clique and based on the worker-peasant alliance."

Three months later, the Hanoi radio announced the founding of the front.

Analysts here note that the Liberation Front is almost identical in organizational structure with the Fatherland Front, the Communist organization in North Vietnam.

A comparative organizational table shows that three political parties are listed within each front. One of these parties is the Communist party and the two others are the allegedly non-Communist parties.

The Communist party carries a different name to each of the fronts. In the North, it is called the Vietnam Workers party (Dang Lao Dong Vietnam) and in the South the People's Revolutionary party.

The People's Revolutionary party describes itself as a "Marxist-Leninist party" purportedly formed in January, 1962. It is believed, on the basis of documentary evidence, to be the surface element of the southern branch of the Vietnamese Communist party. Analysts believe that its establishment was aimed at creating the fiction that an independent Southern Communist party exists.

ALMOST SAME TITLES USED

The two allegedly non-Communist parties, however, use almost the same titles both in the Fatherland Front in the North and in the National Liberation Front in the South.

They are the Democratic and Socialist parties. In the Liberation Front the Socialist party has altered its title to read Radical Socialist. Both these parties were organized by the Communists in North Vietnam in 1944 as typical Communist-front parties to attract left-wing Vietnamese intellectuals and members of the bourgeoisie. There are, in fact, no political groups within the Liberation Front of non-Communist origin.

Both the National Liberation Front and the Fatherland Front have the usual presidium and central committee. They then list a number of mass organizations representing labor, peasants, women, youth, artists and writers, journalists and Buddhists.

The similarity between the organizational structure of the two fronts is so striking that analysts here often wonder why the Vietnamese Communists did not make greater efforts to differentiate the Liberation Front from the Fatherland Front.

Students of Vietnamese Communism view the character of the alleged non-Communist leadership within the Liberation Front as another indication that it is Communist controlled. Little is known about these men, but what is known indicates that they are, without exception, colorless figures with no significant political standing. All have histories of left-wing activities.

LEADER A FORMER LAWYER

Nguyen Huu Tho, the chairman of the Liberation Front, is a 56-year-old former Saigon lawyer who describes himself as a "non-Marxist patriot." No proof has ever been uncovered that Mr. Tho is a member of the Vietnamese Communist party, but he did spend a number of years in prison for pro-Communist activities under both the French colonial administration and under the Diem regime.

The Vietcong freed Mr. Tho from a prison in Phuyen Province on the central Vietnamese coast in December, 1961, and he was subsequently named Liberation Front chairman.

Huynh Tan Phat, chairman of the Democratic party, secretary general of the Liberation Front and head of its Saigon-Cholon-Giadinh committee, was a founding member of the Democratic party in Hanoi in 1944.

He was, however, also reported in 1945 to be a member of the executive committee of the Southern branch of the Vietnamese Communist party. In 1955, his name was listed as one of the members of the executive committee of the Fatherland Front in the South. At that time, the Fatherland Front still emcompassed all of Vietnam and had not yet been officially limited to the North.

The third major allegedly non-Communist Liberation Front leader is Nguyen Van Hieu, chief of the Radical Socialist party and the front's unofficial foreign minister. He now heads the front's office in Prague. Mr. Hieu was active in the Vietminh movement during the Indochina war and was an editor of Giai Phong (Liberation), one of the most important official Vietminh publications in the South.

The official Liberation Front newspaper, incidentally, now carries the same title. The editor now is Mr. Phat.

Most analysts here have concluded on the basis of the available evidence that these men are either pro-Communists or clandestine members of the Communist party.

The Liberation Front's method of operation is a further major factor that had led analysts to believe it is Communist-controlled.

Firstly, the Liberation Front does not control the Vietcong armed forces, despite its claims to the contrary. Documentary evidence, interrogation of prisoners and other intelligence data indicate that the guerrilla units are directed by an organization known as the Central Office for South Vietnam, or Cosvin as it is commonly called here.

Cosvin is believed to be the senior Communist headquarters in the South, reporting directly to the reunification department of the Communist party in Hanoi and thus to the politburo. Through its military affairs department, Cosvin acts as a high command for the Vietcong guerrilla units.

The Liberation Front's jurisdiction, as far as is known, is limited to political and administrative matters handled by its mass organizations and its provincial, district, village and then hamlet committees.

These committees and mass organizations, however, are controlled by Cosvin through the Communist party members who fill the key positions. The Front's committees appear to be appended to the party committees at various levels and, although the party members act in the name of the front, they receive their orders through party channels. In much the same manner, the Communist party controls the governmental machinery in the North, by making certain that party members hold the important positions at all levels.

There is no evidence that the front's presidium and central committee exercise any independent direction over the front's mass organizations and local committees.

A final major indication to analysts here of Communist control over the Liberation Front is the fact that its foreign and internal policy pronouncements have never deviated from the official North Vietnamese position. Over the years, there has been tight coordination between the public voices of Hanoi and the front.

EVIDENCE QUESTIONED

A proposal by Nguyen Huu Tho in January, 1964, for negotiations toward a peaceful end to the Vietnam war, has sometimes been taken as evidence of the front's independence. Closer examination of Mr. Tho's proposal, however, discloses that it was tied to the withdrawal of all United States troops from the South, thus making it identical to the North Vietnamese position.

The front's office abroad, with the exception of Cairo, Algiers and Jakarta, have also been limited to Communist countries. In Jakarta and Algiers the front's offices are in buildings owned or rented by the North Vietnamese embassies there. The offices receive their administrative support from the embassies and the front's representatives are reported to travel on North Vietnamese passports.

The formation of a captive national front organization such as the Liberation Front has a historical precedent within the Vietnamese Communist movement. The tactic as employed with great success in the war against the French through the use of the original Vietminh front, the League for National Independence, and the Lien Viet front, or Vietnamese Alliance, which followed it. Both of these were succeeded by the Fatherland Front.

This time the national-front tactic does not appear to have worked so well as it did in the past. The Communists had hoped at the time of the Liberation Front's formation in 1960 to attract prominent South Vietnamese intellectuals, politicians and religious leaders.

None have as yet joined the front. Thich Tri Quang, for example, the militant Buddhist leader who has opposed almost every Saigon Government since 1954, and who has expressed open hostility to United States policies in Vietnam, has not entered the ranks of the front although he has had many opportunities to do so.

Other Vietnamese nationalist politicians, such as Dr. Pham Huy Co, who lived in exile in Paris during President Diem's reign, also declined to join the front. Practically all prominent non-Communist Vietnamese politicians, including Thich Tri Quang, have repeatedly stated their belief that the front is controlled by the Communists.

Analysts cite two probable reasons why they have not joined—first, the rather obvious Communist nature of the front and second, the fact that the guerrilla war against the Saigon Government and the United States has so far lacked the widespread and intense emotional and patriotic appeal of the struggle against the French.

This does not mean to imply that the Liberation Front and the Vietnamese Communist party have failed to develop considerable support in the South. On the contrary, it is believed that the front and the Communist party have rooted themselves firmly within a significant segment of the peasantry and that as much as 20 to 25 per cent of the population in the South supports the front's program.

The Communist party is the only purely political party here with any appreciable mass following.

The non-Communist elements in the front do not, however, occupy important positions. They are low-level followers or political captives. Analysts feel that they might be weaned away from the front or discouraged from supporting it in the course of protracted warfare.

TIME TO RESIST PRESIDENT NASSER'S BLACKMAIL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I noted in the press with the greatest interest the other day that President Nasser had "demanded"—that was the word used—aid from the United States in the form of a $150-million package of economic assistance. He had demanded this aid as a right. I think it is time to have a word about this subject, in view of the expressed attitude of Congress delivered so often.

By brazen arrogance, by threats of war against his brother Arabs, by active subversion within the Arab States as well as in Africa and elsewhere, by arousing expectations that he might tone down his anti-American campaign throughout the Near East and Africa, and even by keeping alive in the breasts of the most sanguine the hope that he might at last keep his oft-repeated promises to desist from war in Yemen, President Nasser hopes to blackmail the United States into granting up to $150 million worth of food aid, which he has now asked of us.

The $55 million program of American aid begun in January runs out in June and President Nasser is seeking more fuel for his military and propaganda machine. I protest the granting of food aid to President Nasser's United Arab Republic under these circumstances.

I wish to affirm that I will do anything I can to provide food to Egypt's people when they need it. But this should be done directly as a relief measure if it becomes necessary, and the aid should not be allowed to be transposed into arms for President Nasser's war machine. In fact, the estimated cost of maintaining President Nasser's troops in Yemen runs between $150 million and $200 million annually, so we are in effect being asked to finance this adventure through food aid.

As the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings last week indicated, there is a widespread disquiet in the Congress concerning U.S.-Middle East policy—and most especially our policy toward the United Arab Republic. I strongly feel that the American people should be fully informed of the direction of our policy toward the United Arab Republic in the light of President Nasser's recent threats before any new U.S. aid is committed.

Last year, $55 million of U.S. aid was promised by the administration after the congressional session was concluded—such an end run by the administration must not be repeated. I have asked the State Department to inform the American people as to the status of President Nasser's aid application, the progress of the negotiations with respect to it, and whether the United States is assuming a strong posture in the face of Nasser blackmail and threats.

President Nasser brags about his ability to play the East and West against each other—which usually ends with the United States holding the bag. The recent visit to Egypt of Soviet Premier Kosygin was the signal for anti-U.S. blasts and renewed threats by President Nasser to wage warfare against his Arab brethren more inclined to the free world—with the usual anti-Israel counterpoint. The forthcoming visit of Red China's Chou En-lai is clearly designed to introduce a new theme calculated to worry both Moscow and Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, President Nasser is in trouble. He faces increased isolation as some of his closest allies are no longer in power—Ben Bella deposed in Algeria, Kwame Nkrumah deposed in Ghana, Sukarno down but not quite out in Indonesia, and Iraq's President Aref the victim of an airplane crash. And longtime President Nasser targets such as Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Iran are drawing together in their own Moslem alliance. In addition, only last month, 20 top Egyptian Army officers were arrested on charges of plotting against President Nasser because of his unpopular war in Yemen.

President Nasser continues to squander his country's limited resources on a war in Yemen where some 70,000 troops are now committed and by purchases of Soviet arms. These purchases have resulted in the United Arab Republic mortgaging its cotton crop, a chief source of Egyptian foreign trade, to the Soviets for years to come. In addition, the United Arab Republic has turned more and more toward actively assisting the Soviets in penetrating the Middle East, not only in Yemen, but in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, and the Red Sea.

Britain will be withdrawing from bases in southern Arabia the year after next, a withdrawal for which Nasserite subversion must take some credit. A vacuum of power will exist in a strategic part of the world which the Soviets and the Egyptians yearn to fill. Will the United States permit itself to be blackmailed into aiding the United Arab Republic in filling that vacuum and in seeking to strengthen its now waning influence over Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Sudan, and other independent nations in the area?

Last year President Nasser told the United States to drink "the waters of the sea." After kiss-and-make-up talks, he received $55 million in U.S. food aid. This year he has gone a step further and is arrogantly demanding the aid as a right. If President Nasser's blackmail succeeds, if we extend economic aid which he can use to release his limited resources for warfare against his neighbors and threats and propaganda against the United States and its allies, then we will deserve what we get, which will probably be another disaster in another part of the world—this time, the Near East.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Government Operations Committee in the other body last week reported out S. 1160, the Senate-passed version of the freedom-of-information bill. Nothing is more vital today than for our citizens to know the facts of their own Government.

This bill was carefully considered in the Senate. The Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure bent over backward to satisfy the many requests for more secrecy authority made by agency representatives, while at the same time preserving the idea that Government records are public records. I am pleased to be a member of the subcommittee which is chaired by my colleague, Senator Edward V. Long, of Missouri.

A recent editorial in the Washington Post comments that the bill "should have been put on the statute books generations ago." Perhaps it is still not too late, but I sincerely hope that the other body will pass the bill with all due speed and send it on to the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial from the April 29, 1966, issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Right To Know

The House Government Operations Committee's approval of the Freedom of Information bill already passed in the Senate no doubt will send the measure along to passage in the whole House. It ought to be enacted into law.

Few pieces of legislation have had more thorough study in both houses of Congress. There were very full and complete hearings on the Senate side and the House committee gave it long and careful attention. The bill represents a cautious and painstakingly careful effort to meet the requirements of disclosure essential in a democratic society without putting in jeopardy personal rights to privacy or governmental security.

The bill acknowledges the right to know, delimits it carefully in many areas, and provides a court remedy for improper withholding. It should have been put on the statute books generations ago.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY TO NORTH CAROLINA MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO., DURHAM, N.C., APRIL 2, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last month, the Vice President of the United States spoke eloquently in Durham, N.C., at the building dedication of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co. Praising the achievements of this progressive company, Vice President Humphrey traced the growth of business among Negroes in the South and spoke of new opportunities for minority groups under recent legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Vice President's remarks printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co. Building Dedication, Durham, N.C., April 2, 1966

We meet today on a happy rather than a solemn occasion. Some dedications are of monuments to past glories. But today we are dedicating a very substantial—and a very handsome—declaration of faith in the future.

I only wish that John Merrick, Dr. A. M. Moore, and C. C. Spaulding were here to see their dreams come true. I suspect they could not have imagined this building exactly as it is—so thoroughly modern, so much in the spirit of these stirring, vibrant 1960's. But I'm sure they would have visualized something eqally impressive.

How else would they have had the courage and determination to launch this enterprise and keep it going? As the Bible says (Proverbs XXIX, 18): "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

The North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company had hard going indeed in those early days.

The Negro had been emancipated little more than a generation when your company was organized.

Already the effects of the Reconstruction were wearing off.

Oppressive measures had been and were being enacted and the freedom the Negro had so newly gained was being eroded in a hundred overt and devious ways.

But your founders were not deterred or disheartened.

They had little capital, but they had great courage. Our presence here today is a tribute to the prudent use of that capital, and a validation of their courage.

North Carolina Mutual pioneered in providing equitable insurance programs for uneducated and poorly-paid workers—for those who were either denied any insurance at all because of their race or pitilessly exploited if they were allowed to take it out at all.

You went into the homes, the churches, and the schools and urged thrift. You encouraged and aided Negroes in buying homes. You stressed the advantages in personal advancement and community service, of a sound education.

By building bridges for mutual communication, you helped to develop racial cooperation and good will in your community. In 1919, when racial unrest and violence were sweeping the country, Mr. C. C. Spaulding gave wise counsel to your managers and agents, urging them to "make friends of the races in your communities, that all might live together in peace."

Your inspiration and example have not been given to this country alone, for you have opened your doors to visitors and internes from the emerging nations of Africa, so that they could see and learn your procedures and techniques—and, even more important, perhaps, to take heart from your capacity to start from small beginnings, overcome great hardships and difficulties, and reach your present pinnacle of success.

You have come a long way, and you are entitled to pause a moment, take a deep breath, and enjoy the view.

With 420 million dollars of insurance in force at the end of last year, you rank comfortably in the top 10 percent of the Nation's more than 1,400 insurance companies. Your achievement offers eloquent testimony of the business ability and acumen, the financial and investment skills, and the prudence and integrity that American Negroes can bring to the business community, as well as to our larger society.

And the story of North Carolina Mutual demonstrates once again the vital role which private business and industry can play in promoting equal opportunity for our citizens. In recent years, there are many heartening examples of dedicated business and corporate leaders mounting major drives to hire on the basis of full equality and recognizing the vital role their companies can play in building a climate of cooperation and good will to dispel one of hate and suspicion.

Many communities and businesses have learned this lesson, but few have acted upon it with the courage and sense of justice characterized by Durham and North Carolina Mutual.

You have indeed much to celebrate, and your are celebrating it well. I am delighted that the Durham Theater Guild's production of Stephen Vincent Benet's epic poem, "John Brown's Body," is part of your Festival. I only regret that, owing to the pressure of time under which public officials operate, I have not been able to attend it. Like you, I think that the good life, the civilized life, is more than bread, more than automobiles, more than refrigerators—it is poetry, it is drama, it is music and all the arts.

In your Festival symposium, "The Negro in the American Economy," you have discussed the role of Negroes in literature and the arts, in sports, in religion and in education—areas where they have long played a leading part. And you have also dealt with newer fields—business and the professions, labor, communications and government.

In all these areas dramatic progress has been made—and it is steadily accelerating. Indeed, the presence here of your keynoter, Dr. Andrew F. Brimmer, is a striking example of that progress. He has won his present post by sheer ability, after giving such outstanding service as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs that he was chosen last year as one of our ten most outstanding young civil servants.

There are some people—and well-intentioned people, at that—who say in effect: "Why all this agitation and protest? Aren't Negroes ever satisfied?"

I say that such people haven't grasped the true dynamics of the Negro revolution—and believe me, it *is* a revolution.

History teaches us that the great revolutions aren't started by people who are utterly down and out—without hope and vision. They take place where people being to live a little better—and when they see how much yet remains to be achieved.

I say these demands and this striving will not and cannot end until Negroes enjoy the full rights and privileges and opportunities of other American citizens, both in law and in fact.

Great progress has been and is being made. I think, to cite the most recent milestones, of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, initiated by the late President Kennedy and carried through by President Johnson.

I think of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, initiated and enacted under President Johnson's leadership.

We shall continue to press forward toward full and equal civil rights.

In his State of the Union message this year, the President declared that "justice means a man's hope should not be limited by the color of his skin." He then proposed:

Legislation to establish unavoidable requirements for non-discriminatory jury selection in federal and state courts—and to give the Attorney General the power necessary to enforce those requirements.

Legislation to strengthen the authority of federal courts to try those who murder, attack, or intimidate either civil rights workers or others exercising their Constitutional rights—and to increase penalties to a level equal to the nature of the crime.

Legislation, resting on the full Constitutional authority of the federal government, to prohibit racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

Progress has come—and will come—not only from legislation specifically directed at assuring equal rights to Negroes and other minorities—but through programs benefiting the entire American community, and particularly the less-privileged sections of it.

Two years ago the President launched the war against poverty—an action unprecedented in the history of the world. That war will be pressed forward until this bitter word "poverty" is banished not only from our lives, but hopefully even from the language we speak. In the dictionaries of the future, it may still appear—but I hope with the designation "Obsolete."

Now, there are more poor white people than there are poor Negroes, and the majority of Negroes live above the poverty line, as it has been statistically defined. Nevertheless, Negroes do suffer from poverty to a much higher degree than their white fellow citizens, and therefore are among the chief beneficiaries of the poverty war programs.

Negroes are also beginning to benefit from the policies of vigorous economic growth which the government has been pursuing in the past five years. Between February, 1961, and February, 1966, the rate of unemployment for Negroes was cut almost in half. At 7 per cent, it is still much too high—and we certainly cannot be complacent when one of every 14 Negro workers is without a job.

Last year, the Council of Economic Advisors estimated that this country sacrificed

23 billion dollars in gross national product as payment for accumulated costs of discrimination.

If Negroes received the same average pay as whites of the same education the personal income of Negroes and the nation would be 12.8 billion dollars higher.

If Negroes had the same educational attainments as white workers—the same pay and experienced the same unemployment—their personal income would be 20.6 billion dollars higher.

These figures, and I imagine most of you have heard them before, remind us of the terrible price we continue to pay for discrimination and disadvantage. At a time when America is being called to provide leadership around the world, this is a cost we simply cannot afford.

Let me hasten to add: Even if discrimination cost this Nation not one penny, we would have the moral obligation to eradicate it. But we must not close our eyes to the staggering costs we incur each year for our failure to open wide the doors of opportunity for every American.

Last year there was dramatic progress on another front of great importance to the entire American community—and particularly to Negroes. The far-reaching legislation to help our schools and colleges enacted under President Johnson's leadership in the last session of Congress clearly marks 1965 as the threshold of a new era in American education.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act will help approximately 7 million educationally-deprived children from low-income families—a very substantial proportion of them Negro children. It authorizes grants to school districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's counties.

Taken together, the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act alone will bring over 1.2 billion dollars to education throughout the country in this current school year—and a half-billion dollars will go to the schools in the South.

Yet, the future looks a good deal brighter for the Negro—and it looks brighter for the South, too, in which North Carolina Mutual does most of its business.

Some people, you know, used to say: "The South will rise again."

Well, it is rising—but not in the way these people meant.

It is rising economically, as it moves increasingly from a rural into an industrial economy.

The economic gap between it and the rest of the Nation still exists—but it is being steadily closed.

The South is rising, too, in terms of understanding and cooperation among the people of the two races who share it.

I do not forget for a moment that there is still a very dark side to this rising moon. If there were not, there would be no need for the legislation which the President has proposed.

But there is a new South as well as an old South, and it is rapidly gaining ground. The leaders of this new South recognize that Negro and white people have far more to gain from cooperation than from conflict.

The splendid building which we are dedicating today is itself a symbol of that new and better South. As the South as a whole grows and prospers, North Carolina Mutual will continue to grow and prosper.

I therefore take pride and pleasure in helping dedicate this new and splendid headquarters of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co. to the service of this Nation and its people—all its people—and particularly to the service of the new South.

APPALACHIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a recent editorial from Newsday which points up the grave problems which confront the Federal Government in its attempt to include the Appalachian region's 17 million people, almost 1 million of whom are New Yorkers, in the sharing of the Nation's progress and prosperity. I think that one of the important lessons to be learned is the danger which exists in promising too much, too soon.

The editorial notes that the program is often susceptible to political manipulation. I would hope that the Appalachian Commission and the other agencies involved will do all possible to protect the people from political exploitation.

We in Congress have a definite responsibility to watch closely, to see that there are no abuses in the administration of these programs. At the same time, we must also be careful not to expect miracles overnight, for, as the article indicates, progress—however slowly—is being made, but the task is surely a vast one.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appalachia Revisited

After two and a half years, Newsday reporter Bernie Bookbinder has revisited the heart of the 12-State Appalachian region. His reports this week, describing the changes since the start of an intensive federal rehabilitation program, were not encouraging.

The U.S. has spent almost $500,000,000 in those two and a half years in an attempt to end the isolation, poverty and neglect that have prevented many of the region's 17,000,000 people from sharing in the nation's progress and prosperity. Yet there seems to be far too little improvement, either in the appearance of Appalachia or the outlook of those who live in it. Half of the children in a one-room school in eastern Kentucky, for example, cannot afford 10 cents a day for a hot lunch.

The problems, of course, are tremendous. Appalachia's dependence on single industries—coal, timber and small farming—have largely contributed to its poverty. When these resources became exhausted, thousands lost their jobs. Thousands more have been thrown out of work by automation in the mines and on the farms. The attitudes of the mountaineers have also aggravated their plight. Of pioneer stock, imbued with the values of independence and attachment to the land, they have been reluctant to leave the despair of the familiar hollows for the opportunity of the alien cities.

Geography, too, has thwarted the region's development. Rugged mountains and narrow valleys have inhibited transportation and communication, isolating the highland people first from the mainstream of 20th-Century thought and, more recently, from the government's attempts to help them.

Recognizing these handicaps, it would be unreasonable to expect immediate solutions. As John Sweeney, federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, said: "It took Appalachia 100 years to get into the precarious state it's in right now and we're not going to cure it in a year."

Yet, many people in Appalachia were led to believe otherwise. "You people put all these things in the paper about what's going to happen," a mountaineer told a local editor. "And I know it wasn't your fault, but it's a bunch of lies." This skepticism has been reinforced by the manner in which local politicians are directing the war on poverty.

Political advantage is frequently given top priority in the work assignments given jobless fathers, called "happy pappies." That program, which is sound and imaginative in theory, requires the fathers to attend night classes and keep their children in school in order to receive benefits of about $200 a month. This should serve as a good example to the children and help to break the cycle of poverty. But it is also supposed to provide "constructive" work experience and "training." Unfortunately, the pappies are used where they can do the politicians, not the community or themselves, the most good.

NEW AWARENESS

For such reasons, the hard-core Appalachians, those who need help most, are benefiting least from the federal programs. But there are indications that Washington is aware of the problems and is seeking to overcome them. The government, for example, is combining county antipoverty agencies in an attempt to reduce the chances for local political abuses. And "new, more effective and more useful programs" are promised.

Another hopeful sign is the reception given the Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) workers. These idealistic and tough-minded young men and women are making meaningful headway in inspiring the mountain people to help themselves. Their number should be increased.

There is more than sympathetic concern involved in the nation's interest in Appalachia. The programs being tested in the southern mountains may provide solutions to the national problems of automation, unemployment and retraining.

BAR ASSOCIATION REPORT ON PROPOSALS TO PERMIT SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES TO EARN INCOME TO THE EXTENT OF THEIR ABILITIES WITHOUT DEDUCTION FROM SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York—a group of very distinguished lawyers of the New York bar—has just issued a carefully reasoned report concerning bills now pending in Congress to eliminate the income-limiting provisions from the Social Security Act.

I commend this report to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to have the text of the report printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of the Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 42 West 44th Street, on Bills To Permit Social Security Beneficiaries To Earn Income to the Extent of Their Ability Without Deductions From Social Security Benefits

Several bills are before the Congress to permit receipt of full Social Security benefits by otherwise qualified employees over 65 who are able to continue to make a contribution to their own welfare and to society by part-time or full-time work.[1] This Committee endorses the purposes of the bills.

Under present law, persons over 65 receiving Social Security benefits cannot earn more than $1,500 per year without having their benefits reduced.[2] Penalties are provided for failure to report earnings.[3]

These income limitations were initially enacted in 1935 [4] during the period of the Great Depression, when the notion was widespread that as many persons as possible should be removed from the labor force in order to spread the available work. In our opinion the limitations serve no useful purpose today and should be removed.

We have found other ways of promoting high employment than discouraging people anxious and willing to work. Social Security benefits are frequently insufficient by themselves to maintain our older citizens in the dignity which should be their lot. These citizens in our opinion should be encouraged rather than discouraged in their efforts to supplement their income by constructive work which also redounds to the benefit of society. This seems particularly true today when many employers are reporting a shortage of qualified personnel for many jobs.[5] Older citizens who possess skills accumulated during many years of experience may be especially qualified for many of these very positions. Indeed it is now recognized that an important segment of retired persons, as the average life span lengthens, will want and need to continue to work beyond 65 in order to feel a sense of constructive usefulness in their lives.[6]

The earned income limitation is also contrary to the basic philosophy of the Social Security Act, which has always been that benefits were available as a matter of right on the basis of the contribution paid in through Social Security taxes, without resort to a "means test" of any kind.

In addition we note that under present law a person over 65 can receive an unlimited amount of income from investments, whereas he is penalized if he works to earn additional income. Similarly, those over 72 can now earn more than the limit without losing benefits. In our opinion such distinctions have no basis and should be abolished.

We, therefore, endorse the bills calling for repeal of the income limitation.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation; William J. Isaacson, Chairman; Irving Abramson; Jerome H. Adler; Albert X. Bader; William J. Brennan III; John D. Canoni; Samuel J. Cohen; Wilbur Daniels; Richard A. Givens; Alex J. Glauberman; Richard N. Goldstein; Robert C. Isaacs; Isadore Katz.

Samuel M. Kaynard; Arthur Mermin; Francis A. O'Connell, Jr.; Benjamin C. Roberts; Edward Silver; Donald W. Smith; Burton B. Turkus; Stephen C. Vladeck; John Whittlesey; Benjamin Wyle; William A. Ziegler, Jr.; Max Zimny.

TRIBUTE TO CARDINAL SPELLMAN ON GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION AS A PRIEST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this past weekend, New Yorkers of all faiths and religious leaders from all parts of the country joined in honoring New York's archbishop, Francis Cardinal Spellman, on the golden anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

It was only appropriate, Mr. President, that people of all faiths were involved in this tribute, for Cardinal Spellman has the respect, gratitude, and esteem of millions of non-Catholics as well as the devotion of the communicants of his own church.

Cardinal Spellman is probably best known throughout the world for his yearly Christmastime trips to be with our troops in the field in the most difficult and dangerous overseas posts.

But New Yorkers know also about his personal charities, his fervent devotion to the young people of New York, and his personal, constant concern for and aid to St. Vincent's Hospital, the New York Foundling Hospital, and the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation.

I know I speak for millions of New Yorkers when I express my congratulations and best wishes to Cardinal Spellman for his half century of rich accomplishment and his deep solicitude for all peoples.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial from the New York Times of May 15, and a news article from the same paper's May 16 editions.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Priestly Half Century

Fifty years ago today a young Roman Catholic priest from the Boston archdiocese was ordained in Rome. There was nothing about him then to distinguish him from any number of earnest young clerics seemingly destined for a career in a Boston parish. Father Francis J. Spellman's "parish," however, was to be a much larger one than he anticipated. He became an intimate of Pope Pius XII, a member of the College of Cardinals and the Archbishop of New York. Probably no Catholic priest in American history has exercised as much influence on both ecclesiastical and secular affairs.

The Cardinal has been no stranger to public controversy during his years of eminence. Long criticized as a conservative, he showed an admirably flexible spirit in adjusting to the more progressive Catholicism associated with Pope John XXIII and the recent Vatican Council. New York, at once the richest and most complex of archdioceses, has kept up with the changes decreed in Rome. This cheerful acceptance of aggiornamento adds enthusiasm to today's celebration of a half century of rich accomplishment.

Four Cardinals Join in Honoring Spellman Here

(By Paul Hofmann)

With congratulatory messages from the Pope and the President, and with four cardinals and 90 bishops looking on, Cardinal Spellman celebrated his 50th anniversary in the priesthood yesterday. He made it an occasion of piety and humility.

The 77-year-old spiritual leader of New York's Roman Catholics went through a strenuous day with characteristic gusto as testimonials of affection and esteem flowed in from far and near.

Pope Paul VI sent his apostolic blessing in a Latin letter. President Johnson wrote that "this nation has long been the fortunate beneficiary of your wisdom and courage." Many other public figures in the United States and throughout the world also sent tributes.

The Cardinal struck a note of austerity and steadfastness in a homily prepared for delivery during mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral yesterday afternoon. The rite commemorated the first mass offered by the newly ordained Rev. Francis Spellman in St. Peter's in Rome May 14, 1916.

Stressing that laymen were sharing with the clergy in religious apostolate, Cardinal Spellman said: "How many of you, of many faiths, who stand before God accepting self-denial because God asks it of you. The calm and steady manner in which people assume difficult duties, serve their friends, their families, and their country, and give generously to the poor, as typical of the splendid sacrifices that God alone fully knows and records."

The Cardinal said of priesthood: "I think always of it in terms of people—God's people." He affirmed that priests in New York as elsewhere, were dealing in a "flexible and very forward-looking way" with modern problems.

---

[1] E.g., H.R. 258, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mr. Beckworth; H.R. 415, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mrs. Bolton; H.R. 804, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mrs. Kelly; H.R. 1016, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mr. Gilbert, also containing proposals as to retirement age upon which we do not comment; H.R. 1060, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mr. Latta; H.R. 1125, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mr. Multer; H.R. 2387, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mr. Boggs; H.R. 2481, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mr. Springer; H.R. 3428, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mr. Lindsay prior to his election as Mayor of the City of New York; H.R. 3795, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mr. Fino; H.R. 5517 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Mr. Pepper; S. 1490, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965) by Senator Hartke.

[2] 42 U.S.C. § 403(b) and (f). The limit was raised from $1,200 to $1,500; 79 Stat. 363 (1965).

[3] 42 U.S.C.§ 403(g). Enforcement problems are also created where erroneous certifications are given by Social Security recipients as to their outside income. The amounts due the Government are often relatively small, yet the beneficiary may be unable to pay them except over a period of years which may frequently be less than his or her anticipated lifetime. False statements are, of course, a source of possible criminal penalties. E.g., 18 U.S.C. § 1001; 42 U.S.C. § 1307. Older citizens who erroneously report income for Social Security purposes are thus subjected to potential prison sentences in connection with the income limitations under discussion here. Questions necessarily arise in such cases whether the individual understood the requirements of the law or was sufficiently aware of the discrepancies to be liable. These issues in this context create difficult problems for prospecuting authorities and the courts which would be obviated by repeal of the income limitation.

[4] 49 Stat. 623 (1935).

[5] See N.Y. Times, March 27, 1966, p. 1, col. 2 and p. 82, col. 4. Compare also Rosenthal, letter to the editor, N.Y. Times, March 20, 1966.

[6] As stated by Franklin D. Roosevelt in his first inaugural address: "Happiness lies not in the mere possession of money; it lies in the joy of achievement, in the thrill of creative effort." N.Y. Times, March 5, 1933; 2 Hofstadter, *Great Issues in American History* 351, 353 (1958). Compare Pope John XXIII, *Mater et Magistra*, Part II, par. 82–83 (1961); Peter F. Drucker, *Concept of the Corporation* 140, 179 (1960); Drucker, *The Future of Industrial Man* 101–117 (1942); Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Future of Man* 16–18, 118 (Denny trans. 1964); Givens, *The Coming Industrial Citizenship*, 17 Labor L.J. 99 (1966); Khalil Gibran, "On Work" in *The Prophet* 27–31 (Pocket ed. 1955).

He called on the clergy to show "personal piety as an absolute necessity," humility, loyalty to the church, patriotism, "affection for fellow priests and all ministers of religion," and conscientious service to all people. The Cardinal is also military vicar to Roman Catholics in the armed forces.

Workmen erected a special altar in the center of the cathedral for the cardinal's thanksgiving mass yesterday afternoon. Aides explained that Cardinal Spellman had preferred to officiate in the sanctuary's center instead of, as usual, before the main altar in the apse on its east. This was to encourage full participation of the congregation in the prayers and hymns, most of which were in English, in keeping with the recent liturgical reforms in the Catholic Church.

The anniversary mass was preceded by a procession of churchmen from the Cardinal's residence, 452 Madison Avenue, along East 50th Street to the cathedral's main entrance on Fifth Avenue.

Those in attendance included the Roman Catholic Primate of Yugoslavia, Franjo Cardinal Seper. The 50-year-old prelate, who is archbishop of Zagreb, has been touring Slavic communities in the United States for the last two weeks and is at present a house guest of Cardinal Spellman.

James Francis Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles, Joseph Cardinal Ritter of St. Louis and Lawrence Joseph Cardinal Shehan of Baltimore also had come to New York for the anniversary of the ranking Catholic prelate in the United States. Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston, who had earlier said he wanted to participate, was prevented from doing so by the state of his health.

The Pope was represented by the Apostolic Delegate in Washington, the Most Rev. Egidio Vagnozzi, an old friend of Cardinal Spellman's. The assembled archbishop and bishops came from Catholic dioceses throughout the nation.

Most of the high churchmen were staying at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. As on previous such occasions, the management had altars prepared in a hall on the hotel's fourth floor for the convenience of the visiting prelates, many of whom celebrated their daily mass there yesterday morning.

On Friday night Cardinal Spellman was host at an intimate dinner for members of his family, at his residence. Among those present were the Cardinal's two brothers, Martin and John, who are both doctors; two sisters, Marian and Helen, and some 20 other relatives.

Most of the cardinal's close relatives live in or near Whitman, Mass., where he was born into a grocer's family on May 4, 1889.

Early yesterday morning the prelate prayed in his private chapel on the third floor of his revival Gothic residence, and then chatted with some of the visiting churchmen and other wellwishers. He found time also for some work, drafting a speech that he intends to give on the conclusion of the anniversary celebration Tuesday.

Events scheduled for yesterday included a private dinner for hundreds of invited guests at the Waldorf-Astoria. In addition to the visiting prelates, the pastors of the arch diocese's 403 parishes, with four laymen and laywomen each, had been invited to the affair.

Cardinal Spellman is scheduled to preside at mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral at 10 A.M. today. The Rev. Robert W. Moher, a member of the Holy Cross order who is on the cathedral staff, will be the officiating priest.

At 3:30 P.M. the Cardinal will offer a special thanksgiving mass for the religious sisters at Cardinal Spellman High School, 1991 Needham Avenue, the Bronx.

He will celebrate his third thanksgiving mass on the grounds of St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, Yonkers, N.Y., on Tuesday afternoon, after dedicating the New Catholic Communications Center there. The center is a three-channel educational television network.

Cardinal Spellman was praised in the Pope's handwritten letter as "zealous, watchful, undismayed by difficulties; a prudent, generous and open-minded man of accomplishment (sollers, vigil, arduis rebus non territus, consilii prudens et in exsequendo magnificus et munificus)." The text of the letter, which was sent by Pope Paul earlier this month, was released by the Vatican yesterday.

The papal document also authorized Cardinal Spellman to give Apostolic Benediction to the faithful of his archdiocese on a day of his own choosing. Apostolic Benediction is a solemn blessing normally reserved to the Pontiff, but sometimes imparted, on his behalf and authority, by an outstanding prelate.

Good wishes also came from Governor Rockefeller, Mayor Lindsay, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and ROBERT F. KENNEDY; Dan M. Potter for the Protestant Council of the City of New York; Rabbi Edward T. Sandrow; president of the New York Board of Rabbis, and other civic and religious leaders.

NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SUPPLY

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1098) to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In fixing such compensation to be paid for the use of any type of freight car, the Commission shall give consideration to the national level of ownership of such type of freight car and to other factors affecting the adequacy of the national freight car supply, and shall, on the basis of such consideration, determine whether compensation should be computed solely on the basis of elements of ownership expenses involved in owning and maintaining such type of freight car, including a fair return on value, or whether such compensation should be increased by such incentive element or elements of compensation as in the Commission's judgment will provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners, contribute to sound car service practices (including efficient utilization and distribution of cars), and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense. The Commission shall not make any incentive element applicable to any type of freight car the supply of which the Commission finds to be adequate and may exempt from the compensation to be paid by any group of carriers such incentive element or elements if the Commission finds it to be in the national interest."

SEC. 2. Any compensation fixed pursuant to the amendment made to the Interstate Commerce Act by the first section of this Act shall not take effect before September 1, 1966.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1098, the box car bill, in order that we might achieve final passage of this measure.

Let me point out to the Senate that while the House amendments change the language of the bill in a number of respects, the House and Senate versions of S. 1098 are substantially the same. Both bills authorize and direct the Interstate Commerce Commission, after hearing, to prescribe the rental rate paid by railroads using another railroad's freight cars. Both bills give the Commission authority to establish incentive per diem rates in order to encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense. Finally, both bills contain provisions with respect to the exemption of certain types of cars and certain groups of carriers.

The enactment of this bill can save shippers millions of dollars each year, prevent loss of wages due to plant shutdowns, and insure that the railroad transportation needs of our expanding economy and national defense will be met.

Chronic freight car shortages which have plagued whole industries and our Nation's shippers should be a thing of the past when the Interstate Commerce Commission fully utilizes its authority under S. 1098. I am confident that the implementation of this bill will provide the incentive to the Nation's railroads to meet the expanding demands of our economy in the years to come.

One House amendment, not contained in the Senate bill, provides that any compensation fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission cannot take effect before September 1, 1966. The passage of S. 1098 will not produce overnight results. It is designed to provide a long-range solution by increasing the total supply of our Nation's freight cars.

During the interim until S. 1098 can be fully implemented, the Chairman of the ICC has assured me that the ICC will fully exercise its present emergency powers to alleviate hardships caused by a lack of a sufficient number of freight cars.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee.

Before the Senate takes final action on S. 1098, I have a few brief comments which I would like to make about the bill, as it now comes before us.

Senators will recall that the Senate last year approved a similar bill with the amendments recommended by the Senate Commerce Committee. The Senate committee amendment to the bill enumerated four categories of circumstances which the Interstate Commerce Commission had to take into consideration in determining and applying any incentive element to the compensation to be paid for the use of freight cars.

The four specific factors were: First, carriers determined by the Commission as owning an adequate number of freight cars to meet their responsibilities to the needs of commerce and the national defense; second, carriers which terminate a substantially higher percentage of interline traffic than they originate; third, types of freight cars the supply of which the Commission finds to be adequate, and fourth, such other cases or circumstances as the Commission finds to be in the public interest.

Under the Senate version of the bill, the ICC was specifically empowered to exempt from the incentive, or penalty, element of the freight car charges any or all of the groups I have just listed.

The aim of these provisions of the Senate bill, which I had a part in suggesting, was to assure reasonable and fair consideration of the special problems arising in the industry, including the problem of the terminating railroads, whose per diem charges are not related to the number of boxcars they may own.

In the bill before us today, as it has come back from the House of Representatives, the four types of circumstances spelled out in the Senate bill are not directly listed. It is clear, however, that all the factors listed in the Senate bill still have to be considered by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Commission would have the power, and the duty, not to apply the incentive element to any group of carriers, and even a single carrier, where those four circumstances, or any other circumstances, made it in the national interest to do so.

In this connection, I was pleased to note that the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. STAGGERS, in his statement to the House last week declared that—

> The bill in its present form provides that the Commission would be empowered in its discretion to exempt from the incentive element provisions any group of carriers where the Commission finds such exemption to be in the national interest. This provision enables the Commission to make exemptions from paying an incentive element by class of carrier, and permits the Commission to consider the several factors specifically authorized in the Senate bill.

This attitude of the chairman of the House committee corresponds to the assurances which the Chairman of the ICC gave us last year when our committee was working on this bill. In a letter to Chairman MAGNUSON dated March 24, 1965, the Chairman of the Commission declared that all of the factors mentioned in the Senate bill "would be considered by the Commission under the language of the bill as introduced." Obviously, all of these factors must still be considered, reviewed, evaluated, and applied under the language of the House bill.

In the light of these assurances, I shall support the bill in its present form and hope the Senate will give its approval to the amendments of the House to S. 1098.

I am supporting these amendments with the understanding that it is clear from the extensive legislative history of this bill that it gives the Commission the power, and the responsibility to exempt from the incentive per diem those carriers who terminate a substantially higher percentage of interline traffic than they originate. I am confident that the Commission recognizes its responsibilities in this respect and that the intent of the Congress will be fully implemented.

While this legislation will not work any wonders in dealing with the current serious shortage of freight cars, it will spell out more clearly the ICC's powers and responsibilities in this area. It will further encourage the Commission and all the carriers to seek effective and realistic means of ending the box car shortages and providing the cars needed for the commerce of the Nation, without unfairly dealing with any carrier or group of carriers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for the help he has been in this matter, particularly with respect to the New England railroads, in providing a compromise for the New England areas which are terminal points for the railroads, and for the help in getting cars from and to the West and Middle West. I see both Senators from Kansas are present. I do not know of any State that has been more plagued by this problem than their State.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for bringing out this legislation dealing with the problem of the shortage of boxcars. The distinguished chairman of the committee has been laboring in this field for many years. I am familiar with the work he has done on it. I am hopeful it will result in accomplishing its purpose.

I notice that the bill provides that it is to become effective by September.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. I hope the Interstate Commerce Commission will, in the intervening period, use the cars which are available, to somehow, in some way, get them into the areas where they are needed and where there is economic need for them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Commission has the authority to do that. If a situation arises in the Middle West, particularly in States like Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and the grain and wheat belts, the ICC can use the authority which it has used heretofore. I would be the first to join the Senator in asking the Commission to use that authority. We have been assured by the Chairman of the Commission that that would happen.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I have looked over the amendments and I consider them in furtherance of the purpose of the legislation, and wish to join the chairman of the committee in urging the Senate to adopt the amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Am I correct in understanding that the provision involving a terminal line like the New Haven has been retained?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is in the bill.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, after many years of effort, Congress is today finally completing action on legislation which will empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to levy per diem charges on railroads. This action is being taken for the same reason that other regulatory laws are passed. The railroad industry was given years to work out the problem of equitable compensation for boxcars owned by one line and used by another. The industry did not work out the problem. Cars from lines, such as the Great Northern and Northern Pacific, which serve major raw material regions, were not returned in due course. Compensation for car rental arranged among the railroads was not adequate incentive for the using lines to return the cars to the owning lines.

This year the Northwest experienced the most severe boxcar shortage in modern time. As a consequence, a number of us requested the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue an unprecedented exclusion order, directing all lines using boxcars owned by the Great Northern and Northern Pacific to return them. The distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON], whose leadership and tenacity through the years have produced the legislation we are enacting today, chaired the meeting we held last winter with Chairman Bush of the ICC and spokesmen for the Northwestern industries hampered by the boxcar shortage. The day following the meeting the ICC issued its exclusion order, an order so successful that the cars on line on the NP and Great Northern increased from about 50 percent of ownership when the order was issued to 90 percent of ownership when the order was canceled on May 6. I would emphasize that it was the exclusion order which solved the boxcar shortage that plagued the Northwest. However, S. 1098 will help avert similar tieups in the future.

Mr. President, the two major railroads serving Montana, the Great Northern and Northern Pacific, have been most helpful through the years in working out the legislation which Congress is passing today. This spring Director John Willard of the Montana Railroad Association came back to Washington and accompanied me in discussions with members of the House Rules Committee concerning S. 1088. Officials of the National Farmers Union Central Exchange, farmers and businessmen, all played a constructive role. And I know better than any other member, I believe, of the great amount of time which my distinguished colleague from Montana, Majority Leader MANSFIELD, has spent in moving this bill, as well as its predecessors, through the legislative process. Senator MANSFIELD, Chairman MAGNUSON and the rest of his Commerce Committee, and others have developed a constructive approach to regulation. It will, I trust, go a long way toward making boxcar shortages, with the resulting economic dislocation and financial loss, an unpleasant memory

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to cosponsor this legislation when it was introduced on February 10, 1965. I am gratified to support its passage, as amended by the House of Representatives, in this body. Since 1950, the growing shortage of freight cars has been a development of increasing concern to the Nation—to the users, to the railroads, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to those of us to whom these anxious citizens have turned for assistance in finding a remedy to a grave situation.

We are today giving the ICC urgently needed authority to cope with what is becoming a crisis in transportation. The maintenance of our national security, our national strength and our economic well-being will be advanced by the passage of this act.

We look to the railroads themselves to pursue other avenues in efforts to achieve solutions to the problems of loading, unloading and detention; the problems of the car service rules; and the questions involved in the divisions between originating and terminating carriers. We must now begin to take those steps which are both necessary and desirable to alleviate the present shortage of freight cars that has been causing us so much economic distress in so many vital areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington to concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S SPEECH AT SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States visited Arizona on April 16 and addressed over 500 Democratic Party members at an illustrious outdoor banquet at the Guy Stillman Ranch near Scottsdale, Ariz.

In that speech, Vice President HUMPHREY dramatically and succintly stated the issues which we as a Nation and as an international leader, must realize as we approach the autumnal years of the 20th century. It gave me great heart to learn that Vice President HUMPHREY launched his oratory from the lofty dais of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt's renowned "Four Human Freedoms" statement, made a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. President, I commend the Vice President's speech to each and every one of my fellow Senators. In particular, I would call attention to the closing lines of the Vice President's speech, wherein he quoted from a Franklin Roosevelt speech, which was never delivered. I ask unanimous consent that Vice President HUMPHREY'S Scottsdale speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC FUND RAISING DINNER, PHOENIX, ARIZONA, APRIL 16, 1966

As we Democrats meet tonight we look to the future. That's what makes us Democrats. We look forward to new challenges and new opportunities—we know that the world is filled with them. We look forward.

Twenty-one years ago this week our nation lost the man who gave this country forward motion when we needed it most . . . the man who helped us take our place in the world as responsible international citizens . . . . The man who preserved our democratic system at a time when there were those who would have destroyed it.

Twenty-one years ago this week we lost President Franklin Roosevelt.

The work we do today was the work he began. The world we seek—in common with other free nations—is the one that Franklin Roosevelt looked toward more than twenty-five years ago:

"In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

"The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

"The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

"The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms means economic understandings which will secure every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

"The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world."

Franklin Roosevelt saw a world in which the old coercions * * * the old oppressions * * * the old injustices might be pushed aside. He saw a world in which man might emerge into an age of enlightenment and understanding.

Franklin Roosevelt's vision of yesterday is our goal of today. We work so that it may be the reality of tomorrow.

Franklin Roosevelt often said that the only whole men were free men.

Today our task at home is to create a society of whole and free men where every American citizen—no matter where he lives * * * no matter what his skin color * * * no matter where he worships * * * no matter where he comes from—may be a full productive participant in America. To build a better and freer world we need a better and freer America. Our land, our factories, our cities, our water, our roads, our people—these are the things which must be fully developed if our dream is not to exceed our reach.

We are creating a change of prepositions. It used to be that America was the land of freedom and opportunity if you had the right last name or went to the right church or worked in the right place or if your face happened to be the right shade. But today we are changing things. America can and will be the land of freedom and opportunity when each child entering life can look forward to an equal chance to make the most of himself * * * to climb to the limit of his abilities * * * to stand right up and claim his place in life without regard for any irrelevant mark of the surface.

In the last session of the Congress, under President Johnson's leadership—and the leadership of Senator CARL HAYDEN of Arizona—we made into law the hopes and ideas of our generation and the generation before: Voting Rights, Immigration, Education, Medicare, Housing and Urban Development, Arts and Humanities.

We made laws to make war on poverty.

We made laws to turn American agriculture in a new and fruitful direction.

These laws are nothing more than *investments*—many of them deferred for far too long. They are *investments* in the better and stronger America—an America of "whole men"—that must be built if we are to carry our burdens at home and in the world.

Those burdens will not be small burdens. There are, of course, the challenges we face at home.

In four years, 211 million people will live here. Half of them will be under age 25, Within ten years we will need each year, over 2 million new homes . . . thousands of schools . . . transportation systems to move goods and people . . . fresh air and light and open space . . . and art, music, literature, theatre—the things that make life more than a constant struggle for material goods.

But those tasks are nothing compared to the tasks we face in the world around us.

Can the four freedoms be realized not only in America but in the world? Skeptics might say that the odds are against us.

Today two-thirds of mankind lives in the same darkness and ignorance it has known for centuries—and the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations widens each year. At the same time these disinherited of the earth are exposed to modern communication which makes it all too clear that they are not sharing in the benefits we enjoy as a matter of course. These people are the targets of the stirrers-of-trouble and makers-of-violent revolution.

We live in a world in which there are weapons that could wipe out the Northern Hemisphere in less than a half-hour's time.

We live in a world in which large and strong nations have made it their doctrine that democratic institutions must be destroyed and small nations brought to heel with brute force.

How, in this environment, will the four freedoms ever be achieved?

We know the answer.

It is true that America is the last, best hope of earth.

It is up to *us* to lead the way toward the time when the threat of nuclear destruction does not hover above the earth.

It is up to *us* to help the small and weak nations build the fabric of strong, stable—and free—societies, in face of subversion and totalitarian threat.

We know that it is up to *us* to provide the leadership—yes, often to provide the material resources—to stimulate the strong nations of the West to a greater sharing of these tasks.

I have news for you: There will be no time ahead to relax. There will be no breathing space. No oceans can protect us. There will be no way to avoid "entangling alliances."

We are the leaders. And the responsibilities of leadership are ours to bear.

The tides of history are moving fast. We can be engulfed by those tides. Or we can use their powerful generative force. We can harness those tides to the cause of mankind—if we have the courage, if we have the perseverance, if we build the strong cohesive American society that we will need.

Will the four freedoms be achieved?

The answer was given by Franklin Roosevelt in the last words he ever wrote—words he had no chance to use in his Jefferson Day address which would have been delivered twenty-one years ago this week.

Franklin Roosevelt wrote: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

My fellow Democrats: Let us move forward.

POLISH CHRISTIAN MILLENNIUM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUSKIE AT ALLIANCE COLLEGE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last week the distinguished junior Senator from

Maine [Mr. Muskie] delivered an enlightening and inspirational speech on the observance of the Polish Christian Millennium. The address was given at Alliance College in my home State of Pennsylvania. His sense of ethnic pride can be shared by all of us who know of Poland's great contributions to Western civilization. America has been particularly fortunate in having within its citizenry so many men and women of Polish descent to enhance and broaden our cultural foundation.

The 1,000 years of Polish Christianity attest to the spirit, courage, and fortitude of a great people. Because I deem the Senator from Maine's address at Alliance College to be of interest and value to all Americans, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This Is Our Heritage

(Remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie on the Polish Millennium at Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa., May 7, 1966)

President Parcinski, Most Reverend Bishop Watson, Reverend Fathers, Reverend Sisters, Censor Dworakowski, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be here at this time, at this place, and in such distinguished company.

With you, I have enjoyed this evening up to this point.

I have enjoyed the music of Chopin, the performance of Mr. Zugcic and Mr. Aaron, and the singing of the Millennium Singers. And the folk dancing of the Kujawiaki. Dr. Parcinski, has truly been a symbol of that excellence which is the objective of Alliance College.

Now it is my task to speak, and yours to listen. I hope that we finish at the same time.

We are here because, one thousand years ago, Poland entered upon the stage of world history—and embraced Christianity.

Ever since, she has had an impressive and meaningful influence upon Western civilization.

An influence that has enriched the life of Western man.

An influence that has contributed to the development of Western political institutions and concepts.

An influence that has been exerted by Polish leaders who have been, at the same time, leaders in the Western World.

An influence that gives us reason, as Poles, on this millennium anniversary, to be proud of our heritage and what it has meant for mankind.

It is appropriate, therefore, that we should create occasions such as this to review that heritage, to take satisfaction from it, but more important, to draw meaning from it as we contemplate today's world and the unknown future.

There is much of glory in Poland's past—glory which was the product of the love of liberty, fierce independence, intense patriotism, and courage so characteristic of the Polish people.

And because of her geographic position, Poland has had ample opportunity to put these qualities to the test.

On two important occasions in a thousand years, Poland was the first line of defense against invading hordes from the East. She held her line proudly, and the eastern dreams of conquering Europe were dashed.

Every Pole remembers that in 1241, Prince Henryk Pobozny at the cost of his life forced the Mongol invaders to retreat to Asia in the battle of Legnica.

Every Pole remembers that, in 1683, Poland put an end to Turkish expansion in Europe, when the great Jan Sobieski went to the aid of Vienna, and, in a decisive battle, routed the Turks.

And no Pole will ever forget that, even under the burdens Poland has carried in this century, she has fought gallantly in the cause of freedom.

In 1920, Polish armies, led by Marshal Jozef Pilsudski, arrested the march of the Bolsheviks on Germany, and the victory, known as the "miracle on the banks of the Vistula," was credited with saving Europe from communism.

In 1939, Poland was the first to feel the military heel of the Nazis at the start of World War II.

Outmatched at the start by Germany's motorized military machine, Poland was stung 17 days later by an attack on the East front by Russia.

Alone and isolated, unable to defend herself on her homeland, she refused to play a passive role in the war.

Without delay, the Polish Army, Navy and Air Force, 80,000 strong, regrouped in France, fought at the side of France, then with the British, and later on, in Norway, North Africa, Italy, Normandy, Belgium and the Netherlands. In the famous battle of Britain in 1940, Polish airmen were responsible for 15 percent of the German air losses. Altogether, more than 300,000 Poles served with the Allied forces during the war. Meanwhile, at home, Poland built one of the strongest underground networks in Nazi-occupied Europe.

This is a valiant record for a nation which was attacked and overrun by two nations almost before the rest of the world recognized that a global war had begun.

It is the record of a nation which, for a thousand years, has never rejected the burdens of freedom. And, despite the bitter disappointments of the postwar years, the spirit of freedom has never died. The Poznan uprising of 1956 was a vivid expression of that spirit. It still burns today among Poles, both in and out of Poland, and always will.

The same qualities which brought glory on the field of battle, were the inspiration for achievement in the works of peace.

Poland's history sings of human and cultural progress.

Encouraged by centuries of reverence for individual freedom, the arts and sciences flourished.

Even a partial list is impressive:

Europe's first ministry of education resulting from the constitution of 1791;

Mikolaj Kopernik, one of Europe's outstanding scholars in the 16th century, and the father of modern astronomy;

Ludwik Zamenhoff, the inventor of the language of Esperanto;

Madame Marie-Curie-Sklodowska, world-famous for the discovery of radium;

In the field of literature, Wladyslaw Reymont and Henryk Sienkiewicz, winners of Nobel Prizes, Reymont for his novel "The Peasants," and Sienkiewicz for "Quo Vadis"; and the world renowned Jozef Conrad-Korzeniowski, author of "Lord Jim" and other novels.

In no field has the glory of Poland shone more brightly than in the field of music. Frederic Chopin is a gift to the ages. His brilliant compositions will delight the souls of men as long as music is heard. And in our times, the world has thrilled to the incomparable Paderewski, Rubinstein, Landowska, and Rodginski.

These glories are but the beginning of the Polish story.

Especially impressive have been Poland's contributions to the ideals and concepts of democracy.

In the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries, Poland was the largest and most civilized and powerful state in Central and Eastern Europe.

And the significant fact is that this achievement was built on a series of fundamental concepts of liberty:

The "Nemineh Captiuabus" in 1425 which guaranteed personal liberty of the citizens.

The "Statutes of Nieszawa" in 1454 which established a bicameral parliamentary system.

The "Nihil Novi" in 1505 which made the crown powerless to legislate without consent of the two chambers.

Beginning in 1573, election of the kings of Poland, and a new set of laws known as "Pacta Conventa" which gave citizens the right to withdraw allegiance to the king if he transgressed any law or broke any stipulation under which he was elected.

These and other concepts are striking examples of a nation's will to be free of tyranny.

It was the custom for nations seeking empires to subjugate weaker nations and to build autocratic central authority.

Not in Poland. Internally, she decentralized authority. Internationally, she sought to win the hearts of her member nations. She undertook to gain their loyalty, not by coercion, but by making them political and cultural partners.

The free union of Poland and Lithuania, concluded in 1413, is unique in the history of international relations. The treaty puts at the very basis of the union the Christian principle of love.

An attitude of tolerance and respect for local institutions, religion and language was taken by Poland toward her vassal states.

The immense dominions of the Polish crown were divided into 34 provinces, all of which enjoyed all the privileges and benefits of broadly conceived self-government.

Eventually, the degree of local independence contributed to the several partitions of Poland in the 18th century. However, she responded to the internal turmoil by writing the constitution of 1791, a remarkable document in its day. It balanced individual freedoms against the needs of the nation.

Class distinction was ended. Towns obtained administrative and judicial autonomy and parliamentary representation. Peasants were placed under the protection of law. Measures aimed at the abolition of serfdom were sanctioned.

What is there, then, in all this thousand years of history as a Christian nation which has particular pertinence to our day, to our times, and to our future?

Belief in God—yes—with a faith which relates God's will and God's justice and God's compassion to the destiny of Poles and Poland—as in that great national symbol—the black madonna.

And so Poles have believed in and fought for the dignity of man—as they have believed in and fought for the independence of Poland—and as they have believed in and fought for freedom from tyranny.

These beliefs have written our history, inspired our leaders and our people, shaped our institutions, produced our culture, our literature and our music. These beliefs are Poland—the Poland which the world knows and honors and respects—the Poland of history!—the Poland which lives in the hearts and minds of all Poles!

This is the Poland which, in the Warsaw Conference of 1573, guaranteed free worship of any religion.

This is the Poland, whose non-Jewish Poles, hid 300,000 Jews from the searching German Nazis, notwithstanding the threat of the death penalty if caught.

This is the Poland whose Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the "father of American artillery," fought for American independence and then authorized the sale of the lands given him by a grateful America, the proceeds to be used to free and educate slaves.

This is the Poland whose Kasimir Pulaski, the "father of American cavalry," died in the same cause.

This is the Poland of which my father spoke to me, at his knee, for hours on end, out of the fullness of his heart.

Increasingly, as the years passed by and my comprehension grew, he drove home his lesson. What he had lost by leaving Poland had been more than offset by what he gained—for himself and for me. Here, if a man had ability, he could apply it in a manner of his own choosing. Here, if a man had an opinion, he could express it without fear of reprisal. Here, if a man disagreed with governmental policy, he could say so, and, more than that, he could do something about it by casting his ballot at the polls. Here, a man was completely free to reap the fruits of his own integrity, intellectual and physical capacity, his own work. There were no heights toward which he could not strive. It mattered not what his national background, his religious or political beliefs, his economic status in life might be.

These beliefs were my father's life. He held them confidently through periods when he felt the lash of prejudice directed against those of foreign birth and of his creed. On the evening of my inaugural day as Governor of Maine, he turned to me and said, very simply, "Now I can die happy." A few months later the final chapter of his life was written. I am sure that, in the closing moments, he must have thought of the strange and wonderful destiny which had so astonishingly vindicated the beliefs which had uprooted his life.

In 1789, Benjamin Franklin described the America which was my father's life, and his Polish heritage when he wrote:

"God grant, that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man, may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface, and say, 'this is my country'." This is our heritage—and our unfinished task—here and around the globe.

Everyone in America is a member of a minority group. It may be economic, social, political, religious, racial, regional, or based upon national origin. It may not be such today as to set us apart in any unpleasant way. But it could tomorrow!

The character of our minority status may vary in its impact today upon our effective enjoyment of dignity, equality, security, and opportunity. It may not today constitute a disability in any of these respects. But it could tomorrow!

Our particular minority group may be joined today with others in a common cause or common prejudice or a common indifference with majority status. The accompanying power to affect the rights and privileges of minority groups not a part of the coalition is subject to abuse resulting from indifference, callousness, or deliberate intent.

Today, as a member of the current majority, the possibility, or even the actuality, of such abuse may be of no concern to us. But it could be, if our particular minority group becomes the object of tomorrow's prejudice or indifference!

To those who say—and there are such—that certain national and ethnic groups are better and more desirable as Americans than others, let us ask: "Who is to make the selection, and at what point in history, and is the selection subject to revision as the majority coalition changes?"

To those who say that there are superior and inferior citizens, depending wholly upon race, national origin, religion, or color, let us ask, "Who is to make the selection and how can you be sure what your status will be when the majority coalition takes shape?"

I am not suggesting that the case for civil liberties should be based upon fear of each other.

I am saying simply this. Our differences have made our country great. They have done so because, increasingly, creative ability, intellectual capacity, and high moral and spiritual principles, wherever found, have been allowed to seek their highest attainable level.

I am also saying this. Our differences can destroy us; and the instruments for such destruction are prejudice, fear, indifference, hatred and retaliation.

Is it better for us and our country that we seek reasons to like and trust each other? Or is it better that we seek reasons to fear each other?

In the 1860's, the Maine legislature concerned itself with the problem of inducing settlements in the unpeopled townships of the State. An agent was sent to Sweden, with instructions to make vigorous efforts to establish a Swedish colony in Maine. Within ten weeks he had brought to Maine twenty-two men, eleven women and eighteen children—including a pastor, farmers, a civil engineer, a blacksmith, two carpenters, a basket maker, a baker, a tailor and a shoemaker. They carved a home out of the wilderness of northern Maine.

New immigrants followed. Within five years the population had increased to 600 who had built a prosperous community of 130 houses, barns, two steam sawmills, one water power sawmill and the incidental business establishments. At the end of five years, 133 men applied for citizenship.

A member of the Swedish Parliament wrote to the Governor of Maine as follows: "May the young colony of the 'New Sweden' grow and flourish, not only in material strength, but even in developing their moral and intellectual faculties. And may the new population thus add to your state and to your great republic a good and healthy element of moral power from the old world, and becoming imbued with the spirit of your free institutions, reflect that spirit on their native land.

"What we have lost in the old fatherland will then not have been lost to humanity: On the contrary, the trees have only been transplanted on a fresher soil, where they will thrive better, and give richer and more abundant fruits. God bless the harvest. God bless your land."

And we are the new Poland—with a similar mission.

Civil liberty is the sunshine without which the crop will suffer. The enemy of civil liberty is prejudice. The cause of prejudice is fear—fear of the unknown, fear that there is no real basis for mutual trust and confidence, fear that those discriminated against may abuse power and authority if given the chance.

If such fears are well-founded, there is no real basis for democratic institutions. All the evidence from our national history and experience indicates that they are not well-founded. The growth of our free institutions—their effectiveness and strength—has been in direct proportion to the expansion of civil liberties and their enjoyment by greater numbers of our people of more diverse and varied backgrounds, talents, and experiences. This has been our harvest. And it has been fruitful.

The cause of civil liberties, then, is not simply that of do-gooders, or of neighbors interfering without justification in the affairs of neighbors. It is the cause of all those who are concerned that our national climate be a healthy one.

Let those who support this cause, however, avoid self-righteousness. Let us not refuse to give the trust and confidence which we ask. Faith begets faith if buttressed by an accumulation of reassuring experiences.

We have made legislative progress in this field in recent years. Some believe we have moved too fast; others that we have not moved fast enough. Without resolving that difference of opinion, I think it fair to say that we have moved ahead, that the movement has achieved constructive results, and that it gives promise of more progress.

And we should take pride as Poles, that, as we contribute to that progress, we will be enhancing an ancient Polish heritage—a heritage that was nobly expressed in 1413 in the treaty of union between Poland and Lithuania:

"May this deed be remembered forever. It is known to all that he will not attain salvation who is not sustained by the mystery of love which—radiates goodness, reconciles those in discord, unites those who quarrel, dissipates hatred, puts an end to anger, furnishes to all the food of peace, brings together the scattered, lifts up the fallen, makes rough way smooth, turns wrong into right, aids virtues, injures no one, delights in all things; he, who take refuge in its arms will find safety, and thenceforth even though insulted, will have no fear.

"Through love, laws are established, kingdoms are ruled, cities are set in order, and the welfare of the state is brought to its highest."

This is the creed of a Christian nation.

We believe it because it is right.

We believe it because we are God's children.

We know that, only when all God's children are warmed by its beneficent glow, can we hope to achieve justice, and order, and peace on earth.

PHILADELPHIA'S REVEREND SULLIVAN PREACHES SELF-HELP, NOT PROTEST

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Friday, April 15, 1966, a column by Neil Ulman entitled, "Negro Pioneer: Philadelphia's Reverend Sullivan Preaches Self-Help, Not Protest."

Rev. Leon H. Sullivan is one of the outstanding Negro leaders in Philadelphia. Indeed, he is one of our outstanding leaders regardless of his race, creed, or color. He recently received the Philadelphia Award established by Edward W. Bok, which is given every year to the individual who has done most to promote the well-being of Philadelphia. He is a splendid American citizen.

I ask unanimous consent that this short biographical article about Reverend Sullivan by Neil Ulman, entitled "Negro Pioneer: Philadelphia's Reverend Sullivan Preaches Self-Help, Not Protest," be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEGRO PIONEER—PHILADELPHIA'S REV. SULLIVAN PREACHES SELF-HELP, NOT PROTEST

(By Neil Ulman)

PHILADELPHIA.—In recent months hundreds of men have made pilgrimages from around the nation to a Baptist church at the edge of this city's Negro slum. From over 40 different cities, including such disparate spots as Little Rock, Seattle, Los Angeles, Greensboro, N.C., and White Plains, N.Y., they have come to hear a new and unusual philosophy of Negro self-help.

Preaching this rapidly spreading gospel is Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, a dreamer and doer who this week became the second Negro to receive the Philadelphia Award, this community's highest honor to a citizen, for his "outstanding leadership." Charles H. Percy, former chairman of Bell & Howell Co., Senate candidate from Illinois and one of the pilgrims, calls him "one of the ablest leaders of men I have ever met."

The essence of Rev. Sullivan's message is a concept of job training put into practice here two years ago as the Opportunities Industrialization Center, many imitators of which are now popping up across the nation. But Rev. Sullivan's vision sweeps far beyond this single concept; he envisages apartment complexes, shopping centers and banks built by corporations formed with capital from the Negro community and plowing back part of their revenues to expand the training centers in number and scope. Ultimately, he sees job training transforming relief lines into a skilled labor force.

The fulfillment of his vision, he predicts, will be the fruits of his "New Direction" in civil rights—mobilization of Negro wealth for education and production. This, he says, is the logical sequel to programs of protest, "for the salvation of the Negro lies in his ability to help himself."

Hearing the six-foot-five inch prophet of the New Direction explain how investors in two of his church-sponsored corporations can build hundred dollar stakes into equities worth tens of thousands of dollars, a listener is struck with at least skepticism if not suspicion. But when Rev. Sullivan first promised a job training center created by Negroes several years ago, few believed him. Now there are five such centers just in Philadelphia.

HOW IT STARTED

It all started after local business had bowed to Negro boycotts for jobs and asked for a supply of "qualified" Negroes. Rev. Sullivan decided the Negro community had to train the workers itself. Door to door canvassing through the Negro slums and solicitation of small businessmen raised $102,000. Appeals to local corporations brought forth $250,000 in cash and equipment. The Ford Foundation gave $200,000, the city gave a building, and the first OIC was born in February 1964 in an abandoned jailhouse. Hundreds turned out on a bitter cold day to cheer its dedication, and about 1,600 have since been trained and placed in jobs. While that number is small measured against the city's unemployed, the program has succeeded and grown where others, notably Government-sponsored efforts, have failed and died. When hundreds of applicants appeared too ill-educated for technical training in sewing, cooking, metal working, drafting, electronics repair, carpentry and other skills, OIC did not turn them away, but created a "feeder program" to train them first in basic speech, grooming, writing and arithmetic.

The key to its success, Rev. Sullivan and others believe, has been OIC's community roots. "It was important to raise some of the funds from the community, even if we could have gotten them easier from the Government or a foundation," Rev. Sullivan says. "The people have a stake in these centers, now, and they're not going to let them die." Also, as OIC keeps abreast of the latest industrial techniques to shape its courses and find jobs for its trainees, "it is establishing a dialogue between the Negro community and the white industrial community, so that Negroes can begin to communicate with the white power structure," in Rev. Sullivan's view.

Gradually, the preacher has won over the skeptics. "When Rev. Sullivan told me two years ago OIC's would spread across the country, I smiled indulgently," says one observer. Now, with programs operating in seven other cities and organized in 22 more, the doubter confesses, "I believe." Among the 22 about to begin classes in Los Angeles where representatives of several "rival" civil rights groups sit on an OIC board of directors along with local ministers and businessmen. The training center is located in the heart of Watts, and the program is hailed as the first to galvanize that divided and riot-torn community into constructive self-help.

Similarly, skeptics have doubted Rev. Sullivan's scheme for an apartment complex providing low-cost housing in North Philadelphia. But with a group of parishioners at his Zion Baptist Church putting up the initial capital and the Federal Housing Administration insuring a million dollar loan, ground has been broken and what Rev. Sullivan calls "the first of 20" apartment complexes is abuilding.

In all his projects, Rev. Sullivan places his tactical reliance on what he calls "the principle of concentration." The boycott for jobs which germinated OIC "concentrated" on one company at a time. ("Boycotting a downtown area is too diverse.") Similarly with OIC: "We had a lot of problems and not much to start with, but we concentrated it on one thing—job training," he says.

The principle of concentration also guides the newest venture—real estate development. "In every colored community there's a diamond mine of resources," Rev. Sullivan declares. He introduces a visitor to an elderly deacon who claims to have a securities portfolio of $90,000. "I've got 40 like him in the church," says Rev. Sullivan. "Forty like him. Money is no problem. People don't realize it's here because it's never been mobilized. But now we're going to show them."

The first demonstrations are the identically organized Zion Non-Profit Corp. and Zion Investment Associates, Inc., which both grew out of a church savings club. They started as an agreement in 1962 by 50 parishioners to save $10 a month each for 36 months. Soon the investment group had grown to 225 people and the funds were split. About $20,000 went to Zion Non-Profit to raise a million dollar loan. The money will create a two-building 96-unit garden apartment complex in North Philadelphia renting to middle-income families at $78 to $108 per month. The construction will also provide jobs for graduates of OIC building trades courses. When the apartment complex begins paying off its mortgage, Zion Non-Profit will begin another.

STOCK OFFERED TO PUBLIC

The rest of the investment club's funds went to capitalize Zion Investment Associates, Inc., which has already bought and operates a small North Philadelphia apartment building and plans to build a shopping center next to Zion Non-Profit's garden apartments. It has authorized shares of common stock for sale within the church and will offer shares of preferred through the church to the public. "When they refuse to rent to us now, they'll find us buying the building," comments Rev. Sullivan.

Not only is the Negro middle class participating in the development, but also anyone who can buy a $10 share of stock or save $10 a month. And it is this broad community participation in redevelopment that Rev. Sullivan holds so important. "There are times when protest may remain valid," he says, "but the real enthusiasm must be channeled into constructive action. Otherwise we'll find ourselves frustrated and no nearer to freedom of opportunity than we were 15 years ago."

When God changed self-doubting Moses' rod to a serpent and back to a rod as He gave him instructions to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, He was telling Moses to "use what you have in your hands," Rev. Sullivan believes. And this is the theme he preaches in church and which guides his economic projects. "I'm on some sort of crazy beam and I can't get off," he says. "If I'm able to succeed, it's because I'm not political. I don't want money to bind me and I don't want politics to bind me. I must be free, and then I think my people will listen to me. If I'm right inside, they'll listen."

Leon Howard Sullivan was born in poverty in Charleston, W. Va., on October 16, 1922. "In those days a Negro either studied to be a teacher or a minister, or he went to the mines and loaded coal," recalls a fellow West Virginian.

In high school the young Sullivan conducted what he thinks may have been the nation's first sit-in in a segregated Charleston lunch room. "I walked up to the counter and recited the Declaration of Independence," he recalls with a grin. "They served me."

An athletic scholarship took the youth to West Virginia State College, where he played basketball and football, was ordained a Baptist minister at the age of 17, and wrote poetry about the Negro's struggle. A torn knee ligament in his junior year ended his scholarship, and Rev. Sullivan worked a 4-to-12 shift in a steel mill to pay the rest of his way.

HELP FROM POWELL

When the Rev. (now U.S. Representative) ADAM CLAYTON POWELL travelled to West Virginia in 1942, Rev. Sullivan asked him to talk to one of the small churches he then headed and Rep. POWELL did. He also told the young preacher about New York's Union Theological Seminary, and gave Rev. Sullivan a job as an assistant pastor when he came to Union in 1943 at the age of 20.

"He was a real West Virginia mountaineer—tall and gangly and scared to death because he'd never been in the big city before," recalls Congressman POWELL. "I told him, 'You look like you never put on shoes before,' but I had faith in him. People liked him. He had a very winsome personality, and the number one thing you felt about him was his integrity. I wanted to make him a preacher—a man who wouldn't be afraid of a big crowd."

Rev. Sullivan's pulpit style is in the fiery and emotional Baptist tradition, and his emphatic shouting might surprise those who have heard only the calm, dignified tones of Rev. Sullivan the salesman explaining his economic programs. His sermons are short—10 to 15 minutes—and the themes are simple: Use what you have in your hands; set good examples for your children; clean up your language; don't waste your money on whiskey.

Even while he informs and exhorts his congregation on his economic programs, he cautions them against too much materialism: "We're on the move economically and educationally, but we must be on the move spiritually, too."

At the ground-breaking of Zion Non-Profit Corp.'s apartment complex, Rev. Sullivan told the gathered crowd: "From this day on we intend not just to get some of the crumbs—but to bake some of the bread. We do not build just for colored men, but for all men; and we shall create business not just for colored men, but for all men."

One white Southerner transplanted to the Philadelphia business community who holds little love for civil rights leaders "whipping up protest and false hopes" is spending the first years of his recent retirement as liaison man between OIC and the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce. "When all is said and done," he declares, "Leon Sullivan is going to be the man who has done the most for the Negro community. And there's not one segment of the community that won't profit by it—especially business."

HIGH SPEED RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am delighted to note that the Department of Commerce has announced today its intention to extend its demonstration program of high speed rail passenger service in New England.

This is a matter of special interest to me both because the expanded program will mean improved service for my State and also because I am proud to claim an initiating role in the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, under which these demonstration programs are being financed.

When we first contemplated the use of new high speed railroad trains to test consumer response in New England, it seemed that the only possible trackage which could be used would be the 44-mile stretch between Boston and Providence, which is straighter than most of the rest of the main line track.

Now, however, because of the adaptability of a revolutionary new experimental train being built by United Aircraft Corporate Systems Center, and because also of an assurance from the Connecticut Transportation authority that it will assist in the upkeep of trackage, the Department of Commerce has agreed to the extension of the demonstration to the entire length of the 229-mile run between Boston and New York on the New Haven Railroad.

I am most pleased with this decision since it means that the new train will serve the entire length of the State of Rhode Island, not just that portion of the State concerned with the Boston-Providence service. It will also mean that Rhode Islanders will be able to travel from Providence to New York in under 3 hours and that the whole trip from New York to Boston can be made in 3 hours and 15 minutes—a reduction of 1 hour in the fastest schedules now maintained on this run.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks today's announcement by the Department of Commerce regarding the expansion of this fine project.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. In conclusion, I should also like to take note of the fact that arrangements have now been concluded for providing comparable service on the southern end of the Northeast Corridor between Washington and New York. Arrangements have been concluded between the Department of Commerce and the Pennsylvania Railroad for the construction of 50 new high speed passenger cars to operate in this service, and yesterday the Budd Co., the winning bidder for the contract, unveiled the design for the new cars. It is expected that these cars will make the Washington to New York run in just under 3 hours and that service will begin sometime in 1967.

Both segments of this program offer vast improvement over present service and therefore should offer a real new choice to consumers of transportation services in our crowded megalopolis. I am indeed pleased at these positive manifestations of progress on the concept which I initiated 4 years ago this month.

EXHIBIT 1

AGREEMENT OPENS WAY FOR RAIL PASSENGER DEMONSTRATION BETWEEN NEW YORK, BOSTON

Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor said today that agreement has been reached with the State of Connecticut on the possibility of extending a rail passenger service demonstration project to reach all the way from Boston to New York.

The project originally had been scheduled to run only from Boston to Providence, but Secretary Connor said later developments offered hope that travel time could be reduced sufficiently to obtain a satisfactory test of improved service.

The Secretary said the developments were:

A new self-banking suspension system which if it meets engineering expectations, will allow faster speeds on curves, and

The Connecticut Transportation Authority's decision to commit $500,000 to the project which will permit necessary upgrading of the railroad bed and signalling along the New Haven line west of Providence.

Secretary Connor notified Connecticut Governor John H. Dempsey by letter of the Department of Commerce's willingness to cooperate in a one-year test of passenger response to faster, improved, and more comfortable service on the 229-mile Boston-New York run.

The Secretary's letter said the Department's commitment was "subject to the requirement that trains can be operated between those points, meeting standards of passenger comfort, in the maximum elapsed time of three hours and fifteen minutes."

(The New Haven line's fastest trains now schedule the New York-Boston run for 4 hours and 15 minutes.)

Secretary Connor's letter noted a recently approved demonstration of the Pennsylvania Railroad for the 226 miles between Washington and New York would offer regular demonstration passenger service at the maximum time of 3 hours.

"We believe," he added, "that similarly reduced elapsed times for operation between New York and Boston are necessary to obtain a satisfactory test of the future demand for rail passenger service."

Equipment for the New York-Boston demonstration already is on order. The Department awarded a $2.1 million contract to United Aircraft Corporation's Systems Center, Farmington, Connecticut, last January to provide on a leasing basis gas-turbine propelled trains for the Boston-Providence demonstration.

Secretary Connor said this equipment, due for delivery late this year, could be used on the New York-Boston run. It is made up of two train sets of three articulated cars each, and could be added to if response should warrant it.

AFL-CIO SUPPORTS BILL TO MAKE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM PERMANENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Thursday hearings were held on my legislation to make the special milk program for schoolchildren permanent. I am delighted to be able to report to the Senate that the AFL-CIO submitted a statement in support of this legislation.

The AFL-CIO's statement is a masterpiece of succinctness. As it points out, the administration's proposal to cut the school milk program "means that local school boards must either charge students more for their milk, or institute means tests to segregate out the neediest children, or eliminate the program entirely. None of these is a realistic alternative."

The statement then goes on to indicate that a price increase in school milk, which would, of course, result from a slash in the special milk program, caused an 18-percent drop in milk consumption in a wealthy suburban area. Other studies in other areas show a decrease in participation of from 15 to 40 percent when prices rise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement submitted by the AFL-CIO be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION, MARKETING, AND STABILIZATION OF PRICES, SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, ON S. 2921, MAY 11, 1966

The AFL-CIO wishes to express its support for S. 2921 introduced by Senator PROXMIRE to provide a special milk program for school children.

We are fully in accord with the purposes of the bill, and we support the authorizations of $110,000,000 for fiscal 1967, $125,000,000 for fiscal 1968 and $120,000,000 for 1969 and thereafter.

We are indeed pleased that the House of Representatives has restored to the 1967 Agriculture Department appropriation funds to equal the 1966 fiscal year appropriation of $103 million for the school lunch program, but we also feel that making this program permanent and boosting the appropriation to more meaningful levels is necessary.

We strongly believe that to cut funds for these programs inevitably means that local school boards must either charge students more for their milk, or institute means tests to segregate out the neediest children, or eliminate the program entirely. None of these is a realistic alternative in our view.

To increase the price of milk to the school children inevitably cuts down the participation in the program. In Jefferson County, Colorado, one of the nation's wealthier suburban areas, an increase in the price of milk from 2 cents to 3 cents resulted in a drop of 18 percent in milk consumption on a per pupil basis. Other studies in other communities show a range of 15 to 40 percent decrease in participation with rising prices.

Without wishing to belabor the point, we simply want to stress our belief that providing milk for school children is one of the best ways of improving the nation's health. We urge the committee to report the bill favorably and we hope it will be promptly enacted into law.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 9 OF THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Assembly Resolution No. 9 of the California State Legislature regarding Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION No. 9

Adopted in Assembly April 12, 1966.

______,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Adopted in Senate April 11, 1966.

______,
Secretary of the Senate.

This resolution was received by the Secretary of State this __ day of ______, 1966, at __ o'clock __m.

______,
Assistant Secretary of State.

CHAPTER —

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9—Relative to the continuation of the financial assistance provided to local school districts under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, of the 81st Congress

WHEREAS, Activities of the federal government and related military, industrial, commercial and scientific operations are conducted on an immense and increasing scale within the State of California, have involved the removal from local tax rolls of substantial amounts of otherwise taxable property, and have cast upon local governmental agencies the burden and responsibility of providing governmental services for large and increasing numbers of people employed and otherwise involved in those undertakings, all to a degree perhaps unparalleled anywhere else in this nation; and

WHEREAS, The impact and burden of these federal activities and related undertakings are nowhere more keenly felt than in the many school districts which have been called upon to provide educational services for the thousands of children who are dependents of persons who are employed in or otherwise associated with these operations, and with respect to whom little or no local tax support or fiscal subvention is available to the agencies conducting the schools; and

WHEREAS, The Congress of the United States has long recognized the special burdens so imposed upon local educational agencies and has provided substantial financial subventions therefor through legislation embodied in Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, as from time to time amended; and

WHEREAS, In a considerable number of school districts in this state the impact of these federal and related activities is so pronounced that any substantial reduction in the subventions afforded under these federal laws would confront the districts, as well as the state itself, with a major fiscal crisis in financing the continued operation of the public schools involved; and

WHEREAS, The question of whether or not the subventions being afforded under Public Laws 874 and 815 should be continued is before the Congress, and it is of the utmost importance to major segments of the public school system in California that the subventions be continued at undiminished rates; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the vitally needed programs of assistance provided for in Public Laws 874 and 815; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of California in the Congress of the United States.

______,
Speaker of the Assembly.

______,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

______,
Secretary of State.

NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, today is the 152d anniversary of Norwegian Independence Day, May 17, 1842. It was 152 years ago today that a representative assembly of Norwegians convened at Eidsvoll, about 35 miles northeast of the present capital of Oslo, to declare their independence from Sweden and adopt a constitution patterned after the democratic models of the United States and France.

This Constitution has served and guided the people of Norway in developing their democratic institutions certainly as well as that which our forefathers developed for us in 1789. It drew heavily upon the legal traditions of Scandinavia as well as the philosophy of European liberalism prevalent at the time; the same liberal philosophy, I might add, which was witnessed earlier in America through the pens of Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson and manifested itself in our own Declaration of Independence in 1776. The Constitution divided the Government into three branches similar to our own, the executive headed by the King, the legislative, and the judicial. Their constitutional monarchy allowed for national independence, popular sovereignty, and the inviolable rights of the individual against the state.

It was from this Constitution that the Norwegian people have developed their love of democratic institutions and their faith in the dignity of all men and the credibility of international peace.

It is appropriate that the Senate should recognize Norwegian Independence Day because Norway has in no small way affected the development of our own country.

Her greatest contribution, of course, has come from the thousands upon thousands of immigrants who came to our shores in the past century to carve a life and create a civilization out of the American frontier. The Norwegian influence has been especially great in the upper midwest area of the Dakotas, Minnesota, and Montana. In this land of temperate climate, rugged terrain, and sparkling lakes, the Norwegian immigrant found an environment almost identical to his native land and it was only natural that he chose to settle here. The saga of that historic era in American history has been told lucidly by Ole Rolvaag, the father of the current Governor of Minnesota, in his book "Giants of the Earth" and also by Hamlin Garland in his "A Son of the Middle Border."

Both books tell how the dauntless and indefatigable Norwegians challenged the raw frontier, met it in the crucible of the prairie wilderness and tamed it to their will so that its land now feeds half the world and its iron, coal, and timber provide the energy for countless forms of industry.

Today Norwegians have taken their rightful place among the melting pot of America and contribute to the welfare of our Government from the halls of Congress to the local city council and from Main Street to Madison Avenue.

In addition to the direct influence of Norwegian culture upon our land, Norway is perhaps best known on the international front for its unwavering dedication to the causes of world peace by working through the United Nations.

Norway has provided leadership through their great world statesman, Trygve Lie, former Secretary General of the United Nations. He knew the United Nations could never be a perfect instrument of world peace but he dedicated himself to making it work as best as possible. Without his guidance in those early years of development the United Nations might today have already crumbled and vanished like its predecessor.

Mr. President, the support of Norway for the principle of international law and world peace is perhaps nowhere best exemplified than in the troops she has committed to the United Nations special Peace Forces along the Gaza strip, the Suez, Congo, and Korea. The sons of Norwegian families have given their lives in the U.N. peacekeeping efforts to stop these brush fire wars which could have raged out of control had there not been an international agency to stop them. Certainly Norway can be proud of its contribution in this field.

As Norway looks back today over 152 years of independence, she can be proud of her people and her culture. She has truly won the right to be called a leader in the cause of mankind.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAMS, OF DELAWARE, TO THE 14TH ANNUAL REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CONFERENCE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Senators of both parties have a profound respect for the courage and integrity of the junior Senator from Delaware. He has been correctly termed the Senate's watchdog and he is known as a man of forthright candor. This candor was evidenced in a speech he delivered at the 14th annual Republican Women's Conference at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington.

The well researched and heavily documented speech dealt not surprisingly with certain criticisms of the administration, criticisms which were both well founded and sincerely made. And he pointed out the "candidates on the Democratic ticket openly boast to their constituents that if elected their close association with the administration will get more contracts for the State than would be possible if a member of the minority were elected. This is political blackmail. In effect, it is reducing congressional representatives to bagmen and if their claim is true, it means that the Secretary of Defense is not only acting improperly in assigning these contracts, but he is in actual violation of the law which provides that all Government contracts are to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.

Senator Williams' speech goes on to trace the cause and effects of inflation, the war in Vietnam, and the antipoverty scandals that have received too little attention in the Nation's press.

I ask, Mr. President, that Senator Williams' speech, delivered on the 5th day of May 1966, be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, at the 14th Annual Republican Women's Conference at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

Greetings to the most powerful political group in America—The American Women.

I make this statement not in any sense of idle flattery but rather as a statement of fact.

Where in America would you find a group more interested or more sensitive to our foreign policy than the wife or a mother of a man assigned to the foreign battlefields?

Where in America will you find a group more concerned with the problems of inflation than the housewife who buys the family supplies?

Where in America can you find a group more aware of the need for a balanced budget than the housewife who plans the family budget and makes the necessary allocation between a necessity and a luxury?

Yes—where in America can you find any group more concerned with the question of morality and integrity than the mother who is training the child?

The women of America are a powerful political force, and they are on the march.

They recognize that we have a great country and that it will remain a great country as long as the citizens of America take an active interest in their Government.

Our forefathers in creating this Government went to great lengths to protect their rights by establishing a series of checks and balances.

They divided our Government into three branches—the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judiciary—each branch to serve as a check on the other; but foreseeing the day when the three branches may be overwhelmingly controlled by one political party or dominated by one ambitious leader they reserved to themselves one final check—the ballot. Each two years as voters we have an opportunity to change completely one branch of Congress and can in effect take control of the Senate and the United States Government.

We are approaching another election. The Administration today with its top-heavy majority in both the House and the Senate is in effect using the Congress as a rubber stamp to approve edicts from the White House.

Congress is not functioning as check on the Executive Branch.

That is why the 1966 Congressional elections are so important, not just to the Republican Party but to our country as a whole.

We desperately need a more effective minority in Congress—one that can slow down the socialistic trend of this Great Society and at least let the American people have a chance to examine these programs and get the truth as to their costs.

Speaking in the Senate last January I referred to the President's endorsement of legislation on Truth in Packaging and Truth in Lending and suggested that what we needed just as much was a policy of "Truth in Government."

Today the American people are not being told the truth by this Administration, nor is Congress being consulted and advised either on domestic or foreign policy as it has a right to expect from the White House.

Never in our history has there been so much distrust by the American people of their own leaders in Government.

Any Administration controlling the expenditures of over $100 billion annually can wield a tremendous power over American industry and the lives of all citizens, and when we consider that the Defense Department alone spends over $50 billion annually—80% of which is spent under negotiated contracts—you can see the potential abuse of power.

Most of our major corporations are engaged in some type of defense work and with the Secretary of Defense having the power to negotiate, or to refuse to negotiate contracts with a particular company, or the power to assign contracts to a particular state it in effect gives him and the Administration he serves life and death control over an industry or an area.

This has reached the point where now candidates on the Democratic ticket openly boast to their constituents that if elected their close association with the Administration will get more contracts for the state than would be possible if a member of the minority were elected. This is political blackmail. In effect it is reducing Congressional representatives to bagmen, and if their claim is true it means that the Secretary of Defense is not only acting improperly in assigning these contracts but he is in actual violation of the law. The Law specifically provides that all government contracts are to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.

As an example of the danger of this power being abused I refer to the President's crackdown on the steel industry, the aluminum industry, the copper industry, and the farmers in which cases he threatened to control prices by dumping government inventories. There is no provision in the law to authorize the President to use our stockpiles to regulate and control prices.

Jaw-bone price controls without legislative authority are already in effect in this country, but in the face of continued excessive government spending the effects are but momentary. Inflation is rapidly becoming a real danger.

Both the American people and the Congress have been misinformed as to the expenditures of this Administration. Let us review their comments on a balanced budget.

On January 21, 1964, President Johnson, in his first State of the Union message to Congress, said:

"My proposals call for administrative budget expenditures in 1965 of $97.9 billion—$900 million less than requested in the 1964 budget * * * This marks an important first step toward a balanced budget."

This statement was headlined throughout the country as a great step toward economy.

The deficit for that same fiscal year was $6.281 billion, or more than $500 million a month.

The following year, on January 4, 1965, President Johnson, in his State of the Union message, said:

"We will continue along the path toward a balanced budget in a balanced economy."

Some more headlines with Johnson as the Great Economizer. The deficit for fiscal 1966 is estimated at $6.4 billion still over $500 million per month.

On January 24, 1966, the President in his budget message said:

"The overall deficit in the Administration's budget is $1.8 billion, sharply lower than in 1966 and the smallest deficit in 7 years, despite the added costs we are incurring in Southeast Asia. . . . On a consolidated cash basis—which is the most comprehensive measure of budget totals—the 1967 budget will show a surplus of $500 million."

That is another deliberately misleading statement.

Our projected deficit for fiscal 1967 as measured between expenditures and our normal income is over $9 billion. The $1.8 billion figure is arrived at only by counting as normal income the $1½ billion profit the Government will get as a result of reducing the silver content in our coins, plus the $4½ billion extra money that will be collected in fiscal '67 by virtue of accelerating the dates for payment of corporation taxes, plus receipts from the sale of some of our assets, such as F.N.M.A. notes and sales from our defense stockpile.

But the $7.4 billion raised by these three methods are strictly one-shot operations and should not be treated as normal income.

Without this budget juggling the true deficit for fiscal 1967 would be over $9 billion.

Furthermore, for the President to refer to the cash budget as having a surplus in 1967 is even more misleading. To arrive at that conclusion he has counted as normal revenue all collections for the various trust funds—social security taxes, the railroad retirement fund, the medicare tax, the civil service retirement fund, etc.

These are all trust funds, and under the law they cannot be used by any President to defray the normal expenditures of the Government.

If the president of any American corporation were ever to make such a misleading claim to its stockholders the S.E.C. would have him in court tomorrow.

During the 1964 campaign the Administration made a great effort to pin the war label on Barry Goldwater. But can you name one military proposal that Goldwater made that has not been accepted and carried out by the President?

By the way, let me deny one rumor—President Johnson has not asked Goldwater to act as his personal military advisor, or at least not yet.

Just how did we get involved in Viet Nam?

When President Kennedy was elected in 1960 the United States had about 750 military personnel serving as advisers in Viet Nam.

There were only 16,000 military personnel in Viet Nam at the end of 1963 when L.B.J. became President. Today we have over 250,000 troops committed in that area. Before becoming President Mr. Johnson had been quoted as saying he would never agree to the engagement of American troops in a land war in Asia. During the 1964 campaign he accused Goldwater of being a trigger-happy warmonger for proposing some of the same military steps that he took immediately after the ballots were counted.

I am not a military man and am passing no judgment on the wisdom of these decisions; but why were Goldwater's suggestions denounced so viciously during the campaign and then after the election adopted by President Johnson?

Why did Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, early in 1964 promise that the American boys would be home by Christmas when they knew conditions in that area were rapidly deteriorating?

Why have the American people not been told the truth about the seriousness of the situation in Southeast Asia?

On May 13, 1964, Secretary McNamara speaking from Saigon reported:

"Excellent progress . . . the plans we laid out in March, if they are consistently followed up, will work effectively."

When this statement was made Senator STENNIS, the Chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, issued a warning that these were overoptimistic statements and said that more men would be needed in the coming months. He warned that unless the Defense Department recognized this danger and began proper preparations, serious shortages in munitions and supplies would develop. Shortages have developed. We are now rationing bombs and other military supplies. Why did the Administration fool the American people? Was the election of any public official more important than the life of an American boy?

To show just how bad the Administration allowed the situation to deteriorate in Viet Nam during the campaign months I quote Secretary McNamara's statement on November 20, 1964, just 2 weeks *after the elections.* This statement was in response to a newsman's request to interview General Maxwell Taylor, former Ambassador to Viet Nam.

"It would be impossible for Max to talk to these people without leaving the impression that the situation is going to hell."

President Johnson is most anxious to date this Viet Nam conflict back as an Eisenhower commitment. Let us check the record.

To settle that question I quote General Taylor's testimony earlier this year before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"Senator HICKENLOOPER. The point I am getting at is this: We hear so much nowadays the fact that this active militant military action in South Vietnam is a continuing action since about 1954. Now, up until and including 1965, let's say at the end of the Eisenhower Administration, we had about 750 military personnel in South Vietnam, did we not?

"General TAYLOR. It was very small, something like that.

"Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think that is within 25 or 30 of the number, either way, and they were entirely devoted to giving technical advice from training programs to the South Vietnamese troops.

"General TAYLOR. That is correct. That was the period when the French were still there and were giving the tactical training.

"Senator HICKENLOOPER. To your knowledge, did we have any commitment or agreement with the South Vietnamese up to that time, that we would put in active field military forces to conduct a war along with them?

"General TAYLOR. No, sir. Very clearly we made no such commitment. We didn't want such a commitment. This was the last thing we had in mind.

"Senator HICKENLOOPER. When was the commitment made for us to actively participate in the military operations of the war as American personnel?

"General TAYLOR. We, insofar as the use of our combat ground forces are concerned, that took place, of course, only in the spring of 1965. . . .

"Senator HICKENLOOPER. I really want to fix this in point of time, because of the fact we hear so much about this is only carrying out a commitment we made back in 1954 and that our troops are in there as a follow-up of that commitment."

Now, let us examine this presidential greed for power.

The President has asked for standby authority to raise or lower taxes. Just imagine what this embraces. With this dictatorial power any President could blackjack American industry into supporting his policies.

But what makes this bureaucratic suggestion even more attractive to the Great Society bureaucrats is that by this method the Administration could avoid raising taxes until after the 1966 Congressional elections and still be ready to trigger the tax increase into effect early in January 1967.

The question is asked, "Will there be another tax increase in 1967?" The answer is clear. With the Johnson administration operating with a deficit of over $6 billion annually and still determined not to cut back on any of the Great Society welfare programs and with a war in Viet Nam costing over $10 billion annually you have your own answer. Certainly if the Administration continues to refuse to cut spending it will have to raise taxes, and when I say cut spending I mean really cut spending and not just make a grandstand play of turning the lights out so that the American people cannot see what is happening.

Furthermore, do not forget that in the past 75 years no Democratic President has ever left the White House without a higher tax rate in effect than when he took office.

History shows that on only three occasions since 1900 has our national budget been balanced while a Democratic President controlled the government—and Johnson is the greatest spender of them all.

Let us turn the lights back on in the White House for a moment and examine a few of the spending ideas of this Great Society.

On December 2, 1965, President Johnson announced a plan to eliminate 25,000 government jobs. The plan as outlined in a press conference at Houston, Texas, stated that he had instructed the heads of all government departments and agencies to reduce their employment by 1% to 1¼% by the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1966. Once again the press hailed Johnson as the great economizer.

But a report issued by the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures on April 30, 1966, shows:

	Employment	Increase over previous month
December	2,550,742	2,819
January 1966	2,555,572	4,830
February	2,580,518	24,946
March	2,610,780	30,262

This represents an addition of 62,857 who have been added in the four months since the President's December pledge of a 25,000 reduction.

Figuring the Government on a five-day forty-hour workweek this means that instead of reducing employment since his December statement, they have increased it at the rate of 15,000 per month, or 8 every 5 minutes—almost 2 per minute.

Based on this 4-month average the Administration added 15 new employees to the public payroll while the President was holding his ten-minute television conference bragging of the cutback.

Let us examine a few of the fancy but expensive ideas of this Great Society.

$15,000 for some Norwegian psychiatrists to determine the reason for the geographical movement to Norway of mentally unstable persons.

$40,000 for some Australian scientists to discover why Australian aborigines sweat the way they do.

$102,900 has been hidden in the 1966 Defense Department budget that has been allocated for reconditioning the Presidential yacht, the *Honey Fitz,* after it had been put into mothballs a couple of years ago with a lot of ballyhoo about economizing.

And a $94,500 grant to an Oregon school to be used to take 200 students on a six-week trip to visit scenic spots to study such things as alpine botany and lava beds. The lecturers for the class are Walter Reuther and Martin Luther King, to be paid $850 each per lecture.

It has been said that Lon Chaney won fame as "the man of a thousand faces." In view of the many contradictions Lyndon Johnson may go down in history as "the one-man Mount Rushmore."

Poverty Program: A $230,000 grant was made to a Community Action Committee in New York. A breakdown of its first expenditures shows that the directors took a weekend junket to the Adirondacks. The cost of this trip was $2,168.26, which included the cost of an elaborate cocktail party described as being for the purpose of "getting acquainted with each other."

Among the items on their expense account were included $257.75 for cameras and film and $165.60 to replace a stolen camera, $350 for catering service to an open-house, plus another $63.20 for flowers for the ladies. $12.85 is listed in one case to cover the rental of a tuxedo.

A dozen lines hidden in a routine salary increase bill would give two members of the Great Society a 40% increase in their retirement benefits. One man would have had his pension raised from $19,212 to $27,648 annually.

Who says that the poverty program is not being a success—at least for the hierarchy of the Great Society?

To deceive the American people further as to some of the waste and bureaucratic mismanagement, the Administration has now launched a determined effort to throttle future criticism by the G.A.O.

Administration supporters in a recent committee report practically ordered the Comptroller General to tone down his criticism of agency mismanagement and to stop naming the officials responsible because of the embarrassment it was causing.

Why? What are they trying to cover up?

As an example of this operation coverup I quote from the testimony of Mr. David Bell, the Director of our A. I. D. program, before the Foreign Relations Committee:

"Senator AIKEN. I have just one more question which does affect your territory. That is, Why is it that when the General Accounting Office makes a report on mismanagement of an AID program, that all the vital parts of that report are stamped secret?

"Mr. BELL. I am delighted to answer that, sir, because that is not so about the economic assistance program. All of the economic assistance program report, every one without exception so far as I am aware, is an open report and can be published."

That statement was made on television before a nationwide audience.

Not withstanding this clear statement another Comptroller General's report was sent to the Foreign Relations Committee again with a confidential or secret classification. This G. A. O. report was a devastating document outlining a glaring waste and mishandling in the distribution of food in a South American country under Public Law 480 programs. To prevent its release to the public the State Department has classified this document as secret and confidential.

The Foreign Relations Committee noting Mr. Bell's clear promise that such documents would not be classified, unanimously adopted a motion asking Mr. Bell, Director of the AID program, to remove the classification of this document in order that it could be released to the Congress and the public. In his reply on March 4, 1966, Mr. Bell refused to declassify this report. With specific reference to the Comptroller General's report in question Mr. Bell stated that it "makes disclosures of such a sensitive political nature that not only was its classification deemed necessary by the GAO and the concerned agencies, but also its distribution was severely limited to minimize the possibility that its existence might become public knowledge."

I have read this report, and there is nothing contained therein which would in any way jeopardize the security of the United States of America. There is much in the report, however, that would jeopardize the security of some public officials who have approved the improper, if not actually illegal, distribution of these food products which were intended to be distributed as aid to the people in that country.

What we need is more—not less—truth in government.

What is the Great Society anyway? Why was it given this name?

"Great Society" is the trade name of an administration that has become recognized as the most extravagant spending, high-taxing, and high-handed group every to occupy the White House.

The Great Society is a place where the President wants every child to have a good breakfast and then proposes to take away his school lunch.

The Great Society is a place where LBJ wants to do away with the serving of school milk as an economy move but insists on a $750,000 mansion where HUBERT HUMPHREY can serve champagne to visitors.

The Great Society is a place where the Government tells cattlemen to develop more foreign markets and as soon as it has done so, slaps export quotas on cattle hides.

The Great Society is a place where Lady Bird crusades against billboards while LBJ orders that a billboard with his name be erected on every federal building construction site.

The Great Society is a place where LBJ opposes deception in packaging but practices deception in his federal budget package.

The Great Society is a place where they want lenders to state the full cost of credit but believe the public has no right to know the full cost of federal loans and grants.

The Great Society is a place where it is believed that everyone has the right to a job but that no one should have the right to work.

The Great Society is a place where a steel mill sold to Red China is not considered a strategic item for war.

The Great Society is a place where they plant flowers along the freeways while ignoring crime in the streets.

The Great Society claims it is against inflation but is for more spending, where Government sets up guidelines for business but uses pipelines to speed the flow of government funds out of Washington.

The Great Society is a place where communism must be opposed militarily 10,000 miles away but where U.S. funds go to Cuban colleges 90 miles from Florida.

The Great Society is a place where you cut taxes one year to aid prosperity and raise taxes the next year for the same purpose.

The Great Society is a place where tourists are discouraged from going abroad while the Government sends thousands of U.S. officials overseas, where the President calls for curtailment of private investment abroad while shoveling foreign aid funds into foreign economies.

The Great Society is a place where the only criticism you hear of a corrupt public official is when he allows himself to get caught.

Never has there been a time when it is more important to have a strong and more effective minority party.

Not only is it important to elect more Republicans, but since we are a minority party it is even more important that those already elected work harder and demonstrate that they have the courage to stand up in opposition to some of the radical ideas of this Great Society.

It is time that we forget our disagreements and emphasize those points upon which we can all agree. Certainly all Republicans can agree on these five important points:

1. Corrupt Government is on the increase, and unless it is checked by an alert electorate and an independent Congress it can undermine and destroy our American Democracy.

2. The big lie is being used through massive public relations to deceive the public and the Congress, to stifle opposition, and to try to gain questionable support for their programs.

3. An overwhelming Democrat majority in the Congress makes it difficult and in many instances impossible for Republicans and conscientious Democrats to serve as a check on the arrogant actions of the Executive Branch.

4. Only a substantial increase in the Republican strength in the House and Senate will make it possible for Congress to exert itself as an independent check on the arrogance, mismanagement, and corruption now so prevalent in the nation's capital.

Yes, every American citizen should be willing to stand up and be counted for honest government, fiscal integrity, and the right of both Congress and the people to know the truth.

Let's go out and win in 1966 and 1968.

THE GRANGE ON INFLATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Executive Committee on the National Grange, meeting here April 28, adopted a position on inflation control which is a sound and constructive contribution to discussion of this pressing subject.

The Grange opposes, as I have opposed, selective controls on farm prices and proposes measures of greater equity for the economy as a whole.

The Grange statement merits careful consideration, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSITION OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE ON INFLATION

(Statement by the Executive Committee of the National Grange, Apr. 28, 1966)

The Grange has been and continues to be concerned about the possibility of inflation. However, the Executive Committee of the National Grange points out that farmers are in no way responsible for the inflation. Either end of the cyclical economic fluctuations, whether depression or inflation, traditionally has a more devastating effect on agriculture than on any other segment of our economy. Farmers, at present, are least able among all the working people, to bear the results of this inflation.

The prospect of inflation is causing great concern to the Grange today because of the threat of higher costs of production and the attempts to hold down farm prices as a means of price control to the consumers.

Farm costs continue to climb, but farm prices have declined since 1952. All attempts to bring agricultural income up to parity have failed because of the inability of farm prices to follow the steady increase of costs. Some specific examples indicate this trend.

The failure of the market to return to the producer sufficient price and income incentives to match increasing costs has led to a shortage in manufactured dairy products which also threatens the adequate supply of fluid milk. The action taken to lift restrictions on cheese imports further reduces the possibility of farmers receiving sufficient return to give them incentives to increase their production. The result of this action will be the increasing shortage of milk and the ultimate reliance upon an undependable foreign supply for the manufactured milk products necessary to meet our domestic demand.

Composite farm wage rates rose from the 1960–1964 average of $0.783 to $0.945 on April 1, 1965—an increase of $0.162 or 20 percent—which is reflected in index figures of 126 and 138 for that period.

Land values have increased partly as a result of nonfarm money being invested in agricultural land as a hedge.

The index numbers of average value of land per acre increased nationally from 111 in 1960 to 139 in March 1965 for an increase of 25 per cent with additional 10 per cent increases being reported by some states for the past year.

The information on farm indebtedness is particularly disturbing. Total farm debt (excluding CCC loans) in 1960 was $23,674 million, in 1965 it had increased by 52 per cent to $35,932 million and predictions for 1966 indicate a level of $39,400 million or a 66 per cent increase since 1960 and an increase of 11 per cent in the last year.

Interest paid increased from $1,342 million in 1960 to $1,964 in 1965—up 47 percent—and it is predicted to be $2,617 million in 1966—up 95 per cent from 1960 and up 33 per cent in one year.

Not only has the volume of loans and interest paid increased, but the rate has increased 7.3 per cent since 1960 with Federal Land Bank and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation rates increasing 11 per cent while the cost of interest on long term government loans has increased by only 5 per cent.

While prices received by farmers this year were still 6 per cent below prices received in 1952—the last year farmers achieved parity with the rest of the economy—retail food prices in March 1966 were 16 per cent above 1952 and prices paid by farmers were 15 per cent above 1952. While farm prices have reached only 82 per cent of parity, the percentage of disposable income required for food and the farmer's share of the food dollar are at the lowest points in history.

While food prices were increasing by 8 per cent from 1959 to 1964, nonfarm per capita income increased by 11 per cent. In 1964, per capita farm income was $1,381, and nonfarm income was $2,246.

Despite seasonal increases during the past few months, which have now halted and turned downward, the consumer still has a distinct economic advantage over the producer of food and fiber.

Furthermore, attempts to control inflation by selective price rollbacks at the farm level have not eliminated price rises to the consumers.

The Grange recommends that, in any effort to control or contain present inflationary trends, priority should be given to reverse the actions taken during the past few years which were designed to stimulate the economy. This would include reducing investment credit, dropping depreciation rates and slowing down Federally-sponsored construction programs.

In case these methods fail, the second line of attack should be one which will place the burden on the widest possible basis which probably should be a tax increase. This method should be used only after other measures to reduce the available money supply on consumer goods and to stimulate the production of goods in short supply have been taken.

Increases in interest rates represent the harshest method of price controls and should be used with great restraint.

Direct price controls should be used only as a last resort and only after a state of war has been declared.

No price controls, either direct or indirect, should be used to prevent farm prices reaching parity. Government payments should be counted as a part of income in determining parity for crops which share in the benefits of government farm programs.

CCC Sales should be permitted within the intent of the present law. As stocks of feed grain are reduced, and as livestock prices decline, care should be taken to prevent an undue release of feed grains which will lead to an over-production of livestock, especially pork.

Agricultural commodities not under government programs should be allowed to recover previous losses due to the cyclical fluctuations of the market before any direct or indirect controls are applied or the government should be prepared to alleviate the distress caused by the low points in the pricing cycles.

The sacrifice which farmers have made to bring supply into a reasonable relationship to demand should not be cancelled out by increase in planting allotments until there is a reasonable prospect for a similar increase in a profitable cash market, including requirements to meet the U.S. commitment for the War on Hunger.

Failure to reduce or contain farm costs will lead to higher consumer costs or further decline in net farm income, thus delaying the realization of a parity of farm income. Farmers do not want an advantage. They only ask for a return for their contribution to meeting the critical needs of the public which represents a fair relationship to those returns received for similar factors of production in the rest of our economy.

Economic logic based on fairness and justice should be the criterion. Decisions based on political expedience and public acceptance should be discouraged.

A wise, prudent, and just fiscal policy of restraint should prevent the necessity of imposing the harsh and unpopular fiscal policies of control.

The Grange pledges its cooperation and support for such programs.

PAUL DOUGLAS, PEOPLE'S SENATOR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I share with many of my colleagues a tremendous respect and admiration for Senator Paul Douglas.

No Member of this body can be more accurately characterized as the people's Senator.

His position as the most distinguished economist in Congress is unquestioned.

Paul Douglas led the hard and lonely fight for equal rights for all Americans long before the Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

His friends have been the disenfranchised, the weak, and the poor. His only foes are those who have sought special interest and special favor before the bar of government.

Paul Douglas has been a man at whom no one could point the finger of accusation in his personal and political actions. He has always been righteous but never self-righteous.

Recently two articles appeared in the Chicago American and Chicago Daily News, describing Paul Douglas' own willingness to disclose his entire financial picture. These articles indicate conclusively that Paul Douglas is beholden to no group and, above all, treasures his public office as a public trust.

I ask unanimous consent to insert these articles in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago American, Apr. 29, 1966]

Douglas Discloses His 1965 Income Tax: $5,007

(By Robert Gruenberg)

Washington.—Senator Douglas paid the internal revenue service $5,007 on a taxable income of $22,020 in 1965.

His total income was $35,537, but deductions and exemptions totaling $13,517 brought the taxable portion down to $22,020.

The Illinois Democrat is gathering detailed figures, to be made public soon, to explain his income and tax.

Publicizing these figures has become a regular practice for the Senator in the last 3 years.

The current move probably will arouse the resentment of some of his Senate colleagues.

Douglas, with his New England background and his emphasis over the years on economy and ethics in government [he wrote a book about it in 1953], has projected an image which invites the hostility of his more affluent, free-spending colleagues.

SHAKEN BY DODD CASE

They are becoming more sensitive and shaken over developments in the case of Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut.

Dodd is the object of a Senate ethics committee investigation over charges that he received more than $100,000 from three fund-raising dinners and used the money for personal expenses.

It had been widely believed that the events were for the purpose of gathering campaign money.

In justification, a number of senators have pointed out that it is becoming increasingly difficult to make ends meet on a senator's salary of $30,000 annually.

DOUGLAS TELLS VIEW

In Washington, which can be a city of high costs—especially if you're a senator—extra sources of income are necessary, it was indicated.

Asked about this, Senator Douglas said:

"I lived on $30,000 a year without a subsidy. I lived on $22,500 a year without a subsidy, and on $15,000 a year without one."

The last two figures are the previous salaries of senators before they were raised.

Douglas did enjoy extra income, he acknowledged—but it did not come from "testimonial dinners." It came from numerous rounds of lecturing, the former Chicago alderman and university professor explained.

EXPLAINS FEE POLICY

As his senatorial income increased, however, his lecturing decreased, he said. Even while on the lecture circuit, he would not accept fees from special interest groups who might seek his help on legislation beneficial to their cause.

He did accept fees, he said, from university groups, citizens forums, and other relatively nonpartisan groups.

Douglas recalled that once he accepted a fee from the Union League club.

"I felt the Union League club should support good Republicans, so I turned around and gave the fee to [Senators] Wayne Morse, George Aiken, and Charles Tobey," Douglas laughed. Morse of Oregon is a former Republican, and Aiken of Vermont is a "progessive" Republican, as was the late Senator Tobey of New Hampshire, who died in 1953.

Douglas said his campaign monies are handled by two committees. One is an independent citizens committee, which receives contributions and pays many of his expenses.

"It is completely insulated," he said, "from my [personal] expenses. No money is given to me for my personal expenses."

His second campaign fund is one on which he makes a report to the secretary of the Senate after each election.

The 1960 report showed Douglas received $31,027 in contributions, and spent $30,830. The difference, $196, went towards a post-election dinner held for 165 of his most active campaign aids.

LIMIT ON GIFTS

Douglas has a rule prohibiting acceptance—by himself or his staff—of gifts valued at more than $2.50. It is an arbitrary figure which, he joked, "is not going up because of inflation."

Douglas' 1965 income consisted of $29,948 in senatorial salary and $2,270 from an annuity, for a total of $32,218. To this was added $8,050 in other income, for a total of $40,268.

However, $4,731 in "adjustments" and "reimbursements" to this amount—for travel, communications, stationery and rental of his Chicago office—brought the total down to $35,537. Included in the $8,050 is income from "other sources" where items ranging from $3,025 for lectures, to $18.82 in royalties on his book, "Ethics in Government."

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 30, 1966]

Douglas Willingly Shows His Records

(By Charles Nicodemus)

Washington.—His wife does her own washing, gardening and other housework, without help from a maid.

They drive a 1960 Chevrolet.

At home, they entertain little, read a lot, and try to get to bed early.

Until this year, he owned three suits ". . . until my wife and staff made me buy four more, so I wouldn't be among the nation's 10 worst-dressed men."

If none of that sounds like the gay, glamorous high life that many voters seem to believe a U.S. Senator lives, that's too bad, says Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat of Illinois.

"I live within my $30,000-a-year Senate income—with just a little extra from lectures and investments," says Illinois' senior senator.

"And if I didn't live the way I do, I couldn't stay within that income."

The question of whether a U.S. senator can really live on the money the public pays him has become a hot issue in this town, since the disclosure of the problems of Senator Thomas Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, and his personal use of what may or may not have been campaign funds, without paying taxes on them.

Dodd is said, by his staff, to have raised nearly $200,000 since 1961 through 'testimonial' dinners that his aides insist were not campaign functions. Instead, it is contended, they were affairs given to help Dodd raise cash to meet the burdensome expenses of life as a senator.

Those expenses—for travel, entertainment and other political necessities—far exceed Dodd's salary, his staff says.

Like most senators—particularly the Democrats—Douglas is disinclined to sit in judgment, or comment directly on, the problems of his good friend, Tom Dodd.

But he does stress three points that are in sharp contrast to Dodd's position:

1. "I've never raised a penny for my own, personal use—through 'testimonial dinners' or any other device. I have enough trouble raising campaign money, let alone cash for anything else."

2. "I live on my salary and I always have. It's not easy, but it can be done."

3. "My finances are an open book. I've always preached that the public has a right to know the sources of income of their elected representatives."

Some Senators, like DODD, admit that they can't live on $30,000 a year and still live as they would like. Many have substantial outside sources of income.

Others say they do live on $30,000 a year—but refuse to discuss details of their private finances, particularly with inquiring newsmen trying to check out reports that a senator has sizable, unpublicized investments in, or income from, industries that come under his legislative purview.

But not DOUGLAS.

He meets inquiries by pulling out his income tax forms, his ledger books, his contribution lists, and saying, "Here it all is."

Among his expenses are:

$4,051 for entertainment. That includes lunches and an occasional breakfast with visiting constituents, open houses and receptions at his office suite, giving out ball point pens.

"Mrs. Douglas (former Congresswoman Emily Taft Douglas) and I do almost no entertaining at home," he explains.

$3,211 for travel to and from Illinois, and $3,000 for expenses during such trips. DOUGLAS rents a six-room apartment at 5658 S. Blackstone, for $180 a month, subletting five rooms to his Chicago aid, Douglas Anderson, and keeping one room for his personal use.

$3,500 for sending out his regularly broadcast senatorial reports, over radio and television.

$5,007 in income taxes, $800 in District of Columbia taxes, and $250 in personal property taxes paid in Chicago.,

$516 for memberships and subscriptions, $2,722 for contributions to charity and similar causes, and $1,600 in political contributions.

"Public servants are always being tapped by charities—particularly by churches," he notes. "I'd like to do more, but I can't." As for political contributions, "you have to do a lot more in a general election year—like 1964.

"I give to local Chicago and Illinois candidates, mostly."

$1,368 in annual payments on his $9,000 mortgage.

DOUGLAS lives in a tasteful but modest three-bedroom stone house in an upper-middle class section of Northwest Washington.

The house cost $28,000 when he had it built in 1955—plus $7,000 for the land, $8,000 for a swimming pool and other extras, and $10,000 for 1½ adjoining lots he also bought up.

"I got the down payment by selling another, older house I had in the District, which had a $20,000 mortgage.

"I got the money for the pool by cashing in a life insurance policy—and that pool has been the best life insurance I have. It keeps me healthy."

All those expenses total more than $26,000 a year.

Balanced against that is income of $30,000 from the Senate, about $3,000 a year from lectures ("I had to speak more when my Senate salary was less"), $1,500 from bond and stock investments, and $3,300 from two annuities.

That totals $37,500.

"So I guess I have about $10,000 a year to meet normal living expenses," DOUGLAS estimates.

"It doesn't make for high living," he concedes. "But it's a satisfying life—one I don't hesitate to give the details of."

Few other Senators—and no others from Illinois—have ever made similar disclosures.

LEGALITY OF U.S. POSITION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the May 1966 issue of the American Bar Association Journal there is published an article entitled "The Legality of the U.S. Position in Vietnam," written by Eberhard P. Deutsch, chairman of the American Bar Association Committee on Peace and Law Through the United Nations.

Mr. President, this article is the most learned and scholarly I have seen on this subject. It expresses very well, I believe, the background on the basis of which the American Bar Association's House of Delegates adopted unanimously a resolution at its midwinter meeting in Chicago last February, to the effect that the United States is legally in Vietnam.

Mr. Deutsch shows that the points made in the article are supported by 31 outstanding professors of international law at the leading law schools throughout the country.

I believe that anyone who has any doubts on this particular subject will find it very illuminating to read the article, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Bar Association Journal, May 1966]

THE LEGALITY OF THE UNITED STATES POSITION IN VIETNAM

(By Eberhard P. Deutsch, Chairman of the American Bar Association Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations)

By the Geneva Accords of 1954, the commanders in chief of the French Union Forces in Indochina, on the one hand, and of the People's Army of Vietnam, on the other, established the 17th parallel as the military demarcation line between North and South Vietnam, with a demilitarized zone on each side of the line. They stipulated that the armed forces of each party were to respect the demilitarized zone and the territory of the other zone, and that neither zone was to be used "for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy".[1] The accords additionally provided for the creation of an International Commission, composed of India (chairman), Poland and Canada, to supervise the agreements.[2]

In 1962 the International Commission reported, with approval, findings of its Legal Committee to the effect that "there is evidence to show that arms, armed and unarmed personnel, munitions and other supplies have been sent from the Zone in the North to the Zone in the South with the objective of supporting, organizing and carrying out hostile activities, including armed attacks, directed against the Armed Forces and Administration of the Zone in the South", and that the People's Army of Vietnam "has allowed the Zone in the North to be used for inciting, encouraging and supporting hostile activities in the Zone in the South aimed at the overthrow of the Administration in the South".[3]

The evidence further demonstrates that the aggression by North Vietnam against South Vietnam (the Republic of Vietnam) had been going on unabashedly since the signing of the Geneva Accords and that North Vietnam had consistently violated those accords from their inception. An official State Department report recites:

"While negotiating an end to the Indochina War at Geneva in 1954, the Communists were making plans to take over all former French territory in Southeast Asia. When Viet-Nam was partitioned, thousands of carefully selected party members were ordered to remain in place in the South and keep their secret apparatus intact to help promote Hanoi's cause. Arms and ammunition were stored away for future use."[4]

It is important to bear in mind that neither the Republic of (South) Vietnam nor the United States is a party to the Geneva Accords, and that while the United States participated in the discussions leading up to the accords, it did not sign the final declaration. However, during the last plenary session of the Geneva Conference on July 21, 1954, Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, head of the United States delegation, said in an official statement that his Government "would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security".[5]

On September 8, 1954, just a few weeks after the Geneva Accords were executed, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense (SEATO) Treaty was signed. Parties to it were the United States, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines. The United States Senate ratified the treaty on February 1, 1955, by a vote of 82 to 1.[6] It took effect on February 19, 1955.[7]

Paragraph 1 of Article IV of the SEATO Treaty provides that each party thereto "recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area [8] against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes" [9] By a protocol to the treaty executed on the same day, the parties "unanimously designate[d] for the purposes of Article IV * * * the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam".[10]

---

[1] Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam, IC/42/Rev. 2, July 20, 1954 (the first of the Geneva Accords. The others, not immediately relevant, dealt with Laos and Cambodia respectively), Art. 19.

[2] *Id.*, Chap. VI, Arts. 29, 34 *et seq.*

[3] *Special Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet Nam,* Saigon, June 2, 1962, para. 9; reprinted in *Hearings Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. 2793,* 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 736 (1966), hereinafter cited as *Hearings.* The Polish delegation dissented.

[4] *Aggression from the North,* 52 DEP'T STATE BULL. 404, 424 (1965).

[5] 31 DEP'T STATE BULL. 162–163 (1954).

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1060.

[7] 6 U.S.T. & O.I.A. 81, T.I.A.S. No. 3170. The treaty is reproduced in 101 CONG. REC. 1049 (1955) and in STAFF OF SENATE COMM. ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, 89th CONG., 2D SESS., BACKGROUND INFORMATION RELATING TO SOUTHEAST ASIA AND VIETNAM 70–74 (Comm. Print 1966).

[8] Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific, Article VIII.

[9] Execution of the treaty by the United States was "with the understanding that its recognition of the effect of aggression and armed attack and its agreement with reference thereto in Article IV, paragraph 1, apply only to communist aggression . . .". *Supra* note 7, signatory clause.

[10] The protocol is annexed to the treaty.

The SEATO Treaty was made by the parties in a reiteration of "the faith in the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations",[11] nothing in which, according to Article 52 thereof, "precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action . . .". Article 53 of the charter provides that "no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council . . .". These two articles are at the head of Chapter VIII.

The preceding chapter (VII) deals with "Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression". The first twelve articles (39 to 50, inclusive) of that chapter prescribe the measures to be taken by the Security Council to meet "any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression". By the last article (51) of that chapter, it is stipulated expressly that "nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security".

It was clearly with these provisions of Articles 51 and 52 of the Charter of the United Nations in mind that, in Article IV of the SEATO Treaty, each party thereto agreed that it would "act to meet the common danger" in the event of "aggression by means of armed attack [anywhere] in the treaty area" (Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific). "Enforcement action" is clearly action to enforce decisions of the Security Council under Articles 39 to 50 of Chapter VII of the charter. Equally clearly, "enforcement action" does not include measures of "individual or collective self-defense". So that when Article 53 of the charter provides that "no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements . . . without the authorization of the Security Council", it does not refer to such measures of "self-defense" as are contemplated under the SEATO treaty, particularly in light of the explicit recital of Article 51 of the charter that "nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense".

DECLARATION STATES PURPOSE OF AGREEMENT

The "Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference", issued on July 21, 1954, the same day on which the Geneva Accords were signed, states:

"The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Viet Nam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." [12]

It was by no means contemplated, however, that there was to be no ultimate partition of Vietnam. On the contrary, the very next article (7) of the final declaration provided expressly that the political problems of "independence, unity and territorial integrity" were to be determined by free elections, internationally supervised. That article reads "that, so far as Viet-Nam is concerned, the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot . . . under the supervision of an international commission . . .".[13]

It will be recalled that by the protocol to the SEATO Treaty, South Vietnam ("the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Viet Nam") was promised protection as such under the treaty. Reference has since been made to South Vietnam as a "protocol state".[14]

In addition to the reference in the contemporaneous protocol to the SEATO Treaty to "the State of Viet Nam", the Republic of (South) Vietnam "has been recognized as a separate international entity by approximately sixty governments around the world. It has been admitted as a member of several of the specialized agencies of the United Nations. In 1957, the General Assembly voted to recommend South Viet Nam for membership in the United Nations, and its admission was frustrated only by the veto of the Soviet Union in the Security Council." [15]

The right of self-defense under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations is expressed to be unimpaired "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations", and it has been asserted by opponents of United States' policy in Vietnam that this amounts to explicit denial of such a right in the event of attacks against nonmembers of the United Nations. A thesis that members of the United Nations are not permitted to participate in collective self-defense to repel aggression, on the ground that the aggrieved nation is not a member of the United Nations, can hardly be supported on its face, in reason, logic or law.[16] Would proponents of this doctrine suggest that members of the United Nations would have no right to assist Switzerland in self-defense against a foreign invader?

But the right of self-defense has always existed independently of the charter,[17] and that right is recognized expressly in Article 51. It is quite obvious that the charter merely confirms, as to members of the United Nations, the innate right of self-defense appertaining to both members and nonmembers. Article 51 expressly retains, unimpaired, the "inherent" right of both individual and collective self-defense, thus implicitly recognizing the independent existence of the right of members to come to the aid of nonmembers in collective self-defense against aggression, or attack "to maintain international peace and security"— the very first purpose of the United Nations itself, as stated in the charter.[18]

On August 7, 1964, the Congress adopted, by a vote of 88 to 2 in the Senate and 416 to 0 in the House,[19] the Joint Southeast Asia Resolution, in which the preambular clauses recite that "naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace": "these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression" against the South Vietnamese "and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom".

The resolution then states "that the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression"; that "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance in international peace and security in Southeast Asia"; and that "consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocal state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." [20]

In an address delivered at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, on April 4, 1959, President Eisenhower declared that his administration had reached "the inescapable conclusion that our own national interests demand some help from us in sustaining in Viet Nam the morale . . . and the military strength necessary to its continued existence in freedom".[21] In a letter of December 14, 1961, to the President of the Republic of Vietnam, President Kennedy, recalling that the Communist regime of North Vietnam had "violated the provisions of the Geneva Accords . . . to which they bound themselves in 1954" and that "at that time, the United States, although not a party to the Accords, declared that it 'would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security' ", assured him that "in accordance with that declaration, and in response to your request, we are prepared to help the Republic of Viet Nam . . . to preserve its independence".[22]

In President Johnson's message of August 5, 1964, to Congress, reporting the Communist attacks on United States naval vessels in the international waters of the Gulf of Tonkin, he said:

". . . The North Vietnamese regime has constantly sought to take over South Vietnam and Laos. This Communist regime has violated the Geneva accords for Vietnam. It has systematically conducted a campaign of subversion, which includes the direction, training, and supply of personnel and arms for the conduct of guerrilla warfare in South Vietnamese territory. . . . Our military and economic assistance to South Vietnam and Laos in particular has the purpose of helping these countries to repel aggression and strengthen their independence. The threat to the free nations of southeast Asia has long been clear".[23]

---

[11] Prefatory clause.

[12] IC/43/Rev. 2, July 21, 1954; reprinted in BACKGROUND INFORMATION, *supra* note 7, page 66.

[13] Because of the North Vietnamese aggression against South Vietnam, the contemplated elections were never held: "A nationwide election in these circumstances would have been a travesty." Memorandum, *The Legality of United States Participation in the Defense of Viet Nam*, Department of State, Office of the Legal Adviser, March 4, 1966, page 33.

[14] See, for example, *Hearings* 463–465 and Joint Southeast Asia Resolution, 78 Stat. 384, approved August 10, 1964.

[15] Memorandum, *supra* note 13, page 12. See also *Vietnamese-United States Relations*, a joint statement issued at Washington by the President of the United States and the President of Viet Nam, May 11, 1957, White House Press Release. 36 DEP'T STATE BULL. 851–852 (1957).

[16] The principle that members of the United Nations are legally entitled to participate in collective self-defense of nonmembers is sustained by leading authorities on international law. BOWETT, SELF-DEFENSE IN INTERNATIONAL LAW 193–195 (1958); KELSEN, THE LAW OF THE UNITED NATIONS 793 (1950).

[17] OPPENHEIM, INTERNATIONAL LAW, 297 *et seq.* (8th (Lauterpacht) ed. 1955); JESSUP, A MODERN LAW OF NATIONS 163 *et seq.* (1948).

[18] See footnote 16, *supra*.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 14, pp. 18470–18471, 18555.

[20] 78 Stat. 384, approved August 10, 1964.

[21] 40 DEP'T STATE BULL. 579–581 (1959).

[22] 46 DEP'T STATE BULL. 13–14 (1962).

The Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam questions whether President Johnson's deployment of United States forces to Vietnam can "be squared with our Constitution * * * for, contrary to widely held assumptions, the power to make and conduct foreign policy is not vested exclusively in the President, but is divided between him and Congress * * *".[24] In his message of August 5, 1964, to the Congress, President Johnson went on to say unequivocally that "as President of the United States I have concluded that I should now ask the Congress on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom." And the President forthrightly requested that Congress adopt "a resolution expressing the support of the Congress for all necessary action to protect our armed forces * * * and to defend freedom and preserve peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the obligations of the United States under the Southeast Asia Treaty."

Two days later, on August 7, in response to this message from the President, Congress adopted the resolution quoted above, and on August 10 the President signed it as Public Law 88–408.[25]

Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which provides that "nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense", requires that "measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council * * *". That the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was made under and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Article 51, is evidenced by the provision of paragraph 1 of Article IV of the treaty (by which each party agreed to participate in defending acts of aggression in the treaty area), that "measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations".

On August 5, 1954, Adlai E. Stevenson, United States Representative to the United Nations and the Security Council, advised the council formally of two "deliberate armed attacks" by North Vietnamese torpedo boats against a naval unit of the United States on the high seas. He declared that "these wanton acts of violence and destruction" were simply part of "the sabotage of the international machinery established to keep the peace by the Geneva agreements—and the deliberate, systematic and flagrant violations of those agreements by two regimes which signed them and which by all tenets of decency, law and civilized practice are bound by their provisions", all of which, he said, "fit into the larger pattern of what has been going on in Southeast Asia for the past decade and a half".

Ambassador Stevenson assured the Security Council that "we are in Southeast Asia to help our friends preserve their own opportunity to be free of imported terror [and] alien assassination, managed by the North Viet-Nam Communists based in Hanoi and backed by the Chinese Communists from Peiping". He affirmed solemnly "that the deployments of additional U.S. forces to Southeast Asis are designed solely to deter further aggression".[26]

On February 7, 1965, Ambassador Stevenson, by a letter to the President of the Security Council, informed that body of "attacks by the Viet Cong, which operates under the military orders of North Vietnamese authorities in Hanoi". He said the attacks were part of an over-all plan "to make war against the legitimate government of South Viet-Nam" in "violation of international law and the Geneva Accords of 1954". He stated also that, as required by paragraph 2 of Article IV of the Southeast Asia Treaty, the United States and Vietnamese Governments had consulted immediately and had agreed that it had become "necessary to take prompt defensive action" to resist "this continuing aggression". He reported further that the "counter measures . . . are a justified measure of self-defense" and that he was "reporting the measures which we have taken in accordance with our public commitment to assist the Republic of Viet-Nam against aggression from the North".[27]

Of particular interest at this point is the reiterated assertion by the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam, phrased variously throughout its submission, that "only the Security Council . . . is authorized to determine the existence of any . . . act of aggression and . . . the measures to be taken to maintain or restore international peace".[28] To the statements quoted above, which were made by Ambassador Stevenson in his letter of February 7, 1965, he added significantly: "We deeply regret that the Hanoi regime, in its statement of August 8, 1964, which was circulated in Security Council Document S–5888, explicitly denied the right of the Security Council to examine this problem."[29]

Less than three weeks later, in another letter to the President of the Security Council, Ambassador Stevenson transmitted to that body an extensive State Department report entitled *Aggression from the North: The Record of North Viet-Nam's Campaign To Conquer South Viet-Nam,* the facts recited in which, Ambassador Stevenson submitted, "make it unmistakably clear that the character of that conflict is an aggressive war of conquest waged against a neighbor—and make nonsense of the cynical allegation that this is simply an indigenous insurrection".[30]

Innumerable other reports, both formal and informal, were made to the Security Council by the representatives of the United States at the United Nations; and there was even one by President Johnson on July 28, 1965, bespeaking the continued efforts of Secretary General U Thant to find a solution of the Vietnamese problem through the United Nations. In the last of these reports available as this article is written—two letters of January 31, 1966, from Ambassador Goldberg to the President of the Security Council—it is requested "that an urgent meeting of the Council be called promptly to consider the situation in Viet Nam". A draft resolution, calling "for immediate discussions without preconditions . . . among the appropriate interested governments . . . looking toward the application of the Geneva accords . . . and the establishment of a durable peace in Southeast Asia", was transmitted with the second of these letters for consideration by the council.[31]

"We are firmly convinced", said Ambassador Goldberg, "that in light of its obligations under the Charter to maintain international peace and security . . . the Council should address itself urgently and positively to this situation and exert its most vigorous endeavors and its immense prestige to finding a prompt solution to it."[32] Despite all prior, and this formal, urgent submission of the Vietnamese problem to the Security Council, it has never taken any action of any kind looking toward the restoration of international peace and security to Southeast Asia. Neither has the council expressed the slightest criticism of any action taken by the United States in the SEATO area.[33]

In its memorandum in opposition to the policy of the United States, the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam asserts that "the conduct of the U.S. Government in Viet Nam appears plainly to violate the terms of the Geneva Accords".[34] While the United States is not a party to the accords, it did by contemporaneous unilateral declaration agree, in effect, to respect them. But, as demonstrated above, the Geneva Accords since their inception have been violated continuously by the Hanoi regime. It is an accepted principle of international law that a material breach of a treaty by one of the parties thereto dissolves the obligations of the other parties, at least to the extent of withholding compliance until the defaulting party purges its breach.[35]

---

[23] 51 Dep't State Bull. 261–263 (1964).

[24] *Hearings,* Appendix 704–705.

[25] *Supra* note 20.

[26] 51 Dep't State Bull. 272–274 *passim* (1964).

[27] 52 Dep't State Bull. 240–241 *passim* (1965).

[28] *Hearings,* Appendix 695.

[29] In a letter of July 30, 1965, from Arthur J. Goldberg, who succeeded Amassador Stevenson as our Representative to the United Nations and the Security Council, to the President of the Security Council, he repeated, in substance, this statement. Ambassador Goldberg said: "It is especially unfortunate that the regime in Hanoi . . . has denied the competence of the United Nations to concern itself with this dispute in any manner, and has even refused to participate in the discussions in the Council." United States Mission to the United Nations, Press Release 4610, July 30, 1965.

[30] 52 Dep't State Bull. 403, 419 (1965). It is interesting to compare this statement by Ambassador Stevenson with the assertion of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam that "Ho Chi Minh can compare his position in demanding union of Vietnam with that of Lincoln, when Britain and France were threatening to intervene to assure the independence of the Confederacy". *Hearings,* Appendix 692.

[31] United States Mission to the United Nations Press Releases 4798 and 4799, January 31, 1966.

[32] Id., No. 4798.

[33] Memorandum, *supra* note 13, page 20. On February 2, 1966, the Security Council did put the Vietnam question on its agenda at the request of the United States. The vote was nine in favor (Argentina, China, Japan, Jordan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay); two against (Bulgaria and the Soviet Union); four abstentions (France, Mali, Nigeria and Uganda).

Ambassadors Fedorenko of the Soviet Union and Tarabanov of Bulgaria stated that their governments "supported the position of" North Vietnam "that the question be settled within the Geneva Accords", and the former added that the United States "was trying to throttle the struggle of the people of South Vietnam for freedom and independence". Ambassador Seydoux of France insisted that the United Nations "was not the proper framework for achieving a peaceful solution".

No further action has been taken by the Security Council, but by a letter of February 26, 1966, the president of the council advised its members that the differences of opinion among them as to the problem of Vietnam had "given rise to a general feeling that it would be inopportune for the Council to hold further debate at this time", but "that the Council, having decided on February 2 to place on its agenda the item contained in the letter of January 31 from the Permanent Representative of the United States, remained seized of the problem of Viet-Nam." UN Monthly Chronicle, March, 1966, pages 3–10 *passim.*

[34] *Hearings,* Appendix 702.

It has been suggested that because the power to declare war is vested by the Constitution in the Congress alone, the deployment of United States forces to Vietnam by the President, without a formal Congressional declaration of war, violates the constitutional fiat. When the phrasing of this clause of the Constitution was being considered at the convention in 1787, its original form, vesting in Congress the power to "make" war, was changed to give it the power to "declare" war, "leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks"—"he should be able to repel and not to commence war" and "to 'conduct' it which was an Executive function".[36]

The President is, under section 2 of article II of the Constitution, the "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States". Throughout the history of the United States, he has been deemed to have authority to deploy the country's military forces to trouble spots around the world, frequently in combat. The Department of State has a record of some 125 such instances.[37]

In the last analysis, however, the exercise of the President's power as Commander in Chief in deploying forces of the United States to Southeast Asia for the defense of the Republic of Vietnam has the repeated sanction of the Senate, as well as of the Congress as a whole, so that, although the situation now seems unquestionably to constitute war in its technical sense, a formal Congressional verbal declaration of war as such could not conceivably be essential to clothe the President's conduct with constitutional validity. This Congressional sanction has been evidenced by overwhelming majorities in the Senate's approval of the SEATO Treaty, in the adoption of the Joint Congressional Southeast Asia resolution of August 10, 1964, and in the passage of the appropriations necessary to carry on the defensive actions undertaken by the Executive.

First, as to the treaty. In it (paragraph 1, Article IV) each of the parties "recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against" any of them or against the "free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Viet-nam" (protocol) "would endanger its own peace and safety".

The "treaty area", under Article VIII, includes "the general area of the Southwest Pacific not . . . north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude". The United States has historically owned tremendously important and valuable strategic territorial interests in that area. Aside from its trusteeship over the Mariana (except Guam), Marshall and Caroline Islands, the United States owns Guam, Wake and the Samoan group. And yet the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam has asserted that "SEATO is not a regional agency within the letter or spirit of the UN Charter", because "Articles 51 and 53 . . . envisaged regional systems which historically and geographically developed into a regional community—not contemplating a regional system which fused . . . Southeast Asia with a country of the North American Continent"—"separated by oceans and thousands of miles from South East Asia".[38]

In the cited paragraph of the treaty, the United States agreed that in the event of aggression in the treaty area it would "act to meet the common danger". In recommending ratification of the treaty to the Senate, its Foreign Relations Committee reported that "the committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that the acceptance of these obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests."[39] The Senate ratified the treaty on February 1, 1955, by a vote of 82 to 1.[40]

In light of all of the foregoing, it seems difficult to find anything in the nature of an adequate foundation for the *ipse dixit* of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Viet Nam that "the 'Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty'—connecting the United States with Southeast Asia, architectured by Secretary of State Dulles, is a legalistic artificial formulation to circumvent the fundamental limitations placed by the United Nations Charter on unilateral actions by individual members".[41]

Undoubtedly the clearest and most unequivocal Congressional sanction of the President's deployment of United States forces for the defense of South Vietnam is contained in the Joint Southeast Asia resolution of August 10, 1964, reciting expressly "that the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression", and that the United States is "prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom".[42]

The Lawyers' Committee on American Policy Toward Viet Nam quotes a passage from an article in the *Washington Daily News* of June 4, 1965, by Richard Starnes, read into the Congressional Record by Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska, which states that the joint resolution was "passed in the fever of indignation that followed" the Gulf of Tonkin attacks, and then, again as their own *ipse dixit*, assert that "there is no evidence that Congress thought or understood that it was declaring war".[43]

This statement is simply incorrect. When the President sent his message to Congress on August 5, 1964, recommending passage of "a resolution expressing the support of Congress for all necessary action to protect our Armed Forces and to assist nations covered by the SEATO Treaty", he stated explicitly that he "should now ask the Congress on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom".[44]

In the course of a colloquy on the floor of the Senate on August 6, 1964, between Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky and Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee which recommended passage of the resolution,[45] the following discussion (excerpts) took place:

"Senator Cooper. Are we now [by this resolution] giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Viet-nam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

"Senator Fulbright. I think that is correct.

"Senator Cooper. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead us into war, we would give that authority by this resolution?

"Senator Fulbright. That is the way I would interpret it".[46]

Senator Morse himself called the resolution "a predated declaration of war",[47] which would, somewhat enigmatically, give "to the President what I honestly and sincerely believe is an unconstitutional power . . . to make war without a declaration of war".[48] The enigma in this puzzling concept seems to arise from the rather simple and logical hypothesis that the function of a legislative "declaration of war" is to authorize the executive "to make war". Since, by Senator Morse's own statement, the resolution authorizes the President "to make war", it surely has the same legal effect as a Congressional "declaration of war" *in haec verba* would have had.[49]

Actually, while two or three members of the Senate expressed doubt as to whether the resolution was intended to go as far as it did, there was no real question about it. Senator Morse himself made extended speeches against it, repeatedly warning his colleagues as to its dire import, in such words as that it "does go beyond the inherent authority of the President to act in the self-defense of our country and does vest in him authority to proceed to carry out a campaign that amounts in fact to the waging of war".[50]

In the course of a recent debate on the floor of the Senate on a bill for an appropriation in support of the military forces in Vietnam, Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, Chairman of the Armed Forces Committee, said:

"I knew that the joint resolution conferred a vast grant of power upon the President. It is written in terms that are not capable of misinterpretation, and about which it is difficult to become confused. * * * The language could not have been drawn more clearly. Personally, I would be ashamed to say that I did not realize what I was voting for when I voted for that joint resolution. It is only one page in length. It is clear. It is explicit. It contains a very great grant of power."[51]

During the hearings on that appropriation bill before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 18, 1966, Senator Morse asked Secretary of State Rusk whether he thought that the vote on the Southeast Asia Resolution "would have been the same if my colleagues in the Senate had contemplated that it might lead to 200,000 or 400,000 or 600,000 American troops in South Viet

---

[35] 2 Oppenheim, *op. cit. supra* note, 17, at 136, 137. See draft Article 42 of the Law of Treaties by the International Law Commission in the report of its fifteenth session, May 6 to July 12, 1963. U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 18th Sess., Supp. No. 9, (A/5509).

[36] 2 Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention 318–319.

[37] See *State Department Position Paper* prepared for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, November 19, 1965, Background Information, *supra* note 7, at 254.

[38] *Hearings*, Appendix 693.

[39] S. Rep., 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 15 (1955). Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, as a member of the committee, concurred in this report.

[40] *Supra* note 6. The negative vote was that of Senator William Langer of North Dakota. Senator Morse voted for ratification of the treaty on the floor of the Senate where he stated, after ratification of the treaty, that "there is no doubt in my mind that the treaty is in conformity with the United Nations Charter". Congressional Record, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1060.

[41] *Hearings*, Appendix 693.

[42] *Supra* note 20.

[43] *Hearings*, Appendix 710.

[44] 51 Dep't State Bull. 261–263 (1964).

[45] S. Rep., 88th Cong., 2d Sess. (1964).

[46] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18409.

[47] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18427.

[48] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18443.

[49] "When I use a word", Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean,—neither more nor less." Carroll, Through the Looking-Glass.

[50] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18443.

[51] Congressional Record, p. 4370 (1966).

Nam?" The Secretary replied: "I doubt very much that the vote would be substantially different."

In response to that, Senator Morse commented that there would be "a chance next week to find out. * * * I intend to offer [a rescission resolution] as an amendment to the pending business in the Senate."[52] On March 1 Senator Morse offered his amendment to the military appropriation bill, to provide that the "'Joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia' * * * is hereby repealed".[53]

To avoid any question as to the effect and meaning of a vote on his amendment, Senator Morse himself declared that it "would be a vote to make clear to the President that those who vote for the amendment disapprove of the continuation of the exercise of the power he has been exercising under the Tonkin Bay resolution".[54] Senator Russell said "that the defeat of the proposal of the Senator from Oregon by the Members of the Senate . . . will leave the original joint resolution . . . unimpaired, in full strength and vigor, and with Congress, except for two Members of the Senate who voted against the 1964 resolution, solemnly and solidly behind the President in the steps that he has taken in southeast Asia".[55]

After full debate, Senator Mansfield of Montana, the majority leader, moved to table Senator Morse's amendment, and the motion was carried, 92 to 5.[56] After some further discussion, Senator Russell moved for passage of the appropriation bill, and his motion carried by a vote of 93 to 2.[57]

One of the best means available to the Congress for the control of executive action is through the power of the purse—the ultimate necessity of Congressional action for appropriations to provide funds to carry out executive functions. As stated by Senator Morse during the hearings on the military appropriation bill, "a vote on this pending piece of business in the Senate really is a vote as to whether or not we are going to continue to support this program, because the only check, one of the best checks we have, is to say we are not going to finance it".[58] As stated, the bill was passed in the Senate by a vote of 93 to 2. The vote in the House was 392 to 4.[59]

The legal authority of the President of the United States to conduct the present war, for "the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia", which, as the Congress declared in its 1964 resolution, "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace", is surely sustained amply by the composite impact of that resolution, the terms of the SEATO Treaty ratified by the Senate and the appropriations made by the Congress to support the military actions in the treaty area.

That the memorandum of the Lawyers Committee on American policy Towards Vietnam is grounded on an emotional attitude opposed to United States policy, rather than on law, is not only demonstrated by a look at the facts, but is emphasized by the memorandum's concluding paragraph:

"Should we not, twenty years after President Roosevelt's hopeful dream—twenty years after the advent of the nuclear age with the awesome potentiality of incineration of our planet and the annihilation of our civilization and the culture of millenia—Should we not 'spell the end of the system of unilateral action . . . that has been tried for centuries—and has always failed'?"[60]

Contrasted with the tone and substance of that memorandum is the temperate statement of thirty-one professors of international law from leading law schools throughout the United States, which recites simply that they "wish to affirm that the presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam at the request of the Government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of U.S. forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression."[61]

Contrasted also with the tone and temper of the memorandum of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam is the simple resolution adopted unanimously on February 21, 1966, by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association on the joint recommendation of its Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations and its Section of International and Comparative Law.[62] The resolution is supported by a brief report, which concludes "that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the South-East Asia Treaty".[63]

These conclusions as to the legality of the presence of the United States forces in Vietnam under the Constitution of the United States, as a question of domestic law, are those of the author. They were not included in the opinion of the thirty-one professors of international law or in the resolution of the American Bar Association.

WEATHER MODIFICATION—S. 2916

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Executive Office of the President has just released the Interdepartmental Committee for Atmospheric Sciences Report No. 10. ICAS continually reviews the state of the atmospheric sciences programs and makes recommendations.

The Committee on Commerce has been studying the subject of weather modification for several months. A Library of Congress report on weather modification was recently issued by the committee. Last week I introduced an amended version of S. 2916 to establish a weather modification program. I expect agency comment on this amended bill in the near future. The committee will then be in a position to report a bill.

So that all will be aware of the ICAS position, I ask unanimous consent that the weather modification recommendations from ICAS Report No. 10 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Weather Modification

A year ago ICAS recommended that (a) a well planned, intensive investigation of the physical processes of or orographic precipitation should be undertaken, (b) the Weather Bureau should conduct research and if feasible carry on practical work in weather modification, (c) new programs should in no way impair the continued growth of the programs of basic and background research in weather modification primarily under the aegis of the National Science Foundation, and (d) NSF should develop a comprehensive national plan for weather modification. Additional specific recommendations for NSF and FAA planning action (without budgetary implications) were made initiating the development of national plans for research in hail suppression and fog dispersal.

These recommendations have been reflected in the current budget proposals for the weather modification programs of (a) the Department of the Interior (Bureau of Reclamation) FY 1967—$3.20 million and FY 1966—$2.98 million, (b) the Department of Commerce (Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA) FY 1967—$1.55 million up from FY 1966—$.65 million, and (c) the National Science Foundation FY 1967—$3.6 million up from FY 1966—$2.4 million. Hail suppression and fog dispersal plans are in the making. These program levels are considered as minimal, recognizing that Federal programs in this area are undergoing critical re-evaluation as the result of two potentially monumental documents.

The report of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, Publication No. 1350, Weather and Climate Modifications—Problems and Prospects and the report of the Special Commission on Weather Modification of the National Science Foundation, Weather and Climate Modifications, NSF No. 66-3 have just been completed and made available for study. These reports will be considered carefully by each interested agency and by ICAS, to determine their effect upon the national program.

WABASH VALLEY ASSOCIATION VISITS WASHINGTON

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last week 150 members of the Wabash Valley Association from Indiana and Illinois came to Washington to testify before both the House and Senate Subcommittees on Public Works Appropriations.

These people made the long trip to show the Congress and the Army Corps of Engineers their intense interest in flood control, conservation of natural resources and recreation facilities. We asked the committees to approve appropriations of $45 million, which the Bureau of the Budget recommends and an additional $425,000. These additional funds are within the Army Corps of Engineers capability.

The amount includes: $150,000 for preconstruction planning on the Big Pine Reservoir; $100,000 on the Clifty

---

[52] *Hearings* 591.

[53] Congressional Record, p. 4370 (1966).

[54] Congressional Record, p. 4395 (1966).

[55] Congressional Record, p. 4370 (1966).

[56] Congressional Record, p. 4404 (1966).

[57] Congressional Record, p. 4411. Only Senators Morse and Gruening voted against the appropriation. It was announced that five Senators, necessarily absent, would each have voted "yea"; so that a full vote would have been 98 to 2.

[58] *Hearings* 593. On May 4, 1965, President Johnson had requested "the Congress to appropriate, at the earliest possible moment, an additional $700 million to meet mounting military requirements in Vietnam". He explained, in his message to the Congress, that "this is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Each is saying that the Congress and the President stand united before the world in joint determination that the independence of South Vietnam shall be preserved and Communist attack will not succeed." H.R. Doc. No. 157, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965). The appropriation bill (79 Stat. 109) was passed in the Senate, 88 to 3, and in the House, 408 to 7. Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 7, pp. 9210, 9435.

[59] Congressional Record, pp. 4474–4475 (1966).

[60] *Hearings*, Appendix 713.

[61] Congressional Record, p. 1409 (1966).

[62] 52 A B.A.J. 392 (1966).

[63] Congressional Record, pp. 5062–5063 (1966).

Creek Reservoir, $125,000 for Patoka Reservoir; and $25,000 for the Lafayette Reservoir.

In additional testimony the Wabash Valley Association members discussed pollution control, the small watershed program, Interior Department programs and the work of the Army Corps of Engineers.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the following reports by the Army Corps of Engineers: The Wabash Valley Interim Report No. 3, the Wabash Navigation Study, availability of water above Indianapolis, and a report on the joint land acquisition policy.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wabash River Basin Interim Report Number 3

(For meeting with Senator Hartke on April 29, 1966)

1. *Problems and Solutions.* The objective of the Wabash River Basin investigations is the formulation of plans to provide the best use, or combination of uses, of water and related land resources to meet all foreseeable short and long-term needs. The resulting plans of development will include projects and programs that are the responsibilities of local governments as well as the Federal Government. Project development studies consider flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation, generation of hydro-electric power, navigation, fish and wildlife conservation, upstream water control, drainage and irrigation and allied purposes. Extensive and recurrent flood damage is a major problem in relation to water resources throughout the basin. The problem affects urban and agricultural areas and exists generally along the entire length of the main streams of the Wabash and White Rivers and along the greater portions of nearly all their tributaries, although much has been accomplished and more is underway for the alleviation of flood damages by reservoirs, levees, floodwalls and channel improvements.

Demands for municipal and industrial water supplies have been steadily increasing throughout the basin. Preliminary information indicates present need for water quality improvement of several streams in the basin, particularly White River at Indianapolis. There are also some local pollution problems from mine wastes, drainage, domestic sewage and industrial wastes. Preliminary projections of coal mining and thermal power generation in the basin indicate possibility of a very large future need for increased water supply to offset acid mine wastes and to provide for condenser cooling water.

The existing public demand for recreational water areas in the basin is insistent and growing and will be given full consideration. The basin is almost entirely devoid of water-based recreation facilities at present except for a few reservoirs which are completed or under construction. The conservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources is being considered at all projects. In addition, other uses such as navigation, power, and others already discussed will be studied in accordance with present and future needs and project potentialities. Local citizens have expressed great interest in navigation development of the Wabash.

2. *Progress on Interim Report Number 3.* Screening of about 140 reservoir sites resulted in completion of preliminary studies of a number of potential reservoirs including four sites in the East Fork White River Basin, Big Blue, Downeyville, Deputy, and Millport; eight sites in the West Fork White River Basin, Parker City, Perkinsville, Big Walnut, Killbuck, Frankton, Fortville, Richland, and Spencer; and four sites in the Little Wabash River Basin Louisville, Helm, Effingham, and Wilcox Bridge. Five reservoirs and one local flood protection project were selected for survey scope studies in the third interim report.

The five proposed reservoir projects are Big Blue on Blue River; Downeyville on Flat Rock River; big Walnut on Big Walnut Creek, all in Indiana; and Louisville Reservoir on Little Wabash River; and Helm Reservoir on Skillet Fork, the last two in Illinois. Local protection is proposed at Marion, Indiana. Public hearings have been held and basic design studies and cost estimates are essentially completed. Studies of multi-purpose use and coordination with the states and other Federal agencies are completed or well advanced.

The objective of the Third Interim Report is to meet some of the immediate needs of the basin for flood control, water quality control, recreation and other purposes. The proposed reservoirs are upstream type projects located near the head of tributary streams; scoped as multiple-purpose projects which will be compatible with comprehensive plans being developed for the Wabash River Basin.

3. *Schedule.* Interim Report Number 3 is scheduled for completion this summer and will be then reviewed and processed here in Washington for submission to Congress.

Wabash River Basin—Navigation Studies

(For meeting with Senator Hartke on April 29, 1966)

Our study of navigation on the Wabash was started late in 1964 and concerns the reach from the river's mouth to Terre Haute. The objective of the study is to determine whether a more detailed survey scope study, upon which Congressional action could be based, is warranted at this time. The present preliminary study is being carried on as a part of the Wabash River Basin Comprehensive Study.

During the past year, Colonel Roper, District Engineer at Louisville, Kentucky, contracted for and received a special study of coal resources in the Wabash Basin which might be tributary to the Wabash waterway. The District also made a field survey and conducted to survey by questionnaires to determine other commodities that would be susceptible to movement on an improved Wabash waterway. Information developed included origins and destinations of potential traffic. By comparison of transportation costs by the waterway and other available modes such as railway, they have made preliminary estimates of the volume of traffic that would utilize an improved waterway at this time, and estimates of the benefits that would be realized. In order to have the whole picture, however, the volume of future traffic that might use the waterway and benefits attributable to its movement must be estimated. These estimates are now being made.

The physical characteristics of the waterway we are presently considering between Terre Haute and the Ohio River are significantly different from those of the plan considered in 1932 for House Document 100, 73rd Congress, 1st Session. At that time the proposed route followed the river, which is only moderately intrenched in the broad and fertile Wabash Valley, and 18 locks and dams would be needed, with average lift of about 7 feet, to provide slack water navigation and avoid extensive inundation of the valley. From the standpoint of water transportation costs, delays associated with the 18 lockages would be very expensive, and the differential between waterway transportation costs and costs by other transportation modes would be reduced accordingly. To avoid this situation, the plan now under study would involve only six locks and dams and a considerable length of off-river channel. This plan would reduce the waterway length downstream from Terre Haute from 180 miles as considered in 1932 to about 130 miles. Cost of freight transport on the waterway under study would be substantially less than that with the 1932 plan.

To complete the present study requires a drawing together of transportation costs and benefits for all traffic anticipated during the 50-year economic life of the navigation project. This requires traffic projections which are complex and difficult to develop, and which will be subject to detailed review by our higher authority. Consideration will be given to recreation, fish and wildlife, water supply, water quality, hydro-electric power and other possible functions or effects of slack water development.

When our studies are completed for the section to Terre Haute, various decisions will be possible depending upon the study results. If results are very unfavorable, abandonment of all studies would be indicated. If the benefit-cost ratio is favorable, or only moderately unfavorable, survey scope studies to Terre Haute might be recommended, along with continuation of preliminary studies to Lake Erie or Lake Michigan, or both. If survey scope studies are recommended, additional funds will be required for necessary and extensive surveys and foundation exploration and more detailed engineering and economic studies.

I would like you to know also that the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission has retained an economist for the period February to August 1966 to consider the economic impact of navigation in the Wabash Basin and to estimate potential traffic that would move in the areas north of Terre Haute. We have been furnishing all pertinent information that is available to us to assist in those studies and our individual efforts have been fully coordinated.

Wabash River Basin—Availability of Water Above Indianapolis

(For meeting with Senator Hartke on April 29, 1966)

The Wabash River Comprehensive Basin studies indicate steadily increasing demands for municipal and industrial water supplies. Pollution and water quality problems are serious at Indianapolis and upstream. These problems will become more critical in the future as the population and development of the area grow.

Reservoirs proposed in Interim Report Number 3 were considered for water supply for Indianapolis—Big Walnut, about 50 miles west of the city; Big Blue and Downeyville, about the same distance to the east. However, these would be expensive sources of water so that studies are now being made of sites upstream of Indianapolis on the White River.

These studies of the White River for water quality control storage and other purposes are being made on a fully coordinated and comprehensive basis. The problem is complicated by the limited drainage area and flow of the White River as compared with the needs of the area.

These problems of water supply and water quality are being coordinated particularly with the United States Public Health Service and the Wabash Coordinating Committee. Water availability above Indianapolis will be included in the final comprehensive report on Wabash River Basin scheduled for completion in 1969.

BRIEF DISCUSSION OF "JOINT LAND ACQUISITION POLICY" AND GENERAL LAND ACQUISITION POLICY OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

(For meeting with Senator HARTKE on April 29, 1966)

Land for the reservoir projects will be acquired in accordance with the provisions of the "Joint Policies of the Departments of the Interior and Army, Relative to Reservoir Project Lands," which was published in the Federal Register of 22 February 1962, Volume 27, page 1734. This policy provides, generally, that fee title will be acquired to land lying below the top of the flood control pool plus a "freeboard", (generally 3 to 5 feet depending on whether the spillway is gated or ungated), which is the land needed to provide for the adverse effects of saturation, wave action and sloughing of the flood control pool. Where this freeboard does not provide a minimum of 300 feet horizontally from the top of the flood control pool, land will be acquired to encompass the 300 feet. Fee title will be acquired for such lands as are needed to meet present and future requirements for fish and wildlife as determined pursuant to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. Such lands as are needed to meet present and future public requirements for outdoor recreation as may be authorized by the Congress will be acquired. Fee title will be acquired to the dam site area and to lands required for concentrated public use and access purposes.

The criterion for a minimum 300 foot strip horizontal from the top of the flood control pool elevation is an administrative determination which carries out the intent of the current Joint Policy. It ensures that adequate lands are available for the general public, and that the shoreline is not restricted by encroachment of adjacent landowners.

The "Joint Policy" provides for the acquisition of flowage easements rather than fee title in lands under all of the following four conditions:

a. Land lying above (upstream) from the storage pool (conservation, top of power pool, seasonal summer pool).

b. Lands in remote portions of the project.

c. Lands determined to be of no substantial value for protection or enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, or for public recreation.

d. It is to the financial advantage of the Government to acquire flowage easements rather than fee title.

The 300 foot criterion will not be applied in areas where significant development has taken place prior to availability of construction funds; where lands are devoted to public parks, golf courses and cemeteries.

Flowage easements provide, generally, that the Government has the right to occasionally or permanently inundate or flood the land in connection with the operation of the project, for clearing the land, prohibit structures for human habitation, and the erection of any other structure without the approval by the District Engineer of the type and location of the structure.

Generally, oil, gas, and other mineral rights will not be acquired except where mineral development will interfere with the primary purposes of the project. However, mineral rights not acquired will be subordinated to the operation of the project. This permits the development of the mineral interests in such manner as not to interfere with project operations. The District Engineer will approve the type and location of structures for the development of the mineral interests.

Acquisition of land for public use and access is authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 as amended. Access in such circumstances is not limited to a road terminating at the water's edge. Access areas must provide for parking of automobiles and land necessary for health and sanitary facilities. Public access areas are determined after coordination with national, state and local organizations giving consideration to the estimated number of visitors to the lake, proximity of centers of population and the road network which will provide access to the areas.

Public Law 86-645 provides that within a reasonable time after the initial appropriations are made for the construction and land acquisition for a project, the Corps of Engineers will hold public meetings in the vicinity of the project for the purpose of disseminating the following information:

1. Factors considered in making the appraisals;

2. Desire to purchase property without going to court;

3. Legal right to submit to condemnation proceedings;

4. Payment for moving expenses or other losses not covered by appraised market value;

5. Occupancy during construction;

6. Removal of improvements;

7. Payments required from occupants of Government acquired land;

8. Withdrawals by owners of deposits made in court by Government;

9. Use of land by owner when flowage easement is acquired.

The above matters as well as the proposed schedule of land acquisition will be explained at the public meetings. There will be a question and answer period for general questions. A pamphlet covering various aspects of the land acquisition policy and procedures will be distributed to landowners, tenants and interested persons.

THE SUBMARINE "ALVIN"

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the story of a small submarine named *Alvin* in the search for and the recovery of an H-bomb from a depth of 2,500 feet under the ocean offshore from the village of Palomares, Spain, parallels in many ways the recent orbit of the Gemini 8 spacecraft and its docking maneuver with the Agena.

Designed and built in Minnesota to perform oceanographic research, *Alvin* is a mobile, lightweight craft which can transport men to depths greater than those attainable by existing submarines and give them a capability for doing work.

The ideas, thinking, and experience of Allyn Vine, physical oceanographer at the Woods Hole Oceanography Institution—for whom the vehicle is named—were incorporated into the designs of an underseas vehicle.

Aerospace philosophy was here first applied to submarine design. An aeronautical engineer, H. E. Froehlich, experienced in the technology of stratospheric vehicle systems at the balloon capital of the world in Minneapolis, applied this knowledge to the *Alvin* project. He recognized the importance of the strong, yet lightweight structure required to develop a vehicle usable in vast areas of the world's oceans.

It was also important that the vehicle could be transported by plane to the work site in an emergency situation.

Through the foresight of the Office of Naval Research, submarine branch, then under Capt. C. B. Momson, Jr., a program was initiated through Woods Hole Oceanography Institution for the procurement of a research vehicle for deep ocean research in which designs and ideas conceived by the Applied Sciences Division of Litton Industries were incorporated. Under the aggressive leadership of Dr. Paul Fye, director, the institute became the first to acquire and become a user of a deep research vehicle for scientific research.

The remarkable submarine *Alvin*, developed and built by Litton Industries in Minnesota, is officially classified as a "deep submergence vehicle." It is a triumph of technical know-how and advanced industrial skills. *Alvin* has successfully performed research and study tests at depths below 6,000 feet. High intensity flood lights, a mechanical arm and complete maneuverability enable this two-man vehicle to accomplish a variety of under ocean assignments more than a mile below the surface. The hydrogen bomb search and recovery effort was a very sensitive and demanding job requiring outstanding skill and a precision and personal dedication of the crew. Minnesota is proud of its industrial contribution to technology, personified in this case by Litton Industries and *Alvin*.

TARIFFS AND RUBBER FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, in little more than a year the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will expire, and with it the President's authority to participate in multilateral negotiations for a substantial and general cut in tariffs.

The high hopes which accompanied enactment of this forward looking legislation have yet to be realized. Indeed, unless the Common Market soon gives concrete evidence of its desire to see these negotiations succeed, our hopes will be dashed, efforts to increase our markets for exports will be frustrated, and we are likely to face a resurgence of economic protectionism.

The success of the Kennedy round is therefore of great importance, both to this country and to the free world as a whole. The liberalization of trade it would bring about would promote the economic health of all the countries concerned and benefit firms and workers, as well as consumers.

However, it has long been recognized that a reduction in tariffs which clearly serves the national interest can be injurious to certain domestic industries which, despite expanding and increasingly efficient production, face serious competition from imports. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 itself requires the President to pay particular attention to such industries before he decides to offer any tariff reductions.

Such an industry, in my judgment is the rubber footwear industry. This industry is vital to my State and provides employment to some 9,000 workers there. Imports of rubber footwear have over the past 10 years sharply risen and now account for almost 20 percent of the domestic market. More importantly, perhaps, the wholesale prices of the imports, which includes the amount of duty paid, are substantially below the wholesale prices of the domestic products, and in fact the retail prices of the imports are often below the wholesale prices of the domestic product.

The need to give the most careful consideration to the rubber footwear industry in the Kennedy round has been sharply underscored by what has already happened to this industry in the last year or so.

Last summer, rubber footwear gave up its fight to have Congress restore the American selling price method of valuation to synthetic rubber protective footwear, on the firm assurance that the executive branch would urge a uniform tariff of 60 percent for all rubber protective footwear, whether natural or synthetic. No sooner did the industry drop its effort to have the American selling price apply to synthetics than the executive branch withdrew its assurance. That unhappy story was related to this chamber by the junior Senator from Connecticut, to whom the assurance of a 60-percent rate had been made, and who fought valiantly to have our Government honor its word. But what started as a 60-percent rate wound up as 37½ percent.

During congressional action on protective rubber footwear, the Treasury Department was reevaluating its method of applying American selling price to rubber footwear. Although for 30 years the Customs Bureau had consistently compared imported rubber footwear to its highest priced domestic counterpart, Treasury concluded that comparisons ought to be made with the lowest priced domestic counterparts. Earlier this year the Treasury Department began appraising imports of rubber-soled footwear with fabric uppers on this basis. This revision of appraisement practice has amounted to a unilateral tariff cut well in excess of 30 percent. And yet it is clear that this action was taken without consideration of the consequences of such a tariff cut on the economic health of the domestic industry.

I now understand that, while no firm decision has apparently been made, our negotiators in Geneva will shortly begin to explore the possibility of converting rate of duty based upon American selling price to equivalent rates of duty based on foreign or export value. It must be noted that such a negotiation cannot yield any quid pro quo to this industry, since it has long since lost its export markets to the Japanese.

However, and this brings me to my basic point, the rubber footwear industry views with the deepest concern the possibility of further tariff reductions, in excess of the unilateral reductions already suffered in the case of protective rubber footwear and rubber-soled footwear. It is convinced that not merely its economic health but its economic existence depends upon the maintenance of the existing tariffs, which themselves are already inadequate.

I share fully this concern of the rubber footwear industry. The data which I have seen raises a very serious question in my mind as to whether it would be sound policy for our negotiators to offer in the Kennedy round a change in the method of tariff valuation or reductions in the present rates of duty on rubber footwear.

I therefore urge most strongly that Governor Herter and his staff make an intensive economic analysis of the rubber footwear industry in terms of present conditions in that industry and in terms of the present tariff protection afforded it. If such an analysis reveals, as I believe it will, that rubber footwear industry would be seriously injured if further tariff reductions were to be made in the Kennedy round, then I would regard it as the obligation of Governor Herter's office and the White House to refrain from taking further action in the Kennedy round detrimental to this industry's interests.

A PROMISING ROADSIDE PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Seattle Times of May 2 editorialized in support of roadside rest areas for high-speed interstate and cross-State highways. This will be a major step forward in making highway travel more pleasant and safer. The editorial then goes on to suggest bulletin boards listing such tourist services as lodging, food, and recreation. This is an excellent alternative to the billboard problem. It is also a program that can be developed by cooperation between private enterprise and the States. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Promising Roadside Program

The State Highway Commission took welcome steps toward safer, more-convenient and more-scenic motoring when it recently approved a one-and-a-half-million-dollar plan to build a network of 19 rest areas and announced acquisition of 18 scenic strips to prevent the obstruction of highway views. The rest areas will be under contract by next spring.

The rest areas will contribute to safety on the high-speed interstate and cross-state highway network by making it persuasively simple for travelers to take rest breaks. The convenience will be particularly welcomed by families traveling with children.

The commission's decision sets Washington on an overdue course of seeking to equal the attractive roadside safety-rest areas in Oregon and British Columbia.

But in addition to factors of safety and convenience, there is another important use that should be considered for Washington's new roadside rest areas. They would make ideal sites for bulletin boards to provide tourists with information about local lodging, food, recreation, etc.

Federal and state billboard-control laws provide extremely limited opportunities for roadside advertising along the interstate system.

"Information sites in safety-rest areas," says Jack B. Robertson, president of the Washington Roadside Council, "offer the best chance we have seen to solve the billboard problem."

A study by two University of Washington professors, Louis Wagner and Virgil Harder, concluded that "the greatest potential as a primary means of making information available to motorists is via safety-rest areas."

Of the 22 states that have advertising controls along their interstate highways, eight already offer information at safety-rest areas and 11 are considering such a program. The Washington State Highway Department has done some preliminary work toward that objective.

It seems to us that a roadside information-board system could be developed in cooperation with private enterprise at very modest cost.

On the matter of cost, incidentally, the state's rest-area and scenic-strip program has been given a substantial boost from the federal Highway Beautification Act, which provides this state with $1,178,213—without requirement for matching money—for landscaping and scenic improvements.

MOST ECONOMISTS NOW OPPOSE A TAX INCREASE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Johnson administration has been through a long period of strident criticism from those who call for a tax increase.

In my judgment the President has shown commendable restraint and wisdom in resisting the calls for across-the-board tax increase. Such a tax hike could have stunted the Nation's growth and created unemployment.

Today's Wall Street Journal reports that a majority of the economic profession is now swinging around to support the administration's wise decision to wait-and-see in the economy.

Roy Moor, one of the Nation's top economists who formerly served in the Treasury Department, also as an economist for the Joint Economic Committee and as my top staff man—and is now vice president and economist for the Fidelity Philadelphia Trust sums up the case against the tax cut when he says:

> The boom is already cooling and I see the seeds of a downturn in 1967.

He adds that he detects "pretty clear evidence of where large firms are beginning to cut back very slightly on plans for new investments."

This impression, he says, grows out of a whole series of discussions with economists in industrial firms who are beginning to have increased reservations about how much their companies should spend "in coming months."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Debate Over Taxes: Majority of Economists Oppose Tax Rise, Fear It Could Slow Business—They Argue Inflation Danger Isn't Great—Some Favor Standby Authority for Hike—Seeds of a 1967 Downturn?

To boost or not to boost?

That is the question—at least as far as taxes are concerned. It is a question causing remarkable dissension at the top levels of Government. In recent days, for instance, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin has come out for a boost and Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler has come out against one, at least for now. The tax issue is also having repercussions on Wall Street, with many analysts citing the threat of an increase as a factor in the stock market decline.

Where do a majority of the nation's economic experts stand?

Behind the silver-haired chief of the Treasury, according to a Wall Street Journal survey of more than 50 prominent economists at universities, nonprofit research organizations and banks. Well over half, but by no means all, say they oppose any Federal tax increase at this time—for reasons that boil down to the conviction that business activity is not currently so fast-paced as to generate dangerous price inflation.

A BIG DISSENT

The substantial minority who favor a tax boost now—about 40 percent of those interviewed—generally do so in the belief that the long expansion indeed is overheating and that something must quickly be done about it; the practical solution, these analysts contend, is an immediate tax increase.

The considerable disagreement among experts about the matter of taxes, the interviews further show, reflects a more fundamental disagreement over the general state of the U.S. economy; there is a broad consensus that a tax increase indeed would dampen business and check any rapid rise of prices.

The view generally put forward by the majority of analysts opposing a tax increase now is expressed by Albert T. Sommers, vice president and director of economic research at the National Industrial Conference Board, a non-profit business research group in New York City:

"The problems of inflation are diminishing. The economy has been overheated for a long time, but a lot of the steam is coming out of it now." He adds: "For a long time, the stimuli had been running way ahead of the restraints. But now the restraints have caught up; there's been a rise in the Social Security tax, an acceleration of corporate tax payments and individual withholding taxes, and money is at its tightest in a third of a century."

Mr. Sommers warns that "we shouldn't expect that this long expansion won't finally run into a loss of energy. The auto industry is beginning to show this now, and the housing market is no better than stable."

Still more strongly opposed to a tax boost now is Roy E. Moor, vice president and economist of Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., and formerly an economist for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. The boom already is cooling, claims Mr. Moor, and "I see the seeds of a downturn in 1967." He adds that he detects "pretty clear evidence of where large firms are beginning to cut back very slightly on plans for new investments."

This impression, he says, grows out of "a whole series of discussions with economists in industrial firms who are beginning to have increased reservations about how much their companies should spend" in coming months.

To be sure, many of the economists who oppose a tax increase at present hasten to add that events later in the year could change their view. The big imponderable is Vietnam. Typically, A. Gilbert Heebner, vice president and economist of the Philadelphia National Bank, cautions that "very much depends on Vietnam. If defense spending levels off, we might get by without a tax increase." On the other hand, he indicates, a sharp step-up in the Vietnam fighting could necessitate a tax boost.

DISPUTE SLOWDOWN IDEA

Authorities who want a tax boost immediately generally dispute the idea that the economic pace shows signs of slowing.

"We should have a tax increase—and soon," urges James Hund, dean of the school of business at Emory University in Atlanta. "I'm worried about inflation."

Norman Robertson, economist for Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, agrees: "We do have inflation—it's here now. All this nonsense of citing one economic indicator or another as indicative that we don't have it is simply statistical sophistry."

Unless the brakes—in the form of a tax increase—are immediately applied, there will be serious economic repercussions—probably next year, Mr. Robertson warns.

If a tax increase eventually is imposed, what form should it take?

Robert S. Einzig, a professor of economics at the University of California at Berkeley says: "I would recommend a $7 billion boost, applying equally to personal and corporate incomes." He further suggests that "Congress should give the President standby authority to raise taxes, so we don't have to be concerned about waiting for Congress to debate about how much the increase should be. Just his having this power would have a sobering effect on the economy * * *. The boosts could be explicitly temporary."

Some economists would increase income taxes less sharply—$5 billion is a figure frequently mentioned. But they also would reduce or eliminate the 7 percent tax credit that businessmen now are allowed on new plant and equipment expenses.

Capital expansion is one of the most ebullient areas of the economy these days, and this would strike at the heart of the matter," declares William A. Tongue, an economist who teaches at the University of Illinois.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the 3M Co., St. Paul, Minn., has originated, with the cooperation and assistance of the U.S. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and State vocational rehabilitation agencies, a program to employ the handicapped in their own businesses. The program is now under development in 20 States. I ask unanimous consent that a news release explaining the Community Business Services Associates program be printed in the RECORD at this point. I think that the involved Federal and State agencies and the 3M Co. are to be commended for their cooperation and vision in combining private business incentives with true social progress.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BUSINESS ORGANIZATION OFFERS SELF-EMPLOYMENT FOR HANDICAPPED

(Press Conference: 3:30–5:30, April 27, Jefferson Ballroom West, Washington-Hilton)

From: 3M Co., 2501 Hudson Road, St. Paul, Minn., contact: C. Burton Seeker, telephone: (612) 733–1845.

Or: Mr. Al Goldsmith, Public Relations, 1365 National Press Building, Washington, D.C., telephone (202) ME 8–0001.

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A unique business organization promising self-employment to thousands of handicapped individuals was announced here today at the opening sessions of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Called Community Business Services Associates (CBSA), the program is based on cooperation of the U.S. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, State agencies for vocational rehabilitation and a major manufacturing company in establishing handicapped individuals in their own business offering copying, short-run duplication, mailing and other business services, many of which are not presently available in most communities. The program was originated by 3M Company, St. Paul, Minnesota, in developing new markets for its graphic and visual communications products.

The program is currently under development in 20 States—with some CBSA centers functioning and training manpower already assigned. Plans call for expansion into most other States by the end of the year.

"This is a dramatic and imaginative plan to make full use of the abilities of men and women who ask nothing more than a chance to become productive members of their communities," Harold Russell, chairman of the President's Committee, said in announcing the program.

"The continued growth of our economy demands that we make full use of all our social and economic resources. The Community Business Services Associate program is dramatic testimony to the role private business can play in providing opportunity for the capabilities of handicapped citizens," he said.

A local CBSA center is set up by counselors of the State divisions of vocational rehabilitation and a 3M representative working together in a community. Candidates for owner-operators are recommended by the DVR counselors. Judged largely on the basis of desire to achieve self-employment, candidates should have enough finger and arm dexterity to operate office equipment—although some act only as managers and contact men, relying on family members or employees for production work. The community under consideration is also studied to make sure it offers adequate business potential. Some of the operations are thriving in communities of less than 4,000 in population.

The State agency for vocational rehabilitation establishes the owner-operator in his new business. Preparations include an intensive business training program conducted by the 3M representative, along with bookkeeping and accounting systems, promotional materials and followup services. The representative also organizes the community behind the new owner-operator and provides additional instruction as required. The State, in most cases, also arms the new business with equipment, including an infrared copying machine, dry photocopier, overhead projector, illuminated display boxes and an initial inventory of supplies.

The owner-operator offers a wide variety of services to businessmen, organizations and individuals in the community. These include copying documents or laminating them in plastic film, monthly billing services for merchants and professional men, short run duplication, mailing services, point of purchase promotion and overhead projector rental, along with aid in preparing projection transparencies.

As an independent businessman, the CBSA owner-operator can expand to offer any additional services needed by his customers.

As the handicapped individual becomes self-sufficient in his business, rehabilitation officials realize their goal: that of successfully closing the books on the case.

"There is no doubt that this venture will make it possible for thousands of disabled citizens to realize their greatest dreams: to support their families and to be a vital and productive part of their communities," Commissioner Mary E. Switzer of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration commented on the program.

Owner-operators of CBSA enterprises show the same enthusiasm for the program. All of them have experienced the same difficulty in fitting into the competitive employment picture.

The link between the CBSA owner-operator and 3M Company is a business relationship of customer to supplier.

"Community Business Services Associates has been established to serve a distinct market demand," explains Hugh J. MacLeod, 3M's manager for the CBSA program.

"The U.S. Department of Commerce studies disclose that 42 percent of all American businesses do not keep adequate records. These are typically the smaller businesses that cannot justify modern office copying equipment, record handling, and other necessary business services," MacLeod points out. "Often these businesses are located in suburbs and small- to medium-sized communities. Experience proves that these businesses need services and are willing to pay for them, if provided on a scale tailored to their needs."

While small business in small communities is the primary market for CBSA services, experience is proving that larger businesses are equally good customers. This is especially true of the field personnel and remote locations of large companies, MacLeod points out.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF POWER

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann's comments on foreign affairs, and particularly on Vietnam, have consistently been perspicacious. It is regrettable that he is one of the very few columnists who have been writing realistically on this vital issue.

His comment on the President's address at Princeton, entitled: "The Obligations of Power," should be required reading by all who entertain doubts about the wisdom of our policy there.

It illustrates what is so tragically wrong with our foreign policy, which has committed us unilaterally all over the world and dragged us into a needless, costly, expanding and increasingly disastrous war in southeast Asia. In contrast is our domestic program which has been a shining success due in large measure to President Johnson's superb leadership. That achievement on the home front is now being eroded, and will be in large part nullified, by the President's errors in the field of foreign affairs, where he has never had the great grasp and understanding he has had on domestic issues.

I ask unanimous consent that Walter Lippmann's article, "The Obligations of Power," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 17, 1966]

THE OBLIGATIONS OF POWER

(By Walter Lippmann)

In a carefully prepared address at Princeton University the President said last week that "the issue for this generation . . . has to do with the obligations of power in the world for a society that strives despite its worst flaws always to be just, fair, and human." This is indeed the issue for this generation of Americans. What are our obligations in the exercise of the great power which we possess? This is the question which is troubling our people deeply and is dividing them dangerously.

The oldest and the first American answer to the question is in the Declaration of Independence, that power may be used only with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." This is the original American commitment, not to use force without taking into account the opinions of others. This fundamental commitment against the unilateral use of force in human affairs has been, in the American view, the prime obligation of power.

This has been the American idea from the beginning, and in the course of time it has evolved into a fundamental belief that the use of power must be brought under the reign of law. In this century the conviction has expressed itself in American support of the principle of collective security, as represented by the League of Nations, and then by the United Nations and by the regional agreements for the maintenance of peace.

From this, the fundamental obligation of power that it should not be exercised unilaterally. President Johnson has departed conspicuously. Though his intentions have been honorable, though his purposes have no doubt been good, the fact of the matter is that he has used military force more than once—in Santo Domingo, in the Stanleyville intervention, and in Vietnam without asking advice or seeking the consent of our allies all over the globe. He did not go before the United Nations for a verdict as to whether there was an aggression in South Vietnam. He did not consult, as the Treaty stipulates, the other members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, he did not seek the advice and approval of the Organization of American States before going into Santo Domingo. His conduct of foreign relations has been willful, personal, arbitrary, self opinionated, and the fact is that he has won no important support for the Vietnamese war and that all the great states of Asia and Europe are absent from Vietnam, are anxious and suspicious.

The President and his apologists have persuaded themselves that the war in Vietnam is a continuation of, and is legally and morally and strategically the same as, the resistance to the Kaiser, the resistance to Hitler, the resistance to Stalin, the resistance in Korea. They are mistaken. The conduct of American foreign policy since President Johnson was inaugurated in 1965 marks a radical break with the past. President Truman did not intervene in Korea on his own decision; he intervened after he had received the approval and support of the United Nations. This was no mere legal and moral facade. The proof is that the war was fought with the support of seventeen nations. In neither of the world wars of this century did the United States intervene alone or fight alone.

The President said at Princeton that "unlike nations in the past with vast power at their disposal, the United States has never sought to crush the autonomy of her neighbors." Someone should explain to the President that a remark like that, showing that vast power is combined with perfect self approval, grates badly on the nerves of many people at home and abroad.

It is "the taking of too much upon one's self as one's right" which, as the Oxford English Dictionary says, is what "arrogance" is.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this week is being observed throughout America as Soil Stewardship Week. This is a nationwide observance which places emphasis on man's obligation to God as a steward of the soil, water, and related resources.

This is the 12th consecutive annual Soil Stewardship Week sponsored by the Nation's 3,000 local soil and water conservation districts and their national association. During the period of May 15 to 22, observances are being held in literally hundreds of thousands of churches of all faiths.

I think it fitting for the Senate of the United States to pause a moment in its deliberations to observe Soil Stewardship Week and pay tribute to its sponsors. This includes the 89 soil and water conservation districts in my home State of Minnesota.

The men who serve on the governing bodies of these local units of State government deserve our praise for the leadership they are providing in our home communities for keeping before the people the relationship between soil, God, and man. They are performing a great patriotic service. I think the Senate should take this occasion to say, "Thank you."

Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, has recognized Soil Stewardship Week with a special statement from the Department of Agriculture. He states:

> It is our duty to respect the countryside as Creation's wondrous temple; to guard it against those who would desecrate it; to bring to the countryside our talents and our resolve; to exalt the role of the countryside in national advancement; to make certain that rural America continues to serve its high purpose as a source of spiritual as well as material strength in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD Secretary Freeman's statement in recognition of Soil Stewardship Week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK, MAY 15–22, 1966

(By Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture)

The American countryside—that expanse of nature separating our cities and towns and rural hamlets—represents the land we have left to grow in, play in, and build on the American dream.

That is all we have; and when divided and divided again for the multiple needs of a Nation growing rapidly in population, in urban development, in highway mileage, in an array of man-oriented uses alien to nature, this natural landscape that once seemed so limitless shrinks before us at every turn—and we are made aware of the challenging crisis in the countryside.

In this Soil Stewardship Week of 1966, we can, all of us, determine to preserve and enhance the values of the countryside—to overcome the problems and realize the fruitful promise of rural America in this time of dynamic change and growth. We can—and must—return to an alliance with nature. It is a matter of desire, of discipline, and of dedication.

We enjoy a period of grace—even now—before the remaining vestiges of nature unspoiled by man are erased. We still have time to protect, restore, and develop the lands and waters of rural America—if we act with resolve and dispatch.

The crisis we face in the countryside is a crisis of quality in a Nation whose people demand quality in the marketplace but have failed to provide for it in the natural environment. It is a crisis of quantity in a land whose rich natural endowment has been vandalized to a degree of grave proportions.

But most of all it is a crisis of people—the tragic loss of young minds and spirits, of evolving skills and talents.

The Nation's future lies in rural America. The vast countryside offers relief from the teeming cities and their congested suburbs—providing ample land and water to serve the expanding needs of commerce and industry, and broad acres on which to build garden communities for tomorrow's generations.

The rural renaissance—assuring diverse employment opportunities and other community benefits—promises the return to rural America of trained and ambitious youth seeking the challenge of a new frontier. It promises a landscape free of rural poverty as prosperity is extended to every corner of the land. It promises the steady advance of national well-being through a richly rewarding town and country partnership. It promises an enlightened approach to the further development of our natural resources in which protection and progress go hand in hand.

It is our duty to respect the countryside as Creation's wondrous temple; to guard it against those who would desecrate it; to bring to the countryside our talents and our resolve; to exalt the role of the countryside in national advancement; to make certain that rural America continues to serve its high purpose as a source of spiritual as well as material strength in the Nation.

With such stewardship, we may be confident of the continued blessings of this great land—for we will have assured it with our cooperation.

DEDICATION TO PRINCIPLE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, too often it is for the living to cast backwards into time to discover and honor those whose contributions to any human endeavor have proved worthy of remembrance and recognition. It is both fitting and appropriate, therefore, that the press of the United States and of Indiana have recognized in his lifetime the enduring works of a working newsman, Eugene C. Pulliam, writer, editor, businessman, and publisher.

Indiana-oriented and always a spokesman for what he believes is right and fair, Mr. Pulliam is one of 16 journalists of a century and a half of my State's history to be honored by inclusion in the Indiana Journalism Hall of Fame a few days ago. Mr. Pulliam is the only living recipient of this signal honor.

Mr. Pulliam, a native of Kansas, began his career with the Kansas City Star after graduating from DePauw University. He bought the Franklin, Ind., Daily Star 4 years later. His newspaper interests include the Indianapolis Star & News; the Muncie Star and Press, the Vincennes Sun-Commercial, and the Arizona Republic and Phoenix, Ariz., Gazette.

He was one of a group of 10 students who founded Sigma Delta Chi, a national professional journalism fraternity, at DePauw in 1909.

Earlier this year, Mr. Pulliam was accorded the University of Arizona's John Peter Zenger Award for Distinguished Service to Freedom of the Press and the People's Right To Know.

While Mr. Pulliam and I have not always agreed on the issues of the day—and, indeed, may never reach that state of equanimity—we have lasting concurrence in the principle that liberty is best served in complete freedom of public opinion. For this reason, and with sincere admiration and respect for this gentleman's dedication to his principles, I ask unanimous consent that the following remarks by Eugene Pulliam before the Arizona Newspapers Association, in Phoenix, Ariz., be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FREE PRESS VERSUS GOVERNMENT

(By Eugene C. Pulliam, 12th John Peter Zenger Award for Distinguished Service in Freedom of the Press and the People's Right to Know, January 8, 1966)

President Cameron, Chairman Miller, Dr. Harvill, President Paul Miller, members of the Arizona Newspapers Association, ladies and gentlemen and fellow taxpayers:

I don't think I need to tell this audience of newspaper people that I consider it a special privilege to be here in any capacity, but I am doubly honored and humbly grateful to be here to receive the John Peter Zenger Award because of what that award represents. I especially cherish this award because it was voted to me by my own colleagues, and because this award was established to give continuing recognition to the efforts and determination of American newspapermen to keep as the basic right to the free press the inviolable right to tell the truth.

I should like, first of all, to say a word about John Peter Zenger and also about his very remarkable and courageous wife, Anna Zenger. It is surprising how many Americans have never heard of the Zengers. I have received many congratulations on this award, bt at least one out of five of the people who congratulated me has said, "But who was Peter Zenger?"

Well, let me tell you who he was and let me tell you about his wife. Peter Zenger was a New York printer who in 1735 was faced with the same problems and the same dangers that American newspapermen face today. Peter Zenger was just a little printer in New York, but he believed in printing the truth. He was hounded by British authorities. He was harassed by the governor. He was finally accused of criminal libel and jailed. He stayed in jail for many, many months . . . all because he insisted on printing the truth. His lawyers were disbarred by the judge, who was a puppet of the British governor. He was left almost defenseless. Finally, Andrew Hamilton, a famous Philadelphia lawyer, came to New York to aid Zenger. Hamilton presented a brilliant and powerful argument that persuaded the jury to find Zenger not guilty by arguing that Zenger had printed the truth and that the truth is not libelous.

While being held for trial Zenger could communicate only with his wife, and she had to speak to him through the prisoner's keyhole. And it was Anna Zenger who kept their newspaper going, week after week after week. She missed only one edition. She kept the people of New York aroused. Her inspiration, her dedication, her brilliant mind her unbelievable understanding of the importance of this trial made her the real "hero" of this dramatic story. The late Kent Cooper, the former great general manager of the Associated Press, called Anna Zenger "The Mother of American Liberty."

What did the Zenger trial do for liberty? First, it established the right of a jury to decide what is libelous and what is truth and not leave it to a judge who might be biased by some consideration or some pressure. Also it established the principle that truth is a complete defense against libel and therefore a newspaper has the right to print the truth.

I wonder how many American newspapermen and women today would go through the trials and tribulations and heartaches that Peter and Anna Zenger suffered in order to print the truth.

Zenger's trial is as important today in 1966 as it was in 1735, because the issue of freedom of the press and of the people to criticize their government is today, as it was then, the central issue of human liberty.

Then, for the first time, the people, through a jury and the press, successfully asserted their power to preserve free speech and a free press against the tyrannical power of both the government and any judge of the court.

Freedom of the press and freedom of speech in the United States are in greater danger today than they were in the time of Peter Zenger. For today the power of government over the lives and fortunes of the people is greater than at any time in our history, and that power is being used in many different ways to subvert and destroy the freedom of the people to examine the acts of their government, to criticize the policies of their government and to expose the failures of their government.

What do we mean when we talk about freedom of the press? Well, to me freedom of the press means freedom of the public to look behind the curtain of secrecy which governments erect to hide their activities; freedom to read about politicians who want to carry on corrupt and shady deals out of public view; freedom to learn of businessmen whose successes have depended as much on kick-backs and influence-peddling as on their ability to compete in the economic market place; and freedom to criticize labor bosses who employ tactics of coercion and intimidation.

In short, freedom of the press means the freedom of the public—the people—to be informed, to know the precise nature and character of the political and economic forces which control their destinies.

Thomas Jefferson said, " . . . were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

James Madison said, "Nothing could be more irrational than to give the people power and to withhold from them information without which power is abused. A people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with power which knowledge gives them."

If the press does not shine the spotlight of publicity on malefactors of the public trust, who will? Who but the press can act as the public's watchdog in the nation's interest? Who else is on the firing line day after day, fighting for the right of everyone to have access to the facts? Only the newspapers have the resources, the time and the manpower.

What I am saying here is that it is the responsibility of newspapers to do for the public what it hasn't the time or the facilities to do for itself—gather information, select that which is important and present it to the reader. But there are powerful forces aligned against the press, and therefore against the public. They are working to frustrate the free flow of information. It has been said many times, and newspapermen should never forget it—government is always the tyrant of a people, never its friend. Government is the natural enemy of the newspaper. Government understandably wants to conduct the nation's business—your business and mine—in secrecy. Government's relationship with the press has changed and deteriorated drastically in recent years. It is no longer enough for administrations to refuse to cooperate with the press. Now they consider it their duty to mislead and deceive us. I could cite you instance after instance where government officials have defended their policy of actually lying to the public.

Another factor working against the unfettered flow of information is the death of strong competitive newspapers.

It is undeniable that each time a legtimate newspaper folds, our nation comes that much closer to surrendering its prerogatives to centralized government. Each time a newspaper writes "30" to its existence, one more community watchdog disappears.

So I say to you as newspapermen that our responsibility to the public was never more important. It is quite obvious to me that the bureaucrats in Washington find nothing to worry about when a newspaper folds. With taxation and other forms of government intervention, weak newspapers have found it impossible to survive. Washington bureaucracy apparently wants to see to it that all cities of America become one-newspaper towns.

Washington bureaucrats care not for law or constitutional rights. They strive only to make the federal government all-powerful and all-inclusive over the lives and businesses of American citizens. With only one paper in a town, the bureaucrats would have fairly easy sledding in a Congress dominated by a strong chief executive. Newspapers would be brought under government regulation just as radio and television are now regulated.

With federal regulation of the press, government officials would be free to intimidate the press with decrees and orders which would be enforced with the effect of law. Bureaucratic regulation and even outright federal takeover of the press is not beyond the range of possibility. It has happened in other countries and we blindly deceive ourselves if we think it cannot happen here. The multitudinous restrictions of individual freedom under which we live today would, twenty-five years ago, have been unthinkable.

It is easy enough to find scapegoats for the unprecedented conditions and problems facing newspapers today, but it seems to me the blame must be shared by the following:

1. Unions which prevent the introduction of labor-saving and cost-cutting machinery.

2. The continually increased taxation for every conceivable type of social security and welfare, above and beyond the needs of even a "Great Society."

3. The dogged policy of the antitrust division which today makes it almost impossible for a newspaper publisher even to speak to a weak competitor, much less help him keep his paper going.

4. The public, which seems often to care more for entertainment than for knowledge and enlightenment.

5. And, finally, the newspapers themselves for their aloofness and their resistance to change.

Let me give you an example of publisher oversight, aloofness and stupidity for which there is no justification. Some weeks ago the heads of the various printing trades unions and the labor relations committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association held a joint meeting here in Phoenix. Nina and I had a dinner party in our home for the union officers and the publishers' labor committee, together with their wives. In the course of the evening the president of a union, which is represented in the majority of the newspapers throughout this country, told me this was the first time in his life he had been invited to a publisher's home!

Here was a man with the same feelings and ambitions as other men, a man who has reached the top of his chosen profession, yet never before had a publisher thought to invite him to his home. Was this inexcusable oversight deliberate? I don't think so. My personal opinion is that too many publishers fall into the human error of thinking in terms of friends and foes, rather than in terms of human beings.

Instead of constantly fighting each other, I believe the printing trades unions and the publishers should get together on a program of mutual advancement and self-protection. Thousands of mechanical jobs may be at stake if the federal government ever brings the newspapers under federal regulation. The unions and the publishers have so much in common that I cannot help but believe that tolerance and common sense and a willingness on each side to see the other's viewpoint will solve almost any problem confronting us. And we need a united front—the printing unions and the publishers—in this fight to head off federal domination of newspapers, for ours is a common cause versus government.

Also, I think publishers have been very negligent in their efforts to recruit bright young men and women for the newspaper industry. We should do everything we can do to convince young people that the newspaper profession is a calling just as fascinating and as useful and as rewarding as the ministry, medicine or the law.

The final area where the public's right to know is being curtailed is in that twilight zone where the First and Sixth Amendments clash head on—where the constitutional guarantee of a free press runs headlong into the equally explicit constitutional guarantee of a fair trial by an impartial jury. In spite of everything everybody has said—judges, lawyers and columnists—it is very obvious that if the legal profession succeeds in shutting off the flow of pre-trial news on the pretext of assuring an impartial trial, other professions, armed with equally convincing—sounding arguments, will agitate to reduce the newspaper profession to rewriting handouts and routine releases.

There isn't an honest newspaperman in this country who wouldn't fight for the right of any man to have a fair trial. But our job is to protect the public and to make sure the public is informed about what goes on. And we can't do it if the legal profession is going continually to harass us with new regulations and new proceedings which give judges almost a mandate to muzzle the press. It is a fight that affects every newspaper in every city in America.

I don't for one minute condone trial by newspapers. But let's get one thing clear, let's get this straight: no civil right, including the right of a fair trial, is worth a tinker's dam unless it is protected by the right of free expression. If an accused man can't say his piece in court, cannot have lawyers and friends plead his case, what good is his so-called "civil right" to a fair trial? Without the right of free expression, justice would deteriorate into a tragic comedy. When these two amendments clash—and it seems they clash only when publicity-seeking lawyers stage the collision—the First Amendment must take precedence over the Sixth Amendment, because without the First Amendment, the Sixth Amendment would become a mockery of justice.

Thank God we have in America hundreds of judges in the high courts and in the lower courts, many of them in this state, who realize that freedom of expression is the fundamental right of all liberty.

The world of 1966, like Peter Zenger's world of 1735, is still engaged in mortal combat with those who would be free and those who would deny freedom to others; those who believe people should have access to the facts and those who are convinced they know what is best for you and for me. So long as the forces of freedom exist, we who are privileged to be part of those forces must resist arbitrary power and secrecy wherever and whenever it appears. We must take our stand on behalf of the people, all the people. It is the only choice for those who cherish freedom and justice. Liberty can be destroyed by tyrannical government and tyrannical courts if the people can be threatened or persuaded to abandon free speech and a free press. Newspapers defend the right of individuals against the entrenched power of arrogant abuse by public officials. They fight to bring the truth to light; to support justice and oppose injustice; to make certain that every individual is treated equally before the law; to make certain that every American can speak his piece without fear or favor. Today the United States is the last great bastion of liberty in the world, and a free press in America is the last great bastion of the people against complete domination by government.

If newspapers will recognize their responsibility, as well as their opportunity, to print the truth; refuse to be intimidated; refuse to bow to government bureaucracy; then they will serve the highest cause of civilization, which is individual freedom, the freedom of choice and the right of free expression. As partners in freedom, the people and the press in America can save liberty.

Without the right of freedom for the individual, without the right of free expression for everyone, there can be no lasting or satisfying progress for us in America. This is the freedom we must cherish, this is the freedom we must fight for, this is the freedom—if necessary—we must go to jail to preserve. We must cherish it and hold it the dearest thing in life, because if America maintains its freedom, then sometime, somehow, America, being free, will show the rest of the world the road to freedom. This I believe, my friends, is the divine mission of America—freedom for ourselves and eventually freedom for all the world.

And because it is our special mission we should remind ourselves every morning that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

In closing, I want to salute the University of Arizona for its vision and wisdom in recognizing the great contribution Peter Zenger and his wife Anna made to the cause of freedom. And again a thousand grateful thanks for this award.

Good luck and God bless all of you.

PURCHASE OF GALVANIZED IRON AND STEEL PRODUCTS FOR USE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, during the past few months I have made inquiries into the Agency for International Development procurement procedures for galvanized iron and steel products being purchased for use in South Vietnam. My investigation turned up a number of improprieties in the procurement procedure. These improprieties have been confirmed by reports from the Government Accounting Office and the Agency for International Development. It is apparent that the AID program in South Vietnam has grown to such degree that the operations officials for AID in the Far East are unable to properly control it.

The subject of my investigation has been galvanized iron and steel products—a commodity which accounts for only 10 percent of the total commercial import program. Information which has been developed during my inquiry indicates that the problems which have been documented in galvanized iron and steel exist throughout the supporting assistance program.

I do not seek to be critical of AID, but to offer constructive advice which will enable the Agency to properly administer their vital function in Vietnam.

Our economic assistance program has grown to such scope so quickly that the AID mission has not been able to properly oversee their program. This is despite the tremendous efforts put forth by the members of the Agency.

Profiteering businessmen in Saigon are having a field day at our expense. They are requesting licenses for the import of commodities which will sell best and at the best rate of profit, without any true regard for the needs of the people. Essential commodities being imported with priority licenses are being diverted to nonessential, but more profitable uses. Because of the tremendous difference of the official and real exchange rates between American and Vietnamese currency, huge profits are being made simply through currency manipulation on the sale of AID financed goods. Kickbacks are being required by importers. Goods are being left in the valuable warehouse space along Saigon's crowded docks for weeks and months at a time while importers speculate that the prices of the items will go up before they take title.

These problems require the immediate attention of our most skilled management people. I have today addressed a letter to Mr. David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, suggesting the immediate dispatch of a high level task force of management and economic specialists who can analyze the difficult situation which exists and recommend programs of management which could be put into effect quickly to minimize the problems which exist there today.

At this point I would like to insert a copy of the letter so that my feelings on this matter may be properly represented to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
May 17, 1966.

Hon. DAVID BELL,
Administrator, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAVE: My inquiry into the procurement practices of the supporting assistance program of the Agency for International Development for South Vietnam has generated a grave concern over the administrative tasks of our A.I.D. mission in Saigon.

In Vietnam, A.I.D. faces problems unlike any in its history. The swift, sudden increase in the scope of the assistance effort being programed in a war zone in an atmosphere of commercial anarchy challenges the proven methods of A.I.D. management and presents seemingly insurmountable obstacles for the meager staff of your mission there.

It is apparent to me that the size of the A.I.D. effort has outstripped the mission's ability to control the situation. Unscrupulous and profit minded businessmen are taking advantage of our assistance program to make money at the expense of the Vietnamese economy.

The law of profitability has replaced the law of need in determining products for import and sale in the country. Essential products are being diverted from priority and uses to uses which are non-essential but more profitable. Profits are being taken through currency manipulation on the sale of A.I.D. financed goods. Kickbacks to buyers is commonplace.

It is essential that A.I.D. move quickly to bring the Vietnam assistance program under better control. With anticipated expenditures of more than $570 million projected for the coming fiscal year, it is imperative that actions be taken to bring order to the chaotic conditions which exist there.

To insure that A.I.D. dollars are spent in a manner most effective in the stabilization of the national economy of South Vietnam, it is important that the following administrative programs be developed immediately.

(1) Improved guidelines to determine the qualities and varieties of goods procured under the Commodity Import Program be established. This is needed to insure that only those goods essential to the welfare of the national economy be brought in under A.I.D. financing and that realistic quantities of the goods be purchased.

(2) Improved qualitative standards should be developed to insure that goods of serviceable and lasting quality be supplied to the Vietnamese people.

(3) Additional safeguards against corrupt business practices should be instituted to protect suppliers and end users against unscrupulous business activity.

(4) More accurate information on inventories and shipments of A.I.D. financed goods should be developed and maintained.

(5) Procedures should be developed to cut down on the variances of market prices between official and unofficial exchange rates on items financed by A.I.D. so that profits from currency manipulation can be halted.

I realize the enormity of the task facing A.I.D. and sincerely hope that the challenges of our extensive South Vietnam program can be met. I suggest that you immediately recruit a small task force of management and economic specialists, who can quickly analyze the problems in South Vietnam, prepare methods of management control, and develop a program of staff and equipment requirements for the mission.

Such a task force should include persons with capabilities in commercial experience in trade with oriental small business concerns, inventory and supply management, banking and commercial exchange, economic projection, engineering and quality control and data processing.

I believe a group of competent American business and educational leaders could make such an analysis and submit proposals to you within the next 30 days, which would substantially improve the current situation. I pledge my support for whatever realistic proposals for administrative staff and equipment that are indicated necessary by such a task force and will work in the Congress to provide you with the tools necessary for effective administration of our Vietnam program.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

BIRCH BAYH,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the problem which exists in Vietnam is very difficult, but I am confident that American management skills can be applied to them so that they can be brought under control in order that our AID program will reflect the integrity of our Government and the dollars invested made more efficient so that those people of Vietnam will truly profit from them.

THE URGENT NEED FOR MORE INFORMATION ON JOB VACANCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the need for more information on job vacancies has been pointed out a number of times in recent years by Members of Congress, economists, and others concerned with unemployment problems. The Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, of which I am chairman, following up its recommendations of 1962 in a report on "Employment and Unemployment," is currently holding hearings on the feasibility of regular collection and reporting of job vacancy statistics and their potential usefulness in formulating manpower policy at the local and national levels.

This morning we have heard from three individuals who can speak with great authority in this field: Frank H. Cassell, Director of the U.S. Employment Services; Commissioner of Labor Statistics Arthur M. Ross; and Vladimir D. Chavrid, Director of the Office of Manpower Analysis and Utilization.

FRANK H. CASSELL—USES

The subject is so important and the need for support so urgent that I think Members will be interested now in a few excerpts from this testimony emphasizing the uses of job vacancy information.

Mr. Cassell underlined the value at this time of job vacancy information, making these points:

1. The identification of skill shortages in certain occupations and industries has become extremely important in recent months as the trained supply of workers continues to diminish. By providing information on the nature of available job opportunities and the imbalances which exist on a local area basis between the kinds of workers needed and the skills of available workers, the job vacancy program can be of considerable use to the Employment Service operationally in filling current openings and in alleviating skill shortages through training, restructuring jobs, encouraging relaxation of employer specifications, and special recruitment campaigns.

2. The manpower legislation of the 1960's requires detailed knowledge of job opportunities in specific labor areas across the country to provide suitable vocational objectives in training or retraining portions of our work force. This legislation includes, in addition to the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Vocational Education Act, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—and the array of antipoverty programs related to it—as well as the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. In conjunction with other occupational information tools, job vacancy information can help fulfill the requirements of some aspects of this legislation by assisting in the design of improved programs for the retraining of workers with obsolescent skills, those who wish to upgrade their skills, or those who have no marketable skills at all.

3. Some desirable jobs at semiskilled and even unskilled levels are currently hard-to-fill. These could serve as entry level-jobs for "poverty" group workers who lack requisite skills and education to meet qualification standards for higher level jobs. Considerable interest in such job opportunities identified by the vacancy surveys has come from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the President's Commission on Civil Rights, and Plans for Progress employers, all of whom are attempting to fit disadvantaged workers into productive and satisfying employment.

4. Comprehensive information on job opportunities, by occupation and area can help eliminate pockets of unemployment which exist because of lack of skills, geographic isolation, cultural disadvantages, and other obstacles to the matching of workers and jobs. It provides the raw data on job prospects needed by the Employment Service to encourage worker mobility, and to provide information useful in counseling younger workers and students and guiding them toward occupational choices that provide better prospects for employment.

5. The economy has already entered a period of manpower stringency, although shortages are still of the "spot" variety rather than nationwide in scope. If this trend continues, and if the Vietnam conflict makes further demands on the economy, we may need to give further emphasis to ways and means of identifying the industries and areas experiencing the most pressing manpower shortages, to methods which employers can use to facilitate the elimination of manpower bottlenecks, and to manpower programs needed to insure the most effective development and use of human resources. The job

vacancy program provides an important data resource for these purposes.

ARTHUR M. ROSS—BLS

Commissioner Ross noted that there are many collateral uses for such information. For example, it may have significance as a leading indicator of business conditions. A number of foreign countries have found job vacancy figures by area and occupations useful for analyzing the causes of unemployment and determining needed corrective measures. I think his comments on the analytical uses of job vacancy information particularly worthy of attention by the Members of Congress who must give legislative support to the collection of this information. I include a portion of his excellent statement:

1. Job vacancy information can be used to develop a picture of the size and characteristics of unfilled demand for labor. Such information can then be analyzed in its own right, just as many useful analyses are made of the size and characteristics of unemployment.

2. Trends in job vacancies, especially if classified by occupation, can be of considerable value in throwing light on the ability of our economy to adjust to changes in the demand for labor. They may serve as a lead indicator of changing economic conditions.

3. Job vacancy information, when used in conjunction with information on employment, unemployment, labor turnover, and hours of work, can enhance our ability to analyze the current economic situation for light on major policy decisions that have to be made in dealing with unemployment, labor shortages, and inflation. I shall discuss this in more detail below.

4. In the present economic situation, the question of labor shortages has become sufficiently critical, especially in relation to skilled manpower, that the President, as previously indicated, has asked the Department of Labor to watch the situation closely and to prepare regular reports. I have already pointed out that much of our evidence on labor shortages is indirect and circumstantial. We could do a much better job if we had direct evidence on labor shortages through measures of job vacancies classified by occupation, industry and area.

5. Job vacancy information will throw additional light on demand-supply conditions in the job market in relation to changing wage levels. Analyses of the effect of employment changes upon wage rates, although potentially very useful in appraising wage developments and policy, has not exhibited highly precise results when applied to data available for the United States. The additional dimension of job vacancies in the measurement of labor demand would contribute another powerful tool of analysis.

6. Job vacancy data can help us to sharpen the Bureau of Labor Statistics' projections of manpower requirements by occupation which are so essential in developing estimates of training needs to guide in the planning of the many education and training programs supported by the Federal Government. Up to now, these projections have been based on analysis of past trends in manpower requirements as measured by employment. We have recognized that in so far as there is unsatisfied demand for labor, the figures on employment are an imperfect measure of demand for labor.

7. Job vacancy information can be used by business firms to get a picture of the area within which they are recruiting workers, and to help in developing more effective recruiting policies. This would be especially valuable to firms considering new plant locations.

8. Such information could be of equal value to labor organizations in evaluating the demand for the services of their members and in developing policies for training, apprenticeship, and collective bargaining.

In meeting these analytical needs more information is required than merely the number of vacancies. We need to know how many of the jobs employers are trying to fill have been vacant only briefly, and how many of them represent hard-to-fill jobs. The latter may indicate imbalances between supply and demand, resulting from a disparity between the skills needed by industry and the skills available among unemployed workers in the community. They may also reflect unrealistic hiring standards, or low wage rates and unfavorable conditions of employment. To get insight into these questions we need job vacancy data separately for each local area, and by specific occupation. We also need information on wages to see what proportion of the vacancies are offered at wage levels below prevailing entry rates for the occupation in the community.

THE ROLE OF STATE LEGISLATURES IN THE AMERICAN FEDERAL SYSTEM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on April 28, 76 representatives of the business and academic communities and various levels of government met at Arden House, Harriman, New York to consider the performance of State legislature in our federal system. This meeting was conducted under the auspices of the American Assembly of Columbia University. Toward the end of the 4-day meeting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], delivered a thought-provoking speech on the role of State legislatures in the American federal system.

What is inevitable for the future is Federal involvement, and not Federal dominance, in State and local problems. For in our effort to combat the problems of poverty, insufficient education, and urban and rural development, it is the States and localities which are in the front lines. They are close to the problems and can be the most flexible in their response. Only local and State governments—using Federal grants and programs as resources to meet local problems—can carry the war on human deprivation to final victory.

Senator Muskie's speech makes well the point that the burden of shaping and forming this relationship is not solely on the Congress or the Federal Government, but as well on the State legislative bodies. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The State Legislatures in an Age of Creative Federalism

(Address by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Committee on Government Operations, before the American Assembly on State Legislatures in American Politics, Harriman, N.Y., April 30, 1966)

Four months ago, in his state of the Union message to the Congress, President Johnson signalled what I hope will be a new dimension to the Great Society. He urged that we "move on to develop a creative federalism to best use the wonderful diversity of our institutions and our people to solve our problems and fulfill our dreams. Later in the budget message, the President described his interest in more specific terms.

He said that the success or failure of critical new programs depends largely on communications, and a readiness for action among Federal agencies in the field, and State and local governmental units. "We must open the channels of responsibility," he declared. "We must give more freedom of action and judgment to the people on the firing line. We must help State and local governments to deal more effectively with Federal agencies."

This recognition by the President of the need for a more flexible, but more efficient, approach to administering joint-action programs highlights one of the basic goals of "creative federalism." It represents a top-level awareness of the critical roles which State and local administrators and legislators must play in the economic and social development of this country. It represents full acceptance of the strategic positions which these officials occupy in implementing the 170 Federal grant programs now on the books. And it is a signal that this administration intends to cooperate with them and assist them in fulfilling their public responsibilities.

Many of us have been concerned for some time with improving the administrative relationships between Federal, State and local governments. Competent scholars have been studying and reporting on this subject for years. In 1955, a temporary commission (the so-called Kestnbaum Commission) completed a two-year study which was the most perceptive and comprehensive analysis of intergovernmental internal relations since the Constitutional Convention of 1787. In 1959, Congress authorized a permanent bipartisan Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations composed of 26 members from the three levels of government and the public-at-large. During the past six years, this Commission has issued 28 reports containing 200 recommendations for improving State and local program administration and financial organization. Each year it issues a comprehensive legislative program with proposed drafts of bills for consideration by State legislatures.

There are two subcommittees in Congress making continuing investigations in this field. In addition, such well-staffed organizations as the Council of State Governments, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Municipal League, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties have developed comprehensive analyses of Federal-State-local problems, and are cooperating with State and local governments to assist them in modernizing their administrations.

Now is the time to bring together the knowledge and recommendations of these experts to define a positive program for encouraging State and local institutions to become active and effective partners in a creative federalism. Now is the time to update our intergovernmental relations.

I think it is well to emphasize that there is nothing academic or mysterious about intergovernmental relations, although some people tend to treat it as a classroom problem. Intergovernmental relations today directly involves people: their health, their homes, their jobs, their rights as citizens, and their security as free men. We can pass brave new programs to attack poverty, ignorance, urban blight, economic distress, and other human problems. And during the past two Congresses, we have enacted such programs. But the success of this legislation is only as good as the machinery which carries it to the people—in the fastest, most effective way possible. So we must turn the spotlight now on the procedures of government. We must take a hard look at the operating mechanism of our federal system of government to see where it is failing to meet the challenge of the 60's and of the decades to come.

We are concerned here with the role to be played by State legislatures in a creative federal system. It is a critical role—perhaps a major determinant of the future course of American federalism. A number of responsible authorities on our governmental system are saying that State governments are obsolete: that their administrative departments are non-professional and weak; that their legislatures more closely resemble an old-style one-ring circus, than a forum of government; and that their constitutions resemble more the Code of Hammurabi than a code for modern constitutional government.

One by-product of this distrust is that more and more Federal aid programs involving our metropolitan areas are by-passing the States because, frankly, the States have failed to meet their responsibilities to the urban municipalities. The report of the Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee on "The Federal System As Seen by State and Local Officials" unearthed a wide distrust of the States among mayors, county executives, and other local officials. And its later report, "The Federal System As Seen by Federal Aid Officials," revealed a corresponding sentiment among Federal middle-management administrators. A by-product of this distrust is the continuing hostility of public opinion toward State government and the sensational press accounts of alleged inaction and confusion, or worse, at State capitals. Unfortunately, the State legislatures must share a large part of the blame for this decline in the prestige and power of State governments.

As one whose political career began as a State legislator, and who moved on to be a governor, and now a United States Senator, I know that the critics have much on which to build their case. But I also know that State legislatures, as a *Detroit Free Press* editorial recently phrased it, "long have been the most abused of government operations." And I also know—especially with the completion of reapportionment—that the States can and must become viable, effective partners in the economic and social development of this country.

The die is indeed cast, and many State executive and legislative leaders know it. These officials are earnestly seeking to do something about it—because they recognize that the States are now running a $45-billion a year business, employing nearly two million workers. They know that if the States continue to ignore pressing public problems, the Federal Government will have to move in to help the communities involved. The incredible riots in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Philadelphia; the school problem in Boston; the subversion of the Head Start Program in Mississippi and in other States; and the abject condition of the rural poor throughout our country—these are not isolated situations to be left to local authorities for resolution. They are State problems; moreover, they are national problems. The States must step into the breach. If they do not they can claim only a junior partnership position in our federal system.

Why are State legislatures in trouble? Put simply, they are in trouble because their responsibilities have soared with every jump in population count, while their procedures, pay, professional assistance, and personnel are still geared largely to the small problems and small population of yesteryear.

The more naive among us have assumed that reapportionment automatically will correct this condition. They are wrong. All of us can take comfort in the fact that, as of January 1st of this year, 39 States had reapportioned both houses of their legislatures on the basis of population. And all of us should take comfort in the defeat of the Dirksen amendment two weeks ago. But equitable apportionment merely solves a quantitative problem; it does not necessarily solve the qualitative problems I have cited.

It does not solve automatically the problems of 31 States with biennial sessions.

It does not necessarily solve the problems of 33 States with time limits on their regular legislative sessions.

It does not raise the median biennial pay of approximately $2,500 in the 16 States using a daily scale.

It does not improve the $4,800 median biennial pay in the 34 States using a salary scale.

It does not provide offices or secretarial assistance for the State legislators.

It does not assure reorganization of the standing committee system along contemporary functional lines.

It does not strengthen inevitably the professional capability of the legislative reference services and councils in the 42 States which possess them.

It does not guarantee enactment of conflict-of-interest legislation in the States lacking them, nor effective lobbying statutes in the 24 lacking them.

In short, *Baker* v. *Carr* and the 60-odd reapportionment cases that have come in its wake do not meet directly the questions of improved procedures, better pay, less pressure politics and greater prestige. These are State issues that require State constitutional and statutory changes. Put more bluntly, they are reforms that only an aroused citizenry and legislature can enact.

Reapportionment ultimately will give the most dynamic sector of a State's population its fair share of representation. It will make State politics more competitive. It will probably produce a demand for greater governmental services. But all else is sheer conjecture.

"State legislatures," Chief Justice Warren wrote in the *Baker* v. *Carr* decision, "are, historically, the fountainhead of representative government in this country." If the fountainhead is to flow again, we must move beyond reapportionment. We must initiate the reforms that will convert our State legislatures into responsible and respected—as well as representative—deliberative bodies. What is more, we must recognize the impact the legislature exerts on the executive branch and the fiscal processes of the States. The "equal protection of the laws" guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment will not pave the way to progress in these areas.

First there is the problem of the administrative organization and personnel management of the executive branch. Both are chiefly legislative creations. But most legislatures adhere to the view, as a recent study of Main's government phrased it, that "administrative fragmentation helps to make the executive agencies more responsive to legislative wishes and to popular needs . . ." The executive branch becomes thus a cluster of departments, boards, agencies, and commissions—in Maine, numbering more than 120. In the popular mind, it is headed by the State's chief executive; in *fact*, it is headed by no one in particular. In addition, all of the factors contributing to a professional civil service—a merit system, good personnel management, training opportunities, and competitive salary schedules—are determined primarily by the legislature. In this day of big government, big budgets, big revenues, and big grant-in-aid programs, a governor must have some of the tools of modern management at his disposal. Charismatic leadership soon evaporates in an administrative morass, and brokerage politics can put out only minor brush fires in a jurisdictional jungle. The State legislatures, in their statutory and amending roles, have a primary responsibility for correcting this condition. All efforts to create a genuinely creative federalism will fail unless the States put their administrative houses in order.

Second, there is the problem of State legislatures modernizing the machinery for preparing the State budget and developing a competent organization in the legislature to review it. We have accomplished this at the Federal level; no less should be expected of State governments if they are to remain strong partners in our federal system. This need is underscored by the fact that combined State and local expenditures are expected to reach the $120-billion mark by 1972.

Most State governors should be given a wider latitude over the extent to which programs should be funded. They should be given more positive authority in drafting the budget. They should be given a budget officer who is their own man.

Today we have the technology to program executive budgets into computers, to determine the cost-effectiveness of programs, to produce model alternate fiscal plans, and to provide for long-range budget planning. At the same time, cybernetics can keep the executive office informed on changing needs and developing problem areas. It would also provide the State executive with a mechanism for identifying and evaluating more than 170 Federal aid programs available to meet the States' special needs.

But let me make this clear. The assignment of a greater budget power to the governor's office can serve the best interests of the people only if the legislative phase of the process is handled with equal competence. I emphasize the word "equal." As of today, few if any State legislatures have developed a satisfactory mechanism for testing an executive budget. Albert J. Abrams, in a recent article in the *State Legislatures Progress Reporter*, noted that instead of doing something about this, State legislators have developed "a bad case of inferiority complex":

"They retreated fiscally, failed to bring in economists, engineers and budget analysts to help evaluate the governors' proposals and, in effect, abandoned control over the purse-strings. As a result, the imbalance between executive and legislative strength in fiscal policy-making has shriveled legislative power. The legislators generally are reduced to nit-picking, porkbarrel logrolling, frenzied, frustrated across-the-board budget slashing, or a polite "amen" to the governors' budgets."

Legislative committees must be staffed to ask the hard questions, to point up the inadequacies, and to provide the members with sufficient facts to make independent judgments and, where necessary, come up with better alternatives.

As a minimum requirement, legislatures should establish two new agencies to assist them in this field. First, a budget analysis agency should be created to apply cost-effectiveness concepts and to engage in regional and long-term budgeting. Second, a program audit center should be authorized to determine on a year-round basis whether executive agencies are carrying out prescribed policies, and to provide a management-type analysis of administration. A strengthened budgetary process is indispensable if the States are to marshal effectively their own revenues and those of the Federal Government for the critical years ahead. These reforms—in both the legislative and executive branches—are needed to achieve this goal.

The reform of State tax laws and financial procedures is a third basic area of serious intergovernmental concern. No subject for State legislature scrutiny is more important, more complex, more controversial. And none has generated greater attention at the other levels of government.

Ideally, two general principles should apply here: to obtain the maximum revenues possible to service the public needs of the people, and to do this in a manner which is fair and equitable to all persons affected. Unfortunately, the history of State constitutions and laws is filled with more examples of repudiation than of adherence to these principles. The result has been a spectrum of imbalances both in the procurement and the application of State and local financial resources.

Until these imbalances are corrected, it is meaningless to talk about Federal revenue sharing such as the Heller-Pechman proposal, or other unrestricted block grant schemes which could provide windfalls to some States and inequities to others.

What I am suggesting is that all States have a duty to insure a fair and balanced tax package across the board. The major State revenue source is still the yield from taxes levied on consumers. And broad-based progressive taxes still play only a minor overall role in State revenue systems.

Local property taxes are another source of intergovernmental fiscal concern. Such levies still provide nine out of every ten local tax dollars. They still provide nearly a third of combined State and local revenues. But they are not the exclusive problem of local government. The performance of this tax at the local level clearly influences the capacity of localities to carry out their State-assigned duties and the States' allocation of their own revenues. The States' interest, therefore—and I might add the Federal Government's interest also—in the caliber of local property tax administrators is direct and inescapable.

Yet, most States have done little to force local tax officials to raise their assessments to the legal valuation standard, nor have they done much to equalize the existing assessments to a uniform percentage of market value. State legislatures must take a hard, critical look at their property laws. They must know precisely what the property tax situation is in each district, both with respect to the quality of assessment and collection, and to the utilization of the tax. They must change property tax laws to eliminate inequitable and unworkable restrictions, exemptions, and administrative procedures. They must guard against unequal distribution of the property tax burden. They must provide for greater centralization of assessment and collection. They must recognize the factors that undermine high standards of career assessors: popular election, part-time employment, uncertain tenure, required local residence, low pay, and the absence of legally-specified professional qualifications. And they should establish a State supervisory agency to improve property tax administration.

State and local governments increasingly assert that Federal taxes rob them of seriously needed revenues, and that the Federal Government should return more of its tax revenues on a general basis to these jurisdictions. They may have a point, but one thing is certain: such sharing should not even be considered until the States have taken every measure to obtain maximum revenue from all available sources and to equalize tax application and distribution.

The responsibility is squarely on the State legislatures to see that this is done.

WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CAN DO

In this era of creative federalism, the Federal Government is completely sympathetic to strengthening the States generally, and the State legislatures in particular. The contributions that revamped legislatures can make are fully recognized. The vital role that State administrators play is fully understood. The benefits of an up-to-date budgetary process are clearly perceived. The major contributions that a revamped system of State and local finances can make are of paramount concern. But the constitutional and statutory changes in these areas must come from the States themselves. And the focal point of this initiative inevitably must be the legislatures. There is where the real challenge lies.

The Federal Department, however, can contribute indirectly to this development. It can strengthen and coordinate its Federal grant-in-aid programs. It can place increasing emphasis on planning funds and technical assistance for the States and their localities, as the Departments of HEW, Labor, and Housing and Urban Development now are doing. It can enact the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1966 which I had the privilege of introducing last year and which passed the Senate unanimously last August 5th. It can simplify and make more uniform the disbursement of Federal grant funds to the States, as this legislation provides. It can eliminate requirements in grant legislation which restrict the governor's role in the budgetary process and impede State administrative reorganization, as this legislation authorizes. It can require that Federal aid programs be consistent with State and local urban plans, and it can help to strengthen State, regional and local planning, as this legislation is geared to do.

In terms of long-range action, the Federal Government can strengthen the machinery in the Executive Office of the President to provide a more effective means of coordinating and implementing the Nation's domestic programs, as my proposed National Council for Intergovernmental Affairs bill provides. It can assist State and local governments to upgrade the professional capability of their civil service, as my proposed Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1966 authorizes.

But no matter how much help the Federal partner provides, no Federal legislation, no executive order, no administrative improvements of the Federal administrative establishment can get to the heart of most of the basic problems confronting State governments today. These involve State constitutional and statutory changes; a complete modernization of the taxing, financing, and administrative structure; and a deepening desire upon the part of the people for reform. This is as it should be.

Federalism, after all, implies a division of public authority and responsibilities. And federalism, in the long run, will be creative only if the people adopt this as their own goal.

Mr. MONDALE. On the day following his address, the American Assembly adopted the following recommendations. I ask unanimous consent that pages 4 through 12, containing the recommendations, with a list of the participants, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL REPORT OF THE TWENTY-NINTH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

(NOTE.—At the close of their discussions the participants in the Twenty-ninth American Assembly on *State Legislatures in American Politics* reviewed as a group the following statement. The statement represents general agreement; however no one was asked to sign it, and it should not be assumed that every participant necessarily subscribes to every recommendation.)

This is a decisive moment in the development of American politics. It provides an unprecedented opportunity to reevaluate the role of the states and improve their capacity to participate in the federal-state partnership.

The opportunity for positive action arises from the nationwide ferment stirred by the court decisions compelling reapportionment and by mounting concern over changing state participation in the federal structure. The fifty states are searching for the most effective means of making their part more constructive.

At the heart of this appraisal is an intensive re-examination of the state legislature—its functions, its powers and responsibilities, its structure, its procedures, its personnel—opening wide the possibility for fundamental change that can improve this basic institution of American democracy. The states should move with daring and imagination to strengthen the legislature in all its aspects to give it maximum effectiveness in the changing federal system. This focus on the state legislature by no means implies a derogation of the executive. Strengthening each branch strengthens all by contributing to a strong state government.

Reform should go beyond meeting minimum standards of fair representation and beyond changes that simply enable the legislature to do its tasks responsibly and well. We encourage a break with institutional features that now produce chronic weakness and popular distrust.

State legislatures have failed to meet the challenge of change because they have been handicapped by restricted powers, inadequate tools and facilities, inefficient organization and procedures, unattractive features that produce excessive turnover in legislative service and lack of public understanding and confidence and because legislatures themselves have been unduly timid in using the powers already in their possession to strengthen their role.

The states differ greatly among themselves in their natural settings, their social and economic life, their political party systems, and in their legislative habits and practices. Recognizing these differences, we offer the following recommendations as a guide for continuing efforts by the states to improve their legislatures.

1. In many states, legislatures operate under severe constitutional limitations on their powers. Provisions safeguarding the rights of individual citizens and basic procedural protections to insure the integrity of legislative processes should be preserved. Constitutions should, however, leave legislatures as unhampered as possible, encouraging the development of their own self-reliance. Constitutional limits on the taxing power, constitutional ear-marking of revenues, constitutional requirements that bond issues be submitted to popular vote, and other limitations on a legislature's power to appropriate public funds, and to address itself to public questions, should be eliminated.

2. Use of the popular initiative is inconsistent with representative government, except for the call of a constitutional convention. The referendum should not be employed to reverse legislative decisions or to evade legislative responsibility.

3. Enactment of private bills, bills affecting few persons, local and special bills should be minimized in state legislatures. The purposes of such bills, where possible, should be achieved through general legislation.

4. Because public problems often transcend state lines, legislatures should organize themselves to communicate effectively with other state legislatures and agencies of government, and be willing to authorize participation in intergovernmental and regional programs.

5. As the principle of "one man, one vote" is applied, innovations in districting policies to improve patterns of representation are desirable. Districting problems vary greatly from state to state and from area to area within states. Creative use of single-member districts and multimember districts, alone or in combination, may help solve problems of fair representation, especially in urban areas.

6. State constitutions should provide for periodic mandatory reapportionment. When

initial responsibility for reapportionment is vested in a legislature, the authority and duty should be placed in a non-legislative agency to effect the reapportionment should the legislature itself fail to do so.

7. Adoption of a unicameral legislature may prove fruitful in some states. A small unicameral legislature may be especially appropriate in states where the cost of legislative operations is burdensome. Apportionment on the basis of "one man, one vote" has removed one of the historical justifications for bicameral legislative systems. In bicameral systems, states should provide, in applying the principle of "one man, one vote," for differing methods or patterns of representation in the two houses.

8. Legislatures should be of a size to make the position of legislators more important and visible. To permit individual participation, effective deliberation, full staffing, and adequate compensation, legislatures should be no larger than fair representation requires. We believe that in many cases in the United States legislatures are larger than desirable.

9. To develop more responsibility in legislative performance, and more independence, legislatures should be continuing bodies meeting in annual plenary sessions, without limitation of time or subject. Legislatures should be empowered to call themselves into session.

Turnover in office in a representative assembly is inevitable. Electorates change, age takes its toll, members seek other public positions. We are not concerned with this normal attrition. We are concerned about well qualified legislators who voluntarily drop out from service because of the frustrations of legislative life.

Since legislators cannot perform with maximum effectiveness or function in proper balance with the executive branch unless there is continuity of experience among their members, ways should be found to reduce these frustrations. The following recommendations seek to do this.

10. Demands on the time of legislators are mounting in all states. Just as the burdens of legislative service have increased so should compensation and other benefits. Properly incurred expenses should be fully reimbursed.

11. Legislatures should address themselves to the important problems of campaign costs. Both the Congress and state legislatures should consider adoption of tax incentives such as limited tax credits and deductions, to encourage widespread popular financial support of candidates and parties. We also urge the exploration of the possibility of government financing of legislative campaigns.

12. Competent professional staff should be provided the legislature, including staff for the leadership, both majority and minority. Adequate secretarial and professional services should be available to members, both in the capital and in home districts when offices are provided there. Where legislative councils exist, they too should be properly staffed. And competent, professional staffs should be provided, on a year-round basis, for at least the most important committees.

In addition, legislatures should provide central services, including bill drafting, law revision, legislative library and reference services. Such central services should be staffed by professional personnel employed on a permanent non-partisan basis.

By providing these staffs the legislative branch will improve its ability to develop programs, undertake research, exercise oversight, analyze and evaluate the executive budget, insure effective post-audit, and interpret and communicate its activities. Legislatures should not encroach upon day-to-day operations or upon the responsibilities of the executive branch.

13. State legislators should be provided adequate offices and equipment in the state capital and, where appropriate, in home districts. In addition, legislative committees, especially those with important year-round responsibilities, should be properly house and equipped.

14. State legislatures should utilize a strong system of standing committees, few in number, with broad well-defined jurisdictions. Committees in both chambers of two-house legislatures should have parallel jurisdiction to permit joint hearings. The committees should, as far as possible, reflect the major functions of state government. Bills should be assigned to committees by subject matter. Where feasible committee memberships should be proportional to the number of each party in the legislature and each party should be responsible for making committee assignments of its members. The number of committees, their jurisdictions and the rules for reference should be determined by a committee on committees. Committees should meet regularly in open sessions, and in executive sessions when necessary, hold hearings, and publish reports when appropriate. All committee decisions should be made in open sessions.

15. To expedite consideration of legislation, devices consistent with adequate opportunity for debate and deliberation should be adopted. These include prefiling, the consent calendar, electronic voting, fiscal notes, and reproduction of documents by modern techniques.

16. Increasing connections between public and private life have led to public concern over conflicts of interest.

Efforts to define and control conflicts of interest have satisfied neither the public nor the legislatures. We recommend:

First, codes of ethics should be adopted, applying to career, appointed and elected 'public officials, in all branches of state government.

Second, ethics committees or commissions should be created with advisory, review, and investigative functions which should extend to the activities of lobbyists.

Third, all instances of corruption should be vigorously prosecuted.

17. Vigorous party organizations should be encouraged within a state and its legislature. Well organized majority and opposition parties contribute to effective and responsible legislative performance. Organization of the legislature should be on a partisan basis in two-party states and the majority party should elect all officers except the officers and leaders of the minority party.

18. Legislative service will become more attractive when the public better understands the importance of legislatures in a democratic society. To improve this understanding, and to enhance the prestige of legislative service, programs should be undertaken to interpret the functions of state legislatures to and through mass media, and educational and civic institutions.

PARTICIPANTS THE TWENTY-NINTH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

W. Howard Adams, Associate Director, Arts Councils of America, New York.

†† Herbert E. Alexander, Director, Citizens' Research Foundation, Princeton.

John Anderson, Jr., Executive Director, Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, Kansas City.

Norman C. Anderson, State Assemblyman, Wisconsin Legislature, Madison.

Joseph W. Barr, Jr., Mayor, Oil City, Pa.

John E. Bebout, Director, Urban Studies Center, Rutgers—The State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Karl A. Bosworth, Director, Institute of Urban Research, University of Connecticut.

Alvin A. Burger, Executive Director, Texas Research League, Austin.

†† William N. Cassella, Jr., Assistant Director, National Municipal League, New York.

*John H. Chafee, Governor of Rhode Island.

Richard S. Childs, Chairman, Executive Committee, National Municipal League, New York.

Frederick A. Collins, Jr., Vice President, The Sperry and Hutchinson Company, New York.

Morris W. H. Collins, Jr., Director, Institute of Government, University of Georgia.

William G. Colman, Executive Director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

Rt. Rev. Daniel Corrigan, Executive Council of the Episcopal Church, New York.

Marion H. Crank, Representative, State of Arkansas.

Brevard Crihfield, Executive Director, The Council of State Governments, Chicago.

Manning J. Dauer, Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Florida.

Allen Dines, Speaker, House of Representatives, Colorado.

William H. Edwards, Edwards & Angell, Providence.

Jefferson B. Fordham, Dean, The Law School, University of Pennsylvania.

William Giles, Editor, The National Observer, Maryland.

Richard C. Gilman, President, Occidental College.

Frank P. Grad, Associate Director, Legislative Drafting Research Fund, Columbia University.

Daniel Gutman, Dean, New York Law School.

Delos Hamlin, Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Oakland County, Michigan.

Alexander Heard, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University.

††Donald G. Herzberg, Executive Director, The Eagleton Institute of Politics, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Cameron Hightower, State Representative, Texas Legislature.

Lauren Hill, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

Mrs. Willard Hurst, League of Women Voters of Wisconsin, Madison.

Jack F. Isakoff, Professor of Government, Southern Illinois University.

Malcolm E. Jewell, Professor of Political Science, University of Kentucky.

Sam H. Jones, Former Governor of Louisiana, Lake Charles.

Harold A. Katz, Representative, General Assembly, Illinois.

William J. Keefe, Chairman, Department of Political Science, Chatham College.

John P. Keith, Executive Vice President, Regional Plan Association, New York.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick, Executive Director, The American Political Science Association.

Bernard W. Klein, Institute of Public Administration, Lansing, Michigan.

Allan B. Kline, Western Springs, Illinois.

Harry W. Knight, Vice President, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, New York.

†John W. Lederle, President, University of Massachusetts.

Lawrence E. Lesueur, United States Information Agency, Washington, D.C.

Duane Lockard, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University.

William R. MacDougall, General Counsel, County Supervisors Association of California, Sacramento.

Malcolm A. MacIntyre, Vice President, Martin Marietta Corporation, New York.

Harvey C. Mansfield, Professor of Public Law & Government, Columbia University.

George R. Metcalf, President, National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, Auburn, New York.

---

†† Rapporteur.

*Delivered formal address.

†Cecil Morgan, Dean, School of Law, Tulane University.

Frederic A. Mosher, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

*Edmund S. Muskie, United States Senator from Maine.

†Arthur Naftalin, Mayor, City of Minneapolis.

Graham S. Newell, Representative, Vermont General Assembly.

Paul L. Parker, Vice President, General Mills, Minneapolis.

Stanley Peterfreund, President, Douglas Williams Associates, New York.

Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., Carl H. Pforzheimer & Co., New York.

Mrs. Robert J. Phillips, League of Women Voters Education Fund, St. Charles, Illinois.

William Pincus, The Ford Foundation, New York.

James K. Pollock, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan.

Jack A. Rhodes, Director, State Legislative Council, Oklahoma.

Douglas Scott, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

Harold S. Shefelman, Roberts, Shefelman, Lawrence, Gay & Moch, Seattle.

Robert Sherrill, *St. Petersburg Times*, Florida.

Robert F. Steadman, Director, Committee for Improvement of Management in Government, CED, Washington, D.C.

Murray S. Stedman, Jr., Professor of Government, Trinity College, Connecticut.

Hubert W. Stone, Executive Director, Connecticut Public Expenditure Council, Hartford.

Richard F. Treadway, Chairman, Treadway Inns Corporation, Boston.

*Jesse M. Unruh, Speaker of the Assembly, California Legislature.

John C. Wahlke, Professor of Political Science, University of Iowa.

Donald C. Waite, III, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

George V. Werner, Communications Workers or America, Atlanta.

Alfred Willoughby, Executive Director, National Municipal League, New York.

Herbert L. Wiltsee, Director, Southern Office, Council of State Governments, Atlanta.

Wendell W. Witter, Dean Witter & Co., San Francisco.

Wilson W. Wyatt, Wyatt, Grafton & Sloss, Louisville.

Belle Zeller, Professor of Political Science, Brooklyn College.

Mr. MONDALE. I hope there follows throughout the country a thoughtful and spirited discussion of the recommendations of the assembly. We all know that our State legislatures badly need strengthening. I understand that, in addition to the American Assembly, several other groups will promote discussion and consideration of these recommendations. These include the newly formed Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, the National Municipal League, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the Council of State Governments.

KTWO TELEVISION OF CASPER WINS THE A. I. DUPONT BROADCASTING AWARD

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, one of the broadcasting industry's highest honors is that which was created by Mrs. Jessie Ball duPont in memory of her husband, the late Alfred I. duPont, for the purpose of recognizing meritorious broadcasting in the public interest and stimulating achievement in broadcasting.

Only those radio and television stations which excel in the broadcasting profession are considered for the station awards, and the care and research given each of the nominees insures that only the best in the Nation will be recipients.

Television station KTWO in Casper, Wyo., is such a broadcasting institution and it has received the duPont award for "outstanding broadcasting in the public interest."

In ceremonies held last night in Washington's Mayflower Hotel, KTWO was honored for—in the words of the citation presented to vice president and general manager Jack Rosenthal—"the spirited way in which, despite limited resources of personnel and money, it performed for the citizens of its area and State a range of services ordinarily undertaken by a variety of agencies."

The citation continues:

> Situated in a sparsely populated area lacking both a newspaper of state-wide circulation and a clear-channel radio station, KTWO–TV became the principal communications medium. It assumed that responsibility conscientiously. During 1965 this was especially evident in its leadership in the field of education—as witnessed by its support of Casper College, its use of television for classroom instruction throughout Wyoming, and its cancellation of network programing to offer a daily television kindergarten for children of the area.
>
> In this, and in such other programing as its series on See and Know Wyoming, its responsible state-wide coverage of news, and the fairness of its editorial voice in politics, it has responded to the challenge of its situation to further a sense of community in region and state.

The State of Wyoming is justly proud of KTWO, its management, and its personnel. KTWO's true emphasis on the public interest has earned the station an audience that extends even beyond the State's borders.

Wyoming Gov. Clifford P. Hansen took note of KTWO's award in a letter to Mr. Rosenthal in which he noted that "your community and the State of Wyoming are fortunate indeed to have the varied services KTWO provides and you are to be commended for work well done."

One of the highlights of last nights awards program was an address by the chairman and president of Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Mr. Donald H. McGannon. Mr. McGannon's address, which he entitled "Why Don't We Listen to Each Other?" deserves the attention, not only of the broadcasting industry, but of its critics as well, in and out of Congress.

I ask, unanimous consent, that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the Record the full text of the press release which announced KTWO's receipt of the Du Pont award, Governor Clifford Hansen's letter to the KTWO management, and the text of Mr. McGannon's address.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Casper Television Station Selected for Du Pont Award

Lexington, Va., May 9, 1966.—KTWO Television in Casper, Wyoming, has been selected by the Alfred I. duPont Awards Foundation as winner of its 1965 award (for outstanding broadcasting in the public interest). The announcement was made by the Foundation's curator, Professor O. W. Riegel of Washington and Lee University which administers the awards program.

KTWO–TV of Casper, Wyoming, was singled out for a television station award for performing for the citizens of its sparsely populated area and state a range of services ordinarily undertaken by a variety of agencies. Especially noteworthy was its leadership in education as witnessed by its support of Casper College, its use for statewide classroom instruction, and its cancellation of network programming to offer a daily television kindergarten. The station was cited also for its "See and Know Wyoming series, its responsible statewide coverage of news and the fairness of its editorial voice in politics." KTWO is the smallest station ever to win the award.

The awards will be presented to KTWO General Manager Jack Rosenthal and Harri-Scope Board Chairman Irving B. Harris by a representative of the committee of awards, Dr. Fred C. Cole, president of Washington and Lee University, at a dinner on Monday evening, May 16 at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C. Broadcasting industry and government leaders will join in honoring the winners. Highlight of the dinner will be the annual duPont address delivered this year by Donald McGannon, president and chairman of the board of directors of Westinghouse Broadcasting Company.

Established in the memory of Alfred I. duPont by his widow, Mrs. Jessie Ball duPont, the Foundation has been making awards in recognition of meritorious broadcasting in the public interest for the last 24 years.

In television, others receiving duPont Awards this year will be WBBM–TV in Chicago, a station owned and operated by the Columbia Broadcasting System and news commentator Cecil Brown of Los Angeles.

(The text of the citation is attached.)

Dear Jack: Congratulations on receiving the Alfred I. duPont award for outstanding broadcasting in the public interest.

Your community and the state of Wyoming are fortunate indeed to have the varied services KTWO provides and you are to be commended for work well done.

The importance of communication in our state cannot be over emphasized and I am pleased that you have received this well earned recognition.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Clifford P. Hansen.

Why Don't We Listen to Each Other?

(Remarks of Donald H. McGannon, chairman and president, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. at the annual dinner of the Alfred I. DuPont Awards Foundation, Washington, D.C., May 16, 1966)

I am very pleased to be here with you tonight at the annual awards dinner of the Alfred I. duPont Foundation. It has always been an honor to be present at prior award dinners, but I hasten to assure you, Mr. Reigel, that I am doubly honored to have this wonderful opportunity to speak at such a distinguished meeting.

It was Abraham Lincoln who said: "The world has never had a good definition of the word *liberty*, and the American people, just now, are much in need of one." 100 years later, I think it is fair to say—in any discussion of the meaning and values of broadcasting—that the American people have never had a good definition of the word *culture*, and are badly in need of one right now.

Certainly, as one looks at the vigorous, continuing criticisms of broadcasting, particularly television, by some of the most thoughtful people of our time, it seems clear we are now living in a kind of cultural "civil war." On one side is the intellectual elite, who argue vehemently that American television should be quite different than it is now.

---

* Delivered formal address.

On the other side are not only most broadcasters, but also most of the American people—if their viewing behaviour, and the way they continue to buy millions of new black-and-white and color television sets, is any evidence.

Of course, whatever the color of the arguments may be, they are not black-and-white. Not *all* intellectuals deplore "everything on television," or agree with each other on what its functions should be; and not *all* viewers are content with everything they see.

But radical differences *do* remain between those who feel that television has fundamentally missed its opportunities to educate and uplift the public's taste on the one hand, *and those* who feel that the general pattern of American television *is* appropriate for the American people, whatever improvements might be sought within its present patterns.

I am not going to try to resolve any of these complex issues, in my brief comments here. It would be *No* easier to give an objective description of the state of American television today, and *what it should be*, than it was for good Americans to be objective about the issues of *slavery* and the *Union, 100 years ago*.

Lincoln himself went on to say, in the letter from which I took my opening quotation—after summarizing the radically *different* positions on the question of the Union versus slavery, *within the Northern States alone:* "It is easy to conceive that all these shades of opinion may be sincerely entertained by *honest* and *truthful* men."

So it was 100 years ago in the United States, when wholly *patriotic* men like *Robert E. Lee* and William Lloyd Garrison could honorably take opposing sides in *open warfare*.

And so it is today in broadcasting, as it continues in its great ferment of new forms of service, and unceasing *criticisms* of its *content and practices*.

But a curious question remains about the cultural war in and around broadcasting. There is nothing new about the modern intellectual's arguments against television or for that matter *the other mass media*.

The same arguments were made, over *50 years ago*, when motion pictures came into being, and soon captured the attention of mass audiences around the world. The same arguments were made, some 30 years ago, in the early days of radio; crystallized, as you know, in the famous *Blue Book* prepared by *Charles Seipmann* for the FCC; in which virtually every point of criticism and demand now made on television was then made on radio.

When one regards this long record, almost the *only* conclusion we can arrive at is that the *practitioners* and the *critics* have not been listening to each other very much; each going down *his own* track, with apparently *no effective dialogue* taking place between them.

And the basic question to which I want to address myself, tonight, is *why* the consistent and vigorous arguments, about how disappointing the mass media seem to be, have had *so little apparent* effect on the nature of the mass media themselves.

It's hard to know just where to begin, but perhaps the best starting point is for us to do *some listening* to what very thoughtful men have to say about television. Thus, *Arnold Toynbee*, the eminent historian, opens a recent piece about television with these paragraphs:

"Television is not the only one of our marvelous modern means of communication that is being largely wasted on frivolities. The same sad tale is told by the headlines and advertisements in the evening newspapers—and not only in the evening ones—all over the world.

"There is a *contrast here and a misfit* that is striking and painful: on the one hand a technology that is a masterpiece of intellectual creative power and ingenuity; on the other hand, a prostitution of this product of mature human genius to serve childish tastes."

Mr. Toynbee is hardly alone in taking this position. One of our country's *most eminent educators, Robert Hutchins,* said much the same thing in his own words:

"We have triumphantly invented, perfected and distributed . . . throughout the land, one of the greatest marvels in history: television, and have used it for what? To bring Coney Island into every home . . ."

We cannot ascribe such conclusions to the fact that people like Toynbee and Hutchins are probably too busy to *watch* very much television, for here is how one of the most prominent of our *full time* professional critics of television summarizes a recent season of it:[1] "The medium's record has been appalling. The quality of day-to-day entertainment fare, the TV to which the public turns regularly, has been . . . an outpouring of automated drivel that confirms a preoccupation with transistory ratings to the exclusion of other values . . ."

But perhaps the unkindest thing ever said about television comes from an eminent American scholar, *Harold Lasswell,* who raised this question: "Suppose you were an enemy of the United States and were hired to demoralize the American nation, what *television* strategy would you use?"

The professor then answered his own question by proposing that the best way to demoralize the nation through television would be (and I quote): "To keep the present situation as *unchanged* as possible." It would be easy to multiply quotations of this order by the dozen. But it can come as no surprise *to this audience* that many of our *thought leaders* are acutely unhappy with the present state of television.

This poses, however, the first of the questions I want to raise tonight—and let me underscore the fact I am raising *questions* here, not offering *rebuttals*. Indeed, before I am through, I want to raise as many questions about the positions taken by *broadcasters* as by their *critics*.

By way of introducing my first question, let me quote a sentence from Richard Hofstadter's book on *"Anti-intellectualism in American Life."* As an honored member of the Intellectual Establishment he has this to say about his fellow-intellectuals: "American intellectuals have a lamentably thin sense of history."

And it has always struck me that when it comes to discussions of television, the very people who are *most* acquainted with the cultural history of mankind—our historians and educators—so seldom put into any kind of time-perspective the issues they raise between *elite* tastes and *popular* tastes.

Surely, these conflicts arose long before there was any form of modern mass media.

Let me give some specific instances to indicate evidences of these conflicts over the years. The *first* of these states:

"The action he used . . . was wonderfully pleasing to the common people but by well-educated people . . . it was looked upon as mean, humiliating, and unmanly."

This comes from *Plutarch's Life of Demosthenes:* the most effective and most popular orator of ancient Greece.

A second sounds very contemporary: "What is it people want to hear? The latest tune that's warbled through the air!"

This was not about rock-and-roll or the Beatles who were "warbling through the air." This was *Socrates* talking, in Plato's *Republic!*

Later, in speaking of advertising, "Advertisements are now so numerous that they are very negligently perused, and it is therefore become necessary to gain attention by magnificent promises and by eloquence, sometimes sublime . . . sometimes pathetick." This was said in *1758* by Samuel Johnson. An astute observer wrote to his fiancee, saying: "There is bound to be a lot of mass-produced stuff . . . here." What do you think was being described? It was the great French museum, The Louvre, as young Sigmund Freud reacted to it in his first visit in *1885*.

Here, before the turn of the century, in a building housing some of the greatest cultural works of man, were *also* "a lot of mass-produced stuff"—which is hardly a new phenomenon in the history of fine art.

Again, one *could multiply quotations like* these by the dozens, since the conflict between *"good" and "bad"* in *cultural tastes is* one of the issues on which men have *always* had a hard time coming to any agreement.

But the issue was more significantly framed for us, in terms of our own *democracy,* by one of its greatest and earliest observers: *De Tocqueville.*

The date is about *1830;* and keep it in mind as we listen to what he had to say—for we must then try to define the *Question: just how much of American culture is to be related to the historical American process,* and *how much may seem to be the particular contributions of our mass media, today.*

A peculiarly important issue is raised by De Tocqueville when, speaking of handicrafts in general in the young America, he observed that: "When none but the wealthy had watches, they were almost all very good ones; few are now made (in America) that are worth much *but everybody has one in his pocket."*

De Tocqueville saw this as one of the fruits of an inherent "democratic principle," in contrast with the aristocracies of his day. It was a principle which, he says: ". . . induces the artisan to produce with great rapidity many imperfect commodities, and the consumer to content himself with these commodities."

Well, which is better: that a few wealthy people should have very good watches, or that "everybody have a watch in his pocket", even though it be of lesser quality?

But De Tocqueville did not stop with this observation. He saw much the same things happening, in America in 1830, in areas much more closely related to the subject of our discussion. As he said about art: "The production of artists is more numerous but the merit of each production is diminished. In aristocracies, a few great pictures are produced, in democratic countries a vast number of insignificant ones."

As for books, he pointed out that:

"The ever-increasing crowd of readers, and their continual craving for something new, ensure the sale of books that nobody much esteems. Here . . . is a motely multitude whose intellectual wants are to be supplied. They prefer books which may be easily procured, quickly read, and which require no learned research to be understood. Accustomed to the struggle, the crosses and the monotony of practical life, they required strong and rapid emotions, startling passages . . . to rouse them up, and to plunge them at once, as if by violence, into the midst of the subject."

I am *not* offering these quotations as *value-judgments* on the tastes of American people, either early Americans or later ones.

I am simply recording, here, his observations of what *happened* in 1830, *as* democracy began to spread the privileges of the rich to more people than had ever enjoyed them before—as it continues to do, over a century later.

---

[1] Jack Gould, New York Times, 1/2/65.

But whatever else De Tocquevilles's observations may suggest to you, they surely also suggest how much the issue of the content of our arts relates to the *ever-widening audiences* of a successful *democratic society rather than just to television.*

This is not to suggest there are *no issues* about what the cultural levels of television should be; or to suggest that television can be no more than a *mirror* of our society rather than also a force *within* it. I want only to suggest, here, that any useful discussion *of* such issues *cannot* be focused on television alone, as though it were an isolated phenomenon: a devil or angel *in itself*, whichever side you prefer. Clearly, these cultural issues are not *new issues* in *American* society—*or in any other*, for that matter.

But why, then, do the intellectuals of our day so often discuss these issues in television, as though they had no history, sounding as if these problems had *one dimension, without perspective?* By this I do not seek to evade any of the implications of such problems for television—the implications are great—but merely to try to account for the fact that such criticisms, as presently made, and as made for the *past 50 years*, have had so little *practical effect*, and have been of so *little genuine service* to the public or to the mass media themselves.

All the mass media of our time have grown *with explosive force*. Before we appreciate their pressure and influence, they have assumed a form—somewhat immunitable. We cannot therefore usefully apply ourselves to questions of what *should* be, without some clear understanding of just what it is we are talking about.

That is why I feel that, in the many thousands of words uttered and written both for and against American television, the critics and broadcasters alike have been equally guilty in not *examining* more thoroughly the really fundamental questions which might lead us to more useful definitions of *what television really* is and *what it should be doing*.

How much *should* television be like a great "market-place," to which all the people come to hear the latest news and laughter, as well as to choose the latest goods—just as people have *always* gathered in the great market-place of their communities, whether it was the *Agora* of ancient Athens, or the village square of any *Mexican* village today?

Or, how much *should* television be like a great university, designed to educate and uplift the people's mental horizons, whether they pay attention or not?

Or, how much should American television be a *mixture* of the two: of both the market-place *and* the university?

Whatever position one takes on this, shouldn't it be recognized that this is part and parcel of the oldest and most important issue in American democracy itself: how much can the people be left free to decide or be directed?

Good Americans have been divided on this issue. Thomas Jefferson himself defined it for us, in a letter he wrote to his friend, Dupont De Nemours, near the end of his life. What he said was: ". . . both of us act and think from the same knowledge, we both consider the people as children and love them with parental affection. But you love them as infants and are afraid to trust them without nurses, and I (love them) as adults whom I freely leave to self-government."

The issue is also as recent as the Supreme Court ruling which is changing the pattern of virtually all our state governments: the ruling based on the principle of *"one man, one vote."*

I raise the question: *does* this have any relevance to television too? How much *should* broadcasters honor the principle: "one viewer, one vote?"

And if not *this* principle, which one should they honor? I hope you don't think these questions are too general for patient analysis, whereby the broadcasters and the thought-leaders of our nation might arrive at some common *assumptions* and common *objectives* for television?

I do not think so, for these fundamental questions *underlie* all the *lesser questions* which are so often raised about American television—*and so seldomly agreed-on*.

But we *can* ask ourselves more specific questions, too.

For example, the present program-balance of television schedules is approximately 85% "light entertainment", 5% "news" and 10% "public affairs" programming.

Because of the explosion from the other medium this program-balance wasn't arrived at *by any plan* but, in part by momentum and in part by trial and error.

Some questions, therefore:

Should this program-balance be changed, or does it represent about the way American television should be?

If it should be changed, *how much* should it be changed: should "light entertainment" be cut back to 80%, 75%, 70% or what of the total schedule?

And last but far from least:

If changes in the program-balance of television are to be brought about, just *how* should this be done? What guide-lines are to be used by whom? And just how should they be enforced?

In this connection, let me give *you two bits* of information about television *in other* countries. Again, I do not offer these as value-judgments but merely *as a reporter*.

The first comes from an article which appeared in the *Sovetskaya Kultura*—which might be translated as *Soviet Culture*—in September, 1965. The writer complains that Russian television *does not entertain* enough. He estimates that Soviet TV is about *7% fun;* and goes on to say: "The high priests of the blue screen will perhaps dispute this figure *but* (he says) please don't count such things as *animated* cartoons in a program on *health education* as entertainment!"

And he concludes his article with a quotation from a prominent Russian critic who said: "The viewer should not be considered a patient who wishes some medicine, nor a schoolboy to be seated at a desk."

Until this item was shown to me, only a short time ago, I did not realize what strides the Russians were making toward this kind of freedom. Given our own experience, any nation whose people *criticize television*, can't be *all* bad!

And to counter-balance this quotation one of the least democracies in all history, let me give you a very brief one from one of the greatest of all democracies, whose broadcasting standards were entirely set, for many years, *by a semi-government agency*. It is a comment well-reputed to have been made by an *important BBC official* some years ago, who said: "There are certain programs which would be worth broadcasting *even if no one listened to them."*

As we can see, this question of what programming *should* be, is far from a simple one. And to this point, I have been largely considering only what *types* of programs define *good* and *bad* broadcasting, rather than the significantly creative issue of the *individual quality* of programs, within each category.

But yet, whether we are dealing with questions of *type* or of *quality*, all such questions subsume many others.

For example, *whose* standards should be used in trying to evaluate what television is and should be? To what degree should these be the standards of the audience itself, or of broadcasters, or (in America) of advertisers, or of the creators of programs, or of our thought-leaders, or of the government?

Just which of these groups is to tell us what is a *good* program—and how we will *know* when we've got one?

It is safe to say that these groups have largely different standards about what "better television" might be.

Yet, in a democratic world of disagreement, what *public policies*—as distinguished from *private choices*—can be used to define what is meant by "better television?"

I am not suggesting that the question hasn't been raised, and raised again; or that there is any easy answer to it.

I am suggesting that until we more carefully examine, and can roughly agree on, what measuring-rods we should use, it will be impossible to measure, honestly and realistically, what progress television can or should make; or even whether it is moving ahead or falling behind.

It is interesting to note, for example, that even as good an American historian as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., seems to have no doubts at all but that the government should decide what is to go on the air rather than the people themselves—and very few people are as familiar as he is with Jeffersonian history and "The Age of Jackson" which kept our nation from being dominated by *any* elite class.

Taking his position from the technological fact that the government must issue licenses for broadcasting, Schlesinger says: "The case for government concern over television programing is indisputable because government must control the air."

But he goes on to say, immediately after that: "The case for government concern over other arts rests on a less clear-cut juridical basis"—thus introducing an interesting distinction between the degree of control of the government over the content of *broadcasting*, and of any other form of communication, whether newspapers or the theatre, or public debate—all of which are part of television too.

Schlesinger builds his case for greater government stipulation of programing standards in broadcasting from precedents in other areas of government control. He says that: "The setting of federal standards does not mean government domination of the medium any more than the Wages and Hour Act (which prohibited child labor in the United States) meant government domination of business."

He might have also included, I suppose, the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906 as a precedent, which gives the government definite control of what foods and drugs can, or cannot be, sold in the United States.

The issue he raises is an interesting one: Are such matters as working conditions, and acceptable foods and drugs—which call for some measure of effective government control—in the same category as channels of opinion and of taste, in a democracy?

Here, I have an opinion on the matter—but that's not the same as an answer. And the real question we face is: How do we go about *getting an answer;* getting an answer to this, and the many, many more questions about broadcasting, both general and specific, which now provide argument but remarkably little agreement among the different responsible segments of our society responsible thought-leaders and responsible broadcasters alike?

Moreover, we know we cannot expect to see the end of human disagreement about broadcasting, or anything else in the world. The issue we face is not the hope of doing away with disagreement. The real issue is to learn to cope better with disagreement, and to benefit from it creatively, without breaking down into destructive conflicts.

We must learn better to examine our disagreements rather than to fight over them, or to "wish" they weren't there. In the long run, this applies to all the issues which divide men and nations; but it applies most particularly to broadcasting today.

The 180-degree disagreements we now have between the critics and the practitioners of broadcasting are not going to dissolve away merely by "wishing" they weren't there. Nor will they be resolved by more "fighting", as the history of the great arguments against mass media amply demonstrates.

But they *can* be reduced, and lead to fruitful expansions of broadcasting's service to the public, if responsible people on both sides will do some hard work together in examining what their different assumptions are, *why* they are different, and how their basic areas of agreement might be enlarged.

No one can suggest this would be an easy thing to do.

But it *can* be done as has been shown in many other areas of our pluralistic society. Disagreement need *not* break down into conflict, for there are great differences between "disagreement" and "conflict"—one a positive, stimulating force, a clash of minds out of which new ideas and progress can come; the other only a tearing down, not a building up.

Speaking, as I do here, as a broadcaster, I want to make clear that we want *more* help from the thought leaders of the community, not any less interest on their part in what we are doing.

We mutually must face-up to the same question: In what ways might American democracy and American television both be improved?

It was Winston Churchill who said, as you will remember: "Democracy is the worst form of government—except for all the others!"

As broadcasters, we might sincerely believe: "American television *is* the worst form of broadcasting—except for all the others!"

But that isn't good enough and it doesn't make it right. We want to make it substantially better than it is today.

My final question to this room of diversified and dedicated thought leaders is, How do we do it, and when do we get down to the task?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NONPROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1118, Senate Resolution 179.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 179) pertaining to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] be added as a cosponsor of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 179 be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the Senate resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the spread of nuclear weapons constitutes a grave threat to the security and peace of all nations; and

Whereas the knowledge and ability to design and manufacture nuclear weapons is becoming more universally known; and

Whereas the danger of nuclear war becomes greater as additional nations achieve independent nuclear weapon capability; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States, as stated by President Johnson, "to seek agreements that will limit the perilous spread of nuclear weapons, and make it possible for all countries to refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the President's serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supports the principle of additional efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferous problems.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on this subject be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1141) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE RESOLUTION

The resolution would express to the President that the Senate commends his serious and urgent efforts to negotiate an international agreement limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supports the principle of additional efforts by the President which are deemed appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace and for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Senate Resolution 179, relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, was introduced on January 18, 1966, by Senator John O. Pastore, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The resolution was cosponsored by 55 other Senators and was referred on that day to the Joint Committee. Five more Senators were added as cosponsors on January 26, 1966.

The Senate members of the Joint Committee having considered this matter, on April 28, 1966, voted to report out favorably Senate Resolution 179 and to adopt this report.

HEARINGS

Public hearings on Senate Resolution 179 were held on February 23, March 1, and March 7, 1966, before the full committee. The following witnesses testified on behalf of the executive branch of the U.S. Government. These witnesses are listed in order of their appearance.

February 23, 1966: Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, accompanied by William C. Foster, Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

March 1, 1966: William C. Foster, Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

March 7, 1966: Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

In 1945 the United States was the only nation in the world that possessed the knowledge and capability to produce nuclear weapons. Within 4 years—in 1949—the U.S.S.R. became the second nation to develop this capability. In 1952 the United Kingdom, and in 1960 France, became the third and fourth nations to test nuclear weapons. In 1964 Communist China became the fifth nation to demonstrate nuclear weapon capability. Thus, in less than two decades, five nations have joined the "nuclear weapons club."

From the beginning of the atomic age, the United States has recognized the danger to world peace and order if international controls of nuclear weapons and special nuclear material are not adopted. Beginning in 1946 with the Baruch plan, the United States continually has sought ways and means to control the military uses of atomic energy and to channel this tremendous source of power into peaceful uses.

During this same period the United States has recognized the importance of promoting stability and safeguarding the freedom of North Atlantic area nations. Accordingly, effective August 24, 1949, the United States joined with 12 other nations of the free world in the North Atlantic Treaty and agreed—

"* * * that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

The United States, as a member of NATO, has committed its military forces, including significant numbers of nuclear weapons, to the defense of its European allies without, however, transferring these weapons to the control of other nations. The U.S. nuclear weapon policy thus has given its allies a powerful defensive shield which relieves them of the need to develop their own independent nuclear weapons capability. It has helped to deter the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The senior Government officials who testified before the Joint Committee all supported passage of Senate Resolution 179 and emphasized that the long established U.S. policy of support of the principles of NATO is in consonance with the equally long established U.S. policy of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. They stated that passage of Senate Resolution 179 will be of assistance to the executive branch of the Government in furthering U.S. policy.

The Senate members of the Joint Committee, having considered Senate Resolution 179, report favorably thereon with the clear understanding that it in no way detracts from or limits the responsibility of each Member of the Senate to review without previous commitment any treaty or agreement which hereafter may be referred to the Senate for advice and consent.

The following Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have voted to report out favorably Senate Resolution 179, relating to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and to adopt the attached report thereon, with the understanding that the resolution will be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee prior to consideration by the Senate.

John O. Pastore,
Richard B. Russell,
Clinton P. Anderson,
Albert Gore,
Henry M. Jackson,
Bourke B. Hickenlooper,
George D. Aiken,
Wallace F. Bennett,
Carl T. Curtis.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the resolution be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1155) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

The resolution would express to the President that the Senate commends his serious and urgent efforts to negotiate an international agreement limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supports the principle of additional efforts by the President which are deemed appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace and for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems.

BACKGROUND

Legislative history

Senate Resolution 179, relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, was introduced on January 18, 1966, by Senator John O. Pastore, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The resolution was cosponsored by 60 other Senators. By unanimous consent the resolution was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the condition that the resolution be returned to the Senate to be re-referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for its consideration.

The Senate members of the Joint Committee considered this matter on April 28, 1966, and voted to report out favorably Senate Resolution 179 (S. Rept. No. 1141).

In accordance with the prior agreement, Senate Resolution 179 was re-referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as it is this committee which has jurisdiction over matters pertaining to international agreements. The resolution was considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations on May 5, 1966.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

The committee takes into account the fact that public hearings on Senate Resolution 179 were held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on February 23, March 1, and March 7, 1966, at which time the Secretaries of State and Defense, Messrs. Rusk and McNamara; the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. William C. Foster; and Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, testified in support of the resolution. The Committee on Foreign Relations considered the resolution favorably and recommends that the Senate approve Senate Resolution 179.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, President Johnson has characterized the threat of nuclear weapon proliferation as the "gravest of all unresolved human issues."

Senate Resolution 179 would express to the President:

> That the Senate commends his serious and urgent efforts to negotiate an international agreement limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supports the principle of additional efforts by the President which are deemed appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace and for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems.

This resolution, which has been cosponsored by 57 Senators, was the subject of public hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to which committee it had originally been referred. On February 23, 1966, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, accompanied by Mr. William C. Foster, Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, testified in support of the resolution. On March 1, 1966, Mr. William C. Foster, Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, testified in favor of the resolution.

On March 7, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert S. McNamara, added his voice in support of Senate Resolution 179. All witnesses supported it. None testified in opposition to it.

On April 28, the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy unanimously reported favorably this resolution with the understanding that it would be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee prior to consideration. On May 11, the Committee on Foreign Relations reported the resolution without amendment with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

Mr. President, I do not believe any logically thinking individual can doubt that additional proliferation of nuclear weapons is not in the interest of the United States. As Secretary McNamara stated when testifying before the Joint Committee:

> The U.S. national interest in nonproliferation is clear—any increase in the number of nations independently controlling nuclear weapons is an increase in the threat to our security.
>
> The further spread of nuclear weapons increases the danger of nuclear war and diminishes the security of all nations, including the United States.

Secretary Rusk, when he was before the Joint Committee, pointed out:

> Nuclear weapons in the hands of more countries could have consequences for world security which no one can foresee. Every additional country having nuclear weapons, no matter how responsibly governed—and may I inject that not all countries are always responsibly governed—is an additional center of independent decisionmaking on the use of nuclear weapons. International relations are thereby made more complex and more dangerous, and the risk that one of such centers could fall into irresponsible hands is increased.

Senate Resolution 179, which is now before the Senate, supports the long established policy of the United States opposing the spread of nuclear weapons. President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson—all firmly have adhered to this policy. Senate Resolution 179 gives recognition to that policy and to the realization that additional proliferation of nuclear weapons is dangerous, not only to the United States but to all mankind.

I do not know whether or not a nonproliferation treaty or agreement will come before the Senate for advice and consent during this session of Congress. As pointed out in the Joint Committee report accompanying the resolution, the adoption of the resolution in no way detracts from or limits the responsibility of each Member of the Senate to review without previous commitment any treaty or agreement which hereafter may be referred to the Senate for advice and consent.

Since last year the Conference of the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament in Geneva has attempted to reach agreement on a nonproliferation treaty. On May 10 the Conference recessed without having reached an agreement. The Conference is due to resume again on June 14. To many it has been disappointing and disheartening that agreement has not been reached.

However, the goal we seek is much too important for us to give up. Let us not forget the long negotiations and extended discussions which took place from 1958 to 1963 on the discontinuance of nuclear weapon testing. On many occasions we appeared to have reached the point where negotiations would break off with little or no chance for further discussions. But with determination and perseverance, we returned again and again to the Conference and finally reached agreement on a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space. Over 100 nations now have signed the limited test ban treaty.

We must be prepared in June to return to Geneva and continue to seek agreement on a nonproliferation treaty. We must not—we cannot—become disheartened. We must continue to press forward.

Some headway has been made. I was pleased that our representative to the Conference, Mr. Foster, on April 28, in furtherance of my recommendation, offered to make available the privately owned chemical reprocessing plant at West Valley, N.Y., to the International Atomic Energy Agency to develop safeguard procedures and train IAEA inspectors.

I would hope that after the Conference resumes in June further advancements can be made—that other nations and groups of nations will be willing to place their reprocessing plants under IAEA inspections. I would also hope that some effort will be made to strengthen article III of the U.S. proposed treaty along the line I suggested in my speech on the Senate floor January 18 when I introduced Senate Resolution 179. I am disappointed that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has not done so already.

There are strong tides running against those that seek to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

Communist China, on May 9, detonated its third nuclear weapon device, estimated in excess of 100 kilotons and appears well down the road toward development of the hydrogen bomb. India reportedly is reconsidering its previously announced policy not to become a nuclear weapon nation. Other nations closely watching Communist China understandably are concerned and will be debating their future course of action.

No nation desires to be dependent upon another when its national security is at stake. However, in this atomic age in which we live, no nation can be an island unto itself. Each nation must be dependent upon its neighbors. India and other nations must realize that development of independent nuclear weapon capability will not protect their national security. As additional nations obtain nuclear weapons, the risk of nuclear war increases and the dangers of destruction increase for all. But, those nations which elect not to join the nuclear weapon club must be given some assurance that they will not be subject to nuclear blackmail. Until such time as nuclear disarmament with adequate safeguards can be achieved, the existing nuclear powers must be prepared to give assurances to the nonnuclear nations that they will be protected in the event they are threatened by a nuclear aggressor.

This is not an easy task—there is no easy solution. We must continue to attempt to find a solution and to convince the nations of the world of the folly of becoming a nuclear weapon nation.

In adopting Senate Resolution 179, the Senate would attest to the world its continued support of the U.S. existing policy, and would give added strength to those throughout the world who are dedicated toward the limitation of nuclear armament.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. As many of us shall wish to do, I want to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for bringing to the attention of the Senate this most recent of his efforts to establish a saner world. I hope that in the discussion that attaches to the resolution which he proposes the Senate should adopt—and which I certainly hope the Senate will—some comment will develop which will ease the minds of many persons in this country.

I should therefore like to ask the able Senator from Rhode Island whether he would not agree that—underlying the attitude of a great many Americans when we talk about a treaty affecting the testing of weapons, the reduction of weapons stocks, and all the aspects which are the subject of treaty discussion in this area—too many people in this country feel that if we do anything like that, no matter what the safeguards may be, we will run into the danger of being fooled, and therefore they rather automatically close their minds to such a treaty.

Certainly, the Senator from Rhode Island, in the leadership he has given in the whole field of atomic energy, and its military uses particularly, has contributed to clarifying the situation.

Would it not be helpful if all of us, on occasion, would assume some responsibility to describe the dangers that we live with because we do not have this kind of agreement, the danger that we will be tricked with such an agreement, and that we will have to face it with open eyes, and recognize it, and then respond to it with prudence; but, just because there is a possibility of the danger of deception by the signatory to a treaty, it should not automatically rule out our entry into a treaty because the existence of conditions that a treaty would be intended to allay might be considered, in many cases, a greater danger, or a more real danger than the possibility that someone will be "cute" with us on a treaty?

Mr. PASTORE. I am very happy that the Senator from Michigan asked that question. I have not said it once, I have said it on this floor perhaps a hundred times, and throughout the country I must have said it thousands upon thousands of times, that the individual person, be he an American or a national of any other country in the world, does not have the least conception of the tremendous power we are talking about.

We must always remember that the revelation of atomic energy—the splitting of the atom, and the creation of this vast natural power—has been both a blessing and a curse to mankind.

It can be made a blessing, provided we take this awesome power and harness it for good.

I have said time and time again that we will have failed in our generation if we do not accept and meet the challenge of the moment and direct our efforts, in this day and age, towards the use of this power for the betterment of mankind.

To cite a graphic example of what I af talking about, the bomb which fell on Hiroshima in August 1945, was approximately a 20-kiloton bomb. This means that about 20,000 tons of TNT power fell upon the city. It was a primitive bomb. It was a bomb which had not been tested before it was dropped.

This gigantic power was revealed under Stagg Stadium in Chicago by Enrico Fermi in December of 1942. In July of 1945 a test was made of an implosion bomb in the desert of New Mexico.

We dropped an untested type of bomb on Hiroshima in August of 1945.

That bomb completely destroyed the city of Hiroshima.

I was there in 1955, and I saw the damage that had been done. It destroyed every single building with the exception of two. It killed and maimed one-half the population—a population of close to 300,000 souls.

It left a scar upon mankind which it will never forget.

We have come a long way since August 1945. First of all, we begin with the predicate that in August 1945 we were the only nation in the world that possessed the bomb. We were the only nation in the world that had unlocked the secret of the atom.

Today, there are five members of the nuclear club, but we are no longer confined to kilotons, which means thousands of tons of TNT power. Today, we talk about the hydrogen bomb which is spelled out in terms of millions of tons of TNT power.

As another example, I cite the bomb which was recovered a short while ago off the coast of Spain. That one bomb which fell from that plane was reported to be about one-half the entire power that was let go in World War II, by both sides.

Just imagine that. Talk to me about people understanding this subject, they do not have the least conception of the monstrous destructive power we are talking about.

In World War II, the aggregate tonnage of every bullet, of every bomb, dropped—and that includes the block busters which fell on London—added up to 3 megatons.

Today, we have bombs in our stockpile—and we know that the Russians have them also—of more than 20 megatons.

Somebody asked me one day, "How large is a 20 megaton bomb?" Let me dramatize that for the Senate. I am told that if a 20-megaton bomb were broken down into its equivalent TNT power, and that TNT were laid on a freight car, that freight car would extend from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean—this is the equivalent of one thermonuclear bomb.

So, my friends, what I am saying here today is that the time has come in our generation when we must begin to instill some sanity in the minds of men.

We know that today the same hatreds exist that have previously existed. We know that. When we look at what is happening in Cyprus, Vietnam, Korea, and Africa, we say to ourselves, "History has not changed a great deal." But with respect to this type of power, it has changed immensely. Today man has it at his disposal, in a mad moment, within 5 or 15 minutes, to kill more than 200 million people in the world in one surprise attack.

That is the reason why the Senator from Rhode Island has proposed this resolution.

We may never achieve this objective, because we learned a long time ago that the going is tough. We began with President Truman in 1946 and then in 1955 under President Eisenhower. President Eisenhower appointed Harold S. Stassen as his personal representative, under the aegis of the United Nations, to try to work out some kind of agreement. There was talk, talk, and talk, and nothing ever was realized. Then we sent Mr. Wadsworth. Then Arthur Dean was sent there. Now we have Mr. Foster over there. We are trying and trying and trying.

We know that while perhaps we cannot do much about taking bombs out of the hands of the five present members of the nuclear club, the more the bombs are proliferated, the more they are put in the hands of other nations, the more likely the situation that someone will feel called upon to use one.

That is what we are trying to prevent. We are merely reaffirming the policy of the United States of America.

A distinguished friend in this body asked me, "Why do we need this resolution? Everybody knows that is the policy of the U.S. Government. Why do we need the resolution?"

The answer is simple. After all, the Senate is the voice of the people. Members of the Senate are elected by the people. We feel, and this has been reaffirmed and reaffirmed by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the AEC, the head of the Disarmament Agency, Mr. Foster, that the resolution will be helpful. It is another indication of the feeling of the Senate of the United States that we should carry on, we should pursue, we should persevere in the hope that we can work out an agreement.

I repeat, it may never come in my lifetime, but I pray to God that some day, somehow, man will come to sanity and man will use this power for good, and not for destruction.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, readers of the RECORD will understand why we should feel indebted to the Senator from Rhode Island. His eloquent voice across the country has been attempting to establish the terrible facts of life as they exist in the world. Again today we are grateful to the leadership which he gives us in this area.

I have just one last question. Is it not true also, when the Senator talks about a hard road and there being no guarantee of success, that the fault does not lie always and everlastingly with other nations and other people? Is it not true, and has not the Senator from Rhode Island discovered, that there are many Americans who automatically come to the conclusion that an agreement that would be attractive for the Soviets to sign is therefore no good for us? Does not the Senator agree that that is fallacious reasoning?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it is. The best example of that was the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. I joined in the debate when that treaty was before the Senate for its advice and consent. I had many conversations with the late President Kennedy on this subject. As a matter of fact, at his request, in August 1963, I witnessed the signing of the Test Ban Treaty at Moscow.

We have been very careful. What I am talking about does not relate only to one nation. It relates to all mankind. I am not thinking about Moscow, Peking, Paris, London, or Washington as much as I am thinking about people all over the world.

A nonproliferation agreement, if it ever comes to pass, will be for the benefit of all mankind. It will not be solely for the benefit of any one nation.

Naturally, we must be careful that we do not jeopardize the security of this Nation. That is the reason why the going has been tough. We could have had a nuclear test ban treaty as far back as 1958 if we had given in to the Russians, who wanted a treaty predicated on good faith. We could never buy such a deal. We talked about banning all testing underground, but we did not have any effective way of determining such tests. Today, however, we have developed technological means by which we can easily detect tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in space. The best example is that a short while ago, in a matter of hours of the event, we knew that China had exploded its third nuclear device. In fact, we were able to publicly announce about 10 days before the event that it was coming.

So, to answer my colleague, it is true that there are some people who are still skeptical and take the position that every time the Russians or some other country wants to sign an agreement, America, somehow, is giving up a part of its security. That is fallacious thinking.

Those agreements must go before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. They go before the Foreign Relations Committee. They come to the floor of the Senate.

I want to assure the American people that we do nothing, that we have never initialed, and we will never sign, an agreement, that jeopardizes the security of Americans, for the simple reason that we would be destroying the very objective we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. HART. I thank again the Senator from Rhode Island for the leadership which he brings to us by this resolution, which I hope very soon will be overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, speaking from this side of the aisle, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his initiative in proposing the pending resolution, which I was pleased to cosponsor, to mark the resolve of the Senator toward reaching agreements to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is not a solitary effort of the Senator, for he has been devoted to this objective for many years. We owe a great deal to him for his contributions.

All of us were concerned about maintaining the security of our country, at the time we considered the treaty to ban nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in space. But I voted for the treaty because I believed it was a step forward toward the control of nuclear weapons and against their proliferation. This was an accomplishment of President Kennedy's administration.

I am pleased that the Senator recalls the efforts of previous administrations—the efforts of the administration of President Truman, expressed in the United Nations in connection with the Baruch plan; the continuing efforts of President Eisenhower through the United Nations to emphasize the peaceful use of nuclear energy and to secure agreements to control nuclear weapons. President Eisenhower established in the Department of State an office to deal with this most important subject, which is now headed by Ambassador William Foster.

The problem of proliferation grows daily more important. Mr. Nasser suggests that Egypt might develop a nuclear capacity. India, a country which has wanted to preserve a position of peaceful nonalinement, now is reported to be considering nuclear explosions. There are others who claim, as a matter of prestige, or of security, that they should become members of the nuclear club.

I believe that because this country is the greatest nuclear power in the world——

Mr. PASTORE. It is.

Mr. COOPER. It has an additional responsibility, perhaps, to continue making even greater efforts in this respect. It is disheartening at times that the efforts of this country do not seem to succeed; but I believe the continuing quest will give hope and purpose to the people of this country and of the world.

I support the President in his efforts and I am happy to be a sponsor of this resolution, together with many other Senators. I again commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his efforts in this connection.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his fine contribution to the presentation today.

This is not a partisan measure. The security of this Nation and the survival of mankind are universal problems. This matter is the concern of all people and all parties, and woe be to the person who attempts to make it a partisan measure.

I supported President Eisenhower when he made his dramatic presentation to the United Nations upon the establishment of the International Agency for Atomic Energy. I said at that time that that proposal electrified the world. When I was asked by the local press back home what I thought, I congratulated President Eisenhower and every President through the years, beginning with President Truman, who initiated the Baruch plan. Since the problem of nuclear weapons first arose, each President of the United States has attempted to bring about some kind of understanding, some kind of sanity, with respect to this vast and terrible destructive power.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as one of the 60 cosponsors of the pending resolution, the purpose of which is to express support for the President of the United States in his efforts to achieve a treaty to halt the further proliferation of nuclear weapons, I strongly commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the leadership he has displayed. I urge the Senate to pass this legislation promptly.

Two weeks ago today, I attended the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, as a representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I was cordially welcomed by the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Ambassador William Foster. I had the privilege of attending a number of our staff meetings.

During the course of my 3 days in Geneva, I had most interesting discussions with the Ambassadors from Sweden, Poland, Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, India, Canada, Italy, and the United Kingdom, who were serving as the representatives of their respective countries at the Conference.

As a result of those discussions, many of which were informal and off the record, I concluded that among most of the delegates to the Conference there was a sense of urgency to reach some agreement in the nonproliferation field equal in magnitude to the limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty signed in 1963. It will be recalled that although the negotiations for the Test Ban Treaty were consummated by Ambassador Averill Harriman on a trip to Moscow in a very short period of time, measured in days, all the preliminary work had been beaten out on the anvil of discussion at Geneva during a period of several years.

While it may be that the exigencies of diplomacy will result in a similar procedure being followed with respect to a treaty to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons, I have no doubt that the hard-working diplomats at Geneva will have done the essential preliminary work necessary for such a treaty.

I talked with Ambassador Roshchin of the Soviet Union. For a Russian, he was fairly communicative. I came to the conclusion that the Soviet Union is very much interested in achieving a treaty to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

In fact, I am confident that the Senate is not engaging in an exercise in futility in adopting the resolution of Senator PASTORE. Such a treaty, in my judgment, can come into being, and before the end of this year, if we are prepared to come to grips with the problem of nuclear sharing in Europe.

It is true that the war in Vietnam casts something of a pall over the discussions in Geneva. Yet, as a result of my talks with Ambassador Roshchin and his colleagues from the Eastern European countries, my impression is that Vietnam does not present a serious obstacle to agreement. The problem of Germany is much more in the minds of the delegates at Geneva, particularly those from the Iron Curtain countries, than the problem of Vietnam. In fact, I would state categorically that it would not be necessary to come to a truce or a conclusion of the fighting in Vietnam in order to achieve a nuclear nonproliferation treaty which would be acceptable to the Soviet Union and its allies.

With respect to the sense of urgency, about which I spoke a moment ago, I believe that our own delegates and those from the other countries are seriously concerned about coming to an agreement before autumn. The 18-Nation Conference recessed on May 10 and will reconvene about the middle of June. All the delegates believe it imperative that some progress be made before the next meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York. At that time the 18-Nation Conference must render a report; and if the report is negative, as it has been ever since the nuclear test ban treaty was consummated in the summer of 1963, the chiefs of all the delegations, including the principal Soviet negotiator and Mr. Foster, our own chief of delegation, are concerned that there will be a general feeling of "What's the use? Three years have gone by since the test ban treaty was adopted, yet nothing significant has been accomplished. Why not abandon further discussions of arms control and disarmament?"

To my way of thinking, that would be a catastrophe of the first order.

Actually, the verbal differences between the Russian and the American draft treaties on nonproliferation are small.

I ask unanimous consent that the original American draft treaty and the amendments made to it at a later date, and the original Soviet Union draft treaty be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the draft treaties were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORIGINAL UNITED STATES DRAFT TREATY TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The parties to this treaty,

Desiring to promote international peace and security,

Desiring in particular to refrain from taking steps which will extend and intensify the arms race,

Believing that the further spread of nuclear weapons will jeopardize these ends,

Recalling that Resolution 1665 (XVI) of the General Assembly of the United Nations urges all States to cooperate for these purposes,

Desiring to achieve effective agreements to halt the nuclear arms race, and to reduce armaments, including particularly nuclear arsenals,

Reaffirming their determination to achieve agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control,

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

1. Each of the nuclear States Party to this Treaty undertakes not to transfer any nuclear weapons into the national control of any nonnuclear State, either directly, or indirectly through a military alliance; and each undertakes not to take any other action which would cause an increase in the total number of States and other Organizations having independent power to use nuclear weapons.

2. Each of the nuclear States Party to this Treaty undertakes not to assist any non-nuclear State in the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

Article II

1. Each of the non-nuclear States Party to this Treaty undertakes not to manufacture nuclear weapons; each undertakes not to seek or to receive the transfer of such weapons into its national control, either directly or indirectly through a military alliance; and each undertakes not to take any other action which would cause an increase in the total number of States and other Organizations having independent power to use nuclear weapons.

2. Each of the non-nuclear States Party to this Treaty undertakes not to seek or to receive assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons, or itself to grant such assistance.

Article III

Each of the States Party to this Treaty undertakes to cooperate in facilitating the application of International Atomic Energy Agency or equivalent international safeguards on all peaceful nuclear activities.

Article IV

In this Treaty

(A) "Nuclear State" means a State possessing independent power to use nuclear weapons as of ____.

(B) "Non-nuclear State" means any State which is not a nuclear State.

Article V

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America, which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force on the deposit of instruments of ratification by ____ Governments, including those of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this Treaty, and the date of its entry into force.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Article VI

1. This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely subject to the right of any Party to the Treaty to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the Treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests of its Country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other signatory and acceding States and to the United Nations Security Council three months in advance. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events it regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests.

2. ____ years after the entry into force of this Treaty, a conference of Parties may be held at a date and place to be fixed by agreement of two-thirds of the Parties in order to review the operation of the Treaty.

Article VII

This Treaty, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

Done in triplicate at the city of ______, the ______ day of _________, one thousand nine hundred and sixty five.

U.S. REVISED DRAFT ARTICLES I, II, AND IV OF A NONPROLIFERATION TREATY

(Submitted by the United States at the Geneva ENDC on March 22, 1966.)

ARTICLE I

Each of the nuclear-weapon states party to this treaty undertakes:

1. Not to transfer nuclear weapons into the national control of any non-nuclear-weapon state, or into the control of any association of non-nuclear-weapon states.

2. Not to provide to any non-nuclear-weapon state or association of such states—

(*a*) Assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons, in preparations for such manufacture, or in the testing of nuclear weapons; or

(b) Encouragement of inducement to manufacture or otherwise acquire its own nuclear weapons.

3. Not to take any other action which would cause an increase in the total number of states and associations of states having control of nuclear weapons.

4. Not to take any of the actions prohibited in the preceding paragraphs of this article directly, or indirectly through third states or associations of states, or through units of the armed forces or military personnel of any state, even if such units or personnel are under the command of a military alliance.

ARTICLE II

Each of the non-nuclear-weapon states party to this treaty undertakes:

1. Not to manufacture nuclear weapons, and not to seek or to receive the transfer of nuclear weapons into its national control or into the control of any association of non-nuclear-weapon states of which it is a member.

2. Not to seek or receive, and not to provide whether alone or in any association of non-nuclear-weapon states:

(a) Assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons, in preparations for such manufacture, or in the testing of nuclear weapons; or

(b) Encouragement or inducement to manufacture or otherwise acquire its own nuclear weapons.

3. Not to take any other action which would cause an increase in the total number of states and associations of states having control of nuclear weapons.

4. Not to take any of the actions prohibited in the preceding paragraphs of this article directly, or indirectly through third states or associations of states, or through units of its armed forces or its military personnel, even if such units or personnel are under the command of a military alliance.

ARTICLE IV

In this treaty—

(a) "Nuclear-weapon state" means a state controlling nuclear weapons as of * * * (date).

(b) "Non-nuclear-weapon state" means any state which is not a "nuclear-weapon state".

(c) "Control" means right or ability to fire nuclear weapons without the concurrent decision of an existing nuclear-weapon state.

(d) "Nuclear weapon" * * * means (definition to be supplied).

SOVIET DRAFT TREATY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1965

Title

TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Preamble

The States concluding this Treaty, hereinafter referred to as "the Parties to the Treaty",

Considering the devastation that would be visited upon all mankind by a nuclear war and the consequent need to make every effort to avert the danger of such a war and to take measures to safeguard the security of peoples,

In conformity with the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly calling for the conclusion of an agreement on the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons.

Desiring the earliest possible attainment of agreement on the complete prohibition and elimination of all types of nuclear weapons within the framework of general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

Desiring to further the easing of international tension and the strengthening of trust between States, thus facilitating the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament,

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

1. Parties to the Treaty possessing nuclear weapons undertake not to transfer such weapons in any form—directly or indirectly, through third States or groups of States—to the ownership or control of States or groups of States not possessing nuclear weapons and not to accord to such States or groups of States the right to participate in the ownership, control or use of nuclear weapons.

The said Parties to the Treaty shall not transfer nuclear weapons, or control over them or over their emplacement and use, to units of the armed forces or military personnel of States not possessing nuclear weapons, even if such units or personnel are under the command of a military alliance.

2. Parties to the Treaty possessing nuclear weapons undertake not to provide assistance—directly or indirectly, through third States or groups of States—to States not at present possessing nuclear weapons in the manufacture, in preparations for the manufacture or in the testing of such weapons and not to transmit to them any kind of manufacturing, research or other information or documentation which can be employed for purposes of the manufacture or use of nuclear weapons.

Article II

1. Parties to the Treaty not possessing nuclear weapons undertake not to create, manufacture or prepare for the manufacture of nuclear weapons either independently or together with other States, in their own territory or in the territory of other States. They also undertake to refrain from obtaining nuclear weapons in any form—directly or indirectly, through third States or groups of States—for purposes of ownership, control or use and shall not participate in the ownership, control or use of such weapons or in testing them.

The said Parties to the Treaty shall not seek to acquire control over nuclear weapons or over their emplacement and use for units of their armed forces or personnel thereof, even if such units or personnel are under the command of a military alliance.

2. Parties to the Treaty not possessing nuclear weapons undertake not to obtain or seek to obtain, from States possessing nuclear weapons, assistance in the manufacture of such weapons or relevant manufacturing, research or other information or documentation which can be employed for purposes of the manufacture or use of nuclear weapons.

Article III

The Parties to this Treaty shall refrain from offering any support, encouragement or inducement to States seeking to own, manufacture or exercise control over nuclear weapons.

Article IV

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary Governments, which shall circulate it to all Parties to the Treaty. Thereupon, if requested to do so by one third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to the Treaty, including the votes of all Parties possessing nuclear weapons. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all Parties possessing nuclear weapons.

Article V

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign the Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of ____________, which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all Parties possessing nuclear weapons and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of or accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Article VI

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other parties to the Treaty three months in advance.

Article VII

This Treaty, the Russian, English, French, Spanish and Chinese texts of which are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

Mr. CLARK. The fundamental and, in my opinion, unshakable objection of the Russians to our proposal arises from our insistence on maintaining an option under which nuclear sharing with West Germany would be permitted through the NATO alliance. If we were prepared to agree that West Germany should be denied, both individually and through NATO, ownership, control, and use of nuclear weapons, and if their access to such weapons were no greater than at present, a treaty in which Russia might join might well become feasible.

In this connection, I do not believe that Russia would, in the end, balk at the McNamara proposal for a NATO group to include West Germany which would meet periodically to consider nuclear tactics and strategy. This view is shared by a number of the representatives of other countries at Geneva, with whom I talked. The Russians object to a greater access to hardware on the part of West Germany. They do not want to have the finger of West Germany on the nuclear trigger to any greater extent than it is at the moment.

I say parenthetically that that trigger is rather close right now. But nevertheless at the present time neither West Germany nor any other nonnuclear power can have access to nuclear weapons which would permit them to fire such weapons without the unlocking of a device by a representative of the United States of America who, in turn, is responsible through the chain of command directly to the President of the United States, who is the only one who can give the order to unlock the device.

In short, our problem is to chose between agreement with the Russians to join in a major effort to prevent the further spread of national nuclear capability or to continue to flirt with such schemes as MLF, ANF, and the actual sharing of nuclear weapons with West Germany.

I have no doubt that both world peace and our own national security interests strongly impel us to the former course—that is to say, agreement with the Russians.

My colleague, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], has recently returned from a 2-week trip to the capitals of Western Europe. He will in due course report his own views wih respect to this, and a number of other important matters. However, it is certainly telling no tales out of school to state that his conclusions are the same as mine.

Consequently I hope—and this is not the first time that I have expressed this hope—that the executive branch will abandon its efforts to provide for nuclear sharing by West Germany through NATO, a multilateral force, an Atlantic nuclear force, or otherwise.

I urge the administration to support at Geneva a nuclear nonproliferation treaty which first, prohibits the ownership, control, or use of nuclear weapons by any nonnuclear power, whether individually or as a member of an alliance; and second, commits the nuclear powers not to assist in any way, either through an alliance or otherwise, directly or indirectly, any nonnuclear power in obtaining possession, control, or use of such weapons.

I state in passing that my definition of control is the normal and ordinary dictionary definition of that word, and is not the somewhat restricted and unusual definition which has up to this point been placed on that word by our representatives at Geneva.

There is another problem which has to be carefully considered in connection with the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. There are a number of middle-sized powers—for example, Sweden and India—who are not very enthusiastic about a non-nuclear power treaty in which the two great powers, the United States and Russia, make no contribution of their own toward slowing the nuclear arms race.

What the Soviet and American draft treaties do, in effect, is to bind the nuclear powers not to give nuclear weapons to the nonnuclear powers, and to prohibit the nonnuclear powers from acquiring, either from us or through their own ingenuity, the possession, use, or control of nuclear weapons.

The Indians and the Swedes take the same position. They say: "What is the hurry?" India says: "We are a country which could quickly get nuclear weapons. We have no intention of getting them, but we want to preserve our option." They take this position because they are afraid of Communist China.

The Swedes say: "We have no intention of getting nuclear weapons, although we could do so reasonably promptly, but we do not want to surrender our option." They take this position because they want a strong deterrent force to maintain that neutrality which has kept them out of every world war which has been started in Europe over the last hundred years.

If we are to get India, Sweden, and several other countries in the same general position to surrender the nuclear option, it may well be that we and the Soviets will have to make some contribution of our own to indicate that we are anxious to decelerate the nuclear race and are not anxious to continue that race at our present frenzied pace.

The nonalliance powers, like Sweden, India, and other countries, are saying to us: "You should introduce into this treaty, or into a collateral pact, an undertaking on your part to freeze the further production of fissionable material and to deliver a certain number of nuclear warheads for destruction, to give some indication that you are turning the nuclear race downward and not proceeding to escalate the race." I must say that this point of view is a persuasive one.

I believe that our country is prepared to enter into such an agreement. The problem is whether the Soviet Union would be equally willing. This is the point which still remains to be negotiated at Geneva, and it is a difficult problem.

Mr. Foster made a brilliant speech, to my way of thinking, a month or two ago, in which he pointed out that the freeze and the cutoff could be accomplished with an absolute minimum of inspection, with so little inspection that it would be difficult indeed for the Russions successfully to refuse. So far there has been no reaction on the part of the Soviet Union.

I hope that if they want to get a nonproliferation treaty—and I believe they do—that they will give careful thought to the claims of these neutral powers, because if we cannot get them in on the treaty, we shall not have accomplished very much.

As the language of the Pastore resolution states, the spread of nuclear weapons constitutes a grave threat to the security and peace of all nations. It is a threat, moreover, which grows greater with every passing day, as nations which now lack nuclear weapons draw closer to the nuclear brink.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in giving its overwhelming support to this resolution, the Senate will be expressly supporting and endorsing the principle of additional efforts—and I stress those two words—additional efforts by the President, which are appropriate and necessary—and I stress the word necessary—in the interests of peace, for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems.

What those additional efforts are I have tried to make clear in these remarks. I hope that the administration will waste no time in making them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement in support of the treaty by Edward F. Snyder, executive secretary of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, and a statement of Dr. Homer Jack, representing the Unitarian-Universalist Association of the United States and Canada, supporting the resolution, may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. I again commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the splendid initiative he has taken in this grave matter of halting the spread of nuclear weapons.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT BY EDWARD F. SNYDER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION, S. RES. 179

Among Friends as a whole there is a wide and deep concern that the present immensely dangerous arms race be halted, and there is strong support for measures such as S. Res. 179 which support moves in that direction.

We wish to express our appreciation to Senator JOHN PASTORE, to the 55 other Senate sponsors of S. Res. 179, and to the House sponsors including Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD, for their leadership in introducing these resolutions.

While there are many areas where progress toward controlling the arms race should be made, nonproliferation is generally felt to be first in importance. Debates at the UN Disarmament Commission, the UN General Assembly and the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee in the past year have all emphasized the urgent need to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons.

The broad sponsorship of these resolutions is therefore especially timely and important for it indicates general Congressional support for a nonproliferation treaty.

In our view, much of the current level of discussion of the nonproliferation issue can be likened to the tip of the iceberg. The deep, substantive underlying issues are too seldom mentioned, much less earnestly debated.

We feel we do no disservice to the cause of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons by raising the following questions, for we believe that little will really be accomplished until there is more open and frank discussion about some of the impediments to progress.

If halting the further spread of nuclear weapons is given a high priority on the agenda of U.S. foreign policy, it could provide the key to progress on a variety of issues which have been stalemated for more than a decade—a Central European settlement, general and complete disarmament, and U.S. relations with China

If, on the other hand, the price is thought to be too high, further delays seem likely merely to compound the difficulties which grow as each year passes, and as impatience and pressures mount in more and more countries for a nuclear weapons capability.

1. *MLF, Germany and NATO. Is any nonproliferation treaty possible so long as the way is left open for possible West German participation in the control or use of nuclear weapons?* The Soviet Union is adamantly opposed to any arrangement under which West Germany might acquire nuclear weapons control. While we in this country may feel these views are unwarranted or irrational they are nonetheless real to the Soviet people who still have vivid memories of suffering and death in the Second and First World Wars.

The United States, on the other hand, seeking to build allied unity in Europe has explored and is still exploring a variety of methods to provide for West German participation in the decision making process on nuclear weapons control and use. The multilateral force (MLF), the Atlantic nuclear force (ANF), and the various forms of joint planning have all been considered.

The resulting impasse over West German participation in the control and use of nuclear weapons has stalled all progress toward a nonproliferation treaty for at least five years.

Within West Germany itself the acquisition of nuclear weapons does not appear to be a burning political issue. Some commentators view it more as a bargaining device to secure steps toward German reunification.

It would thus seem relevant for the Congress to inquire whether the time is not ripe to begin to move in the direction of a general European settlement. More than 20 years have now elapsed since the Second World War, and contacts between Western and Eastern Europe are growing. In this context a nonproliferation treaty could have a number of constructive reverberations on the whole question of European security.

2. *"Near-nuclear" powers.* Is it reasonable to expect that the United States and the Soviet Union can persuade the "near nuclear" powers to sign a nonproliferation treaty unless the two major nuclear powers indicate their willingness to freeze or cut back their own nuclear stockpiles?

A nonproliferation treaty is clearly in the joint interest of the nuclear powers for it confirms and perpetuates their nuclear superiority. And in fact all of the five nuclear powers have generally followed a policy of nonproliferation, with the exception of the soon-ended Soviet assistance to China and the unsuccessful attempt of the Eisenhower Administration in 1958 to persuade this Committee to authorize it to transfer important nuclear weapons material and information to other countries.

Obviously, also, most of the rest of the world's nations lack the financial resources and the technical competence in the foreseeable future to obtain a nuclear weapons capability.

Thus the economically underdeveloped nations and the nuclear powers are likely to be the most eager to sign a nonproliferation treaty.

But what are the inducements for the dozen or so "near nuclear" powers to sign—countries such as India, Israel, Sweden, South Africa, West Germany, East Germany, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia and others? The nations in this group are the ones which must be persuaded that such a treaty is in their national interest.

During the recent discussions at the UN and in the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee it has become increasingly apparent that the "near nuclears" are not going to resign themselves to a permanent "nuclear have-not" category without some *quid pro quo*.

One part of that *quid pro quo* which has been discussed takes the form of a "nuclear umbrella" or other undertakings whereby the nuclear powers make certain promises regarding the security of the non-nuclear powers. Such pledges raise many exceedingly complex questions of future performance under currently unforeseeable circumstances.

A firmer and more credible type of action would be for the nuclear powers to undertake a cutback in their own nuclear weapons stockpiles and delivery vehicles. The "near nuclear" powers are increasingly pressing for this course. There have even been discussions as to whether such commitments should be undertaken in a "package" or separately from a nonproliferation treaty. However it comes about, it now seems unlikely that the "near nuclears" will sign a nonproliferation treaty without some clear indication that the nuclear powers are moving in the direction of curtailing their own arms development.

Since non-nuclear powers are not likely to sign a nonproliferation treaty while the nuclear powers continue underground testing, it is also of first importance to extend the limited test ban treaty to cover all nuclear weapons tests.

If these comments are relevant, and a review of some of the recent UN discussions seems to warrant them, the Congress will be faced with some difficult questions. As the Joint Committee is well aware, there are problems of inspecting a cut off of production of fissionable material or a freeze or cutback on delivery systems or policing a complete test ban—all of which President Johnson supported in his January 27 statement to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC) in Geneva. The Soviet Union, regrettably, has been extremely reluctant to permit any kind of international inspection on its territory.

If the Joint Committee and the U.S. Government decide to await a 100% foolproof arms control agreement on these issues, the further spread of nuclear weapons thus seems inevitable.

To help assure that a nonproliferation treaty may become a reality, we urge the Congress to weigh the relative risks of an indefinitely continuing nuclear arms race against the probabilities of serious violations of arms control agreements and indicate its support for achievable arrangements to cut back fissionable material and delivery vehicles and to reach a complete test ban.

3. *China. Is it reasonable to expect that a nonproliferation treaty can be maintained for very many years if the People's Republic of China remains outside international negotiations on disarmament?* If a nonproliferation treaty were to be signed in the near future, it would seem very unlikely, under present circumstances, that China would join. But it would also seem fair to surmise that China would continue its nonproliferation policy and would not transfer nuclear weapons know-how or materials to other countries.

But if real progress is to be made toward peace in Asia and toward bringing the nuclear and conventional arms race under control, it is imperative that a formula be found to bring China into the ongoing disarmament negotiations and within the United Nations framework.

It is encouraging to note that at the recently concluded UN General Assembly steps were taken to call a world disarmament conference. Hopefully a formula can be found which will bring China—and France—into these and further negotiations.

We urge the Congress to encourage the Administration to push ahead in trying to find a basis for bringing China into disarmament negotiations. This is a most important issue, as Senator Pastore and others pointed out on the floor when S. Res. 179 was introduced.

4. *Vietnam.* Is it possible to conclude a nonproliferation treaty while the Vietnam war continues? The restraint which Mr. Foster and Mr. Tsarapkin displayed when the ENDC reconvened in Geneva on January 27 was most commendable. Concentration on the nonproliferation and other issues without major recriminations over events in Vietnam is an encouraging sign of interest by both nations in the disarmament question.

We would be profoundly happy if an early nonproliferation agreement could be reached. But we are extremely troubled by the continued slow deterioration of the U.S.-Soviet detente under the impact of the Vietnam war and we question whether a signed treaty is possible now since each is becoming more deeply committed on opposite sides of that tragic struggle.

We suggest that the Congress explore whether the real security interests of the United States and the world require that a higher priority be given to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, rather than a growing U.S. military commitment in a land war on the Asian mainland.

5. *IAEA Inspection.* Are the non-nuclear powers likely to subject themselves to the kind of thorough inspection of their peaceful nuclear programs that the Congress would like? We earnestly hope so. Every nation should increasingly open up its potentially dangerous facilities to international purview.

We are glad to note that President Johnson in his message to the ENDC, January 27, 1966, in commenting on the need for non-nuclear powers to permit IAEA or equivalent international safeguards, said: "At the same time, the major nuclear powers should accept in increasing measure the same international safeguards they recommend for other states."

Over the years, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has taken considerable leadership in urging IAEA safeguards. We hope the Committee will now support additional steps to put all U.S. facilities under IAEA inspection just as rapidly as practicable. This would, in our view, be an act of responsible leadership in the prevention of further spread of nuclear weapons.

We do not believe that definitive answers are necessarily possible to these questions now, but we do believe the issue must be explored in depth. It seems obvious that it is in the clear U.S. interest from both a military and political viewpoint to achieve an effective treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The hard question is, how great a price is the United States prepared to pay to reach that objective?

We believe that nothing but disaster lies at the end of the road of nuclear proliferation. At some point on that road, as President Kennedy said, the genie will be out of the bottle and our nation and the world will suffer a terrible holocaust.

What is needed now is a sense of direction and momentum. A certain momentum began in 1963 with the test ban treaty, the "hot line" and the UN resolution against orbiting weapons of mass destruction. It continued into early 1964 with the mutual U.S.-Soviet announcements of cutbacks in production of fissionable materials. The resulting detente has eroded slowly—surprisingly slowly—under the impact of the Vietnam war.

To reverse the present decline will require more than Senate passage of this resolution. But passage of this resolution can be an important step in giving a much higher place in U.S. foreign policy priorities to the achievement of a nonproliferation treaty.

Peace is a process. As one step is taken the next will be clearer. Steps that seem impossible now can become possible under new circumstances. It is this intent, this process and this direction, perhaps more than the specific measures themselves, which will persuade the near-nuclear powers to refrain from obtaining nuclear weapons. If real progress can begin and be maintained, the nations of the world will have growing confidence that they can find their own national security within a system of international law and under general and complete disarmament, the goal to which President Kennedy committed the United States in 1961.

STATEMENT BY DR. HOMER A. JACK, REPRESENTING THE UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, ON S. RES. 179, LIMITING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The Unitarian Universalist Association is a denomination of liberal churches in the United States and Canada. This Association and its predecessors have long been concerned about world peace. In May 1963, the General Assembly of this Association passed a resolution supporting the Administration's efforts at that time to secure a test-ban treaty because it would "serve to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons." The intent of that resolution also makes possible our endorsement of Senate Resolution 179 commending the President's "serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons" and supporting "the principle of additional efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems."

This statement will not repeat the urgency of international efforts necessary to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Rather it will discuss several problems surrounding a non-proliferation treaty and also endorse other methods to limit the spread of such weapons in addition to a treaty.

One valid question raised in any discussion of a non-proliferation treaty is this: isn't the time too late? It may be too late to prevent India from becoming the sixth nuclear nation. It may never be too late, but many signs point to India's soon becoming the sixth nuclear nation. It has been said that, if India goes atomic, all is lost, for India would be the first non-permanent member of the U.N. Security Council to enter the atomic club. It could be argued, however, that there is a major gradient, not between the five permanent members of the Security Council and all other states, but between the five permanent members plus India and all other states. By standards of population and power, India should now be a permanent member of the Security Council. The door would assuredly be opened wider by India's becoming an atomic power, but this tragic fact would not automatically open the door to the next rung of powers—which are all of a different character than India. This argument is not to justify India's acquiring nuclear weapons; it is rather to indicate that if India did so, the flood-gates to atomic acquisition would not necessarily or immediately be opened.

Whether it is too late or not to prevent India from acquiring nuclear weapons, the prompt signing of a non-proliferation treaty may not be too late to prevent other nations from doing so. The list of next states is well-known: Israel, West Germany, Sweden, etc. A carefully-devised non-proliferation treaty, together with other measures, might be persuasive with the governments and peoples of these and other states to forsake what atomic plans they may now have, especially since a worldwide program of non-proliferation would constitute an important hinge of history—a world-wide change in direction.

A second valid question raised in any discussion of a non-proliferation pact is this: will China and France sign such a treaty? If not, what is the value of a treaty? China and France are not expected to sign such an agreement, at least not immediately, especially since they will not have been parties to its negotiation. Yet an argument can be made for the importance of a non-proliferation treaty, not universally signed immediately. The partial test-ban treaty has also not been universally signed. China and France, and several smaller nations, notably Guinea and Cambodia, refused to sign it. This is regrettable, but so far this has not been fatal. The test-ban treaty was an exercise in detente as much as in disarmament. Likewise, a non-proliferation treaty can help improve the international atmosphere just as much as it can discourage next nations from acquiring nuclear weapons. And hopefully, someday, even China and France might affix their signatures.

A third question raised in any discussion of non-proliferation is this: what guarantees would we wish to insert into the treaty which will induce the non-nuclear nations with a nuclear capability not to want to exercise their option? A nuclear umbrella has often been discussed in connection with such a treaty, but it does not now appear either in the Soviet or the U.S. drafts of the text. This is wise, for no such proposals have yet been made for a guarantee which have any possibility of implementation other than setting up a complicated system of security, probably outside the U.N. It is one thing for a nuclear nation to promise protection to a non-nuclear nation from nuclear blackmail or attack or perhaps even conventional attack in lieu of the acquisition of nuclear weapons. It is quite another thing for a nuclear nation or a group of nuclear nations to define nuclear blackmail or even nuclear or conventional attack and then go to the defense of the victim.

One guarantee which may be more self-enforcing is the recent proposal of the Soviet Union that all nuclear powers signing a non-proliferation treaty pledge not to use nuclear weapons against those non-nuclear powers adhering to the treaty. This proposal merits serious study.

A non-proliferation treaty may be the most important method to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, but other efforts are needed. These include the following.

One. The partial test-ban treaty should be completed, to include all underground tests and, if possible, to be acceded to by all countries. These two goals are not easy to reach, but additional efforts should be made by the U.S. and all nations toward these ends.

Two. Nuclear-free zones should be established in various parts of the world. The U.S. in recent years has become officially more receptive to the creation of such zones. Those in Latin America and perhaps Africa appear most promising and should be encouraged. The greatest opportunity is, of course, a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe. This also raises the most problems, but efforts should be started to explore this possibility.

Three. The International Atomic Energy Agency should inspect all power and research reactors, so that their by-products may not be used for military purposes. To these should be added separation plants.

Four. The present nuclear powers, including the U.S., should undertake increasing nuclear disarmament. All current efforts by the nuclear powers to persuade non-nuclear countries not to manufacture and test nuclear weapons appear to some to have a hypocritical if not a monopolist tone. The goal is to eliminate all nuclear weapons held by all powers. To the degree that the present nuclear powers can make substantial cuts in their nuclear stockpiles, to that degree their persuasiveness can be accepted by some understandably skeptical non-nuclear powers.

The initiative on the part of the U.S. Senate to commend the President for his efforts toward non-proliferation is crucial. The passage of this resolution might signal important American intentions to the Soviet Union and other nations, in the manner that the Dodd resolution conveyed a message to the Soviet Union on the test-ban issue in the spring of 1963. In this spirit we wholeheartedly endorse this resolution and urge its early passage.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, this is, in my judgment, an event of major importance.

Today the Senate of the United States says that we are ready to do our part to insure that the perils of nuclear destruction are controlled and ultimately banished from the earth.

Today the Senate says that the nuclear sword of Damocles of which President Kennedy warned us—"hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or madness"—must be sheathed.

In the midst of crisis in Vietnam, amid constant problems in Latin America, in Europe, and here at home, it is hard to keep our eyes lifted to the ultimate problems of war and peace; the great questions, as Henry Stimson said at the dawn of the atomic age, of whether our politics can grow up to our technology.

This resolution speaks to the other nuclear powers; to them it says that the Senate maintains its commitment to destroy the ultimate weapons before those weapons destroy the societies they were designed to protect.

To other nations of the world, the resolution says that the Senate seeks a world order based not on force but on the rule of law.

Perhaps most important, this resolution says, to all agencies of the U.S. Government, that our efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons must be intensified—that they must go forward with ever greater urgency—that we are simply not doing enough.

We are, of course, engaged in negotiations with the Soviet Union and 16 other nations at Geneva.

But one of the world's five nuclear powers—Communist China—is not represented at that conference.

We know that China is a difficult and hostile power—and that negotiations with China may be frustrating—and perhaps fruitless.

But China exists.

China is a nuclear power.

And without China's cooperation, the proliferation of nuclear weapons may be beyond our capacity to control.

It is therefore our responsibility to take the first step—to take every honorable step—to bring China to the table of discussion at Geneva, or to engage in bilateral discussions at a high level elsewhere—and to take these steps openly and publicly.

But this we have not done.

I think the Senate—I think the American people—are mature enough and concerned enough about the problem of nuclear weapons, to support such negotiations with Communist China.

I think we understand, as President Kennedy told us in 1963, that "world peace does not require that every man love his neighbor"—that even between nations whose interests are fundamentally opposed, there may be agreements, definite and limited in nature, which are in the interests of all.

I therefore urge again that China be invited to Geneva.

And I further urge, as I did last week, that we explore fully with China whether, as Chou En-Lai indicated, they would be willing to suspend nuclear testing if the United States would join in a pledge not to use nuclear weapons between our two countries.

Mr. President, the Senate knows, and the world knows, how urgent it is that we prevent its further spread, to hands which may be less responsible than those which hold it at the moment.

The Senate and the American people must thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his unceasing and effective leadership.

Let us now all join his efforts; and let every American, and every agency of the American Government, follow his example of courage and vision to the end that the nuclear weapon be controlled and ultimately removed from the earth.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I strongly support the position with respect to the pending resolution taken by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. But even more than that, I heartily endorse his suggestion—or perhaps these are my words and not his—that we acted hastily and without careful thought in rejecting out of hand the suggestion of the Communist Chinese Government that we discuss with them an agreement under which each of us would undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

One can well understand why the Chinese made that suggestion. They have a huge land army, which perhaps they would like to send south, or perhaps they would like to send it against Formosa, or even against South Korea; and obviously, it would be to their advantage to have us agree that we would never use the first nuclear weapon.

But on the other hand, as the Senator from New York has so well said, it is absolutely essential, if we are to make any serious progress in disarmament, to have the Chinese Communists at the conference table and talking about these matters, and hopefully joining in an ultimate agreement.

I sincerely hope we could discuss the question of the first use of nuclear weapons on a very broad spectrum, which would include a number of conditions, among which would no doubt be that that pledge would become unavailing if national borders were crossed by armed forces, or if a war of national liberation obviously instigated and supported by the Red Chinese were clearly the case.

But to reject this suggestion out of hand seems to me to have been an unfortunate and serious diplomatic mistake.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. The fact that this offer was first made public by the Chinese Communists; and that a representative from the State Department just last week acknowledged the fact that they had made this offer of agreement a year ago; and that Chou En-lai was able to say that they would not be testing if it had not been for the U.S. refusal to make this kind of an agreement—I think that in the light of these developments, they have been able, to some extent, to put the burden on the United States—though, in my judgment, completely unfairly—for their having resumed their testing.

I do not think it is necessary for us to place ourselves in that position. I think that if the Chinese follow the recommendation or outline given by the Senator from Pennsylvania, saying, "Yes, we will accept that," and then we see how we are going to check it, and how they are going to check it, then we do not test, and they do not test. It seems to me that that would be a major step forward. That would bring them, in fact, under the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Perhaps there were further discussions by the representatives of the State Department, but it appears that first, the United States turned it down flatly; and second, we never asked them to come to Geneva to discuss disarmament.

Our position once again is weakened not only in our country but around the world.

Mr. CLARK. While I agree it would be useful to have them at Geneva, we did not have to go that far. It could have been Warsaw.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator for his complimentary remarks.

I lend my voice in agreement with the last dialog with reference to ruling out of hand any serious discussion on the question of using the atom bomb first.

I think, after all, it needs to be explained and explored. We are living in a very sensitive world, and I see no harm in discussing it.

No one has ever said there had to be an agreement in advance, but we all agree it would be good to sit down and talk about these various serious problems if we are to keep this world intact.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am in complete accord with this resolution and desire to support the President in his efforts to negotiate agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. As we discuss this vital issue, it is appropriate that the Senate take heed and the American people be warned of certain policies of our Defense Department that point toward increasing reliance upon nuclear weapons. It is particularly important that we consider the significance of a plan that has been proposed and is apparently under consideration for nuclear defense of Western Europe.

Upon the return of Secretary McNamara from London, we learn of a new plan for nuclear defense of Western Europe. In justice to McNamara, it should be said that the plan was probably pressed by NATO partners, especially West Germany, but our Defense Secretary apparently favors it and is to serve as chairman of the NATO committee to develop it. Three steps are proposed to fill the gap caused by the virtual abandonment of NATO by France. First, the laying of nuclear landmines at probable invasion points. Second, use of nuclear antiaircraft weapons to repel air attack. Third, nuclear antisubmarine devices to resist naval attack.

It will be contended that these nuclear weapons are carefully selected, that they are to be used only to resist aggression, and that the threat may be a deterrent. But the fact remains it is a proclamation to the world that if an enemy crosses a line, we shall automatically trigger off atomic war. It is an invitation to our enemies to dispense with conventional weapons and prepare to meet nuclear force with nuclear force. It is a direct repudiation of the policy of the "pause" which President Kennedy made the price of our all-out support of NATO; namely, that there should be no nuclear response to any attack until the President of the United States decided it had to be. No immediate gain or temporary security can be worth the price of this plan.

In our arsenals and those of our enemies, there are nuclear weapons sufficient to destroy mankind. This dread possibility casts a shadow over all humanity. It contributes to the recklessness, the bitterness, the bewilderment of today's youth. It is increasingly clear that if the world is to be saved, it will be by a "stalemate"—with both sides possessing these terrible weapons, neither may dare to use them. Bear in mind that poison gas and germ warfare were both available in World War II but never used. This possibility is more real because it does not depend on the chivalry of combatants but on their common desire for survival. Even the Red Chinese, though they may place a low value on human life, prize their expanding industrial development.

This is why we have spent billions on conventional weapons and used them in brush-fire wars, even though we had more effective nuclear ones. This is why we build expensive aircraft carriers when the Polaris submarine would be more devastating. This is why we build and should be building manned bombers, though ballistic missiles would be quicker and deadlier. But the temptation is always there—to save money in time of peace and take the shortcut in time of war. And, of late, there have been signs of our yielding to that temptation. We have been junking our long-range bombers and not replacing them. Obviously, our Defense Department relies on the intercontinental missile. Once we press the button on just one of these—that instant we are plunged into nuclear war beyond recall. Now comes this proposal for automatic nuclear war in Europe.

It is my belief that all other issues, even Vietnam, pale into insignificance compared with this one. It is too grave for politics or personalities. I shuddered when Eisenhower and Dulles proclaimed their policy of massive retaliation. Neither can I agree with those who call for the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam. Nor is this a personal attack on Secretary McNamara, though I regard his overfascination for push-button warfare as a deadly danger.

I was one of those who pioneered for the building of Polaris submarines. I want my country armed with every nuclear weapon available. If any enemy ever unleashes atomic power against us, I want to be ready to meet and excel him. But with the memory of Hiroshima haunting us, let us never be the first to resort or threaten to resort to nuclear war. We can defend freedom with conventional warfare if we really fight.

Americans have a remarkable heritage. Five minutes after we were born on July 4, 1776, we were catapulted into world leadership, for instead of acting like normal, mindless infants, we wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Thus, we were put into orbit by a group of calm-eyed intellectuals who gave the world a new concept of freedom and of people's government that toppled kings from their thrones. Our contribution to the world has always been ideas, not bullets—moral leadership, not military domination.

How can we betray it by leading mankind toward atomic oblivion?

Mr. KUCHEL. I was thoroughly and deeply moved by the comments which were just made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, not only is it my privilege but it is also my responsibility to join with my colleagues in the Senate in supporting Senate Resolution 179, expressing the concern of the Senate that the spread of nuclear weapons be limited. I commend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his effective advocacy of this measure. With the entrance of Communist China into the so-called nuclear club, we can be certain that other, smaller nations will become increasingly interested and active in developing their own nuclear armaments in the interests of survival. For this, we cannot blame them; however, we must recommit ourselves to the protection of free peoples who are today endangered by the threat of Communist expansion.

By so dedicating ourselves, and by recognizing that a boundless proliferation of nuclear armaments heightens the danger of nuclear tragedy by accident, or by ill-considered actions, we can maintain our position as a truly peaceseeking and—perhaps even more important—peacekeeping leader in the forum of international law and politics.

Let us continue in the path we chose when we approved the nuclear test ban treaty. I voted for that measure in the Senate on September 24, 1963, and during debate I characterized the proposal as "a rainbow of promise" for generations to come

We should continue to act with courage and conviction in any reasonable manner which is now open to us to lessen the dangers posed by these fearsome weapons.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his brilliant and magnificent contribution to this important resolution. As always, his erudite mind and patriotic fervor are a source of succor and strength to all of us who are honored to serve with him in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I certainly shall wholeheartedly support Senate Resolution 179. There is not much that I can add to what has already been said by previous speakers on this subject.

I should like to point out, however, that since I have been a Member of the Senate, it has been my observation that the policy set forth on page 2 has also been the policy of Congress. It was clearly reflected in the actions of Congress in 1961 which established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The appropriations which have been supported since that time indicate that the opinion of Congress and the policy of Congress remain unchanged. Therefore, it is fortunate to be able to make clear that both the executive and the legislative branches are in thorough agreement on this policy.

Let me say that I am a little disappointed that the resolution did not include some reference to peaceful uses of nuclear energy, because it has been my opinion for a long time that the key to the problem of proliferation will be peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

I know that the Senator from Rhode Island has stated substantially that same thing in previous discussion of this problem, on the floor of the Senate, and while there is no reference in this resolution to that particular approach, I would hope it would be understood, when the resolution recites that we support the principle of additional efforts by the President, that those efforts will include peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 179 would place the Senate of the United States on record as commending serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and of supporting the principle of additional efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferous problems. The whereas clauses which preface the resolution contain statements of fact with which it is difficult, if not impossible, to argue. It is not my purpose upon taking the floor today to either question the statements of fact contained in the whereas clauses, or deny the laudatory goals sought to be achieved by the resolution.

However, bearing in mind recent occurrences arising out of Senate approval of another rather generally worded resolution, I consider it advisable, in the light of my duties and responsibilities as a U.S. Senator, to express certain reservations before proceeding further. It is, of course, impossible to judge what the end product arising from approval of a resolution of this type may be.

Experience proves that a tree planted in fertile soil with the best of expectations may nevertheless bring forth bitter fruit. I am not here counseling that the tree should not be planted. I say merely that it should be well understood that there is no commitment to eat the fruit which grows from this tree if it does indeed turn out to be bitter.

The international situation does not remain constant. On the contrary, it changes from day to day, and even from hour to hour. Recent developments demonstrate that the capacity of previously nonnuclear powers to develop a meaningful nuclear weapon capability cannot be effectively contained by treaty. Indeed, no treaty could prevent a possible international brigand from developing a nuclear capability through its own research and development efforts.

Approval of the pending resolution should not, and must not, be considered as a binding commitment in advance of any treaty which may subsequently come before the Senate. Additionally, our own efforts toward upgrading our nuclear capability should not be abated. The realism of finite deterrence cannot, at this point, be replaced by the idealism of disarmament.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, no moment could be more timely for the passage of this resolution. Last week our State Department revealed this Government's summary rejection of a Chinese disarmament proposal. The proposal was regarded as "not serious." I have no reason to question that evaluation, but to many nations of the world, the United States has once again appeared unresponsive to an opportunity for peace.

It would be a great tragedy indeed if plans for peace were to fail because we were not prepared to make an adequate response.

This resolution on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is not merely a response. It is an earnest challenge to all nations to join with us in a major effort at nuclear arms control.

But I must emphasize my belief that this resolution will be little more than a pious sentiment unless we are prepared to include China in the international discussions striving for nuclear arms limitation.

I believe we must travel the same path with China that we have with Russia in the past two decades. We must contain her territorial ambitions while convincing her that we do not threaten her own survival. This convincing cannot be accomplished through pronouncements in each other's newspapers. It must be done face to face at bilateral and multilateral conferences, and the United States must open the door to those conference chambers.

The timeliness of this resolution, and of the action we hope will grow out of it, is apparent from the unmistakable indications of progress toward nuclear capability in several smaller nations such as Japan, Israel, Egypt, and certain nonnuclear European countries. It will take all our creative diplomacy to construct a guarantee to the nonnuclear powers that building a nuclear deterent will not enhance their security.

To do this, we must provide these nations with plausible and effective guarantees that a nuclear exchange will not take place on their territory. To persuade India, for instance, not to build her own nuclear weapons, she will want a guarantee by China that it will not unleash or threaten to unleash a nuclear weapon on Indian territory, as well as a guarantee from the United States, and hopefully the Soviet Union, that they would pledge to utilize their nuclear power on behalf of India to forestall any such nuclear attack or threat by China.

Such a guarantee from the United States has great significance. Of course, India hardly needs assurance today of U.S. defense in the event of a conventional or nonnuclear attack by China. But there is always latent concern in nonnuclear nations that in the long run even their stanchest allies would hesitate to come to their defense in a situation in which the ally might consequently suffer annihilative retaliation from the initial nuclear aggressor. For this reason it is advisable for the United States to manifest to India in the strongest terms in connection with the nonproliferation treaty, and on other appropriate future occasions, its continuing determination—even at the risk of its own survival— to preclude a nuclear attack on India.

Finally, perhaps the most significant pledge for India is that from the Soviet Union. A guarantee from the Soviets to deter Chinese nuclear aggression in India would afford increased assurance that by forgoing her own nuclear forces India would not be left at the mercy of Chinese nuclear power in Asia.

In addition to nuclear security and nonproliferation pledges, any effective treaty will, in all probability, have to include safeguards against secret violation of the nonproliferation commitment. Without some safeguards there would be legitimate concern whether over a period of years a signatory nation might not secretly develop a nuclear capacity in violation of its treaty commitment.

The safeguards required will likely involve both periodic inspection in nonnuclear nations and controls upon their use and disposition of nuclear materials acquired from other nations. But we must not be so insistent upon foolproof controls that we permit the disease of nuclear proliferation to infect the world.

Nuclear disarmament may not yet be politically feasible. For now the task is to limit proliferation and obtain nuclear arms control.

We must more clearly recognize that the existence of nuclear weapons is not an asset but a dangerous liability for every nation, including the United States and the other nuclear powers; and we must emphasize our commitment to the ultimate international elimination of all weapons of mass annihilation.

If we believe and act upon what we believe, there is still hope that the "nuclear club" can be held to a maximum of its five present members, and that statesmanship will master these frightful 20th century weapons before they enslave or destroy the civilization which created them.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island on his leadership. I hope this resolution will be acted upon now, while there is still time for nonproliferation to gain the concurrence of the nations of the world.

AN END TO THE RAINS OF POISON

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, nuclear proliferation is a fearful threat to the future of mankind.

As Bertrand Russell once said, "The thing about weapons is, sooner or later they are used." This has been true in the past, there is no particular reason that it will not be true in the future. And, if it is true, the civilization that man has built will be endangered—on every continent, in every country and every society.

Every time a new nation sets off its first atomic blast, every time a new nation joins the nuclear club the chances for Armageddon become measurably greater.

As a direct result of a Senate resolution in 1963, the U.S. Government and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were able successfully to negotiate a test ban treaty This was a step back from the atomic brink and it was welcomed by men of goodwill in our two countries and across the world.

Today we are asked to vote on another resolution, one calling for an end to atomic proliferation. Again the Senate has the opportunity to provide leader ship for men of goodwill who are anxious to reduce the number of atomic weapons and to increase the hopes for peace.

As a human being I support this resolution. As a Senator I urge the President to work for a nonproliferation treaty, effective, meaningful and acceptable to the potential atomic powers. As an Alaskan, I have a special reason for concern.

Eskimos in northern Alaska have received and are still receiving unusual amounts of radioactive fallout. These high levels of exposure are caused by the pollution of the Arctic food chain by the fallout products strontium 90 and cesium 137.

It makes no difference to these people whether the fallout in the atmosphere comes from American, Russian, Chinese, or French atomic tests. It is all the same to them; fallout in the atmosphere has no nationality. The fallout comes to earth and settles on the mosses of the Arctic tundra. The great herds of caribou which wander across the Arctic feed on the mosses and the Eskimos depend upon caribou meat for protein in their diet.

As a result for example, the average cesium 137 body burden of Eskimos at Anaktuvuk Pass is over 1,000 nanocuries. The average body exposure for the average citizen of the 48 states is 12.5 nanocuries. The Eskimos of this small village receive over 80 times as much radiation in their daily diet as do citizens of the other states.

Every bomb that is tested anywhere in the world adds to the radiation levels in the Arctic.

Two weeks ago the Chinese set off their third nuclear device. Next month, the French will set off their first H-bomb. A month ago, an American weapons test at Las Vegas unexpectedly "vented" and released radiation into the atmosphere.

These events are not good news to Alaskans. As their Senator I must view these events with concern and do all that I can to bring an end to atomic testing of all sorts by whatever nation.

I am concerned about Alaska and the radiation exposures some of its people have received. My concern does not stop there. I am worried about the young children in Utah who over the years have received far far more iodine 131 in their milk than is considered acceptable by radiation authorities. It may well be that some of these children are already suffering detectable somatic effects to their thyroid glands.

I am worried too about the people who live along the Colorado River and who may have received disproportionate amounts of radium 137 in their drinking water. I am worried about the citizens of Japan who for the last week or so have been told to wash their fresh fruits and vegetables because of the excessive amounts of fallout from the Chinese test.

In the final analysis, Alaska's radiation problem is everybody's problem. It is as much the responsibility of Red China as it is ours. It is as much the responsibility of the undeveloped noncommitted peoples as it is the participants in the cold war.

It is man's concern for man and that is what this Senate resolution is all about.

I support the resolution.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the proliferation of nuclear weaponry poses a clear and present threat to civilization as we know it on this planet. While we join in a Senate resolution to support the President's intelligent effort to seek international agreement limiting the spread of nuclear weapons, I would call our attention to the concurrent need for a study of world order itself.

In the broader sense, nuclear power is a tool which man may use for his own betterment or for his own destruction. I would call for a bringing together of the world's intellectual and moral skills in the area of disciplined international law, international arms restraints, and economic development. These considerations are inseparable and the control of nuclear proliferation is a part, only, of the total consideration of man's ability to govern himself.

Meanwhile, the war in Vietnam is entering a new phase and the rules under which it is being fought are being revised. The larger risks involved in mindless escalation remain incalculable. Whatever action taken must be weighed against the probable reaction of the Communist enemy. Both sides possess powers of destruction that threaten to trigger a world conflict, a cautioning influence on those who hold the responsibility for using that power.

The new dimensions of Vietnam call for a moral evaluation on a more serious plane than heretofore taken by those who have traditionally viewed Vietnam on a limited scale.

The new dimension of the war necessitates a new dimension in international thinking at this low stage in the development of international order. It is to this larger consideration that I would ask our Nation to dedicate itself.

Let me be more specific. We need to lift ourselves above the level of military action, beyond nationalistic diplomacy, to the overview of the worldwide striving for cooperative moral solutions. Let it not be forgotten that perhaps the greatest thrust toward the founding of the United Nations was the wartime search by the organized and united efforts of American churches for a just and durable peace. The time is ripe for such an effort again, not just by American Protestantism but by the world's religious leaders of all faiths, acting in a realm of moral world interest to which the more selfish individual interests of nationalistic diplomacy has difficulty in approaching.

The Pope in his speech in the United Nations last fall made a most eloquent appeal to Roman Catholic Christians. Nearly every individual denomination and the National Council of Churches has its agency for the promotion of world peace. The World Council of Churches, with membership by the Russian Orthodox and other churches not to be found in the United States in organized form, such as the Maronites, has likewise been in the forefront of concern for international order. Today we are seeing the Buddhists in Vietnam, a different religious faith, exhibiting a concern for the secular order—and it should be remembered that Buddhism in recent years has moved into a far greater general outreach toward the world about it. Moslems, too, have a concern for secular order in the areas where they are dominant.

Therefore, I would suggest that the religious leadership of the world, with whatever help and encouragement can be given by all of us including governments, might move us forward and upward to the plane we need to seek by a world convocation of all faiths to mobilize world opinion toward the kind of ends this resolution seeks.

The hour is late, but the day of man is not yet done.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 179 puts the Senate on record as commending the President's serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supporting the principle of additional efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferous problems.

Secretary of State Rusk told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of six major ways in which the United States is currently taking the initiative to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

The six initiatives which we have taken in talks and negotiations with other nations and with international bodies are the following:

First. Efforts to negotiate a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Second. Efforts to strengthen United Nations and other international security arrangements so that those who forswear nuclear weapons may forever refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race.

Third. Efforts to halt the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons.

Fourth. Efforts to freeze production of offensive and defensive strategic bombers and missiles designed to carry nuclear weapons.

Fifth. Efforts to establish nuclear-free zones in certain areas of the world, such as Africa and Latin America.

Sixth. Support for international nuclear energy safeguard programs designed to detect diversions of nuclear materials or equipment from peaceful to military purposes.

As a cosponsor of the resolution and as a firm believer in this policy I wish to urge our officials in the State Department on to greater efforts. I believe that the overwhelming vote in the Senate for the nuclear test ban treaty, the fact that this resolution is cosponsored by 61 Senators, and the overwhelming vote by which I feel sure it will pass today, indicate the priority which the Senate, in its constitutional role as adviser on foreign policy, gives to the prevention of nuclear proliferation. Indeed I can think of no greater long-range problem.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the overriding issue of our times—and probably the least discussed—is the problem of finding a way to end the proliferation or distribution of nuclear weapons. Every effort must be made to stop the growth of atomic arsenals among nations.

Although the likelihood of war between the United States and the Soviet Union is rapidly receding, the danger now and for years to come is not only that Red China will acquire an atomic arsenal but that many small nations will commence to do likewise. At least eight nations, and perhaps more, could build and explode nuclear weapons within a decade if they tried. Today, any industrial society can develop a 20-kiloton bomb, the size of the one dropped on Hiroshima, within 5 to 7 years. With each passing year more nations will be able to do so unless an ironclad treaty is signed soon to ban the further spread of nuclear weapons.

Unless immediate steps are taken to stop the spread of nuclear arms, there will certainly be 10 or more nations with nuclear bombs by 1970 and missiles with nuclear warheads within that time. By spending about $200 million, any mature industrial country can readily produce one or two atomic bombs. India, Italy, Israel, Japan, Egypt, Indonesia, Australia, Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands, South Africa, and West Germany all have the potential know-how, resources and wealth, or soon will have that capacity, with which to produce nuclear weapons.

Therefore, it is of vital importance that our President be supported to the utmost in his efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. I am hopeful that the resolution introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] will be passed unanimously to further underscore the support of the President by the Congress for the vigorous pursuit of means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons.

We must keep on talking. To speak disarmament is easier than to achieve it. We must be prepared for long, tedious, often discouraging negotiations. The alternative to coexistence is coannihilation.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to strongly support the resolution of my senior colleague and urge its adoption.

Any step in the direction of control, in the diminution of the nuclear warmaking capabilities throughout the world, is a step in the right direction.

The support behind this resolution is shown by the number of cosponsors, which is overwhelming, and I believe it reflects the will not only of the people of our States but of the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am a party to the resolution which is before us today. I favor it very strongly. I, too, congratulate, as have others of my colleagues, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] in bringing this resolution before us. It is very helpful and will show the solidarity of the country behind the goal of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

I do wish, however, to make a few observations on some of the comments which I heard today and which, I heard when I was abroad last week—although they were not too clearly reported in the European newspapers.

For one, I have listened with great interest to the expressed belief that the U.S. Government, the State Department, the President, should be criticized for turning down a Communist Chinese offer to the United States to join in a mutual declaration against the first-strike use of nuclear weapons.

I was not here last week; hence I am not in a position to speak authoritatively as to what occurred; but I did hear what occurred this afternoon, and I have done a little checking on it, because I did not want to break into the discussion until I had done a little checking.

It is apparently a fact that the United States did turn down a Communist Chinese offer to join in this declaration, but standing alone it seems to me that we do not have to join in every propaganda effort of Communist China in order to make us seem logical. The Soviet Premier would have had the United States enter into a paper nonaggression and disarmament agreement some time ago, which we rejected because it failed to provide assurance to the people of the United States that it would be upheld by the U.S.S.R.

Long experience with dictators, including those of the Soviet Union and Communist China, have taught us that, while democracies keep to their agreements, dictators, when it suits their purposes, regard treaties as if they were scraps of paper. On that ground, this country should not be criticized for having turned down such a paper proposal. But I do think, that perhaps the proposal could have been explored, to see whether Peking and Moscow would be willing to agree to more realistic arrangements.

Also, there is nothing sacrosanct about the Geneva Disarmament Conference. That Conference is composed of an ad hoc membership of 18 nations, carefully balanced, after careful negotiations, so as to have a certain number of neutrals and a certain number of superpowers and others. I do not think the Conference would collapse if there were 19 nations instead of 18 at Geneva. If Communist China were to participate in it, I do not think we should oppose it.

I think the United States has shown rather good intentions in respect to disarmament. This incident of the Communist Chinese offer would seem therefore to be a departure from the norm.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks the explanation made by the administration on this incident. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has furnished me the following information on the matter of the Chinese offer and similar proposals by the U.S.S.R.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT BACKGROUND STATEMENT USED AS A BASIS FOR ANSWERING QUESTIONS ON THE CHINESE "NO-FIRST-USE" SUGGESTION

The Chinese have proposed that the nuclear powers outlaw nuclear weapons and commit themselves not to be the first to use them. The United States attitude has been that we should ban aggression in any form and should get on with verified disarmament as promptly as possible on a balanced basis, including conventional forces, in a manner consistent with the security interests of all countries. The Chinese have shown little interest in the important discussions which have been going on for some years at Geneva. They refused to sign the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. They have shown no response to our proposals for the cut-off of the production of materials for nuclear weapons and the freeze on offensive and defensive strategic nuclear delivery vehicles.

DOCUMENTS ON DISARMAMENT, 1962: VOLUME I—JANUARY–JUNE

LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK TO ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL THANT: USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, JUNE 30, 1962 [1]

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of 2 January [2] in which, pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 1653 (XVI) [3] you request the views of my Government on the possibility of convening a special conference for signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons for war purposes.

My Government is fully aware of the importance of the problem to which this resolution is directed. Certainly no state can regard with equanimity the danger posed by the possible use of nuclear weapons. The objective of every law-abiding power must be to seek conditions in which such weapons will no longer form part of the arsenal of any nation. This objective underlies the views expressed by the Representative of the United States during the last session of the General Assembly on the problem of halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It will continue to be the goal of the United States.

While my Government deplores the necessity to arm with weapons of mass destruction, it believes that a prohibition on their use, unaccompanied by measures leading to the attainment of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, cannot provide any real or lasting protection to potential victims of nuclear attack. Indeed, a convention which would be merely an expression of the desire to eliminate nuclear weapons or prevent their spread would not in itself establish the conditions of confidence necessary for universal renunciation of such weapons. My Government believes that the cause of disarmament cannot be advanced by the propagation of illusions about the ease with which it can be solved. There is no quick and easy road to disarmament. Its achievement will require the most devoted, constructive, patient, and realistic efforts. These efforts cannot be mobilized if the world becomes a victim of the illusion that disarmament can be accomplished by declaration without regard to the security concerns of states. Accordingly, in the judgment of my Government, as long as conditions for a successful conference do not exist, there is no point to holding such a conference.

The defense system of the United States and its allies, freely arrived at in accord with the United Nations Charter, includes nuclear weapons. This must continue to be the case as long as it is impossible to be certain through measures of verification that other states, which could use such weapons for aggressive purposes, do not retain a similar array of weapons in their national arsenals. The United States Government can and does offer the fullest assurances that it will never use any weapon, large or small, with aggressive intent. But the United States, like other free nations, must be fully prepared to exercise effectively the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense as provided in the United Nations Charter.

The Charter of the United Nations makes a distinction, not between one weapon and another, but between the use of force for aggression and for defense. This distinction is critical. It is the firm belief of the United States that the only sure way to eliminate the threat to mankind posed by nuclear weapons is to remove them from the arsenals of the nations through a programme of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Elimination of these weapons has been the goal of the United States ever since it first proposed, in 1946, a plan for ensuring, under adequate international safeguards, that atomic energy would be used only for peaceful purposes.[4]

In its Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World, the United States has presented to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference, meeting at Geneva, realistic measures for the elimination from all national arsenals of all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear and thermonuclear weapons.[5] My Government hopes that as the process of disarmament progresses, the threat of the use of all weapons including nuclear weapons will disappear as the weapons themselves are destroyed. To this end the United States is earnestly seeking to attain its goal of a world in which the use of force is subjected to the rule of law; a world in which general and complete disarmament under effective international control has been achieved; a world in which adjustments to change occur peacefully under the principles guiding the United Nations. Specifically, the United States treaty outline provides for the progressive elimination of armaments until states possess in their national arsenals only those forces and agreed types of non-nuclear armaments required for internal order.

The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament is currently charged with negotiating a balanced disarmament agreement under effective international control in keeping with the unanimously approved General Assembly Resolution 1722 (XVI).[6] which called for negotiations based on the Joint US-USSR Statement of Agreed Principles.[7] It is to be noted that the disarmament resolution was adopted subsequent to adoption of the resolution regarding banning the use of nuclear weapons.

My Government believes it appropriate that the question of reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons is being actively considered in the context of general and complete disarmament by the Eighteen Nation Committee in Geneva. It is the fervent hope of the United States Government and its people that the negotiations in Geneva will achieve an agreement which will lead to a free, secure, and peaceful world.

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State of the United States of America.

DOCUMENTS ON DISARMAMENT, 1964—UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

STATEMENT BY ACDA DIRECTOR FOSTER TO THE EIGHTEEN NATION DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE: TESTING AND USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS [EXTRACT], SEPTEMBER 3, 1964 [1]

I have listened with great care to the many statements that have been made today. My delegation will study them. I shall not attempt to answer them in detail now, but I will make a few comments on particular points. I shall begin by referring to one of the statements made by our Soviet colleague, Mr. Tsarapkin.

Much of the discussion we have had has been concerned with reducing and controlling the nuclear threat. If we are ever to begin to bring the nuclear arms race under control, it is going to be necessary some time, somewhere, some day, for the Soviet Union to agree to halt the build-up of delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons. We hoped—and we still hope—that as we talked here about the goal which we are trying to reach, the Soviet Union would agree to halt the arms race. A great deal of time, thought and prayer has been put into the freeze verification statement.[2] Today the Soviet representative, in a very sweeping and, in my opinion, unfortunate statement, but without any specifics, dismissed the freeze verification proposal. I think there should be no doubt around this table about what this means, if indeed it be maintained; it means that the arms race will go on. The inspection suggestions we have made have been designed to meet many of the conditions which have been developed in this room; and I say again that we still hope that we can expect a more specific response at some point to those suggestions.

In our deliberations concerning the pertinent General Assembly resolutions to which our thoughts have been directed today, we should keep in mind the important goals of this Conference. A central goal is the prevention of nuclear war. As we look back twenty-five years to the beginning of the Second World War, we should ponder for a moment what a world war might be like today.

---

[1] A/5174, annex II, pp. 78–80.

[2] Not printed.

[3] *Documents on Disarmament, 1961,* pp. 648–650.

[4] *Documents on Disarmament 1945–1959,* vol. I, pp. 7–16.

[5] *Ante,* pp. 351–382.

[6] *Documents on Disarmament, 1961,* pp. 741–742.

[7] *Ibid.,* pp. 439–442.

[1] ENDC/PV.213, pp. 61–65.

[2] *Ante,* pp. 235–238.

Today one nuclear weapon can contain more explosive force than all the bombs dropped in the Second World War. Today nuclear explosives can be delivered from one side of the world to the other in a matter of minutes. Today a nuclear exchange could kill 300 million people in the United States, in Western Europe and in the Soviet Union in an hour. We cannot prevent such a war by a simple statement of good intentions, as Mr. Burns has pointed out.[3] That is why my country opposes the calling of a conference to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons.

We should all remember that the Second World War was preceded by the Kellogg-Briand Pact.[4] The purpose of that agreement was to outlaw all war, just as the purpose of the Ethiopian proposal is to outlaw nuclear war.[5] One could say that the road to the Second World War was littered with statements of good intentions which turned out to be largely worthless. Giving credence to the mistaken notion that nuclear war can be prevented by a declaration would move us no closer to disarmament. Raising false hopes that this threat could be eliminated so simply would not serve the cause of peace. Suggesting a measure which could reward potential aggressors because their victims let down their guard would not solve the problems of the world. Even Mr. Goldblat, the Polish representative, in his forceful maiden speech this morning, recognized that exclusive reliance on a convention such as he supported might produce a false sense of security.

It is the use of force for aggressive purposes, regardless of the type of weapons used, which poses the real threat to peace. This use of force is already prohibited by the United Nations Charter.[6] At the outset of the nuclear age the United States tried to bring atomic energy activities of all nations under effective international control. We offered in return to give up our monopoly of atomic weapons. This proposal was rejected by the Soviet Union. Having failed in that endeavor, we found it essential to be prepared for any attack.

The United States and its allies depend on nuclear weapons as a necessary deterrent against potential aggression. As such, these weapons are essential to the maintenance of the peace of all nations and the prevention of nuclear war anywhere in the world. Nobody at this table who thinks back to the critical days of October 1962 can have any doubt about the seriousness and the care with which my Government carries its nuclear responsibility. The United States needs no reminder of the consequences of a nuclear war.

A prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, unaccompanied by a verified agreement to eliminate them, could not provide any real or lasting assurance against nuclear warfare. Today's Chairman, in his remarks as representative of Mexico, if I heard him correctly, made a similar point in concluding that this is not an opportune moment for convening a conference to outlaw nuclear weapons. As long as nuclear weapons exist in a divided world, how can anybody rest assured that an agreement to outlaw them would be observed if hostilities broke out? Chairman Khrushchev himself observed that there would be nothing to stop one side in a conflict, whether aggressor or victim, from using nuclear weapons as a last resort.[7] Such realistic views of the situation led us from the beginning to oppose this resolution, and our position remains unchanged. We have instead proposed realistic, concrete and enforceable agreements to deal with the threat of nuclear war. We shall continue to urge their adoption.

My delegation agrees with the statement of the Ethiopian representative at our meeting of 20 August that a conference to outlaw nuclear weapons "would require the support of all States, and especially of those States which possess or are on the way to possessing nuclear weapons."[8] The refusal of my Government to attend such a conference has been clear since Secretary of State Rusk's 1962 reply to an inquiry by the Secretary-General.[9] To ask us, the representatives at this Conference, to agree upon another conference to deal with the control of nuclear weapons is to ask us to vote our lack of confidence in ourselves. My Government sees no advantage in convening a new conference to deal with this subject.

One way in which we can realistically hope to reduce the likelihood of nuclear war is by continuing our efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to nations which do not now have them. If we are concerned now about the danger of a nuclear holocaust when there are only four nuclear Powers, what will our concern be when there are five, ten or twenty?

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SECOND MEETING HELD AT THE PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA, ON TUESDAY, 10 AUGUST 1965, AT 10:30 A.M.

(*Chairman:* Mr. A. Correa do Lago (Brazil))

(Statement by Mr. W. C. Foster)

In his statement of 3 August (ENDC/PV. 220, pp. 17, 18) the Soviet representative also revived his Government's proposal for a convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons and, pending such an agreement, for a non-first-use pledge by the nuclear Powers. My Government has offered assurance that it will not use any weapons, nuclear or otherwise, with aggressive intent. As Secretary Rusk pointed out in a letter of 30 June 1962 to the Secretary-General, however, the Charter of the United Nations makes a distinction, not between one weapon and another, but between the use of force for aggression and for defence. He went on to say:

"It is the firm belief of the United States that the only sure way to eliminate the threat to mankind posed by nuclear weapons is to remove them from the arsenals of the nations through a programme of general and complete disarmament under effective international control."

The Soviet approach to this matter offers no basis for a useful discussion.

In short, these two Soviet proposal hold no prospect for agreement, nor are they addressed to the really critical problem of nuclear proliferation. I do welcome, however, the inclusion of a non-proliferation agreement among the items which the Soviet Union has suggested for action now. Here indeed is an urgent item and one on which we must strive for early agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall today address a letter to the President and to the Department of State urging the United States to make a considered declaration as to this matter, not to merely leave it to a State Department spokesman to say that the offer of no nuclear first strike was made and rejected, but to let us have the time when it was received, under what conditions, what were the reasons, and precisely why we did as we did.

Let us, therefore, have the record set out with respect to what seems to have been, up to now, an exception from every good-faith effort by the United States in respect to disarmament, to which it seemed every consideration was given.

I am suspicious of exceptions, as a lawyer, so I think we ought to have all the facts, and we should not merely criticize or defend our action on the basis of any hypothesis. Let us have all the facts. I cannot conceivably see why security should have been a factor, but we will soon know whether in the extended offer it was deservedly a factor or not, and whether there was a chance for any implementing provision. Let us have the detailed facts, and then let us see whether the United States did not do or did what it should have done under the circumstances.

I agree that, notwithstanding its propaganda gambit, I would not dream of entering an agreement with Communist China by saying that we will not make the first strike, because we know that we would not make the first strike under such agreement, and Communist China may not.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Perhaps it was not said. I agree implicitly with what the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has said. Perhaps it was not said as categorically as he has stated it.

As I understood the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], they did not intimate that we should agree to the declaration or make one or join in one, but merely that we should not have rejected it summarily; that we should have taken the initiative and said, "All right, let us sit down and talk about this."

Everyone is aware that we could not summarily agree not to be the first to use an atomic bomb. And examination of history and the posture of our adversaries will indicate that we know where they are strong and where we are strong. It would be folly for us to jeopardize the security of this Nation, and no one in his right mind would advocate such a procedure.

On the other hand, I believe that sometimes we should grasp the initiative and say, "If that is the way you feel about it, let us sit down and talk about it, and let us find out who the aggressors are. Let us determine under what conditions anyone would normally be called upon to use an atomic bomb."

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Rhode Island always demonstrates his good sense, and he demonstrates it in what he has just said.

I pay the Senator honor as the author of the resolution. I do not wish to impose a question on him, but I think I know him well enough to believe that this one will not press him unduly.

---

[3] ENDC/PV.209, p. 39.

[4] Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Subcommittee on Disarmament, *Disarmament and Security: A Collection of Documents, 1919–55* (S. Com. Print, 84th Cong., 2d sess.), pp. 77–78.

[5] *Documents on Disarmament, 1963*, p. 626.

[6] See art. 2 of the Charter.

[7] *Ante*, p. 351.

[8] *Ante*, p. 354.

[9] *Documents on Disarmament, 1962*, vol. I, pp. 629–631.

Would the Senator not agree with me that we really ought to have all the facts, and that we really do not have them yet?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not want to say categorically that we do not have all the facts. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is religiously, conscientiously, and exhaustively investigating these questions. As a matter of fact, the committee takes most seriously its duties and insists that the executive departments keep us currently and fully informed, as required under the provisions of the atomic energy law. We have gone into these matters. For example, we have had a very detailed briefing on the recent Chinese tests, including an analysis of the debris. Of course, there are some things we really cannot know.

It is difficult to penetrate a man's mind in an attempt to determine his attitudes.

I agree with the Senator from New York that beginning with the administration of President Truman, and pursuing the subject during the administrations of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson, we have tried to bring this tremendous power under international control, in order to bring security and peace to the world.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his gracious intervention.

I repeat that I shall do my utmost to unearth and to produce for the Senate the consecutive factual story, including our declarations at Geneva on this subject. I hope that that will be of some service.

There seems to be general agreement on two propositions.

The first is that we do not have to prove our good faith by joining Communist China in every propaganda balloon that it sends up—to wit, "We will make a paper agreement with you on disarmament or no-first-strike use." The United States does not have to jump at that.

The character of the reports in the European press was that some Senators—the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and others—complained that when the Communist Chinese made an offer to us to issue a joint declaration against first-strike use, we refused to accept the offer. So what? We should have refused it. But, from what I heard today Senator KENNEDY stated the opening should have been exploited and that, of course, is a very different matter and deserves a followup. So, Mr. President, that is one very important point.

The second point is this: As one surveys the foreign policy of the Nation—and I have not only surveyed it in theory but also in practice, out in the field, in Vietnam, in Latin America, in Europe, and in other parts of Asia and the Near East—one comes to the conclusion that this nonproliferation-of-nuclear-weapons treaty represents probably the next major milestone upon the road of the world's progress or lack of it toward peace.

I am one of those who constantly argue—and I deeply feel this—that the reason for being in Vietnam, as we are, is that unless we frustrate the Communist Chinese design of wars of national liberation, the Russians will inevitably continue to compete with the Communist Chinese for the leadership of the Communist world, and will get deeper and deeper into giving that the first priority. This will heighten rather than lessen their intransigence against the free world.

Mr. President, if we can frustrate the design for wars of national liberation as a technique for subverting other countries, then we will give the Russians the opportunity again to restore to number one priority—their effort to come to some terms of coexistence with the entire free world.

That will be signaled by the fact that Russia will enter into a nonproliferation treaty. It seems to me that the next signal that will go up in the world will be that the Russians have again returned to the priority that they had a few years ago, a priority of endeavoring to get along with the free world.

So I believe that this resolution is critically important. It puts the United States squarely on record in terms of Congress backing the President and indicating to Moscow that we are ready to go forward on this matter.

Peaceful coexistence and nonproliferation are the priorities of millions upon millions of people throughout the world.

For the reasons I have just expressed, I consider the resolution to be of supreme importance. I sincerely hope that the Senate may soon adopt it without a dissenting vote.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator From Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 76 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Hruska
Lausche
Mansfield
McGee
Nelson
Neuberger
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So the resolution (S. Res. 179) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate commends the President's serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supports the principle of additional efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferous problems.

The preamble was agreed to.

THE ARROGANCE OF POWER

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on May 5 Senator FULBRIGHT delivered the third of the Christian A. Herter lectures at the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, entitled "The Arrogance of Power." On May 10 Senator FULBRIGHT addressed a convocation sponsored by the Center for Democratic Institutions at Los Angeles on the subject "The University and American Foreign Policy."

There has been a good deal of discussion and of editorial comment about these speeches. I am sure that the Senator from Arkansas did not expect that everyone would accept his analysis without any reservations or all the applications of his views to contemporary foreign policy. I do believe that he has raised a number of issues and questions which deserve the kind of discussion and debate necessary to have well informed citizens in democratic government. In one of his speeches Senator Fulbright stated:

> I am not convinced that either the government or the universities are making the best possible use of their intellectual resources to deal with the problems of war and peace in the nuclear age.

The kind of critical challenges he has been raising can be most helpful in moving us to make this intellectual effort.

I ask unanimous consent that these speeches be printed at this point in the Record. I also ask unanimous consent that the article about Senator Fulbright which appeared in Life magazine in May also be printed in the Record, since it provides an insight into his scholarly and reflective approach to problems and to his character and convictions.

There being no objection, the speeches and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The University and American Foreign Policy

(Speech given by Senator J. W. Fulbright on Tuesday, May 10, 1966, at a convocation sponsored by the Center for Democratic Institutions, Los Angeles, Calif.)

The prospect of death, which used to be a matter for individual contemplation, has become in our generation a problem for the human race. The situation to which we have come is not a unique one in nature; other forms of life have been threatened with extinction or become extinct when they could not adapt to radical changes in their environments. What is unique for man is that the change of environment which threatens his species was not the work of mindless forces of nature but the result of his own creative genius. Unlike other forms of life which have faced the danger of extinction, we have had some choice in the matter, a fact which tells as much about man's folly as it does about his inventiveness. Having chosen to create the conditions for our own collective death, however, we at least retain some choice about whether it is actually going to happen.

It is hard to believe in the destruction of the human race. Because we have managed to avoid a holocaust since the invention of nuclear weapons twenty years ago, the danger of its occurrence now seems remote, like Judgment Day, and references to it have become so frequent and familiar as to lose their meaning; the prospect of our disappearance from the earth has become a cliché, even something of a bore. It is a fine thing of course that the hydrogen bomb hasn't reduced us all to nervous wrecks, but it is a fine thing that, finding the threat incredible, we act as though it did not exist and go on conducting international relations in the traditional manner, which is to say, in a manner that does little if anything to reduce the possibility of a catastrophe.

I am not convinced that either the government or the universities are making the best possible use of their intellectual resources to deal with the problems of war and peace in the nuclear age. Both seem by and large to have accepted the idea that the avoidance of nuclear war is a matter of skillful "crisis management," as though the techniques of diplomacy and deterrence which have gotten us through the last twenty years have only to be improved upon to get us through the next twenty or a hundred or a thousand years.

The law of averages has already been more than kind to us and we have had some very close calls, notably in October 1962. We escaped a nuclear war at the time of the Cuban missile affair because of President Kennedy's skillful "crisis management" and Premier Khrushchev's prudent response to it; surely we cannot count on the indefinite survival of the human race if it must depend on an indefinite number of repetitions of that sort of encounter. Sooner or later, the law of averages will turn against us; an extremist or incompetent will come to power in one major country or another, or a misjudgment will be made by some perfectly competent official, or things will just get out of hand without anyone being precisely responsible as happened in 1914. None of us, however—professors, bureaucrats or politicians—has yet undertaken a serious and concerted effort to put the survival of our species on some more solid foundation than an unending series of narrow escapes.

What we must do, in the words of Brock Chisholm, a distinguished psychiatrist and former Director-General of the World Health Organization, is nothing less than "to reexamine all of the attitudes of our ancestors and to select from those attitudes things which we, on our own authority in these present circumstances, with our knowledge, recognize as still valid in this new kind of world."

I regret that I do not have a definite plan for the execution of so considerable a project, but I have an idea as to who must accept the principal responsibility for it: clearly, the universities. I agree with Dr. Chisholm, who writes: "I think every university has an obligation to consider whether its teaching is in fact universal. Does it open all possible channels of knowledge to its students? Does it teach things in true perspective to each other? Does it take the same attitudes about other cultures as it does about the one which it happens to be working?"

Whatever the circumstances of the moment, whatever the demands of government and industry on the universities—and whatever the rewards for meeting these demands—the highest function of higher education is the "teaching of things in perspective," toward the purpose of enriching the life of the individual and advancing the eternal effort to bring reason and justice and humanity into the relations of men and nations. Toward these ends, the university has a responsibility to analyze existing public policies with a view to determining whether they advance or retard the realization of basic human objectives and whether and how they should be changed.

Obviously, there are great mutual benefits in relations between the universities and government, but when the relationship becomes too close, too extensive and too highly valued by the universities, the higher functions of the university are in danger of being compromised. The danger goes far beyond contractual associations with the CIA, which, unfortunate though they are, are so egregious that, once they are known, there is a tendency to terminate them with all possible haste. Nor is there any danger inherent in government sponsored research of and by itself; on the contrary, government contracts bring needed money to the universities and needed intellectual resources to the government. The danger lies rather in the extent of these connections: as long as they are secondary functions for the university, they are not harmful, but when they become primary areas of activity, when they become the major source of the university's revenue and the major source of the scholar's prestige, then the "teaching of things in perspective" is likely to be neglected and the universality of the university compromised. The harm, in short, lies less in what is done in relation to the government but in what is neglected as a result of it.

Not having been a professor for some years, I must make it clear that I am expressing strong suspicions rather than firm convictions about the effects of government on the universities. I suspect that when a university becomes very closely oriented to the current needs of government, it takes on some of the atmosphere of a place of business while losing that of a place of learning. The sciences, I would expect, are emphasized at the expense of the humanities and, within the humanities, the behavioral school of social science at the expense of the more traditional—and to my mind more humane—approaches. Generally, I would expect an interest in salable information pertaining to current problems to be emphasized at the expense of general ideas pertaining to the human condition.

In such an atmosphere, there can be little room for intellectual individualists whose interest is in making a contribution to the sum of human knowledge without regard to its immediate uses. The kind of professor needed in the government-oriented university, is one, I suspect, who, though technically brilliant, is philosophically orthodox, because the true dissenter, the man who dissents about purpose and not just technique, is likely to lose a sale.

"Sound" scholars produce "sound" disciples. In a research-oriented university, I would expect, the student who is highly valued is the one who can contribute to production. Obviously, the graduate student is a more valuable research assistant than the undergraduate and the scientifically-oriented student is more valuable than the one who is interested in history or philosophy. The latter, indeed, is likely to find himself relegated to the charge of the lower echelon of the faculty, those, that is, who are condemned to teach.

In lending themselves too much to the purposes of government, the universities are failing their higher purposes. They are not contributing to the re-examination of the ideas of our ancestors on which human survival depends; they are not dealing with the central problems of the first generation in human history which holds the power of life and death over its progeny; they are not, in Archibald MacLeish's phrase, trying to produce "an idea that mankind can hold to."

How might some of these considerations guide the universities toward a constructive contribution in the current crisis of our foreign relations?

I most emphatically do not think that the universities should act like recruits called to the colors. I do not think that the humanities must now give way to military science, that civil engineering must give away to military engineering, or that history and philosophy must give way to computerized "war games."

Unless it conceives itself as nothing more than the servant of the party in power, the university has a higher function to perform. The university, it is true, cannot separate itself from the society of which it is a part, but the community of scholars must do more than accept misfortune and consider how it can be overcome. It must ask how we came to misfortune and whether we need have. It must ask what has been done wisely and what has been done foolishly and what the answers to these questions imply for the future. It must ask how it came about that we have had for so long to devote so great a part of our resources to war and its prevention and it must ask whether we are condemned by forces beyond our control to continue to do so. It can, like the Secretary of State, ask what is wrong with the "other side," but it must not fail to ask as well what is wrong with our side, remembering always that the highest devotion we can give is not to our country as it is but to a concept of what we would like it to be.

In considering a crisis such as the war in Vietnam, the politician is usually preoccupied with technique rather than long-term needs. His concern is largely focused on the tactical questions of the war: What are the probable effects of bombing or of not bombing North Vietnam? What degree of escalation is likely to bring the Chinese into the war? What concessions, if any, are likely to induce the enemy to negotiate?

The scholar, on the other hand, in considering the war, must provide the historical and philosophical foundations on which wise political decisions can be based. His proper concern is with questions of means and ends, of motive and purpose: To what extent is the war in Vietnam a civil war, to what extent a war of international aggression, to what extent a conflict of ideologies? Does the American military intervention in Vietnam strengthen our alliances throughout the world, as the Administration believes, or does it weaken them, as General de Gaulle's statement of last winter would seem to indicate? And perhaps the most important questions of all: does this war advance the freedom of southeast Asia or make a mockery of it by subjecting the region to great power domination? does it increase the security of the United States by proving our resolve or reduce it by draining our material and moral resources?

Beyond the services to be performed in connection with the war in Vietnam or with any other single issue or crisis is the broader responsibility to deal with the fundamental questions of war and peace and their roots in human nature. When all is said and done, when the abstractions and subtleties of political science have been exhausted, there remain the most basic unanswered questions about war and peace and why we contest the issues we contest and why we even care about them. As Aldous Huxley has written: "There may be arguments about the best way of raising wheat in a cold climate or of reforesting a denuded mountain. But such arguments never lead to organized slaughter. Organized slaughter is the result of arguments about such questions as the following: Which is the best nation? The best religion? The best political theory? The best form of government? Why are other people so stupid and wicked? Why can't they see how good and intelligent we are? Why do they resist our beneficent efforts to bring them under our control and make them like ourselves?"

Many of the wars fought by man—I am tempted to say most—have been fought over such abstractions. The more I puzzle over the great wars of history, the more I am inclined to the view that the causes attributed to them—territory, markets, resources, the defense or perpetuation of great principles—were not the root causes at all but rather explanations or excuses for certain unfathomable drives of human nature.

Why is it scholars should be asking that nations seem to have to prove that they are bigger, better or stronger than other nations. Why is it they should be asking that implicit in this drive is the assumption that the proof of superiority is force—that when a nation shows that it has the stronger army it is also proving that it has better people, better institutions, better principles—and, in general, a better civilization. Why is it they should be asking that so great a part of our organized efforts as societies is directed toward abstract and mystic goals—toward propagating an ideology, toward enhancing the pride and power and self-esteem of the nation, as if the nation had a "self" and a "soul" apart from the individuals who compose it, and as if the wishes of individual men, for life and happiness and prosperity, were selfish, dishonorable and unworthy of our best creative efforts.

It is a curious thing that in an era when interdisciplinary studies are favored in the universities little, so far as I know, has been done to apply the insights of individual and social psychology to the study of international relations.

It would be interesting—to raise one of many possible questions—to see what could be learned about the psychological roots of ideology: to what extent are ideological beliefs the result of a valid and disinterested intellectual process and to what extent are they instilled in us by conditioning or the accident of birth? Or, to put the question another way, why exactly is it that most young Russians grow up believing in communism and most young Americans grow up believing in democracy or, for that matter, what accounts for the coincidence that most Arabs believe in Islam and most Spaniards in Catholicism? What, in short, is the real source of ideological beliefs and what value do they have as concepts of reality, much less as principles for which men should be willing to fight and die? I am intrigued, for example, by the question of what Barry Goldwater would be saying and doing today if he had been born in Moscow or Peking instead of Arizona.

I recently had the privilege of a luncheon with the distinguished Johns Hopkins psychiatrist, Dr. Jerome Frank, and he explained to me some psychiatric principles which may be pertinent to a better understanding of international relations. He pointed out, for example, that an ideology gives us an identity beyond our own trivial and transitory lives on earth and also serves the purpose of "organizing the world" for us, giving us a picture, though not necessarily an accurate picture, of reality. A person's worldview, or ideology, says Dr. Frank, filters the signals that come to him, giving meaning and pattern to otherwise odd bits of information. Thus, for example, when a Chinese and an American put radically different interpretations on the Vienamese war, it is not necessarily because one or the other has chosen to propound a wicked lie but rather because each has filtered information from the real world through his ideological worldview, selecting the parts that fit, rejecting the parts that do not, and coming out with two radicailly different interpretations of the same events. Even in this country, which we consider relatively homogeneous, it is interesting that the war that began in 1861 was referred to in Massachusetts as the "rebellion of the Southern States," in Pennsylvania as the "Civil War," in Virginia as the "war between the states," and in Texas as the "war to repel Yankee aggression."

I think that the universities could profitably pursue these basic questions of human motivation and differences in perspective. Another area that might be explored is that of the relationship between a nation's foreign and domestic concerns. My own feeling is that an excessive preoccupation with foreign relations over a long period of time is a problem of great importance because it diverts a nation from the sources of its strength, which are in its domestic life. A nation immersed in foreign affairs is expending its capital, human as well as material; sooner or later that capital must be renewed by some diversion of creative energies from foreign to domestic pursuits. I would doubt that any nation has achieved a durable greatness by conducting a "strong" foreign policy, but many have been ruined by expending their energies on foreign adventures while allowing their domestic bases to deteriorate. The United States emerged as a world power in the twentieth century not because of what it had done in foreign relations but because it had spent the nineteenth century developing the North American continent; by contrast, the Austrian and Turkish empires collapsed in the twentieth century in large part because they had for so long neglected their internal development and organization. As one student of politics, I would be grateful for academic enlightenment on this basic question as to the sources of a community's strength.

Our prospects for peace and for the survival of our species depend in great part on our ability to apply the kinds of insight and understanding that only broadly based liberal education can provide. We must bring to our efforts for peace some of the perspectives of history and philosophy and psychology. We must apply the experience of the past with intelligence and discrimination, separating those experiences which seem to have general application from those which are unique or accidental. We must recognize that history can be misleading as well as instructive, and we must avoid the pitfall of simple and literal analogy—such as the eternally repeated example of Munich, which is so often cited as an object lesson for cases which it resembles only slightly or superficially. We must utilize our knowledge of man and his past in the only way it can be utilized, not as a source of detailed prescriptions for specific maladies but as a source of general insight into the kinds of efforts that are likely to succeed and the kinds that are likely to fail, the kinds of policies that are likely to increase the possibility of human survival and the kinds that are likely to reduce that possibility.

We must be prepared to examine each situation and each problem on its merits and we must be prepared, as only educated men can be, to discard old myths in the light of new realities. More important than any single policy decision that we might make is the strengthening of our capacity to reconsider established policies in the light of changing facts and circumstances. It is not so much change itself that the universities can usefully encourage as the capacity for change. Even in the case of those of our present policies which are perfectly sound, it is not at all certain that we would be prepared to alter these policies quickly in response to a wholly new situation or an unforeseen opportunity. One of the basic problems of our policy is thus intellectual rather than political. It is the problem of freeing our minds from the dead weight of habit and prejudice and stereotype and of bringing to bear on foreign policy the rich and diverse resources of liberally educated men.

While the relationship between the executive agencies of the federal government and the universities has become stiflingly close, Congress and the community of scholars have seldom been on intimate terms and have often regarded each other with open disdain. In recent months the Senate Foreign Relations Commitee has been engaged in an experiment designed to correct that long estrangement. Inspired as we have been by President Johnson's policy of "building bridges" to eastern Europe, we have undertaken to build a few bridges between the Senate and the universities.

With results thus far that seem to me highly satisfactory, the Committee has made itself available as a forum for the meeting of politicians and professors and, more broadly, as a forum through which recognized experts and scholars could contribute to Congressional and public understanding of the problems associated with the American involvement in Vietnam and relations with Communist China. We expect in the near future to hold hearings on the Atlantic Alliance and it is my hope that in coming months and years the Committee will continue to invite professors and scholars to join with it in periodic programs of public education.

I believe that a rewarding relationship can be built between the Congress and the universities without either losing sight of its principal responsibility—that of the Congress to represent and of the universities to educate. Valuable though the academic relationship can be to politicians, who have little time but great need for the insights of history, philosophy, psychology and the other disciplines, the education of politicians must obviously be no more than an avocation to those whose principal responsibility is in the classroom.

If there is any one place to which we are entitled to look for the wisdom which may save our generation and future generations from the consequences of man's creative genius, that place is the university. To a certain degree a United States Senator can point the way toward intelligent and creative policies as he sees them; to a much greater degree the President of the United States can do so; but the ultimate answer to the challenge of survival lies with the scholars whose business it is to re-examine the attitudes of our ancestors and, on the basis of that examination, to generate an "idea that mankind can hold to."

THE ARROGANCE OF POWER

(Statement by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, at the Christian A. Herter Lectures—lecture III, Johns Hopkins University, School of Advanced International Studies, Washington, D.C., May 5, 1966)

America is the most fortunate of nations—fortunate in its rich territory, fortunate in having had a century of relative peace in which to develop that territory, fortunate in its diverse and talented population, fortunate in the institutions devised by the founding fathers and in the wisdom of those who have adapted those institutions to a changing world.

For the most part America has made good use of its blessings, especially in its internal life but also in its foreign relations. Having done so much and succeeded so well, America is now at that historical point at which a great nation is in danger of losing its perspective on what exactly is within the realm of its power and what is beyond it. Other great nations, reaching this critical juncture, have aspired to too much and, by over extension of effort, have declined and then fallen. I do not think for a moment that America, with its deeply rooted democratic traditions, is likely to embark upon a campaign to dominate the world in the manner of a Hitler or Napoleon. What I do fear is that it may be drifting into commitments which, though generous and benevolent in intent, are so universal as to exceed even America's great capacities. At the same time, it is my hope—and I repeat it here because it is the major point that I wish to convey in these lectures—that America will escape those fatal temptations of power which have ruined other great nations and will instead do only that good in the world which it can do, both by direct effort and by the force of its own example.

The stakes are high indeed: they include not only America's continued greatness but nothing less than the survival of the human race in an ear when, for the first time in human history, one generation has the power of veto over the survival of the next.

In the seventeenth century a distinguished Frenchman, Jean de la Bruyere, asked a question that remains one of the profound paradoxes of men and nations. "How," he asked, "does it serve the people and add to their happiness if their ruler extend his empire by annexing the provinces of his enemies, . . . how does it help me or my countrymen that my country be successful and covered with glory, that my country be powerful and dreaded, if, sad and worried, I live in oppression and poverty."[1]

The question, phrased somewhat differently, is how and why it happens that the groups into which men organize themselves come to be regarded as ends in themselves, as living organisms with needs and preferences of their own which are separate from and superior to those of the individual, warranting, when necessary, the sacrifice of the hopes, the pleasures and the lives of individual men. It is a paradox of politics that so great a part of our organized efforts as societies is directed toward abstract and mystic goals—toward propagating an ideology, toward enhancing the pride and power and self-esteem of the nation, as if the nation had a "self" and a "soul" apart from the individuals who compose it, and as if the wishes of individual men, for life and happiness and prosperity, were selfish, dishonorable and unworthy of our best creative efforts.

When all is said and done, when the abstractions and subtleties of political science have been exhausted, there remain the most basic unanswered questions about war and peace and why we contest the issues we contest and why we even care about them. As Aldous Huxley has written: "There may be arguments about the best way of raising wheat in a cold climate or of re-afforesting a denuded mountain. But such arguments never lead to organized slaughter. Organized slaughter is the result of arguments about such questions as the following: Which is the best nation? The best religion? The best political theory? The best form of government? Why are other people so stupid and wicked? Why can't they see how good and intelligent we are? Why do they resist our beneficent efforts to bring them under our control and make them like ourselves?"[2]

Many of the wars fought by man—I am tempted to say most—have been fought over such abstractions. The more I puzzle over the great wars of history, the more I am inclined to the view that the causes attributed to them—territory, markets, resources, the defense or perpetuation of great principles—were not the root causes at all but rather explanations or excuses for certain unfathomable drives of human nature. For lack of a clear and precise understanding of exactly what these motives are, I refer to them as the "arrogance of power"—as a psychological need that nations seem to have to prove that they are bigger, better or stronger than other nations. Implicit in this drive is the assumption that the proof of superiority is force—that when a nation shows that it has the stronger army it is also proving that it has better people, better institutions, better principles—and, in general, a better civilization.

The evidence for my proposition is the remarkable discrepancy between the apparent and hidden causes of some modern wars and the discrepancy between their causes and ultimate consequences.

The precipitating cause of the Franco-Prussian war, for example, was a dispute over the succession to the Spanish throne and the ostensible "underlying" cause was French resistance to the unification of Germany. The war was followed by German unification—which probably could have been achieved without war—but it was also followed by the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, the humiliation of France and the emergence of Germany as the greatest power in Europe, which could not have been achieved without war. The peace treaty, incidentally, said nothing about the Spanish throne, which everyone apparently had forgotten. One wonders to what extent the Germans were motivated simply by the desire to cut those haughty Frenchmen down to size and have a good excuse to build another monument in Berlin.

The United States went to war in 1898 for the stated purpose of liberating Cuba from Spanish tyranny, but then, after winning the war—a war which Spain had been willing to pay a high price to avoid—the United States brought the liberated Cubans under an American protectorate, and incidentally annexed the Philippines, because, according to President McKinley, the Lord told him it was America's duty "to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellowmen for whom Christ also died."[3]

Isn't it interesting that the voice was the voice of God but the words were those of Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, Admiral Mahan, those "imperialists of 1898" who wanted America to have an empire just because a big, powerful country like the United States ought to have an empire? The spirit of the times was expressed by Albert Beveridge who proclaimed Americans to be "a conquering race." "We must obey our blood and occupy new markets and if necessary new lands," he said, because "In the Almighty's infinite plan . . . debased civilizations and decaying races" must disappear "before the higher civilization of the nobler and more virile types of man."[4]

In 1914 all Europe went to war, ostensibly because the heir to the Austrian throne had been assassinated at Sarajevo but really because that murder became the symbolic focus of the incredibly delicate sensibilities of the great nations of Europe. The events of the summer of 1914 were a melodrama of abnormal psychology: Austria had to humiliate Serbia in order not to be humiliated herself, but Austria's effort to recover self-esteem was profoundly humiliating to Russia, Russia was allied to France, who had been feeling generally humiliated since 1871, and Austria in turn was allied to Germany, whose pride required her to support Austria no matter how insanely Austria behaved and who may in any case have felt that it would be fun to give the German Army another swing down the Champs Elysees. For these ennobling reasons the world was plunged into a war which took tens of millions of lives, precipitated the Russian Revolution and set in motion the events that led to another world war, a war which took tens of millions more lives and precipitated the world wide revolutions of which we spoke last week, revolutions whose consequences are beyond the foresight of any of us now alive.

Both the causes and consequences of war may have more to do with pathology than with politics, more to do with irrational pressures of pride and pain than with rational calculations of advantage and profit. It has been said that buried in the secret soul of every woman is a drum majorette; it might also be said that there is a bit of the missionary in all of our souls. We all like telling people what to do but unfortunately they usually don't appreciate it. I myself have given my wife some splendid suggestions on household management but she is so ungrateful for my advice that I have stopped offering it. The phenomenon is explained by the Canadian psychiatrist and former Director-General of the World Health Organization Brock Chisholm, who writes:

---

[1] Jean de la Bruyere, French writer and historian, in "Du Souverain ou de la Republique," in *Ouvres Completes*, Julian Benda, ed. (Paris: Libraire Gallimard, 1951), Bibliotheque de al Pleiade, Vol. 23, pp. 302–303.

[2] Aldous Huxley "The Politics of Ecology," (Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1963) p. 6.

[3] Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955) p. 472.

[4] Quoted in Barbara Tuchman, *The Proud Tower* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966), p. 153.

". . . Man's method of dealing with difficulties in the past has always been to tell everyone else how they should behave. We've all been doing that for centuries.

"It should be clear by now that this no longer does any good. Everybody has by now been told by everybody else how he should behave; The criticism is not effective; it never has been, and it never is going to be. . . ."[5]

Ineffective though it has been, the giving—and enforcement—of all this unsolicited advice has at least until recently been compatible with the survival of the human race. Man is now, however, for the first time, in a situation in which the survival of his species is in jeopardy. Other forms of life have been endangered, and many destroyed, by changes in their natural environment; man is menaced by a change of environment which he himself has wrought by the invention of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles. Our power to kill has become universal, creating a radically new situation which, if we are to survive, requires us to adopt some radically new attitudes about the giving and enforcement of advice and in general about human and international relations.

The enormity of the danger of extinction of our species is dulled by the frequency with which it is stated, as if a familiar threat of catastrophe were no threat at all. We seem to feel somehow that because the hydrogen bomb has not killed us yet it it never going to kill us. This is a dangerous assumption because it encourages the retention of traditional attitudes about world politics when our responsibility, in Dr. Chisholm's words, is nothing less than "to re-examine all of the attitudes of our ancestors and to select from those attitudes things which we, on our own authority in these present circumstances, with our knowledge, recognize as still valid in this new kind of world. . . ."[6]

The attitude above all others which I feel sure is no longer valid is the arrogance of power, the tendency of great nations to equate power with virtue and major responsibilities with a universal mission. The dilemmas involved are preeminently American dilemmas, not because America has weaknesses that others do not have but because America is powerful as no nation has ever been before and the discrepancy between its power and the power of others appears to be increasing. I said in a speech in New York last week that I felt confident that America, with its great resources and democratic traditions, with its diverse and creative population, would find the wisdom to match its power. Perhaps I should have been more cautious and expressed only hope instead of confidence, because the wisdom that is required is greater wisdom than any great nation has ever shown before. It must be rooted, as Dr. Chisholm says, in the reexamination of "all of the attitudes of our ancestors."

It is a tall order. Perhaps one can begin to fill it by an attempt to assess some of the effects of America's great power, on some of the small countries whom we have tried to help.

Reflecting on his voyages to Polynesia in the late eighteenth century, Captain Cook later wrote that "It would have been better for these people never to have known us." In a recently published book on European explorations of the South Pacific, Alan Moorehead relates how the Tahitians and the gentle aborigines of Australia were corrupted by the white man's diseases, alcohol, firearms, laws and concepts of morality, by what Moorehead calls "the long down-slide into Western civilization."[7] The first missionaries to Tahiti, says Moorehead, were "determined to recreate the island in the image of lower-middle-class Protestant England * * * They kept hammering away at the Tahitian way of life until it crumbled before them, and within two decades they had achieved precisely what they set out to do." It is said that the first missionaries who went to Hawaii went for the purpose of explaining to the Polynesians that it was sinful to work on Sunday, only to discover that in those bountiful islands nobody worked on any day.

Even when acting with the best intentions, Americans, like other Western peoples who have carried their civilization abroad, have had something of the same "fatal impact" on smaller nations that European explorers had on the Tahitians and the native Australians. We have not harmed people because we wished to; on the contrary, more often than not we have wanted to help people and, in some very important respects, we have helped them. Americans have brought medicine and education, manufactures and modern techniques to many places in the world; but they also brought themselves and the condescending attitudes of a people whose very success breeds disdain for other cultures. Bringing power without understanding, Americans as well as Europeans have had a devastating effect in less advanced areas of the world; without wishing to, without knowing they were doing it, they have shattered traditional societies, disrupted fragile economies, and undermined peoples' confidence in themselves by the invidious example of their own efficiency. They have done this in many instances simply by being big and strong, by giving good advice, by intruding on people who have not wanted them but could not resist them.

Have you ever noticed how Americans act when they go to foreign countries? Foreigners frequently comment on the contrast between the behavior of Americans at home and abroad; in our own country, they say, we are hospitable and considerate, but as soon as we get outside our own borders something seems to get into us and, wherever we are, we become noisy and demanding and strut around as if we owned the place. The British used to say during the war that the trouble with the Yanks was that they were "overpaid, oversexed and over here." I recently took a vacation in Mexico and noticed in a small-town airport two groups of students on holiday, both about undergraduate age; one group was Japanese, the other American. The Japanese were neatly dressed and were talking and laughing in a manner that neither annoyed anybody nor particularly called attention to themselves. The Americans, on the other hand, were disporting themselves in a conspicuous and offensive manner, stamping around the waiting room in sloppy clothes, drinking beer and shouting to each other as if no one else were there.

This kind of scene, unfortunately, has become familiar in many parts of the world. I do not wish to exaggerate its significance; but I have the feeling that, just as there was once something special about being a Roman or a Spaniard or an Englishman, there is now something about the consciousness of being an American abroad, something about the consciousness of belonging to the biggest, richest country in the world, that encourages people who are perfectly well behaved at home to become boorish when they are in somebody else's country and to treat the local citizens as if they weren't really there. One reason why Americans abroad may act as though they "own the place" is that in many places they very nearly do: American companies may dominate large segments of a country's economy; American products are advertised on billboards and displayed in the shop windows; American hotels and snack bars are available to protect American tourists from foreign influence, American soldiers may be stationed in the country and, even if they are not, the population are probably well aware that their very survival depends on the wisdom with which America uses her immense military power.

I think that any American, when he goes abroad, carries an unconscious knowledge of all this power with him and it affects his behavior just as it once affected the behavior of Greeks and Romans, of Spaniards, Germans and Englishmen, in the brief high noons of their respective ascendancies. It was the arrogance of their power that led nineteenth century Englishmen to suppose that if you shouted at a foreigner loud enough in English he was bound to understand you, or that now leads Americans to behave like Mark Twain's "innocents abroad," who reported as follows on their travels in Europe:

"The peoples of those foreign countries are very ignorant. They looked curiously at the costumes that we had brought from the wilds of America. They observed that we talked loudly at table sometimes . . . In Paris, they just simply opened their eyes and stared when we spoke to them in French! We never did succeed in making these idiots understand their own language."[8]

We all, as Dr. Chisholm explains, enjoy telling people how they should behave, and the bigger and stronger and richer we are, the more we feel suited to the task, the more indeed we consider it our duty. Dr. Chisholm relates the story of an eminent cleric who had been proselyting the Eskimos and said: "You know, for years we couldn't do anything with those Eskimos at all; they didn't have any sin. We had to teach them sin for years before we could do anything with them."[9] I am reminded of the three boy scouts who reported to their scoutmaster that as their good deed for the day they had helped an old lady cross the street. "That's fine," said the scoutmaster, "but why did it take three of you?" "Well," they explained, "she didn't want to go."

The good deed above all others that Americans feel qualified to perform is the teaching of democracy and the dignity of man. Let us consider the results of some American good deeds in various parts of the world.

Over the years since President Monroe proclaimed his doctrine, Latin Americans have had the advantages of United States tutelage in fiscal responsibility, in collective security and in the techniques of democracy. If they have fallen short in any of these fields, the thought presents itself that the fault may lie as much with the teacher as with the pupils.

When President Theodore Roosevelt announced his "corollary" to the Monroe Doctrine in 1905, he solemnly declared that he regarded the future interventions thus sanctified as a "burden" and a "responsibility" and an obligation to "international equity." Not once, so far as I know, has the United States regarded itself as intervening in a Latin American country for selfish or unworthy motives—a view not necessarily shared by the beneficiaries. Whatever reassurance the purity of our motives may give must be shaken a little by the thought that probably no country in all human history has ever intervened in another except for what it regarded as excellent motives. "The wicked are wicked, no doubt," wrote Thackeray, "and they go astray and they fall, and they come by their deserts; but who can tell the mischief which the very virtuous do?" [10]

---

[5] Brock Chisholm, ***Prescription for Survival,*** (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), p. 54.

[6] ***Ibid.***, p. 9.

[7] Alan Moorehead, ***The Fatal Impact*** (New York: Harper and Row, 1966).

[8] Mark Twain, ***The Innocents Abroad*** (New York: The Thistle Press, 1962) p. 494.

[9] Brock Chisholm, ***Prescription for Survival, ibid.***, pp. 55–56.

For all our noble intentions, the countries which have had most of the tutelage in democracy by United States Marines are not particularly democratic. These include Haiti, which is under a brutal and superstitious dictatorship, the Dominican Republic, which is in turmoil, and Cuba, which, as no one needs to be reminded, has replaced its traditional right wing dictatorships with a communist dictatorship.

Maybe, in the light of this extraordinary record of accomplishment, it is time for us to reconsider our teaching methods. Maybe we are not really cut out for the job of spreading the gospel of democracy. Maybe it would profit us to concentrate on our own democracy instead of trying to inflict our particular version of it on all those ungrateful Latin Americans who stubbornly oppose their North American benefactors instead of the "real" enemies whom we have so graciously chosen for them. And maybe—just maybe—if we left our neighbors to make their own judgments and their own mistakes, and confined our assistance to matters of economics and technology instead of philosophy, maybe then they would begin to find the democracy and the dignity that have largely eluded them and we in turn might begin to find the love and gratitude that we seem to crave.

Korea is another example. We went to war in 1950 to defend South Korea against the Russian-inspired aggression of North Korea. I think that intervention in that war was justified and necessary. We were defending a country that clearly wanted to be defended: its army was willing to fight and fought well, and its government, though dictorial, was a patriotic government which commanded the support of the people. Throughout the war, however, the United States emphasized as one of its war aims the survival of the Republic of Korea as a "free society," something which it was not then or for a long time after the war. We lost 33,629 American lives in the war and have since spent $5.61 billion on direct military and economic aid and a great deal more on indirect aid to South Korea. The country, nonetheless, remained until recently in a condition of virtual economic stagnation and political instability. These facts are regrettable but the truly surprising fact is that, having fought a war for three years to defend the freedom of South Korea, most Americans are probably ignorant of and almost certainly uninterested in the current state of the ward for whom they sacrificed so much.

We are now engaged in a war to "defend freedom" in South Vietnam. Unlike the Republic of Korea, South Vietnam has an army which without notable success and a weak, dictatorial government which does not command the loyalty of the South Vietnamese people. The official war aims of the United States Government, as I understand them, are to defeat what is regarded as North Vietnamese aggression, to demonstrate the futility of what the communists call "wars of national liberation," and to create conditions under which the South Vietnamese people will be able freely to determine their own future. I have not the slightest doubt of the sincerity of the President and the Vice President and the Secretaries of State and Defense in propounding these aims. What I do doubt—and doubt very much—is the ability of the United States to achieve these aims by the means being used. I do not question the power of our weapons and the efficiency of our logistics; I cannot say these things delight me as they seem to delight some of our officials, but they are certainly impressive. What I do question is the ability of the United States, or France or any other Western nation, to go into a small, alien, undeveloped Asian nation and create stability where there is chaos, the will to fight where there is defeatism, democracy where there is no tradition of it and honest government where corruption is almost a way of life. Our handicap is well expressed in the pungent Chinese proverb: "In shallow waters dragons become the sport of shrimps."

Early last month demonstrators in Saigon burned American jeeps, tried to assault American soldiers, and marched through the streets shouting "Down with the American imperialists," while one of the Buddhist leaders made a speech equating the United States with the communists as a threat to South Vietnamese independence. Most Americans are understandably shocked and angered to encounter such hostility from people who by now would be under the rule of the Viet Cong but for the sacrifice of American lives and money. Why, we may ask, are they so shockingly ungrateful? Surely they must know that their very right to parade and protest and demonstrate depends on the Americans who are defending them.

The answer, I think, is that "fatal impact" of the rich and strong on the poor and weak. Dependent on it though the Vietnamese are, our very strength is a reproach to their weakness, our wealth a mockery of their poverty, our success a reminder of their failures. What they resent is the disruptive effect of our strong culture upon their fragile one, an effect which we can no more avoid than a man can help being bigger than a child. What they fear, I think rightly, is that traditional Vietnamese society cannot survive the American economic and cultural impact.

Both literally and figuratively, Saigon has become an American brothel. A *New York Times* correspondent reports that many Vietnamese find it necessary to put their wives or daughters to work as bar girls or to peddle them to American soldiers as mistresses; that it is not unusual to hear a report that a Vietnamese soldier has committed suicide out of shame because his wife has been working as a bar girl; that Vietnamese have trouble getting taxi cabs because drivers will not stop for them, preferring to pick up American soldiers who will pay outrageous fares without complaint; that as a result of the American influx, bar girls, prostitutes, pimps, bar owners and taxi drivers have risen to the higher levels of the economic pyramid; that middle class Vietnamese families have difficulty renting homes because Americans have driven up the rent beyond their reach and some Vietnamese families have actually been evicted from houses and apartments by landlords who prefer to rent to the affluent Americans; that Vietnamese civil servants, junior army officers and enlisted men are unable to support their families because of the inflation generated by American spending and the purchasing power of the G.I.'s.[11]

The Secretary of Defense recently reported with pride that his Department is providing 9.2 pounds of goods a day for each G.I. for sale in the P.X.'s; what the Secretary neglected to point out was that these vast quantities of consumer goods are the major source of supply for the thriving Vietnamese black market. It is reported that 30 thousand cans of hair spray were sent to Vietnam in March of 1966; since it is unlikely that the American fighting men are major consumers of hair spray, it seems reasonable to suppose that this item has found its way to the black market.

One Vietnamese explained to the *New York Times* reporter whom I mentioned that "Any time legions of prosperous white men descend on a rudimentary Asian society, you are bound to have trouble." Another said: "We Vietnamese are somewhat xenophobe. We don't like foreigners, any kind of foreigners, so that you shouldn't be surprised that we don't like you." [12]

Sincere though it is, the American effort to build the foundations of freedom in South Vietnam may thus have an effect quite different from the one intended. "All this struggling and striving to make the world better is a great mistake;" said Bernard Shaw, "not because it isn't a good thing to improve the world if you know how to do it, but because striving and struggling is the worst way you could set about doing anything." [13]

One wonders as well how much our commitment to Vietnamese freedom is also a commitment to American pride. The two, I think, have become part of the same package. When we talk about the freedom of South Vietnam, we may be thinking about how disagreeable it would be to accept a solution short of victory; we may be thinking about how our pride would be injured if we settled for less than we set out to achieve; we may be thinking about our reputation as a great power, as though a compromise settlement would shame us before the world, marking us as a second rate people with flagging courage and determination.

Such fears are as nonsensical as their opposite, which is the presumption of a universal mission. They are simply unworthy of the richest, most powerful, most productive and best educated people in the world. One can understand an uncompromising attitude on the part of such countries as China or France; both have been stricken low in this century and arrogance may be helpful to them in recovering their pride. It is much less comprehensible on the part of the United States, a nation whose modern history has been an almost uninterrupted chronicle of success, a nation which by now should be so sure of its own power as to be capable of magnanimity, a nation which by now should be able to act on the proposition, as expressed by George Kennan, that "there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives." [14]

The cause of our difficulties in southeast Asia is not a deficiency of power but an excess of the wrong kind of power which results in a feeling of importance when it fails to achieve its desired ends. We are still acting like boy scouts dragging reluctant old ladies across the streets they do not want to cross. We are trying to remake Vietnamese society, a task which certainly cannot be accomplished by force and which probably cannot be accomplished by any means available to outsiders. The objective may be desirable, but it is not feasible.

There is wisdom if also malice in Prince Sihanouk's comparison of American and Chinese aid. "You will note the difference in the ways of giving," he writes. "On one side we are being humiliated, we are given a lecture, we are required to give something in return. On the other side, not only is our dignity as poor people being preserved, but our self-esteem is being flattered—and human beings have their weaknesses, and it would be futile to try to eradicate [them]." [15] Or, as Shaw said: "Religion is a great force—the only real motive force in the world; but what you fellows don't understand is that you must get at a man through his own religion and not through yours." [16]

---

[10] William Makepeace Thackeray, "The Newcomes," Ch. 20.

[11] Neil Sheehan, "Anti-Americanism Grows in Vietnam," *The New York Times*, April 24, 1966, p. 3.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] George Bernard Shaw, *Cashel Byron's Profession* (1886) Ch. 5.

[14] George F. Kennan, "Supplemental Foreign Assistance Fiscal Year 1966—Vietnam," Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 89th Congress, 2nd Session on S. 2793, Part 1 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 335.

The idea of being responsible for the whole world seems to be flattering to Americans and I am afraid it is turning our heads, just as the sense of global responsibility turned the heads of ancient Romans and nineteenth century British. A prominent American is credited with having said recently that the United States was the "engine of mankind" and the rest of the world was "the train." [17] A British political writer wrote last summer what he called "A Cheer for American Imperialism." An empire, he said, "has no justification except its own existence." It must never contract; it "wastes treasure and life;" its commitments "are without rhyme or reason." Nonetheless, according to the author, the "American empire" is uniquely benevolent, devoted as it is to individual liberty and the rule of law, and having performed such services as getting the author released from a Yugoslav jail simply by his threatening to involve the American consul, a service which he describes as "sublime." [18]

What romantic nonsense this is. And what dangerous nonsense in this age of nuclear weapons. The idea of an "American empire" might be dismissed as the arrant imagining of a British Gunga Din except for the fact that it surely strikes a responsive chord in at least a corner of the usually sensible and humane American mind. It calls to mind the slogans of the past about the shot fired at Concord being heard round the world, about "manifest destiny" and "making the world safe for democracy" and the demand for "unconditional surrender" in World War II. It calls to mind President McKinley taking counsel with the Supreme Being about his duty to the benighted Filipinos.

The "Blessings-of-Civilization Trust," as Mark Twain called it, may have been a "Daisy" in its day, uplifting for the soul and good for business besides, but its day is past. It is past because the great majority of the human race are demanding dignity and independence not the honor of a supine role in an American empire. It is past because whatever claim America may make for the universal domain of its ideas and values is countered by the communist counter-claim, armed like our own with nuclear weapons. And, most of all, it is past because it never should have begun, because we are not the "engine of mankind" but only one of its more successful and fortunate branches, endowed by our Creator with about the same capacity for good and evil, no more or less, than the rest of humanity.

An excessive preoccupation with foreign relations over a long period of time is a problem of great importance because it diverts a nation from the sources of its strength, which are in its domestic life. A nation immersed in foreign affairs is expending its capital, human as well as material; sooner or later that capital must be renewed by some diversion of creative energies from foreign to domestic pursuits. I would doubt that any nation has achieved a durable greatness by conducting a "strong" foreign policy, but many have been ruined by expending their energies on foreign adventures while allowing their domestic bases to deteriorate. The United States emerged as a world power in the twentieth century not because of what it had done in foreign relations but because it had spent the nineteenth century developing the North American continent; by contrast, the Austrian and Turkish empires collapsed in the twentieth century in large part because they had for so long neglected their internal development and organization.

If America has a service to perform in the world—and I believe it has—it is in large part the service of its own example. In our excessive involvement in the affairs of other countries, we are not only living off our assets and denying our own people the proper enjoyment of their resources; we are also denying the world the example of a free society enjoying its freedom to the fullest. This is regrettable indeed for a nation that aspires to teach democracy to other nations, because, as Burke said, "Example is the school of mankind, and they will learn at no other." [19]

There is of course nothing new about the inversion of values which leads nations to squander their resources on fruitless and extravagant foreign undertakings. What is new is the power of man to destroy his species, which has made the struggles of international politics dangerous as they have never been before and confronted us, as Dr. Chisholm says, with the need to reexamine the attitudes of our ancestors so as to discard those that have ceased to be valid.

Somehow, therefore, if we are to save ourselves, we must find in ourselves the judgment and the will to change the nature of international politics in order to make it at once less dangerous to mankind and more beneficial to individual men. Without deceiving ourselves as to the difficulty of the task, we must try to develop a new capacity for creative political action. We must recognize, first of all, that the ultimate source of war and peace lies in human nature, that the study of politics, therefore, is the study of man, and that if politics is ever to acquire a new character, the change will not be wrought in computers but through a better understanding of the needs and fears of the human individual.

It is a curious thing that in an era when interdisciplinary studies are favored in the universities little, so far as I know, has been done to apply the insights of individual and social psychology to the study of international relations.

It would be interesting—to raise one of many possible questions—to see what could be learned about the psychological roots of ideology: to what extent are ideological beliefs the result of a valid and disinterested intellectual process and to what extent are they instilled in us by conditioning and inheritance? Or, to put the question another way, why exactly is it that most young Russians grow up believing in communism and most young Americans grow up believing in democracy or, for that matter, what accounts for the coincidence that most Arabs believe in Islam and most Spaniards in Catholicism? What, in short, is the real source of ideological beliefs and what value do they have as concepts of reality, much less as principles for which men should be willing to fight and die?

I recently had the privilege of a luncheon with the distinguished Johns Hopkins psychiatrist, Dr. Jerome Frank, and he explained to me some psychiatric principles which may be pertinent to a better understanding of international relations. He pointed out, for example, that an ideology gives us an identity beyond our own trivial and transitory lives on earth and also serves the purpose of "organizing the world" for us, giving us a picture, though not necessarily an accurate picture, of reality. A person's worldview, or ideology, says Dr. Frank, filters the signals that come to him, giving meaning and pattern to otherwise odd bits of information. Thus, for example, when a Chinese and an American put radically different interpretations on the Vietnamese war, it is not necessarily because one or the other has chosen to propound a wicked lie but rather because each has filtered information from the real world through his ideological worldview, selecting the parts that fit, rejecting the parts that do not, and coming out with two radically different interpretations of the same events.

There is a "strain toward consistency" which leads a country, once it has decided that another country is good or bad, peaceful or aggressive, to interpret every bit of information to fit that preconception, so much so that even a genuine concession offered by one is likely to be viewed by the other as a trick to gain some illicit advantage. A possible manifestation of this tendency is the North Vietnamese view of American proposals to negotiate peace as fraudulent plots. Having been betrayed after previous negotiations—by the French in 1946 and by Ngo Dinh Diem in 1955 when, with American complicity, he refused to allow the elections called for in the Geneva Accords to take place—the Hanoi Government may now feel that American offers to negotiate peace, which we believe to be genuine, are in reality plots to trick them into yielding through diplomacy what we have been unable to make them yield by force.

Another interesting point is the shaping of behavior by expectations, or what is called the self-fulfilling prophecy. Thus, for example, China, fearing the United States but lacking power, threatens and blusters, confirming the United States in its fears of China and causing it to arm against her, which in turn heightens Chinese fears of the United States. Professor Gordon Allport of Harvard made the point some years ago that ". . . while most people deplore war, they nonetheless *expect* it to continue. *And what people expect determines their behavior.*" ". . . the indispensable condition of war," wrote Professor Allport, "is that people must *expect* war and must prepare for war, before, under war-minded leadership, they make war. It is in this sense that 'wars begin in the minds of men.' " [20]

Another striking psychological phenomenon is the tendency of antagonists to dehumanize each other. To most Americans China is a strange, distant and dangerous nation, not a society made up of 700 million individual human beings but a kind of menacing abstraction. When Chinese soldiers are described, for example, as "hordes of Chinese coolies," it is clear that they are being thought of not as people but as something terrifying and abstract, or as something inanimate like the flow of lava from a volcano. Both China and America seem to think of each other as abstractions: to the Chinese we are not a society of individual people but the embodiment of an evil idea, the idea of "imperialist capitalism;" and to most of us China represents not people but an evil and frightening idea, the idea of "aggressive communism."

---

[15] Norodom Sihanouk, "The Failure of the United States in the 'Third World'—Seen Through the Lesson of Cambodia." Reprinted in Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 19, p. 25328.

[16] George Bernard Shaw, *Getting Married* (1911).

[17] McGeorge Bundy is said to have said that in an interview with Henry F. Graff, Professor of History at Columbia University, who reported it in "How Johnson Makes Foreign Policy," *New York Times Magazine*, July 4, 1965, p. 17.

[18] Henry Fairlie, writer for *The Spectator* and *The Daily Telegraph of London*, in "A Cheer for American Imperialism," *New York Times Magazine*, July 11, 1965.

[19] Edmund Burke, "On a Regicide Peace," (1796).

[20] Gordon W. Allport, "The Role of Expectancy," *Tensions That Cause Wars*, Hadley Cantril, ed., (University of Illinois Press, 1950), p. 43.

Obviously, this dehumanizing tendency helps to explain the savagery of war. Man's capacity for decent behavior seems to vary directly with his perception of others as individual humans with human motives and feelings, whereas his capacity for barbarous behavior seems to increase with his perception of an adversary in abstract terms. This is the only explanation I can think of for the fact that the very same good and decent citizens who would never fail to feed a hungry child or comfort a sick friend or drop a coin in the church collection basket celebrate the number of Viet Cong killed in a particular week or battle and can now contemplate with equanimity, or indeed even advocate, the use of nuclear weapons against the "hordes of Chinese coolies." I feel sure that this apparent insensitivity to the incineration of thousands of millions of our fellow human beings is not the result of feelings of savage inhumanity toward foreigners; it is the result of not thinking of them as humans at all but rather as the embodiment of doctrines that we consider evil.

Dr. Chisholm suggests that "What we the people of the world need, perhaps most, is to exercise our imaginations, to develop our ability to look at things from outside our accidental area of being." Most of us, he says, "have never taken out our imaginations for any kind of run in all our lives," but rather have kept them tightly locked up within the limits of our own national perspective.[21]

The obvious value of liberating the imagination is that it might enable us to acquire some understanding of the view of the world held by people whose past experience and present situations are radically different from our own. It might enable us to understand, for example, what it feels like to be hungry, not hungry in the way that a middle-class American feels after a golf game or a fast tennis match, but hungry as an Asian might be hungry, with a hunger that has never been satisfied, with one's children having stunted limbs and swollen bellies, with a desire to change things that has little regard for due process of the law because the desire for change has an urgency and desperation about it that few Americans have ever experienced. Could we but liberate our imagination in this way, we might be able to see why so many people in the world are making revolutions; we might even be able to see why some of them are communists.

Having suggested, as best an amateur can, some of the psychological principles that might be pertinent to international relations, I now venture to suggest some applications.

Paranoid fears, says Dr. Frank, are not entirely false fears; certainly, China's fear of American hostility, though distorted and exaggerated, is not pure invention. In dealing with paranoid individuals, Dr. Frank suggests, it is generally desirable to listen respectfully without agreeing but also without trying to break down or attack the patient's system of beliefs. It is also important not to get over friendly lest the patient interpret effusive overtures as a hostile plot. Dr. Frank also suggests that the paranoid patient is certain to rebuff overtures of friendship many times before beginning to respond.

Applying these principles to China, perhaps the best thing we can do for the time being is to reduce expressions of hostility, put forth only such limited proposals for friendship as might be credible, and otherwise leave her strictly alone. In the wake of the historical trauma to which I referred last week, China's fear and hatred of the West is probably still too deep and likely to remain so for some time to come, to permit of positive cooperation, or, indeed, of anything beyond what we might call mutually respectful relations from a distance.

Before China can accept the hand of Western friendship, she must first recover pride. She must recover that sense of herself as a great civilization which was so badly battered in the nineteenth century and, with it, the strength to open her door to the outside world. Having been all but destroyed as a nation by the forced intrusions of the West, China must first know that she has the strength to reject unwanted foreign influences before she can be expected to seek or accept friendly foreign associations. Or, to make the same point from the side of the United States, before we can extend the hand of friendship to China with any expectation of it being accepted, we must first persuade her that we respect her right to take what we offer or leave it as she thinks best. There is no better way to convey this message to China than by leaving her alone.

If we can give our imaginations a "good run" as Dr. Chisholm recommends, we are likely to learn that the "way of life" which we so eagerly commend to the world has little pertinence either to China's past experience or to her future needs. China, Dr. Fairbank tells us, is a society in which the concept of "individualism" which we cherish is held in low esteem because it connotes a chaotic selfishness, the opposite of the commitment to the collective good which is highly valued by the Chinese. Similarly, the very word for "freedom" (tzu-yu) is said to connote a lack of discipline, even license, the very opposite of the Chinese ideal of disciplined cooperation. Even such basic Western ideas as "loyal opposition" and "self-determination," Professor Fairbank points out, are alien to the Chinese. The cultural gap is further illustrated by the difference in attitudes toward philanthropy: to Americans, it is a Christian virtue; to the Chinese it is, unless reciprocal, insulting and degrading—something that we might keep in mind if relations ever thaw enough to make conceivable American economic aid or, more plausibly, disaster relief in the event of some natural calamity such as flood or famine.[22] In the light of these profound cultural differences, shall we, in Mark Twain's words, "go on conferring our Civilization upon the peoples that sit in darkness, or shall we give those poor things a rest?"[23]

There are, I think, some limited positive steps which the United States might take toward improved relations with China. It would do the United States no harm in the short run and perhaps considerable good in the long run to end our opposition to the seating of Communist China in the United Nations and, depending on events, to follow that up with some positive suggestions for more normal relations. The United States has already proposed visits by scholars and newspapermen between China and the United States, and, although these proposals have been rejected by the Chinese, it might be well, though not too often and not too eagerly, to remind them of the offer from time to time. In proposing these and other initiatives to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as major components in a policy of "without containment isolation," Professor Doak Barnett made the point that "In taking these steps, we will have to do so in full recognition of the fact that Peking's initial reaction is almost certain to be negative and hostile and that any changes in our posture will create some new problems. But we should take them nevertheless, because initiatives on our part are clearly required if we are to work, however slowly, toward the long term goal of a more stable, less explosive situation in Asia and to explore the possibilities of trying to moderate Peking's policies." [24]

The point of such a new approach to China, writes Professor Fairbank, is psychological:

"Peking is, to say the least, maladjusted, rebellious against the whole outer world. Russia as well as America. We are Peking's principal enemy because we happen now to be the biggest outside power trying to foster world stability. But do we have to play Mao's game? Must we carry the whole burden of resisting Peking's pretensions? Why not let others in on the job?

"A Communist China seated in the UN," Fairbank continues, "could no longer pose as a martyr excluded by 'American imperialism,' She would have to face the self-interest of other countries, and learn to act as a full member of international society for the first time in history. This is the only way for China to grow up and eventually accept restraints on her revolutionary ardor." [25]

The most difficult and dangerous of issues between the United States and China is the confrontation of their power in southeast Asia, an issue which, because of its explosive possibilities, cannot be consigned to the healing effects of time. I have suggested in recent statements how I think this issue might be resolved by an agreement for the neutralization of Vietnam under the guarantee of the great powers, and I will not repeat the specifications of my proposal tonight.

Should it be possible to end the Vietnamese war on the basis of an agreement for the neutralization of southeast Asia, it would then be possible to concentrate with real hope of success on the long difficult task of introducing some trust into relations between China and the West, of repairing history's ravages and bringing the great Chinese nation into its proper role as a respected member of the international community. In time it might even be possible for the Chinese and Taiwanese on their own to work out some arrangement for Taiwan that would not do too much damage either to the concept of self-determination or to the Chinese concept of China's cultural indivisibility—perhaps some sort of an arrangement for Taiwanese self-government under nominal Chinese suzerainty. But that would be for them to decide.

All this is not, as has been suggested, a matter of "being kind to China." It is a matter of altering that fatal expectancy which is leading two great nations toward a tragic and unnecessary war. If it involves "being kind to China," those who are repelled by that thought may take some small comfort in the fact that it also involves "being kind to America."

On November 14, 1860, Alexander Hamilton Stephens, who subsequently became Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, delivered an address to the Georgia Legislature in which he appealed to his colleagues to delay the secession of Georgia from the Union. "It may be," he said, "that out of it we may become greater and more prosperous, but I am candid and sincere in telling you that I fear if we yield to passion and without sufficient cause shall take that step, that instead of becoming greater or more peaceful, prosperous and happy—instead of becoming Gods, we will become demons, and at no distant day commence cutting one another's throats. This is my apprehension. Let us, therefore, whatever we do, meet these difficulties, great as they are, like wise and sensible men, and consider them in the light of all the consequences which may attend our action."[26]

---

[21] Broch Chisholm, *Prescription for Survival, ibid*, p. 76.

[22] John K. Fairbank, "How to Deal with the Chinese Revolution," *New York Review of Books*, February 17, 1966, Volume VI, No. 2, p. 14.

[23] "To the Person Sitting in Darkness," from *Europe and Elsewhere*.

[24] Statement of Professor A. Doak Barnett before the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee, March 8, 1966, pp. 2, 13–15.

[25] John K. Fairbank, "How to Deal with the Chinese Revolution," *ibid*., p. 16.

What a tragedy it is that the South did not accept Stephens' advice in 1860. What a blessing it would be if, faced with the danger of a war with China, we did accept it today.

In its relations with China, as indeed in its relations with all of the revolutionary or potentially revolutionary societies of the world, America has an opportunity to perform services of which no great nation has ever before been capable. To do so we must acquire wisdom to match our power and humility to match our pride. Perhaps the single word above all others that expresses America's need is "empathy," which Webster defines as the "imaginative projection of one's own consciousness into another being."

There are many respects in which America, if it can bring itself to act with the magnanimity and the empathy appropriate to its size and power, can be an intelligent example to the world. We have the opportunity to set an example of generous understanding in our relations with China, of practical cooperation for peace in our relations with Russia, of reliable and respectful partnership in our relations with Western Europe, of material helpfulness without moral presumption in our relations with the developing nations, of abstention from the temptations of hegemony in our relations with Latin America, and of the all-around advantages of minding one's own business in our relations with everybody. Most of all, we have the opportunity to serve as an example of democracy to the world by the way in which we run our own society; America, in the words of John Quincy Adams, should be "the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all" but "the champion and vindicator only of her own."[27]

If we can bring ourselves so to act, we will have overcome the dangers of the arrogance of power. It will involve, no doubt, the loss of certain glories, but that seems a price worth paying for the probable rewards, which are the happiness of America and the peace of the world.

[From Life magazine, May 13, 1966]

THE ROOTS OF THE ARKANSAS QUESTIONER

(By Brock Brower)

It's hard any longer to catch the flash of sweet-water Ozark crik that runs through Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's stony eloquence. Mostly, these days, he's keeping to dry, somber, history-minded warnings against the "fatal presumption" that, he fears, could lead America, via Vietnam, to become "what it is not now and never has been, a seeker after unlimited power and empire."

All this, like as not, in the formal rhetoric of white tie and tails. Even when he does take an incidental turn as a plain Arkansas country boy, everybody claims to know better than to believe this. They count him rich enough back home, smart enough all around the rest of the world, and long enough in the U.S. Senate—21 years—to have got over any of that he ever had in him. The countrification is purely for emphasis now, just his way of shooting an extra-hard public look over the top of his tinted glasses at the store-bought Vietnam and China policies of that other hillbilly, Dean Rusk.

Otherwise, according to those who see him as the only temperate and credible public critic of a whole series of Administration positions, Senator FULBRIGHT belongs at this critical moment not to Arkansas but to world opinion. The silly mistake too many of these intellectual admirers of his make—even as they put him atop a kind of opposing summit of American foreign policy—is to think it's some kind of secret burden for him to have come from Arkansas at all.

"They think Arkansas and the South are millstones around his neck, says one northern urban liberal, who has found out differently since going to work for his hero on the Foreign Relations Committee staff, "but they're wrong. He knows his roots."

In fact, there is an underlying parochialism in the senator's harshest arguments against the U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia. Vietnam to him is "this god-forsaken, little country" for which any Arkansas traveler, remembering some of the dragged-down patches of the Ozarks, could only feel sympathy if he ever stumbled across it.

"I wonder why these people are so dedicated?" he asks rhetorically about the Vietcong. "Why do these people *do* this? How do they come by their fanaticism? Well, coming from the South, with all its memories of Reconstruction, I think I can understand. They've been put upon, and it makes them so fanatical they'll fight down to the last man."

It's an attitude he can see people taking down in his own mountain corner of Arkansas, a place never so far from his mind as some would like to have it; a place, in fact, where he went to live at one earlier time in his life when he left a job in Washington, D.C. and spent seven apolitical years, teaching law part time and living on an isolated hill farm called Rabbit's Foot Lodge.

"It was a curious hybrid," he admits, probably the closest thing there'll ever be to an Ozark teahouse. It was built rustic enough, out of adzed logs and clay calking, with lots of wide porches all around. But whoever put it up had clearly been to China and, from down below the spring, looking back up at the muley roofline, it didn't take much of an eye to see it was practically a damn pagoda. For a man who hates even the noise of his wife's snow tires, that Oriental log cabin offered just about the right amount of peace and quiet. In the midst of the acrimonious hearings over Vietnam—with much of the uproar centering around his own vigorous dissent from the Administration's handling of the war—Senator FULBRIGHT didn't mind thinking an occasional long thought about what it used to be like down there, with no politics "to take time and energy away from the substance of things."

"It's very serene country," he says, brooding a little. He went there to live in 1936, bored with life in the capital as a Justice Department antitrust lawyer. His wife Betty was with him, very far from her own Republican upbringing on Philadelphia's Main Line. "It was just like taking a squirrel who's been in a cage all its life and letting it out in the fresh air. You know that Main Line life? It's ba-ronial!" The squirrel got loose with a pot of paint and had the whole inside of Rabbit's Foot Lodge done over in Colonial White instead of leaving it Mountain Dark, but other than that and kicking all the roupy chickens out of the cellar Betty managed to fit right in with local ways—a handsome, sophisticated woman who could still be "just as plain as pig tracks" with anybody she happened to meet.

BILL FULBRIGHT wasn't doing much besides teaching at the University of Arkansas, scene of his former glory as a Razorback halfback, a few miles away in a little Ozark town called Fayetteville that his family a-quarter-to-a-half owned. He loved teaching and the life at the university; and when the trustees suddenly decided to make him president at the tender age of 34, he felt pretty well settled. He could even stay right on out at Rabbit's Foot Lodge because the university didn't have any official manse to house its president back then.

The only one who thought to worry about them way out there was Betty's mother. When she opened up her Philadelphia Inquirer one morning and saw pictures of bales of cotton floating around in the Arkansas floods of 1938, she wired her daughter: hadn't she "better come north immediately and bring the two children." Betty wired back that the floods were as yet 1,700 feet below them and still 300 miles away. And when a hurricane struck New England later that year, they telegraphed her mother: hadn't she better come down to Arkansas to avoid being hit by a falling elm tree?

That's the way they go about keeping everybody up-to-date and informed down in Arkansas. With a needling kind of courtesy. In fact, nobody's ever going to settle for a simple, straight answer as long as there's time to work one up into a little more elaborative shape. The senator often goes to work in that same way at committee hearings, politely needling the witness in order to elicit the fullest sort of disclosure. He doesn't, for instance, just want to find out what prospects were for free elections in Vietnam in 1956. "Now [the chances] have always been poor, and will be for a hundred years, won't they?" he gently prods Dean Rusk. "That was not news to you. . . . Have they ever had them in 2,000 years of history?" And possibly one of the senator's annoyances with Dean Rusk is that the Secretary keeps giving him the same, simple, straight answers—which somehow fail to satisfy FULBRIGHT's own deep doubts about the nature of the war—and won't even try to put his replies into any more instructive form. But the senator can sympathize with the Secretary of State: "It's a hell of a job."

In late 1960, when there was loose talk around that FULBRIGHT might be picked for Secretary of State in Kennedy's cabinet, the possibility thoroughly distressed him: "It's not my dish of tea. I'd hate the protocol, and I'd be damned uncomfortable getting up and giving speeches with which I didn't agree. The poor fella in that job never has time to think for himself."

None of the kind of time for reflection that existed out at Rabbit's Foot Lodge, where the steps down to the spring are too steep to be taken any more than one at a time. "That water was so clear and cold," he likes to remember. He didn't have a single political connection, beyond the coincidental fact that his local congressman, Clyde T. Ellis, had been coming to his classes to pick up a little constitutional law. "I had no idea I'd ever be in politics," he insists. "I sometimes wonder what would've happened if Mother hadn't written that editorial.

"Oh, I don't mean I ponder over it all that much," he says, quickly dismissing that kind of bootless speculation. Nobody else should give it too much thought either, except just enough to keep in mind that, despite a quarter century in public life, Senator FULBRIGHT is essentially a private man manqué. More than any other senator, he comes forward to address himself to issues from the privacy of his own thoughts, and promptly returns there as soon as his opinion has been offered. Not that he doesn't enjoy the measure of political prominence that is his as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—always much in the headlines after another mumbled, seminal speech on the Senate floor, and often seen around social Washington with his wife, who dutifully mends the holes in his protocol. But, as one of his aides explains the difference between him and most senators: "When he's busy, he's busy behind a closed door."

He is an anomaly, especially in gregarious Southern politics, a man of intellect, almost a seminarian, pursuing an aloof career as an often dissident public counselor—he's been called "the Walter Lippmann of the Senate"—with no more real political base than perhaps those few capricious jottings in his mother's newspaper long ago.

---

[26] Alexander Hamilton Stephens, "Secession," in *Modern Eloquence* (New York: P. F. Collier & Sons, 1928), Vol. II, p. 203.

[27] John Quincy Adams, July 4, 1821, Washington, D.C. Reported in *National Intelligencer*, July 11, 1821.

Mrs. Roberta Fulbright, an old schoolteacher herself, was the kind of woman who makes the local Rotarians wonder how far she might've gone if she'd ever been a man—only they wonder right out loud and proudly, pleased to see the local library and a university dormitory named for her. Back in 1906 her husband, Jay Fulbright, got the family off the farm in Missouri by setting up his first little, two-person bank in Arkansas and thereafter pushed the Fulbrights' fortunes to an estimable point. But, in 1923, he died suddenly, leaving Mrs. Fulbright with six offspring; BILL FULBRIGHT, their fourth child, was 18 at the time.

"We came very damn close to going to the poorhouse," FULBRIGHT says, exaggerating some, "but she managed to salvage enough of a nest egg to start over again." That is, she let go the bank stock but kept the lumber business, the Coca-Cola bottling plant, a lot of real estate and a few other Fulbright Enterprises—including a newspaper. Eventually she accumulated enough leverage to clean up the whole county once—but good, throwing out a corrupt courthouse gang and dragging her own man, Buck Lewis, with his big horse pistol, down to Little Rock to get him appointed sheriff.

"But her one big love, besides her family," says FULBRIGHT, "was that newspaper." It's now the Northwest Arkansas Times, and turning a tidy penny. But back then it was The Democrat, a sorry investment, mostly useful for printing the columns Mother Fulbright scribbled together after nobody in the family was left awake to talk to her anymore. ("She loved to talk, God, she loved to talk! She'd wear us out, staying up at night.") She'd write until 3 o'clock in the morning about anything from cooking to politics, or sometimes both at once: "Our politics remind me of the pies the mountain girl had. She asked the guests, 'Will you have kivered, unkivered or crossbar?' All apple. Now that's what we have—kivered, unkivered and crossbar politics, all Democrats." And so Mother Fulbright wrote a thing or two about a Democrat named Homer Adkins. In fact, right after Adkins' triumphant election as governor in 1940, she wrote that the people of Arkansas had just traded a statesmen, Governor Car Baily, for a gladhander and a backslapper.

Governor Adkins returned the compliment by stacking the university board of trustees high enough to have her son fired as president. So then Congressman Ellis came up to his ex-law professor, almost like it was after class, and said since he, Ellis, was going to announce for U.S. senator next Staturday, "you ought to run for my place."

"I'd have never dreamed of it," says FULBRIGHT. "I hadn't even been in three of the 10 counties in all my life." But he was pretty much at loose ends, so he got around to announce for U.S. senator next Saturday, and carried all 10 in the fall of 1942 to win the House seat. And when Governor Adkins decided to run for U.S. senator in 1944, so did Congressman FULBRIGHT; and he beat Adkins, and three other candidates—kivered, unkivered and crossbar.

"Homer Adkins," his mother wrote as her final word against her old enemy, imitating his bad grammar, "has came and went." And her son has now been and gone to the Senate for four terms, not so much a political success as an outsized civic achievement for which the whole state of Arkansas feels it can humbly take a worldwide bow: "He's just as smart as $700." "He's known in every corner of the world." "Who the hell'd've ever dreamed we'd have an international scholar from Arkansas?" "He's an institution. People don't vote against institutions."

"You can beat him," an adviser once told Governor Orval Faubus, who was eager to try in 1962, and might be even more ready in 1968, "if you can get him down off that cloud they got him on."

He's lucky, too, to have that cloud under him, because he really has little taste for the gritty, down-to-earth politicking it normally takes to survive at home and conquer in Washington. He doesn't chew cut with the snuff-dippers back in Arkansas, but he's never been a member of the inner "club" in the Senate—nor much wanted to be—despite his prestige and seniority. In fact, not a few of his colleagues in the Senate view him as a cold and scornful figure, a bit of a cynic, a lot of "a loner," dourly impatient with most lesser mortals—or, in Harry Truman's succinct phrasing, an "overeducated Oxford s.o.b."

There may be a touch or two of truth in that indictment, but the only part of it that could solidly be called a fact is Oxford. He did go there for three years as a Rhodes scholar, from 1925 to 1928, though he prefers to think of that experience as a sort of personal liberation rather than any detriment to his character. It freed him of the local countryside and provided that grounding in the greater world which ultimately—if not exactly at that moment ("All I did at Oxford," he claims, "is have a hell of a good time—played games and studied the minimum")—led to his commanding interest in foreign affairs.

"Remember, I'd never been anywhere to speak of," he explains. "I'd never been to New York or San Francisco or Washington or any of those places. And here I'm picked up out of a little village at an early age * * *"—he was pushed in his studies by his father's telling him every summer: "Go to school, or go to work"; and washing Coke bottles bored him—"* * * and suddenly I go to Oxford. It has a tremendous impact on your attitude."

The best of Europe was opened up to the roaming hill boy within him, and he came away from this Grand Tour and his reading of Modern History and Political Science at Oxford with a wide-eyed internationalist outlook that, going right over the top of his squinty mountain conservatism, gave him a very odd expression indeed, especially in later politics. Unreadable, practically.

Of course, it probably has to be unreadable if he is going to make it suit all the various interests that comprise both his Arkansas constituency and his worldwide following. At one extreme are those rich planters from eastern Arkansas—far less liberal than even his own people up in the Ozarks—who control huge cotton allotments and large voting blocks, and often truck "their" Negroes to the polls to swell a highly deliverable part of the total vote for FULBRIGHT. (Even this is an improvement, according to Mrs. L. C. Bates, past president of the Arkansas NAACP. "They used to didn't even truck 'em. They'd be in the cotton fields when they voted 'em.") But at the other extreme is that widespread and admiring conclave of liberal intellectuals who, also for possessive reasons, embrace FULBRIGHT as more "their" senator than anybody they ever helped elect from their own state. His out-of-Arkansas supporters can't vote for him—some are foreign nationals—but they expect a lot from him, and he is well aware of that expectation. So he is trapped, representing east Arkansas at the same time he is trying to function in somewhat the same intellectual manner as the M.P. whom Oxford University used to send up as his representative to the British parliament. As a result, FULBRIGHT's voting record is crazy-quilt, his politics are pretty much a standoff, and his public countenance—unreadable.

"Nobody knows where to put FULBRIGHT," says Jack Yingling, one of his past legislative assistants, trying to explain why the senator's independent manner seems to annoy so many routine-minded politicos. "He pops up here, he pops up there."

He popped up first in 1943 with a mere five lines of legislation that quickly became famous as "the Fulbright Resolution," a historic gesture that put the House of Representatives on record, even a little before the Senate, as favoring "the creation of appropriate international machinery"—i.e., the United Nations—to keep "a just and lasting peace" after the war. Two years later he offered, as a kind of "economy measure," a plan to use counterpart funds from the sale of war surplus overseas to finance a student exchange program, which ended up as the Fulbright Scholarships. He seemed to be casting his total allegiance with those who advocated the extension of U.S. foreign aid programs throughout One World. But he has since popped up as one of the sharpest critics of "the arrogance" with which he believes the U.S. has handled the whole business of helping other countries, too often forcing anti-Communist military ties upon smaller nations, thereby blunting the positive effects of the aid and creating dangers of U.S. entanglement that need never have existed, e.g., in Vietnam.

On domestic issues he pops up most often as a southern conservative, willing to filibuster against the repeal of the so-called right-to-work law and able to vote against civil rights legislation even after President Kennedy's call to conscience in 1963—to the chagrin of his liberal friends, who will never convince labor that he isn't a Bourbon, or the NAACP that he isn't a bigot. Yet the worst political attacks upon him come from the superpatriots of the southern right wing, who suspect, quite correctly, that his heart isn't really in his racial posture and who know that his deeper convictions include a thorough disapproval of "our national obsession with Communism" and a large distrust of the military mind, along with considerable boggling at what it costs to keep that mind at ease with its grim, strategic thoughts.

"He's shocked as a kid by the expense of the military," an aide observes. He has a gut reaction against the amount of money that must go into building an aircraft carrier—money that cannot then be used to build roads and schools in such places as Arkansas—and he is appalled on similar grounds at the expenditures for the space program. ("It's one of our greatest mistakes. I couldn't possibly have the language and power to say that strongly enough. I've made every effort to cut [the space] appropriation down. I don't care about a mild, gentle program. But this thing just blossomed from nothing into five billion dollars!")

On the other hand, he greatly admires the World Bank for offering liberal terms under which a smaller nation can negotiate a generous loan—while still retaining its national pride—and he would prefer to revamp the U.S. foreign aid program to channel most of its millions, with no military strings attached, through that multilateral instrument: "I never heard anybody say, 'World Bank, go home!' "

For this high-minded approach to the amity among nations he has been honored with full academic pomp in country after country as a kind of international culture hero. But usually on these state visits he manages to pop up at the local marketplace, going over the fruits and vegetables and handwork like a junketing 4-H leader. "I like to see what they raise, what they make," he admits, ready to shop Fiji the same way he would War Eagle, Ark.: "You can understand then how the superiority of the Westerner can be so offensive. Sure, we have a hell of a lot of money and can make bombs, but in the local markets you can see other people showing a lot of talent too." He can no more pass by a busy stall in any of the world's bazaars than he can drive by a fruit stand in the Ozarks without stopping for apples. "Here he is," one of his speech writers remembers from a trip the senator made to the South Pacific, "peering over his half glasses at fresh fruit in Tahiti. And he ends up back at the hotel with five different kinds of mangoes."

In sum, no one position ever really quite leads to another in the unfolding of FULBRIGHT's scattered public stands. The senator himself rather facilely explains this situation by saying, "I like to feel free to take each issue as it comes. On many issues I don't have an opinion, and then I'll trust another's judgment. But that's voluntary." However, his independence of mind also involves far more complicated mental gymnastics. He happens to have remarkable powers of preoccupation. "He tends to think of one issue to the exclusion of all others," explains a member of his staff, and often such an issue will assume the proportions of an intellectual crisis with him. "He usually has about one of these a year. Last year it was what to do about the foreign aid program.

"This year it's the Far East." He closets himself in his senatorial office—much the way a student at Oxford "sports his oak" to study for his examinations—and reads everything he can lay his hands on about what's worrying him. Also: "We bring him people." He mulls over the problem, educating himself in its history and all its possible ramifications, and then finally comes out of his darkened chambers to give a speech or hold a hearing or offer a bill—sometimes to do all three. By then, it is more than likely that the issue has become uniquely identifiable with him—more through his scholarship than his sponsorship: he simply knows the matter best—and sooner or later, in one phase or another, it will acquire his name.

In fact, it is amazing the number of diverse matters that are named FULBRIGHT, considering he is not generally regarded as a mover of men or a perpetrator of events.

Things occasionally pick up his name even though he has little or nothing to do with them. When a letter was sent to the President by 15 senators expressing agreement with FULBRIGHT's stand on Vietnam, Johnson's aide Jake Valenti began carrying it around the White House as "the Fulbright letter," though it was in no way his; Valenti simply grabbed that letter by the easiest handle. In a sense FULBRIGHT's name, with all its past associations, has become that kind of eponym lately. It identifies a new mode of thinking about internationl affairs—inquiring, from a sense of history, how a foreign populace may achieve its own political maturity, free of outside prescription, including any based too closely on the American experience.

Of course, not all things Fulbright are universally popular. He has come in for some heavy criticism about his views on Vietnam. But there still is no doubt that once his name is attached to a particular position, even his boldest detractors are forced into a grudging respect for it. He can never be dismissed as a maverick, the way Senator MORSE of Oregon can, even when they hold practically the same views.

FULBRIGHT has stratagems that assure him this respect; he is deftly courteous, even with a needling question, and he can be deftly elusive—even seems to enjoy being elusive—trailing off through a series of elliptical qualifying remarks that end suddenly with an abrupt, barely related question tossed back at his original interrogator. (He'll discuss his practically nonexistent religious views this way or, for that matter, anything touching himself too closely.) But he is also accorded genuine respect because of the astonishing breadth of view he does, in fact, possess.

From up on his Ozark hilltop—territory more Pioneer West than Genteel Southern—he really can see all the way from east Arkansas to the farthest reaches of the greater world and he is always very cannily relating the one to the other. He will strike just the right note, for instance, with a delegation of visiting Africans after they have explained their difficulties, by saying, as he did recently, that he can understand their problems: "You're about where we were 30 years ago in Arkansas."

And, if he measures the greater world by Arkansas, he is equally willing to measure Arkansas by the greater world. "I come from a very poor state," he never ceases to reiterate, and he likes to talk about Arkansas as if it were an underdeveloped country that had just shaken off the yoke of Arkansas Power and Light's oligarchical rule but still had to depend on foreign aid. He investigated the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the early 50s, he says, to protect it from politics, since he believed the RFC was "the major agency for aid to the underdeveloped states." He has consistently voted for federal aid to education, although voters in Arkansas distrusted Big Government moving in on them, because he believes better schooling is clearly the one best hope for an emergent people. "They forgave me because, 'Well, he's an old professor,'" he thinks. But there are certain internal problems which, he argues, no emergent people will allow anybody from Washington to touch at this stage in their development.

FULBRIGHT did not intervene during the 1957 integration crisis at Central High School in Little Rock, though that incident made Faubus' name almost infamous enough to cancel out FULBRIGHT's own around the world. FULBRIGHT was in England at the time, and he stayed in England for what some caustic wits said "must have been the second semester at Oxford." The NAACP's Mrs. Bates for one, will never forgive him: "I've never quite understood him. He's an intelligent guy. Why does he have to sell his soul and his people like that? This man has a brain and he's shown in every way where he stands. The majority of the liberals here told us he wouldn't sign the Southern Manifesto [a pledge by southern congressmen to fight the Court's segregation decisions]. But he did. No, I'll listen to Faubus more than I'll listen to FULBRIGHT." But FULBRIGHT, thinking of the enfranchised among the emergent people of Arkansas insists, "You don't trifle with them, especially about what concerns them socially." Congressman Brooks Hays publicly supported school integration and was widely applauded for his courage. FULBRIGHT was not. But Brooks Hays shortly lost his seat as congressman from Little Rock.

FULBRIGHT personally is a gradualist who approves of the fact that both the University of Arkansas and Fayetteville's public schools have been integrated. He tries to explain his quandary by saying that he will not buck a white majority "in a matter of this deep interest, in an area where they have knowledge and experience equal or superior to my own." With this rather flimsy justification, FULBRIGHT rides out any and all criticism of his votes against civil rights, arguing that it is simply a question of his political survival. He insists he is then left free to go against his constituents on matters where their knowledge and experience are not equal to his own—on foreign aid, for instance, for which he originally voted, "even though I felt they did oppose it, because they thought they needed it [aid] more."

Lately, however, FULBRIGHT has been wondering if his own people in Arkansas couldn't have done a better job with U.S. foreign policy than anybody in the federal government, including himself. "Maybe their instincts about foreign aid were right," he ponders. "As you know, I've been having second thoughts myself. After all, how did we get mixed up in Vietnam? You could say this whole thing started out of an aid program."

That was a long time ago, however, and his own tardiness in taking cognizance of the situation in Vietnam causes him considerable chagrin. FULBRIGHT remembers Vietnam, from the '50s, as "a very small operation. I wasn't at all concerned. I was entirely preoccupied with Europe. I don't recall we ever had a hearing on Vietnam." But early this year FULBRIGHT sported his oak for another period of intense study—"a Europe man" setting out to learn a whole new field: the other side of the world—and when he came out again, he started a long series of hearings that eventually brought him to some grim conclusions of his own.

In Vietnam he feels that the U.S., at worst, inherited the position already lost by the French in an abandoned colonial war; or that, at best, we interfered misguidedly in a civil struggle that might have resolved itself sooner had the U.S. not intervened. The Communist involvement in the war is not, for FULBRIGHT, the deciding factor; and, indeed, he is doubtful about that whole line of reasoning: "Everytime somebody calls it [a people's movement] 'Communist,' it's reason for intervention." He's convinced this approach has caused the U.S. to initiate too many mistaken troop movements—particularly into the Dominican Republic not too long ago—and that's "another thing that poisons me in this direction."

Moreover, FULLBRIGHT feels that something is basically wrong when the U.S. can become so inextricably involved in the woes of a tiny country like Vietnam that a land war with China looms as a larger threat to the world than ever did the most painful destiny the tiny country might have found for itself: "I'm ashamed that the United States—a big, magnamimous country is picking on the little countries, trying to squash 'em. Why don't we challenge Russia or China directly, if that's how we feel?" He has now come to suspect that what has happened is that the U.S. has gone into too many areas of the world with an abundance of good intention all wrapped up in aid to 83 developing countries—83 possible sources of commitment, and subsequent overbearance—and that one or another of these ties was bound to ensnare us in an unwanted conflict. He has supported foreign aid and since the proposal of the Marshall Plan in 1947; but, "Back when all this started, I didn't think the United States would be so arrogant about it."

That, for FULBRIGHT, is the abiding error. As one of his staff puts it, he has "a strong distaste for the destructive psychological effects of the donor and the suppliant. That's at the core of his reasoning. You don't humiliate people. He appreciates the pride a little country has in telling off a big country."

Indeed, FULBRIGHT feels that the best hope for peace lies in reaching some general accommodation with Communist China so as to save the little countries of Southeast Asia neutrally whole, and he has gone on the Senate floor to argue that position.

So far, nobody has exactly leaped to the support of his proposals and, indeed, nothing of FULBRIGHT's vigorous dissent from Administration policy has yet emerged as anything concrete, even from his own committee. The President is still the power broker: "As long as he's there and there's a two-to-one majority, he's running the show. He has control of this Congress, including my committee. I have a lot of the younger members with me, but they're afraid to expose themselves. They know they can be gutted." FULBRIGHT uncomfortably lacked committee support even for an amendment to the Vietnam aid appropriation that would have dissociated the Senate from any implied approval of Johnson's present course of action.

"I hate like hell to be in the minority," he admits. "It does give me pause." But it's far from a new position for him, and he has always had the inner resources to last it out until he is proven right or wrong. Actually he is really at his best when he is unhesitatingly outspoken.

"One thing you damn soon find out," recalls one faculty member who knew him at the university as a teacher, "and that's what Bill Fulbright feels." It's something he gets partly from the Ozarks, but it's also something he gets from having been a professor. When he speaks out, he sounds almost as if he were exercising tenure as much as his rights as a senator. His dissents from majority opinion seem almost scholarly obligations—as if he wanted to offer a lesson in civics, full of learned references, as much as set down his own opinion. On such occasions he is especially prone to quote Alexis de Tocqueville, the traveling Frenchman who more than a hundred years ago analyzed the intellectual danger of too much conformist thinking in this country in his classic, Democracy in America. "De Tocqueville says things so much better than I could. About the tyranny of the majority. I always have the feeling that book could have been written about America 10 years ago."

Ten years or so ago Fulbright was quoting De Tocqueville in his at-the-time lonely public opposition to Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, whose tactics violated—above all else, for Fulbright—"the code of the gentleman that our democratic society presupposes." Fulbright has always believed that decent conduct within the Senate, one member toward another, is needful for its survival; and when the majority of senators didn't at first seem to find this true, he vigorously dissented. It is still the vote in which he takes the most pride, the only nay that was cast against the appropriations for McCarthy's investigation in 1954. The Ozark part of it was that Fulbright didn't actually make up his mind to do so until he was on the Senate floor and McCarthy insisted on a roll-call vote.

"That put the clincher on it," Jack Yingling remembers. "Fulbright was damned if he was going to be on record as voting for it."

The professorial part was that he promptly rose to speak against the "swinish blight" of anti-intellectualism—and from time to time thereafter dropped quotations from the Bible and Jonathan Swift into the Congressional Record as gibes at McCarthy's loutishness and smear tactics. Fulbright considered McCarthy to be "like an animal."

McCarthy kept up a noisy stream of abuse against "Senator Half-Bright"; but Fulbright waited him out, standing up as the only one willing to be counted, until other senators gradually joined him in sufficient number to pass the censure motion that toppled McCarthy. ("This idea that everything is done by an 'inner group,'" an old congressional hand scoffs. "What they do, they're forced to do by people like Fulbright.") The senator has been a whipping boy for the right wing ever since; and whenever he stirs up another ruckus over superpatriotism, as he did in 1961 with a memorandum to Secretary of Defense McNamara concerning military sponsorship of civilian seminars in anti-Communism, the letters pour in.

But for all its intellectual flair, his clash with McCarthy really lacked the majestically banked thunder of his loftier disagreements with presidents of the United States, which have almost become a habit with him. So far, he has crossed every Chief Executive of the last two decades at least once: Truman over RFC scandals, Eisenhower over Dulles' Middle East policies, and Kennedy over the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Indeed, Fulbright may have been slow in getting around to crossing Johnson, and he has been criticized for that. If he was so opposed to U.S. involvement in Vietnam, why did he act as floor manager in August, 1964, for the Bay of Tonkin resolution, which Johnson has used ever since as a color of congressional authority to take "all necessary steps" to repeal aggression?

"I was derelict there," Fulbright admits, another result of his tardy realization of the true situation in Southeast Asia. "It would probably have been healthy to have gone into conference and had some discussion. But Goldwater had just been nominated. You know how the lines were drawn."

Fulbright was for L.B.J. "publicly and privately"—much closer to Johnson than he had ever been to any previous President. Truman and Fulbright are friends now, but that was hardly the case when Fulbright was investigating influence peddling in the RFC. Kennedy—or the Kennedys, really—he'd never gotten to know; they struck him as a cold lot. Stevenson was much more his candidate; and then, for reasons of long friendship and some mutual understanding, Johnson. They used to sit next to each other in the Senate when Johnson was majority whip, and Johnson invariably deferred to Fulbright on foreign policy matters: "See Bill. He's my Secretary of State." In return, Fulbright looked upon Johnson as "a political genius," backed him for the presidential nomination in 1960 and campaigned strongly for him in Arkansas against insurgent Goldwaterism two years ago.

But they are really antipodal human beings, and even back in their days together in the Senate there was a fatal indication of what would eventually happen in Fulbright's realization that "Johnson just wants to pass bills—he doesn't care what's in them" and in Johnson's impatience with Fulbright's inability at Foreign Relations Committee meetings to "for ——— settle it" in time to get home for supper.

A split was bound to come between the man interested in substance and the man of politics. The issue turned out to be Fulbright's dissent over U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic: "I was reluctant to do it. I'd have preferred that an opposition member do it. But they're all for him. My final consideration was, here's all of Latin America wondering about us. Somebody ought to give the other point of view."

Fulbright tried to couch his speech of last September as a criticism of bad advice given the President, but it still made Johnson furious. Afterward, besides delivering a series of petty social snubs, Johnson lessened any meaningful communication with Fulbright on foreign policy down to a point where he conferred in whispers with Dean Rusk during the entire time that Fulbright made his last effort to propound his views on Vietnam at a White House meeting of the congressional leadership.

"I have to defend my position whether I like doing it or not," Fulbright said just before beginning the public hearings on Vietnam late in January. But he has managed to accomplish something more significant than that. He has used the pressure within Congress for an open airing of the whole range of U.S. foreign policy—pressure that has come particularly from younger members of both houses—to pull the Foreign Relations Committee together again after several frustrating years of chronic absenteeism and foundering morale.

"We were always so plagued by the foreign aid bill," he explains. "That cursed thing took up three quarters of our time. No member really liked it. They were bored with it. It about destroyed the spirit of the committee."

But from the beginning the policy hearings revived everybody's spirits, including Fulbright's—at one particularly low point, he had thought of resigning from his chairmanship—in part because he allowed the Vietnam hearings to develop in a much freer style than is normally his custom.

In the attempt to debate Vietnam and understand our China policy, Fulbright threw a heavy burden upon other senators during their allotted 10 minutes of questioning. Much to his delight, most of them came forward with informed contributions.

"I've never seen them enter into it so deftly," Fulbright says of his colleagues. "I was surprised by the intelligence of some of their questions. They were extraordinarily good." The whole exercise brought the Foreign Relations Committee out of its intellectual doldrums to serve once more as the classic American forum for probing—and, indeed, doubting—presidential certainties about foreign policy, whether they are Wilson's Fourteen Points or Johnson's.

This is a considerable accomplishment for Fulbright—and much in line with his desire to substitute "new realities" for "old myths" which he believes Americans learned too well during their Cold War childhood—but it has not been without its political hardships. Despite his penchant for privacy, he is not immune to the deliberate coldness with which he is being treated by the White House, where his intransigence is being met with a policy of containment and isolation. Also, there has been some speculation as to how well that cloud his constituents have him on would hold up back home, what with Faubus, his eye on 1968, trying to fan it down with outbursts against Fulbright's hampering the war effort.

But Arkansans, for some reason, seem to be equally proud of both Faubus and Fulbright these days, and nobody back home wants to see a confrontation that would lose Arkansas either one or the other. Fulbright can pretty much depend upon their many mutual backers doing everything over the next couple of years to keep them well apart, despite Faubus' obvious wish to close with him in mortal combat.

Beside, it's nearly impossible to bring Bill Fulbright to care much about that kind of danger anyhow. "Maybe you can say I've been here long enough not to give a goddam," he says, almost apologizing for his perseverence in the hearings. But the matter goes much deeper than that. Carl Marcy, staff director of the Foreign Relations Committee, can tell if he's off base in any suggestion he offers if Fulbright snaps back at him: "But you're giving me political advice!" The Senator doesn't want it. Often, when told something isn't good politics, he'll reply, "Wait two or three years. It will be."

"His is the approach of reason," a longtime associate concludes, "and if it doesn't appeal to his reason, it doesn't appeal to him at all."

But that does not mean that Fulbright's reason is a cold, purely cerebral kind of instrument. It is actually just the opposite: a bit old-fashioned, the kind of reason associated with Edmund Burke's great 18th Century political appeals for liberty within tradition and limited human circumstance. "I do have a habit of liking old things," Fulbright smiles. "Old cars, old shoes, old wives." He's had the same Mercedes for 10 years and won't paint it because then he'd have to worry about scratching the paint.

One pair of shoes from London he wore for 30 years, and "I means," says one Arkansan who greatly admired them, "they were all cracks." And Betty, the senator says, is part of that feeling of security he's always had, so that "It never bothered me that I might be defeated." Reason, he feels, is the force by which such little instances of human feeling are kept politically alive, wherever possible, in a dangerously graceless world. "He finds it increasingly difficult to understand these grandiose abstractions about society," one staff man observes.

"He'll often oppose some particular approach to a problem simply because 'Nobody says anything about people being involved.' "

He is very much people himself, right down to his foibles. Ever since his father's early death, his own mortality has worried him, and at 61 he follows a strict regimen that includes constitutionals before breakfast and bloodletting games of golf. ("Sinking that putt," says his wife, "is a passionate thing with him.") Lots of times he doesn't think anybody near and dear to him has a grain of sense, and he lectures them at length and accordingly. He can be as tight as a burr with money. "I'll tell you something," one Arkansas millionaire says, "if both his legs were cut off at the knee and you offered him yours for a nickel, he wouldn't have no use for 'em." And he has his petty moments—even during public hearings when his dislike of generals sometimes escapes his taut courtesy. Yet, with all these personal quirks, he retains a remarkable simplicity—"the kind of simplicity," as one staff man puts it, "that is beyond sophistication."

A story is told of Fulbright's trip to Naples in 1962 to participate in some ceremonies of acclaim for his student-exchange program, during a time when the U.S.S. *Forrestal* happened to be gaudily and mightily in port.

The aircraft carrier seemed to attract any number of junketing congressmen that spring—mostly those concerned with military appropriations—and Fulbright happened to run into a party of them in a Neapolitan square one day. They tried to drag him along to visit this vast tonnage of floating American glory, but he insisted his own business lay down a different street—at the binational center where American "Fulbrights" gather with Italian students to carry on the important business of simply hearing each other out, much the way he himself once did at Oxford. Finally, after he'd politely put off the congressmen and turned back in the direction of the cultural center, he shook his head and said to one of his staff, "Those fellas just don't know where the real power is."

To come out with a statement like that, Fulbright had to put a lot of what normally passes for sophistication far behind him. But he is more than willing to do so. Indeed, he anxiously searches for ways in which "the real power" can be brought to bear upon problems that so far have not been solved by such mighty exhibits as the U.S.S. *Forrestal*. He wants people to begin to "think the 'unthinkable,' " to search among what he terms realistic, if unsettling, alternatives—and not solely among soothing myths—"to find some rational way other than war to settle problems."

"I don't for a moment think that we'll get rid of all wars," he cautions. "We'll have to accept the fact that there are going to be local wars and then try to be very discriminating about them." Even that, however, will take more patience than he is at all sure—following De Tocqueville's ancient doubts about a democracy's handling of foreign policy—Americans can summon up.

"Fulbright has a pretty modest conception of what you can do," says another aide, "but he will take great satisfaction in a modest achievement." And he does indeed take great satisfaction in the modest achievements of the past few months, during which he feels committee witnesses have helped Americans become a lot more "discriminating" about "a local war" in Southeast Asia.

The question, then, naturally arises whether Fulbright should be satisfied with this modest achievement. Should he perhaps attempt to become more than a thoughtful critic: a forceful critic and, for once, go after support for his position instead of waiting, as he always has, for interested parties to come to him?

That would go against his whole nature. It is hard to imagine him at the head of anything so formal-sounding as a Loyal Opposition, even if its objectives were the embodiment of his own thinking. His impress, on the contrary, continues to depend upon his utter independence, which allows him to raise a voice that carries great influence, if little—or no—power in the deliberations of the Senate.

"It's sort of like the inventor and the manufacturer," an aide says. Fulbright helped invent the McCarthy censure, for instance, but he was only minimally involved in its eventual manufacture. "It's the machinery that runs the Senate," Fulbright insists, and he wants never to be a part of a machine. In fact, there is an inherent repulsion within him against the whole modern mechanization of human affairs, such as to lead him to protest against something as big as a moon shot or as minor as the replacement of the commodious old wicker cars in the Senate subway by a clanking train.

"A man has to act within the possibilities of his own personality," says a close aide, "and Fulbright is a private man. He could do more to solicit support. But he doesn't, partly because he thinks it's bad taste to bother people. If they like what he says, they'll say so." But this same aide admits that he himself is worried sometimes by the senator's political quietude and has pressed him on occasion about the possible disappointment he may give his loyal adherents everywhere in the world. Should he not possibly face up to the inevitable obligations of his clear private thinking: to leadership? "When you talk to him about that, he squirms," the aide says. But he notices one small sign of concession: "I don't really get the idea he wants me to stop talking."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pell in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

ACCREDITATION OF THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some weeks ago I was appointed by the Vice President as a member of this year's Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis. In addition to distinguished members of the Board from the House of Representatives and from academic and other groups, I had the honor to serve on this Board with three other Members of the Senate, namely: The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster]; the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible].

After the expenditure of some previous time in acquainting ourselves with the most recent facts about the Academy, the Board of Visitors met at the Academy on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, April 29 and 30 and May 1, 1966. I was not able to attend the Sunday meeting at which time the report of the Board of Visitors to the President was completed, but I did attend the Friday and Saturday sessions and found them to be exceedingly interesting and informative. Since the report of the Board of Visitors is addressed to the President of the United States and should only be released by him, I shall not endeavor to quote from the report or to deal in detail with any of the several items that are included therein and on which the Board of Visitors based their recommendations.

The report of the Board of Visitors, Mr. President, which I hold in my hand, is quite a voluminous document, and I would not read from it even if the President had released it, because it is so voluminous, but I wish to call attention to the fact that the duty of this year's Board of Visitors has been discharged.

In general, I think it is appropriate to say, however, that the Commission on Institutions of Higher Learning of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools entered its ruling renewing the accreditation of the Naval Academy on Friday, April 29, notwithstanding the fact that the Evaluation Committee which had reported to said accreditation body had voiced several criticisms of the Academy along, however, with many other favorable comments. The Commission report was much less critical, by a great deal, than the report of the Evaluation Committee as to conditions at the Academy. The Evaluation Committee was much more exhaustive and critical, but those of us who have sat in the Governor's office of any State or have been county or State officials or bank directors understand that reports such as those of State auditors, bank examiners, and the like may be expected to include all matters, whether large or small, which the examiner feels should be called to the attention of the higher authority. In such reports we expect to find a preponderance of chaff with a minimum of wheat. The renewal of the accreditation of the Academy was accompanied by several conditions which I do not regard, for the purpose of my statement today, as requiring any detailed discussion. Particularly is this so since the formal report of the Board now delivered to the President deals directly with these conditions as well as with other matters of vital concern to the Academy, the midshipmen, the faculty, the naval service, and the entire public of the United States. I believe it appropriate, however, to insert in the Record at this point the press release issued by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Learning of the Middle States Association of College and Secondary Schools which made its ruling renewing the accreditation of the Naval Academy on April 29, the first day of the meeting of the Board of Visitors at the Academy.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release covering the ruling of the Commission be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools informed the Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy today that it had re-affirmed the accreditation of the United States Naval Academy. In taking this action the Commission also required the Academy to file annual reports with respect to several important recommendations made by the Commission. These include, a strengthening of the role of the Board of Visitors by an increase in the number of educators appointed to the Board, and by the scheduling of more meetings. The appointment of an Academic Advisory Committee composed of civilian educators to serve the Superintendent and the staff over the whole range of academic questions and problems, and the formation of a Faculty Academic Council to represent effectively the entire faculty, both military and civilian.

The Commission commended the Academy for the significant progress made in recent years in upgrading the civilian faculty and recommended that the newer standards be applied as well to naval officers receiving faculty appointments. It further urged that Departmental Chairmanship should no longer be limited to naval officers of the rank of Captain and above, but that in appropriate departments civilian faculty should be permitted to assume this responsibility.

While recognizing the difficulty the Academy faces in fulfilling its responsibility to produce naval officers, the Commission strongly objects to the practice of grading system control and noted, with satisfaction, that it has been given assurances by the administration of the Academy that the practice will be discontinued.

The major concern of the Commission had to do with the inadequacy of the Academy Library. The Commission endorsed the recommendation contained in the Berthel Report on the Library, and urged that it be implemented at the earliest possible date. It further recommended that the Library be made an Academic Department with the Librarian as Departmental Head reporting directly to the Academic Dean, and that an executive Librarian be employed immediately and the planning and construction of a new Library building should be given urgent priority.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that when the President releases the report of the Board of Visitors it will be found that our recommendations suggest the taking of effective steps to deal with some, if not all, of the conditions mentioned in the renewed order of accreditation.

In particular, our Board strongly supports the recommendations of that Board as well as the recommendations of the Superintendent of the Naval Academy and his faculty for the early construction of a much more complete library than that now available. I mention this single matter solely because it was apparent to all concerned that the library deficiencies were not only the principal ones referred to by the Evaluation Committee, the Accreditation Board, and the Superintendent in his report, but they were also regarded by all who have studied the situation at the Academy as being the deficiencies which called out most loudly for early and great improvement.

More minor conditions and criticisms are dealt with in the report of the Board of Visitors in a manner which I think is adequate and will be brought to the attention of the public, generally, whenever the President releases the report of the Board of Visitors.

One of our distinguished colleagues in the Senate, the Senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], has addressed the Senate on several occasions this year on this general subject and has evidenced a very great interest and I think a very proper and commendable interest in the welfare of the Naval Academy. Since Senator Randolph had addressed a communication in the form of a memorandum to all four Senate members of the Board of Visitors under date of April 22, 1966, and since this general subject had been discussed in some detail by many newspapers, I thought that it was appropriate for me to address a brief letter to Senator Randolph on May 7, a few days after our service on the Board of Visitors was completed.

I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Record a copy of my letter of May 7 to Senator Randolph.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Board of Visitors,
Naval Academy (1966)
May 7, 1966.

Hon. Jennings Randolph,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Jennings: I appreciate very much your memorandum of April 22 to which you attach various extracts from the Congressional Record and also exchanges of correspondence and a sworn statement, all bearing upon the current situation at the Naval Academy.

I have, of course, great respect for your opinion in this matter, though I have not reached the same conclusion that you have apparently reached. I attended the meetings of the Board of Visitors last Friday and Saturday but could not be there for the Sunday wind up. Incidentally, this is the second time I have served on the Board of Visitors for the Academy and I have besides had two nephews, my only sister's two sons, graduate from the Naval Academy to later serve with distinction in the Navy where they still are serving. Of course, I did not appoint them since they went to the Academy long before I came to the Senate. Mary's nephew also went to the Academy from Arizona before I came to the Senate but was there during the early part of my service here and I was over there frequently during that time. I also keep in reasonably close touch with my appointees and I had a pleasant conference with my present five appointees during my visit last Friday. Incidentally, I have never lost an appointee by reason of any dissatisfaction on his part or poor performance and I do not recall ever having lost but one of my appointees who was a straight "A" student who was required to resign because of a developing eye glaucoma. He immediately went into the Naval Reserve where he served on active duty for several years receiving, as I recall, one or two promotions during his service.

That there are instances of maladjustment at the Academy there is no doubt. Neither is there any doubt that their recent temporary situation relative to marks given to midshipmen was unfortunate. It came as an incident in the period between a numerical marking period and an alphabetical marking period and it occurred with only a very few instructors, one of whom showed himself in other ways to be highly undesirable for continued employment.

I am still serving as a Trustee at Emory and at Florida Southern and have previously served for years as a Trustee of Florida Presbyterian. I regard such incidents as have occurred at the Academy as a part of what should be expected in any institution of higher learning where our modern young men are being trained in large numbers, and there are nearly 4,000 at Annapolis.

Admitting that the picture is not perfect, I think that the Naval Academy is a very splendid institution which is rendering fine service to our nation and in the main to a vast majority of the young men who emerge from it as graduates. I think it is doing a superb job in training professional officers for the world's finest Navy.

You probably know that my own service was in the Army, though my active duty at the front was in that branch of the Army which was then in the aviation field which would now be in the Air Force. I have, however, been a member of the Board of Visitors for all three academies.

I strongly feel that the Naval Academy deserves our vigorous backing and I wanted to so express myself to you as a good friend in whom I have very great confidence.

With cordial regards, I remain,
Yours faithfully,
Spessard,
Spessard L. Holland.

cc: Senator J. Caleb Boggs, Senator Alan Bible, Senator Daniel B. Brewster.

Mr. HOLLAND. Copies of my letter to Senator Randolph were sent to Senators Boggs, Bible, and Brewster.

Under date of May 11 I received a thoughtful reply to my letter of May 7 from Senator Randolph of which I note he sent copies to Senators Bible, Brewster, Boggs, and Robert C. Byrd, who has been appointed as a special investigating committee of one for the Senate Committee on the Armed Services. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter of May 11 from Senator Randolph be incorporated in my statement at this point and made a part thereof.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Public Works,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. Spessard L. Holland,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Spessard: Thanks for your letter of May 7, 1966 in response to my memorandum of April 22, with enclosures, concerning the United States Naval Academy. It is pleasing to read of your totally satisfactory experiences with that institution over the years. It is understandable, therefore, that you have not "reached the same conclusion" that I expressed in Senate comments of April 7 and 21, reprints of which were supplied to you, together with copies of communications authored by my 1964 and 1965 appointees.

If there is any question concerning my support of the validity of the service academies, I believe the answer is found in my willingness to support a 5-year program for the teaching and instruction of midshipmen and cadets to be officers in the regular establishment of the services. This certainly is not a destructive attitude.

But I continue to be opposed to the plebe indoctrination practices which too frequently reach hazing proportions during the academic year and mitigate against the building of sound foundations in basic scholastic subjects. I have conversed with numerous midshipmen and cadets, as well as with alumni of the service academies, who share my concern and do *not* hold with those who seem to feel that every dropout is due to "maladjustment".

Recently I was visited by midshipmen of the first (senior) class who indicated that there is sentiment within the Brigade of Midshipmen and possibly within the administrative structure of the Naval Academy for a shifting of emphasis on plebe indoctrination to the plebe summer period—to a "hard plebe summer," as one midshipman stated. This is a change with which I would be in agreement. And I would recognize the need to maintain minimum elements of so-called plebe indoctrination throughout the fourth class year, provided there would be assurances of closer monitoring to guard against indoctrination turning into harassment or hazing. (Note also the attached facsimile of a letter from a friend who resides in Colorado near the Air Force Academy.)

Recognizing that a Marine "boot camp" type plebe summer for new midshipmen would doubtless induce a substantial rate of dropping out, I would support increased midshipman intake authorization so that the desired plebe population level would be assured at the outset of the academic year.

Members of my staff—one of whom is a service academy graduate who fulfilled his post-graduation active duty obligation—have joined me in a lengthy consideration of these problems. I feel that I have had competent evaluation services and the benefit of much close-in observation and experience to guide and assist in the formulation of conclusions and recommendations.

I, too, believe that "the Naval Academy is a very splendid institution," and I share your belief that its output of officers is "for the world's finest Navy." I would even share your view that the Naval Academy "is doing a superb job in training professional officers for the world's finest Navy" were it not for the fact that I received a letter from a young man whom I nominated, who attended under my quota, and who is scheduled for graduation next month. This young man, without having expressed a single word of gratitude for the opportunities afforded him, closed his letter to me his sponsoring Member of the Senate, as follows:

". . . . *We are a special breed,* and make great sacrifices in an attempt to do our job well. One cannot deny that our job is important, *all we ask is that we be allowed to do it in the way we see fit.*" (Italic supplied.)

Such an arrogant manifestation does not comport with my opinion of that which would result from a "superb job of training". Perhaps it is a result of over-training—or cultism.

Notwithstanding my experiences—which have differed considerably from yours—I agree with your admonition that "the Naval Academy deserves our vigorous backing". It will have mine if the Board of Visitors will help its administration achieve a status which will enable the Naval Academy Superintendent to quote in his annual report a statement of full approval without reservation by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Learning of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

This is the same regional organization which, in 1949, became the designated accrediting agency for the region in which are situated both the United States Naval Academy and the United States Military Academy. The Military Academy was examined and accredited in 1949, and reexamined and accredited in 1959, and in confirming the latter accreditation, the Association's Commission on Institutions of Higher Learning stated:

"The Commission appreciates the opportunity it and others have had to examine the purposes and affairs of an outstanding institution and takes this means to commend the United States Military Academy for setting and revealing, in this additional way, standards and procedures for distinguished work, thereby performing a service to the whole community of higher education. Even in an Association devoted to the pursuit and interpretation of educational excellence, there is only so much room at the top; this space is reserved for a few, including in the Commission's judgment, the United States Military Academy."

As is well known, an evaluation team of the same Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools visited the Naval Academy earlier this year, and I was gratified to read in press accounts that the examining team reported in its statement as follows:

"The strongest and firmest impression we have is one of rapid academic growth and a well-conceived effort to strengthen the academy's academic programs . . ."

But, in another press reporting of the Middle States Association actions it was pointed out that, unlike the prior action in approving the Military Academy with high praise, "The Naval Academy had its accreditation reaffirmed * * * with some strings attached"—including the filing of annual reports on how it (the Naval Academy) is carrying out the recommendations of the Association's evaluation team which visited Annapolis in March.

It was distressing to read these further press reports on the accreditation team's evaluation of the Naval Academy:

"No good college that we know permits administrators alone and directly to prescribe the distribution of grades * * *. There are much data to the effect that Academy students are not achieving academically at the level of students of comparable ability in most civilian colleges and universities. Testimony of both students and civilian faculty members is clear in this regard * * *. Ample evidence exists that students do not approach in amounts of outside study the 2 hours of individual work for each hour of class which is described as Academy polity. It is especially evident that fourth classmen and first classmen are particularly neglectful of their academic work * * *. It may be that the midshipmen feel the demands from the three competing points of emphasis for their time (academics, military, and athletics) are too much * * *."

So, in our "vigorous backing" of the Naval Academy we have an obligation to insist that it devote stronger and more forthright efforts to the achievement of corrections in pursuit of excellence—and we have an equal obligation to help in the accomplishment of these achievements.

A special responsibility, of course, reposes in the Members of the Congress appointed to serve as members of the Board of Visitors of the service academies. In this connection, I invite attention to an editorial in the Thursday, May 5, 1966, issue of The Washington Post, a facsimile of which is attached.

With esteem and cordial best wishes, I am

Truly,

Jennings,
Jennings Randolph.

cc. Senator Alan Bible, Senator Daniel B. Brewster, Senator J. Caleb Boggs, Senator Robert C. Byrd.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no point in my entering at this time into any controversy with Senator Randolph or any other Senator with reference to the situation at the Naval Academy relative to the many fine and outstanding values existing there or to the relatively few items in controversy, some of which are appropriate subjects for criticism. I simply want the Senate to know that the report of the Board of Visitors has been completed and is in the hands of the President of the United States by whom I have no doubt it will be released within a short period. I hope that the efforts and findings of the Board of Visitors will appeal to the Senate and the general public as being factual, sensible and reasonably calculated to advance the interests of the Naval Academy.

In closing I wish to incorporate in my statement the names of the members of the Board of Visitors, aside from Senate Members, already mentioned, who are as follows: From the House of Representatives: Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Carleton J. King, New York; William F. Minshall, Ohio; and Robert T. Stafford, Vermont. From the academic world: Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, president, University of Maryland; Dr. Edwin D. Harrison, president, Georgia Institute of Technology; and Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., president, Howard University. From other distinguished groups: Mr. Edwin D. Etherington, president of the American Stock Exchange, New York; Mr. David J. McDonald, Palm Springs, Calif.; and Mr. Guy Stillman, consulting engineer, Phoenix, Ariz.

Incidentally, the Chairman of the Board is Mr. Stillman, who is a distinguished graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, New York, and who has spent a vast amount of time and energy in keeping up with developments at the Naval Academy and in preparing for the meeting of the Board of Visitors. He is entitled to the sincere thanks of the whole Nation for his devoted service in this work.

Without attempting to deal with this matter in any greater detail at this time, I simply want to express my strong feeling that the Naval Academy deserves our vigorous backing and that I feel it is rendering fine service to our Nation and, in the main, to a vast majority of the young men who emerge from it as graduates. It is doing a superb job in its primary task of training professional officers for the world's finest Navy and in seeing that its graduates also secure an excellent education in the arts and sciences.

This is no time or occasion for controversy with any Members of the Senate or others. The Naval Academy is a subject too near and dear to the hearts of Americans to become a subject of controversy on the floor of the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have had the privilege of reading the very constructive address of the Senator from Florida. I have also listened during the delivery of the Senator's significant speech. He has my appreciation, understanding, and commendation.

Mr. President, I agree that we must be careful not to allow a controversy to develop which would weaken the basic structure of the U.S. Naval Academy. Its purpose is a very important one.

The midshipmen who come from that institution, and who are commissioned by consent of the Senate, place upon us a very real responsibility. Members of Congress nominate most of these young men. We have a direct interest in them, not only in their appointment and progress during the years they are at Annapolis, but also in the final recognition of their merit when commissioned.

So I am very grateful for the privilege of saying to the Senator from Florida that although we may differ in degree on certain of the academic and other phases of life at the Academy, we are as one in our desire and determination to keep the U.S. Naval Academy strong, insofar as we can, without undue interference.

There are dedicated young men there preparing to better serve their country.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. His comments are so appropriate. I have already commended him in my earlier statements for the constructive way in which he approached this subject.

I realize there are some points that I regard as small, minor differences between the distinguished Senator and myself, particularly with reference to some of the academic features of the Academy.

I think that all of us must remember that, different from colleges and universities, the Academy, as do the other two Academies, primarily has the duty of turning out military officers—in this case for our great Navy—and another duty of turning out men of high character and reasonably high education who have met the standards of education which are acceptable generally to colleges throughout our Nation.

I say again, I appreciate the comments and the efforts of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as an ex-officio member of the Board of Visitors of the Naval Academy, representing the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Commission, I have been disturbed by recent criticisms of the Academy's standards and procedures, which have received some local publicity. As a Senator from Maryland and a Board member for several terms, I was particularly concerned to learn the truth about the charges made.

I am pleased to report that the Academy has received a reaffirmation of its accreditation by the Middle Atlantic States Association. This accreditation was accompanied by a report which reflects very favorably on the Academy and of the success it has experienced in implementing the expansion and liberalization of course offerings recommended by the 1959 Board of Visitors, of which I was also a member.

I came away from the Board meetings with a renewed appreciation for the tremendous improvements which have been made over the past few years in academic achievement, training, morale, and motivation at the Academy. The civilian faculty is of the highest caliber. The number of civilians and naval instructors with advanced degrees continues to rise. In the latter category, it has increased from 15 to 55 percent over the past 3 years. This faculty growth has corresponded with a growth in offered elective courses in the arts, sciences, languages, and engineering from 40 to 200 courses over the past few years. There has been a similar improvement in the academic aptitude of entering midshipmen as well as in the academic records of most. I believe that there is considerably less "coasting" by midshipmen at the Naval Academy than by their contemporaries in many civilian colleges.

With all of this has come a better balancing of the academic, military, and athletic elements of the Academy program. As a consequence of these facts, student-faculty morale is extremely high. We can look with satisfaction on the dramatic 30-percent reduction in voluntary resignations by midshipmen this year.

It would not be realistic to expect that this kind of academic revolution could be accomplished in a short time without some difficulty. I am convinced that those problems which have arisen have resulted from the courageous redirection of the Academy's program. I believe the difficulties are temporary and are receiving the concentrated attention of the administration, as evidenced by the plans for the establishment of an academic council and by the Superintendent's decision to remove all grade ceilings next semester—a decision reached prior to current criticism.

The Academic Council will function as the voice and conscience of the civilian-military faculty.

Beyond this, I believe that the most important steps which can be taken by the Academy at this time are those involving: First, improved student counseling; second, the establishment of an academic advisory committee to serve the Superintendent; and third, the enlargement and more frequent meeting of the Board of Visitors. These three recommendations are contained in the Middle Atlantic States evaluation report.

It must be understood that the purpose of the Academy is to prepare career officers for the U.S. Navy. It should never be our purpose to transform the Academy into another liberal arts college. The present high degree of technical competence and readiness of the Naval Establishment attests to the success of the Academy in providing our officer corps.

Each year I have the privilege of appointing several fine young Marylanders as midshipmen at the Naval Academy. I will continue to do so with complete confidence in the ability of this great institution to provide the breadth of instruction necessary for these young men to take their places in American affairs as naval officers, strategists, diplomats, and leaders at home and abroad.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN BILLS, RECEIVE MESSAGES, AND FILE REPORTS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate until noon on Thursday next, the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills; the Secretary of the Senate to receive messages from the President and the House of Representatives; and committees to file reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN GIFTS AND DECORATIONS ACT

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1123, Senate bill 2463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Senate bill 2463, to grant the consent of Congress to the acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "of", to strike out "1965" and insert "1966"; in line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "executive branch of the"; on page 3, line 6, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "head of the executive office or executive"; in line 7, after the word "department", to strike out "or"; in the same line, after the word "agency", to insert "office, or other entity"; in line 16, after the word "appropriate", to strike out "head of office,"; in the same line, after the word "department", to strike out "or"; in the same line, after the word "agency", to insert "office, or other entity,"; and on page 4, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 8. (1) Section 2 of the Act of January 31, 1881 (21 Stat. 604; 5 U.S.C. 114), is amended by striking out the word "No" at the beginning of the section and substituting the words "Except as otherwise provided in the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act of 1965, no".

(2) Section 3 of the Act of January 31. 1881 (21 Stat. 604; 5 U.S.C. 115), is amended by striking out the word "Any" at the beginning of the section and substituting the words "Except as otherwise provided in the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act of 1965, any".

(3) Section 1002 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1030, as amended; 22 U.S.C. 804), is further amended by deleting the first sentence and by striking out the word "however" in the second sentence.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 8. (1) Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of January 31, 1881 (21 Stat. 604; 5 U.S.C. 114, 115), are repealed.

(2) Section 2 of the Act of June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 115a), is repealed.

(3) Section 1002 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 1030; 22 U.S.C. 804), is further amended by deleting the first sentence and by striking out "however," in the second sentence.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 2463

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. In this Act—

(1) The term "person" includes every person who occupies an office or a position in the Government of the United States, its territories and possessions, the Canal Zone government, and the government of the District of Columbia, or is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or a member of the family and household of any such person.

(2) The term "foreign government" includes every foreign government and every official, agent, or representative thereof.

(3) The term "gift" includes any present or thing, other than a decoration, tended by or received from a foreign government.

(4) The term "decoration" includes any order, device, medal, badge, insignia, or emblem tendered by or received from a foreign government.

SEC. 3. No person shall request or otherwise encourage the tender of a gift or decoration.

SEC. 4. Congress hereby gives its consent to a person to accept and retain a gift of minimal value tendered or received as a souvenir or mark of courtesy. A gift of more than minimal value may also be accepted by a person when it appears that to refuse the gift would be likely to cause offense or embarrassment or otherwise adversely affect the foreign relations of the United States; however, gifts of more than minimal value shall be deemed to have been accepted on behalf of the United States and shall be deposited by the donee for use and disposal as the property of the United States in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 5. Congress hereby gives its consent to a person to accept, retain, and wear a decoration which has been tendered in recognition of active field service in time of combat operations or which has been awarded for other outstanding or unusually meritorious performance, subject to the approval of the department, agency, office, or other entity in which such person is employed and the concurrence of the Secretary of State. In the absence of such approval and concurrence, the decoration shall be deposited by the donee for use and disposal as the property of the United States in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 6. Any gift or decoration on deposit with the Department of State on the date of enactment of this Act shall, when approved by the Secretary of State and the appropriate department, agency, office, or other entity, be released to the donee or his legal representative. Such donee may, if authorized, be entitled to wear any decoration so approved. A gift or decoration not approved for release, because of any special or unusual circumstances involved, shall be deemed a gift to the United States and shall be deposited by the donee in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 7. Rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act may be prescribed by or under the authority of the President.

SEC. 8. (1) Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of January 31, 1881 (21 Stat. 604; 5 U.S.C. 114, 115), are repealed.

(2) Section 2 of the Act of June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 115a), is repealed.

(3) Section 1002 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 1030; 22 U.S.C. 804), is further amended by deleting the first sentence and by striking out "however," in the second sentence.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, what this bill does is to attempt to relieve the Congress of the petty problem of having to approve each acceptance of a gift or decoration from a foreign government to a person in U.S. Government service. This has been necessary because of article I, section 9, clause 8 of the Constitution which provides:

> No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office or Title whatever, from any King, Prince or foreign State.

As a result of this provision Congress has had before it practically every session bills authorizing an individual or group of individuals to accept these items.

S. 2463 will make it possible for persons to accept gifts and decorations without further special authorization, under certain conditions. These are that a gift may be accepted only when refusal to do so would result in offense and embarrassment or adversely affect U.S. foreign relations. The gift, moreover, if of more than a minimal value, will be deemed to have been accepted on behalf of the United States and becomes the property of the United States and not of the donee. Minimal value, while not specifically defined in the bill, is, according to the State Department's letter transmitting the draft legislation and its testimony to be established by regulation as not exceeding $50. The reason given for not spelling this ceiling out in law was that some executive branch agencies will wish to set a lower value than $50 and may do so under the bill.

Decorations may be accepted when offered in recognition of active field service in time of combat operations or when awarded for other outstanding or unusually meritorious performance, subject to two approvals—that of the department, agency, office or other entity in which the person is employed and that of the Secretary of State. In the absence of such approval, a decoration also becomes the property of the U.S. Government.

Section 6 of S. 2463 authorizes the Department of State to release, under the same safeguards just summarized, gifts and decorations now on deposit with it. It has some 709 gifts and 4,271 decorations stored at the present time, the handling and maintenance of which is estimated to cost $9,000 a year. As a matter of fact, the vast majority of these items are described as "tiny" and in the nature of souvenirs. The bulk of this material furthermore has been tendered to members of the Armed Forces. The last omnibus bill listing individuals by name devoted over 65 pages to the military and only 6 pages to civilians.

The Committee on Foreign Relations recommends this bill to the Senate with the committee amendments. It believes that this is an equitable way of solving a minor but nagging problem. Under the bill, every recipient will be treated absolutely alike and there will be no further occasions for special pleadings for this person and that group. For the first time, a uniform policy, applicable to all will have been established.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will approve this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR GRIFFIN OF MICHIGAN AS A DELEGATE TO ATTEND THE NINTH CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP MEETING

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to Public Law 42 of the 86th Congress, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, announces the appointment of Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Michigan, to attend the Ninth Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group Meeting on May 18 through 22, 1966, at Washington, D.C., and Oak Ridge, Tenn., in lieu of Senator LEN B. JORDAN of Idaho, resigned.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 17, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God is love: and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.—I John 4: 16.

O God, who art the Father of all, we thank Thee for every expression of Thy love to us, and for the experience of love we enjoy in the home, in our circle of friends, and here in the Halls of Congress. Strengthen Thou the ties that bind us together. Give us courtesy and consideration in our attitude toward one another. May we not allow our disagreements to make us disagreeable, or our differences to make a difference in our relationships, but now and always may the spirit of good will abide in our hearts. Keep us ever mindful of Thy presence, eager to do Thy will and loyal to the royal within ourselves as did Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 11, 1966:

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile.

On May 13, 1966:

H.R. 14012. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11487. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 14215, the appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and related agencies.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 9, I was granted an official leave of absence from the sessions of the House for the period of May 9 through May 16, for the purpose of traveling to Vietnam as a member of the Government Information and Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

With our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California, the Honorable JOHN MOSS, we spent the week in a factfinding mission and held hearings on the overall situation of our assistance to the South Vietnamese people.

During this period I missed several rollcalls on which I would like to state my position on the legislation then under discussion.

On rollcall No. 91, on the amendment to restore the $20 million for the rent supplement program, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 92, on the passage of the independent offices appropriation bill, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 94, on the passage of the Military Medical Benefits Act, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, I would, had I been present, voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 97, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 98, on the passage of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 100, on the adoption of the rule to consider H.R. 14544, to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, I would have voted "aye."

It is needless to say, that if I had been in Washington during the time I was officially excused, I would have answered the quorum calls which are recorded in rollcalls Nos. 88, 89, 90, 93, 95, 96, 99, and 101.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE UNDER THE HIGH SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the horse-and-buggy pace the Department of Commerce has followed in regard to the appointment of an advisory committee, as provided for under the High Speed Ground Transportation Research and Development Act, has led to what I believe to be a flagrant demonstration of disregard and even disrespect for the Congress.

As the result of testimony of Secretary John T. Conner before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, of which I am a member, the Department's commitment to the Pennsylvania Railroad for the demonstration project between Washington and New York City would be limited to the purchase of equipment and to the cost of certain statistical studies, and that the commitment of the railroad would be to all other costs—including that pertaining to track.

It is my understanding that currently the Department is negotiating a contract with the Pennsylvania for $1,764,000 for improvement and maintenance of test track in addition to the contract which they have already entered with the railroad for $9,600,000 for the operation of the demonstration project.

Although last week I did receive a copy of those persons who have been invited to be on the committee, as far as I know, there has been at this time no actual appointment of the Advisory Committee—a delay of more than 8 months since the bill's passage.

It appears to me at this time that most of the contract funds and actual plans for the demonstration program have either been committed or agreed upon—and without the advice of the Advisory Committee, which was clearly the intent of our subcommittee and that of Congress.

The Department's actions, which seem to be pointed variance with the intention of that expressed by the subcommittee, I think would raise some questions about the Department's intentions at a time when a separate Department of Transportation has been recommended.

I am before you, today, so that you may be informed of this matter, and to alert you that I have asked for an investigation into the situation.

CLEAN WATERS ACT OF 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Clean Waters Act of 1966 which is designed to halt the poisonous spread of pollution in America's principal waterways including the Great Lakes system.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that lower levels of government are unable to cope with this nationwide problem and the Federal Government must demonstrate its responsibility by taking immediate steps to help them curb municipal and industrial pollution.

My proposal would provide 90 percent Federal financing instead of the 30 to 40 percent now available and allocate $3 billion in funds to build sewage treatment plants as the first step toward halting the calamity now overwhelming our precious natural resource—our rivers and other waterway systems.

This bill would assist local communities in establishing a comprehensive pollution control program with the assistance of Federal experts. Approximately 92 percent Federal funds would be made available to the communities who could not otherwise join in the antipollution battle.

House colleagues, particularly those who come from areas bordering the Great Lakes, are urged to join me in this proposal.

IN TRYING TO SAVE THE OLD OPERA HOUSE NEW YORK MAY LOSE THE OPERA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a citizens' group has been formed in New York to save the old Metropolitan Opera House. By saving the building, however, they may destroy opera in New York, thus throwing the baby out with the bath.

The old building, according to the Landmarks Commission, is not worth saving.

The Metropolitan Opera has no endowment. With the sale of the property of the old house, the Metropolitan will be assured about a half million dollars each year for 50 years. This would go far to make up any deficit which may exist for Metropolitan when it performs opera at the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts.

This citizens' group induced the Legislature of the State of New York to pass a bill to prevent the sale of the old building. I hope that the Governor will veto that bill.

As a devotee of the opera and a subscriber for more than 40 years, I have helped, with others, to pay the deficit which has always existed in the opera house. The Met cannot function at Lincoln Square without this $500,000 I have just mentioned.

The old house cannot be renovated except at a cost of $10 million. At best it could not profitably be used. It probably would become an old movie house.

The Metropolitan, at the old house, had great difficulty in renting it in offseasons; that is, between the various opera seasons.

Many of the members of this citizens' group never evinced the slightest interest in opera before. Why this sudden urge? Is it publicity?

I would say that some of the members of this citizens' group would think Puccini was the name of a spaghetti and that Richard Wagner was a former baseball player.

RECOGNIZING WATERLOO, N.Y. AS BIRTHPLACE OF MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 587, officially recognizing Waterloo, N.Y., as the birthplace of Memorial Day, and authorizing the President to issue an appropriate proclamation relating to the centennial anniversary of the first celebration of Memorial Day, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 587

Whereas the United States will this year celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the first observance of Memorial Day as a national holiday to pay tribute to those who gave their lives in all our Nation's wars; and

Whereas the people of the village of Waterloo, New York, did proclaim and observe May 5, 1866, as a special day for decorating the graves of those who had lost their lives in the Civil War and in honoring these dead; and

Whereas the village of Waterloo has each year since then observed an annual holiday for this same purpose; and

Whereas the historical records clearly show that this observance in Waterloo, New York, on May 5, 1866, represented the first formal continuous, annual, public observance of Memorial Day as a special annual holiday; and

Whereas Memorial Day has since become a national holiday, observed from one end of the land to the other on May 30 each year for the purpose of paying tribute to the honored dead of all the wars and engagements in which our Armed Forces have been involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States, in grateful recognition of the noble patriotic tradition set in motion one hundred years ago in the village of Waterloo, New York, does hereby officially recognize Waterloo, New York, as the birthplace of Memorial Day, and authorizes and requests the President to issue, prior to May 30, 1966, an appropriate proclamation calling the attention of all citizens to the centennial anniversary of the first observance of Memorial Day in Waterloo, New York.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Rogers of Colorado: On page 2, line 3, strike the word "grateful"; and strike the word "noble".

Strike all "Whereas" clauses.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF MEMORIAL DAY, AT WATERLOO, N.Y., MAY 5, 1866

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that House Concurrent Resolution 587, which I had the honor of introducing on February 10, this year, to give appropriate and proper recognition to the 100th anniversary being celebrated this year of the great national holiday of Memorial Day, has passed. I want to express my appreciation, Mr. Speaker, to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers], for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today, so that this legislation might be enacted in time for the annual Memorial Day observance next weekend and also to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

This resolution pays well deserved recognition to the village of Waterloo, N.Y., located in Seneca County in my congressional district, as the official birthplace of Memorial Day, and it authorizes the President to issue an appropriate proclamation to that effect.

Memorial Day is one of our most important and respected national holidays. Though it started after the Civil War as an occasion for decorating the graves and pausing to remember the sacrifices of those who lost their lives specifically in that war, both in the South and in the North, Memorial Day has since come to be recognized as an occasion for us to pay tribute to all Americans who have paid the supreme sacrifice for their country in all the wars and engagements in which we have participated, including our present operation in Vietnam.

The observance of Memorial Day as a public, annual holiday, set aside for this solemn purpose, was begun 100 years ago this year in Waterloo, N.Y., on May 5, 1866. Local citizens in other communities paused to decorate graves of servicemen killed in the Civil War in one or two instances a week or so before the people of Waterloo did. But the records in the Library of Congress clearly indicate that the ceremony which took place in Waterloo on May 5, 1866, was the first time any community had set aside a day, to be observed henceforth on an annual basis, not only for decorating graves and paying tribute to the honored dead, but also as a general, public holiday, specifically set aside and designated for that purpose.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that Waterloo's original Memorial Day observance occurred 2 years before Gen. John A. Logan, first commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued his famous General Order No. 11 establishing Memorial Day, or "Decoration Day" as it was then known, on an official, continuing basis as far as the GAR was concerned. And it should also be noted that the date of General Logan's famous order was 2 years to the exact day, May 5, from the original Waterloo observance of Memorial Day. Subsequently, by general agreement the Nation moved its observance of the Holiday to May 30 instead of May 5.

It is also interesting to note that New York State was the first State to declare Memorial Day, May 30, as a legal holiday, in 1873. And early this year the New York State Legislature enacted legislation designating Waterloo as the official birthplace of Memorial Day and Governor Rockefeller signed an appropriate proclamation to that effect on March 7, 1966.

An account of the original Memorial Day observance in the beautiful Finger Lakes area of upstate New York is to be found in the following memorandum prepared by the Waterloo Memorial Day Centennial Committee:

> The fact that Waterloo held a Memorial Day observance on May 5, 1866, is well established. Briefly, the story starts in 1865, when Henry C. Welles, a local druggist, mentioned at a social gathering that while praising the living heroes of the war, it would be well to also remember the patriotic dead by decorating their graves. In the spring of 1866, he again mentioned this subject to General John B. Murray, then Seneca County Clerk. Murray, a man of action, quickly advanced the thought and developed it. Plans were formulated by a committee and it was decided to close all businesses and devote a day to honoring the dead.
>
> Townspeople adopted the idea wholeheartedly. Ladies of the village met at a local hall and prepared wreaths, crosses and bouquets for each veteran's grave. The village was decorated with flags at half mast, draped with evergreen boughs and mourning black streamers.
>
> Civic societies joined the procession to the three then existing cemeteries, led by veterans marching to the strains of martial music. Impressive and lengthy services were held at each cemetery, including speeches by General Murray and a local clergyman. No festivities broke the solemnity of the day. On the same day the following year (May 5, 1867), these ceremonies were repeated. In 1868, Waterloo joined with other communities in holding their observance on May 30th. It has been held annually on that day since.
>
> The formal, dignified manner in which Waterloo observed their first Memorial Days initiated the pattern for future Memorial Day observances all over the nation.

Mr. Speaker, appropriate recognition of the importance of this original observance is also to be found in a number of articles from the historical record. For example, the Denver Colorado Catholic states the following:

> The first public demonstration in decorating the graves of federal soldiers at the North, took place at Waterloo, New York, the place where Rev. L. A. Lambert, the efficient Chaplain of the 18th Ill. Volunteers, delivered the excellent memorial address, printed on the first page of this paper. The National holiday known as Decoration Day, had its beginning from this demonstration. We remember the occasion well. Although it was as early as the 30th (sic) of May, the heat was oppressive and many persons were prostrated by it. The year was 1866. The ladies prepared wreaths of flowers for the graves of each and every fallen brave who was buried in the town. The flags of the village were at half mast, and business was entirely suspended. All of the societies of the place accompanied by all the other inhabitants and numerous visitors from the surrounding country, preceded by a band of music, marched to the three ceremonies where impressive memorial ceremonies were performed.

And the official journal of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, the Banner for May 1933, contains the following item:

> The morning of May 5, 1866, dawned clear and beautiful in the little town of Waterloo, New York. It was a morning that was to see the beginning of a beautiful, sacred and solemn custom, a practice that was eventually to become accepted and universally practiced by the American people. On that pleasant morning General John B. Murray, then a resident of Waterloo, conceived the idea of calling together a platoon of ex-soldiers who had worn the Blue of the Northland during the War of the Rebellion, for the purpose of showing by their action, their intense loyalty, their love and devotion toward those of their comrades who had answered the last roll call.
>
> Visualize to yourself what a scene this must have been. Flags floating proudly on the balmy spring breeze, flowers piled in great profusion; flowers that had been gathered by the school children previous to this occasion; members of that large body of soldiers who compressed the Union Army during the War that only a year previous, they had brought to a successful conclusion.
>
> Standing at attention these soldiers received perhaps from the hands of the school children, these first blossoms of spring. Those men were in the prime of their life, and with heads erect, shoulders thrown back, at the command of General Murray, marched to the strains of martial music to the local cemetery and proceeded to decorate the graves of their departed comrades.
>
> That morning, beautiful with the first blossoms of spring; the birds gaily singing; the air sweet with the perfume of flowers; the trees resplendent in their green foliage; all nature seemed to be fitted for this sacred duty. Even the Ruler of the Universe seemed in accord with these Men in Blue; this God of Love and Mercy who had carried them safely through the strife and turmoil of war, seemed to smile benignly down upon these men in Blue, who with reverential respect, with heads bowed with love and devotion, made this first public showing of their love and devotion for their departed comrades.

Plans are already underway, Mr. Speaker, for a 3-day observance in Waterloo this year of the 100th anniversary of that historic celebration, and the featured speaker at the ceremonies on May 30, at 2 p.m., will be the Honorable William J. Driver, Administrator of the U.S. Veterans' Administration.

In that connection the following account of scheduled activities from the Geneva Times of May 2, 1966, will be of interest to the House:

> MAY 28, 29, 30, CENTENNIAL PARADE WILL HIGHLIGHT MEMORIAL DAY RITES IN WATERLOO
>
> WATERLOO.—A liaison meeting at the VFW home last Saturday disclosed many of the plans made by the Memorial Day Centennial Committee, to insure the success of the three-day celebration to begin on May 28.
>
> On Saturday at 8:15 p. m., an original play entitled "Our Great Heritage" will be presented by the Waterloo Faculty Association in the high school gymnasium.
>
> On Sunday morning, all churches in the village will hold special services. The Rt. Rev. Edward R. Welles, D.D., S.T.D., Bishop of the Diocese of West Missouri, will be the guest of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, where he will celebrate the service of Holy Communion and preach at the 11 a.m. service. It was Bishop Welles' ancestral cousin, Mr. Henry C. Welles, who first conceived the idea of Memorial Day as a formal, village-wide, observance to honor the war dead.
>
> There will be a concert of Civil War melodies in LaFayette Park by the Waterloo High School Band. This has tentatively been set for 3 p.m. on Sunday.
>
> On Monday, which will be Memorial Day, the Warner Van-Riper American Legion Post and the Veterans' of Foreign Wars, will march to the cemeteries, to pay their regular visit. They have invited all those who usually participate, such as Girl Scouts, and Boy Scouts, etc. to join them.
>
> The Centennial parade, which will be the highlight of the day observance, will be on Monday afternoon, with participants from the entire Western New York area. The parade will march to the high school grounds for the official centennial observance and an address by the head of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, William J. Driver.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It has been arranged with the school cafeteria for light lunches to be served for the units that make reservations. On Monday, there will also be light lunches for children at 4:30 p.m., in the school cafeteria. At that time there will be a reception for adults in the VFW.
>
> * * * * *
>
> All known ancestors of the Murray and Welles family have been sent personal invitations to attend the observance. Mrs. Edwin Hallady, neighborhood chairman for the Girl Scouts, has received word that a group of Scouts from Canada are interested in attending.
>
> * * * * *

I would also like to commend the many citizens of Waterloo who over the past year have devoted so many hours of their spare time to studying the historical background of this event and making plans for a meaningful ceremony that will appropriately mark the anniversary of Memorial Day.

The community spirit that has gone into making this ceremony a success is the same kind of spirit that we honor in those who answered their country's call in time of peril.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate will also act expeditiously on this resolution, so that the official proclamation by President Johnson may be signed in good time for these anniversary ceremonies.

DISASTER RELIEF—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 439)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit herewith a report of activity under authority of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, and required by section 8 of such law.

Funds which have been appropriated to accomplish the Federal assistance determined eligible under this authority are specifically appropriated to the President for purposes of disaster relief.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 17, 1966.*

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ABDUL WOHABE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10220) for the relief of Abdul Wohabe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10220

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Abdul Wohabe shall be held and considered to have complied with the provisions of section 316 of that Act as they relate to residence and physical presence.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, after the words "provisions of" strike out "section 316" and insert in lieu thereof "section 319".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABRAHAM EZEKIEL COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2696) for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2696

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Abraham Ezekiel Cohen has resided and was physically present in the United States or any State since June 17, 1957, shall be held and considered as compliance with the residence and physical presence requirement of section 316 of said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WON LOY JUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1822) for the relief of Won Loy Jung.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARDO TUSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4083) for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4083

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a)(19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Leonardo Tusa may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR O. McNABB

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1256) for the relief of Victor O. McNabb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

KATHERINE NABOKOFF AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10846) for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff, and others.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HUBERT J. KUPPER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11251) for the relief of Hubert J. Kupper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HAIDER RAZA AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9643) for the relief of Haider Raza and his wife, Irene Raza, and their children, Afzal Anthony and Haider Raymond Raza.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9643

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Haider Raza and his wife, Irene Raza, and their children, Afzal Anthony and Haider Raymond Raza, shall be held and considered to have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 18, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out the date "July 18, 1960." and substitute in lieu therof the date "May 1, 1961."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JADWIGA (ITA) LAPIDES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1275) for the relief of Mrs. Jadwiga (Ita) Lapides.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1275

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Jadwiga (Ita) Lapides shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Jadwiga (Ita) Lapides. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Mrs. Jadwiga (Ita) Lapides shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN SINCLAIR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3631) for the relief of John Sinclair.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Sinclair shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of John Sinclair. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said John Sinclair shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRYAN GEORGE SIMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4437) for the relief of Bryan George Simpson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JACK L. PHILIPPOT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11718) for the relief of Jack L. Philippot.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11718

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of paragraph (7) of section 301(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jack L. Philippot, a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to have been physically present in the United States during the time he was serving abroad in the employ of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGILIO ACOSTA-MARTINEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1748) for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1748

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Virgilio Acosta-Martinez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 22, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF EMPLOYEES AT COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2307) for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin project, Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOHN V. BOLAND CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1483) for the relief of the John V. Boland Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1483

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitation or the exhaustion of administrative remedies, jurisdiction is conferred on the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Boland Construction Company for $272,063.17, in full settlement of its claims against the United States based upon contract numbered DA–25–066–ENG–480, with the United States Army Corps of Engineers, relating to the construction of a radar station at Kirksville, Missouri. Such suit may be instituted at any time within six months after date of enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That proceedings for the determination of such claim and appeal from and payment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction as now provided by law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike "for $272,063.17, in full settlement of its claims".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2914) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FRED M. OSTEEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11940) for the relief of Fred M. Osteen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11940

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the annual leave account of Fred M. Osteen, postal employee of Greenville, South Carolina, there shall be added a separate account of ninety-six hours of annual leave, in full settlement of all claims of the said Fred M. Osteen against the United States for compensation for the loss of such leave which was earned by him in the period January 1, 1958, through December 31, 1959, inclusive, while he was employed in the United States Post Office in Greenville, South Carolina, and which, through administrative error, was not credited to his leave account.

SEC. 2. Section 203(c) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (65 Stat. 680, 67 Stat. 137; 5 U.S.C. 2062(c)), shall not apply with respect to the leave granted by this Act, and such leave likewise shall not affect the use or accumulation, pursuant to applicable law, of other annual leave earned by the said Fred M. Osteen. None of the leave granted by this Act shall be settled by means of a cash payment in the event such leave or part thereof remains unused at the time the said Fred M. Osteen is separated by death or otherwise from the Federal service.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike "ninety-six" and insert "eighty-one".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, an a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONY A. CALLOWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12315) for the relief of Anthony A. Calloway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to McKinley Harris, Junior, the sum of $1,000 in full settlement of all claims against the

United States and against Anthony A. Calloway arising out of an accident which occurred in Chicago, Illinois, on May 3, 1960, when said Anthony A. Calloway was operating a Government motor vehicle in the course of his duties as an employee of the United States Post Office Department and in full satisfaction of the judgment and costs entered against the said Anthony A. Calloway in civil action numbered 64C531 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, based upon said accident. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 20 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN R. SYLVIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12884) for the relief of John R. Sylvia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12884

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John R. Sylvia, the sum of $350 in full settlement of all claims of the said John R. Sylvia against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid or to be paid in settlement of the judgment against him obtained in civil action numbered 64–116–C in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, as a result of a motor vehicle collision on January 22, 1962, in New Bedford, Massachusetts, between a privately owned vehicle and a vehicle being operated by him within the scope of his employment with the United States Post Office Department. The payment authorized by this Act shall be made on the condition that the amount so received shall be paid in settlement of such judgment or that the said John R. Sylvia has made payment in settlement of such judgment. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be find in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATHAN LEVINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7026) for the relief of Nathan Levine.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7026

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Nathan Levine, of New York, New York, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $2,287.80, the amount of an overpayment to him of salary retention payments in the period beginning July 1, 1962, and ending in November 1964, because of an administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said Nathan Levine, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHITE DEER BAPTIST CHURCH, ALLENWOOD, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11253) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11253

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to convey to the White Deer Baptist Church, Allenwood, Pennsylvania, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the 4.32-acre tract of land described in section 2 of this Act and owned by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act (which portion consists of 2.73 acres more or less), upon payment to the United States by or on behalf of the White Deer Baptist Church of the fair market value of the United States portion (as determined by the Attorney General).

SEC. 2. The 4.32-acre tract of land referred to in the first section of this Act is described as follows: Beginning at a point in the centerline of L.R. 176 (old State Route 44), where township route 433 intersects with L.R. 176;

thence from said point north 43 degrees 35 minutes west a distance of 250.08 feet to a stake;

thence north 29 degrees 33 minutes east a distance of 328.04 feet to a stake;

thence north 51 degrees 24 minutes west a distance of 359.43 feet to a stake;

thence south 62 degrees 3 minutes west, a distance of 335.24 feet to a point marked with a button in the centerline of old route 44;

thence along the centerline of old route 44 south 48 degrees 9 minutes east a distance of 260.48 feet to a point marked with a button;

thence south 7 degrees 36 minutes west a distance of 181.21 feet to an iron pipe;

thence south 66 degrees 40 minutes east a distance of 405.53 feet to an iron pipe;

thence south 66 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 49.19 feet to the centerline of L.R. 176 (old route 44), the place of beginning marked with a button. This property being completely surrounded by the Northeast United States Federal Prison Camp, containing 4.32 acres, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 102]

Baring
Barrett
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Carter
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Corbett
Craley
Daddario
Dague
Dawson
Dickinson
Diggs
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Feighan
Flood
Goodell
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Hébert
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Leggett
McCarthy
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Miller
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Murray
Nix
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Powell
Resnick
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
St. Onge
Scott
Sikes
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tupper
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14544) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 14544, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] had 1 hour and 18 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] had 1 hour and 19 minutes remaining. Before the Committee rose the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] had the floor. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] has 19 minutes remaining. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

At the very inception, I would like to compliment the President on the way he is manuevering this legislation toward passage. We on the minority side have pried open the lid of this fiscal and monetary receptacle, but I regret to say that we have not been too successful in publicizing the stench. The President, in the name of party loyalty, has ordered the majority members of this House to put on their gas masks and smile. This is most unfortunate. I am asking the majority to take off their gas masks, take a good whiff of this bill, and think about their country instead of their party.

I wish the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee would tell us how he can abandon his lifelong philosophy of protecting the farmer and small homeowner against high interest rates so that a few big banks can get windfall profits out of participating in budget trickery. That is what this bill provides for, but we have not had a chance to discuss it.

When we had our committee meeting—it came on the day after the President sent his message, and it lasted just 3 hours. I had a telegram from the president of the National Farmers Union. He wanted to testify that this bill would hurt the farmers, but he never got a chance. We had no real hearings because the President told the majority members of this House to hold their noses and smile no matter how bad the legislation smelled. And just to be sure, the President sent his emissary to the committee room to make certain that none of the majority gagged in public.

This may sound like melodrama. The shame is that is is not melodrama, it is the truth.

This bill is a fiscal and monetary monster. It has three major purposes. The first is to provide a mechanism for budget gimmickry—by this I mean expensive large-scale loan refinancing in budget deficit years in order to get budget receipts. The second objective is the indirect, undercover expansion of a number of Government loan programs which compete with private credit. The third aim is to reduce the power of Congress by reducing the power of the standing authorizing committees over the day-to-day volume of Government programs. There may well be a fourth aim because the Federal Government, through the sale of high interest rate participation certificates, can choke the money market, reducing consumer credit lending, mortgage lending and linked industries like homebuilding.

I would like to describe this pooling program in some detail in order to end some misconceptions brought about by the administration's press handouts. Incidentally, the press was briefed on the President's loan-pooling message in the Fish Room of the White House. The President must have a sense of history. This is one of the fishiest programs the administration has ever unwrapped.

The administration handouts are designed to give the impression that this pooling proposal is a conservative way of avoiding increased budget expenditures for new loans while substituting private funds for public funds tied up in existing loans. The whole process is described in language with a very free-enterprising tone to it. I regret to say that all of this is tantamount to fraud. This proposal is not conservative. It is not free-enterprising. It is not straightforward. This program is a mechanism for budget gimmickry and economic trickery all dressed up in fancy language and cloaked in as much secrecy as possible.

The majority knows this very well. If this legislation were any good, the air would echo with administration self-praise and trumpeting. Our committee would have had weeks of hearings while administration witnesses made more noise than a carnival. As it is, the administration is sneaking this bill through Congress with all the fanfare of a grave robbery. There is good reason for this, of course. This bill can survive intense congressional scrutiny about as well as a chocolate bar could survive a hot day.

Through the mechanism established by this legislation, the Government proposes to sell participations in a pool including a Government-wide variety of loans. The Government is not selling the loans. That should be made clear. It is selling participations in a pool of loans. The purchaser gets no title to any of the loans. Private credit is not taking the place of Government credit. Private credit, in effect, is making a loan to the Government with Government assets as a kind of collateral. The private purchasers however, only get notes for their money, they get nothing like a mortgage or possibility of title. By this mechanism, the Government is simply borrowing from private credit sources without going through the Treasury. The administration has selfish reasons for all this trickery.

The administration badly needs to get receipts from private sources this coming fiscal year. They cannot afford to get money through Treasury borrowing. It may be cheaper that way, but it is no good as a budget gimmick. Only private receipts will count as pluses in the budget. Treasury borrowing constitutes no plus on budget ledgers. To pull off the budget gimmick, the administration has to avoid going through Treasury borrowing.

That is why I believe the administration when they say that they are concerned about getting private funds instead of going through the Treasury. They want private funds in no uncertain terms but only because private funds, and private funds alone, can serve as budget receipts so as to camouflage the budget deficit.

All this talk about getting private credit in for its own sake is a lot of rubbish. This administration does not care one iota whether private credit is fattened or flattened. The only thing that this administration really cares about is its own political neck.

What this program is out to do is simple. In the guise of recruiting private capital to take over the burden of Government capital, the administration is offering a program the real thrust of which is to establish a mechanism through which the extent of a budget deficit can be camouflaged in bad years. This will be done by bringing in private funds through loan refinancing. I do not have to remind you that this is a mechanism for economic and political fraud.

I would like to say at this point that if the administration was really and truly concerned with sharing its numerous loan program burdens with private credit, a good start could be made by cutting back a few of the more unfair Government loan programs. Some of the Government loan programs are openly competitive with private credit. For example, the General Accounting Office reported in January 1966, that some 20 percent of Farmers Home Administration housing loans are made in competition with private credit sources. The statutes specifically prohibit this. These loans are among those earmarked for the pools.

According to the GAO, the loanmaking abuses take place because the Farmers Home Administration county agents are more interested in empire building than in conforming to the will of Congress. I introduced a bill to tighten the law to require that applicants submit evidence that they had been refused credit on reasonable terms before they can get cheap subsidized credit. This bill has gotten nowhere. It would inhibit the political powergrabbing of the county agents.

I am mentioning the Farmers' Home loan program because it demonstrates the complete hypocrisy of any interest the administration may have in bringing in private credit. Private credit should have been brought in before the unfair Farmers Home Administration loans were made in the first place. Anything else is hypocrisy.

I am not picking the Farmers Home Administration loan program out of the air. It is very relevant to this discussion. It is relevant because the President has proposed to pool $600 million worth of Farmers Home Administration loans in fiscal 1967. He says so right in the 1967 budget. In my opinion, this is about the last program that ought to be expanded—unless it is overhauled and made fair to private credit. Nevertheless, if the bill we have before us today is passed, the volume of Farmers Home Administration loans will be increased, and more and more of these Government loans will be made in competition with private credit sources. Frankly, when I think about the Farmers Home Administration attitude toward private credit, I cannot read the pious statements of the administration concerning letting private credit take over the job via the loan pools without getting just a bit queasy. The administration wants private funds for budget gimmickry. Nothing more and nothing less.

It is hard for me to see how anyone can believe that any of the administration's talk about bringing in private credit has a genuine free-enterprise motivation. Just the opposite is true. The pool participation sales mechanism will increase the total volume of Government loans because of refinancing. The net result of the pooling mechanism, far from helping private credit, will be to shrink the percentage of the original loan market available to private credit. The Federal Government will make more and more loans as existing loans are refinanced. Private credit will shrink back into a subsidiary role.

Now I am not saying that some private lenders will not profit handsomely from the pools. As a matter of fact, a number of big institutions will be on the receiving end of nice fat windfalls. What I am saying is that government lending will account for more and more of the original loans made in the United States if we allow the many Government agencies to refinance their paper and thus get funds to increase their loan volume. Private credit sources, like banks and insurance companies will be allowed to buy participations in the government loan programs, but they will gradually be squeezed out of making the initial loans. Ultimately, such a trend would lead to the Government doing all the initial lending with bankers being relegated to the position of coupon-clipping de facto civil servants who can invest only in regulated participations at regulated rates.

Now, when bankers are put in a corner like that, they will not survive long. A lot of bankers and institutions are going to make a lot of money out of these participations because of the fact that private credit is still important in this country, and it still must be catered to. But when more and more of the Nation's credit is socialized, bankers are no longer going to be able to rate windfalls. In Soviet Russia, I believe the Government controls all aspects of finance and investment except that the people are free to buy low-interest government bonds. I would hate to see the day come in these United States where Government paper is the only investment available, but this bill is decidedly a step in that direction.

To move onto another aspect of this program, I think I ought to mention the great expense it entails. It has been admitted, many times, by the administration, that a premium is being paid to avoid Treasury financing so that private money can be brought in. I hope I have made it plain that these funds are being sought not for their own sake but for the sake of budget manipulation. But for whatever reason the private funds are being sought, they will cost about a half a percentage point more in interest than funds borrowed through the Treasury. This extra premium—which should be labeled "budget gimmickry expense"—is going to cost the American taxpayer millions a year.

This whole pool mechanism is designed to cost extra, unnecessary tax dollars because it is designed to enable the Government to refinance its paper for budget deficit camouflage purposes in just those inflationary budget deficit years when interest rates will be at their highest. This mechanism will not, by its very nature, serve as a mechanism for refinancing government paper in years when the Government can get the best rates. On the contrary, the Government will use the pool refinancing device in just those years when the rates it will have to pay will be highest because of inflationary budget deficits.

This program makes no economic sense if you are not interested in expanding Government loan programs and camouflaging budget deficits. It makes only political sense. I can see why the President wants this program. It is an attempt to keep economic chickens from coming home to roost.

Not only will this program hurt the taxpayer by soaking him for high refinancing costs in just those years when refinancing is most expensive, but it will hurt him by keeping the Federal budget safe for waste and thus maintaining the need for unnecessarily high taxes.

With this device, the administration can balance budgets. Using this mechanism, the administration can try to justify excess spending instead of recognizing budget imbalances and cutting spending. There are some who will say that this device enables the administration to avoid a tax increase. I say that this device enables the administration to refuse to face up to budget facts. This refusal keeps the budget bloated and the need for taxes higher than it might otherwise be. Excess spending means high taxes—and this program is designed to maximize Federal spending.

I have said that this program keeps the budget safe for waste. It does this and more. Not only does this mechanism bring in receipts which can be counted on the plus side of the budget ledger, it also eliminates the need for certain new obligational authority on the minus side of the ledger. This is double trickery. Sale of $4 billion worth of participations can knock out an $8 billion budget deficit. This is accomplished by chalking up $4 billion more on the plus side and using these receipts, already counted on the plus side, to wipe out the need for up to $4 billion worth of new obligational authority in the loan programs in question. This is an unparalleled budget gimmick.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UDALL). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Since this kind of gimmickry can knock out an $8 billion budget deficit with $4 billion worth of receipts, it can make the budget safe for $8 billion worth of waste. In this way, the pool gimmick can give the Government camouflage for spending much more than it takes in. The pool gimmick will make the budget safe for waste. The only way the Government will get the money to pay for this waste is to have higher taxes than would have been necessary if spending had been reduced to cope with a deficit budget. This, then, is a bill which will pave the way for higher taxes. Higher spending equals higher taxes. They go together like a horse and carriage.

Besides contributing to eventual higher taxes, this program is also highly inflationary. It will push up interest rates in the money markets and it will increase Government spending by taking the pressure off budget deficits. All this is inflationary.

I do not see how my liberal friends on the Banking Committee can sit still and swallow this one. They know very well that this program will encourage deficit spending—which in turn results in inflation and more taxes. They know this. They know this is an expensive budget gimmick. They know it well. They know that private credit is not sought for its own sake, but because it offers budget gimmickry opportunities cheaper Treasury financing would not. They know that the American people are going to pay through the nose here to save the President's political neck. What is worse, they know that this program will hurt homebuyers and millions of other "little people" who need to borrow money. Who will it help? They know that, too. This program will help the President and it will help the fat cat bankers and insurance companies who are going to buy the participation certificates. The fat cats are going to get a windfall. Fat cat cooperation has been bought in advance so that the President can have a budget gimmick to save his political hide.

Why do I say this? I say it because the little guy, the man on the street, has been cut out of this windfall. The administration is limiting participation certificates to denominations of $5,000 or over. If you don't have $5,000, then you have to buy Government bonds. You can believe all the patriotic posters and line up at the Government window to buy Government bonds. You will not get a high interest rate being a patriot. You will do much better if you sneak around to the back door where the President is going to give the fat cats 5½ percent on their money just for clipping coupons and helping the President of the United States put one over on the people.

Because the fat cats will get such a big windfall from putting their millions and billions in participations, I think we can be sure that they will lose any desire they now have—not that they have much now—to put their money into mortgages. Even if the Government tries to expand its mortgage insurance program, it will get nowhere because participations are more attractive to investment funds. Who would buy VA-insured or FHA-insured mortgages at 5¾ percent, assuming service costs or paying a one-half percent service charge, when you can get 5½ percent on participation certificates just by clipping coupons? This pool gimmick is going to clobber the mortgage market. That is why the President of the

National Farmers Union wanted to testify against it. That is why the mortgage bankers and construction people are suspicious. But none of these people got a chance to appear before our committee. Only a magician could have made it before our committee. We had one day of hearings. The administration closed the lid on the garbage pail the day after it was opened. Nobody had a chance to say a word.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. First, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his statement. Now, am I correctly informed that this dinky print of 60 pages constitutes all of the hearings, although at least 30 of those pages are dedicated to letters of transmittal and statements by administration witnesses? Can this possibly constitute the hearings on a bill of such ramifications as this measure?

Mr. FINO. I am sorry to inform the gentleman from Iowa that he is correct. We only had about 3 hours of hearings on this bill. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Rules had more protracted hearings on this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. This is really fantastic.

Mr. FINO. It certainly is.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot recall any other legislation where the Committee on Rules held longer hearings than the committee which has the legislation in charge. In my time in Congress I have never seen anything like this. I think this attests to the gentleman's statement that this is one of the most fraudulent bills that was ever brought before the House of Representatives.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. First of all, let me commend the gentleman from New York on the very forthright statement that he is making here today. It is one of the best statements that I have heard on this bill. I listened to the testimony before the Committee on Rules, and I just want to say it was pointed out before the Committee on Rules that there were several serious defects in this legislation and some amendments were even proposed before the Committee on Rules. That is something unprecedented and points up the seriousness of this matter. This legislation is in need of extensive legislation surgery. I would like to call to the attention of the House a May 10 UPI wire story, which reads as follows:

> WASHINGTON.—Organized labor joined Republicans today in seeking defeat of President Johnson's high-priority plan to refinance Government-sponsored loan programs with private investments.
>
> A labor memo was sent to Congressmen urging defeat of the financing plan whereby the administration would sell $4.2 billion in shares of Government loan programs for farmers, veterans housing, education, and colleges. Through the private participation in the Government programs, the administration will be able to reduce its budget expenditures.
>
> Angus McDonald, director of research for the Farmers Union, said that the union, the National Grange, and the AFL–CIO "are opposed" because it will "increase the cost to the taxpayer while lining the pockets of the big city bankers."
>
> The House Banking Committee, which hopes to bring the measure to the House floor tomorrow, agrees that the proposal will hike interest costs the Government will have to pay to private investors but said the increase will be "relatively minor" compared to Government interest costs for conventional financing.
>
> The proposed bill has passed the Senate but has been bogged down in the House Rules Committee which is expected to give a green light tomorrow for floor action.
>
> The labor opposition gave encouragement to Republicans who plan an all-out fight to defeat the measure which they have attacked as a "gimmick" to make the budget look smaller.
>
> The labor letter said the measure "will cause an increase in money cost on all loans not covered by ceilings. It will increase pressure to do away with or raise interest ceilings. It will tighten money in the home mortgage market. This bill is not in the interest of farmers and others who depend on credit."

This story indicates the widespread opposition to this bill. The gentleman referred to this opposition earlier. I agree that this bill is for the "fat cats" and has nothing in it for small investors or the taxpayers.

Mr. FINO. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Now I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, in the gentleman's colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa he agreed with him that we had very short hearings on H.R. 14544 in the Committee on Banking and Currency. While I am sure the gentleman made the statement in the best of faith and with the highest of motives, and while I would not call his statement fraudulent, it was certainly erroneous, because H.R. 14544 is in principle the counterpart of S. 2499 on which the Committee on Banking and Currency conducted 4 days of hearings which are printed to the extent of 300 pages. We certainly did not have to repeat all of that when we had the hearings on the bill now before us.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman knows full well that the hearings we had on the Small Business Administration concern themselves only with small business. This hearing of 3 hours that we had on this legislation we are considering today lasted only 3 hours. There were other agencies that were included, and there were people that wanted to testify before the committee and were not given the opportunity.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FINO. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that while we were dealing with SBA there we considered the counterpart of this bill, the Senate bill that was before us at the time, we had as witnesses the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Under Secretary of Treasury, the President of the FNMA Corporation, and a host of other witnesses.

There are two and a half pages of index naming all of the witnesses that were before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this time?

Mr. FINO. I would prefer not to yield to the gentleman from Iowa until I finish my statement.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things the administration has done to push this bill is to collect letters in support of it from veterans' organizations. The administration has told the veterans' groups that this pool proposal will help them in some vague way. Actually, VA-insured mortgages are already eligible for pooling and refinancing. The administration has given the veterans' groups a bill of goods. They have no reason to care about this bill, and I know they do not.

I am on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I think I am considered a pretty good friend of the veterans' groups. This bill does nothing for the veterans of America. It only benefits the President and the fat cats.

I am really amazed that the majority of the Banking Committee can sit here and support this legislation. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Banking Committee, the gentleman from Texas, how he can forget his farmers and would-be homebuyers back home and support a program that will give a windfall to his bitter enemies, the big bad banks of New York? How can he vote for a program that mocks the poor people who scrimp to buy Government bonds by letting only the fat cats qualify for the big profits? How can he vote for a program that gives the little guy inflated prices and taxes, plus high interest rates, while the fat cat gets a windfall that will take most of the pain out of the expansion of socialized credit?

Only a blank-check Congress would vote this kind of program just to help the President pull a budget gimmick. I would also note in passing that Congress will be voting away some of its own power if it passes this bill. The standing authorizing committees will clearly lose effective control over the volume of agency loan programs. The only safeguard will be the amount of refinancing involved.

I trust that the majority will take this unperfumed view of the pools legislation to heart. I trust the Congress will not vote for higher spending, inflation, higher taxes, higher mortgage costs to the little guy and a windfall for the fat cats. It would be a shameful thing for Congress to do.

If the President is not above doing something like this, I am confident that the Congress is. I urge the defeat of H.R. 14544.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of noise in the last day and a half during the debate on this bill.

I do not object particularly in an election year to political demagogery. I do not blame my Republican friends for trying to make out a political case. But, listen carefully to some of the amendments they will offer when we get to the 5-minute rule and see how inconsistent they are.

You have heard this bill attacked by name calling and the use of adjectives that were better reserved for use outside of this Chamber. They accuse us of concealment and deception——

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may have the whole truth, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Udall). The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 103]

Baring
Barrett
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Daddario
Dague
Dawson
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Downing
Ellsworth
Feighan
Flood
Gray
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Holland
Howard
Jones, Mo.
Leggett
McCarthy
McCulloch
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Miller
Morgan
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Poff
Pool
Powell
Resnick
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
St. Onge
Scott
Smith, Calif.
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tupper
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watson
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Keogh, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14544), and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called when 359 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, while I did not instigate the point of order which brought the Members to the Committee, I must say that I am flattered by the fact that the making of a point of order was prefaced by the gentleman who made it by the statement that he would like to have Members hear the whole truth.

Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that there have been charges made against those who sponsored this bill of concealment, sleight of hand, trickery, and deception.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of anything that has had the light of day as much as and for as long as this bill has had it. The accusations that have been made against it cannot be sustained.

As I have indicated earlier, Mr. Chairman, this subject has been under discussion in public and in private and in our committee for a long time.

What we are doing here is not something new. It is something that the Government has been doing for many, many years.

Mr. Chairman, when the committee had before it—I mean the Committee on Banking and Currency had before it—S. 2499, which is the counterpart in principle of H.R. 14544 which we are considering today, we took some 300 pages of testimony over a period of 4 days. The list of witnesses is contained in a 3½-page index, prefaced to those hearings.

All those who wanted to be heard by the committee on the subject were heard, both pro and con.

Mr. Chairman, the statement that is made to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House that there was a longer hearing held before the Committee on Rules than there was before the Committee on Banking and Currency on this bill is accurate as far as it goes. But it does not go far enough. The fact is that the principle and details have been fully and fairly discussed. Our Republican friends have mustered and will muster every possible fact and argument available. This hardly smacks of secrecy.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. In a moment.

Mr. WIDNALL. The gentleman has just made a direct statement about the hearings on this bill.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I did. And, when I say this bill, I mean H.R. 14544 and its counterpart, S. 2499.

Mr. WIDNALL. That is not on this bill.

Mr. MULTER. One can quibble over this as much as one likes, but when a bill is introduced on a subject in the other body, and another bill is introduced in this body on the same subject, we are both considering the same principle. Now quibble as much as you like about it. An attempt to legislate a method of conduct for an agency in selling Government obligations and participations therein, is the same whether it concerns 1 Government agency or 50 agencies of the same Government.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I will yield as soon as I get through with my statement. I asked the gentleman to yield to me when he had the time and he did not see fit to do so. I asked the gentleman who preceded him to yield to me when he had the floor and he refused to do so. When I get through with my statement, I will yield to anybody who has a question to ask and answer it and answer anything that anybody says to the contrary of what I say here.

The fact of the matter is that this was not done in secret. It was done out in the open. If Members who are opposing this bill did not hear the President's message when it was read by the Clerk of the House, then know that it was spread upon the Congressional Record in full—then go and read it before talking anymore about secrecy.

If you do not know what is in the bill, I say, read it. If you do not know what is printed in the hearings, I say to you, read the record of the hearings. They come here and try to make charges that may sound very fine when they are making political speeches, but remember, the people back home can read. They will read this debate. You cannot expunge this debate from the Record which is being made here for them to read. When they do read it, they will know who is telling the whole truth.

Now let us consider this for a moment without all the adjectives that have been used. Let us consider what the bill does and what we are trying to do here.

At the outset, understand that the Small Business Administration, the Export-Import Bank, the Veterans' Administration, Fannie Mae, FHA, PHA—the Public Housing Administration——

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in the connection?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield.

Mr. WIDNALL. That is not in the bill. Where is it?

Mr. MULTER. Read the bill and hearings and you will find what is in the bill and what we are talking about.

Everyone of these agencies that I have mentioned and others that I have not mentioned have been carrying out this identical practice which we are trying to correct and control by this bill.

They have been selling Government-owned obligations as long as the Government has been lending money. As long as the Government has been receiving obligations of debtors for Government loans, these agencies of our Government have been selling them. Call them what you will—mortgages, bonds, or obligations—they are assets which we have been selling and will continue to sell.

When we found during the hearings that we conducted on this subject matter involved in this very bill, we found at least one agency was not doing the kind of job that it should be doing in dealing with Government assets.

This bill is to control every last one of these agencies. By this bill the Congress will make sure that they do not run wild in disposing of these obligations that are owned by the U.S. Government.

You can put it any way that you like when you discuss the budget. You can put it any way you like in doing the bookkeeping. The fact of the matter is that when the Government borrows money and issues its obligation whoever owns that obligation has an asset. Likewise, when the Government lends money it receives an obligation to repay the money. That is an asset that the Government owns.

You should be the first ones to try to get those obligations that are owned by the Government into the hands of those people who can afford to buy them and who can afford to hold them.

There has been considerable doubt raised here as to what has been happening to the controls which we, the Congress, exercise over the Federal lending programs. Let me reassure any and every Member who wants to be reassured, that this Participation Sales Act not only will maintain the controls that we now have but it will extend those controls to the process of pooling these assets of the Federal portfolio which will contain the loan paper held by our various lending agencies.

Three broad controls are included in this bill.

First, authority to use funds from the sale of participations in order to make the new loans would be limited.

I repeat—that authority would be limited.

The funds will be permitted to be used to make new loans only to the extent that agencies involved are already authorized by the Congress to make such new loans and only to the extent that we have appropriated money with which to make those loans.

The bill provides that the proceeds from the sales of participations must be dealt with as existing law requires that proceeds from sales or repayments of loans be used.

Second, an appropriation act will be required before any agency will be authorized to place any of its loans in a pool for sale. There is a reason for that. Yes, we are going to sell some of these obligations so that the person who buys them can receive an interest rate return or yield that will be larger than the borrower is paying.

Maybe you do not want to help the farmers or the people who have suffered from some disaster—those people who by the law that we passed get loans at less than the going rate of interest—some of these borrowers pay only 3 or 4 or 5 percent interest per annum.

But in order to sell those loans to the general public or to the pension funds or to the insurance companies, we must give them a higher return as demanded by today's market. If we authorize this action and appropriate the difference, we will authorize and permit these loans to be sold so that the person who owns them will get the going rate. The U.S. Treasury will subsidize the difference.

If you do not want these loans sold, if you do not want the insurance companies and the pension funds to invest in these obligations, if you do not want to make more money available at low-interest rates for housing, education, rural electrification, and disasters, then do not appropriate the money for it.

As originally drafted, this bill provided that prior congressional authorization for the sale of participation certificates would be required only if the assets pooled bore interest rates below the rate at which the participation certificates could be sold in the market. The intention was, and still is, that the Appropriations Committee should consider any sale of certificates where there would be need for appropriations.

The administration and the Committee on Banking and Currency—at least the majority of the committee—have agreed to an amendment proposed by the minority side—and I hope they will go along with their own proposal—which will have the effect of strengthening the congressional control over all of our credit programs. That amendment will provide that no sale of participation certificates on behalf of any agency can be undertaken without prior authorization in an Appropriation Act, which the Congress will have to pass. That Appropriation Act will make up any prospective deficiency between earnings on the pooled loans themselves and the requirements for servicing the participation certificates.

Finally, although title to the pooled loan would pass to FNMA in trust, the lending agency would retain custody of the servicing of its loans. I wish to stress that point. The lending agency would retain complete administrative control over its programs. Let me reemphasize, though, that such control does not include the power to extend any agency's power, authorization, or appropriation. Every agency must act within the limits of its authorization as further limited by its appropriations.

To be specific, take the Small Business Administration as a typical example. We have authorized and appropriated about $4 billion that the Small Business Administration can loan. Once they get to that $4 billion, they cannot make another loan. If we sold every one of the $4 billion of loans that they have made to the general public, the money would go into the Treasury. If those loans are to be sold to yield a higher interest rate than they bear, we will have to appropriate the difference before they can be sold. Beyond that $4 billion limit already set by our duly enacted authorization and appropriation, that agency cannot lend another dollar.

We in the Congress, therefore, will retain all the control we have now over the lending programs through the appropriation process as well as by our oversight duties and our legislative powers. Specifically this bill—I repeat—will not authorize any agency to make more loans than they are authorized to make now. The aggregate amount of such loans would not be increased by this bill. This merely sets up FNMA as the sole seller of these obligations. We do that because this proposal will now eliminate the competition which exists between these agencies which we, the Congress, have authorized to sell, and which are actually selling the obligations of the United States. These agencies have the right to sell them now. They compete with each other on the open market.

When FNMA is made the trustee, it will become the sole agent of the Government to sell them. There will be no competition between the agencies on the market in the sale of these securities. However, there will be much greater competition in the market place and among prospective purchasers—the more people that want to buy, the lower the interest rate.

We will have thus eliminated one of the very vices that has been shown to exist in at least one of these agencies in the sale of these assets. We found during these hearings—and they are here for Members to read—that SBA on one occasion called in a single broker—or underwriter, if we want to call him such—and turned over a part of its portfolio and said to him "For a fee, dispose of them."

We will have no more of that. FNMA will not pay any brokerage to anybody to make such sales. FNMA will seek out the pension funds and the insurance companies, or whoever wants to buy them, at the best rate obtainable. Bear in mind, the best rate obtainable will be in accordance with the demands of the market.

Let me indicate one thing more. There is no better anti-inflationary tool than the one we are setting up here and now by this bill. Among other things, the agency which is permitted to sell these obligations will sell them when the market permits. It will sell them only when there is an excess of money that should be withdrawn from the market.

As we have heard so often from those who are opposing this bill today, we are running into a runaway boom prosperity, inflation is taking hold. They tell us time and time again, inflation is too much money chasing too few goods. If there is too much money around—and I am not ready to concede that there is—then when there is too much money around, this agency can offer those obligations of the U.S. Government for sale and draw out of circulation some of that excess money, thereby acting as an anti-inflationary tool.

When the market is the other way, and interest is at a low rate, we can then borrow more money at the low rate and lend again at the low rate and avoid any sales.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making a very important contribution to this entire matter. Is it not true that FNMA sells mortgages as part of its function at the time when the market can absorb those mortgages? Is it not true FNMA has not been selling mortgages, but is rather at this time buying mortgages?

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman is correct. He emphasizes the point I tried to make.

Mr. HANNA. Is not FNMA selling some of these participations at this time?

Mr. MULTER. There is no question about that.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL CLAWSON].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct a few inaccuracies that wandered into the RECORD as a result of the previous speech by the gentleman from New York.

The gentleman made the flat statement that the committee had more hearings on this bill, more time in hearings on H.R. 14544 than was devoted to the bill before the Rules Committee. He tried to combine the time that was used by the committee in hearings on the Senate bill 2499, which is not a similar bill. It is not the same bill.

For the record, I have in my hand Senate 3283. That is the same bill as H.R. 14544. That bill is resting on the Speaker's desk right now. If we complete action on this, that will be the bill that will be called off the Speaker's desk. It is not Senate 2499. There should be absolutely no confusion over that.

There are some other obvious inaccuracies. The gentleman spoke about the fact that the little investor, the small investor, is now going to have a chance to invest in the very fine participations issued through FNMA. The Government of the United States is now spending thousands of dollars on advertising the 4.15-percent yield Government bonds for the small investor.

That is 4.15 percent. It is on radio. It is on television. It is in full-page ads in the newspapers.

What will this do? It will permit the large investor, the big investor who has from $5,000 up to $1 million, without any effort to get 5½ percent, with no lid on the amount. This is big, high interest frozen in for the profit of the big investor, who really assumes no risk or expense in order to obtain his participation.

I consider it outrageous that the average citizen is not included, if the Government is going to pay 5.5 percent. Why not jack up the 4.15 percent interest on U.S. savings bonds, or raise the ceiling now current at 4¼ percent on Government bonds.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and for making the record clear.

Mr. Chairman, occasionally during the course of debate when difference of opinion is dramatically pronounced as has been demonstrated on the legislation before us today, perhaps others have experienced the insatiable desire that I feel now to express thoughts and ideas so clearly that every Member of the House might be influenced and convinced of the validity of the arguments presented.

As a comparatively new Member of Congress my participation in debate has been limited to those measures on which I felt my contribution would be helpful to other members of the committee. This is one of those infrequent occasions.

No Member should vote on this bill or any amendment thereto without reviewing the minority report. If for no other reason than the failure of the committee to uphold the high standards of this greatest of all deliberative bodies, the bill ought to be returned to the committee for adequate and complete hearings. The proposals, when properly considered with testimony from additional witnesses familiar with the details and mechanics of handling sales of beneficial interests and participations, might possibly be revised and amended to meet the objections. The floor of the House is not the place to attempt the complex revisions necessary to make this bill the type of legislation to which all of us can ascribe our support.

Many questions need the attention of the committee, not the least of which is the method of pooling the "participations." Is it proposed that FNMA would accumulate loans from a number of different agencies, combine them in the same pool and then issue certificates against a variety of loans? Or is it contemplated that loans from separate agencies will be pooled together without intermingling?

Although loans may be mixed and placed in the same "bundle," with differing interest rates and a variety of loan paper from small business to college housing with the possibility of one or more of these loans "going sour" resulting in foreclosure, the management and overhead cost is the obligation of the Federal Government, since the investor in a "participation" has no recourse on the collateral. With the wide variation possible in pooling these loans, even though the bad loan is replaced with a good loan, constant replacement may very well result, including the necessity of reconciling differing maturities, changing interest rates, and so forth. This constant management, together with collection problems as they occur, is, as I understand the bill, the responsibility of the agency originating the direct loan placed in the pool. The holder of a "beneficial interest" or "participation" would have no risk, nor any management obligation and the expense attendant thereto.

FNMA, we have been told, and the evidence is documented, specifically states in their offering that the instrument is not an obligation of the U.S. Government, yet any purchaser of a "participation" quickly recognizes that the Federal Government guarantees the repayment of principal and interest, and the replacement of bad collateral, and that these guarantees are just as valid as if the full faith and credit of the United States were pledged. No purchaser of a "participation" will think otherwise under the terms of this legislation. Yet, we are expected to use this device as a "sale of assets" even though no title passes and the Government continues its obligation to pay. The attempt to separate these participation sales from the budget and debt ceiling under the circumstances described is an affront to the American people and a subterfuge of fiscal policy. Before this system is adopted some method should be set up to inform the American people how many participations are sold, the effect of such a sale on the budget deficit, the debt ceiling, the extra cost to the taxpayer for using this financing method, and so forth.

Another problem that is unresolved and troubles me is the existing language of the FNMA Charter Act and its potential effect if this legislation is passed.

Under the existing FNMA Charter Act, loan assets which may be pooled are limited to obligations of the housing agency or constituent units thereof and mortgages in which the United States or any other agency has an interest. When Wall Street bond counsel got through with that language the bill before us proposes that the scope be vastly broadened to include "and other types of securities, including any instrument commonly known as a security, hereinafter in this subsection called 'obligations'."

If you examine page 2 of the bill, lines 11 to 14, that language provides that securities commonly known as a security are also eligible for pooling with FNMA. Now, certainly, a common stock is a "type of security" which is "commonly known as a security." So, beyond question, agencies could pool the common stocks they hold in numerous Government assistance programs. The provision then goes on to the ridiculous extent of declaring in effect that a common stock is a bond by stating "hereinafter in this subsection called obligations."

No place in testiony before the four committees, which each in their own way held hearings on the bill, is there any intimation that stocks held by Government agencies would be subjected to pooling with FNMA for sale of participation certificates. No one in the administration has ever indicated that there was any intention to do so. In fact, representatives of the administration as well as the bill itself talk only of pooling mortgages and loans of Government agencies.

I have suggested, and administration representatives have agreed, that there is no need for this lose language in the bill. To correct this wide-open provision, we should strike that Wall Street bond counsel gobbledygook, which in effect says a stock is a bond, and in place of it, use simple English language to say that "mortgages and other obligations" will be the types of financial assets that are eligible for pooling with FNMA.

Unfortunately, the time allotted permits mention of only a few of the more confusing, and ambiguous areas of this highly amorphous proposal that remain undefined. However, these should be sufficient to alert Members to the need for this bill to be returned to the Committee on Banking and Currency giving the committee an opportunity to complete its work before bringing legislation to the floor of the House.

Another question which has yet to receive a clear answer asks whether or not the proceeds of these participation certificates can be used by the lending agency for additional loans beyond the authorization ceiling. Less than 2 weeks ago over in the other body, the manager of the bill, Senator Muskie, responded to this query in this manner, and I quote:

> I have spent a good deal of time attempting to get the facts so that I could answer this question, which I expected to be asked, as clearly and precisely as I could. * * * The intent of the bill—and this I can state clearly—is that as to those programs where the proceeds of the sales of direct loans can be used for new loans under present law, it is the intent of this bill that the proceeds of the sale of participation certificates could be used to the same effect.
>
> Mr. Bennett. As though they were sales of the loans themselves?
>
> Mr. Muskie. That is correct. In those programs where that is possible now, that is the intent of this bill.

Now let me ask you, because it has not yet been satisfactorily answered, what are the programs and in what agencies is this possible now under existing law?

Just one final observation because my time has expired, I am inclined to agree with Senator Yarborough, who during debate in the other body on this bill stated, and I quote:

> Madam President, section 8 of the proposed Participation Sales Act authorizes a study of the feasibility, advantages, and disadvantages of direct loan programs compared to guaranteed or insured loan programs. After studying the proposed legislation, I have come to the conclusion that we would perhaps be wiser to enact section 8 and hold the rest of the bill until we see the results of that study.

Why not follow that advice, and in the meantime let the Banking and Currency Committee hold full and complete hearings on the proposal.

And, now, Mr. Chairman, I would like also to comment upon another point, because of a reference made during the course of this debate to the portfolio management. If I may, I would like to draw a comparison between a portfolio held by you or me or any other citizen. You take that portfolio down to the bank and you want a loan. The banker looks at the portfolio. As he goes through the bonds and stocks and whatever other instruments might be there, he says, "I am sorry; I am afraid your portfolio is filled with instruments on which I cannot make a loan. But, you have a rich uncle, an uncle who owns a lot of property in this community. If you get him to cosign this, I shall be glad to make the loan."

Of course, you go to your Uncle Sam and you ask him to cosign the note. He goes along with you. You, in turn, use the loan money which you obtained to buy some more stocks and obtain more securities. You go back to the banker again and want to increase the loan. The same procedure is repeated.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the parallel is properly drawn. In this instance, the portfolio remains the same; in fact, it has actually been increased, and the obligation is still there on the part of Uncle, as well as the nephew. In other words, the portfolio has not changed hands; it has only increased. As he borrowed the new money, he increased the portfolio. And, then, if Uncle goes to borrow money later on to increase his liquidity, the banker is going to ask him, "What obligations do you have?" I am sure he will take cognizance of the fact that he has cosigned the loan of his nephew.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is the method which we are using in the plain, the simple, the clear terms that we have been asked to use in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding additional time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14544, to provide for a program of selling participations in the loans of such programs as the Small Business Administration, college housing, community facilities, and the Farmers' Home Administration.

Congress has authorized these loan programs because it believes that homes for rural people, dormitories for college students, loans for students, and financial assistance to small businessmen is in the national interest. In many cases, Congress has directed that such loans shall be made at a lower rate of interest than the going one.

If we do nothing—if we fail to pass the participation sales bill—these constructive programs will simply dry up. It is impossible for the lending agencies to put themselves in funds by selling off a few of their loans at retail—the market is simply not there, and the interest rate would be prohibitive.

Of course, Congress could vote to terminate small business loans, or college housing loans, or farmers' home loans. But I do not find anyone introducing a bill to do that.

Equally, Congress could enact a $5 billion tax increase, which would then yield enough to fund these programs for the next fiscal year. But such a tax bill would have a disastrous effect on the economy, and I have not found anyone introducing a bill like that, either.

But sadly, I find our Republican friends lined up almost solidly against H.R. 14544. It is claimed that we Democrats are using a budgetary gimmick, and that we are fiscally delinquent. In fact, here is where we Democrats learned about the participation sales technique. President Eisenhower proposed essentially similar programs in his budget messages of 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1958. Just 2 years ago, the Republican minority on H.R. 6009, a bill to provide for increases in the public debt limit, recommended a similar program for selling Government loan assets to private investors.

And now that we are doing what the Republicans have recommended, they are shouting that we are delinquents. If there is any delinquency, it is the Republicans who have contributed to it.

But really, no one is delinquent. By providing an instrument attractive to investors, the Government can make substantial savings in its programs for farm home loans, college dormitories, and small business loans over what it would cost if we tried to sell off these mortgages one by one.

If there is a criticism of the Sales Participation Act, it is that raising the money through the sale of participations probably costs the Federal Government a fraction of a percentage point more than would direct borrowing by the Federal Government through tried and true instruments like Treasury bills, notes, or bonds. This emerges from my colloquy with Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr in the hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on the participation bill on March 30, 1966—hearings, pages 160-161:

> Mr. Reuss. I will be very brief and somewhat philosophical. To my mind, the overriding consideration in Government financing is the rate of saving to the Treasury, you and the taxpayers. I gather from the testimony of Mr. Weitzel and others that a 5-year Treasury security can now be sold at an effective rate of 4.9 percent, whereas a FNMA certificate now yields about 5.5 percent.
>
> Mr. Barr. Roughly, correct, Mr. Reuss.
>
> Mr. Reuss. More than a half percent more.
>
> Mr. Barr. That is right.
>
> Mr. Reuss. Outside of mythological considerations and myths about national debt, and so on, why do we not get the money for the Federal Government's needs in the cheapest possible way—which is by courageously asking Congress for appropriations for what is needed; and for what cannot be met out of the current year's budget—to borrow in the method that will yield the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers? We now have seasoned Treasury securities ranging from 30-day bills to 20-year bonds. If we can borrow money more cheaply for those, why do we not do it? If this has to result in a further education on Congress and the public on the national debt, we can save billions of dollars by such education. Why not do it? What is all the mystification about?
>
> Mr. Barr. Mr. Reuss, no question your route is the cheapest route for the taxpayer and the Government. It is not even debateable.
>
> Mr. Reuss. Why do we not do it, then? Why do we not ask for decent appropriations for SBA and put it back in business, and——
>
> Mr. Barr. Yes.
>
> Mr. Reuss (continuing). Pay for what we can with taxes—I would hope a very large amount in this conjuncture—and borrow the rest at the lowest interest rate.
>
> Mr. Barr. The issue which the administration is putting to the Congress and which the Congress will either approve or disapprove is that we are trying to move a lot of these programs from the public sector into the private sector. Now, whether you agree or not this is what we are attempting to do. But unquestionably it is more costly.
>
> Now, it has seemed to me that there has been a certain advantage, and the country has had a great advantage in moving into areas that were originally considered too risky—housing, small business, and many other areas—establishing the risk so that the private sector can take a look at it and then the Federal Government can pull out and move to other riskier sections.
>
> Now, there is a cost involved, Mr. Reuss, and the question that you and the committee must decide for yourselves is whether the cost is worth it; that is to say, the cost of attempting to involve the private sector so that the Federal Government can move to other areas.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to see the administration have an option of raising the $5 billion or so to carry on these worthwhile Federal lending programs through the next fiscal year by the direct method of Treasury borrowing. Such a method would, over the years, save hundreds of millions of dollars for the taxpayers through reduced interest costs.

Shortly the Treasury will be appearing before the House Committee on Ways and Means asking for an increase in the debt ceiling. Everyone who is interested in economy in Government should support having the Ways and Means

Committee and the Congress increase the debt ceiling by an additional $5 billion—the probable amount to be financed via the participation sales program the next fiscal year—over and beyond whatever other debt increase is necessary.

Such an increase in the debt limit would let the Treasury use the lower interest direct borrowing route to raise the $5 billion, rather than the somewhat higher interest direct sales participation program we are here acting on. The taxpayer would be the beneficiary.

And from the budgetary standpoint, there is nothing but mythology involved. Either way you do it, Uncle Sam is in debt for an extra $5 billion. Either way you do it, these are essentially Government lending programs for college dormitories, farmers' homes, or small business, and the private investor gets into the picture in essence as a lender to the Government. The big difference between the two approaches is that the direct Treasury borrowing approach saves the taxpayer money in interest costs, by forthrightly raising the national debt limit instead of having an equivalent $5 billion liability on the books outside of the national debt. Some myths are worth preserving, but not when they cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support H.R. 14544, not because it is the best way of meeting our financing problem, but because it is a whole lot better than any alternative I hear presented today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be noted as it has been noted in the minority views as well as in the debate on the floor of the House, the distinction between what was done under President Eisenhower and was indeed recommended by the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. REUSS. I just wonder what the distinction is?

Mr. CURTIS. Let me state it. It involves an interpretation of what is a sale. The point is made that this pooling operation certainly is not the recomendations of either the Eisenhower administration or the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means.

What the administration has done is taken hold of the title to an idea and then put a false product under that label.

Mr. REUSS. I am sorry that my efforts to be generous toward the Republicans have met with such an uncharitable rebuff. But despite what my friend from Missouri has said, I still want to credit General Eisenhower and the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee for suggesting the proposition that by cutting investors generally in on these financial assets of the Federal Government, by that device you can save an increase in the national debt.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I am happy to yield again to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is a great rhetorician, and if you should pin praise on the Republicans, it must be taken as from that source.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I should like to read to the gentleman a statement appearing in Time magazine, issue of April 29:

> Actually, in asking Congress last week for broader authority to sell Government-held loans to private investors, President Johnson was resorting to a revenue-stretching device that was pioneered by the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. REUSS. I join Time in giving credit where credit is due.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I wish to get something very clear, although the subject may have been discussed before. I should like to have it cleared up by the gentleman from Wisconsin or the Chairman of the Committee, who have always been proponents of low interest rates. If I had a payroll deduction for Government bonds, how much interest would I receive on those bonds?

Mr. REUSS. You mean what is the rate of interest on savings bonds now?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes.

Mr. REUSS. Recently it was raised to something over 4 percent.

Mr. PATMAN. It is 4.15 percent.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If this legislation passes, and I happen to be wealthy enough to be able to buy $5,000 worth of these participation certificates, how much interest rate will I receive?

Mr. REUSS. You will receive whatever the Federal National Mortgage Association in its judgment decides is the going rate. But, in honesty, that is likely to be more than 4.15 percent.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Around 5.5 percent?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the question?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. The anticipated rate will be one-quarter point to three-eighths of 1 percent higher. But remember that people will profit much more than that, because these bonds are taxable. The income from the bonds or securities would be taxable by every State, local community, city, and political subdivision. They will be subject to taxation in all of those places, whereas on direct Treasury issues they are not.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Savings bonds are subject to tax, are they not? The income tax?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, when redeemed.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to get something clear.

Mr. REUSS. Let me respond to the gentleman from Michigan. He makes a point: Savings bonds today, in the past, and I guess in the future, will not yield as much as comparable market instruments. The way to rectify that is to increase the yield on savings bonds, if that is the judgment of Congress. And I might add that was my judgment when, some months ago, we were asked to vote on that question.

But the best way to help the little people who buy savings bonds is by economy in the Government generally, and any way you slice it, the little person will be helped if Uncle Sam can borrow via the participation certificate route, which we are asking today in this bill, as opposed to having to peddle Uncle Sam's portfolio at retail and pay the money market a much higher rate.

So in the interest of helping the little man, vote for this bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to clear up this question a little bit. If I understand correctly, the small man who has a payroll deduction to buy savings bonds, gets about 4¼ percent and, as I recall, FNMA mortgages sell at about 5¼ or 5½ percent.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. You are dealing with limited purchases there. You can purchase only $10,000 a year I believe. I think recently the amount has been raised, but still it is restricted.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am lost here, because I cannot understand how the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and others who have been saying for so long that they are opposed to high interest rates now want to give the big bankers and investors 5½ percent and the small man who has a payroll deduction for savings bonds 4¼ percent.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, interest rates are not involved in this issue. The interest rate is not involved. The principle is whether or not we should let these securities be sold to the private sector, and assist small business, farmers and others.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The interest rate is involved, to the taxpayer. This is what I cannot understand. What happened to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. PATMAN. They just happen to be high now. They may be low later on.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this administration last year at this time was preparing the budget for 1966–67. It would not balance by $6 billion. So in order to cut down the proposed deficit a bright mind came up with this idea to place Federal assets in a trust and sell a share in these assets to the public by issuing participation certificates. These participation certificates are like a corporation issuing preferred stock which someone has called a polite way to borrow money. This proposed sale of participation certificates is a polite and smart way to get around increasing the national debt ceiling, and at the same time make the budget deficit much smaller.

WHY THE ADMINISTRATION NOW RESORTS TO THIS TYPE OF FINANCING

Aside from the fact that the administration wants to sell $4.2 billion of participation certificates in order to count this sum as a budget receipt and thus hold the deficit this coming year to $1.8 billion instead of $6 billion, there is an even greater reason why the administration wants to resort to this type of financing.

The reason is that there is a statutory 4¼-percent interest ceiling on Treasury bonds sold for maturities longer than 5 years.

The Treasury because of this 4¼-percent interest ceiling tends to do most of its financing in the under 5-year area which, of course, means more frequent trips to the market and the payment of higher interest rates.

This 4¼-percent ceiling has been in effect since April 1918 and the interest was then exempt from income tax, surtaxes, and so forth. Since 1941 the interest on Government bonds is no longer exempt from income tax so that the maximum interest of 4¼ percent now is worth considerably less—after taxes—than in 1941.

Obviously, this 4¼-percent interest rate is no longer competitive and Government borrowing has to be in the form of securities with short or intermediate maturities.

For instance, by the end of January of this year the average maturity of salable Treasury securities—totaling $217 billion dollars—was 4 years and 10 months compared with 5 years and 5 months a year before.

The Treasury would like to see this 4¼-percent ceiling eliminated but, of course for various reasons, mostly political, they are not inclined to ask Congress to eliminate it.

ONE WAY THE GOVERNMENT CIRCUMVENTS THE 4¼-PERCENT INTEREST CEILING

So what are they doing? First of all, they are doing business in short term borrowings, and I am informed that $91.8 billion of bonds will come due this year and when they reborrow to refinance this sum they will pay over 5-percent interest.

THE PROPOSED PLAN TO GET AROUND THE CEILING

The other clever maneuver is to dump into the already tight financial market these participation certificates which we are being asked to authorize here today.

This plan would operate outside the Treasury. And it would reduce direct Treasury borrowings now and present law does not limit the interest rate on these non-Treasury issues. Nor are they counted as part of the national debt even though the certificates are guaranteed by Fannie Mae and the maturities are as long as 15 years and more. And the interest rate will be 5½ percent.

ONE OF THE EFFECTS OF THIS PROPOSED FINANCING

Last week we had a bill up in the Banking Committee to outlaw negotiable certificates of deposits issued by banks. They have grown to about $17 billion outstanding, with $16 billion nonnegotiable certificates of deposit also outstanding.

The witness in favor of outlawing these negotiable certificates of deposits before the House Banking and Currency Committee was the representative of the savings and loan associations. His argument: These certificates of deposits are being bought up by persons who would normally put their money in savings and loan associations, and as a result there is virtually a money panic in the mortgage money market for funds for the savings and loans associations. Despite the drain upon available mortgage funds, the savings and loans he said would not fight this plan here today. I suppose because the President wants it. But, think of the effect the sales of these $4.2 billion in participation certificates will have on a now very, very tight money market. If the savings and loans have no money now as a result of 5½-percent negotiable certificates of deposits, what will happen to them if there is $4.2 billion of Federal participation certificates also dumped on the market? A virtual mortgage money void will result.

WHAT CAN THE GOVERNMENT DO TO AVOID THIS BILL?

The answer to this dilemma that the Government finds itself in asking for this type of back-door financing is to now reduce all unnecessary spending for giveaway programs which will make this dumping of participation certificates unnecessary.

If we cannot cut the budget and save the $5 billion, and if the Government must borrow money, I believe the Congress should give consideration to removing the 4¼ percent ceiling on interest rates, so that the Government can move into the market and sensibly finance the $91.8 billion worth of bonds coming due, so that it will not be necessary to pay the exorbitantly high interest rates on the short 1- to 5-year money.

DO WE HAVE PEACE AND PROSPERITY?

I heard the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday say we have had unprecedented peacetime prosperity for the last 5 years and that the sale of these participation certificates will help to carry on this prosperity. Can the chairman convince anyone that we have had both peace and prosperity in the last 5 years? You ask any mother who today has a son fighting in Vietnam whether we are enjoying both peace and prosperity. Any schoolboy can tell you that our prosperity is because of huge purchases by the Government for defense purposes engendered by an undeclared war.

THIS BILL WILL BE EXPENSIVE TO TAXPAYERS

Another aspect of this program is the added costs to the taxpayer. The Government has already borrowed this $4.2 billion at 4¼-percent interest to acquire these assets. If we now borrow against these assets represented by this $4.2 billion, we will have to pay 5½-percent interest now, or 1¼ percent more interest, or $52.5 million a year additional interest.

CONCLUSION

The sale of these participation certificates will put the Federal Government in the banking business. President Andrew Jackson lead a fight which liquidated the U.S. Bank. We are now by this bill in effect reviving it. And the end will be nowhere in sight. The integrity of the budget and financial soundness of our Nation has been by being forthright, above board, and out in the open for all to see and examine. Let us keep it that way.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. I should like to compliment the gentleman on his statement, particularly in the area of the money market. We are considering in our committee a bill to outlaw certificates of deposits, primarily because they have created an enormous hardship on the homebuilding market through their sopping up of those funds which might be made available to savings and loan institutions. This bill, with equivalent or even higher rates of interest, would have exactly the same effect and be very destructive to the homebuilding market.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, comparing Federal financing to family financing can be dangerous, but I think in this case it can be done.

Suppose a family faced a need for funds—let us say for a son's college tuition—in excess of net family income.

One solution might be to eliminate all luxury or unnecessary family expenditures. I know that this Congress and this administration wants to end all unnecessary spending.

Assuming that our hypothetical family has already eliminated all unnecessary spending, the family could eliminate worthwhile spending. The family could decide that the son should not go to college.

This is the type of Government spending which will be eliminated if we fail to enact this bill today.

To return to our family, they could decide to go to the bank and borrow the money. On the Federal level this would be the same as direct borrowing by the Treasury. This would increase our national debt but it would admittedly be slightly less expensive than the procedures proposed in this bill.

Our hypothetical family could decide to raise the college tuition money by selling a capital asset—say the family automobile. Now we are getting closer to what is proposed in this bill.

Suppose in the past father had loaned money to cousin Ted who now is well-to-do but short of cash. Father could sell

Ted's promissory note to the bank. It is quite likely that the bank would insist that father guarantee Ted's note.

Now we are getting close to the bill today, and are at the procedure which individual agencies have used in the past.

Suppose father has also loaned money to Uncle Fred and Brother Bill, and finds that he can get a better deal at the bank if he pools all three notes and guarantees them.

Now we have arrived at the basic procedure of H.R. 14544.

However, to continue the analogy, let use suppose that the loans to Ted and Fred were made when interest rates were lower than they are today. The bank would insist that father agree to make payments which when added to Ted and Fred's interest would equal today's market interest rate.

We have now reached in our family's financing of son's tuition the most extreme situation contemplated by H.R. 14544.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that that family financing plan is economically sound and that H.R. 14544 is also economically sound.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of H.R. 14544.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROCK. Let us carry the example to the potential inherent in this bill. Let us say he did sell participations in the three loans to the bank and he got the money and used it. Let us say he reloaned it to three others. Then can he come back and sell it to the bank again and continue turning it over, over, and over again until, instead of $1,000 he has $10,000 or $15,000 of obligations? When do you think the bank will pull the string on this man?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I think the bank will pull the string on him when they think he is in an unsound condition, and this is exactly when the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress will do it. It is exactly the same situation.

Of course, family financing is different from Government financing.

Government can raise taxes.

One alternative to the enactment of H.R. 14544 is a substantial tax increase.

Mr. Chairman, some who oppose H.R. 14544 do so because they believe that failure to enact it will force the administration to seek a tax increase.

Some for purely partisan political reasons want to force a Democratic administration to take such a politically unpopular act in an election year.

Some sincerely believe that the necessity for a tax increase at this time is so clear that the administration must be blackjacked into a tax increase by the defeat of this bill.

To this latter group I say let us fight out directly the issue of whether inflationary pressures require a tax increase or not. Let us not require a tax increase for the wrong reasons.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. What I would say I would not seek to do—and I believe most of the Members do not—is to increase taxes, but to force the administration into cutting expenditures.

Mr. MOORHEAD. If I thought we could cut unnecessary expenditures by this $4.5 billion, I would certainly agree with the gentleman, but I believe we are going to have to do it, if we do it, by cutting out community facility loans to small towns, by cutting out assistance to our farmers, by cutting out assistance to small business.

This, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this Congress wants to do or should do. These are the worthwhile programs.

The reason for a tax increase is to cool down inflationary pressures.

It does not involve problems of financing Government except to the extent that such techniques are either inflationary or deflationary.

H.R. 14544 is neither. It is neutral. If anything, it is mildly anti-inflationary.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us pass this bill and then face squarely, without any improper pressure, the question of whether our economy needs the cooling effect of a tax increase.

Others avoid the issue of tax increase and argue that we should continue to finance direct Treasury loan programs through Treasury financing.

Mr. Chairman, that would be a radical change of long established congressional policy.

Mr. Chairman, I think that every Member of Congress remembers with particular clarity, matters which first come before Congress when he is a new Member.

On February 4, 1959, when I had been a Member of this body for just 1 month, a bill came to the floor to authorize money for direct home loans for veterans.

There was great deal of opposition to the bill on the ground that the Federal Government should not be in the money lending business, but should limit itself to Government guarantees of private lending.

As a matter of fact, we adopted an amendment, the effect was to say that there could be no direct loans except where—

> . . . the Administrator finds that private capital is not generally available in any rural area or small city or town for the financing of loans under Sec. 1810.

The then minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], opposing the direct loan program said:

> . . . In other words, the FHA is developing a program that takes advantage of private capital through the guarantee of the amount and the loans are being made in that fashion.

Mr. Chairman, that is what we are trying to do in this bill before the House today.

In the debate in 1959, the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], in arguing for the direct loan program, anticipated the situation we face today. He said:

> I might add that the direct loan program is not a gift to the veterans of our rural areas; it is a profitable investment of the taxpayers' money. The money authorized for the VA direct loan program will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States with interest.

Although at this point in the debate Mr. TEAGUE was anticipating that the Government would hold the loan to maturity, he certainly recognized the fact that many Members of Congress wanted to see the Government get out of the lending business as soon as possible. Subsection (g) of 38 United States Code 1811 provides as follows:

> The Administrator may sell, and shall offer for sale, to any person or entity approved for such purpose by him, any loan made under this section at a price which he determines to be reasonable but not less than 98 per centum of the unpaid principal balance, plus the full amount of accrued interest . . . .

Thus, many years ago, Congress established a policy of encouraging the substitution of private for public capital in loan programs.

At that time, Congress also anticipated the possibility of pooling loans for sale and pooling is the heart of the bill which is before us today. Section 1811(g) provides that—

> If loans are offered to an investor in a package or block of two or more loans no sale shall be made at less than 98 per centum of the aggregate unpaid principal balance of the loans included in such package or block, plus the full amount of accrued interest.

Thus, was the pool of assets concept born. Furthermore, the concept did not contemplate a transfer which would stand on its own feet. The Congress recognized that a Government guarantee would be required. Congress provided for this in section 1811(g) in the following words:

> And the Administrator shall guarantee any loan thus sold subject to the same conditions, terms and limitations which would be applicable were the loan guaranteed under section 1810 of this title.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is designed to apply on a broader scale the very same principles which the Congress adopted many years ago.

I urge the enactment of H.R. 14544.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER].

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of our committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. I think it is sound legislation. It is a reasonable means of converting assets into money, in order that money might be directed to programs that are authorized by the Congress, pursuant to the direction and permission of the appropriations process.

I have listened carefully to the opposition arguments today. And it appears to me there is one ground upon which they base their opposition—one ground that is more important than any other. That is, very simply, that the enactment of this bill will permit the deficit to be reduced—very simply, that the implementation of the participation bill will reduce the deficit of this Government.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Not the total deficit of the Government—the deficit that is subject to debt limitation. But the U.S. Government will still be in the same position.

Mr. WELTNER. The gentleman from Missouri states his contention on the matter. However, the opposition is based on the ground, as is quite clear from the discussion here today, that by converting these assets into cash, we will be able to diminish the impact of what could, without the sale of any assets, be as much as a $6 billion deficit for this year.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If this bill does not pass, what effect will it have on the total deficit for the coming fiscal year—if no action is taken?

Mr. WELTNER. If this bill does not pass, the budget still contains a proposal to dispose of assets, under present programs, in the amount of $2.8 billion. Now, with the passage of this bill, in fiscal year 1967 we can dispose of an additional $1.9 billion.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If this bill does not pass, that portion of the deficit would be financed by bonds sold at a 4.15-percent rate; is that correct?

Mr. WELTNER. I believe that the 4¼-percent bond ceiling has been obsolete for many, many years, because we have been unable to sell long-term bonds at that rate. If I am in error about that, then I would like to be corrected. But it has been my understanding that it has been at least 10 years since we successfully sold a long-term issue with the 4¼-percent bond rate. Consequently, the minority views which state in part that the breaching of the 4¼-percent Government bond ceiling rate as an objection to this is then totally irrelevant. We are not breaching that ceiling rate, because to all intents and purposes that ceiling has been inoperative inasmuch as no issues have been made under that.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in the well is making a very important point and a very true point. The fact is if we do not pass this bill, we will be in the market for short-term Treasury bills at a percentage above the ceiling. The gentleman is exactly right because the money that we will be getting, to the degree that we get any, will be on less than a 5-year maturity.

I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, there has been much talk about "gimmickery," and much opposition raised to this bill on the ground that it is some kind of "gimmick."

I have read the minority views. If there is any gimmickry involved in this legislation, it is the basis of opposition, as discussed in those minority views. For example, if you read the minority views, you will see that there is a quarrel with this bill because, it is charged, that the Postmaster General was present in the hearing room. If that were true, I know not what difference it would make, but it is not the fact. The Postmaster General was not in the hearing room. Here is, at most, some kind of an opposition gimmick.

It is said in these minority views that assets are not sold, they are only refinanced. And here follows a lengthy legalistic viewpoint of what constitutes a sale and what constitutes refinancing. Well, what difference does it make? What difference does it make just how assets be converted into cash, and just where the incidence of title might rest? It makes no difference. And this, too, is a gimmick of opposition.

It is said that a balanced budget can be achieved by bookkeeping, and that is one of the quarrels with this, that a balanced budget can be achieved. It appears to me that that should not be a ground of opposition. That should be a ground of support. How often do we hear from the other side of the aisle the pleas for a balanced budget notwithstanding the biggest budget deficit in the history of the country, some $12 billion, when there was a member of the other party in the White House?

If this is a measure which can balance the budget, why should that not warrant the support of Members of Congress who express such an interest in a balanced budget?

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. I might point out to the gentleman that when we use the term "balanced budget," those of us who favor it, we are speaking of a deficit as an inflation device. In other words, it represents an expenditure of dollars in excess of income. This may balance the administrative budget, but it has absolutely no impact on the reduction of expenditures, this actual cash deficit, the amount of money that is spent in excess of income. That is the difference.

Mr. WELTNER. Is it not money, like any other money, and is it not rather legalistic to say that this is not really money? It is money of the United States Government, and whether it comes from the sale of participation certificates or whether it comes from taxes levied by the Congress, it is still money.

For the life of me, I do not understand these frantic objections to taking assets in a huge and overburdened portfolio, disposing of those in a sound, businesslike manner, and then applying the proceeds to the operations of the U.S. Government. I wonder if the gentleman from Tennessee would suggest, rather than disposing of these assets, that we acquire money in the other way, of raising taxes.

Mr. BROCK. No; I would not.

Mr. WELTNER. I thank the gentleman for that response. I certainly would not, either, and I think that this is an opportunity where we in the Congress can make an orderly, sound, careful, planned disposition of the property of the people of the United States, and devote those proceeds to programs developed for the benefit of the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter that I should like to comment upon briefly, and that is contained in the final section of this act, which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to implement a study, and to submit, within 6 months, legislative proposals which would carry out his recommendations, to changing the lending functions of the Government to a guarantee function.

It has been my view that we should do this insofar as it is possible. The success of the FHA is a strong example of that. Where it is possible, our purpose should be, rather than appropriating money and lending it and selling participations in pools of securities representing those loans, to convert, insofar as possible, to a guarantee program.

I believe this will be a valuable report, and I believe that the adoption of this bill would be an indication on the part of the Members of the Congress that here is a new means whereby we might avoid huge loan portfolios. We might avoid the excessive tying up of the people's money in loan programs, and accomplish the same purpose of making available money to borrowers who need it, and who qualify in accordance with Federal programs.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to express some resentment on the part of the majority that the minority are using the terminology "budget gimmickry."

Mr. WELTNER. Yes; I do object to that term.

Mr. FINO. If it is not budget gimmickry, I would like to know what it is. If we borrow through the Treasury that money, whatever we borrow—the gentleman said before it makes no difference how the money is borrowed, we need the money—either we get it this way or through taxes; is that correct?

Mr. WELTNER. I have yielded to the gentleman. He is making a statement at this point.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I think that the points that have been made by the gentleman from Georgia are very important. The debate on this bill is very important. I am rather disappointed to see the position of the House.

I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I think the Members should be here to hear this colloquy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 104]

Annunzio
Baring
Barrett
Bolling
Broomfield
Broyhill, Va.
Byrne, Pa.
Clark
Colmer
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Dague
Dawson
Dickinson
Downing
Ellsworth
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnum
Flood
Fulton, Pa.
Giaimo
Gilligan
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hawkins
Hébert
Holland
Howard
Jones, Mo.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Leggett
McCarthy
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller
Morgan
Morrison
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen, Mont.
Pool
Powell
Pucinski
Resnick
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Scott
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Stubblefield
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tupper
Watkins
Watson
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. Keogh, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14544, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 356 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, prior to the point of order I had been discussing gimmickry—not the budget gimmickry charged by the minority here, but the gimmickry contained with the opposition to this measure.

I want to point out another factor that comprises this opposition gimmickry. On page 22 of the report, there is in bold, black type this statement: "The debt limit will become meaningless."

Mr. Chairman, anyone who has read this bill knows that it does not amend the legislation that sets the debt limit. It does not affect the ability of the Treasury to borrow money as a direct obligation of the United States. In no way does it affect the debt limit.

It is true that by the sale of participations, which carry with them some contingent liability on the part of the United States, there will be some effect upon the total contingent liability of the Government.

But, Mr. Chairman, if that is to be a reason for opposition, then surely the minority would have to agree that we must put the FHA under the debt limit, and that all insured loans carrying with them the guaranty of the FHA must come within the debt limit.

I have not seen anyone arise on that side of the House to make that suggestion.

So the truth of the matter is that, even on a casual examination, we will see that the debt limit would not become meaningless by this bill.

In fact, the debt limit is not in the slightest affected by this proposal. Were this bill enacted, the debt limit would remain what it is until changed by due process of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Georgia, not only for the statement he has made but also for his being the author of the proposal which puts into the bill a study to be made of this program.

I ask the gentleman this question: Have you not been somewhat surprised that the Republicans have made no reference to the $5.2 billion worth of participation loans that have gone on and that will go on, whether this bill is passed or not?

Mr. WELTNER. I might respond to the gentleman that I have been astounded. In the 88th Congress, when we adopted the conference report on the housing bill, and participation sales were contained therein, there was no cry of "budget gimmickry." In fact, there were over 100 Republican votes supporting that measure.

I have been surprised to see that there has been no reference to any cry of "budget gimmickry" with the adoption of the 1965 housing report in this 89th Congress, wherein the same provisions were made. Certainly there has been no cry of "budget gimmickry" with the sale of $3.3 billion of participations by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, let me say first, in response to the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I do not rise in opposition to this bill because I want a tax increase or for partisan political reasons.

As a matter of fact, I do not rise in opposition to the principle involved in this bill at all. I agree we should mention the fact that we do have participation sales going on today.

If certain amendments are adopted, which would clean up this bill, as the committee should have cleaned it up; if we will take out the loophole providing for a constant revolving fund being allowed to these various agencies outside the authorization limitations placed upon them by the Congress of the United States; if we can put a limit upon the interest rate, so that we will not disrupt the money markets and destroy the housing industry of this country; then I personally agree we should involve free enterprise to the maximum possible degree, and I would support this kind of legislation. I want that to be a part of the Record.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I should like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner] the fact that I believe the Record will show, in 1964, the vote about which he spoke was one in connection with an omnibus housing bill, and the section about which he spoke was never considered in the House of Representatives. There were no hearings on it. It was placed in the bill in the Senate. It came back to the House in a conference report, as a part of the general housing bill.

That is the vote I believe the gentleman spoke about.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WELTNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey is intimating that his colleagues who voted for the bill were unaware of that provision in the bill as contained in the conference report?

Mr. WIDNALL. I would say "yes."

Mr. WELTNER. Was not the gentleman a member of the conference, on the conference committee?

Mr. WIDNALL. If the gentleman will look at the Record, I did not sign the conference report.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I hope my own personal position is somewhat more clear. I do intend to support this bill if we can make it what I consider to be an honest bill. I am not opposed to the principle of maximum free enterprise participation in the money market.

There are certain inconsistencies which have crept into the debate, and which I believe somewhat interesting. I listened to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer], talk about the fact that if we have excess funds today, this would help to sop up those funds, while at the same time the chairman of our Banking Committee says that this will not increase interest costs.

I was interested in the remark that the Republicans were being supported by some rather unusual groups—the ADA, the Farmer's Union, the National Grange, and the AFL–CIO. It is not remarkable to me that we are being supported by any group, rather, I commend them for their intelligence.

I believe it is perhaps more remarkable that the chairman of the committee is supporting the American Bankers Association in this particular instance.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe the gentleman had better take off his list the Farmer's Union and the AFL–CIO. I do not believe they are in opposition to the bill.

As to the ADA, of course that is a rather unusual combination, I will admit.

We are not supporting the bankers so much as they are supporting us, and they are rather consistent in doing that.

Mr. BROCK. Well, we do have an unusual combination. I believe the gentleman will agree to that.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; on both sides.

Mr. BROCK. Of course, the chairman does not often hide his light under a bushel, but, I was fascinated to hear him say that Members of Congress on this bill are relatively inconsistent and though inconsistent, they have been right on each position taken.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am always interested in the remarks of my good friend the chairman of this committee, about how he is joining the bankers or the bankers are joining him. What surprises me is how he has left the small investors and the low interest rates, and joined the big investors in the big money market, with 5½ percent interest rates against 4¼ percent interest rates. I just cannot understand what has happened to the gentleman from Texas. I do not understand it. Perhaps he can explain it.

Mr. BROCK. I share the gentleman's concern.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I shall be delighted to hear an answer.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course I am delighted to help the small business man in the small towns. We are going to do that in the big cities. I would like to help them in the small towns.

Interest rates are not involved in this, regardless of whether they are low or high. The principle here is whether or not we should give the private sector an opportunity to buy these Government securities. Some rates will be high and some will be low, but that is not the principle involved here.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROCK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have some small businessmen in my district, and maybe they are smaller than the small businessmen in the gentleman's district in Texas, but my small businessman, if he wants to buy any Government bonds, will have to get 4¼ percent interest, because I do not have any small businessmen that can go ahead and buy $5,000 participation certificates and get it at 5½ percent. Maybe your small businessmen are wealthy down there. I guess the oil business is down there.

Mr. PATMAN. The small businessmen are not in business as investors. They do not make their money that way. The reason why we have large denominations here is to attract certain funds like pension funds and large corporate funds and funds like that. It is very necessary to do that in order to keep them out of competition with the housing market.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROCK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. My small businessmen are having a little trouble getting by.

Mr. PATMAN. You mean they are having a little trouble getting bonds or getting by?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Getting by in business.

Mr. PATMAN. I thought you said bonds.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If I understand correctly, they will have to pay another 1 percent in the interest rates through the tax window. They are having trouble meeting their taxes and all these things, but they are going to have to make it up through the tax window.

Mr. PATMAN. This does not affect that at all. Besides the additional 1 percent or 1¼ percent that will have to be paid on these participation certificates will be made up two or three times by the taxes they pay which they would not have to pay on Treasury issues, to cities, counties, States, and political subdivisions.

Mr. BROCK. If I may remind the chairman, Treasury does not buy municipal bond issues. People buy those issues.

Mr. MULTER. If the gentleman will yield to me, I will point out some inconsistencies in the colloquy between the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey did say that he did not sign the conference report, but the record shows that he voted for the conference report both in 1964 and 1965.

Mr. BROCK. If we can get back to the topic at hand just briefly, one of the real justifications for this bill and, as a matter of fact, about the only justification for it insofar as the Treasury itself and the administration are concerned is that they are totally unable to put out long-term Government obligations in the market today because we have a legal limit of 4¼ percent on long-term debt. It is an unrealistic limit. That cannot sell bonds at 4¼ percent and consequently they come to the Congress and ask us to provide them with a vehicle for making an end run around the 4¼-percent interest ceiling. It is interesting that the chairman of our committee, who consistently has been for low interest rates and even suggested we lower the long term debt rate, is carrying the ball for the Treasury in an end run around the ceiling on interest which is chargeable on the national debt.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman will also be carrying the ball against increasing the 4¼-percent rate and the gentleman in advocating taking off the ceiling is certainly advocating higher interest rates, I believe.

Mr. BROCK. I am saying to the chairman that we are taking off the ceiling with this bill as it is written without having to face our responsibilities as Members of Congress and facing the problem itself. We are conducting an end run around the law.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, this is not considered a precedent for that, I assure the gentleman. When it is proposed we take the ceiling off the 4¼-percent interest rate we will get the support of the Republican steering committee. We have 100 members on our steering committee from the Democratic side only that will be in opposition to that, and we will do everything we can to defeat it, as we have defeated it twice already in the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. BROCK. In other words, it is fine politically to oppose an increase in the interest rates legally, but it is okay to carry a ball around end and pass a bill that allows the Federal Government to finance its debt at a 5½-percent interest rate when the actual limit, by law, is 4¼ percent.

Is that what the gentleman is saying?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BROCK. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get to the point. What are we doing to the money market? What are we doing to the small homeowners that so many people in this body consistently stand up for? We are taking these participating shares and selling them on the open market, $4.2 billion worth. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] said that this is going to sop up excess funds in the market. Are there excess funds in the market? Are there really excess funds in the market, when today your homeowners cannot buy a house for less than 6½ percent to 6¾ percent interest rates?

Mr. Chairman, what is going to happen to the money market when we go in and sop up more funds and compete to a greater degree, to the extent of $4.2 billion worth, with private financing for these funds?

Mr. Chairman, we are going to force interest costs even higher, to the extent that we will probably increase the cost on housing to the private small homeowner as much as one-half percent?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee concede that practically all of the money that goes into the certificates of deposit, is excess money? That is the kind of money which we are likely to get into these obligations, and money to be used with which to buy these items. We are not looking for the money that is going into the thrift institutions. We are looking toward taking out the excess money going into the CD's.

Mr. BROCK. I do not agree with the gentleman's definition of excess money. Very rarely do I find excess money lying around. I would like to see a lower interest rate. If we had excess money we would have lower interest rates and not higher interest rates.

Mr. MULTER. It is unused funds.

Mr. BROCK. Well, they are not unused funds.

Mr. MULTER. They are lying around when they put them into the CD's. Instead of doing that, one ought to just put them in here?

Mr. BROCK. Why are we trying to compete with CD money? In our committee we have a bill to kill CD's. I am not for it as written, because I believe we can destroy the money market by operating in that fashion. However, that bill to eliminate them was introduced because with 5½-percent interest rates certificates of deposit, by sopping up $17-$18 billion from the money market, are killing savings and loans. Savings and loans must have sufficient funds to loan to the small buyer today. When you issue these participations in this bill at 5½ percent, or 5¾ percent, you are going to pull another $4 billion out of the same market.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, surely the gentleman does not mean that the money which is going into the CD's would go into home loan mortgages?

Mr. BROCK. I do not say that.

Mr. MULTER. That is an entirely different market.

Mr. BROCK. They may not be the same market, but these are dollars which could be spent in that market.

Mr. MULTER. But they are dollars that could be used for that purpose.

Mr. BROCK. They could be in the bank and any number of other financial institutions. They would reinvest them.

Mr. MULTER. But you are trying to reverse the entire lending market because the money that goes into the home loans for mortgages comes out of the thrift institutions.

Mr. BROCK. I am trying to keep you from tearing the dickens out of the whole mortgage market with an increase in interest rates.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to get down to some basic principles. As I understand the certificates of deposits, at least as they work in some New Hampshire banks, this money that goes into a bank via a certificate of deposit—I wonder if I could have the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]?

As I understand it, this money goes into a bank through the vehicle of a certificate of deposit, then goes into the disposable or rather loanable funds of that bank and that bank can then lend that money to construction men for home construction or for a variety of other business uses including mortgage money. That is the way it works in New Hampshire. It that not the way it works countrywise?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer?

Mr. BROCK. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Obviously, the gentleman has his facts confused. Construction money for homes or anything else is short-term money. Mortgages on homes and other buildings such as office buildings constitute long-term money or loans.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Just a minute. The way it works in at least one New Hampshire bank that I can tell you about, when an individual deposits money in that bank through a certificate of deposit that money then is part of the disposable funds of that bank and then the bank can go on and make a loan for a short term or a long term with that money. This is true in New Hampshire and I think it is true in the case of other banks throughout the country. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is in error when he says something that discourages certificates of deposit is not going to cut down on the disposable money that banks have to finance construction, and particularly home financing and construction.

Mr. BROCK. Regardless of whether this bill does or does not affect certificates of deposit, it will result in pulling $4 billion out of the money market. It will be competing for existing funds in the market. That competition obviously will drive interest rates up. There is no question about that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If a man had $5,000 at 5 percent interest in a building and loan association and he can buy $5,000 worth of these participations at 5½ percent interest with the pay guaranteed by the Government; would he not be an idiot to leave the money in the building and loan association paying 5 percent interest? Would that not be taking money out that would otherwise be available for lending?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would say he would be a poor businessman.

Mr. BROCK. Certainly I would consider him an imprudent one.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT].

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there are many things about this that should be discussed. I tried to discuss the question of parliamentary procedure during the discussion on the rule.

It is surprising to me that the Committee on Banking and Currency would permit this bill to be brought to the floor of the House with as little deliberation and as little debate as has been permitted—actually more in the Committee on Rules than in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

But this is only one point that we can consider when we are talking about this bill. Much has been said about trying to get more money in the private sector and trying to help the private sector. But actually I think we are confusing the situation. There is not going to be any more money provided for the private sector. The same people and the same businessmen and the same investors are going to be investing in these participations as would be investing in Treasury certificates or loans of the Small Business Administration. I think we are fooling ourselves if we think this is going to be providing new money or trying to help the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, another point of great confusion in this bill is the question of the guarantee of participations to be sold by FNMA. The agency is required to guarantee loans pooled with FNMA as trustee. On page 5 of the bill, lines 1 to 8, we find authority that the pooling agency or trustor, if required to make good on its guarantee, may use "any appropriated funds and other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to trust are related." That is certainly throwing the credit of the United States back of the agency's guarantee although it is true, to make good on the guarantee might take an appropriation by the Congress.

While this guarantee is good and effective, it apparently was not good enough for Wall Street bond counsel. So they came up with another form of Government guarantee which appears on page 5 of the bill beginning with the line type text on line 9 and carries over to page 6, line 8. This was replaced with a so-called committee amendment adding paragraphs 4 and 5 on pages 6 and 7 of the bill. I urge you to read both the stricken and the substitute language carefully. Although Wall Street bond counsel language protects Wall Street underwriters completely, it does violence to the whole appropriation process of the Congress.

For whom are we legislating—Wall Street investment bankers, or the people? I think it is important that the Congress protect its own prerogatives.

The language to which I have just referred is the second guarantee or "pound of flesh" exacted by Wall Street bond counsel. If this language is allowed to remain in the bill, in effect, you will have an absolute Treasury backing of the agency's guarantee even though the language does not say that the obligations will be guaranteed by the Treasury and therefore by the United States.

But two guarantees are not even enough. There is still a third guarantee. This arises from the fact that, when FNMA sells participations for the account of an agency, FNMA itself will guarantee principal and interest on the participations sold even though they be sold for the benefit of another agency. Each certificate sold bears FNMA's guarantee endorsement. That "guarantee endorsement" will be made good by FNMA if called upon to do so, by FNMA borrowing whatever funds might be necessary from the U.S. Treasury. FNMA has unlimited backdoor borrowing authority from the U.S. Treasury to meet any or all principal or interest payments due on any participation certificates it sells.

A week ago, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] put into the RECORD a copy of the prospectus with reference to the most recent sale by FNMA of $410 million of participation certificates. This appears in the RECORD of May 9, 1966, beginning on page 10033. Notice the "Guarantee of payments due" section. Notice the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury in which he states that FNMA may properly borrow funds to make good its guarantee and that the Treasury Department will make loans to the Association "to enable the Association to meet its guarantee of the payment of principal and interest on the participation certificates." Note please that FNMA has agreed with the underwriters that in the event it is called upon to make good its guarantee of the principal and interest on the certificates, it will apply to the Treasury Department of the United States for a loan or loans in amounts sufficient to make payments of principal and interest on participations sold.

How many "pounds of flesh" do the Wall Street bankers have to have? What does the second guarantee I just mentioned add to the guarantee by FNMA? Both rely on the withdrawal of funds from the U.S. Treasury without any further congressional action. The second guarantee embraced in paragraph 5, appearing in italic print on pages 6 and 7 of the bill, simply is not needed. Not only is it not needed, it is most undesirable because it does such violence to the appropriation procedures of the Congress. I have no doubt that bond counsel would stoutly insist that the second guarantee, from their point of view, is desirable. But the facts prove otherwise and we are dealing with fact and not theory. FNMA has already sold $1.6 billion of participation certificates for its own account and the Veterans' Administration, based solely on Treasury borrowing authority to support FNMA's own guarantee. Wall Street bond counsel could argue until it was blue in the face that the second guarantee was needed but on the record and on the facts, this just is not so. Two all-inclusive Treasury guarantees add nothing to one all-inclusive Treasury guarantee. The controversial Treasury guarantee set up in subparagraph 5, appearing on pages 6 and 7 of the bill, should be stricken from the bill. This is the most practical way of eliminating this confusion in this bill.

The fact is that the guarantees make these participations salable—not the loans which are pooled.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have more time available, I would like to yield to two or three Members in succession. First, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI].

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and urge its enactment.

The marketability of pooled Federal assets underlies the success of the participation sales technique.

The marketability is enhanced to considerable extent by the participation instrument itself—the share in the pool which the private investor buys. Compared with Federal loans sold directly to an investor, the participation share is a much more flexible instrument. This makes it more ready salable at lower interest rates.

The participation technique, in effect, converts obligations which have a relatively narrow market acceptability to obligations which have broad marketability. These obligations are attractive to a wide variety of purchasers: banks, insurance companies, pensions funds, and other institutional investors.

The Federal National Mortgage Association—Fannie Mae—has already gained broad market acceptance for the participations it has been selling under authority granted in the 1964 and 1965 Housing Acts. Thus, there is already a strong foundation to build on.

In contrast, when loans are sold directly, the market is sometimes limited to investors who have some direct knowledge of, or some related interest in, the particular program under which the loans were made. Because of market unfamiliarity the spectrum of investors is relatively narrow and, hence, the interest rate is likely to be relatively high.

The strongest foundation under the participation shares, of course, is the guarantee. This is how the guarantee would work:

Under the legislation as it now stands, each agency pooling its loan would be required to guarantee its pooled obligations to Fannie Mae. This requirement protects Fannie Mae and places the primary responsibility for the loans where it belongs—with the lending agency—where it is now.

The record of borrowers in their repayment of Federal loans is a very good one. Consequently, the risk borne by the lending agency is not necessarily a great one.

Further, the bill would permit the lending agency to draw out of the pool any loan in default or likely to default. Thus, the lending agency would substitute good paper for bad paper if any developed. The lending agency would fulfill its guarantee, when necessary, by using any appropriated or other funds available for the general purposes of programs under which the loans are originally made.

Because of the right of substitution and the lending agency guarantee, it is not anticipated that either Fannie Mae's guarantee of the participations or Fannie Mae's drawing rights on the Treasury would be used. Further, Fannie Mae could not draw on the Treasury in any way to increase its programs or those of participating agencies.

The purpose of the Fannie Mae guarantee and drawing authority would be to provide additional safeguards which would help to assure the most favorable market reception for the participation certificates and hold down the interest rates at which they could be sold.

It has been my intention to make a factual and informative—rather than an argumentative—statement. The facts are usually the best argument.

The facts answer any question about the marketability of participations. The facts provide the answer to veiled allegations about loss of control or of the effectiveness of Federal credit programs.

Perhaps the most important job the facts do in this case is to answer insinuations about misuse of Fannie Mae or its guarantee or its drawing rights on the Treasury. This legislation provides more than ample protection to the investors, the borrowers under Federal credit programs, to Fannie Mae and to the lending agencies, and to the taxpayers. That's why it has my support.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, the hopes of nearly 5 million small businessmen throughout America are riding on the passage of H.R. 14544.

For many small businessmen, the outcome of this legislation may well determine their future. It is no secret that the small businessman would be virtually without sources of finance if it were not for the Small Business Administration. We have seen great evidence of this since October 1965, when the Small Business Administration was forced to curtail its lending programs because of lack of funds. The small businessman when he is in need of capital cannot go to the bank and arrange adequate financing, nor can he go to the public for a stock offering. While commercial banks have helped small business to some extent in this country, many banks are extremely leery of making loans to small enterprises, and other banks refuse to even accept loan applications from small businessmen. In this type of environment, in order for small businesses to survive, the Small Business Administration must have adequate loan funds on hand at all times.

Congress could handle this problem by granting the agency a blank check authorization. This would mean that the agency could make as many loans as it wished and would stockpile these loans for 20 and, perhaps, 30 years until repayment. This is basically the method in which the agency is operating at the present time. There have been some direct sales of SBA loans to institutional investors, but these programs have been far too small and far too ineffective. In many cases where SBA was able to sell a loan, the sale was contingent upon SBA maintaining servicing of the loan.

There is a far more reasonable and effective method for financing the Small Business Administration. I, of course, refer to the legislation before this body today, the Sales Participation Act of 1966. No longer would SBA have to stockpile billions of dollars worth of loans for periods up to 30 years. Under H.R. 14544, the agency would be able to pool these loans whenever a substantial amount had accumulated, and through a trustee, such as Federal National Mortgage Association, sell shares in the pool.

If the Participation Sales Act becomes law, it is estimated that during fiscal 1966, SBA will sell some $350 million worth of loans. This figure is the amount estimated for the agency's lending programs during fiscal 1967. It is further estimated that during fiscal 1967, the agency will sell nearly $200 million worth of loans, an amount estimated to handle loan transactions in the fiscal year. There will still be a few million dollars worth of loans left on the agency's books. However, these are loans of short maturities in which the agency would receive more financial benefit if it waited for the full payoff, rather than selling these loans. In addition, if the short-term maturity loans were placed in a long-term pool, they would have to be substituted in the pool when they reached their maturity.

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that we have a chance to look into the future to see the effects of a piece of pending legislation. However, in this case we do have that privilege. The Federal National Mortgage Association has been selling participation pools since 1964, and I am certain every Member of this body recognizes the tremendous boost that this has given the housing and home buying industry. Passage of H.R. 14544 will provide the same benefits to small business.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge this body to adopt H.R. 14544 to put small business in America back on its feet.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman for yielding this this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress from the great State of Iowa, one of the most agricultural of all the States in this Nation, I urge all who have the most basic of our industries, that of agriculture, at heart, to support the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

This measure will in no way jeopardize any of the Government lending programs that exist today, that involve the farm families. This act will provide for an expansion of a tried and true method of financing through the use of an increased portion of private funds in the necessary and needed function of direct loan financing programs by the Federal Government.

FNMA has a long history of success in this field of operations. It is interesting to note that it has poured an unprecedented amount of money into the housing mortgage market during the first quarter of this year through its buying of Government-backed mortgages from private lending institutions. The amount of this activity is approximately $800 million, almost double the rate of the previous high quarter.

Mr. Chairman, the record clearly shows that FNMA has met with great success in having provided for a flow of funds between lenders and borrowers, sellers and purchasers.

The provisions included under this bill would enlist private financial resources in the participation pool to be established. It would continue a function which has already been started, and has proven its worth.

The passage of this bill, I might add, would do for the direct loan market and the direct loan program, that which has occurred in the insured loan field.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill. I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I recall the years of my youth on a Minnesota farm, when a familiar sight was a team of horses pulling the farm equipment. A horse is an animal that is easily startled. He shies away from sudden noises and is distracted by movements about him. To keep him calm, we used to put blinders on him so that he could only see what was straight ahead. There was still plenty of activity going on around the horses, but they were only aware of what they saw up front.

It occurs to me that the bill before us today constitutes a set of blinders for the American public. John Q. Citizen has become a bit skittish lately after too many years of deficit spending and rising national debt. He started to shy away from the sudden movements about him that indicate another round of wild and uncontrolled spending of his hard-earned money. This administration does not plan to curtail any of its spending schemes, but it would like the public to quit asking so many questions. Therefore, this plan before us today, to permit the sale of participations in Government agency loan pools, was put forth as the "blinder" to fool the public on budget expenditures. It is a gimmick to permit a continuance of wild spending, but the public will not see all of it reflected in the budget. Actually, this bill would render the budget useless.

Even the title of this bill is a misnomer, because nothing is actually sold. What really happens is that pooled assets are merely refinanced in a more costly way because the Federal National Mortgage Association cannot borrow as cheaply as the U.S. Treasury.

I wish to commend the 10 gentlemen who dissented when this bill came before the committee for their pertinent and wise views as stated in the minority report. I hope every Member of the House has read these views. I will not repeat the contents of those minority views except to note the conclusion that—

> This bill offers a cheap budgetary way to circumvent the statutory debt and interest limits, while lulling the people into thinking that the millennium has arrived. But while budget-conscious Americans may be fooled, they will pay dearly.

This hastily conceived legislation opens Pandora's box of evils that will make budgeting a mockery and devious spending a way of life. If a private corporation tried such a scheme, its officers would soon be thrown into jail.

Once initiated there would be no end to this form of budget maneuvering. The $4.2 billion involved this year would be only the beginning, since Uncle Sam owns $33.1 billion of financial assets. By pooling these for participation sales and by the miracles of bookkeeping, we might even reduce the national debt and eliminate annual deficits. At least that is how it would look to the public. The truth, of course, is that the Nation would still be just as far in debt and the taxpayers would actually pay more for the use of the borrowed money.

It is hoped that this Congress will take another long look at the proposal before us and not hurl the Nation in an uncharted direction. The consequences of this legislation are far too important and far reaching to rush it through the Congress. Let us take our own blinders off and witness the dangers around us.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, my friend from California the other day said we would probably have some charges of gimmickry in this bill. I do not want to disappoint him. I am going to make some charges of gimmickry in the bill. From the standpoint of fiscal responsibility in budget and debt management policy, I think it is unfortunate that we have H.R. 14544 before us today. It does violence to my longstanding advocacy of eliminating all gimmickry from the budget process and it authorizes additional nonessential debt service burdens which we can ill afford under the war and inflationary situations now existing.

H.R. 14544 anticipates sales in fiscal 1967 of $4.2 billion of participation certificates covering pooled financial assets of the U.S. Government. The proceeds from these participation certificate sales will be netted into the administrative budget as reductions in spending rather than increases in receipts.

Of course, there is nothing new in that procedure since it is one the Government has followed for a good many years with respect to revolving funds. The fact that this practice has been followed over the years does not make it a correct or desirable one. In my opinion, the use of receipts to offset expenditures distorts the record of budget spending and lulls the uninitiated into a feeling of false security that the budget deficit is modest and Federal spending is still within the realm of reason.

If Congress should refuse to authorize these participation sales, the budget deficit for 1967 would be $6 billion instead of the $1.8 billion, which has received such acclaim from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

An additional bit of undesirable gimmickry that will result from enactment of this bill is the fact that the public debt, which now stands at the astronomical level of $320 billion, will not be increased by the additional Federal spending that will be financed by the participation sales. Under existing law, the obligations of the Federal National Mortgage Association are carried outside the public debt limit and the debt that will be incurred by FNMA through these participation sales will also be outside the public debt limit.

It has been agreed by everyone concerned with H.R. 14544 that the bill will force the Government's interest costs to rise. This is occasioned by the fact that the loan assets to be pledged in the participation certificates bear low interest rates that must be materially increased in the participation certificates if the certificates are to have any market value. That increased interest cost will constitute a budget expenditure.

The Government, through FNMA, must also guarantee the interest payment and the return of principal to investors in these certificates. To the extent that the original loans go sour, and some of them will, then we shall incur further budget expense for the defaulted principal and interest due on those loans.

Now, I ask you, Is it not pure unadulterated gimmickry when the Federal Government—

First, sells a participation certificate with a guaranteed interest and principal return;

Second, retains title to the pledged loan asset which must be serviced until maturity just as the participation certificate must be serviced;

Third, uses the proceeds from the participation certificate sales for additional lending but treats their receipt as a reduction of budget expenditures; and

Fourth, in effect, still has a full faith and credit obligation to pay the principal amount of the participation certificate and the interest thereon, but does not have to treat that obligation as a part of the regular public debt?

If the Government wants to unload these loan assets, would it not be the better part of wisdom to discount them down to their market value, sell them outright, and take the financial beating that would result from having invested in questionable loan assets in the first place?

If it does not want to unload them and is convinced that eventually most of the loans will be repaid with interest, then why do our Federal money managers not go into the marketplace and borrow through the usual procedures, the funds that are absolutely essential for operation of the Government?

This bill will in no wise help to get the Federal Government out of the lending business. To the contrary, it will help expand our lending activities and will take us more deeply into the morass of budget and debt deception.

Mr. Chairman, since it is apparent that the administration considers enactment of this bill one of its program musts, I shall, at the appropriate time, offer two amendments which I feel will materially improve the bill and which will help to protect the Appropriations Committee's subsequent interest and responsibility with respect to its provisions.

The first amendment will continue as does the bill, to provide for indefinite appropriations to finance the insufficiencies that will occur from time to time; but it will eliminate the triggering device which automatically establishes appropriations on the books of the Treasury with which to pay insufficiencies when they arise. The elimination of the automatic trigger will get all of the facts with respect to insufficiencies out on the table for initial review by the Appropriations Committees and the Congress.

The second amendment will provide for the submission of business-type budgets in connection with the academic facilities revolving fund which is authorized in the bill.

Both of these amendments constitute desirable improvements in the bill and since they do no violence to the bill's general provisions, I do hope that they will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you. I have great respect for the gentleman, but I am at a loss to understand why the gentleman made the statement he did with respect to limitations and restrictions when he voted, as the record discloses, in 1964 for an identical proposal without any restrictions or limitations. That is on the conference report on housing.

Mr. BOW. I will explain to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Just a moment.

Mr. BOW. I refuse to yield any further. I find myself somewhat in the same position the gentleman is in today. Perhaps in 1964 I had been a little misled, as apparently the gentleman was. Over the years that I have been a Member of this Congress, which is about 16 or 18 years, I have always found the gentleman opposed to high interest rates—sort of after the bankers and bondholders. Now I find him today with a bill very much in their favor. So you may be surprised, Mr. Chairman, at my vote in 1964 compared to my feelings today, but I may say also that I am surprised to find the chairman in the position he is in.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, the gentleman is wrong in saying that I am for high interest rates. High interest rates are not involved here. But even if I am wrong, what justification is that for the gentleman to be wrong?

Mr. BOW. We are always in the position where we have a right to be wrong occasionally, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. BOW. I am not sure what the vote is and what the bill is that the gentleman is talking about. I am sure he is reading the record correctly. I would not question it, but I am sure we all find ourselves at times in this position. May I say perhaps over the years, being here and listening to the discussions of others, I have perhaps found the folly of my ways.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BOW. I shall accept the additional time, and shall not walk away.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I would like to clarify the record a little bit with respect to the Small Business Administration.

The gentleman from New Jersey merely spoke about the fact that this is going to provide help for the small businessman and save the small businessman who has been in such dire straits, because the Small Business Administration had run out of funds. The Small Business Administration ran out of funds because they refused to request from the Congress additional funds with which to meet the needs of the program.

It had $30 million in authorizations, and still has that amount which can be utilized and which could have been utilized in order to take care of their needs. But, this was an administration decision. This bill is not needed in order to save the Small Business Administration.

Mr. BOW. I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I happen to be on the subcommittee that appropriates funds for the Small Business Administration. No request was made. The fact of the matter is that they delayed the naming of a Director for months and months and months, and if there is any responsibility for the fact that there are no funds for small business, that responsibility is down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that if we did not have the problem with the national debt ceiling 7 years ago, the Democrats might have been for a bill at that time. Likewise, if we did not have a problem with the national debt ceiling this year, probably the Republicans would be in favor of the program. I believe this is the problem. And, unfortunately, we have each been looking at this in our own partisan way—how were we then going to embarrass the other party, by making them raise the debt. When we look at it this year, the Republicans say, now are we going to embarrass the other party, by making them raise the national debt?

Mr. Chairman, if we look at the overall program and not worry about its effect upon the national debt, because it does not amount to that much one way or the other, I believe one can see some of the support which the Eisenhower administration gave it one year and the support which the present administration gives it this year, which is, what is an essentially good concept in the national handling of the debt.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about money that the Government of the United States owes, owes all of us who own a piece of this debt.

Mr. Chairman, we have two kinds of debt. One is a debt that is in terms of deficits that we might develop each year, because we do not have enough tax revenue to cover our expenditures. The other type of debt is when you lend Government credit to Federal agencies for specific lending programs. We have a lot of them such as the Export-Import Bank, the Veterans' Administration, FNMA, the Small Business Investment Corporation, the Farmers Home Administration, the Office of Education for College Housing. All of these are programs, more or less, where the Government will tell someone, "All right, we will guarantee you so that you can buy a house at this lower percentage of interest, and then we will take this debt and fund it."

Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do here is to take the overall debt of the Government of the United States and separate it into other specific types of debt. The debt covered by participation certificate represents the part of the debt which is owed by the debtor and not the overall taxpayer; but the individual debtor such as the small businessman who borrows money or the farmer or the exporter. We are, more or less, separating it from general obligation Government debt. You might compare here the difference between a general obligation bond and the revenue bond. The revenue concept type of debt does not belong in the national debt, because pledged behind that is the obligation of the homeowner and the farmer and the exporter to pay this debt. If they do not pay it, there is a Government guarantee. If they default, the Government will come up with the money.

You know, Mr. Chairman, we are going to have a lot more of this type of debt, because if you look at the new programs, especially in the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, you can see that there is this concept where we loan money at low interest rates, to local governments, money to colleges for dormitories, and money for facilities. This is the type of financing that Congress seems to like, because this means that local governments and agencies can run their own program, and I feel that is best.

What we are trying to do is to try to differentiate one type of debt from another. I think it is about time we did because the revenue concept of debt does not belong to or tie in with the general obligation type of government debt.

There are two questions that I think are very important. We talk about this problem of competition. Now if we are going to sell $4.2 billion worth of this new participation pool, what is this going to mean? Is this going out to compete against the savings and loans or banks? Is this new debt? No, it is not. The $4.2 billion has been already voted by the Congress in program authorizations. We are going to have to finance this anyway whether with regular Treasury notes or with these participation certificates.

I asked the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Barr, if these participation certificates were put into the money market; would this not drain funds from other types of financing such as mortgages, consumer credit, or business expansions, or other types of money that was needed for the general economy? His answer was "No."

If you look at the institutions that will buy this instrument, you will find they will tend to be pension funds or insurance companies, and other types of institutions. This is the type of instrument they like to buy.

Another question is, will this necessarily raise interest rates? No, the certificates will not necessarily raise interest rates.

In February of this year, SBIC issued some debentures called section 302 debentures. These were sold as a separate issue on the market guaranteed by Uncle Sam. We find that these went to a net of 6 percent. I asked Mr. Barr:

> If you had the right to put this in a pool with a lot of other types of debt; what do you think the interest rate would have been?

He said:

> The interest rate would probably be about one-half point less.

In this one case, say on a $100 million sale of debentures, if there were a pooling and they were sold in a sophisticated manner by the Treasury, who must look at the overall economy, I think we would find there would have been a saving of something like $500,000 in the interest cost on this type of transaction.

You are going to find some cases where the interest will go up. In other cases, the interest will go down. I think in terms of debt management of the Federal Government of the United States, you are going to find that with this type of pooling, the Treasury will have more control in the handling of long-term and short-term money and will be able to aid the financing of the Government of the United States far better than they have been.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. In view of the fact that you seem to indicate that there just seems to be Republican opposition to this bill, I would like to ask you this question. Is the National Farmers Union, the Grange, the American Farm Bureau, the Americans for Democratic Action and other groups—are they all part of the Republican apparatus? They have indicated strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. REES. Well, I am rather surprised that the Americans for Democratic Action seem to be moving more and more over to your side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this legislation will forward the desirable objective of substituting private for public credit.

For many years the Federal Government has carried on many lending programs to finance essential activities.

These loan programs have been financed by direct appropriations.

We are all familiar with the various Federal credit programs to help the farmer, the businessman, the homebuyer, the veteran, students in college, and others through Federal loan programs. These loan programs currently exceed $33 billion.

What we are attempting to do here is to sell some of these Federal loans and sell "participations" in pools of loans to private investors. The substitution of private for public credit is a recognized, sound method of financing. This proposition is not new or novel. It has been carried on by a number of agencies for a number of years. By this act we will be extending the principle to include additional types of loans. The substitution of private for public credit has advantages.

It makes effective use of the taxpayers dollar;

It offers private investors and opportunity for sound investment and a fair return;

It benefits business and those of our citizens helped by these programs;

It insures the Government the best possible return on the sale of financial assets;

It provides private investors with widely accepted and highly desirable assets;

It reaches sources of capitol which are not otherwise available and the sales will be handled by a centralized agency—expert in handling these sales—the Federal National Mortgage Association;

And, finally, there will be a diminishing demand for direct appropriations while the Appropriations Committee controls the amounts of participations which will be sold.

The Congress, through the Appropriations Committee, will have an annual review of this matter.

This act provides that, in all cases, the Appropriations Committee must authorize in advance the amounts of participations which can be sold against the Government's assets.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is needed legislation—it is desirable legislation—I support the Sales Participation Act and urge its passage.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. WIDNALL. You mentioned the figure of $725 million that the President used in a recent White House signing ceremony. Is it not true that only about $175 million or $185 million of that has been authorized through the Banking

Currency Committee, and when he uses that figure, does it not mean that from now on the Banking and Currency Committee will be bypassed with respect to any future authorization?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. My remarks were addressed to the loan program of the Small Business Administration. It is possible that there may be additional authorizing for various other agencies of the government. But the SBA has $1.5 billion in loans outstanding at this time, and when these loans are sold, then the fund, as the gentleman knows, goes into the revolving fund, and the loan program can be resumed. There is a great demand for this loan program to be resumed. I am not sure about all the authorizations, but I was directing my remarks to the Small Business Administration in particular.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Sales Participation Act legislation under consideration by the House today.

This proposal has stirred much controversy and is a new departure in Federal financial planning.

The proposal of the administration to sell shares in Government loans, in my opinion, extends tremendous advantage to the larger private investors of the Nation and certainly discriminates quite effectively against the best interests of the little fellow who buys savings bonds at a much lower interest rate from the Government.

I concur wholeheartedly with the observation of the New York Post of April 25, 1965, which points out that if the Congress OK's the plan, private lenders could pocket over $100 million of extra earnings of the next 2 years—courtesy of the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, the real bonanza and benefit of this proposal accrues to the large financial investors such as banks, insurance companies and pension funds who will be earning premium interest from one-fourth to one-half of 1 percent above regular Government funds.

At current interest rates that means that these well-heeled financial interests would be getting a rate of 5½ percent on their investment with all of the work and worry taken care of by softhearted Uncle Sam.

I am convinced beyond a doubt that the primary purpose of this legislation is to cut down on the executive budget deficit. While that might be a very meritorious objective for those of us who sit on this side of the aisle, I do not feel that it is sufficiently valid reason for overlooking the fact that these actual loans that will be sold to private interests will still belong to the Federal agencies which will do all the work of collecting, paying and foreclosing on defaulters, and so forth.

I am very impressed by the figure of estimate which indicates that if the additional interest were to rise to three-fourths of 1 percent, the cost of benefit to these well-heeled financial interests could extend to the level of $132 million in the first 2 years of the program alone.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the Sales Participation Act proposal has not taken into account the serious effect the impact this bill would have upon the national mortgage market.

I do concur wholeheartedly with the observation made here today that FHA and VA insured mortgages would decline by reason of the fact that applicants can get a preferred rate of interest from the Federal National Mortgage Association.

This legislation confers no benefit upon those in greatest need for mortgage financing but seems to me would be a proposal and "gimmick" worked out by the Director of the Budget to mask over and cloud the real picture concerning our Nation's financial affairs.

I urge the defeat of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER]

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14544, the Sales Participation Act of 1966. Without relinquishing congressional control of Federal spending, this legislation would authorize participation of private capital in Government loan programs.

The concept of encouraging private capital to participate in the loan programs of Government agencies is not a new one. The experience gained in 1965 from the sale of $925 million in direct loans and accounts by the Veterans' Administration has been successful. The net result has been beneficial and of great importance to thousands of veterans who were able to receive Government loans without the need for additional congressional appropriations. The participation sales approach has also proved successful in connection with recent programs involving the FHA and Export-Import loans.

I am particularly interested in this legislation because of the effect of the present moratorium on direct small business loans by the Small Business Administration. The moratorium was imposed last year following the extensive damage to small businesses by Hurricane Betsy, resulting in a depletion of the SBA's disaster loan fund. This legislation would create a pool of Government loans, provide private capital to improve the asset sales program, and reduce the number of outstanding loans which the Government now carries.

I support this measure and believe it would result in the lifting of the moratorium on SBA loans, assisting thousands of small businesses in the United States which seek to expand and avail themselves of the services and programs of the Small Business Administration.

First. Some who oppose this bill claim that the sale of participation certificates would adversely affect the mortgage market.

Fact: The potential market for participation certificates extends across the whole capital market, including investors who ordinarily are not mortgage investors. If mortgages were sold directly, as urged by the minority during the House hearings, the market would be limited to regular mortgage lenders, and such sales would, therefore, be directly competitive with new mortgages.

If participation certificates are not sold, the Treasury will have to issue additional obligations in the same amount. Consequently, the sale of participation certificates will not have the effect of increasing total Federal demands on the capital market.

Moreover, Federal borrowing would have to be concentrated in the shorter maturities, and this could compete with construction financing.

The existing authority of VA to sell participations, seems to refute this argument.

Second. Others who oppose this bill claim this program will be a "windfall for the fat cats," and refer to "an unusually high return."

Fact: No one has denied that the participation certificates will cost one-fourth to three-eighths percent more than direct Treasury obligations of comparable maturities. But the Treasury can now borrow only in the short end of the market where rates are high, while the participation certificates can be sold in the longer-term area where rates are lower. It may cost something more overall to sell participation certificates, but the difference will be small.

It is hard to determine the standard of measurement, when the rates are competitively determined by the market. Moreover, the participation certificates will have fixed maturities, and the purchaser will not be insulated against fluctuations in market price. The saver who purchases E bonds or deposits his funds in a savings or share account can get his money back on demand without any worry about changes in market prices.

Third. Others say the cost will be $44 million to $132 million over the next 2 years.

Fact: The budget estimates for FNMA participation sales are $1,660 million in fiscal 1966 and $3,230 million in fiscal 1967, a total of $4,890 million. Assuming an interest differential of one-fourth of 1 percent, the additional cost would be only $4 million in fiscal 1966 and $12 million in fiscal 1967. This is a total of $16 million for the 2 years; $16 million—or $24 million if the cost difference is three-eighths of 1 percent—is a small price to pay for encouraging private participation in these programs and releasing the nearly $5 billion of Federal funds raised from taxation or Treasury borrowing, which is now sterilized in the agency portfolios.

Other opponents of the measure have argued that the sale of participation certificates would adversely affect the mortgage market. This is not the case for even if certificates were not sold, the Treasury would have to issue additional obligations in the same amount. Consequently, the sale of participation certificates will not have the effect of increasing total Federal demands on the capital market.

Pension funds which presently do not buy mortgages, do invest in corporate bonds and common stocks, would now be able to buy these participation certificates. They would thus join our banks and insurance companies traditional investors in Government securities and bring vast sums to the money market.

I support this legislation and remind my colleagues that the concept of asset sales was developed as a bipartisan program under President Eisenhower's administration. H.R. 14544 will strengthen this program and retain the congressional control over agency appropriations and the pool of assets to be sold. I urge my colleagues to add their support to this measure.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask if the other side will use some of their time because we have only one more speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes on the floor under a good label, a label indeed which the Republicans have supported and advocated for years; namely, substituting private investment for public, but that is just about as far as it goes.

The issue is over what else has been put into this bottle under the label.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], certainly put his finger right on it. This is an attempt to make an end run around the 4¼-percent interest ceiling on the Federal debt. The Ways and Means Committee, my committee, will start hearings next week on the Federal debt. The gentleman from Texas has said that he has 100 people on his side lined up to vote against increasing or removing the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term obligations, that is, Government Bonds, beyond 5 years. Because that ceiling is on, the Government has not been able to market long-term bonds.

The gentleman from Georgia, by the way, is certainly uninformed on the subject of debt management and sales because we have been successful—this administration and the previous administrations—in marketing long-term bonds within the interest ceiling.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman, as I recall, said that we had not sold any for 10 years. I had a check made to find out when we last did. Just to set the record straight, on May 15 of last year we sold $2 billion of 9-year bonds at a rate of 4¼ percent. In January of last year we sold $4.3 billion 5-year-and-1-month bonds, at a rate of between 4.16 percent and 4.18 percent.

Also, even in our short-term notes—the last short-term issue of longer than 3 years, which was on February 15—when we sold $7,680 million of 4-year-and-9-month notes, the rate at that time was 5 percent. But, just to keep the record straight, there have been certainly some sales. We have not been deadlocked for the last 10 years.

Mr. CURTIS. I asked the gentleman from Georgia to yield at that point when he was discussing this. He refused. This has been too often the tenor of debates on the floor of the House. In order not to have the remarks of those who might rebut what the person is saying, the person speaking refuses to yield.

Right now the Government bonds beyond 5 years are actually selling at a yield of about 4.7 or 4.8. In other words, they are being discounted. But the Federal Government itself cannot market long-term bonds because of this interest ceiling.

What I was about to say is that those who have been calling this bill a sham, I believe have been doing so with reason, the reason being that the attempt here is to seem not to be increasing interest rates in marketing Government securities when, as a matter of fact, that is exactly what is being done.

There may be 100 votes, or the whole Democratic Party may vote against increasing the interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds, but if they vote for this bill they are just as surely increasing the amount of interest that the Federal Government must pay, and it will be beyond the 4¼-percent ceiling. This is the shame part of this operation.

There is a second sham part of this operation, which has to do with another ceiling, which the Ways and Means Committee will be confronted with in our hearings next week, the ceiling imposed upon the amount of the Federal debt.

The gentleman from California made a very fine statement in analyzing the two different aspects of Federal debt. I think he was in error in putting this dispute on the basis of partisanship, because there are many Democrats, I am happy to say, who share our views on this—not just the ADA Democrats, but some of the conservatives who have not lost sight of the essential picture here.

The gentleman was right in pointing out that there are two aspects of the Federal debt. One is subject to the debt ceiling, and involves the full faith and credit of the United States, per se. The other part, which he pointed out, has to do with the kinds of securities, or the lending of money which is secured in another way. It is that kind of debt which becomes very important in our considerations here.

And this kind of debt is divided into two parts. One kind of debt is that which is marketable, because it has interest rates that are in conformity with the market demands, and those securities are being sold now. I am happy they are.

This is the kind which the debaters on the Democratic side said we have not heard much about. The Government has been selling some of these securities. Indeed they have and I certainly have pointed it out continually and urged that the administration continue to sell them.

Those they can sell because the lending has been done with a conformity to the cost demand in the marketplace for interest. They can do that.

The subsidy aspect of this bill relates to those Government securities pegged at 2 percent or 3 percent, on unrealistic interest rate as far as the marketing end is concerned. For good or ill, wisely or unwisely, we have decided to subsidize in these lending areas, and it is these kinds of securities, that are being put into this pool, which cannot be sold in the market unless we appropriate more money to pay the going interest rates.

Here is one of the differences between the Republican advice and the advice that is incorporated in this bill. Furthermore, if these moneys realized from the sale of these capital assets were used to reduce the Federal debt under the ceiling, this would be fine.

Actually, when the proposal is merely to shift financing from one form of debt which is subject to a debt ceiling to another form which is not subject to a debt ceiling, and when it has with it the implications of further appropriations to be financed by more debt that would be subject to the debt ceiling—we have this kind of poor advice which is being given in this bill.

I would remind the Members the essentiality of what is the Republican advice. This should not be just "Republican" because, Lord bless us, there are many Democrats in this body who have demonstrated by their votes and by their speeches that they also feel the real course of action should be to get our expenditures down to within our means.

This is the real recommendation from our side of the aisle, get expenditures down.

Yes, we can continue to substitute private lending for public, but we should do it on a straightforward basis. Above all, when we are trying to handle the difficult problems of debt management, do not "kid" the public—I hope you do not get away with it—by saying this is holding to low interest rates. Come forthrightly forward and let the Federal Treasury market this debt with efficiency, and remove the 4¼-percent ceiling so that they can save the taxpayers some money, rather than just monetizing the debt in the way they must market it in short-term issues.

NEGOTIABLE CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT ISSUED BY MONEY MARKET BANKS CAUSE HIGHER INTEREST ON U.S. TREASURY SECURITIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it was long ago predicted that high rates on time deposits offered corporations by commercial banks would seriously interfere with the Treasury bill market and most likely lead to higher interest costs and contribute to deficits in the Federal budget.

For instance, Gov. J. L. Robertson, of the Federal Reserve Board, in his December 1956 dissent in the Federal Reserve Board's decision to increase regulation Q observed:

> Finally, it should be noted that if the ceilings are raised sufficiently to be effective, they will enable commercial banks to attract funds now invested in Government securities—short-term and long-term. This may have a detrimental effect on the Government securities market and even lead to higher levels of interest rates generally, as applied to the borrowing public. I doubt the need for, and prospective benefits of, a present change in the ceiling rates on time and savings deposits are such as to warrant risking this possible consequence.

Also, the study by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York published in April 1963 commented that, after regulation Q was increased effective January 1, 1962, "commercial banks were apparently successful in diverting funds from the markets for Treasury bills and municipal securities." There is no doubt that the Federal Reserve Board had encouraged CD competition with Treasury bill rates. The report continues:

> CD's are highly sensitive to competing open market interest rates and, as a result, their increase slowed down in the second half of 1961, when Treasury bill rates started to rise. The rise in Treasury bill rates toward the Regulation Q ceiling narrowed the margin between present yields and CD rates on six-month maturities to only one-eighth of a percentage point in December 1961. Largely because of this, the volume of outstanding CD's stopped growing and then began to recede, falling back to the July level by the year end.
>
> Indeed, time deposits experienced slower growth in the latter part of 1961 as depositors sensitive to interest rate differentials—particularly business establishments, foreign official institutions, and state and local governments—turned to Treasury bills.

Hence the Federal Reserve increase in regulation Q effective January 1, 1962.

More recent comments in the aftermath of the Federal Reserve Board's increase in regulation Q in December 1965 are worthy of attention.

The February issue of Banking magazine, the official organ of the American Bankers Association, on page 39, stated with respect to the emergence of negotiable CD some 5 years previously:

> The Fed was aware that the issuance of negotiable CD's in large denominations, attracting funds which otherwise would be invested in readily marketable Treasury bills or prime commercial paper might influence the terms and conditions under which short-term U.S. Government securities are bought and sold.

And, the Fed was aware that "readily marketable CD's issued in large denominations by well known banks compete directly with short-term treasuries, commercial paper, sales finance company paper, and bankers' acceptance."

Dr. Paul S. Nadler, writing in the same issue of Banking, stated on page 50:

> Many banks first looked at the CD as defensive instrument to keep corporate treasurers and municipal officials from removing their excess balances and placing the money in Treasury bills and other money market instruments.

Similarly, Dunn's Review of February 1966, on page 45, states that corporate treasurers "turned chiefly to Treasury bills were there was no risk, plenty of liquidity and a wide assortment of maturities to choose from—an important factor when dividend and tax payments must be met."

It is interesting to note that the Federal Reserve Board's action of 1965 in raising regulation Q also included shortening permissible maturities to 30 days to provide banks the opportunity to offer any possible maturity a corporate treasurer might desire in order to prevent his idle cash from entering the Treasury bill market.

That the emergence of the negotiable CD has an $18 billion money market instrument has adversely affected Treasury bill rates over the course of the past 5 years is beyond dispute. The negotiable CD is not at all definable as a true bank deposit. It is really a money market instrument which the money market banks utilize fully as a borrowing device to attract large amounts of volatile short-term interest sensitive funds in competition with other money market instruments. The emergence of the negotiable CD and its impact on the Treasury bill market would have been utterly impossible without the willing cooperation of the Federal Reserve Board in raising the interest ceiling and lowering minimum maturities four times just since 1961.

With Treasury bill rates the highest since the days of the Eisenhower tight money administration, the CD problem demands an immediate solution by Congress.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. The gentleman has mentioned spending. I believe this is one of the primary concerns with respect to this bill.

We have witnessed the contradiction implied not only in the bill but also in the understanding of it. We heard the remarks of the gentleman from California and of the gentleman from New Jersey. One implied, in effect, that we could create within these agencies a revolving fund, and the other said we could not.

For that matter, the bill itself is a contradiction; one section says it can be done and another says it cannot.

If an authorization ceiling of $100 million is placed on an agency, they could make loans, then take them and sell them to Fannie Mae and make $100 million, and then make new loans in that amount, and then resell the loans, and make new loans and sell again—three, four, five, six, seven, or eight times.

The bill is completely inconsistent in the spending area.

This is a matter of grave concern. The committee should have handled it. Because the committee did not, it is up to the House of Representatives to handle it.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. I again make the observation that there is a reason for this undue haste, which men on the other side of the aisle have pointed out. This is the undue haste with which this matter has been rammed through the Banking and Currency Committee. It demonstrates an attempt to hide the sham behind the problem involving the interest rate ceiling and the ceiling on the amount of the debt.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. On the last point first, we are concealing nothing, and everybody knows there is no concealment here, whether on the debt ceiling or otherwise.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman and I are at a difference, obviously. Of course, those on the other side do not want to be accused of concealing. I believe the Record is clear. This is one of the most shameful records I have witnessed in the 16 years I have been in the Congress. I believe there has been concealment. I believe it has been a sham. I believe it is a shame.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute, and I ask the gentleman to yield to answer a question.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. With all due respect to the gentleman—and I do have great respect for him and high regard—his argument seems to be that this is a fine proposal during a Republican administration but a bad proposal during a Democratic administration.

Mr. CURTIS. No. The gentleman was not listening to what I said. Perhaps others who read the RECORD will feel the same, but I have tried to point out the difference of opinion.

I have alleged that you people have used a very good label, a fine objective, but have distorted it in the details.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. With reference to the colloquy the gentleman had with the gentleman from Tennessee, there is not any doubt, we may mean the same thing by using different language. We made it perfectly clear that we intend that no revolving fund may use $1 more than is authorized and appropriated to it. We will offer an amendment, when we get to the 5-minute rule, which will make it adequately clear that is all that is intended here, and there is no additional power.

Mr. CURTIS. It would have been better if the committee had done its homework first.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] finished?

Mr. WIDNALL. I want to yield only for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill sets a new high in legislative legerdemain, although that is an honor not to be lightly bestowed.

The main purpose of the bill, it seems to me, is to try to confuse the public about the amount of Federal spending going on this year.

The administrative budget predicts a budget deficit of $1.8 billion. That is based on so-called participation sales of $4.7 billion of financial assets.

In other words the proposed deficit would be $6 billion were it not for the sale of $4.2 billion in assets.

If we knew an individual who sold part of his capital assets and counted it for income we would think him very foolish.

If a farmer sells part of his acreage and then brags about his income, we know he is following a course which will lead to financial ruin.

Obviously, by this kind of sleight of hand it would be possible to balance the budget and even show a surplus. The trouble is you can only sell assets once. If they are sold this year, they cannot be sold again next year, and you have that much more of a problem in meeting expenditures.

There are other considerations which make this legislation very undesirable, but to me the attempt to cover up the actual level of Government spending by such a shoddy device is more than reason enough in itself.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER].

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, in my previous remarks today I indicated that it has been impossible for the Treasury to sell long-term bonds in most recent years because of the fact that the market would not purchase them due to statutory 4¼-percent interest rate maximum they could carry.

Essentially this statement is correct. However, it is true that there have been several advanced refunding issues involving long-term bonds, and several relatively small new bond issues, which the Federal Government in several years past has been able to float.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman,the Sales Participation Act of 1966 is another sad example of the smoke of ingenious ideas hiding but evidencing the fires of economic trouble. The reasons offered for wanting private capital in Federal loan programs are cloaked in free enterprise terminology. However, the real reason for the bill is to brush aside our publicly acknowledged budget deficit.

The truth is that the Federal Government has spent itself into a financial straitjacket. We have witnessed 5 straight years of Federal budget deficits averaging $6.2 billion, shrinking gold reserves, a serious balance-of-payments deficit, very substantial budget increases, frequent extensions in our temporary debt limit, the removal of silver from coins, a reduction in the gold that backstops our currency, the recent reinstatement of excise taxes, and a host of additional indications of economic plight.

It is axiomatic in our society that when a business enterprise has to discount its notes in order to meet operating expenses, it is a sure sign of financial trouble.

The Sales Participation Act is equivalent to discounting notes with recourse, I repeat, with recourse, in order to meet operating expenses—or what we can even less afford—huge charitable contributions at home and abroad that do little more than throttle the ambition of recipients.

It is a standard procedure to ask every youngster what he wants to be when he grows up. As a child, I had what I childishly thought was a clever answer. I said I wanted to be a philanthropist, and when this prompted the inevitable "why" my reply was that I noticed that every philanthropist I read about was very wealthy.

Of course, at that time, I had no way of knowing that Uncle Sam would kick the traces and become an exception to the rule. He has long had the image of one with limitless financial capacity, but sadly enough his image has been tarnished in recent years.

It is ironic that at the very time the administration is asking us to vote in a Participation Sales Act, we are giving away increasing amounts of money—especially in the area of unappreciated foreign aid. How much longer can we continue on this course? If we cannot pay our public debts in a boom period, when can we pay them?

It appears that the United States has only three alternatives to avoid an impending economic crisis. We can, first, continue to extend the debt limit; second, increase taxes; or third, substantially reduce Government spending. Extending the debt limit has become a ritual in Congress, and the administration is seriously considering an increase in taxes. But we continue to ignore the third and sensible alternative—a decrease in spending.

In fact, we are considering a bill today which makes it possible for the Federal Government to make our financial situation appear in better shape for further waste and extravagance.

I will happily support the Sales Participation Act of 1966 if an amendment is adopted to apply the proceeds on the national debt.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, the proposed Sales Participation Act addresses itself to a problem which has been a concern of three administrations, two Democratic and one Republican. The problem is this: What to do with direct Federal lending programs which immobilize larger and larger sums of budget dollars in a bulging, overflowing Federal portfolio of loan paper.

The Government has been selling off these assets—and they are assets, for they are bona fide promises to pay on the part of borrowers with an excellent repayment record over the years—selling these assets to private investors for well over 10 years.

But there are problems associated with direct sales of these assets—problems which are difficult to solve and which place effective limitations on the amount of assets which can be sold in the market.

These problems have given rise to the technique known as participation sales, which gets around most of the difficulties. The technique has been used with success by the Export-Import Bank and the Federal National Mortgage Association—Fannie May.

The participation technique consists of grouping loans in pools and selling participations or shares in the pools rather than selling the underlying loans directly. It is a natural development in the financing of Federal credit programs.

The Government's essential function becomes one of underwriting the credit risk and thus facilitating the flow of funds from investors to borrowers who do not have ready access to capital markets.

The sale of participation certificates backed by the Government makes it feasible for private investors to invest in a variety of programs in which the borrowers' names and credit standings are not well known. The Federal Government acts as an intermediary.

In most Federal credit programs, the Government assumes the credit risk or most of it. The reason is that private lenders are either unwilling or unable to assume the loan risks on the credit terms and conditions necessary to meet the objectives we have established for the programs. By assuming the risk, the Government stimulates the flow of funds from private investors to communities, organizations, and individuals.

Assumption of the risk is essentially the same, whether in a guaranteed loan, an insured loan, or a pool of direct loans in which guaranteed participations are sold.

The Participations Sales Act of 1966 is a natural evolution in the development of more efficient financing techniques. This legislation will strengthen the private market in its ability to support the credit programs which our society and economy need. It will also reduce the total of scarce budget dollars tied up unnecessarily in the portfolio of loans which the Government will be carrying.

I urge full support of H.R. 14544.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, when I first heard of this legislation I was inclined to be skeptical and doubtful that Congress should take this action. Now that I have listened to some of the debate and had opportunity to study the legislation, I see nothing really wrong with it.

I realize that it will authorize actions that will, to those who do not give it adequate consideration, make the national debt appear lower and make the administrative budget seem smaller. But why should that deny a bill if it otherwise is valid and makes good sense. Why should not these loan assets, which the Government owns, be pooled as a basis for sale of these certificates?

It is not creating a false picture to indicate what the real truth is, namely, that the obligation will be paid and that the payment from the Treasury generally will be the disparity between what the interest rates might be and the losses that the Government may take. These losses will be out in the open for all to see to a greater degree than heretofore.

I realize that for many years the budget and appropriation system has to some extent been confusing. I know of a project in the district which adjoins mine, a reclamation project, to provide water for several cities, which will cost about $90 million. According to the present system of budgeting, this shows up as an outlay by the Government that from first appearances will never be returned, just like buying an Army tank or a military aircraft. Actually, though, more than 90 percent of the money spent on this project will be repaid under the repayment provision of the reclamation law. This is not on all fours with exact budget techniques involved in the pending bill, but it emphasizes a point which I think is valid.

If there were no precedent for the procedure involved in this bill and if we had not been doing it from year to year, it might be something we would approach with far greater concern.

But we have done some of this. It seems to be acceptable. It has been recommended by previous administrations. However, whether anyone recommended it or did not recommend it, or whether the Republicans are for it and whether the Democrats are for it is not the point. The point is this: Is this a wise and proper action?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Not for the moment.

Mr. Chairman, a portion of my skepticism about this was that the Congressional appropriations review process would be bypassed or undermined. This was the thing that gave me a great deal of concern in the early consideration of this matter.

Of course, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I am quite jealous of its prerogatives, as all committee chairmen tend to be. But more than that, I am jealous of the prerogatives of the Congress and not just of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, as I see it, we do not lose any of the controls which we have previously had. On the other hand, some of these controls will be strengthened, and all of these participation sales will have to be approved in advance in appropriation bills.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard some discussion here about the continuous purchase of certificates from the revolving funds. Of course, you could continue to purchase the certificates from the revolving fund, if Congress gives its approval to do so, but not otherwise. And, if this is not the clear intent of the bill—the one now pending before us—I certainly would support any action to make this perfectly clear. However, from my knowledge, it is perfectly clear.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am very much interested in what my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is saying, because I have approached my consideration of this subject from that same point of view. There are certain rules of the House which require that the Appropriations Committee shall initiate appropriations, and no funds can be withdrawn from the Treasury, except by appropriations, as is provided for in the Constitution.

I do not understand, and I direct the attention of the gentleman from Texas, to the language contained in paragraphs 4 and 5 on page 6 of the bill. I have read these paragraphs many times and I must say that in my judgment they violate not only the rules of the House but also the Constitution of the United States.

It seems to me that the Appropriations Committee is being turned into an authorizing committee and that the legislative committee is doing the appropriating.

I would appreciate if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would point out wherein I am wrong in that construction of this language.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from North Carolina knows that we have been in this business of disposing of these assets over a period of years, under certain circumstances—under the FNMA, under the Veterans' Administration loan program, and otherwise. As I see it, there is no really radical change in that procedure as a result of this bill. My interpretation of the bill is, as has been pointed out previously in my remarks, that the Appropriations Committee itself would initially determine whether or not and to what extent these certificates would be sold. Then the House and the Senate would have to pass on the matter.

Mr. JONAS. May I make a statement?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I do not believe it can be shown that any previous legislation has ever contained language even close kin to that contained in paragraphs 4 and 5 of section 2 of this bill. As I understand it, this language has never before appeared in legislation during our entire history—it is entirely unprecedented. Now that fact alone would certainly not condemn it, but I suspect this sort of thing has never before been tried because it seems to me to be a violation of the rule that gives exclusive jurisdiction over appropriations to the Committee on Appropriations. What we have here is an indefinite, automatic appropriation based upon a blanket authorization to be made by the Committee on Appropriations. The amount of funds used will not be determined by the Committee on Appropriations but by the terms of the trust instrument which will be dictated by New York City bond attorneys instead of by Congress.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. I want to undertake to answer the question that has been raised by saying that during the discussion in our Committee on Banking and Currency, we found heretofore none of these agencies when disposing of government obligations had to go to the Committee on Appropriations for such appropriations. Now we are writing into this bill for the first time, and now this bill will require that all of these agencies before selling any of these Government obligations, which we own, at a discount—the discount must be made available to them by the Committee on Appropriations and by an appropriation by the Congress.

Mr. JONAS. But the amount of the subsidy, on the discount if you prefer that term, will not be determined in advance by an appropriation act because that act will only authorize the issuance of an "aggregate principal amount" and this somehow by the terms of this bill gets converted into an obligation to comply with the terms of the trust instrument.

Your own committee report on page 5 reads as follows:

> Thus, purchasers of participations would be assured of timely payments of principal and interest without further action by the Congress.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. I use the word "discount" very loosely. What we are doing here is this. We have, for instance, disaster loans which carry a 3 percent interest rate. That carries less than the going interest rate.

This instrument is now going to be sold to the purchaser so as to yield the going rate. Therefore, the Government must make up the difference. The difference is what I have called loosely the "discount." Heretofore they have been able to do that without any authorization. They have the right to do it. Now we say that from now on before you do that, go to the Congress and get a law authorizing you and an appropriation of the money to make up that difference before you sell it at that difference.

Mr. JONAS. I do not find that spelled out in the bill. I hope the gentleman will support an amendment to express this as the clear intent of Congress.

Mr. MULTER. That is the intent of the section you have referred to which is subdivision 4, page 6.

Mr. JONAS. Well, it does not say that.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, this is a matter of interpretation. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I do not know that I can clarify the matter. But we had before our committee Mr. Baughman, who is the chairman of Fannie Mae. He specifically emphasized there was nothing new about this procedure. There was some strengthening provision put in the law and they would have to give to the Congress a justification for an appropriation for interest payments. We are following the same pattern that we have been following on the other sales of securities except that the Director of Fannie Mae serves as a trustee in this capacity.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reassert and repeat my statement that I believe the action proposed here does not do violence to the appropriation process of the Congress of the United States, the House of Representatives and the other body; and that it gives us in some respects more safeguards than we now have.

I think the action proposed in this bill—out in the open and aboveboard, is sound in concept. I do not hesitate to express my approval of this legislation.

I am not sure about all of the people and all of the organizations who are for it or against it. I, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as a Member of the Congress, have studied it. I am not maintaining that the bill is perfect in every respect. Adjustments and refinements based on experience may be required from time to time. But I am in favor of it and I believe it ought to be passed. I believe it to be in the public interest in the years to come that we handle these matters and these obligations in the way proposed in this legislation. I think we have the safeguards that in my judgment we need to have.

Mr. WIDNALL. We have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, and I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Participation Sales Act of 1966".

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14544) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill today have the privilege of extending their remarks and including extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the schedule for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we plan to conclude consideration of H.R. 14544, the Participation Sales Act of 1966, tomorrow. The minimum wage bill, H.R. 13712, previously announced, will go over until next week.

I would like to advise Members for their information that in addition to continuation of consideration of the Participation Sales Act, the following matters are added to the program for tomorrow:

The conference report on H.R. 14215, Department of Interior appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967, will be called up by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Also tomorrow the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] has advised that he will call up by unanimous consent the following bills unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13768, to authorize disposal of celestite from supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13769, to authorize disposal of cordage fiber—sisal—from national stockpile;

H.R. 13770, to authorize disposal of crocidolite asbestos—harsh—from supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13772, to authorize disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from national stockpile and supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13773, to authorize disposal of opium from national stockpile;

H.R. 13366, to authorize the disposal of aluminum from national stockpile.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask the distinguished majority leader in what order we will proceed tomorrow? Will the conference report come up first and then these unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, we would handle the conference report first, and I would think we would try to dispose of these unanimous-consent bills immediately thereafter. They should not take much time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I have been asked by a number of Members on our side if there is any plan to meet on Monday, May 30.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, we have made no plans with reference to that matter. I would like to consult with other Members of the leadership, particularly the Speaker. I am sure we will not have any legislative business on Memorial Day, if that is what the gentleman means.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

RESIGNATIONS OF MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES-CANADA INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications, which were read:

May 17, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Since it will not be possible for me to attend the May meeting of the United States-Canada Interparliamentary Group, I ask that my resignation as a member of the House Delegation be accepted so that an alternate can be appointed.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY R. TUPPER,
Member of Congress, Maine.

May 13, 1966.

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I was indeed sorry to find that I will be unable to join the members of the House Delegation to the Ninth Meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group May 18 through 22. I have advised the Committee on Foreign Affairs of my inability to attend.

It is with much regret that I must ask that I be removed as a member of the United States-Canada Interparliamentary Group. It has been an honor to serve with these fine representatives, and I regret my inability to continue as a member.

My thanks for your assistance, and my warmest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as members of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], to fill the existing vacancies thereon.

SO MUCH IS RIGHT: THE RECORD OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE McNAMARA

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper editorial.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in my years of experience in Congress I have found it is those with the courage to make positive decisions in the interest of our country who come in for the most criticism. That is understandable because there is always room for differences when decisions are being made. The greatest good is accomplished, however, by men willing to assume the responsibility of decision-making, even in the face of criticism.

I have not always been in agreement with the Secretary of Defense but in retrospect I can see in Robert S. McNamara the kind of strong leader Congress looked for when it created the Office of Secretary of Defense. At great personal sacrifice McNamara accepted the challenge of directing the Nation's Military Establishment and he has accomplished much to assure its efficiency and effectiveness thereby advancing our national security.

More and more people throughout the country are beginning to realize this. Witness for instance the writings of the well-known columnist, Roscoe Drummond. Under leave to do so I include with my remarks Mr. Drummond's column which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of Saturday, May 14, 1966. It follows:

McNAMARA RECORD: SO MUCH IS RIGHT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Robert S. McNamara is the most durable secretary of defense the Pentagon has ever had.

In one important sense McNamara is the first secretary of defense the Pentagon has ever had, because he is the first civilian to have won command of the decision-making process of the most powerful arm of the most powerful nation in the world.

McNamara will win no popularity contest in Washington, either in the Pentagon or in Congress.

There are two main reasons. He has forced and end to the warring and wasteful sovereignties of the services—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps. I can remember when the Joint Chiefs of Staff were so disjointed that they couldn't even agree on their missions in the event of war and each laid out war plans that ignored the others.

The effect of this kind of competing disunity within the services was to shift to Congress much of the decision as to how the total defense budget would be divided, a military-financial decision which ought to be made in the Pentagon. Today it is. Congress used to relish the old days and resents the extent to which McNamara has both persuaded and coerced the Joint Chiefs into a working unity under powerful civilian command.

McNamara is not popular in the Pentagon, but he is respected and valued. McNamara is not popular in Congress, but when a reporter asks a critical congressman if he would like to see McNamara quit, he invariably replies, "Heavens, no."

I am not suggesting that McNamara can do no wrong, that his judgment has been infallible. But I do report that he has done so much that's right at the right time that even his critics would be horrified at the prospect of having him leave.

Here are some of the things he has done:

War readiness—When the President decided to put troops into the field in Viet Nam, we were able to move 100,000 men, plus all supporting materiel, 10,000 miles in about 120 days and these troops began fighting almost at once with high morale, and many more have followed.

War supplies—Despite the recurring disorder and limitied harbor facilities, there have been no serious shortages. They have been few and minor and temporary.

Advance planning—We would not have been able to come to the defense of South Viet Nam effectively if McNamara, with President John F. Kennedy's support, had not moved in 1961 to strengthen the conventional and guerrilla-trained forces of the Army. McNamara not only recognized clearly but acted on the premise that the nuclear stalemate would not deter aggression by non-nuclear means. In 1962, two years before we began fighting in Viet Nam, he added to the budgets of all the services in order to make sure they would have the equipment and supplies to match their war plans.

I doubt that there is any "shocking mismanagement" in this record.

DAIRY IMPORT ACT OF 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a copy of the bill which I introduced.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I today introduce for appropriate reference the Dairy Import Act of 1966.

This bill would confirm the right of Congress to control foreign trade in milk, cheese, and other dairy products. It is a just and reasonable bill which provides adequate protection for both the producer and the consumer of dairy products. At the same time, it provides the flexibility needed to make it a workable piece of legislation.

In view of the fact that our Nation's farmers, and particularly the dairy farmers, have faced economic hardships unparalleled in American history since the days of the factory sweatshop, I feel this measure is a very vital step—a very necessary step—toward putting the farmer back onto a sound economic footing.

For the first time in more than a decade, farmers are beginning to see a glimmer of hope for the future. However, the action by the Tariff Commission in allowing larger and larger quantities of dairy products to be imported is severely restricting the operation of existing dairy programs enacted by Congress and is threatening to completely repulse the dairy farmers' attempted return to the affluent society.

This measure, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Wisconsin in the other body, is a moderate, flexible measure which is in the best interest of both the farmer and the taxpayer.

H.R. 15103

(A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Dairy Import Act of 1966."

SEC. 2. No imports of dairy products shall be admitted to the United States for consumption except pursuant to authorizations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. No authorizations for imports of dairy products shall be issued by the Secretary which would result in total imports for consumption of dairy products in any calendar year in excess of the total average annual quantity thereof which was admitted for consumption during the five calendar years 1961 through 1965.

SEC. 4. In the event that total annual domestic consumption of dairy products in any calendar year shall be greater or less than the average total annual domestic consumption of dairy products during the five calendar years 1961 through 1965, the total annual volume of imports for such calendar year authorized under section 3 shall be increased or decreased by a corresponding percentage.

SEC. 5. The President may permit, if he finds such action to be necessary in the public interest, additional quantities of imports of any dairy products the importation of which is regulated under this Act. Additional imports permitted under this section shall be admitted for consumption under special authorizations issued by the Secretary. No additional imports shall be admitted for consumption under this section at a time when prices received by dairy farmers for milk on a national average as determined by the Secretary are at a level less than parity, unless the Secretary shall, at the time such imports are admitted, remove from the domestic market, in addition to other price support purchases and operations, a corresponding quantity of dairy products. The cost of removing such dairy products from the domestic market shall be separately reported and shall not be charged to any agricultural program.

SEC. 6. "Dairy products" for the purpose of this Act includes all forms of milk and dairy products, butterfat, and nonfat milk solids, and any combination or mixture thereof, and also any article, compound, or mixture containing 10 percent or more of butterfat, nonfat milk solids, or any combination of the two. For the purpose of computing quantities of dairy products under this Act, the Secretary may make such computations, in whole or in part, in terms of the butterfat and nonfat milk solids contained in such dairy products.

SEC. 7. The Secretary may prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for the effective administration of this Act.

SEC. 8. Import controls under this Act shall supplement import controls under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and shall apply to dairy products not actually being controlled at the time by quantitative limitations under said section 22 and also to dairy products which at the time are being controlled by such quantitative limitations but at levels which permit a greater quantity of imports than prescribed by this Act.

THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Sidney L. Christie, U.S. District Judge for the Northern and Southern Districts of West Virginia on April 25 addressed the candidates for naturalization immediately prior to their taking the oath of allegiance. Because of the importance of Judge Christie's remarks, under unanimous consent I include his inspiring comments:

As the presiding judge of this court, it is my privilege to conduct this final stage of your journey toward citizenship. I welcome the opportunity; it is one of the more pleasant duties of a United States Judge.

You have studied and made preparation for this important day. You have passed the examination and been recommended for admission to citizenship in this great country. You will soon stand before the bar of this court and take upon yourselves a most solemn obligation—an oath of allegiance and fidelity to the United States of America.

In doing this, however, America does not ask that you cease to love and respect the countries from which you have come; but she does ask that you give your undivided allegiance to her in return for her bestowing upon you the mantle of citizenship with all the rights and privileges that go with it.

I shall not here inquire into your motives or reasons for leaving your native lands to seek a new life, new opportunities and new friends in America. I shall assume them to be good.

Nor will I extol to you our virtues, which we think are many, nor dwell at length upon the things that have gone before to make America the great country she is. I will not attempt to catalogue for you the many opportunities, advantages and benefits that this country has to offer you, for to do so would unduly prolong this proceeding.

You, in preparation for this day, have studied our Constitution, our system of government, and have learned the fundamentals under which our system of government operates. I will assume that you subscribe to them and will help to keep them forever safe and secure.

First—*Privilege to Vote:* As you know, with your citizenship goes the privilege to vote. It is your voice in deciding who will serve you at all levels of government. In many lands, as you know, this right is either partially or wholly denied the average citizen. This is a most valuable right and one which you should cherish and protect. I would caution you not to take it lightly. It lies at the very foundation of our democratic society. To secure it, more than anything else, the war of the American Revolution was fought and won by our forefathers.

You can best use this precious right by aligning yourselves with one or the other of our major political parties. I cannot suggest which—that is for you to decide. Study the traditions, the philosophies and the performance of the two major political parties and then choose the one that best fits your own point of view.

Register to vote and take an active part in the party of your choice. Start at the precinct level; work yourselves up as you would in any line of endeavor. There is nothing wrong about being active in politics; to the contrary, it is good. It is a part of our democratic process. Work from within your party organization to improve your party; not from without. Only through the maintenance of a strong organization of your own party can you choose qualified candidates in the primary to compete with candidates of the opposite party in the general election. The primary, in simple terms, is nothing more than a screening process whereby the party members, through their votes, sift and choose from a larger number of candidates a fewer number as nominees who are found to be best qualified to contest against the nominees of the opposite party in the general election. It is, therefore, axiomatic that for competent and qualified persons to be elected in the general election, whether they be from one party or the other, great care must be given to their selection in the primary.

Thus, it is seen that it is important that we maintain our two-party system in all its strength and vitality so that each will be, in a real sense, a worthy competitor of the other in the business of selecting and electing our public officials.

Second—*Respect for Law:* Laws are rules designed to govern the conduct of human beings. They are imperfect in many instances because they are made by imperfect human beings. But this affords no excuse for disobeying the law. The remedy, instead, is to use your influence to get it changed in an orderly fashion. The recent tendency by some to encourage disobedience of law because it is felt the law is unjust is to be deplored. Such a concept, if carried to its ultimate, could only lead to complete breakdown of law and order; the result—anarchy. No right thinking person would want that to happen. So, it is the duty of all citizens of our country to uphold the law and sincerely try to make it work.

Third—*Be Honest:* Some of you come from lands where money and the luxuries of life are extremly scarce, and seeing many people here with these things in great abundance may lead you to believe that you can secure them quickly by means other than hard work. Such would be an unreal assumption on your part. Your lives here will only be worthwhile if you devote yourselves to honest toil and live clean and respectful lives. Do not fall to the temptation of engaging in gambling, rackets and other types of unlawful enterprises in the hope of becoming rich. This will only lead you to untold trouble and grief. I have, in my lifetime, seen it happen too many times with disastrous results. It is a game in which you cannot possibly win, and I hope that none of you here today will try it.

In conclusion, may I review for you just briefly a few things that may prove helpful in your quest for a useful and happy life in this your adopted country:

1. You should inform yourselves on local and world affairs; keep abreast of the times; know what is going on about you.

2. You should be courteous, unselfish and friendly toward others and practice the policy of a good neighbor.

3. You should be sincere, honest and dependable in all your business dealings, remembering always that a good name, not wealth or power or position, is the real thing that counts.

4. You should take an active part in all the worthwhile activities of your community.

5. You should be fair and just in all your relations with others and respect their right to disagree with you.

6. You should obey the laws of your community and nation, encourage others to do so, and give your support to the efforts of the police and other agencies of law enforcement; understanding that by so doing, you are guaranteeing protection to your person and property from those who would do you harm.

7. You should be industrious, thrifty, and anxious to give an honest day's work for a full day's pay.

8. Finally, you should, by your own conduct, set a good example for others in your community to follow.

I have every confidence that you will live up to these words of friendly advice and to your obligation as worthwhile citizens.

PROTEST AGAINST FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to protest the treatment of Puerto Rico in H.R. 13712, the proposed Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966.

For 25 years, the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, through honest and capable leadership, has dedicated its efforts to the eradication of unemployment, poverty, and substandard living conditions on our island. I am sure that many of you have heard of our "Operation Bootstrap" program. We have made significant strides in our efforts to bring prosperity, through industrialization and diversification to a once stagnant, underdeveloped, almost totally agricultural society. But we have a distance to go before all our citizens will share fully in the abundance and affluence enjoyed by the people of the United States.

It may seem paradoxical that I express my fervent desire to better the condition of labor in Puerto Rico, while at the same time I oppose these minimum wage amendments. There is, however, no contradiction if one understands one fundamental economic principle—that an automatic and substantial wage increase, imposed on a partially-developed and growing economy, threatens to stunt the growth of industrial and retail enterprises and, in so doing, may destroy the source of a growing labor income and the hope of placing the unemployed in productive and remunerative work. This is what we justifiably fear will occur in Puerto Rico.

H.R. 13712, in its present form, will impose an automatic 28 percent two-step wage increase for those industries and employees already covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Such an increase will occur without regard to the economic condition of the industry or trade, or any establishment within such industry or trade. Industries throughout the United States can perhaps easily afford such a wage increase, but a great many in Puerto Rico cannot. To enable Puerto Rico to continue its economic growth, this automatic increase formula must be eliminated. The guiding principle of wage and hour policy in Puerto Rico, as articulated in section 8 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, is "to reach as rapidly as is economically feasible without substantially curtailing employment the objective of the minimum wage in each industry."

We must implement this policy, not mouth it, and then ignore it. We should do this by providing that all wage increases are to be determined, industry by industry, by the special committees which have performed this task conscientiously and effectively since 1940.

The automatic wage increase formula was first established by the 1961 amendments. As I explained last Thursday, its effect was substantially to increase unemployment in Puerto Rico. This occurred even though the 1961 amendments, by establishing a hardship review procedure, enabled most of the affected industries in Puerto Rico to stay in business. H.R. 13712 not only continues the unworkable automatic wage increase formula, but it also, most unreasonably, eliminates the review procedure. Neither I, nor the Government of Puerto Rico, nor the people of Puerto Rico, can understand why this right to appeal has been eliminated. In 1961, it prevented an economic setback in Puerto Rico from becoming an economic catastrophe. If it is decided here that, despite the wishes of the people of the Commonwealth, the automatic wage increase must be imposed, then I must urge that the hardship committees be reinstated.

Puerto Rico objects to H.R. 13712 in one other aspect. As we all know, the proposed amendments will increase the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act by eliminating exemptions and by lowering the dollar volume criterion for enterprises The Secretary of Labor of Puerto Rico estimates that this will bring 115,100 additional workers under the Federal act. All of these employees receive the benefits and protections of Puerto Rico's own minimum wage law. Applying the expanded coverage provisions of H.R. 13712 will be simply an irrational duplication of efforts. It will also create problems which will far outweigh any benefits it might bring.

We all know the difficulties inherent in the process of extending the Fair Labor Standards Act to small, unsophisticated, essentially local businesses. Lack of knowledge, understanding, and sometimes unwillingness on the part of the small, often struggling, entrepreneur will necessarily breed problems of administration and compliance. These problems will arise both in Puerto Rico and in the United States; but here, where there are no language and cultural barriers, they can be easily solved. In Puerto Rico, however, where Spanish is the community language and the complexities of coverage and computations under the act and regulations will be unfathomable to some small Puerto Rican employers, particularly to many small farmers and storekeepers, who live in an insular world far removed from the economically and intellectually sophisticated business community of the United States.

Finally, I would like to include in the RECORD the statements before the Senate Labor Subcommittee, during hearings in San Juan last January, of the secretary of labor to Puerto Rico and the economic adviser to the administrator of the Commonwealth's economic development administration. These are the officials who possess the expertise and knowledge, the facts and figures, the causes and effects on Puerto Rico's labor and economic situation. They are the men that must be particularly heeded if Congress desires to deal equitably and justly with Puerto Rico.

The statements follow:

ON COVERAGE

I

(Statement of Alfredo Nazario, Secretary of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, read before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Education in the hearings held in San Juan, Puerto Rico on January 3, 1966 with reference to H.R. 8259, S. 1986, and H.R. 10518; Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1965)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, Bills H.R. 8259 and S. 1986, as well as Bill H.R. 10518, provide for the extension of coverage by the Fair Labor Standards Act to certain employees not currently within the reach of that statute. Bill H.R. 10518, in particular, would extend minimum wage and overtime protection to retail employeees, including those in auto, truck, and farm implement dealerships; as well as to employees in construction; laundering and dry cleaning; transit systems; restaurants and food service establishments; motion picture theatres; small telephone exchanges; lodging, agriculture and agricultural processing; hotels and motels; telegraphic agencies; hospitals and related institutions; and seasonal amusement or recreational establishments. Overtime protection would also be extended to employees in gasoline service stations. Workers in the aforementioned activities are generally in the lowest wage groups in the nation and most in need of the wage and hour protection provided by the Federal Act.

The Commonwealth Government is in complete agreement and fully identifies itself with the intent and purposes of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, as well as of the House and Senate Labor Committees, in extending coverage to the millions of low-paid workers on the mainland now exempted from the minimum wage and overtime protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. On its own, Puerto Rico has been pursuing since 1940 a firm and determined public program to eliminate, as rapidly as is practicable, substandard labor conditions throughout the island. It has steadfastly striven to raise the living standards of its poverty-stricken population in an effort which pre-dates the Administration's own "war on poverty".

The policies of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have been in the past, and continue to be, therefore, fully consistent with the aims of Congress. However, because we have effectively provided wage and hour protection to all workers under our jurisdiction on the Island, we do not favor the extension to Puerto Rico of the proposed new coverage provisions of the bills now under consideration.

II

As you are probably aware, the Commonwealth has had a well organized and effective minimum wage program for many years. Puerto Rico first enacted its own minimum wage legislation in April, 1941. This legislation was substantially revised in 1956 by the Minimum Wage Act of Puerto Rico, which now prevails.

Under this Act, coverage has been extended to its fullest; only government employees, domestic workers, professional, executive and administrative employees are outside the reach of the Act. All wage and salaried employees are covered, including those in agriculture, as well as those in the retail and wholesale trades, services and manufacturing. Even workers employed by labor unions, and religious and charitable institutions fall under the protection of the minimum wage provisions of the Act. Thus, the Act permits the setting of minimum wage rates for almost all economic activities on the Island. Coverage of the local law is so extensive that approximately 380,000 workers—three fourths of all wage and salaried employees on the Island—are currently covered by minimum wage orders established under the Act. Minimum rates have, in fact, been set for all workers covered by the Act, including those workers which Bills H.R. 8259 and S. 1896 and Bill H.R. 10518, now seek to bring under the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In addition, twenty-two wage decrees, issued under the authority granted to the Minimum Wage Board of Puerto Rico by the 1941 Act (no longer in existence), provide important marginal benefits such as vacation, sick-leave and guaranteed weekly earnings to more than 84,000 workers in various activities including retail and wholesale trade and services.

Our local laws further provide that in intrastate activities workers are entitled to double-time compensation for hours worked in excess of 8 per day and 48 per week; while workers in interstate activities are entitled, on the other hand, to receive time-and-a-half for all hours worked in excess of 8 per day and 40 per week, and double time for hours worked in excess of 48 per week.

III

Minimum wages are currently revised at least once every two years by specially-appointed tripartite committees representing labor, industry and the public, according to the economic condition or capacity to pay of each individual industry. All industries with a minimum wage below $1.25 an hour must be reviewed at least once every two years. As a result, during the past decade each industry's wages have been revised at least four times. From July 1956 to December 1965 a total of 111 minimum wage orders have been issued by the Commonwealth Minimum Wage Board covering approximately 380,000 workers which have had the effect of increasing the annual wages of covered workers by $51 million.

As a result of local revisions, wages in Puerto Rico have steadily increased. As of November 1965 an hourly minimum wage of $1.25 had been set in 98 industry classifications employing around 24,000 workers, and minimum wages per hour ranging from $1.00 to $1.24 had been set in 174 classifications employing around 39,000 workers. There were only 17 industry classifications with a minimum wage below 50 cents per hour. These were mostly in agriculture.

Average gross hourly earnings in manufacturing, including industries in interstate and intrastate commerce, rose from 45 cents in October 1952 to $1.26 in October 1965, an increase of 180 per cent. Straight time hourly wages in the construction industry have increased from 49 cents in 1950 to $1.51 in 1965; in the restaurant industry, from 17 cents in 1944 to 77 cents in 1965; in laundries and dry cleaning establishments, from 21 cents in 1947 to 77 cents in 1964; and hourly earnings in the hotel industry from 76 cents in 1958 to $1.23 in 1965. These are only some of the industries affected by H.R. 10518. (Several tables are included at the end of this statement showing the increases sustained in the prevailing wages in these and other industries, as well as the minimum wage rates set at the time of the revisions.)

The increases in wages have in most cases more than offset the increases in the cost of living. In fact, in only 36 out of 519 industry classifications, has the increase in minimum wages failed to keep pace with the cost of living; in 10 of these cases the minimum wage had already reached $1.25 which is the highest that could be set by law. We have thus been able not only to maintain the living standards of our workers but to increase them substantially. (See appendix on the changes in the cost of living during the various periods under consideration.)

On the other hand, the annual income of wage-earner families has risen from $360 in 1941 to $2,236 in 1963, an increase of 521 percent. After adjustment for the increases in the cost of living, the annual income of these families has increased by about 179 percent.

IV

We are aware that the Hotel and Restaurant Workers' Union as well as the Retail Clerks Union are, nonetheless, in favor of the extension of Fair Labor Standards Act coverage to their respective fields of activities in Puerto Rico. We know also that many workers in these industries—as well as in others—believe that the amendments currently being considered by the Congress would make applicable to Puerto Rico, by legislative fiat, the proposed statutory minimum of $1.75. Others believe that their present wages will be increased by 12, 16 and 12 percents annually if their industries were to come within the scope of the Federal Statute. Very few are cognizant of the fact, that the bills do not propose a statutory increase, as such, for employees in newly covered industries in Puerto Rico, nor has a percentage adjustment proportionate to the mainland increase been proposed for these industries. Extension of coverage in this area—in the case of employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands—simply means—no more and no less—that the U.S. Secretary of Labor would have the authority to appoint special industry committees to recommend the minimum wage rate to be applicable to employees in these industries as is now done with other industries, and in accordance with the standards and procedures prescribed in the law. Thus, to bring these two industries—or any other industry, for that matter—within the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act will add no new benefit or protection to these workers.

Both of these industries—as you will recall—are presently covered by the Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Act. Under that Act, minimum wage determinations are currently being made biennially by special tripartite industry committees.

(*a*) *Hotel and restaurant industry*

The first minimum wage decree applicable to the Hotel Industry was approved in 1944. This decree set wages that ranged from 18 to 21 cents per hour. Minimum wages in this industry have been revised five times since 1944.

The last revision took place in 1964 and the wages then recommended became effective in February of that year. In recognition of the regional differences existing in Puerto Rico, the island has been divided, for minimum wage purposes, into two zones: San Juan, including Cataño and Bayamón, and the rest of the island. In addition, the hotels have been divided in two categories; those that operate a casino or gambling hall, and all other hotels. The minimum wages in the San Juan Metropolitan Area applicable to the hotels with casino are 87½ cents per hour for non-tipping employees, $1.25 for workers in the skilled trades, and 67 cents for employees that receive tips. On the rest of the island, the minimum wages are 80 cents, $1.10 and 65 cents respectively. The minimum wages in all other hotels follow the same occupational classifications. Thus, non-tipping employees in the San Juan Metropolitan Area have a 74-cent minimum while those on the rest of the island have a 60-cent minimum.

Wages in the hotel industry have increased markedly during the last thirteen years. In October of 1950 the straight time hourly wage amounted to 36 cents. In June 1963 this figure had risen to 95 cents, an increase of 164 per cent.

Average hourly earnings on the other hand, have risen from 76.1 cents in September 1958 to $1.24 in September 1965, an increase of 63 per cent.

The Restaurant Industry was first considered for minimum wage purposes in 1944 together with the Hotel Industry. It was estimated at that time that the straight time wage per hour in this industry amounted to 17 cents. The first minimum wage order applicable to this industry set wages of 21 cents per hour in the San Juan Metropolitan Area and 18 cents per hour on the rest of the island.

Since then the minimum wages in this industry have been revised six times. The last revision was conducted in 1965 and the minimum wages per hour then approved range from 70 cents in the San Juan Metropolitan Area to 55 cents on the rest of the island.

Straight time hourly wages in this industry have risen from 17 cents in 1944 to 77 cents in 1965, an increase of 353 per cent. In the San Juan Metropolitan Area, the average wage per hour in 1965 amounted to 85.7 cents. These figures do not take into account the last minimum wage revision which was estimated to have increased wages in the industry by approximately 5 per cent.

(*b*) *The retail trade industry*

The Retail Trade Industry was first considered for the purpose of fixing minimum wages in 1945. The minimum wages set at that time ranged from 17 to 25 cents per hour. Since August 1955, the minimum wages in this industry have been revised five times. At present the Board has under consideration a minimum wage order which would set minimum wages ranging from 50 cents to $1.25 per hour. The industry is classified into three geographical zones and, within each zone, into 10 sub-groups by line of business. In addition there are occupational classifications within the line-of-business sub-groups.

Employees in this industry enjoy the same wage-order decreed fringe benefits as those of the Hotel and Restaurant Industries. These include a minimum weekly compensation guarantee, a weekly day of rest, vacation leave, and sick leave. Work in excess of 8 hours per day or 48 hours per week must be paid at twice the regular wage rate.

The average wage per hour in this industry has increased from 21 cents in 1945 to 91 cents in 1965, an increase of 333 per cent.

V

As you can see, in Puerto Rico—unlike the situation prevailing in many States of the Union which either do not have or do not as actively enforce local minimum wage legislation—the workers who would be brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act by the extended coverage, have long been and are now adequately protected, relative to our over all standard of living, by the Minimum Wage Act of Puerto Rico. There is no need, no urgency, in our judgment, for any further extension of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to Puerto Rico, where workers are now receiving the full and adequate protection of the local minimum wage law. The Commonwealth has had for many years an effective minimum wage program, and through a vigorous implementation of its own act, has been able to substantially increase, as rapidly and as practicably, according to the conditions of each individual industry, the incomes and the standard of living of Puerto Rican workers.

We estimate that if the proposed extended coverage in H.R. 10518 is needlessly made applicable to Puerto Rico, some 115,100 additional workers will be brought under the Federal Act. (The estimated number of workers to be covered after January 1, 1966, is 103,500; and after January 1, 1968, an additional 11,600.) Estimated total employment under Fair Labor Standard Act coverage, including the 38,600 incorporated by virtue of the 1961 amendments, would be roughly 246,000 workers, or 62.4 percent of all employees in local industries now covered by the Commonwealth law. The percentage of total workers covered would be approximately the following: construction, 100 percent; laundry and dry cleaning, 100 percent; manufacturing (local trade), 56.5 percent; wholesale and retail trade, 55.7 percent; hotel, 81.5 percent; motion picture, 50 percent; restaurant, 32.6 percent; hospital, 81.6 percent; transportation, banks and other services, 17.1 percent; agriculture, 16.5 percent.

A good many of the enterprises which would be brought within the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act by any of the 1965 proposed amendments are small, locally-owned, and essentially local in operation. As stated earlier in a position statement of the Commonwealth submitted to this committee last July, neither the employees nor the employers of certain of the enterprises previously exempted from the Act, have the financial resources or, in many instances, the skills required to adequately represent their interest before the Federal quasi-judicial wage proceedings, requiring formal prehearing statements, fluency in English, and judicial review in the District of Columbia. We believe that as a matter of practical availability, the wage review forum under the Minimum Wage Act of Puerto Rico is by far more adequate for equitable minimum wage determination in the industries now sought to be covered by H.R. 8259, S. 1986 and H.R. 10518.

Traditionally, the Federal wage legislation has been made applicable to Puerto Rico largely in order to prevent the creation of an unfair competitive situation between Puerto Rican industries selling their products on the mainland and similar mainland industries. This argument obviously does not apply to the industries and enterprises that would now be brought for the first time under the jurisdiction of the Fair Labor Standards Act. These industries operate exclusively for the local market and do not in any manner compete with similar industries on the mainland on the basis of lower wages. Not even the hotel industry. Room-rates in comparable resort hotels—for instance—are higher in San Juan than in Miami.

VI

For the foregoing reasons, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico requests that the coverage of the Federal Labor Standards Act as amended, up to and including 1961, be maintained, and that there be no further extension of the Act's coverage to the island; that Puerto Rico be exempted, thus, from the application of Sections 202 and 301 through 308 of the proposed 1965 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act in H.R. 8259 and S. 1986. Inasmuch as the Commonwealth does not favor the extension to Puerto Rico of the new coverage sought by H.R. 10518, we request that sections 101, 102, 103 and 201 through 212 not be applicable to Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rican labor force, employment, unemployment, and net migration, fiscal years 1950–65

[Thousands of persons]

Fiscal year	Civilian labor force			Out migration (net)
	Total	Employment	Unemployment	
1950	686	596	90	34
1951	713	603	110	42
1952	679	571	108	62
1953	646	550	96	75
1954	631	539	92	44
1955	637	539	97	31
1956	643	558	85	62
1957	636	552	84	48
1958	637	555	82	26
1959	637	546	90	37
1960	625	542	83	24
1961	629	564	75	14
1962	670	585	84	11
1963	695	606	89	5
1964	736	654	83	4
1965	769	680	89	11

Source: Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics, and Puerto Rico Planning Board.

Employment and unemployment in Puerto Rico, January 1955 to October 1965, by quarters

Date	Employment		Unemployment	
	Number	Percent of labor force	Number	Percent of labor force
1955—January	525	80.9	124	19.1
April	578	89.6	67	10.4
July	555	86.3	88	13.7
October	544	85.8	90	14.2
1956—January	547	85.0	97	15.0
April	584	89.8	66	10.2
July	554	87.2	81	12.8
October	543	85.9	89	14.1
1957—January	546	84.3	101	15.7
April	566	90.0	63	10.0
July	543	87.2	80	12.8
October	543	86.9	82	13.1
1958—January	555	85.1	97	14.9
April	578	89.5	68	10.5
July	543	86.3	86	13.7
October	523	83.4	104	16.6

Employment and unemployment in Puerto Rico, January 1955 to October 1965, by quarters—Continued

Date	Employment		Unemployment	
	Number	Percent of labor force	Number	Percent of labor force
1959—January	545	84.1	103	15.9
April	574	89.4	68	10.6
July	522	84.6	95	15.4
October	535	86.5	84	13.5
1960—January	533	84.4	99	15.6
April	582	91.7	52	8.3
July	543	88.6	70	11.4
October	562	89.0	69	11.0
1961—January	565	86.5	88	13.5
April	545	91.6	55	8.4
July	550	86.8	83	3.2
October	582	87.8	81	12.2
1962—January	597	85.7	99	14.3
April	614	90.7	63	9.3
July	583	87.2	85	12.8
October	601	87.4	87	12.6

Employment and unemployment in Puerto Rico, January 1955 to October 1965, by quarters—Continued

Date	Employment		Unemployment	
	Number	Percent of labor force	Number	Percent of labor force
1963—January	605	84.5	111	15.5
April	635	89.9	71	10.1
July	616	88.1	84	11.9
October	650	88.3	87	11.7
1964—January	662	87.7	93	12.3
April	687	91.1	67	7.8
July	651	88.2	87	11.8
October	672	88.5	87	11.5
1965—January	695	87.1	103	12.9
April	703	90.0	78	10.0
July	687	87.4	99	12.6
October	701	88.4	92	11.6
[illegible]				

Source: Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Percentage distribution of employment by major industry group in Puerto Rico, fiscal years 1958–65

Industry group	Percent							
	1965	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958
All industries	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	17.5	21.2	23.2	23.5	23.7	22.9	24.8	26.9
Forestry and fisheries	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3
Mining	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3
Manufacturing (except home needlework)	17.5	16.1	15.0	15.6	14.9	15.0	14.3	14.3
Home needlework	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.9	1.9	2.1
Construction	9.3	8.7	8.3	8.7	8.7	8.2	6.8	6.6
Wholesale trade	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.5	1.2
Retail trade	16.0	15.4	15.8	15.2	14.7	16.2	15.8	16.3
Finance, insurance, real estate	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.8
Transportation	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.9	4.6	4.7
Communication and public utilities	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.3
Services	15.1	14.9	14.2	14.0	14.0	13.9	14.4	13.0
Government	12.8	12.1	11.6	11.5	11.9	11.5	11.9	11.2

Source: Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Wages and percent increase in wages in selected industries and increase in the cost of living, Puerto Rico

Industry	Straight time wage per hour [1]				Percent increase in wage per hour	Percent increase in the cost of living
	Cents	Year	Cents	Year		
Hotels	36	1950	107	1963	197	48
Hospitals	27	1950	81	1964	200	51
Motion picture	24	1943	88	1965	267	[2] 78
Laundry and dry cleaning	35	1950	77	1964	120	51
Restaurants	17	1944	77	1965	353	[3] 71
Wholesale trade	59	1950	142	1963	141	48
Retail trade	21	1943	91	1965	333	[4] 73
Construction	49	1950	151	1965	208	55
Transportation	52	1950	131	1964	152	51
Manufacturing	[5] 36	1946	[5] 126	1965	250	57

[1] Data refer to earliest and latest figures available on those industries.

[2] Increase between 1943 and May 1965.

[3] Increase between February 1944 and February 1965.

[4] Increase between November 1943 and February 1965.

[5] Gross hourly earnings in both interstate and local industries, increase up to October 1965.

Minimum wage revisions of selected industries in Puerto Rico affected by the proposed coverage extension to the Fair Labor Standards Act

Industry	1st revision		Last revision		Number of revisions since 1956 [1]
	Year	Rates fixed (per hour)	Year	Rates fixed (per hour)	
Hospitals	1943	$0.14	1965	$0.63 to $1.15	5
Hotels and motels	1944	$0.18 to $0.21	1964	$0.56 to $1.25	4
Restaurants	1944	$0.18 to $0.21	1965	$0.55 to $0.70	5
Laundries and dry-cleaning establishments	1947	$0.25 to $0.40	1965	$0.66 to $0.85	5
Motion picture theaters	1945	$0.25 to $0.35	1963	$0.55 to $1.25 [2]	4
Motor vehicle, electric appliances, and other repair shops	1958	$0.50 to $1.00	1965	$0.85 to $1.25	4
Transportation	1946	$0.25 to $0.55	1965	$0.70 to $1.25	5
Other services	1958	$0.60 to $1.00	1964	$0.65 to $1.25	4
Wholesale trade	1949	$0.50	1963	$1.25	7
Retail trade	1945	$0.17 to $0.25	1963	$0.45 to $1.25 [2]	4
Construction	1946	$0.32 to $1.10	1964	$1.10 to $1.50	4

[1] Revisions conducted under the 2d Minimum Wage Act of Puerto Rico approved in July 1956.

[2] Minimum wages in these industries are being currently revised.

Average gross hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries, Puerto Rico, 1946 to October 1965

[Average gross hourly earnings]

1946	$0.356
1947	.413
1948	.429
1949	.441
1950	.440
1951	.453
1952	.477
1953	.500
1954	.519
1955	.561
1956	.639
1957	.757

Average gross hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries, Puerto Rico, 1946 to October 1965—Con.

[Average gross hourly earnings]

1958	$0.826
1959	.866
1960	.922
1961	.988
1962	1.060
1963	1.126
1964	1.182
1965:	
January	1.223
February	1.226
March	1.220
April	1.211

Average gross hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries, Puerto Rico, 1946 to October 1965—Con.

[Average gross hourly earnings]

1965—Continued	
May	$1.219
June	1.225
July	1.233
August	1.234
September	1.243
October	1.255

Source: Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Statement of Amadeo I. D. Francis, Economic Adviser to the Administrator, Economic Development Administration of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Before the Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Labor & Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Presented at San Juan, Puerto Rico, on January 3, 1966

The last time that the U.S. Congress legislated on minimum wages, it included provisions aimed at avoiding a widening in the relative difference between mainland and insular minimums. The mainland minimum of $1.00 was to be raised in two steps: to $1.15 in 1961 and to $1.25 in late 1963. In the case of Puerto Rico, all minimum rates were also to be increased in two steps, simultaneously with the changes in the mainland rate and by proportionate amounts. Thus, a 15-percent increase in Puerto Rican minimums was provided for the first step and a further 10-percent increase for the second.

The 1961 amendments provided, also, that employers in Puerto Rico could apply to the U.S. Secretary of Labor for appointment of a review committee to recommend wage rates in lieu of those resulting from the automatic increases. The Secretary was empowered to appoint such a committee only if the applicants employed a majority of the employees in an industry and if he had reasonable cause to believe that the statutory increase would substantially curtail employment in the industry. Eleven industries in Puerto Rico, employing about one-third of the workers covered by the Act, filed applications for relief from the first 15-percent increase. Ten of these with 34,318 employees, were granted relief, after hearings by review committees, in the form of lower increases than those specified in the Act. Over 70 percent of the employees concerned fell in groups whose minimum rates were raised by 7 to 11 percent.[1] Later, seven of these ten industries also protested the additional 10-percent increase and were granted review committees, which again in most cases recommended hikes below the statutory rate. (An eighth industry, which had not appealed in 1961, requested and was granted a review committee in 1963.)

The automatic increases of 1961 and 1963 were intended only as a minimum standard. Since the committee system of wage review was maintained intact, more rapid increases were also possible, for any Puerto Rican minimum which had not already reached the mainland level. In fact, two regular biennial rounds of minimum wage hearings, as provided for in sec. 8 of the FLSA, were held by the U.S. Department of Labor, in fiscal 1963 and fiscal 1965. A total of 59 special industry committees were convened to review minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico.

As a result of this dual set of actions, minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico have risen greatly since 1961. As of June 1961, the range in minimums was from 26 cents to the statutory rate of $1.00, with twenty of the classifications being pegged at the statutory rate. Today (December 1965), the rates range from 30 cents to the statutory minimum of $1.25, with one-third of the rates being at the ceiling. The U.S. Department of Labor has observed that "this wide range in rates reflects the wide variation in the ability of individual industries to adjust to higher minimum wage rates, and points up the value of the flexible approach to wage adjustments which is made possible by the industry committee system." [2]

The effect on actual wages was a distinct narrowing of the relative spread between Puerto Rico and the mainland. In October 1960, average hourly earnings of Puerto Rican manufacturing workers were 42.2 percent of those in the United States—already a considerable advance from the 1956 ratio of 32.7 percent. By October 1965, the Puerto Rican level had further increased, to 47.7 percent of the U.S. Considering the radically different capital structures of U.S. and Puerto Rican manufacturing, this represents a remarkably rapid approach of the two wage levels to one another. It means, in effect, that over the past decade, Puerto Rican manufacturing wages have risen three times as fast as those in the U.S., in the process of a "catching up" which can never completely occur.

Economic Indicators, 1961 to 1965

Any cursory examination of the principal statistical indicators of the Puerto Rican economy will support the observation made by a highly esteemed labor economist during the House hearings in July, to the effect that the departure from the historical principle of flexibility that had theretofore characterized Congressional determinations of minimum wage policy for Puerto Rico "has not negatively affected economic progress." [3] Commonwealth net income has risen from $1,545 million in fiscal 1960–61 to $2,321 million in fiscal 1964–65, an average annual increase of 10.7% Labor's participation in such income is an impressive 69 percent.

Total offshore shipments have increased from $687 million in fiscal 1961 to $974 million last year. Shipments of new products accounted for most of this increase, as they rose by some 50 percent. The number of "Operation Bootstrap" factories rose from 762 in June 1961 to 1,131 in June 1965 (and an estimated 1,200 today). There have also been, as noted by the aforementioned economist, "substantial increases in employment in the face of minimum wage advances." Thus, total manufacturing employment has risen from 82,300 in fiscal 1961 to 106,700 in fiscal 1965, of which some 70 percent (71,400) is in the "Bootstrap" factories. Average wages in manufacturing rose from 95.2 cents in fiscal 1961 to $1.20 in fiscal 1965 and $1.26 in October 1965. In real terms (after correction for consumer price increases) the rise was on the order of 17.5 cents.

During this four-year period, the Puerto Rican labor force—swelled as the result of sharply reduced migration to the mainland and an influx of non-Puerto Ricans—rose by 21 percent, from 639,000 to 773,000. Total employment opportunities also rose rather impressively, from 564,000 to 688,000, but not enough to absorb all of the increase in the labor force, much less make a dent in the island's chronically high unemployment rate. Thus, in the past four years the number of unemployed has risen by 13 percent, i.e., from 75,000 to 85,000. As a result, at the close of a quinquennium of unparalleled economic growth, Puerto Rico finds itself still saddled with an unemployment rate of some 11 percent, more than twice the U.S. national rate.

There is one particularly disturbing aspect of this record. The chronic shortage of jobs in Puerto Rico has been contributing to the development of an institutional group of (primarily) young men who have voluntarily withdrawn from, or never entered, the labor force. These young people show signs of developing a most undesirable attitude both toward work *per se* and toward a community that is unable to afford them either decent jobs appropriate to their limited levels of skill and education, or alternatively, professional and vocational preparation adequate to enable them to participate productively in the community's common endeavour. The size of the task involved in more adequately equipping these youngsters is augmented by the urgent requirements of those who are already in the island's overcrowded educational system, as well as by the large proportion of workers currently employed who cannot long maintain their jobs in this technological age without greater basic knowledge and skills. The challenge posed to the Puerto Rican community inevitably resolves itself into a desperate and urgent need to accompanying training and retraining by a maximization of the kinds of jobs which can be filled by those with more modest levels of educational and vocational preparation.

It is imperative that any wage policy adopted by, or imposed on, the people of Puerto Rico be consistent with this stark reality. Even as the island strives to move its economy toward industrial activities of increasingly higher productivity and income growth potential, it must be conscious, first and foremost, of the need to provide jobs in sheer numbers, jobs that relatively unskilled labor can fill. Puerto Rico's continued industrial development does not, and must not, depend on the *perpetuation* of low wages or low minimums; [4] yet the wage policy under which it operates at any one moment must be appropriate to its *current* problems, its *current* stage of economic development, and not to the much more highly industrialized, diversified, technologically advanced and productive economy which is its future hope. Within the current context of continued need and hardship, Puerto Rico cannot resign itself to the loss of several thousands of jobs in a desperate attempt to establish the wage levels of an economy it has not yet attained. The challenges it faces—particularly those that are inherent in its current mushrooming of population—are too harsh and imperative to permit such self-deception.

II

Economic implications of H.R. 10518

In the light of the foregoing background, the rest of this statement will direct itself specifically to an examination of the impact that H.R. 10518—the proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which were favorably reported by the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives on August 18, 1965—would have on the Island economy.

This bill has three purposes, namely (a) to extend minimum wage and overtime protection to certain employees not presently covered by the Act; (b) to raise the minimum wage for presently covered employees to $1.75 by mid-1968 (in three annual steps), for newly covered (non-farm) employees to $1.75 by mid-1970 (in six steps commencing January 1, 1966), and for agricultural employees to $1.15 in mid-1966 and $1.25 in mid-1968; and (c) to provide overtime protection for newly covered employees.

Section 304 of H.R. 10518 provides for a percentage of minimum wage increase for those employees in Puerto Rico (and the Virgin Islands) covered by wage orders presently in effect which is the equivalent of the percentage increase on the mainland. It also provides for minimum wages for employees brought within coverage of the Act for the first time by the 1965 amendments, at rates to be set by special industry committees so as "to reach as rapidly as is economically feasible without substantially curtailing employment the objective of the minimum wage prescribed for such employees." The review committees established by the 1961 amendments are eliminated.

---

[1] *1962 Annual Report of the Secretary of Labor*, Appendix Table G, p. 244.

[2] U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, "Minimum Wages in Puerto Rico under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 25 Years June 1938–June 1963", p. 9.

[3] *Minimum Wage-Hour Amendments, 1965.* Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 1st Session, on H.R. 8259, Part 3, p. 1,196 (statement by Lazare Teper).

[4] *Minimum Wage-Hour Amendments, 1965,* Ibid, p. 1,200.

The Chairmen of the House Committee on Education and Labor and of that committee's General Subcommittee on Labor were reported, in the Washington press, as having observed that Federal government data indicated that the impact on the general U.S. economy of the proposed increases in the statutory minimum wage rate would amount to an increase of only one-half of one percent in payroll costs.[5] No similar computation has been made of the impact of the proposed Puerto Rican minimums. Rather there has been the general assumption that "what is good for the U.S. economy is also good for the Puerto Rican economy." This apparent notion that a minimum wage policy which is appropriate for the integrated, highly-developed, industrialized U.S. economy will also be adequate for an underdeveloped, somewhat isolated adjunct of that economy must be most vigorously rejected. Nor does making a few ad hoc adjustments to a basically inappropriate policy improve matters very much.

Data that we ourselves have been able to collect convince us that H.R. 10518, as now written, would have a clearly adverse impact on the Island's economy and on its prospects for continued accelerated growth and development. We confine ourselves, in this statement, to the impact of the proposed automatic increases in manufacturing wage minimums. The impact on the agricultural economy will be discussed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Commonwealth position as regards extended coverage has been expressed by the Commonwealth's Secretary of Labor.

A recent exhaustive study of the wage situation in Puerto Rico[6] reveals that in most key industries the trends in average hourly earnings—at least since 1957—have outrun trends in productivity. This is in sharp contrast with recent mainland experience and violates the general principle embodied in the Administration's "wage-price guidelines" that a close relationship should be maintained between increases in average hourly earnings and productivity gains.

The study also found that the differences between minimum wages and average hourly earnings are much narrower in Puerto Rico than on the mainland. Stated differently, a much larger proportion of workers in Puerto Rico than on the mainland are actually affected by minimum wage regulation. Thus, unlike the stiuation on the mainland, regulation of minimum wages in Puerto Rico has a most important bearing upon overall wage trends and costs. On the mainland, considerably less than 10 percent of the employees covered by the Act are currently paid at the $1.25 minimum.[7] By contrast, an examination of the data on distribution of covered employees by average straight-time hourly earnings, for some 57,000 Puerto Rican manufacturing workers in 20 industries surveyed by the Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor as a part of their fiscal 1965 wage order program, revealed that 19,600, or fully 34.5 percent, were being paid at the minimum wage rates established under the special committee system. It is possible to reason from this, as did Mr. Teper in last July's House hearings, that "the improvement of the economic status of the Puerto Rican worker has to rely on legislative action at the times minimums are generally raised throughout the U.S., and at other times on the actions of industry committees which . . . make periodic revisions in minimums . . . below the national standard."[8] This is only part of the truth, however. It also follows that these same actions, if not carried out with care and awareness of individual circumstances, involve real risks of causing serious economic dislocations and adversely affecting the employment situation—both current and prospective—on the Island.

1. The estimated impact on the "Operation Bootstrap" program of a 40-percent hike in minimum rates

The most current financial data available on "Operation Bootstrap" manufacturing concerns has been utilized to ascertain the impact on this universe of the proposed increases in hourly minimum rates. The basic data may be found in the Annual Statistical Report of EDA Manufacturing Plants, 1963–64 edition, and relate to firms who submitted complete financial returns for fiscal years ending in 1963. Returns were available for 82 percent of all the "Bootstrap" firms in existence in 1963.

Since that date, the second ten-percent increment in minimum rates decreed by the 1961 amendments to the FLSA has gone into effect. In addition, during the past fiscal year, all industries with minima below the statutory rate have been reviewed.[9] Since mid-1963, average hourly earnings of production workers in "Bootstrap" plants have increased by 10 cents, or some nine percent.

It is reasonable to assume, of course, that increases in wages in Puerto Rico, howsoever brought about, are compensated to some degree by increases in productivity (howsoever brought about). For recent years (1961–64) the annual average rate of increase in output per worker, measured in current dollars, has been calculated for Puerto Rican manufacturing as a whole at about 3.8 percent a year. Against this may be balanced the effect of actual and proposed wage changes. Maintaining the calculation in current dollars subsumes the effect of price rises, which can also be a compensating factor.

To arrive at the change in average hourly earnings brought about by a given automatic increase in the Puerto Rican minimum, we have drawn on the experience associated with the 25-percent increase introduced by the 1961 amendments. Despite the several abatements made by the review committees, the net effect was an immediate advance of about 19 percent in average hourly earnings.[10] This was for the period September 1961 to December 1963, which is approximately coincident with the 1961–63 two-step raise, and provides a good analogy for the two-year period, from September 1, 1966 to September 1, 1968, over which H.R. 10518 proposes a 40-percent raise. If the earlier proportionate reaction is duplicated—and this is probably a conservation assumption, especially if no review is provided—the 40-percent increase in minimum would equate to about 30 percent in average hourly earnings. Extrapolating the 1963–65 wage trend to mid-1966 and adding the 30 percent leaves us with an approximate level of manufacturing wage rates in 1968, if H.R. 10518 is to be put into effect about 47.6 percent higher than that which existed in 1963.

Combining the wage rate gain with the productivity offset, we find that the effect of H.R. 10518 is to hit the average Puerto Rican manufacturing firm with a net increase in its unit wage cost, compared with 1963, of approximately 23 percent. We have applied this average increase to the actual wage bills of EDA firms for the year 1963 (or more precisely, for their individual fiscal year ending in 1963). The result is an effect on the numbers of profitable and unprofitable firms which is shown in Table II. Table II also shows the effect of three less drastic levels of automatic increase that have been proposed—namely, of 28 percent, 20 percent, and 12 percent respectively.

Of the 699 firms for whom financial data are available for 1963, 223, representing 16.4 percent of total EDA-plant employment, were already unprofitable in that year. The smallest proposed automatic increase—one of 12 percent by 1966—would add at least 15 firms, with an additional 1,554 employees, to the unprofitable list. If the increases were on the order of 28 percent, two out of five EDA firms, with slightly over one out of three employees, would end up in the unprofitable column. With the full 40 percent applied, as now provided in H.R. 10518, over 44 percent of the EDA firms, with 36 percent of the employment would end up unprofitable.

Although the foregoing average calculation is intended only to get a measure of approximate overall impact, it is clear that only a few industrial classifications among Fomento industries would escape serious injury, were a 40-percent increase to be applied. Some industries—like jewelry, millinery, embroideries, furniture, electroplating, screw machine products and baseballs and softballs—would have few or no profitable firms and would be in serious danger of passing out of existence.

Nor is the foregoing the whole story. Firms do not long remain in business at close to zero profit, and new firms do not come to Puerto Rico without the expectation of a lot more. If we were to take a return on equity of 5 percent as a rough demarcation point between industries which might survive and grow in Puerto Rico and those whose future is at best problematical, we would find that in respect of only 52 of the 90-odd industrial classifications separated out in the 1963 financial report was there any assurance of a dependable future. Taking the most conservative assumptions—that all individual firms with zero profit would sooner or later disappear and that all industries with less than 5 percent profit would cease to grow, the resultant industrial base in Puerto Rico, from which future expansion would essentially have to stem, would be reduced to one-half the present number of firms, 55 percent of the present number of employees, and three-fifths the present number of different kinds of industry.

Total current employment in "Bootstrap" plants is approximately 78,000. The percentages cited above therefore mean that 35,000 hard-won jobs will, at best, hang precariously in the balance and, at worst, totally disappear.

It is readily appreciated that in a dynamic situation, the concerns involved would take whatever feasible measures they found to be within their power to minimize the impact of increases in labor costs of the magnitude that are discussed above. These measures could take the form of increased mechanization, demands for improved productivity, elimination of marginal jobs, etc. As is obvious, any of these measures amount to a contraction in the size of labor force utilized to produce a determined volume of goods. The exact impact is truly difficult to estimate. Attention is invited, however, to the article by Prof. Lloyd Reynolds which recently appeared in the *American Economic Review*,[11] in which the author estimates that such rationalization of production processes in Puerto Rico, motivated by a rapidly rising wage structure, resulted in a loss of 39,000 jobs in the 1954–56 period alone. The accelerated pressure on minimum rates, and thus labor costs, during the subsequent seven-year period undoubtedly resulted in an even more marked restriction of employment opportunities.

---

[5] "The Evening Star," Washington, D.C., Wednesday, August 11, 1965.

[6] Leon H. Keyserling, *Minimum Wages in Puerto Rico in the Setting of Economic Development* (Washington, D.C., July 1965).

[7] Computed from data submitted by the Secretary of Labor to the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Labor (see hearings volume entitled *Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act*, Part I, pp. 48–49.

[8] *Minimum Wage-Hour Amendments 1965*, Ibid, p. 1,200.

[9] A total of 63 wage rates were reviewed by industry committees during 1964–65, with increases ranging from one to over 15 cents. (In six additional instances no increase was recommended; in only one case did the recommended increase exceed 15 cents.)

[10] As noted earlier, over one-third of the Puerto Rican workers covered by the Act, are paid at the established minimum rate. While a slight compacting of the wage spread may be observed in the early stages immediately following an increase in the minimum rate, historical wage differentials tend to very rapidly reestablish themselves. Thus, an increase in the minimum rate has an immediate impact upon those workers earning less than that rate, but also rapidly impacts all the other workers in the affected plant or industry.

It is similarly impossible to estimate the exact extent of adverse impact that the cited labor cost increases would have on Puerto Rico's opportunities for continued growth. However, it is readily apparent that a diminution or disappearance on the above-described scale in the production (principally labor) cost advantages which Puerto Rico currently offers to new manufacturing ventures, would undoubtedly have an adverse impact on "Operation Bootstrap's" promotional prospects. This becomes obviously of the utmost importance once it is appreciated that Puerto Rico's problem is not merely that of minimizing the number of existing jobs that may be lost through increasing labor costs, but, more importantly, maximizing the creation of new jobs for the tens of thousands of anxious young workers that annually enter the labor force.

During the past five years, an average of 30,000 additional workers per year have joined the island's labor force. During the same period, "Bootstrap" factories have added an average of 6,000 manufacturing jobs annually (as jobs in "Brootstrap" plants increased from 46,000 in June 1960 to 75,000 in June 1965). It is estimated that each "Bootstrap" job creates another 1.85 jobs in other sectors of the economy, e.g., trade, construction, finance, transportation, etc. Thus, even under present conditions, the "Bootstrap" plants have accounted, directly and indirectly, for an average of only 17,000 new jobs annually—much fewer than the 30,000 actually needed.

In addition, a majority of the "Bootstrap" factories are currently threatened by the major tariff reductions which it is anticipated will result from the current "Kennedy Round" trade negotiations within the international framework of GATT. It has been reliably estimated that tariff reductions of the magnitudes authorized by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 would imperil almost one-half of the employment opportunities currently existent in "Bootstrap" plants, by increasing pressures on realized sales prices and thus, inevitably, on profit margins. The positive side of the GATT negotiations is of little relevance to Puerto Rico, since Puerto Rican industry is generally not in a position to participate in the compensating industrial activity that will result from widened export markets. Nor is Puerto Rican labor in a position to take advantage of retraining assistance when alternate jobs do not exist.

Pressures on profit margins from both sides—namely the market price of the finished commodity and the production costs of the same article—would, of necessity, have an intolerable impact on the existent manufacturing community and imperil most of the "Bootstrap" gains that have been accomplished by the Puerto Rican people over the past 15 years.

2. The estimated impact on other, traditional activity

The major industrial activities presently covered by the FLSA which are not included in the "Bootstrap" universe are sugar mills and alcoholic beverage factories.[12]

Financial information on these industries is not available, or at least not in sufficient detail to permit a computation of the effects of increased payroll payments on employment in each industry. However, it is relevant to note that during the past decade employment in the alcoholic beverage and brewing industry in Puerto Rico has been relatively constant, at approximately 2,000 employees, while the employment of production and related workers in sugar centrals and refineries in Puerto Rico has steadily declined. There has been a continual attrition in the number of operating facilities on the island, as increasing production costs have forced a major rationalization of the entire industry. The trend toward concentration of raw sugar production in a smaller number of mills is evidenced by the fact that 18 of the 41 sugar mills in operation in 1938—the year in which the FLSA was first enacted—have since discontinued operations. In 1957, the applicable minimum was set at $1.00. In the frequent wage reviews over the past four years, the minimum rate has risen by 19 cents; the last biennial committee reviewing the rate could find cause to raise it by no more than a penny and a half (1½¢). In the spring of 1964, one-half of the workers in the industry were earning less than 10¢ above the minimum rate. Nevertheless, in 1963—with 17 of the 21 concerns showing a profit—the ratio of operating profit to total income averaged a mere 2.9 percent. Some 5 percent of the island's manufacturing workers are currently employed by this industry.

B. An evaluation of the experience with the hardship appeals mechanism provided by the 1961 amendments to the FLSA

The Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 provided for the automatic escalation of all Puerto Rican minimum rates established by the most recent wage orders issued by the Secretary of Labor prior to the effective date of the 1961 amendments (September 5, 1961) by 15 percent, effective sixty days after the aforementioned date, or one year from the effective date of the most recent applicable wage order, whichever was later and, two years thereafter by an additional 10 percent. These rates could be superseded by the recommendations of a review committee which the Secretary could appoint upon being petitioned by employers employing a majority of the employees in an industry, if he had reasonable cause to believe, on the basis of financial and other information submitted by the industry, that compliance with the automatically escalated rate would substantially curtail employment in that industry.

Seven of a total of 30 industries[13] then in existence successfully filed hardship appeals with the U.S. Secretary of Labor in 1961 and in 1963. An analysis of the minimum wage recommendations made between the effective date of the 1961 amendments and December 1963, reveals that within these 28 months the rate for five of the 21 separate classifications within these industries was increased by 25 percent or more. Four received increases of 20 percent or higher; eight had hikes of between 15 and 19.9 percent, and four received increases of less than 15 percent. During this period, all of these industries were subjected to two review committees and one biennial committee hearing (which was held during the intervening year, i.e., fiscal 1962–63).

Subsequently (i.e., during fiscal 1964–65), these industries were all subjected to another biennial review. Despite this activity, *in nine of the 21 classifications, the increase since the effective date of the 1961 amendments has been less than 25 percent.* Three of the nine have had increases of over 20 but less than 25 percent; and five have had increases of between 15 and 19.9 percent. In one instance—operations other than hand-sewing on handkerchiefs, square scarves, and art linen—the resultant increases have amounted to less than ten percent. (See Tables III and IV appended hereto.) This is of particular relevance when it is recognized that these industries have been subjected to four annual reviews by separate and distinct panels, and on at least two of the four occasions on the part of people who could have been expected to be leaning over as much as possible to let the statutorily imposed increases go through.

These nine classifications were found in six industries—handkerchief, square scarf, and art linen (four classifications); and sugar, sweater, seamless hosiery, wrapper type tobacco processing, and hand-sewing on fabric gloves (one each). Despite the holding down of increases to what might be termed a moderate rate of wage escalation, there has actually been a "curtailment of employment" in all but two of the nine classifications, (the exceptions being seamless hosiery and wrapper type tobacco processing). (See Table V.)

From the foregoing record, there seems to be no basis at all to the allegation (made in certain quarters) that some industries took undue advantage of the hardship appeals procedure in order to "shirk their obligations" to their workers. The hardships appeal procedure was set up for the very purpose of exposing hardship, and only those industrial segments facing hardship got a smaller increase than that established by the statute. Those individual classifications within appealing industries that did not face any hardship were allowed to rise to the statutory level. Indeed, it may well be argued that any industry facing a legitimate hardship situation which failed to appeal would be one which shirked its responsibilities to its workers, since the result of its neglect might be that it went out of business.

The record shows that the appealing industries had more than just cause. An examination of the data for each of the seven categories which successfully appealed for review committees in 1961 *and* 1963 reveals that in all but one (namely, hosiery), industry employment, as recorded by the U.S. Wage and Hour Division in its most recent industry survey, was substantially below that found in the survey undertaken immediately prior to the appointment of the requested review committee in 1961. Overall, there has been a loss of 4,000 jobs, or some 14 percent of the beginning total.[14] (See Table VI.)

The actual fact is that review committees are, unfortunately, undersirably influenced by the statutorily imposed increases which would become effective but for their recommendations. The pressure on these committees to make findings which will result in as nearly as possible equivalent increases are unbearably strong.

---

[11] L. G. Reynolds, "Wages and Employment in the Labor-Surplus Economy", *The American Economic Review*, March 1965, pages 19–39. Also see Reynolds, Lloyd G. and Gregory, Peter, ***Wages, Productivity and Industrialization in Puerto Rico*** (The Economic Growth Center, Yale University: 1965)

[12] There are also other non-manufacturing sectors currently covered by the Act for which no analysis has been attempted, namely banking, insurance, and finance; communications, utilities, and transportation; construction, business services, motion pictures, and miscellaneous; and retailing, wholesaling, and warehousing.

[13] These industries employed a total of 22,000 covered workers, or about 40 percent of the estimated 56,000 production workers covered by the FLSA in late 1961.

[14] This diminution of employment occurred despite the increased dollar volume of shipments to the U.S. mainland, as observed by Mr. Teper in his July statement before the General Subcommittee on Labor of the House of Representatives, *Op. cit.*, p. 1, 195.

Experience with the 1961 amendments, as interpreted and administered by the Wage & Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor, revealed several additional shortcomings. In the first place, a rather strict interpretation of the term "industry," as used in section 6(c)(1)(C), meant that very often employers in one industry classification who faced legitimate hardship if the statutorily increased rate were to be imposed on the firms in that classification, found that employers in other, non-homogeneous classifications comprehended within the scope of the same industry did not face a similar situation or, for other reasons (particularly that noted in the following paragraph), were reluctant to join with the threatened concerns in filing an appeal with the Secretary of Labor. Often the employers in such an individual classification did not, of themselves, employ a majority (i.e., 51%) of the employees in the relevant industry and therefore were unable to file what would have been a legitimate appeal for the appointment of a review committee.

Furthermore, an industry, when considering the desirability of petitioning for the appointment of a review committee, found that by its action, it incurred a degree of double jeopardy. This resulted from the Department of Labor determination that a review committee appointed by the Secretary of Labor was empowered to decree a minimum which could *exceed* the statutorily-imposed increase of 15 or 10 percent against which the industry was actually appealing; in fact, the review committee could recommend any rate up to the statutory ceiling (of $1.15 or $1.25 as the case might be). Many industries, faced with this threat, chose to accede to the statutory rate increase rather than petition for a review committee despite the legitimacy of their concern—or that of other classifications within the same industry—that the new rate would in effect "substantially curtail employment in such industry".

It should thus be patently evident that the automatic escalation procedure incorporated in the 1961 amendments to the Act, even though accompanied by the palliative of a hardship appeals procedure, was far from being either an equitable or a rational approach to the objective of progressively raising wage levels in Puerto Rico. Automatic increases take no account whatsoever of the differing financial and competitive situations of different industries. The procedure is not saved by a review mechanism such as was provided in the 1961 amendments, since industries, or portions of industries, badly needing impartial review could either be turned down peremptorily by the U.S. Secretary of Labor or not even qualify to make an appeal because of accidental lines of delineation among industries. And the "double jeopardy" threat inherent in filing an appeal had the effect of dissuading firms in particular classifications of an industry from supporting the legitimate claims to review of other groups in the same industry.

Moreover, the 1961 amendments actually resulted in a curtailment of employment in Puerto Rico, even in those industries which successfully filed appeals. This is a loss of jobs which were far from marginal, in the Puerto Rican context, and whose disappearance the Puerto Rican people, at this stage, can ill afford. In sum, the entire "automatic" procedure must be most energetically rejected as inadequate protection for the delicately balanced wage situation which we continue to face in Puerto Rico, and as unresponsive to the needs of the Puerto Rican economy.

III

The imperativeness of revising the criteria governing the application of the FLSA to Puerto Rico

The policy of the FLSA with respect to industries or enterprises located in Puerto Rico is to reach the objective of the statutory minimum "as rapidly as is economically feasible without substantially curtailing employment". This is a totally inadequate basis for determination of wage policy. Wage policy in Puerto Rico needs to consider not only how substantial curtailment of employment may be avoided, but also how optimum economic growth may be encouraged; how adequate expansion of employment and reduction of unemployment may be achieved; how the structure of the labor force may be beneficially altered; how a proper balance may be struck between investment and consumption; how undue pressure upon prices may be avoided; how the balance of payments and trade may be dealt with; and, particularly, how the income generated in manufacturing may be maximized and distributed more equitably. It is ironical that this narrow criterion of "substantial reduction of employment" continues to be adhered to with respect to wage policy in Puerto Rico, even while the whole trend of economic thinking in the United States and the President's "wage-price guidelines" are based upon a much broader and more realistic set of criteria. In determining how far to go in recommending increases in minimum wages on the mainland, the President and his Economic Advisers clearly take into account a much broader and more realistic range of criteria than merely avoiding "substantial reduction of employment".

Another criterion in the Act is that minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico shall not be set at a point which would involve "competition" with comparable industries in the United States outside of Puerto Rico. This test, while of some validity, is not only excessively protectionist, but is also excessively alarmist, as is made clear by an examination of the actual ratio of Puerto Rican shipments to mainland production. Almost invariably these ratios are minimal; in all but a select few instances Puerto Rican shipments account for less than a fractional percent of mainland production.

It is rightly observed in the recent exhaustive study supported by Yale University's Economic Growth Center, entitled *Wages, Productivity and Industrialization in Puerto Rico* by Lloyd G. Reynolds and Peter Gregory, that:

"The criteria which the committees are instructed to use for wage decisions are inherently contradictory. The instructions to approach the mainland minimum wage as rapidly as feasible and to avoid giving a competitive advantage to the Puerto Rican segment of an industry point toward rapid increases in Puerto Rican wages. On the other hand, the wage decision should 'not substantially curtail employment' in Puerto Rico. At what point does a curtailment become 'substantial'? More important, what about *potential* increases in employment in Puerto Rico which might be realized by following a less aggressive wage policy? Economic development and employment expansion on the island do not appear among the criteria for wage decisions." [15]

H. C. Barton, Jr. and Robert Solo, in a paper on "The Effects of Minimum Wage Laws on the Economic Growth of Puerto Rico", prepared at the Harvard University Center for International Affairs,[16] suggest several measures that might soften the impact of the FLSA on the Puerto Rican economy. These include removing from its jurisdiction all industries in which there is no substantial U.S. competition—for example, home needlework, hand tobacco stemming, and local handcrafts, as well as all industries whose output is a negligible (say 5%) part of the U.S. total. Noting the high cost of transferring enterprise to Puerto Rico, they suggest that industry committees should be enjoined from setting a minimum wage so high as to reduce average profits in a Puerto Rican industry to the U.S. level for the same product. They jointly recommend the following modifications which they argue would appear to give committees a greater leeway to take into account problems of the kind which are unique, but essential, to the development of the Puerto Rican economy.

"To the criterion of a minimum as close to the statutory figure as possible "without substantially curtailing (present) employment" should be added "and without preventing future increase in employment". The injunction that the wage should not give any industry in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands a "competitive advantage" over any industry in the United States should be prefaced by the word "unfair".

In relation with his exhaustive study on *Minimum Wages in Puerto Rico in the Setting of Economic Progress,* Leon H. Keyserling makes even more specific statutory recommendations on the matter. He suggests,[17] in accord with the need for broader criteria than "substantial reduction of employment" and "competition", that Section 8 be amended as follows:

Section 8(a) is amended by deleting the first sentence thereof and substituting the following:

"The policy of this Act with respect to industries or enterprises in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce is to reach as rapidly as is economically feasible, taking into account the considerations set forth in subsection (d) of this section, the objective of the minimum wage prescribed in paragraph (1) of Section 6(a) in each such industry."

Section 3(b) is amended by deleting the last sentence thereof and substituting the following:

"The committee shall recommend to the Secretary the highest minimum wage rates for the industry which it determines are in accord with the considerations set forth in sub-section (d) of this section."

Section 8(c) is amended by deleting the first sentence thereof and substituting the following:

"The industry committee shall recommend such reasonable classifications within any industry as it determines to be necessary for the purpose of fixing for each classification within such industry the highest minimum wage rate (not in excess of that prescribed in paragraph (1) of Section 6(a)) which it determines to be in accord with the considerations set forth in sub-section (d) of this section, and shall recommend for each classification in the industry the highest minimum wage rate which the committee determines to be in accord with said considerations."

After Section 8(c), add a new sub-section (d) as follows:

"(d) In recommending minimum wage rates and classifications pursuant to sub-sections (b) and (c) of this section, the following considerations shall be taken into account: the impact of minimum wage rates upon general wage rates and the structure of wage rates; the role of general wage rates in promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power and economic growth, comparisons with the mainland with respect to ratios of minimum wage rates to average hourly earnings, relative wage and productivity trends, output per employee and per capita, and profit requirements; the bearing of wage rates upon the balance of payments problem; and the competitive effects of wage rates upon related industries on the mainland."

---

[15] *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

[16] Dated December 1959.

[17] "Memorandum: Puerto Rico Minimum Wage Problem in Relation to Fair Labor Standards Act," dated August 10, 1965, pp. 20–21.

In accord with the foregoing, sub-sections (d), (e), and (f) of Section 8 become subsections (e), (f), and (g).

The Commonwealth Government is exceedingly conscious of the validity of the concern over the rapidly narrowing margin of Puerto Rico's locational advantage that Professors Reynolds and Gregory emphasize at the conclusion of their discussion on Wages, Productivity and Employment.[18] Despite the fact that the raising of labor income has been and will continue to be a primary goal of the Commonwealth Government generally, that government is indeed faced with the dilemma mentioned in their study by Messrs. Barton and Solo, namely, "that a very rapid rise in industrial wage rates has been retarding that economic growth which is the source of expanding labor income and which is its hope for absorbing the unemployed into productive and remunerative work."[19]

The Commonwealth Government supports the proposals that have been reiterated by all those who have objectively examined the impact of wage policy upon the Island's imperative need for optimum economic growth, namely that the statutory provisions containing the unduly rigorous and discriminatory controlling criterion applicable to industry committees in Puerto Rico should be ameliorated so as to adequately reflect the growth needs of the Puerto Rican economy. It must simultaneously, of necessity, oppose, with just as much force, any proposal for across-the-board automatic increases which would blandly ignore almost all economic realities and jeopardize all the hard-won gains of "Operation Bootstrap."

CAMBODIAN AID AND COMFORT TO THE VIETCONG

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include news articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a number of press reports in recent days have given added evidence of the aid and comfort the Vietcong receives from Cambodia. Two news stories in particular point to the flow of contraband through the Cambodian port cities of Sihanoukville on the Gulf of Siam and Phnom Penh on the Mekong River. As I said in this Chamber on May 4 in a speech on this very subject I am satisfied that free world ships sailing up the Mekong River through South Vietnam into Cambodia are a factor in the "backdoor" aid the Vietcong is receiving from across the Cambodian border. While in South Vietnam last month I was shocked to learn from an informed naval officer that while 410 free world ships passed through South Vietnam into Cambodia during 1965 that we have no effective control over this traffic to prevent the flow of goods which we have good reason to believe in part are destined ultimately for the Vietcong.

In view of the overwhelming evidence of Prince Sihanouk's open economic and political support of the Vietcong I believe that South Vietnam should be urged in the strongest manner possible to close the Mekong River to all Cambodian-bound ocean traffic, and I have asked the President to do just this. The conditions under which the treaty which made the Mekong International Waterway was signed and the friendly relations between the riparian states it envisaged have been radically altered by the growing hostility of the Cambodian Government. It is time that pressure be brought to bear upon Cambodia to live up to its alleged foreign policy of strict neutrality in the hope that the war itself will not spread into that country.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the following dispatches of R. W. Apple, Jr., entitled, "Port of Cambodia Tied to Vietcong," which appeared in the New York Times of May 15, 1966; and Jack Foisie, of the Los Angeles Times, entitled "Cambodia's Only Big Port Is Called Depot for Russian Military Supplies," appearing in the Washington Post, May 16, 1966; and the articles "Hitting the Sihanoukville Trail," in the May 13, 1966, issue of Time magazine; and "Birmingham-Borderline Case" in the May 16, 1966, issue of Newsweek magazine:

[From the New York Times, May 15, 1966]

Port of Cambodia Tied to Vietcong—U.S. Intelligence Suspects Flow of Materiel

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON, May 14.—Intelligence experts here are convinced that Soviet and Chinese war materiel is being landed at a new Cambodian deep-water port for shipment to Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops fighting in South Vietnam.

There is no absolute proof of this. However, a Western businessman managed recently to obtain credentials to enter the closely guarded port and has provided a detailed picture of its operations.

The port, Krong Presh Sihanouk—also known by its French name, Sihanoukville—was built under a French aid program in the late nineteen-fifties at the entrance of Kompong Som Bay, an inlet of the Gulf of Siam.

The businessman said he had seen a Soviet ship unloading large quantities of medical supplies and small-arms ammunition at a pier. Soviet vessels with military cargoes call regularly at the port, Cambodian officials told him.

DESTINATION IS UNKNOWN

Although he learned that the ship had stopped at Canton in southern China just before sailing into the Cambodian port, the businessman was unable to establish whether her cargo was for the Cambodian army or for the Vietcong.

Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodian chief of state, who denies that his country is giving assistance to the South Vietnamese insurgents, has turned increasingly to the Soviet Union for munitions and equipment for his own armed forces. The French also supply some items.

There are at least two principal routes by which military equipment could reach Vietcong from the port.

Narrow but navigable canals wind across the South Vietnamese-Cambodian border in the Mekong delta area, and sampans move without hindrance from one country to the other. The frontier is about 75 miles from the Cambodian port, over a network of secondary roads adequate for truck traffic.

Neither the United States nor South Vietnam makes any effort to patrol the frontier in this area because it is firmly under Vietcong domination.

An alternate route that could be used to deliver war material to Vietcong forces operating in the Central Highlands involves roads and trails. A 143-mile national highway leads from the port to Pnompenh, and from there a newly discovered "Sihanouk trail" winds through Cambodia and Laos into South Vietnam near the Chuphong mountain massif.

The Mekong River is also a possible avenue of supply, but the South Vietnamese authorities maintain a fairly effective border patrol on the river's principal branches.

The French-built port was completed in 1960. At first it was nothing more than jetties and tin huts, but a town of 10,000 has developed in the last 5 years and a major improvement program is under way.

By 1968 the port will have a new breakwater, a larger harbor and more berthing spaces for ships. The breakwater would help protect the port against southwesterly monsoon winds, which now buffet ships lying at the exposed piers.

The improvement program is also financed by the French under a long-term loan at 2 percent interest. Cambodia was a French protectorate until she won independence in 1953.

A railroad connecting the deep-water port of Pnompenh is also under construction.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 16, 1966]

Cambodia's Only Big Port Is Called Depot for Russian Military Supplies

(By Jack Foisie)

SAIGON, May 15.—Activities at "neutral" Cambodia's only deepwater port of Sihanoukville include Russia freighters unloading military goods, a Western businessman who visited the port recently reported yesterday.

The Vietnamese government has often charged neighboring Cambodia with supplying the Vietcong with arms and other military supplies. Cambodia's chief of state, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, vigorously denies such allegations.

The Westerner, who was able to obtain credentials to enter the closely guarded port on the Gulf of Thailand, said he observed a Soviet vessel unloading cases of medicines and small-arms ammunition.

ARRIVED FROM CHINA

He learned that the vessel came from Canton, a Chinese Communist port. But he was unable to determine positively the origin of the military cargo or its ultimate user.

Cambodia's own armed forces are supplied mainly by the French. Cambodia was a French protectorate, and although independent since 1953, French influence is still strong.

From sources here it was learned there is unimpeded sampan traffic moving from lower Cambodia through canals into the Delta area of South Vietnam.

The canal systems near the border are in areas under Vietcong control. It is asserted here that this is one route by which supplies unloaded at Sihanoukville reach the Vietcong. The port is about 75 miles from the border, with a secondary road system to get the cargo to the canal boats.

RIVER TRAFFIC POLICED

Another possible channel for the war supplies would be to truck them from Sihanoukville over 143 miles of paved road to the Cambodian capital of Phnom Penh. There they could be put aboard river steamers heading down the Mekong through South Vietnamese territory. However, there is reasonably effective policing of this traffic by the Vietnamese.

---

[18] *Op. cit.*, p. 103.

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 42.

The Westerner was able to obtain a comprehensive account of conditions in the areas of Cambodia he visited.

The port of Sihanoukville, he said, was built by the French and completed in 1960 to give Cambodia its first salt water port.

But the summer monsoon winds buffet ships and interfere with cargo operations in the open roadstead. To correct this deficiency, the harbor is being enlarged, a breakwater is being added, and more berths for ships and more space for warehousing are being provided. Work should be completed by early 1968. It is being financed by a French government loan.

RAIL LINK TO CAPITAL

A railroad connecting Sihanoukville to Phnom Penh is expected to be finished in 1969.

Meanwhile, the upstart port is becoming busy, despite its handicaps. This is partly due to Sihanouk's aggressive modernization of his country, and partly due to his careful waltzing between Russia and Communist China. Both provide him with military and economic support.

His relations with the French remain constant if not enthusiastic. His relations with the United States were severed last year after the Prince's abrasive condemnation of American assistance to South Vietnam.

In the first year of operation, 1960, the port was visited by only 15 ships. Compare this slow start with 1965, when 266 ships called at Sihanoukville. They brought 754,500 tons of cargo. The imports came mainly from France, Russia, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

SOME U.S. TRADE

Despite the lack of diplomatic relations, a little trade continues with the United States. American-bound latex (raw rubber) is transshipped at Singapore. Some American machinery reaches Phnom Penh, apparently transshipped at Saigon to river steamers moving upstream under special American export licenses.

In the wily ways of the Far East, even Cambodia and South Vietnam manage to continue trade and transportation ties.

The Western traveler said he came away from Cambodia believing that the Prince may decide to reassociate his nation with the West.

"The Russians and Red Chinese seem to be rocking the country back and forth with aid and demands," he said. "France is in heavy with aid and hard cash for industrial growth. The Prince's Indonesian friends are becoming more friendly with the Western world.

"The Prince may need to make a decision for the West, or be enveloped by the Russian or Red Chinese way of life."

[From Time magazine, May 13, 1966]

SOUTHEAST ASIA HITTING THE SIHANOUK TRAIL

An eerie lull settled over Southeast Asia last week, broken only by the rumble of Polish-built trucks on Red infiltration routes and the steady thump of American bombs aimed at interdicting them. The lull was reflected in South Viet Nam by battle statistics: the Viet Cong and their North Vietnamese allies suffered only 456 dead in the previous week—the lowest toll since January 1965—and even when U.S. air cavalrymen surrounded three Red regiments near Bong Son last week, the bulk of the Communist force slipped furtively away. The enemy battalion that was finally trapped put up a good fight—but reluctantly. The Reds were saving their strength for the monsoon, waiting for the rain-rich thunderheads that hamper American air strikes. And they were doing a lot of their waiting in the sanctuary of neighboring, "neutral" Cambodia.

Of late, Prince Norodom Sihanouk has frankly admitted that Communist troops have been using Cambodia for "rest and recreation" between battles. In April the Prince handed over seven tons of dried fish to a Viet Cong representative in a ceremony at Pnompenh's royal palace. Last week American officials in Saigon disclosed that U.S. troops near the town of Lo Go on the Cambodian border had received heavy weapons fire from Cambodian territory, and were ultimately forced to silence it with howitzer fire. Even more interesting evidence of Sihanouk's cooperation with the Communists was the discovery of a new infiltration route into South Viet Nam—a chain of truck roads, bicycle trails and rivers that provides transport for supplies moving north and east out of Cambodia to some of the most important fighting areas of South Viet Nam. It has come to be known as the "Sihanouk Trail."

The new route—a supplement to the maze of paths and roads leading south called the Ho Chi Minh Trail—was discovered by the Laotian air force, whose commander, Brigadier General Thao Ma, had been keeping a close eye on Cambodia since last September. About that time, Ma received reports of activity along the Se Kong River, a tributary of the Mekong. Near its banks could be heard the sound of blasting and rumble of heavy equipment in a region virtually empty of inhabitants. By early April, Ma's aviators could follow the trail for 60 miles from Cambodia to where it entered South Viet Nam. Last week Time Correspondent Don Neff flew over the Sihanouk Trail in one of six Laotian T-28 fighter-bombers led by General Ma. His report:

"We left the Laotian airstrip at Pakse at 10:25 a.m., flying at 2,500 ft. Some 28 minutes later, my pilot announced: 'We are now at the Cambodian border.' Two minutes later we had located the trail. It snaked out of Cambodia, clear as a road map. The area was flat and only spottily foliaged. I could see the Se Kong River in the background. A note I made at the time says: 'No question about it. From the river going east (toward South Viet Nam) is a large road. The trail winds and turns, the trees growing thicker in a narrow valley.' Sometimes we lost sight of the road. But it seems safe to conclude that it is one continuous trail capable of carrying trucks from Cambodia through Laos into Viet Nam. We flew eastward, diving to less than 1,000 ft. for as close a look as we could get. We decided to unload our ordnance—two napalm canisters, 24 rockets and 700 rounds of .50-cal. machine-gun ammunition per plane—in a heavily forested area about four kilometers north of the Cambodian border. One after another, our planes dived in, hoping to hit hidden trucks under the foliage."

As many as 40 trucks a day use the gravel-topped Sihanouk Trail. The trail bristles with 12.7-mm. antiaircraft emplacements, and other sources say that there are at least 30 Viet Cong supply depots strung along its length. A dozen North Vietnamese regiments are currently poised for action in South Viet Nam, and of these, at least four are inside Cambodia. Half of the remaining eight are within easy marching distance of the Cambodian sanctuary and the supply lines of the Sihanouk Trail. Its strategic value to the Communists is an an alternate route to the Ho Chi Minh Trail. This main south-bound network has been improved by 200 miles of new roads surfaced with crushed stone and often concealed by bamboo trellises covered with branches. Down it flow an estimated 5,500 to 7,000 men each month. In an effort to stem the tide, Guam-based B-52 Stratoforts last week carpet-bombed infiltration outlets in South Viet Nam's "Zone C" for the eighth time in eleven days. But only Ma and his antique, prop-driven T-28s have been hitting the Sihanouk Trail.

Since Cambodia's Sihanouk now offers the Reds active support, he is risking a widening of the war. If the Communist monsoon offensive is to be checked before the rains come, both trails must be severed—or at least heavily interdicted—before they join up in a ribbon of men and supplies that cannot be cut. Though there is no indication that the U.S. will cease to respect Sihanouk's phony neutrality, his policy inevitably carries with it the chance that more and more of the bullets of war will spill over into Cambodia itself.

[From Newsweek magazine, May 16, 1966]

BIRMINGHAM—BORDERLINE CASE

It was Saturday morning, the 30th of April, when elements of the U.S. First Infantry Division ("The Big Red One") moved northward along the Cai Bac River on the border between South Vietnam and Cambodia. As the GI's backed their way through the dense jungle underbrush near the tiny village of Lo Go (map) they suddenly ran into heavy fire. There was a brief skirmish, then a heavy barrage of mortar and automatic-weapons fire pounded in on the Americans from the west bank of the river—across the border in Cambodia. The U.S. troops answered with heavy artillery, pouring round after round across the Cai Bac until the hostile fire was stilled.

The incident, the first in the Vietnam war in which the U.S. openly admitted firing artillery into neighboring Cambodia, was part of a massive sweep through critical Tay Ninh Province, an operation code-named Birmingham. It was also the most dramatic event of a week that saw an end come to the month-long lull in the ground war in South Vietnam.

In another major operation called Davy Crockett, units of the First Cavalry Division (Airmobile), backed up by South Vietnamese troops, landed in three places last Wednesday in the fertile farming land north of the city of Bong Son, 280 miles northeast of Saigon. After four days of fierce fighting, friendly casualties" were described as light, while 416 of the enemy lay dead and over 500 suspected Viet Cong were captured.

But if Davy Crockett was a most successful example of how to kill Viet Cong, it was Operation Birmingham, on the Cambodian border, that was strategically the most significant of the week. Carried out by 15,000 U.S. and Vietnamese troops, its major objective was to sweep through Tay Ninh Province, disrupt the infiltration route from the north and destroy the staging areas the Viet Cong might use if they launch the much anticipated offensive this month after the monsoon rains begin to fall.

Jungle cover: As of last weekend, Operation Birmingham had resulted in only 94 enemy dead, but, said a U.S. military spokesman thirty base camps were destroyed along the Cambodian border. Located under the triple-canopied jungle cover, the camps were well dug in behind log bunkers and zig-zag trenches. Barracks with room, all told, for thousands of enemy soldiers, were put to the torch. And war materiel, perhaps the biggest cache of the war, was destroyed. In one camp, 500 yards from the Cai Bac River, 6,000 uniforms with "Made in China" labels were found. In another, GI's came upon 1,000 pairs of "Ho Chi Minh sandals," made of tire casings and inner tubes, in various stages of manufacture. One U.S. unit overran a huge, but empty, hospital complex.

It was quite a haul, and First Division spokesmen seemed convinced that they had—temporarily at least—cut off a major supply route across the Cai Bac River and into War Zone C, the Viet Cong stronghold northwest of Saigon. And if Cambodian sovereignty was bruised, the Americans in the field were still certain that it was well worth it. The Cambodian Government, predictably enough, insisted last week that its territory had been violated. The attack from across the Cai Bac, said Radio Phnom Penh, was made not by the Viet Cong. The barrages were fired at the U.S. troops by Cambodians defending the frontier against the "daily aggressions" of the United States.

The Americans, almost to a man, laughed off this explanation. On the Cambodian side of the river, say the U.S. troops, there were chutes constructed which enabled sampans to pull under the lower end and take on rice, clothing and equipment for transport across the river. On the Vietnam side, the Viet Cong had fashioned a system of pulleys and hoists to use in unloading the sampans under a cover of trees.

Given all this, U.S. officials in Saigon last week were fully satisfied that the First Division commander in the field had acted properly in replying with artillery when his men were hit from the other side of the river. According to rules announced late last year, officers may take the necessary steps to protect their units, even if this means firing into Cambodia. And, says Maj. Gen. William E. DePuy, commander of the First Division, orders have been given by him to every one of his units down to the squad level that "if they were fired at across the border, they were to fire back." Added DePuy: "I personally approved the artillery fired across the border at Lo Go. I not only approved it, I directed it." As for the results, DePuy said: "I know damn well that we killed them all over the place."

HAWAII HEARS OF RETIREMENT PLANS OF ITS STATEHOOD CHAMPION—REPRESENTATIVE LEO W. O'BRIEN

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most highly respected and admired Members of this august body has revealed that he plans to retire at the conclusion of the 89th Congress. This news, I am sure, has been received with much regret by the people of this State and of the Nation, for Leo W. O'Brien has had an illustrious career as a dedicated statesman and legislator. I am also sure that those of us who have had the privilege of knowing him intimately and who desire for him, above all else, his personal happiness, wish him well as he lays his plans for retirement.

Retirement, in a sense, marks the beginning of a different byway in life's long journey, and he is truly a fortunate man who is able to savor something of the bypaths after he has successfully traversed the main road, which for Congressman O'Brien was that of a successful and distinguished legislator. One of the fascinating byroads which he hopes to take includes a family trip to Hawaii where he is revered as the "Father" of statehood.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin's Washington reporter, Frank Hewlett, reveals in his "Reporting From Washington" column that the hardworking chairman of the territories subcommittee of the House Interior Committee wishes to see his bills which provide for the popular election of the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor of Guam and the Virgin Islands passed before he retires at the close of the 89th Congress. Mr. Hewlett states that Congressman O'Brien hopes that the Senate would pass the bills as a farewell gift to him. Both bills received favorable consideration on the floor of the House yesterday.

I submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record the article which revealed to Hawaii's citizens the planned retirement of the champion of statehood for Hawaii. It appeared in the April 27, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Apr. 27, 1966]

Representative O'Brien of New York, Champion of Territories "Father" of Isle Statehood, Retiring From Congress

Washington.—Representative Leo W. O'Brien of New York, "father" of the Hawaii and Alaska Statehood laws, has decided to retire from Congress.

The 65-year-old lawmaker says he wants to spend more time with his family. He insists he is not sick, and thinks he could win another term from his upstate New York district, but believes it's a good idea to move out at the end of the 89th Congress.

"I'd like to take my grandchildren out in the Pacific and show them some of the islands I've visited," he said. As chairman of the territories subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, O'Brien has become well acquainted with the Pacific area. He sponsored the legislation to convert Hawaii and Alaska from territories to states.

O'Brien's final project in Congress is an attempt to get authority for Guam and the Virgin Islands to elect their own governors. The bills are moving well through the House, but seem to be stirring little enthusiasm in the Senate. O'Brien is expected to work on the Senate, once his measures pass the House, to go along with him as a farewell gift.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 98 I was absent due to attending a dedication ceremony for a day center for our senior citizens, in Erie, Pa.

If I had been present I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 100 I would have voted "yea."

CONSTITUTION DAY—NORWAY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, we are deeply aware of the meaning and significance of our Constitution. Indeed, our very oath of office requires us to pledge that we will uphold the Constitution which has been the firm foundation and guide for the development of our great Nation and the guarantee of our freedoms.

Perhaps our preoccupation with our own Constitution causes us all too often to overlook the constitutions of other nations of the world, constitutions which are equally meaningful and important to the governments and citizens of their respective countries. In an effort to remedy this situation, I would like today to pay tribute to the Norwegian Constitution.

May 17 is a most important day for the people of Norway and their many friends and relatives all over the world. It will mark the 151st anniversary of the Norwegian Constitution of 1814. To all Norwegians, this is truly a momentous and gala event for which they deserve our congratulations.

The adoption of the Norwegian Constitution signalled a major step in the country's drive for independence which came to fruition in 1905. While the Norwegian people had long agitated and struggled for their national freedom, from the end of the 14th century all such movements were frustrated. Nevertheless, the spirit of freedom and liberty and individual self-expression which characterizes the country today continued at an increasing pace.

Caught up in a reluctant partnership with Denmark, Norway became embroiled in the Napoleonic wars as an ally of France. According to the Kiel treaty of January 14, 1814, Denmark was to cede the territory of Norway to Sweden without Norwegian consent. Denmark's Governor in Norway, Prince Christian Frederick, quickly called together a Constitutional Assembly which drafted a Constitution for Norway which met swift approval on May 17, 1814. Prince Christian was elected king by the Norwegian National Assembly.

Sweden immediately undertook to crush the new entity, but after a short period of violence, a truce was signed. The treaty resulted in Norway's union with Sweden but as a separate kingdom under the King of Sweden. However, the king agreed to recognize the Norwegian Constitution. This union lasted until 1905 when under peaceful circumstances the Norwegian Parliament voted for independence. Thus the constitution drawn up 91 years earlier exercised a major influence in the emergence of an independent Norway.

As Americans, we should feel proud that our own Constitution was one of those exercising influence upon the Norwegians as they undertook to write their own document. Certain provisions were borrowed verbatim and others lent their influence. But the document is really a tribute to the devotion of the Norwegian people to their historic high ideals for freedom and justice, and is truly a Norwegian product. Those ideals have long since become a reality in Norway, and that is one of the many reasons I salute Norway and her people on the 151st anniversary of the Constitution Day. May they continue to be an inspiration to others and celebrate many more such anniversaries.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT REINSTATING PRAYER IN SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC PLACES AND THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a proposed amendment to the Constitution that will remove the prohibition imposed by the Supreme Court on public prayer.

In 1962 the Supreme Court ruled in the case of Engel against Vitale that a daily recitation of a short prayer by New York schoolchildren was an unconstitutional violation of the 1st and 14th amendments of the Constitution. The State Board of Regents of New York had written a short nondenominational prayer containing the following words:

> Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.

It was recommended that each school board in the State adopt this prayer, although there was no requirement to do so. Student participation in the prayer was entirely voluntary. Any student could remain silent, or upon request by parents, be excused from class during the prayer.

In ruling that this procedure was unconstitutional, Mr. Justice Black stated:

> It is no part of the business of the government to compose official prayers for any group of American people to recite as part of the religious program carried on by government.

The High Court in 1963 similarly struck down, as unconstitutional, State laws requiring that a passage from the Bible or the Lord's Prayer be read—without comment—at the start of each public school day. I am referring to the case from Pennsylvania of Abington Township against Schempp and the case from Maryland of Murray against Curlett, in which the Supreme Court said the Government must be completely neutral with regard to religion; it must neither aid nor hinder religious activity in any respect.

As a result of these decisions, the people in my State—Florida—have also been told through the circuit court in a decision that was not appealed that the observance of religious holidays, such as Christmas and Easter, by pageants and plays at public schools, are contrary to the provisions of the Constitution.

The prohibition on public prayer has been the subject of litigation in courts across the land. Cases have arisen in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Delaware, Idaho, Michigan, New York, and Virginia, that prohibit public prayer under the strictures of these Supreme Court rulings. A striking, and not untypical, example of the effect of the prohibition is found in the Oshinsky case from New York. Mr. Oshinsky, the principal of School District No. 184 in Whitestone, N.Y., ordered his kindergarten teachers to stop reciting in class a simple, old fashioned, 13-word prayer with their morning cookies and milk. The prayer we all know went as follows:

> God is great, God is good,
> And we thank Him for our food.

I am forced to say that I cannot believe the founders of our Nation, those wise men who composed our Constitution, ever intended for that great document to prohibit such behavior. I believe the constitutional amendment I am proposing would restore, rather than change, our Constitution.

Public prayer has been a part of this land since the pilgrims first gathered on these shores. No man could doubt the strength and comfort, the guidance and hope, that public prayer afforded our colonial forebears. Let us not forget that religious motivation was an important element in colonization and creation of this Nation.

Today we commenced this session of the 89th Congress with a prayer by the Reverend Latch. In doing so we follow the tradition that legislators have followed since the first session of the Continental Congress, in September 1774. Yet tomorrow the Supreme Court may tell us that is unconstitutional and prohibit us from such prayer.

The Court, when telling the State of New York that it was violating the Constitution by writing a 22-word prayer for students to recite, also observed that:

> What New York does on the opening of its public schools is what each House of Congress does at the opening of each day's business.

I refer, of course, to the decision that opened this era of prohibiting public prayers, Engel against Vitale.

I suggest that the constitutionality of our opening prayer may someday be challenged, because I know the Members of this body would not tolerate its abolition. We have all taken a solemn oath to uphold the Constitution, but I know of no Member of this body who believes that our prayer is an unconstitutional exercise, despite the fact that Justice Douglas stated in his concurring opinion in the Engel case that our activities are comparable to those activities deemed unconstitutional.

I should like to ask my colleagues to imagine their personal reaction if the Court were to prohibit our opening prayer. Indeed, I am sure we all can appreciate and understand why good people throughout the land are upset with the Supreme Court's prohibitions of prayers and Bible readings in public schools.

During the last Congress, the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, held extensive hearings on proposed amendments to the Constitution relating to school prayer. These hearings are a public documentation of the necessity for the amendment that I have introduced today.

The proposed amendment I have introduced would not only reverse the Court decisions prohibiting prayer in public schools, but would also prevent any interpretation of the Constitution that might prohibit the Federal or State Governments from referring to or relying upon God in conducting the business of government.

I do not stand alone in making this proposal. Beside me I find colleagues belonging to both political parties and standing behind us are scores of men and women of all faiths and beliefs. The language of the proposed amendment, I believe, largely reflects the work of a special, bipartisan ad hoc committee, on which I served, that was created by some 50 Members of this body who are particularly interested in the problem.

It is sheer folly to think that our Supreme Court is infallible and that its rulings are sacrosanct. Abraham Lincoln, in commenting on the Dred Scott case, spoke of the Court's fallibility and concluded:

> I believe the decision was improperly made, and I go for reversing it.

The same judgment is appropriate for the school prayer decisions, and I go for reversing them through the available Constitution amendment process.

I believe the Supreme Court's school prayer decisions and the lower court rulings that are following in their wake, pose a serious threat to religious liberty. I am deeply disturbed by these decisions, as are millions of other Americans. This amendment does not seek to rebuke the courts; rather it calls for a redeclaration by all Americans that we are, always have been, and will continue to be, a nation under God.

CONSTITUTION DAY—NORWAY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, 152 years ago today, the people of Norway adopted their Constitution. Like our own Nation's revered document, it has borne up well under the stress of time, emerging stronger and even more responsive to the freedom of the people it serves.

Over the years, a great many sons and daughters of Norway came to this country and lots of them came to settle in the State of North Dakota. As early day settlers, they were strong and spirited in the tradition of their homeland and they were well equipped to meet the rugged challenge of the new land. The importance of the role they played—and continue to have—in the growth and progress of North Dakota is well demonstrated by the fact that every segment of our State's economic, education, cultural, political, and spiritual order counts individuals of Norwegian ancestry among its leaders.

Norwegian Independence Day—Syttende Mai—is similar to our own country's Fourth of July. It is a great day in Norway and it is fitting that Congress take this time to salute that wonderful nation of free people.

MEDICARE AND THE SHORTAGE OF HEALTH PERSONNEL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the growing public awareness of an approaching crisis in medical care resulting from the imbalance between the demand for health services and the supply of health personnel should alert Congress and the administration to the need for both short-range and long-range efforts to find a solution.

Last week, as I informed our colleagues, I wrote to the President applauding his decision to appoint a distinguished panel of laymen and experts to study the health personnel needs of the country and urging him to supplement this move by mobilizing existing Federal resources to help meet the immediate problem created by the start of the medicare program on July 1.

On Sunday, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] recommended a new program of building, training, and research to increase the national supply of medical personnel and facilities. He emphasized, as others of us have also pointed out, that the bright hopes of medicare will be dashed if we cannot supply the needed doctors, nurses, hospitals, and nursing homes to provide the services to which our people are entitled.

On Monday of this week, the New York Times called attention in a front-page story to one aspect of the shortage of health personnel, the lack of adequate numbers of anesthesiologists in our hospitals.

And finally, both the Times and the Courier-News of Plainfield, N.J., in their issues of May 17 and May 14, respectively, devoted lead editorials to the crisis.

The two editorials and the article, Mr. Speaker, add important documentation to the problem confronting the Federal Government, and under leave to extend my remarks I include them herewith:

[From the Courier-News, May 14, 1966]

HEALTH PERSONNEL NEEDED

In anticipation of a growing demand for health services following the advent of the Medical Care for the Aged program on July 1 and the expansion of the Kerr-Mills program, there is mounting concern that the nation will not have the doctors, nurses, medical technicians and other health personnel needed to meet the demand. Rep. FLORENCE P. DWYER expressed her concern in a letter to President Johnson this week. Others might follow her example.

A large part of the concern is the disappointment and frustration which will result when elderly people find they are unable to obtain the health services they had anticipated.

A second and very real part of the concern is the extra burden and cost which will fall on hospitals, their staffs and hospital schools of nursing. A solution would be to give greater allowances for the cost of nursing services in the Medicare program and to make direct grants to schools of nursing.

At Muhlenberg Hospital, for example, where a School of Nursing is conducted, the tuition does not meet the cost of the nurse's education. Under the 1964 Nurse Training Act, no allowance was granted to a hospital school. It was for college schools only. The act was amended in 1965 to include hospital schools of nursing, but the formula is still complicated and slim in the allowances granted for calculating allowable costs under the Medicare program. A more generous allowance for the cost of a nurse's education would prove helpful. It would also be more realistic under Title 18 of the Medicare Bill which includes "reasonable cost" for a nurse's training.

Another area where changes could be made would be in direct grants to the hospital School of Nursing to speed up the training process wherever possible. This could be in place of the present program of tuition loans for students which is of little direct help to the hospital and places on the hospital the burden of collecting the loan over a 10-year period.

The President has appointed a committee of citizens and medical experts to study the shortage of health personnel. Public support through our elected representatives in Congress could help to focus attention on the need for solutions to some of the problems.

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1966]

MEDICAL CARE CRISIS

Symptoms are multiplying that a long-foreseen crisis in medical care is finally becoming intolerably acute. Locally there are such manifestations as the threatened mass resignation of nurses from municipal hospitals and the thin spread in the city's supply of anesthesiologists available for surgical procedures. At the state level a furor is developing over the heavy new obligations that will grow out of New York's new law to implement Title XIX of the Social Security Act—aimed at helping the "medically indigent." And on the national level both President Johnson and Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY have made it plain that they are worried about the strain on America's medical resources that will result when Medicare begins to opperate six weeks from now.

For years specialists have been troubled by the growing discrepancy between the nation's need for medical personnel and facilities and availability—both actual and prospective—of doctors, nurses, hospital beds and the like. It is typical of the inadequate public response to warnings of potential disaster that the 1964 Federal Nurses Training Act aimed at assuring 680,000 registered nurses in 1970 even though the Surgeon General's Consultant Group had forecast a need for at least 850,000 nurses by then.

Now it is suddenly and belatedly being realized that Medicare and other programs reducing financial obstacles to adequate medical care are likely to produce a steep rise in patients with no comparable quick increase in either facilities or personnel to care for them. As Senator KENNEDY has properly asked, "What is the value of offering medical treatment to our aged if there are no doctors available to administer it?" But that question should have been asked and acted upon long ago.

To meet the crisis now almost upon the nation, a program of both short-range and long-range measures is required. For the near future emphasis must be placed upon attracting back to medical work all properly trained people—for example, nurses who are now housewives—who have left such employment. This will require higher salaries, better working conditions and greater social prestige for these professions. The short-run program can also usefully encompass steps to speed up the training of students already in medical, nursing and similar schools as well as efforts to increase the efficiency with which available trained personnel are employed.

But no short-run program can fully solve the problem or make up for the neglect and deficiencies of past decades. The long-run program must provide more medical schools, more nursing schools, more hospitals, more nursing homes and other facilities. A larger proportion of this nation's human and other resources will have to be funneled into all areas connected with preventing, treating and curing illness.

Radical changes in present practices may prove essential to meet the nation's needs; both inertia and the pressure of vested-interest groups will have to be overcome. A difficult and strained decade in the medical care supply and demand is being ushered in.

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1966]

HOSPITALS SHORT OF ANESTHETISTS—RESULTING PRACTICE IS BEING INVESTIGATED—MANY JOBS GO TO INDEPENDENT TEAMS

(By Martin Tolchin)

An acute shortage of anesthesiologists in hospitals here has led to practices that are now being investigated by medical authorities.

Hospital directors, confronted with a growing difficulty in staffing their anesthesia sections, have increasingly turned the job over to groups of anesthesiologists who offer a complete service. The groups often hire their own resident physicians and nurses to administer anesthetics, and their own clerical help. Patients are billed directly by the groups, some of which serve five and six hospitals each.

By and large, this widespread group practice is regarded by medical authorities as a practical solution to the shortage of anesthesiologists. The overwhelming majority of groups are believed to provide excellent medical care.

However, United Medical Service and the New York State Society of Anesthesiologists are investigating whether some groups have overextended themselves beyond their ability to provide competent medical care.

Specifically, they are studying whether hospitals retain sufficient control over the groups. They are also studying the quality of supervision exercised by physicians who are the chief anesthesiologists at several hospitals. Finally, they are studying billing procedures to determine whether patients have always received the services for which they are billed.

The State Health Department is considering a Health Code provision that was first recommended in 1961 by the State Department of Social Welfare, which addresses some of these questions. The provision reads:

"Whatever the arrangements for staffing the anesthesia service, the governing authority [hospital] shall not enter into any agreement ceding or abridging its effective, ultimate control of the policies or quality of service."

Municipal, voluntary and proprietary hospitals are all among those served by groups with contracts at several hospitals.

"We don't like it," said Dr. Alonzo S. Yerby, the Hospital Commissioner, "but there isn't much we can do about it."

PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE

"Supervision doesn't mean simply signing up physicians. It means being personally present often enough, and knowing their work well enough, to assure himself that they are capable of doing the job. It means providing the level of supervision demanded by the complexities of the case."

Dr. William S. Howland, chief of anesthesiology at Memorial Hospital and president of the New York State Society of Anesthesiologists, agreed that the problem of supervision stemmed from the shortage of anesthesiologists.

"You can't enforce a code of ethics if you don't have enough people," he observed.

The shortage has been variously attributed to the hitherto relatively low status of anesthesiologists (their status as low man in the operating room has risen in recent years with the development of tricky, difficult and sophisticated anesthetics); and a lack of emphasis on anesthesiology in medical schools.

The shortage is nationwide. Only 8,500 anesthesiologists are practicing in the nation, where there were 12 million operations and three million deliveries last year. This would average 1,760 anesthetic procedures for each physician, some of whom are engaged in research. The maximum for most anesthesiologists is 600 procedures, and the average is 300 to 500.

Taking up the slack are nurse anesthetists, who are certified by the state after 36 months of training, and resident physicians, most of them foreign-educated, who have passed their Educational Council Foreign Medical Graduate examination. Unable to become licensed physicians because they are not United States citizens, they earn $11,000 to $12,000 a year as fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh-year residents employed by anesthesiologists.

Many of these residents, mostly from Japan, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Iran and Caribbean nations, maintain that they administer anesthetics to private patients who are billed by the anesthesiology groups.

They say they do not file official complaints, however, for fear of losing not only their visas, but also their professional careers, because it is illegal for a resident physician to work without supervision, or to have a patient billed for his services.

Moreover, their work does not provide an income while they are awaiting citizenship. A seventh-year resident from the Dominican Republic, who said that attending physicians with less experience sometimes turned to him for help, said of the system: "They need us, and we need them."

The director of one of the largest groups is Dr. Barnett A. Greene, who is chief of anesthesiology at five Brooklyn hospitals. The New York State Medical Directory lists Dr. Greene as chief at Unity, Brooklyn Women's, Cumberland and Midwood Hospitals, and the Brooklyn Hebrew Home and Hospital for the Aged.

His group, Barnett A. Greene Associates, shares Adelphi Hospital with F. Saul Ansbro, who is chief of anesthesiology at Mary Immaculate, St. Anthony's, Holy Family and St. Mary's as well as Adelphi.

The medical directory lists the same five physicians as the entire attending anesthesiology staff at Unity (3,500 operations, 1,500 deliveries annually); Cumberland (3,000 operations, 2,300 deliveries); and Brooklyn Women's (500 major operations, 1,400 deliveries). At Cumberland and Brooklyn Women's, the staff is enhanced by the same two attending physicians.

Asked how the physicians handled and supervised this caseload, Dr. Greene said that the schedules varied and the staffs were augmented by seven foreign graduates and two nurse anesthetists. He observed, however: "I guess we're spreading ourselves a little thin."

ACCREDITATION A FACTOR?

At Flower Fifth Avenue Hospital, one of five institutions served by Flower Anesthetist Associates, the operating room log for April 1 indicated that seven private patients received anesthetics from resident physicians.

Dr. Frank E. Fierro, chief of anesthesiology at the hospital and director of the group said that the residents' names were entered in the log for the purpose of gaining credits toward full accreditation as anesthesiologists and that the actual anesthetist was an attending physician.

Dr. Fierro's group also serves Metropolitan Hospital, St. John's Hospital in Queens, Astoria General and Bird S. Coler. The group includes six partners, eight foreign graduates, and a research staff of one physician and two laboratory assistants.

Blue Shield requires that physicians who bill for services sign a stipulation that reads: "I certify that I personally rendered the above services." In explanatory material to physicians, Blue Shield added: "This does not mean supervision or responsibility for a case—it means you did it," according to Harold Safian, president of Blue Shield.

Anesthesiologists also contend that a patient's lack of choice in selecting an anesthetist is similar to his lack of choice in selecting a surgeon or other physician, in that he must accept a physician on the hospital staff.

Moreover, they question whether most patients have the background to judge the qualifications of an anesthetist.

On the other hand, critics of group practice maintain that hospital-based specialists have a captive audience. They say that patients choose their physicians and surgeons, rather than choose the hospital.

NATO AND AMERICAN POLICY

The **SPEAKER**. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **HALPERN**. Mr. Speaker, this is the third occasion on which I have taken the floor to discuss the NATO situation generally. The alliance, resulting directly from the actions of France, is in a state of flux.

Events are moving swiftly toward the redeployment of NATO decisionmaking organs, and no doubt new groups will be formed to expand management responsibility among our allies.

If we determine that the preservation of the integration principle is the supreme priority, then these developments are to be viewed logically.

It is reported that support for General de Gaulle's contentions is practically negligible among the European member-states. This may be true. NATO has been particularly beneficial to the European countries, many of which have not been willing to make the budgetary sacrifices for defense which might have been expected. Nearly 300,000 American troops stationed on European soil guarantees, to some extent, the comforting prospect of immediate U.S. retaliation in the event of aggression. The burden of this alliance has been unproportionally shouldered by both American conventional and nuclear strength.

The essential fact, however, is that relations with the Soviet Union and Communist East Europe have not progressed to the stage where the need for cooperative defense arrangements is removed. The time may come when this is a distinct possibility. But at present the Atlantic alliance, as a military deterrent and credible weapon, is of vital concern.

In reconstituting the organization, two major factors must be borne in mind: first, means must be found to establish liaison and cooperation with the French Government, and secondly, the problems confronting the alliance, which relate to European political developments, must be realistically dealt with.

It would be foolish to hastily fill the breach with committees and organs and policies which, while reassuring in appearance, ignore the existing difficulties and disequilibrium. The alliance should not become a superficial coverup for the anxieties and doubts that have developed. Defense of the status quo at this point may merely postpone the real settlement of outstanding differences to a future date when these same differences have become more critical and emotional.

How are we going to equate the objective of nuclear sharing with an agreement on nonproliferation? How can West Germany become a meaningful military partner without complicating our dealings with the Soviet Union, Poland, and other East European states with which we hope to improve relations? Does the structure of NATO, and especially the stationing of American Forces in Europe, rule out the development of East-West agreements on central European security and the reunification of the two Germanys?

These are questions which require patient and careful analysis today, before unalterable decisions are made respecting the future of the alliance organization.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] raised a number of extremely pertinent points in his speech to the House of April 25. He discussed various means of correcting the malignant imbalance which exists in the decisionmaking processes of the organization. They merit careful study by the State and Defense Departments.

In effect we are today partly suffering from the consequences of neglect. And since the French decisions we have compounded our error by a thoughtless and rigid commitment to the status quo. This will not do. On April 29, a high official of our Government publicly attacked the French Government in the sharpest language. He hoisted the gravest warning signals; dire predictions were made of a return to "1914"; disintegration of the Western alliance would mean inevitable weakness in bargaining with the U.S.S.R. on European security and German reunification, a warning which carries two overwhelming, and by no means obvious, assumptions.

In this same public utterance, the U.S. Government castigated the French Government for halting the drive toward European unity. The presumptuousness of this accusation defies diplomatic definition. While European unity may be in the interest of the United States, it is not for our Government to determine the politics of the European states. We have no right to criticize our allies for what they do in their own behalf. Unquestionably, the tactless intervention of the United States, which forcefully put itself behind British entry to the Common Market, mitigated against the success of that venture. Our hegemony in Europe is over, and unless we commence to deal with these nations as equal partners, our diplomacy will suffer inevitable setbacks.

The more we tend to commit ourselves to issues of exclusive European concern, the more our power and prestige will come to depend upon events over which we lack the slightest control.

The ironic result is that developments unrelated to our own direct choosing are viewed in the public eye as American policy defeats. We are forever walking a tightrope. To take a recent example, the presumption which causes us to lobby unremittingly and openly for European unity makes it inevitable that our Government shoulder the blame whenever the cause is jolted abroad.

It is the psychology of these fateful, premature advances which inevitably permit us to publicly criticize European leaders and their decisions regarding strictly European problems.

It is my hope that the present period may serve to awaken us to some of the harsh and crucial fallacies which underlie an often sterile policy toward Western Europe.

PLAYING THE FARMERS FOR SUCKERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, after a few years in this body, it is rather easy to become accustomed to the doubletalk and callous treatment which abounds when the agricultural program comes up for consideration. This administration has talked in terms of voluntary farm programs which are really compulsory. The Secretary of Agriculture has callously dumped farm commodities with the idea of controlling market prices and forcing them down. By his own admission this has happened. Last year he told the House Agriculture Committee:

> We purposely sold in order to move our prices down far enough so that they would be way below the support level, the loan level, so that we would thereby get compliance. That was the whole intent and purpose and thrust of the program.

On March 10, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Gardner Ackley, said the same thing on a national television show. He openly and proudly noted:

> I mentioned the fact that increase in supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn, and we're trying to hold down the price of corn. The Government's acquired large stocks of corn in past price support operation; now we're releasing them into the market.

None of this comes as a surprise to me. Farmers and ranchers have been singled out by the administrations as the "villains" in the inflationary spiral and the Secretary of Agriculture announced on March 31 that he was elated that farm prices gave indication of going down. He has consistently ignored the ever-rising cost spiral the farmer is caught in and talks only of the price for farm commodities.

On April 29, I joined with 39 other Members of this House to send a telegram to the President pointing out that we objected to this discriminatory policy against the farmer. The telegram was as follows:

> The PRESIDENT,
> *The White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Your recent actions directed at American farmers and ranchers taken through Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, Secretary of Commerce Connor, and Mr. Gardner Ackley have done and will do little to lower consumer food prices, but will insure financial hardship for many farm families.
>
> Over the years attempts to bolster farm prices have led to large and costly farm programs. Now that farm prices have risen somewhat, you act to undermine the very think we seek. The actions you have ordered taken:
>
> 1. Dumped huge quantities of Government-held stocks of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum at cut-rate prices in order to force compliance with the wheat and feed grain programs and to overexpand livestock productions.
>
> 2. Initiated an incentive program for soybeans in order to create a surplus and force down market prices.
>
> 3. Ordered an increase in the import quota for cheddar cheeses.
>
> 4. Ordered the Department of Defense to substitute margarine for butter and initiated a margarine purchase program for relief donations in place of butter.
>
> 5. Ordered the Department of Defense to cut the use of pork by one-half, and authorized the purchase of meat in foreign countries for our military establishments abroad.
>
> 6. Directed the Department of Commerce to limit the exports of cattle hides and skins.
>
> 7. Made large payments to cotton textile manufacturers to offset a part of the market price for cotton, but let them increase prices of textile goods.
>
> These actions will directly lower prices to farmers, but will not result in significantly lower consumer prices. Depressing farm prices only worsens the farmer's already tight cost-price squeeze. No effective Government action is taken to curb the increasing cost of items farmers must buy to produce our food.
>
> Mr. President, this policy is totally discriminatory against an important segment of our economy gravely injuring a $42 billion industry.
>
> JOE SKUBITZ, ANCHER NELSEN, BOB DOLE, CATHERINE MAY, DURWOOD G. HALL, H. R. GROSS, ALBERT QUIE, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, GEORGE HANSEN, E. ROSS ADAIR, CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., JAMES B. UTT, CHESTER MIZE, JOHN ASHBROOK.
>
> GERALD FORD, LESLIE ARENDS, MELVIN R. LAIRD, JOHN BYRNES, E. A. CEDERBURG, GLENN CUNNINGHAM, RALPH HARVEY, GARNER E. SHRIVER, JOHN ANDERSON, MARK ANDREWS, DON CLAUSEN, GLENN R. DAVIS, ROGERS MORTON.
>
> CHARLES HALLECK, FRANK BOW, PAGE BELCHER, ODIN LANGEN, DELBERT LATTA, BEN REIFEL, E. Y. BERRY, PAUL FINDLEY, LAURENCE BURTON, JAMES F. BATTIN, DAVE MARTIN, ROBERT ELLSWORTH, RICHARD ROUDEBUSH.

In a shocking disregard of the taxpayers' funds, the Secretary sent a seven-page telegram in reply to each of us when a letter would have done just as well. The cost to the taxpayers was $2,400 for this wasteful practice. Even more distasteful was the nature of the Secretary's reply. The following telegram was received in our office:

> WASHINGTON, D.C.,
> *May 9, 1966.*
>
> Hon. JOHN ASHBROOK,
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Your recent wire to the President offers an opportunity to look once again at the remarkably successful record of U.S. agriculture. I welcome the opportunity and thank you for it.
>
> All Americans can be proud of our farmers and their awesome ability to overcome drought, hail, flood, wind, and other vagaries of nature and to produce the most abundant and nutritious supply of food in history.
>
> Those in other countries—friend and foe alike—stand in awe, envy, and thankfulness too that our farmers are able to feed this Nation superbly and yet to produce enough in addition for hungry mouths all over the globe.
>
> The American farmer, working with this administration and a majority of the Congress, has acted these past 5 years to develop farm programs that have brought about amazing results.
>
> It is dramatic and exciting, when you look back at the dismal state of agriculture at the end of the 1950's, to compare today—1966—with 1960.
>
> Gross farm income is up nearly $10 billion.
>
> Net farm income is up early $3.5 billion.
>
> Net income per farm is up more than 50 percent.
>
> Per capita farm income is up 50 percent.
>
> Major farm prices are up:
>
> Beef steers and heifers up $2.10 per hundredweight since 1960.
>
> Hogs up $9 since 1960.
>
> Corn up 12 cents a bushel since 1960.
>
> Soybeans up 72 cents a bushel since 1960.
>
> Manufacturing milk up 52 cents per hundredweight since 1960.
>
> Eggs up 9 cents a dozen since 1960.
>
> Acreages of rice, soybeans, barley, and wheat are up. A 15-percent wheat acreage increase has been announced for 1967.
>
> Loans to rural electric and telephone systems are up 26 percent.
>
> Exports are up to the highest point in industry.
>
> Loans to rural families and rural communities to improve their way of life are up from $300 million to $1 billion.
>
> A few things are down. They are:
>
> SURPLUSES
>
> Taxpayer costs for storage and handling of surpluses.
>
> The percentage of take-home pay needed to buy food.
>
> And, the public standing of those who opposed the farmer, the Congress, and the administration in building this record of farming success.
>
> This administration's unexampled record of success in agriculture is essentially the result of five major legislative acts since 1960. The 40 Members of Congress who signed the wire to the President had an opportunity to cast nearly 200 votes, in total, in support of these important bills for the farmer. However, with 200 chances to help the farmer, you voted "yes" only 27 times in all. A mere 13 percent of your votes for the farmer—87 percent against him.
>
> That is not a record to write home about. Not if you have farmers in your home district.
>
> Yet you said, in your message to the President, that the administration "acts to undermine the very thing we seek."
>
> Obviously you don't seek the positive gains accomplished by the legislation you re-

jected—the higher farm income and higher farm prices, greater farm acreage, increased agricultural exports, and all the other benefits for the farmer.

What do you seek?

You complained about "dumping" stocks of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum. Certainly you know that we sold these grains to meet domestic and world needs. Storage costs were lessened, and farmers' prices remained well above support levels, this was not true before 1960.

You charged erroneously that we raised the support price for soybeans "in order to create a surplus and force down market prices." Certainly you know that our soybean stocks are down to a 3-week supply, and the price of soybeans has gone up 10 to 20 cents a bushel since the announcement.

What is it you seek? To build new surpluses of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum, and create artificial shortages of food for our people, and hold down exports?

Should incentives be denied for soybean production, thus creating a shortage and causing wild fluctuations in price—and profits for speculators? Is that what you seek?

American agriculture has experienced an unprecedented period of progress in the period 1961–66. The income gap between farmers and nonfarmers has narrowed by nearly 20 percent since 1960. Even so, farmers have a long way to go before achieving income parity.

And it is the continuing objective of this administration to keep agriculture on the rise.

Let me tell you what we seek.

We seek your support in this effort.

Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary.

It takes a lot of nerve, Mr. Speaker, for the Secretary of Agriculture to attack our record when we have consistently worked to reduce farm controls and offer the farmer the ability to make decisions for himself. The administration has advocated cutting conservation funds by $220 million, cutting vital research work into the corn borer, cereal leaf beetle and so forth, has advocated cutting Extension Service funds which help 4–H and farm youth groups and even advocates cutting the school lunch program. All of this and they are supposed to be the friend of the farmer.

The farmer expressed himself very definitely in the May 1963 wheat referendum. The Secretary said they were wrong and his party crammed a compulsory program down the throats of the American farmer despite his nationwide rejection of this plan by a vote of 584,285 in favor and 638,572 against. In Ohio the vote was 20,169 in favor and 68,722 in opposition. The breakdown in my district was as follows:

May 21, 1963 referendum vote

	Yes	*No*
Ashland County	168	1,326
Coshocton County	184	676
Guernsey County	117	212
Holmes County	163	537
Knox County	231	821
Licking County	288	882
Muskingum County	173	462
Wayne County	234	1,740

Now, Mr. Speaker, who is working for the best interests of the farmer? The man who works for a compulsory program that the farmer rejects or the man who fights for a program the farmer favors? The answer is rather simple to most people but it would seem that this is lost on the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Freeman states that the farmer has had a 50-percent increase in his income during his tenure of office. I would like to see the farmer who has had a 50-percent increase in income during this time. Costs have gone up but in relation the farm income has lagged far behind. Their original estimates were that their farm program would cut costs in 1962 by up to $2 billion. In truth, it added almost $2 billion in costs. The farmer is a taxpayer, too, and this is reflected in his staggering tax burden which is heaped on his back. Bureaucracy has increased but the farm income has not in any fair proportion. About the only conceded increase has been the amount of the dole which Mr. Freeman has increased during his tenure of office.

His telegram was so full of holes that we felt compelled to reply. He noted that exports were up. Yes, but he overlooked that imports are up and he granted Australian and New Zealand beef interests a sizable increase in the amount of beef products they could dump in this country in direct competition with our farmers. He failed to note that dairy product imports are increasing all of the time, thanks to the State Department and the Agriculture Department, and in just one commodity, cheese—vital to our area—we have already reached the danger point. We fired back the following telegram in answer to his politically inspired answer:

May 12, 1966.

The President,
The White House
Washington, D.C.:

While you were absent from Washington, we received a 7 page telegram from Secretary Freeman purporting to be an answer to our telegram to you dated April 29, concerning specific actions taken or directed by you to lower farm prices in 1966.

We note with interest that Secretary Freeman studiously avoided the major points in our earlier telegram with his 7 pages of propaganda costing taxpayers an estimated $2,400. We note with interest that your reaction has been to announce steps to rescind one of your earlier ill-advised actions to force down farm prices. Your Secretary fails to discuss these actions by trying to divert attention with some highly selective comparisons of 1966 and 1960.

We agree that our farmers and ranchers have done an outstanding job of supplying the nation and the world with low cost food and fiber despite the handicaps imposed by your Secretary of Agriculture in his attempts to control their operations. Gross production and sales of farm products have increased to meet expanding demand; production of wheat and feed grains set a new record high in 1965, although the government has paid out increasing billions of dollars in an attempt to purchase a reduction in these crops. We note that CCC realized losses in Fiscal 1965 totaled $5.2 billion compared with $3.3 billion in fiscal 1960. Thus we wonder how a slight decline in CCC storage and handling costs can be so important.

With respect to net farm income, we note that the estimated increase of $3.5 billion for 1966 is just equal to the expected total payment to farmers out of the Treasury. Also, we note that gross income, including government payments amounting to $2.5 billion, from the controlled crops in 1965, declined slightly while that from uncontrolled crops, livestock and products with no government payments increased by $2.5 billion; therefore, you can sense our concern when you direct actions to reduce farmers' prices of these products in 1966.

As for average per farm income, we note that about one-half of the reported increase since 1960 is due to a decline of 700,000 in the number of farms. We wonder how the farmers who have been forced off their land are enjoying the reported increase in income.

We are pleased that your Secretary admits that prices of livestock and a number of crops are up and we hope that he now will stop all actions to beat them down. He should recognize that market forces, which may be alien to him, are functioning and that attempts at governmental interference are dangerous. We believe there is no substitute for the profit incentive to farmers in the market system. It is noteworthy that an increase in foreign demand has been the major factor reducing surpluses of grains—not the costly attempts at supply management; on the other hand, the loss of foreign outlets for cotton has been the major factor in increasing the cotton surplus.

We cannot conceive of an increase in farmers' indebtedness, either to the government or otherwise, as being an improvement. We do note that the total farm debt has increased by 50 percent since 1960 and assume it is due to the ever-increasing costs of operations which reached an all-time record high in April 1966.

As for our voting record, we stand on our record in opposition to efforts to regiment and control our farmers and we believe that the results of the wheat and turkey referenda proved that ours have been votes with our farmers.

We note with approval that you have seen fit to order the Secretary of Defense to resume the purchases of pork for our troops. Your acceptance of the views expressed by many of us that wheat allotments should be increased will be beneficial to the farmers if properly programmed and administered. We hope that you will direct the agencies to improve further the lot of farmers and ranchers in the other areas we mentioned in our previous telegram by:

(1) Stopping the dumping of wheat and feed grains on the market at cutrate prices.

(2) Rescinding the order to increase the import quota on cheeses.

(3) Resuming the purchases of butter for the Air Force and Army and exercise the authority in the 1965 Act to purchase dairy products for relief donations.

(4) Stopping the purchases of meat abroad for the military establishments.

(5) Removing the export controls on hides and skins.

Gerald Ford, Les Arends, Odin Langen, Melvin R. Laird, John W. Byrnes, Charles Halleck, Frank T. Bow, Albert Quie, Ancher Nelsen, Robert Dole, Charles M. Teague, Joe Skubitz, Catherine May, John Anderson, Dave Martin, E. A. Cederberg, Laurence Burton, Durward Hall, Don Clausen, Chet Mize, George Hansen, E. Ross Adair, John Duncan, Glenn Andrews, Clark MacGregor, William H. Harsha, William L. Dickinson, Jackson E. Betts, Wm. N. McCulloch.

Ralph Harvey, Glenn Cunningham, Delbert Latta, Clarence Brown, Bob Ellsworth, Ben Reifel, James F. Battin, E. Y. Berry, H. R. Gross, Page Belcher, John Ashbrook, Paul Findley, Jack Edwards, Garner Shriver, James B. Utt, Glenn R. Davis, Rogers Morton, Richard Roudebush, Mark Andrews, W. E. Brock, Members of Congress.

(This telegram is paid for in cash by the above-mentioned signers, not at Government expense.)

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture called upon me to help him help the farmer. With a little more of that kind of "help" the farmer will be a prime candidate for the poverty program. Mr.

Freeman is not helping the farmer, he is dooming him to collectivism. If he would just listen to the American farmer and stop trying to push these punitive programs down his throat, he could be assured of my support. This is not his intention and I hope the American farmer will arise to the occasion and make his indignation felt. The farmer is sick and tired of being taken for a sucker by the desk farmers in the Department of Agriculture. Let's start listening to the farmer rather than the bureaucrat. The latest gimmickry is the so-called stockpiling proposal of Mr. Freeman which would give him dictatorial powers over every phase of agriculture. I am going to help the farmer once more by opposing this punitive program. Mr. Secretary, will you join us?

CONGRESSMAN MORRISON ANSWERS ATTACKS BY CONGRESSMAN DERWINSKI ON POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE O'BRIEN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time to clarify a situation raised last week by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI]. It was implied in this Chamber last week that Post Office Department officials had acted improperly, and perhaps illegally, in supporting H.R. 14904, a bill to revise parcel post rates and increase the size and weight of parcels that could be carried through the postal system.

I have a particular interest in this bill since I have the privilege of being the chairman of the subcommittee and the vice chairman of the full committee which approved it. It is no secret that the Post Office Department strongly supports this measure. The distinguished Postmaster General, Lawrence F. O'Brien, and other postal officials testified in behalf of the bill on a number of occasions.

But I know of no instances in which any postal official, in Washington, or elsewhere, acted improperly in regard to this legislation. As the gentleman from Illinois said on the House floor last week, the Postmaster General has a well-deserved reputation for integrity. And I want to assure the gentleman from Illinois that from my vantage point as chairman of the subcommittee which considered this legislation I could detect no actions by subordinates of the Postmaster General which would reflect discredit on him or on the Department he so ably heads.

I was a bit troubled, however, by the charge made here last week that the parcel post bill was "slipped" through the Postal Rates Subcommittee. I hardly think that accurately describes the handling of a bill on which extensive public hearings were held over a period of 2 months.

Voluminous testimony was taken on this legislation from proponents and opponents of the changes it calls for. Representatives of the Post Office Department, the REA and many other groups were given ample opportunity to present their views on the legislation. Transcripts of the hearings have been printed and are available to anyone who wishes to review them.

The bill received full and open consideration.

I might point out that the bill won overwhelming endorsement in both the Postal Rates Subcommittee and the full House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. These votes reflect the well-documented case developed at the hearings that this bill is very definitely in the public interest.

In recent years we have heard a lot about fiscal responsibility. Passage of this bill will permit the Post Office to operate parcel post services in a fiscally responsible manner. Failure of the Congress to enact this bill will force the Post Office to continue operating parcel post services at an unwarranted loss.

The predicament the Post Office finds itself in today over parcel post stems from a law enacted in 1951. That law sharply reduced the size and weight of parcels that could be shipped parcel post from first-class post offices. The primary purpose of the law was to provide a financial shot-in-the-arm to a single firm, the Railway Express Agency.

But the benefit to REA has been small while the detriment to the postal service and the public has been great.

Before 1951, the Post Office Department operated a uniform parcel post system. Packages less than 70 pounds and 100 inches could be mailed anywhere in the United States.

The changes made in parcel post regulations in 1951 established two zones for shipment of packages between first-class post offices. A limit of 20 pounds and 72 inches was set on packages shipped between first-class offices more than 150 miles apart and 40 pounds and 72 inches on packages between first-class offices less than 150 miles apart.

The limit on packages shipped from second-, third-, and fourth-class offices remained 70 pounds and 100 inches.

The restrictions imposed by the 1951 law have had a number of effects, all bad.

The Post Office has been forced to continue providing service on relatively large parcels shipped from rural areas. The cost of providing this service is high.

But the Post Office Department has been severely restricted in the parcels it can handle in urban areas. The Department has lost much of the high volume, low cost service generated in urban areas.

The 140 million Americans living in urban areas are denied adequate parcel post service. Millions have been turned away from post office mailing windows. These restrictions have produced confusion and frustration.

For example, the Post Office can deliver a 70-pound, 100-inch package from a business firm in Jersey City, N.J., to a village in Alaska, but it cannot deliver a 10-pound, 73-inch package sent by the same firm to a destination just across New York State to Buffalo.

The restrictions have increased costs for all users of parcel post, whether they live in the city or the country. The same law that established the new size and weight restrictions also required the Postmaster General to certify that parcel post receipts were within 4 percent of costs.

The loss of so much of its high-volume, low-cost service forced the Post Office to increase rates. This rate increase caused a further decline in volume and another rate increase was required. This undesirable spiral continues.

Although farmers and others in rural areas were supposedly not affected by the 1951 law because no change was made in the size of parcel post packages they could mail, they have suffered along with everyone else from the higher rates made inevitable by the restrictions on urban service.

Some small businesses have attempted to continue getting the full benefit of parcel post service by shipping their larger packages from other than first-class offices. This not only places an additional burden on the business firm, because these parcels usually have to be delivered to a post office out of the firm's immediate area in order to be mailed, but it also is self-defeating in the long-run.

Since the amount of revenue a post office takes in determines its class, if enough business is diverted to a second-class office to take advantage of the more liberal parcel post size limitations, that office ultimately will become a first-class station.

The difficulties I have outlined here, all stemming from the restrictions imposed in 1951, have precipitated a crisis in parcel post service. Encased in its present straitjacket, parcel post simply cannot be maintained on a break-even basis. Unless changes are approved, it will have to be subsidized.

The bill approved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee would permit this. Under the bill, a uniform limit of 40 pounds and 100 inches would be established for all parcels mailed between first-class offices.

I want to point out this would mean that the parcel post service in urban areas would still be more restrictive than it was before 1951.

The bill also would increase parcel post and catalog rates, a move that would increase revenues about $63 million a year. The total increase in revenue under the bill would be $107 million, enough to put parcel post service on a self-financing basis.

The establishment of a single size and weight limit for parcels mailed between first-class offices, rather than the present two-zone setup, would simplify postage computations and be less confusing for the public, businesses and postal clerks.

The Postmaster General would retain his present authority over parcel post rates. He would be required to certify to the President and Congress' that he has taken action to bring parcel post revenues in line with costs.

The bill is a reasonable one. It takes into consideration the interests of people living in rural and urban areas, of business and commercial operations, and of the Post Office Department. It would not, as has been charged, damage the REA.

REA did not receive the great windfall of business it expected from the restrictions imposed in 1951. Much of the business diverted from the Post Office by those restrictions has been taken over by United Parcel Service, buslines and various other carriers.

Almost all the opposition to this bill has been generated by one company, the company that was provided a privileged economic sanctuary under the 1951 restrictions.

I find it ironic that many of the attacks on the proposed changes in parcel post regulations are being palmed off as a defense of private enterprise. It seems highly questionable to me whether any firm that wants the Government to subsidize it by handling its high-cost business while it retains all the low-cost, high-volume traffic is even in private enterprise.

One of the most regrettable aspects of the whole situation is that some of the forces opposing changes in parcel post regulations have been putting out a lot of misinformation. The bill would partially restore—and I want to emphasize the words "partially" and "restore"—parcel post service to what it was before the 1951 change in the law. The public is being told we are proposing "expansion" of parcel post service.

It has been broadly hinted that employees of the firm benefiting from the present setup would lose their pension rights. The truth is the pension rights of these employees are guaranteed by law.

These employees also are being told passage of the legislation will cost them their jobs. Yet Postmaster General O'Brien has publicly stated that the Post Office Department will hire any employee who is thrown out of work because of this legislation. Postmaster General O'Brien restated this pledge just last week in a letter to the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I know the Postmaster General well enough to know this is a good faith commitment that he will honor. But I do not think enactment of this much-needed legislation will put very many, if any, employees out of a job.

Unfortunately, this misinformation has had some effect. Some railroad employees have expressed misgivings about the bill. Apparently the propaganda barrage has made them fearful liberalization of parcel post restrictions would be detrimental to their best interests.

Actually, passage of the legislation will increase parcel post volume and mean greater job security for railroad employees.

I reiterate what I said earlier. The alternative to liberalization of parcel post restrictions is a subsidized parcel post system. The alternative to passage of this bill is continued inadequate parcel post service to the American public and the American business community.

This bill is a reasonable proposal. It is in the public interest. It should be enacted.

REVIEWING THE RECORD ON VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, it is now a year since President Johnson requested of the Congress a vote of confidence for his Vietnam policies through passage of the second supplemental appropriations bill to bear the expenses of our involvement until June 30, 1965. The President at that time affirmed his sincere search for peace through negotiations, a quest which I readily seconded and which I have been advocating ever since.

Now, in light of the recent unsettling political events in South Vietnam, it is incumbent upon us to review the developments during this year and our reactions to them, and in fact, a searching appraisal of our whole policy in pursuit of some form of democratic self-determination for the people of South Vietnam is surely in order. Many of us are deeply disturbed as to the present conditions which do not appear to be laying any substantial foundation for truly free elections, as so many of us desire. I urge the President to reaffirm at this time America's commitment to popular government in South Vietnam, since this is the whole purpose of our military and economic assistance to that country.

As a Member of the 89th Congress and a concerned citizen, I include in the RECORD the statements I have made in regard to the developing situation in South Vietnam, with the request that the search for peace which I and so many Americans earnestly desire not be abandoned at this critical juncture:

THE USE OF GAS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(March 25, 1965, letter to the President signed by Representative PATSY T. MINK and 15 other Congressmen)

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The actions of our military in South Vietnam in providing riot-control type gases to the South Vietnamese appear to have violated our long-standing policy against the first use of gas in warfare.

This national policy was first enunciated on June 9, 1943, by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who said:

"Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we never will be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies."

It was reaffirmed on January 13, 1960, by President Dwight D. Eisenhower who said, when asked at a press conference about our government's policy on the use of gas in warfare:

"So far as my instinct is concerned, (it) is to not start such a thing as that first."

The first use of gas in warfare, however innocuous its variety or effective its results, subjects the using country to the censure of the civilized world. In this instance it undoubtedly will provide a basis for an effective propaganda campaign against our involvement in Southeast Asia, could isolate us from many of our friends, and may result in a legacy of deep resentment in Asia.

In view of the above and the great concern, both nationally and internationally, over the use of gas in Vietnam and in the hope that some action be taken in the interest of our national prestige and moral standing, may we respectfully suggest:

1. That, since the area commander apparently had authority to use these riot-control gases, in case of civil disturbances, an investigation be made into the means by which such authority was extended to authorize use of such gases in combat;

2. that exclusive control and direction over the use of chemical, biological and radiological weapons be restored to the Presidency and finally;

3. that, in the light of former executive pronouncements, an expression of this Administration's policy toward the use of these weapons be made.

Sincerely,

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION

(Statement in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 7, p. 9533)

The fifth of May, 1965 undoubtedly was a day that I shall long remember for the mental and emotional experience I just endured. The President, concerned that the people of the United States did not support his policies in Viet Nam, called upon the Congress in an extraordinary move to gain approval of his program by asking for $700 million to the end of June 30th, 1965. The President by this request asked for a vote of confidence in his leadership. It was readily acknowledged that these funds were not needed for the furtherance of his policies in Viet Nam, for he has the authority to use general funds of the Defense Department, but that he chose this means of asking for a vote of confidence in his leadership to carry this to his avowed ends of peace through negotiations without conditions.

I do not need to state my commitment to peace, and my belief that peace can come to Viet Nam only through the conference table. And herein lies the conflict that I faced in this vote. While I do not agree with any policy of escalation of the war in Viet Nam, it has consistently been denied by the President and all concerned that this is in fact the policy of the government of the United States. Rather the President has repeated several times in recent weeks that the policy of the United States is to seek an unconditional negotiation for the peace and stability of Viet Nam, and further that the strategy now being pursued by this government is to seek this just end to hostilities. With this statement I cannot but heartily agree. Our disagreement then, comes in not knowing what the peace is which we want to secure, nor how the conflict can be stabilized to the end that the right of self-discrimination can be assured, and finally in the matter of the strategy to accomplish these ends in the fastest, most expeditious manner. And it is here at this point that I find myself in utter confusion. Without the facts and the full explanation of the strategy involved, which for obvious reasons cannot be revealed if the strategy is to work, I cannot disagree with the President purely on the assumption that my analysis is superior to his judgment. Facing this dilemma, I am asked by the President to express my confidence that the ways in which he seeks to end this conflict by negotiation can best be achieved by the methods and plans that he has laid.

Had the President never stated that he was pursuing a course which he personally believed would permit the earliest possible convening of negotiations, I would have no choice but to vote against his actions thus far. But in the context of his avowed purposes, I believed that he was entitled to pursue his course with the support of the people of the State of Hawaii, as cast by my vote as one of its Representatives.

Further the President has stated to the Congress that without its overwhelming vote of confidence, his actions are subject to the interpretation by the government of North Viet Nam as not having the full support of the American people. He has explained that his hand would be weakened in his efforts to bring the parties to the conference table. His case is irrefutable. Any leader without the support of his people cannot display the resolution and conviction that this kind of crisis demands.

And so, though I am first and foremost committed to the cause of peace, I cast my vote in support of the President; that I do in fact believe his intent to seek a negotiated peace in Viet Nam. As an elected representative of the people of Hawaii I could not let my feelings as an individual outweigh my responsibilities at this point, and so I had to say to the President that we of Hawaii do have confidence in his integrity and sincerity to achieve the ends of peace by means of negotiation.

The President said to the Congress in his May 4th message:

"For, in the long run, there can be no military solution to the problem of Viet Nam. We must find the path to peaceful settlement. Time and time again we have worked to open that path. We are still ready to talk, without conditions, to any government. We will go anywhere, discuss any subject, listen to any point of view in the interests of a peaceful solution."

This was the basis of my vote of confidence.

PRESS FOR IMMEDIATE NEGOTIATIONS

(Statement in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 16, p. 21822)

Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of grave concern that our dialogues for peace are being smothered by partisan efforts to cast upon our present Administration and upon the Democratic Administrations of the past the sole responsibility for the crisis that now exists for us and for the world in Vietnam. Let us not forget that since the Geneva agreement of 1954 until 1960 this country was led by the Republican Party and much could be said about things that could have been done then which might have prevented this painful situation in that part of the world today. But of what use is hindsight when what we must seek today is a means to end this war and to bring the parties to the conference table. We must be looking to the future and working through every possible means to bring an end to this conflict.

I am thoroughly convinced that our President is earnestly doing everything within his power and resources to seek the peace in Vietnam. I am equally certain that few are completely satisfied with the progress of our efforts to bring this matter to the stage of constructive negotiation. However, I believe that just as we are impatient that the talks begin, still in our anxiety to end this war, we must be willing to allow the President the fullest degree of flexibility to bring about the desired result. We can continue to urge the President to seek the involvement of the United Nations, but he has told us that he is doing everything possible to take this matter to the U.N. Where bombs failed to bring the necessary conciliatory attitude, the President called for a temporary cease-fire also to no immediate avail. He has agreed to negotiate without precondition, but still he has had no affirmative response.

The critical period of the monsoons are nearly over and we have been able to hold our lines. I am firmly of the opinion that Hanoi will, if not already, begin to understand that the peace conference is the only course left to take.

Being of this belief I do now urge the President to persist in his repeated efforts to draw Hanoi to the conference table in an ever increasing demonstration of good faith and determination that negotiations will in fact begin.

Let us stop this dialogue of war and more war preparations of blame and accusations and begin in earnest our preparations for peace. Certain of our goal why should we wait. Let us ready the conference site. Let us send to Geneva our country's foreign policy technicians and statesmen now. Let us commit our course for peace immediately. Let us invite our allies to journey with us once again to Geneva to resolve a new Peace Treaty for Vietnam.

Let us hasten to sit as a nation determined that our will for Peace shall be done. Let us wait upon Hanoi in Geneva and in so doing win this war with utter and complete faith that our President is right in his great expectations for Peace.

And finally let us promise now without reservations that the bombs shall cease to fall from the very instant that the negotiations begin.

Let us be prepared to match every military dollar that we have spent these past 11 years in Vietnam with a like dollar for peace, for the restoration of this war torn country, for its economic development, for education, for food and medical care for its desperately poor people.

Let us produce a lasting peace and credit ourselves as a nation with faith that peoples everywhere liberated from the fear of hunger and deprivation will choose the way of freedom.

IN SUPPORT OF BOMBING MORATORIUM

(December 11, 1965, letter to President signed by Representative PATSY T. MINK and 16 other Congressmen)

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recently, the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee publicly urged that the United States extend its bombings to industrial and other targets in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. Similar proposals have been made by the Minority Leader and the last two Republican candidates for President.

We write you at this time for the purpose of stating our vigorous opposition to those views and our whole-hearted support of the Administration's continuing refusal to extend the bombings to Hanoi-Haiphong. We believe that such an extension would not bring an end to hostilities in Vietnam, but might lead to further escalations of an unpredictable character. Instead of saving lives, such a change in strategy might ultimately bring about a vast increase in American casualties. In addition, the likelihood of massive civilian casualties in North Vietnamese cities would undoubtedly produce a world-wide reaction against the United States government.

The undersigned are not all in agreement as to the precise policies we should be following in Vietnam. Some of us believe that all bombing of North Vietnam should be suspended, at least temporarily. Some of us believe that we should make unequivocally clear that representatives of the Viet Cong would inevitably have to be included in any negotiations regarding the future of South Vietnam.

Yet we are united in our conviction that an extension of our bombings to Hanoi and Haiphong would seriously jeopardize all efforts to bring an early and honorable end to the war.

Respectfully,

PETITION THE UNITED NATIONS

(January 21, 1966, letter to the President signed by Representative PATSY T. MINK and 75 other Congressmen)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Representative PATSY T. MINK, Democrat, of Hawaii, yesterday urged President Johnson to formally request the United Nations to seek an effective cease-fire in Vietnam.

Representative MINK joined 75 other congressmen in informing the President of their strong support of his vigorous efforts to bring the war in Vietnam to the conference table and in pledging support to a formal approach to the United Nations.

"I will continue to bend every effort toward the accomplishment of a just peace in Vietnam," Representative MINK said. "It is my strong conviction that the United States must continue its determined search for peace, and that the United Nations can play a leading role in this regard."

The text of yesterday's letter to the President follows:

JANUARY 21, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We strongly support the vigorous efforts you have undertaken to bring the war in Vietnam to the conference table. Specifically, we applaud you for the moratorium on bombing North Vietnam and for the extensive personal contacts you have initiated with the leaders of other nations to make clear our unrelenting desire for a just peace. We would like to suggest that you further consider one additional dimension to this diplomatic offensive, that we formally request the United Nations to seek an effective ceasefire and that we pledge our support and our resources to such an effort.

While the response from the other side has not been encouraging, we do not believe we should yet assume that the door has been firmly closed. We cannot expect that a conflict which has raged so bitterly for so long will be quickly or easily resolved. Neither can we ignore the alternative to negotiations. A prolonged and probably expanded war with attendant costs in human suffering and material resources.

We staunchly support the determination of our Government to resist the terror and aggression which deny the people of South Vietnam the right freely to determine their own future. We continue to support you in that commitment. We recognize that there are those who urge a resumption of bombings of North Vietnam and a premature abandonment of our peace efforts. We are, however, concerned that unless we can halt or reverse the escalation of the last months it will become increasingly difficult to achieve a further pause, a cease-fire and meaningful negotiations. We urge you, therefore to continue your present determined search for peace until such time as it becomes clear that no reasonable hope remains for a just settlement by peaceful means.

Sincerely yours,

LIMITED MILITARY OBJECTIVES IN VIETNAM

(March 1, 1966, Statement signed by Representative PATSY T. MINK and 77 other Congressmen regarding supplemental defense authorization of 1966, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4431)

Mr. Chairman, we will vote for this supplemental defense authorization. The support of the American and allied troops who are fighting in South Vietnam requires it.

We agree with President Johnson's statement that "we will strive to limit conflict, for we wish neither increased destruction nor increased danger." We therefore reject any contention that approval of this legislation will constitute a mandate for unrestrained or indiscriminate enlargement of the military effort, and we strongly support continued efforts to initiate negotiations for a settlement of the conflict.

We, in particular, wish to express our concurrence with the President's statement of last week in which he declared the Vietnamese conflict to be a limited war for limited objectives calling for the exercise of "prudent firmness under careful control."

EXECUTION OF SOUTH VIETNAMESE BUSINESSMAN

(Statement in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5824)

A grave travesty on justice has been perpetrated by the government of South Vietnam in the name of social and economic reform. The public justification for this execution was, and I quote yesterday's Washington Post, "to fulfill Ky's pledge to President Johnson at the Honolulu Conference to put South Vietnam's social and economic house in order." For all the influence that we have on this regime, we did nothing to stop this senseless public execution which makes a mockery of our whole system of justice.

Out of the Honolulu Conference came a display of unity of purpose of our two governments. There was renewed good will in the joint resolve and reaffirmation to help the people of South Vietnam succeed in their own efforts to secure a better life, but this recent spectacular exhibit of totalitarian edict to secure certain ends points to the vastly different worlds we truly live in.

General Ky's goals and ours may be the same, but can we, in the eyes of the Asians whom we seek to influence and to save from Communism, embrace his methods of the firing squad by our silence and our acquiescence?

I urge the President and the Vice President to quickly intercede to prevent these extreme measures from becoming the means by which all of his social and economic problems are solved.

Lest we make a mockery of our valiant and tragic sacrifice of the lives of our American youth who need to have complete faith in the integrity of the South Vietnamese government, we must forcefully insist that its leadership understand and apply to its own people the same moral and ethical code of conduct that has caused our American soldiers to give their lives for the sake of the ideals of a democratic society.

This barbaric act must not be allowed to be repeated! To accept this kind of a solution to an economic phenomenon is to invite the easy road to ultimate ruin without treating the cause at all! A thousand executed profiteers will not buy a stable economy or a new social order.

SUPPORTING FREE ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Statement in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10329)

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Secretary Dean Rusk has reinforced this nation's determination to abide by the principle of self-determination with respect to the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam, despite the ambiguous reported statements of Prime Minister Ky which his own colleagues found necessary to censor.

After the optimistic declarations of the Honolulu Conference in February about the intentions of the South Vietnamese government to implement reforms and free elections as early as possible, we have witnessed accelerated plans to prepare for thos elections this fall after the people of Vietnam took to the streets themselves to demand a democratic form of government.

Skeptics are pointing out that the Vietnamese have never experienced free elections, and therefore cannot be trusted to make a rapid transition to popular government.

If we are ever to know the true will of these people, we must do everything we can to ensure that the elections are held and that the results will be uncontestable, regardless of the outcome.

Those who agitate for these elections ask only for a hand in the destiny of their country, and since that is the professed reason for our presence in Vietnam, I believe that we must now insure that the voices of all interests will be heard in the conduct of that country's affairs.

With Secretary Rusk's assurances that we will indeed honor our commitment to self-determination for South Vietnam, it now becomes incumbent upon us not to leave open the possibility of later charges that the elections were not in fact "free."

Excessive caution in this matter is further dictated by Premier Ky's reported statement that if the elections do not have results desirable to the present regime, then the Directorate will fight! This must be regarded as a real danger sign and steps must be taken now to insure the absolute validity of these elections. The closest surveillance is absolutely basic!

But, I think it wholly unrealistic for us to place ourselves in the untenable position of being the sole third-party monitor of these elections. Although our foreign policy leaders insist that we will abide by the wishes of the people of South Vietnam regardless of the outcome, there looms of course the qualification that the election be truly "free" and expressive of the "will" of the people of that war-torn nation. It is therefore, in my opinion, unwise for us to assume by ourselves this responsibility as the judge and jury of weighing the quality of these elections.

I therefore join the distinguished Senator from Connecticut in urging that the President most seriously consider the proposal that either the United Nations or the International Control Commission be called in to maintain a field surveillance of these elections, and thereby relieve this country of the untenable task of being the guarantor of the outcome. If our commitment truly is to freedom in Southeast Asia, then we have a solemn obligation to implement the conditions for that freedom. We owe the world, the Vietnamese people, and ourselves no less.

NORWEGIAN CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today is the 152d anniversary of the signing of the Norwegian Constitution at Eidsvoll, near Oslo. The Norwegian Constitution is among the oldest in the world and although, like our own, it has undergone amendment and substitution it still remains the fundamental law of the country.

The constitution drawn in Norway in 1814 leaned heavily on Norwegian legal precedent, but it also absorbed a great deal of the 18th century liberalism which produced the American Declaration of Independence and Constitution, the French Revolution, and the great expansion of democracy in Britain.

Tradition led the parliament to be called the Storting, named after a quasi-democratic body which in the 9th and 10th centuries had been an instrument of royal power. But liberalism led the Norwegians to also put into effect the doctrine of separation of powers developed by the Montesquieu in France and adopted as the basis of our system of government. In addition to dividing power between the executive branch—the King in council—the legislative—Parliament—and the courts, the Norwegian Constitution adopted the doctrines of national independence, popular sovereignty and the rights of the individual versus the state.

The fact that this document and the principles which it espoused have been the law of the land for over 150 years stands as clear tribute to the framers of the Constitution. Its measure of strength was seen in 1884 when the King agreed to appoint a council which had the confidence of the Storting, thus introducing parliamentarianism. Universal suffrage was granted to men in 1898 and women in 1913.

Nowegians are justifiably proud of the system of government they have built on the Constitution of 1814. Norway prospers today and offers a living testimonial to the staying power of a democratic government.

Mr. Speaker, in my district this is a very festive occasion and I recall with great warmth the gay parades and parties that always marked the day. Many times in the past I had the happy fortune to be able to join in the festivities with these fine people. And so it gives me a special pleasure on this important date to join with all Norwegians and Americans of Norwegian birth or descent in celebrating the historic event which took place in Norway 152 years ago.

HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this body reaffirmed one of the basic principles upon which this great Nation was founded: the right to self-determination, the right to choose one's own elected representatives, the right not to be taxed without representation.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, without a dissenting vote this body passed legislation yesterday to enable the Island of Guam and the Virgin Islands to elect their Governors.

The committee reports on these two bills ring with the praises of the peoples of these two territories. I quote for example from the committee's report on the bill to permit the Virgin Islands to elect its Governor:

> It is clear . . . . that the people of the Virgin Islands have had long experience in electing one branch of their government and thus in participating in the making of their own laws. It is the belief of the committee that the people and their legislature have . . . . exercised their powers in a responsible manner.

I quote from the committee report on the bill to provide for the election of the Governor of Guam:

> Following World War II . . . the Island has made remarkable economic, political and social progress. . . . The people of Guam have now had 16 years' experience in electing their own legislature and have demonstrated their capacity for doing so in a responsible manner.

I am certain that these two very commendable bills will be speedily passed by the Senate and signed by the President and I will be the first to congratulate the peoples of these two territories upon the achievement of this long sought goal.

This Nation came into possession of Guam in 1898 as a legacy of the Spanish American War; we acquired the Virgin Islands by purchasing them from Denmark in 1917.

I would like to point out, however, that the territory we now refer to as the District of Columbia was acquired by this Nation from Maryland in 1788 and Virginia in 1789. As a natural result of the bloody war we had just fought to achieve that right, it never occurred to the Federal Government that the people living in the new territory would not have home rule, and indeed, until 1802 the existing State laws were continued in the two municipal corporations which then made up the populated areas of the territory.

In 1802 the city was given a mayor appointed by the President and a city council elected by the people; in 1812 the city council was permitted to elect the mayor. In 1820 and thereafter the mayor was elected by the people. In 1874 when the present Commission form of government was first forced upon the people of the District of Columbia, the Congress ended home rule in Washington and for the first time in three-quarters of a century no part of the District exercised the right of suffrage. Next June 20 it will be 92 years since the people of the District of Columbia were deprived of home rule, a right until that time never contested.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress can, without a dissenting vote, permit the 43,100 residents of the Virgin Islands and the 67,700 residents of Guam the right to elect their own Governor while we cannot permit the 800,000 residents of the District of Columbia that same right?

The zeal for home rule for every place but Washington continues unabated. Not quite 1 year ago the Congress of Micronesia met for the first time. This is the bicameral legislature elected by the 91,700 citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, over which our Nation has jurisdiction as a result of a 1947 agreement with the Security Council of the United Nations. American Samoa, which we acquired in 1900, now has a locally drafted Constitution which was promulgated in 1960 and its 21,400 people elect a House of Representatives.

The fight for home rule for Washington naturally brings publicity and it becomes more and more embarrassing and more and more difficult to explain that the residents of the capital of the mightiest democracy do not have democracy; that they are not permitted to elect their own local government; that they have no say in the disposition of the tax money collected from them, a right accorded to every other individual of voting age in every State and territory of the United States.

There are many ambivalencies created by man in his search for the best means of achieving the common good and no solution to the problems faced by human government can please everyone. But there are some problems which are easily solved. One of these is the right to self-determination for the people of the District of Columbia.

In view of the action this body took yesterday, how can we deny the District of Columbia the same rights and privileges?

FREE WORLD TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Department of State to comment upon the extent of trade between the free world countries and the Communist North Vietnamese and what our Government was doing to halt this trade.

I believe that the Department's answer will be of great interest to our colleagues and I, therefore, commend to their attention the following information as furnished to me by our able and distinguished Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur:

> The Department of State has been concerned for some time over voyages by free world ships to North Viet-Nam, and, through sustained diplomatic efforts, has been successful in bringing about an elimination of ships from most countries in that trade. High level approaches continue to be made to those countries which still have flag ships calling at North Viet-Nam, and it is believed that a reduction of such calls to a hard core minimum is being achieved.
>
> The volume of free world trade with North Viet-Nam amounts to about 15 percent of North Viet-Nam's total trade. This is subject to the strategic embargo restrictions of the Coordinating Committee (COCOM) countries (NATO countries and Japan) governing strategic goods. Free world exports to North Viet-Nam consist mostly of textiles, foodstuffs and fertilizer. Purchases from North Viet-Nam are mainly anthracite, with occasional shipments of apatite, rattan ware, fruits and vegetables. Although we do not yet have complete data on free world trade with North Viet-Nam for the last half of 1965, preliminary estimates indicate that there was a decrease in that trade stemming from the sharp drop in free world shipping to North Viet-Nam during that period.
>
> Since free world trade moves almost entirely by sea, approaches have been made to the countries concerned, through diplomatic channels, in an effort to obtain their cooperation in controlling this shipping. Such an approach is consistent with and in support of relevant United States legislation and has been remarkably successful. For the last six months the monthly average of calls by free world vessels at North Viet-Nam has dropped to 13 as compared with 34 per month in 1964.
>
> During 1965 and early 1966 the following free world countries had one or more ships call at North Viet-Nam: Cyprus, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, and Panama. Many of these calls, however, were made early in 1965, and in the last eight months no Japanese, Lebanese, Dutch, Liberian, or Panamanian ships have called at North Vietnamese ports while France and Italy each have had only one ship making one call.
>
> The free world shipments in question are not being made by the governments concerned, but by private traders in ships sailing under various national registries. Each country has special legal problems in controlling such shipping which take some time to resolve, but we have been making every effort to obtain early and effective action.
>
> There were only three aid-recipient countries which had ships calling at North Viet-Nam during the last eight months, namely, Greece, Norway, and Cyprus. The Greek Government has issued regulations making it unlawful for their ships to carry cargo to or from North Viet-Nam. Norway has taken steps to remove its ships from the trade and no Norwegian ships have called at North Viet-Nam since November. We have discussed the matter with the Government of Cyprus and are confident that the problem relating to that country's ships will be resolved. Some of the ships of these three countries are under long term charters to Communist countries however, and thus not under the control of their owners. Even so, assurances have been received in some cases that once these charters expire, the ships will be removed from the North Viet-Nam trade. The effectiveness of these measures will, of course, be kept under continuing review, having in mind the relevant legislation calling for denial of aid to countries that do not take appropriate steps to remove their ships from the North Viet-Nam trade.
>
> Most of the free world flag ships remaining in the North Viet-Nam trade are under British registry, but it should be noted that few if any are owned by United Kingdom residents. The majority are small coastal vessels owned and registered in Hong Kong and by virtue of their registry are entitled to fly the British flag. Some are controlled by Chinese Communist operators. They are on time charters to Communist China or North Viet-Nam and normally ply in trade only between mainland China and North Viet-Nam. British owners of vessels registered in the United Kingdom have either withheld or withdrawn their ships from this trade or have indicated they intend to do so as present charters expire.
>
> On February 12, 1966, the Maritime Administration announced in the *Federal Register* that the President had approved a policy of barring the carriage of United States Government-financed cargoes shipped from the United States on foreign flag ships calling at North Viet-Nam after January 25. This announcement contained a list of five free world ships which have recently visited North Viet-Nam and which are therefore barred from the carriage of United States-financed goods. Cumulative lists are being published at frequent intervals.

The policy directive barring United States Government-financed cargoes to ships calling at North Viet-Nam was calculated to supplement our diplomatic approaches and the legislative provisions affecting recipients of United States aid whose ships have been in the North Viet-Nam trade. It is believed that these measures will be adequate to remove most of the remaining free world ships from the North Viet-Nam trade. If, however, these measures are not successful further action will be considered.

There has been improvement in the situation as far as British shipping is concerned. The problem is now mainly with ships registered in Hong Kong flying the British flag. The United Kingdom does not permit the shipment of strategic materials to either Cuba or Viet-Nam. Prime Minister Wilson has also been one of the strongest supporters of our policy in Viet-Nam. We are, nonetheless, seriously concerned that some British shipping continues to be involved in the North Viet-Nam and Cuban trade. We have made representations to the British Government on this question.

THE USE OF TAX-EXEMPT BONDS FOR FINANCING INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION NEEDS CONTROLS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, almost every day we read in the financial press of large, financially strong national companies turning the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds to their private advantage. More and more municipalities in all parts of the country are using their credit to finance the construction of giant industrial and commercial plants for lease to such companies. Individual bond flotations by small communities of $20 million and more for this purpose are now commonplace.

About 3 years ago the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations issued a report, entitled "Industrial Development Bond Financing," in which it pointed out some of the abuses and pitfalls that stem from this practice: firms with access to adequate financing using the public treasury for their private gain; communities overextending their credit to provide facilities far beyond their employment needs and in the process overstraining their revenue resources to meet unanticipated demands for public services; and the rampant pirating of industry by one community from another that results from frenetic intercommunity competition for industrial development.

Although only about a half billion dollars worth of local industrial development bonds had been issued up to the time the Advisory Commission issued its report, we recognized that the practice was growing and that safeguards were needed "to minimize intergovernmental friction, to insure that governmental resources deployed for this purpose bear a reasonable relationship to the public purpose served and that the governmental powers employed are not diverted for private advantage." Indeed the practice has been growing apace. At least another billion dollars worth of bonds has been issued since 1962 to finance plants for large, well-heeled firms. Communities in about three-fifths of the States now engage in the practice.

The Advisory Commission recommended that if the States insist on allowing their localities to engage in industrial development bond financing, they should control these activities by providing the following safeguards:

First. Subject all industrial development bond issues to approval by a State supervising agency;

Second. Restrict authority to issue such bonds to local units of general government—counties, municipalities, and organized townships;

Third. Limit the total amount of such bonds that may be outstanding at any one time in the State;

Fourth. Prohibit such financing for pirating of industrial plants by one community from another; and

Fifth. Provide machinery for informing the public as to proposed industrial development bond projects, and to enable citizens to initiate referendums on such projects.

Hawaii enacted the Commission's suggested legislation implementing those recommendations in 1964, and Maine enacted parts of it in 1965. The other States should follow suit, before the system of industrial development bond financing topples of its own weight and in the process does irreparable damage to local finances.

Mr. Speaker, waiting upon the States to stop this unsound practice is not enough. The Congress, too, shares in this responsibility. My bill H.R. 324 strikes against the most blatant abuse of the tax exemption privilege—the purchase by a corporation of tax-exempt bonds that are issued to finance a plant it intends to lease from the bond-issuing community. It would deny the deduction for income tax purposes of rentals paid on facilities financed with industrial development bonds in those cases where the leasing corporation itself purchases some of the tax-exempt securities.

H.R. 324, as the identical bill H.R. 4069 introduced by my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. Fountain], would carry out the recommendations made to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Mr. Speaker, this subject merits our early attention. Further delay can undermine the public's regard for the tax exemption of bona fide State and local bonds.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POPULATION GROWTH AND FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Todd] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the following news item from the May 17 Washington Post be inserted in the Congressional Record to bring to the attention of my colleagues the relationship between population growth and food production. This news story corroborates the situation long anticipated by agricultural economists. Solutions to this deficit in food will very much depend on the kinds of aid the United States stresses to remedy the problem.

FAO Finds Population Outpaces Food Gains

Rome, May 16—World food production apparently failed to keep up with population growth last year and the prospect for this year is no better, the U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) reported today.

"Neither food nor raw materials taken separately are likely to have advanced in step with population growth," said the organization's annual Commodity Review based on information up to the middle of March.

If later final figures show a production increase in 1965, it will be small, the report said. It added that production for 1965-66 was unlikely to keep up with the population growth rate of 2 percent.

The group said that among developed regions North America and Western Europe saw sizable increases in agricultural production. There was a small gain in Japan but drought caused serious harvest reductions in South Africa and Australia.

Among developing countries, Latin American production increased sharply but the rapidly expanding population of the region left the output per person basically unchanged. Unfavorable weather cut production in the far east, including India, and in Africa.

In Communist economies, it said, mainland China appears to have maintained grain production at 1964 levels but severe drought in the Soviet Union and in eastern Europe sharply cut production there last year, necessitating imports.

COLISEUM CONVENTION CENTER—NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Giaimo] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill that would permit the city of New Haven, Conn., to count certain expenditures as local grants-in-aid. The city of New Haven plans to construct a coliseum-convention center as part of its Church Street redevelopment and renewal project—Connecticut R–2.

The purpose of the Church Street project is to feed new life into downtown New Haven, both economically and culturally. The proposed convention center would enhance and compliment the work already achieved in this program. It would give an added boost to retail outlets and increase business activity of the downtown area. As a source of attraction such a convention center would have, it would naturally attract a large number of people outside the immediate geographical area of the Church Street project.

Section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 prevents eligible costs of this project to be defrayed as grant-in-aid. This is because the convention center would serve an area beyond what is technically defined as the urban renewal area of the Church Street project, the very growth, however, that such an urban renewal project seeks.

I submit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit that, notwithstanding the extent to which the coliseum-convention center proposed to be built within the Church Street redevelopment and renewal project—Connecticut R-2—in New Haven, Conn., may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of New Haven in constructing such coliseum-center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives saw fit to unanimously pass H.R. 14347, a bill which I was delighted to introduce, designed to effect a cure for an inequity which has been endured far too long by dependent fathers, mothers, and orphans of service men and women who died as a result of service-connected injuries and illnesses. This category of people are in the minimal income bracket and have had to cope with the increased cost of living with a budget restricted by criteria of obsolete legislation.

I take this opportunity to heartily commend House leadership for promptly bringing this bill to the floor for consideration. I further want to commend every Member of the House for the affirmative action taken in its behalf. Their positive action points up their awareness to such inequities and their desire to support reasonable measures for correction. In this instance they have further recognized this Nation's obligation to those who have served the cause of this great democracy. This bill was supported by all major veterans' organizations.

My bill contains a provision to grant to dependent parents the same 10-percent exclusion previously granted recipients of non-service-connected pension benefits thereby offsetting the recent increase a dependent parent may have received in social security or other retirement benefits. This is an important feature of the bill, inasmuch as the amount of the parent's dependency and indemnity compensation is determined by the amount of the parent's income from other sources.

My bill further provides other income exclusions, such as the proceeds of national service life insurance, profits realized from the disposition of real or personal property, and others that had previously been granted to recipients of non-service-connected pensions but had not been granted to dependent parents receiving dependency and indemnity compensation.

In addition to increasing the rates, my bill also provides for an increase in the income limitation to $1,800 per year for one surviving parent and $3,000 per year if there are two surviving parents. The increase in income limitations will enable many parents who have previously been denied dependency and indemnity compensation to now receive this benefit.

Since the enactment of the dependency and indemnity compensation program in 1957, the income limitations for dependent parents have not been increased. Therefore, I feel the benefits provided by my bill are long overdue, and certainly there is no group more deserving of assistance.

In addition to dependent parents, my bill also provides a cost-of-living increase to children receiving dependency and indemnity compensation. This applies to children in cases where there is no widow receiving benefits. Because there are not too many such cases, they are inclined to be forgotten but there are a number of cases in which a veteran is survived by as many as eight or nine children.

THE 152D ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE NORWEGIAN CONSTITUTION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, in Oslo, Norway, today and in many towns and cities in the United States, celebrations are being conducted in observance of the 152d anniversary of the signing of the Norwegian Constitution. Particularly is this an important day in my State of North Dakota, which has more than 50,000 people of Norwegian extraction.

I have many personal recollections of May 17 celebrations in my hometown of Crosby, N. Dak. At their heart is pride in a nation that has nourished the ideals of democracy and liberty.

The welcome and hospitality in a home with ethnic roots in Norway is demonstrated by the traditional pot of coffee, always on the stove, available to any guest. I also have admired and experienced, among Norwegian-Americans, a high respect for family and home as the basic institution of society. For me, these qualities have much meaning, relating to the dignity of the individual, a cornerstone of the Norwegian form of government and of ours.

In keeping a perspective on our own values, it is helpful for us to observe celebrations of freedom, such as Norwegian Independence Day, in which Norwegians take as much pride as we do in the Fourth of July.

EFFECT OF INTEGRATION GUIDELINES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the recent integration guidelines issued by the Commissioner of Education of the United States are having disastrous effects on the educational program of the Nation. In my judgment, there is no statutory basis for many of the provisions in the so-called guidelines. Actually, some portion of these guidelines are in direct violation of the civil rights legislation so unwisely enacted by the Congress.

Further insistence upon following the guidelines will do irreparable damage to children of all races. This has been attested to by leaders of the Negro race as well as by white leaders and parents.

A good example of the unfortunate consequences of this misadventure by the Commissioner of Education is indicated by a news story which appeared in the Gastonia, N.C., Gazette on May 13, 1966. This story points out the dilemma of the parents of Negro children in Gastonia, N.C., my home city. Gastonia is noted for its good race relations and the harmony which has existed between the races of the city.

As the story points out, the implementation of the guidelines will result in great injustice to both white and Negro children and will not promote the education of either.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives immediately call the Commissioner of Education before it and demand that he retract the miserable action that he has taken in the issuance of the so-called guidelines.

Under unanimous consent I include the newspaper article referred to as a part of my remarks:

TO ALL WHITE: NEGROES PROTEST SCHOOL TRANSFER—THEY WANT TO ATTEND SAME ONES

(By Ray Jimison)

Negroes in the Pleasant Ridge School vicinity are protesting the assignment of around 100 Negro students to previously "all-white" schools.

They want to return to Pleasant Ridge, a predominantly Negro school, next school year, but have been assigned to Abernathy Elementary and Arlington and Wray junior high schools.

Maynard Love, president of the Pleasant Ridge School and spokesman for the Negro group, says a lawsuit will be filed to stop the transfers.

"We favor integration but we don't see why we have to go out of our way to make it balance," he said. The big objection is the transportation problem facing the students, since most of them live relatively close to Pleasant Ridge and will have to go long distances next year to get to school.

In fact, Love points out that some of the Negro students reside just across the street from Pleasant Ridge, on Miller St., but won't be allowed to attend Pleasant Ridge because of the new federal guidelines.

To get the children back in Pleasant Ridge, especially those living virtually in the school's front door, Love headed a delegation that visited both the city and the county school superintendents.

Pleasant Ridge is a county school but the area around it, said Love, is in the city district. He charged that the district line was moved, thus placing the houses on Miller St., across from the school, in the city district.

Supt. Bill Brown of city schools acknowledged that Love and the delegation of some nine parents visited him but said his hands are tied because of the federal guidelines.

He said his school board cannot legally permit the city students to attend a county school. Even if it were legal to grant such transfers, the county board would still have to accept them.

"But we can't even grant the transfers."

He pointed to the ruling which reads, in part, "No arrangement may be made or permission granted for students residing in one school system to attend school in another school system in any case * * *"

This is so, it went on, where the results would tend to limit desegregation or maintain what is essentially a dual school structure in either system or where such attendance is not available to all students without regard to race, color, or national origin.

School officials were to know this afternoon exactly how many students are involved. Brown only guessed at the 100 figure. Love didn't know how many were involved.

Love said the district line was moved to the back of the houses on Miller St., putting the Negro families in front of the school in the city system while keeping other families, mostly white, in the area in the county system and allowing them to continue sending their children to Victory School.

It means, said Love, that Negro children living in the school door will have to attend other schools far away while some Negro students living vast distances from Pleasant Ridge will be forced to come to Pleasant Ridge.

He said an out-of-town attorney has been retained to file the lawsuit for the group. It will be filed against both the city and the county school systems.

But, in essence, the lawsuit will be against the U.S. Office of Education since the school systems say they are acting under federal orders.

Love said his group wants those children living near Pleasant Ridge, and those in the Firestone section, to be able to return to Pleasant Ridge School in September.

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is altogether fitting and appropriate that we pause to pay tribute to the more than 2 million Americans who are being honored during this month, proclaimed by the President to be Senior Citizens Month.

The freedom which Americans enjoy today has been bought and protected at the expense of a tremendous defense effort throughout our Nation's history. Certainly all of us owe a very large measure of gratitude to the great number of older Americans who have served their country during times of great national crisis. This great country and all its blessings are our legacy from them.

Moreover, the immeasurable contributions of America's senior citizens to the economic, cultural, and spiritual development of our Nation deserve the respect and humble gratefulness of all of us.

Yet, too often it seems that we tend to forget just how much all of us do owe to the older Americans we count among our family and our friends, to say nothing of the thousands more whose acquaintance we have never made.

The new medicare program, however, gives fine evidence of our ever-increasing realization of our responsibilities to help those who have done so much to help us. I am especially pleased that the citizens in my district have operated a highly successful Operation Medicare Alert program to guarantee that all eligible senior citizens were well-advised of the benefits of the medicare program, and were granted every assistance in making sure that they were properly registered.

In addition, less than 1 year ago, under the Older Americans Act, the New Jersey Division on Aging was granted $129,500 by the Administration on Aging for the development of beneficial community programs for the older people in my State. First priority has been given to the development of a coordinated statewide program of services administrated through city and county councils on aging.

Acting in the interest of all of America's older citizens, I have introduced legislation to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without reducing the social security benefits allowed. I have also asked that the Housing Act of 1937 be amended to reduce from 62 to 60 the age at which widows may be occupants of low-rent public housing units.

Finally, the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee of the U.S. Post Office has assured me that my request for a commemorative stamp honoring America's senior citizens will be given every consideration for the 1967 stamp program.

This idea was first suggested to me by Mr. Conrad Vuocolo, director of tenant relations for the Jersey City Housing Authority. Mr. Vuocolo is a truly outstanding individual who combines an enthusiastic interest in the welfare of the senior citizens of his community with an unlimited ability to get a job done. Certainly no description of community projects designed to benefit senior citizens could be complete without an acknowledgment of the highly commendable work of this extraordinary citizen.

In conclusion, I believe that the Federal, State, and local programs which I have described attest to our ever-increasing maturity as a nation. Each of these programs and each that we initiate in the future has helped and will continue to help repay the enormous debt we owe to those Americans who helped to build for us the strong and prosperous country we live in today.

On May 23, the senior citizens of my district are sponsoring an all-day conference as their special project for the month of May. To them and to all of America's older citizens, I believe that we owe a special tribute during this month, Senior Citizens Month.

CHILD NUTRITION ACT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago the 89th Congress enacted what can only be described as a landmark in the history of education legislation, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The purpose of this law is to strengthen and improve the educational quality of our schools, especially in areas with many low-income families. But even the best schools and the most highly qualified teachers will be wasted if large numbers of our schoolchildren continue to come to school hungry and if their schools lack even the most modest cafeteria facilities.

Hungry children are not learning children and today better than ever before we recognize the close relationship between physical well-being and educational achievement. That is why I am proud to cosponsor legislation which will help our schoolchildren have the strong bodies they must if they are to have alert minds. H.R. 13361 is a bill to strengthen Federal-State cooperation in improving child nutrition. The need for this legislation is, I think, clear and compelling. In many rural areas our children travel long distances to school. For these children it is a long time until lunch even if they are fortunate to have had a breakfast. In many low-income urban areas children have inadequate breakfasts or none at all before they come to school, and often they have little or no lunch.

The Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education have jointly stated:

> The process of learning virtually ends when a human being becomes uncomfortably hungry. When a child appears at school in the morning having had little or no breakfast, he might just as well have stayed at home. The teacher's effort is wasted. Similarly, a child without lunch loses most of the value of a school afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the school lunch and special school milk programs countless numbers of children have not had to go without lunch and have had additional milk supplements. They have not lost the value of their school afternoons. In fiscal year 1965 alone over 17 million children benefited from federally subsidized school lunches and nearly 3 billion half pints of milk were served. Both programs have been most successful and highly praised by educators, school administrators, and parents. And I think that they have cost us relatively little in view of the rich investment they have made in our children's health and well-being.

Unfortunately, there is a large number of children who do not have access to the school lunch program or the special school milk program, in many cases because their schools do not have the necessary facilities. Nor do the school lunch and special milk programs solve the problem of the child who is hungry when he comes to school in the morning. The Child Nutrition Act of 1966, H.R. 13361, is a necessary adjunct to both programs. The act would, first of all, extend the school lunch program in essentially the same form in which it has been operating so successfully, but would place special emphasis on making the program more available to needy children. It would, for example, extend the definition of school in the present School Lunch Act to include preschool programs operated by school systems.

The act would also authorize a special milk program under which available Federal funds would be disbursed first to schools without a food service, second for needy children in schools with a food service but whose needs are such that additional milk should be offered, and third, to the extent that funds are available, to schools and nonprofit institutions for all children. In this way we hope to reach those children with the greatest need for improved nutrition.

An important new pilot program which would be authorized by the Child Nutrition Act is a breakfast program designed to serve children from low-income areas and who have to travel long distances to school. To the extent practicable, first consideration would be given to schools in areas of greatest economic need, and in cases of severe need, Federal funds could be used to finance up to 90 percent of the cost of operating the program.

Another pilot program which the Child Nutrition Act would authorize is a special food service program to reach children in various nonschool situations such as day-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and playgrounds. This program would help to fill the gap during the summer months when children do not have access to a lunch program and their need for good nutrition has by no means diminished. Again, in instances of severe need Federal funds could be used to cover up to 90 percent of the operating costs of such a program.

Many schools, particularly in low-income rural and urban areas, have been unable to supply their children with a lunch program of any sort because they lack the proper food service facilities. Under H.R. 13361, grants-in-aid would be authorized to assist the States in providing facilities in those areas where local resources are inadequate to support the installation of food service facilities. To help State educational agencies meet the cost of supervising these new programs, the act would apportion funds for administrative expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is greatly needed legislation. It is a logical followup to our efforts in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and in such programs as Project Headstart. It is our opportunity to help insure that no child will be prevented from doing his best in school because he is hungry or ill nourished, or lacks the energy so essential to learning. I agree with the President's statement that "No child in an affluent America should be without an adequate diet."

But let me state very emphatically, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think that we must sacrifice or reduce the present school lunch program or the special milk program to initiate the Child Nutrition Act and to make it effective. If anything, I think that facts and figures indicate that these invaluable programs should be expanded. And I think that it is most significant that on March 24, the House Committee on Agriculture vigorously opposed recommendations by the Bureau of the Budget to cut back appropriations for the school lunch and special school milk programs. The committee also offered its support and assistance to the House Committee on Appropriations and the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee and to each individual Member of the Congress in providing adequate funds for these programs.

The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 should be seen as a supplement to present child feeding programs, not as a substitute. All must work together to make a comprehensive program whereby every child will be able to receive the nourishment he needs for a full day at school. I think that H.R. 13361, the Child Nutrition Act, is in the interests of our children and therefore in the interests of the country, and I urge each of my distinguished colleagues to give it his careful consideration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KREBS (at the request of Mr. HOWARD), for May 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 30 minutes, on May 18; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALLECK (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 5 minutes, on May 19; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORRISON (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOELSON and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. KELLY.
Mr. EVANS of Colorado.
Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. OLSEN of Montana.
Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.
Mr. CLEVENGER.
Mr. BURTON of California.
Mr. MACKIE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2406. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a recommendation of legislation enabling the Smithsonian Institution to accept the Joseph H. Hirshhorn collection of contemporary sculpture and paintings (H. Doc. No. 440); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

2407. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1967 involving a decrease in the amount for the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Civil (H. Doc. No. 441); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2408. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1967 involving a decrease in the amount for the U.S. Information Agency (H. Doc. No. 442); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2409. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment under which Crater Lake Lodge, Inc., is authorized to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Crater Lake National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2410. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2411. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2412. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations of the Department of Commerce to be available until expended or for periods in excess of 1 year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2413. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report with respect to the proposed nature, extent, and cost of U.S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center (Interama) and the anticipated nature and extent of participation by foreign countries (particularly Latin American countries) and private industries, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–355; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2414. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2469. An act amending sections 2 and 4 of the act approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), providing for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a new sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DENTON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 14215, an act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 14643. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 15088. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 15089. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate parity price for 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 15090. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 15091. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15092. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to prohibit public or private agencies assisted under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 from performing certain functions under the rent supplements program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15093. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act to prohibit certain housing activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ (by request):

H.R. 15094. A bill to repeal the laws authorizing limitation of shipowners' liability for personal injury or death, to require evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay judgments for personal injury or death, or to repay fares in the event of nonperformance of voyages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 15095. A bill to establish minimum standards for passenger vessels and to require disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 15096. A bill to permit the city of New Haven, Conn., to count expenditures made in connection with its proposed coliseum-convention center as local grants-in-aid to its Church Street redevelopment and renewal project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 15097. A bill to establish a cooperative Federal-State child nutrition program under the direction of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 15098. A bill to amend public Law 89–284 relating to participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 15099. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 15100. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 15101. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15102. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 15103. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 15104. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 15105. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 15106. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve the programs under such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 15107. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 15108. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to permit the mailing of first-class letter mail to the U.S. Armed Forces in Vietnam at no cost to the sender and to permit the mailing of certain parcels to such Armed Forces personnel at the rates for zone 1 for fourth-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 15109. A bill to amend section 407 of the Social Security Act to make permanent the existing temporary authority to provide aid to families with dependent children in cases where the parent is unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 15110. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 15111. A bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 15112. A bill to exempt from the interest equalization tax certain acquisitions made before the enactment of the Interest Equalization Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 1143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H. Con. Res. 655. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 656. Concurrent resolution relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 854. Resolution providing for an additional clerk for all House Members; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 855. Resolution providing for an additional clerk for all House Members; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

479. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the enactment of legislation to provide for a program of Federal subventions for school districts and other local governmental agencies maintaining public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

480. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the ruling of the Post Office Department with respect to registrars of voters, county and city clerks, and other public officers authorized by law to mail sample ballots; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 15113. A bill for the relief of Dr. Avenilo Aventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 15114. A bill for the relief of Leopold Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 15115. A bill for the relief of Dr. Narayan S. Raja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 15116. A bill for the relief of Seok Yul Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15117. A bill for the relief of Chun Soo Pyun and Esther Kyung Pyun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 15118. A bill for the relief of Mr. Wouter Keesing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Right To Vote on Federal Land in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. EVANS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this is a time when the right to vote is very much in the public mind. Many organizations have worked hard to extend the right to vote to all citizens and this Congress, and the Congress preceding it, have at great length discussed legislation designed to secure and protect this most valuable and precious democratic right.

Some people might think that the denial of the right to vote is limited to single groups of individuals or to single areas of our Nation. This, I know, is not the case.

In my own Colorado congressional district more than 125 individual voters have been effectively deprived of this civil right at Fort Lyon Veterans Hospital near Las Animas, Colo.

In 1885, Colorado ceded the land now comprising Fort Lyon Hospital to the United States and failed to retain State jurisdiction, except for the serving of a summons. Thus, residents living on the Federal grounds are subject to Federal jurisdiction, and under Colorado law, are not eligible to vote in local, State, or national elections.

In later similar cases, such as Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado, the civil rights of persons living on Federal installations have been retained by the State.

A Colorado citizen's committee led by Mr. Michael Halladay, of Las Animas, helped provide the necessary background information on the voting situation at Fort Lyon, and State Senator James Thomas of Rocky Ford, Colo., worked in the Colorado State Legislature and with State officials to determine the best course of action. It appeared from these researches and from the opinion of the Colorado State attorney general that Federal legislation would be the most expeditious way in which to return the necessary jurisdiction to the State of Colorado.

Accordingly, I introduced the necessary legislation to the Congress on February 8 and the Veterans' Affairs Committee has acted favorably on this bill.

The action of the House of Representatives yesterday in passing this bill on the consent calendar is important not only to the affected voters of Fort Lyon Hospital, but also as a continuing recognition of the vital importance of civil rights to our citizens.

Tribute to George B. Merry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILLIP BURTON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute today to a man who has made a major contribution to the welfare of our country which, though little heralded, will have a lasting effect upon the representation of our citizens in their State legislatures.

George B. Merry, staff writer for the Christian Science Monitor in Boston, Mass., has maintained a keen personal, as well as professional, interest in the field of legislative apportionment and congressional redistricting for almost a decade. His legislative malapportionment series was first published in 1958 and his congressional districting series was first published in 1959. Both were subsequently reprinted in booklet form by the National Municipal League.

Then Solicitor General of the United States, Archibald Cox, arguing Baker against Carr before the U.S. Supreme Court, cited Mr. Merry's research in his brief.

A native of Boston and a graduate of Boston public schools, Mr. Merry received his A.B. from Northeastern University in Boston in English journalism in 1948 and joined the staff of the Christian Science Monitor that same year. He has since covered almost every facet of public affairs and presently writes on municipal activities and urban affairs, including State and local political developments in Massachusetts.

In 1963 Mr. Merry was awarded the Public Service Reporting Award by the American Political Science Association for his work in spotlighting the problem of legislative malapportionment.

His work has been not only a tribute to his profession but of even greater meaning to the right of every American to a vote equal in effect to every other citizen of his State.

Soil Stewardship Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, this makes the 12th consecutive year in which the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts has sponsored Soil Stewardship Week. This year, observance of Soil Stewardship Week occurs from May 15 to 22 and the theme of the annual observance is "Crisis in the Countryside."

I am proud to state that the 89th Congress has made a notable record in its conservation work, particularly in the passage of the Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act of 1965, a bill which I was privileged to sponsor. In passage of this legislation, we have recognized and provided a partial solution to one of the greatest crises rural America and its abundant countryside has been forced to endure.

One of the greatest needs of rural America has been the need for adequate and stable water supplies and waste disposal systems to curtail the terrible scourge of pollution. The Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act of 1965 will go far in meeting this crisis by restoring and preserving our vast inland reserves of water.

I believe that in marking Soil Stewardship Week, we of the 89th Congress and every citizen of the United States must renew our pledge to work for the protection of our land and water resources. It is our responsibility to further the action we have taken to provide for the future protection and development of the resources that are ours. We must remember that in our time it is in our care to protect, to develop, and to expand our responsibility for the natural heritage our forefathers found in the fertile region of Iowa and its sister States of the Midwest.

Solution to the Problems of Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the provisions of S. 2935, a bill to authorize Federal grants to encourage regional solutions to transportation problems and to authorize grants under the Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

It is axiomatic that our commuter services are in dire straits, and that those commuter and passenger services are vital to the life of our urban communities and, indeed, vital to the life of the entire country. Without those services being available, our cities would be strangled in a huge congestion of automotive traffic and the economic and social life of the country would be seriously impaired.

Our Federal Government through the years has stepped in to render assistance where the vital interests of the country are at stake. There is indeed a clear need for Federal assistance at this point. We must prevent the further closing down of these vital services and we must take forward-looking steps to achieve improvement and rationalization of transportation into, in and between our urban communities.

The provision in S. 2935 authorizing Federal grants to meet one-half of the annual net operating deficit of any mass transportation company serving urban areas is such a far-reaching step. If commuter operations and if urban transportation services were to be seriously curtailed, the impact on the economy of any urban area would be self-evident.

I would suggest, however, that the committee give serious consideration to the proposal that the bill be amended so as to permit the making of such grants not only to transportation companies, but also to authorities and systems which are operated by the municipalities or by the States. Whether such systems are operated by private companies or by municipal or State authorities, the requirements and the desired ends are identical. I would strongly urge that the committee eliminate this unnatural distinction and that the bill be broadened so as to direct Federal help where help is needed, rather than on some artificial basis.

My support of this bill does not arise solely from my concern for my own city. Every major urban area in the United States will sooner or later experience the same type of problems which are now being faced in the East. Indeed, many areas are already experiencing those problems. It is imperative that we give assistance to that one area in the transportation field where the Government has not been forthcoming with active support. The Government subsidizes the airlines and steamship companies. It provides unbelievable quantities of funds for the highway program. Commuter services, however, have received no such support and this failure of support has resulted in the deplorable conditions currently being faced by our urban communities.

I strongly urge favorable committee action on S. 2935.

The Late Honorable Patrick V. McNamara, U.S. Senator From Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, the caption of an obituary article in a Washington newspaper announced the sad news of the passing of Senator Patrick Vincent McNamara of Michigan by referring to him as a "friend of labor and the aged." That was perhaps his finest epitaph. But he was a friend not only of laboring men and women and of aged men and women. His friends were numbered in the thousands, and they came from every walk of life. I am proud to have been one of them, and to have served in the Michigan congressional delegation with him.

In 1921, at the age of 27, he came to Detroit to head a construction crew. He soon left his pipefitting trade to enter the management side of the construction business, but his active interest in the problems of organized labor never waned throughout his long life. Discussing his lifelong association with the labor movement, he once said:

> My vocation has been the construction industry, but my avocation has been the labor movement. I have never held a paid labor office.

He was known best for his stanch support of Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged, and similar progressive measures. He played a leading role in the struggle to pass the medicare bill for hospital insurance for the aged under the social security system. He was named chairman of the important Senate Public Works Committee in 1963, and was also the chairman of the same Committee's Flood Control-Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee. He was the successful floor manager of a minimum wage bill that raised the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour.

If he believed himself to be in the right, nothing could move him or shake his judgment, but he arrived at his conclusions only after much study and thought.

Arguments—

He once said:

> are only honest misunderstandings. Any time you sit down and calmly consider all the facts, the solution can be easily discerned.

Everyone who knew him agreed that he was genial, had an engaging personality, a keen sense of humor, and a very active mind. He declined to be labeled a liberal, perhaps because with his wide experience in life he thought that no label was appropriate. In refusing to be called a liberal, he said that he was propeople, which amounts to about the same thing.

He was a great man, a great Senator, a friend of the humble and a friend of the great. We mourn his loss and extend our deepest sympathies to the grieving members of his family, whose pride in him must be even deeper than their grief.

Representative Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia, Receives Public Service Award of the Air Freight Forwarders Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS has been honored by the Air Freight Forwarders Association as "Legislative Man-of-the-Year" and has received the 1966 Public Service Award of that organization. The award was announced at the association's ninth annual dinner in New York City, April 29, 1966, an event Representative STAGGERS regrettably could not attend due to illness.

In an address prepared for this occasion and read in his absence, the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce commented on the significance of aviation in building our national economy. He said in part:

> My interest in aviation springs from both personal experience and from my concern for general industrial growth. As a Member of Congress, I have consistently taken the position that good transportation and rapid communication are the two factors which have contributed most to the phenomenal growth of this powerful nation.

Mr. President, I have known HARLEY STAGGERS for more than 30 years, both as a personal friend and as a legislator of conviction and courage. The citizens of West Virginia are fortunate to be represented in the Congress by this able gentleman; the Nation is fortunate to command the energies and abilities of this resourceful individual. I am confident that he will continue to exhibit the highest traits of leadership and clear thinking as he discharges the responsibilities of his important office.

It is a privilege to commend my colleague and coworker, Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, for the significant recognition accorded him by the Air Freight Forwarders Association. He is deserving of the honor.

I request unanimous consent that the statement by Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS, prepared for delivery at the ninth annual dinner of the Air Freight Forwarders Association, April 29, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HARLEY O. STAGGERS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE NINTH ANNUAL DINNER OF THE AIR FREIGHT FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, N.Y., APRIL 29, 1966

The speed of technological development in our time is the distinguishing mark of an age in the world's history when swift change is the rule rather than the exception. Whole industries hitherto undreamed of spring to life and grow like Jonah's gourd overnight. Unlike the gourd, however, many of them seem destined to expand and prosper through the foreseeable future. The airplane industry, or perhaps more correctly, all the industries associated with the production and use of the airplane, furnished a conspicuous example of this rapid development.

Many of the pioneers of the air age are still with us, and add their skill and experience to the further development of that instrument of transportation which they loved dearly enough to pledge their lives for. After all, it is only some sixty years since the day when the first plane managed to stay in the air for a few seconds. Many people believed that it was only a trick of the imagination that the thing would work, and men would really fly. They saw it at the circus and the county fair, but it was only a stunt, and would go away if one shut his eyes.

Then World War I came along, and the airplane became both a missile and a weapon. Daring heroes carried a few miscellaneous bombs against the enemy, but the total results may have been more spectacular than effective. Less than forty years ago Lindbergh spanned the Atlantic in solo flight, and the airplane may be considered to have passed through the period of childhood. During the Second World War it reached its maturity. But it still was far from a practical transportation medium for anything except passengers. For years after the war, a passenger was lucky if he could carry a pocket handkerchief with him.

Suddenly, here within the last decade, we wake up to find the airplane formidable competitors to freight trains, freight steamboats and barges, and independent of existing water courses or expensive rail lines and highways. They can be landed in comparatively inexpensive fields, even if they need to be improvised. They are ready answers to the needs of isolated communities for access to markets without the vast expenditure of time and money to construct the older forms of transportation. As for the matter of economic feasibility, the flying boxcar has answered that. Except perhaps for the extremely bulky and ponderous freight, they can offer rates that are competitive with respect to other agencies.

As a result of all these developments, the airplane industry has proliferated, as the college boys say, into a whole flock of subsidiary and contributory industries. And among these is the industry which I have the honor to address tonight. It is not always possible for a layman to understand exactly how and why an industry that provides a specific service, such as transportation, does split into component parts. But from experience we are convinced that these developments are dictated by convenience, efficiency, and economy. If a contributing industry brings about these benefits, it will grow and prosper.

The industry which you represent has already, in a few short years, proved its usefulness. This is attested by the volume of freight you handle, by the large number and worldwide distribution of the offices you operate, and by the number of people to whom you offer employment. You are recognized as a typical American institution, rendering valuable service and eager to enlarge your value to the public. The natural outcome of prestige such as this practically insures success and the rewards that go with success.

I feel that I have the right to claim some strong affection for the whole idea of aviation. During the war I spent some four years in the air as an officer in the naval air force. My own State of West Virginia is one of those States in which air transportation is likely to play in increasingly larger role, both for passenger travel and for freight. Today a plane can get into and out of the hollows of West Virginia with ease and dispatch. We are building numerous airfields, some of them small but serviceable and some of them more pretentious. We are building up small industries whose products could use air freight to reach markets. Unquestionably West Virginia will find further development of air transport peculiarly profitable.

It follows then, that my interest in aviation springs from both personal experience and from my concern for general industrial growth. As a Member of Congress, I have consistently taken the position that good transportation and rapid communication are the two factors which have contributed most to the phenomenal growth of this powerful Nation. The Constitution sets up "promotion of the general welfare" as one of the specific duties of the Government. I take this seriously, and I endeavor to act in accordance with my conviction.

The congressional committee of which I am presently a member has as one of its functions the general oversight of transportation. Today the transportation industry, as a whole, is beset with many problems. The Nation looks to the Congress, and particularly to the Commerce Committee to provide appropriate answers. The task of promoting the general welfare, as far as transportation is concerned, passes over into the task of adjusting inequities among competing systems, and of providing such regulations as well assure the preservation of the rights and interests of the general public.

In the present age, transportation systems are designated as public utilities, which means that while they are owned and operated, for the most part, by private capital, their methods and modes of operation are of vital public concern. They are given special privileges, and in return they must concede the public interest as paramount. I trust that as a congressman I shall always be able to meet my obligations to all the agencies and industries that have done so much for this country, and at the same time see that the average citizen is adequately protected.

It is truly a great honor to be asked to come to New York to receive an award from an organization for which I have so much respect and esteem. I do not have the pleasure of knowing many of you well, but I feel that a closer acquaintance would strengthen our cordial relations.

I feel that it is necessary to ask you to accept my abject apologies for not participating more fully in your proceedings tonight. Frankly, I spent all of last week in the hospital, and my doctor has insisted that I take things on the quiet and easy for a time. Only my high appreciation of your unexpected—and I fear undeserved—courtesy and thoughtfulness could have induced me to leave home tonight and come all the way to New York.

Please believe that I am grateful from the bottom of my heart. And please believe also that it will be a pleasure and honor to be of service to your organization, and to your members as individuals, in all ways consonant with my duties as a public official.

Norwegian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today I want to pay tribute to our country's proud free friend, Norway, who is celebrating the 152d anniversary of its independence.

On the morning of May 17, every school boy and girl in Norway hops out of bed at the crack of dawn to look at the sky, hoping for a sunny day. But, even if the winds are chill and the rain falls, they will march all morning in the school parade, to tunes played by the boys' brass bands, to celebrate Norway's greatest national holiday—the day in 1814 on which its Constitution was signed. The largest school parade is in Oslo, the capital city. Every year, at the end of their long 3-hour march, Oslo schoolchildren pass under the balcony of the royal palace cheering and spinning their red and blue tasseled caps up in the air on the traditional bamboo canes.

The palace grounds and parade streets are packed with people from the very early hours of the morning. By 7 a.m. the churches open and crowds gather to listen to choirs. Everyone is excited and happy. Freedom and independence mean as much to Norwegians as they do to Americans.

In the afternoon, each neighborhood has a celebration of its own so that the children who are too little to join in the school parades may march near their homes. Everyone joins in the fun—waving the red, white, and blue Norwegian flags—all heading for the place where they will listen to patriotic speeches and play games.

The Eidsvold mansion near Oslo, where the Constitution was signed, is now a national shrine. The gray house with its rust colored trim is preserved and still stands as it was on that memorable day in 1814. Even the furniture is the same.

Two things are noteworthy concerning this celebration. First, the children of Norway are placed in the spotlight. The Norwegians have very much pride in their youth and believe that active participation by them will help the children appreciate the significance of the principles of the Constitution. Secondly, Norway's celebration is not evidenced by a show of armed power. Rather, it is gay and festive, entirely void of military dominance.

The history of Norway, as a political entity, dates back to the latter part of the 9th century, when King Harold, the Fair Haired, succeeded in consolidating a major part of the country through conquest and persuasion. During his rule, the three regional "Lagthing," quasi-democratic legislative assemblies, became the most important instruments of royal power. A fourth "Lagthing" was formed during the rule of King Olav the Holy, 995–1030. Nearly three centuries later, in 1270, King Magnus Lagaboter, the Law Mender, established a common body of law for the whole country, greatly increasing the judicial authority of royal officials.

Despite the increasing monarchial domination, the regional Lagthing retained their power to legislate and pass final sentence in criminal cases as well as in civil law suits. The democratic principles of legislation and judicial proceedings were maintained.

Toward the end of the 14th century, Norway and Denmark became united under one sovereign. During the next four centuries, Norway was ruled by Danish officials and Denmark became the dominant partner, with the King residing in Copenhagen. Throughout this period, however, the hope of achieving freedom, independence and self-government was kept alive in Norway.

In the early part of the 19th century, Norway became Denmark's reluctant partner on the French side in the Napoleonic wars, with Sweden on the opposite side. As hostilities came to an end, Denmark was forced by the Kiel Treaty of January 14, 1814, to cede Norway to Sweden, without Norway's consent. This aroused the indignation of the patriotic Norwegians. They resented having their country handed from one monarch to another as if it were solely a piece of real estate. As a result, the Danish royal Governor in Norway, Prince Christian Frederik, who was also irritated at these actions, hurriedly called a constitutional assembly, composed of 59 government officials, 37 wealthy farmers, and 16 businessmen—altogether 112 delegates—in hope of proclaiming Norway an independent kingdom, with himself as King.

Meeting April 10, the constitutional assembly drafted and, on May 17, 1814, adopted the Constitution of Norway, one of the most liberal constitutions in existence. When the assembly unanimously elected Prince Christian Frederik to be the new King of Norway, Sweden reacted by launching a military attack. After brief hostilities, a truce was negotiated. Under the Moss Convention, Norway became united with Sweden as a separate kingdom under one monarch. At the same time, King Carl Johan of Sweden agreed to recognize Norway's free Constitution. The union lasted until 1905, when it was peacefully dissolved on the initiative of the Norwegian Parliament.

In drafting the fundamental law, the men who met at Eidsvold were influenced by British political tradition, as well as by the principles of the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the ideas of the French Revolution. The articles rest on four basic principles: national independence, sovereignty of the people, division of power, and the inviolable rights of the individual versus the state. This still provides the basic framework for the country's laws.

Civil rights are laid down in a number of specific rules, each with a definite legal bearing. Thus, if the courts, in trying a case, should find that the constitutional rights of a citizen have been infringed upon by a law enacted by Parliament, they are bound to declare the law inapplicable.

Three important provisions specify that first, no person can be imprisoned without trial; second, freedom of speech, publication, and assembly is to be protected; and third, no law may be given retroactive effect.

In these rules one may trace the political line from the American and French declarations of the inalienable human rights. In the Constitution of 1814, however, the ideas of freedom and democracy have found a national form in keeping with Norwegian traditions.

There have been various changes in the Constitution since 1814. In 1884, the parliamentary system of government, by which the King is bound to appoint a Government that has the confidence of the Parliament, was introduced in Norway. However, the words of the Constitution—that the King himself is to choose his Council—have not been altered.

The most important change since 1884 is extension of the franchise to all men and women above the age of 21. In 1898, the limited franchise was replaced by universal suffrage for all men. Women received the right to vote in 1907—first with limitations—but finally in 1913 on the same basis as men.

The controversial "peasant clause" that allotted 100 of the 150 seats in Parliament to rural areas and 50 to urban election districts was repealed in 1952, reflecting the increasing urbanization of the country. It is ironical that the United States today is faced with a similar situation in reapportionment.

As one of the descendants of almost a million Norwegians who have immigrated to the United States, it is heartwarming to know that the United States and Norway stand together on so many international issues seeking to further peace and prosperity around the globe.

Sentinels of Safety Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the Calcite Quarry in Rogers City, Mich., operated by the Michigan Limestone Operations of United States Steel Corp., has won its 11th Sentinels of Safety Trophy in the 41st annual National Safety Competition sponsored by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Mines and the American Mining Congress.

The 455 men mining this huge quarry accumulated 1,083,852 hours last year without a single lost-time injury—at least 400,000 hours more than the winner in any of the 5 other divisions in the competition. And these 6 winners were chosen from 845 entries.

Our Presque Isle County operation, one of the largest limestone quarries in the United States, has been a regular contestant since 1928. In those 38 years, its consistently outstanding performance has earned the prized Sentinels of Safety statuette 11 times.

I commend the employees and management of the quarry for this remarkable achievement, and for the diligent concern for human life that it represents. With all the residents of Upper Michigan, I congratulate the Calcite Quarry for a record that reflects so honorably on all our mining operations in northern Michigan.

The 40th Anniversary of the Passaic County Historical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, in every section of the United States, groups of dedicated individuals are banded together to preserve the history, traditions, and memorabilia of their local areas for the use and enlightenment of future generations. Such an organization is the Passaic County Historical Society in New Jersey. First organized in 1926, the Passaic County Historical Society is presently celebrating the 40th year of its existence.

These 40 years have been fruitful years—years during which the story of Passaic County and of its inhabitants throughout the centuries has been researched and studied by many workers. The results of their labors have been collected and are now carefully preserved in the museum operated by the society and located in one of our Nation's historic landmarks, Lambert Castle in Paterson, N.J. This museum is visited annually by more than 35,000 persons interested in learning more about their ancestors, and the ways in which they lived. This story, unfolded in the exhibits of the museum, is a thrilling one which parallels in many respects the history of our Nation.

Following the settlement of New Netherlands—now New York City—in 1624, Dutch traders and trappers crossed the Hudson River and pushed into what is now Passaic County. On their return to New Netherlands, they told of the fertile valleys, the rolling hills, and of the scenic beauty of the Great Falls of the Passaic River. Their stories induced settlers to purchase the land from the Indians, establish their farms, and build their homes throughout the area. One of these homes, built by Arent Schuyler in 1697, still stands in Pompton Lakes and is still occupied by his descendants, one of whom married Gen. William Colfax, commander of Washington's bodyguard during the Revolution.

At the outbreak of the Revolution, Passaic County has been completely settled by thrifty Dutch farmers, whose fertile acres in the southern half of the county made this region one of the wealthiest in the colonies. Iron had been discovered in the hills of the northern half of the county, and from the Ringwood mines came the ore used to manufacture the guns and cannonballs used by Washington's armies. The great chain which stretched across the Hudson River to protect that fort against the British Navy was a product of these Ringwood forges. Parts of this chain may still be seen at West Point and at Ringwood Manor.

Washington and his army came through the county on several occasions first in 1776, during the terrible retreat through New Jersey which finally ended in a victory at Trenton on Christmas Day. The defense of the Ringwood mines played an important role in his strategy, and patriot soldiers were always in the area, guarding the mines against the British in New York City. Washington was so impressed by the manager of the mines, Robert Erskine, that he appointed Erskine to be Surveyor General of the Continental Army.

With Washington came many of the men who aided him to defeat the British. There was the young Frenchman, the Marquis de Lafayette. His headquarters, still stand in Wayne, a thriving municipality named after another of Washington's generals, Anthony Wayne. In the same community is Washington's own headquarters, the Dey Mansion which he occupied in 1780, and which is now preserved by the Passaic County Park Commission. Col. Alexander Hamilton was an aide of the General and with him visited the Great Falls. Hamilton was so impressed by the falls that years later when he was serving as the first Secretary of the Treasury under President Washington, he recommended the founding of a Federal city at the spot, a city that would utilize the water power of the falls and become the industrial center of the new Nation.

That city, named Paterson after New Jersey's Governor, William Paterson was established in 1792, and, as Hamilton had foreseen, developed into a busy industrial center, becoming famous for its cotton and silk cloth, its locomotives, and its airplane motors. It was in Paterson that Samuel Colt invented the revolver which conquered the West. It was in Paterson that the locomotives were built which helped to settle the great plains of the West. It was in Paterson that John Holland developed the first practical submarine. It was Paterson labor which built the airplane motors which carried Lindbergh across the Atlantic Ocean, and powered the B-17's that bombed Germany into defeat.

Sons of Passaic County left their homes to fight in America's armies in all of her wars. Others left to build the Nation in more peaceful pursuits. One, Daniel Force, was three times elected mayor of Washington, and his library formed the basis of our National Archives now resting in the Library of Congress. Another, Nicholas Murray Butler, more than any other one person, built Columbia University into the great educational institution it now is, and won the Nobel Peace Prize for his services to mankind following World War I. Still another, Garret A. Hobart became Vice President of the United States under McKinley.

It was John W. Griggs, another Passaic County resident, who, as Attorney General of the United States, drafted the declaration of war against Spain, and later became our country's representative at Hague Peace Tribunal.

It is the story of these men, and of thousands of other residents of the county which the Passaic County Historical Society is preserving and telling at its museum located in Lambert Castle. The castle was built in 1892 by Catholina Lambert, a Paterson silk manufacturer, as his home. It is a beautiful sandstone structure patterned after Warwick Castle in England. In it, Mr. Lambert entertained the great and famous people of his day, and in it, he housed the largest privately owned art collection in the United States.

Following the death of Mr. Lambert, the Passaic County Park Commission acquired the castle and the surrounding property on Garret Mountain. The land was developed into a beautiful park, and part of the castle was turned over to the Passaic County Historical Society for its use. Since its founding, the society had slowly acquired many relics and much memorabilia pertaining to Passaic County. The collection was moved into the castle and made available to the public. A few years later, Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, widow of the late Vice President, presented the society with her collection of relics of the Spanish-American War and of the McKinley administration. This gift, now housed in the Hobart room of the museum has grown into one of the best collections of Spanish-American War materials in the Nation.

As the documents and objects acquired by the society over the years increased, it became necessary that they be safely housed. Four years ago, the Board of Chosen Freeholders built a modern fireproof vault in which these precious relics of our past are now stored. New additions are being constantly added to the society's collection, and bit by bit, the story of Passaic County and its residents is being uncovered and preserved for the historians of the future. New workers have joined the society to replace those who have passed on, and these are the men and women who are now carrying on the work started 40 years ago.

I believe that it is fitting for us here today to salute the society on its 40th anniversary, to pay tribute to the work which has been accomplished in the past, and to wish the society and its president, Alfred P. Cappio, success in the years ahead. In this way, we honor, not only the Passaic County Historical Society but also all those other groups and individuals who are performing similar tasks in their own communities. The professional historians who have related the history of our Nation, and of its great men and women, have been remembered on many occasions. Let us honor these volunteers who, in their own localities, are telling the stories of the small towns and villages, and of the ordinary men and women who together developed our great Nation.

Fino Introduces Two Bills To Keep Poverty Agencies From Picking Rent Supplement Tenants and To Kill Planned Private Poverty Rent Supplement Program for Dregs of Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills to prevent the Office of Economic Opportunity from funding local poverty agency rent supplement programs and from serving in any way as a selection agency for HUD's rent supplement program.

The first bill amends the rent supplement statute to prevent the Department of Housing and Urban Development from subcontracting the selection of rent supplement tenants to agencies aided by poverty funds. This bill is aimed at programs like the Washington, D.C., Housing Development Corporation which wants to procure tenants for Federal rent supplement programs.

The second bill amends the community action program section of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prohibit the OEO Director from giving Federal assistance to any program involving the use of Federal funds for the construction of new housing, the rehabilitation or leasing of existing housing, or for the performance of any real estate brokerage function. The bill also prohibits the OEO from giving funds to any organization or program which in any way processes or recommends applicants or applications for any housing program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It would block attempts like that of the Housing Development Corporation to set up local rent supplement programs and serve as a real estate agency for the dregs of society.

I have for some months been following the progress of the so-called Washington, D.C., Housing Development Corporation which is trying to get a poverty grant to serve as a real estate agency for the deprived and which wants to venture into using Government funds to build new houses, lease existing housing, and in other ways move the deprived into new housing. Now I understand that

15 or 20 other cities have submitted similar applications to the OEO. The time has come for action.

The OEO is not this Nation's housing agency. That is the responsibility of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. When that agency runs housing programs, they do so in accord—or they should do so in accord—with the statutes on the books. When an OEO organization runs a housing program, they do so in accord with their own social revolutionary desires. The OEO statute has no technical guidelines. Any money the OEO spends for housing via community action programs is subject to the most flagrant type of abuses. My bills would flush OEO out of the housing field and leave it to HUD which has to act in conformity with housing statutes.

I am dead against the proposed poverty housing agencies. They would be instrumentalities of the poverty agencies like Washington's UPO and New York's HARYOU-Act. Both of these organizations are so irresponsible that they subsidize people like LeRoi Jones, the white-hating black nationalist who advocate a national bloodbath. If we allow the poverty program to set up a string of local poverty housing programs across the country, we will get a wild-eyed string of local multimillion dollar rent supplement programs operating under no restrictions at all.

The proposed Washington housing agency, the "Housing Development Corporation" has bragged of the people it is going to push into every nook and cranny of the suburbs—welfare spongers, criminals, alcoholics, and people living together without being married. I can just imagine the type of local rent supplement program this agency would like to set up. Inasmuch as 15 or 20 cities have requested this type of agency, the poverty housing program could, turn into a social monster program that would make the HUD rent supplement program look like kindergarten.

The poverty housing agencies have all kinds of ambition. They want to be unlicensed real estate boards for the dregs of society: criminals, junkies and the like. My bills block this. They would keep the OEO Director from giving Federal funds to community action programs which include this type of housing and real estate activity.

My second bill makes sure that HUD cannot subcontract, as it looks like it presently can, the selection of rent supplement tenants to agencies and organizations getting poverty program money. I don't want agencies like the UPO or HARYOU-ACT handpicking rent supplement recipients.

I hope the House will act favorably on these two bills. The poverty people don't care about housing. All they care about is social revolution and troublemaking—and coming up with fat payrolls for otherwise unemployable social worker types. The proposed Washington poverty housing agency wants $625,000 for salaries and expenses the first year. They want to employ 15 persons at salaries between $15,000 and $27,000 a year. This is typical. All the poverty housing agency will do is cause trouble and subsidize a lot of good-for-nothings who will get on the payroll.

U.S. Policy in the Middle East—Address by Representative Seymour Halpern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the spotlight of world attention has shifted to a perennial trouble spot, the Middle East, as Soviet Premier Kosygin visits with United Arab Republic President Nasser and tours Egypt. The evidence continues to accumulate that the Arab-Israeli rivalry is not the only threat to peace in that area as the United Arab Republic—Egypt, Syria, and the Yemeni Republicans, bolstered by Soviet arms and economic support, threaten the pro-Western Arab States and hurl anti-imperialist propaganda barbs against the United States and our allies.

In this connection, the recent address of Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, before the biennial convention of the American Jewish Congress is of interest. I ask unanimous consent that Representative HALPERN's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Address by Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN at the American Jewish Congress Biennial Convention, April 29, 1966)

I am deeply honored by your invitation. The American Jewish Congress is known in Washington as distinct from other Jewish organizations because of its independence of thought and action, its courage, and its broad philosophy which sees the wide panorama of issues involved in perfecting our democracy.

Washington has not forgotten the stirring address of your President, Dr. Joachim Prinz, before the momentous "March on Washington" by advocates of equality for our Negro citizens. Nor has Washington forgotten the role the American Jewish Congress played in making the March a historic success. You earned a proud page in the annals of both American history and Jewish history.

I need not recall to this sophisticated and well-informed audience your effective intervention on many recent issues. Your expose of the collaboration by the State Department with Arab discrimination against assignment of United States personnel of Jewish faith to Arab countries set the groundwork for a coming fight in Congress to correct this situation.

As a Congressman who closely followed post-war developments in West Germany, I was moved by the recent confrontation of Dr. Prinz with the German Ambassador. Dr. Prinz said more eloquently and more perfectly what I would like to have stated to the Ambassador.

We are gathered here this afternoon to discuss United States Policy in the Middle East. Frankly, I would really like to know what the policy of our Government is in that area. I have followed every action and expression of our State Department and cannot accurately define the mish-mash of confusion and contradictions that is served up as a meaningful response to the emergent and complex problems of the Middle East.

Since I share your deep conviction that the security of Israel is inextricably linked with the preservation of freedom in the Middle East, I am concerned. I would like to share with you the facts behind my concern. I do not believe in a philosophy of helpless "gevald" or ineffectual hand-wringing. Neither does the American Jewish Congress.

So let us look at the facts and view the situation as it stands today, April 29. Let us then consider what positive steps our Government can take to bring greater clarity and meaning to our policy in the national security interest of the United States and our integrity as a nation committed to the causes of freedom and justice.

In the next few weeks, King Faisal of Saudi Arabia will be welcomed to Washington as the official White House guest of President Johnson. One of the topics on the agenda, no doubt, is the expanding infrastructure of American military support of the Jordanian-Saudi Arabian airpower build-up which includes jets, a radar network, and Hawk ground-to-air missiles.

Also, in the very near future, Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union will visit Cairo as the official guest of President Nasser. One of the topics on the agenda in Egypt, no doubt, is the sale of new, supersonic jets and other arms to Egypt to balance the United States arms shipped to Saudi Arabia and Jordan. We are also aware that Russia recently increased shipments of ultramodern jets to Syria and Iraq.

The Administration is obviously morally obligated to maintain a modicum of stability by supplying some balancing arms to Israel. But where is all this leading?

The United States virtually underwrites the Jordanian economy. Jordan, in order to persuade the rest of the Arab world that she hasn't forgotten her anti-Israel vendetta, has been the source of a number of shooting and infiltration attacks into Israel within the last two weeks. A number of Israelis have been killed and wounded, in attacks from Jordan, within the last year.

I would like to know whether Jordan has made an iron-clad commitment not to use American jets against Israel.

Earlier this week, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Rodger Davies told a conference in Washington that "there has been no change in the basic approach of the United States to the Middle East." He went on to say that American policy was motivated, among other things, by—and I quote directly—"continued flow of Middle East oil."

I would like to know if the United States is obtaining a commitment from Saudi Arabia that would guarantee her use of American-supplied airpower only against Communism and Nasserism.

We can never forget that arms shipped to Jordan and Saudi Arabia are not necessarily addressed to the present rulers of those countries in the turbulent Middle East. A few pistol shots could quickly change the nature of the regimes. We could wake up one morning and find pro-Nasser regimes that have emerged from some coup. So the arms are sent virtually "to whom it may concern". However, since we cannot stop our Government's decision to fill what it considers a vacuum and what it views as a buffer against Communism and Nasserism, let us at least get some kind of assurance that the arms will not be employed aggressively.

Let us not forget that Saudi Arabia and Jordan are members of the Unified Arab

Command, pledged to Israel's destruction, that pledge reiterated at the most recent Arab summit meeting. Let us not forget that Egypt controls the Unified Arab Command and is author of the longterm anti-Israel war in Yemen will one day be free for other adventures.

We have reached the stage in escalation of sophisticated weapons in the Middle East where we must seek a clearer definition of American commitments to peace in that region and to the integrity and security of America's true friend, the State of Israel.

We have vague assurances. We have vague reiterations of various statements by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. I would like to hear a clear-cut 1966 definition of American policy on Israeli security by our President. The President is certainly aware of C.I.A. reports on the Communist shipments of vast weapons supplies—billions of dollars worth—to Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Yemen.

Egypt and Yemen, which is Egypt's stooge, are allied in a war against the majority of Yemen's population who do not desire Nasser's so-called "Arab socialism" which is really naked totalitarianism. Nasser has ignored American efforts to end the small but brutal war. Syria is equally irresponsible and virulently anti-American. Syria recently invited and honored a Viet Cong delegation and Red Chinese who urged that the Arabs initiate what Peking calls "a war of national liberation" against Israel.

Syria is the main base of the fanatical "Palestine Liberation Organization" and other terrorist extremists. Iraq is so unstable that some new colonel might have seized power since we read this morning's newspaper.

What is the State Department's answer to all this? I regret to report that the State Department is drafting new proposals for expanded aid to Egypt. The Department knows very well that Egypt has devoted more land to growth of cotton than is economically sound in a nation faced with food shortages and starvation. The Department also knows that Egypt barters cotton to Russia for jets. And the United States General Accounting Office has exposed the flagrant misrepresentations of the Egyptian Government when it obtained American surplus food by lying about Egyptian patterns of cultivation.

The same State Department that is now subtly trying to tie all kinds of strings to the nuclear desalination plant once promised to Israel is seriously considering a loan of between $100 million and $150 million to Egypt for a similar desalting plant. Other aid for Egypt is in the works—electrical generators, surplus commodities, and perhaps other projects not yet published.

I simply do not understand why the American taxpayer should subsidize the Egyptian economy so that Nasser can divert money from his domestic budget to help pay for additional Soviet weapons. It does not make sense. I have opposed such aid to Egypt in the past and I will offer an amendment this year when the aid bill is before the House.

This year I will strive to obtain a mandatory provision that would require the Executive Department to withhold aid from nations that use their own assets to purchase Soviet weapons.

We have read and heard this week of battles in the skies over North Viet Nam between American fliers and Communists in Soviet-built MIG–21's. Why should our men give their lives to battle MIG–21's in the Far East while our taxpayers help Egypt purchase MIG–21's in the Middle East?

These questions underscore the absolute necessity for organizations like the American Jewish Congress which is made up of fighters for peace. Conformity in considering vital issues is not always a virtue. I have some doubts about the age of consensus.

You have every right to question the credibility gap, the disparity between practice and preachment in our present policies pertaining to the Middle East. While we are preoccupied with Vietnam, the situation in the Middle East bears consistent observation and demands creative solutions. Otherwise we may find ourselves confronted suddenly with another dilemma, one that could prove even more dangerous in its ramifications than Vietnam.

The possibility of a joint American-Soviet moratorium on arms shipments to the Middle East should be pursued with diligence. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union reportedly insisted at the recent CENTO conference in Turkey that any arms limitations be applied not only to the Arab states and Israel but also to Greece, Turkey, and Iran—nations allied with the United States. While we await the facts let us recall that CENTO arms shipped to Pakistan for use against Communism were actually employed against India. Let us also recall that the CENTO line is breached by Soviet penetration of Egypt. Witness the recent news of Egyptian-Soviet naval collaboration in which trawlers and submarines equipped with electronic devices are based in Egypt and observe United States Sixth Fleet movements in the Mediterranean as well as in the Red Sea and Indian Ocean—not to mention the simultaneous surveillance of Israeli shipping.

To what extent are we financing this Egyptian-Soviet collaboration if we approve the pending $250 million in various forms of aid the State Department is considering for Egypt? Does this not undermine the efforts at the CENTO meeting?

Lacking a joint American-Soviet agreement to limit introduction of arms into the region, let us consider the next best step. The continuing Arab threat to destroy Israel and the present arms escalation menaces regional stability and world security. Let us renew our efforts to persuade our Government to exert all its influence to bring Arab states to the peace table with Israel. If we do grant arms and aid, we should at least get a little leverage and influence in return that could be used to promote peace.

In view of the facts of life, we must insist that Israel be fortified by a renewed American defense commitment and whatever the burden thereby placed on Israel's economy in view of the high price of sophisticated arms must be considered when Israel applies for surplus commodity purchases and development loans.

What ever happened to the nuclear desalting plant that the White House described so glowingly as the fruit of Israel-American technical cooperation? If it is held up by strings that the State Department would attach to control Israeli policies, by demands for unilateral inspection of nuclear installations, by exorbitant interest rates on loans, then let us know the facts.

Let there be some steps toward a realistic solution of the Arab refugee problem. The Arabs first must recognize the legal existence of the State of Israel. Then there would be a basis for negotiation. These unfortunate people have been cruelly exploited by Arab demagogues and used as political footballs. Absorption in Arab countries is today more realistic than continuation of an artificial nation-in-exile. The Arab State responsible for displacement of the refugees through their war of aggression in 1948 must begin to assume some responsibility in their rehabilitation and resettlement in Arab lands where there is room and opportunity for them.

Let us remind the State Department, when they praise the alleged moderations of the Nasser regime, that the Suez Canal remains closed to Israeli commerce despite the expressions of the United Nations.

Recently we heard a lot of jokes about Coca-Cola and the "Pause that depresses" and Israel "joining the Pepsi generation." There were hard words over soft drinks when the Coca-Cola Export Corporation initially refused a franchise to Israel. Some suggested that Israel should refuse Coca-Cola the franchise for "Gazoz" (GA-ZOX)—Israel's popular orange drink) and Borscht.

But let us now pause to refresh our consideration of the anti-boycott provisions of the Export Control Act. As ranking Republican member of the House Subcommittee on International Trade, I fought for stronger provisions than those that emerged. A mandatory clause was deleted that would have declared the Arab boycott illegal. Had the clause been retained, any American corporation troubled by the Arabs could have simply said, "Sorry, but the law prevents us from complying with your anti-Israel demands."

The Commerce Department initially opposed any anti-boycott legislation at all. The Secretaries of Commerce and State, you will recall, testified ominously that a move against the Arab boycott would jeopardize the American boycotts of Cuba and Red China—thus inferentially and unfairly linking Israel with those two nations which are not overly popular in Washington. Also, there was innuendo voiced that Israel discriminates against the Arabs, that American business would be controlled by Israeli interests, and so forth.

But we fought and brought out an anti-boycott bill with some teeth in it. Unfortunately, a compromise was cooked up because there was fear of what would happen in the Senate. The Commerce Department agreed to the compromise because it realized the final draft would give the impression of fighting the boycott without actually antagonizing the Arabs.

When the Commerce Department drafted regulations to implement the anti-boycott law as finally adopted last year, companies were asked to report on boycott incidents but were pointedly told that they were not even required to reveal whether they decided to comply with Arab demands.

The Commerce Department's last quarterly report on the law was a meaningless hodgepodge. It confused the Arab boycott issue with the Indian-Pakistani differences over cargo seizures. The Department of Commerce also carefully tabulated each case in which Israel asked shippers to avoid Arab ports when carrying Israel-bound cargo. These were listed as 64 instances of Israeli discrimination against the Arabs. Israel was forced, of course, to issue such shipping orders to prevent seizure of her goods in transit by Arab port authorities. When the Commerce Department finally got around to the deeds by the Arabs, the Department decided that information was inadequate "to permit a clear judgment".

I submit that we have a watered-down anti-boycott law. It has loopholes that make it virtually meaningless. I intend to institute action in my Committee to revive the deleted language by amendment and provide teeth to the law.

Inadequacy in the wording of the law causes companies like Coca-Cola to tend to comply with the Arab boycott pressures and to camouflage such submission. I warned last year, I might add, that just such a situation would ensue unless we had a specific prohibition against compliance with the boycott. The Commerce Department, the State Department, and, unfortunately, some of my colleagues, felt such mandatory wording was unnecessary and undesirable.

At a time when our Nation is facing the outflow of the dollar, it baffles me that the Commerce Department permits American businessmen to be blackmailed by the Arabs from doing dollar-earning business abroad.

I can reveal today that I have asked the Commerce Department for a detailed and comprehensive report on why gaps and loopholes in the antiboycott law have emerged despite assurances given Congress by the Executive Department when the Congress reluctantly agreed to accept the weakened version in the compromise that I opposed.

Let us for a moment look at the brighter side of events. This is the 18th anniversary of Israel. The Hebrew word is "Chai," which means life. It was 23 years ago this month when the Germans were brutally destroying the Warsaw ghetto, murdering the inmates, burning the gallant martyrs. Today the children of Israel, a new generation born in freedom in the Promised Land, sing "Am Yisrael Chai"—the people of Israel live!

We take pride that Israel has grown in size and stature. Israel initiated the Peace Corps concept that we have emulated. Israel gave technical aid and guidance to more than 60 nations of Asia, Africa, and now, Latin America. Israel has become a tried and true friend of the United States, an outpost of freedom in the Middle East.

We cannot solve all the problems confronting Israel. But neither, as the sages say, are we free to desist from them.

It is my fervent conviction that the American Jewish Congress, its leaders, and its members may justifiably share in the proud knowledge that they have served our people. You have fought injustices at home; you have forced the Soviet Union to ameliorate to some extent the restrictions on Jews; you have promoted Jewish education and the struggle for separation of church from state in Federal education; and you have done many other positive things including your faithful, creative, and effective work for peace in the Middle East and Israel-American friendship. I thank you.

Twelfth Report From Washington to the Residents of Los Angeles 30th Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the most important responsibilities of a Member of Congress is to make regular reports on his activities in Washington to his constituents at home.

For that reason, and because of the importance of an active and fully informed citizenry, I would like to include in today's RECORD the text of my 12th in a series of regular reports to the residents of my 30th California Congressional District.

The report follows:

REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON, MAY 1966

(By Congressman ED ROYBAL)

This is the 12th in a series of regular "Reports from Washington" made to the residents of the 30th District on my activities as your Representative in the Nation's Capital.

These, plus nine special reports, were designed to cover all major items of legislation considered by Congress, events of national and international significance, and particularly, those matters of special concern to Metropolitan Los Angeles and Southern California.

The tempo of Congressional action has speeded up lately as the various Committees, after long hours of hearings, are bringing important measures to the Floor for debate and decision by the full membership of the House—and I believe the 2nd session of the 89th Congress will establish a productive record of legislative achievement.

For example, since coming to Congress, I have been working for a fresh approach to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, stressing medical treatment, rehabilitation programs, and intensive aftercare for narcotic victims.

Drug addiction, taking LSD, glue sniffing, and the use of marihuana, weigh heavily on the youth of our nation, especially and we are long overdue in attacking the problem head on.

Now, however, with full Administration endorsement for a federal Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act, I hope to report favorable action soon on this promising new national effort, modeled after California's successful pioneering civil commitment program for addicts.

VOTE YOUR CHOICE

The right to vote is America's badge of freedom. We should treasure and protect this precious right by exercising our franchise on Primary Election Day, June 7.

If you have not yet registered, contact the Los Angeles County Registrar of Voters, phone: 628–9211 (after regular office hours or on weekends call 629–2451), for information on where and how to register in order to be eligible to vote in the General Election this November.

MEDICARE

A new era in American history begins July 1st. That is the date on which the protection of medicare becomes effective for some 19 million men and women 65 and over.

As one of the original Congressional sponsors of this historic plan to provide comprehensive health benefits for the aged, I am deeply gratified that never again in this country should our senior citizens find their life savings suddenly wiped out by huge hospital and medical bills.

And never again should children and grandchildren be forced to strain their own limited financial resources to pay the medical expenses of an elderly parent.

In my opinion, medicare will take its place with the social security program of 30 years ago as among the most progressive and forward-looking pieces of legislation ever enacted by Congress.

AUTO SAFETY

Congress is responding to an aroused public demand for strong affirmative action to help reduce the tragic toll of needless death and injury on the Nation's highways by moving to adopt federal minimum standards for highway traffic, motor vehicle, and tire safety.

With 50,000 Americans killed, over 2,000,000 injured, and tens of million of dollars in property damage and lost wages every year due to auto accidents, we have suddenly awakened to the fact that traffic safety is is one of the most critical problems facing the country today—requiring not only strict Federal engineering and design standards, but also better enforcement of present traffic safety and auto inspection laws, as well as continued emphasis on driver responsibility.

TAX INCREASE

I voted against the Administration's plan to suspend last year's excise tax cut on autos and phone service, and re-impose the previous higher rates, because, though circumstances may change, I didn't feel the current economic situation here at home, or our overseas responsibilities, required such a major increase in Federal taxes at the time.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

I was happy to add my vote in favor of a constructive U.S. role in the new 19-nation Asian Development Bank—as a means of promoting more rapid self-help economic and social progress in Southeast Asia—and hopefully pointing the way toward a brighter, more peaceful future for that war-ravaged part of the world.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

The House also approved stronger authority for the new Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to help eliminate, once and for all, unfair job discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING

Prospects are looking better for enactment this year of the Truth-in-Packaging Consumer Protection Bill to outlaw deceptive and unfair practices in labeling and packaging retail goods, and to provide American consumers and housewives with accurate, complete, and honest information on the foods and drugs they purchase—a big help in managing the family budget, and enabling all consumers to shop and buy wisely.

I am also hopeful we can pass the companion Truth-in-Lending Bill to protect borrowers by requiring full disclosure of the total cost of credit and all hidden charges in financing consumer articles or services.

FELLOW GRAD

I was happy to arrange a special White House tour and personal meeting with the President for my fellow Roosevelt High School graduate, U.S.C.'s 1965 All-American football star, Mike Garrett, and his mother Mrs. Ella Sigur.

Mike visited the Nation's Capital as winner of the California State District Attorney Association's annual Citizenship Award given him for outstanding social and recreation work among local Los Angeles youth groups.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

By an overwhelming 352–10 count, the House passed and sent to the Senate a bill designed to stop the practice of stealing pets, and to prevent cruelty to dogs, cats and other animals used in medical research, without hampering vital programs to find a cure for such killers as heart disease and cancer.

SERVICE ACADEMY EXAMS OF 1967

For the fifth year in a row—in order that every young man in the 30th District, who is interested in one of the freshman cadet openings available next year at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Merchant Marine Academy, will have an equal chance to compete, I am asking all applicants to take the Civil Service Commission's special Academy Designation Exam to be given in the Federal Building in Los Angeles on Monday, July 11th. A make-up exam will be held August 22nd for those unable to report for the July test.

For more information, application blanks, and a letter of authorization to take the exam, interested students should contact my Los Angeles Field Representative Alex Garcia, phone: 688–4870.

PARTICIPATION SALES

By a narrow 206 to 190 vote the House OK'd the Administration's controversial Participation Sales program to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to sell to private investors interest-bearing "participation shares" in pooled government loan assets now held by federal agencies like the Small Business Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Office of Education, Veterans Administration, and the new Department of Housing.

I cast my vote against this Administration proposal because I felt it would have an adverse effect on the home mortgage market, raise the interest rates on home financing, and increase the cost of owning a home to the borrowing public.

In addition, as a member of a special California Congressional Delegation Committee studying the present record high interest rate situation, I am deeply concerned about the harmful financial impact such large-scale federal sales would have on private lending agencies, on the real estate and building industry, and on the entire economy of our State.

AT YOUR SERVICE

The members of my Congressional office staff in Washington, as well as those in our Los Angeles District Office, are anxious to help you in any way they can. I hope you will continue to make full use of the many services available through our offices by contacting us whenever you feel we can be of personal assistance.

LINCOLN STATUE IN MEXICO

The First Lady welcomes me aboard the special Presidential Jet "Air Force One" prior to departure from Washington as members of the official U.S. Delegation to Mexico City for the presentation of a statue of Abraham Lincoln as a symbol of our friendship for the people of Mexico and in commemoration of that Nation's independence.

After stopping in San Antonio to pick up President Johnson, who was staying at the Texas White House, we flew to Mexico City and the most enthusiastic reception ever accorded an American President South of the border.

As one of the original legislative sponsors of the Lincoln statue proposal, I was delighted at the successful conclusion to our more than six years' effort to secure Congressional approval of the project.

In addition, I am confident the nearly 5 million U.S. citizens of Mexican descent are especially honored by this gesture of recognition and token of esteem for the great contributions to the cause of freedom and liberty made by our neighboring Republic of Mexico.

LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

Again this year I sent out a questionnaire soliciting the views of the residents of the 30th District on some of the major legislative issues of special interest to Los Angeles, the State of California, and the Nation.

Like the encouraging experience with my two previous Congressional Polls, I was highly pleased at the overwhelming response to this opportunity to participate in the affairs of government by indicating your opinion on these vital issues.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have urged such top Administration officials as Secretary of State Dean Rusk to explore every possibility for international agreement on stopping the spread of nuclear weapons.

With China's recent atomic explosion, and the French Pacific A-bomb tests scheduled within the next few weeks, time is working against us.

Unless we move quickly to work out a nonproliferation treaty, with adequate safeguards and inspection control provisions, we may miss civilization's last real chance to avoid nuclear destruction.

For, as President John Kennedy said, "Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind".

PEACETIME G.I. BILL

As co-author of the new GI Bill of Rights, I was proud to receive one of the pens President Johnson used in signing into law this permanent program of comprehensive readjustment benefits to help some 5 million post-Korean and Vietnam veterans return to civilian life, go to college, train for a job, and have a chance to buy a home for their families.

Considered one of the best pieces of legislation adopted by the 89th Congress, it includes up to 4-years' college education aid, vocational training, job placement assistance, guaranteed and direct home loans, as well as limited medical care for non-service-connected disabilities.

For information on applying for any of these fine programs, contact the Veterans Administration Los Angeles Regional Office, phone: 478–3711.

CARE

In its 20 years of service to humanity, CARE has brought aid, on a person-to-person basis, to millions all over the world. And with our support, CARE will continue to fulfill this vital role as long as there are hungry or needy people.

If you want to help in this worldwide effort, or assist in the current CARE Vietnam Relief drive to aid civilian war victims and refugees in Vietnam, send your contribution to CARE, Room 1220, 215 W. 5th Street, Los Angeles, California, 90013, phone: 626–3625.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not weary; and they shall walk and not faint.—Isaiah 40: 31.

Quietly and sincerely, our Father, do we wait upon Thee. Without the strength which Thou alone can give we faint and falter and walk not in faith and love. With the strength Thou dost cause to arise within us we are made ready for every responsibility, equal to any experience and adequate for all of life. Make us ready for the responsibilities of this day, equal to the experiences of this hour and adequate for the actions we take this session of Congress.

Strengthen our President as he leads us; our Speaker as he presides over us; and all Members of Congress as they take action on behalf of our people. In Thy strength may we be made strong indeed, in Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2463. An act to grant the consent of the Congress to the acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1098. An act to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 42, 86th Congress, appointed Mr. GRIFFIN to be a member of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group at a meeting to be held in Washington, D.C.-Oak Ridge, Tenn., May 18 through May 22, 1966, in lieu of Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, resigned.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 265) to authorize conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value.

AMENDING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1966, I introduced H.R. 12272 to amend section 902(b) and section 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which sections provide that if a U.S. corporation owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock of a foreign or first-level corporation, and if such foreign corporation owns 50 percent or more of the voting stock of a second-level or a foreign subsidiary, the domestic parent corporation may credit its proportionate share of the subsidiary's taxes against dividends received. Under present law no credit is allowed to the U.S. corporation for foreign taxes paid by a foreign corporation beyond the second level.

The amendment proposed in H.R. 12272 would reduce the 50-percent requirement to 25 percent between the first and second levels and would include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 25-percent test is met.

After careful consideration, I feel that this legislation should also provide that in no event shall the parent corporation obtain the benefit of a tax credit unless the U.S. parent corporation owns directly or indirectly not less than 5 percent of the voting stock of the second- and third-level subsidiaries. This, in effect, would follow the present requirement of indirect ownership in second-level subsidiaries which is a minimum of 10 percent of 50 percent ownership or an aggregate of not less than 5 percent.

I am therefore introducing a new bill in lieu of H.R. 12272 to amend section 902(b) and section 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which will also include an amendment requiring any parent domestic corporation to own at least 5 percent of the voting stock of the second or third level subsidiaries in order to be allowed a tax credit.

The economic benefits which would be derived from such action, as stated at the time H.R. 12272 was introduced, are as follows, all in the national interest:

First: Contribute to the U.S. balance of payments.

Second. Enable American business to expand and grow abroad with reduced amounts of American equity capital.

Third. Create a more favorable business climate aboard by furthering the increased participation of foreign local nations in their own foreign economy.

Fourth. Encourage a demand, wherever feasible, for raw materials, products, and equipment to be supplied from sources within the United States rather than elsewhere, thereby benefiting our economy through increased employment and income.

As I said when I introduced the original bill, inasmuch as this proposed legislation, when enacted, will prove beneficial to the economy of the United States, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to report it out and the Congress to enact this measure at the earliest practicable date.

THE LATE HONORABLE HENRY S. CAULFIELD

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House that the Honorable Henry S. Caulfield, a Member of the House of Representatives from March 4, 1907 to March 3, 1909, passed away in St. Louis, Mo., on May 11.

Judge Caulfield had a distinguished career of public service. In addition to his term in the House of Representatives, he served as Governor of the State of Missouri, judge of the St. Louis Court of Appeals, city counselor, member of the St. Louis Public Library Board, counsel for the Board of Freeholders which drafted the St. Louis City Charter, member of the St. Louis Board of Election Commissioners, and director of public welfare for the city of St. Louis.

Among his many important accomplishments, during his tenure as Governor he established the Missouri Highway Patrol as a nonpolitical department, a reformatory for young offenders, and his recommendations resulted in the enactment of a small loan law to protect workers. In addition, a State budgetary system was formed and a survey commission, which he sponsored, subsequently resulted in modernization and improvement of State institutions and services. His administration was characterized by its freedom from partisan favor seekers.

Although he was a Republican, he did not hesitate to take issue with his party when he felt it was in error. He was sometimes the despair of Republican leaders in St. Louis but he achieved a personal independence and influence in councils of his party because of his reputation for integrity.

He is survived by three daughters, Mrs. Clarence M. Barksdale and Mrs. Justin J. Cordonnier of St. Louis, Mrs. Frances Galena, of Farmington, Mo., and a son, John D. Caulfield, of Highland, Ill. Surviving also are seven grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

I join with the other Members of the Missouri delegation in extending to his family our deepest sympathy. He was beloved by his many friends and his contributions to the welfare of his State and local community will long be remembered.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday I was unavoidably absent during rollcall Nos. 98 and 100. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both rollcalls.

ARE WE FAILING OUR FIGHTING MEN?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and dismayed this morning to hear on an NBC radio news program that an American destroyer patrolling in the waters off South Vietnam was out of ammunition, but was continuing its patrol.

If this be true, it is a fantastic situation. The American people are calling on our servicemen to give their lives in the struggle for freedom in that strife torn area of the world, and for us not to provide them with defensive armament is unthinkable.

I do not vouch for the accuracy of the report, and if it is untrue, it is inaccurate reporting at its worst.

But if it is true, it is dereliction of our duty at its worst.

I call upon the Department of Defense for an immediate explanation to the American people and if this situation is a fact, then the Congress should have a full scale investigation of the entire matter.

The American people will not and should not tolerate our fighting forces not having the necessary equipment to do the job we are calling on them to do. I believe the Congress has consistently provided the necessary funds for the Department of Defense to carry out its mission. There is no reason for a situation of this type at any time.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an explanation of a bill dealing with unemployment compensation which the Committee on Ways and Means has just completed action on.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS (D., Ark.), Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that he and the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES (R., Wis.), the ranking Republican Member of the Committee, have introduced identical bills, H.R. 15119 and H.R. 15120, the "Unemployment Insurance Amendments of 1966". The Committee ordered Mr. MILLS' bill, H.R. 15119, reported to the House.

The bill extends coverage of the Federal-State unemployment insurance system to an estimated 3.5 million additional workers; establishes a permanent program of extended benefits to workers who exhaust their basic entitlement to unemployment compensation payments during periods of high unemployment; furnishes the States a procedure for obtaining judicial review of certain of the findings of the Secretary of Labor with respect to a State's program by appeal to a U.S. Court of Appeals; provides certain additional requirements which must be met by a State in order to have its unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary; and makes other changes which will strengthen and improve the Federal-State unemployment insurance system.

A summary of the major provisions of the bill follows:

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

Today approximately 49.7 million jobs (including those of Federal employees, ex-servicemen and railroad workers) are protected by unemployment compensation. Approximately 15 million jobs are not covered. Nearly 7 million of the workers not covered are in the employment of State or local governments and, except for certain employees in State universities and hospitals, unaffected by the bill. Of the approximately 8 million remaining workers not presently covered, the bill would extend coverage to about 3.5 million, effective January 1, 1969.

The following are the groups of workers to whom coverage would be extended by the bill:

a. *Definition of Employer (workers in the employ of persons or firms with less than 4 employees)*.—Present Federal law applies only to those employers who have 4 or more workers in their employ in 20 weeks in a year. Under the bill an employer would come under the Federal-State system if he employs one or more persons during 20 weeks in a calendar year, or pays wages of $1,500 or more in any calendar quarter in a calendar year. Approximately 1.2 million additional workers would be covered under this provision.

b. *Definition of Employee*.—Approximately 200,000 additional workers would be covered by adopting the definition of employee which is used for social security purposes, with a modification. Those affected by this change are persons who are not considered employees under common law rules, such as certain agent-drivers and outside salesmen. The concept of employee as adopted by the bill differs from that of the Social Security Act in that it does not apply to full-time insurance salesmen and persons who work on materials in their homes which are furnished by another (if they are not employees under common law).

c. *Agricultural Processing, etc. Workers*.—Approximately 200,000 additional workers would be covered by adopting the definition of "agricultural labor" that applies to the social security system, with a modification. Included among the newly covered workers would be those working in processing plants where more than half of the commodities handled were not produced by the plant operator and others working on specific commodities, such as maple sugar workers and those engaged in off-the-farm raising of mushrooms and poultry. The bill would not cover the employees of certain agricultural cooperative organizations who are covered under social security system.

d. *Employees of Non-Profit Organizations and State Hospitals and Institutions of Higher Education.*—Approximately 1.9 million employees of non-profit organizations and State hospitals and institutions of higher education would be brought under the unemployment compensation system. Coverage would not be extended to certain employees of non-profit organizations, however, including duly ordained or licensed ministers of the church; employees of a church; employees of schools other than institutions of higher education; professors, research personnel and principal administrators in an institution of higher education; and physicians and similarly licensed medical personnel of a hospital, but nurses would be covered under the program.

Non-profit organizations must be allowed the option of either reimbursing the State for unemployment compensation attributable to service for them or paying the regular State unemployment insurance contributions. They would not be required to pay the Federal portion of the unemployment tax. A separate effective date would allow the States to put the reimbursable option into effect at any time after December 31, 1966.

The extension of coverage would apply only to non-profit organizations that employ 4 or more workers in 20 weeks during a calendar year.

Certain types of workers, such as domestic servants in private homes, would continue to be excluded from the coverage of the Federal law. In addition, a new exclusion is provided by the bill for students employed under specified work-study programs arranged by the schools they attend, effective January 1, 1967.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

States would be required to amend their laws, effective not later than January 1, 1969, in order to obtain approval by the Secretary of Labor for the purpose of receiving tax credits for employers and payment of administrative expenses, to provide that—

1. A claimant must have had work since the beginning of his benefit year in order to obtain unemployment compensation in his next benefit year (prohibiting the so-called "double dip" which allows a worker to draw full benefits in 2 successive years following a single separation from work);

2. The wage credits of a worker may not be cancelled or totally reduced by reason of a disqualifying act other than discharge for misconduct connected with his work, fraud in connection with a claim for compensation or receipt of disqualifying income such as pension payments. But a State could, for example, disqualify a worker for the duration of a period of unemployment following a disqualifying act, such as a voluntary quit, so long as the worker's benefit rights are preserved for a future period of involuntary unemployment during the benefit year;

3. Compensation may not be denied to workers who are undergoing training with the approval of the State unemployment compensation agency; and

4. Compensation may not be denied or reduced because a claimant lives or files his claim in another State.

Related provisions of the bill permit the States to reduce the tax rates of new employers (to not less than 1 percent) during the first three years they are in business and provide a sanction to enforce an existing prohibition against discriminatory treatment of maritime employees.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Under existing law the decisions of the Secretary of Labor as to whether or not a State law conforms to the requirements of the Federal law are final. There is no specific provision in the law allowing a State to appeal these decisions to a court.

The bill would furnish the States a procedure for appealing these decisions of the Secretary to a United States Court of Appeals within 60 days after the Governor of a State has been notified of an adverse decision by the Secretary. Findings of fact by the Secretary would be conclusive upon the court "unless contrary to the weight of the evidence." The provision would be effective upon enactment.

FEDERAL-STATE EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

The bill would establish a new permanent program which would require the States to enact laws, that would have to take effect beginning with calendar year 1969, to pay extended benefits to workers who exhaust their basic entitlement to unemployment compensation programs during periods of high unemployment.

The Federal Government would pay 50 percent of the benefits under the program, with the States paying the other 50 percent.

These benefits would be paid to workers only during an "extended benefit" period. Such period could exist, beginning after December 31, 1968, either on a national or State basis by the triggering of either a national or State "on" indicator.

A national extended benefit period would be established if (a) the seasonally adjusted rate of insured unemployment for the nation as a whole equalled or exceeded 5 percent for each month in a 3-month period and (b) during the same 3-month period the total number of claimants exhausting their rights to regular compensation (over the entire period) equalled or exceeded 1 percent of covered employment for the nation as a whole. The national extended benefit period would terminate if the rate of insured unemployment remained below 5 percent for a month or if the number of claimants exhausting their rights to compensation added up to less than 1 percent for a 3-month period.

An extended benefit period would be established for an individual State if (a) the rate of insured unemployment for the State equalled or exceeded, during a running 13-week period, 120 percent of the average rate for the corresponding 13-week period in the preceding two calendar years and (b) if such rate also equalled or exceeded 3 percent. An extended benefit period in a State would terminate if either of these conditions was not satisfied.

During either a national or State extended benefit period an individual claimant would be entitled to receive payments equal in amount to those he received under regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) for up to one-half of the number of weeks of his basic entitlement but for not more than 13 weeks. No claimant could receive more than 39 weeks of combined regular and extended compensation.

FINANCING

The bill would increase the rate of tax under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act from the present 3.1 percent of taxable wages to 3.3 percent, effective with respect to wages paid in calendar year 1967 and thereafter. The taxable wage base under the act would be increased from the present $3,000 per year to $3,900 per year, effective with respect to wages paid in calendar years 1969 through 1971 and to $4,200 beginning in 1972 and thereafter.

The bill in effect increases the net Federal unemployment tax from 0.4 percent to 0.6 percent. A portion (0.1 percent) of the net Federal tax would be put in to a separate new account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to finance the Federal share of the extended benefits programs established by the bill.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The bill also contains provisions to—

1. Authorize funds to conduct research relating to the unemployment compensation system and to train Federal and State unemployment compensation personnel;

2. Change the date with respect to which the Secretary of Labor certifies that the State laws are in conformity with the requirements of the Federal law from December 31 to October 31 of each year;

3. Extend for another five years the time within which the States could expend for administrative purposes funds returned to them as excess Federal tax collections.

UNITED STATES FACING ANOTHER CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that the Soviets have developed a new missile system which can be launched by remote control from containers hidden on the ocean floor.

In view of this news is it possible that the United States may once again face a crisis similar to the 1962 Russian missile removal from Cuba?

For some time now the Soviets have been expanding their ocean exploration projects in the South Atlantic, Caribbean, and Gulf of Mexico. Based in Cuba, Russian oceanography ships operating in the waters near the coast of Florida give real cause for concern. Mapping the ocean floor is a matter of high priority among Russian oceanographers.

The United States has already seen that our undersea technology leaves much to be desired. It took 2 months to find our H-bomb lost off the coast of Spain. Would it take as long to detect Russian missiles submerged off the U.S. coast?

I urge the Defense Department to give higher priority to this Nation's efforts to win the "wet space race." The defense of this Nation may not rest with who gets to the moon first, but which world power controls the undersea.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that there will be some rather important votes this afternoon. Does this committee have witnesses from outside the city, does the gentleman happen to know?

Mr. ALBERT. I do not know. I know that the request has been cleared with the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] and it has been cleared with the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House of a slight change in the program. We will now proceed with the consideration of the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, but the stockpile bills will not be called up until after disposition of the bill H.R. 14544, sale of participations in Government agency loan pools.

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1538)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 24, 26, 39, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 27, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$48,855,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,032,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$114,690,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$56,118,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$80,032,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$34,740,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,701,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), $2,675,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,145,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,118,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

"For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), $2,675,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,932,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,998,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$173,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,821,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,464,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 5.

WINFIELD K. DENTON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JOHN O. MARSH,
GEORGE MAHON,
BEN REIFEL,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Public Land Management

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $48,855,000 for management of lands and resources instead of $48,755,000 as proposed by the House and $48,970,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for the identification, evaluation, and survey of islands in Minnesota and Michigan.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $3,032,000 for construction and maintenance instead of $2,900,000 as proposed by the House and $3,062,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $100,000 for the construction of an office building in Malta, Montana, and $32,000 for development of the Fort Meade Recreation Complex on the Makotapi Project in South Dakota.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $114,690,300 for education and welfare services instead of $114,475,000 as proposed by the House and $115,061,300 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill provides an additional $200,000 for the higher education program and $15,300 for employment of a probation officer for the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, North Dakota.

The conferees are in agreement with the Senate proposal that of the amount recommend for resources management, the agricultural extension program shall be funded in the amount of $1,767,000, the same amount as was available in fiscal year 1966; and that housing development will be funded at a level of $1,209,000. This action will replace in the agriculture extension activity that amount which was proposed to be taken from it and added to the Housing Development Program.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $56,118,000 for construction instead of $55,325,000 as proposed by the House and $56,848,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $325,000 for construction of kitchen-dining facilities at Flandreau Indian School, South Dakota; and $468,000 for construction of high school facilities at Maddock, North Dakota.

The conferees are in agreement with the proposal of the Senate for the allocation of the $2,000,000 reduction made in the House bill to specific items in the construction program.

The conferees are also in agreement that in instances where water is a factor in the location of a school construction, funds are not to be requested until a site with an adequate water supply is found.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide $468,000 to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $16,889,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the Senate instead of $16,754,000 as proposed by the House. The increase of $135,000 over the House bill is for grading and surfacing the road between Grass Mountain and St. Francis on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, South Dakota.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Delete the language prohibiting the use of tribal funds to purchase land or water rights in Wyoming if such acquisition would result in the purchases being exempt from local taxation, as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $3,910,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $3,960,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that $50,000 of available funds shall be used for surveying recreational opportunities and recommending development of the Missouri River area between Yankton, South Dakota, and Fort Benton, Montana.

Land and Water Conservation Fund

Amendment No. 10: Allocates $65,703,000 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund for assistance to States as proposed by the Senate instead of $76,203,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11. Allocates $23,471,500 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the National Park Service as proposed by the Senate instead of $17,971,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12. Allocates $18,093,000 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the Forest Service as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,093,000 as proposed by the House.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 13. Appropriates $80,032,000 for surveys, investigations, and research instead of $72,782,000 as proposed by the House and $80,932,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $6,000,000 for exploration and discovery programs relating to heavy metals in short supply in the United States; $600,000 for matching State offerings for cooperative water investigations; and $650,000 to clear phreatophytic growth from the Gila River, Arizona.

Amendment No. 14. Provides a total of $12,950,000 instead of $12,350,000 as proposed by the House and $13,250,000 as proposed by the Senate, to be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations.

The conferees are in agreement that at least $50,000 of this additional amount will be made available by the Geological Survey to match state funds in order to commence a hydrologic survey of the Delmarva Peninsula.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 15. Appropriates $34,740,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of $31,540,000 as proposed by the House and $34,940,000 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase consists of an increase of $3,500,000 for the development of production technologies of heavy metals which are in short supply in the United States, and a decrease of $300,000 for the funding of a culm dump project in Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 16. Appropriates $4,300,000 for solid waste disposal as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for a demonstration culm dump project in Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 17. Appropriates $7,000,000 for Appalachian Region mining area restoration as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Amendment No. 18. Appropriates $20,701,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of $20,312,000 as proposed by the House and $21,076,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $90,000 for tail water research and expansion of biological investigations on Missouri River Reservoirs; and $249,000 for expanded investigation, disappearance of migrating fish, upper reaches of Columbia River Basin; and $50,000 for expanded development of the Pacific Hake Fishery program.

Amendment No. 19. Appropriates $2,675,000 for Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation as proposed by the Senate, and deletes language "to remain available until expended".

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 20. Appropriates $38,145,800 for management and investigations of resources instead of $37,164,000 as proposed by the House and $39,161,400 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: Operation and Maintenance funds for the following fish hatcheries—$50,000, Norfork, Arkansas; $27,000, Natchitoches, Louisiana; $136,500, Wytheville, Virginia; $59,900, Lahonton, Nevada; $13,800, Gavins Point, South Dakota; and $10,500, Valley City, North Dakota.

In addition, $40,000 for the establishment of a cooperative fishery unit, University of Washington; $40,000 for financing the cooperative fishery units at Montana State College, Colorado State University, Utah State University, and the University of Missouri at a $40,000 annual level; $16,000 for technical fishery management assistance; Aberdeen area, Bureau of Indian Affairs; $43,100 additional operating funds, Piedmont Wildlife Refuge; $200,000 predatory animal control; $200,000 studies on artificial fishing reefs; $20,000 for the determination of a suitable site for a trout hatchery in Kentucky; and $125,000 for research on control of Polynesian rats in Hawaii.

The conferees are in agreement that a review and analysis of the funding for the various cooperative wildlife research units shall be made by the Department and that the 1968 budget estimate shall provide uniform funding for these units at a level commensurate with the needs.

Amendment No. 21. Appropriates $7,118,600 for construction instead of $5,130,000 as proposed by the House and $8,341,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $1,363,000 for improvements and additions at the following hatcheries—$115,000, Williams Creek, Arizona; $334,000, Lahonton, Nevada; $190,000, Valley City, North Dakota; $219,000, Creston, Montana; $121,000, New London, Minnesota; $95,000, Dexter, New Mexico; $224,000, Kooskia, Idaho; and $65,000, Berlin, New Hampshire.

Also included is $636,600 for improvements and additions at the following wildlife refuges—$148,600, Camp Cornelia, Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge, Georgia; $100,000, Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge, South Dakota; $38,000, Lake Andes National Wildlife Refuge, South Dakota; $200,000, Eufaula, Alabama;

In addition, $200,000 for the construction of a fish genetics laboratory at Beulah, Wyoming; $16,000 for improvement of the access road to Interstate Highway 94, Northern States Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, North Dakota; $100,000 for continued rehabilitation, Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Oklahoma; and a decrease of $177,000 for the operation of three national fish hatcheries, which amount has been transferred to the appropriation item for the management and investigations of resources.

Amendment No. 22. Appropriates $500,000 for Appalachian Region fish and wildlife restoration projects as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23. Appropriates $2,675,000 for Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation as proposed by the Senate, and deletes language "to remain available until expended".

Amendment No. 24. Appropriates $1,549,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of $1,564,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $35,932,800 for management and protection instead of $35,694,000 as proposed by the House and $36,171,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes an additional $82,500 for operation of new park areas and an additional $156,300 for the operation of new facilities in existing park areas.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $22,894,000 for construction as proposed by the House instead of $23,494,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $4,704,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,650,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $4,998,900 for salaries and expenses instead of $4,984,100 as proposed by the House and $5,051,700 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $14,800 is for one additional position in the Office of the Budget.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 29. Appropriates $173,850,000 for forest land management instead of $172,821,000 as proposed by the House and $174,521,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $410,000 for construction of a dam at the Trout Pond Recreation Area, George Washington National Forest, West Virginia; $25,000 for planning of a visitor center, Mammoth Lakes, California, Inyo National Forest; $100,000 for recreation development, Monroe Reservoir, Wayne Hoosier National Forest, Indiana; $100,000 for recreation management, Boundary, Waters Canoe Area, Minnesota; $90,000 for additional recreational facilities, Lake Michigan Recreation Area, Michigan; $105,000 for construction of a bathhouse, Lake Glendale, Shawnee National Forest, Illinois; $85,000 for preparation of plans and specifications, headquarters building, Black Hills National Forest, Custer, South Dakota; and $114,000 for the installation of an elevator at Blanchard Springs Caverns, Ozark National Forest, Arkansas.

Amendment No. 30. Appropriates $37,821,000 for forest research, instead of $34,955,000 as proposed by the House and $38,578,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $110,000 for the Beaver Creek project, Arizona watershed program; $140,000 for additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Morgantown, West Virginia; $50,000 additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Alexandria, Louisiana; $40,000 for additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Bottineau, North Dakota; $100,000 for Alpine snow and avalanche control research, Fort Collins, Colorado; $125,000 for additional staffing at the Southern Hardwood Laboratory, Stoneville, Mississippi; $143,000 for preparation of design and specifications, Forest Service Laboratories—$28,000, Lincoln, Nebraska; $40,000, Burlington, Vermont; and $75,000, Durham, New Hampshire; $450,000 for construction of a Silviculture and Animal Problems Laboratory, Olympia, Washington; $690,000 for construction of a Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Carbondale, Illinois; $1,000,000 for the construction of an addition to the Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Athens, Georgia; and $18,000 for additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Rapid City, South Dakota.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Public Health Service

Indian health activities

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $73,671,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $73,250,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $100,000 to establish an area-wide preventive mental health program in Alaska; and $321,000 for the operation of a health clinic in Rapid City, South Dakota to care for indigent Indians in that city.

The conferees are in agreement that $250,000 of available funds which the House directed be used along with the increased appropriation of $250,000 to combat trachoma, be restored to the Hospital Health Services budget, and be distributed among consultant services to broaden medical coverage and improve quality of care, maintenance, and rehabilitation for overcoming the existing backlog in that work, and equipment.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $13,464,000 for construction of Indian Health facilities instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House and $13,928,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $87,000 for the renovation of a building in Rapid City, South Dakota for use as an outpatient clinic; $93,000 planning funds for a Public Health Service Indian hospital at Claremore, Oklahoma; and $284,000 for sanitation facilities.

National Capital Transportation Agency

Construction, Rail Rapid Transit System

The conferees direct that this appropriation shall be available only after an amount equal to one-half of this appropriation has been provided by the District of Columbia as required by Public Law 89–177.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

Amendments Nos. 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37: Appropriate $9,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill provides $2,000,000 for the National Endowment for the Humanities under section 7(c) of the act.

Amendment No. 38: Adds Senate language providing that no funds under this appropriation item may be used for any grant or other payment which is to be used directly or indirectly for the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $22,523,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $22,844,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that $50,000 of available funds under this appropriation item shall be used by the Office of Exhibits for preparation of an Alaskan Centenary Exhibit.

National Gallery of Art

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $2,718,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,694,000 as proposed by the House.

Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $25,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $35,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WINFIELD K. DENTON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JOHN O. MARSH,
GEORGE MAHON,
BEN REIFEL,
JOSEPH M. McDADE,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the statement contained in the report, I wish to make the following additional statement:

The conference total is $1,321,615,800.

The conference report compared with:

Appropriations, 1966	+$14, 705, 330
Budget estimates, 1967	−18, 644, 700
House bill	+26, 446, 300
Senate bill	−8, 139, 200

In addition, the bill carries a borrowing authorization of $26 million for the helium program.

Mr. Speaker, while the conference report provides a total of $26,446,300 over the amount approved by the House for this bill, it is my opinion that the amount provided in the conference report represents a reasonable compromise between the amounts recommended by the Senate and the House.

To put this in proper perspective, I think it should be pointed out that $16,850,000 of the increase over the House represents items that probably would have been included in the House bill if they had been submitted in proper form sufficiently early for the House to have considered them.

One of these items relates to an appropriation of $2 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities. You will probably recall in my discussion of this bill on the floor of the House, I pointed out that this item was being passed over without prejudice by the House because the National Council on the Humanities had not been organized sufficiently early to present a comprehensive budget program for the 1967 fiscal year. Since passage of the bill by the House, the Council has been organized and a reasonable program has been formulated for the 1967 fiscal year. The original budget request for this activity was $5 million, the conference report provides $2 million, or a reduction of $3 million. In the opinion of the conferees, this will provide sufficient funds for the first year's operation of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Also included in the conference report is $9,500,000 for the heavy metals program which was not previously considered by the House. This was a budget amendment that went to the Senate after the bill had been passed by the House. The original budget request for this activity was $10,300,000. The provision of these funds is to accelerate the programs of the Department of the Interior devoted to the exploration, discovery, and production technologies of heavy metals in short supply. Heavy metals include antimony-bismuth, mercury, precious metals—including gold, silver, platinum, palladium, osmium, and iridium—tantalum, and tin; and the heavy minerals, monazite and zircon.

The increased needs for these metals by both industry and Government have placed heavy demands on our known mineral reserves and resources. For example, preliminary figures for 1965 indicate production of 20,000 flasks of mercury and consumption of 80,000 flasks; projections for 1966 indicate a deficit of 20,000 to 55,000 flasks. The pattern is similar for silver; in 1964 industrial consumption alone was 3.3 times production in 1964. The Nation is almost totally dependent on outside sources for tin and platinum and heavily dependent on such sources for antimony and bismuth.

Improved knowledge for determining geochemical distribution of heavy metals and new geologic, geochemical, and geophysical concepts and techniques now make it possible to locate resources hitherto unrecognized or concealed. Recent development of new, more precise, lower cost, and more rapid assay techniques which can be brought into the field in portable laboratories make possible a scientific search for heavy metals on a scale never before attainable. Currently uneconomical deposits can be made workable by development of new mining and metallurgical methods. Greater knowledge of the geologic occurrence of the heavy metals, and the ability to discover mines and purify them for use will increase the supply of these important metals.

The third item not originally considered by the House involves $5,350,000 for the anadromous fish program. These funds are provided to carry out the provisions of Public Law 89-304 approved October 30, 1965, for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the anadromous fishery resources within the several States and the Great Lakes.

The act contains a limitation on appropriation of these funds until June 30, 1970, during which time not more than $25 million can be made available for purposes of the act.

This legislation was enacted too late during the last session of Congress to provide funding for its provisions in the 1967 budget estimate. This has proved to be a very popular program. Funds provided under this legislation are on a 50-50 matching basis with the States, and numerous States have already pledged funds for their share of the cost of conducting this program in the respective States.

The remainder of the increases over the House bill represent an investment in the resources and the economy of this Nation, and also an expanded effort to improve the educational, sanitation and health facilities of the American Indian. For example slightly over $2 million of the increase over the House bill is for various services and facilities for the American Indian; $600,000 is for matching State offerings for cooperative water investigations; and slightly over $3.8 million of the increase is related to various activities connected with our national forests.

Mr. Speaker, all of the items in this conference report have received the careful consideration of the conferees, and I believe the funding program as proposed in this conference report will provide a well-balanced financial plan for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1967, and merits the approval of the House.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a summary tabulation of the action taken on the various items in this bill:

Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967

Item	1966 appropriation	1967 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1966 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR									
Public land management	$305, 679, 000	$324, 074, 000	$320, 835, 000	$323, 506, 300	$322, 210, 300	+$16, 531, 300	−$1, 863, 700	+$1, 375, 300	−$1, 296, 000
Mineral resources	126, 072, 170	150, 492, 000	136, 210, 000	147, 060, 000	145, 960, 000	+19, 887, 830	−4, 532, 000	+9, 750, 000	−1, 100, 000
Fish, wildlife, and parks	227, 092, 300	196, 684, 100	199, 179, 000	211, 094, 600	207, 627, 200	−19, 465, 100	+10, 943, 100	+8, 448, 200	−3, 467, 400
Office of Saline Water	22, 485, 000	30, 946, 000	29, 851, 000	29, 851, 000	29, 851, 000	+7, 366, 000	−1, 095, 000		
Office of Water Resources Research	6, 396, 000	6, 894, 000	6, 894, 000	6, 894, 000	6, 894, 000	+498, 000			
Office of the Solicitor	4, 596, 800	4, 704, 000	4, 650, 000	4, 704, 000	4, 704, 000	+107, 200		+54, 000	
Office of the Secretary	4, 557, 200	5, 186, 000	4, 984, 100	5, 051, 700	4, 998, 900	+441, 700	−187, 100	+14, 800	−52, 800
Total, definite appropriations	696, 878, 470	718, 980, 100	702, 603, 100	728, 161, 600	722, 245, 400	+25, 366, 930	+3, 265, 300	+19, 642, 300	−5, 916, 200
Total, appropriations of receipts	145, 745, 000	124, 666, 000	124, 666, 000	124, 666, 000	124, 666, 000	−21, 079, 000			
Total, borrowing authority	(16, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(+10, 000, 000)			
Total, title I, Interior	842, 623, 470	843, 646, 100	827, 269, 100	852, 827, 600	846, 911, 400	+4, 287, 930	+3, 265, 300	+19, 642, 300	−5, 916, 200
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES									
Department of Agriculture, Forest Service:									
Definite appropriations	330, 021, 000	329, 518, 000	328, 203, 000	333, 526, 000	332, 098, 000	+2, 077, 000	+2, 580, 000	+3, 895, 000	−1, 428, 000
Appropriation of receipts	780, 000	780, 000	780, 000	780, 000	780, 000				
Total, Forest Service	330, 801, 000	330, 298, 000	328, 983, 000	334, 306, 000	332, 878, 000	+2, 077, 000	+2, 580, 000	+3, 895, 000	−1, 428, 000
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	91, 000	61, 400	61, 400	61, 400	61, 400	−29, 600			
Commission of Fine Arts	123, 000	115, 000	115, 000	115, 000	115, 000	−8, 000			
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service: Indian health activities	82, 644, 000	88, 870, 000	87, 250, 000	88, 599, 000	88, 135, 000	+5, 491, 000	−735, 000	+885, 000	−464, 000
Indian Claims Commission	347, 000	438, 000	382, 000	382, 000	382, 000	+35, 000	−56, 000		
National Capital Planning Commission	818, 000	7, 244, 000	1, 005, 000	1, 005, 000	1, 005, 000	+187, 000	−6, 239, 000		
National Capital Transportation Agency	4, 104, 000	18, 630, 000	10, 455, 000	10, 455, 000	10, 455, 000	+6, 351, 000	−8, 175, 000		
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities	10, 700, 000	13, 930, 000	7, 000, 000	9, 000, 000	9, 000, 000	−1, 700, 000	−4, 930, 000	+2, 000, 000	
National Council on the Arts	50, 000					−50, 000			
Public Land Law Review Commission	750, 000	907, 000	907, 000	907, 000	907, 000	+157, 000			
Smithsonian Institution	26, 539, 000	35, 791, 000	31, 422, 000	31, 767, 000	31, 446, 000	+4, 907, 000	−4, 345, 000	+24, 000	−321, 000
Civil War Centennial Commission	100, 000					−100, 000			
Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission	1, 425, 000	35, 000	25, 000	35, 000	25, 000	−1, 400, 000	−10, 000		−10, 000
Lewis and Clark Trail Commission	25, 000	25, 000	25, 000	25, 000	25, 000				
Transitional grants to Alaska	5, 376, 000					−5, 376, 000			
Federal development planning committees for Alaska	174, 000	190, 000	190, 000	190, 000	190, 000	+16, 000			
Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	200, 000					−200, 000			
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	20, 000	80, 000	80, 000	80, 000	80, 000	+60, 000			
Total, definite appropriations	463, 507, 000	495, 834, 400	467, 120, 400	476, 147, 400	473, 924, 400	+10, 417, 400	−21, 910, 000	+6, 804, 000	−2, 223, 000
Total, appropriation of receipts	780, 000	780, 000	780, 000	780, 000	780, 000				
Total, title II, related agencies	464, 287, 000	496, 614, 400	467, 900, 400	476, 927, 400	474, 704, 400	+10, 417, 400	−21, 910, 000	+6, 804, 000	−2, 223, 000
Grand total:									
Definite appropriations	1, 160, 385, 470	1, 214, 814, 500	1, 169, 723, 500	1, 204, 309, 000	1, 196, 169, 800	+35, 784, 330	−18, 644, 700	+26, 446, 300	−8, 139, 200
Appropriation of receipts	146, 525, 000	125, 446, 000	125, 446, 000	125, 446, 000	125, 446, 000	−21, 079, 000			
Borrowing authority	(16, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(+10, 000, 000)			
Total	1, 306, 910, 470	1, 340, 260, 500	1, 295, 169, 500	1, 329, 755, 000	1, 321, 615, 800	+14, 705, 330	−18, 644, 700	+26, 446, 300	−8, 139, 200

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a summary tabulation of various items presented in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Interior has done an outstanding job in representing the managers of the House in the conference. He has made an adequate explanation. All of us who are managers on the part of the House have signed this report.

I hope the House will accept the report without modification. I heartily support it in the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at the action of the Members in supporting so overwhelmingly the amendment to save the Metropolitan

Opera House, as a condition on the funds provided the National Arts Endowment.

This amendment was offered in the Senate by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, and is similar to the amendment which I wished to offer in the House in connection with the appropriation for the National Arts Endowment on April 5. My amendment was stricken on a point of order.

I pointed out at that time that many of our historic buildings and sites that are rich in tradition, history, and architecture and of great cultural and artistic value are threatened by the bulldozers and the wrecking balls. Already, some 6,000 of our heritage of 12,000 most historically significant buildings have been destroyed, by progress of a kind which takes no account of history or cultural and artistic values. The Metropolitan Opera House was almost a victim of this kind of shortsighted progress.

The amendment voted by this House today has had a major role in saving the Metropolitan Opera House, and it establishes a precedent of major significance. Certainly no Federal funds should be used to destroy our historic landmarks and our cultural monuments. Saving these is a mark of our maturity as a nation.

It is with pleasure that I note that the New York State Legislature has passed overwhelmingly a measure to save the Metropolitan Opera House, and it is my hope that it will be signed by Governor Rockefeller, especially since it has had such overwhelming support.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, after all is said and done, as I understand it, this bill is $26½ million more than when it left the House. Is that correct?

Mr. DENTON. That is correct, but as I have stated, $16,850,000 of the increase is represented by three items not previously considered by the House which probably would have had the support of the House. Excluding these amounts, the net increase over the House is about $9.5 million more.

Mr. GROSS. $9.5 million more?

Mr. DENTON. $9.5 million above the House bill, if we exclude the three items not previously considered by the House.

Mr. GROSS. Why should we take out three items?

Mr. DENTON. The reason is that had those items been considered by the House, they probably would have been approved.

Mr. GROSS. I have great respect for the gentleman from Indiana, but it is strictly an assumption when he says that if the items totaling nearly $17 million had been considered by the House they would have been adopted. That is an assumption.

Mr. DENTON. Of course I cannot say for certain what the House would have done, but I do know that the subcommittee which handles these matters would have approved the items.

Mr. GROSS. By any possibility is there money in this bill for the new arts museum which is being proposed at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue; for a building to house some kind of so-called art?

Mr. DENTON. There are no funds in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I hope there never will be.

Mr. DENTON. I understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question concerning an item for funds for a school in Tularosa, N. Mex. This is a peripheral school which both Indian children and non-Indian children attend. My colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER] and I testified for this project on the House side. When it went to the Senate side, the Senate put it in. The Senate has put it in 2 years in a row.

Could the gentleman from Indiana give me any words of encouragement about this proposal?

Mr. DENTON. I know how great the interest of the gentleman from New Mexico is in this project. I know how hard he has worked for the education of the Indians.

I assure the gentleman that the committee is sympathetic with his position. However, it was a matter of give and take on many of the items in conference. For New Mexico the House bill provided $1,120,000 for construction of schools, including $700,000 planning funds for the school at Albuquerque which will cost about $12 million to build. For this reason, in considering the general school construction program, the Tularosa project was assigned a lower priority. I am sure we will give it careful consideration at a later time.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, so that I may obtain an expression from him on this same matter.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. As he knows, my colleague from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER] and I have been very interested in securing funds for a school at Tularosa, N. Mex. As the gentleman very well knows, this is a peripheral school attended by both Indian and non-Indian children. We have been attempting to get money to concentrate the local school districts, because they are bonded to the upmost of their capacity, so that they can help build a new school to take care of both the Indian and the non-Indian children. We testified about this and talked about it before our committee here. Twice the Senate put it in the bill. Could the gentleman give me some indication of his feeling as to the merits of this project?

Mr. REIFEL. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] is not excelled by any other person in his interest in the education of Indian children in New Mexico. The distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, has well stated the reason why this particular item was not accepted in conference. I would give the gentleman from New Mexico the same assurance as the chairman did that we will consider, at a later date, his request which has so eloquently been put forward by him and his colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER], before our subcommittee. I am tremendously interested not only as a member of an Indian tribe, but as one who is also trying to help the Indian people get adjusted in our society, by attending mixed schools similar to the one presently operating with these improvements in the gentleman's district. I want to give him that assurance.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I understand that you retained additional funds in here for the fisheries program at the University of Massachusetts which I advocated but you did not go along with the Senate in the money that they inserted here for a wildlife management program at the University of Massachusetts. Is that correct?

Mr. REIFEL. That is correct.

Mr. CONTE. I was quite disappointed in this. It is a very small sum of money, amounting to only $15,000, as I understand it. Could you give me any reassurance that your committee is going to give this some serious consideration next year and see that we get this money back in there?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that this matter is being given serious consideration. This same request is coming from other State institutions, universities, and colleges, throughout the country. This subject was seriously discussed in conference, and it is hoped by next year a uniform policy will be developed, because it is felt that all institutions ought to be given uniform and equitable consideration. The Department of the Interior has been requested to take action in this regard. Perhaps the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] has additional comment on this.

Mr. DENTON. I think the gentleman has stated our position very well. I would only add that the conference report contains instructions to the Department of the Interior to give this matter consideration in the formulation of the 1968 budget estimates.

Mr. CONTE. As I understand it from both the chairman and the ranking minority member, there is one university in the United States receiving $40,000 for their wildlife management.

Mr. DENTON. There is one funded at that level, yes.

Mr. CONTE. And you have asked for a policy statement on it?

Mr. DENTON. That is right.

Mr. CONTE. And next year we can look forward to where either all of them will have $40,000 or all of them will be brought down to a lower figure?

Mr. DENTON. We have instructed the Department to review this matter, but I do not know what their recommendation will be.

Mr. CONTE. I will go along with the committee this year, but will not go along with it again. If one university is allowed $40,000 for its wildlife management program, then every State university should be allowed the same amount of money. We should not discriminate here. You cannot make fish of one and fowl of another. You rest assured I will be watching this item next year and hope that the committee will go along with full funding of this program.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to say that I appreciate the sympathy and consideration that this group has given to the Tularosa School District, and I would hope that next year we can proceed with this project, because it is important, not only to the white children, but to the Indian children, that we give this school help.

Mr. Speaker, I have found that during the short time I have been here, we have spent considerable sums of money and that we have given a lot of attention to the world insofar as education is concerned. I believe it is only proper that we take care of some of our own people. I thank the gentleman from Indiana very much for yielding to me this time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the House conferees for the action taken in conference to improve the funding picture for Indian programs, especially those in Oklahoma which had been severely cut in the budget.

The conference changes are a substantial victory for the Indian extension and housing programs in Oklahoma, and are deeply appreciated.

The $93,000 for planning of a new Public Health Service hospital at Claremore, Okla., will pave the way to construction of a new facility which is urgently needed. I hope there will be no further delay in construction of this new hospital.

The undertaking of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable WINFIELD DENTON, and of his great subcommittee, is very much appreciated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 378, nays 10, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—378

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kupferman
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—10

Brock
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Goodell
Gross
Hall
Jonas
Laird
Walker, Miss.
Wydler

NOT VOTING—43

Abbitt
Baring
Boggs
Bolling
Carter
Celler
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Corman
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Fogarty
Gallagher
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen, Idaho
Hébert
Hosmer
Krebs
Leggett
Long, Md.
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Morrison
Moss
Murray
Nix
Pepper
Powell
Resnick
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Scott
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Vivian
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Krebs with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Williams with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Vivian with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Moss.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment Numbered 5: Page 7, line 2: "*Provided further,* That not to exceed $918,000 shall be for assistance to the Tularosa, New Mexico, School District No. 4 for construction of junior high and high school facilities, and to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That not to exceed $468,000 shall be for assistance to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the motion was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14544) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 14544, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **CHAIRMAN.** When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 1, ending on line 4, page 1 of the bill.

If there are no amendments to the section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(c)";

(2) by inserting after "undertakings and activities" a comma and "hereinafter in this subsection called 'trusts',";

(3) by striking out the words "offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages in which the United States or any agency" in the first sentence thereof and by inserting "and other types of securities, including any instrument community known as a security, hereinafter in this subsection called 'obligations,' in which the United States or any executive department, agency,";

(4) by striking out the third sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following: "Participations or other instruments issued by the Association pursuant to this subsection shall to the same extent as securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States be deemed to be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission."; and

(5) by striking out the fourth sentence thereof.

(b) Section 302(c) of such Act is further amended by adding the following:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of any executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, hereinafter in this subsection called the 'trustor', is authorized to set aside a part or all of any obligations held by him and subject them to a trust or trusts and, incident thereto, may guarantee to the trustee timely payment thereof. The trust instrument may provide for the issuance and sale of beneficial interests or participations, by the trustee, in such obligations or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom; and may provide for the substitution or withdrawal of such obligations, or for the substitution of cash for obligations. The trust or trusts shall be exempt from all taxation. The trust instrument may also contain other appropriate provisions in keeping with the purposes of thus subsection. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Association may be named and may act as trustee of any such trusts and, for the purposes thereof, the title to such obligations shall be deemed to have passed to the Association in trust: *Provided,* That the trust instrument shall provide that custody, control, and administration of the obligations shall remain in the trustor subjecting the obligations to the trust, subject to transfer to the trustee in event of default or probable default, as determined by the trustee, in the payment of principal and interest of the beneficial interests or participations. Collections from obligations subject to the trust shall be dealt with as provided in the instrument creating the trust. The trust instrument shall provide that the trustee will promptly pay to the trustor the full net proceeds of any sale of beneficial interests or participations to the extent they are based upon such obligations or collections. Such proceeds shall be dealt with as otherwise provided by law for sales or repayment of such obligations. The effect of both past and future sales of any issue of beneficial interests or participations shall be the same, to the extent of the principal of such issue, as the direct sale of the obligations subject to the trust. Any trustor creating a trust or trusts hereunder is authorized to purchase, through the facilities of the trustee, outstanding beneficial interests or participations to the extent of the amount of his responsibility to the trustee on beneficial interests or participations outstanding, and to pay his proper share of the costs and expenses incurred by the Federal National Mortgage Association as trustee pursuant to the trust instrument, and for these purposes may use any appropriated funds or other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to the trust are related.

"(3) If any trustor shall guarantee to the trustee the timely payment of obligations he subjects to a trust pursuant to this subsection, and it becomes necessary for such trustor to meet his responsibilities under such guaranty, he is authorized to fulfill such guaranty by using any appropriated funds or other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to the trust are related.

"(4) The Association, as trustee, is authorized to issue and sell beneficial interests or participations under this subsection, notwithstanding that aggregate receipts from obligations subject to the related trust are or may become insufficient in amount to provide for the payment by the trustee (on a timely basis out of current receipts or otherwise) of all interest or principal on such interests or participations (after provision for all costs and expenses incurred by the trustee, fairly prorated among trustors): *Provided,* That no such beneficial interests or participations shall be issued in relation to any obligations unless the trustee determines there is a reasonable probability there will not be an insufficiency as aforesaid, or unless the amounts issued are within aggregate principal amounts authorized in advance in appropriation Acts, and it shall be in order to include provisions authorizing such issuance in an appropriation Act. Whenever such an aggregate principal amount is so authorized, there shall be established on the books of the Treasury as indefinite appropriations such sums as may be necessary from time to time to enable the trustor to pay the trustee such insufficiency as the trustee may require on account of outstanding beneficial interests are participations, and such trustor shall make timely payments to the trustee from such appropriations, subject to and in accord with the trust instrument."

Mr. PATMAN (during reading the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of this section, down to page 7, line 7, be dispensed with, with the understanding that it will be subject to amendment at any point and also subject to any points of order.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made the proposition that points of order would be reserved.

Mr. Chairman, I have several points of order. I would like to have it understood that I shall have an opportunity to present these points of order at the appropriate time, which should be right now, or as soon as this unanimous-consent request is put, I would assume, because of the points of order apply to that part of the bill which the gentleman under his unanimous-consent request would dispense with reading.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will state to the gentleman from North Carolina that if the request of the gentleman from Texas is granted, it will be in order for the gentleman to offer any points of order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 4, line 22, beginning with the word "and", which language is as follows: "and for these purposes may use any appropriated funds or other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to the trust are related."

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this language in the bill on the ground that it violates clause 4, rule XXI, of the rules of the House of Representatives, which requires that bills making appropriations may not originate in committees other than the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 5, line 5, beginning with the word "he" and continuing through lines 5, 6, 7, and 8 to the word "related," which language is as follows: "he is authorized to fulfill such guaranty by using any appropriated funds or other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to the trust are related."

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this language on the ground that it violates clause 4, rule XXI of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from North Carolina has added some language which he does not really intend to include in his point of order? As I understand, the gentleman intended to make a point of order against the language on page 5, line 5, starting with the word "by" down to and including the word "related" on line 8. In other words, as I understand, the gentleman intends to make a point of order against the language reading as follows: "by using any appropriated funds or other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to the trust are related."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is correct and it was my purpose to have the point of order lie against the language on page 5, line 5, beginning with the word "by" down to and including the word "related" on line 8.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this language on the ground that it violates clause 4, rule XXI, of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent on page 4, line 22, to strike out the comma after the word "instrument" and insert a period, and on page 5, line 5, after the word "guaranty" to insert a period, in order that the bill read correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 3 strike out "Notwithstanding any other provision of law," and insert: "Subject to the limitations provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection,"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order against the language to be amended by the committee amendment. I would not insist on the point of order if I knew the committee amendment would be adopted.

Should the committee amendment be rejected, I inquire of the Chair if I then might be able to lodge my point of order against the language stricken by the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from North Carolina that the Chair will undertake to protect the gentleman's right to raise points of order under clause 4 of rule XXI at any time during the consideration of this section of the bill whether the committee amendments are adopted or rejected.

The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 9, strike the word "may" and insert "shall".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 18, strike the words "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the" and insert "The".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 22, after the word "trust" strike the colon and the words "*Provided*, That the" and insert a period and the word "The".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 1, strike out "If" and insert "When".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 1, strike out "shall guarantee" and insert "guarantees".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 9, strike out section (4) and insert:

"(4) Beneficial interests or participations shall not be issued for the account of any trustor in an aggregate principal amount greater than is authorized with respect to such trustor in an appropriation Act. Any such authorization shall remain available until used.

"(5) The Association, as trustee, is authorized to issue and sell beneficial interests or participations under this subsection, notwithstanding that there may be an insufficiency in aggregate receipts from obligations subject to the related trust to provide for the payment by the trustee (on a timely basis out of current receipts or otherwise) of all interest or principal on such interests or participations (after provision for all costs and expenses incurred by the trustee, fairly prorated among trustors). Whenever the issuance of an aggregate principal amount is authorized pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection, such an authorization in an appropriation act shall establish on the books of the Treasury as appropriations such sums as may be necessary from time to time to enable the trustor to pay the trustee such insufficiency as the trustee may require on account of outstanding beneficial interests or participations. Such trustor shall make timely payments to the trustee from such appropriations, subject to and in accord with the trust instrument."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will state the point of order.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 6 beginning with the word "Whenever" on line 22 and running down through the remainder of page 6 to and including the word "instrument" on page 7, line 6. The point of order is based upon my contention that this language violates the provisions of clause 4 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I have a substitute amendment, and I hope it will be acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that we are under the obligation of disposing of the point of order.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Does the gentleman have an amendment to offer?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I wish to propose an amendment.

Mr. JONAS. With the permission of the Chair, I would like to discuss the amendment with the gentleman from Texas. I would first inquire who has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending the point of order raised by the gentleman from North Carolina. The Chair has invited the gentleman from Texas to be heard on the point of order. The Chair will inquire as to whether the gentleman from North Carolina will reserve his point of order so that the substitute language can be offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order to permit the gentleman from Texas to discuss the question. But I would like to discuss it then myself.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN to the committee amendment: Page 6, line 22, strike the sentence beginning on line 22 "Whenever the issuance of" through and including page 7, line 4 "beneficial interests or participations." and insert the following: "There are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation such sums as may be necessary to enable any trustor to pay the trustee such insufficiency as the trustee may require on account of outstanding beneficial interests or participations authorized to be issued pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the point of order that the gentleman is making, he is making it because he is assuming that this is an appropriation. That is not intended at all. This is intended as an authorization only. That is the reason we cannot concede the point of order.

Under the circumstances, I hope the gentleman will agree to accept this amendment, which has been offered, which I think makes it very plain, and not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, in the colloquy yesterday on the floor I did make that point, that this language to which I object would turn the Appropriations Committee into an authorizing committee, and would permit the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the trust instrument created by this language, to do the appropriating.

I stated then that I objected because of that language. I appreciate the effort on the part of the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, to meet the objections raised in the colloquies yesterday.

So far as that particular point is concerned, I am satisfied. However, I would ask the gentleman from Texas why he did not include the language beginning with the word "such" on line 4 on page 7, and running through the word "instrument," because that goes to the heart of one of the objections. It seems to me it gives the trust instrument, prepared by somebody outside the Congress, too much authority over what shall transpire. This is in derogation of the rights of the Appropriations Committee, as well as the House of Representatives.

I would ask the gentleman if he would not include the striking of that language?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think we need to strike those lines to carry out the gentleman's intention, the way we understand it. Of course, we are trying to oblige the gentleman as much as possible.

We wish to leave that language:

> Such trustor shall make timely payments to the trustee from such appropriations, subject to and in accord with the trust instrument.

In other words, that will go immediately after the amendment, if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. JONAS. I understand. But to what appropriations is reference made here on line 5?

Mr. PATMAN. To appropriations that are made by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JONAS. By the amendment that was offered?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That takes care of that point.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe the point of order made by the gentleman from North Carolina is a valid one, and sustainable. On the other hand, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is helpful in clarifying the position that was made yesterday by the gentleman from North Carolina and others on the floor.

Let me ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency this question: Will he assure the Committee and the House that when this bill, with these amendments, and particularly this amendment, goes to conference, he will stand forthrightly against any abdication of this amendment which he is offering at this time?

Mr. PATMAN. We will stand for the House bill as passed, which, of course, I believe the gentleman wants us to do.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. You will give us here today your personal assurance that you will fight at the conference and on the floor against any change in this amendment language which you are offering at this point?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, if the conferees should overrule me, I could not help that, but I will certainly fight in the conference for the position maintained by the gentleman from North Carolina, and by the distinguished minority leader, and the House in its action on this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask the distinguished gentleman this question: Would the gentleman refuse to sign the conference report if this language, which he is offering at this point, is not included?

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman is asking too much, because there would not be a free conference that way. A conference is supposed to be a free conference. Otherwise, the conferees cannot work out the differences between the House and the Senate. We cannot go that far and have a free conference, I respectfully submit to the gentleman.

If there are instructions from the House, which can be made at the proper time, of course the House conferees would be required to respect that mandate from the House of Representatives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Texas is offering this amendment, and it is sponsored by him.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. We assume that the Committee of the Whole today will follow the gentleman's leadership on this point. The gentleman has told us that in the conference he will fight to maintain this particular provision. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I believe it would help the conferees, if the amendment is adopted in the Committee of the Whole today—and I shall vote for it—to have a separate vote on this amendment in the House. Would that not strengthen the hands of the House conferees?

Mr. PATMAN. We do not need to have our hands strengthened. We are for it, too, as the gentleman is. We will do everything in our power.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JONAS. In case the bill agreed on in the conference should delete this amending language, and the bill which came back to the House contained the objectionable language, against which the point of order was lodged, could a point of order be made against the conference report to strike that language?

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair would not assume to undertake to suggest what would be done by the Speaker in that event.

Mr. JONAS. That would be a matter for the Speaker to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JONAS. I recognize that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole cannot pass on it, but it does not hurt to try to get a ruling.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this will clarify what we had in mind all the time. We are not against the gentleman's suggestion; we are for it. We will do everything in our power to maintain that position. The amendment is offered in good faith.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

As I understand the situation now, if we go to conference with this amendment included, we are going to stay with this amendment right through the conference.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. WIDNALL. I just want to be sure about this, because the gentleman has just stated that this is what we intended all the time, yet before the Rules Committee there was a request to waive points of order. This matter could not have been brought up except for what the Rules Committee did, and the bill would have remained exactly as written.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. There is a difference in interpretation. We never did intend this as an appropriation; not at all. It is an authorization.

It depends upon the interpretation one places on it. The gentleman from North Carolina placed the interpretation that it was an appropriation. We placed the interpretation that it was only an authorization.

Mr. WIDNALL. But the gentleman now recognizes the fact that there is complete confusion about it, at least in the minds of a great many Members of Congress, and is doing this to tell everyone exactly what is meant by this—the fact that this is not trying to go around the appropriations process.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The fact is that there was an interpretation by responsible Members of this House—and they are all responsible—to the effect that it was an appropriation. In order to clarify that and to make doubly sure that it will always be considered only an authorization, this is to be approved. It is for that reason. It is a clarification.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to be offered to the committee amendment? If not, the question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 3, strike lines 3 through 6 and insert:

"(2) Subject to the limitations provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, one or more trusts may be established as provided in this subsection by each of the following departments or agencies:

"(A) The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

"(B) The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but only with respect to loans for construction of academic facilities.

"(C) The Department of Housing and Urban Development, except that such authority may not be used with respect to secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

"(D) The Veterans' Administration.

"(E) The Export-Import Bank.

"(F) The Small Business Administration.

The head of each such department or agency, hereinafter in this

Mr. PATMAN. In substance, this amendment specifically names the departments and agencies that would be affected by the Participation Sales Act of 1966. While the bill as originally introduced would have potentially permitted by its language the sale of beneficial interests or participation certificates in Government obligations totaling $33 billion, it was never contemplated that such sales would, in fact, take place. However, the bill was criticized on the grounds that the plain language of the bill would permit sales in that gross amount. Accordingly, the amendment being offered provides for an express limitation on the agencies to be affected.

Those departments or agencies are:

First, the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture;

Second, loans for construction of academic facilities from the Office of Education of HEW;

Third, Department of Housing and Urban Development;

Fourth, the Veterans' Administration;

Fifth, the Export-Import Bank; and

Sixth, the Small Business Administration.

It is estimated that the outstanding loans and other financial assets owned by the named Federal agencies and departments for which participation sales would be authorized under the proposed amendment total $10.9 billion. However, I hasten to assure the House that it is not expected that the total amount of these loans will end up in participation pools in fiscal year 1967. In fact, it is expected that only $2.85 billion of additional participation certificates will be sold in fiscal 1967 under the provisions of the proposed amendment. These facts are unequivocally set forth on page 426 of the fiscal 1967 budget. It should be noted that under existing authority, sales of participation for fiscal 1967 amount to $1.35 billion in loans held by FNMA, VA, and the Export-Import Bank. Thus, the total of participation sales proposed in the 1967 budget including participation sales authorized by this amendment will amount to only $4.2 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the adoption of the proposed amendment, as it provides specific limitations on both the quality and the quantity of financial assets that may be sold under the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for the record, I would like to say that I was preparing to offer a similar amendment on behalf of the minority.

Mr. Chairman, the officials of the Treasury Department informed me that it was not intended that the secondary market operations of FNMA be included in any trust pooling arrangements. They, therefore, accept the position that is embodied in this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to find out about this, and also, generally, under the authorization here, could these securities from these various agencies be mingled in the same pool, or does this require they be separated into their own pool for participation sales?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. That is a good question, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri. We must allow the administrator or the manager of these funds to have discretion.

Mr. CURTIS. Discretion to commingle, if they so desire?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, they will be privileged to do whatever is best in the public interest. If it is better to have a single issue in the pool, FNMA would have the privilege of doing so. If they want to commingle, then they would have the privilege of doing so. In other words, we are trusting their judgment and discretion to do what is best in the particular case, in the public interest.

Mr. CURTIS. But this is completely discretionary—they could keep them singly, or they could commingle them?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further; that is correct, yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE to the amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Amend section 302(c)(2)(A) by striking the period in subsection (A) and substituting a comma therefor and adding the following: "but only with respect to operating loans, direct farm ownership loans, direct housing loans, and direct soil and water loans. Such trusts may not be established with respect to loans for housing for the elderly under sections 502 and 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, nor with respect to loans for nonfarm recreational development."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman's amendment is acceptable to the committee.

We discussed this before the Committee on Rules, as the gentleman from Texas is aware, and we had his able assistance in arriving at the language to be used. Therefore, we are very glad, indeed, to accept the gentleman's amendment, as being designed to carry out the real intent of the committee.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate what the gentleman from Texas has done, and I would like to suggest that I feel the committee has done a good job in offering the amendment that has just been offered by the gentleman from Texas. But the gentleman did not go quite as far as I would like to see the matter go. This amendment extends it to the insured loans of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a point of order?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the language that is now being suggested by the gentleman is already in the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAT-

MAN] which I said I agreed to on behalf of the minority.

Mr. POAGE. No; if the gentleman will look at it, the amendment which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] offered, reads: "The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture." That is the end of the reference to the Department of Agriculture. The amendment which I offered to the Patman amendment picks up right there, strikes that period, and adds the following language, "but only with respect."

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered picks up at that point and adds the language, to make it read, that the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, "but only with respect to operating loans, direct farmownership loans, direct housing loans, and direct soil and water loans. Such trusts may not be established with respect to loans for housing for the elderly under sections 502 and 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949."

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not stated his point of order.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, this language is already included in the bill under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

I have in my hand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to H.R. 14544 and it includes the language which is presently being read.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point that I am making as I have been informed just now that the language of the amendment which was offered and sent to the Clerk's desk as an amendment is different from the language in the copy that I have in my hand, which I understood was the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New Jersey will find that the copy that was given to him includes the Poage amendment and it was indicated by a pencil mark to show the proper place for the Poage amendment. I believe that is the way it is.

But, in any event, Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman from New Jersey that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] I think is in order at this point because we do not have in the amendment I offered the language that the gentleman refers to, and I think the gentleman from New Jersey is in favor of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 5 minutes to speak on my amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me to proceed, I will get caught again in the same way if the gentleman will not allow me to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I will object then.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] rise?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to yield to the gentleman from Texas. The point I was hoping that the gentleman would develop, and I think he probably was going to, and that is the only reason I asked him to yield, was the reason why he wanted to exclude and does exclude in his amendment, certain of these securities under this particular agency. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas and he can continue on.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for excluding these securities is that these are insured loans. They do not belong to the Government. We leave the direct loans eligible for investment by the fund. But the insured loans—the Farmers Home Administration makes $450 million of insured loans for a great many purposes. The operating loans are all brought under the terms of this bill. The other insured, or guaranteed loans are not brought under the terms of this bill. They may be direct land purchase loans. They may be water facility loans. They can be sewerage facility loans. But the Farmers Home Administration does not make them directly from Government funds. Indeed, the Government does not actually make the loans involved in the exemption of this amendment. They are actually loans made by local or private lending agencies, with a Farmers Home guarantee of payment.

For instance, the first sewerage loan made in the United States, the first of the year, was made in the little community of Chilton, Tex. The loan was for $70,000 but the loan was made by the local bank and the Farmers Home Administration simply insured it. Frankly, we do not know of any way it could be sold or used as the basis of any certificate of participation, but I have seen strange things done. All we are trying to do is make sure that these securities go into this fund.

Mr. CURTIS. I see—in other words, these are securities actually sold to the private sector in the beginning.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, and our purpose is to try to protect the friendly situation which presently exists between the local communities and the local lending agencies because we think it is good—we think it is good that the local bank makes this loan. We think it is much better that this loan should be carried off up to New York and made up there.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. Let me say this. This points up though, the point is being made throughout the debate of the failure of the Committee on Banking and Currency to do its homework in this area.

This business of making these changes on the floor of the House, I submit, is not in the best interests of good legislation. I do think this is a good amendment. It sounds like it, at any rate.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to three criticisms of the participation sales legislation and program which have been voiced on this floor.

The first of these criticisms is that the budget treatment of receipts from participation sales amounts to gimmickry. Let us consider this charge carefully.

A Government loan to an individual, or a business, or an institution is a liability—an obligation to pay—on the part of the borrower and an asset for the Government. The borrower is obligated to pay back every cent he borrows from the Government, plus interest. Yet money lent under one of our Federal credit programs is treated as an expenditure. We say the administration has "spent" the money.

Consequently, we call the repayment of a loan a net reduction in expenditure—a "negative expenditure." We could just as well call it revenue. But we have our accounting system, with its set of rules, and it makes as good sense as any other method. The important thing is that the net impact on the deficit is the same whether we call a loan repayment a receipt or a negative expenditure.

Since the 1950's, under the Eisenhower administration, sales of assets have been treated in the same way as repayment of loans—they have been counted as negative expenditures. Hence, receipts from the sale of participations are now—and will continue to be—treated as negative expenditures.

This is a perfectly straight-forward way to treat these transactions in the budget. It is an accounting technique that focuses attention on the net expenditures entailed in a program.

Those who level the charge of budget gimmickry should realize that this procedure is neither something new with this bill nor something new with this administration. It is the conventional budget treatment given the entire program of asset sales. An argument against the method of accounting used in handling asset sales in the Federal budget is less an argument against this bill than against the entire asset sales program already authorized by Congress.

But, say the critics—and this is the second criticism—the assets are not sold. The buyers do not get title to the assets. In the words of the minority report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, all the buyer gets is a piece of the action. Does not this, the critics ask, demand different treatment?

Title in these assets passes in trust to the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the private lender gets an undivided interest in the pool of assets. This is not an unusual circumstance. It does not differ in any substantial degree from the situation of an investor who buys stock in a corporation. The stockholder has ownership, but he does not have a claim to any specific assets of the corporation.

The agencies will continue to service their loans. Many of the loans were made originally by the Government simply because the borrower did not have access to private credit, due to size, location, or lack of established credit standing.

These factors call for continued agency servicing. But this situation differs in no real sense from the operations of a mortgage broker who originates a loan and then sells it to an investor but continues to perform the servicing on behalf of the investor.

In fact, the situation duplicates a procedure sometimes used in the private market. Some mortgage brokers are themselves using the pool participation technique as a means of developing interest in mortgage financing among investors who do not have the facilities to handle mortgages directly.

Neither the possession of the title to the assets nor the maturities of the paricipation certificates change the fact that the borrowers are being financed by private lenders and not by the Government.

So much for the substance of this criticism. But let me consider the mechanics of the point, too.

Would it make any sense or improve our budget handling of these transactions in any way to go on treating loans as expenditures, continue to call repayments of the loans negative expenditures, but call receipts from participation sales something else—revenue, perhaps? We would then have two inputs for the same receipts—two systems going side by side. Would we then have to have another concept—perhaps called a negative receipt—to offset the loan repayments against the participation sales receipts?

With a budget already so complicated that few people outside these Halls and the agencies understand it, would we improve anything by making it still more complicated and incomprehensible? I cannot believe it.

Now for the third criticism. The opposition points out that the yield on participations will be higher than on Treasury borrowings. The participation sales technique will cost the Government more.

True as far as it goes. Participation certificates will cost approximately three-eighths of 1 percent more in their yield than Treasury's. The administration has never tried to obscure this fact.

But is this an argument for greater Treasury borrowing? We will soon face on this floor the annual increase in the public debt limits. Am I to understand that those who are now opposing this participation sales legislation will come forward later this month with proposals to increase the debt limit? I cannot believe that, either.

There are several points to be made on this criticism. First, Treasury borrowing is not an acceptable alternative in order to reduce the portfolio of direct loans the Government holds which is now tying up $33 billion of the taxpayers' money. But the criticism is relevant only if greater Treasury borrowing is an acceptable alternative. Otherwise we are arguing against a strawman.

Second, Treasury borrowing would not further the objective of substituting private for public credit. That is what we are trying to do—to call on the ready resources of the private market and reduce the part which public credit must play in the Federal lending programs.

Third, the modest additional cost of using the participation sales technique is the cost of freeing billions of dollars which are now immobilized in the Government portfolio. Fourth, as participation certificates gain wider and wider acceptance, we expect that the narrow differential of approximately three-eighths of a percent will narrow still further and that the rate on participations will approach still closer to the rate on Treasury securities.

Finally, there is a very telling point that has not been stressed in this House—and I would like to do so now.

Direct sales of loans by Fannie May and the Veterans' Administration in fiscal years 1965 and 1966 have been at an average interest rate of about 5¼ percent throughout the period. After adjusting for the cost to the purchaser of servicing the loans—which varies substantially, depending upon the amount of each loan, but can be estimated as roughly in the range of one-fourth to one-half of 1 percent—the net yield to the investor would be in the range from 4¾ to 5 percent.

The average interest yield on Federal National Mortgage Association participations was 4.3 percent on the November 1, 1964, issue; 4.5 percent on July 1, 1965; 4.7 percent on December 1, 1965; and 5.4 on April 4, 1966. Since neither the Federal National Mortgage Association nor the Veterans' Administration has been selling significant amounts on a direct basis in the calendar year 1966, there is no basis for a meaningful comparison between the interest rate on direct sales and the April 4, 1966, rate.

Thus, the net yield to investors of 4¾ to 5 percent on direct sales should be compared with an average yield of about 4½ percent on the Federal National Mortgage Association's first three participation issues. Accordingly, it appears that direct sales are more costly than participation sales by an amount ranging from one-fourth to one-half of 1 percent.

In the Export-Import Bank program, the volume of direct sales on a recourse basis in recent years has not been significant, relative to the volume of Export-Import Bank participation sales. Direct sales by Export-Import Bank on a guaranteed basis in calendar 1966 to date, for example, have totaled less than $400,000, compared with Export-Import Bank's February participation sale of $364 million.

In calendar 1964, however, there were $24 million of direct sales during the year on a recourse basis. The weighted average rate was 5.18 percent. This compares with the interest rate of 4½ percent on both issues of Export-Import Bank participations in calendar 1964 totaling $822 million.

Thus, although the amount of direct sales in calendar 1964 was only about 3 percent of the volume of participation sales, it is clear that the interest rate on direct sales was significantly above the rate on participations.

Small Business Administration direct sales experience provides a reasonable basis for comparison with participation sales because of the sales by SBA in March and April this year of $110 million of debentures at interest yields of 5.65 percent and 5.75 percent. The 5.4-percent rate on the Federal National Mortgage Association's participation issue of April 4, 1966, was significantly below the rates on SBA's direct sales.

On the basis of this experience, it appears that participation certificates can be sold at interest rates roughly one-fourth to one-half of 1 percent below the rates required for direct sales.

That is the comparison we should be making. Comparison of participation sales yields with Treasury yields is simply not pertinent. But comparison of participation costs with direct sale costs is extremely relevant.

The asset sales program is established and has been carried forward by three administrations. Few if any of us would reverse the process in motion for more than a decade.

Of the alternatives we have for selling these assets, the participation sales technique is substantially the more economical. Experience proves that point.

I have seriously considered three of the arguments put forward by the opposition. I believe they were serious, reasoned criticisms, and I have tried to deal with them in the factual and reasonable fashion they deserve. I believe the facts show that the criticisms are not well taken. I urge, therefore, that we support the President's participation sales legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 3, line 20, strike "may" both times it appears and insert "shall".

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROCK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROCK to the committee amendment: Page 6, line 13, strike "until used." and insert "only for the fiscal year for which it is granted and for the succeeding fiscal year.".

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would also, as in the case of the previous one, conform the House bill to an amendment adopted by the Senate placing a 2-year limit on the time during which an Appropriation Committee authorization would remain available. It should be noted, of course, that this is not a 2-year limitation on the bill itself. The 2-year limitation applies solely to the agency pooling authorization given by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. How would the proposed language change the language commencing at page 6, line 12, reading:

Any such authorization shall remain available until used.

How would it then read?

Mr. BROCK. My amendment would strike the words "until used" and insert "only for the fiscal year for which it is granted and for the succeeding fiscal year."

Mr. PATMAN. I think it is a good amendment. We will accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 20, strike "may" both times it appears and insert "shall".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that amendment has already been adopted.

Mr. PATMAN. Then we will withdraw it for the present. I understood the reading of that in the beginning, but it was not in the bill, and I did not see how it was adopted. But if it was adopted, it suits us. I ask the Chair to check on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has checked, and will state to the gentleman from Texas that the two amendments are identical, the earlier one having been adopted without objection.

Mr. PATMAN. We apologize to the Chair. We just made a mistake on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas have anything further?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have one other amendment in that section.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 2, strike lines 6 through 15 and insert:

"(3) by striking out the words 'offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages in which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof' in the first sentence thereof and by inserting 'and other types of securities, including any instrument commonly known as a security, hereinafter in this subsection called "obligations," in which any department or agency of the United States listed in section 302(c) (2) of this Act,';".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] wish me to yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at this point, a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Is it in order for that to be discussed, first, at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has been recognized for 5 minutes in support of the amendment he offered. The gentleman from New Jersey will be privileged to offer a substitute a little later.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. PATMAN. This is really just a conforming amendment to the amendment that has already been adopted, that was amended by the Poage amendment, that spells out the agencies which are permitted to participate in this act. It is just a conforming amendment. I think it should be adopted for that reason.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 2, strike line 6 and all that follows down through line 15 and insert:

"(3) by striking 'obligations offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages in which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof' in the first sentence thereof and inserting 'mortgages or other types of obligations in which any department or agency of the United States listed in paragraph (2) of this subsection.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman is really undertaking to do is to strike out the word "security."

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, that is the intent. I would like to read into the RECORD the purpose of it.

Mr. PATMAN. May I say, if that is all that is intended, and that is what it does, we are willing to accept it.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read into the RECORD the purpose of this amendment.

I hope the chairman will withhold his acceptance at this point. This is a very short explanation.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the chairman would conform this section of the House bill to language adopted by the Senate which incorporates by reference the agencies eligible to pool loans as set forth in an amendment which will be offered to section 302(c) of the act.

The substitute I have offered likewise would make this change in the bill.

The substitute makes a further change in the amendment offered by the chairman in that it will rule out any possibility that these agencies pooling assets could pool "stock" as well as mortgages or obligations owned by them. The language relating to stocks which the substitute would strike from the bill appears on lines 11 to 14 with reference to types of assets that may be pooled. This language states "and other types of securities, including any instrument commonly known as a security, hereinafter in this subsection called obligations." That language is so broad that there can be no question but that it would also include stocks as well as obligations. My substitute amendment would rule out such possibility by changing that language to read that assets permitted for pooling will consist of only "mortgages or other types of obligations."

The language of the substitute amendment has the approval of the Treasury Department who informed me that it was never their intention to include stocks in assets that could be pooled.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. We are willing to accept the gentleman's interpretation.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman. Is the gentleman willing to accept the substitute?

Mr. PATMAN. And the substitute; yes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

In view of the fact that we got a little confused on the point of order a while ago, I lost all the time which I had to discuss the amendment which was adopted, and to which this amendment and the substitute now represents an addendum. I do want to take some time to get clearly in the RECORD the understanding of the agencies of Government in connection with the Farmers Home Administration.

To that end I should now like to read a letter dated May 3, addressed to me, which states:

DEAR BOB: Following our meeting of last week on the participation sale bill I have been in touch with Charles L. Schultze, the Director of the Budget, regarding the insured loan authority of the Farmers Home Adminisration.

I have been assured that the full $450 million of insurance authority provided in Public Law 89-240 will be available each year to the Farmers Home Administration.

I am very pleased to be able to make this report to you.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE J. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

I also wish to read another letter bearing the same date, addressed to me, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

> DEAR MR. POAGE: Under Secretary Barr tells me that you are concerned not only with the implications of the Participation Sales Act of 1966 on the financing of various Farmers Home Administration programs, but also about the overall level of the FHA's insured real estate loan program.
>
> With respect to the first matter, I believe I covered this in my letter to you of May 2. With respect to the second matter, let me repeat to you the assurances which I gave Secretary Freeman orally that the Bureau of the Budget will place no obstacles in the way of the full use of the $450 million insurance authority recently established by Public Law 89-240.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
> *Director.*

Mr. Chairman, the point is, I want clearly established in the RECORD that those in charge both of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget recognize—and have committed themselves to it—that they will not hereafter object to the use of the full $450 million of guaranteed loan authority which Congress authorized for the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. I believe the point the gentleman has made would strike awe in the hearts of all of us for the ability to misunderstand in this particular area.

The Government has two programs. One program is of insured loans. It has insured loans of a volume of about $100 billion. In that loan program the Government does not get 1 cent of loan assets. It has nothing but a contingent liability. One could scarcely envision an opportunity to sell a participation of that contingent liability.

The Government has another portfolio of direct loans, out of which it does get loan assets. It could only sell participations out of those loan assets.

I think the gentleman by bringing this out has indicated there has been a misunderstanding between the position of the Government on its insured loans and the position of the Government on the other loans.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right, and we are trying to see that this misunderstanding does not continue. We are trying to make sure that there is no future misunderstanding as to the right of the Farmers Home Administration to use the authority which Congress gave the Farmers Home Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINO

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FINO: Page 7, insert the following immediately after line 6:
>
> "(6) Whenever any issue of beneficial interests or participations under this subsection is to be underwritten by any private firms, the Association shall award the contract on the basis of competitive bids."

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that when issues of participations are to be underwritten by private firms, Fannie Mae shall be obliged to award the contracts on the basis of competitive bidding. Odd as it may seem, the bill as introduced does not provide for competitive bidding on the underwriting of participation issues. It leaves the door wide open for favoritism and windfalls.

I believe that no competitive bidding has ever been used by Fannie Mae to get underwriters. This is because Fannie Mae has a cozy arrangement going with four brokerage houses. Each of Fannie Mae's four issues of participations has been sold to this syndicate. Each time, a different one of the four brokerage houses appeared at the top of the list of four underwriters. As I said: This is a cozy little arrangement.

I regret to say that the participation sales program is a windfall for a bunch of "fat cats" from the top of its head to the tip of its toes. First it is a windfall for a fat cat syndicate of brokerage houses who will make about $8 million in commissions from underwriting $2.8 billion worth of participations. They have already made $5 million in the past from underwriting $1.6 billion worth of participations. Second, the whole participation scheme is a windfall for the fat cats who are going to be able to buy participation certificates and make 5½ percent a year just by clipping coupons.

If this is not a double-barreled windfall, I do not know what is. The amendment I am offering at this time would at least knock out one part of the windfall by junking the cozy little arrangement with the four "fat cat" investment houses in favor of competitive bidding.

If we have competitive bidding, I expect it will save the taxpayers a few dollars because competition to underwrite the issue will drive down underwriting costs from the present "cozy" level. I hope the Members of this House still care about the taxpayer. He is the man the President of the United States has said does not deserve the care and feeding given the fat cats.

I hope that the House will support this amendment to provide for competitive bidding by would-be underwriters. It seems only fair that the taxpayers and investment houses of America have this guarantee of fair play. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we have had any charges of wrongdoing in connection with the sale of these securities through FNMA.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I will state that I believe competitive bidding should be allowed, and it is allowed under the bill as drawn. We should leave it to the managers and board of FNMA to sell whatever way they can to best protect the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, we must assume, until we have evidence to the contrary, that they are acting in the public interest, and have acted in the public interest in the past. And, unless we have positive proof and convincing proof to the contrary, I think we should continue to give them discretionary authority and then hold them responsible. If they make mistakes, we can do something about that. But there is no mistake that, as has been pointed out so far, and I believe this would definitely tie the hands of the people who have charge—I do not believe that Congress at this point should undertake any such restriction or limitation. I believe it would be against the public interest. It is for these people who are in charge of that responsibility to determine what is best in the public interest. If they want to do it by competitive bids, they have the authority under the existing law to do it by competitive bids. If they want to do it other ways, they have that power also.

If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, they will be restricted and restrained and be limited in their efforts to serve the public interest.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. First of all, I want to apprise the gentleman from Texas, that I made no charges against any of these four houses. My concern is to have all of them under this legislation have an opportunity to compete so that we have equal opportunity on these participation certificates.

Another point that I made was that it will, if adopted, bring down the cost, which will help the taxpayers.

Mr. PATMAN. In the public interest, though, I will state to the gentleman that the people in charge of FNMA are required under the law to do what is best in the public interest. If they believe competitive bidding in a particular case is best, they will do it—I am sure they will. But if there are other ways of doing it that will be better in serving the public interest, they should not be prohibited from following their best judgment and discretion in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman does not insist on this severe limitation upon their rights and privileges at a time when it is hard enough to deal with these people anyway. The fact that they have had certain brokers—they have not used the same one twice, as I understand it. That is something that is not unknown in financial circles. For instance, there are lots of cases where they use the same broker over and over again, in private business as well as in government, depending upon the best contract they can get, in the public interest.

Mr. FINO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman has indicated that my amendment would limit and tie the hands of FNMA. Now, that is not actually true. What I am trying to do through this amendment is to expand the authority and the facilities of FNMA so they can reach out to all factors and facets of this industry in an effort to try to get competitive bids.

And, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, insofar as saying that it is the responsibility of FNMA to handle this problem, it is also the responsibility of this Congress to make and to give direction and have in the law certain restrictions so that they do not go haywire and give preference to one particular house. I am trying to get everyone into this act.

Mr. PATMAN. I have not heard of any one house complaining.

Mr. FINO. Why should the houses complain?

Mr. PATMAN. If there are no complaints, why act upon it? Upon what are we working? The gentleman is trying to put them in a straitjacket. The gentleman should not want to do that. Let them have discretion. No one has complained about this.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. When the gentleman from Texas says that no one company has complained, that is true, because we only gave them 3 hours in which to present their case and we never permitted nor allowed any of the witnesses to come before the committee to express their views in opposition.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that. We had many witnesses who appeared before the committee and testified on related and supplementary legislation.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman——

The **CHAIRMAN.** For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock], a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the chairman that we are not by this amendment trying to restrict anybody. I do not believe it is the duty of the Congress to assume integrity or good judgment on the part of any Federal agency. I think it is the duty of the Congress to meet its responsibility by imposing those needed restrictions which will insure that the duties and responsibilities of the Federal agencies involved here are properly carried out.

Mr. Chairman, I can see no possible justification for refusing to allow or to encourage and even to insist on competitive bidding.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. We have had this question up in the Joint Economic Committee for 20 years. This question always comes up. Some Members say we should be selling bonds and all Treasury issues at public auction. Other Members say that there should be competitive bids, and other such suggestions.

We have always come to the conclusion to my knowledge that we must give some discretion and some power to the administrators who administer the act expecting them to do what is in the public interest and not to restrict them to any one thing or a course of action. Then if they do not perform their duties well and faithfully, then the next time a bill like this comes up, we can consider a limitation. But since we have gone along so well over the years without really any objections in this respect, I do hope the gentleman will not insist on his amendment.

Mr. BROCK. I would point out to the gentleman that Fannie Mae has yet to permit competitive bidding on any of its participation sales. To date there have only been four brokerage houses participating and they have participated on a rotating basis.

I would like to point out further that the gentleman's own Joint Economic Committee issued a report I believe in March of this year in which his own committee spoke out against participation sales and the gentleman signed the report; is that not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. No, we did not come out against it. We criticized some aspects of it in the report. We wound up by saying that pension funds and trust funds should be allowed to participate in these participation sales and we did that, making a contribution to the success of the participation sales act.

Mr. BROCK. The point is that I can see no justification for refusing to insist that competitive bidding be allowed in this instance.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, if we had any complaints that would be a different matter. But I do not believe any Member has a complaint as to what is being done.

Mr. BROCK. There was no possibility of making a complaint because the Banking and Currency Committee majority refused to hear any additional witnesses, including those from the Mortgage Bankers Association.

Mr. PATMAN. But, of course, we know with all the telegrams that have been sent out and telephone calls that have been made.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], the chairman of our committee, this question. Would not competition in underwriting these issues drive down the costs of such underwriting? We are concerned here with the cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. PATMAN. Sometimes that is true.

Mr. FINO. Does the gentleman from Texas say that the answer to my question is that it is true that such competition would drive down the underwriting cost?

Mr. PATMAN. Sometimes it could be true—but not always. You see in dealing with large issues running into billions of dollars, you have all kinds of questions coming up. Some people say—Well, is the Government buying this? Is the full faith and credit of the Government behind this?

Mr. BROCK. That has no relevance to the matter whatsoever.

Mr. PATMAN. People ask—Is there a Government guarantee behind this? How do we get our money in case of a default? There are always questions like these coming up. So they say, let us do it by negotiation. And by negotiating or negotiations sometimes you can get a better trade than you can by competitive bidding. Where the people in charge are convinced that negotiation would be a better way to handle it, they would be allowed the privilege of doing it and, of course, it would be in the public interest always.

Mr. BROCK. We agree with the desirability of competitive bidding, of course.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas whether he is familiar with the incident involving the SBIC where there was an 8.5 discount on an issue of the SBIC.

Mr. PATMAN. I am familiar with that and I did not like it at all.

Mr. FINO. That was negotiated with one brokerage house—that is the important thing—it was negotiated with one brokerage house.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not like that at all. But I do not know of anyone who can show that a better deal could have been made.

Mr. FINO. How would we know that unless competition was permitted by the different brokerage houses?

Mr. BROCK. If I might point this out—how would we know at any time what the best bid obtainable is, unless we allow competitors to come in and bid.

If the mentioned brokerage house was going to offer an 8½-point discount, they would have offered it on a competitive-bid situation, as they did when the bid was negotiated.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. It is amusing that none of the argument that we are hearing today on this amendment took place during the Eisenhower administration. We have been proceeding with this method of disposing of securities of the U.S. Government for many, many years, and this is the first time that I can remember that anyone has come forward with a proposal such as this.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. This method was never used by the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman tell the committee then how these obligations were disposed of during the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. WIDNALL. They were sold outright—actual sales by the agency.

Mr. MULTER. What difference does it make whether you sell them outright or you sell an interest in them. I am talking about the method of sale, not whether you sell the whole instrument or an interest in the instrument.

Mr. WIDNALL. They are sold in the open market under a program initiated by the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. MULTER. That is precisely what will be done here. They will be sold in the open market. If you have more than one bidder, they will go to the bidder with the lowest cost and the highest yield in the best interests of the U.S. Government. Look at what you are trying to do. Just look at the language of this amendment.

While the purpose may be good in trying to get the best result for the Government in the sale of these assets and participations therein, when you try to do it at the lowest cost of selling, what you have done—and listen to your own language—what you have done here is to provide that when a beneficial interest or participation is to be underwritten, the contract shall be awarded only on the basis of competitive bids. That means that, if there are no competitive bids, you cannot sell them. Whether you intended that result or not there can be no sale if there is only one bidder. If this amendment is adopted we will never be able to dispose of these participation interests. We will never be able to sell an issue or a part of an issue unless we get more than one person to bid. That is what competitive bids mean.

The situation as it exists today and will exist if this amendment is defeated, is that the administration or FNMA will use its discretion. When it can get several bidders to come in and bid, it will sell to the lowest bidder so far as the cost of sale is concerned, and so far as return is concerned, it will go to the highest bidder. In that way the Government's best interests will be served.

We must leave this provision flexible. As the chairman has stated, we must leave this to the discretion of those who will undertake to sell the obligations. When you can bring the whole market in and have many bidders bid against each other, that is fine. The fact is that anyone who knows anything about the way this market operates and the way these sales are made every day in the week in the open market—if you can call it an open market—these underwriters get together and they agree among themselves about what they will buy and on what terms. They say, "We will divide this up. I will take 10 percent, you take 20 percent, another participant takes 50 percent," and so forth. If only one bid comes in, then there is no competitive bidding. Unless you devise some way to stop that kind of business, you will not get competitive bids.

If this language is adopted, you might just as well forget about the bill and not pass it. You will not be able to sell any of these assets or any participations therein.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. For a moment the gentleman sounded like he was supporting the amendment, and then I lost him along the way. I wish to apprise the gentleman that if this amendment is adopted, you will have and must have competitive bidding.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman has said——

Mr. FINO. May I finish my statement?

Mr. MULTER. I refuse to yield any further. Let us stop right there. If there are no competitive bids, if there is not more than one person to offer a bid, there would be no sale under this language. That is what you mean by competitive bids. If you insist that there must be competitive bids and there is only one bidder, there can be no sale.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. The amendment does not say that.

Mr. MULTER. The amendment says that there must be competitive bidding, which means that there must be an open and competitive market. If only one bid comes in, there is no competition. The language is: "Whenever an issue is to be underwritten, the Association, that is, FNMA, shall award the contract on the basis of competitive bids."

That is the entire language. If there are no competitive bids, there can be no sales. That is what this amendment requires.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. It requires the agency to open bidding competitively. If one bid comes in, there is nothing that precludes them from accepting that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and move to strike the requisite number of words.

We have been listening to a very strange colloquy on the part of the majority here. The manner in which we market Government bonds which are under the debt ceiling—and the Ways and Means Committee has to be concerned about it—is through a competitive bid process. It is the open market operation conducted by the Federal Reserve Board. Why anybody would want not to have competitive bidding for these securities puzzles me.

The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee—another committee on which I serve—has rightly pointed out that we have gone into this aspect of the matter.

Let me carry it a bit further to one of our subcommittee on the Joint Committee which deals in this whole broad area of Federal procurement. One of the points this subcommittee has been driving home is that the Government gets a better price when we have competitive bidding. The only time we have negotiated bidding is when, by the very nature of the contract—where you may be procuring a submarine or something very technical—we go to negotiated bidding. That is the only time we do so.

Even on these negotiated biddings, we have been developing a process of breaking out of the primary contract areas, subcontracts where we may have competitive bidding.

I served with my good friend from Texas, who chaired for many years the Small Business Committee. There we were able to establish finally the point that, as competitive bidding is used, the participation of small business increases, and, as competitive bidding is used, the Government gets a better price.

I served with my good friend from Texas in the 82d Congress on the Small Businesss Committee.

It is shocking to me to have this argument develop here. Surely we want to have competitive bidding in this area, just as we have developed it over a period of years through the open market process, where the Federal Reserve System has the responsibility of assisting the Treasury Department in creating a good market for Government securities.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, all I am arguing for is that we do precisely the same as you are advocating, which is the proper procedure for the disposition of other Government securities. This will limit it to a competitive bidding. If there is no competitive bidding, there will be no sale.

Mr. CURTIS. There should not be. Let me make this point. If we have only one bidder there should not be a sale. There is something wrong. We should withdraw it and get it in proper order, if all we have is one person to bid.

Mr. MULTER. The fact of the matter is that whenever a Government issue is offered on the market, and there is only one bidder, Government is not required by law to say we will not sell. We sell, unless we withdraw because the price is too high, or it is going to result in too small a return.

But the law vests discretion in the executive departments. The gentleman cannot point to a single statute which binds the hands of the open market committee to competitive bidding. They can do it by competitive bidding. They can take one bid, if that is all that comes in, or they can negotiate. That is all we do here.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Open Market Committee had not established it over a period of years, this common custom, where they do use competitive bidding, I would say we would need to do it by statute.

We are coming in here with something new. Believe me, there is no reason why we could not state in statute form what the Open Market Committee actually does do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am interested in having the views of the gentleman from Missouri, following his statement that with one bid there would not be a competitive market, concerning the situation which might occur. What would stop two or three or four or five from getting together among themselves? We know that happens.

Mr. CURTIS. They sometimes do.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing unusual about that, in private business. Then one man submits the bid. Where would we be then? Behind one bid, we know, there might be a combination of persons operating or cooperating together.

Mr. CURTIS. I might say to the Speaker, he is absolutely right. That is also public information. If it is known that kind of process has been employed to defeat the purpose of competitive bidding I would tend to withdraw the request for bid, if I were the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Do not the antitrust laws take care of such things as the gentleman mentioned?

Mr. CURTIS. They could, all right.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have discussed this for a long time. I ask for a vote.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FINO and Mr. MULTER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 88, noes 95.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL: On page 4, line 14, immediately after "as the direct sale" insert "with recourse".

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, a committee amendment appearing on page 3, line 9 of the bill, changes the word "may" to "shall." This change was agreed to by the administration witnesses testifying on the bill.

The purpose of the change was to require by statute that an agency pooling loans with FNMA be required to guarantee the loans so pooled. The effect of the amendment is that guaranteed loans be included in the authorized limit for the agency's lending activity.

Unfortunately, the committee acted with such speed in its brief executive session that a necessary conforming change was not made in another sentence of the bill to give real meaning to changing the guaranty requirement from a permissive to a mandatory basis.

The amendment I propose will make this necessary conforming change by making clear that the sales we are talking of are sales "with recourse" which corresponds to the mandatory requirement that loans pooled by an agency be guaranteed by an agency which, of course, means that the loans so pooled are pooled "with recourse."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are willing to accept the amendment. It conforms to the whole intent.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROCK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROCK: On page 7, immediately after line 6, insert:

"(6) No beneficial interest or participation may be issued pursuant to this subsection after the enactment of this paragraph bearing an interest rate in excess of one-half of one percentage point above the 4¼-percent maximum interest rate specified for long-term bonds of the United States in the first section of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 752)."

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment against high interest rates. Those who are against high interest rates should support it. Those who are for high interest rates should vote against it. The issue is that simple.

The interest rate ceiling that this amendment would place on participations sold after the passage of this act would be geared to the existing 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Treasury bonds that is imposed by the Second Liberty Bond Act.

All are in agreement that participation financing is more expensive than Treasury financing. The Treasury claims the additional cost approximates ¼ percent to ⅜ percent. In the present market, on the basis of participations recently sold by both Export-Import Bank and FNMA, the additional cost has amounted to as much as ½ percent to ⅝ percent.

The amendment would recognize this demonstrated rate differential and establish a maximum interest rate ceiling on participations to be sold. This ceiling could not exceed 4¾ percent which is one-half percent more than the statutory 4¼ percent ceiling applicable to long-term Treasury bonds.

This amendment would not kill the participation program. To date, FNMA has sold four issues of participation. The first of three issues aggregating $1.2 billion all were sold with rates under the 4¾ percent rate ceiling which the amendment would establish. The rates for the first three issues varied from 4⅛ percent to 4.70 percent. It is only the last issue—the $410 million offering on March 16, 1966—that would have been barred by the amendment. Rates on this last issue ranged from 5.25 percent to 5.50 percent depending on maturity of the participations sold.

When we are in a money market so tight that a rate of 5.50 percent must be paid on what in effect is U.S. Government credit, there ought to be a rate ceiling temporarily staying such financing. The amendment would do just that. It would effectively postpone operation of the program in periods of extremely tight monetary stringency such as exists at the present time.

As I have said, those who are against high interest rates should vote for the amendment.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted would effectively kill the bill.

I am not in favor of high interest rates. I am in favor of reasonable rates. We have to be realistic. We do not fix the market on interest rates. That is fixed by the Federal Reserve. I do not like the way in which the Federal Reserve has acted with respect to this matter, but what can we do about it.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Texas certainly does not have to defend his stand insofar as interest rates in this country are concerned; is that not so?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; that is exactly right.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not further so that if this amendment is adopted it would put a limitation upon the disposition of the securities and the effort thereof would be to substantially kill the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. It certainly would and it will deny the small businessman opportunities to obtain loans which otherwise he would be permitted to obtain under this bill. It would deny small towns of the opportunity to obtain facilities loans.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to vote for big cities, this is the only opportunity we will have to make a gesture toward helping the small towns of the country.

We have a health problem in small towns involving water and sewer and sanitation facilities of all kinds. That can be helped under this bill, but the bill will be killed with this amendment in it. So why should we take advantage of the small towns and small business and housing and veterans—this would hurt the veterans—it will hurt everybody who is small—including the small towns.

I hope the gentleman will not insist on this amendment. It is just utterly devastating. He states here:

> More than one-quarter of one percent above the four and one-quarter percent rate.

I guess the gentleman has in mind the long-term Government bonds. But he does not say so. I will say to the gentleman, the amendment is very loosely drawn. If the gentleman wants to specify the short-term rate, it could be indefinite—the short-term rate right now is higher than what he would permit us to sell these securities for. So far as the short-term rate is concerned, this amendment is devastating and destructive and it is certainly not in the public interest or in the interest of this bill.

I hope the gentleman will not insist on his amendment. It is just not right. It would be destructive so far as the little people and the poor people are concerned and the small towns.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROCK. I am somewhat interested in the chairman's definition of what is destructive to people such as farmers, veterans, and small towns. These are the very people who are virtually crucified by high interest rates. This amendment is not offered in an effort to kill the bill. It is offered in an effort to keep Fannie Mae from destroying this money market at a time when conditions are stringent and when money is in short supply. When you sell $4 billion worth of these participations in the market, this sale is going to drive interest rates up. That is what is destroying the small businessman.

Mr. PATMAN. I will say to the gentleman, this could be labeled a big bankers' bill. This amendment could be called a bankers' bonus amendment.

Mr. BROCK. I am amazed to hear the gentleman say that the bill is a big bankers' bill, but the amendment would limit interest costs to small borrowers. Does the gentleman deny the statement I made?

Mr. PATMAN. If you stop them from selling long-term Government bonds, which this would, to carry this into effect, then they would have to go into short terms and the big bankers could get 10 percent on the short term. They are not even restricted. Does the gentleman want to do that? Does he want to restrict them on long terms only and no restriction on the short terms?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. I would like to make this point.

If this amendment prevails, we could not sell any of these obligations in today's market.

Today's Wall Street Journal quotes the yield on U.S. Treasury bonds as $4.91.

Here is an advertisement for obligations of the Federal Home Loan Banks—this is in today's paper—5.55 percent is the yield.

Here is another advertisement in the Wall Street Journal of today by one of the national banks advertising a 5½-percent return.

Now how are we going to meet that kind of competition if we limit this as this amendment would?

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROCK. The gentleman from New York has just made my case for me. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We should not be selling these bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has had his say and I have had mine. Let us have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to hold up any vote, but I do not want to have the vote come now with the comment of the gentleman from Texas being the last word on this subject. The very idea of calling this amendment a bonanza for bankers when the apparent purpose and objective sought to be attained by the original bill would be such a bonanza. The only people I know who will benefit from this bill, if it is passed, are the bankers, the institutional investors and the big people in this country. This bill operates directly to the detriment of the small people of this country, and the small homeowners, and the people who are seeking to acquire homes as well as against the small towns and villages.

We have ongoing programs providing now financial help to enable small towns to put in water systems and sewer systems. We do not need this bill for that purpose. This is a bill that would tax the little people all over the country and subsidize the interest rates for the investors of the country who enjoy high interest rates which will flow following the adoption of this bill.

What the amendment will do is to operate in exactly the opposite direction from that. This amendment will be opposed by the bankers and all the people who would like to buy these participation certificates.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I never thought I would see the day that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] would favor higher interest rates. I never thought I would see the day that he would be against competition in the sale of Government securities. I am amazed to see the gentleman converted to positions different from what he has advocated previously.

Now, let me say this: This provision, as I understand it, as it was clearly set forth by the gentleman from Tennessee and amplified by the gentleman from North Carolina, would seek to keep a ceiling on interest rates. It would preclude the large bankers from the major metropolitan cities from having a bonanza. I do not see how anyone on that side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle could possibly oppose this amendment. If you oppose it, you are a high-interest man. If you are for it, you are a low-interest man. Apparently the Democrats are for high-interest rates.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The amendment refers to the Second Liberty Loan Act. That applies only to long-term Government loans. That is a public debt. If you restrict them to where they cannot sell the obligations under long-term notes, then they have to go to a short term. If they go to a short term, there is no restriction on the rate. That is what they want. They want to compel us to go into the short-term market, where the interest rates could be 6 percent, 7 percent, 8 percent, 9 percent, and 10 percent. This would compel us to go into that short-term rate, which would be against the public interest.

I hope the gentleman will not insist on his amendment.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. The chairman is misinformed on the amendment. It has nothing to do with short- and long-term markets. The bill relates to the Liberty Bond Act because it relates to ceiling on long-term debt interest rates, and insofar as this bill is concerned, it limits short- and long-term loans to 4¾ percent. It does not say that we have to go to one market or another. It is a simple device to limit the amount of interest to be paid on these participations.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not blame anyone who is in favor of high interest rates for opposing this amendment. I am opposed to constantly increasing high interest rates, and I therefore support the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I think we have before us an amendment which demonstrates what I said yesterday was the sham of this proposal that the House is now considering. The remarks of the gentleman from Texas about the difficulties that would be imposed in a proper marketing of these securities by having an interest ceiling on it have a great deal of merit. But the gentleman from Texas announced yesterday that he had 100 votes on the Democratic side who would resist the repeal of the 4½-percent interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds, that which is referred to in this amendment. Those are bonds that are over 5 years in maturity.

It is true that in the past few months we have been unable to market any long-term securities. The interest ceiling has disrupted the proper management of the Federal debt. It has, indeed, done the very thing which the gentleman from Texas said would occur. It has forced the Federal Government to move into short-term bills and notes paying higher interest and, I might say, the more you get into the 90-day bill area, the more near money you are producing and actually translating inflationary forces that exist in our society into price increases.

You cannot have it both ways, my good friends on the Democratic side. You cannot argue against the ceiling that is being imposed on these securities, which is a more liberal ceiling than that which you have imposed on our big Federal debt of some $300 billion. This ceiling here proposed is more liberal. It will disrupt the market less than the 4½-percent ceiling that is imposed on the present Federal debt.

If the Democratic Party wants to be a responsible party—and this administration wants to be responsible—and I use that word advisedly—you have got to come in here forthrightly and admit that your policies have created a situation in which the marketplace is demanding higher interest rates.

It is because of the high interest rates that the Treasury is prevented from an orderly marketing of Government securities. This is one reason I have suggested the bill before us is a sham. It is simply trying to avoid facing up to removing the interest ceiling on long-term bonds by leaving the door wide open in the area of approximately $10 billion of securities, where, if the market demands it, interest becomes 6 percent. We will allow the Government to pay this high rate.

Vote as you just did, as a party, on an issue that should not be a party issue. Disregard the arguments that many of the Democrat Members know in their hearts are accurate. Disregard them and play politics with the future of our country.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I make just one comment to the Democratic side. What we have just witnessed is an attempt on the part of the Republicans to control the free market. They are trying to confuse the minds of Members as to how we affect the interest rate when we are borrowing money as against the interest rate of the market when there is bidding on something we are trying to sell. I do not think they will confuse the Members. I think we know what we are voting for. I suggest we defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROCK) there were—ayes 55, noes 89.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BROCK and Mr. MULTER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 90, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point and subject to a point of order at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINO

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FINO: On page 7, insert the following immediately after line 6:
>
> "(6) Certificates of beneficial interest or participation shall be offered in denominations of $100, $500 and $1,000, and in whole-number multiples of $1,000. No minimum subscription other than $100 may be prescribed with respect to any issue of beneficial interests or participations under this subsection."

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there an objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may we have an understanding that we restrict the discussion under this bill to 20 minutes? I ask unanimous consent that we do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Texas that the remainder of the bill has not yet been read.

Mr. PATMAN. I mean that this amendment be restricted to 20 minutes. Let the gentleman from New York have 10 minutes.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to this amendment. Would the Chair advise me when that would be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. After the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] concludes his remarks it would be in order.

Mr. OTTINGER. And would the time reservation apply to my amendment, as well as to Mr. FINO's amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the request on the restriction of time to be on the pending amendment and amendments thereto and that the time close in 20 minutes. Therefore, it would apply to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Did I understand the gentleman from New York who offered the amendment, Mr. FINO, was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes?

Mr. PATMAN. Not yet. We will not object to it if we can restrict the time to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] to proceed for an additional 5 minutes is pending under what the Chair considered to be a reservation by both the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Under the gentleman from Texas' request does he include the 10 minutes of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO]?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be restricted to 25 minutes and 5 minutes be given to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] is recognized for 10 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require participation certificates to be issued in denominations of $100, $500, $1,000 and multiples of $1,000 instead of in denominations of $5,000 and up as proposed. The purpose of my amendment is very simple. I know that the administration wants to reserve the windfall of 5½ percent interest for the fat-cat investors. That is why they are trying to keep the minimum denomination at a level above $1,000. My amendment would let the little guy in the street, the investor with only a few hundred dollars, share in this windfall.

I have already mentioned, during general debate, the reason why the administration is going to pay these outrageously high interest rates. They could borrow the money more cheaply by borrowing through the Treasury, but that would not produce receipts that were good for budget trickery. You need private receipts for budget trickery, and the administration will pay any necessary rate to get them. Of course, the rate they pay is highest in a year just like this one, where inflation is rampant, but what else can we expect a program which, by its very political nature, will be selling participations in inflationary, budget deficit years?

Now you might imagine that fiscal and monetary trickery like this would invoke the condemnation of the fat-cat investors who are always talking about sound economic policies. They are strangely silent instead. Why? Because they are getting a windfall. The President's program is a multimillion-dollar windfall for the fat-cat investors of America. This is because only the fat cats can scrape together enough money to meet the dollar requirements of a $5,000 or $1,000 denomination minimum. You have to be a "fat cat" to have the amount of money required to get 5½ percent interest from the U.S. Government.

This bill is murder on the little guy in the street. First of all, it will boost his tax burden by making the budget safe for excess spending which always means more taxes. Secondly, it will boost his taxes by socking him for the money to pay the high interest rates. Third, it will sock him by sidetracking funds that would otherwise go into mortgages and other credit, and this will make the little guy pay more for his mortgage or other credit. Lastly, it will insult him by paying out 5½ percent interest to the fat cats who come around to the backdoor while regular Government savings bonds pay only 4 percent.

This has a bad odor to me. The Federal Government is spending thousands of dollars on advertising campaigns pushing Government savings bonds. The pitch used is an appeal to patriotism. This is a joke. This administration talks with the patriots and sleeps with the profiteers. Patriotism gets a 4-percent interest rate and collusion with budget-juggling earns 5½ percent for fat cats. I imagine that the President believes that the little guy on the street cannot understand this bill. No doubt some of it is too technical for the layman, but I think what I am discussing right now will be understood in our Nation's cities and towns. The fat cats are going to get 5½ percent for playing ball with a Federal financial swindle, while Joe Taxpayer and Joe Patriot who buy savings bonds are given 4 percent and told everything is rosy. Nobody is going to buy this. A windfall is a windfall, and the people will figure it out.

This whole program is going to be a Democratic teapot dome if it passes. It is a double-barreled windfall. First, a select group of clubby investment houses are going to get a windfall underwriters commission without competitive bidding. Secondly, a lot of "fat cats" are going to get a 5½-percent windfall just for clipping coupons.

I am proud that it has fallen to the Republican Party to protect the man in the street while the administration tiptoes around to the back door with the "fat cats" for a raid on our Nation's tax dollars. My amendment would make the 5½-percent interest rate available to the people—to the small investor with a couple of hundred dollars—so that it will not go just to the "fat cats."

I hope the House will support my amendment. I hope I can count on the support of the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of our committee. I know the gentleman will be with me if he is for the people. I hope the House will join with me to vote for the people. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. When the unanimous consent request was granted, the chair observed on their feet the following Members: the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

For what purpose does the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OTTINGER to the amendment offered by Mr. FINO: Strike the language of the Fino amendment and substitute therefor the following: Add to page 7, line 6, after the end of the sentence on line 6:

"Any beneficial interests or participations issued hereunder shall be issued only in denominations of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) or greater."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, what we do in one area of the financial world has grave effects on other financial institutions. We have recently witnessed the action of the Federal Reserve Board in revising Regulation Q to permit payment of interest at the rate of 5½ percent on certificates of deposit-time deposits.

As a result of this regulation, we have seen virtually all of the money available to the small man—to the man that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], is referring to—drained out of the savings and loan institutions and from the savings banks and even from the small commercial banks of our country.

We have seen as a result the necessity for the Home Loan Bank Board to issue regulations restricting savings and loan institutions in making future commitments in the mortgage market. We hear from our builders all over the country that there is just no mortgage money left or available for the small home owner or for the man who wants to build a home. The small individual or small businessman who needs a small loan finds that there are no funds available for his needs.

If the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] were adopted, it would mean in addition to the certificates of deposit that are already draining money from the mortgage market, there would be issued these participation certificates in small denominations causing a further drain and a further strain on this already strangling markets.

I chose the $15,000 figure as a limitation because that is the amount the President of the United States has recommended as the maximum deposit insurance limit.

The small investor is not going to be hurt by this limitation of $15,000. He still has available all the present avenues to invest his money at larger rates of interest if he so chooses—such as a wide variety of private stocks and bonds and various types of public issues. But it is the small man who will be hurt when he tries to buy a house or tries to obtain a mortgage or tries to obtain a personal loan. It is the builder who is building for this small man who will be hurt if the Fino amendment is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the adoption of my amendment.

I have a bill pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency to limit the use of these certificates of deposit to $15,000 and up. This amendment would be complementary.

We are not hurting the small investor by my amendment. We are just reflecting a situation that presently exists within the financial market with respect to rates of interest that can be obtained by large and small investors. We are not doing any more harm to the small investor than the present situation indicates.

I, therefore, ask for the passage of my amendment and for the defeat of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. My colleague by his amendment which he has offered as a substitute for my amendment would increase the limit from the $5,000 and $10,000 limitation that Fannie Mae currently issues to a limitation of $15,000; is that correct?

Mr. OTTINGER. That is correct.

Mr. FINO. In other words, you are increasing the limitation so that the little fellow has absolutely no chance to get in on this windfall; is that correct?

Mr. OTTINGER. These certificates of participation, as was testified to by the representatives from the Federal agencies, are not intended to go on the general market. They are not intended to compete for already scarce money available to the home buyer and the small home buyer.

These participations are intended for sale to the investment trusts, pensions and the institutional investors of the country.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York, I am afraid, would just wreak further mischief on an already impossibly tight mortgage market throughout the country and make these builders and home buyers bear an unreasonable share of the burden of trying to restrict credit and stop inflation in the country.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. My objection to the present law and my objection to the present situation in Fannie Mae is that you are taking care of the fat cats.

Under your amendment you will take care of the bigger fat cats.

Mr. OTTINGER. My amendment is not going to make anyone a fat cat—but the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] will assuredly make of the Nation's home buyers, small borrowers and small businessmen mighty thin dogs.

I urge adoption of my amendment and defeat of the amendment of my colleague from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I could not believe my ears when the gentleman from New York arose and offered his amendment to put the amount of the certificates up to $15,000. I am an awfully slim cat. I would like to be a fat cat. What do you expect me to do? The gentleman from New York is on his feet on the floor of the House. Do you want to make me buy Government bonds, which are all I can get because these are in denominations I can afford to buy, and get only a little more than 4 percent interest on them, while the certificates to be issued under this bill would be fed out to the bankers in New York and elsewhere in $15,000 denominations and at a 5½-percent interest rate? How do I get fat under the terms of your amendment?

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. The small man will not have anything taken from him. He has all the avenues of investment available to him that he had before, and there are plenty of avenues that will open up.

Mr. GROSS. Like me, he is going to be denied the opportunity to get in on this windfall. I have not got $15,000 to put into one certificate and neither have millions of others. How am I and millions of others going to get in on this windfall?

Mr. OTTINGER. You are going to get in on this in a number of ways. You will have money in the small business program that you never had before. You will have money available for your veterans' programs you did not have before. You will have money available when you want to go out to buy a house or get a mortgage on a house that you did not have before.

Mr. GROSS. It sounds like some bond company must have had some hand in the drafting of this amendment. The record is clear that only a few would have the opportunity to purchase these certificates at the high interest rates unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], is adopted.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I think the gentleman from Iowa is being a little naive. Apparently you have not read the newspapers lately. I think what you should do to get in on one of these nice $15,000 certificates, that the gentleman from New York wants to doll up for you, is to have a little testimonial dinner. Then when you get the proceeds of the testimonial dinner, perhaps you can get in on one of these "fat cat" certificates.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion, but where do I find the testimonial dinner?

Mr. OTTINGER. Some place, somewhere, there must be someone.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said that the Democratic Party was the party of the little people. This afternoon I have seen them vote against every amendment in behalf of the little people. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] well said a little bit ago, you are making the fat cats fatter, sleeker, and fatter—and I thought you claimed the party of the little people.

Mr. Chairman, this is thoroughly bad legislation. It sweeps fiscal responsibility under the rug temporarily, but the day will come when the odor will become so strong that it cannot be hidden by devices of this kind.

As others have stated, it makes a mockery of the Federal debt ceiling. It is deception in its worst form.

I assume there will be a final rollcall vote, but I want to be certain that I am on the record as opposed to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] for 3 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am as amused as all of us should be. When the fat cats start talking about the fat cats getting fatter, I think we should smile. Yes, I am looking at the gentleman who has been using the words "fat cat" throughout this debate from the day it opened. I am just wondering what fat cats he is trying to protect.

I have always been warned against the man who would become offensive and start calling names instead of talking about the merits of a situation. I am frightened now that I see our friends on my left, those on the right side of the aisle, who have always been the friends of the fat cats and the moneyed interests, suddenly moving over onto our side and telling us they are looking out for the little fellow. What is this that has caused them to be so interested in the little fellow all of a sudden? Is it merely because election is around the corner and they are trying to fool the people and to prove that they are the friends of the little man?

Let us see what they are trying to do here. If we adopt the Fino amendment, which would require that these obligations be sold in lots of $100 each, instead, of, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] would indicate that they should be sold, in lots of a minimum of $15,000 each. The savings and loan people and the savings bank people are now crying that they have no money with which to make loans on houses and for other purposes which would help the little man.

This bill is intended to make more money available to them. But this amendment will try to take the money, which should go into thrift institutions and divert them to these obligations. The amendment will drive up the cost of the administration of the program. It will also drive up the interest rate generally, which is high enough now. This will run it even higher. The gentleman knows this as well as anybody, because he has been speaking for these "fat cats" over the years.

The wider the distribution of these instruments we try to sell on the market, the wider we try to get the distribution in the market, the more costly it is to market the instruments.

According to today's Wall Street Journal, the sale of U.S. Treasury bonds are at yields as high as 4.91 percent, just under 5 percent. The national banks are advertising for funds and are willing to pay 5 percent for them. The Home Loan Bank Board is selling its debentures today at a rate that will yield 5.55 percent. Are we going to try to push up the rates still higher, so as to try to attract the little fellow into this kind of operation? It will run the cost still higher.

Let me remind the Members, we have never yet succeeded in legislating the market or the interest rate in the market, or the yield. If we limit the amount of interest that may be paid, the debenture or obligation or security is going to be sold at a discount, and the discount runs the rate that much higher.

I urge defeat of the Fino amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York said that we have never succeeded in legislating the market. I seem to remember that there is something on the statute books right now, called the 4¼-percent ceiling on U.S. Government bonds. That was legislated by the Congress, and the Congress has been unwilling to do anything about that ceiling, because they were so successful in legislating it, I presume. If they were not successful, that problem should be faced up to realistically.

What I would like to emphasize is this: It really pains a great many people to see full-page ads being taken now to sell U.S. savings bonds to the small investor, the low-income person, to sell him through payroll deductions—and these are the patriotic people of the United States—the 4.15-percent U.S. savings bond—investments, while we are now trying to legislate something that is just going to provide a tremendous profit for those who already have large incomes and fine assets.

Actually, this proposal just provides a minimum of 5.5 percent. There is no ceiling on what can be paid through the use of this participation device.

This amendment points out how completely unfair this proposed legislation is with respect to the small investor, the average American citizen. I think this is a good amendment. I hope it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to close the debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why our friends on the minority side would make such an attack on a proposal that they have supported in the past. I had the record here yesterday and the day before yesterday, showing conclusively that they have supported the same proposal without any restrictions or limitations of any kind.

All at once they have converted themselves into a wrecking crew for the purpose of trying to wreck this bill. This bill is for a good purpose and to help good people.

I agree with what has been said by Mr. MULTER and others here. If we accept the Fino amendment we would reduce participation certificates down to $100.

I do not know what it will lead to. One thing it will do. It will drain money out of savings and loans, if that is what the gentlemen wants to do. It will lend itself to doing that.

I believe enough has been done to the savings and loans, without Congress legislating such a destructive effect here against them.

The Fino amendment is very bad. It should not be permitted. I fear it would in effect kill the bill, because it is not possible to administer a bill which is so restricted and limited.

The Ottinger amendment would provide at least $15,000 as the amount. Of course, this bill is patterned for the purpose of attracting large investors, pension funds and insurance funds, so as to keep them out of competition in the housing market and in the savings and loan investments.

If the Fino amendment is adopted or if the Ottinger amendment is adopted, this would clearly change the objectives and the purposes of the bill.

We want this bill operated in the public interest. Leave it to honest, dedicated public officials to do what is in the public interest. We must not put them in a straitjacket. We must not make it impossible for them to perform their duties in the public interest.

I believe it has been operated satisfactorily in the past and I believe it will be operated satisfactorily in the future.

This is a good bill. We have been working on it. The proposal has been around here for more than 20 years, beginning with the Export-Import Bank in 1945. That was adopted unanimously both by the House and the Senate.

Later an amendment was adopted unanimously by the House and the Senate to allow the participation certificates to be sold.

Then in 1964 the Housing Act—adopted by the Republicans—advocated exactly this kind of proposal.

Now the Democrats are in power. They say it was good under the Republicans, and they were all for it, but under the Democrats they are all against it.

What is all this fuss about? I hope each one of these amendments will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Fino and Mr. Multer.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 98, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Widnall: On page 7, insert the following immediately after line 6:

"(6) All beneficial interests and participations issued pursuant to this subsection after the enactment of this paragraph shall be obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States."

Mr. PATMAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New Jersey is trying to change the national debt limit, which, of course, is obviously not in order. The national debt limit is not before the Congress in this bill, or the public debt limit, rather.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not in any way affect the national debt limit. The amendment I propose will make it crystal clear that any participations sold after date of enactment of this act will be guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

It could be predicted, with assurance, that this clear-cut amendment will improve the marketability of participations to be sold and will reduce the cost of such financing relative to outright Treasury financing.

Mr. Chairman, the claim has been made that participations are in effect guaranteed by the United States, even though the FNMA prospectus states on the face thereof, "The participation certificates are not obligations of and are not guaranteed by the United States." This fact may be verified by reference to the copy of the last FNMA prospectus which I put in the Record of May 9, pages 10033–10036.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a completely germane amendment to the bill and does not propose to do what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] says it would do, if adopted.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the law is very plain, I believe, as to what shall be included in the public debt. It does not include this. This is an effort to change the provisions relating to what is included in the public debt.

As I understand it, the law is that certain obligations of the Government are not included and are not intended to be included. We may take, for instance, Federal Reserve notes that are obligations of the United States just as much so as a Government bond. The only difference is that they do not provide for an interest payment. They have $33 billion in Federal Reserve notes outstanding today. However, they are not included in the public debt. The same thing is true on bonds. The bonds that are not cashed, the U.S. Government bonds, Treasury bonds, that are not presented for payment and are paid at maturity, they are taken away from the public debt, because they are not interest-bearing obligations of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to change the law relating to the public debt in a bill that does not contain the subject matter now pending before the House.

Mr. Chairman, I insist that the point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keogh). The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, the language of the pending amendment would be germane to the pending bill and the Chair overrules the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat what I just said before in speaking on the point of order, that one of the most troublesome points occurring repeatedly in such a discussion as the committee accorded the small business participation bill and the overall Participation Sales Act was the matter of the guarantee attaching to participations sold by FNMA.

The claim was made at that time that participations are, in effect, guaranteed by the United States, even though the FNMA prospectus states on the face thereof that "the participation certificates are not obligations of and are not guaranteed by the United States."

This fact may be verified by reference to the copy of the last FNMA prospectus which I put into the Record on May the 9th.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I propose will make crystal clear that any participation sold after date of enactment of this act will be guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it can be predicted with assurance that this clear-cut amendment will improve the marketability of participations to be sold and will reduce the cost of such financing relative to outright Treasury financing.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me the code relating to the public debt limit. The code at chapter 12, section 75–7b provides that where an obligation is guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, it shall be a part of the public debt.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] provides these obligations are guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States—the exact language that is in the code.

Therefore, the amendment would provide that you would have to increase the national debt enough to provide for these obligations if they were sold.

Mr. Chairman, that is another way of defeating this legislation and rendering absolutely null and void the objectives and the intention of this legislation. I hope the amendment is defeated, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is not surprising that after all the charges of deception and concealment and sleight of hand and gimmickry, that we are getting these amendments that are coming from the Republican side of the aisle.

What they are seeking to do by this amendment is to prevent the sale of these instruments unless and until you increase the debt limit. Because, as must be very clear to anyone who knows anything about the subject matter, every obligation guaranteed by the U.S. Government is a part of the public debt. The law so requires.

When you reach the amount fixed as the limit of the public debt, you must stop selling Government obligations, direct or guaranteed.

The purpose of this amendment is that unless and until you do increase the amount of the debt limit, we will not be able to dispose of a single obligation or any interest in an obligation under the terms of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is just one more effort to gut the bill by indirection.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from New York, we are going to have to increase the debt ceiling anyway because it goes back to the permanent ceiling of about $285 billion.

Under any circumstances, this House is going to have to face up to that issue. Far from being concealment, this amendment would be revealing one of the objectives hidden in the bill. One of the points I said was properly made was that this was a sham presentation—as the bill is presently written. Because this is a method of trying to get out from under the debt ceiling as it relates to only a certain portion—although a substantial portion—of the Federal debt. This amendment is the honest way to approach it. This is not going to harm the bill one iota.

The Committee on Ways and Means is simply going to have to compute this additional amount in whatever recommendations we make for the debt ceiling—as I say, we will have to compute this additional amount. This is a more honest way to approach it and a direct way. I think it is a very appropriate amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I would merely add that the argument advanced by the gentleman from New York proves the point that was made throughout the debate yesterday that the effect of this bill will be to conceal the amount of obligations of the Federal Government. This is a borrowing proposition outside of the national debt, and the purpose of the amendment is to make a full disclosure to the American people of the fiscal condition of their Government.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

There are two ceilings imposed by law—one on the aggregate amount of the Federal debt—that is, that portion that is subject to this proposed amendment. The other is the ceiling on the interest charges on long-term bonds.

Now to be honest with the people, let us subject this new proposal to the provisions that this amendment would provide.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the objective of substituting private money for public money here. But let us do it forthrightly and honestly. We have an increased interest rate to bear on this. This is a liability and an obligation against the full faith and credit of the United States.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. If I understand correctly, the gentleman says that by writing this amendment into the bill, it will make it crystal clear that the amount of whatever is sold pursuant to this bill, when it becomes law, will become part of the public debt and within the statutory limitation, and unless and until that is increased, we cannot go beyond it by a sale of these obligations.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct. I also observe that the Ways and Means Committee will present to this House, or there will have to be presented, a proposed increase in the Federal debt. On June 30, I believe the date is, it will revert back to the permanent figure. So in our computations—and we are going to hold hearings—we would simply compute this additional amount in there.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. What happens in the meantime if we want to sell obligations pursuant to this bill when it becomes law that would be in excess of the debt limit prior to the time you bring in the new bill?

Mr. CURTIS. Let me say to my good friend, do not be so hasty. We have all seen demonstrated what happens in the House with a poorly considered bill. Take the extra 30 days. You will not sell anything in that time. Use the time to get your ducks in order. That is my response. Let us lay off the haste and get into the deliberative process. Then we will end up with much better legislation, and we will be a lot more honest with the people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MULTER and Mr. WIDNALL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 90, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONAS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On Page 7, immediately after line 6, insert:
>
> "(6) All of the funds received from the sale of beneficial interests or participations pursuant to this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States and shall not be used for operating expenses of the Government but shall be used to reduce the national debt."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I stated yesterday, during the general debate, that I favor the announced objective sought to be accomplished by this bill; namely, to transfer obligations from Government to private enterprise, to private investors.

I would even support a program to convert more Government-owned mortgages and debt instruments into the hands of the private investors of this country. No one could possibly be more in favor of doing that than I am.

My only objection to what this bill is intended to accomplish is that the proponents of the bill are proposing to use capital assets and convert them into cash, and use the cash to pay general operating expenses of the U.S. Government. That is what would follow if I had some stocks and bonds and, living beyond my means, spending more money than I earned in salary, I converted my stocks and bonds into cash and used the proceeds to help pay my household expenses at the end of the month.

That is not a sound way to operate a family. It is not a sound way to operate a business enterprise. It is not a sound way to operate a government, in my judgment.

The funds generated by this program should go to the Treasury and should not be used to defray general operating expenses of the Government. They should be used to liquidate the national debt, because when these participation certificates are sold we shall be liquidating assets of the Federal Government. The proceeds should be applied against the obligations of the Government.

I wish the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee would accept the amendment so that we can get along with the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Appropriations Committee can lay down any terms it desires concerning the sale of these participation certificates, and it would have to be approved by the Congress. It would come back to us.

If we were to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, we would effectively stop and block and defeat the bill.

What would that do? This includes college housing, too. It involves education. It includes housing of various types.

This is for the farmers. The only way the farmer can get help in many sections of our Nation is to get the help from the Farmers Home Administration. The bankers are no longer patient enough with the small farm loans. They can deal with 1 person or 1 corporation and make more money than from 1,000 farmers. Consequently, it is almost impossible for a small farmer to get a loan throughout this country.

This would effectively stop the Farmers Home Administration from making farm loans.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we have before us a proposition of whether we are willing to help the small towns. Some of them have practically dried up on the vine. Many of them are suffering because of a lack of proper facilities, including sanitation, sewer, water, and things like that. The only way that thousands of communities throughout this Nation can get loans for those purposes, to help on their health programs, is through the Farmers Home Administration. This amendment would effectively defeat the purpose of the bill.

Therefore, my friends, I hope that we will not vote for an amendment which would defeat the purpose of the bill.

The veterans of this country depend upon loans which are made. If this bill is stopped, it will restrict if not scuttle entirely many loans the veterans otherwise would get for the interest, welfare, and benefit of the veterans. This would be against the veterans, and it would be against the small businessman.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I recall so well recently two presidential campaigns in which the Democratic Party complained about the high interest rates of the Eisenhower administration, and I believe the gentleman from Texas was a part of those campaigns.

I have been reading over the Democratic platform. I notice the platform pledges itself to low interest rates.

I read another part of the platform, where it took credit for having stabilized the rates and said:

> Immediately, in 1961, the Federal Housing Agency interest rate was cut from 5¾ percent to 5½ percent. It is now down to 5¼ percent.

I understand that now it has gone back up to 5¾ percent.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas if this bill is a repudiation of the Democratic platform.

Mr. PATMAN. No, it is not. Unfortunately, the Federal Reserve seized the monetary power in this country and defied the President of the United States.

Mr. CEDERBERG. What jurisdiction does the Federal Reserve have over this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. They have complete jurisdiction over interest rates. They seized this power. This bill has nothing to do with interest rates.

Mr. CEDERBERG. It what?

Mr. PATMAN. This bill will have to follow the market on interest rates whether they are high or whether they are low. The passage of this bill does not indicate a Member has voted for high interest rates or for low interest rates. It does not affect interest rates at all. We have to pay the market rate.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The platform of the gentleman's party took credit for cutting interest rates for the Federal Housing Administration from 5¾ to 5½ percent and down to 5¼ percent. You want to take credit for getting it down to 5¼ percent, but you blame the Federal Reserve for getting it back to 5¾ percent. How do you handle that situation?

Mr. PATMAN. The Eisenhower administration gave the Federal Reserve that power.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am not talking about the Eisenhower administration. I am talking about the Johnson administration.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but let me finish my sentence.

Mr. CEDERBERG. No. I just want to know about that.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but the Eisenhower administration let the Federal Reserve have this seized power. It was the worst administration in the history of this Nation, and they permitted that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me say to the gentleman I have listened to him with interest. He would be a match for Cassius Clay because he can certainly roll with the punches and always get back to somebody else's problems. How did it happen we went from 5¼ percent to 5¾?

Mr. PATMAN. If you will do a little listening instead of talking, I will tell you.

Mr. CEDERBERG. This is the Democratic platform. I have listened to the gentleman for 14 years and I have not learned anything yet.

Mr. PATMAN. I am afraid you did not listen.

Mr. CEDERBERG. And I do not expect to get it in a few minutes, but I will try.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking, as he always does. He always does the talking.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I learned a little bit of this from the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Approach it with an open mind instead of an open mouth.

Mr. CEDERBERG. This is your platform.

Mr. PATMAN. If you want to know, I can tell you, if you will just listen.

Mr. CEDERBERG. All right. You tell me.

Mr. PATMAN. And think, too, along with it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. All right.

Mr. PATMAN. You see, the Eisenhower administration, for the first time in history, let the Federal Reserve be recognized as independent from the elected representatives of the people; independent of Congress; independent of the executive; independent of everybody; a fourth branch of Government.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I disagree.

Mr. PATMAN. They have seized that power, and they raised interest rates last December 37½ percent just because they did that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. All right. Now let me talk just a little bit. This administration has been in power for 6 years. You have twice as many Members as the Republicans do in the House. The same goes for the Senate. Why do you not do something about changing this Federal Reserve? You have had 6 years and you have not done it yet.

Mr. PATMAN. We have had 6 years of prosperity and growth, the longest period in all history.

Mr. CEDERBERG. But with high interest rates and high draft calls. You have had 6 years and you are chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. You handle the Federal Reserve. Why do you not change it?

Mr. PATMAN. You had 8 years of Eisenhower.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Then why do you not change it? You have the votes.

Mr. PATMAN. You had the Federal Reserve take charge of interest rates. You cannot change it now because it takes a majority of the Congress, both the House and the Senate.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You have a 2 to 1 advantage here.

Mr. PATMAN. Oftentimes a few fellows can stop things. In a democracy there are a lot of people who can say no and make it stick.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Who is saying no to you on this one?

Mr. PATMAN. Why, you are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, we are arriving at the conclusion of the debate on this very important matter. I think many of us are grateful for that. All things must conclude, including the considerations of the House of Representatives. I should like to point out what we have been attempting to do in this legislation is to bring some kind of reasonableness to the management of the debt of the United States. We are doing the thing which was not done by the administration when it was held by the Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, we are doing something that has been going on for the last 3 years—$3.3 billion of participation certificates have already been sold under this program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if things are in such dishevelment, if this is such an onerous program, why is not there an indictment brought against the $3.3 billion portfolio already sold?

Mr. Chairman, it ought to be clear, if this program is going to raise interest rates, why has there not been a demonstration that the $3.3 billion in participations already sold has had that effect. Where have the Republicans leveled against the existing program the accusation, "You raised the interest rates."

Mr. Chairman, who made that accusation? Nobody.

If there were other accusations saying that participations would have a contracting effect upon the programs which they are supposed to be serving, an indictment could be drawn and you could stab your finger, and say "That is where participation sales are delinquent."

Mr. Chairman, who made that accusation? Nobody.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what is going on. We have the administration, and, therefore, we have the responsibility.

In California, when I was in the legislature there, we had an argument like this that went on where the administration was trying to get a program and the opposition was fighting it on a political basis and using arguments against it for their election.

So I submitted to the statehouse members that I thought this was the situation like the West has always known, where the wagonmaster has to see the wagons over the pass and the Indians stay out in the boondocks and shoot at them. I said, "We certainly have to put up with a lot of arrows." One of my Republican friends got up and said, "The gentleman is probably correct," but I would say to him, "If we quit shooting the arrows, will you promise not to give us the lance?"

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have had a particular number of arrows that have been shot here on a political basis, but not one indictment has been made against this program that has $3.3 billion behind it that is authorized, whether we pass this bill or not, nor criticism leveled against the $1.9 billion authorized outside this bill for the next fiscal year. All we are asking you to do is to say that this is a good program and that it ought to be expanded.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. This program should be expanded to include the $2.8 billion.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. It seems to me based upon its past experience and upon its former performance, it is well established and it should have our support.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HANNA. Therefore, I believe we should go on and do what a responsible administration should do and bring debt management to a true flexibility in dealing with these matters as the market dictates.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will go forward and pass this bill.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The question was taken and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I dislike doing this, but I must demand tellers on this amendment.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MULTER and Mr. JONAS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I may make a unanimous consent request before trying to come to some agreement as to limiting time for debate, I would first ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open for amendment at any point and subject to points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this would not preclude the offering of an amendment to the second section of the bill we have been debating?

Mr. PATMAN. My request would apply to the remainder of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. We are about to pass on to the next section, section 3.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment to the second section of the bill and, therefore, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL: Page 4, line 9, strike the period and insert: ", and the trustor shall promptly pay such proceeds to the Secretary of the Treasury to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe the gentleman from New Jersey has two amendments and we have two. I understand that one of the amendments will be agreed to. I wonder if we could agree to have a 30-minute limitation on those amendments, on all amendments thereto, and on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that we have such a limitation.

Mr. WIDNALL. Ten minutes on each amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. Ten minutes on each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas restate his request?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on all the remaining amendments there be allowed 10 minutes for each, 5 minutes to those who are for the amendment and 5 minutes to those who are against the amendment, the maximum to be 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments and the bill be limited, that debate on each amendment be limited to 10 minutes, and that the debate on the bill and all amendments thereto conclude in 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose we make it 40 minutes. Would the gentleman be satisfied with that?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Texas asked that the bill be considered as read. I do not know whether that request was acted upon or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection was heard on that request.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Under the Rules of the House, would it then be possible to limit debate unless the bill has been considered as read?

The CHAIRMAN. Under a unanimous-consent agreement it would be possible, and the Chair understands that the gentleman from Texas is trying to get an unanimous-consent agreement.

The gentleman from New Jersey has been recognized for 5 minutes in support of his pending amendment.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, there is much confusion as to the use of proceeds which an agency receives from the sale of participations. This can be clarified by the amendment I proposed which directs the agency receiving the proceeds to promptly pay them into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

When the agency made the loans initially funds were drawn from the Treasury for that purpose and the agency became indebted to the Treasury in the amount of funds drawn. It seems to me that when the agency is paid back in funds by "sale" of the loans through the participation device, that it is only proper to extinguish the agency's liability to the Treasury on account of such loans by requiring the agency to pay its debt to the Treasury.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Earlier some mention was made about national debt to the effect that failure to pass this bill or the adoption of some of the amendments would require raising the debt ceiling. I have in my hand a clipping from the AP ticker that just came across. It reads as follows:

> The Treasury Department plans to ask Congress next week for another temporary boost in the debt ceiling.
>
> The request this year is expected to be in the neighborhood of $334 billion, an area which is almost certain to touch off renewed debate over rising debt, deficit financing and Federal spending.
>
> Unless Congress acts—it never has failed to act in the past—the debt ceiling will automatically drop on July 1, the beginning of the fiscal 1967, to its permanent $285 billion level.
>
> The present 1-year temporary ceiling is $328 billion. The Treasury feels it can manage the debt more efficiently if it has a little room between the actual debt and the ceiling.
>
> The request is expected to be transmitted to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee on Monday.

It is truly about time that we faced up to the true fiscal situation in this country and the fact that we are not keeping our house in order. As a result, the continued increased appropriations and increased new programs being enacted by the Congress, and the pressures which have been created, have caused the necessity for a program that involves higher interest rates. Unless Congress is willing to call a halt to this, we are faced with a very serious situation within the country.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this bill has been very interesting and stimulating, and at times there has been some humor, particularly when I heard, to my amazement, my good friend from New York refer to "fat cats", which I thought was rather a slurring reference to most of the big contributors to the Republican Party.

In relation to the pending amendment, this is in effect the same amendment as that which was offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and which was defeated only a few minutes ago.

This amendment would have a serious adverse effect in the field of education, in the field of conservation.

Oh, how I hear these gentlemen from the rural districts speak in favor of and vote for the amendment when the effect of it will be adverse to the people of their district. It will have an adverse effect upon the veterans, it will have a disastrous effect in the field of agriculture, and right across the whole expenditure field of our Government. So when one vote for this he is voting for an amendment that is going to have a far-reaching adverse effect upon both the rural and the urban activities and the life of our country.

So let us not have any deception about the effect of these high-sounding phrases that I have been hearing my Republican friends utter today and utter for the past 38 years.

I heard the arguments against social security, I heard them against minimum wage, I heard them against agriculture, and I heard them against all of the great bills of past years. There were arguments such as socialism, or States rights, and many other slogans.

They try to lick legislation by slogans. However, despite that, the only disturbing note is the fact that one of my dear friends on the Republican side—whose name I will not mention—injected into the debate the phrase "fat cats". That not only referred to those who live in his own district, but also the big contributors, as I have said, of past years and of the present years and future years of our Republican friends and the Republican Party.

I do not blame them for taking the contributions, but I do blame them for slurring them in the House of Representatives.

This bill is not a new proposition. This basic type of asset sales program was used during the administration of President Eisenhower, to the advantage of our country.

It has received support during the Eisenhower, the Kennedy, and the Johnson administrations. It expands congressional control through the pooling of asset sales.

As well said by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] "it will encourage the substitution of private credit for public credit in Federal lending programs."

Reference has been made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] to the fact that the Export-Import Bank since 1962 has made sales of $1.7 billion through participating sales of its loans.

The Federal National Mortgage Association, by reason of authority given by the Housing Act of 1964, sold about $1.6 billion of participating certificates in pools of home mortgages made by the FHA and the Veterans' Administration.

This bill simply extends the method.

We know that about $33 billion are now immobilized in our portfolio, and that 4 years ago it was about $25.1 billion.

As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], well said last Monday in a convincing speech:

> The primary reason for this growth in the portfolio is that the market for individual loans under Federal credit programs is limited. Often this has the effect of driving up the price—expressed in the yield that the Government must guarantee to private investors in order to interest them in direct purchases. Beyond that, we have found that the market often simply does not exist for much of the loan paper we hold.

Those are the words of our distinguished friend and legislator, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. I do not believe there is any sounder man on fiscal affairs in or out of the executive branch of Government than the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

So I urge the passage of the bill. I urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that all of us thoroughly enjoy the observations and comments of our distinguished Speaker any time he takes the well to discuss a pending amendment, legislation as a whole on even politics.

I believe it is proper to state, however, that he did not discuss the real merits of this particular amendment.

This amendment will provide for honesty—I emphasize honesty—in Federal budgeting. It will also provide for the proper control by our House committees of projects and programs over which they have jurisdiction. If we do not adopt this amendment, we will have difficulty in determining whether a budget is honest or inaccurate. Of course, if this amendment is not approved many of the committees of this House will lose proper control over the programs and projects coming before them for their observation and recommendation.

It is amazing to me that my Democratic friends across the aisle have almost to a man opposed amendments here on the floor of the House today that would give the small purchasers of Federal Government securities such as those proposed in this bill an opportunity to participate. The Members of the Democratic Party here today have vigorously opposed those amendments that would benefit small purchasers. They have helped, by their opposition, the big purchasers from the large metropolitan communities.

In addition, my Democratic friends have opposed a ceiling on interest rates. I was almost dumbfounded to note that they apparently favor a higher interest rate, contrary to their own Democratic platform of 1964.

And in addition they have fought hard and successfully to prevent competition in the marketplace in the sale of these participation certificates.

What is wrong with competition? Why can we not have open competitive bidding if these participation certificates are issued? Why should they go to one purchaser, obviously a large banker or combination of bankers? I do not understand the change of heart of my Democratic friends in the handling of this legislation and the problems involved.

Let me conclude with this observation. My good friend, the distinguished Speaker of the House, discussed past political proposals and political differences between Democrats and Republicans. I think it is appropriate to comment that in 1966 we will be in a turbulent political arena. We will be discussing some of the problems we are wrestling with here today. However, I think it is fair for us to point out to our good friends across the aisle right now that we have had higher debt as far as the Federal Government is concerned under this administration; we have had higher interest rates under this administration; we have had higher draft calls under President Johnson. Everything seems to be higher, including prices under this administration and this Democratic-dominated Congress. It is fair to point out, I think, that the Great Society is becoming the "High Society" and the American voters will take this hard fact into consideration in this campaign between now and November.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this particular amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes with 2½ minutes reserved to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not use the 5 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, reminded us of several facts that he considered are valid facts in connection with this bill that I do not consider are valid facts at all. The main point is that the majority party is trying to help certain groups in this country. We are trying to help the country by helping these groups. One such group is the small business people. This bill will help small business people. A vote against this bill will be a vote against the interests of small business in the United States. This bill is in the interests of small towns for facility loans, for water and sewage, and other similar purposes. A vote against this bill is a vote against helping these small towns. There is no other way to consider it. A vote against this bill is a vote against the veterans, because they are involved here, too. They would get tremendous benefits in the way of loans at low rates of interest if this bill is passed. A vote against this bill is a vote against college housing. It is a vote against loans for educational facilities. We think this bill is on the side of the poor people, the low-income groups, the middle-income groups, and in the interest of the country generally.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment which, as the Speaker stated, is another piece of the same amendment practically that was offered awhile ago by the gentleman from North Carolina and was defeated by what I consider to be a pretty sizable vote—I hope that this amendment is defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 305(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by deleting "by $450,000,000 on July 1, 1966,".

(b) Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by deleting "1968:" immediately preceding the first proviso and by substituting therefor "1965, and 1967 and 1968:".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 303(c) of title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out the first nine words in the second sentence and substituting therefor the following: "For the purpose of making payments into the fund established under section 305".

(b) Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is further amended by adding after section 304 the following new section:

"REVOLVING LOAN FUND

"SEC. 305. (a) There is hereby created within the Treasury a separate fund for higher education academic facilities loans (hereafter in this section called "the fund") which shall be available to the Commissioner without fiscal year limitation as a revolving fund for the purposes of this title. The total of any loans made from the fund in any fiscal year shall not exceed limitations specified in appropriation Acts.

"(b)(1) The Commissioner is authorized to transfer to the fund available appropriations provided under section 303(c) to provide capital for the fund. All amounts received by the Commissioner as interest payments or repayments of principal on loans, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations in connection with this title, including any moneys derived directly or indirectly from the sale of assets, or beneficial interests or participations in assets, of the fund, shall be deposited in the fund.

"(2) All loans, expenses, and payments pursuant to operations of the Commissioner under this title shall be paid from the fund, including (but not limited to) expenses and payments of the Commissioner in connection with sale, under section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, of participations in obligations acquired under this title. From time to time, and at least at the close of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay from the fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts interest on the cumulative amount of appropriations paid out for loans under this title or available as capital to the fund, less the average undisbursed cash balance in the fund during the year. The rate of such interest shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield during the month preceding each fiscal year on outstanding Treasury obligations of maturity comparable to the average maturity of loans made from the fund. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest. If at any time the Commissioner determines that moneys in the fund exceed the present and any reasonably prospective future requirements of the fund, such excess may be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury."

SEC. 5. Section 338(c) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking in the second sentence "and (8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(8) section 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1006a); (9) section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1011); and (10)"; and by inserting in the fifth sentence after "title," the following: "section 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, and section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended,".

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of section 1820(e) of title 38, United States Code, respecting the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. PATMAN (during reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point where we are dispensing with the reading thereof, and also subject to any point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point and subject to any point of order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 8, following the period on line 4, add the following:
>
> "A business-type budget for the fund shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 847–849) for wholly owned Government corporations."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides for the annual submission to Congress of a business-type budget with respect to the academic facilities revolving loan fund.

The business-type budget is presently utilized with respect to other revolving funds and to wholly owned Government corporations. While I think we could reasonably expect that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would voluntarily submit business-type budgets with respect to this revolving fund, we should make certain that such a practice will be followed. The amendment will do just that.

I am inclined to believe that the manager of the bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] would be agreeable to accepting this amendment. I say that because he offered and the House approved an identical amendment to the Small Business Administration bill, S. 2729, on March 31 when we were considering the establishment of two revolving funds for that agency.

At that time, the distinguished gentleman said:

> Both of these amendments are minor and technical in nature and in no way change the intent or effect of the bill. The amendments have been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, as well as the minority leadership of the Banking and Currency Committee.
>
> The first portion of the amendments would merely make it clear that budget requirements and projections would still be handled through the Bureau of the Budget and would not come directly from SBA without consulting the Bureau of the Budget.
>
> The second portion of the amendments would put SBA under the Government-owned Corporation Act so that the Appropriations Committee would still be able to review the funding of the agency every year.
>
> Mr. Chairman, these amendments were carefully drawn with the support and help of the minority, and the Members on both sides agree to it. I do not believe there is any objection to it. I hope that it is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, this is a desirable amendment and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the debate on this bill, H.R. 14544, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] said that I had voted in 1964 for a proposal that was identical to this bill. Of course, the gentleman's statement was not correct. I want to set the record straight.

On August 19, 1964, the House approved by a vote of 310 yeas to 70 nays an omnibus housing bill, S. 3049. I voted to approve the conference report but I did not vote to approve anything identical to the provisions of this bill.

After the House had acted on the omnibus housing bill in 1964, the Senate added an amendment which would have permitted the Federal National Mortgage Association to sell beneficial interests or participations in respect to mortgages or interests therein held by Government agencies. The House conferees agreed to that Senate amendment with a House amendment which restricted the participation sales to first mortgages held by the Government.

The statement of the House managers with respect to the conference report—House Report No. 1828—reflects the following:

> The Senate bill contained a provision not in the House amendment authorizing FNMA to sell beneficial interests or participations in respect to mortgages or interests therein held by Government agencies. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision with an amendment restricting its application to first mortgages held by the Government.

Sale of participations which was authorized by the housing bill of 1964 was quite different from the provisions of H.R. 14544, which are not restricted to first mortgage notes but which do permit budget expenditures of very substantial amounts to cover insufficiencies in interest and principal that will occur as a result of enactment of H.R. 14544.

The matter of participation sales was not considered by the House except for adoption of the conference report on the housing bill of 1964. When the bill went to conference, there were 66 items in disagreement among the plethora of provisions in the bill. Naturally, there were provisions in the final version of S. 3049 over which Members would have some reservation but there were also many desirable provisions which overshadowed the undesirable ones.

I make no apology for having voted for the conference report in 1964. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] were sponsoring a sales participation bill today that permitted the pooling only of first mortgages in participation sales certificates, I do not think he would have encountered the opposition that has been expressed these last 3 days to H.R. 14544.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the gentleman from Ohio has a good amendment. It strengthens the language contained in the bill. Therefore, we are very glad to accept it, sir.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Patman: On page 9, line 25, insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 6."

On page 10, insert immediately after line 3:

"(b) After June 30, 1966, no department or agency listed in section 302(c)(2) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act may sell any obligation held by it except as provided in section 302(c) of that Act, or as approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, except that this prohibition shall not apply to secondary market operations carried on by the Federal National Mortgage Association."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in substance, the proposed amendment provides that after June 20, 1966, all sales of obligations by Federal departments and agencies as listed in section 302(c) (2), as just amended by the House, may make sales of obligations only by going the FNMA route. This amendment, in substance, is parallel to the amendment offered requiring that participation sales be made through FNMA. However, it should be noted that some of the agencies affected, such as the Small Business Administration, have under existing statutory authority the authority to make direct sales of obligations without establishing participation pools. I do not deem it advisable that this authority should be continued without the establishment of specific controls. In the first place, the amendment I have offered would prohibit the direct sale of assets by the SBA without the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. I deem it essential that the Secretary of the Treasury have direct responsibility, being the chief fiscal officer of the United States, to approve and coordinate any direct sales by any department or agency having existing authority to make such sales. However, the primary thrust of the proposed amendment is to require that all affected sales of obligations would be made through the establishment of participation pools administered by FNMA and FNMA alone.

It is my view that if the participation sales program is to work, it will work best within a legislative framework providing for strict supervision and strict controls.

Believing that the amendment I have proposed will accomplish these ends; I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I hope that the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is on the floor at the present time because I listened with great interest to his talk the other day when he spoke very forcefully against limiting direct sales by the Government agencies.

This proposal that has been offered by the chairman of our committee would absolutely prohibit direct sales unless approval is obtained from the Treasury of the United States. The agency itself would lose control of using this device for the disposition of assets.

I would ask the chairman, was this amendment cleared with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, it is not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. But I will state to the gentleman, and I know about the gentleman's strong beliefs on these matters, I have worked with him for years. But the limitation on the Secretary of the Treasury and having him approve of the making of direct sales is for the purpose of coordination only.

We have had all kinds of testimony—testimony of different agencies selling at the same time in competition and thus destroying the market and making us pay higher rates of interest. So in the interest of orderly procedure and coordination, we are offering this amendment so as to compel all of them to clear through the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is the only one that they should have to clear through. The Secretary of the Treasury can give the authority to do this in the public interest.

I hope the gentleman will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. WIDNALL. The budget this year provides for $500 million of direct sales by the agencies. This would violate the budget and it would require approval by the Treasury before any of these sales could be made.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows and I know that the Secretary of the Treasury is going to approve any sale that the Director of the Budget, who is a part of the office administered by the Secretary of the Treasury, approves.

I believe this would be a safe procedure and I hope the gentleman will see our viewpoint and support it.

Mr. WIDNALL. May I just ask this question. Why is it needed?

Mr. PATMAN. It is needed to keep from having confusion with all of these different agencies going into the market at the same time without any coordination and thereby destroying the market and making us all pay higher interest rates.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to point out that this is just another example of what should have been done in the committee, if there had been proper committee consideration in full hearings and if the committee had been really able to work its will.

I regret very much today that it has been necessary on the floor of the House to spend so much time on these amendments to try to improve a bill which the members of the committee had no opportunity to study properly in committee.

Mr. Chairman, I feel this is a good amendment and it should be adopted.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to recite a little history in this field of the sale of Government-held mortgages and credit instruments.

It is true that this matter of converting these instruments into cash was started during the Eisenhower administration. I would take issue, however, with the Speaker when he states that the concept of borrowing money through the sale of participation certificates was engaged in during that period, because it certainly was not—and they cannot point to a single instance of it. There is a big distinction between outright sale of obligations and borrowing on participation certificates.

Back in 1963, when the debt ceiling legislation was before the Committee on Ways and Means, we on the minority urged and encouraged the administration to sell some of the debt instruments and credit instruments held by the Government, in order to have the cash and thus not have to borrow as much for purposes of the public debt.

At that time we suggested that not enough effort was being made to make such sales.

Let me first say that what we were talking about was actual sales—the transfer of title. The program that is proposed here today has nothing whatever to do with sales. It is simply another method of borrowing money, and all you have to do is look at one of these certificates of participation and you will see that it is a promissory note by the U.S. Government, due at the date in the future, with an interest rate.

Now, that is not a sale.

What we suggested at that time was that a greater effort should be made for an actual sale, disposition, and conversion to cash of these assets that were held by the Government.

It is interesting to note that at that time the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Gordon, supplied some information to the Ways and Means Committee about some of the dangers that were involved in moving too fast in this area. I am going to put his full explanation and statement on the sales and salability of financial assets of the Federal Government that was presented to the committee at that time into the RECORD when we get into the House. I will ask to include it in my remarks, because I think it is pertinent and I think it is interesting.

But let me read a couple of paragraphs from this letter. First, Mr. Gordon said:

> However, large sales of specialized assets (that is, mortgages) can absorb funds and raise interest rates in a particular market. The housing market is particularly sensitive to changes in interest rates and the availability of funds. Federal assets sales must be carefully planned to avoid depressing mortgage prices and contributing to an undesirable reduction in housing construction.

And yet you are planning here an almost indiscriminate borrowing on the basis of these participation certificates. I caution you against an indiscriminate use even of the borrowing process in this instance. I think it is essential that direct sales be coordinated, and I approve that amendment, as I understand it, and the purpose of the amendment, offered by the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

But let me go further with another caution of Mr. Gordon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, back in 1963. He said:

> Attempting to sell too large a volume of assets too quickly would depress the price of the assets; in consequence, the Government would suffer capital loses which could have been avoided by a more careful paced sales program.

He said also:

> In some cases, that is, college housing loans, a careful program of Government sales can build up private investor interest

> in particular types of obligations and lead in future years to a reduced need for Government direct loans.

But listen to this:

> However, a crash program of sales at heavy discounts, might simply postpone the day when the private market would be willing to absorb these loans at reasonable prices, and might also make it more difficult for colleges and universities currently to float dormitory loans in the private market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this, but I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin will be recognized for 3 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What is proposed here by this participation gimmick is the wholesale putting on the market of certificates and borrowings and promissory notes. By passing this legislation you are flying in the face of these warnings given to us by the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Gordon.

Next Monday, we will have before us in the Ways and Means Committee, and there will be before the Congress very shortly, legislation to increase the debt ceiling. That ceiling today is at $285 billion as a permanent ceiling and $328 billion as a temporary ceiling. We had notice on the wire today that the Secretary of the Treasury will ask that that ceiling be raised to $334 billion.

Let us suggest this to you: By the passage of this bill you will make the debt ceiling a completely meaningless thing.

This bill provides authority to go out and borrow money by the billions, because you have talked about our $30 billion of assets that could be put into pools to "sell"—I put that in quotes—to borrow money again. I assume we will be borrowing money in keeping with the total amount of the assets put into the pool.

If we pass this bill, we make the debt ceiling meaningless. If we do that, let me suggest to the Members that it will come with very ill grace to those of us on this side when they express concern about the need to increase this debt ceiling and ask our help.

Why should we be of any help in increasing a debt ceiling that is made meaningless by the action which may be taken today?

I insert here the statement of Budget Director Gordon referred to above:

Statement on Sales and Salability of Financial Assets of Federal Government

(Prepared at request of the chairman of House Committee on Ways and Means)

On June 30, 1963, the Federal Government will hold an estimated $30 billion in direct loans, mortgages, and other financial assets. In most cases the interest rates or other characteristics of these loans make them unsuitable for sale to private lenders. Indeed, had private credit been available to the borrowers on terms as attractive as those offered under the various Government lending programs, in almost every case the loans would not have been made by the Federal Government.

Nevertheless, some portions of this portfolio are appropriate candidates for a carefully planned program of sales. Substantial sales of assets are, indeed, provided for in the President's 1964 budget—$926 million in fiscal 1963 and $1,846 million in fiscal 1964. Table I lists these sales by type of asset. In addition, the 1964 budget reflects proposals for—

(*a*) Administrative action to obtain federally insured private financing estimated at $280 million on resales of acquired properties by the Federal Housing Administration, thus avoiding corresponding budget expenditures; and

(*b*) Legislation to permit substitution of federally insured loans for a large part of the direct Federal loans now made for rural housing by the Farmers Home Administration; if authorized by the Congress, this insurance program will permit a reduction of about $80 million in direct Federal outlays in fiscal 1964 relative to 1963.

Table II classifies the various loans and mortgages held by the Federal Government into a number of categories, on the basis of the factors affecting their salability, and provides brief descriptions of the relevant characteristics of the loans. For the reasons noted in the table, and discussed further below, the loans and mortgages in the first four categories of table II, totaling $22.6 billion, are generally not appropriate for sale. The remaining major portfolios—totaling some $7.3 billion, contain many loans or mortgages which do lend themselves to a planned program of disposal, a program which is now being carried out. As the table indicates, however, these portfolios also contain a large volume of loans which are not suitable for sale, or which could be sold only at large discounts. There are valid reasons to pursue a planned program of asset sales— substituting, where appropriate, private for public credit. There are equally compelling reasons to avoid a crash effort to unload Government-held securities on the market.

1. Funds acquired through sales of federally held credit instruments reduce the amount of Treasury securities which would otherwise have to be issued. Hence the overall impact of such sales is to a large extent offset. However, large sales of specialized assets—e.g., mortgages—can absorb funds and raise interest rates in a particular market. The housing market is particularly sensitive to changes in interest rates and the availability of funds. Federal asset sales must be carefully planned to avoid depressing mortgage prices and contributing to an undesirable reduction in housing construction.

2. Attempting to sell too large a volume of assets too quickly would depress the price of the assets; in consequence, the Government would suffer capital losses which could have been avoided by a more carefully paced sales program.

3. Sound policy requires that the prices at which comparable mortgages are offered for sale by different Government agencies be substantially the same. The Government cannot be in the position of having one agency undercutting the prices of another. The schedule of sale prices established by the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) for its secondary market (trust fund) operations is used as the basis for sales prices on other Government mortgages. This schedule reflects the range of current market prices. "Cut-rate" sales of Government mortgages below these prices would violate the rule of "similar prices for similar assets" and tend to depress mortgage prices in general.

4. In some cases—e.g., college housing loans—a careful program of Government sales can build up private investor interest in the particular types of obligations, and lead, in future years, to a reduced need for Government direct loans. However, a crash program of sales, at heavy discounts, might simply postpone the day when the private market would be willing to absorb these loans at reasonable prices, and might also make it more difficult for colleges and universities currently to float dormitory loans in the private market.

The asset sales program for the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 takes these various considerations into account. If the demand for loans and mortgages is larger than expected when the budget was formulated, additional sales will be possible on the same price and yield basis as previously assumed. In recent weeks there have been some indications of improvement in the mortgage market; if this improvement persists, fiscal 1963 sales of financial assets will probably exceed the estimates in the budget submitted last January.

MAJOR CATEGORIES OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSETS

The various major types of Federal financial assets are listed with brief comments in table II. The following brief discussion is based on that table.

1. *Some classes of financial assets cannot or should not be sold ($10.9 billion).*—A large volume of Government financial assets represent loans whose very nature makes them largely unsuitable for sale to private lenders. Some loans in this category are repayable in "soft" foreign currencies, some bear little or no interest, some are owed by countries with current financial problems, etc. The marginal comments in the table indicate the particular characteristics which would prevent the sale of such assets in the private market.

2. *In some programs legislation would be needed to allow sales, to allow sales below par, or to provide the guarantees necessary to make sales feasible ($7 billion).*—In some cases present law does not allow the sale of loans, e.g., rural electrification loans, and rural housing mortgages held by the Farmers' Home Administration. In other cases, current legislation does not permit sales below par, and the loans held bear interest rates such that below-par prices would be necessary for sale, e.g., most of the direct mortgage loans held by the Veterans' Administration. In still other cases, legislation would be required to enable the Government to insure or guarantee the loans; without such insurance the loans probably would not be attractive to private lenders, e.g., ship construction loans of the Maritime Administration. Even if appropriate legislation were passed, including authority to provide insurance or guarantees, most loans in this category are of such quality or carry such interest rates as to require large discounts. However, some sales might be possible at reasonable discounts.

3. *Some classes of assets, otherwise salable, carry low interest rates or are not of investment quality. Sizable discounts below par would be required ($3.1 billion).*—The fact that an asset must be sold at a discount is not, in itself, a sufficient reason to preclude its sale. Where, for purposes of public policy, loans have been made by the Federal Government at interest rates and terms substantially more favorable than those available in the private market, a large discount would have to be accepted in order to dispose of the assets. In many cases, sales of assets to the private sector can contribute to the development of private interest in unfamiliar types of credit instruments, leading to the eventual establishment of reasonable private rates and terms. In such cases, it might be appropriate to accept a substantial discount on the initial offerings, as the price of creating a new market for the particular credit instruments involved. Further, the existence of a discount which simply reflects the fact that the level of interest rates has risen since the loan was acquired should be no bar to the sale of the assets involved. However, when the discount reflects an important difference between the market and

the Government in the evaluation of risk qualities, as often happens, there is reason to avoid liquidating such assets. The public's interest is better served by concentrating an asset sales program in those portfolios whose assets are familiar and desirable to private lending institutions. In this way, the prices received by the Government for a given volume of asset sales are likely to be maximized.

4. *In one case, sales of certificates against a pool of assets are a continuing practice, but an increase in sales would involve significant interest costs to the Government ($1.5 billion)*.—Loans against crops are a major instrument of the Commodity Credit Corporation's price support program. Certificates of interest in a pool of these loans are sold to individual banks at interest rates (currently 3 percent) slightly higher than the Treasury bill rate. The $1,471 million in table II for this category represents the amount of CCC loans against which, it is estimated, there will be no certificates outstanding on June 30, 1963. It would be possible to sell certificates against these remaining loans by offering a higher interest rate. Since the bulk of these certificates are redeemable on demand by the banks, it would also be necessary to raise the interest rate on $1 billion of certificates outstanding. The additional one-half of 1 percent interest which would probably be required to sell the additional certificates equal to most of the $1,471 million of loans carried by CCC would cost the Government an extra $12 million per year.

5. *In the case of the Export-Import Bank ($3.5 billion) sale of participations in a pool of loans is planned.*—The Export-Import Bank is assembling a pool of loans against which participations will be sold to private lenders. A pool of adequate size with interest rates, maturities, and capital repayment schedules consistent with the terms of the participation agreement must be assembled. To assure that the Government obtains appropriate terms, careful preplanning and surveying of the private credit market is necessary. In order to make the sale desirable from the Government's point of view, the size of the offering should be substantial.

Of the $3.5 billion of loans which the Export-Import Bank is estimated to hold as of June 30, 1963, a substantial volume is not suitable for inclusion in a pool because of low interest rates, or unsuitable capital repayment schedules. Further, the capacity of the private capital market to absorb this particular type of credit must be considered in determining the magnitude of any sales program.

6. *Some other classes of assets contain significant amounts of readily salable paper ($3.8 billion)*.—The portfolios in this category contain assets which are most suitable for sales. At present mortgage prices, a large proportion of these assets would be priced at a discount. Moreover, a substantial increase in mortgage sales beyond the amounts now contemplated (see table I) would almost certainly require that prices be lowered. The amount of sales which will be possible without a reduction in prices and a depressing effect on the housing credit market will depend upon conditions in the money markets generally and the mortgage market in particular. In addition, further evaluation of individual mortgages by quality, geographic location, etc., will be necessary to determine how many can, in fact, be sold at or near the prevailing market prices for new mortgages.

The college housing loans to public institutions held by the Community Facilities Administration represent a wide range of quality and interest rates. We plan to sell $50 million of these loans and we expect they can be disposed of in the near future at advantageous terms. We are currently exploring various possible methods to increase the salability of these loans. A hurried disposal program, however, would almost surely prevent the Government from obtaining the best terms and prejudice the chances for the best development of this prospective market, as well as disrupting the modest continuing private market for housing bonds of public universities and colleges.

TABLE I.—*Sale of financial assets in fiscal years 1963 and 1964 estimated in 1964 budget*

[In millions of dollars]

Agency and program	Sales in fiscal 1963 [1]	Sales in fiscal 1964 [1]
Department of Agriculture: Commodity Credit Corporation	[2] 639	[2] 825
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Community Facilities Administration, college housing loans to public institutions		50
Federal National Mortgage Association:		
Special assistance functions	50	199
Management and liquidating functions	6	
Federal Housing Administration		60
Veterans' Administration:		
Direct loan program	18	18
Loan guarantee program (vendee loans)	150	147
Export-Import Bank of Washington	60	540
Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation loans	3	
Small Business Administration		7
Total	926	1,846

[1] Sales estimates exclude (*a*) amortization, (*b*) prepayments, (*c*) sales made as part of the process of insuring loans, and (*d*) sales to FNMA.

[2] Excess of certificates issued (sales) over redemption of certificates issued during the year (excluding redemption of prior-year certificates).

TABLE II.—*Sales and salability of financial assets*

[In millions of dollars]

Agency and program	Outstanding direct loans, June 30, 1963 (estimated in 1964 budget)	Remarks on salability
1. Some classes of financial assets cannot or should not be sold:		
Department of Defense: Military assistance credits	198	These instruments are nonnegotiable and bear interest rates ranging from 0 to 3½ percent.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Defense education loans.	294	Federal contributions repayable only after 1969 (later, under proposed legislation). Repayable portion of contribution cannot be determined in advance. If student borrower becomes teacher, a portion of capital and interest repayments are "forgiven."
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation loans	74	Most loans are noninterest bearing.
Department of State: Loans to United Nations	141	1948 headquarters loan is noninterest bearing. Total original 1962 bond issue not yet fully sold making U.S. sale inappropriate. Repayment to United States to be in form of reductions in future U.S. contributions to U.N.
Agency for International Development loans	6,202	About ⅓ of this total is repayable in dollars, of which about half is owed by European countries—mainly 2½ percent, 35-year loans. Other loans (1) are repayable in local currencies; (2) have low interest rates (e.g., ¾ percent) and/or (3) are owed by countries with current financial problems. Where debtor's balance-of-payments permits, Treasury is pressing for prepayment and sales might adversely affect efforts to close gap in balance of payments.
Treasury Department:		
Loan to United Kingdom	3,205	Sale would require modification of loan agreement. Interest rate only 2 percent.
Defense production loans	118	(Actual balance now $55,000,000 due to a prepayment.) Remainder not salable due to default, interest payment deferment, or present efforts to refinance privately.
Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Community Facilities Administration: Miscellaneous programs.	121	Consists mainly of long-term low-interest-rate loans, interest-free advances, and liquidating programs. No reasonable prospects for sale even at substantial discounts.
Federal Housing Administration: Assigned mortgages and defaulted home improvement notes.	300	Mortgage and note payments already in arrears; many have relatively low interest rates
Urban Renewal Administration	153	Bulk of loans made only when local questions preclude private bond counsel from approving loans for private investment, hence not salable.
Public Housing Administration	91	Short-term notes are initially too small for economical private financing; long-term bond sales subject to difficult administrative or legal problems.
Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation loans.	35	Mainly conventional home mortgages acquired in settlement of loans to associations: most are now subject to legal questions, but are ultimately salable in future years.
Subtotal	10,932	

TABLE II.—*Sales and salability of financial assets*—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Agency and program	Outstanding direct loans, June 30, 1963 (estimated in 1964 budget)	Remarks on salability
2. In some programs legislation would be needed to allow sales, to allow sales below par, or to provide the guarantees necessary to make sales feasible:		
Department of Agriculture:		
Rural Electrification Administration	3,720	Legisla rteionquired for sale; very large discounts required due to 2-percent interest raet.
Farmers Home Administration	1,572	Legislation required for most assets to allow sale and to permit guarantees; large discounts likely on major portions.
Department of Commerce:		
Area Redevelopment Administration	29	Legislation required, probably including a guarantee of commercial and industrial loans against default; large discounts likely due to inte.est rates and residual risks.
Maritime Administration	110	Legislation required for a guarantee against default; large discount likely due to interest rate (3½ percent).
Treasury Department:		
Loans to District of Columbia	122	Legislation required for sale; discount not likely due to Federal tax exemption, but sale of assets carrying tax exemption would involve some cost to Treasury.
Veterans' Administration: District loan program	1,475	Legislation required for sales below par. Over half of portfolio at 4¾ percent or less, and most loans are in rural areas. This substantial discounts would be involved.
Subtotal	7,028	
3. Some classes of assets, otherwise salable, carry low interest rates or are not of investment quality. Sizable discounts below par would be required:		
General Services Administration:		
Sales credit	128	Much of portfolio would require large discounts because of below-market interest rates.
Public power bonds	61	Unsecured revenue bonds, not backed by credit of the States involved. Would require very large discount due mainly to 2½-percent interest rate.
Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Federal National Mortgage Association:		
Management and liquidating functions	1,275	Discounts would range from 8 to 12 percent; larger on those ($153,000,000) uninsured. Interest rates from 4 to 4½ percent. Also these are old relatively small mortgages and therefore less attractive to private lenders.
Community Facilities Administration:		
College housing loans to private institutions	785	Fully taxable; substantial discount required. Interest rates from 2¾ to 3½ percent.
Small Business Administration	894	SBA, in making loans, first attempts to secure private participation. Only a minor portion now in SBA portfolio are salable at par without extensive guarantee.
Subtotal	3,143	
4. In one case, sales of certificates against a pool of assets are a continuing practice, but an increase in sales would involve significant interest costs to the Government:		
Department of Agriculture: Commodity Credit Corporation	1,471	Present interest rate on certificates is 3 percent; to attain marked increase in private financing would entail higher rate for all certificates and put additional pressure on 1964 budget.
Subtotal	1,471	
5. In one case, sale of participations in a pool of Government loans is being arranged:		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	3,466	Sale of participations in a $500,000,000 privately acceptable pool now planned. Sales of individual loans of $60,000,000 estimated for 1963 and $40,000,000 for 1964. Substantial volume of loans unsuitable for inclusion in pool due to interest rates or repayment schedules. Planned volume of participation sales must take into account capacity of market to absorb this type of credit.
Subtotal	3,466	
6. Some other classes of assets contain significant amounts of salable paper:		
Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Community Facilities Administration:		
College housing loaus to public institutions	782	Bulk of sales would require large discounts; however, some can and will be sold at or above par.
Public facility loans	134	Some are salable at par; most would require discounts.
Federal National Mortgage Association: Special assistance functions.	2,102	Some can and will be sold at or above par; most would require varying discounts because of submarket interest rates, location and/or quality. Administrative and market problems also hamper rapid sales.
Federal Housing Administration: Excluding assigned mortgages and defaulted home improvement notes.	350	Sizable amount salable at par or small discounts in 1964; administrative limitations prevent large 1963 expansion.
Veterans' Administration: Loan guarantee program (vendee loans).	461	Additional sales possible only with reduction in prices (increased discounts) or improvement of market in areas where bulk of portfolio concentrated.
Subtotal	3,829	
Total	29,869	
Very small programs	113	
Grand total	29,982	

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 10, line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 7. Paragraph (7) of section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended to read:

"'(7) to invest its funds (A) in loans exclusively to members; (B) in obligations of the United States of America, or securities fully guaranteed as to principal and interest thereby; (C) in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Director, in loans to other credit unions in the total amount not exceeding 25 per centum of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus; (D) in shares or accounts of savings and loan associations, the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; (E) in obligations issued by banks for cooperatives, Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal home loan banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or any corporation designated in section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act as a wholly owned Government corporation; or in obligations, participations, or other instruments of or issued by, or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the Federal National Mortgage Association; or (F) in participation certificates evidencing beneficial interests in obligations, or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom, which obligations have been subjected by one or more Government agencies to a trust or trusts for which any executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States (or the head thereof) has been named to act as trustee;'

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with heads of agencies of the

United States carrying on direct loan programs, shall conduct a study, in such manner as he shall determine, on the feasibility, advantages, and disadvantages of direct loan programs compared to guaranteed or insured loan programs and shall report his findings together with specific legislative proposals to the Congress not later than six months after the effective date of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary for the purpose of this section."

Mr. PATMAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, since the amendment is well understood by both sides, that we dispense with further reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as read and printed in the Record.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Patman: On page 11, immediately after line 16, add the following new section:

"Sec. 9. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized during the fiscal year 1966 to sell—

"(1) additional participations in the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust, and

"(2) participations in a trust to be established by the Small Business Administration, each without regard to the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would accomplish two things. In the first instance, it is essential in that it would permit FNMA, during the current fiscal year, to continue its operations in selling additional participations in the Government mortgage liquidation trust. In other words, this amendment would merely preserve the existing authority of FNMA to carry on its activities through the end of the fiscal year.

In addition to the foregoing, this amendment would permit FNMA, during the current fiscal year, that is only up to and including June 30, 1966, to sell participations in a trust to be established by the Small Business Administration. Under existing statutory authority, the Small Business Administration has the authority to make direct sales of its obligations. In fact, not very long ago, the Small Business Administration sold $110 million of such assets. However, that sale was not made from a participation pool administered by FNMA. As a consequence of which, the yields granted by the sale, that is the effective rate of return, were, in my view, excessive. This amendment is offered to cure that problem and still permit the Small Business Administration to move approximately $350 million worth of its assets through participations to be sold by FNMA.

This legislation is needed if the small businessmen of the country are to have available to them urgently needed capital resources. This amendment would, in substance, accomplish the purposes of a bill that has already passed the Senate and which was favorably reported to the House April 25, 1966. I refer to S. 2499, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the issuance and sale of participation interests in pools of loans held by SBA.

I believe that the proposed amendment here offered to H.R. 14544 will best and most efficiently accomplish that purpose, and I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 8 of the bill, lines 5, 6, and 7 through the word "fund." The point is based upon my feeling that the language violates rule XXI, clause 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The appropriations referred to are future appropriations authorized and to be made for the specific purpose of making the transfers here authorized. This is not a case of changing the object of past appropriations, and the point of order should be overruled.

That refers to section 303(c), which I have before me now. It provides:

> For the purpose of making payments into the fund established under section 305, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated * * *.

It is not making the appropriation; it is authorizing the appropriation.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keogh). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas] makes a point of order to the language appearing on page 8, lines 5 through 7, to the end of the sentence on that line, on the ground that it is in violation of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The Chair has examined the language and has listened attentively to the gentleman from Texas, but is of the opinion that since this language directs a transfer of available appropriations it is in fact in violation of rule XXI; and therefore sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Patman: On page 8, strike out lines 5 through 14, and insert the following:

"(b)(1) The Commissioner, when authorized by an appropriation Act, may transfer to the fund available appropriations provided under section 303(c) to provide capital for the fund. All amounts received by the Commissioner as interest payments or repayments of principal on loans, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations in connection with this title, including any moneys derived directly or indirectly from the sale of assets, or beneficial interests or participations in assets, of the fund, shall be deposited in the fund."

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have reluctantly decided to oppose this measure—reluctantly because I recognize the great need for funds for the Small Business Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and other important agencies. I hope and trust that the funds necessary for these agencies to continue their vital work will be provided by other means, and I will certainly support any reasonable and legitimate method of providing such funds.

I am opposing the Participation Sales Act of 1966 even though I voted to report it from the Banking and Currency Committee. I cast that vote in the mistaken belief that the issues raised by this legislation had been adequately considered in previous years and with respect to other participation sales programs, and that, therefore, full hearings were not needed. I now find that is not really the case and that there are many complex problems arising out of H.R. 14544 that should have been subject to full consideration in committee. Under these circumstances, I believe the committee was at fault in not hearing organizations and individuals who would like to have been heard and who should have been heard—whether in opposition to this bill or in favor of some modification of it.

We are living in a time of very tight money and very high interest rates. The burden of this credit shortage is at present distributed very unequally. Money has been siphoned out of the savings banks, the savings and loan associations, and the small commercial banks—away from the home buyer, the small borrower, and the small businessman—and into certificates of deposit which are issued at interest rates of 5½ percent and even higher by the large commercial banks for industrial credit.

The result has been disastrous for the building industry.

The small individual and business borrower cannot find money at his bank. The hardship on the average citizen is great, and it is becoming a more intolerable burden every day.

The home buyer cannot obtain a mortgage. In instance after instance, families are unable to afford to buy their dream house.

The full burden of high interest rates and tight credit is being borne by the little man, the average citizen, and the thrift institutions I mentioned earlier. Savings and loan associations are so tightly squeezed that most cannot make future commitments at all and many may have difficulty meeting withdrawals.

To authorize $47 billion of participation certificates at this time, adding further pressures on an already strained credit supply, and without raising the ceiling on the denominations of issue in order to protect the thrift institutions, may well be the straw that breaks the camel's back. The National Association of Home Builders has opposed this legislation on these grounds and with good reason.

I fear, Mr. Chairman, that passage of this bill without any protection for the thrift institutions and the people they serve will drain off what little money is left in their accounts. The result may even be the complete failure of some of these institutions.

And I hope our colleagues will also keep in mind that interest rates on participation certificates could well move up in the coming months from a high of 5½ percent in mid-March to a high of 6 percent in the not-too-distant future. Compare such interest rates with the low statutory interest rates on Federal direct loans, such as the 2 percent on REA loans and 3 percent on college housing loans. This spread is translated into a considerable cost to the Government and, of course, to the taxpayer.

Certainly, these important considerations, not involved in previous similar sales issued in times of very different credit conditions, should have had a complete airing before the Banking and Currency Committee. An opportunity should have been offered to at least hear the testimony of the struggling construction industry and the crippled thrift institutions which are so vitally affected by this legislation.

If the legislative process is to mean anything, it must mean a full and fair opportunity for those affected by legislation to be heard. We cannot and should not tolerate the kind of precipitous action which resulted in the Sales Participation Act being reported out of committee after less than 2½ hours of consideration.

I cannot, however, support the proposed motion to recommit the bill with instructions to limit the interest rate on participations to 4¾ percent. This is an irresponsible bit of demagoguery. It does not alleviate the problems I have raised, but rather is designed to kill the entire proposal with a show of concern for high interest rates. No certificates could be sold in today's market at the rate sought to be imposed by this motion. What is needed is a provision protecting the small borrower and home buyer, not this transparent bit of showmanship. High interest rates are not the subject of this legislation. The rates these certificates would carry only would reflect the currently high free market rates.

I therefore urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit. At the same time, I urge them to vote against the bill on final passage.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, there is no opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, we often hear of the depression of the thirties—and the stock market crash of 1929—which followed a period of high living and relatively high personal income.

Now, we are in the midst of what the Great Society administration has termed the most prosperous time in history. But the warning flags of recession are flying all around. The most evident warning of the shaky condition of the American economy is the present condition of the stock market.

Stock prices have had sharp drops, waves of selling have taken place, we have not yet experienced a "Black Friday" like that which took place in 1929, but there is nothing to prevent this from happening.

This body is currently considering legislation that in my estimation is typical of the irresponsible fiscal policies by this administration.

Without any consideration of opposing views, the administration railroaded this measure through committee with only 3 hours of hearings.

Not only do I oppose the way in which this bill was presented to Congress, but I oppose the measure itself. This bill is merely a way that the administration has devised to cover up its practice of deficit spending. Procedures such as this can lead our country into another depression.

On May 10, 1966, there appears an article by James J. Kilpatrick in the Washington Evening Star which stated the true purpose of this bill. I insert an excerpt from the article at this point in the Record:

New Version of Old Shell Game Is Charged

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

> The slickest skin game of the old county fairs, at least in the gullible South, was the skin game known as the old shell game. It flourished for years, until some educated cops came along. They put the thimbleriggers on the run and the shell game all but disappeared.
>
> Last week it came back to town. You will find it, if you look fast enough, in H.R. 14544, which came shooting out of the House Banking and Currency Committee like a little green pea under three walnut shells. This is President Johnson's sensational gimmick for turning $4.2 billion in federal assets into $4.2 billion in federal liabilities, all without adding a penny to the federal deficit. Or liabilities into assets. It is all the same thing. Come one, come all, and try your skill! The hand in truth is quicker than the eye.
>
> Johnson sketched the general outlines of his "Sales Participation Act of 1966" back in January, but it wasn't until Wednesday, April 20, that the bill turned up in the House. Then presto! On Thursday, April 21, with the ink still wet on the printed bill, Rep. Wright Patman, D-Texas, scheduled three hours of hearings. Only administration witnesses were called. By a party-line vote of 22–3, with eight disgusted Republicans not voting, the bill came bombing out. A classic committee report followed on April 25. And last week the White House was proceeding in terrorem to get the bill whipped through the Rules Committee for an immediate vote on the floor.
>
> The situation has its funny aspects, which is doubtless part of the game.
>
> On the surface, this is a financing scheme by which the government would "sell off some assets." But the trick is that no assets would be really sold off.
>
> The committee's majority report declares, deadpan, that the plan would "carry forward the objective of substituting private for public credit in funding the loan programs" of various federal agencies. But by its own terms, the bill provides for continued federal subsidies to make the private creditors secure.
>
> The sponsors of this legislation are shouting from the housetops that this "participation" plan is truly nothing new—that it is in fact an old plan, devised by President Eisenhower in 1959. But when Eisenhower undertook to sell off some federal loans, he sold them off in straightforward transactions. Johnson's dazzling runaround is something else entirely.
>
> Under terms of this legislation, the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, would sell certificates of participation in "pools of assets" to be provided from the outstanding loans of various federal agencies. Up to $4.2 billion in such certificates could be sold, provided the market would absorb them, and why shouldn't the market absorb them? These handsome instruments would cost the taxpayers a rate of 5.4 or 5.5 percent, at least half a point higher than the rate on regular Treasury borrowings.
>
> As the outraged Republicans point out in their minority report, this .5 percent represents an expense of $5 million a year on each $1 billion of participations sold. If the entire authority were exercised, the cost to the people would approximate $21 million a year. Over an average maturity of 10 years, these higher outlays for interest would amount to something in excess of $200 million.
>
> Yet the cost of this scheme is the least of the objections to it. The purpose of this legislation is not to promote private credit. The purpose is to conceal a $4.2 billion deficit by entering the certificate sales as a "negative expenditure." Where has the deficit gone? It lies under the third shell on the left. If this maneuver works for 1967, we may never set eyes on a deficit again, for federal agencies have $33 billion in such assets to slide in Fannie May's direction.
>
> By the same token, as the Republicans remark, the federal debt limit can be subjected to hocus-pocus-dominocus. Now you see it, now you don't. If the proceeds of these participations are applied on paper to debt reduction, the government's total debt will not have been reduced in fact. The debt will simply have been transferred to the debt of FNMA, which is outside the statutory limit. In the course of this vanishing act, government credit would be used, if indirectly, to effect a reduction in the federal debt. This isn't done with dollars; it's done with mirrors.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the Sales Participation Act before us today, because I believe that it has both a particular fault and an undesirable implication.

First, Mr. Chairman, the principal effect of this act will be to reduce the apparent national debt. By so doing, the budget for the year will appear more balanced and, thus, the American people will not clearly appreciate the true dollar cost of the war in Vietnam. Some seem to feel that the extra costs of the war are of little consequence. Such is not the case. The war costs over a billion dollars a month. These costs must be financed either with additional Federal loans, implying inflation, or by a reduction in major programs, or by significant additional taxes. We must face this fact objectively. The Sales Participation Act before us today tends to obscure this harsh reality.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I might have been more favorably inclined to vote for the bill if the amendment had passed which was proposed which would have required that all loans sold under the act be sold under competitive bids. I see no justification for not requiring competitive bidding on these issues and, therefore, I voted for the amendment; regrettably, it failed.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly opposed to this bill, H.R. 14544 the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

This bill—incredibly—makes it possible for rich people to purchase Government securities bearing an interest-rate of 5.5 percent or more while the little man who buys U.S. savings bonds can get only 4.25 percent. The administration is limiting purchases to those of $5,000 and over.

But the little man is going to have to furnish most of the taxes to pay the big boys their generous rate.

This legislation is wholly deceptive. It would not have come to us if the administration were able to manage its debt and budget policies properly.

Present law sets a limit of 4.25 percent interest that the Government may pay on its ordinary securities. In the terms of today's money markets and the interest rates being paid there, this is an unrealistic level, far below the rates being paid commercially. Naturally the Government is having a hard time marketing its securities.

But rather than come to Congress in a straightforward manner and seek authority to raise the interest rate, the administration has concocted this costly sham.

END RUN AROUND THE LAW

This measure is an endrun around the law. It proposes that all Government agencies that make loans, pool these loans and that certificates of participation backed by these loans be sold to a restricted group of investors and financial institutions.

Because these certificates would not be issued by the Treasury but rather by the Federal National Mortgage Association, they would not be subject to the 4.5 percent legal limitation on interest. Nor would they be counted as part of the national debt. Nor would they appear in the regular Federal budget.

Thus, by bookkeeping sleight-of-hand, the President will be enabled to increase spending without disturbing the budget figures. With this bill the Government enters the banking business for the first time since President Andrew Jackson led a successful fight to liquidate the U.S. Bank. He would, I believe, be horrified to see it revived, in fact if not in name, by another Democratic President.

A SHAME AND A SHAM

This bill is both a shame and a sham. It is a shame because it will line the pockets of the rich at the expense of overburdened low- and middle-income taxpayer. It is a shame because it sets up a concealed financial operation outside the regular budget and debt-management channels. Only 3 hours of committee hearings—only two witnesses, a sad commentary.

The answer to our financial problems lies not in this wheeler-dealer financial trickery. It is to be found in sensible planning by which Federal spending will be governed under a strict order of priorities. This country is at war and our defense requirements are of the highest priority. Spending huge amounts of borrowed money on domestic projects that could be deferred or which should be abandoned creates inflation, drives up the cost of living, and inspires such tricky schemes as the legislation now before us.

I strongly urge that this bill be defeated.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with care to the debate on H.R. 14544, the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

Many persuasive statements have been made in support of the bill. I have been particularly impressed by the considerations mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] in the debate on the rule, and by the very able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

I have frankly not been impressed by the arguments made in opposition to the bill. Most of the statements in opposition have come from the other side of the aisle and appear to me to have been motivated primarily by partisan political considerations, that is to say, by a desire to embarrass the President.

It is noteworthy that almost none of the opponents of the bill has indicated what alternative method he would favor to enable the Government to raise the additional $2.85 billion in fiscal 1967 that it is expected would be realized from the sale of participation certificates to be authorized by the legislation before us. No Member has suggested a tax increase for this purpose and none of the opponents of the legislation has come forward with a proposal to raise the presently authorized debt limit for the Federal Government.

I have read with interest the statement issued by the American for Democratic Action in opposition to the Participation Sales Act of 1966 and I find some of its arguments to be persuasive. Again, however, the difficulty is that the ADA does not propose any alternative. I would assume that the ADA would not oppose an increase in the debt limit but its statement does not call for such an increase as the alternative to the Participation Sales Act.

In his statement yesterday—May 17—in support of the legislation, the gentleman from Wisconsin indicated that he would like to see "the administration have an option of raising the $5 billion or so to carry on these worthwhile Federal lending programs through the next fiscal year by the direct method of Treasury borrowing," on the grounds that this method would save "hundreds of millions of dollars for the taxpayers through reduced interest costs," and he indicated that he would be prepared to support an increase in the debt limit for that purpose. The question may well be asked whether the many Republican members who have been opposing the Participation Sales Act will support an increase in the debt limit if the President finds that such an increase is necessary and requests the Congress to authorize it.

I know that a number of my colleagues, whom I admire as liberal Democrats, are opposed to the present bill and will vote against it. Curiously, they did not take part in the debate to explain the reasons for their opposition. Some of them are apparently concerned that the additional $2.8 billion of participation certificate sales which this bill is intended to authorize will further aggravate the already tight money market. Perhaps they would prefer that the debt limit be increased instead, but, if so, I would raise the question whether direct Federal borrowing would not have approximately the same effect, in sopping up available credit, that the sale of participation certificates would have.

I believe that the debt limit may have to be increased and, like my colleague from Wisconsin, I would tend to favor direct Federal borrowing as an alternative to the sale of participation certificates. But that is not the issue that is presented to us at this time. In any event, I believe that the administration should have flexibility in the management of its assets, including what amounts to a sale of its assets where that appears to be desirable, as this bill will provide.

I have no hesitancy in opposing the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] which would limit the interest payable on the participation certificates to 4¾ percent. Under the present conditions this would make it impossible to market the participation certificates. In effect, therefore, this limitation amounts to an indirect way of killing the program.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Participation Sales Act of 1966, H.R. 14544, for the following reasons: This program may be just what is needed instead of an increase in taxes in an effort to keep the economy in balance; it will siphon money from large investors, hopefully resulting in an anti-inflationary reaction; it will have a desirable effect on the debt ceiling and may also reduce the necessity of raising it.

This measure is designed to provide an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies and to carry forward the objective of substituting private for public credit in funding certain loan programs. These agencies, with the approval of the Congress, could enter into trust agreements with the Federal National Mortgage Association whereby FNMA would sell participation certificates based on a pool or pools of Federal credit agency loans.

The sale of participations in Government loans is not a new proposal but an expansion of a limited program already in operation. The Export-Import Bank has sold participations since 1962. Federal National Mortgage Association has sold participations in pools of loans made by the FHA and the VA since 1964. Participations in pooled loans are generally bought by banks, insurance companies, State and local governments, foundations, and so forth.

The sale of Government assets was supported by President Eisenhower in his 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1958 budget messages. In 1962, President Kennedy's Committee on Federal Credit Programs, under the then Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, supported private participation in Federal credit programs.

In the 1963 minority report, on a bill to temporarily increase the public debt limit, Republicans stated the Johnson administration could reduce borrowing requirements by additional sales of Government assets.

Presently the Government has $100 billion in Government-guaranteed and Government-insured loans outstanding. Another $33 billion in direct Government loans is outstanding. Participations will be sold only in pools of loans held directly by the Government. President Johnson, in his January 25 budget message, proposed the sale of $4.2 billion in participations; authority exists for the sale of $1.4 billion; H.R. 14544 authorizes the sale of $2.8 billion.

Could it be that my colleagues, on the other side of the aisle, are trying to create a political issue with respect to our economy? Many words have been spoken which sounded to me as if they were trying to talk us into a recession, all in the face of the longest period of prosperity this country has ever known.

The principles contained in this Participation Sales Act of 1966 have, in the past, always met with their approval. Why, then, are they now against this measure as at least a partial solution to the country's money problems. Perhaps they would like nothing better than to place the administration in the embarrassing political squeeze of having to raise taxes which means should only be used as a last resort.

There is one redeeming feature of the inflation argument, however, the Democrats are men of integrity who are not afraid to act, if act we must, to keep our economy strong. Let us pass this bill in the interest of providing an answer. It certainly can do no harm and historically, the role of the Federal Government in the field of credit has been to encourage a smooth, efficient flow of funds between private borrowers and lenders.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress will continue this tradition by approving this legislation.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Gentlemen and ladies, I have taken the 5 minutes to briefly explain the motion to recommit which will be offered shortly.

As some may recall, I stood on the floor yesterday in my first speech on this bill to endorse the principle of the bill. I believe in the subsequent debate we have seen a vindication of the committee process.

If the Committee on Banking and Currency had met its full responsibilities, we would not have seen the acceptance by both sides of clarifying amendments; we would not have seen the acceptance of points of order which struck language violating the Committee on Appropriations' prerogatives and the authorizing committee's prerogatives. But these amendments and points of order have been accepted. We have improved the bill considerably. We have eliminated the revolving fund potential which was inherent in the bill.

There is one particular segment of the bill which remains unimproved, that is, that section of the bill which will have the net effect of increasing interest costs to every borrower in the United States. The recommittal motion will be the amendment offered previously, amendment No. 6, which put a limit of 4¾ percent interest on the interest that could be charged in these participation sales. We have heard the esteemed Speaker of the House, the chairman of the committee, and a number of people on both sides of the aisle speaking for the veteran, for the small businessman, for the home owner, and for the little man of this country. This is our opportunity to vindicate our statements with deeds. The effect of this amendment will be to protect these people.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Do I understand correctly that the gentleman is attempting to say that a vote against the motion to recommit is a vote to raise interest rates?

Mr. BROCK. That is putting it as clearly as you can.

Mr. ARENDS. Thank you. I thought I understood it.

Mr. BROCK. The chairman said that this bill does not relate to higher interest costs. If it does not, then support this recommittal motion and make it clear. Let us be honest about it. If it will increase costs, let us be honest about it and say that is exactly what you are voting for when you vote for the bill as it is written today.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. Yes. Of course.

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest if your amendment is written as the amendment proposed was—and I assume that is correct.

Mr. BROCK. In essence, yes.

Mr. PATMAN. That means if you cannot get the money that way, and obviously you cannot because the market will not permit it, then you will be forced to go into the short-term market where the rate is unlimited and it could be even 10 or 15 percent. There is no limit or no ceiling at all on it. So instead of forcing it lower, you would force them to have higher interest rates.

Mr. BROCK. The gentleman has apparently been unable to find a copy of my amendment, because it has no relation at all to short term or long term.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. The Liberty Loan Act.

Mr. BROCK. It limits the interest rate to 4¾ percent whether it is short term or long term. The effect of the amendment is to keep participations—if the gentleman will permit me to continue—to keep this Government from invading the private money market when money is so tight the only possible impact on selling the $4.2 billion of participations here will be to drive up the interest rate a half percent or more. That is what we are trying to stop with this amendment. It has no effect whatsoever other than to limit interest paid on participation sales to 4¾ percent.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I asked the gentleman to yield in order to announce that I intend to ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], but not a rollcall vote. I think we should support our House conferees in their effort to bring this bill back as we amended it.

Mr. BROCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. BROCK. Let me complete this one thought, if the gentleman will.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], made perhaps as cogent an argument as could be made against the bill as written when he stood up on the first day of debate and said that this bill is right in principle but it is the wrong time and the wrong way of doing it. It will have the effect of increasing interest costs. Let us put this amendment in the bill in our recommittal motion limiting the interest payable so that the Government cannot create havoc in the money market and drive up the cost of home ownership to every home buyer in the United States. That is all we are asking you to do with this recommittal motion. If you support it, you are supporting low interest rates. If you vote for the bill without it, you are going to vote for a high interest bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this is the closing of the debate, and I believe it is.

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] is sincere about his proposal, but it will have exactly the reverse effect from what he says.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee referred to the Liberty Loan Act. That is an act under which all of these bonds are issued. The term "long-term bonds" is used in the amendment. So that means, obviously, if we pass this, we cannot sell the certificates in the market, because the market is higher than that. Being unable to sell the long term, they will be compelled to seek the short term, and there is no ceiling at all. Short term is for a period under 5 years.

In other words, there is no ceiling at all, and instead of it compelling us to have low rates, it will compel us to go to a market where there is no ceiling and pay higher and higher and higher rates and come into competition with other rates and the price of interest will go out of the roof. It is highly inflationary, I will state to my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. The amendment does not say whether they should be in the long-term market or in the short-term market. It says it does not matter where they go, they cannot go beyond 4¾ percent. That is all we are trying to do is to limit the amount of interest, so that we do not disrupt the market. The trouble is through buying in the short market they will push the interest rates up.

Mr. PATMAN. But the gentleman refers to the Liberty Loan Act. That is the act under which we have the long-term rates. Therefore, it will do just the opposite.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my friend will reconsider that proposition because he will put himself in the position that I do not believe he wants to be in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14544) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 852, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the committee amendment, as amended by the Patman and Brock amendments, which appears on page 6, beginning on line 9 of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the other amendments?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, beginning in line 9, insert:

"(4) Beneficial interest or participations shall not be issued for the account of any trustor in an aggregate principal amount greater than is authorized with respect to such trustor in an appropriation Act. Any such authorization shall remain available only for the fiscal year for which it is granted and for the succeeding fiscal year.

"(5) The Association, as trustee, is authorized to issue and sell beneficial interests or participations under this subsection, notwithstanding that there may be an insufficiency in aggregate receipts from obligations subject to the related trust to provide for the payment by the trustee (on a timely basis out of current receipts or otherwise) of all interest or principal on such interests or participations (after provision for all costs and expenses incurred by the trustee, fairly prorated among trustors).

"There are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation such sums as may be necessary to enable any trustor to pay the trustee such insufficiency as the trustee may require on account of outstanding beneficial interests or participations authorized to be issued pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"Such trustor shall make timely payments to the trustee from such appropriations, subject to and in accord with the trust instrument."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONAS) there were—ayes 192, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BROCK. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BROCK moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 14544, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 7, immediately after line 6, insert:

"(6) No beneficial interest or participation may be issued pursuant to this subsection after the enactment of this paragraph bearing an interest rate in excess of one-half of one percentage point above the 4¼ percent maximum interest rate specified for long-term bonds of the United States in the first section of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 752)."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair notes both gentlemen standing and seeking recognition.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I will defer to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 180, nays 217, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—180

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Conable
Conte
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Grider
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
Macdonald
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates

NAYS—217

Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Landrum
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield

Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—34

Abbitt
Baring
Carter
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Ellsworth
Fogarty
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Hébert
Krebs
Leggett
MacGregor
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Moore
Moss
Murray
Nix
Powell
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Scott
Toll
Tupper
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Younger

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Mackay of Georgia against.

Mr. Roncalio for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Krebs against.

Mr. Abbitt for, with Mr. Moss against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Nix against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Murray with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. McDOWELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RACE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 190, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—206

Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Landrum
Long, La.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Wolff
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—190

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dole
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Gilbert
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Grider
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Huot
Hutchinson
Irwin
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stratton
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates

NOT VOTING—35

Abbitt
Baring
Carter
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Ellsworth
Fogarty
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Hébert
Krebs
Leggett
MacGregor
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Moore
Moss
Murray
Nix
Powell
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Scott
Taylor
Toll
Tupper
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Younger

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Moore against.

Mr. Mackay of Georgia for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Roncalio against.

Mr. Krebs for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Williams with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Willis with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to correct section numbers, cross references and punctuation in the bill, H.R. 14544 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 852, I call up for immediate consideration the bill (S. 3283) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3283 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 14544, as passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3283 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 14544, as passed by the House, as follows:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Participation Sales Act of 1966'.

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(1)' immediately following '(c)';

"(2) by inserting after 'undertakings and activities' a comma and 'hereinafter in this subsection called "trusts",';

"(3) by striking 'obligations offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages in which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof' in the first sentence thereof and inserting 'mortgages or other types of obligations in which any department or agency of the United States listed in paragraph (2) of this subsection';

"(4) by striking out the third sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following: 'Participations or other instruments issued by the Association pursuant to this subsection shall to the same extent as securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States be deemed to be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission.'; and

"(5) by striking out the fourth sentence thereof.

"(b) Section 302(c) of such Act is further amended by adding the following:

" '(2) Subject to the limitations provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, one or more trusts may be established as provided in this subsection by each of the following departments or agencies:

" '(A) The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, but only with respect to operating loans, direct farm ownership loans, direct housing loans, and direct soil and water loans. Such trusts may not be established with respect to loans for housing for the elderly under sections 502 and 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, nor with respect to loans for nonfarm recreational development.

" '(B) The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but only with respect to loans for construction of academic facilities.

" '(C) The Department of Housing and Urban Development, except that such authority may not be used with respect to secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

" '(D) The Veterans' Administration.

" '(E) The Export-Import Bank.

" '(F) The Small Business Administration.

The head of each such department or agency, hereinafter in this subsection called the "trustor", is authorized to set aside a part or all of any obligations held by him and subject them to a trust or trusts and, incident thereto, shall guarantee to the trustee timely payment thereof. The trust instrument may provide for the issuance and sale of beneficial interests or participations, by the trustee, in such obligations or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom; and may provide for the substitution or withdrawal of such obligations, or for the substitution of cash for obligations. The trust or trusts shall be exempt from all taxation. The trust instrument may also contain other appropriate provisions in keeping with the purposes of this subsection. The Association shall be named and shall act as trustee of any such trusts and, for the purposes thereof, the title to such obligations shall be deemed to have passed to the Association in trust. The trust instrument shall provide that custody, control, and administration of the obligations shall remain in the trustor subjecting the obligations to the trust, subject to transfer to the trustee in event of default or probable default, as determined by the trustee, in the payment of principal and interest of the beneficial interests or participations. Collections from obligations subject to the trust shall be dealt with as provided in the instrument creating the trust. The trust instrument shall provide that the trustee will promptly pay to the trustor the full net proceeds of any sale of beneficial interests or participations to the extent they are based upon such obligations or collections. Such proceeds shall be dealt with as otherwise provided by law for sales or repayment of such obligations. The effect of both past and future sales of any issue of beneficial interests or participations shall be the same, to the extent of the principal of such issue, as the direct sale with recourse of the obligations subject to the trust. Any trustor creating a trust or trusts hereunder is authorized to purchase, through the facilities of the trustee, outstanding beneficial interests or participations to the extent of the amount of his responsibility to the trustee on beneficial interests or participations outstanding, and to pay his proper share of the costs and expenses incurred by the Federal National Mortgage Association as trustee pursuant to the trust instrument.

" '(3) When any trustor guarantees to the trustee the timely payment of obligations he subjects to a trust pursuant to this subsection, and it becomes necessary for such trustor to meet his responsibilities under such guaranty, he is authorized to fulfill such guaranty.

" '(4) Beneficial interests or participations shall not be issued for the account of any trustor in an aggregate principal amount greater than is authorized with respect to such trustor in an appropriation Act. Any such authorization shall remain available for the fiscal year for which it is granted and for the succeeding fiscal year.

" '(5) The Association, as trustee, is authorized to issue and sell beneficial interests or participations under this subsection, notwithstanding that there may be an insufficiency in aggregate receipts from obligations subject to the related trust to provide for the payment by the trustee (on a timely basis out of current receipts or otherwise) of all interest or principal on such interests or participations (after provision for all costs and expenses incurred by the trustee, fairly prorated among trustors). There are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation such sums as may be necessary to enable any trustor to pay the trustee such insufficiency as the trustee may require on account of outstanding beneficial interests or participations authorized to be issued pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection. Such trustor shall make timely payments to the trustee from such appropriations, subject to and in accord with the trust instrument.'

"Sec. 3. (a) Section 305(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by deleting 'by $450,000,000 on July 1, 1966,'.

"(b) Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by deleting '1968:' immediately preceding the first proviso and by substituting therefor '1965, and 1967 and 1968:'.

"Sec. 4. (a) Section 303(c) of title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out the first nine words in the second sentence and substituting therefor the following: 'For the purpose of making payments into the fund established under section 305'.

"(b) Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is further amended by adding after section 304 the following new section:

" 'REVOLVING LOAN FUND

" 'Sec. 305. (a) There is hereby created within the Treasury a separate fund for higher education academic facilities loans (hereafter in this section called 'the fund') which shall be available to the Commissioner without fiscal year limitation as a revolving fund for the purposes of this title. The total of any loans made from the fund in any fiscal year shall not exceed limitations specified in appropriation Acts. A business-type budget for the fund shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 847–849) for wholly owned Government corporations.

" '(b) (1) The Commissioner, when authorized by an appropriation Act, may transfer to the fund available appropriations provided under section 303(c) to provide capital for the fund. All amounts received by the Commissioner as interest payments or repayments of principal on loans, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations in connection with this title, including any moneys derived directly or indirectly from the sale of assets, or beneficial interests or participations in assets, of the fund, shall be deposited in the fund.

" '(2) All loans, expenses, and payments pursuant to operations of the Commissioner under this title shall be paid from the fund, including (but not limited to) expenses and payments of the Commissioner in connection with sale, under section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, of participations in obligations acquired under this title. From time to time, and at least at the close of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay from the fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts interest on the cumulative amount of appropriations paid out for loans under this title or available as capital to the fund, less the average undisbursed cash balance in the fund during the year. The rate of such interest shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield during the month preceding each fiscal year on outstanding Treasury obligations of maturity comparable to the average maturity of loans made from the fund. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest. If at any time the Commissioner determines that moneys in the fund exceed the present and any reasonably prospective future requirements of the fund, such excess may be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.'

"Sec. 5. Section 338(c) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking in the second sentence 'and (8)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(8) section 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1006a); (9) section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1011); and (10)'; and by inserting in the fifth sentence after 'title,' the following: 'section 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, and section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended,'.

"Sec. 6. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of section 1820(e) of title 38, United States Code, respecting the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"(b) After June 30, 1966, no department or agency listed in section 302(c) (2) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act may sell any obligation held by it except as provided in section 302(c) of that Act, or as approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, except that this prohibition shall not apply to secondary market operations carried on by the Federal National Mortgage Association.

"SEC. 7. Paragraph (7) of section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended to read:

"'(7) to invest its funds (A) in loans exclusively to members (B) in obligations of the United States of America, or securities fully guaranteed as to principal and interest thereby; (C) in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Director, in loans to other credit unions in the total amount not exceeding 25 per centum of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus; (D) in shares or accounts of savings and loan associations, the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; (E) in obligations issued by banks for cooperatives, Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal home loan banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or any corporation designated in section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act as a wholly owned Government corporation; or in obligations, participations, or other instruments of or issued by, or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the Federal National Mortgage Association; or (F) in participation certificates evidencing beneficial interests in obligations, or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom, which obligations have been subjected by one or more Government agencies to a trust or trusts for which any executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States (or the head thereof) has been named to act as trustee;'.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with heads of agencies of the United States carrying on direct loan programs, shall conduct a study, in such manner as he shall determine, on the feasibility, advantages, and disadvantages of direct loan programs compared to guaranteed or insured loan programs and shall report his findings together with specific legislative proposals to the Congress not later than six months after the effective date of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary for the purpose of this section.

"SEC. 9. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized during the fiscal year 1966 to sell—

"(1) additional participations in the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust, and

"(2) participations in a trust to be established by the Small Business Administration.

each without regard to the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 14544, was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 14544.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

STOCKPILE MEASURES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, today the Armed Services Committee is reporting six additional stockpile bills to the House of Representatives. Each of these bills provides for the disposal of quantities of materials which have been determined to be excess to stockpile requirements. Thus far in this session, the administration has submitted 24 legislative proposals for disposition of individual items from the stockpile, and they have given a favorable report on 1 bill introduced by a Member of Congress which provides for the disposal of excess materials from the stockpile. Thus, 25 bills have been considered by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

Let me assure you as chairman of that subcommittee, that we have not only thoroughly examined into the stockpile requirement but we have assured ourselves based on testimony from members of the executive branch that the stockpile objective is adequate for national defense purposes. In addition, we have carefully examined the proposed rate and quantity of disposal so as to insure that such disposal actions will not be disruptive of our markets.

We have adopted a policy in the committee whereby there must be a consensus between members of the affected industry and Government regarding the method of disposition from the stockpile. Where we have been unable to secure such agreement, the committee has deferred action on these bills. Thus, of the 25 bills the subcommittee has considered, we have deferred 6 bills, have reported 19 to the full committee, and 13 of these measures have been enacted into law.

Today, we bring you six additional bills calling for the release of various commodities from the stockpiles. In these six bills, there will be some losses to the Government but also some gains. In the overall profit-and-loss picture, if the price of the commodities remains constant over the period of disposal, the Government will stand to net approximately $22,145,000.

By far, the largest of these commodity bills is aluminum. It provides for the disposal of 920,000 short tons of aluminum from the national stockpile and represents the disposal of all surplus aluminum under terms of an agreement worked out between the Government and the aluminum producers. We are assured that the balance of aluminum left in the stockpiles meets stockpile requirements.

The bills relate to the following commodities: Aluminum; crocidolite asbestos; celestite; cordage fiber, sisal; manganese, metal; and opium.

Because I have a rather detailed statement concerning the release of each of these commodities which I will insert into the RECORD, I will not repeat the details in this general statement.

I feel that the subcommittee, the House Armed Services Committee, and the Congress have cooperated fully with the executive branch of the Government and at the same time maintained congressional control as envisioned by the law.

I am most grateful for the help and cooperation of my outstanding subcommittee and full committee, and the generous consideration and cooperation rendered us by the Members of the House.

DISPOSAL OF CELESTITE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H.R. 13768) to authorize the disposal of celestite from the supplemental stockpile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13768

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately nine thousand eight hundred and sixty-five short tons of celestite now held in the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b): *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13768 calls for the disposal of 9,865 short tons of celestite from the supplemental stockpile.

At the present time, our total inventories contain 50,944 short tons of celestite and the stockpile objective is for 10,300 short tons. Thus, we have a total excess of 40,644 short tons.

The average acquistion cost of celestite was $46.46 per short ton.

Celestite is obtained from England and Mexico.

Celestite is strontium sulfate in the form of friable mineral, which is usually coarsely crystalline. Concentration to a usable ore and the chemical manufacture of strontium compounds is usually required for end use.

The principal uses of the commodity: Strontium compounds produce a dense red flame with high brilliance and visibility range. Compounds are used for pyrotechnics, such as tracer ammunition, military flares, and marine distress signals. Minor uses include glass and ceramics, lubricants, sugar refining, luminescent paints, drilling muds, electrolytic zinc refining, welding-rod coating and caustic soda.

It is estimated that the disposal will take from 4 to 10 years. If the market price remains constant over the period of the disposal, the Government is likely to lose $40,000 from the disposal of this item.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF CORDAGE FIBER

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H.R. 13769) to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber—sisal—from the national stockpile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13769

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately one hundred million pounds of cordage fiber (sisal) now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13769 is a bill calling for disposal of approximately 100 million pounds of cordage fiber—sisal—now held in the national stockpile.

At the present time, we have 300 million pounds in our stockpile but this excludes the quantities authorized for sale but not yet sold under Public Law 88-617, enacted October 2, 1964. The excess of cordage fiber excluding that remaining unsold, is 100 million pounds.

The average acquisition cost of this commodity was 13½ cents per pound and thus far, the average return to the Government based on all sales has been 11 cents per pound. I understand the present market value of fresh sisal is approximately 10½ cents per pound.

Sisal is obtained from Portuguese Africa, Tanzania, and Brazil. Sisal fiber is stripped from the large leaves of the tropical plant Agave sisalana.

Sisal is used principally for rope, baler, binder, and wrapping twine, upholstery and padding, wire rope centers, and reinforcement for paper and plastics.

Some of this sisal has been in storage for 9 years or longer, and rotation costing about 4.3 cents per pound, has not been undertaken since April 1962.

It is contemplated that the disposal plan will take from 4 to 8 years, and if the market price remains firm the total loss to the Government will be approximately $3,500,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF CROCIDOLITE ASBESTOS (HARSH) FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H.R. 13770 to authorize the disposal of crocidolite asbestos—harsh—from the supplemental stockpile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13770

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately forty-five thousand nine hundred and ninety-two short tons of crocidolite asbestos (harsh) now held in the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b): *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13770 provides for the disposal of 45,992 short tons of crocidolite asbestos—harsh—now held in the supplemental stockpile.

At the present time, we have no stockpile objective, it having been removed from the list on September 27, 1960, and we have a total inventory of 45,992 short tons, all of which is excess.

The average acquisition cost of the material for disposal was approximately $259 per short ton, and the present market value is approximately $270 per short ton.

This type of asbestos is obtained from the Republic of South Africa, Australia, and Bolivia, and there is no mine production of this type in the United States or Canada.

In 1964, Congress authorized the disposal of 1,567 short tons of this type of asbestos but, as yet, there have been no disposals.

Crocidolite asbestos is a fibrous amphibole mineral of the hornblende group. Crocidolite is the blue asbestos of commerce. The most important advantage of crocidolite is its superior resistance to attack by acids. Its texture varies from soft to harsh, with good flexibility and fair spinnability. It is used principally in the manufacture of asbestos cement pipe, packing, and gaskets.

It is anticipated that the disposal will take from 5 to 10 years and if the market price remains constant during that period, the Government will stand to gain approximately $483,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF METALLURGICAL GRADE MANGANESE ORE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H.R. 13772) to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13772

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately one million nine hundred thousand short dry tons of metallurgical grade manganese ore now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13772 calls for the disposal of approximately 1.9 million short dry tons of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national and supplemental stockpiles.

At the present time, we have an inventory of 10,780,470 short dry tons of which approximately 3 million are in the Defense Production Act inventory. Our current stockpile objective is 6,647,500 short dry tons.

The average acquisition cost per short dry ton of the metallurgical grade manganese ore in the national stockpile was $39.60, and in the supplemental stockpile was $43.09. The March 7, 1966, issue of the E. & M.J. Metal and Mineral Markets reports ore with a minimum 48 percent manganese content and low impurities at 80 cents per long ton unit of manganese content. This is about $34.25 per short dry ton.

All but 237,466 short dry tons of the material for disposal hereunder is classified as meeting stockpile specifications.

This type of manganese ore comes from India, South Africa, Brazil, and the U.S.S.R.

Metallurgical grade manganese ore is a black ore in the form of lumpy natural ore or agglomerated modules or sinter.

This type of manganese is used in the manufacture of manganese metal, ferro-manganese, and special manganese alloys, which in turn are used to neutralize the effects of sulfur and to remove oxygen. It is used as an addition to special steels to contribute toughness and resistance to shock and abrasion.

It is anticipated that the disposal will take from 5 to 10 years and if the price remains constant during that period, the total loss to the Government will be approximately $28,035,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF OPIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H.R. 13773) to authorize the disposal of opium from the national stockpile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13773

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately thirty-seven thousand two hundred and ninety pounds (morphine content) of stockpile grade gum opium and approximately two thousand two hundred pounds (morphine content) of nonstockpile grade material in various dosage forms now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13773 calls for the release of approximately 37,290 pounds—morphine content—of stockpile grade gum opium and approximately 2,200 pounds—morphine content—of nonstockpile grade material in various dosage forms from the national stockpile.

The current inventory for opium in all of our stockpiles is 187,632 pounds. The current objective is 143,000 pounds.

The average acquisition cost of opium was $69.57 per pound.

Opium is obtained from Turkey and India.

Opium is the dried exudate, from the unripe capsules of the poppy plant, Papaver somoniferum, containing various alkaloids, the most important being morphine. It appears in commerce as dark brown bricks or balls weighing a few pounds each.

The most important alkaloid extracted from opium is morphine, which is used as an analgesic or pain-relieving agent of particular importance in shock treatment. Another opium alkaloid of commercial importance is codeine, which is used as a cough depressant and in the relief of pain.

It is estimated that the disposal of this will take 3 to 4 years. I think it is essential in this instance to mention the method of disposal. The Armed Services Committee was assured by representatives of the General Services Administration that it had worked carefully with the Bureau of Narcotics and that the latter Bureau had concurred on the rate and method of disposition of excess opium. The bulk of the 37,290 pounds—morphine content—for disposal over a 3-year period will be used as payment for cost of upgrading the gum opium which is held against the objective to morphine sulfate. The 2,200 pounds—morphine content—in dosage form which is nonstockpile grade will be offered for sale subject to the concurrence of the Bureau of Narcotics. The upgrading program is expected to take about 3 years.

About one-third of the gum opium to be used to pay the expenses of upgrading will be released each year and the balance of gum opium will be offered for sale upon completion of the upgrading program.

I think that the Office of Emergency Planning has made an extremely wise decision in converting this material remaining in the stockpile into dosage form, alkaloids or salts because only three or four establishments in the United States are licensed to convert this raw material into the dosage form.

After the upgrading is completed, there will be approximately 5,000 pounds of excess gum opium remaining which will then be sold at the market price. It is anticipated that the loss to the Government will be approximately $128,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF ALUMINUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H.R. 13366) to authorize the disposal of aluminum from the national stockpile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Philbin]?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, this bill—H.R. 13366—is the most important of the stockpile bills taken up at this session. With the passage of this measure we are in effect giving our approval to a contract between the Government and the aluminum industry over a 14-year period. It is estimated that the net profit to the Government will be around $50 million.

I have no objection to the contract and, of course, have no objection to this bill to effectuate it. But I do take exception to the circumstances under which this contract was entered into, and I most vigorously object to the administration using defense materials in stockpile for price control and for fiscal purposes.

For several years the aluminum industry has been endeavoring to enter into an agreement with the Government with respect to our aluminum. But these discussions were always at lower levels of Government and with no semblance of finality.

Suddenly, almost overnight, what was nebulous and uncertain became definite and final. Suddenly the 5 years of negotiations at lower levels was moved to the highest level, with the Secretary of Defense participating in the discussions.

This sudden change came about last November when the aluminum companies announced a price increase. Immediately the administration announced the release of 200,000 tons of aluminum from our Defense Production Act stockpile of aluminum. And, incidentally, the Congress has no control over the Defense Production Act stockpile.

Obviously, the administration's threat to dump 200,000 tons of aluminum on the market was not to meet a defense production need but to force the industry to comply with what the Government determined to be the proper price. There naturally followed a rollback in prices. Industry had no alternative.

And there immediately followed negotiations at the highest level of Government, with the Secretary of Defense participating, that resulted in this contract we are now approving.

I am not objecting to the contract, Mr. Speaker. I am objecting to the method by which it was arrived at. I am objecting to using materials in stockpile for national security and defense purposes to fix prices.

By no stretch of the imagination, much less the law, are any of these materials to be either acquired or sold to regulate prices. On the contrary, the law relating to our stockpiling program makes it clear that any disposal of these materials at any time shall be only in such manner and such extent as not to disrupt the free open market.

That there may be an end to this practice I believe two things must be done. First, we should put the two basic stockpiles of defense materials, that under the Defense Production Act not under the control of Congress, and that under the Strategic and Materials Act now under control of Congress—into one stockpile whereby all the materials are under our control.

Second, that provision of existing law that gives the President authority to release materials when, in his judgment, "such release is required for purposes of the common defense" should be amended. The President has been disposed to interpret "common defense" to include "prices" and "revenue needs for his budget." From President Johnson's point of view "to provide for the common defense" is authority to promote his Great Society concepts.

From what has been taking place, both with respect to defense materials in inventory and agriculture commodities in inventory, the administration is converting our free economy into a Government-controlled economy. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has repeatedly dumped grain on the market. We all too well know the steps he recently took for lowering the price of farm products. He is attempting to regulate our agricultural economy and the Secretary of Defense to regulate our industrial economy.

Not only is the administration using Government assets to control prices, it is using them for fiscal manipulations. Under questionable legal authority President Johnson is attempting to do indirectly what he has no authority to do directly. Nor does he have the political courage to ask for such authority.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. First, I wish to commend the gentleman for the statement that he has made. He has answered some questions that were in my mind, and I am sure in the minds of other Members of the House. Among others there is this question: How many stockpiles of aluminum, taking one of the commodities, does this Government have?

Mr. ARENDS. This is one under the Defense Production Act, and this is the one over which the President has control. Then there is the national stockpile. These are the ones on which there may be a contract and agreement with the aluminum industry. I have no quarrel with the contract but I do have a quarrel about the procedures and the objectives of why they used the aluminum as they did.

Mr. GROSS. If the President has the power, as he told the aluminum companies last year he did have the power to withdraw the aluminum, why is this bill before us today? Why does not the President dispose of the aluminum without any approval on the part of Congress?

Mr. ARENDS. He has done exactly that. The only point I am bringing up is that we ought to have control of this stockpile in the Congress of the United States. The stockpile, regardless of whether it is in the hands of Congress or in the hands of the President, should not be used to control prices or for purposes of fiscal policy.

Mr. GROSS. I agree completely with the gentleman, but I have left unanswered the question of why, if the President can withdraw from the stockpile, this legislation is before us today.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, he released it in November under the powers of the Defense Production Act.

Mr. GROSS. If the President has that authority, why are we burdened with this legislation here today?

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. This bill calls for the disposition of approximately 920,000 short tons of aluminum under a contract with producers in the aluminum industry over a period of 14 years. It does not provide for any price fixing. It is not an arbitrary disposal of material. It is being done under existing law, as the gentleman so well knows. I see nothing in this bill that suggests that the committee has not conducted these proceedings in accordance with the law. We are proceeding in a regular way to try to prevail upon Congress to dispose of materials that are excess to the needs of the Government at the present time, and which, over the long term of years, would bring into the Government $450 million, which I think should please the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The point of the question which I am trying to get answered must have escaped the gentleman. I wish to know why, if the President had the authority to say what he did last fall—that without any reference to Congress he would dispose of material from the stockpile—if he has the authority to dispose from the stockpile, why did you bring this legislation here today?

Mr. PHILBIN. As the gentleman knows, we have three different stockpiles. We have the national stockpile, over which the Congress has control. We have the supplemental stockpile. Then we have the Defense Production Act stockpile, which is in control of the executive department of the Government. This committee exercises jurisdiction over those things that come within its own legislative mandate, its statutory mandate. We cannot dispose of materials from the Defense Production Act inventory. The President can and does. The executive department does.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield once more——

Mr. ARENDS. I am happy to yield once more to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I guess I can reserve the right to further object. I do not know, but I believe I can.

What is the stockpile? This is the Defense Production stockpile. What do you call it?

Mr. PHILBIN. The Defense Production Act stockpile.

Mr. GROSS. The Defense Production Act stockpile?

Mr. PHILBIN. The Defense Production Act stockpile, which is in the hands of the executive department.

Mr. GROSS. That is what we are dealing with here and now?

Mr. PHILBIN. No, it is not. It is the other stockpile.

Mr. GROSS. What do you call the stockpile with which we are dealing?

Mr. PHILBIN. The national stockpile, over which Congress has express jurisdiction under the law.

Mr. GROSS. Over which we have jurisdiction?

Mr. PHILBIN. The Congress has jurisdiction.

Mr. GROSS. What stockpile will the President get the aluminum from to beat down the price increase that was attempted by the aluminum company?

Mr. PHILBIN. From the Defense Production Act stockpile, if that is what he did. This disposal is from the national stockpile.

Mr. GROSS. You say there are three stockpiles of aluminum?

Mr. PHILBIN. Stockpiles in which there are different critical materials.

There are stockpiles on which there are different critical materials, the aluminum and practically all of the rare metals stockpiles. Some of the metals we have gotten as a result of our agricultural sales overseas.

Mr. GROSS. What is the supplemental stockpile?

Mr. PHILBIN. That is supplemental to the national stockpile. It contains largely bartered metals, that we got through barter and international transactions relating to the disposal of agricultural products.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe that the action before the Congress today, in the previous bills we acted on here, again demonstrates the tremendous shortage of essential materials in this country. Certainly the development of our gross national product, the normal production of our industry, has been seriously impaired by the shortages of critical materials.

It appears to me—and I shall not object to this legislation—that the Congress ought to address itself to this problem which today is seriously affecting the normal growth of our American industry.

I think the time is long overdue when Congress ought to give serious consideration to a 27-percent depletion allowance on development of these critical steels, as we did in oil. When this country needed oil to keep the wheels of industry going and contribute to the normal growth of this country, we did come up with this plan.

It appears to me that with shortages of copper, zinc, aluminum, silver, and, yes, even of gold, we ought to give some thought to finding a way of producing these critical materials. Depleting our stockpiles is only a stopgap measure, and sooner or later it will bring about some serious problems.

I can appreciate what the gentleman is doing. I want to support his action. I think this series of bills we are acting on now should certainly be an indicator to this Congress that we do not have too much time to lose in facing up to this growing problem of shortages in essential materials in America. One of these days we will wake up to the fact that we do not have any stockpiles. Then what will we do?

It is my hope that the bill the gentleman has brought before this Congress today will stimulate appropriate committees of Congress to give more than passing attention and interest to this mounting problem. I do not think American industry can continue to expand in this country unless we face up to this problem.

In Chicago we are facing great shortages in copper. Many of our production lines are being slowed down simply because we have not the copper to produce the electronic goods we want to produce.

So, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, but I do hope Congress will address itself to this problem.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not take more than 30 seconds, I would like to suggest a better remedy is to pull our long noses out of every fracas everywhere in the world, to quit fighting wars all over the world, and we will have some metals with which to take care of our domestic economy.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13366 provides for the disposal of approximately 920,000 short tons of aluminum now held in the national stockpile.

As of August 31, 1965, we had 1,898,483 short tons of aluminum in the stockpile. The current stockpile objective is 450,000 short tons.

Of the total inventory of aluminum, 760,499 short tons are held in the Defense Production Act stockpile. As you know, this stockpile is under the control of the President, and releases therefrom do not require congressional action.

I think it is interesting to note that the stockpile objectives have varied from 250,000 short tons in 1949 to 2,500,000 in 1954; a subsequent reduction in 1958 to 290,000 short tons; an increase in 1959 to 1,200,000 short tons; and to the 450,000 short ton amount as of June 17, 1963. This is the current objective.

Aluminum is a bluish white, silvery metal, capable of being easily drawn or forged. It is lightweight—one-third lighter than steel—relatively strong, resistant to corrosion, and is electrically conductive. It is derived from bauxite.

Aluminum is principally used in aircraft and missiles, electrical power transmission cables, containers and packaging, and building products.

The average acquisition cost to the Government was $461.21 per short ton. To date, sales of 106,160 short tons of aluminum have been made. The average unit recovery was $465.36 per ton.

In approving this legislation, a slightly different condition prevails here than in any other bill we have had before us.

In November of 1965, the Government and the aluminum producers entered into an agreement subject, of course, to legislation authorizing the disposal by the Congress under which the aluminum producers would purchase all of the surplus aluminum from the stockpile.

The agreement calls for a disposal program over a 14-year period. This, of course, could be changed as the amount to be sold by the Government represents a minimum amount of which the producers could buy in any one year but does not necessarily constitute the maximum amount which they could purchase. Therefore, the entire surplus of aluminum could be disposed of in as short a period of time as 7 years.

Three provisions of the contract are particularly significant. The first is that the producers will purchase the aluminum from the Government at the producers published market price less cost of transportation from the storage points.

The second provision is that while the producers are required to purchase all of the surplus aluminum which the Government desires to sell, the contract on the part of the Government is limited and if the stockpile objective for aluminum is increased, the Government is not required to sell any amount above the stockpile objective.

Third, and probably the reason the producers entered into the contract was a requirement whereby the Department of Defense contractors will be required directly or through subcontractors, to purchase a quantity of excess stockpile aluminum equal in weight to the weight of aluminum products constituting or used in the production of, the items delivered under the contracts, as the case may be. This contract requirement was made a part of all applicable DOD contracts no later than March 31, 1966, and will continue as a portion of such DOD contracts until the entire excess stockpile aluminum is exhausted. And it further permitted the Government at its option to establish a similar requirement affecting contracts made by other Government departments and agencies for products or supplies containing aluminum.

The committee believes that the agreement appears to be in the best interests of both the Government and the aluminum industry as it provides for an orderly disposal of all surplus aluminum from the stockpile, yet at the same time, the agreement contains sufficient flexibility to protect the interests of the Government in the event the stockpile objective is increased.

If the price remains constant over the period of the disposal, the Government will stand to make a net profit of approximately $53,365,000.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection. the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13366

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately nine hundred and twenty thousand short tons of aluminum now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). The time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

Sec. 2. No disposal shall be made pursuant to the authority of this Act if such disposal would reduce the aggregate quantity of aluminum in the national stockpile and the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061–2166), below the present aluminum stockpile objective of four hundred and fifty thousand short tons.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILL TO UTILIZE SHORT-SHELF-LIFE ITEMS IN FEDERAL SUPPLY SYSTEMS

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, for several years the Subcommittee on Procurement and Regulation of the Joint Economic Committee under the chairmanship of Senator Douglas has been delving into the great economic waste involved in the management of so-called short-shelf-life items in the Government's stores inventories. To the layman, these are items of a perishable nature, which should be stored under proper environmental conditions and used somewhere in the Government while still usable or turned over to other public institutions if need be before they become worthless.

The subcommittee—and I want to add here that the gentleman from Texas, Congressman Patman, chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] have helped vitally in its work—has found that millions of dollars worth of paint, photographic materials, medical supplies, rubber goods, and other items have become unissuable on the agencies' shelves and then discarded. Some of the paint has gone to schools who have reconstituted it and used it for some purposes and costly photographic paper sometimes is used as scratch and drawing paper in our schools. But the original and intended utility for which we, the taxpayers, have paid high prices is usually lost.

In 1960, the subcommittee learned that $1 million worth of paint was declared surplus annually by the military agencies, and we were able to convince top management in the executive branch that the function of management of such materiel was essentially civilian in character and should be transferred to the General Services Administration. When this was done, it was found that large quantities of the stock was unissuable. So we asked the GAO to review and report on the matter.

The GAO made a survey and report to the subcommittee and the Comptroller General advised us:

> With respect to the transfer, items costing approximately $3.6 million were identified as (1) excess to requirements, (2) deteriorated and unfit for use, (3) not on the records but physically in the supply system, or (4) on the records but missing from stock.
>
> In addition, prior to these transfers, the GSA reduced its inventory balances by $2 million because stocks could not be located or were unfit for use.

I might add that the GSA had inherited the stock inventory mess from the services and had not had time to straighten it out.

I want to add also that this problem is not confined to the DOD, that the

Public Health Service has destroyed $19 million dollars worth of medical equipment and supplies the last year and has at least $8 million more that will be outdated in the next 18 months if not used.

We also found that GSA had declared as surplus considerable quantities of outdated photographic materials.

In our subcommittee report of September 1964 we recommended that the DSA and GSA make a joint survey of the short-shelf-life problem and report its findings. This was done and it was found that inventories of $703 million worth of items were so classified. A vigorous program to identify, date, issue, and protect these items is now underway.

A legislative problem was found, however, that agency heads could not truthfully state in all cases that items whose life span was about gone were unneeded and so could not declare them excess so another agency could use them nor could they be declared surplus so schools and hospitals could use them under the Donable Act that the Speaker has been interested in for years.

So in order to enable agency heads to permit this valuable property to be used first in the Federal establishment if possible, and if not to donate it under existing legislation, I am introducing a bill which defines "excess property" as being unneeded by the agency head or of too short a remaining storage or shelf life for possible use by his agency. The bill I am introducing also makes special provision for items in the medical stockpile which are subject to special legislation and to medical materials or supplies in foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I should add that the second section of my bill is a companion to S. 3328 which was introduced in the other body by Senator PROXMIRE and cosponsored by Senators DOUGLAS and METCALF.

It should be added in conclusion that there is urgency about the passage of this legislation. There are millions of dollars worth of perishable items which will do no one any good if ways and means are not found to put them to use. We are an affluent nation but there is an end to the amount of waste we can permit.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit certain short storage or shelf life property to be declared excess, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (e) of section 3 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 472), is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "Federal agency" and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or (2) the remaining storage or shelf life of which is determined by the head of such agency to be of too short duration to justify continued retention of such property for possible use by such agency."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p)(1) Whenever the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (referred to hereinafter in this subsection as the 'Secreretary') determines that the remaining storage or shelf life of any medical materials or supplies stored for national emergency purposes pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98a–h), or the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2251–2297), is of too short a duration to justify their continued retention for national emergency purposes, such materials or supplies shall be considered for the purposes of section 202 of this Act to be excess property. If such materials or supplies are not transferred to any other Federal agency pursuant to section 202 of this Act, they shall be made available for disposal pursuant to this section as surplus property. Whenever practicable, the Secretary shall make such determination at such time as to insure that such medical materials or supplies can be disposed of in compliance with this subsection before their shelf life expires and they are rendered unfit for human use.

"(2) Whenever the storage or shelf life of any medical materials or supplies stored for national emergency purposes, pursuant to the Acts referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, has been extended as the result of retesting, the Secretary may make as to such materials or supplies the determination described in paragraph (1) within 30 days after the date on which the storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies has been extended.

"(3) The Secretary shall inform the recipients of medical materials or supplies made available for donation pursuant to this subsection of the estimated remaining storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies, and whether the original estimated storage life thereof has been extended as the result of retesting.

"(4) The United States shall not be responsible for the safety, freshness, or effectiveness of any medical materials or supplies donated pursuant to this subsection, and the Secretary shall inform all recipients of such materials or supplies of that fact."

(b) Section 402 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 512), is amended by—

(1) Inserting, immediately after the section number "Sec. 402.", the subsection designation "(a)";

(2) Striking out in the first sentence thereof the clause designations "(a)" and "(b)", and inserting in lieu thereof the clause designations "(1)" and "(2)", respectively; and

(3) Adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe pursuant to this subsection, any executive agency having in any foreign country any medical materials or supplies which, if situated within the United States would be available for donation pursuant to section 203(p) of this Act, may donate such materials or supplies without cost, for use in any foreign country, to medical or health organizations which are qualified to receive such materials or supplies under section 203(p) of this Act."

INTOLERABLE CONDITION OF SHAW JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, for some time Members of the Congress and the public have been greatly concerned about the intolerable condition of Shaw Junior High School, and have recognized the urgent need to replace the present overcrowded and substandard facility with an adequate, up-to-date school. However, there have been no easy solutions to finding and financing a site suitable to serve the Shaw School district. Despite the real difficulties, a solution must be found and concrete action taken at the earliest possible date.

I believe that the initiation of an urban renewal project in the area offers some new opportunities for finding a solution. In recent weeks, the District Commissioners, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Redevelopment Land Agency have taken official steps to initiate the planning of an urban renewal project in an area which is roughly coterminus with the service area of the Shaw Junior High School. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is now reviewing the request for planning funds filed by the Redevelopment Land Agency.

Under urban renewal, a major portion of the cost of acquiring the real property within the site selected for the school can be financed with Federal urban renewal funds. With urban renewal assistance, the cost of the site to the School Board can be reduced to what a vacant site would cost. This additional financial assistance would provide an opportunity for more flexibility in the selection of a proper site for the new facility based upon sound considerations of school and neighborhood needs.

In addition, under urban renewal the new facility can be constructed while the present school facility is being used, and upon completion of the new facility, the land upon which the old school is located can be used for the construction of new low or moderate income housing or for some other appropriate use.

There is a practical problem which must be solved if the site is to be acquired without undue delays as a part of the urban renewal project. Under the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, the statute governing the exercise of urban renewal powers in the District of Columbia, the Redevelopment Land Agency may not exercise its power to acquire and dispose of real property until after official adoption of an urban renewal plan by the National Capital Planning Commission and approval of the plan by the District Commissioners. In a project of the size and scope of the Shaw School urban renewal area it normally takes approximately 2 years to prepare an urban renewal plan for the project and secure required local and Federal approvals of the plan. In my opinion, the intolerable condition of the Shaw Junior High School demands more immediate corrective action than would be possible under a schedule based upon normal urban renewal requirements.

I think that there is a solution to this problem. In 1959, the Congress amended the Housing Act to permit, under certain conditions, physical activities including real property acquisition in advance of the local and Federal approvals of an urban renewal plan for the entire project area. The Federal statute also provides that Federal loan funds may be utilized, where requested, for these activities. Many local jurisdictions have enacted legislation to take advantage of these provisions of the national legislation.

The amendment to the local law which I am introducing today to authorize early land acquisition under urban renewal powers would provide a practical and effective technique to permit prompt acquisition and preparation of an acceptable site for a new Shaw Junior High School. At least 2 years could be saved over the time required if the regular urban renewal planning process and plan approvals are followed. The legislation I am introducing would amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide the authority for the Redevelopment Land Agency to exercise its urban renewal powers for the purpose of acquiring and preparing a site for a new Shaw Junior High School prior to official local adoption and approval of an urban renewal plan for the entire Shaw project area. I wish to emphasize that, under the proposed amendment, the District Commissioners retain their responsibility for selection of the site and approval of the acquisition and disposition of all property within the site selected for the new facility. The legislation does not therefore change the manner in which the site would be officially selected if urban renewal powers were not involved, and in no way diminishes the authority and responsibility of the Congress and the District Commissioners in the decisions affecting the nature of the facility to be built and the financing of its construction.

I urge the enactment of the legislation for the District of Columbia as a proper and important step in meeting our responsibility to eliminate an intolerable situation in our Nation's Capital.

AN ADDRESS BY A DISTINGUISHED PUERTO RICAN, DR. ARTURO MORALES-CARRIÓN

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and pride that I call attention to an address by a distinguished Puerto Rican and my friend, Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrión, special adviser to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, which was delivered before the Naval Academy Foreign Affairs Conference, Annapolis, Md., on April 22, 1966.

Dr. Morales-Carrión is an expert on Latin American affairs. He is also a statesman and a scholar.

In this magnificent speech, Dr. Morales-Carrión distills complicated, historical, current, and emerging problems into language of simplicity. He is concerned with the human values, with the people that cause the problems, and who must be helped in solving them, as they must also help themselves. He considers these perplexities in the light of today's complicated world, of relieving human misery, of unleashing the shackles which have bound progress through countless years and of the development of a new society which will emerge. I believe that with the right policies to guide us, we can insure that the new society of South America will be in keeping with our democratic ideology.

As the address emphasizes, three ingredients necessary to meaningful and effective policymaking are knowledge, experience, and wisdom, and the last ingredient is not only the most important, but the most uncertain. In our dealings with the world and its people we must exercise wisdom, but first, we must achieve it. Tomorrow's stage and tomorrow's drama of world events is the future, and unless we go now about setting that stage, it may not be a drama to our liking.

Dr. Morales-Carrión speaks of the great surge of population expansion throughout Latin America. He says it is a continent of young people who are mostly in the cities and represent, therefore, "to a high degree, the hope, the problem and the pathos of city life." These young peole are also the real hope of tomorrow, for it is they who will either construct a peaceful, progressive society through the land, or who will create more problems. They are the logical target of both the Communist and the democratic world. Unless we reach this target, the consequences cannot be predicted.

Latin America is truly in a revolutionary status; it is a land of change, where nothing is static except perhaps the setting, the geography. We can inspire these changes and help to create the right climate for them—the ideas, system of production, social structure, power complexes, and economic forces. We can do all of this through our leadership, help, exchange of ideas, and working with the Organization of American States and other international bodies, recognizing that Latin America today is not thinking in terms of nuclear deterrents or world armed conflict, but is rather concerned with a better way of life, a fair system of politics, and social justice.

These points and many other fascinating observations are made in Dr. Morales-Carrión's address. I am sure that every Member of the House will benefit from reading it, and it is for this reason that I take this opportunity to include the address in the extension and revision of my remarks.

The address follows:

Latin America: A New Exploration

(By Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrión)

Those of us who watch the hemisphere ramparts are highly gratified to learn of your interest in exploring here the "terra incognita" of Latin America. It is an arduous but fascinating task, as the sailors of old discovered, when they started the great era of New World explorations. But today, geographical discovery is not enough. We don't have to chart the seas and lands which comprise our hemisphere. We have to chart new courses in the area of social and cultural behaviour; we have to discover psychological motivations in the field of politics and economics. We have to grasp value systems which are highly complex. These are rough seas, my friends, and the weather may be stormy. But I am certain that your seamanship in this adventurous ocean will be at par with the fine traditions of the Naval Academy.

You are setting forth in a long voyage in understanding, when you attempt to learn about international affairs and about the intricacies of policy-making. Three requisites are needed, in my opinion, for a successful completion of this effort. The first is knowledge—knowledge of basic facts about the lands and peoples to be explored. This knowledge is not difficult to obtain. Our affluent society has abundant knowledge, available to the young. All you have to do is to follow the prescription given to me by an Andalucian professor: "jarabe de codos a una mente clara"—a lot of elbow grease, added to a clear mind.

But, then, after knowledge, comes experience. Here we are treading on more difficult grounds, for there is no short cut to experience. It requires the rub of the world, which no book, no professor, no academy can give. It comes through trial and error and sometimes it's the priceless product of frustration and failure.

And the third requirement is wisdom. Here is, indeed, a rare gift. Its quality is very restrained. It doesn't drop like a gentle rain from heaven. It belongs to the area of human scarcity. It is not just a mixture of knowledge and experience. It grows from within, from a depth of feeling and thinking which is highly individualized, and not easily measured by our most sensitive computers.

These three ingredients go into the exercise which we call policy-making. But while we can be fairly certain of the first—knowledge—and can secure to a high degree the needed expertise, we are never sure of achieving the third—wisdom. Only history preserves the roll-call of the wise. And even, then, historical judgments are often fickle and subject to constant revision.

There is no choice but to be ready to revise our judgments in the elusive search for wisdom. The beginning of wisdom perhaps lies in the realization that our world is in a state of flux, that change is a basic rule in national and international life, and that new modes of thought and feeling are constantly emerging. Policy-making does not deal with a world of frozen things and stratified concepts; it rather deals with a stream where, as the Greek sage, Heraclitus, once remarked, "we cannot bathe in the same waters, for there is always an onrushing of new waves."

What are the new onrushing waves of Latin Americans? What are the new modes of thought and feeling? The answers, I am afraid, may be too complex or time-consuming, but I shall try to sketch a few thoughts, a few pointers, which might be useful to your exploration.

In sketching these pointers, I must, like Janus, the Greek god, look into both the past and the future, although I fully sympathize with that college professor who was always talking about the future until one of his students asked: "Why do you talk so much about the future? The professor replied: "Because that's a place where I am planning to spend a lot of time."

One basic fact to remember about Latin America is that it is not an "emerging" region nor a group of "emerging nations." Historically, it has been around for quite a while. Neither is it a unit, a coherent whole. As a matter of fact, it is a polycentric cultural universe. It is a region where power has been dispersed and fragmented. In many ways, Latin America is a creature of dispersion: geographical disperson, cultural dispersion, power dispersion. It has belonged to the world of the political invertebrates, ever since the Napoleonic times. You cannot deal with it as with the well-rounded coherent power entities—the political vertebrates—in the contemporary period: England, France, Germany, Russia, Japan, even China. Cultural diversity and political polycentrism are the rule in Latin America—a potpourri, a *guiso* or stew made of the most varied ingredients, savory and pungent, not easily digestible to those who are tasting it for the first time.

Another basic fact to remember is that Latin America, in spite of its contradictions, its diversity, its apparent exoticism, is very much a part of the West, not to be lumped with the African and the Asiatic countries, as an "alien" culture. The basic Latin American streak is Mediterranean, with the Iberian pattern incorporating elements of the Greco-Roman world, of the Arabic civilizations and the middle African cultures, as well as the ancient Indian heritages, but always striving to emphasize the dominant trends of Western culture in the social and economic institutions, the religion, the economy, the law, the artistic expressions. Several years ago, a distinguished Cuban sociologist, Fernando Ortiz, coined the term "transculturation," to designate the migration of men, ideas, words, institutions and plants to the New World milieu, which went into the creation of the mosaic which is Latin America.

But Latin America's process of adjustment was strongly affected by its geography, which had such a heavy influence on the historical development of the area.

Latin American history is not, like U.S. history, a march from East to West, an orderly and systematic filling in of the land, of the wide, open spaces. The struggle against geography—with few exceptions—has failed to achieve complete success. For Latin America, geography is seldom a friend, and frequently an enemy. It is too often an untamed force. Chile, for instance, has been called a geographical extravaganza. A German philosopher, Count Von Keyserling, while traveling in the Bolivian and Peruvian altiplano, felt that he was going through a lunar landscape and after experiencing the *soroche* or mountain sickness, wrote about the "dissolution of personality." The jungles of the eastern divide have been called a green hell, and have been described by some writers in terms quite adequate for an additional chapter to Dante's *Divine Comedy*. The Amazon, according to a contemporary Brazilian writer, Vianna Moog, "is an unpatriotic river, since if experts are to be believed, the land it swallows up only to disgorge later in the Atlantic is carried along by the Gulf Stream to add new territories to Mexico and the United States, in the alluvial formations of Yucatán and Florida."

There are, of course, in Latin America charming and hospitable valleys, rich and generous lands, magnificent beaches, breathtaking views, but the challenge to communications is still a formidable one and most of the area is compartmentalized, isolated, dispersed. The spine of the Andes has paradoxically created a political invertebrate.

But if Latin America is a study in human and social perplexity, it is a perplexity that is very much alive. As a matter of fact, it is alive and growing at an amazing rate. It has been fashionable to talk of the population explosion—influenced as we are by military jargon. The Latin Americans, however, do not explode. They just make love and have babies. In 1955, the population was 176 million; at the end of 1964, it reached 225 million: a gain of 50 million in ten years! The biological escalation, if continued, will give us an increase of population for the decade 1970–1980 of over 91 million: almost one hundred million in ten years! The computers on vital statistics will be kept busy; so will the pediatricians.

This population growth is changing the face of Latin America. It is no longer the traditional land of *mañana* so dear to American clichés; it is instead, the land of children, of youthful faces—a new biological look. Recent census-taking has revealed that more than 50 percent of the population is under 20 years of age. This is an onrushing wave that proves how right the old sage Heraclitus was.

But where are all these youthful faces? Are they filling the geographical spaces and spreading across the vast hinterland of the continent? Not so, say the statistical indices. For instance: Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Peru have among them 60 percent of the population of Latin America. Their urban population was over 35 million in 1950; in 1960, it climbed to nearly 60 million. The young are mostly in the cities.

They are, to a high degree, the hope, the problem and the pathos of city life. "From the Rio Grande to Cape Horn in every second coffin carried toward a grave is the body of a child who could live no longer than five years," reports *World Health,* the magazine of the World Health Organization. "Among children aged one to four, half the deaths are attributed to malnutrition."

The youthful world of Latin America, the world of adolescents, is putting tremendous pressure on the educational facilities, from the primary schools to the universities. It's worrying the economists no end, as they consider and revise their new theories about the "input" and "output" of the economic process. It startles the politicians, for the youthful teenagers have a knack of taking to the streets and of shaking the very seats of government power. And finally, it irritates the generals and the zealous custodians of public order. The emerging mass of adolescents is a great human target in the struggle of ideologies, with the Communists and the Christian Democrats battling for its allegiance, and the more moderate democratic groups and parties increasing their efforts to rejuvenate their traditional political leadership.

We may say, in repeating an outworn cliché, that the youthful groups are the future of Latin America. But what kind of a future? The trends will depend to a high degree on the vision and foresight of their adult contemporaries. For this vision is the factor which can provide the constructive channels for the explosive energy of the new generations.

The population growth has sharpened the inadequacies of the social and economic structures of Latin America. And there is a growing body of thinking, among responsible Latin Americans, a certain outlook which is beginning to influence economic decisions, political action and the complex network of international relationships.

One basic premise of this thinking is that Latin America is now truly in a revolutionary situation. This may sound paradoxical, for we are used to the notion that Latin America is the classical land of revolutions.

But let's not confuse the traditional exercise of star-studded officers in executing palace *coups* with the profound urge for change which is sweeping Latin America. While the military in many countries played the dangerous game of musical chairs, the agrarian structure, based on the *hacienda,* largely remained untouched.

The *hacienda*—or *fazenda* in Brazil—organized rural life since the colonial period. It became a self-centered world, mirroring the isolation and dispersion of power in Latin America. It was a system of economic production; a cell of political and even military action; a powerful social structure based on "familismo" or the predominance of family ties and values; and a system of human relationships, a way of life, a "culture" in the deepest and broadest sense of the word.

The *hacienda* was the counterpart of the city, which inherited the administrative tradition of the colonial period—the city with its bureaucrats, its lawyers, its ambitious traders, and, of course, its military headquarters where the men of the sword—the *espadones*—dreamed their dreams of Napoleonic grandeur and plotted against each other. In this exercise, the military were aided by crafty lawyers, who were always ready to write the proclamations, rationalizing the next "cuartelazo." (Note that this Spanish word "cuartelazo" is much more appropriate than "coup d'état." For what was involved in many cases was action by the "cuartel," and not a sophisticated "coup" against the "state").

The world of the *hacienda* has been shaken to its very roots. It has not altogether vanished, but the cracks are already showing.

It has not kept with with modern technology and is being challenged by the new social pressures. Furthermore, the old "paternalismo" is no longer acceptable to many peons who are now learning about trade unions, and collective bargaining. The disenchanted peons are flocking to the city, where the lure of modernity is great. The cities are being transformed, with the emphasis on new industries, requiring a variety of new services. Generating this transformation is an emerging middle sector, which is not subservient to the old oligarchical families. This new middle class is eager to wield political and social power, sometimes in alliance with new groups within the military.

This brief social sketch adds up to a revolutionary situation. For Latin America is anything but static. Ideas, systems of production, social structure, power complexes—everything is beginning to change. The economic aspects of change have been carefully studied; much less so, the political, social and cultural aspects. The economic basis of life can be reduced to meaningful statistics. It has, therefore, been easier to formulate a new economic thought for Latin America and to make a diagnosis of its economic ills, than to delve into the much more baffling world of cultural motivations and political action.

The new economic philosophy is based on the theory of development. Its theoretical expression is found in the reports of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America or in the technical papers prepared by the Organization of American States and other international organizations. Its action program is found in the 1961 Charter of Punta del Este, which established the Alliance for Progress, in the reports of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress and the work of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Latin American development requires a massive effort, both national and international, to expand and modernize industry and agriculture; to tackle agrarian reform, transportation development and rural modernization; to promote housing, education and public health, all within an integrated national development plan, aiming at self-sustained economic growth. It envisions close international collaboration in the promotion of trade and communications and the strengthening of national currencies.

The United States has committed its financial support to this effort. It has become an established part of U.S. policy. The Organization of American States has adopted it as its economic program and as a blueprint for multinational action. In spite of many difficulties and shortcomings, of many painful shortages, particularly in the field of human resources, the Alliance—as an expression of Latin American economic development—is beginning to move. It is really, as Dr. José A. Mora, the OAS Secretary General, recently pointed out, "not an Alliance for Progress, but an Alliance *in* Progress."

But beyond the basic economic thrust, there lies the impact on the new social and political world of Latin America. Economic action as envisaged really aims at national integration, by wiping out—or profoundly changing—the tradition bipolar world of the *hacienda* and the city, and by incorporating into the stream of national life, the marginalized and neglected elements—the Indians, the rural poor, the isolated and dispersed communities. And it aims at regional integration, which, for the first time since the Wars of Independence, is beginning to have a real, not a rhetorical meaning.

The economists see in an integrated Latin America the great consumers' market, the vast economic space that will make possible real industrialization and economic expansion and the breakdown of the compartmentalized, fragmented, economic archipelago of the past.

But integration is also developing a political and cultural mystique. It is beginning to appeal to the parliamentary leadership, to the political parties, to the university community and to the young. It is, in this sense, not merely concerned with the statistical imperatives of the new economic thought, but with a new psychological urge to do away with an invertebrate, balkanized Latin America. It seeks a voice and a role for Latin America in the contemporary world. Regional integration is one of the most revolutionary doctrines that has swept the area, since the unfulfilled dreams of Bolivar and the Liberators.

Sometimes, it has been referred to as continental nationalism. Its aims may be too grandiose for the immediate political and economic reality. But many Latin Americans feel that their nationalism needs a recasting. While nationalism built the limited world of the thirteen original colonies into the United States of today—a great cohesive effort in Western history—in Latin America, with the possible exception of Brazil, nationalism was a factor of dispersion and isolation. It failed to preserve the imposing historical cohesion, the power structure of the Spanish empire. But nation-building now has a new meaning with the emerging doctrines of economic development.

It is symptomatic of the revolutionary situation in Latin America that the most alert political or intellectual leadership, committed to the preservation of western values, is looking beyond national frontiers toward the creation of regional or subregional groupings, with a new coherence and solidarity.

These are some of the pointers to the future, some of the onrushing waves to which we were alerted by Heraclitus. Latin America is in a crisis of growth. It is not an affluent but an ardent land. It is not thinking—as the United States is—of nuclear deterrents, of containment, of the balance of terror, of controlled reprisals or the inadvertent war. It is primarily concerned with its social pressures, its slums, its lack of productivity, the crisis of its oligarchies, the scheming of its military, the squabbles of its politicos, and the agitation of its young people. It is highly involved in the social question, not the nuclear question.

Latin America is perhaps the crucible of a new form, a new mode of the Western World, which because of historical vicissitudes and the contemporary power relationships, is not evolving under the shadow of a possible nuclear conflict, and, therefore, is less obsessed with nuclear annihilation—a form, an entity which will most probably not project its economic or political power in other continents, but will concentrate its efforts in the development of its huge hinterland and the taming of its geography. Before conquering outer space, Latin America has its own geographical and social space to conquer. It will be for a long time a paradoxical arena of human turmoil and clashing ways of life, a land of tensions and generational struggles, largely self-centered. To some, it will continue to be a despairing land to explore, a nemesis of computers and organized rational thinking, a source of exasperation to policy makers engaged in the power balancing process.

To others, it will continue to be a fascinating chapter in the adventures and troubles and contradictions of modern man in building a more human and fruitful social order, and an invitation to the quest for knowledge, experience and wisdom.

NEW LEFTWING IN AMERICA MAKING AS ITS GOAL IN LIFE PURGING OF DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES WHO DO NOT OPPOSE AND CRITICIZE THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I read an article appearing in the Evans and Novak column.

According to this column, the new left wing in America is making as their goal in life the purging of democratic candidates who do not oppose and criticize the administration's policies and actions in South Vietnam.

I note further that one of the great brains and money raisers in this new left-leftwing is a person by the name of Michael Straus. I think this is the same Michael Straus who was Commissioner of Reclamation when the infamous third division of the Riverton project in Wyoming was authorized and passed. To give you an example of the great wisdom and vision that Mr. Straus possesses I refer you to Public Law 88–278 which gives the Bureau of Reclamation the authority to buy land in the third division. Now pending before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is H.R. 7398, a bill which would completely write off the cost of this project and this is what will have to be done eventually. In simple language, the third division of the Riverton project is a complete flop. In my opinion, the campaign to purge incumbent Democratic Congressmen who support President Johnson's policy in South Vietnam will meet with the same fate.

I might not have made the same decisions that the President of the United States has made and I might not agree with everything that he does in South Vietnam or anywhere else, but I do not have his responsibility. I might not even agree with the leadership of this House but I do not have the Speaker's responsibility either. I resent as a Democrat, as a Member of this House, and also as a citizen of the United States the new left-leftwing just as much as I resent the new right-rightwing. If they desire a political battle to purge Democratic candidates, I invite them to participate in the November election in the great State of New Mexico. I think this would be an excellent testing ground and I would be delighted to have my opponent receive their help.

The article referred to follows:

MONEY FOR THE LEFT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

On the eve of last Sunday's (May 15) peace march on the White House, youthful demonstrators mingled with left wing fat cats in the fashionable Northwest Washington home of Michael Straus (an Assistant Secretary of the Interior in Roosevelt days).

Present at the Saturday night affair were some of the leading lions of the peace movement headed by Dr. Benjamin Spock, the pediatrician-turned-politician. Their purpose: to raise money to defeat liberal Democratic candidates who support President Johnson on Vietnam.

Actually, the evening at the Straus home was pretty much of a flop. Not all the wealthy liberals invited turned up. Those that did were a little skeptical of turning their checks over to "non-professionals" right on the spot. Still, the effort was another example of the surprising determination of the New Left to get into practical politics.

The naked attempt to pressure Democratic candidates into opposing Mr. Johnson on Vietnam, launched last fall in Washington, has not disintegrated as many professional politicians predicted it would.

The determination is particularly shown in the fund-raising effort by the National Conference for New Politics, which has rented swanky offices at 660 Fifth Avenue in Manhattan. Recently, it sent out a fund-raising appeal signed by Simon Casady, a left-wing California politician; Julian Bond, the paid staffer for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (Snick) who became a martyr to liberals when denied a seat in the Georgia legislature, and the ubiquitous Dr. Spock.

The Spock-Bond-Casady letter is supposed to bring in $65,000 to finance peace candidates this year. If it doesn't, plans are afoot for another fund appeal to a smaller clientele—this one signed by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who has displayed an unfailing touch in money-raising.

The money is supposed to go to a "white list" of some 50 peace candidates, about 30 of them running for Congress—some of them incumbent, more of them challenging incumbents. And the placid attitude by regular Democrats is changing into deep concern.

Consider Rep. JAMES MICHAEL HANLEY, a 46-year-old freshman Democrat elected during the LBJ landslide of 1964 from the Republican stronghold of Onondaga County (Syracuse), N.Y. HANLEY is a straight-out liberal on bread-and-butter matters, but also happens to be an anti-Communist—a fatal fault in the opinion of the New Left.

HANLEY found this out the night of Sunday, May 1, when he traveled home to Syracuse to meet with local leaders of the Liberal Party. HANLEY was the Liberal as well as the Democratic nominee in 1964. But, since then, the Syracuse Liberal Party has been taken over by the New Left. On May 1, they made clear to HANLEY they were unalterably opposed to his support of the President in Vietnam.

As a result, HANLEY withdrew from consideration for the Liberal nomination. It is now likely to go to a peace candidate: Norman Balabanian, a professor of electrical engineering at Syracuse University who lately has been on sabbatical at the University of California at Berkeley—national headquarters of the New Left.

The arithmetic is ominous for Hanley. In 1964, he won by only 5000 votes while getting 4400 votes on the Liberal line. Moreover, the Liberal endorsement could be worth more this year if it is backed by funds provided by the National Conference for New Politics.

That's why regular Democrats are taking seriously such efforts as the fund-raising party in the Straus home last Saturday night. It fits in with an admission of goals by "Interchange," a publication sponsored by Snick, the Students for a Democratic Society, the Mississippi Democratic Freedom Party, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the Institute for Policy Studies and the National Students Association. "Interchange" declares:

> Maybe he (an independent candidate) could get only a small vote but could take enough votes away from Congressman X to cause X to lose to the other major party candidate. This would be a way of showing both parties that some people felt strongly enough about peace in Vietnam . . . that they would give or withhold their votes."

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the partisan carping against the war on poverty is having little effect. Responsible persons know that the war on poverty is a tremendously important national effort, and a particularly inappropriate target for politically inspired attacks. It is also an increasingly successful effort and is gaining a momentum all across the Nation, which augurs well for our disadvantaged fellow citizens, and for our common future.

As an outstanding example of the endorsement the war on poverty is receiving from responsible observers, I refer my colleagues to an article by the distinguished, nationally syndicated columnist, Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Poverty War Does Vital Job Despite Flaws."

Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Drummond is known as a man with a secondary preference for Republicans and a primary preference for the truth. His article should make profitable reading for our friends on the minority side. Mr. Drummond concludes that:

> No program as pioneering as the war on poverty will be without its flaws and its fumbling. But this is the right war at the right time against the right enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Mr. Drummond's excellent article, as it appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on May 10, inserted at this point in the Record.

The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 10, 1966]

POVERTY WAR DOES VITAL JOB DESPITE FLAWS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—Because the war on poverty is berated by some of the "organized poor" and buffeted by some administrative foulups and local corruption, there is danger that its worth and necessity will be undermined. It is doing much of value. It needs to be done.

In separate speeches Henry Ford, 2d, and Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, have together provided a persuasive case:

That the war on poverty is no dream-world reform but is imperative because there is so much poverty in the midst of so much prosperity.

That there is an urgent role for both government and private enterprise to help the underprivileged to acquire the incentive and skills to get their stake in society.

That failure of either government or private enterprise to do this risks the kind of social violence which nearly engulfed the nation at the depth of the depression.

Henry Ford warns that the U.S. "must move more rapidly to solve its social problems and thereby eliminate the conditions that breed anger and frustration and blind rebellion."

Sargent Shriver puts the purpose of the war on poverty in similar terms:

"We are going through a period of social and economic unrest not unlike that we saw in the thirties. Consequently there will be explosions.

"American society cannot afford wildcat strikes in the industrial area. Even less can it afford a wildcat strike against the entire social order—and that's what Watts was."

This is why Shriver sees the Economic Opportunity Act as being for the poor what the National Labor Relations Act was for labor. It offers representation, participation, a forum for bargaining and new grievance procedures between the poor and the rest of society.

As Ford points out, we are still moving too slowly, but government and private enterprise are both moving. The growth of the economy during the past year enabled more than 2,000,000 families to cross over the "poverty line" to an annual income of $3,000 or better. Unemployment rate among Negro adults dropped to 5.5 percent. The need is to create workers with the necessary skills to fill the jobs already created by economic growth.

This is exactly what the Government's war on poverty is all about. It is not a handout agency and it does not rest on a handout philosophy. It aims to provide the special education, the training and the incentive to those who, because of many deprivations, have lost their way.

Here are a few examples: Head Start is a preschool program for 4 and 5-year olds. Upward Bound is a tutorial and remedial education program for high school students with college potential. Job Corps provides work and training for school dropouts. One school superintendent complained to his principals: "Job Corps has fewer dropouts than we do. And they start with 100 percent dropouts."

No program as pioneering as the war on poverty will be without its flaws and its fumbling. But this is the right war at the right time against the right enemy.

BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM J. GLASGOW—100 YEARS OLD TODAY

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, in my home city of El Paso, Tex., a birthday celebration of wide interest to our entire country is being held. The oldest living graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, Brig. Gen. William J. Glasgow, is 100 years old today. Other distinguished graduates of the Academy will call to pay their respects and will present the general with a 100th anniversary album. Maj. Robert E. Glasgow, of the West Point staff, a distant cousin to the general, will extend the greetings from today's corps of cadets.

In El Paso today, General Glasgow is a living, vital link to our historic past. He graduated from the Military Academy in 1891, and his first assignment was with the cavalry at Fort Bayard, N. Mex. These were the closing days of the Indian campaigns of the Southwest, and Lieutenant Glasgow counted among his duties the pursuit of the "Apache Kid" over the New Mexico desert.

In the Spanish-American War, he performed an important service in outfitting troops embarking from Florida and then saw active duty in Cuba. Early in this century, he served in the Dakotas and in the Philippines, and in 1916, as a cavalry major, he was a member of the expedition that pursued the bandit Pancho Villa into Mexico.

In World War I, Lieutenant Colonel Glasgow rendered outstanding service as director of an officers training camp at Fort Myer, Va., training some 4,000 officers for service overseas. At the Army War College, he prepared a curriculum for National Guard officers; and as commander of an infantry brigade he was preparing his unit for service in France when the war ended.

His temporary rank of brigadier general, conferred during World War I, became permanent in 1927. In the meantime, he had seen important service in various command and instructional posts of the Army. He was retired for physical disability in 1927, and returned to El Paso, where he served for 13 years as personnel director for Phelps-Dodge Corp., retiring in 1940.

Nearly 70 years ago, on October 29, 1896, the dashing young cavalry officer married Miss Josephine Magoffin—thereby uniting two great pioneer families of the Southwest. Miss Magoffin's grandfather, James Wiley Magoffin, was one of the pioneers of the Santa Fe Trail, and rendered distinguished diplomatic service to this country during the Mexican War of 1846–47.

Her father, Joseph Magoffin, was a distinguished pioneer mayor of El Paso. General Glasgow's father, E.. J Glasgow, was also a pioneer of the Santa Fe Trail and of its extension from Santa Fe into Chihuahua.

Since 1927, General and Mrs. Glasgow have lived in the majestic old Magoffin home, built by Mayor Joseph Magoffin in 1875, and recently designated a Texas historical landmark. Here, the general has contributed greatly, as both student and historian, to our knowledge of Southwestern history.

A gracious gentleman of the old school; a worthy exemplar, in the finest sense, of the term "an officer and a gentleman," Gen. William J. Glasgow, on his 100th birthday, is an example to all of us of a life spent proudly in the service of his country.

EXEMPLARY REHABILITATION CERTIFICATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives legislation which would allow, under proper evidence, the awarding of a rehabilitation certificate for certain persons who have received discharges from the Armed Forces under less than honorable conditions. This bill, H.R. 15053, would amend title 10 of the United States Code, by authorizing the award of exemplary rehabilitation certificates to veterans who adequately prove rehabilitated conduct for at least a 3-year period.

Large numbers of persons who have been dismissed or discharged from military service under other than honorable service have had considerable difficulty securing and holding steady employment. My bill would assist those persons by allowing them to be considered for an exemplary rehabilitation certificate, issued by the Department of Labor.

The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to establish boards to receive and act on applications for the certificate.

The boards would issue the certificate to an applicant, who may appear in person and may be represented by counsel, and who shows that his character is good and that his conduct and activities have been exemplary for a period of not less than 3 years. An applicant would present certain evidence to the boards, including statements from a law enforcement official, persons acquainted with the applicant, his employer, if any, and the board could carry on an independent investigation.

Job counseling and employment placement would be given to individuals receiving the certificate. Present law prohibits these benefits given to these potential applicants at the present time. No veterans' benefits or other advantages of a good conduct discharge would be affected.

It has been estimated that over 500,000 persons living today hold a less than honorable military discharge, which would make them eligible for application for an exemplary rehabilitation certificate. Department of Defense figures from 1957 to 1965 show that 215,255 discharges have been awarded under other than honorable conditions, or 3.2 percent of all military discharges awarded during this 9-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful for early action on this legislation. It would allow qualified persons an opportunity to earn a better employment opportunity for themselves. Many of these veterans suffer employment difficulties far beyond what would be occasioned by an identical offense in civilian life.

The bill reads as follows:

H.R. 15053

A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates to certain individuals after considering their character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part II of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after chapter 79 thereof the following new chapter:

"Chapter 80. Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates

"Sec.
"1571. Establishment of boards.
"1572. Consideration and issuance of certificate.
"1573. Matters considered.
"1574. Other benefits.
"1575. Job counseling and employment placement.
"1576. Reports.

"§ 1571. Establishment of boards.

"The Secretary of Labor shall establish boards to receive and act on any application for an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate received under this chapter from any person who was discharged or dismissed under conditions other than honorable at least three years before the date of receipt of such application.

"§ 1572. Consideration and issuance of certificate.

"In the case of any person discharged or dismissed from an armed force under conditions other than honorable before or after the enactment of this chapter, a board may, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, consider an application for, and issue to that person, an 'Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate' dated as of the date of issuance, if it is established to the satisfaction of the board that such person has rehabilitated himself, that his character is good, and that his conduct, activities, and habits since he was so discharged or dismissed have been exemplary for a reasonable period of time, but not less than three years. The Secretary of Labor shall supply a copy of each such Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate which is issued, to the Secretary of Defense, who shall place such copy in the military personnel record of the individual to whom the certificate is issued.

§ 1573. Matters considered.

"(a) For the purposes of section 1572, oral and written evidence, or both, may be used, including—

"(1) a notarized statement from the chief law enforcement officer of the town, city, or county in which the applicant resides, attesting to his general reputation so far as police and court records are concerned;

"(2) a notarized statement from his employer, if employed, attesting to his general reputation and employment record;

"(3) notarized statements from not less than five persons, attesting that they have personally known him for at least three years as a person of good reputation and exemplary conduct, and the extent of personal contact they have had with him; and

"(4) such independent investigation as the board may make.

"(b) Any person making application under this chapter may appear before a board considering such application in person or by counsel.

"§ 1574. Other benefits.

"No benefits under any laws of the United States (including, but not limited to, those relating to pensions, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guarantees, retired pay, or other benefits based on military service) shall accrue to any person to whom an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate is issued under section 1572 unless he would be entitled to those benefits under his original discharge or dismissal.

"§ 1575. Job counseling and employment placement.

"The Secretary of Labor shall accord to any individual who has been discharged or dismissed under conditions other than honorable, but who has been issued an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate under this chapter, the same privileges and benefits accorded to veterans under chapter 41 of title 38.

"§ 1576. Reports.

"The Secretary of Labor shall report to Congress not later than January 15 of each year the number of cases reviewed by each board under this chapter, and the number of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates issued."

SEC. 2. The analysis of part II of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"79. Correction of Military Records.... 1551"

the following:

"80. Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates.............................. 1571".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 2001 of title 38, United States Code, clauses (3) and (5) of section 2002 of such title, and sections 2003 and 2004 of such title are amended by striking out "veterans of any war or of service after January 31, 1955" each place it appears therein.

(b) The first sentence of section 2002 of such title 38 is amended by striking out "veteran of any war or of service after January 31, 1955".

(c) Clauses (1) and (4) of section 2002 of such title 38 are amended by striking out "veterans of any war or of service after January 31, 1955," each place it appears in such clauses.

IT IS UP TO CONGRESS TO PROTECT THE AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1966, the most enlightening spokesman for the administration, Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors and ex officio Secretary of Agriculture, informed the Super Market Institute in Chicago that:

> The support price for milk was increased in the hope that it would help to encourage a larger output. By assuring milk producers that they will get at least this higher minimum, we may well obtain lower actual prices on milk than would otherwise be the case.

Meanwhile, another administration official, Orville Freeman, was busy making widely publicized apologies to selected audiences of U.S. Senators for the recent siege of activities directed against farm prices and insisting that American farmers still have a voice at the Nation's highest conference tables.

Speaking for my fellow farmers, we are tired of all this conflicting and politically expedient ballyhoo. It is time for Congress to reemphasize its clear intent concerning the treatment of our family farmers.

Like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have received many letters calling for stronger congressional action to protect the agricultural economy from discriminatory administration policies. I am today introducing a concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against any actions of any governmental agencies which would have the effect of lowering farm prices when those prices are below parity levels. This administration has apparently forgotten that this protection is already written into law, so it is necessary for us to remind them.

To conclude my remarks, I insert a letter I received from Mr. Otie M. Reed, the executive director of the National Creameries Association, followed by the text of my concurrent resolution:

NATIONAL CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1966.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: We continue to be disturbed over the apparent trend in governmental policy in respect to dairy products, insofar as this policy has been disclosed through a number of administrative actions and announcements during the last few months. We do not believe the trend in policy so disclosed meets the intent of the Congress as exemplified in legislation affecting dairy farm income.

We are sure that you are aware of these actions and statements by responsible officials which disturb us. Suffice it to say that they include such matters as (a) the failure to increase price supports in an amount that would be sufficient, in our opinion, to stop the downward plunge in milk cow numbers and milk production, and thus to assure an adequate supply; (b) the effort to reduce drastically the Special School Milk Program; (c) the discontinuation of the use of butter by the Armed Forces; (d) the purchase of substitutes for relief distribution in lieu of purchases of dairy products; (e) the numerous statements that have been made by responsible Government officials that retail food prices are too high and this situation is blamed, inferentially at least, upon high farm prices; and (f) the recent move on the part of the Administration to increase cheese quotas for the purpose of moderating increases in cheese prices and to correct "imbalances" in the price of manufacturing milk entering different uses.

Production of milk in the United States continues to run considerably below the comparable period a year ago. In March, U.S. milk production was 4.6 percent below March 1965. In the important dairy manufacturing States, milk production was down from March the preceding year by 7 percent in Wisconsin, 10 percent in Minnesota, 13 percent in Iowa, 11 percent in North Dakota, 8 percent in South Dakota, 13 percent in Nebraska, and 5 percent in Kansas. Ohio was down 2 percent and the States of Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan were down 6 percent from the preceding year.

The USDA is forecasting a decline in total milk production of about 2 percent under last year's production of 125.1 billion pounds. This assumes improved pasture and forage and normal gains in output per cow—assumptions which may not be borne out. It suffices to state that for the first 3 months of this year, production was down 5.2 percent as compared to the same period a year ago. USDA also reports that through April 21 this year cheese production was down 3 percent and butter production 26 percent.

Dairy farmers must make their future production plans considerably in advance. Their attitude in respect to maintaining the dairy enterprise on U.S. farms and of bringing it back to levels more commensurate with the adequate supply criterion is influenced markedly by the attitude of Government. Yet the attitude of Government, as disclosed by the enumeration of actions and statements set forth heretofore, can have no other effect than that of causing dairy farmers to have serious misgivings as to the future of their dairy enterprise and thus will contribute to the shrinking of this enterprise on farms in the United States and, in particular, on the large number of dairy farms that produce milk for use in manufactured dairy products.

The efforts of the Administration to increase cheese quotas under Section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, clearly is a very disturbing factor in the attitude of dairy farmers in this country.

It seems clear to us that the Administration has embarked upon a policy involving (a) the establishment of relatively low levels of price support, and (b) increasing import quotas to hold down prices.

We feel the Congress never intended that Government policy be as described above, but rather the Congress intended that Government programs be designed to secure parity prices for farmers and that import controls be meticulously applied as long as prices to farmers are below parity. Under the price support program for this marketing year beginning April 1, the price support level for manufacturing milk is at 78 percent of parity and for milkfat is at 75 percent of parity.

We trust our views in this matter will be of interest to you, and we hope that in some manner the Congress can reverse the policy which clearly seems to have been adopted by the Administration in respect to dairy prices and dairy farm income in the United States.

We note that in the Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution 88 has been introduced by Senator MCGOVERN for himself and forty other Senators, which resolution makes the intent of Congress clear that no agency of Government take action for the purpose of preventing the price of an agricultural commodity selling below parity from rising to parity.

We think it would be highly desirable for the House of Representatives to adopt a resolution having the same purpose as Senate Concurrent Resolution 88.

Sincerely yours,

OTIE M. REED,
Executive Director.

H. CON. RES. 660

Whereas the Congress of the United States has frequently declared parity prices and parity income for farmers a national objective; and

Whereas such congressional directives are a matter of law, as in section 2 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as amended by section 302 of the Agricultural Act of 1948, which directs that the powers conferred in the Act shall be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture "to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions for agricultural commodities in interstate commerce as will establish, as the prices to farmers, parity prices as defined in section 301(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938"; and

Whereas agricultural prices April 15, 1966, were at 80 per centum of parity; and

Whereas the Department of Commerce imposed license and export restrictions on cattle hides, calf and kip skins on March 7, 1966, thus lowering prices received by livestock farmers; and

Whereas the Department of Defense ordered a 50 per centum cutback in purchases of pork products to be served our men in the services in order to lower prices on these products; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has ceased to purchase and serve butter to most of our servicemen, eliminating market opportunities for dairy farmers; and

Whereas the United States Tariff Commission, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and the President, increased Cheddar cheese imports in competition with the domestic dairy farmers; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has requested larger increases in Cheddar cheese imports in future years; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation sold large quantities of wheat and feed grains, thus depressing prices received by grain farmers for their products; and

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget recommended cutbacks in important programs such as the school lunch and special milk programs for children, land-grant college research, and conservation; and other programs which affect the agricultural economy; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture increased raw sugar imports to lower the market prices received by domestic sugar producers; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation ordered the removal of its corn stocks from feed-deficit areas, thus increasing farmers' costs to obtain needed feed and seed supplies; and

Whereas since 1952, farm production costs have increase 15 per centum while prices received by farmers have decreased 6 per centum; and

Whereas both agricultural and nonagricultural agencies of the Government are involved in actions intended to freeze or roll back agricultural prices which are below parity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the provision of the Agricultural Act of 1948 shall be construed, as Congress intended as applicable to all agencies of Government, as well as to the Secretary of Agriculture, and that no action be taken by any agency of Government with the effect of preventing the price of an agricultural commodity selling below parity from rising to parity.

SYLVESTER REPLY TO ARTICLE APPEARING IN WEEKLY PUBLICATION OF OVERSEAS PRESS CLUB

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased, in behalf of both comity and equity, to present both sides of any question. Herewith I insert in the RECORD, at the request of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, his letter to me, and his letter to the president of the Overseas Press Club of America. The letter was reprinted with a minor error in the weekly publication of the Overseas Press Club of America, entitled "The Bulletin," and subtitled "Sylvester Reply."

I print it without further comment in interest of the above except, as one of the "doctors" in the House, to observe that "the nearer the bone the greater the blood." Objective readers will note that the reply maligns the original article, but does not deny the allegations. I know not the purpose of the Overseas Press Club of America, but this raises the question of "the kettle calling the pot black."

The material referred to follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1966.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALL: This is in pursuance of our conversation this morning in which you, having inserted in the May 12 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Morley Safer's personal attack on me, agreed you would have my answer inserted in the RECORD.

This answer appeared in the May 14 issue of the Bulletin of the Overseas Press Club, of which I am a member.

I am sending a copy of my letter and a copy of the Bulletin in which it was used. The Bulletin contains a minor error in the penultimate paragraph. The word "would" is used whereas, my letter had the word "should."

Sincerely,

ARTHUR SYLVESTER.

MAY 10, 1966.

Mr. VICTOR RIESEL,
President, Overseas Press Club of America,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR VIC: On receipt of "Dateline 1966" I was startled to read in the "Contributor's Column" that the article which Arthur G. Milton, publisher of the Overseas Press Club's annual magazine, had asked me to write was billed as a reply to an abusive piece in the same issue by Morley Safer. Since I had not seen Safer's gem of misrepresentation until it appeared, since your people had not advised me that he was going to write for the issue and since I was never offered an opportunity to reply, I think this sort of editorial dishonesty directed against a club member is inexcusable.

The enclosed copy of my full article with the deleted portions underlined will show you the sort of editing to which it was subjected. The deleted sections contain much of the thought and substance of my views toward the television medium. It makes me wonder what sort of editorial policy Messrs. Milton, Jess Gorkin, and Edwin Kiester, Jr., adhere to. I say this because Safer's attack on me is based on his recollection of what took place on a Saturday night in July 1965 in Barry Zorthian's home in Saigon.

While the readers of the current "Dateline" which is locked up for a year were denied an opportunity to hear the other side and misled as well, I appreciate the opportunity to be heard in the Bulletin.

Why its editor chose, in the April 30 issue, to subject me to further abuse by reprinting from the "Dateline" only the attack on me, again without opportunity to reply, is beyond me.

Furthermore, I can't understand why the Bulletin rewrite couldn't even report Safer correctly. The Bulletin said that Safer "told of a briefing held between Vietnam correspondents and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Arthur Sylvester." What Safer actually wrote was: "Zorthian opened by saying that this was not to be the usual briefing 'for information,' but a bull session." Strange to say Safer got that right but otherwise his recollection of the evening was "bull."

The Bulletin excerpted from Safer the statement that "One newsman asked Sylvester, after he had announced to them that it was their duty to report only information that made us look good, if they were expected to be the 'handmaidens of government.' 'That's exactly what I expect,' was Sylvester's reply."

This is utterly untrue. Additionally, I must say Safer is the only man I ever heard refer to another man as a "handmaiden," especially a newsman.

Perhaps I shouldn't be surprised at Safer's distortions, misstatements of fact, and self-created quotations attributed to me in view of the fact that he wrote: "I was with Murray Fromson, CBS Southeast Asia correspondent. As we returned from our nightly broadcast to New York we looked forward to the cool drinks that are always available at Zorthian's villa." Apparently Safer's primary interest that night was in working over the drinks and then came his working over me as a clouded and confused afterthought.

Perhaps I shouldn't squawk when I consider the distortion of U.S. Marine Corps activity Safer perpetrated on CBS for which he won a prize and the undying contempt of the Marines.

Maybe I should brush it all off but it was this same Safer who was cited by Colonel Ben W. Legare in Saigon, last August 11, for this violation of well articulated security rules, thereby endangering American troops. Even Safer's former boss, Fred W. Friendly, Vice President of CBS, expressed concern at this performance.

Nevertheless, I do feel the treatment given a member of the Club by both the "Dateline" and the Bulletin was shabby to say the least.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR SYLVESTER.

RISING PRICE IN QUININE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's UPI dispatch No. 123 and No. 136 entitled "Quinine," reveals according to Senate investigators, an international cartel controlling the rapidly rising prices of quinine and quinidine in spite of a plentiful supply. As one of the "doctors in the House," I have recently written constituents and Government agencies concerning this problem. I ask unanimous consent that they be reprinted herewith, and strongly recommend that the appropriate congressional investigative machinery be placed in gear to correct any domestic participation in any such monopoly and price control mechanism, on behalf of the poor and harassed heart sufferers requiring quinidine for regulation of the vital heart rhythm, so say nothing of the quinine needed by our military force in fighting the dreaded falciparum type of malaria causing so many nonbattle casualties to our troops in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, during World War II, I was in part responsible for a medical missionary bringing cinchona tree "slips" or plants in a suitcase out of Indonesia for experimental farms in semitropical America, and so forth. Based on our stockpiles of cinchona bark, quinine and its isomers, or for other reasons—the experiment was allowed to falter.

It is unthinkable that this rare and vital commodity sopped up the surplus from our strategic stockpile at 20 cents an ounce, and through international controls are now extracting over $2 an ounce for the basic drug. It is even more fantastic that those disposing of it for the United States—the GSA—did not establish a domestic upset price, to say nothing of letting it get in the hands of the Dutch and West German quinine processors in view of our McNamara war, and increased national need.

I strongly urge the immediate investigation of the Departments of State and Defense and/or others involved in the domestic and international scandal, toward the application of penalties or at least withholding of aid to the governments allowing such despicable practices.

QUININE

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 17, 1966.

Senate investigators showed today that an international cartel increased prices of quinine and quinidine despite a plentiful supply of the raw material used to make the drugs.

Chief Counsel Jerry Cohen, of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, submitted the evidence after U.S. sellers of Dutch quinine testified that prices have soared because of world shortages.

De Schepper said "the reason for the high prices is a worldwide shortage of cinchona tree bark which is the raw material from which quinine and quinidine are extracted."

But Cohen introduced State Department documents, import figures, and cinchona production figures supplied by Indonesia, the world's largest producer of the cinchona bark.

All the documents showed that there had been an abundant supply of the bark since 1964 when prices started soaring.

Under questioning, the Greeff official admitted that the shortage of cinchona tree bark could be attributed to speculators hoarding supplies from Indonesia.

The firm represented Dutch quinine processors between 1961 and 1964 in purchasing more than 8 million ounces of quinine from the U.S. strategic stockpile for about 20 cents an ounce. The same firms are selling it for about $2 an ounce today.

Subcommittee officials showed that about a third of the U.S. quinine ended up in the hands of West German quinine processors despite the fact that only one Dutch firm made the purchase.

MARIONVILLE, MO.,
January 18, 1966.

Dr. DURWARD G. HALL,
Congressman, Missouri Seventh District,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HALL: Since you are our Congressman, and also because you are a physician, I trust you can explain to me what is happening with regard to the drug, Quinidine.

I regret that it is very necessary to my well being. I require at least four- 3Gr. tablets each day to help control Auricular Fibrillation. Thus when the price has gone up from $8.00 per thousand to $70.00 to $100.00 per thousand in a short time, I am wondering if some one is not withholding it to speculate, or profiteer.

I have no income except Social Security, which is not sufficient to pay such exorbitant prices for Quinidine, and to meet my other necessary expenses also. I read somewhere that the government planned to release some of its stockpile of Quinine and Quinidine because of the rapid raise in the prices. Is that correct?

Thanking you for any information you can give me, I am,

Respectfuly yours,

MARJORIE S. ALLISON.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE, FOOD AND DRUG
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1966.
Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALL: This is in reply to your request of January 25, 1966, in behalf of Mrs. Marjorie Allison, Marionville, Missouri, about quinidine.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act deals with the safety, purity, and labeling of drugs. It contains no provisions authorizing us to regulate the prices charged for quinidine sulfate or any other drug; neither are there other Federal statutes containing such authorization. Thus, we have no control over the prices and supply of quinidine.

We understand from recent articles in trade publications and newspapers that there has apparently been an upheaval in the quinine-quinidine market due to various factors. Quinine is used in treating malaria, and quinidine is used to treat irregular heartbeat in cardiac patients. Both are alkaloids extracted from the bark of the cinchona tree, the highest grades of which grow principally in the islands of Indonesia and in the Congo. We have no information as to the reason for the increase in the price of quinidine beyond that which appeared in the newspapers and trade publications.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. DAVIS,
Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Planning.

PHARMACEUTICAL
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1966.
The Honorable DURWARD G. HALL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DURWARD: Your recent letter regarding the rising costs of the drug quinidine raises a question about which this association and its member firms have been much concerned in the past year. We in the prescription drug industry are certainly sympathetic to the problem of your constituent, Mrs. Marjorie Allison, and wish that we could do something to alleviate the situation for her and other quinidine users.

It is true that both quinine and its derivative quinidine have been rising in price since the middle of last year. We have watched developments closely and have shared with several Federal agencies such information as we have obtained. In particular PMA has maintained contact with the Departments of Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare, and also the special inter-agency committee investigating the problem.

Quinidine, used to treat irregular heartbeat in cardiac patients, is an alkaloid usually derived from quinine which, in turn, is extracted from cinchona bark. Most of the world supply has come from Indonesia and the Congo. Political instability in these newly independent countries, unpredictable production from these customary sources, as well as from wild trees in Latin America coupled with a possible speculative "corner" on the available supply have served to create "shortages". The problem has been compounded in the recent past by a renewed demand, especially for quinine which is needed for treatment of selected malaria strains in Viet-Nam. Demand, although relatively small on the whole, seems to be increasing also for quinidine, as the size of the elderly population grows—the principal age group requiring the drug.

After World War II, there was a drop in use of quinine as an antimalarial, and we understand that this resulted in decreased plantings of cinchona trees. New plantings require seven years or more to reach a size suitable for harvesting. Further complicating the picture is the fact that this nation has been almost entirely dependent on processing conducted by the Dutch and upon supplies of the intermediates coming from the Netherlands, West Germany and the United Kingdom. Furthermore, there are reports indicating that raw material from Indonesia has been flowing to Red China, although apparently some has reappeared on the black market in Hong Kong and elsewhere at "inflated" prices. Thus, we in the United States have no control over rising prices. (See the attached release from Eli Lilly & Co.)

The pharmaceutical industry in this country is endeavoring to keep in touch with the situation and is making every effort to supply regular orders. However, this has been difficult, in the face of almost daily increasing price quotations on raw material purchases. These costs are necessarily reflected in higher prices to retailers and ultimately to the public. As far as we have been able to determine, in general the manufacturers of finished drugs containing quinine are not raising their wholesale prices beyond increases in costs involved.

It is our understanding that the government has released recently some of its stockpile, as your constituent states. However, not since 1963 has there been any release for general public use. Rather it has been allocated to the military for its urgent needs. This use of stockpile supplies should provide some downward pressure on raw material price levels since it means a slight lessening in current demand relative to supply.

Although the total market for quinine-quinidine types of products is small, nonetheless several of the industry's firms are engaged in modest research programs aimed at discovering economically feasible synthetics to replace quinidine, while others have substitute products on the market which partly replace quinidine for selected physical problems. Perhaps Mrs. Allison's physician can review available synthetic chemotherapeutics to determine their appropriateness in the light of the quinidine shortage.

Efforts are being made to mitigate the problems raised by the "shortage" but there are no especially promising signs on the horizon at the moment. Research programs may ultimately result in lessening U.S. dependence on foreign raw material supplies. We can only assure you that the pharmaceutical industry is alert to the overall problem. It will continue its efforts to maintain an adequate supply of these drugs while working to develop substitutes in the laboratory.

Sincerely,

C. JOSEPH STETLER,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1966.
MRS. MARJORIE S. ALLISON,
Marionville, Mo.

MY DEAR MRS. ALLISON: Further to your recent letter and my interim reply of 25 January 1966, herewith our copies of letters from the Food and Drug Administration of the Department H.E.W. in Washington, as well as the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers of America's President, my personal friend Mr. Joe Stetler. I believe the letters are self-explanatory, and you are obviously a victim, not of a self induced price squeeze of pharmacists of America, but of a black market controlled by the Dutch, or worse, Mr. Sukarno of Indonesia who is instable at best, through China and the international outlet at Hong Kong.

Possibly the best tact to take is as suggested by Mr. Stetler in checking with your physician to see if some synthetic could not be used appropriately, in light of the quinidine shortage.

You'll be interested to know that my personal interest goes back to before World War II in this regard, at which time I ordered out of Indonesia a medical missionary who had a reserve commission in the Army. He later wrote a book bearing his name, but the interesting fact is that he brought young cinchona trees and plantings with him. We tried desperately to get these established in South America and in our own tropical areas, with very little success, and finally dropped the effort after World War II.

I realize we have not been helpful to you, but I appreciate your writing in the interest of equity and justice, to say nothing of good government, as it has stimulated my research and hence my knowledge in this difficult area. You will note that the government has released some of its critical and strategic stockpile of quinine and quinidine, but only to the military. Of course, as one of the "doctors in the House" and a Member of Armed Services Committee, I'm familiar with this and the death dealing falciparum strain of malaria we are dealing with in South Vietnam, which responds only to quinine, in spite of all the fancy new synthetic drugs that will take care of ordinary malaria, such as atabrine, etc.

Believe me, my prayer is for relief from your desperate situation, and regained health in the future.

Sincerely,

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT SERVES URBAN NEEDS

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, Georgia's Ninth Congressional District is right next to the expanding Atlanta area, giving us a unique incentive to develop our land and water resources to serve the multiple needs of the metropolitan region and the State as a whole.

The people of the Ninth District have made outstanding progress in taking advantage of this opportunity through participation in sound soil and water conservation measures.

The Ninth District leads the State in the number of small watershed projects, authorized under Public Law 566. I understand we have about 20 projects underway and others that are awaiting approval. Nine of these are multiple-purpose projects, designed to serve, in addition to flood control and watershed protection, municipal water supply, recreation, or fish and wildlife protection. I feel confident that still more of these vital upstream projects will be assigned the broad purposes they are capable of serving and for which they are needed.

In Gwinnett County we have a resource conservation and development project well underway. One of the major purposes of this large regional project covering about 280,000 acres is recreational development. This, too, is a primary objective on much of the rural land elsewhere in the Ninth District. Ours is an area of scenic foothills and mountains, of beautiful streams, extensive forests, and a favorable climate. There is a growing need for outdoor recreational facilities in the vicinity, and we hope more visitors from distant places will become acquainted with the scenic attractions and recreational opportunities in northeastern Georgia.

Many privately operated recreational enterprises have already been established with assistance from the Soil Conservation Service and local soil and water conservation districts. These rural lands are being improved and put to the best possible use. This is something we have got to accomplish throughout the Nation in the years ahead as greater and greater demands are made on the available land and water resources.

As our urban concentrations become more populous, we must be prepared to offer the city dweller adequate space in the countryside where he can relax and play. That is an essential need if we are to continue to have a physically healthy and mentally alert society.

I am gratified that the landowners and operators in northeast Georgia are helping to provide developed areas for camping, picknicking, fishing, hiking, horseback riding, and other outdoor recreation that is eagerly sought by the urban population. In so doing, they are also applying soil and water conservation practices on the land that effectively control erosion, prevent floods, store water for municipal and agricultural needs, and assure that the invaluable natural resources which are ours to use and enjoy will serve the long-term benefit of our region, State, and Nation.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the rules and precedents of the House of Representatives give jurisdiction of the Selective Service System to the Committee on Armed Services.

I know there is a favorite pastime on Capitol Hill of others muscling in on the jurisdiction of the appropriate committees. We have the jurisdiction of the Selective Service. We have no notion of seeing anybody arrogate to himself this jurisdiction or eroding our jurisdiction in this area.

Indeed, we do not plan to delegate any of this authority.

In this connection, carrying out our responsibility to the House and the Nation, I have today directed a letter to the Director of Selective Service, inviting him and commanding him to appear before our committee at the earliest possible moment for a state of health briefing on the posture of the Selective Service System.

We plan to carry out our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the membership, the interests of others to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. ARENDS. I am pleased to hear the gentleman make this statement, because I am well aware of where the jurisdiction lies. I know the ability and the capability of our committee. We will do a good job when the time comes.

I have told various Members that at the appropriate time, when we can get to it, we will fully go into this question of the draft, and they will be advised of the action by our committee.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Positively.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished gentleman, anyone and everyone who has an interest will be invited. The Members will have prior invitation over those who are not members. We have carried out this practice in the past, giving all parties an opportunity to be heard.

We have been busy, Mr. Speaker. We will get to this at the earliest possible moment.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

PENSION FUNDS AND THE STOCK MARKET

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am introducing a bill which I believe is long overdue, both in the interests of pension and welfare fund beneficiaries and the American investor. In fact, due to the enormous sums involved in these funds, this bill is of great importance to the American economy.

Last Thursday, May 12, I made a speech on the floor of the House concerning a possible cause of stock market fluctuations.

At that time I said:

> It is rather significant that every year since 1962 during the month of May and the latter part of April and sometime in June we have seen wild fluctuations in the stock market.

I stated that I had strong suspicion that the reporting requirements of Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act has resulted in the selling off of vast amounts of stock just prior to the filing of the required reports.

Circumstantial evidence would support this conclusion.

Forty percent of the annual reports required under this act are filed during the month of May.

I believe that many of these benefit plans, in order to show a conservative portfolio, are trading off large amounts of their more speculative stocks prior to filing their sworn statement with the Department of Labor.

With about $85 billion now being held by such pension plans, it would not take too large a proportion of this money to adversely affect the stock market. There are those who argue that the May slump in auto sales has caused the stock market decline. Others claims a general uncertainty in the future of the economy has its effect. Still others claim the threat of a tax increase is causing the slump.

I do not discount any of these factors, but I believe they come into play only after the initial trigger has set off a stock market decline; and I am convinced that that trigger is the flushing out of pension fund portfolios.

The bill that I am today introducing is intended to secure more information on this vital matter.

My bill will amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended, to require certain additional disclosures by these plans with regard to their investments.

It would require that covered plans disclose fully their transactions during the preceding 12-month period in common and preferred stock at the time that they file their annual reports with the Office of Labor-Management and Welfare-Pension Reports.

The proposal requires disclosure of both sales and purchase of common and preferred stock, including the date of sale or purchase, the purchase or sale price, the identity of the stock, and the number of shares traded.

Mr. Speaker, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is intended to effect honest and responsible administration of private employee benefit plans.

The administrator of every covered welfare and pension plan is required to file with the Department of Labor, and to make available to plan participants and beneficiaries upon request, a description of the plan.

Annual financial reports are also required from plans covering 100 or more participants.

The 1962 amendments to the original law gave the Secretary of Labor interpretive and limited enforcement authority and required bonding of plan personnel in a position to cause a loss to the plan through fraud or dishonesty.

Also, criminal provisions were added concerning embezzlement, false reporting, bribery, and kickbacks with respect to benefit plans.

It is to be noted, however, that the Secretary is without authority to interfere in the internal management of any benefit plan.

This is a good, effective, and necessary law. I wholly subscribe to the policy that the Federal Government should not interfere in the internal management of benefit plans without additional facts to demonstrate that such involvement would be necessary; however, additional disclosure is necessary.

With $85 billion in these benefit plans there is a substantial stake to protect.

With the investment potential of this huge sum, the impact on the stock market could be tremendous if financial manipulations occurred calculatedly or even if there were coincidental effects.

In the January 1965 report by the President's Committee on the Corporate Pension Funds and Other Private Retirement and Welfare Programs, it was estimated that there would be a further increase in the total amount of investment held by private retirement funds to around $225 billion by 1980.

By 1964, the noninsured funds were investing half of their new resources in common stocks.

This has certainly been one of the factors contributing to increases in common stock prices, although it would be very difficult to estimate the quantitative importance of this single factor.

Mr. Speaker, we have now $85 billion affecting the stock market. Imagine, if you will, what possibilities exist for manipulating the stock market when these pension funds reach assets totaling $225 billion by 1980.

Whatever the type of investments made by retirement funds, such investments should be made honestly, conscientiously, and prudently. It is important that there be the greatest assurance on these points. To gain this assurance, there is a clear need of strengthening the statutory provisions for assuring compliance with these standards.

Full disclosure of relevant facts is a prerequisite for self-help and for the enforcement of statutory measures for the protection of individuals and the interest of society. My amendment requiring the disclosure of further information related to the investment of retirement plans will take us a long way toward this goal.

A MODERN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to promote the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels.

Over 100 years ago a select committee of the House of Representatives lamented the decline of America's status as a maritime nation and emphasized the need for the development of our maritime capacity. We are still struggling with this problem today.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 noted the "public interest in a strong merchant marine," in order to "promote the commerce of the United States and to aid in the national defense."

Despite this clearly stated goal of national policy, the American merchant marine has been continuing its decline in recent years. A substantial portion of domestic maritime commerce occurs on the Great Lakes. Iron ore carried on the Great Lakes alone accounts for 52 percent of the total U.S. domestic traffic. The States bordering on the Great Lakes contain 37 percent of our population, produce more than 50 percent of the Nation's manufactured goods, and nearly 60 percent of its steel and grain.

The percentage of Great Lakes shipping carried by American fleet ships has been declining substantially in recent years, as Canadian ships haul more and more of the cargo. This is particularly unfortunate since the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway has presented an opportunity for increased traffic on the Great Lakes, and the loss of the business to Canada has adverse effects on our balance of payments, the capability of our merchant marine, and the Nation's shipbuilding capacity.

Canada has responded to this opportunity by providing a system of rapid amortization and construction subsidies, which has resulted in the construction of 42 new large ships since 1949. Canada will add seven new ships to its Great Lakes fleet during this year. No new American-flag Great Lakes ships have been constructed since 1960, and there have been no conversions since 1961. During this time there has been a decline in our carrying capacity of Great Lakes vessels as well as a decline in our share of the Great Lakes trade.

This is a sad commentary on our record of meeting the objective of the Merchant Marine Act "to promote the commerce of the United States." However, the record in attaining the second objective of the act—"to aid in the national defense"—is equally dismal.

The admirable record of the American-flag Great Lakes fleet in moving commodities over the Great Lakes during World War II and the Korean war could not be duplicated today. During World War II, 90 percent of the Nation's steel mills were dependent upon Great Lakes vessels for their supply of iron ore, including those mills located along the Atlantic seaboard. During the height of the Korean conflict the transportation of iron ore and other commodities over the Great Lakes was again vital to our national defense goals.

However, during World War II the American-flag Great Lakes fleet comprised 365 vessels, while during the Korean conflict it contained 326 vessels. Today the Great Lakes fleet contains only 228 vessels, and the number is declining. In the event of a national emergency, it is doubtful that the U.S. Great Lakes fleet could provide the necessary transportation.

Mr. Speaker, the decline of our merchant marine is attended by equally grave consequences for our shipbuilding industry: it imposes severe hardships on employees and firms engaged in ship construction, and dangerously undermines our ability to produce and maintain the ships vital to our national defense and economic health.

In regard to shipbuilding, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 states that the merchant marine shall be "composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States."

Mr. Speaker, this contemplates policies that will encourage the development of shipbuilding firms, foster the development of ship maintenance and repair facilities, and insure favorable employment opportunities for our shipbuilding and maintenance employees. Despite these facts, Mr. Speaker, employment in the shipbuilding industry has been on the decline. I am hopeful that my bill will be a first step in reversing this trend.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is the greatest manufacturing and trading Nation in the history of the world. We have been at the forefront of the technological revolution, leading in the development of automatic data processing and automated manufacturing equipment. We are developing a supersonic plane and aspire to be the first Nation to send a man to the moon.

The contrast between our performance in these fields and our dismal record in attaining our merchant marine goals is startling. In view of the fact that 98 percent of the world's cargo is hauled over water, we can no longer afford to aspire to the top ranks in space while drifting to the bottom in the capacity of our merchant marine. I share the views recently expressed by the public members of the Maritime Advisory Committee that the national prestige of our country, as a leading world power and maritime nation, requires the development of a "blue ribbon" merchant marine.

I am hopeful that my bill will provide a significant first step in attaining this goal, and reverse the trend of recent years. My bill will permit before tax earnings from vessels documented under the laws of the United States to be deposited in a construction reserve fund for the "construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of a vessel." It also provides for depreciation at the rate of 15 percent, provided the differences between the normal depreciation rate and the 15-percent rate is also deposited in the construction reserve fund. Adjustments to the basis of newly constructed or reconstructed vessels will be made to reflect the use of tax-free funds in their construction or reconstruction.

My bill also provides that withdrawals from the construction reserve fund for purposes other than those contemplated by the act will be taxable in the year withdrawn. Finally, provision is made to liberalize the requirement of present law that construction or reconstruction begin within 2 years of the date amounts are deposited in the construction reserve fund.

Mr. Speaker, the need is great and the hour is late. I strongly urge the Congress to enact this bill as expeditiously as possible.

A PERSONAL CONTRIBUTION

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and respect that I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of all Members of the House of Representatives a most remarkable and highly personal contribution being made by members of our medical profession. They are volunteers, working without pay for at least 2 months in South Vietnam. Their patients, as mentioned in the following news articles, are the 15.5 million civilians for whom there is only one Vietnamese doctor available for every 50,000—well over 50 times worse than the physician-patient ratio in the United States.

Two of these volunteer doctors are from Saginaw, Mich. They are Dr. Hugh T. Caumartin and Dr. Hugh L. Sulfridge. It is an honor that I can speak from personal experience of the dedication and sacrifice these men are making. It has been my privilege to know them personally, as they reside in Michigan's Eighth District.

I would especially like to point out the request made by Dr. Sulfridge of the need for chloromycetin. He has written home saying that they need 200 grams a week. A fund has been established so future purchases can be made. I have written to the Department of State and the Agency for International Development to learn what can be done to make available all necessary medication.

At this time I would like to insert two articles which I hope all Members will read. They are articles which appeared in the May 15, 1966, edition of the Saginaw News and another from the May 20, 1966, edition of Time.

They are as follows:

[From the Saginaw News, May 15, 1966]

AND OF WORK IN HOSPITALS—VOLUNTEER DOCTORS GIVE INSIGHT TO VIET NAM WAR

(By John D. Tucker, News staff writer)

Insight into South Viet Nam is offered in letters from Dr. Hugh T. Caumartin and Dr. Hugh L. Sulfridge, both of Saginaw, who are working as volunteers in that country.

Dr. Caumartin is at the Bing-Dan Hospital in Saigon while Dr. Sulfridge is at Can Tho, 120 miles south of Saigon.

In a letter to be reproduced in the Saginaw County Medical Association publication. Dr. Caumartin writes:

This is a large, crowded place. There are 400 beds, but frequently two to four patients are assigned to a bed, depending on patient size and acuity of illness or injury.

"I had heard the Vietnamese physicians are difficult with Americans. I have, however, found them very gracious. Many are escapees from North Viet Nam (to get away from Communism) and most received a good part of their education in France.

"At first at Binh-Dan, I minded my business * * * but gradually some of the medical staff began coming in to consult. * * * Then I was invited to attend their weekly medical staff clinical conferences, which are very interesting. * * * They are very tolerant of my halting French * * *.

"The students (sixth year medical students from the University of Saigon) started dropping in to look at films of their assigned patients and then began coming in during their quiet times to ask if they could be with me while I worked.

"The director of the hospital was very pleased and we have now worked out a regular teaching schedule. The students are stimulating—they are just thirsting for knowledge. I was surprised at the end of my first lecture. I said, 'Et pour aujourdhui je suis fini avec la conference, et ce matin, pour moi, fait un plaisir.', which merely meant I was concluding the lecture and the morning had been a pleasure. They all stood up and clapped 'Pour nous aussi!'—'For us too.' "

Dr. Caumartin said he found the patients appreciative and remarkable.

"Almost too uncomplaining," he wrote. "Recently," he continued, "I fluoroscoped a little 5-year-old boy who was brought in from the outskirts of town after being struck with mine fragments in the lower chest * * * his right lung was involved and he had some beginning accumulation of blood * * * Despite his discomfort and apprehension, he was very cooperative. His mother was there and displayed a calm but obviously very loving and solicitous attitude.

"There are, of course, many orphans, including babies. I was talking to one physician assigned to another provincial hospital (at My Tho) and he told me the baby orphanage in his town was having 30 babies die monthly out of a census average of 300. He investigated and found they were not boiling the water for the formulas. He got them started and for the past two weeks only one baby died. Over here typhoid, cholera and staphylococcus infections are very common."

One facet of the political picture is brought home in Dr. Caumartin's letter, which reads: "* * * These people have the greatest potential of any of the Asians. * * * Many of the South Vietnamese have told me they appreciate everything the Americans are doing, that they fear Communism, that they don't want the Americans to leave, and that the reports in their papers and on the radio to the contrary represent only a distinct minority viewpoint. True, the Vietnamese are all desirous of peace (they have had over 20 years of war), but the aim is for peace without Communism. Many physicians I have talked to escaped with their immediate families after 1954, leaving all material things behind.

"Certain minor groups in the United States also voiced an opinion that America should withdraw from Viet Nam so as to avoid a potentially greater war. But both America and South Viet Nam are fighting for freedom, and if we Americans pulled out, then Viet Nam would be sacrificed to Communism and our statements relative to freedom in our own and other parts of the world would be rather hollow and meaningless.

"* * * In general, hospitals have not been bothered * * * and in addition, everyone wants to protect the doctor. We never make any effort to differentiate patients and many of them are Viet Cong (for they are also suffering Vietnamese). And if we can demonstrate the desire of Americans to help and to share, rather than to exploit, then we have done something to spread the concept of democracy in a tangible fashion.

We think, then, that this should be a significant experience."

At Can Tho, where Dr. Sulfridge is stationed, about 80 percent of the patients have had traumatic incidents, such as gunshot wounds, mine fragments, napalm and phosphorus burns. The small hospital averages 15 major operations and many more minor operations each day, Dr. Sulfridge reported.

"The death rate," he added, from every conceivable disease is high."

It was a letter from Dr. Sulfridge that prompted a campaign in the Saginaw Valley to provide a supply of chloromycetin for the Can Tho hospital. Dr. Sulfridge said they could use 200 grams a week and a fund was established here. Carl G. King, executive secretary of the Saginaw County Medical Society, reports enough has been contributed for the first week but more contributions are needed—and are coming in.

The gifts, he said are from individuals, organizations, churches and school children.

I'm surprised at the spontaneity, and pleased. These doctors volunteered their services," he said. King said he thought the federal government would be able to supply the drug in the near future.

Those wishing to help the doctors in Viet Nam may send their donations to "Doctors," 107 Hayden, Saginaw.

[From Time, May 20, 1966]

DOCTORS: VOLUNTEERS FOR VIET NAM

Of all the difficult campaigns now being conducted by Americans in South Viet Nam, one of the most productive is the work of a handful of civilians. They are U.S. doctors, largely surgeons, who have volunteered to work without pay for at least two months in the republic's pathetically few and ill-equipped general hospitals. Their patients are the 15.5 million civilians for whom there is, in effect, only one Vietnamese doctor available for every 50,000—well over 50 times worse than the physician-patient ratio in the U.S.

$10 a Day. Viet Nam's townsfolk and peasantry have always been prey to tuberculosis, malaria, cholera and plague. Now they need modern doctoring, particularly orthopedic surgery, even more urgently, because they are frequent victims of Viet Cong shot and shell. The medical mercy mission was proposed by President Johnson early last year, and Dr. William B. Walsh, the persuasive head of the People-to-People Health Foundation (which sponsors the hospital ship *Hope*), agreed to run a pilot program.

The first group of U.S. volunteer doctors arrived last September; the current head count is 29, scattered up and down the country working alongside similar teams from Korea, Switzerland, the Philippines, Iran, Taiwan, New Zealand and Australia. The U.S. program limits itself to volunteer physicians under 55. They get free transportation and a $10 per-diem for incidentals. Balanced against this is time lost from practice that amounts to a sacrifice of thousands of dollars.

Michigan Radiologist Hugh T. Caumartin, for one, decided the sacrifice was more than worthwhile. As a World War II victim of leg injuries from machine-gun fire, he had to get a fitness clearance. When Orthopedist Hugh L. Sulfridge Jr. checked Caumartin and pronounced him fit, Sulfridge himself caught the volunteer spirit. Both doctors flew out last month, Caumartin to read X rays and teach radiological techniques in Saigon, while Sulfridge went to the 70-year-old complex of decaying buildings that makes up the hospital at Can Tho, 80 miles southwest of the capital, in the steaming Mekong Delta.

Three in a Bed. Surgeon Sulfridge, who often has to make do without electric power or running water, has three Vietnamese nurses (two women, one man) to assist him. He makes rounds with an interpreter and is lucky to have one—many project doctors have to elicit symptoms and give instructions by sign language. Like all newly arrived Americans, he was appalled at first by the filth and overcrowding in the wards, with two or three patients in a single dirty bed. Within 48 hours he was performing as many as seven major operations a day, was so immersed in work that he hardly noticed the conditions.

The need for medical and especially surgical care is so great, the supply so short, and the gratitude of the long-suffering Vietnamese so apparent, that some doctors soon decide that their two-month tours are far too short. University of Colorado Surgeon Thomas Carey has volunteered for four months. Says Dr. Herschel L. Douglas, 31, a general practitioner from Lovington, N. Mex.: "It's difficult to come here and get involved emotionally and morally and then just go home and forget about it." Home after one tour last fall, Dr. Douglas found he could not forget. He has gone back, for a least a year, as U.S. AID public-health director for the Delta area, with its 8,000,000 people.

THE GRAND CANYON AND THE WET LANDS: A LESSON IN LOGIC

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Grand Canyon is America's most treasured natural wonder. It is an irreplaceable gift of God to our Nation.

Besides its awesome beauty and spectacle, it is rich in biological and ecological information and the most revealing single page of the earth's history.

And yet, with all the talk by this administration in Washington, D.C., of preserving the natural beauties of our land, it is sad to find that the Grand Canyon is to be adorned and "bottled up" by two gigantic dams. These dams are for the sole purpose of producing power to make money.

It seems strange that while we are asked to remove the billboards from U.S. Highway No. 1, we are asked to desecrate the greatest natural wonder that has been given to our land and our people. I do not believe that we are such a nation of hypocrites as to allow this to happen.

I fully understand and sympathize with the problems of the people of the Southwest. Their need for water is great and they are entitled to help in meeting that need. But I refuse to give them the Grand Canyon. It belongs to us all. It should remain inviolate.

There is much to be said on both sides of the argument growing in this country between the "conservationists" and the proponents of "water engineering." As our population grows, some give will have to take place to meet the needs of the people. Care and reasonable balance can, and must, be exercised.

Leading the way in the Federal area is, and will continue to be, the Department of the Interior. This Department suffers from an enormous "conflict of interest." Within it is the Bureau of Reclamation, the Nation's leading proponent of "water engineering" and the National Park Service, whose goal is conservation and recreation.

When the chips are down, however, the "water engineers" take over.

Although it is difficult to establish the administration's position, Mr. Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, has come out for construction of the Bridge Canyon and Marble Gorge Dams in the Grand Canyon. In this he is backed by the Bureau of Reclamation. They are all for these hydroelectric "moneymaker" dams. The National Park Service stands mute.

Worse than that, the Park Service acts as if it were struck dumb at a time when it should be shouting to the heavens. They have been charged publicly with having issued a memo forbidding the giving out of information on these dams and ending with the words "destroy this memo after reading." They have not denied this, nor answered the charge. I am constrained to believe such a memo exists.

It should be—it must be—made public. The National Park Service should be made to testify publicly on this and on their position on these dams. So too should the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Geological Survey, and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

To the conservationists in the East this proposed destruction of the Grand Canyon, aided and abetted by the Department of the Interior, should be a warning of a clear and present danger.

The wildlands of the Grand Canyon are at least as precious as the wetlands off the shorelines in the town of Hempstead. Yet the Department of the Interior and the Secretary of the Interior are not acting to protect the Grand Canyon but rather are active participants in its despoliation.

I have never been moved by the argument that Federal acquisition and control of our Hempstead and Oyster Bay Wetlands and their domination by the Secretary of the Interior—whoever he may be, now or hereafter—will protect the interests of the people of the town of Hempstead. On the contrary, the elected town officials will respond to the people in the town, when the Secretary must look to interests massive in size and nationwide in scope. Local rule—or ruin—appears to me to be the choice.

Those who harp on the errors of the past, should look forward to the promise of the future. Protection for the wetlands has been publicly signed, sealed and delivered by the town of Hempstead and the State of New York.

The dams in the Grand Canyon must not be built. We in the East have a stake in this as Americans. We also have a stake as taxpayers. Federal dollars will subsidize the project at every turn.

The price of the water to result from the overall project will be subsidized. Much of this water will be used to grow cotton—a surplus item—which is the most subsidized farm product in America. Since the dams will pay no taxes on power revenues, another subsidy results. The low interest on construction capital loans is another subsidy. The list is endless.

In this fight the "conservationists" are clearly right. Their fight is your fight and my fight.

There is much lip service to the cause of conservation and national beauty in Washington at this time. I like to rely on a man who believed in what he said and who proved it by his actions, President Theodore Roosevelt.

He warned our people:

> I want to ask you to do one thing in connection with the Grand Canyon in your own interest and in the interests of the country. Leave it as it is. You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it, and man can only mar it.

To which I add, "Amen."

AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis magazine of March 1966, published a very thought-provoking article by Joan Hobson, wife of an English doctor, which details the present situation of English doctors after almost 18 years of socialized medicine in Great Britain.

From the British experience with state medicine, it would seem that the doctor has been the forgotten man in the program. The citizens of this Nation might well profit by Britain's past history in this area as the beginning date for the medicare program, July 1, approaches. On that day close to 17 million people over 65 years of age will become eligible for benefits under the program. In the State of New York an added burden upon doctors will be realized when the State medical assistance law becomes operative. In comparison with the Federal medicare setup, the New York program is a vastly larger medical assistance program which will open the doors of doctors, dentists, hospitals and nursing homes to some 8 to 9 million coming within its new and very liberal "indigent" classification. Unlike the Federal program, the medical assistance law applies to persons of all ages.

As we embark on our first venture into a directly sponsored Government medical program, it might be prudent to remember the doctor, a uniquely important factor in any medical program. After almost 18 years, the plight of British doctors is described by Mrs. Hobson in these words:

> Never before has despair been so widespread in the medical profession. Because of the excessive demands placed on them, doctors have lost their original lukewarm enthusiasm for socialized medicine, and a hopelessness is reflected in their work.

I recommend the article, "The Crisis in British Medicine," and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

THE CRISIS IN BRITISH MEDICINE

(By Joan Hobson)

(NOTE.—This wife of an English doctor says that her country's GP's have had enough. They're about ready to quit en masse unless something is done about their low pay, long working hours, and steady loss of prestige.)

More than 75 per cent of Great Britain's doctors have written letters of resignation to the National Health Service. The letters, however, have not yet arrived. They are stored, ready for instant despatch, in a well-guarded strong room beneath the Medical Association's London headquarters. The situation between government and general practitioners in England has reached the critical stage, and unless substantial reforms are quickly made in pay and work conditions, these letters of resignation will shortly be sent to the Minister of Health. Three months later the British Health Service will collapse.

Since socialized medicine was introduced in the British Isles, doctors have been struggling against terrific odds to make a success of this all-time high in welfare service. But now they are exhausted to the point of being physically incapable of dealing with the work load imposed by over-demanding patients. While improved pay would enable them to employ more nursing and clerical aid, lack of money is not their main grouse. Government directives and restrictions have robbed them of the clinical freedom essential to the practice of good medicine. They have no assurance of a decent income during retirement or the means to break the vicious cycle of an increasing number of patients and a declining number of doctors.

In 1911 the humanitarian politician David Lloyd George dreamed of free medical care for all. "The spectre of sickness haunts the poor of Britain," he declared, and with his National Insurance Act he laid the foundations of State Medicine as it stands today. Up to that time the poor had received medical treatment as charity, undertaken by generous-spirited doctors. Free treatment seemed an unrealistic ideal. As a beginning, medical cover was extended to the 13½ million workers who earned less than $480 a year. Men paid 7 cents a week, and received free medical care and a sickness benefit of $2 a week. Their wives and families and the elderly and unemployable got no benefit. But British pride often resulted in neglected illness. Many who couldn't afford a doctor didn't call one. As a result many general practitioners organized their own clubs, with monthly dues. Members of these clubs were treated without further charge.

Successive governments amended and augmented the Lloyd George scheme. Contributions and benefits were raised to keep pace with rising living costs, and at the end of World War II an all-embracing service was discussed as part of peacetime development under socialism.

The plan was to cover every inhabitant of the British Isles. Peers of the realm were to pay weekly contributions along with the commoners. Only children, pensioners, and the Royal Family were exempted from payment. The proposed benefits were enormous. Services of the country's top specialists were to become available to the poorest families. The Gypsy could consult (through the proper channels) the exclusive Harley Street gynecologist. The village idiot could be referred to the nation's top psychiatrist.

Doctors were to become civil servants, receiving a fixed salary. Not surprisingly, the medical profession objected strongly to this proposal, pioneered by Lord Beveridge, but a forceful Aneurin Bevan, after a series of stormy debates, compelled doctors to accept the National Health Service on a trial basis. With apparent generosity he gave them the choice of joining his scheme or remaining outside it. But in rescinding all previous forms of medical cover and fixing contributions from upper income brackets at a high level, he made certain that private patients would be so few that doctors refusing his terms would be deprived of their livelihood.

As a first step toward nationalization each doctor who accepted National Health Service terms in 1948 lost the right to sell his practice. Whereas before the selling price of a practice was calculated at three times the amount it produced yearly, the government took over at one and a half times. Thus a doctor who had bought a practice in 1946 for $20,000 found two years later that its official value had dropped to $10,000. The government undertook to pay the doctor interest at a miserable 2¾ percent on the determined figure until he retired, when he would be paid the lump sum—by then, because of devaluation, worth only a fraction of its original value.

It was impossible to forecast public reaction to what looked like free medicine. Optimistic politicians claimed that work would not increase; pessimistic doctors anticipated a spate of chronic complaints. On July 5, 1948, the public gleefully jumped on the bandwagon bearing down on the defenseless servant medicos.

Each doctor had shortsightedly signed a contract agreeing to accept sole responsibility for each registered patient for the dizzily high sum of $2.25 per year. This figure has over the years, been grudgingly stepped up to $3, plus $2.10 for "each properly registered patient above the 400th to the 1600th on the list of a qualified practitioner. Payment to such practitioner for each aforesaid registered patient above the number of 1601 to be paid at the heretofore stated rate of $3."

The government reckons that each doctor can care for 3500 patients. Doctors know that they cannot possibly give first-class attention to so large a number, but as family men with decent standards of living to maintain they must, to earn a reasonable amount, strive to recruit at least that number—but discreetly.

Stringent ethics forbid advertising; even illuminated name plates are prohibited. A white lamp lettered "Surgery" * is the most commercialism permitted. When a couple of grateful patients—they do still exist—inserted a notice in one well-known newspaper, reading "Mr. and Mrs. Norman Stringer announce the arrival of their first born son. Sincere thanks to Dr. Brown for safe delivery," Dr. Brown was severely reprimanded by the Medical Association and instructed to inform patients that publicly expressed appreciation was taboo.

The average doctors' gross income is $12,000, out of which he must furnish consulting, waiting, and dressing rooms; car, gasoline, telephone; stationery; nursing, secretarial, and cleaning help—leaving some $6,500 for his family expenses.

One utopian carrot dangled before doctors in early NHS negotiations was the promise of government-provided local health centers, where surgeries would be conducted on a duty-rotation basis. Nursing and clerical staffs were to be supplied and working from home was to end. No date was fixed for the opening of these "Houses of Healing," and doctors are still, after twenty years, waiting for them to materialize.

To date no provisions have been made to relieve doctors of their 365 days of 24-hour duty; each must arrange for and pay a deputy in his absence. In many cities cooperative groups have been formed to gain occasional free hours, though this is not practical in rural areas, and the majority of patients dislike the practice. Brian Abel-Smith, a sociologist and TV personality widely respected for his normally well-considered opinions, recently said, "If I'm taken ill in the night I want my own doctor, not some unknown deputy." One woman who went to her doctor's office for an "urgent" tonic and found Dr. X instead of her own Dr. Y muttered to a friend in the waiting room, "I'll come back tomorrow. I don't like the color of this one's eyes."

This year the British National Health Service should reach its eighteenth birthday. Under present circumstances it won't survive to celebrate. Never before has despair been so widespread in the medical profession. Because of the excessive demands placed on them, doctors have lost their original lukewarm enthusiasm for socialized medicine, and a hopelessness is reflected in their work.

If a doctor does something to irk a registered patient, he can be reported to a disciplinary committee and brought before an area court. His name will be blackened in the neighborhood, and the patient will transfer to another doctor. Or if a doctor refuses his patients' requests for unnecessary house calls and free cotton for stuffing toys and tea cosies, the patient and his family may register with a rival practitioner, thereby reducing his income.

The family physician has lost his pre-1948 image as a dedicated, infallible family friend. Unjustly but inevitably, patients have lost their loyalty to and respect for these fallen angels with financial problems. Dr. Hale-White, chairman of the Fellowship for Freedom in Medicine, cites a wealthy National Health Patient who habitually refers to her gardener as "Mr. Fewtrell" and addresses her medical adviser as "Abbey-Beck." Good gardeners are hard to come by, but a medical man can always be replaced—free.

England's overworked medicos are now on the level of tradespeople and factory workers. Curt messages are pushed through their mailboxes reading something like, "Jones, call immediately." Notes for the plumber or coal merchant are couched in more polite terms.

When the 18,000 practitioners announced their intention of resigning from the service, their prestige fell even lower. As members of the country's lowest paid profession, British GP's resent and envy American doctors as the United States' highest paid professional men. Accountants, lawyers, and dentists all receive higher rewards for fewer hours than do the nationalized doctors. Sheet metal workers go home with $150 at the end of a week in which they have worked a few hours above the basic forty.

There exists at present a unique situation; on the one hand is an administration genuinely anxious to provide medical care for its people; on the other there are 23,000 doctors who have elected to devote their lives to providing it. One would think that the two could get together and arrive, like sensible people, at a satisfactory scheme. But it has never worked out that way. The government dictates to the doctors what they must do and the doctors try to talk their way out of unacceptable chores.

A good deal of professional resentment arises because the family doctor cannot reconcile much of his work with necessary, pure medicine. The doctor-in-training expects a hard-working life. He anticipates interesting days spent taking case histories and examining, advising, treating, and curing the sick. He realizes that on numerous nights his sleep will be interrupted, but sees himself leaving a warm bed to deliver a new life or to save an old one, not to make frivolous, fruitless journeys. One desperate GP who had already been called out twice before midnight by the same patient asked his wife to answer the next call and try to keep the patient happy until morning. When the phone rang she answered and said, "I'm sorry, the doctor's out; can I help you?"

A little too loudly the doctor whispered, "Who is it?"

"I'll call him later," said the patient. "But before he comes back you'd better get rid of that other man, hadn't you?"

Successive ministers of health have had their own plans for the profession. Besides maintaining a comprehensive service, they also are preoccupied with keeping expenses to a minimum and retaining contented voters. This forces the GP to become much more than merely a straight-forward doctor; he must also become a low-level, all-purpose cog in one or another of the vast wheels of the political welfare organization. During a surgery in which he has seen around thirty people, a doctor probably has had to fill out at least a hundred prescriptions and certificates.

When a service is apparently free, with no money changing hands at the time, demands will be great in number and often trivial in quality. The pre-1948 bottle of half-crown physic no longer satisfies. Newly developed drugs and specialized surgery techniques are regularly featured in semi-documentary films and TV programs. There are three or four Dr. Kildare-type television shows each week, as well as a regular technical series for medical men. These, of course, are also seen by lay viewers, and with startling results. A dramatic operation televised tonight will bring a horde of patients tomorrow, each firmly convinced he needs that particular kind of surgery.

Each contributor now pays up to $2.50 weekly for medical care, sickness benefit, unemployment compensation, and old age pension. Only a nickel of this is devoted to

---

*In Britain a doctor sees patients without appointment during his "surgery" period.

medical care, leaving general tax funds to supply the missing millions needed to keep the National Health Service running. Unlike those who gratefully accepted straight medical care for their 7 cents in 1911, patients now feel entitled to anything that's going. "I'll have some new reading glasses, and a spare set of dentures," says the opportunist.

Patients assume that when a prescription is issued it only remains for the pharmacist to fill it. But it doesn't take long for the Pricing Bureau to pinpoint the sins of the practitioner whose prescription costs are above average. His identity will be traced by a clerk, his name reported to an administrator, and he will be visited and cautioned by a government employee who has no personal knowledge of the cases in question. Deductions to cover the cost of supposed overprescribing of expensive items are made from the doctor's monthly pay check. A disregarded request to curtail the use of costly drugs can result in fines of up to $280.

Medicos are not trained to scrimp on quality, and they resent the government's trying to force them to pinch pennies. They feel that they must be free to order whatever they deem necessary, be it health salts or hormones. To them, medicine should not be merchandised on a discount basis.

Doctors are harried with all kinds of other inescapable rules and regulations. A patient must have a certificate to claim sickness benefit and to absent himself from work, as well as another indicating when he's well again. A broken arm needs weekly confirmation that it's still broken; eyes cannot be tested without a doctor's note. Medical officers of health impugn a GP's ability to decide if a long-term patient is ill enough to continue on sick leave, and demand detailed reports on conditions and progress. Local authorities must be informed of infectious diseases within twenty-four hours. After seeing a child and diagnosing measles, the doctor must ignore more urgent work to complete a complicated notification and post it immediately. Expectant mothers must have a form granting them permission to have their baby. A doctor must also take time to keep a mileage record for income tax purposes, otherwise the authorities will refuse his claim for legitimate medical journeys.

Thousands of doctors would prefer a private practice, but these hardly exist today. A man with an outstanding bedside manner might make a reasonable living in some fashionable seaside resort, but such plum situations are difficult to find and command prices of up to $56,000. Only one private practice has been offered in the British Medical Journal columns over the past six months, and it was in Ireland.

One way out for the British doctor is emigration to America, Canada, Australia, or South Africa. Doctors are taking it at the rate of four hundred a year—one-fifth of the yearly output of British Medical schools. It is only the presence of Indian and Pakistani nationals who come to practice in Britain that keep hospitals running with any sort of efficiency.

Doctors are desperately anxious about the future. There are currently 43 GP's to every 100,000 Britons, compared with 144 to 100,000 in the U.S. in 1962. In underprivileged Yugoslavia the number is 76 to 100,000, making Yugoslav state medicine an outstanding success. The British population is rising steadily, and there may be a serious doctor shortage within the next ten years. Politicians are fond of describing the British Health Service as "Best in the World," not mentioning that the doctors are paying for it with early deaths from coronary thrombosis. Fourteen per cent of them have heart attacks before age 50.

Ill health is forcing doctors to retire early, even though retirement pay is inadequate. Retirement pay is calculated at one-eighteenth of pensionable income for each year of service. A doctor with an average number of patients who joined the scheme in 1948 would retire now with a whopping $1,800 per annum.

Medical treatment in England has improved since 1948, but to use this fact as proof of NHS success is naiveté itself. People also have come to enjoy better food, better homes, bigger cars, and regular holidays—all without the existence of a National Comestible Service, government-built Britannia cars, or a Ministry of Vacations.

The American Medical Association's long, though ill-fated campaign against Medicare, described by one prominent member, Dr. Donovan Ward, as "Not one, but two steps down the path of socialized medicine," rightly used the failings of the British Health Service to illustrate the dangers of state medicine. In the vast halls of administration, for example, along the corridors of medical power, doctors are outnumbered by administrative staff more than 2 to 1. The health service seems doomed to strangle itself with the ever-tightening strands of bureaucracy.

Human nature can't be changed; people will inevitably strive to get their "money's worth." Aneurin Bevan himself said in 1952, "I shudder to think of the ceaseless cascade of medicine pouring down British throats," and slapped a 25-cent charge on each prescription. This, collected by pharmacists, slightly eased the flood of demands until, as a powerful political platform, the present Labour government removed the charge in February 1965, causing an additional six million prescriptions each month, costing $10,000,000, to be filled.

If compulsion to participate in state medicine were relaxed, hundreds of thousands of Britons would opt out and undertake the entire responsibility for their own medical care. But no one will if it means that they have to pay twice.

The majority of family physicians are unmaterialistic men, dedicated to their profession but untrained in verbal warfare. Belatedly they have appointed the General Medical Services Committee to negotiate with the government to form a new-look health charter. Minister of Health Kenneth Robinson is flourishing offers of extra pay for weekend and night calls, with some financial aid toward clerical help, but such trivia bypass the very heart of the problem. Robinson's proposals do nothing to reduce the work load. The obvious solution is for doctors to charge a small fee, say 25 cents, for each consultation and home visit; this would supplement the docor's income and act as a strong deterrent to unnecessary demands. But Robinson says he will never agree to this, although it has worked successfully in Sweden.

In 1948 state medicine cost $363 million. The total for 1966 will be $28 billion. New hospitals must be built to augment and replace the long-neglected, out-of-date ones that serve at present. If the health service does manage to survive, its cost will go up year after year.

The GP's are accused of selfishly fighting for their own interests. However, they are really fighting for a structure within which better doctoring will be possible. At present they are sick of clerical chores and non-ill patients who demand certificates rather than treatment. Poor pay and long hours do not—indeed cannot—encourage good medicine. In the constant struggle to balance time against numbers, standards are falling and good intentions fading.

When Lloyd George's brain-child was conceived fifty-four years ago, he couldn't have visualized the insatiable monster it has developed into. If the British Health Service is to be saved, energetic steps must be taken at once.

It is now eleven months since the profession stated its case before the minister. Robinson says negotiations "are bound to take a long time," but his delaying tactics merely strengthen the doctor's determination to despatch those resignations, thus breaking the contract they entered into with the government almost eighteen years ago.

A BILL TO AMEND THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas.

Mr. Speaker, under the present law, counties or municipalities with a population of over 250,000 qualify for Federal assistance for public works and development facilities. The law, however, should be amended to extend eligibility to "compact and contiguous areas," containing a population of over 250,000.

The purpose of my amendment would be to include contiguous areas within large metropolitan areas within the coverage of the Public Works and Economic Development Act. As of now, these units do not qualify only because they are not separate entities.

While only those contiguous units of equal or greater size than the presently defined municipality of 250,000 would qualify under the proposed amendment, the largely disadvantaged areas, including New York's Lower East Side and Harlem should also be covered and would be greatly benefited by new opportunities for long-term employment and economic growth.

Thus, the present necessity for the "entire municipality" to be in economic distress before redevelopment funds are available would be eliminated. In this way, the acutely distressed areas in New York City and other very large municipalities would no longer be discriminated against and Federal help would be received where it is most needed.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEXINGTON SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lexington School for the Deaf, headed by Mr. Clarence D. O'Connor, superintendent, which is located in my district at 904 Lexington Avenue, will observe its 100th anniversary in June 1967, together with the Clarke School for the Deaf in Northampton, Mass.

Both schools when they were founded in 1867, introduced to the United States the oral system which provides an opportunity for all children born deaf to learn to speak and to read lips. The 100th anniversary of this event will also be observed during the centennial celebration.

In connection with this dual observance, I have, at the request of the Lexington School, asked U.S. Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien to issue a commemorative stamp on this occasion in recognition of a century of pioneering work by these two schools in the oral education of deaf children.

Such a gesture would not only honor these schools, but would also provide encouragement for others who are also laboring in this most important and meaningful field of education of our deaf children.

The 100th anniversary of these schools will be celebrated by a weeklong international conference to be sponsored by the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf. It will be held in Northampton, Mass., on June 19, 20, and 21, and in New York City on June 22, 23, and 24. The commemorative stamp, if approved by the Postmaster General, could be issued simultaneously from both those cities.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—A PROBLEM OF WANING FAITH

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the freedom which every American enjoys today can be attributed to many factors, one of the most important of which is the contribution which has been made by the American career serviceman who has devoted his life to the defense of liberty and this Nation.

I wish I could say in all sincerity that a grateful Nation had responded and recognized the great contributions which these servicemen have rendered in the defense of liberty. In many respects, it has, but when it comes to the question of the treatment of military retirees I am afraid that we must admit to having defaulted.

In 1963 Congress corrected part of an inequity by applying the 100-year-old tradition of computing retired military pay on the basis of active duty pay to the 1958 act. But, unfortunately, this act only went part of the way. In effect, it renounced a 100-year commitment to retired members of the military services by telling them that in the future their retired pay would not be recomputed on the basis of active duty pay.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district, one of the most patriotic organizations I have ever known, the Peninsula Retired Officers' Club, has made an extensive study of this particular problem. They have not given their conclusions and views on the basis of personal gain, but rather on a sense of justice, a sense of morality, and what is right for the benefit of the United States of America.

I am pleased to include as a part of my remarks a study report, entitled "National Defense—A Problem of Waning Faith," which has been conducted in depth by the Peninsula Retired Officers' Club.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues as a very important study which not only involves justice for those who have already served in the defense of liberty, but those who will serve such a defense in the future:

NATIONAL DEFENSE—A PROBLEM OF WANING FAITH

(A study prepared under the direction of the executive committee of the Peninsula Retired Officers' Club, Moffett Field, Calif., March 1966)

In the coming months, thousands of wives and mothers will "commit" their sons to the dangers in Viet Nam. This commitment will be involuntary in a personal sense; in a National sense, the demand that our men be exposed to the dangers of warfare is an obligation of citizenship.

Today all too many citizens look upon military service as something to be avoided. When once committed, a sufficient number of men perform enough deeds of bravery so that some of their fellow citizens do indulge the thought that there is privilege and honor in serving one's country.

The core of battle success in the United States is the professional officer and enlisted man, charged with the leadership of less experienced troops. The depth of morale, the training, and experience of these professionals are the final determinants in the balance of "success" or "failure" of military action.

The citizenry seldom recognizes these vital elements of this balance. It is the loss of life in battle which is the sole unreplaceable "cost" of a battle. Cities can be rebuilt; munitions replaced; aircraft and ships refurbished. *But the men lost are irreplaceable.*

How can we reduce the loss of our greatest asset, our young men? The vital factor is the morale, training, and experience of the professional officers and enlisted men upon whom we place such weighty burdens of leadership.

Professionalism is not secured by promoting a twenty-year old youth to Master Sergeant or to Major. Professionalism is a dedicated career accomplishment. It is attaining the highest standards of excellence. It is a lifetime study and practice of all the skills and knowledge necessary for proficiency in the art and science required of the military profession.

Since the end of World War II, there has been a steady and continuing decimation of the professional base of leadership, a decimation not apparent in the higher ranks of leadership which were involved in World War II, but in the maturing ranks of leadership among officers and enlisted men whose careers started in the late nineteen forties to date. This steady decimation, manifested by early resignation or refusal to re-enlist, has been apparent to succeeding administrations and sessions of Congress.

The "career-retention problem" has been studied at every level of Government. The problem increases almost in proportion to the number of studies made. The studies have produced no tangible results. They ploughed the ground in investigating the incentives which would convince a young American to cast his lot as a dedicated servant to his nation. But retention rates continue to sag. Why don't young men choose professional military service as a career? Why don't career officers and enlisted men stay longer in the service? Take a brief backward look.

Retired officers and enlisted men once occupied positions in the van of patriotism. They were the professionals who led the troops through the World Wars, and the recent wars. They were the professional manpower pool charged with this most important duty of citizenship. Casualties are inevitable, but men know that the higher the professional training of competent officers, the smaller is the loss of men. In this respect this record is superb.

We military retirees have achieved a proud and distinctive performance in our honorable profession. The honor due Professionalism, however, has not been forthcoming. We dedicated professionals have been relegated to inferior status. Rightful prestige has been trampled upon and degraded. Is this a suitable reward? What is the human reaction to bad faith and humiliating treatment by what should be a grateful Government?

There are strong indications that our concern is directly related to the career implications being shown by our younger successors in service to the Nation. As individuals, they perceive our lot and their treatment. They themselves face unrealistic regulations prescribing premature retirement. They believe military careers depend upon commensurate compensation during active and retired service, and that such service should command respect. They witness *ex post facto* laws with the government altering the legal consequences of past acts. They see the fluctuating policy of changing the rules after completion of the service. They make their decisions early enough in life to avoid these unattractive manifestations of unconcern by the Administration and the Congress.

What weight they give to our plight is indeterminable. But, it is an obvious aspect which influences their decision to become or not to become career officers and enlisted men. The bold and brutal figures of early resignations from among the embryo and neophyte groups of American men whom we initially commission and enlist is startling proof of the gross error of our present policy.

We retirees, without exception, thoroughly resent the watering down of the basic and fundamental "retirement incentives" offered us at the beginning of our careers. Our treatment is clear to those younger men who, we hoped, would take our places. This breach of faith toward retirees is illogical. Retirees cannot comprehend the premise that in these United States of America what is manifestly a contract for retirement, made twenty, thirty, or more years in the past, can be brutally abrogated years after the services have been rendered, and retirement accomplished.

Our legislators must have been confused by words, phrases, charts, and explanations of the several administrations presenting the "problem." The hearings are replete with dissertations of what a military retiree is, and what the Nation's obligations to him are or should be. But the fact remains. The nation, speaking through its Congress, has decreed that retired pay was neither a vested right, a guaranteed right, nor an amount calculated on the existing statutes and rules in vogue during service. Traditionally, a "savings clause" is placed in every statute in which the status of individuals is being changed. The one and only exception to this American Tradition affects just the career professionals of the armed services.

Some rationalize that these old professionals who have served their tours and accomplished their duties "have lost their usefulness"; are now too "expensive" to the Nation; that hewing to the traditional retirement pay computation laws is too great a burden on the taxpayers. Statistically, it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (though hidden in a welter of other figures) that "Retired Pay" in 1939 ate up a greater percentage of the armed services budget than it did in 1965, or will in 1970!

Having broken faith with the one hundred year old retired pay rule, the Congress and the Administration compound the injustice by changing other "fringe benefits" to the individual retiree. Year after year, benefits promised or held out as an incentive or traditionally recognized as part of the privileges of our predecessors are whittled away from the professional military officers. This is exemplified in Veterans Hospitals by the downgrading of Congressionally awarded and honorably earned titles, as Commander to that of plain Mister. The retiree has seen the effects of the constant watering down of privileges in the commissary and post exchange stores and the dilution of privileges once recognized through "Customs". The expenditure in dollars applied to these items is not large. The seriousness is not mere dollars nor in privileges eroded away, but in the sum total of all these.

These are the things that break morale. This is why military service has lost attractiveness for able men.

One member of the Congress has said, "As important as all the benefits and all the pay raises we can pass is the simple knowledge that we keep our promises. We will never have adequate retention unless the man joining the services can feel secure that the benefits promised him in his youth will not be eroded with age."

There exists a distrust of promises made by the government as evidenced by the critical retention problems. Only by Congressional action can faith in the government be restored and a solution to the retention problem made possible.

RISING WAGE SETTLEMENTS INCREASE INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the administration's key assumptions with regard to the possibility of containing inflation without budget restraint has been that wage settlements would put less upward pressure on costs this year than they did last year. Results for the first quarter are already proving this assumption incorrect.

The Bureau of National Affairs recently reported that the overall median wage increase for the first quarter, based on 522 agreements, is 9.1 cents—up more than 1 cent from the comparable period last year. In addition, deferred increases, effective after 1 year, appeared in 63 percent of settlements, 12 percentage points above last year's first-quarter figure.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the report of the Bureau of National Affairs and a column by Sylvia Porter from the Washington Evening Star of April 18, 1966, which discusses the implications of the accelerating wage gains:

WAGE PATTERNS: FIRST QUARTER, 1966

The over-all median wage increase for the first quarter of 1966, based on 522 agreements reported in CBNC's Table of Current Contract Settlements, is 9.1 cents—up more than a penny from the comparable period of last year. The manufacturing median is 8.4 cents compared to 7.0 cents in the first quarter of 1965; the figure for nonmanufacturing is 10.2 cents as against 9.8 cents a year ago.

When construction settlements are eliminated, the all-industries figure drops two tenths of a cent to 8.9 cents. The nonmanufacturing median also drops two tenths of a cent to 10.0 cents, which compares with 9.7 cents—a one tenth of a cent drop—in first quarter 1965.

First-quarter wage patterns this year and last are compared in the charts below. The most common increases—seven to nine cents—were reported in 32 percent of contracts this year, as against 31 percent for the corresponding period for 1965. Smaller increases—from a penny to six cents—appeared in 17 percent of this quarter's agreements, down 10 percentage points from last year, while pay raises of a dime or more were found in 48 percent of this year's contracts, compared to 33 percent in 1965. The proportion of contracts in which wages were negotiable but not changed dropped considerably, from 9 to 2 percent.

Deferred increases, effective after one year, appeared in 63 percent of settlements, 12 percentage points above last year's first-quarter figure (and 8 points below the late 1964 figure). New or revised pension plans were negotiated in 29 percent of contracts, 2 percentage points above the comparable figure last year. Insurance plans, new or changed, appeared in 53 percent of contracts, down 4 points from last year's figure. New or changed vacation plans appeared in 41 percent of contracts while holidays were added or changed in 38 percent.

Severance-pay provisions were down 1 point to 4 percent from the first quarter of last year (and down 4 points from the 1964 fourth quarter figure). Supplemental unemployment benefits were mentioned in less than 1 percent of contract settlements so far this year, down from the comparable period last year. Escalator clauses also figured in less than 1 percent of settlements, down from last year, while reduction in hours occurred in 2 percent of contracts, the same as a year ago.

Manufacturing & nonmanufacturing: Almost half of manufacturing settlements boosted wages a dime or more while 63 percent of nonmanufacturing contracts did so. One-to-six-cent increases appeared in 20 percent of this quarter's manufacturing agreements, as against 13 percent of nonmanufacturing settlements; seven-to-nine-cent increases figured in 34 percent of manufacturing settlements, 24 percent of nonmanufacturing. Settlements calling for no change in wages (but in which wages were subject to negotiation) occurred three times as often in manufacturing—3 percent of contracts—as in nonmanufacturing—1 percent. Deferred increases were found in 67 percent of manufacturing settlements, 13 percentage points above the figure in nonmanufacturing.

Fringe activity was, on the whole, brisker in manufacturing than in nonmanufacturing. Manufacturing bargaining led in the frequency of added or revised pension plans—30 percent of contracts, as against 26 percent in nonmanufacturing—while nonmanufacturing led 56 percent as compared to 52 percent in new or changed insurance plans. Four percent of both manufacturing and nonmanufacturing contracts provided for severance pay changes; the workweek was cut in 4 percent of nonmanufacturing agreements, but in only 1 percent of manufacturing agreements. Supplemental unemployment benefits were reported in 1 percent of manufacturing contracts while nonmanufacturing reported none during this quarter.

Geographic analysis shows that the largest increases were recorded on the West Coast—a 9.9 cent median—followed by 9.8 cents in the Midwest and by 9.7 cents in the North-Central area. The West Coast figure for the comparable period last year was 8.4 cents. The lowest median settlement again was reported in New England—7.4 cents this year compared to 5.9 cents last year. However, this area led in the frequency of new or changed pension and insurance plans with 43 percent and 57 percent respectively. The Midwest again led in deferred increases with 76 percent as compared to 68 percent last year. The West Coast shows the greatest number of contracts providing revised severance pay benefits—7 percent—down from 8 percent last year.

1st quarter 1966 settlements by regions [1]

	West coast	Midwest	North central	Middle Atlantic	South-east	New England	South-west
Total number of settlements	41	29	141	136	84	51	20
Percentage distribution: [2]							
Decrease							
No increase		3	1	2	4	4	5
1 to 3 cents		3	1	2	1	2	
4 to 6 cents	17	10	8	15	25	29	15
7 to 9 cents	27	28	35	33	25	41	40
10 to 12 cents	32	37	33	26	24	20	20
13 to 15 cents	7	10	14	12	11	2	
Over 15 cents	17	10	8	10	11	2	20
Pensions	31	24	29	30	15	43	32
Insurance	49	48	56	54	47	57	55
Escalator clause		2	1				4
Deferred increase [3]	63	76	66	62	58	62	64
Hours reduced	2			5	2		
Severance pay	7	5	3	6	1	2	4
SUB [4]			1	1	1		
Holidays	26	26	45	40	37	33	41
Vacations	42	26	47	44	30	40	41
Median settlement (cents)	9.9	9.8	9.7	8.9	8.5	7.4	8.8

---

[1] Data for Rocky Mountain region are insufficient to provide a meaningful breakdown. However, such data are available upon request.

[2] Percentages may not total 100 percent because of rounding.

[3] Increases effective 2d year or later.

[4] Supplemental unemployment benefits (includes various types of guarantees).

1st quarter median settlements

	1966	1965
	Cents	*Cents*
All industries	9.1	7.7
All industries, excluding construction	8.9	7.6
Manufacturing	8.4	7.0
Nonmanufacturing	10.2	9.8
Nonmanufacturing, excluding construction	10.0	9.7

Distribution of 1st quarter 1966 settlements in selected industries

	Total settlements[1]	Decrease	No increase	1 to 3 cents	4 to 6 cents	7 to 9 cents	10 to 12 cents	13 to 15 cents	Over 15 cents	Median settlement	Pensions	Insurance	Escalator clause	Deferred increases[2]	Hours reduced	Severance pay	SUB[3]	Holidays	Vacations
MANUFACTURING										*Cents*									
Aerospace	9	-	1	-	-	3	3	1	1	9.8	5	7	-	9	-	2	-	6	5
Apparel and other finished textiles	29	-	2	-	11	5	5	3	-	6.5	8	10	-	13	3	-	-	15	9
Chemicals and allied products	27	-	-	-	3	8	10	3	3	9.9	8	16	-	25	-	-	-	14	14
Electrical machinery and equipment	18	-	1	-	-	6	5	1	4	10.0	5	12	-	13	-	-	-	5	8
Fabricated metals	26	-	2	-	2	7	5	3	3	9.5	11	16	-	23	-	2	1	13	17
Foods and beverages	69	-	1	1	8	32	16	2	3	8.1	32	48	2	63	-	3	1	38	39
Furniture and fixtures	7	-	-	1	1	3	1	1	-	7.8	2	3	-	7	-	-	-	4	4
Leather and leather products	7	-	-	1	2	1	3	-	-	8.0	3	5	-	6	-	1	-	4	1
Lumber and wood products	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	8.5	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	1
Machinery (except electrical)	30	-	-	-	6	13	7	-	3	8.4	16	19	-	23	-	2	1	16	18
Miscellaneous manufacturing industries	14	-	1	-	5	3	1	1	2	7.0	4	5	-	11	-	-	-	6	5
Ordnance	7	-	-	-	1	2	4	-	-	9.6	5	5	-	6	-	-	-	1	3
Paper and allied products	52	-	1	-	11	19	16	3	1	8.1	15	38	-	32	-	-	-	27	24
Petroleum	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	13.0	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
Primary metals	16	-	1	-	2	3	7	1	2	9.8	5	5	-	9	-	-	-	2	2
Printing and publishing	36	-	-	-	6	7	10	3	9	10.2	4	6	-	21	-	7	-	3	11
Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments	5	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	5.8	2	3	-	5	-	1	-	2	1
Rubber products	9	-	-	-	1	5	1	1	-	7.8	1	4	-	7	-	-	1	6	4
Stone, clay, and glass products:																			
Combined	14	-	-	2	4	2	3	1	-	6.5	2	9	-	12	-	-	-	8	4
Brick and clay	5	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	5.5	-	3	-	4	-	-	-	2	1
Cement	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6.0	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Other	8	-	-	-	2	2	2	1	-	9.0	1	4	-	8	-	-	-	5	3
Textile mill products	29	-	1	1	4	11	7	3	-	8.0	6	20	-	17	-	-	-	18	18
NONMANUFACTURING																			
Communications	5	-	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	5.3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Construction	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	7	17.8	1	3	-	7	1	-	-	-	3
Services (combined)	26	-	-	-	1	5	8	3	3	10.5	5	19	-	13	4	1	-	11	19
Shipping and longshoring	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	12.0	2	3	-	2	-	1	-	1	1
Transportation:																			
Combined	20	-	-	-	1	6	2	7	2	10.5	12	19	-	21	4	1	-	10	9
Airline	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	16.0	1	3	-	4	-	1	-	1	1
Railroad	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	14.0	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Streetcar, bus, and taxi	15	-	-	-	1	6	2	4	-	9.0	11	16	-	15	4	-	-	9	8
Trucking and warehousing	4	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	11.5	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	1
Utilities (light, power, gas, and water)	15	-	-	-	-	8	8	2	3	11.7	9	9	-	13	-	-	-	5	6
Wholesale and retail trade	56	-	-	1	6	15	16	9	3	9.7	23	48	1	51	-	6	-	26	35

---

[1] Includes some settlements carrying wage increases of unspecified amounts; not included in tabulations of medians or bracket totals.

[2] Includes increases effective 2d year, or later.

[3] Supplemental unemployment benefits (includes various types of guarantees).

NOT SO "QUIET" ON WAGE FRONT

(By Sylvia Porter)

The "all quiet" on the labor front is ending. Negotiated cash wage increases in the 1966 first quarter were the highest for any quarter in eight years.

The vital contribution that comparatively stable wages have been making to industry's profit margins and to years of non-inflationary prosperity is in danger. The average cash wage increase in the first quarter for all industries was 9.1c an hour, up 1.4c over the opening three months of 1965 and approaching the unquestionably inflationary level of 10.2c in 1958.

The key role rising wages are playing in the relentless climb in construction costs is now beyond dispute. The median (middle) wage raise in construction in the first three months was 17.8c an hour, the highest for any first quarter since the source of these statistics—the Bureau of National Affairs in Washington—began collecting the data in 1959.

"NEGATIVE" REPORT

This is the first time in many years that I have had to write a wage report of the "negative" nature—"negative" not because anyone begrudges the good fortune of those winning fat pay raises but because this accelerating upward trend warns that in the sphere of wages as well as of prices, a renewed spiral is the dominant threat. Throughout this entire decade, the pace of increase in wages has been under excellent control—with the average annual adjustment ranging from 7.1c to 8.5c a hour.

But now the BNA statistics—based on 522 settlements in the first quarter—indicate that the pattern of stability is being badly bent, if not smashed. The BNA believes the 9.1c average so far this year is easily above the 3.2 percent increase in wages considered non-inflationary under the administration's guideposts.

What's more, the research agency declares that "virtually all the factors bearing on collective bargaining suggest the outlook is for continued large wage increases in contract settlements." Its analysis of almost another 100 contracts signed in the past couple weeks reveals an even higher average level of raises than 9.1c.

Union demands are running much bigger than a year ago and a comparison of the first quarter of 1966 with the last quarter of 1965 shows "a widening gap" in the level of settlements.

LABOR SHORTAGE

Growing labor shortages in many areas and occupations "favor higher wage settlements." Union leaders are trying to recoup 1966's larger Social Security tax on employes as well as win pay increases in other ways: the extra Social Security tax will cost employers and employes alike as much as 5c an hour for the worker earning as much as $6,600 a year in 1966.

Construction settlements again will tilt the average wage increase higher in the months ahead, adds the BNA.

And this is only the cash wage side of the picture. Workers are winning major gains in fringe benefits as well. New or changed insurance plans appeared in 53 percent of the settlements. New or changed vacation plans showed up in 41 percent of the contracts. Additions or changes in holidays were in 38 percent of the signing.

As a final point, 9 percent of the first-quarter contracts last year granted no wage raises at all. This year, the no-increase proportion is down to 2 percent.

IS THE ECONOMY IN A BOOM-AND-BUST CYCLE?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, two eminent economic writers have taken a highly critical look at the administration's policy to deal with inflation in their columns in the Washington Post of May 9, 1966.

Harold B. Dorsey notes that the administration has permitted the growth of a boom which is creating excesses that are likely to lead to a slowdown in economic activity next year. One reason for the sharp drop in the stock market recently is a loss of investor confidence in the ability of the administration to use fiscal policy wisely to keep the economy in a sound and sustainable growth trend. Disillusionment with the "new economics" has been growing, Dorsey says, because administration policies led to an unanticipated overheating of the economy and because Congress is adding to spending precisely when it should be held down.

Jay Livingston suggests that the stock market drop partly reflects the remarks of Chairman Ackley of the Council of Economic Advisers before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce last week. Dr. Ackley suggested that profits were going too high, raising the specter of another "voluntary" guideline. Livingston discusses some of the difficulties of trying to fight inflation by consensus and points out the futility of attempting to control human behavior by personal persuasion instead of by law. Livingston says that either the President must cut spending or raise taxes if inflation is to be controlled.

Under unanimous consent I place the two articles referred to in the Record at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 9, 1966]

President Makes Discovery: Consensus Requires Consent

Eleven months ago it was the "Martin market." Today it's the "Ackley market."

In June, William McChesney Martin Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, spoke of "disquieting similarities" to 1929. He feared overspeculation and overexpansion. Wall Street quivered. Stocks fell.

Now Gardner Ackley, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has the distinction of having a Wall Street slide named after him. At the U.S. Chamber of Commerce annual meeting, Ackley hit businessmen where it hurts—in the profit-and-loss account.

"The earnings figures," said Ackley, "make it clear that prices have been raised more than costs, or prices have not been reduced when costs have fallen."

Rising prices and profit margins, added Ackley, do not encourage labor-leader "moderation" at the wage-bargaining table.

Thus the White House seeks to invoke another "voluntary control"—profits stability. Businessmen are asked to look at their profit-and-loss figures and then to ask themselves: Is this price increase necessary?

Ackley's comments only added to Wall Street doubts about profits. The high rate of capacity at which most industry is operating indicates that volume at the top lacks elasticity. So, if costs rise, profits will fall.

In addition, credit is tight. Businessmen and building contractors are not able to expand when, where, and how they please. This, too, limits profits.

Finally, interest rates—government securities yield almost 5%—have become increasingly attractive relative to dividends on industrial stocks, which yield about 3.2%.

Ackley's speech didn't change any facts. But it adds a new dimension to investor concern. Higher profits will be frowned on. And, by analogy, higher dividends. The speech also emphasized all the difficulties of anti-inflation by consensus.

To ask a businessman to stabilize—hold down—profits is akin to asking labor leaders to "bargain low" for wages or an athlete to try for second place when he wants to win. It's "agin nature." A consensus is like an alliance: It lasts as long as the policy has near-unanimous consent. That's what the word means.

But now, businessmen are openly complaining about the "voluntary restraints" on investment and bank lending abroad. They protest that their chance of capturing their "fair share" of rapidly-expanding foreign markets are reduced.

Farmers, too, feel put upon, even though net farm income this year will climb to an estimated $15.1 billion, as against $14.1 billion last year. During the five years Orville Freeman has been Secretary of Agriculture, farm income has climbed 20%. But never has his mail been so abundant or vehement:

From Canton, Iowa: "Previously, I had always thought that the Secretary of Agriculture worked for the interest of the farmers. Now I find he works for the consumer. The farmer doesn't count."

From Withee, Wis.: "I am a farmer's wife and a proud one, too. My husband and I are much offended by statements government officials make stating farm prices are high and a cause of the rise in the cost of living."

From Spearfish, S. Dakota: "I have supported you throughout, but since you deserted the farmers I am deserting you. I rather think your Boss put the skids under you."

Why this outcry? Secretary Freeman tried to reassure urban dwellers: Inflation hadn't taken permanent possession of the supermarket. Temporary shortages and the undersupply of hogs caused the sharp rise in food prices this year.

Now hogs and other foodstuffs would be more plentiful. The cost of living would decline. The Secretary expressed satisfaction with the prospect. That was his "special interest" indiscretion. Farmers felt he was rejoicing at their expense.

So it *ever has been when government tries to control human behavior, especially by personal persuasion instead of law.* And now President Johnson recognizes this. That's why he has reconstituted the Labor-Management Committee, why he asked the members to put themselves in his place and recommend a course of action. He is destined to get only one answer: *Do yourself what you would have others do.*

Either the President must curb federal spending or he must raise taxes. In one way or the other, he must disinflate aggregate demand for goods and services. Inflation can't be regulated indefinitely by words, guideposts or guidelines.

Loss of Confidence in New Economics Concept

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

New York, May 8.—An explanation for the unusually sharp decline in the stock market—approximately 10 percent in less than three months—at a time when the rate of growth in the economy is spectacular might be stated succinctly as follows:

It is obvious that the economy is in a super-boom condition.

Historically and logically, booms are followed by a perceptible slackening of growth trends at a minimum and by depressions at a maximum.

The boom-recession sequence is logical because the excesses which are an integral part of the boom are also the maladjustments which cause the subsequent recession. Booms *are* booms because they reflect a telescoping into a brief period of time demands that might better have been spread over a longer period.

The current tight situation in credit and capital markets—which is characteristic of most booms—simply reflects the fact that the sharp growth in the business activity has been dependent on an excessive and unsustainable expansion in the demand for credit and capital. If the recent rate of expansion in money and credit cannot continue then the rate of expansion in the business measurements must at least slow down.

The trend of stock prices is usually strongly influenced by the anticipated trend in the business measurements, because the latter suggests the probable trend of earnings.

The foregoing points are well known to experienced investment managers who must peer into the future when they are formulating their policies. It is unfortunate that, at times such as the present, the less sophisticated public almost invariably becomes overly impressed with the excellence of the current business and earnings figures. In fact, investment managers consider a sharp increase in public participation in the market—evident in the past several months—as one of the signals of a cyclical top in the market.

But do not the foregoing generalizations overlook important details? Has enough weight, for example, been given the New Economics concept, i.e., the use of fiscal policies to flatten out the excessive peaks and valleys which so often distort the economy's long-term growth trend?

The concept worked very well from 1962 until last autumn. Unfortunately, however, it has been unable to prevent a very sharp cyclical upswing which now contains the kind of excesses and maladjustments which, historically and logically, have caused an economic backlash.

At least in retrospect, it now seems clear that a tax increase of about $5–7 billion should have been injected for the single year 1966. But now the excesses have been permitted to develop and these excesses, in themselves, constitute correctives that are likely to dampen activity by next winter. At that time, a dose of higher taxes would probably dampen down things too much—assuming there is to be no escalation of defense expenditures above the pattern now scheduled. Thus, it would seem that we have missed the opportunity to use higher taxes as a component of fiscal policies designed to prevent the excesses inherent in a boom.

The concept of the New Economics must also assume that Congress will go along with the policies formulated by the planners. Serious doubts are now being cast on this assumption as Congress seems inclined to deviate seriously from the fiscal policies which were designed and imbedded in the Administration's budget.

There has been a loss of confidence in the New Economics concept (1) because the development of an overheated economy was not anticipated in the planning and (2) because Congress wants to spend significantly more money at a time when the state of the economy most emphatically needs less spending.

Consequently, sophisticated investors are not only demonstrating their concern about the possible development of a classic boom-recession sequence, but also their increasing doubt about the ability of fiscal policy manipulation to keep the economy in a sound and sustainable growth trend.

COMDR. JEREMIAH DENTON, A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Edwards] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the name of Comdr. Jeremiah Denton should live in U.S. history books as one of the great heroes of our country.

This man personifies the very best in American manhood, and makes a mockery of the so-called "peaceniks." His singleness of purpose and his courage have already been compared with that of Nathan Hale. Both men elevated dedication to their country above their own basic survival, and so earned the everlasting gratitude of their Nation.

Commander Denton is a U.S. Navy pilot. On July 18, 1965, his plane was shot down over Vietnam. He parachuted to safety and was captured by the forces of Ho Chi Minh.

On May 2 a Japanese newsreel company filmed a 10-minute interview with Commander Denton in Hanoi. The interview, of course, was conducted at the pleasure of the North Vietnamese authorities; perhaps was even instigated by them as a propaganda device of a kind used many times before.

The Japanese interviewers evidently were not friendly to Commander Denton, from the tone of their questions. Either that, or the questions were put into the mouths of the Japanese by the North Vietnamese.

But Commander Denton, married and the father of seven children, did not allow himself to be intimidated by these conditions. After 10 months of captivity he spoke up as a true patriot in a way which makes all Americans proud, in every sense of the word.

When the questioners challenged his religion by relating it to what they termed a "barbarous" act of his Government, Commander Denton replied:

> Whatever the position of my Government is, I will support it. Yes, sir, I am a member of that Government and I will support it as long as I live.

Commander Denton is from Mobile, Ala. His mother still lives there. His wife and children live in Virginia.

They should know, and all America should agree, that our country owes a great debt to Commander Denton and to others like him who are so courageously demonstrating to the world what it is to be an American.

Following are newspaper items regarding Comdr. Jeremiah Denton:

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register, May 12, 1966]

Captured Mobilian Backs U.S. Position—Pilot Interviewed in Hanoi

Tokyo.—An American Navy pilot captured by the North Vietnamese was quoted as telling a Japanese cameraman that he will support the U.S. government whatever its position "as long as I live."

The Nihon Denpa News (NDN), a Japanese newsreel company, reported Tuesday the filmed interview was obtained May 2 by its Hanoi correspondent with Cmdr. Jeremiah A. Denton of Mobile.

Denton's strong support of the United States contrasted with antiwar statements which Hanoi Radio has sometimes reported in the past as coming from some American prisoners.

NO SIGN OF INJURIES

The NDN film shows Denton sitting in a large room with NDN correspondent Toshimichi Suzaki. The interview lasted 10 minutes. Denton, 42, appeared in good health and showed no sign of injuries he suffered when he parachuted into Viet Nam last July 18 after his plane was shot down.

Part of the question and answer exchange went this way:

Q—What do you think about the so-called Viet Nam war? . . .

A—Well, I don't know what is happening but whatever the position of my government is, I support it fully.

Q—How do you feel about the bombing of American planes against innocent Vietnamese?

A—I don't know anything about bombing any innocent people.

Q—What are your present hopes?

A—I'm hopeful that God's will will be done. . . .

Q—Do you have some religious belief?

A—I'm Catholic.

Q—We have eyewitnessed the barbarous bombing of a Catholic church in North Viet Nam. We have heard the position of your government is that such bombing will end the war.

A—Whatever the position of my government is, I will support it. Yes, sir, I am a member of that government and I will support it as long as I live.

A graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, Denton is married to the former Jane Maury of Mobile, and is the father of seven children.

His mother, Mrs. Irene S. Denton, resides at 107 Providence Street.

Denton was asked whether he believed the North Vietnamese claim that more than 1,000 U.S. planes had been shot down during the Viet Nam war.

"No, sir, I don't believe they've shot down that many," Denton replied.

PRETTY WELL

He said he was treated "pretty well" on his capture and was given tea, water, inoculations and medicine. He said he received "quite good" food and adequate clothing and medicine but felt his present treatment by the Vietnamese "could be much improved." He added: "I feel pretty well."

He said his wife and seven children lived in Virginia and that he had received two letters from them since being captured, the last one in March. He said he had not answered the last letter.

Denton said he used to receive regular news of the war and the United States but had not heard anything recently.

The interviewer asked if he thought his family was worrying about him.

"Yes, I think they probably are. . . . I'd be surprised if they were not."

The news agency said Denton was brought to Hanoi for the interview from a camp outside the city.

[From the Mobile Press, May 12, 1966]

United States Should Seek an Exchange to Free Brave Mobile Airman

The beatniks and pacificists attempting to undermine support of the war on communism in Viet Nam must surely feel like hanging their heads in shame when and if they read the inspiring words of Navy Comdr. Jeremiah A. Denton, a Mobilian, now held prisoner of war in North Viet Nam.

Commander Denton, 42-year-old son of Mrs. Irene Denton, 107 Providence St., and husband of the former Jane Maury of Mobile, told a Japanese interviewer that whatever the position of the United States government is in South Viet Nam he will support it "as long as I live."

Courage of this nature is most heartening in this time when so many Americans, including some of our own government's leaders, are appealing for a cessation of the war in Viet Nam. They evidently want our government to hand South Viet Nam over to the Reds.

Commander Denton said another impressive thing in the interview when he expressed the hope that "God's will will be done" in Viet Nam.

Our guess is that the interviewer would not have been allowed to see Denton if the Reds had had any idea he would express such loyalty to the United States.

It is one of the great blessings of this land of ours that it produces men of the caliber of Commander Denton, whose plane was shot down over Viet Nam last July. The hearts of all Americans should go out to this serviceman and his family.

In fact, the government should take every step possible to effect his release by the enemy through a prisoner exchange agreement.

[From the Alabama Journal, May 10, 1966]

Commander Denton's Answer

A pale, haggard man from Alabama faced a communist camera crew in North Viet Nam recently and gave some plain, straight answers that ought to be remembered.

He'd been a prisoner of war since last July. In the totally alien world of Southeast Asia, Americans have learned not to be surprised at cruelly crushed, animal-like responses from husks of men who've survived 10 months of Oriental custody.

Jeremiah Denton, of Mobile, looked exhausted. His answers to questions were sometimes inaudible, but goaded for his opinion of U.S. action in Viet Nam—the whole point, it would seem, of the interview—he visibly forced an answer he wanted to be heard.

"Whatever the position of my government, I support it. Yes, sir. I am a member of that government and I will support it as long as I live."

This is the kind of universal honor that transcends differing religious and cultural backgrounds. It commands respect from enemy fighting men in the same way Allied officers in World War II respected Gen. Erwin Rommel in North Africa.

Denton, a commander in the Navy, made no new phrases such as were credited to Nathan Hale after a night of captivity. He had survived 10 months of interrogation. Stop and think how long the last 10 months have been in your own life.

Whether the communists released the interview because they failed to get the import of what he was saying or because of more devious reasons doesn't really matter. His almost routine assumption of old-fashioned responsibility is a solid rebuttal to a hundred peacenik marches.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION LEGISLATION, S. 1160

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the May 17, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee a policy statement regarding S. 1160, freedom-of-information legislation, was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the Record the complete text of this statement:

Republican Policy Committee Statement on Freedom of Information Legislation, S. 1160

The Republican Policy Committee commends the Committee on Government Operations for reporting S. 1160. This bill clarifies and protects the right of the public to essential information. Subject to certain exceptions and the right to court review, it would require every executive agency to give public notice or to make available to the public its methods of operation, public procedures, rules, policies, and precedents.

The Republican Policy Committee, the Republican Members of the Committee on Government Operations, and such groups as the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the professional journalism society Sigma Delta Chi, the National Editorial Association, and the American Bar Association have long urged the enactment of this legislation. Due to the opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, however, this proposal has been bottled up in Committee for over a year. Certainly, information regarding the business of the Government should be shared with the people. The screen of secrecy which now exists is a barrier to reporters as representatives of the public, to citizens in pursuit of information vital to their welfare, and to Members of Congress as they seek to carry out their constitutional functions.

Under this legislation, if a request for information is denied, the aggrieved person has the right to file an action in a U.S. District Court, and such court may order the production of any agency records that are improperly withheld. So that the court may consider the propriety of withholding, rather than being restricted to judicial sanctioning of agency discretion, the proceedings are de novo. In the trial, the burden of proof is correctly placed upon the agency. A private citizen cannot be asked to prove that an agency has withheld information improperly for he does not know the basis for the agency action.

Certainly, as the Committee report has stated: "No Government employee of any level believes that the 'public interest' would be served by disclosure of his failures or wrongdoings * * *." For example, the cost estimates submitted by contractors in connection with the multimillion-dollar deep sea "Mohole" project were withheld from the public even though it appeared that the firm which had won the lucrative contract had not submitted the lowest bid. Moreover, it was only as a result of searching inquiries by the press and Senator KUCHEL, Republican, of California, that President Kennedy intervened to reverse the National Science Foundation's decision that it would not be in the public interest to disclose these estimates.

The requirements for disclosure in the present law are so hedged with restrictions that it has been cited as the statutory authority for 24 separate classifications devised by Federal agencies to keep administrative information from public view. Bureaucratic gobbledygook used to deny access to information has included such gems as: "Eyes Only," "Limited Official Use," "Confidential Treatment," and "Limitation on Availability of Equipment for Public Reference." This paper curtain must be pierced. This bill is an important first step.

In this period of selective disclosures, managed news, half-truths, and admitted distortions, the need for this legislation is abundantly clear. High officials have warned that our Government is in grave danger of losing the public's confidence both at home and abroad. The credibility gap that has affected the administration pronouncements on domestic affairs and Vietnam has spread to other parts of the world. The on-again, off-again, obviously less-than-truthful manner in which the reduction of American forces in Europe has been handled has made this country the subject of ridicule and jokes. "Would you believe?" has now become more than a clever saying. It is a legitimate inquiry.

Americans have always taken great pride in their individual and national credibility. We have recognized that men and nations can be no better than their word. This legislation will help to blaze a trail of truthfulness and accurate disclosure in what has become a jungle of falsification, unjustified secrecy, and misstatement by statistic. The Republican Policy Committee urges the prompt enactment of S. 1160.

URBAN MASS TRANSIT IN QUEENS COUNTY, N.Y.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have previously taken the floor to remark upon the urgent transportation crisis facing Metropolitan New York and other major cities of the Nation.

Without any doubt, the urban congestion wrought by inadequate means of public transport is one of the most crucial problems of America's big cities.

On April 19, I reported on the experience of a project in Queens County, N.Y., initiated by the Queens-Long Island mass transportation demonstration program. This particular operation, centered around the installation of a shuttle bus to divert traditional riders away from overcrowded subways, proved successful, and indicates that we can find limited, practical means of easing localized transit tieups.

Queens County, on Long Island, is a major public transportation complex. Any solution to servicing Long Island-Manhattan traffic must assume Queens as a principal factor.

Yet, taken as a whole, southeastern Queens and the Greater Jamaica area have thus far been largely ignored. The substandard and woefully inadequate public transport system has brought deterioration to the economic well-being of the area. The commuter crisis at this focal point has reached unmanageable proportions.

Communities in southeast Queens and the surrounding Nassau area are currently being served by almost 4,000 daily buses, transporting more than 130,000 passengers. The congestion caused by converging buses and private automobiles in Jamaica is nothing less than monumental. At peak hours during the morning, long lines of commuters stretch out for two blocks or more waiting for buses.

This central commuter area of southeast Queens and Jamaica lacks efficient, rapid rail service which is indispensable to both an adequate public transport system and the economic development of this densely populated community of New York.

The local citizenry, through the Jamaica Chamber of Commerce, has come forward with a realistic, practical means of meeting this urgent problem. Their chief recommendation is to transfer the facilities of a subway line to the right-of-way of the Long Island Railroad, extending the line eastward and southward to reach the localities of Jamaica, Hillside, Hollis, Bellaire, Queens Village, St. Albans, Springfield Gardens, Rochdale, Laurelton, and Rosedale.

Costs of this plan are minimal, since in large measure existing track will be used, which the chamber rightly seeks to exploit. It is imperative that this proposal, along with other suggestions of the Jamaica Chamber of Commerce, be fully explored by the metropolitan commuter transportation authority and other related agencies in New York. The authority is currently studying a plan whereby the BMT subway line will merge with the Long Island Railroad in the vicinity of Atlantic Avenue in Brooklyn, to proceed to lower Manhattan. The transfer proposal is a logical extension of the authority's anticipated decisions, and it is desperately needed.

Future planning with respect to the Long Island Railroad should not deal exclusively with increased service to Nassau and Suffolk Counties from Manhattan without considering the dire conditions prevailing in the Greater Jamaica area.

I have stated before that integrated planning of expanded transit service is a prerequisite. What I mean is that we need comprehensive schemes which take in the total topographic need, and which do not ignore vital affected areas.

The plan to expand rail service to southeast Queens is a constructive step in the right direction, and flows correctly from current thinking on improving the entire metropolitan transit system. Local citizens have responded intelligently to the transportation snarl that is paralyzing their community. City, State, and Federal authorities should be moved to cooperate in every possible way.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to yield to the able and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO], with whom I am privileged to share the representation of southeast Queens and who has worked relentlessly to improve transit and community facilities in that area.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, in many areas of the Nation there is a growing need today for an improvement of mass transportation facilities to save the economic life of our cities. Because of inadequate transportation facilities, many cities are becoming ghost towns as people turn to the suburban shopping centers for all their needs.

In Jamaica, Queens County, N.Y., we have this problem facing us—an area represented by my colleague, Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN, and myself. Fortunately, we have a wide-awake and forward-looking chamber of commerce which is doing something about this problem.

Recently Congressman HALPERN and I met in Washington with Mr. Vincent Albanese, president, and other representatives of the Jamaica Chamber of Commerce. At that time they outlined to us proposals of the chamber for a considerable improvement in transit facilities—plans which I recommend and which would go a long way toward providing an answer to the commutation problems of an estimated 130,000 commuters in southeast Queens and which would ease traffic congestion in the city, congestion with which every city is familiar. The proposals of the Jamaica Chamber have been presented to the metropolitan commuter transportation authority which must coordinate the program for the entire New York City area.

The Jamaica Chamber of Commerce has sought to find the most effective answer to the problem which besets us and at the least possible cost. In my opinion, they have succeeded in doing this.

The proposals call for the transfer of the Jamaica BMT to the right-of-way of the Long Island Railroad in the vicinity of 130th Street and to extend eastward on the main line and southerly on the Atlantic division to the county line. A possible connection would serve John F. Kennedy International Airport. Also, the Jamaica Avenue BMT line would be removed to the terminal station located at 168th Street and Jamaica Avenue. Continuation of this outmoded structure would be an unnecessary duplication of service, the chamber has pointed out. The plans call for a major transportation terminal and office complex to be constructed in the vicinity of the Long Island Railroad's Jamaica station.

The present Jamaica Avenue BMT line, terminating at 168th Street, does not provide rapid transit service to nearly 500,000 people located beyond this point to the east. Communities to be served under the chamber's proposals would include Jamaica, Hillside, Hollis, Bellaire, Queens Village, St. Albans, Springfield Gardens, Rochdale Village, Laurelton and Rosedale.

Congressman HALPERN and I, in a letter to William J. Ronan, chairman, Metropolitan Commuter Transportation Authority, State of New York, have stated that we highly recommend and support an integration of the Long Island Railroad and the BMT line which can be effected with a minimum of cost. We have stressed that the common utilization of existing track would, we believe, give immediate needed mass transit to this area and would aid in the rejuvenation of the Jamaica shopping area, creating a greater number of jobs thereby making for a better economy.

The Congress in enacting the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964 has provided for assistance in programs such as we have outlined, however, the Federal Government does not possess the authority to directly assist such projects unless they are part of the local government's overall transit planning. For this reason we seek to have the Jamaica Chamber of Commerce's plan incorporated in the plan of the metropolitan commuter transportation authority. It is our understanding that the authority is considering a plan whereby the BMT will merge with the Long Island Railroad in the vicinity of Atlantic Avenue in Brooklyn and proceed to a lower Manhattan terminal. The Jamaica chamber's proposal would basically be an extension of such a plan.

MAJOR DISASTER BEFALLS MIDSOUTH COTTON AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a major disaster has befallen the people of the Midsouth cotton area consisting of the States of Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Heavy rains over the past several weeks embracing a wide area have prevented the planting of cotton and the fulfillment of the plans made by the farmers through their ASC committees under the provisions of Public Law 89–321 of the 89th Congress, 1st session, which is known as the Agriculture Act of 1965.

This act provides that should a farmer plant not less than 90 percent of his domestic acreage allotment of cotton, he would have been deemed to have planted the entire amount of such allotment and would receive price support and payments as set out in the act specifically. The provisions of law further state:

> An acreage on a farm in any such year which the Secretary finds was not planted to cotton because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall be deemed to be planted to cotton for purposes of payments under this subsection if such acreage is not subsequently devoted to any other income-producing crop in such year.

Under the bill that I am introducing today it would change this language as follows: It would strike "if such acreage is not" and would insert in lieu thereof the words "and such acreage may be."

Under the present or current provision of the law the Department of Agriculture can aid those who had previously planted their cotton crops by allowing them both price support and cotton payments and permitting them to plant some other income-producing crop. However, under this language of the act, unless it is changed, a farmer who had not been privileged to plant 90 percent of his domestic allotment would receive price support only and no payment and could not utilize the land for any income producing purpose.

I am introducing a bill today to permit these flooded-out farmers, or farmers living on land which, due to excessive rainfall, or whose land is so wet that they cannot get into the fields to plant it to cotton before the time is too late for the growing of a cotton crop to plant some other crop which could be grown and harvested in a shorter period of time. Then, in such event, such persons could be permitted to obtain price support and the cotton payments which his neighbor is entitled to, or who had successfully planted his crop before the coming of the rains and the excessive wet weather. Such person could then plant soybeans or some other income-producing crop under the terms of the bill which I am presenting today.

I understand that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STUBBLEFIELD], and others may also introduce similar legislation.

The relief which is sought is to alleviate conditions which were caused solely and exclusively by an act of God. Farmers had gone to their ASC committees and signed up under the 1965 Cotton Act and had done everything within their power to comply with the provisions of the law and the regulations thereof. Now they find themselves in a position where due to the lateness of the year they will not be able to get their cotton planted and make a crop since cotton requires quite a long growing season. The rains continue to fall in this section of the belt.

I am setting forth here below the information received this day from the U.S. Weather Bureau at Little Rock with reference to the precipitation in certain areas in my district over the immediate past few weeks as recorded by the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, at Little Rock, Ark. It is as follows:

> (Rainfall information by inches as received from Mr. Benny Terry of the United States Weather Bureau by telephone today:)
>
> April 23: Walnut Ridge, 1.42; Jonesboro, 1.45; Grubbs, 1.10; Paragould, 1.78.
>
> April 24: Alicia, 2.83; Grubbs, 2.17; Patterson, 2.25; Newport, 1.55; Jonesboro, 2.59.
>
> April 25: Paragould, 2.40.
>
> April 26: Newport, 1.15; Walnut Ridge, .65; Patterson, 1.62; Jonesboro, .93.
>
> April 27: Newport, 3.42; Walnut Ridge, 1.69; Patterson, .18; Jonesboro, 1.70.
>
> April 29: Paragould, .43.
>
> April 30: Walnut Ridge, .08; Jonesboro, .39; Newport, .03; Helena, 1.86; Marianna, 1.42.
>
> May 1: Marianna, 1.67; Helena, 1.46; Walnut Ridge, .04; Newport, .46; Patterson, .79; Paragould, .11 Jonesboro, .11.
>
> May 2: Jonesboro, .17; Walnut Ridge, .21; Marianna .07; Patterson, .63; Helena, .67.
>
> May 12: Patterson, 1.23; Newport, 1.32; Walnut Ridge, 1.14; Jonesboro, 1.10; Marianna, .32.
>
> May 13: Marianna, .91; Walnut Ridge, .20; Jonesboro, .10; Patterson, .13; Helena, 1.20.
>
> May 16: Patterson, .25; Newport, .06; Jonesboro, .55; Walnut Ridge, .99; Helena, .27; Marianna, .28.
>
> May 18: Patterson, .81; Newport, .45; Walnut Ridge, .21; Jonesboro, .42; Helena, 1.06; Marianna, .90.

I hope that the members of the Agriculture Committee of both the House and the Senate, the Department of Agriculture, and the Members of both legislative branches of the Government will assist in the passage and early approval of this emergency legislation which is so necessary for the well-being of the farmers and a great area itself in the Midsouth portion of the Cotton Belt.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, sometime during this session of the Congress the Members of the House will be called upon to vote on a momentous issue. I refer to title IV of the administration's civil rights bill which would force a homeowner or other residential property owner to sell or rent his property to persons other than those of his choice. I doubt that I have ever read a bill which is so destructive of the right of private property ownership as is this one.

My attention has been invited to two editorials on this subject. One is entitled "Freedom of Choice," by Alan L. Emlen, chairman of the Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards which appeared in the May 16 issue of Headlines, the weekly publication of that association; and the second is entitled "Civil Rights, Wholesale," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on May 13, 1966.

I commend the reading of both these editorials to the Members of the House before they vote on a measure which would inject the element of legal coercion in the private dealings between private individuals over the disposition of privately owned property.

On May 18, 1966, a number of representatives of national religious organizations testified before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee in support of title IV which would force homeowners to sell their homes to persons other than those of their choice. I find it difficult to comprehend the reasoning behind the pleas of these groups. In the final analysis we must recognize that bias or prejudice are spiritual defects which no secular law can cure. I have read with great interest an address by Everett R. Trebilcock, Esq., general counsel of the Michigan Real Estate Association, before the annual convention of that association in Grand Rapids in September 1964. It is entitled "Thoughts on the Use of Law To Advance or Enforce the Christian Ethic." I strongly urge that the Members of the House read this important message and reflect on its meaning before they vote to invoke the police expedient to force one person to accept another in their private arrangements for the sale or rental of their homes.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the two aforementioned editorials and the address by Mr. Trebilcock.

[From Realtor's Headlines, May 16, 1966]

Freedom of Choice

(By Alan L. Emler, Chairman, Realtors' Washington Committee)

In an apparent attempt to use force and compulsion as a method of transforming the nation into racially integrated neighborhoods and communities, the Administration has asked Congress to deny to home owners and other real property owners the right to dispose of their property, through sale or rental, to persons of their choice. This is the unmistakable purpose of Title IV of the pending Civil Rights Act of 1966 (H.R. 14765 and S. 3296).

This legislation is premised on the mistaken belief that the exercise of freedom of choice by a real property owner is an act of racial discrimination. This assumption is a gross oversimplification which apparently rejects a traditional and fundamental right, both of which have their roots in the English common law—a tradition and right of freedom of contract and freedom of choice in the disposition of one's own property.

We are convinced moreover, that an objective of the legislation is to hasten the erosion of the right of private property ownership in the United States. We have detected the theme in a number of proposals of this and prior Administrations involving the control of the future use of the land. However, in the past, the efforts have been of a more subtle variety, such as the use of the taxpayer's money to control the future development of "new towns."

Personal choice in the disposition of one's property apparently stands to thwart the dreams of the planners of the society of tomorrow. Freedom of choice and freedom of contract have apparently become anachronisms in the scheme of those who would determine for us the choice of our neighbors and our tenants.

We believe that an enduring solution to the problem of the minority ghetto is attainable and is, in fact, being attained by the temporizing influence of the church, school, and men of good will. For example, we note that in 1965 only one half of 1 per cent of the listings of California's multiple listing systems surveyed contained some preference in the choice of buyer. The people of this state rejected by a better than two to one majority the element of compulsion—of legal coercion—in the disposition of their private property. However, through voluntary efforts the Realtors of California are making commendable progress in providing equal opportunity for all in the acquisition of housing.

The American people are striving toward the solution of this problem, and the solution is attainable. Yet in every instance where state legislation comparable to that of the pending bill was submitted to a referendum of the people, it has been rejected by overwhelming majorities. Voluntary efforts are achieving this objective. The use of force—the employment of the police system, the destruction of the human right of real property ownership, the suppression of freedom of contract—are all destructive of the objective of biracial understanding. We urge the Congress to choose the traditional American way of voluntary effort, and to reject the alien way of the police expedient.

We are hopeful that all home owners and owners of rental property will make known their views on this momentous issue to their representatives in the House and their two United States Senators.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 13, 1966]

Civil Rights, Wholesale

When he sent the latest civil rights message to Congress, President Johnson said new legislation must be on a broad scale rather than restricted to specific problems like voting. This week Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee was if anything more emphatic: "We must deal in wholesale and not retail measures."

We find the reasoning dubious, even dangerous, and the so-called open housing provision of the new Administration bill tells why. It's wholesale, all right.

The provision would prohibit discrimination in the sale or rental of any house or vacant land intended for housing anywhere in the country. Allegedly aggrieved persons could bring punitive damage suits in Federal court. In addition, the Attorney General would be authorized to bring civil suits to ensure compliance or to intervene in private suits.

That some people do refuse to sell a house solely on racial grounds is not in question, and perhaps they are wrong-headed. On the other hand, plenty of homeowners evidently don't take that consideration into account. But whatever the specific case, the open housing provision is demonstrably unfair to the majority of Americans.

It means any homeowner could be caught up in costly, lengthy litigation, trying to prove that he didn't refuse to sell because of race. In view of the notorious "blockbusting" tactics—where real estate operators deliberately zero in on a white neighborhood—that have already been employed in various places, it is a bludgeon that could be used to punish most unjustly a great many people and disturb the peace of whole communities.

On the level of principle, the open housing provision tears to shreds the traditional right of a homeowner to sell or not sell for his own private reasons or simply on impulse.

You may agree or disagree with the action of the California Supreme Court in overturning a state constitutional amendment prohibiting the state from abrogating a person's right to sell or rent as he, in his absolute discretion, chooses. The point is that the amendment was originally approved two to one by California voters, and the reason for the large margin is that it expresses what the U.S. has always, until recent years, regarded as a fundamental human right.

The California court insisted that the right to acquire and possess property of every kind without discrimination "is now beyond dispute." If so, what of the right of everyone to dispose of property however he sees fit?

Beyond that question, it must be asked where the Federal Government gets the authority to sweep into a private home and tell the owner what he has to do. Senator Dirksen calls the Federal open housing proposal absolutely unconstitutional, and common sense argues that he is on sound ground.

The Administration counters, in part, that it is Constitutional because of the interstate commerce clause. What's the connection? Because some of the items in the construction or furnishing of the house probably crossed state lines? This kind of contention twists that poor clause beyond recognition and should be beneath the dignity of any Government official.

Perhaps the most depressing aspect of such legislation is the social philosophy from which it emanates. Suddenly it's all wrong to pursue the ancient aspirations of succeeding and excelling. Wrong to want to move to a place where the neighbors will be congenial, or to get away from one where they are not. Wrong to want anything beyond the horizon of the lowest common denominator. No wonder some individualists feel like stopping this world and getting off.

Governmental authorities, we have frequently said, have an obligation to do what they can to ensure that Negroes enjoy the same rights as all other citizens. They have no right to discriminate against the majority. And when they try to legislate personal decisions, they do wholesale injury to a free society.

Thoughts on the Use of Law To Advance or Enforce the Christian Ethic

(By Everett R. Trebilcock)

The current interdenominational effort by Christian Churches to promote open occupancy legislation is frequently accompanied by the declaration that discrimination is evil and contrary to the Judeo-Christian tradition. It is said that the Christian faith is founded upon love and brotherhood without regard to race or ethnic origin; that consistent with this, all professing Christians should treat all people as brothers; that racial, religious or ethnic discrimination or preference in private living, and particularly in residential housing, is antithetical to this doctrine; that since people should live together without reference to race, religion, or ethnic origin consistent with such doctrine, it is a proper province of law to compel our people to integrate; and that since the end is that which Christian love and brotherhood would bring to pass were the latter practiced, the force of law may properly be advocated by Christians as an efficient expedient to accomplish this end. This curious employment of the secular power in aid of the Christian ethic has far reaching implications for Christians and it merits thereby thoughtful and earnest consideration by members of that faith.

History discloses many instances wherein the power of the state has been invoked by an established religion for the purpose of crushing heresy and promoting the "true faith" as such was envisioned at the time. For the most part such efforts represented an attempt within the Christian community to promote one doctrine or church over another. Few, if any, of such attempts had any enduring beneficial effects and most of them resulted in revolt and division within the contesting members of the Christian community involved. One has only to remember the Spanish Inquisition, the persecution of the "heretics" in late medieval England and the Puritan witch trials in Massachusetts. Even such efforts as the promotion of Sabbath observance through Sunday closing laws have been poorly received, these having been honored in the breach rather than by observance, despite the scriptural admonition that the Sabbath be kept holy.

Thus, when Christian religious leaders have invoked the temporal power in aid of religion the results have been both unfortunate and unsuccessful. One may well wonder why our modern day Christian clergy tend to be oblivious to this lesson of history as they seek to avail themselves of the power of the State to promote the brotherhood of man. Although we are not concerned in the open occupancy of housing controversy with the elimination of heresy or the establishment of doctrine as such, the end sought is even more presumptious than these, namely, the advancement of Christian love through legal force. Thoughtful consideration of this proposition, we submit, will demand its rejection and will establish that the end of Christian love and brotherhood cannot and must not have for its bed fellow the instrumentality of legal force.

The Christian belief that we should love one another is in effect an affirmative answer to Cain's question "Am I my brother's keeper?" It is significant too that love for one's fellow man was most frequently stated by Christ in close conjunction with the first and greatest Christian commandment that we love God. It would seem fairly inferable from the foregoing that it is basic Christianity that each professing Christian concede that his primary reason for being is to come to know and to love his God. Love for his fellow man most surely will flow from the Christian who has fulfilled the first and greatest commandment by experiencing and reciprocating the Divine Love. In short, one may not hate one's fellow mortals (even one's enemy) if he has exeprienced the spiritual transformation which attends the fulfillment of the first commandment that he love his God. This Christian love or "agape" as the theologians refer to it is conditioned on the attainment of a sublime humility which when experienced can no longer be accommodated with one's taking a lesser view of others than one holds for himself as a child of the Divine.

It is vital to note that the Christian message spread upon the pages of the New Testament is completely disassociated from any suggestion that legal compulsion should ever be employed to facilitate Christian love whether to one's God or to one's fellow man. The delineation between the legitimate expectations of Caesar and the expectations of God is made unmistakably clear in the scriptures. "Seek and ye shall find" is the enduring promise of the New Testament. Voluntarism not force is the essence implicit in Christ's appeal that we seek our God through Him and that we love our fellow man. This is truly the heart of the Christian faith and to seek its attainment through legal expedients is to pervert and destroy that faith.

This latter day appeal of the Christian clergy that we regiment ourselves through legally coerced open occupancy housing carries with it an awesome disclaimer of the ability of the Church to persuade its adherents and convert others to the Christian Way. Nor can this approach be justified by that conclusion so frequently heard from the professional clergy that they must make the Christian faith "relevant to our times". In so stating, our ministers have forgotten that the Christian message for mankind in the first century was either relevant for all eternity or an irrelevance in its inception.

When the church contends that it is appropriate to use the force of law to bring about social situations or relationships which might exist were Christian love to have received its practical fulfillment, the church has plainly debased itself and its tradition. To compel people in the relationships of life to accept one another or to act as though they did through force of law is to destroy whatever hope exists for the true attainment of brotherhood of all men through spiritual conviction. These considerations cannot be expected to deter non-Christians, be they atheists, agnostics or even humanists, but they should be of serious concern to those who follow the Ministry of Christ.

Some of the more practically inclined proponents of forced housing among the Christian clergy recognize that bias or prejudice are spiritual defects which no secular law can cure, but it is argued that employment of legal force to eliminate the outward manifestation of prejudice through discriminatory acts is nonetheless appropriate. This is to say that the law may be properly addressed to the result while the spiritual problems of the cause go unresolved. One might say with equal logic that irrespective of whether a man by convictions accepts Divine Providence he should be made to act as though he did, or that when one should display brotherhood or affection for another human he should be compelled to treat such person as though he felt and experienced these sentiments existant or not. Prohibition and restraints of this type have their place in criminal jurisprudence but surely they are improperly employed in the private affairs of life among free men.

From the standpoint of American political philosophy, there is a very real paradox involved in the use of the power of the state to compel, directly or indirectly, the formulation and observance of standards governing the interrelations of our many racial, ethnic and religious groups. It is worthy of note that although this Nation from its inception has declared itself to be under God, the Bill of Rights of its Constitution has unequivocally declared that the power of the state may not be invoked either in aid of or in opposition to belief or disbelief of its citizens in Divine Providence. This in no way suggests that it is the policy of the nation or of any state to discourage religion or the belief in God, but rather it is eloquent evidence of the profound conviction that government has no proper function in interposing political power between Man and God, however well intended this might be. Viewed in another light, it is fundamental national policy that man in order to be truly free must be at liberty to accept or reject God uninfluenced, much less coerced, by force of law. Necessarily, then, the intellect and conscience of our people alone are entrusted with the determination of whether or not it will accept the fellowship of God or reject the same.

Herein lies the paradox of which we speak, for despite the existence of this fundamental tenet of government with respect to the acceptance or rejection of religion and the committing of the entire matter to the dictates of individual conscience, there are those who now urge that the power of government is properly employed to coerce the acceptance by one person of another in the affairs of life, irrespective of the element of personal choice. Thus, while the state secures to its citizens the right to accept or reject the Diety himself as their consciences may dictate, its power would be invoked to compel the acceptance by the individual of all men and to prescribe penalties and sanctions for those who fail to conform to the state established criteria of mutual acceptance. As a fundamental proposition of government, this incongruity cannot be resolved, for as a man has the right to accept or reject the fellowship of God without legal coercion by the state, so must he be free to accept or reject his fellow man, for there can be no true fellowship in either case which does not spring from a free spirit and unfettered conscience.

Perhaps the time is here for the Christian layman to express himself on the subject matter at hand for the edification of his spiritual leaders. He would do well to make the point that integration in housing cannot be regarded as a manifestation of Christian fulfillment unless the indifference to racial or ethnic considerations which permits its attainment is the natural consequence of spiritual convictions. This thought underlies the position of many adherents of the Christian faith who oppose the force of law in this or related areas of life and who feel deeply that a desirable end cannot in a Chirstian view justify illegitimacy in means. Our church leaders need to know that the laity marks well the respective provinces of Christ and Caesar even in a democratic society and that it will not permit the former to be supplanted by the latter. This is not to say that the church has no role to play in inter-group relations but rather to suggest that the enduring power of the Church is yet in the pulpit, confessional and sanctuary and not in the legislative halls, the administrative agencies or the courts of law, and that the sword of Caesar must never presume to clear the way for Christ in this or any other age.

DR. ULYSSES S. WIGGINS—PHYSICIAN AND FREEDOM FIGHTER

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **CAHILL**. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ulysses S. Wiggins, a noted Camden, N.J., physician, departed this life on April 8, 1966, after a lifetime of service to his fellowmen. While Dr. Wiggins was respected and beloved as an eminently qualified doctor of medicine, he was probably better known in New Jersey and indeed, throughout the United States, for his dedication to the cause of equal rights and the elimination of racial discrimination wherever it was found. His life illustrates more dramatically than any words of mine, the unlimited opportunities offered by America to those who have the will and the desire to succeed. His life also dramatically illustrates what can be accomplished in a righteous cause when dedicated and brave men are willing to work and sacrifice for their ideals. For truly the civil rights movement in the United States today has achieved many of its goals because of Dr. Ulysses S. Wiggins and men like him.

In my congressional district, Dr. Wiggins epitomized the freedom fighter. He did this by his own example, his quiet persuasion, and by his logical reasoning, and by the results he achieved. Dr. Wiggins believed that his cause was just, and that presented in an intelligent and persuasive manner, he could convince others and accomplish his desired results. This he has done throughout all of south Jersey and his example and leadership have, I am told, been an inspiration to the leaders on the national level who have been likewise fighting for equal rights in other parts of our country. Indeed, Dr. Wiggins was a national figure in the NAACP himself, and made a great contribution to its overall success since he first became president of the Camden branch in 1941.

Dr. Wiggins was a son of parents who were actually slaves in Augusta, Ga. From this early struggle, he prepared himself by industry and education to the day when he received a medical degree from the University of Michigan. He began practicing as a physician in 1928, and since that time has been one of Camden's best known and best loved doctors.

I came to know Dr. Wiggins personally more than 20 years ago. On many occasions I had the opportunity of talking to him for long periods of time about matters of current, local, and national interest. In all of these associations, I found him knowledgeable, able, cooperative, and anxious to do whatever he could to help his community, his State, and his Nation.

During his lifetime he was an active participant in many civic, fraternal, and religious groups to which he contributed the wealth of his talents and experiences. He was a past president of the South Jersey Medical Association, of the New Jersey Medical Association, was a staff member of Camden's Cooper Hospital, and was a member of the American Medical Association. He served on the national board of the NAACP and was, for 6 years, president of the New Jersey State Conference of NAACP Branches.

Dr. Wiggins was a pioneer in assisting Negroes to obtain jobs requiring skills and was instrumental in the placement of the first Negroes in many of the industries of south Jersey. He helped place the first Negro Yellow Cab driver, the first Negro cashier in the American Stores Co., the first Negro salesgirl in Sears & Roebuck, the first Negro toll collectors and policemen of the port authority. He aided actively in the peaceful and intelligent integration of Camden schools. He was in the forefront of all legislative efforts in the State of New Jersey and in the U.S. Congress in bringing about equal rights for the Negroes of our country.

His life was indeed a rich one because he gave so much of it to so many of his fellow citizens. Our community has lost an outstanding citizen and leader, and the United States has lost an outstanding citizen.

I had the sad honor of attending the last rites for Dr. Wiggins and I was deeply impressed by the two eulogies that were delivered. The first was by Bishop Stephen Gill Spottswood, D.D., of Washington, D.C., and the second by Charles S. Lee, D.D., of Philadelphia, Pa. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to incorporate in in these remarks, the text of these two eulogies:

A TRIBUTE TO DR. ULYSSES S. WIGGINS

(By Bishop Stephen Gill Spottswood, D.D.)

"He is not dead, the soldier fallen here;
His spirit walks thruout the world today;
He still proclaims his message far and near;
Might is not right, the truth must have its way!

The cold damp soil cannot this hero hide—
This knightly man who did not fear to die—
For liberty and freedom still abide;
Weep not for him, tho here he lowly lies.

Go forth and tell his message to the world;
In vain their fight, in vain the foe withstood,
Unless above all kingdoms be unfurled
The pure white flag of love and brotherhood."

—THOMAS CURTIS CLARKE.

Beyond a lifetime of devotion to the fight for freedom for the last seventeen years, Dr. Ulysses S. Wiggins has served brilliantly on the National Board of Directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. And he has given untiring day to day service to the Board.

He was dedicated to the fight-for-freedom. He equated his indefatigable labors in the healing art with his endless devotion to the Camden Branch N.A.A.C.P., the New Jersey State Conference of Branches, Region II, N.A.A.C.P., and the National Board of Directors.

Dr. Wiggins was a great humanitarian. He not only was a great official of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People but he was a princely friend and pal. We, his colleagues, appreciated the warmness of his personality and the stance of his character. He stood, like a rock, for the ideas and ideals of his mind and soul. He never surrendered his vision of the American dream. He held fast to the vitality of the Constitution. He fought thru his leadership in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for the fulfillment of the democracy his mind and heart envisioned as the ultimate Americanism. Yea, the concept of his vision embraced the far-flung fruits of democracy: the brotherhood of all men, world peace and human tranquility.

In the Fourth Gospel (John 7:17) Jesus is quoted, "If any man's will is to do his will, he shall know whether the teaching is from God".

Ulysses S. Wiggins, as teacher, physician and freedom fighter displayed an intent to do God's will. This indicates that he was one of God's noblemen, truly, as son of God!

Now he joins the increasing caravan of crusaders who fought thru the ages for the Holy Grails, guaranteeing the redemption of mankind from sin, slavery and segregation. He will live enshrined in the hearts of us who have served with him and when the roll-call of freedom fighters is unscrolled, his name will be inscribed in letters of gold!

A TRIBUTE TO DR. U. S. WIGGINS

(By Charles S. Lee, D.D.)

What does one say about a man whose life speaks so eloquently for itself? So I have come only to pay a tribute to a very great Man. Dr. Wiggins was a leader of men, fearless and strong. He was a moulder of opinion, wise and able. He was a student of human nature, keen of insight and understanding. He was a helper of man, kind and warm. He gave more to the society in which he lived than he ever took away. Truly, Dr. Wiggins possessed the key to immortality in his life time.

This key is easy to know about, but it is difficult for man to possess, because too often we are motivated with selfish pride and small ambitions. What is this key to immortality? It was given by Jesus when He said, "Come ye blessed of my father and inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was hungry and ye fed me, I was thirsty and ye gave me drink, I was naked and ye clothed me, I was sick and ye visited me, I was in prison and ye came unto me." And when His disciples questioned Him about these things, He gave the answer that made clear how to possess this key to immortality. He said, "As ye have done it unto the least of these your brethren, ye have done it unto me." Truly, Dr. Wiggins lives now to live forever.

The above eulogies, Mr. Speaker, brought forcefully, dramatically, and effectively to the minds of all present at the funeral service, the rich and lasting contributions made by Dr. Wiggins.

It is my understanding that a group of citizens in the Camden area are planning to erect a suitable memorial to his memory. I was pleased to learn of this plan and have arranged to cooperate in aiding in its realization.

Dr. Wiggins, however, built his own memorial during his lifetime and has left it for posterity as an inspiration for all who follow. His memorial is the memory of his life carried in the minds and hearts of those with whom he was associated; his memorial is in the health and the physical well-being of the patients and families for whom he cared as a physician; his memorial is in the ultimate victory of the great cause he espoused. He will always be remembered as an outstanding citizen and as a great physician and freedom fighter.

I speak for all the people of the First Congressional District in expressing to his widow Alice, who has been his wife since 1933, the profound and deep sympathy on the passage of a great man.

INDUSTRY—"ALABAMY BOUND" ON THE FORESTRY SPECIAL

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, a bright new chapter was written in Alabama last month in the history of industrial promotions for my home State. The occasion was the running of the first forestry special train in the heart of Dixie by the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.

This was the biggest and most effective public relations affair that has ever been held in Alabama, and I am proud it took place in my district, the Third, in the southeastern area of the State. Alabama welcomes industry and I can think of no better way to let businessmen know that the welcome mat is out for them.

On April 13 a special train from Montgomery to Cottonton, Ala., carried top forestry, governmental, and industrial leaders to a field forestry demonstration on the W. O. Motley Farm located in the middle of the Chattahoochee River Valley.

The guest list of well over 300 leaders of industry read like "Who's Who in American Enterprise." Company presidents, vice presidents, and executive assistants gathered from 25 States to take the forestry special.

The forestry demonstration included field exhibits on tree crops, their harvesting, and the finished products that are made from them.

The program emphasized the importance of the forest products, pulp and paper, and related industries to Alabama.

An unprecedented boom in Alabama's paper industry during 1965 attracted an investment of $180 million and has put the State in line to become the Nation's leading paper producer.

The train was met at the Motley farm by the Brundidge FFA Chapter String Band playing "Dixie" and members of four other local chapters of Future Farmers of America served as guides to the exhibits.

Many local mayors, city councilmen, and chamber of commerce officials were on hand to greet the train and become acquainted with the industry leaders. What could be a better opportunity for a get-together among industrialists who are always looking for new industry sites—and local and State officials who are anxious to see new businesses and new jobs in the area.

Already, as a result of the meet, I have heard of several industrialists who are talking seriously with local officials about expansion into southeast Alabama. It has also been gratifying for my office to answer a number of requests from businessmen who needed to have various information about possibilities for industrial location in Alabama.

It was my pleasure to be the congressional sponsor for the occasion, but the man most responsible for the overwhelming success of the program was Robert N. Hoskins, general manager of industrial development for the Seaboard Air Line Railroad. He was the master of ceremonies as well as director of the program which, incidentally, ran right on schedule, and that was a feat in itself with so many participants. Due to Bob Hoskins' efforts everyone had a profitable and enjoyable time.

At the field forestry program, Gov. George C. Wallace welcomed the group which included distinguished business executives, Members of the U.S. Congress, and the Alabama State Legislature, as well as heads of many State departments and agencies. Governor Wallace was introduced by James R. Thorne, executive vice president of the Seaboard.

State and National press were on hand to record the activities of the nearly 1,000 guests of the Seaboard Railroad and the State of Alabama.

E. V. McSwiney, executive vice president of the Georgia Kraft Co., made the principal address and was introduced by Howard P. Toxey, vice president of the Seaboard. I would like to read E. V. McSwiney's remarks to give my colleagues some idea of how basic the paper and container board industry is to America's economy and welfare:

E. V. McSwiney's Speech for Seaboard Air Line Railroad Event, April 13, 1966

Geologists tell us that fossil remains show the conifer—or cone-bearing tree—is one of the first trees in the vegetation cycle. It therefore, in a sense, laid the basis for man's society by being one of the early timber producers. It still is the basis for most of the wood industry in the world, and on this significant occasion, it seems appropriate to note that the conifer—the pine tree, if you will—has provided the foundation for the modern South's burgeoning growth.

We southerners are building an epic economy on a solid foundation of wood, and it is a great pleasure for me to be here near the site of the construction of Georgia Kraft Co.'s new division, the Alabama Kraft Co., for this observance held by our good friends and business associates of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad. As we stand here on the lands of one of the more than 1½ million owners of this great southern forest, we must be impressed that without the cooperative application of scientific forest management by the pulp and paper industry and these owners of the majority of the southern forests, we would not have the abundance of fast growing pulpwood which has made possible this new mill with its 350 jobs and its $3½ million annual payroll.

From southern trees, Georgia Kraft Co.'s Alabama Kraft Co. Division will produce 800 tons of containerboard per day. When the mill begins operation early next year, it will become a member of one of the largest manufacturing industries in the country—an industry with more than 5,200 mills spread across the Nation producing an aggregate of 43 million tons of paper and paperboard each year. The 43 million-ton figure established in 1965 represents a 4-percent increase over the previous year and marks the seventh consecutive recordbreaking year for the U.S. paper and paperboard industry.

Nationwide the industry last year paid its 640,000 employees some $4.5 billion in wages, salaries, and fringe benefits. Sales hit a record $18 billion. Every year the industry pays $250 million in local and State taxes and its Federal taxes amount to more than $650 million.

It is a basic industry and paper is basic to our civilization. One might almost say that paper usage is a measure of the development of a nation. The United States consumes more paper than any other nation. The total is 92 billion pounds a year, or roughly 479 pounds per person. Advanced countries like Sweden and Canada have an annual per capita consumption of over 300 pounds. Russia uses about 42 pounds per person, and as for China where papermaking began, the average consumption is estimated at only 6 pounds per capita.

Paper and paperboard are involved in some way in the packaging of 99 out of every 100 products the average American buys. In fact, where paper is not the principal material we still find paper used as product labels, packaging, protective liners, overwrap, interleaving, closures, and in many other forms.

The segment of industry which Alabama Kraft Co. will supply—the packaging industry—is relatively new in the United States. It emerged as an important factor in the economy in 1914 when the Interstate Commerce Commission ruled that common carriers no longer could discriminate against fiber boxes. This decision opened the way for competition with wooden crates, and started corrugated material on its way to becoming the most widely used of all shipping containers.

The paper industry has many effects upon our economy. It offers major markets to many other industries. Estimates of the industry's purchases of chemicals, for example, range upward of a billion dollars a year. Freight costs, calculated in terms of materials shipped to the industry and finished or semifinished products shipped from the industry, total about $1 billion annually and much of this production is carried by America's efficient and progressive railroads.

Alabama's share of this tremendous industry during the most recent year for which complete figures are available—1964—amounted to $83,108,000 in pulpwood purchases, employment with pulp and paper companies for 13,169 people, and a total payroll for the year of $85,943,800. The replacement value of mills now existing in Alabama, disregarding the several new mills now being built throughout the State, is estimated at almost a half billion dollars. And all of this comes from wood—a renewable natural resource.

About 25 percent of all the timber harvested in the United States is used to produce wood pulp. By the end of the century the present harvest is expected to triple. When that time comes, the pulpwood used in a year will amount to about 105 million cords, or enough wood to make a solid pile of pulpwood logs covering Manhattan Island to a depth of 22 feet.

Innovations have helped expand and improve on the usage of wood. The development of the wood chip market is an outstanding example.

Georgia Kraft Co. recently used the one millionth cord of chips purchased from sawmills. The Macon mill began the purchase of chips in 1957 to be followed by the Rome mill in 1959.

These chips are cut from slabs, edging strips and other portions of the logs which were burned before a use was developed. The sawmillers have received around $16 million from Georgia Kraft for both pine and hardwood chips.

Georgia Kraft Co., as an important part of the southern pulp and paper industry, has demonstrated its concern for the conservation of our forest resources by working with other forest industries to utilize more of the tree and the forest in its continuing efforts to reduce waste. With these important points in mind, it becomes apparent that the taxing of forestlands must be handled fairly and that taxes must be assessed in a manner which will allow persons willing to invest in forest land to obtain a reasonable profit from their investment. Considering that in much of the southern area, pulpwood production is based on a 30-year cycle, it is obvious that the taxes assessed against the land make up a primary factor in the cost of pulpwood production.

The handling of taxation against forest land ranges across the entire spectrum from bad to very good. Ad valorem taxes are assessed on a local basis, and far-sighted leaders in some counties have taken the initiative to encourage local governmental units to consider the taxation of forest-land as agricultural land—and it cannot be argued that forest land is anything else. Trees are a crop and represent the longest term growth crop now in production. More progress must be made in the proper evaluation and solution of this problem if the production of wood is to continue to contribute effectively to our economy.

Another significant problem which the paper industry has worked on for many years and in which the industry has made tremendous investments, is the adequate control of water quality. Paper industry's concern for this problem goes back some 44 years to 1922 when an association established a committee to collect data on the research of the industry and other organizations.

In 1939, the Sulphite Pulp Manufacturers Research League was formed and given the responsibility for improving stream conditions. Shortly after the formation of that unit, the paper industry created the National Council for Stream Improvement, an organization which is nationwide in scope. With five regional groups located throughout the Nation, the council carries out basic research, seeking solutions to the industry's waste problems and making these findings available for use at mills.

Pulp and paper mills readily and fully accept the responsibility to help maintain water quality, but they should not be expected to proceed at a rate and cost which would cripple one of the country's largest industries.

Scientific and technological progress have enabled the paper industry to meet the needs of an ever-increasing population and an ever higher standard of living. Often we think that technology is the mainspring of modern society, but all of the scientific progress and all of the technology in the world are of no earthly benefit unless they are used by people for people.

The people of this great State of Alabama are its finest asset. They are private enterprise-oriented, ambitious, and independent. The quality of the people has been reflected in the quality of leadership at all levels. The unstinting and unselfish service rendered to Alabama Kraft Co. by the leaders of these communities and your State has contributed to the existence of this new mill.

I also want to bring to your attention the remarks of my longtime friend Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, USDA:

REMARKS AT COTTONTON, ALA., BY EDWARD P. CLIFF, CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AT THE COOPERATIVE FIELD FORESTRY PROGRAM OF THE SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILROAD CO., COTTONTON, ALA., APRIL 13, 1966

Three years have passed since I had the pleasure of participating in one of these field trips—it is good to be here. I am always impressed by how much Seaboard Air Line people contribute to the advancement of forestry. The southern States are indeed fortunate to be able to benefit from this practical approach of demonstrating the principles of woodland management and wise resource use in the field—and the influence of these meetings extends far beyond this region.

In 1963 at Live Oak, Florida, I spoke briefly of my conviction that promotion of multiple use management of woodlands is most important. I suggested that this was the key to success in forestry programs aimed at farmers and other owners of small forest tracts. We have made progress in that direction. Industrial and public foresters alike are gaining skill and effectiveness in pointing out opportunities to manage forest properties for recreational, esthetic, wildlife, and other values as well as for timber production. But I think our job has really just begun.

In the past three years we have also witnessed a most remarkable upsurge in public interest regarding natural beauty, environmental pollution, the scenic and esthetic aspects of outdoor recreation, and so forth. I'm sure that all of us want our communities and our country to be beautiful, wholesome places in which to live. But we must make sure that the conservation movement continues to include the original concept of wise use of resources. I am concerned that the term "conservation" seems to be taking on a popular interpretation that too often seems to leave little or no room for commercial use. All of this is immensely important to American industries that must rely on continued use of natural resources—directly or indirectly.

Despite our efforts, the gap in public understanding of forestry practices may be widening. We must not allow our efforts to promote support and application of the principles of multiple use management to be "too little and too late." Nonindustrial private lands, such as we see here today, now supply more than 70 percent of the timber cut in the South. This can continue only if the level of management of these lands is raised and only if the farmers and other owners manage them with profitable timber production as one of the major goals. With the rapidly expanding use of timber in this region, this type of management becomes increasingly important on these lands.

We are working hard to step up Forest Service efforts to illustrate and demonstrate the compatibility of timber production with other uses and values through scientific resource management. We are attempting to strengthen the cooperative forestry programs run by State Forester Stauffer here in Alabama and his counterparts in other States. Next week in Chicago at the Silver Anniversary of the American Tree Farm System, I am going to urge forest industries people to increase their support of the State Foresters. I urge you to do the same because State Forestry organizations must provide a great deal of the increased effort so clearly needed.

We have recently moved in another way to bring greater emphasis to State and private forestry matters. Two Area Directors have been established in the East to head up our field work pertaining to cooperative forestry programs. Bill Bacon will be working closely with you from Atlanta, and your long-time friend, Jim Vessey, will be working in the Northeast from Upper Darby. These men and their staffs will bring full-time, top-level guidance to our part of this work.

I cannot overstate the importance that we in the Forest Service place upon the success of cooperative forestry programs—and in particular those directed toward small private holdings.

Cooperating with Seaboard in the overall program were: the Alabama Forest Products Association; Alabama Division of Forestry; Alabama Division of Vocational Education; Alabama State Planning and Industrial Development Board; Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce; American Can Co.; Atlantic Creosoting Co.; Container Corp. of America; Georgia Kraft Co.; Gulf States Paper Corp.; Kimberly-Clark Corp.; Koppers Co., Inc.; International Paper Co.; Moore Dry Kiln Co.; Southern Wood Preserving Co.; Timberline Equipment Co.; Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp.; United States Steel Corp.; and the U.S. Forest Service.

I would like to take this means to say "thank you" to all of those who made this great program possible. And let me say to my colleagues, if you ever have the chance to have the forestry special visit your district, take advantage of the opportunity. It is an experience you will long remember; it is a program that will be of lasting benefit to your State. Seaboard Air Line Railroad has proved itself a friend of Alabama's industrial expansion and we will never forget her good-neighbor policy.

RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY PASSES RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO PAY SURVIVOR'S BENEFITS TO CERTAIN WIDOWS

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to request permission to revise and extend my remarks and to include a resolution (H. Res. 1780) passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island entitled "Resolution memorializing Congress to pay survivor's benefits to widows who have no children and who are unable to obtain gainful employment."

H. RES. 1780

Resolution memorializing Congress to pay survivor's benefits to widows who have no children and who are unable to obtain gainful employment

Whereas, It is an unfortunate occurrence when someone is widowed and left without a mainstay of support, now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the state of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations through its general assembly, requests the congress of the United States to enact legislation which would extend payment of survivor's benefits to widows who have no children and who are unable to obtain gainful employment; and be it further

Resolved, That the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use concerted effort to enact legislation which would extend said benefits; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress.

I, August P. La France, Secretary of State of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, hereby certify that the aforegoing is a true copy of resolution (H. 1780) entitled "Resolution memorializing Congress to pay survivor's benefits to widows who have no children and who are unable to obtain gainful employment," taken from the records in this office and compared with the original resolution (H. 1780) passed by the General Assembly at the January Session, A.D. 1966 and became effective on the tenth day of May, 1966, and now remaining on file and of record in this office.

In Testimony Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Rhode Island, this eleventh day of May, A.D. 1966.

AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

OUTSTANDING EDUCATOR DISCUSSES HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the first in a series of four articles concerning higher education written by Dr. Mary Ellen Mancina Batinich, principal of the John A. Walsh Elementary School, located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent.

Dr. Batinich has an outstanding educational background and has earned a bachelor of music education degree, a master of arts degree, and a Ph. D. degree from Northwestern University.

She has been cited for her achievements as artist, author, and lecturer, in addition to her accomplishments as an educator. Last summer she was given the highly responsible position of head principal of six centers of the Operation Headstart program, and largely as a result of her experienced leadership and her astute direction, the program was a tremendous success.

Dr. Batinich's objectives in writing these articles were:

First. To develop an awareness of the value of a college education and to stress the importance of a positive attitude in this regard;

Second. To point out how to provide an environment for education so that the student will have the desire to attend college;

Third. To examine the means by which a student can be admitted to college; and

Fourth. To acquaint students who have the ability and the capacity to succeed in college and their parents with the means to finance a college education.

It is my intention to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all four of the articles in this series. The first one, entitled, "An Investment in Your Future—A College Education," follows:

I. THE VALUE OF AN EDUCATION

It appears obvious that workers most in demand in the years ahead will be those with a marketable skill as evidenced by education or specialized training . . . and in the most rapidly growing group—the professional and technical occupations—graduation from college is the usual requirement . . . (3).

Perhaps the high school English teacher should be instructed to revert back to the old-fashioned punishment of having each of his students write the above United States Department of Labor prediction on the chalkboard 500 times in order to ingrain it in his memory. The quotation which was drawn from the Department's "Occupational Outlook for 1970" must be heeded by the forward-looking students of today who are willing to accept the challenge of further education or training. Unless more students are encouraged to invest in their future, this exciting challenge of the 70's could be severely handicapped.

How wisely the high school student invests the critical years that lie immediately ahead of him will determine whether he has accepted the challenge for 1970. An investment of time in preparing to meet the 1970's job demand in the professional and technical fields will insure higher dividends in the form of a better life for the individual.

EMERGING CHALLENGE

The technological rate of change, spurred on by the revolution of automation, continues at a dizzying pace, eliminating an increasing number of unskilled jobs and creating a greater need for workers with advanced training. As a result, the "Outlook" continues, by 1970, about 47 percent of all employed persons will be white-collar workers (professional and technical, managerial, clerical and sales) compared with 43.1 percent in 1960 and 37.5 percent in 1950.(3)

The challenge of job opportunities is clearly evident, but apparently many students and parents are either unaware of the need or unwilling to adopt the positive attitude toward education necessary to accept the challenge.

Who will be qualified to fill these jobs? The National Science Foundation recently reported that less than 50 percent of the pupils in the top third of their high school senior class continue through college. These students have allowed education to fall by the wayside and have probably accepted jobs that could normally be handled well by people with less ability. We can no longer afford to let talent and skill go undeveloped in this way. Attitudes must be updated to keep pace with the changes so that every ability is recognized and encouraged.

THE ATTITUDE OF RESPONSIBILITY

Why haven't attitudes changed? Why don't many capable students go on to college? Perhaps because the same technological change that requires an increasingly higher skill to maintain itself also has made possible a way of life which is not conducive to generating the needed talents.

In the past, for example, boys chopped wood, piled it, filled the woodbox, and fed the fire when necessary; today they can give the thermostat a quick flick of the wrist and achieve the same result. The assignment of tasks which presented an opportunity to put children on their own, to give them goals to attain and to develop in them a sense of responsibility has passed out of existence with the need for the tasks. There must be modern-day substitutes to develop these traits. There is so much talk about rights today; but little mention is made of the responsibility which is associated with every right. Can it be that too many parents provide all of the material things for their children but fail to provide opportunities for them to become aware of their responsibilities?

EDUCATION FOR THE WHOLE PERSON

Are we stressing the importance of a positive attitude toward educational responsibilities only to accept a prophetic challenge? There are many additional benefits of a good education—benefits that cannot be measured in dollars. An education brings more meaning to life by fostering the development of many good habits needed throughout life, such as learning to observe, evaluate and make decisions based upon the evaluation, understanding the importance of good human relations, and finding ways to enhance personal value to society and consequently to be a more useful citizen. Great personal satisfactions can also accrue to the individual who can turn to books, music and the arts for intellectual stimulation.

BECOMING AN EXCITING PART OF TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

The old adage, "A woman's place is in the home," is no longer entirely true. The woman college graduate today is not the rarity she once was, the odd character who traded charm and graciousness for knowledge and intelligence. An increasing number of women are selecting a career in many professional and technical fields opened to them because of the critical job demand. The fact that most girls today will spend more than one-third of their lives working (4) means that they must prepare themselves for two careers—one in the home and the other outside of the home.

College educated men usually seek a wife who also is well-educated. An educated wife is not only an asset to her husband in advancing his business or professional status but is also better able to understand today's problems, to know different cultures, and to appreciate the arts more fully.

An educated woman can participate directly in her children's education by understanding the evolving attitudes and concepts in the field of education, including "The New Math," and by providing better guidance for her children. She can be an active participant rather than an "outsider" looking in. It is generally accepted that: when you educate a man, you educate an individual; when you educate a woman, you educate an entire family . . .

CAN YOU AFFORD NOT TO GO TO COLLEGE?

The Census figures of 1960 reveal startling facts of the value of an education in terms of earned income. The man who did not complete eighth grade will probably attain a lifetime earning of $184,000 while a high school graduate will earn approximately $247,000 during his lifetime. A college graduate can normally expect to earn about $417,000; thus he will earn on the average $170,000 more during his lifetime than the man who ended his formal education with high school graduation.(1)

But remember, education is only one ingredient of the recipe that might help you earn amounts such as the above. Increased earning power also depends on which occupation one enters, the quality of the education obtained, and the ability and efforts of the individual. Some men with exceptional ability and extensive experience have become successful without a college education. But today, greater opportunities exist for those professionals who have at least a bachelor's degree.

These facts of future earning power emphasize that you cannot afford *NOT* to go to college. But what about the present expenses of a college education? Can you afford not to go to college because of the high cost of an education? Scholarships, fellowships, grants, loans and work-study plans are becoming increasingly available. In the absence of other means of financial aid, the Higher Education Act of 1965, which makes funds available, assures that no American high school senior will be kept from attending college because he is poor.

WHAT ARE YOU DOING ABOUT IT?

It is essential that a positive attitude toward obtaining a college education be developed towards parents and students.

A parent should assist his child in mapping out educational plans, impressing upon him early in life the importance of an education, developing in him a sense of personal responsibility and a positive attitude toward education. The parent should also make certain that his child is prepared, i.e., eligible for college when it is ready for him, and should investigate the financial resources available to meet college expenses.

A student should be responsible for cooperating with his parents in achieving the above, for developing the desire to attend college, and in trying for the highest possible grades. A student should remember that "going to college is like opening a savings account at compound interest in terms of self-fulfillment and enrichment of life." (2) Each student should realize that while education is a lifelong process that the benefits of formal education accrue beyond the financial and employment aspects to spiritual fibre and personal excellence.

SUMMARY

The wise family, knowing that in the near future there will be fewer and fewer jobs for unskilled workers, will encourage their children not only to go to college but even to plan for graduate work. This family recognizes that technological changes are placing a greater premium on men and women with advanced training.

Most Americans honor education and understand its obvious as well as its intangible purposes. Aside from the fact that education increases income, it also adds worth and dignity to the individual, enables him to lead a better life, and assists him in his self-fulfillment.

An investment in education is an investment in the future. It should be recognized that: "Grace is given of God, but knowledge is bought in the market."—Arthur Hugh Clough.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, many words have been written and said in recognition of Poland's struggle for independence throughout the course of its history. We have all recognized the desire of the Polish people for their rightful place in a free society. With this spirit in mind my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, addressed the Polish American Congress on Saturday, May 7, 1966, at the manifestation and banquet commemorating Polish Constitution Day. I believe his understanding of the meaning of freedom for the Polish people should be brought to the attention of this body. With permission I would like his speech printed into the RECORD at this point.

If there is one nation in the world where freedom does not have to be defined—that nation is Poland. To the Polish people who are celebrating the 175th Anniversary of their Constitution and commemorating a thousand years of Christianity in their country, the meaning of freedom will not be found under F in Webster's. Nor will it be fully understood only in the well-meaning phrases of men who, today, shower that country and its people with praise and congratulations.

To the Polish people, the meaning of freedom will be found within their very being. It is written in the blood of Warsaw in 1944. It is written in the headlines of September the 1st, 1939. Its spirit will be discovered in the stirring measures of Chopin's "Revolutionary Etude." And its determination is present today in the valor of Cardinal Wyszynski.

The history of Poland is a testament to freedom because Poland's struggle has been unending. In no other country in the world have frustrations been so great. In no other country, have periods of freedom been so swiftly followed so often by periods of tyranny. In no other country, have the people been so victimized by the presence of ambitious powers on their borders.

And, precisely because the struggle has been so great, in no other country has the torch of freedom burned so brightly in the mind and the hearts of the people. The Polish people need never *speak* of the struggle for freedom for they have lived it—for ten centuries of struggle, defeat, glory, setback and victory.

As I attempted to put together a few words for this occasion, I wondered how anyone else on this earth could speak of freedom to the Polish people. My words—indeed, the words of the greatest writers and orators, would not be sufficient. I, therefore, wondered what the people of Poland would tell me, what lesson they would teach out of a thousand years of struggle, accomplishment, valor and idealism. I am not quite sure of the words but I think that these are the things that are in their minds and hearts and I think that they would say something like this:

—Speak to us not of justice and democracy. Our constitution, written 175 years ago was the first forceful expression of justice and democracy in a Europe still largely governed by absolute monarchies.

—Speak to us not of love of country. We have seen our country split, divided and ravaged three times alone during the 19th century by ambitious neighbors. Our love of country has been tested too often for us to need to learn the lesson again.

—Speak to us not of Christian civilization. We have nourished it for a thousand years and our armies fought for it, died for it and saved it at the gate of Vienna against the Moslem invasion of Europe.

—Speak to us not of the evils of oppression. Twice, after losing our freedom, we rose up to win it again, only to be crushed ruthlessly by superior forces.

—Speak to us not of aggression, for the light of freedom was extinguished all over the world when the aggressor marched through our country in 1939.

—Speak to us not of tyranny for two of the most despicable tyrants the world has ever known played their inhuman game of chess on our soil, making us the hostage of broken treaties and the desire for conquest.

—Speak to us not of valor for, in the weary August of 1944, we rose up two hundred thousand strong against Nazi tanks to reclaim our city; and we then knew despair when Russian guns went silent before our city and supplies were withheld when Stalin refused to permit American and British planes to land at Russian airfields. And then we knew betrayal when our only choice was to capitulate to a Communist front or die. And finally we knew unbelievable suffering when our city was leveled to the ground and thousands lay dead in the streets of Warsaw.

These are the testimonies to the human spirit which the history of Poland teaches me. It is a record of bravery and undaunted courage to rival that of any nation in the world and perhaps to surpass all of them.

But they are not only the witnesses of history. The same qualities appear today and have reappeared since Poland fell under the shadow of Communist control twenty years ago. Poznan, in 1956, was an electrifying telegram to the world that Poland's pursuit of freedom had not ended. The commanding presence of Cardinal Wyszynski is, to this very day, a symbol of Poland's love of religious liberty. And the recent actions of Gomulka make it only too clear that the stifling of freedom is still the landmark of Communist domination.

To every American—no matter what his ancestry—the courage and idealism of the Polish people provide a powerful magnet. To every American who loves freedom, the experience of the Polish people stands as a symbol which unites all of us who pursue liberty. I understand that fact, not through the words of testimonials but through the deeds of the Polish people, not through the mere facts of history but through the blood, valor, endurance and idealism of the Polish nation.

This is why the Polish are so much a part of America. This is why the American people and their government will not hesitate to extend the hand of assistance behind the Iron Curtain. And this is why we shall not be content until Poland is once again free—free *not* until the next tyrant comes along—and *not* until the next aggressor marches in—*but for all time.* To that proposition, all Americans are dedicated.

ALL THIS HAPPENED—THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR, PARTS V AND VI

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues parts V and VI of the continuing series of the history of the American Labor movement appearing in the Seafarer's Log a publication of the Seafarers International Union.

Parts I and II appear in the RECORD of March 30, 1966, pages 7195 through 7198; part III appears in the RECORD of March 31, 1966, pages 7348 and 7349; and part IV appears in the RECORD of May 4, 1966, page 9860.

Parts V and VI follow:

ALL THIS HAPPENED—THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR

(Part 5 of a Seafarers Log feature)

The twentieth century was to see the American labor movement adopt a new militancy. Despite setbacks it suffered in the previous decades the union movement had proved it would keep fighting and that it was a force to be reckoned with. At the AFL convention in 1900, Samuel Gompers reported: "It is noteworthy, that while in every previous industrial crisis the trade unions were literally mowed down and swept out of existence, the unions now in existence have manifested not only the power of resistance, but of stability and permanence." Change was in the air.

Following the stunning defeat labor suffered in the Pennsylvania hard-coal (anthracite) mining regions during the "Long Strike" of 1874–75, deplorable working conditions had continued and become even worse. The Mineworkers, who had been actively organizing in both the hard-coal and bituminous or soft-coal regions and had carried out successful strike actions there, returned to organize the Pennsylvania hard-coal miners in 1902. After long and fruitless negotiations with the coal companies it became obvious that the mineowners would not negotiate in good faith and a strike was called in May.

The mineowners resorted to the same terror tactics which had broken the "Long Strike" many years before. The Coal and Iron Police was mobilized and many new "deputies" added. Scabs were recruited from all over the country. Most of the scabs were afraid to go down into the dangerous underground mine-shafts however. The UMW maintained strict discipline among the strikers, who ignored much provocation from the Coal and Iron Police goons in order to avoid violence and bloodshed. The strike dragged for months, and as winter neared, coal reserves to feed factory furnaces and heat homes were dangerously low. It was obvious that fault for the prolonged strike lay with the mineowners and President Theodore Roosevelt finally stepped in to end their intransigence. He told management that if they refused to negotiate or submit the dispute to arbitration he would send in troops—not as strikebreakers—but to seize and run the mines in the national interest. Faced by an angry public and a President who had had all he could take of their stalling, the mineowners agreed to arbitration, called in their goons, and soon reached a settlement with the union.

One of organized labor's biggest problems in this period were the court injunctions which restricted its fights against the employers, and which led Gompers to comment: "God save labor from the courts." A classic example was the Danbury Hatters case. In 1908, 250 striking members of the Hatters Union at a Danbury, Conn., plant, were ordered to pay $310,000 in damages because the court ruled it had violated the Sherman anti-trust law by organizing a boycott against the company. The strikers lost their savings, their homes were attached for 14 years, until the AFL paid the damages.

Labor progress was continuing on many fronts during this period. The conditions under which American seamen labored was receiving publicity for the first time and Andrew Furuseth, leader of the International Seamens Union and the Sailors Union of the Pacific had begun his long fight to obtain freedom for seamen of the United States—and of the world.

Soon after the UMW victory in the Pennsylvania hard-coal mines, another militant brand of unionism grew up in the American West—the Industrial Workers of the World—the IWW, better known as the Wobblies.

The IWW was formed at a Chicago convention in 1905 attended by an assortment of unionists, socialists and radicals. It took a lot of sorting out to produce some unity out of such diversity of beliefs—a unity which was never really solidly achieved and led eventually to the IWW's downfall. But a working unity was finally hammered out, and the IWW emerged, led by William (Big Bill) Haywood of the Western Federation of Miners. The IWW motto was "One Big Union" made up of all the working men and women in the nation. As often as not the IWW did not initiate strike action, but rushed trained and able organizers to the scene of a spontaneous but unorganized walkout anywhere in the country.

The Wobbly concepts of trade unionism struck real fear into the hearts of America's big-business establishment, and it wasn't long after the Chicago convention that an attempt was made to frame Big Bill Haywood for murder. He and two other officials of the Western Federation of Miners were accused of killing a former Idaho governor who had used stern measures to break a series of strikes by the WFM while he was Governor of the state.

The well-known anti-labor Pinkerton Detective Agency was hired to collect the evidence against Haywood. The case was placed in the hands of James McParlan, the same man who had produced the "evidence" used to convict union officials and break the "Long Strike" in the Pennsylvania coal fields in 1875. He soon produced a "confession" from a WFM member with a shady past, who claimed he had committed not one but 27 murders under the direction of the WFM leaders. The IWW hired the famous criminal lawyer Clarence Darrow for the defense.

In short order, Darrow punched so many holes in the prosecution charges that the Idaho jury could bring back nothing but a "Not Guilty" verdict. In similar situations, other IWW members and organizers were not so lucky. Many were lynched, beaten and jailed. Joe Hill, famed IWW songwriter and organizer was tried and executed by the state of Utah for a murder most historians still feel he did not commit. In spite of everything however, the IWW carried on, organizing farm workers, shoreside and seagoing maritime workers, lumberjacks, factory workers—anyone who wanted union representation.

The IWW used direct methods to discourage anti-labor violence. When the "Pennsylvania Cossacks," a constabulary force, noted for its brutality against strikers, killed a worker during a strike at the Pressed Steel Car Company in 1909, the IWW strike committee threatened that in the future a "Cossack" would be killed for every striker killed. The anti-striker violence ended suddenly and the strike was won.

The IWW also adhered to its pledge to go anywhere to provide leadership to unorganized workers engaged in a spontaneous walkout. This was the case in 1912 when textile workers, most of them foreign-born women, struck the American Woolen Company in Lawrence, Massachusetts, after wages had been cut below the level even of sheer survival. IWW organizers rushed to the scene, organized picket lines, soup kitchens, printed leaflets and provided leadership to the striking women. The strike dragged on into a bitterly-cold winter, but it was the employer who broke first. The police were ordered to break the strike by attacking a group of women and children, who were clubbed and beaten. The townspeople were so sickened by the display of brutality that even the local anti-labor newspaper condemned the employer. Soon afterward the Company gave in and the strike was won.

In the end however, the IWW, whose membership never was more than 250,000, collapsed because of the anti-war position of the leadership and because of its organizational failures. When the United States entered World War I in 1917, many of its leaders denounced the action and refused to support the war effort. Many, including Haywood were imprisoned and the leaderless organization collapsed. However, the IWW wrote a fiery page in the history of the American labor movement.

ALL THIS HAPPENED—THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR

(Part 6 of a Seafarers Log feature)

The policies of President Woodrow Wilson had strong labor backing as the United States entered World War I. Wilson enjoyed great popularity with American labor. He was the first President to address an AFL convention and the first to hold that the right to organize was in the public interest. It was during Wilson's first administration that the Clayton Act was passed, clearly stating that labor unions were not "trusts" or combinations in restraint of trade—a charge made by many employers in an attempt to thwart union action. It was also under his administration that a separate Labor Department was established, with the Secretary of Labor a member of the President's Cabinet. The first Labor Secretary was William B. Wilson, former secretary-treasurer of the AFL United Mine Workers Union.

Unions grew in membership in the war period. By 1920 the AFL unions represented four million workers.

With the United States entrance into the war, most American unions adhered to a "no-strike" pledge to assure American soldiers an uninterrupted stream of American war production. Prices soon began to rise however, and although industry's war profits soared, American workers met increasing difficulty making ends meet. Many workers found it impossible to live up to their no-strike pledge, and before the end of 1917 almost 4,500 strikes were in progress involving over a million workers. The War Labor Board was created to alleviate the situation. Through the Board, a living wage was established in each industry involved in war production and unions were authorized to act as bargaining agents for the workers. American business accepted labor's new position because war profits were at record highs and a "don't rock the boat" philosophy prevailed. But American employers were simply biding their time. With the end of the war and the flooding of the labor market by 2 million returning soldiers, "getting back to normal" became the national slogan. For most employers this meant a return to their old anti-labor agitation, wage slashing, and a rejection of Federally controlled wages and hours and compulsory union recognition.

At the same time that the employers' anti-labor activity climbed toward its peak, post-war prices and living costs were skyrocketing. American workers were caught in a bind for which there was only one answer. During 1919–1920 well over a million workers went on strike. The employers used all of the traditional union-busting devices against them, plus a new one—the "Big Red Scare." Employers did their best to link each American strike with the Communist Revolution which had just taken place in Russia. Simple strikes for higher wages were greeted by screaming headlines like "The Bolsheviks Are Taking Over!" Some strikes were in fact undermined by the Red Scare tactics. In most cases, however, the walkouts continued because the strikers were not radicals of any sort and certainly not Communist sympathizers. They were simply working men who could not live on what the employer offered and took the only action available to them to better their condition. During the war, the steel industry remained non-union and when 24 AFL unions joined in 1919 to organize steel workers the workers joined the unions by the thousands. As fast as they joined the union, they were laid off. A strike followed and the steel towns were scenes of violence and repression. Eighteen lives were lost and the strike was smashed.

The Red Scare madness reached its height in the famous Sacco and Vanzetti case. Nicola Sacco, a shoemaker, and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, a fish-peddler, were anarchist labor organizers arrested in 1920 and charged with a payroll holdup and murder. The evidence against them was extremely weak and it was generally felt that they were being tried for their radical anarchist views and labor backgrounds, rather than for any involvement in the Braintree, Massachusetts robbery. The Red Scare was at its height, however, and the two men were convicted and executed, although they continued to proclaim their innocence to the very end.

For the badly abused American seamen, much progress was made during the period just before World War I and during the presidency of Woodrow Wilson. A campaign by the Sailors Union of the Pacific had already led, in 1892, to the enactment of legislation abolishing penalties for desertion on coastwise vessels. In addition, assignment of wages and the attachment of seamen's clothing on coastwise ships was made illegal. This legislation was later partly nullified, but new legislation limited penalties to forfeiture of wages and clothing on coastwise runs. The penalty for desertion in foreign ports was limited to one month's imprisonment. At last the American seaman had some legal rights, if still very few. But spurred by Andrew Furuseth, leader of the International Seamen's Union and head of the Sailors Union of the Pacific, the fight was continued and legislation destined to become the Seamen's Act of 1915 was introduced into Congress by Senator Robert M. La Follette and Representative William B. Wilson (who would later become the nation's first Secretary of Labor).

The struggle leading up to passage of the Seamen's Act lasted for over 20 years. During that time there were some small successes and many great disappointments. Through all that time, Furuseth haunted the halls of Congress. He acted as the conscience of an entire nation—a strong, rich nation, yet one which had allowed greedy shipowners to force such vile conditions upon seamen that a journalist could write with absolute truth in 1896 "the difference between a deep-water sailor and a slave is $15 per month."

Furuseth obtained invaluable and unselfish support and assistance from Senator Robert La Follette. Furuseth lobbied constantly for legislation to improve the lot of American seamen. He wrote magazine articles, debated the issue with anyone at the drop of a hat, actively lined up support in Congress. When the Seamen's Act was finally passed in 1915 and signed into law by President Wilson, it was in large measure a personal triumph of one man's devotion to his fellow men.

The Seamen's Act definitely abolished imprisonment for desertion, guaranteed half pay in every port of loading and unloading, increased foc'sle space, and improved the scale of provisions. In addition, it set definite standards of experience for able-bodied seamen, limited work in port to 9 hours daily, abolished all but necessary work on Sundays and holidays, legislated that 65 percent of the deck crew had to be ABs and 75 percent of each department had to understand the language of the officers. It made mandatory the provision of sufficient lifeboats for everyone aboard, assured payment for injuries received at work, and much more.

Although some of the Act's provisions were later undermined through lax and discriminatory enforcement by the Department of Commerce and conflicting legislation, and many other important improvements had to wait for later years to be realized, the Seamen's Act has been aptly called the Emancipation Proclamation of Seamen because it released them from virtual slave conditions. And Furuseth's long and great battle to secure its passage inscribed his name indelibly in the history of the seamen's union movement as "the Patron Saint of Seafarers."

ARCHBISHOP LUCEY'S TRIPLE JUBILEE

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the great spiritual leaders of the Southwest is the illustrious archbishop of the archdiocese of San Antonio, Robert E. Lucey. Last week a most significant ceremony and occasion was the marking of Archbishop Lucey's "Triple Jubilee."

Under unanimous consent, I insert at this place in the Record the accounts of this great event in the San Antonio Light and the San Antonio Evening News:

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, May 11, 1966]

Banquet Climaxes Archbishop's Big Day

Plaudits from the nation's top leaders on down were heaped upon Archbishop Robert Emmet Lucey at a banquet Tuesday night.

The ceremonial dinner, attended by 1,200 persons in richly decorated Villita Assembly Hall, was in honor of the "triple jubilee" celebration of the archbishop of the See of San Antonio.

Two princes of the Roman Catholic Church, Francis Cardinal Spellman, New York, and Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, Baltimore, joined with a multitude of church prelates from throughout the Western Hemisphere, leaders of other faiths and local civic leaders in paying tribute to Lucey upon his 75th birthday, 50 years as a priest and 25 years as archbishop.

L.B.J. MESSAGE

President Johnson, in a telegram to his "devoted friend," said:

"This is a day in which all Texans share in pride and hope . . . This day also reminds us of the long search you have led in finding more education for more people, more jobs, more hope, more decency, more dedication to God and country.

"Lady Bird and I send you our jubilant congratulations."

Vice President Humphrey also sent a wire in which he praised Lucey for being a "champion of our finest ideals."

The banquet was the climax to a day in which Lucey also celebrated a Solemn Pontifical Mass before 6,500 persons at Municipal Auditorium.

The impressive Assembly Hall ceremony began as the speakers, visiting archbishops, cardinals, and Lucey walked with their escorts from the foyer down a red-carpeted aisleway to a two-tier head table while a string sextet played.

THREE-HOUR EVENT

Six candlelabras on each tier, flanked by bouquets of flowers, cast a magnificent glow over the 3-hour event. Scarlet and red colors in honor of the prelates blazed throughout the hall.

Lucey, who received a standing ovation when he entered the hall and when he rose to speak, responded to the plaudits with praise of his own for the speakers and his faith and country.

He gave "a thousand thanks" to those who had come to pay him honor.

Referring to Methodist Bishop O. Eugene Slater, Rabbi David Jacobson and Ralph Garza, three of the speakers, Lucey said their presence together "are symbols of the good will that pervades this community."

He spoke of America's role in helping feed people of many countries, and said he "gives thanks" because "by the grace of God we are the greatest nation in the world."

He also spoke of the "enemies of God."

"If justice is not defended always and everywhere, justice will die," he said.

AMERICA NEEDED

"The world needs America for justice and liberty. Without America, the world would be in chaos."

The humanitarian, who long has fought for the betterment of the underprivileged, said he "grieves" when he "thinks of race riots and the exploitation of workers."

The archbishop also praised Spellman (his classmate in Rome) and Shehan. He talked of his school days in Italy, and when he first met Spellman and how he was impressed with his "thoughtfulness to others."

Garza talked of Lucey's work in the church, including his role in the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. (Lucey began this work as a priest in Los Angeles.)

"Our city now is a mecca of CCD," Garza said.

"We give thanks to God for giving Archbishop Lucey to us for 25 years."

Jacobson said he wished to "testify to the extraordinary influence for good of the archbishop of San Antonio upon every resident."

MAN OF PEOPLE

He termed Lucey a "man of humanity" who has "added dimensions to every faith."

The rabbi likened Lucey to a prophet who is "a man of truth, he sees facts as they are; a man of justice, his justice is absolute."

He said the archbishop has "been deeply involved in the affairs of the chronicle of man," and termed him an administrator who knows the value of communication.

Slater cited Lucey for his "devotion to the highest welfare of every human being," and said people hold the archbishop in high esteem.

The bishop said Lucey is "a man of integrity, a man of compassion, faithful to every trust.

"On this day," Slater said "we salute you . . . we offer the prayer that you may be given years of fruitful ministry among us . . ."

Rt. Rev. J. L. Manning, chancellor of the archdiocese and master of ceremonies, cited Lucey for preaching Catholic action, and said he had "a briefcase full of telegrams" for him.

CARDINAL RITTER

Joseph Cardinal Ritter, St. Louis, who delivered the sermon at the Mass, had to return to his home before the banquet.

Bishop Gerald Bergan of Omaha gave the invocation, and Bishop John Morkovsky the benediction.

Introduced by Lucey were his sister, Sister Angela Clare; niece, Sister Mary Eloise; boyhood friend, Thomas P. White, associate justice of the California Supreme Court, and priests from Los Angeles.

The dinner menu included broiled whole stuffed rock cornish game hen with oven browned potatoes and fresh garden peas, Florida crab meat supreme, cherries jubilee and wine.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Evening News, May 10, 1966]

Lucey "Triple Jubilee": Thousands Pay Tribute

Highlights and pivotal points of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey's long church career were recalled Tuesday by Joseph Cardinal Ritter of St. Louis.

Cardinal Ritter brought the sermon during a pontifical Mass in Municipal Auditorium Tuesday morning marking Archbishop Lucey's "Triple Jubilee"—his 75th birthday, 50 years a priest, and 25 years as archbishop.

"Very early he began his involvement in the two great apostolates of his life," said Cardinal Ritter in his sermon.

"The care of the poor, which eventually brought him membership on the Executive Board of the California State Department of Social Welfare; and the evolution of a meaningful program of religious instruction

through the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine."

"It would be too much to hope that Archbishop Lucey's campaigns for the rights of the underprivileged were always popular," he recalled.

"Just a few weeks ago, the President of the United States reminded us of the trials brought on by these efforts."

Cardinal Ritter then quoted President Johnson on the following:

"I remember Archbishop Lucey in the 1930s and he wasn't nearly as respectable then as he is now—he was a kind of a bolshevik in the minds of a lot of people when he came down here.

"I remember his writing me and quarreling and fussing and just doing everything that he could do to try to help do something for people who were picking pecans in San Antonio for eight cents an hour."

After he finished the quote from President Johnson, Cardinal Ritter observed:

"Still, Texans must have a soft spot in their hearts for revolutionaries because the President did invite your Archbishop to offer the invocation at his 1965 inauguration."

The St. Louis cardinal declared that "from any point of view, Archbishop Lucey has had a long, a full and distinguished career, and one which would measure up against the demands of the most exacting partisan of (church) renewal."

The auditorium, for the morning, was transformed into a cathedral, with the altar set on the stage in a setting of thousands of flowers.

In the overflow, standing-room-only crowd were Archbishop Lucey's sister and niece, both nuns. They are Sister Angela Clare of Santa Monica, Cal., and Sister Aloyse of Oakland, Cal.

According to the new rites ordered by the Ecumenical Council, the altar faced the congregation. And among those taking Holy Communion were youngsters costumed in the native dress of 12 nations.

Catholic schools, given a holiday Tuesday, were represented at the Mass in groups.

Adding to the color of the occasion were the many colors of the various habits of the religious orders—blacks, whites, browns, maroons, and the scarlets, reds and magenta of the higher prelates.

On the stage, the three cardinals sat at the opposite end from the archbishop's throne. Other clergymen who participated in the mass sat at the rear of the stage.

A native of Los Angeles, Archbishop Lucey was ordained a priest in Rome in 1916.

After serving as a priest in his native city and state, he was elevated to bishop and sent to Amarillo. In 1941 he was made an archbishop and given charge of the San Antonio Archdiocese.

Two other cardinals were in San Antonio to participate in the program honoring Archbishop Lucey—Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York and Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, archbishop of Baltimore.

Over 50 high dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church from North, Central and South America are in San Antonio for the "Triple Jubilee."

In addition, alumni of the North American College of Rome also are here for their annual convention. Archbishop Lucey is president of the alumni. Their sessions will be at the Granada Hotel Wednesday and Thursday.

Later Tuesday, beginning at 7 p.m., a banquet will be held in Archbishop Lucey's honor in Villita Assembly Hall. A crowd of 1,200 is expected.

Speakers at the banquet will be Methodist Bishop O. Eugene Slater, Rabbi David Jacobson of Temple Beth El, Cardinal Spellman, and Ralph Garza, the latter speaking for the laity. Monsignor Joseph L. Manning will be master of ceremonies.

INSTANT AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year Eastern Airlines' air shuttle celebrated its fifth anniversary. This unique service has provided a significant milestone in air transportation between Washington and New York, and Boston and New York.

In the April 7, 1966 issue of Flight International magazine of London, Mr. Arthur D. Lewis, senior vice president and general manager of Eastern, was asked about his company's plans for the shuttle. Like so many of my colleagues, I frequently use the air shuttle to get back to my district in New York.

I would like the interview with Mr. Lewis inserted in the RECORD in order that my colleagues may read of how this ingenious service has benefited the traveling public over the past 5 years.

The interview follows:

INSTANT AIR TRANSPORT

(Interview with Mr. Arthur D. Lewis of Eastern by J. M. Ramsden—Mr. Lewis is senior vice-president of Eastern)

This month the unique Eastern "Air Shuttle" service is five years old. It has now carried about 10 million passengers. There is no other air service quite like it in the world—it is the ultimate in passenger convenience, which is what transport is all about. You can go to the airport in the certain knowledge that you are guaranteed a seat within the hour. No telephoning, no booking, and no messing about with tickets, which are sold on board.

Next month the Air Shuttle moves on to a new and even more appealing development—jet service. Boeing 727s are to be progressively introduced on May 1, replacing Super Connies and Electras.

We recently called on Mr. Arthur D. Lewis, senior vice-president of the airline, to ask him about the Shuttle, about the potential US market for an airbus, and about the value of competition in air transport.

Is the shuttle here to stay, and on a guaranteed-seat basis?

Yes, as it is currently operated.

The original concept of the shuttle, which was using old written-down equipment, has changed radically, hasn't it? Now you are going to introduce jets?

Yes, we are going to introduce jets on the first sections and we'll back them up with Electras on the second sections. Ultimately, in about a year and a half from now, we'll phase out the Super Constellations entirely.

Surely the economics of operating $4 million 727s compared with almost zero-book-value Constellations are very different, aren't they?

Well, in the "first section"[1] it is not so different; we get good utilisation on the first section. This is an aircraft that turns on itself all day long. The aircraft will leave New York at 7 o'clock, it will arrive at Washington at 7:45, turn out of Washington at 8:30, back in New York in time to turn out on the 10 o'clock, and so on until 10 o'clock at night. It takes three jets to fly the first sections between New York and Washington. It takes another three jets to operate between New York and Boston. We'll use six jets to perform the first section, and on all those six jets we will get good utilisation—8 or 9hr a day.

The expense comes when you *guarantee* a passenger a seat. That's where the standby equipment comes in, and that's where utilisation drops very sharply. The aircraft required to operate the second section would get less utilisation, the third section would get still less, and the aircraft providing the fourth or fifth section would average less than an hour a day. The fleet *average*, then, is about four hours—though the jet aircraft assigned to the first section does a good day's work.

So you will not offer a guaranteed jet seat?

No—just a guaranteed seat. We don't anticipate putting the pure jet on the second section. They will be Electras permanently. Otherwise the economics would fall apart on you, because your depreciation charges with very low utilization would accelerate so rapidly.

So the economics of the jet shuttle are based on prime use of jets and back-up by depreciated Electras?

Yes.

And this is how it will stay?

Yes.

Do you ever foresee the day when it will be all jets?

Well, not in the reasonable future. The cost, when you get only an hour or two daily utilisation on an aircraft that costs $4 million, goes right through the roof. The Electras will run out of depreciation in two or three years from now. So what we are doing is to offer a jet service for most of our people, and then a turbine service for the remainder.

Is the shuttle making a profit?

Yes.

Can you give a measure to it?

It's not great. It is a modest profit.

You are also talking about lower fares. I always thought that the new Eastern management's discovery was that the public will actually pay a premium for this kind of convenient service. Now you're lowering fares, aren't you?

We are lowering them in the off-peak hour. We are charging the higher fare for the peak where back-up is required to such an extent. If by offering a lower fare in the off peak we can pull the demand curve down slightly, it will justify the lower cost. We thought it better to do it this way than to make a very modest rate reduction that would apply generally, including in the peak period.

What is the competition like on these routes, New York/Washington and New York/Boston?

On New York/Boston competition is hourly service by Northeast Airlines, with DC–6 equipment. New York-Washington is fairly frequent, but not hourly, scheduled service on American Airlines, principally with Electras.

There are more air carriers than that on the route, aren't there?

You have other carriers in those markets with restricted operating rights—by that I mean a flight that can operate between New York and Washington but it must go on to another point.

Why hasn't the competition emulated the Air Shuttle?

Because until we made our rate adjustments there's just no question that we lost

---

[1] First section is the first aircraft that operates each hourly service. The back-up aircraft needed to provide the guaranteed seat is the second section or third section, etc.

money on the show. That's number one. Number two, we have now reached the point, with our present volume of business, where we are making a modest profit. I don't think the market will stand competitively two full-blown shuttles without the load factor deteriorating to such an extent that neither carrier would make money. I don't really know what goes on in the minds of our competitors, but these are the things I'd be looking at if I were sitting on the other side evaluating what to do.

One of the excuses given for not having shuttles in Europe is that the cost of stand-by pilots is so high. Would you like to say something about this?

The shuttle is an expensive operation. It is an expensive operation if you honestly take care of the people when they want to fly. It is a much more expensive operation than just a high-frequency service. Standby pilots, standby flight-crews, standby stewardesses—all the standby facilities you have to have to handle a tremendous quantity of people early in the morning and nobody really at noon—are very expensive.

What are the break-even and actual load factors on the shuttle, very roughly, today?

Break-even is a little less than 50 per cent, actual is about 56–57 per cent.

We talk in Europe about the need to avoid wasteful duplication. Some of our big airlines feel that competition, especially on the scale they see it in America, is wasteful. What do you say about that?

Well it's like strychnine, I guess. A little of it is very helpful to you, and too much can be rather debilitating. Without it at all there is no stimulus, you might say. So that you go from a condition where lethargy can basically affect an industry in the way it thinks about many, many problems to a point where you get more competition than you need, and the cost of it rises faster than the benefits that come from it. The extent of the competition you can have will vary with the size of the market and the profitability of the market. A short-haul, high-density market can stand competition better than a short-haul, low-density market. But it can't stand as much competition as a long-haul high-density market. The greater profitability of the longer-haul market will help to sustain more competition.

The benefit of competition is that it makes you work harder to keep your costs under control. It makes you work harder in the interests of the passenger, so that what you do is for his benefit more than it is for your own. It makes it important for you to look to new technological developments and embrace them rapidly rather than reject them. It causes you to strive to develop traffic. Our sales efforts here in New York, and American's sales efforts in New York, and United's sales efforts, and Delta's and National's all continue to get more people to fly by air than would fly if we were not fighting for the total development of business. Our sales efforts generate totally more air transportation.

Now all this—up to a point—will give you a stronger industry, and a more virile industry and one with lower costs, and one that will meet more public needs, and will move along faster. But you can get so much competition that you begin to destroy the economics of the industry. The pendulum can go too far, and paralysis can set in, and you won't have the economic strength to buy the equipment you need, or your operating costs will be higher than they really should be and you discourage traffic, even though you are out selling it hard, because your rates are high.

Are you in any way near this in the USA, or in any part of the USA?

What you can absorb in the way of competition will vary at any given time, depending upon the volume of business. What we were able to absorb in 1959, 1960 and 1961 was less than we are able to absorb today. We still have some major markets in the country that are served by only one carrier. For example, Delta is the only carrier that operates between New Orleans and Chicago. It's the only carrier that operates between Atlanta and Dallas. We don't have many such routes as that, unfortunately! But there are three carriers between New York and New Orleans, five carriers between New York and Chicago, three carriers between New York and Atlanta, three carriers between New York and Miami, three carriers between New York and Puerto Rico, three carriers between New York and Mexico City. To put a fourth carrier between New York and Mexico City would probably do little to stimulate us to do more than we are now doing, but it would take away from our resources. I suspect, if you put a second carrier between New Orleans and Chicago, that Delta service would improve.

Do you suffer from surface competition?

Well, the only major competition today really is the private automobile, and we are growing faster in the inter-city business than the private automobile is growing. We are making some inroads in that total market. The railroads for any medium- to long-haul distance are gradually passing out of the picture. The bus lines in the United States today have an average haul of something like 35 miles. They are not medium- to long-haul carriers. I don't know what will ultimately develop on high-speed trains in the north-east corridor between Washington and Boston, but it will take a major, truly major technological development, and a major infusion of capital, to create the kind of services that will be significant in diverting business from the air back to the ground. Now, the private automobile on the other hand represents a major source of additional revenue potential for the airline industry, and I think that the tariffs that we are putting in now for the off-peak days of the week—the round-trip excursion fares—will do a lot to bite into that market. Of course, that market is so much bigger than we are that a very small bite is a pretty big increase for us. Automobile travel is something like 700 billion passenger-miles. Air travel is something like 50.

Do you find that the telephone today is a competitor, and is it going to be more of a competitor when families and businessmen can ring each other up on the TV telephone and look at each other?

Everything that you do to increase communications helps us today. Anything that you do to make it simpler to do business, in New York and Los Angeles, in New York and in Rome, causes people to fly between New York and Los Angeles and New York and Rome.

It is actually stimulating?

Oh, today it is stimulating. Anything you do to increase the art of communication at this point will cause people to travel more. When the industry is several times as big as it is, some decades away, you may then find that it levels out and these generative forces may become less generating and more competitive.

I lived in Hawaii for nine years. When I got out to Hawaii, during the piston-engine era, it was 20 hours from Hawaii to the east coast. Between 1955 and 1960 they put the cable in between Hawaii and the east coast instead of the radio telephone. Our telephone contacts in Hawaiian Airlines with the mainland jumped threefold. The fact that we could function with people effectively by telephone caused us to travel by air. So you can decentralise plants, you can enlarge your markets, you can go to universities farther from home—all because the total communication art, the total ability, means that—say—Lisbon is not so far away. Lisbon used to be very far away, but it is not far away now at all because people think about Lisbon. It took communications to cause them to think about it.

You see the point I make? You've got to visualise yourself going there. One of the most important things that has happened to us in the last 30 years has been the development of the national magazine—*Time, Life, Newsweek, Look.* If you look at the national magazines available in this country in 1925, as compared to today, it was just nothing. When you get that quantity of a flow of ideas or thoughts, they see New York, Paris, they see ads, and want to go places. Television is an extension of that.

In the business-travel market I am sure that as the "total communication" between here and Charlotte, for example, increases, *we* will increase. It will mean that more people will be doing more business between New York and Charlotte.

We're talking in Europe about a short-range airbus, a big aircraft of 200 or 250 seats for operation of sectors of up to about 500 miles. An aeroplane that's payload rather than fuel. Why hasn't the American airline market thrown up this requirement yet? I am wondering whether we are not chasing after the wrong conception in Europe, where frequencies are very much lower than they are here. It puzzles me that an airline like yours hasn't been talking about the need for an airbus and why Boeing and Douglas have not been trying to sell you the idea. Or perhaps they have?

We can have a 200-passenger aeroplane. This is the DC–8–61, which we have in about two markets—New York-Puerto Rico and New York-Miami. We're up to 20 flights a day in peak period to Miami. Frequency does have value. Take New York-Chicago. Frequency of service to the business traveller is a key element. The size of aircraft has gone up from DC–6s at 50 seats to 120-130 passengers today. The number of markets that you can get good utilisation out of an aeroplane that size is relatively small. You take a DC–8 today. It will go out in the morning to Miami, turn round and come back to New York, on to Houston, turn round and go back to Mexico City, turn round and go down to Atlanta then New Orleans, then Houston, then non-stop to Washington and back. As a result we get around ten hours a day. But if we had short-haul aeroplanes that could only operate in the peak because they were so big then your utilisation would be quite low and your costs would tend to go up.

Take the shuttle, which is the highest density market we have. If we had a 200-passenger aeroplane it would cost us more to operate that, net, than it would our present DC–9. Demand on Monday morning is for roughly four sections. At 9 o'clock it's roughly two, at 10 o'clock it's one. That means you're going from 400-seat demand to 200-seat demand to 100-seat demand. So if you had a 200-passenger aeroplane rotating all day long you would have very low costs for those passengers you carried at 8 o'clock but at 10, 11, 12 and 1 o'clock your cost per unit would be very high.

The airbus as it is visualised in Europe at the moment will be ready for service in about 1973, it will have big fan engines . . . Twin engines?

Yes. Will you need such an aircraft then, do you think?

By the mid-seventies we may be able to use a family of aircraft like the airbus. I didn't mean to imply that we would not. By that time we could well be doing so. The thing I have real hesitancy about is the 700-passenger aeroplane.

There are four things that promote traffic—communications, the price of the ticket, the frequency of the service, and the convenience of the service. Which one is the great traffic generator?

The basic forces that cause growth are speed, convenience and safety. The fact that you physically can get between New York and Miami in 2½ hours instead of 2½ days—that's number one. Fear as a deterrent, or lack of fear, or acceptance of fear, is probably a bigger factor in my mind than fare. Most people approach flying with a fairly high degree of tension and insecurity; if that feeling is too great they will simply find another way. They'll drive to the Cape instead of going to Miami; instead of taking two trips, they'll take one; instead of taking their family they'll go by themselves. These are the things that you do when you're afraid. If you're not afraid then you visualise a trip to Miami—but until that comes into your mind—well, you're not even going to be a customer. You've got to first visualise yourself in Miami. Once these two big factors are settled in the mind, then fare can be important, although I've never seen a study that shows that there is an elasticity in the demand for travel that would come anywhere near one. Which means you'll tend to lose revenue when you cut your fares. The biggest cost of a business trip is being away from your office. The biggest cost is not being at that desk, not the fare between here and Miami. So when businessmen travel they travel for reasons other than fare, and fare is a very small part of the reason for not travelling. Of course, the pleasure market, where people pay for their own ticket, it a little more responsive to fare changes. But, you know, if you did not have the basic relationship between Europe and the United States that you do today you wouldn't—regardless of the economy fares across the North Atlantic—you wouldn't have anything like the volume of business we have today. If you had these same fares in 1949 you wouldn't have anything like the volume of business you have got today.

You appear to have shown on the shuttle that frequency stimulates traffic more than price?

It's not frequency so much as it's simplicity. A fellow can decide momentarily to go to Washington and get right up from that desk and go in that elevator and go out and get on an aeroplane and he doesn't have to fuss about it. It's the simplicity of it.

AUTOMOTIVE SAFETY

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks the subject of automotive safety has received considerable attention from congressional committees and from the general public. At the request of one of my constituents, I would like to include in the Record a copy of the exchange of correspondence on this subject between Mr. Donald E. Janzen of Ann Arbor, Mich., and Mr. Roy Abernethy, the president of the American Motors Corp.

Donald E. Janzen,
2012 Manchester,
Ann Arbor, Mich., March 25, 1966.

President,
American Motors Corp.,
14250 Plymouth Rd.,
Detroit, Mich.

Dear Sir: Last month at this time there were five major U.S. automobile manufacturers: General Motors, Ford Motor Co., Chrysler Motor Co., American Motors, and Studebaker. Studebaker has since discontinued manufacturing automobiles. Who is on the bottom of the pile now? From my point of view it looks like American Motors. I am writing because I believe there exists one of the most profitable "dark horses" in automotive history waiting for some company to take a chance on.

I am enclosing an article that appeared in the Louisville Courier Journal, March 6, 1966. The review is by Dr. Wm. K. Keller, past President of the American Association of Automotive Medicine. The dark horse which can be capitalized on is Safety. You may ask who is interested in safety, but would you believe that the safety set is growing? There are even rumblings among the "younger generation" which indicate a growing concern for safer automobiles. Graduate students, like myself, who are traditionally thought of as being in the sports car class, are looking for safety features. Naturally there exists the fast back set whose only interest is horsepower and body design, but then how many of these normally turn to an American Motors car? I have seen very few. Let me list those groups which I believe would choose a safe auto to a swift one.

1. Senior Citizens
2. Families
3. Housewives transporting small children
4. Parents buying automobiles for their children
5. A growing number of individuals who do not want to end up a statistic

And just what kind of automobile is the "safe car" of which I speak Well, here's a starter. Standard equipment safety and harness belt, padded dash, built-in roll bar, proper glass, recessed knobs, collapsible steering wheel, effective brakes, outside rear view mirror, enlarged inside rear view mirror, adequate, safe tires,—sound, safe features—not gimmicks like a recording to tell you of a washed out bridge ahead. How many people are killed every year by going over a washed out bridge? But now you tell me that the cost of making such a car would be excessive and would not be competitive with other manufacturers. Well, how about leaving off chrome, or even more drastic, why not use the same body design for several years? This has certainly not been a drawback to Volkswagen. These safety features could be added to the Rambler American. Would it sell? Is it worth taking a chance? Well, the entire auto industry is built on the chance Henry Ford took, and look what happens to competition with the Big Three. Your advertising for such an automobile is ready made. Skip this line about "For those in the Know" and present your product in terms of the number of injuries caused by unsafe cars. Perhaps you could even convince insurance agencies that the Safe Rambler American should have lower rates. Think of the selling point there!

The American Motor Company makes a good automobile but what it needs is a gimmick. . .after all, look at Ford Mustang. . It's hard to find a more uncomfortable car. . . but then we are told that it's for "the smart set." I believe the "smart set" is more interested in safety than is realized and the first automobile manufacturer that starts pushing sensible, much needed safety features will move out in front. Certainly it's worth the gamble to make one model to see what happens.

How many people are employed by American Motors to sample public opinion? Well here is a public opinion. I will tell you what is wanted in an automobile. Someday American Motors is going to pay some expert to give you this information . . . make a safe car. My price is cheap. It's free. Like the diet soft drink, filter tip cigarettes, and stainless steel blades, safe automobiles will sell too. I bet you a thousand shares of stock it will.

Sincerely,

Donald E. Janzen.

American Motors Corporation,
Detroit, April 11, 1966.

Mr. Donald E. Janzen,
2012 Manchester,
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dear Mr. Janzen: I appreciate having your comments about the importance of automotive safety.

First of all, I assure you that all of us in the management of American Motors share your interest and concern in developing safer vehicles.

We do not believe, however, that safety should be a competitive matter. With the cross-licensing agreements that have been in effect in the auto industry for many years, and other steps that can be taken, we think safety features and devices that are demonstrated to save human lives should be made available to all manufacturers. This does not mean, of course, that we will not continue to call public attention to safety developments that we have pioneered.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Roy Abernethy.

"THE HILL COUNTRY: LYNDON JOHNSON'S TEXAS"

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record the review by the Louisville Times critic, Mr. Dudley Saunders, on the recent television special "The Hill Country: Lyndon Johnson's Texas," which appeared in the Louisville, Ky., Times on May 10, 1966.

Shows His Ancestral Roots—TV Special Gives the Nation a Better Understanding of L.B.J.

(By Dudley Saunders)

It is quite possible that the American public had a better chance last night to understand the basic nature of its President than ever before.

On its surface, "The Hill Country: Lyndon Johnson's Texas" was not a spectacular special (except in its casting). It was neither original nor particularly incisive.

The Johnson special followed the pattern of Sophia Loren's TV tour of Rome, Elizabeth Taylor in London, or Princess Grace in that gambling joint.

Basically, the subject was giving us a guided tour of the place where he or she was born and reared or lived. But there the similarity ends.

Whether Johnson knew it or not he was revealing the whys and wherefores of his nature as he showed us the rolling Texas country that helped make him what he is today.

We also saw a different Johnson last night—not the politician or the homespun persuader we've gotten used to in recent years. The man we saw was relaxed and reflective, the tall Westerner at home with the land he loves.

"I am home here. It gives me serenity. I grew up on its (Pedernales River) banks and I am comfortable here."

Johnson talked quietly about the land, its people and his childhood memories as the TV cameras lovingly photographed goats munching on low branches, deer jumping fences, sheep and whitefaced cattle grazing in the big, open country.

The rugged and beautiful country—barren here and drenched in flowers there—seemed a million miles removed from the sculptured New England coves of John Kennedy. For the thousandth time we marveled at the enormity and difference of our land.

Johnson showed us the little stone stockade his grandfather built against Indians. He showed us the house where he was born and reared and the river his mother always feared would claim him.

Here, too, was his childhood memory of his mother crying late at night at the outdoor water pump; of dawn-to-dark days as a road laborer; of flood and drought and too little and too much.

The more he talked the more obvious it became that Johnson really was at peace in his hill country. This was where his ancestors planted their roots a century ago and passed on their family folklore to him and where he began creating his own lore.

A MAN WITH ANCESTRAL ROOTS

Johnson walked in the shaded family burial ground, identified the graves of his relatives, and then pointed out the place where he would be buried.

Johnson belongs to that rapidly vanishing generation which had ancestral roots, but sired today's increasingly mobile, rootless and restless society.

Johnson, unlike most of his citizens, seemed to know where home is. He knows where he came from and where he is going. He is not afraid to say this is home; this is where I stay.

This special reminds us that we have come a long way from our agrarian days and yet perhaps not so far. Our roots are in the soil and in both a biological and psychic sense, yet we have rebelled and demanded freedom from restraint.

EXCELLENT FILMS, BEAUTIFULLY EDITED

Is it any wonder that we envied a man last night who had clung to his home and found serenity there?

The special may have been about Johnson, but its fringe effect was to make us question our own destination.

The photography was excellent and beautifully edited. Ray Scherer's handling of questions and narration was good. Glenn Paxon's pastoral score was occasionally schmaltzy, but effective and Western.

Even if it didn't provoke you to muse upon the changing state of our land and life—as it did me—it was still a very pleasant and human hour.

PROTESTING NEW DRAFT CRITERIA

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, with the completion of the first rounds of the Selective Service qualification test, the new criteria to determine draft deferment are receiving increased attention. The criteria I speak of are class rank and test scores, which have been established by the Selective Service System as guidelines for local draft boards to use when it becomes necessary to lift the deferment status of a certain number of college students in order to replenish our national supply of men eligible for the draft.

After careful study, it has been determined that the 1.8 million men who are presently classified as II-S and are therefore draft deferred, constitute a valuable source of additional draftees which can be tapped when necessary. But since all the students are not needed, the Selective Service has devised the class-rank and test-score criteria as guidelines for a fair means of selecting the necessary men.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this country never has to utilize these standards. They are not only basically inadequate as a just means of selection, but their use is serving, I believe, to create a very unfavorable image of the U.S. Armed Forces.

There is enough serious doubt within the academic world as to the virtue of measuring intelligence and potential by such mechanical means as to make the efficacy of these criteria dubious, at the very least. A recent study by the American college testing program has found that virtually no correlation exists between the marks made by a student in college and his later success. Albert Einstein, for example, was considered dull in school and had a terrible time passing his examinations.

Certainly, the validity of the class-rank criterion is highly tenuous, if only on the basis of the nature of higher education. The academic standards at some universities and colleges are simply lower than at others. Even within a single institution, one course of study may be far less demanding than another. No simple, standardized examination has yet been designed which is truly adequate to measure accurately these delicate distinctions. And I cannot believe that a computerized rank in class based upon the numerical scores given to a student's work at any given university could possibly be more effective.

In addition, the Selective Service college qualification test is admittedly predisposed toward mathematics and thus is initially weighted against the large number of students studying the liberal arts.

Finally, these criteria shift the responsibility for deciding which students shall continue to be deferred in part from the Selective Service System to the campus faculties. A group of 142 Chicago professors has summed up the displeasure of the academic community at this shifting of responsibility.

> When deferment is tied to performance in class, an atmosphere is generated which seriously interferes with the educational process.

The new system for selection is most unsatisfactory, however, in its injustice to those who must already bear the brunt of the draft: the low-income groups who rarely have the opportunity to pursue a higher education on a full-time basis and at a fully accredited university. There is no provision at present to test the potential of an individual outside the academic world, and certainly the measure of the contributions an individual can make to this society should not be dependent solely, or even in large part, upon his educational background.

Under the new system for selection, however, any man who has not had the opportunity to go on to college is automatically deemed to be of less concern to his country than his more fortunate friend who can financially manage a college degree. What little college he might be able to afford on a part-time basis is denied him, because under the new system, he is expendable and so is plucked out of school and tossed into khaki, while his full-time college classmate is not.

The new selection system gives the strong impression that there is a presumption against equal concern for those who do not go to college, or for those whose work is quite satisfactory, although not superior in college. It further raises a presumption that the men left with the heavy burden of defending our country are not the most desirable. This would be a cruel injustice to all the brave and able men who now form the mightiest fighting force in the world. Never before have our armed services demanded the high degree of intelligence, dedication, and ability that our modern Defense Establishment now requires.

The U.S. Armed Forces have always proved to be a valuable training ground for large numbers of young men who, while giving a few years of their life to the service of their country, receive training in new skills which are beneficial to them in their civilian life.

The new system for selection, however, threatens to distort this image of the Armed Forces into a picture of some sort of melting pot for the ignorant, the unskilled, the uneducated, and the financially unendowed.

The new system appears to cast discredit upon the outstanding records of the many thousands of fine young men who have in the past and are today, in the present, dedicating part, if not all, of their lives to the defense of their country. Wearing the U.S. uniform should not be considered a modern-day dunce cap, or the badge of the poor or educationally underprivileged, of the dropout or the misfit. I strongly believe that the men who serve our Nation today deserve the same high measure of respect and honor which Americans have always shown their servicemen in the past. It is to them and to their predecessors that our country owes its freedom.

Class rank and examination scores not only fail to provide for a just means of selection; they represent a serious threat to the prestige of the U.S. Armed Forces as well. The proposed system is discriminatory to the student, it imposes an unfair and unwanted burden on the college authorities, and it tends to downgrade service in our Armed Forces. For these and many other reasons, it is my hope that the Selective Service System will reappraise and reevaluate the new criteria for draft deferment.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year Rumanian patriots meet on the 10th of May to celebrate the anniversary of Rumanian independence. They meet privately, in small groups, for today Rumania is no longer independent, and its Communist masters have outlawed the celebration of patriotic holidays. Laws, however, cannot control the spirit of a nation. Although a national celebration has been outlawed, millions of Rumanians will be quietly raising their glasses to toast their independent heritage on May 10 this year, as they have every year since 1877.

As so many of the small nations of Eastern Europe, Rumania has suffered from a long history of foreign domination that belies the distinct cultural and linguistic heritage that identifies its nationhood. For two centuries prior to the proclamation of independence in 1877, Rumania was under the political and military domination of the Ottoman Empire. But, the Turks, unfortunately, have not been the only foreign power that has coveted Rumania's territory.

As the power of the Ottoman Empire began to decline during the 19th century, imperial Russia began to make inroads in the outlying areas of the Empire, including Rumania. Nevertheless, Russian domination of Rumania was successfully thwarted in the 1850's by the intervention of England and France in the Crimean War. After the defeat of Russia in the Crimean War, the Rumanian people were granted their first real degree of autonomy. The Rumanians seized the opportunity to pass a number of liberal reforms. Serfdom was abolished; the peasants were granted the ownership of much of the land; compulsory education was introduced, and voting rights were extended to a far greater percentage of the population. A new liberal constitution was promulgated in 1866.

When the Russians and the Turks were once again at logger-heads in 1877 the Rumanians rallied to the side of the Russians, this time to finally expel the last vestiges of Ottoman rule from Rumania. The war was successful and on May 10, 1877, Rumania declared herself totally independent from Turkish rule.

After 1877, and during the First World War, Rumania closely alined herself with the West to avoid Russian encroachment.

Today Rumania is a vassal state of the Soviet Empire which expanded in Eastern Europe on the ashes of the Second World War. Nevertheless, the restless spirit of the Rumanian people continues to be a reflection of their distinctly national culture. If the Rumanians have accepted the influences of any foreign culture since the Second World War, they have come from Western Europe rather than their Soviet masters. In fact, today even the Communist functionaries who rule Rumania have been forced to recognize the inevitable rebirth of Rumanian nationalism as well as the desire of the Rumanian people for closer contacts with the West.

As Rumanians celebrate the 89th anniversary of their independence from Ottoman rule this year, the nation is in a state of change. It is clear that the Rumanian people have unequivocally refused to accept the Communist dogma of their Soviet masters. More and more the people are reasserting their national spirit and their desires for a renewal of their traditional friendship with the Western World. Whether their Communist masters will be capable of fully recognizing the depth of these feelings remains to be seen.

In the meantime, thousands of quiet celebrations will take place throughout Rumania on May 10th as Rumanian patriots gather to commemorate their independence from Turkey and renew their quest for a future free from the colonial rule of the Soviet Union.

It is a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to congratulate the Rumanian people on the anniversary of their independence day and renew my wishes for an independent Rumania of the future.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the most uninformed, shameful, and unfortunate remark made by a prominent American in recent months was to the effect that our people's concern for traffic safety is a fad and that like the hula hoop craze it will vanish in 6 months.

How anyone of any consequence could make such an utterance in the face of the fact that nearly one thousand men, women, and children suffer violent deaths each week in traffic accidents is hard to comprehend.

The remark misjudges the compassion and the intelligence of the Members of this Congress and the people we represent.

Unthinking individuals have said that our concern is emotional. The record belies this charge because the committees of Congress have heard convincing testimony from detached scientists that much could be done to reduce our losses, the human suffering of the victims and the unspeakable sorrow of the survivors.

I can only hope that the man who made the "hula hoop" remark will live long enough to see us apply the kind of intelligence reflected in the testimony of Dr. James D. Gatts who appeared before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recently.

I commend this testimony to those who share our concern and who wish to see a national attack launched to curb losses from traffic accidents.

May 1966.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am honored to have the opportunity of appearing before you today to testify in favor of the establishment of federal motor vehicle safety standards. My name is James D. Gatts. I am a doctor of medicine and a former Air Force jet pilot. At the Republic Aviation Division of Fairchild Hiller, I am Manager of the Life Sciences and Space Environment Department and, as such, direct medical and human factors aspects of a variety of terrestrial and space programs including the New York State safety car program.

While I am highly in favor of the safety car program as a reasonable approach to the objective establishment of safety standards based on functional hardware, I would rather confine my thoughts to those of a physician and an aerospace medical technologist who is deeply concerned with an enormous medical problem.

I shall not waste your time quoting statistics. The problem at this point is not to establish the fact that there is a problem, but rather what, when, and how we should direct our efforts to cope with it. I have heard considerable doubt expressed as to the method of concentrating on the automobile to save lives. I do not believe that anyone would deny that the problem really involves each element in the man-machine complex which includes the car, the driver, and the environment in which and over which it operates. The problem of assessing the causation of the tragedies associated with failure of the car-driver-road system can be argued from now until doomsday. Frequently, a cause can be found in all three parts of the system. Certainly, all elements and systems need to be optimized and it appears that a great deal can be done in each area. But, on the other hand, as a member of the medical community I feel that there is an expediency here. Each year, each month, or even each hour that we wait produces an ever accelerating toll in death and injury and there are good and proper reasons for concentrating on the car as the quickest and most effective approach to attacking the medical-sociological problem of highway death and injury. Some of these reasons include the following:

1. The vehicle is the most feasible from the standpoint of time to change in that one-half of our nation's automobiles are replaced every six years, while an equivalent highway change may require thirty years, and human limitations will probably never significantly change.

2. The vehicle is the most flexible in that essentially all of its features are alterable.

whereas variables such as weather conditions on our highways or the effects of aging and driver reaction are controllable only in limited respects.

3. The vehicle is more readily studied, modified, and tested in an experimental laboratory procedure as it is small when compared to the size of a highway system, and simple when compared to the complexities of the human sensory motor system.

4. The cost to the government of achieving vehicle modifications through scientific action are relatively small. A few million dollars for experimentation with safety cars may eventually produce safety design in cars whose value is tens of billions of dollars. This same expenditure can act as a lever in reducing injuries and property damage that now costs over eight billion dollars a year.

For these reasons and many others, I believe that the most feasible and expedient approach to the traffic problem in the United States is to concentrate initially on changing the vehicle. First of all, the vehicle can be modified in such a way as to reduce to some unknown degree its involvement or incidence in accident situations. This should be done just as quickly as possible. Certainly there are problems involved, and nobody knows exactly how much the incidence of accident situations can be reduced by changing the vehicle, but I don't think anybody would deny that some reduction of accidents will occur by incorporating better human factors design in the operating systems, braking systems, suspension systems, etc. in an automobile. Secondly, and perhaps even more important because it is more highly definable, is the possibility of greatly reducing injury or death resulting from a collision by making the car crash injury resistant. It is not necessary to debate whether it is the highway, the car, or the operator who actually causes most of the accidents. While many people would argue these points, I don't think anybody can logically argue with the fact that it is the automobile that causes the injury. Nor do I think that anybody can logically argue that simple, straightforward state-of-the-art improvement in the interior design of the automobile would not significantly and immediately reduce the incidence of injuries as a result of collision.

It is most important to understand that collisions are not synonymous with injury and death. That injury and death is, to a large extent, a result of ill-considered and hazardous interior design in automobiles. Changing this design is not particularly difficult, is not particularly complicated, nor is it particularly expensive.

In the aerospace industry, safety and performance are our business. Certainly mistakes are made, but when repeated accidents happen in the aerospace industry, groups of airplanes are immediately grounded with specific orders. Production line units are modified and modifications are made immediately on field units before the planes are reflown. We, like most Americans, think airplanes can be dangerous. My associates in the aerospace industry and my colleagues in the medical profession, and a growing body of Americans also think that automobiles can be dangerous.

People have said that changes in automobile design for safety's sake should be evolutionary and done with careful testing. I won't insult anybody by refuting this argument. Perhaps it is analogous to saying that a faulty aircraft or commercial transport should be transitioned out of service slowly. What we know about physical trauma reduction is so far ahead of the practice that revolutionary change is a necessity.

As to the question of whether safety design will hurt our transport economy, this is a supposition that is not at all based on facts that I can see. First of all, government control and standards in federal aviation and commercial aviation have multiplied many times the commercial return and the progress of the industry. There is no reason to suspect that the same thing would not be true in the automotive field. Secondly, at the present rate each year there are many, many thousands of potential automobile buyers that can't buy because they are under ground. Third, certainly a significant portion of the 8 billion dollars spent to bury and patch-up people might well be used to purchase new automobiles. Fourth, there is no reason to believe that design and construction of a safe automobile would necessarily increase the price at all. It is a fact that many of the safety suggestions offered by various members of the medical profession and engineers would actually reduce the price of an automobile.

Certainly, the appearance of a motor vehicle is an important consideration; especially so to the style-conscious American public. I am amused, but also provoked, with a recent article appearing in a widely circulated American news magazine. The writer is attempting to mislead when he states that a safety car might look like a tank, have a top speed of 40 or 50 miles an hour, and weigh so much that it would be extremely costly to operate. The writers know that millions of Americans will read and believe the message in that it is carefully worded to get the point across. I would welcome a comparison of the classical, functional beauty of any high-performance American aircraft with the styling approaches displayed in the automotive industry. I venture to say that functional design is a greater source of true or classic beauty than any transient stylishness whether we are talking about silverware, F–105's, houses, automobiles, or what have you. It is not unusual for automobile styles to ape functional design of aircraft. Safety design in automobiles does not inherently limit the acceleration or highway speed. In the aerospace industry we are not consciously stylish, but how many of you have recently seen an ugly aircraft?

The systems approach to design and analyses of safety car systems is just as feasible for safety car design as it is for space station and high-performance aircraft design. Its advantages are primarily involved in ensuring comprehensive analysis of automotive safety requirements by allowing design according to needed function rather than a series of small changes to a traditional product. This approach almost automatically points out the required performance definition. The method is distinguished by the fact that formal analysis and exact definition of the functions to be performed precede final design of the equipment. From the chosen functions, mechanical systems which perform the functions are defined in terms of numbers. In this way, the effectiveness of the mechanisms can be measured and logically fitted to the other systems in overall design. A procedure of "set a goal and work to it for design" is formally set up. For example, a systematic approach to the passenger compartment structural system of the safety car might include: (1) passenger compartment integrity, (2) passenger compartment deceleration and deflection systems, (3) interior contact injury prevention systems, (4) occupant or occupant-injury prevention systems, and (5) passenger restraint systems. If the goals are sufficiently comprehensive, the systems approach ensures similar comprehensiveness in analyzing the problem as a whole.

This approach can examine the entire spectrum of automobile usage by all kinds of people on all existing types of streets, highways, and turnpikes to meet those uses as safely as is possible.

Aeropace safety by design would imply the deliberate incorporation of injury preventing or reducing features into the initial structure of the automobile as a design goal in opposition to adding safety devices or modifying conventional components. Safety by design would also incorporate many human factors (accident prevention) considerations.

The most effective approach to crash injury protection necessitates the assumption that all types of accident situations will continue to occur, and that design safety should attempt to protect a wide range of coverage with particular emphasis or weighing of high injury incidence areas in the auto interior. I feel that reasonable design goals would include a forward crash impact injury protection at speeds up to 50 miles an hour, a rear crash impact injury protection at speeds up to 50 miles an hour, a lateral crash impact injury protection up to 40 miles an hour, and an uncomplicated rollover injury protection up to 70 miles an hour. With these design conditions, it is possible to reduce the total number of occupant injuries by more than one-half, as compared to automobiles now on the road, by employing practical crash injury reduction or protection methods. These design impact speeds encompass between 70 and 80 per cent of all injury producing accidents, including both urban and rural environment. Our safety car program is the first attempt to design a car to a crash speed rating with predicted results that I know of.

The following are typical preliminary design goals which have been developed to establish the guidelines for the safety car design:

1. The passenger compartment will be designed to be inviolate up to and including all design goals. This means that intrusion of parts such as engines or wheels forward or aft of the passenger compartment will not occur up to any of the design goals. It would also exclude invasion of the passenger area by most blunt objects from outside the car.

2. No crash will cause the steering column to be pushed into the passenger compartment. The geometry and action of the steering column and wheel will not be effected by crushing of the front end throughout design goals.

3. The steering wheel column will be designed to deflect and absorb energy and will provide adequate impact surface area to resist the motion of the driver's body without serious injury to the chest at the accelerations and force encountered under design goals.

4. Ejection of occupants will not occur in any crash up to the design goals. The doors will remain closed and windshields will not break through.

5. All occupants will be provided with suitable restraint means. Infant and child restraint devices will be available in both front and rear seating areas. The psychological acceptance of the restraint system will be maximized by deliberate design considerations.

6. Occupants not using restraint will be significantly safer than in cars of conventional construction under the same conditions.

7. Impact injury producing structures will be removed from the sphere of contact with head, shoulders, and chest of the restraint occupant wherever possible. Where this cannot be accomplished, the design will be such as will minimize the injury potential of the mechanism by limiting its strength to avoid excessive unit area pressures on the body.

8. Glass panels will be chosen to provide maximum deflection to alleviate head injuries. In accomplishing this, the size of glass fragments produced and other potential danger will be considered.

9. Gas tanks will not tear loose or rupture from internal pressure under any design goals. The structure adjacent to the gas tanks will be such as to minimize the possibility of the tank being pierced by collapsing structure.

10. Injury producing mechanisms will be constructed in such a fashion as to: increase deflection rapidly under load, absorb energy, and, increase contact area with the body as the deflection increases.

The aerospace approach to crash injury prevention is to establish an optimum design point that allows a maximum incorporation of psychologically acceptable crash injury protection features within a reasonable cost range. The problem is considerably simplified when safety design is a primary goal and not confined to adding gadgets to the passenger compartment.

We have, for the last 25 years, seen many excellent groups such as the Stapp Conference, the ACIR, the Federal Aviation Agency, and many other civilian and government research groups turn out reams of excellent studies. We could continue this for another 25 years with more equally good intentions and no results—this approach becomes little more than a pseudoscience. With this same approach we could still be experimenting with and analyzing how to improve the Wright Brothers' airplane flown in 1903, but people developed new concepts and had the courage to build and test them. The point I want to make is that we know at present more than enough to make many progressive steps in the design of an automobile. How many times do we have to pick pieces of glass, instruments, tin, radio knobs, rearview mirrors, etc. out of people's faces (or vice versa) to realize that placing them in an impact position isn't good safety design? We're not geniuses in the aerospace industry, but we do know enough to close the windows when it rains. We've been in the safety business for many years. Republic Aviation has a record of successful aircraft ejection in 92.6 percent of the attempts. We are used to the responsibility of building aircraft to military and government standards.

It is interesting to ponder what the savings in human life, crippling, and maiming injuries might be if the entire billion dollars for retooling at the end of this year were spent in retooling specifically for safety. The fact that we are 25 or 30 or more years late in establishing mandatory safety standards, or that we may not initially write perfect safety standards, or that we might offend somebody, or that we have a natural resistance to change does not negate the responsibility to protect American people from continued physical trauma as a result of automobiles which are hazardously designed or produced.

THE FOREFRONT OF TOMORROW'S KNOWLEDGE: AN ADDRESS BY THE REVEREND THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C., PRESIDENT OF UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, AT THE 16TH ANNUAL "UNIVERSITY FOR PRESIDENTS" OF THE YOUNG PRESIDENTS' ORGANIZATION, PHOENIX, ARIZ., APRIL 25, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and provocative addresses I have seen in some time was delivered recently by one of the most distinguished citizens of my congressional district, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame.

Father Hesburgh's address was delivered at the 16th annual "University for President's" meeting of the Young Presidents' Organization at Phoenix, Ariz., on April 25, 1966. The text of the address follows:

THE FOREFRONT OF TOMORROW'S KNOWLEDGE

(An address by the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame, at the 16th annual "University for Presidents" of the Young Presidents' Organization, Phoenix, Ariz., Apr. 25, 1966)

I come to you today as one having great longevity in your society of the young. The date of my presidential rank was 1952—the age was 35, and it takes no mathematical genius to calculate that I must leave your ranks next month after attaining the horrendous age of 49. So you will excuse me I trust, if my remarks today have some of the serious and sober lineaments of a last will and testament. Once before many years ago, I spoke at the YPO at our annual meeting here in Phoenix. That talk was a clarion cry of young hope. This is a swan song—more critical, more mature, more soul-searching perhaps, but still hopeful. One cannot shed the scars of the passing years, but one can at least learn from them. If I pass judgment on our YPO history as a whole, not this or that officer or staff member past or present, then I am a part of that history too, and, I must add, not a very constructive part. Some things are difficult to say until you can open the back door and run for the hills.

In the early days of YPO, a number of us were possessed by the great hope of a possible new accomplishment on the part of this organization. YPO seemed to have everything that all other older business organizations lacked. Its members had the freshness and imagination of youth, generosity of spirit, openness of mind, vigor of inquiry, and spontaneity of judgment. There was a liveliness and lilt to the conversations, whether they took place around the swimming pool on sunlit days or in a hotel room jam-packed with eager discussants during the wee hours of the morning. Here was a group already successful and, therefore, reasonably fearless and secure. The world was their oyster and they were eager to get at it. They were ready to go. What a pity that our early discussions did not begin by asking where.

Optimism, energy, intelligence—these are great qualities if they are directed to a great goal, to reach out to a distant shore, to sail an uncharted sea or sky, to experience the great thrill of accomplishing what has as yet not been done.

There was some of this sense of anticipation in the early days: hope ran deeply, the light shone brightly, horizons were unlimited. YPO was something really new, truly great, and there was a real anticipation of YPO doing great things. So a number of us believed; not all, for YPO had not been founded with any missionary zeal.

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE YOUNG PRESIDENTS' ORGANIZATION

Has YPO indeed accomplished those early dreams of some of us? I think not. Maybe the arrow was aimed too low. Anyway, the trajectory was too flat. Instead of the members using what they uniquely had to do something they could uniquely do, YPO'ers gave most of their energy, intelligence, and competence to the perfecting, rather than the using in a broader context, of what they had to offer.

I grant that there is nothing wrong in learning how to be ever more successful in business, especially when this is done in a very energetic, sophisticated, and self-conscious way. A "University for Presidents" is a very useful exercise—enjoyable too if it happens at a delightful spot in the company of so many personable, talented, and already successful people. It's great to be a member of an ever more successful club. But there is a difference between polishing a new car and using it to drive somewhere really worthwhile.

Excuse me if I liken our organization to an engine of accomplishment in realms perhaps only peripherally related to business. YPO can justify its existence by what it started out to be and what it is. I am speaking of what YPO might have been and what YPO might yet become. You may still say, as many of you have, as in the recent survey, that you are perfectly satisfied with YPO as it is. If so, then the thrust of my remarks is to challenge this satisfaction, and to question whether YPO can stand up to the stark reality of today's world and honestly be satisfied with what it is and nothing more.

The old adage, business is business, certainly has applied traditionally to business organizations. Perhaps what I am saying somewhat sadly is that one might have expected something more of the YPO than this self-conscious turning in upon its members' main concern, namely business, because it is precisely this self-centeredness that has dogged the business fraternity since the first moment of its organized existence. It takes strong medicine to exorcise the historic image of the Robber Barons, the stuffiness of the NAM, the drabness of the Department of Commerce, the self-serving rhetoric of many Chambers of Commerce. These others may be excused in some instances because their leadership has often been monopolized by senior citizens who carved out their business careers in a different social context than that of today. But the YPO'ers were the generation of World War II, of the age of a new frontier, of scientific revolution and technological innovation. You arrived with the computers, the social revolution of Civil Rights and human development, the new world of exploding knowledge and extraordinary new power.

That you should have voiced some of the same old, tattered, and faded business slogans, should have slicked up, rather than cast out the old image of business, is, for me at least, a worrisome thought.

What was and what is needed today is a new world for business, a new concept of the total business career, a bright image of what the young business man can be in the total world in which he lives. What we have instead, I fear, is a tidied-up, more efficient, computerized, chrome-plated version of the same old weary world of the business man. Business is still business, and nothing more.

Perhaps what I am saying will come through more clearly if I project it in the most far-out perspective possible. To this end, I would like to quote to you the words of a Hindu mystic-poet, Rabindranath Tagore, addressed to Chinese university students, on the shore of the Yangtze River, back in the middle twenties: (How far out can one get?)

"We should know that truth, any truth man acquires, is for everyone. Money and property belong to individuals, to each of you, but you must never exploit truth for your personal aggrandizement; that would be selling God's blessing for a profit. However, science is also a truth; it has its place in the healing of the sick, and in giving more food and leisure for life. When it helps the strong crush the weak, and rob those who are asleep, it is using truth for impious ends. Those who are thus sacrilegious will suffer and be punished, for their own weapons will be turned against them.

Know that no organization, however large, can help you, no league of prudence or of power, but only individual faith in the infinite, the invisible, the incorruptible, the fearless.

The great human societies are the creation not of profiteers, but of dreamers. The millionaires who produce bales of merchandise in enormous quantities have never yet built a great civilization; it is they who are about to destroy what others have built. Come to the rescue and free the human soul from the dungeon of the machine. Proclaim the spirit of man, and prove that it lies not in machine guns and cleverness, but in a simple faith." ("A Tagore Reader," p. 209, Macmilian, 1961)

I grant you that these are both mystical and poetic words—but there is a basic truth lying beneath them, if you care to dig. I could quote you more modern words of a young Latin American student who bitterly lists the results of an unbridled free enterprise in his country: "The concentration of land, and wealth, and power in the hands of the few to the many-faceted degradation of the many." He is anything but mystical and poetic. His are burning words with the quality of acid and hatred. But this is his image of the contribution of American business and free enterprise. Rightly or wrongly, this is what he and many of his fellow Latin American students think of us today.

Where does all of this leave us? Rather far from our title and the subject of this year's "University for Presidents" you may think. You may also remember at this point the story of the Texan who pulled out two guns in the middle of an unpopular speech. "Don't shoot me", cried the speaker. "Don't worry", said the gunman, "I'm just going to shoot the bum who invited you here."

While Bob Galvin takes cover, I shall look at our precise subject against the background of what has been said thus far.

What is the forefront of tomorrow's knowledge? You all know that knowledge which has taken centuries to accumulate in man's long history is now doubling in less than every twenty years. No one can conceivably keep up with the knowledge explosion, today's much less tomorrow's. But we might live with it more productively if we could see this expanding knowledge under a different aspect, namely, power. Knowledge is power, power to do many things hitherto impossible to man. If I were in a different business than the knowledge business, I might tell you that knowledge tomorrow will bring you the power to operate your businesses better, to produce better, to market better, and, of course, to make more money, thus to acquire even more power. But instead I ask you: knowledge for what, money for what, power for what? These questions are not unlike the thrust of my earlier question: YPO for what?

These are uneasy questions. The real test of any responsible American today is how he answers them. The American business man, young or old, must answer them with special care, for the assumption all over the world is, in large measure, that he really does not care, that he is mainly interested in himself, his affluent society, his success, his fun and games, his prosperity, even while 80 percent of the world's population earns less than $500.00 a year, and 50 percent of mankind earns less than $100.00 a year; even while a third of the human beings on earth are completely cut off from the knowledge explosion because they are unable to read or write; even while hundreds of millions of men and women today face a hard, cruel, and inhuman life and the prospect of an early death without hope.

And what really agonizes this wretched, faceless mass of humanity is that whatever wonderful new knowledge and power are beyond the horizon tomorrow, their hopelessness will equally afflict their children and probably their children's children—unless the few knowledgeable, the few powerful, and the few affluent of this world rejoin the majority of the human race today and begin to care about what happens to this vast majority tomorrow.

In my business, the knowledge business, we have begun to take stock of ourselves. The International Association of Universities met in Tokyo last September where we agreed that beyond the classical role of our universities to push forward the boundaries of knowledge and to transmit to each new generation of students all knowledge, new and old, we have a new and unprecedented role to play in the modern world: to become involved in service to mankind, to collaborate in the development of a better day for human beings who are, in the numbers of hundreds of millions, ignorant, poor, ill, homeless, and hopeless—here and all over the world.

Take the Poverty Program, for example. Most business men with whom I've discussed this program label it as wasteful, a political hand-out, a badly administered mess, a generally stupid enterprise, badly conceived and about to accomplish next to nothing, despite its extravagant cost. Let's assume all this to be true (which I don't), might there be something more positive to be done about it besides the voicing of empty criticism? Is there really a problem here for all Americans?

Our University took a look at it more closely and we found that poverty in America has many faces, but three that are most easily discerned. There are the poor who will be always with us: the widows, the orphans, the mentally deficient, the crippled, the abandoned, the old people. Then there are those relatively few who are poor and enjoy being on relief without having to work. But thirdly, there is the largest mass of poor who would like to break out of the swamp and wasteland in which they have been trapped. These are the drop-outs, those obsoleted by automation and higher educational requirements for work today, the functional illiterates, those handicapped by the neighborhoods and schools of their youth, the lack of personal motivation and aspiration engendered by all the examples of wasted, empty lives all around them.

These are people who might be redeemed for a better day. But it won't happen if the most knowledgeable, the most intelligent, the most powerful people in our society, among whom are the members of YPO, aren't willing to get involved in solving the problem, in creating imaginative solutions, in breaking through the bureaucratic crust of present programs, in a word, by criticizing present programs constructively and lending a helping hand to get the job done better on the local scene where the problem exists and must be met.

Then take the problem of world poverty. Barbara Ward, in her brilliant book, "The Rich Nations and The Poor Nations," has well illustrated the fact that the gap between the developed and the underdeveloped, the haves and the have-nots, the rich nations and the poor nations, is widening day by day, getting worse instead of better. The population of the West, 20 percent of the world population, last year consumed 75 percent of the world's income. In 1965, the West added sixty to seventy billion dollars to its income, a single year increase that was larger than the gross national product of all of Latin America, and twice the gross national product of India.

Our country reached a gross national product of 640 billion dollars last year, an annual increase of 45 billion dollars for our 190 million people, while all Africa, with 300 million people, had a total income of 30 billion dollars, one-third less than our annual increase last year.

While this has been happening, our foreign aid program has been going down rather than up. Ten or fifteen years ago, when American national income was not half of what it is today, some 2 percent of that income was devoted to foreign aid. Today, the figure is closer to 0.3 percent.

Again, Barbara Ward has said: "A great society must live not only by mind and body, but by conscience and spirit as well. Surely if 0.3 percent of national income is all we can afford for those who starve, those without shelter, those whose children are dying and those who will certainly live at least thirty years less because we can do nothing, then we cannot say we are Christian or of the great Judaic tradition, we cannot say here is the fine product of a humane Western civilization, we cannot say we are the last best hope of mankind, we can say nothing that will not in fact be a mockery of our claims and a proof of our complacency."

The sad fact is that most Americans couldn't be less interested because again the knowledgeable, the powerful, and the affluent say in concert: put an end to these hand-outs, cut out these wasteful and badly-administered programs, call home the dopey do-gooders who are squandering our hard-earned resources in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

Again, granting for the sake of argument the validity of this criticism, how many knowledgeable, powerful, and affluent business men, old or young, have spent a day of their lives really studying the depths of this problem, trying to give of their talent to find some solution to this haunting specter of worldwide and superabundant human misery surrounding our small pocket of prosperity. If ideas are needed, where are the knowledgeable? If better administration is needed, where are the good administrators? If power and affluence are in our hands, shall we put them to service in this most pressing of all human problems, or hug them to ourselves like selfish children with an expensive toy?

It is a bitter and horrendous thought that we are spending about $300,000 this year for every Viet-Cong soldier killed, in a land where the per capita income is $93.00 a year. It is unconscionable that in a nation that spends annually more than six billion for cigarettes, twelve billion for liquor, twenty billion for gambling, and I spare you the tab for entertainment, we haggle over the two billion spent for hundreds of millions of people in misery and, even worse, give so little of our own personal human talents to the sad plight of our fellow human beings. The ten thousand Peace Corps volunteers, working, at $75.00 a month, in the schools and slums and countrysides of some 45 underdeveloped nations put our whole nation to shame. In a sense, they alone, in their youthful idealism and commitment, redeem us from our negligent unconcern and inhumanity.

There are myriad other challenges that I have not yet mentioned, but which are no less worthy of involvement by the YPO or its members: good government, which we get as much of as we deserve, by our interest, involvement, and participation; good and widespread discussion of the great issues of our day, both here and abroad; good education, the key to all the future, and something too important for you, your children, and the nation to be left to the isolated efforts of a few dedicated and underpaid people in each community; the moral climate of business, the image it creates among the coming generation, all too many of whom view it with distrust and cynicism; the good society and its values, something that cannot be bought or simply voted for, because it must be the fruit of a total human effort in a democracy, not just the effort of a machine, a party, or a few political hacks. I could go on listing issues that have, unfortunately, had minimal attention and action from YPO, like Civil Rights, peace in our times, the ecumenical movement uniting heretofore warring religions and cultures, the urban jungles that are creating widening human garbage heaps in all of our major cities, air and water pollution, and all the rest.

You may say this is really none of our business as YPO'ers. Then I ask, whose business is it if not of those most endowed with the growing knowledge, the great leverage of local power, the affluence and security to govern one's time and the use of one's talent? If such as we, the young, the intelligent, and the energetic, are not interested, how will the problem ever be solved?

We need more Will Garveys building low cost housing around the world, and more Bob Galvins taking time out to back promising newcomers to the political scene. Perhaps as an organization we need more challenge and discussion about our personal responsibility to do more than run good businesses, promote our own personal interests, while the larger world in which we live needs desperately our vision, our intelligence, our knowledge, our power, our energy, our talent, our interest, and our commitment. I honestly believe that all we glory in today, here in America and in the West, is riding for a tremendous fall if groups like ours do not rejoin the totality of the human race with all its agonies, and begin to be more attentive to the deepest hopes of the vast majority of mankind for such simple human needs as food, health, housing, education—the basic prerequisites of human dignity. The greater part of the world today is one vast open wound. And it needs more than the band-aid we offer it. It needs you—all of you.

I said at the beginning of these remarks that I would speak critically, but in hope. That hope is founded on the human potential of talent and energy and intelligence found among the men of the YPO, and that of the wives, too. There is too much potential power here to be used only for examining yourselves, your financial and administrative techniques, your business practices, your state of physical or mental health, or the current level of your financial successes. It makes a neat club, but the world will not be saved from the dead weight of its human misery and agonizing problems by neat clubs.

What I am calling for, as our knowledge grows and our power widens, is a greater compassion for the deeper human problems and a greater involvement in the current revolution of human development and human opportunity for a better day. May I say one final word: we all need a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment as we pass through life, some sense that the world is better for our passing through it. This satisfaction and fulfillment can come to each of you superficially by your being deeply involved in the exciting drama of a growing business—but man does not live by bread alone or by good balance sheets either. In the very heart of our humanity, we must, for real human satisfaction and fulfillment, touch life and hope on a deeper level, in serving God where He is perhaps best found and served today, in the pathetic lives of those who have none of our advantages, but who desperately need our hand of help if hope is not to die in their souls.

Ask yourself the ultimate question: What is the real image of the YPO in America and abroad today? What should it be?

Au revoir, arriverderci, auf Wiedersehen, hasta la vista, do wedienje, da szydana, sayonara, so long—I've been a quiet, dues-paying, rather useless member of the YPO for many years, but at least we oldsters must show you youngsters that we go out in a flame of challenge—which was what brought us all to the YPO in the first place. As they say in show biz, you take it from here.

EXAMPLE OF REGIONAL ARTS ACTIVITY

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the purposes of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities is to advance the arts and the humanities on regional bases. Members will recall a colloquy I had with the gentleman from West Virginia emphasizing this goal of the enabling legislation.

There are, of course, many regional endeavors in the arts already in existence. One fine example of such an endeavor was an exhibition at Lafayette College of the works of five Delaware River area artists. Four of the five reside on the New Jersey side of the river. Naturally, I am proud of this fact.

Although this was a regional exhibition, there was nothing "Mickey Mouse" about it. The list of museums that have sought the works of the five artists and the places where they have exhibited reads like an Almanac De Gotha of the Nation's museums and galleries. Additionally, the list includes some of the most highly respected European galleries.

This exhibition by Lafayette College, which was shown from April 16 through May 10 is an outstanding example of the ability of a local area to mount a cultural production of high caliber.

The degree of artistic excellence of the exhibition is described in the foreword to the catalog, written by another fine Delaware River area artist, the distinguished author, James A. Michener. I include the foreword as a part of my remarks:

FOREWORD

For two reasons it is a pleasure as well as an honor for me to participate in even a small way in this exhibition. First, the five distinguished artists whose works are being shown are my neighbors and it's good to know that impressive creative work is being completed within one's own area. Second, these men are real professionals deeply versed in art and highly successful in its practice. I knew their work in New York galleries and museums before I knew them and the credentials they bring into this show are enviable.

Clarence Carter, the dean of the group, has painted one of the most popular canvases shown at the Museum of Modern Art, and I never see his memorable "Jane Reed and Dora Hunt," in which two mountain women wander down a railroad track looking for fallen bits of coal, but what I wish that it were mine. His surrealist works, of which the paintings shown here are good examples, are strong statements of the mystical view of life.

Reginald Neal is both a fine painter and a distinguished graphics artist, and it is appropriate that his works in this exhibition combine these two forms of art. The colorful background sheets have been printed in time-tested traditional manner, lithograph in this case, while the transparent overlays have been painted and so placed as to permit an interplay between the lithography and the painting. A handsome, ingratiating work of art results.

Ed Higgins is one of America's finest sculptors and his marriage of steel and epoxy creates new forms, new surfaces and a brilliant new juxtaposition of light and dark. His work has captivated critics and collectors alike for it strikes a modern note against a starkly classical background.

John Goodyear has been one of the pioneers in optical art and has been represented in many of the important group shows which introduced this development to the American art world. I well remember the first day I saw one of his striking creations, a beautifully painted flat surface in front of which moved two sets of equally well-painted wooden slats, so that as I looked a whole series of fine paintings came into view and vanished. The works shown here are advances on those first brilliant inventions.

Richard Anuszkiewicz burst upon the art world in a splash of red and green figures so set off against each other that the canvas scintillated. His work was immediately recognized as a further advance in the ages-old attempt by artists to use color as color in new ways so that the laws of optics would be brought home to ordinary viewers. His subtle use of the after-image which remains in the mind's eye after the initial image has vanished has accounted for much of the acclaim he has met with.

Observe that each of these artists insists that the viewer participate in the finished work of art. Ed Higgins almost demands that you cherish his juxtaposition of harsh metal and alluring epoxy. One almost yearns to feel the surfaces he has created. When looking at Clarence Carter's surrealistic visions one is invited to compare them with his own imaginings, or to adjust his previous preconceptions to Carter's statements. Note that when looking at a Neal construction, it remains constant and springs into life only when the viewer moves about, whereas one can stand indefinitely before Goodyear's machine without anything happening. Then, a touch of the finger sets the grid in motion and suddenly a wealth of images results. And the scintillating canvases of Richard Anuszkiewicz spring to life primarily because the viewer's eye races back and forth between the clashing colors, the cleverly placed symbols, and the true image and the after-image.

The twenty-five works in this show are not only extremely professional in their execution. (Be sure to study the biographies of these men; see what museums have sought their works; see where they have exhibited.) The works are also fun. They are fun to see and they are good to live with. They refresh the eye and tidy up the brain. They have been made by your neighbors for your delectation.

And . . . most of them are for sale . . . to be taken home . . . and enjoyed at leisure.

JAMES A. MICHENER.

THE JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride today that I introduce a bill to authorize construction of a new art museum for our Nation's Capital—the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

I am proud because this museum will house one of the world's foremost art collections, a collection that has just been donated to the United States by Joseph H. Hirshhorn, of Greenwich, Conn., a constituent of mine.

And I am proud because it was to the United States that Joseph Hirshhorn made his gift.

Few men indeed have risen further in life than this immigrant from Latvia who began his career as a Wall Street officeboy. He is reputed to be worth more than $100 million now, but his fortune is no greater than his generosity.

He has given to this Nation between $25 and $50 million worth of works of art and it is to construct a home suitable for this superb collection that I introduce this bill today.

The new museum, which will be located on the Mall between Seventh and Ninth Streets, will house more than 1,500 pieces of sculpture and the more than 4,800 paintings and drawings which have been donated by Joseph Hirshhorn.

But he did not stop there. He has given his country $1 million more with which to buy additional works of art.

Yes, Joseph Hirshhorn's generosity is great. It is only right that the Congress show its appreciation by acting swiftly to authorize construction of the museum that will bear his name.

Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carried one of its fine "Man in the News" profiles. Its subject was Joseph Herman Hirshhorn. It tells far better than I can the story of this remarkable man. I include it in the RECORD at this point along with the text of the bill I now offer for appropriate referral.

If ever a Congressman was proud of a constituent, I am proud of this one.

The article and bill follow:

HARDHEADED COLLECTOR—JOSEPH HERMAN HIRSHHORN

If they ever reconstruct Williamsburg, Brooklyn, they would do well to concentrate on the street where Joseph Herman Hirshhorn, the immigrant boy from Latvia, lived somewhere along the way to his 24 art-festooned acres in Greenwich, Conn. His American success story reached a happy climax in Washington yesterday when President Johnson announced that Mr. Hirshhorn was donating his art collection, worth between $25 and $50 million, to the Government.

Mr. Hirshhorn is one of the country's great art collectors. He is also one of the country's great businessmen. He made his money on stocks and on Canadian uranium—some say he is worth more than $100 million but he does not discuss it—and he spends it on art, all kinds, all styles, all schools.

A STERN REPLY

A dealer once tried to sell the 66-year old collector the work of a young talent; it would be sure to gain in value as time went by.

Mr. Hirshhorn drew himself up to his full 5 feet 4 and replied sternly: "Don't tell me how to make money. I don't collect art to make money. I do it to spend money."

Most of his art—4,000 paintings and 1,500 sculptures—is in warehouses. But there are works that adorn his Round Hill home in Greenwich where 100 large sculptures are on display. Others decorate his home on the French Riviera. Still more, some 200 paintings, are in a permanent circulating exhibition that belongs to the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation.

Lately, much of Mr. Hirshhorn's time has been taken up with art, although he shows up at his small Park Avenue office from time to time to keep his business in hand. On his desk are several telephones and he is an expert at handling a number of them at once.

"He used to trade unlisted stocks in the nineteen-twenties, a live period," an associate remarked. "He knows how to handle phones."

"MY MONEY, MY TASTE"

The gray-haired, well-dressed financier is a witty, plain-spoken man who has advisers but who makes his own decisions, usually in a way to clean things up quickly. When he works, he works hard. When he was traveling on business to Western Canada during the oil boom, he would land in Calgary at 5 A.M. and work until midnight.

Whether he is buying art or stocks, he is hard-headed in his dealings.

"This is my money and my taste," he once said, discussing his art purchases. "I've operated that way all my life—in my life and my business. I like to test my own judgment. I don't care if my grandfather or my friends like it."

On the other hand, his philanthropies amount to a formidable, unpublicized sum. He has helped young artists and older ones down on their luck. He discourages them from "gambling" when they ask for stock tips.

In the mid-thirties, some critics said that Mr. Hirshhorn bought art "wholesale" when, in reality, he was buying in volume to help artists he knew. In later years, he has restricted his buying in depth, to those artists whose work he likes. He will not trade or sell his purchases.

Mr. Hirshhorn has never been a moth drawn to the flame of prestige. He does not collect to be in a social set. Abram Lerner, Mr. Hirshhorn's curator, recalled that when he started in his job in 1955, he found paintings in closets and even in the trunk of an automobile. Unlike a museum, which usually has a historical perspective, Mr. Hirshhorn has always bought according to his taste.

The collector was born Aug. 11, 1899 in Mitau, Latvia the twelfth of thirteen children. In 1905, his widowed mother brought the family to Brooklyn, where she worked long hours for $12 a week.

"Poverty has a bitter taste," Mr. Hirshhorn said years later, recalling how his mother was sent to the hospital when a fire gutted their tenement on Humboldt Street, and the family was dispersed to various homes in the neighborhood. "I ate garbage."

When he was 14, he went to work as a Wall Street office boy. He did not waste time polishing up the handle of the big front door; instead he studied the market.

Three years later, Mr. Hirshhorn had made $168,000 on an initial $255 investment. He moved his mother to a home on Long Island and seemed to be on his way to permanent prosperity as a broker on the Curb Exchange. But, with the end of World War I, he guessed wrong on the market and found his fortune had shrunk to $4,000. Mr. Hirshhorn says he has always learned by his mistakes. At any rate, he was back on top in a few years and intuitively got out of the market with $4-million just before it broke in 1929.

A URANIUM BONANZA

Mr. Hirshhorn was attracted to the possibilities of Canada, bought 470 square miles of land and, by 1950, was mining uranium. His biggest coup occurred in 1952. On the advice of Franc Joubin, a geologist who had little audience elsewhere, Mr. Hirshhorn secretly put together 56,000 square miles of claims in Ontario's Algoma Basin and struck a uranium bonanza in Blind River.

His interest in art was never a result of being rich, but its dimensions are rooted in money. When he was a child, Mr. Hirshhorn was attracted to the pictures on the Prudential Life Insurance Company's calendars. As a young market trader, he bought his first originals from an artist who made etchings of Wall Street near the exchange.

Mr. Hirshhorn lives with his fourth wife, Olga, in Greenwich. He is the father of six children, two of them adopted, and is a grandfather several times over. He is board chairman of the Callahan Mining Company, and the principal stockholder in Prairie Oil Royalties, a Canadian concern.

He has been trying to follow doctor's orders to take it easy, but finds it a trial. When he appears at Parke-Bernet, the auctioneer knows that he has to keep a sharp eye for the little man with the expressive face who signals vigorously with his program. If there is any doubt, Mr. Hirshhorn lets the auctioneer know what he is up to. He calls out his bids in a loud, clear voice.

"He's a tiger," an old, close friend said.

H.R. 15123

A bill to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

SECTION 1. (a) The area bounded by Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street, and Madison Drive, in the District of Columbia, is hereby appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution as the permanent site of a museum and sculpture garden to be used exclusively for the exhibition of works of art.

(b) The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution is authorized to remove any existing structure, to prepare architectural and engineering designs, plans, and specifications, and to construct a suitable museum and sculpture garden for the use of the Smithsonian Institution within the area designated in section 1(a) of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The museum and sculpture garden provided for by this Act shall be designated and known in perpetuity as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and shall be a free public museum and sculpture garden under the administration of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

(b) The faith of the United States is pledged that the United States shall provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep, operation, and administration of the

Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

(c) The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be the permanent home of the collections of art of Joseph H. Hirshhorn and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, and shall be used exclusively for the storage, exhibition, and study of works of art, and for the administration of the affairs of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

SEC. 3. (a) There is established in the Smithsonian Institution a Board of Trustees to be known as the Trustees of the Joseph H. Hishhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, which shall provide advice and assistance to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on all matters relating to the administration, operation, maintenance, and preservation of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden; and which shall have the sole authority (i) to purchase or otherwise acquire (whether by gift, exchange, or other means) works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (ii) to loan, exchange, sell, or otherwise dispose of said works of art, and (iii) to determine policy as to the method of display of the works of art contained in said museum and sculpture garden.

(b) The Board of Trustees shall be composed of the Chief Justice of the United States and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, who shall serve as ex officio members, and eight general members to be appointed as follows: four of the general members first taking office shall be appointed by the President of the United States from among nominations submitted by Joseph H. Hirshhorn and four shall be appointed by the President from among nominations submitted by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The general members so appointed by the President shall have terms expiring one each on July 1, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975 as designated by the President. Successor general members (who may be elected from among members whose terms have expired) shall serve for a term of six years, except that a successor chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of office of his predecessor shall be chosen only for the remainder of such term. Vacancies occurring among general members of the Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be filled by a vote of not less than four-fifths of the then acting members of the Board of Trustees.

SEC. 4. The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director and, subject to his supervision, an administrator and two curators of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, none of whose appointment, compensation, or duties shall be subject to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Board of Regents may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient administration, operation, and maintenance of the Joseph H. Hishhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including all sums necessary for planning construction, and operating the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill seeking the creation of a commission to be known as the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

The problem of obscenity and pornography has been a matter of national concern for some time and continues daily to grow worse.

It is my contention that the Federal Government has a responsibility to investigate the seriousness of the situation and to determine whether more effective methods should be devised to control the flow of materials which are harmful to the public, particularly to minors.

Under the measure I have offered, a 16-member Commission would be created. Of this number, eight would be appointed by the President, four by the Speaker of the House, and four by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that in no sense is this a measure to provide censorship.

Under the provisions of the bill it would be the duty of the Commission, with the aid of leading constitutional law authorities, to analyze laws pertaining to the control of obscenity and pornography and to evaluate and recommend definitions of obscenity and pornography, and to ascertain methods used in the distribution of such materials and to explore the nature of the traffic in them and further to recommend such legislative, administrative, or other appropriate action as the Commission holds necessary to regulate the flow of such traffic, without in any way interfering with constitutional rights .

The Commission would be empowered to hold hearings anywhere in the United States and would be required to report its recommendations to the President and Congress no later than January 31, 1967.

Members of this body are well aware of the confusion created by the recent Supreme Court decision involving Ralph Ginzburg, editor of the pseudo intellectual gloss magazine, Eros.

The High Court in a 5-to-4 decision upheld Ginzburg's conviction for violating a Federal law which makes it a crime to introduce obscene material in the mails. That decision established a new law by holding for the first time that courts may look outside the contents of a book itself to determine if a publication is obscene. In other words, the book could be converted into an obscene publication if the publisher intended it to be salacious or panderous.

The subject of obscenity and pornography is not one that I am discussing for the first time in Congress. As far back as 1961, as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I joined in denouncing these evils as deadly to the mind as narcotics and I do so again today. A year later I appeared before the House Committee on Rules to support a measure I had offered calling for a full investigation of complaints regarding production and distribution of objectionable motion picture and related advertising.

It was only a few years ago that one would find stuck away in a corner of a newspaper page a small advertisement calling attention to a suggestive type movie. Today, however, one finds page ads containing lurid descriptions and pictures.

May I say in conclusion that my files today contain many letters from worried parents vigorously protesting the pornographic material and obscene literature which is finding its way into the hands of their young schoolchildren.

It is high time that something be done to find means to halt this traffic.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARDY (at the request of Mr. DOWNING), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS, for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BATTIN (at the request of Mr. REID of New York), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. REID of New York), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. REID of New York), for 20 minutes, on May 23; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN for 30 minutes on May 19.

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. LOVE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REID of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. GURNEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHISLER.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. MCGRATH.

Mr. FRASER.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2463. An act to grant the consent of the Congress to the acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1098. An act to amend section I(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez; and

S. 2696. An act for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2415. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the national oceanographic program for fiscal year 1967; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2416. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the seventh annual report on the user charges program of the executive branch, for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2417. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for scientific and technological research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2418. A letter from the Chairman, Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, transmitting the third annual report for 1965 of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2419. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authority to the Secretary of Defense to acquire properties and provide other relief for certain homeowners whose properties are situated at or near military installations which have been ordered to be closed; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 265, an act to authorize conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value; without amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1357. An act to revise existing bail practices in courts of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 13822. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Postmaster General to further the research and development and construction engineering programs of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 14904. A bill to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 15119. A bill to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 15120. A bill to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 15121. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 15122. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 15123. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 15124. A bill to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15125. A bill creating a Commission to be known as the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 15126. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 15127. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a paraplegia rehabilitation allowance of $100 per month for veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 15128. A bill providing for fair jury selection in State courts and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 15129. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal facilities, and to otherwise assure humane care and treatment of laboratory animals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 15130. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey land at the St. Marks and Anclote National Wildlife Refuges to the State of Florida and to accept some land from the State for use as part of the Sanibel National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 15131. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 15132. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 15133. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACKIE:

H.R. 15134. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve the programs under such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 15135. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 15136. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 15137. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 15138. A bill to provide for the coinage of proof sets of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins bearing the date 1966; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 15139. A bill to amend sections 902(b) and 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 25 percent between first and second levels and to include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 25-percent test is met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 15140. A bill to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, to authorize early land acquisition for the purpose of acquiring a site for a replacement of Shaw Junior High School; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 15141. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 15142. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 15143. A bill to make certain expenditures made by the city of Springfield, Mass., eligible as local grants-in-aid for the purpose of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 15144. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to the payment of postal money orders; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 15145. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit assistance to any country which is 6 months or more in arrears with respect to payment of its assessed share of United Nations expenses; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 15146. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 15147. A bill to modify the authorization for flood protection on Alameda Creek, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 15148. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 15149. A bill to make certain expenditures of the city of Portland, Oreg., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 15150. A bill to provide that certain expenditures made by the city of Sheridan, Colo., shall be eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 15151. A bill to permit the planting of soybeans in lieu of cotton in certain disaster areas in 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 15152. A bill to permit the planting of soybeans in lieu of cotton in certain disaster areas in 1966; the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 15153. A bill to permit the planting of soybeans in lieu of cotton in certain disaster areas in 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 15154. A bill to permit the planting of soybeans in lieu of cotton in certain disaster areas in 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 15155. A bill to amend section 103 (d)(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 15156. A bill to amend section 103 (d)(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 15157. A bill to amend section 103 (d)(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 15158. A bill. to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 15159. A bill to authorize the payment of allowances to defray commuting expenses of civilian employees of executive agencies assigned to duty at remote worksites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 15160. A bill to provide further assistance to farmers suffering crop or livestock losses in unprecedented frosts and freezes in 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15161. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to require more complete disclosure of certain investment transactions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 15162. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish REA electrification and telephone loan accounts and Federal banks for rural electric and rural telephone systems to provide supplemental financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.J. Res. 1144. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning September 23, 1966, as Long Island Fair Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H. Con. Res. 657. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 658. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 659. Concurrent resolution relative to parity prices from agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Con. Res. 660. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the administration should cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and that existing provisions of law respecting parity of farm prices apply to all agencies of the Goverment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H. Con. Res. 661. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Res. 856. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed transfer of the Army and Air Force Exchange Services from New York City; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 857. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Commissioner of Education's policies and guidelines on school desegregation, and to stay action until such study is completed; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 15163. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Alaimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 15164. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Klinger, his wife, Susanna Klinger, and their minor children, Hiedi S. Klinger and Roselind Klinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 15165. A bill for the relief of Gerald Levine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Imports Threaten Domestic Cattle Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great alarm and fear for the American cattleman that I view the most recent statistics on the rapidly increasing meat imports into this country.

Despite legislation to curb this foreign inflow of beef and veal, the imports of these meats in the first quarter of 1966 have risen by more than 20 percent. Red meat imports, all types of meat, are up more than 34 percent. Indeed, the administration is threatening the American cattlemen with economic ruination by allowing meat imports to go unchecked.

This latest import flood is the starting point of another bust in cattle prices similar to the 1963 collapse when prices were driven to their lowest level in years because of the great influx of foreign beef. This flood represents the newest chapter in the administration's merciless campaign to beat down farm prices. We have seen the price of nearly every commodity forced down and down by the Secretary of Agriculture. Now the American cattleman has been betrayed.

Congress passed legislation to prohibit this type of antifarmer trade policy, and I think that Congress should against review this problem with the aim of imposing stricter curbs on meat imports, before the cattle market is once again driven down by the negligence of the administration.

Letter to a Dairy Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, MEL LAIRD, has written a letter to a dairy farmer friend of mine which I commend to the attention of all my colleagues.

MEL LAIRD represents the district that produces more milk and cheese than any other district in the Congress. Therefore, he is particularly well qualified to discuss the very critical problems the dairy farmer—and, indeed, all farmers—face in this country as a result of recent Johnson-Freeman administration actions.

Under unanimous consent, I insert MEL LAIRD's letter to my dairy farmer friend in the RECORD at this point

The letter referred to follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C , May 12, 1966.

DEAR BOB: One out of every nine workers in our state makes his living in agriculture. Our district leads the nation in the production of whole milk, cheese and other milk products while statewide, we grow more hay, alfalfa, sweetcorn and peas than any other state.

The farm policies here in Washington are set by a Democratic Administration that controls not only the Executive Branch of our Government but also the Congress by a two-to-one majority. Many feel that the Johnson-Freeman farm policies of recent months are part of a program that will liquidate the dairy farmer in Wisconsin.

Today, contrary to the glowing reports we often hear from Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, many farmers are suffering. As the trend continues toward larger and more efficient farms, the smaller farmer without the capital or the ability to expand is being squeezed out of business. Moreover, the return that the family farmer gets on his investment and labor is generally poor.

Let's look at the situation that our dairy farmers and processors are facing today thanks largely to ill-advised government policies. In recent weeks there have been seven major indications that the dairy farmer has become the "whipping boy" of this Administration.

First, the President's proposal in his budget message to cut back drastically the School Milk and School Lunch Programs for fiscal 1967.

Second, the Democratic Administration's decision to put substitutes on Army and Air Force menus instead of butter.

Third, President Johnson's press conference last month in which he urged the nation's housewives to stop using dairy products as one way of curbing the rising cost of living.

Fourth, the unrealistic price support level of $3.50 per hundred-weight for 3.7 percent butterfat milk ($3.31 for 3.5 milk). This will not insure an adequate supply of milk for Wisconsin dairy plants but it will insure that many dairy farmers will continue to leave the land.

Fifth, the opening up of the U.S. market to foreign cheese which is produced under substandard conditions abroad. Our own dairy farmers and producers are required by law to meet certain sanitary standards and cannot compete with cheap, foreign imports produced under unsanitary conditions which sell for at least 10 cents below the U.S. price.

Sixth, the Johnson-Freeman decision to ask the Tariff Commission to allow even greater foreign imports of cheddar cheese into this country in the 1966–1967 marketing year which begins on July 1, 1966.

Seventh, the decision to restrict exports of cattle hides, calf and kip skins which caused lower domestic livestock prices.

I have received many letters from our dairy farmers. Many of you have called me long-distance. On my visits back to the District, much of our discussion has focused on the problems you are facing.

If you asked me to summarize the main questions you have raised in our discussion, it would go something like this: "Mel, just what are those boys in Washington doing to us farmers and why? Don't they realize we are paying higher prices every year for our farm equipment? Don't they know we are getting a lower return on our investments because of inflation and because a lot of the rise in food prices doesn't find its way back into the farmer's pocket? What are they thinking of in Washington, anyway?" These are the kinds of questions you are asking, and they are good ones.

There is no justification for this Administration to single out our farmers as the "whipping boy" for inflation. Yet, this is precisely what the Administration here in Washington is doing. I testified late last month before the U.S. Tariff Commission in opposition to the increased quotas for cheddar cheese that the Administration has proposed. I urged the Commission not to go along with making our farmers the "whipping boy" for inflation, pointing out that because these foreign producers do not have to meet the same sanitary standards you do, they will bring this cheese in at a lower price than the U.S. price and that this will drive our prices down.

These recent policies of the Democratic Administration can only increase the number of our farmers who are leaving dairying for more promising ways of making a living. I have tried repeatedly to impress on the Secretary of Agriculture the necessity for taking a fairer and more realistic attitude toward this country's farmers. I will continue to do so. My own program for improving Wisconsin's farm income is enclosed with this letter.

Best regards,

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

Wolff Endorses National Council of Churches Formula for Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the problem of Vietnam does not lend itself to a black or white solution; we must constantly and aggressively search for new ways to bring a just peace to that troubled land. I have not seen a clearer articulation of a general road to follow toward peace in Vietnam than that outlined by Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church, which was adopted by the National Council of Churches. The five points adopted by the National Council are similar to positions adopted by national Catholic and Jewish groups. The five points include:

(1) a United Nations-convened peace conference with representation by all interested parties; (2) readiness on the part of the United States for unconditional discussion and negotiation; (3) strict adherence on the part of the U.S. to the policy of avoiding bombing of centers of population in North Viet Nam; (4) increased efforts to relieve the desperate plight of non-combatants in South Viet Nam; (5) a phased withdrawal of all U.S. troops and bases from Viet Namese territory, if and when they can be replaced by adequate international peacekeeping forces;

The search for peace must continue; every available means must be explored. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support the five points enumerated above as I do.

Toward a Review of the Draft—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon's Washington Evening Star carries the headline: "All Youth Should Serve, McNamara Says." The story reports:

> Every young person should give two years of service to his country, either in military service, the Peace Corps, or some other volunteer development work at home or abroad, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said today.

The need for review of our draft system has been evident for some time. Secretary McNamara's suggestion will have wide support. The National Service Conference of May 7, 1966, in New York City, discussed this same suggestion. A summary of that conference appears on page A2668 of yesterday's daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I believe that the following excerpt from Secretary McNamara's speech in Montreal today deserves wide notice:

EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY ROBERT S. MCNAMARA BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, QUEEN ELIZABETH HOTEL, MONTREAL, CANADA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1966

With respect to a "community of effort" let me suggest a concrete proposal for our own present young generation in the United States.

It is a committed and dedicated generation: it has proven that in its enormously impressive performance in the Peace Corps overseas; and in its willingness to volunteer for a final assault on such poverty and lack of opportunity that still remain in our own country.

As matters stand, our present Selective Service System draws on only a minority of eligible young men.

That is an inequity.

It seems to me that we could move toward remedying that inequity by asking every young person in the United States to give two years of service to his country—whether in one of the military services, in the Peace Corps, or in some other volunteer developmental work at home or abroad.

We could encourage other countries to do the same; and we could work out exchange programs—much as the Peace Corps is already planning to do.

While this is not an altogether new suggestion, it has been criticized as inappropriate while we are engaged in a shooting war.

But I believe precisely the opposite is the case. It is more appropriate now than ever. For it would underscore what our whole purpose is in Vietnam—and indeed anywhere in the world where coercion, or injustice, or lack of decent opportunity still holds sway.

It would make meaningful the central concept of security: a world of decency and development—where every man can feel that his personal horizon is rimmed with hope.

Hammonton's 100th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, the lovely city of Hammonton is marking its 100th anniversary Saturday evening with a communitywide centennial ball. I am pleased to pay tribute to the forward-looking residents of Hammonton, which is located in Atlantic County in New Jersey's Second Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent.

When the area which is Hammonton today was first settled by colonists, it was the site of a Leni-Lenape Indian village. In 1812, a settlement was founded by William Coffin some 30 miles east of Philadelphia and 30 miles from the coast. That settlement received its name from Coffin's son's name—John Hammond Coffin.

William Coffin brought the first industry—a sawmill—to Hammonton and shortly after, glass manufacturing began there. Throughout its history, Hammonton has been a center of glass manufacture, from the flasks produced in the infancy of the industry to the wide variety of glass items made there in more recent times.

In 1866, Hammonton received a charter by a special act of the New Jersey Legislature and was ruled by a president-and-council form of government until 1907, when the present mayor-council form was adopted.

Today, a century after its charter was received, Hammonton's industrial makeup includes agriculture—the growing of berries and vegetables, principally—in addition to clothing factories, a large pharmaceutical plant, cooky factories, and frozen foods plants.

Located in the center of New Jersey's widest section, it is a lovely recreational area, and the center of these activities are found in Hammonton Lake Park.

The residents of Hammonton, under the leadership of Mayor Peter Parisi, have not been content to merely review their history during this centennial year, but have been making plans for future improvements for their community—improvements which will rank with the recent erection of a new hospital, a new junior-senior high school and new Protestant and Catholic churches in starting Hammonton's second century.

As Hammonton's Representative in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to this important anniversary in its history.

Truth in Packaging and Truth in Lending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, I introduced H.R. 15102, a measure called truth in packaging and labeling and H.R. 15101, a bill better known as truth in lending.

If a fair packaging and labeling bill were enacted into law, most of the abuses called deceptive practices would become illegal. For example, among three sizes of soap powder sold by the same manufacturer, there was the "king size" package, containing 5 pounds, 11 ounces, and costing $1.33; the "giant size," containing 3 pounds, 5½ ounces, and costing 79 cents; and the regular size, containing 1 pound, 6 ounces, at a cost of 32 cents. It is difficult to tell at a glance or even to figure with pencil and paper which is the best buy. However, "king size" and "giant size" suggest a bargain. Long division will show in this case that the best buy was the regular size package. Another interesting phenomenon may be witnessed in advertisements which boldly proclaim "four servings" or "six servings." These may be true if we are serving small children who have been nibbling all day long, but if the product is intended to be served to adults, then these ads are grossly misleading. One of the most common complaints of consumers is "slack fill." As one pamphlet on packaging practices stated, "There's nothing like air to fill a package." Manufacturers usually excuse slack fill by claims that the product settles in the box, however, slack fill goes beyond normal settling and is a prevalent practice.

The conventional weapons in present legislation were not designed to deal with the complexities of the modern marketplace. Instead, they were designed to deal with the occasional deception which was not a great problem when the relatively few products then available were sold across the counter in the neighborhood store.

Essentially, present law fails for lack of any enforcible authority at all, or for lack of authority to establish generally applicable standards of interpretation. Where authority does not technically exist, each case must nonetheless be fought out individually with no general ground rules for reference. It is no wonder that enforcement is inadequate and it can never become adequate under these circumstances.

It is therefore my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will see its way clear to pass a fair packaging and labeling bill during this session of Congress.

The truth-in-lending measure would require lenders to state the full cost of credit, simply and clearly, and to state it before any credit contract is signed. This legislation would help consumers budget their incomes more intelligently, because they will know the price of credit in the same clear terms as the price of milk or gasoline. It would help the consumer in that he could compare credit costs so he could shop for the best combination of quality and price—including all of the charges involved. It would help the consumer to avoid unscrupulous lenders who use excessive credit charges and other sharp practices.

This bill will also help the legitimate lender by offering protection against any competitor who seeks to gain business by misrepresenting credit costs. It will insure the fair and effective competition that legitimate lenders desire. It will not regulate the cost of credit itself, or interfere with existing laws. It will not reduce the volume of credit or dampen the vigor of consumer buying.

This legislation will right the balance of legal protection between lenders and borrowers and I hope the Congress will enact this measure to insure that the American consumer is given a clear price tag when he shops for credit.

"The Day of the Americans," First American Book on the Liberation of Dachau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, during this period when many of our soldiers are again in the field, I wish to commend to Members a new book by Nerin E. Gun, published on April 29 by Fleet Publishing Corp., of New York. This is "The Day of the Americans," which tells the true story of how the heroic soldiers of the U.S. Army 42d—Rainbow—and 45th—Thunderbird—Divisions liberated the Nazi concentration camp in Dachau, Germany, on April 29, 1945, thereby saving the life of the author, Mr. Gun, and many thousands of other innocent prisoners from extermination by the Nazis. Nerin Gun has written his book in thanks to these American soldiers, "who liberated, not conquered."

Nerin Gun is a naturalized American citizen who lives in the attractive village of Sea Cliff, beautifully set on the New York shore of Long Island Sound. His father was a Turkish diplomat, and Mr. Gun was a Turkish national, 19 years old, and taking a course at the University of Berlin toward a law degree, when World War II started. He took a job as a neutral correspondent for Swiss, and later also for Turkish news services, and at 19, became the youngest foreign correspondent accredited to cover World War II from Berlin. He first displeased the Nazi authorities by writing a story about the German occupation of Paris which was cited by the International Red Cross in its appeal to the Nazis for more humane treatment of Frenchmen.

He further irritated them by making the first dispatch from the field predicting the defeat of Hitler's armies during the Nazi invasion of Russia. After he filed the first eyewitness report of the atrocities of the Warsaw ghetto, he was imprisoned, then expelled from Germany by the personal order of Hitler. When later covering the war from Hungary, he was again imprisoned, and was falsely accused by the Nazis of being a British intelligence agent, though never tried. He was sent to a series of prisons and camps, and was in the Dachau camp, under threat of execution, when the Americans liberated the Dachau camp. Nerin E. Gun and Richard Hottelet—now the CBS correspondent at the United Nations—were the only accredited journalists ever imprisoned by the Nazis exclusively for stories they filed.

While in Dachau, Gun was a member of the underground resistance committee, and his duties were to record, by a stolen camera and collection of documents and notes, what had happened there, in case the Nazis succeeded in destroying other evidence. At first, Gun thought that the world had been sufficiently told of the record—at Nuremberg, in other books. But no book about Dachau has ever before been published in this country. And when Gun, now an American citizen, with his native American wife revisited Dachau in 1964, 20 years after the liberation, he found that there was not a single reminder or memorial in all Dachau of the fact that the Americans had liberated the camp.

He found that the young people—and some of the adults—of Dachau were reluctant even to admit that the camp had ever existed as an instrument of Nazi terror and extermination. Some even claimed that it was an invention of propaganda. He realized that his duty, to document and record, was still necessary and unfulfilled. So he has written this brilliant and thought-provoking book, which alternates between chapters on his experiences and reflections about the continuing meaning to the world of the Nazi terror.

Nerin E. Gun, after being liberated from Dachau, resumed his career as a journalist. He has written for almost every major European magazine, and his articles have appeared in the United States in Life, This Week, Pageant, and other publications. He became an American citizen in 1958 and married an American. He and his wife and their young daughter live in Sea Cliff between his worldwide trips as a journalist. His previous book, "The Red Roses of Texas," was an account, written for Europeans, of the United States of America on the day of President Kennedy's assassination. It filled the vital role of informing the English, French, Italians, Germans, and people of a number of other countries, how the tragic events of the assassination affected Americans—and it also gave a true and generous portrait of America and our customs to other nations of the world.

That a man like Nerin E. Gun, member of a distinguished Turkish intellectual family, son of an Italian mother, educated in France and Germany, and international traveler and observer, would choose to live in America, and praise this Nation and our institutions and traditions of freedom and democracy, is evidence of the great vigor of Americans, both in our national history and in the wide dissemination of American ideals. It is to be hoped that "The Day of the Americans" will be widely read here, as it will be abroad. Library Journal, a distinguished organ of comment on books, has recommended "The Day of the Americans" for all public libraries.

John Barkham of the Saturday Review has called the book genuinely unusual. The Mid-Century Book Society will distribute it to thousands of American readers as an April book club selection. I commend it to Members for its historical testimony, and as food for thought.

Project Headstart in 19th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE SCHISLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal that has been highly complimentary has been said and written about the success of Project Headstart nationally. This is one of the brightest spots in the war on poverty, and it ranks as one of the most successful Government programs at a reasonable cost.

We are now engaged in the launching of similar programs for the summer of 1966 in large and small communities throughout the Nation. The program will be broader in scope and coverage this year than last. It will involve more students and the expenditure of more funds.

But whatever is accomplished in 1966 will be based on the initial successes achieved last year when Headstart projects were undertaken in the midst of a lot of predictions that they would not work. They did work, and the critics have long since been silenced. As a matter of fact, many of the critics are now in the forefront with cheers because they, too, recognize that much of the success of Headstart stems from the enthusiasm and energy of local citizens, schoolteachers, and administrators, and other public officials.

Because what we do this year with Headstart will be measured against what was achieved during the program's first year, I thought it might be wise to pause a moment to look back at last year's pioneering effort. It is the work of these educational pioneers that pointed us in the direction of success. My wife, Carolyn, visited the Headstart projects in the 19th Congressional District last summer while the program was still in full swing. From August 2 through August 5, 1965, she, along with Mrs. Leo F. O'Brien, wife of the State representative from Galesburg, toured the Project Headstart programs in the district. Mrs. Paul Rink, wife of the State representative from Rock Island, joined Mrs. Schisler and Mrs. O'Brien in Moline and Rock Island.

I have asked my wife to write a report on their findings. Her report follows:

REPORT OF MRS. GALE SCHISLER ON 19TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT HEAD START PROJECTS

Four cities, with a total of 10 centers, were involved in the Head Start projects in the 19th Congressional District. They were Monmouth (Warren County), Galesburg (Knox County), and Rock Island and Moline (Rock Island County).

Following is a general review of the projects Mrs. Leo O'Brien, Mrs. Paul Rink, and I visited:

Monday, August 2, we visited Monmouth Project Head Start whose sponsor was the United Presbyterian Church, with Dr. Jay Ebersole serving as the principal officer. The project was held at one center, Harding School. There were 60 children enrolled. Total cost of the program was $11,087.00, financed by a non-federal share of $1,187.00 and an OEO grant of $9,900.00. The school board donated most of the school facilities as an in-kind contribution. The community gave full support to the project by contributing time and talent during the actual school hours, and the mothers helped by making such supplies as paste, aprons, paints, etc. Business houses gave discounts on toys, supplies, and food as their contributions. The distant students were transported to and from the school by taxi since this proved to be the cheapest mode of transportation. The school was located in the center of the area where most of the eligible students resided, and there were not enough living far enough away to hire a school bus to transport the distant students.

The ages of the children ranged from 3½ to 5½ years. From their budget, the program director paid custodial fees, staff salaries, food bills, and some bills for school supplies. Breakfast and a hot lunch were included in the morning's schedule for each child. A typical menu included: for lunch—chicken casserole, creamed peas, celery and carrot sticks, peaches, fruit drink, bread and jelly; and for breakfast—milk and cinnamon rolls. Listed below are some of the persons responsible for Monmouth Head Start:

Staff director-teacher: Mrs. Carol Bowman.

Teachers: Mrs. Margaret Bratton, Mrs. Karen Milliron, Mrs. Karen Squire.

Parent-teacher coordinator: Mrs. Agatha Gummerson.

Nutritionist: Mrs. Ruth Bunn.

Secretary: Mrs. Jean Kistler.

Part-time teachers: Music, Miss Linda Miller; physical education, Miss Judy Anderson.

Speech therapist: Miss Carroll Innskeep.

Assistant teachers: Miss Phyllis Wallace, Mrs. Jean Wallace, Miss Alice McClanahan, Miss Fadia Merkham, Mr. Rodger Kelly, Mrs. Ada Gaskill, Miss Diane Lemmerman, Mrs. Mary Valentin.

Principal officer: Dr. Jay Ebersole.

Tuesday, August 3, we visited Galesburg Project Head Start, whose sponsor was the Community Unit School District No. 205 with Dr. Orval L. Trail serving as the principal officer. The in-kind contributions by the school board included the four centers and most of the school facilities. This project was operated as a pre-school rather than pre-kindergarten because there is no kindergarten within the school system. Therefore, most of the play equipment had to be purchased, although some things were donated. A mid-morning snack was provided for the children. There were no transportation problems since each center was located in the area where the students lived. There were 103 children enrolled, with an approximate daily attendance of 90. There were 14 professional staff members, a few paid volunteers and many volunteers. The total cost of the program was $15,036.00, including $1,520.00 as the nonfederal share and a $13,516.00 OEO grant. Following is the list of personnel in the Galesburg project:

Director: Mr. Donald Lohmar.

Secretary: Miss Nancy Olson.

Teachers: Mrs. Carol Hare, Mrs. LaVerne Johnson, Mrs. Marlene Riley, Mrs. Betty Wallis, Mrs. Willabell H. Williams, Mrs. Judy Wilson.

Assistant teachers: Mrs. Geraldine Anderson, Mrs. Janice Downard, Mrs. Dorothy Hanna, Mrs. Bernadine Harris, Mrs. Carol Hinkson, Miss Martha Way.

Teacher aides: Mrs. Alberta Bettisworth, Miss Joyce Gohlinghorst, Mrs. June Lewis, Miss Kay Watkins, Miss Diane Wetherford, Miss Kay Zuck, Miss Judy Ryberg.

Principal officer: Dr. Orval L. Trail.

Wednesday, August 4, we visited Moline Project Head Start whose sponsor was the Moline School District No. 40. The principal officer, Mrs. Ardath Scott, had correlated a similar program the summer before which proved to be quite successful. The format for the 1964 summer program was used as a basis for the 1965 Project Head Start. There were 105 children enrolled, averaging 97 daily attendance. There were three centers, 11 professional staff members, 6 paid non-residents, 14 volunteer residents, and approximately 8 other volunteers. Since there is a kindergarten within the school system, the program centered around pre-kindergarten age children.

The school board furnished the centers and most of the play equipment. The total cost of the project was $16,887.00, which was comprised of a non-federal share of $2,000.00 and an OEO grant of $14,887.00. There was also an adult program in connection with this project. The mothers met once a week for "coffee" and listened to doctors, ministers, nutritionists, educators, etc., discuss religious training and problems, legal problems, goals of the Head Start program, meal planning and preparation, home planning, psychological problems, medical problems, and physical health of the children. Following is the list of personnel responsible with the Moline Head Start Project:

Director-principal officer: Mrs. Ardath K. Scott.

Teachers: Mrs. Verna Gail Johnson, Mrs. Jewell Higdon, Mrs. Helen Byrne, Mrs. Sara Jane DeLeon, Mrs. Ruth Peterson, Mrs. Elsie Hagberg, Mrs. Eunice Bennett.

Social worker: Mrs. Betty Reeves.

Psychologist: Mr. Robert Johnson.

Nurse: Mrs. Frances Lawless.

Clerk: Mrs. Ruth Rosenberg.

Doctors: Dr. J. R. Goran, Dr. Earl H. Clark.

Thursday, August 5, we visited Rock Island Project Head Start, sponsored by Rock Island for Head Start, whose principal officer was Mr. Raymond P. Botch, City Manager. The city hall kept books for the project and the school board provided the two centers and most of the facilities for the program. There were 105 pre-kindergarten (ages 4½ to 5½) children enrolled. The total cost of the program was $18,418.00, with $1,855.00 as the non-federal share and $16,563.00 as the OEO grant. The children were served a breakfast snack and a hot lunch before going home. There were no transportation problems since the schools were located in the area where the children resided. Listed below are the persons and organizations who helped with the Rock Island Head Start Project:

Principal officer: Mr. Raymond P. Botch.

Director: Mrs. Eloise Smith.

Teachers: Mrs. Jane Adams, Mrs. Helen Bellinger, Miss Bertha Dexheimer, Miss Judy Hunigan, Mrs. Dorothy Nelson, Miss Judy Varner, Miss Nancy Stone.

Nurse: Mrs. Florence McLaughlin.

Social worker: Miss Mabel Lawler.

Secretaries: Miss Marilyn Becke, Miss Rene Nelson.

Cafeteria staff: Mrs. Kathryn Stechalin, Mrs. Mamie Jones, Mrs. Lydia Morrison, Mrs. Roselle Jackson, Mrs. Pauline Woods.

Paid workers: Mr. William Eye, Mr. William Nelson.

Neighborhood volunteers: Mrs. W. A. Flanagan, Mrs. Max Heber, Mrs. R. A. Kemble, Mrs. Herbert Lowry, Mrs. Muriel McElrath, Miss Carolyn Moore, Miss Linda Moore.

Other volunteers: Miss Marguerite Downing, Miss Maxine Frye, Mrs. Howard Goff, Miss Pamela Good, Mrs. Lloyd Hance, Miss Merrill Harris, Miss Fern Hawks, Mrs. Clarence E. Hodson, Miss Edna Horst, Mrs. Lester King, Mrs. W. S. Mellish, Mrs. Henry Miles, Miss Marcia Moore, Mrs. Eugene Moses, Mrs. Louis Orwitz, Miss Sally Pierceson, Mrs. Evelyn Schroeder, Mrs. E. R. Sundquist, Mrs. Robert Wellman, Mr. Walter Kolloff, Mr. Wilbur Lartz, Mr. Paul Sulser, Mr. and Mrs. John Good, Mrs. David Isaacson, Mrs. Lois Mitchell, Miss Virginia Cale, Miss Kit Dizotell, Mrs. Charles O. Austin.

Custodians: Mr. Arthur Anderson, Mr. Sylvester Fluegel, Mr. Richard Kaskadden, Mr. Dean Paulson.

Volunteer nurses: Miss Frances Downing, Mrs. Gerald Sutton.

Volunteer social worker: Miss Margaret Brooks.

Volunteer teachers: Mrs. Joan Bryant, Mrs. Bonnie Griffith, Mrs. Ruth Kettering, Mrs. Eugene Morris, Mrs. Roseen Rapley, Miss Betty Schreitling, Mrs. Betty Peal.

Volunteer medical assistants: Mrs. Richard Edwards, Mr. Paul Hawthorn, Podiatrists' Association, Visiting Nurses Association, Polio Foundation, Public Health Office.

Stores who donated: The Book Nook, Engman's Drug Store, McHugh Pharmacy, McPike Drug Company, Schlegel Drug Store, Schneider's Drug Store, Athletic Shop.

Junior volunteers: Tom Adams, Sharon Allen, Stephanie Allen, Gail Andich, Kathy Cain, Wilda Cannon, Linda Golden, Brenda Jones, Mary Kemble, Tom Kemble, Janet Lockhart, Vicki Marshall, Jill Robbons, Sheryl Walkup, Marilyn Workheiser, Ruth Ann Morris, Colleen Kelly.

Headstart committee members: Miss Mary Hill, Miss Johanna Casey, Miss Louise Deckers, Mr. Ken Koch, Mr. David Willming, Rev. Henry Warkentin, Mr. Robert Sinnett, Mr. Frederick Patton, Mr. Pete Pappas, Mr. Dale Holmgrain, Mrs. Gary Hodson, Mayor James H. Haymaker, Mrs. Walter Congdon, Mr. Raymond P. Botch, Mr. Vernon Winters, Mrs. Walter Kimmel.

Rock Island Board of Education: Mr. William C. Bell; Mr. Ted Arnold; Mr. Max Larson; Mr. Earl H. Hanson, Superintendent; Mr. Charles Austin, Assistant Superintendent; Mr. Virgil R. Helms, Assistant Superintendent.

Others who helped: Mr. Jack Mosenfelder, Niabi Zoo, Stone's Apple Farm, Mr. Lee Saylor, Mr. James McMillan, Rock Island County Department of Public Aid, Arsenal Courts Office, Mrs. R. E. Cale, Central Fire Station.

Listed below are some general comments based on observations in each city:

1. Much of the success of each project derived from the marvelous staff involved in each project. Everyone showed much enthusiasm toward the goals and work with the children and with the program.

2. The length of the program varied from seven to eight weeks. In some cases, the staff had an orientation week before actually starting classes.

3. Recruitment of the children was achieved through the school principal, school nurse, Department of Public Aid, ADC lists, etc.

4. Attendance was very good, which was very encouraging to the staff.

5. Good community and area response resulted whenever help was solicited.

6. There was lack of time to acquaint the entire community with the local projects. In some cases, news media did not have time or the staff to tell the story as fully or as often as they could have. However, we notified radio, television and newspapers in each of the four cities when and where we would be. Generally speaking, our visits were received very well by the news media.

7. Some problems were created when supplies and forms were late in arriving. Some items arrived several weeks after the program had been started.

8. Field trips included visits to farms, orchards, airports, fairs, zoos (where available), business establishments, restaurants, and dairies. Some trips included the fire station, and in some cases the postmen visited the centers to explain their duties.

9. Some professional medical skills were donated in part, and children were given dental and medical examinations, often for the first time.

10. Professional staffs are hopeful that more communities will avail themselves of the opportunities offered by Head Start. They were so grateful and pleased with the records established by children in this particular age group and economic background.

11. The continuing enthusiasm of staff members was demonstrated by their plans to make talks and show slides throughout the 1965–66 school year before community groups to tell the story of their achievements and the children's progress during the summer of 1965.

12. On the basis of our tour, we can predict a bright future for Project Head Start, both in the 19th Congressional District of Illinois and throughout the country.

Mrs. GALE SCHISLER.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call attention to a letter I received from Mrs. LaVerne Johnson, of Galesburg, who was one of the teachers in the Galesburg, Ill., Headstart project. Mrs. Johnson's summary conveys the enthusiasm and interest of all who were engaged in making these programs successful throughout the 19th District. Her letter follows:

The Honorable GALE SCHISLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHISLER: I was very happy and fortunate to have been a part of the Headstart program. I feel both the pupils and the teacher were benefited. By the time school started, the pupils were oriented for a classroom situation and their horizons had been broadened due to this program.

They could participate in class discussions and school would be more meaningful.

This program also afforded an opportunity to detect cases needing special testing, both physical and mental. If need be, students could be tested in advance for special education classes for early placement, preventing a development of discipline problems in the regular classroom. This approach could perhaps prevent some potential dropouts.

However, the teachers felt the program should have ended the last of July. The weather was hot and the pupils were bushed. We felt if there were a local workshop for the teachers, rather than a week in college, the program could start sooner. After all, the problems in Headstart differed very little from the problems in our regular classroom.

All "deprived" children were not attending. By that, I mean: children of well-to-do parents who go off by themselves and leave a sitter in charge. The families where only the father is left in the family, and he works to maintain a life for four or five children. The instances where both the mother and father work and do not have time to give their children the proper head start. The children from these are deprived of the simple experiences that mean so much to a child. These little experiences mean a lot in the classroom for peer acceptance.

All in all, Project Headstart is a tremendous idea, and it represents an advance in our educational policies and programs.

Sincerely,

MRS. LAVERNE JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, as a former schoolteacher and principal, I would like to add my personal endorsement for Project Headstart. I have always been convinced that the early years of training are the key to effective educational programs. For that reason, Project Headstart ranks at the head of the list in importance because it has advantage of training children who are most likely to need additional help in order to bring them up to a par with more fortunate children.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that a teacher's influence never stops; it affects eternity. Everyone engaged in the pioneering Headstart projects of 1965 have a right to be proud of the influence their contributions will have in the future as the children they trained move into the mainstream of our educational system.

Kansas Fourth Congressional District 1966 Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since coming to Congress to send to my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas a questionnaire on several of the major issues facing our Nation on the foreign and domestic fronts. It has been very helpful and enlightening to me to receive the opinions and additional views of thousands of citizens. It is gratifying to observe a genuine and growing interest in representative government and legislative affairs.

This year my 1966 opinion poll was sent to approximately 94,000 citizens in the 7 counties of the new Kansas Fourth District. This was done with the assistance of interested volunteers who aided me in addressing envelopes from telephone directories. More than 16,000 questionnaires have been returned; and tabulations have been completed. Hundreds included personal letters or notes in which they explained their positions, and many informed me of other alternatives to such crucial questions as Vietnam. Following is a sampling of some of the comments and excerpts from letters which accompanied the questionnaires from constituents:

ON VIET NAM

I sometimes think we would have been much better off to train missionaries, doctors, etc. to be sent to help these people, rather than guns and ammunition.

On the question of Viet Nam, it is impossible to quit now without showing the world that we are an undependable nation, not to be trusted when the going gets rough. Whether we should have become involved in the first place or not has no bearing on that. We are now in and must not desert those we have engaged to protect. We should be willing to negotiate—but only from strength—and with no thought of giving away as few as possible of the rights of those we protect—but rather of securing to them full enjoyment of those rights.

It is becoming increasingly evident that we are supporting a corrupt Saigon government which does not have the support of the Vietnamese people. The best choice is not to have gone in the first place. But withdrawal is no answer at this point.

I feel more bombing of North Viet Nam should be done on the lines of communication and I feel we should mine its big harbor, I believe it is in the Bay of Tonkin.

I think the war effort in Viet Nam should be continued and increased if need be to the point of forcing the Viet Cong to seek a negotiated settlement.

ON FISCAL POLICY

The deficit spending that is now going on should be sharply cut back or deferred. What good is a Great Society if it is a Bankrupt Society?

The expression, "threatened inflation" is getting to be a sick theme. Inflation is rampant; is here now and growing momentarily worse.

If we are to increase our strength and help the poverty people of our land, then I suppose we will have to continue our deficit spending and raise taxes. However, there surely should be some way to cut out unnecessary spending. The biggest saving could come from eliminating our foreign aid program in its entirety.

ON THE GREAT SOCIETY AND OTHER MATTERS

As a widow with a small business it seems to me that this Administration is making it very difficult to make a living.

Out here, the anti-poverty war, seems to be so much the boon-doggle, and too expensive for the good it does, we certainly feel it cannot be expanded without too much abuse.

My middle class status has about had it. All my insurance savings are depreciated to a 40 percent level. I saw World War I, served in World War II, missed Korea by a hair, and the mess in Viet Nam leaves me cold.

"The Great Society overwhelms me. I've heard these two words now for quite a while and am still not sure just what they mean."

ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

I have very little faith that this letter will ever arrive at the Congressman's desk and would imagine the favorable odds on his reading it would be more astronomical than the number of dollars being spent on both the Viet Nam fiasco and the Space Program combined.

I got your letter asking for my assistance. I am afraid I can't tell you what to do. I think we are in an awful mix up.

My thanks for your opinion poll. Without its gentle nudge I would have confined myself to grousing to the fellows at work, and never had the experience of writing to my Congressman. Thank you for doing your job so that I can do mine.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following completed tabulations of 16,084 questionnaires which were returned to my office:

ANNUAL 4TH DISTRICT OPINION POLL RESULTS

[Answers in percent]

VIET NAM

1. Do you favor continuing U.S. participation in the Viet Nam war effort at present levels while keeping the door open for negotiated settlement?

Yes	61.7
No	24.8
No answer	13.5

2. Do you favor escalation of the war in Viet Nam to seek military victory?

Yes	49.4
No	33.8
No answer	16.8

3. Do you favor withdrawal from Viet Nam under any conditions?

Yes	7.7
No	75.0
No answer	17.3

FOREIGN POLICY

4. Do you favor increasing U.S. food shipments to hungry nations abroad?

Yes	58.7
No	31.3
No answer	10.0

5. Do you favor an International Education Act to aid education of children in foreign lands?

Yes	46.5
No	43.2
No answer	10.3

6. Do you favor an International Health Act to fight disease abroad?

Yes	51.1
No	37.5
No answer	11.4

7. Do you favor reduction or elimination in U.S. foreign aid to countries that continually have failed to support U.S. foreign policy objectives?

Yes	85.1
No	11.5
No answer	3.4

FISCAL POLICY

8. Do you favor continuing deficit spending in order to meet rising defense costs and funding of Great Society domestic programs?

Yes	15.1
No	73.5
No answer	11.4

9. To counter inflation, should Congress—

(a) Defer and/or cut back spending?

Yes	78.7
No	11.8
No answer	9.5

(b) Raise taxes?

Yes	18.5
No	61.2
No answer	20.3

(c) Increase government authority to regulate wages and prices?

Yes	24.6
No	58.6
No answer	16.8

GENERAL

10. Do you favor increasing the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.75 per hour, extend minimum wage to farm labor and others not presently covered?

Yes	45.9
No	48.9
No answer	5.2

11. Do you favor additional income tax credits or deductions for parents of college students?

Yes	63.9
No	32.8
No answer	3.3

12. Do you favor increased appropriations for the anti-poverty program?

Yes	19.1
No	75.9
No answer	5.0

13. Do you favor the Shriver Bill to provide for automatic increases in Social Security payments based on the cost-of-living index?

Yes	76.4
No	19.2
No answer	4.4

14. Do you favor the Human Investment Act which would encourage business and industry to train the unemployed and underskilled through a program of tax credits?

Yes	74.1
No	20.1
No answer	5.8

15. Do you favor sale of wheat and general expanded trade with the Soviet Union and other communist bloc nations?

Yes	44.0
No	50.9
No answer	5.1

School Project Pays Tribute to American Soldiers in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, a wonderful group of kindergarten children in Orlando, Fla., in my congressional district, have paid what I consider a truly great tribute to our young American soldiers who now are fighting in far-off Vietnam.

Since I have been serving in Congress, I cannot remember an example, by any group of my constituents, of a keener awareness of a great national issue affecting the lives of all of us, the future of the Nation, and indeed of our world.

Those boys, thousands of miles from home, fighting their way through jungles in a strange land, must often wonder whether their sacrifices are being appreciated. Especially they must do so when they read of draft-card burnings, student protests, peace marches on Washington, and even some of the debate here in Congress.

As Memorial Day approaches, this is a time to remember and honor; for the end of the bitter conflict in Vietnam is not in sight. For the mothers and fathers, the wives and sweethearts, the families of those who are fighting, this is a sad and anxious time.

I now am in possession of an expression of faith and appreciation for all that every man in a U.S. uniform is doing in distant Asia. It comes from the hearts of a group of boys and girls, 4- and 5-years-old, who have been reading about sacrifices made in the past by brave Americans who are fighting and dying in the swamps and jungles of southeast Asia.

These pupils at Temple Israel Nursery-Kindergarten, 331 Cathcart Street, Orlando, have sent to me a large, bound booklet with pictures, prayers, and messages of cheer to be forwarded to our troops in Vietnam.

I wish each and every Member of this body could visit my office and see this moving and inspiring work by these pupils. It is unfortunate that it cannot be shared by all Americans.

I place two letters and a prayer from the booklet into the RECORD. The first gives a brief history of how this notable project developed and shows a good deal of keen insight by these pupils into the workings of democracy and freedom.

It is signed by Joyce Srour, director, and Teddy Meister, kindergarten teacher.

Second only to one's parents, teachers mold, shape, and build the character, personality, and motivation of young people. At no time of life is this of greater importance than in the formative preschool ages, in the nursery-kindergarten years.

Rabbi Morris Feldman and the teachers Joyce Srour and Teddy Meister, deserve the highest praise for motivating and guiding the children of the Temple Israel Nursery-Kindergarten in this most unusual and worthy school project. It is indeed an example of teaching in the finest tradition of this noble profession.

Means of communication and ability to travel are making our planet smaller with each passing day. The problems of all races and creeds are becoming intertwined and interrelated. No nation is too small or too remote not to be a potential source of trouble to the rest of the world and its peace and well being.

There is not the time or space, nor is it appropriate here, to relate the importance of the project of these schoolchildren to the commitment of this Nation to the preservation of peace in our troubled world. But there is an important relation. For the teachers of this school are motivating their pupils in an awareness of the commitment of this great Nation to the cause of freedom and the preservation of world peace.

I can think of no greater contribution that these teachers can make to these great goals of the United States.

I just wish we had hundreds of thousands of similar teachers in our schools everywhere throughout our land.

Temple Israel Nursery-Kindergarten has been in existence for 9 years. Our school is available to the children of members of our congregation, and is also open to any others who wish their children to attend.

During the year, our curriculum contains areas of study in science, art, literature, social studies, music, physical education, as well as a readiness program to prepare children for entering first grade.

During the month of February, one such study was in relation to Lincoln and Washington. We discussed how hard they had to work to keep our country free—and—of the Presidents coming after them who also had this same great task. Many of the children were quite aware of the struggle in Vietnam and told us about our servicemen fighting now. This lead to a comparison of similarities of history—that we have had to work at peace in the past, that we do it now in Vietnam, and will always have to defend it in the future. Several children brought newspaper photographs and articles, many others drew their own pictures of what they thought Vietnam was like. The children realized how hard the soldiers are working and fighting for us and wondered if we could do something for them. Several suggestions were made, and it was decided to send a book of bright happy pictures to cheer them up. This is the result of our work. We as teachers, are proud and delighted with our 4 and 5 year olds, and know that this has been a most rewarding and enriching experience for them.

The second letter is to our fightingmen from the children themselves and is accompanied by a prayer on the first page of the booklet.

ORLANDO, FLA.,
April 1966.

DEAR SERVICEMEN: We are only 4 and 5 years old, but our teachers have told us all about you and the wonderful job you are doing.

We know you are in Viet Nam to help the Vietnamese people be free. Just as other servicemen have done before, you are protecting us now. We learned that Freedom is our most important (gift) heritage. Ever since our Pilgrim fathers came to our country, we have fought to keep freedom, and help other nations keep theirs.

We hope our pictures will make the days happier for you. We want you to know how very proud we all are of you, and we pray that you will all come back home safe and sound very soon.

Here is our special prayer for you:

O God, May the time soon come when people in all the lands will live in peace, and will show the whole world the way you want men to live with one another.

O God, let there be peace. Be kind to our men in service. Help them to live happily. Amen.

The students who participated in this project are:

Barbara Albertson, Andrea Behn, Craig Coenson, Teddy Chira, Lisa Graham, Robin Grant, Ben Lefkowitz, Howard Levy, Elise Levy, Jeffrey Lieberman, Loretta Maslanick, Howard Meister, Aaron Oser, Robert Pasamanick, Bruce Roberts, Scott Roberts, Kyle Roth, Stephen Tresser, Roger Spitzer, Gregory Van Torne, Sharon Weinrauch, and Joshua Weinreich.

These pupils have several small photographs of their classroom activities and many very good paintings and drawings of their individual interpretation of the war in Vietnam.

There are many poignant reminders, throughout this touching salute to our servicemen, of the monumental struggle going on so far away in miles, so near to all of us in consequence.

I am sending this volume to the Department of Defense, asking that it be brought to the attention of Gen. William C. Westmoreland, who is doing such a fine job in leading our troops in Vietnam.

There can be no doubt that our servicemen who turn the pages of this booklet will be reminded and comforted that their countrymen of all ages, even the little children, are keenly aware of the great sacrifice and contribution our soldiers are making in behalf of our Nation and the peace of the world.

De-
be
am
a
m.
rv-
ok-
hat
the
the
ol-
on